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Cyclic systems of dichotomous random variables have played a prominent role in contextuality research, describing such experimental paradigms as the Klyachko-Can-Binicioğlu-Shumovsky, Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen-Bell, and Leggett-Garg ones in physics, as well as conjoint binary choices in human decision making. Here, we study cyclic systems that are, generally, inconsistently connected (i.e. allow for “disturbance,” or “signaling”), and we relate them to two measures of the degree of contextuality in contextual systems, CNT1 and CNT2. It has been previously shown that only the latter can be naturally extended into a measure of the degree of noncontextuality in noncontextual systems, NCNT2. Both CNT2 and NCNT2 are defined as the L1-distance between a point representing a cyclic system and the surface of the polytope representing all possible noncontextual cyclic systems with the same single-variable marginals. We completely characterize this polytope, as well as the polytope of all possible couplings for cyclic systems with given single-variable marginals, and we establish that, for contextual cyclic systems, CNT2 is equal to CNT1. Both of them are proportional to the absolute value of the difference between the two sides of a generalized maximally tight Bell inequality. For noncontextual cyclic systems, the measure NCNT2 is shown to be proportional to the smaller of the same difference and the L1-distance to the surface of the box circumscribing the noncontextuality polytope. These simple relations, however, do not generally hold beyond the class of cyclic systems, and noncontextuality of a system does not follow from noncontextuality of its cyclic subsystems.

I. INTRODUCTION

A cyclic system of rank \( n = 2, 3, \ldots \), is a system

\[
\mathcal{R} = \{ \{ R_i^1, R_i^{i+1} \} : i = 1, \ldots, n \},
\]

where \( i \oplus 1 = i + 1 \) for \( i < n \), and \( n \oplus 1 = 1 \); \( R_i^j \) denotes a Bernoulli (0/1) random variable measuring content \( q_i \) in context \( c_i \) (\( j = i, i \oplus 1 \)). A content is any property that can be present or absent (e.g., spin of a half-spin particle in a given direction), a context here is defined by which two contents are measured together (simultaneously or in a specific order). A cyclic system of rank \( n \) has \( n \) contexts containing two jointly distributed random variables each, \( \{ R_i^1, R_i^{i+1} \} \). Each of such pairs is referred to as a bunch (of random variables). The system also has \( n \) connections \( \{ R_i^{i+1}, R_i^j \} \) (where \( i \oplus 1 = i - 1 \) for \( i > 1 \), and \( 1 \oplus 1 = n \)), each of which contains two stochastically unrelated (i.e., possessing no joint distribution) random variables measuring the same content in two different contexts.

Cyclic systems have played a prominent role in contextuality studies [1 2 19]. The matrices below represent cyclic systems of rank 5 (describing, e.g., the Klyachko-Can-Bificioğlu-Shumovsky experiment [15 20]), rank 4 (describing, e.g., Bell’s “Alice-Bob” experiments [1 5 8 14]), rank 3 (describing, e.g., the Leggett-Garg experiments [3 16 21 22]), and rank 2 (of primary interest outside quantum physics, e.g., describing the question-order experiment in human decision making [13 24]).

\[
\begin{array}{ccc|c|c}
R_1^1 & R_2^1 & c^1 \\
R_2^2 & R_3^2 & c^2 \\
R_3^3 & R_4^3 & c^3 \\
R_4^4 & R_5^4 & c^4 \\
& & & c^5 \\
\hline
q_1 & q_2 & q_3 & q_4 & q_5 & R_5 \\
\end{array}
\]

A cyclic system is consistently connected if \( R_i^1 \) and \( R_i^{i+1} \) are identically distributed for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \). This assumption is commonly made in quantum physical applications (but, e.g., for the Leggett-Garg system it does not generally hold [3 10]). The present paper, however, is based on the Contextuality-by-Default (CbD) theory [10 11 15], which is not predicated on this assumption, that is, the systems of random variables we consider are generally inconsistently connected. Cyclic systems have been intensively analyzed within the framework of CbD [3 12 13 17 19]. In this paper they are studied in relation to the measures of contextuality and noncontextuality considered in Ref. [18]. The familiarity of the reader with CbD (e.g., Refs. [10 18]) for understanding this paper is not necessary but desirable. Although we recapitulate here all relevant definitions and results, they are presented in the form specialized to cyclic systems rather than in complete generality, and the motivations behind the constructs may not always be apparent. In particular, we take it for granted in this paper that it is important to seek principled and unified ways of measuring both contextuality and noncontextuality.

---
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Of the several measures of contextuality considered in Ref. [18] we focus here on two, labeled CNT$_1$ and CNT$_2$. The former is the oldest measure introduced within the framework of ChD [12, 17, 19], whereas CNT$_2$ is the newest one, introduced in Ref. [18] for the first time. A detailed description of these measures will have to wait until we have introduced the necessary definitions and results. In a nutshell, however, a cyclic system (with the distribution of each of the random variables $R_j$ being fixed) is represented in ChD by two vectors of product expectations, $p_b$ and $p_c$, conventionally referred to as vectors of “correlations.” The subscripts $b$ and $c$ stand for the just-defined ChD terms “bunch” and “connection.” The vector $p_b$ encodes the correlations within the bunches $\{R_i^{(1)}, R_i^{(2)}\}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$. The vector $p_c$ encodes the correlations imposed on the within-connection pairs $\{R_i^{(1)}, R_j^{(2)}\}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, defining thereby so-called couplings of the connections (recall that the connections themselves do not possess joint distributions). A cyclic system whose (non)contextuality we measure is represented by vectors $p_b^\ast, p_c^\ast$, where $p_b^\ast$ consists of the observed bunch correlations, and $p_c^\ast$ consists of the correlations computed for the connections in a special way (the maximal couplings of the connections). In the case of CNT$_1$, the $L_1$-distance is measured between $p_c^\ast$ and the feasibility polytope $\mathcal{F}_c$ comprising all possible $p_c^\ast$-vectors compatible with $p_b^\ast$. In the case of CNT$_2$, $L_1$-distance is computed between $p_b^\ast$ and the noncontextuality polytope $\mathcal{F}_b$ comprising all $p_b$-vectors compatible with $p_c^\ast$. The two measures therefore are, in a well-defined sense, mirror images of each other.

