How much contextuality?

Karl Svozil

Institute of Theoretical Physics, Vienna University of Technology,
Wiedner Hauptstraße 8-10/136, A-1040 Vienna, Austria[*]
(Dated: March 7, 2012)

The amount of contextuality is quantified in terms of the probability of the necessary violations of noncontextual assignments to counterfactual elements of physical reality.

Some of the mind boggling features attributed to quantized systems are their alleged ability to counterfactually [1, 2] respond to complementary queries [3, 4], as well as their capacity to experimentally render outcomes which have not been encoded into them prior to measurement [5]. Moreover, under certain "reasonable" assumptions, and by excluding various exotic quasi-classical possibilities [6, 7], quantum mechanics appears to "outperform" classical correlations by allowing higher-that-classical coincidences of certain events, reflected by violations of Boole-Bell type constraints on classical probabilities [8–10]. One of the unresolved issues is the reason (beyond geometric and formal arguments) for the quantitative form of these violations [11, 12]; in particular, why Nature should not allow higher-than-quantum or maximal violations [13, 14] of Boole's conditions of possible experience [8, p. 229].

The Kochen-Specker theorem [15], stating the impossibility of a consistent truth assignment to potential outcomes of even a finite number of certain interlinked complementary observables, gave further indication for the absence of classical simultaneous omniscience in the quantum domain. From a purely operational point of view, the quantitative predictions that result from Bell- as well as Kochen-Specker-type theorems present a advancement over quantum complementarity. But they do not explicitly indicate the conceivable interpretation of these findings; at least not on the phenomenologic level. Thus the resulting explanations, although sufficient and conceptually desirable and gratifying, lack the necessity.

One possibility to interpret these findings, and the prevalent one among physicists, is in terms of contextuality. Contextuality can be motivated by the benefits of a quasi-classical analysis. In particular, omniscience appears to be corroborated by the feasability of the potential measurements involved: it is thereby implicitly assumed that all potentially observable elements of physical reality [3] exist prior to any measurement; albeit any such (potential) measurement outcome (the entirety of which could thus consistently pre-exist before the actual measurement) depends on whatever other observables (the context) are co-measured alongside [16, 17]. As, contrary to a very general interpretation of that assumption, the quantum mechanical observables are represented con-

text independently, any such contextual behavior should be restricted to *single* quanta and outcomes within the quantum statistical bounds. This, in essence, is quantum realism in disguise. Nevertheless, it requires very little modifications – indeed, none on the statistical level, and some on the level of individual outcomes as described below – both of the quantum as well as of the classical representations.

Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen type experiments [3] for entangled higher than two-dimensional quantized systems seem to indicate that contextuality, if viable, will remain hidden to any direct physical operationalization (and thus might be criticized to be metaphysical) even if counterfactual measurements are allowed [18]. Because "the immense majority of the experimental violations of Bell inequalities does not prove quantum nonlocality, but just quantum contextuality" [19], current claims of proofs of noncontextuality are solely based on violations of classical constraints in Boole-Bell-type, Kochen-Specker-type, or Greenbergerger-Horne-Zeilinger-type configurations.

Nevertheless, insistence on the simultaneous physical contextual coexistence of certain finite sets of counterfactual observables necessarily results in "ambivalent" truth assignments which could be explicitly illustrated by a *forced* tabulation [20, 21] of contextual truth values for Boole-Bell-type or Kochen-Specker-type configurations. Here contextual means that the truth value of a particular quantum observable depends on whatever other observables are measured alongside this particular observable. Any forced tabulation of truth values would render occurrences of mutually contradicting, potential, counterfactual outcomes of one and the same observable, depending on the measurement context [22]. The amount of this violation of noncontextuality can be quantified by the frequency of occurrence of contextuality. In what follows these frequencies will be calculated for a number of experimental configurations suggested in the literature.

First, consider the generalized Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt (CHSH) inequality

$$-\lambda \le E(a,b) + E(a,b') + E(a',b) - E(a',b') \le \lambda \quad (1)$$

which, for $\lambda = 2$ and $\lambda = 2\sqrt{2}$, represents bounds for classical [4, 23] and quantum [24] expectations of dichotomic observables with outcomes "−1" and "+1," re-

a_b	$a_{b'}$	a'_b	$a'_{b'}$	b_a	$b_{a'}$	b'_a	$b'_{a'}$
+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	−1
−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	+1
+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1

TABLE I. The first two rows represent contextual assignments associated with an algebraic maximal rendition ($\lambda = 4$) of the CHSH inequality. The third and the fourth assignments are noncontextual.

spectively. The algebraic maximal violation associated with $\lambda = 4$ is attainable only for hypothetical "nonlocal boxes" [13, 14, 25, 26] or by bit exchange [27].

