

# Classical simulation of two spin- $S$ singlet state correlations involving spin measurements.

Alihanj<sup>1</sup>, Pramod S. Joag<sup>2</sup>

Department of Physics, University of Pune, Pune - 411007, India.

Sibasish Ghosh<sup>3</sup>

The Institute of Mathematical Sciences, C. I. T. Campus, Taramani, Chennai - 600 113, India.

## Abstract

We give a classical protocol to exactly simulate quantum correlations implied by a spin- $s$  singlet state for the infinite sequence of spins satisfying  $(2s + 1) = 2^n$ , in the worst-case scenario, where  $n$  is a positive integer. The class of measurements we consider here are only those corresponding to spin observables. The required amount of communication is found to be  $\log_2 d$  where  $d = 2s + 1$  is the dimension of the spin- $s$  Hilbert space.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Hk, 03.65.Ud, 03.65.Ta, 03.67.Mn

## 1 Introduction

It is well known that quantum correlations implied by an entangled quantum state of a bipartite quantum system cannot be produced classically, i.e., using only the local and realistic properties of the subsystems, without any communication between the two subsystems [1]. By quantum correlations we mean the statistical correlations between the outputs of measurements independently carried out on each of the two entangled parts. Naturally, the question arises as to the minimum amount of classical communication (number of bits) necessary to simulate the quantum correlations of an entangled bipartite system. This amount of communication quantifies the nonlocality of the entangled bipartite quantum system. It also helps us gauge [2] the amount of information hidden in the entangled quantum system itself in some sense, the amount of information that must be space-like transmitted, in a local hidden variable model, in order for nature to account for the excess quantum correlations.

---

<sup>1</sup>Electronic address: ahanj@physics.unipune.ac.in

<sup>2</sup>Electronic address: pramod@physics.unipune.ac.in

<sup>3</sup>Electronic address: sibasish@imsc.res.in

In this scenario, Alice and Bob try and output  $a$  and  $b$  respectively, through a classical protocol, with the same probability distribution as if they shared the bipartite entangled system and each measured his or her part of the system according to a given random Von Neumann measurement. As we have mentioned above, such a protocol must involve communication between Alice and Bob, who generally share finite or infinite number of random variables. The amount of communication is quantified [3] either as the average number of bits  $\overline{C}(P)$  over the directions along which the spin components are measured (average or expected communication) or the worst case communication, which is the maximum amount of communication  $C_w(P)$  exchanged between Alice and Bob in any particular execution of the protocol. The third method is asymptotic communication i.e., the limit  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \overline{C}(P^n)$  where  $P^n$  is the probability distribution obtained when  $n$  runs of the protocol carried out in parallel i.e., when the parties receive  $n$  inputs and produce  $n$  outputs in one go. Note that, naively, Alice can just tell Bob the direction of her measurement to get an exact classical simulation, but this corresponds to an infinite amount of communication. The question whether a simulation can be done with finite amount of communication was raised independently by Maudlin [4], Brassard, Cleve and Tapp [5] and Steiner [6]. Brassard, Cleve and Tapp used the worst case communication cost while Steiner used the average. Steiner's model is weaker as the amount of communication in the worst case can be unbounded although such cases occur with zero probability. Brassard, Cleve and Tapp gave a protocol to simulate entanglement in a singlet state (i.e., the EPR pair) using eight bits of communication. Csiszar [7] has improved it where one requires six bits of communication. Toner and Bacon [8] gave a protocol to simulate two-qubit singlet state entanglement using only one bit of communication. Interestingly, quantum correlations that cannot be classically simulated without communication also occur in a scenario where incompatible observables are successively measured on class of input (single particle) spin- $s$  states which can be simulated with a classical protocol with communication between successive measurements [9].

Classical simulation of quantum correlations is accomplished for spin- $1/2$  singlet state, requiring the optimum amount, namely, 1 bit of classical communication in the worst-case scenario, using arbitrary projective measurement on each site [8]. It is important to know how does the amount of this classical communication change with the change in the value of the spin  $s$ , in order to quantify the advantage offered by quantum communication over the classical one. Further, this communication cost quantifies, in terms of classical resources, the variation of the nonlocal character of quantum correlations with spin values. In this paper we give a classical protocol to simulate the measurement correlation in a singlet state of two spin- $s$  systems, considering only measurement of spin observables (i.e., measurement of observables of the form  $\hat{a} \cdot \vec{\sigma}$  where  $\hat{a}$  is any unit vector in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  and  $\vec{\sigma} = (\sigma_x; \sigma_y; \sigma_z)$  with each  $\sigma_i$  being a  $(2s+1) \times (2s+1)$  traceless Hermitian matrix and the all three together form the  $SU(2)$  algebra) where  $2s+1 = 2^n$ ,  $n$  being any positive integer. As  $s$  can only take integral or half-integral values, the allowed values of  $s$  form the infinite sequence  $s_{n=1} = 1/2, s_{n=2} = 3/2, s_{n=3} = 5/2$ , etc. For  $s_n = 2^{n-1} - 1/2$ , our

