

# Impossibility of bipartite full nonlocality, all-versus-nothing proofs, and pseudo-telepathy in small Bell scenarios

Yuan Liu,<sup>1</sup> Ho Yiu Chung,<sup>1</sup> Emmanuel Zambrini Cruzeiro,<sup>2</sup> Junior R. Gonzales-Ureta,<sup>3</sup> Ravishankar Ramanathan,<sup>1,\*</sup> and Adán Cabello<sup>4,5,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Computer Science, The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong

<sup>2</sup>Instituto de Telecomunicações, 1049-001 Lisbon, Portugal

<sup>3</sup>Department of Physics, Stockholm University, 10691 Stockholm, Sweden

<sup>4</sup>Departamento de Física Aplicada II, Universidad de Sevilla, E-41012 Sevilla, Spain

<sup>5</sup>Instituto Carlos I de Física Teórica y Computacional, Universidad de Sevilla, E-41012 Sevilla, Spain

We show that the following statements are equivalent: (i) A quantum correlation  $p$  is in a face of the nonsignaling polytope that does not contain local points. (ii)  $p$  has local fraction zero; i.e.,  $p$  has full nonlocality (FN). (iii)  $p$  provides an all-versus-nothing (AVN) or Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger-like proof of nonlocality. (iv)  $p$  is a pseudo telepathy (PT) strategy. These connections imply that a long-standing question posed by Gisin, Méthot, and Scarani of whether quantum PT is possible with minimal requirements is fundamental for quantum information, quantum computation, and foundations of quantum mechanics, and can be addressed by a variety of strategies. Here, by combining different methods, we show that the answer is negative: according to quantum mechanics, nature does not allow for FN/AVN/PT in the  $(3, 3; 3, 2)$  Bell scenario. Moreover, we show that FN/AVN/PT is also impossible in  $(3, 2; 3, 4)$ . We also study  $(3, 3; 3, 3)$  and found no example of FN/AVN/PT. We discuss the implications of these results and further applications of the methods presented.

**Introduction.**—Bell nonlocality [1] is arguably the most fascinating of the predictions of quantum mechanics (QM). It also has many applications, ranging from secure communication [2] and randomness amplification [3] to self-testing of quantum devices [4] and reduction of communication complexity [5]. However, perhaps its most important role is to serve as a guide to understanding where does QM come from [6]. This is so because the sets of quantum nonlocal correlations for different Bell scenarios (with different number of parties, inputs, and outputs) provide a detailed signature that can be used to identify what is the physical principle that explains the origin of QM [7]. The problem we are interested in is strongly related to that, as it has been noticed [8, 9] that the best way to understand the set of quantum correlations in a small Bell scenario is to think about it as a “shadow” of the set of quantum correlations in a larger Bell scenario in which QM shows its “full power” in a sense that will be clear soon. This full power can be understood following four, in principle different, approaches.

**First approach: The geometry of the set of quantum correlations.**—Let  $p(a, b|x, y)$  be a correlation (or behavior [10] or empirical model [11]) for a bipartite Bell scenario. Let  $x \in X$  and  $y \in Y$  be Alice’s and Bob’s measurement settings, respectively. Let  $a \in A$  and  $b \in B$  be Alice’s and Bob’s outcomes, respectively. If  $p(a, b|x, y)$  violates a Bell inequality, then  $p(a, b|x, y)$  is outside the local polytope (the set of all local realistic correlations) and inside the nonsignaling (NS) polytope (the set of all correlations satisfying NS) [12]. Using the results in [13, 14], it can be proven that neither QM [15] nor any theory that assigns probabilities to sharp observables can attain a nonlocal vertex of a NS polytope. In fact, e.g., the maximum quantum violation of the Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt (CHSH) Bell inequality [16] is very far from




FIG. 1. (a) In the  $(2, 2; 2, 2)$  Bell scenario, the correlation  $p_{\text{CHSH}}(a, b|x, y)$  is in the boundary of the set of quantum correlations and maximally violates the CHSH Bell inequality [16] that defines the boundary of the local polytope. However,  $p_{\text{CHSH}}(a, b|x, y)$  is far from the boundary of the nonsignaling (NS) polytope. Also in  $(2, 2; 2, 2)$ ,  $p_{\text{H}}(a, b|x, y)$  which corresponds to the optimal proof of nonlocality of Hardy [21], is in a face of the NS polytope that contains a local point [17]. (b) In the  $(3, 4; 3, 4)$  Bell scenario, the correlation  $p(a, b|x, y)$  is in the boundary of the set of quantum correlations, maximally violates a Bell inequality, and is in a face of the NS polytope that has no local points [18].

the faces of the NS polytope; see Fig. 1 (a). If we denote by  $(|X|, |A|; |Y|, |B|)$  the bipartite Bell scenario where Alice has  $|X|$  settings, each of them with  $|A|$  outputs, and Bob has  $|Y|$  settings, each of them with  $|B|$  outputs, then the CHSH scenario is the  $(2, 2; 2, 2)$  Bell scenario. In the CHSH scenario, QM can produce nonlocal correlations in a face of the NS polytope. However, it is a face that contains local points [17]; see Fig. 1 (a). Remarkably, QM can produce bipartite nonlocal correlations in a face of the NS polytope that does not contain local points [18]; see Fig. 1 (b). The simplest example we know occurs in the  $(3, 4; 3, 4)$  Bell scenario [18] and was introduced in [19, 20].

**Second approach: Quantifying nonlocality.**—Given a quantum nonlocal correlation  $p(a, b|x, y)$ , we can consider all possible decompositions of the form

$$p(a, b|x, y) = q_L p_L(a, b|x, y) + (1 - q_L) p_{NL}(a, b|x, y), \quad (1)$$

\* ravi@cs.hku.hk

† adan@us.es

in terms of local correlations  $p_L(a, b|x, y)$  and NS correlations  $p_{NL}(a, b|x, y)$ , with respective weights  $q_L$  and  $1 - q_L$ , and  $0 \leq q_L \leq 1$ . The local fraction [22] of  $p(a, b|x, y)$ , denoted  $l_f$ , is the maximum local weight over all decompositions of the form (1). That is,  $l_f \doteq \max_{\{p_L, p_{NL}\}} q_L$ . The nonlocal fraction, defined as  $1 - l_f$  is a measure of the nonlocality of  $p(a, b|x, y)$ . If  $1 - l_f = 0$ , then the correlation is local. If  $1 - l_f = 1$ , then the correlation is fully nonlocal (FN) [18] (or strongly contextual [11], or strongly nonlocal [23]). There are quantum information protocols that require bipartite FN correlations [24–28].

*Third approach: All-vs-nothing nonlocality.*—In foundations of QM, the proof of impossibility of local hidden variables of Greenberger, Horne, and Zeilinger (GHZ) [29] has a remarkable property: it relies on a simple algebraic argument based on certain events never occur. The original proof required four parties [29]. Mermin simplified it to three [30]. A similar proof, but with only two parties, was introduced in [19, 20]. Mermin coined the name all-versus-nothing (AVN) for this type of proofs [31]. The tripartite case stimulated experiments with trios of entangled photons [32] and trapped ions [33, 34]. The bipartite proof stimulated experiments with pairs of hyperentangled photons [18, 35–37].

