

# Bell Nonlocality and the Reality of Quantum Wavefunction

Anandamay Das Bhowmik and Preeti Parashar

Physics and Applied Mathematics Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, 203 BT Road, Kolkata, India.

Manik Banik

School of Physics, IISER Thiruvananthapuram, Vithura, Kerala 695551, India.

Status of quantum wavefunction is one of the most debated issues in quantum foundations – whether it corresponds directly to the reality or just represents knowledge or information about some aspect of reality. In this work we propose a  $\psi$ -ontology theorem addressing this question. Our theorem invokes an assumption, called ‘no ontic retro-causality’, about the underlying ontological model. We provide physical rationale for this assumption and discuss novelty of the present theorem over the existing ones. At the core of our derivation we utilize another seminal no-go result by John S. Bell that rules out any *local realistic* world view for quantum theory. We show that Bell nonlocality excludes the ontological explanations where quantum wavefunction is treated as mere information, viz. the  $\psi$ -epistemic explanations. In fact, models even with some degree of epistemicity can not fully incorporate the phenomena of Bell nonlocality observed in quantum theory.

*Introduction:*– What does a quantum wavefunction stand for? Does it represent the state of reality of the physical system ( $\psi$ -ontic doctrine) or it merely provides information about the system ( $\psi$ -epistemic doctrine)? This question remains as the most debated issue in quantum foundations ever since the advent of the theory [1]. A mathematically precise formulation of this question, within a broad class of realist approaches to quantum theory, can be made in the ontological model framework of Harrigan & Spekkens [2] (see also [3, 4]). Epistemicity, in this framework, is defined (as well as quantified) through the amount of overlap between probability distributions over the ontic states resulting from different quantum preparations.

In a fascinating development, Pusey, Barrett, and Rudolph (PBR) have shown that  $\psi$ -epistemic interpretation contradicts prediction of quantum theory in any model where independently prepared systems have independent physical states (named as preparation independence (PI) assumption) [5]. This result drew attention of quantum foundations community and within few days several researchers reported similar theorems [6–9], commonly called as  $\psi$ -ontology theorems [10], derived under different assumptions. Subsequently, several criticisms were raised regarding the assumptions used in those  $\psi$ -ontology theorems [11–14] (see also [10]). In particular, the authors in [14] have shown that the physical rationale for composition principles such as PI overreaches and thus places the no-go theorem put forward by PBR into jeopardy.

Interestingly, Owen Maroney came up with a new kind of  $\psi$ -ontology theorem that uses no additional assumption and rules out a class of ontological models with certain degree of epistemicity [15, 16]. Subsequently, several other results were obtained excluding  $\psi$ -epistemic models with increasingly lower degree of epistemicity and consequently imposing higher degree

of onticity on quantum wavefunction [17–21]. However, all these theorems apply to Hilbert spaces of dimension strictly greater than two.

In this work we derive a new  $\psi$ -ontology theorem that excludes the  $\psi$ -epistemic models both the maximal and the non-maximal ones. Importantly our theorem does not assume the ontic composition principles of PI and more significantly it applies to arbitrary Hilbert space dimension including the qubit. Our theorem invokes a new assumption which we call ‘no ontic retro-causality’ (NOR). The rationale for this assumption is inspired from the fact that physical state of one system should not influence the past and/or future of the physical reality of a different system. Our result demonstrates an interesting connection between degree of epistemicity and Bell nonlocality [22–25]. While it was already recognized that  $\psi$ -complete and  $\psi$ -ontic models for quantum theory are inconsistent with the concept of *locality* [1, 2], our result establishes the fact in the reverse direction. It shows that the observed phenomenon of Bell nonlocality in quantum theory leads towards  $\psi$ -ontic interpretation for quantum wavefunction in a class of ontological models.

*Framework:*– We first recall the ontological model framework as developed in [2] (see also [3, 4, 10, 13]). Such a model consists of a space  $\Lambda$  of ontic states that completely identify the possible physical properties of a system. A quantum system prepared in the state  $|\psi\rangle$  is associated with a probability distribution  $\mu(\lambda|\psi)$  over  $\Lambda$ , where each realization of the preparation  $|\psi\rangle$  results in an ontic state  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  sampled with probability measure  $\mu(\lambda|\psi)$ . The probability distribution of the resulting ontic states is called the epistemic state associated with  $|\psi\rangle$  and  $\Lambda_\psi := \{\lambda \in \Lambda \mid \mu(\lambda|\psi) > 0\}$  is called the ontic support of  $|\psi\rangle$ . For all  $|\psi\rangle$ , we must have  $\int_{\Lambda_\psi} d\lambda \mu(\lambda|\psi) = 1$ . Whenever an observable  $M$  is measured on a system, the possible outcomes are the

