

Perfect demonstration of Bell Nonlocality without Inequalities from Non-Perfect Correlations

Weidong Tang^{1,*}

¹*School of Mathematics and Statistics, Shaanxi Normal University, Xi'an 710119, China*

The all-versus-nothing proof of Bell nonlocality is a kind of mainstream demonstration of Bell's theorem without inequalities. Two species of such proofs, called the "always-type" all-versus-nothing proof and the "sometimes-type" all-versus-nothing proof, are both widely investigated. So far, almost all previous "always-type" all-versus-nothing proofs of Bell nonlocality are induced by perfect correlations from stabilizer states. Based on that, many people may customarily assume that only perfect correlations can give rise to "always-type" all-versus-nothing proofs. Here we present a kind of "always" type all-versus-nothing proof of Bell nonlocality from non-perfect correlations, clearing up this long-standing misconception. Our results may shed new light on the study of Bell nonlocality, and may have potential applications in some quantum information technologies.

As one of the most striking features of quantum mechanics and a very important quantum resource of quantum information processing, nonlocality has been widely used in quantum communications and computation. Among various kinds of nonlocality, the most common one is the Bell nonlocality[1, 2], which states that any local realistic model[1, 3] is incompatible with quantum mechanics. To show this quantum feature, a well-known method is to test various of Bell inequalities[1, 3], but the shortcoming of this approach can only provides a probabilistic demonstration of Bell nonlocality. By contrast, another significant approach to demonstrate Bell nonlocality by resorting to some logical contradictions(sometimes also called "Bell's theorem without inequalities"[4, 5] or "nonlocality without inequalities"[6, 7]) does not have such limitations. Demonstrations of Bell nonlocality by this method can be either deterministic or probabilistic. The Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger(GHZ) paradox[4, 5] and the Hardy's paradox[6, 7] are two famous examples, which can give two kinds of all-versus-nothing(AVN) proofs[8] for Bell nonlocality, respectively. From the angle of the success probability (of ruling out local realism), the former provides an "always-type" all-versus-nothing(ATAVN) proof (ideally 100%) while the latter provides a "sometimes-type" AVN proof(less than 100%)[9], and consequently, they can also be referred to as perfect demonstration and probabilistic demonstration of Bell nonlocality (without inequalities) respectively. Besides the GHZ paradox[4, 5] and Hardy's paradox[6, 7], many other ingenious AVN proofs are also very characteristic in the study of Bell nonlocality, such as Cabello's four-qubit AVN proof based on two maximally entangled states[10], the GHZ-like AVN proofs for mixed states[11, 12], and the multi-setting GHZ-like AVN proofs[13]. So far, many of such AVN proofs have been tested experimentally[14-17].

To date, almost all of the ATAVN proofs of Bell nonlocality are constructed based on perfect correlations from specific quantum systems(stabilizer states). Here the perfect correlations[4, 18], stand for a group of in-

dependent stabilizer-induced perfect correlated (or anti-correlated) relations(constraints), and can usually be written as $|\langle\psi_n|S_i|\psi_n\rangle| = 1$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, where $|\psi_n\rangle$ is an n -qubit stabilizer state, and S_i is a stabilizer(up to a phase factor) of $|\psi_n\rangle$. Although these perfect demonstrations of Bell nonlocality can show the distinction of quantum mechanics and classical theories in a quite simple way, they may mislead many people to regard that only perfect correlations can lead to a ATAVN proof. To clear up this popular misconception, exploring ATAVN proofs from non-perfect correlations is of great importance. Here the non-perfect correlations, can be defined as a group of constraints: $|\langle\varphi_n|K_i|\varphi_n\rangle| = c_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$, where $|\varphi_n\rangle$ is an n -qubit state, K_i is a product of local observables with eigenvalues ± 1 , and there exists at least one $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, such that $c_k \neq 1$.

To construct a perfect demonstration(an ATAVN proof) for Bell nonlocality from non-perfect correlations, one need to overcome at least two difficulties. One is how to choose a suitable quantum state, and the other is finding a proper method to formulate an "always-type" contradiction from a group of non-perfect correlated constraints. To address them, it is worthy to notice that some quantum states can induce more than one "sometimes-type" AVN proof(Hardy-like proof) and combining all such "sometimes-type" AVN proofs (induced from the same quantum state) together may greatly improve the success probability of ruling out local realism[10, 19]. As long as this success probability can be improved to 100%, then an ATAVN proof can be produced. Based on this thought, the projected-coloring graph(PCG) state proposed very recently[19] seems be a suitable candidate. More precisely, if enough "sometimes-type" AVN proofs can be induced from non-perfect correlations of a PCG state, combining them together will produce such an ATAVN proof.

