

CAN QUANTUM THEORY BE UNDERPINNED BY A NON-LOCAL
HIDDEN VARIABLE THEORY ?

B J Dalton

Centre for Quantum Science and Technology Theory, Swinburne University of
Technology, Melbourne, Victoria 3122, Australia

0.1 Abstract

In this paper we consider the description by a general Bell-type non-local hidden variable theory of bipartite quantum states with two observables per subsystem. We derive Bell inequalities of the Collins-Gisin-Linden-Massar-Popescu type which involve combinations of the probabilities of related outcomes for measurements for the four pairs of sub-system observables. It is shown that the corresponding quantum theory expressions violate the Bell inequalities in the case of the maximally entangled state of the bipartite system. The CHSH Bell inequality is also derived from this general CGLMP Bell-type non-local hidden variable theory. This shows that quantum theory can not be underpinned by a Bell-type non-local hidden variable theory. So as a general Bell-type local hidden variable theory has already been shown to conflict with quantum theory, it follows that quantum theory can not be understood in terms of any CGLMP Bell-type hidden variable theory - local or non-local.

1 INTRODUCTION

This paper deals with the issue of whether quantum theory needs to be completed or underpinned by a *non-local hidden variable theory* (NLHVT), an issue that originates from the 1930's papers of *Einstein* [1] and *Schrodinger* ([2], [3]) and the 1960's paper of *Bell* ([5]). The key word is *non-local*, as it is now widely accepted that quantum theory is *not* underpinned by a *local* hidden variable theory (LHVT).

1.1 Quantum Paradoxes

The 1930's papers identified two paradoxical features arising from the *Copenhagen interpretation of quantum theory* (QTHY), even for the simplest case of *bipartite* systems. The first was *macroscopic entanglement* – such as in the Schrodinger cat experiment, wherein states could exist in *bipartite* systems in which a sub-system could *simultaneously* occupy two *macroscopically distinct* states. Here the system state was an *entangled* state of a cat and a radioactive atom, a quantum superposition state involving *both* the cat being dead *and* the cat being alive. This conflicted with common sense - the cat should be *either* dead or alive. The second was *EPR steering* - measuring the *value* for an *observable* chosen for *one* sub-system *A* sometimes could *instantaneously* affect the outcome for measuring the *value* of an *observable* in a *second* sub-system *B* that was *spatially well-separated*. This contradicted *relativity* and for a system involving two particles in a possible state with a well-defined position difference (and a well-defined momentum sum), also led to a violation of the *Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle* in terms of evidently being able to assign precise values to both the position and momentum of one of the two particles. So maybe the particle really does have both a definite position and momentum - and the cat is either dead or alive, whilst the probabilistic feature of quantum theory is just similar to that in classical statistical mechanics ?

1.2 Quantum Theory Incompleteness ?

Thus arose *Einstein's question*: [1]. Does quantum theory (though agreeing with *experiment*) require *completion* via an *underlying theory* that determines the *actual values* of *physical quantities* (realism) - such as the position and momentum (for the particle) or being alive or being dead (for the cat), even if these are hidden within the *probability distribution* ? Since the work of Bohm [4] and Bell [5] such underlying (or underpinning) theories are now generally referred to as *hidden variable theories*. (HVT).

1.3 Local and Non-Local Hidden Variable Theory

In response, Bell introduced [5] a so-called *local hidden variable theory* (LHVT) for describing the quantum states of composite systems. These states are re-

ferred to as *Bell local states*. In the original *deterministic* version the *hidden variables* (HV) determine the *actual* outcome for each *separate sub-system*, when any of its observables are measured. In the *general version* of LHVT the HV essentially act like *classical phase space* variables, and determine the *probabilities of outcomes* for each *sub-system separately* when any of its observables are measured (*the locality feature*). A key idea is that the HV only depend on *state preparation process* – not on the subsequent *choice* of what observables will be *measured*.

LHVT provides predictions for *inequalities* involving results based on *mean values* or the *probabilities* of joint measurement outcomes of *pairs* of observables from the *two* sub-systems - generically referred to as *Bell inequalities*. We can then *test* whether the *inequality predictions* based on *LHVT* are consistent both with *quantum theory* predictions and with *experiment*. As described below, *some* Bell inequality violations show *LHVT* fails. So does this mean that quantum theory should be underpinned or completed via a *Bell-type non-local HVT* (NLHVT) ?

In this paper a general *non-local* hidden variable theory will be presented, and Bell inequalities obtained based on this NLHVT. We will show that the famous CHSH [6] Bell inequality can be established from NLHVT as well as from LHVT. We then consider Bell inequalities of the Collins, Gisin, Linden, Massar Popescu (CGLMP) type (see [7], [8]). It will then be shown that in a *maximally entangled* state in a bipartite system there are clear violations of these Bell inequalities, thus showing that it is *not possible* to underpin or complete quantum theory via this general Bell-type non-local hidden variable theory. As well as being an important *quantum foundations* issue, there are also implications also for *quantum technology*, *since systems* for secure communications, quantum information processing, etc depend on there being different outcomes predicted for quantum theory and for hidden variable theory.

1.4 Bohmian Mechanics

It should be noted that previous to the work of Bell [5], a *different* kind of non-local hidden variable theory was introduced by Bohm [4] in the 1950's, based on earlier work by de Broglie (see [9] for a recent account). The approach involves *deterministic particle trajectories* dependent on a so-called *quantum potential* determined (in the non-relativistic version) from the multi-particle *Schrodinger wave function* for the system. The *particle positions* act like *hidden variables* and non-locality refers to the feature that the *velocity* of any one particle depends on the positions of *all* the other particles, no matter where their relative locations may be. This would violate *special relativity*, but as the related version of quantum theory is also non-relativistic this outcome is merely being consistent. As the derivation of the equations for Bohmian mechanics (BM) invokes the existence of the wave-function, assumes the correctness of the *time-dependent Schrodinger equation* (TDSE) and that the *modulus squared* of the wave function is the *position probability density* for the particles, it may be con-

cluded that Bohmian mechanics is based on just the same equations as quantum theory but with some *extra assumptions* and *ontological features* (the deterministic trajectories) *added*. The particle trajectory feature is based on deriving a continuity equation for the position probability density and identifying the *gradient* of the *phase* S of the wave-function (divided by the particle mass) with the *velocity* for the deterministic particle trajectory - whose existence is now incorporated into the theory. This identification is based on a continuity equation for the position probability derived from equations for the phase and amplitude of the wave-function obtained from the TDSE. So the addition of deterministic trajectories complies with Einstein's suggestion of *completing* quantum theory by adding new features - the deterministic trajectories. Whether the particle positions should be regarded as "hidden variables" is a moot point. Unlike the hidden variables λ introduced by Bell [5] (see below), the particle positions could in principle be observed, and they obey well defined Hamilton-Jacobi equations involving the quantum potential - in contrast to the unspecified equations for the $P(\lambda|c)$ and $P(\alpha|\Omega_A, \lambda)$ in Bell's approach. BM is rather like classical physics and uses a more familiar mathematics based on calculus rather than the mathematics of linear vector spaces and Hermitian operators. Many of the characteristic results in standard quantum theory can also be shown in BM. For example the component L_z of the orbital angular momentum of a particle is $xp_y - yp_x$, which becomes $x(\partial S/\partial y) - y(\partial S/\partial x) = (\partial S/\partial \phi)$ from the particle trajectory assumption in which $p_y = mv_y$ etc.. As the *stationary* solution of the Schrodinger equation for a spherical potential involves a phase $S = \beta - Et + \hbar m\phi$ (m an integer) it follows that L_z has a *quantised* value $m\hbar$. Other quantum theory features such as the *symmetry* or *anti-symmetry* of the wave-function for identical particles are just *assumed* true in Bohmian mechanics. *Relativistic versions* of Bohmian mechanics are still being developed, as are *quantum field theory* versions. As far as is known, Bohmian mechanics does not predict any *new* physical results, but it has been applied to the well-known two-slit experiment for single particles [10] - where it is shown that the particle trajectories are affected by the quantum potential (that reflects the interference effects on the wave-function due to the two slits), and this then leads to the periodic particle position probability distribution on the observation screen. Whether Bohmian mechanics can describe bipartite systems for *all* pairs of non-commuting observables in each sub-system is an issue that is not examined in the present paper. However, interest in Bohmian mechanics and its extensions still continues [11].

1.5 Other Proposed Non Local HVT

Another approach to completing quantum theory is the *Many Worlds Interpretation (MWI)* [12]. Essentially the *probabilistic feature* of quantum theory - where in general each possible outcome of measuring an observable only occurs with a certain probability - is replaced with a *deterministic picture* in which all the different outcomes actually occur, but now in different universes. The MWI has recently been discussed by Vaidman [13]. Leggett [14], introduced a so-called

Crypto-Nonlocal (CN) hidden variable theory. In the context of the present paper, the LHVT expression (2) $P(\alpha|\Omega_A, \lambda)P(\beta|\Omega_B, \lambda)$ for the bipartite system case would be replaced in the CN theory by $P(\alpha|\Omega_A, \Omega_B, \lambda)P(\beta|\Omega_A, \Omega_B, \lambda)$, so that although the *outcome* for measuring either sub-system observable does not depend on the outcome for measuring the other sub-system observable, it does depend on the *choice* of the other observable. It is not clear whether this would produce different Bell inequalities from the NLHVT replacement $P(\alpha, \beta|\Omega_A, \Omega_B, \lambda)$. CN theory has been found to violate quantum theory and experiment [15].

1.6 Plan of Paper

First however, we need to outline the key equations describing *both* LHVT *and* a form of NLHVT in the simplest case of bipartite systems. Here the basic probability involves the outcomes for *one* observable in *each* sub-system. We then discuss the well-known CHSH example of a Bell inequality based on LHVT that is inconsistent with quantum theory. We also outline the idea behind LHVT. For reasons of completeness we next point out how Bell inequalities are also relevant to discussing quantum entanglement and EPR steering based on a classification of Bell local states into three categories involving so-called *local hidden quantum states* [16]. The material outlining this is in Appendix A. We then introduce the so-called CGLMP Bell inequalities [7]. Here the basic probability involves the outcomes for two observables in *each* sub-system, resulting in more general LHVT and NLHVT forms. We then show a novel result - namely that the CHSH Bell inequality can *also* be proved for this more general NLHVT. The violation of the CHSH Bell inequality for this NLHVT approach proves that quantum theory cannot be underpinned by this type of NLHVT. The CGLMP inequalities themselves are applied in a bipartite system where each sub-system has *two* observables, each with the *same* number d of outcomes) and set out the relevant equations for the inequalities - involving the quantity S , and introduce the observables and the test quantum state, both for the LHVT and NLHVT cases. The quantity S involves the *probabilities* of *all* the outcomes for *pairs of observables* in the two sub-systems, where the outcomes are *shifted* by fixed amounts. The next section covers the basic *matrix equation method* for determining *sufficiency* requirements for possible Bell inequalities of the form $S \leq 4, S \leq 3, S \leq 2, S \leq 1$ in *four* cases for the NLHVT situation. Based on a consideration of *all* the *sub-cases*, sufficiency conditions **for Bell tests** in each of these four cases are set out, with the detailed derivations being presented in Appendix B. The *number* of sub-cases is 1, 4, 6, 4 for $S \leq 4, S \leq 3, S \leq 2, S \leq 1$ respectively. The conditions are in the form of *inequalities* involving the *outcome shifts*, and for the cases of $S \leq 2, S \leq 1$, there are *more than one* such inequality for *each* of the sub-cases that are involved. At least one inequality must be satisfied for every sub-case. The last part of this section then sets out the quantum theory expressions for S . A comparison of the quantum theory numerical results for S with the NLHVT results then follows. We again

show that the CGLMP Bell inequality based on NLHVT is violated in quantum theory, reinforcing the previous conclusion based on CHSH. The paper ends with a Summary and Conclusions.

