

# Correlating Local Quantum Reality with Causally Disconnected Choices

Diego S. S. Chrysothemos,<sup>1,\*</sup> Jonas Maziero,<sup>1,†</sup> and Renato M. Angelo<sup>2,‡</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, Center for Natural and Exact Sciences, Federal University of Santa Maria, Roraima Avenue 1000, Santa Maria, Rio Grande do Sul, 97105-900, Brazil*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics, Federal University of Paraná, P.O. Box 19044, 81531-980, Curitiba, Paraná, Brazil*  
(Dated: August 3, 2023)

In 1935, Einstein, Podolsky, and Rosen claimed the incompleteness of quantum mechanics by assuming that local actions cannot influence the elements of reality in a distant location. In this Letter, we show that Alice's local quantum operations can be correlated with the quantum reality of observables in the causally disconnected laboratory of Bob. We propose a modified optical quantum eraser experiment that can be implemented using current technology for verifying our theoretical predictions, without any need for retrodiction. We simulate such an experiment using IBM quantum computers.

Keywords: Nonlocality; Quantum irrealism; Entanglement; Quantum eraser; Quantum simulation

Physical theories developed prior to the early 1900s were deeply rooted in two taken-for-granted tenets: realism and local causality. Realism assumes that the physical properties of all systems are well defined regardless of any observers' interventions. Local causality, on the other hand, suggests that effects can only derive from nearby causes. From these premises, it readily follows that physical reality can by no means be influenced at a distance. Quantum mechanics, it turns out, seems to stand in direct opposition to this state of affairs. This discrepancy prompted Einstein, Podolsky, and Rosen (EPR) to boldly challenge the theory. Unwilling to negotiate the assumption of local causality, the authors put forward a rationale claiming that quantum mechanics is an incomplete model of the physical world [1].

It is widely accepted nowadays that Bell inequality violations proved EPR wrong. The point, nevertheless, deserves circumspection. As Bell showed [2, 3] and numerous sophisticated experiments confirmed [4–9], a Bell inequality violation implies that Nature is not compatible with the hypothesis of local causality. However, intense debate [10–23] culminated with local causality being acknowledged as a set of hypotheses, often incorporating the assumptions of realistic hidden variables, freedom of choice, and locality. Although many researchers argue that Bell tests disprove locality, thus leading to the phenomenon known as Bell nonlocality [24], the fact remains that such tests do not definitively resolve the question of which of these hypotheses, if not all of them, is in conflict with Nature's actual behavior.

In this Letter, we defend the quantum nonlocality perspective via a different framework. We raise and answer the question: Can the elements of reality in Bob's laboratory be correlated with causally disconnected choices made at Alice's laboratory? We address this question within the framework of an optical setup that can be feasibly implemented using current technologies [25]. Furthermore, we provide demonstrative evidence (modulo a locality loophole) to support our claims through quantum state tomography experiments conducted on IBM's quantum computers [26].

A great deal of work has been made regarding quantum nonlocality [24] and quantum steering [27]. But while in these

works realism is considered through hidden variables or hidden states, here we use an operational approach that was developed [28] to extend the original EPR's definition [1]: "A sufficient condition for the reality of a physical quantity is the possibility of predicting it with certainty, without disturbing the system". Much attention has been given also to the quantum eraser [29]. Our Letter also goes well beyond these developments by introducing a procedure to quantify the wave-like behavior without need for retrodiction, avoiding thus the associated paradoxes.

Key to our argument will be a measure of quantum irrealism which has recently received much attention, from both the theoretical [30–39] and the experimental sides [40, 41]. The idea was introduced by Bilobran and Angelo in Ref. [28]. From the premise that a measurement of an observable  $A = \sum_i a_i M_i^a$  acting on the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_A$ , for a given preparation  $\rho$  on  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$  (with  $\mathcal{H}_B$  possibly multipartite), determines an element of reality (a well defined value for  $A$ ), the authors suggested  $\Phi_A(\rho) = \rho$  as a criterion for  $A$ 's realism, where  $\Phi_A(\rho) := \sum_i \hat{M}_i^a \rho \hat{M}_i^a$  denotes a nonselective measurement of  $A$  (a dephasing map in  $A$ 's eigenbasis) and  $\hat{M}_i^a = M_i^a \otimes \mathbb{1}_B$ . A quantum state satisfying  $\rho = \Phi_A(\rho)$  is then called an  $A$ -reality state, for an  $A$  measurement is not capable of inducing any alteration in the preparation. Indeed, for such state one has  $\Phi_A \circ \Phi_A(\rho) = \rho$ . To quantify how far the observable  $A$  is from being an element of physical reality, we employ the so-called *irreality* measure [28]:

$$\mathfrak{I}_A(\rho) = S(\Phi_A(\rho)) - S(\rho), \quad (1)$$

where  $S(\rho) = -\text{Tr}(\rho \log_2 \rho)$  is the von Neumann entropy. The irreality of any physical quantity  $A$  is never negative and vanishes if, and only if,  $\rho = \Phi_A(\rho)$ . Moreover, the irreality measure can be decomposed as  $\mathfrak{I}_A(\rho) = C_A(\rho_{\mathcal{A}}) + D_A(\rho)$ , where  $C_A(\rho_{\mathcal{A}}) = S(\Phi_A(\rho_{\mathcal{A}})) - S(\rho_{\mathcal{A}})$  is the relative entropy of coherence [42] and  $D_A(\rho)$  is the quantum discord of the  $A$  measurement. Interestingly, this shows that  $A$  realism is prevented by two forms of quantumness, namely, quantum coherence [42] and quantum correlations [43]. For a thorough discussion about the measure in Eq. (1) we refer the reader to Ref. [36].

