

Minimum full nonlocality, all versus nothing nonlocality, and quantum pseudo telepathy

Adán Cabello^{1,2,*}

¹*Departamento de Física Aplicada II, Universidad de Sevilla, E-41012 Sevilla, Spain*

²*Instituto Carlos I de Física Teórica y Computacional, Universidad de Sevilla, E-41012 Sevilla, Spain*

Full nonlocality (FN) is the strongest form of nonlocality and plays a crucial role in quantum information and computation. It has been recently shown that FN, all versus nothing (AVN) nonlocality, and pseudo telepathy (PT) are equivalent, and this has led to advance in the long-standing open problem of what is the simplest form of bipartite FN/AVN/PT. It has been shown that bipartite FN/AVN/PT is impossible in Bell scenarios with small input and output cardinalities and that existing tools cannot help answer whether it is possible in larger scenarios. Here, we prove that FN/AVN/PT is equivalent to a specific type of Kochen-Specker (KS) set and, by exploring all known KS sets with small cardinality, we show that, arguably, (i) the simplest bipartite FN/AVN/PT is the correlation in *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 010403 (2001), and (ii) the simplest bipartite FN/AVN/PT in the simplest bipartite quantum system that allows for FN/AVN/PT, which is a pair of qutrits, happens when Alice (Bob) has 9 (7) measurements of 3 outcomes. This scenario is small enough to allow observation of qutrit-qutrit FN/AVN/PT and to connect the Bell and KS theorems in one experiment. ^a

Introduction.—Not all forms of quantum nonlocality are equally powerful and useful. Certain quantum information protocols [1–6] and proofs of fundamental results such as the quantum computational advantage for shallow circuits [7] and MIP*=RE [8] require the strongest form of nonlocality, which occurs when, in addition to violating a Bell inequality, the correlation is in a nonlocal face of the nonsignaling polytope [9]. This is equivalent [9] to require that the correlation has local fraction [10] zero (or nonlocal fraction one). When this occurs, it is said that the correlation has full nonlocality (FN) [11] or is strongly nonlocal [12]. Surprisingly, although we know that correlations with this property are allowed by quantum mechanics [11], there are two long-lasting problems [13] that remain open: (A) What is the simplest form of bipartite FN nonlocality (i.e., the one requiring the smallest number of local measurements). (B) What is the simplest form of bipartite FN for the simplest quantum system that allows for bipartite FN, which can be proven is a pair of qutrits [14, 15].

Recently, it has been proven [9] that FN is equivalent to two concepts that were known to be equivalent to one another [15, 16]: all versus nothing (AVN) nonlocality [17–21], also called Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) nonlocality [22] (defined below), and pseudo telepathy (PT) [16, 23], defined as a strategy that allows to win every round of a nonlocal game which is impossible to win with any classical strategy that does not involve communication.

The FN/AVN/PT equivalence shows the deep connection between problems in foundations of quantum mechanics and fundamental results in quantum computation and information processing advantage. In addition, it shows that tools from different fields can be combined to address problems (A) and (B) [9].

In fact, tools suggested by the FN/AVN/PT equivalence have led to advances in the solution of problems (A) and (B). If we denote by $(|X|, |A|; |Y|, |B|)$ the Bell scenario where

$|X|$ is the number of measurement settings of Alice, $|A|$ the number of outcomes of Alice’s measurements, and similarly $|Y|$ and $|B|$ for Bob, it has been recently proven [9] that FN/AVN/PT is impossible in any bipartite Bell scenario up to $(3, 3; 3, 2)$ and $(3, 2; 3, 4)$. This extends previous results showing that FN/AVN/PT is impossible in $(2, |A|; |Y|, |B|)$ [13] and $(|X|, 2; |Y|, 2)$ [24]. However, the tools used to obtain these results do not allow to explore exhaustively bipartite Bell scenarios with more inputs and outputs.

