

Couplers for Non-Locality Swapping

Paul Skrzypczyk* and Nicolas Brunner†

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

(Dated: June 21, 2022)

Studying generalized non-local theories brings insight to the foundations of quantum mechanics. Here we focus on non-locality swapping, the analogue of quantum entanglement swapping. In order to implement such a protocol, one needs a coupler that performs the equivalent of quantum joint measurements on generalized ‘box-like’ states. Establishing a connection to Bell inequalities, we define consistent couplers for theories containing an arbitrary amount of non-locality, which leads us to introduce the concepts of perfect and minimal couplers. Remarkably, Tsirelson’s bound for quantum non-locality naturally appears in our study.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum Mechanics (QM) is a non-local theory [1], however not a maximally non-local one according to relativity [2]. More precisely there exist theories, containing more non-locality than QM, that still respect the no-signalling principle [3, 4]. The study of such theories has already brought a lot of insight to QM [4, 5, 6, 7], but one of the great remaining challenges is to find what physical principle, yet still unknown despite intensive research, limits quantum non-locality.

Interestingly it has been shown by van Dam [8] and Brassard et al. [9] that a particular class of post-quantum theories known as (isotropic) Popescu-Rohrlich (PR) boxes [2], appear very unlikely to exist since they allow for a dramatic increase of communication power compared to QM. Essentially these models make all communication complexity problems trivial, while QM does not. Moreover it was also shown by Linden et al. [10] that these same post-quantum theories allow for non-local computation, a feature also forbidden in QM. The remarkable fact about this last work is that, contrary to [8, 9], it indicates a tight separation between quantum and post-quantum correlations.

Recently it was also suggested that the bound on quantum non-locality may be a consequence of the rich dynamics featured in QM. In particular, Barrett [4] and Short et al. [11] showed that a theory restricted only by the no-signalling principle allows only for poor (or classical) dynamics, suggesting “*a trade-off between states and measurements*” [12].

In a recent paper we (together with another author) introduced the concept of a *genuine* box, a particular way of restricting the set of allowed states in a generalized theory. Inspired from the black-box approach to quantum correlations [13], we argued that the set of states to be considered for dynamical processes (such as joint measurements) must be restricted to genuine boxes. The idea is that these genuine boxes are the elementary states of the theory; all other states can then be constructed by adding classical circuitry. Remarkably, this restriction allows one to reintroduce quantum-like dynamics into the model, even in theories allowing for maximal non-locality.

The theory features then a new element, the *coupler*, a device performing the analogue of a quantum joint measurement [11]. The coupler enables non-locality swapping of PR boxes and teleportation. Astonishingly, quantum correlations, in particular Tsirelson’s bound [14] of quantum non-locality, naturally emerged from the coupler [15].

In the present paper, we generalize the coupler of [15] to theories allowing for limited non-locality. We also investigate the possibility of varying the set of genuine boxes. For each case we derive couplers for non-locality swapping and study their properties. Remarkably, quantum correlations, more precisely Tsirelson’s bound, will appear again in our study.

The paper is organized as follows. After reviewing general properties of couplers (Sec. II), we indicate a strong analogy between couplers and Bell inequalities (Sec. III). Taking advantage of this connection, we then extend the coupler of [15] to theories with bounded non-locality, introducing perfect and minimal couplers (Sec. IV). Indeed an example of particular interest will be a theory where non-locality is bounded by Tsirelson’s bound, similarly to quantum mechanics (Sec. V). Finally we highlight two occurrences where Tsirelson’s bound naturally appears (Sec. VI).

II. PROPERTIES OF COUPLERS

Here we work in generalized non-signalling theories, where states are bipartite boxes with binary inputs $(x, y \in \{0, 1\})$ and binary outputs $(a, b \in \{0, 1\})$, such as PR boxes [2, 3].

Let us consider the scenario of non-locality swapping, the




FIG. 1: Coupler for non-locality swapping. The coupler is the analogue of a quantum joint measurement. When applied to two PR boxes shared by Alice-Bob and Bob-Charlie, it enables non-locality swapping. More precisely, when the protocol succeeds ($b' = 0$) the final box shared by Alice and Charlie $P(ac|xz)$ is non-local since it violates the CH inequality.

