

Simulating nonlocal no-signaling boxes

Mátyás Koniorczyk¹, Péter Naszvadi¹, András Bodor¹, Ottó Hanyecz^{1,2},
Peter Adam^{1,3}, and Miklós Pintér⁴

¹Department of Quantum Optics and Quantum Information, Institute for Solid State Physics and Optics, Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary

²Department of Computer Algebra, Faculty of Informatics, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary

³Institute of Physics, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary

⁴Corvinus Center for Operational Research, Institute of Advanced Studies, Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary

December 12, 2022.

Abstract

We present a computer framework to simulate two-party boxes that exhibit nonclassical no-signaling correlations through a Web-based application programming interface (RESTful Web API). Unlike real quantum-based correlations, the simulated ones are not instantaneous and are created via communication with a trusted server. They can, however, be useful in a number of applications, including e.g. teaching the use of nonlocal correlations, designing and testing infocommunication systems, and engineering software interfaces for new quantum hardware. We demonstrate the use of the API via the simple implementation of the Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt game. Up to our knowledge no such a framework has been implemented or proposed thus far.

1 Introduction

The study of nonclassical correlations was triggered by the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox [9] raising a fundamental question of physics. The problem was first quantified by J.S. Bell [4] who studied a scenario of two separated parties are in hold of a physical system each, so that the two systems had interacted before. He pointed out that if the parties can choose between different measurements on their systems, the measurement results can show correlations that cannot be explained by the assumption of pre-shared randomness; this is reflected in the violation of certain inequalities. The underlying physical phenomenon is quantum entanglement [12, 5]. Notably the correlations obey the no-signaling property: they cannot be used for transmitting information between the parties. The first experiment to verify such correlations was proposed by Clauser, Horne,

Shimony, and Holt [8], however, it was an extremely hard task to produce such correlations with the technology of the 1960s.

The evolution of lasers and nonlinear optics in the 1990's, notably the availability of entangled photon pairs [16] has brought Bell-type correlations to the forefront of research interest. The structure of quantum and generic nonlocal no-signaling correlations has been broadly studied and understood [7]. Device-independent quantum cryptography, based on this kind of correlations, is now one of the most promising technologies, and a broad variety of protocols have been designed and demonstrated for numerous tasks, including secure key distribution [20], bit commitment [1], or digital signatures [19]. Quantum communication with satellites became now reality [23], and quantum communication networks are being built [21].

In spite of this tremendous development, quantum technologies are still expensive and not broadly accessible. While it is possible to understand various protocols based on their descriptions, an actual implementation leads to a deeper understanding. In addition, as the technology is still in an experimental phase, the current physical implementations are strongly tied to physical details, making them less transparent from the viewpoints of a system engineer, a programmer, or a mathematician. In fact, nonlocal no-signaling correlations, as a mathematical notion, can also be understood without any reference to any physical realization or motivation, following a device independent approach entirely based on the mathematical description of the behavior of "black boxes". The possible communication or cryptoprotocols based on such correlations are interesting *per se*, and can be useful even when implemented with simulated correlations.

In the present work we introduce a framework for simulating nonlocal no-signaling correlations with certain limitations. As it is based on the encrypted communication with a trusted server it cannot of course operate between really (that is, space-like) separated parties and the readout after the inputs is not instantaneous. On the other hand it does not suffer from certain limitations that physical implementations are facing, notably those of persistence. Moreover, it can simulate not only quantum correlations, but also supraquantum ones: those beyond quantum mechanical (i.e. physical) realizability.

As for the technical implementation, our service relies on RESTful WEB API technology; the dominant one in network services currently. A software library can be easily developed in virtually any development environment or programming language that hides the otherwise simple details of low-level API operation. This facilitates the implementation, development, and testing of any protocol based on nonlocal no-signaling correlations, the development of computer applications using such resources, etc.

