

EPR Paradox, Bell Inequalities and Peculiarities of Quantum Correlations

Apoorva D. Patel^{1,2*}

¹Centre for High Energy Physics, Indian Institute of Science, Bengaluru 560012, Karnataka, India.

²International Centre for Theoretical Sciences, TIFR, Bengaluru 560089, Karnataka, India.

Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): adpatel@iisc.ac.in;

Abstract

Quantum theory revolutionised physics by introducing a new fundamental constant and a new mathematical framework to describe the observed phenomena at the atomic scale. These new concepts run counter to our familiar notions of classical physics, and pose questions about how to understand quantum physics as a fundamental theory of nature. Peculiarities of quantum correlations underlie all these questions, and this article describes their formulation, tests and resolution within the standard framework of quantum theory.

Keywords: Bell inequalities, Contextuality, EPR paradox, Leggett-Garg inequalities, Quantum correlations, Wigner functions

In the early years of twentieth century, properties of photons and atomic energy spectra challenged the existing framework of classical physics. To explain the observations, a new fundamental constant had to be introduced, the Planck's constant. Even with its incorporation, semi-classical physics could not fully describe the observed phenomena, and a completely new theoretical framework had to be constructed, named quantum physics. This new framework brought in non-commuting observables and probabilistic events, which raised many questions about its interpretation that still continue to be debated.

Section 1 of this review introduces the foundational debate between what is real and what is observable, and follows it up with the Bell inequality based

on locality and the Leggett-Garg inequality based on macrorealism. Section 2 describes the experimental tests that violate these inequalities and confirm the standard quantum mechanical analysis. Section 3 covers various scenarios that have been proposed for the interpretation of the observed but non-intuitive quantum phenomena. Section 4 describes other peculiar features of quantum correlations: non-contextuality, the Wigner function formulation, the Schmidt decomposition and quantum statistics. Section 5 presents a short outlook for this subject.

1 Interpreting Quantum Mechanics

The question of interpretation of quantum mechanics goes all the way back to its origin. Even though Einstein contributed to many early developments in quantum mechanics, he was uncomfortable with its probability interpretation. He was not satisfied with quantum mechanics being treated as an empirical theory; he wanted quantum mechanics to arise from a deterministic underlying structure, similar to how macroscopic statistical mechanics arises from microscopic atomic scale phenomena. The Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) paper posed this question directly: Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete? [1]

Bohr responded to the EPR paper, in the same journal, with the same title. He reiterated his Copenhagen interpretation, and that did not attract much attention. Schrödinger responded as well, sharpening Einstein's question. That response is remembered well for the two concepts he introduced. One is that of "entanglement", i.e. unusual quantum correlations between two separated parts of a system [2]. The other is that of a "cat" (named after him), which could be dead or alive depending on the occurrence of a quantum event [3]. The philosophical debate on these peculiarities, often referred to as the "hidden variable" problem, still goes on.

Subsequently, Bohm rephrased the question of quantum correlations in the setting of a finite dimensional system [4], which turned out to be crucial for performing accurate experimental tests. For this setting, Bell showed that the observable correlations must obey an inequality, when the hidden variables of quantum theory satisfy certain properties [5]. This analysis has been extended to different quantum systems and different observable correlations, and has generated a lot of discussion about interpretation of quantum mechanics [6]. The 2022 Nobel Prize in Physics was awarded to John F. Clauser, Alain Aspect and Anton Zeilinger, for performing accurate experiments that demonstrated that the Bell inequality is clearly violated by quantum correlations between two photons produced in a singlet state. The Nobel citation reads "for experiments with entangled photons, establishing the violation of Bell inequalities and pioneering quantum information science" [7].

1.1 The Fundamental Conundrum

At the heart of the interpretation of quantum mechanics is a quandary described by two Greek words, ontology and epistemology. The former concerns finding out what is real, irrespective of the observers. The latter focuses on what is observable in practice, and that may depend on the capability of the observer.

It is well-established that quantum dynamics produces probabilistic outcomes, and the measurement postulate of quantum mechanics successfully gives the prescription to predict the probability distribution. But what has remained mysterious is how and why the probabilistic outcomes arise, and whether the observer plays any role in that. Probabilistic description of physical phenomena is routine in statistical physics. It is understood as arising from an ensemble of underlying dynamics, which is unobserved and hence summed (or integrated) over all possibilities that may occur. The mystery then is: Can the quantum indeterminacy be explained as arising from so far unobserved “hidden variables”?

The use of “effective theories”, valid within specific ranges of their degrees of freedom, is widespread in physics. Such theories provide an excellent description of the observed data, in terms of certain empirically adjusted parameters. These parameters are understood to be consequences of the unobserved degrees of freedom (apart from fundamental constants), and carry information about their dynamics. For example, a fluid is generally described as a continuous medium, while its properties such as temperature, density and pressure parametrise the underlying atomic dynamics. Moreover, the underlying atomic dynamics produces observable signals in certain correlations, such as the Brownian motion of a particle in a fluid and the fluctuation-dissipation relation.

The hidden variables of quantum mechanics must have a distribution to produce probabilistic outcomes. Even when they are integrated out, they would leave behind observable parameters and contributions to correlations. The question then is whether we can learn something about the properties of the hidden variables by observing their consequences in the effective description. It is in this sense that the peculiarities of quantum correlations takes the centre-stage in trying to figure out the nature of the hidden variables.

It should be noted that physical parameters and correlations arising from global conservation laws do not conflict with the locality of relativity. They represent certain symmetries of the overall dynamics, and are part of inherent features of nature. For example, when a firecracker bursts and one half of it is then found at one place, it can be immediately inferred that the other half went in the opposite direction (as dictated by the conservation of momentum) without making a separate observation or worrying about instantaneous communication of information. The peculiarities of quantum correlations go beyond such situations, and that was emphatically illustrated by Bell.

