

**ON A QUESTION OF  
BLECHER, PISIER, SHLYAKHTENKO**

ROY ARAIZA, MARIUS JUNGE, AND CARLOS PALAZUELOS

ABSTRACT. We show the failure of a matricial version of Grothendieck’s theorem for operator spaces, thereby resolving a long-standing open question in the field. Moreover, by showing that such a counterexample can occur in the simplest context of commutative  $C^*$ -algebras, we address some other open questions in operator algebras. Our constructions, completely explicit and fairly simple, are inspired by some techniques in quantum information theory.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

Grothendieck’s contributions to functional analysis [8], despite initially overlooked, transformed Banach space theory and gave rise to the Grothendieck program on operator algebras [18]. Moreover, Grothendieck’s “fundamental theorem” has applications today that span a wide range of fields, including computer science and quantum information theory [13, 22].

In his work, Grothendieck employed a functorial approach to study the smallest  $\otimes_\epsilon$  and largest  $\otimes_\pi$  norms on the tensor product of two Banach spaces. His fundamental theorem can be formulated as follows:

$$(1.1) \quad \ell_1 \otimes_\epsilon \ell_1 \cong \ell_1 \otimes_{\gamma_2^*} \ell_1 \quad \text{isomorphically,}$$

where  $\gamma_2^*$  is dual of the  $\gamma_2$  norm, derived from the Hilbert space factorization norm for linear maps. This theorem highlights a remarkable property of tensor products of Banach spaces, revealing deep connections between different norms and structures (see [5] and the references therein).

In 1974 Pisier provided a positive answer to one of Grothendieck’s problems by showing that

$$(1.2) \quad A^* \otimes_\epsilon B^* \cong A^* \otimes_{\gamma_2^*} B^* \quad \text{isomorphically}$$

holds for  $C^*$ -algebra  $A, B$  with an additional approximability assumption [16]. That is, Pisier replaced commutative  $L_1$ -spaces by noncommutative ones. This result was later improved by Haagerup [9], who removed the approximability assumption made in [16] and clarified the correct analogue to  $\gamma_2^*$  in the context of operator algebras.

The category of operator spaces, which are closed subspaces of  $C^*$ -algebras endowed with an induced matricial structure, is closed under taking dual spaces, closed subspaces and quotients.

---

*Key words and phrases.* Grothendieck’s Theorem, Operator spaces.

MJ is partially supported by the NSF grants DMS 2247114 and Raise-TAG183917. C.P. is partially supported by the MICINN project PID2020-113523GB-I00, by QUITEMAD+-CM, P2018/TCS4342, funded by Comunidad de Madrid and by Grant CEX2019-000904-S funded by MCINN/AEI/ 10.13039/501100011033. C.P. gratefully acknowledges financial support for this publication by the Fulbright Program, which is sponsored by the U.S. Department of State, the U.S.- Spain Fulbright Commission.

In particular, the dual of a  $C^*$ -algebra has a natural operator space structure. Moreover, a theory of tensor products can be naturally developed in this category [3], allowing for analogues of Grothendieck's smallest and largest tensor norms. It turns out that for operator spaces  $X \subset \mathcal{B}(H)$  and  $Y \subset \mathcal{B}(K)$ , the smallest norm

$$X \otimes_{\min} Y \subset \mathcal{B}(H \otimes_2 K)$$

matches exactly the construction for tensor products of  $C^*$ -algebras. On the other hand, Grothendieck's Hilbert space factorization norm is usually replaced by the so-called Haagerup tensor product

$$\|\xi\|_{X \otimes_h Y} = \inf_{\xi = \sum_{k=1}^m x_k \otimes y_k} \|(x_1, \dots, x_m)\| \left\| \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ \vdots \\ y_m \end{pmatrix} \right\|.$$

The Haagerup tensor product  $X \otimes_h Y$  comes with a natural operator space structure and appears to be the appropriate tool to refine (1.2) into a form more closely resembling (1.1). Indeed, in 1991 Blecher conjectured a fully functorial operator space version of Grothendieck's theorem: for general  $C^*$ -algebras  $A$  and  $B$ , it holds

$$(1.3) \quad A^* \otimes_{\min} B^* \stackrel{?}{\cong} A^* \otimes_{\mu} B^* \quad \text{completely isomorphically,}$$

where  $A^* \otimes_{\mu} B^* = A^* \otimes_h B^* + B^* \otimes_h A^*$  may be considered as a quotient of the direct sum  $A^* \otimes_h B^* \oplus B^* \otimes_h A^*$  with respect to the map  $q(a_1 \otimes b_1 \oplus b_2 \otimes a_2) = a_1 \otimes b_1 + a_2 \otimes b_2$ .

A breakthrough in this problem was achieved by Piser and Shlyakhtenko in [20], where they conclusively demonstrated that the answer to the preceding question is indeed positive at the Banach space level. They proved

$$(1.4) \quad A^* \otimes_{\min} B^* \cong A^* \otimes_{\mu} B^* \quad \text{isomorphically,}$$

assuming that the  $C^*$ -algebras  $A$  and  $B$  are exact. Notably, their results extended beyond the setting of  $C^*$ -algebras to encompass general exact operator spaces. Subsequently, Haagerup and Musat in [10] furthered this understanding to include general  $C^*$ -algebras. However, the broader question concerning the operator space structure of the corresponding tensors products in Conjecture (1.3) remained unresolved in [20] (see also [18, Problem 21.2]).

The first result presented in this work provides a negative answer to Blecher's conjecture. Moreover, to this end, we do not consider the whole matricial structure of the tensor product, but only a column structure. If  $\mathcal{K}(\ell_2)$  denotes the space of compact operators on  $\ell_2$  and  $C$  is the column operator space, we prove:

**Theorem 1.1.**

$$C \otimes_{\min} (\mathcal{K}(\ell_2)^* \otimes_{\min} \mathcal{K}(\ell_2)^*) \neq C \otimes_{\min} (\mathcal{K}(\ell_2)^* \otimes_{\mu} \mathcal{K}(\ell_2)^*) \quad \text{isomorphically,}$$

In fact, we will demonstrate an even stronger result than Theorem 1.1 by proving the same statement with the operator space  $\mathcal{K}(\ell_2)^* \otimes_{\min} \mathcal{K}(\ell_2)^*$  replaced by  $\mathcal{K}(\ell_2)^* \otimes_{\max} \mathcal{K}(\ell_2)^*$ . This allows us to link the previous conjecture on Grothendieck's theorem with some fundamental questions in operator algebras. To explain the scope of this and the following results, given an operator space  $X$ , let us denote by  $OA(X)$  its unital universal operator algebra and by  $C^*\langle X \rangle$  its unital universal  $C^*$ -algebra, respectively (see Section 2 for details). Then, it was proved in [14] that

$$X \otimes_{\mu} Y \subset OA(X) \otimes_{\max} OA(Y) \quad \text{completely isometrically,}$$

while one defines the max norm so that

$$X \otimes_{\max} Y \subset C^*\langle X \rangle \otimes_{\max} C^*\langle Y \rangle \quad \text{completely isometrically.}$$

Hence, the analogous statement to Theorem 1.1, when the min is replaced with the max norm, can be restated in terms of the corresponding subspaces of the previous algebras when  $X = Y = \mathcal{K}(\ell_2)^*$  is the space of trace class operators.

