

# Superdeterministic hidden-variables models II: conspiracy

Indrajit Sen<sup>1,\*</sup> and Antony Valentini<sup>1,2,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics and Astronomy,  
Clemson University, Kinard Laboratory,  
Clemson, SC 29634, USA*

<sup>2</sup>*Augustus College,  
14 Augustus Road,  
London SW19 6LN UK*

(Dated: July 27, 2020)

We prove that superdeterministic models of quantum mechanics are conspiratorial in a mathematically well-defined sense, by further development of the ideas presented in a previous article  $\mathcal{A}$ . We consider a Bell scenario where, in each run and at each wing, the experimenter chooses one of  $N$  devices to determine the local measurement setting. We prove, without assuming any features of quantum statistics, that superdeterministic models of this scenario must have a finely-tuned distribution of hidden variables. Specifically, fine-tuning is required so that the measurement statistics depend on the measurement settings but not on the details of how the settings are chosen. We quantify this as the overhead fine-tuning  $F$  of the model, and show that  $F > 0$  (corresponding to ‘fine-tuned’) for any  $N > 1$ . The notion of fine-tuning assumes that arbitrary (‘nonequilibrium’) hidden-variables distributions are possible in principle. We also show how to quantify superdeterministic conspiracy without using nonequilibrium. This second approach is based on the fact that superdeterministic correlations can mimic actual signalling. We argue that an analogous situation occurs in equilibrium for a superdeterministic model of our scenario. We quantify the conspiracy by showing that an appropriately defined formal entropy for superdeterministic models of our scenario spontaneously decreases with time. In both approaches, superdeterministic models become arbitrarily conspiratorial as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . We thus quantitatively confirm Bell’s intuition that superdeterministic models are conspiratorial.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In a previous article  $\mathcal{A}$  [1], we gave a broad overview of superdeterministic models and criticisms thereof. We also discussed the properties of these models in nonequilibrium. In particular, we showed that nonequilibrium extensions of superdeterministic models have two striking properties. First, the measurement statistics have a general dependence on the mechanism used to determine the measurement settings. This implies that the equilibrium distribution has to be finely-tuned such that these effects disappear in practice. Second, although these models violate marginal-independence (that is, they violate formal no-signalling), there is no actual signalling. Instead, the local outcomes and distant settings are only statistically correlated due to initial conditions. We argued that this mimicking of a signal using statistical correlations is intuitively conspiratorial. Both these properties were discussed qualitatively in  $\mathcal{A}$ . In this paper, we further develop these ideas mathematically to give two separate ways to quantify the conspiratorial character of superdeterministic models.

It is useful to discuss here the relation between experimental observations, fine tuning, and the nonequilibrium framework. Although all possible distributions are allowed in nonequilibrium, experimental observations are important in the framework. A useful example here would be the astrophysical and cosmological tests of nonequilibrium distributions that have been proposed in pilot-wave theory [2, 3]. The framework, however, considers it unsatisfactory to fine tune the hidden-variables distribution to reproduce the experimental observations. A classic example of this is signal locality (formal no-signalling), which has been experimentally confirmed in numerous experiments. A satisfactory explanation of signal locality cannot be given, in this framework, by fine tuning the distribution [4]. Note that the same conclusion was arrived at later by other workers using causal discovery algorithms on Bell correlations [5]. In this paper, we use the nonequilibrium framework to ask whether superdeterministic models need to be fine tuned so that the measurement statistics depend on the measurement settings but not on the details of how the

---

\*Electronic address: isen@clemson.edu

†Electronic address: antonyv@clemson.edu

settings are chosen.

The paper is structured as follows. In section II we define our experimental scenario and show that superdeterministic models of our scenario are fine tuned in order to reproduce some basic empirical observations (unrelated to quantum statistics). We also show that nonlocal and retrocausal models of our scenario do not have to be similarly fine tuned. We quantify the fine tuning involved in section III by introducing a fine tuning parameter  $F$ . In section IV, we propose a different approach to quantify the conspiracy which foregoes any appeal to nonequilibrium. This is based on a generalisation of the idea that the mimicking of an actual signal by statistical correlations is intuitively conspiratorial. We show that an analogous situation occurs in superdeterministic models even when restricted to equilibrium. We quantify this conspiratorial behaviour as a spontaneous entropy drop at the hidden-variables level. In the concluding section V we discuss our results.

## II. SUPERDETERMINISTIC CONSPIRACY AS FINE TUNING

Consider the standard Bell scenario [6], where two spin-1/2 particles prepared in the spin-singlet state are each subjected to one of two local spin measurements, say  $M_x$  (corresponding to  $\hat{\sigma}_x$ ) or  $M_z$  (corresponding to  $\hat{\sigma}_z$ ), in a spacelike separated manner. The local measurement settings at both wings are chosen using a *setting mechanism*, which is defined as any physical system that outputs a measurement setting. A simple example is a die whose faces have been painted either  $M_x$  or  $M_z$ . An experimenter can roll the die for each run and use its output to choose the local measurement setting. Other examples of setting mechanisms can include coins, random number generators, humans choosing measurement settings, and so on.

We suppose that the experimenter at each wing has a setup consisting of  $N$  different setting mechanisms, which collectively give  $N$  outputs for each run. The experimenter then chooses one of the outputs and uses it as the actual measurement setting for that run (how he makes this choice has no relevance to our argument, so it can be specified arbitrarily). Nevertheless, the outputs of *all* the  $N$  setting mechanisms are recorded for each run at both the wings.

We label the hidden variables that determine the measurement outcomes at both wings by  $\lambda$ . The output of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  ( $j^{\text{th}}$ ) setting mechanism at wing A (B) is labelled by  $\alpha_i$  ( $\beta_j$ ), where  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  and  $\alpha_i, \beta_j \in \{M_x, M_z\}$ . We label the experimenters' choice of the outputs in the following manner: if the experimenter at wing A (B) chooses the  $i^{\text{th}}$  ( $j^{\text{th}}$ ) setting mechanism, then we have  $\gamma_A = i$  ( $\gamma_B = j$ ). Lastly, we label the actual measurement settings at wing A (B) by  $M_A$  ( $M_B$ ), where  $M_A, M_B \in \{M_x, M_z\}$ .

