# Local hidden-variables can account for EPR quantum correlations

A. Matzkin

*Laboratoire de Spectrométrie Physique (CNRS Unité 5588),*

*Université Joseph-Fourier Grenoble-1,*

*BP 87, 38402 Saint-Martin d'Hères, France*

arXiv:0706.2964v1 [quant-ph] 20 Jun 2007

## Abstract

A local hidden-variable model for two entangled particles in an EPR setting is shown to reproduce the quantum-mechanical outcomes and expectation values. Contrarily to the usual hidden-variable (HV) distributions introduced by Bell, we relax the constraint (necessary in order to derive the Bell inequalities) requiring that a given HV distribution should account for the simultaneous reality of quantum-mechanical counterfactual events. We assume instead that a random local interaction induced by measurements results in a change of the corresponding hidden-variable distribution. We first recover from the HV distribution the quantum probabilities and averages for a single spin-1/2 particle, and then tackle the two-particle problem in the singlet state. By introducing an initial correlation between hidden variables at the source, the averages of spin measurements along arbitrary axes are obtained from the HV distributions without appealing to nonlocal effects [1].

In their celebrated paper [2], Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen (EPR) argued that quantum mechanics was incomplete on the ground that for entangled states the formalism predicts with certainty the measurement outcomes of noncommuting observables although they cannot have simultaneous reality. They argued the alternative to incompleteness was to make the reality of one particle's properties depend on the measurement made on the other particle, irrespective of their spatial separation. EPR concluded: "*no reasonable definition of reality could permit this*" nonlocal action at-a-distance. In a seminal work [3], Bell showed that local models based on a distribution of hidden variables (HV) intended to complete quantum mechanics must satisfy an inequality involving averages taken over the hidden variable distributions. He also showed these models fail, given that in certain circumstances the average values of 2-particle quantum observables violate these inequalities. Since then, experimental setups aimed at measuring observables violating the inequality have confirmed with increasing precision the quantum mechanical predictions [4]. The current received view is that Bell-type inequalities 'prove' that local realism is incompatible with quantum mechanics [5] and that acceptable HV models can only be non-local. However, it is seldom emphasized that Bell-type HV models are only a subset of the local models that can be envisaged in order to reproduce quantum correlations. Indeed, the main assumption [6, 7] in the derivation of the Bell inequalities – to suppose that the hidden variables can account for counterfactual events that would make sense of the simultaneous existence of noncommuting observables – arises from a particular reading of the EPR argument, but is by no means a necessary ingredient in order to enforce locality or to reproduce quantum correlations. General arguments going in this direction have already been given [8, 9]. In this work we go further by putting forward, for the first time, an explicit local hidden variable model compatible with quantum mechanical predictions. The model will be developed for the prototypical spin-1/2 pair. The basis of our model will consist in relaxing the counterfactual assumption recalled above by introducing a probabilistic interaction between the hidden variables and the measurement apparatus, and in imposing an initial correlation between the hidden variables determining the measurement outcomes of each particle.

In his original derivation of the inequalities, Bell [3] investigated the fragmentation of two spin-1/2 particles formed in the singlet state. Before getting to the 2 particle problem proper, we will consider the hidden variable distribution for a *single* spin-1/2 particle. Recall first that the measurement of the spin projection along an axis $b$ making an angle $\theta_b$ with

an arbitrarily chosen $a$ axis is represented by the operator (we put $\hbar = 1$)

$$S_b(\theta) = \frac{1}{2}(\rho_+(\theta_b) - \rho_-(\theta_b)) \tag{1}$$

where $\rho_\pm(\theta_b) = |\pm(\theta_b)\rangle \langle\pm(\theta_b)|$ are the density matrices corresponding to the eigenstates with eigenvalues $\pm 1/2$ that represent the possible outcomes of a spin measurement along the axis. If the system is initially in the state $\rho_+(\theta_a)$, measuring $S_b$ perturbs the system, which ends up in either of the states $\rho_\pm(\theta_b)$ with probabilities obtained from elementary quantum mechanics as

$$P_{+a\to+b} = \mathrm{Tr}\,(\rho_+(\theta_a)\rho_+(\theta_b)) = \cos^2\frac{\theta_b - \theta_a}{2} \tag{2}$$

$$P_{+a\to-b} = \mathrm{Tr}\,(\rho_+(\theta_a)\rho_-(\theta_b)) = \sin^2\frac{\theta_b - \theta_a}{2}. \tag{3}$$

