

Causal Data Fusion with Quantum Confounders

Pedro Lauand,^{1,2,*} Bereket Ngussie Bekele,^{2,3} and Elie Wolfe²

¹*Instituto de Física “Gleb Wataghin”, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, 130830-859, Campinas, Brazil*

²*Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, N2L 2Y5*

³*Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia*

From the modern perspective of causal inference, Bell’s theorem — a fundamental signature of quantum theory — is a particular case where quantum correlations are incompatible with the classical theory of causality, and the generalization of Bell’s theorem to quantum networks has led to several breakthrough results and novel applications. Here, we consider the problem of causal data fusion, where we piece together multiple datasets collected under heterogeneous conditions. In particular, we show quantum experiments can generate observational and interventional data with a non-classical signature when pieced together that cannot be reproduced classically. We prove this quantum non-classicality emerges from the fusion of the datasets and is present in a plethora of scenarios, even where standard Bell non-classicality is impossible. Furthermore, we show that non-classicality genuine to the fusion of multiple data tables is achievable with quantum resources. Our work shows incorporating interventions—a central tool in causal inference—can be a powerful tool to detect non-classicality beyond the violation of a standard Bell inequality. In a companion article [1], we extend our investigation considering all latent exogenous causal structures with 3 observable variables.

Introduction—Estimating cause-and-effect relations behind the correlations observed among some measured variables is a central goal of science and one of the most challenging aspects of causality theory [2–4]. The difficulty stems from the fact that one cannot conclusively infer a cause-and-effect relationship between two events or variables based only on the correlation observed between them, i.e. “correlation does not imply causation”. The reason is that any correlation observed between two or more random variables can be explained, in the classical regime, by a potentially unobserved common cause. Comprehending the conditions under which such confounding factors can be controlled, allowing for the derivation of a causal hypothesis from empirical data, has paved the way for the development of several causal analysis tools. Interventions [5] are the go-to tool in the field of causal analysis enabling better decisions among competing explanations for given statistics, a task known as *causal discovery*, and also to estimate causal relationships or predict counterfactual quantities which allow us to analyze how relative strengths of different causal pathways could play a role in establishing some observed correlations, a task known as *causal inference*. However, there are situations where intervening in the system may not be feasible, such as ethical constraints or when the focus is on assessing causal effects in previous experiments.

Instrumental variables [6] allow for the quantification of cause-and-effect relationships even in the absence of interventions. To achieve this, some causal assumptions must be met, namely, the instrument must influence the cause of the cause-and-effect relationships we are interested in and it must be independent of any confounding factors of the original variables. Instrumental inequalities, constraints that any experiment in compliance with the instrumental assumptions should respect, have been introduced [7] and their violation explicitly proves that one does not have a proper instrument. Concepts such as interventions and instrumental variables have become fundamental tools for assessing causal effects across a range of disciplines [8–10]. Despite its success, all such tools and applications rely on the classical notion of causality that, since Bell’s theorem [11], we

know cannot account for all quantum correlations.

Bell’s theorem is a cornerstone of quantum physics and it provides a device-independent [12] proof of the incompatibility of classical and quantum predictions, that is, solely based on the causal assumptions of an experiment and agnostic of any internal mechanisms or physical details of the measurement and state preparation devices. Historically, the mismatch between quantum and classical correlations was shown for a particular causal structure and, in the last decade, has been generalized to causal structures of increasing complexity and with different topologies [13]. This has led to a formalization of a quantum common cause and, more generally, quantum causal models [14–16]. Typically, this incompatibility is proven by violating a Bell inequality which requires only passive observations of the experiment under scrutiny.