In this paper, we provide a complete characterization of the noncontextuality polytope, and show that the $L_1$-distance between this polytope and the observed vector $p_b^\ast$ is a single-coordinate distance, i.e. it can be computed along a single coordinate of $p_b^\ast$. Moreover, this distance is the same along all coordinates of $p_b^\ast$ (see Fig. 1A), and it is proportional to the amount of violation of the generalized Bell criterion derived in Ref. [17] for noncontextuality of (generally inconsistently connected) cyclic systems.[?] In other words, if we schematically present the Bell criterion as stating that a system is noncontextual if and only if some expression $E$ does not exceed a constant $k$, then CNT$_2$ is proportional to $E - k$ when this value is positive. Since precisely the same is true for CNT$_1$ [17], with the same proportionality coefficient, we have

$$\text{CNT}_2 = \text{CNT}_1. \quad (3)$$

To understand why this is the case, we characterize the polytope $\mathcal{P}$ of all possible vectors $(p_b, p_c)$, and show that its $L_1$-distance from the vector $(p_b^\ast, p_c^\ast)$ representing the observed contextual cyclic system has the same properties as above: it is a single-coordinate distance, the same along any of the coordinates of $(p_b^\ast, p_c^\ast)$. The equality of the two measures follows from this immediately.

Despite the fact that CNT$_1$ and CNT$_2$ are “mirror images” of each other, only one of them, CNT$_2$, was shown in Ref. [18] to be naturally extendable to a measure of the degree of noncontextuality in noncontextual systems, NCNT$_2$. Geometrically, this measure is the $L_1$-distance between a point $p_b^\ast$ inside the noncontextuality polytope $\mathcal{P}_b$ and the polytope’s surface. It is, too, a single-coordinate distance (as is the case for any internal point of any convex region [23]), but its properties are somewhat more complicated due to the structure of $\mathcal{P}_b$. The polytope $\mathcal{P}_b$ is circumscribed by an $n$-box $\mathcal{R}_b$, so that some of the faces of $\mathcal{P}_b$ lie within the box’s interior, while others lie within its surface. If the point $p_b^\ast$ is $L_1$-closer to an internal face of $\mathcal{R}_b$ than to the surface of the box, NCNT$_2$ can be measured along any single coordinate of $p_b^\ast$ (see Fig. 1B), and it is proportional to the amount of compliance of the system with the generalized Bell criteria of noncontextuality [17]. In other words, in this case NCNT$_2$ is proportional $k - E$ if the criterion is written as $E \leq k$. However, NCNT$_2$ becomes the $L_1$-distance between $p_b^\ast$ and the surface of the box $\mathcal{R}_b$ when this distance is smaller than that to any internal face of $\mathcal{P}_b$ (Fig. 1C). In this case, NCNT$_2$ is not related to the Bell inequalities.

One might wonder why we could not simply define the degree of contextuality by the amount of violation of the appropriate Bell criterion (and, by extension, define the degree of noncontextuality by the amount of compliance
II. CYCLIC SYSTEMS

In each context \(i = 1, \ldots, n\) of the cyclic system \(T\), the joint distribution of the bunch \(R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_n\) is described by three numbers,

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle R_i \rangle &= p_i = \Pr \{ R_i = 1 \} \\
\langle R_{i}^{(1)} \rangle &= p_{i}^{(1)} = \Pr \{ R_i = 1 \} \\
\langle R_i R_{i}^{(1)} \rangle &= p_{i,i}^{(1)} = \Pr \{ R_i = R_i^{(1)} = 1 \}
\end{align*}
\]

(One does not need a superscript for the product expectation because the context is uniquely determined by the two contents measured in this context.) For instance, a cyclic system of rank 4 has all bunch distributions in it described as shown in Fig. 2.

![Figure 2. Diagram of all bunch distributions for a rank-4 cyclic system.](image)

A cyclic system therefore can be represented by two column vectors:

\[
\mathbf{p}_T = (1, p_{12}, p_{23}, \ldots, p_{n1})^T,
\]

which is the vector of single-variable expectations preceded by \(\langle \rangle = 1\) (the index 1 stands for "low-level marginals"), and

\[
\mathbf{p}_R = (p_{12}, p_{23}, \ldots, p_{n-1,n}, p_{nn})^T,
\]

the vector of all bunch product expectations.

A coupling of a connection \(R_i, R_i^{(1)}\) is a pair of jointly distributed random variables \(T_i, T_i^{(1)}\) with the same 1-marginals:

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle T_i \rangle &= \langle R_i \rangle = p_i \\
\langle T_i^{(1)} \rangle &= \langle R_i^{(1)} \rangle = p_i^{(1)}
\end{align*}
\]

In other words, a coupling adds to each pair \(p_i, p_i^{(1)}\) describing the connection a product expectation

\[
\langle T_i T_i^{(1)} \rangle = p_i^{(1)} = \Pr \{ T_i = T_i^{(1)} = 1 \},
\]

as it is shown in Fig. 3. This can generally be done in an infinity of ways, constrained only by

\[
\max(0, p_i^{(1)} - 1) \leq p_i^{(1)} \leq \min(p_i, p_i^{(1)}) = p_i^{(1)}.
\]

If couplings are constructed for all connections, they are represented by a vector of connection product expectations,

\[
\mathbf{p}_c = (p_{21}, p_{32}, \ldots, p_{n(n-1)}, p_{nn})^T.
\]

An (overall) coupling of the entire system \(\mathcal{R}\) is a set

\[
\mathcal{S} = \{ S_i : j = i, i \oplus 1; i = 1, \ldots, n \}
\]

of jointly distributed random variables such that, for \(i = 1, \ldots, n\),

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle S_i \rangle &= \langle R_i \rangle = p_i \\
\langle S_i^{(1)} \rangle &= \langle R_i^{(1)} \rangle = p_i^{(1)}
\end{align*}
\]

In other words, a coupling \(\mathcal{S}\) induces as its 1-marginals and 2-marginals the same vectors \(\mathbf{p}_T, \mathbf{p}_R\) as those representing \(\mathcal{R}\). An overall coupling also induces couplings of all connections as its 2-marginals \(S_i^{(1)}, S_i^{(2)}\), which means that it induces a vector \(\mathbf{p}_c\) of connection product expectations.
III. (NON)CONTEXTUALITY

In the following it is convenient to speak of cyclic systems as represented by vectors
\[
P = \begin{pmatrix} p_l \\ p_b \\ p_c \end{pmatrix},
\]
(13)
even though \( p_c \) is computed and added to a given system. Since this can be done in multiple ways, one and the same system is represented by multiple vectors \( p \).