1.2 Bell Inequality [5]

The quantum correlations pointed out by EPR, and rephrased by Bohm, concern two-particle singlet states, created at a common origin and then evolved so that the two components appear at a space-like separation. In case of photons, such situations arise in the two-photon cascade transitions of certain atoms, or the two-photon decay of a neutral pion, where both the initial and the final states have zero total momentum and zero total angular momentum. The zero momentum implies that the two photons fly off in opposite directions, while the zero angular momentum implies that the internal states of the two photons are anti-correlated, in terms of their spins or polarisations. The quantum mechanical description of this entangled singlet internal state is: $|\psi_{12}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle)$. If only one of the photons is observed, it is found to be in either $|\uparrow\rangle$ or $|\downarrow\rangle$ state with equal probability.

Now consider the situation where two space-like separated observers A and B measure the two photon spins along non-parallel and non-orthogonal directions, say \vec{a} and \vec{b} . The measurement outcomes are then probabilistic, and let us label them as $A(\vec{a}), B(\vec{b}) \in \{\pm 1\}$. The directions are chosen such that conservation of angular momentum offers no relation between $A(\vec{a})$ and $B(\vec{b})$, and the property to be investigated is the correlation between the two.

Next, since the two photons have a common origin, let us imagine that the distributions of $A(\vec{a})$ and $B(\vec{b})$ arise from some common ensemble of underlying hidden variables $\{\lambda\}$. The hidden variables appear at the point of origin of the two photons, and are then carried by the photons till the points of their observation. We assign to the ensemble of hidden variables a normalised weight distribution $\rho(\lambda)$, with $\int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) = 1$, and relabel the measurement outcomes as $A(\vec{a}, \lambda)$ and $B(\vec{b}, \lambda)$ to express their implicit dependence on the hidden variables.

The two-point correlation of the measurement outcomes in this setting is: $P(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) A(\vec{a}, \lambda) B(\vec{b}, \lambda)$, and global spin conservation implies $B(\vec{b}, \lambda) = -A(\vec{b}, \lambda)$. Then, using the property that $A(\vec{b}, \lambda)^2 = 1$, we can construct the following difference of correlations:

$$P(\vec{a}, \vec{c}) - P(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) A(\vec{a}, \lambda) A(\vec{b}, \lambda) [1 - A(\vec{b}, \lambda) A(\vec{c}, \lambda)]. \quad (1)$$

This difference obeys a simple bound, following from the triangle inequality $|x + y| \leq |x| + |y|$ (the sum can be replaced by an integral),

$$\begin{aligned} |P(\vec{a}, \vec{c}) - P(\vec{a}, \vec{b})| &\leq \int d\lambda \underbrace{|\rho(\lambda)|}_{\geq 0} \underbrace{|A(\vec{a}, \lambda) A(\vec{b}, \lambda)|}_{=1} \underbrace{|[1 - A(\vec{b}, \lambda) A(\vec{c}, \lambda)]|}_{\geq 0} \\ &= 1 + P(\vec{b}, \vec{c}). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Here the simplification uses the properties indicated below the equation; the last factor of the integrand is non-negative and so the absolute value sign is

dropped, the middle factor of the integrand is dropped since it is equal to one, and the absolute value sign of the first factor is dropped assuming that the ensemble weight of the hidden variables is non-negative.

In quantum mechanics, the spin (or polarisation) operator producing the measurement outcome $A(\vec{a}, \lambda)$ is $\vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{a} \equiv (\sigma_1)_x a_x + (\sigma_1)_y a_y + (\sigma_1)_z a_z$. The two-point correlation is then $P(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = \langle (\vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{a})(\vec{\sigma}_2 \cdot \vec{b}) \rangle = -\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}$, due to anti-correlation of the spin components $(\sigma_1)_i$ and $(\sigma_2)_i$. This correlation violates the bound derived above in Eq.(2) for many choices of $\vec{a}, \vec{b}, \vec{c}$. For example, choosing the directions $\vec{a} = \uparrow, \vec{b} = \nearrow, \vec{c} = \rightarrow$ in two-dimensional space yields, $P(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} = P(\vec{b}, \vec{c})$ and $P(\vec{a}, \vec{c}) = 0$, while $|0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}| \not\leq 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$.

1.3 Leggett-Garg Inequality [8]

The Bell inequality constrains correlations between two halves of a quantum system at space-like separation. Leggett and Garg formulated a different constraint for correlations between states of a single quantum system at different times. In their set up, a classical macrorealistic system possesses three properties: the system is in one of its distinct possible states at every instance, this state can be determined with negligible perturbation to the subsequent evolution, and any measurement result cannot be affected by what is measured later. They demonstrated that an inequality following from macrorealism is violated by the non-classical nature of temporal correlations in a quantum system. In a sense, the assumption of non-invasive measurements in macrorealism replaces that of local measurements in Bell's analysis.

The simplest example concerns the state of a two-state quantum system (qubit) at three different times. Let $Q(t_i) \in \{\pm 1\}$ be the binary observable measured at each time, and construct the correlations $C_{ij} = \langle Q(t_i)Q(t_j) \rangle$ for all $t_i > t_j$. Then, macrorealism implies that the combination $K_3 \equiv C_{21} + C_{32} - C_{31} \in [-3, 1]$. This Leggett-Garg inequality follows from just enumerating the eight possibilities for $Q(t_i)$, and observing that for each of them K_3 is either 1 or -3 . Any probabilistic combination of the eight possibilities would therefore keep $K_3 \in [-3, 1]$. Note that it is not necessary to specify the initial state of the quantum system.