The derivation of a Bell inequality can be seen as a particular case of a causal inference task. Recently, it has been shown that the violation of a Bell inequality is not the only signature of the incompatibility between quantum correlations and causality theory [17–20]. Specifically, they show how quantum correlations can change the cause-and-effect relations that can be inferred considering the estimation of counterfactual interventions. Remarkably, this new phenomenon is present even when quantum correlations cannot violate any standard Bell-type inequality in the simplest instrumental scenario. This opens new possibilities to explore the role of causality within quantum theory. Here, we consider *data fusion* problem, which consists of piecing together multiple datasets collected under heterogeneous conditions [21]. We show the data fusion problem exhibits an opportunity for detecting the non-classicality of quantum experiments in this new data regime, considering joint probabilities for passive observations and *do-conditional* probabilities for observations under intervention. Remarkably, these experiments have the feature that, even though individually each data table admits a classical model explanation, these datasets admit no single classical model when considered jointly. We call this new type of non-classicality “non-classicality from data fusion”.




FIG. 1: Here we have the three scenarios considered. In Fig. 1a1 we have the triangle scenario with communication between A and B , represented by a direct influence $A \rightarrow B$. In Fig. 1a2 we can see the relaxation of the Unrelated Confounders (UC) scenario, with extra communication between A and C . Finally, in Fig. 1a3 we can see a chain-like structure, $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C$ with a tripartite common cause.

We explore quantum non-classicality from data fusion for all latent exogenous causal structures with 3 observable variables. We introduce a robust framework able to assess the classical compatibility of the fusion between observational data and multiple interventions in a generic causal structure. Then, we show that the bounds constraining the possible data tables classically compatible with a given causal structure admit quantum violations, i.e. the analogous experiment with quantum confounders generates data (observational and interventional) that cannot be explained with classical latent variable models. In particular, we show that this non-classicality is present even in causal structures where standard Bell non-classicality, involving only passive observations, is impossible and that non-classicality genuine to multiple interventions can also be achieved with quantum resources. This work focuses on three main cases but we expand our investigation in a companion article [1] which also provides all the required technical proofs of the results in this work.

Causal Modeling—Causal assumptions can be captured by directed acyclic graphs (DAGs), comprising a finite collection of nodes and a set of directed edges. Each node denotes a

random variable, categorized into observable nodes, depicted by triangles, represented by classical variables, and latent nodes, depicted by circles, signifying variables inaccessible to us. For passive observations, we obtain the joint probability distribution of the observable variables. In this work, we focus on the case of three observable variables, namely A , B , and C . Passive observations of the observed variables are captured by a joint probability distribution P_{ABC} . Causal models aim to specify the mechanisms that play a role in establishing observable data. To achieve this, it accounts for the dependencies of every variable with its *causal parents*, denoted $\text{Pa}(X)$, which can be defined as the variables that share incoming edges with X . Classical compatibility is defined in terms of the conditional probability distribution $p_X(x|\text{Pa}(x))$, where $\text{Pa}(x)$ denotes that the random variables in the set $\text{Pa}(X)$ take their respective values, for each node in the graph. From these response functions, we can define the *Markov* decomposition of the DAG. We will specify this decomposition for each case throughout the text. For a general construction, see our companion article [1]. In quantum causal models, each latent variable, Λ_i , is represented by a density matrix ψ_{Λ_i} , and observable variables are associated with positive semi-definite operator-valued measurement effects (POVMs) properly normalized.

Interventions play a crucial role in causal inference, allowing us to ascertain the causal connections among variables within a specified process [2, 6]. Unlike passive observations, interventions involve locally changing the underlying causal structure of an experiment, eliminating all external influences that a given variable might have, and putting it under the exclusive control of an observer. The probability of observing the variables B and C when the variable A undergoes an intervention and is artificially set to $A = a$ is represented by do-conditional probabilities $P_{BC}(b,c|\text{do}(A = a))$, eliminating the response function $p_A(a|\text{Pa}(a))$ from the model decomposition. Analogously, for quantum causal models, we can substitute the operator $E_{a|\text{Pa}(a)}$ by 1. Similarly, we can define the do-conditionals $P_{AC}(a,c|\text{do}(B = b))$ and $P_{AB}(a,b|\text{do}(C = c))$.

