

Escaping the Shadow of Bell’s Theorem in Network Nonlocality

Maria Ciudad-Alañón^{1,2}, Emanuel-Cristian Boghiu³, Paolo Abiuso⁴, and Elie Wolfe^{1,2}

¹Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, 31 Caroline Street North, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 2Y5

²Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, N2L 3G1

³ICFO – Institut de Ciències Fotoniques, The Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology, 08860 Castelldefels (Barcelona), Spain

⁴Institute for Quantum Optics and Quantum Information - IQOQI Vienna, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Boltzmannngasse 3, A-1090 Vienna, Austria

The possibility of nonclassicality in networks unrelated to Bell’s original eponymous theorem has recently attracted significant interest. Here, we identify a sufficient condition for being “outside the shadow of Bell’s theorem” and introduce a testable criterion capable of certifying the novelty of instances of network-nonclassicality which we call minimal network nonclassicality. We provide examples of minimally network nonclassical correlations realizable in quantum theory as well as examples coming from more exotic operational probabilistic theories. In particular, we apply these concepts to the simplest configuration of the 3-chain scenario (a.k.a. the bilocality scenario) to prove that certain correlations have escaped the shadow of Bell’s theorem. While some of the examples herein are unprecedented, we also revisit more familiar examples of network nonclassicality in order to highlight the contrast between our approach versus prior approaches with respect to assessing novelty.

1 Introduction

In 1964, John Bell showed that quantum theory leads to correlations that cannot be explained by any theory that satisfies the assumptions of mea-

surement independence and local causality [1, 2]. This phenomenon — which we call *Bell-type nonclassicality*¹ — led to the development of an entire field of research aimed at understanding and resolving the conflict between these assumptions and quantum theory. Considerable progress has been made in this area, particularly in understanding how various nonclassical features of quantum theory manifest as Bell-type nonclassicality, and in showing how this nonclassicality can become a resource for quantum information processing tasks, such as randomness generation or physics-based cryptography (see Ref. [3] for a review).

The original scenario considered by Bell consists of two separated parties each locally performing independently chosen measurements in their laboratories. As the two laboratories cannot communicate instantly as per the finite speed of light, correlations among their outcomes can only arise from previously shared bipartite sources (including e.g., entangled quantum states). When restricting to classical theory, these assumptions of measurement independence and local causality are equivalent to the existence of a local hidden-variable description of the experiment, i.e., a classical common-cause explanation of the observed measurement correlations (Fig. 1a). Bell nonclassicality, then, is the property of certain experiments featuring quantum nonseparable sources to

Maria Ciudad-Alañón: mciudadalanon@pitp.ca

¹Also known as Bell nonlocality.

result in outcomes inexplicable by any such classical common-cause model. The same situation can be immediately extended to the case of $N > 2$ isolated parties sharing 1 common source, which we shall include here in the terminology of *Bell scenario*.

In recent years it was observed, however, that the single common-cause explanation of an N -partite experiment, is a specific example within a broader spectrum of *causal models*, which can be systematically studied with the tools provided by the field of causal inference [4]. Causal models consist of observable random variables with known probability distributions and latent variables with unknown distributions which, together, explain observed correlations through causal influences, i.e., functional relationships between the values of different variables.

Causal models have gained attention in the field of quantum information theory as they provide a natural generalisation of Bell’s scenario to other scenarios of interest, such as those of *quantum networks* of space-like separated parties sharing independent quantum states [5]. These networks allow for novel quantum phenomena that have no analogue in Bell’s scenario, such as the possibility of performing entanglement swapping, which can distribute entanglement between distant, initially independent parties in the network [6].

Thus, causal models have been generalised to include quantum sources of correlations [7, 8]. Contrasting the correlations achievable in a causal model with either classical or quantum sources of correlations allows for the identification of *quantum advantage* in a given network topology, understood as the generation of network correlations that cannot be realised with classical resources alone. Causal models have also been generalised to allow for sources of correlations from other theories, possibly beyond quantum mechanics, such as theories constrained only by no-superluminal signalling [9, 10]. The causal network approach to quantum (and post quantum) nonclassicality has proven to be powerful in the analysis of foundational questions [5, 10–13], and it provides new tools for understanding information processing in a theory-agnostic way.

The study of causal models with quantum re-

sources naturally suggest certain open questions. It is in particular natural to ask:

1. What are the simplest scenarios of nonclassicality?
2. When is it possible to guarantee a network nonclassical behaviour is also nontrivial, i.e., not merely a logical consequence of quantum advantages in standard Bell scenarios?

The latter question can be rephrased as follows: Given some observed nonclassical correlations in a network, can we confidently distinguish whether their nonclassicality is ultimately traceable to Bell-type nonclassicality, or whether it represents a *new type of network nonclassicality*? We here, as also noted by others [14–16], highlight that many significant correlations in networks are such that their nonclassicality *can* be traced back to standard Bell nonclassicality (cf. Sec. 2 for details).

These questions have led to various studies and proposed definitions on what one should consider as *genuine* network nonclassicality.

The approach of Šupić *et al.* [14] is to define non-genuine nonclassical quantum correlations as those realisable in a network where the parties perform local measurements on the sources they receive, and local wirings of their local measurement settings and outcomes. Some examples of correlations have been proven to be outside this set (i.e. genuine network nonclassical according to Ref. [14]), particularly by certifying, through self-testing [17], the use of entangling measurements [18, 19] or the use of non-entangling measurements that cannot be implemented with local operations and classical communication [20]. Nevertheless, while self-testing represents the highest standard of nonclassicality benchmark in quantum networks, existing techniques based on it are technically challenging and can only detect very pure sources of entanglement. Moreover, we shall show that certain correlations arising *only via entangled measurements* can nevertheless be seen as simple liftings of standard Bell violations.

A different approach can be found in Refs. [16, 21, 22]. They aim to depart from the standard Bell scenario by identifying nonclassical correlations manifesting in networks without independent measurement choices. However, the absence of measurement choices is insufficient to establish

Bell-unrelatedness. Fritz [23, Thm. 2.16] shows how Bell-type nonclassicality can be embedded in a larger network to produce nonclassicality without measurement choices.

Yet another approach is given by Ref. Pozas-Kerstjens *et al.* [24], who propose a theory-independent definition of *full network nonclassicality*² (FNN), describing the set of correlations that requires *all* sources in the network to be nonclassical in order to manifest. Full network nonclassicality can be certified by linear programming via the inflation technique [25, 26]³. In addition, the tests are noise robust, facilitating the experimental demonstration [15]. However, we will argue that FNN includes certain correlations which we consider as traceable to the standard Bell scenario, demonstrating that full network nonclassicality is therefore *not* a proxy for Bell-unrelatedness.


In this work we also take up the challenge of articulating what makes a network-nonclassical correlation truly novel versus nonclassicality “in the shadow of Bell’s theorem”. We will not claim to provide a single precise definition here. The concept — however vague — is worth naming. In particular, while we will not attempt to sharply delineate the boundary between novel-or-not network nonclassicality, we *will* attempt to lay out an expansive vision of what might constitute the shadow of Bell’s theorem.

Definition [Being in the Shadow of Bell’s Theorem, informal (Shadowed)]: A network nonclassical correlation should be said to “live in the shadow of Bell”, (hereafter **Shadowed**), whenever it can somehow be traced back to Bell’s theorem as applied in the standard Bell scenario consisting of one common cause connecting all parties. [This definition is intentionally vague!⁴]

²The authors originally named it *full network nonlocality*. We have elected to substitute the word “nonlocality” for “nonclassicality”, as “nonlocality” carries some connotation of unhelpful philosophical baggage.

³Despite the *test* for FNN being a linear program, the *certificates* of FNN are polynomial functions of the observed probabilities.

