

No extension of quantum theory can have improved predictive power*

Roger Colbeck^{1,†} and Renato Renner²

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

²Institute for Theoretical Physics, ETH Zurich, 8093 Zurich, Switzerland

(Dated: 9th August 2011)

According to quantum theory, measurements generate random outcomes, in stark contrast with classical mechanics. This raises the question of whether there could exist an extension of the theory which removes this indeterminism, as suspected by Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen (EPR). Although this has been shown to be impossible, existing results do not imply that the current theory is maximally informative. Here we ask the more general question of whether *any* improved predictions can be achieved by *any* extension of quantum theory. Under the assumption that measurements can be chosen freely, we answer this question in the negative: no extension of quantum theory can give more information about the outcomes of future measurements than quantum theory itself. Our result has significance for the foundations of quantum mechanics, as well as applications to tasks that exploit the inherent randomness in quantum theory, such as quantum cryptography.

Given a system and a set of initial conditions, classical mechanics allows us to calculate the future evolution to arbitrary precision. Any uncertainty we might have at a given time is caused by a lack of knowledge about the configuration. In quantum theory, on the other hand, certain properties—for example position and momentum—cannot both be known precisely. Furthermore, if a quantity without a defined value is measured, quantum theory prescribes only the probabilities with which the various outcomes occur, and is silent about the outcomes themselves.

This raises the important question of whether the outcomes could be better predicted within a theory beyond quantum mechanics [1]. An intuitive step towards its answer is to consider appending *local hidden variables* to the theory [2]. These are classical variables that allow us to determine the experimental outcomes (see later for a precise definition). Here we ask a new, more general question: is there *any* extension of quantum theory (not necessarily taking the form of hidden variables) that would convey *any* additional information about the outcomes of future measurements?

We proceed by giving an illustrative example. Consider a particle heading towards a measurement device which has a number of possible settings, denoted by a parameter, A , corresponding to the different measurements that can be chosen by the experimenter. The measurement generates a result, denoted X . For concreteness, one could imagine a spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ particle incident on a Stern-Gerlach apparatus. Each choice of measurement corresponds to a particular orientation of the device and the outcome is assigned depending on which way the beam is deflected. Within quantum theory, a description of the quantum state of the particle and of the measure-




FIG. 1: **Illustration of the scenario.** A measurement is carried out on a particle, depicted as a photon measured using an arrangement comprising a polarizing beam splitter and two detectors. The measurement choice (the angle of the polarizing beam splitter) is denoted A and the outcome, X , is assigned -1 or 1 depending on which detector fires. On the right, we represent the additional information that may be provided by an extended theory, Ξ , shown here taking the form of either **a** hidden variables, i.e., a classical list assigning outcomes, or **b** a more general (e.g. quantum) system.

ment apparatus allows us to calculate the distribution, $P_{X|A}$, of the outcome, X , for each measurement choice, A . Another example is described in Figure 1.

In this work we consider the possibility that there exists additional, yet to be discovered, information that allows the outcome X to be better predicted. We do not place any restrictions on how this information is manifest, nor do we demand that it allows the outcomes to be calculated precisely. In particular, it could be that the additional information gives rise to a more accurate distribution over the outcomes. For example, in an experiment for which quantum theory predicts a uniform distribution over the outcomes, X , there could be additional information that allows us to calculate a value, X' ,

*The published version of this work can be found in *Nature Communications* **2**, 411 (2011) at <http://www.nature.com/ncomms/journal/v2/n8/full/ncomms1416.html>.

[†]rcolbeck@perimeterinstitute.ca

such that $X = X'$ with probability $\frac{3}{4}$ (in the model proposed by Leggett [3], for instance, the local hidden variables provide information of this type). More generally, we allow for the possibility of an extended theory that provides non-classical information. For example, it could comprise a “hidden quantum system”, which, if measured in the correct way, gives a value correlated to X .

I. RESULTS

Assumptions

In order to formulate our main claim about the non-extendibility of quantum theory, we introduce a framework within which any arbitrary additional information provided by an extension of the current theory can be considered. In the following, we explain this framework on an informal level (see the Supplementary Information for a formal treatment).

The crucial feature of our approach is that it is operational, in the sense that we only refer to directly observable objects (such as the outcome of an experiment), but do not assume anything about the underlying structure of the theory. Note that the outcome, X , of a measurement is usually observed at a certain point in spacetime. The coordinates of this point (with respect to a fixed reference system) can be determined operationally using clocks and measuring rods. Analogously, the measurement setting A needs to be available at a certain spacetime point (before the start of the experiment). To model this, we introduce the notion of a *spacetime random variable* (SV), which is simply a random variable together with spacetime coordinates (t, r_1, r_2, r_3) . Operationally, a SV can be interpreted as a value that is accessible at a given spacetime point (t, r_1, r_2, r_3) . We now model a measurement process as one that takes an input, A , to an output, X , where both X and A are SVs.

Our result is based on the assumption that measurement settings can be chosen freely (which we call Assumption *FR*). We note that this assumption is common in physics, but often only made implicitly. It is, for example, a crucial ingredient in Bell’s theorem (see [4]). Formulated in our framework, Assumption *FR* is that the input, A , of a measurement process can be chosen such that it is uncorrelated with certain other SVs, namely all those whose coordinates lie outside the future lightcone of the coordinates of A . We note that this reference to a lightcone is only used to identify a set of SVs, and does not involve any assumptions about relativity theory (see the Supplementary Information). However, the motivation for Assumption *FR* is that, when interpreted within the usual relativistic spacetime structure, it is equivalent to demanding that A can be chosen such that it is uncorrelated with any *pre-existing* values in any reference frame. That said, the lack of correlation between the relevant SVs could be justified in other ways, for example by using a notion of “effective freedom” (discussed in [4]).

We also remark that Assumption *FR* is consistent with a notion of relativistic causality in which an event B cannot be the *cause* of A if there exists a reference frame in which A occurs before B . In fact, our criterion for A to be a *free choice* is satisfied whenever anything correlated to A could potentially have been caused by A . However, in an alternative world with a universal (frame-independent) time, one might reject Assumption *FR* and replace it with something weaker, for example that A is free if it is uncorrelated with anything in the past with respect to this universal time. Nevertheless, since experimental observations indicate the existence of relativistic spacetime, we use a notion of *free choice* consistent with this.

We additionally assume that the present quantum theory is correct (we call this Assumption *QM*). This assumption is natural since we are asking whether quantum theory can be *extended*. In fact, we only require that two specific aspects of quantum theory hold, and so split Assumption *QM* into two parts. On an informal level, the first is that measurement outcomes obey quantum statistics, and the second is that all processes within quantum theory can be considered as unitary evolutions if one takes into account the environment (see the Supplementary Information for more details). We remark that the second part of this assumption need only hold for microscopic processes on short timescales and does not preclude subsequent wave function collapse.

Main Findings

Consider a measurement which depends on a setting A and produces an output X . According to quantum theory, we can associate a quantum state and measurement operators with this process from which we can compute the distribution $P_{X|A}$.

