

# Constant-sized correlations are sufficient to robustly self-test maximally entangled states with unbounded dimension

Honghao Fu \*

*Joint Center for Quantum Information and Computer Science,  
Institute for Advanced Computer Studies and Department of Computer Science,  
University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA*

## Abstract

We show that for any prime odd integer  $d$ , there exists a correlation of size  $\Theta(r)$  that can robustly self-test a maximally entangled state of dimension  $4d - 4$ , where  $r$  is the smallest multiplicative generator of  $\mathbb{Z}_d^\times$ . The construction of the correlation uses the embedding procedure proposed by Slofstra (*Forum of Mathematics, Pi*. Vol. 7, (2019)). Since there are infinitely many prime numbers whose smallest multiplicative generator is at most 5 (M. Murty *The Mathematical Intelligencer* 10.4 (1988)), our result implies that constant-sized correlations are sufficient for robust self-testing of maximally entangled states with unbounded local dimension.

## 1 Introduction

The certification of a quantum device is an important building block for many quantum information processing tasks, especially when the devices are provided by some untrusted vendor. We would like such certification to be done based solely on the observed measurement statistics and with the only assumption that any local device cannot communicate their own inputs to the other local devices. The measurement statistics are referred to as correlations.

It has been shown that certain quantum correlations require the distant parties to share a particular entangled state up to some local isometry. This phenomenon is referred to as self-testing. If we can further prove that, when the observed correlation deviates from the ideal one to some extent, the shared state is still close to the ideal state up to some local isometry, then we say the self-test is robust.

The fact that the verifier only interacts classically with the unknown device makes self-testing a powerful tool for applications in quantum cryptography and computational complexity theory. It allows a classical party to delegate quantum computations to some untrusted service provider and verify that the computations are performed honestly and correctly [RUV13, CGJV19]. Self-testing also becomes a critical component of the security proofs of device-independent quantum cryptographic protocols [MY98, FM18]. Since the setting of multi-prover interactive proof systems is similar to a self-test, self-testing arguments also help to prove lower bounds of the computational power of entanglement-assisted multiprover interactive proof systems [FJVV19, NW19].

---

\*Email: [h7fu@umd.edu](mailto:h7fu@umd.edu)

The case of robust self-testing of the EPR pair,

$$|EPR\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle),$$

is fully understood. The techniques for this case are first introduced in [MYS12], then improved in [BP15]. Robust self-testing of partially entangled qubits is proved later in [YN13], the authors of which also propose an generalized swap-isometry that can be used to robustly self-test large dimensional maximally entangled states. Robust self-testings of tensor product of maximally and partially entangled qubits are proved in [Col16, NV17, NV18], with the last one being the one with the smallest input and output alphabets. Self-testing of all pure bipartite entangled states is proved in [CGS17]. The authors of [CGS17] construct a family of correlations such that an entangled state of any local dimension has a self-testing correlation in this family. To generate a correlation in the family, Alice and Bob use constant-sized input alphabets but size- $d$  output alphabets, where  $d$  is the local dimension of the entangled state. The robustness of this family of correlations is proved in [CS17b].

Our work aims at minimizing the sizes of the input and output alphabets of a correlation that can self-test a maximally entangled states with large local dimension. For comparisons, all the correlations used in the results listed above have either input or output alphabets with sizes dependent on the local dimension of the entangled state. Our progress is summarized in the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.1 (Informal).** *There exists an infinite-sized set  $D$  of odd prime numbers such that, for any  $d \in D$ , the maximally entangled state of local dimension  $4(d - 1)$  can be robustly self-tested with constant-sized input and output alphabets.*

The formal statement of this theorem is given in Theorem 6.17 and Theorem 6.18.

The set  $D$  is, specifically, the set of all odd prime numbers whose smallest primitive root is either 2, 3, or 5. We say that  $r$  is a primitive root of  $d$  if  $r$  is the multiplicative generator of the group  $\mathbb{Z}_d^\times$ . It has been shown that  $D$  has infinitely many elements [Mur88].

## 1.1 Proof overview

To prove Theorem 1.1, we construct a correlation with  $\Theta(r)$ -sized input and constant-sized output alphabets for each odd prime number  $d$  whose smallest primitive root is  $r$ . This correlation is denoted by  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$ . Note that the size of neither the input nor the output alphabet of  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$  depends on  $d$ . Once we prove  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$  can robustly self-test a maximally entangled state of dimension  $4(d - 1)$ , we apply it to all  $d \in D$  and prove Theorem 1.1.

The correlation  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$  contains a winning correlation of a specially-designed binary linear system game. In a general linear system game, Alice is given a random equation from a linear system and she should give an assignment to each variable of the equation. Bob is asked to assign a value to a random variable of the chosen equation. They win the game if Alice's assignment satisfies the equation and Bob's assignment to the variable matches Alice's assignment. A widely-used and thoroughly-studied example of a linear system game is the Magic Square game [Ara04]. In this game, the linear system is

$$\begin{array}{lll} x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = 0 & x_4 + x_5 + x_6 = 0 & x_7 + x_8 + x_9 = 0 \\ x_1 + x_4 + x_7 = 0 & x_2 + x_5 + x_8 = 1 & x_3 + x_6 + x_9 = 0. \end{array}$$

Using two copies of  $|EPR\rangle$ , the Magic square game can be won with certainty. It has been shown that if a strategy can win this game almost perfectly, the shared state must be close to  $|EPR\rangle^{\otimes 2}$  up to some local isometry [WBMS16]. So we say that the Magic Square game can robustly self-test  $|EPR\rangle^{\otimes 2}$ . The key observation that leads to the self-testing proof is that a winning strategy must contain binary observables  $X$  and  $Z$  that satisfy the anti-commutation relation

$$XZ = -ZX.$$

Intuitively, we can think of the Magic Square game as a way to enforce the anti-commutation relation [CS17a].

Our linear system game,  $LS(r)$ , is designed to enforce the relation

$$UOU^\dagger = O^r, \tag{1}$$

for unitaries  $U$  and  $O$ , and some integer  $r$ . The inspiration comes from Slofstra's seminal work [Slo19], where he proves that there exists a binary linear system game that cannot be won by any finite-dimensional quantum strategy but a limit of finite-dimensional strategies can win it perfectly. It implies that the set of quantum correlations generated by finite-dimensional strategies is not closed. In the proof, he proposes and validates a new way to design binary linear system games to enforce conjugacy relations of the form  $XYX^\dagger = Z$  for unitaries  $X, Y$  and  $Z$ .

Following Slofstra's design, the sizes of the input alphabets for Alice and Bob are of order  $\Theta(r)$ , and the answer sets are of size  $\Theta(1)$  in  $LS(r)$ .

The reason that we choose eq. (1) to be the relation enforced by  $LS(r)$  is the following. Winning  $LS(r)$  guarantees that the winning strategy contains binary observables  $M_1, M_2, M_3, M_4$  on Alice's side and  $N_1, N_2, N_3, N_4$  on Bob's side such that

$$U = M_3M_4 = N_3N_4 \qquad O = M_1M_2 = N_1N_2$$

with  $U$  and  $O$  satisfying eq. (1). Moreover, if we can certify that the unitary  $O$  has the eigenvalue  $\omega_d := e^{i2\pi/d}$  where  $r$  is a primitive root of  $d$ , eq. (1) automatically guarantees that the spectrum of  $O$  contains  $\{\omega_d^j\}_{j=1}^{d-1}$ . It also guarantees that the eigenspace of each distinct eigenvalue has the same dimension.

The strong guarantee of eq. (1) is built on the assumption of an eigenvalue of the unitary  $O$ , so the next problem is how to certify that  $O$  has eigenvalue  $\omega_d$ . In order to solve it, we design  $\mathcal{C}(d, r)$  to contain an extension of the optimal correlation that achieves the maximal violation of the weighted CHSH inequality. The  $\alpha$ -weighted CHSH inequality is defined by

$$\mathcal{I}_\alpha = \alpha \langle M_1N_1 \rangle + \alpha \langle M_1N_2 \rangle + \langle M_2N_1 \rangle - \langle M_2N_2 \rangle \leq 2|\alpha|,$$

where  $M_x$  and  $N_y$  for  $x, y \in \{1, 2\}$  are some binary observables. Define  $\mu = \arctan(1/\alpha)$ ,

$$\sigma_z = |0\rangle\langle 0| - |1\rangle\langle 1| \qquad \sigma_x = |0\rangle\langle 1| + |1\rangle\langle 0|,$$

which are the Pauli-Z and Pauli-X operators. This inequality is maximally violated when the shared state is  $|EPR\rangle$ , Alice's binary observables are

$$\tilde{M}_1 = \sigma_z \qquad \tilde{M}_2 = \sigma_x,$$

and Bob's binary observables are

$$\tilde{N}_1 = \cos(\mu)\sigma_z + \sin(\mu)\sigma_x \qquad \tilde{N}_2 = \cos(\mu)\sigma_z - \sin(\mu)\sigma_x?$$

We first prove that the maximal violation of  $\mathcal{I}_\alpha$  can robustly self-test the shared state  $|\psi\rangle$  and the observables  $\tilde{M}_1, \tilde{M}_2$  and  $\tilde{N}_1, \tilde{N}_2$  in Section 4. Then we notice that

$$\tilde{N}_1 \tilde{N}_2 = \cos(2\mu)\mathbb{1} - \sin(2\mu)\sigma_z \sigma_x$$

has eigenvalues  $e^{i2\mu}$  and  $e^{-i2\mu}$ .

Therefore, in the extended correlation, we set  $\alpha = \cot(-\pi/d)$  for some odd prime  $d$  whose primitive root is  $r$ , and ask Alice and Bob to reuse the observables  $M_1, M_2$  and  $N_1, N_2$  from a winning strategy of  $LS(r)$ . Then we can certify that the unitary  $O = M_1 M_2 = N_1 N_2$  has eigenvalues  $\omega_d$  and  $\omega_d^{-1}$ . Combining this observation with the fact that  $O$  satisfy the relation eq. (1), we can conclude that all the eigenvalues of  $O$  contains  $\{\omega_d^j\}_{j=1}^{d-1}$ , and the eigenspaces of all such eigenvalues have the same dimension.

The full correlation  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$  is produced by an ideal strategy that can win  $LS(r)$  perfectly and can reproduce the aforementioned extended correlation perfectly. Combining the implications of a quantum strategy to win  $LS(r)$  and reproduce the extended correlation, we can prove that the correlation  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$  can robustly self-test the state  $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle$  defined by

$$|\tilde{\psi}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} |j\rangle |d-j\rangle \right) \otimes |EPR\rangle^{\otimes 2}.$$

More precisely, we prove that if some quantum strategy using the shared state  $|\psi\rangle$  can produce a correlation that is within trace distance  $\epsilon$  to  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$ , then there exist an local isometry  $\Phi_A \otimes \Phi_B$  and a state  $|junk\rangle$  such that

$$\|\Phi_A \otimes \Phi_B(|\psi\rangle) - |junk\rangle \otimes |\tilde{\psi}\rangle\| = O(d^{5/2} r^d \epsilon^{1/8}). \quad (2)$$

Note that the isometry  $\Phi_A \otimes \Phi_B$  only involves local operations on Alice's and Bob's side. The isometry  $\Phi_A \otimes \Phi_B$  captures the essence of the generalized swap-isometry proposed in [YN13], but it is constructed in a different way.

As mentioned at the start of this subsection, the last step of proving Theorem 1.1 is to apply the general self-testing result of  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$  to the prime numbers with a primitive root 2, 3 or 5. The theorem follows naturally from the fact that there are infinitely many such prime numbers [Mur88].

## 1.2 Structure of the paper

We start with notations and background information in Section 2. Since the correlation we designed can win a special linear system game and satisfy an extended weighted CHSH test, we introduce the linear system game in Section 3 and the extended weighted CHSH test in Section 4. Then we give the correlation  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$  and the ideal strategy to generate it in Section 5. Section 6 is devoted to the robust self-testing proof. We end this paper with conclusions in Section 7.

## 2 Preliminaries and notations

### 2.1 Notations and mathematical background

The EPR pair is denoted by

$$|EPR\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle), \quad (3)$$

and the Pauli operators are denoted by

$$\sigma_x = |0\rangle\langle 1| + |1\rangle\langle 0| \quad \sigma_z = |0\rangle\langle 0| - |1\rangle\langle 1|. \quad (4)$$

The  $d$ -th root of unity is denoted by  $\omega_d := e^{2\pi i/d}$ . Note that we only work with finite Hilbert spaces in our work.

For quantum states and operators on different Hilbert spaces, we use subscripts to label them. For example,  $O_A$  is an operator on Alice's side and  $|0\rangle_B$  is a state on Bob's side. The only exception is when we label projectors used in a quantum strategy defined below. In this case, the subscript is the input and the superscript is the output. For example,  $M_x^a$  is Alice's projector for input  $x$  and output  $a$ . Operators defined by the projectors follow the same convention, for example,  $M_x := M_x^0 - M_x^1$  is a binary observable. If we add tilde to an operator, then this operator is fully characterized and belongs to some ideal strategy. Otherwise, the operator is general and the only assumption is that it is finite-dimensional.

We use the following notation for the closeness between quantum states.

$$|u\rangle \simeq_\epsilon |v\rangle \iff \| |u\rangle - |v\rangle \| \leq \epsilon. \quad (5)$$

Similarly, for numbers  $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$ , the closeness is denoted by  $a \simeq_\epsilon b \iff |a - b| \leq \epsilon$ .

We use some basic number theory in our work.

**Definition 2.1.** *A primitive root of a prime number  $d$  is an integer  $r$  such that  $r$  has multiplicative order  $d - 1$  in the ring of integers modulo  $d$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ .*

In other words,  $r$  is a multiplicative generator of  $\mathbb{Z}_d^\times$ .

We also need some basic notions of group presentation and group representation, so We introduce them below. For more contexts, please refer to [DF04].

Let  $S$  be a set of letters. We denote by  $\mathcal{F}(S)$  the *free group generated by  $S$* , which consists of all finite words made from  $\{s, s^{-1} | s \in S\}$  such that no  $ss^{-1}$  or  $s^{-1}s$  appears as a substring for any  $s$ , where  $s^{-1}$  denotes the inverse of  $s$ . The group law is given by concatenation and cancellation. For a more formal treatment, we refer to Section 6.3 of [DF04].

**Definition 2.2** (Group presentation). *Given a set  $S$ , let  $\mathcal{F}(S)$  be the free group generated by  $S$  and  $R$  be a subset of  $\mathcal{F}(S)$ . Then  $\langle S : R \rangle$  denotes the quotient of  $\mathcal{F}(S)$  by the normal subgroup generated by  $R$ . If the group  $G$  is isomorphic to  $\langle S : R \rangle$ , then we say  $G$  has a presentation  $\langle S : R \rangle$ .*

If both sets  $S$  and  $R$  are finite, then we say the group  $G = \langle S : R \rangle$  is *finitely-presentable*. The elements of  $S$  are the *generators* and the elements of  $R$  are the *relations*. When we refer to an equation of the form  $a = b$  with  $a, b \in \mathcal{F}(S)$  as a "relation," it is understood that we mean the element  $ab^{-1} \in R$ . There are two types of relations that we will be working with. Considering a subset of generators  $\{s_j\}_{j=1}^n \subset S$  such that  $s_{j_1} \neq s_{j_2}$  if  $j_1 \neq j_2$ , the relations of the form  $\prod_{j=1}^n s_j = e$ , where  $e$  is the identity element, are called *linear relations*; and the relations of the form  $s_i s_j s_i^{-1} = s_k$  for some  $i \neq j$  are called *conjugacy relations*.

There are two special types of groups that we will work with in Section 3. We give the definitions below.

**Definition 2.3.** *Suppose  $C \subset [n] \times [n] \times [n]$ , where  $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Let*

$$\Gamma = \langle \{s_i\}_{i \in [n]} : \{s_i^2 = e\}_{i \in [n]} \cup \{s_i s_j s_i = s_k\}_{(i,j,k) \in C} \rangle.$$

*We say a group is a conjugacy group if it has a presentation of this form.*

A conjugacy group is a special case of what Slofstra defined as a linear-plus-conjugacy group (Definition 26 of [Slo19]). The difference is that a conjugacy group does not have linear relations. The next definition follows the definition of a nice linear-plus-conjugacy group (Definition 28 of [Slo19]).

**Definition 2.4.** Suppose  $C \subset [n] \times [n] \times [n]$ , where  $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Let

$$\Gamma = \langle \{s_i\}_{i \in [n]} \cup \{s_{jk}\}_{(i,j,k) \in C} : \{s_i^2 = e\}_{i \in [n]} \cup \{s_{jk}^2 = e, s_i s_j s_i = s_k, s_{jk} s_j s_k = e\}_{(i,j,k) \in C} \rangle.$$

We say a group is a nice conjugacy group if it has a presentation of this form.

The relation  $s_{jk} s_j s_k = e$  implies that  $s_j$  commutes with  $s_k$  because

$$[s_j, s_k] = s_j s_k s_j s_k = s_{jk}^2 = e.$$

Next we give the definition of a group representation.

**Definition 2.5.** A representation of a group  $G$  on the finite Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  is a homomorphism from  $G$  to the group of invertible linear operators on  $\mathcal{H}$ .

The last concept of group theory that we need is a group embedding.

**Definition 2.6** (Group embedding). An embedding of  $G$  into  $K$  is an injective group homomorphism:  $\phi : G \rightarrow K$ .

## 2.2 Nonlocal games

In a nonlocal game, there are two players, Alice and Bob and each of them is requested to give an answer for a randomly chosen question. We denote Alice's question set by  $\mathcal{X}$  and her family of answer sets by  $\{\mathcal{A}_x\}_x$  for each  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ . Similarly, Bob's question set is denoted by  $\mathcal{Y}$  and his family of answer sets is denoted by  $\{\mathcal{B}_y\}_y$  for each  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ . Note that when  $\mathcal{A}_x = \mathcal{A}$  for each  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , we simply say the output alphabet is  $\mathcal{A}$ , and we follow this convention on Bob's side too. The probability distribution over the questions of a nonlocal game is given by a functions  $\pi : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , A nonlocal game also comes with a family of functions  $\{V_{(x,y)} : \mathcal{A}_x \times \mathcal{B}_y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}_{x,y}$  for each  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ , which is the family of scoring functions. Note that when  $\mathcal{A}_x = \mathcal{A}$  for all  $x$  and  $\mathcal{B}_y = \mathcal{B}$  for all  $y$ , we write the scoring function as  $V : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

We also define a nonlocal test to be a tuple  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \{\mathcal{A}_x\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}, \{\mathcal{B}_y\}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}, \pi)$ , where  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \{\mathcal{A}_x\}_x, \{\mathcal{B}_y\}_y$  and  $\pi$  are as defined for a nonlocal game. Hence, a nonlocal test does not have scoring functions.

A quantum strategy of a nonlocal game or a nonlocal test presented in terms of projective measurements consists of projective measurements  $\{\{M_x^a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}_x}\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$  on Alice's side,  $\{\{N_y^b\}_{b \in \mathcal{B}_y}\}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}$  on Bob's side, and a shared state  $|\psi\rangle$ . By projective measurements, we mean that  $(M_x^a)^2 = M_x^a = (M_x^a)^\dagger$  and  $(N_y^b)^2 = N_y^b = (N_y^b)^\dagger$ . Then Alice and Bob's quantum strategy produces the conditional probability distribution

$$P(a, b | x, y) = \langle \psi | M_x^a \otimes N_y^b | \psi \rangle, \quad (6)$$

for each  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  and  $(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}_x \times \mathcal{B}_y$ . Note that the tensor product structure indicates that the two parties cannot communicate with each other, which is the reason why we say such task is nonlocal. For simplicity we omit the tensor product symbol between operators acting on different Hilbert spaces in the rest of the work. If  $M_x^a : \mathcal{H}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_A$  and  $N_y^b : \mathcal{H}_B \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_B$ , then  $M_x^a N_y^b : \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ .

**Definition 2.7.** Given input alphabets:  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$ , and families of output alphabets:  $\{\mathcal{A}_x\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$  and  $\{\mathcal{B}_y\}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}$ , a correlation is a family of conditional probability distributions  $\{P(a, b|x, y) : a \in \mathcal{A}_x, b \in \mathcal{B}_y\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}}$ .

The size of a correlation is the sum of the sizes of the conditional probability distributions in the correlation.

A particular type of nonlocal games that we are interested in is called binary linear system games.

**Definition 2.8** (Binary linear system game). Let  $Hx = c$  be an  $m \times n$  system of linear equations over  $\mathbb{Z}_2 = \{0, 1\}$  (meaning that  $H$  is an  $m$ -by- $n$  matrix with entries in  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  and  $c$  is a length- $n$  vector with entries in  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ ). The associated linear system game involves two players Alice and Bob. The input and output alphabets are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X} &= \{I_i\}_{i=1}^m & \mathcal{Y} &= \{1 \dots n\} \\ \mathcal{A}_{I_i} &= (\mathbb{Z}_2)^{I_i} & \mathcal{B} &= \mathbb{Z}_2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $I_i = \{j : H(i, j) = 1\}$ . When Alice and Bob answer with  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $b$  for questions  $I_i$  and  $j$  respectively, the scoring functions are defined by

$$V_{(I_i, j)}(\mathbf{a}, b) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \sum_{k \in I_i} H(i, k)a(k) \equiv c(i) \pmod{2} \text{ and } a(j) = b \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

A widely-used example of a linear system game is the Magic Square game introduced in [Ara04], which have equations

$$\begin{array}{lll} x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = 0 & x_4 + x_5 + x_6 = 0 & x_7 + x_8 + x_9 = 0 \\ x_1 + x_4 + x_7 = 0 & x_2 + x_5 + x_8 = 1 & x_3 + x_6 + x_9 = 0. \end{array}$$

Note that the equations above are taken modulo 2. We follow this convention in the rest of our work. For the formulation of a general linear system games over  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ , we refer to Section 3.1 of [CS17a].

**Definition 2.9** (Binary observable strategy of a linear system game). A quantum strategy presented in terms of binary observables for the binary linear system game  $Hx = c$  consists of

1. a pair of finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces  $\mathcal{H}_A$  and  $\mathcal{H}_B$ ;
2. a collection of binary observables  $N_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , on  $\mathcal{H}_B$  such that  $N_j^2 = \mathbb{1}$  for every  $1 \leq j \leq n$ ;
3. a collection of binary observables  $M_{ij}$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq n$  on  $\mathcal{H}_A$  such that
  - (a)  $M_{ij}^2 = \mathbb{1}$  for every  $i, j$ , and
  - (b)  $M_{il}M_{ik} = M_{ik}M_{il}$  for every  $i, l, k$  such that  $H(i, l) = H(i, k) = 1$ ;

and

4. a quantum state  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ .

Note that a measurement strategy of a binary linear system game can be converted to a binary observable strategy. Let a measurement strategy be  $(\{\{M_i^a\}_{a \in X_i}\}_{i=1}^m, \{\{N_j^b\}_{b=0}^1\}_{j=1}^n, |\psi\rangle)$ , where

$X_i$  is the answer set of equation  $i$ . The corresponding binary observable strategy consists of,  $|\psi\rangle$ ,  $N_j := N_j^0 - N_j^1$  and

$$M_{ij} := \sum_{a:a(j)=0} M_i^a - \sum_{a:a(j)=1} M_i^a$$

for  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . Hence, in the rest of the work, we focus on binary observable strategies of linear system games. Specifically, we assume that Alice has a binary observable for each variable in each equation, so when she is asked the assignment of a particular variable, she simply measures according to the corresponding observable of that variable.

A perfect binary observable strategy for the linear system game associated with  $Hx = c$  can be constructed from a finite-dimensional representation of a finitely presentable group over  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ , called the solution group.

**Definition 2.10** (Solution group of a linear system game). *Let  $Hx = c$  be an  $m \times n$  linear system. The solution group of this system is the group*

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(H, c) := \langle x_1, \dots, x_n, J : J^2 = e, Jx_i = x_iJ \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq n, \\ \prod_{j=1}^n x_j^{H(i,j)} = J^{c(i)} \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq m, \text{ and} \\ x_l x_k = x_k x_l \text{ if } H(i, k) = H(i, l) = 1 \text{ for some } i \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The relation  $J^2 = x_i^2 = e$  means that all the generators are of order 2. Let  $\Psi$  be a finite-dimensional representation of  $\Gamma(H, c)$  such that  $\Psi(J) = -\mathbb{1}$  on the carrier space  $\mathbb{C}^d$ . Then a perfect strategy for the linear system game ( $Hx = c$ ) has

1.  $M_{ij} = \Psi(x_j)$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and  $1 \leq j \leq n$ ,
2.  $N_j = \Psi(x_j)^\top$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq n$ ,
3. the maximally entangled state  $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{k=1}^d |k\rangle |k\rangle$ .

### 2.3 The weighted CHSH inequality [AMP12].

The weighted CHSH inequality a variation of the CHSH inequality [CHSH69]. We formulate it as a nonlocal game. The input alphabets and output alphabets of Alice and Bob are  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y} = \{1, 2\}$  and  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B} = \mathbb{Z}_2$ . The scoring function for the  $\alpha$ -weighted CHSH test, when  $|\alpha| \geq 1$ , is defined by

$$V(a, b, x, y)_{\alpha\text{-CHSH}} = \begin{cases} \alpha(-1)^{a+b}, & \text{if } x = 1, \\ (-1)^{a+b}, & \text{if } x = 2, y = 1, \\ (-1)^{1+a+b}, & \text{if } x = y = 2. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

The input distribution is  $\pi(x, y) = 1/4$  for all  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ .

Let Alice and Bob's quantum strategy in terms of projectors be  $(\{\{M_x^a\}_a\}_x, \{\{N_y^b\}_b\}_y, |\psi\rangle)$ . We define binary observables  $M_x := M_x^0 - M_x^1$  and  $N_y := N_y^0 - N_y^1$  from Alice and Bob's projectors. The weighted CHSH inequality states that

$$\mathcal{I}_\alpha = \alpha \langle M_1 N_1 \rangle + \alpha \langle M_1 N_2 \rangle + \langle M_2 N_1 \rangle - \langle M_2 N_2 \rangle \leq 2|\alpha|, \quad (9)$$

where  $\langle M_x N_y \rangle := \langle \psi | M_x N_y | \psi \rangle$  is the expectation value of the observables. The weighted CHSH inequality is true if Alice and Bob share some product state  $|\phi\rangle = |\phi_A\rangle \otimes |\phi_B\rangle$ . However, if they share an entangled state  $|\psi\rangle$ , the value of  $\mathcal{I}_\alpha$  can be as large as  $\mathcal{I}_\alpha^{\max} = 2\sqrt{1 + \alpha^2}$  [AMP12].



**Definition 2.11** (Ideal strategy to achieve  $\mathcal{I}_\alpha^{\max}$  [AMP12]). Define  $\mu := \arctan(1/\alpha)$ . The ideal strategy for weighted CHSH with parameter  $\alpha$ , which achieves the value  $\mathcal{I}_\alpha^{\max}$ , consists of the joint state  $|EPR\rangle$  and observables  $\tilde{M}_1 = \sigma_z$ ,  $\tilde{M}_2 = \sigma_x$ ,  $\tilde{N}_1 = \cos(\mu)\sigma_z + \sin(\mu)\sigma_x$  and  $\tilde{N}_2 = \cos(\mu)\sigma_z - \sin(\mu)\sigma_x$ .

An interesting observation of the weighted CHSH inequality is that it admits robust self-testing of the ideal strategy given above. We give the formal statement of this robust self-testing property of  $\mathcal{I}_\alpha$  in Section 4.1. In Section 5 we design a nonlocal test called the extended weighted CHSH test based on the ideal correlation that maximally violates the weighted CHSH inequality.

## 2.4 Approximation tools

In the rest of the paper, we use the following approximation results implicitly and explicitly.

**Proposition 2.12.** Let  $|v\rangle$  and  $|v'\rangle$  be vectors such that the relation  $|v\rangle \simeq_\epsilon |v'\rangle$  holds. Then for any unit vector  $|u\rangle$ ,

$$\langle v|u\rangle \simeq_\epsilon \langle v'|u\rangle.$$

*Proof.* We can write  $|v'\rangle = |v\rangle + |v''\rangle$ , where  $\| |v''\rangle \| \leq \epsilon$ , then

$$\| \langle v|u\rangle - \langle v'|u\rangle \| = \| \langle v''|u\rangle \| \leq \| |u\rangle \| \| |v''\rangle \| \leq \epsilon.$$

□

**Proposition 2.13.** Let  $|u_i\rangle$  and  $|v_i\rangle$  for  $i = 1, 2$  be vectors with norm less than equal to 1 such that  $|u_1\rangle \simeq_{\epsilon_1} |v_1\rangle$  and  $|u_2\rangle \simeq_{\epsilon_2} |v_2\rangle$ . Then,

$$\langle u_1|u_2\rangle \simeq_{\epsilon_1+\epsilon_2} \langle v_1|v_2\rangle.$$

*Proof.* By direct calculation we have

$$\begin{aligned} \| \langle u_1|u_2\rangle - \langle v_1|v_2\rangle \| &\leq \| \langle u_1|u_2\rangle - \langle v_1|u_2\rangle \| + \| \langle v_1|u_2\rangle - \langle v_1|v_2\rangle \| \\ &\leq \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Proposition 2.12. □

**Proposition 2.14.** Let  $U$  be a unitary matrix and  $|u\rangle$  and  $|v\rangle$  be two vectors such that

$$U|u\rangle \simeq_{\epsilon_1} a|u\rangle \quad U|v\rangle \simeq_{\epsilon_2} b|v\rangle,$$

for some  $a \neq b \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $\|a\| = \|b\| = 1$ . Then,

$$\| \langle u|v\rangle \| \leq \max(\| |u\rangle \|, \| |v\rangle \|) \frac{\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2}{\|1 - a^{-1}b\|} + \frac{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}{\|1 - a^{-1}b\|}.$$

*Proof.* We write  $U|u\rangle = a|u\rangle + |u'\rangle$  such that  $\| |u'\rangle \| \leq \epsilon_1$ . Similarly, we write  $U|v\rangle = b|v\rangle + |v'\rangle$  such that  $\| |v'\rangle \| \leq \epsilon_2$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u|v\rangle &= \langle Uu|Uv\rangle \\ &= (a^{-1}\langle u| + \langle u'|)(b|v\rangle + |v'\rangle) \\ &= a^{-1}b\langle u|v\rangle + a^{-1}\langle u|v'\rangle + b\langle u'|v\rangle + \langle u'|v'\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\langle v|u\rangle\| &= \frac{\|a^{-1}\langle u|v'\rangle + b\langle u'|v\rangle + \langle u'|v'\rangle\|}{\|1 - a^{-1}b\|} \\ &\leq \frac{\|a\|\|v\|\|u'\| + \|b\|\|u\|\|v'\| + \|\langle u'|v'\rangle\|}{\|1 - a^{-1}b\|} \\ &\leq \max(\|u\|, \|v\|) \frac{\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2}{\|1 - a^{-1}b\|} + \frac{\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}{\|1 - a^{-1}b\|}.\end{aligned}$$

□

**Proposition 2.15.** Let  $|u\rangle$  and  $|v\rangle$  be two vectors such that  $\|u\| \simeq_{\epsilon_1} 1$ ,  $\|v\| \simeq_{\epsilon_2} 1$ , and  $\langle u|v\rangle \simeq_{\epsilon_3} 1$ . Then

$$|u\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2 + \epsilon_3})} |v\rangle.$$

*Proof.* Direct calculation gives us that

$$\begin{aligned}\| |u\rangle - |v\rangle \|^2 &= \| |u\rangle \|^2 + \| |v\rangle \|^2 - 2\langle u|v\rangle \\ &\leq (1 + \epsilon_1)^2 + (1 + \epsilon_2)^2 - 2(1 - \epsilon_3) \\ &= 2(\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2 + \epsilon_3) + \epsilon_1^2 + \epsilon_2^2 \\ &= O(\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2 + \epsilon_3).\end{aligned}$$

□

**Proposition 2.16.** Let  $|u\rangle$  be a vector with norm less than or equal to 1 such that for a unitary  $U$ ,

$$U|u\rangle \simeq_{\epsilon} a|u\rangle,$$

for  $a \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $\|a\| = 1$ . Then,

$$U^n|u\rangle \simeq_{n\epsilon} a^n|u\rangle$$

for all  $n \geq 1$ .

*Proof.* We can prove it by induction. The  $k = 1$  case follows the given condition. Assume it holds for  $k = n - 1$  and consider  $k = n$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|U^n|u\rangle - a^n|u\rangle\| &\leq \|U\| \|U^{n-1}|u\rangle - a^{n-1}|u\rangle\| + \|a^{n-1}\| \|U|u\rangle - a|u\rangle\| \\ &\leq (n-1)\epsilon + \epsilon = n\epsilon,\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that  $\|U\| = 1$ .

□

**Lemma 2.17** (Substitution Lemma). Let  $\mathcal{H}_A$  and  $\mathcal{H}_B$  be two Hilbert spaces, and  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ . Suppose there exist unitaries  $\{V\} \cup \{V_i\}_{i=1}^k \cup \{M_i\}_{i=1}^n$  on  $\mathcal{H}_A$  and  $\{N_i\}_{i=1}^n$  on  $\mathcal{H}_B$  such that

$$M_i|\psi\rangle \simeq_{\epsilon_1} N_i|\psi\rangle$$

for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , and

$$V|\psi\rangle \simeq_{\epsilon_2} \prod_{i=1}^k V_i|\psi\rangle.$$

Then,

$$V \prod_{i=1}^n M_i|\psi\rangle \simeq_{2n\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2} \left( \prod_{i=1}^k V_i \right) \left( \prod_{i=1}^n N_i \right) |\psi\rangle.$$

*Proof.* We prove this lemma by induction on  $n$ . The  $n = 0$  case follows the condition that  $V|\psi\rangle \simeq_{\epsilon_2} \Pi_{i=1}^k V_i|\psi\rangle$ .

Assume the conclusion holds for  $n = m$ . Consider the case  $n = m + 1$ , then

$$\begin{aligned}
V\Pi_{i=1}^{m+1}M_i|\psi\rangle &= V(\Pi_{i=1}^m M_i)M_{m+1}|\psi\rangle \\
&\simeq_{\epsilon_1} V(\Pi_{i=1}^m M_i)N_{m+1}|\psi\rangle \\
&= N_{m+1}V(\Pi_{i=1}^m M_i)|\psi\rangle \\
&\simeq_{2m\epsilon_1+\epsilon_2} N_{m+1}\left(\Pi_{i=1}^k V_i\right)\left(\Pi_{i=1}^m M_i\right)|\psi\rangle \\
&= \left(\Pi_{i=1}^k V_i\right)\left(\Pi_{i=1}^m M_i\right)N_{m+1}|\psi\rangle \\
&\simeq_{\epsilon_1}\left(\Pi_{i=1}^k V_i\right)\left(\Pi_{i=1}^{m+1} M_i\right)|\psi\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Adding the error terms in the derivation above together gives us that

$$V\Pi_{i=1}^{m+1}M_i|\psi\rangle \simeq_{(2m+2)\epsilon_1+\epsilon_2}\left(\Pi_{i=1}^k V_i\right)\left(\Pi_{i=1}^{m+1} M_i\right)|\psi\rangle.$$

By the principle of inductive proof, the proof is complete.  $\square$

### 3 The binary linear system game $LS(r)$

In this section, we introduce a binary linear system game that is a component of the full test. This game is designed to enforce relations that should be satisfied by Alice and Bob's observables.

The inspiration comes from Slofstra's seminal work [Slo19], in which he embeds a group with generators  $x$  and  $y$  satisfying the relation  $xyx^{-1} = y^2$  into the solution group of a binary linear system game. We generalize the relation  $xyx^{-1} = y^2$  and embed the following group

$$\mathcal{P} = \langle u, o : uou^{-1} = o^r \rangle, \tag{10}$$

for some  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , into the solution group,  $\Gamma$ , of a binary linear system game,  $LS(r)$ . The steps to embed  $\mathcal{P}$  into  $\Gamma$  follows the procedure detailed in the proofs of Proposition 33, Lemma 29 and Proposition 27 of [Slo19], so the group  $\mathcal{P}$  (eq. (10)) is first embedded into  $\mathcal{P}_0$  (Definition 3.1), then  $\mathcal{P}_1$  (Definition 3.3), and finally into the group  $\Gamma$  (Definition 3.5), and we obtain a chain of embeddings:

$$\mathcal{P} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}_1 \hookrightarrow \Gamma. \tag{11}$$

This section is structured as follows. In Section 3.1, we define the group  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and prove that  $\mathcal{P}$  is embedded in  $\mathcal{P}_0$ . In Section 3.2, we define the group  $\mathcal{P}_1$  and prove that  $\mathcal{P}_0$  is embedded in  $\mathcal{P}_1$ . Section 3.3 contains the definition of the group  $\Gamma$  and the proof that  $\mathcal{P}_1$  is embedded in  $\Gamma$ . The purposes of introducing each intermediate group are explained along the definitions. In Section 3.4, we construct  $LS(r)$  from  $\Gamma$  and give the formal definition of  $LS(r)$ .

Note that, we defer the full definitions of the representations of  $\mathcal{P}_0$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_1$  and  $\Gamma$  until Appendix B. Instead, We only highlight a few operators from a finite-dimensional representation of  $\Gamma$ . The representation of  $\Gamma$  will be used later to build the ideal strategy of the full test.

### 3.1 The group $\mathcal{P}_0$

The group  $\mathcal{P}_0$  is a conjugacy group (Definition 2.3), and is defined below. The purpose of this step is to embed  $\mathcal{P}$  into a group where all the generators are of order-2, because it is impossible to find a homomorphism from  $\mathcal{P}$  to a solution group that maps  $u$  or  $o$ , which can have arbitrary order, to a single binary generator. On the other hand, a homomorphism from  $\mathcal{P}_0$  to a solution group can be easier to find because all the generators of  $\mathcal{P}_0$  are binary.

**Definition 3.1.** Let the set  $S_0$  be

$$S_0 = \{o_i\}_{i=1}^r \cup \{u_i\}_{i=1}^5,$$

and the set  $R_0$  be the union of

$$R_{base} = \{s^2 = e \mid s \in S\},$$

$$R_u = \{u_3 = u_2 o_1 u_2, \quad u_4 = u_2 o_2 u_2, \quad u_5 = u_1 u_3 u_1, \quad o_2 = u_1 u_4 u_1, \quad u_5 = o_1 o_r o_1\},$$

and

$$R_o = \begin{cases} \bigcup_{j=1}^{r/2-1} \{o_{1+2j} = o_1 o_{2j} o_1, \quad o_{2+2j} = o_2 o_{1+2j} o_2\} & \text{if } r \text{ is even,} \\ \{o_3 = o_2 o_1 o_2\} \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{(r-3)/2} \{o_{2+2j} = o_1 o_{1+2j} o_1, \quad o_{3+2j} = o_2 o_{2j+2} o_2\} & \text{if } r \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

The group  $\mathcal{P}_0$  is a group with presentation  $\langle R_0 : S_0 \rangle$ .

The special generators of  $\mathcal{P}_0$  are  $o_1, o_2, u_1$  and  $u_2$  because the product  $o_1 o_2$  behaves similarly as  $o$ , and the product  $u_1 u_2$  behaves similarly as  $u$ . Moreover, the conjugacy relations in  $R_0$  can be combined to recover the relation  $u o u^{-1} = o^r$ , as proved in the next proposition.

**Proposition 3.2.** The group  $\mathcal{P}$  is embedded in  $\mathcal{P}_0$ . Furthermore, the generators of  $\mathcal{P}_0$  satisfy the relations

$$(u_1 u_2) o_2 (u_2 u_1) = o_2 \tag{12}$$

$$(u_1 u_2)^j o_1 o_2 (u_2 u_1)^j = (o_1 o_2)^{r^j}, \tag{13}$$

for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Proof.* We prove eq. (12) first. It is easy to see that

$$u_1 (u_2 o_2 u_2) u_1 = u_1 u_4 u_1 = o_2. \tag{14}$$

Next, The proof that  $\mathcal{P}$  is embedded in  $\mathcal{P}_0$  is based on the  $j = 1$  case of eq. (13). Once it is proved, we can use the recipe given in the proof of Proposition 33 of [Slo19] to construct a finite-dimensional representation of  $\mathcal{P}_0$  from a finite-dimensional representation of  $\mathcal{P}$ . Then Lemma 15 of [Slo19] proves that a homomorphism  $\phi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_0$  such that  $\phi(u) = u_1 u_2$  and  $\phi(o) = o_1 o_2$  is injective.

We prove eq. (13) by induction. The base case follows the direct calculation given below

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 u_2 o_1 o_2 u_2 u_1 &= u_1 (u_2 o_1 u_2) (u_2 o_2 u_2) u_1 \\ &= (u_1 u_3 u_1) (u_1 u_4 u_1) \\ &= u_5 o_2 \\ &= o_1 o_r o_1 o_2. \end{aligned}$$

Then we substitute the definitions of  $o_k$  for  $k = r \dots 3$  into the equation above, which proves the  $j = 1$  case.

Assume the statement is true for  $j = n$ , then for  $j = n + 1$

$$\begin{aligned} (u_1 u_2)^{n+1} o_1 o_2 (u_2 u_1)^{n+1} &= u_1 u_2 (o_1 o_2)^{r^n} u_2 u_1 \\ &= (u_1 u_2 o_1 o_2 u_2 u_1)^{r^n} \\ &= (o_1 o_2)^{r^{n+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

where from the first line to the second line, we insert  $(u_2 u_1)(u_1 u_2)$  between every pair of  $o_1 o_2$ , and from the second line to the third line, we apply the  $j = 1$  case  $r^n$  times. Hence, the statement is true.  $\square$

Note that our representation  $\Psi_0$  of  $\mathcal{P}_0$  is different from the representation constructed in the proof of Proposition 33 of [Slo19]. We give the formal definition of  $\Psi_0$  (Definition B.1) in Appendix B.

To better characterize all the conjugacy relations of  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and simplify the presentation of  $\mathcal{P}_0$ , we relabel  $u_i$  and  $o_i$ 's as  $a_i$ 's in such a way that

$$a_j := \begin{cases} o_j & \text{for } j = 1, 2 \\ u_{j-2} & \text{for } j = 3 \dots 7 \\ o_{j-5} & \text{for } j = 8 \dots r + 5. \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

Then we define the set  $C(r)$  of tuples  $(i, j, k)$  such that

$$C(r) = \{(i, j, k) \mid (a_i a_j a_i = a_k) \in R_0\}. \quad (16)$$

The size of  $C(r)$  is  $r + 3$ . Hence, another presentation of the group  $\mathcal{P}_0$  is

$$\mathcal{P}_0 = \langle \{a_i\}_{i=1}^{r+5} : \{a_i^2 = e\}_{i=1}^{r+5} \cup \{a_i a_j a_i = a_k \mid (i, j, k) \in C(r)\} \rangle,$$

and we will construct  $\mathcal{P}_1$  based on this presentation of  $\mathcal{P}_0$ .

### 3.2 The group $\mathcal{P}_1$

The group  $\mathcal{P}_1$  is a nice conjugacy group (Definition 2.4). We embed  $\mathcal{P}_0$  into  $\mathcal{P}_1$  to make the construction of a finite-dimension representation of  $\Gamma$  from a finite-dimension representation of  $\mathcal{P}_1$  easier.

**Definition 3.3.** Define the set  $S_1$  to be

$$S_1 = \{a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i\}_{i=1}^{r+5} \cup \{f_0\} \cup \{h_{jk}\}_{(i,j,k) \in C(r)},$$

and the set  $R_1$  to be

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 = & \{s^2 = e \mid s \in S_1\} \\ & \cup \{a_i = b_i c_i = f_0 d_i, \quad f_0 b_i f_0 = c_i\}_{i=1}^{r+5} \\ & \cup \{h_{jk} b_j c_k = e, \quad d_i b_j d_i = c_k\}_{(i,j,k) \in C(r)}. \end{aligned}$$

The group  $\mathcal{P}_1$  is a group with the presentation  $\langle S_1 : R_1 \rangle$ .

Note that the group  $\mathcal{P}_1$  is the same as the group  $K$  used in the proof of Lemma 29 of [Slo19]. For each  $1 \leq i \leq r+5$ , the relation  $a_i = b_i c_i$  guarantees that  $b_i$  commutes with  $c_i$ . For each  $(i, j, k) \in C(r)$ , the linear relation  $h_{jk} b_j c_k = e$  guarantees that  $b_j$  commutes with  $c_k$ .