⁴One might even say that our definition of Shadowed



(a) Bell’s scenario (b) 3-party chain (c) Triangle

Figure 1: Examples of various causal models, where A, B, C represent observed random variables, X, Y, Z locally generated settings in a Bell test and $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \Lambda_3$ latent variables. The latent variables could be either classical variables, quantum systems or more general sources of correlations.

Here we will propose a feature capable of witnessing the novelty (non-Shadowedness) of a given correlation which we call Minimal Network Nonclassicality (MNN). It is a theory-agnostic definition, consistent with that of Ref. [24]. Our definition is constructed so as to ensure that MNN correlation cannot be simulated via underlying embeddings of standard Bell nonclassicality. At a high level, our definition qualitatively ranks correlations according to how challenging they are in terms of **detecting** their nonclassicality, in contrast to both Ref. [24] and Ref. [14] which rank correlations according to how expensive they are to **produce**. Indeed, our definition of MNN will be motivated by first appreciating that all Shadowed correlations — read expansively — share a common feature. The *absence* of this feature in all MNN correlations is what makes our definition of MNN valuable for certifying the novelty of instances of network nonclassicality.

2 Beyond Bell nonclassicality

Our starting observation consists in noticing that, among several known examples of nonclassicality in networks, many can be seen to leverage simpler Bell-type nonclassicality cleverly embedded into a non-Bell-scenario network. This class of strategies is what we have termed Shadowed. A notable example of a Shadowed embedding was pointed out by Fritz [23], showing how two parties violating the Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt (CHSH) inequality can be classically wired to a third party

has *blurry edges*, pun intended.

to violate locality in the resulting triangle network.

Moreover, in the scenario depicted in Fig. 1b, which we refer to as *3-chain scenario* (also known as the *bilocality* scenario [5, 27, 28]), entanglement-swapping can be exerted to exhibit nonclassicality by means of (e.g.) CHSH violations between the extremal parties when post-selecting on successful teleportation by the middle party. We detail these (and other) examples, together with the inequalities that detect their nonclassicality in Appendix A. It is therefore natural to ponder whether novel forms of nonclassicality arise from the structure of the network rather than being attributed to a Bell-nonclassicality embedding. In the above-mentioned examples (as detailed in App. A), the violation of classicality can be seen to ultimately leverage only *one* effective nonclassical source, either part of the original network or induced by wiring and measurements (for instance, the entanglement-swapping example exploits entanglement between the extremal parties induced by postselection on an entangled measurement).

In retrospect, such a pattern is inevitable because Bell’s theorem is ultimately about the *failure of a (single) classical common cause to explain a nonclassical correlation*. This is consistent with a resource-theoretic approach to Bell inequality violation which takes a classical common cause to define the free subtheory and a nonclassical common cause to define the enveloping theory [29]. Therefore, to be Shadowed, the nonclassicality of a correlation *must* be traced back to the nonclassicality of some (potentially *implicit*) common cause. We use this observation to define a set of nonclassical distributions which include all (but perhaps not *only*) Shadowed strategies:

Definition [**Subset Unavoidable Nonclassicality (SUN)**]: A correlation is said to exhibit Subset Unavoidable Nonclassicality (hereafter SUN) if all explanations for realizing it in the given network — allowing for nonclassical resources — rely on some fixed subset of the parties exploiting a nonclassical common cause, where we do not distinguish between a nonclassical common cause which is originally present in the network as a source from one which is induced via postselection.




Figure 2: Representation of the observational causal order for the 3-chain network. Outside arrows represent dominance (i.e. the set of correlations compatible with one scenario are included in the set of correlations compatible with the other). Λ represents a classical source, while OPT , an OPT one.

Proposition 1: If a network nonclassical correlation can be traced back to Bell’s theorem in the standard Bell scenario, then it certainly must be such that all explanations for the correlation rely on some particular subset of the parties making use of a nonclassical common cause (either an originally-present nonclassical source or a nonclassical common cause induced by postselection).

Shorthand: Shadowed \implies SUN

Mnemonic: To be in Shadow the SUN must be present.

Let us consider, for simplicity, the 3-chain scenario with three parties and two bipartite shared sources (Fig. 1b). We begin by recognizing that the 3-chain scenario induces different sets of correlations based on the nature of the sources therein (Fig. 2). Furthermore, these sets of correlations are partially-ordered by set inclusion. First, we define the set \mathcal{S}_0 as the correlations compatible with the 3-chain scenario using only classical sources,

that is, those that can be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\mathcal{S}_0}(a,b,c|x,y,z) &= \int d\lambda_1 d\lambda_2 p(\lambda_1)p(\lambda_2) \times \dots \\ & p(a|x,\lambda_1)p(b|y,\lambda_1,\lambda_2)p(c|z,\lambda_2). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Additionally, one can define $\mathcal{S}_1^{[AB^O BC^L]}$ and $\mathcal{S}_1^{[AB^L BC^O]}$, representing the sets of correlations compatible with one source being classical and the other being OPT-compatible. An OPT-compatible source refers to the most general *Operational Probabilistic Theory* [30] boxes that satisfy no-signalling constraints, device-replication and source independence [9]. The sets $\mathcal{S}_1^{[AB^O BC^L]}$ and $\mathcal{S}_1^{[AB^L BC^O]}$ are illustrated in Fig. 2 and can be expressed in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\mathcal{S}_1^{[AB^O BC^L]}}(a,b,c|x,y,z) &= \int d\lambda p(\lambda) p_{AB^O}(a,b|x,\{y,\lambda\}) p(c|z,\lambda), \end{aligned} \quad (2a)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\mathcal{S}_1^{[AB^L BC^O]}}(a,b,c|x,y,z) &= \int d\lambda p(\lambda) p(a|x,\lambda) p_{BC^O}(b,c|\{y,\lambda\},z), \end{aligned} \quad (2b)$$

where in Eqs. (2) p_{AB^O} and p_{BC^O} each denote a respective bipartite set of no-signalling correlations and where λ always serves as an input for B . Notice that, in the bipartite case, the NS corresponds to the most general OPT boxes.

Clearly it holds both that $\mathcal{S}_0 \subset \mathcal{S}_1^{[AB^O BC^L]}$ and that $\mathcal{S}_0 \subset \mathcal{S}_1^{[AB^L BC^O]}$, while in general the latter sets are not comparable (cf. Fig. 2 and 3). Finally, a superset \mathcal{S}_2 can be defined as the correlations arising by any OPT in the 3-chain network, (cf. Fig. 2) that is:

$$\begin{aligned} & p_{\mathcal{S}_2}(a,b,c|x,y,z) \text{ s.t.} \\ & \sum_b p_{\mathcal{S}_2}(a,b,c|x,y,z) = p(a|x)p(c|z) \\ & \sum_a p_{\mathcal{S}_2}(a,b,c|x,y,z) = \sum_a p_{\mathcal{S}_2}(a,b,c|x,y,z') \forall z,z' \\ & \sum_c p_{\mathcal{S}_2}(a,b,c|x,y,z) = \sum_c p_{\mathcal{S}_2}(a,b,c|x',y,z) \forall x,x' \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Note that the subindices of \mathcal{S}_0 , \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 indicate the number of nonclassical sources required

in the network to compute the correlations belonging to those sets.

The introduction of these sets allows us to formally define *Minimal Network Nonclassicality* (MNN), a form of nonclassicality that is certainly not Shadowed, in the 3-chain scenario. In particular, a correlation $p(a,b,c|x,z)$ is MNN in such network iff it belongs to the set $\{\mathcal{S}_1^\cap \setminus \mathcal{S}_0\}$ (cf. Fig. 4), where $\mathcal{S}_1^\cap \equiv (\mathcal{S}_1^{[AB^O BC^L]} \cap \mathcal{S}_1^{[AB^L BC^O]})$. That is, MNN correlations are nonclassical but can still be explained by constraining any of the two sources to be classical.

