

Simulation of partial entanglement with no-signaling resources

Nicolas Brunner,¹ Nicolas Gisin,¹ Sandu Popescu,^{2,3} and Valerio Scarani⁴

¹Group of Applied Physics, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

²H.H.Wills Physics Laboratory, University of Bristol, Tyndall Avenue, Bristol BS8 1TL, U.K.

³Hewlett-Packard Laboratories, Stoke Gifford, Bristol BS12 6QZ, U.K.

⁴Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, Singapore

(Dated: June 1, 2022)

With the goal of gaining a deeper understanding of quantum non-locality, we decompose quantum correlations into more elementary non-local correlations. In particular we present two models for simulating the correlations of partially entangled states of two qubits without communication, hence using only non-signaling resources. The crucial role of the quantum marginals is discussed.

PACS numbers:

Quantum correlations are very peculiar, especially those violating some Bell inequality [1]. Gaining a deeper insight into such nonlocal quantum correlation is a grand challenge. Children gain understanding of how their toys function by dismantling them into pieces. In this Letter we shall follow a similar approach. We shall decompose the quantum correlations into simpler, more elementary, nonlocal correlations. Specifically, we like to present a model simulation of von Neumann measurements on partially entangled states of two qubits.

This work is part of the general research program that looks for nonlocal models compatible and incompatible with quantum predictions. The goal is to find out what is essential in quantum correlations. Note that we do not claim that Nature functions as our model. But we believe that finding the minimal resources sufficient to simulate quantum correlations, and studying the computational power that such correlations offer [2, 3, 4, 5], provide enlightening insights into the quantum world.

In reference [6] a model is presented simulating the correlations between the outcomes of von Neumann measurements performed on two qubits in a maximally entangled state. This model uses as resources only shared randomness and one non-local box, the so-called PR-box [7] that satisfies the relation $a \oplus b = xy$, where x, y are Alice's and Bob's input bits, and a, b their outcome bits (see Fig. 1). In general nonlocal boxes provide some elementary nonlocal correlations. They are elementary in that they allow only for a limited (usually finite) number of inputs and outputs and they are extremal points in the convex set of nonsignaling correlations [8]. They are nonlocal in the sense that they violate some Bell inequality. Importantly, they do not allow signalling, that is the statis-

tics of the local outcomes (i.e. the marginals) are independent from the other parties inputs. This model demonstrates that the resource needed to simulate maximally entangled qubit pairs is surprisingly simple. Indeed, what could be simpler than $a \oplus b = xy$?

However, it was soon after discovered that this same resource is provably not sufficient to simulate some partially entangled two-qubit states [9]. A reason for this a priori surprising result is that PR-boxes have random marginals, while the correlation arising from partially entangled quantum states have nontrivial marginals.

It is interesting to establish the following connection with Leggett's approach to quantum correlation [10], which recently attracted quite some attention [11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16]. In models *à la Leggett* one assumes that the elementary correlations have some nontrivial marginals; Leggett's original idea is that each qubit, when analysed individually, appears to be always in a pure state, see [10, 14]. However, one can prove that any such model, with elementary correlation having nontrivial marginals, fails to reproduce the quantum correlation of maximally entangled states of two-qubits [14, 16].

From the above, it appears that it is especially difficult to simulate at the same time nonlocal correlations and nontrivial marginals, like those corresponding to partially entangled quantum states. In order to overcome this difficulty, we shall introduce the concept of *correlated local flips*. The idea is that some nonlocal box first simulates nonlocal correlations with trivial marginals; then one can bias the marginal with local flips.

Formally, a correlation is a conditional probability distribution $P(\alpha\beta|\vec{a}\vec{b})$, where α, β denote the outcomes observed by Alice and Bob when they perform measurements labelled by \vec{a} and \vec{b} [23]. For binary outcomes ($\alpha, \beta \in \{-1, +1\}$), the correlations are conveniently written as

$$P(\alpha, \beta|\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = \frac{1}{4} \left(1 + \alpha M_A(\vec{a}) + \beta M_B(\vec{b}) + \alpha\beta C(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) \right) \quad (1)$$

where $M_A(\vec{a}), M_B(\vec{b})$ are the local marginals, and $C(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = P(\alpha = \beta|\vec{a}, \vec{b}) - P(\alpha \neq \beta|\vec{a}, \vec{b})$ is the correlation term. Here we shall focus on pure entangled states of two qubits




FIG. 1: The Popescu-Rohrlich box is the elementary resource needed for simulating maximally entangled states of two qubits. Note that \oplus means the sum modulo 2.