2 QTHY & HVT BASIC EQUATIONS

We consider the case of a bipartite system in which the two sub-systems may be spatially separated. At present we only consider *one* observable per sub-system- the case of *two* will be considered later.

2.1 QTHY & HVT Probabilities - Bipartite Systems

The *QTHY* and *LHVT* joint probabilities $P(\alpha, \beta | \Omega_A, \Omega_B)$ for measurements of observables Ω_A, Ω_B for sub-systems A, B with outcomes α, β are:

$$P(\alpha, \beta | \Omega_A, \Omega_B, \rho)_Q = \text{Tr}((\hat{\Pi}_\alpha^A \otimes \hat{\Pi}_\beta^B) \hat{\rho}) \quad (1)$$

$$P(\alpha, \beta | \Omega_A, \Omega_B, c)_{LHVT} = \sum_\lambda P(\lambda | c) P(\alpha | \Omega_A, \lambda) P(\beta | \Omega_B, \lambda) \quad (2)$$

For QTHY $\hat{\Pi}_\alpha^A$ is the *projector* onto the space of *eigenvectors* for operator $\hat{\Omega}_A$ with *eigenvalue* α . $\hat{\rho}$ is *density opr* specifying the *preparation process* c of the quantum state. For LHVT, *hidden variables* λ determined with probability $P(\lambda | c)$ for preparation process c . The projectors satisfy $\sum_\alpha \hat{\Pi}_\alpha^A = \hat{1}^A$ and $\sum_\beta \hat{\Pi}_\beta^B = \hat{1}^B$.

In the *probabilistic* form of LHVT the *hidden variables* λ determine each *local sub-system* measurement probabilities $P(\alpha | \Omega_A, \lambda)$, $P(\beta | \Omega_B, \lambda)$ for *classical observables* Ω_A, Ω_B - which are combined using *classical probability theory* to determine joint measurement probabilities. Since the probabilities for *all* outcomes must add up to *unity* we have $\sum_\alpha P(\alpha | \Omega_A, \lambda) = 1$ and $\sum_\beta P(\beta | \Omega_B, \lambda) = 1$. The origin of this expression for the LHVT probability expression involving the product of *separate* sub-system probabilities is set out below in Section 2.4. This form for the LHVT probability is widely used - apart from [5], see for example Refs. [16], [17], [9].

Both the QTHY and the LHVT probability satisfy the *no-signaling* condi-

tion. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\alpha} P(\alpha, \beta | \Omega_A, \Omega_B, c)_Q &= \text{Tr}((\hat{1}^A \otimes \hat{\Pi}_{\beta}^B) \hat{\rho}) = \sum_{\alpha^{\#}} P(\alpha^{\#}, \beta | \Omega_A^{\#}, \Omega_B, c)_Q \\
\sum_{\beta} P(\alpha, \beta | \Omega_A, \Omega_B, c)_Q &= \text{Tr}((\hat{\Pi}_{\alpha}^A \otimes \hat{1}^B) \hat{\rho}) = \sum_{\beta^{\#}} P(\alpha, \beta^{\#} | \Omega_A, \Omega_B^{\#}, c)_Q \\
\sum_{\alpha} P(\alpha, \beta | \Omega_A, \Omega_B, c)_{LHVT} &= \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda | c) P(\beta | \Omega_B, \lambda) = \sum_{\alpha^{\#}} P(\alpha^{\#}, \beta | \Omega_A^{\#}, \Omega_B, c)_{LHVT} \\
\sum_{\beta} P(\alpha, \beta | \Omega_A, \Omega_B, c)_{LHVT} &= \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda | c) P(\alpha | \Omega_A, \lambda) = \sum_{\beta^{\#}} P(\alpha, \beta^{\#} | \Omega_A, \Omega_B^{\#}, c)_{LHVT}
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where two different choices of sub-system observables $\Omega_A^{\#}, \Omega_B^{\#}$ and outcomes $\alpha^{\#}, \beta^{\#}$ are considered. Thus the outcome for sub-system's observable is *unaffected* by the *outcome* or *choice* of the other sub-system's observable.

If the LHVT form for the probability $P(\alpha, \beta | \Omega_A, \Omega_B, c)_{LHVT}$ does not apply, then what form would apply for NLHVT? As explained in Sect. 2.4 the locality condition results in $P(\alpha, \beta | \Omega_A, \Omega_B, c)_{LHVT}$ involving the product of separate sub-system outcome probabilities as in Eq (2). Hence a general NLHVT probability will be one which does not involve separate sub-system probabilities. Thus, in the *probabilistic* form of this general type of NLHVT, the *hidden variables* λ should determine the *combined sub-system* measurement *probabilities* $P(\alpha, \beta | \Omega_A, \Omega_B, \lambda)$, for *both classical observables* Ω_A, Ω_B . In this general non-local hidden variable theory there is *no separate* (or local) HVT probability for each sub-system.

$$P(\alpha, \beta | \Omega_A, \Omega_B, c)_{NLHVT} = \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda | c) P(\alpha, \beta | \Omega_A, \Omega_B, \lambda) \tag{4}$$

Again, the sum of the probabilities for all outcomes must be unity, so $\sum_{\alpha, \beta} P(\alpha, \beta | \Omega_A, \Omega_B, \lambda) = 1$. This form for the NLHVT probability is the general form that would be involved when the local form in (2) is not applicable. Other more specific forms of NLHVT (such as Bohmian Mechanics) are briefly discussed in Sects. 1.4 and 1.5. There is no obvious reason why the *no-signaling* condition would apply in NLHVT.

2.2 Joint Measurement Mean Values

QTHY and LHVT expressions for the *mean values* of joint measurement outcomes for Ω_A, Ω_B are:

$$\langle \Omega_A \otimes \Omega_B \rangle_Q = \text{Tr}(\hat{\Omega}_A \otimes \hat{\Omega}_B) \hat{\rho} \tag{5}$$

$$\langle \Omega_A \otimes \Omega_B \rangle_{LHVT} = \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda | c) \langle \Omega_A(\lambda) \rangle \langle \Omega_B(\lambda) \rangle \tag{6}$$

where $\langle \Omega_A(\lambda) \rangle = \sum_{\alpha} \alpha P(\alpha|\Omega_A, \lambda)$ is LHVT mean value for measurement of Ω_A when hidden variables are λ . Similarly for $\langle \Omega_B(\lambda) \rangle$.

The NLHVT expression for the *mean values* of joint measurement outcomes for Ω_A, Ω_B is

$$\langle \Omega_A \otimes \Omega_B \rangle_{NLHVT} = \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda|c) \langle (\Omega_A \otimes \Omega_B)(\lambda) \rangle \quad (7)$$

where $\langle (\Omega_A \otimes \Omega_B)(\lambda) \rangle = \sum_{\alpha, \beta} \alpha \beta P(\alpha, \beta|\Omega_A, \Omega_B, \lambda)$ is the NLHVT mean value for measurement of Ω_A and Ω_B when hidden variables are λ .

2.3 CHSH Bell Inequality Test

The well-known *CHSH* Bell inequality ([6]) for bipartite system where outcomes α, β are restricted to $(+1, -1)$ and involving *two measurement choices* for each sub-system is

$$|S| = |\langle \Omega_{A1} \otimes \Omega_{B1} \rangle_{LHVT} + \langle \Omega_{A1} \otimes \Omega_{B2} \rangle_{LHVT} + \langle \Omega_{A2} \otimes \Omega_{B1} \rangle_{LHVT} - \langle \Omega_{A2} \otimes \Omega_{B2} \rangle_{LHVT}| \leq 2 \quad (8)$$

Note the minus sign. This is violated for the *singlet state* of two spin 1/2 systems (spin operators are in units $\hbar/2$).

$$|\Psi\rangle = \left(| +1 \rangle_{S_{\mu}^A} | -1 \rangle_{S_{\mu}^B} - | -1 \rangle_{S_{\mu}^A} | +1 \rangle_{S_{\mu}^B} \right) / \sqrt{2} \quad \mu = x, y, \text{ or } z \quad (9)$$

for Pauli spin operators $\Omega_{A1} = \sigma_z^A$, $\Omega_{A2} = \sigma_x^A$, $\Omega_{B1} = -(\sigma_x^B + \sigma_z^B)/\sqrt{2}$, $\Omega_{B2} = +(\sigma_x^B - \sigma_z^B)/\sqrt{2}$, for which we find $S = 2\sqrt{2}$ from quantum theory. This is based on the quantum theory mean value for the product of Pauli spin operator components along directions specified by unit vectors $\vec{a}$ and $\vec{b}$ given by $\left\langle \vec{\sigma}^A \cdot \vec{a} \otimes \vec{\sigma}^B \cdot \vec{b} \right\rangle_Q = -\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}$ for the singlet state.

Note that the proof of the CHSH Bell inequality is based on the LHVT form (2) for the joint probability. It *cannot* be proved from the NLHVT form (4), though as we will see in Sect 3.2, the CHSH Bell inequality *can* be proved based on the *two* observable per sub-system NLHVT joint probability form (15).

Thus in some Bell inequalities (such as the *CHSH inequalities* [6]) quantum states were found in *microscopic* bipartite systems where *failure* of Bell LHVT was *predicted*, and *experiments* ([18], [19]) *agreed* with quantum theory. This was sufficient to rule out *LHVT* accounting for quantum theory *in general*.

2.4 Origin of LHVT Expression

The origin of the LHVT joint probability expression (2) is explained in Ref [9]. Consider two *events* - *A* being the measurement of observable Ω_A with outcome α and *B* being the measurement of observable Ω_B with outcome β , where in both cases when the hidden variables are λ . These events have a joint

probability $P(B, A)$ for *both* occurring, whilst the probability of the *separate* events are $P(A)$, $P(B)$. Consider a situation (such as may occur when the events occur for separate widely separated sub-systems) where the *conditional probability* $P(B|A)$ for event B occurring *given* that event A occurs has the same probability *as if* event A does *not* occur. This is the situation of *locality*. Here the conditional probability $P(B|A)$ is independent of event A and thus will not depend on the probability $P(A)$ of event A occurring.

$$P(B|A) = P(B) \quad (10)$$

$$P(B, A) = P(B|A)P(A) \quad (11)$$

$$= P(B) \times P(A) = P(A) \times P(B) = P(A, B) \quad (12)$$

after applying Bayes' theorem. Thus the probability $P(B, A) = P(A, B)$ of both events occurring is equal to the product of the probabilities of each separate event occurring, and we obtain the LHVT expression (2)

$$P(\alpha, \beta|\Omega_A, \Omega_B, \lambda)_{LHVT} = P(\alpha|\Omega_A, \lambda)P(\beta|\Omega_B, \lambda) \quad (13)$$

$$P(\alpha, \beta|\Omega_A, \Omega_B, c)_{LHVT} = \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda|c)P(\alpha|\Omega_A, \lambda)P(\beta|\Omega_B, \lambda) \quad (14)$$

after averaging over all hidden variables λ - which occur with probability $P(\lambda|c)$. for preparation process c .

