

Emergence of Quantum Mechanics from Non-Locality Swapping

Paul Skrzypczyk,^{1,*} Nicolas Brunner,^{1,†} and Sandu Popescu^{1,2,‡}

¹ *H.H. Wills Physics Laboratory, University of Bristol, Tyndall Avenue, Bristol, BS8 1TL, United Kingdom*

² *Hewlett-Packard Laboratories, Stoke Gifford, Bristol, BS12 6QZ, United Kingdom*

(Dated: June 13, 2022)

Recently the study of general non-signalling theories has brought a lot of insight to quantum mechanics. By investigating these generalized models, the hope is to find out what is essential in quantum mechanics; what makes it so special. Answering this question will definitely provide a deeper understanding of the foundations of quantum mechanics, and may enable further developments in quantum information science. In the present paper, we revisit the paradigmatic model of non-signalling boxes and introduce the concept of a genuine box. This will allow us to present the first generalized non-signalling model featuring quantum-like dynamics. In particular, we present the coupler, a device enabling non-locality swapping, the analogue of quantum entanglement swapping, as well as teleportation. Remarkably, a clear boundary between quantum and post-quantum correlations naturally emerges in our study.

It is a remarkable fact that we observe correlations between distant measurements that cannot be explained on the basis of a previous interaction. Specifically, Bell inequalities [1] show that the correlations predicted by Quantum Mechanics (QM) cannot be ascribed to a local theory. To date, all experiments confirm that Nature is inherently non-local [2, 3].

However, QM predicts also an upper bound on the non-locality of allowed correlations, as shown by Tsirelson [4]. In trying to understand this upper bound Popescu and Rohrlich [5] asked whether it was a direct consequence of relativity – whether correlations more non-local would lead to signalling – and surprisingly found this not to be the case.

This discovery prompted the study of more general models, containing more non-locality than QM, but still respecting the no-signaling principle [6]. The ultimate goal of this line of research is to find out what is special about QM; what distinguishes it from other non-signaling theories. Among the fundamental questions is the following: What physical principle limits quantum non-locality? This is still unknown today, but there is no doubt that answering this question will bring deeper understanding of the foundations of QM, as well as further developments in quantum information science.

Studying the information theoretic properties of generalized non-signaling models has already provided insight to these questions [7, 8, 9]. On the one hand, many astonishing features of QM, such as no-cloning, no broadcasting and monogamy of correlations, have been shown to be general properties of any non-signaling model [9, 10, 11]. Hence these properties do not give a clear separation between QM and post-quantum theories. On the other hand, first steps towards establishing such a separation were taken by van Dam [12] and Brassard *et al.* [13] who showed that particular classes of post-quantum models allow for a dramatic increase of communication power compared to the quantum case. Furthermore, Linden *et al.* [14] showed that the same post-quantum theories allow for non-local computation while QM does not. Tantalizingly, a first glimpse of a clear separation appeared: the non-local AND gate can be performed when one has access to post-quantum correlations, but the probability of success vanishes the instant these correlations become quantum.

More importantly however, there is one crucial aspect of QM that generalized models have failed to reproduce until now, namely its dynamics; in particular, the ability to perform joint measurements on two systems, which is the key ingredient for fascinating quantum processes, such as teleportation [15] and entanglement swapping [16]. In fact, Short *et al.* [17] and Barrett [9] showed that there are no genuinely joint measurements in theories constrained only by no-signaling, thus suggesting the existence of another fundamental principle inherent to QM, that generalized models fail to capture.

Here we take a new conceptual perspective on generalized non-signalling models, which allows us to implement joint measurements. By revisiting the paradigmatic model of Popescu-Rohrlich (PR) boxes [5], we present a model featuring rich dynamics, such as non-locality swapping, the analogue of quantum entanglement swapping, and teleportation.

The starting point of our study will be to make appropriate restrictions to the set of attainable states. While these restrictions may appear at first sight to be completely arbitrary, we will fully justify them. We argue that the set of states to be considered for describing dynamical processes such as joint measurements must be restricted to *genuine boxes*. These boxes are in fact the most elementary states of the theory; all the other valid boxes can be built from these genuine boxes by adding classical circuitry. While this distinction plays no role in the case of disjoint (or classical) processes, it turns out to be crucial for the implementation of joint measurements.