If in a vector \( p_c \),
\[
p^i,i^{\oplus 1} = \min (p^i_i, p^i_{i^{\oplus 1}}), i = 1, \ldots, n,
\]
(14)
then the values of \( p^i,i^{\oplus 1} \) are maximal possible ones, and the expectations of the connections used to compute these product expectations are called maximal couplings.

Let us agree that an observed, or target system \( R \) (one being investigated) is represented by the vector
\[
P^* = \begin{pmatrix} p^*_l \\ p^*_b \\ p^*_c \end{pmatrix},
\]
(15)
where \( p^*_l \) and \( p^*_b \) are as they are observed, and \( p^*_c \) is the vector of the maximal connection product expectations.

Definition 1. A target system \( R \) represented by vector \( (p^*_l, p^*_b, p^*_c)^\top \) is noncontextual if it has a coupling \( S \) that induces as its marginals the vector \( p^*_c \) (of maximal connection product expectations). If no such coupling exists, the system is contextual.

In other words, if a system is noncontextual it has an overall coupling that (by definition) satisfies [12], and also
\[
\langle S^i_i^\otimes 1 \rangle = p^i,i^\otimes 1 = \min (p^i_i, p^i_{i^\otimes 1}), i = 1, \ldots, n.
\]
(16)
For any overall coupling \( S \) of a system, let \( h \) be a column-vector of probabilities
\[
Pr [S^1 = r^1_1, S^2 = r^2_2, \ldots, S^n = r^n_n, S^0 = r^0_1]
\]
across all \( 2^{2n} \) combinations of \( r^j \) = 0/1. Let
\[
M = \begin{pmatrix} M_l \\ M_b \\ M_c \end{pmatrix}
\]
(17)
be a Boolean (incidence) matrix with 0/1 cells. The \( 2^{2n} \) columns of \( M \) are indexed by events
\[
S^1_1 = r^1_1, S^2_1 = r^2_2, \ldots, S^n_1 = r^n_n, S^0_1 = r^0_1,
\]
(18)
while its rows are indexed by the elements of \( p \) (with \( M_l \) corresponding to \( p_l \), \( M_b \) to \( p_b \), and \( M_c \) to \( p_c \)). A cell \((l, m)\) of \( M \) is filled with 1 if the following is satisfied: for each random variable \( S^j_l \) entering the expectation that indexes the \( l \)th row of \( M \), the value of \( S^j_l \) in the event indexing the \( m \)th column of \( M \) is equal to 1. Otherwise the cell is filled with zero. For instance, if the \( l \)th row of \( M \) corresponds to the expectation \( \langle S^1_1, S^2_1^\otimes 1 \rangle \) in \( p \), we put 1 in the cell \((l, m)\) if both \( r^1_1 \) and \( r^2_1 \) in the event \( i^\otimes 1 \) corresponding to the \( m \)th column of \( M \) are 1; otherwise the cell is filled with zero.

Once \( M \) and \( h \) are defined, one can reformulate the definition of (non)contextuality as follows.

Definition 2. A target system \( R \) represented by vector \( p^* = (p^*_l, p^*_b, p^*_c)^\top \) is noncontextual if and only if there is a vector \( h \geq 0 \) (componentwise) such that
\[
Mh = p^*.
\]
(19)
Otherwise the system is contextual.

IV. RELABLING FROM 0/1 TO ±1

For many aspects of cyclic systems it is more convenient to label the values of the random variables ±1 rather than consider them Bernoulli, 0/1. This amounts to switching from \( R_l \) variables to \( A_j^l \) = \( 2R_j^l - 1 \). In the case of the connection couplings [14], this means switching from \( T_j^l \) to \( U_j^l = 2T_j^l - 1 \). A cyclic system \( R \) with Bernoulli variables will then be renamed into a cyclic system \( A \) with ±1-variables. We have, for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \),
\[
\langle A_j^l \rangle = e_j^l = 2p_j^l - 1, j = i, i \oplus 1
\]
(20)
\[
\langle A_i^l A_i^l \rangle = e_i^l,i^\otimes 1 = 4p_i^l,i^\otimes 1 - 2p_i^l - 2p_i^l,i^\otimes 1 + 1,
\]
(21)
and this defines the componentwise transformation of the expectation vectors
\[
\begin{pmatrix} e_1 \\ e_b \\ e_c \end{pmatrix} = \phi \begin{pmatrix} p_l \\ p_b \\ p_c \end{pmatrix}.
\]
(22)
The relabeling in question is useful in the formulation of the Bell-type criterion of noncontextuality. Let us denote
\[
s_1 (e_b) = \max \{ \lambda_i e_i^l, i = 1, \ldots, n \}
\]
(23)
and
\[
\delta (e_l) = \min (n - 2 + \delta (e_l), n).
\]
(24)
Note that \( \delta \) and \( \Delta \) depend on \( e_l \), but since this vector is fixed, we may (and will henceforth) consider \( \delta \) and \( \Delta \) as constants. [27]

Theorem 3 (Kujala-Dzhafarov [17]). A cyclic system \( A \) is noncontextual if and only if
\[
s_1 (e_b) - \Delta \leq 0.
\]
(25)
This result generalizes the criterion derived in Ref. [2] for consistently connected cyclic systems (those with \( \delta = 0 \).
V. MEASURES OF CONTEXTUALITY AND A MEASURE OF NONCONTEXTUALITY

The idea of the two measures of contextuality considered in Ref. [13], CNT\(_1\) and CNT\(_2\), is as follows. First we think of the space of all \(p = (p_1, p_b, p_c)\) obtainable as \(p = Mh\) with \(h \geq 0\). In this space, we fix the 1-marginals at \(p_1^*\) (observed values), and define the polytope

\[
P = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} p_b \\ p_c \end{pmatrix} \mid \exists h \geq 0: \begin{pmatrix} p_1^* \\ p_b \\ p_c \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} M_1 \\ M_b \\ M_c \end{pmatrix} h \right\},
\]

(26)

This polytope describes all possible couplings of all systems with low-marginals \(p_1^*\). Then we do one of the two: either we fix \(M_b h = p_b^*\) and see how close \(p_c = M_c h\) can be made to \(p_c^*\) by changing \(h\); or we fix \(M_c h = p_c^*\) and see how close \(p_b = M_b h\) can be made to \(p_b^*\). These two procedures define two polytopes that we use to define CNT\(_1\) and CNT\(_2\), respectively.