The fusion of observational and interventional data can be understood as a particular instance of the *compatibility problem*, asking whether some statistics of the experiment (observational and interventional) are jointly compatible with a given causal structure. To achieve this, we use the *interruption technique* [22]. Truly, starting from a given causal structure an interruption involves creating a modified scenario by splitting the node upon intervention into two distinct variables. Moreover, we can express multiple interventions by iteratively interrupting the nodes upon intervention. This approach has precedent in the causal inference literature in the "single-world intervention graphs" (SWIGs) [23] and also the node-splitting procedure of Ref. [24].

Numerical Methods— In this work, we explore three qualitative distinct numerical modeling approaches. The first numerical approach involves characterizing a polytope [25], which can be naturally cast as a Linear Program (LP). Primarily, this is used in cases with a single latent source and the classical compatibility problem amounts to deciding whether a given point is inside or

outside some polytope. The second numerical approach is based on quadratic optimization [26], a natural generalization of an LP problem. Adopting the so-called *branch and bound methods* [27], which involves systematically and iteratively narrowing down the range of variables, dividing them into subproblems that can each be approximated by a corresponding LP problem. This branching subroutine enables the attainment of tighter relaxations, leading to upper and lower bounds that gradually converge towards the global optimal solution. The third numerical approach is that of the *inflation technique* [28]. The inflation approach considers when one has access to many independent copies of the scenario's variables and can put them in different configurations. The use of the inflation technique with convex optimization allows us to derive analytical causal compatibility inequalities via convex duality. For details on our numerical methods, we refer the reader to our companion article [1].

Quantum non-classicality from data-fusion—Herein we show how quantum correlations can generate a non-classical signature violating bounds involving the fusion of observational and interventional data. To guarantee that this non-classicality is exclusive to the interplay between the observations and the interventions under scrutiny, we further require that the individual data tables admit a classical model explanation. In this regard, all quantum violations we show go beyond the paradigmatic violation of a standard Bell-type inequality and can only be attributed to the fusion of the data tables. We focus on the cases shown in Fig. 1.

Consider the DAG shown in Fig. 1a1. We have A, B and C with bipartite latent variables α, β , and γ between B and C , A and C , and A and B respectively with an additional edge $A \rightarrow B$. The classical model decomposition is given by

$$P_{ABC}(a,b,c) = \sum_{\alpha,\gamma,\beta} p(\alpha)p(\gamma)p(\beta)p_A(a|\gamma,\beta)p_B(b|\alpha,\gamma,a)p_C(c|\alpha,\beta) \quad (1)$$

and

$$P_{BC}(b,c|do(A=a)) = \sum_{\alpha,\gamma,\beta} p(\alpha)p(\gamma)p(\beta)p_B(b|\alpha,\gamma,a)p_C(c|\alpha,\beta). \quad (2)$$

The data tables that can arise in quantum models are given by

$$\begin{aligned} P_{ABC}(a,b,c) &= \text{Tr}(\psi_{AB} \otimes \psi_{BC} \otimes \psi_{AC} (E_{a|b} \otimes E_b \otimes E_{c|b,a})) \\ P_{BC}(b,c|do(A=a)) &= \text{Tr}(\psi_{AB} \otimes \psi_{BC} \otimes \psi_{AC} (\mathbb{1} \otimes E_b \otimes E_{c|b,a})). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

This scenario can be seen as a generalization of the triangle network, explored at length by the community [29–31]. For this causal structure, we prove in **Lemma 1** in our companion article that, when $|A| = 2$, non-classicality from data fusion of $\{P_{ABC}, P_{BC|do(A)}\}$ is equivalent to standard network non-classicality of $Q_{ABC|A^\#}$ over the corresponding SWIG, i.e. the graph resulting from interruption technique, which correspond to the standard triangle scenario where B has a binary input

$A^\#$ and A is binary. Then, we prove the existence of quantum compatible models that exhibit non-classicality from data fusion by using a protocol of disguised Bell non-classicality as network non-classicality, due to Fritz [32]. Furthermore, we use **Lemma 1** to show the validity of inequality constraints over $\{P_{ABC}, P_{BC|do(A)}\}$ originated from Bell-like inequalities classically valid for the triangle scenario that admit quantum violation. The details of our proof of non-classicality for the specific protocol used can be found in Section IV D and the corresponding causal inequality can be found in Appendix E of our companion article.