The aforementioned library can be easily modified to use a physical device's API instead of the web-service based simulation. It is likely that if the quantum technology to physically implement certain nonlocal no-signaling correlations will mature, the physical devices will practically appear in a way similar to our present implementation to a software developer. In this way an application developed using our simulation framework can be easily modified to use physical hardware in the future as quantum communication devices become prevalent and affordable. Currently, on the other hand, it enables the development and testing of protocols without the need of the currently costly or not-yet-existent devices which can be readily converted to use new physical hardware as soon as it becomes actually available.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives a brief introduction to the theory of no-signaling boxes. In Section 3 we address the fundamental aspects of simulating no-signaling boxes, including some details which become the most apparent when a protocol

implemented in practice. Section 4 describes the system architecture and the key implementational details. Section 5 provides examples of the use of the service. In Section 6 conclusions are drawn and an outlook is provided.

2 Nonlocal boxes

Consider two parties, Alice and Bob, who are physically separated from each other so the communication between them is excluded, apart possibly from the following. They have access to a device (or, more precisely, a pair of devices) which generates pairs of random variates $(a, b) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ so that the variate a is available only for Alice while the other variate b is available only for Bob. Each output pair depends on an input pair, too, so that Alice’s input $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is entered by Alice locally, and so is Bob’s $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. The distribution of the output variates depends on the pair of (local) inputs $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ according to the conditional probability distribution $P(a, b|x, y)$. Such devices will be termed as a “pairs of boxes”, or simply a “box” in what follows. We will assume the sets \mathcal{A} , \mathcal{B} , \mathcal{X} , \mathcal{Y} to be finite. So far we allow for arbitrary correlations; many bipartite boxes would enable communication between the parties, though we will focus on those which do not in what follows.

When a box is used multiple times¹, the input pairs and the corresponding variate pairs have to be labeled. The labels k will be elements of an arbitrary index set \mathcal{K} , and the tuple (a_k, b_k, x_k, y_k) will be termed as the data of *transaction* k . We do not prescribe any ordering on the set \mathcal{K} , albeit in practical realizations it is frequently related to time, e.g. due to a causal ordering. We assume a Markovian property of the pair of boxes, namely, the probability distribution of the variates (a_k, b_k) in a given transaction k is entirely determined by x_k, y_k , and $P(a, b|x, y)$.

Let us now restrict our attention to those boxes, which cannot be used for the parties to communicate. This is the exclusion of signaling: it implies that Alice and Bob cannot use their box to implement a communication channel solely by using the boxes. In mathematical terms this can be expressed with the following no-signaling conditions:

$$\sum_b P(a, b|x, y) = P(a|x) \quad \forall y, \quad (1)$$

and similarly

$$\sum_a P(a, b|x, y) = P(b|y) \quad \forall x. \quad (2)$$

Note that these conditions imply the existence of local marginals of the joint conditional probability distribution. Hence, it is possible to operate the boxes asynchronously: Alice can provide x_k anytime, obtaining a_k immediately, and the same holds for Bob, y_k and b_k . The times of when a party use the box in a given transaction, and thus the order of the uses is independent. This property can also give rise to interesting protocols [6]. In what follows we will restrict ourselves to no-signaling boxes.

The notion of locality of a box pair is to consider those which can be realized with randomness shared in advance before the transaction. A scenario with such a box pair is illustrated in Fig. 1. Such boxes are described by conditional probability distributions

¹We note here that in some works a given transaction, i.e. a single use of a box is referred to as an instance of a box. When compared to those works, a “box” there is a “transaction” in our terminology, whereas a “box” there is a “type of our box” here.




Figure 1: A local box pair: it can be implemented with randomness shared in advance. The vertical dash-dotted line represents spatial separation, whereas the horizontal one represent difference in time. Thus there are two phases: the preparation of the box and the actual use. In the second phase no communication is allowed between the boxes.

that can be expressed as a convex combination of products of local deterministic boxes. A local deterministic box on Alice’s side assigns a given $a(x)$ to each x , whereas such a box at Bob’s side assigns a given $b(y)$ to each y ; their product is the parallel application of the two. Such a pair of boxes has a deterministic (Dirac) conditional probability distribution. Randomness shared in advance enables the realization of any convex combination of these distributions without any communication between the parties. Such boxes are termed as “local”.