Then, we will move to the presentation of the *coupler*, an imaginary device that allows one to perform such joint measurement on PR boxes [17], enabling non-locality swapping, as well as teleportation.

Finally, and probably most surprisingly, we show that quantum non-locality emerges naturally from the coupler. More precisely, when considering noisy PR boxes, the coupler prevents non-locality swapping exactly from the moment the noisy PR box reaches the Tsirelson bound [4]. Furthermore, in a natural subspace of the full state space, the coupler prevents non-locality swapping if and only if the state is attainable by QM. Let us stress that this correspondence is utterly surprising: the set of quantum states naturally emerges from




FIG. 2: **Genuine boxes.** (a) A ‘quantum’ black-box contains a source producing a quantum state, here two photons entangled in polarization, and on both sides a measurement device, here a polarizing beam splitter (PBS) followed by detectors. To each input value x , corresponds an orientation of the PBS, thus performing the polarization measurement in a different basis. The genuine part of the box is the quantum state; in order to perform a joint measurement, an observer must first remove the measurement device (PBS and detectors). (b) Construction of a non-genuine PR box. It contains the genuine PR box and some classical circuitry: NOT gates on the inputs and outputs. All symmetries of the PR box can be obtained in this way. Importantly, when a joint measurement is to be performed, that is by applying the coupler, one should first open the black-box, remove the circuitry, and connect the coupler to the genuine PR box.

Let us first re-examine the standard “black box” approach to quantum correlations, where they are stripped back to their purest form; where measurement choices and outcomes are both reduced to single bits of information [21]. It is instructive to think about how such a setup would in reality be produced.

The black box must consist of a quantum system, to be measured, and the appropriate measuring devices (see Fig. 2). For the case of two polarized photons, we would require one polarizer on each side of the box, with two possible orientations (one to be used for each input bit), and detectors recording the measurement outcome and outputting the corresponding bit. In this picture, the quantum state is the genuine part of the box; the measurement is then a processing. Indeed, by changing the orientation of the polarizer for each measurement setting one can produce many different black-boxes starting from the same initial quantum state, but they are clearly not genuinely different. On the other hand, it is also possible to produce the same black-box by using two different quantum states, subjected to appropriate measurements, i.e. the boxes appear to be the same although their genuine part is different. This will have important implications as we show below.

The PR box can be seen as the abstraction of this arrangement. Clearly in this case there are no quantum states and polarizers in the box, which makes it more delicate to separate what is genuine in the box from what is not. Note that as long as we do not need to look inside the box, as is the case in most of the scenarios considered so far, we need make no distinction between genuine and non-genuine.

However, when dynamics are introduced in the model, things change. Let us first think of the quantum case. Suppose Bob shares two quantum boxes, with Alice and Charlie respectively. The important point here is that joint measurements are performed on quantum particles, and not on measurement outcomes. Thus, in order to perform a joint measurement on his two particles, Bob clearly has to open the boxes, remove the polarizers, and then perform the joint measurement on the two particles. Therefore, it is crucial that the joint measurement is performed on the genuine part of the

box, that is on the quantum state, and not on the black-box itself. Clearly, now it is important what the actual quantum state is: two boxes that appeared to be the same while containing different states and different polarizers, may now behave differently.

Now we argue that for PR boxes, the situation is completely analogous. As mentioned earlier, all 8 different PR boxes can be generated from the single PR box (2) by adding classical circuitry. Thus these boxes are not genuinely different. Now, in order to perform a joint measurement, it is crucial to apply the coupler to the genuine part of the box, i.e. to the genuine PR box and not the input and output wires. Therefore, when applying the coupler, one has first to remove any classical circuitry and then connect the coupler to the genuine PR box (see Fig. 2).

In the light of the results of Ref [9, 17] and of our own results, we argue that the concept of genuine boxes is not a particularity of the quantum case, but is in fact general to non-signaling models. Therefore we believe it is of fundamental importance.

The question now is what is the set of genuine boxes. While the full set of non-signalling states is a well defined concept, there is here some freedom in choosing the set of genuine boxes. When all 8 PR boxes are put on an equal footing, i.e. as all being genuine, then interesting dynamics are forbidden [9, 17]. Here we choose the simplest and most natural possibility: we consider as genuine all local deterministic states (1) and we add one single PR box (2). This choice will allow for rich dynamics, as we will show in the next section.

