On the structure of quantum and classical implementations of Popescu-Rohrlich box

Anna Jenčová and Martin Plávala

Mathematical Institute, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Štefánikova 49, Bratislava, Slovakia

We construct implementations of PR boxes using quantum and classical channels as state spaces. In both cases our constructions are very similar and they share the same idea taken from general probabilistic theories and the square state space model. We construct all quantum qubit channels that maximally violate a given CHSH inequality, we show that they all are measure-and-prepare channels and that they have certain block-diagonal structure and we present some examples of such channels.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Bell non-locality is a well known topic in quantum theory, yet we still lack full understanding of its implications. The research of Bell non-locality was inspired by the famous paradox of Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen [1] that questioned the completeness of quantum theory.

As it was later shown by Bell [2] the EPR paradox does not question the completeness of quantum theory, but it rather separates it from any other classical theory. This was demonstrated by the well-known Bell inequalities, that constrain any classical theory but are violated by quantum theory. Probably the most well known and most studied of Bell inequalities is the CHSH inequality [3] that can be violated by quantum states and measurements, but this violation is constrained by the Tsirelson bound [4]. On one hand this shows that quantum theory is more non-local than any classical theory, on the other hand, Popescu and Rohrlich proved that the CHSH inequality may be violated even more by a non-signaling theory [5]. Since then, it is a long-standing question whether the Tsirelson bound does have any operational meaning for quantum theory. The non-signaling theories that maximally violate CHSH inequality are called Popescu-Rohrlich boxes, or PR-boxes, and it was shown that the existence of such systems in real world would have several rather interesting implications [6–8], see also [9] for a review.

In the present paper, we study the CHSH inequality in the framework of general probabilistic theories. We show that for any theory, we can construct an implementation of a PR-box if and only if there are pairs of maximally incompatible measurements. This construction is then applied to obtain quantum and classical non-local and non-signaling channels that maximally violate the CHSH inequality. In the case of quantum theory we will obtain the already known results [10–13] but for qubits (two-dimensional input and output spaces) we will characterize all such channels, moreover, we prove that all these channels must be measure-and-prepare.

One has to be careful when using channels as described below. The formalism implies that we are able to use the channel only once, hence we will be exploiting input state incompatibility of measurements on channels [14]. From a realistic viewpoint it is important to remember that using a non-local channel may take some time and resources, but it is communication only if the channel is signaling. Nevertheless, we still show that both classical and quantum channels provide superquantum correlations and maximal violations of CHSH inequality in a non-signaling scenario, hence they are an implementation of PR box.

The article is organized as follows: in Sec. II we give a quick overview of general probabilistic theories as it will be used in later calculations. In Sec. III we derive the results using the square state space model and we apply them to classical and quantum channels in Sec. IV, respectively to reconstruct the results presented in [10–13]. In Sec. VI we derive the structure of all qubit quantum channels that maximally violate the given CHSH inequality, prove some of their properties and provide some examples.

II. OVERVIEW OF GENERAL PROBABILISTIC THEORIES AND TENSOR PRODUCTS

General probabilistic theories provide a framework that describes measurements of a physical systems in a general and mathematically clear way. We briefly describe the formalism below, which is useful for calculations and allows to obtain general results applicable to various state spaces. Since it will be sufficient for all of our calculations, we will only consider theories with finite dimensional state spaces and only two-outcome measurements.

A. Structure of general probabilistic theories

Let V be a finite dimensional real vector space with the standard Euclidean topology and let K ⊂ V be a compact convex set. The points of K are interpreted as states of the system and the convex combination is interpreted operationally, that is the state λx + (1 − λ)y corresponds to having x with probability λ and y with probability 1 − λ.

Let A(K) denote the linear space of real-valued affine functions on K. We will denote constant functions by the
value they attain. Let \( f, g \in A(K) \), then we introduce an ordering to \( A(K) \) as follows: \( f \geq g \) if and only if for every \( x \in K \) we have \( f(x) \geq g(x) \). Let \( A(K)^+ = \{ f \in A(K) : f \geq 0 \} \) denote the convex, closed, generating, pointed cone of positive functions and let \( E(K) = \{ f \in A(K) : 0 \leq f \leq 1 \} \) denote the set of effects on \( K \), called the effect algebra. The effect algebra \( E(K) \) is important in general probabilistic theories as every finite-outcome measurement is described by a collection of effects that sum up to 1. The condition \( 0 \leq f \leq 1 \) is imposed to make the probabilities of obtaining the measurement outcomes positive.

Denote \( A(K)^* \) the dual of \( A(K) \) and denote \( A(K)^{++} \) the positive cone dual to \( A(K)^+ \), i.e.

\[
A(K)^{++} = \{ \psi' \in A(K)^* : \psi'(f) \geq 0, \forall f \in A(K)^+ \}.
\]

\( K \) is isomorphic to the state space \( \{ \psi' \in A(K)^{++} : \psi'(1) = 1 \} \), see [15] Chapter 1, Theorem 4.3. For simplicity we will omit this isomorphism and we will treat \( K \) as a subset of \( A(K)^* \).

The cone \( A(K)^{++} \) is generating, so we can express every \( \psi \in A(K)^* \) as

\[
\psi = \alpha x - \beta y
\]

for some \( x, y \in K \) and \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}, \alpha, \beta \geq 0 \). Remember, that we are omitting the isomorphism between \( K \) and \( \{ \psi' \in A(K)^{++} : \psi'(1) = 1 \} \).

The cone \( A(K)^{++} \) gives rise to an ordering on \( A(K)^* \), let \( \psi, \varphi \in A(K)^* \), then \( \psi \geq \varphi \) if and only if \( \psi - \varphi \in A(K)^{++} \), i.e. if \( \psi - \varphi \geq 0 \).