The characteristic feature of AVN proofs can be summarized as follows. For simplicity, we will focus on the bipartite case, which can be easily extended to scenarios with more parties. A table of zeros for the  $(|X\rangle, |A\rangle; |Y\rangle, |B\rangle)$  Bell scenario is a matrix with  $|X| \times |A|$  rows and  $|Y| \times |B|$  columns containing either zeros or empty entries. A zero in the entry  $(a, b|x, y)$  indicates that the probability of event  $(a, b|x, y)$  is zero. An AVN proof is a quantum correlation that produces a table of zeros that cannot be realized by any local hidden (LHV) variable model. Specifically, given  $S = S_A \cup S_B$ , with  $S_A = \{(a|x)\}_{x \in X, a \in A}$  and  $S_B = \{(b|y)\}_{y \in Y, b \in B}$ , a table of zeros is not realizable by any LHV if, for every assignment  $f : S \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  satisfying  $\sum_a f(a|x) = 1, \forall x \in X$ , and  $\sum_b f(b|y) = 1, \forall y \in Y$ , there is a pair  $\{(a|x), (b|y)\}$  for which  $f(a|x) = f(b|y) = 1$  and  $p(a, b|x, y) = 0$ .

*Fourth approach: Nonlocal games and pseudo telepathy.*—A bipartite nonlocal game [38] is a 4-tuple  $G = (X \times Y, A \times B, \pi, W)$ , where  $X$  ( $Y$ ) is the input set of the first player, Alice (the second player, Bob),  $A$  ( $B$ ) is the corresponding set of outputs,  $\pi(X \times Y)$  is the distribution of inputs, and  $W(X \times Y, A \times B) \in \{0, 1\}$  is the winning condition, i.e., the condition that inputs and outputs should satisfy to win the game. Consequently, the winning probability of the game is given by

$$\omega(G) = \sum_{x, y, a, b} \pi(x, y) p(a, b|x, y) W(a, b, x, y). \quad (2)$$

The game  $G$  allows for a perfect quantum pseudo telepathy (PT) strategy [39, 40] if a quantum correlation  $p(a, b|x, y)$  allows Alice and Bob to win every round of  $G$ . That is, if  $W(a, b, x, y) = 1$  for all  $(a, b|x, y)$  such that  $p(a, b|x, y) \neq 0$ . In other words, there is a quantum PT strategy whenever the quantum winning probability is  $\omega_Q(G) = 1$ , while using any classical strategy (that does not involve communication between Alice and Bob) the winning probability is

$\omega_C(G) < 1$ . The advantage of PT is qualitatively different than the advantage QM provides for other nonlocal games (e.g., for the CHSH game [16]) for which  $\omega_C(G) < \omega_Q(G)$ , but  $\omega_Q(G) < 1$ . This explains why quantum PT strategies have a special status in foundations of quantum computation and play a crucial role in the proofs of some fundamental results such as the quantum computational advantage for shallow circuits [41] and  $\text{MIP}^* = \text{RE}$  [42].

*The first question of Gisin, Méthot, and Scarani.*—In the context of nonlocal games, Cleve *et al.* proved that, for bipartite quantum PT, the minimal cardinality of the set of outputs  $A \times B$  is  $3 \times 2$  [43]. Then, Gisin, Méthot, and Scarani (GMS) proved that, for bipartite quantum PT, the set of inputs  $X \times Y$  cannot be of cardinality  $2 \times n$ , for any  $n$  [44]. GMS left as an “open question of interest,” whether bipartite quantum PT is possible with “minimal requirements” (i.e.,  $3 \times 3$  inputs and  $3 \times 2$  outputs) [44].

*Equivalence between the four approaches.*—The reason why the question of GMS is interesting beyond nonlocal games is because it also affects foundations of QM, quantum information, and quantum computation. This follows from the following.

**Theorem 1.** *The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *A quantum correlation  $p$  is in a face of the nonsignaling polytope that does not contain local points.*
- (ii)  *$l_f(p) = 0$ , i.e.,  $p$  has full nonlocality.*
- (iii)  *$p$  provides an all-versus-nothing proof.*
- (iv)  *$p$  is a pseudo telepathy strategy.*

*Proof.* The equivalence between (i) and (ii) follows from the observation that  $l_f$  is a geometric measure of nonlocality with respect to the local and NS polytopes. By definition of  $l_f$ , any point outside the local set that either is not in the NS polytope or is in a face that has local points must have  $0 < l_f < 1$ . For example, for the maximum quantum violation of the CHSH Bell inequality,  $l_f = 2 - \sqrt{2} \approx 0.586$ , while for the optimal Hardy correlation [21], which is in a face with local points [17],  $12 - 5\sqrt{5} \approx 0.820$ ; see Fig. 1 (a). In contrast, if the correlation is in a face with no local points, then  $l_f = 0$ ; see Fig. 1 (b).

The equivalence between (iii) and (iv) follows from the observation that a quantum correlation  $p(a, b|x, y)$  yields  $\omega_C(G) < \omega_Q(G) = 1$  if and only if its table of zeros cannot be realized by any LHV variable model.

The equivalence between (ii) [(and (i))] and (iv) [(and (iii))] can be proven as follows. To prove that (iv) implies (ii), let us observe that, by (iv), there is a game  $G$  for which there is a quantum strategy (correlation)  $p$  that provides a winning probability  $\omega^{(p)}(G) = 1 = \omega_{NS}(G)$ , while  $\omega_C(G) < 1$ , where  $\omega_{NS}(G)$  is the winning probability allowed by NS correlations. Let us now consider any convex decomposition of  $p$  of the form (1). Then, by the linearity of the winning probability in Eq. (2),

$$\omega^{(p)}(G) = q_L \omega^{(p_L)}(G) + (1 - q_L) \omega^{(p_{NL})}(G), \quad (3)$$

where  $\omega^{(p_L)}(G)$  and  $\omega^{(p_{NL})}(G)$  are the winning probabilities using the local correlation  $p_L$  and the NS correlation  $p_{NL}$ ,

respectively. Since  $\omega^{(p)}(G) = 1$  and  $0 \leq \omega(G) \leq 1$ , then  $\omega^{(pL)}(G) = 1$  whenever  $0 < q_L$ . This contradicts the assumption that  $\omega_C(G) < 1$ . Therefore,  $q_L = 0$  in any convex decomposition of  $p$  of the form (1). That is,  $l_f = \max_{\{p_L, p_{NL}\}} q_L = 0$ .

To prove that (ii) implies (iv), let us observe that, by (ii),  $l_f(p) = 0$ . As shown in [45], the local fraction can be computed by the following linear program:

$$\begin{aligned} l_f(p) = \max \quad & \sum_i q_i \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_i q_i P_i^L \leq p \\ & q_i \geq 0 \quad \forall i. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Here,  $P_i^L$  correspond to vertices of the local polytope and  $\sum_i q_i P_i^L \leq p$  must be interpreted term by term. The dual of this linear program can be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_I \quad & \text{tr}(I^T p) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \text{tr}(I^T P_i^L) \geq 1 \quad \forall i \\ & I \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Again,  $I \geq 0$  must be interpreted term by term, and  $i$  runs over all vertices of the local polytope. By the strong duality theorem of linear programming [46], the dual and primal optima are equal when one of the two problems has an optimal solution [we have that  $\min_I \text{tr}(I^T p) = l_f(p) = 0$ ]. In other words,  $I$  defines a Bell expression  $\text{tr}(I^T p)$  whose minimum value in QM is the algebraic minimum 0 achieved by  $p$ , and whose minimum local value is  $\geq 1$ . Moreover, in order to achieve the algebraic minimum, the Bell expression  $I(a, b, x, y)$  has to have coefficients equal to zero for every  $p(a, b|x, y) > 0$ . This allows us to reformulate the Bell inequality for  $I(a, b, x, y)$  as a PT game  $G$ . The winning condition of  $G$  is

$$W(a, b, x, y) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } I(a, b, x, y) = 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

That is, by taking the complement of  $I$ , we obtain the game  $G$  with  $\omega_C(G) < 1$  and for which  $p$  provides  $\omega^{(p)}(G) = 1$ .

