

Two convergent NPA-like hierarchies for the quantum bilocal scenario

Marc-Olivier Renou¹ and Xiangling Xu²

¹*ICFO-Institut de Ciències Fòniques, The Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology, Castelldefels (Barcelona), Spain; marc-olivier.renou@icfo.eu*

²*Institute for Theoretical Physics, ETH Zürich, Switzerland; xiangxu@student.ethz.ch*

Abstract. Characterising the correlations that arises when locally measuring a single joint quantum system is one of quantum information theory main problem. The seminal work [M. Navascués *et al*, NJP 10,7,073013 (2008)], known as the NPA hierarchy, reformulates it as a polynomial optimisation problem over noncommutative variables and proposed a convergent hierarchy of necessary conditions, each testable using semidefinite programming. More recently, the problem of characterising the quantum network correlations that arise when locally measuring *several independent* quantum systems distributed in a network received considerable interest. Several generalisation of the NPA hierarchy such as the Scalar Extension [Pozas-Kerstjens *et al*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 123, 140503 (2019)] were introduced but remain uncharacterised. In this work, we introduce a new hierarchy, prove its equivalence to the Scalar Extension and characterise its convergence in the case of the simplest network, the bilocal scenario.

Contents

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Motivation	3
1.2. Content	5
1.3. Main Contribution	5
1.4. Discussion and open problems	7
2. Tripartite quantum distributions and standard NPA hierarchy	8
2.1. Overview	8
2.2. Noncommutative polynomial formulation	9
3. Bilocal quantum distribution and two converging hierarchies	10
3.1. Bilocal quantum distribution	11
3.2. Factorisation bilocal NPA hierarchy	12
3.3. Scalar extension technique and linear bilocal NPA hierarchy	14

3.4. Stopping criteria and finite-dimensionality	17
4. Inflation-NPA hierarchy and generalisation to other Networks	18
4.1. Inflation-NPA hierarchy	18
4.2. Generalisation to other network scenarios	22
5. Conclusion	23
A. A formal construction of noncommutative polynomials	25
A.1. Noncommutative polynomials generated by finite alphabets	25
A.2. Scalar extension polynomials	26
A.3. Moment matrix and unital symmetric linear functional	28
A.4. Noncommutative polynomials form topological vector spaces	28
B. Detailed proofs for convergence of bilocal NPA hierarchy	29
B.1. Proof for factorisation bilocal NPA hierarchy	29
B.2. Proof for scalar extension NPA hierarchy	32
B.3. Proof for hierarchies with rank loop	34
C. Scalar extension operators are scalars	37
D. The inflation-NPA hierarchy	41
D.1. Formalism of inflation-NPA hierarchy in bilocal scenario	41
D.2. The inflation-NPA hierarchy excludes the shared random bit distribution in the triangle scenario	44
D.3. Commutator-based definition of quantum correlations in networks	45
E. The four party star network	46
F. Bilocal Tsirelson’s problem	49
F.1. A sketch proof of Tsirelson’s theorem	51
References	52

1. Introduction

Quantum correlations (the joint probability distribution established between independent parties measuring a same shared quantum state) are important both for foundational and applications of quantum theory. They underlie the Bell theorem [5, 10], a theoretical physics milestone [9]. They are used in the device independent framework to obtain practical application in terms of certification [39], e.g. of quantum devices [27, 38, 42], randomness [13, 32] or cryptographic protocols [1, 45]. In all these approaches, no assumption is made on the state and measurements. Hence, being able to characterise the set of probability distributions allowed by quantum theory is crucial. This can be done with the *NPA hierarchy* [24, 29, 31], which provides a converging hierarchy of Semi-Definite Programs (SDPs) to this set, using non-commutative polynomial optimisation theory.

More recently, a generalised framework in which several independent quantum sources are distributed and measured by several party in a *network scenario* received considerable interest [7, 15, 34, 35, 43]. It offered new insights on foundations and

applications of quantum theory [11, 12, 20, 41, 49], in particular the simple bilocal scenario in which two independent sources are distributed to three parties in a line [3, 25, 36, 37, 46]. This calls for a generalisation of the *NPA hierarchy*. Several methods were proposed, but to our knowledge no proof of convergence exists.

In this paper, we introduce a new *factorisation NPA hierarchy*, show that it is equivalent to the *scalar extension NPA hierarchy* of [33], and prove convergence to the set of *Bilocal Commutator Quantum Distributions*, a relaxation of the quantum correlations obtainable in the bilocal scenario. We discuss the relation of these two hierarchies with the *Inflation-NPA hierarchy* of [47] and generalisation of our result to generic networks. We conclude with arguments in favor of a tensor (and not commutator) approach for the postulates of quantum information theory [44].

Besides the natural implications of our results to the study of quantum correlations in networks, we believe that our work can be of more broad interest. We concentrate over the physically motivated problem of the characterisation of the correlations that can be obtained in the bilocal scenario in which specific polynomial constraints are satisfied, but our method can be extended to more general polynomial optimisation problems. Our method is adaptable to any (commutative or non commutative) polynomial optimisation problem in which the optimisation is performed on a measure which is constrained to factorise as a product of two independent measures.

1.1. Motivation

Bilocal scenario quantum correlations

In this article, we focus on the quantum bilocal scenario involving three parties, A, B, C measuring two independent sources ρ, σ distributed through the bilocal network (see Figure 1b). We focus on the set of quantum correlations $\vec{P} = \{p(abc|xyz)\}$ which can be obtained in this scenario, where $p(abc|xyz)$ is the probability of measurement results a, b, c given that A, B, C respectively performed measure x, y, z . According to the Born rule, they write

$$p(abc|xyz) = \text{Tr}_{\rho \otimes \sigma} (A_{a|x} \otimes B_{b|y} \otimes C_{c|z}),$$

where $\rho \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_L}), \sigma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{B_R} \otimes \mathcal{H}_C)$ are density operators, $A_{a|x} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A), B_{b|y} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{B_L} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_R}), C_{c|z} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_C)$ are PVMs, and $\mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{H}_{B_L}, \mathcal{H}_{B_R}, \mathcal{H}_C$ are arbitrary Hilbert spaces¹.

Such correlations, which we call *Tensor Bilocal Quantum Distributions*, are the most basic example of quantum network correlations, the correlations which arise

¹When τ is a state, we use notation $\text{Tr}_{\tau}(M) := \text{Tr}(\tau \cdot M)$. In polynomial optimisation, the function $\text{Tr}_{\tau}(\cdot)$ is called a unital symmetric positive linear functional, often written $L(\cdot)$.




Figure 1. (a) Standard three-party Bell scenario. A three-particles quantum state, mathematically represented by a density operator $\tau \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C)$ (a positive operator such that $\text{Tr}(\tau) = 1$), is created, each particle is sent to one of three separated parties A, B, C . A measures the received particle according to some input x , obtaining an output a , mathematically represented by a PVMs $A_{a|x} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ (a set of positive operators such that $\sum_a A_{a|x} = \mathbb{1}$), and B, C do the same. The behavior of the experiment is described by a probability distribution $\vec{P} = \{p(abc|xyz)\}$ with $p(abc|xyz) = \text{Tr}_\tau(A_{a|x} \otimes B_{b|y} \otimes C_{c|z})$.

(b) Bilocal scenario. Two two-particles quantum state (mathematically represented by two positive operators $\rho \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_L}), \sigma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{B_R} \otimes \mathcal{H}_C)$ such that $\text{Tr}(\rho) = \text{Tr}(\sigma) = 1$) are created, A (resp. C) receiving one particle from ρ (resp. σ) and B one of each state, as depicted. A, B, C measurement operators are mathematically represented by positive operators $A_{a|x} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A), B_{b|y} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{B_L} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_R}), C_{c|z} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_C)$ such that $\sum_a A_{a|x} = \sum_b B_{b|y} = \sum_c C_{c|z} = \mathbb{1}$. The behavior of the experiment is described by a probability distribution $\vec{P} = \{p(abc|xyz)\}$ with $p(abc|xyz) = \text{Tr}_{\rho \otimes \sigma}(A_{a|x} \otimes B_{b|y} \otimes C_{c|z})$.

when several independent quantum states are distributed to several parties in a network [43].

Standard Bell scenario quantum correlations and NPA hierarchy

We first quickly recall an existing result already known for the more standard Bell scenario involving three parties, A, B, C measuring a *unique source* τ (see Figure 1a). In this scenario, a quantum correlation $\vec{P} = \{p(abc|xyz)\}$ (a *tensor quantum correlation*) is given through the Born rule

$$p(abc|xyz) = \text{Tr}_\tau(A_{a|x} \otimes B_{b|y} \otimes C_{c|z}),$$

where the density operator $\tau \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C)$ represents the state, the PVMs $A_{a|x} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A), B_{b|y} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B), C_{c|z} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_C)$ represent the performed measurement, and $\mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{H}_B, \mathcal{H}_C$ are arbitrary Hilbert spaces.

Inner approximations of this set of correlations can easily be obtained, e.g. by sampling Hilbert spaces, states and measurement operators. An outer approximation was found by Navascués, Pironio, and Acín in [29]. Their method, called the NPA hierarchy, is the noncommutative counterpart of the Parrilo-Lassere hierarchy [24, 31]. It provides a converging hierarchy of Semi-Definite Programs (SDPs) to any noncommutative polynomial optimisation problem over an archimedean semialgebraic set (a condition always satisfied in our context).

For the set of quantum correlation \vec{P} obtainable in the scenario of Figure 1a, for a hierarchy level n , the NPA method asks for the existence of a *moment matrix* (or Hankel matrix) Γ_n compatible with \vec{P} (see Equation 2.1). The non-existence of such Γ_n proves that \vec{P} cannot be a tensor quantum correlation. Importantly, this existence problem is an SDP, which is easily solvable on a computer, with certificates of non-existence. Increasing the hierarchy level n (which indexes the size of Γ_n) gives stronger tests, and as n increases, this sequence of tests singles out the larger set of *commutator quantum correlations* $\vec{Q} = \{q(abc|xyz)\}$ writing

$$q(abc|xyz) = \text{Tr}_\tau(A_{a|x}B_{b|y}C_{c|z}),$$

where τ is a density operator, $A_{a|x}, B_{b|y}, C_{c|z} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ are PVMs commuting together and all these operators are now part of the same global Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H} . It was recently proven that for arbitrary infinite dimensional Hilbert spaces, the set of tensor quantum correlations is strictly included in the set of commutator quantum correlations [21]: informally, $\{\vec{P}\} \subsetneq \{\vec{Q}\}$. However, in the case where the Hilbert spaces are restricted to be finite dimensional, the two sets coincide [40].

1.2. Content

After a more formal introduction of the standard NPA hierarchy to fix notations (see Section 2), we provide the first proof of convergence of two hierarchies of outer approximation of the set of bilocal quantum correlations (see Section 3). We discuss this result in light of the Inflation-NPA hierarchy and its generalisation to larger networks (see Section 4). We conclude by discussing the tensor and commutator approach for the postulates of quantum information theory (see Section 5).

1.3. Main Contribution

Our first hierarchy, the *factorisation bilocal NPA Hierarchy*, is introduced in Section 3.2. It is based on the same moment matrix Γ as in the standard NPA hierarchy, to which we impose an additional nonlinear factorisation constraint corresponding to the relation

$$\text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{a}\hat{y}) = \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{a}) \cdot \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{y}), \quad (1.1)$$

where $\hat{\alpha}$ (resp. $\hat{\gamma}$) is a monomial in Alice's PVMs (resp. Charlie's PVMs), and τ should be thought of as $\tau = \rho \otimes \sigma$: see Def. 3.3. This results in a hierarchy of (unpractical) non-SDP problems.

Our second hierarchy, *scalar extension bilocal NPA hierarchy*, is introduced in Section 3.3. It was already proposed in [33] without a proof of convergence. For any monomial $\hat{\alpha}$ in Alice's PVMs, it introduces a new scalar operator \hat{k}_α to the moment matrix. It imposes that \hat{k}_α commutes with all operators and that $\text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha}) = \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{k}_\alpha)$, which we show, enforces that the reconstructed operators from the hierarchy satisfy

$$\hat{k}_\alpha = \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha}) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}. \quad (1.2)$$

It also imposes the additional condition

$$\text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\gamma}) = \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{k}_\alpha\hat{\gamma}), \quad (1.3)$$

which is equivalent to Equation 1.1 given that Equation 1.2 holds. This results in a hierarchy of SDPs based on an enlarged moment matrix Ω , in which the nonlinear condition Equation 1.1 is linearised by adding the new variable \hat{k}_α .

Our main result is the following theorem (see Theorems 3.1 and 3.2) of convergence of these two hierarchies to the same set of *commutator bilocal quantum correlations*, introduced below after the theorem.

Theorem (Convergence of the factorisation bilocal and scalar extension NPA hierarchies). Let $\vec{Q} = \{q(abc|xyz)\}$ be a probability distribution. The following are equivalent:

- (i) \vec{Q} is a commutator bilocal quantum correlation,
- (ii) \vec{Q} passes all factorisation bilocal NPA hierarchy tests,
- (iii) \vec{Q} passes all scalar extension NPA hierarchy tests,

where the set of commutator bilocal quantum correlations (see Def. 3.2) is defined as

Definition (Commutator Bilocal Quantum Distributions). \vec{Q} is a *Commutator Bilocal Quantum Distribution* iff there exists a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , positive operators (possibly infinite trace) ρ, σ , and PVMs $\hat{A}_{a|x}, \hat{B}_{b|y}, \hat{C}_{c|z} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that

- (i) $q(abc|xyz) = \text{Tr}(\rho\sigma \cdot \hat{A}_{a|x}\hat{B}_{b|y}\hat{C}_{c|z})$
- (ii) $\forall \hat{A}_{a|x}, \hat{B}_{b|y}, \hat{C}_{c|z}, [\hat{A}_{a|x}, \hat{B}_{b|y}] = [\hat{B}_{b|y}, \hat{C}_{c|z}] = [\hat{C}_{c|z}, \hat{A}_{a|x}] = 0$
- (iii) $\tau := \rho\sigma = \sigma\rho$ is a density operator (i.e. traces to one)
- (iv) $\forall \hat{A}_{a|x}, \hat{C}_{c|z}, [\hat{A}_{a|x}, \sigma] = [\rho, \hat{C}_{c|z}] = 0.$

We also provide a stopping criterion for our two hierarchies corresponding to the case where the reconstructed Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is finite-dimensional (see Theorem 3.3 of Section 3.4).

1.4. Discussion and open problems

The set of Commutator Bilocal Quantum Distribution is a strict relaxation of the physical set of Tensor Bilocal Quantum Distribution. Is it problematic?

Remark first that the standard NPA hierarchy also does not converge to the physical set of Tensor Quantum Distributions predicted by quantum theory for the Bell scenario, but to its natural approximation when only considering the commutation algebraic relations of the PVMs (see Definition 2.2 and Theorem 2.1), this relaxation is also strict [21]. As the set of Commutator Bilocal Quantum Distribution is the natural approximation of the set of Tensor Bilocal Quantum Distribution when only considering commutation algebraic relations of the PVMs and states, it is tempting to interpret our result as generalising the proof of convergence of the standard NPA hierarchy. However, we believe this affirmation lacks justifications for the following three reasons, all associated with a problem we leave open:

- Restricting to finite-dimension Hilbert spaces, the standard NPA hierarchy recovers the physical set of distributions (i.e. the tensor and commutator definitions become equivalent). We were unable to prove a similar result for our hierarchies (see Appendix F).
- A third *inflation-NPA hierarchy* introduced in [47] can also be used to approximate the set of physical correlations in the bilocal scenario (see Section 4.1). We show that when an inflation-NPA hierarchy exists, our two hierarchies also exist (see Theorem 4.2), but were unable to prove the converse or find a counter example.
- These three hierarchies can be generalised to larger network scenarios (see Figure 3). In the triangle scenario, we show that the generalised inflation-NPA hierarchy is strictly more accurate than the generalisation of our two hierarchies (which are trivial as no factorisation constraint exists anymore, see Section 4.2). The characterisation of the convergence of the generalised inflation-NPA hierarchy is a significant open problem for the theory of quantum correlations.

We conclude our paper by discussing the formulation of quantum information theory in terms of a commutator postulate. We remark that in case the inflation-NPA hierarchy is stricter than our two hierarchies for the bilocal scenario (problem we left open), then redefining quantum theory by postulating that Commutator Bilocal Quantum Distributions are the correlations feasible in the bilocal scenario would imply that NPA-inflation hierarchy is not an allowed method to characterise quantum correlations in networks.

2. Tripartite quantum distributions and standard NPA hierarchy

2.1. Overview

As a preliminary background and to fix the notation, we briefly discuss the standard NPA hierarchy introduced by Navascués, Pironio, and Acín [29] for outer approximation of the quantum distribution obtainable in the standard tripartite Bell scenario of Figure 1a.

We first introduce the set of Tensor Tripartite Quantum Distributions, which are all the behaviours feasible in this scenario according to quantum theory:

Definition 2.1 (Tensor Tripartite Quantum Distributions). Let $\vec{P} = \{p(abc|xyz)\}$ be a three-party probability distribution. We say that \vec{P} is a *Tensor Tripartite Quantum Distribution* iff there exists a composite Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C$, a density operator τ over \mathcal{H} , and PVMs $\{\hat{A}_{a|x}\}$ over \mathcal{H}_A , $\{\hat{B}_{b|y}\}$ over \mathcal{H}_B and $\{\hat{C}_{c|z}\}$ over \mathcal{H}_C such that

$$p(abc|xyz) = \text{Tr}_\tau \left(\hat{A}_{a|x} \otimes \hat{B}_{b|y} \otimes \hat{C}_{c|z} \right).$$

The outer approximations of this set are given by the NPA hierarchy method, which we now sketch. First, given that \vec{P} is a Tensor Tripartite Quantum Distribution with $p(abc|xyz) = \text{Tr}_\tau \left(\hat{A}_{a|x} \otimes \hat{B}_{b|y} \otimes \hat{C}_{c|z} \right)$, one can construct the $n \geq 3$ order moment matrix Γ^n as:

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathbb{1} \\ (A_{a|x})^\dagger \\ (B_{b|y})^\dagger \\ (C_{c|z})^\dagger \\ (A_{a|x}A_{a'|x'})^\dagger \\ (A_{a|x}B_{b|y})^\dagger \\ \dots \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{cccccc} \mathbb{1} & A_{a|x} & B_{b|y} & C_{c|z} & A_{a|x}A_{a'|x'} & A_{a|x}B_{b|y} & \dots \\ 1 & & & & & \text{Tr}_\tau \left(\hat{A}_{a|x} \hat{B}_{b|y} \right) & \\ & \text{Tr}_\tau \left(\hat{A}_{a|x} \hat{B}_{b|y} \right) & & & & & \\ & \text{Tr}_\tau \left(\hat{B}_{b|y} \right) & & & & & \\ & & \text{Tr}_\tau \left(\hat{A}_{a'|x'} \hat{A}_{a|x} \hat{B}_{b|y} \right) & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \end{array} \right], \quad (2.1)$$

where the lines and columns are labelled by all formal monomials in $\{A_{a|x}, B_{b|y}, C_{c|z}\}$ of length at most n , and the entries are the trace over τ of the product of the monomials labelling the entries (we only indicated some of the coefficients and omitted tensor products for readability, and used relation $\hat{B}_{b|y}^2 = \hat{B}_{b|y}$). Γ^n satisfies several properties:

- (i) $\Gamma_{1,1}^n = 1$.
- (ii) Γ^n is symmetric positive.
- (iii) Γ^n satisfies several linear constraints, such as $\Gamma_{(A_{a|x})^\dagger, B_{b|y}}^n = \Gamma_{\mathbb{1}, A_{a|x}B_{b|y}}^n$.

Moreover, $\Gamma_{\mathbb{1}, A_{a|x} B_{b|y} C_{c|z}}^n = p(abc|xyz)$: we say that Γ^n is compatible with \vec{P} .

