

The CHSH-Bell inequality and Tsirelson's bound with postselection

Dominic W. Berry,¹ Hyunseok Jeong,² Magdalena Stobińska,³ and Timothy C. Ralph²
¹*Centre for Quantum Computer Technology, Macquarie University, Sydney, NSW 2109, Australia*
²*Centre for Quantum Computer Technology, Department of Physics,
The University of Queensland, St Lucia, Qld 4072, Australia*
³*Instytut Fizyki Teoretycznej, Uniwersytet Warszawski, Warszawa 00-681, Poland*

We find the necessary and sufficient condition on postselection for the CHSH-Bell inequality to hold for local realistic theories. This condition is weaker than the usual fair sampling assumption, demonstrating that the CHSH-Bell inequality will be valid under a wider variety of types of loss than previously believed. This condition implies that Tsirelson's bound must be satisfied for entangled states.

I. INTRODUCTION

The contradiction between local realism and quantum mechanics was first highlighted by the paradox of Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen (EPR) [1]. Later, Bell proposed a remarkable inequality that should be obeyed by any local realistic theory [2]. More practical versions of Bell's inequality were presented by Clauser, Horne, Shimony and Holt (CHSH) [3], and Clauser and Horne [4]. The experimental demonstration of the violation of these inequalities with photons [5] provides strong evidence against local realistic (hidden variable) theories.

In the case of the CHSH version of Bell's inequality [3], the absolute value of the Bell function, which describes the quantum correlation between two systems, is not allowed to exceed 2 by a local realistic theory. Even though the CHSH-Bell inequality can be violated for certain quantum systems, the maximum value for the violation is Tsirelson's bound of $2\sqrt{2}$ [6].

All spatially separate experiments for Bell inequality tests to date have been optical and have relied on postselection. That is, results are rejected if one, or both of the photons in a particular pair are lost. In the case of the CHSH-Bell inequality, the interpretation of the results relies on the fair sampling assumption [3, 7]. That is, it is assumed that the efficiency is independent of the measurement settings, so the ensemble of detected pairs of photons provides a fair statistical sample of the ensemble of emitted pairs. Alternatively, the efficiency may depend on the measurement setting, but be independent of hidden variables [8]. Often it is assumed that the efficiency is independent of both the measurement setting and hidden variables.

Given the utility of postselection in Bell tests, it is important to explore more generally the conditions for which it is valid. In this paper, we find a general condition on the loss that is necessary and sufficient for the CHSH-Bell inequality to be satisfied by any local hidden variable theory. In contrast to the usual fair sampling assumption, this condition allows the efficiency to depend arbitrarily on both the measurement settings and the hidden variable, provided the efficiency may be expressed as a product of a function of the measurement setting and a function of the hidden variable. This demonstrates that

the CHSH-Bell inequality will be valid under a wider variety of types of loss than previously believed.

It is also of considerable interest to study if postselection can enhance the strength of Bell correlations beyond the Tsirelson bound without compromising their validity. A method of using postselection on three qubits to enable violations of the CHSH-Bell inequality beyond Tsirelson's bound was proposed in Ref. [9]. Unfortunately, as we prove in this paper (see Appendix A), this approach also allows unentangled states to violate the CHSH-Bell inequality. Here we show generally that any form of postselection that allows violation of Tsirelson's bound must also allow the CHSH-Bell inequality to be violated for a local realistic theory and for unentangled states.

II. CONDITION ON POSTSELECTION FOR HIDDEN VARIABLES

First we prove a condition on the postselection that is necessary and sufficient for the CHSH-Bell inequality to be valid for a local hidden variable theory. Alice and Bob share two components of an entangled state ρ , and each performs one of two dichotomic measurements. The probability of obtaining the measurement results $s_1, s_2 \in \{-, +\}$ is denoted by $p_{s_1 s_2}(\alpha, \beta, \rho)$, where $\alpha \in \{A, a\}$ and $\beta \in \{B, b\}$ are the measurement settings for Alice and Bob, respectively. The usual CHSH-Bell quantity is defined by

$$\mathcal{B}_c = C(A, B) + C(A, b) + C(a, B) - C(a, b) \quad (1)$$

where $C(\alpha, \beta) = p_{++}(\alpha, \beta, \rho) - p_{+-}(\alpha, \beta, \rho) - p_{-+}(\alpha, \beta, \rho) + p_{--}(\alpha, \beta, \rho)$.

For a stochastic local hidden variable theory probabilities are given as

$$p_{s_1 s_2}(\alpha, \beta, \rho) = \sum_x p(x|\rho) p(s_1|\alpha, x) p(s_2|\beta, x), \quad (2)$$

where x is the hidden variable. Summing over the measurement results gives the efficiencies as

$$\mathcal{E}(\alpha, \beta, \rho) = \sum_x p(x|\rho) \mathcal{E}(\alpha, x) \mathcal{E}(\beta, x), \quad (3)$$

where $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma, x) = p(+|\Gamma, x) + p(-|\Gamma, x)$ is the efficiency for measurement setting $\Gamma \in \{A, a, B, b\}$ and hidden variable x .