We know that, in a superdeterministic model,  $\lambda$  is correlated with the measurement settings. As these models are deterministic, it follows that  $\lambda$  is correlated with the physical variables that determine the measurement settings. In our scenario, the measurement settings are functions of the  $N$  setting mechanism outputs and the experimenter's choice for each run (at both wings). Therefore, in general,  $\lambda$  will be correlated with  $\{\alpha\}$  ( $\{\beta\}$ ) and  $\gamma_A$  ( $\gamma_B$ ) at wing A (B), where  $\{\alpha\} = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_N\}$  and  $\{\beta\} = \{\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_N\}$ . A superdeterministic model of our scenario is schematically illustrated as a causal model [5, 7] in Fig. 1.

The measurement statistics will be encoded in the distribution  $p(O_A, O_B | M_A, M_B)$ . For both type I and type II models, this distribution can be expanded as

$$p(O_A, O_B | M_A, M_B) = \sum_{\lambda} \sum_{\{\alpha\}, \gamma_A} \sum_{\{\beta\}, \gamma_B} p(O_A, O_B, \lambda, \{\alpha\}, \gamma_A, \{\beta\}, \gamma_B | M_A, M_B) \quad (1)$$

$$= \sum_{\lambda} \sum_{\{\alpha\}, \gamma_A} \sum_{\{\beta\}, \gamma_B} p(O_A, O_B | \lambda, M_A, M_B) p(\lambda | M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}, \gamma_A, \{\beta\}, \gamma_B) p(\{\alpha\}, \gamma_A, \{\beta\}, \gamma_B | M_A, M_B) \quad (2)$$

where we have used  $p(O_A, O_B | \lambda, \{\alpha\}, \gamma_A, \{\beta\}, \gamma_B, M_A, M_B) = p(O_A, O_B | \lambda, M_A, M_B)$  as the measurement outcomes depend only the measurement settings given the hidden variables. We note that the measurement statistics depend, in general, on  $\{\alpha\}, \gamma_A$  and  $\{\beta\}, \gamma_B$  as the hidden-variables distribution  $p(\lambda | M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}, \gamma_A, \{\beta\}, \gamma_B)$  has a dependence on these variables. For example, suppose the variables are  $(\{\alpha\}', \gamma_A', \{\beta\}', \gamma_B')$  for a particular set of runs and  $(\{\alpha\}'', \gamma_A'', \{\beta\}'', \gamma_B'')$  for another set. Let the measurement settings for both the sets be the same. That is,  $M_A(\{\alpha\}', \gamma_A') = M_A(\{\alpha\}'', \gamma_A'')$  and  $M_B(\{\beta\}', \gamma_B') = M_B(\{\beta\}'', \gamma_B'')$ . In general, the measurement statistics for both the sets will differ. This can be due to two different reasons. First,  $\lambda$  may be correlated with different setting mechanisms differently. For example, suppose  $\gamma_A' = i$  and  $\gamma_A'' = j$ , ( $j \neq i$ ). In the first set,  $\lambda$  is correlated with  $M_A$  due to its correlation with  $\alpha_i$ . In the second set,  $\lambda$  is correlated with  $M_A$  due to its correlation with  $\alpha_j$ . In general,




FIG. 1: Directed acyclic graph of a superdeterministic model of our scenario. The experimenters choose one of the  $N$  setting mechanisms at each wing to select the measurement setting for each run. The setting mechanisms at wing A (B) are depicted by the variables  $\alpha$ 's ( $\beta$ 's). The experimenter's choice of setting mechanism at wing A (B) is depicted by  $\gamma_A$  ( $\gamma_B$ ). In a type I model, either  $\lambda$  causally influences the variables  $\{\alpha\}$ ,  $\gamma_A$  at wing A and  $\{\beta\}$ ,  $\gamma_B$  at wing B, or there are common causes between  $\lambda$  and these variables. Both the possibilities are represented by the figure. In the case of common causes, we subdivide  $\lambda$  as  $\lambda = (\lambda', \mu_A, \mu_B)$ , where  $\lambda'$  causally influences the outcomes  $O_A$  and  $O_B$ , and  $\mu_A$  ( $\mu_B$ ) causally influences both  $\lambda'$  and  $\{\alpha\}$ ,  $\gamma_A$  ( $\{\beta\}$ ,  $\gamma_B$ ). In both cases, there is a correlation between  $\lambda$  and the measurement settings  $M_A$  and  $M_B$ .

$\lambda$  may be correlated with  $\alpha_i$  and  $\alpha_j$  differently. In that case, the hidden-variables distribution will be different for both sets, leading to different measurement statistics in general. Second,  $\lambda$  may be non-trivially correlated to the unused setting mechanisms. For example, suppose  $\gamma'_A = \gamma''_A = i$ , but  $\alpha'_j \neq \alpha''_j$ . If  $\lambda$  is non-trivially correlated with  $\alpha_j$ , then the distribution will be different for both the sets, leading to different measurement statistics again in general. Many such sets can be similarly constructed that have the same measurement settings  $M_A$  and  $M_B$  but different  $\{\alpha\}$ ,  $\gamma_A$ ,  $\{\beta\}$ ,  $\gamma_B$  values. The measurement statistics for these sets will be the same only if

$$p(O_A, O_B | M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}', \gamma'_A, \{\beta\}', \gamma'_B) = p(O_A, O_B | M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}'', \gamma''_A, \{\beta\}'', \gamma''_B) \quad (3)$$

where  $M_A(\{\alpha\}', \gamma'_A) = M_A(\{\alpha\}'', \gamma''_A)$  and  $M_B(\{\beta\}', \gamma'_B) = M_B(\{\beta\}'', \gamma''_B)$ . Equation (3) formalises the condition that the measurement statistics depend only on the measurement settings. Expanding both distributions over  $\lambda$ , we have

$$\sum_{\lambda} p(O_A, O_B | \lambda, M_A, M_B) p(\lambda | M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}', \gamma'_A, \{\beta\}', \gamma'_B) = \sum_{\lambda} p(O_A, O_B | \lambda, M_A, M_B) p(\lambda | M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}'', \gamma''_A, \{\beta\}'', \gamma''_B) \quad (4)$$

It is clear that condition (4) will not be satisfied in general for an arbitrary hidden-variables distribution  $p(\lambda | M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}, \gamma_A, \{\beta\}, \gamma_B)$ . Therefore, we conclude that superdeterministic models of our scenario must be fine tuned. Note that this fine tuning is not needed to reproduce any particular feature of quantum predictions, like marginal independence (formal no signalling), non contextuality etc. It is only needed to satisfy equation (3).