*First strategy.*—Theorem 1 allows us to address the question of GMS by combining different tools. Our first strategy is based on the geometric and information-theoretic approaches and the observation made in [44] that any *known* quantum PT strategy corresponds to a maximum violation of a tight Bell inequality.

**Theorem 2.** *Quantum mechanics does not allow for bipartite FN/AVN/PT maximally violating a tight Bell inequality using “the minimal requirements,” that is, in the (3, 3; 3, 2) Bell scenario.*

*Proof.* The set of classical correlations for the (3, 3; 3, 2) Bell scenario is fully described by a set of 25 classes of tight Bell inequalities [45, 47], the facets of the corresponding local polytope. Since we have the half-space representation of the local polytope (i.e., we have the local polytope defined as an




FIG. 2. Pentagram used in the game to demonstrate that games with PT strategies do not necessarily define tight Bell inequalities.

intersection of a finite number of half-spaces), we can calculate, for every facet, the corresponding quantum bound (or an upper bound of it) using the Navascués-Pironio-Acín (NPA) hierarchy [48]. We have found that for every facet, the quantum bound is strictly smaller than the NS bound. In [49] (Appendix A), we provide the local, quantum and NS bounds for each facet.  $\square$

*The second question of Gisin, Méthot, and Scarani.*—The problem of the first strategy is that it depends on an assumption that has not been proven, namely that FN/AVN/PT should correspond to a maximal violation of a tight Bell inequality. In fact, GMS left this question open in [44]: Do all PT games define tight Bell inequalities? Here, we provide a negative answer to this second question of GMS.

**Theorem 3.** *Games having quantum PT strategies do not always define tight Bell inequalities.*

The proof is based on a PT game in the (5, 8; 5, 8) Bell scenario. Consider the pentagram in Fig. 2. It has five edges and 10 vertices; four vertices in each edge. In each round of the game  $G$ , Alice and Bob are asked to output 1 or  $-1$  to each of the four vertices of one edge (not necessarily the same edge). That is, each party must output four bits. The conditions to win  $G$  are the following: (I) The product of the four outputs must be 1, except when the edge is  $\{A, B, C, D\}$ . In this case, the product must be  $-1$ . (II) If the parties are asked different edges, both parties must output the same value for the vertex at the intersection of the edges. (III) If the parties are asked the same edge, Alice’s four outputs must be the same as Bob’s respective outputs.

It is easy to see that, the classical winning probability is  $\omega_C(G) = \frac{23}{25}$ . However, the quantum correlation  $p$ , produced with two eight-dimensional systems in the state  $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \sum_{i=0}^7 |ii\rangle$ , and measuring, on each eight-dimensional system,  $A = X \otimes Z \otimes Z$ ,  $B = Z \otimes X \otimes Z$ ,  $C = Z \otimes Z \otimes X$ ,  $D = X \otimes X \otimes X$ ,  $ab = I \otimes I \otimes Z$ ,  $ac = I \otimes Z \otimes I$ ,  $ad = X \otimes I \otimes I$ ,  $bc = Z \otimes I \otimes I$ ,  $bd = I \otimes X \otimes I$ , and  $cd = I \otimes I \otimes X$ , where  $X$  and  $Z$  are the corresponding Pauli matrices, and  $I$  is the identity [31], gives  $\omega^{(p)}(G) = 1$  and thus provides a PT strategy.

However, the Bell inequality defined by the game  $G$  is not tight. To show it, let us denote the inputs as follows:  $0 : \{A, B, C, D\}$ ,  $1 : \{A, ab, ac, ad\}$ ,  $2 : \{ab, B, bc, bd\}$ ,

$3 : \{ac, bc, C, cd\}$ , and  $4 : \{ad, bd, cd, D\}$ . Then, the Bell inequality associated to  $G$  is

$$I_G = p(A = A|0, 1) + p(A = A|1, 0) + \dots + p(cd = cd|4, 3) + \sum_{x=0}^4 p(a = b|x = y) \leq 23, \quad (7)$$

where, e.g.,  $p(A = A|0, 1)$  is the probability that Alice's and Bob's output for vertex  $A$  are equal when Alice's input is 0 and Bob's input is 1.  $p(a = b|x = y)$  is the probability that Alice's and Bob's outputs are equal, one by one, when Alice's and Bob's inputs are the same. Inequality (7) is saturated by 628 local vertices, which span a subspace of dimension 460. However, the dimension of the NS space of the  $(5, 8; 5, 8)$  Bell scenario is 1295. Therefore, inequality (7) is not tight.

Moreover, this is not an isolate case. On the contrary. In [49] (Appendix C), we present a general method for lifting not facet-preserving (i.e., non-tight) Bell inequalities in which it holds the property that, if the original Bell inequality corresponds to a PT game, then the lifted Bell inequality is still a PT game.

*Second strategy.*—The second strategy to solve the first question of GMS is based on the observation that AVN proofs require correlations whose table of zeros cannot be realized classically. The idea is to identify all tables of zeros that cannot be realized classically unless one of the zeros is removed and then check whether these tables can be realized with a quantum correlation. We will refer to one of such tables as a critical nonlocal table of zeros (CNTZ). For example, a CNTZ in the  $(3, 2; 3, 3)$  Bell scenario is the following:

	$y$	0	1	2
$x$	$b$	0 1 2	0 1 2	0 1 2
	$a$			
0	0	0 0 -	- - -	- - -
	1	- - -	- - 0	0 - -
1	0	- - 0	- - -	- - -
	1	- - -	- - 0	0 - -
2	0	- - -	- - -	- 0 0
	1	- - -	0 0 -	- - -

Note that it is impossible to find  $f : \{(a|x)\}_{x \in X, a \in A} \cup S_B = \{(b|y)\}_{y \in Y, b \in B} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  satisfying  $\sum_a f(a|x) = 1$ ,  $\forall x \in X$ , and  $\sum_b f(b|y) = 1$ ,  $\forall y \in Y$ , without having a pair  $\{(a|x), (b|y)\}$  for which  $f(a|x) = f(b|y) = 1$  and  $p(a, b|x, y) = 0$ .

We wrote a Matlab program that produces all CNTZs, modulo relabelings of inputs, outputs, and parties. The version for  $(3, 3; 3, 2)$  is in [49] (Appendix D). We run this program on a high-performance computer and obtained 223 nonequivalent CNTZs for the  $(3, 3; 3, 2)$  Bell scenario.