In general, an n -qubit PCG state can be defined as

$$|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p+1}} |\vec{0}\rangle_{\{1,2,\dots,n\}} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \theta_i |\vec{0}\rangle_{\vec{\mathcal{S}}_i} |\vec{1}\rangle_{\mathcal{S}_i}, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{S}_i \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, $1 \leq |\mathcal{S}_i| < n$, $|\mathcal{S}_i \cup \mathcal{S}_j| > \max\{|\mathcal{S}_i|, |\mathcal{S}_j|\}$ ($i \neq j$), and the coefficients $\theta_i \in \{1, -1\}$. Besides, $|\vec{0}\rangle_{\{1,2,\dots,n\}} \equiv \otimes_{k=1}^n |0\rangle_k$, $|\vec{1}\rangle_{\mathcal{S}_i} \equiv \otimes_{k \in \mathcal{S}_i} |1\rangle_k$, and $|\vec{0}\rangle_{\vec{\mathcal{S}}_i} \equiv \otimes_{k \in \vec{\mathcal{S}}_i} |0\rangle_k$. Moreover, \mathcal{I} is the index set used for describing a group of specific subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and therefore $p = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} |\theta_{\mathcal{S}_i}| = |\mathcal{I}|$.

The PCG state plays a central role in the construction of a kind of ‘‘sometimes-type’’ AVN proof called the Hardy-like quantum pigeonhole(HLQP) paradox[19] which can rule out the local hidden variable (LHV) theories[1, 3] in terms of a logical contradiction from classical pigeonhole principle. Here we shall briefly show this quantum effect by resorting to a simple example based on the following three-qubit PCG state

$$|\Psi_3\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|000\rangle - |011\rangle - |101\rangle - |110\rangle), \quad (2)$$

which is essentially a GHZ state. Let $|+\rangle = (|0\rangle + |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and $|-\rangle = (|0\rangle - |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ be two ‘‘boxes’’ and each qubit be a ‘‘pigeon’’. Then one can get the following properties(Hardy-like conditions):

$$P(X_2 X_3 = -1 | Z_1 = 1) = 1, \quad (3a)$$

$$P(X_1 X_3 = -1 | Z_2 = 1) = 1, \quad (3b)$$

$$P(X_1 X_2 = -1 | Z_3 = 1) = 1, \quad (3c)$$

$$P(Z_1 = 1, Z_2 = 1, Z_3 = 1) = 0.25. \quad (3d)$$

Here $P(X_2 X_3 = -1 | Z_1 = 1)$, for example, is the conditional probability of $X_2 X_3$ measured with outcome -1 given that the result of $Z_1 = 1$. Besides, $P(Z_1 = 1, Z_2 = 1, Z_3 = 1)$ stands for the joint probability of obtaining the result of $Z_1 = 1, Z_2 = 1, Z_3 = 1$.

By invoking the properties of (3a) to (3d), one can construct a three-qubit HLQP paradox to show that any realistic interpretation of quantum mechanics must be nonlocal. First of all, suppose that three qubits of $|\Phi_3\rangle$ are held by three observers in different places(hereafter all the measurements are limited to spacelike separated measurements). Then consider a run of the experiment that Z_1, Z_2 and Z_3 are measured and the results $Z_1 = 1, Z_2 = 1$ and $Z_3 = 1$ are obtained. Assume that $|\Psi_3\rangle$ admits a local realistic description, namely, for example, the result(a predefined value) of measuring Z_1 is independent of the choice of the measurements performed on the other qubits. As a consequence, if X_2 and X_3 were measured in this run, their outcomes should satisfy $X_2 X_3 = -1$ (pigeon 2 and pigeon 3 are in different boxes). Likewise, $X_1 X_3 = -1$ and $X_1 X_2 = -1$ should also be satisfied in the same run. It follows that any pair of the ‘‘pigeons’’ are staying in different ‘‘boxes’’, a contradiction by classical pigeonhole principle. Then one can

get a three-qubit HLQP paradox. For more complicated examples, see Ref.[19].

However, only one type of HLQP paradox (associated with the measurement results $Z_1 = Z_2 = \dots = Z_n = 1$) was discussed in Ref.[19]. In fact, some other types of HLQP paradoxes may also be induced from a PCG state. For example, besides the group of constraints given in Eq.(3), other results obtained from the measurements of Z_1, Z_2 and Z_3 can also induce three groups of Hardy-like conditions, and each of them will produce a HLQP paradox either. In other words, $|\Psi_3\rangle$ can induce a total of four ‘‘sometimes-type’’ AVN proofs(HLQP paradoxes). Moreover, one can even formulate an ATAVN proof by combining these four HLQP paradoxes together. But this ATAVN proof essentially arises from perfect correlations of a stabilizer state rather than from non-perfect correlations, which seems to be in analogy with the proof of Bell’s theorem in Ref.[10]. For detailed discussion, see Appendix A.

On the other hand, recall that an original HLQP paradox can usually be pictorially represented by a PCG. Similar representations also apply to other types of HLQP paradoxes, and for simplicity, they are still referred to as PCGs. As mentioned above, we shall construct an ATAVN proof in terms of a combination of HLQP paradoxes (induced from a specific PCG state). Then a pictorial description for an ATAVN proof can also be given by combining the associated PCGs together. To show that, notice that each conditional constraint induced from the n -qubit($n \geq 3$) state $|\Psi\rangle$ in Eq.(1) can be written as

$$P\left(\prod_{k \in \mathcal{S}'_j} X_k = \theta'_j | \vec{Z}_{\vec{\mathcal{S}}'_j} = \vec{1}_{\vec{\mathcal{S}}'_j}, \vec{Z}_{\vec{\mathcal{S}}'_j} = -\vec{1}_{\vec{\mathcal{S}}'_j}\right) = 1, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{S}'_j \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, $j \in \mathcal{I}'$ (another index set), $\vec{\mathcal{S}}'_j \cup \vec{\mathcal{S}}'_{j-} = \vec{\mathcal{S}}'_j$ and $\theta'_j \in \{1, -1\}$. Besides, $\vec{Z}_{\vec{\mathcal{S}}'_j} = \vec{1}_{\vec{\mathcal{S}}'_j}$, for example, stands for $Z_{l_1} = 1, Z_{l_2} = 1, \dots, Z_{l_p} = 1$ ($\{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_p\} = \vec{\mathcal{S}}'_j$).