eigenvalues  $\phi_k$  with the associated eigenvectors  $|\phi_k\rangle$ , i.e.,  $M = \sum_k \phi_k |\phi_k\rangle \langle \phi_k|$ . Here we restrict our attention to rank-1 projective measurements only, although quantum theory allows more general measurement process described by positive operator valued measure (POVM). Given a system in the ontic state  $\lambda$ , the probability of obtaining the  $k^{\text{th}}$  outcome is given by an response function  $\xi(\phi_k|\lambda, M) \in [0, 1]$ . A generic ontological model keeps open the possibility for this outcome response to be contextual [3]; whenever measurement context is not important we will denote the response function simply as  $\xi(\phi_k|\lambda)$ . An *outcome deterministic* (OD) ontological model demands  $\xi(\phi_k|\lambda, M) \in \{0, 1\} \forall k, \lambda, M$ . An operational transformation procedures  $T$  at ontological level corresponds to a transition matrix  $\Gamma_T(\lambda, \tilde{\lambda})$  denoting the probability density for a transition from the ontic state  $\lambda$  to the ontic state  $\tilde{\lambda}$ . In prepare and measure scenario, the reproducibility of the Born rule at operational level demands  $\int_{\Lambda} d\lambda \xi(\phi_k|\lambda, M) \mu(\lambda|\psi) = |\langle \phi_k|\psi \rangle|^2 := \text{Pr}(\phi_k|\psi)$ .

*Degree of epistemicity:*— An ontological model where the quantum overlap  $|\langle \psi|\phi \rangle|^2$  for any two state vectors  $|\psi\rangle$  and  $|\phi\rangle$  is completely accounted for by the overlap between the corresponding epistemic distributions  $\mu(\lambda|\psi)$  and  $\mu(\lambda|\phi)$  is called maximally  $\psi$ -epistemic, i.e., in a maximally  $\psi$ -epistemic model  $\int_{\Lambda_\psi} \mu(\lambda|\psi) d\lambda = |\langle \psi|\phi \rangle|^2$  for all pairs of  $|\psi\rangle, |\phi\rangle$  [15]. Maroney's theorem [15] and the subsequent results [16–21] exclude maximally  $\psi$ -epistemic model and a class of ontological models with increasingly lower degree of epistemicity. Denoting  $\text{Supp}[\xi(\psi|\lambda)] := \{\lambda \in \Lambda \mid \xi(\psi|\lambda) > 0\}$  and  $\text{Core}[\xi(\psi|\lambda)] := \{\lambda \in \Lambda \mid \xi(\psi|\lambda) = 1\}$ , the following set inclusion relations are immediate:

$$\Lambda_\psi \subseteq \text{Core}[\xi(\psi|\lambda)] \subseteq \text{Supp}[\xi(\psi|\lambda)].$$

An OD model satisfies  $\text{Core}[\xi(\psi|\lambda)] = \text{Supp}[\xi(\psi|\lambda)]$ , whereas a model with  $\Lambda_\psi = \text{Core}[\xi(\psi|\lambda)]$  is termed as *reciprocal* [13]. Interestingly, the author in [13] have also established that

$$\text{Maximally } \psi\text{-epistemic} \Leftrightarrow \text{OD} \wedge \text{Reciprocal}. \quad (1)$$

*Ontic composition:*— The discussion so far considers ontological models for a single system only. More involving situations arise for composite systems. Consider System-A and System-B with ontic state space  $\Lambda^A$  and  $\Lambda^B$ , respectively. For a composite quantum system prepared in a state  $\rho_{AB}$ , a naive classical thinking suggests the joint ontic state  $\lambda_{\text{joint}}$  to be in  $\Lambda_A \times \Lambda_B$ , i.e.,  $\Lambda_{\rho_{AB}} \subseteq \Lambda^A \times \Lambda^B$ . However, lesson from the seminal Bell's theorem indicates towards a more intricate description of the ontic state for composite system. Violation of any local realistic inequality by some joint quantum preparation  $\rho_{AB}$  necessitates some 'nonlocal' ontic state space  $\Lambda^{\text{NL}}$ . To say more precisely, this non-

