

A note on the relation between the Contextual Fraction and CNT_2

Víctor H. Cervantes*

Abstract

Contextuality (or lack thereof) is a property of systems of random variables. Among the measures of the degree of contextuality, two have played important roles. One of them, Contextual Fraction (CNTF) was proposed within the framework of the sheaf-theoretic approach to contextuality, and extended to arbitrary systems in the Contextuality-by-Default approach. The other, denoted CNT_2 , was proposed as one of the measures within the Contextuality-by-Default approach. In this note, I prove that $\text{CNTF} = 2\text{CNT}_2$ within a class of systems, called cyclic, that have played a prominent role in contextuality research.

Contextuality (or lack thereof) is a property of systems of random variables. The theory of contextuality, which in psychology has developed from the extension of the theory of selective influences, provides the means to detect this property and, more recently, to measure the degree of (non)contextuality of a system. Among several measures of the degree of contextuality that have been proposed in the literature, I consider here two: the Contextual Fraction (CNTF), proposed by Abramsky, Barbosa, and Mansfeld [2], and CNT_2 , proposed by Kujala and Dzhafarov [31]. Both have played prominent roles. CNTF has been associated with the quantification of the computational advantages of some quantum computation processes [2]. On the other hand, CNT_2 has been shown to be the only measure of contextuality proposed so far that can be extended to a measure of noncontextuality, NCNT_2 [31, 24]. Moreover, NCNT_2 is the only measure of noncontextuality currently available.

There have been many applications of contextuality analysis in psychology. Several of them are due to the emergence of the quantum cognition field (e.g., [9, 11, 12, 29]). Other applications come from the selective influences literature and the aim to develop a principled approach to the ubiquitous violations of marginal selectivity in psychological research (e.g., [6, 13, 14, 15, 18, 27, 23, 21, 35]). Almost all of these applications include experimental data or designs whose representation is in a prominent class of systems of random variables, called cyclic systems (defined below). Dzhafarov, Kujala, and Cervantes [24, 26] have completely characterized the measure CNT_2 for cyclic systems. Using their results, I present a proof that, in the class of cyclic systems, $\text{CNTF} = 2\text{CNT}_2$.

*University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Table 1: Contents of the “Snow Queen” experiment.

Content	Choice between	
q_1	Gerda	Troll
q_2	Beautiful	Unattractive
q_3	The Snow Queen	Old Finn woman
q_4	Kind	Evil

1 Contextuality-by-Default

This section introduces the definitions and results from the Contextuality-by-Default theory (CbD) [22, 20, 19, 31, 17, 24] that are needed for the proof. Throughout the text, I shall use the data from Cervantes and Dzhafarov [14] to illustrate the defined objects and computations. Their data come from an online experiment in which participants were asked to make two conjoint choices, one of a character and one of a characteristic to describe the character, in accordance with a storyline sketching Hans Christian Andersen’s “The Snow Queen”. The manipulations determined the pair of characters, and the pair of characteristics from which a participant made their choices.

A *system* of random variables is a set of double-indexed random variables R_q^c , where $q \in Q$ denotes their *content*, which can be interpreted as a question to which the random variable responds, and $c \in C$ is their *context*, the conditions under which it is recorded. A system can be presented as

$$\mathcal{R} = \{R_q^c : c \in C, q \in Q, q \prec c\}, \quad (1)$$

where $q \prec c$ denotes that content q is recorded in context c . The sets of contents and contexts for the “Snow Queen” experiment, $Q_{\text{SQ}} = \{q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4\}$ and $C_{\text{SQ}} = \{c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4\}$, are presented in Tables 1 and 2, and \mathcal{R}_{SQ} will denote the corresponding system of random variables.

For each $q \in Q$, the subset of the system

$$\mathcal{R}_q = \{R_q^c : c \in C, q \prec c\} \quad (2)$$

is referred to as the *connection* corresponding to content q . No two random variables within a connection \mathcal{R}_q are jointly distributed; thus, they are said to be *stochastically unrelated*.¹ Analogously, for each $c \in C$, the subset

$$R^c = \{R_q^c : q \in Q, q \prec c\} \quad (3)$$

is referred to as the *bunch* for context c . The variables within a bunch are jointly distributed. That is, bunches are random vectors with a given probability distribution. Table 3 presents the joint distributions of the four bunches of \mathcal{R}_{SQ} .

The class of systems known as cyclic has had a prominent role in contextuality research. Cyclic systems are the object of Bell’s theorem [7, 8], the Leggett–Garg theorem [32], and Suppes and Zanotti’s theorem [33], among many other

¹More generally, any two $R_q^c, R_{q'}^{c'} \in \mathcal{R}$ with $c \neq c'$ are stochastically unrelated.

Table 2: Contexts of the “Snow Queen” experiment.

Context	Conjoint choices made
c_1	q_1 and q_2
c_2	q_2 and q_3
c_3	q_3 and q_4
c_4	q_4 and q_1

Table 3: Joint distributions of each of the bunches of the “Snow Queen” experiment. Adapted from Table 3 of [14]. The value encoding each choice for the variables R_j^i is shown in parentheses.

R^{c_1}	R_2^1		Mar. character	R^{c_4}	R_4^1		Mar. character
	Beautiful (0)	Unattractive (1)			Kind (0)	Evil (1)	
R_1^1				R_1^1			
Gerda (0)	.843	.020	.864	Gerda (0)	.797	.035	.832
Troll (1)	.029	.107	.136	Troll (1)	.018	.150	.168
Mar. characteristic	.872	.128		Mar. characteristic	.815	.185	

R^{c_2}	R_2^2		Mar. character	R^{c_3}	R_4^3		Mar. character
	Beautiful (0)	Unattractive (1)			Kind (0)	Evil (1)	
R_3^2				R_3^3			
Snow Queen (0)	.769	.011	.780	Snow Queen (0)	.135	.536	.671
Finn woman (1)	.070	.150	.220	Finn Woman (1)	.320	.009	.329
Mar. characteristic	.839	.161		Mar. characteristic	.455	.545	

Note. Mar. = marginal observed proportion

theoretical results (e.g., [4, 30]). It is also encountered in most applications which empirically probe for contextuality (e.g., [3, 5, 10, 14, 27, 28, 34]). Moreover, it has been shown that a system without cyclic subsystems is necessarily noncontextual [24, 1]. A system \mathcal{R} is *cyclic* if

1. each of its contexts contains two jointly distributed *binary* random variables,
2. each content is measured in two contexts, and
3. there is no proper subsystem of \mathcal{R} that satisfies 1 and 2.

