

Lower-bounding entanglement with nonlocality in a general Bell's scenario

Liang-Liang Sun*

*Department of Modern Physics and Hefei National Research Center for
Physical Sciences at the Microscale and School of Physical Sciences,
University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China*

Xiang Zhou

*Hefei National Research Center for Physical Sciences at the Microscale and School of Physical Sciences,
University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China*

Zhen-Peng Xu

*School of Physics and Optoelectronics Engineering,
Anhui University, Hefei 230601, People's Republic of China*

Sixia Yu[†]

*Department of Modern Physics and Hefei National Research Center for
Physical Sciences at the Microscale and School of Physical Sciences,
University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China and
Hefei National Laboratory, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230088, China*

(Dated: December 6, 2023)

Understanding the quantitative relation between entanglement and Bell nonlocality is a long-standing open problem of both fundamental and practical interest. Here we provide a general approach to address this issue. Starting with an observation that entanglement measures, while defined dramatically different in mathematics, are basically the distances between the state of interest and its closest separable state, we relate this minimal distance between states with distance-based Bell nonlocality, namely, the minimal distance between correlation of interest with respect to the set of classical correlations. This establishes the quantitative relation between entanglement and Bell nonlocality, leading to the bounds for entanglement in various contexts. Our approach enjoys the merits of: (i) generality, it applies to any Bell's scenario without requiring the information of devices and to many entanglement measures, (ii) faithfulness, it gives a non-trivial entanglement estimation from any nonlocal correlation.

Strongly correlated quantum subsystems could be entangled and behave like a single physical subject. That is, a local measurement on one subsystem can instantaneously modifies the states of other subsystems even if they are in a space-like distance [1]. By choosing the measurement settings for each subsystem properly, one could obtain correlations between outcomes going beyond the scope allowed by the classical tenets of realism and locality. This can be verified by the violation of Bell's inequality, referred to as nonlocality [2]. Entanglement and nonlocality draw clear cut between quantum theory and classical ones [1–5]. Practically, they are also appreciated as the key resources for quantum advantages in many information tasks, such as, quantum teleportation [6], quantum cryptography [7], quantum algorithms [8–10], and quantum metrology [11]. Motivated by the fundamental interest and also practical usage like device-independent (DI) estimation of entanglement (where no information about devices are used thus robust to all the systematic errors) [12], the interplay between entanglement and nonlocality has been exploited intensely [13–21].

It is clear that entanglement is necessary for jj nonlocality, however, establishing quantitative relation between them encounters inevitable difficulties. On the one hand, entanglement and nonlocality are distinct concepts, and their interrelation turns out to be quite subtle: (1) there are entangled states that do not demonstrate nonlocality [22] and (2) maximum jj nonlocality does not always call for the maximum entanglement [23]. On the other hand, in the theory of entanglement, entanglement measures are defined dramatically different in mathematics. For most of them, analytical computation is even NP-hard [24–26]. Only in some special cases, such as two-qubit systems, the computation can be thoroughly done [1]. These specific analytical results become the key ingredients to estimate entanglement in the relevant minimal Bell's scenario [27, 28]. In general, such useful results are missing. Till now, except the entanglement measure of negativity [12], it is still an open question that how to establish quantitative connections between entanglement measures, especially the ones having clear operational meanings, and nonlocality in general Bell's scenarios.

To answer this question, we provide a general framework enabling one to estimate various measures of entanglement while not requiring background knowledge about quantum systems or Bell's scenario. Our starting point is that,

though entanglement measures may have drastically different forms, they are all related to the minimal distance of the concerned state with respect to the set of separable states. Similarly, nonlocality is also quantified by the distance between the correlation of interest to the closest local correlation. Inspired by this similarity, we connect these two distances and provide nontrivial lower bounds for entanglement measures with any nonlocal correlation. Especially, we can estimate the extremely weak form of entanglement, namely, bound entanglement. Our estimation can be asymptotically tight in some multipartite systems.

RESULTS

Lower bounding Entanglement with distance with respect to closest separable state.—The most intuitive method to quantify entanglement is the minimal distance of a concerned state ρ with respect to the set Ω of the separable states [29, 30], that is,

$$E_{\mathcal{D}}(\rho) = \min_{\varrho \in \Omega} \mathcal{D}(\rho, \varrho) \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{D} is a distance measure of states. Clearly, different choices of state distances give rise to different entanglement measures [30–33]. For example, choosing the relative entropy $S(\rho||\varrho) \equiv \text{tr} \rho(\log \rho - \log \varrho)$ as the distance measure, one obtains the relative entropy of entanglement $E_{\text{Re}}(\rho)$ [30], which serves as an upper bound for the entanglement of distillation [34]. With the trace-distance $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Tr}}(\rho_1, \rho_2) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} |\rho_1 - \rho_2|$ where $\text{tr} |A| = \text{tr} \sqrt{AA^\dagger}$, which quantifies how well two states can be operationally distinguished [35], one can define a measure $E_{\text{Tr}}(\rho) \equiv \min_{\varrho \in \Omega} \mathcal{D}_{\text{Tr}}(\rho, \varrho)$ as the distinguishability of the state ρ from the set of separable states.

Another relevant method is the convex-roof construction [36]: Starting with a measure established for a pure state $|\phi\rangle$, denoted as $E(|\phi\rangle)$, then it can be extended to a general mixed state ρ via the convex-roof construction as $\tilde{E}(\rho) \equiv \min_{\{f_i, |\phi_i\rangle\}} \sum f_i E(|\phi_i\rangle)$, where the minimization is taken over all possible decompositions $\rho = \sum_i f_i |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|$. The entanglement of formation $\tilde{E}_{\text{F}}(\rho)$ [37], the concurrence $\tilde{E}_{\text{C}}(\rho)$, and the geometric measure of entanglement $\tilde{E}_{\text{G}}(\rho)$ [38, 39] are defined in this way. Besides the aforementioned two major approaches, there are also other measures such as the robustness of entanglement to noise E_{Rob} [39]. We recall the corresponding definitions in Methods.

