Parity Violation on Bell Tests

Yong Du(杜勇)

The 2024 International Workshop on the High Energy CEPC, Hangzhou, Oct 24, 2024

Based on

[2409.15418](https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.15418), with Xiao-Gang He, Chia-Wei Liu, Jian-Ping Ma


```
nature > nature physics > editorials > article
Editorial | Published: 08 September 2022
Survey the foundations
<u>Nature Physics</u> 18, 961 (2022) Cite this article
3939 Accesses | 1 Citations | 7 Altmetric | Metrics
It is easy to dismiss research into the foundations of quantum mechanics as irrelevant
to physicists in other areas. Adopting this attitude misses opportunities to appreciate
the richness of quantum mechanics.
```


Quantum teleportation with entangled photons

Quantum Cryptography and new protocols: Quantum Key Distribution using entangled photons

Gisin, Nature, 2017

Yin et al, Nature 2020

Practically, it is not that challenging to prepare entangled pairs

Cascade photons

$t\bar{t}$ at the LHC

Kocher & Commins, PRL, 1967

CMS-PHO-EVENTS-2022-033

Practically, it is not that challenging to prepare entangled pairs

Cascade photons

$t\bar{t}$ at the LHC

Kocher & Commins, PRL, 1967

CMS-PHO-EVENTS-2022-033

The challenges lie in performing a loophole free test, and now there are well-established methods for that. *Luminosity will probably be the key ingredient as we'll see later.*

The high-luminosity of CEPC/FCC-ee, especially the TeraZ option, makes it ideal for this kind of studies with, for example, $f\bar{f}$ pairs.

CEPC Snowmass 2021, 2205.08553

The high-luminosity of CEPC/FCC-ee, especially the TeraZ option, makes it ideal for this kind of studies with, for example, *ff* pairs.

CEPC Snowmass 2021, 2205.08553

Fermions are also special to quantum mechanics, thus promising candidates for excluding some local hidden variable theories.

Formalism and Exp Extraction

Formalism and Exp Extraction

The entangled spin-half bipartite system can be properly described by the spin-density matrix expanded in the $SU(2) \otimes SU(2)$ Hilbert space:

$$
\rho = \frac{1}{4} \left(I_4 + \sum_i B_i^+ s^i \otimes I_2 + \sum_j B_j^- I_2 \otimes s^j + \sum_{i,j} C_{ij} s^i \otimes s^j \right)
$$

Polarization of the subsystem

$$
\frac{d\Gamma_{\Lambda}}{d\Omega_{p}}\left(\vec{s}_{1},\hat{l}_{p}\right) \propto 1 + \alpha \vec{s}_{1} \cdot \hat{l}_{p}
$$

Formalism and Exp Extraction

The entangled spin-half bipartite system can be properly described by the spin-density matrix expanded in the $SU(2) \otimes SU(2)$ Hilbert space:

$$
\rho = \frac{1}{4} \left(I_4 + \sum_i B_i^+ s^i \otimes I_2 + \sum_j B_j^- I_2 \otimes s^j + \sum_{i,j} C_{ij} s^i \otimes s^j \right)
$$

$$
e^+
$$

$$
e^-
$$

$$
I/\psi
$$

$$
\pi^+ (\pi^0)
$$

$$
\pi^-
$$

$$
p
$$

$$
\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega_k d\Omega_p d\Omega_{\bar{p}}} \propto \text{Tr} \left[\rho \left(1 + \alpha s_1 \cdot \hat{I}_p \right) \left(1 - \bar{\alpha} s_2 \cdot \hat{I}_p \right) \right]
$$

Equally applies to LHC, CEPC, FCC-ee $(e^+e^-/pp \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-/t\bar{t}$ *for instance)!*

The underlying assumption is that the fermion pair is entangled, which is not guaranteed to be present!

The underlying assumption is that the fermion pair is entangled, which is not guaranteed to be present!