The relation between  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1$  is summarized in the propositions below.

**Proposition 3.4.** *The group  $\mathcal{P}_0$  is embedded in  $\mathcal{P}_1$ .*

*Proof.* We prove this proposition by showing that generators  $a_i$ 's in  $S_1$  satisfy the relation  $a_i a_j a_i = a_k$  for all  $(i, j, k) \in C(r)$ . This means the homomorphism  $\phi : \mathcal{P}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_1$  that maps  $a_i$  to  $a_i$  is homomorphism from  $\mathcal{P}_0$  to  $\mathcal{P}_1$ .

We first show that  $d_i c_j d_i = b_k$ , which is because

$$d_i c_j d_i = d_i (f_0 b_j f_0) d_i = f_0 (d_i b_j d_i) f_0 = f_0 c_k f_0 = b_k.$$

Then, we can prove that

$$a_i a_j a_i = f_0 d_i b_j c_j f_0 d_i = (f_0 d_i b_j d_i f_0) (f_0 d_i c_j d_i f_0) = (f_0 c_k f_0) (f_0 b_k f_0) = b_k c_k = a_k,$$

where we use the fact that  $f_0$  commutes with  $d_i$ .

A representation of  $\mathcal{P}_1$  can also be built upon a representation of  $\mathcal{P}_0$ . Suppose  $\Psi_0$  is a representation of  $\mathcal{P}_0$  on some Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , then a representation of  $\mathcal{P}_1$ ,  $\Psi_1$ , on the Hilbert space  $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{H}$  can be constructed such that

$$\Psi_1(a_i) = \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{C}^2} \otimes \Psi_0(a_i)$$

as proved in Lemma 29 of [Slo19]. Then, the injectivity of  $\phi$  follows Lemma 15 of [Slo19].  $\square$

The consequence of this proposition is that  $\mathcal{P}$  is embedded in  $\mathcal{P}_1$ . We give the formal definition of the representation  $\Psi_1$  of  $\mathcal{P}_1$  (Definition B.2) in Appendix B.

### 3.3 The group $\Gamma$

The group  $\Gamma$  is a solution group, so all the generators of  $\Gamma$  are of order-2 and all the relations are linear relations. Moreover, the linear relations can be combined to recover the conjugacy relations in  $R_1$ .

**Definition 3.5.** *Define the set  $S$  to be*

$$S = \{a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i, \{p_{i,j}\}_{j=1}^5\}_{i=1}^{r+5} \cup \{f_i, g_i, m_i\}_{i=0}^2 \cup \{h_{jk}\}_{(i,j,k) \in C(r)} \cup \{q_{\mathbf{c},j}\}_{j=1}^6\}_{\mathbf{c} \in C(r)},$$

and the set  $R$  to be the union of the following sets of linear relations:

- for each  $i = 1 \dots r+5$ :

$$R_i = \{a_i = b_i c_i = f_0 d_i, \quad f_0 f_1 f_2 = e, \quad b_i f_2 p_{i,1} = e, \quad p_{i,1} p_{i,2} p_{i,3} = e, \\ f_0 p_{i,3} p_{i,4} = e, \quad c_i p_{i,4} p_{i,5} = e, \quad f_1 p_{i,2} p_{i,5} = e\},$$

- for each  $\mathbf{c} = (i, j, k) \in C(r)$ :

$$R_{\mathbf{c}} = \{h_{jk} b_j c_k = e, \quad d_i q_{\mathbf{c},1} f_2 = e, \quad b_j f_2 q_{\mathbf{c},2} = e, \quad q_{\mathbf{c},2} q_{\mathbf{c},3} q_{\mathbf{c},4} = e, \\ d_i q_{\mathbf{c},4} q_{\mathbf{c},5} = e, \quad c_k q_{\mathbf{c},5} q_{\mathbf{c},6} = e, \quad q_{\mathbf{c},1} q_{\mathbf{c},3} q_{\mathbf{c},6} = e\},$$

- $R_{MS} = \{f_0f_1f_2 = e, \quad g_0g_1g_2 = e, \quad m_0m_1m_2 = e, \quad f_0g_2m_0 = e, \\ f_2g_0m_1 = e, \quad f_1g_1m_2 = J\},$
- $R_J = \{JsJs = e | s \in S\} \cup \{J^2 = e\},$
- $R_{base} = \{s^2 = e | s \in S\}.$

The group  $\Gamma$  is a group with the presentation  $\langle S \cup \{J\} : R \rangle$ .

In the next proposition, we prove that the group  $\mathcal{P}_1$  is embedded in  $\Gamma$ .

**Proposition 3.6.** *The group  $\mathcal{P}_1$  is embedded in  $\Gamma$ . The generators of  $\Gamma$  also satisfy the relations:*

$$f_0g_0f_0g_0 = J, \tag{17}$$

$$f_2g_2f_2g_2 = J. \tag{18}$$

*Proof.* To prove the first claim, we show that the generators  $b_i, c_i, d_i$  satisfy the relations  $d_i b_j d_i = c_k$  for each  $\mathbf{c} = (i, j, k) \in C(r)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} d_i b_j d_i &= (k_{c1} f_2)(f_2 k_{c2})(k_{c4} k_{c5}) \\ &= k_{c1}(k_{c2} k_{c4}) k_{c5} \\ &= (k_{c1} k_{c3}) k_{c5} \\ &= k_{c6} k_{c5} \\ &= c_k. \end{aligned}$$

The derivation of  $f_0 b_i f_0 = c_i$  is similar for  $1 \leq i \leq r+5$ , so we omit it here. Hence, a map  $\phi : \mathcal{P}_1 \rightarrow \Gamma$  that maps  $s$  to  $s$  for each  $s \in S_1$  is a homomorphism between  $\mathcal{P}_1$  and  $\Gamma$ . A representation of  $\Gamma$  can be constructed from a representation of  $\mathcal{P}_1$  as shown in the proof of Proposition 27 of [Slo19], so the injectivity of homomorphism  $\phi$  follows Lemma 15 of [Slo19].

Equation (17) can be proved by

$$\begin{aligned} &f_0g_0f_0g_0 \\ &= (f_1f_2)(f_2m_1)(f_1f_2)(f_2m_1) \\ &= f_1m_1f_1m_1 \\ &= f_1(g_0f_2)f_1(m_0m_2) \\ &= f_1g_0(f_2f_1)(f_0g_2)m_2 \\ &= f_1g_0g_2m_2 \\ &= f_1g_1m_2 \\ &= J. \end{aligned}$$

Equation (18) can be proved analogously. □

Since  $\mathcal{P}$  is embedded in  $\mathcal{P}_1$ , we can conclude that  $\mathcal{P}$  is embedded in  $\Gamma$  as well.

The formal definition of a representation of  $\Gamma$  is given in Definition B.3. We highlight a few important operators here. The representation  $\Psi$  of  $\Gamma$  is defined on the Hilbert space  $W_2 \otimes W_2 \otimes W_{d-1}$ , where  $W_k$  denotes a Hilbert space of dimension  $k$ ,

$$W_k = \text{span}\{|x_j\rangle\}_{j=1}^k. \tag{19}$$

We denote the standard basis of  $W_k$  by  $\{|x_j\rangle\}_{j=1}^k$ . We denote the identity operator for the subspace  $W_k$  by  $\mathbb{1}_{W_k}$ .

We define an operator  $\tilde{O}$  on  $W_{d-1}$  as

$$\tilde{O} = \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \omega_d^j |x_j\rangle\langle x_j|.$$

Note that another form of the basis of  $W_{d-1}$  is  $\{|x_{rj}\rangle\}_{j=0}^{d-2}$ , where the subscript  $rj$  is taken modulo  $d$  implicitly, because another form of  $\tilde{O}$  is

$$\tilde{O} = \sum_{j=0}^{d-2} \omega_d^{rj} |x_{rj}\rangle\langle x_{rj}|. \quad (20)$$

We use the second form of the basis when it is convenient. The other basis of  $W_{d-1}$  that we use is  $\{|u_j\rangle\}_{j=0}^{d-2}$  defined by

$$|u_k\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}} \sum_{j=0}^{d-2} \omega_{d-1}^{jk} |x_{rj}\rangle.$$

The basis  $\{|u_j\rangle\}$  is the eigen-basis of operator  $\tilde{U}$  defined by

$$\tilde{U} = \sum_{j=0}^{d-2} \omega_{d-1}^j |u_j\rangle\langle u_j|.$$

Note that in the standard basis,

$$\tilde{U} = \sum_{j=0}^{d-2} |x_{rj-1}\rangle\langle x_{rj}|. \quad (21)$$

The unitaries  $\tilde{U}$  and  $\tilde{O}$  are special because they satisfy the relation  $\tilde{U}\tilde{O}\tilde{U}^\dagger = \tilde{O}^r$ .

Here we only present what  $a_1, a_2, a_3$  and  $a_4$  are mapped to by the representation  $\Psi$ , since they are the key generators of  $\Gamma$ .

$$\Psi(a_1) = \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \left( \sum_{j=1}^{(d-1)/2} \omega_d^j |x_j\rangle\langle x_{d-j}| + \omega_d^{-j} |x_{d-j}\rangle\langle x_j| \right) \quad (22)$$

$$\Psi(a_2) = \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \left( \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} |x_j\rangle\langle x_{d-j}| \right). \quad (23)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(a_3) = & \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \left[ |u_0\rangle\langle u_0| + \omega_{d-1}^{(d-1)/2} |u_{(d-1)/2}\rangle\langle u_{(d-1)/2}| \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{k=1}^{(d-3)/2} \left( \omega_{d-1}^k |u_k\rangle\langle u_{d-1-k}| + \omega_{d-1}^{-k} |u_{d-1-k}\rangle\langle u_k| \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(a_4) = & \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \left[ |u_0\rangle\langle u_0| + |u_{(d-1)/2}\rangle\langle u_{(d-1)/2}| \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{k=1}^{(d-3)/2} (|u_{d-1-k}\rangle\langle u_k| + |u_k\rangle\langle u_{d-1-k}|) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$



The tensor structure of the representations come from the construction of  $\Psi$ . These operators are important because  $\Psi(a_1a_2) = \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \tilde{O}$  and  $\Psi(a_3a_4) = \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \tilde{U}$  where  $\tilde{O}$  is defined in eq. (20) and  $\tilde{U}$  is defined in eq. (21). The unitaries  $\Psi(a_1a_2)$  and  $\Psi(a_3a_4)$  satisfy the following equation

$$\Psi(a_3a_4)\Psi(a_1a_2)\Psi(a_4a_3) = \Psi(a_1a_2)^r,$$

as  $\tilde{U}\tilde{O}\tilde{U}^\dagger = \tilde{O}^r$ .

### 3.4 The game $LS(r)$

From the group  $\Gamma$  we can construct the binary linear system game  $LS(r)$ . Basically, we associate a variable  $x(s)$  to each generator  $s \in S$ . Then each linear relation in  $R$  can be translated to a linear equation. For example, the linear relation  $f_0f_1f_2 = e$  is translated to the equation  $x(f_0) + x(f_1) + x(f_2) = 0$ , and the relation  $f_1g_1m_2 = J$  is translated to the equation  $x(f_1) + x(g_1) + x(m_2) = 1$ . The complete list of the equations is given in Definition A.1. The construction of  $LS(r)$  proves the following theorem. The definition of  $LS(r)$  follows this theorem.

**Theorem 3.7.** *The group  $\mathcal{P}$  can be embedded in the solution group of a binary linear system game which has  $n(r) := 16r + 75$  variables and  $m(r) := 14r + 62$  equations, where each equation has 3 variables.*

**Definition 3.8.** *The linear system game  $LS(r)$  consists of*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X}^{LS} &= \{I_i\}_{i=1}^{m(r)}, \\ \mathcal{Y}^{LS} &= \{x(s) : s \in S\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $I_i = \{s : H(i, s) = 1\}$  is the set of all the nonzero coefficient of equation  $i$  and  $m(r) := 14r + 62$  is the number of equations. Details of  $I_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m(r)$  can be found in Definition A.1. Alice's answer sets are

$$\mathcal{A}_{I_i}^{LS} = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^{I_i}$$

for  $1 \leq i \leq m(r)$ . Bob's answer set is

$$\mathcal{B}^{LS} = \mathbb{Z}_2.$$

The probability distribution is uniform over all the pairs  $(I_i, x(s))$  such that  $s \in I_i$ , so

$$\pi^{LS}(I_i, x(s)) = \begin{cases} 1/N(r) & \text{if } s \in I_i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where  $N(r) := 157r + 685$  is the total number of valid question pairs. We define

$$X_i := \{\mathbf{a} \in (\mathbb{Z}_2)^{I_i} : \sum_{s \in I_i} a(s) = c(i)\},$$

which is the set of all the valid answers of equation  $i$ . Given an answer  $(\mathbf{a}, b)$  for question  $(I_i, x(s))$ , the score function is

$$V_{I_i, x(s)}^{LS}(\mathbf{a}, b) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \mathbf{a} \in X_i \text{ and } a(s) = b \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

As indicated above, the total number of question pairs is  $N(r) = 157r + 685 = \Theta(r)$ .

The ideal strategy of  $LS(r)$  is based on the representation  $\Psi$  of  $\Gamma$  defined in Definition B.3. We discuss the ideal strategy of  $LS(r)$  in Section 5.1 when we introduce the ideal strategy of the full test.

## 4 Extending the weighted CHSH inequality $\mathcal{I}_\alpha$ into a nonlocal test

In this section, we introduce the extended weighted CHSH test, which is going to be a component of the full test introduced in Section 5. The ideal correlation for this test contains the ideal correlation that achieves  $\mathcal{I}_{-\cot(\pi/d)}^{\max}$ . To ease the study of the implication of a strategy that realize the ideal correlation of the extended weighted CHSH test, we fill in the background of the robust self-testing property of the general weighted CHSH inequality,  $\mathcal{I}_\alpha$ , first.

### 4.1 Robust self-testing of $|EPR\rangle$ via $\mathcal{I}_\alpha$

In this section, we discuss how the weighted CHSH inequality can be used to robustly self-test  $|EPR\rangle$  and Pauli operators defined in Definition 2.11.

The formal statement is given in the theorem below. Since the proof uses the same techniques as in [BP15], we defer the proof till Appendix C, and we only list the key relations that will be reused in Section 6 here.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Define  $\mu := \arctan(1/\alpha)$ . If a quantum strategy  $(|\psi\rangle, \{M_x := M_x^0 - M_x^1\}_{x=1,2}, \{N_y := N_y^0 - N_y^1\}_{y=1,2})$  achieves that  $\mathcal{I}_\alpha \geq \mathcal{I}_\alpha^{\max} - \epsilon$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$ , then there exists a local isometry  $\Phi = \Phi_A \otimes \Phi_B$  and an auxiliary state  $|junk\rangle$  such that*

$$\|\Phi(M_x \otimes N_y |\psi\rangle) - |junk\rangle \otimes (\tilde{M}_x \otimes \tilde{N}_y) |EPR\rangle\| = O\left(\frac{1}{\cos^2(\mu) \sin^{1/2}(\mu)} + \frac{1}{\sin(\mu)^{3/2}}\right) \sqrt{\epsilon}$$

for  $x, y \in \{0, 1, 2\}$  where the subscript 0 refers to the identity operator and  $\tilde{M}_x, \tilde{N}_y$  are defined in Definition 2.11.

We follow the convention used in [BP15], which defines

$$\begin{aligned} Z_A &:= M_1 & X_A &:= M_2 \\ Z_B &:= \frac{N_1 + N_2}{2 \cos \mu} & X_B &:= \frac{N_1 - N_2}{2 \sin \mu}. \end{aligned}$$

The key relations that will be reused are

$$Z_A |\psi\rangle \simeq \frac{\sqrt{s\epsilon}}{c} Z_B |\psi\rangle, \quad (26)$$

$$X_A |\psi\rangle \simeq \frac{\sqrt{\epsilon}}{\sqrt{s}} X_B |\psi\rangle, \quad (27)$$

$$X_A (\mathbb{1} + Z_B) |\psi\rangle \simeq \frac{c+1}{c\sqrt{s}} \sqrt{\epsilon} X_B (\mathbb{1} - Z_A) |\psi\rangle, \quad (28)$$

$$Z_A (\mathbb{1} + X_B) |\psi\rangle \simeq \frac{s+1}{c\sqrt{s}} \sqrt{\epsilon} Z_B (\mathbb{1} - X_A) |\psi\rangle, \quad (29)$$

$$Z_A X_A |\psi\rangle \simeq \frac{1+c+s}{c\sqrt{s}} \sqrt{\epsilon} - X_A Z_A |\psi\rangle, \quad (30)$$

$$X_A Z_A |\psi\rangle \simeq \frac{2s^2+cs+c+s}{cs\sqrt{s}} \sqrt{\epsilon} - X_B Z_B |\psi\rangle. \quad (31)$$

We keep the exact error terms for the substitution steps in Section 6.

### 4.2 The extended weighted CHSH test

In this subsection, we first give the definition of the extended weighted CHSH test, then we discuss the ideal strategy of it. We defer the ideal correlation of this test til Section 5.3 as it will be presented as a part of the ideal correlation of the full test.

**Definition 4.2.** In the extended weighted CHSH test, the input alphabets and output alphabets for Alice and Bob are

$$\mathcal{X}^{EXT} = \mathcal{Y}^{EXT} = \{0, 1, 2, n(r) + 1, n(r) + 2\},$$

$$\mathcal{A}_z^{EXT} = \mathcal{B}_z^{EXT} = \begin{cases} \{0, 2\} & \text{if } z = 0, \\ \{0, 1\} & \text{if } z \in \{1, 2\} \\ \{0, 1, 2\} & \text{if } z \in \{n(r) + 1, n(r) + 2\}. \end{cases}$$

The probability distribution over all the question pairs  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X}^{EXT} \times \mathcal{Y}^{EXT}$  is uniform.

The reason why this test is called the extended weighted CHSH test will be clear after we introduce the ideal strategy. The superscript *EXT* stresses the fact the labeled object is for the extended weighted CHSH test.

Recall the Hilbert space  $W_{d-1}$  defined in eq. (19). To better characterize the shared state and the observables of the ideal strategy, we need to decompose  $W_{d-1}$  into 2-dimensional orthogonal subspaces. In order to do it, we introduce the third basis of  $W_{d-1}$ :  $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=1}^{d-1}$  defined by

$$|j\rangle = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|x_j\rangle + e^{-ij\pi/d}|x_{d-j}\rangle) \quad (32)$$

$$|d-j\rangle = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(|x_j\rangle - e^{-ij\pi/d}|x_{d-j}\rangle) \quad (33)$$

for  $1 \leq j \leq \frac{d-1}{2}$ . Then the 2-dimensional subspaces are

$$V_j = \text{span}(|j\rangle, |d-j\rangle) \quad (34)$$

for  $1 \leq j \leq \frac{d-1}{2}$ . The projector onto  $V_j$  is denoted by  $\Pi_{V_j}$ . On each subspace  $V_j$ , we define states

$$|j_\times\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|j\rangle + |d-j\rangle) \quad |(d-j)_\times\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|j\rangle - |d-j\rangle) \quad (35)$$

and

$$|j_+\rangle = \cos\left(-\frac{j\pi}{2d}\right)|j\rangle + \sin\left(-\frac{j\pi}{2d}\right)|d-j\rangle \quad |(d-j)_+\rangle = \sin\left(-\frac{j\pi}{2d}\right)|j\rangle - \cos\left(-\frac{j\pi}{2d}\right)|d-j\rangle \quad (36)$$

$$|j_-\rangle = \cos\left(-\frac{j\pi}{2d}\right)|j\rangle - \sin\left(-\frac{j\pi}{2d}\right)|d-j\rangle \quad |(d-j)_-\rangle = \sin\left(-\frac{j\pi}{2d}\right)|j\rangle + \cos\left(-\frac{j\pi}{2d}\right)|d-j\rangle. \quad (37)$$

Note that  $\{|j_\times\rangle, |(d-j)_\times\rangle\}$ ,  $\{|j_+\rangle, |(d-j)_+\rangle\}$  and  $\{|j_-\rangle, |(d-j)_-\rangle\}$  are three sets of basis states of  $V_j$ . These are the states that the ideal strategy measures.

The shared state of the ideal strategy is

$$|\tilde{\psi}\rangle^{EXT} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{(d-1)/2} e^{ij\pi/d} (|j\rangle|j\rangle + |d-j\rangle|d-j\rangle). \quad (38)$$

Note that in the standard basis of  $W_{d-1}$ ,

$$|\tilde{\psi}\rangle^{EXT} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} |x_j\rangle|x_{d-j}\rangle.$$

First of all, the ideal strategy ensures that when Alice and Bob get the same question from the set  $\{0, n(r) + 1, n(r) + 2\}$ , they always give the same answer. Alice's and Bob's measurements for questions  $0, n(r) + 1$  and  $n(r) + 2$  are

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}_0^0 &= \tilde{Q}_0^0 = \Pi_{V_1} & \tilde{P}_0^2 &= \tilde{Q}_0^2 = \Pi_{V_1}^\perp \\ \tilde{P}_{n(r)+1}^0 &= \tilde{Q}_{n(r)+1}^0 = |1\rangle\langle 1| & \tilde{P}_{n(r)+1}^1 &= \tilde{Q}_{n(r)+1}^1 = |d-1\rangle\langle d-1| \\ \tilde{P}_{n(r)+2}^0 &= \tilde{Q}_{n(r)+2}^0 = |1_\times\rangle\langle 1_\times| & \tilde{P}_{n(r)+2}^1 &= \tilde{Q}_{n(r)+2}^1 = |(d-1)_\times\rangle\langle (d-1)_\times| \\ \tilde{P}_{n(r)+1}^2 &= \tilde{Q}_{n(r)+1}^2 = \Pi_{V_1}^\perp & \tilde{P}_{n(r)+2}^2 &= \tilde{Q}_{n(r)+2}^2 = \Pi_{V_1}^\perp, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Pi_{V_1}^\perp = \mathbb{1} - \Pi_{V_1}.$$

Intuitively, these questions force Alice and Bob to agree on the subspace  $V_1$  and on the basis of  $V_1$  that they measure.

