

Information Causality and Noisy Computations

Li-Yi Hsu*, I-Ching Yu†, Feng-Li Lin†

* *Department of Physics, Chung Yuan Christian University, Chung-li 32023, Taiwan and*

† *Department of Physics, National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei, 116, Taiwan*

We reformulate the information causality in a more general framework by adopting the results in signal propagation and computation in a noisy circuit. In our framework, the information causality leads to a broad class of generalized Tsirelson inequalities, and a no-go theorem for the reliable nonlocal computation of complicated functions. The former will put the information causality under the scrutiny experimentally, and the latter implies a negative result in reliably retrieving the information out of black hole by the nonlocal computation with physically realizable resources.

Introduction. Physical principle is important guidance in formulating a physical theory, such as the uncertainty principle for quantum mechanics and equivalence principle for general relativity. A more fundamental principle is the space-time causality. In the context of quantum information it can be formulated as the no-signaling principle, which puts a limitation on the possible extent of non-locality without violating space-time causality. Despite of its non-local nature, quantum mechanics is a no-signaling theory. However, there is unexpected richness embarrassment, that is, exist a broad class of no-signaling theories other than quantum mechanics. These theories can violate Bell-type inequalities more than Tsirelson's bound [3, 4], i.e., they are more non-local than quantum mechanics could do [1, 2, 5–7]. Clearly, no-signaling is not enough as a principle to single out physical theories such as quantum mechanics, then what shall be [8, 9]?

Recently information causality, which is more subtle than no-signaling and can single out quantum mechanics as a physical theory, is proposed as a new physical principle [9]. It states that in a bipartite code protocol prepared with any physically local or non-local resources, the accessible information gain cannot exceed the amount of classical communication. In [9, 10] the information causality is demonstrated by a generic task similar to random access codes (RAC) and oblivious transfer. In this task, a database of k bits $\vec{a} := (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{k-1})$, where a_i is the random variable $\forall i$, only known by Alice is prepared, and the distant party Bob is given a random variable $b \in (0, \dots, k-1)$ along with a bit α send by Alice. With the bit α and the pre-shared correlation with Alice, Bob's task is to optimally guess the bit a_b . Then, according to information causality the quantity I is upper bounded

$$I = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} I(a_i; \beta | b = i) \leq 1. \quad (1)$$

Here $I(a_i; \beta | b = i)$ is the Shannon mutual information between a_i and Bob's guessing bit β if Bob is asked to access a_i by the condition $b = i$. Classically, I can reach 1 once $\alpha = a_i$ and $I(a_i; a_j) = \delta_{ij}$ (i.e., the Kronecker delta). To achieve the above task, the non-local correlations are initially distributed between Alice and Bob.

However, information causality states that the allowed non-locality by a physical theory cannot increase Bob's information gain. In this Letter, a direct spin-off of information causality is shown to generate a broad class of generalized multi-setting Tsirelson-type inequalities. As a result, we can then put the information causality as a physical principle under scrutiny by experimentally verifying or falsifying the generalized Tsirelson's bounds.

In this Letter, the strategy of reformulating information causality is as follows. Firstly the physically achievable non-local correlation is simulated by the no-signaling box (NS-box). Specifically the NS-box can be formulated as a noisy distributed gate exploited for nonlocal computation. We can embed this gate in a setting of RAC. In a way, Alice and Bob execute the RAC protocol using a noisy circuit. The noise of the NS-box is intrinsic and systematic inherited from the underlying physics theory such as quantum mechanics. Then the failure probabilities of Bob's task is related to the noise of the NS-box, and the quantity $I(a_i; \beta | b = i)$. In this framework, the signal decay theorem in [12, 13] for a noisy circuit is exploited to yield a tight bound for $I(a_i; \beta | b = i)$. Finally we can apply information causality to yield the generalized Tsirelson-type inequalities.

On the other hand, if there is no classical communication, RAC can be regarded as nonlocal computation, since distant Alice and Bob compute a general Boolean function without knowing the other's input [14]. From this aspect, information causality is closely connected with a nonlocal version of a fundamental question on noisy computation, which is raised by von Neumann [15]. Could the physical circuit with the systematic error intrinsically perform the reliable noisy nonlocal computation of any Boolean function? By reliable noisy computation, it means that the failure probability of the computation is less than 1/2 without invoking an infinitely large circuit. Dictated by the information causality, we will see that the answer is negative for the RAC circuit.