COUPLER FOR NON-LOCALITY SWAPPING

Entanglement swapping [16] is among the most fascinating dynamical processes allowed by quantum theory as well as a key ingredient for quantum communication and computation. It has been experimentally demonstrated in a wide range of physical systems [22, 23, 24].

Let us start by briefly reviewing the quantum protocol. An observer, Bob, shares a maximally entangled state with both Alice and Charlie, two distant observers. Initially, the global state of the system is $|\psi^-\rangle_{AB_1}|\psi^-\rangle_{B_2C}$, where $|\psi^-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)$ is the singlet state. A successful protocol entangles Alice's and Charlie's particles, though these never interacted.

The core of entanglement swapping is the ability of Bob to perform a joint measurement of his two particles (B_1, B_2), that is to measure them in a basis where the eigenstates are entangled. The simplest form of such a measurement is the projection onto the symmetric and anti-symmetric subspaces of two qubits, i.e. the projective measurement

$$M = \{|\psi^-\rangle\langle\psi^-|, \mathbb{1} - |\psi^-\rangle\langle\psi^-|\}. \quad (3)$$

Such a process is also referred to as a partial Bell state measurement, since it is in general possible to find a basis where all eigenstates are maximally entangled – the Bell basis. Here the protocol is successful when Bob's particles are projected onto the singlet state; otherwise the procedure failed. In the first case, the global state of Alice, Bob and Charlie undergoes the following transformation

$$|\psi^-\rangle_{AB_1}|\psi^-\rangle_{B_2C} \rightarrow |\psi^-\rangle_{B_1B_2}|\psi^-\rangle_{AC}.$$

Thus entanglement has been swapped between AB_1 and B_2C to B_1B_2 and AC , so that Alice and Charlie now share a singlet state and are both uncorrelated from Bob (see Fig. 3). Importantly, it is not until the announcement of Bob's successful joint measurement that Alice and Charlie learn which state they hold and whether they share any non-local correlations.

It is straightforward to extend the scenario of entanglement swapping to our generalized model. Instead of entangled quantum states, Bob shares now a generalized non-local state, i.e. a probability distribution, with both Alice and Charlie. To implement non-locality swapping one must first define the coupler, the analogue of a quantum joint measurement (see Fig. 3). The coupler is a device which, when applied on Bob's two states, encompasses the inputs and outputs and returns a single bit b' , i.e. the transformation

$$P(ab_1|xy_1)P(b_2c|y_2z) \xrightarrow{\chi} P(ab'c|xz).$$

Now let us define the action of the coupler on two PR states:

$$P^{\text{PR}}(ab_1|xy_1)P^{\text{PR}}(b_2c|y_2z) \xrightarrow{\chi} P(ab'c|xz) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{3}P^{\text{PR}}(ac|xz) & b' = 0 \\ \frac{2}{3}P^{\text{f}}(ac|xz) & b' = 1 \end{cases}$$

Thus with probability $P(b' = 0) = \frac{1}{3}$ Bob succeeds in swapping a PR state to Alice and Charlie. With probability $P(b' = 1) = \frac{2}{3}$, the protocol fails, and Alice and Charlie share the failure state




FIG. 3: **Entanglement and non-locality swapping.** (a) The quantum protocol of entanglement swapping. By performing a joint measurement on his two particles, Bob swaps entanglement to Alice and Charlie. (b) Non-locality swapping is the analog procedure on generalized non-signalling states, here PR boxes. The joint measurement is performed by applying the coupler. The coupler encompasses Bob's inputs and outputs and returns a single bit b' , which informs Bob whether the swapping procedure succeeded or failed. Note that the original measuring devices of Bob's two boxes (the PBS in Fig. 2) have been removed and replaced by a single joint measuring device (a beam-splitter and two detectors for measuring coincidences).

$$P^{\text{f}} = \frac{3}{2} \left(\mathbb{1}(ac|xz) - \frac{1}{3}P^{\text{PR}}(ac|xz) \right),$$

which is an allowed state.

