

# A critical appraisal of tests of locality and of entanglement versus non-entanglement at colliders

Philip Bechtle<sup>a</sup>, Cedric Breuning<sup>a</sup>, Herbi K. Dreiner<sup>a,b</sup>, Claude Duhr<sup>a,b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Physikalisches Institut, Universität Bonn, D-53115 Bonn, Germany*

<sup>b</sup> *Bethe Center for Theoretical Physics, Universität Bonn, D-53115 Bonn, Germany*

Emails: bechtle@physik.uni-bonn.de, ccbreuning@uni-bonn.de, dreiner@uni-bonn.de, cduhr@uni-bonn.de

## Abstract

It has been argued more than 30 years ago that it is not possible to test locality at colliders, due to the inability to directly measure non-commuting observables such as spin components in current collider experiments. Recently, there has been a lot of phenomenological and experimental activity around testing locality via Bell-type experiments or entanglement versus non-entanglement in a collider environment. These results seem to evade the earlier no-go theorem by indirectly measuring spin correlations via their relation to angular correlations between momenta. We perform a careful study of the feasibility of such an approach. We scrutinize the relationship between spin and angular correlations in both quantum mechanics and local hidden variable theories. Our conclusion is that it is currently not possible to perform a logically coherent set of experimental measurements at colliders that would allow one to test locality or entanglement versus non-entanglement. This reaffirms the earlier no-go theorem. We stress that the no-go theorem does not apply to measurements of observables inspired from entanglement and Quantum Information Theory to test the Standard Model of particle physics.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Relating spin and angular correlations</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Relating spin and angular correlations in QFT . . . . .	4
2.2	Relating spin and angular correlations in LHVTs . . . . .	5
<b>3</b>	<b>Testing locality at colliders</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Direct measurements of the spin-analyzing power</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Constraining subsets of LHVTs</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Discussion and conclusion</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Local Hidden Variable Theories</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Some useful Integrals in rewriting <math>P(\mathbf{q} \mathbf{s})</math></b>	<b>17</b>

## 1 Introduction

One of the most striking features that sets quantum mechanics (QM) apart from classical theories is entanglement, which leads to correlations between outcomes of causally-disconnected experiments that cannot be explained by classical local theories. For this reason, entanglement and its consequences have been the subject of interest since the early days of QM, cf. ref. [1]. It was realized [2] that QM leads to results that are inconsistent with certain *local hidden variable theories* (LHVTs),<sup>1</sup>. In these LHVTs a system is described by a set of *hidden* variables  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \Lambda$  which determine the outcome of the experiments, but which remain themselves inaccessible to direct experimental measurements. Instead, the hidden variables are distributed according to a certain probability density function (PDF)  $P(\lambda)$ , and the expectation value of an observable  $A$  measured in an experiment takes the form

$$\langle A(\mathbf{a}) \rangle = \int_{\Lambda} d^n \lambda A(\mathbf{a}, \lambda) P(\lambda). \quad (1)$$

Here  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_m)$  denote the settings of the experiment, which are assumed be to independent of the hidden variables  $\lambda$ . In this context *locality* refers to the fact that the outcomes of a measurement of another observable  $B(\mathbf{b})$  that is causally disconnected from  $A(\mathbf{a})$  cannot be influenced by the outcomes of a measurement of  $A(\mathbf{a})$ . In particular, this implies that the settings  $\mathbf{b}$  must be independent of  $\mathbf{a}$ , and the correlation function of the product takes the form

$$\langle A(\mathbf{a})B(\mathbf{b}) \rangle = \int_{\Lambda} d^n \lambda A(\mathbf{a}, \lambda) B(\mathbf{b}, \lambda) P(\lambda). \quad (2)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>See appendix A for a brief review of LHVTs.

The distinctive features of LHVTs compared to QM were quantified in the famous paper by Bell [2], who showed that, in the context where the observables  $A$  and  $B$  take the discrete values  $\pm 1$ , the correlation function in eq. (2) necessarily satisfies certain inequalities which may be violated in QM. In particular, Clauser, Horne, Shimony and Holt (CHSH) showed that, as a consequence of Bell's result, in any LHVT the correlation function in eq. (2) satisfies the inequality [3]

$$|\langle A(\mathbf{a})B(\mathbf{b}) \rangle - \langle A(\mathbf{a}')B(\mathbf{b}) \rangle + \langle A(\mathbf{a})B(\mathbf{b}') \rangle + \langle A(\mathbf{a}')B(\mathbf{b}') \rangle| \leq 2. \quad (3)$$

In QM the CHSH inequality in eq. (3) may be violated (though it is still bounded by  $2\sqrt{2}$ ). The origin of the violation can be traced back to the non-commuting nature of the observables and the fact that the quantum state can be entangled.

The Bell and CHSH inequalities provide tests that allow one to experimentally discriminate between LHVTs and QM. Thus they are of fundamental importance if we want to unravel the structure of the laws of nature. The violation of the CHSH inequality was established experimentally in the spin correlations of an entangled pair of photons in the famous experiments by Clauser and collaborators, Aspect and collaborators, Zeilinger and collaborators, and many others [4]–[14], where the observables  $A(\mathbf{a})$  and  $B(\mathbf{b})$  correspond to measuring the spins of the photons in directions determined by the measurement settings  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\mathbf{b}$ . QM and entanglement are thus extremely well established in the context of quantum optics and photon spin correlations, and rule out an interpretation in terms of an LHVT.

Proposals to measure entanglement and non-locality at collider experiments are not new [15], [16]. However, very recently, it was proposed that it is possible to test for entanglement versus non-entanglement at very high energies at the LHC [17], [18], which has spurred follow-up experimental activities at the ATLAS and CMS experiments [19]–[21] and also a very large number of phenomenological studies [18], [22]–[52], which fall into different categories: studies of angular correlations of top quark decays [18], [22]–[40],  $\tau$  lepton decays [22], [41]–[49] and  $b$  quark decays [50], [51]. The decays of a Higgs boson to a pair of vector bosons,  $H \rightarrow VV^*$ , with the vector bosons decaying leptonically have also been investigated [53]–[66], see also the related work ref. [67]. In further proposals Kaons [68]–[71], B mesons [71]–[74] and charmonium decays into strange baryons [15], [16], [75], [76] have been considered. Furthermore, critical analyses of the specific logic of such interpretations have been put forward [77], [78]. We refer to ref. [52] for an overview of various proposals. Very recently, it has been claimed that entanglement has been measured with high significance at BESIII in strange baryon decays [79]. Most of these proposals are based on measuring angular distributions and/or angular correlations of decay products, and of relating these angular observables to spin states. Some ideas (e.g. refs. [70], [74]) employ flavor states and their following self-analyzing decay as a laboratory for entanglement. While the majority of our analysis will concentrate on angular observables, we will briefly comment on tests of locality based on flavor states in the summary.

These proposals offer novel possibilities for collider phenomenology. For example, since quantum entanglement has been traditionally studied in the context of Quantum Information Theory, this may open the door to import concepts from this field and to apply them to build new collider observables for precision measurements of the Standard Model (SM) of particle physics and/or to constrain signals of new physics. At the same time, we are confronted with new challenges, as is typically the case whenever concepts from one field are applied to another. In particular, care is needed how to perform and interpret studies of entanglement at colliders in order not to result in logical fallacies.<sup>2</sup>

Given the large amount of recent activity around studying entanglement and Bell's inequalities at colliders, in the present paper we critically assess the possibility of using collider experiments to test QM

---

<sup>2</sup>For example, recent literature often refers to ‘measuring entanglement’ at colliders. This is a clear misnomer: Entanglement is a property of a quantum state, and not an observable that can be measured. Similarly, one cannot ‘test Bell's inequality’. Bell proved a mathematical theorem which is valid for all LHVTs. One can only test for locality via Bell's inequality.

against LHVTs, e.g. by testing for violations of Bell’s inequalities in a collider environment. Clearly, any valid experiment that claims to test QM against LHVTs cannot at the same time implicitly assume QM from the start. This seemingly obvious fact is particularly important at particle colliders, where theoretical predictions are routinely performed in the context of Quantum Field Theory (QFT). Extreme care is thus needed that QFT and QM are not assumed at any stage in the argument if QM itself is put to the test against LHVTs at a collider. Our goal is to argue that it is currently *not* possible to perform any logically coherent test of entanglement versus non-entanglement and locality via the Bell or CHSH inequalities at colliders without already assuming the validity of QM from the start. Such an assumption invalidates any of these proposed tests. This observation is not new. In fact, it has already been pointed out more than 30 years ago that it is not possible to test locality via a Bell’s inequalities at colliders [80]. In essence, ref. [80] starts from the fact that at a collider we cannot measure the spins of the produced particles, but only their momenta. Due to the commuting nature of the momentum operator in QM, it is always possible to construct a LHVT that reproduces the expectation values of any given observable that is a function of momenta only [80], [81]. Hence, no violation of Bell’s inequalities can be observed in this way. Only by assuming QM can a non-local function be extracted from differential cross section measurements at current colliders.

Violations of Bell’s inequalities are tightly linked to measuring correlations of products of non-commuting observables, like spin correlations. Spin correlations, however, are not directly measurable at colliders. Recent approaches to studying entanglement at colliders have mostly been based on the idea that spin correlations can be measured indirectly at colliders, by extracting them from appropriate angular correlations between decay products. This has led to a vast literature and proposals on how to test locality via Bell’s inequalities and/or to establish entanglement versus non-entanglement at colliders, apparently evading the no-go theorem of ref. [80]. The main result of this paper is a critical analysis of the idea that spin correlations can be indirectly measured at colliders and used as a means to test locality through studying entanglement versus non-entanglement and potential violations of Bell’s inequalities. By studying the precise relation between spin and angular correlations at colliders, we find that these approaches always ultimately assume QM at some stage in the reasoning. This reveals a logical fallacy also in this indirect approach of attempting to access spin correlations through angular correlations of momenta, which invalidates the proposed tests of QM vs. LHVTs at colliders, and confirms the no-go theorem of ref. [80] (though a certain subclass of LHVTs may still be constrained, as was also pointed out in ref. [80]). We emphasize that the no-go theorem applies to the statement about tests of locality at colliders or of entanglement versus non-entanglement. It does not apply to using observables inspired from Quantum Information Theory and entanglement (e.g., concurrence) to test various models of QFT among themselves, e.g., as a means to test the SM of particle physics against various extensions of it, while always assuming QM.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: In section 2 we review existing ways of relating spin and angular correlations, both in QFT and in LHVTs. In sections 3 and 4 we show that it is currently not possible to relate spin and angular correlations without presupposing QFT and thus QM. This shows that it is not possible to perform any logically consistent test of locality via Bell’s inequalities at colliders based on spin correlations, in agreement with the no-go theorem of ref. [80]. In section 5 we discuss how measurements of angular correlations can be turned into constraints on certain classes of LHVTs. In section 6 we draw our conclusions.

## 2 Relating spin and angular correlations

In this section we review how to relate spin and angular correlations at colliders. More specifically, we consider the production of a fermion pair  $F_+F_-$  that subsequently decays according to

$$F_+ \rightarrow f_{+,1}, \dots, f_{+,n}, \quad F_- \rightarrow f_{-,1}, \dots, f_{-,n}. \quad (4)$$

We assume that the widths of the fermions are small enough so that they can be identified as sharp resonances, which motivates to consider their on-shell production. Prime examples for such processes are the production and the decays of top or  $\tau$  pairs. In the following we focus on the correlations associated with the first two final state particles, respectively,  $f_{\pm,1}$ .

