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#### Abstract

In this paper we discuss the effect of the unpolarized state in the spin-correlation measurement of the ${ }^{1} S_{0}$ two-proton state produced in the ${ }^{12} \mathrm{C}\left(d,{ }^{2} \mathrm{He}\right)$ reaction at the Kernfysisch Versneller Instituut (KVI), Groningen. We show that in the presence of the unpolarized state the maximal violation of the Clauser, Horne, Shimony and Holth (CHSH)-Bell inequality is lower than the classical limit if the purity of the state is less than $\sim 70 \%$. In particular, for the KVI experiment the violation of the CHSH-Bell inequality should be corrected by a factor of $\sim 10 \%$ from the pure ${ }^{1} S_{0}$ state.


PACS number: 03.67.Mn

## 1. Introduction

In an experiment performed at the Kernfysisch Versneller Instituut (KVI), Groningen [5] with the goal to test Bell inequality violation in nuclear physics (perhaps to be applied in quantum information physics), the experimental group, by bombarding a ${ }^{12} \mathrm{C}$ target with $170 \mathrm{MeV} d$, was able to generate a singlet spin, two-proton state coupled to unpolarized state with $\sim 10 \%$ contribution. In this paper we analyse the experimental results of this experiment and show that the effect of the unpolarized state is important and could not be neglected.

## 2. CHSH inequalities and entanglement in a mixed ensemble

Bell-type inequalities relating averages of four random dichotomic variables $a, a^{\prime}$ and $b, b^{\prime}$ represent measurements of spin in directions $\hat{a}, \hat{a}^{\prime}$ and $\hat{b}, \hat{b}^{\prime}$. The Clauser, Horne, Shimony and Holth (CHSH) [3] form of Bell-type inequalities for spin- $1 / 2$ case could be written in the form
$\left|E\left(\phi_{1}, \phi_{1}^{\prime}, \phi_{2}, \phi_{2}^{\prime}\right)\right|=\left|E\left(\phi_{1}, \phi_{2}\right)+E\left(\phi_{1}, \phi_{2}^{\prime}\right)+E\left(\phi_{1}^{\prime}, \phi_{2}\right)-E\left(\phi_{1}^{\prime}, \phi_{2}^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqslant 2$
where $\phi_{i}$ is the analyser angular setting for the $i$ th particles $(i=1,2)$ and $E\left(\phi_{i}, \phi_{j}\right)$ is the correlation function defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
E\left(\phi_{i}, \phi_{j}\right)=\frac{N_{++}+N_{--}-N_{+-}-N_{-+}}{N_{\text {total }}} . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

In quantum-theory language the CHSH operator corresponding to the CHSH inequality is represented by an operator

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{B}=\hat{a} \cdot \sigma \otimes\left(\hat{b}+\hat{b}^{\prime}\right) \cdot \sigma+\hat{a}^{\prime} \cdot \sigma \otimes\left(\hat{b}-\hat{b}^{\prime}\right) \cdot \sigma \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

acting in Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B}}$ in $2 \otimes 2$ dimension. The correlation function is given by the mean value of the operator $\hat{a} \sigma \otimes \hat{b} \sigma$. For a pure state this correlation function could be easily computed, e.g. for singlet state we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
E\left(\phi_{i}, \phi_{j}\right)=-\cos \left(\phi_{i}-\phi_{j}\right) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

For mixed state, however, the mean value should be averaged over the ensemble and therefore the CHSH inequality is not a sufficient condition to test the presence of entanglement [7]. Different measures of the entanglement have been proposed in the literature for mixed state ${ }^{1}$, e.g. entanglement of formation, distillation, relative entropy of entanglement, negativity, etc. Here we will use the entanglement of formation as our measure of the entanglement.