The postselected form of the CHSH quantity is

$$\mathcal{B} = \frac{C(A, B)}{\mathcal{E}(A, B, \rho)} + \frac{C(a, B)}{\mathcal{E}(a, B, \rho)} + \frac{C(A, b)}{\mathcal{E}(A, b, \rho)} - \frac{C(a, b)}{\mathcal{E}(a, b, \rho)}. \quad (4)$$

Using this, it can be shown that the generalisation of the CHSH-Bell inequality for the case of postselection is

$$|\mathcal{B}| \leq 4 - 2 \sum_x p(x|\rho) \min_{\alpha_x, \beta_x} \frac{\mathcal{E}(\alpha_x, x)\mathcal{E}(\beta_x, x)}{\mathcal{E}(\alpha_x, \beta_x, \rho)}, \quad (5)$$

In addition, the probabilities $p(\pm|\Gamma, x)$ may be chosen to saturate this inequality. (See Appendix B for this, and all following derivations.)

If the condition that $\mathcal{E}(\alpha, x)\mathcal{E}(\beta, x)/\mathcal{E}(\alpha, \beta, \rho)$ is independent of α and β whenever $p(x|\rho) > 0$ is satisfied, then it is easily seen that the sum in Eq. (5) is equal to 1, so $|\mathcal{B}| \leq 2$. On the other hand, if this condition is not satisfied then the sum is less than 1. As the probabilities may be chosen to saturate the inequality, there exists a hidden variable model which gives $|\mathcal{B}| > 2$. Hence we see that this condition is necessary and sufficient for the Bell inequality to be satisfied.

We can express the condition in a more convenient way as follows. The value of $\mathcal{E}(\alpha, x)\mathcal{E}(\beta, x)/\mathcal{E}(\alpha, \beta, \rho)$ can only be a function of x and ρ , so

$$\mathcal{E}(\alpha, x)\mathcal{E}(\beta, x) = \mathcal{E}(\alpha, \beta, \rho)f(x, \rho). \quad (6)$$

Alternatively, because the left-hand side has no dependence on ρ and is a product of a function of α and β , we must have

$$\mathcal{E}(\alpha, \beta, x) = \mathcal{E}(\alpha)\mathcal{E}(\beta)\mathcal{E}(x). \quad (7)$$

That is, the efficiency is independent between measurement settings and any hidden variable. Contrary to the usual assumptions, the efficiency can depend on both the measurement settings and the hidden variable, provided it satisfies this relation.

III. UNENTANGLED STATES

An alternative case which can be considered is that we wish $|\mathcal{B}| \leq 2$ to be satisfied for unentangled states. This is important if we wish to demonstrate entanglement, but are not concerned with disproving hidden variable theories.

For quantum theory the probabilities of local measurement results are obtained via the observables M_Γ^\pm by $p(\pm|\Gamma, \rho) = \text{Tr}(M_\Gamma^\pm \rho)$, where ρ is the local reduced density operator. We also use the notation $M_\Gamma = M_\Gamma^+ + M_\Gamma^-$ for the operator corresponding to a successful measurement.

If we sum the restriction (7) over the values of the hidden variable, we obtain

$$\mathcal{E}(\alpha, \beta, \rho) = \mathcal{E}(\alpha)\mathcal{E}(\beta) \sum_x p(x|\rho)\mathcal{E}(x). \quad (8)$$

This implies the condition for quantum states that

$$\mathcal{E}(\alpha, \beta, \rho) = \mathcal{E}(\alpha)\mathcal{E}(\beta)\mathcal{E}(\rho). \quad (9)$$

This restriction may be expressed as

$$\text{Tr}[(M_\alpha \otimes M_\beta)\rho] = \mathcal{E}(\alpha)\mathcal{E}(\beta)\mathcal{E}(\rho). \quad (10)$$

This restriction implies that $M_\alpha/\mathcal{E}(\alpha)$ is independent of α , and $M_\beta/\mathcal{E}(\beta)$ is independent of β .

It is relatively trivial to show that (10) is a sufficient condition for the Bell inequality to be satisfied. As an unentangled state may be regarded as a hidden variable theory, and the condition (10) implies that (7) is satisfied, we obtain $|\mathcal{B}| \leq 2$.

On the other hand, it is nontrivial to show that it is a necessary condition. This is because one cannot arbitrarily choose the probabilities $p(\pm|\Gamma, x)$ for given efficiencies. Therefore it is not necessarily possible to saturate the inequality (5), as in the case of a general hidden variable theory. However, it is possible to show that it is a necessary condition by, in the case where (10) is violated, deriving a separable state and a set of measurement operators M_Γ^\pm such that $\mathcal{B} > 2$.