Our goal is to relate the spin correlation matrix

$$C_{ij} = \langle s_+^i s_-^j \rangle, \quad i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathbf{s}_{\pm} = (s_{\pm}^1, s_{\pm}^2, s_{\pm}^3)$  are the directions of the spins of  $F_{\pm}$  in their respective rest frames, to the correlation matrix

$$Q_{ij} = \langle q_+^i q_-^j \rangle, \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathbf{q}_{\pm}$  is the direction of the momentum of  $f_{\pm,1}$  in the rest frame of  $F_{\pm}$ . Note that we assume  $|\mathbf{s}_{\pm}| = |\mathbf{q}_{\pm}| = 1$ . The combination of spin correlations that enters the CHSH inequality can be cast in a form involving the spin correlation matrix  $\mathbf{C}$ . More precisely, eq. (3) is equivalent to

$$|(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{a}')^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{b} + (\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{a}')^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{b}'| \leq 2. \quad (7)$$

## 2.1 Relating spin and angular correlations in QFT

The relationship between spin and angular correlations in QFT is well known, and has been extensively studied in particular in the context of top pair production [82]–[95]. We will therefore be brief with the derivations and only focus on the main aspects.

In QFT the differential probability for the production of the fermion pair  $F_+ F_-$  and its subsequent decay is proportional to the matrix element squared of the process. In the narrow width approximation, this matrix element squared factorizes into the spin-correlated matrix element for the production of an on-shell  $F_+ F_-$  pair, connected by the spin density matrix,  $\Gamma_{\beta\bar{\beta}}^{F_{\pm}}$ ,

$$|\mathcal{M}(F_+ F_- + X \rightarrow \{f_{+,i}\}, \{f_{-,i}\} + X)|^2 \sim \mathcal{M}(F_+ F_- + X)_{\beta\bar{\beta}} \Gamma_{\beta\bar{\beta}'}^{F_+} \Gamma_{\bar{\beta}\bar{\beta}'}^{F_-} \mathcal{M}(F_+ F_- + X)_{\beta'\bar{\beta}'}^*, \quad (8)$$

where  $X$  denotes additional radiation (which may need to be taken into account at higher orders in perturbation theory), and  $\beta^{(\prime)}$  and  $\bar{\beta}^{(\prime)}$  are the spin eigenvalues of the  $F_+$  and  $F_-$  along some quantization axis. We assume that we are inclusive over all final-state momenta except for the directions  $\mathbf{q}_+$  and  $\mathbf{q}_-$  of the decay products  $f_{+,1}$  and  $f_{-,1}$ . The spin density matrices are hermitian  $2 \times 2$  matrices, and may thus be expanded into the basis  $(\mathbb{1}, \vec{\sigma})$  of Pauli matrices. By rotational invariance, the most general form is

$$\Gamma^{F_+} \propto \mathbb{1} + \alpha_1 \mathbf{q}_+ \cdot \vec{\sigma}. \quad (9)$$

The constant of proportionality is related to the total decay rate of  $F_+$ , and its precise form is irrelevant here. The constant  $\alpha_1$  is called the *spin-analyzing power* of  $F_+$ . Inserting eq. (9) into eq. (8), one arrives at the following expression for the normalized differential cross section as a function of the directions  $\mathbf{q}_{\pm}$  [94],

$$\frac{1}{\sigma} \frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega_+ d\Omega_-} = \frac{1 + \alpha_1 \mathbf{B}_+ \cdot \mathbf{q}_+ + \bar{\alpha}_1 \mathbf{B}_- \cdot \mathbf{q}_- + \alpha_1 \bar{\alpha}_1 \mathbf{q}_+^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{q}_-}{16\pi^2}, \quad (10)$$

where  $d\Omega_{\pm}$  are the infinitesimal solid angles in the respective  $F_{\pm}$  rest frames, attached to the directions  $\mathbf{q}_{\pm}$ , and  $\bar{\alpha}_1$  is the spin-analyzing power of  $F_-$ . The vectors  $\mathbf{B}_{\pm}$  are related to the net polarizations of  $F_+$  and  $F_-$ , and  $\mathbf{C}$  is the spin correlation matrix from eq. (5). From eq. (10) we can easily read off the relation between the spin and angular correlations (see appendix B),

$$Q_{ij} = \langle q_+^i q_-^j \rangle = \int_{S^2 \times S^2} d\Omega_+ d\Omega_- \frac{1}{\sigma} \frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega_+ d\Omega_-} q_+^i q_-^j = \frac{\alpha_1 \bar{\alpha}_1}{9} C_{ij}. \quad (11)$$

Equation (11) is the desired relation between the spin and angular correlations in QFT. This relation is well known, and is the basis for many spin correlation studies at colliders, e.g., in the context of top or  $\tau$  physics. We stress that the derivation of this relation deeply relies on the use of QFT, in particular on the squared matrix element in the narrow-width approximation, which is a quantity intrinsic to QFT. Before we discuss what this relation becomes in a LHVT, let us make a comment about the spin-analyzing powers  $\alpha_1$  and  $\bar{\alpha}_1$ . It follows from CPT-invariance (which is a very general property of a local relativistic QFT) that the spin-analyzing powers of  $F_+$  and  $F_-$  are related by

$$\bar{\alpha}_1 = -\alpha_1. \quad (12)$$

Second, the spin-analyzing power is closely related to the differential decay rate of  $F_+$  in the direction of  $f_{+,1}$ ,

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma} \frac{d\Gamma}{d\Omega_+} = \frac{1 + \alpha_1 P_+ \cos \theta}{4\pi}, \quad (13)$$

where  $\cos \theta = \mathbf{q}_+ \cdot \mathbf{d}$  is the angle between  $\mathbf{q}_+$  and some reference direction  $\mathbf{d}$ , with  $|\mathbf{d}| = 1$ , and  $P_+$  is the polarization of  $F_+$  in the direction  $\mathbf{d}$ . We have

$$P_+ \equiv P(\mathbf{s}_+ \cdot \mathbf{d} > 0) - P(\mathbf{s}_+ \cdot \mathbf{d} < 0) \propto \mathbf{B}_+ \cdot \mathbf{d}, \quad (14)$$

where  $P(\mathbf{s}_+ \cdot \mathbf{d} > 0)$  is the probability that the spin  $\mathbf{s}_+$  of  $F_+$  in the latter's rest frame points in the direction  $\mathbf{d}$ . For a sample perfectly polarized in the direction  $\mathbf{d}$ , i.e.  $P_+ = 1$ , we infer the probability for the particle  $f_{+,1}$  to be emitted in the direction  $\mathbf{q}_+$ , if the spin of  $F_+$  points in the direction  $\mathbf{s}_+$  as

$$P(\mathbf{q}_+ | \mathbf{s}_+) = \frac{1 + \alpha_1 \mathbf{q}_+ \cdot \mathbf{s}_+}{4\pi}. \quad (15)$$

## 2.2 Relating spin and angular correlations in LHVTs

We now discuss how the analysis of the previous section changes in the context of a LHVT. Since our goal is to test QM against LHVTs, we pay particular attention not to assume any concepts from QFT. Our analysis only relies on the following assumptions:

1. We assume a LHVT, with hidden variables  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ .
2. Special relativity holds, in particular Poincaré-invariance.
3. The particle species  $F_+$  and its anti-particle  $F_-$  have spin  $\frac{1}{2}$ . In particular, the spin's projection along any axis can only take the values  $\pm \frac{1}{2}$ .
4.  $F_+$  and  $F_-$  decay independently, and the decays of one fermion do not depend on the measurement process of the other. While this property is harder to check and may depend on the measurement setup, it is essential in order to perform local Bell-type experiments.

Let us make a comment on CPT-invariance. If we assume CPT-invariance, then the anti-particle  $F_-$  has the same decay channels, lifetime and branching ratios as the particle  $F_+$ . CPT-invariance is automatically satisfied in the context of local, relativistic QFTs. Since our goal is to investigate if we can test QM, and thus QFT, against LHVTs, we cannot logically take CPT-invariance for granted anymore. We therefore do not assume CPT-invariance in our discussion, but we comment on it at the end.

We start from the representation of the matrix of angular correlations, cf. eq. (6),

$$Q_{ij} = \langle q_+^i q_-^j \rangle = \int_{S^2 \times S^2} d\Omega_+ d\Omega_- q_+^i q_-^j P(\mathbf{q}_+, \mathbf{q}_-). \quad (16)$$

Here  $P(\mathbf{q}_+, \mathbf{q}_-)$  is the joint PDF to produce the final-state decay products, where the momentum of  $f_{\pm,1}$  points in the direction  $\mathbf{q}_{\pm}$  in the rest frame of  $F_{\pm}$ . Let us make a comment: at first glance, the integral in eq. (16) does not match the structure of an expectation value in a LHVT as given in eqs. (1) and (2). In particular, eq. (16) does not involve any integration over the hidden variables  $\lambda$ . In appendix A we show that both representations are valid and follow from the axioms of a LHVT, cf. ref. [96].

We now use Bayes' law to write

$$P(\mathbf{q}_+, \mathbf{q}_-) = \int_{S^2 \times S^2} d\Omega_+^s d\Omega_-^s P(\mathbf{q}_+, \mathbf{q}_- | \mathbf{s}_+, \mathbf{s}_-) P(\mathbf{s}_+, \mathbf{s}_-), \quad (17)$$

where  $\mathbf{s}_{\pm}$  is the direction of the spin of  $F_{\pm}$  in the particle's rest frame ( $|\mathbf{s}_{\pm}| = 1$ ), and  $d\Omega_{\pm}^s$  is the infinitesimal spherical solid angle associated with the direction  $\mathbf{s}_{\pm}$ . Here  $P(\mathbf{s}_+, \mathbf{s}_-)$  is the joint PDF to produce the final state  $F_+ F_-$  with the spins in their respective rest frames pointing in the directions  $\mathbf{s}_+$  and  $\mathbf{s}_-$ , and  $P(\mathbf{q}_+, \mathbf{q}_- | \mathbf{s}_+, \mathbf{s}_-)$  is the conditional probability that  $F_+$  and  $F_-$  with these polarizations decay into the final states with the given directions  $\mathbf{q}_{\pm}$  for  $f_{+,1}$  and  $f_{-,1}$ . We may now use the assumption that the decays of the two fermions are independent, and that they do not depend on the properties of the respective other fermion. This implies

$$P(\mathbf{q}_+, \mathbf{q}_- | \mathbf{s}_+, \mathbf{s}_-) = P(\mathbf{q}_+ | \mathbf{s}_+) P(\mathbf{q}_- | \mathbf{s}_-). \quad (18)$$

Hence,

$$\langle q_+^i q_-^j \rangle = \int_{S^2 \times S^2} d\Omega_+^s d\Omega_-^s P(\mathbf{s}_+, \mathbf{s}_-) S_+^i(\mathbf{s}_+) S_-^j(\mathbf{s}_-), \quad (19)$$

where we defined

$$\mathbf{S}_{\pm}(\mathbf{s}_{\pm}) \equiv \int_{S^2} d\Omega_{\pm} \mathbf{q}_{\pm} P(\mathbf{q}_{\pm} | \mathbf{s}_{\pm}). \quad (20)$$

It seems that we need an explicit expression for  $P(\mathbf{q} | \mathbf{s})$  to proceed. In QFT, it is given by eq. (15). Here, however, we cannot rely on QFT, and we are limited to using the assumptions spelled out at the beginning of this section. As we now show, the explicit functional dependence of  $P(\mathbf{q} | \mathbf{s})$  is to a large extent irrelevant.

