

# Nonlocal games and the Grothendieck-Tsirelson inequality

Introduction to quantum information theory

Maxi Brandstetter, Arne Heimendahl, Felix Kirschner

University of Cologne

September 21, 2018

# Outline

## 1 Introduction

- Basics
- Nonlocal games
- A special case of nonlocal games
- A specific example

## 2 Local and quantum correlation matrices

- Local correlation matrices
- Quantum correlation matrices
- The relations between quantum correlation and local correlation matrices

## 3 Grothendieck-Tsirelson Theorem

- Motivation: The Grothendieck-Tsirelson Theorem
- Grothendieck's Inequality
- Tsirelson's Theorem
- Grothendieck-Tsirelson Theorem

# Let's get on the same page

- We should know what a *state* is

# Let's get on the same page

- We should know what a *state* is
  - ▶ i.e. a psd matrix  $\rho$  that satisfies  $\text{Tr}(\rho) = 1$

## Let's get on the same page

- We should know what a *state* is
  - ▶ i.e. a psd matrix  $\rho$  that satisfies  $\text{Tr}(\rho) = 1$
- We should know what the *tensor product* does

## Let's get on the same page

- We should know what a *state* is
  - ▶ i.e. a psd matrix  $\rho$  that satisfies  $\text{Tr}(\rho) = 1$
- We should know what the *tensor product* does

- ▶ We use the Kronecker product  $A \otimes B = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11}B & \dots & a_{1n}B \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ a_{n1}B & \dots & a_{nn}B \end{pmatrix}$

## Let's get on the same page

- We should know what a *state* is
  - ▶ i.e. a psd matrix  $\rho$  that satisfies  $\text{Tr}(\rho) = 1$
- We should know what the *tensor product* does

- ▶ We use the Kronecker product  $A \otimes B = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11}B & \dots & a_{1n}B \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ a_{n1}B & \dots & a_{nn}B \end{pmatrix}$

- We should be familiar with the *Dirac notation*

## Let's get on the same page

- We should know what a *state* is
  - ▶ i.e. a psd matrix  $\rho$  that satisfies  $\text{Tr}(\rho) = 1$
- We should know what the *tensor product* does
  - ▶ We use the Kronecker product  $A \otimes B = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11}B & \dots & a_{1n}B \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ a_{n1}B & \dots & a_{nn}B \end{pmatrix}$
- We should be familiar with the *Dirac notation*
  - ▶  $|\psi\rangle$  is a vector in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and  $\langle\psi|$  is its conjugate transpose



## Let's get on the same page

- We should know what a *state* is
  - ▶ i.e. a psd matrix  $\rho$  that satisfies  $\text{Tr}(\rho) = 1$
- We should know what the *tensor product* does
  - ▶ We use the Kronecker product  $A \otimes B = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11}B & \dots & a_{1n}B \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ a_{n1}B & \dots & a_{nn}B \end{pmatrix}$
- We should be familiar with the *Dirac notation*
  - ▶  $|\psi\rangle$  is a vector in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and  $\langle\psi|$  is its conjugate transpose

## Quantum systems

- A quantum system is a portion of the whole universe. For example a set of electrons.
- A quantum system  $X$  is associated with a copy of  $\mathbb{C}^k$
- It may consist of subsystems  $X_1, \dots, X_N$  each of which is associated with a copy of  $\mathbb{C}^{n_i}$ . In this case  $k = n_1 \dots n_N$

# Measurements

Physical quantities can be measured. But what is a measurement mathematically?

# Measurements

Physical quantities can be measured. But what is a measurement mathematically?

- A measurement can be performed on a system  $X$  that is in state  $\rho$

# Measurements

Physical quantities can be measured. But what is a measurement mathematically?

- A measurement can be performed on a system  $X$  that is in state  $\rho$
- We want the set of outcomes to be finite. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be this set

# Measurements

Physical quantities can be measured. But what is a measurement mathematically?

- A measurement can be performed on a system  $X$  that is in state  $\rho$
- We want the set of outcomes to be finite. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be this set
- The outcome of a measurement is supposed to be a random variable  $\chi$  that takes values in  $\mathcal{A}$  with a certain probability

# Measurements

Physical quantities can be measured. But what is a measurement mathematically?

- A measurement can be performed on a system  $X$  that is in state  $\rho$
- We want the set of outcomes to be finite. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be this set
- The outcome of a measurement is supposed to be a random variable  $\chi$  that takes values in  $\mathcal{A}$  with a certain probability
- This can be achieved:

## Definition

### Measurement

- We define a measurement by a set of psd matrices  $\{F^a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  that sum up to the identity matrix, i.e.  $\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} F^a = I$
- The outcome of a measurement is a random variable  $\chi$  with probability distribution:  $\mathbb{P}[\chi = a] = \text{Tr}(\rho F^a)$
- A projective measurement is defined by psd matrices that satisfy  $F^a F^b = \delta_{ab} F^a \forall a, b \in \mathcal{A}$

- To define an expected value we define outcomes in  $\mathcal{A}$  as real numbers

- To define an expected value we define outcomes in  $\mathcal{A}$  as real numbers
- $\mathbb{E}[\chi] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} a \text{Tr}(\rho F^a) \stackrel{\text{lin}}{=} \text{Tr}(\rho(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} a F^a))$



- To define an expected value we define outcomes in  $\mathcal{A}$  as real numbers
- $\mathbb{E}[\chi] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} a \text{Tr}(\rho F^a) \stackrel{\text{lin}}{=} \text{Tr}(\rho(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} a F^a))$
- $\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} a F^a$  is called observable

- To define an expected value we define outcomes in  $\mathcal{A}$  as real numbers
- $\mathbb{E}[\chi] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} a \text{Tr}(\rho F^a) \stackrel{\text{lin}}{=} \text{Tr}(\rho(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} a F^a))$
- $\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} a F^a$  is called observable
- A simple case we will use later are  $\{-1, 1\}$ -valued observables

- To define an expected value we define outcomes in  $\mathcal{A}$  as real numbers
- $\mathbb{E}[\chi] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} a \text{Tr}(\rho F^a) \stackrel{\text{lin}}{=} \text{Tr}(\rho(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} a F^a))$
- $\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} a F^a$  is called observable
- A simple case we will use later are  $\{-1, 1\}$ -valued observables
- if we consider projective measurements we have

$$(F^+ - F^-)^2 = \underbrace{F^{+2}}_{=F^+} - \underbrace{F^+ F^-}_{\delta_{+-}=0} + \underbrace{F^{-2}}_{F^-} = F^+ + F^- = I$$

- i.e. a  $\{-1, 1\}$ -valued observable is both unitary and Hermitian

# Doling out subsystems

- Consider a system  $X$  consisting of subsystems  $X_1, \dots, X_N$  which we distribute among  $N$  parties, which may be located anywhere in the universe

# Doling out subsystems

- Consider a system  $X$  consisting of subsystems  $X_1, \dots, X_N$  which we distribute among  $N$  parties, which may be located anywhere in the universe
- The parties *share* the state  $X$  is in

# Doling out subsystems

- Consider a system  $X$  consisting of subsystems  $X_1, \dots, X_N$  which we distribute among  $N$  parties, which may be located anywhere in the universe
- The parties *share* the state  $X$  is in
- Every party may perform a measurement on their subsystem  $X_i$ , i.e. there are  $N$  sets of psd matrices  $\{F^{a_1}\}_{a_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_1 \times n_1}, \dots, \{F^{a_N}\}_{a_N \in \mathcal{A}_N} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_N \times n_N}$

# Doling out subsystems

- Consider a system  $X$  consisting of subsystems  $X_1, \dots, X_N$  which we distribute among  $N$  parties, which may be located anywhere in the universe
- The parties *share* the state  $X$  is in
- Every party may perform a measurement on their subsystem  $X_i$ , i.e. there are  $N$  sets of psd matrices  $\{F^{a_1}\}_{a_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_1 \times n_1}, \dots, \{F^{a_N}\}_{a_N \in \mathcal{A}_N} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_N \times n_N}$

The joint probability distribution of the  $N$  measurement outcomes  $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_N$  is

$$\mathbb{P}[\chi_1 = a_1, \chi_2 = a_2, \dots, \chi_N = a_N] = \text{Tr}(\rho F_1^{a_1} \otimes \dots \otimes F_N^{a_N})$$

# Entanglement

- We will only consider pure states, i.e. states that they have rank 1 and therefore can be written as  $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$



# Entanglement

- We will only consider pure states, i.e. states that they have rank 1 and therefore can be written as  $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$
- We do that because mixed states do not give an advantage over pure states

# Entanglement

- We will only consider pure states, i.e. states that they have rank 1 and therefore can be written as  $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$
- We do that because mixed states do not give an advantage over pure states
- A state is called product state if it can be written as  $|\psi\rangle = |\psi_1\rangle|\psi_2\rangle \dots |\psi_N\rangle$

# Entanglement

- We will only consider pure states, i.e. states that they have rank 1 and therefore can be written as  $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$
- We do that because mixed states do not give an advantage over pure states
- A state is called product state if it can be written as  $|\psi\rangle = |\psi_1\rangle|\psi_2\rangle \dots |\psi_N\rangle$
- When a vector  $|\psi\rangle$  is referred to as a state we mean the matrix  $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$

# Entanglement

- We will only consider pure states, i.e. states that they have rank 1 and therefore can be written as  $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$
- We do that because mixed states do not give an advantage over pure states
- A state is called product state if it can be written as  $|\psi\rangle = |\psi_1\rangle|\psi_2\rangle \dots |\psi_N\rangle$
- When a vector  $|\psi\rangle$  is referred to as a state we mean the matrix  $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$
- A state that is not a product state is called entangled

## Example

- Let  $|\psi\rangle = |\psi_A\rangle|\psi_B\rangle$  be a system and give  $|\psi_A\rangle$  to Alice and  $|\psi_B\rangle$  to Bob

## Example

- Let  $|\psi\rangle = |\psi_A\rangle|\psi_B\rangle$  be a system and give  $|\psi_A\rangle$  to Alice and  $|\psi_B\rangle$  to Bob
- Let them perform measurements  $\{G^b\}_{b \in \mathcal{B}}$  and  $\{F^a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$  on their respective quantum systems

## Example

- Let  $|\psi\rangle = |\psi_A\rangle|\psi_B\rangle$  be a system and give  $|\psi_A\rangle$  to Alice and  $|\psi_B\rangle$  to Bob
- Let them perform measurements  $\{G^b\}_{b \in \mathcal{B}}$  and  $\{F^a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$  on their respective quantum systems
- What is the probability of Alice getting measurement outcome  $\chi_A = a$  and Bob getting  $\chi_B = b$ ?

## Example

- Let  $|\psi\rangle = |\psi_A\rangle|\psi_B\rangle$  be a system and give  $|\psi_A\rangle$  to Alice and  $|\psi_B\rangle$  to Bob
- Let them perform measurements  $\{G^b\}_{b \in \mathcal{B}}$  and  $\{F^a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$  on their respective quantum systems
- What is the probability of Alice getting measurement outcome  $\chi_A = a$  and Bob getting  $\chi_B = b$ ?

## Calculation

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Tr}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|F^a \otimes G^b) &= \langle\psi|F^a \otimes G^b|\psi\rangle \\ &= (\langle\psi_A| \otimes \langle\psi_B|)(F^a \otimes G^b)(|\psi_A\rangle \otimes |\psi_B\rangle) \\ &= ((\langle\psi_A|F^a) \otimes (\langle\psi_B|G^b))(|\psi_A\rangle \otimes |\psi_B\rangle) \\ &= \langle\psi_A|F^a|\psi_A\rangle \otimes \langle\psi_B|G^b|\psi_B\rangle \\ &= \langle\psi_A|F^a|\psi_A\rangle\langle\psi_B|G^b|\psi_B\rangle\end{aligned}$$

This is equal to the product of the probabilities of Alice measuring  $a$  and Bob measuring  $b$ , i.e. the outcomes do not correlate.