No-signaling boxes form a significantly larger set than that of the local boxes. Therefore there exist “nonclassical correlations” which are interesting both fundamentally and in applications, and some of these can be realized with physical arrangements (i.e. quantum mechanically). Our simulation will address nonlocal no-signaling boxes in general. Boxes that can be realized physically include local boxes as a proper subset, and they are a proper subset of no-signaling boxes. The structure of the set of physically realizable boxes is defined by the laws of quantum mechanics, we will not go into detail but will show an example of this kind.

It can be expected that no-signaling boxes based on quantum entanglement will be prevalently available as a technology. Quantum-based boxes require the sharing of physical systems, but there is no interaction between the elements of the box during their operation. This scenario is depicted in Fig. 2.

The physical systems are particles; typically photons in case of many realizations. The parts of the system are initially at the same location, a source, and they are interacting, which results in an entangled state in some of their internal degrees of freedom, like the polarization of the two photons. The two subsystems are then sent to the parties Alice and Bob, who choose the measurements corresponding to the inputs x and y and carry them out on their particle to get a and b as the measurement result.

Notably, the operation is instantaneous: the parties obtain the (correlated) results immediately after sending the input to the box on both sides, even if the parties’ separation is spacelike, and thus there is no way to communicate. Whenever Alice and Bob carry out their measurements, the results are readily available right after the completion of the measurement of each party; there is no need to wait the minimum time that would allow




Figure 2: A quantum box pair, compare also with Fig. 1. The circles with upwards arrows inside represent quantum systems (e.g. particles); they are shared in advance. Due to their interaction at the source, they form pairs which are entangled. This enables the realization of nonlocal no-signaling correlation, albeit not the most general ones.

the two sites to communicate² This feature can be important in certain applications [17].

The measurement by each party is done solely on the particle available to the given party. Thus there is no interaction or communication between the boxes at the parties (after sharing the pair of particles). Nor there is any interaction or communication between the boxes of Alice and Bob. Thus it is guaranteed that no other party will know about the particular values of $x(y)$ and $a(b)$ but Alice (Bob).

Note also that from the no-signaling principle it follows that the two parties may carry out their respective measurements anytime, in arbitrary causal order, without synchronization. If Alice and Bob could store the particles for an arbitrarily long time, they could share enough entangled particle pairs in advance and they could choose freely when to make a given measurement. In practice, however, the coherence times of such particles is short, thus the entangled state is destroyed within a very short time. Hence, in practical scenarios they obtain the particles from a central source (e.g. via fibers or free-space propagation), and often there is a time synchronization to ensure that the measurements are associated with actual members of pairs. Hence, the realization of arbitrary timings, that is, using up pairs with different timing and ordering deliberately on the two sides has up to our knowledge not yet been explored in experiments, although it would not be impossible, apart from some challenges due to loss and decoherence.

Nonlocal no-signaling boxes realized with quantum systems are important for a number of proposed and already existing applications, including protocols of quantum- and device independent cryptography [20], game theory [14], etc. Altogether, currently the preparation of quantum-based box pairs is possible but is still an experimental and technological challenge. Hence, in order to collect experience with the use of such boxes, it is reasonable to create a simulator that can be used to experiment with them.

3 Simulating no-signaling boxes

Our goal is to simulate a pair of nonlocal no-signaling boxes whose behavior is described by a given conditional probability distribution $P(a, b|x, y)$. We define first what we mean

²Recall that information can only be propagated at a limited speed. There will be a “local” reaction time of the box, but this can be negligible.




Figure 3: The nonlocal box emulation scenario. A bidirectional communication is allowed between *the boxes* of Alice and Bob, via an encrypted channel, with a trusted server, during the whole process of using the box. Meanwhile Alice and Bob are still not able to communicate each other by using the box.

type	local	quantum	logical
shared randomness	yes	no	no
entanglement	no	yes	no
bidirectional secure communication	no	no	yes

Table 1: A comparison of resources needed to realize a local, a quantum, and a logical (emulated) no-signaling box pair.

by a logical implementation or simulation as opposed to the physical realizations. Then we describe the principle of the actual simulation algorithm.