By rotational invariance, we know that  $P(\mathbf{q} | \mathbf{s})$  can only depend on

$$\cos \theta \equiv \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{s}. \quad (21)$$

Rotational invariance also implies that

$$P(\mathbf{R}\mathbf{q} | \mathbf{R}\mathbf{s}) = P(\mathbf{q} | \mathbf{s}), \quad (22)$$

for every rotation  $\mathbf{R} \in \text{SO}(3)$ . This in turn implies that the functions  $\mathbf{S}_{\pm}$  defined in eq. (20) have the property

$$\mathbf{S}_{\pm}(\mathbf{R}\mathbf{s}_{\pm}) = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{S}_{\pm}(\mathbf{s}_{\pm}). \quad (23)$$

Indeed, changing integration variables from  $\mathbf{q}_{\pm}$  to  $\mathbf{R}\mathbf{q}_{\pm}$  and using the fact that the integration measure is invariant under rotations, we find

$$\mathbf{S}_{\pm}(\mathbf{R}\mathbf{s}_{\pm}) = \int_{S^2} d\Omega_{\pm} \mathbf{q}_{\pm} P(\mathbf{q}_{\pm} | \mathbf{R}\mathbf{s}_{\pm}) = \int_{S^2} d\Omega_{\pm} \mathbf{R}\mathbf{q}_{\pm} P(\mathbf{R}\mathbf{q}_{\pm} | \mathbf{R}\mathbf{s}_{\pm}) = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{S}_{\pm}(\mathbf{s}_{\pm}). \quad (24)$$

It is easy to see that eq. (23) forces the most general form of  $\mathbf{S}_{\pm}(\mathbf{s}_{\pm})$  to be

$$\mathbf{S}_{\pm}(\mathbf{s}_{\pm}) = g_{\pm}(\mathbf{s}_{\pm}^2) \mathbf{s}_{\pm}, \quad (25)$$

for some scalar functions  $g_{\pm}$ . Moreover, since  $\mathbf{s}_{\pm}^2 = 1$ , we see that

$$\mathbf{S}_+(\mathbf{s}_+) = A \mathbf{s}_+ \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{S}_-(\mathbf{s}_-) = \bar{A} \mathbf{s}_-, \quad (26)$$

for some real constants  $A \equiv g_+(1)$  and  $\bar{A} \equiv g_-(1)$ .

Inserting eq. (26) into eq. (19), we find

$$Q_{ij} = \langle q_+^i q_-^j \rangle = A \bar{A} \int_{S^2 \times S^2} d\Omega_+^s d\Omega_-^s P(\mathbf{s}_+, \mathbf{s}_-) s_+^i s_-^j = A \bar{A} \langle s_+^i s_-^j \rangle = A \bar{A} C_{ij}. \quad (27)$$

We see that, very generally, the matrices of angular and spin correlations are proportional to each other. We stress that this feature is generic, and does not rely at all on the detailed features of the underlying LHVT. Indeed, the only assumptions that went into the derivation of eq. (26) are rotational invariance and the independence of the two measurements, expressed through eqs. (22) and (18), respectively.

Let us conclude by connecting the constants  $A$  and  $\bar{A}$  to the spin-analysing powers  $\alpha_1$  and  $\bar{\alpha}_1$  known from QFT. In order to see the connection, let us assume that the PDF  $P(\cdot|\mathbf{s})$  is a continuous function of  $\cos \theta$  (which is also the case in QFT). Since the unit sphere is compact, this immediately implies that  $P(\cdot|\mathbf{s})$  is bounded everywhere on the unit sphere,  $|P(\cdot|\mathbf{s})| \leq M < \infty$ , for some positive real number  $M$  (that may depend on  $\mathbf{s}$ ). Then we have

$$\int_{S^2} d\Omega |P(\mathbf{q}|\mathbf{s})|^2 \leq 4\pi M^2 < \infty. \quad (28)$$

Hence,  $P(\mathbf{q}|\mathbf{s})$  is a square-integrable function on the sphere  $S^2$ . Thus it can be expanded into the basis of spherical harmonics. Since  $P(\mathbf{q}|\mathbf{s})$  only depends on  $\cos \theta$ , this expansion reduces to an expansion in Legendre polynomials. We then have

$$P(\mathbf{q}|\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_{\ell}}{4\pi} P_{\ell}(\cos \theta), \quad (29)$$

where the  $\alpha_{\ell}$  are real numbers. The normalization condition  $\int_{S^2} d\Omega P(\mathbf{q}|\mathbf{s}) = 1$  implies  $\alpha_0 = 1$ . The other coefficients are left unconstrained by the normalization condition. In appendix B we show that the constants  $A$  and  $\bar{A}$  are related to the coefficient of the Legendre polynomial with  $\ell = 1$ ,

$$A = \frac{\alpha_1}{3} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{A} = \frac{\bar{\alpha}_1}{3}, \quad (30)$$

where  $\bar{\alpha}_1$  is the coefficient of  $\frac{1}{4\pi} \mathbf{q}_- \cdot \mathbf{s}_-$  in  $P(\mathbf{q}_-|\mathbf{s}_-)$ , i.e., for  $\ell = 1$ . Note in particular that the result of the integral in eq. (20) is entirely determined by the  $\ell = 1$  polynomial, and it is independent of the coefficients of the Legendre polynomials with  $\ell > 1$ . In analogy with the QFT case in eq. (15), we also refer to the coefficients  $\alpha_1$  and  $\bar{\alpha}_1$  as the spin-analyzing powers.

Let us make some final comments. In principle,  $\alpha_{\ell}$  and  $\bar{\alpha}_{\ell}$  are free parameters for  $\ell > 0$ . However, they are naturally bounded. For example, we have

$$|\alpha_1| = 3|\langle \cos \theta \rangle| \leq 3\langle |\cos \theta| \rangle = 3 \int_{S^2} d\Omega_+ |\cos \theta| P(\mathbf{q}_+|\mathbf{s}_+) \leq 3. \quad (31)$$

Similar relations hold for  $\ell > 1$ . Note that the same bound (with exactly the same derivation) holds in QFT.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, we have not assumed CPT-invariance, so that a priori  $\alpha_1$  and  $\bar{\alpha}_1$  are distinct. If we impose CPT-invariance, we find

$$\bar{\alpha}_{\ell} = (-1)^{\ell} \alpha_{\ell}, \quad (32)$$

in agreement with the corresponding result in QFT, cf. eq. (12).

---

<sup>3</sup>In QFT we have the even stricter bound  $|\alpha_1| \leq 1$ .



### 3 Testing locality at colliders

Comparing eqs. (11) and (27), we remarkably find exactly the same relation between spin and angular correlations in QFT and LHVTs, namely we have in both cases

$$\mathbf{Q} = \frac{\alpha_1 \bar{\alpha}_1}{9} \mathbf{C}. \quad (33)$$

Let us make some comments about this relation. In fact, the final form in eq. (33) has already appeared in the literature before, cf., e.g., refs. [42], [80], [97]. We believe, however, that this is the first time that a derivation has been performed that consistently only uses assumptions belonging to either QFT or LHVTs. For example, previous derivations rely on the restricted form in eq. (15), or they assume that the joint distribution  $P(\mathbf{s}_+, \mathbf{s}_-)$  is always a normalized PDF. The latter assumption is not valid in QM, where  $P(\mathbf{s}_+, \mathbf{s}_-)$  is not a PDF, but rather has to be interpreted as the Sudarshan  $P$ -function [98], which may be negative, or even singular.

Having established eq. (33) as the relation between spin and angular correlations in both QM and LHVTs, we may ask for the implications. The left-hand side of eq. (33) only involves the matrix  $\mathbf{Q}$  of angular correlations, which are directly measurable at colliders. We can then use eq. (33) to extract (and thus indirectly measure) the spin correlation matrix  $\mathbf{C}$ , *however only if the spin-analyzing powers  $\alpha_1$  and  $\bar{\alpha}_1$  are known*. Any test of locality or study of entanglement via spin correlations at colliders will have to face this fact.

Let us illustrate this on the example of the CHSH inequality. We assume that we have measured the matrix of angular correlations in a collider experiment. From this we can compute the quantity (cf. eq. (7))

$$R_Q \equiv \max_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{a}', \mathbf{b}'} |(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{a}')^T \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{b} + (\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{a}')^T \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{b}'|. \quad (34)$$

Since angular correlations do not lead to a violation of the CHSH inequality (see ref. [99] for concrete examples), we have

$$R_Q \leq 2. \quad (35)$$

Analogously, we define (cf. eq. (7))

$$R_C \equiv \max_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{a}', \mathbf{b}'} |(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{a}')^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{b} + (\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{a}')^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{b}'|. \quad (36)$$

Note that, unlike  $R_Q$ ,  $R_C$  cannot be directly measured at colliders, but, since  $R_Q$  and  $R_C$  are linear in  $\mathbf{Q}$  and  $\mathbf{C}$ , respectively, we can use eq. (33) to relate  $R_C$  to  $R_Q$ ,

$$R_C = \frac{9}{|\alpha_1 \bar{\alpha}_1|} R_Q. \quad (37)$$

From eq. (31) we see that we always have

$$R_Q \leq R_C. \quad (38)$$

Hence, even though  $R_Q$  always satisfies the CHSH bound in eq. (35),  $R_C$  may violate it. Whether or not it is violated of course depends on the specific process studied, but it also depends on the model-dependent values of  $\alpha_1$  and  $\bar{\alpha}_1$ , which are unknown at this point.

We then have two possibilities how to obtain values for the spin-analyzing powers:

1. **Theory input:** The spin-analyzing powers are computable within the SM (or an appropriate extension of it), and we use these theoretical values as input. This is what has typically been done in

current phenomenological studies and experimental measurements. In this case, however, we have used a QFT computation as input to our indirect measurement. As a consequence, our indirect measurement presupposes QM, and therefore it can no longer serve as a test of QM against LHVTs. Hence, in this approach, any test of locality via Bell's inequalities or measurement that establishes entanglement at colliders is logically invalidated.

2. **Experimental input:** One possible way out could be to obtain the spin-analyzing powers from an independent direct experimental determination, without relying on theory input that presupposes QM.

We will come back to the last point in section 4. Before that, let us illustrate the first point on the study of entanglement in two cases. First, we discuss the interpretation of the measurement of angular correlations in  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma\Lambda\bar{\Lambda} \rightarrow \gamma p\pi^- \bar{p}\pi^+$  from refs. [79], [100], [101] in terms of a test of entanglement, and second in top-pair production at the LHC, proposed in refs. [17], [22]–[24], [39], [52] and measured in refs. [19], [20].

In the first example of ref. [79], BESIII interprets the measurement of angular correlations of protons and antiprotons in the process  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma\eta_c \rightarrow \gamma\Lambda\bar{\Lambda} \rightarrow \gamma p\pi^- \bar{p}\pi^+$  as a measurement of entanglement and as an exclusion of locality in LHVTs with a significance of  $5.2\sigma$  using Bell- and CHSH-type inequalities. This decay channel has already been critically discussed in ref. [80].<sup>4</sup> The analysis is based on the idea that the expectation value  $E$  of the spin correlations between the  $\Lambda$  spins along the directions  $\mathbf{n}_{1,2}$ , for the  $\Lambda$ 's emerging from the  $\eta_c$  decay, can be measured through the observation of the relative angle between the protons' momenta,  $\theta_{p\bar{p}}$ :

$$E(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2) = \langle S | \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_1 \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_2 | S \rangle = -\cos\theta_{p\bar{p}}, \quad (39)$$

which is derived from QM. Furthermore, the paper by the BESIII collaboration starts with the claim that the parameter  $\alpha_\Lambda$  in the function relating the measured distribution  $I(\theta_{p\bar{p}})$  of the angle  $\theta_{p\bar{p}}$  between the proton momenta

$$I(\theta_{p\bar{p}}) = 1 + \alpha_\Lambda^2 \cos\theta_{p\bar{p}}, \quad (40)$$

has been experimentally measured as  $\alpha_\Lambda = 0.750 \pm 0.009 \pm 0.004$  in refs. [100], [101]. Although experimental input appears to have been used exclusively to determine the critical input parameter  $\alpha_\Lambda$  independently of the assumption of QM, a look at the derivation of the angular distributions from which  $\alpha_\Lambda$  is obtained reveals that the measurement of  $\alpha_\Lambda$  is inferred from a fit to a QFT prediction [102], and thus it is only valid within the assumptions of QM. However, this parameter is necessary to interpret the observed distribution  $I$ . Therefore, the interpretation of the  $p\bar{p}$  angular correlations at BESIII as a test of LHVTs depends in two critical points on assuming QM in the measurement of decay angular parameters and thus cannot exclude LHVTs. The same is true for the next section of the paper, where the corresponding dependence on  $\alpha_\Lambda$  appears in the CHSH inequality.