**Definition 4.** If a system \(R\) represented by vector \(p^*\) is contextual,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{CNT}_1 &= L_1(p_c^*, \partial P_c) = L_1(p_c^*, P_c) \\
\text{the } L_1\text{-distance between } p_c^* \text{ and the feasibility polytope } P_c = \left\{ p_c \mid \exists h \geq 0: \begin{pmatrix} p_1^* \\ p_b \\ p_c \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} M_1 \\ M_b \\ M_c \end{pmatrix} h \right\}.
\end{align*}
\]

(27)

Written in extenso,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{CNT}_1 &= \min_{p_c \in P_c} \| p_c^* - p_c \|_1 = 1 \cdot p_c^* - \max_{p_c \in P_c} (1 \cdot p_c).
\end{align*}
\]

(28)

Because \(p_1^*\) is fixed, the transformation \(\phi\) in \((21)\) is affine. Denoting \(\phi(p_c) = e_c^*\) and \(\phi(p_c) = e_c\), we have

\[
\| p_c^* - p_c \|_1 = \frac{\| e_c^* - e_c \|_1}{4}.
\]

(30)

This allows us to redefine the measure in the way more convenient for our purposes,

\[
\text{CNT}_1 = \frac{1}{4} L_1(e_c^*, E_c),
\]

(31)

where (pointwise)

\[
E_c = \phi(P_c).
\]

(32)

**Definition 5.** If a system \(R\) represented by vector \(p^*\) is contextual,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{CNT}_2 &= L_1(p_b^*, P_b) = L_1(p_b^*, \partial P_b) \\
\text{the } L_1\text{-distance between } p_b^* \text{ and the noncontextuality polytope } P_b = \left\{ p_b \mid \exists h \geq 0: \begin{pmatrix} p_1^* \\ p_b \\ p_c \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} M_1 \\ M_b \\ M_c \end{pmatrix} h \right\}.
\end{align*}
\]

(29)

Here,

\[
\text{CNT}_2 = \min_{p_b \in E_b} \| p_b^* - p_b \|_1.
\]

(35)

For the same reason as above,

\[
\text{CNT}_2 = \frac{1}{4} L_1(e_b^*, E_b),
\]

(36)

the \(L_1\)-distance between \(e_b^* = \phi(p_b^*)\) and the polytope

\[
E_b = \phi(P_b).
\]

(37)

For convenience, we will use the same term, “feasibility polytope,” for both \(P_c\) and \(E_c\). Analogously, both \(P_b\) and \(E_b\) can be referred to as “noncontextuality polytope.”

As for any two \(\pm 1\) random variables, we have

\[
|e_i^* + e_{i+1}^*| - 1 \leq e_i, e_{i+1} \leq 1 - |e_i^* - e_{i+1}^*|, i = 1, \ldots, n.
\]

(38)

Therefore the convex polytope \(E_b\) is circumscribed by the \(n\)-box

\[
E_b = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \left[ |e_i + e_{i+1}| - 1, 1 - |e_i - e_{i+1}| \right].
\]

(39)

We can analogously define the \(n\)-box circumscribing \(E_c\), but we do not need this notion.

The idea of the noncontextuality measure NCNT\(_2\) extending CNT\(_2\) to noncontextual systems is as follows.

**Definition 6.** If a system \(R\) represented by vector \(p^*\) is noncontextual,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{NCNT}_2 &= L_1(p_b^*, \partial P_b) = L_1(p_b^*, E_b) \\
\text{the } L_1\text{-distance between } p_b^* \text{ and the surface of the noncontextuality polytope } P_b.
\end{align*}
\]

(40)

Note that CNT\(_2\), too, could be defined as the distance from a point to \(\partial P_b\), so the definition is the same for both CNT\(_2\) and NCNT\(_2\), only the position of the \(p_b^*\) changes from the outside to the inside of the polytope. In extenso,

\[
\text{NCNT}_2 = \frac{1}{4} \inf_{e_b \in E_b} \| e_b^* - e_b \|_1 = \frac{1}{4} \min_{e_b \in E_b} \| e_b^* - e_b \|_1.
\]

(41)

As shown in Ref. [13], no such extension to a noncontextuality measure exists for CNT\(_1\) (see Section IX for the argument by which this is established).

VI. ADDITIONAL TERMINOLOGY AND CONVENTIONS

To focus now on CNT\(_2\) and NCNT\(_2\), we need a few additional terms and conventions. We confine our consideration to the space of all possible points \(e_b\), which is the the \(n\)-cube

\[
C_b = [-1, 1]^n.
\]

(42)

Given an arbitrary \(n\)-box

\[
X = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \left[ \min x_i, \max x_i \right] \subseteq C_b,
\]

(43)
A vertex $V$ of $X$ is called odd if its coordinates contain an odd number of min $x_i$’s; otherwise the vertex is even. A hyperplane is said to be pocket-forming at vertex $V$ if it cuts each of the $n$ edges emanating from $V$, i.e., if it intersects each of them between $V$ and the edge’s other end. The region within $X$ strictly above the pocket-forming hyperplane at $V$ is called a pocket at $V$. This pocket is said to be regular if the pocket-forming hyperplane cuts all $n$ edges emanating from $V$ at an equal distance from $V$. We apply this terminology to two special $n$-boxes: the $n$-box $\mathbb{R}_b$ circumscribing the noncontextuality polytope $[39]$, and the ambient $n$-cube $\mathcal{C}_b$ itself.

We will assume in the following that no context in the system contains a deterministic variable. If such a context exists, the $n$-box $\mathbb{R}_b$ is degenerate (has lower dimensionality than $n$), and

$$\mathbb{R}_b = \mathbb{R}_b,$$

making the system trivially noncontextual. Indeed, assume, e.g., that $A_1^1$ is a deterministic variable. We know that any deterministic variable can be removed from a system without affecting its (non)contextuality [9]. The system therefore can be presented as a non-cyclic chain

$$A_2^1, A_2^2, A_2^3, \ldots, A_2^n, A_1^n.$$

Whatever the joint distributions of adjacent pairs in such a chain, there is always a global joint distribution that agrees with these pairwise distributions as its marginals: for any assignment of values to the links of the chain, the coupling probability is obtained as the product of the chained conditional probabilities.