$|\psi(\theta)\rangle = \cos\theta|00\rangle + \sin\theta|11\rangle$. Thus the quantum correlation $P_Q(\alpha\beta|\vec{a}\vec{b})$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} M_A(\vec{a}) &= ca_z, \quad M_B(\vec{b}) = cb_z \\ C(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) &= a_z b_z + s(a_x b_x - a_y b_y), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $c \equiv \cos 2\theta$ and $s \equiv \sin 2\theta$.

Now, we would like to decompose the correlations P_Q into simpler ones, such that

$$P_Q(\alpha, \beta|\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = \int d\lambda P_\lambda(\alpha, \beta|\vec{a}, \vec{b}), \quad (3)$$

where $d\lambda$ is a normalized measure. One needs non-local resources for creating the correlations P_λ , and a strategy (represented by the λ 's) for judiciously combining these elementary correlations. In this Letter we provide such a decomposition. The remarkable feature of our model is that the elementary nonlocal correlations are obtained without communication, that is using only no-signaling resources.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We first introduce the technique of local flips, which allows one to bias locally (i.e. to create nontrivial marginals) an initially unbiased probability distribution. Then we apply this technique to the simulation of partially entangled states. We show that four PR-boxes augmented with another nonlocal box, the Millionaire-box (M-box), are sufficient for reproducing the correlations of partially entangled states. Furthermore, we show that this model also works in the so-called EPR2 [17] approach to quantum non-locality, recently brought back into focus in Ref. [18]. This provides finally a decomposition, in which the nonlocal resources (PR-boxes and M-box) are almost never used in the limit of very partially entangled states.

Correlated local flips. Let $P_0(\alpha, \beta|\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = \frac{1}{4}(1 + \alpha\beta C_0(\vec{a}, \vec{b}))$ denote an initial probability distribution, with random marginals and correlation term $C_0(\vec{a}, \vec{b})$. Now, Alice and Bob perform local flips on P_0 ; that is, Alice (Bob) flips the output -1 with a probability f_a (f_b), while the output $+1$ is left untouched. Indeed after this processing (also called a Z channel), the marginals are biased towards $+1$. Let us now assume that $f_b \geq f_a$ and that the flips of Alice and Bob are both determined by a shared random variable Λ uniformly distributed in $[0, 1]$. Alice and Bob flip their -1 outcome if and only if $\Lambda < f_a$ and $\Lambda < f_b$, respectively. The resulting probability distribution reads

$$P_f(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{1}{4}(1 + \alpha f_a + \beta f_b + \alpha\beta(f_a + (1 - f_b)C_0)). \quad (4)$$

It should be pointed out that the flips f_a and f_b must be correlated; this will be crucial in the following. Note also that every probability distribution $P(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{1}{4}(1 + \alpha M_A + \beta M_B + \alpha\beta C)$ with $M_B \geq M_A$ can be generated in this way.

Partially entangled states and local flips. We just described a technique for creating a probability distribution with nontrivial marginals, starting from an initial probability distribution with trivial marginals. Now the intuition is the following: since correlation with trivial marginals seem to be easier to create with standard nonlocal resource (e.g. a PR-box), let us do the identification $P_f = P_Q$ and find out what is the required initial distribution P_0 . For partially entangled states of two-qubits (P_Q given by (2)), this leads to

$$f_a = ca_z, \quad f_b = cb_z, \quad C_0 = \vec{a} \cdot \vec{B} \quad (5)$$

where $\vec{B} \equiv (sb_x, sb_y, b_z - c)/(1 - cb_z)$. Note that $|\vec{B}| = 1$. Remarkably, \vec{B} corresponds to Bob's original measurement setting \vec{b} moved one step back on the Hardy ladder [19].

