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Abstract

We discuss three measures of contextuality for systems of dichotomous random variables. They are developed within the framework of the Contextuality-by-Default (CbD) theory, and apply to inconsistently connected systems (those with “disturbance” allowed). For one of these measures of contextuality, presented here for the first time, we construct a corresponding measure of noncontextuality. The other two CbD-based measures do not suggest ways in which degree of noncontextuality of a system can be quantified. We find the same to be true for the contextual fraction measure developed by Abramsky, Barbosa, and Mansfield. This measure of contextuality is confined to consistently connected systems. However, any such a measure can be made comparable to CbD-based measures by means of a procedure that transforms any system of random variables into a consistently connected one.
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1 Introduction

We will consider certain measures of contextuality and see if they can be naturally extended into measures of noncontextuality. What we mean by natural extendability can be illustrated by an example. Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a system of random variables, let $F(\mathcal{R})$ be a real-valued functional, and let the following be accepted as a definition, or derived as a theorem: the system $\mathcal{R}$ is contextual if and only if $F(\mathcal{R}) > 0$. Suppose that in the universe of possible systems $\mathcal{R}$ the value of $F(\mathcal{R})$ varies on the interval $(a, b)$, with $a < 0 < b$. It is natural then to consider a positive value of $F(\mathcal{R})$ as the degree of contextuality of $\mathcal{R}$, increasing as $F(\mathcal{R})$ increases from 0 to $b$:

$$F(\mathcal{R}) > 0 \implies \text{CNT} = F(\mathcal{R}).$$ (1)

Equally naturally, this measure can be extended to a measure of noncontextuality, increasing as $F(\mathcal{R})$ decreases from 0 to $a$:

$$F(\mathcal{R}) \leq 0 \implies \text{NCNT} = -F(\mathcal{R}).$$ (2)

By contrast, if the functional $F(\mathcal{R})$ varied on an interval $(0, b)$, the degree of contextuality would be defined as before, but it would not extend to a measure of noncontextuality: all noncontextual system would be mapped into a single number.

We will consider three contextuality measures, all based on the Contextuality-by-Default (CbD) theory and applicable to arbitrary systems of dichotomous random variables. (Generalizations that would make our analysis applicable to multivalued variables are possible but not necessary: in the contemporary version of CbD [14,16], any system of random variables is to be presented in a canonical form, one in which each original random variable is replaced with a set of jointly distributed dichotomous variables.) Two of our measures, CNT$_1$ and CNT$_2$, are, in a well-defined sense, mirror images of each other, but we will see that only one of them, CNT$_2$, is naturally extendable to a measure of noncontextuality. The third measure, CNT$_3$, is of a different kind, and it is not extendable to a measure of noncontextuality. We will also discuss the measure of contextuality called contextual fraction, developed by Abramsky, Barbosa, and Mansfield [2]. Because it is not CbD-based, it is only applicable to consistently connected systems of random variables (those with no “disturbance”). To make it comparable to our three measures of contextuality, we present a simple way of converting any system of random variables into a consistently connected one. This consistification method is implicit in all CbD-based computational algorithms [13,20], but explicitly it has been first described by Amaral, Duarte, and Oliveira [5] (with one significant difference from our version, as explained in Section 7.2). We will see that contextual fraction does not have a natural noncontextuality counterpart.

In quantum physics, measures of noncontextuality may be of interest when dealing with systems intermediate between quantum and classical ones (as, e.g., in [23]). They can also be profitably used in non-physical applications of contextuality.
analysis, notably in the analysis of human behavior [8][9]. Thus, some models of decision making can predict both contextual and noncontextual systems of random variables, and noncontextual systems may indicate features of decision making that are, if anything, of greater interest than those in contextual systems [7]. Measures of noncontextuality are also of great interest in statistical analysis of data, where it may be equally important to establish contextuality or noncontextuality of a system of random variables known to us on a sample level.

2 Basics of the Contextuality-by-Default approach

2.1 A system \( R \) of random variables is a set whose elements are random variables \( R_q^c \) labeled in two ways: by their contents \( q \in Q \) (that which the random variable measures or responds to) and their contexts \( c \in C \) (the conditions under which this random variable is recorded):

\[
R = \{ R_q^c : c \in C, q \in Q, q \prec c \},
\]

where \( q \prec c \) indicates that content \( q \) is measured (or responded to) in context \( c \). Throughout this paper, the set of contents \( Q \) and the set of contexts \( C \) are finite, and all random variables in the system are dichotomous.

2.2 In CbD, with no loss of generality, one can make \( q \prec c \) hold true for all \( q \) and \( c \), by placing in every “empty” \((q,c)\)-cell a dummy variable with a single possible value \([12]\). We will not be using this construction in this paper, as it is convenient to think of the relation \( \prec \) as the format of the system \( R \), the arrangement of the random variables without information of their distributions.

