

# Comment on ” Consequences of the single-pair measurement of the Bell parameter”

Marian Kupczynski

Département de l’Informatique et Technologie, UQO, Case postale 1250, succursale Hull, Gatineau. QC, Canada J8X 3X7

ORCID:0000-0002-0247-7289

**ABSTRACT.** Genovese and Piacentini [Phys.Rev.A 111, 022204 (2025)] claim that in a recent experiment [S.Virzi *et al.*, Quantum Sci. Technol. 9, 045027 (2024)] the Bell parameter was measured on a single pair of photons thus it challenges several conclusions and discussions on the meaning of Bell inequalities as well as certain QM interpretations. We explain that the parameter measured in Vizri *et al.* experiment it is not the Bell parameter S which was discussed and estimated in many loophole free tests. Therefore, this experiment neither challenges our understanding of Bell Tests nor allows having doubts about Bohr complementarity and contextuality.

In their article, Genovese and Piacentini [1] present a comprehensive discussion of recent literature on Bell Tests and discuss implications of *Virzi et al* experiment [2].

They start with the definition of the Bell parameter. ” *If one considers the correlations between Alice’s and Bob’s measurements performed randomly choosing between two possible settings and respectively dubbed  $A_i$  and  $B_j$  ( $i, j = 1, 2$ ), by averaging on multiple experiments one can write the correlation parameter:*

$$B = \langle A_1B_1 + A_1B_2 + A_2B_1 - A_2B_2 \rangle \quad (1)$$

*Then, it can be demonstrated that  $|B| \leq 2$  for every LHVT [the so-called Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt (CHSH) inequality], but can reach  $2\sqrt{2}$  in QM ”.*

This definition requires an explanation. In (1),  $B = \langle C \rangle$ , where C is a random variable being a function of four jointly distributed binary random variables ( $A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2$ ) [3-7]. The values of C for each trial can only be evaluated using Nx4 spreadsheet in which outcomes ( $\pm 1, \pm 1, \pm 1, \pm 1$ ) of measurements of 4 random variables are displayed [8]. Then, for all finite samples the estimates of |B| are smaller or equal to 2, and the inequality inequality  $|B| \leq 2$  cannot be violated.

Neither in an ideal EPRB experiment [9] nor in Bell Tests [10] exist joint probability distributions of ( $A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2$ ) and Bell knew it very well. Therefore, the Bell parameter evaluated in quantum mechanics

and estimated in Bell Tests is not B, as it was defined in (1), but S [9]:

$$S = \langle A_1B_1 \rangle + \langle A_1B_2 \rangle + \langle A_2B_1 \rangle - \langle A_2B_2 \rangle \quad (2).$$

The CHSH inequality is not  $|B| \leq 2$  but  $|S| \leq 2$ . Bell did not notice [3-8] that in the proofs of Bell-CHSH inequalities the existence of a joint probability distribution of ( $A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2$ ) was tacitly assumed.

In Bell Tests pairwise expectation values in (2), can only be estimated in 4 different random experiments thus these estimates may violate  $|S| \leq 2$ . Four Nx2 data spreadsheets cannot be reshuffled to form quadruplets [11] and CHSH inequality is violated. Even, if one assumes, as in the local realistic hidden variable model [7-9] that experimental outcomes are predetermined, estimates of S violate CHSH 50 % of time [12, 13]. Only if sample size N increases the violation of (2) becomes less and less significant.

In quantum mechanics every experiment is described by its dedicated context dependent probabilistic model thus:

$$\langle A_iB_j \rangle = Tr(\rho \hat{A}_i \otimes \hat{B}_j) \quad (3)$$

and  $|S| \leq 2\sqrt{2}$ . If in (1), one substitutes the random variables by operators  $A_iB_j \rightarrow \hat{A}_i \otimes \hat{B}_j$  one obtains an operator  $\hat{C}$  which does not correspond to any physical observable. It cannot be measured because it contains non-commuting operators corresponding to incompatible physical observables.

Therefore expectation value  $\langle \hat{C} \rangle$  is in fact meaningless.

Nevertheless, if (3) is used to evaluate  $|S|$ , then according to quantum mechanics  $|\langle \hat{C} \rangle| = |S|$  and this equality is used, as a convenient mathematical tool, to prove that  $2\sqrt{2}$  (the Tsirelson bound) is the maximal value of  $S$  for any quantum state  $\rho$  and for a large class of quantum operators [8, 14, 15].

According to Contextuality-by-Default approach (CbD) random variables should be labelled by an experimental context and a measured content [16]. Therefore, experimental data in Bell tests are described by 4 pairs of random variables:

$$(A_{11}B_{11}), (A_{12}B_{12}), (A_{21}B_{21}), (A_{22}B_{22}) \quad (4)$$

and a priori  $|S| \leq 4$  [17]. Therefore, in Bell Tests [10] we can only assess a plausibility of different probabilistic models/couplings [18]. In particular, we compare the quantum coupling:

$$\langle A_{ij}B_{ij} \rangle = \text{Tr}(\rho \hat{A}_i \otimes \hat{B}_j) \quad (5)$$

with the Bell-local realistic coupling :

$$\langle A_{ij}B_{ij} \rangle = \int_{\Lambda} A_i(\lambda) B_j(\lambda) \rho(\lambda) d\lambda \quad (6)$$

The meaning and implications of Bell Tests are now well understood. Bell Tests allowed rejecting, with high confidence Bell-local and Bell-causal non-contextual hidden variable models [10-13, 17-19] proposed as probabilistic couplings similar to (6). They also confirmed the validity of Bohr complementarity and contextuality. The measuring instruments do not passively read pre-existing values of physical observables but play an important and active role.