The ideal strategy also ensures that when Alice gets  $x \in \{1, 2\}$  and Bob gets  $y \in \{n(r) + 1, n(r) + 2\}$ , their answers  $a, b \in \{0, 1\}$  should maximize  $\mathcal{I}_{\cot(-\pi/d)}$  with Alice and Bob's roles flipped; and when Alice gets  $x \in \{n(r) + 1, n(r) + 2\}$  and Bob gets  $y \in \{1, 2\}$ , their answers  $a, b \in \{0, 1\}$  should maximize  $\mathcal{I}_{\cot(-\pi/d)}$ . This is the reason behind naming this test the extended weighted CHSH test. It is also the reason behind having Alice and Bob agreeing on the subspace  $V_1$ .

When Alice and Bob gets question 1 or 2, what they measure are

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}_1^0 &= \tilde{Q}_1^0 = \sum_{j=1}^{(d-1)/2} |j_+\rangle\langle j_+| & \tilde{P}_1^1 &= \tilde{Q}_1^1 = \sum_{j=1}^{(d-1)/2} |(d-j)_+\rangle\langle (d-j)_+| \\ \tilde{P}_2^0 &= \tilde{Q}_2^0 = \sum_{j=1}^{(d-1)/2} |j_-\rangle\langle j_-| & \tilde{P}_1^1 &= \tilde{Q}_1^1 = \sum_{j=1}^{(d-1)/2} |(d-j)_-\rangle\langle (d-j)_-|. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, their measurements on  $V_1$  for question 1 and 2, follow the measurements to achieve  $\mathcal{I}_{\cot(-\pi/d)}^{\max}$ . What they measure on the complementary of  $V_1$  in  $W_{d-1}$  is irrelevant for this test, but important for the full test introduced in the next section.

## 5 The full test

The full test consists of the linear system game  $LS(r)$ , the extended weighted CHSH test and a commutation game. We explain how the games and test are conducted and introduce the ideal strategy for each of them in Section 5.1. Then we explain how they are combined in the full test and present the ideal strategy for the full test in Section 5.2. The full correlation, denoted by  $\mathfrak{C}(r, d)$ , is generated by the ideal strategy and presented in Section 5.3.

### 5.1 The components of the full test

The first component of the full test is  $LS(r)$  (Definition 3.8). The ideal strategy of  $LS(r)$  follows the representation  $\Psi$  of  $\Gamma$  (Definition B.3). Recall the two Hilbert spaces  $W_{d-1}$  and  $W_2$  defined in eq. (19). In the ideal strategy Alice and Bob share the state

$$|\tilde{\psi}\rangle^{LS} = \frac{1}{2}(|x_1\rangle|x_1\rangle + |x_2\rangle|x_2\rangle)^{\otimes 2} \otimes \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} |x_j\rangle|x_{d-j}\rangle \right). \quad (39)$$

Alice and Bob's observables for each variable  $x(s)$  are defined by

$$\tilde{M}(s) = \tilde{N}(s) = \Psi(s)$$

for each  $s \in S$ .

The second component is the extended weighted CHSH test, introduced in Section 4.2.

The third component is a commutation game. Our commutation game is based on the commutation test used in [CGJV19]. The goal of the commutation game is to make sure that some of Alice's binary observables for  $LS(r)$  commute with her observable for the extended weighted CHSH test, when acting on the shared state. So we reuse questions and answers from the two other components of the full test.

Bob's input set consists of eight question pairs

$$\mathcal{Y}^{\text{COMM}} = \{(n(r) + 1, x(s)), (n(r) + 2, x(s)) : s = f_0, f_2, g_0, g_2\},$$

and Alice's input set is

$$\mathcal{X}^{\text{COMM}} = \{n(r) + 1, n(r) + 2, x(f_0), x(f_2), x(g_0), x(g_2)\}.$$

The answer sets are

$$\mathcal{A}_x^{\text{COMM}} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z}_3 & \text{if } x \in \{n(r) + 1, n(r) + 2\} \\ \mathbb{Z}_2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$\mathcal{B}^{\text{COMM}} = \mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_2.$$

The probability distribution is

$$\pi^{\text{COMM}}(x, (y_1, y_2)) = \begin{cases} 1/16 & \text{if } x = y_1 \text{ or } x = y_2 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The scoring function is

$$V^{\text{COMM}}(a, (b_1, b_2), x, (y_1, y_2)) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = y_1 \text{ and } a = b_1 \\ 1 & \text{if } x = y_2 \text{ and } a = b_2 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The probability distribution makes sure that Alice gets one of the two questions that Bob gets. To win this game, Alice and Bob should agree on the answer to the common question.

We defer the ideal strategy for this test till the next subsection because the ideal strategy for the other two tests above can win this game as well.

## 5.2 The full test and the ideal strategy

**Definition 5.1** (The full test). *Define*

$$\mathcal{X}^{\text{EXT}'} = \mathcal{Y}^{\text{EXT}'} = \{0, x(a_1), x(a_2), n(r) + 1, n(r) + 2\}.$$

The question sets of the full test are

$$\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}^{\text{LS}} \cup \mathcal{X}^{\text{EXT}'} \cup \mathcal{X}^{\text{COMM}},$$

$$\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Y}^{\text{LS}} \cup \mathcal{Y}^{\text{EXT}'} \cup \mathcal{Y}^{\text{COMM}}.$$

Define answer sets  $\mathcal{A}_x^{EXT'}$  for each  $x \in \mathcal{X}^{EXT'}$  by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_{x(a_1)}^{EXT'} &= \mathcal{A}_1^{EXT} \\ \mathcal{A}_{x(a_2)}^{EXT'} &= \mathcal{A}_2^{EXT} \\ \mathcal{A}_x^{EXT'} &= \mathcal{A}_x^{EXT} \quad \text{for } x \neq x(a_1), x(a_2)\end{aligned}$$

The answer sets  $\mathcal{B}_y^{EXT'}$  are defined analogously. The answer sets of the full test are

$$\mathcal{A}_x = \begin{cases} \mathcal{A}_x^{LS} & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{X}^{LS} \\ \mathcal{A}_x^{EXT'} & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{X}^{EXT'} \\ \mathcal{A}_x^{COMM} & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{X}^{COMM}, \end{cases} \quad \mathcal{B}_y = \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z}_2 & \text{if } y \in \mathcal{Y}^{LS} \\ \mathcal{B}_y^{EXT'} & \text{if } y \in \mathcal{Y}^{EXT'} \\ \mathcal{B}_y^{COMM} & \text{if } y \in \mathcal{Y}^{COMM}. \end{cases}$$

Define

$$N := N(r) + 25 + 16 = 157r + 726.$$

The question distribution of the full test,  $\pi : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined by

$$\pi(x, y) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{N} & \text{if } (x, y) \in \mathcal{X}^{LS} \times \mathcal{Y}^{LS} \text{ and } \pi^{LS}(x, y) > 0 \\ \frac{1}{N} & \text{if } (x, y) \in \mathcal{X}^{EXT'} \times \mathcal{Y}^{EXT'} \\ \frac{1}{N} & \text{if } (x, y) \in \mathcal{X}^{COMM} \times \mathcal{Y}^{COMM} \text{ and } \pi^{COMM}(x, y) > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that  $\mathcal{X}^{EXT'}$  is obtained from  $\mathcal{X}^{EXT}$  by replacing 1 by  $x(a_1)$  and 2 by  $x(a_2)$ , and similarly for  $\mathcal{Y}^{EXT'}$ . The answer sets  $\mathcal{A}_x^{EXT'}$  are constructed from  $\mathcal{A}_x^{EXT}$  in a similar way.

The ideal strategy for the full test is an extension of the ideal strategy of  $LS(r)$  to make it generate the ideal correlation of the extended weighted CHSH test. Recall the subspace  $W_{d-1}$  and  $W_2$  defined in eq. (19). The shared state of the ideal strategy is

$$|\tilde{\psi}\rangle = |\tilde{\psi}\rangle^{LS} = \frac{1}{2}(|x_1\rangle|x_1\rangle + |x_2\rangle|x_2\rangle)^{\otimes 2} \otimes |\tilde{\psi}\rangle^{EXT}. \quad (40)$$

Alice and Bob's observables for each variable in the linear system of  $LS(r)$  are

$$\tilde{M}(s) = \tilde{N}(s) = \Psi(s)$$

for each  $s \in S$  and  $\Psi$  is defined in Definition B.3. When Alice get  $I_i \in \mathcal{X}^{LS}$ , she measures her half of the shared state according to  $\tilde{M}(s)$  for each  $s \in I_i$ .

Alice's and Bob's observables for question  $x(a_1)$  and  $x(a_2)$  of  $\mathcal{X}^{EXT'}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}^{EXT'}$  are

$$\tilde{M}(a_j) = \tilde{N}(a_j) = \Psi(a_j)$$

for  $j = 1, 2$ . They can reproduce the ideal correlation because

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{M}(a_j) &= \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes (\tilde{P}_j^0 - \tilde{P}_j^1) \\ \tilde{N}(a_j) &= \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes (\tilde{Q}_j^0 - \tilde{Q}_j^1),\end{aligned}$$

for  $j = 1, 2$ , which can be checked using eqs. (32), (33), (36) and (37). In particular, the observables  $\tilde{M}(a_j)$  and  $\tilde{N}(a_j)$  are measuring the same state on the subspace  $V_1$  as  $\tilde{P}_j$  and  $\tilde{Q}_j$  for  $j = 1, 2$ .

Recall the ideal projectors  $\tilde{P}_x^a$  and  $\tilde{Q}_y^b$  for the extended weighted CHSH test defined in Section 4.2. Alice's projectors for the question  $x \in \{0, n(r) + 1, n(r) + 2\}$  of  $\mathcal{X}^{EXT'}$  are

$$\tilde{M}_x^a = \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \tilde{P}_x^a$$

for each  $a \in \mathcal{A}_x^{EXT'}$ . Bob's projectors for the question  $y \in \{0, n(r) + 1, n(r) + 2\}$  of  $\mathcal{Y}^{EXT'}$  are

$$\tilde{N}_y^b = \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \tilde{Q}_y^b$$

for each  $b \in \mathcal{B}_y^{EXT'}$ .

Alice's measurements for  $x \in \mathcal{X}^{COMM}$  is the same as her measurements for the other two tests. When Bob gets question  $(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{Y}^{COMM}$ , he measures according to  $\tilde{N}_{y_1}^b$  first and then  $\tilde{N}(y_2)$  because  $\tilde{N}_{y_1}^b$  commutes with  $\tilde{N}(y_2)$  for all  $b$  by construction. This ensures that the ideal strategy can win the commutation game.

An important property of the ideal strategy for it to win  $LS(r)$  is summarized in the following proposition.

**Proposition 5.2.** *The observables  $\tilde{M}(s)$ ,  $\tilde{N}(s)$  and the shared state  $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle$  defined above satisfy the relations*

$$\tilde{M}(s)\tilde{N}(s)|\tilde{\psi}\rangle = |\tilde{\psi}\rangle, \quad (41)$$

for each  $s \in S$ .

*Proof.* Define  $S' = \{f_0, f_1, f_2, g_0, g_1, g_2, m_0, m_1, m_2\} \subset S$ . Notice that for each  $s \in S'$ , both  $\tilde{M}(s)$  and  $\tilde{N}(s)$  act trivially on  $W_{d-1}$ , so we omit the verification about  $\tilde{M}(s)\tilde{N}(s)|\tilde{\psi}\rangle = |\tilde{\psi}\rangle$  for each  $s \in S'$

Next, we notice that each  $s \in S$  can be expressed as the product of a sequence of generators in  $S'$  and  $a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4$  following the relations in  $R$ , so to prove eq. (41), it suffices to prove that it holds true for  $s = a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4$ . Recall that  $\tilde{M}(a_j) = \tilde{N}(a_j) = \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \text{Psi}_0(a_j)$  in Definition B.3, where  $\Psi_0$  is defined in Definition B.1, and  $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|x_1\rangle|x_1\rangle + |x_2\rangle|x_2\rangle)^{\otimes 2} \otimes |\tilde{\psi}\rangle^{EXT}$ . Hence, the problem is further reduced to proving

$$\Psi_0(a_j) \otimes \Psi_0(a_j)|\tilde{\psi}\rangle^{EXT} = |\tilde{\psi}\rangle^{EXT}.$$

for  $1 \leq j \leq 4$ .

Using eqs. (22) and (23), it is straightforward to see that  $\Psi_0(a_j) \otimes \Psi_0(a_j)|\tilde{\psi}\rangle^{EXT} = |\tilde{\psi}\rangle^{EXT}$  for  $j = 1, 2$ . Before checking the two cases  $j = 3$  and  $j = 4$ , we can use eqs. (24) and (25) to derive that

$$\Psi_0(a_3a_4) \otimes \Psi_0(a_3a_4)|\tilde{\psi}\rangle^{EXT} = |\tilde{\psi}\rangle^{EXT}.$$

The eigenvectors of  $\Psi_0(a_3a_4)$  are  $|u_k\rangle$ , for  $0 \leq k \leq d-2$ , and  $|u_k\rangle$  are defined by

$$|u_k\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}} \sum_{j=0}^{d-2} \omega_{d-1}^{jk} |x_{rj}\rangle.$$

Hence we can express  $|x_{rj}\rangle$  in terms of  $|u_k\rangle$  as

$$|x_{rj}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}} \sum_{k=0}^{d-2} \omega_{d-1}^{-jk} |u_k\rangle.$$

Then using the expression of  $\Psi_0(a_4)$  from Definition B.1, we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_0(a_4)|x_{rj}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}}\Psi_0(a_4)\left(|u_0\rangle + \omega_{d-1}^{-j(d-1)/2}|u_{(d-1)/2}\rangle + \sum_{k=1}^{(d-3)/2}(\omega_{d-1}^{-jk}|u_k\rangle + \omega_{d-1}^{jk}|u_{d-1-k}\rangle)\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}}\left(|u_0\rangle + (-1)^j|u_{(d-1)/2}\rangle + \sum_{k=1}^{(d-3)/2}(\omega_{d-1}^{-jk}|u_{d-1-k}\rangle + \omega_{d-1}^{jk}|u_k\rangle)\right) \\ &= |x_{r,d-1-j}\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Note that the expression of  $\Psi_0(a_4)$  can also be found in eq. (25), as  $\Psi(a_4) = \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \Psi_0(a_4)$ . Consequently, we can show that  $\Psi_0(a_4) \otimes \Psi_0(a_4)|\tilde{\psi}\rangle^{EXT} = |\tilde{\psi}\rangle^{EXT}$  because

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_0(a_4) \otimes \Psi_0(a_4)|\tilde{\psi}\rangle^{EXT} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}}\sum_{j=0}^{d-2}\Psi_0(a_4) \otimes \Psi_0(a_4)|x_{rj}\rangle|x_{r,d-1-j}\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}}\sum_{j=0}^{d-2}|x_{r,d-1-j}\rangle|x_{rj}\rangle \\ &= |\tilde{\psi}\rangle^{EXT},\end{aligned}$$

Combining it with the fact that  $\Psi_0(a_3a_4) \otimes \Psi_0(a_3a_4)|\tilde{\psi}\rangle^{EXT} = |\tilde{\psi}\rangle^{EXT}$ , we can conclude that  $\Psi_0(a_3) \otimes \Psi_0(a_3)|\tilde{\psi}\rangle^{EXT} = |\tilde{\psi}\rangle^{EXT}$ .  $\square$

### 5.3 The correlation $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$

The full correlation is generated by the ideal strategy presented in the previous subsection. We denote the full correlation by  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r) = \{(\tilde{P}(a, b|x, y))_{a,b}\}_{x,y}$ . To help readers to understand the proofs in Section 6 better, parts of the full correlation are given in the tables below.

		$x = n(r) + 1$		$x = n(r) + 2$	
		$a = 0$	$a = 1$	$a = 0$	$a = 1$
$y = 1$	$b = 0$	$\frac{\cos^2(\pi/2d)}{d-1}$	$\frac{\sin^2(\pi/2d)}{d-1}$	$\frac{1-\sin(\pi/d)}{2(d-1)}$	$\frac{1+\sin(\pi/d)}{2(d-1)}$
	$b = 1$	$\frac{\sin^2(\pi/2d)}{d-1}$	$\frac{\cos^2(\pi/2d)}{d-1}$	$\frac{1+\sin(\pi/d)}{2(d-1)}$	$\frac{1-\sin(\pi/d)}{2(d-1)}$
$y = 2$	$b = 0$	$\frac{\cos^2(\pi/2d)}{d-1}$	$\frac{\sin^2(\pi/2d)}{d-1}$	$\frac{1+\sin(\pi/d)}{2(d-1)}$	$\frac{1-\sin(\pi/d)}{2(d-1)}$
	$b = 1$	$\frac{\sin^2(\pi/2d)}{d-1}$	$\frac{\cos^2(\pi/2d)}{d-1}$	$\frac{1-\sin(\pi/d)}{2(d-1)}$	$\frac{1+\sin(\pi/d)}{2(d-1)}$

Table 1: The correlation for  $x \in \{n(r) + 1, n(r) + 2\}$  and  $y \in \{1, 2\}$ .

We don't explicitly calculate the conditional probabilities of the form  $P(2, 0|x, y)$  when  $x \in \{n(r) + 1, n(r) + 2\}$  and  $y \in \{1, 2\}$  because they are irrelevant. Note that when  $x \in \{1, 2\}$  and  $y \in \{n(r) + 1, n(r) + 2\}$ , the correlation table is very similar to Table 1, so we omit it here.



		$x = n(r) + 1$			$x = n(r) + 2$			$x = 0$	
		$a = 0$	$a = 1$	$a = 2$	$a = 0$	$a = 1$	$a = 2$	$a = 0$	$a = 2$
$y = n(r) + 1$	$b = 0$	$\frac{1}{d-1}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2d-2}$	$\frac{1}{2d-2}$	0	$\frac{1}{d-1}$	0
	$b = 1$	0	$\frac{1}{d-1}$	0	$\frac{1}{2d-2}$	$\frac{1}{2d-2}$	0	$\frac{1}{d-1}$	0
	$b = 2$	0	0	$\frac{d-3}{d-1}$	0	0	$\frac{d-3}{d-1}$	0	$\frac{d-3}{d-1}$
$y = n(r) + 2$	$b = 0$	$\frac{1}{2d-2}$	$\frac{1}{2d-2}$	0	$\frac{1}{d-1}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{d-1}$	0
	$b = 1$	$\frac{1}{2d-2}$	$\frac{1}{2d-2}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{d-1}$	0	$\frac{1}{d-1}$	0
	$b = 2$	0	0	$\frac{d-3}{d-1}$	0	0	$\frac{d-3}{d-1}$	0	$\frac{d-3}{d-1}$
$y = 0$	$b = 0$	$\frac{1}{d-1}$	$\frac{1}{d-1}$	0	$\frac{1}{d-1}$	$\frac{1}{d-1}$	0	$\frac{2}{d-1}$	0
	$b = 2$	0	0	$\frac{d-3}{d-1}$	0	0	$\frac{d-3}{d-1}$	0	$\frac{d-3}{d-1}$

Table 2: The correlation for  $x, y \in \{0, n(r) + 1, n(r) + 2\}$ .

		$y = (n(r) + 1, f_0)$					
		$b = (0, 0)$	$b = (0, 1)$	$b = (1, 0)$	$b = (1, 1)$	$b = (2, 0)$	$b = (2, 1)$
$x = n(r) + 1$	$a = 0$	$\frac{1}{2d-2}$	$\frac{1}{2d-2}$	0	0	0	0
	$a = 1$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2d-2}$	$\frac{1}{2d-2}$	0	0
	$a = 2$	0	0	0	0	$\frac{d-3}{2d-2}$	$\frac{d-3}{2d-2}$
$x = f_0$	$a = 0$	$\frac{1}{2d-2}$	0	$\frac{1}{2d-2}$	0	$\frac{d-3}{2d-2}$	0
	$a = 1$	0	$\frac{1}{2d-2}$	0	$\frac{1}{2d-2}$	0	$\frac{d-3}{2d-2}$

Table 3: The correlation for the commutation test for questions  $x(f_0)$  and  $n(r) + 1$ .

The correlation tables for the other seven pairs of questions of the commutation game are similar.

## 6 Robust self-testing with $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$

In this section, we examine the properties of a strategy  $\mathfrak{S}$  that can reproduce the correlation  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$  approximately and prove that the shared state of  $\mathfrak{S}$  must be close to the state  $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle$  up to some local isometry.

We first give the definition of an approximate strategy of a fixed correlation.

**Definition 6.1.** Let  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$  be input alphabets,  $\{\mathcal{A}_x\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}, \{\mathcal{B}_y\}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}$  be families of output alphabets. For a correlation  $\tilde{\mathfrak{C}} = (\tilde{P}(a, b|x, y))$  with  $(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}_x \times \mathcal{B}_y$  and  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ , and a distribution  $\pi$  over all the  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ , we say a quantum strategy  $\mathfrak{S} = (|\psi\rangle, \{M_x^a\}, \{N_y^b\})$  is an  $\epsilon$ -approximate quantum strategy of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{C}}$  with respect to the distribution  $\pi$ , if it produces the correlation  $(P(a, b|x, y) = \langle \psi | M_x^a N_y^b | \psi \rangle)$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \pi} \left[ \sum_{ab} |P(a, b|x, y) - \tilde{P}(a, b|x, y)| \right] \leq \epsilon. \quad (42)$$

In our full test, the probability distribution over question pairs is  $\pi$  given in Definition 5.1. In the rest of this section, when we say some strategy can approximate  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$ , we mean that the approximation is with respect to this distribution  $\pi$ .

The number of all the possible question pairs is  $N = \Theta(r)$ . Considering that the number of possible output pairs is constant for each question pair  $(x, y)$ , the approximate condition in eq. (42) directly implies that, if  $\mathbb{S}$  is an  $\epsilon$ -approximate strategy of  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$ , then

$$P(a, b|x, y) \simeq_{O(r\epsilon)} \tilde{P}(a, b|x, y),$$

for all valid  $(a, b, x, y)$  of the full test.

In the next three subsections, we analyze the implication of an approximate strategy for the correlations of the three components introduced in Section 5.1.

## 6.1 Implication of approximately winning $LS(r)$

In this subsection, we study the implications of a strategy that can win  $LS(r)$  with probability close to 1. We prove a series of propositions, which lead us to Lemma 6.7. Lemma 6.7 is a key step of the self-testing proof in Section 6.4.