2.3 In each context \( c \), the subset of random variables

\[
R^c = \{ R_q^c : q \in Q, q \prec c \}
\]

is jointly distributed, i.e., it is a random variable in its own right. It is referred to as the bunch for (or corresponding to) context \( c \). For each content \( q \), the subset of random variables

\[
R_q = \{ R_q^c : c \in C, q \prec c \}
\]

is referred to as the connection for (or corresponding to) content \( q \). The elements of a connection are not jointly distributed, they are stochastically unrelated. More generally, any \( R_q^c \) and \( R_q^{c'} \) are stochastically unrelated unless \( c = c' \).

2.4 The terminology above is illustrated in Fig. [11] One might protest that given the notion of a context and a content, the corresponding notions of a bunch and a connection are unnecessary. It is indeed possible, as we have done in some of our publications, to avoid the use of the latter two terms by speaking instead of context-sharing and content-sharing variables. However, in discussing measures of (non)contextuality and algorithms computing them, the use of the terms in question, e.g., when speaking of “bunch probabilities” and “connection probabilities”, is very convenient.

2.5 A system is consistently connected (satisfies the “no-disturbance” requirement) if the distribution of each random variable in it depends on its content only. If this is not the case, the system is inconsistently connected. (The latter term can also be used for arbitrary systems, that may but need not be consistently connected.)

2.6 The general definition of a coupling for an indexed set \( \mathcal{X} \) of random variables is that it is a jointly distributed and identically indexed set \( Y \) of random variables such that, for any subset \( X \) of \( \mathcal{X} \) possessing a joint distribution, the corresponding subset of \( Y \) is identically distributed. In particular, every element of \( \mathcal{X} \) is distributed as the corresponding element of \( Y \). (The difference in fonts here, \( \mathcal{X} \) vs \( Y \), reflects the fact that \( Y \) is a random variable in its own right, while \( \mathcal{X} \) generally is not.)

2.7 A coupling of a system \( R \) is a set of jointly distributed random variables

\[
S = \{ S_q^c : c \in C, q \in Q, q \prec c \},
\]

such that, for any context \( c \), the bunches \( S^c \) and \( R^c \) are identically distributed. The restriction \( \{ S_q^c : c \in C \} \) of this coupling to two content-sharing \( R_q^c \) and \( R_q^{c'} \) is called a maximal coupling of \( R_q^c \) and \( R_q^{c'} \) if the probability of \( S_q^c = S_q^{c'} \) is maximal.
The system \( R \) is defined as the set of variables in play, every connection has a unique multimaximal coupling, and for any subset of the system, the probability of the subset can be represented by a vector of bunch probabilities if no such coupling exists.

Any system \( R \) has a coupling \( S \) whose restrictions to all connections are multimaximal couplings of \( R \). With only dichotomous variables in play, every connection has a unique multimaximal coupling, and for any subset \( \{ R_{q_1}^e, R_{q_2}^e, \ldots, R_{q_n}^e \} \) of a connection \( R_q \), the probability of \( S_q^e = S_{q_1}^e = \ldots = S_{q_n}^e \) is maximal possible.

### 2.8 The system \( R \) is noncontextual if it has a coupling \( S \) whose restrictions to all connections are multimaximal couplings of these connections. The system is contextual if no such coupling \( S \) exists.

### 3 Vectorial representation of systems

#### 3.1 Any system \( R \) can be represented by a vector of bunch probabilities. Abramsky, Barbosa, and Mansfield would call it an empirical model. For any context \( c \), assuming the \( n_c \) random variables in its bunch were enumerated \( R_{1}^c, \ldots, R_{n_c}^c \), we define

\[
\mathbf{p}^{(c)} = \begin{bmatrix}
    p_{1}^{(c)} \\
    \vdots \\
    p_{1}^{(n_c)}
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
    \Pr [ R_{1}^c = -1, \ldots, R_{j}^c = -1, \ldots, R_{n_c}^c = -1 ] \\
    \vdots \\
    \Pr [ R_{1}^c = r_1, \ldots, R_{j}^c = r_j, \ldots, R_{n_c}^c = r_{n_c} ] \\
    \vdots \\
    \Pr [ R_{1}^c = 1, \ldots, R_{j}^c = 1, \ldots, R_{n_c}^c = 1 ]
\end{bmatrix},
\]

where \( \Pr \) stands for probability, and \( r_1, \ldots, r_{n_c} \) run through all \( 2^{n_c} \) combinations of \( \pm 1 \)'s. The vector of bunch probabilities is defined as

\[
\mathbf{p}_b = \begin{bmatrix}
    \mathbf{p}_1^{(c)} \\
    \vdots \\
    \mathbf{p}_j^{(c)} \\
    \vdots \\
    \mathbf{p}_k^{(c)}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(the boldface index \( \mathbf{b} \) stands for “bunches”).
3.2 For any content $q$, assuming the $m_q$ elements of the corresponding connection were enumerated $R^1_q, \ldots, R^{m_q}_q$, any coupling $(S^1_q, \ldots, S^{m_q}_q)$ of this connection is defined by

$$
P_{(q)} = \begin{bmatrix}
p_{(q),1} \\
p_{(q),2} \\
\vdots \\
p_{(q),2^{n_q}}
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
\Pr \left[ S^1_q = -1, \ldots, S^j_q = -1, \ldots, S^{m_q}_q = -1 \right] \\
\ldots \\
\Pr \left[ S^1_q = s_1, \ldots, S^j_q = s_j, \ldots, S^{m_q}_q = s_{m_q} \right] \\
\ldots \\
\Pr \left[ S^1_q = 1, \ldots, S^j_q = 1, \ldots, S^{m_q}_q = 1 \right]
\end{bmatrix}, \tag{9}
$$

with the same meaning of the terms as in (7). The vector of connection probabilities is defined as

$$
P_c = \begin{bmatrix}
P_{q_1} \\
P_{q_2} \\
\vdots \\
P_{q_{|Q|}}
\end{bmatrix}, \tag{10}
$$

(the boldface index $c$ stands for “connections”).