IV. TSIRELSON'S BOUND

It can be shown that the restriction (9) implies that Tsirelson's bound must be satisfied. We define new measurement operators as $\tilde{M}_\Gamma^\pm = M_\Gamma^{-1/2}M_\Gamma^\pm M_\Gamma^{-1/2}$. These measurement operators now give unit efficiency (so there is no postselection). We also define $\tilde{\rho}$ to be the normalised form of $M^{-1/2}\rho M^{-1/2}$, where $M = M_\alpha \otimes M_\beta / [\mathcal{E}(\alpha)\mathcal{E}(\beta)]$.

Under this change of the measurement operators and state, the value of \mathcal{B} is unchanged. The inequalities that hold without postselection must continue to hold, and in particular Tsirelson's bound $|\mathcal{B}| \leq 2\sqrt{2}$ holds. Thus we find that the condition on the loss which is necessary in order for the Bell inequality to hold for unentangled states also implies that Tsirelson's bound must hold.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have shown the necessary and sufficient condition on postselection such that the CHSH-Bell inequality is still valid for hidden variable theories. The efficiency may be a function of both the hidden variable and measurement settings, provided it factorises as a product of functions of these quantities. This is a far weaker condition than the usual fair sampling assumption, so Bell

inequalities may be used in a wider variety of situations than previously believed.

The necessary and sufficient condition on postselection for the CHSH-Bell inequality to hold for unentangled states is equivalent, except the role of the hidden variable is replaced by the quantum state. This condition is also sufficient to guarantee that Tsirelson's bound holds for entangled states. This implies that, for a form of postselection which allows Tsirelson's bound to be violated, the CHSH-Bell inequality need not hold for local realistic theories or for unentangled states.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by Australian Research Council and Queensland State Government, and partially supported by a MEN Grant No. 1 PO3B 137 30.

APPENDIX A: POSTSELECTION OF REF. [9]

Here we show that the approach to postselection in Ref. [9] allows violation of the CHSH-Bell inequality with unentangled states. Reference [9] considers the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) state $|\Psi\rangle = (|++\rangle_y + |--\rangle_y)/\sqrt{2}$, where $|\pm\rangle_y$ are Y eigenstates, and the three parties make measurements in the X or Z basis. The qubits are labeled i, j and k according to the following prescription. When Z is measured on each qubit, either two results are -1 and one is $+1$, or all three are $+1$. If two results are -1 , the corresponding qubits are taken to be i and j . If all three results are $+1$, the labels i, j and k are assigned randomly.

In practice, Z is not always measured on all three qubits, so it is not possible to apply this method directly. Instead, one could force qubit 3 to be k by measuring Z on it and postselecting on a measurement result of 1 (as proposed by [9]). Alternatively, one could randomly select a qubit, and force it to be k by this method.

The form of the CHSH-Bell inequality in Ref. [9] is $|\mathcal{B}| \leq 2$, with

$$\mathcal{B}_x = C(Z_i, Z_j) - x_k C(Z_i, X_j) - x_k C(X_i, Z_j) - C(X_i, X_j). \quad (\text{A1})$$

Here subscripts are used to indicate the operator acting on the corresponding qubit, and x_k is the result which would be obtained by measuring X_k . As X_k is not measured, the value of x_k is inferred from the results of the measurements on qubits i and j . One takes x_k to be the negative of the product of the measurement results for qubits i and j (if X is measured on one and Z on the other). Because of this method for selecting x_k ,

$$-x_k C(Z_i, X_j) = -x_k C(X_i, Z_j) = 1. \quad (\text{A2})$$

For the GHZ state, one also obtains $C(Z_i, Z_j) = 1$ and $C(X_i, X_j) = -1$, so $\mathcal{B}_x = 4$.

However, if one uses this method for selecting i, j and k , as well as for selecting the value of x_k , with an unentangled state, then the inequality $|\mathcal{B}_x| \leq 2$ can still be violated. Consider, for example, the state

$$\rho = \frac{1}{4}(|--\rangle_z \langle --| + |+-\rangle_z \langle +-| + |-+\rangle_z \langle -+| + |++\rangle_z \langle ++|). \quad (\text{A3})$$

It is found that, regardless of which qubit is taken to be k , the Z_i and Z_j measurements are perfectly correlated, so $C(Z_i, Z_j) = 1$. There are no correlations in the X measurements, so $C(X_i, X_j) = 0$, and Eq. (A2) still holds (because that is due to the method of determining x_k). We therefore find $\mathcal{B}_x = 3$, which violates both the Bell inequality and Tsirelson's bound.

APPENDIX B: DERIVATIONS

Lemma 1. *Any local hidden variable theory must satisfy*

$$|\mathcal{B}| \leq 4 - 2 \sum_x p(x|\rho) \min_{\alpha_x, \beta_x} \frac{\mathcal{E}(\alpha_x, x)\mathcal{E}(\beta_x, x)}{\mathcal{E}(\alpha_x, \beta_x, \rho)}, \quad (\text{B1})$$

For given \mathcal{E} there exist probabilities $p(\pm|\Gamma, x)$ that saturate this inequality.