For a qubit, we can choose $\hat{Q}(t_i) = \vec{a}_i \cdot \vec{\sigma}$ with unit vectors \vec{a}_i . Then, as per the Born rule where projective measurements alter the quantum state, the observed correlations are:

$$C_{ij} = \langle \vec{a}_i \cdot \vec{\sigma} \vec{a}_j \cdot \vec{\sigma} \rangle = \vec{a}_i \cdot \vec{a}_j . \quad (3)$$

Let θ_{ij} be the angle between \vec{a}_i and \vec{a}_j . Choosing all a_i to be coplanar with $\theta_{21} = \theta_{32} = \pi/3$ and $\theta_{31} = 2\pi/3$, gives K_3 its maximum value, $K_3^{\max} = 3/2$, which violates the Leggett-Garg inequality. (Note that always $K_3 \geq -3$.)

The four-term version of the Leggett-Garg inequality, $K_4 \in [-2, 2]$ for $K_4 \equiv C_{21} + C_{32} + C_{43} - C_{41}$, is related to the CHSH inequality of Eq.(4).

2 Experimental Tests

2.1 Bell Test Experiments

Bell's derivation of the two-photon correlation inequality provided a clear target for experimentalists to test. Of course, they had to develop the technology that would produce reliable singlet photon-pair sources, detect single photons with high success rate and measure their polarisations to high accuracy. They also had to close many loopholes, so that the observed correlations connect to the hidden variable properties and not to other extraneous coincidences. These developments occurred in several stages.

Compared to the correlation check described by Bell, a modified version proposed by Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt (CHSH) is easier to implement experimentally [9]. In this version, A chooses one of two polarisation measurement directions differing by angle $\frac{\pi}{4}$, B does the same, and B's measurement directions are rotated from those of A by angle $\frac{\pi}{8}$. A linear combination of the the four possible polarisation correlations (labeled by the measurement directions $\vec{a}, \vec{a}', \vec{b}, \vec{b}'$) then satisfies a Bell-type inequality:

$$|P(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) + P(\vec{a}, \vec{b}') + P(\vec{a}', \vec{b}) - P(\vec{a}', \vec{b}')| \leq 2. \quad (4)$$

This CHSH inequality follows from the observation that for every assignment of the measurement outcomes $\{A(\vec{a}), A(\vec{a}'), B(\vec{b}), B(\vec{b}')\} \in \{\pm 1\}$, the left hand side of the above formula evaluates to ± 2 .

Having contributed to the CHSH proposal as a graduate student, Clauser took up the challenge to test the inequality as a postdoctoral fellow at Berkeley. He did not have research funds. So the experiment was carried out using borrowed equipment and some discarded parts in a basement laboratory, together with graduate student Freedman. Calcium atoms were used to generate entangled photon pairs, and the four correlation terms of the CHSH inequality were measured one by one. The observed correlation results clearly violated the inequality, asserting the peculiar nature of quantum correlations.

The Clauser-Freedman experiment did not test the assumption made by Bell that there is no communication of any information between the measurements performed by A and B. Aspect and his collaborators at Orsay overcame this shortcoming by refining the experiment. The entangled photon pairs were generated at a higher rate, and the polarisation measurement directions on either side were randomly switched at a rate faster than the time light took to travel between A and B. The observed violation of the CHSH inequality was stronger and in accordance with the quantum mechanical prediction.

Zeilinger and his collaborators at Innsbruck and Vienna later conducted more refined tests of Bell-type inequalities, to firmly close the communication loophole. For CHSH inequality tests, entangled photon pairs were created by shining a laser on a special crystal, and random numbers switching between polarisation measurement directions were constructed using signals from distant galaxies to rule out any bias. They also demonstrated quantum

teleportation using a two-photon entangled state, where the quantum state of a photon disappears from one location and reappears at a distant location without any material transfer. This demonstration was then extended to entanglement swapping, creating a quantum entangled state between two parties who have not interacted in the past.

2.2 GHZ Test [10]

Greenberger, Horne and Zeilinger considered quantum correlations beyond the two-qubit correlations of Bell states. They proposed a correlated three-qubit state, which provides a deterministic separation (in contrast to probabilistic expectation values) between answers predicted by a Bell-type analysis and physical quantum measurement. This GHZ state is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|000\rangle - |111\rangle)$. It is a simultaneous eigenstate with eigenvalue 1 of the three commuting operators: $A^{(1)}B^{(2)}B^{(3)}$, $B^{(1)}A^{(2)}B^{(3)}$ and $B^{(1)}B^{(2)}A^{(3)}$, with $A^{(i)} = \sigma_1^{(i)}$ and $B^{(j)} = \sigma_2^{(j)}$, where the superscript denotes the qubit position. It is also an eigenstate with eigenvalue -1 of the fourth operator $A^{(1)}A^{(2)}A^{(3)}$.

All the operators $A^{(i)}$ and $B^{(j)}$ have eigenvalues ± 1 , and they square to identity. The three factors of the three-qubit operators listed above can be independently measured in experiments, and multiplied to obtain the operator eigenvalues. Also, all four three-qubit operators commute and their eigenvalues can be measured in any order. Classically, with these properties, all the measurement values can be multiplied, and the product of all the factors in the first three operators gives the factors of the fourth operator (all $B^{(j)}$ factors get squared). Then the fourth operator should give the eigenvalue 1, contrary to the quantum eigenvalue -1 .

The reason for the difference between classical and quantum predictions is that, with anticommutation of $A^{(i)}$ and $B^{(i)}$, the product of the first three operators gives minus the fourth operator:

$$\begin{aligned} & (A^{(1)} \otimes B^{(2)} \otimes B^{(3)}) (B^{(1)} \otimes A^{(2)} \otimes B^{(3)}) (B^{(1)} \otimes B^{(2)} \otimes A^{(3)}) \\ &= (A^{(1)}B^{(1)}B^{(1)}) \otimes (B^{(2)}A^{(2)}B^{(2)}) \otimes (B^{(3)}B^{(3)}A^{(3)}) = -A^{(1)} \otimes A^{(2)} \otimes A^{(3)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

This GHZ example thus connects the non-commutative nature of quantum mechanics to a deterministic outcome.

