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Abstract: Quantum non-locality tests have been of interest since the original EPR paper. The present paper discusses whether the CGLMP (Bell) inequalities obtained by Collins et al are possible tests for showing that quantum theory is not underpinned by local hidden variable theory (LHVT). It is found by applying Fine’s theorem that the CGLMP approach involves a LHVT for the probabilities associated with measurements on two observables (each from one of the two sub-subsystems), even though the underlying probabilities for measurements of all four observables involve a hidden variable theory which is not required to be local. The latter HVT probabilities involve outcomes of simultaneous measurements of pairs of observables corresponding to non-commuting quantum operators, which is allowed in classical theory. Although the CGLMP inequalities involve probabilities for measurements of one observable per subsystem and are compatible with the Heisenberg uncertainty principle, there is no unambiguous quantum measurement process linked to the probabilities in the CGLMP inequalities. Quantum measurements corresponding to the different classical measurements that give the same CGLMP probability are found to yield different CGLMP probabilities. However, violation of a CGLMP inequality based on any one of the possible quantum measurement sequences is sufficient to show that the Collins et al LHVT does not predict the same results as quantum theory. This is found to occur for a state considered in their paper - though for observables whose physical interpretation is unclear. In spite of the problems of comparing the HVT inequalities with quantum expressions, it is concluded that the CGLMP inequalities are indeed suitable for ruling out local hidden variable theories. The state involved could apply to a macroscopic system, so the CGLMP Bell inequalities are important for finding cases of macroscopic violations of Bell locality. Possible experiments in double-well Bose condensates involving atoms with two hyperfine components are discussed.
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1 Introduction

The concept of hidden variable theory was introduced in papers by Einstein, Schrodinger, Bell and Werner ([1], [2], [3], [4], [5]). Einstein suggested that quantum theory, though correct was incomplete - in that the probabilistic measurement outcomes predicted in quantum theory could be just the statistical outcome of an underlying deterministic theory, where the possible measured outcomes for all observables always have specific values, and measurement merely reveals what these values are. Hence observable quantities (such as position and momentum) could be regarded as elements of reality irrespective of whether an actual measurement has taken place. The EPR paradox is based on this assumption and involved an entangled state for two well-separated and no longer interacting distinguishable particles, which had well-defined values for the position difference and the momentum sum. For this state, measuring the position (or the momentum) for the first particle would instantly affect the outcome for measuring the position (or the momentum) of the second particle (a feature we now refer to as steering). Einstein regarded this as being in conflict with causality. The paradox is that by measuring the position for the first particle, the position for the second particle is then known without doing a measurement. So by then measuring the momentum for the second particle a joint precise measurement of both the position and momentum for the second particle would have occurred - apparently contradicting the Heisenberg uncertainty principle. The Schrodinger cat paradox [3] is another example, but now involving a macroscopic sub-system (the cat) in an entangled state with a microscopic sub-system (the two state radioactive atom). From the Einstein concept of reality the cat must be either alive or dead even before the box is opened to see what is the case. However, in the Copenhagen interpretation of quantum theory (see [6] for a discussion), the values for observables do not have a presence in reality until measurement takes place. Hence, from the Copenhagen viewpoint the cat is neither dead nor alive until the box is opened - which is a paradox in the Einstein concept of reality but not from the Copenhagen viewpoint. Bohm [7] described a similar paradox to EPR, but now involving a system consisting of two spin 1/2 particles in a singlet state, and where the observables were spin components with quantised measured outcomes rather than the continuous outcomes that applied to EPR.

Einstein believed that an underlying realist theory could be found, based on what are now referred to as hidden variables - which would specify the real or underlying state of the system. However, it was not until 1965 before a quantitative general form for local hidden variable theory (LHVT) was proposed by Bell [4]. This was relevant for the EPR paradox and could be tested in experiments. In its simplest form, the key idea is that hidden variables are specified probabilistically when the state for the composite system is prepared, and these would determine the actual values for all the sub-system observables even after the
sub-systems have separated - and even if the observables were incompatible with simultaneous precise measurements (such as two different spin components). In the EPR experiment they would specify both the position and momentum for each distinguishable particle. More elaborate versions of local hidden variable theory only require the hidden variables to determine the probabilities of measurement outcomes for each sub-system observable, with the overall expressions for the joint sub-system measurement outcomes being obtained in accordance with classical probability theory (see [8], [9], [10], [11], [12] for a description). States where the joint probability can be described via local hidden variable theory are referred to as Bell local. Quantum states for composite systems that could be described by local hidden variable theory were such that certain inequalities would apply involving the mean values of products for the results of measuring pairs of observables for both sub-systems - the Bell inequalities [4], [13]. States for which a local hidden variable theory does not apply (and hence violate Bell inequalities) are the Bell non-local states. Based on the entangled singlet state of two spin 1/2 particles Clauser et al [14] proposed an experiment that could demonstrate a violation of a Bell inequality. This would show that local hidden variable theory could not account for experiments that can be explained by quantum theory. Subsequent experimental work violating Bell inequalities confirmed that there are some quantum states for which a local hidden variable theory does not apply and where quantum theory was needed to explain the results (see Brunner et al [10] for a recent review). The existence of some quantum states (such as the two qubit Bell states [15]) for which the Bell inequalities are not obeyed and which was confirmed experimentally is itself sufficient to show that Einstein’s hope that an underlying reality represented by a local hidden variable theory could always underpin quantum theory cannot be realised.

As Brunner et al [10] point out, a wide variety of different Bell inequalities have been derived. A class of Bell inequalities introduced by Collins et al [16] are of particular interest. The CGLMP inequalities are of particular significance in that they can be violated for a quantum state for a macroscopic system, as Collins et al show in their paper. The Collins et al [16] formalism is based on a HVT in which the fundamental probability \( C(j, k, l, m) \) (for which no quantum expression exists) is for the outcomes of measuring four observables (\( A_1, A_2 \) for one sub-system, \( B_1, B_2 \) from the other, with the outcomes listed as \( j, k \) and \( l, m \) accordingly), but where the observables for the same sub-system would be incompatible according to quantum theory. The authors state that their approach is a local hidden variable theory, but it is not obvious why this is the case. The derivation of the CGLMP inequalities does not require the HVT for the \( C(j, k, l, m) \) to be local, and to involve separate probabilities for the observables of each sub-system - a key requirement for locality. However, as we point out in the present paper this is not required for the theory to be local. A theorem due to Fine [17] shows that the marginal probabilities associated with measurements of one observable per sub-system \( P(\alpha_a, \beta_b | A_a, B_b) \) (where \( a, b = 1, 2 \) and where \( \alpha_1 = j, \alpha_2 = k, \beta_1 = l, \beta_2 = m \)) can described by a
local hidden variable theory, and this is all that is required to justify their claim. It is the $P(\alpha_\alpha, \beta_\beta|A_\alpha, B_\beta)$ which can be expressed in LHVT form, not the $C(j, k, l, m)$. As shown in this paper, the proof of the CGLMP inequalities does not depend on the HVT probabilities $C(j, k, l, m)$ themselves satisfying the locality requirement.