Tsirelson-type inequalities. We start by reformulating the NS-box as a noisy distributed gate for nonlocal computation. The NS-box as a non-local box is pre-shared between two distant Alice and Bob. Locally, Alice and Bob input k -bit strings $\vec{x} := (x_0, \dots, x_{k-1})$ and

$\vec{y} := (y_0, \dots, y_{k-1})$, respectively, into the half of the gate, which then outputs bits $A_{\vec{x}}$ and $B_{\vec{y}}$, respectively. The general NS-box is characterized by the conditional joint probabilities $\Pr[A_{\vec{x}}, B_{\vec{y}} | \vec{x}, \vec{y}]$, which must fulfill the no-signaling conditions. Note that the length of the strings and the dimension of input space can be chosen by design. In this letter, our NS-box is further characterized by the success probabilities $\Pr[A_{\vec{x}} + B_{\vec{y}} = f(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) | \vec{x}, \vec{y}]$ of computing a nonlocal task function, $f(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$. Such task is a nonlocal one if $f(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$ cannot be decomposed as “single-vector” functions of either \vec{x} or \vec{y} .

The RAC protocol for our purpose is not unique and will depend on the chosen task function $f(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$ and on how we encode Alice’s database \vec{a} and Bob’s given random variable b into \vec{x} and \vec{y} , respectively. Here we give an example for illustration by choosing $f(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) = \vec{x} \cdot \vec{y}$. First, Alice and Bob perform the encoding so that $x_i = a_0 + a_i$, and $y_i = \delta_{i,b}$ for $i = 0, \dots, k-1$. Note that $x_0 = 0$. Second, given the communication bit $\alpha = a_0 + A_{\vec{x}}$ send by Alice, Bob outputs the guess $\beta = \alpha + B_{\vec{y}}$. As a result, Bob can then decode Alice’s bit a_b successfully whenever $A_{\vec{x}} + B_{\vec{y}} = \vec{x} \cdot \vec{y}$ is true. According to quantum mechanics, the above can be physically realized as follows. For arbitrary bit strings \vec{x} and \vec{y} , there are the corresponding measurements $\vec{M}_{\vec{x}}$ and \vec{b} , of which the outcomes are $A_{\vec{x}}$ and $B_{\vec{y}}$, respectively. There are then 2^{k-1} and k local measurement settings for Alice and Bob, respectively. We will implicitly use this protocol for later discussions.

For the above protocol, the success probability of Bob’s task in decoding Alice’s bit a_b is related to the one for noisy computation as following

$$\Pr[\beta = a_b | b] = \frac{1}{\dim\{\vec{x}\}} \sum_{\{\vec{x}\}} \Pr[A_{\vec{x}} + B_{\vec{y}} = f(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) | \vec{x}, \vec{y}], \quad (2)$$

where $\dim\{\vec{x}\}$ is the dimension of the input space spanned by the encoding $\{\vec{x}\}$. Define the correlation functions to $C_{\vec{x}, \vec{y}} := \sum_{A_{\vec{x}}=0,1} \sum_{B_{\vec{y}}=0,1} (-1)^{A_{\vec{x}}+B_{\vec{y}}} \Pr[A_{\vec{x}}, B_{\vec{y}} | \vec{x}, \vec{y}]$. Then we can find

$$\xi_{\vec{y}} = \frac{1}{\dim\{\vec{x}\}} \sum_{\{\vec{x}\}} (-1)^{f(\vec{x}, \vec{y})} C_{\vec{x}, \vec{y}}. \quad (3)$$

where the coding noise parameter is defined to be $\xi_{\vec{y}} := 2 \Pr[\beta = a_b | b] - 1$. The sub-index \vec{y} of $\xi_{\vec{y}}$ is understood to be equivalent to Bob’s given parameter b via encoding.