Recall that in  $LS(r)$  the question pair is denoted by  $(I_i, x(s))$  where  $I_i$  labels an equation and  $x(s)$  is a variable for some  $s \in I_i$ . We denote Alice's observable for variable  $x(s)$  in equation  $i$  by  $M_i(s)$  and Bob's observable for variable  $x(s)$  by  $N(s)$ .

The first implication of an approximate winning strategy is given in the proposition below.

**Proposition 6.2.** *Let  $\mathbb{S}$  be an  $\epsilon$ -approximate strategy of  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$ . Define  $M(s) := M_i(s)$  where  $i$  is the smallest among all  $i$ 's such that  $x(s) \in I_i$ . Then,*

$$M(s)N(s)|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} |\psi\rangle \quad (43)$$

$$\prod_{s \in I_i} M(s)|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (-1)^{c(i)} |\psi\rangle, \quad (44)$$

for all  $s \in S$ .

*Proof.* The condition that  $(\tilde{P}(\mathbf{a}, b|I_i, s))$  of  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$  wins the linear system game optimally is equivalent to

$$\sum_{\mathbf{a}, b: \mathbf{a} \in X_i, a(j)=b} \tilde{P}(\mathbf{a}, b|I_i, s) = 1$$

for all  $i = 1 \dots m(r)$ . We also know that the shared state  $|\psi\rangle$  and observables  $M_i(s)$  and  $N(s)$  of  $\mathbb{S}$  satisfy the relation

$$\langle \psi | M_i(s) N(s) | \psi \rangle = 2 \sum_{\mathbf{a}, b: \mathbf{a} \in X_i, a(s)=b} P(\mathbf{a}, b|I_i, s) - 1,$$

as proved in [Slo19]. Using the fact that  $\mathbb{S}$  approximates the winning correlation of  $LS(r)$ , we can further see that

$$\langle \psi | M_i(s) N(s) | \psi \rangle \simeq_{O(r\epsilon)} 2 \sum_{\mathbf{a}, b: \mathbf{a} \in X_i, a(j)=b} \tilde{P}(\mathbf{a}, b|I_i, s) - 1 = 1.$$

Since  $M_i(s)$  and  $N(s)$  are binary observables, the equation above implies that

$$\|M_i(s)|\psi\rangle - N(s)|\psi\rangle\|^2 = 2 - 2\langle \psi | M_i(s) N(s) | \psi \rangle \leq 2 - 2(1 - O(r\epsilon)) = O(r\epsilon),$$

or equivalently,

$$M_i(s)|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} N(s)|\psi\rangle,$$

for each  $1 \leq i \leq m(r)$  and generator  $s$  of  $\Gamma$ . Recall that  $M(s) := M_i(s)$  for the smallest  $i$  such that  $s \in I_i$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} M(s)N(s)|\psi\rangle &= M_i(s)N(s)|\psi\rangle \\ &= N(s)M_i(s)|\psi\rangle \\ &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} N(s)^2|\psi\rangle \\ &= |\psi\rangle \end{aligned}$$

for all  $s \in S$ .

The fact that  $\mathbb{S}$  is an  $\epsilon$ -approximate strategy also tells us that Alice gives satisfying assignment for each equation with probability  $1 - O(r\epsilon)$ , or equivalently,

$$\prod_{s \in I_i} M_i(s)|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (-1)^{c(i)}|\psi\rangle$$

for  $1 \leq i \leq m(r)$ . If we replace each  $M_i(s)$  with  $M(s)$  in the equation above, we demonstrate the effect on a general case that  $I_i = \{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|M_i(s_1)M_i(s_2)M_i(s_3)|\psi\rangle - M(s_1)M(s_2)M(s_3)|\psi\rangle\| \\ &\leq \|M_i(s_1)M_i(s_2)M_i(s_3)|\psi\rangle - M(s_1)M_i(s_2)M_i(s_3)|\psi\rangle\| \\ &\quad + \|M(s_1)M_i(s_2)M_i(s_3)|\psi\rangle - M(s_1)M(s_2)M_i(s_3)|\psi\rangle\| \\ &\quad + \|M(s_1)M(s_2)M_i(s_3)|\psi\rangle - M(s_1)M(s_2)M(s_3)|\psi\rangle\| \\ &\leq 3O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon}) = O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon}), \end{aligned}$$

where we bound each term in line 2,3 and 4 by Lemma 2.17. Hence we can conclude that

$$\prod_{s \in I_i} M(s)|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (-1)^{c(i)}|\psi\rangle$$

for  $1 \leq i \leq m(r)$ . Note that with the same technique, we can prove that

$$\prod_{s \in I_i} N(s)|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (-1)^{c(i)}|\psi\rangle$$

for  $1 \leq i \leq m(r)$ . □

To make the following derivations easier to understand, we introduce a new terminology.

**Definition 6.3.** Let  $S$  be a set of generators, and  $\{s_i\}_{i=1}^n$  and  $\{s'_j\}_{j=1}^m$  be two sequences of  $S$ . Define a relation  $r$ , whose equation form is  $\prod_{i=1}^n s_i = \prod_{j=1}^m s'_j$ . We say operators  $\{M(s) : s \in S\}$   $\epsilon$ -approximately satisfy the relation  $r$  on the state  $|\psi\rangle$  if

$$\prod_{i=1}^n M(s_i)|\psi\rangle \simeq_{\epsilon} \prod_{j=1}^m M(s'_j)|\psi\rangle.$$

Using the new terminology, Proposition 6.2 can be rephrased as the following proposition.

**Proposition 6.4.** Let  $\mathbb{S}$  be an  $\epsilon$ -approximate strategy of  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$ . Then the observables  $\{M(s)\}_{s \in S}$  and  $\{N(s)\}_{s \in S}$  defined in Proposition 6.2,  $O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})$ -approximately satisfy each relation  $t \in R$  on the shared state  $|\psi\rangle$ , where  $S$  is the generator set of  $\Gamma$  and  $R$  is the relation set of  $\Gamma$ .

Recall that the group  $\mathcal{P}_1$  (Definition 3.3) is embedded in  $\Gamma$ , as proved in Proposition 3.6. Following the embedding procedure, we can prove the next proposition.

**Proposition 6.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be an  $\epsilon$ -approximate strategy of  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$ . Then the observables  $\{M(s)\}_{s \in S_1}$  and  $\{N(s)\}_{s \in S_1}$ , defined in Proposition 6.4,  $O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})$ -approximately satisfy each relation  $t \in R_1$  on  $|\psi\rangle$ , where  $S_1$  is the generator set of  $\mathcal{P}_1$  and  $R_1$  is the relation set of  $\mathcal{P}_1$ .*

*Proof.* We prove

$$M(f_0)M(b_1)M(f_0)|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M(c_1)|\psi\rangle \quad (45)$$

to demonstrate the techniques. From the fact that Alice's observables  $O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})$ -approximately satisfy the linear relations of  $\Gamma$ , we can get that

$$\begin{aligned} M(f_0)|\psi\rangle &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M(f_1)M(f_2)|\psi\rangle \\ M(b_1)|\psi\rangle &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M(f_2)M(p_{1,1})|\psi\rangle \\ M(f_0)|\psi\rangle &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M(p_{1,3})M(p_{1,4})|\psi\rangle \end{aligned}$$

Then we expand  $M(f_0)M(b_1)M(f_0)|\psi\rangle$  using the three equations above and Lemma 2.17,

$$\begin{aligned} M(f_0)M(b_1)M(f_0)|\psi\rangle &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M(f_1)M(f_2)M(b_1)M(f_0)|\psi\rangle \\ &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M(f_1)M(f_2)M(f_2)M(p_{1,1})M(f_0)|\psi\rangle \\ &= M(f_1)M(p_{1,1})M(f_0)|\psi\rangle \\ &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M(f_1)M(p_{1,1})M(p_{1,3})M(p_{1,4})|\psi\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

In the rest of the proof, we skip steps of applying Lemma 2.17. Next, we can simplify  $M(f_0)M(b_1)M(f_0)|\psi\rangle$  as

$$\begin{aligned} M(f_0)M(b_1)M(f_0)|\psi\rangle &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M(f_1)M(p_{1,1})M(p_{1,3})M(p_{1,4})|\psi\rangle \\ &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M(f_1)M(p_{1,2})M(p_{1,4})|\psi\rangle \\ &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M(p_{1,5})M(p_{1,4})|\psi\rangle \\ &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M(c_1)|\psi\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where from the second line to the third line, we used the relation  $M(p_{1,1})M(p_{1,2})M(p_{1,3})|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} |\psi\rangle$ , and from the third line to the fourth line, we used the relation  $M(c_1)M(p_{1,4})M(p_{1,5})|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} |\psi\rangle$ .

The derivation of other relations in  $R_1$  from relations in  $R$  involves the same number of substitutions and uses similar techniques, so we omit it here.  $\square$

Essentially the proof above follows the proof of Proposition 3.6, so we can follow the proof of Proposition 3.4 to prove the next proposition.

**Proposition 6.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be an  $\epsilon$ -approximate strategy of  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$ . Then the observables  $\{M(s)\}_{s \in S_0}$  and  $\{N(s)\}_{s \in S_0}$ , defined in Proposition 6.4,  $O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})$ -approximately satisfy each relation  $t \in R_0$  on the shared state  $|\psi\rangle$ , where  $S_0$  is the generator set of  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and  $R_0$  is the relation set of  $\mathcal{P}_0$ .*

Following the steps of the embedding of  $(a_3a_4)^l a_1 a_2 (a_4 a_3)^l = (a_1 a_2)^{r^l}$  into  $\Gamma$  presented in the proof of Proposition 3.2, we can prove the next lemma.

**Lemma 6.7.** Let  $\mathbb{S}$  be an  $\epsilon$ -approximate strategy of  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$  and  $\{M(s), N(s)\}_{s \in S}$  be the observables defined in Proposition 6.4. Then,

$$M(a_1)M(a_2)(M(a_4)M(a_3))^l|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{l+1/2}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (M(a_4)M(a_3))^l(M(a_1)M(a_2))^{r^l}|\psi\rangle, \quad (46)$$

$$N(a_1)N(a_2)(N(a_4)N(a_3))^l|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{l+1/2}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (N(a_4)N(a_3))^l(N(a_1)N(a_2))^{r^l}|\psi\rangle, \quad (47)$$

for all  $l \geq 1$ .

*Proof.* Proving the  $l = 1$  case is essentially proving that observables  $\{M(a_i)\}_{i=1}^4$  and  $\{N(a_i)\}_{i=1}^4$   $O(r^{3/2}\sqrt{\epsilon})$ -approximately satisfy the relation

$$(a_3a_4)(a_1a_2)(a_4a_3) = (a_1a_2)^r \quad (48)$$

on the shared state  $|\psi\rangle$ . The derivation follows the proof of Proposition 3.2. The  $O(r^{3/2}\sqrt{\epsilon})$  approximation error comes from the fact that the derivation of eq. (48) has  $\Theta(r)$  substitution steps, where each substitutes uses a different relation of  $R_0$ . So we have

$$M(a_1)M(a_2)(M(a_4)M(a_3))|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{3/2}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (M(a_4)M(a_3))(M(a_1)M(a_2))^r|\psi\rangle. \quad (49)$$

Assume the statement is true for  $l = n$  and consider the case that  $l = n + 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} M(a_1)M(a_2)(M(a_4)M(a_3))^{n+1}|\psi\rangle &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (N(a_3)N(a_4))M(a_1)M(a_2)(M(a_4)M(a_3))^n|\psi\rangle \\ &\simeq_{O(r^{n+1/2}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (N(a_3)N(a_4))(M(a_4)M(a_3))^n(M(a_1)M(a_2))^{r^n}|\psi\rangle \\ &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (M(a_4)M(a_3))^n(M(a_1)M(a_2))^{r^n}(M(a_4)M(a_3))|\psi\rangle \\ &\simeq_{O(r^{n+3/2}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (M(a_4)M(a_3))^{n+1}(M(a_1)M(a_2))^{r^{n+1}}|\psi\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where from the second last to the last line we repeat the process of applying eq. (49) and the relation  $(M(a_1)M(a_2))^r|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{3/2}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (N(a_1)N(a_2))^r|\psi\rangle$ ,  $r^n$  times. In short, we have

$$M(a_1)M(a_2)(M(a_4)M(a_3))^{n+1}|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{n+3/2}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (M(a_4)M(a_3))^{n+1}(M(a_1)M(a_2))^{r^{n+1}}|\psi\rangle. \quad (50)$$

By the principal of induction, the proof is complete. The proof for Bob's observables  $\{N(s)\}_{s \in S}$  is analogous.  $\square$

We define

$$O_A := M(a_1)M(a_2) \quad U_A := M(a_3)M(a_4) \quad (51)$$

$$O_B := N(a_1)N(a_2) \quad U_B := N(a_3)N(a_4). \quad (52)$$

The conclusion of Lemma 6.7 can be rewritten as

$$O_A(U_A^\dagger)^n|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{n+1/2}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (U_A^\dagger)^n O_A^{r^n}|\psi\rangle.$$

On Bob's side, the similar relation holds.

The other key relations that are embedded in  $\Gamma$  are  $f_0g_0 = Jg_0f_0$  and  $f_2g_2 = Jg_2f_2$ . We summarize the implications in the following proposition.

**Proposition 6.8.** Let  $\mathbb{S}, \{M(s), N(s)\}_{s \in S}$  be the strategy and observables defined in Proposition 6.4. Then,

$$M(f_0)M(g_0)|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} -M(g_0)M(f_0)|\psi\rangle \quad (53)$$

$$M(f_2)M(g_2)|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} -M(g_2)M(f_2)|\psi\rangle. \quad (54)$$

Following the substitution steps to prove eq. (17) and eq. (18) in the proof of Proposition 3.6, this proposition can be proved with the same techniques used in the proof of Proposition 6.4.

## 6.2 Implication of the extended weighted CHSH test

In this subsection, we prove a series of propositions and lemmas derived from the fact that some strategy can approximate the ideal correlation of the extended weighted CHSH test, which lead to a key result that will be used in the self-testing proof in Section 6.4.

We will work with a strategy  $\mathbb{S}$  that can approximate  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$ , which contains the ideal correlation of the extended weighted CHSH test. About the notation, for  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X}^{EXT} \times \mathcal{Y}^{EXT}$  and  $(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}_x^{EXT} \times \mathcal{B}_y^{EXT}$ , Alice and Bob's projectors are denoted by  $M_x^a$  and  $N_y^b$ , as illustrated in Section 2. Since the two answers for questions 1 and 2 are 0 and 1, we denote Alice and Bob's binary observables for these two questions by  $M_1, M_2$  and  $N_1, N_2$  respectively. Note that the observables  $M_1 \equiv M(a_1)$  and  $M_2 \equiv M(a_2)$ , where  $M(a_1)$  and  $M(a_2)$  are used in  $LS(r)$ , because questions 1 and 2 are equivalent to questions  $x(a_1)$  and  $x(a_2)$  in the full test. Similarly, on Bob's side, we have  $N_1 \equiv N(a_1)$  and  $N_2 \equiv N(a_2)$ . For simplicity, in this subsection, we use  $M_1, M_2$  and  $N_1, N_2$  only.

**Proposition 6.9.** *Let  $\mathbb{S}$  be an  $\epsilon$ -approximate quantum strategy of  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$ . Then the strategy  $\mathbb{S}$  satisfies the following relations*

$$\begin{aligned}
M_0^0 N_0^0 |\psi\rangle &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M_0^0 |\psi\rangle \\
&\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1) |\psi\rangle \\
&\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (M_{n(r)+2}^0 + M_{n(r)+2}^1) |\psi\rangle \\
&\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} N_0^0 |\psi\rangle \\
&\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (N_{n(r)+1}^0 + N_{n(r)+1}^1) |\psi\rangle \\
&\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (N_{n(r)+2}^0 + N_{n(r)+2}^1) |\psi\rangle \\
M_0^2 N_0^2 |\psi\rangle &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M_0^2 |\psi\rangle \\
&\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M_{n(r)+1}^2 |\psi\rangle \\
&\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M_{n(r)+2}^2 |\psi\rangle \\
&\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} N_0^2 |\psi\rangle \\
&\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} N_{n(r)+1}^2 |\psi\rangle \\
&\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} N_{n(r)+2}^2 |\psi\rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} N_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle & M_{n(r)+1}^1 |\psi\rangle &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} N_{n(r)+1}^1 |\psi\rangle \\
M_{n(r)+2}^0 |\psi\rangle &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} N_{n(r)+2}^0 |\psi\rangle & M_{n(r)+2}^1 |\psi\rangle &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} N_{n(r)+2}^1 |\psi\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We prove  $(M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1) |\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} N_0^0 |\psi\rangle$  as an example. The rest of the relations follow the same line of argument.

Recall that the implication of  $\mathbb{S}$  being an  $\epsilon$ -approximate strategy is that  $P(a, b|x, y) \simeq_{O(r\epsilon)} \tilde{P}(a, b|x, y)$  for each question pair  $(x, y)$  and its associating answer pair  $(a, b)$ . From the correlation, we can observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle \psi | (M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1) N_0^0 | \psi \rangle \\
&= P(0, 0|n(r) + 1, 0) + P(1, 0|n(r) + 1, 0) \\
&\geq \frac{2}{d-1} - O(r\epsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, the correlation also tells us that

$$\langle \psi | N_0^0 | \psi \rangle = P_B(0|0) \simeq_{O(r\epsilon)} \frac{2}{d-1}$$

$$\langle \psi | (M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1) | \psi \rangle = P_A(0|n(r)+1) + P_A(1|n(r)+1) \simeq_{O(r\epsilon)} \frac{2}{d-1},$$

The equations above imply that

$$\begin{aligned} & \| (M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1) | \psi \rangle - N_0^0 | \psi \rangle \|^2 \\ &= \langle \psi | N_0^0 | \psi \rangle + \langle \psi | (M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1) | \psi \rangle - 2 \langle \psi | N_0^0 (M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1) N_0^0 | \psi \rangle \\ &= O(r\epsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that  $(M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1)^2 = M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1$ . Hence we can conclude that  $(M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1) | \psi \rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} N_0^0 | \psi \rangle$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 6.10.** *Let  $\mathfrak{S}$  be an  $\epsilon$ -approximate strategy of  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$ . We define*

$$M_{n(r)+1} = M_{n(r)+1}^0 - M_{n(r)+1}^1 \quad M_{n(r)+2} = M_{n(r)+2}^0 - M_{n(r)+2}^1, \quad (55)$$

$$N_{n(r)+1} = N_{n(r)+1}^0 - N_{n(r)+1}^1 \quad N_{n(r)+2} = N_{n(r)+2}^0 - N_{n(r)+2}^1. \quad (56)$$

Then,

$$\mathfrak{S}_1 = \left( M_{n(r)+1}, M_{n(r)+2}, N_1, N_2, \frac{M_0^0 | \psi \rangle}{\|M_0^0 | \psi \rangle\|} \right), \quad (57)$$

$$\mathfrak{S}_2 = \left( N_{n(r)+1}, N_{n(r)+2}, M_1, M_2, \frac{M_0^0 | \psi \rangle}{\|M_0^0 | \psi \rangle\|} \right). \quad (58)$$

are two  $O(d\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})$ -approximate strategies of the ideal correlation that achieves  $\mathcal{I}_{\cot(-\pi/d)}^{\max}$ .

Note that here we only consider  $\epsilon$  small enough such that  $\|M_0^0 | \psi \rangle\| > 0$ .

*Proof.* We first prove that  $\mathfrak{S}_1$  is an  $O(d\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})$ -approximate strategies of  $\mathcal{I}_{\cot(-\pi/d)}^{\max}$ . This step requires examining the terms of the form  $\langle \psi | M_0^0 M_x^a N_y^b M_0^0 | \psi \rangle$  for  $x = n(r) + 1, n(r) + 2, y = 1, 2$  and  $a, b = 0, 1$ . We find that these terms relate to  $\langle \psi | M_x^a N_y^b | \psi \rangle$  by

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \psi | M_x^a N_y^b | \psi \rangle \\ &= \langle \psi | (M_0^0 + M_0^2) M_x^a N_y^b (M_0^0 + M_0^2) | \psi \rangle \\ &= \langle \psi | M_0^0 M_x^a N_y^b M_0^0 | \psi \rangle + \langle \psi | M_0^0 M_x^a N_y^b M_0^2 | \psi \rangle + \langle \psi | M_0^2 M_x^a N_y^b M_0^0 | \psi \rangle + \langle \psi | M_0^2 M_x^a N_y^b M_0^2 | \psi \rangle \\ &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} \langle \psi | M_0^0 M_x^a N_y^b M_0^0 | \psi \rangle + \langle \psi | M_0^0 M_x^a N_y^b M_x^2 | \psi \rangle + \langle \psi | M_x^2 M_x^a N_y^b M_0^0 | \psi \rangle + \langle \psi | M_x^2 M_x^a N_y^b M_x^2 | \psi \rangle \\ &= \langle \psi | M_0^0 M_x^a N_y^b M_0^0 | \psi \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the facts that  $M_0^2 | \psi \rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M_x^2 | \psi \rangle$  and that  $M_x^0 M_x^2 = 0$  for the relevant values of  $(x, y, a, b)$ .

To demonstrate the effect of this relation, we use an example. If Alice and Bob share state  $M_0^0|\psi\rangle/\|M_0^0|\psi\rangle\|$  and apply  $M_{n(r)+1}^0N_1^0$ , then

$$\frac{\langle\psi|M_0^0M_{n(r)+1}^0N_1^0M_0^0|\psi\rangle}{\langle\psi|M_0^0|\psi\rangle}\simeq_{O(d\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})}\frac{\langle\psi|M_{n(r)+1}^0N_1^0|\psi\rangle}{\langle\psi|M_0^0|\psi\rangle}\simeq_{O(dre)}\frac{\cos^2(-\pi/2d)}{2},$$

where the first error term is derived from

$$\frac{\|\langle\psi|M_0^0M_{n(r)+1}^0N_1^0M_0^0|\psi\rangle-\langle\psi|M_{n(r)+1}^0N_1^0|\psi\rangle\|}{\langle\psi|M_0^0|\psi\rangle}\leq\frac{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})}{\frac{2}{d-1}-O(r\epsilon)}=O(d\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon}).$$

The rest of the conditional probabilities produced by  $\mathfrak{S}_1$  can be derived in the same way. Using the fact that  $O(d\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})$  dominates  $O(dre)$ , we can prove that  $\mathfrak{S}_1$  is an  $O(d\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})$ -approximate strategy of the ideal correlation that achieves  $\mathcal{I}_{\cot(-\pi/d)}^{\max}$ . The proof for  $\mathfrak{S}_2$  is analogous so we omit it here.  $\square$

Based on Propositions 6.9 and 6.10, we identify a special sub-normalized state  $|\psi_1\rangle$ ,

$$|\psi_1\rangle=1/2(M_{n(r)+1}^0+iM_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^1-iM_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^0+M_{n(r)+1}^1)|\psi\rangle. \quad (59)$$

The special properties of  $|\psi_1\rangle$  are summarized in the propositions below. Based on the properties of  $|\psi_1\rangle$ , we will prove that  $|\psi_1\rangle$  can be used to approximate  $|\psi\rangle$  in Lemma 6.15.