Consequently the problem of simulating correlations originating from von Neumann measurements on partially entangled states reduces to the problem of simulating the unbiased probability distribution $P_0 = \frac{1}{4}(1 + \alpha\beta\vec{a} \cdot \vec{B})$. Such a "scalar product" correlation can be reproduced with a single bit of communication [20] or with a single PR-box [6]. However there is a caveat: Alice and Bob must know whether $b_z \geq a_z$ (as assumed above) or if on the contrary $a_z \geq b_z$! This is due to the fact that the local flips must be correlated.

At first sight it may seem that a resource solving this problem will lead to signaling, because it would reveal a relationship between Alice's and Bob's measurements. Remarkably, this is not the case. Next we show that a no-signaling (non-local) resource known as the Millionaire box (M-box) is exactly the tool we need.

The Millionaire box. Two millionaires challenge each other: who is richer? Since millionaires are in general quite reluctant to reveal how much money they own, they prefer to use the Millionaire-box (M-box) [21], a nonlocal resource defined as follows: $a \oplus b = [x \leq y]$, where the inputs x, y are in the continuous interval $[0, 1]$, and the outputs are binary, $a, b \in \{0, 1\}$. $[X]$ denotes the logical value of X . The outputs a, b are locally random to ensure no-signaling. Note that the M-box admits an infinite number of possible inputs.

So, both millionaires input the amount of money they own x, y into the machine; the parity of the outputs ($a + b$) indicates the winner. Fortunately, the M-box is also useful to physicists, as will be shown in the next section.

Note that in case the inputs x, y are binary, the M-box is simply equivalent to a PR-box. It is also worth mentioning that the M-box reaches the no-signaling bound of all the Bell inequalities I_{NN22} [22].

M-box and local flips. As shown above, the technique of local flips allows one to recover the correlation of partially entangled states, under the condition that $b_z \geq a_z$ (or $a_z \geq b_z$). But how do Alice and Bob know whether $b_z \geq a_z$ or $a_z \geq b_z$? Now we show that the M-box can overcome this problem.

The model is sketched in Fig. 2. Alice and Bob share two PR-boxes for creating "scalar product" correlations; from now

on we call these CGMP-boxes [6][24]. The first one is used to create the correlation given by the scalar product $\vec{a} \cdot \vec{B}$, i.e. corresponding to the case $b_z \geq a_z$ and the second one for the scalar product $\vec{A} \cdot \vec{b}$, i.e. for the case $a_z \geq b_z$. Local flips are then performed. At this point, Alice and Bob have each got two possible outputs A_1, A_2 and B_1, B_2 , but don't know which one to use.

Next, they input the z -component of their measurement setting (respectively a_z and b_z [25]) into the M-box, and get outputs a and b . It is clear that, for the simulation to succeed, the final output of Alice and Bob, A and B , should be equal to A_1, B_1 if $b_z \geq a_z$, and equal to A_2, B_2 if $a_z \geq b_z$. Mathematically this translates into the following expression

$$A + B = (a + b)(A_1 + B_1) + (a + b + 1)(A_2 + B_2). \quad (6)$$

Developing the previous equation, one gets

$$\begin{aligned} A + B &= a(A_1 + A_2) + A_2 + b(B_1 + B_2) + B_2 \\ &\quad + a(B_1 + B_2) + b(A_1 + A_2), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

which contains some local terms, as well as some non-local terms. Remarkably, the non-local terms (the two last ones) are simply obtained by using two supplementary PR-boxes, $a_3 + b_3 = a(B_1 + B_2)$, and $a_4 + b_4 = b(A_1 + A_2)$ (see Fig. 2).

So finally, using four PR-boxes (two CGMP-boxes and two additional PR-boxes) and one M-box, one can simulate the correlation of any partially entangled state of two qubits. Whether the M-box can be replaced by a finite number of PR-boxes (or more generally with a nonlocal box having a finite number of possible inputs) is indeed an interesting open question.

However, the previous model has an important drawback. The frequency at which the non-local resources are used is independent of the degree of entanglement of the state, which does not seem very natural. On the contrary, intuition suggests that for very partially entangled states, the non-local resources should almost never be used. In the next section, based on the EPR2 approach of quantum correlations, we show how our model can be improved in order to satisfy this requirement.