For each result $(\vec{1}_{\mathcal{S}_i}, -\vec{1}_{\vec{\mathcal{S}}_i})$ obtained from the measurement of $\vec{Z}_{\{1,2,\dots,n\}}$, putting all of its compatible conditional constraints into a group(wherein for each conditional constraint associated with \mathcal{S}'_i , it is required that $\vec{\mathcal{S}}'_{i+} \subset \mathcal{S}_i, \vec{\mathcal{S}}'_{i-} \subset \vec{\mathcal{S}}_i$), one can get a total of $p+1$ such groups, and accordingly, one can produce $p+1$ PCGs. To be specific, if the measurement of $\vec{Z}_{\{1,2,\dots,n\}}$ gives the result $(\vec{1}_{\vec{\mathcal{S}}_i}, -\vec{1}_{\mathcal{S}_i})$ in a run of the experiment, assume that the group of conditional constraints associated with $\{\mathcal{S}'_{i_1}, \mathcal{S}'_{i_2}, \dots, \mathcal{S}'_{i_\alpha}\}$ are compatible with this result, then a PCG can be produced in the following way: (i) Each \mathcal{S}'_{i_k} ($k \in \{1, 2, \dots, \alpha\}$) generates an edge, with colors red and green associated with $\theta'_{i_k} = -1$ and $\theta'_{i_k} = 1$ respectively. (ii) The notations, \bullet and \circ , stand for the qubits in $\vec{\mathcal{S}}_i$ and \mathcal{S}_i respectively.

Consider such a vertex-coloring problem of a PCG: For any $r \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, if the predefined value $X_r = 1$




FIG. 1. Pictorial representations for three ATAVN proofs of Bell nonlocality from non-perfect correlations, in which each PCG is an un-colorable PCG.

($X_r = -1$), color the r -th vertex in the projected-coloring graph with blue (yellow). Note that each edge S'_{i_k} implies a constraint $\prod_{l \in S'_{i_k}} X_l = \theta'_{i_k}$. Then if there are no classically consistent vertex-coloring solutions, the PCG is called an un-colorable PCG. Clearly, each un-colorable PCG corresponds to a HLQP paradox. Accordingly, if the $p + 1$ PCGs induced from $|\Psi\rangle$ are all un-colorable PCGs, an ATAVN proof can be obtained, see a minimal example in Appendix B. Sometimes the pictorial representation by PCGs is very helpful in fast identifying the qualified ATAVN proofs.

Next, we shall give our main results.

Our first perfect demonstration of Bell nonlocality from non-perfect correlations is induced from the following symmetric four-qubit PCG state

$$|\Phi_4\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{7}}(|0000\rangle - |S(2,2)\rangle), \quad (5)$$

where $|S(2,2)\rangle$ is the sum of all permutations of $|0\rangle|0\rangle|1\rangle|1\rangle$, i.e., $|S(2,2)\rangle = |0011\rangle + |0101\rangle + |0110\rangle + |1001\rangle + |1010\rangle + |1100\rangle$.

Then seven groups of Hardy-like conditions can be derived from $|\Phi_4\rangle$.

(I) The first group of Hardy-like conditions can be written as

$$P(Z_1 = 1, Z_2 = 1, Z_3 = 1, Z_4 = 1) = \frac{1}{7}, \quad (6)$$

and

$$P(X_k X_l = -1 | Z_i = Z_j = 1) = 1, \quad (7)$$

where $i \neq j \neq k \neq l \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Note that Eq.(7) contains 6 conditional probability relations.

To construct a HLQP paradox, let us consider a run of the experiment that Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 and Z_4 are measured and the results $Z_1 = 1, Z_2 = 1, Z_3 = 1$ and $Z_4 = 1$ are obtained. Similar to the argument of the aforementioned three-qubit HLQP paradox, assume that $|\Phi_4\rangle$ admits a local realistic description. One can infer that if X_1, X_2, X_3 and X_4 were measured in this run, their values should satisfy $X_1 X_2 = X_1 X_3 = X_1 X_4 = X_2 X_3 = X_2 X_4 = X_3 X_4 = -1$, which contradict with classical pigeonhole principle. As a consequence, a HLQP paradox can be produced.