Concurrence quantifies the entanglement of the fermion pair

$$
C(\rho) = \max[0, 2\lambda_{\text{max}} - \text{Tr}\,R] \qquad R = \sqrt{\sqrt{\rho}(\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y)\rho^*(\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y)\sqrt{\rho}}
$$

Yong Du (TDLI)

The underlying assumption is that the fermion pair is entangled, which is not guaranteed to be present!

Concurrence quantifies the entanglement of the fermion pair

$$
C(\rho) = \max[0, 2\lambda_{\text{max}} - \text{Tr}\,R] \qquad R = \sqrt{\sqrt{\rho}(\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y)\rho^*(\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y)\sqrt{\rho}}
$$

Yong Du (TDLI)

The original Bell inequality requires simultaneously adjusting two directions with a spacelike separation randomly, thus practically very challenging.

The CHSH inequality instead avoids this simultaneity:

$$
\mathcal{B}(\rho) = 2\sqrt{\mu_1 + \mu_2} \le 2\sqrt{2} \qquad \mu_{1,2} \text{ the largest two eigenvalues of } C^T C
$$

The original Bell inequality requires simultaneously adjusting two directions with a spacelike separation randomly, thus practically very challenging.

The CHSH inequality instead avoids this simultaneity:

See also Wu et al, [2406.16298](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.16298)

Quantum entanglement ⊃ Bell inequality violation

Current studies on Bell tests focused on parity-conserving interactions: QED conserves it, $\Lambda_{\rm QCD}^2 G_F$ suppression for octet baryons from J/ψ decay. *But not generically true!*

Current studies on Bell tests focused on parity-conserving interactions: QED conserves it, $\Lambda_{\rm QCD}^2 G_F$ suppression for octet baryons from J/ψ decay. *But not generically true!*

The simplest case is the spin-1/2 bipartite system resulting from spin-0 and spin-1 particle decays

The simplest case is the spin-1/2 bipartite system resulting from spin-0 and spin-1 particle decays

The silly simple *spin-0 case (* $h \rightarrow f_1 \bar{f}_2$ *):* $\mathscr{L} = h \bar{f}_1 \left(g_S - g_P \gamma_5 \right) f_2$

The simplest case is the spin-1/2 bipartite system resulting from spin-0 and spin-1 particle decays

The not that simple *spin-1 case* $(V \to f\bar{f})$: $\mathscr{L} = V^{\mu} \bar{f} \gamma_{\mu} (F_V + F_A \gamma_5) f$

The simplest case is the spin-1/2 bipartite system resulting from spin-0 and spin-1 particle decays

The not that simple *spin-1 case* $(V \to f\bar{f})$: $\mathscr{L} = V^{\mu} \bar{f} \gamma_{\mu} (F_V + F_A \gamma_5) f$

YD, He, Liu, Ma, [2409.15418](https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.15418)

The simplest case is the spin-1/2 bipartite system resulting from spin-0 and spin-1 particle decays

The not that simple *spin-1 case* $(V \to f\bar{f})$: $\mathscr{L} = V^{\mu} \bar{f} \gamma_{\mu} (F_V + F_A \gamma_5) f$

Stat. improvement! YD, He, Liu, Ma, [2409.15418](https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.15418)

What is missing? Interactions with the surroundings (as has always been).

What is missing? Interactions with the surroundings (as has always been).

Figure credit: CMS collaboration

This environmental effect is largely overlooked in literature. As I will show soon, this ignorance may lead to misunderstandings in interpreting the physical results.

What is missing? Interactions with the surroundings (as has always been).

Figure credit: CMS collaboration

This environmental effect is largely overlooked in literature. As I will show soon, this ignorance may lead to misunderstandings in interpreting the physical results.

To isolate the effects from the magnetic field and to make our point, we focus on particles decay before hitting the detector. Good examples are τ , Λ_c^+ and Ξ^- for LEP/ CEPC/FCC-ee and BESIII, respectively.

