

## Experimental Scheme to Test the Fair Sampling Assumption in EPR-Bell Experiments

Guillaume Adenier and Andrei Yu. Khrennikov<sup>\*</sup>

Department of Mathematics and System Engineering, Växjö University, 351 95 Växjö, Sweden.

(Dated: August 26, 2003)

We propose here an experimental test of the fair sampling assumption in two-channel EPR-Bell experiments for which the detection loophole holds.

In order to assess that a violation of Bell inequality [1] has been experimentally observed, EPR-Bell experiments [2, 3] for which the detection loophole holds are interpreted assuming fair sampling [4, 5]. The purpose of this note is to propose an experimental scheme to test this fair sampling assumption for two-channel type experiments.

Let labels as usual the possible measurement results for each particle as +1 if the particle is detected in the ordinary channel, as -1 if it is detected in the extraordinary channel, and as 0 if it remains undetected. Let label the settings of the left and right two-channel measurement devices respectively as  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  (see Fig. 1).

With a local realistic model, an apparent violation of a Bell Inequality can be obtained because of the existence of the 0 channel. The pairs that must remain unregistered for this purpose must however not be selected completely randomly, but according to the context of the two-channel measurement devices encountered by the particles [4], that is, the sampling must be unfair and done according to  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$ . Note that it is a completely local process, the rejection of pairs mimics nonlocality only because of the coincidence circuitry, since as long as one particle is undetected the whole pair is naturally rejected.

The trouble with the one-channel experiment that makes checking of the fair sampling assumption impossible is that the only measurement result that can be recorded is the +1 result. Hence, channels -1 and 0 cannot be distinguished as they correspond both to a non detection. In the two-channel experiment, this distinction is made, and all four coincidence rates are available| not only  $R_{++}$  as in the one-channel experiment, but also  $R_{+-}$ ,  $R_{-+}$ , and  $R_{--}$ . It is therefore possible to compute the total rate of detected pairs as  $R_d = R_{++} + R_{+-} + R_{-+} + R_{--}$ , which as we shall see can prove to be a crucial tool to test the fair sampling assumption.

Suppose that such an unfair sampling is indeed at stakes in a two-channel experiment. Let  $R_u$  be the rate of pairs rejected according to this unfair sampling process, and  $R_f$  be the rate of pairs rejected according to a fair one. The total rate  $R$  of pairs entering in the coincidence circuitry is then  $R = R_d + R_f + R_u$ . The unfair sampling part  $R_u$  is a coherent process depending strongly on the polarization distribution of the source and of the orientations  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  of the two-channel devices [4]. On the

contrary, the fair sampling part  $R_f$  should be completely independent of these factors, provided that the rate  $R$  of pairs entering in the coincidence circuitry is a constant of time.

Let us assume the source is indeed stable, so that both  $R$  and  $R_f$  are invariants for different settings of the instruments. It means that  $R_d + R_u$  must remain invariant too, so that  $R_d$  can be an indirect way to check whether an unfair sampling  $R_u$  is at stakes. Since it is however possible to build a local realistic model that exhibit independent errors [6], in which  $R_d$  remains a constant for a source of entangled photons, whatever  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$ , and since a model with dependent errors exhibit in this case very small oscillations of  $R_d$  [4] anyway, observing that  $R_d$  is invariant for a source of entangled photon cannot be taken as a proof that there is no unfair sampling at stakes. Hence, our proposal to test fair sampling for the two-channel experiment is to modify and control the source. Instead of the rotationally invariant singlet state, we propose to send a set of pairs already sampled, i.e., with a preferred direction of polarization. Provided that there is an unfair sampling at stakes with the measurement setup, then when this -sampled source meets the unfair sampling measurement setup depending on  $\theta$ ,  $R_u$  and therefore  $R_d$  should exhibit some variations when  $\theta$  is varied. The result of simulations [4] shows a strong variation (see Fig. 2).

In order to control the source experimentally, our proposal is thus to insert aligned polarizers oriented along an angle  $\theta$  in the coincidence circuitry before the two-channel measurement devices, both oriented along the same angle  $\theta$  (see Fig. 3). If the sampling is fair then  $R_d$  should remain invariant when the angle  $\theta$  is varied with respect to  $\theta'$ , and no such oscillations as in Fig. 2 should be observed.

The fair sampling test we propose here should be simple to implement, and should allow to either discard all known local realistic models based on detection loophole, or on the contrary, to show that the analyzers which are assumed to be ideal two-channel measuring devices are in fact unfair and therefore inappropriate for an EPR-Bell test.

---

<sup>\*</sup>Pre-doc fellowship of EU-Netw ork \Q P and Applications";  
Electronic address: guillaume.adenier@m.silvixu.se




FIG. 1: Two-channel EPR-Bell experiment with photons. The source is the rotationally invariant singlet state  $|\psi\rangle$  and the measurement is made by two polarizer beam splitters with parameters  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$ , monitored by a fourfold coincidence setup (not represented here).




FIG. 2: Numerical simulation of the total coincidence rate for a source controlled with aligned polarizers (see Ref. [4]).

<sup>y</sup> Electronic address: andreikhrennikov@m.silvixu.se

- [1] J. S. Bell, *Physics* 1, 195 (1964).
- [2] A. Aspect, J. Dalibard, and G. Roger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 49, 91 (1982).
- [3] G. Weihs, T. Jennewein, C. Simon, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zeilinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 81, 5039 (1998).
- [4] G. A. Denier and A. Khrennikov, *quant-ph/0306045*.
- [5] A. Garuccio and V. Rapisarda, *Nuovo Cimento A* 65, 269 (1981).
- [6] J. A. Larsson, Ph.D. thesis, Linköping Univ. Press, Sweden (2000).




FIG. 3: Scheme of controlled EPR-Bell experiment to test fair sampling. The only difference with the usual EPR-Bell experiment (see Fig. 1) is the source, which is controlled by the parameter  $\theta$ . In case of unfair sampling, this setup should exhibit oscillations for the total coincidence rate as in Fig. 2.