Eq. (1) can be rewritten in an explicitly contextual form by the substitution

$$E(x,y) \mapsto E(x_y, y_x), \qquad (2)$$

where x_y stands for "observable x measured alongside observable y" [21]. Contextuality manifests itself through $x_y \neq x_{y'}$. Because in the particular CHSH configuration there are no other observables measured alongside the ones that appear already in Eq. (1), this form is without ambiguity.

Eq. (1) refers to the expectation values for four complementary measurement configurations on the same particles (two particles and two measurement configurations per particle). These expectation values can in principle be computed from the statistical average of the individual two-particle contributions. This requires that all of them exist counterfactually – a requirement that, at least according to the contextuality assumption, is satisfied – because only one of the four configurations can actually be simultaneosly measurable; the other three have to be assigned in a consistent manner and contribute to the expectation values $E(a,b) = (1/N) \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i b_i$. Here, a_i and b_i stand for the outcomes of the dichotomic observables a and b in the ith experiment; N is the number of individual experiments. Suppose we are interested in individual outcomes contributing to a violation of Eq. (1). For the sake of simplicity, suppose further that one would like to force the algebraic maximum of $\lambda = 4$ upon Eq. (1), and suppose that only one observable, say b', is contextual (a highly counterintuitive assumption). Then one obtains, for individual outcomes, say, in the ith experiment,

$$(\pm 1)(\pm 1) + (\pm 1)x + (\pm 1)(\pm 1) - (\pm 1)(-x) = 4, \quad (3)$$

and thus $x = \pm 1$. That is, the algebaic maximum of $\lambda = 4$ can be reached by a single instance of contextual assignment $b'_a = -b'_{a'}$ per quantum. Table I enumerates the two possible truth value assignments associated with this configuration.

It should be stressed that there is no unique correspondence between the proportionality of contextuality and

amount of CHSH violation. Indeed, it can be expected that there are several possible sets of truth assignments with relative frequencies with differing amounts of contextuality yielding the same violation. This plasticity is particularly true for more than one instance of contextuality, where two or more violations of noncontextuality may compensate each other. Take, for example, the four-touple $(E(a,b), E(a,b'), E(a',b), E(a',b'))$ of expectation values contained in Eq. (1), and its transition $(+1,+1,+1,-1) \rightarrow (+1,+1,-1,-1)$, which, for example, can be achieved by changing one instance of contextuality at b' to two instances of contextuality at b' and b, resulting in $E(a,b)+E(a,b')+E(a',b)-E(a',b') = 4 \rightarrow 2$.

That contextuality could accommodate any bound $0 < \lambda < 4$ can be demonstrated by interpreting all possible noncontextual and contextual assignments, as well as the resulting corresponding joint expectations enumerated in Table II as vertices of a convex correlation polytope. According to the Minkoswki-Weyl representation theorem [28, p 29], an equivalent (hull) representation of the associated convex polyhedron is in terms of the halfspaces defined by Boole-Bell type inequalities of the form

$$
\begin{aligned}
-1 &\leq E(a_b) + E(b_a) + E(a_b b_a), \\
-1 &\leq E(a_b) - E(b_a) - E(a_b b_a), \\
-1 &\leq -E(a_b) + E(b_a) - E(a_b b_a), \\
-1 &\leq -E(a_b) - E(b_a) + E(a_b b_a),
\end{aligned}
\qquad (4)
$$

(and the inequalities resulting from permuting $a \leftrightarrow a'$, $b \leftrightarrow b'$) which, for $E(a_b) = E(b_a) = 0$, reduce to $-1 \leq E(a_b b_a) \leq 1$. Note that, by taking only the 16 context-independent ($x_y = x_{y'}$) from all the 256 assignments, the CHSH inequality (1) with $\lambda = 2$ is recovered.