Now, consider the DAG in Fig. 1a2. This scenario features A, B , and C with two bipartite latent variables γ between A and B , and α between B and C , with B directly influencing A and C , i.e. $A \leftarrow B \rightarrow C$, and an arrow $A \rightarrow C$. We consider the data tables $\{P_{ABC}, P_{BC|do(A)}, P_{AC|do(B)}\}$, a classical model generates data tables given by

$$\begin{aligned} P_{ABC}(a,b,c) &= \sum_{\alpha,\gamma} p(\alpha)p(\gamma)p_A(a|\gamma,b)p_B(b|\alpha,\gamma)p_C(c|\alpha,b,a) \\ P_{BC}(b,c|do(A=a)) &= \sum_{\alpha,\gamma} p(\alpha)p(\gamma)p_B(b|\alpha,\gamma)p_C(c|\alpha,b,a) \\ P_{AC}(a,c|do(B=b)) &= \sum_{\alpha,\gamma} p(\alpha)p(\gamma)p_A(a|\gamma,b)p_C(c|\alpha,b,a), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

and quantum models respect

$$\begin{aligned} P_{ABC}(a,b,c) &= \text{Tr}(\psi_{AB} \otimes \psi_{BC} (E_{a|b} \otimes E_b \otimes E_{c|b,a})) \\ P_{BC}(b,c|do(A=a)) &= \text{Tr}(\psi_{AB} \otimes \psi_{BC} (\mathbb{1} \otimes E_b \otimes E_{c|b,a})) \\ P_{AC}(a,c|do(B=b)) &= \text{Tr}(\psi_{AB} \otimes \psi_{BC} (E_{a|b} \otimes \mathbb{1} \otimes E_{c|b,a})). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

This causal structure can be regarded as a relaxation of the *Unrelated Confounders* (UC) scenario where A can influence C directly. The UC scenario has only recently been considered from a quantum information perspective [33–35] and is akin to the causal structure underlying the entanglement-swapping experiment [36]. Section IV B and Appendix A of our companion article show that the UC scenario exhibits robust quantum non-classicality from data fusion when all variables are dichotomic. Furthermore, we can show that from non-classicality from data fusion in the UC scenario we can achieve non-classicality in its relaxation shown in Fig. 1a2. Truly, using the arguments outlined in Section IV B we find that the inequality

$$W := P_A(0|do(B=0))^2 - P_A(0|do(B=0))I + E + J \leq 0, \quad (6)$$

where I and J are linear expressions given by

$$\begin{aligned} I &:= 2P_{AB}(0,0) + P_B(1) + P_{BC}(1,0|do(A=0)) \\ &\quad + P_{ABC}(0,1,1) - 2P_{ABC}(0,1,0) \\ J &:= P_{AB}(0,0) - 2P_B(0) + 2P_{AB}(0,0) - 2P_{ABC}(0,1,0). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

and E carries quadratic terms

$$E := 2P_{AB}(0,1)P_{BC}(1,0|do(A=0)) + P_{AB}(0,0)P_B(0) + (2P_B(0) - P_{AB}(0,0))(P_{BC}(1,0|do(A=0)) + P_{ABC}(0,1,0)) - P_{AB}(0,0)^2 - P_{ABC}(0,1,0)^2, \quad (8)$$