Proof. We start from the postselected form of the CHSH quantity given in Eq. (4). This can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{B} = \sum_x p(x) \left\{ \frac{\Delta(A, x)\Delta(B, x)}{\mathcal{E}(A, B, \rho)} + \frac{\Delta(a, x)\Delta(B, x)}{\mathcal{E}(a, B, \rho)} + \frac{\Delta(A, x)\Delta(b, x)}{\mathcal{E}(A, b, \rho)} - \frac{\Delta(a, x)\Delta(b, x)}{\mathcal{E}(a, b, \rho)} \right\}, \quad (\text{B2})$$

where $\Delta(\Gamma, x) = p(+|\Gamma, x) - p(-|\Gamma, x)$.

Because the probabilities are non-negative, we have

$$|\Delta(\Gamma, x)| \leq \mathcal{E}(\Gamma, x). \quad (\text{B3})$$

In addition, for given $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma, x)$, we can choose the $p(\pm|\Gamma, x) = 0$ such that $\Delta(\Gamma, x)$ takes any value in the range $[-\mathcal{E}(\Gamma, x), \mathcal{E}(\Gamma, x)]$. Because \mathcal{B} is linear in each of the $\Delta(\Gamma, x)$, to maximise or minimise it we take extremal values of the $\Delta(\Gamma, x)$. By choosing the sign of each $\Delta(\Gamma, x)$, we can obtain any combination of signs for the terms in Eq. (B2), provided the product of the signs is negative. That is, we can obtain one negative term or one positive term.

In particular, taking $\Delta(\Gamma, x) = \mathcal{E}(\Gamma, x)$ makes the last term negative. Then changing $\Delta(b, x)$ to $-\mathcal{E}(b, x)$ makes only the third term negative. Alternatively, changing $\Delta(a, x)$ to $-\mathcal{E}(a, x)$ makes only the second term negative, or changing $\Delta(b, x)$ to $-\mathcal{E}(b, x)$ and $\Delta(A, x)$ to $-\mathcal{E}(A, x)$ makes only the first term negative. To change the overall sign, so one term is positive and the remaining are negative, we can change the sign of both $\Delta(A, x)$ and $\Delta(a, x)$.

To maximise \mathcal{B} , we take three terms positive and one negative for each value of x . The value of \mathcal{B} will be maximised with the smallest term taken to be negative. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B} \leq \sum_x p(x|\rho) & \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{E}(A,x)\mathcal{E}(B,x)}{\mathcal{E}(A,B,\rho)} + \frac{\mathcal{E}(a,x)\mathcal{E}(B,x)}{\mathcal{E}(a,B,\rho)} \right. \\ & + \frac{\mathcal{E}(A,x)\mathcal{E}(b,x)}{\mathcal{E}(A,b,\rho)} + \frac{\mathcal{E}(a,x)\mathcal{E}(b,x)}{\mathcal{E}(a,b,\rho)} \\ & \left. - 2 \frac{\mathcal{E}(\alpha_x,x)\mathcal{E}(\beta_x,x)}{\mathcal{E}(\alpha_x,\beta_x,\rho)} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B4})$$

where the α_x and β_x are chosen to minimise

$$\frac{\mathcal{E}(\alpha_x,x)\mathcal{E}(\beta_x,x)}{\mathcal{E}(\alpha_x,\beta_x,\rho)}. \quad (\text{B5})$$

Summing the first four terms in Eq. (B4) gives

$$\mathcal{B} \leq 4 - 2 \sum_x p(x|\rho) \frac{\mathcal{E}(\alpha_x,x)\mathcal{E}(\beta_x,x)}{\mathcal{E}(\alpha_x,\beta_x,\rho)}. \quad (\text{B6})$$

Similarly, the value of \mathcal{B} will be minimised by taking three terms negative in Eq. (B2), and taking the smallest term positive. That just gives the negative of what was obtained before, so

$$\mathcal{B} \geq -4 + 2 \sum_x p(x|\rho) \frac{\mathcal{E}(\alpha_x,x)\mathcal{E}(\beta_x,x)}{\mathcal{E}(\alpha_x,\beta_x,\rho)}. \quad (\text{B7})$$

Together these inequalities give the CHSH-Bell inequality for the case of postselection given by Eq. (5). As the above argument is constructive, it shows how to choose probabilities $p(\pm|\Gamma, x)$ in order to saturate this inequality. \square

Theorem 1. *The condition that*

$$\frac{\mathcal{E}(\alpha,x)\mathcal{E}(\beta,x)}{\mathcal{E}(\alpha,\beta,\rho)} \quad (\text{B8})$$

is independent of α and β for $p(x|\rho) > 0$ is necessary and sufficient for $|\mathcal{B}| \leq 2$ to be satisfied for all probabilities $p(\pm|\Gamma, x)$.