(II) The other six groups of Hardy-like conditions have the same structure (up to a permutation): For any given $i \neq j \neq k \neq l \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$,

$$P(Z_i = -1, Z_j = -1, Z_k = 1, Z_l = 1) = \frac{1}{7}, \quad (8)$$

and

$$P(X_j X_l = 1 | Z_i = -1, Z_k = 1) = 1, \quad (9a)$$

$$P(X_j X_k = 1 | Z_i = -1, Z_l = 1) = 1, \quad (9b)$$

$$P(X_i X_l = 1 | Z_j = -1, Z_k = 1) = 1, \quad (9c)$$

$$P(X_i X_k = 1 | Z_j = -1, Z_l = 1) = 1, \quad (9d)$$

$$P(X_i X_j = -1 | Z_k = 1, Z_l = 1) = 1. \quad (9e)$$

Consider a run of the experiment that Z_i, Z_j, Z_k and Z_l are measured and the results $Z_i = -1, Z_j = -1, Z_k = 1$ and $Z_l = 1$ (associated with one of the six components of $|S(2,2)\rangle$) are obtained. As long as the quantum state $|\Phi_4\rangle$ admits a local realistic model, one can always conclude that if X_i, X_j, X_k and X_l were measured in this run, their values should satisfy $X_i X_j = -1, X_i X_k = X_i X_l = X_j X_k = X_j X_l = 1$, which also violate pigeonhole counting principle. Then a total of six such HLQP paradoxes are obtained.

Since in any run of the experiment, the measurements of Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 and Z_4 can only give seven groups of results, and for every group of the results, one can invoke one of the proofs of seven HLQP paradoxes referred in (I) and (II) to exclude the local realistic description of the quantum system. To be specific, seven groups of results $\{Z_1 = Z_2 = Z_3 = Z_4 = 1\}$ and $\{Z_i = -1, Z_j = -1, Z_k = 1, Z_l = 1\}$ ($i \neq j \neq k \neq l \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$) will give rise to seven contradictions $\{X_1 X_2 = X_1 X_3 = X_1 X_4 = X_2 X_3 = X_2 X_4 = X_3 X_4 = -1\}$ and $\{X_i X_j = -1, X_i X_k = X_i X_l = X_j X_k = X_j X_l = 1\}$ ($i \neq j \neq k \neq l \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$), respectively. Therefore, combining the seven HLQP paradoxes together will produce an ATAVN proof. For the pictorial representation, see Fig.1-(a).

Note that $|\Phi_4\rangle$ is not an eigenstate of each $X_i X_j Z_k Z_l$, i.e., $\langle \Phi_4 | X_i X_j Z_k Z_l | \Phi_4 \rangle \neq \pm 1$. As a result, this four-qubit ATAVN proof is constructed from non-perfect cor-

relations. Besides, this example can induce an analytical construction for a family of n -qubit ($n \geq 4$) ATAVN proofs from non-perfect correlations. Detailed discussion is shown in Appendix C.

In addition, another four-qubit example of perfect demonstration for Bell nonlocality can be constructed base on the four-qubit state $|\Phi'_4\rangle = (|0000\rangle - |0101\rangle - |0110\rangle - |1001\rangle - |1010\rangle - |1100\rangle)/\sqrt{6}$, which also arises from non-perfect correlations. One can check that from Fig.1-(b). Moreover, some states which are local unitary equivalent to $|\Phi'_4\rangle$ can also induce similar ATAVN proofs, and a typical example is shown in Appendix D. These examples can be analytically generalized to the systems with n ($n \geq 4$) qubits either.

Next, we shall present a five-qubit ATAVN proof of Bell nonlocality based on non-perfect correlations.

Consider the following projected-coloring graph state

$$|\phi_5\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(|00000\rangle - |S(1,4)\rangle), \quad (10)$$

where $|S(1,4)\rangle = |01111\rangle + |10111\rangle + |11011\rangle + |11101\rangle + |11110\rangle$.

$|\phi_5\rangle$ can induce six groups of Hardy-like conditions.

(I') The first group of Hardy-like conditions can be described as follows:

$$P(Z_1 = 1, Z_2 = 1, Z_3 = 1, Z_4 = 1, Z_5 = 1) = \frac{1}{6}, \quad (11)$$

and

$$P(X_j X_k X_l X_m = -1 | Z_i = 1) = 1, \quad (12)$$

where $i \neq j \neq k \neq l \neq m \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$. Note that Eq.(12) contains five conditional probability relations.

Similar to the aforementioned examples, Consider $Z_1 = 1, Z_2 = 1, Z_3 = 1, Z_4 = 1, Z_5 = 1$ obtained in a run of the experiment. According to the LHV theories, if X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5 were measured in the same run, their results should satisfy $X_2 X_3 X_4 X_5 = X_1 X_3 X_4 X_5 = X_1 X_2 X_4 X_5 = X_1 X_2 X_3 X_5 = X_1 X_2 X_3 X_4 = -1$, which lead to a contradiction. Then a HLQP paradox is produced.

(II') The other five Hardy-like conditions belong to the same class (from the angle of permutations), and each of them can be specified as

$$P(Z_i = 1, Z_j = -1, Z_k = -1, Z_l = -1, Z_m = -1) = \frac{1}{6}, \quad (13)$$

and

$$P(X_j X_k X_l X_m = -1 | Z_i = 1) = 1, \quad (14a)$$

$$P(X_i X_j = 1 | Z_k = Z_l = Z_m = -1) = 1, \quad (14b)$$

$$P(X_i X_k = 1 | Z_l = Z_m = Z_j = -1) = 1, \quad (14c)$$

$$P(X_i X_l = 1 | Z_m = Z_j = Z_k = -1) = 1, \quad (14d)$$

$$P(X_i X_m = 1 | Z_j = Z_k = Z_l = -1) = 1, \quad (14e)$$

where $i \neq j \neq k \neq l \neq m \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$.