Our proposal consists of experimentally verifying that the




Figure 1: Schematic representation of the reality quantum correlator (RQC), an optical setup with atoms 1 and 2 respectively placed in the upper and lower paths of a Mach-Zehnder interferometer (MZI). In this setting, QWP stands for a quarter wave-plate, PBS (as  $\text{PBS}_A$ ) is a polarizing beam splitter, HWP is a half wave plate, M represents mirrors, BS is a beam splitter,  $D_{j,k}$  are detectors (with  $j = 0, 1$  and  $k = a, b$ , where  $a (b)$  is the path of the photon  $\mathcal{A} (\mathcal{B})$ ), and  $\text{BBO}'$  stands for a non-linear crystal of beta barium borate supplemented with an auxiliary equipment, through which a pair of photons is produced with their polarizations partially entangled. The  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  photons go to spacelike separated regions so that they cannot communicate during the time interval needed for the local operations. Photon  $\mathcal{A}$  can pass through a QWP and goes through the  $\text{PBS}_A$  while the photon  $\mathcal{B}$  goes through a MZI. The dotted blue box represents the two arrangements adopted for implementing the reality correlator: for the  $\text{QWP}_{\text{out}}$  ( $\text{QWP}_{\text{in}}$ ) configuration, QWP is out (in) of photon  $\mathcal{A}$ 's path and a procedure exists that nonlocally correlates Alice's choices with photon  $\mathcal{B}$ 's path and atoms' energies being (not being) elements of the physical reality.

quantum reality of an observable in Bob's laboratory can be correlated with causally disconnected choices in Alice's laboratory. To this end, we conceive the optical setting depicted in Fig. 1, henceforth named reality quantum correlator (RQC). A beta barium borate crystal (BBO) produces a pair of photons in the Bell state  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle_{AB} + |10\rangle_{AB})$ , with  $|01\rangle_{AB} \equiv |0\rangle_A |1\rangle_B$  meaning that the polarization degrees of freedom  $A$  and  $B$  of the photons  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  are horizontal and vertical, respectively, and similarly for  $|10\rangle_{AB}$ . Here, however, in order to analyze the role of the initial entanglement between  $A$  and  $B$ , we consider the partially entangled state  $|\Psi_+\rangle_{AB} = \varsigma |01\rangle_{AB} + \varsigma |10\rangle_{AB}$  produced by the BBO plus an auxiliary equipment ( $\text{BBO}'$ ) [44], with  $\varsigma = \cos(\theta/2)$ ,  $\varsigma = \sin(\theta/2)$ , and  $\theta \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ . The photons are sent to spacelike separated regions, thus ensuring that they cannot causally influence each other during Alice's procedures. The photon  $\mathcal{B}$  goes to a Mach-Zehnder interferometer (MZI) while the photon  $\mathcal{A}$  moves toward a polarizing beam splitter ( $\text{PBS}_A$ ), before which Alice can choose to include or not a quarter-wave plate (QWP). Being responsible for transforming the linear into circular polarization, this device will define the configurations referred to as  $\text{QWP}_{\text{in}}$  or  $\text{QWP}_{\text{out}}$  depending on whether it is placed in or out of photon  $\mathcal{A}$ 's path. The polarizing beam splitter (PBS) in photon  $\mathcal{B}$ 's path fully transmits (resp. reflects) horizontal (resp. vertical) polarization. After that, a half-wave plate (HWP) disentangles the polarization  $B$  from the other degrees of freedom. Next,  $\mathcal{B}$  is submitted to nondestructive interactions with two other systems, here generically named atoms 1 and 2 (see Refs. [45–47] for some practical examples on how to encode a photon's which-way information without destroying it). Prepared in their excited energy states  $|1\rangle_{\epsilon_1}$  and  $|1\rangle_{\epsilon_2}$ , the atoms 1 and 2 are respectively inserted in the upper and lower paths of the MZI. Upon local interaction with the photon  $\mathcal{B}$ , one of the atoms