The validity of introducing in a classical HVT the fundamental probability $C(j, k, l, m)$ for simultaneous measurements of incompatible observables is not being challenged, but it does have consequences. It results in there being no unambiguous quantum measurement process for treating the probabilities involved in the CGLMP inequalities. However, it is contended here that in spite of there being no unambiguous quantum measurement process, comparisons between the HVT and quantum predictions are still possible - and these are sufficient to show that the Collins et al [16] HVT does not predict the same results as quantum theory. The basis for our contention may be summarised as follows: In order to compare the predictions of the Collins et al [16] version of HVT with those from quantum theory, the two sets of predictions must be applied to the outcomes for the same measurement processes. Secondly, so as to avoid an immediate conflict with the Heisenberg uncertainty principle, the actual measurement processes involved in determining the quantities in the CGLMP inequalities must avoid the simultaneous measurement of observables that are incompatible according to quantum theory - otherwise there would be no quantum theory expressions available to determine the relevant probabilities. The measurement process considered by Collins et al [16] avoids conflict with the Heisenberg uncertainty principle by just involving steps where only one observable from each sub-system is being measured at a time. In compliance with this requirement, the CGLMP inequalities involve probabilities for the outcomes of such pairs of observables, with the outcomes for the other pair of observable being left unrecorded. However, there are a number of differing measurement processes that are equivalent in classical HVT and which yield the same probability for the outcomes just described. These differ in the order in which measurements on the two pairs of sub-system observables is made, and on whether or not measurements are actually made on the pair of observables whose outcomes are left unrecorded. Though these differing measurement processes yield the same final outcome probability in classical physics, the same is not the case in quantum physics. Fundamentally this is because quantum measurements change the state whereas classical measurements do not. As we will see, the quantum theory expressions differ if the pairs of observables are measured in a different order, and not measuring a pair of observables yields a different outcome probability for the other pair of observables, than if the first pair are measured and their outcomes disregarded. Hence there are a number of different quantum theory expressions that correspond to the probabilities occurring the CGLMP inequalities, a feature that has not previously been recognised. However, as each of these quantum measurement processes is equivalent to a classical measurement process from which the probabilities in the CGLMP inequalities can be obtained, then a violation of a CGLMP inequality based on any
one of the quantum measurement processes is sufficient to show that the Collins et al [16] HVT does not predict the same results as quantum theory. The most convenient quantum measurement process is the one where pairs of observables whose results are to be left unrecorded, are never measured at all. Based on this expression, Collins et al [16] find a quantum state (the maximally entangled state of two $d$ dimensional systems) that displays a violation of the CGLMP inequality $I \leq 3$. An issue still remaining is that the observables involved for the CGLMP violation presented in [16] have no obvious physical interpretation, as they are associated with Hermitian operations that are off-diagonal in the basis states for each sub-system.

So far no experiments confirming a CGLMP Bell violation have been reported. As Bose-Einstein condensates in cold atomic gases are now available based on double-well potentials supporting localised modes, cases are available where there are two localised modes per well associated with different hyperfine states. With the modes for each well defining two sub-systems, the two different observables for each sub-system could be defined in terms of the Schwinger spin states for each sub-system. With equal numbers $N/2$ of bosons in each sub-system it may be possible to prepare a maximally entangled state with $d = N + 1$. It would be of particular interest to see if there is a violation of the CGLMP inequalities for such a system, since if the number of bosonic atoms is large, an experimental situation for confirming general non-locality in a macroscopic system may be available.

In Section 2 the basic features of the CGLMP formalism will be reviewed - including the relationship between the fundamental probability introduced and probabilities that appear in the CGLMP inequalities. The classical measurement processes associated with such inequalities is identified. In Section 3 the relationship between the CGLMP formalism and hidden variable theory (both non-local and local) is described, and one of key CGLMP inequalities is derived. In Section 4 the issue of replicating the classical measurement processes associated with the CGLMP inequalities with measurement processes for which there is a quantum theory formalism is treated - including a comparison with the standard local HVT situation where the fundamental probability introduced only involves one observable for each sub-system. The quantum theory expressions used to determine the quantities in the CGLMP inequalities are identified, and a quantum state for which an inequality violation occurs is referred to. Section 5 summarises the results. Details are set out in the Appendix.

In this paper the same symbols will be used for the measurement outcomes, but classical HVT observables will generally be distinguished from quantum observables by the absence of the operator symbol. Quantum theory probability expressions will have a subscript $Q$. 
2 The CGLMP Formalism

In this section the fundamental probabilities \( C(j, k, l, m) \) for joint measurements of two sub-system observables for each of the two sub-systems introduced by Collins et al [16] are seen as describing measurement outcomes possible in classical physics, though not in quantum physics. They represent a deterministic form of hidden variable theory (HVT), and the issue of whether the HVT is local or non-local will be examined. It can be seen that all of the probabilities for joint measurements of one sub-system observable for each of the two sub-systems \( A, B \) of a bipartite system introduced by Collins et al [16] are also recognisable as standard probabilities in classical physics. All can be validly expressed in terms of the fundamental joint measurement probabilities \( C(j, k, l, m) \).

2.1 Probabilities Introduced by Collins et al

In the standard notation we would express the probability \( C(j, k, l, m) \) in Collins et al [16] that the measurement of observables \( A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 \) results in outcomes listed as \( j, k, l, m \) as

\[
C(j, k, l, m) \equiv P(j, k, l, m|A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2) \quad (1)
\]

Here the observables for sub-system \( A \) are \( A_1, A_2 \) and those for sub-system \( B \) are \( B_1, B_2 \), and all four observables have the same number \( d \) of different outcomes - listed as \( j, k, l, m = 0, 1, ..., d - 1 \). As stated in [16], their formulation is a deterministic version of hidden variable theory - as was the original treatment by Bell [3] (see Eq. (14) therein), where the hidden variables determine the actual outcomes for measurements. Collins et al [16] point out that their treatment can also be presented in a more general non-deterministic version of HVT, where the hidden variables merely determine the probabilities for measurement outcomes - such as presented in recent work in Refs. [8], [10]. Both approaches lead to the same CGLMP inequalities, and the choice between them is not relevant to the other issues raised in this paper. All probabilities satisfy the standard requirements of being real, positive numbers in the range from 0 to 1, and with their sums over all possible outcomes being equal to 1.

The fundamental Collins et al [16] probability \( C(j, k, l, m) \) is based on the simultaneous measurement of two observables for each sub-system - which is allowed in a classical theory such as hidden variable theory. Due to the Heisenberg uncertainty principle, such probabilities do not occur in quantum theory unless the quantum operators for each sub-system commute - so in general there is no quantum expression for \( P(j, k, l, m|A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2) \). Thus in the Collins et al [16] approach, the fundamental probability in the classical theory which is intended to underly quantum theory does not itself have a quantum counterpart. Such an approach is perfectly valid, but it will mean that only probabilities such as the marginal probabilities associated with measurements of one observable per sub-system \( P(\alpha_a, \beta_b|A_a, B_b) \) (where \( a, b = 1, 2 \) and where
\(\alpha_1 \equiv j, \alpha_2 \equiv k, \beta_1 \equiv l, \beta_2 \equiv m\) could have a quantum counterpart. The probability \(P(j, l|A_1, B_1)\) of outcomes \(j, l\) for measurements of observables \(A_1, B_1\) (which are for different sub-systems) is an example.

In the Collins et al. [16] classical theory such probabilities are derivable from the \(C(j, k, l, m)\) and can be interpreted in terms of classical measurements, as we point out in the next two paragraphs. Furthermore, there are a number of measurement processes that would be equivalent in classical physics and lead to the same probabilities such as the \(P(\alpha_a, \beta_b|A_a, B_b)\). However, as we will see in Section 4 the quantum expressions for such probabilities \(P(\alpha, \beta|A_1, B_1)\) obtained by applying these different but equivalent measurement processes are all different, so the question arises as to which of these quantum descriptions should be used to evaluate the probabilities that appear in the CGLMP inequalities? Should all be used to test the inequalities or is any one of them enough?