local variable captures the essence of nonlocal correlation in the sense of Bell [22, 23], although the observed quantum correlations are perfectly compatible with no-signaling principle that prohibits instantaneous transfer of information. Therefore, we can say,  $\Lambda_{\rho_{AB}} \subseteq (\Lambda^A \times \Lambda^B) \cup \Lambda^{\text{NL}}$ , where  $\Lambda^{\text{NL}}$  accounts for Bell type local realistic inequality violation. For product states, separable state, and *local* entangled states [26–28] distributions over nonlocal ontic variable remain empty, i.e.  $\Lambda_{\rho_{AB}} \cap \Lambda^{\text{NL}} = \emptyset$ . But, does it presuppose that for such a state the ontic states ought to be in  $\Lambda^A \times \Lambda^B$  always? PBR in their derivation have considered such an assumption. In fact their PI assumption is even restrictive as it explicitly spells  $\mu(\lambda_A, \lambda_B|\psi_A \otimes \psi_B) = \mu(\lambda_A|\psi_A)\mu(\lambda_B|\psi_B)$  [5]. However, such an assumption is conservative as it considers (local) reality of the product measurements only. It is possible that a composite system even prepared in product state contains properties that are accessible through global measurements only, e.g., Bell basis measurement. More dramatically, the phenomena of 'nonlocality without entanglement' indeed indicates towards such a situation even without involving any entanglement in the measurement basis [29–31]. Thus for a bipartite product (also for separable and *local* entangled) quantum state  $\rho_{AB}$  the ontic support should be considered as  $\Lambda_{\rho_{AB}} \subseteq \Lambda^A \times \Lambda^B \times \Lambda^G$ , where  $\Lambda^G$  carries strictly relational information about the two systems. The relational variables remains hidden under local measurements, i.e. presumed not to be accessible by local measurements. The Cartesian product structure assumed above is not necessary for our argument but it provides a simple way to present the idea. For an entangled state  $\rho_{AB}$  exhibiting Bell nonlocality the ontic description will be  $\Lambda_{\rho_{AB}} \subseteq (\Lambda^A \times \Lambda^B \times \Lambda^G) \cup \Lambda^{\text{NL}}$  with  $\Lambda_{\rho_{AB}} \cap \Lambda^{\text{NL}} \neq \emptyset$ .

*Result:*— We are now in a position to prove our new  $\psi$ -ontology theorem. To this aim we consider a quantum copying machine  $\mathbb{M}$  that perfectly copies the states  $|0\rangle$  and  $|1\rangle$ . The pioneering 'no-cloning' theorem does not prohibit existence of such a machine as the copying states are mutually orthogonal [32]. The action of  $\mathbb{M}$  can be described by a unitary evolution  $U_{\mathbb{M}}$  satisfying  $U_{\mathbb{M}}|i\rangle|r\rangle = |i\rangle|i\rangle$ , where  $|r\rangle$  is some fixed reference state and  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ . The machine has two input ports, one fed with particles  $R$  prepared in some reference state  $|r\rangle$  and the other fed with system  $S$  prepared in state  $|0\rangle$  or  $|1\rangle$ .

The action of this copying machine is worth analyzing in the ontological picture. Whenever  $S$  is prepared in the state  $|i\rangle$ , a composite ontic state  $\lambda_{\text{joint}} = (\lambda^S, \lambda^R, \lambda^G)$  is fed into the machine, where  $\lambda^S \in \Lambda_i \subseteq \Lambda^S$ ,  $\lambda^R \in \Lambda_r \subseteq \Lambda^R$ , and  $\lambda^G \in \Lambda^G$ , i.e.  $\Lambda_{ir} := \{\mu(\lambda_{\text{joint}}|ir) > 0\} \subseteq \Lambda^S \times \Lambda^R \times \Lambda^G$ . Importantly, we do not demand  $\int d\lambda^G \mu(\lambda^S, \lambda^R, \lambda^G|ir) = \mu(\lambda^S|i)\mu(\lambda^R|r)$ . Therefore, neither the PBR's *strong*

assumption of ‘preparation independence’ nor the assumption ‘Local independence’ as considered in [12] is presumed in our derivation. After the successful completion of cloning, the machine yields the outcome  $|ii\rangle$ , *i.e.*, it yields an ontic state belonging in  $\Lambda_{ii} \subseteq \Lambda^S \times \Lambda^R \times \Lambda^G$ . Please note that being a product state neither  $|ir\rangle$  nor  $|ii\rangle$  has any ‘nonlocal’ ontic reality, *i.e.*  $\Lambda_{ir} \cap \Lambda^{NL} = \emptyset = \Lambda_{ii} \cap \Lambda^{NL}$ .