will be stimulated to jump to the ground state ( $|0\rangle_{\epsilon_i}$ ). Reflections take place in the mirrors (M) and the paths are recombined at the beam splitter (BS). The path degree of freedom of the photon  $\mathcal{A} (\mathcal{B})$ , hereafter referred to as  $a (b)$ , is measured by the detectors  $D_{j,a} (D_{j,b})$ , with  $j \in \{0, 1\}$ . The notation is such that a click in  $D_{j,a}$  means that the  $j$ -th spatial mode of the photon  $\mathcal{A}$  was  $|j\rangle_a$ , where 0 (1) stands for the horizontal (vertical) spatial mode. As we show next, when Alice chooses the configuration  $\text{QWP}_{\text{out}}$  and performs projective measurements with post-selection on  $a$ , the overall picture in Bob's site is such that the photon  $\mathcal{B}$ 's behavior becomes particle-like ( $\mathfrak{S}_b = 0$ ), the atoms end up in a separable state, and the atoms' energies  $\epsilon_{1,2}$  become elements of reality. On the other hand, opting for  $\text{QWP}_{\text{in}}$  and performing again projective measurements with post-selection on  $a$ , Alice establishes maximum coherence to  $b$ , which leads this degree of freedom to maximally violate realism (i.e.,  $\mathfrak{S}_b = 1$ ) and the photon  $\mathcal{B}$  to exhibit wave-like behavior [41]. After passing the MZI and being detected, the photon  $\mathcal{B}$  leaves the atoms 1 and 2 entangled, thus implying that  $\epsilon_{1,2}$  are no longer elements of the physical reality.

A similar experiment was designed in Ref. [25], but with the big difference that in our setup the photon  $\mathcal{B}$  interacts with the atoms 1 and 2 within the MZI. Because of this, issues related to the need for retrodiction in quantum eraser experiments (QEE) are circumvented here. In QEE, one usually quantifies the wave-like behavior of the quanton inside the MZI (WBI) by looking at the interferometric visibility (IVI) estimated via measurements made after the BS. Besides IVI not being well suited to quantify the WBI in general [48], this kind of approach can lead to paradoxes like Afshar's claimed violation of Bohr's quantum complementarity principle [49]. The use of IVI to quantify the WBI also led to the argument that the late choice of putting the BS in the photon's path

would turn its past behavior into wave-like. This is another issue that we avoid with the inclusion of the atoms [50]. With this we also answer the question left open in Ref. [51] of how to quantify the WBI in the context of the generalized-entangled quantum eraser. Our crucial premise is that only a delocalized system (a wave) can entangle two non-interacting far apart atoms. Finally, another interesting facet of the RQC is that by utilizing a procedure analogous to the quantum teleportation protocol [52], Alice and Bob can prepare a certain entangled state of the atoms, which can be used as a resource for quantum information protocols.

Proceeding with the formal analysis of the RQC, the whole system starts in  $|\Psi_0\rangle = |\Psi_+\rangle_{AB}|00\rangle_{ab}|11\rangle_{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}$ . Once the photon  $\mathcal{B}$  enters the MZI and passes through the PBS, the state becomes  $|\Psi_1\rangle = (i\langle 0|1\rangle_{ABb} + s|100\rangle_{ABb})|011\rangle_{a\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}$ , with PBS introducing a phase  $e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}} = i$  [53, 54] in the reflected component, the one related to the vertical polarization  $|1\rangle_B$ . Then  $\mathcal{B}$  passes through the HWP, which reverses the polarization and thus transforms  $|\Psi_1\rangle$  into

$$|\Psi_2\rangle = (i\langle 0|1\rangle_{Ab} + s|10\rangle_{Ab})|00\rangle_{Ba}|11\rangle_{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}. \quad (2)$$

One sees that the HWP disentangles  $B$  from the other degrees of freedom, leaving only  $A$  and  $b$  entangled. At the next stage of photon  $\mathcal{B}$ 's route, the photon-atoms interaction (PAI) yields  $|\Psi_3\rangle = (i\langle 0|1\rangle_{Ab}|10\rangle_{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2} + s|10\rangle_{Ab}|01\rangle_{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2})|00\rangle_{Ba}$ . Mirrors change the spatial mode with addition of a negligible global phase  $e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}}$ . Their actions transform the state  $|\Psi_3\rangle$  into  $|\Psi_4\rangle = (-c|00\rangle_{Ab}|10\rangle_{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2} + is|11\rangle_{Ab}|01\rangle_{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2})|00\rangle_{Ba}$ . Since the BS's action leads  $|0\rangle_b$  and  $|1\rangle_b$  to  $|\omega_+\rangle_b \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle_b + i|1\rangle_b)$  and  $i|\omega_-\rangle_b \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|1\rangle_b + i|0\rangle_b)$ , respectively, the state becomes

$$|\Psi_5\rangle = (c|010\rangle_{A\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}|\omega_+\rangle_b + s|101\rangle_{A\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}|\omega_-\rangle_b)|00\rangle_{Ba}. \quad (3)$$

Equations (2) and (3) are subsidiary to the analysis that follows. We are now ready to assess how Alice's choice of configuration  $\text{QWP}_{\text{in}}$  or  $\text{QWP}_{\text{out}}$  correlates with the realism of observables accessible to Bob. Specifically, we compute the irreality for the path  $b$  and for the energies  $\epsilon_{1,2}$  in different experiments.