The four different joint probabilities for measurement outcomes for one observable from each of the two sub-systems discussed in Collins et al. [16] are

\[
P(A_1 = j, B_1 = l) = P(j, l|A_1, B_1) = \sum_{k,m} P(j, k, l, m|A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2) = \sum_{k,m} C(j, k, l, m) \\
P(A_2 = k, B_2 = m) = P(k, m|A_2, B_2) = \sum_{j,l} P(j, k, l, m|A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2) = \sum_{j,l} C(j, k, l, m)
\] (2)

Here \(P(A_1 = j, B_1 = l) = P(j, l|A_1, B_1)\) is the probability for outcomes \(j, l\) for measurement of observables \(A_1, B_1\) irrespective of the outcomes for measurement of observables \(A_2, B_2\). Such joint probabilities for one observable for each sub-system are obviously allowed in the CGLMP classical hidden variable theory, given that simultaneous measurements all four observables \(A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2\) are allowed. They also can be described in quantum theory, as will be seen in Section 4. One possible classical measurement process is for all specific outcomes \(j, l\) for measurement of observables \(A_1, B_1\) and the outcomes \(k, m\) for measurements on \(A_2, B_2\) to be recorded. The probability for the outcomes \(j, l\) for measurements of \(A_1, B_1\) irrespective of the outcomes \(k, m\) for measurements of \(A_2, B_2\) is then obtained by dividing the number of results with the same \(j, l\) by the total number of results. Note that as classical measurements can be made without disturbing the system, the order in which the pairs of measurements for observables \(A_1, B_1\) and \(A_2, B_2\) occur is irrelevant, so doing the measurements in a different order would be another measurement process that is classically equivalent for determining \(P(A_1 = j, B_1 = l)\). Similar remarks apply to the other three joint probabilities \(P(A_1 = j, B_2 = m), P(A_2 = k, B_1 = l)\) and \(P(A_2 = k, B_2 = m)\).

However, there is further way to measure probabilities such as \(P(A_1 = j, B_1 = l)\). All specific outcomes \(j, l\) for measurement of observables \(A_1, B_1\)
could be recorded but no measurements would be made on $A_2, B_2$, so again the outcomes $k, m$ would be unrecorded. The probability for the outcomes $j, l$ for measurements of $A_1, B_1$ is obtained by dividing the number of results with the same $j, l$ by the total number of results. Exactly the same expression as in Eq. (2) would apply for this different classical measurement process as for the ones described in the previous paragraph. Similar remarks apply to the other three joint probabilities $P(A_1 = j, B_2 = m)$, $P(A_2 = k, B_1 = l)$ and $P(A_2 = k, B_2 = m)$.

In contrast to Eqs. (2), the quantum theory expression for the $P(\alpha_a, \beta_b|A_a, B_b)$ is

$$P_Q(\alpha_a, \beta_b|A_a, B_b) = \text{Tr}(\widehat{\Pi}_{A_a}^{A_a} \otimes \widehat{\Pi}_{B_b}^{B_b})\hat{\rho}$$

(3)

where $\widehat{\Pi}_{A_a}^{A_a}$ and $\widehat{\Pi}_{B_b}^{B_b}$ are projection operators for the eigenvectors of $\hat{A}_a$ and $\hat{B}_b$ with eigenvalues $\alpha_a$ and $\beta_b$, and $\hat{\rho}$ is the quantum density operator.

Collins et al also introduce probabilities for when the outcomes for observables of the two sub-systems are either the same or differ by a fixed amount. The general notation would be $P(B_b = A_a + p(\text{mod } d))$ for the case where the outcome for $B_b$ differs from that for $A_a$ by $p(\text{mod } d)$. Thus in terms of both the standard notation and in terms of the $C(j, k, l, m)$ we have for example

$$P(A_1 = B_1) = \sum_j P(A_1 = j, B_1 = j)$$

$$= \sum_{j, k, m} C(j, k, j, m)$$

(4)

and

$$P(B_1 = A_2 + 1) = \sum_k P(A_2 = k, B_1 = k + 1(\text{mod } d))$$

$$= \sum_{j, k, m} C(j, k, k + 1(\text{mod } d), m)$$

(5)

Here $P(A_1 = B_1) = \sum_j P(j, j|A_1, B_1)$ is the probability that the outcomes for measurements of $A_1$ and $B_1$ are the same, irrespective of what the outcome $j$ is and irrespective of what the outcomes are for measurements of $A_2$ and $B_2$. Such probabilities for one observable for each sub-system are allowed in classical hidden variable theory, since simultaneous measurements all four observables $A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2$ are allowed, and then all the specific outcomes $j, j$ for measurement of observables $A_1, B_1$ which are the same and irrespective of the outcomes $k, m$ for measurements on $A_2, B_2$ can be recorded. Again, the same expressions would apply if the outcomes for the observables $A_2, B_2$ were just left unmeasured or if the order in which the pairs $A_1, B_1$ and $A_2, B_2$ were measured was reversed. Similar considerations apply to $P(B_1 = A_2 + 1)$ except here the outcomes for measurements of $A_2$ and $B_1$ are $k$ and $k + 1(\text{mod } d)$, irrespective of what the outcome $k$ is.
In contrast to Eqs. (4) and (5) the quantum theory expressions for $P(B = A + p \text{ (mod) } d)$ would be

$$P_Q(B = A + p \text{ (mod) } d) = \sum_{\alpha} P_Q(\alpha, \alpha + p \text{ (mod) } d | A, B)$$

$$= \sum_{\alpha} \text{Tr}(\hat{\Pi}^A_{\alpha} \otimes \hat{\Pi}^B_{\alpha + p \text{ (mod) } d}) \hat{\rho}$$

Thus we now have both classical HVT and quantum theory expressions for $P(\alpha, \beta | A, B)$ and $P(B = A + p \text{ (mod) } d)$, so comparisons of the CGLMP inequalities with quantum theory can be made.

As we will see, the CGLMP inequalities are based on the four HVT probabilities $P(A_1 = j, B_1 = l)$, ..., $P(A_2 = k, B_2 = m)$ or to be more specific $P(A_1 = B_1)$, $P(B_1 = A_2 + 1)$, $P(A_2 = B_2)$ and $P(B_2 = A_1)$. The key point is that the classical measurement process envisaged by Collins et al [16] on which the CGLMP inequalities are based could involve measuring the outcomes for all four observables $A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2$ and then combining the results for which two outcomes (such as $j, l$ for observables $A_1, B_1$) are present irrespective of the outcomes (such as $k, m$ for $A_2, B_2$) for the other two observables, to determine probabilities such as $P(A_1 = j, B_1 = l) = P(j, l | A_1, B_1)$. The CGLMP inequalities could also be based on measurements of compatible observables (such as the pairs $A_1, B_1$ and $A_2, B_2$) and in either order. Alternatively, a different classical measurement process would be one in which the outcomes for two observables (such as $k, m$ for $A_2, B_2$) are never measured at all. In classical physics the probability for outcome $j, l$ for measuring a pair of observables $A_1, B_1$ and not recording the outcome $k, m$ after also measuring the other pair of observables $A_2, B_2$ would be the same as when measuring the other pair of observables never occurred. Similar remarks apply for determining the probabilities such as $P(A_1 = B_1)$, where only results for all the same outcomes (such as $j = l$ for observables $A_1, B_1$) are combined.