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

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

analogue of quantum entanglement swapping [16]. An observer, Bob, shares non-local boxes with both Alice and Charlie. The goal of the protocol is for Bob to establish non-local correlations between (initially uncorrelated) Alice and Charlie. In order to do this, Bob applies the coupler to his two boxes (see Fig. 1), which is the analogue of a quantum joint measurement [4, 11]. The coupler χ encompasses the inputs and outputs of his two boxes, and returns a single bit b' , thus implementing the following transformation:

$$P(ab_1|xy_1)P(b_2c|y_2z) \xrightarrow{\chi} P(ab'c|xz). \quad (1)$$

where $P(ab_1|xy_1)$ is the initial box shared by Alice and Bob, $P(b_2c|y_2z)$ the initial box shared by Bob and Charlie. The final box shared by Alice and Charlie, given that the coupler returns b' , is $P(ac|xzb')$.

In order to be valid, the coupler must fulfil a certain number of requirements; we refer the reader to [11] for more details on properties of couplers. First of all, the coupler must be non-signalling, in the sense that Bob cannot signal to Alice and Charlie by applying or not applying the coupler. Therefore, one must have

$$P(ac|xz) = \sum_{b'} P(ab'c|xz) = \sum_{b'} P(b')P(ac|xzb').$$

Moreover, the coupler must be consistent when applied directly to any bipartite state allowed in the model. That is, one should check that the probability that the coupler outputs b' ,

$$P(b') = \sum_{b_1 b_2 y_1 y_2} \chi(b', b_1 b_2 y_1 y_2) P(b_1 b_2 | y_1 y_2) \quad (2)$$

is a valid probability, i.e. $0 \leq P(b') \leq 1$. Note that since the coupler's action on a box is linear [11], it is sufficient to check this for extremal allowed states only.

III. CONNECTION BETWEEN COUPLERS AND BELL INEQUALITIES

As just mentioned, the probability that the coupler outputs b' is a linear function of the state the coupler is applied to. Therefore it is convenient to rewrite equation (2) in vectorial form:

$$P(b' = 0) = \vec{\chi} \cdot \vec{P} \quad (3)$$

Subsequently, the requirement that the coupler χ outputs with a valid probability when applied on the state \vec{P} is given by

$$0 \leq \vec{\chi} \cdot \vec{P} \leq 1 \quad (4)$$

for all allowed states \vec{P} .

In [11] equation (4) was (rightly) interpreted as defining a polytope of couplers: the *coupler polytope*. Its facets are given by the set of vectors \vec{P} ; any consistent coupler is therefore a vector $\vec{\chi}$ inside the polytope. There is however a second possible interpretation of (4), which consists in inverting the roles of the the vectors \vec{P} and the vectors $\vec{\chi}$, thus defining another

polytope, the dual of the coupler-polytope. This new polytope is much more familiar; it is the (well-known) state polytope [17]. In this representation, the vertices of the polytope are specified by the extremal states (vectors \vec{P}) while its facets are now associated to the couplers $\vec{\chi}$.

The advantage of this second interpretation is that facets of the state polytope are well understood [3]. There are only two classes of facets; the first are positivity facets, so-called *trivial* facets, ensuring that any state is a valid probability distribution. The second are Bell inequalities. Our interpretation of equation (4) now leads us to identify valid couplers with facets of the state polytope, and as expected, it turns out that there are two corresponding classes of couplers.

In [4, 11], it was shown that, in the case all boxes (with binary inputs and outputs) compatible with the no-signalling principle are taken into account, any valid coupler is a *wiring*, that is a measurement which admits a classical description in terms of inputting into each box and applying circuitry. From the analogy explained above, wirings should be associated with the facets of the full non-signalling polytope, which are known to be (trivial) positivity facets [3]. More generally, associating wirings with trivial facets strongly suggests that there are no joint measurement in any theory constrained only by the no-signalling principle, which turns out to be correct, as shown recently in [12].