3.1 Logical implementation

In our simulation scenario we accept that there is two-way communication between *the boxes* at the parties and a trusted server. This is depicted in Fig 3. We require, however, that while the boxes themselves communicate, the parties cannot use the box pair for sending any information: the simulated correlations are no-signaling from the actors' perspective. Otherwise speaking, the *correlations* themselves are nonlocal, regardless of the implementation. Hence, our simulation scenario can well be considered also as a *logical implementation* of a nonlocal box.

When comparing with the physical implementation, as a trivial consequence of being generated via communication the central server will have all information about the results, and also there is a need to wait for the completion of the communication with the central server before the result becomes known, so the formation of the correlations is certainly not instantaneous. On the other hand, because of the no-signaling principle, no synchronization assumed and the set of the transactions \mathcal{K} does not need to have a causal structure. As we will point out later, this feature is easily implemented in this framework.

As an additional benefit, it is certainly possible to simulate correlations that are no-signaling but cannot be realized quantum mechanically, such as a Popescu-Rohrlich (PR) box that will be described in Section 5 in detail. Assuming that the server is trusted, the communication between the server and the boxes is secure, and that the parties use the boxes according to the prescription, such an implementation can be interesting *per se*. We conclude this subsection with tabulating the required resources and the features of the various implementations in Tables 1 and 2.

type	local	quantum	logical
instantaneous	yes	yes	no
interaction-free	yes	yes	no
quantum confidential	yes	yes	no
quantum behaviors	no	yes	yes
supraquantum behaviors	no	no	yes

Table 2: A comparison of features offered by a local, a quantum, and a logical (emulated) no-signaling box pair.

3.2 Algorithm

Let us now describe the actual algorithm of the simulation. Assume first that Alice is the first to send her input, that is, she uses her box with the given transaction in time before Bob. (Recall that no synchronization is assumed but the transaction is uniquely identified by a value of k .) So Alice sends a particular x_k value in transaction k to the box. The result a_k of the box is drawn according to the local marginal

$$P(a|x = x_k) = \sum_b P(a, b|x = x_k, y = \bar{y}) \quad (3)$$

where $\bar{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$ is an arbitrary fixed y (due to the no-signaling condition in Eq. (1) any element can be chosen). The respective value of the random variate x_k is sent to Alice, while the triple (k, x, a) is stored in the database.

If Bob provides his input (k, y_k) later and asks for his output b_k , it is a random variate drawn according to the conditional distribution

$$P(b|a = a_k, x = x_k, y = y_k) = \frac{P(b, a_k|x = x_k, y = y_k)}{P(a_k|x = x_k, y = y_k)}, \quad (4)$$

where

$$P(a_k|x = x_k, y = y_k) = \sum_b P(b, a = a_k|x = x_k, y = y_k). \quad (5)$$

and the transaction is completed (after storing all details in the database). As the protocol is symmetric, when Bob is the first to initiate transaction k , the roles are reverted but the procedure is the same.

In a software implementation of this simulation it is therefore vital to ensure the following condition. When transaction k has been initiated by Alice, no reply to Bob can be generated before the transaction has concluded for Alice, that is, before a is generated and (k, x_k, a_k) has been stored. The same holds for Bob's initiation of transaction k for (k, y_k, b_k) . Using conventional relation database management, this can be ensured by locking the table of transactions, or at least transaction k whenever it is acted upon on behalf of either of the parties.

Note that there can be two kinds of actions: if the transaction was already initiated by the other party then we use the joint probability with the known condition, whereas if it wasn't we just use the local marginal but keep the given input. Looking at the empirical marginals ex post, they will follow the local marginal distributions that exist because of the no-signaling condition.




Figure 4: UML[2] component diagram of the software architecture.

4 Implementation

In this Section we describe the software architecture that has been used for the implementation. The components of the IT architecture are depicted in Figure 4. The simulation is based on a central service run on a server. The service provides a RESTful API to clients, using HTTP GET requests with URL parameters, and returning the result in JSON format. (An example of a session will be presented later.)