From a generic viewpoint, we will assume the outcomes are determined by the hidden variables in the following way: (i) The eigenvalues depend on a given property of the HV *and* on an interaction induced by the measurement; by analogy with the EPR criterion of physical reality (that involves the prediction with certainty of a physical quantity "*without in any way disturbing a system*" [2]), we will use the term disturbance to describe this interaction. (ii) An eigenstate is characterized by an HV distribution for which the disturbance has no net effect on the *individual* outcome. (iii) When a measurement disturbs the initial state of the quantum system, the HV in the distribution are modified, the disturbance acting on the HV as an interaction with a random character. (iv) On average the perturbation has no net effect: average values over the initial HV distribution do not depend on the disturbance.

Here we shall take as the hidden variable a unit vector $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ on the unit sphere (see Fig. 1(a)). The distribution of $\lambda$ and the disturbance are chosen as follows. Let $\Sigma_{\pm a}$ be the positive $(+)$ or negative $(-)$ hemisphere centered on the $a$ axis. We denote by $R_{\Sigma_{\pm a}}(\lambda)$ the uniform distribution on the hemisphere $\Sigma_{\pm a}$. When the system is in the state described by $\rho_\pm(\theta_a)$, the corresponding hidden-variable distribution is set to be given by $R_{\Sigma_{\pm a}}(\lambda)$. Suppose a measurement is made along the $b$ axis; we will assume that the outcome is related to the sign of the projection $\lambda_b = \boldsymbol{\lambda}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{b}}$ *and* to the disturbance provoked by the measurement. We will model the disturbance with a random variable $\varepsilon$ uniformly distributed on $[-1/2, 1/2]$ and defined such that the measured spin projection $\mathcal{M}_b$ on $b$ is

$$\mathcal{M}_b = +1/2 \text{ if } \lambda_b + \varepsilon > 1/2 \tag{4}$$

$$\mathcal{M}_b = -1/2 \text{ if } \lambda_b + \varepsilon < -1/2, \tag{5}$$

and if $-1/2 < \lambda_b + \varepsilon < 1/2$, $\varepsilon$ is reapplied until one of the conditions (4) or (5) is met. The probability of obtaining a positive outcome for a given $\lambda$ by a single application of $\varepsilon$ is given by

$$p^+_{\lambda_b} = p(\varepsilon > \frac{1}{2} - \lambda_b) = H(\lambda_b)\lambda_b, \tag{6}$$

where $H(x)$ is the step function ($p^+_{\lambda_b}$ vanishes if $\lambda_b < 0$ because $\varepsilon < 1/2$). For a negative outcome,

$$p^-_{\lambda_b} = -H(-\lambda_b)\lambda_b. \tag{7}$$

The probability of obtaining $\mathcal{M}_b = +1/2$ (resp. $-1/2$) after the first application of $\varepsilon$ is obtained by integrating $p^+_{\lambda_b}$ ($p^-_{\lambda_b}$) over the HV distribution. Suppose the system is in the state $\rho_+(\theta_a)$; then $\lambda \in R_{\Sigma_{+a}}$, and integrating over $\lambda$ gives

$$P^\pm_1 = \int p^\pm_{\lambda_b} R_{\Sigma_{+a}}(\lambda) \sin\theta_\lambda d\theta_\lambda d\phi_\lambda = \frac{A_1}{2} \begin{cases} \cos^2 \frac{\theta_b - \theta_a}{2} \\ \sin^2 \frac{\theta_b - \theta_a}{2} \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