A cyclic system $A$ is called a variant of a cyclic system $B$ of the same rank if

$$\{A_i^1, A_i^{(1)}\} = \pm 1 \cdot \{B_i^1, B_i^{(1)}\},$$

for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

**Lemma 7** (Kujala-Dzhafarov, [17]). All variants of a system have the same values of $s_1(e_b)$ and $|e_i - e_1^{(1)}|$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$ (hence also they have the same value of $\Delta$).

**Lemma 8** (Kujala-Dzhafarov, [17]). Among the $2^n$ variants of a cyclic system there is one, called canonical, in which (following a circular permutation of indices)

$$|e_{n1}| \leq e_{i,i+1}, i = 1, \ldots, n - 1.$$  

(45)

Clearly, a canonical variant of a system is a canonical variant of any variant of the system, including itself. In a canonical variant of a system,

$$s_1(e_b) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} e_{i,i+1} - e_{n1}.$$  

(46)

### VII. PROPERTIES OF THE NONCONTEXTUALITY POLYTOPE

**Lemma 9.** For each odd vertex $V = \{\lambda_i : i = 1, \ldots, n\}$ of $\mathcal{C}_b$, the inequality $\sum \lambda_i e_{i,i+1} > \Delta$ describes a regular pocket at $V$. The distance at which the hyperplane $\sum \lambda_i e_{i,i+1} = \Delta$ cuts each of the edges of the cube emanating from $V$ is $n - \Delta$. (See Fig. 4)

**Proof.** Verify that, for any $\Delta$, each of the $n$ points

$$x_k = \{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k (1 - n + \Delta), \ldots, \lambda_n\}, k = 1, \ldots, n,$$

satisfies

$$\sum \lambda_i x_{i,i+1} = n - 1 + \lambda_k (1 - n + \Delta) = \Delta,$$

whence so does the hyperplane passing through these points. Since $n - 2 \leq \Delta \leq n$, the distance $n - \Delta$ is between 0 and 2, so that the hyperplane does cut each of the edges joined at the vertex. 

![Figure 4. Illustration for Lemma 9, n = 2 and n = 3.](image)

**Lemma 10.** For a given $\Delta$, no two pockets $\sum \lambda_i e_{i,i+1} > \Delta$ and $\sum \lambda_i' e_{i,i+1} > \Delta$ formed by the hyperplanes at different odd vertices of $\mathcal{C}_b$ intersect. The pocket-forming hyperplanes at the odd vertices are also disjoint within $\mathcal{C}_b$ unless $\Delta = n - 2$. (See Fig. 5)

**Proof.** Two odd vertices have non-overlapping sets of edges emanating from them, and each of the two hyperplanes cuts its own set. The only case when an axis from one set is cut at the same point as an axis from another set is when the cuts are at the ends of the emanating edges, and this means that $\Delta = n - 2$.

**Lemma 11.** If a point $x$ is within the pocket formed at an odd vertex $V = \{\lambda_i : i = 1, \ldots, n\}$ of $\mathcal{C}_b$ by a hyperplane $\sum \lambda_i e_{i,i+1} = \Delta$, then

$$s_1(x) = \sum \lambda_i x_{i,i+1} = \Delta_x > \Delta,$$

and $s_1(x) - \Delta$ is the distance between the points at which the two hyperplanes $\sum \lambda_i' e_{i,i+1} = \Delta_x$ and $\sum \lambda_i e_{i,i+1} = \Delta$ cut any of the edges emanating from $V$. (See Fig. 6)

**Proof.** We need to show that for any other odd vertex $V' = \{\lambda_i' : i = 1, \ldots, n\}$ of $\mathcal{C}_b$, $\sum \lambda' x_{i,i+1} \leq \Delta_x$. This is indeed the case because for any value $\Delta' \geq n - 2$, the hyperplane $\sum \lambda' e_{i,i+1} = \Delta'$ does not cut any of the edges emanating from vertex $V$, except, possibly, at their other ends (if $\Delta' = n - 2$). Consequently, $\sum \lambda' x_{i,i+1} < n - 2 \leq \Delta < \Delta_x$. 

![Figure 6.](image)
The extended noncontextuality polytope $\mathcal{N}_b \subseteq \mathcal{C}_b$ is defined by $2^{n-1}$ half-plane inequalities
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i e_{i,i\oplus1} \leq \Delta, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n,
\]
where where $n - 2 \leq \Delta \leq n$ and $\{\lambda_i : i = 1, \ldots, n\}$ are odd vertices of $\mathcal{C}_b$. Therefore we can identify $\mathcal{N}_b$ by the value of $\Delta$, and write $\mathcal{N}_b = \mathcal{N}_b(\Delta)$. (See Fig. 7)

**Lemma 12.** If a point $x$ is within the extended noncontextuality polytope $\mathcal{N}_b(\Delta)$, then
\[
s_1(x) = \sum \lambda_i x_{i,i\oplus1} = \Delta_x \leq \Delta,
\]
where $V = \{\lambda : i = 1, \ldots, n\}$ is an odd vertex of $\mathcal{C}_b$ (unique if $\Delta > n - 2$) at which the hyperplane $\sum \lambda_i e_{i,i\oplus1} = \Delta_x$ forms a pocket. The difference $\Delta - \Delta_x$ is the distance between the points at which the two hyperplanes cut any of the edges emanating from $V$. (See Fig. 8)

We know that $\mathcal{E}_b$ is the intersection of $\mathcal{R}_b$ and the polytope $\mathcal{N}_b(\Delta)$. The following lemma stipulates an important property of this intersection.

**Lemma 13.** All even vertices of $\mathcal{R}_b$ are within $\mathcal{E}_b$. (See Fig. 9)
Proof. By induction. For \( n = 2 \) we have to show that the even vertices \( (1 - |e_1^2 - c_1^2|, 1 - |e_2^2 - c_2^2|) \) and \( (|e_1^2 + c_1^2| - 1, |e_2^2 + c_2^2| - 1) \) are within \( E_b \). For the former vertex this means that
\[
|(1 - |e_1^2 - c_1^2|) - (1 - |e_2^2 - c_2^2|)| \leq |e_1^2 - c_1^2| + |e_2^2 - c_2^2|.
\]
Without loss of generality, let the left-hand side be \( (|e_1^2 + c_1^2| - 1) - (|e_2^2 + c_2^2| - 1) \). The inequality then is equivalent to
\[
|e_2^2 - e_1^2| \leq |e_1^2 - c_1^2| + |e_2^2 - c_2^2| + |e_1^2 - e_2^2|,
\]
which is true by the triangle inequality. For the second even vertex we have to show that
\[
|(|e_1^2 + c_1^2| - 1) - (|e_2^2 + c_2^2| - 1)| \leq |e_1^2 - c_1^2| + |e_2^2 - c_2^2|.
\]
Again, without loss of generality, let the left-hand side be \( (|e_1^2 + c_1^2| - 1) - (|e_2^2 + c_2^2| - 1) \).