The server component realizes a component needed for user authentication and management, and a component that realizes the PR box emulator described in Section 3.2. Both of the components use the same underlying relational database which they communicate via its standard internal interface.

The server component is implemented in Python programming language. It is based on SQLAlchemy [3] as an object-relational mapper and Flask [10] as the WEB API provider framework. The currently running beta version uses PostgreSQL [11] as a relational database manager. The random variates used by the server at the time of writing this paper are obtained from a "Quantis" USB Quantum Random Number Generator, model "USB-4M", manufactured by "ID Quantique"[13] with the serial number 184443A410. The Python library for accessing this device was also developed in the framework of the present project[15]. At the time of the publication of this article as an e-print, the beta version will be available for the public after a free registration, for academic and educational purposes [22].

Owing to the use of a standard API, a client can be any device running any software that is capable of consuming RESTful APIs at a basic level. Hence the possible client implementations and devices range from tutorial codes in various programming languages through smartphone applications to test crypto protocol implementations. A screenshot of a simple desktop graphical user interface is to be found in Fig. 5




Figure 5: A simple desktop graphical user interface for the logical nonlocal box implementation

$x \downarrow y \rightarrow$ $a \downarrow b \rightarrow$		0		1	
		0	1	0	1
0	0	1	-1	1	-1
	1	-1	1	-1	1
1	0	1	-1	-1	1
	1	-1	1	1	-1

$x \downarrow y \rightarrow$ $a \downarrow b \rightarrow$		0		1	
		0	1	0	1
0	0	1/2	0	1/2	0
	1	0	1/2	0	1/2
1	0	1/2	0	0	1/2
	1	0	1/2	1/2	0

Table 3: The payoff function of the CHSH game (top) and the PR-box, the no-signaling behavior maximizing it (bottom).

5 Demonstration

In this section we demonstrate the use of simulated no-signaling correlations by implementing the so-called Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt (CHSH) game [8, 14]. It can be considered as a tutorial project with pairs of participants who implement their box pair, and then play the game with and without using it.

The game itself is the following. The two players, Alice and Bob are separated and are not allowed to communicate. In each turn of the game Alice randomly chooses an input x which is 0 or 1, while Bob randomly chooses an input y which is 0 or 1. Importantly, they have to be really honest about choosing these with a uniform distribution. Alternatively they can be provided these inputs by a trusted source. Then Alice says an output a , Bob says an output b . They both get a unit of reward in the following two cases: if both of them chose 1 as input ($x = y = 1$), and their output is the opposite, i.e. $a = 1, b = 0$ or $a = 0, b = 1$, or if any of them had 0 as an input, and their outputs a and b are same. Otherwise there is a unit of negative payoff. The payoff function is thus the same for both parties; it is tabulated in Tab. 3.

This game is the so-called Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt (CHSH) game, which is behind the celebrated CHSH inequality. It can be proven that if Alice and Bob are not allowed to communicate and are restricted to use pre-shared randomness (even an infinite sequence of correlated random bits, shared before their separation), the best they can do is the following: they agree in advance to always say $a = 0$ ($b = 4$) regardless of their inputs x and y . In that case they will win in 75% of the cases, that is, in case of uniformly distributed input pairs they get 1 in 3/4 of the cases and -1 in 1/4 of them, so the average payoff will be 1/2. It can be proven that no other, even randomized strategy involving pre-shared randomness can result in a better payoff. This limit on the payoff is the Bell-CHSH inequality.

The limit of 1/2 on the average payoff can be overcome when the parties are allowed to use a pair of no-signaling boxes. The nonlocal no-signaling behavior of a box pair that enable Alice and Bob to obtain the maximal average payoff of 1, is also tabulated in Tab. 3; is called the Popescu-Rohrlich box. If they both feed their box with their inputs x and y and they provide the respective output a and b as the output, they will be positively rewarded in all the cases. It can be shown, however, that the access to such a box pair does not able to send any message or signal to the other. They get, however, coordinated without communication.