We ask whether there could exist an extension of quantum theory that provides us with additional information (which we denote by Ξ) that is useful to predict the outcome. In order to keep the description of the information, Ξ , as general as possible, we do not assume that it is encoded in a classical system, but instead characterize it by how it behaves when observed. (Formally, we model access to Ξ analogously to the measurement of a quantum system, i.e., as a process which takes an input SV and produces an output SV.) We demand that Ξ can be accessed at any time (similarly to classical or quantum information held in a storage device) and that it is *static*, i.e., its behaviour does not depend on where or when it is observed.

Our main result is that we answer the above question in the negative, i.e., we show that, using Assumptions *FR* and *QM*, the distribution $P_{X|A}$ is the most accurate description of the outcomes. More precisely, for any fixed (pure) state of the system, the chosen measurement setting, A , is the only non-trivial information about X , and any additional information, Ξ , provided by an extended

theory is irrelevant. We express this via the Markov chain condition

$$X \leftrightarrow A \leftrightarrow \Xi. \quad (1)$$

This condition expresses mathematically that the distribution of X given A and Ξ is the same as the distribution of X given only A [5]. Hence, access to Ξ does not decrease our uncertainty about X , and there is no better way to predict measurement outcomes than by using quantum theory.

In the Methods, we sketch the proof of this (the full proof is deferred to the Supplementary Information).

II. DISCUSSION

We now discuss experimental aspects related to our result. Note that at the formal level, we present a theorem about certain defined concepts based on certain assumptions, hence what remains is to connect our definitions to observations in the real world, and experimentally confirm the assumptions, where possible. Assumption *FR* refers to the ability to make free choices and—while we can never rule out that the universe is deterministic and that free will is an illusion—this is in principle falsifiable, e.g. by a device capable of guessing an experimentalist's choices before they are made. (See also [6] where the possibility of weakening this assumption is discussed.)

The validity of Assumption *QM* could be argued for based on experimental tests of quantum theory. However, the existence of the particular correlations we use in the second part of our proof is quantum-theory independent, so worth establishing separately. Due to experimental inefficiencies, these correlations cannot be verified to arbitrary precision. Figure 2 bounds our ability to experimentally establish (1) depending on the quality of the setup used (characterized here by the visibility). For more details, see the Methods.

We proceed by discussing previous work on extensions of quantum theory. To the best of our knowledge, all such extensions that have been excluded to date can also be excluded using our result.

The question asked by EPR [1] was whether quantum mechanics could be considered complete. They appealed to intuition to argue that an extended theory should exist and one might then have hoped for a *deterministic completion*, i.e. one that would uniquely determine the measurement outcomes—contrast this with our (more general) notion, where the extended theory may only give partial information. Bell [2] famously showed that a deterministic completion is not possible when the theory is supplemented by *local hidden variables*. (To relate this back to our result, this corresponds to the special case where the additional information, Ξ , is a classical value specified by the local hidden variables. A short discussion on the term *local* can be found in the Supplementary Information.) Recently, a conclusion [7] similar to Bell's

has been reached using the Kochen-Specker theorem [8]. These results have been extended to arbitrary (i.e. not necessarily local) hidden variables [9, 10] under the assumption of relativistic covariance (see also [11], as well as [12] where a condition slightly weaker than locality is used to derive a theorem similar to Bell's).

The aforementioned papers left open the question of whether there could exist an extended theory which provides additional information about the outcomes without determining them completely. (Note that, in his later works, Bell uses definitions that potentially allow probabilistic models [13]. However, as explained in the Supplementary Information, non-deterministic models are not compatible with Bell's other assumptions.) In the case that the additional information takes the form of *local hidden variables*, an answer to the above question can be found in [3, 14, 15], and the strongest result is that any local hidden variables are necessarily uncorrelated with the outcomes of measurements on Bell states [15]. (We remark that the model in [3] also included non-local hidden variables. However, we have not referred to these in this paragraph, since, as mentioned below in the context of de Broglie-Bohm theory, the presence of non-local hidden variables contradicts Assumption *FR*.)

In the present work, we have taken this idea further and excluded the possibility that *any* extension of quantum theory (not necessarily in the form of local hidden variables) can help predict the outcomes of *any* measurement on *any* quantum state. In this sense, we show the following: under the assumption that measurement settings can be chosen freely, quantum theory really is complete.

We remark that several other attempts to extend quantum theory have been presented in the literature, the de Broglie-Bohm theory [16, 17] being a prominent example (this model recreates the quantum correlations in a deterministic way but uses non-local hidden variables, see e.g. [18] for a summary). Our result implies that such theories necessarily come at the expense of violating Assumption *FR*.

Another way to generate candidate extended theories is via models which simulate quantum correlations. We discuss the implications of our result in light of such models in the Supplementary Information. In addition, we remark that a claim in the same spirit as ours has recently been obtained based on the assumption of non-contextuality [19].

Randomness is central to quantum theory and with it comes a range of philosophical implications. In this Article we have shown that the randomness is inherent: any attempt to better explain the outcomes of quantum measurements is destined to fail. Not only is the universe not deterministic, but quantum theory provides the ultimate bound on how unpredictable it is. Aside from these fundamental implications, there are also practical ones. In quantum cryptography, for example, the unpredictability of measurement outcomes can be quantified

and used to restrict the knowledge of an adversary. Most security proofs implicitly assume that quantum theory cannot be extended (although there are exceptions, the first of which was given in [20]). However, in this work, we show that this follows if the theory is correct.

III. METHODS

Our main result is the following theorem whose proof we sketch here (see the Supplementary Information for the formal treatment).

Theorem 1.—For any quantum measurement with input SV A and output SV X and for any additional information, Ξ , under Assumptions QM and FR , the Markov chain condition (1) holds.

The proof is divided into three parts. The first two are related to a Bell-type setting, involving measurements on a maximally entangled state. In Part I, we show that Assumption FR necessarily enforces that Ξ is *non-signalling* (in the sense defined below). In Part II we show that for a particular set of bipartite correlations, if Ξ is non-signalling, it cannot be of use to predict the outcomes. These correlations occur in quantum theory (cf. the first part of Assumption QM) when measuring a maximally entangled state and hence we conclude that no Ξ can help predict the outcomes of measurements on one half of such a state. Finally, in Part III, we use the second part of Assumption QM to argue that this conclusion also applies to all measurements on an arbitrary (pure) quantum state. Together, these establish our claim.

The bipartite scenario used for the first two parts of the proof involves two quantum measurements, with inputs A and B and respective outputs X and Y . The setup is such that the two measurements are spacelike separated in the sense that the coordinates of A are spacelike separated with the coordinates of Y , and, likewise, those of B are spacelike separated with those of X .

As mentioned in the main text, we model the information provided by the extended theory, Ξ , by its behaviour under observation. We introduce a SV, C , which can be thought of as the choice of what to observe, and another SV, Z , which represents the outcome of this observation. In terms of these variables, our main result, Equation (1), can be restated that for all values of a , c and x , we have

$$P_{Z|acx} = P_{Z|ac} . \quad (2)$$

(Note that we use lower case to denote specific values of the corresponding upper case SVs.)