In the case where the hidden variable theory is non-local, the factorisation in Eq.(13) does *not* apply (see Ref [16]) and $P(\alpha|\Omega_A, \lambda)P(\beta|\Omega_B, \lambda)$ would be replaced by $P(\alpha, \beta|\Omega_A, \Omega_B, \lambda)$, as in Eq (4).

2.5 Quantum Entanglement and EPR Steering ?

Bell locality violation also implies that *EPR steering* and *quantum entanglement* both occur. However quantum entanglement or EPR steering can *also* occur for *some* Bell local states ([20], [16], [21], [22], [23]). Although this paper is focused on tests for *Bell locality* violation, Bell tests for *quantum entanglement* or *EPR steering* are also important ([23]). After all, issues regarding these effects were part of the motivation for the search for a theory to underpin quantum theory. For completeness, a brief outline of how LHVT Bell states can be divided into *three* categories with different features for Quantum Entanglement and EPR Steering is set out in Appendix A. The violation of *other* Bell inequalities for LHVT based on this categorisation involving *local hidden quantum states (LHS)* [16] show whether or not *Quantum entanglement* or *EPR steering* is occurring.

Bell inequalities also exist for *multi-partite* systems such as in GHZ states [24] or for measurements at *three* different times as in the *Leggett-Garg inequalities* ([25]). A recent review dealing with Bell correlations in *macroscopic* and *mesoscopic* systems is in Ref.[26]

In the present paper we will be focused on the so-called *CGLMP Bell inequalities* ([7], [8]) for bipartite systems.

3 CGLMP BELL INEQUALITIES

The CGLMP Bell inequalities will now be discussed - both for the *local* hidden variable theory case and for the *non-local* hidden variable theory case. Here we consider the case of a bipartite system in which the two sub-systems may be spatially separated, but now we consider *two* observables per sub-system.

3.1 General CGLMP Considerations

A *bipartite* system with *two* observables per sub-system, based on a *HVT* joint probability $P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}) \equiv C(j, k, l, m)$ for all *four* observables $\Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}$ ([7], [8]) is considered. To *shorten* the notation we may write $\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m \equiv j, k, l, m$. In this bipartite case there are the *same* number d of *outcomes* for each observable listed $0, 1, \dots, d-1$ for each observable listed as j, k, l, m .

CGLMP ([7]) wrote their paper for a *deterministic* version of HVT. Here the hidden variables are the *outcomes* $\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m$ themselves. However, they pointed out that their theory also has a *probabilistic* version, - in which hidden variables λ only determine the probabilities $P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda)$ of the outcomes. for particular λ . In this probabilistic case we would have

$$P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}) = \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda | c) P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) \quad (15)$$

For each HV choice λ the probabilities for all outcomes must add to unity, so $\sum_{jklm} P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) = 1$. This form for $P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2})$ applies for *both* the LHVT and NLHVT situations, with the (below) LHVT form (17) involving a factorisation of $P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda)$.

There is no reason why the HVT cannot be a NLHVT whose basic probability is given by Eq (15) and which involves *two* observables per sub-system. After all, this is consistent with the idea of *realism* in which the hidden variables are the *actual* outcomes $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2$ of the observables $\Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}$ in the *deterministic* version or their *probabilities* $P(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda)$ in the *probabilistic* version with hidden variables λ . Such an approach is the basis of the CGLMP paper. In both probabilistic and deterministic versions the outcomes have a real existence prior to any measurements, as Einstein wanted in any theory underpinning quantum theory. Also in hidden variable theory, the observables are *not* non-commuting Hermitian operators, so it is *legitimate* to have an approach where *all* observables (commuting or non-commuting in quantum theory) have *simultaneous outcomes*. In Bohmian Mechanics the positions and momenta of every particle is ascribed a real existence. Of course for comparison with quantum theory or experiment we must construct expressions that correspond to quantities obtainable from quantum theory formulae or which can be measured. However this can be achieved - as for quantities such as $\langle \Omega_{Ai} \otimes \Omega_{Bj} \rangle$, which in *quantum theory* are given by $Tr(\hat{\Omega}_{Ai} \otimes \hat{\Omega}_{Bj} \hat{\rho})$ or

in *experiment* by repeated measurements on each pair of observables Ω_{A_i} and Ω_{B_j} to determine the mean value of the product of the outcomes.

CGMP also only considered cases where the outcomes for one of the observables for each sub-system was considered - Ω_{A1} or Ω_{A2} for sub-system A and Ω_{B1} or Ω_{B2} for sub-system B . We restrict ourselves to this situation, and hence the only HVT *marginal probabilities* we consider (in the general probabilistic version) are

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\alpha_j, \beta_l | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{B1}) &= \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda | c) \sum_{\alpha_k \beta_m} P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) \\
P(\alpha_k, \beta_{l1} | \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}) &= \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda | c) \sum_{\alpha_j \beta_m} P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) \\
P(\alpha_j, \beta_m | \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B2}) &= \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda | c) \sum_{\alpha_k \beta_l} P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) \\
P(\alpha_k, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{B2}) &= \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda | c) \sum_{\alpha_j \beta_l} P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda)
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

So far we have not specified whether the CGLMP Bell inequalities we consider are based on a *local* or a *non-local* version of HVT. [7] state that they are considering a local version of HVT. This statement is rather puzzling as CGLMP do not express $P(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda)$ or $C(j, k, l, m)$ as the *product* of *separate* sub-system probabilities - which could be either as $P(\alpha_1, \alpha_2 | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}; \lambda)P(\beta_1, \beta_2 | \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda)$ or as $P(\alpha_j | \Omega_{A1}, \lambda)P(\alpha_k | \Omega_{A2}, \lambda)P(\beta_l | \Omega_{B1}, \lambda)P(\beta_m | \Omega_{B2}, \lambda)$. This issue is discussed in an earlier paper on the CGLMP inequalities [27]. It was pointed out there that a theorem by Fine [28] shows that the *marginal probabilities* (such as $P(\alpha_1, \beta_1 | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{B1})$ in Eq (16) can be written in LHVT form. As these marginal probabilities are used to evaluate the quantity S (see Eq (30)) in the CGLMP Bell inequality, it *could* be claimed that CGLMP is based on LHVT and hence a violation of the inequality shows quantum theory can not be underpinned by LHVT. That may be the case, but what we *now* show is that the CGLMP Bell inequality can *also* be established using NLHVT (just as for CHSH) - and hence the inequality - being inconsistent with quantum theory - shows that quantum theory is *also* not underpinned by this non-local hidden variable theory.

The joint probability $P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2})$ in the CGLMP Bell inequality (30) is applied in determining the overall result for four different sets of measurements, each involving one observable for each sub-system. These measurement choices are $(\Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{B1})$, $(\Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1})$, $(\Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B2})$ and $(\Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{B2})$.

For completeness - using the *locality* condition (15) for $P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda)$, we see that the LHVT expression for the joint probability is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}) \\
&= \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda | c) P(\alpha_j | \Omega_{A1}, \lambda) P(\alpha_k | \Omega_{A2}, \lambda) P(\beta_l | \Omega_{B1}, \lambda) P(\beta_m | \Omega_{B2}, \lambda) \tag{17}
\end{aligned}$$

The *marginal probabilities* for joint outcomes of *one* observable for *each* sub-system satisfy *LHVT* conditions [28]. A typical marginal probability for LHVT is $P(\alpha_j, \beta_l | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{B1}) = \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda | c) P(\alpha_j | \Omega_{A1}, \lambda) P(\beta_l | \Omega_{B1}, \lambda)$ - which is obviously of LHVT form. Note that $\sum_{\alpha_k, \beta_m} P(\alpha_k | \Omega_{A2}, \lambda) P(\beta_m | \Omega_{B2}, \lambda) = 1$. For the

NLHVT the results for the marginal probabilities are just given by (16).

Bell inequalities involve the *marginal probabilities* that *two* observables have *same* outcome, such as $P(\Omega_{A1} = \Omega_{B1}) = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} P(\alpha_j, \beta_j | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{B1})$, or two observables have outcomes *shifted* (mod d), such as $P(\Omega_{B1} = \overline{\Omega_{A2} + 1}) = \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} P(\alpha_k, \beta_{k+1(\text{mod } d)} | \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1})$. The shift by mod d is so that $k + 1(\text{mod } d)$ still lies in the range $0, 1, \dots, d - 1$.

A *typical* CGLMP Bell inequality is

$$S = P(\Omega_{A1} = \Omega_{B1}) + P(\Omega_{B1} = \overline{\Omega_{A2} + 1}) + P(\Omega_{A2} = \Omega_{B2}) + P(\Omega_{B2} = \Omega_{A1}) \leq 3 \quad (18)$$

3.2 NLHVT Proof of CHSH Bell Inequality

The proof of the CHSH Bell inequality based on local hidden variable theory is well known [6], and is set out in Ref [9]. However, as the CHSH Bell inequality involves *two* observables per sub-system Ω_{A1}, Ω_{A2} for sub-system A with outcomes α_1, α_2 - and similarly for sub-system B , it is of interest to consider the situation where a general non-local hidden variable theory applies. Here there is a *non-local hidden variable theory* joint probability $P(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2})$ for the measurement of *all four* observables - even though each pair of sub-system observable cannot be simultaneously measured according to quantum theory. Probability conservation gives $\sum_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2} P(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}) = 1$. The question is: Does the CHSH Bell inequality still apply ?

In this case for a probabilistic HVT

$$P(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}) \quad (19)$$

$$= \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda | c) P(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) \quad (20)$$

The *marginal probabilities* for measurement outcomes for *one* observable for

each sub-system would be

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\alpha_1, \beta_1 | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{B1}) &= \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda | c) \sum_{\alpha_2 \beta_2} P(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) \\
P(\alpha_2, \beta_1 | \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}) &= \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda | c) \sum_{\alpha_1 \beta_2} P(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) \\
P(\alpha_1, \beta_2 | \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B2}) &= \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda | c) \sum_{\alpha_2 \beta_1} P(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) \\
P(\alpha_2, \beta_2 | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{B2}) &= \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda | c) \sum_{\alpha_1 \beta_1} P(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda)
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where all *four* choices of the pairs of sub-system observables (Ω_{Aa}, Ω_{Bb}) are considered. Note the sums over the *unrecorded* observable outcomes. These expressions are as (16) with a notation change.

Typical terms in the expression for S can then be obtained. For the first term

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \Omega_{A1} \otimes \Omega_{B1} \rangle_{LHVT} &= \sum_{\alpha_1, \beta_1} \{ \alpha_1 \beta_1 \} P(\alpha_1, \beta_1 | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{B1}) \\
&= \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda | c) \sum_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2} P(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) \{ \alpha_1 \beta_1 \}
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

The other terms are derived similarly.