Experimentally, the GHZ states can be prepared probabilistically, purified sufficiently by suitable measurements, and then the eigenvalue of the fourth operator can be measured. Zeilinger and his group performed such a test, and it showed that indeed the quantum mechanical prediction is correct.

2.3 Leggett-Garg Inequality Tests

The Leggett-Garg macrorealistic inequality can be applied to systems of arbitrary size. Indeed, one of the motivations for developing it was to check whether macroscopic objects can exist in a superposition of states. Its tests have been performed for microscopic objects such as photons or nuclear spins, for larger

size superconducting transmon systems, and in a non-invasive setting that can be size independent with a two-state ancilla as the measuring apparatus [11].

An ideal non-invasive binary measurement of a system can be performed by a two-state ancilla such that one of the states of the system flips the ancilla while the other one does nothing (this is known as the C-NOT operation). Then in the post-selected subset of an ensemble of experiments where the ancilla is unaffected, the system state is determined non-invasively and its subsequent evolution can be investigated. How the initial state of the system or the ancilla was prepared does not matter in this scenario.

This strategy can be used to evaluate the Leggett-Garg correlation C_{ij} . For non-invasive measurements of $Q(t_j)$, two ensembles of experiments are put together—the first system state is non-invasively post-selected in one and the second system state is non-invasively post-selected in the other (with a complementary set-up). No post-selection is necessary after measurements of $Q(t_j)$, because the system evolution beyond t_j is of no consequence. Thus the combination K_3 is evaluated using six separate ensembles of experiments. The expectation value determinations can be statistically improved, by treating multiple impurities embedded in a material as an ensemble, provided that the impurities are dilute enough to interact negligibly with each-other.

Such a test, carried out using an ensemble of nucleus-electron spin pairs in phosphorus-doped silicon, confirms the quantum prediction, disproving macro-realism [11]. In particular, the experimental parameters could attain the values (i.e. sufficiently low temperature in a stable magnetic resonance set-up), needed for accurate ancilla preparation as well as for negligible perturbation to the controlling system state during the non-invasive measurement.

3 The Way Out

Experimental tests of all Bell-type inequalities demonstrate that observed physical correlations between photons (or spins) agree with the standard quantum mechanical analysis, and disagree with constraints derived using hidden variables with certain properties. These repeated confirmations of quantum mechanical predictions reiterate the fundamental question: What is the origin of the peculiar quantum correlations? Obviously, at least one of the assumptions in the derivation of inequalities must be given up. We do not want to give up the conservation laws or causality, because that would destroy the framework of physics at its core. Also, quantum dynamics and special relativity have been successfully merged in quantum field theory and verified to a fantastic level of accuracy. So we know that there is no need to give up one or the other. We need to therefore inspect more subtle ingredients in the analysis to find a credible interpretation of quantum mechanics.

Give up locality: This is the frequently used label, i.e. quantum mechanics is non-local. (It does not mean the same thing as existence of non-local quantum correlations, which the experiments verify.) Some of the hidden variables in this case are non-local and unobservable (to avoid conflict with special

relativity), and the de Broglie-Bohm theory is an explicit example of this scenario.

Give up statistical independence: This is a difficult to overcome loophole. In this case, the hidden variables in some way depend on the measurement settings, so the observables are influenced by the measurement apparatus. Superdeterministic, retrocausal and supermeasured theories with such properties have been constructed, keeping in mind the fact that correlation is not the same as causation.

Give up positivity: This is how the standard formulation of quantum mechanics works, without giving up locality or statistical independence. The quantum ensemble weights are allowed to be negative, i.e. $\rho(\lambda) \not\geq 0$. Indeed, the quantum density matrix is such a weight, with $Tr(\rho O)$ providing the expectation value of a physical observable O . The quantum density matrix is a Hermitian generalisation of the classical probability distribution, and its off-diagonal elements contribute to the quantum correlations tested with non-parallel and non-orthogonal directions. In the Wigner function form [12], written down before the EPR paper, the quantum density matrix becomes real. Physically observable quantities require smearing the Wigner function over an area in the phase space (with the characteristic scale $\Delta x \Delta p \sim h$), which wipes out locally negative weights and restores positivity of observed probabilities. Section 4.2 discusses this attribute of the quantum density matrix in more detail. How such a density matrix may arise in quantum mechanics, and the dynamics of what really happens during quantum measurement, remain open questions for a different level of analysis.

It must be emphasised that negative weights in the analysis of a physical problem are not an obstacle of principle. As an example, consider the diffusion equation describing evolution of temperature over a region. It is routinely solved by decomposing the temperature into its Fourier eigenmodes, and then determining the contribution of each eigenmode. By definition, the Fourier eigenmodes are sinusoidal functions, giving both positive and negative contributions. On the other hand, the temperature that is the sum of all Fourier eigenmodes is always positive. There is no conflict of any kind, and the important lesson is that physical reality should not be demanded of mathematical variables.

4 Quantum Correlations

The previous sections discussed topics that arose from an effort to interpret quantum mechanics as an effective theory, and the constraints it imposes on the hidden variables. Although some philosophical questions remain, all the experimental tests have emphatically confirmed the standard formulation of quantum theory. There are other peculiarities of quantum correlations that mathematically follow from this standard formulation of quantum mechanics, and we describe them in this section.

4.1 Contextuality [13]

The Bell-Kochen-Specker theorem uses the non-commuting operator structure of quantum mechanics in a clever way to elucidate the property that the results of quantum measurements are context-dependent and do not just reproduce a pre-existing value [14, 15]. Moreover, it is not necessary to specify the quantum state on which this property can be tested.