(1) If \( e_1^2 + c_1^2 \geq 0, e_2^2 + c_2^2 \geq 0 \), the inequality acquires the form
\[
(e_1^2 - e_2^2) + (e_1^2 - e_1^2) \leq |e_1^2 - c_1^2| + |e_2^2 - c_2^2|,
\]
which is true.

(2) If \( e_1^2 + c_1^2 < 0, e_1^2 + c_1^2 \geq 0 \), the inequality acquires the form
\[
(e_1^2 - e_1^2) + (e_2^2 - e_2^2) \leq |e_1^2 - c_1^2| + |e_2^2 - c_2^2|,
\]
which is true.

(3) If \( e_1^2 + c_1^2 \geq 0, e_1^2 + c_2^2 < 0 \), we have
\[
(e_1^2 + c_1^2) + (e_2^2 + c_2^2) = (e_1^2 - e_1^2) + (e_2^2 - e_2^2) + 2(e_1^2 + c_2^2) \leq (e_1^2 - e_1^2) + (e_2^2 - e_2^2) \leq |e_1^2 - c_1^2| + |e_2^2 - c_2^2|,
\]
which is true. The fourth case is analogous.

Assume now that the statement of the theorem holds for all \( 2 \leq k < n \). We have to show that
\[
s_1(\mathbf{x}) \leq n - 2 + \delta^{(n)}
\]
for any even vertex of \( R_b \). Without changing the values of \( s_1 \) and any of the summands in \( \delta^{(n)} \), we can put the inequality in the canonical form (Lemma 8).

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} x_{i,i+1} - x_{n1} \leq n - 2 + \delta^{(n)}.
\]

Consider two cases.

(Case 1) At least one of the coordinates \( x_{i,i+1} (i = 1, \ldots, n - 1) \) is a max-coordinate. Let it be \( x_{12} = 1 - |x_1^2 - x_2^2| \). We can rewrite the inequality as
\[
\left(\sum_{i=2}^{n-1} x_{i,i+1} - x_{n1}\right) + 1 - |x_1^2 - x_2^2| \leq (n - 3 + \delta^{(n-1)}) + 1 - |x_1^2 - x_2^2| - |x_1^2 - x_1^2|.
\]

The value of \( \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} x_{i,i+1} - x_{n1} \) is equal to the \( s_1 \) of some system of rank \( n - 1 \), and since the vector \( \{x_{23}, \ldots, x_{n-1,n}, x_{n1}\} \) contains an even number of min-coordinates,
\[
\left(\sum_{i=2}^{n-1} x_{i,i+1} - x_{n1}\right) \leq n - 3 + \delta^{(n-1)}
\]
holds by the induction hypothesis. At the same time, obviously,
\[
1 - |x_1^2 - x_2^2| \leq 1 + |x_1^2 - x_1^2| + |x_2^2 - x_2^2| - |x_1^2 - x_1^2|,
\]
and this establishes (*) for this case.

(Case 2) All coordinates \( x_{i,i+1} (i = 1, \ldots, n - 1) \) are min-coordinates. Let us then replace two of them (which is possible since \( n - 1 \geq 2) \) with the corresponding max-coordinates — this will leave the number of the min-coordinates even. The left-hand side of (*) can only increase, but we can use the argument of the previous case to show that it is still less than the (unchanged) right-hand side of (*).

This completes the proof.

\[\square\]

**Corollary 14.** A point \( \mathbf{x} \) represents a contextual system if and only if it belongs to a pocket formed by a pocket-forming hyperplane \( \sum \lambda_i e_i = \Delta \) at an odd vertex \( V = \{\lambda_i : i = 1, \ldots, n\} \) of \( R_b \). These pockets are regular and their number is \( 0 \leq k \leq 2^{n-1} \). (See Fig. 10.)

---

**VIII. MAIN THEOREMS**

The following two theorems now are simple corollaries of the previous results. Consider a noncontextual polytope
\[
E_b = R_b \cap N_b(\Delta).
\]

**Theorem 15.** The \( L_1 \) distance between \( E_b \) and a point \( e_b^* \) representing a contextual system is a single-coordinate distance, equal to \( s_1(e_b^*) - \Delta \) for all coordinates. This is the value of \( \text{CNT}_2 \). (See Fig. 17.)
Let us define a new measure now, the $L_1$-distance between the box $\mathbb{R}_b$ and a point $\mathbf{e}_b$ within the box:

$$m(\mathbf{e}_b) = \min_{i=1,...,n}\left(\min\left(\frac{e_i - |e_i + e_{i+1}|}{1 - |e_i - e_{i+1}| - e_{i+1}|}; 1 + |e_i - e_{i+1}| - e_{i+1}|+ 1\right)\right).$$

(49)

**Theorem 16.** The $L_1$-distance between $\mathbb{R}_b$ and a point $\mathbf{e}_b$ representing a noncontextual system is a single-coordinate distance, equal to $\min(\Delta - s_1(\mathbf{e}_b), m(\mathbf{e}_b))$. This is the value of NCNT$_2$. If this value equals $s_1(\mathbf{e}_b) - \Delta$, it is the same for all coordinates. (See Fig. 12)

Figure 12. Illustration for Theorem 16 for $n = 2$, a detailed analogue of Figs. 11 and 13. Left panel: the case $\Delta - s_1(\mathbf{e}_b) \leq m(\mathbf{e}_b)$. Right panel: the case $\Delta - s_1(\mathbf{e}_b) > m(\mathbf{e}_b)$.