Let us start with the configuration  $\text{QWP}_{\text{out}}$ . When the photon  $\mathcal{A}$  passes through  $\text{PBS}_A$ ,  $|\Psi_2\rangle$  transforms to  $|\Psi_2^{\text{out}}\rangle = i(c|001\rangle_{Aab} + s|110\rangle_{Aab})|011\rangle_{B\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}$ . Every time the detector  $D_{0,a}$  clicks, the collapsed state reads  $|000111\rangle_{AaBb\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}$ . In these cases, the state accessible from Bob's location is  $\Omega_2^{\text{out}} = |\Omega_2^{\text{out}}\rangle\langle\Omega_2^{\text{out}}|$ , where  $|\Omega_2^{\text{out}}\rangle = |0111\rangle_{Bb\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}$ . The application of the dephasing map  $\Phi_b$  is innocuous in this situation, that is,  $\Phi_b(\Omega_2^{\text{out}}) = \Omega_2^{\text{out}}$ , resulting that  $\mathfrak{S}_b(\Omega_2^{\text{out}}) = 0$ . Therefore, by post-selecting on  $|0\rangle_a$ , Alice guarantees that path  $b$  is an element of reality, meaning that Bob will not be able to verify wave-like behavior for  $\mathcal{B}$ . Indeed, it is straightforward to show that the state at the output of the MZI is  $|000\omega_+10\rangle_{AaBb\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}$ . Because the energy states have no coherence and are not entangled,  $\epsilon_{1,2}$  are elements of reality. All this demonstrates that  $\mathcal{B}$  traveled a definite arm of the MZI and did not couple with atom 1 (particle-like behavior).

In the  $\text{QWP}_{\text{in}}$  configuration, QWP converts  $|0\rangle_A$  and  $|1\rangle_A$  into  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle_A + i|1\rangle_A)$  and  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle_A - i|1\rangle_A)$ , respectively. As a consequence, the state in Eq. (2), transforms into  $|\psi_2^{\text{in}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle_A|\beta_+\rangle_b - i|1\rangle_A|\beta_-\rangle_b)|0011\rangle_{aB\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}$ , where  $|\beta_{\pm}\rangle_b \equiv s|0\rangle_b \pm i|1\rangle_b$ . Finally, after the  $\text{PBS}_A$ , the state of the system results in  $|\Psi_2^{\text{in}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle_{Aa}|\beta_+\rangle_b + |11\rangle_{Aa}|\beta_-\rangle_b)|011\rangle_{B\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}$ . As before, every time  $D_{0,a}$  clicks, the state reduces to  $|000\beta_+11\rangle_{AaBb\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}$ . Hence, the state accessible to Bob is  $\Omega_2^{\text{in}} = |\Omega_2^{\text{in}}\rangle\langle\Omega_2^{\text{in}}|$ , with  $|\Omega_2^{\text{in}}\rangle = |0\beta_+11\rangle_{Bb\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}$ . The fundamental difference to the previous case is now apparent: here, one has  $\Phi_b(\Omega_2^{\text{in}}) \neq \Omega_2^{\text{in}}$  because the dephasing map  $\Phi_b$  destroys the path coherence in  $|\beta_+\rangle_b$ , so that one finds  $\mathfrak{S}_b(\Omega_2^{\text{in}}) = -c^2 \log_2 c^2 - s^2 \log_2 s^2$ . The irreality is seen to depend on the parameters that determine the initial entanglement between  $A$  and  $B$ . In particular, maximum entanglement ( $c = s = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ ) triggers maximum irreality, meaning that there is no element of reality for photon  $\mathcal{B}$ 's path. To verify this, Bob needs to certify entanglement between  $\epsilon_1$  and  $\epsilon_2$ . Direct calculations show that the state at the output of the MZI reads  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|000\rangle_{AaB}(|1\rangle_b|\xi_-\rangle_{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2} + i|0\rangle_b|\xi_+\rangle_{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2})$ , where we defined  $|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2} \equiv s|01\rangle_{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2} \pm c|10\rangle_{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}$ . Hence, via post-selection on, say  $|0\rangle_b$ , Bob can verify entanglement in  $|\xi_+\rangle_{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}$  and conclude that  $\epsilon_{1,2}$  are not elements of reality. It is worth noticing that had we opted to use only one atom, we would have a simpler version of the RQC in which Bob would be able to validate  $\mathcal{B}$ 's wave-like behavior through a different quantum resource. Indeed, it is not difficult to show that in such case Bob would find quantum coherence in the atomic energy.

We have thus far shown that (i) the configuration chosen by Alice correlates with  $b$ 's realism and (ii) Bob can verify this effect by looking at the quantum resources encoded in the atoms' degrees of freedom (or, alternatively, in the energy irreality). Now we consider a scenario wherein Alice's intervention is temporarily postponed. We start with the state in Eq. (3) and firstly consider the configuration  $\text{QWP}_{\text{out}}$ . By the passage of  $\mathcal{A}$  through the  $\text{PBS}_A$ , the state  $|\Psi_5\rangle$  changes to  $|\Psi_5^{\text{out}}\rangle = (c|0010\rangle_{Aa\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}|\omega_+\rangle_b + is|1101\rangle_{Aa\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}|\omega_-\rangle_b)|0\rangle_B$ . Measurements of  $a$  and  $b$  post-selected on 0 result in  $|000010\rangle_{AaBb\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}$ . In this case, the state accessible to Bob is  $\Omega_5^{\text{out}} = |\Omega_5^{\text{out}}\rangle\langle\Omega_5^{\text{out}}|$  with  $|\Omega_5^{\text{out}}\rangle = |0010\rangle_{Bb\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}$ . The action of either  $\Phi_{\epsilon_1}$  or  $\Phi_{\epsilon_2}$  is innocuous, because the energies are neither entangled nor in superposition. It immediately follows that  $\mathfrak{S}_k(\Omega_5^{\text{out}}) = 0$  ( $k \in \{1,2\}$ ), meaning that  $\epsilon_k$  are elements of reality. This is the same conclusion we reached when considering Alice's intervention in a previous stage of the dynamics, which reveals that the precise time of Alice's actions is not relevant in these experiments. That is, no fine tuning is required.