protocol requires  $n$  cbits of communication and  $2n$  number of independent and uniformly distributed shared random variables.

We describe the general classical simulation of singlet state of two spin- $s$  systems in section II, followed by the specification of the measurement scenario, which we will be considering in the present paper. We briefly describe the protocol of Toner and Bacon [8] in section III. We present our results for spin- $s$  singlet state in section IV. Finally, our conclusions are summarized in section V.

## 2 Correlation of two spin- $S$ singlet state

The singlet state  $|j_s i_{AB}\rangle$  of two spin- $s$  particles  $A$  and  $B$  is the eigenstate corresponding to the eigenvalue 0 of the total spin observable of these two spin systems, namely the state

$$|j_s i_{AB}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2s+1}} \sum_{m=-s}^s (-1)^m |j_s i_A - m\rangle |j_s i_B + m\rangle; \quad (1)$$

where  $|j_s i\rangle, |j_s i+1\rangle, \dots, |j_s i-1\rangle, |j_s i\rangle$  are eigenstates of the spin observable of each of the individual spin- $s$  system. Thus  $|j_s i_{AB}\rangle$  is a maximally entangled state of the bipartite system  $A+B$ , described by the Hilbert space  $\mathbb{C}^{2s+1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{2s+1}$ . In the case of classical simulation of the quantum correlation  $\langle \hat{a} \otimes \hat{b} \rangle_{|j_s i_{AB}\rangle}$  of the two-qubit singlet state  $|j_{1/2} i\rangle$ , Alice considers measurement of traceless observable  $\hat{a}$  and Bob considers that of the traceless observable  $\hat{b}$ . These are spin observables. Analogous to the Pauli matrices, one can consider  $(2s+1)^2 - 1$  number of traceless but trace-orthogonal Hermitian  $(2s+1) \times (2s+1)$  matrices  $\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2, \dots, \hat{a}_{(2s+1)^2 - 1}$  (i.e.,  $\text{Tr} \hat{a}_i = 0$  for all  $i$  but  $\text{Tr}(\hat{a}_i \hat{a}_j) = 0$  if  $i \neq j$ ; see, for example, [10]) such that a general projective measurement on the individual spin- $s$  system corresponds to the measurement of an observable of the form  $\hat{c} \cdot \hat{J}$ , where  $\hat{c}$  is a unit vector in  $\mathbb{R}^{(2s+1)^2 - 1}$  and  $\cdot$  is the  $((2s+1)^2 - 1)$ -tuple  $(c_1; c_2; \dots; c_{(2s+1)^2 - 1})$  of the above-mentioned matrices. In general, the quantum correlation  $\langle \hat{c} \cdot \hat{J} \otimes \hat{d} \cdot \hat{J} \rangle_{|j_s i_{AB}\rangle}$  will be a bilinear function in the components on  $\hat{c}$  and  $\hat{d}$ . In the special case when  $(\hat{a}_i \hat{a}_j)_{|j_s i} = \delta_{ij}$  for all  $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, (2s+1)^2 - 1$ , the quantum correlation will be of the form  $\hat{c} \cdot \hat{d}$ .

Classical simulation of this general quantum correlation seems to be quite hard one possible reason being the absence of Bloch sphere structure for higher spin systems. Rather we will consider only measurement of spin observables, namely the observables of the form  $\hat{a} \cdot \hat{J}$  on each individual spin- $s$  system, where  $\hat{a}$  is an arbitrary unit vector in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  and  $\hat{J} = (J_x; J_y; J_z)$ . For the  $(2s+1) \times (2s+1)$  matrix representations of the spin observables  $J_x, J_y$ , and  $J_z$ , please see page 191–192 of ref. [11].