Next, for the sake of demonstration, an example configuration will be given that conforms to Tsirel'son's maximal quantum bound of $\lambda = 2\sqrt{2}$ [11]. Substituting this for $2\sqrt{2}$ in Eq. (3) yields $x = \pm(\sqrt{2} - 1)$; that is, the (limit) frequency for the occurrence of contextual assignments $b'_a = -b'_{a'}$ as enumerated in Table I with respect to the associated noncontextual assignments $b'_a = b'_{a'}$ (rendering 2 to the sum of terms in the CHSH expression) should be $(\sqrt{2} - 1) : (2 - \sqrt{2})$. More explicitly, if there are four different assignments, enumerated in Table I, which may contribute quantum mechanically by the correct (limiting) frequency, then Table III is a simulation of 20 assignments rendering the maximal quantum bound for the CHSH inequalities.

With regards to Kochen-Specker type configurations [15, 29] with no two-valued state, any co-existing set of observables (associated with the configuration) must breach noncontextuality at least once. Other Kochen-Specker type configurations [15, 30, 31] still allowing two-valued states, albeit an insufficient number for a homeomorphic embedding into Boolean algebras, might require contextual value assignments for quantum statistical rea-

a_b	$a_{b'}$	a'_b	$a'_{b'}$	b_a	$b_{a'}$	b'_a	$b'_{a'}$	$a_b b_a$	$a_{b'}b'_a$	$a'_b b_{a'}$	$a'_{b'}b'_{a'}$
-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	$+1$	$+1$	$+1$	$+1$
-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	$\mathbf{-1}$	$\mathbf{+1}$	$+1$	$+1$	$+1$	-1
-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	$\mathbf{+1}$	$\mathbf{-1}$	$+1$	-1	$+1$	$+1$
-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	$+1$	$+1$	$+1$	-1	$+1$	-1
-1	-1	-1	-1	$\mathbf{-1}$	$\mathbf{+1}$	-1	-1	$+1$	$+1$	-1	$+1$
-1	-1	-1	-1	$\mathbf{-1}$	$\mathbf{+1}$	$\mathbf{-1}$	$\mathbf{+1}$	$+1$	$+1$	-1	-1
-1	-1	-1	-1	$\mathbf{-1}$	$\mathbf{+1}$	$\mathbf{+1}$	$\mathbf{-1}$	$+1$	-1	-1	$+1$
-1	-1	-1	-1	$\mathbf{-1}$	$\mathbf{+1}$	$+1$	$+1$	$+1$	-1	-1	-1
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$
$\mathbf{-1}$	$\mathbf{+1}$	$\mathbf{-1}$	$\mathbf{+1}$	$\mathbf{-1}$	$\mathbf{+1}$	$\mathbf{-1}$	$\mathbf{+1}$	$+1$	-1	-1	$+1$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$
$\mathbf{+1}$	$\mathbf{-1}$	$\mathbf{+1}$	$\mathbf{-1}$	$\mathbf{+1}$	$\mathbf{-1}$	$\mathbf{+1}$	$\mathbf{-1}$	$+1$	-1	-1	$+1$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$
$+1$	$+1$	$+1$	$+1$	$+1$	$+1$	$\mathbf{-1}$	$\mathbf{+1}$	$+1$	-1	$+1$	$+1$
$+1$	$+1$	$+1$	$+1$	$+1$	$+1$	$\mathbf{+1}$	$\mathbf{-1}$	$+1$	$+1$	$+1$	-1
$+1$	$+1$	$+1$	$+1$	$+1$	$+1$	$+1$	$+1$	$+1$	$+1$	$+1$	$+1$

TABLE II. (Color online) Contextual (bold) and noncontextual value assignments, and the associated joint values.

sons; but this question remains unsolved at present.

In summary, several concrete, quantitative examples of contextual assignments for co-existing complementary – and thus strictly counterfactual – observables have been given. The amount of noncontextuality can be characterized quantitatively by the required relative amount of contextual assignments versus noncontextual ones reproducing quantum mechanical predictions; or, alternatively, by the required relative amount of contextual assignment versus all assignments. One may thus consider the average number of contextual assignments per quantum as a criterion.

With regard to the above criteria, as could be expected, Kochen-Specker type configurations require assignments which violate noncontextuality for every single quantum, whereas Boole-Bell-type configurations, such as CHSH, would still allow occasional noncontextual assignments. In this sense, Kochen-Specker-type arguments violate noncontextuality stronger than Boole-Bell-type ones.

These considerations are relevant under the assumption that contextuality is a viable concept for explaining the experiments [19, 32–35]. As I have argued elsewhere [1, 18, 21, 36], this might not be the case; at least contextuality might not be a necessary quantum feature. In particular the abandonment of quantum omniscience, in the sense that a quantum system can carry information about its state with regard to only a *single* context [5], in conjunction with a *context translation principle* [22, 37] might yield an alternative approach to the quantum formalism. Thereby the many degrees of freedom of the "quasi-classical" measurement apparatus effectively introduce stochasticity in the case of a mismatch between preparation and measurement context.