### 3 Local Hidden Variable Theory and CGLMP Inequalities

In this section the issue of whether the Collins et al [16] probabilities are consistent with hidden variable theory is considered, and if so whether that hidden variable theory is a local one. The paper by Collins et al [16] clearly states that their formalism is a local theory, but it is contended here that locality has not been invoked. We begin by first reviewing the standard approach to hidden variable theory (both local and non-local) based on considering just one observable at a time for both sub-systems. The Collins et al approach involving two observables for both sub-system is then discussed. The derivation of a key CGLMP inequality then follows, with the proof not requiring the fundamental probabilities $C(j, k, l, m)$ to be determined in accord with local HVT.
This is the basis of our contention that the CGLMP approach is not restricted to a local HVT. Furthermore - as shown below, adding the requirement that the \( C(j, k, l, m) \) are determined in accord with local HVT does not lead to an inequality of the form \( I \leq I_L \), where \( I_L \) is less than 3, as might be hoped for if \( C(j, k, l, m) \) is restricted to be based on local HVT. The presentation set out below is in terms of the more general non-deterministic HVT, but the deterministic version can be obtained by replacing the hidden variable probability distribution \( P(\lambda) \) by a delta function.

3.1 Consequences of Fine’s Theorem: One Observable per Sub-System

We can now apply Fine’s theorem \[17\] to express the two sub-system measurement probabilities \( P(\alpha_a, \beta_b|A_a, B_b) \) in a local hidden variable theory form. This result only requires the \( P(\alpha_a, \beta_b|A_a, B_b) \) being given as the marginal probabilities based on the four observable probabilities \( C(j, k, l, m) \), as set out in Eq. \[2\]. We thus have

\[
P(\alpha_a, \beta_b|A_a, B_b) = \sum_\lambda P(\lambda)P(\alpha_a|A_a, \lambda)P(\beta_b|B_b, \lambda)
\]  

where \( P(\lambda) \) is the probability distribution for the hidden variables \( \lambda \) and \( P(\alpha_a|A_a, \lambda) \) and \( P(\beta_b|B_b, \lambda) \) are the separate sub-system probabilities that measurements of \( A_a \) and \( B_b \) lead to outcomes \( \alpha_a \) and \( \beta_b \) (respectively), when the hidden variable is \( \lambda \). The same hidden variables determine the probabilities for all four cases \( A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 \) separately. For simplicity the hidden variables are assumed to be discrete - the generalisation to continuous hidden variables is trivial. Thus in a local HVT the probability \( P(\alpha_a, \beta_b|A_a, B_b, \lambda) \) for the joint measurement outcome for \( A_a \) and \( B_b \) for each hidden variable situation factorises into separate probabilities \( P(\alpha_a|A_a, \lambda) \) and \( P(\beta_b|B_b, \lambda) \) for each sub-system. This criterion for locality has been set out in numerous papers (see for example, \[8\], \[9\], \[10\], \[11\], \[12\]). Note that this expression shows that the measurement events where \( A_a \) leads to outcome \( \alpha_a \) and \( B_b \) leads to outcome \( \beta_b \) are classically correlated.

The expression for \( P(\alpha_a, \beta_b|A_a, B_b) \) given in the last equation confirms the statement in Collins et al \[16\] that their treatment involves a local hidden variable theory. In a non-local hidden variable theory factorisation of the probability \( P(\alpha_a, \beta_b|A_a, B_b, \lambda) \) for the outcomes that measurements of \( A_a \) and \( B_b \) lead to outcomes \( \alpha_a \) and \( \beta_b \) (respectively) when the hidden variable is \( \lambda \), would not apply. We would then have

\[
P(\alpha_a, \beta_b|A_a, B_b) = \sum_\lambda P(\lambda)P(\alpha_a, \beta_b|A_a, B_b, \lambda)
\]  

instead of Eq. \[7\]. Local hidden variable theory can be seen as a special case of the last equation.
From the local hidden variable theory expression we can then demonstrate the **no signaling** conditions

\[
P(\alpha_a | A_a) = \sum_{\beta_b} P(\alpha_a, \beta_b | A_a, B_b) = \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda) P(\alpha_a | A_a, \lambda) \\

P(\beta_b | B_b) = \sum_{\alpha_a} P(\alpha_a, \beta_b | A_a, B_b) = \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda) P(\beta_b | B_b, \lambda)
\]  

(9)

Here \(P(\alpha_a | A_a)\) is the probability that measurement of \(A_a\) leads to outcome \(\alpha_a\) irrespective of what the outcome is for measurement of \(B_b\), and the result that this is given by \(\sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda) P(\alpha_a | A_a, \lambda)\) shows that this probability for the measurement outcome for \(A_a\) would be the same irrespective of what observable \(B_b\) was chosen for the other sub-system. Thus, if \(B_b\) were to be replaced by \(B_b^\#\) and hence \(P(\beta_b | B_b, \lambda)\) by \(P(\beta_b^\# | B_b^\#, \lambda)\) we still have \(P(\alpha_a | A_a) = \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda) P(\alpha_a | A_a, \lambda)\) so the measurement outcomes for \(A_a\) for one sub-system do not even depend on the choice of observable \(B_b\) for the other sub-system. So whatever measurement is carried out for \(B_b\) for one sub-system has no effect on the outcome for a measurement on observable \(A_a\) for the other, a result that would be expected never to be violated if the two sub-systems were well-separated. Similar considerations apply for \(P(\beta_b | B_b)\). The non-local case \((8)\) does not lead to the non-signaling condition.

### 3.2 Local Hidden Variable Theory: Two Observables per Sub-System

We could also write down expressions for the four observable probabilities \(C(j, k, l, m)\) depending on whether these involve a local hidden variable theory or not. For the *local hidden variable theory* situation we would have

\[
C(j, k, l, m) \equiv P(j, k, l, m | A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2) \\
= \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda) P(j, k | A_1, A_2, \lambda) P(l, m | B_1, B_2, \lambda)
\]  

(10)

where \(P(j, k | A_1, A_2, \lambda)\) is the probability for the outcomes \(j, k\) to occur for measurement on one sub-system of \(A_1, A_2\) when the hidden variables are \(\lambda\) and \(P(l, m | B_1, B_2, \lambda)\) is the probability for the outcomes \(l, m\) to occur for measurement on the other sub-system of \(B_1, B_2\) when the hidden variables are \(\lambda\). Here the hidden variable determine the probabilities for both observables together in each separate sub-system.

Another situation would be where a *non-local hidden variable theory* situation applies. In this case we would have

\[
C(j, k, l, m) \equiv P(j, k, l, m | A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2) \\
= \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda) P(j, k, l, m | A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2, \lambda)
\]  

(11)
for the situation of a non-local HVT. Here $P(j, k, l, m|A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2, \lambda)$ is the probability for the outcomes $j, k, l, m$ for measurement of $A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2$ to occur when the hidden variables are $\lambda$. Here the hidden variable determine the probabilities for all four observables together. This corresponds to a non-deterministic hidden variable theory, and it is suggested in Collins et al [16] that the $C(j, k, l, m)$ are compatible with such an expression [18].

Neither expression (10) nor (11) is found in the paper by Collins et al, [16], but as we have seen this is not required for their approach to be a local hidden variable theory. It is sufficient that the two observable probabilities $P(\alpha_a, \beta_b|A_a, B_b)$ are given by a LHVT expression, and this has been established via Fine’s theorem.

A final possibility is that no hidden variable theory applies at all, so the $P(\alpha_a, \beta_b|A_a, B_b)$ are no longer given as the marginal probabilities based on probabilities $C(j, k, l, m)$ of the measurement outcomes for all four observables.

### 3.3 The Basic Collins et al Inequality

In this section we will derive the Collins et al [16] inequality $I \leq 3$ (see Eq. (3) therein). We show that the proof of the CGLMP inequalities does not depend on the HVT probabilities $C(j, k, l, m)$ themselves satisfying the locality requirement.

