

Refutation of the quantum qutrit ternary probability

© Copyright 2018 by Colin James III All rights reserved.

We assume the method and apparatus of Meth8/VL4 with τ autology as the designated *proof* value, F as contradiction, N as truthity (non-contingency), and C as falsity (contingency). The 16-valued truth table is row-major and horizontal.

LET: p, q, r, s : probability, Alice [Bob is *not* Alice]; outcomes (0,1,2), measures (0,1);
 \sim Not; $\&$ And; $+$ Or; $>$ Imply, greater than; $<$ Not Imply, less than; $=$ Equivalent;
 $\%$ possibility, one or some; $\#$ necessity, all; $(p@p)$ 0, zero; $(\%p>\#p)$ 1, one; $(\%p<\#p)$ 2, two.

From: Hu, X-M.; Liu, B-H.; Guo, Y.; Xiang, G.Y.; Huang, Y-F.; Li, C-F.; Guo, G-C.; Kleinmann, M.; Cabello, A. (2018). Observation of stronger-than-binary correlations with entangled photonic qutrits. arxiv.org/pdf/1712.06557.pdf.

Correlations between the outcomes of measurements performed by two parties, called Alice and Bob, are described by joint probabilities $P(a,b|x,y)$, where x and y are Alice's and Bob's measurement settings, respectively, and a and b are Alice's and Bob's measurement outcomes, respectively. The experiment is a bipartite Bell-type experiment in which Alice randomly chooses between two different measurements, $x = 0,1$, each of them with three possible outcomes, $a = 0,1,2$, and Bob randomly chooses between two different measurements, $y = 0,1$, each of them with three possible outcomes, $b = 0,1,2$. (1.1)

$$\begin{aligned} r &= ((\%p>\#p) + (\%p<\#p)) + (p@p) ; \\ s &= ((\%p>\#p) + (p@p)) ; \\ ((r &= ((\%p>\#p) + (\%p<\#p)) + (p@p)) \& (s = ((\%p>\#p) + (p@p)))) \\ &> (p \& ((q \& (r \& s)) + (\sim q \& (r \& s)))) ; \end{aligned} \quad \begin{matrix} TTTT & NNNN & TTTT & CTCT \end{matrix} \quad (1.2)$$

In fact, the result of the experiment demonstrates that none of the four measurements (Alice's or Bob's) can be binary. (2.1)

$$\begin{aligned} ((r &= ((\%p>\#p) + (\%p<\#p)) + (p@p)) \& (s = ((\%p>\#p) + (p@p)))) \\ &> \sim (\%r = ((\%p>\#p) + (p@p))) ; \end{aligned} \quad \begin{matrix} TTTT & TTTT & TTTT & CCCC \end{matrix} \quad (2.2)$$

Eqs. 1.2 and 2.2 as rendered are *not* tautologous.

To weaken the argument, we test the sum of the propositions of the outcomes to be greater than one as tautologous, because after all that is the state supposedly observed by experiment.

If outcomes are 1,2,0, then the sum of probabilities are greater than 1. (3.1)

$$(r = ((\%p>\#p) + (\%p<\#p)) + (p@p)) > (\%p>\#p) ; \quad \begin{matrix} TTTT & NNNN & TTTT & NNNN \end{matrix} \quad (3.2)$$

Remarks: The cited paper was paid for by the governments of China, Hungry, Spain, Sweden. The footnoted data set link at personal.us.es/adan/binary.htm is a table of 16 columns and 4500 rows. We could not replicate the χ^2 -values in Table II. Consequently, we applied the N-by-M contingency test (superset of Chi-squared test with expected values derived from observed values) on the first 1000 rows. We found Fisher $P \leq 01$, $\chi^2 = 0.0000001$; $df = 14,985$. In other words, the data set as published is random data. We conclude this impugns the data collection, data set, results, and entire experiment.