One of the main results in this paper is that the generalized Tsirelson’s bound should be

$$\left| \sum_{\{\vec{y}\}} \xi_{\vec{y}} \right| = \frac{1}{\dim\{\vec{x}\}} \left| \sum_{\{\vec{x}\}, \{\vec{y}\}} (-1)^{f(\vec{x}, \vec{y})} C_{\vec{x}, \vec{y}} \right| \leq \sqrt{k}. \quad (4)$$

For $k = 2$, (4) is the Tsirelson’s bound $|C_{0,0} + C_{0,1} + C_{1,0} - C_{0,0}| \leq 2\sqrt{2}$ [3]. We have verified (4) to be the maximal violation of nonlocality in quantum mechanics by using

the semidefinite programming for general k [11]. This is why we call (4) as the generalized Tsirelson’s bound.

Indeed, later we will see that the information causality will yield (4). This implies that the information causality can be tested by experimentally verifying or falsifying (4) via measuring the correlation functions of a quantum system.

We now turn to the connection between $I(a_i, \beta | b)$ and $\xi_{\vec{y}}$. Once b is given, Bob can immediately learn $B_{\vec{y}}$, which, according to the no-signaling condition, will not affect $I(a_i, \beta | b)$. In other words, $I(a_i, \beta | b) = I(a_i, \beta | b, B_{\vec{y}})$. Then, we can use the following signal decay theorem on signal propagation proven by Evans and Schulman in [12, 13].

Theorem 1: Let X, Y and Z be Boolean random variables. Consider a cascade of two communication channels: $X \leftrightarrow Y \leftrightarrow Z$. There X and Y are the input and the output of the first channel, respectively. Let Y in turn be the input of a cascading binary symmetric channel C_ϵ with the noise parameter ϵ , i.e.,

$$C_\epsilon = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}(1+\epsilon) & \frac{1}{2}(1-\epsilon) \\ \frac{1}{2}(1-\epsilon) & \frac{1}{2}(1+\epsilon) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let Z be the output of C_ϵ , (That is, $Z = \bar{Y}$ with the bit-flipping probability $\frac{1}{2}(1-\epsilon)$)

$$\frac{I(X; Z)}{I(X; Y)} \leq \epsilon^2. \quad (5)$$

A special case is for the first channel to be noiseless or trivial, i.e., $I(X; Y = X) = 1$ such that $I(X; Z) \leq \epsilon^2$. Note also that no matter what the properties of the second channel, there is a data processing inequality $I(X; Z) \leq I(X; Y)$.

We apply this theorem to our RAC protocol as follows. As Alice’s inputs a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{k-1} are random variables and hence independent of each other, so that all the a_j ’s with $j \neq i$ can be fixed without disturbing $I(a_i; \beta | b)$. Let $X = a_i, Y = a_0 + f(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$, and $Z = \beta$. Here Y is Bob’s ideal answer and hence $I(X; Y) = 1$. The coding noise ϵ for our protocol is $\xi_{\vec{y}}$, then according to the Theorem 1, we have

$$I(a_i; \beta | b = i) \leq \xi_{\vec{y}}^2. \quad (6)$$

Note that the upper bound of $I(a_i; \beta | b = i)$ is tight, i.e., the equality in (6) holds if $\Pr[a_0 + f(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) | a_i = 0] = \Pr[a_0 + f(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) | a_i = 1] = 1/2$.

Therefore, the information causality in Eq. (1) yields

$$I \leq \sum_{\{\vec{y}\}} \xi_{\vec{y}}^2 \leq 1. \quad (7)$$

In [9, 10], similar inequalities are derived to avoid the divergence of I , and then justifies the information causality. However, such trouble does not exist in our reformulation by the tight bound of the Theorem 1. By

the help of (3) the second inequality in (7) becomes a quadratic Tsirelson-type inequality for the correlation function $C_{\vec{x}, \vec{y}}$. Moreover, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we can obtain $|\sum_{\{\vec{y}\}} \xi_{\vec{y}}| \leq \sqrt{k}$, that results in the linear Tsirelson inequality of Eq. (4).