To check the quantum realizability of each CNTZ, we used the NPA hierarchy at level 1 (or 2). We found that none of the CNTZs yielded a feasible solution to the corresponding semidefinite programming (SDP) problem in the NPA hierarchy.

Our program for producing all CNTZs relies on the structure of the Bell symmetric group [49] (Appendix E). The size

of the Bell symmetric group grows rapidly with the addition of more parties, inputs, or outputs. Consequently, the program becomes computationally too demanding for applying it to the  $(3, 3; 3, 3)$  and  $(3, 4; 3, 3)$  Bell scenarios. Nevertheless, for  $(3, 2; 3, 4)$ , we still can handle it by using, at a certain step of the program, a sub-group  $S'$  of the symmetric group  $S$ . This provides a faster convergence and results of a manageable size for the subsequent checking of the quantum realizability. See [49] (Appendix D) for details. Again, none of the CNTZs in  $(3, 2; 3, 4)$  were found to have a quantum realization. This proves the following.

**Theorem 4.** *Quantum mechanics does not allow for FN/AVN/PT neither in the  $(3, 3; 3, 2)$  nor in the  $(3, 2; 3, 4)$  Bell scenarios.*

*The  $(3, 3; 3, 3)$  Bell scenario.*—Theorem 4 goes beyond the original question of GMS and motivates trying to answer a more ambitious question: Is FN/AVN/PT possible in  $(3, 3; 3, 3)$ ? Recall that FN/AVN/PT is possible in  $(3, 4; 3, 4)$ . At this stage, none of our two strategies can provide exhaustive answers. However, we have computed the NS and quantum bounds for at least 4801183 classes of local facets in the  $(3, 3; 3, 3)$  Bell scenario and found no example of FN/AVN/PT. The lower bound on the number of classes was computed using the tally, i.e., the frequency of distinct coefficients in each inequality, from a total list of 8269146 facets. The quantum bounds were obtained at level  $1+AB$  in the NPA hierarchy.

*Conclusions and implications.*—We have shown that a long-standing question by Gisin, Méthot, and Scarani has fundamental importance beyond nonlocal games, since it affects quantum information, quantum computation, and foundations of QM. The reason why is the equivalence between statements (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv) in Theorem 1.

Then, we have proven that the first question of GMS has a negative answer: according to QM, FN/AVN/PT cannot happen in the  $(3, 3; 3, 2)$  Bell scenario. In addition, we have extended the study beyond the original question and proved that FN/AVN/PT cannot happen either in the  $(3, 2; 3, 4)$  Bell scenario. This result indicates that the only still open (symmetric) scenarios where FN/AVN/PT can happen are  $(3, 3; 3, 3)$ ,  $(3, 3; 4, 2)$ , and  $(3, 4; 3, 3)$ , since it is known that FN/AVN/PT can happen in  $(3, 3; 4, 4)$  [18, 20, 38].

In  $(3, 3; 3, 3)$ , we have explored millions of maximal quantum violations of tight Bell inequalities and found that FN/AVN/PT does not happen. However, this is not yet a proof that FN/AVN/PT is impossible  $(3, 3; 3, 3)$ .

Studying scenarios beyond the one involved in first question of GMS is important for several reasons. Before this work, it was known that FN/AVN/PT was impossible in  $(2, n; m, n)$  for any finite number of inputs  $m$  and outputs  $n$  [44]. Similarly, it was known that FN/AVN/PT was impossible in  $(m, 2; m, 2)$  for any finite number of inputs  $m$  [43]. However, if  $m$  tends to infinity, using a maximally entangled state, quantum correlations can be arbitrarily close to a face of the NS polytope with no local points [50]. After this work, we know that  $(3, 3; 3, 2)$  and  $(3, 3; 4, 2)$  do not allow for FN/AVN/PT, which means that, in these scenarios, there is a finite gap be-

tween quantum correlations and faces of the NS polytope that do not contain local points. This leads to the question of what is the maximum nonlocality (i.e., the minimum local fraction) that can be achieved in these scenarios and how is it achieved (with maximally entangled states or with partially entangled states). This question may shed light on the problem of the “anomaly” in quantum nonlocality, namely, the fact that, for some facets of  $(m, 2; m, 2)$ , the maximum quantum violation is not achieved using maximal entanglement [51]. In this work we have also partially answered the first question: the minimum local fraction allowed by QM in  $(3, 3; 3, 2)$  maximally violating a tight Bell inequality is  $l_f = 0.4019$ ; see [49] (Appendix A). However, more research is needed in these directions.

The main open problem, however, is whether FN/AVN/PT is possible in the  $(3, 3; 3, 3)$ ,  $(3, 3; 4, 2)$ , and  $(3, 4; 3, 3)$  Bell scenarios. The equivalence of approaches and the strategies introduced here have allowed us to push the limits. However, even these tools seem not to be powerful enough to answer this question. Sharper tools are needed.

We thank useful conversations with Mateus Araújo. This work was supported by the EU-funded project FoQaCiA and the MCINN/AEI (Project No. PID2020-113738GB-I00). E.Z.C. acknowledges funding by FCT/MCTES - Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (Portugal) - through national funds and when applicable co-funding by EU funds under the project UIDB/50008/2020, and FCT through project 2021.03707.CEECIND/CP1653/CT0002. J.R.G.U. acknowledges support from Akademikernas a-kassa (Sweden). L.Y., H.Y.C. and R.R. acknowledge support from the Early Career Scheme (ECS) grant “Device-Independent Random Number Generation and Quantum Key Distribution with Weak Random Seeds” (Grant No. 27210620), the General Research Fund (GRF) grant “Semi-device-independent cryptographic applications of a single trusted quantum system” (Grant No. 17211122), and the Research Impact Fund (RIF) “Trustworthy quantum gadgets for secure online communication” (Grant No. R7035-21). Some computations in this work were performed using research computing facilities offered by Information Technology Services, the University of Hong Kong. A.C. acknowledges support from the Wallenberg Center for Quantum Technology (WACQT).