The previous viewpoint strongly motivates considering Conjecture 1.3 when focusing on commutative  $C^*$ -algebras; specifically, when  $X = Y = \ell_1$ . This problem, already considered in [20] (see also [17, Chapter 25]), highlights the equivalence, at the matrix level, to the context originally considered by Grothendieck, since the equivalence

$$\ell_1 \otimes_{\mu} \ell_1 \cong \ell_1 \otimes_{\max} \ell_1 \quad \text{isomorphically,}$$

follows from the classical Grothendieck's Theorem stated in (1.1). Our second result, the main result of this work, states that this is not longer true in the category of operator spaces:

**Theorem 1.2.**

$$\mathcal{K}(\ell_2) \otimes_{\min} (\ell_1 \otimes_{\max} \ell_1) \neq \mathcal{K}(\ell_2) \otimes_{\min} (\ell_1 \otimes_{\mu} \ell_1) \quad \text{isomorphically.}$$

Since it is well known that  $C^*\langle \ell_1 \rangle = C^*(\mathbb{F}_{\infty})$ , one can alternatively express Theorem 1.2 by indicating that the natural inclusion  $OA(\ell_1) \otimes_{\max} OA(\ell_1) \subseteq C^*(\mathbb{F}_{\infty}) \otimes_{\max} C^*(\mathbb{F}_{\infty})$  is not completely isomorphic, even when restricted to the linear subspace  $\ell_1 \otimes \ell_1$ . According to the precise definitions of  $OA(\ell_1)$  and  $C^*\langle \ell_1 \rangle$ , Theorem 1.2 underscores a significant limitation in lifting specific sets of commuting contractions to commuting unitaries (see Remark 4.1).

The approach followed in this work delves into the deep relationship between the theories of operator spaces and nonlocal games [15]. On one hand, the proof of Theorem 1.1 is inspired by the CHSH $_n$  games [1], an extension of the renowned CHSH inequality, which holds paramount significance in quantum theory. On the other hand, the proof of Theorem 1.2 utilizes certain embeddings between noncommutative  $L_p$ -spaces proved by the second and third authors in [12], which are motivated by the quantum teleportation protocol in quantum computation. The combination of these techniques, along with some operator space computations, lead to completely explicit and (arguably) simple elements to demonstrate the previous theorems.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Basic on operator spaces and operator algebras.** In this section we will review some of the necessary basics of operator spaces and their tensor products which we will invoke throughout the manuscript. We refer to [6, 17] for comprehensive references on the topic.

An *operator space* is a closed subspace  $X \subset \mathcal{B}(H)$ , where  $\mathcal{B}(H)$  denotes the spaces of bounded operators acting on a complex Hilbert space  $H$ . For any such subspace one naturally obtains a sequence of matrix norms  $\|\cdot\|_n$  on  $M_n(X)$  via the inclusion  $M_n(X) \subseteq M_n(\mathcal{B}(H)) \simeq \mathcal{B}(H^{\oplus n})$ . Ruan's Theorem [21] characterizes the sequences of norms that can be achieved in this manner, offering an alternative definition of an operator space as a complex Banach space  $X$  equipped with a sequence of matrix norms  $(M_n(X), \|\cdot\|_n)$  that satisfy specific conditions. In both scenarios, we say that  $X$  is endowed with an *operator space structure*.

When considering operator spaces, the norm on linear operators must reflect the matrix structure defined by the operator space structure. For a linear map between operator spaces  $T : X \rightarrow Y$ , we say that it is *completely bounded* if  $\|T\|_{cb} := \sup_n \|\text{Id} \otimes T : M_n(X) \rightarrow M_n(Y)\|$  is finite. We will say that  $T$  is *completely contractive* if  $\|T\|_{cb} \leq 1$ . Moreover,  $T$  is termed a *complete isomorphism* (resp. *complete isometry*) if it is an isomorphism with  $T$  and  $T^{-1}$  completely bounded (resp. completely contractive).

Given an operator space  $X$ , then  $X^*$  has a privileged operator space structure with norms on  $M_n(X^*)$  given via the identification

$$M_n(X^*) = \text{CB}(X, M_n),$$

where the latter denotes the operator space of completely bounded maps  $T : X \rightarrow M_n$  endowed with the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{cb}$ . Every  $C^*$ -algebra  $A$  has a natural operator space structure. Therefore, by duality,  $\ell_1$  and the space of trace class operators  $S_1$  also have a natural operator space structure, as they are the duals of  $c_0$  and the space of compact operators  $\mathcal{K}(\ell_2)$ , respectively. Moreover, the natural operator spaces structure on the space of bounded operators acting on  $\ell_2$ ,  $S_\infty$ , matches the one given by the duality  $S_1^* = S_\infty$ .

Important examples which we use throughout this manuscript are the *column* and *row* Hilbert operator spaces. Given a Hilbert space  $H$ , the column operator space  $H_c$  is defined by means of the natural identification

$$H \cong \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}, H).$$

For the particular case  $H = \ell_2^n$ , we will simply denote  $C_n$ . By duality, we can define the row operator space  $H_r = (H_c)^*$ , where we recall that, given a Hilbert space  $H$ , its dual space  $H^*$  is naturally identified with the conjugate  $\overline{H}$ . As in the previous case, the finite dimensional row space will be simply denoted by  $R_n$ .

An abstract theory for operator space tensor products was first developed by Blecher and Paulsen in [3] in which they introduce the *projective* and *injective* operator space tensor products. Given two operator spaces  $X, Y$ , and  $w \in M_n(X \otimes Y)$ , define the *operator space projective norm* of  $w$  as

$$\|w\|_\wedge := \inf\{\|\alpha\|\|x\|\|y\|\|\beta\|\},$$

where the infimum is taken over  $p, q, n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $x \in M_p(X)$ ,  $y \in M_q(Y)$ ,  $\alpha \in M_{n,pq}$ ,  $\beta \in M_{pq,n}$ , such that  $w = \alpha(x \otimes y)\beta$ . We denote by  $X \hat{\otimes} Y$  the corresponding operator space. As one may expect from its name, the projective tensor norm preserves (complete) quotients. One may also consider this operator space as the ‘‘predual’’ of the operator space  $\text{CB}(X, Y^*)$ . In particular, one has the complete isometry  $(X \hat{\otimes} Y)^* = \text{CB}(X, Y^*)$ . As previously stated, the operator space *injective (minimal)* tensor product is induced via the embedding into the minimal  $C^*$ -algebra tensor product. Thus, if  $X \subset \mathcal{B}(H), Y \subset \mathcal{B}(K)$ , then we have the completely isometric embedding  $X \otimes_{\min} Y \subset \mathcal{B}(H \otimes_2 K)$ . In particular, it follows that the min norm is preserved by (complete) isometries. It can be seen that, given  $w \in M_n(X \otimes Y)$ , one has

$$\|w\|_{M_n(X \otimes_{\min} Y)} = \sup \left\| (\text{Id} \otimes T \otimes S)(w) \right\|_{M_n(\mathcal{B}(H \otimes K))},$$

where the supremum is taken over all Hilbert spaces  $H$  and  $K$  and all complete contractions  $T : X \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(H)$  and  $S : Y \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(K)$ . In comparison to the projective tensor product, we have the completely isometric embedding  $X \otimes_{\min} Y \subseteq \text{CB}(X^*, Y)$ . Hence, we see that the projective and the injective norms are dual to each other and for finite-dimensional operator spaces  $X, Y$ , there

are the following completely isometric identifications

$$(X \hat{\otimes} Y)^* = X^* \otimes_{\min} Y^*, \quad (X \otimes_{\min} Y)^* = X^* \hat{\otimes} Y^*.$$

Given operator spaces  $X \subset \mathcal{B}(H)$  and  $Y \subset \mathcal{B}(K)$ , we define the *Haagerup operator space norm* for  $w \in M_n(X \otimes Y)$  as

$$\|w\|_h := \inf\{\|u\|_{M_{n,r}(X)}\|v\|_{M_{r,n}(Y)}\},$$

where the infimum runs over  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $u, v$ , such that  $w_{i,j} = \sum_{k=1}^r u_{i,k} \otimes v_{k,j}$  for every  $i, j$ . We denote by  $X \otimes_h Y$  the corresponding operator space, which is usually called the *Haagerup operator space tensor product*. Despite being injective, projective and self-dual, it has been long known that  $\otimes_h$  is not commutative.