The aim of this work is to introduce a new tool to solve (A) and (B). It is based on the observation that AVN/GHZ is connected to an even older result in foundations of quantum mechanics: The Kochen-Specker (KS) theorem [25]. This connection comes from the observation made by Stairs [26–28] and Heywood and Redhead [29, 30], and refined by others [11, 14, 24, 31], that, what we now call bipartite AVN nonlocality can be produced using: (a) a qudit-qudit maximally entangled state with $d \geq 3$ and (b) making each of the parties to measure observables of a KS set [14, 25, 32] in dimension d . In a nutshell, the main result introduced here is a proof that bipartite FN/AVN/PT happens if and only if the initial quantum set and the set of measurements of Alice and Bob define a special type of KS set. This approach does not assume any specific state, covers all known forms of FN/AVN/PT, and shows how to find new ones.

The FN/AVN/PT/B-KS equivalence.—Let us recall the definition of AVN nonlocality.

Definition 1 (Table of zeros [9]). *The table of zeros for a correlation $\{p(a, b|x, y)\}_{x \in X, y \in Y, a \in A, b \in B}$ in the $(|X|, |A|; |Y|, |B|)$ Bell scenario is a table with $|X| \times |A|$ rows and $|Y| \times |B|$ columns in which, in the entry $(a, b|x, y)$, there is a 0 if $p(a, b|x, y) = 0$, and nothing (i.e., the entry is empty) otherwise.*

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 deterministic local hidden variable model 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

^a Presented in “From GHZ to Tic Tac Toe: A Symposium to Celebrate Danny Greenberger’s 90th Birthday”, Vienna, September 27–29, 2023.

which $f(a|x) = f(b|y) = 1$ and $p(a, b|x, y) = 0$.

Definition 2 (Bipartite AVN [9]). A correlation $\{p(a, b|x, y)\}_{x \in X, y \in Y, a \in A, b \in B}$ is AVN nonlocal if and only if its table of zeros is not realizable by any deterministic local hidden variable model.

In a nutshell, a correlation is AVN nonlocal if, looking only at the zeros in $\{p(a, b|x, y)\}_{x \in X, y \in Y, a \in A, b \in B}$, we notice that they cannot be produced by any deterministic local hidden variable model.

To introduce our result, we need two additional definitions.

Definition 3 (KS [14, 25, 32] and generalized [33] KS set). A (generalized) KS set in dimension d is a set S of projectors (not necessarily) of rank-one which does not admit an assignment $f : S \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ satisfying: (I) two mutually orthogonal projectors $u, v \in S$ cannot have $f(u) = f(v) = 1$. (II) For every set of mutually orthogonal projectors summing up to the identity, one and only one of them must be assigned 1.

Definition 4 (Bipartite KS set). Consider a $(|X|, |A|; |Y|, |B|)$ Bell scenario and a quantum realization in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ in which Alice's observable x is defined by a set of mutually orthogonal projectors $\{\Pi_{a|x}\}_{a \in A}$ in \mathcal{H}_A satisfying $\sum_a \Pi_{a|x} = I_A$, where I_A is the identity in \mathcal{H}_A , and Bob's observable y is defined by a set of mutually orthogonal projectors $\{\Pi_{b|y}\}_{b \in B}$ in \mathcal{H}_B satisfying $\sum_b \Pi_{b|y} = I_B$, where I_B is the identity in \mathcal{H}_B . A bipartite KS set (B-KS) is a set of rank-one projectors $S = S_A \cup S_B$, where $S_A = \{s_{a|x}\}_{x \in X, a \in A}$ and $S_B = \{s_{b|y}\}_{y \in Y, b \in B}$ are in $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ such that S does not admit an assignment $f : S \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ satisfying: (I) two mutually orthogonal projectors $s_{a|x} \in S_A$ and $s_{b|y} \in S_B$ cannot have $f(s_{a|x}) = f(s_{b|y}) = 1$. (II) For every x , $\sum_a f(s_{a|x}) = 1$ and, for every y , $\sum_b f(s_{b|y}) = 1$.

Our main result can be stated as follows:

Theorem 1. A correlation $\{p(a, b|x, y)\}_{x \in X, y \in Y, a \in A, b \in B}$ allows for FN/AVN/PT if and only if $S = S_A \cup S_B$, where S_A is the set of rank-one projectors onto Alice's post-measurement states [defined in Eq. (1)] and S_B is the set of rank-one projectors onto Bob's post-measurement states [defined in Eq. (2)], is a B-KS set.