Likewise, once $Z_i = 1, Z_j = Z_k = Z_l = Z_m = -1$ are obtained in some run of the experiment, one can infer that if X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5 were measured in this run, their results should satisfy $X_j X_k X_l X_m = -1, X_i X_j = X_i X_k = X_i X_l = X_i X_m = 1$ according to local realism. Clearly, such constraints contradict with classical pigeon-hole Principle. Based on this, one can get five HLQP paradoxes.

Notice that measuring Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, Z_4, Z_5 of $|\phi_5\rangle$ can only give six groups of results, and any of them can induce a HLQP paradox according to (I') and (II'). Combining them together will produce an ATAVN proof, see Fig.1-(c). Moreover, note that $|\langle \phi_5 | Z_i X_j X_k X_l X_m | \phi_5 \rangle| \neq 1$ and $|\langle \phi_5 | X_i X_j Z_k Z_l Z_m | \phi_5 \rangle| \neq 1$, which indicates that this five-qubit perfect demonstration of Bell nonlocality is produced from non-perfect correlations.

Based on that, one can analytically construct a family of $2n + 3$ -qubit ($n \geq 1$) ATAVN proofs from non-perfect correlations. More details are shown in Appendix E.

In the end, some remarks are in order. First, notice that sometimes permutation symmetries can greatly simplify the discussion for the involved HLQP paradoxes. Therefore, a permutation symmetrical system or a ‘‘nearly’’ permutation symmetrical system (one or several components missing from a permutation symmetrical state) is preferred in our consideration. Second, the main difficulty for experimental test of such an ATAVN proof is the preparation of the corresponding quantum states. Fortunately, the involved quantum systems in some aforementioned ATAVN proofs seem to be ‘‘very close’’ to stabilizer states and as a consequence, they can be obtained from specific post-selections performed on those stabilizer states. For example, the stabilizer state (four-qubit GHZ state) $|S_4\rangle = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(|\odot\odot\odot\odot\rangle + |\odot\odot\odot\odot\rangle) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(|0000\rangle + |1111\rangle - |S(2,2)\rangle)$ is very close to $|\Phi_4\rangle$. Clearly, the main problem in the preparation of $|\Phi_4\rangle$ is how to remove the component $|1111\rangle$ from $|S_4\rangle$. To address that, one only need to perform an extra post-selection operation after the preparation of the four-qubit GHZ state $|S_4\rangle$. If the detectors for the branch of $Z_1 = -1, Z_2 = -1, Z_3 = -1, Z_4 = -1$ do not fire, the system will be prepared to the state $|\Phi_4\rangle$ [20].

To summarize, some four- or five-qubit ATAVN proofs of Bell nonlocality from non-perfect correlations have been proposed, and similar explorations also apply to the cases for more particles. Based on the few-particle examples, various families of ATAVN proofs can be discovered by analytical constructions. Our results can greatly enrich the families of AVN proofs, and may lead to some new protocols in reducing communication complexity[21, 22], multiparty quantum key distribution[23] and quantum games[24].

Besides, note that these ATAVN proofs from non-perfect correlations are consist of several HLQP para-

doxes. Thus in some sense the ATAVN proof might only be regarded as an coarse-grained approach, and in contrast, some Hardy-like proofs of Bell nonlocality seems to be more fundamental. On the other hand, it turns out that sometimes the system involved in an ATAVN proof from non-perfect correlations can be prepared by leaking out some information (one or more of the components) from a stabilizer state. If this stabilizer state itself can provide an ATAVN proof from perfect correlations (e.g. the aforementioned four-qubit GHZ state $|S_4\rangle$ can give a GHZ paradox), then even some of its information were lost, it might still give rise to an ATAVN proof (in terms of non-perfect correlations). Namely, there exist certain “always-type” proofs of Bell nonlocality which can be perfectly protected against some information loss. Details of such nonlocality-protecting ATAVN proofs require further investigation. We believe that this kind of property would be very useful in some quantum information technologies.

We thank K. Han, W. Du and D. Zhou for helpful discussions.