In the second example, we discuss  $pp \rightarrow t\bar{t} + X$  production, cf. refs. [19]–[21], where the tops decay leptonically and the  $\mathbf{q}_\pm$  are the directions of the momenta of the charged leptons in the (anti-)top rest frame, respectively. The distribution of the normalized differential cross section as a function of the angle  $\cos\varphi = \mathbf{q}_+ \cdot \mathbf{q}_-$  can be written as

$$\frac{1}{\sigma} \frac{d\sigma}{d\cos\varphi} = \frac{1 - D^Q \cos\varphi}{2}, \quad (41)$$

where<sup>5</sup> Here  $D^Q = -3\langle\cos\varphi\rangle^Q = -3\text{Tr}\mathbf{Q}$  is proportional to the trace of the measured angular correlation matrix of the lepton momenta  $\mathbf{q}$ .

<sup>4</sup>Interestingly, ref. [80] is cited in ref. [79], however without any acknowledgment of the critical discussion.

<sup>5</sup>We diverge here from the Atlas notation and introduce four variables  $D$ ,  $D^{\text{exp}}$ ,  $D^Q$ ,  $D^C$ , as well as  $D^{\text{SM}}$ , below. This will hopefully help to keep the discussion unambiguous.

Recently the CMS and ATLAS collaborations have measured angular distributions related to spin correlations in top quark decays. In the following, we use the measurement of ATLAS as an example. They obtained the value  $D^{\text{exp}} = -0.537 \pm 0.002 (\text{stat.}) \pm 0.019 (\text{syst.})$  [19], where  $D^{\text{exp}}$  is a measurement of  $D^{\text{Q}}$ .

Let us examine this result in the light of the previous discussion. In general we can define a second variable  $D^{\text{C}}$  in terms of the spin correlation  $D^{\text{C}} \equiv \text{Tr } \mathbf{C}/3$ . Please note the different sign and scaling between  $D^{\text{Q}}$  and  $D^{\text{C}}$ . Using the general connection we have established between  $\mathbf{Q}$  and  $\mathbf{C}$  in eq. (33), we can relate  $D^{\text{Q}}$  and  $D^{\text{C}}$

$$-\frac{1}{3}D^{\text{Q}} \stackrel{!}{=} \langle \cos \varphi \rangle^{\text{Q}} = \text{Tr } \mathbf{Q} = \frac{\alpha_1 \bar{\alpha}_1}{9} \text{Tr } \mathbf{C} = \frac{\alpha_1 \bar{\alpha}_1}{3} D^{\text{C}}. \quad (42)$$

This equation can be read from right to left leading in the last (furthest to the left) equality in a prediction for the observable  $D^{\text{Q}}$  based on both the spin analyzers  $\alpha$  and  $D^{\text{C}}$ . Most importantly, for the case  $\alpha_1 = -\bar{\alpha}_1 = 1$ , we obtain  $D^{\text{Q}} = D^{\text{C}}$ . In QM we have  $D^{\text{SM}} \equiv \text{Tr } \mathbf{C}^{\text{SM}}/3$ . Analogously the SM thus makes a prediction for the observed angular correlation relating  $D^{\text{Q}}$  and  $D^{\text{SM}}$

$$-\frac{1}{3}D^{\text{Q}} \stackrel{!}{=} \langle \cos \varphi \rangle^{\text{SM}} = \text{Tr } \mathbf{Q}^{\text{SM}} = \frac{\alpha_1^{\text{SM}} \bar{\alpha}_1^{\text{SM}}}{9} \text{Tr } \mathbf{C}^{\text{SM}} = \frac{\alpha_1^{\text{SM}} \bar{\alpha}_1^{\text{SM}}}{3} D^{\text{SM}} = -\frac{(\alpha_1^{\text{SM}})^2}{3} D^{\text{SM}}. \quad (43)$$

In the last equality on the right we assumed CPT-invariance. The spin-analyzing power of top quarks is predicted by the SM to be  $|\alpha_1^{\text{SM}}| \simeq 1$  and thus we have the prediction  $D^{\text{Q}} \simeq D^{\text{SM}}$ . However this *only* holds as such within the SM. In the ATLAS paper [19] only one symbol  $D$  is used throughout corresponding to setting  $\alpha_1 = \alpha^{\text{SM}} = 1$  and thus  $D = D^{\text{Q}} = D^{\text{SM}}$ .

Furthermore, the SM predicts the inequality [18]

$$D^{\text{SM}} < -\frac{1}{3}, \quad (44)$$

based on the Peres-Horodecki criterion [103], [104] for entanglement. The condition eq. (44) can be interpreted as a sign of spin entanglement in top-pair production, because eq. (44) is equivalent to  $\langle \mathbf{s}_+ \cdot \mathbf{s}_- \rangle = \text{Tr } \mathbf{C}^{\text{SM}} = 3D^{\text{SM}} < -1$ . In any LHVT, however, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality implies

$$|\langle \mathbf{s}_+ \cdot \mathbf{s}_- \rangle| \leq \int_{S^2 \times S^2} d\Omega_+^s d\Omega_-^s |\mathbf{s}_+ \cdot \mathbf{s}_-| P(\mathbf{s}_+, \mathbf{s}_-) \leq \int_{S^2 \times S^2} d\Omega_+^s d\Omega_-^s P(\mathbf{s}_+, \mathbf{s}_-) = 1. \quad (45)$$

Note that this reasoning crucially relies on  $P(\mathbf{s}_+, \mathbf{s}_-)$  being a normalized PDF, which is the case for a LHVT, but not necessarily in QM. Thus in an LHVT we have  $|D^{\text{C}}| = |\text{Tr } \mathbf{C}/3| \leq 1/3$ , and therefore the  $D^{\text{C}}$  resulting from an LHVT always violates eq. (44).

If the experiment had measured a correlation of spins, the Peres-Horodecki criterion would allow to make a statement about entanglement. However, the experiment has measured the angular correlation of momenta  $\mathbf{q}$  corresponding to

$$\langle \cos \varphi \rangle^{\text{Q}} = \text{Tr } \mathbf{Q}. \quad (46)$$

We see that ATLAS has not measured  $D^{\text{SM}}$  directly, but only indirectly via eq. (43). Thus care has to be taken to interpret this measurement. There are two possibilities:

1. The measured value agrees with the SM prediction,  $\langle \cos \varphi \rangle^{\text{exp}} \simeq \langle \cos \varphi \rangle^{\text{SM}}$  (within uncertainties). Then it is no surprise that we have the inequality

$$D^{\text{exp}} \equiv -3\langle \cos \varphi \rangle^{\text{exp}} = -3\langle \cos \varphi \rangle^{\text{Q}} \simeq -3\langle \cos \varphi \rangle^{\text{SM}} = (\alpha_1^{\text{SM}})^2 D^{\text{SM}} < -\frac{1}{3}. \quad (47)$$

This is not a test of entanglement versus non-entanglement but just a consistency test of the SM. It rests on the assumption that the SM relation  $|\alpha_1^{\text{SM}}| \simeq 1$  must hold. We would like to stress that the fact that measured angular distributions between different momenta in top decays agree with the SM prediction cannot be taken as a proof that correlations between spins and momenta agree with the SM.

2. If instead a significant deviation between  $\langle \cos \varphi \rangle^{\text{exp}}$  and  $\langle \cos \varphi \rangle^{\text{SM}}$  was observed, then we may have discovered new physics in the production and/or decay of top quarks. In that case, it is logically flawed to assume  $|\alpha_1^{\text{SM}}| \simeq 1$  as a property of top decays.

Hence, we see that, either way, we do not arrive at the conclusion that we can unequivocally establish entanglement in top production without presupposing QM, and so it is not logically possible to conclude that ATLAS has observed entanglement without presupposing the SM. The same applies for the methodically similar results of ref. [20] from the CMS collaboration. CMS obtained  $D = -0.480_{-0.017}^{+0.016}$  (stat.)  $_{-0.023}^{+0.020}$  (syst.) at the parton level.

## 4 Direct measurements of the spin-analyzing power

In the previous section we have argued that we cannot determine spin correlations from angular correlations of momenta at colliders, unless we use the spin-analyzing powers  $\alpha_1$  and  $\bar{\alpha}_1$  as inputs. If the spin-analyzing powers are used as theory inputs derived under the assumption of QM, then the spin correlations cannot provide any valid test of QM against LHVTs. This leaves us with the logical possibility that we may directly measure the spin-analyzing powers in an independent fashion, without assuming QM. In this section we discuss this possibility.

Since the spin-analyzing power of  $F_+$  is closely connected to the angular distribution of its decay products, we can try to measure  $\alpha_1$  from the differential decay rate of  $F_+$ . We have in mind a situation where  $F_{\pm}$  are charged  $\tau^{\pm}$  leptons, but we keep the discussion general. The polarization of our sample of  $F_+$ 's in the beam direction  $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$  is

$$P_+ = P(\mathbf{s}_+ \cdot \hat{\mathbf{z}} > 0) - P(\mathbf{s}_+ \cdot \hat{\mathbf{z}} < 0) = \frac{N(\mathbf{s}_+ \cdot \hat{\mathbf{z}} > 0) - N(\mathbf{s}_+ \cdot \hat{\mathbf{z}} < 0)}{N(\mathbf{s}_+ \cdot \hat{\mathbf{z}} > 0) + N(\mathbf{s}_+ \cdot \hat{\mathbf{z}} < 0)}, \quad (48)$$

or equivalently

$$P(\mathbf{s}_+ \cdot \hat{\mathbf{z}} > 0) = \frac{1 + P_+}{2}, \quad \text{and} \quad P(\mathbf{s}_+ \cdot \hat{\mathbf{z}} < 0) = \frac{1 - P_+}{2}. \quad (49)$$

If  $\cos \theta \equiv \mathbf{q}_+ \cdot \hat{\mathbf{z}}$  is the cosine of the angle between  $\mathbf{q}_+$  and the beam direction  $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\Gamma} \frac{d\Gamma}{d\cos \theta} &= 2\pi P(\mathbf{q}_+ | \hat{\mathbf{z}}) P(\mathbf{s}_+ \cdot \hat{\mathbf{z}} > 0) + 2\pi P(\mathbf{q}_+ | -\hat{\mathbf{z}}) P(\mathbf{s}_+ \cdot \hat{\mathbf{z}} < 0) \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_{2m}}{2} P_{2m}(\cos \theta) + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{P_+ \alpha_{2m+1}}{2} P_{2m+1}(\cos \theta). \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

We used the general form of  $P(\mathbf{q}_+ | \hat{\mathbf{z}})$  derived in section 2.2, since we do not want to make any assumption of QM vs. LHVT at this stage. The angular distribution on the left-hand side is measurable at colliders. A measurement strategy could be to fit the distribution to a (truncated) ansatz in terms of Legendre polynomials, as in the last line of eq. (50). However, we can only isolate the even coefficients  $\alpha_{2m}$  from the fit, while for the odd Legendre coefficients we can only extract the product  $P_+ \alpha_{2m+1}$  with the polarization. In particular, we are only able to extract the product  $P_+ \alpha_1$  from the fit.