The quantity $I$ is defined by

$$I = P(A_1 = B_1) + P(B_1 = A_2 + 1) + P(A_2 = B_2) + P(B_2 = A_1)$$  \hfill (12)

so without invoking a local hidden variable theory for the $C(j, k, l, m)$ themselves, we have

$$I = \sum_{j,k,m} C(j, k, j, m) + \sum_{j,k,m} C(j, k, k+1, m) + \sum_{j,k,l} C(j, k, l, k) + \sum_{j,k,l} C(j, k, l, j)$$

$$= \sum_{j,k,l,m} C(j, k, l, m) \left[ \delta_{l,j} + \delta_{l,k+1} + \delta_{m,k} + \delta_{m,j} \right]$$  \hfill (13)

Now the quantity in the brackets $[]$ is never negative and could only have possible values of 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 in view of the Kronecker delta only having values of 0 or 1. The value 4 is impossible since this would require $j = k = m = l$ for the first, third and fourth Kronecker $\delta$ to equal 1 but requires $l = k + 1$ (mod $d$) for the second Kronecker $\delta$ to also equal 1. Hence $[] \leq 3$ and thus

$$I \leq \sum_{j,k,l,m} C(j, k, l, m) [3] \leq 3$$

This inequality is valid irrespective of whether or not $C(j, k, l, m)$ itself is given by a hidden variable theory expression, such as the non-local form (11) or by the...
local hidden variable theory expression (10). It is also valid when the hidden variable probability $P(\lambda)$ is replaced by a delta function, which turns a non-deterministic HVT into a deterministic HVT. As the CGLMP inequality has been derived using a HVT which has been shown to be local via Fine’s theorem, we conclude that a quantum state for which $I > 3$ would then violate Bell locality.

Collins et al [16] state that the inequality $I \leq 4$ applies to general non-local theory. In the case where no hidden variable theory applies, the quantities $P(A_1 = B_1), P(B_1 = A_2 + 1)$ et are no longer related to a set of probabilities $C(j, k, l, m)$, and hence (13) no longer applies. In this case each term could be any positive number between 0 and 1, so $I \leq 4$. Finally, whether the CGLMP inequalities turn out to be useful in finding quantum states for which measurement outcomes cannot be interpreted via HVT (local or otherwise) depends on identifying measurement processes that replicates those in the Collins et al [16] approach, but whose outcomes can be uniquely treated using quantum theory. This will be considered in section 4.

4 Possible Quantum Theory Measurement Processes in CLGMP Formalism

We now examine three possible quantum measurement processes that replicate classical measurement processes in the Collins et al [16] approach for the specific case of $P(A_1 = j, B_1 = l)$. These differ by the order in which measurements on the recorded observables $A_1, B_1$ and the unrecorded observables $A_2, B_2$ occur, and on whether the unrecorded observables $A_2, B_2$ are measured at all. Treatment of the other probabilities in Eq. (2) would be similar. Following the Copenhagen interpretation of quantum theory, in each case the density operator changes during the process via quantum projector operators that correspond to the quantum measurement that has taken place. The new density operator must of course still satisfy the condition $Tr\hat{\rho} = 1$. The density operator also changes when outcomes are left unrecorded. On the other hand, it does not change if no measurement is made. It is found that for each of these three equivalent classical measurement processes there is a measurement process in accord with quantum theory that replicates the measurement process that underpins the CGLMP inequalities. However, different quantum theory expressions apply in each case. Although the three measurement processes are different, it is concluded that for showing that the Collins et al HVT [16] does not predict the same results as quantum theory, it is sufficient to demonstrate a CGLMP violation for any one of the three (or more) quantum expressions that could be considered. As we will see, the measurement process in which the pair of observables with unrecorded outcomes are not measured at all leads to quantum expressions for the probabilities in the CGLMP inequalities that enabled Collins et al [16] to identify a quantum state that violates an inequality.
This ambiguity regarding the quantum measurement process is fundamentally due to the approach of basing these inequalities on a HVT probability \( C(j, k, l, m) \) for the outcome of a measurement that is disallowed in quantum theory. In contrast, there is no such issue involved for Bell inequalities based on HVT of the standard type, where measurements of one observable for both sub-systems are allowed in quantum theory. To make this clear we first consider the standard type.

### 4.1 Quantum Theory Measurements: One Observable per Sub-System

In the case where the fundamental HVT probability \( P(\alpha, \beta|A, B, \lambda) \) involves measurements for a single observable for each sub-system there is no ambiguity in relating the classical HVT measurement for \( P(\alpha, \beta|A, B) \) to the quantum measurement process. In the classical HVT the order of measuring \( A, B \) is irrelevant. In the quantum case if \( A \) is measured first with outcome \( \alpha \), then the probability of this outcome is given by \( \text{Tr}(\hat{\Pi}_\alpha^A \otimes \hat{1}_B)\hat{\rho} \) and the quantum state changes to \( \hat{\rho}^\# \), where (see Sect 8.3.1 in Ref [3])

\[
\hat{\rho}^\# = (\hat{\Pi}_\alpha^A \otimes \hat{1}_B)\hat{\rho}(\hat{\Pi}_\alpha^A \otimes \hat{1}_B)/\text{Tr}(\hat{\Pi}_\alpha^A \otimes \hat{1}_B)\hat{\rho}.
\]

If \( \hat{B} \) is measured second with outcome \( \beta \), then the conditional probability for this outcome given the previous outcome \( \alpha \) for measuring \( \hat{A} \) would be

\[
\text{Tr}(\hat{1}_A \otimes \hat{\Pi}_\beta^B)\hat{\rho}^\# = \text{Tr}(\hat{1}_A \otimes \hat{\Pi}_\beta^B)(\hat{\Pi}_\alpha^A \otimes \hat{1}_B)\hat{\rho}(\hat{\Pi}_\alpha^A \otimes \hat{1}_B)\hat{\rho}/\text{Tr}(\hat{\Pi}_\alpha^A \otimes \hat{1}_B)\hat{\rho} = \text{Tr}(\hat{\Pi}_\alpha^A \otimes \hat{\Pi}_\beta^B)\hat{\rho}/\text{Tr}(\hat{\Pi}_\alpha^A \otimes \hat{1}_B)\hat{\rho}.
\]

The overall probability for the measurement of \( \hat{A} \) with outcome \( \alpha \) and \( \hat{B} \) with outcome \( \beta \) is obtained by multiplying the conditional probability with the probability for first measuring \( \hat{A} \) with outcome \( \alpha \), and equals the usual quantum expression for the probability of a joint measurement

\[
P_Q(\alpha, \beta|A, B) = \text{Tr}(\hat{\Pi}_\alpha^A \otimes \hat{\Pi}_\beta^B)\hat{\rho}
\]

After the second measurement the new quantum state will be \( \hat{\rho}^{**} \), where

\[
\hat{\rho}^{**} = (\hat{1}_A \otimes \hat{\Pi}_\beta^B)\hat{\rho}^\#/\text{Tr}(\hat{1}_A \otimes \hat{\Pi}_\beta^B)\hat{\rho}^# = (\hat{\Pi}_\alpha^A \otimes \hat{\Pi}_\beta^B)\hat{\rho}(\hat{\Pi}_\alpha^A \otimes \hat{\Pi}_\beta^B)/\text{Tr}(\hat{\Pi}_\alpha^A \otimes \hat{\Pi}_\beta^B)\hat{\rho}
\]

after some operator algebra and using \( \hat{\Pi}^2 = \hat{\Pi} \). The expressions for the joint measurement probability \( P(\alpha, \beta|A, B) \) and the final quantum state \( \hat{\rho}^{**} \) are those expected from quantum theory. A key point is that the same results are obtained if \( \hat{B} \) with outcome \( \beta \) is measured first and \( \hat{A} \) with outcome \( \alpha \) is measured second. Hence a HVT expression for \( P(\alpha, \beta|A, B) \) based on classical
measurements of $A, B$ taken in either order is linked to a unique quantum theory expression describing the same measurement process.