FIG. 2: Simulating partial entanglement with four PR-boxes and an M-box.

EPR2. In reference [17], Elitzur, Popescu and Rohrlich (whence EPR2 !) considered an experiment involving many photon pairs. They asked whether one could describe a subset of these pairs with local correlations only, while the remaining ones are described non-locally. Indeed the global statistic, considering the local and non-local subsets of pairs, should reproduce the quantum statistic. Formally the EPR2 approach consists in decomposing some quantum correlations P_Q as a convex sum of a local probability distribution P_L and a non-local one P_{NL} :

$$P_Q = p_L(\rho)P_L + (1 - p_L(\rho))P_{NL}. \quad (8)$$

The weight $p_L(\rho)$ is thus a measure of the locality of the state ρ . Note that in general P_{NL} does not need to be quantum, but is restricted to no-signaling correlations by construction.

A decomposition of the form (8) is particularly well-suited for the task of simulating quantum correlations, since only the non-local part P_{NL} has to be simulated, the local part requiring only shared randomness. In this sense the improvement over the original EPR2 decomposition presented in [18] is especially interesting here, since, for the family of states $|\psi(\theta)\rangle$ that we are considering, the weight of the non-local part $p_{NL}(\theta) = 1 - p_L(\theta)$ vanishes in the limit $\theta \rightarrow 0$ of separable states. We are going to provide a simulation of that P_{NL} using again four PR-boxes and one M-box, followed by correlated local flips [26]. This second model thus fulfills the desideratum that very weakly entangled states can be simulated by a vanishing amount of non-local resources.

The exact form of the decomposition (P_L , P_{NL} and $p_{NL}(\theta)$) can be found in Ref [18]. Let us point out an important feature of this decomposition: the non-local part P_{NL} depends on the chosen measurement settings. More precisely when the settings of Alice is such that $a_z \leq (1 - s)/c$ (i.e. inside a slice of the Bloch sphere around the equator), her local marginal vanishes; and similarly for Bob. On the contrary, when the measurement setting lies outside the slice, the marginal is biased. When both the settings of Alice and Bob are found inside the slice, the correlation reduces to a simple scalar product with trivial marginals.

The model is very similar to what has been presented above, thus we only describe Alice's and Bob's strategies. As previously, the required non-local resources are two CGMP-boxes, an M-box and two additional PR-boxes. After establishing non-local correlations with both CGMP-boxes, Alice and Bob perform local flips. Finally they use two additional PR-boxes to compute the correct output. Fig. 3 is a sketch of the model.

Alice proceeds as follows. When her setting is inside the slice ($a_z \leq (1 - s)/c$), she inputs according to \vec{a} into both CGMP-boxes, and does not perform any local flip ($f_a = 0$). When her setting is outside the slice, she inputs the first CGMP-box according to $\vec{A} = (sa_x, sa_y, c - a_z)/(1 - a_z c)$ and the second CGMP-box according to \vec{a} . Then she biases her output towards outcome +1 with probability $f_a = F(a_z)$ [27]. Note that \vec{a} is again, up to one sign, the original setting \vec{a} moved back one step on the Hardy ladder.

Bob proceeds almost similarly. When his setting is inside the slice ($b_z \leq (1-s)/c$), he inputs both CGMP-boxes according to $\vec{b}' = (b_x, -b_y, -b_z)$. When his setting is outside the slice, he inputs the first CGMP-box according to \vec{b}' and the second according to $\vec{B} = (sb_x, -sb_y, b_z - c)/(1 - b_z c)$. Then he biases his output with probability $f_b = F(b_z)$.