3.3 Finally we stack up the two vectors, for bunches and for connections, to obtain the complete vector of probabilities.

$$
P_{\text{complete}} = \begin{bmatrix}
P_b \\
P_c
\end{bmatrix}. \tag{11}
$$

3.4 For purposes of computing CbD-based measures of contextuality, $P_{\text{complete}}$ is not convenient because of its redundancy: one cannot change any component of $P^{(c)}$ or $P_{(q)}$ without changing some of its other components. We will deal therefore with one of the numerous versions of a reduced vector of probabilities in which components can be changed independently. The variant we choose is introduced in [13]. It is based on the idea of replacing $P^{(c)}$ in (7) with probabilities

$$
\Pr \left[ R^c_{q_i} = 1 : i \in I \right] \tag{12}
$$

for various subsets $I$ of $\{1, \ldots, n_c\}$. Analogously, $P_{(q)}$ in (9) is replaced with probabilities

$$
\Pr \left[ S^c_{q_j} = 1 : j \in J \right] \tag{13}
$$

for various subsets $J$ of $\{1, \ldots, m_q\}$. These probabilities (and also the events whose probabilities they are, when this cannot cause confusion) are referred to as k-marginals, where $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ is the order of the marginals (the number of the random variables involved). The 0-marginal is a constant taken to be 1, and the 1-marginals $\Pr \left[ R^1_q = 1 \right] = \Pr \left[ S^1_q = 1 \right]$ are shared by the bunches and the connections. Because of this, to avoid redundancy, we put the 0-marginal and all 1-marginals in one group, all higher-order marginals for bunches into a second group, and all higher-order marginals for connections into a third group.

3.5 Let us order in some way all random variables in the system: $R^c_{q_1}, \ldots, R^c_{q_{|Q|}}$. Define

$$
P_I = \begin{bmatrix}
1 \\
\Pr \left[ R^c_{q_1} = 1 \right] \\
\vdots \\
\Pr \left[ R^c_{q_{|Q|}} = 1 \right]
\end{bmatrix}, \tag{14}
$$

where the first element, 1, is the zero-marginal, and the boldface index $I$ stands for “low-order marginals”.
3.6 For a given context \( c \), let us enumerate \( 1, \ldots, 2^{nc} - nc - 1 \) all nonempty and non-singleton subsets of the corresponding bunch: \( \binom{nc}{2} \) 2-marginals followed by \( \binom{nc}{3} \) 3-marginals etc. Define

\[
p^c = \begin{bmatrix}
p_i^c \\
\vdots \\
p_i^c \\
\vdots \\
p_{2^{nc}-nc-1}^c
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
\Pr \left[ R_i^c = 1, R_{i+1}^c = 1 \right] \\
\vdots \\
\Pr \left[ R_{i+1}^c = 1, \ldots, R_{i+j}^c = 1, \ldots, R_{i+nc}^c = 1 \right]
\end{bmatrix},
\]

and the reduced vector of bunch probabilities

\[
p_b = \begin{bmatrix}
p_{c1}^c \\
\vdots \\
p_{c(C)}^c
\end{bmatrix}. \tag{15}
\]

3.7 We analogously define, having imposed some couplings on the connections,

\[
p_q = \begin{bmatrix}
p_{q1} \\
\vdots \\
p_{qi} \\
\vdots \\
p_{q2^{mq}-1}
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
\Pr \left[ S_q^1 = 1, S_q^2 = 1 \right] \\
\vdots \\
\Pr \left[ S_q^{i-1} = 1, S_q^i = 1, \ldots, S_q^{i, m_q} = 1 \right]
\end{bmatrix}, \tag{16}
\]

The reduced vector of connection probabilities is

\[
p_c = \begin{bmatrix}
p_{q1} \\
\vdots \\
p_{qi} \\
\vdots \\
p_{q2^{mq}-1}
\end{bmatrix}. \tag{17}
\]

3.8 Without loss of generality, one can delete from \( p_c \) all \( k \)-marginals with \( k > 2 \). As shown in [13], the 1-marginals and 2-marginals define multimaximal couplings of the connections uniquely, and this makes them sufficient for all CbD-based measures of contextuality.

3.9 Finally,

\[
p = \begin{bmatrix}
p_1 \\
p_b \\
p_c
\end{bmatrix} \tag{19}
\]

is the reduced vector of probabilities representing system \( R \).