Since the Bell inequalities involve joint probabilities such as $P(\alpha, \beta|A, B)$ or joint mean values derived from these such as
\[
\langle A \otimes B \rangle = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} (\alpha \times \beta) P(\alpha, \beta|A, B)
\] (18)
then the LHVT expression based on (7) and the quantum theory expression based on (16) can be compared in terms of the same measurement process. The mean value expressions are
\[
\langle A \otimes B \rangle_{\text{LHVT}} = \sum_\lambda P(\lambda) \sum_{\alpha,\beta} (\alpha \times \beta) P(\alpha|A, \lambda) P(\beta|B, \lambda)
\]
\[
= \sum_\lambda P(\lambda) \langle (A)_{\lambda} \rangle_{\text{LHVT}} \langle (B)_{\lambda} \rangle_{\text{LHVT}}
\]
\[
\langle A \otimes B \rangle_{\text{Q}} = \text{Tr} \sum_{\alpha,\beta} (\alpha \times \beta) (\hat{\Pi}_A^\alpha \otimes \hat{\Pi}_B^\beta) \hat{\rho} = \text{Tr}(\hat{A} \otimes \hat{B})\hat{\rho}
\] (19)
in an obvious notation.

4.2 Quantum Theory Measurements: Two Observables per Sub-System

We now examine three possible quantum measurement processes that attempt to replicate classical measurement processes in the Collins et al [16] approach for the specific case of $P(A_1 = j, B_1 = l)$. Details are set out in Appendix 8.

The first possibility would be if the measurements on $A_2, B_2$ which led to outcomes $k, m$ were performed first. The outcomes $k, m$ were then left unrecorded and the measurements on $A_1, B_1$ which led to outcomes $j, l$ were performed second. In this case the joint probability for the outcomes of measurements on $A_1, B_1$ is given by
\[
P_Q(j, l, (k, m)|A_1, B_1, (A_2, B_2)_{1}) = \sum_{k,m} \text{Tr} \left( \hat{\Pi}_k^{A_2} \hat{\Pi}_j^{A_1} \hat{\Pi}_k^{A_2} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_m^{B_2} \hat{\Pi}_l^{B_1} \hat{\Pi}_m^{B_2} \right) \hat{\rho}
\] (20)
where $\hat{\Pi}_C^\alpha$ etc are the usual quantum projectors, with $\sum_\alpha \hat{\Pi}_C^\alpha = \hat{1}_C$, etc. The notation $P_Q(j, l, (k, m)|A_1, B_1, (A_2, B_2)_{1})$ indicates that the $A_2, B_2$ measurements were carried out first and the results left unrecorded.

The second possibility would be if the measurements on $A_1, B_1$ resulting in outcomes $j, l$ were performed first. The measurement of $A_2, B_2$ leading to outcomes $k, m$ which are then left unrecorded were performed second. In this case the joint probability for the outcomes of measurements on $A_1, B_1$ is given by
\[
P_Q(j, l, (k, m)|A_1, B_1, (A_2, B_2)_{2}) = \sum_{k,m} \text{Tr} \left( \hat{\Pi}_j^{A_1} \hat{\Pi}_k^{A_2} \hat{\Pi}_j^{A_1} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_l^{B_1} \hat{\Pi}_m^{B_2} \hat{\Pi}_l^{B_1} \right) \hat{\rho}
\] (21)
where $\hat{\Pi}^C_j$ etc are the usual quantum projectors, with $\sum_j \hat{\Pi}^C_j = \hat{1}_C$, etc. The notation $P_Q(j, l, (k, m)|A_1, B_1, (A_2, B_2)_2)$ indicates that the $A_2, B_2$ measurements were carried out second and the results left unrecorded.

In the general case where the two operators of each sub-system do not commute, the results for $P_Q(j, l, (k, m)|A_1, B_1, (A_2, B_2)_1)$ or $P_Q(j, l, (k, m)|A_1, B_1, (A_2, B_2)_2)$ for these two measurement processes are not the same. The same applies to the classical hidden variable theory of Collins et al [16] for probabilities that occur in the CGLMP inequalities are replicated by a number of different quantum theory expressions depending on which of the classically equivalent measurement processes associated with the HVT probability is considered. In classical measurement theory for the particular case of $P(A_1 = j, B_1 = l)$ it should not make any difference if $A_1, B_1$ were measured first resulting in outcomes $j, l$ followed by measurements of $A_2, B_2$ resulting in all outcomes $k, m$ from that when the measurements of $A_2, B_2$ were carried out first and the outcomes $k, m$ left unrecorded, followed by measurements of $A_1, B_1$ leading to outcomes $j, l$. However, the quantum measurement theory treatment of the two different sequences give different results, both in terms of the overall quantum probabilities for the process and the final quantum state that is created. Similarly, if the unrecorded observables $A_2, B_2$ are never measured at all, a third quantum expression is involved. So which one is to be chosen to give the quantum theory analogue of the Collins et al [16] quantity $P(A_1 = j, B_1 = l)$?

Fortunately, since the overall aim is to demonstrate that the Collins et al HVT does not predict the same results as quantum theory, we may choose
any one of the quantum expressions provided that a quantum state can be found for which a CGLMP inequality is violated. After all, the three different measurement processes described above are all treatable via quantum theory, and all three are equivalent classically for replicating the HVT quantities such as $P(A_1 = j, B_1 = l)$. It is sufficient to show that a CGLMP inequality is violated for one measurement process and for one quantum state to demonstrate that the Collins et al HVT [16] cannot predict the same results as quantum theory. From the point of view of simplicity in the quantum calculations, the most suitable measurement process to choose would be the one where unrecorded observables are never measured at all.

Collins et al [16] make the comparison of the CGLMP hidden variable theory predictions with those from quantum theory by choosing the measurement processes to be those where the unrecorded pair of observables are just not measured at all - the third (and simplest) possibility discussed above. It can easily be confirmed from the quantum theory probability expression set out in Eq. (14) therein for $P_{QM}(A_a = k, B_b = l)$ that this is the approach that has been adopted. Hence Collins et al [16] use the following quantum theory expression for $P_Q(A_1 = j, B_1 = l)$

$$P(A_1 = j, B_1 = l) = \sum_{k,m} C(j, k, l, m) \equiv Tr\left(\hat{\Pi}_j^{A_1} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_k^{B_1}\right) \hat{\rho} = P_Q(j, l|A_1, B_1)$$

(23)

For the final probabilities $P(A_1 = B_1), P(B_1 = A_2 + 1)$ etc that appear in the CGLMP inequalities, similar considerations apply and expressions such as

$$P(A_1 = B_1) = \sum_{j,k,m} C(j, k, j, m) \equiv Tr\left(\hat{\Pi}_j^{A_1} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_j^{B_1}\right) \hat{\rho} = \sum_{j} P_Q(j, j|A_1, B_1)$$

$$P(B_1 = A_2 + 1) = \sum_{j,k,m} C(j, k, k + 1 (mod d), m) \equiv Tr\left(\hat{\Pi}_k^{A_2} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_{k+1 (mod d)}^{B_1}\right) \hat{\rho} = \sum_{k} P_Q(k, k + 1 (mod d)|A_2, B_1)$$

(24)

have been assumed in Collins et al [16].