Let us now feed the above copying machine with the system state prepared in  $|+\rangle = (|0\rangle + |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ . At the ontological level the machine receives some ontic state  $\lambda_{joint} \in \Lambda^S \times \Lambda^R \times \Lambda^G$  sampled with probability distribution  $\mu(\lambda_{joint}|+\rangle) = \mu(\lambda^S, \lambda^R, \lambda^G|+\rangle)$ . Applying Bayes rule of probability we can write  $\mu(\lambda^S, \lambda^R, \lambda^G|+\rangle) = \mu(\lambda^S|+\rangle)\mu(\lambda^R|\lambda^S, +\rangle)\mu(\lambda^G|\lambda^S, \lambda^R, +\rangle)$ . Assume that the model is maximally  $\psi$ -epistemic, which implies that the entire ontic support of  $|+\rangle$  gets shared between  $\Lambda_0$  and  $\Lambda_1$ , *i.e.*,  $\Lambda_+ = (\Lambda_+ \cap \Lambda_0) \cup (\Lambda_+ \cap \Lambda_1)$ . For the  $\lambda^S \in \Lambda_+ \cap \Lambda_0$  we can again write  $\mu(\lambda^S, \lambda^R, \lambda^G|0r\rangle) = \mu(\lambda^S|0r\rangle)\mu(\lambda^R|\lambda^G, |0r\rangle)\mu(\lambda^G|\lambda^R, \lambda^S, |0r\rangle)$ . Consider that there exists  $\lambda^R \in \Lambda_r$  such that  $\mu(\lambda^R|\lambda^S, +\rangle) \neq 0$  but  $\mu(\lambda^R|\lambda^S, |0r\rangle) = 0$ . This leads to the following perplexing situation. Suppose in the first run the ontic state  $\lambda^S \in (\Lambda_0 \cap \Lambda_+)$  is prepared for  $S$ . For  $R$ , however, it is yet to be decided whether  $\lambda^R$  is allowed or not – the very possibility/impossibility of the realization of ontic state  $\lambda^R$  for  $R$  in the first run depends on which ontic states  $\lambda^S$  for  $S$  will be realised in future runs. Depending on whether  $\lambda^S$  will be sampled from the set  $\Lambda_+ \setminus (\Lambda_0 \cap \Lambda_+)$  [  $\Lambda_0 \setminus (\Lambda_0 \cap \Lambda_+)$  ] in future run, the ontic state  $\lambda^R$  is allowed [not allowed] in the first run. We assume absence of such influence from future ontic preparations to ontic preparations taking place at present and call this assumption *no ontic retro-causality* (NOR). To say more precisely, the NOR demands  $\mu(\lambda^R|\lambda^S, |0r\rangle) = \mu(\lambda^R|\lambda^S, +\rangle)$ . However, a weaker version of NOR (W-NOR) assuring  $\mu(\lambda^R|\lambda^S, |0r\rangle) = 0 \Rightarrow \mu(\lambda^R|\lambda^S, +\rangle) = 0$  suffices our purpose. With a similar reasoning W-NOR assures  $\mu(\lambda^G|\lambda^R, \lambda^S, |0r\rangle) = 0 \Rightarrow \mu(\lambda^G|\lambda^R, \lambda^S, +\rangle) = 0$ . Therefore, for any  $\lambda^S \in \Lambda_+ \cap \Lambda_0$  we have,  $\mu(\lambda^S, \lambda^R, \lambda^G|0r\rangle) = 0 \Rightarrow \mu(\lambda^S, \lambda^R, \lambda^G|+\rangle) = 0$ . Similarly, for any  $\lambda^S \in \Lambda_+ \cap \Lambda_1$  we have,  $\mu(\lambda^S, \lambda^R, \lambda^G|1r\rangle) = 0 \Rightarrow \mu(\lambda^S, \lambda^R, \lambda^G|+\rangle) = 0$ . These two together further imply  $\Lambda_{+r} \subseteq \Lambda_{0r} \cup \Lambda_{1r}$ . Thus whenever we feed the machine with  $|+\rangle$  state, the composite ontic states that enters into the machine belong to  $\Lambda_{0r} \cup \Lambda_{1r}$ , on which the machine’s action is already known. At this point we again apply the NOR to the ontological transformation, *i.e.*, machine’s action on a given composite ontic state does not depend on which other composite ontic state will be fed into the machine in future. Note that the assumption NOR applied to ontic transformation is weaker than the as-