Our first key observation is: besides measures E_{Tr} and E_{Re} that are directly defined in terms of minimal state distances, the other measures relate also closely to the minimal distance (see Methods for the proof):

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}_{\text{F}}(\rho) &\geq \min_{\varrho \in \Omega} S(\phi||\varrho), & \tilde{E}_{\text{C}}(\rho) &\geq \sqrt{2} \min_{\varrho \in \Omega} \text{IF}(\rho, \varrho), \\ \tilde{E}_{\text{G}}(\rho) &\geq \min_{\varrho \in \Omega} \text{IF}^2(\rho, \varrho), & E_{\text{Rob}}(\rho) &\geq \frac{E_{\text{Tr}}(\rho)}{1 - E_{\text{Tr}}(\rho)}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where fidelity $\text{F}(\rho, \varrho) \equiv \text{Tr}(\sqrt{\sqrt{\rho}\varrho\sqrt{\rho}})$ and infidelity $\text{IF} \equiv \sqrt{1 - \text{F}^2}$. For pure states, these lower bounds are tight for the first three measures.

Relation between entanglement and Bell nonlocality.—Let us first recall a general Bell scenario: space-like separated observers, A_1, \dots, A_N , share a joint N -partite system. Each observer, e.g., A_i , can randomly perform one measurement m_i from the set of all possible ones \mathcal{M}_i and obtains an outcome a_i . By $p(\vec{a}|\vec{m})$ we specify the joint probability of obtaining outcomes $\vec{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_N)$ under the measurement settings $\vec{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_N)$. The collection of such probabilities $\mathbf{P} = \{\mathbf{p}_{\vec{m}}\}_{\vec{m}}$, with $\mathbf{p}_{\vec{m}} \equiv \{p(\vec{a}|\vec{m})\}_{\vec{a}}$ over measurement settings and outcomes, is referred to as a *behavior* [40]. If a behavior allows a quantum realization, there exists at least one state ρ and a set of measurements such that the behavior $\mathbf{P}_\rho = \{p_\rho(\vec{a}|\vec{m}) = \text{Tr}(\rho \cdot \otimes_{i=1}^N \Pi_{a_i|m_i})\}_{\{\vec{a}, \vec{m}\}}$ with $\Pi_{a_i|m_i}$ specifying the measurement operator corresponding to the outcome a_i under the setting m_i on A_i 's side.

Classical physics assumes realism and locality, and one observable's value is determined before the implementation of the measurement by hidden variables. Thus the set of local behaviors, specified by \mathcal{L} , is a convex polytope with the vertices to be the extreme deterministic behaviors and the facets being tight Bell inequalities [2]:

$$\beta(\mathbf{P}) = \sum_{\vec{a}, \vec{m}} \alpha_{\vec{a}|\vec{m}} \cdot p(\vec{a}|\vec{m}) \leq c, \quad \forall \mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{L}, \quad (3)$$

where c specifies the maximum classical value of Bell's quantity. A violation of a given Bell inequality, namely, $\beta(\mathbf{P}) > c$, certifies nonlocality, and the degree $\beta(\mathbf{P}) - c$ is taken as a natural quantification of nonlocality. However, such a quantification highly depends on the Bell's inequality involved, and a nonlocal behavior may not violate an




FIG. 1. Comparison between the quantifications of entanglement and nonlocality: Entanglement (E) essentially captures the distance between state of interest and the closest separable state. Analogously, nonlocality (N) captures the distance of one correlation \mathbf{P}_ρ away from the set of local correlations.

unsuitably chosen Bell's inequalities and thus it cannot be verified. Alternatively, noting that one behavior is non-local if and only if it is not in the polytope formed by classical correlations, one can consider the minimal distance between the concerned behavior \mathbf{P} with respect to classical ones as

$$\mathfrak{D}(\mathbf{P}, \mathcal{L}) \equiv \min_{\{\mathbf{q}_{\vec{m}}\}_{\vec{m} \in \mathcal{L}}} \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{\vec{m}} D(\mathbf{p}_{\vec{m}}, \mathbf{q}_{\vec{m}}), \quad (4)$$

where $D(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$ is a classical distance measure between distributions \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{q} and with τ we specify the number of different choices of measurement settings \vec{m} . This minimum distance $\mathfrak{D}(\mathbf{P}, \mathcal{L})$ [41], capturing how a concerned behavior goes beyond the local ones, quantifies nonlocality in a different way from the Bell's violation and is referred to as distance-based Bell nonlocality here. As the set of local correlations \mathcal{L} can be well characterized in principle for any given Bell scenario [2, 42], for a given behavior \mathbf{P} we can compute the distance $\mathfrak{D}(\mathbf{P}, \mathcal{L})$ by an optimization over the set \mathcal{L} of local behaviors. In what follows, we show such distance-based quantifications of entanglement and nonlocality can be unified, for which, a geometrical illustration is shown in Fig.1.

As far as local measurements of settings \vec{m} performed on ρ and ϱ are concerned, it follows from data processing inequality that

$$\mathcal{D}(\rho, \varrho) \geq D(\mathbf{p}_{\vec{m};\rho}, \mathbf{p}_{\vec{m};\varrho}), \quad (5)$$

where D specifies the statistics distance induced by state distance \mathcal{D} . For example, the statistics distance arising from the trace-distance $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Tr}}(\rho, \varrho)$ is the Kolmogorov distance $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\vec{a}} |p(\vec{a}|\vec{m}; \rho) - p(\vec{a}|\vec{m}; \varrho)|$. Denote $\varrho \in \Omega$ the closest separable state to the state ρ , then $\mathcal{D}(\rho, \varrho)$ is the distance-based entanglement defined via Eq.(1). As there are different choices of \vec{m} in Eq.(5), each of them relates to an inequality of the form Eq.(5). As $\varrho \in \Omega$ implies the corresponding behavior $\mathbf{P}_\varrho = \{\mathbf{p}_{\vec{m};\varrho}\}_{\vec{m} \in \mathcal{L}}$, summing Eq.(5) over all possible \vec{m} 's we have

$$\mathcal{D}(\rho, \varrho) \geq \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{\vec{m}} D(\mathbf{p}_{\vec{m};\rho}, \mathbf{p}_{\vec{m};\varrho}) \geq \mathfrak{D}(\mathbf{P}_\rho, \mathcal{L}) \quad (6)$$