Figure 13 illustrates the dynamics of CNT$_2$ and NCNT$_2$ as point $\mathbf{e}_b$ moves along the diagonal connecting two opposite vertices of $\mathbb{R}_b$ for cyclic systems of several ranks. To emphasize that NCNT$_2$ is an extension of CNT$_2$ (and vice versa), we plot NCNT$_2$ with minus sign: as $\mathbf{e}_b$ moves closer to the surface of $\mathbb{R}_b$, CNT$_2$ decreases from a positive value to zero, the system becomes noncontextual, and as the point continues to move inside the polytope, the value of $-\text{NCNT}_2$ proceeds to decrease continuously.

**IX. POLYTOPE OF ALL POSSIBLE COUPLINGS**

We now need to gain insight into why CNT$_1$ and CNT$_2$ are the same for cyclic systems. Is it a peculiar coincidence? Does CNT$_1$, if interpreted geographically, have the same “nice” properties as CNT$_2$? The answer to the first question turns out to be negative, and to second one affirmative.

In section V we introduced in (26) the polytope $\mathcal{P}$ of all possible couplings for a system with the low-marginals $\mathbf{p}_L$. As in the cases of $\mathcal{P}_b$ and $\mathcal{P}_c$, we redefine this polytope in terms of $\pm 1$-variables,

$$E = \phi(\mathcal{P}),$$

(50)

and use it to define a measure of contextuality

$$\text{CNT}_0 = L_1\left(\left(\frac{\mathcal{P}_b}{\mathcal{P}_c}\right), E\right) = \frac{1}{4}L_1\left(\left(\mathbf{e}_b^T, \mathbf{e}_c^T\right), E\right).$$

(51)

To investigate the properties of $E$ and $\text{CNT}_0$ we use the following result:

**Theorem 17** (Kujala-Dzhafarov-Larsson [19]). A system represented by $(\mathbf{e}_b^T, \mathbf{e}_c^T)^T$ is noncontextual if and only
This can be understood as a special case of Theorem 3 if one uses the procedure of treating connections as if they were additional contexts, rendering thereby any system consistently connected [11]. Here and in the following we write $s_1(e_b^i, e_c^j)$ instead of the more correct $s_1((e_b^i, e_c^j)^T)$.

It is evident now that the entire development in Sections VII to X can be repeated with $E$ replacing $E_b$, except that the ambient cube $C$, extended noncontextuality polytope $N$, and the box $R$ circumscribing $E$ (replacing, respectively, $C_b$, $N_b$, and $R_b$) are $2n$-dimensional rather than $n$-dimensional, and the value of $\Delta$ that defines the polytope is $2n - 2$. In particular, the shape of the polytope $N$ is always a $2n$-demicube, the convex hull of the $2^{2n-1}$ even vertices of $C_b$, similar to the one shown in the right-hand panels of Fig. 5 except that the minimal meaningful number of dimensions has to be 4 (representing a cyclic system of rank 2). The following analogue of Theorem 15 then holds.

**Theorem 18.** The $L_1$-distance between $E$ and a point $(e_b^i, e_c^j)^T$ representing a contextual system is a single-coordinate distance, equal to $s_1(e_b^i, e_c^j) - (2n - 2)$ for all coordinates. This is the value of $\text{CNT}_0$.

It is easy to see now that

$$\text{CNT}_0 = \text{CNT}_1 = \text{CNT}_2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (52)

Indeed, the single-coordinate $L_1$-distance mentioned in the theorem can be taken along an $e_b$-coordinate or along an $e_c$-coordinate, and with all other coordinates being fixed at appropriate values, this will be a single-coordinate $L_1$-distance from, respectively, $E_b$ or $E_c$. Since we know that

$$\text{CNT}_1 = \text{CNT}_2 = s_1(e_b^i) - \Delta,$$  \hspace{1cm} (53)

and that

$$\text{CNT}_0 = s_1(e_b^i, e_c^j) - (2n - 2),$$  \hspace{1cm} (54)

we have an indirect proof that when $s_1(e_b^i, e_c^j) > (2n - 2)$ (i.e., the system is contextual),

$$s_1(e_b^i, e_c^j) = s_1(e_b^i) + n - \delta.$$  \hspace{1cm} (55)

Note that $\text{CNT}_0$, like $\text{CNT}_1$ and unlike $\text{CNT}_2$, cannot be naturally extended to a noncontextuality measure. Because $e_b^i$ consists of the maximal possible values of $e^{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ ($i = 1, \ldots, n$), any point $(e_b^i, e_c^j)^T$ representing a noncontextual system should lie on the surface of the polytope $E$, yielding

$$s_1(e_b^i, e_c^j) - (2n - 2) = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (56)

The argument leading to this conclusion was presented in Ref. [13] for $E_c$. When applied to $E$, it goes as follows: if $(e_b^i, e_c^j)^T$ were an interior point of $E$, it would be surrounded by a $2n$-ball entirely within $E$, and one would be able to increase any component of $e_b^i$ while remaining within this ball, which is not possible. $\text{CNT}_2$ remains the only one of the contextuality measures considered in the literature that can be naturally extended into a noncontextuality measure.

**X. CONCLUSION WITH A GLIMPSE INTO NON-CYCLIC SYSTEMS**

Most of the regularities established in this paper do not generalize to non-cyclic systems. In particular, $\text{CNT}_1$ and $\text{CNT}_2$ do not generally coincide, nor one of them is any function of the other. This can be seen in Fig. 14 that presents the values of $\text{CNT}_1$ and $\text{CNT}_2$ for several systems obtained by modifying the non-cyclic PR3 box system described in Ref [10]. The PR3 box system is given by

$$\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c}
A_1^1 & A_1^2 & \cdots & A_1^n & e_1 \\
A_2^1 & A_2^2 & \cdots & A_2^n & e_2 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
A_n^1 & A_n^2 & \cdots & A_n^n & e_n \\
\end{array}$$

(57)

where $A_i^j$ are ±1-random variables with $e_i^k = 0$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, 6, k = 1, \ldots, 9$. In the original system $e_{23} = e_{45} = -1$, and $e_{ij} = 1$ in all other contexts. We have looked at the changes in the values of $\text{CNT}_1$ and $\text{CNT}_2$ in response to two ways of modifying these parameters, described in the legend of Fig. 14. For each combination of the parameters, $\text{CNT}_1$ and $\text{CNT}_2$ were computed by means of linear programming [18], provided the corresponding system was contextual. We see that in none of these cases $\text{CNT}_1$ and $\text{CNT}_2$ were equal to each other. Moreover, we can see that no functional relation between the two is satisfied either: for either of the measures, there are pairs of systems with different values of this measure at a fixed value of the other.