It is well known that the previous norms behave nicely when considering tensor products of linear maps. Specifically, if  $\alpha$  denotes any of the previous three norms and  $T_i : X_i \rightarrow Y_i$  are completely bounded maps for  $i = 1, 2$ , then the map

$$T_1 \otimes T_2 : X_1 \otimes_\alpha X_2 \rightarrow Y_1 \otimes_\alpha Y_2$$

is completely bounded and

$$\|T_1 \otimes T_2\|_{cb} = \|T_1\|_{cb}\|T_2\|_{cb}.$$

This is usually refer to as the *metric mapping property* in the category of operator spaces. Also, by iterating the process, one can define the aforementioned norms on the tensor product of more than two spaces. Remarkably, all three norms exhibit associativity. Furthermore, the previous properties (related to projectivity, injectivity, duality, etc.) remain consistent and apply in the same manner.

The previously discussed tensor norms are closely related when examining the column and row spaces. In fact, it can be proven that for every operator space  $X$ , the equalities

$$(2.1) \quad C \otimes_{\min} X = C \otimes_h X \quad \text{and} \quad X \otimes_{\min} R = X \otimes_h R$$

hold completely isometrically. By duality, one also has  $R \hat{\otimes} X = R \otimes_h X$  and  $X \hat{\otimes} C = X \otimes_h C$  completely isometrically.

The previous identifications, along with the aforementioned properties of the tensor norms we are considering, easily imply that the following identities are complete isometries:

$$(2.2) \quad S_\infty \otimes_{\min} X = C \otimes_h X \otimes_h R, \quad S_1 \hat{\otimes} X = R \otimes_h X \otimes_h C.$$

Equation (2.2) and the well-known estimate  $\|\text{Id} : R_n \rightarrow C_n\|_{cb} = \|\text{Id} : C_n \rightarrow R_n\|_{cb} = \sqrt{n}$ , can be used to show that for every operator space  $X$ , it holds:

$$(2.3) \quad \left\| \frac{\text{Id}}{n} : S_\infty^n \otimes_{\min} X \rightarrow S_1^n \hat{\otimes} X \right\|_{cb} = 1.$$

As emphasized in the introduction, the non-commutativity of the Haagerup tensor norm leads one to consider the so-called *symmetrized Haagerup tensor product*  $\otimes_\mu$ , where given  $w \in M_n(X \otimes Y)$  we define

$$(2.4) \quad \|w\|_\mu := \inf\{\|w_1\|_{M_n(X \otimes_h Y)} + \|w_2^T\|_{M_n(Y \otimes_h X)} : w = w_1 + w_2\}.$$

Here, for  $w = \sum_i a_i \otimes x_i \otimes y_i$ , we have let  $w_2^T = \sum_i a_i \otimes y_i \otimes x_i$ .

Given an operator space  $X$ , its universal (unital) operator algebras  $OA(X)$  (see [17, Chapter 6] for a detailed construction of the algebra) is characterized by the following universal property: for any complete contraction  $T : X \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(H)$  there exists a unique unital morphism  $\pi : OA(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(H)$

extending  $T$ , where  $X$  is naturally embedded in  $OA(X)$ . This algebra is particularly interesting since, for operator spaces  $X$  and  $Y$ , it is known [14, Lemma 5] that

$$X \otimes_{\mu} Y \subset OA(X) \otimes_{max} OA(Y) \quad \text{completely isometrically.}$$

Here, the max norm is defined at the level of unital operator algebras. In particular, the previous inclusion shows that for any element  $w \in M_n(X \otimes Y)$ , we have

$$\|w\|_{M_n(X \otimes_{\mu} Y)} = \sup \left\| (\text{Id} \otimes T \odot S)(w) \right\|_{M_n(\mathcal{B}(H))},$$

where the supremum runs over all complex Hilbert spaces  $H$  and all complete contractions  $T : X \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(H)$  and  $S : Y \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(H)$  with commuting ranges and where we have denoted  $T \odot S$  the operator such that  $T \odot S(x \otimes y) = T(x)S(y)$ .

On the other hand, the universal (unital)  $C^*$ -algebra associated to an operator space  $X$ ,  $C^*\langle X \rangle$  (see [17, Chapter 8] for a detailed construction of the algebra<sup>1</sup>), is characterized by the following universal property: For any complete contraction  $T : X \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(H)$  there exists a unique unital  $*$ -homomorphism  $\pi : C^*\langle X \rangle \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(H)$  extending  $T$ , where  $X$  is naturally embedded in  $C^*\langle X \rangle$ . It can be seen that  $OA(X)$  can be identified with the closed subalgebra generated by  $X$  in  $C^*\langle X \rangle$  so that  $OA(X) \subset C^*\langle X \rangle$  completely isometrically. One then defines the max tensor product of two operator spaces  $X$  and  $Y$  so that the following inclusion is a complete isometry:

$$X \otimes_{max} Y \subset C^*\langle X \rangle \otimes_{max} C^*\langle Y \rangle,$$

where  $C^*\langle X \rangle \otimes_{max} C^*\langle Y \rangle$  denotes the corresponding tensor product in the category of  $C^*$ -algebras. In particular, if we use bracket notation  $[A, B]$  for the commutator of two operators in  $\mathcal{B}(H)$ , for any element  $w \in M_n(X \otimes Y)$  we have

$$(2.5) \quad \|w\|_{M_n(X \otimes_{max} Y)} = \sup \left\| (\text{Id} \otimes T \odot S)(w) \right\|_{M_n(\mathcal{B}(H))},$$

where the supremum is taken over all complex Hilbert spaces  $H$  and all complete contractions  $T : X \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(H)$  and  $S : Y \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(H)$  such that  $[T(x), S(y)] = [T(x), S(y)^{\dagger}] = 0$  for every  $x \in X$  and  $y \in Y$ . While the universal algebra is in general an unknown object, it is well known that  $C^*\langle \ell_1^n \rangle = C^*(\mathbb{F}_{n-1})$  and  $C^*\langle S_1^n \rangle = B_n$ , where  $C^*(\mathbb{F}_{n-1})$  is the full  $C^*$ -algebra associated to the free group and  $B_n$  denotes the Brown algebra.

**2.2. Some basic results involving the Haagerup tensor norm.** In this section, we present some auxiliary results that will significantly simplify the readability of the proofs for the main theorems.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Given any natural number  $n$ , we have*

$$\|Id : S_1^n \hat{\otimes} (S_1^n \otimes_{min} S_{\infty}^n) \rightarrow S_1^{n^2} \otimes_{min} S_{\infty}^n\|_{cb} \leq 1.$$

*Proof.* According to the properties of the min and the Haagerup tensor norms, the following identifications are complete isometries.

$$\begin{aligned} S_1^n \hat{\otimes} (S_1^n \otimes_{min} S_{\infty}^n) &= S_1^n \hat{\otimes} (S_{\infty}^n \otimes_{min} S_1^n) = R_n^A \otimes_h (C_n^B \otimes_h (R_n^C \otimes_h C_n^C) \otimes_h R_n^B) \otimes_h C_n^A \\ &= (R_n^A \otimes_h C_n^B) \otimes_h R_n^C \otimes_h C_n^C \otimes_h (R_n^B \otimes_h C_n^A). \end{aligned}$$

<sup>1</sup>This algebra should not be confused with the injective envelop of an operator space  $I(X)$  as discussed in [4, 11].

Note that we have used the super indexes  $A$ ,  $B$  y  $C$  to denote the three spaces appearing in the tensor product  $S_1^n \hat{\otimes} (S_\infty^n \otimes_{\min} S_1^n)$ . This allows us to indicate to which of these spaces the column or row spaces correspond in the following equalities.