**Proposition 6.11.** *Let  $\mathfrak{S}$  be an  $\epsilon$ -approximate strategy of  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$  and  $|\psi_1\rangle$  be as defined in eq. (59). Then,*

$$\| |\psi_1\rangle \|^2 \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} \frac{1}{d-1}. \quad (60)$$

*Proof.* We start by expanding the inner product

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle\psi_1|\psi_1\rangle \\ &=1/4\langle\psi|(M_{n(r)+1}^0-iM_{n(r)+1}^1M_{n(r)+2}+iM_{n(r)+1}^0M_{n(r)+2}+M_{n(r)+1}^1) \\ &\quad (M_{n(r)+1}^0+iM_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^1-iM_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^0+M_{n(r)+1}^1)|\psi\rangle \\ &=1/2\langle\psi|(M_{n(r)+1}^0+M_{n(r)+1}^1-iM_{n(r)+1}^1M_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^0+iM_{n(r)+1}^0M_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^1)|\psi\rangle \end{aligned}$$

Here we apply the trick to flip  $M_{n(r)+1}^1$  and  $M_{n(r)+1}^0$  to Bob's side and get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\psi|M_{n(r)+1}^1M_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^0|\psi\rangle &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})}\langle\psi|N_{n(r)+1}^1M_{n(r)+2}N_{n(r)+1}^0|\psi\rangle \\ &=\langle\psi|N_{n(r)+1}^1N_{n(r)+1}^0M_{n(r)+2}|\psi\rangle=0. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have  $\langle\psi|M_{n(r)+1}^0M_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^1|\psi\rangle\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})}0$ . Hence, from the ideal correlation, we get

$$\langle\psi_1|\psi_1\rangle\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})}1/2\langle\psi|(M_{n(r)+1}^0+M_{n(r)+1}^1)|\psi\rangle\simeq_{O(r\epsilon)}\frac{1}{d-1}. \quad (61)$$

$\square$

**Proposition 6.12.** *Let  $\mathfrak{S}$  be an  $\epsilon$ -approximate strategy of  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$  and  $|\psi_1\rangle$  be as defined in eq. (59). Then,*

$$N_1N_2|\psi_1\rangle\simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})}\omega_d|\psi_1\rangle. \quad (62)$$



The idea of this proof is to apply the general results in Section 4.1 to the strategy  $\mathfrak{S}_1$ , so in the first half of the proof, we can derive how  $N_1$  and  $N_2$  act on the state  $M_{n(r)+1}^0|\psi\rangle$  and  $M_{n(r)+1}^1|\psi\rangle$ . In the second half, we combine  $M_{n(r)+1}^0|\psi\rangle$  and  $M_{n(r)+1}^1|\psi\rangle$  in a way and show that it is an eigenvector of  $N_1N_2$ . It turns out that this combination of  $M_{n(r)+1}^0|\psi\rangle$  and  $M_{n(r)+1}^1|\psi\rangle$  is closely related to  $|\psi_1\rangle$ . We show all the calculations to make the proof easier to read.

*Proof.* Following the convention in Section 4.1, we define

$$\begin{aligned} c &:= \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d}\right) & s &:= \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{d}\right) \\ Z_A &:= M_{n(r)+1} & X_A &:= M_{n(r)+2} \\ Z_B &:= \frac{N_1 + N_2}{2c} & X_B &:= \frac{N_1 - N_2}{-2s}. \end{aligned}$$

In the first step, we will show how  $(N_1 + N_2)/2c$ , or  $Z_B$ , acts on  $M_{n(r)+1}^0|\psi\rangle$  and  $M_{n(r)+1}^1|\psi\rangle$ . Recall that Theorem 4.1 applies to all approximating strategies of  $\mathcal{L}_{-\cot(\pi/d)}^{\max}$ , so we can substitute appropriate operators and the shared state into eq. (26) to see that

$$\|Z_B M_0^0|\psi\rangle - Z_A M_0^0|\psi\rangle\| \leq \sqrt{s} \|M_0^0|\psi\rangle\| O(\sqrt{dr}^{1/4} \epsilon^{1/4}) = O(r^{1/4} \epsilon^{1/4} / \sqrt{d}).$$

Since  $M_0^0|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1)|\psi\rangle$ , the equation above can be rewritten as

$$Z_B(M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1)|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} (M_{n(r)+1}^0 - M_{n(r)+1}^1)|\psi\rangle,$$

where we use the fact that  $Z_A = M_{n(r)+1}^0 - M_{n(r)+1}^1$ . Using the fact  $M_{n(r)+1}^0 M_{n(r)+1}^1 = 0$ , we can further deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon}/d) &\geq \|Z_B(M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1)|\psi\rangle - (M_{n(r)+1}^0 - M_{n(r)+1}^1)|\psi\rangle\|^2 \\ &= \|Z_B M_{n(r)+1}^0|\psi\rangle - M_{n(r)+1}^0|\psi\rangle\|^2 + \|Z_B M_{n(r)+1}^1|\psi\rangle + M_{n(r)+1}^1|\psi\rangle\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which immediately gives us that

$$\frac{N_1 + N_2}{2c} M_{n(r)+1}^0|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} M_{n(r)+1}^0|\psi\rangle, \quad (63)$$

$$\frac{N_1 + N_2}{2c} M_{n(r)+1}^1|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} -M_{n(r)+1}^1|\psi\rangle. \quad (64)$$

Next, we study how  $X_B = (N_1 - N_2)/(-2s)$  acts on  $M_{n(r)+1}^0|\psi\rangle$  and  $M_{n(r)+1}^1|\psi\rangle$ . Substituting the appropriate operators and the shared state into eqs. (28) and (29), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{N_1 - N_2}{-2s} M_{n(r)+1}^0 M_0^0|\psi\rangle &\simeq_{(\|M_0^0|\psi\rangle\|/\sqrt{s}) O(\sqrt{dr}^{1/4} \epsilon^{1/4})} M_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1}^1 M_0^0|\psi\rangle \\ \frac{N_1 - N_2}{-2s} M_{n(r)+1}^1 M_0^0|\psi\rangle &\simeq_{(\|M_0^0|\psi\rangle\|/\sqrt{s}) O(\sqrt{dr}^{1/4} \epsilon^{1/4})} M_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1}^0 M_0^0|\psi\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Using the facts that  $M_0^0|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1)|\psi\rangle$  and  $O(\sqrt{dr}^{1/4} \epsilon^{1/4})$  dominates  $O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})$ , we can simplify the equations above to get

$$(N_1 - N_2) M_{n(r)+1}^0|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} -2s M_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1}^1|\psi\rangle, \quad (65)$$

$$(N_1 - N_2) M_{n(r)+1}^1|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} -2s M_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1}^0|\psi\rangle. \quad (66)$$

In summary, we can rearrange terms in eqs. (63) to (66) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
N_1 M_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle &\simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} c M_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle - s M_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1}^1 |\psi\rangle, \\
N_1 M_{n(r)+1}^1 |\psi\rangle &\simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} -c M_{n(r)+1}^1 |\psi\rangle - s M_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle, \\
N_2 M_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle &\simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} c M_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle + s M_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1}^1 |\psi\rangle, \\
N_2 M_{n(r)+1}^1 |\psi\rangle &\simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} -c M_{n(r)+1}^1 |\psi\rangle + s M_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we can expand  $N_1 N_2 M_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle$  by first substitute in the approximate expression of  $N_2 M_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle$  and repeatedly substitute in the four equations above to get that

$$\begin{aligned}
&N_1 N_2 M_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle \\
&\simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} (c N_1 M_{n(r)+1}^0 + s M_{n(r)+2} N_1 M_{n(r)+1}^1) |\psi\rangle \\
&\simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} (c^2 M_{n(r)+1}^0 - c s M_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1}^1 - c s M_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1}^1 - s^2 M_{n(r)+2}^2 M_{n(r)+1}^0) |\psi\rangle \\
&= (\cos(\frac{2\pi}{d}) M_{n(r)+1}^0 - \sin(\frac{2\pi}{d}) M_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1}^1) |\psi\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Following similar steps, we can get that

$$\begin{aligned}
&N_1 N_2 M_{n(r)+1}^1 |\psi\rangle \\
&\simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} (-c N_1 M_{n(r)+1}^1 + s M_{n(r)+2} N_1 M_{n(r)+1}^0) |\psi\rangle \\
&\simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} (c^2 M_{n(r)+1}^1 + c s M_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1}^0 + c s M_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1}^0 - s^2 M_{n(r)+2}^2 M_{n(r)+1}^1) |\psi\rangle \\
&= (\cos(\frac{2\pi}{d}) M_{n(r)+1}^1 + \sin(\frac{2\pi}{d}) M_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1}^0) |\psi\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Multiplying  $M_{n(r)+2}$  to the approximate expression of  $N_1 N_2 M_{n(r)+1}^1 |\psi\rangle$ , we can get that

$$N_1 N_2 M_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1}^1 |\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} \sin(\frac{2\pi}{d}) M_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle + \cos(\frac{2\pi}{d}) M_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1}^1 |\psi\rangle,$$

where we use the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}
(M_{n(r)+2})^2 M_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle &= (M_{n(r)+2}^0 + M_{n(r)+2}^1) M_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle \\
&\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} N_{n(r)+1}^0 M_0^0 |\psi\rangle \\
&\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} N_{n(r)+1}^0 (M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1) |\psi\rangle \\
&\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1) M_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle \\
&= M_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the approximate expressions of  $N_1 N_2 M_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle$  and  $N_1 N_2 M_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle$  gives us that

$$N_1 N_2 (M_{n(r)+1}^0 + i M_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1}^1) |\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} \omega_d (M_{n(r)+1}^0 + i M_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1}^1) |\psi\rangle. \quad (67)$$

In the last step, we prove  $|\psi_1\rangle$  can be approximated by

$$|\psi_1\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} 1/2(\mathbb{1} - i M_{n(r)+2}) (M_{n(r)+1}^0 + i M_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1}^1) |\psi\rangle.$$

The central step of proving the approximation above is to prove  $(M_{n(r)+2})^2 M_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle$ , which is proved in the previous paragraph. So we multiply eq. (67) on both sides by  $1/2(\mathbb{1} - iM_{n(r)+2})$  and get

$$N_1 N_2 |\psi_1\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} \omega_d |\psi_1\rangle. \quad (68)$$

□

**Proposition 6.13.** *Let  $\mathbb{S}$  be an  $\epsilon$ -approximate strategy of  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$  and  $|\psi_1\rangle$  be as defined in eq. (59). Then,*

$$M_1 M_2 |\psi_1\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{dr}^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4})} \omega_d^{-1} |\psi_1\rangle. \quad (69)$$

This proof is similar to the proof of Proposition 6.12 but with one extra step. We first prove that there exists a state  $|\psi_2\rangle$  that is close to  $|\psi_1\rangle$ , then we show  $|\psi_2\rangle$  is close to an eigenstate of  $M_1 M_2$ . In the last step, we show that  $|\psi_1\rangle$  is also close to an eigenstate of  $M_1 M_2$ .

*Proof.* In this proof, we still use the notation  $c := \cos(\pi/d)$  and  $s := \sin(\pi/d)$ . We first introduce an approximation of  $|\psi_1\rangle$ ,

$$|\psi_2\rangle = 1/2(N_{n(r)+1}^0 - iN_{n(r)+2}N_{n(r)+1}^1 + iN_{n(r)+2}N_{n(r)+1}^0 + N_{n(r)+1}^1)|\psi\rangle, \quad (70)$$

and we will show that

$$|\psi_1\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{dr}^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4})} |\psi_2\rangle. \quad (71)$$

To prove eq. (71), we compare each term of  $|\psi_1\rangle$  with  $|\psi_2\rangle$ . Recall that  $M_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} N_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle$  and  $M_{n(r)+1}^1 |\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} N_{n(r)+1}^1 |\psi\rangle$  from Proposition 6.9, then

$$\begin{aligned} & |\psi_2\rangle - |\psi_1\rangle \\ & \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (-N_{n(r)+2}N_{n(r)+1}^1 + N_{n(r)+2}N_{n(r)+1}^0)|\psi\rangle - (M_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^1 - M_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^0)|\psi\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, proving eq. (71) is reduced to proving  $(M_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^1 - M_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^0)|\psi\rangle$  is close to  $(-N_{n(r)+2}N_{n(r)+1}^1 + N_{n(r)+2}N_{n(r)+1}^0)|\psi\rangle$ . At this point, we can substitute appropriate operators and the shared state of  $\mathbb{S}_1$  into the anti-commutation relation (eq. (30)) and see that

$$M_{n(r)+1}M_{n(r)+2}M_0^0|\psi\rangle \simeq_{\frac{\|M_0^0|\psi\rangle\|}{c\sqrt{s}}O(\sqrt{dr}^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4})} -M_{n(r)+1}M_{n(r)+2}M_0^0|\psi\rangle.$$

Using the fact  $c = 1 - \pi^2/(2d^2) + O(1/d^4)$  and  $s = \pi/d + O(1/d^3)$ , the error term above is of order  $O(\sqrt{dr}^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4})$ . Then we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} M_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}|\psi\rangle &= M_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}(M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1 + M_{n(r)+1}^2)|\psi\rangle \\ &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}M_0^0|\psi\rangle \\ &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{dr}^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4})} -M_{n(r)+1}M_{n(r)+2}M_0^0|\psi\rangle \\ &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} -M_{n(r)+1}M_{n(r)+2}|\psi\rangle \\ &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} -M_{n(r)+1}N_{n(r)+2}|\psi\rangle \\ &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} -N_{n(r)+2}N_{n(r)+1}|\psi\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that  $M_0^0|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1)|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (M_{n(r)+2}^0 + M_{n(r)+2}^1)|\psi\rangle$ .

Next, we show that  $M_1M_2|\psi_2\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} \omega_d^{-1}|\psi_2\rangle$ , which gives us eq. (79) after substituting in eq. (71). With similar derivation as in the proof of Proposition 6.12, we can apply results from Section 4.1 to the strategy  $\mathbb{S}_2$  to get that

$$(M_1 + M_2)N_{n(r)+1}^0|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} 2cN_{n(r)+1}^0|\psi\rangle. \quad (72)$$

$$(M_1 + M_2)N_{n(r)+1}^1|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} -2cN_{n(r)+1}^1|\psi\rangle, \quad (73)$$

$$(M_1 - M_2)N_{n(r)+1}^0|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} -2sN_{n(r)+2}N_{n(r)+1}^1|\psi\rangle \quad (74)$$

$$(M_1 - M_2)N_{n(r)+1}^1|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} -2sN_{n(r)+2}N_{n(r)+1}^0|\psi\rangle. \quad (75)$$

So we can further deduce that

$$M_1M_2(N_{n(r)+1}^0 - iN_{n(r)+2}N_{n(r)+1}^1)|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} \omega_d^{-1}(N_{n(r)+1}^0 - iN_{n(r)+2}N_{n(r)+1}^1)|\psi\rangle. \quad (76)$$

It can be shown that  $|\psi_2\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} 1/2(\mathbb{1} + iN_{n(r)+2})(N_{n(r)+1}^0 - iN_{n(r)+2}N_{n(r)+1}^1)|\psi\rangle$ . Proving this approximation of  $|\psi_1\rangle$  uses the same techniques as in the proof of Proposition 6.12, so we omit it here.

We multiply both sides of eq. (76) by  $1/2(\mathbb{1} + iN_{n(r)+2})$  and get that

$$M_1M_2|\psi_2\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} \omega_d^{-1}|\psi_2\rangle. \quad (77)$$

In the end, the relation  $|\psi_1\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{d}r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4})} |\psi_2\rangle$  implies that

$$M_1M_2|\psi_1\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{d}r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4})} \omega_d^{-1}|\psi_1\rangle. \quad (78)$$

□

The effects of  $M_1, M_2$  and  $N_1, N_2$  acting on  $|\psi_1\rangle$  are summarized in the next proposition.

**Proposition 6.14.** *Let  $\mathbb{S}$  be an  $\epsilon$ -approximate strategy of  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$  and  $|\psi_1\rangle$  be as defined in eq. (59). Then,*

$$M_1|\psi_1\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{d}r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4})} \omega_d M_2|\psi_1\rangle, \quad (79)$$

$$N_1|\psi_1\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} \omega_d^{-1}N_2|\psi_1\rangle. \quad (80)$$

*Proof.* From the proof of Proposition 6.12, we know

$$N_1(M_{n(r)+1}^0 + iM_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^1)|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} (c - si)M_{n(r)+1}^0|\psi\rangle - (ci + s)M_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^1|\psi\rangle,$$

$$N_2(M_{n(r)+1}^0 + iM_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^1)|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} (c + si)M_{n(r)+1}^0|\psi\rangle + (s - ci)M_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^1|\psi\rangle,$$

so

$$N_1(M_{n(r)+1}^0 + iM_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^1)|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} \omega_d^{-1}N_2(M_{n(r)+1}^0 + iM_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^1)|\psi\rangle,$$

which gives us the second approximation relation of the proposition.

For the first approximation relation, we follow the proof of Proposition 6.13 and examine the effect of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  on  $|\psi_2\rangle$ . In particular, we know

$$M_1(N_{n(r)+1}^0 - iN_{n(r)+2}N_{n(r)+1}^1)|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} (c + si)N_{n(r)+1}^0|\psi\rangle + (ci - s)N_{n(r)+2}N_{n(r)+1}^1|\psi\rangle$$

$$M_2(N_{n(r)+1}^0 - iN_{n(r)+2}N_{n(r)+1}^1)|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} (c - si)N_{n(r)+1}^0|\psi\rangle + (ci + s)N_{n(r)+2}N_{n(r)+1}^1|\psi\rangle.$$

So we know  $M_1|\psi_2\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} \omega_d M_2|\psi_2\rangle$ . Lastly, using eq. (71), we get the first approximation relation. □

Next lemma is the major result of this subsection, which gives us a decomposition of  $|\psi\rangle$ . Before proving the next lemma, we make one important observation. Recall that Proposition 6.2 establishes that there exist observables  $\{M(s), N(s)\}$  such that  $M(s)N(s)|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} |\psi\rangle$  for  $s \in S$ . Then we can deduce that

$$M(a_4)M(a_3) \otimes N(a_4)N(a_3)|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M(a_4) \otimes N(a_4)|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} |\psi\rangle,$$

or equivalently,

$$U_A^\dagger \otimes U_B^\dagger |\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} |\psi\rangle.$$

Intuitively, it means that  $|\psi\rangle$  is invariant under the permutation induced by  $U_A^\dagger \otimes U_B^\dagger$ . We use this observation in the proof of the following lemma.

**Lemma 6.15.** *Let  $\mathfrak{S}$  be an  $\epsilon$ -approximate strategy of  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$  and define  $|\psi'\rangle := \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} (U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} |\psi_1\rangle$  with  $\log_r j$  being the discrete log and  $|\psi_1\rangle$  as defined in eq. (59). Then,*

$$|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(dr^{d/2}\epsilon^{1/8})} |\psi'\rangle. \quad (81)$$

*Proof.* The proof takes two steps. In the first step, we show that the norm of  $|\psi'\rangle$  is close to 1. In the second step, we show that  $\langle \psi | \psi' \rangle$  is close to 1.

Expanding  $\langle \psi' | \psi' \rangle$ , we get

$$\langle \psi' | \psi' \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \langle \psi_1 | (U_A U_B)^{\log_r j} (U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} | \psi_1 \rangle + \sum_{j \neq j'} \langle \psi_1 | (U_A U_B)^{\log_r j} (U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j'} | \psi_1 \rangle.$$

Observe that

$$\langle \psi_1 | (U_A U_B)^{\log_r j} (U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} | \psi_1 \rangle = \langle \psi_1 | \psi_1 \rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} \frac{1}{d-1},$$

so we need to show when  $j \neq j'$ , the inner product  $\langle \psi_1 | (U_A U_B)^{\log_r j} (U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j'} | \psi_1 \rangle$  is close to 0. Using the relation  $O_B(U_B^\dagger)^j |\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(r^{j+1/2}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (U_B^\dagger)^j O_B^j |\psi\rangle$  and eq. (62), we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} O_B(U_B^\dagger)^j |\psi_1\rangle &= \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{1} - iM_{n(r)+2}) (M_{n(r)+1}^0 + iM_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1}^1) O_B(U_B^\dagger)^j |\psi\rangle \\ &\simeq_{O(r^{j+1/2}\sqrt{\epsilon})} \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{1} - iM_{n(r)+2}) (M_{n(r)+1}^0 + iM_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1}^1) (U_B^\dagger)^j O_B^j |\psi\rangle \\ &= (U_B^\dagger)^j O_B^j |\psi_1\rangle \\ &\simeq_{O(r^{j+1/4}\epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} \omega_d^{r^j} (U_B^\dagger)^j |\psi_1\rangle \end{aligned}$$

In short, we have shown that

$$O_B(U_B^\dagger)^j |\psi_1\rangle \simeq_{O(r^j \epsilon^{1/4}/\sqrt{d})} \omega_d^{r^j} (U_B^\dagger)^j |\psi_1\rangle, \quad (82)$$

where we drop the insignificant error term  $r^{1/4}$ . With similar derivation, we can also get

$$O_A(U_A^\dagger)^j |\psi_1\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{dr} \epsilon^{1/4})} \omega_d^{-r^j} (U_A^\dagger)^j |\psi_1\rangle, \quad (83)$$

which will be used in Section 6.4. Hence for  $j \neq j'$ ,  $(U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^j |\psi_1\rangle$  and  $(U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{j'} |\psi_1\rangle$  are close to eigenvectors of the unitary  $O_B$  with different eigenvalues. Applying Proposition 2.14 to eq. (82) gives us that

$$\langle \psi_1 | (U_A U_B)^j (U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{j'} | \psi_1 \rangle \simeq_{O((r^j + r^{j'})\epsilon^{1/4})} 0,$$

where we use the fact that  $\|1 - \omega_d^{r^{j'} - r^j}\| = O(1/d)$ . Therefore, we can calculate the norm of  $|\psi'\rangle$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi' | \psi' \rangle &= \sum_{j, j'=1}^{d-1} \langle \psi_1 | (U_A U_B)^{\log_r j} (U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j'} | \psi_1 \rangle \\ &\simeq_{O(dr^d \epsilon^{1/4})} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \langle \psi_1 | (U_A U_B)^{\log_r j} (U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} | \psi_1 \rangle \\ &\simeq_{O(dr\sqrt{\epsilon})} (d-1) \frac{1}{d-1} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Next we calculate  $\langle \psi | \psi' \rangle$  which is

$$\langle \psi | \psi' \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \langle \psi | (U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} | \psi_1 \rangle \simeq_{O(d^2 \sqrt{r} \sqrt{\epsilon})} (d-1) \langle \psi | \psi_1 \rangle.$$

The problem is reduced to calculate  $\langle \psi | \psi_1 \rangle$ , which is

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi | \psi_1 \rangle &= \frac{1}{2} \langle \psi | (M_{n(r)+1}^0 + iM_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1}^1 - iM_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1) | \psi \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \langle \psi | (M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1) | \psi \rangle - i \langle \psi | M_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1} | \psi \rangle \right) \\ &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r} \sqrt{\epsilon})} \frac{1}{2} \left( \langle \psi | (M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1) | \psi \rangle - i \langle \psi | N_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1} | \psi \rangle \right) \\ &\simeq_{O(r\epsilon)} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{d-1} = \frac{1}{d-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the approximation of  $\langle \psi | N_{n(r)+2} M_{n(r)+1} | \psi \rangle$  comes from the correlation. Hence, we know  $\langle \psi | \psi' \rangle \simeq_{O(d^2 \sqrt{r} \sqrt{\epsilon})} 1$ .