Now will present a simple definition of a two-outcome measurement in general probabilistic theories. Generally speaking, measurement is a procedure that assigns probabilities to possible measurement outcomes. For simplicity we will restrict ourselves to only two-outcome measurement with outcomes labeled by the numbers \(-1, 1\). Let \( f \in E(K) \) and \( x \in K \), then the effect \( f \) corresponds to a two-outcome measurement \( A \) with outcomes labeled by \( 1 \) and \(-1\), such that for \( x \in K \), we have

\[
P_x(A = 1) = f(x),
\]

\[
P_x(A = -1) = (1 - f)(x) = 1 - f(x).
\]

where \( P_x(A = 0) \) denotes the probability of obtaining the outcome labeled as 1 when we measure a system in the state \( x \) and \( P_x(A = -1) \) denotes the probability of obtaining the outcome labeled as \(-1\). It is easy to see that \( P_x(A = 1) + P_x(A = -1) = 1 \).

Measurements with a finite number of outcomes are similarly described by collections of effects \( f_i \in E(K) \), such that \( \sum \psi = 1 \). For a more general treatment of measurements see e.g. [10] Section 2.2.

### B. Tensor products and bipartite systems in general probabilistic theories

Composite systems in general probabilistic theories are described by tensor products of the state spaces. For simplicity, we will only consider the tensor product of a state space \( K \subset V \) with itself.

There are several ways how to define the tensor product of compact convex sets, but there is a minimal and a maximal one. All these sets are compact convex subsets in the tensor product of the containing vector spaces.

The minimal tensor product, denoted \( K \otimes K \) is the convex hull of the points of the form \( x \otimes y \) for \( x, y \in K \), i.e.

\[
K \otimes K = \text{conv}\{ x \otimes y : x, y \in K \}.
\]

To give more insight into the definition, we will give an example using the state space of quantum theory. Let \( \mathcal{H} \) be a finite dimensional complex Hilbert space, \( \dim(\mathcal{H}) = \dim(\mathcal{H}) \), let \( B_\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H}) \) denote the set of self-adjoint operators on \( \mathcal{H} \) and let \( \mathcal{S}_\mathcal{H} = \{ \rho \in B_\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H}) : \rho \geq 0, \text{Tr}(\rho) = 1 \} \) denote the set of states on \( \mathcal{H} \), where \( \rho \geq 0 \) means that \( \rho \) is positive semi-definite and \( \text{Tr}(\rho) \) denotes the trace of \( \rho \), that is sum of diagonal elements of the matrix. \( \mathcal{I} \) denotes the identity operator.

Consider \( \mathcal{S}_\mathcal{H} \) as a state space in the sense of general probabilistic theories, then \( \mathcal{S}_\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{S}_\mathcal{H} \) is the set of all separable states.

The maximal tensor product, denoted \( K \hat{\otimes} K \), is the state space of all no-signaling states, that is

\[
K \hat{\otimes} K = \{ \psi \in A(K)^* \otimes A(K)^* : \psi(f \otimes g) \geq 0, \forall f, g \in A(K)^+ \}
\]

where \( A(K)^* \otimes A(K)^* \) denotes the tensor product of vector spaces. In quantum theory, the set \( \mathcal{S}_\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{S}_\mathcal{H} \) is the set of all (normalized) entanglement witnesses [17] Definition 6.38).

The real tensor product, denoted by \( K \otimes K \), is the set of all bipartite states of a given theory. It does not have any general definition as it is specified by the theory we are working with. We only require that it is a state space, that is, a compact convex subset in \( V \otimes V \), such that

\[
K \otimes K \subseteq K \hat{\otimes} K \subseteq K \otimes K.
\]

In quantum theory we have \( \mathcal{S}_\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{S}_\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}} \), so in this case, all of the inclusions are strict.

Consider a bipartite system \( K \otimes K \) and let \( A, B \) be measurements on \( K \) corresponding to effects \( f_A, f_B \). The measurements \( A, B \) give rise to a measurement \( A \otimes B \), with four outcomes, on the bipartite system as follows: let \( x \in K \otimes K \), then

\[
P_x(A = 1, B = 1) = (f_A \otimes f_B)(x),
\]

\[
P_x(A = 1, B = -1) = (f_A \otimes (1 - f_B))(x),
\]

\[
P_x(A = -1, B = 1) = ((1 - f_A) \otimes f_B)(x),
\]

\[
P_x(A = -1, B = -1) = ((1 - f_A) \otimes (1 - f_B))(x).
\]
The probabilities of the measurement $A \otimes B$ are well defined as we have $K \otimes K \subset K \otimes K$. Moreover we can reconstruct the original marginal measurements $A$, $B$ by summing over the other one; i.e. we always have

$$P_x(A = 1, B) = P_x(A = 1, B = 1) + P_x(A = 1, B = -1).$$ (1)

For the probabilities given by Eq. (1) to be well defined we must require that the marginal probability $P_x(A = 1)$ is the same for every possible measurement $B$, or in other words if $B$ and $B'$ are any two measurements on $K$ then we must have

$$P_x(A = 1, B) = P_x(A = 1, B').$$

The condition (2) together with the analogical

$$P_x(B, A = 1) = P_x(B', A = 1).$$

are called a non-signaling conditions because they mean that neither side can signal to the other by only using different local measurements and without announcing the outcome of the measurement. It is easy to see that it is satisfied precisely when the state $x$ is in $K \otimes K$.

C. Review of CHSH inequality

We provide a very short introduction to the CHSH inequality. We define a correlation $E(A, B)$ between the measurements $A$ and $B$ as

$$E(A, B) = P_x(A = 1, B = 1) - P_x(A = 1, B = -1) - P_x(A = -1, B = 1) + P_x(A = -1, B = -1).$$

It is straightforward that we have $-1 \leq E(A, B) \leq 1$. The correlations play a central role in the formulation of the CHSH inequality.

Assume that we have a bipartite system and we have two-outcome measurements $A$ and $A'$ on the first part of the system and two-outcome measurements $B$ and $B'$ on the second part, then the CHSH quantity $X_{CHSH}$ is given as

$$X_{CHSH} = |E(A, B) + E(A', B') + E(A', B) - E(A', B')|.$$ 

It is known that in classical theories we have $X_{CHSH} \leq 2$, while in quantum theory the Tsirelson bound gives $X_{CHSH} \leq 2\sqrt{2}$. The maximal possible value is $X_{CHSH} = 4$, this is the value that was shown by Popescu and Rohrlich to be reachable by a non-signaling theory.