$\hat{J}$  matrices satisfy the  $SU(2)$  algebra, namely  $[J_x; J_y] = iJ_z$ ,  $[J_y; J_z] = iJ_x$ ,  $[J_z; J_x] = iJ_y$ . The eigenvalues of  $\hat{a} \cdot \hat{J}$  are  $-s, -s+1, \dots, s-1, s$  for all  $\hat{a} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ . The quantum correlations  $\langle \hat{a} \cdot \hat{J} \otimes \hat{b} \cdot \hat{J} \rangle_{|j_s i_{AB}\rangle}$  (which we will denote here as  $\langle \hat{a} \cdot \hat{b} \rangle_i$ , where  $i$  runs through

all the eigenvalues of  $\hat{a} \cdot \mathbf{J}$  and  $\hat{b} \cdot \mathbf{J}$  runs through all the eigenvalues of  $\hat{b} \cdot \mathbf{J}$  is given by

$$\langle \mathbf{h} | \hat{a} \cdot \mathbf{J} \hat{b} \cdot \mathbf{J} | \mathbf{h} \rangle = \frac{1}{3} s(s+1) \hat{a} \cdot \hat{b}; \quad (2)$$

where  $\hat{a}$  and  $\hat{b}$  are the unit vectors specifying the directions along which the spin components are measured by Alice and Bob respectively [12]. Note that, by virtue of being a singlet state,  $\langle \mathbf{h} | = 0 = \langle \mathbf{h} |$  irrespective of directions  $\hat{a}$  and  $\hat{b}$ . From now onward, we will consider only those spin- $s$  systems for which  $2s+1 = 2^n$ ,  $n$  being any positive integer. Thus we see that the allowed spin systems will form the sub-class  $f_{2^{n-1}} : n = 1; 2; \dots$  of half-integral spins.

### 3 Classical simulation of two spin-1/2 singlet state

As the working principles of our protocol are of similar in nature with those of Toner and Bacon [8], before describing our protocol, we would like to briefly describe the protocol of Toner and Bacon to simulate the measurement correlations on  $j_{1=2}$ . In this scenario, Alice and Bob's job is to simulate the quantum correlation  $\langle \mathbf{h}_{1=2} | \hat{a}_{1=2} \cdot \hat{b}_{1=2} | \mathbf{h}_{1=2} \rangle = \frac{1}{4} \hat{a} \cdot \hat{b}$ , together with the conditions that  $\langle \mathbf{h} | = 0 = \langle \mathbf{h} |$ . To start with, Alice and Bob share two independent random variables  $\hat{a}$  and  $\hat{c}$ , each of which has uniform distribution on the surface of the Bloch sphere  $S_2$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Given the measurement direction  $\hat{a}$ , Alice calculates  $\frac{1}{2} \text{sgn}(\hat{a} \cdot \hat{a})$ , which she takes as her measurement output. Note that  $\text{sgn}(x) = 1$  for all  $x \geq 0$  and  $\text{sgn}(x) = -1$  for all  $x < 0$ . As  $\hat{a}$  is uniformly distributed on  $S_2$ , for each given  $\hat{a}$ ,  $\frac{1}{2} \text{sgn}(\hat{a} \cdot \hat{a})$  will take its values  $\frac{1}{2}$  and  $-\frac{1}{2}$  with equal probabilities, i.e.,  $\text{Prob}(\frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}) = \text{Prob}(-\frac{1}{2} = -\frac{1}{2}) = \frac{1}{2}$  (and hence,  $\langle \mathbf{h} | = 0$ ). Alice then sends the one bit information  $c = \text{sgn}(\hat{a} \cdot \hat{a}) \text{sgn}(\hat{a} \cdot \hat{c})$  to Bob. Note that instead of sending  $\text{sgn}(\hat{a} \cdot \hat{a})$ , by sending  $c$ , Alice does not allow Bob to extract any information about her output. This is so because  $\text{Prob}(\frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} | c = 1) = \text{Prob}(-\frac{1}{2} = -\frac{1}{2} | c = 1)$  and  $\text{Prob}(\frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} | c = -1) = \text{Prob}(-\frac{1}{2} = -\frac{1}{2} | c = -1)$ . After receiving  $c$ , and using his measurement direction  $\hat{b}$ , Bob now calculates his output  $\frac{1}{2} \text{sgn}[\hat{b} \cdot (\hat{c} + c\hat{a})]$ . Now

$$\langle \mathbf{h} | = \frac{1}{2(4)^2} \int_{\hat{a} \in S_2} \int_{\hat{c} \in S_2} \text{sgn}[\hat{b} \cdot (\hat{c} + \text{sgn}(\hat{a} \cdot \hat{a}) \text{sgn}(\hat{a} \cdot \hat{c}) \hat{a})] d\hat{a} d\hat{c}; \quad (3)$$