On the other hand, one can show that retrocausal and nonlocal models of our scenario do not need this finetuning<sup>1</sup>. Let us first consider retrocausal models of our scenario. The causal order diagram for such a model is shown in Fig. 2 a). The measurement setting causally affects  $\lambda$  backwards in time. The measurement setting, in turn, is causally determined by the setting mechanisms and the the experimenters' choices forwards in time. In this way,  $\lambda$  is correlated with the variables  $\{\alpha\}$ ,  $\gamma_A$  at wing A and  $\{\beta\}$ ,  $\gamma_B$  at wing B. Intuitively, we expect that only the measurement setting, not the exact manner in which the measurement setting is chosen, will be important. This is because the setting of the measuring apparatus, regardless of how it is selected, causally affects  $\lambda$  (backwards in time). Therefore, the correlation between  $\lambda$  and the measurement settings does not depend on how the settings are chosen, that is,  $p(\lambda | M_B, \{\alpha\}, \gamma_A, \{\beta\}, \gamma_B) = p(\lambda | M_B)$  for the retrocausal model in Fig. 2 a). We can understand this more

<sup>1</sup> It is important to recognise that all hidden-variable models need to be fine-tuned in order to reproduce marginal independence (formal no signalling) [4, 5], unless a dynamical explanation of finetuning is given [3, 8, 9]. The fine tuning we are discussing here refers only to that necessary to satisfy condition (3).

explicitly by considering the joint distribution of the model parameters

$$p(O_A, O_B, \lambda, M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}, \gamma_A, \{\beta\}, \gamma_B) = p(O_A|\lambda, M_A)p(O_B|\lambda, M_B)p(\lambda|M_B)p(M_A|\{\alpha\}, \gamma_A) \times p(M_B|\{\beta\}, \gamma_B)p(\{\alpha\})p(\gamma_A)p(\{\beta\})p(\gamma_B) \quad (5)$$

We can sum over the variables  $\{\alpha\}, \gamma_A$  at wing A and  $\{\beta\}, \gamma_B$  at wing B to yield

$$\sum_{\{\alpha\}, \gamma_A} \sum_{\{\beta\}, \gamma_B} p(O_A, O_B, \lambda, M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}, \gamma_A, \{\beta\}, \gamma_B) = p(O_A|\lambda, M_A)p(O_B|\lambda, M_B)p(\lambda|M_B) \quad (6)$$

This means that we can always build a reduced model with only the parameters  $p(O_A|\lambda, M_A)$ ,  $p(O_B|\lambda, M_B)$  and  $p(\lambda|M_B)$  defined. The variables  $\{\alpha\}, \gamma_A, \{\beta\}, \gamma_B$  do not need to be explicitly included in the model. Therefore, the model does not have to be fine tuned with respect to these variables and condition (3) is automatically satisfied.

Next consider a nonlocal model of our scenario. The causal order diagram will be as shown in Fig. 2 b). The joint distribution of the model parameters is

$$p(O_A, O_B, \lambda, M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}, \gamma_A, \{\beta\}, \gamma_B) = p(O_A|\lambda, M_A, M_B)p(O_B|\lambda, M_B)p(\lambda)p(M_A|\{\alpha\}, \gamma_A) \times p(M_B|\{\beta\}, \gamma_B)p(\{\alpha\})p(\gamma_A)p(\{\beta\})p(\gamma_B) \quad (7)$$

Similar to the retrocausal model, we can sum over the variables  $\{\alpha\}, \gamma_A$  at wing A and  $\{\beta\}, \gamma_B$  at wing B:

$$\sum_{\{\alpha\}, \gamma_A} \sum_{\{\beta\}, \gamma_B} p(O_A, O_B, \lambda, M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}, \gamma_A, \{\beta\}, \gamma_B) = p(O_A|\lambda, M_A, M_B)p(O_B|\lambda, M_B)p(\lambda) \quad (8)$$

Therefore, we can always eliminate the variables  $\{\alpha\}, \gamma_A, \{\beta\}, \gamma_B$  from the model description. The only necessary model parameters are  $p(O_A|\lambda, M_A, M_B)$ ,  $p(O_B|\lambda, M_B)$  and  $p(\lambda)$ . A nonlocal model of our scenario, thus, does not have to be fine tuned with respect to the variables  $\{\alpha\}, \gamma_A, \{\beta\}, \gamma_B$  in order to satisfy condition (3). Unlike retrocausal and nonlocal models, the variables  $\{\alpha\}, \{\beta\}, \gamma_A$ , and  $\gamma_B$  cannot be summed over similarly for superdeterministic models of our scenario. The causal order diagram for a superdeterministic model of our scenario (see Fig. 1) implies that  $p(\lambda|M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}, \gamma_A, \{\beta\}, \gamma_B) = p(\lambda|\{\alpha\}, \gamma_A, \{\beta\}, \gamma_B)$ .

The measurement statistics depend crucially on the correlation between  $\lambda$  and the variables  $\{\alpha\}, \{\beta\}, \gamma_A$ , and  $\gamma_B$  (given  $M_A$  and  $M_B$ ). Therefore, fine tuning is required so that the measurement statistics depend on the measurement settings but not on the details of how the settings are chosen. Note that we did not impose any features of quantum statistics, that is, any features of the Born rule, to argue that superdeterministic models are fine tuned. In principle, we can impose the additional requirement that the superdeterministic model reproduces the Born rule. This will require an additional fine tuning. However, this is not relevant to the question we are asking in this paper: whether superdeterministic models require fine tuning so that the measurement statistics depend on the measurement settings but not on the details of how the settings are chosen. Our results show that superdeterministic models require fine tuning regardless of whether they reproduce quantum statistics, in sharp contrast with retrocausal or nonlocal models. Further note that we did not impose the condition of locality or determinism either.

