

Comment on “Separability of quantum states and the violation of Bell-type inequalities”

Christoph Simon*

Laboratoire de Spectrométrie Physique, CNRS et Université de Grenoble 1, St. Martin d’Hères, France

(Dated: October 30, 2018)

The statement of E.R. Loubenets, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 042102 (2004), that separable states can violate classical probabilistic constraints is based on a misleading definition of classicality, which is much narrower than Bell’s concept of local hidden variables. In a Bell type setting the notion of classicality used by Loubenets corresponds to the assumption of perfect correlations if the same observable is measured on both sides. While it is obvious that most separable states do not satisfy this assumption, this does not constitute “non-classical” behaviour in any usual sense of the word.

In Ref. [1] the author claims to show that separable quantum states do not satisfy all “classical probabilistic constraints”. Here I argue that the definition of classicality used is misleading.

The notion of “joint classical measurements”, on which the author’s assertion rests, is explicitly introduced in the appendix of Ref. [1]. She considers three “properties” A , D_1 and D_2 , either two of which can be measured jointly. In a Bell-type situation with two separate subsystems (to which the formalism is applied in the paper), these properties correspond to measurements on a single subsystem. The author considers the joint measurements $A - D_1$, $A - D_2$ and $D_1 - D_2$. She does not specify which of the two properties is measured for which subsystem. In fact, it is implicit in her definition that this does not matter.

This becomes clear from the author’s postulates for the correlation functions corresponding to the joint measurements, see Eq. (A3) in the appendix of Ref. [1]. She assumes that there are three functions $f_A(\theta)$, $f_{D_1}(\theta)$ and $f_{D_2}(\theta)$ of the hidden variables θ , which give the measured values of the properties A , D_1 and D_2 . It is obvious from Eq. (A3) that the same function is supposed to apply, independently of the subsystem on which the respective property is measured. In order for the three joint measurements to be possible, at least one of the three properties has to be measured on the first subsystem in one combination and on the second subsystem in another combination, i.e. it has to switch sides. Eq. (A3) implicitly assumes that this makes no difference.

In a general local hidden variable model as considered by Bell in Ref. [2] a priori there are six independent functions, corresponding to measuring each property A , D_1 and D_2 either on the first or on the second subsystem. Only if one has additional information about the system under consideration can this number be reduced. For example, in Ref. [2] Bell assumed that the system under consideration exhibits perfect anti-correlations, if the same property is measured on both subsystems. This was made possible by the fact that he only wanted to apply his inequality to the quantum mechanical singlet state of two spin-(1/2) systems, which exhibits such perfect anti-correlations.

Eq. (A3) in Ref. [1] corresponds to the assumption of perfect correlations. For a given value of θ , i.e. for a given system, the same value will be obtained for the property A , irrespectively of whether it is measured on the first or on the second subsystem. If it is measured for both subsystems at the same time, there will thus be perfect correlation.

In contrast to Bell, the author then applies the derived inequality to a state which does not exhibit such perfect correlations at all. In fact, if the same observable (the spin along the same direction) is measured on both sub-systems for the state Eq. (6) of Ref. [1], the spin correlation function for the given state is always *non-positive*, as can be seen from Eq. (7) of Ref. [1], whereas perfect correlations would correspond to a value +1 of the correlation function for all such joint measurements along identical directions. It is thus not at all surprising that the state violates the derived inequality.

However, it is quite misleading to suggest that this constitutes a violation of “classical probabilistic constraints”. It is simply a consequence of the fact that the author has implicitly defined “classicality” to mean the existence of perfect correlations. There are of course many examples of classical systems in the conventional sense that do not exhibit perfect correlations.

In conclusion, Ref. [1] does not demonstrate non-classical properties of separable states in any usual sense of the word. It is worth mentioning that in Ref. [2] Bell gives an explicit hidden variable model for spin measurements on a single spin-(1/2) system, which immediately leads to a local hidden variable model for separable states of two spin-(1/2) systems such as the state discussed by the author.

* Electronic address: christoph.simon@ujf-grenoble.fr

[1] E.R. Loubenets, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 042102 (2004).

[2] J.S. Bell, Physics **1**, 195 (1964), reprinted in M. Bell, K. Gottfried and M. Veltman (Eds.), *John S. Bell on The Foundations of Quantum Mechanics* (World Scientific, Singapore, 2001).