The quantity S in the CHSH inequality would then be given by

$$\begin{aligned}
S &= \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda | c) \sum_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2} P(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) \{ \alpha_1 \beta_1 + \alpha_1 \beta_2 + \alpha_2 \beta_1 - \alpha_2 \beta_2 \} \\
&= \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda | c) \sum_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2} P(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) \{ \alpha_1 (\beta_1 + \beta_2) + \alpha_2 (\beta_1 - \beta_2) \}
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

In the CHSH case where $\Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}$ are all components of *Pauli spin observables* in spin 1/2 sub-systems, all the *outcomes* are either +1 or -1. In which case $(\beta_1 + \beta_2)$ can either be -2, 0, 0 or +2 and for these situations $(\beta_1 - \beta_2)$ will be 0, +2, -2 or 0 respectively. Thus *one* of the two factors $(\beta_1 + \beta_2)$ or $(\beta_1 - \beta_2)$ will be zero whilst the other has a magnitude of 2. The magnitude of both α_1 and α_2 is 1. Thus in all cases $|\{ \alpha_1 (\beta_1 + \beta_2) + \alpha_2 (\beta_1 - \beta_2) \}| = 2$.

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
|S| &\leq \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda | c) \sum_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2} P(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) \times 2 \\
&\leq 2.
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

as required - using the magnitude of a sum being less than or equal to the sum of the magnitudes.

The CHSH Bell inequality can also be proved based on the LHVT form (17) for the joint probability with *two* observables per sub-system, where $P(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) = P(\alpha_1 | \Omega_{A1}, \lambda) P(\alpha_2 | \Omega_{A2}, \lambda) P(\beta_1 | \Omega_{B1}, \lambda) P(\beta_2 | \Omega_{B2}, \lambda)$. So it is only for the *one* observable per sub-system form (4) for the NLHVT where the CHSH Bell inequality proof fails.

Thus the CHSH inequality *also* holds for this type of NLHVT, so its violation for the singlet state listed in Section 2.3 shows that this type of *non-locality* is *not consistent* with quantum theory. Hence we find the new result that quantum theory *cannot* be underpinned by this type of NLHVT. Evidently, the violation of the CHSH Bell inequality also rules out a very general type of NLHVT as well ! We will find that the same outcome applies when the CGLMP Bell inequalities are considered.

3.3 Observables and Quantum State

We now introduce the quantum theory observables that will be used in the CGLMP inequalities, along with the quantum state which will be used for comparison with HVT predictions - both local and non-local. .

The Bell inequality (18) based on the LHVT expression is *violated* for the quantum theory *maximally entangled state*

$$|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} |j\rangle_A \otimes |j\rangle_B \quad (25)$$

for quantum theory *observables* whose *eigenstates* for *eigenvalues* k, l in the case of observables Ω_{Aa}, Ω_{Bb} ($a, b = 1, 2$) are:

$$\begin{aligned} |k\rangle_{A,a} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \exp i \frac{2\pi}{d} j (k + \theta_a) |j\rangle_A & a = 1, 2 \quad \theta_1 = 0, \theta_2 = 1/2, \\ |l\rangle_{B,b} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \exp i \frac{2\pi}{d} j (-l + \phi_b) |j\rangle_B & b = 1, 2 \quad \phi_1 = 1/4, \phi_2 = -1/4. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Here the $|j\rangle_A$ and $|j\rangle_B$ are orthonormal basis states for sub-systems A, B respectively. Note that the observables Ω_{A1}, Ω_{A2} are *not* assumed to *commute*, neither are Ω_{B1}, Ω_{B2} . These observables are also *not* required to have any *obvious* physical meaning. However the eigenvectors $|k\rangle_{A,a}, |l\rangle_{B,b}$ can be seen

to satisfy the expected *orthonormality conditions* for different k, l . Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle k | k^* \rangle_{A,a} &= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \exp i \frac{2\pi}{d} j (-k + k^*) \\
&= \frac{1}{d} \frac{(1 - \exp i \frac{2\pi}{d} d(-k + k^*))}{(1 - \exp i \frac{2\pi}{d} (-k + k^*))} = 0 \quad \text{if } k \neq k^* \\
&= 1 \quad \text{if } k = k^*
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

with a similar result for $\langle l | l^* \rangle_{B,b}$. Bell non-locality for *above* CGLMP Bell inequality (18) *occurs* for $d = 2$.

The basic *quantum* expressions for the *sub-system probabilities* in the case of the *maximally entangled state* is (see [7])

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\alpha_k, \beta_l | \Omega_{Aa}, \Omega_{Bb}, \rho)_Q &= |(\langle k |_{A,a} \otimes \langle l |_{B,b} | \Psi \rangle)|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{d} \left| \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \langle k |_{A,a} | j \rangle_A | \langle l |_{B,b} | j \rangle_B \right|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{d^3} \left| \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \exp -i \frac{2\pi}{d} j (k + \theta_a) \exp -\frac{2\pi}{d} j (-l + \phi_b) \right|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{d^3} \frac{|(1 - \exp(-i 2\pi(k - l + \theta_a + \phi_b)))|^2}{|(1 - \exp(-i \frac{2\pi}{d}(k - l + \theta_a + \phi_b)))|^2} \\
&= \frac{1}{d^3} \frac{\sin^2(\pi(k - l + \theta_a + \phi_b))}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{d}(k - l + \theta_a + \phi_b))} \\
&= \frac{1}{2d^3} \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{d}(k - l + \theta_a + \phi_b))}
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where we have used $\sin^2(\pi(k - l + \theta_a + \phi_b)) = \{\sin \pi(k - l) \cos \pi(\theta_a + \phi_b) + (\cos \pi(k - l) \sin \pi(\theta_a + \phi_b))\}^2 = \{0 + (\pm 1)(\pm 1/\sqrt{2})\}^2$, noting that the only $\theta_a + \phi_b$ values are $1/4, -1/4, 3/4, 1/4$ and $\sin \pi(1/4) = -\sin \pi(-1/4) = \sin \pi(3/4) = 1/\sqrt{2}$. Also, $(k - l)$ is always an integer.

Macroscopic Bell non-locality *occurs* in *other* CGLMP Bell inequalities for d large. Experimental verification up to $d = 12$ was found by [29].

3.4 NLHVT Case

We now consider a *more general CGLMP Bell inequality* involving

$$S = P(\Omega_{A1}=\overline{\Omega_{B1}+\Delta_{11}})+P(\Omega_{B1}=\overline{\Omega_{A2}+\Delta_{12}})+P(\Omega_{A2}=\overline{\Omega_{B2}+\Delta_{22}})+P(\Omega_{B2}=\overline{\Omega_{A1}+\Delta_{21}}) \quad (30)$$

where the outcome shifts Δ_{ij} are all integers and it is understood that $+\Delta_{ij}$ means $+\Delta_{ij} \pmod d$.

As in the LHVT case, there are two *observables* Ω_{A1}, Ω_{A2} for sub-system A and two observables Ω_{B1}, Ω_{B2} for sub-system B . The *eigenvectors* for all the observables are (26), (27) as for the LHVT case. We will also consider quantum probabilities for the same *maximally entangled state* (25) that was treated in the LHVT case. However, we now use the NLHVT expressions for the probabilities and no longer invoke *locality*.

First we construct the NLHVT expression for S . We have using the *marginal probabilities* in (16)

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \sum_{j,l} P(\alpha_j, \beta_l | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{B1}) \delta_{j,l+\Delta_{11}} + \sum_{k,l} P(\alpha_k, \beta_l | \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}) \delta_{l,k+\Delta_{12}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k,m} P(\alpha_k, \beta_m | \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B2}) \delta_{k,m+\Delta_{22}} + \sum_{j,m} P(\alpha_j, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{B2}) \delta_{m,j+\Delta_{21}} \\ &= \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda|c) \left\{ \begin{aligned} &\sum_{j,l} \sum_{\alpha_k \beta_m} P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) \delta_{j,l+\Delta_{11}} \\ &+ \sum_{k,l} \sum_{\alpha_j \beta_m} P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) \delta_{l,k+\Delta_{12}} \\ &+ \sum_{k,m} \sum_{\alpha_j \beta_l} P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) \delta_{k,m+\Delta_{22}} \\ &+ \sum_{j,m} \sum_{\alpha_k \beta_l} P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) \delta_{m,j+\Delta_{21}} \end{aligned} \right\} \\ &= \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda|c) \left\{ \begin{aligned} &\sum_{jklm} P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) \\ &\times \{ \delta_{j,l+\Delta_{11}} + \delta_{l,k+\Delta_{12}} + \delta_{k,m+\Delta_{22}} + \delta_{m,j+\Delta_{21}} \} \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (31) \end{aligned}$$

Clearly the quantity $\delta = \{ \delta_{j,l+\Delta_{11}} + \delta_{l,k+\Delta_{12}} + \delta_{k,m+\Delta_{22}} + \delta_{m,j+\Delta_{21}} \}$ can have values 4, 3, 2, 1 depending on how many of the Kronecka deltas are equal to 1 rather than 0. We see that the CGLMP Bell inequality in the NLHVT case will just depend on the value for δ

$$\begin{aligned} S &\leq \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda|c) \left\{ \sum_{jklm} P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) \times \delta \right\} \\ &\leq \delta \quad (32) \end{aligned}$$

using $\sum_{j,k,l,m} P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) = 1$ and $\sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda|c) = 1$. In the next Section we determine *sufficiency requirements* on the *shifts* Δ_{ij} for the cases $\delta = 4, 3, 2, 1$.

By comparison with (31) the corresponding expression **if** LHVT applies is

$$S = \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda|c) \left\{ \sum_{j,k,l,m} P(\alpha_j|\Omega_{A1}, \lambda) P(\alpha_k|\Omega_{A2}, \lambda) P(\beta_l|\Omega_{B1}, \lambda) P(\beta_m|\Omega_{B2}, \lambda) \right. \\ \left. \times (\delta_{j,l+\Delta_{11}} + \delta_{l,k+\Delta_{12}} + \delta_{k,m+\Delta_{22}} + \delta_{m,j+\Delta_{21}}) \right\} \quad (33)$$

where here the locality based *factorisation* of $P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m|\Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda)$ occurs. However the *same* sum of Kronecka deltas is present. In this LHVT version we see that we also have

$$S \leq \delta \quad (34)$$

using $\sum_{j,k,l,m} P(\alpha_j|\Omega_{A1}, \lambda) P(\alpha_k|\Omega_{A2}, \lambda) P(\beta_l|\Omega_{B1}, \lambda) P(\beta_m|\Omega_{B2}, \lambda) = 1$ as each factor is equal to 1, for example $\sum_j P(\alpha_j|\Omega_{A1}, \lambda) = 1$.

This means that if the NLHVT is violated by quantum theory, then the LHVT will *also* be violated.

Note that the sum of the joint measurement probabilities where *specific relationships* occur between the *measurement outcomes* for the two sub-systems is in general less than the sum of the joint measurement probabilities for *all* such relationships. Thus $P(\Omega_{A1}=\overline{\Omega_{B1} + \Delta_{11}}) = \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda|c) \sum_{j,l} P(\alpha_j, \beta_l|\Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{B1}, \lambda) \delta_{j,l+\Delta_{11}} \leq \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda|c) \sum_{j,l} P(\alpha_j, \beta_l|\Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{B1}, \lambda) = P(\Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{B1}) = 1$, where $P(\Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{B1})$ is the overall probability for *all* outcomes of joint measurements for the choice Ω_{A1} and Ω_{B1} . Similar considerations apply to $P(\Omega_{B1}=\overline{\Omega_{A2}+\Delta_{12}})$, $P(\Omega_{A2}=\overline{\Omega_{B2} + \Delta_{22}})$ and $P(\Omega_{B2}=\overline{\Omega_{A1} + \Delta_{21}})$.