* wdtang@snnu.edu.cn

- [1] J. S. Bell, “On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox,” *Physics Physique Fizika* **1**, 195–200 (1964).
- [2] Nicolas Brunner, Daniel Cavalcanti, Stefano Pironio, Valerio Scarani, and Stephanie Wehner, “Bell nonlocality,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **86**, 419–478 (2014).
- [3] John F. Clauser, Michael A. Horne, Abner Shimony, and Richard A. Holt, “Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 880–884 (1969).
- [4] Daniel M Greenberger, Michael A Horne, and Anton Zeilinger, “Going beyond Bell’s theorem,” in *Bell’s theorem, quantum theory and conceptions of the universe* (Springer, 1989) pp. 69–72.
- [5] Daniel M. Greenberger, Michael A. Horne, Abner Shimony, and Anton Zeilinger, “Bell’s theorem without inequalities,” *American Journal of Physics* **58**, 1131–1143 (1990).
- [6] Lucien Hardy, “Quantum mechanics, local realistic theories, and lorentz-invariant realistic theories,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 2981–2984 (1992).
- [7] Lucien Hardy, “Nonlocality for two particles without inequalities for almost all entangled states,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 1665–1668 (1993).
- [8] N. D. Mermin, “Extreme quantum entanglement in a superposition of macroscopically distinct states,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 1838–1840 (1990).
- [9] Adán Cabello, “Bell’s theorem with and without inequalities for the three-qubit greenberger-horne-zeilinger and w states,” *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 032108 (2002).
- [10] Adán Cabello, “Bell’s theorem without inequalities and without probabilities for two observers,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 1911–1914 (2001).
- [11] GianCarlo Ghirardi and Luca Marinatto, “Greenberger-horne-zeilinger argument of nonlocality without inequalities for mixed states,” *Phys. Rev. A* **74**, 022101 (2006).
- [12] Changliang Ren, Hong-Yi Su, Zhen-Peng Xu, Chunfeng Wu, and Jing-Ling Chen, “Optimal ghz paradox for three qubits,” *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 13080 (2015).
- [13] Weidong Tang, Sixia Yu, and C. H. Oh, “Multisetting greenberger-horne-zeilinger paradoxes,” *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 012131 (2017).
- [14] Dik Bouwmeester, Jian-Wei Pan, Matthew Daniell, Harald Weinfurter, and Anton Zeilinger, “Observation of three-photon greenberger-horne-zeilinger entanglement,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 1345–1349 (1999).
- [15] Jian-Wei Pan, Dik Bouwmeester, Matthew Daniell, Harald Weinfurter, and Anton Zeilinger, “Experimental test of quantum nonlocality in three-photon greenberger-horne-zeilinger entanglement,” *Nature* **403**, 515 (2000).
- [16] C. Cinelli, M. Barbieri, R. Perris, P. Mataloni, and F. De Martini, “All-versus-nothing nonlocality test of quantum mechanics by two-photon hyperentanglement,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 240405 (2005).
- [17] Zu-En Su, Wei-Dong Tang, Dian Wu, Xin-Dong Cai, Tao Yang, Li Li, Nai-Le Liu, Chao-Yang Lu, Marek Żukowski, and Jian-Wei Pan, “Experimental test of the irreducible four-qubit greenberger-horne-zeilinger paradox,” *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 030103 (2017).
- [18] Adán Cabello, Otfried Gühne, and David Rodríguez, “Mermin inequalities for perfect correlations,” *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 062106 (2008).
- [19] Weidong Tang, “Hardy-like quantum pigeonhole paradox and the projected-coloring graph state,” [preprint arXiv:2103.08194](https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.08194) (2021).
- [20] One can also see that from $|S_4\rangle\langle S_4| \rightarrow M|S_4\rangle\langle S_4|M^\dagger/\sqrt{\langle S_4|M^\dagger M|S_4\rangle} = |\Phi_4\rangle\langle\Phi_4|$, where $M = I - |1111\rangle\langle 1111|$.
- [21] Richard Cleve and Harry Buhrman, “Substituting quantum entanglement for communication,” *Phys. Rev. A* **56**, 1201–1204 (1997).
- [22] Harry Buhrman, Richard Cleve, Serge Massar, and Ronald de Wolf, “Nonlocality and communication complexity,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82**, 665–698 (2010).
- [23] Yao Fu, Hua-Lei Yin, Teng-Yun Chen, and Zeng-Bing Chen, “Long-distance measurement-device-independent multiparty quantum communication,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 090501 (2015).
- [24] Mafalda L. Almeida, Jean-Daniel Bancal, Nicolas Brunner, Antonio Acín, Nicolas Gisin, and Stefano Pironio, “Guess your neighbor’s input: A multipartite nonlocal game with no quantum advantage,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 230404 (2010).




FIG. 2. Pictorial representation by PCGs for the ATAVN paradox induced from $|\Psi_3\rangle = (|000\rangle - |011\rangle - |101\rangle - |110\rangle)/2$. The four PCGs are associated with type I-IV HLQP paradoxes in Table I respectively.

Appendix A: A three-qubit ATAVN proof for Bell nonlocality from perfect correlations

In fact, the three qubit GHZ state $|\Psi_3\rangle = (|000\rangle - |011\rangle - |101\rangle - |110\rangle)/2$ can give a total of four groups of Hardy-like conditions, See Table I-(I-IV). Clearly, each of them can produce a HLQP paradox. Then $|\Psi_3\rangle$ can induce a total of four “sometimes-type” AVN proofs (HLQP paradoxes).