Noisy nonlocal computation. In the previous discussion we only consider the information causality using a single nonlocal NS-box as the coding protocol. Instead, we can treat the NS-box as a gate for doing the nonlocal noisy computation, i.e., computing the function $f(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$ with the answer obtained by combing Alice's and Bob's outputs, namely, $A_{\vec{x}}$ and $B_{\vec{y}}$. The computation is successful if $A_{\vec{x}} + B_{\vec{y}} = f(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$ so that the computational noise parameter is defined as

$$\epsilon_{\vec{x}, \vec{y}} := 2\Pr[A_{\vec{x}} + B_{\vec{y}} = f(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) | \vec{x}, \vec{y}] - 1. \quad (8)$$

Unlike using the same gate for RAC, no classical communication between Alice and Bob is required to perform the nonlocal computation. On the other hand, from (8) and (3) the computational noise of the gate is related to its coding noise by

$$\xi_{\vec{y}} = \frac{1}{\dim\{\vec{x}\}} \sum_{\{\vec{x}\}} \epsilon_{\vec{x}, \vec{y}}. \quad (9)$$

Since the coding noise is constrained by the information causality, so is the computational noise based on the above relation.

Furthermore, we may combine the NS-box gates to form more complicated circuit without worrying about the coding protocol. Then the total task function for the whole circuit will be a complicated function, i.e., composite of task functions of all NS-boxes. We then may try to answer the following fundamental question: *could a noiseless (nonlocal) computation be simulated using the noisy nonlocal physical resource?*

To be specific, we consider the so-called (n, k, l) -circuit G by cascading layers of the noisy gates into a circuit in the form of a directed acyclic tree, see Fig 1. On the top of G , there are n inputs to the NS-boxes, the leaves; at the bottom there is only one NS-box, the root. The longest path from leaves to the root is called the depth of the circuit, denoted by l . The maximal input number of a gate in G is k . Note that, In [9] G comprised of $k = 2$ gates is exploited to compress n -bit \vec{x} into ont bit $A_{\vec{x}}$. However, there is no restriction on the task function for each NS-box, as long as the final circuit is a consistent acyclic tree diagram.

We then use the circuit G to perform the following nonlocal computation. Alice's n -bit database $\vec{a} := (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1})$ is given to the leaves of G , and a conditional input $b \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ is given to the distant Bob. The previous encoding $\vec{a} \rightarrow \vec{x}$ and $b \rightarrow \vec{y}$ for RAC protocol is similarly exploited here. Encode Alice's output properly and then feed into the NS-box at the next




FIG. 1: RAC protocol for a (n, k, l) -circuit. Each vertex of the circuit corresponds to a NS-box, with its details shown in the big ellipses.

layer with again Bob's conditional input. Perform the same procedure recursively until reaching the root, with its output as the answer to the total task function at the root.

Since Bob's input is conditional, we can then model the gate as a local one which computes the function of Alice's inputs only. Furthermore, once \vec{y} and $B_{\vec{y}}$ is fixed after Bob's local operations, and \vec{x} is known to Alice, the computation succeeds if $A_{\vec{x}} = f(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) + B_{\vec{y}}$ (or $B_{\vec{y}} = f(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) + A_{\vec{x}}$ from Bob's point of view). Equivalently, you may think that Bob's decoding (Alice's encoding) is noise free, and blame the computational noise to Alice's encoding (Bob's decoding) error due to the physical limitation of the underlying theory. This makes easier to understand the above procedure of noisy computation for the circuit G . Now we can consider the information flow of G .

Theorem 2: For the noisy local circuit G with an arbitrary depth, the root outputs one-bit information at most.

Note that the circuit G can perform RAC if the appropriate protocol is given at each layer, and the 1-bit communication is allowed for the whole process. Then, the above theorem implies that the information causality holds true for the circuit G .

To prove the theorem, we shall show that the mutual information between leaves and root of G is bounded by one. This can be done by mathematical induction as follows. Start with the circuit of depth one, which is nothing but a single NS-box, so the information causality ensures the bound. We then assume the the bound holds true for a circuit of depth ℓ . According to information causality and sub-additivity, the mutual information $I_{\ell}^{(m)}$ between leaves and root obeys $I_{\ell}^{(m)} \leq \sum_{i_m} I(X_{i_m}; R_m) =$

$\sum_{i_m} I(X_{i_m}; R_m | \text{Bob's knowledge}) \leq 1$, where the index m labels a collection of circuits of depth ℓ with root R_m , and the index i_m labels the inputs of the m -th circuit. Now, we construct a circuit of depth $\ell + 1$ by connecting all the roots R_m 's to a single NS-box whose output is R , then the mutual information $I_{\ell+1}$ between leaves and root R of the final circuit should obey the sub-additivity, i.e., $I_{\ell+1} \leq \sum_m \sum_{i_m} I(X_{i_m}; R)$. From the Theorem 1 we have $I(X_{i_m}; R) \leq \xi_m^2 I(X_{i_m}; R_m)$ since we have a cascade of two channels: $X_{i_m} \hookrightarrow R_m \hookrightarrow R$ where the second channel is the binary symmetric one with the noise ξ_m . Using this, we have $I_{\ell+1} \leq \sum_m \xi_m^2 \sum_{i_m} I(X_{i_m}; R_m) \leq \sum_m \xi_m^2 \leq 1$. Q.E.D.