A cyclic system with n contexts (and n contents) is said to be a cyclic system of *rank* n . For any cyclic system, the contexts and contents can be rearranged and numbered so that the system can be written as

$$\mathcal{R}_n = \{ \{ R_i^i, R_{i \oplus 1}^i \} : i = 1, \dots, n \}, \quad (4)$$

where R_j^i stands for $R_{q_j}^{c_i}$, and $\oplus 1$ denotes cyclic shift $1 \mapsto 2, \dots, n-1 \mapsto n, n \mapsto 1$.² Thus, the variables $\{ R_i^i, R_{i \oplus 1}^i \}$ constitute the bunch corresponding to context c_i . The following matrices depict three cyclic systems: a cyclic system of rank 2 (where *rank* refers to the number of contents, or, equivalently, the number of contexts), a cyclic system of rank 3, and a cyclic system of rank 4. The latter gives the structure of the system \mathcal{R}_{SQ} that represents the “Snow Queen” experiment.

²Similarly, $\ominus 1$ will denote the inverse shift of $\oplus 1$.

R_1^1	R_2^1	c_1
R_1^2	R_2^2	c_2
q_1	q_2	\mathcal{R}_2

R_1^1	R_2^1		c_1
	R_2^2	R_3^2	c_2
R_1^3		R_3^3	c_3
q_1	q_2	q_3	\mathcal{R}_3

R_1^1	R_2^1			c_1
	R_2^2	R_3^2		c_2
		R_3^3	R_4^3	c_3
R_1^4			R_4^4	c_4
q_1	q_2	q_3	q_4	\mathcal{R}_4

Without loss of generality, we assume that the binary random variables in our systems take the values 0 and 1. Table 3 shows which choice of character and of characteristic is encoded as 0 and which as 1 for the description and contextuality computations for the ‘‘Snow Queen’’ experiment. Kujala and Dzhaferov [31] introduce some notation to produce a vectorial description of such a system. This representation is obtained by taking the probabilities of events for each random variable, for each bunch, and for each connection in the system. Let $\mathbf{l}_{(\cdot)}$, $\mathbf{b}_{(\cdot)}$, and $\mathbf{c}_{(\cdot)}$ denote these vectors, respectively. For describing a cyclic system, the first two vectors are written:

$$\mathbf{l}_{(\cdot)} = \left(\begin{array}{c} \Pr(R_i^i = r_i^i) \\ \Pr(R_{i\oplus 1}^i = r_{i\oplus 1}^i) \end{array} \right)_{i=1,\dots,n}, \quad (5)$$

$$\mathbf{b}_{(\cdot)} = \left(\Pr(R_i^i = r_i^i, R_{i\oplus 1}^i = r_{i\oplus 1}^i) \right)_{i=1,\dots,n}, \quad (6)$$

with $r_i^i, r_{i\oplus 1}^i = 0, 1$.

The vector $\mathbf{c}_{(\cdot)}$ is composed of imposed probabilities. These probabilities describe a *coupling* of the variables within each connection. A coupling of a set of random variables $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$, where I indexes the variables in the set, is a new set of jointly distributed random variables $\{Y_i\}_{i \in I}$ such that for each $i \in I$, the distributions of X_i and Y_i coincide. In CbD, the couplings chosen for each connection are their multimaximal couplings. In a *multimaximal coupling* of a set of random variables, for any two $Y_i, Y_{i'}$, the probability $\Pr(Y_i = Y_{i'})$ is the maximal possible given their individual distributions. If we denote the variables of the multimaximal coupling of connection \mathcal{R}_{q_j} by

$$\mathcal{T}_{q_j} = \{T_j^i : c_i \in C, q_j \prec c_i\}, \quad (7)$$

one obtains the vector

$$\mathbf{c}_{(\cdot)} = \left(\Pr(T_i^i = r_i^i, T_i^{i\oplus 1} = r_i^{i\oplus 1}) \right)_{i=1,\dots,n}, \quad (8)$$

with $r_i^i, r_{i\oplus 1}^i = 0, 1$, and where

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(T_i^i = 0, T_i^{i\oplus 1} = 0) &= \min(\Pr(R_i^i = 0), \Pr(R_i^{i\oplus 1} = 0)), \\ \Pr(T_i^i = 1, T_i^{i\oplus 1} = 1) &= \min(\Pr(R_i^i = 1), \Pr(R_i^{i\oplus 1} = 1)), \\ \Pr(T_i^i = 0, T_i^{i\oplus 1} = 1) &= \Pr(R_i^{i\oplus 1} = 1) - \Pr(T_i^i = 1, T_i^{i\oplus 1} = 1), \\ \text{and} \\ \Pr(T_i^i = 1, T_i^{i\oplus 1} = 0) &= \Pr(R_i^i = 1) - \Pr(T_i^i = 1, T_i^{i\oplus 1} = 1). \end{aligned}$$

Using this notation, Table 4 presents the multimaximal couplings for each of the four connections of system \mathcal{R}_{SQ} .

Table 4: Distributions of the multimaximal couplings of each of the connections of the ‘‘Snow Queen’’ experiment. The variable T_j^i denotes the variable in the coupling corresponding to R_j^i .

T_{q_1}	T_1^4		Mar. character	T_{q_2}	T_2^2		Mar. character
	Gerda (0)	Troll (1)			Beautiful (0)	Unattractive (1)	
T_1^1				T_2^1			
Gerda (0)	.832	.032	.864	Beautiful (0)	.839	.033	.872
Troll (1)	.000	.136	.136	Unattractive (1)	.000	.128	.128
Mar. characteristic	.832	.168		Mar. characteristic	.839	.161	

T_{q_4}	T_4^4		Mar. character	T_{q_3}	T_3^2		Mar. character
	Kind (0)	Evil (1)			Snow Queen (0)	Finn Woman (1)	
T_4^3				T_3^3			
Kind (0)	.455	.000	.455	Snow Queen (0)	.671	.000	.671
Evil (1)	.360	.185	.545	Finn Woman (1)	.109	.220	.329
Mar. characteristic	.815	.185		Mar. characteristic	.780	.220	