To this end, we have bounded the distance of state ρ away from the set Ω of separable states by statistics in a general Bell's scenario. Combined with our observation Eq.(2), we then have

Theorem.1 (Lower-bounding entanglement with distance-based nonlocality) *Entanglement measures have lower bounds in terms of functions of distance-based nonlocality as*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}_{\text{F,Re}}(\rho) &\geq \mathfrak{D}_{\text{Re}}(\mathbf{P}_\rho, \mathcal{L}), & E_{\text{Tr}}(\rho) &\geq \mathfrak{D}_{\text{Tr}}(\mathbf{P}_\rho, \mathcal{L}), \\ \tilde{E}_{\text{G}}(\rho) &\geq \mathfrak{D}_{\text{IF}}^2(\mathbf{P}_\rho, \mathcal{L}), & \tilde{E}_{\text{C}}(\rho) &\geq \mathfrak{D}_{\text{IF}}(\mathbf{P}_\rho, \mathcal{L}), \\ E_{\text{Rob}}(\rho) &\geq \frac{\mathfrak{D}_{\text{Tr}}(\mathbf{P}_\rho, \mathcal{L})}{1 - \mathfrak{D}_{\text{Tr}}(\mathbf{P}_\rho, \mathcal{L})}. \end{aligned}$$

This provides an answer for the long-standing open question how entanglement relates to nonlocality, allowing one to estimate various entanglement measures in DI setting.

We also note that the distance-based nonlocality $\mathfrak{D}(\mathbf{P}_\rho, \mathcal{L})$ is not easy to compute in a multipartite scenario. This is because there are exponentially increasing deterministic extreme correlations with respect to the size of system [43–46], rendering the typical linear programming approach for characterization the set \mathcal{L} inefficient [47]. To overcome

this difficulty, we also provide an estimation solely with the Bell's violation. We first lower-bound E_{Tr} with violation of Bell's inequality (see Methods)

$$E_{\text{Tr}}(\rho) \geq \mathfrak{D}_{\text{Tr}}(\mathbf{P}_\rho, \mathcal{L}) \geq \frac{\beta(\mathbf{P}_\rho) - c}{\alpha} \equiv \beta_\alpha, \quad (7)$$

where $\alpha = \sum_{\vec{m}} (\max_{\vec{a}} \alpha_{\vec{a}|\vec{m}} - \min_{\vec{a}} \alpha_{\vec{a}|\vec{m}})$. Second, by lower-bounding those entanglement measures with E_{Tr} (see Methods), we finally obtain their lower bounds in terms of Bell violations

Theorem.2 (Lower-bounding entanglement with Bell's violation) *With the degree of modified Bell's violation β_α , we have lower bounds on entanglement measures as*

$$E_{\text{Re}}, \tilde{E}_{\text{F}} \geq \frac{2}{\ln 2} \beta_\alpha^2, \quad \tilde{E}_{\text{G}} \geq \beta_\alpha^2, \quad \tilde{E}_{\text{C}} \geq \sqrt{2} \beta_\alpha, \quad E_{\text{Rob}} \geq \frac{\beta_\alpha}{1 - \beta_\alpha}. \quad (8)$$

Examples.— In the following, we illustrate our results with several examples. First, let us consider the minimal Bell scenario, where there are two parties, and in every round they each can locally perform one of the two binary measurements indexed by $x, y \in \{0, 1\}$ where the outcomes are labeled by $a, b \in \{0, 1\}$. In this setting, the facets of the classical correlation polytope is given by one Bell's inequality up to the relabelling of measurements and outcomes, namely, the Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt (CHSH) inequality [48]

$$\beta_{\text{CHSH}}(\mathbf{P}) = \sum_{a,b,x,y} (-1)^{a+b+xy} p(ab|xy) \leq 2, \forall \mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{L}. \quad (9)$$

In this scenario, the quantity $\beta(\mathbf{P})$ has been already quantitatively related to E_{C} and E_{F} [27, 28, 49], where the thorough study of entanglement for two-qubit system has lots implications, including the computation of entanglement measures, the quantitative connection between concurrence $E_{\text{C}}(\rho)$ and Bell's violation β as $E_{\text{C}}(\rho) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\beta^2 - 4}$ [28] in two-qubit system, and also Jordan's lemma [50–52] which extends this connection to an arbitrary dimensional system. Here, following this line of research, the estimation that $E_{\text{G}}(\rho) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 - \sqrt{1 - (\frac{\beta-2}{2\sqrt{2}-2})^2}}$ can also be given (See Methods).

Our framework, namely, Theorems 1 and 2, provides a sub-optimal bound without using the relevant results of entanglement and nonlocality. For example, consider the behavior $\mathbf{P}_\rho = \{p(ab|xy) = \frac{1+(-1)^{a+b+xy}/\sqrt{2}}{4}\}$ which maximally violates CHSH inequality. Interestingly, by exploiting symmetry we can give the classical correlation closest to the behavior \mathbf{P}_ρ as $p_l(ab|xy) = \frac{1+(-1)^{a+b+xy}/2}{4}$ (Methods). We have then the lower bounds following Theorem 1: $E_{\text{Tr}}(\rho) \geq 0.104$, $E_{\text{G}}(\rho) \geq 0.02$, $E_{\text{Re}}(\rho) \geq 0.046$, $\tilde{E}_{\text{F}}(\rho) \geq 0.046$, $E_{\text{C}}(\rho) \geq 0.30$, $E_{\text{Rob}}(\rho) \geq 0.12$. By making use of Theorem 2, we obtain $E_{\text{Tr}}(\rho) \geq 0.104$, $E_{\text{G}}(\rho) \geq 0.01$, $E_{\text{C}}(\rho) \geq 0.15$, $E_{\text{Re}}(\rho) \geq 0.031$, $\tilde{E}_{\text{F}}(\rho) \geq 0.031$, where these lower bounds are smaller due to the fact that Theorem 2 is a relaxation of Theorem 1. Our lower bounds can be tighten when more details of the scenario are considered. Notice that a maximal CHSH violation is well-known to self-test anti-commuting qubit measurements for both Alice and Bob [53, 54]. For such measurements, the maximum value of Bell's function for separable states is $\sqrt{2}$ (see Methods), namely, $\beta(\mathbf{P}_\rho) \leq \sqrt{2}$ for $\rho \in \Omega$. Therefore, one can replace the $c = 2$ with $\sqrt{2}$. Then we have $E_{\text{Tr}}(\rho) \geq 0.125$, $E_{\text{G}}(\rho) \geq 0.04$, $E_{\text{C}}(\rho) \geq 0.30$, and $E_{\text{Re}}(\rho) \geq 0.33$.