3.10 As mentioned in Section 2.7 with reference to [14, 15], if the couplings of connections are chosen to be multimaximal, then all \( k \)-marginal probabilities in \( \mathcal{R} \) with \( k > 1 \) are maximal possible, given the values of the 1-marginal probabilities.

3.11 Any component of \( p^c \) or of \( p_q \) can generally change its value while other components remain fixed (which is impossible in \( p^{(c)} \) and \( p^{(q)} \)). However, the range of possible changes is limited: every \( k \)-marginal probability is limited from above by any \( k - 1 \)-marginal it contains, and from below by any \( (k + 1) \)-marginal containing it.
3.12 One could construct other reduced representations, all linear transforms of the complete representation. One interesting way, e.g., is to replace the probabilities in (16) and (17) with the expected values of the products of the corresponding random variables,

\[ 1, \langle R_q^c \rangle, \langle R_q^c R_{q_2}^c \rangle, \langle R_q^c R_{q_2}^c R_{q_3}^c \rangle, \ldots, \]

and analogously for connection couplings,

\[ \langle S_q^c \rangle, \langle S_q^c S_{q_2}^c \rangle, \langle S_q^c S_{q_2}^c S_{q_3}^c \rangle, \ldots. \]

4 Contextuality in vectorial representation

4.1 Consider a system \( \mathcal{R} \) with \( N \) dichotomous random variables, and let \( v \) be the \( 2^N \)-component vector of possible values of a(ny) coupling \( S \) of the system. An element of \( v \) can be viewed as a conjunction of events

\[ \{ S_q^c = r_q^c : c \in C, q \in Q, q \prec c \}, \]

with \( r_q^c = \pm 1 \). Then any given \( S \) is specified by a \( 2^N \)-vector \( x \) of the probabilities with which the corresponding elements of \( v \) occur. Clearly,

\[ x \geq 0, \|x\| = 1, \]

where the inequality is componentwise, and the norm is \( L_1 \). We call \( x \) a coupling vector for \( \mathcal{R} \).

4.2 Let \( p \) be a (reduced) vector of probabilities. Then the \( i \)-th component of \( p \) is the joint probability of the event

\[ \{ S_q^c = 1 : (c, q) \in D_i \} \]

for some \( D_i \). The latter can be a low-marginal event, in which case it is empty or a singleton; or \( D_i \) can be a bunch event, in which case it consists of a fixed \( c \) paired with two or more \( q \)-s; or else it can be a connection event, in which case it has a fixed \( q \) paired with two or more \( c \)-s (or with precisely two \( c \)-s, in view of Section 3.8).

4.3 We now construct a Boolean matrix \( M \) having \( 2^N \) columns, with the \( j \)-th column being labeled by the \( j \)-th value of \( v \) \((j = 1, \ldots, 2^N)\). This matrix is the same for all systems in the format of \( \mathcal{R} \). The \( i \)-th row of this matrix is labeled by the event \((24)\) whose probability is the \( i \)-th element of \( p \). If all the random variables in this event equal to 1 in the \( j \)-th value of \( v \), then we put 1 in the cell \((i, j)\) of \( M \). All other cells of \( M \) are filled with zeros.

4.4 The matrix can be presented as

\[ M = \begin{pmatrix} M_1 \\ M_b \\ M_c \end{pmatrix}, \]

with \( M_1, M_b, \) and \( M_c \) corresponding to the \( p_l \)-part (low-marginal probabilities), \( p_b \)-part (bunch probabilities), and \( p_c \)-part (connection probabilities) of \( p \), respectively. In particular, the first row of \( M \) corresponds to the zero-marginal 1, and this row contains 1 in all cells.

4.5 Let \( p^* \) be a (reduced) vector of probabilities whose \( p_l \)-part and \( p_b \)-part consist of empirical probabilities (estimated from an experiment or predicted by a model), and \( p_c \)-part consists of the connection probabilities for multimaximal couplings. Then the system \( \mathcal{R} \) represented by \( p^* \) is noncontextual if and only if

\[ Mx = p^* \]

for some nonnegative coupling vector \( x \). If no such nonnegative \( x \) exists, then \( \mathcal{R} \) is contextual. In reference to (23), note that \( \|x\| = 1 \) is guaranteed by the first row of \( M \) and first element of \( p^* \).

4.6 As a step towards measures of contextuality, consider the convex polytope

\[ \mathbb{P} = \{ p : Mx = p, \text{ for some } x \geq 0 \}. \]

It corresponds to the set of all possible couplings of all systems in the format of \( \mathcal{R} \).
4.7 A specific system $\mathcal{R}$ is defined by specifying the vectors $\mathbf{p}_i = \mathbf{p}_i^*$ and $\mathbf{p}_b = \mathbf{p}_b^*$. This defines a convex polytope which is a cross-section of the polytope $\mathbb{P}$,

\[
\mathbb{P}_c = \left\{ \mathbf{p}_c : \mathbf{M}_c \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{p}_c, \text{ for some } \mathbf{x} \geq 0, \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{p}_1^*, \mathbf{M}_b \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{p}_b^* \right\}.
\]

(28)

We refer to it as the feasibility polytope (for system $\mathcal{R}$). It corresponds to the set of all possible couplings of system $\mathcal{R}$.