Let us now see how the gameplay is actually implemented using the API calls. (We will use the `curl` command available on most Linux systems to communicate the API with GET request. Alternatively, the URL can be written into the browser.)

1. Alice sends $x = 0$ as her input to box 1, a CHSH box. The transaction id is a date followed by a 3-digit zero-padded ordinal number.

```
curl --get 'https://nonlocalbox.wigner.hu/api/v1/
  useBox?boxID=1&transactionID=20211106001&x=0&
  apiKey=$ALICE_KEY '

{"a":1,"boxID":1,"status":0}
```

The box has emitted the reply $a = 1$. The zero `status` implies that there is no error.

2. Let now Bob send $y = 0$. Note that for $x = y = 0$ the results should be correlated, so Bob should get $b = 1$. And indeed,

```
curl --get 'https://nonlocalbox.wigner.hu/api/v1/
  useBox?boxID=1&transactionID=20211106001&y=0&
  apiKey=$BOB_KEY '

{"b":1,"boxID":1,"status":0}
```

3. In a next transaction (with an incremented ID), Bob will be the first to send $y = 1$:

```
curl --get 'https://nonlocalbox.wigner.hu/api/v1/
  useBox?boxID=1&transactionID=20211106002&y=1&
  apiKey=$BOB_KEY '

{"b":1,"boxID":1,"status":0}
```

The box gave $b = 1$.

4. Now assume that Alice also opts for $x = 1$, thus the results should be anticorrelated, i.e. $a = 0$ should be obtained. And indeed:

```
curl --get 'https://nonlocalbox.wigner.hu/api/v1/
  useBox?boxID=1&transactionID=20211106002&x=1&
  apiKey=$ALICE_KEY '
```

```
{"a":0,"boxID":1,"status":0}
```

Note that both parties obtain a uniformly distributed random result for their inputs, when observed just locally. However, when analyzed together, the expected joint conditional probability of the CHSH nonlocal box can be observed. We encourage the reader to register for the service and verify this.

6 Conclusions

We have reported on the design and implementation of a RESTful WEB API service that implements nonlocal no-signaling correlations logically. Thereby it is capable of simulating nonlocal quantum correlations that are perhaps the most intriguing features of quantum mechanics and are essential ingredients of most applications in quantum information and communication, notably in device independent quantum cryptography. The described web service has also been implemented by us and we made it available to the community [22].

From the point of view of scientific research, one of our contributions is the algorithm that implements no-signaling correlations using a central trusted resource: we have not seen it before in the literature. The discussion of the asynchronous nature of no-signaling correlations can also be considered as a minor contribution of this kind. While it is mentioned in some previous contributions, probably because of its difficult implementation in quantum experiments, it gained less attention before. During the development we report here, this has lead us to finding the first known application in which the non-sequential use of nonlocal no-signaling resources is useful [6].

From the technological point of view our contribution makes nonlocal no-signaling correlations readily available using the perhaps most commonly used web service technology. This can serve as a test and development environment for applications, even those designed for physical realizations of quantum correlations; device independent cryptographic protocols for instance. The API technology paves the way of designing a broad range of applications ranging from demonstrations on various platforms as well as practically useful ones, possibly.

Finally, from the dissemination point of view we believe that our API is an enabler in the experience-based teaching of nonclassical correlations and Bell-type quantum phenomena. At the time of writing of this paper, this application of our API is being tested in a high-school environment, and a mobile phone application is planned to increase the dissemination impact. We hope that these will help a number of people to understand the basics of the phenomena whose experimental study has lead to the Nobel prize in Physics awarded in 2022 [18].

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the National Research, Development, and Innovation Office of Hungary under project numbers K133882 and K124351 and the Ministry of Innovation and Technology and the National Research, Development and Innovation Office within the Quantum Information National Laboratory of Hungary and the Thematic Excellence Programme. M.K. wants to thank László Pere for inspiring discussions.

