

A possible statistics loophole in Bell's theorem

Andrea Aiello*

Max Planck Institute for the Science of Light, Staudtstrasse 2, 91058 Erlangen, Germany

(Dated: December 25, 2024)

Bell's theorem proves the incompatibility between quantum mechanics and local realistic hidden-variable theories. In this paper we first show that, contrary to a common belief, the theoretical proof of Bell's theorem is not affected by counterfactual reasoning. Second, we show that the experimental verification of this theorem may be affected by our unavoidable ignorance about the probability distribution of the hidden variables. Our study is based on the standard theory of random variables, and lays the groundwork for a critical rethinking of Bell's theorem and its consequences.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum mechanics is at the same time the most successful and the most debated theory in physics we have, still today more than one hundred years after its foundation. One of the reasons for this debate originated from the celebrated paper by Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen [1], where the authors discussed the possible incompleteness of quantum mechanics (QM), and the need to complete it by introducing additional variables, which later became known as hidden variables. The rest is well-known history and needs not be repeated here. We only point out that the turning point in that history was represented by the so-called Bell's theorem and its by-products [2]. In short, Bell proved that no local, realistic hidden-variable (HV) theory could describe the outcomes of certain correlation experiments with entangled particles [3, 4]. He was able to express his theorem in the form of an inequality that could be verified experimentally. Since then, many variants of such inequality have been derived [5], like the largely used CHSH (Clauser, Horne, Shimony et Holt) inequality [6]. More recently, Bell's theorem has made a comeback mainly due to its usage in the field of quantum information [7]. Despite these successes, Bell's theorem has not been free from criticisms [8–13], the most significant of which is perhaps the use of counterfactual reasoning [14].

The purpose of this work is twofold. First, we demonstrate that, in fact, there is no counterfactual reasoning in the proof of the CHSH inequality. Then, we show that any experimental verification of this inequality is inevitably affected by a loophole rooted in our ignorance about the statistical distribution of the hidden variables. The tools we use to obtain our results are simply basic quantum mechanics and random variable theory.

This paper is structured as follows. In Sec. II, we present a quick review of two-photon correlation experiments. Next, in Sec. III we show that counterfactual reasoning is not necessary to prove the CHSH inequality. In Sec. IV we calculate the actual upper bound of this inequality. Finally, in Sec. V, we draw our conclusions. Four appendixes reporting detailed calculations,

complete the paper.

II. A BRIEF REVIEW OF TWO-PHOTON CORRELATION EXPERIMENTS

Consider a light source that emits pairs of counter-propagating photons, say photon A and photon B , in the entangled state

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(|e_+^{(A)}\rangle \otimes |e_-^{(B)}\rangle - |e_-^{(A)}\rangle \otimes |e_+^{(B)}\rangle \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(|e_+^{(A)}, e_-^{(B)}\rangle - |e_-^{(A)}, e_+^{(B)}\rangle \right), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where the two vectors $|e_k^{(A)}\rangle$, ($k = \pm 1$), form a complete and orthonormal basis in the two-dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_A representing the polarization state of photon A . The same definitions hold, mutatis mutandis, for photon B . By definition, $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^{(A)} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{(B)}$, where \mathcal{H} is the four-dimensional Hilbert space of the pair of photons. Note that throughout this paper, when an index takes on the two values ± 1 , we write q_{\pm} as an abbreviation of $q_{\pm 1}$, for the generic quantity q_k , ($k = \pm 1$).

After being emitted, photons A and B propagate to Alice and Bob, respectively, who can test the linear polarization of the photons they receive, using rotatable polarization analyzers. Alice's analyzer has one input port, where the photons enter, and two output ports, labeled d_{A+} and d_{A-} , from which the photons can exit. If a photon exits the analyzer from d_{A+} , its polarization is described by the vector state

$$|\zeta_+^{(A)}(\alpha)\rangle = \cos \alpha |e_+^{(A)}\rangle + \sin \alpha |e_-^{(A)}\rangle, \quad (2)$$

where $\alpha \in [0, \pi)$ is the angle by which the analyzer is rotated. Conversely, when the photon exits from the port d_{A-} , its polarization is represented by the vector state

$$|\zeta_-^{(A)}(\alpha)\rangle = -\sin \alpha |e_+^{(A)}\rangle + \cos \alpha |e_-^{(A)}\rangle. \quad (3)$$

Again, the same definitions apply to photon B replacing everywhere A with B and α with β . Behind each of Alice and Bob's output ports of their analyzers there is a detector that fires when reached by a photon.

* andrea.aiello@mpl.mpg.de

In this context, the term “experiment” denotes the emission of a pair of photons by the light source, followed by the firing of a pair of Alice’s and Bob’s detectors. The possible outcomes of this experiment are given by the set Ω (sample space of the experiment), whose elements are all the ordered pairs $(d_{Ak}, d_{Bl}) := \omega_{kl}$, $(k, l = \pm 1)$, that is

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega &= \{(d_{A+}, d_{B+}), (d_{A+}, d_{B-}), \\ &\quad (d_{A-}, d_{B+}), (d_{A-}, d_{B-})\} \\ &:= \{\omega_{++}, \omega_{+-}, \omega_{-+}, \omega_{--}\}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $+$ and $-$ stand for $+1$ and -1 , respectively. We remark that each experiment, which we denote by E , is characterized by an ordered pair of angles (α, β) that describe the orientation of Alice and Bob’s analyzers respectively, hence we write $E = E(\alpha, \beta)$. Different pairs of angles characterize different experiments, so that $E(\alpha, \beta) \neq E(\alpha', \beta')$, when $(\alpha, \beta) \neq (\alpha', \beta')$.

Next, we define the two dichotomic random variables X and Y , as

$$X(\omega_{kl}) = k, \quad \text{and} \quad Y(\omega_{kl}) = l, \quad (5)$$

where $k, l = \pm 1$. By hypothesis, X and Y have respective probabilities

$$P(X = k) = p_k, \quad \text{and} \quad P(Y = l) = q_l, \quad (6)$$

with $0 \leq p_k, q_l \leq 1$, $(k, l = \pm 1)$. Their joint probabilities are the four nonnegative numbers

$$P(X = k, Y = l) = p_{kl}, \quad (7)$$

with

$$\sum_{k, l = \pm 1} p_{kl} = 1, \quad (8)$$

and

$$p_k = \sum_{l = \pm 1} p_{kl}, \quad q_l = \sum_{k = \pm 1} p_{kl}, \quad (k, l = \pm 1). \quad (9)$$

By definition, the four probabilities p_{kl} depends on the analyzers’ orientation angles α and β , that is

$$p_{kl} = p_{kl}(\alpha, \beta). \quad (10)$$

As shown in [15], for a pair of dichotomic random variables $X = \pm 1$ and $Y = \pm 1$, it is always possible to write

$$\begin{aligned} P(X = k, Y = l) \\ = \frac{1}{4} + k \frac{\mathbb{E}[X]}{4} + l \frac{\mathbb{E}[Y]}{4} + kl \frac{\mathbb{E}[XY]}{4}, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

with $k, l = \pm 1$, and here and hereafter $\mathbb{E}[U]$ denotes the expected value of the random variable U .

Since the vector state (1) is invariant with respect to rotations in the polarization space, whatever theory we use to calculate the probabilities $p_{kl}(\alpha, \beta)$, the marginal probabilities must satisfy $p_+ = p_- = 1/2$ and $q_+ = q_- = 1/2$. This implies that the random variables X and Y have zero mean,

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = 0 = \mathbb{E}[Y], \quad (12)$$

and unit variances,

$$\mathbb{E}[X^2] = 1 = \mathbb{E}[Y^2]. \quad (13)$$

Therefore, if we write the linear correlation coefficient between X and Y as,

$$C(\alpha, \beta) := \mathbb{E}[XY] = \sum_{k, l = \pm 1} kl p_{kl}(\alpha, \beta), \quad (14)$$

from (11-13) it follows that

$$p_{kl}(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{1}{4} + kl \frac{C(\alpha, \beta)}{4}. \quad (15)$$

This expression is valid irrespective of whatever theory we use to calculate $C(\alpha, \beta)$, either quantum mechanics or a hidden-variable theory. The only obvious constraint to $C(\alpha, \beta)$ is

$$-1 \leq C(\alpha, \beta) \leq 1. \quad (16)$$

For completeness, we also calculate the variance $\mathbb{V}[XY]$ of XY [16], as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}[XY] &= \mathbb{E}[X^2Y^2] - (\mathbb{E}[XY])^2 \\ &= 1 - C^2(\alpha, \beta). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The four probabilities p_{kl} can be estimated from the experimental data by repeating the experiment $N \gg 1$ times and using the frequency interpretation of probability [16]. Let N_{kl} , $(k, l = \pm 1)$ be the number of simultaneous clicks of the detectors behinds port d_{Ak} and d_{Bl} . Then we estimate

$$p_k \cong \frac{N_{k+} + N_{k-}}{N}, \quad q_l \cong \frac{N_{+l} + N_{-l}}{N}, \quad (18)$$

and

$$p_{kl} \cong \frac{N_{kl}}{N}, \quad (19)$$

with $N_{++} + N_{+-} + N_{-+} + N_{--} = N$. From (14) and (19) it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[XY] \cong \frac{N_{++} - N_{+-} - N_{-+} + N_{--}}{N}. \quad (20)$$

Alternatively, the correlation coefficient $\mathbb{E}[XY]$ can be calculated by using either *a*) quantum mechanics, or *b*) some hypothetical hidden-variable theories. Bell’s theorem [5] basically consists of comparing certain linear combinations of correlation coefficients calculated according to *a*) and *b*). A popular form of Bell’s theorem is the so-called CHSH’s inequality. It is often stated in textbooks that counterfactual reasoning is required to derive this inequality [14, 17]. In the next section we will show that this belief is unjustified.