An important requirement for the coupler to be valid is that Bob cannot signal to Alice and Charlie by applying the coupler. Indeed, here we have

$$P(ac|xz) = \sum_{b'} P(ab'c|xz) = \mathbb{1}(ac|xz),$$

where $\mathbb{1}(ac|xz) = \frac{1}{4} \forall a, c, x, z$ is the maximally mixed state. Therefore, the state of Alice and Charlie is independent of whether Bob applied the coupler or not, as desired.

Next we find that, when applied directly onto any allowed state, the coupler outputs $b' = 0$ with a probability that is proportional to the CH value of that particular state, that is

$$P(b' = 0|P(ab|xy)) = \frac{2}{3}\vec{\text{CH}} \cdot \vec{P}(ab|xy). \quad (4)$$

This constant of proportionality is however crucial, since it ensures that the coupler outputs a valid probability when applied to any allowed state. Notably, upon applying the coupler




FIG. 4: **Emergence of quantum correlations from the coupler.** In a natural section of the polytope, the states that cannot be used for non-locality swapping (by the coupler) correspond exactly to the set of quantum states Q (red region), as characterized by the Tsirelson-Landau-Masanes criteria (red border). For isotropic states, which lie on the line joining the PR box and the identity $\mathbb{1}$, the limit for non-locality swapping corresponds to the Tsirelson bound (cross) $B_Q = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{1}{2}$, the bound of quantum non-locality for the CH inequality. Note that the coupler acts consistently on any allowed state, since the probability of outputting $b' = 0$ (right axis) is a re-scaling of the CH value (left axis).

directly to a PR state, Bob always obtains the outcome $b' = 0$. This is exactly what happens in the quantum case: when Bob holds a singlet and performs the joint measurement (3), he always projects onto the anti-symmetric subspace. A derivation of equation (4) can be found in the Methods section.

Finally, the analogue of quantum teleportation can also be implemented with the coupler; see the Methods section for details.

EMERGENCE OF QUANTUM CORRELATIONS

We have just seen that the coupler, when applied to two PR boxes shared by Alice-Bob and Bob-Charlie, creates a PR box between Alice and Charlie. We will refer to this as *perfect* swapping, since after the process Alice and Charlie share a state which is exactly as non-local as both initial states.

A natural question to ask is now whether Bob, by applying the coupler, can also swap non-locality between Alice and Charlie, starting from imperfect boxes. Let us first consider noisy state of the form

$$P_\xi^{\text{PR}} \equiv \xi P^{\text{PR}} + (1 - \xi) \mathbb{1}, \quad (5)$$

with $0 \leq \xi \leq 1$. These states are called isotropic, and are similar to quantum Werner states [25]. The CH value of the noisy states (5) is $\vec{\text{CH}} \cdot \vec{P}_\xi^{\text{PR}} = \xi + \frac{1}{2}$.

Using the linearity of the coupler one can check that when Bob succeeds in swapping non-locality (i.e. he obtains the outcome $b' = 0$ from the coupler) starting from two P_ξ^{PR} boxes, the final state shared between Alice and Charlie has CH value

$$\vec{\text{CH}} \cdot \vec{P}(ac|xz) = \xi^2 + \frac{1}{2}. \quad (6)$$

Note that since this function is quadratic, the coupler enables perfect swapping only for noiseless PR boxes; two noisy boxes can only be swapped to a noisier box.

Now, the remarkable point is the following. Non-locality can be swapped using two boxes P_ξ^{PR} if and only if P_ξ^{PR} is post-quantum; that is if and only if $\vec{\text{CH}} \cdot \vec{P}_\xi^{\text{PR}} > B_Q = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, where B_Q is the Tsirelson bound of the CH inequality. This means that when the two initial boxes P_ξ^{PR} are noisy enough to have been produced quantum mechanically, the resulting box shared by Alice and Charlie is so noisy as to become local. This is easily shown by solving equation (6) under the condition $\vec{\text{CH}} \cdot \vec{P}_{AC} > 1$.

Even more surprisingly, this result can be generalized to an entire section of the polytope (see Fig. 4); details supplied in the Methods section. In other words, the fact that two copies of a given state – sitting on this particular section – can swap non-locality when the coupler is applied, is a necessary and sufficient condition for that state to be quantum. Here quantumness is checked using the criteria of Tsirelson-Landau-Masanes [26, 27, 28]. Hence just by considering the issue of non-locality swapping in the simplest possible set of genuine non-local states part of the boundary between quantum and post-quantum correlations emerges.