Note. Mar. = marginal probability

The system \mathcal{R}_{SQ} is then described by vectors³

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{l}_{(\cdot),SQ}^{*\top} &= (.864, .136, .872, .128, .839, .161, .780, .220, \\ &\quad .671, .329, .455, .545, .815, .185, .832, .168), \\ \mathbf{b}_{(\cdot),SQ}^{*\top} &= (.843, .029, .021, .107, .769, .011, .070, .150, \\ &\quad .135, .320, .536, .009, .797, .035, .018, .150), \\ \mathbf{c}_{(\cdot),SQ}^{*\top} &= (.832, .000, .032, .136, .839, .033, .000, .128, \\ &\quad .671, .109, .000, .220, .455, .000, .360, .185). \end{aligned}$$

A system is noncontextual if it is possible to construct a coupling of \mathcal{R} that agrees simultaneously with the bunches and with the multimaximal couplings of the connections [22, 20]. If such a coupling exists, it can be found as the solution to a system of linear equations defined using vectors $\mathbf{l}_{(\cdot)}$, $\mathbf{b}_{(\cdot)}$, and $\mathbf{c}_{(\cdot)}$. First, let $\mathbf{p}_{(\cdot)}$ be the concatenation of the three vectors $\mathbf{l}_{(\cdot)}$, $\mathbf{b}_{(\cdot)}$, and $\mathbf{c}_{(\cdot)}$. Next consider a vector \mathbf{s} of length 2^{2n} of all possible values that a coupling of the entire system \mathcal{R}_n can take. That is, if we denote a coupling of \mathcal{R}_n by S_n , then S_n is a random vector whose values are the conjunction of events

$$\{S_j^i = r_j^i : i, j = 1, \dots, n, q_j \prec c_i\},$$

with $r_j^i = 0, 1$. These values are the components of \mathbf{s} . Let $\mathbf{M}_{(\cdot)}$ be an incidence (0/1) matrix with 2^{2n} columns labeled by the elements of \mathbf{s} and $12n$ rows labeled by the events whose probabilities are the components of $\mathbf{p}_{(\cdot)}$. This matrix is constructed as follows:

- If the u th component of $\mathbf{p}_{(\cdot)}$ is $\Pr(R_j^i = r_j^i)$ and the v th component of \mathbf{s} includes the event $S_j^i = r_j^i$, then the cell (u, v) of $\mathbf{M}_{(\cdot)}$ is a 1;

³The third probability in vector $\mathbf{b}_{(\cdot)}^*$ has been modified to .021 to adjust for rounding error, so that the four shown values of of the first context precisely sum to 1 .

- if the u th component of $\mathbf{p}_{(\cdot)}$ is $\Pr(R_i^i = r_i^i, R_{i\oplus 1}^i = r_{i\oplus 1}^i)$ and the v th component of \mathbf{s} includes the event $\{S_i^i = r_i^i, S_{i\oplus 1}^i = r_{i\oplus 1}^i\}$, then the cell (u, v) is a 1;
- if the u th component of $\mathbf{p}_{(\cdot)}$ is $\Pr(T_i^i = r_i^i, T_i^{i\oplus 1} = r_i^{i\oplus 1})$ and the v th component of \mathbf{s} includes the event $\{S_i^i = r_i^i, S_i^{i\oplus 1} = r_i^{i\oplus 1}\}$, then the cell (u, v) is a 1;
- all other cells have zeroes.

A detailed description of the construction of $\mathbf{M}_{(\cdot)}$ for general systems of binary random variables can be found in [19].

The system \mathcal{R}_n described by $\mathbf{p}_{(\cdot)}$, is noncontextual [19] if and only if there is a vector $\mathbf{h} \geq 0$ (component-wise) such that

$$\mathbf{M}_{(\cdot)}\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{p}_{(\cdot)}^*. \quad (9)$$

Any solution \mathbf{h}^* provides the probability distribution of a coupling S_n of \mathcal{R}_n that contains as its marginals both the bunch distributions and the multimaximal couplings of the connections of \mathcal{R}_n .

It is evident that the rows of $\mathbf{M}_{(\cdot)}$ are not linearly independent. For example, one can compute

$$\Pr(R_i^i = 0) + \Pr(R_i^i = 1) = 1,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr(R_i^i = 0, R_{i\oplus 1}^i = 0) + \Pr(R_i^i = 0, R_{i\oplus 1}^i = 1) \\ & + \Pr(R_i^i = 1, R_{i\oplus 1}^i = 0) + \Pr(R_i^i = 1, R_{i\oplus 1}^i = 1) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the row of $\mathbf{M}_{(\cdot)}$ corresponding to $\Pr(R_i^i = 0)$ is a linear combination of the rows corresponding to $\Pr(R_i^i = 0, R_{i\oplus 1}^i = 0)$, $\Pr(R_i^i = 0, R_{i\oplus 1}^i = 1)$, $\Pr(R_i^i = 1, R_{i\oplus 1}^i = 0)$, $\Pr(R_i^i = 1, R_{i\oplus 1}^i = 1)$, and $\Pr(R_i^i = 1)$.

The vectorial description can be reduced by taking only a subset of the components of $\mathbf{p}_{(\cdot)}$, such that the corresponding rows of $\mathbf{M}_{(\cdot)}$ are linearly independent. Let us choose the following reductions of the vectors $\mathbf{l}_{(\cdot)}$, $\mathbf{b}_{(\cdot)}$, and $\mathbf{c}_{(\cdot)}$ and denote them \mathbf{l} , \mathbf{b} , and \mathbf{c} :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{l} &= (p_j^i)_{i,j=1,\dots,n, q_j \prec c_i} = (\Pr(R_j^i = 1))_{i,j=1,\dots,n, q_j \prec c_i}, \\ \mathbf{b} &= (p_{i,i\oplus 1})_{i=1,\dots,n} = (\Pr(R_i^i = 1, R_{i\oplus 1}^i = 1))_{i=1,\dots,n}, \quad \text{and} \quad (10) \\ \mathbf{c} &= (p^{i,i\oplus 1})_{i=1,\dots,n} = (\Pr(T_i^i = 1, T_i^{i\oplus 1} = 1))_{i=1,\dots,n}. \end{aligned}$$

The system \mathcal{R}_{SQ} can then be described by the reduced vectors

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{l}_{SQ}^{*\top} &= (.136, .128, .161, .220, .329, .545, .185, .168), \\ \mathbf{b}_{SQ}^{*\top} &= (.107, .150, .009, .150), \quad \text{and} \\ \mathbf{c}_{SQ}^{*\top} &= (.136, .128, .220, .185). \end{aligned}$$