Genovese and Piacentini, do not make distinction between  $B$  and  $S$ , and claim that in the experiment [2], the Bell parameter was measured on a single-pair of photons. Therefore, it challenges not only the explanation of Bell Tests, reviewed above, but also modal interpretations of quantum mechanics [20-21].

As we explained above the Bell parameter is  $S$  and not  $B$ , thus it cannot be measured for a single pair of entangled photons.  $S$  contains 4 pairwise expectation

values (2) which can be only estimated in dedicated experiments performed in 4 different incompatible experimental contexts.

The experiment [2] follows a completely different protocol. Two entangled photonic signals are produced and successive weak measurements (WM) are performed by Alice and Bob on incoming signals (not on single photons, which we do not see and follow). Entangled signals are slightly deviated and *using detectors with two-dimensional spatial resolution, Alice and Bob can extract the information on their polarization measurements, as well as on their cross-correlations, from the coordinates set  $X_A, Y_A, X_B, Y_B$  generated by the detection of each entangled photon* [2].

After a complicated and model dependent calculation, a “value of  $B$ ” is outputted for each quadruple of spatial coordinates associated to a pair of distant correlated clicks. Next, the average of all these values is calculated. The meaning of this “ $B$ -value” is not well understood and it should not be called *a measurement of  $B$  on a single photon - pair*.

In (1), random variables  $(A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2)$ , taking  $\pm 1$  values, are jointly distributed and are not measured in sequence. Therefore, the condition  $|B| \leq 2$  is satisfied for all finite sample. In contrast, the calculated “ $B$ -values”, 50% of time, are greater than  $2\sqrt{2}$ . Bell Tests allow studying the dependence of  $S$  on setting angles and compare it with quantum predictions. It is not clear how it could be done for “ $B$ -values”.

The experiment of [2] is original and interesting. It may lead to new applications in quantum information and computing but it neither challenges our understanding of Bell Tests nor allows having doubts about Bohr complementarity and contextuality.

During weak measurements a system being measured is minimally disturbed. By repeating the measurement many times and averaging the results, one can gather some new information about the system without causing significant disturbance. However the meaning of the measurement outcomes is not always clear, thus one has to be cautious before jumping into extraordinary metaphysical conclusions based on them.

- [1] M.Genovese and F. Piacentini, Consequences of the single-pair measurement of the Bell parameter, *Phys. Rev. A* **111**, 022204–Published 4 February, 2025
- [2] S. Virzì *et al.*, Entanglement-preserving measurement of the Bell parameter on a single entangled pair, *Quantum Sci.Technol.* **9**, 045027 (2024).
- [3] A. Fine, Hidden variables, joint probability, and the Bell inequalities, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **48**, 291 (1982).
- [4] M. Kupczynski Bertrand's paradox Bell's inequalities. *Phys Lett A.* (1987) 121:205–7
- [5] K.Hess and W., Philipp ,Bell's Theorem: Critique of Proofs With and Without Inequalities. *AIP Conf Proc.* **750**:150–7(2005)
- [6] A. Khrennikov, Nonlocality as well as rejection of realism are only sufficient (but non-necessary!) conditions for violation of Bell's inequality, *Inf. Sci.* **179**, 492 (2009).
- [7] M.Kupczynski , Can we close the Bohr-Einstein quantum debate?, *Phil.Trans.R.Soc.A.*, 20160392. Published:02 October 2017 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2016.0392>
- [8] M. Kupczynski, Is the moon there if nobody looks: Bell inequalities and physical reality, *Front. Phys.* **8**, 273 (2020).
- [9] J.S.Bell , *Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics*, Cambridge UP, Cambridge, (2004)
- [10] The BIG Bell Test Collaboration, Challenging local realism with human choices, *Nature* **557**, 212–216 (2018) .
- [11] H.De Raedt , M.I.Katsnelson, M.S. Jattana, V.Mehta, M. Willsch, D.Willsch, K.Michielsen and F.Jin, , Einstein–Podolsky–Rosen–Bohm experiments: A discrete data driven approach. *Ann. Phys.* **453**, 169314 (2023)
- [12] R. D. Gill, Statistics, Causality and Bell's Theorem, *Stat. Science* **29**, 512 (214)
- [13] M. Kupczynski, EPR paradox, quantum nonlocality and physical reality, *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.* **701**, 012021 (2016)
- [14] Cirel'son BS. Quantum generalizations of Bell's inequality. *Lett Math Phys.* (1980) **4**:93–100
- [15] A. Khrennikov, Get rid of nonlocality from quantum physics, *Entropy* **21**, 806 (2019).
- [16] E.N Dzhafarov , J.V. Kujala and J.-Å. Larsson, Contextuality in three types of quantum-mechanical Systems, *Foundations of Physics* **7**, 762-782 (2015).
- [17] M.Kupczynski, Contextuality by default description of Bell tests: Contextuality as the rule and not as an exception. *Entropy*, **23**, 1104 (2023).
- [18] M. Kupczynski, Quantum nonlocality: How does nature do it? *Entropy* **26**, 191 (2024).
- [19] A. Khrennikov, Contextuality, Complementarity , Signaling, and Bell Tests. *Entropy* **24**, 1380 (2022) (
- [20] D. Dieks, Consistent histories and relativistic invariance in the modal interpretation of quantum mechanics, *Phys. Lett. A* **265**, 317 (2000).
- [21] O.Lombardi and D. Dieks, Modal interpretations of quantum mechanics, in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2024 edition), edited by E. N. Zalta and U. Nodelma (Metaphysics Research Laboratory, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, 2024).
- [22] P. Grangier, Completing the quantum formalism in a contextually objective framework, *Found. Phys.* **51**, 76 (2021).

clear