It might be tempting to think that cyclic systems could help one in at least detecting if not measuring (non)contextuality of a system. Clearly, if a system contains a contextual cyclic subsystem, then it is contextual. This is not surprising, however, because this is true for any contextual subsystem, cyclic or not [10][11]. Could it be, one might wonder, that a system is always noncontextual if it does not contain a contextual cyclic subsystem? The answer is negative, as we see from the following counterexample. Let a system of dichotomous random variables be

$$\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c}
R_1^1 & R_1^2 & R_1^3 & R_1^4 & e_1 \\
R_2^1 & R_2^2 & R_2^3 & R_2^4 & e_2 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
R_n^1 & R_n^2 & R_n^3 & R_n^4 & e_n \\
\end{array}$$

(58)

with four contents measured in three contexts. Let the
Because the variables in each bunch are pairwise independent, their joint (here, pairwise) distributions coincide. There is no reason for preferring CNT$_1$ to CNT$_2$, or vice versa. Although CNT$_1$ and CNT$_2$ are noncontextual, NCNT$_1$ and NCNT$_2$ are not: both violations of the generalized Bell criterion derive in Ref. [18], the reason for this is that in this hypothetical coupling we should have $(S_1^1, S_2^1) = (S_3^3, S_4^3)$, and $(S_2^2, S_1^2) = (S_2^3, S_2^3)$. It turns out that $s_2 + s_3 = -1$ only if $(S_3^3, S_4^3) = (1, 1)$. This competes the counterexample.

To summarize, we know now that the regular way in which the noncontextuality polytopes $P_b/E_b$ and the polytope of all possible couplings $P/E$ create pockets at the vertices of the circumscribing boxes makes CNT$_1$ and CNT$_2$ single-coordinate distances that are equal to each other. Both of them are proportional to the degree of violation of the generalized Bell criterion derived in Ref. [17], $s_1 (e_0) - \Delta$. We have known from Ref. [18], that the noncontextuality polytope $P_b/E_b$ and the polytope of all possible couplings $P/E$ create pockets at the vertices of the circumscribing boxes makes CNT$_1$ and CNT$_2$ single-coordinate distances that are equal to each other. Both of them are proportional to the degree of violation of the generalized Bell criterion derived in Ref. [17], $s_1 (e_0) - \Delta$. We have known from Ref. [18], that CNT$_2$, unlike CNT$_1$, naturally extends to a measure of noncontextuality, NCNT$_2$, and this can be taken as a reason for preferring CNT$_2$ to CNT$_1$. NCNT$_2$ is a single-coordinate distance, and in the case of cyclic systems, the properties of the noncontextuality polytope make NCNT$_2$ proportional, with the same proportionality coefficient as for CNT$_2$ and CNT$_1$, to the smaller of two quantities: the degree of compliance with the generalized Bell inequality, $\Delta - s_1 (e_0)$, and the distance $m (e_0)$ from the surface of the circumscribing box $\mathbb{R}_b$. We also know that none of these regularities extend beyond the class of cyclic systems, so the general theory of the relationship between the measures considered in this paper has much left to develop.

$\mathbf{99}$

$$\begin{array}{c|c|c}
 R^1_k & R^2_k & R^3_k \\
 \hline
 -1 & -1 & +1 \\
 -1 & +1 & -1 \\
 +1 & -1 & -1 \\
 +1 & +1 & +1 \\
 \end{array}$$

Here, the probabilities of the triples of values in each bunch are shown in the rightmost columns, with all remaining triples having probability zero. One can check that all random variables are distributed uniformly,

$$\Pr [R^k_1 = -1] = \Pr [R^k_2 = +1] = \frac{1}{2},$$

so the system is consistently connected. All pairs $(R^k_i, R^k_j)$ are also uniformly distributed.

$$\begin{array}{c|c|c}
 R^k_i & R^k_j \\
 \hline
 -1 & -1 \\
 -1 & +1 \\
 +1 & -1 \\
 +1 & +1 \\
 \end{array}$$

This means that the system is strongly consistently connected: whenever a set of contents is measured in two contexts, their joint (here, pairwise) distributions coincide. Because the variables in each bunch are pairwise independent, any cyclic subsystem of this system is noncontextual. The entire system, however, is contextual. Indeed, in the hypothetical coupling satisfying the definition of noncontextuality, if $(S_1^1, S_2^1, S_3^1) = (-1, -1, 1)$, then $(S_2^2, S_3^2, S_4^2)$ can only be $(-1, -1, 1)$, and $(S_3^3, S_4^3)$ can only be $(-1, 1, 1)$. The reason for this is that in this hypothetical coupling we should have $(S_1^1, S_2^1) = (S_3^3, S_4^3)$, and $(S_2^2, S_3^2) = (S_2^3, S_2^3)$. However it should also be true that $(S_2^2, S_4^2) = (S_3^3, S_4^3)$, and this is not the case in the above triples: $(S_2^2, S_4^2) = (-1, -1)$ while $(S_3^3, S_4^3) = (1, 1)$. This competes the counterexample.

To summarize, we know now that the regular way in which the noncontextuality polytopes $P_b/E_b$ and the polytope of all possible couplings $P/E$ create pockets at the vertices of the circumscribing boxes makes CNT$_1$ and CNT$_2$ single-coordinate distances that are equal to each other. Both of them are proportional to the degree of violation of the generalized Bell criterion derived in Ref. [17], $s_1 (e_0) - \Delta$. We have known from Ref. [18], that CNT$_2$, unlike CNT$_1$, naturally extends to a measure of noncontextuality, NCNT$_2$, and this can be taken as a reason for preferring CNT$_2$ to CNT$_1$. NCNT$_2$ is a single-coordinate distance, and in the case of cyclic systems, the properties of the noncontextuality polytope make NCNT$_2$ proportional, with the same proportionality coefficient as for CNT$_2$ and CNT$_1$, to the smaller of two quantities: the degree of compliance with the generalized Bell inequality, $\Delta - s_1 (e_0)$, and the distance $m (e_0)$ from the surface of the circumscribing box $\mathbb{R}_b$. We also know that none of these regularities extend beyond the class of cyclic systems, so the general theory of the relationship between the measures considered in this paper has much left to develop.
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