Proof: Part I.—The entire setup described above (including the additional information Ξ , accessed by choosing an observable, C , and obtaining an outcome, Z) gives rise to a joint distribution $P_{XYZ|ABC}$. The purpose of

this part of the proof is to show that Assumption FR implies that $P_{XYZ|ABC}$ must satisfy particular constraints, called *non-signalling constraints*, which characterize situations where operations on different isolated systems cannot affect each other. Formally, these are

$$P_{YZ|ABC} = P_{YZ|BC} \quad (3)$$

$$P_{XZ|ABC} = P_{XZ|AC} \quad (4)$$

$$P_{XY|ABC} = P_{XY|AB} \quad (5)$$

We remark that the observation that the assumption of free choice gives rise to certain non-signalling constraints has been made already in [11], and a similar argument has been presented by Gisin [9] and Blood [10]. (Note that the arguments in [9, 10] implicitly assume that measurements can be chosen freely).

Assumption FR allows us to make A a free choice and hence we have

$$P_{A|BCYZ} = P_A \quad (6)$$

(the setup is such that the measurements specified by A and B are spacelike separated and, furthermore, Ξ is static, so we can consider the case where its observation is also spacelike separated from the measurements specified by A and B). Furthermore, using the definition of conditional probability ($P_{Q|R} := P_{QR}/P_R$), we can write

$$P_{YZA|BC} = P_{YZ|BC} \times P_{A|BCYZ} = P_A \times P_{YZ|BC} ,$$

where we inserted (6) to obtain the second equality. Similarly, we have

$$P_{YZA|BC} = P_{A|BC} \times P_{YZ|ABC} = P_A \times P_{YZ|ABC} .$$

Comparing these two expressions for $P_{YZA|BC}$ yields the desired non-signalling condition (3). By a similar argument the other non-signalling conditions can be inferred from Assumption FR .

Proof: Part II.—For the second part of the proof, we consider the distribution $P_{XY|AB}$ resulting from certain appropriately chosen measurements on a maximally entangled state. We show that any enlargement of this distribution (via a system Ξ that is accessed in a process with input SV C and output SV Z) to a distribution $P_{XYZ|ABC}$ which satisfies the above non-signalling conditions is necessarily trivial in the sense that Ξ is uncorrelated to the rest. For this we draw on ideas from *non-signalling cryptography* [20], which are related to the idea of basing security on the violation of Bell inequalities [21]. Technically, we employ a lemma (see Lemma 1 in the Supplementary Information), whose proof is based on *chained Bell inequalities* [22, 23] and generalizes results of [15, 24].

Consider any bipartite measurement with inputs $A \in \{0, 2, \dots, 2N - 2\}$ and $B \in \{1, 3, \dots, 2N - 1\}$, for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and binary outcomes, X and Y . The correlations

of the outcomes can be quantified by

$$I_N := P(X = Y|A = 0, B = 2N - 1) + \sum_{\substack{a,b \\ |a-b|=1}} P(X \neq Y|A = a, B = b). \quad (7)$$

Our lemma then asserts that, under the non-signalling conditions derived in Part I,

$$D(P_{Z|abcx}, P_{Z|abc}) \leq I_N \quad (8)$$

for all a, b, c and x , where D is the *variational distance*, defined by $D(P_Z, Q_Z) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_z |P_Z(z) - Q_Z(z)|$. The variational distance has the following operational interpretation: if two distributions have variational distance at most δ , then the probability that we ever notice a difference between them is at most δ .

The argument up to here is formally independent of quantum theory. However, as we describe below (see the Experimental Verification section), for any fixed orthogonal rank-one measurement on a two-level subsystem, one can construct $2N - 1$ other measurements such that, according to quantum theory, applying these measurements to maximally entangled states leads to correlations which satisfy $I_N \propto \frac{1}{N}$. It follows that, in the limit of large N , an arbitrarily small bound on $D(P_{Z|abcx}, P_{Z|abc})$ can be obtained. We thus conclude that $P_{Z|abcx} = P_{Z|abc}$, which, by the non-signalling condition (4), also implies (2). We have therefore shown that the relation (1) holds for the outcome X of any orthogonal rank-one measurement on a system that is maximally entangled with another one (our claim can be readily extended to systems of dimension 2^t for positive integer t by applying the result to t two-level systems).

We also remark that Markov chains are reversible, i.e. $P_{Z|abcx} = P_{Z|abc}$ implies $P_{X|abcz} = P_{X|abc}$, which together with the non-signalling conditions gives $P_{X|abcz} = P_{X|a}$. This establishes that, for any choices of B and C , learning Z does not allow an improvement on the quantum predictions, $P_{X|a}$.

Proof: Part III.—To complete our claim, it remains to show that the Markov chain condition (1) holds for measurements on arbitrary states (not only for those on one part of a maximally entangled state shared between two sites). The proof of this proceeds in two steps. The first is to append an additional measurement with outcome X' , chosen such that the pair (X, X') is uniformly distributed. In the second step, we split the measurement into two conceptually distinct parts, where, in the first, the measurement apparatus becomes entangled with the system to be measured (and, possibly the environment) and, in the second, this entangled state is measured giving outcomes (X, X') . Since these outcomes are uniformly distributed, the state before the measurement can be considered maximally entangled, so that (1) holds with X replaced by (X, X') . This implies (1) and hence completes the proof of Theorem 1.




FIG. 2: **Achievable values of I_N depending on the experimental visibility.** This figure relates to the measurement setup used for testing the accuracy of Assumption *QM* as described in the Methods. The setup involves two parties and is parameterized by the number of possible measurement choices available to each party, N . The plot gives the minimum I_N achievable depending on the visibility (red line), which determines the smallest upper bound on the variational distance from the perfect Markov chain condition (1) that could be obtained with that visibility (see Eq. (8)). It also shows the optimal value of N which achieves this (blue line). For comparison, the values achievable using $N = 2$, which corresponds to the CHSH measurements [26] (yellow line), and the case $N = 8$, which is optimal for visibility 0.98 (green line), are shown.

Experimental Verification—As explained above, the validity of parts of Assumption *QM* can be established by a direct experiment. In particular, to verify the existence of the correlations required for Part II of the proof, i.e. those with small I_N , one should generate a large number (much larger than N) of maximally entangled particles and distribute them between the measurement devices. At spacelike separation, a two-level subsystem (e.g. a spin degree of freedom) should then be measured, the measurement being picked at random from those specified below, and the results recorded. This is repeated for all of the particles. The measurement choices and results are then collected and used to estimate the terms in I_N using standard statistical techniques.

For an arbitrary orthogonal basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$, the required measurements can be constructed in the following way. Recall that the choice of measurement on one side takes values $A \in \{0, 2, \dots, 2N - 2\}$ and similarly, $B \in \{1, 3, \dots, 2N - 1\}$. We define a set of angles $\theta^j = \frac{\pi}{2N}j$ and states

$$\{|\theta_+^j\rangle, |\theta_-^j\rangle\} = \left\{ \cos \frac{\theta^j}{2} |0\rangle + \sin \frac{\theta^j}{2} |1\rangle, \sin \frac{\theta^j}{2} |0\rangle - \cos \frac{\theta^j}{2} |1\rangle \right\}.$$

The required measurement operators are then $E_{\pm}^a = |\theta_{\pm}^a\rangle\langle\theta_{\pm}^a|$ and $F_{\pm}^b = |\theta_{\pm}^b\rangle\langle\theta_{\pm}^b|$.