sumption of ‘Ontic indifference’ [6], which assumes that ‘Any quantum transformation on a system which leaves unchanged any given pure state,  $|\psi\rangle$ , can be performed in such a way that it does not affect the underlying ontic states,  $\lambda \in \Lambda_\psi$ , in the ontic support of that pure state’. The assumption of NOR thus leads to the fact that after the machine’s action the ontological support of  $\mu(\lambda_{joint}|\mathbb{M}[+\rangle])$  should be contained within  $\Lambda_{00} \cup \Lambda_{11}$ , *i.e.*,  $\text{Supp}[\mu(\lambda_{joint}|\mathbb{M}[+\rangle])] \subseteq \Lambda_{00} \cup \Lambda_{11}$ . Since we have  $\Lambda_{ii} \cap \Lambda^{NL} = \emptyset$  for  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ , therefore  $\text{Supp}[\mu(\lambda_{joint}|\mathbb{M}[+\rangle])] \cap \Lambda^{NL} = \emptyset$ .

But the above conclusion is in direct contradiction with predictions of quantum theory. Due to linearity of the machine’s action one will obtain the output  $|\phi^+\rangle = (|0\rangle|0\rangle + |1\rangle|1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$  whenever the machine  $\mathbb{M}$  is supposed to copy the state  $|+\rangle$ . Being the maximally entangled state it exhibits maximum violation of Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt (CHSH) inequality [33] for suitable measurement choice on its local parts. Hence the entire ontic support of the output pairs cannot be contained within  $\Lambda^S \times \Lambda^R \times \Lambda^G$ ; in other words  $\Lambda_{\phi^+} \cap \Lambda^{NL} \neq \emptyset$ .

A similar proof runs if we feed any state  $|\psi\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$  into the machine  $\mathbb{M}$  instead of the state  $|+\rangle$ , where  $\mathbb{C} \ni \alpha, \beta \neq 0$  and  $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$ . In a maximally  $\psi$ -epistemic theory the ontic support  $\Lambda_\psi$  entirely gets shared between  $\Lambda_0$  and  $\Lambda_1$ . Whereas for  $|+\rangle$  these two shares are equal, for  $|\psi\rangle$  the shares are proportional to the quantum overlaps. The assumption of NOR in this case also implies  $\text{Supp}[\mu(\lambda_{joint}|\mathbb{M}[|\psi\rangle])] \cap \Lambda^{NL} = \emptyset$ . But this is again in contradiction with quantum prediction as the machine’s action on  $|\psi\rangle$  yields the state  $\alpha|00\rangle + \beta|11\rangle$  which is known to be Bell nonlocal [34].

Our result thus establishes that maximally  $\psi$ -epistemic model satisfying the assumptions of NOR cannot account for the Bell nonlocal correlations. In the ‘orthodox’ interpretation of quantum theory, the wavefunction  $\psi$  alone provides the complete description of reality which itself can be considered as  $\psi$ -complete ontological model. Researchers have already acknowledged that Einstein had shown incompatibility of  $\psi$ -complete model with locality through a simple argument at the Solvay conference [1]. In Einstein’s own words [35]:

... One arrives at very implausible theoretical conceptions, if one attempts to maintain the thesis that the statistical quantum theory is in principle capable of producing a complete description of an individual physical system ....

Extending this result, the authors in [2] have shown that

Any  $\psi$ -ontic ontological model that reproduces the quantum statistics (QSTAT) violates locality.

In brief, these two results together assert " $\psi$ -complete and/or  $\psi$ -ontic  $\Rightarrow \neg$  locality". Our theorem can be viewed as a converse of this claim as it shows that

"Nonlocality (in the sense of Bell)  $\Rightarrow \neg$  (maximally  $\psi$ -epistemic  $\wedge$  NOR)". At this point we recall the result of Ref. [17], where it has been shown that "maximally  $\psi$ -epistemic  $\Rightarrow$  Kochen-Specker noncontextual". Therefore Kochen-Specker contextuality [36] excludes maximally  $\psi$ -epistemic models for quantum systems with Hilbert space dimension strictly greater than two. Similarly, our theorem shows that the Bell nonlocality rules out maximally  $\psi$ -epistemic ontological model that satisfies the assumption NOR. Although our theorem invokes an additional assumption, but this makes the result more versatile as it applies to qubit quantum system too.