Now, since  $\|\text{Id} : R_n^A \otimes_h C_n^B \rightarrow C_n^B \otimes_h R_n^A\|_{cb} \leq 1$  and  $\|\text{Id} : R_n^B \otimes_h C_n^A \rightarrow C_n^A \otimes_h R_n^B\|_{cb} \leq 1$ , we conclude our proof by noticing the following completely isometric identifications:

$$\begin{aligned} (C_n^B \otimes_h R_n^A) \otimes_h R_n^C \otimes_h C_n^C \otimes_h (C_n^A \otimes_h R_n^B) &= C_n^B \otimes_h (R_n^A \otimes_h R_n^C \otimes_h C_n^C \otimes_h C_n^A) \otimes_h R_n^B \\ &= C_n^B \otimes_h (R_n^{AC} \otimes_h C_n^{AC}) \otimes_h R_n^B \\ &= S_\infty^n(S_1^{n^2}). \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 2.2.** *Given two operator spaces  $X$  and  $Y$  and any natural number  $n$ , we have*

- a)  $\|T : X \otimes_h M_n(Y) \rightarrow M_n(X \otimes_h Y)\|_{cb} \leq 1$ , where  $T$  is defined as  $T(x \otimes A \otimes y) = A \otimes x \otimes y$  on elementary tensors.
- b)  $\|\text{Id} : M_n(X) \otimes_h Y \rightarrow M_n(X \otimes_h Y)\|_{cb} \leq 1$ .

*Proof.* In order to prove the first estimate, note that

$$X \otimes_h M_n(Y) = (X \otimes_h (C_n \otimes_h Y \otimes_h R_n)) = (X \otimes_h C_n) \otimes_h (Y \otimes_h R_n)$$

completely isometrically. Now,  $\|\text{Id} : X \otimes_h C_n \rightarrow C_n \otimes_h X\|_{cb} \leq 1$ . On the other hand,

$$(C_n \otimes_h X) \otimes_h (Y \otimes_h R_n) = C_n \otimes_h (X \otimes_h Y) \otimes_h R_n = M_n(X \otimes_h Y)$$

completely isometrically. Hence, we prove the estimate a).

In order to prove the second estimate, note that

$$M_n(X) \otimes_h Y = (C_n \otimes_h X \otimes_h R_n) \otimes_h Y = (C_n \otimes_h X) \otimes_h (R_n \otimes_h Y)$$

completely isometrically. Now,  $\|\text{Id} : R_n \otimes_h Y \rightarrow Y \otimes_h R_n\|_{cb} \leq 1$ . On the other hand,

$$(C_n \otimes_h X) \otimes_h (Y \otimes_h R_n) = C_n \otimes_h (X \otimes_h Y) \otimes_h R_n = M_n(X \otimes_h Y)$$

completely isometrically. Hence, estimate b) follows. □

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $X$  be an operator space and  $(x_k)_k \subset X$  any sequences. Then,*

$$\left\| \sum_k e_k \otimes x_k \otimes e_k \right\|_{R \otimes_h X \otimes_h R} = \left( \sum_k \|x_k\|_X^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

*Proof.* Consider the operator space  $Y = R \otimes_h X \subset \mathcal{B}(H)$ , for a certain Hilbert space  $H$  and denote  $y_k = e_k \otimes x_k \in \mathcal{B}(H)$  for every  $k$ . It is clear that  $\|y_k\| = \|x_k\|$  for every  $k$ . In addition, using the injectivity of the Haagerup tensor norm, we can write

$$\left\| \sum_k y_k \otimes e_k \right\|_{R \otimes_h X \otimes_h R}^2 = \left\| \sum_k y_k \otimes e_k \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(H) \otimes_h R}^2 = \left\| \sum_k y_k y_k^* \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(H)} \leq \sum_k \|y_k\|_{\mathcal{B}(H)}^2 = \sum_k \|x_k\|_X^2,$$

where we have used the triangle inequality.

In order to prove the converse inequality, note that a completely analogous proof applies if we replace  $R$  with  $C$  and  $X$  with  $X^*$ , so that we can prove that for every sequence  $(x_k^*)_k \subset X^*$  the following inequality holds:

$$\left\| \sum_k e_k \otimes x_k^* \otimes e_k \right\|_{C \otimes_h X^* \otimes_h C}^2 \leq \sum_k \|x_k^*\|_{X^*}^2.$$

Hence, since  $(R \otimes_h X \otimes_h R)^* = C \otimes_h X^* \otimes_h C$  (completely) isometrically and also  $(\ell_2(X))^* = \ell_2(X^*)$  isometrically, the inequality

$$\left( \sum_k \|x_k\|_X^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \left\| \sum_k e_k \otimes x_k \otimes e_k \right\|_{R \otimes_h X \otimes_h R},$$

follows by duality.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $X$  be an operator space and  $(x_k)_k \subset X$  any sequences. Then,*

$$\left\| \sum_k e_k \otimes x_k \otimes e_k \right\|_{R \otimes_h X \otimes_h C} = \sum_k \|x_k\|_X.$$

*Proof.* The statement follows from the isometric identification  $R \otimes_h X \otimes_h C = S_1(X)$ , simply by restricting to the diagonal of  $S_1$ , which is  $\ell_1$ .  $\square$

### 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

In this section we prove the following theorem, from which Theorem 1.1 follows immediately.

**Theorem 3.1.** *For every prime number  $n$  there exists an element  $\eta_n \in C_{n^4} \otimes S_1^n \otimes S_1^n$  such that  $\|\eta_n\|_{C_{n^4} \otimes_{\min}(S_1^n \otimes_{\max} S_1^n)} \leq \sqrt{2}n^{\frac{3}{4}}$  and  $\|\eta_n\|_{C_{n^4} \otimes_{\min}(S_1^n \otimes_{\mu} S_1^n)} \geq n$ .*

Here and throughout the rest of the paper, we are considering  $\mathbb{Z}_n = \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$  with addition and multiplication modulo  $n$ . For consistency in notation, we will represent the canonical basis of  $\mathbb{C}^n$  as  $\{e_i : i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ . Additionally, we use the notation  $e_{i,j}$  to denote the matrix whose entries are all zero except for a one in the  $i$ -th row and  $j$ -th column.

The upper bound in the previous result will follow from the next two lemmas.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $T : S_1^n \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(H)$  be a complete contraction and denote  $E_x^a = T(e_{a,x})^\dagger T(e_{a,x})$  for every  $x, a = 1, \dots, n$ . Then, for every  $x$  and every sequence of complex numbers  $(\alpha_a)_a$  such that  $\sup_a |\alpha_a| \leq 1$ , it holds that*

$$\left\| \sum_a \alpha_a E_x^a \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(H)} \leq 1.$$

*Proof.* According to the isometric identifications  $CB(S_1^n, \mathcal{B}(H)) = S_\infty^n \otimes_{\min} \mathcal{B}(H) = S_\infty(\ell_2^n \otimes_2 H)$ ,  $T$  can be naturally identified with a contraction  $\hat{T} = \sum_{x,a} e_{a,x} \otimes T(e_{a,x})$  so that

$$\hat{T}^\dagger \hat{T} = \sum_{x,x'} e_{x,x'} \otimes \left( \sum_a T(e_{a,x})^\dagger T(e_{a,x'}) \right) \leq \mathbb{1}_{S_\infty^n \otimes_{\min} \mathcal{B}(H)}.$$

In particular, it must hold that  $\sum_a E_x^a \leq \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}(H)}$  for every  $x$ . Moreover, since the elements  $E_x^a$  are semidefinite positive, the previous condition implies that, for every  $x$ , the linear map  $T_x : \ell_\infty^n \rightarrow$



$\mathcal{B}(H)$ , defined as  $T_x(e_a) = E_x^a$  for every  $a$ , is a completely positive and (completely) contractive map. Thus,  $\sum_a \alpha_a E_x^a = T_x(\sum_a \alpha_a e_a)$  is a contraction in  $\mathcal{B}(H)$ .  $\square$

The proof of the following lemma is inspired by the analysis of the entangled value of the CHSH $_q$  games conducted in [1].