Although quantum theory predicts that arbitrarily small values of I_N can be obtained for large N , due to imperfections and errors in the devices, it will not be possible to experimentally achieve this. In [25], a discussion of the achievable values of I_N with imperfect visibilities

was given. For visibilities less than 1, it is not optimal to take N as large as possible to minimize the observed I_N . Thus, to get increasingly small bounds on the variational distance in (8), one must increase the experimentally obtained visibilities as well as the number of measurement settings (see Figure 2).

REFERENCES

- [1] Einstein, A., Podolsky, B. & Rosen, N. Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete? *Physical Review* **47**, 777–780 (1935).
- [2] Bell, J. S. On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox. In *Speakable and unspeakable in quantum mechanics*, chap. 2 (Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- [3] Leggett, A. J. Nonlocal hidden-variable theories and quantum mechanics: An incompatibility theorem. *Foundations of Physics* **33**, 1469–1493 (2003).
- [4] Bell, J. S. Free variables and local causality. In *Speakable and unspeakable in quantum mechanics*, chap. 12 (Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- [5] Cover, T. M. & Thomas, J. A. *Elements of Information Theory* (John Wiley and Sons Inc., 2006), 2nd edn. Section 2.8.
- [6] Colbeck, R. & Renner, R. Free Randomness Amplification. e-print [arXiv:1105.3195](https://arxiv.org/abs/1105.3195) (2011).
- [7] Conway, J. & Kochen, S. The free will theorem. *Foundations of Physics* **36**, 1441–1473 (2006).
- [8] Kochen, S. & Specker, E. P. The problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics. *Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics* **17**, 59–87 (1967).
- [9] Gisin, N. On the impossibility of covariant nonlocal “hidden” variables in quantum physics. e-print [arXiv:1002.1390](https://arxiv.org/abs/1002.1390) (2010).
- [10] Blood, C. Derivation of Bell’s locality condition from the relativity of simultaneity. e-print [arXiv:1005.1656](https://arxiv.org/abs/1005.1656) (2010).
- [11] Colbeck, R. & Renner, R. Defining the local part of a hidden variable model: a comment. e-print [arXiv:0907.4967](https://arxiv.org/abs/0907.4967) (2009).
- [12] Tresser, C. Bell’s theory with no locality assumption. *The European Physical Journal D* **58**, 385–396 (2010).
- [13] Bell, J. S. La nouvelle cuisine. In *Speakable and unspeakable in quantum mechanics*, chap. 24 (Cambridge University Press, 2004), 2nd edn.
- [14] Branciard, C. *et al.* Testing quantum correlations versus single-particle properties within Leggett’s model and beyond. *Nature Physics* **4**, 681–685 (2008).
- [15] Colbeck, R. & Renner, R. Hidden variable models for quantum theory cannot have any local part. *Physical Review Letters* **101**, 050403 (2008).
- [16] de Broglie, L. La mécanique ondulatoire et la structure atomique de la matière et du rayonnement. *Journal de Physique, Serie VI* **VIII**, 225–241 (1927).
- [17] Bohm, D. A suggested interpretation of the quantum theory in terms of “hidden” variables. I. *Physical Review* **85**, 166–179 (1952).
- [18] Bell, J. S. de Broglie-Bohm, delayed choice double-slit experiment, and density matrix. In *Speakable and unspeakable in quantum mechanics*, chap. 14 (Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- [19] Chen, Z. & Montina, A. Measurement contextuality is implied by macroscopic realism. e-print [arXiv:1012.2122](https://arxiv.org/abs/1012.2122) (2010).
- [20] Barrett, J., Hardy, L. & Kent, A. No signalling and quantum key distribution. *Physical Review Letters* **95**, 010503 (2005).
- [21] Ekert, A. K. Quantum cryptography based on Bell’s theorem. *Physical Review Letters* **67**, 661–663 (1991).
- [22] Pearle, P. M. Hidden-variable example based upon data rejection. *Physical Review D* **2**, 1418–1425 (1970).
- [23] Braunstein, S. L. & Caves, C. M. Wringing out better Bell inequalities. *Annals of Physics* **202**, 22–56 (1990).
- [24] Barrett, J., Kent, A. & Pironio, S. Maximally non-local and monogamous quantum correlations. *Physical Review Letters* **97**, 170409 (2006).
- [25] Suarez, A. Why aren’t quantum correlations maximally nonlocal? Biased local randomness as essential feature of quantum mechanics. e-print [arXiv:0902.2451](https://arxiv.org/abs/0902.2451) (2009).
- [26] Clauser, J. F., Horne, M. A., Shimony, A. & Holt, R. A. Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories. *Physical Review Letters* **23**, 880–884 (1969).

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Časlav Brukner, Adán Cabello, Jerry Finkelstein, Jürg Fröhlich, Nicolas Gisin, Gian Michele Graf, Adrian Kent, Jan-Åke Larsson, Lluís Masanes, Nicolas Menicucci, Ognian Oreshkov, Stefano Pironio, Rainer Plaga, Sofia Wechsler and Anton Zeilinger for discussions on this work and thank Lúcia del Rio for the illustrations. This work was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (grant Nos. 200021-119868 and 200020-135048) and the European Research Council (grant No. 258932). Research at Perimeter Institute is supported by the Government of Canada through Industry Canada and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Research and Innovation.

SUPPLEMENTARY METHODS

FORMAL STATEMENT OF THE CLAIM

In this section, we provide a formal description of our result and the assumptions it is based on. Their physical significance is explained in the main text.

Definitions

Definition 1. A *spacetime random variable* (SV), X , is a random variable together with a set of coordinates $(t, r_1, r_2, r_3) \in \mathbb{R}^4$.

The coordinates can be used to define an order relation between SVs, which one may interpret as a time ordering within relativistic spacetime. (Note, however, that on a formal level, we do not require any assumptions about relativity theory.)

Definition 2. We say that a pair (A, X) of SVs is *time-ordered*, denoted $A \rightsquigarrow X$, if the coordinate (t, r_1, r_2, r_3) of A lies in the backward lightcone of the coordinate (t', r'_1, r'_2, r'_3) of X , i.e., $(t - t')^2 \geq \|r - r'\|^2$, $t \leq t'$. Furthermore, we say that two time-ordered pairs $A \rightsquigarrow X$ and $B \rightsquigarrow Y$ are *spacelike separated* if $A \not\rightsquigarrow Y$ and $B \not\rightsquigarrow X$.

The next two definitions refer to quantum theory or, more precisely, quantum measurements. They will be used later for the formulation of Assumption *QM*.