Let us point out however that not the entire quantum versus post-quantum boundary emerges in this way: on other sections the coupler ceases to swap non-locality before reaching the quantum bound.

CONCLUSION AND PERSPECTIVES

In summary, we have revisited the paradigmatic model of post-quantum non-signalling correlations (PR boxes), introducing the concept of genuine boxes. In practice this allows us to restrict the space of non-signalling boxes. In this restricted space the dynamics turns out to be far richer than the one allowed in the full space of non-signalling boxes and some well-known quantum effects reappear in this model. In particular we presented the coupler, a device which allows non-locality swapping between two PR boxes.

Surprisingly, we showed that quantum correlations naturally emerge from the study of the coupler. Let us stress that this intimate connection is remarkable, since it links a dynamical process in a very natural non-signalling model directly to quantum mechanics. We must recognize however that at

this stage neither is it clear for us why quantum mechanics emerges in this way, nor what is the full significance of these results.

In the future we plan to investigate further on this connection, and look for a fundamental principle potentially underlying it. We believe that studying other information theoretical tasks from the new perspective of genuine boxes may help us understand what is so special about quantum mechanics.

METHODS

Deriving the action of the coupler on allowed states

Here we derive the action of the coupler on any allowed state. Since all consistent couplers are linear functions of the inputs and outputs of a state [17], it is sufficient here to consider only extremal states.

Let us start with the deterministic ones. Note first that the output of the coupler must be consistent regardless of the timings of Alice's and Charlie's inputs and of Bob's application of the coupler. That is, if Bob, after applying the coupler, learns from Alice and Charlie their respective inputs and outputs, he should get the same result as if he learnt Alice's and Charlie's inputs and outputs and then applied the coupler. Conditioning the final probability distribution $P(ab'c|xyz)$, on Bob learning Alice's and Charlie's inputs and outputs, one has $P(b' = 0|acxz) = \frac{2}{3}$, when $xz \oplus a \oplus c = 0$, and $P(b' = 0|acxz) = 0$ otherwise. Finally we note that when Bob learns the four values a, c, x, z he knows that he is holding the extremal local state P_{xazc}^L , thus the action of the coupler on the deterministic states is given by

$$P(b' = 0|P_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}^L) = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{3} & \alpha\gamma \oplus \beta \oplus \delta = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

This again can be understood geometrically – if the local state is on the facet $\text{CH} = 1$ the coupler outputs $b' = 0$ with probability $\frac{2}{3}$, whilst if the state is on the facet $\text{CH} = 0$ then it deterministically outputs $b' = 1$.

Next, let us find the action of the coupler on the PR box. In order to do this, we decompose a given probability distribution in two different ways. We consider the point $P^c(b_1b_2|y_1y_2)$ in the centre of the $\text{CH} = 1$ facet, half way between the PR box and the identity, which can be written as a convex combination of the extremal states in the following ways:

$$P^c(b_1b_2|y_1y_2) = \frac{1}{8} \sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma} P_{\alpha\beta\gamma(\alpha\gamma\oplus\beta)}^L(b_1b_2|y_1y_2) \quad (8)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} (P^{\text{PR}}(b_1b_2|y_1y_2) + \mathbb{1}(b_1b_2|y_1y_2)) \quad (9)$$

the first decomposition (8) being the equal sum of the 8 extremal vertices of the upper facet. By applying the coupler to both decompositions, using the linear action of the coupler on

the convex sum and demanding they give the same probability of outputting b' , it is found that

$$P(b' = 0|P^{\text{PR}}(b_1b_2|y_1y_2)) = 1. \quad (10)$$

Thus upon applying the coupler directly to a PR state, Bob always obtains the outcome $b' = 0$; exactly as in the quantum case.

From inspection of equations (7) and (10) it is clear that the coupler outputs $b' = 0$ with a probability that is proportional to the CH value of the state it is applied to, i.e.

$$P(b' = 0|P(ab|xy)) = \frac{2}{3} \vec{\text{CH}} \cdot \vec{P}(ab|xy). \quad (11)$$

This constant of proportionality ensures that the coupler outputs a valid probability when applied to any allowed state. Note that the inconsistency of the potential coupler presented in Ref. [17] becomes now obvious, since it outputted with a probability equal to the CH value; therefore, when applied onto the PR box, it gave a non-valid probability of $\frac{3}{2}$. Along the same line, it is also clear why the coupler runs into inconsistencies if we try to reintroduce the seven disallowed non-genuine PR boxes; for instance the anti-PR, defined by the relation $a \oplus b \oplus 1 = xy$ would lead to negative probabilities.