We also note that our lower-bound could be already tight for some Bell's scenarios. Let us consider the $\{n, 2, 2\}$ Bell's scenario, namely, n parties, two measurements per party and two outcomes per measurement. When the total number n of parties is odd, the Mermin-Ardehali-Belinskii-Klyshko (MABK) inequality [43, 55–57] can be cast into (see Methods)

$$\beta_{\text{MABK}}(\mathbf{P}) = \sum_{\substack{\vec{a}, \vec{m} \in \{0, 1\}^n \\ \vec{1} \cdot \vec{m} \text{ odd}}} (-1)^{\Gamma(\vec{m}) + \vec{1} \cdot \vec{a}} p(\vec{a}|\vec{m}) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{\leq} 2^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \quad (10)$$

where $\Gamma(\vec{m}) = \sum_{j>k} m_j m_k$ with $m_i \in \{0, 1\}$ specifying the setting on i -th observer and $\vec{1} = (1, 1, \dots, 1) \in \{0, 1\}^n$. The maximal violation of the MABK inequality is achieved by n -partite GHZ state and for each observer the settings are chosen as $\{\sigma_x, \sigma_z\}$. In this case, $\tau_{\text{MABK}} = 2^n$ with classical bound $c = 2^{\frac{n-1}{2}}$ and the maximal quantum violation 2^{n-1} , the DI lower bound reads

$$\frac{1}{2} = E_{\text{Tr}}(\rho_{\text{GHZ}}) \geq \frac{1}{2} - 2^{-\frac{n+1}{2}},$$

which tends to the exact value of trace-distance measure of entanglement of n -partite GHZ state in the case of infinite n . In all the examples above, the estimation for other relevant entanglement measures, e.g., E_{Tr} , \tilde{E}_G , and E_{rob} can be obtained similarly via Theorem 2.

As the second example, we consider a bipartite scenario and show that bound entanglement, albeit very weak and can not be detected by negativity [12], still allows for a DI quantification with our approach. Let us consider a scenario due to Yu and Oh, in which, the party Alice performs d dichotomic measurements labeled with $\{0, 1, 2, \dots, d-1\}$ while another party Bob performs only two measurements with the first one, labeled with 0, being dichotomic and the second one, labeled with 1, having d outcomes. For any local realistic model, it holds [58]

$$\beta_{\text{Yu-Oh}}(\mathbf{P}) = p(00|01) - \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} p(0k|k0) - \sum_{k=1}^{d-1} p(10|k1) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{\leq} 0. \quad (11)$$

It is clear that the total number of possible measurement settings $\tau_{\text{Yu-Oh}} = 2d$ and a violation to this inequality will lead to a nontrivial estimation of E_{Tr} as

$$E_{\text{Tr}}(\rho) \geq \frac{\beta_{\text{Yu-Oh}}(\mathbf{P}_\rho)}{2d}, \quad (12)$$

which provide DI estimation of entanglement for a family of nonlocal bound entangled states [58].

Conclusion and discussion.— Understanding the quantitative connection between entanglement and Bell nonlocality is a fundamental issue. Previously, this connection is considered mainly in the minimal Bell's scenario, but remained almost unexplored in general Bell's scenarios where the structures of relevant entanglement and nonlocality are not well-understood. Here, we exploit the basic idea in quantifying these two quantities. We also find that although entanglement measures are defined with different strategies, they closely relate to the distances between state of interest with respect to the set of separable states. We then show that this kind of state distance can be estimated in Bell's scenarios with the distance between the relevant correlation to the closest classical correlations. Thus, we obtained a feasible and versatile approach to estimate many entanglement measures, including the entanglement of formation, the robustness of entanglement, the entanglement of concurrence, and the geometric measure of entanglement. Especially, we did not assume anything on the functionalities of devices, which means one can estimate entanglement experimentally in a device-independent manner, which is robust to any kind of systematic noise.

The quantitative relation between entanglement and Bell nonlocality established here upgrades the claim that *Bell nonlocality verifies entanglement* into *Bell nonlocality lower bounds entanglement*, although the lower bounds sometimes are not tight. For further research, we believe our framework may immediately applies to the issue of, for example, quantitatively study of the rich structure of multipartite entanglement, especially the quantification of genuinely multipartite entanglement.

L.L.S. and S.Y. would like to thank Key-Area Research and Development Program of Guangdong Province Grant No. 2020B0303010001. Z.P.X. acknowledges support from National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12305007), Anhui Provincial Natural Science Foundation (Grant No. 2308085QA29).

METHODS.

Entanglement of formation and the relative entropy of entanglement.— Entanglement of formation $\tilde{E}_F(\rho)$ [37] is defined via a convex-roof construction with the pure state measure $E_F(|\phi\rangle)$ defined as the von Neumann entropy of subsystem $S(\phi^{(A)}) \equiv -\text{tr}(\phi^{(A)} \log \phi^{(A)})$ where $\phi^{(A)} = \text{Tr}_B(|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|)$, which is equivalent to the minimal distance of $|\phi\rangle$ to set of separable state, namely, $E_F(|\phi\rangle) = \min_{\varrho \in \Omega} S(\phi||\varrho)$ [1]. Denoting the ensemble $\{r_i, |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|\}$ and the closest separable state of $|\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|$ as ϱ_i , we have

$$E_F(\rho) = \sum_i r_i S(\phi_i||\varrho_i) \geq S(\rho||\varrho) \geq \min_{\varrho'} S(\rho||\varrho') = E_{\text{Re}}(\rho),$$

where $\varrho \equiv \sum_i r_i \varrho_i$ and the second inequality is due to the convexity of relative entropy. It follows the quantum Pinsker inequality $S(\rho||\varrho) \geq \frac{2}{\ln 2} [\mathcal{D}_{\text{Tr}}(\rho, \varrho)]^2$ that

$$\begin{aligned} E_F(\rho) &\geq E_{\text{Re}} = \min_{\varrho \in \Omega} S(\rho||\varrho) = S(\rho||\varrho') \\ &\geq \frac{2}{\ln 2} \min_{\varrho \in \Omega} [\mathcal{D}_{\text{Tr}}(\rho, \varrho)]^2 \equiv \frac{2}{\ln 2} (E_{\text{Tr}})^2, \end{aligned}$$

where ϱ' specifies the closest separable state of ρ with respect to the relative entropy.