Clearly, these considerations have large consequences for the type of randomness that could be rendered by quantum random number generators based on beam splitters, and on quantum oracles in general [38, 39], as context translation schemes may still be deterministic and even computable, whereas irreducible indeterminism can be postulated only from a complete lawlessness [40] of the underlying processes.

[*] svozil@tuwien.ac.at; http://tph.tuwien.ac.at/~svozil

[1] Karl Svozil, "Quantum scholasticism: On quantum contexts, counterfactuals, and the absurdities of quantum omniscience," Information Sciences **179**, 535–541 (2009).

[2] Lev Vaidman, "Counterfactuals in quantum mechanics," in *Compendium of Quantum Physics*, edited by Daniel Greenberger, Klaus Hentschel, and Friedel Weinert (Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007) pp. 132–136, arXiv:0709.0340.

[3] Albert Einstein, Boris Podolsky, and Nathan Rosen, "Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?" Physical Review **47**, 777–780 (1935).

[4] J. F. Clauser and A. Shimony, "Bell's theorem: experimental tests and implications," Reports on Progress in Physics **41**, 1881–1926 (1978).

[5] Anton Zeilinger, "A foundational principle for quantum mechanics," Foundations of Physics **29**, 631–643 (1999).

[6] Itamar Pitowsky, "Resolution of the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen and Bell paradoxes," Physical Review Letters **48**,

1299–1302 (1982).

[7] David A. Meyer, "Finite precision measurement nullifies the Kochen-Specker theorem," Physical Review Letters **83**, 3751–3754 (1999), quant-ph/9905080.

[8] George Boole, "On the theory of probabilities," Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London **152**, 225–252 (1862).

[9] M. Froissart, "Constructive generalization of Bell's inequalities," Il Nuovo Cimento B (1971-1996) **64**, 241–251 (1981), 10.1007/BF02903286.

[10] Itamar Pitowsky, *Quantum Probability—Quantum Logic* (Springer, Berlin, 1989).

[11] Boris S. Cirel'son (=Tsirel'son), "Some results and problems on quantum Bell-type inequalities," Hadronic Journal Supplement **8**, 329–345 (1993).

[12] Stefan Filipp and Karl Svozil, "Generalizing Tsirelson's bound on Bell inequalities using a min-max principle," Physical Review Letters **93**, 130407 (2004), quant-ph/0403175.

[13] S. Popescu and D. Rohrlich, "Quantum nonlocality as an axiom," Foundations of Physics **24**, 379–358 (1994).

[14] Günther Krenn and Karl Svozil, "Stronger-than-quantum correlations," Foundations of Physics **28**, 971–984 (1998).

[15] Simon Kochen and Ernst P. Specker, "The problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics," Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics (now Indiana University Mathematics Journal) **17**, 59–87 (1967).

[16] Niels Bohr, "Discussion with Einstein on epistemological problems in atomic physics," in *Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist*, edited by P. A. Schilpp (The Library of Living Philosophers, Evanston, Ill., 1949) pp. 200–241.

[17] John S. Bell, "On the problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics," Reviews of Modern Physics **38**, 447–452 (1966).

[18] Karl Svozil, "Proposed direct test of a certain type of noncontextuality in quantum mechanics," Physical Review A **80**, 040102 (2009).

[19] Adán Cabello, "Experimentally testable state-independent quantum contextuality," Physical Review Letters **101**, 210401 (2008).

[20] Asher Peres, "Unperformed experiments have no results," American Journal of Physics **46**, 745–747 (1978).

[21] Karl Svozil, "Quantum value indefiniteness," Natural Computing **online first**, 1–12 (2010), arXiv:1001.1436.

[22] Karl Svozil, "Contexts in quantum, classical and partition logic," in *Handbook of Quantum Logic and Quantum Structures*, edited by Kurt Engesser, Dov M. Gabbay, and Daniel Lehmann (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2009) pp. 551–586, arXiv:quant-ph/0609209.

[23] John F. Clauser, Michael A. Horne, Abner Shimony, and Richard A. Holt, "Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories," Physical Review Letters **23**, 880–884 (1969).