Using the reduced vectors (10), Kujala and Dzhafarov [31] define the linear programming tasks used to compute the CbD-based measures of contextuality. Let a system \mathcal{R}_n be described by

$$\mathbf{p}^* = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{l}^* \\ \mathbf{b}^* \\ \mathbf{c}^* \end{pmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

where \mathbf{l}^* and \mathbf{b}^* are the empirical probabilities of the system, and \mathbf{c}^* are the probabilities found from the multimaximal couplings of each of its connections. Let \mathbf{M} be the incidence matrix found by taking the rows of $\mathbf{M}_{(\cdot)}$ corresponding to the elements of \mathbf{p}^* . Note that the system is noncontextual if and only if there is a vector $\mathbf{h} \geq 0$ (component-wise) such that

$$\mathbf{M}\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{p}^*, \quad (12)$$

subject to $\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{h} = 1$ [19]. Denoting the rows of \mathbf{M} that correspond to \mathbf{l}^* , \mathbf{c}^* , \mathbf{b}^* by, respectively, $\mathbf{M}_l, \mathbf{M}_c, \mathbf{M}_b$, we can rewrite (12) in extenso:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{M}_l \\ \mathbf{M}_b \\ \mathbf{M}_c \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{h} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{l}^* \\ \mathbf{b}^* \\ \mathbf{c}^* \end{pmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

For the system \mathcal{R}_{SQ} that describes the data from the ‘‘Snow Queen’’ experiment, the matrix \mathbf{M} and the corresponding submatrices $\mathbf{M}_l, \mathbf{M}_b$, and \mathbf{M}_c are depicted in Table 5 in the Appendix.

The contextuality measure $\text{CNT}_2(\mathcal{R}_n)$ can then be computed solving the linear programming task

find	minimizing	subject to
\mathbf{x}	$\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{d}$	$-\mathbf{d} \leq \mathbf{b}^* - \mathbf{M}_b \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{d}$
		$\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d} \geq 0$
		$\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x} = 1$
		$\mathbf{M}_l \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{l}^*$
		$\mathbf{M}_c \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{c}^*$

For any solution \mathbf{x}^* , $\text{CNT}_2(\mathcal{R}_n) = \|\mathbf{b}^* - \mathbf{M}_b \mathbf{x}^*\|_1 = \|\mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{M} \mathbf{x}^*\|_1$. Dzhafarov et al. [24] showed that for a cyclic system, the value of $\text{CNT}_2(\mathcal{R})$ is a one-coordinate distance; that is, if \mathcal{R}_n is contextual, there exists a solution \mathbf{x}^* such that \mathbf{d}^* has zeroes for all but one of its components. They further showed that for each coordinate $i = 1, \dots, n$ of \mathbf{d} , there is a solution \mathbf{x}^* such that d_i is the nonzero component. Note that there are infinitely many solutions to the linear programming task since there are at least two solutions. Table 6 in the Appendix presents one such solution to this task for system \mathcal{R}_{SQ} representing the ‘‘Snow Queen’’ experiment.

A system is said to be *consistently connected* if for any two $R_q^c, R_q^{c'}$, the respective distributions of R_q^c and $R_q^{c'}$ coincide. This property of a system corresponds to the *marginal selectivity* condition in the selective influences literature

in psychology, as well as to the *no-disturbance* or the *no-signaling* requirements in quantum physics. If this property is not satisfied, the system is said to be *inconsistently connected*. In general, a system of random variables \mathcal{R} is not consistently connected. Note that whenever a system \mathcal{R} is consistently connected, then for any two $R_q^c, R_q^{c'}$, the corresponding variables of a multimaximal coupling of \mathcal{R}_q are almost always equal (that is, $\Pr(T_q^c = T_q^{c'}) = 1$).

The contextuality measure CNTF proposed in [2] is defined only for consistently connected systems. However, there is a procedure that can be applied to any system of binary random variables to generate a new system \mathcal{R}^\ddagger that is consistently connected and whose contextually status is the same as that of the original system \mathcal{R} . Moreover, if \mathcal{R} is consistently connected then $\text{CNTF}(\mathcal{R})$ and $\text{CNTF}(\mathcal{R}^\ddagger)$ are equal [17]. The *consistification* of system \mathcal{R} is obtained by constructing a new system \mathcal{R}^\ddagger in the following manner. First, define the set of contents Q^\ddagger of the new system as

$$Q^\ddagger = \{q_{ij} : c_i \in C, q_j \in Q, q_j \prec c_i\}.$$

That is, for each content q_j and each of the contexts c_i in which it is recorded, we define a content q_{ij} = “ q_j recorded in context c_i ”. Next, define the new set of contexts C^\ddagger as

$$C^\ddagger = C \sqcup Q,$$

the disjoint union of the contexts and the contents of the system \mathcal{R} . Then, define the new relation

$$\prec^\ddagger = \{(q_{ij}, c_i) : q_j \in Q, c_i \in C, q_j \prec c_i\} \sqcup \{(q_{ij}, q_j) : q_j \in Q, c_i \in C, q_j \prec c_i\}.$$

That is, the new content q_{ij} is recorded in precisely two of the new contexts, $c_i \in C^\ddagger$ and $q_j \in C^\ddagger$. In this manner, the bunch

$$R^{c_i} = \left\{ R_{q_{ij}}^{c_i} : q_{ij} \in Q^\ddagger, q_{ij} \prec^\ddagger c_i \right\}$$

coincides with the bunch

$$R^{c_i} = \left\{ R_q^{c_i} : q \in Q, q \prec c_i \right\}$$

of the original system; while the bunch

$$R^{q_j} = \left\{ R_{q_{ij}}^{q_j} : q_{ij} \in Q^\ddagger, q_{ij} \prec^\ddagger q_j \right\}$$

is constructed by defining new jointly distributed random variables $\{R_{q_{ij}}^{q_j}\}_{q_{ij} \prec^\ddagger q_j}$ such that R^{q_j} is the multimaximal coupling of \mathcal{R}^{q_j} . Note that if \mathcal{R} is a cyclic system of rank n , then its consistified system \mathcal{R}^\ddagger is a consistently connected cyclic system of rank $2n$. The following matrices show the consistification of system \mathcal{R}_2 and how its bunches relate to the bunches of the original system and the multimaximal couplings of its connections .