The generalisation for an arbitrary network with m parties and n sources is straightforward. We can similarly define sets of correlations based on the types of sources allowed. Specifically, \mathcal{S}_0 and \mathcal{S}_n corresponds to correlations compatible with all sources being classical or all sources being nonclassical, respectively. Additionally, we can define \mathcal{S}_i^\cap and \mathcal{S}_i^\cup as, respectively, the intersection and the union of the possible sets of correlations compatible with i nonclassical sources.

Then, we can formally define MNN for any network.

Definition [Minimal Network Nonlocality (MNN)]: In a given network with m parties and n sources, a correlation $p(\bar{a}|\bar{x})$ is considered to be Minimally Network Nonlocal (hereafter MNN) iff it cannot be modeled by allowing all the sources in the network to be classical, while it is compatible with *all* causal interpretations wherein exactly one of the sources is of OPT-variable nature and the others are classical. Here, $\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$ represents the inputs and $\bar{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_m)$, the outputs of each party. In other words, $p(\bar{a}|\bar{x})$ is MNN iff it belongs to the set $\mathcal{S}_1^\cap \setminus \mathcal{S}_0$.

Note that the definition of MNN has been explicitly constructed to ensure the following:

Proposition 2: If a correlation is minimally network nonclassical, then it must *not* rely on any particular subset exploiting a nonclassical common cause.

Shorthand: $\text{MNN} \implies \neg \text{SUN}$

Mnemonic: Seeing the M(oo)NN requires an absence of SUN.

Putting Props. 1 and 2 together immediately leads us to the following theorem, which essentially powers all of the results that follow:

Theorem 1: If a correlation is minimally network nonclassical, then evidently it has escaped the shadow of Bell’s theorem.

Shorthand: $\text{MNN} \implies \neg \text{Shadowed}$

Mnemonic: In M(oo)NNlight there are no Shadows.

Notice that, we are interested in theory-independent notions of network nonclassicality. In the particular case of the 3-chain scenario, for instance, we considered the sets \mathcal{S}_0 , $\mathcal{S}_1^{[AB^O BC^L]}$, $\mathcal{S}_1^{[AB^L BC^O]}$ and \mathcal{S}_2 and the corresponding hierarchy of correlations based on general no-signalling OPTs. Clearly, a corresponding hierarchy can be defined using quantum sources of correlations defining the sets $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_0 = \mathcal{S}_0$, $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1^{[AB^O BC^L]}$, $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1^{[AB^L BC^O]}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_2$, for which it holds in general that $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i \subset \mathcal{S}_i$.

A few comments are in order: The MNN property describes correlations whose nonclassicality cannot be traced back to a specific source (any of the sets compatible with one nonclassical source can explain them), and might therefore be interpreted as a “delocalized” nonclassicality. In this sense, MNN explicitly avoids SUN strategies. In




Figure 3: Venn diagram representation of the sets of correlations realizable by the corresponding networks depicted in Fig. 2. Note that $\mathcal{S}_2 \supset (\mathcal{S}_1^{[AB^O BC^L]} \cap \mathcal{S}_1^{[AB^L BC^O]})$ and that $\mathcal{S}_0 \subset (\mathcal{S}_1^{[AB^O BC^L]} \cup \mathcal{S}_1^{[AB^L BC^O]})$. Only the bilocal set \mathcal{S}_0 is wholly contained within the quantumly-realizable set \mathcal{Q}_2 , i.e. $\mathcal{S}_0 \subset \mathcal{Q}_2$. Note that *none* of the sets in the diagram are actually convex.

particular, Theorem 1 implies that all the Bell-embedding examples discussed above the (cf. Appendix A) are not MNN. Secondly, MNN should be contrasted with full network nonclassicality (FNN) [24]. FNN essentially picks out those correlations which are *maximally expensive* in the sense that they can only be realized by taking *all* the latent sources in the network to be nonclassical. In stark contrast, MNN picks out correlations which are *minimally expensive* in the same sense. That is, the *cost* of realizing an MNN correlation can be *paid for* in so many different ways, such that no *particular* subset of the parties need to share a nonclassical common cause to obtain the correlation. As such, while we here consider MNN correlations to be unambiguously outside of the shadow of Bell’s theorem, the very same correlations would necessarily be assessed as *lacking novelty* in the FNN framework! While it is tautologically impossible for any correlation to be both MNN and FNN, we would reiterate that within the novelty assessment framework advocated here it is perfectly plausible for a correlation to be both FNN and at the same time untraceable back to Bell’s theorem. That is, Thm. 1 only works in one direction.

In the case of the 3-chain scenario analyzed here (see Fig. 2), in which MNN corresponds to $\mathcal{S}_1^\cap \setminus \mathcal{S}_0$, FNN would be defined by $\mathcal{S}_2 \setminus \mathcal{S}_1^\cup$. Both FNN and MNN are a properties relative to the fixed network topology, and are not, in general, preserved when modifying the latter. Moreover, the sets of MNN and FNN correlations are both generally nonconvex.

In the following we provide instances of MNN correlations realizable in the 3-chain scenario with quantum sources, as well as several other examples showing the nontrivial hierarchy of correlations arising already in this simple network.

3 MNN in the simplest network

In order to analyze the nonclassicality-hierarchy above introduced and to exhibit examples of MNN correlations, we continue to consider what is arguably the simplest nontrivial network featuring more than one shared source, that is the 3-chain scenario (Fig. 2) described in Sec. 2, in its sim-




Figure 4: We recapitulate the Venn diagram per Fig. 3, where here we shade in the subsets of correlations which are MNN (blue region) and FNN (yellow region). The named points within the figure correspond to example correlations in the main text.

plest configuration. That is, we take all outputs $\{a, b, c\}$ to be binary, as well as the inputs x of Alice and z of Charlie, while y is trivial (Bob has no input). In fact, any reduction of these chosen cardinalities trivializes the scenarios (cf. Appendix B). We developed tools to assess the nonclassicality properties of a given correlation $p(a, b, c|x, z)$ in this configuration. First, to determine whether a correlation is classical in the minimal 3-chain scenario (i.e. belonging to \mathcal{S}_0 as per Eq. (1)) we developed an oracle using the *Gurobi* solver [31]. The oracle uses a simple algorithm based on a pictorial representation of the simplest 3-chain scenario (see details in Appendix C). This oracle can also be generalized to larger cardinalities of inputs and outputs, by exploiting the formalism proposed in [28]. Secondly, to determine the compatibility with $\mathcal{S}_1^{[AB^O BC^L]}$ and $\mathcal{S}_1^{[AB^L BC^O]}$ (Fig. 2), Linear Programs (LP) are used. These programs are based on imposing the conditions of no-signalling, source-independence and compatibility with the probability distribution (further details can be found in Appendix D). The results obtained with these LPs are equivalent to the ones obtained using the inflation technique [25, 32].

We are then able to demonstrate the existence of correlations in all the different parts of the Venn diagram, i.e. proving that the causal hierarchy in Fig. 2 is nontrivial. In Fig. 3 we visually depict the different sets of correlations, \mathcal{S}_0 , $\mathcal{S}_1^{[AB^O BC^L]}$,

$\mathcal{S}_1^{[AB^L BC^O]}$, \mathcal{S}_2 and the set of quantumly-realizable correlations in the 3-chain scenario \mathcal{Q}_2 . In Fig. 4 we also depict the MNN and FNN sets and the correlations that will be discussed in this section. Using our numerical methods, we were able to show that the MNN set is non-trivial, and furthermore, realisable within quantum theory.