So far we have shown that Bell nonlocality prohibits ontological model that is maximally  $\psi$ -epistemic and satisfies NOR. We will now show that any  $\psi$ -epistemic ontological model can be excluded through our method. Recall that in a  $\psi$ -ontic model each quantum state yields non overlapping ontic support within  $\Lambda$ , *i.e.*  $\Lambda_\psi \cap \Lambda_\phi = \emptyset$  for all pairs of  $\psi, \phi$ . Contrary to this let us assume a  $\psi$ -epistemic model. In such a model  $\Lambda_\psi$  has nonzero overlap with  $\Lambda_i$ , where  $|\psi\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$ ,  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ , and  $\alpha, \beta \neq 0$ . In a non-maximally  $\psi$ -epistemic model the support  $\Lambda_\psi$  will not be fully contained within  $\Lambda_0 \cup \Lambda_1$  for some  $|\psi\rangle$ , *i.e.* with  $\Lambda_\psi \setminus (\Lambda_0 \cup \Lambda_1) \neq \emptyset$ . In such a model whenever the machine  $\mathbb{M}$  be fed with the state  $|\psi\rangle$ , the input joint ontic state will be  $\lambda_{joint} = (\lambda^S, \lambda^R, \lambda^G)$ , where  $\lambda^S$  belongs in one of the three disjoint sets  $\Lambda_\psi \cap \Lambda_0, \Lambda_\psi \cap \Lambda_1, \Lambda_\psi \setminus (\Lambda_0 \cup \Lambda_1)$ . Whenever  $\lambda_{joint} = (\lambda^S, \lambda^R, \lambda^G)$  with  $\lambda^S \in \Lambda_i \cap \Lambda_\psi$  will be fed to the machine, due to the assumption NOR, the machine's action on  $(\lambda^S, \lambda^R, \lambda^G)$  would be the same as if the state  $|i\rangle$  has been fed instead of  $|\psi\rangle$ . Hence, the machine will yield  $|ii\rangle$  as output. Only when  $(\lambda^S, \lambda^R, \lambda^G)$  with  $\lambda^S \in \Lambda_\psi \setminus (\Lambda_0 \cup \Lambda_1)$  is fed as input, the machine will be able to yield  $|\phi_{SR}\rangle = \alpha|00\rangle + \beta|11\rangle$  as output. Therefore, due to the assumption of NOR, whenever the machine is fed with the state  $|\psi\rangle$ , it yields the output  $|ii\rangle$  with probability  $p_i$  and with probability  $(1 - p_0 - p_1)$  it yields the output  $|\phi_{SR}\rangle = \alpha|00\rangle + \beta|11\rangle$ ; where  $p_i = \int_{\Lambda_i \cap \Lambda_\psi} d\lambda^S d\lambda^R d\lambda^G \mu(\lambda^S, \lambda^R, \lambda^G | \psi)$ ,  $i = 0, 1$ . This, however, is again in direct contradiction with the predictions of quantum theory, according to which, output of the machine will be a pure state  $|\phi_{SR}\rangle$ . Statistics obtained from local measurements on the state  $|\phi_{SR}\rangle$  shows Bell-CHSH inequality violation by the maximum amount  $2\sqrt{1 + 4|\alpha|^2|\beta|^2}$  [34]. While  $\psi$ -epistemic ontological models satisfying NOR yield violation by the amount  $p_0 CHSH_{|00\rangle} + p_1 CHSH_{|11\rangle} + p_2 CHSH_{|\phi_{SR}\rangle}$ , which is strictly less than  $CHSH_{|\phi_{SR}\rangle} = 2\sqrt{1 + 4|\alpha|^2|\beta|^2}$ , unless  $p_0 = p_1 = 0$ . But this implies  $\Lambda_0 \cap \Lambda_\psi = \emptyset = \Lambda_1 \cap \Lambda_\psi$ , *i.e.* the model be  $\psi$ -ontic.