Concurrence — Entanglement concurrence $\tilde{E}_C(\rho)$ is defined via convex-roof construction with the pure state measure $E_C(|\phi\rangle) \equiv \sqrt{2 - 2\text{Tr}[(\phi^{(A)})^2]} = \sqrt{2}\sqrt{1 - \text{F}^2(\phi, \varrho_\phi)} = \sqrt{2}\text{IF}(\phi, \varrho_\phi)$ with $\varrho_\phi \in \Omega$ specifying the diagonal parts in Schmidt basis, where $\text{F}(\rho, \varrho) \equiv \text{Tr}\sqrt{\sqrt{\varrho}\rho\sqrt{\varrho}}$ is fidelity. Specify the decomposition achieving the convex-roof with $\{r_i, |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|\}$ and the closest separable state for $|\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|$ as ϱ_i with respect to the measure of infidelity, we then has

$$\begin{aligned} E_C(\rho) &\geq \sqrt{2} \sum_i r_i \text{IF}(\phi_i, \varrho_i) \geq \sqrt{2} \text{IF}(\rho, \varrho'') \\ &\geq \sqrt{2} \min_{\varrho \in \Omega} \text{IF}(\rho, \varrho). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $\varrho'' \equiv \sum_i r_i \varrho_i$. We have $E_C(|\phi\rangle) = \sqrt{2}\sqrt{1 - \text{tr}[\phi^{(A)}]^2} = \sqrt{2}\sqrt{1 - \text{Tr}(|\phi\rangle\langle\phi| \cdot \varrho_\phi)} \geq \sqrt{2}\mathcal{D}_{\text{Tr}}(\phi, \varrho_\phi)$, we have used the inequality $\sqrt{1 - \text{Tr}(\rho_1, \rho_2)} \geq \mathcal{D}_{\text{Tr}}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$. Then it follows

$$\begin{aligned} E_C(\rho) &\geq \sqrt{2} \sum_i r_i \mathcal{D}_{\text{Tr}}(\phi_i, \varrho_i) \\ &\geq \sqrt{2} \min_{\varrho \in \Omega} \mathcal{D}_{\text{Tr}}(\rho, \varrho) = \sqrt{2} E_{\text{Tr}}(\rho). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Geometric measure of entanglement. — The geometric measure of entanglement $\tilde{E}_G(\rho)$ [38, 39] is a convex-roof of $E_G(\phi) = \max_{|\phi'\rangle \in \Omega} (1 - |\langle\phi|\phi'\rangle|^2)$, i.e., via the maximal squared overlap with the separable pure states. We note that $|\langle\phi|\phi'\rangle|^2 = \text{F}^2(\phi, \phi')$. Specify ensemble achieving the convex-roof as $\{r_i, |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|\}$ the closest pure separable state to $|\phi_i\rangle$ as $|\varphi_i\rangle$. We note $E_G(\phi_i) = 1 - \text{F}^2(|\phi_i\rangle, |\varphi_i\rangle) = \text{IF}^2(|\phi_i\rangle, |\varphi_i\rangle)$,

$$E_G(\rho) = \sum_i r_i \text{IF}^2(|\phi_i\rangle, |\varphi_i\rangle) \geq [\sum_i r_i \text{IF}(|\phi_i\rangle, |\varphi_i\rangle)]^2 \quad (15)$$

$$\geq \text{IF}^2(\rho, \varrho'') \geq \min_{\varrho \in \Omega} \text{IF}^2(\rho, \varrho), \quad (16)$$

where $\varrho'' = \sum_i r_i |\varphi_i\rangle\langle\varphi_i|$, and we have used the joint-convexity of infidelity in the second inequality. For arbitrary two pure states $|\phi\rangle, |\varphi\rangle$, we have $\sqrt{1 - |\langle\phi|\varphi\rangle|^2} = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left[|\phi\rangle\langle\phi| - |\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi| \right] \equiv \mathcal{D}_{\text{Tr}}(\phi, \varphi)$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_G(\rho) &= \sum_i r_i \cdot E_G(\phi_i) = \sum_i r_i [\mathcal{D}_{\text{Tr}}(\phi_i, \varrho_{\phi_i})]^2 \\ &\geq [\mathcal{D}_{\text{Tr}}(\rho, \sum_i r_i \varrho_{\phi_i})]^2 \geq [E_{\text{Tr}}(\rho, \varrho)]^2. \end{aligned}$$

Robustness of Entanglement. — There are also other measures such as the robustness of entanglement [39]

$$E_{\text{Rob}}(\rho) = \frac{p}{1-p}, \quad (17)$$

where $0 \leq p \leq 1$ is the minimal number for some separable state $\varrho \in \Omega$ such that the mixture $(1-p)\rho + p\varrho$ becomes separable. This measure quantifies the robustness of entanglement to noise. For the E_{Rob} , we specify the the optimal separable state as ϱ and minimal wight as p , then $\rho_\omega \equiv (1-p)\rho + p\varrho \in \Omega$. From $1 \geq \mathcal{D}_{\text{Tr}}(\rho, \varrho)$ it follows $p \geq p\mathcal{D}_{\text{Tr}}(\rho, \varrho) = \mathcal{D}_{\text{Tr}}(\rho, \rho_\omega) \geq E_{\text{Tr}}(\rho)$. We thus arrive at

$$E_{\text{Rob}}(\rho) = \frac{p}{1-p} \geq \frac{E_{\text{Tr}}(\rho)}{1 - E_{\text{Tr}}(\rho)}. \quad (18)$$