III. THERE IS NOT COUNTERFACTUAL REASONING IN THE DERIVATION OF THE CHSH INEQUALITY

To obtain the CHSH inequality [6], we must run four distinct experiments, labeled $E_\mu(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu)$, with $\mu = 1, 2, 3, 4$, which are identical to the experiment $E(\alpha, \beta)$ described above, apart from the different orientations of Alice and Bob's polarization analyzers. Consequently, we need to define four distinct pairs of dichotomic random variables, say $(X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), (X_3, Y_3)$ and (X_4, Y_4) , which represent the outcomes of the experiments E_1, E_2, E_3 and E_4 , respectively.

Note that here and hereafter we will use a notation that is a natural generalization of the one previously established. However, to avoid possible ambiguities, we give the details of this notation in Appendix A.

A. General facts

As first step, we calculate the so-called Bell parameter $S = S(\alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta')$, defined by

$$\begin{aligned} S(\alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta') &= \mathbb{E}[X_1 Y_1] + \mathbb{E}[X_2 Y_2] + \mathbb{E}[X_3 Y_3] - \mathbb{E}[X_4 Y_4] \\ &= C(\alpha, \beta) + C(\alpha, \beta') + C(\alpha', \beta) - C(\alpha', \beta'), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where

$$C(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu) := \mathbb{E}[X_\mu Y_\mu] = \sum_{k, l = \pm 1} kl p_{kl}(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu), \quad (22)$$

with $\mu = 1, \dots, 4$, and

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha_1, \beta_1) &= (\alpha, \beta), \\ (\alpha_2, \beta_2) &= (\alpha, \beta'), \\ (\alpha_3, \beta_3) &= (\alpha', \beta), \\ (\alpha_4, \beta_4) &= (\alpha', \beta'). \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

The probability distribution $p_{kl}(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu)$ of the outcomes of the experiment $E_\mu(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu)$ can be calculated either using quantum mechanics, thus obtaining $p_{kl}^{\text{QM}}(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu)$, or local realistic hidden-variable theories which supposedly give $p_{kl}^{\text{HV}}(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu)$. What is important to remark here is that in both cases, since the four experiments E_1, \dots, E_4 are performed independently, the joint probability distribution of the eight random variables $X_1, Y_1, X_2, Y_2, X_3, Y_3, X_4, Y_4$, is given by the product of the individual distributions of the four experiments, viz.,

$$P(X_1 = k_1, Y_1 = l_1, X_2 = k_2, Y_2 = l_2, X_3 = k_3, Y_3 = l_3, X_4 = k_4, Y_4 = l_4) = \prod_{\mu=1}^4 p_{k_\mu l_\mu}(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu), \quad (24)$$

with $k_\mu, l_\mu = \pm 1$.

We can also write the Bell parameter $S(\alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta')$ in (21), as the expectation value of the single random variable T , defined by

$$T = X_1 Y_1 + X_2 Y_2 + X_3 Y_3 - X_4 Y_4. \quad (25)$$

Explicitly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S(\alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta') &= \mathbb{E}[X_1 Y_1] + \mathbb{E}[X_2 Y_2] + \mathbb{E}[X_3 Y_3] - \mathbb{E}[X_4 Y_4] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[X_1 Y_1 + X_2 Y_2 + X_3 Y_3 - X_4 Y_4] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[T]. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

From the definition (25), it follows that the random variable T may take only the five values,

$$T \rightarrow 0, \pm 2, \pm 4. \quad (27)$$

This means that if we run the four experiments just for a (small) finite number of times, we could achieve $|S(\alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta')| > 2$ with nonzero probability, even if the world were ruled by local realistic HV theories.

We can find the probability density function $f_T(t)$ of T using the random variable transformation theorem [18]. A straightforward calculation gives

$$f_T(t) = \sum_{n=0, \pm 2, \pm 4} p_n \delta(t - n), \quad (28)$$

where

$$p_n = \sum_{k_1, l_1 = \pm 1} \sum_{k_2, l_2 = \pm 1} \sum_{k_3, l_3 = \pm 1} \sum_{k_4, l_4 = \pm 1} p_{k_1 l_1}(\alpha, \beta) p_{k_2 l_2}(\alpha, \beta') p_{k_3 l_3}(\alpha', \beta) p_{k_4 l_4}(\alpha', \beta') \delta(n, k_1 l_1 + k_2 l_2 + k_3 l_3 - k_4 l_4), \quad (29)$$

with $\delta(i, j)$ denoting the Kronecker delta function

$$\delta(i, j) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \neq j, \\ 1 & \text{if } i = j. \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

In Eq. (29) the probabilities $p_{k_1 l_1}(\alpha, \beta), \dots, p_{k_4 l_4}(\alpha', \beta')$ are given by (15). The explicit values of the probabilities p_n are given in Appendix C. It is instructive to verify that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[T] &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} t f_T(t) dt \\ &= \sum_{n=0, \pm 2, \pm 4} n p_n \\ &= C(\alpha, \beta) + C(\alpha, \beta') + C(\alpha', \beta) - C(\alpha', \beta'). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Moreover, we can calculate the variance $\mathbb{V}[T]$ of T , obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}[T] &= \mathbb{E}[T^2] - \mathbb{E}[T]^2 \\ &= 4 - C^2(\alpha, \beta) - C^2(\alpha, \beta') \\ &\quad - C^2(\alpha', \beta) - C^2(\alpha', \beta'), \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

in agreement with (17). We remark that these expressions for $\mathbb{E}[t]$ and $\mathbb{V}[T]$ are valid for any correlation function $C(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu)$, either classical or quantum mechanical.

However, quantum mechanics and local realistic hidden-variable theories predict different values for the correlation functions $C(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu)$. Per each individual experiment $E_\mu(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu)$, quantum mechanics gives (see Appendix B for detailed calculation),

$$\begin{aligned} C^{\text{QM}}(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu) &= \sum_{k, l = \pm 1} kl p_{kl}^{\text{QM}}(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu) \\ &= -\cos[2(\alpha_\mu - \beta_\mu)], \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

while local realistic HV theories yield [3],

$$\begin{aligned} C^{\text{HV}}(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu) &= \sum_{k, l = \pm 1} kl p_{kl}^{\text{HV}}(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{D}} f_\Lambda(\lambda) a(\alpha_\mu, \lambda) b(\beta_\mu, \lambda) d\lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

In Eq. (34) $f_\Lambda(\lambda) := \rho(\lambda)$ denotes the probability density function of the random vector Λ , characterized by the domain \mathcal{S} and the range \mathcal{D} :

$$\Lambda : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}, \quad (35)$$

and normalized to

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}} \rho(\lambda) d\lambda = 1. \quad (36)$$

It is not necessary to specify how many components Λ has, nor whether they are discrete, continuous, or mixed. Following the common convention, here and in the following we will write Λ and λ as if they were continuous one-dimensional parameters. The two functions $a(\alpha_\mu, \lambda)$ and $b(\beta_\mu, \lambda)$, supposedly take only two values,

$$a(\alpha_\mu, \lambda) = \pm 1, \quad b(\beta_\mu, \lambda) = \pm 1, \quad (37)$$

and determine the results of the outcomes of the measurements performed by Alice and Bob, respectively. When a photon pair is emitted, the random variable Λ takes a specific value λ , and this fixes the either $+1$ or -1 values of $a(\alpha_\mu, \lambda)$ and $b(\beta_\mu, \lambda)$. At this point it is convenient to consider the angles $(\alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta')$ given and fixed, so that we can simplify the notation renaming

$$\begin{aligned} a(\alpha, \lambda) &= a(\lambda), \\ a(\alpha', \lambda) &= a'(\lambda), \\ b(\beta, \lambda) &= b(\lambda), \\ b(\beta', \lambda) &= b'(\lambda), \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{D}$. In the remainder we will use one or the other expressions according to convenience. These functions are what mathematicians call *simple functions* [19], that is measurable functions that takes only finitely many values. They can be written as,

$$\begin{aligned} a(\lambda) &= \sum_{k=\pm 1} k \chi_{\mathcal{A}_k}(\lambda), \\ a'(\lambda) &= \sum_{k=\pm 1} k \chi_{\mathcal{A}'_k}(\lambda), \\ b(\lambda) &= \sum_{l=\pm 1} l \chi_{\mathcal{B}_l}(\lambda), \\ b'(\lambda) &= \sum_{l=\pm 1} l \chi_{\mathcal{B}'_l}(\lambda), \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where $\chi_{\mathcal{F}}(x)$ denotes the indicator function of the set \mathcal{F} , defined by

$$\chi_{\mathcal{F}}(x) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{F}, \\ 0, & \text{if } x \notin \mathcal{F}. \end{cases} \quad (40)$$