# Nonlocal games

# Nonlocal games

- Three participants: Alice, Bob and a referee

# Nonlocal games

- Three participants: Alice, Bob and a referee
- Referee sends a question  $s$  to Alice and a question  $t$  to Bob

# Nonlocal games

- Three participants: Alice, Bob and a referee
- Referee sends a question  $s$  to Alice and a question  $t$  to Bob
- Alice and Bob are assumed to be located anywhere in the universe respectively

# Nonlocal games

- Three participants: Alice, Bob and a referee
- Referee sends a question  $s$  to Alice and a question  $t$  to Bob
- Alice and Bob are assumed to be located anywhere in the universe respectively
- Alice and Bob must not communicate once the game has started

# Nonlocal games

- Three participants: Alice, Bob and a referee
- Referee sends a question  $s$  to Alice and a question  $t$  to Bob
- Alice and Bob are assumed to be located anywhere in the universe respectively
- Alice and Bob must not communicate once the game has started
- Alice sends answer  $a$  and Bob sends answer  $b$  back to the referee, who then decides whether both win or both lose

# Mathematically speaking

- Four finite sets  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}$

# Mathematically speaking

- Four finite sets  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}$
- probability distribution  $\pi$  over  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T}$   
 $\pi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow [0, 1]$



# Mathematically speaking

- Four finite sets  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}$
- probability distribution  $\pi$  over  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T}$   
 $\pi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow [0, 1]$
- The referee sends with probability  $\pi(s, t)$   $s$  to Alice and  $t$  to Bob

# Mathematically speaking


- Four finite sets  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}$
- probability distribution  $\pi$  over  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T}$   
 $\pi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow [0, 1]$
- The referee sends with probability  $\pi(s, t)$   $s$  to Alice and  $t$  to Bob
- They answer with an element  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $b \in \mathcal{B}$  respectively

# Mathematically speaking

- Four finite sets  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}$
- probability distribution  $\pi$  over  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T}$   
 $\pi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow [0, 1]$
- The referee sends with probability  $\pi(s, t)$   $s$  to Alice and  $t$  to Bob
- They answer with an element  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $b \in \mathcal{B}$  respectively
- A map  $V : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$

# Mathematically speaking

- Four finite sets  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}$
- probability distribution  $\pi$  over  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T}$   
 $\pi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow [0, 1]$
- The referee sends with probability  $\pi(s, t)$   $s$  to Alice and  $t$  to Bob
- They answer with an element  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $b \in \mathcal{B}$  respectively
- A map  $V : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$
- They win if  $V(s, t, a, b) = 1$  and lose otherwise



# Classical strategies

- All players know  $\pi$  and  $V$  and the information they received but not what the other players received

# Classical strategies

- All players know  $\pi$  and  $V$  and the information they received but not what the other players received
- They are allowed to agree on a strategy beforehand but must not communicate once the game started

# Classical strategies

- All players know  $\pi$  and  $V$  and the information they received but not what the other players received
- They are allowed to agree on a strategy beforehand but must not communicate once the game started
- A deterministic strategy is a map  $a : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  for Alice and  $b : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  for Bob

# Classical strategies

- All players know  $\pi$  and  $V$  and the information they received but not what the other players received
- They are allowed to agree on a strategy beforehand but must not communicate once the game started
- A deterministic strategy is a map  $a : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  for Alice and  $b : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  for Bob
- The winning probability then is:

$$\mathbb{E}_{(s,t) \sim \pi} [V(a(s), b(t), s, t)]$$



# Quantum case

- Suppose Alice and Bob both have a subsystem  $X_A, X_B$  of a quantum system  $X$  which is in state  $\rho$ , i.e. Alice and Bob share state  $\rho$

# Quantum case

- Suppose Alice and Bob both have a subsystem  $X_A, X_B$  of a quantum system  $X$  which is in state  $\rho$ , i.e. Alice and Bob share state  $\rho$
- If the state is entangled measurements might give correlated measurement outcomes

# Quantum case

- Suppose Alice and Bob both have a subsystem  $X_A, X_B$  of a quantum system  $X$  which is in state  $\rho$ , i.e. Alice and Bob share state  $\rho$
- If the state is entangled measurements might give correlated measurement outcomes
- Alice and Bob may gain information by performing measurements

# Quantum case

- Suppose Alice and Bob both have a subsystem  $X_A, X_B$  of a quantum system  $X$  which is in state  $\rho$ , i.e. Alice and Bob share state  $\rho$
- If the state is entangled measurements might give correlated measurement outcomes
- Alice and Bob may gain information by performing measurements
- Answering according to measurement outcomes could increase winning probability

# Mathematically speaking

- Given a quantum system  $X$  consisting of two  $n$ -dimensional subsystems  $X_A, X_B$  in some entangled state  $\rho$

# Mathematically speaking

- Given a quantum system  $X$  consisting of two  $n$ -dimensional subsystems  $X_A, X_B$  in some entangled state  $\rho$
- Alice performs a measurement  $\{F_s^a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  on her subsystem  $X_A$  and Bob performs a measurement  $\{G_t^b\}_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  on his subsystem  $X_B$

# Mathematically speaking

- Given a quantum system  $X$  consisting of two  $n$ -dimensional subsystems  $X_A, X_B$  in some entangled state  $\rho$
- Alice performs a measurement  $\{F_s^a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  on her subsystem  $X_A$  and Bob performs a measurement  $\{G_t^b\}_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  on his subsystem  $X_B$
- They send their measurement outcome as their answer to the referee

# Mathematically speaking

- Given a quantum system  $X$  consisting of two  $n$ -dimensional subsystems  $X_A, X_B$  in some entangled state  $\rho$
- Alice performs a measurement  $\{F_s^a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  on her subsystem  $X_A$  and Bob performs a measurement  $\{G_t^b\}_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  on his subsystem  $X_B$
- They send their measurement outcome as their answer to the referee
- Their winning probability is:

$$\mathbb{E}_{(s,t) \sim \pi} \left[ \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \text{Tr}(\rho F_s^a \otimes G_t^b) V(a, b, s, t) \right]$$



# Two player XOR games

- Let the sets  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be  $\{0, 1\}$ , so Alice and Bob both answer either with 1 or 0

# Two player XOR games

- Let the sets  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be  $\{0, 1\}$ , so Alice and Bob both answer either with 1 or 0
- The predicate  $V$  is defined as  $V(a, b, s, t) = [a \oplus b = f(s, t)]$ , where  $f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$

# Two player XOR games

- Let the sets  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be  $\{0, 1\}$ , so Alice and Bob both answer either with 1 or 0
- The predicate  $V$  is defined as  $V(a, b, s, t) = [a \oplus b = f(s, t)]$ , where  $f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$
- A truth table for  $a \oplus b$  looks like this

$\oplus$	0	1
0	0	1
1	1	0

# Bias and violation ratio

- Alice and Bob can always win this game with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$  by flipping an unbiased coin

# Bias and violation ratio

- Alice and Bob can always win this game with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$  by flipping an unbiased coin
- The classical bias of an XOR game  $G$  is defined as the difference of the probabilities of winning and losing for an optimal classical strategy and denoted by  $\beta(G)$

# Bias and violation ratio

- Alice and Bob can always win this game with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$  by flipping an unbiased coin
- The classical bias of an XOR game  $G$  is defined as the difference of the probabilities of winning and losing for an optimal classical strategy and denoted by  $\beta(G)$
- The bias  $\beta^*(G)$  of entangled strategies is calculated the same way

# Bias and violation ratio

- Alice and Bob can always win this game with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$  by flipping an unbiased coin
- The classical bias of an XOR game  $G$  is defined as the difference of the probabilities of winning and losing for an optimal classical strategy and denoted by  $\beta(G)$
- The bias  $\beta^*(G)$  of entangled strategies is calculated the same way
- It is twice the amount by which the maximal winning probability exceeds  $\frac{1}{2}$

# Bias and violation ratio

- Alice and Bob can always win this game with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$  by flipping an unbiased coin
- The classical bias of an XOR game  $G$  is defined as the difference of the probabilities of winning and losing for an optimal classical strategy and denoted by  $\beta(G)$
- The bias  $\beta^*(G)$  of entangled strategies is calculated the same way
- It is twice the amount by which the maximal winning probability exceeds  $\frac{1}{2}$
- Since  $\frac{1}{2} + \gamma - (1 - \frac{1}{2} - \gamma) = 2\gamma$



# Bias and violation ratio

- Alice and Bob can always win this game with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$  by flipping an unbiased coin
- The classical bias of an XOR game  $G$  is defined as the difference of the probabilities of winning and losing for an optimal classical strategy and denoted by  $\beta(G)$
- The bias  $\beta^*(G)$  of entangled strategies is calculated the same way
- It is twice the amount by which the maximal winning probability exceeds  $\frac{1}{2}$
- Since  $\frac{1}{2} + \gamma - (1 - \frac{1}{2} - \gamma) = 2\gamma$
- The violation ratio is defined as  $\frac{\beta^*(G)}{\beta(G)}$

# Signs and observables

- It is convenient to use the  $\{-1, 1\}$ -basis instead of the  $\{0, 1\}$ -basis for boolean valued objects

# Signs and observables

- It is convenient to use the  $\{-1, 1\}$ -basis instead of the  $\{0, 1\}$ -basis for boolean valued objects
- Let  $a : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  and  $b : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be classical strategies and  $\pi$  the probability distribution the referee uses to pick  $s, t$

# Signs and observables

- It is convenient to use the  $\{-1, 1\}$ -basis instead of the  $\{0, 1\}$ -basis for boolean valued objects
- Let  $a : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  and  $b : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be classical strategies and  $\pi$  the probability distribution the referee uses to pick  $s, t$
- The bias is given by the probability under  $\pi$  that  $a(s) \oplus b(t) = f(s, t)$  minus the probability under  $\pi$  that  $a(s) \oplus b(t) \neq f(s, t)$

This means the bias can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{(s,t) \sim \pi} \left[ (-1)^{[a(s) \oplus b(t) = f(s,t)]} \right] = \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{(s,t) \sim \pi} \left[ (-1)^{a(s) \oplus b(t) + f(s,t)} \right] = \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{(s,t) \sim \pi} \left[ (-1)^{a(s)} (-1)^{b(t)} (-1)^{f(s,t)} \right] \end{aligned}$$

This means the bias can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{(s,t) \sim \pi} \left[ (-1)^{[a(s) \oplus b(t) = f(s,t)]} \right] = \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{(s,t) \sim \pi} \left[ (-1)^{a(s) \oplus b(t) + f(s,t)} \right] = \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{(s,t) \sim \pi} \left[ (-1)^{a(s)} (-1)^{b(t)} (-1)^{f(s,t)} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Define the sign matrix  $\Sigma_{s,t} = (-1)^{f(s,t)}$  and functions  $\chi(s) = (-1)^{a(s)}$  and  $\psi(t) = (-1)^{b(t)}$ .

The expected value becomes

$$\mathbb{E}_{(s,t) \sim \pi} [\chi(s) \psi(t) \Sigma_{st}]$$

## Recap

- The measurement outcomes in an XOR game are  $\{0, 1\}$
- Alice and Bob have measurements  $\{F_s^0, F_s^1\}$  and  $\{G_t^0, G_t^1\}$  and share an entangled state
- The probability of Alice and Bob answering with  $a, b$  upon receiving  $s, t$  respectively is  $\langle \psi | F_s^a \otimes G_t^b | \psi \rangle$

## Recap

- The measurement outcomes in an XOR game are  $\{0, 1\}$
- Alice and Bob have measurements  $\{F_s^0, F_s^1\}$  and  $\{G_t^0, G_t^1\}$  and share an entangled state
- The probability of Alice and Bob answering with  $a, b$  upon receiving  $s, t$  respectively is  $\langle \psi | F_s^a \otimes G_t^b | \psi \rangle$

Lets calculate the expected value of  $(-1)^{a \oplus b}$



## Recap

- The measurement outcomes in an XOR game are  $\{0, 1\}$
- Alice and Bob have measurements  $\{F_s^0, F_s^1\}$  and  $\{G_t^0, G_t^1\}$  and share an entangled state
- The probability of Alice and Bob answering with  $a, b$  upon receiving  $s, t$  respectively is  $\langle \psi | F_s^a \otimes G_t^b | \psi \rangle$

Lets calculate the expected value of  $(-1)^{a \oplus b}$

$$\begin{aligned} & (1) \cdot \mathbb{P}[a = b] + (-1) \cdot \mathbb{P}[a \neq b] = \\ &= \langle \psi | F_s^0 \otimes G_t^0 | \psi \rangle + \langle \psi | F_s^1 \otimes G_t^1 | \psi \rangle \\ & \quad - \langle \psi | F_s^1 \otimes G_t^0 | \psi \rangle - \langle \psi | F_s^0 \otimes G_t^1 | \psi \rangle \\ &= \langle \psi | (F_s^0 - F_s^1) \otimes (G_t^0 - G_t^1) | \psi \rangle \end{aligned}$$

- Define  $\{-1, 1\}$ -observables  $F_s = F_s^0 - F_s^1$  and  $G_t = G_t^0 - G_t^1$  with the property that their square is the identity matrix

- Define  $\{-1, 1\}$ -observables  $F_s = F_s^0 - F_s^1$  and  $G_t = G_t^0 - G_t^1$  with the property that their square is the identity matrix
- Using this strategy the bias becomes

$$\mathbb{E}_{(s,t) \sim \pi} [\langle \psi | F_s \otimes G_t | \psi \rangle \Sigma_{s,t}]$$

- For any XOR game the bias is defined as the difference of the probabilities of winning and loosing

- Define  $\{-1, 1\}$ -observables  $F_s = F_s^0 - F_s^1$  and  $G_t = G_t^0 - G_t^1$  with the property that their square is the identity matrix
- Using this strategy the bias becomes

$$\mathbb{E}_{(s,t) \sim \pi} [\langle \psi | F_s \otimes G_t | \psi \rangle \Sigma_{s,t}]$$

- For any XOR game the bias is defined as the difference of the probabilities of winning and loosing
- Which is, if considering the  $\{-1, 1\}$  basis, the expected value above

- Define  $\{-1, 1\}$ -observables  $F_s = F_s^0 - F_s^1$  and  $G_t = G_t^0 - G_t^1$  with the property that their square is the identity matrix
- Using this strategy the bias becomes

$$\mathbb{E}_{(s,t) \sim \pi} [\langle \psi | F_s \otimes G_t | \psi \rangle \Sigma_{s,t}]$$

- For any XOR game the bias is defined as the difference of the probabilities of winning and loosing
- Which is, if considering the  $\{-1, 1\}$  basis, the expected value above
- We are looking to maximize this quantity

# Classical strategies

When using classical strategies this is

$$\begin{aligned} \max \{ & \mathbb{E}_{(s,t) \sim \pi} [\chi(s)\psi(t)\Sigma_{st}] : \chi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}, \\ & \psi : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \{-1, 1\} \} \end{aligned}$$

# Entangled strategies

When using entangled strategies the winning probability might increase indefinitely with the dimensions, so we use the  $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{ \mathbb{E}_{(s,t) \sim \pi} [\langle \psi | F_s \otimes G_t | \psi \rangle \Sigma_{st}] : |\psi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^n, \\ F_s, G_t \in \mathcal{W}(\mathbb{C}^n) \}$$

with  $\mathcal{W}$  being the set of all  $\{-1, 1\}$ -observables in  $\mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ .

# The CHSH game

- The CHSH game (Clauser, Horner, Shimony, Holt) is a two player XOR game with  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{T} = \{0, 1\}$  and  $\pi$  being the uniform distribution
- $f(s, t) = s \wedge t$ , i.e.  $f(1, 1) = 1$  and  $f(0, 0) = f(0, 1) = f(1, 0) = 0$
- Alice and Bob can win  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the games by using deterministic strategies  $(1, 0)$  or  $(0, 1)$

## Quantum strategy

- Let Alice and Bob share an EPR state
- Define

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, Y = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

- $XY + YX = 0$  and  $X^2 = Y^2 = I$
- For Alice define the observable for question 0 by  $F_0 = X$  and for question 1 by  $F_1 = Y$
- Bobs observables are going to be  $G_0 = (X - Y)/\sqrt{2}$  for question 0 and  $G_1 = (X + Y)/\sqrt{2}$  for question 1



The bias of the entangled strategy equals

$$\mathbb{E}_{(s,t) \sim \pi} [\Sigma_{s,t} \langle \psi | F_s \otimes G_t | \psi \rangle] = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{s,t=0}^1 (-1)^{s \wedge t} \langle \text{EPR} | F_s \otimes G_t | \text{EPR} \rangle$$

The bias of the entangled strategy equals

$$\mathbb{E}_{(s,t) \sim \pi} [\Sigma_{s,t} \langle \psi | F_s \otimes G_t | \psi \rangle] = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{s,t=0}^1 (-1)^{s \wedge t} \langle \text{EPR} | F_s \otimes G_t | \text{EPR} \rangle$$

Straight forward calculation shows

$$\langle \text{EPR} | F_s \otimes G_t | \text{EPR} \rangle = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, & (0,0), (1,0), (0,1) \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, & (1,1) \end{cases}$$

The bias of the entangled strategy equals

$$\mathbb{E}_{(s,t) \sim \pi} [\Sigma_{s,t} \langle \psi | F_s \otimes G_t | \psi \rangle] = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{s,t=0}^1 (-1)^{s \wedge t} \langle \text{EPR} | F_s \otimes G_t | \text{EPR} \rangle$$

Straight forward calculation shows

$$\langle \text{EPR} | F_s \otimes G_t | \text{EPR} \rangle = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, & (0,0), (1,0), (0,1) \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, & (1,1) \end{cases}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\langle \text{EPR} | F_s \otimes G_t | \text{EPR} \rangle = \frac{(-1)^{s \wedge t}}{\sqrt{2}}, s, t \in \{0,1\}$$

The bias of the entangled strategy equals

$$\mathbb{E}_{(s,t) \sim \pi} [\Sigma_{s,t} \langle \psi | F_s \otimes G_t | \psi \rangle] = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{s,t=0}^1 (-1)^{s \wedge t} \langle \text{EPR} | F_s \otimes G_t | \text{EPR} \rangle$$

Straight forward calculation shows

$$\langle \text{EPR} | F_s \otimes G_t | \text{EPR} \rangle = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, & (0,0), (1,0), (0,1) \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, & (1,1) \end{cases}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\langle \text{EPR} | F_s \otimes G_t | \text{EPR} \rangle = \frac{(-1)^{s \wedge t}}{\sqrt{2}}, s, t \in \{0,1\}$$

Thus,

$$\frac{1}{4} \left( (-1)^{0 \wedge 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + (-1)^{1 \wedge 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + (-1)^{0 \wedge 1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + (-1)^{1 \wedge 1} \left( -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \right) = \frac{1}{4} \frac{4}{\sqrt{2}}$$

The bias is  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ !

The bias is  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ !

## Note

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} = \beta^*(G) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} + \gamma}_{\text{winning probability}} - (1 - \frac{1}{2} - \gamma) = 2\gamma \Rightarrow \gamma = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}$$

The bias is  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ !

### Note

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} = \beta^*(G) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} + \gamma}_{\text{winning probability}} - (1 - \frac{1}{2} - \gamma) = 2\gamma \Rightarrow \gamma = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}$$

The winning probability follows directly

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \approx 0.85 \dots$$

# Outline

## 1 Introduction

- Basics
- Nonlocal games
- A special case of nonlocal games
- A specific example

## 2 Local and quantum correlation matrices

- Local correlation matrices
- Quantum correlation matrices
- The relations between quantum correlation and local correlation matrices

## 3 Grothendieck-Tsirelson Theorem

- Motivation: The Grothendieck-Tsirelson Theorem
- Grothendieck's Inequality
- Tsirelson's Theorem
- Grothendieck-Tsirelson Theorem



# Local correlation matrices

- Deterministic strategies of Alice and Bob correspond to vectors  $\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^{\mathcal{S}}$ , respectively  $\eta \in \{-1, 1\}^{\mathcal{T}}$ .

# Local correlation matrices

- Deterministic strategies of Alice and Bob correspond to vectors  $\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^{\mathcal{S}}$ , respectively  $\eta \in \{-1, 1\}^{\mathcal{T}}$ .
- Their common answer is the product  $\xi_i \eta_j$ .

# Local correlation matrices

- Deterministic strategies of Alice and Bob correspond to vectors  $\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^{\mathcal{S}}$ , respectively  $\eta \in \{-1, 1\}^{\mathcal{T}}$ .
- Their common answer is the product  $\xi_i \eta_j$ .
- Instead of deterministic strategies they can also answer according to the probability distribution of random variables  $X_i, Y_j$ .

# Local correlation matrices

- Deterministic strategies of Alice and Bob correspond to vectors  $\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^{\mathcal{S}}$ , respectively  $\eta \in \{-1, 1\}^{\mathcal{T}}$ .
- Their common answer is the product  $\xi_i \eta_j$ .
- Instead of deterministic strategies they can also answer according to the probability distribution of random variables  $X_i, Y_j$ .
- Their common answer is  $\mathbb{E}[X_i Y_j]$ .
- This information can be encoded in an  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T}$  matrix.

◀ Motivation Quantum

## Definition

Let  $(X_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}$  and  $(Y_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n}$  be families of random variables on a common probability space such that  $|X_i|, |Y_j| \leq 1$  almost surely. Then  $A = (a_{ij})$  is the corresponding *classical (or local) correlation matrix* if

$$a_{ij} = \mathbb{E}[X_i Y_j]$$

for all  $1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n$ .

## Definition

Let  $(X_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}$  and  $(Y_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n}$  be families of random variables on a common probability space such that  $|X_i|, |Y_j| \leq 1$  almost surely. Then  $A = (a_{ij})$  is the corresponding *classical (or local) correlation matrix* if

$$a_{ij} = \mathbb{E}[X_i Y_j]$$

for all  $1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n$ .

- Set of all local correlation matrices:  $\text{LC}_{m,n}$ .

## Definition

Let  $(X_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}$  and  $(Y_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n}$  be families of random variables on a common probability space such that  $|X_i|, |Y_j| \leq 1$  almost surely. Then  $A = (a_{ij})$  is the corresponding *classical (or local) correlation matrix* if

$$a_{ij} = \mathbb{E}[X_i Y_j]$$

for all  $1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n$ .

- Set of all local correlation matrices:  $\text{LC}_{m,n}$ .

## Lemma

$$\text{LC}_{m,n} = \text{conv}\{\xi \eta^T \mid \xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n\}$$

## Definition

Let  $(X_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}$  and  $(Y_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n}$  be families of random variables on a common probability space such that  $|X_i|, |Y_j| \leq 1$  almost surely. Then  $A = (a_{ij})$  is the corresponding *classical (or local) correlation matrix* if

$$a_{ij} = \mathbb{E}[X_i Y_j]$$

for all  $1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n$ .

- Set of all local correlation matrices:  $\text{LC}_{m,n}$ .

## Lemma

$$\text{LC}_{m,n} = \text{conv}\{\xi \eta^T \mid \xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n\}$$

- No matter which probabilistic strategy there is a deterministic one which is at least as good as the one one chooses.



$$LC_{m,n} \supset \text{conv}\{\xi\eta^T \mid \xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n\}.$$

- $\xi\eta^T \in LC_{m,n}$  for all  $\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n$  (Choose  $X_i \equiv \xi_i, Y_j \equiv \eta_j$ ).



$$LC_{m,n} \supset \text{conv}\{\xi\eta^T \mid \xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n\}.$$

- $\xi\eta^T \in LC_{m,n}$  for all  $\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n$  (Choose  $X_i \equiv \xi_i, Y_j \equiv \eta_j$ ).
- Suffices to show that  $LC_{m,n}$  is convex.



$LC_{m,n} \supset \text{conv}\{\xi\eta^T \mid \xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n\}$ .

- $\xi\eta^T \in LC_{m,n}$  for all  $\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n$  (Choose  $X_i \equiv \xi_i, Y_j \equiv \eta_j$ ).
- Suffices to show that  $LC_{m,n}$  is convex.
- Let  $a_{ij}^{(k)} = \mathbb{E}[X_i^{(k)} Y_j^{(k)}]$  for  $k \in \{0, 1\}$



$$LC_{m,n} \supset \text{conv}\{\xi\eta^T \mid \xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n\}.$$

- $\xi\eta^T \in LC_{m,n}$  for all  $\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n$  (Choose  $X_i \equiv \xi_i, Y_j \equiv \eta_j$ ).
- Suffices to show that  $LC_{m,n}$  is convex.
- Let  $a_{ij}^{(k)} = \mathbb{E}[X_i^{(k)} Y_j^{(k)}]$  for  $k \in \{0, 1\}$
- Find  $(X_i), (Y_j)$  with  $|X_i|, |Y_j| \leq 1$  almost surely such that for  $\beta \in [0, 1]$   
 $\beta a_{ij}^{(0)} + (1 - \beta) a_{ij}^{(1)} = \mathbb{E}[X_i Y_j]$ .



$LC_{m,n} \supset \text{conv}\{\xi\eta^T \mid \xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n\}$ .

- $\xi\eta^T \in LC_{m,n}$  for all  $\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n$  (Choose  $X_i \equiv \xi_i, Y_j \equiv \eta_j$ ).
- Suffices to show that  $LC_{m,n}$  is convex.
- Let  $a_{ij}^{(k)} = \mathbb{E}[X_i^{(k)} Y_j^{(k)}]$  for  $k \in \{0, 1\}$
- Find  $(X_i), (Y_j)$  with  $|X_i|, |Y_j| \leq 1$  almost surely such that for  $\beta \in [0, 1]$   
 $\beta a_{ij}^{(0)} + (1 - \beta) a_{ij}^{(1)} = \mathbb{E}[X_i Y_j]$ .
- Define a Bernoulli random variable  $\alpha$  (which is independent form  $X_i^{(k)}, Y_j^{(k)}$ ) such that  $\mathbb{P}(\alpha = 0) = \beta, \mathbb{P}(\alpha = 1) = 1 - \beta$  and set  $X_i = X_i^{(\alpha)}, Y_j = Y_j^{(\alpha)}$ .



$LC_{m,n} \supset \text{conv}\{\xi\eta^T \mid \xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n\}$ .