III. CALCULATION

It is known that for some systems the degree of compatibility of measurements is tied to violation of the CHSH inequality [18, 19] and it is known that the square state space described below is the simplest on which there are maximally incompatible measurements [20, 21].

The square $S$ is a state space with four extreme points $s_{00}, s_{10}, s_{01}, s_{11}$, such that

$$\frac{1}{2}(s_{00} + s_{11}) = \frac{1}{2}(s_{10} + s_{01}).$$

Let $f, g \in E(S)$ be given as

$$f(s_{00}) = f(s_{01}) = g(s_{00}) = g(s_{10}) = 0,$$

$$f(s_{11}) = g(s_{01}) = g(s_{11}) = 1.$$

Let $A, B$ be the corresponding two-outcome measurements with values labeled by $-1$ and $1$, so that for $s \in S$ the outcome probabilities are given as

$$P_s(A = 1) = f(s),$$

$$P_s(A = -1) = (1 - f)(s),$$

$$P_s(B = 1) = g(s),$$

$$P_s(B = -1) = (1 - g)(s).$$

These two measurements are maximally incompatible [20, 21]. We will now find a state $\phi \in S \otimes S$ such that the CHSH inequality is maximally violated if the same pair of measurements measurements $A, B$ is applied in both parts.

It is easy to see that for maximal CHSH violation in any theory, that is for $X_{CHSH} = 4$, it is necessary and sufficient that we have

$$P_\phi(A = 1, A = 1) + P_\phi(A = -1, A = -1) = 1,$$

$$P_\phi(A = 1, B = 1) + P_\phi(A = -1, B = -1) = 1,$$

$$P_\phi(B = 1, A = 1) + P_\phi(B = -1, A = -1) = 1,$$

$$P_\phi(B = 1, B = -1) + P_\phi(B = -1, B = 1) = 1,$$

with all other probabilities equal to 0. From


and

$$P_\phi(A = 1, B) = P_\phi(A = 1, B = 1) + P_\phi(A = 1, B = -1) = P_\phi(A = 1, B = 1)$$

one easily concludes that the non-signaling condition [2] implies

$$P_\phi(A = 1, A = 1) = P_\phi(A = 1, B = 1).$$

In a similar fashion one may show

$$P_\phi(A = 1, B = 1) = P_\phi(B = 1, A = 1) = P_\phi(B = -1, B = 1) = P_\phi(A = -1, A = -1)$$
This implies that all of the non-zero probabilities must be equal to \( \frac{1}{2} \), i.e.

\[
P_\phi(A = 1, A = 1) = P_\phi(A = -1, A = -1) = \frac{1}{2},
\]

\[
P_\phi(A = 1, B = 1) = P_\phi(A = -1, B = -1) = \frac{1}{2},
\]

\[
P_\phi(B = 1, A = 1) = P_\phi(B = -1, A = -1) = \frac{1}{2},
\]

\[
P_\phi(B = 1, B = -1) = P_\phi(B = -1, B = 1) = \frac{1}{2}.
\]

Every \( \phi \in A(S)^* \otimes A(S)^* \) can be written as

\[
\phi = \psi_{00} \otimes s_{00} + \psi_{10} \otimes s_{10} + \psi_{01} \otimes s_{01}
\]

for some \( \psi_{00}, \psi_{10}, \psi_{01} \in A(S)^* \). Since we require \( \phi \in S \otimes S \) we must have

\[
1(\psi_{00} + \psi_{10} + \psi_{01}) = 1
\]

and

\[
\psi_{10} \geq 0 \quad \psi_{00} + \psi_{10} \geq 0 \\
\psi_{01} \geq 0 \quad \psi_{00} + \psi_{01} \geq 0
\]

is obtained by applying the maps \( 1 \otimes 1, \text{id} \otimes f, \text{id} \otimes (1-f), \text{id} \otimes g, \text{id} \otimes (1-g) \) to \( \phi \), where \( \text{id} \) denotes the identity map. From the Eq. (3) – (6) we get

\[
\psi_{10}(f) = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \psi_{10}(1-f) = 0,
\]

\[
(\psi_{00} + \psi_{01})(f) = 0, \quad (\psi_{00} + \psi_{01})(1-f) = \frac{1}{2},
\]

\[
\psi_{01}(f) = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \psi_{01}(1-f) = 0,
\]

\[
(\psi_{00} + \psi_{10})(f) = 0, \quad (\psi_{00} + \psi_{10})(1-f) = \frac{1}{2},
\]

\[
\psi_{10}(g) = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \psi_{10}(1-g) = 0,
\]

\[
(\psi_{00} + \psi_{01})(g) = 0, \quad (\psi_{00} + \psi_{01})(1-g) = \frac{1}{2},
\]

\[
\psi_{01}(g) = 0, \quad \psi_{01}(1-g) = \frac{1}{2},
\]

\[
(\psi_{00} + \psi_{10})(g) = \frac{1}{2}, \quad (\psi_{00} + \psi_{10})(1-g) = 0,
\]

which has a solution

\[
\psi_{00} = \frac{1}{2}(s_{00} - s_{10}),
\]

\[
\psi_{10} = \frac{1}{2}s_{11},
\]

\[
\psi_{01} = \frac{1}{2}s_{10}.
\]

This gives

\[
\phi = \frac{1}{2}((s_{00} - s_{10}) \otimes s_{00} + s_{11} \otimes s_{10} + s_{10} \otimes s_{01}).
\]

Let now \( K \) be any state space and let \( f, g \in E(K) \). By [20], these effects correspond to maximally incompatible measurements if and only if there are four points \( x_{00}, x_{10}, x_{01}, x_{11} \in K \) satisfying

\[
\frac{1}{2}(x_{00} + x_{11}) = \frac{1}{2}(x_{10} + x_{01})
\]

and such that

\[
\begin{align*}
f(x_{00}) &= f(x_{01}) = g(x_{00}) = g(x_{10}) = 0, \\
f(x_{10}) &= f(x_{11}) = g(x_{01}) = g(x_{11}) = 1.
\end{align*}
\]

We will call such a set of points a witness square for \( f, g \). Using these points, we can define an element in \( V \otimes V \) similarly as in Eq. (7). If this element describes a bipartite state of the given theory, then we know that such system is an implementation of a PR box. In other words:

**Proposition 1.** Let \( K \) be a state space on which there exists a pair of maximally incompatible measurements and let \( x_{00}, x_{10}, x_{01}, x_{11} \in K \) be the corresponding witness square. Then \( K \) is an implementation of a PR box if

\[
\frac{1}{2}((x_{00} - x_{10}) \otimes x_{00} + x_{11} \otimes x_{10} + x_{10} \otimes x_{01}) \in K \otimes K.
\]

The following result shows that the condition in Prop. 1 only depends on the choice of the tensor product.