An example of this novel type of nonclassicality, denoted as $p_{\text{MNN}}^{(1)}$ in Fig. 4, is found in the simplest 3-chain scenario, thus proving the existence of the gap between \mathcal{S}_0 and \mathcal{S}_1^\cap . This correlation $p_{\text{MNN}}^{(1)} = \mu p_{\text{ES}} + (1 - \mu) p_L$ is a mixture of a version of the entanglement-swapping scenario p_{ES} [27, 28] and a local Bell test p_L (more details are provided in Appendix E). By construction, the entanglement-swapping distribution is feasible using entangled sources and entangled measurements. Indeed, it is a fully-network nonclassical correlation [24]. However, when convexly combined with a specific local Bell test, it is not necessary for both sources to be nonclassical. We selected scenarios that ensure the convex combination remains quantum, thereby demonstrating that this type of nonclassicality can manifest within quantum theory. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that the protocol proposed in [33] can be modified for use in the 3-chain scenario (see details in Appendix E). This leads to a probability distribution, $p_{\text{MNN}}^{(2)}$, which is compatible with quantum theory, depends on a parameter θ and it is MNN for $\theta \in (0, \pi/4) \cup (\pi/4, \pi/2)$. Furthermore, we studied the amount of noise that the aforementioned MNN examples, that are quantumly realizable, could tolerate before becoming classically compatible. This coincides with the point at which incompatibility with the MNN arises. If each source emits a Werner state [34] of the form $\rho_v = v\rho + (1 - v)\mathbb{1}$, where $v \in [0, 1]$ is the visibility and ρ is the state produced by the source when there is no noise, then a quantum demonstration of MNN can be achieved with appropriate measurements when $v \geq v_{\text{crit}}$. The value of the critical visibility for the convex mixture $p_{\text{MNN}}^{(1)}$ is $v_{\text{crit}} \approx 0.987$ for the convex weight $\mu = 0.65$ (see Appendix A). However, in the case of $p_{\text{MNN}}^{(2)}$ with $\theta = \pi/8$, the critical visibility reach a notable lower value of $v_{\text{crit}} \approx 0.861$, thus providing a candidate to experimentally observe MNN.

Finally, we find post-quantum examples of min-

imal nonclassical correlations, denoted as $p_{\text{MNN}}^{(3)}$ in Fig. 4. These are generated using a similar mixing strategy with a post-quantum box p_{PS} and the same local Bell test p_L (further details in Appendix E). Note that we can certify that these examples are post-quantum via quantum inflation [32, 35].

Furthermore, in order to prove the nontriviality of every set represented in Fig. 4, we give an example of a correlation $p_{\text{Fritz}}^{(R)}$ that is contained in $\mathcal{S}_1^{[AB^O BC^L]} \setminus \mathcal{S}_1^\cap$. That correlation is a wiring-based embedding of the CHSH inequality considered by Fritz [23] (cf. Sec A). Similarly, we can construct a correlation $p_{\text{Fritz}}^{(L)}$ that belongs to $\mathcal{S}_1^{[AB^L BC^O]} \setminus \mathcal{S}_1^\cap$.

All the results mentioned in this section pertain to the simplest configuration in the 3-chain network and represent the first examples requiring quantum sources in that configuration. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that the protocol proposed in [36] for the 3-chain scenario with output cardinalities $\{|A|, |B|, |C|\} = \{2, 4, 2\}$ and input cardinalities $\{|X|, |Y|, |Z|\} = \{3, 1, 3\}$, which utilizes the elegant joint measurement [37], is also MNN. This result was computationally demonstrated by employing analogous programs to those described in Appendices C and D but tailored for higher cardinalities.

4 Motivating MNN and alternatives

The desideratum motivating this work is a conservative framework for assessing the novelty of nonclassical phenomena arising in nontrivial network topologies, i.e. those with more than one independent nonclassical source.

Recall that a correlation is said to be SUN iff it can be explained without relying on any particular pair of parties exploiting a nonclassical common cause (notice that here we do not distinguish between a nonclassical common cause which is originally present in the network as a source from one which is induced via postselection). Recall further that $\text{MNN} \implies \neg\text{SUN} \implies \neg\text{Shadowed}$. However, perhaps a correlation need *not* be MNN in order to be escape Bell theorem’s Shadow? We will answer

this in the affirmative in Prop. 3. Anticipating that finding, we herein consider what sort of *relaxation* of MNN would nevertheless still imply $\neg\text{SUN}$.

To be clear, however, we **leave as an open question** whether or not $\text{SUN} \implies \text{Shadowed}$. We suspect (but cannot be certain) that as a community we will eventually define Shadowed in a manner that excludes certain FNN correlations in addition to excluding all MNN correlations.

A superficially appealing — but ultimately mistaken — approach for constructing a superset of MNN correlations while retaining the $\neg\text{SUN}$ implication would be to include all nonclassical correlations which can be explained every which way of constraining a single source within the network to be classical. Such a correlation evidently does not rely on exploiting the nonclassicality of a single source *originally present* in the network. The hypothetical set of such correlations formally corresponds to $\mathcal{S}_{n-1}^\cap \setminus \mathcal{S}_0$ (cf. Sec. 2). The astute reader may anticipate the fallacy in the above construction: despite requiring multiple qualitatively distinct causal explanation for the same correlation, the aforementioned criterion leaves open the possibility of embedding the violation of a Bell inequality via an *induced* common cause.

To illustrate the problem with a concrete example, consider the triangle scenario with two outputs for each party and two inputs for two out of the three parties (Alice and Charlie). An entanglement-swapping protocol (details in Appendix A) can be implemented in this scenario, resulting in a correlation which not merely SUN, but is actually pretty clearly Shadowed as the correlation violates the CHSH inequality between Alice and Charlie under suitable postselection of Bob’s outcome. As the same time, this correlation turns out to be compatible with \mathcal{S}_2^\cap (cf. App. F), thereby highlighting the insufficiency of imposing *merely* compatibility with \mathcal{S}_2^\cap instead of truly imposing $\neg\text{SUN}$.

We thus tailored the definition of MNN to ensure that it would not admit any SUN correlation. At the same time, we acknowledge that alternatives may also be considered. For instance, we could prohibit the use of entangled measurement in conjunction with the aforementioned compatibility with every one-classical source




Figure 5: Representation of two possible configurations of the square network with two classical sources and two nonclassical ones. The intersection of correlations feasible in both configurations defines a set \bar{S} .

configuration. It should be noted that such a conjoined-restrictions criterion would exclude the entanglement-swapping example previously mentioned. Nonetheless, we opted for MNN as it is more readily formalizable and verifiable.

We thus acknowledge the potential restrictiveness of the MNN notion. Consider, for instance, the square network depicted in Fig. 5. In such scenario one can define the set of correlations, say \bar{S} , that are compatible with both configurations represented (that is, classical sources shared by AB and BC and nonclassical sources shared by CD and DA (left), or the complementary configuration (right)). Clearly, MNN correlations are in principle a strict subset of \bar{S} . At the same time, it is not difficult to see that correlations belonging to \bar{S} prevented to feature SUN nonclassicality (and, therefore, Shadowed nonclassicality) leveraging nonclassicality of any of the four network source, as well as of sources induced via entanglement swapping.

In summary, we can state the following proposition:

Proposition 3: The fact that a correlation is not minimally network nonclassical does not imply that it relies on any particular subset exploiting a nonclassical common cause. Equivalently, not relying on any particular subset exploiting a nonclassical common cause to explain a correlation does not mean that such correlation is minimally network nonclassical.

Shorthand: $\neg\text{MNN} \not\Rightarrow \text{SUN}$.

Mnemonic: SUN can be absent despite no $M(\infty)\text{NN}$.