Proof. In order for \mathcal{B} to satisfy the usual CHSH-Bell inequality, $|\mathcal{B}| \leq 2$, the sum in Eq. (5) must be equal to 1. Given that the condition is satisfied, we may take $\alpha_x = \alpha$ and $\beta_x = \beta$ for some arbitrary α and β in Eq. (5), giving

$$|\mathcal{B}| \leq 4 - 2 \sum_x p(x|\rho) \frac{\mathcal{E}(\alpha,x)\mathcal{E}(\beta,x)}{\mathcal{E}(\alpha,\beta,\rho)} = 2. \quad (\text{B9})$$

Thus the condition is sufficient.

To prove necessity, we show that if the condition is not satisfied, then $|\mathcal{B}| \leq 2$ may be violated. If the condition is not satisfied for $x = x_0$, then select α and β such that

$$\frac{\mathcal{E}(\alpha,x)\mathcal{E}(\beta,x)}{\mathcal{E}(\alpha,\beta,\rho)} > \frac{\mathcal{E}(\alpha_{x_0},x)\mathcal{E}(\beta_{x_0},x)}{\mathcal{E}(\alpha_{x_0},\beta_{x_0},\rho)}. \quad (\text{B10})$$

We then have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_x p(x) \frac{\mathcal{E}(\alpha_x,x)\mathcal{E}(\beta_x,x)}{\mathcal{E}(\alpha_x,\beta_x,\rho)} \\ & \leq \sum_x p(x) \frac{\mathcal{E}(\alpha,x)\mathcal{E}(\beta,x)}{\mathcal{E}(\alpha,\beta,\rho)} \\ & \quad - p(x_0|\rho) \left(\frac{\mathcal{E}(\alpha,x)\mathcal{E}(\beta,x)}{\mathcal{E}(\alpha,\beta,\rho)} - \frac{\mathcal{E}(\alpha_{x_0},x)\mathcal{E}(\beta_{x_0},x)}{\mathcal{E}(\alpha_{x_0},\beta_{x_0},\rho)} \right) \\ & = 1 - p(x_0|\rho) \left(\frac{\mathcal{E}(\alpha,x)\mathcal{E}(\beta,x)}{\mathcal{E}(\alpha,\beta,\rho)} - \frac{\mathcal{E}(\alpha_{x_0},x)\mathcal{E}(\beta_{x_0},x)}{\mathcal{E}(\alpha_{x_0},\beta_{x_0},\rho)} \right) \\ & < 1. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B11})$$

As there exists a choice of probabilities $p(\pm|\Gamma, x)$ which saturate the inequality (5), we can obtain $|\mathcal{B}| > 2$. As there exist choices of probabilities which give $|\mathcal{B}| > 2$ if the condition is violated, it is a necessary condition. \square

Theorem 2. *The restriction*

$$\text{Tr}[(M_\alpha \otimes M_\beta)\rho] = \mathcal{E}(\alpha)\mathcal{E}(\beta)\mathcal{E}(\rho) \quad (\text{B12})$$

is a necessary and sufficient condition for $|\mathcal{B}| \leq 2$ to be satisfied for all unentangled states.

Proof. Part A: Necessity

We define

$$M_{\alpha,\beta} \equiv \frac{M_\alpha \otimes M_\beta}{\mathcal{E}(\alpha)\mathcal{E}(\beta)}. \quad (\text{B13})$$

We have that, for example

$$\text{Tr}[(M_{A,\beta} - M_{a,\beta})\rho] = 0 \quad (\text{B14})$$

for all ρ . This implies that $M_{\alpha,\beta}$ is not a function of α or β , and may be simply denoted M .

Thus the restriction (9) implies that $M_\alpha/\mathcal{E}(\alpha)$ is independent of α , and $M_\beta/\mathcal{E}(\beta)$ is independent of β . That is, M_a and M_A can only differ by a multiplicative constant, and similarly for M_b and M_B . Now if $M_\alpha/\mathcal{E}(\alpha)$ is not independent of α , then there must exist orthogonal states $|\varphi_0\rangle$ and $|\varphi_1\rangle$ such that

$$\langle \varphi_0 | M_a | \varphi_0 \rangle \langle \varphi_1 | M_A | \varphi_1 \rangle \neq \langle \varphi_0 | M_A | \varphi_0 \rangle \langle \varphi_1 | M_a | \varphi_1 \rangle. \quad (\text{B15})$$

This result may be proven in the following way. Let us assume that all orthogonal states give equality in (B15). Then, for any orthogonal basis $\{|\varphi_j\rangle\}$, we have

$$\langle \varphi_j | M_a | \varphi_j \rangle = \kappa \langle \varphi_j | M_A | \varphi_j \rangle, \quad (\text{B16})$$

for some κ . Therefore $\text{Tr}(M_a) = \kappa \text{Tr}(M_A)$. Now we can take $\{|\varphi'_j\rangle\}$ to be the basis which diagonalises $M_a - \kappa M_A$. Now we have

$$\langle \varphi'_j | M_a | \varphi'_j \rangle = \kappa' \langle \varphi'_j | M_A | \varphi'_j \rangle, \quad (\text{B17})$$

so $\text{Tr}(M_a) = \kappa' \text{Tr}(M_A)$. Because $\text{Tr}(M_\alpha)$ is nonzero (these are positive operators), we have $\kappa = \kappa'$. Therefore the diagonal elements of $M_a - \kappa M_A$ must be zero in

the basis $\{|\varphi'_j\rangle\}$. As this is the basis which diagonalises $M_a - \kappa M_A$, we must have $M_a = \kappa M_A$. Hence we find that equality in (B15) implies $M_a = \kappa M_A$, so if M_a is not proportional to M_A , then there must exist orthogonal states $|\varphi_0\rangle$ and $|\varphi_1\rangle$ such that (B15) is satisfied.