Combining these four HLQP paradoxes together, one can get an ATAVN proof for Bell nonlocality. To show that, consider any run of the experiment that Z_1, Z_2 and Z_3 are measured. According to Table I, only four groups of results are possible (each occurs with a probability of 25%). If the quantum state admits a LHV model, a contradiction can be obtained from any group of the results. To be specific, $\{Z_1 = 1, Z_2 = 1, Z_3 = 1\}, \{Z_1 = 1, Z_2 = -1, Z_3 = -1\}, \{Z_1 = -1, Z_2 = 1, Z_3 = -1\}$ and $\{Z_1 = -1, Z_2 = -1, Z_3 = 1\}$ will give rise to $\{X_2X_3 = -1, X_1X_3 = -1, X_1X_2 = -1\}, \{X_2X_3 = -1, X_1X_3 = 1, X_1X_2 = 1\}, \{X_2X_3 = 1, X_1X_3 = -1, X_1X_2 = 1\}$ and $\{X_2X_3 = 1, X_1X_3 = 1, X_1X_2 = -1\}$, respectively. Clearly, all these relations violate classical pigeonhole principle.

However, from the angle of the GHZ paradox, i.e., $Z_1X_2X_3|\Psi_3\rangle = -|\Psi_3\rangle, X_1Z_2X_3|\Psi_3\rangle = -|\Psi_3\rangle, X_1X_2Z_3|\Psi_3\rangle = -|\Psi_3\rangle$ and $Z_1Z_2Z_3|\Psi_3\rangle = |\Psi_3\rangle$, one can conclude that the Hardy-like conditions listed in in Table I arise from the perfect correlations of the

stabilizer state $|\Psi_3\rangle$.

Appendix B: Pictorial representation for a three-qubit ATAVN proof for Bell nonlocality

Notice that the PCG can give an intuitive representation for the HLQP paradox. Naturally, combining the associated PCGS together, one can get the pictorial representation for the ATAVN proof referred in Appendix A, see Fig.2.

Appendix C: An ATAVN proof for n ($n \geq 4$) qubits from non-perfect correlations

consider the following n -qubit ($n \geq 4$) projected-coloring graph state

$$|\Phi_n\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{C_n^2 + 1}}(|00 \cdots 0\rangle - |S(n-2, 2)\rangle), \quad (15)$$

where $|S(n-2, 2)\rangle$ is the sum of all permutations of $|0\rangle|0\rangle \cdots |0\rangle|1\rangle|1\rangle$ (discard the duplicates), namely, $|S(n-2, 2)\rangle = |00 \cdots 011\rangle + |00 \cdots 101\rangle + |00 \cdots 110\rangle + \cdots + |11 \cdots 000\rangle$.

consider the $C_n^2 + 1$ components in $|\Phi_n\rangle$. It turns out that the maximal number of the qubits shared by any two components is $n-2$. Based on this observation, we can get $(C_n^2 + 1)$ groups of Hardy-like conditions which belongs to two classes.

The first class (contains only one group):

$$P(Z_1 = 1, Z_2 = 1, \cdots, Z_n = 1) = \frac{1}{C_n^2 + 1}, \quad (16)$$

and

$$P(X_{i_1}X_{i_2} = -1 | Z_{i_3} = Z_{i_4} = \cdots = Z_{i_n} = 1) = 1, \quad (17)$$

where $i_1 \neq i_2 \neq \cdots \neq i_n \in \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$. Note that Eq.(17) contains C_n^2 such relations.

The second class (contains C_n^2 groups, only one of them is listed in the following): For any given $i_1 \neq i_2 \neq \cdots \neq i_n \in \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$,

$$P(Z_{i_1} = -1, Z_{i_2} = -1, Z_{i_3} = 1, \cdots, Z_{i_n} = 1) = \frac{1}{C_n^2 + 1}, \quad (18)$$

and

$$P(X_{i_2}X_{j_{n-2}} = 1 | Z_{i_1} = -1, Z_{j_1} = Z_{j_2} = \cdots = Z_{j_{n-3}} = 1) = 1, \quad (19a)$$

$$P(X_{i_1}X_{j_{n-2}} = 1 | Z_{i_2} = -1, Z_{j_1} = Z_{j_2} = \cdots = Z_{j_{n-3}} = 1) = 1, \quad (19b)$$


$$P(X_{i_1}X_{i_2} = -1 | Z_{i_3} = Z_{i_4} = \cdots = Z_{i_n} = 1) = 1. \quad (19c)$$

Here $j_1 \neq j_2 \neq \cdots \neq j_{n-2} \in \{1, 2, \cdots, n\} \setminus \{i_1, i_2\}$. Note

that both of Eqs.(19a) and (19b) contain $n-2$ similar

TABLE I. Hardy-like conditions of four HLQP paradoxes induced from $|\Psi_3\rangle$.

I	$P(X_2X_3 = -1 Z_1 = 1) = 1, P(X_1X_3 = -1 Z_2 = 1) = 1, P(X_1X_2 = -1 Z_3 = 1) = 1, P(Z_1 = 1, Z_2 = 1, Z_3 = 1) = 0.25$
II	$P(X_2X_3 = 1 Z_1 = -1) = 1, P(X_1X_3 = 1 Z_2 = -1) = 1, P(X_1X_2 = -1 Z_3 = 1) = 1, P(Z_1 = -1, Z_2 = -1, Z_3 = 1) = 0.25$
III	$P(X_2X_3 = -1 Z_1 = 1) = 1, P(X_1X_3 = 1 Z_2 = -1) = 1, P(X_1X_2 = 1 Z_3 = -1) = 1, P(Z_1 = 1, Z_2 = -1, Z_3 = -1) = 0.25$
IV	$P(X_2X_3 = 1 Z_1 = -1) = 1, P(X_1X_3 = -1 Z_2 = 1) = 1, P(X_1X_2 = 1 Z_3 = -1) = 1, P(Z_1 = -1, Z_2 = 1, Z_3 = -1) = 0.25$

FIG. 3. Pictorial representations for the ATAVN proof induced from $(|0000\rangle + |0101\rangle + |0110\rangle + |1001\rangle + |1010\rangle - |1100\rangle)/\sqrt{6}$, in which each PCG is a representation of a HLQP paradox.

relations.