$R_{q_{11}}^{c_1}$	$R_{q_{12}}^{c_1}$			c_1
	$R_{q_{12}}^{q_2}$	$R_{q_{22}}^{q_2}$		q_2
		$R_{q_{22}}^{c_2}$	$R_{q_{21}}^{c_2}$	c_2
$R_{q_{11}}^{q_1}$			$R_{q_{21}}^{q_1}$	q_1
q_{11}	q_{12}	q_{22}	q_{21}	\mathcal{R}_2^\ddagger

R_1^1	R_2^1			c_1
	T_2^1	T_2^2		q_2
		R_2^2	R_1^2	c_2
T_1^1			T_1^2	q_1

If a system \mathcal{R} is consistently connected, the contextual fraction proposed by Abramsky et al. [2] can be computed solving the following linear programming task:

find	maximizing	subject to
\mathbf{z}	$\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{z}$	$\mathbf{M}_{(\cdot)} \mathbf{z} \leq \mathbf{p}_{(\cdot)}^*$
		$\mathbf{z} \geq 0$
		$\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{z} \leq 1$

For any solution \mathbf{z}^* , $\text{CNTF}(\mathcal{R}) = 1 - \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{z}^*$. As for the task to compute CNT_2 , there are infinitely many solutions to this task. The previous task is equivalent to the one proposed in [2] which uses a simpler representation of the system [17]. Now, if we consider the consistified system \mathcal{R}_n^\ddagger of a cyclic system \mathcal{R}_n , then equality 14 is satisfied by Th. 18 of [24] and, if \mathcal{R}_n is consistently connected, equality 15 is satisfied by Th. 7 of [17].

$$\text{CNT}_2(\mathcal{R}_n) = \text{CNT}_2(\mathcal{R}_n^\ddagger), \quad (14)$$

$$\text{CNTF}(\mathcal{R}_n) = \text{CNTF}(\mathcal{R}_n^\ddagger). \quad (15)$$

Moreover, Th. 7 of [17] also shows that, regardless of consistent connectedness, the linear programming task to compute $\text{CNTF}(\mathcal{R}^\ddagger)$ is equivalent to the task just given for consistently connected systems. Hence, we will abuse notation and simply write CNT_2 and CNTF for the measures of the systems \mathcal{R}_n and \mathcal{R}_n^\ddagger , and use equality 15 as the definition of the contextual fraction for inconsistently connected systems.

2 Main theorem

Theorem 1. *If \mathcal{R}_n is a cyclic system of rank n , then $\text{CNTF} = 2\text{CNT}_2$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{R}_n be a cyclic system of rank n . Note that if \mathcal{R}_n is noncontextual, both measures CNT_2 and CNTF equal zero and, trivially, $\text{CNTF} = 2\text{CNT}_2$. Thus, we will assume that \mathcal{R}_n is contextual.

Let us take the consistification \mathcal{R}_n^\ddagger of \mathcal{R}_n and, for the linear programming task to compute its CNTF measure, denote the components of the vector $\mathbf{p}_{(\cdot)}^*$ corresponding to an arbitrary context i by p_{11}^* , p_{01}^* , p_{10}^* , and p_{00}^* . By construction of $\mathbf{p}_{(\cdot)}^*$, these components equal

$$p_{11}^* = p_{i,i\oplus 1}, \quad (16)$$

$$p_{01}^* = p_i^i - p_{i,i\oplus 1}, \quad (17)$$

$$p_{10}^* = p_{i\oplus 1}^i - p_{i,i\oplus 1}, \quad (18)$$

$$p_{00}^* = 1 - p_i^i - p_{i\oplus 1}^i + p_{i,i\oplus 1}, \quad (19)$$

where p_i^i , $p_{i\oplus 1}^i$, and $p_{i,i\oplus 1}$ are defined in (10). Next, let us denote the corresponding rows of the incidence matrix $\mathbf{M}_{(\cdot)}$ by $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}11}^\top$, $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}01}^\top$, $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}10}^\top$, and $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}00}^\top$, respectively, the vector that results by removing from $\mathbf{p}_{(\cdot)}^*$ the components p_{11}^* , p_{01}^* , p_{10}^* , and p_{00}^* by \mathbf{p}_{-i}^* , and the submatrix of $\mathbf{M}_{(\cdot)}$ without rows $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}11}^\top$, $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}01}^\top$, $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}10}^\top$, and $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}00}^\top$ by $\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{p}-i}$. Note that $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}11}^\top + \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}01}^\top + \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}10}^\top + \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}00}^\top = \mathbf{1}^\top$ and that the summands are orthogonal because they correspond to pairwise disjoint events; therefore, we can rewrite the task to compute CNTF as follows:

find	maximizing	subject to
\mathbf{z}	$\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}11}^\top \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}01}^\top \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}10}^\top \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}00}^\top \mathbf{z}$	$\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}11}^\top \mathbf{z} \leq p_{11}^*$ $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}01}^\top \mathbf{z} \leq p_{01}^*$ $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}10}^\top \mathbf{z} \leq p_{10}^*$ $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}00}^\top \mathbf{z} \leq p_{00}^*$ $\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{p}-i} \mathbf{z} \leq \mathbf{p}_{-i}^*$ $\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{z} \leq 1$ $\mathbf{z} \geq 0$

Clearly, when maximizing $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}11}^\top \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}01}^\top \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}10}^\top \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}00}^\top \mathbf{z}$, one is making all four $p_{rs}^* - \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}rs}^\top \mathbf{z}$, with $r, s = 0, 1$, as small as simultaneously possible. Thus, the linear programming task is equivalent to:

find	minimizing	subject to
\mathbf{z}	$a_{11} + a_{01} + a_{10} + a_{00}$	$\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{q}11}^\top \mathbf{z} + a_{11} = p_{11}^*$ $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{q}01}^\top \mathbf{z} + a_{01} = p_{01}^*$ $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{q}10}^\top \mathbf{z} + a_{10} = p_{10}^*$ $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{q}00}^\top \mathbf{z} + a_{00} = p_{00}^*$ $\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{p}-i} \mathbf{z} \leq \mathbf{p}_{-i}^*$ $\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{z} \leq 1$ $\mathbf{z}, a_{11}, a_{10}, a_{01}, a_{00} \geq 0$