Note that by definition

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcup_{k=\pm 1} \mathcal{A}_k &= \mathcal{D} = \bigcup_{k=\pm 1} \mathcal{A}'_k, \\ \bigcup_{l=\pm 1} \mathcal{B}_l &= \mathcal{D} = \bigcup_{l=\pm 1} \mathcal{B}'_l. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Then, from (34) and(39), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} C^{\text{HV}}(\alpha, \beta) &= \int_{\mathcal{D}} \rho(\lambda) a(\alpha, \lambda) b(\beta, \lambda) d\lambda \\ &= \sum_{k,l=\pm 1} kl \int_{\mathcal{D}} \rho(\lambda) \chi_{\mathcal{A}_k}(\lambda) \chi_{\mathcal{B}_l}(\lambda) d\lambda \\ &= \sum_{k,l=\pm 1} kl \int_{\mathcal{A}_k \cap \mathcal{B}_l} \rho(\lambda) d\lambda, \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

where we have used the following property of the indicator functions: $\chi_{\mathcal{F}}(x)\chi_{\mathcal{G}}(x) = \chi_{\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G}}(x)$. Comparing (42)

with the first line of (34), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} p_{kl}^{\text{HV}}(\alpha, \beta) &= \int_{\mathcal{A}_k \cap \mathcal{B}_l} \rho(\lambda) d\lambda, \\ p_{kl}^{\text{HV}}(\alpha, \beta') &= \int_{\mathcal{A}_k \cap \mathcal{B}'_l} \rho(\lambda) d\lambda, \\ p_{kl}^{\text{HV}}(\alpha', \beta) &= \int_{\mathcal{A}'_k \cap \mathcal{B}_l} \rho(\lambda) d\lambda, \\ p_{kl}^{\text{HV}}(\alpha', \beta') &= \int_{\mathcal{A}'_k \cap \mathcal{B}'_l} \rho(\lambda) d\lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

B. The CHSH inequality

Each distinct experiment $E_\mu(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu)$ is characterized by a different random vector Λ_μ , with $\mu = 1, 2, 3, 4$, and these four random vectors are *independent and identically distributed* according to the same probability density function $\rho(\lambda)$. Therefore, the joint probability density function of $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \Lambda_3, \Lambda_4$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\Lambda_1 \Lambda_2 \Lambda_3 \Lambda_4}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4) &= \prod_{\mu=1}^4 f_{\Lambda_\mu}(\lambda_\mu) \\ &= \prod_{\mu=1}^4 \rho(\lambda_\mu). \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Then, using (34) and (44), we can rewrite (21) as,

$$\begin{aligned} S(\alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta') &= C(\alpha, \beta) + C(\alpha, \beta') + C(\alpha', \beta) - C(\alpha', \beta') \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{D}^4} a(\alpha, \lambda_1) b(\beta, \lambda_1) \prod_{\mu=1}^4 f_{\Lambda_\mu}(\lambda_\mu) d\lambda_\mu + \int_{\mathcal{D}^4} a(\alpha, \lambda_2) b(\beta', \lambda_2) \prod_{\mu=1}^4 f_{\Lambda_\mu}(\lambda_\mu) d\lambda_\mu \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathcal{D}^4} a(\alpha', \lambda_3) b(\beta, \lambda_3) \prod_{\mu=1}^4 f_{\Lambda_\mu}(\lambda_\mu) d\lambda_\mu - \int_{\mathcal{D}^4} a(\alpha', \lambda_4) b(\beta', \lambda_4) \prod_{\mu=1}^4 f_{\Lambda_\mu}(\lambda_\mu) d\lambda_\mu, \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \int_{\mathcal{D}} a(\lambda_1) b(\lambda_1) \rho(\lambda_1) d\lambda_1 + \int_{\mathcal{D}} a(\lambda_2) b'(\lambda_2) \rho(\lambda_2) d\lambda_2 \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathcal{D}} a'(\lambda_3) b(\lambda_3) \rho(\lambda_3) d\lambda_3 - \int_{\mathcal{D}} a'(\lambda_4) b'(\lambda_4) \rho(\lambda_4) d\lambda_4, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

$$= \int_{\mathcal{D}} \rho(\lambda) [a(\lambda)b(\lambda) + a(\lambda)b'(\lambda) + a'(\lambda)b(\lambda) - a'(\lambda)b'(\lambda)] d\lambda. \quad (47)$$

There is a reason why we wrote this equation in three detailed steps, as we will soon see.

It is easy to show that the quantity

$$\begin{aligned} M(\lambda) &= a(\lambda)b(\lambda) + a(\lambda)b'(\lambda) \\ &\quad + a'(\lambda)b(\lambda) - a'(\lambda)b'(\lambda), \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

satisfies

$$M(\lambda) = \pm 2. \quad (49)$$

To this end, it suffice to rewrite $M(\lambda)$ as,

$$M(\lambda) = (a + a')b + (a - a')b'. \quad (50)$$

Clearly, if $a + a' = 0$, then $a - a' = \pm 2$; and if $a - a' = 0$, then $a + a' = \pm 2$. This implies $M(\lambda) = \pm 2$. Therefore, from (47) it follows that

$$|S(\alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta')| \leq \int_{\mathcal{D}} \rho(\lambda) |M(\lambda)| \leq 2. \quad (51)$$

This is the celebrated CHSH inequality. It is not difficult to see that this demonstration remains perfectly valid if we replace the four functions a, a', b, b' , with their expressions (39), so that the concerns expressed by Cetto and coworkers [11], about the partitions (41) of the range \mathcal{D} of the random parameters Λ , are unfounded.

It has been argued that the quantity $M(\lambda)$ actually does not exist and that counterfactual reasoning is involved. For example, Peres wrote:

“There is no doubt that counterfactual reasoning is involved: the four numbers a, b, c, d , [a, b, a', b' in this work] cannot be simultaneously known. The first observer can measure either a or c , but not both; the second one—either b or d . Therefore Eq. (6.29) [Eq. (49) in this work] involves at least two numbers which do not correspond to any tangible data, and it cannot be experimentally verified.”

(Quoted and adapted from section **6-4** in Ref. [14]). Similarly, Cohen-Tannoudji and coauthors, wrote that,

“[...] one must then consider that it is meaningless to attribute four well defined values A, A', B, B' [a, a', b, b' in this work] to each pair. Since only a maximum of two of them can be measured in a given experiment, we should not be able to talk about these four numbers or argue about them even as unknown quantities.”

(Quoted and adapted from section **F-3-b** in Ref. [17]).

Despite these latter two statements, it is clear that in our detailed derivation (47) we did not make use of quantities that could not be measured. We started from the results of four *independent* experiments in (45), and derived the CHSH inequality from there. Therefore, in our calculations we have not exploited counterfactual reasonings. So, where does the contradiction arise from? The reason underlying this conflict is the linearity of the expectation value of a random variable [20] or, equivalently in this case, the linearity of integration [21]. In our derivation we used such linearity to write

$$S = S(\alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta'), \text{ as}$$

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \int_{\mathcal{D}^4} ab + \int_{\mathcal{D}^4} ab' + \int_{\mathcal{D}^4} a'b - \int_{\mathcal{D}^4} a'b' \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{D}} ab + \int_{\mathcal{D}} ab' + \int_{\mathcal{D}} a'b - \int_{\mathcal{D}} a'b' \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{D}} (ab + ab' + a'b - a'b'). \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

From this equation it is clear that the quantity $ab + ab' + a'b - a'b'$ does not need to represent a physically measurable quantity, it is just the result of a formal mathematical manipulation that we performed to pass from (46) to (47). However, in the traditional derivations of the CHSH inequality presented in many textbooks and articles, such linearity is used in reversed manner, that is they first calculate $M(\lambda) = a(\lambda)b(\lambda) + a(\lambda)b'(\lambda) + a'(\lambda)b(\lambda) - a'(\lambda)b'(\lambda)$, which is *physically not measurable*, and then evaluate the average

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \int_{\mathcal{D}} (ab + ab' + a'b - a'b') \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{D}} ab + \int_{\mathcal{D}} ab' + \int_{\mathcal{D}} a'b - \int_{\mathcal{D}} a'b'. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Note the different domain of integration in the first line of (52) and the last line of (53). We have thus demonstrated that contrary to common belief, there is no need to use counterfactual reasoning to derive the CHSH inequality. This is our first main result.

In the next section we will show that, however, the inequality (51) cannot be used for comparison with the results of real-world experiments. Before doing so, we would like to point out that the linearity discussed above was questioned by Czachor, who showed that some models of HV theories could violate it [13]. Moreover, a proposal has recently been made to measure $M(\lambda)$ on a single entangled photon pair [22].