### III. QUANTIFICATION OF FINE TUNING

In this section, we quantify the degree of fine tuning required for superdeterministic models of our scenario to satisfy condition (3). We first assume that

$$p(\lambda|M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}, \{\beta\}, \gamma_A, \gamma_B) = l/L \quad \forall \lambda \quad (9)$$

for some  $l \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, L\}$ , where  $L$  is a very large positive integer. Although we have assumed  $\lambda$  is a discrete variable, our argument can be applied to discrete approximations of any continuous distribution, where the approximation is made closer as  $L$  is increased. Let the number of possible values of  $\lambda$  be  $\Lambda$ . From the ‘excess-baggage’ theorem [10], we know that  $\Lambda$  has to be infinite. We therefore prove our results in the limit  $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ .

We can represent the hidden-variable distribution by using the probability simplex ( $p \in \mathcal{R}_+^\Lambda | \sum_\lambda p(\lambda|M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}, \{\beta\}, \gamma_A, \gamma_B) = 1, p(\lambda|M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}, \{\beta\}, \gamma_A, \gamma_B) \geq 0$ ). In the simplex notation, a particular




FIG. 2: Causal order diagrams for retrocausal and nonlocal models of our scenario. There are  $N$  setting mechanisms at each wing. For each run, the experimenters choose one of the setting mechanisms to select the measurement setting for that run. Part a) illustrates a retrocausal model of our scenario. The measurement setting  $M_B$  causally affects the hidden variable  $\lambda$  backwards in time. This leads to a correlation between the variables  $\{\beta\}, \gamma_B$  and  $\lambda$ . Part b) illustrates a nonlocal model of our scenario. The measurement setting  $M_B$  nonlocally affect the outcome  $O_A$ . In both cases, it is possible to sum over the  $\{\alpha\}, \gamma_A$  variables at wing A and  $\{\beta\}, \gamma_B$  variables at wing B to build a reduced model without these variables.

configuration of the distribution is represented by a single point  $p$  on a  $(\Lambda - 1)$  dimensional object. By a configuration, we mean a particular value of the distribution for all  $\lambda$ 's. For example, for  $\Lambda = 3$ , the different configurations of the distribution can be represented by points on a plane (see Fig. 3). Each point on the plane specifies a particular set of values  $\{p(\lambda_1|M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}, \{\beta\}, \gamma_A, \gamma_B), p(\lambda_2|M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}, \{\beta\}, \gamma_A, \gamma_B), p(\lambda_3|M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}, \{\beta\}, \gamma_A, \gamma_B)\}$  for the distribution  $p(\lambda|M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}, \{\beta\}, \gamma_A, \gamma_B)$ . Let the number of points on the simplex that satisfy (9) for all  $\lambda$  be labelled by  $V(\Lambda)$ . In nonequilibrium, there are  $V(\Lambda)$  possible configurations of each distribution. Clearly,  $V(\Lambda)$  scales with  $\Lambda$ .

Let  $\Omega_i$  be the total number of independent distributions in the model, including nonequilibrium distributions. Each distribution can take one of  $V(\Lambda)$  configurations (points on the simplex). The  $\Omega_i$  distributions can have  $V(\Lambda)^{\Omega_i}$  different configurations in total. Let the model impose certain constraints on the configurations to satisfy condition (3). Suppose, as a result of these constraints, the total number of configurations is reduced to  $v(\Lambda)^{\Omega_f}$ . Then we define the quantity

$$F = 1 - \frac{v(\Lambda)^{\Omega_f}}{V(\Lambda)^{\Omega_i}} \quad (10)$$

as the overhead fine-tuning of the hidden-variables model. If  $F = 0$  we call the model *completely general*, as the total number of configurations after applying the constraints is the same as before. On the other hand, if  $F = 1$  we call the model *completely fine-tuned*, as there are no configurations left after imposing the constraints. Any value of  $F$  outside  $[0, 1]$  reflects inconsistency in the model. We now use this definition to quantify the fine tuning of superdeterministic models of our scenario.

We first consider the kind of superdeterministic model usually proposed in the literature, where there is single distribution  $p(\lambda|M_A, M_B)$ . One can obtain such a model by imposing the following constraints on the general distribution  $p(\lambda|M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}, \{\beta\}, \gamma_A, \gamma_B)$ :

$$p(\lambda|M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}, \{\beta\}, \gamma_A = i, \gamma_B = j) = p(\lambda|M_A, M_B, \alpha_i, \beta_j, \gamma_A = i, \gamma_B = j) \quad (11)$$

$$p(\lambda|M_A, M_B, \alpha_i, \beta_j, \gamma_A = i, \gamma_B = j) = p(\lambda|M_A, M_B) \quad (12)$$

for all  $i, j$ . Note that  $M_A = M_A(\{\alpha\}, \gamma_A)$  and  $M_B = M_B(\{\beta\}, \gamma_B)$ . Constraint (11) implies that  $\lambda$  is correlated only with the setting mechanism actually used for a particular run. Constraint (12) implies that  $\lambda$  is correlated with the




FIG. 3: Schematic illustration of the probability simplex for  $\Lambda = 3$ . Each point on the shaded plane represents a particular distribution  $\{p(1), p(2), p(3)\}$ . In general, a hidden-variable distribution can be represented by a point on a  $(\Lambda - 1)$  dimension space in this fashion for any  $\Lambda$ .

output of each setting mechanism in the same way. Note that  $p(\lambda|M_A, M_B)$  need not be the equilibrium distribution, as we have not imposed the condition that the model reproduces the predictions of quantum mechanics. It is clear that a superdeterministic model that satisfies equations (11) and (12) will satisfy equation (4), and thereby condition (3). Let us find out the value of  $F$  for such a model.