**Proposition 2.** Let \( K \) be a state space on which there exists a pair of maximally incompatible measurements and let \( x_{00}, x_{10}, x_{01}, x_{11} \in K \) be the corresponding witness square. Then

\[
\frac{1}{2}((x_{00} - x_{10}) \otimes x_{00} + x_{11} \otimes x_{10} + x_{10} \otimes x_{01}) \in K \otimes K.
\]

**Proof.** Let \( S = \text{conv}(s_{00}, s_{10}, s_{01}, s_{11}) \) be the square as used in the calculations above and define an affine map \( \iota : S \to K, \iota(s_{ij}) = x_{ij} \) for \( i, j \in \{0, 1\} \). The map \( \iota \) gives rise to an adjoint map \( \iota^* : A(K) \to A(S) \) given for \( h \in A(K) \) and \( s \in S \) as

\[
(\iota^* h)(s) = h(\iota(s)).
\]

Notice that if \( h \in A(K)^+ \), then we have \( \iota^* h \in A(S)^+ \).

Let \( \phi \in S \otimes S \) be as given by Eq. (7), then we have

\[
(\iota \otimes \iota)(\phi) = \frac{1}{2}((x_{00} - x_{10}) \otimes x_{00} + x_{11} \otimes x_{10} + x_{10} \otimes x_{01})
\]

and for every \( h_1, h_2 \in A(K)^+ \) we get

\[
(h_1 \otimes h_2)((\iota \otimes \iota)(\phi)) = ((\iota^* h_1) \otimes (\iota^* h_2))(\phi) \geq 0
\]

as \( \phi \in S \otimes S \) and \( \iota^* h_i \in A(S)^+ \). It follows that \( (\iota \otimes \iota)(\phi) \in K \otimes K. \)

\[\square\]
Let us note that also conversely, any implementation of a PR box requires a pair of maximally incompatible two-outcome measurements (or, more precisely, two pairs, but here we assume that the same pair is applied in both parts). Indeed, let \( f, g \in E(K) \) and \( \phi \in K \otimes K \) be such that the equalities (3)-(6) hold and put

\[
x_{00} = (f \otimes 1, \phi), \quad x_{11} = ((1-f) \otimes 1, \phi),
\]
\[
x_{01} = (g \otimes 1, \phi), \quad x_{10} = ((1-g) \otimes 1, \phi),
\]

then it can be seen that \( 2r_{i,j} \in K \) and these elements form a witness square for \( f, g \).

## IV. THE CASE OF CLASSICAL CHANNELS

Let \( \mathcal{S}_C = \text{conv}(s_0, s_1) \) be a line segment that represents the state space of the classical bit. A channel \( \mathcal{S}_C \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_C \) is defined as an affine map. The set \( C_C \) of all channels (on the classical bit) can be viewed as a state space of some theory. It can be seen that each effect on \( C_C \) has the form

\[
F_{s,f}(\Phi) = f(\Phi(s)), \quad \Phi \in C_C
\]

for some state \( s \in \mathcal{S}_C \) and an effect \( f \in E(\mathcal{S}_C) \). Moreover, the tensor product \( C_C \otimes C_C \) can be identified with the set of classical bipartite channels satisfying the no-signalling condition.

We will show that we may apply our results in this setting. First, let us find a pair of effects that defines a pair of maximally incompatible two-outcome measurements.

Define the channels \( \Phi_{s_0}, \Phi_{s_1}, \Phi_{id}, \Phi_{not} : \mathcal{S}_C \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_C \) as follows

\[
\Phi_{s_0}(s_0) = s_0, \quad \Phi_{s_0}(s_1) = s_0,
\]
\[
\Phi_{s_1}(s_0) = s_1, \quad \Phi_{s_1}(s_1) = s_1,
\]
\[
\Phi_{id}(s_0) = s_0, \quad \Phi_{id}(s_1) = s_1,
\]
\[
\Phi_{not}(s_0) = s_1, \quad \Phi_{not}(s_1) = s_0.
\]

Let \( f \in E(\mathcal{S}_C) \) be given as \( f(s_0) = 0 \) and \( f(s_1) = 1 \). We will consider the two-outcome measurements \( A, B \), given by the effects \( F_{s_1,f} \) and \( F_{s_0,f} \), respectively, that is,

\[
P_\Phi(A = 1) = f(\Phi(s_1)),
\]
\[
P_\Phi(A = -1) = (1-f)(\Phi(s_1)),
\]
\[
P_\Phi(B = 1) = f(\Phi(s_0)),
\]
\[
P_\Phi(B = -1) = (1-f)(\Phi(s_0)).
\]

Notice that

\[
P_{\Phi_{s_0}}(A = 1) = 0, \quad P_{\Phi_{s_0}}(B = 1) = 0,
\]
\[
P_{\Phi_{s_1}}(A = 1) = 1, \quad P_{\Phi_{s_1}}(B = 1) = 0,
\]
\[
P_{\Phi_{not}}(A = 1) = 0, \quad P_{\Phi_{not}}(B = 1) = 1,
\]
\[
P_{\Phi_{s_1}}(A = 1) = 1, \quad P_{\Phi_{s_1}}(B = 1) = 1,
\]

so that the four channels form a witness square for \( A, B \). Hence the two measurements are maximally incompatible.

Now we can construct the channel \( \Phi \) as

\[
\Phi(s_0 \otimes s_0) = \frac{1}{2}(s_1 \otimes s_0 + s_0 \otimes s_1),
\]
\[
\Phi(s_1 \otimes s_0) = \frac{1}{2}(s_0 \otimes s_0 + s_1 \otimes s_1),
\]
\[
\Phi(s_0 \otimes s_1) = \frac{1}{2}(s_0 \otimes s_0 + s_1 \otimes s_1),
\]
\[
\Phi(s_1 \otimes s_1) = \frac{1}{2}(s_0 \otimes s_0 + s_1 \otimes s_1).
\]

It follows by Props. [1] and [1] (but is also straightforward to verify directly) that this channel, together with the measurements \( A, B \) provides a maximal violation of the CHSH inequality.