*Discussions:*– The PBR theorem initiated a surge in research interest regarding the reality of quantum wave-

function [6–10, 37–42]. Between the two competitive views –  $\psi$ -ontic vs.  $\psi$ -epistemic – it favours the former. To this claim it uses an assumption, called PI, regarding the ontology of a composite system. Establishing such a powerful doctrine about the reality of quantum state, the theorem goes through detailed scrutiny and the PI assumption gained several criticism [11–14]. In particular the criticism in [14] is quite severe. Note that, any theorem establishing  $\psi$ -onticity of two dimensional quantum states must require additional assumption either on the dynamics of ontic evolution or about ontic composition. The authors in [14] consider ontic composition assumption that is weaker than the assumption of 'preparation independence' and reject vast class of deterministic hidden-variables theories, including those consistent on their targeted domain. This result puts challenge on the compositional aspect of the real/ontic states one might wish to assume through preparation independence while modeling a tensor-product quantum state. It therefore motivates renewed aspiration for more rational assumption establishing  $\psi$ -ontic nature of quantum wavefunction. At this point our theorem starts contributing. We consider a new assumption, namely NOR, and argue why it is more natural than the assumption of PI. Our result shows that the observed phenomenon of quantum nonlocality excludes the  $\psi$ -epistemic explanations for quantum systems associated with Hilbert spaces of dimension two and onward. In this regard, the toy model of Spekkens [43] is worth mentioning. The model is maximally  $\psi$ -epistemic by construction. Though it reproduces number of phenomena as observed in quantum theory, it is a Bell local model. Our theorem establishes a general result in this direction as it shows that a class of epistemic models satisfying the metaphysical assumption of NOR is inconsistent with the nonlocal behavior of quantum theory. Extent of our theorem is also broader than the  $\psi$ -ontology theorems in [15–21] as these results exclude only certain degree of epistemicity and apply to Hilbert spaces with dimension greater than two but remain silent for qubit system. Our result also opens up new research possibilities. One can apply other local realistic inequalities to establish more stringent restriction on the underlying ontological models. It may also be interesting to study what new kind of restriction will be imposed on  $\psi$ -epistemicity from genuine quantum nonlocality.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

ADB and MB acknowledge fruitful discussions with Guruprasad Kar, Some Sankar Bhattacharya, and Tamal Guha. MB would like to thank Michael J. W. Hall for useful suggestions (through private communication).

MB acknowledges research grant through INSPIRE-

faculty fellowship from the Department of Science and Technology, Government of India.