In the end, we combine  $\langle \psi | \psi' \rangle \simeq_{O(d^2 \sqrt{r} \sqrt{\epsilon})} 1$  and  $\| |\psi'\rangle \|^2 \simeq_{O(dr^d \epsilon^{1/4})} 1$ , and apply Proposition 2.15 to conclude

$$|\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(dr^d/2\epsilon^{1/8})} |\psi'\rangle.$$

□

### 6.3 Implications of passing the commutation games

The commutation game is introduced to certify some observables used in  $LS(r)$  commute with the operators for the extended weighted CHSH test. For the details of the general commutation test, we refer to Appendix A.2 of [CGJV19]. We use similar techniques in our proof but our proof also bases on the correlation given in Table 3.

The implication of winning the commutation game is summarized in the following proposition.

**Proposition 6.16.** *Let  $\mathbb{S}$  be an  $\epsilon$ -approximate strategy of  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$ . Then,*

$$M_{n(r)+1}^0 M(s) |\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M(s) M_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle, \quad (84)$$

$$M_{n(r)+1}^1 M(s) |\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M(s) M_{n(r)+1}^1 |\psi\rangle, \quad (85)$$

$$M_{n(r)+2} M(s) |\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M(s) M_{n(r)+2} |\psi\rangle, \quad (86)$$

for  $s = f_0, f_2, g_0, g_2$ .

Note that the  $M(s)$ 's for  $s = f_0, f_2, g_0, g_2$  tested in the commutation game are measured for the Magic Square equations in  $LS(r)$ . They will be used to construct the isometry in the next subsection.

*Proof.* Proving eq. (86) is an application of Lemma 28 of [CGJV19] with  $\sqrt{\epsilon}$  replaced by  $O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})$ .

For the other relations, we prove  $M_{n(r)+1}^0 M(f_0) |\psi\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M(f_0) M_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle$  to demonstrate the techniques involved.

We denote Bob's projectors by  $\{N_{(n(r)+1, f_0)}^{b_1 b_2}\}$  where  $b_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_3$  and  $b_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_2$ . From the correlation in Table 3, we can get that

$$\begin{aligned} M_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (N_{(n(r)+1, f_0)}^{00} + N_{(n(r)+1, f_0)}^{01}) |\psi\rangle \\ M(f_0) |\psi\rangle &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} \left( \sum_{b_1, b_2} (-1)^{b_2} N_{(n(r)+1, f_0)}^{b_1 b_2} \right) |\psi\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Then we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} M_{n(r)+1}^0 M(f_0) |\psi\rangle &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M_{n(r)+1}^0 \left( \sum_{b_1, b_2} (-1)^{b_2} N_{(n(r)+1, f_0)}^{b_1 b_2} \right) |\psi\rangle \\ &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} \left( \sum_{b_1, b_2} (-1)^{b_2} N_{(n(r)+1, f_0)}^{b_1 b_2} \right) (N_{(n(r)+1, f_0)}^{00} + N_{(n(r)+1, f_0)}^{01}) |\psi\rangle \\ &= (N_{(n(r)+1, f_0)}^{00} + N_{(n(r)+1, f_0)}^{01}) \left( \sum_{b_1, b_2} (-1)^{b_2} N_{(n(r)+1, f_0)}^{b_1 b_2} \right) |\psi\rangle \\ &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} (N_{(n(r)+1, f_0)}^{00} + N_{(n(r)+1, f_0)}^{01}) M_{r+6} |\psi\rangle \\ &= M(f_0) (N_{(n(r)+1, f_0)}^{00} + N_{(n(r)+1, f_0)}^{01}) |\psi\rangle \\ &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} M(f_0) M_{n(r)+1}^0 |\psi\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

□

## 6.4 Robust self-testing

Based on the propositions and lemmas proved so far, we can prove the self-testing theorem.

**Theorem 6.17.** *Let  $\mathbb{S}$  be an  $\epsilon$ -approximate strategy of  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$ . Then there exists an isometry  $\Phi_A \otimes \Phi_B =$*

$(\Phi_{A,2} \otimes \Phi_{B,2})(\Phi_{A,1} \otimes \Phi_{B,1})$  and a state  $|junk\rangle$  such that  $\| |junk\rangle \| \simeq_{O(\sqrt{dr}^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4})} 1$  and

$$\Phi_A \otimes \Phi_B(|\psi\rangle) \simeq_{O(d^{5/2}r^d\epsilon^{1/8})} |junk\rangle \otimes |EPR\rangle^{\otimes 2} \otimes |\tilde{\psi}\rangle \quad (87)$$

$$\Phi_A \otimes \Phi_B(O_A|\psi\rangle) \simeq_{O(d^{5/2}r^d\epsilon^{1/8})} |junk\rangle \otimes |EPR\rangle^{\otimes 2} \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \omega_d^{d-j} |x_{d-j}\rangle_{A'} |x_j\rangle_{B'} \quad (88)$$

$$\Phi_A \otimes \Phi_B(O_B|\psi\rangle) \simeq_{O(d^{5/2}r^d\epsilon^{1/8})} |junk\rangle \otimes |EPR\rangle^{\otimes 2} \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \omega_d^j |x_{d-j}\rangle_{A'} |x_j\rangle_{B'} \quad (89)$$

$$\Phi_A \otimes \Phi_B(U_A|\psi\rangle) \simeq_{O(d^{5/2}r^d\epsilon^{1/8})} |junk\rangle \otimes |EPR\rangle^{\otimes 2} \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} |x_{(d-j)r-1}\rangle_{A'} |x_j\rangle_{B'} \quad (90)$$

$$\Phi_A \otimes \Phi_B(U_B|\psi\rangle) \simeq_{O(d^{5/2}r^d\epsilon^{1/8})} |junk\rangle \otimes |EPR\rangle^{\otimes 2} \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} |x_{d-j}\rangle_{A'} |x_{jr-1}\rangle_{B'}. \quad (91)$$

The state  $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle$  is defined in eq. (40).

Before proving Theorem 6.17, we state the consequence of it. It implies that, for any odd prime number  $d$  whose primitive root is  $r$ , there exists a correlation of size  $\Theta(r)$  that can robustly self-test the maximally entangled state of local dimension  $4(d-1)$ . Since there are infinitely many prime numbers whose smallest primitive roots are in the set  $\{2, 3, 5\}$  [Mur88], we can apply Theorem 6.17 to the set  $D$  of all such odd prime numbers and prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 6.18.** *There exists an infinity-sized set  $D$  of prime numbers such that for each  $d \in D$ , there exists a constant-sized correlation that can self-test the maximally entangled state of local dimension  $4(d-1)$ .*

Before proving Theorem 6.17, we introduce the isometry  $\Phi_A \otimes \Phi_B$ , which has two steps. We denote the isometry used in the first step and the second step by  $\Phi_{A,1} \otimes \Phi_{B,1}$  and  $\Phi_{A,2} \otimes \Phi_{B,2}$  respectively, which are illustrated in the two figures below.

To construct the isometry  $\Phi_{A,1} \otimes \Phi_{B,1}$ , we use  $U_A, O_A$  and  $U_B, O_B$  defined in eqs. (51) and (52) to produce a copy of  $|\Sigma^{(d-1)}\rangle$ .

To construct the isometry  $\Phi_{A,2} \otimes \Phi_{B,2}$ , we use the observables  $M(f_0), M(f_2), M(g_0), M(g_2)$  and  $N(f_0), N(f_2), N(g_0), N(g_2)$  to produce two copies of  $|EPR\rangle$ . Intuitively,  $M(f_0)$  acts as  $\mathbb{1} \otimes \sigma_x$ ;  $M(f_2)$  acts as  $\sigma_x \otimes \mathbb{1}$ ;  $M(g_0)$  acts as  $\mathbb{1} \otimes \sigma_z$  and  $M(g_2)$  acts as  $\sigma_z \otimes \mathbb{1}$ ; and similarly on Bob's side.




Figure 1: The isometries  $\Phi_{A,1} \otimes \Phi_{B,1}$ .

The isometry  $\Phi_{A,1} \otimes \Phi_{B,1}$  has the following steps:

1. Append control register  $|x_0\rangle_{A'}$  on Alice's side and  $|x_0\rangle_{B'}$  on Bob's side;



2. Apply Quantum Fourier Transform ( $QFT_d$ ) to Alice and Bob's control registers;
3. Apply Controlled- $O_{A/B}$  operations (i.e. if the control register is in state  $|x_k\rangle_{A'/B'}$ , apply  $O_{A/B}^k$ );
4. Apply inverse Quantum Fourier Transform ( $QFT_d^{-1}$ ) to the control registers;
5. Apply Controlled- $U_{A/B}$  operations (i.e. If Alice's control register is in state  $|x_j\rangle$ , she applies  $U_A^{\log_r(d-j)}$ . If Bob's control register is in state  $|x_j\rangle$ , he applies  $(U_B)^{\log_r j}$ ).

Note that  $|x_0\rangle$  is orthogonal to  $W_{d-1}$ , so  $\text{span}\{x_j\}_{j=0}^{d-1}$  has dimension  $d$ .




Figure 2: The isometries  $\Phi_{A,2} \otimes \Phi_{B,2}$ .

The second isometry is the standard isometry used in the self-testing result of the Magic Square game [WBMS16]. The only thing to note is that the state  $|reuse\rangle$ , which is on the same Hilbert space as  $|\psi\rangle$  and produced by  $\Phi_{A,1} \otimes \Phi_{B,1}$ , is the input state to  $\Phi_{A,2} \otimes \Phi_{B,2}$ . In this sense, our isometry is a 2-step sequential procedure.

*Proof of Theorem 6.17.* The proof takes two steps. We first show that

$$\Phi_{A,1} \otimes \Phi_{B,1}(|\psi\rangle) \simeq_{O(d^{5/2}r^d\epsilon^{1/8})} \sqrt{d-1}|\psi_1\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} |x_{d-j}\rangle_{A'} |x_j\rangle_{B'}. \quad (92)$$

Then we show that there exists a state  $|junk\rangle$  such that

$$\Phi_{A,2} \otimes \Phi_{B,2}(\sqrt{d-1}|\psi_1\rangle) \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} |junk\rangle \otimes |\Sigma^{(2)}\rangle^{\otimes 2}. \quad (93)$$

Combining the two equations above we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi_{A,2} \otimes \Phi_{B,2}(\Phi_{A,1} \otimes \Phi_{B,1}(|\psi\rangle)) \\ & \simeq_{O(d^{5/2}r^d\epsilon^{1/8})} \left[ \Phi_{A,2} \otimes \Phi_{B,2}(\sqrt{d-1}|\psi_1\rangle) \right] \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} |x_{d-j}\rangle_{A'} |x_j\rangle_{B'} \\ & \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} |junk\rangle \otimes |EPR\rangle^{\otimes 2} \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} |x_{d-j}\rangle_{A'} |x_j\rangle_{B'}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that  $\Phi_{A,2} \otimes \Phi_{B,2}$  only acts nontrivially on the state  $|\psi_1\rangle$ . The state  $\sqrt{d-1}|\psi_1\rangle$  is the state  $|reuse\rangle$  in the two figures.

Lemma 6.15 implies that  $\Phi_{A,1} \otimes \Phi_{B,1}(|\psi\rangle) \simeq_{O(dr^{d/2+1/4}\epsilon^{1/8})} \Phi_{A,1} \otimes \Phi_{B,1}(|\psi'\rangle)$ , so we focus on how the isometry evolves  $|\psi'\rangle$ . The evolution is summarized below.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} (U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} |\psi_1\rangle |x_0\rangle_{A'} |x_0\rangle_{B'} \\
& \xrightarrow{QFT_d} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{k_1, k_2=0}^{d-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} (U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} |\psi_1\rangle |x_{k_1}\rangle_{A'} |x_{k_2}\rangle_{B'} \\
& \xrightarrow{\text{Controlled-}O_{A/B}} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{k_1, k_2=0}^{d-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} O_A^{k_1} (U_A^\dagger)^{\log_r j} O_B^{k_2} (U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} |\psi_1\rangle |x_{k_1}\rangle_{A'} |x_{k_2}\rangle_{B'} \\
& \simeq_{O(d^{5/2}r^d\epsilon^{1/4})} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{k_1, k_2=0}^{d-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} (U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} \omega_d^{(k_2-k_1)j} |\psi_1\rangle |x_{k_1}\rangle_{A'} |x_{k_2}\rangle_{B'} \\
& \xrightarrow{QFT_d^{-1}} \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{l_1, l_2=0}^{d-1} \sum_{k_1, k_2=0}^{d-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} (U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} \omega_d^{k_1(d-j-l_1)} \omega_d^{k_2(j-l_2)} |\psi_1\rangle |x_{l_1}\rangle_{A'} |x_{l_2}\rangle_{B'} \\
& = \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} (U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} |\psi_1\rangle |x_{d-j}\rangle_{A'} |x_j\rangle_{B'} \\
& \xrightarrow{\text{Controlled-}U_{A/B}} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} U_A^{\log_r j} (U_A^\dagger)^{\log_r j} U_B^{\log_r j} (U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} |\psi_1\rangle |x_{d-j}\rangle_{A'} |x_j\rangle_{B'} \\
& = |\psi_1\rangle \otimes \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} |x_{d-j}\rangle_{A'} |x_j\rangle_{B'}.
\end{aligned}$$

When we analyze the effect of the controlled- $O_{A/B}$ , we applied eqs. (82) and (83) repeatedly. In summary, we have shown that

$$\Phi_{A,1} \otimes \Phi_{B,1}(|\psi\rangle) \simeq_{O(d^{5/2}r^d\epsilon^{1/8})} \left( \sqrt{d-1}|\psi_1\rangle \right) \otimes \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} |x_{d-j}\rangle_{A'} |x_j\rangle_{B'} \right), \quad (94)$$

where we use the fact that  $O(d^{5/2}r^d\epsilon^{1/8})$  dominates both  $O(dr^{d/2+1/4}\epsilon^{1/8})$  and  $O(d^{5/2}r^d\epsilon^{1/4})$ . The relation  $\sqrt{d-1}\|\psi_1\rangle\| \simeq_{O(\sqrt{d}r^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4})} 1$  is derived from the fact that  $\|\psi_1\rangle\|^2 \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} 1/(d-1)$ .

To prove eq. (93), we first recall that

$$|\psi_1\rangle = \frac{1}{2} (M_{n(r)+1}^0 + iM_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^1 - iM_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1) |\psi\rangle.$$

The other observation that we need is that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Phi_{A,2} \otimes \Phi_{B,2}(|\psi_1\rangle) \\
& = \frac{1}{16} \sum_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \{0,1\}^4} M(f_0)^{a(4)} N(f_0)^{b(4)} M(f_2)^{a(3)} N(f_2)^{b(3)} M(g_0)^{a(2)} N(g_0)^{b(2)} M(g_2)^{a(1)} N(g_2)^{b(1)} |\psi_1\rangle |\mathbf{a}\rangle_{A''} |\mathbf{b}\rangle_{B''}
\end{aligned}$$

For simplicity we define

$$\begin{aligned}
M^{\mathbf{a}} & := M(f_0)^{a(4)} M(f_2)^{a(3)} M(g_0)^{a(2)} M(g_2)^{a(1)} \\
N^{\mathbf{b}} & := N(f_0)^{b(4)} N(f_2)^{b(3)} N(g_0)^{b(2)} N(g_2)^{b(1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Our goal is to use Proposition 6.16 to show that

$$M^{\mathbf{a}}|\psi_1\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} \frac{1}{2}(M_{n(r)+1}^0 + iM_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^1 - iM_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1)M^{\mathbf{a}}|\psi\rangle, \quad (95)$$

for all  $\mathbf{a} \in \{0, 1\}^4$ ,

We show how to apply Proposition 6.16 to commute  $M(g_2)^{a(1)}$  through  $\frac{1}{2}(M_{n(r)+1}^0 + iM_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^1 - iM_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1)$  and then similar process can be repeated for  $M(g_0)^{a(2)}$ ,  $M(f_2)^{a(3)}$  and  $M(f_0)^{a(4)}$  using Lemma 2.17,

$$\begin{aligned} & M(g_2)^{a(1)} \frac{1}{2}(M_{n(r)+1}^0 + iM_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^1 - iM_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1)|\psi\rangle \\ & \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} \frac{1}{2}[(M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1)M(g_2)^{a(1)} - iM(g_2)^{a(1)}M_{n(r)+2}N_{n(r)+1}]|\psi\rangle \\ & \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} \frac{1}{2}[(M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1)M(g_2)^{a(1)} - iN_{n(r)+1}M_{n(r)+2}M(g_2)^{a(1)}]|\psi\rangle \\ & \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} \frac{1}{2}[(M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1)M(g_2)^{a(1)} - iM_{n(r)+2}M(g_2)^{a(1)}M_{n(r)+1}]|\psi\rangle \\ & \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} \frac{1}{2}[(M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1)M(g_2)^{a(1)} - iM_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}M(g_2)^{a(1)}]|\psi\rangle \\ & = \frac{1}{2}(M_{n(r)+1}^0 + iM_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^1 - iM_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1)M(g_2)^{a(1)}|\psi\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

In summary, we have

$$M^{\mathbf{a}}N^{\mathbf{b}}|\psi_1\rangle \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} \frac{1}{2}(M_{n(r)+1}^0 + iM_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^1 - iM_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1)M^{\mathbf{a}}N^{\mathbf{b}}|\psi\rangle \quad (96)$$

for all  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \{0, 1\}^4$ , which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi_{A,2} \otimes \Phi_{B,2}(|\psi_1\rangle) \simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} \\ & \frac{1}{2}(M_{n(r)+1}^0 + iM_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^1 - iM_{n(r)+2}M_{n(r)+1}^0 + M_{n(r)+1}^1)(\Phi_{A,2} \otimes \Phi_{B,2}(|\psi\rangle)). \end{aligned}$$

At this point we can apply Lemma C.1 of [WBMS16] to  $\Phi_{A,2} \otimes \Phi_{B,2}(|\psi\rangle)$  and conclude that

$$\Phi_{A,2} \otimes \Phi_{B,2}(\sqrt{d-1}|\psi_1\rangle) \simeq_{O(\sqrt{d}\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} |\text{junk}\rangle \otimes |EPR\rangle^{\otimes 2}, \quad (97)$$

for some state  $|\text{junk}\rangle$  whose norm can be deduced from the norm of  $|\psi_1\rangle$ .

In the rest of the proof, we only show how  $\Phi_{A,1} \otimes \Phi_{B,1}$  acts on  $O_A|\psi\rangle$  and  $U_A|\psi\rangle$ .

If the initial state is  $O_A|\psi\rangle$ , we first use the fact that  $\Phi_{A,1} \otimes \Phi_{B,1}(O_A|\psi\rangle) \simeq_{O(dr^{d/2+1/4}\epsilon^{1/8})} \Phi_{A,1} \otimes$

$\Phi_{B,1}(O_A|\psi')$ ), and then we calculate  $\Phi_{A,1} \otimes \Phi_{B,1}(O_A|\psi')$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
O_A|\psi'\rangle|x_0\rangle_{A'}|x_0\rangle_{B'} &= \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} O_A(U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} |\psi_1\rangle|x_0\rangle_{A'}|x_0\rangle_{B'} \\
&\simeq_{O(\sqrt{dr^d}\epsilon^{1/4})} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} (U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} \omega_d^{-j} |\psi_1\rangle|x_0\rangle_{A'}|x_0\rangle_{B'} \\
&\xrightarrow{QFT_d} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \sum_{k_1, k_2=0}^{d-1} (U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} \omega_d^{-j} |\psi_1\rangle|x_{k_1}\rangle_{A'}|x_{k_2}\rangle_{B'} \\
&\xrightarrow{\text{Controlled-}O_{A/B}} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \sum_{k_1, k_2=0}^{d-1} O_A^{k_1} (U_A^\dagger)^{\log_r j} O_B^{k_2} (U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} \omega_d^{-j} |\psi_1\rangle|x_{k_1}\rangle_{A'}|x_{k_2}\rangle_{B'} \\
&\simeq_{O(d^{5/2}r^d\epsilon^{1/4})} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{k_1, k_2=0}^{d-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} (U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} \omega_d^{-j} \omega_d^{(k_2-k_1)j} |\psi_1\rangle|x_{k_1}\rangle_{A'}|x_{k_2}\rangle_{B'} \\
&\xrightarrow{QFT_d^{-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} (U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} \omega_d^{d-j} |\psi_1\rangle|x_{d-j}\rangle_{A'}|x_j\rangle_{B'} \\
&\xrightarrow{\text{Controlled-}U_{A/B}} \sqrt{d-1} |\psi_1\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \omega_d^{d-j} |x_{d-j}\rangle_{A'}|x_j\rangle_{B'}.
\end{aligned}$$

The analysis for  $\Phi_{A,1} \otimes \Phi_{B,1}(O_B|\psi)$  is very similar.