- 
- [1] J. S. Bell, *Physics* **1**, 195 (1964).
  - [2] A. K. Ekert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 661 (1991).
  - [3] R. Colbeck, *Quantum and Relativistic Protocols for Secure Multi-Party Computation*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge (2006), [arXiv:0911.3814](https://arxiv.org/abs/0911.3814) [quant-ph].
  - [4] D. Mayers and A. Yao, *Quantum Info. Comput.* **4**, 273 (2004).
  - [5] Č. Brukner, M. Żukowski, J.-W. Pan, and A. Zeilinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 127901 (2004).
  - [6] J. A. Wheeler, in *Quantum Theory and Measurement*, edited by J. A. Wheeler and W. H. Zurek (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1983) pp. 182–213.
  - [7] S. Popescu and D. Rohrlich, *Found. Phys.* **24**, 379 (1994).
  - [8] A. Cabello, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 220402 (2015).
  - [9] A. Cabello, *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 032120 (2019).
  - [10] B. S. Cirel’son, *Hadron. J. Suppl.* **8**, 329 (1993).
  - [11] S. Abramsky and A. Brandenburger, *New J. Phys.* **13**, 113036 (2011).
  - [12] I. Pitowsky, *Quantum Probability-Quantum Logic*, Lecture Notes in Physics, Vol. 321 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989).
  - [13] A. Cabello, S. Severini, and A. Winter, [arXiv:1010.2163](https://arxiv.org/abs/1010.2163) [quant-ph] (2010).
  - [14] A. Cabello, S. Severini, and A. Winter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 040401 (2014).
  - [15] R. Ramanathan, J. Tuziemski, M. Horodecki, and P. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 050401 (2016).
  - [16] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 880 (1969).
  - [17] K. T. Goh, J. m. k. Kaniewski, E. Wolfe, T. Vértesi, X. Wu, Y. Cai, Y.-C. Liang, and V. Scarani, *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 022104 (2018).
  - [18] L. Aolita, R. Gallego, A. Acín, A. Chiuri, G. Vallone, P. Mataloni, and A. Cabello, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 032107 (2012).
  - [19] A. Cabello, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 1911 (2001).
  - [20] A. Cabello, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 010403 (2001).
  - [21] L. Hardy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 1665 (1993).
  - [22] A. C. Elitzur, S. Popescu, and D. Rohrlich, *Phys. Lett. A* **162**, 25 (1992).
  - [23] S. Abramsky, R. Barbosa, G. Carù, N. De Silva, K. Kishida, and S. Mansfield, in *12th Conference on the Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication, and Cryptography, TQC 2017*, Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics, LIPIcs, edited by M. Wilde (Schloss Dagstuhl- Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik GmbH, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany, 2018) pp. 9:1–9:20.
  - [24] T. S. Cubitt, D. Leung, W. Matthews, and A. Winter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 230503 (2010).
  - [25] K. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, M. Pawłowski, and M. Bourennane, [arXiv:1006.0468](https://arxiv.org/abs/1006.0468) [quant-ph] (2010).
  - [26] T. Vidick, [arXiv:1703.08508](https://arxiv.org/abs/1703.08508) [quant-ph].
  - [27] R. Jain, C. A. Miller, and Y. Shi, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **66**, 5567 (2020).
  - [28] Y.-Z. Zhen, Y. Mao, Y.-Z. Zhang, F. Xu, and B. C. Sanders, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 080801 (2023).
  - [29] D. M. Greenberger, M. A. Horne, and A. Zeilinger, in *Bell’s Theorem, Quantum Theory and Conceptions of the Universe* (Springer, 1989) pp. 69–72.
  - [30] N. D. Mermin, *Phys. Today* **43**, 9 (1990).
  - [31] N. D. Mermin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 1838 (1990).
  - [32] J.-W. Pan, D. Bouwmeester, M. Daniell, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zeilinger, *Nature (London)* **403**, 515 (2000).
  - [33] D. Leibfried, M. D. Barrett, T. Schaetz, J. Britton, J. Chiaverini, W. M. Itano, J. D. Jost, C. Langer, and D. J. Wineland, *Science* **304**, 1476 (2004).
  - [34] C. F. Roos, M. Riebe, H. Häffner, W. Hänsel, J. Benhelm, G. P. T. Lancaster, C. Becher, F. Schmidt-Kaler, and R. Blatt, *Science* **304**, 1478 (2004).
  - [35] C. Cinelli, M. Barbieri, R. Perris, P. Mataloni, and F. De Martini, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 240405 (2005).
  - [36] T. Yang, Q. Zhang, J. Zhang, J. Yin, Z. Zhao, M. Żukowski,

- Z.-B. Chen, and J.-W. Pan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 240406 (2005).
- [37] J.-M. Xu, Y.-Z. Zhen, Y.-X. Yang, Z.-M. Cheng, Z.-C. Ren, K. Chen, X.-L. Wang, and H.-T. Wang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 050402 (2022).
- [38] P. K. Aravind, *Am. J. Phys.* **72**, 1303 (2004).
- [39] G. Brassard, A. Broadbent, and A. Tapp, *Found. Phys.* **35**, 1877 (2005).
- [40] A. L. Broadbent, *Quantum Nonlocality, Cryptography and Complexity*, Ph.D. thesis, Université de Montréal (2008).
- [41] S. Bravyi, D. Gosset, and R. König, *Science* **362**, 308 (2018).
- [42] Z. Ji, A. Natarajan, T. Vidick, J. Wright, and H. Yuen, *Comm. ACM* **64**, 131 (2021).
- [43] R. Cleve, P. Høyer, B. Toner, and J. Watrous, in *Proceedings. 19th IEEE Annual Conference on Computational Complexity* (2004) pp. 236–249.
- [44] N. Gisin, A. A. Méthot, and V. Scarani, *Int. J. Quant. Inf.* **5**, 525 (2007).
- [45] T. Cope and R. Colbeck, *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 022114 (2019).
- [46] J. Matouek and B. Gärtner, *Understanding and Using Linear Programming* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006).
- [47] J. Jesus and E. Zambrini Cruzeiro, [arXiv:arXiv:2212.03212 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.03212) (2022).
- [48] M. Navascués, S. Pironio, and A. Acín, *New J. Phys.* **10**, 073013 (2008).
- [49] See Supplemental Material for a complete list of facets of the local polytope for  $(3, 3; 3, 2)$  (Appendix A), details on our search in  $(3, 3; 3, 3)$  (Appendix B), a method for lifting Bell inequalities without preserving tightness (Appendix C), an algorithm for obtaining CNTZs (Appendix D), and an introduction to the Bell symmetric group (Appendix E).
- [50] J. Barrett, A. Kent, and S. Pironio, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 170409 (2006).
- [51] A. Acín, T. Durt, N. Gisin, and J. I. Latorre, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 052325 (2002).
- [52] <http://cvxr.com/cvx/>.
- [53] <https://github.com/sqlp/sdpt3>.
- [54] M. Żukowski, D. Kaszlikowski, A. Baturó, and J.-Å. Larsson, [arXiv:quant-ph/9910058 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9910058) (1999).
- [55] S. Lörwald and G. Reinelt, *EURO Journal on Computational Optimization* **3**, 297 (2015).
- [56] [https://1drv.ms/f/s!AsQvM75z11kn2dkRU\\_5KnJcz3WhtMg?e=dhgiV8](https://1drv.ms/f/s!AsQvM75z11kn2dkRU_5KnJcz3WhtMg?e=dhgiV8).
- [57] S. Pironio, *J. Math. Phys.* **46**, 062112 (2005).
- [58] D. Collins and N. Gisin, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **37**, 1775 (2004).
- [59] J. East and J. Mitchell, *N. Z. J. Math.* **51**, 85 (2021).