Assume that the quantum system admits a LHV model, then one can prove that each of these Hardy-like conditions conflicts with classical pigeonhole principle. As a consequence, a total of $(C_n^2 + 1)$ HLQP paradoxes can be obtained. Combining them together will give rise to an n -qubit ($n \geq 4$) ATAVN proof of Bell nonlocality. Since $|\langle \Phi_n | X_{i_1} X_{i_2} Z_{i_3} Z_{i_4} \cdots Z_{i_n} | \Phi_n \rangle| \neq 1$, $|\langle \Phi_n | X_{i_1} X_{j_{n-2}} Z_{i_2} Z_{j_1} Z_{j_2} \cdots Z_{j_{n-3}} | \Phi_n \rangle| \neq 1$ and $|\langle \Phi_n | X_{i_2} X_{j_{n-2}} Z_{i_1} Z_{j_1} Z_{j_2} \cdots Z_{j_{n-3}} | \Phi_n \rangle| \neq 1$, this ATAVN proof is constructed from non-perfect correlations.

Appendix D: Another ATAVN proof of four qubits based on non-perfect correlations

Consider the state $|\Phi_4''\rangle = (|0000\rangle + |0101\rangle + |0110\rangle + |1001\rangle + |1010\rangle - |1100\rangle)/\sqrt{6}$. Similarly, combining the six HLQP paradoxes associated with the measurement results of Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 and Z_4 together, we can construct an ATAVN paradox. For the pictorial representation, see Fig.3.

$$P(Z_i = 1, Z_{j_1} = -1, Z_{j_2} = -1, \cdots, Z_{j_{2n+2}} = -1) = \frac{1}{2n+4}, \quad (23)$$

and

$$P(X_{j_1} X_{j_2} \cdots X_{j_{2n+2}} = -1 | Z_i = 1) = 1, \quad (24a)$$

$$P(X_i X_{k_{2n+2}} = 1 | Z_{k_1} = Z_{k_2} = \cdots = Z_{k_{2n+1}} = -1) = 1, \quad (24b)$$

where $j_1 \neq j_2 \neq \cdots \neq j_{2n+2} \in \{1, 2, \cdots, 2n+3\} \setminus \{i\}$ and

Appendix E: An ATAVN proof of Bell nonlocality for $2n+3$ ($n \geq 1$) qubits from non-perfect correlations

consider the following $(2n+3)$ -qubit projected-coloring graph state

$$|\phi_{2n+3}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n+4}}(|00 \cdots 0\rangle - |S(1, 2n+2)\rangle), \quad (20)$$

where $|S(1, 2n+2)\rangle$ is the sum of all permutations of $\underbrace{|0\rangle}_1 \underbrace{|1\rangle|1\rangle \cdots |1\rangle}_{2n+2}$ (discard the duplicates), namely,

$$|S(1, 2n+2)\rangle = |011 \cdots 11\rangle + |101 \cdots 11\rangle + |110 \cdots 11\rangle + \cdots + |11 \cdots 110\rangle.$$

consider the $2n+4$ components in $|\phi_{2n+3}\rangle$, we can get $2n+4$ groups of Hardy-like conditions which belongs to two classes.

The first class (contains only one group):

$$P(Z_1 = 1, Z_2 = 1, \cdots, Z_{2n+3} = 1) = \frac{1}{2n+4}, \quad (21)$$

and

$$P(X_{j_1} X_{j_2} \cdots X_{j_{2n+2}} = -1 | Z_i = 1) = 1, \quad (22)$$

where $i \neq j_1 \neq j_2 \neq \cdots \neq j_{2n+2} \in \{1, 2, \cdots, 2n+3\}$. Note that Eq.(22) contains $2n+3$ such relations.

The second class (contains $2n+3$ groups, only one of them is listed in the following): The i -th group of such Hardy-like conditions ($i = 1, 2, \cdots, 2n+3$) are

$k_1 \neq k_2 \neq \cdots \neq k_{2n+2} \in \{j_1, j_2, \cdots, j_{2n+2}\}$. Note that

Eq.(24b) contains $2n + 1$ similar relations.

Likewise, a total of $2n + 4$ HLQP paradoxes can be induced. Combining them together will lead to an

ATAVN proof of Bell nonlocality from non-perfect correlations since $|\langle \Phi_n | Z_i X_{j_1} Z_{j_2} \cdots Z_{j_{2n+2}} | \Phi_n \rangle| \neq 1$ and $|\langle \Phi_n | X_i X_{k_{2n+2}} Z_{k_1} Z_{k_2} \cdots Z_{k_{2n+1}} | \Phi_n \rangle| \neq 1$.