Definition 3. A *quantum measurement*, denoted $(A \rightsquigarrow X, \{E_x^a\}_{a,x}, \mathcal{H}_S)$, is a pair of time-ordered SVs, $A \rightsquigarrow X$, called *input* and *output*, respectively, together with a family of measurement operators $\{E_x^a\}_{a,x}$ on a Hilbert space, \mathcal{H}_S , such that $\sum_x (E_x^a)^\dagger E_x^a = \mathbb{1}_S$ for all a .

We interpret the input A as the choice of an observable and X as the outcome of the measurement with respect to this observable. Quantum theory determines the distribution of X conditioned on A , depending on the quantum state ρ_S of the system to which the measurement is applied.

Definition 4. Given a density operator ρ_S on \mathcal{H}_S , the quantum measurement $(A \rightsquigarrow X, \{E_x^a\}_{a,x}, \mathcal{H}_S)$ is said to be *compatible* with ρ_S if

$$P_{X|A}(x|a) = \text{tr}((E_x^a)^\dagger E_x^a \rho_S) ,$$

for all a and x . Likewise, a pair of quantum measurements $(A \rightsquigarrow X, \{E_x^a\}_{a,x}, \mathcal{H}_S)$ and $(B \rightsquigarrow Y, \{F_y^b\}_{b,y}, \mathcal{H}_T)$ is said to be *compatible* with ρ_{ST} defined on $\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_T$ if

$$P_{XY|AB}(xy|ab) = \text{tr}[(E_x^a)^\dagger E_x^a \otimes (F_y^b)^\dagger F_y^b \rho_{ST}] ,$$

for all a, b, x and y .

We describe the process of *choosing* a value A as a pair of SVs, $O_A \rightsquigarrow A$, where O_A is called the *trigger event* (O_A may be a constant). The process is considered *free* if the outcome A is not correlated to anything that existed before the trigger event O_A in any reference frame.

Definition 5. Given a set of SVs Γ , a *free choice* (with respect to Γ) is a pair of time-ordered SVs, $O_A \rightsquigarrow A$, such that A is statistically independent of the collection $\Gamma' := \{W \in \Gamma : O_A \not\rightsquigarrow W\}$, i.e., $P_{A\Gamma'} = P_A \times P_{\Gamma'}$.

Quantum-Mechanical Description of the Measurement Process

Before stating our assumptions, let us briefly recall the quantum-mechanical description of a measurement process. Most generally, a quantum measurement on a system S is described by a family $\{E_x\}_x$ of operators acting on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_S such that $\sum_x E_x^\dagger E_x = \mathbb{1}$. If the state of S before the measurement is given by a density operator ρ_S then each possible outcome $X = x$ has probability

$$P_X(x) = \text{tr}(E_x^\dagger E_x \rho_S) .$$

(Note that this is reflected by Definitions 3 and 4.) Furthermore, conditioned on this outcome, the state of S after the measurement is

$$\sigma_S^{(x)} = \frac{E_x \rho_S E_x^\dagger}{P_X(x)}.$$

Averaged over all outcomes, the state is therefore given by $\sigma_S = \mathcal{E}(\rho_S)$, where \mathcal{E} is the trace-preserving completely positive map (TPCPM) defined by

$$\mathcal{E} : \rho_S \mapsto \sigma_S = \sum_x P_X(x) \sigma_S^{(x)} = \sum_x E_x \rho_S E_x^\dagger.$$

The TPCPM \mathcal{E} can be seen as part of an extended TPCPM $\bar{\mathcal{E}} : \rho_S \mapsto \sigma_{SDR}$ (in the sense that $\mathcal{E} = \text{tr}_{DR} \circ \bar{\mathcal{E}}$) which specifies the joint state σ_{SDR} of S , the measurement device, D , and possibly (parts of) the environment, R , after the measurement (one may think of $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ as describing the joint evolution that the system S , measurement device D and the environment R undergo during a measurement). By choosing a sufficiently large environment, we can always take $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ to be an isometry. Since the measurement outcome X is determined by the final state of the measurement device D , there exists a family of mutually orthogonal projectors $\{\Pi_x\}_x$ on the associated Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_D , where each Π_x projects onto the subspace containing the support of the state of D corresponding to outcome $X = x$. Formally, this corresponds to the requirement that

$$\forall x : \text{tr}_{DR}[\bar{\mathcal{E}}(\rho_S)(\mathbb{1}_S \otimes \Pi_x \otimes \mathbb{1}_R)] = E_x \rho_S E_x^\dagger. \quad (\text{S.9})$$

Assumptions

To formulate our assumptions as well as our main claim, we consider an arbitrary quantum measurement

$$(A \rightsquigarrow X, \{E_x^a\}_{a,x}, \mathcal{H}_S) \quad (\text{S.10})$$

with constant input $A = \bar{a}$ and output X . Furthermore, we consider two SVs, C and Z , such that $C \rightsquigarrow Z$, which model the access to extra information provided by a potential extended theory.

Our first assumption demands that the measurement we consider is correctly described by quantum mechanics.

Assumption QMa. *There exists a pure quantum state ρ_S which is compatible with the quantum measurement (S.10).*

For the next assumption, let $\bar{\mathcal{E}} : \rho_S \mapsto \sigma_{SDR}$ be an isometry from \mathcal{H}_S to $\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_D \otimes \mathcal{H}_R$ and let $\{\Pi_x\}_x$ be a family of projectors such that (S.9) holds for the operators $\{E_x^a\}_x$ specified by the measurement (S.10).¹ The isometry $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ models the joint evolution of the system, S , on which the measurement (S.10) is carried out, the measurement device, D , and the parts of the environment, R , that may have been affected by the measurement.² We then consider arbitrary measurements $\{F_x^a\}_{a,x}$ and $\{G_y^b\}_{b,y}$ on the subsystems D and SR , respectively, with the property that $F_x^{\bar{a}} = \Pi_x$.


The following assumption demands that the statistics produced by these additional measurements are as predicted by quantum theory. Furthermore, the outcome X of the initial measurement (S.10) can be recovered by measuring (in an appropriate basis) the state of the device D used for this measurement.

Assumption QMb. *For appropriately defined SVs A', X', B, Y , the quantum measurements $(A' \rightsquigarrow X', \{F_x^a\}_{a,x}, \mathcal{H}_D)$ and $(B \rightsquigarrow Y, \{G_y^b\}_{b,y}, \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_R)$ are compatible with $\sigma_{SDR} = \bar{\mathcal{E}}(\rho_S)$. Furthermore, the measurement on D is consistent with the initial measurement (S.10), in the sense that $X' = X$ whenever $A' = A = \bar{a}$.*

While the above assumptions are essentially consequences of the requirement that the existing quantum theory is correct, our last assumption demands that the measurement settings can be chosen freely.

¹ There are many ways to choose $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ and $\{\Pi_x\}_x$ with this property; our next assumption need only hold for one such choice.

² Note that, for (S.9) to hold, it is sufficient that $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ describes the interaction between S and D (and possibly R) on a microscopic scale and for a short time. Hence, the fact that $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ is an isometry does not preclude subsequent “collapse” of the wave function.