Now for the restriction (9) to be violated, we need either $M_a/\mathcal{E}(\alpha)$ not independent of α or $M_b/\mathcal{E}(\beta)$ not independent of β (or both). Therefore we can select $|\varphi_j\rangle$ and $|\chi_j\rangle$ such that

$$\langle\varphi_0|M_a|\varphi_0\rangle\langle\varphi_1|M_A|\varphi_1\rangle \leq \langle\varphi_0|M_A|\varphi_0\rangle\langle\varphi_1|M_a|\varphi_1\rangle, \quad (\text{B18})$$

$$\langle\chi_0|M_b|\chi_0\rangle\langle\chi_1|M_B|\chi_1\rangle \leq \langle\chi_0|M_B|\chi_0\rangle\langle\chi_1|M_b|\chi_1\rangle, \quad (\text{B19})$$

with strict inequality in at least one of these cases. We also select these states such that the quantities on the right-hand side are nonzero. This is always possible unless one of the operators M_Γ is zero. We exclude this case, because then it is not possible to obtain the postselected correlation probabilities. We therefore have

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle\varphi_0|M_a|\varphi_0\rangle\langle\varphi_1|M_A|\varphi_1\rangle\langle\chi_0|M_b|\chi_0\rangle\langle\chi_1|M_B|\chi_1\rangle \\ &< \langle\varphi_0|M_A|\varphi_0\rangle\langle\varphi_1|M_a|\varphi_1\rangle\langle\chi_0|M_B|\chi_0\rangle\langle\chi_1|M_b|\chi_1\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B20})$$

We take the density operator

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2}(|\varphi_0\rangle\langle\varphi_0| \otimes |\chi_0\rangle\langle\chi_0| + |\varphi_1\rangle\langle\varphi_1| \otimes |\chi_1\rangle\langle\chi_1|). \quad (\text{B21})$$

In terms of the operators, the postselected Bell quantity \mathcal{B} is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B} &= \frac{\text{Tr}(\Delta M_A \Delta M_B \rho)}{\text{Tr}(M_A M_B \rho)} + \frac{\text{Tr}(\Delta M_A \Delta M_b \rho)}{\text{Tr}(M_A M_b \rho)} \\ &+ \frac{\text{Tr}(\Delta M_a \Delta M_B \rho)}{\text{Tr}(M_a M_B \rho)} - \frac{\text{Tr}(\Delta M_a \Delta M_b \rho)}{\text{Tr}(M_a M_b \rho)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B22})$$

For this density operator

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^1 \left(\frac{\langle\Delta M_A\rangle_j \langle\Delta M_B\rangle_j}{\text{Tr}(M_A M_B \rho)} + \frac{\langle\Delta M_A\rangle_j \langle\Delta M_b\rangle_j}{\text{Tr}(M_A M_b \rho)} \right. \\ &\left. + \frac{\langle\Delta M_a\rangle_j \langle\Delta M_B\rangle_j}{\text{Tr}(M_a M_B \rho)} - \frac{\langle\Delta M_a\rangle_j \langle\Delta M_b\rangle_j}{\text{Tr}(M_a M_b \rho)} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B23})$$

where the $\langle\cdots\rangle_j$ indicates the expectation value using the state $|\varphi_j\rangle$ (for Alice) or $|\chi_j\rangle$ (for Bob).

Given the M_Γ , we select the measurement operators for the individual results as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} M_a^+ &= |\varphi_0\rangle\langle\varphi_0| \langle M_a \rangle_0, & M_a^- &= M_a - |\varphi_0\rangle\langle\varphi_0| \langle M_a \rangle_0, \\ M_A^+ &= M_A, & M_A^- &= 0, \\ M_b^+ &= M_B, & M_b^- &= 0, \\ M_B^+ &= |\varphi_0\rangle\langle\varphi_0| \langle M_B \rangle_0, & M_B^- &= M_B - |\varphi_0\rangle\langle\varphi_0| \langle M_B \rangle_0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B24})$$

We therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\Delta M_a\rangle_j &= (-1)^j \langle M_a \rangle_j, \\ \langle\Delta M_A\rangle_j &= \langle M_A \rangle_j, \\ \langle\Delta M_b\rangle_j &= \langle M_b \rangle_j, \\ \langle\Delta M_B\rangle_j &= (-1)^j \langle M_B \rangle_j. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B25})$$

