

How Non-Local are n Noisy Popescu-Rohrlich Machines?

Matthias Fitz¹ Esther Hänggi¹ Valerio Scarani² Stefan Wolf¹

¹ Computer Science Department, ETH Zürich, Switzerland *

² Centre for Quantum Technologies and Department of Physics, National University of Singapore, Singapore **

Abstract. In this paper, we consider the question of how much non-locality there is in n Popescu-Rohrlich Machines with errors ε (ε -PRMs) — where we quantify non-locality by partitioning the system's behavior into a local part of maximal weight and a remaining non-local part. We show that the local part of n symmetric ε -PRMs is of order $\Theta(\varepsilon^{\lceil n/2 \rceil})$, and that the local part of n maximally biased (asymmetric) δ -PRMs is exactly $(3\delta)^n$.

1 Introduction

The behavior of a bipartite input/output system $P_{XY|UV}$ is *non-local* if it cannot be obtained from pre-shared information. For example, the measurement choice/outcome behavior of certain *entangled* quantum states is non-local. As an application, non-locality can imply device-independent unconditional secrecy in quantum cryptography [1]: hidden parameters that do not exist cannot be known by the adversary; and the stronger the non-locality is, the more secret is the respective information. Non-local correlations can also be seen as a resource to fulfill distributed tasks [10].

Non-locality of a binary input/output system is typically characterized by the Popescu-Rohrlich Machine (PRM) [7] that, on inputs X and Y , produces random outputs U and V such that $X \oplus Y = U \cdot V$. Quantum mechanically, PRM behavior can only be simulated with an accuracy of roughly 85% [3], whereas the classical limit is 75% [2].

The question how much non-locality there is in a certain system's behavior, where non-locality is quantified by partitioning a system's behavior into a local part of maximal weight and the remaining non-local part, has first been asked in [5] (see also [8]). We study the local content of (a number of) imperfect PRMs. Note that the local part of a perfect PRM is zero.

Main Result: Our main result is that the local part of n symmetric ε -PRMs is of order $\Theta(\varepsilon^{\lceil n/2 \rceil})$ and that the local part of n maximally biased (asymmetric) δ -PRMs is exactly $(3\delta)^n$.

2 Definitions

Note that we restrict ourselves to bipartite systems although generalizations to more parties are possible. These bipartite systems take an input and yield an output from a well-defined alphabet on each side (i.e., to each party) and can be characterized by a conditional probability distribution $P_{XY|UV}(x, y, u, v)$ where U and V are the inputs, and X and Y are the outputs on the respective sides.

Definition 1. A bipartite conditional probability distribution $P_{XY|UV}(x, y, u, v)$ is called non-signalling if the two parties cannot use it to transmit information, i.e.,

$$\sum_x P_{XY|UV}(x, y, u, v) = \sum_x P_{XY|UV}(x, y, u', v) \quad \forall y, v, \quad (1)$$

$$\sum_y P_{XY|UV}(x, y, u, v) = \sum_y P_{XY|UV}(x, y, u, v') \quad \forall x, u. \quad (2)$$

All distributions we consider in this paper are non-signalling. Note that the space of all non-signalling probability distributions of a certain input/output alphabet is a convex polytope.

* Supported by Swiss National Science Foundation.

** Supported by the National Research Foundation and Ministry of Education, Singapore.

Definition 2. A non-signalling probability distribution is local deterministic if it can be written as

$$P_{XY|UV} = \delta_{x,f(u)} \cdot \delta_{y,g(v)} , \quad (3)$$

where $f : U \rightarrow X$ and $g : V \rightarrow Y$ are deterministic functions mapping from the set of inputs to the set of outputs and δ is the Kronecker delta.

This means that each output is uniquely determined by the input on the same side.

Definition 3. A non-signalling probability distribution is local if it is a convex combination of local deterministic probability distributions.

All local probability distributions can be simulated by two distant parties using a pre-agreed strategy and shared randomness — the shared randomness indicates them which local deterministic probability distribution to use, and the output is then a deterministic function of the input (on the same side).

Definition 4. Given a bipartite non-signalling probability distribution $P_{XY|UV}$, the maximum p , $0 \leq p \leq 1$, such that the probability distribution can be written as the convex combination of a local and a non-signalling probability distribution is called its local part:

$$P_{XY|UV} = p \cdot P_{local} + (1 - p) \cdot P_{ns} . \quad (4)$$

A probability distribution is local if and only if its local part is equal to one. However, in the special case of probability distributions taking binary input and giving binary output, there is a simple inequality which can be used to determine if a probability distribution is local.

Proposition 1 (Bell [2]). A bipartite probability distribution $P_{XY|UV}$ taking binary input and giving binary output is non-local if

$$P(X \oplus Y = U \cdot V) > 0.75 \quad (5)$$

for uniform inputs.