Hence, if \vec{P} is a Tensor Tripartite Quantum Distribution, then for all $n \geq 3$ there exists a moment matrix Γ^n compatible with \vec{P} . This provides a hierarchy of outer approximation of the set of Tensor Tripartite Quantum Distributions. Given \vec{P} and some $n \geq 3$, if there is no moment matrix Γ^n compatible with \vec{P} , then \vec{P} is not a Tensor Tripartite Quantum Distributions. Importantly, the problem of finding such Γ_n is an SDP, which can be solved on a computer, with certificates of nonexistence.

A higher hierarchy level n provides more accurate tests (as a compatible matrix Γ^{n-1} can always be extracted from Γ^n). However, as this hierarchy is only sensitive to the algebraic relations between the operators (such as $\hat{B}_{b|y}^2 = \hat{B}_{b|y}$ or $[\hat{A}_{a|x}, \hat{C}_{c|z}] = 0$), this hierarchy of outer approximation does not exactly characterise the set of Tensor Tripartite Quantum Distributions. It was shown to converge to the larger set of Commutator Tripartite Quantum Distributions ([29]):

Theorem 2.1 (Convergence of the standard NPA hierarchy). *Suppose that $\vec{Q} = \{q(abc|xyz)\}$ is a probability distribution for Alice, Bob, and Charlie. Then \vec{Q} passes all the standard NPA hierarchy tests iff \vec{Q} is a Commutator Tripartite Quantum Distribution,*

where the Commutator Tripartite Quantum Distributions are defined as:

Definition 2.2 (Commutator Tripartite Quantum Distributions). \vec{Q} is a *Commutator Tripartite Quantum Distribution* iff there exists a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , a positive operator τ with $\text{Tr}(\tau) = 1$, and PVMs $\{\hat{A}_{a|x}\}$, $\{\hat{B}_{b|y}\}$ and $\{\hat{C}_{c|z}\}$ over \mathcal{H} such that

- (i) $q(abc|xyz) = \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{A}_{a|x} \hat{B}_{b|y} \hat{C}_{c|z})$
- (ii) $\forall \hat{A}_{a|x}, \hat{B}_{b|y}, \hat{C}_{c|z}$, we have $[\hat{A}_{a|x}, \hat{B}_{b|y}] = [\hat{B}_{b|y}, \hat{C}_{c|z}] = [\hat{C}_{c|z}, \hat{A}_{a|x}] = 0$.

Any Tensor Tripartite Quantum Distribution is trivially a Commutator Tripartite Quantum Distribution². The converse, known as Tsirelson's problem, was first conjectured but turned out to be false (see [21], where it was also proven that the set of physical Tensor Tripartite Quantum Distributions is not computable). Nonetheless, for finite-dimensional quantum systems, these two definitions are equivalent, thanks to an inductive result of Tsirelson's Theorem (see Theorem F.1 and Remark F.2 in Appendix F).

2.2. Noncommutative polynomial formulation

Given a probability distribution \vec{Q} , the NPA hierarchy tests the existence of operators in a Hilbert space, allowing us to express \vec{Q} as a Commutator Tripartite Quantum

²The new operators $\hat{A}_{a|x}, \hat{B}_{b|y}, \hat{C}_{c|z}$ are constructed as the original ones, padding with identities over the other local Hilbert spaces

Distribution. Hence, this hierarchy cannot be formalised using operators or Hilbert spaces, as such objects may not exist. We now present the standard *canonical abstraction* procedure capable of performing this formalisation of the NPA hierarchy (based on noncommutative polynomials, see [8]), introducing abstract *letters* for each potential PVMs of the parties.

We introduce the alphabets $\underline{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_I)$, $\underline{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_J)$, and $\underline{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_K)$ respectively composed of the letters $\{A_{a|x}\}$, $\{B_{b|y}\}$, and $\{C_{c|z}\}$, one letter for each PVMs $\{\hat{A}_{a|x}\}$, $\{\hat{B}_{b|y}\}$, and $\{\hat{C}_{c|z}\}$ (I, J, K are the respective numbers of Alice, Bob, and Charlie PVMs operators).

The products of multiple measurement operators then correspond to combinations of letters $l_i \in \underline{a} \cup \underline{b} \cup \underline{c}$, referred to as words denoted by bold Greek letters ω , forming the set $\langle \underline{a}, \underline{b}, \underline{c} \rangle$. A word consisting of the letters in \underline{a} is written as α , forming the set $\langle \underline{a} \rangle$. Similarly, we write $\beta \in \langle \underline{b} \rangle$ associated with the alphabet \underline{b} and $\gamma \in \langle \underline{c} \rangle$ associated with \underline{c} . 1 is the empty word with no letters.

We further impose the algebraic relations satisfied by the measurement operators on the letters. More precisely, as the measurement operators are projectors, measurement operators of distinct parties commute together and are self-adjoint, and hence we impose

$$\begin{aligned} l_i^2 &= l_i, \\ [a_i, b_j] &= [a_i, c_k] = [b_j, c_k] = 0, \\ l_i^\dagger &= l_i, (l_i l_j)^\dagger = l_j^\dagger l_i^\dagger = l_j l_i, \end{aligned}$$

where the operation \dagger is an involution on the letters of a word, which stands for the conjugate transpose operation on operators. These rules imply that the words α , β , γ commute with each other. Therefore, any word ω admits a unique minimal form $\omega = \alpha\beta\gamma$ where no letter is squared. Equality over words is checked in this minimal form. The length of ω , denoted by $|\omega|$, is the number of letters in this minimal form.

The entries in the moment matrix Γ^n are indexed with the words ω such that $|\omega| \leq n$. Additionally, the ring of noncommutative polynomials $\mathbb{T}^{abc} = \mathbb{R}\langle \underline{a}, \underline{b}, \underline{c} \rangle$ arises; see Appendix A.1.

3. Bilocal quantum distribution and two converging hierarchies

This section contains the main results of our paper. We first introduce the two sets of Bilocal Quantum Tensor Distributions and Bilocal Quantum Commutator Distributions (see Figure 1b and Section 3.1). Then, we introduce the factorisation (Section 3.2) and the scalar extension (Section 3.3) bilocal NPA hierarchies. We show the

convergence of both hierarchies to the set of Bilocal Quantum Commutator Distributions. At last, we provide a finite-level stopping criterion for the two hierarchies, corresponding to finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces (Section 3.4).

3.1. Bilocal quantum distribution

Here, we first introduce the set of Bilocal Quantum Tensor Distributions (Definition 3.1), which according to quantum theory is the set of correlations that can be obtained in the bilocal scenario, in which two independent quantum sources are distributed to three parties (see Figure 1b). Then, we introduce the set of Bilocal Quantum Commutator Distributions (Definition 3.2), which is an outer approximation of this set, which will be characterised by our two hierarchies introduced in the next sections.

According to quantum theory, the set of correlations that can be obtained in the bilocal scenario are

Definition 3.1 (Tensor Bilocal Quantum Distributions). Let $\vec{P} = \{p(abc|xyz)\}$ be a three-party probability distribution. We say that \vec{P} is a *Tensor Bilocal Quantum Distribution* iff there exists a composite Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_L} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_R} \otimes \mathcal{H}_C$, two density operators ρ_{AB_L} over $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_L}$ and $\sigma_{B_R C}$ over $\mathcal{H}_{B_R} \otimes \mathcal{H}_C$, and some PVMs $\{\hat{A}_{a|x}\}$ over \mathcal{H}_A , $\{\hat{B}_{b|y}\}$ over $\mathcal{H}_{B_L} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_R}$, and $\{\hat{C}_{c|z}\}$ over \mathcal{H}_C such that

$$p(abc|xyz) = \text{Tr}_{\rho_{AB_L} \otimes \sigma_{B_R C}} \left(\hat{A}_{a|x} \otimes \hat{B}_{b|y} \otimes \hat{C}_{c|z} \right).$$

As for the standard NPA hierarchy, we will only consider the abstract algebraic commutativity relations among the density operators and PVMs. This leads to the following definition of Commutator Bilocal Quantum Distribution.

Definition 3.2 (Commutator Bilocal Quantum Distributions). Let $\vec{Q} = \{q(abc|xyz)\}$ be a three-party probability distribution. We say that \vec{Q} is a *Commutator Bilocal Quantum Distribution* iff there exists a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , a density operator τ , two positive operators (possibly infinite trace) ρ and σ , and some PVMs $\{\hat{A}_{a|x}\}$, $\{\hat{B}_{b|y}\}$, and $\{\hat{C}_{c|z}\}$ over \mathcal{H} such that

- (i) $\tau = \rho \cdot \sigma = \sigma \cdot \rho$,
- (ii) $q(abc|xyz) = \text{Tr}_{\tau} \left(\hat{A}_{a|x} \hat{B}_{b|y} \hat{C}_{c|z} \right)$,
- (iii) $[\hat{A}_{a|x}, \hat{B}_{b|y}] = [\hat{B}_{b|y}, \hat{C}_{c|z}] = [\hat{C}_{c|z}, \hat{A}_{a|x}] = 0$,
- (iv) $[\hat{A}_{a|x}, \sigma] = [\rho, \hat{C}_{c|z}] = 0$,

for all $\hat{A}_{a|x}, \hat{B}_{b|y}, \hat{C}_{c|z}$.

The set of Tensor Bilocal Quantum Distributions of Def. 3.1 is trivially contained in the set of Commutator Bilocal Quantum Distributions of Def. 3.2. Due to [21], the converse is wrong, and the physical set of Tensor Bilocal Quantum Distributions is not computable. We were unable to prove the equality or not between these two sets for finite Hilbert spaces and leave this question open (see Appendix F).

3.2. Factorisation bilocal NPA hierarchy

We now introduce the factorisation bilocal NPA hierarchy (definitions 3.3 and 3.4) and show its convergence to the set of Commutator Bilocal Quantum Distributions (theorem 3.1).

We use the canonical abstraction formalism of Section 2.2, with alphabets \underline{a} , \underline{b} , and \underline{c} in the letters $\{A_{a|x}\}$, $\{B_{b|y}\}$, and $\{C_{c|z}\}$, which are in one-to-one correspondence with the sets of PVMs $\{\hat{A}_{a|x}\}$, $\{\hat{B}_{b|y}\}$, and $\{\hat{C}_{c|z}\}$, respectively. Note that in the bilocal scenario, for $\hat{\alpha}$, $\hat{\gamma}$ respectively monomials in the PVMs of Alice and Charlie, with $\tau = \rho_{ABL} \otimes \sigma_{BRC}$, we have nonlinear constraints of the form

$$\text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\gamma}) = \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha}) \cdot \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\gamma}). \quad (3.1)$$

This motivates the following definition:

Definition 3.3 (Factorisation Bilocal Moment Matrix). Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let Γ^n be a square matrix indexed by all words $\omega \in \langle \underline{a}, \underline{b}, \underline{c} \rangle$ of length $|\omega| \leq n$. We say that Γ^n is a *Factorisation Bilocal Moment Matrix of order n* if

- (i) $\Gamma_{1,1}^n = 1$.
- (ii) Γ^n is positive.
- (iii) it satisfies all the linear constraints

$$\Gamma_{\omega,\nu}^n = \Gamma_{\omega',\nu'}^n \quad (3.2)$$

whenever $\omega^\dagger \nu = \omega'^\dagger \nu'$.

- (iv) it satisfies the additional nonlinear factorisation constraints

$$\Gamma_{\alpha,\gamma}^n = \Gamma_{\alpha,1}^n \cdot \Gamma_{1,\gamma}^n, \quad (3.3)$$

where $\alpha \in \langle \underline{a} \rangle$ and $\gamma \in \langle \underline{c} \rangle$.

We further say that Γ^n is compatible with the tripartite distribution \vec{Q} iff $\Gamma_{1,A_{a|x}B_{b|y}C_{c|z}}^n = q(abc|xyz)$. An infinite matrix Γ^∞ is said to be a *Factorisation Bilocal Moment Matrix* iff all of its principal extracted matrices are Factorisation Bilocal Moment Matrices of some finite order.

Note that if one drops condition (iv), this definition becomes the standard NPA Moment Matrix of Section 2.1. It is straightforward to show that any Bilocal Tensor Quantum Distribution admits a Factorisation Bilocal Moment Matrix Γ^n for all n . This yields the following hierarchy:

Definition 3.4 (Factorisation bilocal NPA hierarchy). Let $\vec{Q} = \{q(abc|xyz)\}$ be a tripartite probability distribution. We say that \vec{Q} passes *factorisation bilocal NPA hierarchy* if for all integers $n \geq 3$, there exists a Factorisation Bilocal Moment Matrix Γ^n of order n that is compatible with \vec{Q} .

We are ready for our first main result.

Theorem 3.1 (Convergence of the factorisation bilocal NPA hierarchy). *Let $\vec{Q} = \{q(abc|xyz)\}$ be a tripartite probability distribution. Then \vec{Q} passes all the factorisation bilocal NPA hierarchy tests iff \vec{Q} is a Commutator Bilocal Quantum Distribution.*

Proof. We present here a sketch of the proof that is detailed in the Appendix B.1. It is straightforward to show that if \vec{Q} is a Commutator Bilocal Quantum Distribution, then it admits a compatible Factorisation Bilocal Moment Matrix of any order (the nonlinear constraint (iv) is derived from the commutativity of ρ and σ and the properties of the operator trace).

For the converse direction, suppose there exists compatible Factorisation Bilocal Moment Matrix Γ^n for all $n \geq 3$. The first part of our proof is similar to the proof of convergence of the standard NPA hierarchy (see [29]). We first construct a compatible infinite size Factorisation Bilocal Moment matrix Γ^∞ by extracting a convergent sequence from the set of compatible Γ^n . Then we construct the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} and the operators $\tau = |\phi_1\rangle\langle\phi_1|$, $\hat{A}_{a|x}$, $\hat{B}_{b|y}$, $\hat{C}_{c|z}$ through a Gelfand–Naimark–Segal (GNS) representation from Γ^∞ . The constructed operators are, respectively, a state and PVMs that automatically satisfy constraints (ii) and (iii) in Def. 3.2.

In the last part of our proof, we construct the operators ρ , σ . Remarking that ρ should commute with all polynomials in all operators $\hat{\gamma}$ associated with a word $\gamma \in \langle c \rangle$, we construct ρ as the orthogonal projector on the subspace V_{BRC} generated by all these polynomials in $\hat{\gamma}$. We similarly define the operator σ as the orthogonal projector on the subspace V_{ABL} generated by all polynomials in the operators \hat{a} . Note that both V_{BRC} and V_{ABL} contain $|\phi_1\rangle$. We orthogonally decompose them as $V_{BRC} = \text{Span}\{|\phi_1\rangle\} \oplus W_{BRC}$ and $V_{ABL} = \text{Span}\{|\phi_1\rangle\} \oplus W_{ABL}$. Then, we show that the factorisation condition (iv) in the moment matrices imposes that the two complement subspaces are orthogonal to each other, that is, $W_{ABL} \perp W_{BRC}$.

As ρ and σ are, respectively, the orthogonal projectors over V_{BRC} and V_{ABL} , this directly implies that they commute and their product is the projector over $\text{Span}\{|\phi_1\rangle\}$,

that is τ , which proves constraints (i) of Def. 3.2 . The last constraint (iv) is proven similarly using this orthogonality relation, which concludes the proof. ■

Although Theorem 3.1 gives a convergence to Commutator Bilocal Quantum Distribution, as the name suggests, it does not support the application of semi-definite programming (SDP) due to the nonlinearity in the constraints (iv) of Def. 3.3. In other words, while Theorem 3.1 provides a theoretical characterisation, its practical usefulness to characterise bilocal quantum distributions is unclear. We solve this problem in the next section, considering a new hierarchy in which new scalar variables linearising these constraints are added.

3.3. Scalar extension technique and linear bilocal NPA hierarchy

We now show that the nonlinearity issue of the factorisation bilocal NPA hierarchy can be circumvented thanks to the *scalar extension* method proposed in [33]. We introduce the scalar extension bilocal NPA hierarchy (Def. 3.5 and 3.6), and show its convergence to the set of Commutator Bilocal Quantum Distributions (Theorem 3.2).

As we will see in this section, the main idea of the scalar extension method is to introduce, for any word α corresponding to the operator $\hat{\alpha}$, its scalar extension letter κ_α corresponding to the scalar operator $\text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha})\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$. We then construct the Scalar Extension Moment Matrix Ω^n with all words of length $\leq n$ written from the alphabets $\underline{a}, \underline{b}, \underline{c}$ and $\underline{\kappa}_A$, the set of all scalar extension letters (truncating $\underline{\kappa}_A$ to keep it finite). We will require that κ_α commutes with all other letters, which we show asymptotically imposes that the reconstructed operators from the GNS construction (introduced in the proof of Theorem 3.1) is a scalar operator that is proportional to identity. We will also require that $\Omega_{1,\alpha}^n = \Omega_{1,\kappa_\alpha}^n$, which imposes that the reconstructed operators from the GNS construction satisfy $\hat{\kappa}_\alpha = \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha})\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Finally, we will impose the condition $\Omega_{1,\alpha\gamma}^n = \Omega_{1,\kappa_\alpha\gamma}^n$ which corresponds to a linearised version of Equation 3.1 rewritten as $\text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\gamma}) = \text{Tr}_\tau((\text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha})\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}})\hat{\gamma}) = \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\kappa}_\alpha\hat{\gamma})$. Consequently, thanks to the new variables in the alphabet $\underline{\kappa}_A$, we will obtain a hierarchy which can be solved via SDPs, but in which the nonlinear factorisation relations of the previous hierarchy are still asymptotically satisfied.

3.3.1. Scalar extension with canonical abstraction. In this section, we extend the noncommutative polynomial formalism of Section 2.2 to include the scalars. In addition to the alphabets and rules introduced in Section 2.2, we introduce the new (infinite size) alphabet $\underline{\kappa}_A$ composed of the letters κ_α for all $\alpha \in \langle \underline{a} \rangle$.

We impose that κ_α commutes with all letters and is self-adjoint, that is, for all $\alpha \in \langle \underline{a} \rangle$ and letter $l_i \in \underline{a} \cup \underline{b} \cup \underline{c} \cup \underline{\kappa}_A$:

$$[\kappa_\alpha, l_i] = 0.$$

$$\kappa_\alpha^\dagger = \kappa_\alpha$$

Note that $\kappa_{\alpha\alpha'} \neq \kappa_{\alpha'\alpha}$ and $\kappa_\alpha^2 \neq \kappa_\alpha$ in general. These rules imply that any word ω in $\langle \underline{a}, \underline{b}, \underline{c}, \underline{\kappa}_A \rangle$ admits a unique minimal form $\kappa\alpha\beta\gamma$ where $\kappa \in \langle \underline{\kappa}_A \rangle$ (and $\alpha \in \langle \underline{a} \rangle$, $\beta \in \langle \underline{b} \rangle$, $\gamma \in \langle \underline{c} \rangle$ have no squared letters), used to define its length and the equality of words. Note that the alphabet $\underline{\kappa}_A$ is infinite in size. Therefore, to keep the size of the moment matrix finite, we introduce $\underline{\kappa}_A^n$ as the alphabet (of finite size) consisting only of letters κ_α with $|\alpha| \leq n$.

With scalar extension, the ring of *bilocal scalar extension polynomials* \mathbb{T}_a^{abc} naturally arises; see Appendix A.2 for a formal discussion.

3.3.2. Scalar extension bilocal NPA hierarchy. We now construct the Scalar Extension Bilocal Moment Matrix Ω^n whose entries are indexed by words in $\langle \underline{a}, \underline{b}, \underline{c}, \underline{\kappa}_A^n \rangle$.