must hold for all classically compatible data tables in the scenario of Fig. 1a2. Using the same protocol outlined in **Theorem 1** of Section IVB, where A and B share a maximally entangled state ϕ^+ with isotropic noise, and B and C share a classical source α . A is assigned the measurements σ_x if $b=0$ and σ_z if $b=1$ while B is associated with the measurements $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\sigma_x + (-1)^a \sigma_z)$ with $\alpha \in \{0,1\}$. C deterministically outputs α , regardless of the value b and a , i.e. $p_C(c|\alpha, b, a) = \delta_{c,\alpha}$. We can achieve quantum violations of this inequality given by $I^Q = \frac{1}{16}(18+7\sqrt{2})$, $J^Q = \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{2}-1)$, $E^Q = \frac{1}{128}(51+2\sqrt{2})$, and $P_A^Q(0|do(B=0)) = \frac{1}{2}$. Reaching $W^Q = \frac{1}{128}(38\sqrt{2}-53) \approx 0.005782$. Introducing critical visibility v to the quantum source, we can try to quantify this non-classicality by mixing it with the maximally mixed state. We can show with inflation technique critical visibility of $v \approx 0.96$, then we use quadratic optimization to numerically certify the non-classicality emerging from data fusion of the whole range of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} < v \leq 1$.

Finally, we consider the causal structure depicted in Fig. 1a3 where we have a chain-like structure for the observable variables, i.e. $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C$ and a single tripartite common cause Λ between them. Classically, the data tables $P_{ABC}(a,b,c)$, $P_{BC}(b,c|do(A=a))$ and $P_{AC}(a,c|do(B=b))$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} P_{ABC}(a,b,c) &= \sum_{\lambda} p(\lambda) p_A(a|\lambda) p_B(b|a,\lambda) p_C(c|b,\lambda) \\ P_{BC}(b,c|do(A=a)) &= \sum_{\lambda} p(\lambda) p_B(b|a,\lambda) p_C(c|b,\lambda) \\ P_{AC}(a,c|do(B=b)) &= \sum_{\lambda} p(\lambda) p_A(a|\lambda) p_C(c|b,\lambda). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

and quantum models yields

$$\begin{aligned} P_{ABC}(a,b,c) &= \text{Tr}(\psi_{ABC}(E_a \otimes E_{b|a} \otimes E_{c|b})) \\ P_{BC}(b,c|do(A=a)) &= \text{Tr}(\psi_{ABC}(\mathbb{1} \otimes E_{b|a} \otimes E_{c|b})) \\ P_{AC}(a,c|do(B=b)) &= \text{Tr}(\psi_{ABC}(E_a \otimes \mathbb{1} \otimes E_{c|b})). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Initially, we only require each data table to be classically attainable for certifying non-classicality from data fusion. However, any combination of data tables could potentially result in a violation. Now, we introduce an additional criterion: each pair of data tables must also be classically attainable within our model. This added constraint ensures that the non-classicality observed cannot be attributed to specific interactions between observations and interventions or between different interventions. Instead, it can only be ascribed to the fusion of all data tables. This novel form of violation is termed non-classicality from data fusion in the three-way synthesis. We give a precise definition in Section IIC of [1].

We show there exist quantumly compatible data tables when all variables are dichotomic, that are non-classical in the three-way synthesis, we use a pure non-maximally entangled three-qubit state

$$|\psi_{ABC}\rangle := \frac{e^{-i\frac{\pi}{8}}}{\sqrt{2}}|0_A\rangle|\psi_{BC}^-\rangle + \frac{e^{i\frac{\pi}{8}}}{\sqrt{2}}|1_A\rangle|\theta_{BC}^+\rangle \quad (11)$$

where $|\psi_{BC}^-\rangle = (|01_{BC}\rangle - |10_{BC}\rangle) / \sqrt{2}$ and $|\theta_{BC}^+\rangle = (|01_{BC}\rangle + i|10_{BC}\rangle) / \sqrt{2}$. A is associated the measurement σ_x , B is associated a measurement depending on the outcome a , $\frac{\sigma_x + (-1)^a \sigma_y}{\sqrt{2}}$, and C depending on b , $\frac{\sigma_x + (-1)^b \sigma_y}{\sqrt{2}}$. We prove that the inequality