Lower bound E_G in minimal Bell's scenario. — We recall that, for two binary measurements, say A_0 and A_1 , acting in Hilbert space \mathcal{H} of finite dimension. There are decompositions $\mathcal{H}_A = \oplus_i \mathcal{H}_{i|A}$ and $A_{0,1} = \otimes_i A_{0,1}^{(i)}$, such that $\mathcal{H}_{i|A}$ are two-dimensional and $A_{0,1}^{(i)}$ are projective measurements acting on it. This argument applies to the measurements on Bob's side. With notions $\hat{P}_{i|A}$ and $\hat{P}_{j|B}$ specifying the projectors on the space $\mathcal{H}_{i|A}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{j|B}$ and $\hat{\Pi}_{ij} \equiv \hat{P}_{i|A} \otimes \hat{P}_{j|B}$, $\sum_{i,j} \hat{\Pi}_{i,j} \rho \hat{\Pi}_{i,j} = \sum_{i,j} f_{ij} \rho_{ij}$. It follows the monotonicity of entanglement measure under physical operation that

$$E(\rho) \geq \sum f_{ij} E(\rho_{ij}).$$

Note that, any two-qubit state can be convert into the one diagonal in Bell's basis [52] via local operation and classical communication while not changing the maximum score of Bell's inequaty. We specify such diagonal state corresponding to ρ_{ij} by $\rho_{ij|bell}$. Definitely, $E(\rho_{ij}) \geq E(\rho_{ij|bell})$. Then we have

$$E(\rho) \geq \sum f_{ij} E(\rho_{ij}) \geq \sum f_{ij} E(\rho_{ij|bell}). \quad (19)$$

For Bell's diagonal state, one has $E_C(\rho_{ij|bell}) \geq \sqrt{\frac{\beta^2_{ij|bell}}{4} - 1}$, via a the technique like convex closure to acquire a closed form, one has [49]

$$\begin{aligned} E_C(\rho) &\geq \sum f_{ij} E_C(\rho_{ij}) \geq \sum f_{ij} \sqrt{\frac{\beta^2_{ij|bell}}{4} - 1} \\ &\geq \frac{\beta - 2}{2\sqrt{2} - 2}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Focus on E_G , for two-qubit system one has $E_G = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 - E_C^2}$ [39], thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_G(\rho) &\geq \sum_{ij} f_{ij} \frac{1}{2} [1 - \sqrt{1 - E_C^2(\rho_{ij})}] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \{1 - \sqrt{1 - [\sum_{ij} f_{ij} E_C(\rho_{ij})]^2}\}. \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \{1 - \sqrt{1 - (\frac{\beta-2}{2\sqrt{2}-2})^2}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Optimizing the estimation of entanglement with the maximum Bell nonlocality of CHSH inequality. — When the maximum value of CHSH inequality is $2\sqrt{2}$, the measurements on each side are self-test to be mutually unbiased. For them, there are well-known uncertainty relations $\langle A_0 \rangle^2 + \langle A_1 \rangle^2 \leq 1$ and $\langle B_0 \rangle^2 + \langle B_1 \rangle^2 \leq 1$. These relations imply a bound on $\max_{\rho \in \Omega} \langle \mathcal{B} \rangle_{\rho}$. Specifically, for a product state $\rho = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B$, one has the correlations as $\langle A_i B_j \rangle_{\rho} = \langle A_i \rangle_{\rho_A} \langle B_j \rangle_{\rho_B}$ and $\langle \mathcal{B}_{chsh} \rangle_{\rho} = \sum_{i,j=0,1} (-1)^{ij} \langle A_i \rangle_{\rho_A} \langle B_j \rangle_{\rho_B}$. The uncertainty relations then imply $\max_{\rho \in \Omega} \langle \mathcal{B}_{chsh} \rangle_{\rho} = \sqrt{2}$. Then one can optimizing the distance within the correlation $\mathcal{L}_{\sqrt{2}} \equiv \{\mathbf{Q} | \beta(\mathbf{Q}) \leq \sqrt{2}\}$.

Proof of Theorem 2 — Given an arbitrary Bell inequality

$$\beta(\mathbf{P}_{\rho}) = \sum_{\vec{a}|\vec{m}} \alpha_{\vec{a}|\vec{m}} p_{\rho}(\vec{a}|\vec{m}) \leq c$$

and denote

$$\alpha_{\vec{m}}^{\pm} = \frac{\max_{\vec{a}} \alpha_{\vec{a}|\vec{m}} \pm \min_{\vec{a}} \alpha_{\vec{a}|\vec{m}}}{2}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\beta(\mathbf{P}_{\rho}) - \beta(\mathbf{P}_l) \\ &= \sum_{\vec{a}, \vec{m}} \alpha_{\vec{a}|\vec{m}} (p_{\rho}(\vec{a}|\vec{m}) - p_l(\vec{a}|\vec{m})) \\ &= \sum_{\vec{a}, \vec{m}} (\alpha_{\vec{a}|\vec{m}} - \alpha_{\vec{m}}^+) (p_{\rho}(\vec{a}|\vec{m}) - p_l(\vec{a}|\vec{m})) \\ &\leq \sum_{\vec{m}} \alpha_{\vec{m}}^- \sum_{\vec{a}} |p_{\rho}(\vec{a}|\vec{m}) - p_l(\vec{a}|\vec{m})| \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{\vec{m}} \alpha_{\vec{m}}^- D(\rho, \rho^*) = \alpha D(\rho, \rho^*) \end{aligned}$$

where with ρ^* is the nearest separable state for ρ under trace distance and

$$\alpha = 2 \sum_{\vec{m}} \alpha_{\vec{m}}^- = \sum_{\vec{m}} (\max_{\vec{a}} \alpha_{\vec{a}|\vec{m}} - \min_{\vec{a}} \alpha_{\vec{a}|\vec{m}})$$

Symmetry — The CHSH inequality is maximally violated by the correlation $\mathbf{P}_{\rho} = \{p(ab|xy)\}$ where

$$p(ab|xy) = \frac{1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (-1)^{a+b+xy}}{4}.$$