For any solution \mathbf{z}^* , compute $\text{CNTF} = a_{11}^* + a_{01}^* + a_{10}^* + a_{00}^*$. Clearly, for every solution \mathbf{z}^* , the values a_{11}^* , a_{01}^* , a_{10}^* , a_{00}^* , can be expressed as

$$p_{11}^* - \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}11}^\top \mathbf{z}^* = \lambda_{11}^* \text{CNTF}, \quad (20)$$

$$p_{01}^* - \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}01}^\top \mathbf{z}^* = \lambda_{01}^* \text{CNTF}, \quad (21)$$

$$p_{10}^* - \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}10}^\top \mathbf{z}^* = \lambda_{10}^* \text{CNTF}, \quad (22)$$

$$p_{00}^* - \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}00}^\top \mathbf{z}^* = \lambda_{00}^* \text{CNTF}, \quad (23)$$

where $0 \leq \lambda_{11}^*, \lambda_{01}^*, \lambda_{10}^*, \lambda_{00}^* \leq 1$, and $\lambda_{11}^* + \lambda_{01}^* + \lambda_{10}^* + \lambda_{00}^* = 1$.

Now, since \mathcal{R}_n^{\ddagger} is a cyclic system, by Th. 15 of [24], there exists a pair \mathbf{x}^* and \mathbf{d}^* that solve the linear programming task to compute CNT_2 in which \mathbf{d}^* has all entries except one equal to zero. Moreover, from the properties described in [24], for each $i = 1, \dots, 2n$, one can find a solution of this form. Hence, for any context i , by defining $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{b}_i}$, \mathbf{b}_{-i}^* , and $\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{b}_{-i}}$ analogously to $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{prs}}$, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^* , and $\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{p}_{-i}}$, we can rewrite the linear programming task to compute CNT_2 as:

find	minimizing	subject to
\mathbf{x}	d_i	$-d_i \leq b_i^* - \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{b}_i}^T \mathbf{x} \leq d_i$
		$\mathbf{x}, d_i \geq 0$
		$\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{x} = 1$
		$\mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{l}^*$
		$\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{b}_{-i}} \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}_{-i}^*$
		$\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{c}} \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{1}$

and, for any solution \mathbf{x}^* , compute $\text{CNT}_2 = d_i^*$. Furthermore, for any solution \mathbf{x}^* , either $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{b}_i}^T \mathbf{x}^* + d_i^* = b_i^*$ or $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{b}_i}^T \mathbf{x}^* - d_i^* = b_i^*$. Without loss of generality, assume that $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{b}_i}^T \mathbf{x}^* - d_i^* = b_i^*$.

By construction of the vectors \mathbf{b}^* and $\mathbf{p}_{(\cdot)}^*$, $b_i^* = p_{11}^*$. From this equality and equalities (16)–(19), after some algebraic manipulation, one can find that the following relations are satisfied for any solution \mathbf{x}^* :

$$p_{11}^* - \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{q}_{11}}^T \mathbf{x}^* = -d_i^*, \quad (24)$$

$$p_{01}^* - \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{q}_{01}}^T \mathbf{x}^* = d_i^*, \quad (25)$$

$$p_{10}^* - \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{q}_{10}}^T \mathbf{x}^* = d_i^*, \quad (26)$$

$$p_{00}^* - \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{q}_{00}}^T \mathbf{x}^* = -d_i^*. \quad (27)$$

The equalities (24)–(27) show how much a solution \mathbf{x}^* deviates from being a solution to the CNTF linear programming task in the following sense. Clearly, \mathbf{x}^* is not a solution for the CNTF task because we assumed \mathcal{R}_n^{\ddagger} is contextual; thus, $d_i^* > 0$. However, for a solution to the CNTF task all values on the right-hand side of (24)–(27) should be positive, as shown by equalities (20)–(23). That is, if we tried to produce a candidate solution \mathbf{x}^{**} of the CNTF task by modifying \mathbf{x}^* , one would need to modify the components of \mathbf{x}^* corresponding to the ones of $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}_{11}}^T$ and $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}_{00}}^T$. In particular, the candidate \mathbf{x}^{**} can be constructed so that $p_{11}^* - \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}_{11}}^T \mathbf{x}^{**} = 0$ and $p_{00}^* - \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}_{00}}^T \mathbf{x}^{**} = 0$. Thus, by minimality of the solutions to the CNTF task, we obtain that $1 - \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{x}^{**} = 2d_i^* = 2\text{CNT}_2 \geq \text{CNTF}$.

On the other hand, from the equalities (20)–(23), given a solution \mathbf{z}^* to the

CNTF task, one can produce a vector \mathbf{z}^{**} such that

$$p_{11}^* - \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}11}^\top \mathbf{z}^{**} = 0, \quad (28)$$

$$p_{01}^* - \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}01}^\top \mathbf{z}^{**} = \frac{1}{2} \text{CNTF}, \quad (29)$$

$$p_{10}^* - \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}10}^\top \mathbf{z}^{**} = \frac{1}{2} \text{CNTF}, \quad (30)$$

$$p_{00}^* - \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}00}^\top \mathbf{z}^{**} = 0. \quad (31)$$

Such solution shows how much a solution \mathbf{z}^* deviates from being a solution to the CNT_2 linear programming task. Since $\text{CNTF} = 1 - \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{z}^* > 0$ and a solution to the CNT_2 task satisfies $1 - \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}^* = 0$, one would need to increase the magnitude of some components of \mathbf{z}^{**} to produce a candidate vector \mathbf{z}^{***} . In particular, because a solution \mathbf{x}^* of the CNT_2 task satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}11}^\top + \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}10}^\top) \mathbf{x}^* &= p_{11}^* + p_{10}^* \\ &= \Pr(R_i^i = 1) \\ &= p_i^{i*} \end{aligned}$$

(due to p_i^i being a component of \mathbf{I}^*), and analogously for $p_{i \oplus 1}^i$, the components of \mathbf{z}^{**} corresponding to the ones of $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}11}^\top$ and $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}00}^\top$ need be modified so that $p_{11}^* - \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}11}^\top \mathbf{z}^{***} = -\frac{1}{2} \text{CNTF}$ and $p_{00}^* - \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}00}^\top \mathbf{z}^{***} = -\frac{1}{2} \text{CNTF}$. Since d_i^* is minimal, this shows that $\text{CNTF} \geq 2\text{CNT}_2$. Therefore, $\text{CNTF} = 2\text{CNT}_2$. \square

3 Discussion

The proof presented in this paper improves the understanding of the relationship between the different approaches to studying contextuality. Dzhamfarov et al. [24] showed that in cyclic systems CNT_2 is equal to another measure, CNT_1 , and in [31] it was conjectured that these measures are proportional to a measure computed based on negative probabilities, CNT_3 . If this conjecture is found to be true, the current result shows that all these different approaches to the quantification of contextuality capture essentially the same feature of cyclic systems.