Definition 3.5 (Scalar Extension Bilocal Moment Matrix). Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let Ω^n be a square matrix indexed by all words $\omega \in \langle \underline{a}, \underline{b}, \underline{c}, \underline{\kappa}_A^n \rangle$ of length $|\omega| \leq n$. We say that Ω^n is a *Scalar Extension Moment Matrix of order n* if

- (i) $\Omega_{1,1}^n = 1$.
- (ii) Ω^n is positive.
- (iii) it satisfies all the linear constraints

$$\Omega_{\omega, \nu}^n = \Omega_{\omega', \nu'}^n \tag{3.4}$$

whenever $\omega^\dagger \nu = \omega'^\dagger \nu'$.

- (iv) for all $\alpha \in \langle \underline{a} \rangle$ and $\gamma \in \langle \underline{c} \rangle$,

$$\Omega_{1, \alpha\gamma}^n = \Omega_{1, \kappa_\alpha\gamma}^n. \tag{3.5}$$

We further say that Ω^n is compatible with the tripartite distribution \vec{Q} iff $\Omega_{1, A_{a|x} B_{b|y} C_{c|z}}^n = q(abc|xyz)$. An infinite matrix Ω^∞ is said to be a *Scalar Extension Bilocal Moment Matrix* iff all of its principal extracted matrices are Scalar Extension Bilocal Moment Matrix of some finite order.

Definition 3.6 (Scalar extension bilocal NPA hierarchy). Let $\vec{Q} = \{q(abc|xyz)\}$ be a tripartite probability distribution. We say that \vec{Q} passes the *scalar extension bilocal NPA hierarchy* if for any integer $n \geq 3$, there exists a Scalar Extension Bilocal Moment Matrix Ω^n of size n which is compatible with \vec{Q} .

Now we can state our second main result.

Theorem 3.2 (Convergence of the scalar extension bilocal NPA hierarchy). *Suppose that $\vec{Q} = \{q(abc|xyz)\}$ is a tripartite probability distribution. Then \vec{Q} passes all the scalar extension bilocal NPA hierarchy tests iff \vec{Q} is a Commutator Bilocal Quantum Distribution.*

Proof. Here, we provide only a sketch and refer to Appendix B.2 and Appendix C for more details.

Proving the necessity of the hierarchy is again straightforward. For the converse, we assume the existence of a hierarchy of compatible Ω^n . We repeat the GNS construction as in the standard NPA hierarchy proof of convergence to construct the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , the operators τ , $\hat{A}_{a|x}$, $\hat{B}_{b|y}$, $\hat{C}_{c|z}$, and the operators \hat{k}_α from a compatible infinite size Factorisation Bilocal Moment matrix Ω^∞ (obtained by extracting a convergent sequence from the set of compatible Ω^n). Consequently, we obtain operators satisfying the constraints (ii) and (iii) in Def. 3.2.

Moreover, the GNS construction obtains operators \hat{k}_α that commute with all operators $\hat{\omega}$. Inspired by [23], we then show that these operators must be scalar multiples of identity (see Appendix C). It follows from Equation (3.5), taking $\gamma = 1$, that $\hat{k}_\alpha = \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha}) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Then, the condition Equation (3.5) imposed on the moment matrix gives: $\text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\gamma}) = \Omega_{1,\alpha\gamma}^n = \Omega_{1,\hat{k}_\alpha\gamma}^n = \text{Tr}_\tau((\text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha}) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}) \hat{\gamma}) = \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha}) \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\gamma})$, which imposes the nonlinear factorisation condition of Equation (3.1).

Therefore, we can introduce ρ and σ in the same way as in the proof of Theorem 3.1, which satisfy conditions (i) and (iv) of Definition 3.2 by the same calculation. ■

Note that in this proof, we show that in the infinite-size Factorisation Bilocal Moment matrix Ω^∞ , the factorisation constraints are all satisfied. Hence, from Ω^∞ one can extract an infinite-size Factorisation Bilocal Moment matrix Γ^∞ (by removing all lines and columns indexed by a word in which a letter of the alphabet $\underline{\kappa_A}$) compatible with \vec{Q} , as well as an infinite hierarchy of compatible Factorisation Bilocal Moment matrix Γ^n (additionally restricting to words of length smaller than n). Remark that this does not imply that Γ^n can necessarily be extracted from Ω^n .

As a last comment, note that we could introduce a larger scalar extension by including new letters ν_γ for all words γ , and impose that any ν_γ commutes with any letter and that the new moment matrix in words written from the alphabets $\langle \underline{a}, \underline{b}, \underline{c}, \underline{\kappa_A}^n, \underline{\nu_C}^n \rangle$ satisfies a condition analogous to (iv). However, this extension would have been redundant since the equation $\text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\gamma}) = \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha} (\text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\gamma}) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}})) = \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\nu}_\gamma)$ does not provide new information.

3.4. Stopping criteria and finite-dimensionality

So far, we have shown that both the factorisation and scalar extension bilocal NPA hierarchies characterise the set of Commutator Bilocal Quantum correlations (Def. 3.2) in the asymptotic limit. The reconstructed Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is a priori infinite-dimensional, and there is no promise in the speed of convergence of these two hierarchies. In this section, we give a stopping criterion for our two hierarchies, and show that it is associated to a finite-dimensional reconstructed Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Our stopping criterion is similar to the one for the NPA hierarchy given in [29]. However, as we will discuss later in Appendix F, we do not prove that the set of finite-dimensional Hilbert space Tensor Bilocal Quantum correlations is recovered: we will leave this question open.

Definition 3.7 (Rank loop). For any $N \geq 3$, the Factorisation Moment Matrix Γ^N is said to have a *rank loop* if

$$\text{rank}(\Gamma^{N-1}) = \text{rank}(\Gamma^N). \quad (3.6)$$

The rank loop condition is defined similarly for Scalar Extension Bilocal Matrix Ω^n .

Theorem 3.3 (Stopping criteria). *Let $\vec{Q} = \{q(abc|xyz)\}$ be a tripartite probability distribution. The following are equivalent:*

- (i) \vec{Q} admits a finite-dimensional Commutator Bilocal Quantum representation.
- (ii) \vec{Q} admits a Factorisation Bilocal Moment Matrix Γ^N which has a rank loop for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (iii) \vec{Q} admits a Scalar Extension Bilocal Moment Matrix Ω^N which has a rank loop for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. We give a sketch proof of (i) \implies (ii), (ii) \implies (i), and (iii) \implies (ii). Note that (i) \implies (iii) can be proven in the same way as (i) \implies (ii). See Appendix B.3 for more details.

It is straightforward to prove that (i) \implies (ii). From a Commutator Bilocal quantum representation in a Hilbert space of finite dimension d , one can construct a sequence of Factorisation Bilocal Moment Matrices Γ^n . Then, the sequence of $\text{rank}(\Gamma^n)$ is increasing (as Γ^{n-1} is a sub-matrix of Γ^n) and is upper bounded by d , which implies the rank loop. Repeating the same argument with the Scalar Extension Bilocal Moment Matrix Ω^n we can also show (i) \implies (iii).

Next, let us give a sketch proof of (ii) \implies (i). Assume that Γ^N admits a rank loop. Following the proof of the stopping criteria for the standard NPA case, from Γ^N we construct a finite-dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with operators τ , $\hat{A}_{a|x}$, $\hat{B}_{b|y}$, $\hat{C}_{c|z}$, which satisfy the desired properties thanks to the rank loop condition. Next, we

introduce the operator ρ as the projector on the subspace generated by all polynomials taking the variables $\hat{\gamma}$ associated with all words in $\gamma \in \langle \underline{c} \rangle$ such that $|\gamma| \leq N$. We similarly define σ as the projector on the subspace generated by polynomials evaluating in $\hat{\alpha}$ such that $|\alpha| \leq N$. Applying the factorisation constraints, we show that ρ and σ satisfy the conditions in Definition 3.2.

Finally, for (iii) \implies (ii), assume that we have a Ω^N with a rank loop. Analogous to (iii) \implies (i), we can construct a finite-dimensional quantum representation for Ω^N . One can then obtain a sequence of Scalar Extension Moment Matrices Ω^m (compatible with Ω^N), for all $m \geq N$, with increasing rank but upper bounded by the dimension of the representation. An implication of Appendix B.2 shows that all Ω^m must satisfy the nonlinear constraints, then we may extract a sequence of Factorisation Bilocal Moment Matrix Γ^m with increasing but finite rank. Repeating the argument in (i) \implies (ii) we conclude that there exists some $M \geq N$ such that Γ^M admits a rank loop. \blacksquare

4. Inflation-NPA hierarchy and generalisation to other Networks

In this section, we first introduce a third hierarchy, which can be used to approximate quantum distributions in the bilocal scenario: the NPA-inflation hierarchy of [47]. This hierarchy was obtained by combining the standard inflation technic [18, 28, 48] to the NPA method [29], see [26] for an attempt to characterise its convergence. We prove that any distribution compatible with this NPA-inflation method is a Commutator Bilocal Quantum Distribution (i.e. is compatible with the two hierarchies introduced in Section 3), and leave the question of equality or strict inclusion (in full generality or in the finite-dimensional case) between these two sets open.

Then, we introduce more general network scenarios (see Figure 3) and discuss generalisations of factorisation, scalar extension, and NPA-inflation hierarchies to these scenarios. We remark that for the triangle scenario, the nonSDP and scalar extension hierarchies are trivial (they correspond to the standard NPA hierarchy), while the NPA inflation hierarchy is nontrivial, showing a clear gap in the two sets which can be identified by these hierarchies in the context of generic network scenarios.

4.1. Inflation-NPA hierarchy

Consider a Tensor Bilocal Quantum Distribution \vec{P} (Definition 3.1). Following [47], we now show that \vec{P} can be associated to a new two-parameter sequence of increasing size moment matrices $\Xi^{n,m}$ satisfying some specific additional symmetry constraints. This can be used to construct a new hierarchy capable of showing that some given distribution cannot be a Tensor Bilocal Quantum Distribution, called the NPA-inflation

hierarchy (also called quantum inflation hierarchy). We then prove that this method is more (or equally) precise than the two factorisation and scalar extension hierarchies.

4.1.1. Inflation-NPA Hierarchy for the Bilocal scenario. Let \vec{P} be a Tensor Bilocal Quantum Distribution: there exist a composite Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_L} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_R} \otimes \mathcal{H}_C$ and operators such that

$$p(abc|xyz) = \text{Tr}_{\rho_{AB_L} \otimes \sigma_{B_R C}} \left(\hat{A}_{a|x} \otimes \hat{B}_{b|y} \otimes \hat{C}_{c|z} \right).$$

Consider two integers $n \geq 3, m \geq 1$. Introducing m copies of the Hilbert spaces and copies of the operators in these Hilbert spaces, we now construct a new inflation-NPA moment matrix $\Xi^{n,m}$ satisfying some SDP constraints, notably the linear symmetry conditions corresponding to the fact that copies should be interchangeable.

We introduce m independent copies of each Hilbert spaces, called $\mathcal{H}_A^i, \mathcal{H}_{B_L}^j, \mathcal{H}_{B_R}^k$, and \mathcal{H}_C^l . We consider copies of all PVMs measurement operators in every possible (combination of) Hilbert space. More precisely, we consider m operators $\{\hat{A}_{a^i|x^i}^i\}$ (resp. $\{\hat{C}_{c^l|z^l}^l\}$), copies of $\hat{A}_{a|x}$ (resp. $\hat{C}_{c|z}$) acting over the Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H}_A^i (resp. \mathcal{H}_C^l), and m^2 operators $\{\hat{B}_{b^j,k^k|y^j,k^k}^{j,k}\}$ copies of $\hat{B}_{b|y}$ acting on Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_{B_L}^j \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_R}^k$. We also consider m independent copies of ρ_{AB_L} and $\sigma_{B_R C}$, denoted by $\rho_{AB_L}^i$ acting over $\{\mathcal{H}_A^i \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_L}^i\}$ and $\sigma_{B_R C}^l$ acting over $\{\mathcal{H}_{B_R}^l \otimes \mathcal{H}_C^l\}$. We introduce τ_m the global state tensor product of all states, $\mathcal{H}^i = \mathcal{H}_A^i \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_L}^i \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_R}^i \otimes \mathcal{H}_C^i$ the i th diagonal spaces, $\hat{B}_{b^i,i^i|y^i,i^i}^{i,i}$ the i th diagonal PVM and \mathcal{H} the global Hilbert space tensor product of all Hilbert spaces.

In the following, to simplify the notation, we leave the inputs and the outputs of the operators implicit (e.g. A^i should be thought of as $A_{a^i|x^i}^i$). As in the standard NPA case, we also identify an operator over a local Hilbert space with the operator acting over the full Hilbert space padding with identity operators, which allows to replace all tensor products with simple products³.

Physically, $\Xi^{n,m}$ corresponds to the “standard” moment matrix of a new hypothetical scenario in which the parties now have access to several copies of the sources and decide which one to measure according to the additional input i for A , (j, k) for B and l for C (see Figure 2), to which we additionally impose symmetry conditions deduced from the interchangeability of the copies of the states. More precisely, $\Xi^{n,m}$ is indexed by words ω, ν (of size $\leq n$) composed of letters $\{A^i\}, \{B^{j,k}\}, \{C^l\}$, and its coefficients are $\Xi_{\omega,\nu}^{n,m} = \text{Tr}_{\tau_m} (\hat{\omega}^\dagger \hat{\nu})$. It satisfies four types of conditions:

³e.g., A^i acting over \mathcal{H}_A^i is identified with $A^i \otimes \mathbb{1}$ acting over \mathcal{H} where the identity acts over the tensor product of all Hilbert spaces except \mathcal{H}_A^i . Then, for instance, the operator $A^i \otimes A^{i'} \otimes C^l$ is identified with $A^i \cdot A^{i'} \cdot C^l$




Figure 2. Physical scenario corresponding to the inflation technique (to simplify, inputs x, y, z and outputs a, b, c are omitted). In case a distribution \vec{P} is obtain in the bilocal scenario, one can consider the new (thought) scenario in which the sources are duplicated, and each party is given *additional* inputs i, j, k ; and l . The parties apply the measurement specified in the original scenario to the copies of the states given by these extra inputs. Here, we represented the case where A performs here measurement $A_{a|x}$ over her share of state ρ^1 , corresponding to the new operator $A^1_{a|x}$. Similarly, here Bob measures operator $B^1_{b|y}$ over his shares of states ρ^1, σ^1 and Charlie measures $C^1_{c|z}$ over his share of state σ^1 . Note that in that case Charlie measures a state not considered by the other parties: his behavior factorises from the rest, which is imposed by the condition (iv) of the main text. Moreover, as the states and PVMs are copies of each other, the behavior should be invariant under $S_2 \times S_2$ permutation group, as specified by condition (iii) of the main text. Condition (iv) corresponds to the situation in which all parties measure all diagonal operators, that is Alice measures $A^1_{a|x}$ and $A^2_{a|x}$, Bob measures $B^1_{b|y}$ and $B^2_{b|y}$, Charlie measures $C^1_{c|z}$ and $C^2_{c|z}$. $\Xi^{n,m=2}$ is the moment matrix associated to this scenario, satisfying conditions (iii) and (iv) due to the specificities of this scenario where states and operators are duplicated.

- (i) $\Xi_{1,1}^{n,m} = 1$ and $\Xi^{n,m}$ is symmetric positive.
- (ii) commutation of operators in different Hilbert spaces implies that $\Xi^{n,m}$ satisfies several linear constraints (e.g. A^1 commutes with A^2 and $B^{1,1}$ commutes with $B^{2,3}$ but not with $B^{1,2}$).
- (iii) the invariance of τ_m under permutations $\theta, \theta' \in S_m \times S_m$ of the copies of ρ_{AB_L} and $\sigma_{B_R C}$ implies new linear constraints on $\Xi^{n,m}$. Acting with θ (resp. θ') over τ_m is equivalent to permuting the index i, j (resp. k, l) in $A^i, B^{j,k}, C^l$, hence, for instance, $\Xi_{1,A^0 A^1 B^{0,1} C^1}^{n,m} = \Xi_{1,A^1 A^0 B^{1,2} C^2}^{n,m}$ (here $\theta = (0\ 1)$ and $\theta' = (1\ 2)$).

Moreover, note that when only diagonal operators $A^i, B^{i,i}, C^i$ are involved, the trace over τ_m factorises as a product of m traces over each diagonal space \mathcal{H}^i . Hence

$\Xi^{n,m}$ satisfies $\Xi_{1, \prod_{i=1}^m A^i B^{i,i} C^i}^{n,m} = \prod_{i=1}^m p(a^i b^{i,i} c^i | x^i y^{i,i} c^i)$ with \vec{P} ⁴. We say that $\Xi^{n,m}$ is compatible with \vec{P} .

As for the NPA and our previous hierarchies, the existence of a hierarchy of NPA-inflation moment matrices $\Xi^{n,m}$ compatible with any tensor bilocal distribution \vec{P} can be used as a way to test whether some given distribution \vec{Q} has such a model. If for some n, m , there does not exist any $\Xi^{n,m}$ compatible with \vec{Q} (this is an SDP problem), then \vec{Q} is not a Tensor Bilocal Quantum Distribution.

Remark 4.1. Note that a moment matrix constructed from a Tensor Bilocal Quantum Distribution $\Xi^{n,m}$ satisfies additional nonlinear factorisation constraints. More precisely, for some words $\alpha^i, \beta^{ii}, \gamma^i$ respectively in the letters $\{A^i\}, \{B^{i,i}\}$ and $\{C^i\}$, we have the factorisation constraint $\Xi_{1, \prod_i \alpha^i \beta^{ii} \gamma^i}^{n,m} = \prod_i \Xi_{1, \alpha^i \beta^{ii} \gamma^i}^{n,m}$. This condition can be imposed in the tests, but it is not practical as it results in nonSDP problems. It is likely that these conditions are anyway imposed when m, n go to infinity (the proof would be related to the de Finetti like theorems). A formal proof of convergence of the NPA-inflation hierarchy could first exploit these additional nonlinear conditions.

4.1.2. Commutator quantum distribution and inflation-NPA hierarchy. We now prove that if \vec{Q} is detected as infeasible by the scalar extension hierarchy (that is, if \vec{Q} is not a commutator bilocal quantum distribution), then the Inflation-NPA hierarchy will also detect it.

Theorem 4.2. *Consider a distribution $\vec{Q} = \{q(abc|xyz)\}$. The existence of $\Xi^{n,2}$ compatible with \vec{Q} implies the existence of a scalar extension moment matrix Ω^n . Hence, if \vec{Q} passes the bilocal inflation-NPA hierarchy, then it also passes the factorisation and scalar extension bilocal NPA hierarchies, that is, it is a commutator bilocal distribution.*

Proof. By identifying the PVMs of the first diagonal space with $\{\hat{A}_{a|x}\}, \{\hat{B}_{b|y}\}, \{\hat{C}_{c|z}\}$ and A^2 from the second diagonal space with scalar extension, it is straightforward to construct a Scalar Extension Bilocal Moment Matrix. See Appendix D.1 for more details. ■

We leave the problem of proving the converse of Theorem 4.2, or finding a counterexample, open (also restricting to finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces). The difficulty lies in the off-diagonal measurements of Bob. That is, given a Factorisation Moment Matrix Γ^m , it is natural to define $\Gamma_{1, \alpha \beta \gamma}^m = \Xi_{1, \alpha^1 \beta^{11} \gamma^1}^{n,m}$. With the $S_m \times S_m$ symmetry and diagonalisation constraint, we are able to define many entries of $\Xi^{n,m}$. However,

⁴Physically, this terms corresponds to the parties m parallel implementations of the initial experiment, one for each (ρ^i, σ^i) .




Figure 3. Some generalised network scenario: the triangle scenario (a) and the four party star network (b).

entries such as $\Xi_{1,B^{11}B^{12}}^{n,m}$ cannot be obtained in this way. With a tensor product structure, the structure $\mathcal{H}_{B_L} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_R}$ can be used; but this is not possible with only the commutator relations.