Consider a system of two qubits, for which certain Pauli operators are measured. Pauli operators for the same qubit mutually anticommute, while those for different qubits commute. Also, the eigenvalues for all Pauli operators are ± 1 . Now consider measurement of the nine Pauli operators that are arranged in a 3×3 array as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \sigma_x^{(1)} I^{(2)} & I^{(1)} \sigma_x^{(2)} & \sigma_x^{(1)} \sigma_x^{(2)} \\ I^{(1)} \sigma_y^{(2)} & \sigma_y^{(1)} I^{(2)} & \sigma_y^{(1)} \sigma_y^{(2)} \\ \sigma_x^{(1)} \sigma_y^{(2)} & \sigma_y^{(1)} \sigma_x^{(2)} & \sigma_z^{(1)} \sigma_z^{(2)} \end{array}$$

This arrangement is such that the three Pauli operators in each row and each column mutually commute, and so can be simultaneously measured. The product of the three operators in each row and the first two columns is $+1$, while the product of the three operators in the third column is -1 . Hence, the product of all nine observables is $+1$ row-wise, but -1 column-wise, and that is impossible to satisfy. We can only surmise that measurements of the operators on different rows (or different columns) require different experimental arrangements, and there is no a priori reason to believe that these arrangements would not affect the results. In other words, the results of observations do not depend just on the state of the system but also on the full set-up of the apparatus.

This example illustrates that in quantum mechanics the value of an observable when it is part of one mutually commuting set may not be the same when it is part of another mutually commuting set, when some of the members of one set do not commute with some of the members of the other. This property is called ‘‘contextuality’’. Subsequent to this deduction, Bell considered spatially separated observations of two qubits that guarantee non-contextuality as per relativity, and derived his inequality based on the assumption of locality. This is already discussed in Section 1.2.

4.2 Wigner Function

The quantum density matrix generalises the concept of classical probability distribution, and encodes complete information about a quantum system. Expectation value of any observable can be calculated from it by the simple rule, $\langle O \rangle = Tr(\rho O)$. The Wigner function is the quantum density matrix, in the representation where its relative index is Fourier transformed to its conjugate variable [12]. It is real by construction. Since it is defined in the symplectic phase space, its domain is quantised in units of the Planck constant.

4.2.1 Infinite dimensional systems

The Wigner function for a continuous one-dimensional quantum state is:

$$\begin{aligned} W(x, p) &= \frac{1}{2\pi\hbar} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy \psi^*\left(x - \frac{y}{2}\right) e^{ipy/\hbar} \psi\left(x + \frac{y}{2}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi\hbar} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy \rho\left(x - \frac{y}{2}, x + \frac{y}{2}\right) e^{ipy/\hbar}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$$\rho\left(x - \frac{y}{2}, x + \frac{y}{2}\right) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dp W(x, p) e^{-ipy/\hbar}. \quad (7)$$

It can be negative, but its marginals are non-negative.

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dp W(x, p) = |\psi(x)|^2 = \rho(x, x), \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx W(x, p) = |\tilde{\psi}(p)|^2. \quad (8)$$

Its smeared values over a phase space volume element $\Delta x \Delta p = 2\pi\hbar$ (associated with counting of states in quantum statistics) are also non-negative. The normalisation condition is:

$$\text{Tr}(\rho) = 1 \quad \longleftrightarrow \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx dp W(x, p) = 1. \quad (9)$$

The expectation value of a Hermitian operator O is obtained as:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle O \rangle &\equiv \text{Tr}(\rho O) = \int dx dy \rho\left(x - \frac{y}{2}, x + \frac{y}{2}\right) O\left(x + \frac{y}{2}, x - \frac{y}{2}\right) \\ &= \int dx dy \int dp W(x, p) e^{-ipy/\hbar} \int dq O(x, q) e^{iqy/\hbar} \\ &= 2\pi\hbar \int dx \int dp W(x, p) \int dq O(x, q) \delta(p - q) \\ &= 2\pi\hbar \int dx dp W(x, p) O(x, p). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

It should be noted that $O(x, p)$ implicitly defined here is Hermitian, and its normalisation is fixed by the convention $\langle I \rangle = 1$.

4.2.2 Finite dimensional systems

For a finite dimensional quantum system with d degrees of freedom, the odd and even values of d need to be handled separately. When d is odd,

$$W(n, k) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{m=0}^{d-1} \rho_{n-m, n+m} e^{4\pi i k m / d}, \quad (11)$$

is a valid Wigner function [16, 17]. Here the indices are defined modulo d , i.e. $n, k, m \in Z_d = \{0, 1, \dots, d-1\}$. The odd value of d allows all independent indices to be covered in two cycles of Z_d .

This definition does not work for even d . If the index shift is made one sided, the Wigner function does not remain real. So an alternative construction is needed, incorporating a “quantum square-root”. Since any integer is an odd number times a power of two, figuring out the Wigner function for $d = 2$ (i.e. a qubit) is sufficient to reach any d using tensor products.

For $d = 2$, the Wigner function can be defined using eigenvalues of σ_z and σ_x as the two conjugate labels (replacing x and p). σ_z and σ_x are related by the Hadamard operator, $\sigma_z = H\sigma_x H$, which gives the discrete Fourier transformation in $d = 2$. For instance, one can call $W(+, +)$ the weight for the spin being up along both z -axis and x -axis. The Wigner function for a qubit can be constructed as a map from the Bloch sphere representation, $\rho = (I + \hat{n} \cdot \vec{\sigma})/2$, with the replacements:

$$\begin{aligned} I &\rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, & \sigma_x &\rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \sigma_y &\rightarrow \pm \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, & \sigma_z &\rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The ambiguity in the sign for σ_y is related to the charge conjugation symmetry of the $SU(2)$ group algebra, $\vec{\sigma} \leftrightarrow -\vec{\sigma}^*$, and both choices should be checked for consistency. The normalisation condition $\text{Tr}(\rho) = 1$ becomes $\sum_{ij} W(i, j) = 1$, while $\rho^2 \preceq \rho$ gives $\sum_{ij} W(i, j)^2 \leq 1/2$.