- $\xi\eta^T \in LC_{m,n}$  for all  $\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n$  (Choose  $X_i \equiv \xi_i, Y_j \equiv \eta_j$ ).
- Suffices to show that  $LC_{m,n}$  is convex.
- Let  $a_{ij}^{(k)} = \mathbb{E}[X_i^{(k)} Y_j^{(k)}]$  for  $k \in \{0, 1\}$
- Find  $(X_i), (Y_j)$  with  $|X_i|, |Y_j| \leq 1$  almost surely such that for  $\beta \in [0, 1]$   
 $\beta a_{ij}^{(0)} + (1 - \beta) a_{ij}^{(1)} = \mathbb{E}[X_i Y_j]$ .
- Define a Bernoulli random variable  $\alpha$  (which is independent form  $X_i^{(k)}, Y_j^{(k)}$ ) such that  $\mathbb{P}(\alpha = 0) = \beta, \mathbb{P}(\alpha = 1) = 1 - \beta$  and set  $X_i = X_i^{(\alpha)}, Y_j = Y_j^{(\alpha)}$ .
- Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[X_i Y_j] &= \mathbb{E}[X_i^{(\alpha)} Y_j^{(\alpha)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha=0\}}] + \mathbb{E}[X_i^{(\alpha)} Y_j^{(\alpha)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha=1\}}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[X_i^{(0)} Y_j^{(0)}] \mathbb{P}(\alpha = 0) + \mathbb{E}[X_i^{(1)} Y_j^{(1)}] \mathbb{P}(\alpha = 1) \\ &= \beta a_{ij}^{(0)} + (1 - \beta) a_{ij}^{(1)}.\end{aligned}$$



$$LC_{m,n} \subset \text{conv}\{\xi\eta^T \mid \xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n\}$$

- Let  $a_{ij} = \mathbb{E}[X_i Y_j]$  for  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued random variables  $(X_i), (Y_j)$  defined on a common probability space  $\Omega$  with  $|X_i|, |Y_j| \leq 1$  almost surely.

$$LC_{m,n} \subset \text{conv}\{\xi\eta^T \mid \xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n\}$$

- Let  $a_{ij} = \mathbb{E}[X_i Y_j]$  for  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued random variables  $(X_i), (Y_j)$  defined on a common probability space  $\Omega$  with  $|X_i|, |Y_j| \leq 1$  almost surely.
- Set  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_m)$  and  $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$ , then  $X \in [-1, 1]^m$ ,  $Y \in [-1, 1]^n$  almost surely.



$$LC_{m,n} \subset \text{conv}\{\xi\eta^T \mid \xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n\}$$

- Let  $a_{ij} = \mathbb{E}[X_i Y_j]$  for  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued random variables  $(X_i), (Y_j)$  defined on a common probability space  $\Omega$  with  $|X_i|, |Y_j| \leq 1$  almost surely.
- Set  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_m)$  and  $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$ , then  $X \in [-1, 1]^m$ ,  $Y \in [-1, 1]^n$  almost surely.
- Hypercube description by its vertices:  $[-1, 1]^d = \text{conv}\{\xi \mid \xi \in \{-1, 1\}^d\}$ .

$$LC_{m,n} \subset \text{conv}\{\xi\eta^T \mid \xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n\}$$

- Let  $a_{ij} = \mathbb{E}[X_i Y_j]$  for  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued random variables  $(X_i), (Y_j)$  defined on a common probability space  $\Omega$  with  $|X_i|, |Y_j| \leq 1$  almost surely.
- Set  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_m)$  and  $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$ , then  $X \in [-1, 1]^m$ ,  $Y \in [-1, 1]^n$  almost surely.
- Hypercube description by its vertices:  $[-1, 1]^d = \text{conv}\{\xi \mid \xi \in \{-1, 1\}^d\}$ .
- Define random variables  $\lambda_\xi^{(X)} : \Omega^m \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that

$$X(\omega) = \sum_{\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m} \lambda_\xi^{(X)}(\omega) \xi$$

almost surely and  $\sum_{\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m} \lambda_\xi^{(X)}(\omega) = 1$ .

$$\text{LC}_{m,n} \subset \text{conv}\{\xi\eta^T \mid \xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n\}.$$

- Define random variables  $\lambda_\xi^{(X)} : \Omega^m \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that

$$X(\omega) = \sum_{\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m} \lambda_\xi^{(X)}(\omega) \xi$$

almost surely and  $\sum_{\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m} \lambda_\xi^{(X)}(\omega) = 1$ .

- Using the same decomposition for  $Y$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} a_{ij} &= \mathbb{E}[X_i Y_j] = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m} \lambda_\xi^{(X)} \xi_i\right) \left(\sum_{\eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n} \lambda_\eta^{(Y)} \eta_j\right)\right] \\ &= \sum_{\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n} \mathbb{E}[\lambda_\xi^{(X)} \lambda_\eta^{(Y)}] \xi_i \eta_j. \end{aligned}$$



$$LC_{m,n} \subset \text{conv}\{\xi\eta^T \mid \xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n\}.$$

- Define random variables  $\lambda_\xi^{(X)} : \Omega^m \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that

$$X(\omega) = \sum_{\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m} \lambda_\xi^{(X)}(\omega) \xi$$

almost surely and  $\sum_{\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m} \lambda_\xi^{(X)}(\omega) = 1$ .

- Using the same decomposition for  $Y$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} a_{ij} &= \mathbb{E}[X_i Y_j] = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m} \lambda_\xi^{(X)} \xi_i\right) \left(\sum_{\eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n} \lambda_\eta^{(Y)} \eta_j\right)\right] \\ &= \sum_{\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n} \mathbb{E}[\lambda_\xi^{(X)} \lambda_\eta^{(Y)}] \xi_i \eta_j. \end{aligned}$$

- Due to  $\sum_{\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n} \mathbb{E}[\lambda_\xi^{(X)} \lambda_\eta^{(Y)}] = 1$  the matrix  $(a_{ij})$  is a convex combination of  $\xi\eta^T$ ,  $\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ .



# Quantum correlation matrices

- Alice and Bob share a common state  $\rho$  and get inputs  $i \in \mathcal{S}, j \in \mathcal{T}$ .

Motivation Locality

# Quantum correlation matrices

- Alice and Bob share a common state  $\rho$  and get inputs  $i \in \mathcal{S}, j \in \mathcal{T}$ .
- They perform measurements  $\{F_i^\xi\}_{\xi=\pm 1}$ , respectively  $\{G_j^\eta\}_{\eta=\pm 1}$ .

Motivation Locality

# Quantum correlation matrices

- Alice and Bob share a common state  $\rho$  and get inputs  $i \in \mathcal{S}, j \in \mathcal{T}$ .
- They perform measurements  $\{F_i^\xi\}_{\xi=\pm 1}$ , respectively  $\{G_j^\eta\}_{\eta=\pm 1}$ .
- The probability that their response is  $(\xi, \eta)$  for inputs  $(i, j)$  is given by  $a_{ij} = \text{Tr}(\rho F_i^\xi \otimes G_j^\eta)$ .
- Again we can encode this information in a matrix.

Motivation Locality

## Definition

Let  $(X_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}$  and  $(Y_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n}$  be self-adjoint operators on  $\mathbb{C}^{d_1}$ , respectively  $\mathbb{C}^{d_2}$  for some positive integers  $d_1, d_2$ , satisfying  $\|X_i\|_\infty, \|Y_j\|_\infty \leq 1$ .  $A = (a_{ij})$  is called *quantum correlation matrix* if there exists a state  $\rho$  on  $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}$  such that

$$a_{ij} = \text{Tr}(\rho X_i \otimes Y_j).$$



## Definition

Let  $(X_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}$  and  $(Y_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n}$  be self-adjoint operators on  $\mathbb{C}^{d_1}$ , respectively  $\mathbb{C}^{d_2}$  for some positive integers  $d_1, d_2$ , satisfying  $\|X_i\|_\infty, \|Y_j\|_\infty \leq 1$ .  $A = (a_{ij})$  is called *quantum correlation matrix* if there exists a state  $\rho$  on  $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}$  such that

$$a_{ij} = \text{Tr}(\rho X_i \otimes Y_j).$$

- Set of all quantum correlation matrices denoted by  $\text{QC}_{m,n}$ .

## Definition

Let  $(X_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}$  and  $(Y_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n}$  be self-adjoint operators on  $\mathbb{C}^{d_1}$ , respectively  $\mathbb{C}^{d_2}$  for some positive integers  $d_1, d_2$ , satisfying  $\|X_i\|_\infty, \|Y_j\|_\infty \leq 1$ .  $A = (a_{ij})$  is called *quantum correlation matrix* if there exists a state  $\rho$  on  $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}$  such that

$$a_{ij} = \text{Tr}(\rho X_i \otimes Y_j).$$

- Set of all quantum correlation matrices denoted by  $\text{QC}_{m,n}$ .

## Lemma

$$\text{QC}_{m,n} = \{(\langle x_i, y_j \rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} \mid x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}, |x_i| \leq 1, |y_j| \leq 1\}$$

$$\text{QC}_{m,n} \subset \{(\langle x_i, y_j \rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} \mid x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}, |x_i| \leq 1, |y_j| \leq 1\}$$

- $a_{ij} = \text{Tr}(\rho X_i \otimes Y_j)$ , state  $\rho$  on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}$  and Hermitian operators  $(X_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}$ ,  $(Y_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n}$  on  $\mathbb{C}^{d_1}$ , respectively  $\mathbb{C}^{d_2}$  satisfying  $\|X_i\|_\infty, \|Y_j\|_\infty \leq 1$ .

$$\text{QC}_{m,n} \subset \{(\langle x_i, y_j \rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} \mid x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}, |x_i| \leq 1, |y_j| \leq 1\}$$

- $a_{ij} = \text{Tr}(\rho X_i \otimes Y_j)$ , state  $\rho$  on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}$  and Hermitian operators  $(X_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}$ ,  $(Y_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n}$  on  $\mathbb{C}^{d_1}$ , respectively  $\mathbb{C}^{d_2}$  satisfying  $\|X_i\|_\infty, \|Y_j\|_\infty \leq 1$ .
- Define a positive semidefinite symmetric bilinear form on the space of Hermitian operators on  $\mathcal{H}$  by  $\beta : B^{(sa)}(\mathcal{H}) \times B^{(sa)}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  where  $\beta(S, T) = \text{Re}(\text{Tr} \rho ST)$ .

$$QC_{m,n} \subset \{(\langle x_i, y_j \rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} \mid x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}, |x_i| \leq 1, |y_j| \leq 1\}$$

- $a_{ij} = \text{Tr}(\rho X_i \otimes Y_j)$ , state  $\rho$  on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}$  and Hermitian operators  $(X_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}$ ,  $(Y_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n}$  on  $\mathbb{C}^{d_1}$ , respectively  $\mathbb{C}^{d_2}$  satisfying  $\|X_i\|_\infty, \|Y_j\|_\infty \leq 1$ .
- Define a positive semidefinite symmetric bilinear form on the space of Hermitian operators on  $\mathcal{H}$  by  $\beta : B^{sa}(\mathcal{H}) \times B^{sa}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  where  $\beta(S, T) = \text{Re}(\text{Tr} \rho ST)$ .
- Obtain an inner product vector space  $U := B^{sa}(\mathcal{H}) / \ker \beta$  equipped with the inner product

$$\tilde{\beta}([S], [T]) = \beta(S, T).$$

$$QC_{m,n} \subset \{(\langle x_i, y_j \rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} \mid x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}, |x_i| \leq 1, |y_j| \leq 1\}$$

- $a_{ij} = \text{Tr}(\rho X_i \otimes Y_j)$ , state  $\rho$  on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}$  and Hermitian operators  $(X_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}$ ,  $(Y_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n}$  on  $\mathbb{C}^{d_1}$ , respectively  $\mathbb{C}^{d_2}$  satisfying  $\|X_i\|_\infty, \|Y_j\|_\infty \leq 1$ .
- Define a positive semidefinite symmetric bilinear form on the space of Hermitian operators on  $\mathcal{H}$  by  $\beta : B^{(sa)}(\mathcal{H}) \times B^{(sa)}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  where  $\beta(S, T) = \text{Re}(\text{Tr} \rho ST)$ .
- Obtain an inner product vector space  $U := B^{(sa)}(\mathcal{H}) / \ker \beta$  equipped with the inner product

$$\tilde{\beta}([S], [T]) = \beta(S, T).$$

- Identify  $X_i \otimes I, I \otimes Y_j$  with vectors  $x_i, y_j$  in  $U$ , then

$$\tilde{\beta}(x_i, y_j) = \beta(X_i \otimes I, I \otimes Y_j) = \text{ReTr}(\rho X_i \otimes Y_j) = a_{ij}.$$

$$\text{QC}_{m,n} \subset \{(\langle x_i, y_j \rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} \mid x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}, |x_i| \leq 1, |y_j| \leq 1\}.$$

- Identify  $X_i \otimes I, I \otimes Y_j$  with vectors  $x_i, y_j$  in  $U$ , then

$$\tilde{\beta}(x_i, y_j) = \beta(X_i \otimes I, I \otimes Y_j) = \text{ReTr}(\rho X_i \otimes Y_j) = a_{ij}.$$

- $\beta(X \otimes I, X \otimes I), \beta(I \otimes Y, I \otimes Y) \leq 1$   
(this can be shown by starting with a pure state  $\rho = |\psi\rangle \langle \psi|$  and using a *Schmidt-decomposition* and  $\|X_i\|_\infty, \|Y_j\|_\infty \leq 1$ ).



$$\text{QC}_{m,n} \subset \{(\langle x_i, y_j \rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} \mid x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}, |x_i| \leq 1, |y_j| \leq 1\}.$$

- Identify  $X_i \otimes I, I \otimes Y_j$  with vectors  $x_i, y_j$  in  $U$ , then

$$\tilde{\beta}(x_i, y_j) = \beta(X_i \otimes I, I \otimes Y_j) = \text{ReTr}(\rho X_i \otimes Y_j) = a_{ij}.$$

- $\beta(X \otimes I, X \otimes I), \beta(I \otimes Y, I \otimes Y) \leq 1$   
(this can be shown by starting with a pure state  $\rho = |\psi\rangle \langle \psi|$  and using a *Schmidt-decomposition* and  $\|X_i\|_\infty, \|Y_j\|_\infty \leq 1$ ).
- Project the  $y_j$ 's orthogonally onto  $\text{span}\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$  (wlog  $m \leq n$ ).





$$\text{QC}_{m,n} \subset \{(\langle x_i, y_j \rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} \mid x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}, |x_i| \leq 1, |y_j| \leq 1\}.$$

- Identify  $X_i \otimes I, I \otimes Y_j$  with vectors  $x_i, y_j$  in  $U$ , then

$$\tilde{\beta}(x_i, y_j) = \beta(X_i \otimes I, I \otimes Y_j) = \text{ReTr}(\rho X_i \otimes Y_j) = a_{ij}.$$

- $\beta(X \otimes I, X \otimes I), \beta(I \otimes Y, I \otimes Y) \leq 1$   
(this can be shown by starting with a pure state  $\rho = |\psi\rangle \langle\psi|$  and using a *Schmidt-decomposition* and  $\|X_i\|_\infty, \|Y_j\|_\infty \leq 1$ ).
- Project the  $y_j$ 's orthogonally onto  $\text{span}\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$  (wlog  $m \leq n$ ).
- If  $\pi(y_j)$  is the projection of  $y_j$  then  $\tilde{\beta}(x_i, \pi(y_j)) = \tilde{\beta}(x_i, y_j)$ .



$$\mathcal{QC}_{m,n} \subset \{(\langle x_i, y_j \rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} \mid x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}, |x_i| \leq 1, |y_j| \leq 1\}.$$

- Identify  $X_i \otimes I, I \otimes Y_j$  with vectors  $x_i, y_j$  in  $U$ , then

$$\tilde{\beta}(x_i, y_j) = \beta(X_i \otimes I, I \otimes Y_j) = \text{ReTr}(\rho X_i \otimes Y_j) = a_{ij}.$$

- $\beta(X \otimes I, X \otimes I), \beta(I \otimes Y, I \otimes Y) \leq 1$   
(this can be shown by starting with a pure state  $\rho = |\psi\rangle \langle \psi|$  and using a *Schmidt-decomposition* and  $\|X_i\|_\infty, \|Y_j\|_\infty \leq 1$ ).
- Project the  $y_j$ 's orthogonally onto  $\text{span}\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$  (wlog  $m \leq n$ ).
- If  $\pi(y_j)$  is the projection of  $y_j$  then  $\tilde{\beta}(x_i, \pi(y_j)) = \tilde{\beta}(x_i, y_j)$ .
- The vectors still have not the right dimension but again, we can project them onto vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ .



- In order to show

$$\text{QC}_{m,n} \supset \{(\langle x_i, y_j \rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} \mid x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}, |x_i| \leq 1, |y_j| \leq 1\}$$

we will use the following:

- In order to show

$$\text{QC}_{m,n} \supset \{(\langle x_i, y_j \rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} \mid x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}, |x_i| \leq 1, |y_j| \leq 1\}$$

we will use the following:

### Proposition

For all  $n \geq 1$  there is a subspace of the  $2^n \times 2^n$  Hermitian matrices where every element is the multiple of a unitary matrix.

- In order to show

$$\text{QC}_{m,n} \supset \{(\langle x_i, y_j \rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} \mid x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}, |x_i| \leq 1, |y_j| \leq 1\}$$

we will use the following:

### Proposition

For all  $n \geq 1$  there is a subspace of the  $2^n \times 2^n$  Hermitian matrices where every element is the multiple of a unitary matrix.

- The proof is based on  $n$ -fold tensor products of the Pauli matrices which are the three matrices

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, Y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, Z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, I = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

- $X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $Y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $Z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $I = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$

## Proof.

- Define  $U_i = I^{\otimes(i-1)} \otimes X \otimes Y^{\otimes(n-i)}$ ,  
 $U_{n+i} = I^{\otimes(i-1)} \otimes Z \otimes Y^{\otimes(n-i)}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .



- $X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $Y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $Z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $I = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$

## Proof.

- Define  $U_i = I^{\otimes(i-1)} \otimes X \otimes Y^{\otimes(n-i)}$ ,  
 $U_{n+i} = I^{\otimes(i-1)} \otimes Z \otimes Y^{\otimes(n-i)}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .
- $U_i$ 's are anti-commuting traceless Hermitian unitaries, i.e.  $U_i U_j = -U_j U_i$  for  $i \neq j$  and  $U_i^2 = I$ .



- $X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $Y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $Z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $I = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$

## Proof.

- Define  $U_i = I^{\otimes(i-1)} \otimes X \otimes Y^{\otimes(n-i)}$ ,  
 $U_{n+i} = I^{\otimes(i-1)} \otimes Z \otimes Y^{\otimes(n-i)}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .
- $U_i$ 's are anti-commuting traceless Hermitian unitaries, i.e.  $U_i U_j = -U_j U_i$  for  $i \neq j$  and  $U_i^2 = I$ .
- For  $X = \sum_{i=1}^{2n} \xi_i U_i$  we can calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
 XX^* &= XX = \sum_{i=1}^{2n} \xi_i^2 I + \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq 2n} \xi_i \xi_j U_i U_j \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^{2n} \xi_i^2 I + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq 2n} \xi_i \xi_j U_i U_j - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq 2n} \xi_i \xi_j U_i U_j \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^{2n} \xi_i^2 I = |\xi|^2 I.
 \end{aligned}$$





- Set

$$U_i = I^{\otimes(i-1)} \otimes X \otimes Y^{\otimes(n-i)},$$

$$U_{n+i} = I^{\otimes(i-1)} \otimes Z \otimes Y^{\otimes(n-i)}, i = 1, \dots, n.$$

- Moreover, taking two linear combinations  $X = \sum_{i=1}^{2n} \xi_i U_i$ ,  $Y = \sum_{i=1}^{2n} \eta_i U_i$  and consider the trace of the product we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(XY) &= \sum_{i=1}^{2n} \xi_i \eta_i \text{Tr} I + \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq 2n} \xi_i \eta_j \text{Tr}(U_i U_j) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{2n} \xi_i \eta_i 2^n = 2^n \cdot \langle \xi, \eta \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that the product  $U_i U_j$  is traceless for  $i \neq j$ .

$$\text{QC}_{m,n} \supset \{(\langle x_i, y_j \rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} \mid x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}, |x_i| \leq 1, |y_j| \leq 1\}$$

- Let  $(x_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}, (y_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}$  such that  $|x_i|, |y_j| \leq 1$ .

$$QC_{m,n} \supset \{(\langle x_i, y_j \rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} \mid x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}, |x_i| \leq 1, |y_j| \leq 1\}$$

- Let  $(x_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}, (y_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}$  such that  $|x_i|, |y_j| \leq 1$ .
- Let  $X_i = \sum_{k=1}^{\min\{m,n\}} x_i(k) U_i$  and  $Y_j^T = \sum_{k=1}^{\min\{m,n\}} y_j(k) U_k$  where the  $U_i$ 's are  $d \times d$  matrices with  $d = 2^{\lceil \min\{m,n\}/2 \rceil}$ .

$$QC_{m,n} \supset \{(\langle x_i, y_j \rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} \mid x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}, |x_i| \leq 1, |y_j| \leq 1\}$$

- Let  $(x_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}, (y_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}$  such that  $|x_i|, |y_j| \leq 1$ .
- Let  $X_i = \sum_{k=1}^{\min\{m,n\}} x_i(k) U_k$  and  $Y_j^T = \sum_{k=1}^{\min\{m,n\}} y_j(k) U_k$  where the  $U_i$ 's are  $d \times d$  matrices with  $d = 2^{\lceil \min\{m,n\}/2 \rceil}$ .
- $\text{Tr}(X_i Y_j^T) = d \cdot \langle x_i, y_j \rangle$  and  $\|X_i\|_\infty \leq 1$  since  $X_i X_i^* = |x_i|^2 I$  and  $|x_i|^2 \leq 1$  (the same holds for  $Y_j$ )

$$\text{QC}_{m,n} \supset \{(\langle x_i, y_j \rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} \mid x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}, |x_i| \leq 1, |y_j| \leq 1\}$$

- Let  $(x_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}, (y_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}$  such that  $|x_i|, |y_j| \leq 1$ .
- Let  $X_i = \sum_{k=1}^{\min\{m,n\}} x_i(k) U_i$  and  $Y_j^T = \sum_{k=1}^{\min\{m,n\}} y_j(k) U_k$  where the  $U_i$ 's are  $d \times d$  matrices with  $d = 2^{\lceil \min\{m,n\}/2 \rceil}$ .
- $\text{Tr}(X_i Y_j^T) = d \cdot \langle x_i, y_j \rangle$  and  $\|X_i\|_\infty \leq 1$  since  $X_i X_i^* = |x_i|^2 I$  and  $|x_i|^2 \leq 1$  (the same holds for  $Y_j$ )
- Let  $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i=1}^d |i\rangle \otimes |i\rangle$  and  $\rho = |\psi\rangle \langle \psi|$ . Note that we can write  $\rho$  as

$$\rho = |\psi\rangle \langle \psi| = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{1 \leq k, l \leq d} |k\rangle \otimes |k\rangle \langle l| \otimes \langle l| = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{1 \leq k, l \leq d} |k\rangle \langle l| \otimes |k\rangle \langle l|.$$

$$QC_{m,n} \supset \{(\langle x_i, y_j \rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} \mid x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}, |x_i| \leq 1, |y_j| \leq 1\}.$$

- Let  $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i=1}^d |ii\rangle$  and  $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ . Note that we can write  $\rho$  as

$$\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{1 \leq k, l \leq d} |kk\rangle\langle ll| = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{1 \leq k, l \leq d} |k\rangle\langle l| \otimes |k\rangle\langle l|.$$

- Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\rho X_i \otimes Y_j) &= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{1 \leq k, l \leq d} \text{Tr}(|k\rangle\langle l| X_i \otimes |k\rangle\langle l| Y_j) \\ &= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{1 \leq k, l \leq d} \text{Tr}(|k\rangle\langle l| X_i) \text{Tr}(|k\rangle\langle l| Y_j) \\ &= \frac{1}{d} \text{Tr} X_i Y_j^T = \langle x_i, y_j \rangle. \end{aligned}$$



- $QC_{m,n}$  is convex.

- $QC_{m,n}$  is convex.
- Let  $a_{ij} = \langle x_i, y_j \rangle$  and  $\bar{a}_{ij} = \langle \bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_j \rangle$  for  $x_i, y_j, \bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}$  such that  $|x_i|, |y_j|, |\bar{x}_i|, |\bar{y}_j| \leq 1$ .



- $QC_{m,n}$  is convex.
- Let  $a_{ij} = \langle x_i, y_j \rangle$  and  $\bar{a}_{ij} = \langle \bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_j \rangle$  for  $x_i, y_j, \bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}$  such that  $|x_i|, |y_j|, |\bar{x}_i|, |\bar{y}_j| \leq 1$ .
- Define vectors  $\tilde{x}_i := \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\lambda}x_i \\ \sqrt{1-\lambda}\bar{x}_i \end{pmatrix}, \tilde{y}_j := \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\lambda}y_j \\ \sqrt{1-\lambda}\bar{y}_j \end{pmatrix}$  for  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ .

- $\text{QC}_{m,n}$  is convex.
- Let  $a_{ij} = \langle x_i, y_j \rangle$  and  $\bar{a}_{ij} = \langle \bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_j \rangle$  for  $x_i, y_j, \bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}$  such that  $|x_i|, |y_j|, |\bar{x}_i|, |\bar{y}_j| \leq 1$ .
- Define vectors  $\tilde{x}_i := \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\lambda}x_i \\ \sqrt{1-\lambda}\bar{x}_i \end{pmatrix}, \tilde{y}_j := \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\lambda}y_j \\ \sqrt{1-\lambda}\bar{y}_j \end{pmatrix}$  for  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ .
- It holds  $|\tilde{x}_i| \leq \lambda \left| \begin{pmatrix} x_i \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right| + (1-\lambda) \left| \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \bar{x}_i \end{pmatrix} \right| \leq 1$  and  $\langle \tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_j \rangle = \lambda \langle x_i, y_j \rangle + (1-\lambda) \langle \bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_j \rangle$ .

- $\text{QC}_{m,n}$  is convex.
- Let  $a_{ij} = \langle x_i, y_j \rangle$  and  $\bar{a}_{ij} = \langle \bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_j \rangle$  for  $x_i, y_j, \bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}$  such that  $|x_i|, |y_j|, |\bar{x}_i|, |\bar{y}_j| \leq 1$ .
- Define vectors  $\tilde{x}_i := \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\lambda}x_i \\ \sqrt{1-\lambda}\bar{x}_i \end{pmatrix}, \tilde{y}_j := \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\lambda}y_j \\ \sqrt{1-\lambda}\bar{y}_j \end{pmatrix}$  for  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ .
- It holds  $|\tilde{x}_i| \leq \lambda \left| \begin{pmatrix} x_i \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right| + (1-\lambda) \left| \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \bar{x}_i \end{pmatrix} \right| \leq 1$  and  $\langle \tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_j \rangle = \lambda \langle x_i, y_j \rangle + (1-\lambda) \langle \bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_j \rangle$ .
- Right dimension is obtained by projecting  $(\tilde{x}_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}, (\tilde{y}_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n}$  on  $\text{span}\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$  or  $\text{span}\{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ , as in the proof before.

# The relations between quantum correlation and local correlation matrices

- $LC_{m,n} = \text{conv}\{\xi\eta^T \mid \xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n\}$
- $QC_{m,n} = \{(\langle x_i, y_j \rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} \mid x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}, |x_i| \leq 1, |y_j| \leq 1\}$
- $LC_{m,n} \subset QC_{m,n}$

# The relations between quantum correlation and local correlation matrices

- $LC_{m,n} = \text{conv}\{\xi\eta^T \mid \xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n\}$
- $QC_{m,n} = \{(\langle x_i, y_j \rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} \mid x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}, |x_i| \leq 1, |y_j| \leq 1\}$
- $LC_{m,n} \subset QC_{m,n}$
- Set  $x_i = \xi_i |1\rangle$  and  $y_j = \eta_j |1\rangle$  it immediately follows  $\xi_i \eta_j = \langle x_i, y_j \rangle$ . Hence,  $\xi\eta^T \in QC_{m,n}$  (rest follows with the convexity of  $QC_{m,n}$ ).