4 REQUIREMENTS FOR NLHVT BELL INEQUALITIES

First we consider the *conditions* involving the Kroneka deltas involved in the simple CGLMP inequality and the *matrix approach* used to treat them. Since the requirements *only* involve considering the situations where the Kronecka sum δ is given by 4, 3, 2 or 1, it follows that the requirements will be the same for both the LHVT and NLHVT cases.

4.1 Conditions and Basic Matrix Approach

To derive the *sufficiency requirements* on the *outcome shifts* Δ_{ij} for the NLHVT Bell Inequalities (32) we must consider the *conditions* where the various Kronecka deltas are equal to *unity*. These conditions are

$$\begin{aligned} C1 & : & j &= l + \Delta_{11} \\ C2 & : & l &= k + \Delta_{12} \\ C3 & : & k &= m + \Delta_{22} \\ C4 & : & m &= j + \Delta_{21} \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

We will consider *cases* where; Case 1 - *all* of $C1, C2, C3, C4$ are *true* (T); Case 2 - *three* of $C1, C2, C3, C4$ are true and *one* is *false* (F); Case 3 - *two* of $C1, C2, C3, C4$ are true and *two* are false; Case 4 - *one* of $C1, C2, C3, C4$ is true and *three* are false. For these four Cases, there are a number of *Sub-Cases* depending on which of $C1, C2, C3, C4$ are *true* and which are *false* - one for Case 1, four for Case 2, six for Case 3 and four for Case 4. For the four Cases the value of $\delta = (\delta_{j,l+\Delta_{11}} + \delta_{l,k+\Delta_{12}} + \delta_{k,m+\Delta_{22}} + \delta_{m,j+\Delta_{21}})$ are the same for every Sub-Case, namely $\delta = 4, 3, 2, 1$. for Cases 1, 2, 3, 4 respectively. As described in Sect.3.4 for these four Cases the values of δ are used to determine the Bell inequality $S \leq \delta$ (32) using Eq. (31) for S (defined in Eq. (30)). However, the *requirements* on the *shifts* Δ_{ij} for each *Sub-Case* will be *different*, and these are set out below. Details are given in Appendix B. .

To derive these requirements it turns out that we must consider matrix equations of the form

$$M \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{\Delta} \tag{36}$$

where M is a square matrix and $\mathbf{v}$ is a column vector whose elements are some (or all) of the integers j, k, l, m and $\mathbf{\Delta}$ is a column vector whose elements are sums of the various Δ_{ij} . We will use the result that if the *determinant* of M is zero ($|M| = 0$) then there is only a possible solution for $\mathbf{v}$ if *all* the elements of the corresponding $\mathbf{\Delta}$ are zero. This will then lead to a set of *requirements* on the shifts Δ_{ij} to lead to Bell inequalities: $S \leq 4, S \leq 3, S \leq 2, S \leq 1$ for each Sub-Case of the Cases 1, 2, 3, 4. Note that we merely have to have *one* element of $\mathbf{\Delta}$ **to be non-zero** to show there is *no* solution for $\mathbf{v}$.

The key point is that the CGLMP Bell Inequalities are of the form $S \leq \delta$, so they *only* depend on the *number* of the conditions $C1, C2, C3, C4$ that are satisfied. The *basic strategy* for each Sub Case is to take each condition that is required to be *False*, then substitute the conditions that are required to be *True* into these to arrive at the *matrix equation* (36) for the *remaining* indices from j, k, l, m and then *identify* the column vector Δ for this Sub-Case. We then show that the determinant $|M|$ is zero. As then there is to be *no solution* for the conditions that are *False*, we then obtain the requirement that *at least one* of the elements of Δ is non-zero. Hence the requirement for each Sub-Case will be a list of *And/Or* statements. Each statement is a set of *And/Or inequalities* (or an equality in the Case of $S \leq 4$) arranged in *rows* for the various Sub-Cases, and involving the *outcome shifts* $(\Delta_{11}, \Delta_{12}, \Delta_{22}, \Delta_{21})$. If **at least one** of these these inequalities are satisfied in *every row*, then we have obtained *sufficiency requirements* to show $S \leq \delta$ for the Case involved. Note that we do not obtain *necessity requirements*, as a particular set of outcome shifts $(\Delta_{11}, \Delta_{12}, \Delta_{22}, \Delta_{21})$ may provide sufficiency requirements for *more than one* of $S \leq 3, S \leq 2$ and $S \leq 1$. If more than one is satisfied then the *overall* NLHVT prediction is $S \leq$ the *smallest* of 3, 2, 1 satisfied. This is logical since if for the outcome shifts $(\Delta_{11}, \Delta_{12}, \Delta_{22}, \Delta_{21})$ we can show that $S \leq 3, S \leq 2$ and $S \leq 1$ then overall we have $S \leq 1$. The Case of $S \leq 4$ is an exception, as we will see. Sufficiency requirements for $S \leq 4$ are incompatible with those for $S \leq 3, S \leq 2$ and $S \leq 1$.

4.2 Requirements for Bell Inequality Tests

These Sub-Case requirements are derived in Appendix B for all Sub-Cases of the four Cases. These are summarised below in Eqs. (37), (38), (39) and (40). The *resulting requirements* for the four Cases is based on the distinct Sub-Case requirements and *must* cover all Sub-Cases to constitute *sufficient* (rather than *necessary*) requirements for concluding that according to our general NLHVT we have S satisfying $S \leq 4, S \leq 3, S \leq 2$ or $S \leq 1$. These requirements are set out below in Eqs. (37), (38), (39) and (40) respectively. In deriving these results we have used $\sum_{j,k,l,m} P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) = 1$

$$\text{and } \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda|c) = 1.$$

4.2.1 Case1 - $S \leq 4$

The requirements for the single Sub-Case are

$$\Delta_{11} = 0 \quad \text{And} \quad \Delta_{12} = 0 \quad \text{And} \quad \Delta_{22} = 0 \quad \text{And} \quad \Delta_{21} = 0 \quad (37)$$

If *all* these requirements are satisfied the Bell inequality $S \leq 4$ would be guaranteed. Note that if these requirements are satisfied then those for $S \leq 3, S \leq 2, S \leq 1$ are not.

4.2.2 Case 2 - $S \leq 3$

The requirements for all four Sub-Cases are the same

$$\Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} \neq 0 \quad \text{Sub - Cases } a, b, c, d \quad (38)$$

If this requirement applies the Bell inequality $S \leq 3$ would be satisfied.

4.2.3 Case 3 - $S \leq 2$

The requirements for the six different Sub-Cases are

$$\begin{array}{llll} \Delta_{22} \neq 0 & \text{And/Or} & \Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} \neq 0 & \text{Sub - Case } a \\ \Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} \neq 0 & \text{And/Or} & \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} \neq 0 & \text{Sub - Case } b \\ \Delta_{12} \neq 0 & \text{And/Or} & \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} \neq 0 & \text{Sub - Case } c \\ \Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} \neq 0 & \text{And/Or} & \Delta_{21} \neq 0 & \text{Sub - Case } d \\ \Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} \neq 0 & \text{And/Or} & \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} \neq 0 & \text{Sub - Case } e \\ \Delta_{11} \neq 0 & \text{And/Or} & \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} \neq 0 & \text{Sub - Case } f \end{array} \quad (39)$$

Since we wish to *guarantee* that the Bell inequality $S \leq 2$ would occur irrespective of the Sub-Case, we can be *certain* of this by checking for a given set of *outcome shifts* $(\Delta_{11}, \Delta_{12}, \Delta_{22}, \Delta_{21})$ that *at least one* of the *distinct* inequalities in *each row* of the last equation is satisfied. For example, the requirements $\Delta_{11} \neq 0, \Delta_{12} \neq 0, \Delta_{22} \neq 0$ and $\Delta_{21} \neq 0$ would satisfy the requirements for Sub-Cases (a), (c), (d) and (f) but not those for Sub-Cases (b) and (e), so with these four requirements **alone** we cannot conclude that $S \leq 2$.

4.2.4 Case 4 - $S \leq 1$

The requirements for the four different Sub-Cases are

$$\begin{array}{llllll} \Delta_{12} \neq 0 & \text{And/Or} & \Delta_{22} \neq 0 & \text{And/Or} & \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} \neq 0 & \text{Sub - Case } a \\ \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{12} \neq 0 & \text{And/Or} & \Delta_{22} \neq 0 & \text{And/Or} & \Delta_{21} \neq 0 & \text{Sub - Case } b \\ \Delta_{11} \neq 0 & \text{And/Or} & \Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} \neq 0 & \text{And/Or} & \Delta_{21} \neq 0 & \text{Sub - Case } c \\ \Delta_{11} \neq 0 & \text{And/Or} & \Delta_{12} \neq 0 & \text{And/Or} & \Delta_{22} + \Delta_{21} \neq 0 & \text{Sub - Case } d \end{array} \quad (40)$$

Since we wish to *guarantee* that the Bell inequality $S \leq 1$ would occur irrespective of the sub-case, we can be *certain* of this by checking for a given set of outcome shifts $(\Delta_{11}, \Delta_{12}, \Delta_{22}, \Delta_{21})$ that *at least one* of the *distinct* inequalities in *each row* of the last equation are satisfied.

4.3 Example

As an example of what happens for a particular choice of outcome shifts we choose the case $(\Delta_{11}, \Delta_{12}, \Delta_{22}, \Delta_{21}) = (1, -2, 1, -2)$. It is obvious that the requirement for $S \leq 4$ is not satisfied.

We substitute the numerical values into Eqs. (38), (39) and (40) .

For $S \leq 3$ (all Sub-Case) we see that $\Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} = (-2) \neq 0$ as required.

For $S \leq 2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{22} &= (2) \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} = (-3) \neq 0 && \text{Sub - Case a} \\
\Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} &= (-1) \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} = (-1) \neq 0 && \text{Sub - Case b} \\
\Delta_{12} &\neq (-2) \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} = (0) \neq 0 && \text{Sub - Case c} \\
\Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} &= (0) \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{21} = (-2) \neq 0 && \text{Sub - Case d} \\
\Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} &= (-1) \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} = (-1) \neq 0 && \text{Sub - Case e} \\
\Delta_{11} &= (1) \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} = (-3) \neq 0 && \text{Sub - Case f}
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

so as there is at least one inequality satisfied for each Sub-Case we see that the requirements for $S \leq 2$ are satisfied.

For $S \leq 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{12} &= (-2) \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{22} = (1) \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} = (-1) \neq 0 && \text{Sub - Case a} \\
\Delta_{11} + \Delta_{12} &= (-1) \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{22} = (1) \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{21} = (-2) \neq 0 && \text{Sub - Case b} \\
\Delta_{11} &= (1) \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} = (-1) \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{21} = (-2) \neq 0 && \text{Sub - Case c} \\
\Delta_{11} &= (1) \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{12} = (-2) \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{22} + \Delta_{21} = (-1) \neq 0 && \text{Sub - Case d}
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

so as there is at least one inequality satisfied for each Sub-Case we see that the requirements for $S \leq 1$ are satisfied.