4.8 A symmetrically opposite construction is the convex polytope

\[
\mathbb{P}_b = \left\{ \mathbf{p}_b : \mathbf{M}_b \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{p}_b, \text{ for some } \mathbf{x} \geq 0, \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{p}_1^*, \mathbf{M}_c \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{p}_c^* \right\}.
\]

(29)

We can call it the noncontextuality polytope (for system $\mathcal{R}$), as it corresponds to all noncontextual systems in the format of $\mathcal{R}$ and with the same 1-marginals as $\mathcal{R}$.

4.9 Clearly, system $\mathcal{R}$ is noncontextual if and only if $\mathbf{p}_c^* \in \mathbb{P}_c$ and $\mathbf{p}_b^* \in \mathbb{P}_b$, with the two statements implying each other,

\[
\mathbf{p}_c^* \in \mathbb{P}_c \iff \mathbf{p}_b^* \in \mathbb{P}_b.
\]

(30)

5 Measures of contextuality

5.1 For a contextual system $\mathcal{R}$, $\mathbf{p}_c^*$ is outside $\mathbb{P}_c$, and the $L_1$-distance between them is a natural measure of contextuality,

\[
\text{CNT}_1 = \min_{\mathbf{p}_c \in \mathbb{P}_c} \| \mathbf{p}_c^* - \mathbf{p}_c \| = 1 \cdot \mathbf{p}_c^* - \max_{\mathbf{p}_c \in \mathbb{P}_c} (1 \cdot \mathbf{p}_c),
\]

(31)

where the equality follows from $\mathbf{p}_c^* \geq \mathbf{p}_c$ (componentwise). We can also write

\[
\text{CNT}_1 = 1 \cdot \mathbf{p}_c^* - \max_{\mathbf{x} \geq 0, \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{p}_1^*, \mathbf{M}_b \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{p}_b^*} (1 \cdot \mathbf{M}_c \mathbf{x}).
\]

(32)

This measure was the first one proposed within the framework of CbD [19,20]. Its linear programming implementation is

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{find} & \quad \text{maximizing} & \quad \text{subject to} \quad & \quad \mathbf{x} \quad 1 \cdot \mathbf{M}_c \mathbf{x} \quad \mathbf{x} \geq 0, \\
& & & \quad \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{p}_1^*, \\
& & & \quad \mathbf{M}_b \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{p}_b^*
\end{align*}
\]

(33)

A solution $\mathbf{x}^*$ must exist, and any such $\mathbf{x}^*$ yields

\[
\text{CNT}_1 = 1 \cdot (\mathbf{p}_c^* - \mathbf{M}_c \mathbf{x}^*) = 1 \cdot (\mathbf{p}_c^* - \mathbf{M} \mathbf{x}^*).
\]

(34)

5.2 The “symmetrically opposite” measure is the $L_1$-distance of $\mathbf{p}_b^*$ from the contextuality polytope $\mathbb{P}_b$,

\[
\text{CNT}_2 = \min_{\mathbf{p}_b \in \mathbb{P}_b} \| \mathbf{p}_b^* - \mathbf{p}_b \| = \min_{\mathbf{x} \geq 0, \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{p}_1^*, \mathbf{M}_c \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{p}_c^*} \| \mathbf{p}_b^* - \mathbf{M}_b \mathbf{x} \|.
\]

(35)

This measure is introduced here for the first time. Its linear programming implementation is

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{find} & \quad \text{minimizing} & \quad \text{subject to} \quad & \quad \mathbf{x} \quad 1 \cdot \mathbf{d} \quad -\mathbf{d} \leq \mathbf{p}_b^* - \mathbf{M}_b \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{d}, \\
& & & \quad \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d} \geq 0, \\
& & & \quad \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{p}_1^*, \\
& & & \quad \mathbf{M}_c \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{p}_c^*
\end{align*}
\]

(36)

Again, for any solution $\mathbf{x}^*$,

\[
\text{CNT}_2 = \| \mathbf{p}_b^* - \mathbf{M}_b \mathbf{x}^* \| = \| \mathbf{p}_c^* - \mathbf{M} \mathbf{x}^* \|.
\]

(37)
5.3 The third measure to consider, CNT$_3$, has been proposed in [13], and brought to its present form in [14][16]. However, the ideas on which it is based date back to Dirac, with contemporary elaborations, including relating it to contextuality, found in [11][9][10][21]. The measure is based on the observation [13] that if one drops the nonnegativity constraint in (23), replacing thereby probability distributions with signed-measure distributions, then the set

$$\mathcal{Y} = \{ y : My = p^*, 1 \cdot y = 1 \}$$

is nonempty. Clearly,

$$y \in \mathcal{Y} \implies 1 \cdot |y| \geq 1,$$

were the absolute value is computed componentwise. The system then is noncontextual if and only if there is a $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ with

$$1 \cdot |y| = 1 \cdot y = 1.$$

It follows that

$$\text{CNT}_3 = \min_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} (1 \cdot |y|) - 1$$

is a natural measure of contextuality. As shown in [13], this minimum is always attained. The quantity $1 \cdot |y|$ is called total variation (of the signed measure), so CNT$_3$ can be referred as the minimum total variation measure (ignoring the subtraction of 1). The linear programming implementation of CNT$_3$ is

$$\begin{align*}
\text{find} & \quad \text{minimizing} \quad y_+, y_- \quad \text{subject to:} \\
& \quad 1 \cdot y = M (y_+ - y_-) = p^*, \\
& \quad y_+, y_- \geq 0
\end{align*}$$