## V. THE CASE OF QUANTUM CHANNELS

For quantum channels we will use the example of maximally incompatible measurements on quantum channels that was already presented in [20] and apply the results of Prop. [1].

Quantum channel is a completely positive and trace preserving linear map \( \Phi : B_h(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow B_h(\mathcal{H}) \). The set of channels is isomorphic to the set of Choi matrices

\[
C(\mathcal{H}) = \{ A \in B_h(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}) : A \geq 0, \text{Tr}_1(A) = 1 \}
\]

where \( \text{Tr}_1 \) is the partial trace over the first Hilbert space. Let \( \{|i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathcal{H})} \) be an orthonormal base of \( \mathcal{H} \), then \( |\psi^+_{\dim(\mathcal{H})}\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathcal{H})} |i\rangle \otimes |i\rangle \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H} \) is a multiple of the maximally entangled state and the Choi matrix of a channel \( \Phi \) is given as \( C(\Phi) = (\Phi \otimes id)(|\psi^+_{\dim(\mathcal{H})}\rangle \langle \psi^+_{\dim(\mathcal{H})}|) \).

Measurements on channels can be described in two ways, which are equivalent up to factoring out some redundant degrees of freedom [22, 23]. Let \( \rho \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}'} \) and let \( E_1, \ldots, E_n \in B_h(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}') \) be operators such that \( E_i \geq 0 \) for all \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \) and \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} E_i = 1 \), i.e. \( E_1, \ldots, E_n \) is a POVM [17]. The measurement on channels given by \( \rho \) and \( E_1, \ldots, E_n \) is given by the probabilities

\[
P_\Phi(A = i) = \text{Tr}( (\Phi \otimes id)(\rho) E_i )
\]

for \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \) and any quantum channel \( \Phi : B_h(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow B_h(\mathcal{H}) \). Note that we can always assume the state \( \rho \) to be pure as we can always purify it by enlarging the Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H}' \). Another way to represent a measurement on channels is by operators \( F_1, \ldots, F_n \in B_h(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}) \) such that

\[
P_\Phi(A = i) = \text{Tr}(C(\Phi)F_i)
\]

for \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \). One can show that we may always choose \( F_i \geq 0 \) for all \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \) and we must have
The channel $\Phi$ is non-signaling by construction. It is
by linearity, for every $\rho$ the CHSH inequality. Let us denote $\rho$
In this way, $\Phi$ is a channel of a bipartite causal (or no-signalling)
channel [10], here swap denotes the swap gate, that is for $X, Y \in B_h(H)$
we have
\[
\text{SWAP}(X \otimes Y) = Y \otimes X.
\]
In this way, $\mathcal{C}(H) \otimes \mathcal{C}(H)$ is isomorphic to the set $\mathcal{C}^{\otimes 2}(H \otimes H)$ of Choi matrices of no-signalling bipartite channels.
We next describe a pair of maximally incompatible two-outcome measurements on channels. Let $\rho_1, \rho_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathcal{S}_H$, such that $\rho_1 \rho_2 = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 = 0$. Then there exist projectors $M, N$, such that $M \rho_1 = \rho_1, M \rho_2 = 0, N \rho_1 = \sigma_1, N \sigma_2 = 0$. Also let us denote $M^\perp = 1 - M$, $N^\perp = 1 - N$.
Consider the channels $B_h(H) \rightarrow B_h(H)$ given for $X \in B_h(H)$ as
\[
\begin{align*}
\Phi_{00}(X) &= \text{Tr}(X) \rho_2, \\
\Phi_{10}(X) &= \text{Tr}(NX) \rho_1 + \text{Tr}(N^\perp X) \rho_2, \\
\Phi_{01}(X) &= \text{Tr}(NX) \rho_2 + \text{Tr}(N^\perp X) \rho_1, \\
\Phi_{11}(X) &= \text{Tr}(X) \rho_1
\end{align*}
\]
and the two-outcome measurements $A, B$ on the channels given as
\[
\begin{align*}
P_B(A = 1) &= \text{Tr}(\Phi_0(\sigma_1) M), \\
P_B(A = -1) &= \text{Tr}(\Phi_0(\sigma_1) M^\perp), \\
P_B(B = 1) &= \text{Tr}(\Phi_0(\sigma_2) M), \\
P_B(B = -1) &= \text{Tr}(\Phi_0(\sigma_2) M^\perp).
\end{align*}
\]
It is straightforward to verify that the measurements $A, B$ are maximally incompatible and the channels $\Phi_{00}, \Phi_{10}, \Phi_{01}, \Phi_{11}$ form a witness square for $A, B$.
Let now $\Phi$ be the tensor product element as described in Prop. [1] that would provide the maximal violation of the CHSH inequality. Let us denote $\rho_{\text{cor}} = \frac{1}{2}(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_1 + \rho_2 \otimes \rho_2)$ and $\rho_{\text{ac}} = \frac{1}{2}(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2 + \rho_2 \otimes \rho_1)$. Let $X, Y \in B_h(H)$, then we have
\[
\Phi(X \otimes Y) = \frac{1}{2} \left( (\Phi_{00}(X) - \Phi_{10}(X)) \otimes \Phi_{00}(Y) + \Phi_{11}(X) \otimes \Phi_{01}(Y) \right).
\]
By linearity, for every $\rho \in S_{H \otimes H}$ we have
\[
\Phi(\rho) = \text{Tr}(N \otimes N^\perp)(\rho) \rho_{\text{cor}} + \text{Tr}(I \otimes I - N \otimes N^\perp)(\rho) \rho_{\text{ac}}.
\]
The channel $\Phi$ is non-signaling by construction. It is straightforward to verify that the channel $\Phi$ and the measurements $A, B$ maximally violate the CHSH inequality.