Thus, the requirements for $S \leq 3$, $S \leq 2$ and $S \leq 1$ are all satisfied and we can conclude overall that NLHVT predicts $S \leq 1$ for this choice of outcome shifts.

4.4 Quantum Theory Test

Here we compare the quantum theory expressions for S with those from NLHVT based on a specific choice for the Δ_{ij} .

In QTHY the result for the quantity S is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
S &= \sum_{jl} P(\alpha_j, \beta_l | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{B1}, \rho)_Q \delta_{j,l+\Delta_{11}} + \sum_{kl} P(\alpha_k, \beta_l | \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \rho)_Q \delta_{l,k+\Delta_{12}} \\
&\quad + \sum_{km} P(\alpha_k, \beta_m | \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B2}, \rho)_Q \delta_{k,m+\Delta_{22}} + \sum_{jm} P(\alpha_j, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{B2}, \rho)_Q \delta_{m,j+\Delta_{21}}
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

and using the QTHY result (29) for $P(\alpha_k, \beta_l | \Omega_{Aa}, \Omega_{Bb}, \rho)_Q$ in the case of the *maximally entangled state* we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
S &= \frac{1}{2d^3} \sum_{jl} \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{d}(j-l+\theta_1+\phi_1))} \delta_{j,l+\Delta_{11}} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2d^3} \sum_{kl} \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{d}(k-l+\theta_2+\phi_1))} \delta_{l,k+\Delta_{12}} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2d^3} \sum_{km} \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{d}(k-m+\theta_2+\phi_2))} \delta_{k,m+\Delta_{22}} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2d^3} \sum_{jm} \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{d}(j-m+\theta_1+\phi_2))} \delta_{m,j+\Delta_{21}} \\
&= \frac{1}{2d^3} \sum_l \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{d}(\Delta_{11}+\theta_1+\phi_1))} + \frac{1}{2d^3} \sum_l \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{d}(-\Delta_{12}+\theta_2+\phi_1))} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2d^3} \sum_m \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{d}(\Delta_{22}+\theta_2+\phi_2))} + \frac{1}{2d^3} \sum_m \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{d}(-\Delta_{21}+\theta_1+\phi_2))} \\
&= \frac{1}{2d^2} \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{d}(\Delta_{11}+\theta_1+\phi_1))} + \frac{1}{2d^2} \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{d}(-\Delta_{12}+\theta_2+\phi_1))} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2d^2} \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{d}(\Delta_{22}+\theta_2+\phi_2))} + \frac{1}{2d^2} \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{d}(-\Delta_{21}+\theta_1+\phi_2))}
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

for S in the *QTHY approach*. Note that adding an integer multiple of d to the Δ_{ij} does not alter the result.

Note that although the four sets of measurements for the result for S involve *one pair* of the two sub-system observables at a time - $(\Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{B1})$, $(\Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{B1})$, $(\Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{B1})$ or $(\Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{B1})$ the outcomes for the *other pair* of observables are *disregarded*. In an earlier paper [8] we pointed out that although for HVT (which involves non-quantum observables) the way the other pair of observable outcomes was disregarded was unambiguous, this was *not* the case in quantum theory. Options included (a) not measuring the other pair observables at all (b) measuring the other pair of observables and then discarding the results - and this could be done in *two ways* depending on whether the disregarded observables were measured *first or second*. The quantum expressions differ for (a) and (b) since the latter involve a projection operation into the space of the disregarded observables. Any of these would be a possible quantum prediction for comparison purposes. However, as it is only necessary to show HVT is inconsistent with *one* possible quantum prediction we choose the simplest option, namely that in each term the other observables are *not measured* at all. This was the choice made by CGLMP and Eq (29) for the quantum theory expression $P(\alpha_k, \beta_l | \Omega_{Aa}, \Omega_{Bb}, \rho)_Q$ is determined this way.

We could choose as a special case Δ_{ij} in the form $\Delta_{ij} = d \times \Delta_{ij}^*$ where the Δ_{ij}^* are all integers. In this case, using $\sin^2(\pi\Delta_{ij}^* + \eta) = (\sin(\pi\Delta_{ij}^*) \cos(\eta) +$

$\cos(\pi\Delta_{ij}^*)\sin(\eta))^2 = \sin^2(\eta)$ in Eq (44), we obtain for the *QTHY approach*

$$\begin{aligned}
S &= \frac{1}{2d^2} \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{d}(d\Delta_{11}^* + \frac{1}{4}))} + \frac{1}{2d^2} \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{d}(-d\Delta_{12}^* + \frac{3}{4}))} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2d^2} \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{d}(d\Delta_{22}^* + \frac{1}{4}))} + \frac{1}{2d^2} \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{d}(-d\Delta_{21}^* - \frac{1}{4}))} \\
&= \frac{1}{2d^2} \left(\frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{4d})} + \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{3\pi}{4d})} + \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{4d})} + \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{4d})} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2d^2} \left(\frac{3}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{4d})} + \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{3\pi}{4d})} \right) \tag{45}
\end{aligned}$$

We have used the values $a = 1, 2$ $\theta_1 = 0, \theta_2 = 1/2$ and $b = 1, 2$ $\phi_1 = 1/4, \phi_2 = -1/4$ from Eqs (26), (27) for the eigenvectors. This last result shows that in quantum theory the value of S is *independent* of the Δ_{ij}^* . It only depends on the integer d . The NLHVT Bell inequalities for S do of course depend on the Δ_{ij}^* .

For the choice $d = 10$ we find that in QTHY $S \approx 2.52$, so this exceeds $S = 2$ and $S = 1$ though not $S = 4$ and $S = 3$ that could occur in NLHVT depending on the requirements for these cases being met. For the choice $(\Delta_{11}^*, \Delta_{12}^*, \Delta_{22}^*, \Delta_{21}^*) = (1, -2, 1, -2)$ it is easily confirmed that the requirements for $S \leq 4$ are *not* met. However the requirements for $S \leq 3$, for $S \leq 2$ and for $S \leq 1$ are **all** met. . Other choices are also be made. For example with $(\Delta_{11}^*, \Delta_{12}^*, \Delta_{22}^*, \Delta_{21}^*) = (1, -3, 1, -3)$ it is easily confirmed that the requirements for $S \leq 4$ are *not* met. However the requirements for $S \leq 3, S \leq 2$ and $S \leq 1$ are *all* met. In both these situations NLHVT predicts $S \leq 1$ - this being the smallest of the three inequalities. Thus we have found cases for $d = 10$ where the *quantum theory* prediction that $S = 2.52$ is *inconsistent* with the *NLHVT Bell inequality* prediction of $S \leq 1$.

We could also choose $(\Delta_{11}, \Delta_{12}, \Delta_{22}, \Delta_{21}) = (0, 1, 0, 0)$ as in the original CGLMP Bell inequality (18). For this choice the requirements for $S \leq 3$, for $S \leq 2$ and for $S \leq 1$ are **all** met. .In this case the CGLMP Bell inequality predicts $S \leq 1$. For this choice the QTHY expression for S is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
S &= \frac{1}{2d^2} \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{d}(\frac{1}{4}))} + \frac{1}{2d^2} \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{d}(-1 + \frac{3}{4}))} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2d^2} \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{d}(\frac{1}{4}))} + \frac{1}{2d^2} \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{d}(-\frac{1}{4}))} \\
&= \frac{2}{d^2} \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{4d})} \tag{46}
\end{aligned}$$

For the case of $d = 2$ this gives $S = 3.41$. For the choice $(\Delta_{11}, \Delta_{12}, \Delta_{22}, \Delta_{21}) = (0, 1, 0, 0)$ the requirements for $S \leq 4$ are *not* met, but those for $S \leq 1$ are met,.However NLHVT is inconsistent with QTHY in this choice of $(\Delta_{11}, \Delta_{12}, \Delta_{22}, \Delta_{21})$ - as it was for LHVT where in both types of HVT the inequality $S \leq 1$ is violated in Q THY.

5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

A brief review of the origins of local hidden variable theory, Bell local states and Bell inequalities has been presented. We have also outlined the basic justification for LHVT. The classification of Bell local states into three categories based on the *local hidden quantum state* approach of Wiseman [16] has been explained. We outlined how the Bell inequalities provide tests for whether local hidden variable theory is in conflict with quantum theory and also which categories of Bell local states exhibit quantum entanglement or EPR steering.

The new result in this paper is that a Bell-type *non-local* hidden variable theory has been presented, and Bell inequalities obtained based on this NLHVT. This is based on the approach of Collins, Gisin, Linden, Massar Popescu (CGLMP) for *bipartite* systems, where the basic joint probability involves the outcomes for two observables for each sub-system. In addition to showing that the well-known CHSH inequality can also be proved for such a NLHVT, we have also considered CGLMP Bell inequalities involving the quantity S that involves joint probabilities for outcomes from a *pair* of sub-system observables, *one* in each sub-system. *Sufficiency* conditions for the *outcome shifts* have been obtained for CGLMP inequalities $S \leq 4, S \leq 3, S \leq 2$ and $S \leq 1$. It has been shown that in a *maximally entangled* state in a bipartite system clear *quantum theory* violations of these CGLMP Bell inequalities occur, thus showing that it is *not possible* to underpin or complete quantum theory via a CGLMP Bell-type non-local hidden variable theory. The same sufficiency conditions also show that there is *also* a quantum theory violation for the CGLMP version of LHVT.

It should be pointed out that the observables chosen have *no obvious* physical meaning. Also the experimental measurements for the NLHVT Bell inequality terms would *difficult to perform*. Nor would the maximally entangled state be *easy to prepare*. However these issues are *irrelevant* as all that is needed is that the observables are *possible* quantum observables, the state is a *possible* quantum state and the Bell inequality measurements *could* be carried out.

The result that a Bell-type non-local hidden variable theory is also in conflict with quantum theory is of *some significance* since it shows that quantum theory *can not* be understood in terms of Bell-type hidden variable theory. This is *irrespective* of whether the hidden variable theory is *local* or *non-local*.

6 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to acknowledge discussions on quantum foundations with several colleagues - M Reid, S Barnett, B Garraway, L Heaney, J Goold, T Busch, L Rosales, R Teh, B Opanchuk and P Drummond.

7 APPENDIX A - LOCAL HIDDEN QUANTUM STATES, ENTANGLEMENT & EPR STEERING

Quantum states can be divided into *entangled* and *separable* states, but in *LHVT* can also be divided into *Bell local* and *Bell non-local* states. These categories *overlap* [20].

7.1 Separable States

For *separable* states, prepare *sub-systems* A, B in *quantum states* $\hat{\rho}_R^A, \hat{\rho}_R^B$, where *combined* state $\hat{\rho}_R^A \otimes \hat{\rho}_R^B$ occurs with *classical probability* P_R [20]. With density opr $\hat{\rho}_{sep} = \sum_R P_R \hat{\rho}_R^A \otimes \hat{\rho}_R^B$ and $P(\alpha|\Omega_A, R) = \text{Tr}_A(\hat{\Pi}_\alpha^A \hat{\rho}_R^A)$ etc., joint outcome prob is given by a *LHVT form*:

$$P(\alpha, \beta|\Omega_A, \Omega_B, \rho_{sep})_Q = \sum_R P_R P(\alpha|\Omega_A, R) \times P(\beta|\Omega_B, R) \quad (47)$$

This is of the *same form* as for Bell local states, showing that all *separable* states are *Bell-local* ($R \rightarrow \lambda$). Hence *Bell non-local* states must be *entangled*.

