Comment on "State-Independent Experimental Test of Quantum Contextuality in an Indivisible System"

In this Comment we argue that the experiment described in the recent Letter [1] does not allow to make conclusions about contextuality. Our main criticism is that the measurement of the observables as well as the preparation of the state manifestly depend on the chosen context. Contrary to that, contextuality is about the behavior of the *same* measurement device in different experimental contexts (cf. e.g. Ref. [2–4]).

The authors aim to experimentally demonstrate that the noncontextuality assumption is violated by quantum systems. Specifically, they report a violation of the noncontextuality inequality recently introduced by Yu an Oh [5], which is of the form

$$\sum_{k} \langle A_k \rangle - \frac{1}{4} \sum_{(k,\ell) \in E} \langle A_k A_\ell \rangle \le 8.$$
 (1)

The notation $\langle A_k A_\ell \rangle$ is an abbreviation denoting the expectation value of the product of the outcomes of the observables A_k and A_ℓ . This inequality holds for any noncontextual model, i.e., any model having preassigned values for each observable A_k , irrespective of the measurement context (the different pairs $A_k A_\ell$). Therefore, the experimenter must convincingly argue that the assignment of the observables is independent of the context. This is a central point in any experimental test of contextuality. For the argument leading to Eq. (1) it is thus crucial that (i) the same symbol A_k always corresponds to the same measurement and (ii) the expectation value is evaluated always for the same state of the system.

In Table I, we list the different measurement procedures that have been used in the experiment, as provided by the supplementary material of the Letter. Clearly, except for A_{z_1} and $A_{y_3^-}$, none of the observables is measured context independently. In particular, the observables $A_{h_{\alpha}}$ ($\alpha = 0, 1, 2, 3$) are measured in each context differently, violating condition (i). In addition the input states are chosen differently for different contexts—an approach that has not been investigated before and directly violates condition (ii).

Since no experimental data or discussion concerning these issues is provided in the Letter, the only means to conclude that those different procedures actually correspond to the same physical observable is to invoke previous knowledge about the functioning of the optical devices. However, since the setup is operated on a single photon level, this actually requires to employ their quantum mechanical description. But then the experiment can merely be used to verify the predictions of quantum mechanics *within* the framework of quantum mechanics, rather than a to provide a proof of contextual behavior.

	z_1	z_2	z_3	y_1^-	y_2^-	y_3^-	y_1^+	y_{2}^{+}	y_{3}^{+}	h_1	h_2	h_3	h_0
z_1	1	1	1	1			1						
z_2	1a	?	1a		3			3					
z_3	1a'	1a'	?			2a'			2a'				
y_1^-	1b'			1b'			1b'			X2			X2
y_2^-		3b'			3b'			3b'			Y2		Y2
y_3^-			2			2			2			2	2
y_1^+	1b			1b			1b				X5	X4	
$\frac{y_1^+}{y_2^+}$	1b	3b		1b	3b		1b	3b		Y4	X5	X4 Y5	
$\frac{y_1^+}{y_2^+}$ $\frac{y_2^+}{y_3^+}$	1b	3b	2a	1b	3b	2a	1b	3b	?	Y4 4	X5 5	X4 Y5	
$\frac{y_{1}^{+}}{y_{2}^{+}}\\ \frac{y_{3}^{+}}{h_{1}}$	1b	3b	2a	1b X2d	3b	2a	1b	3b Y4c	? 4c	Y4 4 4c	X5 5	X4 Y5	
$ \begin{array}{r} y_1^+ \\ y_2^+ \\ y_3^+ \\ h_1 \\ h_2 \end{array} $	1b	3b	2a	1b X2d	3b Y2d	2a	1b X5c	3b Y4c	? 4c 5c	Y4 4 4c	X5 5 5c	X4 Y5	
$\begin{array}{c} y_1^+ \\ y_2^+ \\ y_3^+ \\ h_1 \\ h_2 \\ h_3 \end{array}$	1b	3b	2a	1b X2d	3b Y2d	2a 2d	1b X5c X4c	3b Y4c Y5c	? 4c 5c	$\frac{Y4}{4}$	X5 5 5c	X4 Y5 2d	

TABLE I. Different realizations of the 13 observables in the different contexts. In each row k, the entries correspond to the different experimental realizations of the observable A_k depending on the context, i.e., for column ℓ in the context $\langle A_k A_\ell \rangle$, for $\ell = k$ in the single observable context $\langle A_k \rangle$. In the entries, the number corresponds to the setting of HWP5 $(1: 0^{\circ}, 2: 25.5^{\circ}, 3: 45^{\circ}, 4: -22.5^{\circ}, 5: 67.5^{\circ})$ and the lower case letter to the setting of HWP6 (a: 0° , b: 22.5° , c: 17.63° , d: -17.63°). Where only the number occurs, the setting of HWP6 does not influence the observable, since the observable was measured using Detector 1; if Detector 3 was used, a prime is added. An X denotes a change of the input state prior to measurement by swapping $|0\rangle$ and $|2\rangle$, while Y denotes a swap of $|1\rangle$ and $|2\rangle$. For $\langle A_{z_2}\rangle$, $\langle A_{z_3}\rangle$, and $\langle A_{y_3^+}\rangle$ it is not clear from the material which setting was used in the experiment.

E. Amselem[§], M. Bourennane[§], C. Budroni⁹, A. Cabello⁶, O. Gühne⁹, M. Kleinmann⁹, J.-Å. Larsson⁶, and M. Wieśniak⁴.

⁸Department of Physics, Stockholm University, S-10691 Stockholm, Sweden; ⁹Naturwissenschaftlich-Technische Fakultät, Universität Siegen, Walter-Flex-Straße 3, D-57068 Siegen, Germany; ⁶Departamento de Física Aplicada II, Universidad de Sevilla, E-41012 Sevilla, Spain; ⁶Institutionen för Systemteknik, Linköpings Universitet, SE-58183 Linköping, Sweden; ²Institute of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, University of Gdańsk, 80-952 Gdańsk, Poland.

- C. Zu, Y.-X. Wang, D.-L. Deng, X.-Y. Chang, K. Liu, P.-Y. Hou, H.-X. Yang, and L.-M. Duan, Phys. Rev. Lett. 109, 150401 (2012).
- [2] J. S. Bell, Rev. Mod. Phys. **38**, 447 (1966).
- [3] A. Peres, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 24, L175 (1991).
- [4] N. D. Mermin, Rev. Mod. Phys. **65**, 803 (1993).
- [5] S. Yu and C. H. Oh, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 030402 (2012).