VI. THE SPECIAL CASE OF NONLOCAL QUBIT CHANNELS

In the following the nonlocal channels that will play the role of entangled state will be acting on the space of two qubits, hence we term this case the nonlocal qubit channels. Let $H$ be a complex Hilbert space, $\dim(H) = 2$ and let $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ be an orthonormal base of $H$. For vectors from $H \otimes H$, we will use the shorthand $|i\rangle \otimes |j\rangle = |ij\rangle$ for $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$.
We will begin by characterizing maximally incompatible pairs of two-outcome measurements and their witness squares. Let the two measurements be given by pure states $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{H \otimes H'}$ and POVMs $M, M^\perp, N, N^\perp \in B_h(H \otimes H')$, where $0 \leq M \leq 1$, $0 \leq N \leq 1$ and $M^\perp = 1 - M$, $N^\perp = 1 - N$. Let $\ker(M)$ denote the projection onto the kernel of $M$. Then by [9] and [10], a witness square $\Phi_{00}, \Phi_{10}, \Phi_{01}, \Phi_{11} \in \mathcal{C}(H)$ must satisfy
\[
\ker(M)(\Phi_{10} \otimes \text{id})(\rho) \ker(M) = 0,
\]
and
\[
\ker(M)(\Phi_{11} \otimes \text{id})(\rho) \ker(M) = (\Phi_{00} \otimes \text{id})(\rho) + (\Phi_{01} \otimes \text{id})(\rho).
\]
From (8) it follows that
\[
(\Phi_{00} \otimes \text{id})(\rho) + (\Phi_{11} \otimes \text{id})(\rho) = (\Phi_{10} \otimes \text{id})(\rho) + (\Phi_{01} \otimes \text{id})(\rho)
\]
and after applying $\ker(M)$ we get
\[
(\Phi_{00} \otimes \text{id})(\rho) = (\Phi_{01} \otimes \text{id})(\rho).
\]
It follows that $\rho$ cannot have maximal Schmidt rank as then [12] would imply $\Phi_{00} = \Phi_{01}$ which is impossible by [9] and [10]. Since we have assumed $\dim(H) = 2$, it follows that $\rho$ must have Schmidt rank 1, i.e. $\rho$ must be a pure product state, so we can assume $\rho = |x\rangle \langle x|$ for some $|x\rangle \in H$, $||x|| = 1$, and $M \in B_h(H)$, since $\rho$ is not entangled and we do not need the ancillary Hilbert space $H'$. From
\[
\text{Tr}(\Phi_{10}(|x\rangle \langle x|)M) = \text{Tr}(\Phi_{11}(|x\rangle \langle x|)M) = 1
\]
and
\[
\text{Tr}(\Phi_{00}(|x\rangle \langle x|)M) = \text{Tr}(\Phi_{01}(|x\rangle \langle x|)M) = 0
\]
it follows that there must be an orthonormal basis $|\xi_0\rangle, |\xi_1\rangle$ of $H$ such that
\[
M = |\xi_1\rangle \langle \xi_1|,
\]
\[
M^\perp = |\xi_0\rangle \langle \xi_0|
\]
and for $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$ we have
\[
\Phi_{ij}(|x\rangle \langle x|) = |\xi_i\rangle \langle \xi_i|.
\]
In a similar fashion, one can show that we must have
\[ \sigma = \ket{y}ra{y} \text{ for some } \ket{y} \in \mathcal{H}, \quad \| \ket{y} \|^2 = 1, \]
and that there is an orthonormal basis \( \ket{\eta_0}, \ket{\eta_1} \) of \( \mathcal{H} \) such that
\[
N = \ket{\eta_1}ra{\eta_1},
N^\perp = \ket{\eta_0}ra{\eta_0},
\]
and for \( i, j \in \{0, 1\} \) we have
\[
\Phi_{ij}(\ket{y}ra{y}) = \ket{\eta_j}ra{\eta_j}.
\]
Let \( T \in B(\mathcal{H}) \) be given by \( T\ket{x} = \ket{y} \) and let \( \Phi^T_{ij} = \Phi_{ij}(T \cdot T^*) \). Then \( \Phi^T_{ij} \) are completely positive maps satisfying \( [8] \), with Choi matrices
\[
C(\Phi^T_{ij}) = \left( \begin{array}{cc} \ket{\xi_i}ra{\eta_j} & X_{ij} \end{array} \right)
\]
where \( X_{ij} \in B(\mathcal{H}) \). It follows by positivity of \( C(\Phi^T_{ij}) \) that we must have
\[
X_{ij} = \ket{\xi_i}ra{\xi_i}K_{ij}\ket{\eta_j}\bra{\eta_j} = z_{ij}\ket{\xi_i}\bra{\eta_j},
\]
where \( z_{ij} \in \mathbb{C}, \quad |z_{ij}| \leq 1 \), see e.g. [24, 1.3.2 Proposition]. From Eq. [8] we get
\[
z_{00}\ket{\eta_0}\bra{\eta_0} + z_{11}\ket{\eta_1}\bra{\eta_1} = z_{10}\ket{\xi_1}\bra{\eta_0} + z_{01}\ket{\xi_0}\bra{\eta_1}
\]
from which it follows that \( z_{ij} = 0 \) for all \( i, j \in \{0, 1\} \). This implies that \( C(\Phi^T_{ij}) \) are block-diagonal matrices. In particular,
\[
0 = \text{Tr}(\Phi^T_{ij}(\ket{0}\bra{1})) = \text{Tr}(\Phi_{ij}(\ket{x}ra{y})) = \bra{x,y},
\]
so that \( \{\ket{x, \ket{y}\} \) is an orthonormal basis of \( \mathcal{H} \) and we have proved that \( \Phi_{ij} \) are block-diagonal in this basis.
We can summarize as follows.