Note that, up to relabelling of the inputs and outputs, the above condition is in fact *equivalent* to non-locality. After [4], we call the condition $X \oplus Y = U \cdot V$ *CHSH-condition*.

For larger input and output alphabets, the following Lemma 1 will be of use.

Lemma 1. Consider two non-signalling probability distributions $P_{XY|UV}$ and $P_{ns,1}$. Then the former one can be written as a convex combination of the latter one with weight p and a second non-signalling probability distribution $P_{ns,2}$

$$P_{XY|UV} = p \cdot P_{ns,1} + (1 - p) \cdot P_{ns,2} \quad (6)$$

if and only if

$$p \cdot P_{ns,1}(x, y, u, v) \leq P_{XY|UV}(x, y, u, v) \quad \forall x, y, u, v . \quad (7)$$

In particular, this is valid when $P_{ns,1}$ is a local deterministic strategy.

Proof. Assume first that $p \cdot P_{ns,1}(x, y, u, v) \leq P_{XY|UV}(x, y, u, v) \quad \forall x, y, u, v$ and let us show that there exists some $P_{ns,2}$ such that $P_{XY|UV} = p \cdot P_{ns,1} + (1 - p) \cdot P_{ns,2}$: Since both $P_{XY|UV}$ and $P_{ns,1}$, are normalized and non-signalling, $P_{ns,2}$ is also normalized and non-signalling (both properties are linear).

It remains to show that $P_{ns,2}(x, y, u, v) \geq 0 \quad \forall x, y, u, v$. But $P_{ns,2}(x, y, u, v) = (1/(1 - p))(P_{XY|UV} - p \cdot P_{ns,1})$, which is larger than zero by assumption.

To see the reverse direction: Assume $p \cdot P_{ns,1}(x, y, u, v) > P_{XY|UV}(x, y, u, v)$ for some x, y, u, v . Then $P_{ns,2}(x, y, u, v) < 0$ and thus $P_{ns,2}$ is not a probability distribution. \square

3 Symmetric ε -PRMs

3.1 One Symmetric ε -PRM

We now study the case of one single ε -PRM ($\varepsilon \in [0, 0.25]$), i.e., one PRM that fullfills the CHSH-condition with probability $1 - \varepsilon$ but for which the output bits on both sides are unbiased.

Definition 5. A symmetric ε -PRM is a bipartite conditional probability distribution given by the following probability table.

		0		1	
		0	1	0	1
V	U	X	Y		
	0	1	0	1	
0		1/2 - ε /2	ε /2	1/2 - ε /2	ε /2
1		ε /2	1/2 - ε /2	ε /2	1/2 - ε /2
1		1/2 - ε /2	ε /2	1/2 - ε /2	ε /2
0		ε /2	1/2 - ε /2	1/2 - ε /2	ε /2

(8)

We denote this probability distribution by $P_{XY|UV}^{1,\varepsilon}$ (for 1 ε -PRM).

A symmetric ε -PRM can be seen as the convex combination of a perfect PRM and a completely random bit:

$$P_{XY|UV}^{1,\varepsilon} = 2\varepsilon \cdot P_{XY|UV}^{1,1/2} + (1 - 2\varepsilon) \cdot P_{XY|UV}^{1,0}. \quad (9)$$

Note that the distribution of the random bit is completely local, i.e., its local part is equal to 1 while the perfect PRM's local part is 0. However, the conclusion that the local part of $P_{XY|UV}^{1,\varepsilon}$ must be 2ε is wrong because $P_{XY|UV}^{1,\varepsilon}$ can be expressed as another convex combination with higher local weight:

$$\begin{aligned}
 P_{XY|UV}^{1,\varepsilon} = & \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \cdot \frac{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}}{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \cdot \frac{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}}{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \cdot \frac{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}}{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \cdot \frac{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}}{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}} \\
 & + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \cdot \frac{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}}{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \cdot \frac{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}}{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \cdot \frac{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}}{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}} + (1 - 4\varepsilon) \cdot \frac{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}}{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}}
 \end{aligned}$$

which shows, that the local part must be at least 4ε . In fact, the local part cannot be found by just subtracting local deterministic strategies, but must be optimized using a linear programming technique. By Lemma 1, we can write any non-signalling probability distribution as

$$P_{XY|UV} = p_i \cdot P_{ld,i} + (1 - \sum_i p_i) \cdot P_{ns} \quad (10)$$

where $P_{ld,i}$ are the different local deterministic strategies fixed by the input and output size. Together with the definition of the local part this implies Lemma 2.

Lemma 2. The local part is the optimal value of the linear program:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \max : & \sum_i p_i \\
 \text{s.t.} : & \sum_i p_i \cdot P_{ld,i}(x, y, u, v) \leq P_{XY|UV}(x, y, u, v) \\
 & 0 \leq p_i.
 \end{aligned}$$

This also shows that the decomposition of $P_{XY|UV}^{1,\varepsilon}$ given above is indeed optimal and the local part of $P_{XY|UV}^{1,\varepsilon}$ is 4ε .