where $A_1 = 1$; the position of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ on the sphere is expressed for convenience relative to the $a$ axis, and in spherical coordinates $R_{\Sigma_{+a}}$ is simply given by $H(\pi/2 - \theta_\lambda)/(2\pi)$. According to Eq. (8), the probability of obtaining either outcome after one application of $\varepsilon$ is $1/2$, so that for the remaining half of the $\lambda$'s further applications will take place. The $k$th application of $\varepsilon$ acts on the remaining $2^{1-k}$th fraction of the distribution and gives a contribution $P^\pm_k$ identical to Eq. (8) but with a factor $A_k = 2^{1-k}$. The total probability of obtaining $\mathcal{M}_b = +1/2$ is obtained by summing the terms $P^+_k$ in the limit $k \to \infty$. Since $\sum_k A_k = 2$, we obtain

$$P_{R_{\Sigma_{+a}}}(\mathcal{M}_b = \pm 1/2) = \begin{cases} \cos^2 \frac{\theta_b - \theta_a}{2} \\ \sin^2 \frac{\theta_b - \theta_a}{2} \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

where Eqs. (9) are identical to the quantum results (2) and (3). If we take the initial quantum state to be $\rho_-(\theta_a)$, then relative to Eqs. (2)-(3) the quantum probabilities become $P_{-a\to\pm b} = P_{+a\to\mp b}$, and it can be checked that our HV model, with now $\lambda \in R_{\Sigma_{-a}}$, gives probabilities identical to the quantum results,

$$P_{R_{\Sigma_{-a}}}(\mathcal{M}_b = \pm 1/2) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{A_k}{2} \int H(\lambda_b)\lambda_b R_{\Sigma_{-a}}(\lambda) \sin\theta_\lambda d\theta_\lambda d\phi_\lambda = \begin{cases} \sin^2 \frac{\theta_b - \theta_a}{2} \\ \cos^2 \frac{\theta_b - \theta_a}{2} \end{cases}. \tag{10}$$

The quantum measurement probabilities are therefore recovered by postulating a hidden-variable distribution and a probabilistic interaction of the hidden-variable with the measuring apparatus. Note that when the axes $a$ and $b$ are taken to be the same, the disturbance

has no effect on the individual outcomes: for a distribution $R_{\Sigma_{+a}}$ the condition (5) will never be met, and one will obtain $\mathcal{M}_a = +1/2$ with certainty (and $\mathcal{M}_a = -1/2$ if $\lambda \in R_{\Sigma_{-a}}$). A consequence is that if $\lambda$ is uniformly distributed on the *entire* sphere $\Sigma$, for any axis $b$ the disturbance will result in a positive or negative outcome depending on whether $\lambda$ belongs to the positive or negative hemispheres, so that

$$P_{R_\Sigma}(\mathcal{M}_b = \pm 1/2) = 1/2. \tag{11}$$

The model employed for the disturbance is arbitrary and was given here for illustrative purposes due to its mathematical simplicity (more elaborate models can be constructed, the only requirement being to recover the quantum probabilities). However according to our assumption (iv) given above, the following property must be verified irrespective of the model: the disturbance must vanish on average, so that averages over the measured outcomes are those obtained directly in terms of the relevant HV property (here the value of the projection $\lambda_b$). Indeed, we have

$$\langle \lambda_b \rangle_{R_{\Sigma_{\pm a}}} = \langle \mathcal{M}_b \rangle_{R_{\Sigma_{\pm a}}} = \pm \frac{1}{2} \cos(\theta_b - \theta_a), \tag{12}$$

where

$$\langle \lambda_b \rangle_{R_{\Sigma_{\pm a}}} = \int \lambda_b R_{\Sigma_{\pm a}}(\lambda) \sin\theta_\lambda d\theta_\lambda d\phi_\lambda \tag{13}$$

is the average taken over the distribution and

$$\langle \mathcal{M}_b \rangle_{R_{\Sigma_{\pm a}}} = \sum_{k=-1}^{1} \frac{k}{2} P_{R_{\Sigma_{\pm a}}}(\mathcal{M}_b = \frac{k}{2}) \tag{14}$$

is the average obtained from the measurement outcomes. The term on the right in Eq. (12) is identical to the quantum mechanical average $\langle S_b \rangle_{\rho_\pm(\theta_a)}$. Eq. (12) ensures that the average values do not depend on the specific model chosen for the disturbance, so that the quantum mechanical expectation values are directly related to averages over the HV properties.