4.1 Epigraph

*To summarize our proving scheme,
recall Shadows need SUN to be seen,
so if Shadows you dread,
seek the $M(\infty)\text{NN}$ overhead
as no SUN is in sight when the $M(\infty)\text{NN}$ beams.*

5 Conclusions

In this work, motivated by the goal of finding novel types of statistical nonclassicality in (quantum and postquantum) networks, we introduced the notion of Minimal Network Nonclassicality (MNN), describing correlations whose nonclassicality can be explained via the use of a single nonclassical source in any point of the given network. This property guarantees, at the same time, that such nonclassicality is non-expensive in terms of nonclassical sources, and cannot be traced back to obvious liftings of simpler Bell nonclassical scenarios. Via numerical results we prove the existence of MNN, both in the quantum and in the post-quantum regime, already in the simple 3-chain (or bilocality) scenario with minimum cardinality of inputs and outputs. In particular, we find a point ($p_{\text{MNN}}^{(2)}$, cf. Sec. 3) with specific noise-resistance of $\sim 14\%$, thus providing a candidate of experimentally-observable MNN. It is important to stress that we introduced the notion of MNN as a *sufficient* condition for a nonclassical correlation to be genuinely beyond simple Shadowed nonclassicality, however we do not claim such condition to be necessary, nor to be *the* definition of genuine network nonclassicality (cf. Discussion 4). Rather, it highlights a peculiar phenomenon which might be useful in understanding novel properties and applications of quantum causal networks.

Finally, while major efforts have been recently focused on characterizing the simplest possible examples of nonclassicality in the triangle network [16, 38], we notice that the 3-chain scenario, in its minimal-cardinality configuration, arguably represents the simplest network scenario with more than a single-source (cf. App. B). In this work we served a thorough analysis of this simple network and developed the tools necessary

to solve the feasibility problem in the different sets of the nonclassicality hierarchy. See Fig. 4 for a summary of pertinent results. Further future di-

rections and challenges include the exploration of the MNN set in larger networks, as well as proof-of-principle implementation.

6 Acknowledgements

We thank Pedro Lauand, Daniel Centeno, Victor Gitton and Marc-Olivier Renou for discussions and comments. This work is supported by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 (CEX2019-000910-S, PRE2019-088482), Fundació Cellex, Fundació Mir-Puig, and Generalitat de Catalunya through the CERCA program.

Research at Perimeter Institute is supported in part by the Government of Canada through the Department of Innovation, Science and Economic Development and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Colleges and Universities. P.A. is supported by the QuantERA II programme, that has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 101017733, and from the Austrian Science Fund (FWF), project I-6004.



Bibliography

- [1] John S Bell, “On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox,” *Physics Physique Fizika* **1**, 195 (1964).
- [2] Howard M. Wiseman and Eric G. Cavalcanti, “Causarum Investigatio and the Two Bell’s Theorems of John Bell,” in *Quantum [Un]Speakables II: Half a Century of Bell’s Theorem*, edited by Reinhold Bertlmann and Anton Zeilinger (2017) pp. 119–142.
- [3] Nicolas Brunner, Daniel Cavalcanti, Stefano Pironio, Valerio Scarani, and Stephanie Wehner, “Bell nonlocality,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **86**, 419–478 (2014).
- [4] Judea Pearl, *Causality* (2009).
- [5] Armin Tavakoli, Alejandro Pozas-Kerstjens, Ming-Xing Luo, and Marc-Olivier Renou, “Bell nonlocality in networks,” *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **85**, 056001 (2022).
- [6] M. Żukowski, A. Zeilinger, M. A. Horne, and A. K. Ekert, ““Event-ready-detectors” Bell experiment via entanglement swapping,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 4287–4290 (1993).
- [7] John-Mark A. Allen, Jonathan Barrett, Dominic C. Horsman, Ciarán M. Lee, and Robert W. Spekkens, “Quantum Common Causes and Quantum Causal Models,” *Phys. Rev. X* **7**, 031021 (2017).
- [8] Jonathan Barrett, Robin Lorenz, and Ognjan Oreshkov, “Quantum Causal Models,” (2020), [arXiv:1906.10726 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1906.10726).
- [9] Nicolas Gisin, Jean-Daniel Bancal, Yu Cai, Patrick Remy, Armin Tavakoli, Emmanuel Zambrini Cruzeiro, Sandu Popescu, and Nicolas Brunner, “Constraints on nonlocality in networks from no-signaling and independence,” *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 2378 (2020).
- [10] Xavier Coiteux-Roy, Elie Wolfe, and Marc-Olivier Renou, “Any physical theory of nature must be boundlessly multipartite nonlocal,” *Phys. Rev. A* **104**, 052207 (2021).
- [11] Marc-Olivier Renou, David Trillo, Mirjam Weilenmann, Thinh P. Le, Armin Tavakoli, Nicolas Gisin, Antonio Acín, and Miguel Navascués, “Quantum theory based on real numbers can be experimentally falsified,” *Nature* **600**, 625–629 (2021).

- [12] Mirjam Weilenmann and Roger Colbeck, “Self-Testing of Physical Theories, or, Is Quantum Theory Optimal with Respect to Some Information-Processing Task?” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 060406 (2020).
- [13] Mirjam Weilenmann and Roger Colbeck, “Toward correlation self-testing of quantum theory in the adaptive Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt game,” *Phys. Rev. A* **102**, 022203 (2020).
- [14] Ivan Šupić, Jean-Daniel Bancal, Yu Cai, and Nicolas Brunner, “Genuine network quantum nonlocality and self-testing,” *Phys. Rev. A* **105**, 022206 (2022).
- [15] Xue-Mei Gu, Liang Huang, Alejandro Pozas-Kerstjens, Yang-Fan Jiang, Dian Wu, Bing Bai, Qi-Chao Sun, Ming-Cheng Chen, Jun Zhang, Sixia Yu, Qiang Zhang, Chao-Yang Lu, and Jian-Wei Pan, “Experimental Full Network Nonlocality with Independent Sources and Strict Locality Constraints,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 190201 (2023).
- [16] Marc-Olivier Renou, Elisa Bäumer, Sadra Boreiri, Nicolas Brunner, Nicolas Gisin, and Salman Beigi, “Genuine Quantum Nonlocality in the Triangle Network,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 140401 (2019).
- [17] Ivan Šupić and Joseph Bowles, “Self-testing of quantum systems: a review,” *Quantum* **4**, 337 (2020).
- [18] Marc Olivier Renou, J ędrzej Kaniewski, and Nicolas Brunner, “Self-Testing Entangled Measurements in Quantum Networks,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 250507 (2018).
- [19] Jean-Daniel Bancal, Nicolas Sangouard, and Pavel Sekatski, “Noise-Resistant Device-Independent Certification of Bell State Measurements,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 250506 (2018).
- [20] Ivan Šupić and Nicolas Brunner, “Self-testing nonlocality without entanglement,” *Phys. Rev. A* **107**, 062220 (2023).
- [21] Alejandro Pozas-Kerstjens, Nicolas Gisin, and Marc-Olivier Renou, “Proofs of Network Quantum Nonlocality in Continuous Families of Distributions,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 090201 (2023).
- [22] Paolo Abiuso, Tamás Kriváchy, Emanuel-Cristian Boghiu, Marc-Olivier Renou, Alejandro Pozas-Kerstjens, and Antonio Acín, “Single-photon nonlocality in quantum networks,” *Phys. Rev. Res.* **4**, L012041 (2022).
- [23] Tobias Fritz, “Beyond Bell’s theorem: correlation scenarios,” *New J. Phys.* **14**, 103001 (2012).
- [24] Alejandro Pozas-Kerstjens, Nicolas Gisin, and Armin Tavakoli, “Full Network Nonlocality,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 010403 (2022).
- [25] Elie Wolfe, Robert W. Spekkens, and Tobias Fritz, “The Inflation Technique for Causal Inference with Latent Variables,” *J. Causal Inference* **7**, 20170020 (2019).
- [26] Miguel Navascués and Elie Wolfe, “The Inflation Technique Completely Solves the Causal Compatibility Problem,” *J. Causal Inference* **8**, 70–91 (2020).
- [27] C. Branciard, N. Gisin, and S. Pironio, “Characterizing the Nonlocal Correlations Created via Entanglement Swapping,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 170401 (2010).
- [28] Cyril Branciard, Denis Rosset, Nicolas Gisin, and Stefano Pironio, “Bilocal versus nonbilocal correlations in entanglement-swapping experiments,” *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 032119 (2012).
- [29] Elie Wolfe, David Schmid, Ana Belén Sainz, Ravi Kunjwal, and Robert W Spekkens, “Quantifying bell: The resource theory of nonclassicality of common-cause boxes,” *Quantum* **4**, 280 (2020).
- [30] Giulio Chiribella, Giacomo Mauro D’Ariano, and Paolo Perinotti, “Probabilistic theories with purification,” *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 062348 (2010).