Teleportation

Teleportation can also be implemented with the coupler. When the joint measurement succeeds ($b' = 0$), one has

$$P^{\text{PR}}(ab_1|xy_1) P_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}^L(b_2c|y_2z) \xrightarrow{b'=0} P_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}^L(ac|xz). \quad (12)$$

Thus when Alice-Bob share a PR state, and Bob-Charlie a deterministic state $P_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}^L$, the final state held by Alice, given that the joint measurement succeeded, is $P_{\alpha\beta}^L$. Therefore, Bob can teleport any (single-party) state $P_B = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} p_{\alpha\beta} P_{\alpha\beta}^L$, with $\sum_{\alpha,\beta} p_{\alpha\beta} = 1$, to Alice, which can be seen by using the linearity of the coupler. Note that here the PR provides the teleportation channel, as does the maximally entangled state in the quantum protocol.

Quantumness and no-swapping

Here we show that, in a two dimensional section of the polytope, non-locality can be swapped using two copies of a noisy box if and only if this box is post-quantum. Let us consider noisy state of the form

$$P_{\xi,\gamma}^{\text{PR}} \equiv \xi P^{\text{PR}} + \gamma P^{\text{PR}_2} + (1 - \xi - \gamma) \mathbb{1} \quad (13)$$

with $\xi + \gamma \leq 1$ and $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{2}$; note that PR_2 is another PR box (given by the relation $a \oplus b = x(y \oplus 1)$). This is however not an allowed state, but is convenient for decomposing noisy states;

note that this introduces no inconsistency. The CH value of the noisy states (13) is $\vec{C}\vec{H} \cdot \vec{P}_{\xi,\gamma}^{\text{PR}} = \xi + \frac{1}{2}$.

When Bob succeeds in swapping non-locality starting from two $P_{\xi,\gamma}^{\text{PR}}$ boxes, the final state shared between Alice and Charlie has CH value

$$\vec{C}\vec{H} \cdot \vec{P}(ac|xz) = \xi^2 + \gamma^2 + \frac{1}{2} \quad (14)$$

Similarly to the case of isotropic states, non-locality can be swapped from two noisy boxes $P_{\xi,\gamma}^{\text{PR}}$ if and only if $P_{\xi,\gamma}^{\text{PR}}$ is post-quantum; i.e. if $\vec{P}_{\xi,\gamma}^{\text{PR}}$ violate the Tsirelson-Landau-Masanes inequality [26, 27, 28], a necessary and sufficient condition for a probability distribution to be quantum.

The proof goes as follows. Noisy states $P_{\xi,\gamma}^{\text{PR}}$ that do not allow for non-locality swapping, i.e. which lead to $\vec{C}\vec{H} \cdot \vec{P}(ac|xz) \leq 1$, are characterized by the relation

$$\xi^2 + \gamma^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (15)$$

A necessary and sufficient criteria for a set of correlations to be quantum is given by the Tsirelson-Landau-Masanes criteria which we write here in the form of Landau [27]

$$|E_{00}E_{01} - E_{10}E_{11}| \leq \sqrt{(1 - E_{00}^2)(1 - E_{01}^2)} + \sqrt{(1 - E_{10}^2)(1 - E_{11}^2)} \quad (16)$$

where $E_{xy} = P(a = b|xy) - P(a \neq b|xy)$ is the correlator associated to the pair of measurements x, y . For noisy states $P_{\xi,\gamma}^{\text{PR}}$, the four correlators are given by $E_{00} = E_{01} = \xi + \gamma$ and $E_{10} = -E_{11} = \xi - \gamma$. Inserting these last expressions in (16), we get exactly the relation (15), which completes the proof. Note that (15) is simply the equation of a circle of radius $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ in the (ξ, γ) plane; the center of the circle corresponds to the maximally mixed state $\mathbb{1}$ (see Fig. 4).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful to J. Barrett and A. J. Short for many insightful discussions. S.P. and P.S. acknowledge support through the UK EPSRC project 'QIP IRC'. N.B. acknowledges financial support by the Swiss National Science Foundation.