IV. ACTUAL BOUNDS ON THE SAMPLE MEAN OF THE BELL OPERATOR S

Let us consider the individual experiment $E_{\mu}(\alpha_{\mu}, \beta_{\mu})$, with $\mu = 1, 2, 3, 4$. To perform it, Alice and Bob rotate their polarization analyzers along the angles α_{μ} and β_{μ} , respectively, and repeat the experiment a large number N of times. According to HV theories, at each photon pair emission, the random vector Λ_{μ} takes a specific but random value, say $\lambda_{\mu, n}$, ($n = 1, \dots, N$), so that the N repetitions of the experiment $E_{\mu}(\alpha_{\mu}, \beta_{\mu})$ are characterized by the list of N values

$$\{\lambda_{\mu, 1}, \lambda_{\mu, 2}, \dots, \lambda_{\mu, N}\}. \quad (54)$$

Let $N_{\mu,kl}$, ($k, l = \pm 1$) be the number of simultaneous clicks of Alice and Bob's detectors behinds port $d_{A_\mu k}$ and $d_{B_\mu l}$, respectively. Then, at the end of the day Alice and Bob measure the following correlation between the outcomes of their measurements,

$$\mathbb{E}[X_\mu Y_\mu] \cong \frac{N_{\mu,++} - N_{\mu,+ -} - N_{\mu,- +} + N_{\mu,--}}{N}. \quad (55)$$

This correlation would be equal, if an HV theory were valid, to

$$C_N^{\text{HV}}(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N a(\alpha_\mu, \lambda_{\mu,n}) b(\beta_\mu, \lambda_{\mu,n}), \quad (56)$$

where the subscript N reminds that this is a finite version of (34). In more technical terms, $C_N^{\text{HV}}(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu)$ is the *sample covariance* of the random variables $a(\alpha_\mu, \lambda_{\mu,n})$ and $b(\beta_\mu, \lambda_{\mu,n})$ [16].

Now, suppose to have performed N times the four experiments E_1, \dots, E_4 , thus obtaining an estimate S_N of the value of the Bell parameter S . According to HV theories, S_N would be given by [10],

$$\begin{aligned} S_N &= C_N^{\text{HV}}(\alpha, \beta) + C_N^{\text{HV}}(\alpha, \beta') + C_N^{\text{HV}}(\alpha', \beta) - C_N^{\text{HV}}(\alpha', \beta') \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \left[a(\lambda_{1,n}) b(\lambda_{1,n}) + a(\lambda_{2,n}) b'(\lambda_{2,n}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + a'(\lambda_{3,n}) b(\lambda_{3,n}) - a'(\lambda_{4,n}) b'(\lambda_{4,n}) \right] \\ &:= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N M_n, \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

where we have defined $M_n = M_n(\lambda_{1,n}, \lambda_{2,n}, \lambda_{3,n}, \lambda_{4,n})$, as

$$\begin{aligned} M_n &:= a(\lambda_{1,n}) b(\lambda_{1,n}) + a(\lambda_{2,n}) b'(\lambda_{2,n}) \\ &\quad + a'(\lambda_{3,n}) b(\lambda_{3,n}) - a'(\lambda_{4,n}) b'(\lambda_{4,n}), \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

The difference between M_n in (58) and $M(\lambda)$ in (47), is that while $M(\lambda)$ depends on a *single* set of values λ , M_n depends on the *four* set of values $\lambda_{1,n}, \lambda_{2,n}, \lambda_{3,n}$ and $\lambda_{4,n}$. Since the latter are independent numbers sampled from the same probability distribution $\rho(\lambda)$, we have that

$$\min M_n = -4, \quad \text{and} \quad \max M_n = 4. \quad (59)$$

Therefore, one could be tempted to state that $|S_N| \leq 4$, thus contradicting $|S| \leq 2$ in (51). However, this conclusion would not be correct, as we are going to show now.

A. Actual upper bound of S_N

Let us analyze the problem from a practical point of view, considering only the measured data at our disposal [2, 23–26]. To measure S_N we must perform $4N$ experiments, that is we must generate $4N$ distinct photon pairs. After we had ran the experiment $4N$ times using different polarization analyzers settings for Alice and Bob, at the end of the day we got an array of $4N$ values, say V_N , given by

$$V_N = \frac{1}{N} \begin{bmatrix} x_{1,1} y_{1,1} & x_{2,1} y_{2,1} & x_{3,1} y_{3,1} & x_{4,1} y_{4,1} \\ x_{1,2} y_{1,2} & x_{2,2} y_{2,2} & x_{3,2} y_{3,2} & x_{4,2} y_{4,2} \\ x_{1,3} y_{1,3} & x_{2,3} y_{2,3} & x_{3,3} y_{3,3} & x_{4,3} y_{4,3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ x_{1,N} y_{1,N} & x_{2,N} y_{2,N} & x_{3,N} y_{3,N} & x_{4,N} y_{4,N} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (60)$$

where $x_{\mu,n} = \pm 1$ and $y_{\mu,n} = \pm 1$ are the values taken by the random variables X_μ and Y_μ , respectively, in the n^{th} repetition of the experiment E_μ , with $\mu = 1, 2, 3, 4$, and $n = 1, \dots, N$. The sum of the elements of the μ^{th} column gives, by definition, an estimate of the correlation coefficient $\mathbb{E}[X_\mu Y_\mu]$:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N x_{\mu,n} y_{\mu,n} \cong \mathbb{E}[X_\mu Y_\mu]. \quad (61)$$

According to (56), if an HV theory were valid, the same matrix V_N would be given by,

$$V_N^{\text{HV}} = \frac{1}{N} \begin{bmatrix} a(\lambda_{1,1})b(\lambda_{1,1}) & a(\lambda_{2,1})b'(\lambda_{2,1}) & a'(\lambda_{3,1})b(\lambda_{3,1}) & a'(\lambda_{4,1})b'(\lambda_{4,1}) \\ a(\lambda_{1,2})b(\lambda_{1,2}) & a(\lambda_{2,2})b'(\lambda_{2,2}) & a'(\lambda_{3,2})b(\lambda_{3,2}) & a'(\lambda_{4,2})b'(\lambda_{4,2}) \\ a(\lambda_{1,3})b(\lambda_{1,3}) & a(\lambda_{2,3})b'(\lambda_{2,3}) & a'(\lambda_{3,3})b(\lambda_{3,3}) & a'(\lambda_{4,3})b'(\lambda_{4,3}) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ a(\lambda_{1,N})b(\lambda_{1,N}) & a(\lambda_{2,N})b'(\lambda_{2,N}) & a'(\lambda_{3,N})b(\lambda_{3,N}) & a'(\lambda_{4,N})b'(\lambda_{4,N}) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (62)$$

By definition, the elements of the $N \times 4$ matrix V_N^{HV} are equal to either $+1$ or -1 , and given by the corresponding elements of V_N in (60). If we sum the μ^{th} column of V_N^{HV} , we obtain the correlation function (56). Clearly,

rearranging the order of the elements in each column will not alter the value of such correlation function. So, we can exploit this freedom to recast V_N^{HV} in the new matrix W_N^{HV} , defined by

$$W_N^{\text{HV}} = \frac{1}{N} \begin{bmatrix} a(\lambda_{1,1})b(\lambda_{1,1}) & a(\lambda_{2,s_1})b'(\lambda_{2,s_1}) & a'(\lambda_{3,t_1})b(\lambda_{3,t_1}) & a'(\lambda_{4,f_1})b'(\lambda_{4,f_1}) \\ a(\lambda_{1,2})b(\lambda_{1,2}) & a(\lambda_{2,s_2})b'(\lambda_{2,s_2}) & a'(\lambda_{3,t_2})b(\lambda_{3,t_2}) & a'(\lambda_{4,f_2})b'(\lambda_{4,f_2}) \\ a(\lambda_{1,3})b(\lambda_{1,3}) & a(\lambda_{2,s_3})b'(\lambda_{2,s_3}) & a'(\lambda_{3,t_3})b(\lambda_{3,t_3}) & a'(\lambda_{4,f_3})b'(\lambda_{4,f_3}) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ a(\lambda_{1,N})b(\lambda_{1,N}) & a(\lambda_{2,s_N})b'(\lambda_{2,s_N}) & a'(\lambda_{3,t_N})b(\lambda_{3,t_N}) & a'(\lambda_{4,f_N})b'(\lambda_{4,f_N}) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (63)$$

This matrix has been built in such a way that at least in the first $M' \leq N$ rows we have

$$\lambda_{1,n} \approx \lambda_{2,s_n} \approx \lambda_{3,t_n} \approx \lambda_{4,f_n}, \quad (64)$$

for all $n = 1, \dots, M'$. This assumption presupposes that a notion of distance $\|\lambda - \lambda'\|$ between any two points λ and λ' in \mathcal{D} , could be introduced. Clearly, it would be meaningless to be more rigorous about this assumption since the procedure we are illustrating is purely hypothetical, in the sense that it cannot be materially performed since we are completely ignorant about the parameters λ and their distribution $\rho(\lambda)$. What matters is that this procedure *could be performed* if we had a detailed hidden-variable theory.