3.2 Two Symmetric ε -PRMs

Now, consider two independent symmetric ε -PRMs. We can write these two machines as one single machine taking 2 input bits and giving 2 output bits on each side:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{XY|UV}^{2,\varepsilon}(x, y, u, v) &= P_{XY|UV}^{2,\varepsilon}((x_1x_2), (y_1y_2), (u_1u_2), (v_1v_2)) \\ &= P_{XY|UV}^{1,\varepsilon}(x_1, y_1, u_1, v_1) \cdot P_{XY|UV}^{1,\varepsilon}(x_2, y_2, u_2, v_2). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Obviously, it is always possible to write each of the two machines separately as a combination of one local and one non-local machine. This would give a local weight of $(4\varepsilon)^2$. However, as seen before, the local part might be larger and, indeed, the local part of two symmetric ε -PRMs is the same as the local part of one single symmetric ε -PRM.

Lemma 3.

$$P_{XY|UV}^{2,\varepsilon} = (4\varepsilon) \cdot P_{XY|UV}^{2,local} + (1 - 4\varepsilon) \cdot P_{XY|UV}^{2,0}.$$

Proof. It is obvious that the local part of two symmetric ε -PRMs cannot be larger than 4ε as this would contradict the fact that 4ε is the local part of one symmetric ε -PRM. To demonstrate that this value can be reached we provide an explicit decomposition in Appendix A and a second (different) one in Appendix B. \square

This has direct consequences for the amount of (non-signaling) secrecy which can be extracted from the outputs of *two* symmetric ε -PRMs as compared to one single ε -PRM [1].

Corollary 1 (Non-signaling Secrecy). *It is not possible to use two symmetric ε -PRMs with public inputs in parallel to create a secret bit (the secrecy of which is solely based on the non-signaling postulate) about which the adversary knows less than about the bit created by the use of a single symmetric ε -PRM. Further, this bound is tight, as it is always possible to simply ignore the second machine.*

Similarly, we can consider the question whether *two* symmetric ε -PRMs allow for the construction of an ε -PRM with smaller error $\varepsilon' < \varepsilon$. Again, the answer is negative since a local probability distribution always remains local even if a function is applied to it.

Corollary 2 (Distillation). *It is not possible to use two symmetric ε -PRMs in parallel in order to create a symmetric ε' -PRM with $\varepsilon' < \varepsilon$. This bound is tight as, by ignoring the second machine, we trivially have an ε -PRM.*

An even stronger result was shown directly by [9].

3.3 $n \geq 3$ Symmetric ε -PRMs

Before we consider the general case we, let us take a closer look at the case $n = 3$. We can look at the problem from a ‘game’ point of view: the PRM can be seen as a tool which always wins the so-called CHSH-game. In this game, Alice and Bob are both given a random bit and each of them need to reply with a bit. They win the game if and only if the XOR of their output bits is equal to the AND of their input. Three PRMs can now be seen as the same game where Alice and Bob are playing three rounds of the game in parallel. This allows them to apply a better strategy than playing each of the three games independently.

Lemma 4. *For every local deterministic strategy for three PRMs there always exist inputs u and v such that Alice and Bob lose two out of the three rounds of the CHSH-game.*

Proof. Assume, without loss of generality, that $x(000) = 000$. In order to lose at most one out of the three rounds of the game for the case $u = 000$, $y(v)$ must have Hamming weight at most one: $y(v) \in \{000, 001, 010, 100\} \forall v$. Now consider $x(111) = x_1x_2x_3$. A priori this can be anything: $x(111) = x_1x_2x_3 \in \{000, 001, 010, 011, 100, 101, 110, 111\}$. Now, look at $y(\bar{x}_1\bar{x}_2\bar{x}_3) = y_1y_2y_3$ when $u = 111$: in order to win all three rounds for this case, it must hold that $y_i = x_i$ if and only if $x_i = 1$, i.e., $y(\bar{x}_1\bar{x}_2\bar{x}_3) = 111$. Thus, in order to win at least two rounds, $y(\bar{x}_1\bar{x}_2\bar{x}_3)$ must have Hamming weight at least two. This contradicts the fact that $y(v)$ must have Hamming weight at most one. \square

Lemma 5. *Every local deterministic strategy for three PRMs can have weight p_i at most $(\varepsilon/2)^2(1/2 - \varepsilon/2)$.*