For the momenta, the magnetic field simply induces a rotation along the \hat{z} direction due to the Lorentz force:

$$
R_p = e^{-iJ \cdot \left(\frac{qH}{m\gamma}\right)t}
$$

For the momenta, the magnetic field simply induces a rotation along the \hat{z} direction due to the Lorentz force:

$$
R_p = e^{-iJ \cdot \left(\frac{qH}{m\gamma}\right)t}
$$

For the spins, induction instead of spin precession as described by the Bargmann-Michel-Telegdi equation: Bargmann, Michel, Telegdi, PRL 1959

$$
\frac{dS(t)}{dt} = \frac{ge}{2m} S(t) \times \left[\gamma H + (1 - \gamma) \frac{H \cdot v}{v^2} v \right] \equiv S(t) \times \tilde{H}
$$

Magnus expansion is sufficient $|\tilde{H}| \approx \frac{ge\tau_f |H| \gamma}{m} \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-2} \sim 10^{-4})$

$$
R_s = e^{-iJ \cdot \Omega_1(t)} \qquad \Omega_1(t) = \int_0^t dt' \frac{ge}{2m} \left[\gamma H + (1 - \gamma) \frac{H \cdot v(t')}{v^2} v(t') \right]
$$

First-order

H

Due to the magnetic effect

YD, He, Liu, Ma, 2409.15418

$$
\rho(0,0) = \frac{1}{4} \Big(\mathbf{I}_4 + \sum_i B_i^+ s^i \otimes \mathbf{I}_2 + \sum_j B_j^- \mathbf{I}_2 \otimes s^j + \sum_{i,j} C_{ij} s^i \otimes s^j \Big)
$$

$$
\rho(t_1, t_2) = \frac{1}{4} \Big(\mathbf{I}_4 + \sum_i B_i^+ s^i \otimes \mathbf{I}_2 + \sum_j B_j^- \mathbf{I}_2 \otimes s^j + \sum_{i,j} C_{ij} s^i \otimes s^j \Big)
$$

Due to the magnetic effect

YD, He, Liu, Ma, 2409.15418

$$
\rho(0,0) = \frac{1}{4} \Big(\mathbf{I}_4 + \sum_i B_i^+ s^i \otimes \mathbf{I}_2 + \sum_j B_j^- \mathbf{I}_2 \otimes s^j + \sum_{i,j} C_{ij} s^i \otimes s^j \Big)
$$

$$
\rho(t_1, t_2) = \frac{1}{4} \Big(\mathbf{I}_4 + \sum_i B_i^+ s^i \otimes \mathbf{I}_2 + \sum_j B_j^- \mathbf{I}_2 \otimes s^j + \sum_{i,j} C_{ij} s^i \otimes s^j \Big)
$$

Statistical average is taken over the decay time through a Gaussian PDF:

$$
p(t_1, t_2) = \frac{1}{2\pi\sigma_{\text{TOF}}^2} e^{-\frac{(t_1 - \tau)^2 + (t_2 - \tau)^2}{2\sigma_{\text{TOF}}^2}}
$$
\n
$$
\sigma_{\text{TOF}}^{\text{BESIII}} = 33 \,\text{ps}
$$
\n
$$
\sigma_{\text{TOF}}^{\text{LEP}} = 150 \,\text{ps}
$$

* a Poisson PDF instead barely affects our conclusion

Decay time correlation is ignored as we lack this info (*also crucial for a loophole free test!*), thus high luminosity would possibly be urgently needed for a loophole free test at colliders.

Q: How large is this environmental effect?

Q: How large is this environmental effect?

$$
\rho = \frac{1}{4} \Big(\mathbf{I}_4 + \sum_i B_i^+ s^i \otimes \mathbf{I}_2 + \sum_j B_j^- \mathbf{I}_2 \otimes s^j + \sum_{i,j} C_{ij} s^i \otimes s^j \Big)
$$

Rotational invariance puts constraints on the generic form of R (backup slide), and P and CP invariance will lead to, for instance, $C_{12} = C_{21}$ under P or CP invariance

$$
\Delta \bar{C}_{12} \equiv \bar{C}_{12} - \bar{C}_{21}
$$

 $\Delta \bar{C}_{12} \neq 0$ would correspond to a spurious P and/or CP violation due to interaction with the environmental magnetic field.