4.2. Generalisation to other network scenarios

Up to now, we consider quantum correlations which can be obtained in the three-parties Bell and Bilocal scenarios as in Figure 1. Quantum theory can also be used to define what correlations can be obtained in more complex scenarios, such as the four party star network, line scenarios or the triangle scenario of Figure 3, and all the three hierarchies we introduced can be generalised to these scenarios.

Let us now discuss the generalisation of our results to these generalised scenarios. We will first remark that the generalisation of our factorisation and scalar extension hierarchies is sometimes strictly less efficient to the NPA-inflation hierarchy, providing a clear gap in the case of the triangle scenario. Then, we evoke the potential generalisation of our main result to the star network scenario.

Let us first concentrate on the triangle scenario of Figure 3c, where the correlations predicted by quantum theory are:

Definition 4.1 (Tensor Triangle Quantum Distributions). Let $\vec{P} = \{p(abc|xyz)\}$ be a three-party probability distribution. We say that \vec{P} is a *Tensor Triangle Quantum Distribution* iff there exists a composite Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{A_L} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A_R} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_L} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_R} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{C_L} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{C_R}$, density operators $\rho_{A_R B_L}$ over $\mathcal{H}_{A_R} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_L}$, $\sigma_{B_R C_L}$ over $\mathcal{H}_{B_R} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{C_L}$,

$\pi_{C_R A_L}$ over $\mathcal{H}_{C_R} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A_L}$, and some PVMs $\{\hat{A}_{a|x}\}$ over $\mathcal{H}_{A_L} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A_R}$, $\{\hat{B}_{b|y}\}$ over $\mathcal{H}_{B_L} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_R}$, and $\{\hat{C}_{c|z}\}$ over $\mathcal{H}_{C_L} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{C_R}$ such that

$$p(abc|xyz) = \text{Tr}_{\rho_{A_R B_L} \otimes \sigma_{B_R C_L} \otimes \pi_{C_R A_L}} \left(\hat{A}_{a|x} \otimes \hat{B}_{b|y} \otimes \hat{C}_{c|z} \right).$$

The generalisation of our factorisation or scalar extension hierarchies to this new set of correlation is trivial. Indeed, no factorisation condition can be imposed anymore, as any pair of parties is sharing a quantum source. Hence, they consist of testing the existence of a hierarchy of moment matrices subject to the same conditions as in the standard NPA hierarchy. Then, they are unable to distinguish triangle quantum correlations from correlation which can be obtained in the standard tripartite Bell scenario of Figure 1a.

In particular, the shared random bit distribution (in which the parties coordinately output 0 or 1 with probability 1/2, there are no inputs) is clearly feasible in the standard tripartite Bell scenario and hence cannot be detected as infeasible by the generalised factorisation or scalar extension hierarchies. However, we prove in Appendix D.2 that the NPA-inflation shows that it is infeasible in the triangle scenario. This proves that in the context of generic networks, the two generalised factorisation and scalar extension hierarchies can detect strictly fewer distributions as infeasible compared to the NPA-inflation hierarchy.

We also discuss in Appendix E a potential generalisation of our main results to the case of the star network scenario of Figure 3a.

5. Conclusion

Let us conclude our paper with a discussion of the tensor and commutator alternatives for defining quantum correlations. Throughout our paper, we introduced the correlations predicted by quantum theory in various networks using tensor-based definitions (Def. 2.1, 3.1 and 4.1). Then, we introduced several commutator-based relaxations of these definitions (Def. 2.2, 3.2, see also Def. D.3 of Appendix D.3). We presented the tensor-based definitions as the one postulated by quantum theory and the commutator-based definitions as nonphysical (but practical) relaxations.

However, this categorisation is still debated [44]. In the case of standard Bell scenarios, the commutator-based distributions of Def. 2.2 is sometimes taken as the set of correlations postulated by quantum theory⁵, tensor-based distributions becoming an

⁵For instance, [29] introduces the two definitions on equal footage, and then adopt the commutator one as the one postulated by quantum theory

inner relaxation of this now physical set. Note that as the two are known to be equivalent for finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces (and different for general ones [21]), the choice of a tensor-based or a commutator-based postulate may not result in fundamental different predictions for realistic experiments.

This situation might be more problematic once considering the bilocal scenario in which two independent sources are prepared, assuming that the postulates should include a rule to encode this independent preparation⁶. Our tensor-based Definition 2.1 is the standard way to introduce quantum bilocal correlations. We are not aware of any concrete proposal with a commutator-based postulate, but see our commutator-based Definition 2.2 as the natural candidate. However, adopting it may have significant consequences, even in the finite-dimensional case.

Indeed, assume now that there exists a (maybe finite dimensional Hilbert space) Commutator Bilocal Quantum Distribution \vec{Q}_0 rejected by the inflation-NPA hierarchy⁷. As \vec{Q}_0 is feasible in the bilocal scenario according to our new commutator-based postulate, the NPA-inflation hierarchy is not an allowed method to characterise quantum correlations in networks. We explain in Appendix D.3 why the consideration of other networks might give even stronger arguments against this commutator-based postulate, which could imply that quantum theory does not allow to consider independent copies of systems.

Acknowledgements. We thank Antonio Acín and Miguel Navascués for discussions.

Funding. M.-O.R. is supported by the supported by the grant PCI2021-122022-2B financed by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by the European Union Next-GenerationEU/PRTR. This work was partially funded by the Government of Spain (FIS2020-TRANQI and Severo Ochoa CEX2019-000910-S), Fundacio Cellex, Fundacio Mir-Puig, Generalitat de Catalunya (CERCA, AGAUR SGR 1381 and QuantumCAT), the ERC AdG CERQUTE and the AXA Chair in Quantum Information Science.

⁶Note that this is not necessary: in practice the tripartite Bell scenario formalism captures the bilocal scenario, as the two sources can be modelled by a unique global source, hence a formalism with no rule for independent preparation is possible.

⁷We left that question open, but we conjecture it exists. Note that if not, our two hierarchies are equivalent (maybe in finite dimension Hilbert spaces only) to the inflation-NPA hierarchy for the bilocal scenario, but not for the triangle scenario

A. A formal construction of noncommutative polynomials

In this section, we provide a more mathematically rigorous construction of noncommutative polynomials such as \mathbb{T}^{abc} and \mathbb{T}_a^{abc} . We also discuss the relation between moment matrix and linear functional, which is useful in Appendix C.

A.1. Noncommutative polynomials generated by finite alphabets

Fixed some $I \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider an alphabet $\underline{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_I)$ consisting of letters a_i for $i = 1, \dots, I$. The reduced monoid generated by the alphabet \underline{a} is denoted by $\langle \underline{a} \rangle$ with *reducibility condition*

$$a_i^2 = a_i$$

for each letter a_i . All elements of $\langle \underline{a} \rangle$ are called *words* and are assumed to be in minimal forms; that is, there is no word with two equal consecutive letters. The *empty word* is denoted by 1. The *length* of the word ω , denoted by $|\omega|$, is the number of letters in the word. The ring of *noncommutative polynomials* associated with \underline{a} is then written as $\mathbb{T}^a = \mathbb{R}\langle \underline{a} \rangle$.

We now endow a \star -structure on \mathbb{T}^a by introducing an involution⁸ such that $\forall i, j = 1, \dots, I$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R}^\dagger &= \mathbb{R}, a_i^\dagger = a_i, \\ (a_i a_j)^\dagger &= a_j^\dagger a_i^\dagger = a_j a_i. \end{aligned}$$

The subset of polynomials invariant under involution is called *symmetric* and is denoted by $\text{Sym}\mathbb{T}^a = \{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{T}^a \mid \mathbf{p}^\dagger = \mathbf{p}\}$. It follows that $\mathbb{T}^a = \mathbb{R}\langle \underline{a} \rangle$ is a \star -algebra.

To make sense of the terminology “polynomial”, we need a notion of evaluation. Fix a finite-dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with a set of variables $\{\underline{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_I) \mid A_i \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\}$. Define *evaluation* for any $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{T}_a^a$ to be the matrix polynomial $\mathbf{p}(\underline{A})$, by replacing each letter a_i with the operator A_i , where \hat{a}_i is the operator corresponding to the word α .

Example A.1. Consider $\underline{a} = (a_1, a_2, a_3)$, and $\mathbf{p} = a_1 a_2 a_3 + a_2^2 \in \mathbb{T}^a$. For evaluation, we may choose the Hilbert space of a qubit with the variables being Pauli matrices $\vec{\sigma} = (\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z)$. Whence,

$$\mathbf{p}_\tau(\vec{\sigma}) = \sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_z + \sigma_y^2$$

⁸In mathematical literature, this involution is usually denoted by $*$. Instead, we use \dagger to simplify the notation and note the intuition from the conjugate transpose.

We can easily generalise the above definition to the case of having multiple alphabets. For our purposes, it suffices to consider only two more alphabets $\underline{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_J)$ and $\underline{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_K)$ for some $J, K \in \mathbb{N}$. In this case, the elements of the reduced monoid $\langle \underline{a}, \underline{b}, \underline{c} \rangle$ are again called *words*, assuming the minimal forms due to the additional reducibility conditions

$$b_j^2 = b_j, c_k^2 = c_k$$

for each letter b_j and c_i . Moreover, we require all letters from different alphabets to commute with each other, that is,

$$[a_i, b_j] = [a_i, c_k] = [b_j, c_k] = 0,$$

for any $i = 1, \dots, I, j = 1, \dots, J$, and $k = 1, \dots, K$. The ring of *bilocal noncommutative polynomials* is defined as $\mathbb{T}^{abc} = \mathbb{R}\langle \underline{a}, \underline{b}, \underline{c} \rangle$ with the same \star -structure, where the superscripts of \mathbb{T} are used to refer to the alphabets used. Given any Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , the evaluation can be generalised by introducing more variables $\{\underline{B} = (B_1, \dots, B_J) \mid B_j \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\}$ and $\{\underline{C} = (C_1, \dots, C_L) \mid C_k \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\}$.

We remark that both \mathbb{T}^a and \mathbb{T}^{abc} are topological vector spaces; see Appendix A.4. The significance of this observation is subtle yet important, which allows for the application of the Banach–Alaoglu Theorem that shall be needed.

As a convention, we use bold Greek letters to refer to words, while bold letters such as \mathbf{p} to refer to noncommutative polynomials. In particular, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ refers to the words in $\langle \underline{a} \rangle$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ for $\langle \underline{b} \rangle$, and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ for $\langle \underline{c} \rangle$. Incidentally, any word $\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \langle \underline{a}, \underline{b}, \underline{c} \rangle$ can be uniquely decomposed $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \boldsymbol{\alpha}\boldsymbol{\beta}\boldsymbol{\gamma}$. This coincides with our discussion in Section 2.2, and by construction, the canonical abstraction of any Commutator Tripartite Quantum Distribution gives rise to the ring \mathbb{T}^{abc} .

A.2. Scalar extension polynomials

Consider the alphabet \underline{a} . For any word $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \langle \underline{a} \rangle$, we define *scalar extension* of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ to be $\kappa_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, imposing the commutation condition:

$$[\kappa_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}'] = [\kappa_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, \kappa_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}'}] = 0 \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}' \in \langle \underline{a} \rangle.$$

Despite being fully commuting, note that $\kappa_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}\boldsymbol{\alpha}'} \neq \kappa_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}'\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ in general. Denote the *infinite* alphabet generated by the scalar extension of \underline{a} by $\underline{\kappa}_A$, and let $\underline{\kappa}_A^n$ be the finite alphabet consisted of letter $\kappa_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ with $|\boldsymbol{\alpha}| \leq n$. The elements in the free monoid $\langle \underline{\kappa}_A \rangle$ are said to be *pure scalar words* and are generally represented by $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$. The *length* of the word $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ is defined as the number of letters in the word, denoted by $|\boldsymbol{\kappa}|$.

Observe also that, different from the reduced monoid $\langle \underline{a} \rangle$, in the free monoid $\langle \underline{\kappa}_A \rangle$ we have $\kappa_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^2 \neq \kappa_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ in general.

Following the commutation relations, define the commutative ring of *pure scalar extension polynomials* associated with \underline{a} as $T_a = \mathbb{R}[\kappa_\alpha, \alpha \in \langle \underline{a} \rangle]$. We define the ring of *scalar extension polynomials* as $\mathbb{T}_a^a = T_a \langle \underline{a} \rangle$.

Similarly to the previous section, we can generalise \mathbb{T}_a^a to the case of having multiple alphabets. In particular, given the alphabets \underline{b} and \underline{c} , define the ring of *bilocal scalar extension polynomials* to be $\mathbb{T}_a^{abc} = T_a \langle \underline{a}, \underline{b}, \underline{c} \rangle$, while imposing commutativity

$$[\kappa_\alpha, \beta] = [\kappa_\alpha, \gamma] = 0.$$

It is clear that \mathbb{T}_a^a contains \mathbb{T}^a and \mathbb{T}_a^{abc} contains \mathbb{T}^{abc} . The \star -structure can then be extended to \mathbb{T}_a^a and \mathbb{T}_a^{abc} by requiring $T_a^\dagger = T_a$.

Note that any *word* in $\langle \underline{a}, \kappa_A \rangle$ is of the form $\kappa\alpha$. Analogously, any word in $\langle \underline{a}, \underline{b}, \underline{c}, \kappa_A \rangle$ is of the form $\kappa\alpha\beta\gamma$.

We can evaluate the polynomials in \mathbb{T}_a^a . Fix a finite-dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with a set of variables $\{\underline{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_I) \mid A_i \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\}$, and choose a normalised positive operator $\tau \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Define τ -*evaluation* for any $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{T}_a^a$ to be the matrix trace polynomial $\mathbf{p}_\tau(\underline{A})$, by replacing each letter a_i with operator A_i and each κ_α with the number $\text{Tr}(\tau \hat{\alpha}) = \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha})$, where $\hat{\alpha}$ is the operator corresponding to the word α . The generalisation to \mathbb{T}_a^{abc} is straightforward.

Here is an example of τ -evaluation.

Example A.2. Consider $\underline{a} = (a_1, a_2, a_3)$. We have $\mathbf{p} = \kappa_{a_1} \kappa_{a_1 a_3} + \kappa_{a_2}^2 \in T_a$ and $\mathbf{q} = a_1 \kappa_{a_1} \kappa_{a_2} a_3 \in \mathbb{T}_a^a$. For evaluation, we may choose the Hilbert space of a qubit with the variables being Pauli matrices $\vec{\sigma} = (\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z)$. Take τ as an arbitrary density operator. Whence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{p}_\tau(\vec{\sigma}) &= \text{Tr}(\tau \sigma_x) \text{Tr}(\tau \sigma_x \sigma_z) + \text{Tr}(\tau \sigma_y)^2 \\ \mathbf{q}_\tau(\vec{\sigma}) &= \sigma_x \text{Tr}(\tau \sigma_x) \text{Tr}(\tau \sigma_y) \sigma_z. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, due to Appendix A.4, both \mathbb{T}_a^a and \mathbb{T}_a^{abc} are topological vector spaces. As mentioned before, this observation is important because it allows us to apply the Banach–Alaoglu Theorem.

Remark A.3. We can generalise the notion of scalar extension to more alphabets. For example, we can enlarge \mathbb{T}_a^{abc} via the scalar extension of \underline{c} , which is identified by ν . Using subscripts to refer to alphabets that admit scalar extensions, define $T_{ac} = \mathbb{R}[\kappa_\alpha, \nu_\gamma]$, $\alpha \in \langle \underline{a} \rangle$, $\gamma \in \langle \underline{c} \rangle$ and $\mathbb{T}_{ac}^{abc} = T_{ac} \langle \underline{a}, \underline{b}, \underline{c} \rangle$. In addition, we need the commutation relations $[\kappa_\alpha, \nu_\gamma] = 0$.

Also, note that it is possible to generalise τ -evaluation to noncommutative polynomials with multiple scalar extensions by considering a tensor product of Hilbert spaces and associating scalar extension operators to suitable partial traces. In the context of bilocal scenarios, this extra scalar extension does not provide any new information.

A.3. Moment matrix and unital symmetric linear functional

We discuss the equivalence between the moment matrices, such as Γ^n in Section 2.1, and linear functional of \mathbb{T}^{abc} . The discussion here has an obvious generalisation to \mathbb{T}_a^{abc} .

Without loss of generality, we work with $\mathbb{T}^a = \mathbb{R}\langle a \rangle$ for convenience. Fix $d \in \mathbb{N}$, denote $\mathbb{T}_{\leq 2d}^a$ as all polynomials with words of length $\leq 2d$.

A matrix H indexed by words of length $\leq d$ is said to satisfy *noncommutative Hankel condition* if

$$H_{\omega, \nu} = H_{\omega', \nu'}, \text{ whenever } \omega^\dagger \nu = \omega'^\dagger \nu'.$$

The matrix H indexed by words of length $\leq d$ is a *moment matrix of order d* , also known as *Hankel matrix*, if it satisfies the noncommutative Hankel condition, is positive semi-definite, and $H_{1,1} = 1$. We note that this coincides with the properties of the moment matrix Γ^n in the standard NPA hierarchy, which justifies the terminology “moment matrix”.

To study the properties of \mathbb{T}^{abc} , a natural object to consider is its dual, which is the space of its linear functionals. In particular, we focus on *unital symmetric positive linear functional* $L : \mathbb{T}_{\leq 2d}^a \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. A linear functional L is said to be *unital* if $L(1) = 1$ and *symmetric* if $L(\mathbf{p}) = L(\mathbf{p}^\dagger)$ for all \mathbf{p} in the domain of L . If $L(\mathbf{p}^\dagger \mathbf{p}) \geq 0$ for all $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{T}_{\leq 2d}^a$, we say that L is positive.

These two objects are, in fact, equivalent. Given a unital symmetric positive linear functional $L : \mathbb{T}_{\leq 2d}^a \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we can define a moment matrix H of order d via formula $H_{\omega, \nu} = L(\omega^\dagger \nu)$, and vice versa. To conclude the equivalence, the only nontrivial thing that needs to be checked is the positiveness.

Indeed, for any two polynomials $\mathbf{p} = \sum_{\omega} p_{\omega} \omega$, $\mathbf{q} = \sum_{\nu} q_{\nu} \nu \in \mathbb{T}_{\leq d}^a$, we obtain two vectors \vec{p} and \vec{q} given by the real coefficients p_{ω} and q_{ν} . We then compute

$$L(\mathbf{p}^\dagger \mathbf{q}) = \sum_{\omega, \nu} p_{\omega}^\dagger q_{\nu} L(\omega^\dagger \nu) = \sum_{\omega, \nu} p_{\omega} q_{\nu} H_{\omega, \nu} = \vec{p}^T H \vec{q},$$

and the equivalence follows.

The moment matrix perspective is taken in the main part of the paper, as is most of the physical literature on NPA hierarchy. In Appendix C, however, the notation of linear functional is much more convenient. The equivalence of these two perspectives enables such an interchange of notation.

A.4. Noncommutative polynomials form topological vector spaces

We show that both \mathbb{T}_a^a and \mathbb{T}_a^{abc} are topological vector spaces, which implies that \mathbb{T}^a and \mathbb{T}^{abc} are also topological vector spaces. Let us focus on the case of \mathbb{T}_a^a , as the

subsequent generalisation is rather straightforward. While the vector space structure is clear, we need to endow a reasonable topology. To this end, we seek a suitable norm for \mathbb{T}_a^a .

Recalling the notion of τ -evaluation in Section A.2, we endow the topology with the following norm: for any $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{T}_a^a$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{p}\| = \max\{ & \|\mathbf{p}_\tau(\underline{A})\|_{\text{op}} \mid \forall k, n \in \mathbb{N}, \\ & \underline{A} \in \text{Sym}_k^n(\mathbb{R}), \|A_i\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1, \forall i = 1, \dots, n \\ & \tau \in \text{Mat}_k(\mathbb{R}), \text{Tr}(\tau) = 1, \tau \geq 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{Sym}_k^n(\mathbb{R})$ is the set of n -tuples of $k \times k$ symmetric real matrices (the variables) and $\|\cdot\|_{\text{op}}$ is the usual matrix norm.