On the other hand, intuition also suggests that Bell inequalities could represent joint measurement, since in general a Bell inequality reveals a joint property of a state, namely the amount of non-locality it contains. This intuition turns out to be correct as well. In [15], we presented a coupler enabling non-locality swapping of PR boxes. The action of this coupler on any allowed state $P(ab|xy)$ was found to be

$$\vec{\chi} \cdot \vec{P}(ab|xy) = \frac{2}{3} \vec{\text{CH}} \cdot \vec{P}(ab|xy), \quad (5)$$

where $\vec{\chi} \cdot \vec{P}(ab|xy) \equiv P(b' = 0|P(ab|xy))$. Here we have denoted the Clauser-Horne (CH) [18] value of a state as a scalar product

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{\text{CH}} \cdot \vec{P}(ab|xy) &= P(11|00) + P(00|10) \\ &+ P(00|01) - P(00|11). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

For local states, one has $0 \leq \text{CH} \leq 1$, the CH Bell inequality. The importance of the factor $\frac{2}{3}$ in equation (5) will be discussed later.

This demonstrates a clear connection between couplers and facets of the state polytope. On the one hand, trivial facets are associated to classical measurements, so-called wirings. On the other hand, Bell inequalities represent joint measurements. Indeed this connection enforces the idea of a trade off between states and measurements [12]; discarding states is essential for defining joint measurements.

IV. GENERALIZED COUPLERS

This connection can now be built upon substantially to look at the task of non-locality swapping in a more general setting.




FIG. 2: The set of states allowed in our model. Here we study theories with limited non-locality. More precisely, non-locality is upper bounded by X_t and lower bounded by X_b ; for perfect couplers, the genuine states must be taken to be L^ξ and P_ξ^{PR} (see text). In order to output with a valid probability when applied on any allowed state, the coupler (right scale) must be a re-scaling of the CH inequality (left scale). Note that the asymmetry of the restricted polytope ($X_b < 1 - X_t$) will turn out to be a necessary condition for the existence of couplers.

In [15] we restricted the set of genuine states to the (local) deterministic states

$$P_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}^{\text{L}}(ab|xy) = \begin{cases} 1 & a = \alpha x \oplus \beta, b = \gamma y \oplus \delta \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

parameterized by $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in \{0, 1\}$, and added a single non-local vertex, the PR box:

$$P^{\text{PR}}(ab|xy) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & a \oplus b = xy \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

where \oplus denotes addition modulo 2.

A very natural extension of this previous analysis consists of varying the set of genuine boxes. There are two interesting directions to investigate (see Fig. 2).

1. Decrease the amount of non-locality allowed in the theory; that means that the genuine PR box (8) may be replaced by a noisy box.
2. One may add another genuine non-local box, violating the lower bound of the CH inequality. This will bring back into the study non-local boxes sitting in the lower region of the polytope, which was completely discarded in our previous study.

Here we shall choose all non-local genuine boxes to be isotropic, though a similar study may be done for more general genuine boxes. Isotropic states have the form

$$P_\xi^{\text{PR}} = \xi P^{\text{PR}} + (1 - \xi) P^{\overline{\text{PR}}} \quad (9)$$

where $P^{\overline{\text{PR}}}$ is the ‘anti-PR’ box:

$$P^{\overline{\text{PR}}}(ab|xy) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & a \oplus b \oplus 1 = xy \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

One has $\vec{\text{CH}} \cdot P^{\overline{\text{PR}}} = -\frac{1}{2}$, and $\vec{\text{CH}} \cdot P_\xi^{\overline{\text{PR}}} = 2\xi - \frac{1}{2}$.

Here we will choose the set of genuine boxes by fixing the amount of non-locality allowed in the theory. More precisely we will define an upper bound X_t as well as a lower bound X_b on the CH value of authorized boxes (see Fig. 2).

To associate a coupler to a given choice of X_t and X_b we recall that our previous coupler [15] returned $b' = 0$ with a probability proportional to the CH value of the state it is applied to (see equation (5)). For the PR box – the state leading to the largest CH value – the output $b' = 0$ is deterministically returned, while $b' = 1$ is always returned for states sitting on the lower CH facet – states with the smallest CH value.

This suggests the following generalization. The coupler should return the output $b' = 0$ deterministically for states with $\text{CH} = X_t$ and $b' = 1$ for states with $\text{CH} = X_b$ (see Fig. 2). In practice this means that the coupler will not simply be proportional to the CH value, but given by the linear function

$$\vec{\chi} = \frac{1}{X_t - X_b} (\vec{\text{CH}} - X_b \vec{\chi}_D) \quad (11)$$

where $\vec{\chi}_D$ is the *deterministic* coupler which always outputs $b' = 0$ and acts as an identity element [28]. Note also that equation (11) is a shift of $-X_b$ of the CH value, followed by a re-scaling by a factor of $\frac{1}{X_t - X_b}$.