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $n$  be a prime number and consider*

$$(3.1) \quad \eta_n = \sum_{\substack{x,y,a,b \in \mathbb{Z}_n \\ a+b=xy}} e_{xyab,1} \otimes e_{a,x} \otimes e_{b,y} \in C_{n^4} \otimes S_1^n \otimes S_1^n.$$

Then,

$$\|\eta_n\|_{C_{n^4} \otimes_{\min}(S_1^n \otimes_{\max} S_1^n)} \leq \sqrt{2n}^{\frac{3}{4}}.$$

*Proof.* According to Equation (2.5), we must show that for every pair of complete contractions  $T : S_1^n \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(H)$  and  $S : S_1^n \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(H)$  satisfying  $[T(x), S(y)] = [T(x), S(y)^\dagger] = 0$  for every  $x, y \in S_1^n$ , we have

$$\|(\text{Id} \otimes T \odot S)(\eta_n)\|_{C_{n^4} \otimes_{\min}(S_1^n \otimes_{\max} S_1^n)}^2 \leq 2n\sqrt{n}.$$

Then, for any such pair of complete contractions, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\text{Id} \otimes T \odot S)(\eta_n)\|_{C_{n^4} \otimes_{\min}(S_1^n \otimes_{\max} S_1^n)}^2 &= \left\| \sum_{\substack{x,y,a,b \in \mathbb{Z}_n \\ a+b=xy}} e_{xyab,1} \otimes T(e_{a,x})S(e_{b,y}) \right\|_{C_{n^4} \otimes_{\min} \mathcal{B}(H)}^2 \\ &= \left\| \sum_{\substack{x,y,a,b \in \mathbb{Z}_n \\ a+b=xy}} T(e_{a,x})^\dagger T(e_{a,x})S(e_{b,y})^\dagger S(e_{b,y}) \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(H)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the commutativity relations between  $T$  and  $S$ .

If we denote  $E_x^a = T(e_{a,x})^\dagger T(e_{a,x})$ ,  $F_y^b = S(e_{b,y})^\dagger S(e_{b,y})$  and  $\omega = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}$ , we can write the previous expression as

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \sum_{x,y,a,b \in \mathbb{Z}_n} \omega^{k(a+b-xy)} E_x^a F_y^b \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(H)} = \frac{1}{n} \left\| \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \sum_{x,y \in \mathbb{Z}_n} \omega^{-kxy} \left( \sum_a \omega^{ka} E_x^a \right) \left( \sum_b \omega^{kb} F_y^b \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(H)}.$$

According to Lemma 3.2, the complete contractivity of  $T$  and  $S$  guarantees that  $T_x^k := \sum_a \omega^{ka} E_x^a$  and  $S_y^k := \sum_b \omega^{kb} F_y^b$  are contractions in  $\mathcal{B}(H)$  for every  $x, y, k$ . On the other hand, for every norm-one vectors  $\xi, \eta \in H$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \sum_{x,y \in \mathbb{Z}_n} \omega^{-kxy} \langle \eta, (T_x^k S_y^k)(\xi) \rangle = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \langle v_k, (\text{Id} \otimes \Phi_k)(u_k) \rangle,$$

where  $u_k = \sum_y S_y^k(\xi) \otimes e_y \in H \otimes \ell_2^n$ ,  $v_k = \sum_x (T_x^k)^\dagger(\eta) \otimes e_x \in H \otimes \ell_2^n$  and  $\Phi_k = (\omega^{-kxy})_{x,y} \in M_n$ .

Now, it is clear that  $\|u_k\| \leq \sqrt{n}$  and  $\|v_k\| \leq \sqrt{n}$  for every  $k$ . Also,  $\|\Phi_k\| = \sqrt{n}$  for every  $k \neq 0$  (note that  $(1/\sqrt{n})\Phi_k$  is a unitary matrix) and  $\|\Phi_0\| = n$ . Hence, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \langle v_k, (\text{Id} \otimes \Phi_k)(u_k) \rangle \leq n + (n-1)\sqrt{n} \leq 2n\sqrt{n}.$$

□

The following lemma will be very useful in order to prove the lower bound in Theorem 3.1.

**Lemma 3.4.** *For any natural number  $n \geq 2$ , let's consider a function  $f : \mathbb{Z}_n^4 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  such that for every  $x, y$ , there exists a bijection  $\pi_{x,y} : \mathbb{Z}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_n$  such that  $f(x, y, a, b) = 1$  if and only if  $\pi_{x,y}(a) = b$ . Then,*

$$\xi_f = \sum_{x,y,a,b \in \mathbb{Z}_n} f(x, y, a, b) e_{xyab} \otimes e_{a,x} \otimes e_{b,y}$$

satisfies

$$\|\xi_f\|_{R_{n^4} \otimes_h (S_\infty^n \otimes_h S_\infty^n)} = n^2.$$

The same estimate applies to the element

$$\xi_f^T = \sum_{x,y,a,b \in \mathbb{Z}_n} f(x, y, a, b) e_{xyab} \otimes e_{b,y} \otimes e_{a,x}.$$

*Proof.* The homogeneity of the row operator spaces structure, together with the associativity of the Haagerup tensor norm and the completely isometric identification  $S_\infty^n = C_n \otimes_h R_n$ , allow us to rearrange the tensors  $e_{xyab} = e_x \otimes e_y \otimes e_a \otimes e_b$  to write

$$\|\xi_f\|_{R_{n^4} \otimes_h (S_\infty^n \otimes_h S_\infty^n)} = \left\| \sum_y e_y \otimes \xi_y \otimes e_y \right\|_{R_n \otimes_h Y \otimes_h R_n},$$

where  $Y = R_{n^3} \otimes_h S_\infty^n \otimes_h C_n$  and

$$\xi_y = \sum_{x,a,b} f(x, y, a, b) e_{xab} \otimes e_{a,x} \otimes e_b \in Y.$$

According to Lemma 2.3, we have

$$\|\xi_f\|_{R_{n^4} \otimes_h (S_\infty^n \otimes_h S_\infty^n)} = \left( \sum_y \|\xi_y\|_Y^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

In addition, for any fixed  $y$  we can again use the properties of the Haagerup tensor norm to write

$$\|\xi_y\|_Y = \left\| \sum_b e_b \otimes \xi_{y,b} \otimes e_b \right\|_{R_n \otimes_h Z \otimes_h C_n},$$

where  $Z = R_{n^2} \otimes_h S_\infty^n$  and

$$\xi_{y,b} = \sum_{x,a} f(x, y, a, b) e_{xa} \otimes e_{a,x} \in Z.$$

Now, according to Lemma 2.4, we have

$$\|\xi_y\|_Y = \sum_b \left\| \sum_{x,a} f(x, y, a, b) e_{xa} \otimes e_{a,x} \right\|_Z.$$

Finally, by once again invoking Lemma 2.3, we find that for ever  $y$  and  $b$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{x,a} f(x,y,a,b) e_{xa} \otimes e_{a,x} \right\|_Z &= \left\| \sum_x e_x \otimes \left( \sum_a f(x,y,a,b) e_a \otimes e_a \right) \otimes e_x \right\|_{R_n \otimes_h (S_1^n) \otimes_h R_n} \\ &= \left( \sum_x \left\| \sum_a f(x,y,a,b) e_a \otimes e_a \right\|_{S_1^n}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \sqrt{n}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the properties of the function  $f$ .