It should be noted, however, that outside the class of cyclic systems, these measures are not generally the same. Dzhamfarov et al. [24, 25] present some examples that show that CNT_2 and CNT_1 are not in general functions of each other. It is also easy to see that CNT_2 and CNTF do not need to be proportional for noncyclic systems. Take for example any number m of separate systems of random variables and consider the system obtained from their disjoint union. That is, take systems \mathcal{R}_k , with corresponding sets of contexts and contents C_k and Q_k , $k = 1, \dots, m$, and construct the system

$$\mathcal{R} = \{R_q^c : c \in \sqcup_{k=1}^m C_k, q \in \sqcup_{k=1}^m Q_k, q \prec c\}.$$

The following matrix shows an example of such a system, one composed of disjoint cyclic subsystems.

R_1^1	R_2^1			c_1
R_1^2	R_2^2			c_2
		R_3^3	R_4^3	c_3
		R_3^4	R_4^4	c_4
q_1	q_2	q_3	q_4	\mathcal{R}

As shown in [16], for this system, $\text{CNT}_2(\mathcal{R}) = \sum_{k=1}^m \text{CNT}_2(\mathcal{R}_k)$, whereas $\text{CNTF}(\mathcal{R}) = \max_{k=1, \dots, m} \text{CNTF}(\mathcal{R}_k)$.

Lastly, in addition to the measures I have mentioned above, Cervantes and Dzhafarov [16] have recently proposed a hierarchical measure of contextuality and noncontextuality based on CNT_2 . In the class of cyclic systems, this hierarchical measure reduces to the contextuality measure CNT_2 and the non-contextuality measure NCNT_2 .

References

- [1] Samson Abramsky. Relational databases and Bell’s theorem. In Val Tanen, Limsoon Wong, Leonid Libkin, Wenfei Fan, Wang-Chiew Tan, and Michael Fourman, editors, *In Search of Elegance in the Theory and Practice of Computation: Essays Dedicated to Peter Buneman*, pages 13–35. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013.
- [2] Samson Abramsky, Rui Soares Barbosa, and Shane Mansfield. Contextual Fraction as a Measure of Contextuality. *Physical Review Letters*, 119(5):050504, August 2017.
- [3] Guillaume Adenier and Andrei Yu. Khrennikov. Test of the no-signaling principle in the Hensen loophole-free CHSH experiment: Test of the no-signaling principle. *Fortschritte der Physik*, 65(9):1600096, September 2017.
- [4] Mateus Araújo, Marco Túlio Quintino, Costantino Budroni, Marcelo Terra Cunha, and Adán Cabello. All noncontextuality inequalities for the n-cycle scenario. *Physical Review A*, 88(2), August 2013.
- [5] Masanari Asano, Takahisa Hashimoto, Andrei Yu Khrennikov, Masanori Ohya, and Yoshiharu Tanaka. Violation of contextual generalization of the Leggett-Garg inequality for recognition of ambiguous figures. *Physica Scripta*, T163:014006, 2014.
- [6] Irina Basieva, Víctor H. Cervantes, Ehtibar N. Dzhafarov, and Andrei Khrennikov. True contextuality beats direct influences in human decision making. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 148(11):1925–1937, November 2019.

- [7] John S. Bell. On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox. *Physics*, 1(3):195–200, 1964.
- [8] John S. Bell. On the problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 38(3):447–452, July 1966.
- [9] Peter Bruza, Jerome R. Busemeyer, and Liane Gabora. Introduction to the special issue on quantum cognition. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 53(5):303–305, October 2009.
- [10] Peter D. Bruza, Kirsty Kitto, Brentyn J. Ramm, and Laurianne Sitbon. A probabilistic framework for analysing the compositionality of conceptual combinations. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 67:26–38, 2015.
- [11] Jerome R. Busemeyer and Peter D. Bruza. *Quantum Models of Cognition and Decision*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, 2012.
- [12] Jerome R. Busemeyer and Zheng Wang. What Is Quantum Cognition, and How Is It Applied to Psychology? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 24(3):163–169, June 2015.
- [13] Víctor H. Cervantes and Ehtibar N. Dzhafarov. Exploration of Contextuality in a Psychophysical Double-Detection Experiment. In Jose Acacio de Barros, Bob Coecke, and Emmanuel Pothos, editors, *Quantum Interaction. LNCS*, volume 10106 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 182–193. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2017.
- [14] Víctor H. Cervantes and Ehtibar N. Dzhafarov. Snow queen is evil and beautiful: Experimental evidence for probabilistic contextuality in human choices. *Decision*, 5(3):193–204, July 2018.
- [15] Víctor H. Cervantes and Ehtibar N. Dzhafarov. True contextuality in a psychophysical experiment. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 91:119–127, August 2019.
- [16] Víctor H. Cervantes and Ehtibar N. Dzhafarov. Contextuality Analysis of Impossible Figures. *Entropy*, 22(9):981, September 2020.
- [17] Ehtibar N. Dzhafarov. The Contextuality-by-Default View of the Sheaf-Theoretic Approach to Contextuality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.02718*, 2019.
- [18] Ehtibar N. Dzhafarov and Janne V. Kujala. Quantum entanglement and the issue of selective influences in psychology: An overview. In Jerome R. Busemeyer, François Dubois, Ariane Lambert-Mogiliansky, and Massimo Melucci, editors, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, number 7620, pages 184–195. Springer, Dordrecht, 2012.
- [19] Ehtibar N. Dzhafarov and Janne V. Kujala. Context-content systems of random variables: The Contextuality-by-Default theory. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 74:11–33, 2016.