Conclusion and Outlook. By dismantling the quantum correlations of partially entangled states of two-qubits into more elementary nonlocal but no-signaling correlations, we gained insight into the quantum world. Our decomposition is likely not to be optimal in the sense that there might exist more economical models. Still, there are already two lessons we learn from the present decomposition. First, the less the quantum state is entangled, the less frequently one needs to use nonlocal resources to simulate it; as intuition suggests. Next, whenever one needs nonlocal resources, then these are definitively larger for (at least some) partially entangled states than for the maximally entangled states [9]. Hence, in counting the resources required to simulate two-qubit states, we learn that one should distinguish between the required amount of nonlocal resources and the frequency at which one has to use them. Among the open questions, we like to underline the following ones. First, can one simulate some partially entangled states with a single PR-box? Indeed, in [9] it is proven that very weakly entangled states can't be simulated with a single PR-

box, but it turns out to be surprisingly difficult to prove the natural generalization to all partially entangled states. Next, how could one prove that a decomposition is minimal? As said, we now know that this question has two sides. Minimality of the resources, and minimality of the frequency at which one has to use them. Our experience suggests that the first aspect is an especially difficult problem. The second aspect looks more promising: it seems natural to conjecture that an EPR2-type decomposition with $p_{NL}(\theta) = 1 - c$ [18] should exist.

N.B. and N.G. acknowledge financial support from the EU project QAP (IST-FET FP6-015848) and Swiss NCCR Quantum Photonics. N.B. acknowledges the hospitality of the National University of Singapore. Fruitful discussions with Harry Bruhman's group are acknowledged.




FIG. 3: Sketch of the model. 1) Alice and Bob inside the slice; both CGMP boxes can be used. 2) Alice inside, Bob outside; then indeed $a_z \leq b_z$. 3) Alice outside, Bob inside. 4) Alice and Bob outside. Depending whether $a_z \leq b_z$ or $a_z \geq b_z$, the M-box selects the correct CGMP box. Note that we have omitted the two additional PR-boxes (PR_3, PR_4 of Fig. 2).

-
- [1] J. Bell, *Physics* **1**, 195 (1964).
 - [2] J. Barrett, L. Hardy, and A. Kent, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 010503 (2005).
 - [3] A. Acin, N. Gisin, and L. Masanes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 120405 (2006).
 - [4] A. Acin *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 230501 (2007).
 - [5] C. Brukner, M. Zukowski, J.-W. Pan, and A. Zeilinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 127901 (2004).
 - [6] N. Cerf, N. Gisin, S. Massar, and S. Popescu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 220403 (2005).
 - [7] S. Popescu and D. Rohrlich, *Found. Phys.* **24**, 379 (1994).
 - [8] J. Barrett *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 022101 (2005).
 - [9] N. Brunner, N. Gisin, and V. Scarani, *New Journal of Physics* **7**, 88 (2005).
 - [10] A. J. Leggett, *Found. Phys.* **33**, 1469 (2003).
 - [11] S. Groblacher *et al.*, *Nature* **446**, 871 (2007).
 - [12] T. Paterek *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 210406 (2007).
 - [13] C. Branciard *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 210407 (2007).
 - [14] C. Branciard *et al.*, arXiv:0801.2241.
 - [15] A. Suarez, arXiv:0801.3050 (unpublished).
 - [16] R. Colbeck and R. Renner, arXiv:0801.2218 (unpublished).
 - [17] A. Elitzur, S. Popescu, and D. Rohrlich, *Phys. Lett. A* **162**, 25 (1992).
 - [18] V. Scarani, arXiv:0712.2307v1 [quant-ph].
 - [19] L. Hardy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 1665 (1993).
 - [20] B. F. Toner and D. Bacon, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 1874 (2003).
 - [21] A. C. C. Yao, *FOCS* 1982 160.
 - [22] D. Collins and N. Gisin, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **37**, 1775 (2004).
 - [23] Here we note the measurement settings with vectors on the Bloch sphere.
 - [24] To get the output of the CGMP-box one must add some sign functions to the outputs of the PR-box (see [6]).
 - [25] Since $P_Q(-\alpha, \beta | -\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = P_Q(\alpha, \beta | \vec{a}, \vec{b})$, it is sufficient to consider the case where $a_z, b_z \geq 0$.
 - [26] Note that the non-local part of the original model of EPR2 [17] can also be simulated using the same resources; however there $p_{NL}(\theta) \rightarrow \frac{3}{4}$ in the limit $\theta \rightarrow 0$.
 - [27] The function F is defined as following: $F(x) = (cx - 1 + s)/s$ (see [18]).