This is indeed a norm: Both the triangular inequality and the absolute homogeneity are clear from the definition. Positive-definiteness is due to the fact that no non-zero trace polynomial vanishes on matrices of all finite sizes. The topological structure follows.

B. Detailed proofs for convergence of bilocal NPA hierarchy

In this section, we prove in detail that both the NonSDP bilocal NPA hierarchy and the scalar extension bilocal NPA hierarchy converge to the Commutator Bilocal Quantum Distribution. In addition, we show that the rank loop condition indicates finite stopping criteria.

B.1. Proof for factorisation bilocal NPA hierarchy

Let us first prove Theorem 3.1.

Proof. We start with the easier direction, given any $n \geq 3$ and suppose that we have a Commutative Bilocal Quantum Distribution \vec{Q} as in Definition 3.2. Without loss of generality, we may assume $\tau = |\phi_1\rangle\langle\phi_1|$ for some normalised vector $|\phi_1\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ by purification. We now wish to show the factorisation bilocal NPA hierarchy of order n is satisfied for all $n \geq 3$.

To this end, we use the canonical abstraction and define the n th order moment matrix Γ^n through $\Gamma_{\omega, \nu}^n = \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\omega}\hat{\nu})$, where $\hat{\omega}$ and $\hat{\nu}$ are the operators corresponding to the words $\omega, \nu \in \langle \underline{a}, \underline{b}, \underline{c} \rangle$.

By construction, Γ^n clearly satisfies the linear constraints and recovers \vec{Q} with the appropriate choice of words. Positivity is ensured since Γ^n is a Gram matrix. We only need to check the nonlinear factorisation constraint. Let α and γ be words in $\langle \underline{a} \rangle$ and

$\langle c \rangle$, respectively. We compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Tr}_\tau(\hat{a}^\dagger \tau \hat{\gamma}) &= \mathrm{Tr}(\tau \hat{a}^\dagger \tau \hat{\gamma}) \\
&= \mathrm{Tr}(\rho \sigma \hat{a}^\dagger \rho \sigma \hat{\gamma}) \\
&= \mathrm{Tr}(\rho \hat{a}^\dagger \sigma \rho \sigma \hat{\gamma}) \\
&= \mathrm{Tr}(\hat{a}^\dagger \sigma \rho \sigma \hat{\gamma} \rho) \\
&= \mathrm{Tr}(\hat{a}^\dagger \sigma \rho \sigma \rho \hat{\gamma}) \\
&= \mathrm{Tr}(\hat{a}^\dagger \tau^2 \hat{\gamma}) = \mathrm{Tr}_\tau(\hat{a}^\dagger \hat{\gamma}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the commutativity and cyclicity of the trace are applied several times. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_{\alpha, \gamma}^n &= \mathrm{Tr}_\tau(\hat{a}^\dagger \hat{\gamma}) \\
&= \mathrm{Tr}_\tau(\hat{a}^\dagger \tau \hat{\gamma}) \\
&= \langle \phi_1 | \hat{a}^\dagger | \phi_1 \rangle \langle \phi_1 | \hat{\gamma} | \phi_1 \rangle \\
&= \mathrm{Tr}_\tau(\hat{a}^\dagger) \mathrm{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\gamma}) = \Gamma_{\alpha, 1}^n \Gamma_{1, \gamma}^n,
\end{aligned}$$

as desired.

Conversely, we construct a GNS representation of \mathbb{T}^{abc} given the existence of Factorisation Bilocal Moment Matrix Γ^n of order n for any natural number $n \geq 3$, exactly as in [29]. We then construct the operators ρ and σ with the help of nonlinear factorisation constraints.

We only provide a quick sketch for the GNS representation here, since it was explicitly done in [29]. For a more mathematical-style GNS construction, we refer the interested readers to the proof for Lemma C.1.

According to the Banach–Anaoğlu Theorem, there exists a subsequence $\{\Gamma^{n_i}\}$ of Γ^n that converges to a limit Γ^∞ in the weak- \star topology. In particular, the convergence is pointwise, i.e. $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_{\omega, \nu}^{n_i} = \Gamma_{\omega, \nu}^\infty$ for all ω, ν , and hence the limit Γ^∞ satisfies all linear constraints and nonlinear factorisation constraints. Let Γ_N^∞ denote the extracted submatrix of Γ^∞ indexed by words of length $\leq N$, it follows that Γ_N^∞ is positive for all N .

Now we apply a sequential Cholesky decomposition of the matrices Γ_N^∞ , which realises Γ^∞ as a Gram matrix of an *infinite* family of vectors $\{|\phi_\omega\rangle\}$ indexed by all words ω and

$$\Gamma_{\omega, \nu}^\infty = \langle \phi_\omega | \phi_\nu \rangle.$$

The desired Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is then defined as the closure of the linear span of $\{|\phi_\omega\rangle\}$, with respect to the inner product induced by the above formula. Let $|\phi_1\rangle = |v^{00}\rangle$ denote the vector corresponding to the null word 1, we define the global state $\tau = |\phi_1\rangle\langle\phi_1| = |v^{00}\rangle\langle v^{00}|$.

Now, for each word $\omega = \alpha\beta\gamma \in \langle \underline{a}, \underline{b}, \underline{c} \rangle$, we can construct the corresponding operators with the same decomposition $\hat{\omega} = \hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}\hat{\gamma}$, where the commutation relation

$$[\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}] = [\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\gamma}] = [\hat{\beta}, \hat{\gamma}]$$

is satisfied. For each letter $a_i \in \underline{a}$, the operator \hat{a}_i is a Hermitian projector acting on \mathcal{H} via the formula

$$\hat{a}_i |\phi_v\rangle = |\phi_{\hat{a}_i v}\rangle,$$

and meeting all standard NPA hierarchy constraints. Similarly to the letters $b_j \in \underline{b}$ and $c_k \in \underline{c}$.

To construct operators ρ and σ , define $V_{ABL} = \text{Span}\{P(\{\hat{\alpha}\})\}_P$ as the subspace generated by all polynomials that only evaluate operators $\hat{\alpha}$. Clearly, the space V_{ABL} is not empty, since it contains $|v^{00}\rangle$. Starting from $|v^{00}\rangle$, we use the Gram–Schmidt process to construct an orthogonal basis $\{P_i(\{\hat{\alpha}\})|v^{00}\rangle = |v^{i0}\rangle, i \in I\}$ for some polynomials P_i and some countable index set I . We similarly introduce $V_{BRC} = \text{Span}\{Q(\{\hat{\gamma}\})\}_Q$ with the orthogonal basis $\{Q_j(\{\hat{\gamma}\})|v^{00}\rangle = |v^{0j}\rangle, j \in J\}$ for some countable index set J . We may assume $0 \in I \cap J$. Now, we define

$$\rho = \sum_j |v^{0j}\rangle\langle v^{0j}| \quad (\text{B.1})$$

$$\sigma = \sum_i |v^{i0}\rangle\langle v^{i0}|. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

It remains to check that both ρ and σ satisfy the desired properties in Definition 3.2. Clearly we have $\rho^2 = \rho$, $\sigma^2 = \sigma$.

We claim that $\langle v^{i0}|v^{0j}\rangle = 0$ for all $i \in I \setminus \{0\}$ and $j \in J \setminus \{0\}$. Indeed, if $i, j \neq 0$, we may assume $P_i(\{\hat{\alpha}\}) = \sum_{\hat{\alpha}} p_{\hat{\alpha}}^i \hat{\alpha}$ and $Q_j(\{\hat{\gamma}\}) = \sum_{\hat{\gamma}} q_{\hat{\gamma}}^j \hat{\gamma}$, for some real coefficients $p_{\hat{\alpha}}^i$ and $q_{\hat{\gamma}}^j$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v^{i0}|v^{0j}\rangle &= \langle v^{00}|P_i(\{\hat{\alpha}\})^\dagger \cdot Q_j(\{\hat{\gamma}\})|v^{00}\rangle \\ &= \sum_{\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\gamma}} (p_{\hat{\alpha}}^i)^\dagger q_{\hat{\gamma}}^j \cdot \langle v^{00}|\hat{\alpha}^\dagger \hat{\gamma}|v^{00}\rangle \\ &= \sum_{\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\gamma}} (p_{\hat{\alpha}}^i)^\dagger q_{\hat{\gamma}}^j \cdot \Gamma_{\alpha, \gamma}^\infty \\ &= \sum_{\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\gamma}} (p_{\hat{\alpha}}^i)^\dagger q_{\hat{\gamma}}^j \cdot \Gamma_{\alpha, 1}^\infty \cdot \Gamma_{1, \gamma}^\infty \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\gamma}} (p_{\hat{\alpha}}^i)^\dagger q_{\hat{\gamma}}^j \cdot \langle v^{00} | \hat{\alpha}^\dagger | v^{00} \rangle \langle v^{00} | \hat{\gamma} | v^{00} \rangle \\
&= \langle v^{00} | P_i(\{\hat{\alpha}\})^\dagger | v^{00} \rangle \langle v^{00} | Q_j(\{\hat{\gamma}\}) | v^{00} \rangle \\
&= \langle v^{i0} | v^{00} \rangle \langle v^{00} | v^{0j} \rangle = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where both nonlinear factorisation constraint and orthogonality are applied. It follows that

$$\rho \cdot \sigma = \sum_{ij} |v^{0j}\rangle \langle v^{0j}| \cdot |v^{i0}\rangle \langle v^{i0}| = |v^{00}\rangle \langle v^{00}| = \tau = \sigma \cdot \rho.$$

Finally, we check $[\rho, \hat{\gamma}] = [\hat{\alpha}, \sigma] = 0$. Observe that the support of $[\rho, \hat{\gamma}]$ is within V_{BRC} and

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle v^{0j} | [\hat{\gamma}, \rho] | v^{0j'} \rangle &= \sum_k \langle v^{0j} | \hat{\gamma} | v^{0k} \rangle \langle v^{0k} | v^{0j'} \rangle - \sum_k \langle v^{0j} | v^{0k} \rangle \langle v^{0k} | \hat{\gamma} | v^{0j'} \rangle \\
&= \langle v^{0j} | \hat{\gamma} | v^{0j'} \rangle - \langle v^{0j} | \hat{\gamma} | v^{0j'} \rangle = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

for all $j, j' \in J$. It follows that $[\rho, \hat{\gamma}] = 0$. The analogous argument with the basis on V_{ABL} shows that $[\hat{\alpha}, \sigma] = 0$. It is straightforward that Definition 3.2.(iv) is true, which finishes the proof. \blacksquare

Remark B.1. In mathematical notation, the GNS representation we constructed in the above proof is the triple (\mathcal{H}, π, τ) , where the \star -representation

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi : \mathbb{T}^{abc} &\rightarrow \mathcal{H} \\
\omega &\mapsto \hat{\omega}
\end{aligned}$$

satisfies all the desired NPA constraints. The state (in the functional analysis sense) τ is defined by the linear completion of the formula

$$\tau(\hat{\omega}) = \tau(\pi(\omega)) = \Gamma_{1,\omega}^\infty = \langle \phi_1 | \phi_\omega \rangle,$$

which is in bijective correspondence to the density operator $|\phi_1\rangle \langle \phi_1|$.

This connects the notation used in Appendix B.2 and Appendix C.

B.2. Proof for scalar extension NPA hierarchy

While intuitive, the fact that the scalar extension operators $\hat{\kappa}_\alpha$ are scalar multiples of the identity is nontrivial. We shall deal with the technicality in Appendix C and prove this fact in Corollary C.2. For now, let us assume this fact and show Theorem 3.2.

Proof. For the easy direction, given any $n \geq 3$ and suppose that we have a Commutative Bilocal Quantum Distribution \vec{Q} as in Definition 3.2. Construct the alphabets \underline{a} , \underline{b} , and \underline{c} with scalar extension $\underline{\kappa_A}$ as in Definition 3.6. For each operator $\hat{\alpha}$ corresponding to α , associate the scalar extension operator $\hat{\kappa}_\alpha = \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha}) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with the scalar extension letter κ_α .

We now define Ω^n via $\Omega_{\omega, \nu}^n = \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\omega} \hat{\nu})$. By construction, we only need to check

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{1, \kappa_\alpha}^n &= \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\kappa}_\alpha) \\ &= \text{Tr}(\tau \cdot \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha}) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}) \\ &= \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha}) \text{Tr}_\tau(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}) = \Omega_{1, \alpha}^n. \end{aligned}$$

For the converse, the first step is exactly the same as in Appendix B.1, so we omit the details here. Construct a GNS representation (\mathcal{H}, π, τ) from the weak- \star limit Ω^∞ of the given scalar extension hierarchy $\{\Omega^n\}_n$, with

$$\vec{\Omega}_{\omega, \nu}^\infty = \langle \phi_\omega | \phi_\nu \rangle$$

and \mathcal{H} being the closed linear span of $\{|\phi_\omega\rangle\}$. Again, the vector $|\phi_1\rangle = |v^{00}\rangle$ corresponding to the null word 1 is a cyclic vector of \mathcal{H} . Unlike Section B.1, here we also have the scalar extension operator $\hat{\kappa}_\omega$ associated with the scalar extension word κ_ω , which is fully commuting. All words admit the decomposition of the form $\omega = \kappa\alpha\beta\gamma$ that has the representation

$$\pi(\omega) = \pi(\kappa\alpha\beta\gamma) = \hat{\omega} = \hat{\kappa}\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}\hat{\gamma}.$$

Additionally, for each letter $a_i \in \underline{a}$, $b_j \in \underline{b}$, and $c_k \in \underline{c}$, the associated operators satisfy all the standard NPA constraints.

It remains to check the constraints involving scalar extension. Due to Remark C.3, we may apply Corollary C.2 to conclude that any scalar extension word $\hat{\kappa}_\alpha$ is a scalar multiple, that is, $\hat{\kappa}_\alpha = c \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$ for some constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Since Equation 3.5 holds, we must have

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{1, \alpha}^\infty &= \Omega_{1, \kappa_\alpha}^\infty \\ \langle \phi_1 | \phi_\alpha \rangle &= \langle \phi_1 | \phi_{\kappa_\alpha} \rangle \\ \langle \phi_1 | \hat{\alpha} | \phi_1 \rangle &= \langle \phi_1 | \hat{\kappa}_\alpha | \phi_1 \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

which implies the formula for scalar extension operators:

$$\hat{\kappa}_\alpha = \langle \phi_1 | \hat{\alpha} | \phi_1 \rangle \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}} = \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha}) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

This equation confirms our intuition and clearly satisfies all the necessary constraints.

Using this formula, the factorisation constraint (upto \dagger) can now be shown:

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_{1,\alpha\gamma}^\infty &= \Omega_{1,\kappa\alpha\gamma}^\infty \\ &= \langle \phi_1 | \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha}) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}} \hat{\gamma} | \phi \rangle \\ &= \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha}) \cdot \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\gamma}) = \Omega_{1,\alpha}^\infty \Omega_{1,\gamma}^\infty.\end{aligned}$$

One obvious consequence is that the scalar extension bilocal NPA hierarchy implies the factorisation bilocal NPA hierarchy. For the other implication, define

$$\rho = \sum_j |v^{0j}\rangle\langle v^{0j}| \quad (\text{B.4})$$

$$\sigma = \sum_i |v^{i0}\rangle\langle v^{i0}|. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Using the factorisation constraint, we can repeat the calculation done in Section B.1, which shows that ρ and σ satisfy all the required properties. \blacksquare

B.3. Proof for hierarchies with rank loop

In this section, we prove Theorem 3.3, which is restated for readability.

Theorem B.2 (Stopping criteria). *Let $\vec{Q} = \{q(abc|xyz)\}$ be a tripartite probability distribution. The following are equivalent:*

- (i) \vec{Q} admits a finite-dimensional Commutator Bilocal Quantum representation.
- (ii) \vec{Q} admits a Factorisation Bilocal Moment Matrix Γ^N which has a rank loop for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (iii) \vec{Q} admits a Scalar Extension Bilocal Moment Matrix Ω^N which has a rank loop for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. We first show that (i) \iff (ii), where the method is similar to [29], and we note that (i) \implies (iii) can be shown with the same argument. Then we complete the proof with (iii) \implies (ii).

Assume (i), that is, we consider \vec{P} having a finite-dimensional commutator representation: there exists a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} of dimension $d < \infty$, a pure state with decomposition $\tau = |\phi_1\rangle\langle\phi_1| = \rho \cdot \sigma = \sigma \cdot \rho$, and PVMs $\{A_{a|x}\}$, $\{B_{b|y}\}$, and $\{C_{c|z}\}$ such that the conditions of Def. 3.2 are satisfied. We need to prove (i) \implies (ii), that is, \vec{P} admits a Factorisation Bilocal Moment Matrix Γ^N which has a rank loop for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

For any $n \geq 3$, we construct the alphabets as in Definition 3.4 and define the moment matrix of order n through

$$\Gamma_{\omega, \nu}^n = \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\omega}\hat{\nu}) = \langle \phi_1 | \hat{\omega}^\dagger \hat{\nu} | \phi_1 \rangle,$$

for length $|\omega|, |\nu| \leq n$.

Note that $\text{rank}(\Gamma^n) \leq d$ since for any ω with length $\leq n$, $\text{Span}\{\{\hat{\omega}|\phi_1\rangle\}_{|\omega| \leq n}\}$ has dimension $\leq d$. Additionally, by construction Γ^n is compatible with \vec{P} . It is also a submatrix of Γ^{n+1} . Hence

$$\text{rank}(\Gamma^n) \leq \text{rank}(\Gamma^{n+1}) \leq d < \infty.$$

It follows that for some sufficiently large N there exists a Factorisation Moment Matrix Γ^N such that

$$\text{rank}(\Gamma^{N-1}) = \text{rank}(\Gamma^N).$$

Note that we can show (i) \implies (iii) using the same argument as above with the Scalar Extension Moment matrix constructed in Appendix B.2.

Let us now prove that (ii) \implies (i). Suppose that we have Γ^N that satisfies the rank loop condition and $\text{rank}(\Gamma^N) = d$. Similarly to Section B.1, we perform a Cholesky decomposition to realise that Γ^N is a Gram matrix given by

$$\Gamma_{\omega, \nu}^N = \langle \phi_\omega | \phi_\nu \rangle \tag{B.6}$$

for a *finite* family of vectors $\{|\phi_\omega\rangle\}_{|\omega| \leq N}$. We define the Hilbert space

$$\mathcal{H} = \text{Span}\{|\phi_\omega\rangle\}_{|\omega| \leq N}$$

with the inner product induced by the above equation. It follows that $\dim(\mathcal{H}) = d$.

Let $|\phi_1\rangle$ be the vector associated with the empty word 1 and let $\tau = |\phi_1\rangle\langle\phi_1|$. We construct the operator $\hat{\omega} = \hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}\hat{\gamma}$ corresponding to $\omega = \alpha\beta\gamma$ in the same way as in Section B.1. For each letter $a_i \in \underline{a}$, $b_j \in \underline{b}$, and $c_k \in \underline{c}$, the associated operators are self-adjoint.

Now we check the commutativity of \hat{a}_i , \hat{b}_j , and \hat{c}_k , and subsequently $\hat{\alpha}$, $\hat{\beta}$, and $\hat{\gamma}$. Since we only have words defined up to length N , we let ω, ν be arbitrary words of length $\leq N - 1$ and calculate

$$\langle \phi_\omega | [\hat{a}_i, \hat{b}_j] | \phi_\nu \rangle = \Gamma_{a_i\omega, b_j\nu}^N - \Gamma_{b_j\omega, a_i\nu}^N = 0,$$

due to linear constraints and self-adjointness. Similarly we have

$$\langle \phi_\omega | [\hat{a}_i, \hat{c}_k] | \phi_\omega \rangle = \langle \phi_\omega | [\hat{b}_j, \hat{c}_k] | \phi_\omega \rangle = 0.$$

Note that, in general, these equations are not enough to show the commutativity, as we also need the information from $\{|\phi_\omega\rangle\}_{|\omega|=N}$. But with the rank loop condition $\text{rank}(\Gamma^{N-1}) = \text{rank}(\Gamma^N)$ we may write

$$\mathcal{H} = \text{Span}\{|\phi_\omega\rangle\}_{|\omega|\leq N} = \text{Span}\{|\phi_\omega\rangle\}_{|\omega|\leq N-1}. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

That is, the vectors in RHS also span \mathcal{H} and thus the support of \hat{a}_i , \hat{b}_j , and \hat{c}_k . The commutativity follows.