**Proposition 3.** Any maximally incompatible pair of two-outcome measurements on qubit channels is given by PPOVMs of the form
\[
F = \ket{\xi_1}ra{\xi_1} \otimes \ket{x}ra{x}, \quad F^\perp = \ket{\xi_0}ra{\xi_0} \otimes \ket{x}ra{x},
G = \ket{\eta_1}ra{\eta_1} \otimes \ket{y}ra{y}, \quad G^\perp = \ket{\eta_0}ra{\eta_0} \otimes \ket{y}ra{y},
\]
where \( \{\ket{x, \ket{y}\} \), \( \{\ket{\xi_0}, \ket{\xi_1}\} \) and \( \{\ket{\eta_0}, \ket{\eta_1}\} \) are orthonormal bases of \( \mathcal{H} \). The Choi matrices of the corresponding witness square are of the form
\[
C_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} \ket{\xi_i}ra{\xi_i} & 0 \\ 0 & \ket{\eta_j}ra{\eta_j} \end{pmatrix}.
\]
Note that \( F, F^\perp, G, G^\perp \) are mutually orthogonal rank 1 projections in \( B(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}) \). It follows that we may fix one choice of the three bases, all other PPOVMs of possible maximally incompatible pairs are obtained by applying suitable unitary conjugations.
We are going to use the following choice: we put \( \ket{\xi_1} = \ket{\eta_1} = \ket{x} = \ket{0} \) and \( \ket{\xi_0} = \ket{\eta_0} = \ket{y} = \ket{1} \). The corresponding PPOVMs are
\[
F = \ket{00}\bra{00}, \quad F^\perp = \ket{10}\bra{10},
G = \ket{01}\bra{01}, \quad G^\perp = \ket{11}\bra{11}.
\]
and the Choi matrices of the witness square are
\[
C_{00} = \ket{1}\bra{1} \otimes \mathbb{1}, \quad C_{10} = \ket{00}\bra{00} + \ket{11}\bra{11},
C_{11} = \ket{0}\bra{0} \otimes \mathbb{1}, \quad C_{01} = \ket{10}\bra{10} + \ket{01}\bra{01}.
\]
We now describe all no-signaling bipartite qubit channels such that the use of this maximally incompatible pair leads to maximal violation of the CHSH inequality. Note that this set is a face \( \mathcal{F}_{PR} \) of \( C^{ns}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}) \) and that all other such faces, for other maximally incompatible pairs, are obtained by conjugation by unitaries controlled on the input spaces. We next show that this face, and hence all other such faces, consists entirely of measure-and-prepare channels.
So let \( C \in \mathcal{F}_{PR} \). The equations \([3]-[6]\) set the values of all
\[
\text{Tr}(C \text{ SWAP}_{23}(H \otimes H')), \quad H, H' \in \{ F, F^\perp, G, G^\perp \}
\]
Since \( \text{SWAP}_{23}(H \otimes H') \) with \( H, H' \in \{ F, F^\perp, G, G^\perp \} \) give all projections onto the product basis vectors, we see that all \( C \in \mathcal{F}_{PR} \) have the same values on the diagonal. In particular, \( \mathcal{F}_{PR} \) contains a diagonal matrix \( C_{sq} \) which corresponds to the element in \( C(\mathcal{H}) \otimes C(\mathcal{H}) \) obtained from Prop. [1]
Since \( C \) is the Choi matrix of a no-signaling bipartite channel, we must have \( C \geq 0 \) and
\[
\text{Tr}_1 C = I_3 \otimes C_{24}, \quad \text{Tr}_2 C = I_4 \otimes C_{13}
\]
for some \( C_{24}, C_{13} \geq 0 \). Since a positive matrix with zero on the diagonal must have the corresponding row and column also zero, we obtain from these conditions that
\[
C = \frac{1}{2} \left[ Z_{11} \otimes |11\rangle\langle 11| + \sum_{\alpha, \beta \in \{0, 1\}^2 \setminus \{11\}} Z_{\alpha, \beta} \otimes |\alpha\rangle\langle \beta| \right]
\]
where
\[
Z_{11} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & z_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad |z_{11}| \leq 1
\]
and for the second block,
\[
Z_{\alpha, \beta} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & x_{\alpha, \beta} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ y_{\alpha, \beta} & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = Z^*_{\beta, \alpha}, \quad \alpha \neq \beta,
\]
\[
Z_{\alpha, \alpha} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & z_{\alpha} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ z_{\alpha} & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad |z_{\alpha}| \leq 1.
\]
We see that \( C \) is block-diagonal, with the first block a product element. Let us denote the second block by \( C_2 \).
Of course it is almost impossible to get necessary and sufficient conditions for positivity of \( C_2 \), but we will later on present several possible choices of the values of \( z_{\alpha}, x_{\alpha, \beta} \).
and $y_{\alpha,\beta}$. Still the block diagonal structure of $C$ gives a non-trivial insight into the structure of no-signaling qubit channels that maximally violate the CHSH inequality. Namely, there is a separation between the cases where the input state is from the span of $|00\rangle,|01\rangle,|10\rangle$ and when it is $|11\rangle$, but there still is some freedom left in what happens in the second block.

Now we will prove that the channel $\Phi$ such that $C = C(\Phi)$ is always measure-and-prepare by showing that $C$ is always separable when considered as matrix on two copies of the four-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$. Obviously, $C$ is separable if and only if $C_2$ is separable, so we concentrate on separability of the second block. We will show that this problem can be reduced to separability of the matrix obtained by dropping the columns and rows that contain only zeros. This can be proved by using the positive-partial-transpose (or PPT for short) criterion \cite{25,26}.

**Lemma 1.** Let $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_2$ now denote the two-dimensional Hilbert space and let $\mathcal{H}_3$ denote the three-dimensional Hilbert space with the orthonormal basis $|1\rangle,|2\rangle,|3\rangle$. Let $B \in B_3(\mathcal{H}_2) \otimes B_3(\mathcal{H}_3)$ be given as

$$B = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{3} B_{\alpha,\beta} \otimes |\alpha\rangle\langle\beta| \right]$$

(13)

where

$$B_{\alpha,\alpha} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & z_{\alpha} \\ z_{\alpha} & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$B_{\alpha,\beta} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_{\alpha,\beta} \\ y_{\alpha,\beta} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha \neq \beta.$$ 

Then $C_2$ is separable if and only if $B$ is separable.