$$D := P_{ABC}(1,0,0) + P_{ABC}(1,1,1) - P_{AC}(0,0) + P_{AC}(0,0|do(B=0)) + P_{BC}(b \neq c|do(A=1)) \leq 1 \quad (12)$$

is valid for all classically compatible data tables, and using the outlined protocol we find $D^Q = 1 + \frac{2-\sqrt{2}}{16\sqrt{2}}$ reaching a violation of $\beta_Q = \frac{2-\sqrt{2}}{16\sqrt{2}} \approx 0.025888$. Furthermore, to prove that this protocol is pairwise compatible we show that it respects specific inequality constraints shown in Appendix B of [1].

Discussion—The generalization of Bell's theorem to other causal structures has sparked new forms and new applications of non-classical behavior. However, a central concept in causality theory - that of an intervention - remains significantly unexplored. Unlike observations, an intervention locally changes the underlying causal relations, erasing all causes acting on the variable we intervene upon. We show that non-classicality considering this new data regime of passive observations and interventions jointly is a generic feature. To exemplify this, we prove here the existence of quantum non-classicality from data fusion in three completely saturated scenarios, i.e. when all probability distributions over three observable variables P_{ABC} admit a classical explanation for any cardinality of the variables. However, when the observations P_{ABC} are considered jointly with interventions we can prove the existence of quantum non-classicality. Furthermore, we show that more refined notions of non-classicality from data fusion are achievable with quantum resources, where the violations are genuine to multiple interventions.

Finally, we expand our investigation in a companion article [1] for all latent exogenous causal structures with three observed variables. We show interventions represent a potent new tool for comprehending and observing non-classical behavior and leave their potential practical applications to information processing, like e.g. randomness extraction [37] and communication complexity [38], for future work. Furthermore, we have focused on the scenario where all the observed variables are classical but generalizations where observed variables are made quantum, moving to the paradigm of quantum steering [39] open an interesting venue for future work. For instance, the teleportation protocol [40], remote state preparation [41], and dense coding [42], which have an underlying instrumental causal structure, could be generalized to new network scenarios with quantum communication. We hope our work might trigger further developments in these directions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the São Paulo Research Foundation FAPESP (Grant No. 2022/03792-4). Research at Perimeter Institute is supported by the Government of Canada through the Department of Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Research, Innovation and Science.