Given any  $\hat{a} \in S_2$ , for each choice of  $\hat{c} \in S_2$ , the two values of the integrand corresponding to  $\hat{c}$  and  $-\hat{c}$  are negative of each other. As the distribution of  $\hat{c}$  on  $S_2$  is taken to be uniform, the above-mentioned observation immediately shows that  $\langle \mathbf{h} | = 0$ . As  $\frac{1}{2} f_{1=2} : 1=2g$ , therefore  $\text{Prob}(\frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}) = \text{Prob}(-\frac{1}{2} = -\frac{1}{2}) = \frac{1}{2}$ . In order to compute  $\langle \mathbf{h} |$ , one should observe that Bob's output can also be written as  $\frac{1}{2} \int_{d=1}^1 [(1 + cd) \text{sgn}[\hat{b} \cdot (\hat{c} + d\hat{a})]]$ . The following two among the four integrals (which appears in  $\langle \mathbf{h} |$ )

$$\frac{1}{8(4)^2} \int_{\hat{a} \in S_2} \int_{\hat{c} \in S_2} \text{sgn}(\hat{a} \cdot \hat{a}) \text{sgn}[\hat{b} \cdot (\hat{c} - \hat{a})] d\hat{a} d\hat{c}$$

cancels each other by incorporating the inversion  $\hat{a} \cdot \hat{b} \rightarrow -\hat{a} \cdot \hat{b}$ . And the rest two integrals

$$\frac{1}{8(4)^2} \int_{\hat{a} \in S_2} \int_{\hat{b} \in S_2} \text{sgn}(\hat{a} \cdot \hat{b}) \text{sgn}(\hat{b} \cdot (\hat{a} \times \hat{b})) d\hat{a} d\hat{b}$$

are same and they are equal to the integral

$$\frac{1}{8(4)^2} \int_{\hat{a} \in S_2} \int_{\hat{b} \in S_2} \text{sgn}(\hat{a} \cdot \hat{b}) \text{sgn}(\hat{b} \cdot (\hat{a} \times \hat{b})) d\hat{a} d\hat{b} :$$

And hence we have

$$\frac{2}{8(4)^2} \int_{\hat{a} \in S_2} \int_{\hat{b} \in S_2} \text{sgn}(\hat{a} \cdot \hat{b}) \text{sgn}(\hat{b} \cdot (\hat{a} \times \hat{b})) d\hat{a} d\hat{b} = \frac{2}{8(4)^2} \int_{\hat{a} \in S_2} \int_{\hat{b} \in S_2} \text{sgn}(\hat{a} \cdot \hat{b}) \hat{b} \cdot \hat{a} d\hat{a} d\hat{b} = \frac{1}{4} \hat{a} \cdot \hat{b} : \quad (4)$$