[24] Boris S. Cirel'son (=Tsirel'son), "Quantum generalizations of Bell's inequality," Letters in Mathematical Physics **4**, 93–100 (1980).

[25] Sandu Popescu and Daniel Rohrlich, "Action and passion at a distance," in *Potentiality, Entanglement and Passion-at-a-Distance: Quantum Mechanical Studies for Abner Shimony, Volume Two (Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science)*, edited by R. S. Cohen, M. A. Horne, and J. Stachel (Kluwer Academic publishers, Dordrecht, 1997) pp. 197–206, quant-ph/9605004.

[26] Jonathan Barrett, Noah Linden, Serge Massar, Stefano Pironio, Sandu Popescu, and David Roberts, "Nonlocal correlations as an information-theoretic resource," Physical Review A **71**, 022101 (2005).

[27] Karl Svozil, "Communication cost of breaking the Bell barrier," Physical Review A **72**, 050302(R) (2005), physics/0510050.

[28] Günter M. Ziegler, *Lectures on Polytopes* (Springer, New York, 1994).

[29] Adán Cabello, José M. Estebaranz, and G. García-Alcaine, "Bell-Kochen-Specker theorem: A proof with 18 vectors," Physics Letters A **212**, 183–187 (1996).

[30] Karl Svozil, *Quantum Logic* (Springer, Singapore, 1998).

[31] Cristian Calude, Peter Hertling, and Karl Svozil, "Embedding quantum universes into classical ones," Foundations of Physics **29**, 349–379 (1999).

[32] Yuji Hasegawa, Rudolf Loidl, Gerald Badurek, Matthias Baron, and Helmut Rauch, "Quantum contextuality in a single-neutron optical experiment," Physical Review Letters **97**, 230401 (2006).

[33] H. Bartosik, J. Klepp, C. Schmitzer, S. Sponar, A. Cabello, H. Rauch, and Y. Hasegawa, "Experimental test of quantum contextuality in neutron interferometry," Physical Review Letters **103**, 040403 (2009), arXiv:0904.4576.

[34] Elias Amselem, Magnus Rådmark, Mohamed Bourennane, and Adán Cabello, "State-independent quantum contextuality with single photons," Physical Review Letters **103**, 160405 (2009).

[35] G. Kirchmair, F. Zähringer, R. Gerritsma, M. Kleinmann, O. Gühne, A. Cabello, R. Blatt, and C. F. Roos, "State-independent experimental test of quantum contextuality," Nature **460**, 494–497 (2009), arXiv:0904.1655.

[36] Karl Svozil, "Noncontextuality in multipartite entanglement," J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **38**, 5781–5798 (2005), quant-ph/0401113.

[37] Karl Svozil, "Quantum information via state partitions and the context translation principle," Journal of Modern Optics **51**, 811–819 (2004), quant-ph/0308110.

[38] Cristian S. Calude and Karl Svozil, "Quantum randomness and value indefiniteness," Advanced Science Letters **1**, 165–168 (2008), eprint arXiv:quant-ph/0611029, arXiv:quant-ph/0611029.

[39] Cristian S. Calude, Michael J. Dinneen, Monica Dumitrescu, and Karl Svozil, "Experimental evidence of quantum randomness incomputability," Phys. Rev. A **82**, 022102 (2010).

[40] Anton Zeilinger, "The message of the quantum," Nature **438**, 743 (2005).

a_b	$a_{b'}$	a'_b	$a'_{b'}$	b_a	$b_{a'}$	b'_a	$b'_{a'}$
+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1
+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	**+1**	**−1**
−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	**−1**	**+1**
−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1
+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	**+1**	**−1**
+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	**+1**	**−1**
+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	**−1**	**+1**
+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1
+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	**+1**	**−1**
+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	**+1**	**−1**
+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	**−1**	**+1**
−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1
+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	**+1**	**−1**
+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	**+1**	**−1**
−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1
−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	**−1**	**+1**
+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	**+1**	**−1**
−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1
+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	**−1**	**+1**
−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1
−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	**−1**	**+1**
−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1
−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1
−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1
+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	**+1**	**−1**
−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	**−1**	**+1**
−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1
−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	**−1**	**+1**
−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1
+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	**+1**	**−1**
−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1	**−1**	**+1**

TABLE III. (Color online) 20 Counterfactual assignments of contextual (bold) and noncontextual values, and the associated joint values, rendering an approximation 2.95 for Tsirel'son's maximal quantum bound $2\sqrt{2}$ for the CHSH sum.