The model (after being constrained) has only four independent distributions  $p(\lambda|M_A, M_B)$ , as  $M_A$  and  $M_B$  can each take one of two values:  $M_x$  or  $M_z$ . Thus,  $\Omega_f = 4$ . Each of the four distributions can take any of the  $V(\Lambda)$  points on the simplex, as (4) is satisfied automatically due to (11) and (12). Therefore,  $v(\Lambda) = V(\Lambda)$ . The fine-tuning parameter  $F$  will be

$$F = 1 - \frac{V(\Lambda)^4}{V(\Lambda)^{\Omega_i}} \quad (13)$$

Let us calculate  $\Omega_i$ . We know that there are  $N$  possible  $\gamma_A$  and  $\gamma_B$  values. Each  $\alpha$  or  $\beta$  can take one of 2 values ( $M_x$  or  $M_z$ ). The number of possible  $\{\alpha\}$  or  $\{\beta\}$  values, therefore, is  $2^N$ . In total, there will be  $N^2 2^{2N}$  independent distributions  $p(\lambda|M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}, \{\beta\}, \gamma_A, \gamma_B)$ . Thus,  $\Omega_i = N^2 2^{2N}$ . This implies that

$$F = 1 - V(\Lambda)^{4 - N^2 2^{2N}} \quad (14)$$

For  $N = 1$ ,  $F = 0$  (there is no fine tuning). However, for any  $N > 1$ ,  $F = 1$  in the limit  $V(\Lambda) \rightarrow \infty$  (we know that as  $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $V(\Lambda) \rightarrow \infty$ ). Therefore, the model is arbitrarily close to complete fine tuning for any  $N > 1$ . This means that using constraints (11) and (12) to reproduce the features  $a$ ) and  $b$ ) is a bad strategy from a fine tuning perspective.

Let us now consider more general superdeterministic models. We know that equation (4) is the minimum constraint that needs to be satisfied in order to satisfy (3). Let us, therefore, determine  $F$  for a superdeterministic model of our scenario with (4) as the only constraint. This will be the minimum fine tuning required for a general superdeterministic model of our scenario. To begin, we note that the total number of independent distributions does not change as a result of (4), so that  $\Omega_f = \Omega_i$ . Out of the  $\Omega_i$  distributions, there are  $\Omega_i/4$  distributions corresponding to a particular value of  $(M_A, M_B)$ . That is, there are  $\Omega_i/4$  distributions corresponding to each of  $(M_x, M_x)$ ,  $(M_x, M_z)$ ,  $(M_z, M_x)$  and  $(M_z, M_z)$ . We need to ensure that equation (4) is satisfied for each value of  $(M_A, M_B)$ . Consider the  $\Omega_i/4$  distributions that correspond to a particular value of  $(M_A, M_B)$ . Consider a single distribution out of these possibilities. Let this distribution be unconstrained, so that the number of possible configurations of this distribution is  $V(\Lambda)$ . Let us label the  $j^{\text{th}}$  configuration of the unconstrained distribution by  $p^j(\lambda|M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}^u, \{\beta\}^u, \gamma_A^u, \gamma_B^u)$ , where  $j \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots, V(\Lambda)\}$ . Consider another distribution  $p(\lambda|M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}^c, \{\beta\}^c, \gamma_A^c, \gamma_B^c)$  out of the rest  $\Omega_i/4 - 1$  possible distributions that correspond to  $(M_A, M_B)$ . Equation (4) then implies that

$$\sum_{\lambda} p(O_A, O_B|\lambda, M_A, M_B) p^j(\lambda|M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}^u, \gamma_A^u, \{\beta\}^u, \gamma_B^u) = \sum_{\lambda} p(O_A, O_B|\lambda, M_A, M_B) p(\lambda|M_A, M_B, \{\alpha\}^c, \gamma_A^c, \{\beta\}^c, \gamma_B^c) \quad (15)$$

Clearly, the rest  $\Omega_i/4 - 1$  distributions will have to be constrained in order to satisfy (15). Let the number of configurations of each constrained distribution that satisfies (15) for the  $j^{\text{th}}$  configuration of the unconstrained distribution be labelled by  $v_{AB}^j(\Lambda)$ , where  $0 < v_{AB}^j(\Lambda)/V(\Lambda) < 1$ . The total number of configurations of the distributions corresponding to  $(M_A, M_B)$  will then be  $\sum_{j=1}^{V(\Lambda)} v_{AB}^j(\Lambda)^{\frac{\Omega_i}{4}-1}$ . The fine tuning parameter  $F$  will be

$$F = 1 - \frac{\prod_{A,B} \sum_{j=1}^{V(\Lambda)} v_{AB}^j(\Lambda)^{\frac{\Omega_i}{4}-1}}{V(\Lambda)^{\Omega_i}} \quad (16)$$

We know that  $v_{AB}^j(\Lambda)/V(\Lambda) < 1 \forall j, A, B$ . This implies that

$$\left(\frac{v_{AB}^j(\Lambda)}{V(\Lambda)}\right)^{\frac{\Omega_i}{4}-1} < 1 \quad (17)$$

$$\Rightarrow \sum_{j=1}^{V(\Lambda)} \left(\frac{v_{AB}^j(\Lambda)}{V(\Lambda)}\right)^{\frac{\Omega_i}{4}-1} < V(\Lambda) \quad (18)$$

This suggests that we write the fine-tuning parameter in the following form

$$F = 1 - \prod_{A,B} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{V(\Lambda)} (v_{AB}^j(\Lambda)/V(\Lambda))^{\frac{\Omega_i}{4}-1}}{V(\Lambda)} \quad (19)$$

$$= 1 - \prod_{A,B} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{V(\Lambda)} (v_{AB}^j(\Lambda)/V(\Lambda))^{N^2 2^{2N-2}-1}}{V(\Lambda)} \quad (20)$$

For  $N = 1$ ,  $F = 0$  (there is no fine tuning). From equations (18) and (20), we see that  $0 < F < 1$  for any  $N > 1$ . This implies that for a finite  $N$ , unlike the superdeterministic model that satisfied (11) and (12), the model is not completely fine tuned (but fine tuned). Lastly,  $F = 1$  in the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . This is because  $(v_{AB}^j(\Lambda)/V(\Lambda))^m \rightarrow 0$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ .

#### IV. CONSPIRACY AS SPONTANEOUS ENTROPY DROP

In the previous section, we quantified the conspiratorial character of superdeterministic models of our scenario in terms of a fine tuning parameter  $F$ . The definition of  $F$  rests on the concept of quantum nonequilibrium as  $V(\Lambda)$  includes contributions from *all* configurations of the hidden-variable distribution. For example, consider two distributions  $p(\lambda|\{\alpha\}', \{\beta\}', \gamma'_A, \gamma'_B)$  and  $p(\lambda|\{\alpha\}'', \{\beta\}'', \gamma''_A, \gamma''_B)$ , where  $M_A(\{\alpha\}', \gamma'_A) = M_A(\{\alpha\}'', \gamma''_A)$  and  $M_B(\{\beta\}', \gamma'_B) = M_B(\{\beta\}'', \gamma''_B)$ . For most of the configurations of  $p(\lambda|\{\alpha\}', \{\beta\}', \gamma'_A, \gamma'_B)$  and  $p(\lambda|\{\alpha\}'', \{\beta\}'', \gamma''_A, \gamma''_B)$ , equation (4) will not be satisfied. But the definition of  $F$  includes all these configurations as well in the quantity  $V(\Lambda)^{\Omega_i}$ . This is natural in a nonequilibrium framework, where all hidden-variable distributions are possible in principle. In this section, we give a quantification of superdeterministic conspiracy without having to invoke the possibility (in principle) of quantum nonequilibrium<sup>2</sup>. This approach is more general also in the sense that  $\lambda$  and  $p(\lambda|\{\alpha\}', \{\beta\}', \gamma'_A, \gamma'_B)$  do not have to be assumed discrete. On the other hand, this approach is more limited in that it is applicable only to superdeterministic models that satisfy constraint (11). This approach is, however, still widely applicable as all the superdeterministic models that have been proposed in the literature so far posit a single distribution  $p(\lambda|M_A, M_B)$ . Therefore, they satisfy both constraints (11) and (12) when extended to our scenario.

To begin, we first remind ourselves of the conspiratorial nature of apparent-signalling in superdeterminism, as discussed in  $\mathcal{A}$ . The violation of marginal-independence (or formal no-signalling) does not imply actual signalling a superdeterministic context. The local marginals and the distant settings are correlated, but the distant setting

---

<sup>2</sup> Although there are compelling theoretical reasons [2, 4, 11] that motivate nonequilibrium extensions of hidden-variable models, a debate about nonequilibrium, for the purposes of this article, is secondary to proving that superdeterministic models are unequivocally conspiratorial.

does not causally affect the local marginal. The correlation is set up by the initial conditions. This appears to be a signal, because the distant setting can be controlled by an experimenter and the local marginal is correlated with the experimenter's decisions. We, therefore, term superdeterministic signalling as apparent signalling. We will now argue that such situations occur in superdeterministic models even in equilibrium.

Consider a superdeterministic model of our scenario that satisfies (11). Equation (11) implies that there are runs for which  $\lambda$  is correlated only with the outputs  $\alpha_i$  and  $\beta_j$ , and further, that these runs occur only when the experimenters choose  $\gamma_A = i$  and  $\gamma_B = j$ . We may say that these runs belong to a *sub-ensemble*  $E = (i, j)$  having the hidden-variables distribution  $\rho(\lambda|\alpha_i, \beta_j, \gamma_A = i, \gamma_B = j)$ . There will be  $N^2$  such sub ensembles. However, although a run belonging to  $(i, j)$  only occurs when the experimenters choose  $\gamma_A = i$  and  $\gamma_B = j$ , there is no causal relationship between  $\gamma_A, \gamma_B$  and the sub-ensemble  $E$ . Therefore, (similar to the case of apparent signalling) although it appears that the experimenters' choices determine which sub ensemble a particular run belongs to, it is only the case that the experimenters' choices are very tightly correlated with the sub ensemble values. Intuitively, such an explanation appears conspiratorial. The question is whether this intuition can be quantified. Below, we show that it can be, as a spontaneous decrease of an appropriately-defined subjective 'entropy' at the hidden-variables level.

Consider a superdeterministic model of our scenario that satisfies (11). Let there be  $N_0$  runs in total. Each run belongs to a particular sub-ensemble  $E = (i, j)$  out of  $N^2$  possibilities. The number of possible sequences of sub-ensembles over the  $N_0$  runs is

$$W = N^{2N_0} \quad (21)$$

In quantum equilibrium, the experimenters cannot know which sequence, out of the  $W$  possibilities, is actually the case. Suppose the experimenters find out by some means the exact sequence. Then, they can choose  $\gamma_A$  and  $\gamma_B$  values that do not match this sequence. In that case, the Bell correlations will not be reproduced. But the measurement statistics cannot violate quantum predictions if quantum equilibrium is assumed. Therefore, quantum equilibrium precludes knowledge of the sub-ensemble sequence from the experimenters. The experimenters may assign subjective (Bayesian) probabilities to each possible sequence of sub-ensembles. Say the sequences are labelled by  $k$ , where  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, W\}$ . Then these subjective probabilities  $p_k$  may be associated with a formal mathematical entropy of

$$S = - \sum_{k=1}^W p_k \ln p_k \quad (22)$$

This is the Shannon entropy of the distribution of sub-ensemble sequences over the  $N_0$  runs. Note that this entropy is subjective in the sense that there is only one actual sequence for the experiment, but the experimenters have assigned probabilities  $p_k$  to different sequences out of ignorance of the actual sequence.

Next, let the experimenters choose the setting mechanisms to use for each run. That is, they choose the value of  $\gamma_A$  and  $\gamma_B$  for each run. Constraint (11) implies that just by making this choice (and if these choices are final), the experimenters will instantaneously know about the exact sub-ensemble sequence. This is because if the experimenters choose  $\gamma_A = i$  and  $\gamma_B = j$  for a particular run, equation (11) implies that the run belongs to the sub ensemble  $(i, j)$ . Therefore, one of the probabilities  $p_k$  then equals to 1 and the rest are all 0's. The associated entropy  $S = -1 \ln 1 = 0$ . Thus the two experimenters have somehow caused the entropy  $S$  to decrease by

$$\Delta S = \sum_{k=1}^W p_k \ln p_k \quad (23)$$

This decrease is guaranteed by equation (11) to occur. The experimenter at wing A (B) has to make no conscious effort to match  $\gamma_A$  ( $\gamma_B$ ) values to the sub ensemble sequence. Therefore, it is fair to say that this entropy decrease is *spontaneous* (see Fig. 1). Intuitively, the argument quantifies the counter-intuitiveness of gaining information about a system by a series of spontaneously correct choices.