For simplicity, now we only consider the case that the computational noise is isotropic to \vec{x} , denoted by $\epsilon_{\vec{y}}$. From (9) we have $\epsilon_{\vec{y}} = \xi_{\vec{y}}$ and the information causality requires $\sum_{\{\vec{y}\}} \epsilon_{\vec{y}}^2 \leq 1$. Then, we would like to know if the reliable computation is also constrained by the information causality or not. To check this, we invoke the main theorem on the conditions for the reliable noisy computation in [12, 13] by Evans and Schulman. It states that a circuit of complete k -ary tree with depth l (i.e., $n = k^l$) can perform δ -reliable noisy computation only

- (i) if $\sum_{\{\vec{y}\}} \epsilon_{\vec{y}}^2 > 1$ then $\ell \geq \log(n\Delta) / \log(\sum_{\{\vec{y}\}} \epsilon_{\vec{y}}^2)$,
- (ii) if $\sum_{\{\vec{y}\}} \epsilon_{\vec{y}}^2 \leq 1$ then $n \leq 1/\Delta$,

where $\Delta := 1 + \delta \log \delta + (1 - \delta) \log(1 - \delta)$. The computation is called δ -reliable if the root outputs correctly with probability $1 - \delta$ (with $\delta < 1/2$). This theorem provides a more strict conditions than the original proposal by Von Neumann [15, 16].

By definition, smaller $\epsilon_{\vec{y}}$ means larger noise, and the condition (ii) is for the cases with larger noise so that only functions with smaller number of inputs can be reliably computed. Immediately, we see that information causality implies a large computational noise for the RAC circuit so that only condition (ii) for reliable noisy computation can be possibly fulfilled. As a result, Alice's output asymptotically becomes random since $\Delta \rightarrow 0$ and hence $\delta \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

In summary, our results imply that *the information causality prevents any physically realizable (n, k, l) -circuit from achieving the reliable computations of too complicated functions, i.e., with either too many inputs or lengthy steps needed.*

Discussion. If the result holds true for more general circuits, it could be quite profound, for example for black hole physics. Consider Alice and Bob share a nonlocal machine made by the circuit G discussed above. Alice then enters a black hole, and Bob remains outside of it. Then, we may ask if Bob can reliably retrieve Alice's information inside the black hole by performing the nonlocal computation. Our result implies the answer to be negative if the information causality is obeyed. This

is indeed the case for the machine with nonlocal quantum correlation as discussed in [17, 18]. This implies a deep relation between information causality and the fast scrambling of quantum informations in a random systems.

Moreover, as our Universe can be thought as a huge computer made of physical resources, and performs the computation as the Universe evolves. Therefore, the information causality implies that the Universe cannot perform arbitrarily reliable computation due to the intrinsic systematic error, which then generates the entropy as the computation goes. This then provides a computational perspective of the second law of thermodynamics.

The authors acknowledge financial support from the National Science Council of the Republic of China under Contract No. NSC.99-2112-M-033-007-MY3 and 97-2112-M-003-003-MY3. This work is partially supported by the Physics Division of the National Center for Theoretical Sciences.

SUPPLEMENTAL

We now use the semidefinite programming (SDP) to check the Tsirelson-like bound mentioned in the main text. SDP is the problem of optimizing a linear function subjected to certain conditions associated with a symmetric positive semidefinite (SPSD) matrix X , i.e., $v^T X v \geq 0$, for $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and is denoted by $X \succeq 0$. It can be formulated as the standard primal problem as follows. Given the $n \times n$ symmetric matrices C and D_q 's with $q = 1, \dots, m$, we like to optimize the $n \times n$ SPSP matrix $X \succeq 0$ such that we can achieve the following:

$$\text{minimize} \quad \text{Trace}(C^T X) \quad (10a)$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \text{Trace}(D_q^T X) = b_q, \quad q = 1, \dots, m. \quad (10b)$$

Corresponding to the above primal problem, we have a dual problem as following:

$$\text{maximize} \quad \sum_{q=1}^m y_q b_q \quad (11a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad S = C - \sum_{q=1}^m y_q D_q \succeq 0. \quad (11b)$$

This corresponds to optimize over the Lagrangian multipliers for the constraints (10b).