## 4 Classical simulation of two spin-S singlet state using spin measurements

Let us now come to our protocol. In the simulation of the measurement of the observable  $\hat{a} \cdot \mathbf{J}$  (where  $\hat{a} \in \mathbb{R}^3$  is the supplied direction of measurement), Alice will have to reproduce the  $2^n$  number of outcomes  $\hat{a} \cdot \mathbf{J} = 2^{n-1} \hat{a} \cdot \hat{b} \cdot \hat{c} \cdot \hat{d} \cdot \hat{e} \cdot \hat{f} \cdot \hat{g} \cdot \hat{h} \cdot \hat{i} \cdot \hat{j} \cdot \hat{k} \cdot \hat{l} \cdot \hat{m} \cdot \hat{n} \cdot \hat{o} \cdot \hat{p} \cdot \hat{q} \cdot \hat{r} \cdot \hat{s} \cdot \hat{t} \cdot \hat{u} \cdot \hat{v} \cdot \hat{w} \cdot \hat{x} \cdot \hat{y} \cdot \hat{z}$  with equal probability. If we consider the series  $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^n f(k) 2^{n-k}$ , where, for each  $k$ ,  $f(k)$  can be either 1 or -1, it turns out that the series can only take the above-mentioned  $2^n$  different values of  $\hat{a} \cdot \mathbf{J}$ . The probability distribution of these different values of the series will depend on that of the  $n$ -tuple  $(f(1); f(2); \dots; f(n))$ . In order to make this probability distribution an uniform one (which is essential here for the simulation purpose), we choose here  $f(k) = \text{sgn}(\hat{a} \cdot \hat{b}_k)$  for each  $k$ , where  $\hat{a}$  is the measurement direction for Alice while  $\hat{b}_1, \hat{b}_2, \dots, \hat{b}_n$  are independent and uniformly distributed random variables on  $S_2$ . We have seen in the above-mentioned Toner and Bacon protocol that if Alice and Bob share the two independent and uniformly distributed random variables  $\hat{b}_k \in S_2$  and  $\hat{c}_k \in S_2$ , then the random variable  $r_k = \text{sgn}(\hat{b}_k \cdot \hat{c}_k + \text{sgn}(\hat{a} \cdot \hat{b}_k) \text{sgn}(\hat{a} \cdot \hat{c}_k))$  is uniformly distributed over  $\{1; -1\}$ . Hence, as above, the quantity  $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^n 2^{n-k} \text{sgn}(\hat{b}_k \cdot \hat{c}_k + r_k \hat{b}_k \cdot \hat{c}_k)$  will have  $2^n$  different values  $\hat{a} \cdot \mathbf{J} = 2^{n-1} \hat{a} \cdot \hat{b} \cdot \hat{c} \cdot \hat{d} \cdot \hat{e} \cdot \hat{f} \cdot \hat{g} \cdot \hat{h} \cdot \hat{i} \cdot \hat{j} \cdot \hat{k} \cdot \hat{l} \cdot \hat{m} \cdot \hat{n} \cdot \hat{o} \cdot \hat{p} \cdot \hat{q} \cdot \hat{r} \cdot \hat{s} \cdot \hat{t} \cdot \hat{u} \cdot \hat{v} \cdot \hat{w} \cdot \hat{x} \cdot \hat{y} \cdot \hat{z}$  all with equal probabilities. But the interesting point to note is that in the calculation of the average (over the independent but uniformly distributed random variables  $\hat{b}_1, \hat{b}_2, \dots, \hat{b}_n, \hat{c}_1, \hat{c}_2, \dots, \hat{c}_n$ ) of the product  $\text{sgn}(\hat{a} \cdot \hat{b}) \text{sgn}(\hat{b} \cdot (\hat{a} \times \hat{b}))$ , there will be no contribution from cross terms like  $\text{sgn}(\hat{a} \cdot \hat{b}_k) \text{sgn}(\hat{b}_k \cdot (\hat{a} \times \hat{b}_l))$  if  $k \neq l$ .

The protocol proceeds as follows: Alice outputs  $\hat{a} \cdot \mathbf{J} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^n 2^{n-k} \text{sgn}(\hat{a} \cdot \hat{b}_k)$ . Alice sends  $n$  bits  $c_1; c_2; \dots; c_n$  to Bob where  $c_k = \text{sgn}(\hat{a} \cdot \hat{b}_k) \text{sgn}(\hat{a} \cdot \hat{c}_k)$  for  $k = 1; 2; \dots; n$ , where  $\hat{b}_1, \hat{b}_2, \dots, \hat{b}_n, \hat{c}_1, \hat{c}_2, \dots, \hat{c}_n$  are independent shared random variables between Alice and Bob, each being uniformly distributed on  $S_2$ . Thus we see that, in terms

of shared randomness,  $\mathbf{r} = (\hat{r}_1; \hat{r}_2; \dots; \hat{r}_n; \hat{r}_1; \hat{r}_2; \dots; \hat{r}_n)$  is the shared random variable between Alice and Bob. After receiving these  $n$  bits from Alice, Bob outputs  $\mathbf{b} = \frac{1}{2} \prod_{k=1}^n 2^{n-k} \text{sgn}[\hat{b}:(\hat{a}_k + c_k \hat{r}_k)]$ . It follows immediately from the discussion in the last paragraph that

$$h_i = \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{(4)^{2n}} \sum_{k=1}^n 2^{2n-2k} \sum_{\mathbf{Z}} d^{\hat{a}_1} \dots d^{\hat{a}_{k-1}} d^{\hat{a}_{k+1}} \dots d^{\hat{a}_n} d^{\hat{a}_1} \dots d^{\hat{a}_{k-1}} d^{\hat{a}_{k+1}} \dots d^{\hat{a}_n} \text{sgn}(\hat{a}:\hat{r}_k) \text{sgn}[\hat{b}:(\hat{a}_k + d_k \hat{r}_k)] d^{\hat{a}_k} d^{\hat{r}_k} : \quad (5)$$