Now, let us suppose that in addition to the condition (64), there are $M \leq M' \leq N$ rows of W_N^{HV} , such that the random parameters λ s are close enough to yield

$$\begin{aligned} a(\lambda_{2,s_n}) &= a(\lambda_{1,n}), \\ \text{AND } b(\lambda_{3,t_n}) &= b(\lambda_{1,n}), \\ \text{AND } a'(\lambda_{4,f_n}) &= a'(\lambda_{3,t_n}) = a'(\lambda_{1,n}), \\ \text{AND } b'(\lambda_{4,f_n}) &= b'(\lambda_{2,s_n}) = b'(\lambda_{1,n}). \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

In this case we would be able to split the sum in (57) in

two parts, as follows:

$$S_N = \frac{M}{N} S_N^{(1)} + \frac{N-M}{N} S_N^{(2)}, \quad (66)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S_N^{(1)} &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left[a(\lambda_m)b(\lambda_m) + a(\lambda_m)b'(\lambda_m) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + a'(\lambda_m)b(\lambda_m) - a'(\lambda_m)b'(\lambda_m) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} S_N^{(2)} &= \frac{1}{N-M} \sum_{k=1}^{N-M} \left[a(\lambda_k)b(\lambda_k) + a(\lambda'_k)b'(\lambda'_k) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + a'(\lambda''_k)b(\lambda''_k) - a'(\lambda'''_k)b'(\lambda'''_k) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

Clearly, for $S_N^{(1)}$ we have that

$$|S_N^{(1)}| \leq 2. \quad (69)$$

However, since $\lambda_k, \lambda'_k, \lambda''_k, \lambda'''_k$ are four independent values sampled from the same probability distribution $\rho(\lambda)$, we also have that

$$|S_N^{(2)}| \leq 4. \quad (70)$$

Therefore, from (66-70) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |S_N| &\leq \frac{M}{N} |S_N^{(1)}| + \frac{N-M}{N} |S_N^{(2)}| \\ &\leq 2 \frac{M}{N} + 4 \frac{N-M}{N} = 4 - 2 \frac{M}{N}. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

From the law of large numbers [27], we expect that (in a probabilistic sense),

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} S_N = S. \quad (72)$$

Therefore, from (71) it follows that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} M = N, \quad (73)$$

so that $4 - 2M/N \rightarrow 2$ in (71), and we recover the theoretical form (51) of the CHSH inequality. It is interesting to remark that Eq. (71) implies that we get $|S_N| > 2$, whenever $M < N$, and we obtain $|S_N| > 2\sqrt{2}$, whenever $M < (2 - \sqrt{2})N \approx 0.6N$.

1. Discussion

The emission of photon pairs by the source of light in a two-photon correlation experiment naturally occurs a discrete number of times, and the number N of times an experiment can be repeated is necessarily finite. So, if we want a realistic comparison between the predictions of quantum mechanics and those of a hypothetical local realistic hidden-variable theory, we have to take this fact into account. This implies that the actual limit imposed by HV theories on the Bell parameter is not

$$|S| \leq 2, \quad (74)$$

but rather

$$|S_N| \leq 4 - 2 \frac{M}{N}, \quad (75)$$

where the right side of this equation can be any real number between 2 and 4, depending on the value of $M = M(N)$. However, there is *no way* to determine the value of the right-hand side of (75) from theory alone.

It is important to emphasize that if we were knowledgeable about hidden variable models, that is, if we knew the nature of the parameters λ , their distribution $\rho(\lambda)$ and the two functions $a(\alpha, \lambda)$ and $b(\beta, \lambda)$, then the statistical analysis described above would not be purely hypothetical, but would be completely analogous to what is routinely done when using a sample of experimental data to make inferences about a probabilistic model. The key problem is that we are inevitably ignorant of such models. This is the second main result of this paper.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, we have demonstrated two things in this paper. First, no counterfactual reasoning is required to prove the CHSH inequality. Second, the upper bound of this inequality can be greater than 2, depending on the rapidity of the convergence of the limit $M \rightarrow N$. The numerical value of this bound though is not computable because of our unavoidable ignorance about the probability distribution of the hidden variables. Because of the relevance of Bell's theorem in practical applications of quantum mechanics, such as quantum computing or quantum cryptography, we believe that these results have the potential to open up new avenues on this important topic.

Appendix A: Notation

In this appendix we describe in great detail some notation used in the main text, in order to avoid possible ambiguities. First we introduce the notation suitable for the description of an individual experiment, and then we extend it to the case of four independent experiments.

1. Single experiment

The set of four *independent* experiments $E_\mu(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu)$, ($\mu = 1, \dots, 4$), is described by quantum mechanics as follows. In each individual experiment the physical system of interest is the pair of photons, called A_μ and B_μ , emitted by the light source. They are characterized by two independent degrees of freedom: the polarization and the path of propagation, all the other degrees of freedom being the same. Let us associate the standard bases $\{|e_+^{(A_\mu)}\rangle, |e_-^{(A_\mu)}\rangle\}$ and $\{|e_+^{(B_\mu)}\rangle, |e_-^{(B_\mu)}\rangle\}$, to two orthogonal states of linear polarization of photons A_μ and B_μ , respectively. By hypothesis, these photons are entangled with respect to the polarization degrees of freedom and each pair can be described by the state vector $|\psi_\mu\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_\mu = \mathcal{H}^{(A_\mu)} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{(B_\mu)}$, defined by

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_\mu\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|e_+^{(A_\mu)}\rangle \otimes |e_-^{(B_\mu)}\rangle - |e_-^{(A_\mu)}\rangle \otimes |e_+^{(B_\mu)}\rangle) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|e_+^{(A_\mu)}, e_-^{(B_\mu)}\rangle - |e_-^{(A_\mu)}, e_+^{(B_\mu)}\rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (A1)$$

Next, suppose that in the experiment E_μ , Alice and Bob test the linear polarization state of their photons, using polarizers which can be rotated by the angles α_μ and β_μ around the direction of propagation of photons A_μ and B_μ , respectively. Each polarizer has two output ports, labeled $d_{A_\mu+}, d_{A_\mu-}$ for Alice and $d_{B_\mu+}, d_{B_\mu-}$ for Bob. Photons exiting port $d_{A_\mu+}$ ($d_{B_\mu+}$) are linearly polarized along the direction given by the angle α_μ (β_μ) of the rotated polarizer, and photons exiting port $d_{A_\mu-}$ ($d_{B_\mu-}$) are polarized orthogonally to α_μ (β_μ).

Let $Z^{(A_\mu)}(\alpha_\mu)$ be an observable that takes the values $+1$ or -1 , depending on whether the photon exits from port $d_{A_\mu+}$ or port $d_{A_\mu-}$ of Alice's polarizer. Similarly, $Z^{(B_\mu)}(\beta_\mu)$ is an observable taking the values $+1$ or -1 , depending on whether the photon exits from port $d_{B_\mu+}$ or port $d_{B_\mu-}$ of Bob's polarizer. These two observables can be represented by the Hermitian operators $\hat{Z}^{(A_\mu)}(\alpha_\mu) \in \mathcal{H}^{(A_\mu)}$ and $\hat{Z}^{(B_\mu)}(\beta_\mu) \in \mathcal{H}^{(B_\mu)}$, which are defined by

$$\hat{Z}^{(F)}(\phi) := |\zeta_+^{(F)}(\phi)\rangle\langle\zeta_+^{(F)}(\phi)| - |\zeta_-^{(F)}(\phi)\rangle\langle\zeta_-^{(F)}(\phi)|, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} |\zeta_+^{(F)}(\phi)\rangle &= \cos\phi|e_+^{(F)}\rangle + \sin\phi|e_-^{(F)}\rangle, \\ |\zeta_-^{(F)}(\phi)\rangle &= -\sin\phi|e_+^{(F)}\rangle + \cos\phi|e_-^{(F)}\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A3})$$

with $|\zeta_\pm^{(F)}(0)\rangle = |e_\pm^{(F)}\rangle$, and $(F, \phi) = (A_\mu, \alpha_\mu)$, or $(F, \phi) = (B_\mu, \beta_\mu)$. By definition,

$$\hat{Z}^{(F)}(\phi)|\zeta_\pm^{(F)}(\phi)\rangle = \pm|\zeta_\pm^{(F)}(\phi)\rangle. \quad (\text{A4})$$

The two-photon Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_μ is spanned by the basis vectors $|k_\mu, l_\mu\rangle$, defined by

$$|k_\mu, l_\mu\rangle := |\zeta_{k_\mu}^{(A_\mu)}(\alpha_\mu)\rangle \otimes |\zeta_{l_\mu}^{(B_\mu)}(\beta_\mu)\rangle. \quad (\text{A5})$$

By definition, these vectors form an orthonormal and complete basis in the space \mathcal{H}_μ , that is

$$\begin{aligned} \langle k_\mu, l_\mu | k_\nu, l_\nu \rangle &= \delta(k_\mu, k_\nu)\delta(l_\mu, l_\nu), \\ \sum_{k_\mu, l_\mu = \pm 1} |k_\mu, l_\mu\rangle\langle k_\mu, l_\mu| &= \hat{I}_\mu, \quad (\mu, \nu = 1, \dots, 4), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6})$$

where $\hat{I}_\mu \in \mathcal{H}_\mu$ is the identity operator, and $\delta(i, j)$ denotes the Kronecker delta function defined by

$$\delta(i, j) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \neq j, \\ 1 & \text{if } i = j. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A7})$$