Let us stress that these couplers are probabilistic, similarly to quantum partial Bell state measurements. We will refer to $P(b' = 0)$ as the *success probability* of the coupler as when Bob obtains the outcome $b' = 0$ the desired (non-local) state is created between Alice and Charlie. Note that in case the coupler fails ($b' = 1$), Alice and Charlie are left with a local state. It can be shown that the success probability of the coupler (11), when Bob shares two initial P_ξ^{PR} boxes with Alice and Charlie, is given by

$$P(b' = 0) = \frac{1 - 2X_b}{2(X_t - X_b)} \quad (12)$$

which notably is independent of ξ . In the case of success, the CH value of the final box shared by Alice and Charlie is

$$\vec{\text{CH}} \cdot \vec{P}(ac|xz) = \frac{1}{1 - 2X_b} (2\xi - 1)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \quad (13)$$

These two last relations can now be used to characterize the entire class of couplers – details of their derivations can be found at the end of the paper in Appendix A.

Consistency requires that the final state shared between Alice and Charlie should not be more non-local than the original states shared between Alice-Bob and Bob-Charlie, since this would enable the creation of non-locality. On the other hand, for non-locality to be swapped we also require that the final state must be non-local. In the next subsections, we show that valid couplers, i.e. satisfying these requirements, are characterized by the relations:

$$\frac{1}{2} - (X_t - \frac{1}{2})^2 < X_b \leq \frac{\frac{3}{2} - X_t}{2}. \quad (14)$$

A. Perfect couplers

An important requirement for the coupler is that it does not allow one to create non-locality, otherwise the study of models with restricted non-locality would be pointless. Mathematically, this translates to the condition

$$\vec{\text{CH}} \cdot \vec{P}(ac|xz) \leq X_t. \quad (15)$$

Inserting $2\xi - 1 = X_t - \frac{1}{2}$ into (13), this leads to

$$X_b \leq \frac{\frac{3}{2} - X_t}{2}. \quad (16)$$

the right hand inequality of (14).

We call a coupler reaching the upper bound of inequality (16) a *perfect* coupler. When Bob applies such a perfect coupler (and the swapping succeeds), the final box of Alice and Charlie is as non-local as the two initial boxes shared by Alice-Bob and Bob-Charlie; starting from two P_{ξ}^{PR} boxes, Alice and Charlie get a P_{ξ}^{PR} , where P_{ξ}^{PR} is the most non-local box allowed in the model, i.e. $X_t = 2\xi - \frac{1}{2}$.

The coupler presented in Ref. [15] (given by $X_b = 0$, $X_t = \frac{3}{2}$) is a perfect coupler – it swaps two PR boxes to a PR box – and indeed saturates inequality (16).

For perfect couplers, the probability of success, i.e. of obtaining the outcome $b' = 0$, turns out to be equal to $\frac{1}{3}$, independently of X_t .

Remarkably, a perfect coupler can be found for any model with limited non-locality (see Fig. 3). However the existence of such a perfect coupler imposes restrictions on the set of genuine local boxes, since $X_b > 0$ when $1 < X_t < \frac{3}{2}$. This means that the deterministic states sitting on the lower CH facet are no longer authorized. Even though this restriction may appear quite strong, we will argue that it is not. In fact, the crucial requirement for the coupler to be consistently defined is that it acts validly on any local states that can be obtained from the genuine non-local box itself. In particular, when the initial non-local box is noisy, these (reduced) local states are also noisy which does not force us to include deterministic states for consistency. Below we discuss this issue and show that the perfect coupler can be defined consistently in any model with limited non-locality.




FIG. 3: Couplers (defined by X_b and X_t) for non-locality swapping in theories where non-locality is bounded; more precisely the CH value of any allowed state is upper bounded by X_t . The shaded region, delimited by perfect and minimal couplers, represents all valid couplers. Note that a perfect coupler can be validly defined for all theories, since the noisy local states (see text) are allowed (their CH value is always larger than X_b). The minimal coupler allows one to keep all deterministic states if and only if the theory is post-quantum (dot). Furthermore, in a theory with an arbitrarily small amount of non-locality, the noisy states are obtained from a Tsirelson box (cross), the maximally non-local box allowed by QM.