It follows from the discussion in section III regarding Toner and Bacon's work that  $h_i = \frac{1}{4} \prod_{k=1}^n 2^{2n-2k} \hat{a} \hat{b}$ . Summing the geometric series and using  $(2s+1) = 2^n$  we finally get

$$h_i = \frac{1}{3} s(s+1) \hat{a} \hat{b} : \quad (6)$$

This protocol exactly simulates quantum mechanical probability distribution for particular types of projective measurements, namely the spin measurement, on the spin  $s$  singlet state with  $2s+1 = 2^n$  for positive integer  $n$ . The above protocol applies to infinite, although sparse, subset of the set of all spins (i.e., all integral and half integral values). The most important finding is that the amount of communication goes as  $\log_2(2s+1)$  or as  $\log_2 s$  for  $s \gg 1$ . Our protocol works equally for any two spin- $s$  maximally entangled state as that can be locally unitarily connected to the singlet state.

## 5 Conclusion

Our result provides the amount of classical communication in the worst case scenario if we consider only measurement of spin observables on both sides of a two spin- $s$  singlet state with the restriction that the dimension  $2s+1$  of each subsystem must be a positive integral power of 2, and just  $n = \log_2(2s+1)$  bits of communication from Alice to Bob is sufficient. We are unable to show whether our protocol is optimal (in the sense of using minimum number of classical communication). On the other hand, if we consider most general projective measurements on both the sides of a maximally entangled state of two qudits, with  $d = 2^n$ , it is known that (see [5]) Alice would require at least of the order of  $2^n$  bits of communication to be sent to Bob, in the worst case scenario when  $n$  is large enough. But for general  $d$ ,  $\log_2 d$  can be shown to be a lower bound on the average amount of classical communication that one would require to simulate the maximally entangled correlation of two qudits considering most general type of projective measurements [13]. It is also known that  $\log_2 d$  bits of classical communication on average is sufficient to simulate the measurement correlation of a maximally entangled state of two qudits, when both Alice and Bob consider only measurement of traceless binary observables [14]. It thus seems that even if simulation of maximally entangled correlation in the most general

case of projective measurement is a hard problem, and one would require to send classical communication at least of the order of the dimension (for large dimensional case), there is still some room to search for efficient simulation protocols in lower dimensions.

Acknowledgment: We thank Gunuprasad Kar and R. Simon for encouragement. A.A. and P.S.J. thank Andre Methot for an effective correspondence. S.G. thanks the Physics Department, Pune University for its hospitality during which part of this work was done. Finally, we would like to thank the anonymous referee for valuable comments and suggestions to revise the earlier version of the present manuscript.

## References

- [1] J.S.Bell, Physics (Long Island City, N.Y.) 1, 195 (1964).
- [2] A.A.Methot, Eur. Phys. Journal D, 29, 445 (2004).
- [3] S.Pironio, Phys. Rev. A 68, 062102 (2003).
- [4] T.Maudlin, in PSA 1992, Volume 1, edited by D.Hull, M.Forbes, and K.Okruhlik (Philosophy of Science Association, East Lansing, 1992), pp. 404 – 417.
- [5] G.Brassard, R.R.Cleve, and A.Tapp, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 1874 (1999).
- [6] M.Steiner, Phys. Lett. A 270, 239 (2000).
- [7] J.A.Csirik, Phys. Rev. A 66 014302 (2002).
- [8] B.F.Toner and D.Bacon, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 187904 (2003).
- [9] A.Ahanjand P.Joag, quant-ph/0602005.
- [10] J.Schlienz and G.Mahler, Phys. Rev. A 52, 4396 (1995).
- [11] J. J. Sakurai, "Modern Quantum Mechanics" (revised edition) (Addison-Wesley, 1999).
- [12] A.Peres, "Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods", (Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993).
- [13] J.Barrett, A.Kent, and S.Pironio, Phys. Rev. Lett. 97, 170409 (2006).
- [14] J.Degorre, S.Laplane, and J.Roland, Phys. Rev. A 75, 012309 (2007).