With any solution $y^*_+, y^*_-$,

$$\text{CNT}_3 = 1 \cdot |y^*_+ - y^*_-| - 1.$$  

6 Noncontextuality

6.1 Consider now the situation when $R$ is noncontextual. With respect to the CNT$_1$ measure, this means that $p^*_c \in P_c$. The question we pose is whether CNT$_1$ can be extended into a noncontextuality measure by computing

$$\text{NCNT}_1 = \inf_{p_c \in \partial Q} \| p^*_c - p_c \| = \min_{p_c \in \partial Q} \| p^*_c - p_c \|,$$

where $\partial Q$ indicates the boundary of the polytope $Q$. The answer to this question turns out to be negative: while this distance is well-defined, it is zero for any $p^*_c$. Indeed, if $p^*_c$ were an interior point of $P_c$, one could increase some of the probabilities in (17) by a small amount and still remain within $P_c$. But this is impossible, since all $k$-marginal probabilities with $k > 1$ have maximal possible values. CNT$_1$ does not have a noncontextual counterpart.

6.2 The situation is different with CNT$_2$. The measure

$$\text{NCNT}_2 = \inf_{p_b \notin \partial B} \| p^*_b - p_b \| = \min_{p_b \in \partial B} \| p^*_b - p_b \|$$

is well-defined and varies as $p^*_b$ varies within $P_b$. To compute NCNT$_2$ we can make use of the following theorem [22]: a point on the boundary of a convex polytope $L_1$-closest to an interior point differs from the latter in a single coordinate. This means that all we have to do is to increase or decrease the probabilities in (15) one by one as far as possible without leaving the polytope, and to choose the smallest change at the end.

The linear programming implementation of this procedure is as follows. Let all elements of $p^*_b$ be enumerated $1, \ldots, K$. Then, for every $i = 1, \ldots, K$,

$$\begin{align*}
\text{find} & \quad \text{maximizing} \quad d^+_i, d^-_i \quad \text{subject to} \\
& \quad p^*_b + d^+_i e_i = M_b x, \\
& \quad d^-_i, x \geq 0 \quad (46)
\end{align*}$$
and

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{find} \quad & \text{maximizing} \quad d_i^- \cdot x_i \quad d_i^+ \cdot x_i \quad \text{subject to} \\
& p_i^* - d_i^- e_i = M_i x, \\
& d_i^- \cdot x \geq 0, \\
& M_i x = p_i^i, \\
& M x = p_c^i
\end{align*}
\]  

where \( e_i \) is the unit vector with the \( i \)th component equal to 1. Once the solution \( d_i^{*-i}, d_i^{i+} \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, K \) are determined,

\[
\text{NCNT}_2 = \min_{i=1, \ldots, K} \left\{ \min \left( d_i^{*-i}, d_i^{i+} \right) \right\} .
\]

6.3 Consider now \( \text{CNT}_3 \). If \( \mathcal{R} \) is noncontextual, there is a nonnegative \( x \) such that \( M x = p^* \), and

\[
\text{CNT}_3 = 1 \cdot x - 1 = 0.
\]

There seems to be no way to extend it to a noncontextuality measure without modifying its logic.

7 Consistified systems

7.1 If a measure of contextuality is defined for consistently connected systems only, it cannot be directly compared to the CbD-based measures. One can, however, convert an inconsistently connected system \( \mathcal{R} \) into a contextually equivalent consistently connected one, \( \mathcal{R}^\uparrow \). Contextual equivalence means that \( \mathcal{R} \) is contextual if and only if so is \( \mathcal{R}^\uparrow \). Note however, that if there is a measure of contextuality (or noncontextuality) applicable to both \( \mathcal{R} \) and \( \mathcal{R}^\uparrow \), its values need not coincide for the two systems.