Supplementary Figure S1 | Abstraction of the setup. Q_1 and Q_2 depict a pair of quantum systems with inputs A and B and outputs X and Y respectively. Ξ is a system which represents the additional information provided by the extended theory. Although these three systems (solid boxes) can be independently manipulated, they form parts of a larger system (dotted box). While no restriction is placed on the internal behaviour of the larger system, it follows from Part I of the proof that the combined distribution, $P_{XYZ|ABC}$, is non-signalling.

Assumption FR. *There exist SVs O_A , O_B and O_C with $O_A \rightsquigarrow X'$, $O_B \rightsquigarrow Y$ and $O_C \rightsquigarrow Z$ spacelike separated such that $O_A \rightsquigarrow A'$, $O_B \rightsquigarrow B$ and $O_C \rightsquigarrow C$ are free choices with respect to $\{A', B, C, X', Y, Z\}$, and all possible values of A' and B are taken with nonzero probability.*

Main Claim

Theorem 1. If the quantum measurement (S.10), modelled by the pair $A \rightsquigarrow X$, and the additional information, $C \rightsquigarrow Z$, are such that Assumptions *QMa*, *QMb* and *FR* are satisfied then the Markov chain condition $X \leftrightarrow (A, C) \leftrightarrow Z$ holds.

PART II OF THE PROOF

In this section, we prove the core inequality of Part II of our proof, Eqn. 8 in the Methods, which is stated as Lemma 1 below.

Recall the bipartite scenario described in the main text. The measurements at each site are parameterized by values $A \in \{0, 2, \dots, 2N - 2\}$ and $B \in \{1, 3, \dots, 2N - 1\}$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and their respective outcomes, X and Y , are taken to be binary. The measurements give rise to a joint probability distribution $P_{XY|AB}$ from which we quantify the correlations relevant for our statement in terms of I_N defined by

$$I_N(P_{XY|AB}) := P(X = Y | A = 0, B = 2N - 1) + \sum_{\substack{a, b \\ |a - b| = 1}} P(X \neq Y | A = a, B = b) .$$

We consider enlargements of this probability distribution, $P_{XYZ|ABC}$ (see Figure S1), that satisfy the non-signalling property (cf. Part I of the proof), i.e.,

$$P_{XY|ABC} = P_{XY|AB} \tag{S.11}$$

$$P_{XZ|ABC} = P_{XZ|AC} \tag{S.12}$$

$$P_{YZ|ABC} = P_{YZ|BC} . \tag{S.13}$$

The claim is that any such extension approximately satisfies $P_{Z|abcx} = P_{Z|abc}$, i.e., Z is independent of X for any choices of a , b and c . The accuracy of the approximation is measured in terms of the variational distance. For two distributions, P_X and P_Y over identical alphabets, this is defined by $D(P_X, P_Y) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_i |P_X(i) - P_Y(i)|$.

Lemma 1. *For any non-signalling probability distribution, $P_{XYZ|ABC}$, in which the random variables X and Y are binary, we have*

$$D(P_{Z|abcx}, P_{Z|abc}) \leq I_N(P_{XY|AB}) \tag{S.14}$$

for all a , b , c , and x .

The proof is a generalization of an argument given in [15], which develops results of [20] and [24].

Proof. We first consider the quantity I_N evaluated for the conditional distribution $P_{XY|AB,cz} = P_{XY|AB,cz}(\cdot, \cdot | \cdot, \cdot, c, z)$, for any fixed c and z . The idea is to use this quantity to bound the trace distance between the conditional distribution $P_{X|acz}$ and its negation, $1 - P_{X|acz}$, which corresponds to the distribution of X if its values are interchanged. If this distance is small, it follows that the distribution $P_{X|acz}$ is roughly uniform.

Let $P_{\bar{X}}$ be the uniform distribution on X . For $a_0 := 0$, $b_0 := 2N - 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_N(P_{XY|AB,cz}) &= P(X = Y|A = a_0, B = b_0, C = c, Z = z) + \sum_{\substack{a,b \\ |a-b|=1}} P(X \neq Y|A = a, B = b, C = c, Z = z) \\
&\geq D(1 - P_{X|a_0b_0cz}, P_{Y|a_0b_0cz}) + \sum_{\substack{a,b \\ |a-b|=1}} D(P_{X|abcz}, P_{Y|abcz}) \\
&= D(1 - P_{X|a_0cz}, P_{Y|b_0cz}) + \sum_{\substack{a,b \\ |a-b|=1}} D(P_{X|acz}, P_{Y|bcz}) \\
&\geq D(1 - P_{X|a_0cz}, P_{X|a_0cz}) \\
&= 2D(P_{X|a_0b_0cz}, P_{\bar{X}}). \tag{S.15}
\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows from the fact that $D(P_{X|\Omega}, P_{Y|\Omega}) \leq P(X \neq Y|\Omega)$ for any event Ω (see Lemma 2 below). Furthermore, we have used the non-signalling conditions $P_{X|abcz} = P_{X|acz}$ (from (S.12)) and $P_{Y|abcz} = P_{Y|bcz}$ (from (S.13)), and the triangle inequality for D . By symmetry, this relation holds for all a and b . We hence obtain $D(P_{X|abcz}, P_{\bar{X}}) \leq \frac{1}{2}I_N(P_{XY|AB,cz})$ for all a, b, c and z .

We now take the average over z on both sides of (S.15). The left-hand-side gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_z P_{Z|abc}(z) I_N(P_{XY|AB,cz}) &= \sum_z P_{Z|c}(z) I_N(P_{XY|AB,cz}) \\
&= \sum_z P_{Z|a_0b_0c}(z) P(X = Y|a_0, b_0, c, z) + \sum_{\substack{a,b \\ |a-b|=1}} \sum_z P_{Z|abc}(z) P(X \neq Y|a, b, c, z) \\
&= P(X = Y|a_0, b_0, c) + \sum_{\substack{a,b \\ |a-b|=1}} P(X \neq Y|a, b, c) \\
&= I_N(P_{XY|AB,c}), \tag{S.16}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the non-signalling condition $P_{Z|abc} = P_{Z|c}$ (which is implied by (S.12) and (S.13)) several times. Furthermore, taking the average on the right-hand-side of (S.15) yields $\sum_z P_{Z|abc}(z) D(P_{X|abcz}, P_{\bar{X}}) = D(P_{XZ|abc}, P_{\bar{X}} \times P_{Z|abc})$, so we have

$$2D(P_{XZ|abc}, P_{\bar{X}} \times P_{Z|abc}) \leq I_N(P_{XY|AB,c}) = I_N(P_{XY|AB}), \tag{S.17}$$

where the last equality follows from the non-signalling condition (S.11).