Equation (11) and the assumption of quantum equilibrium are both crucial for this entropy decrease. Suppose that equation (11) is not true. There are two possibilities in this case. First,  $\lambda$  is correlated to multiple setting mechanisms. In that case, the sub ensembles and the associated entropy  $S$  cannot be defined. Second,  $\lambda$  is correlated to individual setting mechanisms, but these are not the ones chosen by the experimenters. In that case, the experimenters can assign probabilities  $p_k$  to different sub-ensemble sequences as before. But, after choosing  $\gamma_A$  and  $\gamma_B$  for each run, they will not have any more information about the actual sub ensemble-sequence than




FIG. 4: Illustration of spontaneous entropy drop at the hidden-variables level in superdeterministic models. Each solid ball represents a particular pair  $\gamma$  of setting mechanisms. Its colour represents the value of  $\gamma$ . Each socket represents an experimental run and its colour represents the sub-ensemble  $E = (i, j)$  for that run. Initially, as shown in the middle figure, there are a number of balls kept in a bag, arranged in no particular order, along with an equal number of sockets. The experimenters have to ensure that a run belonging to a particular sub-ensemble, say  $(i, j)$ , is measured only when  $\gamma_A = i$  and  $\gamma_B = j$ . Pictorially, this corresponds to matching the colours of both the balls and the sockets. However, the experimenters do not have access to the information ‘which run belongs to which sub-ensemble’ in quantum equilibrium. That is, the experimenters know the colour of the balls but not the colour of the sockets. Therefore, they perform the task by pure guesswork. One would expect that a situation like that shown in the left-hand figure would therefore arise. However they always find out that they have successfully matched each and every ball with its appropriate socket, as shown in the right-hand figure, because of some conspiratorial mechanism. Though logically possible, the mechanism causes a spontaneous entropy drop at the hidden-variables level.

before. So there will be no entropy decrease  $\Delta S$  in this case. The assumption of quantum equilibrium also plays a crucial role as it implies that the experimenters initially cannot know the actual sub-ensemble sequence. This allows the experimenters to assign the subjective (Bayesian) probabilities  $p_k$  to different sub-ensemble sequences.

We now evaluate the net spontaneous entropy decrease for the simplest case that  $p_k = 1/W \forall k$ . This is found to be

$$\Delta S = -2N_0 \ln(N) \quad (24)$$

Thus the magnitude of the entropy drop  $\Delta S$  increases logarithmically with the number of setting mechanisms  $N$  available at each wing of the experiment. In the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , we have  $\Delta S \rightarrow \infty$  and in this sense we may say that the superdeterministic model becomes arbitrarily conspiratorial. Similar to the previous approach, nonlocal and retrocausal models are not conspiratorial according to this approach. This is because the variables  $\{\alpha\}, \gamma_A$  and  $\{\beta\}, \gamma_B$  can be excluded from these models (see section II), so that there are no sub-ensembles associated with different setting mechanisms.

## V. DISCUSSION

We have provided two different ways to quantify the often-alleged conspiratorial character of superdeterministic models, using intuitive suggestions from a previous article  $\mathcal{A}$ . The first approach utilises the idea that different setting mechanisms lead to different measurement statistics in general for a nonequilibrium superdeterministic model. We showed that superdeterministic models must be fine-tuned so that the measurement statistics depend on the measurement settings, but not on how these settings are chosen. We quantified the fine tuning by defining an overhead fine-tuning parameter  $F$ . We calculated  $F$  for two different kinds of superdeterministic models of our scenario. We first considered superdeterministic models as usually proposed in the literature, with a single hidden-variables distribution  $p(\lambda|M_A, M_B)$ . We showed that the fine tuning for such a model is drastic as  $F = 1$  (corresponding to ‘completely fine tuned’) for any  $N > 1$ . We also considered more general superdeterministic models of our scenario. For these general models, we showed that  $F < 1$  for any  $N > 1$ . In the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $F = 1$ . No features of quantum statistics, such as the Born rule, marginal-independence (formal no-signalling), or non-contextuality were assumed in deriving this result. The result also did not depend on locality or determinism,

although superdeterministic models are by definition deterministic, and usually local.

It is useful to discuss some possible misunderstandings about this result. One might argue that, in a nonequilibrium framework, an enormous amount of fine-tuning is inevitable anyway just to restrict outcomes to the Born rule. A bit more fine-tuning is therefore perhaps nothing to be concerned about. A counter example to such an argument would be the pilot-wave theory, where no fine tuning is necessary to reproduce the Born rule, even when nonequilibrium is allowed. This is because an arbitrary distribution in pilot-wave theory dynamically relaxes to the equilibrium distribution over time, given appropriate assumptions about the initial distribution [8, 9]. Note that equilibration as an explanation of fine tuning is noted in the causal modelling literature as well [5, 12]. Another possibility is that one might argue that an un-fine-tuned ( $F = 0$ ) classical universe will have a high-entropy past. The fine-tuning argument applied to our universe would therefore prove that a low-entropy past is very unlikely, disproving the second law of thermodynamics. However, there remain ambiguities whether the entropy of the universe is a well-defined concept because of the role of gravity [13]. In the early universe, this problem is severe because gravitational effects cannot be ignored. Therefore, it is not clear at present whether an explanation of thermodynamics in terms of low-entropy past of the universe can be given.

The parameter  $F$  quantifies how special the hidden-variables distribution has to be so that the measurement statistics depend only on the measurement settings. Clearly, the notion of ‘special’ is meaningful only when there are multiple possible distributions, that is, if nonequilibrium is allowed (at least in principle). Those who consider nonequilibrium distributions to be unmotivated may find this approach to be artificial. We have, therefore, provided a second way to quantify the conspiracy, which does not employ the concept of nonequilibrium.