* Electronic address: paul.skrzypczyk@bristol.ac.uk

† Electronic address: n.brunner@bristol.ac.uk

‡ Electronic address: s.popescu@bristol.ac.uk

[1] J. Bell, *On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen Paradox*, *Physics* **1**, 195 (1964).

[2] A. Aspect, *Bell's inequality test: more ideal than ever*, *Nature* **398**, 189 (1999).

- [3] D. N. Matsukevich *et al.*, *Bell Inequality Violation with Two Remote Atomic Qubits*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 150404 (2008).
- [4] B. S. Tsirelson, *Quantum generalizations of Bell's inequality*, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **4**, 93 (1980).
- [5] S. Popescu and D. Rohrlich, *Causality and non-locality as axioms for quantum mechanics*, *Found. Phys.* **24**, 379 (1994).
- [6] J. Barrett *et al.*, *Non-local correlations as an information theoretic resource*, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 022101 (2005).
- [7] J. Barrett, L. Hardy, and A. Kent, *No Signaling and Quantum Key Distribution*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 010503 (2005).
- [8] A. Acin, N. Gisin, and L. Masanes, *From Bell's Theorem to Secure Quantum Key Distribution*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 120405 (2006).
- [9] J. Barrett, *Information processing in generalized probabilistic theories*, *Phys. Rev. A* **75**, 032304 (2007).
- [10] L. Masanes, A. Acin, and N. Gisin, *General properties of nonsignaling theories*, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 012112 (2006).
- [11] H. Barnum, J. Barrett, M. Leifer, and A. Wilce, *Generalized No-Broadcasting Theorem*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 240501 (2007).
- [12] W. van Dam, *Implausible Consequences of Superstrong Nonlocality*, *quant-ph/0501159* (2005).
- [13] G. Brassard *et al.*, *Limit on Nonlocality in Any World in Which Communication Complexity Is Not Trivial*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 250401 (2006).
- [14] N. Linden, S. Popescu, A. J. Short, and A. Winter, *Quantum Nonlocality and Beyond: Limits from Nonlocal Computation*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 180502 (2007).
- [15] C. H. Bennett *et al.*, *Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen channels*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1895 (1993).
- [16] M. Zukowski, A. Zeilinger, M. A. Horne, and A. K. Ekert, *"Event-ready-detectors" Bell experiment via entanglement swapping*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 4287 (1993).
- [17] A. J. Short, S. Popescu, and N. Gisin, *Entanglement swapping for generalized nonlocal correlations*, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 012101 (2006).
- [18] I. Pitowski, *Quantum Probability, Quantum Logic* (Springer Verlag, Heidelberg, 1989).
- [19] J. F. Clauser and M. A. Horne, *Experimental consequences of objective local theories*, *Phys. Rev. D* **10**, 526 (1974).
- [20] J. Barrett and A. J. Short, *Strong non-locality: a trade-off between states and measurements*, in preparation (2008).
- [21] A. Acin *et al.*, *Device-Independent Security of Quantum Cryptography against Collective Attacks*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 230501 (2007).
- [22] J.-W. Pan, D. Bouwmeester, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zeilinger, *Experimental Entanglement Swapping: Entangling Photons That Never Interacted*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 3891 (1998).
- [23] M. Halder *et al.*, *Entangling independent photons by time measurement*, *Nature Physics* **3**, 692 (2007).
- [24] M. Riebe *et al.*, *Deterministic entanglement swapping with an ion-trap quantum computer*, *Nat Phys* **4**, 839 (2008).
- [25] R. F. Werner, *Quantum states with Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen correlations admitting a hidden-variable model*, *Phys. Rev. A* **40**, 4277 (1989).
- [26] B. S. Tsirelson, *Some results and problems on quantum Bell-type inequalities*, *Hadronic J. Suppl.* **8**, 329 (1993).
- [27] L. Landau, *Empirical two-point correlation functions*, *Found. Phys.* **18**, 449 (1988).
- [28] L. Masanes, *Necessary and sufficient condition for quantum-generated correlations*, *quant-ph/0309137*.