* p223457@dac.unicamp.br

- [1] P. Lauand, B. Ngussie Bekele, and E. Wolfe, “Quantum Non-classicality from Causal Data Fusion,” (2024).
- [2] J. Pearl, *Causality* (Cambridge university press, 2009).
- [3] J. Splawa-Neyman, D. M. Dabrowska, and T. P. Speed, *Statistical Science* **5**, 465 (1990).
- [4] D. B. Rubin, *Journal of Educational Psychology* **66**, 688 (1974).
- [5] J. Pearl, *Statistics Surveys* **3**, 96 (2009).
- [6] A. Balke and J. Pearl, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **92**, 1171 (1997).
- [7] J. Pearl, in *Proceedings of the Eleventh Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, UAI’95 (Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., San Francisco, CA, USA, 1995) p. 435–443.
- [8] C. N. Glymour, *The mind’s arrows : Bayes nets and graphical causal models in psychology / Clark Glymour*. (MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass. :, 2001).
- [9] B. Shipley, *Cause and Correlation in Biology: A User’s Guide to Path Analysis, Structural Equations and Causal Inference with R*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2016).
- [10] J. Peters, D. Janzing, and B. Schölkopf, *Elements of Causal Inference: Foundations and Learning Algorithms* (MIT Press, 2017).
- [11] J. S. Bell, *Physics Physique Fizika* **1**, 195 (1964).
- [12] S. Pironio, V. Scarani, and T. Vidick, *New Journal of Physics* **18**, 100202 (2016).
- [13] A. Tavakoli, A. Pozas-Kerstjens, M.-X. Luo, and M.-O. Renou, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **85**, 056001 (2022).
- [14] J. Pienaar and Č. Brukner, *New Journal of Physics* **17**, 073020 (2015).
- [15] J. Barrett, R. Lorenz, and O. Oreshkov, arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.10726 (2019).
- [16] F. Costa and S. Shrapnel, *New Journal of Physics* **18**, 063032 (2016).
- [17] M. Gachechiladze, N. Miklin, and R. Chaves, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 230401 (2020).
- [18] R. Chaves, G. Carvacho, I. Agresti, V. Di Giulio, L. Aolita, S. Giacomini, and F. Sciarrino, *Nature Physics* **14**, 291 (2018).
- [19] M. Ringbauer, C. Giarmatzi, R. Chaves, F. Costa, A. G. White, and A. Fedrizzi, *Science Advances* **2**, e1600162 (2016), <https://www.science.org/doi/pdf/10.1126/sciadv.1600162>.
- [20] K. Ried, M. Agnew, L. Vermeyden, D. Janzing, R. W. Spekkens, and K. J. Resch, *Nature Physics* **11**, 414 (2015).
- [21] E. Bareinboim and J. Pearl, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **113**, 7345 (2016).
- [22] E. Wolfe, A. Pozas-Kerstjens, M. Grinberg, D. Rosset, A. Acín, and M. Navascués, *Phys. Rev. X* **11**, 021043 (2021).
- [23] T. S. Richardson and J. M. Robins, *Working Paper Number 128 Center for Statistics and the Social Sciences University of Washington* (2013).
- [24] A. Choi, M. Chavira, and A. Darwiche, “Node splitting: A scheme for generating upper bounds in bayesian networks,” (2012), arXiv:1206.5251 [cs.AI].
- [25] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization* (Cambridge University Press, 2006).
- [26] J. Nocedal and S. J. Wright, *Numerical optimization*, 448 (2006).
- [27] I. M. Bomze, *Journal of Global Optimization* **22**, 17 (2002).
- [28] E. Wolfe, R. W. Spekkens, and T. Fritz, *Journal of Causal Inference* **7** (2019).
- [29] M.-O. Renou, E. Bäumer, S. Boreiri, N. Brunner, N. Gisin, and S. Beigi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 140401 (2019).
- [30] N. Gisin, J.-D. Bancal, Y. Cai, P. Remy, A. Tavakoli, E. Zambri Cruzeiro, S. Popescu, and N. Brunner, *Nature Communications* **11**, 2378 (2020).
- [31] T. C. Fraser and E. Wolfe, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 022113 (2018).
- [32] T. Fritz, *New Journal of Physics* **14**, 103001 (2012).
- [33] P. Lauand, D. Poderini, R. Nery, G. Moreno, L. Pollyceno, R. Rabelo, and R. Chaves, *PRX Quantum* **4**, 020311 (2023).
- [34] P. Lauand, D. Poderini, R. Rabelo, and R. Chaves, “Quantum non-classicality in the simplest causal network,” (2024), arXiv:2404.12790 [quant-ph].
- [35] G. Camillo, P. Lauand, D. Poderini, R. Rabelo, and R. Chaves, *Phys. Rev. A* **109**, 012220 (2024).
- [36] M. Zukowski, A. Zeilinger, M. Horne, and A. Ekert, *Physical Review Letters* **71** (1993).
- [37] S. Pironio, A. Acín, S. Massar, A. B. de la Giroday, D. N. Matsukevich, P. Maunz, S. Olmschenk, D. Hayes, L. Luo, T. A. Manning, and C. Monroe, *Nature* **464**, 1021 (2010).
- [38] H. Buhrman, R. Cleve, S. Massar, and R. de Wolf, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82**, 665 (2010).
- [39] B. D. M. Jones, I. Šupić, R. Uola, N. Brunner, and P. Skrzypczyk, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 170405 (2021).
- [40] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1895 (1993).
- [41] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, B. M. Terhal, and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 077902 (2001).
- [42] C. H. Bennett and S. J. Wiesner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 2881 (1992).