1. Noisy local states

It is instructive to think how single-party states can be obtained starting from an initial (bipartite) non-local box. For instance, in a theory limited only by non-signalling one can prepare any deterministic state starting from a PR box. If Alice and Bob share a PR box, and Alice sends her input x and output a to Bob, then Bob holds the deterministic (single-party) state P_{xa}^L (i.e. $b = xy \oplus a$). Now, in a theory with limited non-locality, i.e. where extremal non-local states are noisy PR boxes P_{ξ}^{PR} , the local states obtained by such a procedure are not deterministic but noisy. These states are given by

$$L_{\alpha\beta}^{\xi} = \xi P_{\alpha\beta}^L + (1 - \xi) P_{\alpha,\beta \oplus 1}^L \quad (17)$$

(see Fig. 2). One can show that any bipartite local states obtained from these noisy local states satisfy

$$Z_b \leq \vec{\text{CH}} \cdot \vec{L}_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}^{\xi} \leq Z_t \quad (18)$$

where $Z_b = \frac{1}{2} (1 - (2\xi - 1)^2)$, $Z_t = 1 - Z_b$, and $L_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}^{\xi} \equiv L_{\alpha\beta}^{\xi} L_{\gamma\delta}^{\xi}$

Importantly, for a perfect coupler one has that $X_b \leq Z_b$ (indeed $Z_t < X_t$), thus ensuring that the coupler acts consistently on any local states that can be created in the model. Therefore the perfect coupler can be consistently defined in any model with limited non-locality, i.e. with $1 < X_t \leq \frac{3}{2}$. Note that local

boxes sitting on the upper CH facet must also be made noisy, otherwise the coupler runs into inconsistencies.

Let us point out that, except for the case of a fully non-local theory, the CH value of the noisy local state do not reach the minimal authorized CH value X_b (see Fig. 3). More precisely, one has that $X_b < Z_b$ when $1 < X_t < \frac{3}{2}$. Indeed one could have expected to find that these two values would in fact coincide (i.e. $X_b = Z_b$ for all X_t), thus giving a natural motivation for restricting the set of genuine local states, but this is not the case. An interesting open question would be to explain this discrepancy.

B. Minimal couplers

A second requirement for the coupler is that it swaps non-locality, i.e. that when Bob succeeds in applying the coupler to two copies of the most non-local state allowed in the model ($\vec{C}\vec{H} \cdot P_{\xi}^{\text{PR}} = X_t$), non-locality – even an arbitrarily small amount – is swapped to Alice and Charlie. This implies

$$\vec{C}\vec{H} \cdot \vec{P}(ac|xz) > 1 \quad (19)$$

which leads to

$$X_b > \frac{1}{2} - (X_t - \frac{1}{2})^2 \quad (20)$$

the left hand inequality of (14).

Here X_b represents, roughly speaking, the tolerable amount of boxes sitting in the lower region of the polytope. In particular, deterministic states can be kept if and only if the model is post-quantum, i.e. $X_t > B_Q$ where $B_Q = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ is Tsirelson's bound [29]. Interestingly, it is precisely when the model becomes quantum that the deterministic states must be made noisy ($X_t = B_Q$ implies $X_b > 0$).

The probability of success for the minimal coupler is bounded by $P(b' = 0) < \frac{X_t - 1/2}{X_t + 1/2}$; note that $P(b' = 0) \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$ when $X_t \rightarrow \frac{3}{2}$.

Interestingly, the minimal coupler in a model restricted only by non-signalling (i.e. $X_t = \frac{3}{2}$) is given by $X_b > -\frac{1}{2}$. Thus non-locality swapping is possible as long as the anti-PR is discarded. More generally, it can be seen from Fig. 3 that a theory with symmetric non-locality (that is with $X_b = 1 - X_t$) does not allow the existence of couplers, therefore enforcing the idea that some states must be discarded in order to get interesting dynamics.

V. QUANTUM CASE

The quantum case deserves indeed special attention. Here non-locality is limited by Tsirelson's bound $X_t = B_Q$.