7.2 The procedure of consistification consists in treating couplings of connections as if they were additional bunches. This is implicit in any CbD-based algorithm for establishing or measuring contextuality [13][14][19][20]. Explicitly, however, it was first described by Amaral and coauthors in [5], and then in more detail in [4]. The present construction differs in one significant aspect: we use multimaximal couplings for systems of dichotomous random variables, whereas Amaral and coauthors use maximal couplings, and allow for multivalued variables (as we did in the older version of CbD, e.g., in [13]). The difference between the two couplings of a set \( \{X_1, \ldots, X_n\} \) is that in the multimaximal coupling \( \{Y_1, \ldots, Y_n\} \) we maximize probabilities of all equalities \( Y_i = Y_j \) (whence it follows that we also maximize the probability of \( Y_{i_1} = Y_{i_2} = \ldots = Y_{i_k} \) for any subset of \( \{Y_1, \ldots, Y_n\} \)), whereas a maximal coupling \( \{Z_1, \ldots, Z_n\} \) only maximizes the single chain equality \( Z_1 = Z_2 = \ldots = Z_n \). The reason we adhere to multimaximal couplings and canonical systems, with all variables dichotomized, were laid out in [13][16]. Here, it will suffice to say that our multimaximal couplings are unique, whereas maximal couplings generally are not, even for dichotomous variables (if there are more than two of them). Since measures of (non)contextuality generally depend on what couplings are being used, the approach advocated in [4, 5] faces the problem of choice.

7.3 Given an arbitrary system \( \mathcal{R} \), the new system \( \mathcal{R}^\uparrow \) has a set \( Q^\uparrow \) of “new” contents, a set \( C^\uparrow \) of “new contexts”, and a “new” format relation \( \prec^\uparrow \). The corresponding constructs in the original system, \( Q, C, \) and \( \prec \), will be labeled “old”. We will illustrate the algorithm of consistification on two systems, one chosen for being the smallest nontrivial system,

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
& * & * \\
& * & * \\
q_1 & q_2 & \bar{C}_2
\end{array}
\]

and the other for having a sufficiently irregular format to represent an arbitrary system,

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
& * & * \\
& * & * \\
& * & * \\
q_1 & q_2 & q_3 & q_4 & \bar{A}
\end{array}
\]
7.4 For each random variable $R^i_j$ in $\mathcal{R}$ we form a new content, denoted $q^i_j$. The set of all new contents is

$$Q^i = \{q^i_j : c^i \in C, q_j \in Q, q_j \prec c^i\}.$$  \hfill (51)

The number of new contents is the cardinality of $\prec$, which cannot exceed $|C \times Q|$. For our examples above, the new contents are

$$Q^i = \{q_1^1, q_2^1, q_1^2, q_2^2\} \text{ for system } C_2,$$

and

$$Q^i = \{q_1^1, q_2^1, q_2^2, q_3^2, q_4^3, q_1^3, q_3^3, q_1^4, q_4^5, q_5^5\} \text{ for system } A.$$  \hfill (53)

7.5 New contexts are formed as the set

$$C^\dagger = C \sqcup Q.$$  \hfill (54)

For our examples,

$$C^\dagger = \{c^1, c^2, q_1, q_2\} \text{ for system } C_2,$$

and

$$C^\dagger = \{c^1, c^2, c^3, c^4, c^5, q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4\} \text{ for system } A.$$  \hfill (56)

The number of new contexts is $|C| + |Q|$.

7.6 The new format relation is

$$\prec^\dagger = \{(q^i_j, c^i) : c^i \in C, q_j \in Q, q_j \prec c^i\} \sqcup \{(q^i_j, q_j) : c^i \in C, q_j \in Q, q_j \prec c^i\}.$$  \hfill (57)

That is, a new content $q^i_j$ is measured (responded to) in the new contexts $c^i$ and $q_j$ only. In our examples,

7.7 Each $(q^i_j, c^i)$-cell contains the old random variables $R^i_j$. The new bunch

$$R^i = \{R^i_j : q^i_j \in Q^i, q^i_j \prec^\dagger c^i\}.$$  \hfill (58)

coincides with the old bunch

$$R^i = \{R^i_j : q_j \in Q, q_j \prec c^i\}.$$  \hfill (59)

Each $(q^i_j, q_j)$-cell contains a new random variable $V^i_j$ whose distribution is the same as that of $R^i_j$. The bunch

$$V^i = \{V^i_j : q^i_j \in Q^i, q^i_j \prec^\dagger q_j\}.$$  \hfill (60)

is the multimaximal coupling of the old connection

$$\mathcal{R}_j = \{R^i_j : c^i \in C, q_j \prec c^i\}.$$  \hfill (61)
Note the following properties of the consistified systems.

1. Bunches corresponding to different old contexts, \( c^i, c^{i'} \), are disjoint.
2. Bunches corresponding to different old contents, \( q_j, q_j' \), are disjoint.
3. A bunch corresponding to an old content, \( q_j \), and a bunch corresponding to an old context, \( c^i \), have at most one connection between them, \( \{ R_j^i, V_j^i \} \).
4. The connection corresponding to any new content \( q_j^i \) contains precisely two random variables, \( R_j^i \) and \( V_j^i \), with the same distribution.

Property 3 above means that a consistified system is not only consistently connected, but also strongly consistently connected. The latter term corresponds to “complete marginal selectivity” in [11] and means the following: if two sets of random variables in different contexts have the same contents (in the matrix representation, occupy the same columns in two different rows), then their joint distributions are the same. It is an important constraint in Abramsky and colleagues’ approach to contextuality. For instance, our example system \( C_2 \) in (49) will only be considered in this approach if the two bunches \( \{ R_1^1, V_1^1 \} \) and \( \{ R_2^1, V_2^1 \} \) are identically distributed, which would make this system trivial. By contrast, if one adopts the CbD-based consistification of \( C_2 \), in (62), Abramsky’s analysis will be the same as ours.