If the feasible solutions for the primal problem and the dual problem attain their minimal and maximal values denoted as p' and d' respectively, then $p' \geq d'$, which is called the duality gap. This implies that the optimal solution of primal problem is bounded by dual problem. This then leads to the following: Both the primal and the dual problems attain their optimal solutions as the duality gap closes, i.e., $d' = p'$.

We will now formulate the finding of the generalized Tsirelson's bound in the form of the primal problem, and then acquire the bound by solving the the primal and the dual problems optimally as described above. We will consider the following two cases based on different RAC protocol used in the main text with different multi-settings. In this protocol Alice has a database of k bits $(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{k-1}) (a_i \in \{0, 1\})$, and the distant Bob is given a random variable $b \in (0, \dots, k-1)$ and a bit α send by Alice. Bob's task is to guess a_b faithfully through α .

case(a) In this case, Alice's input \vec{x} is a bit-string with $k-1$ bits given by $(a_0 + a_1, a_0 + a_1 \dots, a_0 + a_{k-1})$, and Bob's correlated input \vec{y} is also a bit-string with $k-1$ bits given by $y_i = \delta_{i,b}$ for $b \neq 0$, and $\vec{y} = \vec{0}$ for $b = 0$. In this case, the Tsirelson-like inequality derived from information causality following the procedure in the main text is

$$\left| \sum_{\{\vec{x}\}, \{\vec{y}\}} (-1)^{\vec{x} \cdot \vec{y}} C_{\vec{x}, \vec{y}} \right| \leq 2^{k-1} \sqrt{k}. \quad (12)$$

case(b) In this case, instead of $k-1$ bits, Alice's input is a bit-string with k bits given by $\vec{x} = (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{k-1})$. Bob's correlated input \vec{y} is also a bit-string with k bits given by $y_i = \delta_{i,b+1}$. Then, the Tsirelson-like inequality from information causality is

$$\left| \sum_{\{\vec{x}\}, \{\vec{y}\}} (-1)^{\vec{x} \cdot \vec{y}} C_{\vec{x}, \vec{y}} \right| \leq 2^k \sqrt{k}. \quad (13)$$

To cast the above problem of finding the Tsirelson's bound in the context of quantum mechanics, we need to use Tsirelson's theorem [19]. It says that for any quantum state $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathbb{A} \otimes \mathbb{B}$ shared by two observers Alice and Bob with their measurement outcomes being $A_s \in [-1, 1] (s \in \{1 \dots m\})$ and $B_t \in [-1, 1] (t \in \{1 \dots n\})$, respectively, then their quantum correlation function can be expressed by the inner product of two real unit vectors $\alpha_s, \beta_t \in \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$.

Now, given the correlation function $C_{\vec{x}, \vec{y}}$ used in (12) or (13), the Tsirelson's theorem guarantees that we can find the corresponding unit vectors $\alpha_{\vec{x}}, \beta_{\vec{y}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\dim[A] + \dim[B]}$ such that $C_{\vec{x}, \vec{y}} = \alpha_{\vec{x}} \cdot \beta_{\vec{y}}$, where $\dim[A]$ and $\dim[B]$ are the numbers of Alice's and Bob's measurement settings, respectively. Then, we can cast the problem of finding the Tsirelson-like bound in (12) or (13) into the following form of optimal problem for SDP,

$$\text{maximize} \quad \left| \sum_{\{\vec{x}\}, \{\vec{y}\}} (-1)^{\vec{x} \cdot \vec{y}} \alpha_{\vec{x}} \cdot \beta_{\vec{y}} \right| \quad (14a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \|\alpha_{\vec{x}}\| = \|\beta_{\vec{y}}\| = 1, \quad \forall \vec{x}, \vec{y}. \quad (14b)$$

Then, the associated dual problem is

$$\text{minimize} \quad \sum_{q=1}^m y_q \quad (15a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad S = \sum_{q=1}^m y_q D_q - C \succeq 0. \quad (15b)$$