The perfect quantum coupler is given by $X_b = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}})$. It prevents non-locality swapping, when the two initial isotropic

states are such that $\vec{C}\vec{H} \cdot P_{\xi}^{\text{PR}} \leq \frac{1}{2} + 2^{-\frac{3}{4}}$. It is worth mentioning that in quantum mechanics, Werner states ($\rho_w = w|\Psi^{-}\rangle\langle\Psi^{-}| + (1-w)\frac{\mathbb{1}}{4}$) cannot be swapped under a similar condition, namely $\vec{C}\vec{H} \cdot \vec{P}_{\rho_w} \leq \frac{1}{2} + 2^{-\frac{3}{4}}$.

Note however that the perfect quantum coupler has a success probability of $\frac{1}{3}$, whereas a quantum partial Bell state measurement (here basically the projection onto the antisymmetric subspace, see [15]) succeeds with probability $\frac{1}{4}$.

Finally, the minimal quantum coupler can be associated to the perfect coupler for a PR box (see below).

VI. PERFECT VS MINIMAL AND TSIRELSON'S BOUND

In this section we discuss the relation between perfect and minimal couplers, and show that Tsirelson's bound for quantum non-locality naturally emerges from it on two occasions.

Let us first point out that perfect and minimal couplers are directly related. In a model with a given amount of non-locality X_t , the perfect coupler is characterized by $X_b = \frac{3/2 - X_t}{2}$. Because of the linearity of the coupler, all non-local boxes with $\vec{C}\vec{H} \cdot P_{\xi}^{\text{PR}} < X_t$ are swapped to a noisier box $P_{\xi'}^{\text{PR}}$ with $\xi' < \xi$. At some point, the boxes become too noisy and forbid non-locality swapping with the perfect coupler: let us denote the box at the threshold P_{th}^{PR} . Then it follows that the coupler defined by $X_t = \vec{C}\vec{H} \cdot P_{th}^{\text{PR}}$ and X_b is a minimal coupler. In other words, the point where a perfect coupler stops to swap corresponds to a minimal coupler.

Astonishingly, this implies that the perfect coupler for a PR box (i.e. $X_t = \frac{3}{2}$, $X_b = 0$) corresponds to the minimal quantum coupler (i.e. $X_t = B_Q$, $X_b \rightarrow 0$). This is a way of rephrasing the result of [15]; though there the correspondence could be generalized to a whole section of the polytope. Let us stress that this link is remarkable, since it relates a dynamical process in a very natural generalized theory directly to quantum correlations.

Next let us point out another occurrence where Tsirelson's bound naturally appears in our study. In a theory containing a vanishing amount of non-locality ($X_t \rightarrow 1$), the perfect and minimal couplers coincide, as can be seen from Fig. 3. This is intuitive since the theory allows only for very weakly non-local boxes. In this regime, the coupler is characterized by $X_b \rightarrow \frac{1}{4}$; therefore the noisy local states L^{ξ} must satisfy the condition that $\vec{C}\vec{H} \cdot \vec{L}^{\xi} \geq \frac{1}{4}$. Now, a natural question is the following. What non-local box is required in order to obtain such noisy local states (i.e. satisfying $\vec{C}\vec{H} \cdot \vec{L}^{\xi} = \frac{1}{4}$) from the procedure described previously (Sec. IV.A.1) The answer is that this box must be the Tsirelson box, that is the isotropic PR box P_{ξ}^{PR} satisfying $\vec{C}\vec{H} \cdot P_{\xi}^{\text{PR}} = B_Q$.

This second link is astonishing since it involves not only the coupler, but also the procedure for creating noisy local states explained previously. In this sense it is also clearly different from the first connection we mentioned above.

Let us stress that, at the moment, both of these connections remain completely mysterious to us. Nevertheless we believe

they might be related to some physical principle potentially restricting quantum non-locality.

VII. CONCLUSION

In summary, we presented a study of generalized couplers for non-locality swapping. We started by pointing out a strong connection between couplers and Bell inequalities. This led us to associate (trivial) positivity facets (or inequalities) with classical measurements, so-called wirings, and Bell inequalities with joint measurements. Then, taking advantage of this connection we presented a general class of couplers for theories with limited non-locality. This allowed us to introduce two important classes of couplers, namely perfect and minimal couplers. Finally we discussed the quantum case and presented two appearances of Tsirelson's bound in our study.