This correlation is highly symmetric, e.g., it is unchanged under the following transformations

i) $a \rightarrow a + c$ and $b \rightarrow b + c$;

ii) $x \rightarrow x + z$ and $y \rightarrow y + w$ and $a \rightarrow a + zy + xw + zw$

for arbitrary $c, w, z = 0, 1$, where addition is modular 2. Next we shall show that i) the nearest local correlation shares the same symmetry and ii) this symmetry determines the local correlation to be of form

$$p_l(ab|xy) = \frac{1 + \alpha(-1)^{a+b+xy}}{4}$$

with $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}$ in order to satisfy the CHSH inequality. For a local correlation $\mathbf{p}_l = \{p_l(ab|xy)\}$ we denote

$$q_l(st|xy) = \sum_{a,b=0}^1 (-1)^{sa+tb} p_l(ab|xy)$$

so that

$$p_l(ab|xy) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{s,t=0}^1 (-1)^{sa+tb} q_l(st|xy)$$

In order to evaluate

$$\mathfrak{D}(\mathbf{p}_\rho, \mathcal{L}) = \min_{\mathbf{Q}_l \in \mathcal{L}} \max_{x,y} \sum_{a,b} |p_\rho(ab|xy) - p_l(ab|xy)|$$

we note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{a,b} |p_\rho(ab|xy) - p_l(ab|xy)| \\ &= \sum_{a,b} |p_\rho(a+c, b+c|xy) - p_l(a+c, b+c|xy)| \\ &= \sum_{a,b} |p_\rho(a, b|xy) - p_l(a+c, b+c|xy)| \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{c=0}^1 \sum_{a,b} |p_\rho(a, b|xy) - p_l(a+c, b+c|xy)| \\ &\geq \sum_{a,b} \left| p_\rho(a, b|xy) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{c=0}^1 p_l(a+c, b+c|xy) \right| \end{aligned}$$

Thus a new correlation

$$\begin{aligned} p'_l(ab|xy) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{c=0}^1 p_l(a+c, b+c|xy) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{s=0}^1 (-1)^{s(a+b)} q_l(ss|xy) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \left(1 + (-1)^{a+b} \sum_{s,t=0}^1 (-1)^{sx+ty} r_{st} \right) \end{aligned}$$

is not farer away from \mathcal{L} , where

$$r_{st} = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{x,y=0}^1 q_l(11|xy) (-1)^{sx+ty}$$

In the similar manner from symmetry ii it follows that the new correlation

$$\begin{aligned}
p'_l(ab|xy) &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{z,w=0}^1 p'_l(a + zy + xw + zw, b|x + z, y + w) \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \left(1 + (-1)^{a+b} \sum_{s,t=0}^1 r_{st} (-1)^{sx+ty} \sum_{z,w=0}^1 (-1)^{zw+z(y+s)+w(x+t)} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \left(1 + (-1)^{a+b} \sum_{s,t=0}^1 r_{st} (-1)^{sx+ty} \cdot 2(-1)^{(y+s)(x+t)} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \left(1 + (-1)^{a+b+xy} 2 \sum_{s,t=0}^1 r_{st} (-1)^{st} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

with $\alpha = 2 \sum_{st} r_{st} (-1)^{st}$. To satisfy CHSH inequality it is clear that $\alpha \leq 1/2$ so that we obtain

$$\mathfrak{D}(\mathbf{p}_\rho, \mathcal{L}) = \frac{1}{2} \min_{\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} - \alpha \right) = \frac{\sqrt{2} - 1}{4}$$

Proof of Eq.(10) — In a local realistic model, we have

$$p(\vec{a}|\vec{m}) = \sum_{\lambda} \rho_{\lambda} \prod_{i=1}^n p_{\lambda}(a_i|m_i)$$

and we shall prove by induction on odd n that

$$\sum_{\vec{1} \cdot \vec{m} \equiv_2 1} (-1)^{\Gamma(\vec{m})} \langle A_{\vec{m}} \rangle \leq 2^{\frac{n-1}{2}}$$

where we have denoted $A_{\vec{m}} = \prod_k A_{m_k}$ with $A_{m_k} = (-1)^{a_k}$ and average is taken over $p(\vec{a}|\vec{m})$. In fact, by noting that if we write $\vec{m} = (x, y, \vec{m}')$ it holds

$$\Gamma(\vec{m}) = \Gamma(\vec{m}') + xy + (x + y)\vec{1}' \cdot \vec{m}'$$

and thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\vec{1} \cdot \vec{m} \equiv_2 t} (-1)^{\Gamma(\vec{m})} A_{\vec{m}} &= (A_{00}^{12} - A_{11}^{12}) \sum_{\vec{1}' \cdot \vec{m}' \equiv_2 1} (-1)^{\Gamma(\vec{m}')} A_{\vec{m}'} + (A_{01}^{12} + A_{10}^{12}) \sum_{\vec{1}' \cdot \vec{m}' \equiv_2 0} (-1)^{\Gamma(\vec{m}')} A_{\vec{m}'} \\
&= (A_{00}^{12} - A_{11}^{12}) \sum_{\vec{1}' \cdot \vec{m}' \equiv_2 1} (-1)^{\Gamma(\vec{m}')} A_{\vec{m}'} + (-1)^{\Gamma(\vec{1}')} (A_{01}^{12} + A_{10}^{12}) \sum_{\vec{1}' \cdot \vec{m}' \equiv_2 1} (-1)^{\Gamma(\vec{m}')} A_{\vec{m}'+\vec{1}'}
\end{aligned}$$

from which it follows

$$\beta_M \stackrel{L}{\leq} \sum_{\lambda} \rho_{\lambda} \left(\langle A_{00}^{12} - A_{11}^{12} \rangle_{\lambda}^2 + (-1)^{\Gamma(\vec{1}')} \langle A_{01}^{12} + A_{10}^{12} \rangle_{\lambda}^2 \right) 2^{\frac{n-3}{2}} \leq 2 \cdot 2^{\frac{n-3}{2}} = 2^{\frac{n-1}{2}}$$