Inequality (S.17) and the relation $D(P_X, Q_X) \leq D(P_{XY}, Q_{XY})$ imply $D(P_{X|abc}, P_{\bar{X}}) \leq \frac{1}{2}I_N(P_{XY|AB})$, and hence

$$\left| P_{X|abc}(x) - \frac{1}{2} \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} I_N(P_{XY|AB}) \tag{S.18}$$

for all a, b, c and x . Furthermore, since

$$2D(P_{XZ|abc}, P_{\bar{X}} \times P_{Z|abc}) = \sum_z \left| P_{XZ|abc}(0, z) - \frac{1}{2} P_{Z|abc}(z) \right| + \sum_z \left| P_{XZ|abc}(1, z) - \frac{1}{2} P_{Z|abc}(z) \right|,$$

and both terms on the right-hand-side are equal, using (S.17) we have

$$\sum_z \left| P_{XZ|abc}(x, z) - \frac{1}{2} P_{Z|abc}(z) \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} I_N(P_{XY|AB}),$$

for all a, b, c and x . Combining this with (S.18) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
D(P_{Z|abcx}, P_{Z|abc}) &= \sum_z \left| \frac{1}{2} P_{Z|abcx}(z) - \frac{1}{2} P_{Z|abc}(z) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_z \left| \frac{1}{2} P_{Z|abcx}(z) - P_{X|abc}(x) P_{Z|abcx}(z) \right| + \sum_z \left| P_{X|abc}(x) P_{Z|abcx}(z) - \frac{1}{2} P_{Z|abc}(z) \right| \\
&= \sum_z P_{Z|abcx}(z) \left| \frac{1}{2} - P_{X|abc}(x) \right| + \sum_z \left| P_{XZ|abc}(x, z) - \frac{1}{2} P_{Z|abc}(z) \right| \\
&\leq I_N(P_{XY|AB}) .
\end{aligned}$$

This establishes the relation (S.14). \square

Lemma 2. *Let X and Y be random variables jointly distributed according to P_{XY} . The variational distance between the marginal distributions P_X and P_Y is bounded by*

$$D(P_X, P_Y) \leq P(X \neq Y) .$$

Proof. Let $P_{XY}^\neq := P_{XY|X \neq Y}$ be the joint distribution of X and Y conditioned on the event that they are not equal. Similarly, define $P_{XY}^\equiv := P_{XY|X=Y}$. We then have

$$P_{XY} = p_\neq P_{XY}^\neq + (1 - p_\neq) P_{XY}^\equiv$$

where $p_\neq := P(X \neq Y)$. By linearity, the marginals of these distributions satisfy the same relation, i.e.,

$$P_X = p_\neq P_X^\neq + (1 - p_\neq) P_X^\equiv \quad \text{and} \quad P_Y = p_\neq P_Y^\neq + (1 - p_\neq) P_Y^\equiv .$$

Hence, by the convexity of the variational distance,

$$D(P_X, P_Y) \leq p_\neq D(P_X^\neq, P_Y^\neq) + (1 - p_\neq) D(P_X^\equiv, P_Y^\equiv) \leq p_\neq ,$$

where the last inequality follows because the variational distance cannot be larger than one, and $D(P_X^\equiv, P_Y^\equiv) = 0$. \square

PART III OF THE PROOF

In this section we give the proof of the final part of Theorem 1.³ We use the setup and assumptions as formulated at the beginning of the Supplementary Methods. In Parts I and II of the proof (see the main text and the previous section) we showed that for all a, b, c and x , the relation $P_{Z|acx} = P_{Z|ac}$ holds for projective quantum measurements compatible with one half of a maximally entangled state (cf. Lemma 1 and recall that for such measurements, the quantity I_N can be made arbitrarily small for sufficiently large N). Part III, explained here, extends this claim to arbitrary states (not necessarily maximally entangled ones) and arbitrary measurements.

The argument proceeds in two steps. The first is to reduce the problem to a situation where the measurement outcome is essentially uniform. Let $(A \rightsquigarrow X, \{E_x^{\bar{a}}\}_x, \mathcal{H}_S)$ be the quantum measurement under consideration (where the input $A = \bar{a}$ is fixed). The idea is that we can always append a second measurement, generating \bar{X} , such that the distribution of the joint output (X, \bar{X}) is flat (to any desired accuracy).

Lemma 3. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and let ρ_S be an arbitrary density operator on \mathcal{H}_S . For any measurement on S there exists an additional measurement such that the joint output distribution of (X, \bar{X}) , obtained by applying the two measurements sequentially to ρ_S , has distance ε to a flat distribution.*

Proof idea. It is easy to see that any probability distribution can be turned into an approximately flat one by adding an additional random process that “splits” each probability into sufficiently many smaller events. Furthermore, any such random process can be obtained by an appropriate choice of projective measurement (in a sufficiently large Hilbert space). \square

³ The proof we give here is similar to an argument given by Zurek [27] to derive the Born rule starting from unitarity.

Let $\{E_{x,\bar{x}}^{\bar{a}}\}_{x,\bar{x}}$ be the set of measurement operators corresponding to the measurement $(A \rightsquigarrow (X, \bar{X}), \{E_{x,\bar{x}}^{\bar{a}}\}_{x,\bar{x}}, \mathcal{H}_S)$ which generates the pair (X, \bar{X}) , and let ρ_S be a pure quantum state compatible with this measurement (see Assumption *QMa*). Next, we introduce projectors $\{\Pi_{x,\bar{x}}\}_{x,\bar{x}}$ and an isometry \mathcal{E} such that $\sigma_{SDR} = \mathcal{E}(\rho_S)$ satisfies

$$\text{tr}_{DR}((\mathbb{1}_S \otimes \Pi_{x,\bar{x}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_R) \sigma_{SDR} (\mathbb{1}_S \otimes \Pi_{x,\bar{x}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_R)) = E_{x,\bar{x}}^{\bar{a}} \rho_S (E_{x,\bar{x}}^{\bar{a}})^\dagger.$$

(Note that the isometry can always be defined such that the projectors $\Pi_{x,\bar{x}}$ have rank one.) According to Assumption *QMb* we can append additional quantum measurements $(A' \rightsquigarrow (X', \bar{X}'), \{F_{x,\bar{x}}^a\}_{a,x,\bar{x}}, \mathcal{H}_D)$ (with $F_{x,\bar{x}}^{\bar{a}} = \Pi_{x,\bar{x}}$) and $(B \rightsquigarrow Y, \{G_y^b\}_{b,y}, \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_R)$, such that the output statistics are compatible with σ_{SDR} . Furthermore, $(X', \bar{X}') = (X, \bar{X})$ whenever $A' = \bar{a}$. Finally, by Assumption *FR* we can take A' and B to be free choices with $O_A \rightsquigarrow (X', \bar{X}')$, $O_B \rightsquigarrow Y$, and $O_C \rightsquigarrow Z$ spacelike separated (where O_A , O_B , and O_C are the trigger events for A' , B , and C , respectively).