We now will turn the problem (14) into the primal problem (10) by constructing the matrices X, C and A_i 's from the unit vectors $\alpha_{\vec{x}}$ and $\beta_{\vec{y}}$. Following the way in [20], the mapping is as follows. Define the matrix P whose columns are vectors $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\dim[A]}, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{\dim[B]})$. Then the SDSP matrix X is given by $P^T P$, which can be put into the following block form

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} E & F \\ G & H \end{pmatrix}$$

where the matrix elements of each block are $E_{ij} = \alpha_i \cdot \alpha_j$, $F_{ib} = \alpha_i \cdot \beta_b$, $G_{aj} = \beta_a \cdot \alpha_j$ and $H_{ab} = \beta_a \cdot \beta_b$ with $i, j = 1, \dots, \dim[A]$ and $a, b = 1, \dots, \dim[B]$. Note that F and G are used in (14), and instead E and H are used in (14b). Therefore, we can write down the matrices C and D_q 's accordingly so that the problem (14) is equivalent to the problem (10). It is easy to see that C is a matrix with only non-vanishing off-diagonal block of matrix elements given by $(-1)^{\vec{x} \cdot \vec{y}}$, and D_q 's are the diagonal matrices with only one nonzero unit matrix element. We omit their detailed form here.

After setting up the SDP for finding the Tsirelson-like bound, we use the package named SeDuMi [21] to solve it for both case (a) and (b) with any value of k . The result agrees extremely well with the bound obtained from information causality up to $\mathcal{O}(10^{-5})$. To be more concrete, the numerical results are shown below: for case (a) up to $k = 8$, we have

k	3	4	5	6	7	8
SDP	6.9282	16.0000	35.7771	78.3837	169.3281	362.0387

This agrees extremely well with the RHS of (12). Similarly, for case (b) up to $k = 8$, we have

k	3	4	5	6	7	8
SDP	13.8564	32.0000	71.5542	156.7673	338.6562	724.0773

It again agrees extremely well with (13). Our numerical program can run for any k , and it seems there is no violation of information causality will be expected based on what we have tested.

-
- [1] J. Barrett, N. Linden, S. Massar, S. Pironio, S. Popescu, and D. Roberts, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 022101 (2005).
 - [2] J. Barrett, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 032304 (2007).
 - [3] B. S. Tsirelson Lett. Math. Phys. **4**, 93 (1980).
 - [4] S. Popescu and D. Rohrlich, Found. Phys. **24**, 379 (1994).
 - [5] J. Barrett, L. Hardy, and A. Kent, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 010503 (2005).
 - [6] Ll. Masanes, A. Acín, and N. Gisin, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 012112 (2006).
 - [7] V. Scarani, N. Brunner, L. Masanes, S. Pino, and A. Acín, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 042339 (2006).

- [8] P. Skrzypczyk, N. Brunner, and S. Popescu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 110402 (2009).
- [9] M. Pawłowski, T. Paterek, D. Kaszlikowski, V. Scarani, A. Winter, and M. Żukowski, *Nature*, **461**, 1101 (2009).
- [10] M. Pawłowski and M. Żukowski, *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 042326 (2010).
- [11] See the supplemental.
- [12] W. Evans and L. J. Schulman, *Proceedings of the 34th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, 594 (1993).
- [13] W. Evans and L. J. Schulman, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, **45** 2367 (1999).
- [14] N. Linden, S. Popescu, A. J. Short, and Andreas Winter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 180502 (2007).
- [15] J. von Neumann, in *Automata Studies*, C. E. Shannon and J. McCarthy, Eds. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 1956, pp. 43.
- [16] N. Pippenger, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 34(2):194-197, March 1988.
- [17] P. Hayden and J. Preskill, *JHEP* **0709**, 120 (2007) [arXiv:0708.4025 [hep-th]].
- [18] Y. Sekino and L. Susskind, *JHEP* **0810**, 065 (2008) [arXiv:0808.2096 [hep-th]].
- [19] B. Tsirelson, *Hadronic J. Suppl.* 8, 329 (1993).
- [20] S. Wehner, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 022110 (2006).
- [21] J. Sturm and AdvOL, <http://sedumi.mcmaster.ca>.