Spurious P and/or CP violation can be of $\mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$ for $|H| = 1$ tesla.

Non-negligible and may become observable at a future high-lumi electron collider!

The spin correlation can be easily modified by the presence of new physics, *e.g.*, U(1) gauge boson or 4-fermion operators: New physics in the heatmap

Sakurai, Spannowsky, PRL 2024

Up to now, the discussion, though free of referring to any specific local hidden variable theory, however does rely on the knowledge of a quantum one.

Q: Do we have to?

Challenging the validity of general QFT can be achieved from the simple spin-0 *h* decay:

$$
\rho = \frac{1}{4} \Big(I_4 + \sum_i B_i^+ s^i \otimes I_2 + \sum_j B_j^- I_2 \otimes s^j + \sum_{i,j} C_{ij} s^i \otimes s^j \Big)
$$

Assuming no special direction for nature, *i.e.,* SO(3) invariance alone (in the rest frame of *h*)

$$
\overrightarrow{B}^+ = b_{1k}\hat{k}, \quad \overrightarrow{B}^- = b_{2k}\hat{k} \qquad \qquad C_{ij} = c_0 \delta_{ij} + c_2 \epsilon_{ijl} \hat{k}_l + c_5 \left(\hat{k}_i \hat{k}_j - \frac{\delta_{ij}}{3} \right)
$$

Challenging the validity of general QFT can be achieved from the simple spin-0 *h* decay:

$$
\rho = \frac{1}{4} \Big(\mathbf{I}_4 + \sum_i B_i^+ s^i \otimes \mathbf{I}_2 + \sum_j B_j^- \mathbf{I}_2 \otimes s^j + \sum_{i,j} C_{ij} s^i \otimes s^j \Big)
$$

Assuming no special direction for nature, *i.e.,* SO(3) invariance alone (in the rest frame of *h*)

$$
\overrightarrow{B}^+ = b_{1k}\hat{k}, \quad \overrightarrow{B}^- = b_{2k}\hat{k} \qquad C_{ij} = c_0 \delta_{ij} + c_2 \epsilon_{ijl} \hat{k}_l + c_5 \left(\hat{k}_i \hat{k}_j - \frac{\delta_{ij}}{3} \right)
$$

Angular momentum conservation immediately leads to (3 independent parameters):

$$
b_{1k} = -b_{2k} \t c_0 = -1 - \frac{2}{3}c_5
$$

$$
\mathcal{B}(\rho) = 2\sqrt{2 - b_{1k}^2 - \epsilon} \t C(\rho) = \frac{1}{2} [(\mathcal{B}(\rho)^2 - 4)(\mathcal{B}(\rho)^2 - 4 + 4\epsilon)]^{\frac{1}{4}}
$$

 $\epsilon = 1 - b_{1k}^2 - c_2^2 - (1 + c_5)^2$. In any QFT, $\epsilon = 0$ is guaranteed and *unprovenly* utilized for fitting.

Free test of QFT along with the Bell tests

If $\epsilon \neq 0$ were observed, new paradigm beyond the QFT will be needed!

Free test of QFT along with the Bell tests

If $\epsilon \neq 0$ were observed, new paradigm beyond the QFT will be needed!

Free test of QFT along with the Bell tests

If $\epsilon \neq 0$ were observed, new paradigm beyond the QFT will be needed! *Time for data reanalysis is NOW!*

Summary

- The entangled fermion pair can be utilized for testing QE and BN. We found parity violation could significantly modify the spin correlations of the bipartite system for both spin-0 and spin-1 particles.
- ✤ The largely overlooked environmental effect was examined and we found a spurious P and/or CP violation of $O(10^{-4} \sim 10^{-3})$ can be induced. This has to be subtracted for a genuine determination of P and CP violation at a future high-lumi lepton collider.
- ✤ We also propose a free test of the QFT framework using the simplest spin-0 decay and encourage our experimental colleagues to do such tests NOW.