The second approach uses another idea from  $\mathcal{A}$  that the violation of formal no-signalling in superdeterministic model in nonequilibrium does not imply actual signalling. This is because the distant measurement setting does not causally influence the local outcomes, although they are statistically correlated. Analogous to this, we have argued that, for a superdeterministic model of our scenario restricted to equilibrium, although the experimenters’ choices of setting mechanisms appears to causally affect the sub-ensemble sequence, the experimenters’ choice and the sub-ensemble sequence are only statistically correlated. We have shown that this leads to a spontaneous drop  $\Delta S$  of a formal entropy  $S$  at the hidden-variables level, and that  $\Delta S \rightarrow \infty$  logarithmically fast with  $N$ . By quantifying the conspiracy in this way, as a spontaneous drop of entropy, we may say that the equilibrium superdeterministic model becomes arbitrarily conspiratorial as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

Nonlocal and retrocausal models of our scenario are non-conspiratorial by definition according to either approach, as the variables related to the different setting mechanisms and experimenters’ choices can be eliminated from the model description. Note that nonlocal, retrocausal models and superdeterministic models are all conspiratorial in the sense that they require fine-tuning in order to satisfy marginal independence/ formal no-signalling [4, 5], unless a dynamical explanation of finetuning is given [3, 8, 9]. Our results here are concerned only with the notion of superdeterministic conspiracy (see  $\mathcal{A}$ ).

We have quantitatively proven that superdeterministic models are conspiratorial in two different ways. What are the possible options for a future superdeterminist? Let us consider the possible options for circumventing our two arguments separately. Consider first the fine-tuning argument. One option to evade fine tuning is to eschew the possibility of quantum nonequilibrium. This will involve abandoning the distinction between initial conditions and the law, which is a central principle in scientific theories. Such a superdeterministic account of quantum phenomena has been proposed by Palmer [14, 15]. In this proposal, both the initial conditions and the law are determined by the geometry of the state space (see also ref. [16] for a detailed discussion of Palmer’s proposal in a hidden-variables framework). Another option is to build a superdeterministic model with a dynamical relaxation mechanism such that an arbitrary distribution that does not satisfy equation (3) evolves over time to a distribution that satisfies it.<sup>3</sup> For example, dynamical relaxation to the equilibrium distribution is a natural consequence of the evolution law in pilot-wave theory [3, 8, 9]. In such a superdeterministic model, however, small deviations from equilibrium may occur. This is because the relaxation process to the equilibrium distribution may get delayed due to various factors [2, 3]. For quantum systems trapped in nonequilibrium, the superdeterministic model will predict the violation of condition (3). One may use this to experimentally test such a superdeterministic model in the nonequilibrium regime. Let us now consider the spontaneous entropy drop argument. This approach does not depend on quantum nonequilibrium, but it

---

<sup>3</sup> Given appropriate assumptions about the initial distribution, as in classical statistical mechanics [17].

is applicable only to models that satisfy condition (11). Therefore, a superdeterministic model that violates condition (11) can circumvent this argument. However, such a model will be extremely difficult to build, as  $\lambda$  will not only be correlated to the physical variables that determine the measurement settings, but also to other physical variables that *might* have been used by the experimenters to choose the settings. The experimenters can, in principle, choose any variable from the entire observable universe to decide which measurement to perform. A superdeterministic model that violates (11) will have to model the entire universe in this case to explain a localised quantum experiment. Therefore, a future superdeterministic model that violates equation (11) and has a dynamical relaxation mechanism to satisfy condition (3) will in principle evade the charge of superdeterministic conspiracy, but building such a model is likely to be extremely difficult. It is the authors' opinion that this strongly suggests that we should look for simpler options to understand the puzzle of Bell correlations.

### Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the anonymous referees for helpful comments.

- 
- [1] I. Sen and A. Valentini. Superdeterministic hidden-variables models I: nonequilibrium and signalling. *arXiv:2003.11989*, 2020.
  - [2] A. Valentini. Astrophysical and cosmological tests of quantum theory. *J. Phys. A*, 40(12), 2007.
  - [3] A. Valentini. Foundations of statistical mechanics and the status of the Born rule in de Broglie-Bohm pilot-wave theory. In *Statistical Mechanics and Scientific Explanation: Determinism, Indeterminism and Laws of Nature*. World Scientific, 2020.
  - [4] A. Valentini. Signal-locality in hidden-variables theories. *Phys. Lett. A*, 297(5-6), 2002.
  - [5] C. J. Wood and R. W. Spekkens. The lesson of causal discovery algorithms for quantum correlations: Causal explanations of Bell-inequality violations require fine-tuning. *New J. Phys.*, 17(3), 2015.
  - [6] J. S. Bell. *Speakable and unspeakable in quantum mechanics: Collected papers on quantum philosophy*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2004.
  - [7] J. Pearl. *Causality*. Cambridge university press, 2009.
  - [8] A. Valentini. Signal-locality, uncertainty, and the subquantum H-theorem. I. *Phys. Lett. A*, 156(1-2), 1991.
  - [9] A. Valentini and H. Westman. Dynamical origin of quantum probabilities. *Proc. R. Soc. A*, 461(2053):253–272, 2005.
  - [10] L. Hardy. Quantum ontological excess baggage. *Stud. Hist. Phil. Sci. B*, 35, 2004.
  - [11] A. Valentini. Universal signature of non-quantum systems. *Phys. Lett. A*, 332(3), 2004.
  - [12] D. Dash. Restructuring Dynamic Causal Systems in Equilibrium. In *AISTATS*. Citeseer, 2005.
  - [13] J. Earman. The past hypothesis: Not even false. *Stud. Hist. Philos. Sci. B*, 37(3):399–430, 2006.
  - [14] T. Palmer. The Invariant Set Postulate: a new geometric framework for the foundations of quantum theory and the role played by gravity. *Proc. R. Soc. A*, 465(2110):3165–3185, 2009.
  - [15] T. Palmer. Discretization of the Bloch sphere, fractal invariant sets and Bells theorem. *Proc. R. Soc. A*, 476(2236):20190350, 2020.
  - [16] I. Sen. Discussion of Palmer's superdeterministic proposal in a hidden-variables setting. In preparation.
  - [17] R. C. Tolman. *The principles of statistical mechanics*. Oxford Univ. Press, 1938.