Proof. Any quantum correlation in a Bell scenario can be achieved with a pure state and projective local measurements. Therefore, given $\{p(a, b|x, y)\}_{x \in X, y \in Y, a \in A, b \in B}$, we will assume that we know a realization consisting on a pure quantum state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, a set of projective measurements for Alice, $\{\Pi_{a|x}\}_{x \in X, a \in A}$ in \mathcal{H}_A , and a set of projective measurements for Bob, $\{\Pi_{b|y}\}_{y \in Y, b \in B}$ in \mathcal{H}_B producing $\{p(a, b|x, y)\}_{x \in X, y \in Y, a \in A, b \in B}$.

In addition, for convenience, we will assume that both Alice's and Bob's projective measurements could have been measured ideally so the post-measurement state can be obtained using Luder's rule [34]. That is, if Alice measures $x = \{\Pi_{a|x}\}_{a \in A}$ on $|\psi\rangle$ and obtains outcome a (and she does

not know whether or not Bob has performed a measurement), then, according to Alice, the quantum state of the pair transforms from a pure state into a new pure state as follows:

$$|\psi\rangle \longrightarrow |\psi_{a|x}\rangle = \frac{(\Pi_{a|x} \otimes I_B)|\psi\rangle}{\sqrt{\langle\psi|(\Pi_{a|x} \otimes I_B)|\psi\rangle}}. \quad (1)$$

Similarly, if Bob measures $y = \{\Pi_{b|y}\}_{b \in B}$ on $|\psi\rangle$ and obtains b (and he does not know whether or not Alice has performed a measurement), then, from Bob's perspective, the quantum state of the pair transforms from a pure state into a new pure state as follows:

$$|\psi\rangle \longrightarrow |\psi_{b|y}\rangle = \frac{(I_A \otimes \Pi_{b|y})|\psi\rangle}{\sqrt{\langle\psi|(I_A \otimes \Pi_{b|y})|\psi\rangle}}. \quad (2)$$

Let us define S_A as the set of rank-one projectors onto all possible Alice's post-measurement states. That is, $S_A = \{|\psi_{a|x}\rangle\langle\psi_{a|x}|\}_{x \in X, a \in A}$, where $|\psi_{a|x}\rangle$ is given by Eq. (1). Similarly, let us define S_B as the set of rank-one projectors onto all possible Bob's post-measurement states. That is, $S_B = \{|\psi_{b|y}\rangle\langle\psi_{b|y}|\}_{y \in Y, b \in B}$, where $|\psi_{b|y}\rangle$ is given by Eq. (2). Notice that S_A and S_B are sets of rank-one projectors in $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$.

Now consider the table of zeros of $\{p(a, b|x, y)\}_{x \in X, y \in Y, a \in A, b \in B}$. Notice that there is a zero in the entry $(a, b|x, y)$ if and only if the corresponding $|\psi_{a|x}\rangle\langle\psi_{a|x}|$ and $|\psi_{b|y}\rangle\langle\psi_{b|y}|$ are orthogonal. Therefore, $\{p(a, b|x, y)\}_{x \in X, y \in Y, a \in A, b \in B}$ is AVN nonlocal if and only if $S = S_A \cup S_B$ is a B-KS set. \square

Consequences of the FN/AVN/PT/B-KS equivalence.—Theorem 1 provides a new tool to address some open problems, including problems (A) and (B). To show it, let us consider the following.

Definition 5 (Local view of a B-KS set). Given a B-KS set $S = S_A \cup S_B$ in $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ produced by measurements that project the initial entangled state into product states, Alice's local view of S is a set of (not necessarily rank-one) projectors $S' = S'_A \cup S''_A$ in \mathcal{H}_A , where S'_A is obtained from S_A by tracing out Bob's part and S''_A is obtained from S_B by tracing out Bob's part.

Corollary 1. A correlation $\{p(a, b|x, y)\}_{x \in X, y \in Y, a \in A, b \in B}$ allows for FN/AVN/PT with measurements that project the initial entangled state into product states if and only if there exists S' that is a local view of a B-KS set.