Let us consider now the configuration  $\text{QWP}_{\text{in}}$ . After the system evolves to the state  $|\Psi_5\rangle$ , the photon  $\mathcal{A}$  traverses QWP and  $\text{PBS}_A$ . The resulting state is given by  $|\Psi_5^{\text{in}}\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|000\rangle_{Aab}|\xi_+\rangle_{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2} - i|001\rangle_{Aab}|\xi_-\rangle_{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2} + |110\rangle_{Aab}|\xi_-\rangle_{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2} - i|111\rangle_{Aab}|\xi_+\rangle_{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2})|0\rangle_B$ . Assuming again projection and post-selection on  $|0\rangle_{ab}$ , we arrive at  $|0000\rangle_{AaBb}|\xi_+\rangle_{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}$ . In this case, the state accessible from Bob's location is  $\Omega_5^{\text{in}} = |\Omega_5^{\text{in}}\rangle\langle\Omega_5^{\text{in}}|$  with  $|\Omega_5^{\text{in}}\rangle = |00\rangle_{Bb}|\xi_+\rangle_{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}$ . Clearly, the energies are left entangled. As a consequence,  $\mathfrak{S}_{\epsilon_k}(\Omega_5^{\text{in}}) = -c^2 \log_2 c^2 -$




Figure 2: The quantum circuit implemented in the IBMQ for simulating the reality quantum correlator (RQC). Each horizontal line represents a qubit which is identified with the notation used in the main text and all qubits are initialized in the state  $|0\rangle$ . The photons  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  possess respective path degrees of freedom,  $a$  and  $b$ , and the polarization degrees of freedom,  $A$  and  $B$ . The polarizations get partially entangled by means of the non-linear crystal of barium beta borate plus auxiliary equipment (BBO'), which is simulated in quantum computers through the action of the  $\text{RY}(\theta)$  gate on  $A$ , the CNOT gate having  $A$  as control and target in  $B$ , and the Pauli  $X$  gate acting on  $B$ . This controls entanglement through the continuous parameter  $\theta$ . The photon  $\mathcal{B}$  enters the Mach-Zehnder interferometer (MZI) passing firstly through the polarizing beam splitter (PBS) which, as  $\text{PBS}_A$ , is implemented with the  $C_Z$  and  $C_Y$  gates, both with polarization as control and the path as target. Then,  $\mathcal{B}$  passes through the half-wave plate (HWP), which is responsible for disentangling the polarization degree of freedom and can be implemented through a CNOT with control in  $b$  and target in  $B$ . The gate  $X$  is applied on the qubits  $\epsilon_1$  and  $\epsilon_2$  to produce the initial state  $|11\rangle$  considered in our proposal. The photon-atoms interaction (PAI) is constructed using CNOTs, both with control in  $b$  and target in  $\epsilon_1$  or  $\epsilon_2$  (for  $\epsilon_1$ , though, the gate  $X$  has to be applied before and after the CNOT, as we want the interaction to occur when the path  $b$  is in state  $|0\rangle$ ), corresponding to the upper path of the MZI). The mirrors' (M) combined action is implemented using  $U_M^b = YZ$  and the beam splitter (BS) is simulated with  $U_{\text{BS}}^b = SHS$ . Finally, the quarter wave plate (QWP), responsible for turning the linear polarization  $A$  into circular, is implemented via  $U_{\text{QWP}}^A = SH$ . For the demonstration, two runs of quantum state tomography (QST) were performed for both configurations,  $\text{QWP}_{\text{out}}$  and  $\text{QWP}_{\text{in}}$ . The first run, referred to as  $\text{QST}_b$ , was performed after  $\mathcal{B}$  passes through the HWP and before the photon interacts with the atoms represented by the first vertical dashed line. The second one,  $\text{QST}_{\epsilon_{1,2}}$ , represented by the second vertical dashed line, was performed at the output of the MZI. For a more detailed description of converting optical devices via quantum logic gates see the Supplementary Material [55].

$s^2 \log_2 s^2$ , implying that the energies will not be elements of reality in general. In particular, the irrealties are numerically equal to the amount of entanglement encoded in both the initial state  $|\Psi_0\rangle$  and  $|\xi_+\rangle_{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}$ . Again, we see that the time of Alice's actions plays no relevant role to our claim that they can correlate with the reality of Bob's observables. Furthermore, notice that such effect does not allow for signaling, for Bob's certification can be done only after classically communicating with Alice.