The expectation values can be expressed as $\langle O \rangle = \sum_{ij} W(i, j) O(i, j)$, where the operator normalisation, fixed by imposing $\langle I \rangle = 1$, is different from that for the Wigner function. The qubit operators map as:

$$I \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \vec{\sigma} \cdot \hat{m} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} m_x \pm m_y + m_z & -m_x \mp m_y + m_z \\ m_x \mp m_y - m_z & -m_x \pm m_y - m_z \end{pmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

The marginals giving qubit observables $\langle I \pm \sigma_i \rangle$ are all non-negative, while the expectation values are $\langle \vec{\sigma} \cdot \hat{m} \rangle = \hat{n} \cdot \hat{m}$.

In this convention, the Wigner function is non-negative within the octahedron $\pm x \pm y \pm z = 1$ embedded in the Bloch sphere (taking into account both the signs of σ_y). The directions $\hat{n}_j \in \{\pm 1, \pm 1, \pm 1\}$, orthogonal to the faces of the octahedron, give the maximum negativity to the Wigner function.

Wigner functions for multi-qubit states are easily constructed using tensor products. For example, the density matrix for the two-qubit singlet state is:

$$\rho_{\text{singlet}} = \frac{1}{4} (I \otimes I - \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x - \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y - \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z), \quad (14)$$

which, with the above replacements, yields the Wigner function:

$$W_{\text{singlet}} = \frac{1}{8} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & +1 & +1 & -1 \\ +1 & +1 & +1 & +1 \\ +1 & +1 & +1 & +1 \\ -1 & +1 & +1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (15)$$

Its negative components are enough to give $\langle(\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{a})(\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{b})\rangle = -\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}$, and violate the Bell inequality. Representing \vec{a} and \vec{b} on the Bloch sphere, the positive and negative hemispheres around them yield the measurement outcomes $+1$ and -1 . Then $\langle(\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{a})(\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{b})\rangle$ is the sum of four independent components with probabilities $p_{++} = \frac{1}{4}(1 - \vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}) = p_{--}$, $p_{+-} = \frac{1}{4}(1 + \vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}) = p_{-+}$.

4.2.3 Quantum features

Bell-type inequalities for experimentally observable correlations are derived assuming statistical probability distributions for unobserved local hidden variables. The standard formulation of quantum theory bypasses them, without introducing any new variables, when the statistical probability distributions are replaced by the density matrix. Quantum density matrices bring in complex weights in general, Wigner functions make the weights real by a particular choice of representation, but the possibility of the weights being non-probabilistic (e.g. negative) remains. That is the sense in which Wigner functions are different from classical phase space distributions.

Properties of Wigner functions have been useful in understanding how quantum algorithms can be advantageous compared to their classical counterparts. The Clifford group operations are those that transform the Pauli group $\{I, \sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z\}^{\otimes n}$ within itself, up to phase factors $\{\pm 1, \pm i\}$. For a single qubit, these operations are the symmetry operations of the octahedron described in the previous section, which transform the non-negative Wigner function region to itself. The Gottesman-Knill theorem proves that all Clifford group operations can be perfectly simulated in polynomial time on a probabilistic classical computer [18].

For a general quantum algorithm, Wigner functions can be associated with the initial product state, the logic gate operations, and the final local measurements. The outcome probabilities of any quantum algorithm can then be expressed as a phase space probability distribution, which is a product of these Wigner function factors summed over all evolution time steps t and all quantum state components n . When all the Wigner function factors are non-negative, the evolution describes a classical stochastic process, which can be efficiently sampled with an effort polynomial in n and t [19]. This result is robust with respect to sampling errors and bounded approximations, and generalises the Gottesman-Knill theorem.

4.3 Schmidt Decomposition

This is a striking result from linear algebra, which predates quantum theory. It simplifies the description of correlations between two complementary parts of a quantum system, by making a clever choice of basis.

Any pure quantum state of a bipartite system can be expressed in the form:

$$|\psi_{AB}\rangle = \sum_{i,\mu} a_{i\mu} |i_A\rangle |\mu_B\rangle \equiv \sum_i |i_A\rangle |\bar{i}_B\rangle, \quad (16)$$

where $|i_A\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_A$ and $|\mu_B\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_B$ form complete orthonormal bases, while the vectors $|\bar{i}_B\rangle \equiv \sum_{\mu} a_{i\mu} |\mu_B\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_B$ may not be either normalised or mutually orthogonal. Now choose the orthonormal basis $\{|i_A\rangle\}$ such that the reduced density matrix ρ_A is diagonal. ρ_A can be also expressed as the partial trace $\text{Tr}_B(\rho_{AB})$. Comparison of the two forms gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_A &= \sum_i p_i |i_A\rangle \langle i_A| \\ &= \text{Tr}_B \left(\left(\sum_i |i_A\rangle |\bar{i}_B\rangle \right) \left(\sum_j \langle j_A| \langle \bar{j}_B| \right) \right) = \sum_{ij} \langle \bar{j}_B | \bar{i}_B \rangle |i_A\rangle \langle j_A|. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Consistency in the orthonormal basis $\{|i_A\rangle\}$ requires that $\sum_j \langle \bar{j}_B | \bar{i}_B \rangle = p_i \delta_{ij}$. Thus $\{|\bar{i}_B\rangle\}$ also form an orthogonal basis, and the vectors $|i'_B\rangle = p_i^{-1/2} |\bar{i}_B\rangle$ are orthonormal. Moreover, we can also express $|\psi_{AB}\rangle = \sum_i p_i^{1/2} |i_A\rangle |i'_B\rangle$, and have the reduced density matrix $\rho_B = \sum_i p_i |i'_B\rangle \langle i'_B|$.