Proof. Lemma 4 states that, for every local deterministic strategy i , there exist u, v, x, y such that $P_{Id,i}(x, y, u, v) = 1$, but $P_{XY|UV}^{3,\varepsilon}(x, y, u, v) = (\varepsilon/2)^2(1/2 - \varepsilon/2)$. Together with Lemma 1 this implies that $p_i \leq (\varepsilon/2)^2(1/2 - \varepsilon/2)$. \square

Lemma 6. *The local part of three symmetric ε -PRMs is of the order of ε^2 .*

Proof. It needs to be of order at least ε^2 because the combination of a common strategy for the first two machines and a separate strategy for the third machine demonstrates that the local part must be at least $(4\varepsilon)^2$. It also cannot be larger: the strategies which lose at most two rounds of the CHSH-game do not depend on the error ε of the PRM — implying that the number of involved local deterministic strategies is bounded by some constant d . Thus, together with Lemma 5, the local part can be at most $d \cdot (\varepsilon/2)^2(1/2 - \varepsilon/2) + O(\varepsilon^3) = O(\varepsilon^2)$. \square

Lemma 7. *For every local deterministic strategy for n PRMs, there always exist inputs u and v such that Alice and Bob lose at least half of the n rounds of the CHSH-game.*

Proof. This proof is the generalization of the proof of Lemma 4: Assume, without loss of generality, that $x(0 \dots 0) = 0 \dots 0$. In order to lose at most k out of the n rounds of the game for the case $u = 0 \dots 0$, $y(v)$ must have Hamming weight at most k (independently of v). Now, let $x(1 \dots 1) = x_i$ and consider $y(\bar{x}_i)$: in order to win all n rounds for the case $u = 1 \dots 1$, $y(\bar{x}_i)$ must be equal to $x(1 \dots 1)$ exactly at the positions where x_i is '1', i.e., $y(\bar{x}_i) = 1 \dots 1$. Thus, in order to lose at most k rounds, $y(\bar{x}_i)$ must have Hamming weight at least $n - k$. Since $k < n/2$, this contradicts the fact that $y(v)$ must have Hamming weight at most k . \square

Theorem 1. *The local part of n symmetric ε -PRMs is of order $\Theta(\varepsilon^{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil})$.*

Proof. It is easy to see that this order can be reached as a local part of $(4\varepsilon)^{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}$ can be achieved by combining the ε -PRMs in pairs. On the other hand, Lemma 7 states that it cannot be larger than $d \cdot \varepsilon^{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil} + O(\varepsilon^{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil + 1})$, where d is some constant. \square

Lemma 8. *The local part of n symmetric ε -PRMs as a function $f(\varepsilon)$ is a continuous function that is defined by a finite partition of the function domain into intervals $I = \{I_1, \dots, I_m\}$ and a collection of polynomials $p_1(\varepsilon), \dots, p_m(\varepsilon)$ such that $f(\varepsilon) = p_i(\varepsilon)$ if $\varepsilon \in I_i$.*

Proof. The local part is determined by the solution of a linear program of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \max : & c^T x \\ \text{s.t.} & A \cdot x \leq b \\ & x \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

where the vector c is the all-one vector, the matrix A only contains zeroes or ones, and b is a vector of polynomials in a parameter ε (and all other elements do not depend on this parameter). By definition of the dual program the solution (optimum) of the above program is equal to the solution of the linear program below:

$$\begin{aligned} \min : & b^T y \\ \text{s.t.} & A^T \cdot y \leq c \\ & y \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

The domain of this linear program is constant (because none of the inequalities depend on ε) and a convex set (in fact, a polyhedron). We know that the optimum is necessarily attained in an extremal point - a vertex of the polyhedron. Every vertex corresponds to one specific y - let us call it y^k for the k -th vertex. The solution of the linear program can then be written as $\min_k (b^T y^k) = \min_k (\sum_i b_i \cdot y_i^k)$. As the b_i 's are all polynomials in ε of order at most n and the y_i^k are constants, $b^T y^k$ is a linear combination of polynomials of order n and therefore itself a polynomial of at most order n . Therefore the local part is given by the minimum of a finite number of fixed polynomials with limited order. \square

3.4 Explicit Bounds

Lemma 9. *The local part of n ε -PRMs is at most $2^{2n} \cdot \sum_{i=\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}^n \binom{n}{i} (1-\varepsilon)^{n-i} \varepsilon^i$.*

Proof. Lemma 7 states that if we sum over all the entries of probability in the symmetric ε -PRM we have also counted the weight of every local strategy at least once. The entry with probability $(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2})^{n-i} (\frac{\varepsilon}{2})^i$ occurs exactly $2^n \cdot \binom{n}{i}$ times per input and there are 2^{2n} inputs. Note that this is approximately equal to $(64\varepsilon)^{n/2}$ for large n and small ε . \square

For very small ε the entry with the lowest probability is always the ‘limiting’ one. We can therefore approximate the leading coefficient better for very small ε (the polynomial f_1 from below):