In what follows, we will demonstrate the proposed experiments using one of the IBM's quantum computers (IBMQ). The calibration data for the Falcon processor `ibm_nairobi` quantum chip we used here is shown in the Supplementary Material [55]. In order to reproduce the RQC of Fig. 1 we use six qubits, see Fig. 2. The main idea of implementing an optical device in a quantum computer is to obtain the unitary matrix of the optical device and convert it into quantum logic gates (more information about these implementations is in the Supplementary Material [55] and related quantum simulations can be found in Refs. [48, 51]). Limited by the number of times we can execute a given quantum circuit, we performed quantum state tomography (QST) for a reduced number of qubits. Although all the simulations of the setup were made in the IBMQ with all the six qubits (namely  $a, A, b, B, \epsilon_1$ , and  $\epsilon_2$ ), just as theoretically presented, QST was conducted only over  $A, b, \epsilon_1$ , and  $\epsilon_2$ . This is perfectly admissible because  $a$  is max-

imally correlated with  $A$  (so, measuring one gives the other) and  $B$  is fully uncorrelated. Indeed, one can verify theoretically that the irreality does not change with this simplification.

The QST was run in two different stages of the circuit (vertical dashed lines in Fig. 2) for both configurations  $\text{QWP}_{\text{out}}$  and  $\text{QWP}_{\text{in}}$ . The first run, referred to as  $\text{QST}_b$ , was performed when the system is in the state  $|\Psi_2^{\text{out(in)}}\rangle$ . The second run, denoted  $\text{QST}_{\epsilon_{1,2}}$ , was performed at the output of the MZI, when the system state is  $|\Psi_5^{\text{out(in)}}\rangle$ . In both cases, we performed the QST of  $\mathcal{A}$  after the  $\text{PBS}_A$ , with  $a$  and  $B$  discarded. In the first case, we calculated the irreality of  $b$  and in the second case we obtained the irrealties of the atomic energies  $\epsilon_1$  and  $\epsilon_2$ . The results are shown, respectively, in Figs. 3 (a) and 3 (b). It is well known that current [26] quantum computers still have associated errors due to couplings with the environment as well as thermal imperfections and imperfections of the devices [56]. Because of this, we use Qiskit tools to mitigate [57] the errors obtained in the demonstration points. The treatment significantly improved our demonstrative results which are seen to agree fairly well with the theory and validates our claim that there is correlation of the quantum reality of the observables in Bob's laboratory with causally disconnected choices made at Alice's laboratory.

In conclusion, our experiment on IBMQ simulates the possibility of a nonlocal form of reality correlation in quantum systems considering an operational quantum reality quantifier,




Figure 3: Theoretical (lines) and simulated and demonstrative (points) results for the irreality as a function of  $\theta$ , the parameter related to the initial polarization entanglement. The simulation results, obtained via classical emulation of the quantum circuit, are denoted by triangular points, whereas the experimental results are given by diamond and square points. (a) Irreality of the photon  $\mathcal{B}$  path,  $\mathfrak{S}_b$ , calculated from quantum state tomography applied after the HWP and before  $\mathcal{B}$  interacts with the atoms 1 and 2. (b) Irrealities of the atoms' energies ( $\mathfrak{S}_{\epsilon_{1,2}}$ ) calculated for the quantum state obtained at the MZI output. Both graphs present the results considering the scenarios  $\text{QWP}_{\text{in}}$  and  $\text{QWP}_{\text{out}}$ . The simulated and experimental points around the solid theoretical line refer to the case where the QWP is inserted in the device ( $\text{QWP}_{\text{in}}$ ). The points around the dashed theoretical line are for cases where QWP is not present in the experimental apparatus ( $\text{QWP}_{\text{out}}$ ). For  $\theta = \pi/2$  (resp.  $\theta = 0$ ) the initial entanglement between the polarizations  $A$  and  $B$  is maximum (resp. zero). The error bars are the standard deviation for ten repetitions of the demonstration. For the demonstrations using IBMQ, we employed the Falcon processor `ibm_nairobi` quantum chip (calibrations is given in the Supplementary Material [55]).

opening up new avenues for investigating the nature of reality within the realm of quantum information processing. We hope that our results may motivate researchers to implement our experiment proposal in actual optical settings, thus closing the locality loophole that we have in our IBMQ demonstration. Methods to close the “freedom of choice” loophole are also available [25]. It is worth mentioning that if one allows Alice to classically communicate her choices and results to Bob before his procedures, then one would have a time-like

interval between events. It would then be possible to argue that Alice can exert causal control over elements of reality at a distance.

We thank Luiz C. Ryff, Alexandre D. Ribeiro, Felipe E. L. da Cruz, and Douglas F. Pinto for helpful discussions. R.M.A. and J.M. acknowledge support of the National Institute for the Science and Technology of Quantum Information (INCT-IQ), Grant No. 465469/2014-0. R.M.A. was supported by the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq), Grant No. 309373/2020-4. J.M. was supported by the CNPq, Grant No. 309862/2021-3. D.S.S.C. was supported by the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES), Grant No. 88887.827989/2023-00. The authors acknowledge support from the CNPq through the Grant No. 409673/2022-6.

