CMPT 476 Lecture 8 Bell's inequality and non-local games



Last class we discussed the EPR paradox which sepmed to allow instantaneous communication between Alice and Bob. This led Einstein and others to believe that quantum theory was incomplete since it opposed to violate relativity. They posited that a complete picture of reality should be based on local hidden variables. Today, we look at Bell's theorem which famously showed that quantum mechanics connot be predicted by any local hidden variable model.

(Local hidden variable models)

Let Alice and Bob share an entangled pair

P147 - -- -- -- -- -- 109

(P.g. for concreteness, = (100> +111))

A local hidden variable model asserts that for a set (or all?) possible single-qubit measurements Mi the result of measuring Mi on Alice or Bob's qubit was pre-determined at the time of entanglement.

What does this mean?

say we have 2 measurements M_{χ} & M_{χ} , each with 2 results, Ω or 1. Denote the result of measuring Alice or Bob's qubit $M_{\chi\chi\chi}$ (A) & $M_{\chi\chi\chi}$ (B). This means that the 4 values M_{χ} (A), M_{χ} (A), M_{χ} (B), M_{χ} (B) exist in the universe and are independent of who measures first and in which boses they measure.

(Boll's inequality) $Le + A_0 = (-1)^{M_X(A)}, A_1 = (-1)^{M_Z(A)}$ $B_0 = (-1)^{M_X(B)}, B_1 = (-1)^{M_Z(B)}$

Then (on average) \sim needed to violate the inequality 19 ter $A_0B_0 + A_0B_1 + A_1B_0 - A_1B_1 \leq 2$

Note that Bo = ±B1. If Bo = B1 then

A, B, + A, B, + A, B, -A, B, = 2A, = + 2

Over a times, the average is hence

$$\frac{\mathcal{E}_{i} \mathcal{A}_{o} \mathcal{B}_{o}^{i} + \mathcal{A}_{o}^{i} \mathcal{B}_{i}^{i} + \mathcal{A}_{i}^{i} \mathcal{B}_{o}^{i} + \mathcal{A}_{i}^{i} \mathcal{B}_{i}^{i}}{h} = 2$$

(Bell's theorem)

The inequality above ran be violated with an entangled quantum state:

1. Start with the entangled state 14) = = (1007+1117)

2. Let Mx (A) be meas. in \$107,1173

$$M_{Z}(A)$$
 be meas. in $\{(+)_{1}(-)\}_{(100)}$

$$M_{Z}(A)$$
 be meas. in $\{(+)_{1}^{(-)}\}_{1,007}$ / 19,7 $M_{X}(B)$ be meas. in $\{(-5)_{1}^{(0)}\}_{1,1007}$ / 19,7 $M_{X}(B)$ be meas. in $\{(-5)_{1}^{(0)}\}_{1,1007}$

3. Now we calculate meas. statistics... yuch

(computational basis) tensor-prod (rotated basis?) (0) < 9, The expected value of AOBO is the summation of the results of measuring in the computational

basis and the a0 and all basis and the probabilities of measuring in both bases.

1 (11(9,1.14)12 = 1 cose#

 $=\cos^2\frac{\pi}{2}-\sin^2\frac{\pi}{2}$ - VZ

(formally this is the experted value of AoBo)

4. By a similar argument, the experted values are: 世(AoBi)= では、世(ABi)=でき、世(ABi)=-ジョ

5. Now, what is the experted value of the sum?

 $E(A_0B_0 + A_0B_1 + A_1B_0 - A_1B_1)$ $= E(A_0B_0) + E(A_0B_1) + E(A_1B_0) - E(A_1B_1)$ $= 4 \cdot \frac{3}{2}$ $= 2\sqrt{2}$ > 2

(Non-local games)

A common theme in Quentum computer science is to phrase the above in a more computational way: as a game where Alice and Bob are not allowed to communicate directly, but share entanglement. It's helpful to see both perspectives, though non-local games fail to capture the modern generalization of Bell's theorem to the Kochen-specter theorem and notions of contextuality, which we lack the language to express atthis point.

* Others may Nisagree with me here

((HSH game (Clauser, Horner Shimony & Holt))

The game is a co-operative one where Alice and Bob try to win against a referee. They are allowed to communicate be fore the game begins, but not while the game is on. Here are the rules:

- 1. The referen gives Alice and Bob each a bit a, b respectively in secret.
- 2. Without communicating, Alice and Bob each give the referee abit back, x and y
- 3. Alice and Bob win if and only if

(The classical strategy)

x = y = 0. Observe that $x \cdot ay = 0 = a \cdot b$ unles $a = b = l_1$ so if a&b are random, vin 3y + imes

(Optimality for classical)

Note that any deterministic strategy, i.e. functions fighty, gibty

fails on at least one input (25% of the time), Since

E , 6 (a) \$ 9 (b) = 0 mod 2

Earb = {0,1} a.p = 1 mod 2

To sep the previous fact we often grange the outcomes in a table (called a parity argument)

a 5	f(1) \(\Phi g(b) \)		9.5
6.0	f(0) Dg(0)		0
0 1		9(1)	0
	f(1) \$960)		0
((9(1)	

Summing the rows mod 2 we see that f (a) and g (b) appear twice for each value of a& b, hence they cancel, since x+x=0 mod 2 for all $x \in \{0,1\}$

Since any probabilistic Strategy is a wrighted sum of deterministic ones, no such strategy can succeed more than 75% or 34 on average.

(Quantum strategy)

Pre-game: Alice and Bob prepare the state 14)= (100 + 1117)

Alice: if q=0 they measure in the Elozylizz basis
a=1 then measure in the {1+>1->} basis

Bob: if 6=0 then measure in \$ 1907, 19,73 6=1 then measure \$1507, 15,73

Claim. Alice and Bob vin 85% of the time.

Proof: Suppose q=6=0=0.5. Then Alice& Bob win if they measure 020 (i.p 10>190>) or 121 (i.p. 11>19.7). We computed these probabilities before:

Col(ad.14) \pm (11(a)1.14) \pm cos 2 \pm \approx 0.85 The other cases are similar

(Non-locality and Quentum competation)

The key take-away is that with shared entanglement, only local operations (i.e. operators & measurements only on individual qubits or subsystems) are needed to perform tasks which would classically require communication.

	omputational	task
Classical		Quantum
		Partang lement