It then follows that  $\|\xi_f\|_{R_n^4 \otimes_h (S_\infty^n \otimes_h S_\infty^n)} = n^2$  as we wanted.

The estimate for  $\xi_f^T$  can be proved completely analogously by just interchanging  $x,y$  and  $a,b$ .  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 3.1. To do so, we will use notation  $H_A = H_B = \ell_2^n$  to indicate the order considered when taking the Haagerup tensor norm.

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* According to Lemma 3.3, for any prime number  $n$  the element

$$\eta_n = \sum_{\substack{x,y,a,b \in \mathbb{Z}_n \\ a+b=xy}} e_{xyab,1} \otimes e_{a,x} \otimes e_{b,y}$$

satisfies

$$\|\eta_n\|_{C_{n^4} \otimes_{\min} (S_1(H_A) \otimes_{\max} S_1(H_B))} \leq \sqrt{2} n^{\frac{3}{4}}.$$

On the other hand, according to Lemma 3.4 applied to the function  $f(x,y,a,b) = \delta_{b,xy-a}$ , the element

$$P_n = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{\substack{x,y,a,b \in \mathbb{Z}_n \\ a+b=xy}} e_{1,xyab} \otimes e_{a,x} \otimes e_{b,y}$$

satisfies

$$(3.2) \quad \max\{\|P_n\|_{R_{n^4} \widehat{\otimes} (S_\infty(H_A) \otimes_h S_\infty(H_B))}, \|P_n^T\|_{R_{n^4} \widehat{\otimes} (S_\infty(H_B) \otimes_h S_\infty(H_A))}\} = 1.$$

Hence, for any decomposition  $\eta_n = \eta_{n,1} + \eta_{n,2}$  in  $C_{n^4} \otimes S_1(H_A) \otimes S_1(H_B)$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} n &= \langle \eta_n, P_n \rangle = \langle \eta_{n,1}, P_n \rangle + \langle \eta_{n,2}, P_n \rangle = \langle \eta_{n,1}, P_n \rangle + \langle \eta_{n,2}^T, P_n^T \rangle \\ &\leq \|\eta_{n,1}\|_{C_{n^4} \otimes_{\min} (S_1(H_A) \otimes_h S_1(H_B))} + \|\eta_{n,2}^T\|_{C_{n^4} \otimes_{\min} (S_1(H_B) \otimes_h S_1(H_A))}. \end{aligned}$$

According to the definition of the  $\mu$  norm (2.4), this concludes the proof.  $\square$

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

In this section we prove the following theorem, from which Theorem 1.2 follows immediately.

**Theorem 4.1.** *For every prime number  $n$  there exists an element  $\beta_n \in M_{n^6} \otimes \ell_1^{n^2} \otimes \ell_1^{n^2}$  such that  $\|\eta_n\|_{S_\infty^6 \otimes_{\min} (\ell_1^{n^2} \otimes_{\max} \ell_1^{n^2})} \leq \sqrt{2} n^{\frac{3}{4}}$  and  $\|\eta_n\|_{S_\infty^6 \otimes_{\min} (\ell_1^{n^2} \otimes_\mu \ell_1^{n^2})} \geq n$ .*

The strategy to prove Theorem 1.2 consists of transforming the element  $\eta_n \in C \otimes S_1 \otimes S_1$  defined in the proof of Theorem 1.1, into another element  $\beta_n \in S_\infty \otimes \ell_1 \otimes \ell_1$  such that the norms  $\max$  and  $\mu$  are preserved. To do this, given  $n$ , let us consider the unitary matrices  $X, Z \in M_n$ , defined

by  $X(e_j) = e^{\frac{2\pi ij}{n}} e_j$  and  $Z(e_j) = e_{j+1}$  respectively on the canonical vectors  $(e_j)_{j=0}^{n-1}$  and denote  $T_{k,l} = X^k Z^l$  for every  $k, l = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ .

The following lemma, whose proof is included for completeness, was proved in [12] and is inspired by the quantum teleportation protocol in quantum information theory.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $J : S_1^n \rightarrow S_\infty^n(\ell_1^{n^2})$  and  $W : S_\infty^n \rightarrow S_\infty^n(\ell_\infty^{n^2})$  be the linear maps defined, respectively, as*

$$J(\rho) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k,l=0}^{n-1} T_{k,l}^\dagger \rho T_{k,l} \otimes e_{k,l} \quad \text{and} \quad W(\rho) = \sum_{k,l=0}^{n-1} T_{k,l}^T \rho \bar{T}_{k,l} \otimes e_{k,l}.$$

*Then,  $J$  and  $W$  are complete contractions.*

*Proof.* Since  $W$  is a completely positive and unital map between  $C^*$ -algebras, we have  $\|W\|_{cb} = 1$ .

In order to study the map  $J$ , let us define  $\eta_{k,l} = (T_{k,l} \otimes \text{Id})(\phi) \in \ell_2^{n^2}$  for every  $k, l = 0, \dots, n-1$ , where  $\phi = (1/\sqrt{n}) \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e_j \otimes e_j$ . It is very easy to check that these vectors form an orthonormal basis of  $\ell_2^{n^2}$ . Moreover, one can check that for every  $h \in \ell_2^n$ , the following identity holds

$$h \otimes \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} e_i \otimes e_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k,l=0}^{n-1} \eta_{k,l} \otimes T_{k,l}^\dagger(h).$$

This allows us to write, for every  $\rho \in S_1^n$ , the identity

$$\rho \otimes \phi = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k,l,k',l'=0}^{n-1} H_{k,l}^{k',l'} \otimes T_{k,l}^\dagger \rho T_{k',l'},$$

where  $\phi = \sum_{i,j=0}^{n-1} e_{i,j} \otimes e_{i,j}$  and  $H_{k,l}^{k',l'} : M_{n^2} \rightarrow M_{n^2}$  is the rank one operator defined as  $H_{k,l}^{k',l'}(v) = \langle \eta_{k',l'}, v \rangle \eta_{k,l}$ .

On the other hand, the fact that the vectors  $\eta_{k,l}$ ,  $k, l = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$  form an orthonormal basis of  $\ell_2^{n^2}$  guarantees that the projection  $P : S_1^{n^2} \rightarrow \ell_1^{n^2}$ , defined by

$$P(A) = \sum_{k,l=0}^{n-1} \langle \eta_{k,l}, A(\eta_{k,l}) \rangle e_{k,l},$$

is a complete contraction. According to Lemma 2.1, the identity map  $\text{Id} : S_1^n \hat{\otimes} (S_1^n \otimes_{\min} S_\infty^n) \rightarrow S_1^{n^2} \otimes_{\min} S_\infty^n$  is completely contractive. It then follows that the map  $i : S_1^n \rightarrow S_1^{n^2} \otimes_{\min} S_\infty^n$ , defined by  $i(\rho) = \rho \otimes \phi$ , is automatically completely contractive and the complete contractivity of  $J$  follows from the identity  $J = (P \otimes \text{Id}) \circ i$ .  $\square$

Lemma 4.2 is the key point to transfer the statement of Theorem 3.1 on non-commutative  $L_1$ -spaces into a statement involving commutative ones. Indeed, if  $\eta_n$  is the element defined in (3.1), then we define  $\beta_n = (\text{Id} \otimes J \otimes J)(\eta_n)$ , so that

$$(4.1) \quad \beta_n = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{\substack{x,y,a,b \in \mathbb{Z}_n \\ a+b=xy \\ k,l,k',l' \in \mathbb{Z}_n}} e_{xyab,1} \otimes R_{a,x}^{k,l} \otimes R_{b,y}^{k',l'} \otimes e_{k,l} \otimes e_{k',l'} \in C_{n^4} \otimes S_\infty^n \otimes S_\infty^n \otimes (\ell_1^{n^2} \otimes \ell_1^{n^2}),$$

where we have denoted  $R_{a,x}^{k,l} = T_{k,l}^\dagger e_{a,x} T_{k,l}$  for every  $a, x, k, l$ .