It is convenient to extend $\hat{Z}^{(A_\mu)}(\alpha_\mu)$ and $\hat{Z}^{(B_\mu)}(\beta_\mu)$ to the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_μ , by defining

$$\hat{X}_\mu(\alpha_\mu) := \hat{Z}^{(A_\mu)}(\alpha_\mu) \otimes \hat{I}^{(B_\mu)}, \quad (\text{A8a})$$

$$\hat{Y}_\mu(\beta_\mu) := \hat{I}^{(A_\mu)} \otimes \hat{Z}^{(B_\mu)}(\beta_\mu). \quad (\text{A8b})$$

From (A4) and (A5), it follows that

$$\hat{X}_\mu(\alpha_\mu)|k_\mu, l_\mu\rangle = k_\mu|k_\mu, l_\mu\rangle, \quad (\text{A9a})$$

$$\hat{Y}_\mu(\beta_\mu)|k_\mu, l_\mu\rangle = l_\mu|k_\mu, l_\mu\rangle, \quad (\text{A9b})$$

where $k_\mu, l_\mu = \pm 1$. Moreover, we remark that

$$[\hat{X}_\mu(\alpha_\mu), \hat{Y}_\mu(\beta_\mu)] = 0, \quad (\text{A10})$$

for all angles α_μ and β_μ . From a physical point of view, this simple relation has a very important meaning: the measurements performed on photons A_μ and B_μ are independent of each other. In other words, any polarization test made by Alice has not influence on any other polarization measurement made by Bob, and vice versa, regardless of the state of the two photons. There is no room for further discussion on this point, as also made clear in Sec. 7 of Ref. [28].

Consider now the result of a measurement of the correlation between the values assumed by the observables $\hat{Z}^{(A_\mu)}(\alpha_\mu)$ and $\hat{Z}^{(B_\mu)}(\beta_\mu)$ in a single run of the experiment E_μ . Such correlation is quantified by the expectation value of the correlation operator

$$\hat{C}_\mu(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu) := \hat{X}_\mu(\alpha_\mu)\hat{Y}_\mu(\beta_\mu) \in \mathcal{H}_\mu, \quad (\text{A11})$$

with respect the state $|\psi_\mu\rangle$. By construction,

$$\hat{C}_\mu(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu)|k_\mu, l_\mu\rangle = k_\mu l_\mu|k_\mu, l_\mu\rangle, \quad (k_\mu, l_\mu = \pm 1). \quad (\text{A12})$$

2. Four experiments

Consider now the four *independent* experiments $E_1 - E_4$ together. Each of the four sources emits a pair of photons in the state $|\psi_\mu\rangle$, so that the overall four-pair state is given by

$$|\Psi\rangle = |\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\psi_2\rangle \otimes |\psi_3\rangle \otimes |\psi_4\rangle \in \mathcal{H}, \quad (\text{A13})$$

where

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_3 \otimes \mathcal{H}_4. \quad (\text{A14})$$

The Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is spanned by the 256 basis vectors

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \bigotimes_{\mu=1}^4 |k_\mu, l_\mu\rangle \right\} &= \left\{ |k_1, l_1\rangle |k_2, l_2\rangle |k_3, l_3\rangle |k_4, l_4\rangle \right\} \\ &:= \left\{ |K, L\rangle \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A15})$$

with $k_1, l_1, \dots, k_4, l_4 = \pm 1$. From (A6) it follows that these vectors form an orthonormal and complete basis in the space \mathcal{H} , that is

$$\begin{aligned} \langle K, L | K', L' \rangle &= \delta(K, K')\delta(L, L'), \\ \sum_{K, L} |K, L\rangle\langle K, L| &= \hat{I}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A16})$$

where $\hat{I} \in \mathcal{H}$ is the identity operator,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{I} &= \bigotimes_{\mu=1}^4 \hat{I}_\mu \\ &= \bigotimes_{\mu=1}^4 \left\{ \sum_{k_\mu, l_\mu = \pm 1} |k_\mu, l_\mu\rangle\langle k_\mu, l_\mu| \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A17})$$

and $\delta(K, K')\delta(L, L')$ is a shorthand for

$$\delta(K, K')\delta(L, L') = \prod_{\mu=1}^4 \delta(k_\mu, k'_\mu)\delta(l_\mu, l'_\mu). \quad (\text{A18})$$

Next, using (A11) we define the ‘‘Bell operator’’ \hat{T} , as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{T} &:= \hat{C}_1(\alpha, \beta) \otimes \hat{I}_2 \otimes \hat{I}_3 \otimes \hat{I}_4 \\ &\quad + \hat{I}_1 \otimes \hat{C}_2(\alpha, \beta') \otimes \hat{I}_3 \otimes \hat{I}_4 \\ &\quad + \hat{I}_1 \otimes \hat{I}_2 \otimes \hat{C}_3(\alpha', \beta) \otimes \hat{I}_4 \\ &\quad + \hat{I}_1 \otimes \hat{I}_2 \otimes \hat{I}_3 \otimes \hat{C}_4(\alpha', \beta') \\ &:= \hat{T}_1 + \hat{T}_2 + \hat{T}_3 - \hat{T}_4. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A19})$$

From (A12, A15) and (A19), it follows that

$$\hat{T}_\nu |K, L\rangle = k_\nu l_\nu |K, L\rangle, \quad (\text{A20})$$

with $\nu = 1, \dots, 4$, which implies

$$\hat{T} |K, L\rangle = (k_1 l_1 + k_2 l_2 + k_3 l_3 - k_4 l_4) |K, L\rangle. \quad (\text{A21})$$

Since

$$k_1 l_1 + k_2 l_2 + k_3 l_3 - k_4 l_4 = 0, \pm 2, \pm 4, \quad (\text{A22})$$

when $k_1, l_1, \dots, k_4, l_4 = \pm 1$, then \hat{T} possesses only 5 distinct eigenvalues, multiply degenerate. Specifically, the degree of degeneracy g is given by,

$$g[\pm 4] = 16, \quad g[\pm 2] = 64, \quad g[0] = 96. \quad (\text{A23})$$

The detailed random variable T representation of the operator \hat{T} with respect to the vector state $|\Psi\rangle$, will be given in Appendix D, here we report only the main formulas. The expectation value of T is given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[T] &= -\cos[2(\alpha - \beta)] - \cos[2(\alpha - \beta')] \\ &\quad - \cos[2(\alpha' - \beta)] + \cos[2(\alpha' - \beta')], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A24})$$

as it should be. The variance of T is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}[T] &= \mathbb{E}[(T - \mathbb{E}[T])^2] \\ &= 2 - \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \cos[4(\alpha - \beta)] + \cos[4(\alpha - \beta')] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \cos[4(\alpha' - \beta)] + \cos[4(\alpha' - \beta')] \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A25})$$

in agreement with (32).

Appendix B: QM probability distributions

In this Appendix we calculate explicitly the probability distribution $p_{kl}^{\text{QM}}(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu)$ that we have introduced in Sec. III. However, first we provide for a short recap of some formulas from random variables theory, which we will need later.

1. Short recap of random variables theory formulas

We briefly recall that from von Neumann’s spectral theorem [29, 30], it follows that given a self-adjoint operator \hat{X} and a normalized state vector $|\psi\rangle$, there is a unique random variable X associated with \hat{X} and $|\psi\rangle$, which is distributed according to the probability density function $f_X^{|\psi\rangle}(x)$ defined by,

$$f_X^{|\psi\rangle}(x) = \langle \psi | \delta(x\hat{I} - \hat{X}) | \psi \rangle, \quad (\text{B1})$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is one of the values assumed by X when an experiment is performed (see, e.g., sec. 3-1-2 in [31], and problem 4.3 in [32]). When \hat{X} possesses a discrete spectrum, that is $\hat{X}|x_n\rangle = x_n|x_n\rangle$, with $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then (54) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} f_X^{|\psi\rangle}(x) &= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \delta(x - x_n) |\langle x_n | \psi \rangle|^2 \\ &:= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \delta(x - x_n) p_n, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B2})$$

where $p_n = |\langle x_n | \psi \rangle|^2$, is the so-called probability mass function of the random variable X .

Thus, we write $X \sim f_X^{|\psi\rangle}(x)$, and we can calculate the expectation value of any regular function $F(\hat{X})$ of \hat{X} with respect to $|\psi\rangle$, either as $\langle F(\hat{X}) \rangle_\psi = \langle \psi | F(\hat{X}) | \psi \rangle$, or as $\langle F(\hat{X}) \rangle_\psi = \mathbb{E}[F(X)]$, where $\mathbb{E}[F(X)]$ denotes the expected value of the random variable $F(X)$, calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[F(X)] &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} F(x) f_X^{|\psi\rangle}(x) dx \\ &= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} F(x_n) p_n, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B3})$$

where the equation in the second line applies when \hat{X} has a discrete spectrum with eigenvalues x_n .