- 
- [1] G. Bacciagaluppi and A. Valentini; Quantum Theory at the Crossroads: Reconsidering the 1927 Solvay Conference; Cambridge University Press (2009) [[arXiv:quant-ph/0609184](#)].
- [2] N. Harrigan and R. W. Spekkens; Einstein, incompleteness, and the epistemic view of quantum states; *Found Phys* **40**, 125 (2010).
- [3] R. W. Spekkens; Contextuality for preparations, transformations, and unsharp measurements; *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 052108 (2005).
- [4] N. Harrigan and T. Rudolph; Ontological models and the interpretation of contextuality; [arXiv:0709.4266 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [5] M. F. Pusey, J. Barrett, and T. Rudolph; On the reality of the quantum state; *Nature Phys.* **8**, 475 (2012)
- [6] L. Hardy; Are Quantum States Real? *International Journal of Modern Physics B* **27**, 1345012 (2013)
- [7] R. Colbeck and R. Renner; Is a System's Wave Function in One-to-One Correspondence with Its Elements of Reality? *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 150402 (2012).
- [8] R. Colbeck and R. Renner; A system's wave function is uniquely determined by its underlying physical state; *New J. Phys* **19**, 013016 (2017).
- [9] M. K. Patra, S. Pironio, and S. Massar; No-Go Theorems for  $\psi$ -Epistemic Models Based on a Continuity Assumption; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 090402 (2013)
- [10] M. S. Leifer; Is the quantum state real? An extended review of  $\psi$ -ontology theorems; *Quanta* **3**, 67 (2014).
- [11] M. Schlosshauer and A. Fine; Implications of the Pusey-Barrett-Rudolph Quantum No-Go Theorem; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 260404 (2012).
- [12] J. Emerson, D. Serbin, C. Sutherland, and V. Veitch; The whole is greater than the sum of the parts: on the possibility of purely statistical interpretations of quantum theory; [arXiv:1312.1345 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [13] L. Ballentine; Ontological Models in Quantum Mechanics: What do they tell us? [arXiv:1402.5689 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [14] M. Schlosshauer and A. Fine; No-Go Theorem for the Composition of Quantum Systems; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 070407 (2014).
- [15] O. J. E. Maroney; How statistical are quantum states? [arXiv:1207.6906 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [16] O. J. E. Maroney; A brief note on epistemic interpretations and the Kochen-Specker theorem; [arXiv:1207.7192 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [17] M. S. Leifer and O. J. E. Maroney; Maximally Epistemic Interpretations of the Quantum State and Contextuality; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 120401 (2013).
- [18] J. Barrett, E. G. Cavalcanti, R. Lal, and O. J. E. Maroney; No  $\psi$ -Epistemic Model Can Fully Explain the Indistinguishability of Quantum States; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 250403 (2014).
- [19] M. S. Leifer;  $\psi$ -Epistemic Models are Exponentially Bad at Explaining the Distinguishability of Quantum States; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 160404 (2014).
- [20] C. Branciard; How  $\psi$ -Epistemic Models Fail at Explaining the Indistinguishability of Quantum States; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 020409 (2014).
- [21] M. Ringbauer, B. Duffus, C. Branciard, E. G. Cavalcanti, A. G. White, and A. Fedrizzi; Measurements on the reality of the wavefunction; *Nature Phys* **11**, 249 (2015).
- [22] J. S. Bell; On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox; *Physics* **1**, 195 (1964); Reprinted in J. S. Bell; *Speakable and Unspeakable In Quantum Mechanics*, (Cambridge University Press, England, Cambridge, 2004)
- [23] J. S. Bell; On the Problem of Hidden Variables in Quantum Mechanics; *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **38**, 447 (1966).
- [24] N. D. Mermin; Hidden variables and the two theorems of John Bell; *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **65**, 803 (1993).
- [25] N. Brunner, D. Cavalcanti, S. Pironio, V. Scarani, and S. Wehner; Bell nonlocality; *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **86**, 419 (2014).
- [26] R. F. Werner; Quantum states with Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen correlations admitting a hidden-variable model; *Phys. Rev. A* **40**, 4277 (1989).
- [27] J. Barrett; Nonsequential positive-operator-valued measurements on entangled mixed states do not always violate a Bell inequality; *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 042302 (2002).
- [28] J. Bowles, F. Hirsch, M. T. Quintino, and N. Brunner; Local Hidden Variable Models for Entangled Quantum States Using Finite Shared Randomness; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 120401 (2015).
- [29] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, C. A. Fuchs, T. Mor, E. Rains, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters; Quantum nonlocality without entanglement; *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 1070 (1999).
- [30] S. Halder, M. Banik, S. Agrawal, and S. Bandyopadhyay; Strong Quantum Nonlocality without Entanglement; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 040403 (2019).
- [31] S. S. Bhattacharya, S. Saha, T. Guha, and M. Banik; Nonlocality Without Entanglement: Quantum Theory and Beyond; *Phys. Rev. Research* **2**, 012068(R) (2020).
- [32] W. Wootters and W. Zurek; A Single Quantum Cannot be Cloned; *Nature* **299**, 802 (1982).
- [33] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt; Proposed Experiment to Test Local Hidden-Variable Theories; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 880 (1969).
- [34] N. Gisin; Bell's inequality holds for all non-product states; *Phys. Lett. A* **154**, 201 (1991).
- [35] P. A. Schilpp; Albert Einstein, Philosopher-Scientist: The Library of Living Philosophers (Volume VII), page 671 (1970).
- [36] S. Kochen and E. P. Specker; The Problem of Hidden Variables in Quantum Mechanics; *J. Math. Mech* **17**, 59 (1967).
- [37] P. G. Lewis, D. Jennings, J. Barrett, and T. Rudolph; Distinct Quantum States Can Be Compatible with a Single State of Reality; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 150404 (2012).
- [38] A. Montina; Epistemic View of Quantum States and Communication Complexity of Quantum Channels; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 110501 (2012).

- [39] J. Bub; Bananaworld: Quantum Mechanics for Primates; [arXiv:1211.3062 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [40] M. Banik, S. S. Bhattacharya, S. K. Choudhary, A. Mukherjee, and A. Roy; Ontological Models, Preparation Contextuality and Nonlocality; [Found Phys 44, 1230 \(2014\)](#).
- [41] D. Jennings and M. Leifer; No return to classical reality; [Contemporary Physics 57, 60 \(2015\)](#).
- [42] S. Bandyopadhyay, M. Banik, S. S. Bhattacharya, S. Ghosh, G. Kar, A. Mukherjee, and A. Roy; Reciprocal Ontological Models Show Indeterminism Comparable to Quantum Theory; [Found Phys 47, 265 \(2017\)](#).
- [43] R. W. Spekkens; Evidence for the epistemic view of quantum states: A toy theory; [Phys. Rev. A 75, 032110 \(2007\)](#).