# The relations between quantum correlation and local correlation matrices

- $LC_{m,n} = \text{conv}\{\xi\eta^T \mid \xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n\}$
- $QC_{m,n} = \{(\langle x_i, y_j \rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} \mid x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}, |x_i| \leq 1, |y_j| \leq 1\}$
- $LC_{m,n} \subset QC_{m,n}$
- Set  $x_i = \xi_i |1\rangle$  and  $y_j = \eta_j |1\rangle$  it immediately follows  $\xi_i \eta_j = \langle x_i, y_j \rangle$ . Hence,  $\xi\eta^T \in QC_{m,n}$  (rest follows with the convexity of  $QC_{m,n}$ ).
- Inclusion is strict in general.

- Let us consider the case  $n = m = 2$ .

- Let us consider the case  $n = m = 2$ .
- $\text{LC}_{2,2} = \text{conv}\{\xi\eta^T \mid \xi \in \{-1, 1\}^2, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^2\}$
- It holds

$$\text{LC}_{2,2} = \text{conv}\left\{\pm \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \pm \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \pm \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \pm \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}\right\}.$$



- Let us consider the case  $n = m = 2$ .
- $\text{LC}_{2,2} = \text{conv}\{\xi\eta^T \mid \xi \in \{-1, 1\}^2, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^2\}$
- It holds

$$\text{LC}_{2,2} = \text{conv}\left\{\pm \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \pm \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \pm \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \pm \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}\right\}.$$

- We can also write it as in intersections of halfspaces:

$$\text{LC}_{2,2} = \{A \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2} \mid -1 \leq \text{Tr} AM \leq 1 \text{ for all } M \in \mathcal{K}\}, \quad (1)$$

$$\text{where } \mathcal{K} = \left\{\frac{1}{2}\sigma\left(\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right), \sigma\left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) \mid \sigma \in \{\text{id}, (1\ 2), (1\ 3), (1\ 4)\}\right\}.$$

- We will show that the inclusion is strict by showing that both sets yield different values if we maximize in a certain direction

- We will show that the inclusion is strict by showing that both sets yield different values if we maximize in a certain direction
- Let  $M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$

- We will show that the inclusion is strict by showing that both sets yield different values if we maximize in a certain direction
- Let  $M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$
- $\text{LC}_{2,2} = \{A \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2} \mid -1 \leq \text{Tr} AM \leq 1 \text{ for all } M \in \mathcal{K}\}$ , where  
 $\mathcal{K} = \{\frac{1}{2}\sigma\left(\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right), \sigma\left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) \mid \sigma \in \{\text{id}, (1\ 2), (1\ 3), (1\ 4)\}\}$ .
- $\max\{\text{Tr}(AM) \mid A \in \text{LC}_{2,2}\} = 2$

- $\max\{\text{Tr}(AM) \mid A \in \text{LC}_{2,2}\} = 2$

- $\max\{\text{Tr}(AM) \mid A \in \text{LC}_{2,2}\} = 2$
- Recall  $QC_{2,2} = \{\langle x_i, y_j \rangle \mid x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2, |x_i|, |y_j| \leq 1\}$ .

- $\max\{\text{Tr}(AM) \mid A \in \text{LC}_{2,2}\} = 2$
- Recall  $QC_{2,2} = \{\langle x_i, y_j \rangle \mid x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2, |x_i|, |y_j| \leq 1\}$ .

- $\max\{\text{Tr}(AM) \mid A \in \text{LC}_{2,2}\} = 2$
- Recall  $\text{QC}_{2,2} = \{\langle x_i, y_j \rangle \mid x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2, |x_i|, |y_j| \leq 1\}$ .
- $A \in \text{QC}_{2,2}$  we obtain, by Cauchy-Schwarz and  $|y_i| \leq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(AM) &= \langle x_1, y_1 \rangle + \langle x_1, y_2 \rangle + \langle x_2, y_1 \rangle - \langle x_2, y_2 \rangle \\ &= \langle x_1 + x_2, y_1 \rangle + \langle x_1 - x_2, y_2 \rangle \leq |x_1 + x_2||y_1| + |x_1 - x_2||y_2| \\ &\leq |x_1 + x_2| + |x_1 - x_2|. \end{aligned}$$



- $\max\{\text{Tr}(AM) \mid A \in \text{LC}_{2,2}\} = 2$
- Recall  $\text{QC}_{2,2} = \{\langle x_i, y_j \rangle \mid x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2, |x_i|, |y_j| \leq 1\}$ .
- $A \in \text{QC}_{2,2}$  we obtain, by Cauchy-Schwarz and  $|y_i| \leq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(AM) &= \langle x_1, y_1 \rangle + \langle x_1, y_2 \rangle + \langle x_2, y_1 \rangle - \langle x_2, y_2 \rangle \\ &= \langle x_1 + x_2, y_1 \rangle + \langle x_1 - x_2, y_2 \rangle \leq |x_1 + x_2||y_1| + |x_1 - x_2||y_2| \\ &\leq |x_1 + x_2| + |x_1 - x_2|. \end{aligned}$$

- $(|x_1 + x_2| + |x_1 - x_2|)^2 \leq 4(|x_1|^2 + |x_2|^2)$

- $\max\{\text{Tr}(AM) \mid A \in \text{LC}_{2,2}\} = 2$
- Recall  $\text{QC}_{2,2} = \{\langle x_i, y_j \rangle \mid x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2, |x_i|, |y_j| \leq 1\}$ .
- $A \in \text{QC}_{2,2}$  we obtain, by Cauchy-Schwarz and  $|y_i| \leq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Tr}(AM) &= \langle x_1, y_1 \rangle + \langle x_1, y_2 \rangle + \langle x_2, y_1 \rangle - \langle x_2, y_2 \rangle \\ &= \langle x_1 + x_2, y_1 \rangle + \langle x_1 - x_2, y_2 \rangle \leq |x_1 + x_2||y_1| + |x_1 - x_2||y_2| \\ &\leq |x_1 + x_2| + |x_1 - x_2|.\end{aligned}$$

- $(|x_1 + x_2| + |x_1 - x_2|)^2 \leq 4(|x_1|^2 + |x_2|^2)$
- $\text{Tr}(AM) \leq |x_1 + x_2| + |x_1 - x_2| \leq 2\sqrt{|x_1|^2 + |x_2|^2} \leq 2\sqrt{2}.$

- $\max\{\text{Tr}(AM) \mid A \in \text{LC}_{2,2}\} = 2$
- Recall  $\text{QC}_{2,2} = \{\langle x_i, y_j \rangle \mid x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2, |x_i|, |y_j| \leq 1\}$ .
- $A \in \text{QC}_{2,2}$  we obtain, by Cauchy-Schwarz and  $|y_i| \leq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Tr}(AM) &= \langle x_1, y_1 \rangle + \langle x_1, y_2 \rangle + \langle x_2, y_1 \rangle - \langle x_2, y_2 \rangle \\ &= \langle x_1 + x_2, y_1 \rangle + \langle x_1 - x_2, y_2 \rangle \leq |x_1 + x_2||y_1| + |x_1 - x_2||y_2| \\ &\leq |x_1 + x_2| + |x_1 - x_2|.\end{aligned}$$

- $(|x_1 + x_2| + |x_1 - x_2|)^2 \leq 4(|x_1|^2 + |x_2|^2)$
- $\text{Tr}(AM) \leq |x_1 + x_2| + |x_1 - x_2| \leq 2\sqrt{|x_1|^2 + |x_2|^2} \leq 2\sqrt{2}$ .
- Bound is achieved by  $A = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ , induced by the vectors  $x_1 = x_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1, 1)$  and  $y_1 = y_2 = (1, 0)$ .

## 1 Introduction

- Basics
- Nonlocal games
- A special case of nonlocal games
- A specific example

## 2 Local and quantum correlation matrices

- Local correlation matrices
- Quantum correlation matrices
- The relations between quantum correlation and local correlation matrices

## 3 Grothendieck-Tsirelson Theorem

- Motivation: The Grothendieck-Tsirelson Theorem
- Grothendieck's Inequality
- Tsirelson's Theorem
- Grothendieck-Tsirelson Theorem

## 1 Introduction

- Basics
- Nonlocal games
- A special case of nonlocal games
- A specific example

## 2 Local and quantum correlation matrices

- Local correlation matrices
- Quantum correlation matrices
- The relations between quantum correlation and local correlation matrices

## 3 Grothendieck-Tsirelson Theorem

- **Motivation: The Grothendieck-Tsirelson Theorem**
- Grothendieck's Inequality
- Tsirelson's Theorem
- Gorthendieck-Tsirelson Theorem

## Theorem (Grothendieck-Tsirelson)

There exists an absolute constant  $K \geq 1$  such that, for any positive integers  $m, n$ , the following three equivalent conditions hold:

(1) We have the inclusion

$$\text{QC}_{m,n} \subset K \text{LC}_{m,n}. \quad (2)$$

(2) For any  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  and for any  $\rho, X_i, Y_j$  verifying the conditions of Definition 4.2.1 we have

$$\sum_{i,j} M_{ij} \text{Tr} \rho(X_i \otimes Y_j) \leq K \max_{\xi \in \{-1,1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1,1\}^n} \sum_{i,j} M_{ij} \xi_i \eta_j \quad (3)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \text{Tr} M A^\top \leq \max_{\xi \in \{-1,1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1,1\}^n} \text{Tr} M (\xi \eta^\top)^\top. \quad (4)$$

(3) For any  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  and for any (real) Hilbert space vectors  $x_i, y_j$  with  $|x_i| \leq 1, |y_j| \leq 1$  we have

$$\sum_{i,j} M_{i,j} \langle x_i, y_j \rangle \leq K \max_{\xi \in \{-1,1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1,1\}^n} \text{Tr} \xi^\top M \eta. \quad (5)$$

## 1 Introduction

- Basics
- Nonlocal games
- A special case of nonlocal games
- A specific example

## 2 Local and quantum correlation matrices

- Local correlation matrices
- Quantum correlation matrices
- The relations between quantum correlation and local correlation matrices

## 3 Grothendieck-Tsirelson Theorem

- Motivation: The Grothendieck-Tsirelson Theorem
- **Grothendieck's Inequality**
- Tsirelson's Theorem
- Gorthendieck-Tsirelson Theorem

## Lemma (Grothendieck's identity)

Let  $x, y \in S^{d-1}$ . Let  $r \in S^{d-1}$  be a random unit vector chosen from  $O(d)$ -invariant probability distribution on the unit sphere. Then

- i,  $\mathbb{P}[\text{sign}(\langle x, r \rangle) \neq \text{sign}(\langle y, r \rangle)] = \frac{\arccos(\langle x, y \rangle)}{\pi}$
- ii,  $\mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(\langle x, r \rangle) \text{sign}(\langle y, r \rangle)] = \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin(\langle x, y \rangle)$ .



## Lemma (Grothendieck's identity)

Let  $x, y \in S^{d-1}$ . Let  $r \in S^{d-1}$  be a random unit vector chosen from  $O(d)$ -invariant probability distribution on the unit sphere. Then

- i,  $\mathbb{P}[\text{sign}(\langle x, r \rangle) \neq \text{sign}(\langle y, r \rangle)] = \frac{\arccos(\langle x, y \rangle)}{\pi}$
- ii,  $\mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(\langle x, r \rangle) \text{sign}(\langle y, r \rangle)] = \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin(\langle x, y \rangle)$ .

## Proof.

- If  $x$  and  $y$  are linearly dependent, then
  - ▶ if  $x = y$ :  $\arccos(\langle x, y \rangle) = \arccos(1) = 0$ .

## Lemma (Grothendieck's identity)

Let  $x, y \in S^{d-1}$ . Let  $r \in S^{d-1}$  be a random unit vector chosen from  $O(d)$ -invariant probability distribution on the unit sphere. Then

- i,  $\mathbb{P}[\text{sign}(\langle x, r \rangle) \neq \text{sign}(\langle y, r \rangle)] = \frac{\arccos(\langle x, y \rangle)}{\pi}$
- ii,  $\mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(\langle x, r \rangle) \text{sign}(\langle y, r \rangle)] = \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin(\langle x, y \rangle)$ .

## Proof.

- If  $x$  and  $y$  are linearly dependent, then
  - ▶ if  $x = y$ :  $\arccos(\langle x, y \rangle) = \arccos(1) = 0$ .
  - ▶ if  $x = -y$ :  $\arccos(\langle x, y \rangle) = \arccos(-1) = \pi$ .

## Lemma (Grothendieck's identity)

Let  $x, y \in S^{d-1}$ . Let  $r \in S^{d-1}$  be a random unit vector chosen from  $O(d)$ -invariant probability distribution on the unit sphere. Then

- i,  $\mathbb{P}[\text{sign}(\langle x, r \rangle) \neq \text{sign}(\langle y, r \rangle)] = \frac{\arccos(\langle x, y \rangle)}{\pi}$
- ii,  $\mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(\langle x, r \rangle) \text{sign}(\langle y, r \rangle)] = \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin(\langle x, y \rangle)$ .