- [20] Ehtibar N. Dzhafarov and Janne V. Kujala. Contextuality-by-Default 2.0: Systems with Binary Random Variables. In *Quantum Interaction*, volume 10106 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 16–32. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2017.
- [21] Ehtibar N. Dzhafarov and Janne V. Kujala. Probability, random variables, and selectivity. In William H. Batchelder, Hans Colonius, Ehtibar N. Dzhafarov, and Jay Myung, editors, *New Handbook of Mathematical Psychology*, pages 85–150. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2017.
- [22] Ehtibar N. Dzhafarov, Janne V. Kujala, and Víctor H. Cervantes. Contextuality-by-Default: A brief overview of ideas, concepts, and terminology. In Harald Atmanspacher, Thomas Filk, and Emmanuel Pothos, editors, *Quantum Interaction. LNCS*, volume 9535, pages 12–23. Springer, Dordrecht, 2016.
- [23] Ehtibar N. Dzhafarov, Janne V. Kujala, Víctor H. Cervantes, Ru Zhang, and Matt Jones. On contextuality in behavioral data. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 374:20150234, 2016.
- [24] Ehtibar N. Dzhafarov, Janne V. Kujala, and Víctor H. Cervantes. Contextuality and noncontextuality measures and generalized Bell inequalities for cyclic systems. *Physical Review A*, 101(4), April 2020.
- [25] Ehtibar N. Dzhafarov, Janne V. Kujala, and Víctor H. Cervantes. Erratum: Contextuality and noncontextuality measures and generalized Bell inequalities for cyclic systems [Phys. Rev. A **101**, 042119 (2020)]. *Physical Review A*, 101(6), June 2020.
- [26] Ehtibar N. Dzhafarov, Janne V. Kujala, and Víctor H. Cervantes. Epistemic odds of contextuality in cyclic systems. *The European Physical Journal Special Topics*, April 2021.
- [27] Ehtibar N. Dzhafarov, Ru Zhang, and Janne V. Kujala. Is there contextuality in behavioural and social systems? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 374:20150099, 2015.
- [28] B. Hensen, H. Bernien, A. E. Dréau, A. Reiserer, N. Kalb, M. S. Blok, J. Ruitenberg, R. F. L. Vermeulen, R. N. Schouten, C. Abellan, W. Amaya, V. Pruneri, M. W. Mitchell, M. Markham, D. J. Twitchen, D. Elkouss, S. Wehner, T. H. Taminiau, and R. Hanson. Loophole-free Bell inequality violation using electron spins separated by 1.3 kilometres. *Nature*, 526(7575):682–686, 2015.
- [29] Andrei Khrennikov, Irina Basieva, Ehtibar N. Dzhafarov, and Jerome R. Busemeyer. Quantum Models for Psychological Measurements: An Unsolved Problem. *PLoS ONE*, 9(10):e110909, October 2014.

- [30] Janne V. Kujala and Ehtibar N. Dzhafarov. Proof of a conjecture on contextuality in cyclic systems with binary variables. *Foundations of Physics*, 46:282–299, 2016.
- [31] Janne V. Kujala and Ehtibar N. Dzhafarov. Measures of contextuality and non-contextuality. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 377(2157):20190149, November 2019.
- [32] A. J. Leggett and Anupam Garg. Quantum mechanics versus macroscopic realism: Is the flux there when nobody looks? *Physical Review Letters*, 54(9):857–860, 1985.
- [33] Patrick Suppes and Mario Zanotti. When are probabilistic explanations possible? *Synthese*, 48:191–199, 1981.
- [34] Zheng Wang and Jerome R. Busemeyer. A quantum question order model supported by empirical tests of an a priori and precise prediction. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 5(4):689–710, 2013.
- [35] Ru Zhang and Ehtibar N. Dzhafarov. Noncontextuality with marginal selectivity in reconstructing mental architectures. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6:735, 2015.

Appendix

Table 6: Example solutions to the linear programming tasks for computing CNT_2 and CNTF for system \mathcal{R}_{SQ} describing the “Snow Queen” experiment. The left panel shows vectors $\mathbf{x}^{*\top}$, and $\mathbf{z}^{*\top}$. Vector \mathbf{x}^* solves the linear programming task for computing CNT_2 so that $d_2 = \text{CNT}_2(\mathcal{R}_{\text{SQ}}) = .069$. Vector \mathbf{z}^* solves the task to compute CNTF . To help readability of the nonzero components, all zero components of the solutions are omitted and replaced by the number of omitted elements inside parentheses. The lower section shows the vectors of matrix $\mathbf{M}_{(\cdot)}$ corresponding to the probabilities of bunch R_{SQ}^2 . The elements of these vectors corresponding to the zero components of the solutions have also been replaced by the number of omitted components. The right panel shows the results of the product of the vectors of matrix $\mathbf{M}_{(\cdot)}$ and the solutions to each linear programming task, as well as the actual probabilities from bunch R_{SQ}^2 .

$\mathbf{x}^{*\top}$	0.009	(5)	0.018	(17)	0.08	(95)	0.029	(14)	0.021	(63)	0.033	(31)	0.139	(15)	0.109	0.032	0.035	(1)	0.36	(3)	0.135			
$\mathbf{z}^{*\top}$	0.009	(5)	0.018	(17)	0.011	(95)	0.029	(14)	0.021	(63)	0.033	(31)	0.07	(15)	0.109	0.032	0.035	(1)	0.36	(3)	0.135	$\mathbf{m}_{\text{prs}}\mathbf{x}^*$	$\mathbf{m}_{\text{prs}}\mathbf{z}^*$	$\mathbf{p}_{(\cdot)}^*$
$\{S_2^2 = 1, S_3^2 = 1\}$	0	(5)	0	(17)	0	(95)	1	(14)	0	(63)	0	(31)	0	(15)	1	1	1	(1)	1	(3)	1	0.700	0.700	.769
$\{S_2^2 = 0, S_3^2 = 1\}$	0	(5)	0	(17)	1	(95)	0	(14)	0	(63)	0	(31)	0	(15)	0	0	0	(1)	0	(3)	0	0.080	0.011	.011
$\{S_2^2 = 1, S_3^2 = 0\}$	0	(5)	0	(17)	0	(95)	0	(14)	0	(63)	0	(31)	1	(15)	0	0	0	(1)	0	(3)	0	0.139	0.070	.070
$\{S_2^2 = 0, S_3^2 = 1\}$	1	(5)	1	(17)	0	(59)	0	(14)	1	(63)	1	(31)	0	(15)	0	0	0	(1)	0	(3)	0	0.081	0.081	.150