- [31] Gurobi Optimization, LLC, “[Gurobi Optimizer Reference Manual](#),” (2023).
- [32] Emanuel-Cristian Boghiu, Elie Wolfe, and Alejandro Pozas-Kerstjens, “Inflation: a Python library for classical and quantum causal compatibility,” [Quantum](#) **7**, 996 (2023).
- [33] Pedro Lauand, Davide Poderini, Rafael Rabelo, and Rafael Chaves, “Quantum non-classicality in the simplest causal network,” (2024), [arXiv:2404.12790 \[quant-ph\]](#) .
- [34] Reinhard F Werner, “Quantum states with Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen correlations admitting a hidden-variable model,” [Phys. Rev. A](#) **40**, 4277 (1989).
- [35] Elie Wolfe, Alejandro Pozas-Kerstjens, Matan Grinberg, Denis Rosset, Antonio Acín, and Miguel Navascués, “Quantum Inflation: A General Approach to Quantum Causal Compatibility,” [Phys. Rev. X](#) **11**, 021043 (2021).
- [36] Armin Tavakoli, Nicolas Gisin, and Cyril Branciard, “Bilocal Bell Inequalities Violated by the Quantum Elegant Joint Measurement,” [Phys. Rev. Lett.](#) **126**, 220401 (2021).
- [37] Nicolas Gisin, “The Elegant Joint Quantum Measurement and some conjectures about N-locality in the Triangle and other Configurations,” (2017), [arXiv:1708.05556 \[quant-ph\]](#) .
- [38] Sadra Boreiri, Antoine Girardin, Bora Ulu, Patryk Lipka-Bartosik, Nicolas Brunner, and Pavel Sekatski, “Towards a minimal example of quantum nonlocality without inputs,” [Phys. Rev. A](#) **107**, 062413 (2023).
- [39] Nicolas Brunner, Daniel Cavalcanti, Stefano Pironio, Valerio Scarani, and Stephanie Wehner, “Bell nonlocality,” [Rev. Mod. Phys.](#) **86**, 419–478 (2014).
- [40] Alessia Suprano, Davide Poderini, Emanuele Polino, Iris Agresti, Gonzalo Carvacho, Askery Canabarro, Elie Wolfe, Rafael Chaves, and Fabio Sciarrino, “Experimental Genuine Tripartite Nonlocality in a Quantum Triangle Network,” [PRX Quantum](#) **3**, 030342 (2022).
- [41] Alejandro Pozas-Kerstjens, Antoine Girardin, Tamás Kriváchy, Armin Tavakoli, and Nicolas Gisin, “Post-quantum nonlocality in the minimal triangle scenario,” [New J. Phys.](#) **25**, 113037 (2023).
- [42] *Code available under request.*

A Shadowed and related inequalities

Here we detail simple known embeddings of bipartite Bell nonclassicality and the relative inequalities that arise from those scenarios.

A.1 Post-selection-based nonclassicality

Entanglement-swapping is a well-known phenomenon that generates nonclassicality in the 3-chain scenario [27, 28]. It involves establishing nonclassical correlations between two particles that have never interacted previously. Let us consider the scenario depicted in Fig. 1b. The sources emit pairs of particles in a maximally entangled state, say $|\phi^+\rangle = (|00\rangle + |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. Bob performs a coarse-grained Bell state measurement on the two received particles, yielding two possible outputs $b = 0, 1$, which correspond to the measurement operators $\hat{B}_0 = |\psi^+\rangle\langle\psi^+|$ and $\hat{B}_1 = \mathbb{1} - |\psi^+\rangle\langle\psi^+|$, respectively. Then, when Bob outputs 0, he performed entanglement swapping, and Alice and Charlie will be sharing a maximally entangled state. On the other hand, Alice and Charlie perform the measurements in a way that when Bob outputs 0, they can violate the CHSH inequality. Specifically, they can perform measurements that maximally violate the CHSH inequality, which are $\hat{A}_0 = (\sigma_x - \sigma_z)/\sqrt{2}$, $\hat{A}_1 = (\sigma_x + \sigma_z)/\sqrt{2}$, $\hat{C}_0 = \sigma_x$ and $\hat{C}_1 = \sigma_z$. It is sufficient to test CHSH inequality to see whether entanglement-swapping has occurred. Therefore, we can attribute the violation of the 3-chain classicality to the violation of CHSH between Alice and Charlie when post-selecting on $b = 0$.

A.2 Wiring-based embedding nonclassicality

Another method for producing nonclassicality, considered in [23], involves Bob and Charlie sharing a classical source λ that can take the value 0 or 1. Bob's measurement is determined by λ , while Charlie outputs λ and ignores z . This can be interpreted as an scenario in which Charlie's output becomes Bob's input. Furthermore, conditioning on Charlie, Alice and Bob perform measurements that violates the CHSH inequality, i.e. $\hat{A}_0 = (\sigma_x - \sigma_z)/\sqrt{2}$, $\hat{A}_1 = (\sigma_x + \sigma_z)/\sqrt{2}$, $\hat{B}_0 = \sigma_x$ and $\hat{B}_1 = \sigma_z$. Thus, by defining $p_z(a, b|x, c) = p(a, b|x, c, z) = \frac{p(a, b, c|x, z)}{p(c|z)}$, the following necessary inequality is obtained:

$$-2 \leq \sum_{a, b} (-1)^{a+b} \left(\frac{p(a, b, 0|0, z)}{p(c=0|z)} + \frac{p(a, b, 1|0, z)}{p(c=1|z)} + \frac{p(a, b, 0|1, z)}{p(c=0|z)} - \frac{p(a, b, 1|1, z)}{p(c=1|z)} \right) \leq 2, \quad (4)$$

which simply corresponds to the CHSH applied to $p_z(a, b|x, c)$. In this manner, we can trace back all the nonclassical correlations to violations of the previously mentioned CHSH inequality. Notice that this protocol is compatible with having one nonclassical source between A and B and a classical source between B and C but not the reverse configuration, as a classical source between A and B prohibits $p_z(a, b|x, c)$ from violating the CHSH inequality.

It is important to note that this represents only one possible wiring configuration; however, numerous alternatives, such as choosing $c = \lambda \oplus z$, yield similar inequalities. Additionally, a symmetric protocol can be considered by permuting A and C so that we have a classical source between A and B and $p_x(b, c|a, z)$ violates CHSH.

B Minimality of the scenario

In order to study scenarios beyond standard Bell games [39] (1 shared source, $N \geq 2$ parties), a network should involve at least two independent sources, and (therefore) at least three parties. The smallest nontrivial networks in this sense are the 3-chain-network considered in this work [27, 28] (sometimes called *bilocal network* in the literature) and the *triangle network* (three parties sharing three bipartite source [5, 16]). In recent years the latter has attracted a lot of interest [21, 22, 40], as it also provides quantum examples of network nonclassicality without random measurement inputs, and research efforts are dedicated towards the characterization of the simplest (i.e., with minimal cardinality of the outputs) games featuring (quantum) nonclassicality in the triangle network [38, 41]. Little attention however has been given to the 3-chain scenario, which is arguably “smaller”. It is in fact, minimal in terms of the number of sources and parties that form the network (2 sources and 3 parties) beyond the standard Bell scenarios.