Lemma 10. *For small ε the local part is at least $2^{n/2} \binom{n}{n/2} (1-\varepsilon)^{n/2} \varepsilon^{n/2}$ for even n and $2^{(n+3)/2} \binom{n}{(n+1)/2} (1-\varepsilon)^{(n-1)/2} \varepsilon^{(n+1)/2}$ for odd n .*

Proof. For the case of two PRMs we have seen that there exists a (local deterministic) strategy which for 8 different inputs it wins both rounds of the CHSH-game, for another 8 inputs it wins one round and it never loses both rounds of the CHSH-game. Taking the product of this strategy gives us a strategy which never loses more than $\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$ rounds (independently of the input) and loses exactly $\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$ rounds for exactly $8^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}$ inputs. Through depolarization [6] of this strategy we can obtain a local strategy, such that each of the entries with probability $(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2})^{n-\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil} (\frac{\varepsilon}{2})^{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}$ is covered the same number of times and if we sum over all the entries with probability $(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2})^{n-\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil} (\frac{\varepsilon}{2})^{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}$ then every strategy is counted exactly $8^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}$ times (note that for low epsilon, the ‘limiting probability’ is always the one with the highest order in ε , no matter how the rest of the strategy looks like). Therefore, for low ε , these strategies can reach a local part of

$$\text{local part} = 8^{-\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \cdot 2^{2n} \cdot 2^n \cdot \binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)^{\lceil n/2 \rceil}. \quad (12)$$

Note that this is approximately $(8\varepsilon)^{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$ for large n by the Stirling approximation. \square

4 Maximally Biased δ -PRMs

Consider a PRM which fullfills the CHSH-condition in three out of the four input-cases with probability $1 - \delta$ and in the fourth case perfectly, and where the output bit X is maximally biased towards zero.

Definition 6. *A maximally biased δ -PRM is a bipartite conditional probability distribution given by the following probability table.*

		U		0		1	
		V		0		1	
Y		X		0	1	0	1
		0	1	0	1	0	1
0	0	1	0	1	0	1	(13)
	1	$\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta}{2}$	
1	0	1	0	1	0	1	(13)
	1	$\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2}$	0	

The local part of one maximally biased δ -PRM is 3δ which can be reached by the following decomposition:

$$P_{XY|UV}^{1,\delta} = \frac{\delta}{2} \cdot \frac{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array}}{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array}} + \frac{\delta}{2} \cdot \frac{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}}{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}} + \frac{\delta}{2} \cdot \frac{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}}{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}}$$

$$+ \frac{\delta}{2} \cdot \frac{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}}{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}} + \frac{\delta}{2} \cdot \frac{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}}{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}} + (1-3\delta) \cdot \frac{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}}{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}}$$

We will now see that, for $n > 1$ maximally biased δ -PRMs, the local part is $(3\delta)^n$. This value can obviously be reached by decomposing each of the n individually.

Lemma 11. *For every local deterministic strategy for n maximally biased PRMs, either the strategy has weight zero or there exist inputs u, v such that Alice and Bob lose all the n rounds of the CHSH-game.*

Proof. For the maximally biased PRMs, there are two conditions for a strategy to have non-zero weight:

$$x_i(u_i = 1) \neq y_i(v_i = 1) \tag{14}$$

$$(x_i(u_i), y_i(v_i)) \neq (1, 0) \quad \forall u_i, v_i \neq (1, 1) \tag{15}$$

On the other hand, if these conditions are fulfilled then the strategy can have non-zero weight. Now let us try to construct a strategy with weight greater than zero because only these are of interest for finding the local part. We will show that the i -th answers to the all-zero and all-one input either completely determine *all* answers for the i -th round (and we will be able to reduce to the case of $n-1$ rounds) — or they are such that there exists another input where all rounds are lost.

FIRST CASE: $x_i(1\dots 1) = 1$. Because of Condition (14) we have $y_i(v_i = 1) = 0$ (no matter what the rest of the input is). And in the same way, we must also have $x_i(u_i = 1) = 1$ independently of the input. However, because of Condition (15), we must have $y_i(v_i = 0) = 0$ and $x_i(u_i = 0) = 0$ independently of the rest of the input. Therefore all outputs of the i -th round are completely determined by the input of the i -th round (giving a product strategy) and furthermore the i -th round is lost for the input $(u_i, v_i) = (1, 0)$ for all possible combinations of the remaining inputs, and the problem reduces to the case of $n-1$ PRMs.