We proceed to the 2 particle case. Following Bell [3] we assume the particles were originally formed in the singlet state and are spatially separated so that individual spin measurements along arbitrary axes can be made. The singlet state, whose density matrix is given by

$$\rho = \sum_{k_1,k_2=\pm 1} \frac{(-1)^{\frac{k_1-k_2}{2}}}{2} |k_1(\theta_u)\rangle |-k_1(\theta_u)\rangle \langle k_2(\theta_u)| \langle -k_2(\theta_u)| \tag{15}$$





FIG. 1: (a) Single particle HV distribution: a vector $\lambda$ on the unit sphere belonging to the distribution $R_{\Sigma_{+a}}$ (zone shaded in blue) corresponding to the quantum eigenstate $\rho_+(\theta_a)$; the measurement of the spin along the $b$ axis depends on the value of the projection $\lambda_b$ on that axis, but also on a disturbance $\varepsilon$ that randomly modifies the value of this projection (except if the spin is measured along the symmetry axis of the distribution – here the $a$ axis – in which case the disturbance has no effect). (b) and (c) 2-particle HV distributions. (b) shows the HV distribution for the singlet state, with the hidden variables $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ describing particles 1 and 2 respectively being uniformly distributed on the unit sphere, but correlated by pointing in opposite directions. Predictions relative to the first measurement are made with this distribution. (c) shows the situation after having measured particle 1's spin on the $a$ axis and found $\mathcal{M}_{1a} = -1/2$. We infer that $\lambda_1$ was in the $\Sigma_{-a}$ region (in blue) and given the correlation (17) we know that $\lambda_2$ is in the $\Sigma_{+a}$ region (in orange). Predictions relative to the second measurement are made with this distribution, conditioned on the result of the first measurement. The overall average matching the quantum mechanical value is obtained by summing the conditional expectation over all the events.

is rotationally invariant (and does not depend on the choice of $\theta_u$). The total spin and its projection along any quantization axis vanish. The spin projections of particles 1 and 2 along respective axes $a$ and $b$, represented by the observable $S_{1a}S_{2b}$, has the expectation value

$$\langle S_{1a}S_{2b}\rangle_\rho = \mathrm{Tr}(S_{1a}S_{2b}\rho) = -\frac{1}{4}\cos(\theta_b - \theta_a). \tag{16}$$

Our aim is to extend the HV model expounded above to the 2 particle-case. We will suppose that the spin of each particle is determined by a hidden variable attached to each particle. Let us denote by $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_2$ two vectors on the unit-sphere pointing in the direction of the spin angular momentum of each of the particles. In order to account for the rotational invariance and the total spin properties of the singlet state, we choose each hidden variable

to be uniformly distributed on the sphere and impose the correlation

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1 + \boldsymbol{\lambda}_2 = 0 \tag{17}$$

between the hidden variables. Eq. (17) means that in the singlet state, the hidden variables are uniformly distributed on the sphere $\Sigma$, but point in opposite directions. This is exactly what one would expect for the angular momenta of two classical particles with a uniform statistical distribution and zero total angular momentum [10]. The correlation between $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ is imposed initially at the source. The disturbance between each particle and its measurement apparatus will not conserve the correlation, but as we now show, Eq. (17) allows to make a conditional inference on the distribution of the hidden variable attached to one of the particles *if* the measurement outcome on the other particle is known.