In a mixed ensemble any bipartite quantum state $\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}$ can be written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}=\frac{1}{4}\left(I \otimes I+\mathbf{A} \cdot \sigma \otimes I+I \otimes \mathbf{P} \cdot \sigma+\sum_{i, j=1}^{3} D_{i j} \sigma_{i} \otimes \sigma_{j}\right) . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\sigma_{i}$ are the pauli matrices, $I$ is the identity operator and $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{P}$ are vectors in $\mathcal{R}^{3}$. The $D_{i j}$ form a $3 \times 3$ matrix called the correlation matrix $D$. In this representation of the density matrix the mean value of the CHSH-Bell operator is given by [4]

$$
\begin{equation*}
\langle\mathcal{B}\rangle=\hat{a} \cdot\left[D\left(\hat{b}+\hat{b}^{\prime}\right)\right]+\hat{a}^{\prime} \cdot\left[D\left(\hat{b}-\hat{b}^{\prime}\right)\right] . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using the representation of the density matrix given in equation (5), we characterize any bipartite quantum state $\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}$ by the following.

- The entanglement measured by the 'tangle', $\tau$, of the entanglement of formation [6] and defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tau=\max \left\{\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}-\lambda_{3}-\lambda_{4}, 0\right\} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the $\lambda$ are the square roots of the eigenvalues, in decreasing order, of the matrix $\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}\left(\sigma_{y} \otimes \sigma_{y} \rho_{\mathrm{AB}}^{\star} \sigma_{y} \otimes \sigma_{y}\right)$ and $\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}^{\star}$ is the complex conjugation of $\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}$ in the computational basis $\{|++\rangle,|+-\rangle,|-+\rangle,|--\rangle\}$.

- The maximum amount of the CHSH-Bell violation of the state $\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}$ [4]

$$
\begin{equation*}
\langle\mathcal{B}\rangle^{\max }=2 \sqrt{M\left(\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}\right)} . \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

$M\left(\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}\right)$ is the sum of the two larger eigenvalues of $D D^{\dagger} .{ }^{2}$

- The purity of the state that measures how far the state is from pure state

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{L}=\operatorname{Tr}\left(\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}^{2}\right) \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$
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Figure 1. Plot of $\langle\mathcal{B}\rangle_{\text {Werner }}^{\max }$ (dashed line) and $\tau$ (solid line) versus the purity $\gamma$. The dotted line is the Bell limit, the circle is the KVI limit for $\gamma \sim 0.9$.

## 3. Analysis of the experimental data of the KVI experiment

The spin state of the two protons produced in the ${ }^{12} \mathrm{C}\left(d,{ }^{2} \mathrm{He}\right)$ reaction at $E_{d}=170 \mathrm{MeV}$ at KVI [5] is a singlet state mixed with the unpolarized (random contamination) state with $\gamma(0 \leqslant \gamma \leqslant 1)$ controlling the degree of mixing (the details of the experimental setup and analysis method of the $\left(d,{ }^{2} \mathrm{He}\right)$ reaction were described in detail in [5]). Given all that, we can write the density matrix of such state as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho_{\mathrm{W}}=(1-\gamma) \frac{I}{4}+\gamma\left|\Psi^{-}\right\rangle\left\langle\Psi^{-}\right| \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

which interpolates between the unpolarized state $I / 4$ and singlet state $\left|\Psi^{-}\right\rangle=(|+-\rangle-$
 a monotonic function of $\gamma$. Thus, in this paper we use $\gamma$ as our measure of purity. Also, for Werner state it is easy to prove, using the condition noted above, that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\langle\mathcal{B}\rangle_{\text {Werner }}^{\max }=\gamma\langle\mathcal{B}\rangle_{\text {pure }}^{\max } \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that a violation of the modified Bell inequality does not exclude an explanation with a hidden variable theory. In figure 1 we plot $\langle\mathcal{B}\rangle_{\text {Werner }}^{\max }$ and the tangle $\tau$ versus the purity $\gamma$. As we can see in this figure the Werner state does not violate the Bell inequality if its purity $\gamma$ is less than $1 / \sqrt{2} \sim 70 \%$. However, the entanglement is still non-zero in the Werner state until $\gamma>1 / 3 \sim 33 \%$. Therefore, some quantum correlations cannot be seen only by measuring the violation of the Bell-type inequality because some of them (Werner states) are entangled but still do not violate the Bell inequality. Note that there is a possible experimental measurement of the entanglement based on the entanglement witness [8] that we think to implement in the future experiment.