To conclude, we would like to point out some interesting open questions. First concerning the connection between couplers and Bell inequalities. There exists another type of inequalities – apart from trivial and Bell inequalities. These are Bell-type inequalities allowing the use of some non-local resource [19, 20, 21], such as classical communication or non-local boxes. Interesting couplers may also appear from such inequalities. Second it would be worth studying more general scenarios, especially those featuring more measurement inputs. As noted in [11], the case of three settings is of particular interest, since quantum tomography of qubits requires three measurements. Next, concerning couplers, it would be nice to find a coupler performing the analogue of a complete (quantum) Bell state measurement, where all eigenstates are entangled. Another point is to see whether the existence of couplers have implications for information theoretic tasks in generalized theories, for instance for bit commitment [22, 23, 24, 25], or non-locality distillation [26, 27]. Finally, the biggest question is definitely to find why quantum correlations and couplers seem to be so intimately related.

VIII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful to J. Barrett, T. S. Cubitt, A. R. U. Devi, N. Gisin, S. Popescu, A. J. Short, V. Scarani, and J. Wullschlegler for many insightful discussions. P. S. acknowledge support through the UK EPSRC project 'QIP IRC'. N. B. acknowledges financial support by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF).

APPENDIX A: DERIVATION OF COUPLER ACTION

We recall that the action of a coupler is a linear transformation of the form

$$P(ab_1|xy_1)P(b_2c|y_2z) \xrightarrow{\chi} P(ab'c|xz). \quad (\text{A1})$$

We are interested in the specific case of applying the coupler (11) to isotropic PR boxes (9). First it is advantageous to realise that the probability of success $P(b' = 0)$ is determined entirely by the state that Bob holds locally, i.e.

$$P(b' = 0) = \vec{\chi} \cdot \vec{P}(b_1b_2|y_1y_2). \quad (\text{A2})$$

Since isotropic PR boxes have uniform marginals, independently of ξ , Bob always holds the maximally mixed state $\mathbb{1}(b_1b_2|y_1y_2)$ and therefore we find

$$\begin{aligned} P(b' = 0) &= \vec{\chi} \cdot \mathbb{1}(b_1b_2|y_1y_2), \\ &= \frac{1}{X_t - X_b} \left(\vec{\text{CH}} - X_b \vec{\chi}_D \right) \cdot \mathbb{1}(b_1b_2|y_1y_2), \\ &= \frac{1 - 2X_b}{2(X_t - X_b)}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A3})$$

where we used the fact that $\vec{\text{CH}} \cdot \mathbb{1} = \frac{1}{2}$.

To find the final state prepared between Alice and Charlie upon Bob obtaining the outcome $b' = 0$ (i.e. when the coupler succeeds in swapping non-locality) we must use the facts that (i) the coupler (11) is a linear combination of two couplers that both act linearly (ii) the isotropic PR boxes (9) are convex combinations of the PR and anti-PR box. Therefore the only actions we need to know are the following

$$\begin{aligned} P_{AB_1}^{\text{PR}} P_{B_2C}^{\text{PR}} \xrightarrow{\vec{\text{CH}}} \frac{1}{2} P_{AC}^{\text{PR}}, & \quad P_{AB_1}^{\text{PR}} P_{B_2C}^{\overline{\text{PR}}} \xrightarrow{\vec{\text{CH}}} \frac{1}{2} P_{AC}^{\overline{\text{PR}}}, \\ P_{AB_1}^{\overline{\text{PR}}} P_{B_2C}^{\text{PR}} \xrightarrow{\vec{\text{CH}}} \frac{1}{2} P_{AC}^{\overline{\text{PR}}}, & \quad P_{AB_1}^{\overline{\text{PR}}} P_{B_2C}^{\overline{\text{PR}}} \xrightarrow{\vec{\text{CH}}} \frac{1}{2} P_{AC}^{\text{PR}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