One may wonder if this is a limitation of our measurement strategy, and if we could find another observable that allows us to extract the value of  $\alpha_1$  without knowledge of the polarization  $P_+$ . We believe that this is not possible, as we now explain. At current collider experiments, we only have access to the momenta of the particles; there is no direct spin measurement. The spin-analyzing power is connected to the conditional probability  $P(\mathbf{q}_+|\hat{\mathbf{z}})$ , which requires the knowledge of a spin quantization axis  $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ . Connecting a measurement of only momenta to the spin-analyzing power requires Bayes' law as in the first line of eq. (50). The prior for the spin direction in eq. (49) then necessarily involves the polarization. Hence, we will not be able to extract  $\alpha_1$  independently from  $P_+$ .

This leaves us with the possibility to determine the polarization by an independent experimental measurement. Note that the measurements of the  $\tau$  lepton polarization  $P_\tau$  at the LHC in  $pp \rightarrow Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$  events [105], [106] do not qualify as an independent measurement of  $P_\tau$ , because they use the QFT prediction for the decay angular distribution of a variety of  $\tau$  decay final states as an input to the interpretation of the measurement. Then, the only way to know the  $\tau$  polarization  $P_\tau$  independently from the  $\tau$  decay is to determine it in the production of the  $\tau$ . At first glance this seems indeed possible when polarized beams are used in an  $e^+e^-$  collider. Assuming an idealized beam polarization of  $P_{e^-} = -1$  and  $P_{e^+} = +1$ , the polarization of the  $\tau$  pair would be given by the scattering angle  $\theta_\tau$  of the  $\tau$  with respect to the beam axis as in  $P_+ = P_\tau = \cos\theta_\tau$ . This result is independent of QM itself and can be derived only from assuming angular momentum conservation and projecting the spin of the initial state onto the final state. Then, in bins of  $\cos\theta_\tau$ ,  $P_+$  would be known. Even when using realistic polarizations for, e.g., a future  $e^+e^-$  linear collider of  $P_{e^-} = -0.8$  and  $P_{e^+} = +0.3$ , the remaining polarization of the  $\tau$ 's might result in sufficient statistical precision on  $P_+$  to disentangle  $P_+$  and  $\alpha_1$  in the decay angular distributions.

However, the above proposal does not stand up to scrutiny, because such a measurement of the  $\tau$  polarization also presupposes QM, albeit indirectly. It is derived from the beam polarization, and indeed, all known ways of measuring the beam polarization (see ref. [107] for an overview and ref. [108] for an in-depth description of the measurement from  $W^+W^-$  production) resort to testing quantum mechanical predictions: The polarimeter measurement is based on observing the angular distribution of Compton scattering of a polarized laser beam on the polarized beam. The polarization is extracted from fitting the QFT prediction of polarized Compton scattering to the data. The same method is used for the in-situ measurement in  $e^+e^- \rightarrow W^+W^- \rightarrow \ell^+\nu\ell^-\bar{\nu}$ , where the cross-section and angular measurements of the leptons in the final state are fitted to the predictions from QFT, and from which the polarization is then extracted together with other information about the interaction. We thus see that, at least in current collider experiments, it is not possible to measure the polarization  $P_+$  independently from the combination  $P_+\alpha_1$ , and thus we cannot extract  $\alpha_1$  directly from experiment without presupposing QM.

## 5 Constraining subsets of LHVTs

In the previous sections we have argued that the only way to measure spin correlations in collider experiments is by extracting them from angular correlations. This procedure involves the spin-analyzing powers  $\alpha_1$  and  $\bar{\alpha}_1$  (and  $\bar{\alpha}_1 = -\alpha_1$  if we assume CPT-invariance) via eq. (33), and we have argued that there is currently no way to extract the spin-analyzing powers from experiments without presupposing QM. Therefore, any collider test of locality and violation of Bell's inequalities based on spin correlations cannot succeed in unequivocally establishing QM and ruling out LHVTs. This is in agreement with the no-go theorem of ref. [80].

In ref. [80] it was also argued that it is possible to rule out certain subsets of LHVTs (see also ref. [78]). In the following we elaborate on this fact, using the setup of the CHSH inequality from section 3, from where we also borrow all the notations and conventions. For simplicity, we assume that CPT-invariance holds, though the extension of the discussion to include CPT violation is immediate. Since we cannot

measure  $\alpha_1 = -\bar{\alpha}_1$  directly, we consider it a parameter of the model (which could be either a QFT or a LHVT), bounded by eq. (31). Our goal is to determine if we exclude LHVTs with a certain value of  $\alpha_1$ , given a certain experimental measurement of  $R_Q$ . We will consider two different approaches how to do this and evaluate their validity.

**Attempting to exclude LHVTs based on  $R_C$  instead of  $R_Q$ .** The first approach consists in fixing  $\alpha_1$  to some value, for example the value predicted by the SM,  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_1^{\text{SM}}$ . We can then ask ourselves if we can learn anything from a value of  $R_C$  derived from an experimental measurement of  $R_Q$  under the assumption of the fixed value of  $\alpha_1$  that we could not already have known from evaluating  $R_Q$  alone. Such a test only makes sense if we assume that the LHVT agrees with the experimental measurement of  $R_Q$  – otherwise there would be no reason to base the test on  $R_C$ , because if a specific LHVT disagrees with a specific measured value of  $R_Q$  there is already enough reason to discard that LHVT. Since according to eq. (35) we always have  $R_Q \leq 2$ , though, there can always be a set of LHVTs which satisfy the measured  $R_Q$ . Note that this is the approach taken in the literature in many phenomenological and experimental studies of testing locality at colliders. If the value of  $R_C$  derived from the measurement does violate the CHSH inequality, it is tantalizing to speculate that we have excluded LHVTs with  $\alpha_1 \simeq \alpha_1^{\text{SM}}$ . However, it turns out that from such a test no LHVT can be excluded that is not already excluded by the assumptions of the interpretation of the measurement: For it to be explained by an LHVT, said LHVT would need to satisfy  $R_C \leq 2$ . Together with  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_1^{\text{SM}}$  and  $R_Q \leq 2$ , this implies that we already know that no LHVT exists that both predicts the measured  $R_Q$  and has  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_1^{\text{SM}}$ , because that theory would predict a  $R_C > 2$ , which no LHVT can. Thus, for every LHVT that is in agreement with the measured  $R_Q$  that leads to  $R_C > 2$  under the assumption  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_1^{\text{SM}}$ , the assumption on  $\alpha_1$  cannot be justified, and thus nothing can be learned from testing against  $R_C$  instead of testing against  $R_Q$ .

**Deriving bounds on  $\alpha_1$ .** The other approach consists in using the experimental measurement to derive a bound on  $\alpha_1$  so that the CHSH inequality is satisfied. It is easy to check that the condition  $R_C \leq 2$  reduces to

$$3\sqrt{\frac{R_Q}{2}} \leq |\alpha_1| \leq 3, \quad (51)$$

where the upper bound comes from eq. (31). A measurement of  $R_Q$  then allows us to exclude LHVTs which violate that bound, i.e., LHVTs with  $|\alpha_1| < 3\sqrt{\frac{R_Q}{2}}$ . We stress, however, that LHVTs that satisfy the bound cannot be ruled out by collider experiments.

We can use eq. (51) and check which range of  $\alpha_1$  in an LHVT would make it impossible to exclude that LHVT if we measure the value of  $R_Q$  predicted by the SM. The exact value of that bound depends on the specific CHSH test and the specific set of observables. As an example, we consider the analysis of  $e^+e^- \rightarrow Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$  processes at  $\sqrt{s} = 91.2 \text{ GeV}$  and  $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZH \rightarrow f\bar{f}\tau\tau$  at  $\sqrt{s} = 240 \text{ GeV}$  studied in detail in refs. [41], [44], [80]. For these analyses, a measurement of an observable equivalent to  $R_Q$  around the SM value cannot anymore lead to a violation of the CHSH inequality for  $R_C$  if  $\alpha_1$  exceeds a value of  $\sqrt[4]{1.238} \approx 1.055$  or  $\sqrt[4]{2} \approx 1.19$ , respectively, well within the theoretical bound of eq. (31). From this example we can observe that already a mild deviation of the spin-analyzing power of a LHVT compared to the SM can shield said LHVT from exclusion.

## 6 Discussion and conclusion

In this paper, we have critically analyzed the possibility of testing locality using Bell- or CHSH-type inequalities or establishing entanglement versus non-entanglement in current collider experiments without

already presupposing the SM at some point in the reasoning. If such an experiment were feasible, it would allow us to test QM against LHVTs in a high-energy, relativistic environment, which is very different from the quantum optics experiments in which violations of Bell's inequalities have been established. Moreover, quantum optic experiments are performed on photons, while collider-based experiments would allow us for the first time to test QM against LHVTs in fermionic systems, as in the original paper by Bell [2]. Most importantly, it would allow for a revolutionary test: Excluding LHVTs without resorting to employing non-commutating sets of measurements, and consequently without the need of a macroscopic manipulation of the measurement during the lifetime of the particles under study. This has spurred a great deal of activity in the collider physics community. Since the question of testing QM against LHVTs is such a fundamental one, it is important to critically assess the proposed experiments, to make sure that they do not present any fallacies or loopholes that would invalidate the conclusions.

In fact, it is well known that many, but not all (for (nearly) loophole-free experiments see, e.g., refs. [12]–[14]), measurements of quantum non-locality suffer from a series of loopholes, caused by limitations in the experimental realization of idealized assumptions in the CHSH and Bell inequality derivations. These loopholes have mostly been put forward in the context of quantum optics based tests of locality, and they also apply to collider environments. (See, e.g., ref. [52] and references therein for an overview of loopholes at collider experiments.) These loopholes are present and need to be addressed. As an example relevant for collider experiments, we can consider the detection loophole [109]. Here, it is assumed that the failure to detect a particle in its final state is not only a function of random inefficiencies of the measurement apparatus, but it is at least partly governed by an underlying feature of the LHVT. Particle physics experiments presently do not meet the requirement of detecting a sufficient fraction of the final states considered to exclude this loophole. Therefore, the question arises of whether the problems outlined in previous sections are just another loophole that could be closed by improving the experimental apparatus: for example, the detection loophole may be closed by a gradual increase of efficiency and background rejection through building more and more ideal detectors. The purpose of this paper, however, is to address a more fundamental issue: Is it even possible at all to test locality or entanglement versus non-entanglement at a collider?

It has been pointed out a long time ago [80] that there are fundamental obstacles in testing locality in collider experiments (see also refs. [77], [78]). Given the recent vast phenomenological and experimental activity, the goal of our paper is to perform an explicit detailed study of the no-go theorem of ref. [80], in order to highlight its features and to explain in detail the reasons why it is intrinsically not possible to test locality in current collider experiments. In essence, the issue boils down to our inability to perform direct measurements of spin correlations at colliders, as already pointed out in ref. [80]. Instead, they can only be inferred from angular correlations. We have meticulously studied the relationship between spin and angular correlations in both QM and LHVT, and remarkably, the relation between the two is identical in both classes of theories (though the derivations are quite distinct). In both cases the relation involves the spin-analyzing powers of the decaying particles, which need to be provided independently. They do not follow from a direct measurement of the angular correlations. Hence, no test of locality or entanglement can be logically consistent if the SM is presupposed in the values used for the spin-analyzing power, which is typically the case when these values are taken from theory (e.g., by fixing them to their SM values).

We have also studied the possibility of directly measuring the spin-analyzing powers independently in the experiment, which would be a way to obtain these values without presuming the SM. However, also in this direction one hits a roadblock. We have shown that it is possible to measure only the product of the spin-analyzing power and the polarization of the decaying particles. This is rooted (yet again) in the fact that collider experiments only measure momenta, and not spins, and the conversion from momenta to spins proceeds via Bayes' law, which introduces the product of the two quantities. An independent measurement of the polarization from the polarization of the initial state (e.g., at an  $e^+e^-$  collider) is currently also not feasible without using information from theory, thus again presupposing the SM. Hence, we conclude that with current experimental setups at colliders, where we can only measure momenta and not spins, it is not

possible to perform a logically coherent and independent test of locality, reaffirming the no-go theorem of ref. [80]. At the same time, our analysis extends the results of ref. [80] and shows that it is also not possible to establish the presence of entanglement at current collider experiments without presupposing the SM.