After the particles have been formed and have flown apart, the first step consists in measuring on particle 1 the spin projection $S_{1a}$ along an axis $a$. We know from Eq. (11) that if $\lambda_1$ is distributed on $\Sigma$ we will obtain $\mathcal{M}_{1a} = \pm 1/2$ with probability 1/2 (which is of course the quantum result in the state (15)). Now if, say, one obtained $\mathcal{M}_{1a} = +1/2$, then this means that $\lambda_1$ was, before the measurement, somewhere on the half-sphere $\Sigma_{+a}$, and from the correlation Eq. (17) we infer that $\lambda_2$ is on the half-sphere $\Sigma_{-a}$. Conversely if $\mathcal{M}_{1a} = -1/2$, then we infer that $\lambda_1 \in R_{\Sigma_{-a}}$ and $\lambda_2 \in R_{\Sigma_{+a}}$. Needless to say, the change in the distribution of the HV, distributed on the entire sphere before the measurement and now restricted, with equal probability, to one of the hemispheres $\Sigma_{\pm a}$ is a logical inference made on the basis of the knowledge of the measurement outcome and of the initial correlation between the hidden variables (i.e., the distributions do not 'physically collapse' to one of the hemispheres).

The second step, namely measuring the spin projection of particle 2 along an axis $b$, now becomes a one-particle problem. If the first measurement yielded $\mathcal{M}_{1a} = +1/2$, we know that $\lambda_2 \in R_{\Sigma_{-a}}$, and we apply our one-particle model given above with the HV distribution $R_{\Sigma_{-a}}$ for $\lambda_2$. In the particular case in which $b$ is taken to coincide with $a$, we know from Eqs. (5) or (10) that we will obtain with certainty $\mathcal{M}_{2a} = -1/2$. If $b$ is different from $a$ the outcomes $\mathcal{M}_{2b} = \pm 1/2$ are possible with respective probabilities $\sin^2(\theta_b - \theta_a)/2$ and $\cos^2(\theta_b - \theta_a)/2$ [Eq. (10)]. If the first measurement yielded $\mathcal{M}_{1a} = -1/2$ we apply the model with the HV distribution $R_{\Sigma_{+a}}$ for $\lambda_2$, obtaining again the correct quantum probabilities for the measurements carried out on particle 2.

The average of the 2 particle measurements is obtained by considering all the possible combinations involving these two steps, namely an initial measurement and the subsequent measurement conditioned on the result of the first. We assume for definiteness that particle 1 is measured first on the $a$ axis, but we can interchange $1 \leftrightarrow 2$ or $a \leftrightarrow b$, i.e. it does not matter which axis or particle is measured first. Let $\mathcal{M}_{1a} = k_1/2$ ($k_1 = \pm 1$) denote the result of the initial measurement. We then know that $\lambda_2 \in R_{\Sigma_{(-k_1)a}}$ and can determine the average for the second measurement, obtained by summing over the possible outcomes $\mathcal{M}_{2b} = k_2/2$ each having a probability $P_{R_{\Sigma_{(-k_1)a}}}(\mathcal{M}_{2b} = k_2)$ [given by Eqs. (9) or (10)]: this yields by Eqs. (12) and (14)

$$\langle \lambda_{2b} \rangle_{R_{\Sigma_{(-k_1)a}}} = \langle \mathcal{M}_{2b} \rangle_{R_{\Sigma_{(-k_1)a}}} = \frac{-k_1}{2} \cos(\theta_b - \theta_a) \tag{18}$$

which is a conditional expectation. The total average for the 2 particle outcome is then obtained by summing Eq. (18) over the possible outcomes $\mathcal{M}_{1a} = k_1/2$ of the first measurement, each having a probability $P_{R_\Sigma}(\mathcal{M}_{1a} = k_1) = 1/2$. This gives

$$\langle \mathcal{M}_{1a}\mathcal{M}_{2b} \rangle_{R_\Sigma} = \sum_{k_1=\pm 1} \frac{k_1}{2} P_{R_\Sigma}(\mathcal{M}_{1a} = k_1) \langle \lambda_{2b} \rangle_{R_{\Sigma_{(-k_1 a)}}} \tag{19}$$

$$= -\frac{1}{4} \cos(\theta_b - \theta_a). \tag{20}$$

which is seen to be equal to the quantum expectation value (16).