Facet class	Name	$L$	$Q$ (NPA)	$NS$	$Q/NS$	$l_f$
1	CHSH	0.0	0.2071	0.5	0.4142	0.5858
2	$I_{[[2,3],[2,2,2]]}^1$	0	0.2532	0.6667	0.3798	0.6202
3	$I_{[[2,3],[2,2,2]]}^2$	0.0	0.2532	0.6667	0.3798	0.5858
4	$I_{2332}$	0.0	0.4142	1	0.4142	0.5858
5	$I_{3322}$	0.0	0.2509	1	0.2509	0.7499
6	$I_{3322}$	0.0	0.2509	1	0.2509	0.75
7	$I_{3322}$	0.0	0.2509	1	0.2509	0.5858
8	$I_{[[2,2,3],[2,2,2]]}^1$	0.0	0.4142	1	0.4142	0.5858
9	$I_{[[2,2,3],[2,2,2]]}^2$	0.0	0.4142	1	0.4142	0.5858
10	$I_{[[2,2,3],[2,2,2]]}^3$	1.0	1.3913	2	0.6956	0.6019
11	$I_{[[2,2,3],[2,2,2]]}^4$	0.0	0.3913	1	0.3913	0.6019
12	$I_{[[2,2,3],[2,2,2]]}^5$	1.0	1.3913	2	0.6956	0.6019
13	$I_{[[2,2,3],[2,2,2]]}^6$	0.0	0.3913	1	0.3913	0.6019
14	$I_{[[2,2,3],[2,2,2]]}^7$	0.0	0.4142	1	0.4142	0.5858
15	$I_{[[2,2,3],[2,2,2]]}^8$	0.0	0.4365	1.5	0.291	0.6441
16	$I_{[[2,3,3],[2,2,2]]}^1$	0.0	0.3015	0.75	0.402	0.4019
17	$I_{[[2,3,3],[2,2,2]]}^2$	0.0	0.3015	0.75	0.402	0.4019
18	$I_{[[2,3,3],[2,2,2]]}^3$	1.0	1.4145	2	0.7073	0.5858
19	$I_{[[2,3,3],[2,2,2]]}^4$	0.0	0.4145	1	0.4145	0.5858
20	$I_{[[2,3,3],[2,2,2]]}^5$	0.0	0.4365	1.5	0.291	0.6412
21	$I_{[[2,3,3],[2,2,2]]}^6$	0.0	0.4365	1.5	0.291	0.665
22	$I_{[[2,3,3],[2,2,2]]}^7$	0.0	0.3913	1	0.3913	0.6019
23	$I_{[[2,3,3],[2,2,2]]}^8$	0.0	0.3913	1	0.3913	0.6019
24	$I_{3332}$	0.0	0.4145	1	0.4145	0.5858

TABLE I. Table providing the local  $L$ , quantum  $Q$ , nonsignaling  $NS$  bounds for each class of facets of  $(3,3;3,2)$ . Two measures of the distance of the optimal quantum correlation to the nonsignaling set are also provided, the ratio  $Q/NS$  and the local fraction  $l_f$ .

#### Appendix A: Complete list of facets in $(3, 3; 3, 2)$

Table I shows the local (L), quantum (Q), and nonsignaling (NS) bounds for every nontrivial (excluding positivity) class of facet of the  $(3,3;3,2)$  Bell scenario. The names of the classes and inequalities follow those in [47]. Table I also includes two measures of nonlocality for the correlations that attain the maximum violation of these inequalities: the ratio between the quantum and NS bound ( $Q/NS$ ), and the local fraction  $l_f$  [22]. We see that class 18 exhibits the largest quantum to NS bound ratio, 70.73 %. More importantly, none of the optimal quantum strategies attains the optimal NS bound. The local fractions presented correspond to the optimal quantum strategies for ququarts, which saturate the NPA bound except in the case of the  $I_{3322}$  inequality, i.e., classes 5 to 7. To find the optimal quantum strategies, we employed a see-saw of SDP problems. We used Matlab's CVX [52] and the SDPT3 solver [53]. The local fractions were then calculated for the corresponding correlations using linear programming [54] [see Eq. (4)].

#### Appendix B: Search for FN/AVN/PT in $(3, 3; 3, 3)$

We studied the boundary of the quantum correlations for the  $(3, 3; 3, 3)$  Bell scenario using the same tools used for

(3, 3; 3, 2), namely, computing an upper bound to the maximal quantum violation of facet Bell inequalities and comparing this bound with the maximum value attained by NS correlations. However, the complete list of facets for (3, 3; 3, 3) is not known. A partial list containing 21170 facets was published in [45]. Here we enlarged this previous list by running PANDA [55] using high performance computing (HPC), using as additional input the known facet inequalities. We obtained a partial list of 8269146 facets that can be found in [56]. By computing the tally for each facet, we find that there are at least 4801183 classes in the list. Using HPC, we were able to calculate the quantum bound and NS value for every facet, verifying that in none of the cases there was FN/AVN/PT.

### Appendix C: Non-facet preserving lifting of Bell inequalities

In [57], Pironio introduced a method for “lifting” a Bell inequality in a given Bell scenario into a Bell inequality in a Bell scenario with more observers, measurement settings, or measurement outcomes. Pironio’s method has the property that,

$$\widetilde{W}(a, b, x, y) = \begin{cases} W(a, b, x, y) & \text{if } (x, y) \in (X_1, Y_1) \text{ or } (x, y) \in (X_2, Y_2), \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C1})$$

Then, the best local winning strategies of  $\widetilde{G}$  are the optimal ones for winning  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  separately. That is, if there are  $n_{LHV}$  local deterministic boxes that give the maximal local value of  $\omega(G)$ , there are  $n_{LHV}^2$  local deterministic boxes that maximally win  $\widetilde{G}$ . The optimal quantum strategies for  $\widetilde{G}$  will be the optimal quantum strategies for  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  separately.

The dimension of the local polytope in the  $(m, k; m, k)$  Bell scenario is [58]

$$d_{m,k} = [m(k-1) + 1]^2 - 1. \quad (\text{C2})$$

Suppose that the Bell inequality associated to a game  $G$  described above, with  $|X| = |Y| = m$  and  $|X| = |Y| = k$ , is tight. Then, all the local deterministic strategies that give the maximal value of  $\omega(G)$  compose the hyperplane of dimension  $d_{m,k} - 1$  of the local polytope  $L(m, k; m, k)$ . This means that, if one can arrange each local deterministic strategy that gives the maximal value of  $\omega(G)$  as a vector and arrange  $n_{LHV}$  vectors as rows in a matrix, then the rank of the matrix  $M_G$  should be  $\text{rank}(M_G) = d_{m,k}$ .

If we similarly arrange each local deterministic strategy that gives the maximal winning value of game  $\widetilde{G}$  as a vector, and arrange  $n_{LHV}^2$  vectors as rows of matrix  $M_{\widetilde{G}}$ . The matrix can be written as  $M_{\widetilde{G}} = [v_{(1,1),i} \oplus v_{(2,2),j} \oplus v_{(1,2),p} \oplus v_{(2,1),q}]$ , where  $v_{(1,1),i}$  is the vector corresponds to the input  $(X_1, Y_1)$ ,  $v_{(2,2),j}$  corresponds to the input  $(X_2, Y_2)$ , and  $v_{(1,2),p}$  [or  $v_{(2,1),q}$ ] corresponds to the input  $(X_1, Y_2)$  [or  $(X_2, Y_1)$ ]. For each row of  $M_{\widetilde{G}}$  (i.e., each optimal local deterministic strategy of  $\widetilde{G}$ ), once  $v_{(1,1),i}$  and  $v_{(2,2),j}$  are given, then the other two  $v_{(1,2),p}$  and  $v_{(2,1),q}$  are fixed. According to the lifting

if the original Bell inequality was tight (a facet of the local polytope), then the lifted Bell inequality is also tight. Here, we introduce a lifting method that does *not* preserve tightness and apply it to a tight Bell inequality associated to a game having a quantum PT strategy in order to produce a non-tight Bell inequality associated to a game having a quantum PT strategy.