Let us now construct the operators ρ and σ . As before, define

$$V_{ABL} = \text{Span}\{P(\{\hat{a}\})\}_P = \text{Span}\{P_i(\{\hat{a}\})|v^{00}\rangle = |v^{i0}\rangle, i \in I\}$$

for some index set I and

$$V_{BRC} = \text{Span}\{Q(\{\hat{\gamma}\})\}_Q = \text{Span}\{Q_j(\{\hat{\gamma}\})|v^{00}\rangle = |v^{0j}\rangle, j \in J\}$$

for some index set J . Then we define

$$\rho = \sum_j |v^{0j}\rangle\langle v^{0j}| \quad (\text{B.8})$$

$$\sigma = \sum_i |v^{i0}\rangle\langle v^{i0}|. \quad (\text{B.9})$$

As subspaces of \mathcal{H} , both V_{ABL} and V_{BRC} are of dimension $\leq N$, and thus ρ , σ are finite-dimensional operators.

Again, $|v^{i0}\rangle$ and $|v^{0j}\rangle$ are orthogonal if $i, j \neq 0$. Suppose that $P_i(\{\hat{a}\}) = \sum_{\hat{\alpha}} p_{\hat{\alpha}}^i \hat{\alpha}$ and $Q_j(\{\hat{\gamma}\}) = \sum_{\hat{\gamma}} q_{\hat{\gamma}}^j \hat{\gamma}$ for some real coefficients $p_{\hat{\alpha}}^i$ and $q_{\hat{\gamma}}^j$. We compute

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v^{i0}|v^{0j}\rangle &= \langle v^{00}|P_i(\{\hat{a}\})^\dagger \cdot Q_j(\{\hat{\gamma}\})|v^{00}\rangle \\ &= \sum_{\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\gamma}} (p_{\hat{\alpha}}^i)^\dagger q_{\hat{\gamma}}^j \cdot \langle v^{00}|\hat{\alpha}^\dagger \hat{\gamma}|v^{00}\rangle \\ &= \sum_{\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\gamma}} (p_{\hat{\alpha}}^i)^\dagger q_{\hat{\gamma}}^j \cdot \Gamma_{\alpha, \gamma}^N \\ &= \sum_{\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\gamma}} (p_{\hat{\alpha}}^i)^\dagger q_{\hat{\gamma}}^j \cdot \Gamma_{\alpha, 1}^N \cdot \Gamma_{1, \gamma}^N \\ &= \sum_{\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\gamma}} (p_{\hat{\alpha}}^i)^\dagger q_{\hat{\gamma}}^j \cdot \langle v^{00}|\hat{\alpha}^\dagger|v^{00}\rangle \langle v^{00}|\hat{\gamma}|v^{00}\rangle \\ &= \langle v^{00}|P_i(\{\hat{a}\})^\dagger|v^{00}\rangle \langle v^{00}|Q_j(\{\hat{\gamma}\})|v^{00}\rangle \\ &= \langle v^{i0}|v^{00}\rangle \langle v^{00}|v^{0j}\rangle = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then the same argument as in Section B.1 shows that ρ , σ satisfy Definition 3.2.

Finally, we show (iii) \implies (ii). Suppose that we have some Ω^N with a rank loop and let us first show that it also satisfies the factorisation constraints. Similarly as in the proof of (iii) \implies (i), we obtain a GNS representation $(\mathcal{H}, \tau = |\phi_1\rangle\langle\phi_1|)$ of $\dim \mathcal{H} = d < \infty$, where the operators $\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\gamma}, \hat{\kappa}_\alpha$ are associated with $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \kappa_\alpha$. Then by the rank loop condition, the exact same argument shows that all the desired commutation relations are satisfied.

Using these operators, we follow the formula in Appendix B.2 to construct a hierarchy of Ω^m compatible with Ω^N for all $m \geq N$. Note that the rank of all Ω^m must be $\leq d$. By the Banach–Analogu Theorem, we find a limit Ω^∞ that is compatible with Ω^m for all $m \geq N$. Therefore, as shown in Appendix B.2 it can be concluded that Ω^∞ satisfies all the nonlinear factorisation constraints. It follows that the compatible submatrices Ω^m also satisfies $\Omega_{\alpha,\gamma}^m = \Omega_{\alpha,1}^m \Omega_{1,\gamma}^m$ for all $m \geq N$.

Therefore, for each m , we may extract Factorisation Bilocal Moment Matrix Γ^m from Ω^m by forgetting all the indices involved with κ_α . Observe that $\text{rank}(\Gamma^m) \leq \text{rank}(\Gamma^{m+1}) \leq d$ for all $m \geq N$. Repeating the argument in (i) \implies (ii), we conclude that there exists a sufficiently large M such that Γ^M admits a rank loop. \blacksquare

C. Scalar extension operators are scalars

In order to prove the sufficiency of the scalar extension bilocal NPA hierarchy, we need one more technical lemma, which justifies the terminology of the “scalar extension”. That is, we want to show that, given an operator $\hat{\alpha}$ corresponding to the word α , the operator corresponding to the scalar extension κ_α takes the form $\hat{\kappa}_\alpha = \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha}) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$.

In fact, this is a consequence of the noncommutative polynomial analogy of the following theorem in the representation theory of C^* -algebra: a GNS representation (aka. cyclic representation) of a C^* -algebra is irreducible iff the state is pure iff the state is an extreme point of the space of states; see [8, Theorem 2.3.19]. Therefore, in this section, we take the linear functional approach and consider the techniques used in [23].

We can actually prove a more general result by considering a broader class of positive unital symmetric linear functionals. Instead of requiring positivity for the whole $\text{Sym}\mathbb{T}_a^{abc} = \{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{T}_a^{abc} \mid \mathbf{p}^\dagger = \mathbf{p}\}$, we only require positivity for some subset $M \subset \text{Sym}\mathbb{T}_a^{abc}$. For technical reasons, we further require M to be an *archimedean quadratic module*, that is, for all $\omega \in \mathbb{T}_a^{abc}$ it satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} 1 \in M, M + M \subset M, \omega^\dagger M \omega \subset M, \\ \text{and } \exists N \in \mathbb{N} : N - \omega^\dagger \omega \in M. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\text{Sym}\mathbb{T}_a^{abc}$ is an archimedean quadratic module.

We first state the lemma for the representation of \mathbb{T}_a^a , the case of \mathbb{T}_a^{abc} follows as an easy corollary.

Lemma C.1. *Let $M \subset \text{Sym}\mathbb{T}_a^a$ be an archimedean quadratic module and let $L : \mathbb{T}_a^a \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a unital symmetric linear functional such that $L(M) \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.*

Then there exists a GNS representation (\mathcal{H}, π, τ) associated with L , where \mathcal{H} is a Hilbert space, $\pi : \mathbb{T}_a^a \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is a \star -representation, and $\tau : \pi(\mathbb{T}_a^a) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a state. It follows that $\pi(T_a) = \mathbb{R}\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$, i.e. scalar extension operators are scalar multiples.

Proof. The proof consists of three steps. We start by applying the Krein-Milman Theorem to reduce the problem to the case where L is an extreme point, which is analogous to pure states in [8, Theorem 2.3.19]. Then we construct the desired GNS representation in the language of noncommutative polynomial. We conclude the proof by showing that the scalar extension operators are indeed scalars.

We begin with an analogous argument made in the proof in Section B.1 but formulated from the linear functional perspective. Define the set

$$C = \{L' : \mathbb{T}_a^a \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid L'(M) \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, L' \text{ is a unital symmetric linear functional}\}.$$

The set C is dual to \mathbb{T}_a^a and is clearly nonempty since it contains L . It is also convex by definition. Therefore, with the observation that \mathbb{T}_a^a is a topological vector space, we may apply the Banach-Alaoglu Theorem to conclude that C is weak- \star compact.

Now the Krein-Milman Theorem implies that any $L' \in C$ is a weak- \star limit of some convex combination of the extreme points. By linearity and continuity, it suffices to assume that $L \in \text{ex}(C)$ without loss of generality.

We wish to construct a suitable GNS representation. To do so, we define an inner product given by the formula

$$\langle q \mid p \rangle = L(pq^\dagger),$$

for any $p, q \in \mathbb{T}_a^a$. In addition, define the set

$$\mathcal{N} = \{q \in \mathbb{T}_a^a \mid L(qq^\dagger) = \langle q \mid q \rangle = 0\}.$$

We claim that \mathcal{N} is a linear subspace and a left-ideal. Indeed, for any $p, q \in \mathbb{T}_a^a$ and some constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$, we apply the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to obtain

$$L((p + cq)(p + cq)^\dagger) \leq 2c\sqrt{L(pp^\dagger)L(qq^\dagger)} = 0,$$

which shows the subspace structure. To see that it is a left-ideal, let $q \in \mathcal{N}$ and $p \in \mathbb{T}_a^a$. Since M is archimedean, there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ such that $1 - \delta pp^\dagger \in M$ and,

hence,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq L(\mathbf{q}(1 - \delta \mathbf{p} \mathbf{p}^\dagger) \mathbf{q}^\dagger) &= L(\mathbf{q} \mathbf{q}^\dagger) - \delta L(\mathbf{q} \mathbf{p} (\mathbf{q} \mathbf{p})^\dagger) \\ &\leq L(\mathbf{q} \mathbf{q}^\dagger) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

implying $\mathbf{q} \mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{N}$.

Also, note that $L(\mathcal{N}) = 0$. Fix any $\delta > 0$ and let $\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{N}$, the conditions $L(M) \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and M being archimedean imply

$$0 \leq L((\delta \pm \mathbf{q})(\delta \pm \mathbf{q})^\dagger) = \delta(\delta \pm 2L(\mathbf{q})),$$

which shows the claim due to δ is chosen arbitrarily.

Therefore, we can consider the quotient space $\mathbb{T}_a^a/\mathcal{N}$ where we denote the equivalence class of $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{T}_a^a$ by $|\phi_{\mathbf{p}}\rangle$, the equivalence class corresponding to the empty word 1 is denoted as $|\phi_1\rangle$. The inner product defined earlier naturally induces an inner product on $\mathbb{T}_a^a/\mathcal{N}$ via the formula

$$\langle \phi_\omega | \phi_\nu \rangle = L(\omega^\dagger \nu). \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Now, we define the desired Hilbert space \mathcal{H} as the completion of $\mathbb{T}_a^a/\mathcal{N}$ with respect to the inner product $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$ and denote the conjugation by \dagger .

The \star -representation $\pi : \mathbb{T}_a^a \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is defined by left multiplication, namely

$$\pi(\mathbf{p}) |\phi_\omega\rangle = \hat{p} |\phi_\omega\rangle = |\phi_{\mathbf{p}\omega}\rangle, \quad (\text{C.2})$$

with the kernel $\ker(\pi) = \mathcal{N}$. Note that the action of π makes the vector $|\phi_1\rangle$ cyclic in \mathcal{H} .

Finally, we define the state $\tau : \pi(\mathbb{T}_a^a) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ via

$$\tau(\pi(\mathbf{p})) = L(\mathbf{p}) = \langle \phi_1 | \phi_{\mathbf{p}} \rangle. \quad (\text{C.3})$$

It can be shown that τ is in bijective correspondence with the density operator $|\phi_1\rangle\langle\phi_1|$ by functional analysis. We obtain the desired GNS triple (\mathcal{H}, π, τ) .

For any $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{T}_a^a$ and letter $a_i \in \underline{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$, we check

$$\langle \phi_{\mathbf{p}} | \pi(a_i)^\dagger | \phi_{\mathbf{p}} \rangle = \langle \phi_{a_i \mathbf{p}} | \phi_{\mathbf{p}} \rangle = L((a_i \mathbf{p})^\dagger \mathbf{p}) = L(\mathbf{p}^\dagger a_i \mathbf{p}) = \langle \phi_{\mathbf{p}} | \pi(a_i) | \phi_{\mathbf{p}} \rangle,$$

implying that the operator $\pi(a_i)$ is self-adjoint. The same calculation shows that $\pi(\kappa_\alpha)$ is self-adjoint for any α .

The final step is to show that $\pi(T_a) = \mathbb{R}\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$. The set $\pi(T_a)$ is commutative and invariant under involution \dagger , so is its weak closure \mathcal{E} . Suppose, for contradiction, that $\pi(T_a) \supsetneq \mathbb{R}\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$, then we must also have $\mathcal{E} \supsetneq \mathbb{R}\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$. (The converse inclusion is clear.)

As a consequence of Borel Functional Calculus, it follows that \mathcal{E} admits a nontrivial projection P . By the cyclicity of $|\phi_1\rangle$, the nontriviality is equivalent to

$$P|\phi_1\rangle \neq 0 \text{ and } (1 - P)|\phi_1\rangle \neq 0.$$

Consider

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= \|P|\phi_1\rangle\|^2 = \langle\phi_1|P^2|\phi_1\rangle = \langle\phi_1|P|\phi_1\rangle \\ L_1(\mathbf{p}) &= \frac{\langle\phi_1|P\pi(\mathbf{p})P|\phi_1\rangle}{\lambda} \\ L_2(\mathbf{p}) &= \frac{\langle\phi_1|(\pi(\mathbf{p}) - P\pi(\mathbf{p})P)|\phi_1\rangle}{1 - \lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

We can easily check that $L_1, L_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ and that L is a convex combination of L_1 and L_2 :

$$L(\mathbf{p}) = \lambda L_1(\mathbf{p}) + (1 - \lambda)L_2(\mathbf{p}).$$

But L is assumed to be an extreme point, it follows that $L = L_1 = L_2$. In particular, we have the following equation

$$\lambda\langle\phi_1|\pi(\mathbf{p})|\phi_1\rangle = \langle\phi_1|P\pi(\mathbf{p})P|\phi_1\rangle. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

Furthermore, since P lies in the weak closure \mathcal{E} , there exists a sequence $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset T_a$ converging to P weakly under the action of π . By commutativity $[T_a, \mathbb{T}_a^a] = 0$ we compute

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle\phi_1|\pi(s_n)\pi(\mathbf{p})\pi(s_n)|\phi_1\rangle \\ &= \langle\phi_1|\pi(s_n \mathbf{p} s_n)|\phi_1\rangle \\ &= \langle\phi_1|\pi(\mathbf{p} s_n^2)|\phi_1\rangle \\ &= \langle\phi_1|\pi(\mathbf{p})\pi(s_n)^2|\phi_1\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

By letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain the equation

$$\langle\phi_1|P\pi(\mathbf{p})P|\phi_1\rangle = \langle\phi_1|\pi(\mathbf{p})P^2|\phi_1\rangle = \langle\phi_1|\pi(\mathbf{p})P|\phi_1\rangle. \quad (\text{C.5})$$

Combining Equation C.4 and Equation C.5, we can show

$$\langle\phi_1|\pi(\mathbf{p})\lambda|\phi_1\rangle = \langle\phi_1|P\pi(\mathbf{p})P|\phi_1\rangle = \langle\phi_1|\pi(\mathbf{p})P|\phi_1\rangle, \quad (\text{C.6})$$

whence the cyclicity of $|\phi_1\rangle$ implies that $P|\phi_1\rangle = \lambda|\phi_1\rangle$. Since P is a projection, we must have either $\lambda = 0$ or $\lambda = 1$. But then either $P|\phi_1\rangle = 0$ or $(1 - P)|\phi_1\rangle = 0$, leading to a contradiction. \blacksquare

Corollary C.2. *Let $M \subset \text{Sym}\mathbb{T}_a^{abc}$ be an archimedean quadratic module and let $L : \mathbb{T}_a^{abc} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a unital symmetric linear functional such that $L(M) \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.*

Then there exists a GNS representation (\mathcal{H}, π, τ) associated with L , where \mathcal{H} is some Hilbert space, $\pi : \mathbb{T}_a^{abc} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is a \star -representation and $\tau : \pi(\mathbb{T}_a^{abc}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a state. It follows that $\pi(T_a) = \mathbb{R}\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$, i.e. scalar extension operators are scalar multiples.

Proof. The proof of Lemma C.1 can be easily adapted to the ring \mathbb{T}_a^{abc} . ■

We also observe that this proof can be generalised to the case of having multiple scalar extensions.

Remark C.3. Note that $\text{Sym}\mathbb{T}_a^{abc}$ is an archimedean quadratic module, and the functional L that is positive over $\text{Sym}\mathbb{T}_a^{abc}$ is precisely a positive unital symmetric linear functional. This type of L corresponds to moment matrices.

Now, we associate a linear functional L with the given infinite Scalar Extension Moment Matrix Ω^∞ (as in Appendix B.2). To see this, first use the equivalence in the finite case and then apply the Banach–Anaoglu Theorem, as demonstrated by the proofs in both Appendix B.1 and Appendix C.

With the identification of L to Ω^∞ , we notice that the GNS representation for Corollary C.2 coincides with the GNS representation for the scalar extension bilocal NPA hierarchy in Section B.2.

Therefore, Corollary C.2 is applicable to the proof of Theorem 3.2 in order to conclude that any scalar extension operator $\hat{\kappa}_\alpha$ is a scalar, as previously claimed.

D. The inflation-NPA hierarchy

D.1. Formalism of inflation-NPA hierarchy in bilocal scenario

We use noncommutative polynomial formalism to encode the Inflational data of inflation order m . That is, we associate POVMs $\{\hat{A}_{a^i|x^i}^i\}$, $\{\hat{B}_{b^j,k|y^j,k}^{j,k}\}$, and $\{\hat{C}_{c^l|z^l}^l\}$ with alphabets \underline{a}^i , $\underline{b}^{j,k}$, and \underline{c}^l , for $i, j, k, l = 1, \dots, m$. We impose the same algebraic rules on all the letters inherited from the underlying operators and inflational structure.

Therefore, any word $\omega \in \langle \underline{a}^i, \underline{b}^{j,k}, \underline{c}^l \mid i, j, k, l = 1, \dots, m \rangle$ admits a decomposition⁹

$$\omega = \alpha^1 \cdots \alpha^m \beta \gamma^1 \cdots \gamma^m,$$

⁹Unlike the decomposition of words in non-inflated scenario, the expression here is not unique. Nonetheless, it is always possible to choose a canonical representation by fixing a rule on the ordering of all $\beta^{j,k}$ that respect the partial commutativity. We omit proposing such a rule since it is cumbersome and irrelevant to the following discussion.

where $\beta \in \langle \underline{b}^{jk} \mid j, k = 1, \dots, m \rangle$. Note that we cannot further write $\beta = \beta^{11} \dots \beta^{jk} \dots \beta^{mm}$ since β^{jk} does not commute with $\beta^{j'k'}$ in general.

The resulting ring of noncommutative polynomials is

$$\mathbb{T}\langle \alpha^1 \dots \alpha^m \underline{b}^{11} \dots \underline{b}^{mm} \underline{c}^1 \dots \underline{c}^m \rangle = \mathbb{R}\langle \underline{a}^i, \underline{b}^{jk}, \underline{c}^l \mid i, j, k, l = 1, \dots, m \rangle.$$

The product symmetric group $S_m \times S_m$ naturally acts on the inflation words by permuting the superscripts. For example, let $\theta, \theta' \in S_m$ and consider the word $\omega = \alpha^1 \dots \alpha^m \beta^{11} \dots \beta^{jk} \dots \beta^{mm} \gamma^1 \dots \gamma^m$. Then

$$(\theta \times \theta')(\omega) = \alpha^{\theta(1)} \dots \alpha^{\theta(m)} \beta^{\theta(1)\theta'(1)} \dots \beta^{\theta(j)\theta'(k)} \dots \beta^{\theta(m)\theta'(m)} \gamma^{\theta'(1)} \dots \gamma^{\theta'(m)}.$$

Now we can define Inflation Bilocal Moment Matrix and Inflation-NPA bilocal hierarchy.