Note that the complete contractivity of  $J$  along with the commutative and associative properties of the min norm and the metric mapping property immediately imply that

$$\|\beta_n\|_{C_{n^4} \otimes_{\min} S_\infty^2 \otimes_{\min} (\ell_1^{n^2} \otimes_{\min} \ell_1^{n^2})} \leq \|\eta_n\|_{C_{n^4} \otimes_{\min} (S_1^n \otimes_{\min} S_1^n)}.$$

The next lemma shows that we can actually upper bound the max norm of  $\beta_n$ .

**Lemma 4.3.** *Given any natural number  $n$ , we have*

$$\|\beta_n\|_{C_{n^4} \otimes_{\min} S_\infty^2 \otimes_{\min} (\ell_1^{n^2} \otimes_{\max} \ell_1^{n^2})} \leq \|\eta_n\|_{C_{n^4} \otimes_{\min} (S_1^n \otimes_{\max} S_1^n)}.$$

*Proof.* Given any pair of (complete) contractions  $T, S : \ell_1^{n^2} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(H)$  such that  $[T(e_{k,l}), S(e_{k',l'})] = [T(e_{k,l}), S(e_{k',l'})]^\dagger = 0$  for every  $k, l, k', l'$ , we define the linear maps

$$\tilde{T}, \tilde{S} : M_n(\ell_1^{n^2}) \rightarrow M_n \otimes_{\min} M_n \otimes_{\min} \mathcal{B}(H) = \mathcal{B}(\ell_2^n \otimes_2 \ell_2^n \otimes_2 H),$$

as  $\tilde{T}\left(\sum_{k,l} A_{k,l} \otimes e_{k,l}\right) = \sum_{k,l} A_{k,l} \otimes \mathbb{1} \otimes T(e_{k,l})$  and  $\tilde{S}\left(\sum_{k,l} B_{k,l} \otimes e_{k,l}\right) = \sum_{k,l} \mathbb{1} \otimes B_{k,l} \otimes S(e_{k,l})$ .

Since  $\tilde{T}$  and  $\tilde{S}$  are clearly complete contractions, we deduce from Lemma 4.2 that the maps

$$\hat{T}, \hat{S} : S_1^n \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\ell_2^n \otimes_2 \ell_2^n \otimes_2 H),$$

defined as  $\hat{T} = \tilde{T} \otimes J$  and  $\hat{S} = \tilde{S} \otimes J$  respectively, are also completely contractive. Moreover, it is clear that  $[\hat{T}(\rho), \hat{S}(\gamma)] = [\hat{T}(\rho), \hat{S}(\gamma)]^\dagger = 0$  for every  $\rho, \gamma \in S_1^n$ . Then, we conclude our proof by noticing that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\text{Id}_{C_{n^4} \otimes S_\infty^2} \otimes T \odot S)(\beta_n)\|_{C_{n^4} \otimes_{\min} S_\infty^2 \otimes_{\min} S_\infty^2 \otimes_{\min} \mathcal{B}(H)} \\ &= \|(\text{Id}_{C_{n^4}} \otimes \hat{T} \odot \hat{S})(\eta_n)\|_{C_{n^4} \otimes_{\min} \mathcal{B}(\ell_2^n \otimes_2 \ell_2^n \otimes_2 H)} \\ &\leq \|\eta_n\|_{C_{n^4} \otimes_{\min} (S_1^n \otimes_{\max} S_1^n)}. \end{aligned}$$

□

We are now ready to prove the main result of the paper. It's very useful to denote  $H_A = H_B = \ell_2^n$  as well as  $\ell_\infty^{n_A^2} = \ell_\infty^{n_B^2} = \ell_\infty^{n^2}$  to precisely indicate the rearrangement in the various steps of the proof.

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* On the one hand, according to Lemma 4.3, we have that

$$\|\beta_n\|_{C_{n^4} \otimes_{\min} S_\infty(H_A) \otimes_{\min} S_\infty(H_B) \otimes_{\min} (\ell_1^{n_A^2} \otimes_{\max} \ell_1^{n_B^2})} \leq \|\eta_n\|_{C_{n^4} \otimes_{\min} (S_1(H_A) \otimes_{\max} S_1(H_B))} \leq \sqrt{2} n^{\frac{3}{4}}.$$

On the other hand, using the notation of Lemma 4.2, let us consider the element

$$(4.2) \quad Q_n = \frac{1}{n^2} (\text{Id}_{R_{n^4}} \otimes W \otimes W)(P_n) = \frac{1}{n^4} \sum_{\substack{x,y,a,b \in \mathbb{Z}_n \\ a+b=xy \\ k,l,k',l' \in \mathbb{Z}_n}} e_{1,xyab} \otimes S_{a,x}^{k,l} \otimes S_{b,y}^{k',l'} \otimes e_{k,l} \otimes e_{k',l'},$$

in  $R_{n^4} \otimes S_\infty(H_A) \otimes S_\infty(H_B) \otimes (\ell_\infty^{n_A^2} \otimes \ell_\infty^{n_B^2})$ , where we have denoted  $S_{a,x}^{k,l} = T_{k,l}^T e_{a,x} \overline{T}_{k,l}$  for every  $a, x, k, l$ .

Since  $\langle \beta_n, Q_n \rangle = \langle \eta_n, P_n \rangle = n$ , we can conclude the proof of the theorem in the same way as the proof of Theorem 1.1, by simply demonstrating that

$$\max \left\{ \|Q_n\|_{(R_{n^4} \widehat{\otimes} S_1(H_A) \widehat{\otimes} S_1(H_B)) \widehat{\otimes} (\ell_\infty^{n_A^2} \otimes_h \ell_\infty^{n_B^2})}, \|Q_n^T\|_{(R_{n^4} \widehat{\otimes} S_1(H_A) \widehat{\otimes} S_1(H_B)) \widehat{\otimes} (\ell_\infty^{n_B^2} \otimes_h \ell_\infty^{n_A^2})} \right\} \leq 1.$$

In order to prove the inequality

$$\|Q_n\|_{(R_{n^4} \widehat{\otimes} S_1(H_A) \widehat{\otimes} S_1(H_B)) \widehat{\otimes} (\ell_\infty^{n_A^2} \otimes_h \ell_\infty^{n_B^2})} \leq 1,$$

we used that  $\|P_n\|_{R_{n^4} \widehat{\otimes} (S_\infty(H_A) \otimes_h S_\infty(H_B))} \leq 1$  and the fact that  $W$  is a complete contraction to guarantee that

$$\|(\text{Id}_{R_{n^4}} \otimes W \otimes W)(P_n)\|_{R_{n^4} \widehat{\otimes} [(S_\infty(H_A) \otimes_{\min} \ell_\infty^{n_A^2}) \otimes_h (S_\infty(H_B) \otimes_{\min} \ell_\infty^{n_B^2})]} \leq 1.$$

Now, according to the first property proved in Lemma 2.2 applied to  $X = S_\infty(H_A) \otimes_{\min} \ell_\infty^{n_A^2}$  and  $Y = \ell_\infty^{n_B^2}$ , the previous estimate implies that

$$\|(\text{Id}_{R_{n^4}} \otimes W \otimes W)(P_n)\|_{R_{n^4} \widehat{\otimes} [S_\infty(H_B) \otimes_{\min} ((S_\infty(H_A) \otimes_{\min} \ell_\infty^{n_A^2}) \otimes_h \ell_\infty^{n_B^2})]} \leq 1,$$

where the terms must be rearranged according to the map  $T$  in Lemma 2.2.