Proof. If the local measurements project into product states, then all the elements of S'_A and S''_A are projectors (but not necessarily of rank-one [11, 24]) and, if $S = S_A \cup S_B$ is a B-KS in $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, then $S' = S'_A \cup S''_A \in \mathcal{H}_A$ is a local view of a B-KS set. \square

Corollary 2. A correlation $\{p(a, b|x, y)\}_{x \in X, y \in Y, a \in A, b \in B}$ allows for FN/AVN/PT with measurements that project the initial entangled state into product states if and only if $S' = S'_A \cup S''_A$, defined above, is a generalized KS set.

In fact, S' is a generalized KS that has the following additional restriction: Declaring S' a generalized KS set just needs checking that, if requirement (II) in the definition of generalized KS set is satisfied, then requirement (I) fails already for the relations of orthogonality between the projectors of S'_A and the projectors of S''_A . That is, one does not need to check the relations of orthogonality between projectors of S'_A (or S''_A).

Corollary 2 allows us to prove something that cannot be proven with previous tools [9].

Theorem 2. *Bipartite FN/AVN/PT is impossible in $(3, 3; 3, 3)$ with maximal observables.*

Proof. FN/AVN/PT in $(3, 3; 3, 3)$ with maximal observables (i.e., represented by nondegenerate projectors) would require the existence of a KS set in dimension $d = 3$ with $3 \times 3 + 3 \times 3 = 18$ rank-one projectors. However, it has been proven that the smallest KS set in $d = 3$ must have, at least, 24 rank-one projectors [35]. In fact, the smallest *known* KS set in $d = 3$ has 31 rank-one projectors [36]. \square

Corollary 2 can also be used to prove another interesting result. The fact that state-independent contextuality does not require a KS set, but only a state-independent contextuality (SI-C) set [37–39] may suggest that, similarly, bipartite FN/AVN/PT may be produced by SI-C sets that are not KS sets [40, 41]. However, Corollary 2 implies

Theorem 3. *SI-C sets that are not KS sets do not produce bipartite FN/AVN/PT when all measurements project the initial entangled state into product states.*

Another interesting problem is whether bipartite FN/AVN/PT requires maximally entangled states [42]. Theorem 1 does not solve this problem but suggests that the answer is negative.

Solving problems (A) and (B).—Corollary 2 offers a method to address problems (A) and (B) when the initial state is maximally entangled and the local measurements transform the entangled states into product states. We can consider all generalized KS sets [or, in the case of problem (B), only the ones in $d = 3$] with an increasingly larger number of elements and, for each of them, compute the way to distribute them between Alice and Bob (including the possibility of giving the same element to both of them) to generate a local view of a B-KS set $S' = S'_A \cup S''_A$ minimizing $|X| \times |Y|$. Then, among all of them, find the one that gives the bipartite FN/AVN/PT of minimum input cardinality.

There is no comprehensive catalog of generalized KS sets in any dimension, but there is an extensive literature about the KS and generalized KS sets with the smallest cardinalities known after 56 years of research. In fact, it can be proven [45] that the smallest KS set in any dimension requires 18 rank-one projectors [46]. Applying the method described above to all the KS sets in [36, 43, 46–52] and all generalized KS sets in [53, 54], we can formulate the following.




FIG. 1. Graph of orthogonality of the local view of the B-KS set leading to the bipartite FN/AVN/PT of minimum input cardinality found with the method described in the text. Each dot represents a projector onto the indicated (unnormalized) state. Dots in the same line are orthogonal. This B-KS and this local view are obtained by distributing between Alice and Bob the 24 rank-one projectors of the KS set in $d = 4$ in [43]. S'_A is defined by the 12 red dots and defines $|X| = 3$ observables with 4 outcomes represented by the 4 cliques of size 4 in red. S''_A is defined by the 12 blue dots and defines $|Y| = 3$ observables with 4 outcomes represented by the 4 cliques of size 4 in blue. The underlying (uncolored and without vectors) figure is taken from [44].