As described in the main text, any bipartite nonlocal game  $G$  can be written as a 4-tuple  $G = (X \times Y, A \times B, \pi, W)$ , where  $X$  and  $Y$  are the inputs sets for space-like separated players (Alice and Bob),  $A$  and  $B$  are the corresponding outputs sets,  $\pi : \pi(X, Y)$  is the input distribution (here we simply take it always to be uniform in the support of inputs) and  $W : W(A, B, X, Y) \in \{0, 1\}$  is the winning condition function. The associated Bell inequality is characterized by the winning probability of the game  $\omega(G) = \sum_{a \in A, b \in B, x \in X, y \in Y} \pi(x, y) W(a, b, x, y) p(a, b|x, y)$ .

Given a game  $G$ , let us take two copies of it, called  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , and define a new game  $\widetilde{G}$  as follows:  $\widetilde{G} = (\widetilde{X} \times \widetilde{Y}, A \times B, \widetilde{\pi}, \widetilde{W})$ , where  $\widetilde{X} = X_1 \cup X_2$ ,  $\widetilde{Y} = Y_1 \cup Y_2$ ,  $\widetilde{\pi}$  is the uniform distribution over the inputs, and

described above,  $v_{(1,1),i}$  and  $v_{(2,2),j}$  are rows of the matrix  $M_G$  of the original game  $G$ . More importantly, they are chosen from rows of  $M_G$  independently. Since  $n$  linearly independent vectors define a hyperplane of dimension  $n - 1$ , then, for the two matrices  $A$  and  $B$ , we have  $\text{rank}(A \oplus B) = \text{rank}(A) + \text{rank}(B) - 1$  by the Cartesian product of the corresponding hyperplanes. Therefore, if the dimension of the face supported by the optimal local realizations of the game  $G$  is the dimension of the facet minus  $t$ , then the dimension of the face for the new game  $\widetilde{G}$  is at least the dimension of the facet minus  $2t + 1$ .

Suppose that the original game  $G$  is tight, i.e.,  $t = 0$ . Then,

$$\text{rank}(M_{\widetilde{G}}) \leq d_{2m,k} - 1 = [2m(k-1) + 1]^2 - 2. \quad (\text{C3})$$

Therefore, the lifting is not facet-preserving.

Interestingly, we can use this lifting strategy recursively, i.e., we can take  $n$  copies of the tight game  $G_1, G_2, \dots, G_n$  and define a new game  $\widetilde{G}_n = (\widetilde{X}_n \times \widetilde{Y}_n, A \times B, \widetilde{\pi}_n, \widetilde{W}_n)$ , where  $\widetilde{X}_n = X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \dots \cup X_n$ ,  $\widetilde{Y}_n = Y_1 \cup Y_2 \cup \dots \cup Y_n$ ,  $\widetilde{\pi}_n$  is the uniform distribution over the new inputs set, and

$$\widetilde{W}_n(a, b, x, y) = \begin{cases} W(a, b, x, y) & \text{if } (x, y) \in (X_i, Y_i) \forall i \in [n], \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C4})$$

For  $\widetilde{G}_n$ , there are  $n_{LHV}^n$  optimal local deterministic boxes that achieve its optimal value, and the hyperplane defined by them in the  $(nm, k; nm, k)$  Bell scenario is upper bounded by  $d_{nm,k} - (n - 1)$ . Clearly, if  $G$  is a PT game, then  $\widetilde{G}_n$  is also a

PT game (the optimal quantum strategy is simply the optimal quantum strategies for  $G_i \forall i \in [n]$  separately).

In the following, we present two examples of how our lifting method is applied. The second example lifts a Bell inequality that has a PT strategy.

(I) The CHSH Bell inequality is the facet inequality in the  $(2, 2; 2, 2)$  Bell scenario. The winning condition for the CHSH game is

$$W(a, b, x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a \oplus b = x \cdot y, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C5})$$

There are 8 local deterministic boxes that optimally win this game with  $\omega(\text{CHSH}) = \frac{3}{4}$  [the inputs are uniformly distributed  $\pi(x, y) = 1/4, \forall x, y$ ], and they form the facet of  $L(2, 2; 2, 2)$ , i.e.,  $\text{rank}(M_{\text{CHSH}}) = d_2$ . If we consider 2, 3, and 4 copies of the CHSH game and lift the game as described above, then  $\text{rank}(M_{\overline{\text{CHSH}}_2}) = 23 = d_{4,2} - 1$ ,  $\text{rank}(M_{\overline{\text{CHSH}}_3}) = 46 = d_{6,2} - 2$ , and  $\text{rank}(M_{\overline{\text{CHSH}}_4}) = 77 = d_{8,2} - 3$ , respectively.

(II) The Bell inequality associated to the magic square game  $MS$  [20, 38] is a tight inequality [44] in the  $(3, 4; 3, 4)$  Bell scenario. The winning condition function  $W(A, B, X, Y)$  is in Fig. C. There are 144 local deterministic strategies that achieve the maximal value of  $\omega(MS) = \frac{8}{9}$  [the inputs are uniformly distributed  $\pi(x, y) = 1/9, \forall x, y$ ]. Arrange each local deterministic strategy as a vector and then arrange the 144 vectors in a matrix. The rank of the matrix is  $\text{rank}(M_{MS}) = 99$ , which equals to  $d_{3,4} = 99$ . For the lifted game  $\overline{MS}_2$ , there are  $144^2 = 20736$  local deterministic strategies achieving the optimal winning value and  $\text{rank}(M_{\overline{MS}_2}) = 359 = d_{6,4} - 1$ .

		$y = 0$			$y = 1$			$y = 2$					
		0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3
$x = 0$	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1
	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
	3	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0
$x = 1$	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0
	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1
$x = 2$	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0
	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
	3	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1

FIG. 3. Winning condition  $W(A, B, X, Y)$  for the magic square game.

#### Appendix D: Algorithm for enumerating critical nonlocal tables of zeros

To simplify the enumeration of the critical nonlocal tables of zeros (CNTZs) and minimize the computational overhead, Algorithm 1 partitions the table into two sub-regions, denoted  $R_{blue}$  and  $R_{red}$ . We initially enumerate the CNTZs within these sub-regions, focusing solely on events occurring within these indicated sub-regions.

It is important to note that, if a table is a CNTZ, then its respective sub-region must also be a CNTZ if we only consider events restricted to that sub-region. However, the converse is not true: combining CNTZs from the sub-regions does not always yield a CNTZ for the whole. Consequently, after identifying all CNTZs in both  $R_{blue}$  and  $R_{red}$ , we designate their joint pair as *pretable* and proceed to construct full-table CNTZs based on these. On the other hand, the two sub-regions  $R_{blue}$  and  $R_{red}$  are symmetric. Therefore, we can relabel Alice's output indices to shift events from  $R_{blue}$  to  $R_{red}$  or vice versa. Once we have enumerated all CNTZs within  $R_{blue}$ , we compute all orbits of each table in the symmetric group  $S_{blue}$  and subsequently shift them to  $R_{red}$ .

To mitigate the computational burden, at one step (function GroupReduction) of Algorithm 1, we use a sub-group  $S'$  of the symmetric group  $S$  to reducing  $ZeroTable$  to  $ZeroTable_{sub}$  faster. This ensures that  $CriticalZeroTable \subseteq ZeroTable_{sub} \subseteq ZeroTable$  and that  $ZeroTable_{sub}$  is of a manageable size for checking of the quantum realizability.