We can now apply the second property proven in Lemma 2.2 to  $X = \ell_\infty^{n_A^2}$  and  $Y = \ell_\infty^{n_B^2}$  to conclude that the previous estimate implies that

$$\|(\text{Id}_{R_{n^4}} \otimes W \otimes W)(P_n)\|_{R_{n^4} \widehat{\otimes} [S_\infty(H_B) \otimes_{\min} S_\infty(H_A) \otimes_{\min} (\ell_\infty^{n_A^2} \otimes_h \ell_\infty^{n_B^2})]} \leq 1.$$

Finally, by using that  $S_\infty(H_A) = S_\infty(H_B) = S_\infty^n$  and Equation (2.3), we can conclude that

$$\|Q_n\|_{R_{n^4} \widehat{\otimes} S_1(H_B) \widehat{\otimes} S_1(H_A) \widehat{\otimes} (\ell_\infty^{n_A^2} \otimes_h \ell_\infty^{n_B^2})} \leq 1.$$

Note that the commutativity of the projective tensor norms implies that

$$\|Q_n\|_{R_{n^4} \widehat{\otimes} S_1(H_A) \widehat{\otimes} S_1(H_B) \widehat{\otimes} (\ell_\infty^{n_A^2} \otimes_h \ell_\infty^{n_B^2})} \leq 1$$

as we wanted.

Given that  $\|P_n^T\|_{R_{n^4} \widehat{\otimes} (S_\infty(H_B) \otimes_h S_\infty(H_A))} \leq 1$ , employing the same argument enables us to deduce that

$$\|Q_n^T\|_{R_{n^4} \widehat{\otimes} S_1(H_A) \widehat{\otimes} S_1(H_B) \widehat{\otimes} (\ell_\infty^{n_B^2} \otimes_h \ell_\infty^{n_A^2})} \leq 1.$$

This concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 4.1.** Let  $(x_i)_i$  and  $(y_j)_j$  be two families of contractions in  $\mathcal{B}(H)$  such that  $[x_i, y_j] = 0$  for every  $i, j$ . If we assume, in addition, the elements  $x_j$  to be normal, it follows from Fuglede's Theorem [7] that  $[x_i, y_j^\dagger] = 0$  for every  $i, j$ . According to Russo-Dye Theorem, we can then write that for every family of matrices  $(a_{i,j})_{i,j} \in M_n$ , it holds that

$$\left\| \sum_{i,j} a_{i,j} \otimes x_i y_j \right\|_{M_n(\mathcal{B}(H))} \leq \sup \left\| \sum_{i,j} a_{i,j} \otimes u_i v_j \right\|_{M_n(\mathcal{B}(H))} \leq \left\| \sum_{i,j} a_{i,j} \otimes e_i \otimes e_j \right\|_{M_n(\ell_1 \otimes_{\max} \ell_1)},$$

where the supremum runs over all families of commuting unitaries  $(u_i)_i, (v_j)_j$  in  $\mathcal{B}(H)$ . While Ricard demonstrated [19, Proposition 13.10] the existence of families of commuting contractions  $(x_i)_i, (y_j)_j$  satisfying

$$\left\| \sum_{i,j} a_{i,j} \otimes x_i y_j \right\|_{M_n(\mathcal{B}(H))} > \left\| \sum_{i,j} a_{i,j} \otimes e_i \otimes e_j \right\|_{M_n(\ell_1 \otimes_{\max} \ell_1)},$$

even for scalar coefficients  $(a_{i,j})_{i,j} \in \mathbb{C}$  for every  $i, j$ , Theorem 1.2 provides families of commuting contractions that dramatically violate this inequality - such that even an equivalence between the norms is not possible. In this sense, Theorem 1.2 can be understood as a qualitative witness to the fact that these commuting contractions cannot be normal. We are grateful to Mikael Rørdam for reminding us of Fuglede's result.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] M. Bavarian, P. W. Shor, Information Causality, Szemerédi-Trotter and Algebraic Variants of CHSH. In Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science, ITCS'15, pages 123-132, New York, NY, USA, ACM (2015).
- [2] D. Blecher, A collection of problems on operator algebras. Contemporary Mathematics, 120 (1991). See also: D. Blecher, Generalizing Grothendieck's program. "Function spaces", Edited by K. Jarosz, Lecture Notes in Pure and Applied Math. vol.136, Marcel Dekker (1992).
- [3] D. Blecher, V. Paulsen, Tensor products of operator spaces. J. Funct. Anal. 99, 262-292 (1991).
- [4] D. Blecher, V. Paulsen, Multipliers of operator spaces, and the injective envelope. Pacific J. Math. 200 (1), 1-17 (2001).
- [5] A. Defant, K. Floret, Tensor Norms and Operator Ideals. North-Holland (1993).
- [6] E. G. Effros, Z.-J. Ruan, Operator spaces. 23, London Mathematical Society Monographs. New Series. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York (2000).
- [7] B. Fuglede, A commutativity theorem for normal operators. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 36, 35-40 (1950).
- [8] A. Grothendieck, Résumé de la théorie métrique des produits tensoriels topologiques (French). Bol. Soc. Mat. So Paulo, 8, 1-79 (1953).
- [9] U. Haagerup, The Grothendieck inequality for bilinear forms on  $C^*$ -algebras. Adv. Math. 56, 2, 93-116 (1985).
- [10] U. Haagerup, M. Musat, The Effros-Ruan conjecture for bilinear forms on  $C^*$ -algebras. Invent. Math. 174, 139-163 (2008).
- [11] M. Hamana, Injective envelopes of operator systems. Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. 15 (3), 773-785 (1979).
- [12] M. Junge, C. Palazuelos, CB-norm estimates for maps between noncommutative  $L_p$ -spaces and quantum channel theory. Int. Math. Res. Not. (3) 875-925 (2016).
- [13] S. Khot, A. Naor, Grothendieck-type inequalities in combinatorial optimization. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 65(7), 992-1035 (2012).
- [14] T. Oikhberg, G. Pisier, The maximal tensor product of operator spaces. Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc., 42(2): 267-284 (1999).
- [15] C. Palazuelos, T. Vidick, Survey on Nonlocal Games and Operator Space Theory. J. Math. Phys. 57 (2016).
- [16] G. Pisier, Grothendieck's theorem for noncommutative  $C^*$ -algebras, With an appendix on Grothendieck's constants. J. Funct. Anal. 29, no. 3, 397-415 (1978).
- [17] G. Pisier, An Introduction to Operator Spaces. London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes Series 294, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2003).
- [18] G. Pisier, Grothendieck's Theorem, past and present. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., 49, 237-323 (2012).
- [19] G. Pisier, Tensor products of  $C^*$ -algebras and operator spaces - the Connes-Kirchberg problem. London Math. Soc. Stud. Texts, 96 (2020).
- [20] G. Pisier, D. Shlyakhtenko, Grothendieck's theorem for operator spaces. Invent. Math. 150, 185-217 (2002).
- [21] Z.-J. Ruan, Subspaces of  $C^*$ -algebras. J. Funct. Anal. , 76(1), 217-230, (1988).
- [22] B. S. Tsirelson. Some results and problems on quantum Bell-type inequalities. Hadronic J. Supp. 8(4), 329-345 (1993).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS & ILLINOIS QUANTUM INFORMATION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN, 1409 W. GREEN ST. URBANA, IL 61891. USA

*Email address:* `raraiza@illinois.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS & ILLINOIS QUANTUM INFORMATION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN, 1409 W. GREEN ST. URBANA, IL 61891. USA

*Email address:* `junge@math.uiuc.edu`

INSTITUTO DE CIENCIAS MATEMÁTICAS (ICMAT), DEPARTAMENTO DE ANÁLISIS MATEMÁTICO Y MATEMÁTICA APLICADA, FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID, MADRID 28040. SPAIN

*Email address:* `cpalazue@ucm.es`