Note that any combination of P^{PR} and $P^{\overline{\text{PR}}}$ is taken to the maximally mixed state when the deterministic coupler $\vec{\chi}_D$ is applied. Upon expanding all the terms and using relations (A4) the final state is found to be

$$\begin{aligned} P(ac|xz, b' = 0) &= \frac{1}{1 - 2X_b} \left([1 - 2\xi(1 - \xi) - X_b] P^{\text{PR}}(ac|xz) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + [2\xi(1 - \xi) - X_b] P^{\overline{\text{PR}}}(ac|xz) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

which has CH value

$$\vec{\text{CH}} \cdot \vec{P}(ac|xz) = \frac{1}{1 - 2X_b} (2\xi - 1)^2 + \frac{1}{2}. \quad (\text{A6})$$

Equation (A6) can be simply generalized to the case where Alice-Bob share a P_{ξ}^{PR} box, and Bob-Charlie share a $P_{\xi'}^{\overline{\text{PR}}}$ box; it suffices to replace the term $(2\xi - 1)^2$ by $(2\xi - 1)(2\xi' - 1)$.

-
- [1] J. Bell, *Physics* **1**, 195 (1964).
- [2] S. Popescu and D. Rohrlich, *Found. Phys.* **24**, 379 (1994).
- [3] J. Barrett, N. Linden, S. Massar, S. Pironio, S. Popescu, and D. Roberts, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 022101 (2005).
- [4] J. Barrett, *Phys. Rev. A* **75**, 032304 (2007).
- [5] L. Masanes, A. Acin, and N. Gisin, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 012112 (2006).
- [6] H. Barnum, J. Barrett, M. Leifer, and A. Wilce, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 240501 (2007).
- [7] N. Cerf, N. Gisin, S. Massar, and S. Popescu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 220403 (2005).
- [8] W. van Dam, [quant-ph/0501159](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0501159) (2005).
- [9] G. Brassard, H. Buhrman, N. Linden, A. A. Methot, A. Tapp, and F. Unger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 250401 (2006).
- [10] N. Linden, S. Popescu, A. J. Short, and A. Winter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 180502 (2007).
- [11] A. J. Short, S. Popescu, and N. Gisin, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 012101 (2006).
- [12] J. Barrett and A. J. Short, in preparation (2008).
- [13] A. Acin, N. Brunner, N. Gisin, S. Massar, S. Pironio, and V. Scarani, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 230501 (2007).
- [14] B. S. Tsirelson, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **4**, 93 (1980).
- [15] P. Skrzypczyk, N. Brunner, and S. Popescu, [arXiv:0811.2937](https://arxiv.org/abs/0811.2937).
- [16] M. Zukowski, A. Zeilinger, M. A. Horne, and A. K. Ekert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 4287 (1993).
- [17] I. Pitowski, *Quantum Probability, Quantum Logic* (Springer Verlag, Heidelberg, 1989).
- [18] J. F. Clauser and M. A. Horne, *Phys. Rev. D* **10**, 526 (1974).
- [19] D. Bacon and B. F. Toner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 157904 (2003).
- [20] N. Brunner, N. Gisin, and V. Scarani, *New Journal of Physics* **7**, 88 (2005).
- [21] N. Brunner, N. Gisin, and V. Scarani, *J. Math. Phys.* **47**, 112101 (2006).
- [22] S. Winkler, S. Wolf, and J. Wullschleger, [arXiv:0811.3589](https://arxiv.org/abs/0811.3589).
- [23] H. Buhrman, M. Christandl, F. Unger, S. Wehner, and A. Winter, *Proceedings of the Royal Society A* **462**, 1919.
- [24] H. Barnum, O. C. Dahlsten, M. Leifer, and B. Toner, *Proceedings of IEEE Information Theory Workshop* 386 (2008).
- [25] A. J. Short, N. Gisin, and S. Popescu, *Quant. Inf. Proc.* **5**, 131 (2006).
- [26] M. Foster, S. Winkler, and S. Wolf, [arXiv:0809.3173](https://arxiv.org/abs/0809.3173).
- [27] A. J. Short, [arXiv:0809.2622](https://arxiv.org/abs/0809.2622).
- [28] One possibility for the deterministic coupler is: $\vec{\chi}_D \cdot \vec{P} = P(00|00) + P(01|00) + P(10|00) + P(11|00) = 1$ for all \vec{P} .
- [29] Note that here we consider the CH inequality – for the CHSH inequality, one has the well known value $B_Q = 2\sqrt{2}$.