ρ **constraints**

Rotational invariance puts constraints on the generic form of *R*:

$$
B_1(\hat{\boldsymbol{p}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{k}}) = \hat{\boldsymbol{p}}b_{1p}(\omega) + \hat{\boldsymbol{k}}b_{1k}(\omega) + \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}b_{1n}(\omega),
$$

\n
$$
B_2(\hat{\boldsymbol{p}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{k}}) = \hat{\boldsymbol{p}}b_{2p}(\omega) + \hat{\boldsymbol{k}}b_{2k}(\omega) + \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}b_{2n}(\omega),
$$

\n
$$
C^{ij}(\hat{\boldsymbol{p}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{k}}) = \delta^{ij}c_0(\omega) + \epsilon^{ijk} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{p}}^k c_1(\omega) + \hat{\boldsymbol{k}}^k c_2(\omega) + \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}^k c_3(\omega) \right) + \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{p}}^i \hat{\boldsymbol{p}}^j - \frac{1}{3} \delta^{ij} \right) c_4(\omega) + \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{k}}^i \hat{\boldsymbol{k}}^j - \frac{1}{3} \delta^{ij} \right) c_5(\omega)
$$

\n
$$
+ \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{p}}^i \hat{\boldsymbol{k}}^j + \hat{\boldsymbol{k}}^i \hat{\boldsymbol{p}}^j - \frac{2}{3} \omega \delta^{ij} \right) c_6(\omega) + \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{p}}^i \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}^j + \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}^i \hat{\boldsymbol{p}}^j \right) c_7(\omega) + \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{k}}^i \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}^j + \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}^i \hat{\boldsymbol{k}}^j \right) c_8(\omega),
$$

Further constraints from discrete symmetries such as P and CP:

$$
b_{1p}(\omega) = b_{2p}(\omega) = b_{1k}(\omega) = b_{2k}(\omega) = c_1(\omega) = c_2(\omega) = c_7(\omega) = c_8(\omega) = 0, \quad \text{(from P invariance)}
$$

 $b_{1m}(\omega) = b_{2m}(\omega)$, $m = p, k, n$ and $c_i(\omega) = 0$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. (from CP invariance)

ρ **for the spin-1 case**

The spin density matrix for a spin-1 decay process:

$$
\vec{B}^{\pm} = \frac{1}{\bar{N}} \sqrt{1 - y_m^2} \left(y_m c_{\theta} \hat{p} + (1 + (1 - y_m) c_{\theta}^2) \hat{k} \right) \text{Re}\left(\frac{F_A}{F_V} \right) ,
$$
\n
$$
C_{ij} = \frac{1}{\bar{N}} \left[\frac{1}{3} \bar{N} \delta_{ij} + (1 - (1 - y_m^2) \left| \frac{F_A}{F_V} \right|^2) (\hat{p}_i \hat{p}_j - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij}) - ((1 - y_m) c_{\theta} (1 - (1 + y_m) \left| \frac{F_A}{F_V} \right|^2)) (\hat{p}_i \hat{k}_j + \hat{k}_i \hat{p}_j - \frac{2}{3} c_{\theta} \delta_{ij}) \right.
$$
\n
$$
+ (1 - y_m) \left(1 + c_{\theta}^2 (1 - y_m) \right) (\hat{k}_i \hat{k}_j - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij}) + \sqrt{1 - y_m^2} s_{\theta} \left((\hat{p}_i \hat{n}_j + \hat{n}_i \hat{p}_j) - (1 - y_m) c_{\theta} (\hat{k}_i \hat{n}_j + \hat{n}_i \hat{k}_j) \right) \text{Im}\left(\frac{F_A}{F_V} \right) \right] ,
$$
\n
$$
\bar{N} = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + c_{\theta}^2 + y_m^2 s_{\theta}^2 + (1 - y_m^2) (1 + c_{\theta}^2) \left| \frac{F_A}{F_V} \right|^2 \right],
$$

 $y_m =$ 2*mf mV*