References

- [1] N Aharon, S Massar, S Pironio, and J Silman. Device-independent bit commitment based on the CHSH inequality. *New Journal of Physics*, 18(2):025014, feb 2016.
- [2] Sinan Si Alhir. *Learning UML*. O’Reilly, 2003.
- [3] Michael Bayer. Ssqlalchemy. In Amy Brown and Greg Wilson, editors, *The Architecture of Open Source Applications Volume II: Structure, Scale, and a Few More Fearless Hacks*. aosabook.org, 2012.
- [4] J. S. Bell. On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox. *Physics Physique Fizika*, 1:195–200, Nov 1964.
- [5] Ingemar Bengtsson and Karol Zyczkowski. *Geometry of Quantum States*. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- [6] András Bodor, Orsolya Kálmán, and Mátyás Koniorczyk. Error-free interconversion of nonlocal boxes. *Phys. Rev. A*, 106:012223, Jul 2022.
- [7] Nicolas Brunner, Daniel Cavalcanti, Stefano Pironio, Valerio Scarani, and Stephanie Wehner. Bell nonlocality. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 86:419–478, Apr 2014.
- [8] John F. Clauser, Michael A. Horne, Abner Shimony, and Richard A. Holt. Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 23:880–884, Oct 1969.
- [9] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen. Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete? *Phys. Rev.*, 47:777–780, May 1935.
- [10] Miguel Grinberg. *Flask web development: developing web applications with python*. ” O’Reilly Media, Inc.”, 2018.
- [11] The PostgreSQL Global Development Group. PostgreSQL relational database. <https://www.postgresql.org>. Accessed: 2022-10-26.
- [12] Ryszard Horodecki, Paweł Horodecki, Michał Horodecki, and Karol Horodecki. Quantum entanglement. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 81:865–942, Jun 2009.
- [13] ID Quantique. Quantis quantum random number generators (manufacturer’s website). <https://www.idquantique.com/random-number-generation/products/quantis-random-number-generator>, 2019. Accessed: 2022-03-07.

- [14] Mátyás Koniorczyk, András Bodor, and Miklós Pintér. Ex ante versus ex post equilibria in classical bayesian games with a nonlocal resource. *Phys. Rev. A*, 101:062115, Jun 2020.
- [15] Mátyás Koniorczyk. A python module for the quantis usb legacy quantum random generator. https://github.com/kmatyas-wig/quantis_rand, 2021. Accessed: 2012-03-07.
- [16] Paul G. Kwiat, Klaus Mattle, Harald Weinfurter, Anton Zeilinger, Alexander V. Sergienko, and Yanhua Shih. New high-intensity source of polarization-entangled photon pairs. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 75:4337–4341, Dec 1995.
- [17] Pierfrancesco La Mura. Correlated equilibria of classical strategic games with quantum signals. *International Journal of Quantum Information*, 3(1):183–188, 2005.
- [18] Nobel Prize Outreach. The Nobel prize in physics 2022. <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/physics/2022/summary>. Accessed: 2022-10-26.
- [19] G. L. Roberts, M. Lucamarini, Z. L. Yuan, J. F. Dynes, L. C. Comandar, A. W. Sharpe, A. J. Shields, M. Curty, I. V. Puthoor, and E. Andersson. Experimental measurement-device-independent quantum digital signatures. *Nature Communications*, 8(1):1098, October 2017.
- [20] René Schwonnek, Koon Tong Goh, Ignatius W. Primaatmaja, Ernest Y.-Z. Tan, Ramona Wolf, Valerio Scarani, and Charles C.-W. Lim. Device-independent quantum key distribution with random key basis. *Nature Communications*, 12(1):2880, may 2021.
- [21] Christoph Simon. Towards a global quantum network. *Nature Photon*, 11(11):678–680, oct 2017.
- [22] The Wigner nonlocal box emulator API (website). <https://wigner.hu/nonlocalbox/>, 2022. Will be available around the publication of the present e-print.
- [23] Giuseppe Vallone, Davide Bacco, Daniele Dequal, Simone Gaiarin, Vincenza Luceri, Giuseppe Bianco, and Paolo Villoresi. Experimental satellite quantum communications. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 115:040502, Jul 2015.