We therefore obtain the quantum expectation value $\langle S_{1a} S_{2b} \rangle_\rho$, known to violate Bell's inequality, by postulating HV distributions perturbed by a measurement interaction with an imposed initial correlation. Nonlocality does not play any role. The fact that in Eq. (19) the distribution for the hidden variable $\lambda_2$ depends on the measurement outcome $k_1$ of particle 1 is not the result of action at a distance but a conditional statement, the inference being grounded on the initial correlation (17). Action at a distance would imply that measuring the first particle instantaneously changes the distribution of the second particle, whereas here we employ a logical inference in our computations in order to make predictions with the maximally available knowledge. This is consistent with the hidden variable approach, in which the distributions are statistical tools representing a certain state of information [12]. As remarked by Jaynes [8], Bell's HV model does not allow to make this type of inference. Indeed, Bell sought hidden variable distributions capable of completing quantum mechanics as required by his reading of EPR, namely able to account for simultaneous

events that are quantum-mechanically incompatible (like measuring the spin projection of a single particle along 2 different axes). This imposes the factorization of the probability of obtaining joint events, thereby precluding the use of conditional probabilities. In our model, introducing a disturbance impedes the realization of the simultaneous counterfactual events, which become mutually exclusive, and assuming the correlation (17) naturally leads to the use of conditional statements. Our HV distributions are therefore not bound by Bell's theorem (recall that the existence of these counterfactual events is a necessary condition in the derivation of Bell's inequalities [6, 7]). Note that from a logical viewpoint, the substance of Bohr's reply [11] to EPR was quite similar to the mechanism put forward in the present model: "*the finite interaction between object and measuring agencies conditioned by the very existence of the quantum of action*" implies that measuring the spin projection along a given axis brings in "*an essentially uncontrollable*" action that "*cuts ourselves off from any possibility of applying the law of conservation*" of rotation to the system so as to make predictions on the second particle.

We have shown that by assuming that hidden variable distributions are disturbed by measurements – in an analog manner that Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen stated that a quantum state is disturbed when a measurement involves observables that do not commute with the corresponding density matrix – we are able to recover the quantum expectation values. Our model is local and based on a double inference: the measurement outcome of the first particle allows to infer its HV distribution previous to the measurement; in turn, the knowledge of this distribution allows to infer, via an initially established correlation between the hidden variables attached to each particle, the HV distribution relative to the second particle. We can therefore conclude that without supplementary assumptions, the violation of Bell inequalities by quantum-mechanical averages does not appear to be a valid ground to support nonlocality.

---

[1] This paper is a much simplified version of the previously posted eprint A. Matzkin, arXiv:quant-ph/0703271 (2007). The essential difference lies in the one-particle model (which is simpler and gives an explicit account allowing to recover the quantum probabilities), not in the reasoning leading to the 2-particle correlation.

[2] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. 47, 777 (1935).

[3] J. S. Bell, Physics 1, 195 (1964).

[4] Aspect, J. Dalibard and G. Roger, Phys. Rev. Lett. 49, 1804 (1982); Y. Hasegawa, R. Loidl, G. Badurek, M. Baron and H. Rauch, Nature 425, 45 (2003).

[5] A. Zeilinger, Rev. Mod. Phys. 71, S288 (1999); A. Cabello, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 060403 (2004).

[6] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, Phys. Rev. Lett. 28, 880 (1969). A. Fine, Phys. Rev. Lett. 48, 291 (1982).

[7] J. S. Bell in B. d'Espagnat (Ed.) *Foundations of quantum mechanics* (Academic Press, New York, 1971), p. 171.

[8] E. T. Jaynes, in J. Skilling (Ed.), *Maximum-Entropy and Bayesian Methods*, Kluwer, Dordrecht (1989) p. 1.

[9] W. Unruh, Int. J. Qu. Inf. 4, 209 (2006).

[10] A. Matzkin, E-Print quant-ph/0703251 (2007).

[11] N. Bohr, Phys. Rev. 48, 696 (1935). Bohr referred to the position and momentum of the particles, employed by EPR [2], and not to spin projections, which were introduced in an EPR context later by D. Bohm, *Quantum Theory*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood (NJ, USA, 1951).

[12] It is noteworthy that genuine action at a distance should result in signalling, whereas a logical inference cannot transmit physical signals.