SECOND CASE: $x_i(1\dots 1) = 0$. Because of Condition (14) we have $y_i(v_i = 1) = 0$ (no matter what the rest of the input is). And in the same way, we must also have $x_i(u_i = 1) = 0$ independently of the rest of the input. We now classify the PRMs into two types with respect to Alice's output: Those for which $x_i(u_i = 0) = 0 \quad \forall u$ and those for which $\exists u : u_i = 0 \wedge x_i(u) = 1$. Without loss of generality we assume that the first j of the n PRMs are of the first type and that the remaining $n-j$ PRMs are of the second type. The PRMs of the first type lose the CHSH game for input $(u_i, v_i) = (0, 1)$ independently of the rest of the input. The PRMs of the second type must yield $y_i(v_i = 0) = 1$ independently of the rest of the input — otherwise the strategy has zero weight. However, this means that this PRM always loses the CHSH game for input $(u_i, v_i) = (1, 0)$. Therefore, all CHSH-games are lost for input (u, v) such that $(u_i, v_i) = (\delta_{i>j}, \delta_{i\leq\delta})$. \square

Theorem 2. *The local part of n maximally biased δ -PRMs is $(3\delta)^n$.*

Proof. Lemma 11 shows that every strategy with non-zero weight has at least one input for which all rounds are lost. This shows that the sum of probabilities of inputs and outputs which lose *all* rounds of the CHSH-game must be larger or equal the local part. There are 3^n of these input/output combinations — each with associated probability δ^n . Thus the local part is at most $(3\delta)^n$. On the other hand, we can reach a local part of $(3\delta)^n$ by using product strategies. It follows that *local part* = $(3\delta)^n$. \square

5 Conclusion

We have demonstrated that the local part of n symmetric ε -PRMs is of order $\Theta(\varepsilon^{\lceil n/2 \rceil})$ and that the local part of n maximally biased (asymmetric) δ -PRMs is exactly $(3\delta)^n$. To quantify the local part of n symmetric ε -PRMs exactly remains an open problem.

References

1. J. Barrett, L. Hardy, and A. Kent. No signalling and quantum key distribution. *Physical Review Letters*, 95:010503, 2005.
2. J. S. Bell. On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox. *Physics*, 1:195–200, 1964.
3. B. S. Cirel'son. Quantum generalizations of Bell's inequality. *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 4(2):93–100, 1980.

4. J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt. Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories. *Physical Review Letters*, 23(15):880–884, 1969.
5. A. C. Elitzur, S. Popescu, and D. Rohrlich. Quantum nonlocality for each pair in an ensemble. *Physics Letters A*, 162(1):25–28, 1992.
6. Ll Masanes, A. Acin, and N. Gisin. General properties of nonsignaling theories. *Physical Review A*, 73:012112, 2006.
7. S. Popescu and D. Rohrlich. Quantum nonlocality as an axiom. *Foundations of Physics*, 24(3):379–385, 1994.
8. V. Scarani. On the local and non-local content of bipartite qubit and qutrit correlations. *Physical Review A*, 77:042112, 2008.
9. A. Short. No purification for two copies of a noisy entangled state. 2008, quant-ph/0809.2622.
10. W. van Dam. Implausible consequences of superstrong nonlocality. 2005, quant-ph/0501159.

A Strategy for Two Symmetric ε -PRMs

The following local deterministic strategies for 2-bits input and 2-bits output on each side reach a local weight of 4ε when decomposing two symmetric ε -PRMs. The local deterministic strategies are described by giving the output as function of the input ($x(u)$ and $y(v)$). Note that there exists another combination of local deterministic strategies reaching the same weight. These strategies are given in Appendix B.