This result, which converts a bipartite quantum state from a double sum over indices i and μ to a single sum over index i , by a clever choice of basis, has many physical implications (subject to the specific choice of partition):

- There is no restrictions on the dimensionalities of \mathcal{H}_A and \mathcal{H}_B . The number of non-zero values of p_i that appear in the preceding expansions of the reduced density matrices ρ_A and ρ_B is called the Schmidt rank r_S . Obviously, $r_S \leq \min(\dim(\mathcal{H}_A), \dim(\mathcal{H}_B))$. When $r_S = 1$, the quantum state factorises between parts A and B , and there are no correlations. But when $r_S > 1$, the quantum state does not factorise between parts A and B , i.e. they are entangled.
- When $\dim(\mathcal{H}_A) \leq \dim(\mathcal{H}_B)$, only up to $\dim(\mathcal{H}_A)$ degrees of freedom of \mathcal{H}_B can be correlated with those of \mathcal{H}_A . This is true even if \mathcal{H}_B has many more degrees of freedom than \mathcal{H}_A , as is often the case when A labels the system and B its environment. Diagonalisation of ρ_B is needed to explicitly find these degrees of freedom, but diagonalisation of ρ_A is enough to specify their number. This one-to-one correspondence between $|i_A\rangle$ and $|i'_B\rangle$ is a constraint on the bipartite correlations, known as “monogamy”.
- The orthonormal basis sets $\{|i_A\rangle\}$ and $\{|i'_B\rangle\}$ with non-zero values of p_i have the same size. So they can be related by a unitary transformation (including both rotations and reflections). Also, the Schmidt decomposition is unaffected

by independent local unitary transformations on the two parts. Any transformation of the form $U_A \otimes U_B$ merely redefines the basis sets $\{|i_A\rangle\}$ and $\{|i'_B\rangle\}$.

- Since any mixed state density matrix can be diagonalised as $\rho_A = \sum_i p_i |i_A\rangle\langle i_A|$, it can always be extended to a pure state by adding suitable $|i'_B\rangle$. Such an extension of a mixed state to a pure state is not unique, but the required number of $|i'_B\rangle$ does not exceed $\dim(\mathcal{H}_A)$, and so the pure state dimension does not exceed $(\dim(\mathcal{H}_A))^2$. This concept turns out to be very useful in construction of error-correction codes for bounded error quantum computation that eliminate undesired system-environment correlations. It is also useful in construction of error mitigation schemes that focus on removing the dominant errors corresponding to non-leading large p_i .

- The correlations between the two parts of a pure quantum state can be quantified in terms of the entropy:

$$S(\{p_i\}) = - \sum_i p_i \log(p_i) = -\text{Tr}(\rho_A \log(\rho_A)) = -\text{Tr}(\rho_B \log(\rho_B)) . \quad (18)$$

Noting that $S(|\psi_{AB}\rangle) = -\text{Tr}(\rho_{AB} \log(\rho_{AB})) = 0$ for the pure state $|\psi_{AB}\rangle$, $S(\{p_i\})$ is called the *entropy of formation* of the mixed state. $S(\{p_i\})$ is maximised when all p_i are equal, $S_{\max} = \log(r_S)$. That corresponds to equipartition or the microcanonical ensemble of statistical mechanics.

- For a system of two qubits, the Schmidt decomposition is $|\psi_{AB}\rangle = \sqrt{p}|i_A\rangle|i'_B\rangle + \sqrt{1-p}|j_A\rangle|j'_B\rangle$, with $p \in [0, 1]$ and $i \neq j$. In this case, the entropy $S(p)$ is a monotonically increasing function of p for $p \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, and can be used to compare correlations between the two qubits, i.e. specify whether one two-qubit system is more or less correlated than another one. The choice $p = \frac{1}{2}$ gives the maximally entangled Bell states, which form a complete orthonormal basis in the four-dimensional Hilbert space. With the one-to-one correspondence between $|i_A\rangle$ and $|i'_B\rangle$, they are very useful in construction of quantum cryptographic protocols.

4.4 Quantum Statistics

Quantum physics brings in the notion of identical particles, a concept that is absent in classical physics. This feature produces many striking effects, when more than one identical particles are present in a system. With the inclusion of special relativity, the framework of quantum field theory expands the scope of such telltale effects even further.

For evolution of n identical particles, $n!$ permutation possibilities need to be summed over. Equivalently, there are $n!$ possible paths that interfere giving rise to quantum effects. Some of the outstanding examples are:

- The spin-statistics connection is a fundamental property that relates the intrinsic spin of a particle and the statistics of collections of such particles [20]. It can be understood geometrically as the exchange of two identical particles being equivalent to rotating one of them by angle 2π . Its explicit proof requires relativistic quantum field theory and representation theory of the

Lorentz group, although it can be simplified assuming the existence of antiparticles. Only two possibilities occur in 3+1 dimensions: Symmetric bosons with integral spin and antisymmetric fermions with half-integral spin, with two exchanges returning the quantum state to its original form. On the other hand, any value of spin is allowed for hard-core (quasi)particles in 2+1 dimensions.

- The symmetric Bose-Einstein statistics and antisymmetric Fermi-Dirac statistics form the basis of quantum statistical physics. In reality, the basic building blocks of matter are all fermions, while their interactions are mediated by bosons. Beyond that, the statistical rules apply to composite quantum objects as well. Anyonic statistics can be more complicated; it is analysed using concepts of braiding and topology.

- Antisymmetric Fermi-Dirac statistics incorporates the Pauli exclusion principle, i.e. any quantum state can contain either one fermion or no fermion. That leads to the shell model for multi-electron atoms and multi-nucleon nuclei as well as the Fermi sea and band structure of metals and insulators.