8 Contextual fraction

8.1 Let us consider the measure proposed by Abramsky, Barbosa, and Mansfield [2], called contextual fraction (CNTF), and let us assume it applies to a system \( R \) that has been consistified. We can use our definition of contextuality, and form the vectors \( p, x \) and matrix \( M \) as above. The only new constraint is

\[
p_c = 1, \tag{63}\]

due to the system’s consistent connectedness, but this time it does not diminish generality. Like in the case of CNT\(_3\), we immerse the coupling vectors \( x \) into a larger set of vectors \( z \), only this time we retain the property \( z \geq 0 \) while replacing \( 1 \cdot x \) with \( 1 \cdot z \leq 1 \).

\[
1 \cdot z \leq 1. \tag{64}\]

8.2 Consider the convex polytope

\[
Z = \{ z : Mz \leq p^*, z \geq 0 \}. \tag{65}\]

This polytope is nonempty, because, e.g., it contains \( z = 0 \). If \( Z \) does not contain \( z \) with \( 1 \cdot z = 1 \), the system is contextual, and its degree of contextuality can be measured by the difference between 1 and the maximal total mass \( 1 \cdot z \) achievable in \( Z \):

\[
\text{CNTF} = 1 - \max_{z \in Z} (1 \cdot z). \tag{66}\]

The linear programming formulation of this measure is

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{find} & \quad \text{maximizing} & \quad z^* \\
\text{subject to:} & \quad 1 \cdot z & \leq p^* \\
& \quad Mz & \leq p^* \\
& \quad z & \geq 0
\end{align*} \tag{67}\]
Can this measure be extended to a measure of noncontextuality? The answer is negative, for the same reason as in the case of CNT$_3$. If $Z$ contains a vector $z$ such that $1 \cdot z = 1$, then $Mz = p^*$ and CNT$_F = 0$. We do not have here conceptual means to distinguish different noncontextual systems.

9 Conclusion

We have provided an overview of three CbD-based measures of contextuality. Two of them, CNT$_1$ and CNT$_2$ are $L_1$-distances between a probability vector representing a system and a convex polytope. For either of the measures, if the probability vector is not outside the polytope, a natural way of extending this measure to a noncontextuality measure is to compute the $L_1$-distance from the point to the surface of the polytope. We have seen, however, that in the case of CNT$_1$, the probability vector never gets inside the feasibility polytope: as CNT$_1$ decreases to zero, and the vector becomes noncontextual, it sticks to the polytope’s surface. By contrast, for CNT$_2$, as its value decreases to zero, the vector of probabilities continues to move inside the contextuality polytope. CNT$_2$ therefore is naturally extended to NCNT$_2$, the distance from an interior point to the polytope’s surface.

We have also seen that two other measures, the CbD-based CNT$_3$ and Abramsky, Barbosa, and Mansfield’s CNTF (applied to consistified systems) do not lend themselves to noncontextuality extension. The quantities they use, total variation in CNT (applied to consistified systems) do not lend themselves to noncontextuality extension. The quantities they use, total variation in CNT$_2$ and total mass in CNTF, only vary with probability vectors representing contextual systems.

The relationship between the four measures of contextuality discussed in this paper is far from being clear. One nice feature of CNT$_1$, the oldest CbD-based measure, is that it is proportional to the violation of the generalized Bell inequalities in the case of cyclic systems [17,19]:

\[
\text{CNT}_1 = \frac{1}{2} \max_{(e_1, \ldots, e_k) \in (-1,1)^n} \sum_{i=1}^n t_i \langle R_i^1 R_i^2 \rangle_n - n + 2 - \sum_{i=1}^n |\langle R_i^1 \rangle| - |\langle R_i^2 \rangle|.
\]

Here, the bunch for context $c_i$ ($i = 1, \ldots, n$) consists of two random variables $R_i^1, R_i^2$, where $i \oplus 1 = i + 1$ for $i < n$ and $n \oplus 1 = 1$. (This inequality generalizes to arbitrary systems the inequality proved in [6], in a very different way, for consistently connected systems.) It has been conjectured, based on numerical computations conducted with the help of Victor Cervantes, that

\[
\text{CNT}_3 = \text{CNT}_1 / (n - 1).
\]

We know, however, that CNT$_1$ and CNT$_3$ are not generally related to each other by any function [9]. The relations between these two measures and CNT$_2$ and CNTF is yet to be investigated.

It is worthwhile to note that all measures of (non)contextuality involve a great deal of arbitrariness. For instance, (N)CNT$_2$ could be constructed with another $L_p$ or $L_\infty$ replacing $L_1$, and there seem to be no compelling principles to guide one’s choice. The choice of a reduced vector of probabilities adds another dimension of arbitrariness: although all reduced representations are linearly related, they may have different minima. It is possible therefore that one could profitably use several different measures to characterize a given system.
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