Since the outcomes (X', \bar{X}') of the measurement (for $A' = \bar{a}$) are almost (up to an arbitrarily small distance ε) uniformly distributed, and the state σ_{SDR} is pure, it must be (almost) maximally entangled between the measurement device, \mathcal{H}_D and the remaining systems, $\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_R$ (by a suitable choice of the additional measurement, we can always take this to be maximally entangled over an integer number of two-level systems). Furthermore, $\{\Pi_{x,\bar{x}}\}_{x,\bar{x}}$ are orthogonal projectors. Hence, by a suitable choice of the additional measurements producing (X', \bar{X}') and Y , the argument given in Parts I and II of the proof implies that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and for all c, x and \bar{x} ,

$$D(P_{Z|A'=\bar{a},cx\bar{x}}, P_{Z|A'=\bar{a},c}) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Since the values of (X, \bar{X}) and (X', \bar{X}') coincide for $A' = A = \bar{a}$ (cf. Assumption *QMb*), we have

$$D(P_{Z|A=\bar{a},cx}, P_{Z|A=\bar{a},c}) \leq \varepsilon.$$

This relation holds for all \bar{a} , and, since ε can be arbitrarily small, establishes the desired Markov chain condition $P_{Z|A=\bar{a},cx} = P_{Z|A=\bar{a},c}$.

REMARKS ON THE NOTION OF LOCALITY

Here we make some comments about the notion of locality. The main point is to highlight that Bell's notion of locality is similar to, but slightly less general than, the non-signalling nature of the extension (as derived in Part I of the proof).

To quote Bell [2], *locality* is the requirement that “...the result of a measurement on one system [is] unaffected by operations on a distant system with which it has interacted in the past...” Indeed, our non-signalling conditions reflect this requirement and, in our language, the statement that $P_{XYZ|ABC}$ is non-signalling is equivalent to a statement that the model is *local* (see also the discussion in [28]). (We remind the reader that we do not assume the non-signalling conditions, but instead derive them from the free choice assumption.)

In spite of the above quote, Bell's formal definition of locality is slightly more restrictive than these non-signalling conditions. Bell considers extending the theory using hidden variables, here denoted by the variable Z . He requires $P_{XY|ABZ} = P_{X|AZ} \times P_{Y|BZ}$ (see e.g. [13]), which corresponds to assuming not only $P_{X|ABZ} = P_{X|AZ}$ and $P_{Y|ABZ} = P_{Y|BZ}$ (the non-signalling constraints, also called *parameter-independence* in this context), but also $P_{X|ABYZ} = P_{X|ABZ}$ and $P_{Y|ABXZ} = P_{Y|ABZ}$ (also called *outcome-independence*). These additional constraints do not follow from our assumptions and are not used in this work.

A possible reason for the discrepancy is that Bell principally considered extended theories which are deterministic given the hidden variables. In this case, the distinction between Bell's notion of locality and the non-signalling conditions we use is unimportant: if X is deterministic given A and Z , then $P_{X|ABYZ} = P_{X|AZ}$ follows automatically. In fact, the converse also holds: given parameter-independence and outcome-independence a necessary condition for the model to recreate the quantum correlations arising from measurements on a maximally entangled state is that it is deterministic given the hidden variables. To see this, note that for any measurement $A = a$, there is a corresponding measurement $B = b_a$ such that quantum theory predicts identical outcomes. In other words, $P_{X|ab_ayz} = \delta_{x,y}$. The assumptions of parameter-independence and outcome-independence give $P_{X|az} = P_{X|ab_ayz}$, and so $P_{X|az}(x) = \delta_{x,y}$. This implies that X and Y are determined given A and Z .

CANDIDATE EXTENSIONS BASED ON SIMULATIONS OF QUANTUM CORRELATIONS

It has been shown in a number of ways that quantum correlations can be simulated from other resources. For example, all correlations generated by projective measurements on a maximally entangled pair of qubits can be

simulated by shared randomness and one bit of classical communication [29], or by shared randomness and a non-local box [30] (a hypothetical device with stronger-than-quantum correlations [31, 32]). Furthermore, these results have been generalized to arbitrary (not necessarily maximally entangled) pure states [33].

Since such simulations recreate quantum correlations, they may appear at first sight to be extensions of quantum theory. We will not provide an exhaustive treatment of all such models, but instead give a short explanation as to why the examples above do not contradict our claim.

First note that the ability to simulate quantum correlations does not imply the ability to predict the outcomes of a genuine quantum experiment. However, when thinking about these simulations in the context of extending quantum theory, the hypothesis is that the components of the simulation really exist and are used to generate outcomes.

The case where communication is needed is analogous to de Broglie-Bohm theory [16, 17] (discussed in the main text). In order that the simulation can work in the case of spacelike separated measurements, the communication bit, Z (which depends on one of the measurement choices, say A), must propagate faster than light. The bit Z is therefore accessible outside the future lightcone of A . According to Assumption *FR*, it must be possible to choose A to be independent of this (now pre-existing) information, which would no longer be the case. Such models therefore contradict Assumption *FR*.

In the model of [30], where a non-local box is used for the simulation, even with full access to this box, there is no better way to predict the measurement outcomes. To see this, note that the output, X , of a measurement specified by a parameter, A , is generated in the simulation by XORing a shared classical value with the output of a non-local box, whose input depends on A . Since the individual outputs of a non-local box are uniform and random the same is true for X . Hence, while the simulation recreates the correct quantum correlations, it does not extend quantum theory in the sense of providing any extra information about future measurement outcomes. It is hence in agreement with Part II of the proof

However, because it recreates the quantum correlations, the simulation provides more information about the outcomes of joint measurements. To see that this is incompatible with quantum theory, one would need to apply Part III of our argument, using a description of how the model evolves under reversible operations. Such a description is not given in the above model and, furthermore, in consistent theories which permit non-local boxes [34] the reversible dynamics are known to be trivial [35]. They cannot therefore result in a state whose statistics are consistent with those from a quantum evolution, and hence contradict Assumption *QMb*.

SUPPLEMENTARY REFERENCES

- [27] Zurek, W. H. Relative states and the environment: Einselection, enviance, quantum Darwinism, and the existential interpretation. e-print [arXiv:0707.2832](#) (2007).
- [28] Hall, M. J. W. Comment on ‘Non-realism: deep thought or a soft option?’, by N. Gisin. e-print [arXiv:0909.0015](#) (2009).
- [29] Toner, B. & Bacon, D. Communication cost of simulating Bell correlations. *Physical Review Letters* **91**, 187904 (2003).
- [30] Cerf, N. J., Gisin, N., Massar, S. & Popescu, S. Simulating maximal quantum entanglement without communication. *Physical Review Letters* **94**, 220403 (2005).
- [31] Cirel’son, B. Some results and problems on quantum Bell-type inequalities. *Hadronic Journal Supplement* **8**, 329–345 (1993).
- [32] Popescu, S. & Rohrlich, D. Quantum nonlocality as an axiom. *Foundations of Physics* **24**, 379–385 (1994).
- [33] Brunner, N., Gisin, N., Popescu, S. & Scarani, V. Simulation of partial entanglement with nonsignaling resources. *Physical Review A* **78**, 052111 (2008).
- [34] Barrett, J. Information processing in generalized probabilistic theories. *Physical Review A* **75**, 032304 (2007).
- [35] Gross, D., Müller, M., Colbeck, R. & Dahlsten, O. C. O. All reversible dynamics in maximally nonlocal theories are trivial. *Physical Review Letters* **104**, 080402 (2010).