In table 1 we compare the quantum theory predictions assuming a pure singlet state (case 1) and mixed Werner states (case 2) for the spin of the two detected protons for several violating cases of the CHSH-Bell inequality. The value of $\chi^{2}=\sum_{i}\left[\left(R_{\mathrm{th}}^{i}-R_{\exp }^{i}\right) / \Delta R_{\mathrm{exp}}^{i}\right]^{2}$ is given at the bottom of the table for both cases. We have found that $\chi_{\text {Werner }}^{2}<\chi_{\text {singlet }}^{2}$ as

Table 1. Experimental data and quantum theory predictions for a pure singlet state (case 1) and mixed Werner states (case 2) for several violating cases of the CHSH-Bell inequality according to the definition given in equation (1).

| CHSH-Bell <br> inequality | QM |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Case 1 | Case 2 | Experimental data |
| $E\left(50^{\circ}, 0^{\circ}, 25^{\circ}, 75^{\circ}\right)$ | 2.46 | 2.21 | $0.67 \pm 2.30$ |
| $E\left(60^{\circ}, 0^{\circ}, 30^{\circ}, 90^{\circ}\right)$ | 2.60 | 2.34 | $1.21 \pm 2.42$ |
| $E\left(70^{\circ}, 0^{\circ}, 35^{\circ}, 105^{\circ}\right)$ | 2.72 | 2.45 | $1.54 \pm 2.76$ |
| $E\left(80^{\circ}, 0^{\circ}, 40^{\circ}, 120^{\circ}\right)$ | 2.80 | 2.52 | $2.11 \pm 2.86$ |
| $E\left(90^{\circ}, 0^{\circ}, 45^{\circ}, 135^{\circ}\right)$ | 2.83 | 2.55 | $2.23 \pm 2.48$ |
| $E\left(100^{\circ}, 0^{\circ}, 50^{\circ}, 150^{\circ}\right)$ | 2.79 | 2.51 | $2.39 \pm 2.87$ |
| $E\left(110^{\circ}, 0^{\circ}, 55^{\circ}, 165^{\circ}\right)$ | 2.69 | 2.34 | $2.58 \pm 2.91$ |
| $E\left(120^{\circ}, 0^{\circ}, 60^{\circ}, 180^{\circ}\right)$ | 2.50 | 2.25 | $2.75 \pm 2.95$ |
| $\chi^{2}$ | 1.26 | 0.85 |  |

expected. However, we cannot judge this result as evidence of the mixing of the singlet with the unpolarized state because the experimental data have many errors.

## 4. Conclusion

In this paper we have discussed the effect of the unpolarized state in the spin correlation measurement of the ${ }^{1} S_{0}$ two-proton state produced in the ${ }^{12} \mathrm{C}\left(d,{ }^{2} \mathrm{He}\right)$ reaction at KVI. We have shown that even a small coupling (less than $10 \%$ ) of the pure singlet state with the unpolarized state changes dramatically the Bell-violation value. After introducing the contribution of the unpolarized state we found a better $\chi^{2}$. The experimental results have a large statistical error and therefore not conclusive for testing Bell's inequality, but with a modified experimental setup, measurements with significantly improved precision will become feasible.
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[^0]:    1 Any measurement of the entanglement should not increase by local operation (e.g. unitary transformation) and classical communication (e.g. phone calls), known as LOCC.
    ${ }^{2}$ In this case the directions $\hat{b}$ and $\hat{b}^{\prime}$ of the analyser setting are equal to $\cos (\theta) \hat{c}_{\max } \pm \sin (\theta) \hat{c}_{\max }^{\prime}$ and the directions $\hat{a}, \hat{a}^{\prime}$ are equal to $\frac{D \hat{c}_{\text {max }}}{\left\|D \hat{c}_{\text {max }}\right\|}, \frac{D \hat{c}_{\text {max }}^{\prime}}{\left\|D \hat{c}_{\text {max }}^{\prime}\right\|}$, respectively. $\hat{c}_{\text {max }}$ and $\hat{c}_{\text {max }}^{\prime}$ are two unit (not unique) and mutually orthogonal vectors in $\mathcal{R}^{3}$ that maximize the function $\|D \hat{c}\|^{2}+\left\|D \hat{c}^{\prime}\right\|^{2}$ (see [4] for more detail).