\* Electronic address: [starkediego@gmail.com](mailto:starkediego@gmail.com)

† Electronic address: [jonas.maziero@ufsm.br](mailto:jonas.maziero@ufsm.br)

\* Electronic address: [renato.angelo@ufpr.br](mailto:renato.angelo@ufpr.br)

- [1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality Be Considered Complete?, *Phys. Rev.* **47**, 777 (1935).
- [2] J. S. Bell, On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox, *Phys. Phys. Fiz.* **1**, 195 (1964).
- [3] J. S. Bell, in *John S. Bell on the Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, edited by M. Bell, K. Gottfried, and M. Veltman (World Scientific, Singapore, 2001), pp. 50-60.
- [4] B. Hensen, H. Bernien, A. E. Dr eau, A. Reiserer, N. Kalb, M. S. Blok, J. Ruitenberg, R. F. L. Vermeulen, R. N. Schouten, C. Abell an *et al.*, Loophole-Free Bell Inequality Violation Using Electron Spins Separated by 1.3 Kilometres, *Nature* **526**, 682 (2015).
- [5] M. Giustina, M. A. M. Versteegh, S. Wengerowsky, J. Handsteiner, A. Hochrainer, K. Phelan, *et al.*, Significant-Loophole-Free Test of Bell's Theorem with Entangled Photons, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 250401 (2015).
- [6] L. K. Shalm, E. Meyer-Scott, B. G. Christensen, P. Bierhorst, M. A. Wayne, M. J. Stevens, T. Gerrits, S. Glancy, D. R. Hamel, M. S. Allman *et al.*, Strong Loophole-Free Test of Local Realism, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 250402 (2015).
- [7] B. Hensen, N. Kalb, M. S. Blok, A. E. Dr eau, A. Reiserer, R. F. L. Vermeulen, R. N. Schouten, M. Markham, D. J. Twitchen, K. Goodenough *et al.*, Loophole-Free Bell Test Using Electron Spins in Diamond: Second Experiment and Additional Analysis, *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 30289 (2016).
- [8] D. Rauch, J. Handsteiner, A. Hochrainer, J. Gallicchio, A. S. Friedman, C. Leung, B. Liu, L. Bulla, S. Ecker, F. Steinlechner *et al.*, Cosmic Bell Test Using Random Measurement Settings from High-Redshift Quasars, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 080403 (2018).
- [9] M. H. Li, C. Wu, Y. Zhang, W. Z. Liu, B. Bai, Y. Liu, W. Zhang, Q. Zhao, H. Li, Z. Wang *et al.*, Test of Local Realism into the Past without Detection and Locality Loopholes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 080404 (2018).
- [10] A. Khrennikov, Bell's Inequality: Physics Meets Probability *Info. Sci.* **179**, 492 (2009).
- [11] C. Tresser, Bell's Theory with No Locality Assumption, *Eur. Phys. J.* **58**, 385 (2010).