Motivated by the quest of minimal scenarios exhibiting quantum nonclassicality, we now argue that among all configurations (input-output cardinalities) of the 3-chain network, the case with 2-1-2 inputs (indicating the respective cardinalities $|X|-|Y|-|Z|$) and 2-2-2 outputs (respective cardinalities $|A|-|B|-|C|$) is minimal, making it arguably the truly minimal configuration of beyond-Bell nonclassicality. Specifically, we consider

$$p(a,b,c|x,z) \quad \text{with dichotomic variables } \{a,b,c,x,z\}, \quad (5)$$

according to the 3-chain network configuration with trivial input for Bob (Fig. 1b, Fig. 2). In the case of classical theory the decomposition of the corresponding p is then given by

$$p(a,b,c|x,z) = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 d\lambda_1 d\lambda_2 p_A(a|x, \lambda_1) p_B(b|\lambda_1, \lambda_2) p_C(c|z, \lambda_2). \quad (6)$$

Number of inputs and outputs is minimal.

- If one reduces the cardinality of any of the outputs, effectively the scenario collapses to a 2 party scenario: 1) of the form

$$p(a,c|x,z) = p(a|x)p(c|z), \quad (7)$$

which can be fully filled with local strategies; or 2) of the form

$$p(a,b|x,z) = p(a,b|x), \quad (8)$$

with b independent from x . It follows that

$$p(a,b|x,z) = p(b)p(a|b,x), \quad (9)$$

which, as a set can be filled via classical strategies where the common source between Alice and Bob distributes b according to $p(b)$.

- If we reduce the cardinality of any of the two inputs, we obtain a probability of the form

$$p(a,b,c|x) \quad (10)$$

This can be nonclassical iff $p(a,b|c,x)$ is nonclassical.⁵

⁵We are grateful to Marina Maciel Ansanelli for sharing a proof of this last claim with us in private communication.

C Oracle for assessing nonclassicality in the 3-chain scenario

To construct an oracle for assessing nonclassicality in the 3-chain scenario, we propose a simple formalism based in a pictorial representation. This approach applies specifically to the simplest nontrivial configuration necessary to produce nonclassicality in the 3-chain scenario which consists of 2-1-2 inputs (indicating the respective cardinalities $|X|-|Y|-|Z|$) and 2-2-2 outputs (respective cardinalities $|A|-|B|-|C|$).

A correlation $p(a,b,c|x,z)$ will be classical in the 3-chain scenario iff it can be written as:

$$p(a,b,c|x,y,z) = \int \int d\lambda_1 d\lambda_2 \mu(\lambda_1) \mu(\lambda_2) p_A(a|x, \lambda_1) p_B(b|y, \lambda_1, \lambda_2) p_C(c|z, \lambda_2). \quad (11)$$

The response functions in it can be assumed to be deterministic, as any randomness in them can be absorbed in $\mu(\lambda_1)$ and $\mu(\lambda_2)$. Furthermore, λ_1 and λ_2 can be taken as flat distributions from 0 to 1 (then, $\mu(\lambda_1) = 1 = \mu(\lambda_2)$), by rescaling the response function of each party. Hence, the equation (11) becomes:

$$p(a,b,c|x,y,z) = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 d\lambda_1 d\lambda_2 p_A(a|x, \lambda_1) p_B(b|\lambda_1, \lambda_2) p_C(c|z, \lambda_2). \quad (12)$$

This means that correlations can be represented in a square as it is showed in Fig. 6a. Moreover, λ_1 and λ_2 are taken to be between 0 and 1 and their order can be permuted without loss of generality. Hence, we obtain Fig. 6b.




Figure 6: Pictorial representation of a classical correlation in the 3-chain scenario. The blue part corresponds to $p(a,b=1,c|x,z)$. The black regions in the bars correspond to $a=1$ in the λ_1 -axis and $c=1$ in the λ_2 -axis.

This way of visualising classical strategies divides the square into 16 rectangles (R_J with $J=1,2,\dots,16$) each corresponding to one of the 16 possible deterministic strategies that Alice and Charlie decide upon receiving λ_1 and λ_2 respectively. In each rectangle, there can be a coloured part (which we will call S_J) and an uncoloured part that represent the probability of Bob outputting 1 or 0, respectively:

$$S_J = p(b=1 \wedge \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\} \in R_J). \quad (13)$$

Moreover, there are two more variables that are unobservable, α and β , which correspond to another two degrees of freedom that can be visualized in Fig. 6b. Then, in order to fulfill the classicality condition, the variables S_J must satisfy certain conditions.

First, since the variables S_J corresponds to probabilities, they all have to fulfill positivity and have to be less than one,

$$S_J \geq 0 \text{ for } J=0,1,\dots,16. \quad (14)$$

$$S_J \leq 1 \text{ for } J=0,1,\dots,16. \quad (15)$$

Secondly, the variables S_J have to be smaller than the rectangles they are contained in,

$$S_J \leq R_J \text{ for } J=0,1,\dots,16. \quad (16)$$

Eq. (16) makes Eq. (15) redundant. All these conditions can be translated in terms of probabilities:

$$\begin{aligned}
S_1 &\leq \alpha \cdot \beta \\
S_2 &\leq [p(a=1,b,c|x=0,z=0) - \alpha] \cdot \beta \\
S_3 &\leq [p(a=1,b,c|x=1,z=0) - \alpha] \cdot \beta \\
S_4 &\leq [p(a=1,b,c|x=1,z=0) - p(a=1,b,c|x=0,z=0) + \alpha] \cdot \beta \\
S_5 &\leq \alpha \cdot [p(a,b,c=1|x=0,z=0) - \beta] \\
S_6 &\leq [p(a=1,b,c|x=0,z=0) - \alpha] \cdot [p(a,b,c=1|x=0,z=0) - \beta] \\
S_7 &\leq [p(a=1,b,c|x=1,z=0) - \alpha] \cdot [p(a,b,c=1|x=0,z=0) - \beta] \\
S_8 &\leq [p(a=1,b,c|x=1,z=0) - p(a=1,b,c|x=0,z=0) + \alpha] \cdot [p(a,b,c=1|x=0,z=0) - \beta] \\
S_9 &\leq \alpha \cdot [p(a,b,c=1|x=0,z=1) - \beta] \\
S_{10} &\leq [p(a=1,b,c|x=0,z=0) - \alpha] \cdot [p(a,b,c=1|x=0,z=1) - \beta] \\
S_{11} &\leq [p(a=1,b,c|x=1,z=0) - \alpha] \cdot [p(a,b,c=1|x=0,z=1) - \beta] \\
S_{12} &\leq [p(a=1,b,c|x=1,z=0) - p(a=1,b,c|x=0,z=0) + \alpha] \cdot [p(a,b,c=1|x=0,z=1) - \beta] \\
S_{13} &\leq \alpha \cdot [p(a,b,c=1|x=0,z=1) - p(a,b,c=1|x=0,z=0) + \beta] \\
S_{14} &\leq [p(a=1,b,c|x=0,z=0) - \alpha] \cdot [p(a,b,c=1|x=0,z=1) - p(a,b,c=1|x=0,z=0) + \beta] \\
S_{15} &\leq [p(a=1,b,c|x=1,z=0) - \alpha] \cdot [p(a,b,c=1|x=0,z=1) - p(a,b,c=1|x=0,z=0) + \beta] \\
S_{16} &\leq [p(a=1,b,c|x=1,z=0) - p(a=1,b,c|x=0,z=0) + \alpha] \cdot \\
&\quad \cdot [p(a,b,c=1|x=0,z=1) - p(a,b,c=1|x=0,z=0) + \beta].
\end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Additionally, some conditions on Bob's response function have to be satisfied. It is sufficient to look at $p(a,b=1,c|x,z)$ (the coloured part in Fig. 6), since $p(a,b=0,c|x,z) = p(a|x)p(c|z) - p(a,b=1,c|x,z)$. These conditions are:

$$\begin{aligned}
S_1 + S_2 + S_5 + S_6 &= p(a=1,b=1,c=1|x=0,z=0) \\
S_3 + S_4 + S_7 + S_8 &= p(a=0,b=1,c=1|x=0,z=0) \\
S_9 + S_{10} + S_{13} + S_{14} &= p(a=1,b=1,c=0|x=0,z=0) \\
S_{11} + S_{12} + S_{15} + S_{16} &= p(a=0,b=1,c=0|x=0,z=0) \\
S_1 + S_3 + S_5 + S_7 &= p(a=1,b=1,c=1|x=1,z=0) \\
S_9 + S_{11} + S_{13} + S_{15} &= p(a=1,b=1,c=0|x=1,z=0) \\
S_1 + S_2 + S_9 + S_{10} &= p(a=1,b=1,c=1|x=0,z=1) \\
S_3 + S_4 + S_{11} + S_{12} &= p(a=0,b=1,c=1|x=0,z=1) \\
S_1 + S_3 + S_9 + S_{11} &= p(a=1,b=1,c=1|x=1,z=1).
\end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Finally, observing the pictorial representation (Fig. 6b) the last conditions for the unobserved variables are:

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha &\geq 0 \\
\alpha &\leq p(a=1|x=1) \\
\alpha &\leq p(a=1|x=0) \\
\alpha &\geq p(a=1|x=1) - p(a=0|x=0) \\
\beta &\geq 0 \\
\beta &\leq p(c=1|z=1) \\
\beta &\leq p(c=1|z=0) \\
\beta &\geq p(c=1|z=1) - p(c=0|z=0),
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

but the third, the fourth and the last two equations of (19) are redundant with the other constraints. Then, we have 18 variables and 45 constraints.

This formalism gives completely equivalent results to the one proposed in Ref. [28], that uses a decomposition onto deterministic correlations, but the former reduces the number of variables [42].

D Feasibility MNN Linear Programs

We wanted to see whether a probability distribution is compatible with the the DAG shown in Fig. 7a. For a matter of convenience, we rewrite it in the unpacked version (see Fig. 7b, and Ref. [26, Sec.5] for the definition of unpacking).




Figure 7: Representation of the 3-chain scenario compatible with one classical source λ and one OPT source. 7a illustrates the version before unpacking and 7b, after unpacking.

In order to determine if a correlation p is or not compatible with the DAG previously mentioned, we need to establish whether there exist a probability distribution $Q(A_0, A_1, B, C|z)$ such that the following conditions are fulfilled:

- No Signalling (NS): $Q(A_0, A_1, B|z=0) = Q(A_0, A_1, B|z=1)$.
- Independence: $Q(A_0, A_1, C) = Q(A_0, A_1)Q(C)$.
- Compatibility with p : $p(A=a, B=b, C=c|X=x, Z=z) = Q(A_x=a, B=b, C=c|z=z)$.

We implemented this feasibility program using Gurobi [31] and you can find more details in [42].

For the case in which the source between Alice and Bob is OPT-compatible and the one between Bob and Charlie is classical, we followed an analogous procedure.

E Examples of MNN correlations

This appendix provides detailed examples of minimal nonclassical correlations. We can define a “post-selection” box p_{PS} given by the following correlations:

$$p_{PS}(a,b=0,c|x,z) = p_{ps} \cdot p_{PR\text{-}box(V)}(a,c|x,z) \quad (20)$$

$$p_{PS}(a,b=1,c|x,z) = \frac{1}{4} - p_{ps} \cdot p_{PR\text{-}box(V)}(a,c|x,z), \quad (21)$$

where $p_{PR\text{-}box(V)}$ is given by

$$p_{PR\text{-}box(V)}(a,b|x,y) = (1 + V \cdot (-1)^{a+b+x \cdot y})/4. \quad (22)$$

The correlation coming from the post-selection box is parameterized by the visibility V and the probability of post-selection p_{ps} . Note that in the case of $V = 1/\sqrt{2}$ and $p_{ps} = 1/4$, it coincides with the entanglement-swapping correlation that we described on [A](#).

We can also define a Bell local test p_{local} in the following way. Bob and Charlie share a classical source λ , which can return 0 or 1. Bob’s measurement is determined by λ and Charlie outputs λ directly, ignoring z . Then, Charlie’s outputs can be interpreted as Bob’s inputs. Also, both Alice and Bob perform the same measurements: $\hat{A}_0 = \hat{B}_0 = (\sigma_x - \sigma_z)/\sqrt{2}$ and $\hat{A}_1 = \hat{B}_1 = (\sigma_x + \sigma_z)/\sqrt{2}$. Thus, producing a local correlation in the 3-chain scenario. Explicitly, the produced correlations are as follows:

$$p(a,b,c|x,z) = p(c|z) \cdot p(a,b|x,c) \quad \text{where} \quad p(c|z) = \frac{1}{2} \quad (23)$$

$$\text{and} \quad p(a,b|x,c) = \begin{cases} 1/4 & \text{if } x \oplus c = 1 \\ 1/2 & \text{if } x \oplus c = 0 \text{ and } a \oplus b = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } x \oplus c = 0 \text{ and } a \oplus b = 1 \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

The cases of minimal network nonclassicality appear when we convexly mix the correlations previously mentioned (Eq. 25) for a certain range of μ given $V \in (1/\sqrt{2}, 1)$ and $p_{ps} = 1/4$.

$$p(a,b,c|x,z) = \mu \cdot p_{Post\text{-}selection}(V, p_{ps}) + (1 - \mu) \cdot p_{local}. \quad (25)$$

In particular, we know that the case of $V = 1/\sqrt{2}$ and $p_{ps} = 1/4$ is quantum, because this correlation can be obtained in a protocol where Alice always performs the same measurements on the same states, ensuring that the correlation obtained by means of the convex combination is also quantum. This case is MNN for $\mu \in (0.455, 0.705)$.

In addition, we also found post-quantum correlations certified via quantum inflation utilizing the Inflation library [32]. These are given by the same convex combination when $V = 1$ and $p_{ps} = 1/4$ and they are MNN for $\mu \in (0, 0.5)$.

Finally, it is noteworthy that a modified version of the protocol proposed in [33] is also MNN. In this case, the state shared by Alice and Bob and the one by Bob and Charlie is a maximally entangled state, concretely $|\phi^+\rangle = (|00\rangle + |11\rangle)/2$. The measurements performed by Alice and Charlie are $\hat{A}_0 = \hat{C}_0 = \sigma_x$ and $\hat{A}_1 = \hat{C}_1 = \sigma_z$ for their inputs $x, z = 0, 1$, respectively. Bob has two possible outcomes and the respective measurements are $\hat{B}(b=0) = |\psi_\theta\rangle\langle\psi_\theta|$ and $\hat{B}(b=1) = \mathbb{1} - |\psi_\theta\rangle\langle\psi_\theta|$, where $|\psi_\theta\rangle = \sin\theta|01\rangle + \cos\theta|10\rangle$. This protocol is MNN for $\theta \in (0, \pi/2) \setminus \theta/4$.

F Observational causal order for the triangle scenario




Figure 8: Representation of the observational causal order for the triangle network. Outside arrows represent dominance (i.e. the set of correlations compatible with one scenario are included in the set of correlations compatible with the other). Λ represents a classical source, while OPT , an OPT one.