However, *some* Bell local states are also *entangled* [20]. For *Bell-local* states which are *separable*, *both* sub-systems are associated with a *quantum* density operator. Hence idea of a *local hidden quantum state (LHQS)* was introduced [16], [21], [22].

7.2 Local Hidden Quantum State

Bell-local states in bipartite systems can be further divided into *three* disjoint categories, depending on *two, one* or *none* of the sub-systems being associated with a *local hidden quantum state* [16], [21], [22]. LHQS $\hat{\rho}_C(\lambda)$ are to be *possible* quantum states – these must comply with conditions such as the *super-selection rules* of there being *no coherences* between states with *differing* (massive) particle numbers.

7.3 Bell-Local States - Three Categories

For the *bipartite* case - there are *three* categories of *Bell-local* states

$$\begin{aligned} P(\alpha, \beta|\Omega_A, \Omega_B, c)_{LHVT} &= \sum_\lambda P_Q(\alpha|\Omega_A, \lambda) P_Q(\beta|\Omega_B, \lambda) P(\lambda|c) & \text{Cat 1} \\ P(\alpha, \beta|\Omega_A, \Omega_B, c)_{LHVT} &= \sum_\lambda P(\alpha|\Omega_A, \lambda) P_Q(\beta|\Omega_B, \lambda) P(\lambda|c) & \text{Cat 2} \\ P(\alpha, \beta|\Omega_A, \Omega_B, c)_{LHVT} &= \sum_\lambda P(\alpha|\Omega_A, \lambda) P(\beta|\Omega_B, \lambda) P(\lambda|c) & \text{Cat 3} \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where subscript Q indicates sub-system measurement probability determined from a *local hidden quantum state* $\hat{\rho}_C(\lambda)$, via $P_Q(\gamma|\Omega_C, \lambda) = \text{Tr}_C(\hat{\Pi}_\gamma^C \hat{\rho}_C(\lambda))$. Bell inequalities will *differ* depending on whether there are sub-systems associated with a LHQS.

7.4 Tests for Quantum Entanglement and EPR Steering

For the case of *two modes*, we introduce *spin operators* $S_x = \frac{1}{2}(b^\dagger a + a^\dagger b)$, $S_y = \frac{1}{2i}(b^\dagger a - a^\dagger b)$, $S_z = \frac{1}{2}(b^\dagger b - a^\dagger a)$.

Category 1 states are *same* as *separable* states since *both* sub-system probabilities are given by quantum expressions. Violation of *inequalities* based on Category 1 states $\rightarrow$ *Quantum entanglement* (non-separability) occurs. Example: *Spin squeezing* test for *two mode* entanglement [30] $\langle \Delta S_x^2 \rangle < \frac{1}{2} |\langle S_z \rangle|$ or $|\langle \Delta S_y^2 \rangle| < \frac{1}{2} |\langle S_z \rangle|$.

For *Category 2* states only *one* sub-system probability (B) is given by quantum expression involving *LHS* quantum density operator $-\hat{\rho}^B(\lambda)$. Here no EPR steering of B by A occurs $\rightarrow$ Outcomes β for Ω_B depend *only* on $\hat{\rho}_B(\lambda)$ – *not* on α, Ω_A . Violation of *inequalities* based on Category 2 states $\rightarrow$ *EPR steering* of B outcomes by A measurement occurs. Example: generalised Hillary-Zubairy *planar spin variance* test for *two mode* EPR steering [31], [23]. $\langle \Delta S_x^2 \rangle + \langle \Delta S_y^2 \rangle < (\frac{1}{4} \langle N \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle S_z \rangle)$.

7.5 Tests for Bell Non-Locality

For *Category 3* states *neither* of sub-system probabilities given by quantum expression - no *local hidden quantum state*. . *Inequality* violations based on Category 3 states $\rightarrow$ *Bell locality cannot* apply. Example: *CHSH Bell Inequality (above)* for *two spin 1/2* systems. Thus *Bell non-locality* is shown by violations of inequalities based on

$$P(\alpha, \beta | \Omega_A, \Omega_B, c)_{LHVT} = \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda | c) P(\alpha | \Omega_A, \lambda) P(\beta | \Omega_B, \lambda) \quad (49)$$

7.6 Bell - Non-Local States

A *fourth* category of states are the *Bell non-local* states.

$$P(\alpha, \beta | \Omega_A, \Omega_B, c)_{NLHVT} = \sum_{\lambda} P(\alpha, \beta | \Omega_A, \Omega_B, \lambda) P(\lambda | c) \quad \text{Cat 4} \quad (50)$$

Here there is no *separate* $P(\gamma | \Omega_C, \lambda)$ for each sub-system. Violation of inequalities based on Category 4 states show that *non-local hidden variable theories* also *fail*.

Figure 1: The classification of hidden variable Bell local states into three categories, plus the hidden variable Bell non-local states. Also the classification of quantum states as separable and entangled. The features of the various types of states are stated.

7.7 Overall Scheme

The *overall scheme* can be pictured as (see [27], [23]) Here we have *assumed* that Quantum Theory is underpinned by Hidden Variable Theory - local or non-local and that Bell non-local states are quantum entangled states. The issue of whether or not quantum theory is underpinned by a non-local hidden variable theory is the focus of the main part of this paper.

8 APPENDIX B - REQUIREMENTS FOR BELL TESTS

In this Appendix we will derive the requirements for Bell Inequality tests in the NLHVT situation.

8.1 Case 1 - Bell Inequality - All Conditions T

If $C1 = T, C2 = T, C3 = T, C4 = T$ we then have

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} j \\ k \\ l \\ m \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_{11} \\ \Delta_{12} \\ \Delta_{22} \\ \Delta_{21} \end{bmatrix} \quad (51)$$

As $|M| = 0$ there is only a non-zero solution for $\mathbf{v}$ if the following *requirements* are satisfied

$$\Delta_{11} = 0 \quad \Delta_{12} = 0 \quad \Delta_{22} = 0 \quad \Delta_{21} = 0 \quad (52)$$

This solution is $j = k = l = m$ and here we have $\delta = 4$

Hence applying this result for δ in Eq. (31)

$$\begin{aligned} S &\leq \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda|c) \left\{ \sum_{j,k,l,m} P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) (4) \right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda|c) (4) \\ &\leq 4 \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

The Bell inequality is then $S \leq 4$.

8.2 Case 2 - Bell Inequality - Three Conditions T, One F

Here there are *four* sub-cases. In all of these sub-cases we have $\delta = 3$.

8.2.1 Sub-Case a - $C1 = T, C2 = T, C3 = T, C4 = F$

Substituting $C1, C2, C3$ into $C4$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} m &= j + \Delta_{21} \\ &= l + \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} \\ &= k + \Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} \\ &= m + \Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

As $C4 = F$ it follows that the last equation is false. Hence the following requirement must be satisfied

$$\Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} \neq 0 \quad (55)$$

8.2.2 Sub-Case b - $C1 = T, C2 = T, C3 = F, C4 = T$

Substituting $C1, C2, C4$ into $C3$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} k &= m + \Delta_{22} \\ &= j + \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} \\ &= l + \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} \\ &= k + \Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

As $C3 = F$ it follows that the last equation is false. Hence the following requirement must be satisfied

$$\Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} \neq 0 \quad (57)$$

8.2.3 Sub-Case c - $C1 = T, C2 = F, C3 = T, C4 = T$

The requirement and the Bell inequality is the same as for Sub-Cases a and b.

8.2.4 Sub-Case d - $C1 = F, C2 = T, C3 = T, C4 = T$

The requirement and the Bell inequality is the same as for Sub-Cases a, b and c.

8.2.5 All Sub-Cases of Case 2

Overall, we see that if the requirement is satisfied, we can say $\delta = 3$.

Hence applying this result for δ in Eq. (31)

$$\begin{aligned} S &\leq \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda|c) \left\{ \sum_{j,k,l,m} P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) (3) \right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda|c) (3) \\ &\leq 3 \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

From above the following requirement must be satisfied for Case 2 to cover all sub-cases.

$$\Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} \neq 0 \quad (59)$$

The Bell inequality is then $S \leq 3$.

8.3 Case 3 - Bell Inequality - Two Conditions T, Two Conditions F

Here there are *six* sub-cases. In all of these sub-cases $\delta = 2$.

8.3.1 Sub-Case a $C1 = T, C2 = T, C3 = F, C4 = F$

Substituting $C1, C2$ into $C3, C4$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} k &= m + \Delta_{22} \\ m &= j + \Delta_{21} \\ &= l + \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} \\ &= k + \Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

Thus we have the matrix equation

$$\begin{bmatrix} +1 & -1 \\ -1 & +1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} k \\ m \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_{22} \\ \Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} \end{bmatrix} \tag{61}$$

Since $C3 = F, C4 = F$ we require there *not* to be a solution.

As $|M| = 0$ there is *not* a non-zero solution for $\mathbf{v}$ if the following *requirements* are satisfied

$$\Delta_{22} \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} \neq 0 \tag{62}$$

8.3.2 Sub-Case b $C1 = T, C2 = F, C3 = T, C4 = F$

Substituting $C1, C3$ into $C2, C4$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} l &= k + \Delta_{12} \\ &= m + \Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} \\ m &= j + \Delta_{21} \\ &= l + \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} \end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

Thus we have the matrix equation

$$\begin{bmatrix} +1 & -1 \\ -1 & +1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} l \\ m \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} \\ \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} \end{bmatrix} \tag{64}$$

Since $C2 = F, C4 = F$ we require there *not* to be a solution.

As $|M| = 0$ there is *not* a non-zero solution for $\mathbf{v}$ if the following *requirements* are satisfied

$$\Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} \neq 0 \tag{65}$$

8.3.3 Sub-Case c $C1 = T, C2 = F, C3 = F, C4 = T$

Substituting $C1, C4$ into $C2, C3$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} l &= k + \Delta_{12} \\ k &= m + \Delta_{22} \\ &= j + \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} \\ &= l + \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

Thus we have the marix equation

$$\begin{bmatrix} -1 & +1 \\ +1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} k \\ l \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_{12} \\ \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} \end{bmatrix} \quad (67)$$

Since $C2 = F, C3 = F$ we require there *not* to be a solution.

As $|M| = 0$ there is *not* a non-zero solution for $\mathbf{v}$ if the following *requirements* are satisfied

$$\Delta_{12} \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} \neq 0 \quad (68)$$

8.3.4 Sub-Case d $C1 = F, C2 = T, C3 = T, C4 = F$

Substituting $C2, C3$ into $C1, C4$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} j &= l + \Delta_{11} \\ &= k + \Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} \\ &= m + \Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} \\ m &= j + \Delta_{21} \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

Thus we have the marix equation

$$\begin{bmatrix} +1 & -1 \\ -1 & +1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} j \\ m \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} \\ \Delta_{21} \end{bmatrix} \quad (70)$$

Since $C1 = F, C4 = F$ we require there *not* to be a solution.