2. Calculation of $p_{k_\mu l_\mu}^{\text{QM}}(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu)$

From (A8) and (B1), it follows that given the operators $\hat{X}_\mu(\alpha_\mu)$ and $\hat{Y}_\mu(\beta_\mu)$, and given the vector state $|\psi_\mu\rangle$, we can define the two random variables X_μ and Y_μ , distributed according to

$$X_\mu \sim f_{X_\mu}^{|\psi_\mu\rangle}(x), \quad \text{and} \quad Y_\mu \sim f_{Y_\mu}^{|\psi_\mu\rangle}(y), \quad (\text{B4})$$

where

$$f_{X_\mu}^{|\psi_\mu\rangle}(x) = \langle \psi_\mu | \delta(x\hat{I}_\mu - \hat{X}_\mu(\alpha_\mu)) | \psi_\mu \rangle, \quad (\text{B5a})$$

$$f_{Y_\mu}^{|\psi_\mu\rangle}(y) = \langle \psi_\mu | \delta(y\hat{I}_\mu - \hat{Y}_\mu(\beta_\mu)) | \psi_\mu \rangle. \quad (\text{B5b})$$

For illustration purposes, we will perform an explicit calculation only for $f_{X_\mu}^{|\psi_\mu\rangle}(x)$. Inserting the identity operator (A6) into (B5a), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{X_\mu}^{|\psi_\mu\rangle}(x) &= \langle \psi_\mu | \delta(x\hat{I}_\mu - \hat{X}_\mu(\alpha_\mu)) \left(\sum_{k_\mu, l_\mu = \pm 1} |k_\mu, l_\mu\rangle \langle k_\mu, l_\mu| \right) | \psi_\mu \rangle \\
&= \sum_{k_\mu = \pm 1} \delta(x - k_\mu) \sum_{l_\mu = \pm 1} |\langle k_\mu, l_\mu | \psi_\mu \rangle|^2 \\
&:= \sum_{k_\mu = \pm 1} \delta(x - k_\mu) p_{k_\mu}^{\text{QM}}, \tag{B6}
\end{aligned}$$

where (A9a) has been used, and we have defined

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{k_\mu}^{\text{QM}} &:= \sum_{l_\mu = \pm 1} |\langle k_\mu, l_\mu | \psi_\mu \rangle|^2 \\
&= \langle \psi_\mu | \left(|k_\mu\rangle \langle k_\mu| \otimes \sum_{l_\mu = \pm 1} |l_\mu\rangle \langle l_\mu| \right) | \psi_\mu \rangle \\
&= \langle \psi_\mu | \left(|k_\mu\rangle \langle k_\mu| \otimes \hat{I}^{(B_\mu)} \right) | \psi_\mu \rangle. \tag{B7}
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting (A1) into (B7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{k_\mu}^{\text{QM}} &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\left| \langle e_+^{(A_\mu)} | k_\mu \rangle \right|^2 + \left| \langle e_-^{(A_\mu)} | k_\mu \rangle \right|^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \langle k_\mu | \left[|e_+^{(A_\mu)}\rangle \langle e_+^{(A_\mu)}| + |e_-^{(A_\mu)}\rangle \langle e_-^{(A_\mu)}| \right] | k_\mu \rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{2}. \tag{B8}
\end{aligned}$$

Since the two operators $\hat{X}_\mu(\alpha_\mu)$ and $\hat{Y}_\mu(\beta_\mu)$ commute, it is possible to calculate the joint probability density function $f_{X_\mu Y_\mu}^{|\psi_\mu\rangle}(x, y)$, defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{X_\mu Y_\mu}^{|\psi_\mu\rangle}(x, y) &= \langle \psi_\mu | \delta(x\hat{I}_\mu - \hat{X}_\mu(\alpha_\mu)) \delta(y\hat{I}_\mu - \hat{Y}_\mu(\beta_\mu)) | \psi_\mu \rangle \\
&= \langle \psi_\mu | \delta(x\hat{I}_\mu - \hat{X}_\mu(\alpha_\mu)) \delta(y\hat{I}_\mu - \hat{Y}_\mu(\beta_\mu)) \left(\sum_{k_\mu, l_\mu = \pm 1} |k_\mu, l_\mu\rangle \langle k_\mu, l_\mu| \right) | \psi_\mu \rangle \\
&= \sum_{k_\mu, l_\mu = \pm 1} \delta(x - k_\mu) \delta(y - l_\mu) |\langle k_\mu, l_\mu | \psi_\mu \rangle|^2 \\
&:= \sum_{k_\mu, l_\mu = \pm 1} \delta(x - k_\mu) \delta(y - l_\mu) p_{k_\mu l_\mu}^{\text{QM}}(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu), \tag{B9}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have defined

$$p_{k_\mu l_\mu}^{\text{QM}}(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu) := |\langle k_\mu, l_\mu | \psi_\mu \rangle|^2, \quad (k_\mu, l_\mu = \pm 1). \tag{B10}$$

Substituting (A1) and (A5) into (B10), we find

$$p_{k_\mu l_\mu}^{\text{QM}}(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu) = \frac{1}{4} \{1 - k_\mu l_\mu \cos[2(\alpha_\mu - \beta_\mu)]\}. \tag{B11}$$

Using this equation, it is easy to obtain the marginal

distribution (B8) as,

$$p_{k_\mu}^{\text{QM}} = \sum_{l_\mu=\pm 1} p_{k_\mu l_\mu}^{\text{QM}}(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu) = \frac{1}{2}. \quad (\text{B12})$$

Appendix C: Probabilities p_n in Eq. (29)

In this Appendix we adopt the shorthand $C_1 = C(\alpha, \beta)$, $C_2 = C(\alpha, \beta')$, $C_3 = C(\alpha', \beta)$, and $C_4 =$

$C(\alpha', \beta')$. A straightforward calculation gives:

$$\begin{aligned} p_0 &= \frac{3}{8} - \frac{1}{8} (C_1 C_2 + C_1 C_3 - C_1 C_4 + C_2 C_3 - C_2 C_4 - C_3 C_4) - \frac{3}{8} C_1 C_2 C_3 C_4, \\ p_{\pm 2} &= \frac{1}{4} \pm \frac{1}{8} (C_1 + C_2 + C_3 - C_4) \mp (C_1 C_2 C_3 - C_1 C_2 C_4 - C_1 C_3 C_4 - C_2 C_3 C_4) + \frac{1}{4} C_1 C_2 C_3 C_4, \\ p_{\pm 4} &= \frac{1}{16} \pm \frac{1}{16} (C_1 + C_2 + C_3 - C_4) + \frac{1}{16} (C_1 C_2 + C_1 C_3 - C_1 C_4 + C_2 C_3 - C_2 C_4 - C_3 C_4) \\ &\quad \pm \frac{1}{16} (C_1 C_2 C_3 - C_1 C_2 C_4 - C_1 C_3 C_4 - C_2 C_3 C_4) - \frac{1}{16} C_1 C_2 C_3 C_4. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C1})$$

Appendix D: Random variable representation of the Bell operator \hat{T}

In this section we calculate and study the random variable T associated with the operator \hat{T} and the vector state $|\Psi\rangle$, defined by Eqs. (A19) and (A13), respectively. Using (B1) we can calculate

$$\begin{aligned} f_T^{|\Psi\rangle}(t) &= \langle \Psi | \delta(t\hat{I} - \hat{T}) | \Psi \rangle \\ &= \sum_{K,L} \langle \Psi | \delta(t\hat{I} - \hat{T}) | K, L \rangle \langle K, L | \Psi \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D1})$$

where (A16) has been used. From (A21) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(t\hat{I} - \hat{T}) | K, L \rangle &= \delta(t - k_1 l_1 - k_2 l_2 - k_3 l_3 + k_4 l_4) | K, L \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D2})$$

Substituting (D2) into (D1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f_T^{|\Psi\rangle}(t) &= \sum_{K,L} \delta(t - k_1 l_1 - k_2 l_2 - k_3 l_3 + k_4 l_4) |\langle K, L | \Psi \rangle|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D3})$$

and we use (A13) and (A15) to calculate,

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle K, L | \Psi \rangle|^2 &= \prod_{\mu=1}^4 | \langle k_\mu, l_\mu | \psi_\mu \rangle |^2 \\ &= \prod_{\mu=1}^4 p_{k_\mu l_\mu}^{\text{QM}}(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D4})$$

where (B10) has been used. So, being the four experiments independent, the probability distribution of T is factorable, as expected. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[T] &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} t f_T^{|\Psi\rangle}(t) dt \\
&= \sum_{k_1, l_1 = \pm 1} \sum_{k_2, l_2 = \pm 1} \sum_{k_3, l_3 = \pm 1} \sum_{k_4, l_4 = \pm 1} \prod_{\mu=1}^4 p_{k_\mu l_\mu}^{\text{QM}}(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu) \int_{\mathbb{R}} t \delta(t - k_1 l_1 - k_2 l_2 - k_3 l_3 + k_4 l_4) dt \\
&= \sum_{k_1, l_1 = \pm 1} \sum_{k_2, l_2 = \pm 1} \sum_{k_3, l_3 = \pm 1} \sum_{k_4, l_4 = \pm 1} p_{k_1 l_1}^{\text{QM}}(\alpha, \beta) p_{k_2 l_2}^{\text{QM}}(\alpha, \beta') p_{k_3 l_3}^{\text{QM}}(\alpha', \beta) p_{k_4 l_4}^{\text{QM}}(\alpha', \beta') (k_1 l_1 + k_2 l_2 + k_3 l_3 - k_4 l_4) \\
&= \sum_{\mu=1}^4 s_\mu \left[\sum_{k_\mu, l_\mu = \pm 1} k_\mu l_\mu p_{k_\mu l_\mu}^{\text{QM}}(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu) \right], \tag{D5}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have introduced the useful parameters $s_1 = s_2 = s_3 = 1$, and $s_4 = -1$.