**Proof.** The idea of the proof is quite simple: $B$ is essentially $C_2$ after removing all of the rows and columns containing just zeros. Let us define the isometries $V_1 : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ and $V_2 : \mathcal{H}_3 \to \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ as

$$V_1|0\rangle = |00\rangle, \quad V_1|1\rangle = |11\rangle$$

and

$$V_2|0\rangle = |00\rangle, \quad V_2|2\rangle = |10\rangle, \quad V_2|3\rangle = |01\rangle.$$ 

Then

$$B = (V_1^* \otimes V_2^*) C_2 (V_1 \otimes V_2).$$

Since clearly $(V_1 V_1^* \otimes V_2 V_2^*) C_2 = C_2$, we see that also

$$C_2 = (V_1 \otimes V_2) B (V_1^* \otimes V_2^*).$$

The assertion is now immediate. \hfill \Box

**Lemma 2.** Let $B$ as given in Lemma 1 be positive, then it is separable.

**Proof.** Since $B$ is proportional to a state in $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_3}$, it is separable if and only if it is positive under partial transpose. We will apply the transpose to the first part, so we will show that the matrix

$$B^T = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{3} B_{\alpha,\beta}^T \otimes |\alpha\rangle\langle\beta| \right]$$

is positive. Let $V \in B_3(\mathcal{H}_2)$ be given as

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

then $V$ is unitary, $V = V^\dagger$ and for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} t & z_1 \\ z_2 & t \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} t & z_2 \\ z_1 & t \end{pmatrix}^T.$$ 

It follows that

$$B^T = (V \otimes \mathbb{1}_3) B (V \otimes \mathbb{1}_3)$$

so we have $B^T \succeq 0$ and $B$ is separable. \hfill \Box

We have proved the following result.

**Proposition 4.** Let $\Phi$ be a channel that allows maximal violation of the CHSH inequality. Then $\Phi$ is a measure-and-prepare channel.

We will proceed with presenting a few examples of possible choices of parameters $z_{\alpha}, x_{\alpha,\beta}, y_{\alpha,\beta}$.

**Example 1.** In the simplest case, all parameters are zero, this corresponds to the diagonal matrix $C = C_{sq}$. The corresponding channel has the form

$$\Phi_{sq}(\rho) = (|11\rangle\langle11| + \frac{1}{2}(|01\rangle\langle01| + |10\rangle\langle10|))$$

$$+ (1 - (|11\rangle\langle11| + \frac{1}{2}(|01\rangle\langle01| + |10\rangle\langle10|)).$$

**Example 2.** Another possible choice of parameters is

$z_{\alpha} = \pm 1, \quad x_{\alpha,\beta} = y_{\alpha,\beta} = 0, \quad \forall \alpha, \beta.$

The resulting channels $\Phi_{\pm}$ are similar to $\Phi_{sq}$, we have

$$\Phi_{\pm}(\rho) = (1 - (|11\rangle\langle11|)) |\psi^\pm\rangle \langle\psi^\pm| + (|11\rangle\langle11|) |\psi^\pm\rangle \langle\psi^\pm|$$

where

$$|\psi^\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|00\rangle \pm |11\rangle),$$

$$|\phi^\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|01\rangle \pm |01\rangle).$$

A similar channel was also constructed by \cite{13}. Clearly both of the channels are well defined and maximally violate the CHSH inequality.
Example 3. Let us introduce the notation, for $|z| \leq 1,$
\[
\tau(z) := \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & z \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\bar{z} & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{pmatrix},
\]
\[
\sigma(z) := \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & z & 0 \\
0 & \bar{z} & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix},
\]
Let $M_i \in B(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}), i = 1, \ldots, k$ be effects such that $\sum_i M_i = I - |11\rangle\langle11|$ and let $|w_i| \leq 1, i = 0, 1, \ldots, k.$ Then the measure-and-prepare channel
\[
\Phi(\rho) = (11|\rho|11)\sigma(w_0) + \sum_{i=1}^{k} Tr(M_i\rho)\tau(w_i)
\]
is in $\mathcal{F}_{PR},$ with values of the parameters
\[
z_\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^{k} w_i\langle \alpha | M_i | \alpha \rangle, \quad x_{\alpha,\beta} = y_{\alpha,\beta} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} w_i\langle \alpha | M_i | \beta \rangle.
\]
This example contains the above examples. Note that not all channels in $\mathcal{F}_{PR}$ can be written in this form, since here $x_{\alpha,\beta} = y_{\alpha,\beta}.$

Example 4. We next look at an example where all the parameters have the same nonzero value, namely
\[
\frac{1}{3} = z_\alpha = x_{\alpha,\beta} = y_{\alpha,\beta}, \quad \forall \alpha, \beta.
\]
The choice of the value $z_{11}$ is not important here. One can use numerical calculations to check that the given parameters actually describe a positive semi-definite matrix, that is a Choi matrix of a channel in $\mathcal{F}_{PR}.$ This example shows that we can have all of the parameters non-zero at the same time.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

We have shown that maximally incompatible measurements lead to maximal violation of the CHSH inequality given that a certain state belongs to the real tensor product of the state spaces. We have applied the results to derive the implementations of PR boxes by classical and quantum non-signaling channels. The derivation we used was carried out in the framework of general probabilistic theories, which opens the door for generalizations of our calculation. For the case of no-signalling bipartite qubit channels, we described the face of all such channels maximally violating the CHSH inequality for given maximally incompatible measurements. We have also proved that all such channels are necessarily measure-and-prepare.

The is a plethora of open questions and further directions of research: one may ask about the structure of all implementations of PR boxes for channels in higher dimensions and also for more general state spaces, one may also ask which states (and which measurements) violate the CHSH inequality more than a given number. One may also consider a resource theory of CHSH inequality violations.

Our results also raises a question how good a test of quantumness of a system the CHSH inequality is if having too big CHSH violation constrains us to measure-and-prepare channels, which can be seen as classical channels in a sense. This suggests existence of some kind of trade-off between CHSH violation and some notion of quantumness of no-signalling channels.

We hope that this article will open an interesting research direction in information theory in the framework of general probabilistic theories. As it shows, the results of such research would have applications in quantum information theory and it would also allow for an interesting comparison between the different theories. For the sake of such research one may need to even get better understanding of the nature of channels in general probabilistic theories.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported by grant VEGA 2/0069/16 and by the grant of the Slovak Research and Development Agency under contract APVV-16-0073.