Thus, in spite of the CGLMP Bell inequalities being based on expressions such as $P(A_1 = B_1), P(B_1 = A_2 + 1)$ which have several possible equivalents in quantum theory, conclusions that certain quantum states and related observables lead to violations of Bell locality can still be made.
4.3 Quantum State Violating Collins Inequality

An example of a quantum state (see their Eq. 12) that violates the inequality $I \leq 3$ is considered by Collins et al [16], based on quantum expressions in Eq. (24). This is the maximally entangled state for two $d$ dimensional sub-systems. Such a case could apply to two sub-systems with the same spin $s$, for which the spin eigenstates are $|s, m\rangle$, where $m = -s, \ldots, +s$. For the (unnormalized) state

$$\sum_{m=-s}^{s} |s, m\rangle_A |s, m\rangle_B$$

the quantum expression for $I$ is found to be greater than 3 for all $d = 2s + 1$, corresponding to a Bell inequality violation in a macroscopic system if $s$ is large. However, this violation involved introducing physical quantities $A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2$ as Hermitian operators defined by their eigenvalues and eigenvectors (see Eq. (13) in Ref [16]), the latter being linear combinations of the $|s, m\rangle_A(B)$. However, as the operators turn out to be off-diagonal in these basis states, it is not obvious what physical observable they correspond to. No experimental tests of the CGLMP Bell inequalities have been carried out. However, it may be possible to test the CGLMP inequalities in Bose-Einstein condensates in cold atomic gases based on double-well potentials, with two localised modes per well associated with different hyperfine states and with the $|s, m\rangle_A$ and $|s, m\rangle_B$ being Schwinger spin states for each the sub-system. The two different observables for each sub-system could be defined in terms of the Schwinger spin states.

5 Conclusion

The significance of the CGLMP (Bell) inequalities as possible tests for showing that quantum theory is underpinned by a local hidden variable theory has been discussed. The question of whether Collins et al actually used a local form of hidden variable theory has been examined, and it is concluded that although the fundamental hidden variable theory probabilities $C(j, k, l, m)$ of measurement outcomes for two observables in each sub-system may not satisfy the requirements for a local HVT, the application of Fine’s theorem shows that the marginal probabilities $P(\alpha, \beta|A_\alpha, B_\beta)$ for measurements of one observable in both of the two sub-systems do satisfy the locality requirement. As the CGLMP inequalities involve measurements based on the marginal probabilities, it is concluded that the CGLMP inequalities provide a test for Bell locality - as the authors stated. The proof of the CGLMP inequalities does not depend on the HVT probabilities $C(j, k, l, m)$ themselves satisfying the locality requirement. The CGLMP (Bell) inequalities are based on a form of hidden variable theory (HVT) that allows for simultaneous measurements of pairs of observables that correspond to non-commuting quantum operators. However, although this is allowed in a classical probability theory, it does lead to the CGLMP Bell inequalities being based on expressions for which a number of different quantum theory expressions apply, corresponding to different measurement processes that would have been equivalent in classical physics. Fundamentally, this is because quantum mea-
surements change the quantum state whereas classical measurements leave the state unchanged, and for observables whose outcomes are unrecorded whether measurements of these observables are made and discarded, differs in quantum theory from the case where the measurements are not made at all. However, conclusions that certain quantum states and related observables lead to violations of HVT can still be made based on any one of the possible quantum theory expressions that replicates an equivalent classical measurement processes that could determine the probabilities in the CGLMP inequalities. The most convenient quantum measurement process is the one where pairs of observables whose results are to be left unrecorded are never measured at all. Based on this expression Collins et al have identified a quantum state that violates the CGLMP inequality $I \leq 3$. The state involved could apply to macroscopic systems. However, the observables found by Collins et al to be associated with the CGLMP inequality $I \leq 3$ violation have no obvious physical interpretation. Leaving aside the issue of interpreting the observables, it is concluded that the CGLMP inequalities have been shown to rule out local hidden variable theories. We also point out that CGLMP tests might be carried out in systems such as Bose-Einstein condensates of atomic gases with two hyperfine components in a double potential well, as states and observables based on the Schwinger spin states for each well could be suitable.

6 Acknowledgements

The author is grateful for helpful discussions with Drs E Cavalcanti, R Y Teh and J Vaccaro, and Professors S M Barnett and B M Garraway. Financial support from University of Glasgow and Imperial College, London during the conduct of this research is acknowledged. The author is also grateful to two referees for raising issues that have resulted in a somewhat different conclusion about CGLMP inequalities.

7 Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References


8 Appendix - Quantum Measurement Processes Replicating \( P(A_1, B_1) \)

The first possibility would be if the measurements on \( A_2, B_2 \) which led to outcomes \( k, m \) were performed first. In this case the original density operator \( \hat{\rho} \) changes to \( \hat{\rho}^\# \) where (see Sect 8.3.1 in Ref [3])

\[
\hat{\rho}^\# = \left( \hat{\Pi}^{A_2}_k \otimes \hat{\Pi}^{B_2}_m \right) \hat{\rho} \left( \hat{\Pi}^{A_2}_k \otimes \hat{\Pi}^{B_2}_m \right) / Tr \left( \hat{\Pi}^{A_2}_k \otimes \hat{\Pi}^{B_2}_m \right) \hat{\rho}
\] (25)

Here \( \hat{\Pi}^{A_2}_k \) etc are the usual quantum projectors, with \( \sum_k \hat{\Pi}^{A_2}_k = \hat{1}_A \), etc. If the results for all the outcomes \( k, m \) are then left unrecorded the density operator changes again to \( \hat{\rho}^{##} \) where

\[
\hat{\rho}^{##} = \sum_{k,m} \hat{\rho}^\# \times Tr \left( \hat{\Pi}^{A_2}_k \otimes \hat{\Pi}^{B_2}_m \right) \hat{\rho} = \sum_{k,m} \left( \hat{\Pi}^{A_2}_k \otimes \hat{\Pi}^{B_2}_m \right) \hat{\rho} \left( \hat{\Pi}^{A_2}_k \otimes \hat{\Pi}^{B_2}_m \right)
\] (26)

This of course differs from the original density operator \( \hat{\rho} \). So it is not as if \( A_2, B_2 \) had never been measured at all. The quantum probability for measurements on \( A_2, B_2 \) which led to all outcomes \( k, m \) is obviously

\[
P_Q((k, m)|A_2, B_2) = \sum_{k,m} Tr \left( \hat{\Pi}^{A_2}_k \otimes \hat{\Pi}^{B_2}_m \right) \hat{\rho} = 1, \quad \text{where the notation} \ (k, m) \ \text{indicates outcome events for all} \ k, m.
\]

The probability that subsequent measurement of observables \( A_1, B_1 \) resulting in outcomes \( j, l \) will be given by the conditional probability

\[
Tr \left( \hat{\Pi}^{A_1}_j \otimes \hat{\Pi}^{B_1}_l \right) \hat{\rho}^{##} = \sum_{k,m} Tr \left( \hat{\Pi}^{A_1}_j \otimes \hat{\Pi}^{B_1}_l \right) \left( \hat{\Pi}^{A_2}_k \otimes \hat{\Pi}^{B_2}_m \right) \hat{\rho} \left( \hat{\Pi}^{A_2}_k \otimes \hat{\Pi}^{B_2}_m \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{k,m} Tr \left( \hat{\Pi}^{A_2}_k \hat{\Pi}^{A_1}_j \hat{\Pi}^{A_2}_k \otimes \hat{\Pi}^{B_2}_m \hat{\Pi}^{B_1}_l \hat{\Pi}^{B_2}_m \right) \hat{\rho}
\] (27)

so that the overall quantum probability for the event where measurement of \( A_1, B_1 \) results in outcomes \( j, l \) after measurement of \( A_2, B_2 \) results in all outcomes \( k, m \) is obtained by multiplying this conditional probability by \( P_Q((l, m)|A_2, B_2) = 1 \), and is given by

\[
P_Q(j, l, (k, m)|A_1, B_1, (A_2, B_2)_1) = \sum_{k,m} Tr \left( \hat{\Pi}^{A_2}_k \hat{\Pi}^{A_1}_j \hat{\Pi}^{A_2}_k \otimes \hat{\Pi}^{B_2}_m \hat{\Pi}^{B_1}_l \hat{\Pi}^{B_2}_m \right) \hat{\rho}
\] (28)