weight	$u_1 u_2$				$v_1 v_2$				weight	$u_1 u_2$				$v_1 v_2$			
p_i	00	01	10	11	00	01	10	11	p_i	00	01	10	11	00	01	10	11
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	11	11	10	11	11	10	01	10	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	01	00	01	10	01	01	00	01
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	01	00	00	00	00	01	00	11	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	01	11	01	01	01	01	11	10
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	01	01	11	10	11	01	01	01	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	10	10	00	10	10	11	10	10
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	00	00	10	11	10	00	00	00	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	01	10	11	10	10	11	01	01
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	01	00	11	11	01	11	01	01	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	10	01	00	01	01	00	10	10
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	00	00	01	00	00	01	10	01	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	00	01	00	11	00	00	01	00
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	00	01	01	01	01	00	01	10	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	10	00	10	10	10	10	00	01
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	11	11	11	01	11	10	11	11	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	11	00	01	00	00	01	11	11
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	01	01	00	01	01	00	11	00	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	00	00	10	00	00	01	00	00
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	00	01	10	10	00	10	00	00	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	00	11	10	11	11	10	00	00
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	11	11	01	00	01	11	11	11	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	01	01	11	01	01	00	01	01
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	11	10	01	01	11	01	11	11	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	00	10	00	00	00	00	10	11
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	10	11	11	11	11	10	11	00	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	11	10	11	00	11	11	10	11
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	10	11	10	10	10	10	10	00	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	11	01	11	11	11	11	01	00
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	01	10	01	00	00	01	11	11	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	10	11	10	01	10	10	11	10
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	10	10	11	10	10	11	00	11	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	11	11	01	11	11	10	11	11
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	10	01	10	11	11	10	00	00	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	11	10	01	10	10	11	11	11
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	10	10	00	01	00	10	10	10	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	01	01	01	11	01	01	00	00
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	10	11	00	00	10	00	10	10	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	11	00	11	10	11	11	00	01
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	00	11	00	01	01	00	10	10	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	10	00	00	00	00	01	10	10
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	10	10	10	00	10	11	10	10	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	00	00	00	10	00	00	00	01
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	11	10	00	00	10	01	10	11	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	01	00	11	00	00	01	01	01
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	10	10	01	00	00	11	10	11	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	11	01	01	01	01	00	11	11
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	10	11	01	01	11	00	11	10	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	10	11	00	11	11	10	10	10
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	01	01	01	11	01	00	01	01	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	00	11	00	01	00	00	11	10
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	00	00	00	10	00	01	00	00	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	00	10	10	10	10	11	00	00
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	11	10	10	10	10	11	10	01	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	11	11	11	01	11	11	11	10
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	11	10	11	11	11	11	11	01	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	01	10	01	00	01	01	10	11
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	00	00	11	10	10	01	00	01	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	10	10	10	00	10	10	10	11
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	11	00	11	10	10	11	01	01	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	10	01	10	11	10	10	01	00
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	10	10	10	11	10	10	00	10	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	01	11	11	11	11	10	01	01
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	11	11	11	10	11	11	01	11	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	00	01	10	01	01	00	00	00
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	00	01	00	00	00	00	00	10	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	01	01	10	11	01	01	00	00
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	11	00	01	00	01	01	10	11	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	11	10	10	10	10	11	00	11
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	11	11	00	01	01	10	11	10	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	11	10	01	01	01	11	11	11
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	01	01	01	00	01	01	11	01	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	10	10	10	11	10	10	10	00
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	01	00	10	10	00	11	00	01	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	10	11	00	00	00	10	10	10
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	10	11	00	11	10	10	11	10	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	00	01	01	01	01	00	11	00
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	00	00	00	01	00	00	10	00	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	00	00	00	01	00	00	00	10
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	01	00	01	01	01	01	01	11	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	11	11	11	10	11	11	01	01
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	00	00	10	00	00	00	00	01	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	10	11	11	11	11	10	01	10
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	00	10	10	10	10	10	00	01	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	00	01	10	10	10	00	00	00
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	00	01	11	11	11	10	01	00	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	01	01	01	00	01	01	01	11
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	00	01	10	01	00	00	01	00	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	00	00	11	10	00	11	00	01
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	01	01	10	11	11	00	01	00	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	11	11	00	01	11	00	11	10
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	01	11	11	11	11	11	01	00	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	10	10	01	00	10	01	10	11
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	01	01	11	01	01	01	01	00	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	01	00	00	00	00	01	10	01
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	01	00	11	00	01	01	00	01	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	01	00	11	11	11	01	01	01
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	10	00	00	00	00	00	10	11	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	00	01	11	11	11	00	01	00
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	10	01	00	01	00	00	11	10	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	10	10	00	01	10	00	10	10
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	11	11	01	11	11	11	11	10	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	00	01	00	00	00	00	10	00
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	01	10	11	10	11	11	00	01	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	00	00	10	11	00	00	00	00
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	00	11	10	11	10	10	01	00	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	11	11	10	11	11	10	11	00
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	10	10	00	10	10	10	10	11	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	10	10	11	10	10	11	01	01
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	11	10	01	10	11	11	10	11	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	11	10	11	11	11	01	11	11
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	11	01	01	01	01	01	11	10	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	10	11	01	01	01	10	11	10
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	11	01	11	11	11	10	01	01	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	11	10	00	00	00	11	10	11
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	10	11	10	01	11	10	10	10	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	01	00	01	01	01	01	11	01
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	10	00	10	10	10	11	00	00	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	11	11	01	00	11	01	11	11
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	00	10	00	00	00	01	10	10	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	01	01	00	01	01	00	01	10
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	01	11	01	01	01	00	11	11	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	01	01	11	10	01	11	01	01
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	01	00	01	10	00	01	01	01	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	01	00	10	10	10	01	00	01
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	00	01	00	11	01	00	00	00	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	00	00	01	00	01	00	11	11
$(1/16) \cdot (\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2)$	11	10	11	00	10	11	11	11	$(1/8) \cdot \varepsilon^2$	10	11	10	10	10	10	00	10