We note another interesting difference between collider experiments and polarimeter-based experiments, such as those in refs. [12]–[14]. The latter critically offer the option to experimentally establish the non-commuting nature of spin-related measurements, because the same particle, say a photon, can be measured consecutively in two polarimeters at different orientations  $x$  and  $y$ . Such an experimental confirmation of non-commutation only occurs in measurements where a voluntary macroscopic manipulation of the measurement device is possible (and required) during the lifetime of the particles studied in the measurement. No such possibility exists in current collider-based experiments. No set of non-commuting measurements can be performed, and consequently no repetition of a polarization measurement on the same particle is possible to prove the non-commuting nature of a set of measurements. We would like to add the remark that if it had been possible to construct the equivalent of a set of non-commuting measurements from a combination of commuting measurements, it would potentially have represented one of the greatest breakthroughs in our understanding of the measurement process in QM since its inception, with implications far beyond merely confirming non-locality in collider measurements.

The main argument underpinning our inability to test locality at current collider experiments goes in essence back to Kasday [81]. In ref. [80] it was shown how to extend Kasday’s work on correlated photons to the collider context and thus how to construct an LHVT that reproduces distributions at collider experiments where only the momenta of the final state particles are measured. Said LHVT can obviously not be excluded based on the measurement outcomes alone, and so this LHVT is consistent with these experimental outcomes. We stress that this is very different from the famous result by Werner [110]. In his seminal paper, Werner has shown that a quantum theory may admit so-called *Bell local states*, which may be entangled, but still have the property that the expectation value of any product of two observables  $A$  and  $B$  admits a description in terms of an LHVT. Thus QM and the LHVT give the same experimental predictions on the product of these two observables.

The interpretation and the implications of Kasday’s construction are different. For example, if we assume the SM of particle physics, spin correlations in a specific set-up may violate CHSH-type inequalities. In that case, these spin correlations cannot be described by an LHVT, and the underlying quantum state cannot be a Bell local state. The spin correlations, however, are not directly measurable at current colliders, and need to be extracted from angular correlations using the model-dependent spin analyzing powers. The angular correlations in turn admit a description in terms of an LHVT through Kasday’s construction, even though the quantum state is not Bell local.

We have focused in our analysis on proposed Bell or CHSH tests or studies of entanglement based on angular observables. However, we would like to stress that we expect that the no-go theorem of non-locality tests at colliders also applies to other measurements, such as self-analyzing flavor states or using measurements of CP-violation. As already noticed in refs. [77], [111], among other conceptual challenges, QFT is also implicitly assumed in using the corresponding self-analyzing decay. In fact, we expect that the proposals to test locality using flavor states or CP-violation suffer from similar problems as discussed in this paper in the context of spin-correlations, and we expect them to be subject to the same no-go theorem.

We reiterate that the no-go theorem only applies to tests of locality in collider experiments or to tests that aim at establishing the existence of entanglement in a system without presupposing the SM. In particular, it does not apply to approaches that aim at transferring concepts from Quantum Information Theory to build observables to discriminate between different QFTs describing models of particle physics, e.g., between the SM and various extensions of it that by construction retain the SM spin analyzers.

Finally, we mention that our inability to test locality or entanglement versus non-entanglement at colliders is reminiscent of the Münchhausen trilemma in philosophy [112], which can be stated as asserting



that there are only three ways of proving any absolute truth:

- a circular argument, where a step in a proof presupposes the statement one wants to prove,
- an infinite regression, where every step in a proof requires another proof asserting its validity,
- dogmatism, which consists in accepting certain statements as true without requiring an independent proof.

Indeed, we have argued at length how fixing the spin-analyzing power to its SM value presupposes QM, thereby leading to a circular argument. The possibility of measuring the spin-analyzing power independently led us to study how polarizations of decaying particles can be measured, which requires one to understand how polarizations of initial states are determined without presupposing QM in general or the SM in particular, thereby leading to a regression. This only leaves dogmatism, which would consist in simply accepting that the spin-analyzing power or the polarization are known by some means without questioning its origin. We consider each of these possibilities equally unsatisfactory, reaffirming the no-go theorem of ref. [80] that it is not possible to test locality and entanglement versus non-entanglement at colliders using spin correlations without already presupposing the SM.

## Acknowledgements

We thank Klaus Desch, Christian Grefe, Kazuki Sakurai, Fabio Maltoni and Xerxes Tata for important constructive input and discussions. The Cluster of Excellence EXC 3107 “Color meets Flavor” has already played an important role in its constituting phase in bringing the authors from theory and experiment together and in supporting their collaboration.

## A Local Hidden Variable Theories

In this appendix we give a short review of LHVTs, because they feature prominently in the context of Bell’s inequalities, but they are typically not introduced in detail in textbooks on quantum physics. The discussion in this appendix closely follows the exposition in ref. [96].

LHVTs postulate the existence of an ensemble of pairs of systems, labeled 1 and 2. Each pair is characterized by a set of local hidden variables  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ , but otherwise the two systems are distinct. We also assume that  $\Lambda$  is equipped with a PDF  $P(\lambda)$ . We can perform experiments on each system. Assume that we perform an experiment  $A_i$  with setting  $\mathbf{a}_i$  on the system  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , and assume that each experiment may deliver a result  $s_i \in \mathcal{S}_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ . We assume *measurement independence*, by which we mean that the experiment settings  $\mathbf{a}_i$  are independent of the local hidden variables  $\lambda$  and of the way the original system was prepared.

We postulate that there is a joint PDF – called *response probability* –  $p_{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2}(s_1, s_2 | \lambda)$  that the experiment  $A_i$  with setting  $\mathbf{a}_i$  returns the value  $s_i$ . We also assume *Bell locality*, by which we mean that the joint PDF factorizes as

$$p_{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2}(s_1, s_2 | \lambda) = p_{\mathbf{a}_1}^1(s_1 | \lambda) p_{\mathbf{a}_2}^2(s_2 | \lambda). \quad (52)$$

Note that in this setting, experiments in an LHVT itself only deliver the result  $s_i$  with a given probability, even for fixed  $\lambda$ . We could impose in addition *outer determinism* (sometimes also called *realism*), by requiring that  $p_{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2}(s_1, s_2 | \lambda)$  takes values in  $\{0, 1\}$ . For our purposes, this is not required.

We can then define the expectation value of the product in the usual way

$$\langle A_1(\mathbf{a}_1) A_2(\mathbf{a}_2) \rangle = \int_{\Lambda} d^n \lambda \int_{S_1} ds_1 \int_{S_2} ds_2 s_1 s_2 p_{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2}(s_1, s_2 | \lambda) P(\lambda) = \int_{\Lambda} d^n \lambda A_1(\mathbf{a}_1, \lambda) A_2(\mathbf{a}_2, \lambda) P(\lambda), \quad (53)$$

where in the last step we used Bell locality in eq. (52) to define

$$A_i(\mathbf{a}_i, \lambda) \equiv \int_{S_i} ds_i s_i p_{\mathbf{a}_i}^i(s_i | \lambda). \quad (54)$$

We recover in this way eq. (2) with  $A_1 = A$ ,  $A_2 = B$ . Alternatively, we can also integrate over the local hidden variables to obtain

$$\langle A_1(\mathbf{a}_1) A_2(\mathbf{a}_2) \rangle = \int_{S_1} ds_1 \int_{S_2} ds_2 s_1 s_2 P_{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2}(s_1, s_2), \quad (55)$$

where we defined the joint PDF

$$P_{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2}(s_1, s_2) = \int_{\Lambda} d^n \lambda p_{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2}(s_1, s_2 | \lambda) P(\lambda). \quad (56)$$

This justifies eq. (16).

## B Some useful Integrals in rewriting $P(\mathbf{q}|\mathbf{s})$

The following angular integrals can be used to arrive at eq. (11):

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S^2} d\Omega_{\pm} q_{\pm}^i &= 0, \\ \int_{S^2} d\Omega_{\pm} q_{\pm}^i q_{\pm}^j &= \frac{4\pi}{3} \delta_{ij}. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

We now show that if  $P(\mathbf{q}|\mathbf{s})$  has the form in eq. (29), then necessarily

$$\int_{S^2} d\Omega \mathbf{q} P(\mathbf{q}|\mathbf{s}) = \frac{\alpha_1}{3} \mathbf{s}. \quad (58)$$

Note that this implies eq. (30). Let  $\mathbf{R}$  be the  $3 \times 3$  rotation matrix such that  $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{R}\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ , where  $\hat{\mathbf{z}} = (0, 0, 1)$  is the unit vector pointing along the  $z$ -axis. Then, using rotational invariance

$$\int_{S^2} d\Omega \mathbf{q} P(\mathbf{q}|\mathbf{s}) = \int_{S^2} d\Omega \mathbf{R}\mathbf{q} P(\mathbf{R}\mathbf{q}|\mathbf{R}\hat{\mathbf{z}}) = \mathbf{R} \int_{S^2} d\Omega \mathbf{q} P(\mathbf{q}|\hat{\mathbf{z}}). \quad (59)$$

We now choose standard spherical coordinates on  $S^2$ ,

$$\mathbf{q} = (\cos \varphi \sin \theta, \sin \varphi \sin \theta, \cos \theta), \quad \mathbf{q} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{z}} = \cos \theta, \quad d\Omega = d\cos \theta d\varphi. \quad (60)$$

If we use the orthogonality of the Legendre polynomials,

$$\int_{-1}^1 dx P_{\ell}(x) P_{\ell'}(x) = \frac{2}{2\ell + 1} \delta_{\ell\ell'}, \quad (61)$$

it is easy to show that

$$\int_{S^2} d\Omega \mathbf{q} P(\mathbf{q}|\hat{\mathbf{z}}) = \frac{\alpha_1}{3} \hat{\mathbf{z}}. \quad (62)$$

The result immediately follows.