Conjecture 1. *The simplest form of bipartite FN/AVN/PT is produced by the following correlation: Alice and Bob share two ququarts in the state*

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^3 |ii\rangle, \quad (3)$$

Alice measures the three observables given by the following (unnormalized) orthogonal bases:

$$x = 0 : \{(1,0,0,0), (0,1,0,0), (0,0,1,0), (0,0,0,1)\}, \quad (4a)$$

$$x = 1 : \{(1,1,1,1), (1,-1,1,-1), (1,1,-1,-1), (1,-1,-1,1)\}, \quad (4b)$$

$$x = 2 : \{(1,1,1,-1), (1,1,-1,1), (1,-1,1,1), (-1,1,1,1)\}, \quad (4c)$$

and Bob measures the three observables given by the following (unnormalized) orthogonal bases:

$$y = 0 : \{(1,1,0,0), (1,-1,0,0), (0,0,1,1), (0,0,1,-1)\}, \quad (5a)$$

$$y = 1 : \{(1,0,1,0), (0,1,0,1), (1,0,-1,0), (0,1,0,-1)\}, \quad (5b)$$

$$y = 2 : \{(1,0,0,1), (1,0,0,-1), (0,1,1,0), (0,1,-1,0)\}, \quad (5c)$$

Proof. The local view of the B-KS set leading to the bipartite FN/AVN/PT of minimum input cardinality found with the method described above is the one shown in Fig. 1. \square

The correlation in Conjecture 1 is not new. It was introduced in [18, 55], has been used extensively in the literature




FIG. 2. Graph of orthogonality of the local view of the B-KS set leading to the qutrit-qutrit FN/AVN/PT of minimum input cardinality found with the method described in the text. Each dot represents a projector onto the indicated (unnormalized) state. Adjacent dots are orthogonal. This B-KS and this local view are obtained by distributing between Alice and Bob the 33 rank-one projectors of the KS set in $d = 3$ in [43] (but one could use any other KS set of the Peres-Penrose family [50, 57, 58]) in a particular way. Notice that, unlike in the example of Fig. 1, here the same rank-one projector is sometimes given to both parties. S'_A is defined by the 16 red dots and the 9 violet dots and defines 9 observables with 3 outcomes (represented by circumferences and triangles in red). S''_A is defined by the 12 blue dots and the 9 violet dots and defines 7 observables with 3 outcomes (represented by triangles in blue). The underlying (uncolored and without vectors) figure is taken from [44].

(e.g., [7, 8, 23, 56]), and tested experimentally with hyper-entangled photons [11, 20, 21, 45].

Conjecture 2. *The simplest form of qutrit-qutrit FN/AVN/PT is produced by the following correlation: Alice and Bob share the state*

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \sum_{i=0}^2 |ii\rangle, \quad (6)$$

Alice measures in one of the following nine (unnormalized)

orthogonal bases:

$$x = 0 : \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 1), (0, 1, -1)\}, \quad (7a)$$

$$x = 1 : \{(0, 1, 0), (1, 0, 1), (1, 0, -1)\}, \quad (7b)$$

$$x = 2 : \{(0, 0, 1), (1, 1, 0), (1, -1, 0)\}, \quad (7c)$$

$$x = 3 : \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, \sqrt{2}), (0, \sqrt{2}, -1)\}, \quad (7d)$$

$$x = 4 : \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, -\sqrt{2}), (0, \sqrt{2}, 1)\}, \quad (7e)$$

$$x = 5 : \{(0, 1, 0), (1, 0, \sqrt{2}), (\sqrt{2}, 0, -1)\}, \quad (7f)$$

$$x = 6 : \{(0, 1, 0), (1, 0, -\sqrt{2}), (\sqrt{2}, 0, 1)\}, \quad (7g)$$

$$x = 7 : \{(0, 0, 1), (1, \sqrt{2}, 0), (\sqrt{2}, -1, 0)\}, \quad (7h)$$

$$x = 8 : \{(0, 0, 1), (1, -\sqrt{2}, 0), (\sqrt{2}, 1, 0)\}, \quad (7i)$$

and Bob measures in one of the following seven (unnormalized) orthogonal bases:

$$y = 0 : \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\}, \quad (8a)$$

$$y = 1 : \{(1, 1, 0), (1, -1, \sqrt{2}), (-1, 1, \sqrt{2})\}, \quad (8b)$$

$$y = 2 : \{(1, -1, 0), (1, 1, \sqrt{2}), (1, 1, -\sqrt{2})\}, \quad (8c)$$

$$y = 3 : \{(1, 0, 1), (1, \sqrt{2}, -1), (-1, \sqrt{2}, 1)\}, \quad (8d)$$

$$y = 4 : \{(1, 0, -1), (1, \sqrt{2}, 1), (1, -\sqrt{2}, 1)\}, \quad (8e)$$

$$y = 5 : \{(0, 1, 1), (\sqrt{2}, 1, -1), (\sqrt{2}, -1, 1)\}, \quad (8f)$$

$$y = 6 : \{(0, 1, -1), (\sqrt{2}, 1, 1), (-\sqrt{2}, 1, 1)\}. \quad (8g)$$

Proof. The local view of the B-KS set leading to the bipartite FN/AVN/PT of minimum input cardinality found with the method described above is the one shown in Fig. 2. \square

To our knowledge, no qutrit-qutrit experiment has ever produced FN/AVN/PT. Arguably, the reason is that, until now, the simplest forms of qutrit-qutrit FN/AVN/PT known required too many settings [11, 14, 24, 31]. Conjecture 2 offers the possibility to finally observing qutrit-qutrit FN/AVN/PT and experimentally connecting Bell's theorem to the KS theorem in the simplest quantum system in which the KS theorem can be formulated.

I thank I. Bengtsson, K. Bharti, J. R. Gonzales-Ureta, L. Porto, R. Ramanathan, D. Saha, S. Trandafir, Z.-P. Xu, and E. Zambrini Cruzeiro for helpful discussions and comments. This work was supported by the EU-funded project **FoQaCiA**, the **MCINN/AEI** (Project No. PID2020-113738GB-I00), and the Wallenberg Center for Quantum Technology (WACQT).

* adan@us.es

[1] T. S. Cubitt, D. Leung, W. Matthews, and A. Winter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 230503 (2010).

[2] 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).

[3] T. Vidick, [arXiv:1703.08508](https://arxiv.org/abs/1703.08508) [quant-ph].