B Further Inspection of the Symmetric Case

Since this appendix is devoted to symmetric ε -PRMs, for simplicity we write $P^{(\varepsilon)}$ instead of $P_{XY|UV}^{1,\varepsilon}$. As explained in the main text, a known result is

$$P^{(\varepsilon)} = (1 - 4\varepsilon) P^{(0)} + 4\varepsilon P^{(1/4)} \quad (16)$$

where $P^{(1/4)}$ is the closest local point to $P^{(0)}$ (actually, $P^{(1/4)} = \frac{1}{2}P^{(0)} + \frac{1}{2}I$ with I the uniform probability distribution $P_{XY|UV} = \frac{1}{4}$). We want to study the non-local part of

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} &= P^{(\varepsilon)} \times P^{(\varepsilon)} = \\ &= (1 - 4\varepsilon)^2 P^{(0)} \times P^{(0)} + (4\varepsilon)^2 P^{(1/4)} \times P^{(1/4)} \\ &\quad + 4\varepsilon(1 - 4\varepsilon) \left[P^{(0)} \times P^{(1/4)} + P^{(1/4)} \times P^{(0)} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

We are going to show that $\mathbf{S} \equiv P^{(0)} \times P^{(1/4)} + P^{(1/4)} \times P^{(0)} = P_{NL} + P_L$. This implies

$$\mathbf{P} = (1 - 4\varepsilon) \mathbf{P}_{NL} + 4\varepsilon \mathbf{P}_L \quad (18)$$

with $\mathbf{P}_{NL} = (1 - 4\varepsilon)P^{(0)} \times P^{(0)} + 4\varepsilon P_{NL}$ and $\mathbf{P}_L = (1 - 4\varepsilon)P_L + 4\varepsilon P^{(1/4)} \times P^{(1/4)}$; as a consequence, the local part of \mathbf{P} is 4ε , just as the local part of the single copy $P^{(\varepsilon)}$.

The most elegant way of finding P_L exploits a symmetry. Indeed, all $P_{XY|UV}$ above the facet $CHSH = 2$ can be brought to the form $P^{(\varepsilon)}$ by applying the depolarization procedure \mathcal{D} defined in Appendix A of [6]. For instance, $P^{(1/4)} = \mathcal{D}([00;00])$ where $[00;00]$ is the deterministic probability distribution $P_{XY|UV} = \delta_{X,0}\delta_{Y,0}$ i.e. $X_U = 0$ and $Y_V = 0$. It is in particular obvious that $\mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D}[\mathbf{P}] = \mathbf{P}$ and consequently $\mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D}[\mathbf{S}] = \mathbf{S}$. It is therefore natural to look for $P_L = \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D}[\mathbf{D}]$ where \mathbf{D} is some deterministic point for four inputs and four outputs. By inspection, one finds

$$P_L = \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D}([0001;0020]) \quad (19)$$

with $\mathbf{D} = [0001;0020]$ the deterministic point where the X_U and Y_V are defined as $X_0 = X_1 = X_2 = 0, X_3 = 1, Y_0 = Y_1 = Y_3 = 0, Y_2 = 2$. Finally, since each application of \mathcal{D} defines an orbit of 8 points, each of P_L and $P^{(1/4)} \times P^{(1/4)}$ is a convex combination of 64 deterministic points; therefore \mathbf{P}_L is a convex combination involving 128 deterministic points. The explicit list is given below.

Two remarks to conclude:

- None of the 64 4×4 deterministic points, whose mixture gives P_L , can be described as a product of two 2×2 deterministic points. For instance, consider Alice in $\mathbf{D} = [0001;0020]$, and write both inputs and outputs in binary form: $X_{00} = X_{01} = X_{10} = 0 \equiv (0, 0)$ but $X_{11} = 1 \equiv (0, 1)$. Manifestly, this list cannot be written as $X_{U=uu'} = (x_u, x_{u'})$.
- One could in principle study the local part of $\mathbf{P}_n = P^{(\varepsilon)} \times \dots \times P^{(\varepsilon)}$ the product of n symmetric ε -PRMs: indeed,

$$\mathbf{P}_n = \sum_{k=0}^n (4\varepsilon)^k (1 - 4\varepsilon)^{n-k} \mathbf{S}_{n,k} \quad (20)$$

with $\mathbf{S}_{n,k}$ the sum of all terms containing k factors $P^{(1/4)}$ and $n - k$ factors $P^{(0)}$. Obviously, $\mathbf{S}_{n,0}$ is fully non-local and $\mathbf{S}_{n,n}$ is fully local. All the others may contain both a local and a non-local part, satisfying the symmetry $\mathcal{D} \times \dots \times \mathcal{D}$. Studying the local part of each $\mathbf{S}_{n,k}$ then gives a lower bound on the local part of \mathbf{P}_n . Unfortunately, we have not found an easy way of finding the result. Even for the case $n = 3$, the inspection is too heavy; we have evidence that $\mathbf{S}_{n,1}$ should be fully non-local, while $\mathbf{S}_{n,2}$ has a local part.