## References

- [1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, “Can quantum mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?” *Phys. Rev.*, vol. 47, pp. 777–780, 1935.
- [2] J. S. Bell, “On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox,” *Physics Physique Fizika*, vol. 1, pp. 195–200, 1964.
- [3] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, “Proposed Experiment to Test Local Hidden-Variable Theories,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 23, no. 15, pp. 880–884, 1969.
- [4] S. J. Freedman and J. F. Clauser, “Experimental Test of Local Hidden-Variable Theories,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 28, no. 14, pp. 938–941, 1972.
- [5] E. S. Fry and R. C. Thompson, “Experimental Test of Local Hidden-Variable Theories,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 37, pp. 465–468, 8 Aug. 1976.
- [6] A. Aspect, P. Grangier, and G. Roger, “Experimental Tests of Realistic Local Theories via Bell’s Theorem,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 47, pp. 460–463, 7 Aug. 1981.
- [7] A. Aspect, P. Grangier, and G. Roger, “Experimental Realization of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen-Bohm Gedankenexperiment: A New Violation of Bell’s Inequalities,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 49, pp. 91–94, 2 Jul. 1982.
- [8] A. Aspect, J. Dalibard, and G. Roger, “Experimental Test of Bell’s Inequalities Using Time-Varying Analyzers,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 49, pp. 1804–1807, 25 Dec. 1982.
- [9] G. Weihs, T. Jennewein, C. Simon, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zeilinger, “Violation of Bell’s Inequality under Strict Einstein Locality Conditions,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 81, no. 23, pp. 5039–5043, 1998.
- [10] J.-W. Pan, D. Bouwmeester, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zeilinger, “Experimental Entanglement Swapping: Entangling Photons That Never Interacted,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 80, pp. 3891–3894, 18 May 1998.
- [11] A. Vaziri, G. Weihs, and A. Zeilinger, “Experimental Two-Photon, Three-Dimensional Entanglement for Quantum Communication,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 89, p. 240 401, 24 Nov. 2002.
- [12] M. Giustina *et al.*, “Significant-Loophole-Free Test of Bell’s Theorem with Entangled Photons,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 115, no. 25, p. 250 401, 2015. arXiv: 1511.03190 [quant-ph].
- [13] L. K. Shalm, E. Meyer-Scott, B. G. Christensen, P. Bierhorst, M. A. Wayne, M. J. Stevens, *et al.*, “Strong Loophole-Free Test of Local Realism,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 115, p. 250 402, 25 Dec. 2015. arXiv: 1511.03189 [quant-ph].
- [14] B. Hensen, H. Bernien, A. E. Dréau, A. Reiserer, N. Kalb, M. S. Blok, *et al.*, “Loophole-free Bell inequality violation using electron spins separated by 1.3 kilometres,” *Nature*, vol. 526, no. 7575, pp. 682–686, 2015. arXiv: 1508.05949 [quant-ph].
- [15] N. A. Törnqvist, “Suggestion for Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen experiments using reactions like  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \Lambda\bar{\Lambda} \rightarrow \pi^-p\pi^+p$ ,” *Foundations of Physics*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 171–177, 1981.
- [16] N. A. Törnqvist, “The decay  $J/\psi \rightarrow \Lambda\bar{\Lambda} \rightarrow \pi^-p\pi^+p$  as an einstein-podolsky-rosen experiment,” *Physics Letters A*, vol. 117, no. 1, pp. 1–4, 1986.
- [17] M. Fabbrichesi, R. Floreanini, and G. Panizzo, “Testing Bell Inequalities at the LHC with Top-Quark Pairs,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 127, no. 16, p. 161 801, 2021. arXiv: 2102.11883 [hep-ph].
- [18] Y. Afik and J. R. M. de Nova, “Entanglement and quantum tomography with top quarks at the LHC,” *Eur. Phys. J. Plus*, vol. 136, no. 9, p. 907, 2021. arXiv: 2003.02280 [quant-ph].
- [19] The ATLAS Collaboration, “Observation of Quantum Entanglement with Top Quarks at the ATLAS Detector,” *Nature*, vol. 633, no. 8030, pp. 542–547, Sep. 19, 2024. arXiv: 2311.07288 [hep-ex].

- [20] The CMS Collaboration, “Observation of Quantum Entanglement in Top Quark Pair Production in Proton–Proton Collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV,” *Reports on Progress in Physics*, vol. 87, no. 11, p. 117 801, Nov. 1, 2024. arXiv: 2406.03976 [hep-ex].
- [21] A. Hayrapetyan *et al.*, “Measurements of polarization and spin correlation and observation of entanglement in top quark pairs using lepton+jets events from proton-proton collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 110, no. 11, p. 112 016, 2024. arXiv: 2409.11067 [hep-ex].
- [22] M. Fabbrichesi, R. Floreanini, and E. Gabrielli, “Constraining New Physics in Entangled Two-Qubit Systems: Top-Quark, Tau-Lepton and Photon Pairs,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 83, no. 2, p. 162, Feb. 19, 2023. arXiv: 2208.11723 [hep-ex].
- [23] J. Aguilar-Saavedra, “Postdecay quantum entanglement in top pair production,” *Physical Review D*, vol. 108, no. 7, p. 076 025, 2023. arXiv: 2307.06991 [hep-ph].
- [24] K. Cheng, T. Han, and M. Low, “Optimizing entanglement and Bell inequality violation in top antitop events,” *Physical Review D*, vol. 111, no. 3, p. 033 004, 2025. arXiv: 2407.01672 [hep-ph].
- [25] C. Severi, C. D. E. Boschi, F. Maltoni, and M. Sioli, “Quantum tops at the LHC: from entanglement to Bell inequalities,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 82, no. 4, p. 285, 2022. arXiv: 2110.10112 [hep-ph].
- [26] R. Aoude, E. Madge, F. Maltoni, and L. Mantani, “Quantum SMEFT tomography: Top quark pair production at the LHC,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 106, no. 5, p. 055 007, 2022. arXiv: 2203.05619 [hep-ph].
- [27] Y. Afik and J. R. M. de Nova, “Quantum information with top quarks in QCD,” *Quantum*, vol. 6, p. 820, 2022. arXiv: 2203.05582 [quant-ph].
- [28] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra and J. A. Casas, “Improved tests of entanglement and Bell inequalities with LHC tops,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 82, no. 8, p. 666, 2022. arXiv: 2205.00542 [hep-ph].
- [29] Y. Afik and J. R. M. de Nova, “Quantum Discord and Steering in Top Quarks at the LHC,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 130, no. 22, p. 221 801, 2023. arXiv: 2209.03969 [quant-ph].
- [30] C. Severi and E. Vryonidou, “Quantum entanglement and top spin correlations in SMEFT at higher orders,” *JHEP*, vol. 01, p. 148, 2023. arXiv: 2210.09330 [hep-ph].
- [31] Z. Dong, D. Gonçalves, K. Kong, and A. Navarro, “Entanglement and Bell inequalities with boosted  $t\bar{t}$ ,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 109, no. 11, p. 115 023, 2024. arXiv: 2305.07075 [hep-ph].
- [32] K. Cheng, T. Han, and M. Low, “Optimizing fictitious states for Bell inequality violation in bipartite qubit systems with applications to the  $t\bar{t}$  system,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 109, no. 11, p. 116 005, 2024. arXiv: 2311.09166 [hep-ph].
- [33] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra and J. A. Casas, “Entanglement Autodistillation from Particle Decays,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 133, no. 11, p. 111 801, 2024. arXiv: 2401.06854 [hep-ph].
- [34] F. Maltoni, C. Severi, S. Tentori, and E. Vryonidou, “Quantum detection of new physics in top-quark pair production at the LHC,” *JHEP*, vol. 03, p. 099, 2024. arXiv: 2401.08751 [hep-ph].
- [35] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra, “A closer look at post-decay  $t\bar{t}$  entanglement,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 109, no. 9, p. 096 027, 2024. arXiv: 2401.10988 [hep-ph].
- [36] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra, “Full quantum tomography of top quark decays,” *Phys. Lett. B*, vol. 855, p. 138 849, 2024. arXiv: 2402.14725 [hep-ph].
- [37] F. Maltoni, C. Severi, S. Tentori, and E. Vryonidou, “Quantum tops at circular lepton colliders,” *JHEP*, vol. 09, p. 001, 2024. arXiv: 2404.08049 [hep-ph].
- [38] C. D. White and M. J. White, “Magic states of top quarks,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 110, no. 11, p. 116 016, 2024. arXiv: 2406.07321 [hep-ph].
- [39] T. Han, M. Low, and T. A. Wu, “Quantum entanglement and Bell inequality violation in semi-leptonic top decays,” *JHEP*, vol. 07, p. 192, 2024. arXiv: 2310.17696 [hep-ph].

- [40] Z. Dong, D. Gonçalves, K. Kong, A. J. Larkoski, and A. Navarro, “Analytical insights on hadronic top quark polarimetry,” *JHEP*, vol. 02, p. 117, 2025. arXiv: 2407.07147 [hep-ph].
- [41] M. Fabbrichesi and L. Marzola, “Quantum Tomography with  $\tau$  Leptons at the FCC-ee: Entanglement, Bell Inequality Violation,  $\sin \theta_W$ , and Anomalous Couplings,” *Physical Review D*, vol. 110, no. 7, p. 076004, Oct. 3, 2024. arXiv: 2405.09201 [hep-ph].
- [42] M. M. Altakach, P. Lamba, F. Maltoni, K. Mawatari, and K. Sakurai, “Quantum Information and  $CP$  Measurement in  $H \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$  at Future Lepton Colliders,” *Physical Review D*, vol. 107, no. 9, p. 093002, May 9, 2023. arXiv: 2211.10513 [hep-ph].
- [43] K. Ehatäht, M. Fabbrichesi, L. Marzola, and C. Veelken, “Probing entanglement and testing Bell inequality violation with  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$  at Belle II,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 109, p. 032005, 3 Feb. 2024. arXiv: 2311.17555 [hep-ph].
- [44] C. Breuning, P. Bechtle, K. Desch, and C. Greife, “Prospects of measuring quantum entanglement in  $\tau\tau$  final states at a future  $e^+e^-$  Higgs factory,” *EPJ Web Conf.*, vol. 315, p. 01005, 2024. arXiv: 2409.20239 [hep-ph].
- [45] P. Lo Chiatto, “Interference Resurrection of the  $\tau$  Dipole through Quantum Tomography,” Aug. 2024. arXiv: 2408.04553 [hep-ph].
- [46] P. Privitera, “Decay correlations in  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$  as a test of quantum mechanics,” *Physics Letters B*, vol. 275, no. 1, pp. 172–180, 1992.
- [47] T. Han, M. Low, and Y. Su, “Entanglement and Bell Nonlocality in  $\tau^+\tau^-$  at the BEPC,” 2025. arXiv: 2501.04801 [hep-ph].
- [48] K. Ma and T. Li, “Testing Bell inequality through  $h \rightarrow \tau\tau$  at CEPC,” 2024. arXiv: 2309.08103 [hep-ph].
- [49] Y. Zhang, B.-H. Zhou, Q.-B. Liu, S. Li, S.-C. Hsu, T. Han, *et al.*, “Entanglement and Bell Nonlocality in  $\tau^+\tau^-$  at the LHC using Machine Learning for Neutrino Reconstruction,” 2025. arXiv: 2504.01496 [hep-ph].
- [50] Y. Kats and D. Uzan, “Prospects for measuring quark polarization and spin correlations in b-bbar and c-cbar samples at the LHC,” *PoS*, vol. ICHEP2024, p. 504, 2025. arXiv: 2410.10564 [hep-ph].
- [51] Y. Afik, Y. Kats, J. R. M. de Nova, A. Soffer, and D. Uzan, “Entanglement and Bell nonlocality with bottom-quark pairs at hadron colliders,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 111, no. 11, p. L111902, 2025. arXiv: 2406.04402 [hep-ph].
- [52] A. J. Barr, M. Fabbrichesi, R. Floreanini, E. Gabrielli, and L. Marzola, “Quantum entanglement and Bell inequality violation at colliders,” *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.*, vol. 139, p. 104134, 2024. arXiv: 2402.07972 [hep-ph].
- [53] A. J. Barr, “Testing Bell inequalities in Higgs boson decays,” *Phys. Lett. B*, vol. 825, p. 136866, 2022. arXiv: 2106.01377 [hep-ph].
- [54] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra, A. Bernal, J. A. Casas, and J. M. Moreno, “Testing entanglement and Bell inequalities in  $H \rightarrow ZZ$ ,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 107, no. 1, p. 016012, 2023. arXiv: 2209.13441 [hep-ph].
- [55] R. Ashby-Pickering, A. J. Barr, and A. Wierzychucka, “Quantum state tomography, entanglement detection and Bell violation prospects in weak decays of massive particles,” *JHEP*, vol. 05, p. 020, 2023. arXiv: 2209.13990 [quant-ph].
- [56] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra, “Laboratory-frame tests of quantum entanglement in  $H \rightarrow WW$ ,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 107, no. 7, p. 076016, 2023. arXiv: 2209.14033 [hep-ph].
- [57] M. Fabbrichesi, R. Floreanini, E. Gabrielli, and L. Marzola, “Bell inequalities and quantum entanglement in weak gauge boson production at the LHC and future colliders,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 83, no. 9, p. 823, 2023. arXiv: 2302.00683 [hep-ph].