As $|M| = 0$ there is *not* a non-zero solution for $\mathbf{v}$ if the following *requirements* are satisfied

$$\Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{21} \neq 0 \quad (71)$$

8.3.5 Sub-Case e $C1 = F, C2 = T, C3 = F, C4 = T$

Substituting $C2, C4$ into $C1, C3$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} j &= l + \Delta_{11} \\ &= k + \Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} \\ k &= m + \Delta_{22} \\ &= j + \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

Thus we have the marix equation

$$\begin{bmatrix} +1 & -1 \\ -1 & +1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} j \\ k \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} \\ \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} \end{bmatrix} \quad (73)$$

Since $C1 = F, C3 = F$ we require there *not* to be a solution.

As $|M| = 0$ there is *not* a non-zero solution for $\mathbf{v}$ if the following *requirements* are satisfied

$$\Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} \neq 0 \quad (74)$$

8.3.6 Sub-Case f $C1 = F, C2 = F, C3 = T, C4 = T$

Substituting $C3, C4$ into $C1, C2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} j &= l + \Delta_{11} \\ l &= k + \Delta_{12} \\ &= m + \Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} \\ &= j + \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

Thus we have the marix equation

$$\begin{bmatrix} -1 & +1 \\ -1 & +1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} l \\ j \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_{11} \\ \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} \end{bmatrix} \quad (76)$$

Since $C1 = F, C2 = F$ we require there *not* to be a solution.

As $|M| = 0$ there is *not* a non-zero solution for $\mathbf{v}$ if the following *requirements* are satisfied

$$\Delta_{11} \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} \neq 0 \quad (77)$$

8.3.7 All Sub-Cases of Case 3

Overall, we see that if the requirement is satisfied, we can say $\delta = 2$.

Hence applying this value of δ in Eq. (31)

$$\begin{aligned} S &\leq \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda|c) \left\{ \sum_{j,k,l,m} P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) (2) \right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda|c) (2) \\ &\leq 2 \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

From above the following *requirements* must be satisfied for Case 3 to cover all sub-cases.

$$\begin{array}{llll}
\Delta_{22} \neq 0 & \text{And/Or} & \Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} \neq 0 & \text{Sub - Case a} \\
\Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} \neq 0 & \text{And/Or} & \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} \neq 0 & \text{Sub - Case b} \\
\Delta_{12} \neq 0 & \text{And/Or} & \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} \neq 0 & \text{Sub - Case c} \\
\Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} \neq 0 & \text{And/Or} & \Delta_{21} \neq 0 & \text{Sub - Case d} \\
\Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} \neq 0 & \text{And/Or} & \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} \neq 0 & \text{Sub - Case e} \\
\Delta_{11} \neq 0 & \text{And/Or} & \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} \neq 0 & \text{Sub - Case f}
\end{array} \tag{79}$$

The Bell inequality is then $S \leq 2$.

8.4 Case 4 Bell Inequality - One Condition T, Three Conditions F

Here there are *four* sub-cases. In all these sub-cases $\delta = 1$.

8.4.1 Sub-Case a $C1 = T, C2 = F, C3 = F, C4 = F$

Substituting $C1$ into $C2, C3, C4$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
l &= k + \Delta_{12} \\
k &= m + \Delta_{22} \\
m &= j + \Delta_{21} \\
&= l + \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21}
\end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

Thus we have the matrix equation

$$\begin{bmatrix} -1 & +1 & 0 \\ +1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & +1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} k \\ l \\ m \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_{12} \\ \Delta_{22} \\ \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} \end{bmatrix} \tag{81}$$

Since $C2 = F, C3 = F, C4 = F$ we require there *not* to be a solution.

As $|M| = 0$ there is *not* a non-zero solution for $\mathbf{v}$ if the following *requirements* are satisfied

$$\Delta_{12} \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{22} \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} \neq 0 \tag{82}$$

8.4.2 Sub-Case b $C1 = F, C2 = T, C3 = F, C4 = F$

Substituting $C2$ into $C1, C3, C4$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} j &= l + \Delta_{11} \\ &= k + \Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} \\ k &= m + \Delta_{22} \\ m &= j + \Delta_{21} \end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

Thus we have the matrix equation

$$\begin{bmatrix} +1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & +1 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & +1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} j \\ k \\ m \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} \\ \Delta_{22} \\ \Delta_{21} \end{bmatrix} \tag{84}$$

Since $C1 = F, C3 = F, C4 = F$ we require there *not* to be a solution.

As $|M| = 0$ there is *not* a non-zero solution for $\mathbf{v}$ if the following *requirements* are satisfied

$$\Delta_{12} + \Delta_{11} \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{22} \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{21} \neq 0 \tag{85}$$

8.4.3 Sub-Case c $C1 = F, C2 = F, C3 = T, C4 = F$

Substituting $C3$ into $C1, C2, C4$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} j &= l + \Delta_{11} \\ l &= k + \Delta_{12} \\ &= m + \Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} \\ m &= j + \Delta_{21} \end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

Thus we have the matrix equation

$$\begin{bmatrix} +1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & +1 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & +1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} j \\ l \\ m \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_{11} \\ \Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} \\ \Delta_{21} \end{bmatrix} \tag{87}$$

Since $C1 = F, C2 = F, C4 = F$ we require there *not* to be a solution.

As $|M| = 0$ there is *not* a non-zero solution for $\mathbf{v}$ if the following *requirements* are satisfied

$$\Delta_{11} \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{21} \neq 0 \tag{88}$$

8.4.4 Sub-Case d $C1 = F, C2 = F, C3 = F, C4 = T$

Substituting $C4$ into $C1, C2, C3$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} j &= l + \Delta_{11} \\ l &= k + \Delta_{12} \\ k &= m + \Delta_{22} \\ &= j + \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

Thus we have the marix equation

$$\begin{bmatrix} +1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & +1 \\ -1 & +1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} j \\ k \\ l \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_{11} \\ \Delta_{12} \\ \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} \end{bmatrix} \quad (90)$$

Since $C1 = F, C2 = F, C4 = F$ we require there *not* to be a solution.

As $|M| = 0$ there is *not* a non-zero solution for $\mathbf{v}$ if the following *requirements* are satisfied

$$\Delta_{11} \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{12} \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{22} \neq 0 \quad (91)$$

8.4.5 All Sub-Cases of Case 4

Overall, we see that if the requirement is satisfied, we can say $\delta = 1$.

Hence applying **this result for** δ in Eq. (31)

$$\begin{aligned} S &\leq \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda|c) \left\{ \sum_{j,k,l,m} P(\alpha_j, \alpha_k, \beta_l, \beta_m | \Omega_{A1}, \Omega_{A2}, \Omega_{B1}, \Omega_{B2}; \lambda) (1) \right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda|c) (1) \\ &\leq 1 \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

From above the following *requirements* must be satisfied for Case 4 to cover all sub-cases.

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{12} &\neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{22} \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{21} \neq 0 && \text{Sub - Case a} \\ \Delta_{11} + \Delta_{12} &\neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{22} \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{21} \neq 0 && \text{Sub - Case b} \\ \Delta_{11} &\neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{22} + \Delta_{12} \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{21} \neq 0 && \text{Sub - Case c} \\ \Delta_{11} &\neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{12} \neq 0 \quad \text{And/Or} \quad \Delta_{22} + \Delta_{21} \neq 0 && \text{Sub - Case d} \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

The Bell inequality is then $S \leq 1$.

References

- [1] A Einstein, B Podolsky and N Rosen, *Phys. Rev.* **47**, 777 (1935).
- [2] E Schrodinger, *Naturwissenschaften* **23**, 807 (1935).
- [3] E Schrodinger, *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **31**, 555 (1935).
- [4] D Bohm, *Phys. Rev.* **85**, 166,180 (1952).
- [5] J Bell, *Physics*, **1**, 195 (1964).
- [6] J Clauser, M Horne, A Shimony and R Holt, *Phys. Rev. Letts.* **23**, 880 (1969).
- [7] D Collins, N Gisin, N Linden, S Massar and S Popescu, *Phys. Rev. Letts.* **88**, 040404 (2002).
- [8] B Dalton, *Eur. Phys. J. Spec. Topics* **230**, 903 (2021).
- [9] D Durr and D Lazarovici, *Understanding Quantum Mechanics* (Springer Nature, Switzerland, 2020).
- [10] C Philippidis, C Dewdney and B J Hiley, *Nuov. Cim.* **52B**, 15 (1979).
- [11] M Ghadini, M Hall and H Wiseman, *ArXiv Quant-Ph* 1807.01568. (2018).
- [12] H Everett, *Rev. Mod.Phys.* **29**, 454 (1957).
- [13] L Vaidman, *Many-Worlds Innterpretation of Quantum Mechanics* Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosopphy (2021).
- [14] A Leggett, *Found. Phys.* **33**, 1469 (2003).
- [15] C Branciard, A Ling, N Gisin, C Kurtsiefer, A Lamas-Linares and V Scarani, *Phys.Rev. Letts.* **99**, 210407 (2007).
- [16] H Wiseman, S Jones and A Doherty, *Phys. Rev. Letts* **98**, 140402 (2007).
- [17] M D Reid, P D Drummond, W P Bowen, E G Cavalcanti, P K Lam, H Bachor, U L Anderson and G Leuchs, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 1728 (2009).
- [18] A Aspect, J Dalibard and G Roger, *Phys. Rev. Letts* **49**, 1804 (1982).
- [19] G Weihs, T Jennewein, C Simon, H Weinfurter and A Zeilinger *Phys. Rev. Letts* **81**, 5039 (1997).
- [20] R Werner, *Phys. Rev. A* **40**, 4277 (1989).
- [21] S Jones, H Wiseman, A Doherty, *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 052116 (2007).
- [22] E Cavalcanti, S Jones, H Wiseman and M Reid, *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 032112 (2009).

- [23] B Dalton, B Garraway and M Reid, *Phys. Rev. A* **101**, 012117 (2020).
- [24] D Greenberger, M Horne and A Zeilinger, *Amer J Phys* **58**,1131 (1990).
- [25] A Leggett and A Garg, *Phys. Rev. Letts* **54**, 857 (1980).
- [26] R Y Teh, L Rosales-Zarate, P D Drummond and M D Reid, *Arxiv* 2112.06496 (2021).
- [27] B Dalton, *Eur. Phys. J. Spec. Topics* **227**, 2069 (2019).
- [28] A Fine, *Phys. Rev. Letts* **48**, 291 (1982).
- [29] A Dada, J.Leach, G Butler, M Padgett and E Anderson, *Nat Phys* **7**, 677 (2011).
- [30] B Dalton, L Heaney, J Goold, B Garraway and T Busch, *New J Phys* **16**, 013026 (2014).
- [31] M Hillary and M Zubairy, *Phys. Rev. Letts* **96**, 050503 (2006).

QUANTUM THEORY	LOCAL HIDDEN VAR THEORY	LOCAL HIDDEN VAR THEORY	QUANTUM THY FEATURES	LHV FEA
Separable States	Bell Local States	Category 1	Quantum Separable	LH No Be
Quantum Entangled States		Category 2	Quantum Entangled	LHS No Bel
		Category 3	Quantum Entangled	Ste Bel
		Bell Non Local States	Category 4	Quantum Entangled