		$B_0$			$B_1$			$B_2$		
		0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2
$A_0$	0	0	0	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	1	.	.	.	.	.	0	0	.	.
$A_1$	0	.	.	0	.	.	.	.	.	.
	1	.	.	.	.	.	0	0	.	.
$A_2$	0	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0	0
	1	.	.	.	0	0	.	.	.	.

FIG. 4. An example of CNTZ in the  $(3, 2; 3, 3)$  Bell scenario. The two sub-regions  $R_{blue}$  and  $R_{red}$  used in Algorithm 1 are indicated with blue and red backgrounds, respectively.



**Algorithm 1:** Enumerate all CNTZs in the  $(3, 3; 3, 2)$  Bell scenario

---

```

// Step 0: Preparation.
1 Label the events in the table. // A CNTZ is a vector of these labels.
2 Denote the full table as region  $R$  and split it into two sub-regions  $R_{blue}$  and  $R_{red}$  // Whenever the region is
   indicated, only events within the indicated region are taken into account.
3 Generate the symmetric group  $S$  for the whole table and  $S_{blue}$  for sub-region  $R_{blue}$  // See Appendix E for details
   on the symmetric group.
// Step 1: Generate CNTZs in the blue region.
4  $ZeroTable_{blue} := \text{GenerateZPB}([ ], R_{blue})$ ;
5  $CriticalZeroTable_{blue} := \text{GroupReduction}(ZeroTable_{blue}, S_{blue})$ ;
// Step 2: Generate pre CNTZs in the full table.
6 Initialize  $CriticalZeroTable_{red}$  as an empty cell set;
7 for each element  $table$  in  $CriticalZeroTable_{blue}$  do
8    $OrbitTable_{blue} := \text{orbits of } table \text{ in the symmetric group } S_{blue}$ ;
9   Change the labels of each element  $orbittable_{blue}$  of  $OrbitTable_{blue}$  such that the tables are moved from  $R_{blue}$ 
   to the region  $R_{red}$ , and add the shifted orbit tables to  $CriticalZeroTable_{red}$ ;
10 end
11 Initialize  $PreTable$  as an empty cell set;
12 for each element  $table_{blue}$  in  $CriticalZeroTable_{blue}$  do
13   for each element  $table_{red}$  in  $CriticalZeroTable_{red}$  do
14      $pretable := [table_{blue}, table_{red}]$ ;
15     Add  $pretable$  to  $PreTable$ ;
16   end
17 end
18  $PreTable = \text{GroupReduction}(PreTable, S)$ ;
// Step 3: Generate CNTZs based on pre CNTZs in the full table.
19 Initialize  $ZeroTable$  as an empty cell set;
20 for each element  $pretable$  in set  $PreTable$  do
21   Add  $\text{GenerateZPB}(pretable, R)$  to  $ZeroTable$ ;
22 end
23  $CriticalZeroTable := \text{GroupReduction}(ZeroTable, S)$ ;

```

---

```

// Add zeros to the pre CNTZ to make it a CNTZ in the indicated region.
1 Function  $ZeroTable = \text{GenerateZPB}(pretable, region)$  :
2   Initialize  $ZeroTable$  as an empty cell set;
3    $LocalStrategy := \text{all feasible local deterministic tables in the } region \text{ that satisfy the zero constraints in } pretable$ ;
4   if  $LocalStrategy$  is empty then
5     Add  $pretable$  to  $ZeroTable$ ;
6   else
7      $localstrategy := \text{Randomly pick one local deterministic table in } LocalStrategy$ ;
8     for each element  $e$  of  $localstrategy$  do
9       Add  $\text{GenerateZPB}([pretable, e], region)$  to  $ZeroTable$ ;
10    end
11  end
12 end

```

---

```

// Use the symmetric group for deleting the duplicated tables.
1 Function  $OutputTable = \text{GroupReduction}(InputTable, Group)$  :
2   Sort  $InputTable$  by the length of its elements;
3   Initialize  $OutputTable$  as an empty cell set;
4   while  $InputTable$  is not empty do
5      $table := InputTable\{1\}$ ;
6     Add  $table$  to  $OutputTable$ ;
7      $OrbitTable := \text{orbits of } table \text{ in the symmetric group } Group$ ;
8     for each element  $orbittable$  of  $OrbitTable$  do
9       Filter the element  $input$  in  $InputTable$  if it takes  $orbittable$  as a subset, i.e.,  $input \supseteq orbittable$ ;
10    end
11  end
12 end

```

---

### Appendix E: The Bell Symmetric group

Here, we review the group structure of the Bell symmetric group and the bound of its minimal number of generators.

The Bell symmetric group can be expressed using the wreath product of symmetric groups of different order. Then, let us first recall the definition of wreath product of symmetric groups. Let  $S_n$  be the symmetric group on  $n$  elements.

**Definition 1.** Let  $S \leq S_n$  and  $G$  be an arbitrary group. Let us define

$$G \wr S := G^n \rtimes S \quad (\text{E1})$$

Consequently, the elements of  $G \wr S$  are of the form  $(g_1, \dots, g_n; \sigma)$ , where  $g_i \in G$  and  $\sigma \in S$ . The action of  $\sigma \in S$  on  $(g_1, \dots, g_n) \in G^n$  is given by

$$\sigma \cdot (g_1, \dots, g_n) = (g_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, g_{\sigma(n)}). \quad (\text{E2})$$

The operation on  $G \wr S$  is given by

$$(g_1, \dots, g_n; \sigma)(h_1, \dots, h_n; \tau) = (g_1 h_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, g_n h_{\sigma(n)}; \sigma\tau). \quad (\text{E3})$$

The inverse of an element is given by

$$(g_1, \dots, g_n; \sigma)^{-1} = (g_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}^{-1}, \dots, g_{\sigma^{-1}(n)}^{-1}; \sigma^{-1}). \quad (\text{E4})$$

Now consider the  $(3, 2; 3, 2)$  Bell scenario. Bell scenarios are defined modulo permutation of settings and outputs. Therefore, if  $S$  is the Bell symmetric group of  $(3, 2; 3, 2)$ , then  $S$  includes four types of symmetries: permutations of Alice's inputs, permutations of Bob's inputs, permutations of Alice's outputs, and permutations of Bob's outputs.  $S$  does not include the permutation of the parties. Since a permutation in Alice's side commutes with a permutation in Bob's side, then the group structure of  $S$  is given by

$$S = (S_2 \wr S_3) \times (S_3 \wr S_3), \quad (\text{E5})$$

where the  $S_2 \wr S_3$  is the group generated by the permutations in Alice's side while  $S_3 \wr S_3$  is the group generated by the permutations in Bob's side. Since a permutation in Alice's side commutes with a permutation in Bob's side, we take direct product between these groups. For any group  $G$ , we denote by  $d(G)$  the minimal number of generators of it. Using Theorem 1.1 in [59], we have  $d(S_2 \wr S_3) = d(S_3 \wr S_3) = 2$ . Therefore,

$$2 = d(S_2 \wr S_3) \leq d(S) \leq d(S_2 \wr S_3) + d(S_3 \wr S_3) = 4. \quad (\text{E6})$$