The notation \( P_Q(j, l, (k, m)|A_1, B_1, (A_2, B_2)_1) \) indicates that the \( A_2, B_2 \) measurements were carried out first and the results left unrecorded. The subsequent measurement of observables \( A_1, B_1 \) leading to outcomes \( j, l \) results in the further change of the density operator from \( \hat{\rho}^{##} \) to \( \hat{\rho}^{###} \) where

\[
\hat{\rho}^{###} = \sum_{k,m} \left( \hat{\Pi}^{A_1}_j \hat{\Pi}^{A_2}_k \otimes \hat{\Pi}^{B_1}_l \hat{\Pi}^{B_2}_m \right) \hat{\rho} \left( \hat{\Pi}^{A_2}_k \hat{\Pi}^{A_1}_j \hat{\Pi}^{A_2}_k \otimes \hat{\Pi}^{B_2}_m \hat{\Pi}^{B_1}_l \hat{\Pi}^{B_2}_m \right) / \left\{ \sum_{k,m} Tr \left( \hat{\Pi}^{A_2}_k \hat{\Pi}^{A_1}_j \hat{\Pi}^{A_2}_k \otimes \hat{\Pi}^{B_2}_m \hat{\Pi}^{B_1}_l \hat{\Pi}^{B_2}_m \right) \hat{\rho} \right\}
\] (29)
Next we consider the second possibility for what happens in quantum theory in a measurement process that replicates the classical measurement process on which \(P(A_1 = j, B_1 = l)\) is based when observables \(A_1, B_1\) resulting in outcomes \(j, l\) are measured first, followed by measurement of \(A_2, B_2\) leading to outcomes \(l, m\), which are then left unrecorded.

After the first measurement the original density operator \(\hat{\rho}\) changes to \(\hat{\rho}^c\) where (see Sect 8.3.1 in Ref [6])

\[
\hat{\rho}^c = \left(\hat{\Pi}_j^{A_1} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_l^{B_1}\right) \hat{\rho} \left(\hat{\Pi}_j^{A_1} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_l^{B_1}\right) / Tr \left(\hat{\Pi}_j^{A_1} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_l^{B_1}\right) \hat{\rho}
\]  

(30)

The probability for measurement of observables \(A_1, B_1\) resulting in outcomes \(j, l\) is given by

\[
P_Q(j, l | A_1, B_1) = Tr \left(\hat{\Pi}_j^{A_1} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_l^{B_1}\right) \hat{\rho}
\]  

(31)

After the subsequent measurement of \(A_2, B_2\) leading to outcomes \(k, m\) the density operator becomes

\[
\hat{\rho}^{c_k} = \left(\hat{\Pi}_k^{A_2} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_m^{B_2}\right) \hat{\rho} \left(\hat{\Pi}_k^{A_2} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_m^{B_2}\right) / \left\{ Tr \left(\hat{\Pi}_k^{A_2} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_m^{B_2}\right) \hat{\rho}\right\}
\]  

(32)

and this outcome occurs with a conditional probability

\[
Tr \left(\hat{\Pi}_k^{A_2} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_m^{B_2}\right) \hat{\rho}^{c_k}
\]

The conditional probability for all outcomes \(k, m\) for measurements of \(A_2, B_2\) following measurements of \(A_1, B_1\) resulting in outcomes \(j, l\) will then be

\[
\sum_{k, m} Tr \left(\hat{\Pi}_k^{A_2} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_m^{B_2}\right) \hat{\rho}^{c_k} = \sum_{k, m} Tr \left(\hat{\Pi}_k^{A_2} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_m^{B_2}\right) \left(\hat{\Pi}_j^{A_1} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_l^{B_1}\right) \hat{\rho} \left(\hat{\Pi}_j^{A_1} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_l^{B_1}\right) / \left\{ Tr \left(\hat{\Pi}_j^{A_1} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_l^{B_1}\right) \hat{\rho}\right\}
\]  

(33)

The overall quantum probability for the event where measurement of \(A_1, B_1\) results in outcomes \(j, l\) before measurement of \(A_2, B_2\) results in all outcomes \(k, m\) is obtained by multiplying this conditional probability by \(P_Q(j, l | A_1, B_1)\) and is given by

\[
P_Q(j, l, (k, m) | A_1, B_1, (A_2, B_2)_2) = \sum_{k, m} Tr \left(\hat{\Pi}_j^{A_1} \hat{\Pi}_k^{A_2} \hat{\Pi}_l^{A_1} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_m^{B_2} \hat{\Pi}_l^{B_1}\right) \hat{\rho}
\]  

(34)

The notation \(P_Q(j, l, (k, m) | A_1, B_1, (A_2, B_2)_2)\) indicates that the \(A_2, B_2\) measurements were carried out second and the results left unrecorded. Note the different expressions for
\[P_Q(j, l, (k, m)|A_1, B_1, (A_2, B_2)_1)\) and \(P_Q(j, l, (k, m)|A_1, B_1, (A_2, B_2)_2)\), which are both different to \(P_Q(j, l|A_1, B_1)\), the probability for just measuring \(A_1, B_1\) alone. The density operator and after the \(A_2, B_2\) measurements were carried out and the outcomes \(l, m\) are left unrecorded changes from \(\hat{\rho}^{kk} \) to \(\hat{\rho}^{kk} \).

We now consider a third possibility. In the general case where the two operators of each sub-system do not commute, the results for \(P_Q(j, l, (k, m)|A_1, B_1, (A_2, B_2)_1)\) and \(\hat{\rho}^{kk} \) or \(P_Q(j, l, (k, m)|A_1, B_1, (A_2, B_2)_2)\) and \(\hat{\rho}^{kk} \) are not the same as if measurements on \(A_2, B_2\) had never taken place at all. The probability \(P_Q(j, l|A_1, B_1)\) for measurement of observables \(A_1, B_1\) alone that results in outcomes \(j, l\) would be

\[P_Q(j, l|A_1, B_1) = Tr \left( \hat{\Pi}_j^{A_1} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_l^{B_1} \right) \hat{\rho} \quad (36)\]

and quantum density operator following this measurement just of observables \(A_1, B_1\) alone would be

\[\hat{\rho}_{j,l} = \left( \hat{\Pi}_j^{A_1} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_l^{B_1} \right) \hat{\rho} \left( \hat{\Pi}_j^{A_1} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_l^{B_1} \right) / Tr \left( \hat{\Pi}_j^{A_1} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_l^{B_1} \right) \hat{\rho} \quad (37)\]

So not only does the measurement probability \(P_Q(j, l|A_1, B_1)\) differ from \(P_Q(j, l, (k, m)|A_1, B_1, (A_2, B_2)_1)\) or \(P_Q(j, l, (k, m)|A_1, B_1, (A_2, B_2)_2)\), but the final quantum states \(\hat{\rho}_{j,l}\) differs from \(\hat{\rho}^{###} \) or \(\hat{\rho}^{kk} \) are also different. Thus the classical probability \(P(j, l|A_1, B_1) = \sum_{k, m} P(j, k, l, m|A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2)\) is linked to a third quantum probability for a possible measurement process that replicates one of the equivalent classical measurement processes on which \(P(A_1 = j, B_1 = l)\) is based.