Actually the upper bound for quantum theory is the algebraic upper bound for this inequality and is achieved by GHZ state. To show this we shall employ the graph state representation of GHZ state by complete graph

$$|GHZ\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{\vec{x}} (-1)^{\Gamma(\vec{x})} |\vec{x}\rangle$$

with stabilizers $\mathcal{G}_k = X_k Z_{\bar{k}}$ with $X = \sigma_x$ and $Z = \sigma_z$. By measuring observables $\{X, Z\} = \{\hat{A}_0, \hat{A}_1\}$ for each party we obtain correlation

$$p(\vec{a}|\vec{m}) = \frac{1 + \frac{1}{2}(1 - (-1)^{\vec{1} \cdot \vec{m}})(-1)^{\vec{1} \cdot \vec{a} + \Gamma(\vec{m})}}{2^n}. \quad (22)$$

as a result of identity

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{GHZ} - Z_I \rho_{GHZ} Z_I &= \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \sum_{\vec{m} \cdot \vec{1} \equiv 2^1} \prod_{k=1}^n \mathcal{G}_k^{m_k} \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \sum_{\vec{m} \cdot \vec{1} \equiv 2^1} (-1)^{\Gamma(\vec{m})} \hat{A}_{\vec{m}}\end{aligned}$$

* sun18@ustc.edu.cn

† yusixia@ustc.edu.cn

- [1] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2009).
- [2] N. Brunner, D. Cavalcanti, S. Pironio, V. Scarani, and S. Wehner, Rev. Mod. Phys. **86**, 419 (2014).
- [3] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777 (1935).
- [4] E. Schrödinger, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **31**, 555 (1935).
- [5] J. S. Bell, Physics Physique Fizika **1**, 195 (1964).
- [6] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895 (1993).
- [7] A. K. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 661 (1991).
- [8] R. Raussendorf and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5188 (2001).
- [9] R. Raussendorf, D. E. Browne, and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 022312 (2003).
- [10] H. J. Briegel, D. E. Browne, W. Dür, R. Raussendorf, and M. V. den Nest, Nat. Phys **5**, 19 (2009).
- [11] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, Science **306**, 1330 (2004).
- [12] T. Moroder, J.-D. Bancal, Y.-C. Liang, M. Hofmann, and O. Gühne, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 030501 (2013).
- [13] S. Yu, Q. Chen, C. Zhang, C. H. Lai, and C. H. Oh, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 120402 (2012).
- [14] S. Yu, Z.-B. Chen, J.-W. Pan, and Y.-D. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 080401 (2003).
- [15] A. Acín, S. Massar, and S. Pironio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 100402 (2012).
- [16] R. Augusiak, M. Demianowicz, J. Tura, and A. Acín, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 030404 (2015).
- [17] L. Masanes, Y.-C. Liang, and A. C. Doherty, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 090403 (2008).
- [18] H. M. Wiseman, S. J. Jones, and A. C. Doherty, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 140402 (2007).
- [19] J. Barrett, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 042302 (2002).
- [20] S. Popescu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2619 (1995).
- [21] L. Hardy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 1665 (1993).
- [22] R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 4277 (1989).
- [23] A. Acín, R. Gill, and N. Gisin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 210402 (2005).
- [24] S. Hill and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 5022 (1997).
- [25] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998).
- [26] M. Jafarizadeh, M. Mirzaee, and M. Rezaei Keramati, Int. J. Quantum Inf. **3** (2005).
- [27] K. Bartkiewicz, B. Horst, K. Lemr, and A. Miranowicz, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 052105 (2013).
- [28] Z. Su, H. Tan, and X. Li, Phys. Rev. A **101**, 042112 (2020).
- [29] V. Vedral, M. B. Plenio, M. A. Rippin, and P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 2275 (1997).
- [30] V. Vedral and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 1619 (1998).
- [31] V. Vedral, M. B. Plenio, K. Jacobs, and P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 4452 (1997).
- [32] O. Biham, M. A. Nielsen, and T. J. Osborne, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 062312 (2002).
- [33] D. Shapira, Y. Shimoni, and O. Biham, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 044301 (2006).
- [34] E. Rains, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **47**, 2921 (2001).
- [35] C. W. Helstrom, J. Stat. Phys. **1**, 231 (1969).
- [36] A. Uhlmann, Open Syst. Inf. Dyn. **5**, 209 (1998).
- [37] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824 (1996).
- [38] H. Barnum and N. Linden, J. Phys. A Math. Theor. **34**, 6787 (2001).
- [39] T.-C. Wei and P. M. Goldbart, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 042307 (2003).
- [40] B. S. Tsirelson, Hadronic J. Suppl. **329** (1993).
- [41] S. G. A. Brito, B. Amaral, and R. Chaves, Phys. Rev. A **97**, 022111 (2018).
- [42] D. Kaszlikowski, P. Gnaniński, M. Żukowski, W. Miklaszewski, and A. Zeilinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 4418 (2000).
- [43] N. D. Mermin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 1838 (1990).
- [44] R. F. Werner and M. M. Wolf, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 032112 (2001).
- [45] M. Żukowski and i. c. v. Brukner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 210401 (2002).
- [46] M. Żukowski, D. Kaszlikowski, A. Baturó, and J.-Å. Larsson, Strengthening the bell theorem: conditions to falsify local realism in an experiment (1999), arXiv:quant-ph/9910058.
- [47] S. Boyd, S. P. Boyd, and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex optimization* (Cambridge university press, 2004).
- [48] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **23**, 880 (1969).
- [49] Y. Zhu, X. Zhang, and X. Ma, Entanglement quantification via nonlocality (2023), arXiv:2303.08407 [quant-ph].

- [50] B. S. Tsirelson, *Hadronic J. Suppl.* **8**, 329 (1993).
- [51] L. Masanes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 050503 (2006).
- [52] S. Pironio, A. Acín, N. Brunner, N. Gisin, S. Massar, and V. Scarani, *New J. Phys.* **11**, 045021 (2009).
- [53] D. Mayers and A. Yao, *Quantum Info. Comput* **4**, 273 (2004).
- [54] D. Mayers and A. Yao, *Quantum cryptography with imperfect apparatus* (1998).
- [55] S. M. Roy and V. Singh, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 2761 (1991).
- [56] A. V. Belinskii and D. N. Klyshko, *Physics-Uspekhi* **36**, 653 (1993).
- [57] M. Ardehali, *Phys. Rev. A* **46**, 5375 (1992).
- [58] S. Yu and C. H. Oh, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 032111 (2017).