Substituting (33) into (D5), we recover the well known result

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[T] &= \sum_{\mu=1}^4 s_\mu C^{\text{QM}}(\alpha_\mu, \beta_\mu) \\
&= -\cos[2(\alpha - \beta)] - \cos[2(\alpha - \beta')] \\
&\quad - \cos[2(\alpha' - \beta)] + \cos[2(\alpha' - \beta')]. \tag{D6}
\end{aligned}$$

An important parameter characterizing the probability distribution $f_X(x)$ of a random variable X , is the variance $\mathbb{V}[X]$, defined by

$$\mathbb{V}[X] = \mathbb{E}[X^2] - (\mathbb{E}[X])^2. \tag{D7}$$

In our case a straightforward calculation gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{V}[T] &= 2 - \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \cos[4(\alpha - \beta)] + \cos[4(\alpha - \beta')] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \cos[4(\alpha' - \beta)] + \cos[4(\alpha' - \beta')] \right\}. \tag{D8}
\end{aligned}$$

It is instructive to visualize the range of $\mathbb{E}[T]$ and $\mathbb{V}[T]$ by randomly sampling the four angles $\alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta'$, uniformly in the interval $[0, \pi]$, and plotting the frequency of occurrence of the values of $\mathbb{E}[T]$ and $\mathbb{V}[T]$. This is shown in Figs. 1 and 2, respectively. From Fig. 1 it is interesting to note how the values of $\mathbb{E}[T]$ in the interval $[-2, 2]$, are almost uniformly distributed, only slightly peaked at $\mathbb{E}[T] = \pm 2$. Outside this interval the frequency of occurrence of $\mathbb{E}[T]$ drops significantly, being actually quite low for $\mathbb{E}[T] = \pm 2\sqrt{2}$. This means that values of $|\mathbb{E}[T]|$ bigger than 2, occur for a small range of Alice and bob's polarizers orientations. The plot of the variance $\mathbb{V}[T]$ in Fig. 2, shows that $\mathbb{V}[T] = 2$ is the most likely value. The frequency of occurrence of $\mathbb{V}[T] \neq 2$, drops quickly to zero when we move away from $\mathbb{V}[T] = 2$.

-
- [1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, *Phys. Rev.* **47**, 777 (1935), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRev.47.777>.
 - [2] W. Myrvold, M. Genovese, and A. Shimony, in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by E. N. Zalta and U. Nodelman (Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, 2024), Spring 2024 ed., URL <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2024/entries/bell-theorem/>.
 - [3] J. S. Bell, *Physics Physique Fizika* **1**, 195 (1964), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysicsPhysiqueFizika.1.195>.
 - [4] J. S. Bell, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **38**, 447 (1966), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/RevModPhys.38.447>.
 - [5] Leslie E. Ballentine, *Quantum Mechanics: A Modern Development* (World Scientific Publishing, Singapore, 1998), ISBN 981-02-4105-4.
 - [6] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 880 (1969), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.23.880>.
 - [7] M. M. Wilde, *Quantum Information Theory* (Cambridge University Press, 2017), 2nd ed.
 - [8] W. De Baere, *Lettere al Nuovo Cimento* (1971-1985) **39**, 234 (1984), ISSN 1827-613X, URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02789587>.
 - [9] A. Böhm, *Quantum Mechanics* (Springer-Verlag New York Inc., 1986), ISBN 978-1-4612-6128-5, URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-6126-1>.




FIG. 1. Frequency of occurrence of the values of the mean $\mathbb{E}[T]$, which are reported on the horizontal axis, when the four angles $\alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta'$, are uniformly sampled at random in the interval $[0, \pi)$. The histogram was constructed from a sample of 2^{24} random numbers. The vertical lines mark the values $\pm 2\sqrt{2}$, ± 2 , and 0.




FIG. 2. Frequency of occurrence of the values of the variance $\mathbb{V}[T]$, which are reported on the horizontal axis, when the four angles $\alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta'$, are uniformly sampled at random in the interval $[0, \pi)$. The histogram was constructed from a sample of 2^{24} random numbers.

[10] G. Adenier, *Refutation of Bell's Theorem* (WORLD SCIENTIFIC, 2001), vol. Volume 13 of *QP-PQ: Quantum Probability and White Noise Analysis*, pp. 29–38, ISBN 978-981-02-4846-8, 0, URL https://doi.org/10.1142/9789812810809_0002.

[11] A. M. Cetto, A. Valdés-Hernández, and L. de la Peña, *Foundations of Physics* **50**, 27 (2020), ISSN 1572-9516, URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10701-019-00313-8>.

[12] J. P. Lambare and R. Franco, *Foundations of Physics* **51**, 84 (2021), ISSN 1572-9516, URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10701-021-00488-z>.

[13] M. Czachor, *Acta Physica Polonica A* ISSN 1898-794X **143**, S158 (2023), URL https://appol.ifpan.edu.pl/index.php/appa/article/view/143_s158.

[14] A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods*, vol. 72 of *Fundamental Theories of Physics* (Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1995), 1st ed., ISBN 0-792-33632-1.

[15] J. J. Halliwell and J. M. Yearsley, *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 022114 (2013), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.87.022114>.

[16] Papoulis, A. and Pillai, S. U., *Probability, Random Variables, and Stochastic Processes* (McGraw-Hill, 2002), 4th ed., ISBN 0-07-366011-6, URL <https://www.mhhe.com/engcs/electrical/papoulis/>.

[17] Claude Cohen-Tannoudji, Bernard Diu, Franck Laloë, *Quantum Mechanics*, vol. 3 (Wiley-VCH, Singapore, 2020), ISBN 978-3-527-34555-7.

[18] D. T. Gillespie, *American Journal of Physics* **51**, 520 (1983), ISSN 0002-9505, URL <https://doi.org/10.1119/1.13221>.

[19] W. Rudin, *Principles of Mathematical Analysis* (McGraw-Hill, Inc., Boston, 1976), 3rd ed., ISBN 978-0-07-054235-8.

[20] E. W. Weisstein, “*Expectation Value.*”, From *MathWorld*—A Wolfram Web Resource, URL <https://mathworld.wolfram.com/ExpectationValue.html>.

[21] Elliott H. Lieb and Michael Loss, *Analysis* (American Mathematical Society, Providence, USA, 2001), 2nd ed., ISBN 0-8218-2783-9.

[22] S. Virzì, E. Rebufello, F. Atzori, A. Avella, F. Piacentini, R. Lussana, I. Cusini, F. Madonini, F. Villa, M. Gramagna, et al., *Quantum Science and Technology* **9**, 045027 (2024), URL <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/2058-9565/ad6a37>.

[23] A. Aspect, P. Grangier, and G. Roger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49**, 91 (1982), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.49.91>.

[24] W. Tittel, J. Brendel, H. Zbinden, and N. Gisin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 3563 (1998), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.81.3563>.

[25] G. Weihs, T. Jennewein, C. Simon, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zeilinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 5039 (1998), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.81.5039>.

[26] L. Mandel and E. Wolf, *Optical Coherence and Quantum Optics* (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1995).

[27] M. Taboga, *Lectures on Probability Theory and Mathematical Statistics* (CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2017), 3rd ed., ISBN 9781981369195.

[28] B.-G. Englert, *The European Physical Journal D* **67**, 238 (2013), ISSN 1434-6079, URL <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjd/e2013-40486-5>.

[29] J. von Neumann, *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2018), ISBN 9781400889921, URL <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400889921>.

[30] A. Aiello, *Spectral theorem for dummies: A pedagogical discussion on quantum probability and random variable theory* (2022), URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.12742>.

[31] C. Itzykson and J.-B. Zuber, *Quantum Field Theory* (Dover Publications, Inc., Mineola, New York, USA, 2005), ISBN 0-486-44568-2.

[32] S. Coleman, *Lectures of Sidney Coleman on Quantum Field Theory* (World Scientific Publishing, Singapore, 2019), ISBN 978-981-4635-50-9, foreword by David Kaiser, <https://www.worldscientific.com/doi/pdf/10.1142/9371>, URL <https://www.worldscientific.com/doi/abs/10.1142/9371>.