- [4] R. Jain, C. A. Miller, and Y. Shi, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **66**, 5567 (2020).
- [5] Y.-Z. Zhen, Y. Mao, Y.-Z. Zhang, F. Xu, and B. C. Sanders, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 080801 (2023).
- [6] K. Bharti and R. Jain, [arXiv:2310.01540 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.01540) (2023).
- [7] S. Bravyi, D. Gosset, and R. König, *Science* **362**, 308 (2018).
- [8] Z. Ji, A. Natarajan, T. Vidick, J. Wright, and H. Yuen, *Comm. ACM* **64**, 131 (2021).
- [9] Y. Liu, H. Y. Chung, E. Zambrini Cruzeiro, J. R. Gonzales-Ureta, R. Ramanathan, and A. Cabello, (2023), [arXiv:2310.10600 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.10600).
- [10] A. C. Elitzur, S. Popescu, and D. Rohrlich, *Phys. Lett. A* **162**, 25 (1992).
- [11] L. Aolita, R. Gallego, A. Acín, A. Chiuri, G. Vallone, P. Mataloni, and A. Cabello, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 032107 (2012).
- [12] 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.
- [13] N. Gisin, A. A. Méthot, and V. Scarani, *Int. J. Quant. Inf.* **5**, 525 (2007).
- [14] R. Renner and S. Wolf, in *International Symposium on Information Theory, 2004. ISIT 2004. Proceedings.*, IEEE (IEEE, 2004) p. 322.
- [15] G. Brassard, A. A. Méthot, and A. Tapp, *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **5**, 275 (2005).
- [16] A. L. Broadbent, *Quantum nonlocality, cryptography and complexity*, Ph.D. thesis, Université de Montréal (2008).
- [17] N. D. Mermin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 1838 (1990).
- [18] A. Cabello, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 010403 (2001).
- [19] Z.-B. Chen, J.-W. Pan, Y.-D. Zhang, Č. Brukner, and A. Zeilinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 160408 (2003).
- [20] C. Cinelli, M. Barbieri, R. Perris, P. Mataloni, and F. De Martini, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 240405 (2005).
- [21] 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).
- [22] D. M. Greenberger, M. A. Horne, and A. Zeilinger, in *Bell's Theorem, Quantum Theory and Conceptions of the Universe*, Fundamental Theories of Physics, Vol. 37, edited by M. Kafatos (Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 1989) pp. 69–72.
- [23] G. Brassard, A. Broadbent, and A. Tapp, *Found. Phys.* **35**, 1877 (2005).
- [24] R. Cleve, P. Høyer, B. Toner, and J. Watrous, in *Proceedings. 19th IEEE Annual Conference on Computational Complexity* (2004) pp. 236–249.
- [25] S. Kochen and E. P. Specker, *J. Math. Mech.* **17**, 59 (1967).
- [26] A. Stairs, *Quantum Mechanics, Logic and Reality*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario (1978).
- [27] A. Stairs, *Philos. Sci.* **50**, 578 (1983).
- [28] H. R. Brown and G. Svetlichny, *Found. Phys.* **20**, 1379 (1990).
- [29] P. Heywood and M. L. G. Redhead, *Found. Phys.* **13**, 481 (1983).
- [30] M. L. G. Redhead, *Incompleteness, Nonlocality, and Realism* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1987).
- [31] A. Elby and M. R. Jones, *Phys. Lett. A* **171**, 11 (1992).
- [32] M. Pavičić, J.-P. Merlet, B. D. McKay, and N. D. Megill, *J. Phys. A* **38**, 1577 (2005).
- [33] Z.-P. Xu, D. Saha, K. Bharti, and A. Cabello, (2023), [arXiv:2309.05735 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.05735).
- [34] G. Lüders, *Ann. Phys. (Leipzig)* **443**, 323 (1951).
- [35] Z. Li, C. Bright, and V. Ganesh, [arXiv:2306.13319 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.13319) (2023).
- [36] A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods* (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1993).
- [37] S. Yu and C. H. Oh, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 030402 (2012).
- [38] I. Bengtsson, K. Blanchfield, and A. Cabello, *Phys. Lett. A* **376**, 374 (2012).
- [39] Z.-P. Xu, J.-L. Chen, and H.-Y. Su, *Phys. Lett. A* **379**, 1868 (2015).
- [40] C.-J. Huang, G.-Y. Xiang, Y. Guo, K.-D. Wu, B.-H. Liu, C.-F. Li, G.-C. Guo, and A. Tavakoli, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 020401 (2021).
- [41] J. R. Gonzales-Ureta, A. Predojević, and A. Cabello, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **5**, L012035 (2023).
- [42] L. Mančinska, in *Computing with New Resources*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 8808 (2014) pp. 200–207.
- [43] A. Peres, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **24**, L175 (1991).
- [44] K. Blanchfield, *Geometry and foundations of quantum mechanics*, Ph.D. thesis, Department of Physics, Stockholm University, Stockholm (2014).
- [45] 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).
- [46] A. Cabello, J. M. Estebarez, and G. García-Alcaine, *Phys. Lett. A* **212**, 183 (1996).
- [47] M. Kernaghan and A. Peres, *Phys. Lett. A* **198**, 1 (1995).
- [48] J. Bub, *Found. Phys.* **26**, 787 (1996).
- [49] J. Bub, *Interpreting the Quantum World* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1997).
- [50] R. Penrose, in *Quantum Reflections*, edited by J. Ellis and D. Amati (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2000) pp. 1–27.
- [51] P. Lisoněk, P. Badziąg, J. R. Portillo, and A. Cabello, *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 042101 (2014).
- [52] C. Budroni, A. Cabello, O. Gühne, M. Kleinmann, and J.-Å. Larsson, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **94**, 045007 (2022).
- [53] S. P. Toh, *Chin. Phys. Lett.* **30**, 100302 (2013).
- [54] S. P. Toh, *Chin. Phys. Lett.* **30**, 100303 (2013).
- [55] A. Cabello, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 1911 (2001).
- [56] P. K. Aravind, *Am. J. Phys.* **72**, 1303 (2004).
- [57] E. Gould and P. K. Aravind, *Found. Phys.* **40**, 1096 (2010).
- [58] I. Bengtsson, in *AIP Conference Proceedings*, Vol. 1508 (American Institute of Physics, Melville, NY, 2012) pp. 125–135.