- [12] N. Gisin, Non-Realism: Deep Thought or a Soft Option?, *Found Phys* **42**, 80 (2012).
- [13] T. Maudlin, What Bell Did, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **47**, 424010 (2014).
- [14] M. Żukowski and Č. Brukner, Quantum Non-Locality - It Ain't Necessarily So..., *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **47**, 424009 (2014).
- [15] H. M. Wiseman, The Two Bell's Theorems of John Bell, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **47**, 424001 (2014).
- [16] H. M. Wiseman and E. G. Rieffel, Are There Really Two Different Bell's Theorems?, *Int. J. Quantum Found.* **1**, 85 (2015).
- [17] E. J. Gillis, On the Analysis of Bell's 1964 Paper by Wiseman, Cavalcanti, and Rieffel *Int. J. Quantum Found.* **1**, 199 (2015).
- [18] T. Norsen, Are There Really Two Different Bell's Theorems? arXiv:1503.05017.
- [19] E. Santos, Mathematical and Physical Meaning of the Bell Inequalities, *Eur. J. Phys.* **37**, 055402 (2016).
- [20] H. M. Wiseman and E. G. Cavalcanti, Causarum Investigatio and the Two Bell's Theorems of John Bell, in *Quantum [Un]Speakables II: Half a Century of Bell's Theorem*, edited by R. Bertlmann and A. Zeilinger (Springer International Publishing, Switzerland, 2017), pp. 119–142.
- [21] C. Abellan, A. Acín, A. Alarcón, O. Alibart, C. Andersen, F. Andreoli, A. Beckert, F. Beduini, A. Bendersky, M. Bentivegna *et al.*, Challenging Local Realism with Human Choices, *Nature* **557**, 212 (2018).
- [22] A. Khrennikov, Two Faced Janus of Quantum Nonlocality, *Entropy* **22**, 303 (2020).
- [23] E. G. Cavalcanti and H. M. Wiseman, Implications of Local Friendliness Violation for Quantum Causality, *Entropy* **23**, 925 (2021).
- [24] N. Brunner, D. Cavalcanti, S. Pironio, V. Scarani, and S. Wehner, Bell Nonlocality, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **86**, 839(E) (2014).
- [25] X. Ma, J. Kofler, A. Qarry, N. Tetik, T. Scheidl, R. Ursin, S. Ramelow *et al.*, Quantum Erasure with Causally Disconnected Choice, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **110**, 1221 (2013).
- [26] IBM Quantum. <https://quantum-computing.ibm.com> (2021).
- [27] R. Uola, A. C. S. Costa, H. C. Nguyen, and O. Gühne, Quantum steering, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **92**, 015001 (2020).
- [28] A. L. O. Bilobran and R. M. Angelo, A Measure of Physical Reality, *Europhys. Lett.* **112**, 40005 (2015).
- [29] X. Ma, J. Kofler, and A. Zeilinger, Delayed-choice gedanken experiments and their realizations, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **88**, 015005 (2016).
- [30] P. R. Dieguez and R. M. Angelo, Information-Reality Complementarity: The Role of Measurements and Quantum Reference Frames, *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 022107 (2018).
- [31] I. S. Freire and R. M. Angelo, Quantifying Continuous-Variable Realism, *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 022105 (2019).
- [32] A. C. Orthey Jr. and R. M. Angelo, Nonlocality, Quantum Correlations, and Violations of Classical Realism in the Dynamics of Two Noninteracting Quantum Walkers, *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 042110 (2019).
- [33] N. G. Engelbert and R. M. Angelo, Hardy's Paradox as a Demonstration of Quantum Irrealism, *Found. Phys.* **50**, 105 (2020).
- [34] A. C. S. Costa and R. M. Angelo, Information-Based Approach towards a Unified Resource Theory, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **19**, 325 (2020).
- [35] M. F. Savi and R. M. Angelo, Quantum Resource Covariance, *Phys. Rev. A* **103**, 022220 (2021).
- [36] A. C. Orthey Jr. and R. M. Angelo, Quantum Realism: Axiomatization and Quantification *Phys. Rev. A* **105**, 052218 (2022).
- [37] I. L. Paiva, P. R. Dieguez, R. M. Angelo, and E. Cohen, Coherence and Realism in the Aharonov-Bohm Effect, *Phys. Rev. A* **107**, 032213 (2023).
- [38] N. G. Engelbert and R. M. Angelo, Considerations on the Relativity of Quantum Irrealism, *Entropy* **25**, 603 (2023).
- [39] M. L. W. Basso and J. Maziero, Reality Variation under Monitoring with Weak Measurements, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **21**, 255 (2022).
- [40] L. Mancino, M. Sbroscia, E. Rocca, I. Gianani, V. Cimini, M. Paternostro, and M. Barbieri, Information-Reality Complementarity in Photonic Weak Measurements, *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 062108 (2018).
- [41] P. R. Dieguez, J. R. Guimarães, J. P. S. Peterson, R. M. Angelo, and R. M. Serra, Experimental Assessment of Physical Realism in a Quantum-Controlled Device, *Commun. Phys.* **5**, 82 (2022).
- [42] T. Baumgratz, M. Cramer, and M. B. Plenio, Quantifying Coherence, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 140401 (2014).
- [43] H. Ollivier and W. H. Zurek, Quantum Discord: A Measure of the Quantumness of Correlations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 017901 (2001).
- [44] M. P. Almeida, F. de Melo, M. Hor-Meyll, A. Salles, S. P. Walborn, P. H. S. Ribeiro, and L. Davidovich, Environment-Induced Sudden Death of Entanglement, *Science* **316**, 579 (2007).
- [45] E. Distante, S. Daiss, S. Langenfeld, L. Hartung, P. Thomas, O. Morin, G. Rempe, and S. Welte, Detecting an Itinerant Optical Photon Twice without Destroying It, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 253603 (2021).
- [46] Y. P. Huang and M. G. Moore, On-demand generation of entanglement of atomic qubits via optical interferometry, *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 032349 (2008).
- [47] A. Lamas-Linares, J. C. Howell, and D. Bouwmeester, Stimulated emission of polarization-entangled photons, *Nature* **412**, 887 (2001).
- [48] D. S. S. Chrysothemis, M. L. W. Basso, and J. Maziero, Quantum coherence versus interferometric visibility in a biased Mach-Zehnder interferometer, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **22**, 68 (2023).
- [49] S. S. Afshar, E. Flores, K. F. McDonald, and E. Knoesel, Paradox in Wave-Particle Duality, *Found. Phys.* **37**, 295 (2007).
- [50] R. M. Angelo and A. D. Ribeiro, Wave-particle duality: an information-based approach, *Found. Phys.* **45**, 1407 (2015).
- [51] D. S. S. Chrysothemis, M. L. W. Basso, and J. Maziero, Quantum simulation of the generalized-entangled quantum eraser and the related complete complementarity relations, *Phys. Scr.* **98**, 035107 (2023).
- [52] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen channels, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1895 (1993).
- [53] V. Degiorgio, Phase shift between the transmitted and the reflected optical fields of a semireflecting lossless mirror is  $\pi/2$ , *Am. J. Phys.* **48**, 81 (1980).
- [54] A. Zeilinger, General properties of lossless beam splitters in interferometry, *Am. J. Phys.* **49**, 882 (1981).
- [55] See Supplemental Material at [URL will be inserted by publisher] **COMPLETE AFTER MODIFICATIONS for the Table with the Calibration data for the IBMQ Falcon processor `ibm_nairobi` quantum chip.**
- [56] M. Papič, A. Auer, and I. Vega, Error Sources of Quantum Gates in Superconducting Qubits, arXiv:2305.08916 [quant-ph] (2023).
- [57] D. C. McKay, T. Alexander, L. Bello, M. J. Biercuk, L. Bishop, J. Chen, *et al.*, Qiskit Backend Specifications for OpenQASM and OpenPulse Experiments, arXiv:1809.03452 [quant-ph]

ph] (2018).