This gives the postselected Bell quantity as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^1 \left((-1)^j \frac{\langle M_A \rangle_j \langle M_B \rangle_j}{\text{Tr}(M_A M_B \rho)} + \frac{\langle M_A \rangle_j \langle M_b \rangle_j}{\text{Tr}(M_A M_b \rho)} \right. \\ &\left. + \frac{\langle M_a \rangle_j \langle M_B \rangle_j}{\text{Tr}(M_a M_B \rho)} - (-1)^j \frac{\langle M_a \rangle_j \langle M_b \rangle_j}{\text{Tr}(M_a M_b \rho)} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^1 \left(\frac{\langle M_A \rangle_j \langle M_B \rangle_j}{\text{Tr}(M_A M_B \rho)} + \frac{\langle M_A \rangle_j \langle M_b \rangle_j}{\text{Tr}(M_A M_b \rho)} \right. \\ &\left. + \frac{\langle M_a \rangle_j \langle M_B \rangle_j}{\text{Tr}(M_a M_B \rho)} + \frac{\langle M_a \rangle_j \langle M_b \rangle_j}{\text{Tr}(M_a M_b \rho)} \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{\langle M_a \rangle_0 \langle M_b \rangle_0}{\text{Tr}(M_a M_b \rho)} - \frac{\langle M_A \rangle_1 \langle M_B \rangle_1}{\text{Tr}(M_A M_B \rho)} \\ &= 4 - \frac{2 \langle M_a \rangle_0 \langle M_b \rangle_0}{\langle M_a \rangle_0 \langle M_b \rangle_0 + \langle M_a \rangle_1 \langle M_b \rangle_1} \\ &\quad - \frac{2 \langle M_A \rangle_1 \langle M_B \rangle_1}{\langle M_A \rangle_0 \langle M_B \rangle_0 + \langle M_A \rangle_1 \langle M_B \rangle_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B26})$$

Now we use Eq. (B20); adding terms to both sides gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle M_a \rangle_0 \langle M_b \rangle_0 \langle M_A \rangle_0 \langle M_B \rangle_0 + \langle M_a \rangle_0 \langle M_b \rangle_0 \langle M_A \rangle_1 \langle M_B \rangle_1 \\ &+ \langle M_A \rangle_1 \langle M_B \rangle_1 \langle M_a \rangle_0 \langle M_b \rangle_0 + \langle M_A \rangle_1 \langle M_B \rangle_1 \langle M_a \rangle_1 \langle M_b \rangle_1 \\ &< \langle M_a \rangle_0 \langle M_b \rangle_0 \langle M_A \rangle_0 \langle M_B \rangle_0 + \langle M_a \rangle_0 \langle M_b \rangle_0 \langle M_A \rangle_1 \langle M_B \rangle_1 \\ &+ \langle M_A \rangle_0 \langle M_B \rangle_0 \langle M_a \rangle_1 \langle M_b \rangle_1 + \langle M_A \rangle_1 \langle M_B \rangle_1 \langle M_a \rangle_1 \langle M_b \rangle_1. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B27})$$

Rearranging this gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle M_a \rangle_0 \langle M_b \rangle_0 (\langle M_A \rangle_0 \langle M_B \rangle_0 + \langle M_A \rangle_1 \langle M_B \rangle_1) \\ &+ \langle M_A \rangle_1 \langle M_B \rangle_1 (\langle M_a \rangle_0 \langle M_b \rangle_0 + \langle M_a \rangle_1 \langle M_b \rangle_1) \\ &< (\langle M_A \rangle_0 \langle M_B \rangle_0 + \langle M_A \rangle_1 \langle M_B \rangle_1) \\ &\times (\langle M_a \rangle_0 \langle M_b \rangle_0 + \langle M_a \rangle_1 \langle M_b \rangle_1), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B28})$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\langle M_a \rangle_0 \langle M_b \rangle_0}{\langle M_a \rangle_0 \langle M_b \rangle_0 + \langle M_a \rangle_1 \langle M_b \rangle_1} \\ &+ \frac{\langle M_A \rangle_1 \langle M_B \rangle_1}{\langle M_A \rangle_0 \langle M_B \rangle_0 + \langle M_A \rangle_1 \langle M_B \rangle_1} < 1 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B29})$$

We therefore obtain $\mathcal{B} > 2$.

Thus we find that, if Eq. (9) is not satisfied, for given M_Γ there exists a separable state and a set of measurement operators M_Γ^\pm such that $\mathcal{B} > 2$. Condition Eq. (9) is therefore a necessary condition for the Bell inequality to be satisfied for separable states.