Definition D.1 (Inflation Bilocal Moment Matrix). Fix $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\Xi^{n,m}$ be a square matrix indexed by all words $\omega \in \langle \underline{a}^i, \underline{b}^{jk}, \underline{c}^l \mid i, j, k, l = 1, \dots, m \rangle$ of length $|\omega| \leq n$. We say that $\Xi^{n,m}$ is a *mth-Inflation Moment Matrix of order n* if

- (i) $\Xi^{n,m}_{1,1} = 1$.
- (ii) $\Xi^{n,m}$ is positive.
- (iii) it satisfies all the linear constraints

$$\Xi^{n,m}_{\omega, \nu} = \Xi^{n,m}_{\omega', \nu'}$$

whenever $\omega^\dagger \nu = \omega'^\dagger \nu'$.

- (iv) it satisfies the $S_m \times S_m$ symmetry

$$\Xi^{n,m}_{1, \omega} = \Xi^{n,m}_{1, (\theta \times \theta')(\omega)}, \quad (\text{D.1})$$

for all permutations $\theta, \theta' \in S_m$.

We further say that $\Xi^{n,m}$ is compatible with the tripartite distribution \vec{Q} iff

$$\Xi^{n,m}_{1, \prod_{i=1}^m A^i_{\alpha^i | x^i} B^{i,i}_{b^{i,i} | y^i, i} C^i_{c^i | z^i}} = \prod_{i=1}^m q(a^i b^{i,i} c^i | x^i y^i z^i).$$

An infinite matrix $\Xi^{\infty, m}$ is said to be a *mth-Inflation Moment Matrix* iff all of its principal extracted matrices are *mth-Inflation Moment Matrix* of some finite order.

Remark D.1. As noted in the main text, there are extended nonlinear constraints that can also be imposed. That is,

$$\Xi^{n,m}_{1, \prod_{i=t}^s \alpha^i \beta^{ii} \gamma^i} = \prod_{i=t}^s \Xi^{n,m}_{1, \alpha^i \beta^{ii} \gamma^i} \quad (\text{D.2})$$

for $1 \leq t \leq s \leq m$ and arbitrary diagonal words $\omega^i = \alpha^i \beta^{ii} \gamma^i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ with length $\leq n$. We do not include this extended version since it is nonSDP and hence impractical.

It is likely that with a de Finetti-type argument, the extended nonlinear constraints follow from Definition D.1 in the asymptotic limit of n, m .

Definition D.2 (Bilocal inflation-NPA hierarchy). Let $\vec{Q} = \{q(abc|xyz)\}$ be a tripartite probability distribution. We say that \vec{Q} passes *bilocal inflation-NPA hierarchy* if for all integers $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 3$, there exists a m th-Inflation Bilocal Moment Matrix $\Xi^{n,m}$ of order n that is compatible with \vec{Q} .

As the archetype for quantum inflation for bilocal scenario, the Tensor Bilocal Quantum Distribution passes the bilocal inflation-NPA hierarchy, as expected.

Lemma D.2. *All Tensor Bilocal Quantum Distributions \vec{P} passes the bilocal inflation-NPA hierarchy.*

Proof. With inflation canonical abstraction we may define

$$\Xi_{\omega, \nu}^{n,m} = \text{Tr}_{\tau_n} \left(\hat{\omega}^\dagger \hat{\nu} \right)$$

for suitable words ω, ν . It is clear that $\Xi^{n,m}$ satisfies Definition D.1. ■

Next, we restate and prove Theorem 4.2, which is the observation that inflation-NPA hierarchy provides a tighter approximation than Tensor Bilocal Quantum correlations.

Theorem D.3. *If the probability distribution $\{\vec{P} = \{p(abc|xyz)\}$ passes the bilocal inflation-NPA hierarchy, then it also passes the factorisation and scalar extension bilocal NPA hierarchies.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2 it suffices to consider the scalar extension bilocal NPA hierarchy. For any $n \geq 3$ and $m \geq 2$, we show that we can obtain the Scalar Extension Moment Matrix Ω^n from m th-Inflation Moment Matrix $\Xi^{n,m}$.

In fact, it is enough to only have a second-order inflation $m = 2$. We first identify the alphabets $\underline{a}^1, \underline{b}^{11}$, and \underline{c}^1 of $\Xi^{n,2}$ with $\underline{a}, \underline{b}$, and \underline{c} for Ω^m . Furthermore, we identify the scalar extension κ_α with α^2 , which makes sense since α^2 commutes with $\alpha^1, \beta^{1,1}$, and γ^1 .

Now, define Ω^n by

$$\Omega_{1, \alpha \beta \gamma \kappa_\alpha}^n = \Xi_{1, \alpha^1 \beta^{1,1} \gamma^1 \alpha^2}^{n,2}.$$

By construction, condition (i), (ii), and (iii) of Definition 3.5 are evident. Condition (iv) follows easily due to the $S_m \times S_m$ symmetry

$$\Omega_{1,\alpha\gamma}^n = \Xi_{1,\alpha^1\gamma^1}^{n,2} = \Xi_{1,\alpha^2\gamma^1}^{n,2} = \Omega_{1,\kappa\alpha\gamma}^n.$$

■

However, the converse remains an open question.

D.2. The inflation-NPA hierarchy excludes the shared random bit distribution in the triangle scenario

In this section, we briefly explain why the inflation-NPA hierarchy can be used to prove the impossibility of obtaining a shared random bit distribution in the triangle scenario. This proof is directly inspired by the standard proof of [47].

Consider the uniform shared random bit distribution $\vec{P}_{ABC} = 1/2([000] + [111])$, where [000] (resp. [111]) is the deterministic distribution of all parties outputting 0 (resp. 1). Assume by contradiction that it admits an inflation-NPA hierarchy of compatible moment matrices $\Xi^{n,m}$. We now show that the existence of $\Xi^{2,2}$ already provides a contradiction.

First, note that the distribution $\vec{Q}_{A^{11}B^{11}C^{12}}$ with the coefficients

$$q(a_{11}b_{11}c_{12}) = \Xi_{A^{11}B^{11},C^{12}}^{2,2} \quad (\text{D.3})$$

is a probability distribution (for simplicity in the notation, we omitted the subscripts, e.g. A^{11} should be interpreted as $A_{a_{11}}^{11}$), as these numbers are positive (they can be seen as concrete measurement probabilities in a quantum experiment) and sum to one according to the constraints satisfied by $\Xi^{2,2}$.

According to the diagonalisation constraint, we have the marginal $\vec{Q}_{A^{11}B^{11}}$ over the first two outputs satisfying $\vec{Q}_{A^{11}B^{11}} = \vec{P}_{AB} = 1/2([00] + [11])$, meaning that we have $a^{11} = b^{11}$ is a shared uniform random bit. Moreover, we have $\vec{Q}_{B^{11}C^{12}} = \vec{Q}_{B^{11}C^{11}} = 1/2([00] + [11])$, where we first used the symmetry condition and then the diagonalisation constraint, meaning that we have $b^{11} = c^{12}$ is a shared uniform random bit. These two conditions imply that we must have $a^{11} = c^{12}$ is a shared random bit, that is, $\vec{Q}_{A^{11}C^{12}} = 1/2([00] + [11])$.

However, the symmetry condition also imposes $\vec{Q}_{A^{11}C^{12}} = \Xi_{A^{11},C^{12}}^{2,2} = \Xi_{A^{11},C^{22}}^{2,2}$, and the diagonalisation constraint implies $\Xi_{A^{11},C^{22}}^{2,2} = \vec{P}_A \cdot \vec{P}_C = 1/4([00] + [01] + [10] + [11])$, which is contradictory.

D.3. Commutator-based definition of quantum correlations in networks

In this section, we propose a general commutator-based definition of the accessible quantum correlations \vec{Q} feasible in an arbitrary network, generalising the Definition 3.2 of Commutator Bilocal Quantum Distributions \vec{Q} . Then, we discuss the potential issues with this definition.

The general commutator-based definition of the accessible quantum correlations \vec{Q} feasible in an arbitrary network is:

- (i) The global state, represented by a density operator τ , acts over a global Hilbert space \mathcal{H} .
- (ii) Each party A, B, C, \dots PVMs operators $\hat{A}_{a|x}, \hat{B}_{b|y}, \hat{C}_{c|z}, \dots$ acts over \mathcal{H} , two operators associated with different parties commute.
- (iii) $q(abc \dots |xyz \dots) = \text{Tr}_\tau \left(\hat{A}_{a|x} \hat{B}_{b|y} \hat{C}_{c|z} \dots \right)$.
- (iv) Each source is associated with a projector ρ, σ, π, \dots acting over \mathcal{H} , and two operators associated with different sources commute. Moreover, the product of these operators is $\tau = \rho \cdot \sigma \cdot \pi \dots$.
- (v) For any party (say, A) not connected to a source (say, corresponding to source ρ), the associated operators commute with the source projector (here, $[\rho, \hat{A}_{a|x}] = 0$).

Note that if we restrict to only (i), (ii), and (iii), we recover commutator multipartite quantum correlations as in the standard Bell scenarios.

As we show in Theorem 4.2, inflation-NPA method converges to a subset of the set of Commutator Bilocal Quantum Correlations. The question of equality, or strict inclusion, is open.

Strict inclusion would imply that either the definition of Commutator Bilocal Quantum Correlations cannot be taken as the quantum theory postulated correlations in the bilocal scenario, or that the inflation-NPA method is not an allowed method to characterise quantum correlations in the bilocal scenario.

In networks beyond the bilocal scenario, this commutator based postulate becomes even more suspicious. For instance, in the triangle scenario of Figure 3a, it reads:

Definition D.3 (Commutator Triangle Quantum Distributions). Let $\vec{Q} = \{q(abc|xyz)\}$ be a three-party probability distribution. We say that \vec{Q} is a *Commutator Triangle Quantum Distribution* iff there exists a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , a density operator τ , three mutually commuting positive operators (of possibly infinite trace) ρ, σ , and π , and some PVMs $\{\hat{A}_{a|x}\}$, $\{\hat{B}_{b|y}\}$, and $\{\hat{C}_{c|z}\}$ over \mathcal{H} such that

- (i) τ acts over \mathcal{H} .
- (ii) $[\hat{A}_{a|x}, \hat{B}_{b|y}] = [\hat{B}_{b|y}, \hat{C}_{c|z}] = [\hat{C}_{c|z}, \hat{A}_{a|x}] = 0$.

- (iii) $q(abc|xyz) = \text{Tr}_\tau \left(\hat{A}_{a|x} \hat{B}_{b|y} \hat{C}_{c|z} \right)$.
- (iv) $[\rho, \sigma] = [\sigma, \pi] = [\pi, \rho] = 0$ and $\tau = \rho \cdot \sigma \cdot \pi$.
- (v) $[\hat{A}_{a|x}, \rho] = [\hat{B}_{b|y}, \pi] = [\hat{C}_{c|z}, \sigma] = 0$.

In that case, there exists a weaker method than inflation-NPA to find a constraints on the obtainable correlations, based on the method of nonfanout inflation [20, 48]. It is solely based on the assumptions of causality and that any device should be replicable in independent copies [2, 4, 11, 12, 17]. For network scenarios without loops, the nonfanout inflation does not provide nontrivial constraints beyond the fact that marginal correlations between groups of parties not sharing a source should factorise (as there does not exist any nontrivial nonfanout inflation of no loop networks). However, in other networks such as the triangle network, it implies that a feasible \vec{Q} should be associated to compatible distributions in all the nonfanout inflation of this network. For instance, in the case of the triangle network, \vec{Q} should be associated to an other distribution \vec{R} defined in the hexagon inflation of the triangle, compatible with \vec{Q} . It is uncertain that any \vec{Q} satisfying the Definition D.3 above is always associated to such distributions \vec{R} in the hexagon inflation of the triangle. In case it is not, this would imply that such a version of quantum theory based on a commutator-based postulate does not allow to consider independent copies of systems, which we would see as a strong philosophical argument against this version of quantum theory.

E. The four party star network

The set of distributions that can be obtained in the four-party star network of Figure 3a (according to the tensor postulate) is a direct generalisation of Def. 3.1, with an extra state π_{DBD} acting over $\mathcal{H}_{B_D} \otimes \mathcal{H}_D$ and additional PVMs for D . We now discuss the potential generalisation of our proof in Section 3 to this new scenario. We show that when a distribution \vec{Q} admits a *Factorisation Star-shaped Trilocal Moment Matrix* (see Definition E.1), then it is an *Anti-state Commutator Star-shaped Quantum Distribution* (which is weaker than what we could expect following the definition of Appendix D.3). As we do not use all the assumptions at our disposition, we conjecture that a more restricted model, maybe the one of Section D.3, can be proven from the existence of such a hierarchy of Factorisation Star-shaped Trilocal Moment Matrix.

Let us first generalise the factorisation hierarchy by introducing pairwise factorisation constraints:

Definition E.1 (Factorisation Star-shaped Trilocal Moment Matrix). Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let Γ^n be a square matrix indexed by all words $\omega \in \langle \underline{a}, \underline{b}, \underline{c}, \underline{d} \rangle$ of length $|\omega| \leq n$. We say that Γ^n is a *Factorisation Star-shaped Trilocal Moment Matrix of order n* if

- (i) $\Gamma_{1,1}^n = 1$.
- (ii) Γ^n is positive.
- (iii) it satisfies all the linear constraints

$$\Gamma_{\omega,\nu}^n = \Gamma_{\omega',\nu'}^n$$

whenever $\omega^\dagger \nu = \omega'^\dagger \nu'$.

- (iv) it satisfies the pairwise nonlinear factorisation constraints

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{\alpha,\gamma}^n &= \Gamma_{\alpha,1}^n \cdot \Gamma_{1,\gamma}^n, \\ \Gamma_{\alpha,\delta}^n &= \Gamma_{\alpha,1}^n \cdot \Gamma_{1,\delta}^n, \\ \Gamma_{\gamma,\delta}^n &= \Gamma_{\gamma,1}^n \cdot \Gamma_{1,\delta}^n,\end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha \in \langle a \rangle$, $\gamma \in \langle c \rangle$, and $\delta \in \langle d \rangle$.

- (v) it satisfies the nonlinear constraints

$$\Gamma_{\alpha\gamma,\delta}^n = \Gamma_{\alpha\gamma,1}^n \cdot \Gamma_{1,\delta}^n,$$

equivalent to the three-factorisation $\Gamma_{\alpha\gamma,\delta}^n = \Gamma_{\alpha,1}^n \cdot \Gamma_{\gamma,1}^n \cdot \Gamma_{1,\delta}^n$ due to (iv).

An infinite matrix Γ^∞ is said to be a *Factorisation Star-shaped Trilocal Moment Matrix* if all of its extracted matrices are Factorisation Trilocal Moment Matrices of some finite order. We further say that Γ^n is compatible with the four-party distribution \vec{Q} iff

$$\Gamma_{1,A_{a|x}B_{b|y}C_{c|z}D_{d|w}}^n = q(abcd|xyzw).$$

Observe that condition (iv) in Definition E.1 does not imply condition (v). In other words, condition (iv) alone does not fully contain the consequences in terms of factorisation of the topology of the star-shaped network. This definition is associated with the following hierarchy of tests that some distribution \vec{Q} is feasible in the four-party star network:

Definition E.2 (Factorisation star-shaped trilocal NPA hierarchy). Let $\vec{Q} = \{q(abcd|xyzw)\}$ be a probability distribution for Alice, Bob, Charlie, and Dave. We say that \vec{Q} passes the *factorisation star-shaped trilocal NPA hierarchy* if for all integers $n \geq 4$, there exists a Factorisation Star-shaped Trilocal Moment Matrix Γ^n of order n that is compatible with \vec{Q} .

We now show that if \vec{Q} admits such a hierarchy, then it is an Anti-state Com-mutator Star-shaped Quantum Distribution (defined below). However, contrary to the bilocal scenario, we do not prove the converse and conjecture that it does not hold, as we suspect that our proof does not use condition (v) in Definition E.1.

Definition E.3 (Anti-state Commutator Star-shaped Trilocal Quantum Distributions).

Let $\vec{Q} = \{q(abcd|xyzw)\}$ be a probability distribution for Alice, Bob, Charlie, and Dave. We say that \vec{Q} is a *Anti-state Commutator Star-shaped Trilocal Quantum Distribution* iff there exists a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , a density operator τ , three positive operators (possibly infinite trace) $\bar{\rho}$, $\bar{\sigma}$, $\bar{\pi}$ commuting with each other, and PVMs $\{\hat{A}_{a|x}\}$, $\{\hat{B}_{b|y}\}$, $\{\hat{C}_{c|z}\}$, $\{\hat{D}_{d|w}\}$ over \mathcal{H} such that

- (i) $q(abcd|xyz) = \text{Tr}(\tau \cdot \hat{A}_{a|x} \cdot \hat{B}_{b|y} \cdot \hat{C}_{c|z} \cdot \hat{D}_{d|w})$
- (ii) $[\hat{A}_{a|x}, \hat{B}_{b|y}] = [\hat{A}_{a|x}, \hat{C}_{c|z}] = [\hat{A}_{a|x}, \hat{D}_{d|w}] = [\hat{B}_{b|y}, \hat{C}_{c|z}] = [\hat{B}_{b|y}, \hat{D}_{d|w}] = [\hat{C}_{c|z}, \hat{D}_{d|w}] = 0$
- (iii) $\tau = \bar{\rho} \cdot \bar{\sigma} = \bar{\sigma} \cdot \bar{\pi} = \bar{\pi} \cdot \bar{\rho}$
- (iv) $[\bar{\rho}, \bar{\sigma}] = [\bar{\rho}, \bar{\pi}] = [\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\pi}] = 0$
- (v) $[\hat{A}_{a|x}, \bar{\rho}] = [\hat{C}_{c|z}, \bar{\sigma}] = [\hat{D}_{d|w}, \bar{\pi}] = 0$

for all $\hat{A}_{a|x}$, $\hat{B}_{b|y}$, $\hat{C}_{c|z}$, and $\hat{D}_{d|w}$.

Note that this definition is not the natural extension of Def. 3.2. Indeed, here the operators $\bar{\rho}$, $\bar{\sigma}$, $\bar{\pi}$ should not be understood as the original states ρ , σ , π , but as the corresponding ‘‘anti-states’’ $\bar{\rho} = \sigma \cdot \pi$, $\bar{\sigma} = \pi \cdot \rho$ and $\bar{\pi} = \rho \cdot \sigma$. The bilocal scenario can be seen as a degenerated case: as there are only two states, we could interpret in the proof of Theorem 3.1 our constructed σ as $\bar{\rho}$ and ρ as $\bar{\sigma}$.

Theorem E.1 (Convergence of the factorisation star-shaped trilocal NPA hierarchy).

Suppose that $\vec{Q} = \{q(abcd|xyzw)\}$ is a probability distribution for Alice, Bob, Charlie, and Dave. If \vec{Q} passes all the factorisation star-shaped trilocal NPA hierarchy tests, then \vec{Q} is a *Anti-state Commutator Star-shaped Trilocal Quantum Distribution*.

Moreover, if we forget the condition (v) of Definition E.3 (three-factorisation), then the above two statements are equivalent.

Proof. The proof is completely analogous to the proof of Theorem 3.1 in Appendix B.1. Suppose we have a Anti-state Commutator Star-shaped Trilocal Quantum Distribution \vec{Q} and we wish to show that Definition E.3 can be satisfied modulo (v). The only non-trivial conditions that need to be shown are (iv).