## Proof.

- If  $x$  and  $y$  are linearly dependent, then
  - ▶ if  $x = y$ :  $\arccos(\langle x, y \rangle) = \arccos(1) = 0$ .
  - ▶ if  $x = -y$ :  $\arccos(\langle x, y \rangle) = \arccos(-1) = \pi$ .
- If  $x$  and  $y$  are linearly independent, then

## Lemma (Grothendieck's identity)

Let  $x, y \in S^{d-1}$ . Let  $r \in S^{d-1}$  be a random unit vector chosen from  $O(d)$ -invariant probability distribution on the unit sphere. Then

- i,  $\mathbb{P}[\text{sign}(\langle x, r \rangle) \neq \text{sign}(\langle y, r \rangle)] = \frac{\arccos(\langle x, y \rangle)}{\pi}$
- ii,  $\mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(\langle x, r \rangle) \text{sign}(\langle y, r \rangle)] = \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin(\langle x, y \rangle)$ .

## Proof.

- If  $x$  and  $y$  are linearly dependent, then
  - ▶ if  $x = y$ :  $\arccos(\langle x, y \rangle) = \arccos(1) = 0$ .
  - ▶ if  $x = -y$ :  $\arccos(\langle x, y \rangle) = \arccos(-1) = \pi$ .
- If  $x$  and  $y$  are linearly independent, then
  - ▶ project  $r$  orthogonally on  $\text{span}\{x, y\}$  which gives us a vector  $s$  with  $\langle x, r \rangle = \langle x, s \rangle$  and  $\langle y, r \rangle = \langle y, s \rangle$ ,

## Lemma (Grothendieck's identity)

Let  $x, y \in S^{d-1}$ . Let  $r \in S^{d-1}$  be a random unit vector chosen from  $O(d)$ -invariant probability distribution on the unit sphere. Then


- i,  $\mathbb{P}[\text{sign}(\langle x, r \rangle) \neq \text{sign}(\langle y, r \rangle)] = \frac{\arccos(\langle x, y \rangle)}{\pi}$
- ii,  $\mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(\langle x, r \rangle) \text{sign}(\langle y, r \rangle)] = \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin(\langle x, y \rangle)$ .

## Proof.

- If  $x$  and  $y$  are linearly dependent, then
  - ▶ if  $x = y$ :  $\arccos(\langle x, y \rangle) = \arccos(1) = 0$ .
  - ▶ if  $x = -y$ :  $\arccos(\langle x, y \rangle) = \arccos(-1) = \pi$ .
- If  $x$  and  $y$  are linearly independent, then
  - ▶ project  $r$  orthogonally on  $\text{span}\{x, y\}$  which gives us a vector  $s$  with  $\langle x, r \rangle = \langle x, s \rangle$  and  $\langle y, r \rangle = \langle y, s \rangle$ ,
  - ▶ the normalized vector  $n := s/|s|$  is uniformly distributed on the intersection of the unit sphere and  $\text{span}\{x, y\}$  by the  $O(d)$ -invariance of the probability distribution.

### Proof (cont.).

Calculation of the probability that the signs of the scalar products  $\langle x, n \rangle$  and  $\langle y, n \rangle$  are unlike:



$$\mathbb{P}[\text{sign}(\langle x, n \rangle) \neq \text{sign}(\langle y, n \rangle)] = 2 \frac{\arccos(\langle x, y \rangle)}{2\pi} = \frac{\arccos(\langle x, y \rangle)}{\pi}$$

## Proof (cont.).

We conclude with the proof of the second part of Lemma 6:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(\langle x, r \rangle) \text{sign}(\langle y, r \rangle)] \\ &= 1 - 2 \frac{\arccos(\langle x, y \rangle)}{\pi} \\ &= \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin(\langle x, y \rangle),\end{aligned}$$

because  $\arcsin(t) + \arccos(t) = \pi/2$ . □

## Lemma (Krivine's trick)

Let  $x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_n \in S^{m+n-1}$  be given. Furthermore, let  $r \in S^{n+m-1}$  be a random unit vector chosen from the  $O(n+m-1)$ -invariant probability distribution on the unit sphere. Then there are  $x'_1, \dots, x'_m, y'_1, \dots, y'_n \in S^{m+n-1}$  so that

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(\langle x'_i, r \rangle) \text{sign}(\langle y'_j, r \rangle)] = \beta \langle x_i, y_j \rangle, \quad (6)$$

with  $\beta = \frac{2}{\pi} \ln(1 + \sqrt{2})$ .



## Definition (The $k$ -th tensor product)

The  $k$ -th tensor product of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with orthonormal basis  $e_1, \dots, e_n$  is denoted by  $(\mathbb{R}^n)^{\otimes k}$  and it is a Euclidean vector space of dimension  $n^k$  with orthonormal basis  $e_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{i_k}$ ,  $i_l \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . In particular

$$\begin{aligned} \langle e_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{i_k}, e_{j_1} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{j_k} \rangle &= \prod_{l=1}^k \langle e_{i_l}, e_{j_l} \rangle \\ &= \begin{cases} 1 & , \text{ if } i_l = j_l \text{ for all } l = 1, \dots, k, \\ 0 & , \text{ otherwise,} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

and for  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $v = v_1 e_1 + \dots + v_n e_n$  we define  $v^{\otimes k} \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^{\otimes k}$  by

$$\begin{aligned} v^{\otimes k} &:= (v_1 e_1 + \dots + v_n e_n) \otimes \dots \otimes (v_1 e_1 + \dots + v_n e_n) \\ &= \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k} v_{i_1} \dots v_{i_k} e_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{i_k}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Thus, for  $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\langle v^{\otimes k}, w^{\otimes k} \rangle = \langle v, w \rangle^k. \quad (9)$$

## Lemma (Krivine's trick)

Let  $x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_n \in S^{m+n-1}$  be given. Furthermore, let  $r \in S^{n+m-1}$  be a random unit vector chosen from the  $O(n+m-1)$ -invariant probability distribution on the unit sphere. Then there are  $x'_1, \dots, x'_m, y'_1, \dots, y'_n \in S^{m+n-1}$  so that

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(\langle x'_i, r \rangle) \text{sign}(\langle y'_j, r \rangle)] = \beta \langle x_i, y_j \rangle, \quad (10)$$

with  $\beta = \frac{2}{\pi} \ln(1 + \sqrt{2})$ .

## Proof of Krivine's trick.

- Define  $E : [-1, +1] \rightarrow [-1, +1]$  by  $E(t) = \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin(t)$ .

## Lemma (Krivine's trick)

Let  $x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_n \in S^{m+n-1}$  be given. Furthermore, let  $r \in S^{n+m-1}$  be a random unit vector chosen from the  $O(n+m-1)$ -invariant probability distribution on the unit sphere. Then there are  $x'_1, \dots, x'_m, y'_1, \dots, y'_n \in S^{m+n-1}$  so that

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(\langle x'_i, r \rangle) \text{sign}(\langle y'_j, r \rangle)] = \beta \langle x_i, y_j \rangle, \quad (10)$$

with  $\beta = \frac{2}{\pi} \ln(1 + \sqrt{2})$ .

## Proof of Krivine's trick.

- Define  $E : [-1, +1] \rightarrow [-1, +1]$  by  $E(t) = \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin(t)$ .
- $E(\langle x'_i, y'_j \rangle) = \mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(\langle x'_i, r \rangle) \text{sign}(\langle y'_j, r \rangle)] \stackrel{!}{=} \beta \langle x_i, y_j \rangle$  by Grothendieck's identity.

## Lemma (Krivine's trick)

Let  $x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_n \in S^{m+n-1}$  be given. Furthermore, let  $r \in S^{n+m-1}$  be a random unit vector chosen from the  $O(n+m-1)$ -invariant probability distribution on the unit sphere. Then there are  $x'_1, \dots, x'_m, y'_1, \dots, y'_n \in S^{m+n-1}$  so that

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(\langle x'_i, r \rangle) \text{sign}(\langle y'_j, r \rangle)] = \beta \langle x_i, y_j \rangle, \quad (10)$$

with  $\beta = \frac{2}{\pi} \ln(1 + \sqrt{2})$ .

## Proof of Krivine's trick.

- Define  $E : [-1, +1] \rightarrow [-1, +1]$  by  $E(t) = \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin(t)$ .
- $E(\langle x'_i, y'_j \rangle) = \mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(\langle x'_i, r \rangle) \text{sign}(\langle y'_j, r \rangle)] \stackrel{!}{=} \beta \langle x_i, y_j \rangle$  by Grothendieck's identity.
- Idea: To find  $\beta, x'_i, y'_j$  invert  $E$ :

$$E^{-1}(t) = \sin(\pi/2 \cdot t) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \underbrace{\frac{(-1)^{2k+1}}{(2k+1)!} \left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^{2k+1}}_{=: g_{2k+1}} t^{2k+1},$$

## Proof (cont.).

- Define the infinite-dimensional Hilbert space

$$H = \bigoplus_{r=0}^{\infty} (\mathbb{R}^{m+n})^{\otimes 2k+1}. \quad (11)$$

## Proof (cont.).

- Define the infinite-dimensional Hilbert space

$$H = \bigoplus_{r=0}^{\infty} (\mathbb{R}^{m+n})^{\otimes 2k+1}. \quad (11)$$

- Define  $\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_j \in H$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, m, j = 1, \dots, n$  componentwise:

$$(\tilde{x}_i)_k = \text{sign}(g_{2k+1}) \sqrt{|g_{2k+1}| \beta^{2k+1}} x_i^{\otimes 2k+1} \quad (12)$$

$$(\tilde{y}_j)_k = \sqrt{|g_{2k+1}| \beta^{2k+1}} y_j^{\otimes 2k+1} \quad (13)$$

## Proof (cont.).

- Define the infinite-dimensional Hilbert space

$$H = \bigoplus_{r=0}^{\infty} (\mathbb{R}^{m+n})^{\otimes 2k+1}. \quad (11)$$

- Define  $\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_j \in H$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, m, j = 1, \dots, n$  componentwise:

$$(\tilde{x}_i)_k = \text{sign}(g_{2k+1}) \sqrt{|g_{2k+1}| \beta^{2k+1}} x_i^{\otimes 2k+1} \quad (12)$$

$$(\tilde{y}_j)_k = \sqrt{|g_{2k+1}| \beta^{2k+1}} y_j^{\otimes 2k+1} \quad (13)$$

- Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_j \rangle &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} g_{2k+1} \beta^{2k+1} \langle x_i^{\otimes 2k+1}, y_j^{\otimes 2k+1} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} g_{2k+1} \beta^{2k+1} \langle x_i, y_j \rangle^{2k+1} \\ &= E^{-1}(\beta \langle x_i, y_j \rangle). \end{aligned}$$

## Proof (cont.).

- Hence,  $\beta$  is defined by the condition that the vectors  $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_m, \tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_n$  are unit vectors:

$$1 = \langle \tilde{x}_i, \tilde{x}_i \rangle = \langle \tilde{y}_j, \tilde{y}_j \rangle = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2k+1)!} \left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^{2k+1} \beta^{2k+1} = \sinh\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\beta\right)$$
$$\Leftrightarrow \quad \beta = \frac{2}{\pi} \operatorname{arcsinh}(1) = \frac{2}{\pi} \ln(1 + \sqrt{2})$$



## Proof (cont.).

- Hence,  $\beta$  is defined by the condition that the vectors  $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_m, \tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_n$  are unit vectors:

$$1 = \langle \tilde{x}_i, \tilde{x}_i \rangle = \langle \tilde{y}_j, \tilde{y}_j \rangle = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2k+1)!} \left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^{2k+1} \beta^{2k+1} = \sinh\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\beta\right)$$
$$\Leftrightarrow \quad \beta = \frac{2}{\pi} \operatorname{arcsinh}(1) = \frac{2}{\pi} \ln(1 + \sqrt{2})$$

- Problem:  $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_m, \tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_n$  are infinite-dimensional

## Proof (cont.).

- Hence,  $\beta$  is defined by the condition that the vectors  $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_m, \tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_n$  are unit vectors:

$$1 = \langle \tilde{x}_i, \tilde{x}_i \rangle = \langle \tilde{y}_j, \tilde{y}_j \rangle = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2k+1)!} \left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^{2k+1} \beta^{2k+1} = \sinh\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\beta\right)$$
$$\Leftrightarrow \quad \beta = \frac{2}{\pi} \operatorname{arcsinh}(1) = \frac{2}{\pi} \ln(1 + \sqrt{2})$$

- Problem:  $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_m, \tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_n$  are infinite-dimensional
- Solution: the positive definite and symmetric Gram matrix  $G$

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} \langle \tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_1 \rangle & \cdots & \langle \tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_m \rangle & \langle \tilde{x}_1, \tilde{y}_1 \rangle & \cdots & \langle \tilde{x}_1, \tilde{y}_n \rangle \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \langle \tilde{x}_m, \tilde{x}_1 \rangle & \cdots & \langle \tilde{x}_m, \tilde{x}_m \rangle & \langle \tilde{x}_m, \tilde{y}_1 \rangle & \cdots & \langle \tilde{x}_m, \tilde{y}_n \rangle \\ \langle \tilde{y}_1, \tilde{x}_1 \rangle & \cdots & \langle \tilde{y}_1, \tilde{x}_m \rangle & \langle \tilde{y}_1, \tilde{y}_1 \rangle & \cdots & \langle \tilde{y}_1, \tilde{y}_n \rangle \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \langle \tilde{y}_n, \tilde{x}_1 \rangle & \cdots & \langle \tilde{y}_n, \tilde{x}_m \rangle & \langle \tilde{y}_n, \tilde{y}_1 \rangle & \cdots & \langle \tilde{y}_n, \tilde{y}_n \rangle \end{pmatrix} \quad (14)$$

## Proof (cont.).

- Due to the properties of  $G$  we can decompose  $G$  via a real orthogonal matrix  $Q$  with columns that are the eigenvectors of  $G$  and a real diagonal matrix  $\Lambda$  having the eigenvalues of  $G$  on the diagonal, thus

$$G = Q\Lambda Q^\top = \underbrace{(Q\Lambda^{1/2})^\top}_{=:A} (Q\Lambda^{1/2}). \quad (15)$$



## Proof (cont.).

- Due to the properties of  $G$  we can decompose  $G$  via a real orthogonal matrix  $Q$  with columns that are the eigenvectors of  $G$  and a real diagonal matrix  $\Lambda$  having the eigenvalues of  $G$  on the diagonal, thus

$$G = Q\Lambda Q^\top = \underbrace{(Q\Lambda^{1/2})^\top}_{=:A} (Q\Lambda^{1/2}). \quad (15)$$

- The columns of  $A$  are the vectors  $x'_1, \dots, x'_m, y'_1, \dots, y'_n \in S^{m+n-1}$  we are looking for.