Part B: Sufficiency

A separable state may be written as

$$\rho = \sum_x |\psi_x\rangle\langle\psi_x| \otimes |\phi_x\rangle\langle\phi_x|. \quad (\text{B30})$$

The index x may be regarded as equivalent to a hidden variable for a local hidden variable theory. The condition (10) then implies that the condition for local hidden variable theories to satisfy the postselected Bell inequality is satisfied, and hence $|\mathcal{B}| \leq 2$. \square

Theorem 3. *The condition*

$$\text{Tr}[(M_\alpha \otimes M_\beta)\rho] = \mathcal{E}(\alpha)\mathcal{E}(\beta)\mathcal{E}(\rho) \quad (\text{B31})$$

is sufficient for $\mathcal{B} \leq 2\sqrt{2}$ to be satisfied for all states.

Proof. In terms of $M = M_\alpha \otimes M_\beta / [\mathcal{E}(\alpha)\mathcal{E}(\beta)]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B} &= \frac{\text{Tr}(\Delta M_A \Delta M_B \rho)}{\mathcal{E}(A)\mathcal{E}(B)\text{Tr}(M\rho)} + \frac{\text{Tr}(\Delta M_A \Delta M_b \rho)}{\mathcal{E}(A)\mathcal{E}(b)\text{Tr}(M\rho)} \\ &+ \frac{\text{Tr}(\Delta M_a \Delta M_B \rho)}{\mathcal{E}(a)\mathcal{E}(B)\text{Tr}(M\rho)} - \frac{\text{Tr}(\Delta M_a \Delta M_b \rho)}{\mathcal{E}(a)\mathcal{E}(b)\text{Tr}(M\rho)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B32})$$

Let P be the projector onto the support of M . It is then clear that this equation is also satisfied with ρ replaced with $P\rho P$. Now define $\rho' = \sqrt{M}P\rho P\sqrt{M}$. Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B} &= \frac{\text{Tr}(M^{-1/2} \Delta M_A \Delta M_B M^{-1/2} \rho')}{\mathcal{E}(A)\mathcal{E}(B)\text{Tr}(\rho')} \\ &+ \frac{\text{Tr}(M^{-1/2} \Delta M_A \Delta M_b M^{-1/2} \rho')}{\mathcal{E}(A)\mathcal{E}(b)\text{Tr}(\rho')} \\ &+ \frac{\text{Tr}(M^{-1/2} \Delta M_a \Delta M_B M^{-1/2} \rho')}{\mathcal{E}(a)\mathcal{E}(B)\text{Tr}(\rho')} \\ &- \frac{\text{Tr}(M^{-1/2} \Delta M_a \Delta M_b M^{-1/2} \rho')}{\mathcal{E}(a)\mathcal{E}(b)\text{Tr}(\rho')}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B33})$$

where the inverses are taken on the support of M .

Now we have the simplification

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{M^{-1/2} \Delta M_\alpha \Delta M_\beta M^{-1/2}}{\mathcal{E}(\alpha)\mathcal{E}(\beta)} \\ &= M_\alpha^{-1/2} \Delta M_\alpha M_\alpha^{-1/2} \otimes M_\beta^{-1/2} \Delta M_\beta M_\beta^{-1/2} \\ &= \Delta \tilde{M}_\alpha \otimes \Delta \tilde{M}_\beta, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B34})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \tilde{M}_\Gamma &= \tilde{M}_\Gamma^+ - \tilde{M}_\Gamma^- \\ &= M_\Gamma^{-1/2} M_\Gamma^+ M_\Gamma^{-1/2} - M_\Gamma^{-1/2} M_\Gamma^- M_\Gamma^{-1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B35})$$

We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B} &= \text{Tr}[(\Delta \tilde{M}_A \otimes \Delta \tilde{M}_B + \Delta \tilde{M}_A \otimes \Delta \tilde{M}_b \\ &+ \Delta \tilde{M}_a \otimes \Delta \tilde{M}_B - \Delta \tilde{M}_a \otimes \Delta \tilde{M}_b)\rho''], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B36})$$

where $\rho'' = \rho' / \text{Tr}(\rho')$. That is, \mathcal{B} is the usual CHSH-Bell quantity in terms of the modified measurement operators and state. It must therefore satisfy Tsirelson's bound, and hence $\mathcal{B} \leq 2\sqrt{2}$. \square

-
- [1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777 (1935).
 [2] S. Bell, Physics **1**, 195 (1964).
 [3] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **23**, 880 (1969).
 [4] J. F. Clauser and M. A. Horne, Phys. Rev. D **10**, 526 (1974).
 [5] S. J. Freedman and J. F. Clauser, Phys. Rev. Lett. **28**, 938 (1972); A. Aspect, P. Grangier and G. Roser, Phys.

- Rev. Lett. **47**, 460 (1981).
 [6] B. S. Tsirelson, Lett. Math. Phys. **4**, 93 (1980).
 [7] J. F. Clauser and A. Shimony, Rep. Prog. Phys. **41**, 1881 (1978).
 [8] A. Shafiee and M. Golshani, J. Mod. Opt. **52**, 1405 (2005).
 [9] A. Cabello, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 060403 (2002); A. Cabello, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 042114 (2002).