Condition (iv) is done similarly to Appendix B.1. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Tr}_{\tau}(\hat{\alpha}^{\dagger} \tau \hat{\gamma}) &= \text{Tr}(\tau \hat{\alpha}^{\dagger} \tau \hat{\gamma}) = \text{Tr}(\bar{\sigma} \bar{\rho} \hat{\alpha}^{\dagger} \bar{\sigma} \bar{\rho} \hat{\gamma}) \\
 &= \text{Tr}(\bar{\rho} \hat{\alpha}^{\dagger} \bar{\sigma} \bar{\rho} \hat{\gamma} \bar{\sigma}) \\
 &= \text{Tr}(\hat{\alpha}^{\dagger} \bar{\rho} \bar{\sigma} \bar{\rho} \hat{\gamma}) \\
 &= \text{Tr}(\hat{\alpha}^{\dagger} \tau^2 \hat{\gamma}) = \text{Tr}_{\tau}(\hat{\alpha}^{\dagger} \hat{\gamma}),
 \end{aligned}$$

where we used the commutativity and cyclicity of the trace. This implies $\Gamma_{\alpha,\gamma}^n = \Gamma_{\alpha,1}^n \Gamma_{1,\gamma}^n$ with the same argument as in Appendix B.1. The other two constraints in (iv) follow analogously.

For the converse, we only comment on the construction of $\bar{\rho}$, $\bar{\sigma}$, $\bar{\pi}$ since the rest are the same. Let the vector corresponding to the null word 1 be $|\phi_1\rangle = |v^{000}\rangle$. Define the subspaces $V_{AB_1} = \text{Span}\{P(\{\hat{\alpha}\})\}_P$, $V_{B_2C} = \text{Span}\{Q(\{\hat{\gamma}\})\}_Q$, and $V_{B_3D} = \text{Span}\{R(\{\hat{\delta}\})\}_R$ each with orthogonal basis $\{P_i(\{\hat{\alpha}\})|v^{000}\rangle = |v^{i00}\rangle, i \in I\}$, $\{Q_j(\{\hat{\gamma}\})|v^{000}\rangle = |v^{0j0}\rangle$ and $\{R_k(\{\hat{\delta}\})|v^{000}\rangle = |v^{00k}\rangle, k \in K\}$ for some countable index set I, J, K , respectively. Using nonlinear factorisation constraints, the analogous calculation as in Appendix B.1 shows

$$\bar{\rho} = \sum_i |v^{i00}\rangle\langle v^{i00}| \quad (\text{E.1})$$

$$\bar{\sigma} = \sum_j |v^{0j0}\rangle\langle v^{0j0}| \quad (\text{E.2})$$

$$\bar{\pi} = \sum_k |v^{00k}\rangle\langle v^{00k}| \quad (\text{E.3})$$

satisfying all the desired properties. ■

Remark E.2. We remark again that the converse of Theorem E.1 is not true in general, i.e. an Anti-state Commutator Star-shaped Trilocal Quantum Distribution may not admit a hierarchy of Factorisation Star-shaped Trilocal Moment Matrices satisfying the three-factorisation constraints. Indeed, to this end, we would need to show that the equation

$$\text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{\alpha}^\dagger \hat{\gamma}^\dagger \hat{\delta}) \stackrel{?}{=} \text{Tr}(\tau \hat{\alpha}^\dagger \hat{\gamma}^\dagger \tau \hat{\delta})$$

holds. But this is not true since we cannot “merge” two τ ’s on the right-hand side of the equation with the commutation relations and cyclicity of trace given by the definition of Anti-state Commutator Star-shaped Trilocal Quantum Distributions.

This observation suggests that the factorisation star-shaped trilocal NPA hierarchy converges to a proper subset of all Anti-state Commutator Star-shaped Trilocal Quantum Distributions. It may converge to the model described in Appendix D.3.

F. Bilocal Tsirelson’s problem

Two alternatives postulates exists to introduce the distributions predicted by quantum theory: the tensor-based postulate of Definition 2.1 and the commutator-based postulate of Definition D.3. If a tensor-based model implies the existence of a commutator-based model, the question of the converse implication was a long-standing problem

(equivalent to Kirchberg's Conjecture and Connes' Embedding Conjecture [14, 16, 19, 30]) that is only recently disproven by [21]. However, Tsirelson proved that restricting to finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces, the two definitions are equivalent [40, 44]. He proved the following theorem:

Theorem F.1 (Tsirelson). *Given a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , let $\{\hat{A}_{a|x}\}$, $\{\hat{B}_{b|y}\}$ be two finite commuting sets of positive operators in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, each generating a finite-dimensional von Neumann algebra \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} . Let $\vec{Q} = \{q(ab|xy)\}$ be a probability distribution associated with $\{\hat{A}_{a|x}\}$, $\{\hat{B}_{b|y}\}$ and a global state τ .*

Then there exists a Hilbert space $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$ with a decomposition $\bar{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, such that $\{\hat{A}_{a|x}\}$ can be mapped into $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ and $\{\hat{B}_{b|y}\}$ can be mapped into $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ via injective \star -homomorphisms. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} \{\hat{A}_{a|x}\} &\mapsto \{\hat{A}_{a|x} \otimes \mathbb{1}_B\} \\ \{\hat{B}_{b|y}\} &\mapsto \{\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \hat{B}_{b|y}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, there exists a state $\bar{\tau}$ over $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$ recovering the probability distribution \vec{Q} with the operators $\{\hat{A}_{a|x} \otimes \mathbb{1}_B\}$ and $\{\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \hat{B}_{b|y}\}$, namely,

$$q(ab|xy) = \text{Tr}_\tau(\hat{A}_{a|x} \hat{B}_{b|y}) = \text{Tr}_{\bar{\tau}}(\hat{A}_{a|x} \otimes \hat{B}_{b|y})$$

Remark F.2. Observe that an inductive application of Theorem F.1 can easily yield a Tensor Tripartite Quantum Distribution given any finite-dimensional Commutator Bilocal Quantum Distribution. Thus, Definition 2.1 is equivalent to Definition 2.2 under the assumption of finite-dimensionality. By the same line of reasoning we can argue the finite-dimensional equivalence of any multi-partite quantum correlations.

We may ask the question of whether the equivalence still holds for finite-dimensional bilocal scenarios, that is, if restricting to finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces we have that Definition 3.1 and 3.2 become equivalent (a positive answer would then prove the converse of Theorem 4.2 when the obtained Hilbert space is of finite-dimensional).

We leave this question open, and now discuss why the proof is not a straightforward application of Tsirelson's Theorem F.1. One of the impediments is due to the fact that the new global state $\bar{\tau}$ constructed does not necessarily admit a bilocal decomposition. That is, the equality $\bar{\tau} = \rho'_{ABL} \otimes \sigma'_{BRC}$, where ρ'_{ABL} and σ'_{BRC} are some operators, does not always hold. In addition, there is a more subtle problem when embedding the PVMs into the split Hilbert space in bilocal scenarios.

F.1. A sketch proof of Tsirelson's theorem

Let us elaborate by discussing the proof of Theorem F.1. To this end, we introduce the following known facts in the theory of operator algebra; for more details see [6] and [22].

Definition F.1. Given a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , a von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is called a *factor*¹⁰ if it has a trivial centre, that is

$$Z(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{A}' = \mathbb{C}\mathbb{1},$$

where \mathcal{A}' denotes the commutant of \mathcal{A} .

The significance of factors is that any von Neumann algebra admits a direct integral decomposition. By assuming finite-dimensionality, we have the following structural result.

Theorem F.3. *Every finite-dimensional von Neumann algebra \mathcal{A} is a direct sum of m factors, where $m = \dim Z(\mathcal{A})$.*

Let p be a projection on some subspace \mathcal{K} of \mathcal{H} and $u \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, the compression of u to \mathcal{K} , denoted by u_p is an element of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ such that $u_p : v \mapsto pu v$. Then we have the following lemma.

Lemma F.4. *Suppose that $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is a \star -algebra and $p \in \mathcal{A}'$ is a projection. Then $p\mathcal{A}p$ and $\mathcal{A}_p = \{u_p \mid u \in \mathcal{A}\}$ are both \star -algebra and the map*

$$p\mathcal{A}p \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_p, pup \mapsto u_p$$

is a \star -isomorphism. Moreover, if we also have $p \in \mathcal{A}''$, then

$$(\mathcal{A}')_p = (\mathcal{A}_p)'$$

Theorem F.5. *Let \mathcal{A} be a factor in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, where \mathcal{H} is finite-dimensional. Then there exists a spatial isomorphism¹¹ $\mathcal{H} \simeq \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$, represented by a unitary map $u \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $u\mathcal{A}u^\dagger = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1) \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_2}$.*

Moreover, for the commutant \mathcal{A}' we have $u\mathcal{A}'u^\dagger = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_1} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2)$ ¹².

We are ready to give a sketch proof of Theorem F.1 referencing [40] and [44].

¹⁰For our purpose, all factors are automatically of Type-I. We shall omit the terminology for simplicity.

¹¹In the theory of operator algebra, it refers to the isomorphism induced by the adjoint action of some unitary.

¹²This is a direct consequence of Lemma F.4

Proof. The technique is known as “doubling the centre”. Note that $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{A}$. If \mathcal{A} is a factor, then we are done by Theorem F.5. Otherwise, since the centre $Z(\mathcal{A})$ is a finite-dimensional unital commutative C^* -algebra, the Gelfand–Naimark Theorem gives rise to a finite set of minimal orthogonal central projections $\{p_i\} \subset Z(\mathcal{A})$ that sum up to the identity $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$.

Therefore, we may identify \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{A}' with direct sum representations $\bigoplus_i \mathcal{A}_i$ and $\bigoplus_i \mathcal{A}'_i$ ¹³, respectively, where $\mathcal{A}_i = \mathcal{A}_{p_i}$. It can be checked that \mathcal{A}_i is a factor for all i . Consequently, we have a direct sum decomposition $H \cong \bigoplus_i p_i(\mathcal{H}) = \bigoplus_i \mathcal{H}_i$.

Then, applying Theorem F.5 we split \mathcal{A}_i and \mathcal{A}'_i with tensor products and, subsequently, we have $H_i = H_i^1 \otimes H_i^2$. It can be checked that the natural embedding of \mathcal{H} in $(\bigoplus_i H_i^1) \otimes (\bigoplus_i H_i^1)$ induces the desired injective \star -homomorphism for \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{A}' . Moreover, the (C^* -algebraic) functional on $(\bigoplus_i H_i^1) \otimes (\bigoplus_i H_i^1)$ induced from $\text{Tr}_\tau(\cdot)$ can be checked as a state. Hence, finite-dimensionality implies the existence of an associated density operator $\bar{\tau}$. ■

Remark F.6. Now we are able to describe the difficulty of showing a bilocal version of Theorem F.1, which is due to the existence of operators ρ and σ . Indeed, for example, we may consider the fact that $\mathcal{B}, C, \{\sigma\} \subset \mathcal{A}'$ and perform a minimal central decomposition of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{A}' . But then we cannot say the same about ρ since $\rho \notin \mathcal{A}'$ in general, and hence it is not clear how one can embed ρ isomorphically in the new Hilbert space. A similar problem arises when we attempt to start with algebra C .

One may also consider the algebra generated by \mathcal{A} and ρ , with C and σ lying in its commutant, to obtain a splitting $\mathcal{H}_{ABL} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{BRC}$. Although seemingly recovering Tensor Bilocal Quantum correlations in Definition 3.1, the algebra \mathcal{B} may not be embedded into the splitting Hilbert space isomorphically. The failure of this example is also related to the difficulty of proving the converse of Theorem 4.2 in finite dimension, as it is unclear how to find a sensible splitting of Bob’s measurement \mathcal{B} .

Furthermore, evident from the proof above, we are not guaranteed that the new global state $\bar{\tau}$ admits the desired bilocal decomposition.

References

- [1] A. Acín, N. Gisin, and L. Masanes, From Bell’s Theorem to Secure Quantum Key Distribution. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97** (2006), no. 12, 120405
- [2] J.-D. Bancal and N. Gisin, Nonlocal boxes for networks. *Physical Review A* **104** (2021), no. 5
- [3] J.-D. Bancal, N. Sangouard, and P. Sekatski, Noise-resistant device-independent certification of bell state measurements. *Physical Review Letters* **121** (2018), no. 25

¹³Note there is no ambiguity in the notation \mathcal{A}'_i due to Lemma F.4.

- [4] S. Beigi and M.-O. Renou, Covariance decomposition as a universal limit on correlations in networks. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **68** (2022), no. 1, 384–394
- [5] J. S. Bell, On the einstein podolsky rosen paradox. *Physica Physique Fizika* **1** (1964), 195–200
- [6] B. Blackadar, *Operator algebras: Theory of c^* -algebras and von neumann algebras*. Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2006
- [7] C. Branciard, N. Gisin, and S. Pironio, Characterizing the nonlocal correlations created via entanglement swapping. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104** (2010), 170401
- [8] O. Bratteli and D. W. Robinson, *Operator algebras and quantum statistical mechanics*. Theoretical and Mathematical Physics, Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, Berlin, 1997
- [9] N. Brunner, D. Cavalcanti, S. Pironio, V. Scarani, and S. Wehner, Bell nonlocality. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **86** (2014), 419–478
- [10] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23** (1969), 880–884
- [11] X. Coiteux-Roy, E. Wolfe, and M.-O. Renou, Any physical theory of nature must be boundlessly multipartite nonlocal. *Physical Review A* **104** (2021), no. 5
- [12] X. Coiteux-Roy, E. Wolfe, and M.-O. Renou, No bipartite-nonlocal causal theory can explain nature’s correlations. *Physical Review Letters* **127** (2021), no. 20
- [13] R. Colbeck and R. Renner, Free randomness can be amplified. *Nat. Phys.* **8** (2012), no. 6, 450–453
- [14] A. Connes, Classification of injective factors cases II 1 , II ∞ , III λ , λ 1. *The Annals of Mathematics* **104** (1976), no. 1, 73
- [15] T. Fritz, Beyond bell’s theorem: correlation scenarios. *New Journal of Physics* **14** (2012), no. 10, 103001
- [16] T. Fritz, Tsirelson’s problem and kirchberg’s conjecture. *Reviews in Mathematical Physics* **24** (2012), no. 05, 1250012
- [17] N. Gisin, J.-D. Bancal, Y. Cai, P. Remy, A. Tavakoli, E. Z. Cruzeiro, S. Popescu, and N. Brunner, Constraints on nonlocality in networks from no-signaling and independence. *Nature Communications* **11** (2020), no. 1
- [18] V. Gitton, Outer approximations of classical multi-network correlations. 2022, URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.04103>
- [19] I. Goldbring, The connes embedding problem: A guided tour. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* **59** (2022), no. 4, 503–560
- [20] J. Henson, R. Lal, and M. F. Pusey, Theory-independent limits on correlations from generalized Bayesian networks. *New J. Phys.* **16** (2014), no. 11, 113043
- [21] Z. Ji, A. Natarajan, T. Vidick, J. Wright, and H. Yuen, Mip*=re. *Communications of the ACM* **64** (2021), no. 11, 131–138
- [22] R. Kadison and J. Ringrose, *Fundamentals of the theory of operator algebras. volume ii*. Fundamentals of the Theory of Operator Algebras, American Mathematical Society, 1997
- [23] I. Klep, V. Magron, and J. Volčič, Optimization over trace polynomials. *Annales Henri Poincaré* **23** (2022), no. 1, 67–100
- [24] J. B. Lasserre, A sum of squares approximation of nonnegative polynomials. *SIAM Review* **49** (2007), no. 4, 651–669

- [25] C. M. Lee and M. J. Hoban, Towards device-independent information processing on general quantum networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120** (2018), 020504
- [26] L. T. Ligthart, M. Gachechiladze, and D. Gross, A convergent inflation hierarchy for quantum causal structures. 2021, URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.14659>
- [27] D. Mayers and A. Yao, Quantum cryptography with imperfect apparatus. In *Proc. 39th symposium on foundations of computer science*, pp. 503–509, 1998
- [28] M. Navascués and E. Wolfe, The inflation technique completely solves the causal compatibility problem. *Journal of Causal Inference* **8** (2020), no. 1, 70–91
- [29] M. Navascués, S. Pironio, and A. Acín, A convergent hierarchy of semidefinite programs characterizing the set of quantum correlations. *New Journal of Physics* **10** (2008), no. 7, 073013
- [30] N. Ozawa, About the connes embedding conjecture. *Japanese Journal of Mathematics* **8** (2013), no. 1, 147–183
- [31] P. A. Parrilo, Structured Semidefinite Programs and Semialgebraic Geometry Methods in Robustness and Optimization. *PhD thesis* (2000)
- [32] S. Pironio et al., Random numbers certified by Bell’s theorem. *Nature* **464** (2010), no. 7291, 1021–1024
- [33] A. Pozas-Kerstjens, R. Rabelo, L. Rudnicki, R. Chaves, D. Cavalcanti, M. Navascués, and A. Acín, Bounding the sets of classical and quantum correlations in networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123** (2019), 140503
- [34] M.-O. Renou and S. Beigi, Nonlocality for generic networks. *Physical Review Letters* **128** (2022), no. 6
- [35] M.-O. Renou, E. Bäumer, S. Boreiri, N. Brunner, N. Gisin, and S. Beigi, Genuine quantum nonlocality in the triangle network. *Physical Review Letters* **123** (2019), no. 14
- [36] M. O. Renou, J. Kaniewski, and N. Brunner, Self-testing entangled measurements in quantum networks. *Physical Review Letters* **121** (2018), no. 25
- [37] M.-O. Renou, D. Trillo, M. Weilenmann, T. P. Le, A. Tavakoli, N. Gisin, A. Acín, and M. Navascués, Quantum theory based on real numbers can be experimentally falsified. *Nature* **600** (2021), no. 7890, 625–629
- [38] T. V. Rotem Arnon-Friedman, Renato Renner, Simple and tight device-independent security proofs. *arXiv:1607.01797* (2016)
- [39] V. Scarani, The Device-Independent Outlook on Quantum Physics. *Acta Physica Slovaca* **62** (2012), no. 4, 347
- [40] V. B. Scholz and R. F. Werner, Tsirelson’s Problem. *arXiv e-prints* (2008), arXiv:0812.4305
- [41] P. Sekatski, S. Boreiri, and N. Brunner, Partial self-testing and randomness certification in the triangle network. 2022, URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.09921>
- [42] I. Šupić and J. Bowles, Self-testing of quantum systems: a review. *Quantum* **4** (2020), 337
- [43] A. Tavakoli, A. Pozas-Kerstjens, M.-X. Luo, and M.-O. Renou, Bell nonlocality in networks. *Reports on Progress in Physics* **85** (2022), no. 5, 056001
- [44] B. Tsirelson, Bell inequalities and operator algebras. 2006, URL <https://www.tau.ac.il/~tsirel/Research/bellpalg/main.html>
- [45] U. Vazirani and T. Vidick, Fully device-independent quantum key distribution. *Physical Review Letters* **113** (2014), no. 14

- [46] M. Weilenmann and R. Colbeck, Self-testing of physical theories, or, is quantum theory optimal with respect to some information-processing task? *Physical Review Letters* **125** (2020), no. 6
- [47] E. Wolfe, A. Pozas-Kerstjens, M. Grinberg, D. Rosset, A. Acín, and M. Navascués, Quantum inflation: A general approach to quantum causal compatibility. *Phys. Rev. X* **11** (2021), 021043
- [48] E. Wolfe, R. W. Spekkens, and T. Fritz, The inflation technique for causal inference with latent variables. *Journal of Causal Inference* **7** (2019), no. 2
- [49] I. Šupić, J. Bowles, M.-O. Renou, A. Acín, and M. J. Hoban, Quantum networks self-test all entangled states. 2022, URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.05032>