## Definition

For  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  define the quadratic program

$$\begin{aligned}\|M\|_{\infty \rightarrow 1} &= \max \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n M_{ij} \xi_i \eta_j : \xi_i^2 = 1, i = 1, \dots, m, \eta_j^2 = 1, j = 1, \dots, n \right\} \\ &= \max \{ \text{Tr } M \eta \xi^\top : \xi \in \{-1, 1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1, 1\}^n \}.\end{aligned}\quad (16)$$

## Definition

The SDP relaxation of  $\|M\|_{\infty \rightarrow 1}$  is given via:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{sdp}_{\infty \rightarrow 1}(M) &= \max \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n M_{ij} \langle x_i, y_j \rangle \\ &\quad x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{m+n} \\ &\quad |x_i| = 1, i = 1, \dots, m \\ &\quad |y_j| = 1, j = 1, \dots, n\end{aligned}$$

## Theorem (Grothendieck's inequality)

There exists a constant  $K$  such that for all  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ :

$$\|M\|_{\infty \rightarrow 1} \leq \text{sdp}_{\infty \rightarrow 1}(M) \leq K \|M\|_{\infty \rightarrow 1}. \quad (17)$$

### Proof.

Use the following approximation algorithm with randomized rounding:

**Algorithm 1:** Approximation algorithm with randomized rounding for  $\|M\|_{\infty \rightarrow 1}$

1. Solve  $\text{sdp}_{\infty \rightarrow 1}(M)$ . Let  $x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_n \in S^{m+n-1}$  be the optimal unit vectors.
2. Apply Krivine's trick (Lemma 9) and use vectors  $x_i, y_j$  to create new unit vectors  $x'_1, \dots, x'_m, y'_1, \dots, y'_n \in S^{m+n-1}$ .
3. Choose  $r \in S^{m+n-1}$  randomly.
4. Round:  $\xi_i = \text{sign}(\langle x'_i, r \rangle)$   
 $\eta_j = \text{sign}(\langle y'_j, r \rangle)$

## Proof (cont.).

Expected quality of the outcome:

$$\begin{aligned}\|M\|_{\infty \rightarrow 1} &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n M_{ij} \xi_i \eta_j \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n M_{ij} \mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(\langle x'_i, r \rangle) \text{sign}(\langle y'_j, r \rangle)] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n M_{ij} \beta \langle x_i, y_j \rangle \\ &= \beta \text{sdp}_{\infty \rightarrow 1}(M),\end{aligned}$$

where the second last equality follows by Krivine's trick with  $\beta = \frac{2 \ln(1+\sqrt{2})}{\pi}$ , thus  $K \leq \beta^{-1}$ .

## 1 Introduction

- Basics
- Nonlocal games
- A special case of nonlocal games
- A specific example

## 2 Local and quantum correlation matrices

- Local correlation matrices
- Quantum correlation matrices
- The relations between quantum correlation and local correlation matrices

## 3 Grothendieck-Tsirelson Theorem

- Motivation: The Grothendieck-Tsirelson Theorem
- Grothendieck's Inequality
- Tsirelson's Theorem
- Gorthendieck-Tsirelson Theorem



## Theorem (Tsirelson)

*(Hard direction)* For all positive integers  $n, r$  and any  $x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n \in S^{r-1}$ , there exists a positive integer  $d := d(r)$ , a unit vector  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$  and  $\{-1, 1\}$ -observables  $F_1, \dots, F_n, G_1, \dots, G_n \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$ , such that for every  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , we have

$$\langle \psi | F_i \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle = \langle x_i, y_j \rangle. \quad (18)$$

Moreover,  $d \leq 2^{\lceil r/2 \rceil}$ .

*(Easy direction)* Conversely, for all positive integers  $n, d$ , unit vectors  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$  and  $\{-1, 1\}$ -observables  $F_1, \dots, F_n, G_1, \dots, G_n \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$ , there exist a positive integer  $r := r(d)$  and  $x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n \in S^{r-1}$  such that for every  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , we have

$$\langle x_i, y_j \rangle = \langle \psi | F_i \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle. \quad (19)$$

Moreover,  $r \leq 2d^2$ .

label=Tsirelsonproof.

Reminder:  $\langle \psi | F_i \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle = \text{Tr} \underbrace{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|}_{=: \rho} F_i \otimes G_j$ , where  $\rho$  is a pure state.

For the hard direction look at the second part of the proof of

$\text{QC}_{m,n} = \{(\langle x_i, y_j \rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} \mid x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}, |x_i| \leq 1, |y_j| \leq 1\}$  (◀ Lemma).

Due to the additional restriction that  $F_i$  and  $G_j$  are  $\{-1, 1\}$ -observables the other direction gets easier:

- $F_i \otimes I |\psi\rangle$  and  $I \otimes G_j |\psi\rangle$  are unit vectors in  $\mathbb{C}^{d^2}$ , since  $|\psi\rangle$  has norm 1 and the observables  $F_i$  and  $G_j$  are unitary operators.

## label=Tsirelsonproof.

Reminder:  $\langle \psi | F_i \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle = \text{Tr} \underbrace{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|}_{=: \rho} F_i \otimes G_j$ , where  $\rho$  is a pure state.

For the hard direction look at the second part of the proof of

$\text{QC}_{m,n} = \{(\langle x_i, y_j \rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} \mid x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}, |x_i| \leq 1, |y_j| \leq 1\}$  ([Lemma](#)).

Due to the additional restriction that  $F_i$  and  $G_j$  are  $\{-1, 1\}$ -observables the other direction gets easier:

- $F_i \otimes I|\psi\rangle$  and  $I \otimes G_j|\psi\rangle$  are unit vectors in  $\mathbb{C}^{d^2}$ , since  $|\psi\rangle$  has norm 1 and the observables  $F_i$  and  $G_j$  are unitary operators.
- Since  $F_i$  and  $G_j$  are Hermitian, we have that the inner product

$$\begin{aligned} \langle F_i \otimes I|\psi\rangle, I \otimes G_j|\psi\rangle &= (F_i \otimes I|\psi\rangle)^* (I \otimes G_j|\psi\rangle) = \underbrace{(|\psi\rangle^*)}_{= \langle \psi|} \underbrace{F_i^*}_{= F_i} \otimes I^* (I \otimes G_j|\psi\rangle) \\ &= \langle \psi | (F_i \otimes I)(I \otimes G_j) | \psi \rangle = \langle \psi | F_i \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle \\ &= \text{Tr} |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| F_i \otimes G_j \end{aligned}$$

is a real number.

## Proof (cont.).

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \psi | F_i \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle &= \operatorname{Re}(\langle \psi | F_i \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle) \\ &= \langle \operatorname{Re}(F_i \otimes I | \psi \rangle), \operatorname{Re}(I \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle) \rangle + \langle \operatorname{Im}(F_i \otimes I | \psi \rangle), \operatorname{Im}(I \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle) \rangle.\end{aligned}$$

## Proof (cont.).

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \psi | F_i \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle &= \operatorname{Re}(\langle \psi | F_i \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle) \\ &= \langle \operatorname{Re}(F_i \otimes I | \psi \rangle), \operatorname{Re}(I \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle) \rangle + \langle \operatorname{Im}(F_i \otimes I | \psi \rangle), \operatorname{Im}(I \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle) \rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Define  $x_i, y_j \in S^{2d^2}$  by

$$x_i = \begin{pmatrix} \operatorname{Re}(F_i \otimes I | \psi \rangle) \\ \operatorname{Im}(F_i \otimes I | \psi \rangle) \end{pmatrix}, \quad y_j = \begin{pmatrix} \operatorname{Re}(I \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle) \\ \operatorname{Im}(I \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (20)$$

## Proof (cont.).

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \psi | F_i \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle &= \operatorname{Re}(\langle \psi | F_i \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle) \\ &= \langle \operatorname{Re}(F_i \otimes I | \psi \rangle), \operatorname{Re}(I \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle) \rangle + \langle \operatorname{Im}(F_i \otimes I | \psi \rangle), \operatorname{Im}(I \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle) \rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Define  $x_i, y_j \in S^{2d^2}$  by

$$x_i = \begin{pmatrix} \operatorname{Re}(F_i \otimes I | \psi \rangle) \\ \operatorname{Im}(F_i \otimes I | \psi \rangle) \end{pmatrix}, \quad y_j = \begin{pmatrix} \operatorname{Re}(I \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle) \\ \operatorname{Im}(I \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (20)$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle x_i, y_j \rangle &= \langle \operatorname{Re}(F_i \otimes I | \psi \rangle), \operatorname{Re}(I \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle) \rangle + \langle \operatorname{Im}(F_i \otimes I | \psi \rangle), \operatorname{Im}(I \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle) \rangle \\ &= \operatorname{Re}(\langle \psi | F_i \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle) \\ &= \langle \psi | F_i \otimes G_j | \psi \rangle,\end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

Due to the similarity between those two proofs, we can prove that we can replace  $X_i$ ,  $Y_j$  and  $\rho$  in the definition of Quantum correlation matrices by  $\{-1, 1\}$ -observables and a pure state.

The only thing we need to prove is the following:

$$\text{QC}_{m,n} = \{(\langle x_i, y_j \rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} \mid x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\min\{m,n\}}, |x_i| = 1, |y_j| = 1\} \quad (21)$$

If we can find unit vectors  $u, v \in \{x_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq m\}^\perp \cap \{y_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq n\}^\perp$  such that  $u \perp v$ , we can define unit vectors

$$\begin{aligned} x'_i &= x_i + \sqrt{1 - |x_i|^2} u \\ y'_j &= y_j + \sqrt{1 - |x_i|^2} v \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\langle x'_i, y'_j \rangle = \langle x_i, y_j \rangle.$$

Otherwise we increase the dimension to find vectors  $u$  and  $v$  and then decrease the dimension by a posteriori projecting the new vectors onto  $\text{span}\{x_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$  or  $\text{span}\{y_j : 1 \leq j \leq m\}$  according to whether  $m \leq n$  or  $m > n$ .

## 1 Introduction

- Basics
- Nonlocal games
- A special case of nonlocal games
- A specific example

## 2 Local and quantum correlation matrices

- Local correlation matrices
- Quantum correlation matrices
- The relations between quantum correlation and local correlation matrices

## 3 Grothendieck-Tsirelson Theorem

- Motivation: The Grothendieck-Tsirelson Theorem
- Grothendieck's Inequality
- Tsirelson's Theorem
- Grothendieck-Tsirelson Theorem



## Theorem (Grothendieck-Tsirelson)

There exists an absolute constant  $K \geq 1$  such that, for any positive integers  $m, n$ , the following three equivalent conditions hold:

(1) We have the inclusion

$$\text{QC}_{m,n} \subset \text{KLC}_{m,n}. \quad (22)$$

(2) For any  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  and for any  $\rho, X_i, Y_j$  verifying the conditions of Definition 4.2.1 we have

$$\sum_{i,j} M_{ij} \text{Tr } \rho(X_i \otimes Y_j) \leq K \max_{\xi \in \{-1,1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1,1\}^n} \sum_{i,j} M_{ij} \xi_i \eta_j \quad (23)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \text{Tr } M A^\top \leq \max_{\xi \in \{-1,1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1,1\}^n} \text{Tr } M (\xi \eta^\top)^\top. \quad (24)$$

(3) For any  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  and for any (real) Hilbert space vectors  $x_i, y_j$  with  $|x_i| \leq 1, |y_j| \leq 1$  we have

$$\sum_{i,j} M_{ij} \langle x_i, y_j \rangle \leq K \max_{\xi \in \{-1,1\}^m, \eta \in \{-1,1\}^n} \text{Tr } \xi^\top M \eta. \quad (25)$$

## Proof.

Since (25) is a direct consequence of Grothendieck's inequality the only thing left to prove is the equivalence between (1)-(3). The equivalence of (3) and (2) (the Tsirelson's bound) is a consequence of either the proof of Lemma ?? or Tsirelson's Theorem (Theorem 1).




Figure: Visualization  
Nonlocal Games and beyond