- Degenerate Fermi gas produces pressure at its Fermi surface. In situations where the temperature can be ignored, such as white dwarfs and neutron stars, it gives their equation of state. When effects of special relativity are included, the pressure has a limiting value. When gravitational compression exceeds that pressure the stars collapse, a dramatic consequence known as the Chandrasekhar limit.

- Unlike fermions, an unlimited number of bosons can occupy any quantum state, e.g. as in case of lasers. Also, bosons can be produced or absorbed singly, while fermions must be created or annihilated as particle-antiparticle pairs. When the number of bosons is conserved, it is possible for a macroscopic fraction of them to occupy the ground state of the system at low enough temperatures, a phenomenon known as the Bose-Einstein condensation where dissipation disappears. Condensation of hard-core bosons produces superfluidity, while condensation of bound fermions pairs (which are composite bosons) produces superconductivity. The complete lack of dissipation in both cases is a distinctly quantum property.

- The Hong-Ou-Mandel effect demonstrates characteristic interference between two identical photons [21]. When such photons enter a 1:1 beam splitter simultaneously, one in each input port, they always exit the beam splitter in the same output mode. There is zero probability for them to exit separately as one each in the two output modes. This effect is useful in accurately testing the distinguishability of the photons, in frequency timing or path lengths.

- The Hanbury Brown and Twiss effect describes correlations in the intensities received by two detectors from a narrow beam of particles [22]. For a source of identical particles, there are two possibilities for paths to the detectors, parallel and crossed. Their interference leads to oscillating intensity correlations (in arrival times at the detectors), corresponding to bunching for bosons, anti-bunching for fermions, and no correlations for coherent sources (e.g. lasers). This effect has been used to resolve the source sizes from radio astronomy to heavy-ion collisions.

5 Outlook

Where does all this leave us? While it is certainly worthwhile to keep on contemplating about foundational questions and interpretation of quantum mechanics, it is best to follow Mermin's advice for practical applications of quantum mechanics: "Shut up and calculate!" In fact, the Physics Breakthrough Prize for 2022 was awarded to Charles H. Bennett, Gilles Brassard, David Deutsch and Peter Shor "for foundational work in the field of quantum information" [23]. They have used the well-established features of quantum theory to direct progress in the rapidly growing field of quantum technology.

Acknowledgments. This work was supported in part by the MSIL Chair Professorship at IISc.

Declarations

- The corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky and N. Rosen, *Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?*, Phys. Rev. 47 (1935) 777-780.
- [2] E. Schrödinger, *Discussion of probability relations between separated systems*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. 31 (1935) 555-563.
- [3] E. Schrödinger, *The present situation in quantum mechanics*, Naturwissenschaften 23 (1935) 807-812.
- [4] D. Bohm, *Quantum Theory*, Prentice-Hall (1951).
- [5] J.S. Bell, *On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox*, Physics 1 (1964) 195-200.
- [6] J.S. Bell, *Speakable and Unsayable in Quantum Mechanics*, Cambridge University Press (1987).
- [7] See, <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/physics/2022/press-release/>
- [8] A.J. Leggett and A. Garg, *Quantum mechanics versus macroscopic realism: Is the flux there when nobody looks?*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 54 (1985) 857-860.
- [9] J.F. Clauser, M.A. Horne, A. Shimony and R.A. Holt, *Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 23 (1969) 880-884; Erratum, Phys. Rev. Lett. 24 (1970) 549.

- [10] D.M. Greenberger, M.A. Horne, A. Shimony and A. Zeilinger, *Bell's theorem without inequalities*, Am. J. Phys. 58 (1990) 1131-1143.
- [11] G.C. Knee, S. Simmons, E.M. Gauger, J.J.L. Morton, H. Riemann, N.V. Abrosimov, P. Becker, H.-J. Pohl, K.M. Itoh, M.L.W. Thewalt, G.A.D. Briggs and S.C. Benjamin, *Violation of a Leggett-Garg inequality with local non-invasive measurements*, Nature Commun. 3 (2012) 606.
- [12] E.P. Wigner, *On the quantum correction to thermodynamic equilibrium*, Phys. Rev. 40 (1932) 749-759.
- [13] N.D. Mermin, *Hidden variables and the two theorems of John Bell*, Rev. Mod. Phys. 65 (1993) 803-815.
- [14] J.S. Bell, *On the problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics*, Rev. Mod. Phys. 38 (1966) 447-452.
- [15] S. Kochen and E.P. Specker, *The problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics*, J. Math. Mech. 17 (1967) 59-87.
- [16] See for example, F. A. Buot, *Method for calculating $Tr \mathcal{H}^n$ in solid-state theory*, Phys. Rev. B 10 (1974) 3700-3705.
- [17] W.K. Wootters, *A Wigner-function formulation of finite-state quantum mechanics*, Ann. Phys. 176 (1987) 1-21.
- [18] D. Gottesman, *The Heisenberg representation of quantum computers*, Proc. XXII International Collquium on Group Theoretical Methods in Physics, S.P. Corney, R. Delbourgo and P.D. Jarvis (Eds.), International Press, Cambridge, UK (1999), 32-43.
- [19] A. Mari and J. Eisert, *Positive Wigner functions render classical simulation of quantum computation efficient*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 109 (2012) 230503.
- [20] R.F. Streater and A.S. Wightman, *PCT, Spin and Statistics, and All That*, Princeton University Press (2000).
- [21] C.K. Hong, Z.Y. Ou and L. Mandel, *Measurements of subpicosecond time intervals between two photons by interference*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 59 (1987) 2044-2046.
- [22] R. Hanbury Brown and R.Q. Twiss, *A new type of interferometer for use in radio astronomy*, Philosophical Magazine 45 (1954) 663-682.
- [23] See, <https://breakthroughprize.org/News/73>