- [58] R. Aoude, E. Madge, F. Maltoni, and L. Mantani, “Probing new physics through entanglement in diboson production,” *JHEP*, vol. 12, p. 017, 2023. arXiv: 2307.09675 [hep-ph].
- [59] A. Bernal, P. Caban, and J. Rembieliński, “Entanglement and Bell inequalities violation in  $H \rightarrow ZZ$  with anomalous coupling,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 83, no. 11, p. 1050, 2023. arXiv: 2307.13496 [hep-ph].
- [60] Q. Bi, Q.-H. Cao, K. Cheng, and H. Zhang, “New observables for testing Bell inequalities in W boson pair production,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 109, no. 3, p. 036 022, 2024. arXiv: 2307.14895 [hep-ph].
- [61] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra, “Tripartite entanglement in  $H \rightarrow ZZ, WW$  decays,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 109, no. 11, p. 113 004, 2024. arXiv: 2403.13942 [hep-ph].
- [62] A. Subba and R. Rahaman, “On bipartite and tripartite entanglement at present and future particle colliders,” Apr. 2024. arXiv: 2404.03292 [hep-ph].
- [63] A. Ruzi, Y. Wu, R. Ding, S. Qian, A. M. Levin, and Q. Li, “Testing Bell inequalities and probing quantum entanglement at a muon collider,” *JHEP*, vol. 10, p. 211, 2024. arXiv: 2408.05429 [hep-ph].
- [64] M. Grossi, G. Pelliccioli, and A. Vicini, “From angular coefficients to quantum observables: a phenomenological appraisal in di-boson systems,” *JHEP*, vol. 12, p. 120, 2024. arXiv: 2409.16731 [hep-ph].
- [65] M. Sullivan, “Constraining New Physics with  $h \rightarrow VV$  Tomography,” Oct. 2024. arXiv: 2410.10980 [hep-ph].
- [66] Y. Wu, R. Jiang, A. Ruzi, Y. Ban, X. Yan, and Q. Li, “Testing Bell inequalities and probing quantum entanglement at CEPC,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 111, no. 3, p. 036 008, 2025. arXiv: 2410.17025 [hep-ph].
- [67] R. Grabarczyk, “An improved Bell-CHSH observable for gauge boson pairs,” Oct. 2024. arXiv: 2410.18022 [hep-ph].
- [68] F. Benatti and R. Floreanini, “Bell’s locality and  $\varepsilon/\varepsilon'$ ,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 57, R1332–R1336, 3 Feb. 1998. arXiv: hep-ph/9712274.
- [69] F. Benatti and R. Floreanini, “Direct CP-violation as a test of quantum mechanics,” *The European Physical Journal C-Particles and Fields*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 267–273, 2000. arXiv: hep-ph/9912348.
- [70] R. Bertlmann, W. Grimus, and B. Hiesmayr, “Bell inequality and CP violation in the neutral kaon system,” *Physics Letters A*, vol. 289, no. 1, pp. 21–26, 2001. arXiv: quant-ph/0107022.
- [71] S. Banerjee, A. K. Alok, and R. MacKenzie, “Quantum correlations in  $B$  and  $K$  meson systems,” *The European Physical Journal Plus*, vol. 131, no. 5, p. 129, 2016. arXiv: 1409.1034 [hep-ph].
- [72] M. Fabbrichesi, R. Floreanini, E. Gabrielli, and L. Marzola, “Bell inequality is violated in  $B_0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^*(892)^0$  decays,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 109, no. 3, p. L031104, 2024. arXiv: 2305.04982 [hep-ph].
- [73] A. Go, A. Bay, K. Abe, H. Aihara, D. Anipko, V. Aulchenko, *et al.*, “Measurement of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen-Type Flavor Entanglement in  $\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B^0 \bar{B}^0$  Decays,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 99, p. 131 802, 13 Sep. 2007. arXiv: quant-ph/0702267.
- [74] A. Go, “Observation of Bell inequality violation in  $B$  mesons,” *Journal of Modern Optics*, vol. 51, no. 6-7, pp. 991–998, 2004. arXiv: quant-ph/0310192.
- [75] S. P. Baranov, “Bell’s inequality in charmonium decays  $\eta_c \rightarrow \Lambda \bar{\Lambda}, \chi_c \rightarrow \Lambda \bar{\Lambda}$  and  $J/\psi \rightarrow \Lambda \bar{\Lambda}$ ,” *Journal of Physics G: Nuclear and Particle Physics*, vol. 35, no. 7, p. 075 002, May 2008.
- [76] S. P. Baranov, “Bell’s Inequality in Charmonium Decays,” *International Journal of Modern Physics A*, vol. 24, no. 02n03, pp. 480–483, 2009.

- [77] R. Bertlmann, A. Bramon, G. Garbarino, and B. Hiesmayr, “Violation of a Bell inequality in particle physics experimentally verified?” *Physics Letters A*, vol. 332, no. 5, pp. 355–360, 2004. arXiv: [quant-ph/0409051](#).
- [78] S. Li, W. Shen, and J. M. Yang, “Can Bell inequalities be tested via scattering cross-section at colliders ?” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 84, no. 11, p. 1195, 2024. arXiv: [2401.01162 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [79] M. Ablikim *et al.*, “Test of local realism via entangled  $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$  system,” May 2025. arXiv: [2505.14988 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [80] S. A. Abel, M. Dittmar, and H. K. Dreiner, “Testing locality at colliders via Bell’s inequality?” *Phys. Lett. B*, vol. 280, pp. 304–312, 1992.
- [81] L. Kasday, in *Proc. Intern. School of Physics “Enrico Fermi”*, 1971, p. 195.
- [82] G. L. Kane, G. A. Ladinsky, and C. P. Yuan, “Using the Top Quark for Testing Standard Model Polarization and CP Predictions,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 45, pp. 124–141, 1992.
- [83] W. Bernreuther and A. Brandenburg, “Tracing CP violation in the production of top quark pairs by multiple TeV proton proton collisions,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 49, pp. 4481–4492, 1994. arXiv: [hep-ph/9312210](#).
- [84] W. Bernreuther, A. Brandenburg, Z. G. Si, and P. Uwer, “Top quark spin correlations at hadron colliders: Predictions at next-to-leading order QCD,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 87, p. 242 002, 2001. arXiv: [hep-ph/0107086](#).
- [85] W. Bernreuther, A. Brandenburg, Z. G. Si, and P. Uwer, “Top quark pair production and decay at hadron colliders,” *Nucl. Phys. B*, vol. 690, pp. 81–137, 2004. arXiv: [hep-ph/0403035](#).
- [86] G. Mahlon and S. J. Parke, “Angular correlations in top quark pair production and decay at hadron colliders,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 53, pp. 4886–4896, 1996. arXiv: [hep-ph/9512264](#).
- [87] G. Mahlon and S. J. Parke, “Improved spin basis for angular correlation studies in single top quark production at the Tevatron,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 55, pp. 7249–7254, 1997. arXiv: [hep-ph/9611367](#).
- [88] G. Mahlon and S. J. Parke, “Maximizing spin correlations in top quark pair production at the Tevatron,” *Phys. Lett. B*, vol. 411, pp. 173–179, 1997. arXiv: [hep-ph/9706304](#).
- [89] S. J. Parke and Y. Shadmi, “Spin correlations in top quark pair production at  $e^+e^-$  colliders,” *Phys. Lett. B*, vol. 387, pp. 199–206, 1996. arXiv: [hep-ph/9606419](#).
- [90] P. Uwer, “Maximizing the spin correlation of top quark pairs produced at the Large Hadron Collider,” *Phys. Lett. B*, vol. 609, pp. 271–276, 2005. arXiv: [hep-ph/0412097](#).
- [91] G. Mahlon and S. J. Parke, “Spin Correlation Effects in Top Quark Pair Production at the LHC,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 81, p. 074 024, 2010. arXiv: [1001.3422 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [92] M. Baumgart and B. Tweedie, “Discriminating Top-Antitop Resonances using Azimuthal Decay Correlations,” *JHEP*, vol. 09, p. 049, 2011. arXiv: [1104.2043 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [93] M. Baumgart and B. Tweedie, “A New Twist on Top Quark Spin Correlations,” *JHEP*, vol. 03, p. 117, 2013. arXiv: [1212.4888 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [94] M. Baumgart and B. Tweedie, “Transverse Top Quark Polarization and the  $t\bar{t}$  Forward-Backward Asymmetry,” *JHEP*, vol. 08, p. 072, 2013. arXiv: [1303.1200 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [95] W. Bernreuther, D. Heisler, and Z.-G. Si, “A set of top quark spin correlation and polarization observables for the LHC: Standard Model predictions and new physics contributions,” *JHEP*, vol. 12, p. 026, 2015. arXiv: [1508.05271 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [96] W. Myrvold, M. Genovese, and A. Shimony, “Bell’s Theorem,” in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, E. N. Zalta and U. Nodelman, Eds., Spring 2024, Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, 2024.

- [97] S. Chen, “Test of Bell’s Inequality and Entanglement Measurement in Collider Experiments,” M.S. thesis, University of Tokyo, 2014.
- [98] E. C. G. Sudarshan, “Equivalence of Semiclassical and Quantum Mechanical Descriptions of Statistical Light Beams,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 10, pp. 277–279, 7 Apr. 1963.
- [99] S. A. Abel, H. K. Dreiner, R. Sengupta, and L. Ubaldi, “Colliders are Testing neither Locality via Bell’s Inequality nor Entanglement versus Non-Entanglement,” Jul. 2025. arXiv: 2507.15949 [hep-ph].
- [100] M. Ablikim *et al.*, “Polarization and Entanglement in Baryon-Antibaryon Pair Production in Electron-Positron Annihilation,” *Nature Phys.*, vol. 15, pp. 631–634, 2019. arXiv: 1808.08917 [hep-ex].
- [101] M. Ablikim *et al.*, “Precise Measurements of Decay Parameters and  $CP$  Asymmetry with Entangled  $\Lambda - \bar{\Lambda}$  Pairs,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 129, no. 13, p. 131 801, 2022. arXiv: 2204.11058 [hep-ex].
- [102] G. Fäldt and A. Kupsc, “Hadronic structure functions in the  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \bar{\Lambda}\Lambda$  reaction,” *Phys. Lett. B*, vol. 772, pp. 16–20, 2017. arXiv: 1702.07288 [hep-ph].
- [103] A. Peres, “Separability criterion for density matrices,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 77, pp. 1413–1415, 1996. arXiv: quant-ph/9604005.
- [104] P. Horodecki, “Separability criterion and inseparable mixed states with positive partial transposition,” *Phys. Lett. A*, vol. 232, p. 333, 1997. arXiv: quant-ph/9703004.
- [105] M. Aaboud *et al.*, “Measurement of  $\tau$  polarisation in  $Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow \tau\tau$  decays in proton-proton collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV with the ATLAS detector,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 78, no. 2, p. 163, 2018. arXiv: 1709.03490 [hep-ex].
- [106] A. Hayrapetyan *et al.*, “Measurement of the  $\tau$  lepton polarization in Z boson decays in proton-proton collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV,” *JHEP*, vol. 01, p. 101, 2024. arXiv: 2309.12408 [hep-ex].
- [107] J. List, “Polarised Beams at Future  $e^+e^-$  Colliders,” *PoS ICHEP2020*, p. 691, 2021. arXiv: 2012.11267 [hep-ex].
- [108] I. Marchesini, “Triple gauge couplings and polarization at the ILC and leakage in a highly granular calorimeter,” Ph.D. dissertation, Hamburg U., 2011.
- [109] P. M. Pearle, “Hidden-variable example based upon data rejection,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 2, pp. 1418–1425, 1970.
- [110] R. F. Werner, “Quantum states with Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen correlations admitting a hidden-variable model,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 40, pp. 4277–4281, 1989.
- [111] A. Bramon, R. Escribano, and G. Garbarino, “Bell’s inequality tests: From photons to B-mesons,” *J. Mod. Opt.*, vol. 52, pp. 1681–1684, 2005. arXiv: quant-ph/0410122.
- [112] H. Albert, *Traktat über kritische Vernunft*. Mohr Siebeck, 1968.