If the initial state is  $U_A|\psi\rangle$ , we first use the fact that  $\Phi_{A,1} \otimes \Phi_{B,1}(U_A|\psi)\rangle \simeq_{O(dr^{d/2+1/4}\epsilon^{1/8})} \Phi_{A,1} \otimes \Phi_{B,1}(U_A|\psi')\rangle$ , and then we calculate  $\Phi_{A,1} \otimes \Phi_{B,1}(U_A|\psi')$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
U_A|\psi'\rangle|x_0\rangle_{A'}|x_0\rangle_{B'} &= \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} U_A(U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} |\psi_1\rangle|x_0\rangle_{A'}|x_0\rangle_{B'} \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} (U_A^\dagger)^{\log_r j-1} (U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} |\psi_1\rangle|x_0\rangle_{A'}|x_0\rangle_{B'} \\
&\xrightarrow{QFT_d} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \sum_{k_1, k_2=0}^{d-1} (U_A^\dagger)^{\log_r j-1} (U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} |\psi_1\rangle|x_{k_1}\rangle_{A'}|x_{k_2}\rangle_{B'} \\
&\xrightarrow{\text{Controlled-}O_{A/B}} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \sum_{k_1, k_2=0}^{d-1} O_A^{k_1} (U_A^\dagger)^{\log_r j-1} O_B^{k_2} (U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} |\psi_1\rangle|x_{k_1}\rangle_{A'}|x_{k_2}\rangle_{B'} \\
&\simeq_{O(d^{5/2}r^d\epsilon^{1/4})} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{k_1, k_2=0}^{d-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} (U_A^\dagger)^{\log_r j-1} (U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} \omega_d^{k_2j-k_1jr^{-1}} |\psi_1\rangle|x_{k_1}\rangle_{A'}|x_{k_2}\rangle_{B'} \\
&\xrightarrow{QFT_d^{-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} (U_A^\dagger)^{\log_r j-1} (U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} |\psi_1\rangle|x_{(d-j)r^{-1}}\rangle_{A'}|x_j\rangle_{B'} \\
&\xrightarrow{\text{Controlled-}U_{A/B}} \sqrt{d-1} |\psi_1\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} |x_{(d-j)r^{-1}}\rangle_{A'}|x_j\rangle_{B'},
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that  $(d-j)r^{-1} \equiv d-jr^{-1} \pmod{d}$ . The analysis for  $\Phi_{A,1} \otimes \Phi_{B,1}(U_B|\psi)$  is very similar.  $\square$

In the next two propositions, we show  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$  can robustly self-test  $\tilde{O}_1$  and  $\tilde{O}_2$  on Alice and Bob's sides respectively.

**Proposition 6.19.** *Let  $\mathfrak{S}$  be an  $\epsilon$ -approximate strategy of  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$ . Then there exists an isometry  $\Phi'_A \otimes \Phi'_B = (\Phi_{A,2} \otimes \Phi_{B,2})(\Phi'_{A,1} \otimes \Phi'_{B,1})$  and a state  $|junk'\rangle$  such that  $\| |junk'\rangle \| \simeq_{O(\sqrt{dr}^{1/4}\epsilon^{1/4})} 1$  and*

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi'_A \otimes \Phi'_B(M_1|\psi\rangle) &\simeq_{O(d^{5/2}r^d\epsilon^{1/8})} |junk\rangle \otimes |EPR\rangle^{\otimes 2} \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \omega_d^j |x_j\rangle_{A'} |x_j\rangle_{B'} \\ \Phi'_A \otimes \Phi'_B(M_2|\psi\rangle) &\simeq_{O(d^{5/2}r^d\epsilon^{1/8})} |junk\rangle \otimes |EPR\rangle^{\otimes 2} \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} |x_j\rangle_{A'} |x_j\rangle_{B'}.\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Comparing to  $(\Phi_{A,1} \otimes \Phi_{B,1})$ , the only difference in  $(\Phi'_{A,1} \otimes \Phi'_{B,1})$  is in the Controlled- $U_{A/B}$  step. In  $(\Phi'_{A,1} \otimes \Phi'_{B,1})$ , when the control register is in the state  $|x_j\rangle$ , both Alice and Bob will apply  $U_{A/B}^{\log_r j}$ . Since this is the only difference, the proof focuses on the effect of  $(\Phi'_{A,1} \otimes \Phi'_{B,1})$ .

Since  $\Phi_{A,1} \otimes \Phi_{B,1}(|\psi\rangle) \simeq_{O(dr^{d/2+1/4}\epsilon^{1/8})} \Phi_{A,1} \otimes \Phi_{B,1}(|\psi'\rangle)$ , we focus on  $M_1|\psi'\rangle$  and  $M_2|\psi'\rangle$ . By Proposition 6.14, we know that

$$\begin{aligned}M_1|\psi'\rangle &= M_1M_2M_2|\psi'\rangle \\ &\simeq_{O(\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} O_A(U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} M_2|\psi_1\rangle \\ &\simeq_{O(r^d\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon}\sqrt{d})} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} (U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} \omega_d^j M_2|\psi_1\rangle,\end{aligned}$$

so we first calculate  $\Phi_{A,1} \otimes \Phi_{B,1}(M_2|\psi'\rangle)$ , which is

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{j=1}^{d-1} M_2(U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} |\psi_1\rangle |x_0\rangle_{A'} |x_0\rangle_{B'} \\ &\simeq_{O(d^2\sqrt{r}\sqrt{\epsilon})} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} M_2(U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} M_2|\psi_1\rangle |x_0\rangle_{A'} |x_0\rangle_{B'} \\ &\xrightarrow{QFT_d} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{k_1, k_2=0}^{d-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} (U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} M_2|\psi_1\rangle |x_{k_1}\rangle_{A'} |x_{k_2}\rangle_{B'} \\ &\xrightarrow{\text{Controlled-}O_{A/B}} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{k_1, k_2=0}^{d-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} O_A^{k_1} (U_A^\dagger)^{\log_r j} O_B^{k_2} (U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} |\psi_1\rangle |x_{k_1}\rangle_{A'} |x_{k_2}\rangle_{B'} \\ &\simeq_{O(d^{5/2}r^d\epsilon^{1/4})} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{k_1, k_2=0}^{d-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} (U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} \omega_d^{(k_2+k_1)j} M_2|\psi_1\rangle |x_{k_1}\rangle_{A'} |x_{k_2}\rangle_{B'} \\ &\xrightarrow{QFT_d^{-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} (U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} M_2|\psi_1\rangle |x_j\rangle_{A'} |x_j\rangle_{B'} \\ &\xrightarrow{\text{Controlled-}U_{A/B}} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} U_A^{\log_r j} (U_A^\dagger)^{\log_r j} U_B^{\log_r j} (U_B^\dagger)^{\log_r j} M_2|\psi_1\rangle |x_j\rangle_{A'} |x_j\rangle_{B'} \\ &= M_2|\psi_1\rangle \otimes \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} |x_j\rangle_{A'} |x_j\rangle_{B'}.\end{aligned}$$

Then it is easy to see that

$$\Phi_{A,1} \otimes \Phi_{B,1}(M_2|\psi'\rangle) \simeq_{O(r^d d^{5/2} \epsilon^{1/4})} M_2|\psi_1\rangle \otimes \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \omega_d^j |x_j\rangle_{A'} |x_j\rangle_{B'},$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 6.20.** *Let  $\mathbb{S}$  be an  $\epsilon$ -approximate strategy of  $\mathfrak{C}(d, r)$ . Then there exists an isometry  $\Phi''_A \otimes \Phi''_B = (\Phi_{A,2} \otimes \Phi_{B,2})(\Phi''_{A,1} \otimes \Phi''_{B,1})$  and a state  $|junk'\rangle$  such that  $\| |junk'\rangle \| \simeq_{O(\sqrt{dr}^{1/4} \epsilon^{1/4})} 1$  and*

$$\Phi''_A \otimes \Phi''_B(N_1|\psi\rangle) \simeq_{O(d^{5/2} r^d \epsilon^{1/8})} |junk'\rangle \otimes |EPR\rangle^{\otimes 2} \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \omega_d^{-j} |x_j\rangle_{A'} |x_j\rangle_{B'}$$

$$\Phi''_A \otimes \Phi''_B(N_2|\psi\rangle) \simeq_{O(d^{5/2} r^d \epsilon^{1/8})} |junk'\rangle \otimes |EPR\rangle^{\otimes 2} \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} |x_j\rangle_{A'} |x_j\rangle_{B'}.$$

Since the proof is very similar to the proof of the previous proposition, we omit the proof here. Instead, we just state the difference between  $(\Phi''_{A,1} \otimes \Phi''_{B,1})$  and  $(\Phi'_{A,1} \otimes \Phi'_{B,1})$ . Once again, the difference is in the Controlled- $U_{A/B}$  step. In  $(\Phi''_{A,1} \otimes \Phi''_{B,1})$ , when the control register is in the state  $|x_j\rangle$ , both Alice and Bob will apply  $U_{A/B}^{\log_r(d-j)}$ .

## 7 Conclusions

In summary, we identify a family of correlations with constant-sized input and output alphabets that can be used to robustly self-test maximally entangled states with unbounded local dimension. Before our work, the most efficient way was to use  $O(\log d)$ -sized input and  $O(\log \log d)$ -sized output alphabets to robustly self-test the maximally entangled state of dimension  $d = 2^n$  [NV18].

Our result gives us deeper understandings of the set of quantum correlations. In previous works that proved the non-closeness of the set of quantum correlations [Slo19, SV18], lower bounds of the entanglement required to achieve certain correlations are identified. We discover a large family of correlations such that we know exactly the entangled state required to achieve each of the correlations in this family.

## Acknowledgment

The author is deeply grateful to his PhD advisor, Carl Miller, for the enlightening discussions with him, his patient guidance and useful critiques through this project. His original ideas about combining a linear system game with a Bell inequality and characterizing prime numbers by their primitive roots are invaluable to this work. He also helped the author with the design of the extended weighted CHSH test and the editing of the draft.

## References

- [AMP12] Antonio Acín, Serge Massar, and Stefano Pironio. Randomness versus nonlocality and entanglement. *Physical review letters*, 108(10):100402, 2012. [doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.100402](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.100402).

- [Ara04] Padmanabhan K. Aravind. Quantum mysteries revisited again. *American Journal of Physics*, 72(10):1303–1307, 2004. doi:[10.1119/1.1773173](https://doi.org/10.1119/1.1773173).
- [BP15] Cédric Bamps and Stefano Pironio. Sum-of-squares decompositions for a family of Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt-like inequalities and their application to self-testing. *Physical Review A*, 91(5):052111, 2015. doi:[10.1103/PhysRevA.91.052111](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.91.052111).
- [CGJV19] Andrea Coladangelo, Alex B Grilo, Stacey Jeffery, and Thomas Vidick. Verifier-on-a-leash: new schemes for verifiable delegated quantum computation, with quasilinear resources. In *Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques*, pages 247–277. Springer, 2019. doi:[10.1007/978-3-030-17659-4\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-17659-4_9).
- [CGS17] Andrea Coladangelo, Koon Tong Goh, and Valerio Scarani. All pure bipartite entangled states can be self-tested. *Nature communications*, 8:15485, 2017. doi:[10.1038/ncomms15485](https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms15485).
- [CHSH69] John F Clauser, Michael A Horne, Abner Shimony, and Richard A Holt. Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories. *Physical review letters*, 23(15):880, 1969. doi:[10.1103/PhysRevLett.23.880](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.23.880).
- [Col16] Andrea W Coladangelo. Parallel self-testing of (tilted) EPR pairs via copies of (tilted) CHSH. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.03687*, 2016.
- [CS17a] Andrea Coladangelo and Jalex Stark. Robust self-testing for linear constraint system games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.09267*, 2017.
- [CS17b] Andrea Coladangelo and Jalex Stark. Separation of finite and infinite-dimensional quantum correlations, with infinite question or answer sets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.06522*, 2017.
- [DF04] David Steven Dummit and Richard M Foote. *Abstract algebra*, volume 3. Wiley Hoboken, 2004.
- [FJVY19] Joseph Fitzsimons, Zhengfeng Ji, Thomas Vidick, and Henry Yuen. Quantum proof systems for iterated exponential time, and beyond. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 473–480. ACM, 2019. doi:[10.1145/3313276.3316343](https://doi.org/10.1145/3313276.3316343).
- [FM18] Honghao Fu and Carl A Miller. Local randomness: Examples and application. *Physical Review A*, 97(3):032324, 2018. doi:[10.1103/PhysRevA.97.032324](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.97.032324).
- [Mur88] Maruti Ram Murty. Artin’s conjecture for primitive roots. *The Mathematical Intelligencer*, 10(4):59–67, 1988. doi:[10.1007/BF03023749](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03023749).
- [MY98] Dominic Mayers and Andrew Yao. Quantum cryptography with imperfect apparatus. In *Proceedings 39th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (Cat. No. 98CB36280)*, pages 503–509. IEEE, 1998. doi:[10.1109/SFCS.1998.743501](https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1998.743501).
- [MYS12] Matthew McKague, Tzyh Haur Yang, and Valerio Scarani. Robust self-testing of the singlet. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 45(45):455304, 2012. doi:[10.1088/1751-8113/45/45/455304](https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8113/45/45/455304).

- [NV17] Anand Natarajan and Thomas Vidick. A quantum linearity test for robustly verifying entanglement. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1003–1015. ACM, 2017. doi:10.1145/3055399.3055468.
- [NV18] Anand Natarajan and Thomas Vidick. Low-degree testing for quantum states, and a quantum entangled games PCP for QMA. In *2018 IEEE 59th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 731–742. IEEE, 2018. doi:10.1109/FOCS.2018.00075.
- [NW19] Anand Natarajan and John Wright. *NEEXP* is Contained in *MIP\**. In *2019 IEEE 60th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 510–518. IEEE, 2019. doi:10.1109/FOCS.2019.00039.
- [RUV13] Ben W Reichardt, Falk Unger, and Umesh Vazirani. Classical command of quantum systems. *Nature*, 496(7446):456, 2013. doi:10.1038/nature12035.
- [Slo19] William Slofstra. The set of quantum correlations is not closed. In *Forum of Mathematics, Pi*, volume 7. Cambridge University Press, 2019. doi:10.1017/fmp.2018.3.
- [SV18] William Slofstra and Thomas Vidick. Entanglement in non-local games and the hyperlinear profile of groups. In *Annales Henri Poincaré*, volume 19, pages 2979–3005. Springer, 2018. doi:10.1007/s00023-018-0718-y.
- [WBMS16] Xingyao Wu, Jean-Daniel Bancal, Matthew McKague, and Valerio Scarani. Device-independent parallel self-testing of two singlets. *Physical Review A*, 93(6):062121, 2016. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.93.062121.
- [YN13] Tzyh Haur Yang and Miguel Navascués. Robust self-testing of unknown quantum systems into any entangled two-qubit states. *Physical Review A*, 87(5):050102, 2013. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.87.050102.

## A The linear system of $LS(r)$

**Definition A.1.** *The linear system of  $LS(r)$  has variables  $x(s)$  for each  $s \in S$ , and equations:*

- for each  $1 \leq i \leq r + 5$ :

$$\begin{aligned} x(a_i) + x(b_i) + x(c_i) = 0 & \quad x(a_i) + x(f_0) + x(d_i) = 0 \\ x(b_i) + x(f_2) + x(p_{i,1}) = 0 & \quad x(p_{i,2}) + x(p_{i,3}) + x(p_{i,4}) = 0 \quad x(f_0) + x(p_{i,3}) + x(p_{i,4}) = 0 \\ x(c_i) + x(p_{i,4}) + x(p_{i,5}) = 0 & \quad x(f_1) + x(p_{i,2}) + x(p_{i,3}) = 0; \end{aligned}$$

- for each  $\mathbf{c} = (i, j, k) \in C(r)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} x(h_{jk}) + x(b_j) + x(c_k) = 0 \\ x(d_i) + x(q_{\mathbf{c},1}) + x(f_2) = 0 & \quad x(b_j) + x(f_2) + x(q_{\mathbf{c},2}) = 0 \quad x(q_{\mathbf{c},2}) + x(q_{\mathbf{c},3}) + x(q_{\mathbf{c},4}) = 0 \\ x(d_i) + x(q_{\mathbf{c},4}) + x(q_{\mathbf{c},5}) = 0 & \quad x(c_k) + x(q_{\mathbf{c},5}) + x(q_{\mathbf{c},6}) = 0 \quad x(q_{\mathbf{c},1}) + x(q_{\mathbf{c},3}) + x(q_{\mathbf{c},6}) = 0; \end{aligned}$$

- *Magic Square equations:*

$$\begin{aligned} x(f_0) + x(f_1) + x(f_2) = 0 & \quad x(g_0) + x(g_1) + x(g_2) = 0 & \quad x(m_0) + x(m_1) + x(m_2) = 0 \\ x(f_0) + x(g_2) + x(m_0) = 0 & \quad x(f_2) + x(g_0) + x(m_1) = 0 & \quad x(f_1) + x(g_1) + x(m_2) = 1. \end{aligned}$$



## B A representation of $\Gamma$

In this section we give the full description of a representation of  $\Gamma$ ,  $\Psi$ , which is built upon representations of  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1$ . We need the representation  $\Psi$  of  $\Gamma$  to construct the ideal strategy of  $LS(r)$ .

Recall the two Hilbert spaces  $W_{d-1}$  and  $W_2$  defined in eq. (19), which are the carrier spaces of the representations given below, On the Hilbert space  $W_2$ , we define

$$X_{W_2} = |x_1\rangle\langle x_2| + |x_2\rangle\langle x_1| \quad Y_{W_2} = i|x_1\rangle\langle x_2| - i|x_2\rangle\langle x_1| \quad Z_{W_2} = |x_1\rangle\langle x_1| - |x_2\rangle\langle x_2|,$$

**Definition B.1.** *The representation,  $\Psi_0$ , of  $\mathcal{P}_0$  on  $W_{d-1}$  is defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_0(a_1) &= \sum_{j=1}^{(d-1)/2} \omega_d^j |x_j\rangle\langle x_{d-j}| + \omega_d^{-j} |x_{d-j}\rangle\langle x_j| \\ \Psi_0(a_2) &= \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} |x_j\rangle\langle x_{d-j}| \\ \Psi_0(a_3) &= |u_0\rangle\langle u_0| + \omega_{d-1}^{(d-1)/2} |u_{(d-1)/2}\rangle\langle u_{(d-1)/2}| \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{(d-3)/2} \left( \omega_{d-1}^k |u_k\rangle\langle u_{d-1-k}| + \omega_{d-1}^{-k} |x_{d-1-k}\rangle\langle x_k| \right) \\ \Psi_0(a_4) &= |u_0\rangle\langle u_0| + |u_{(d-1)/2}\rangle\langle u_{(d-1)/2}| \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{(d-3)/2} (|u_{d-1-k}\rangle\langle u_k| + |u_k\rangle\langle u_{d-1-k}|), \end{aligned}$$

The representation of the rest of the generators can be constructed from  $\Psi_0(a_1)$ ,  $\Psi_0(a_2)$ ,  $\Psi_0(a_3)$  and  $\Psi_0(a_4)$  following the defining conjugacy relations in  $\mathcal{P}_0$ .

We can check that

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_0(a_1 a_2) &= \sum_{j=0}^{d-2} \omega_d^{r_j} |x_{r_j}\rangle\langle x_{r_j}| = \tilde{O} \\ \Psi_0(a_3 a_4) &= \sum_{j=0}^{d-2} |x_{r_{j-1}}\rangle\langle x_{r_j}| = \tilde{U}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{O}$  and  $\tilde{U}$  are defined in eqs. (20) and (21). We can also check that the representation  $\Psi_0$  satisfies the relations that  $\Psi_0(a_3 a_4) \Psi_0(a_2) \Psi_0(a_4 a_3) = \Psi_0(a_2)$  by first observing that

$$\Psi_0(a_3) \Psi_0(a_4) = \sum_{j=0}^{d-2} |x_{r_{j-1}}\rangle\langle x_{r_j}|.$$

Then we can calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Psi_0(a_3)\Psi_0(a_4)\Psi_0(a_2)\Psi_0(a_4)\Psi_0(a_3) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{(d-3)/2} \Psi_0(a_3)\Psi_0(a_4)(|x_{rj}\rangle\langle x_{r,d-1-j}| + |x_{r,d-1-j}\rangle\langle x_{rj}|)\Psi_0(a_4)\Psi_0(a_3) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{(d-3)/2} |x_{rj-1}\rangle\langle x_{r,d-2-j}| + |x_{r,d-2-j}\rangle\langle x_{rj-1}| \\
&= \Psi_0(a_2).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, following the proof of Lemma 29 of [Slo19], we construct a representation of  $\mathcal{P}_1$ .

**Definition B.2.** The representation  $\Psi_1$  of  $\mathcal{P}_1$  on  $W_2 \otimes W_{d-1}$  is defined by

- for  $f_0$

$$\Psi_1(f_0) = X_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_{d-1}};$$

- for  $i = 1 \dots r + 5$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_1(a_i) &= \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \Psi_0(a_i) \\
\Psi_1(b_i) &= |x_1\rangle\langle x_1| \otimes \Psi_0(a_i) + |x_2\rangle\langle x_2| \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_{d-1}} \\
\Psi_1(c_i) &= |x_1\rangle\langle x_1| \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_{d-1}} + |x_2\rangle\langle x_2| \otimes \Psi_0(a_i) \\
\Psi_1(d_i) &= X_{W_2} \otimes \Psi_0(a_i);
\end{aligned}$$

- for  $(i, j, k) \in C(r)$ ,

$$\Psi_1(h_{jk}) = |x_1\rangle\langle x_1| \otimes \Psi_0(a_j) + |x_2\rangle\langle x_2| \otimes \Psi_0(a_k).$$

Finally, we follow the proof of Proposition 27 of [Slo19] to construct the representation  $\Psi$  of  $\Gamma$ .

**Definition B.3.** The representation  $\Psi$  of  $\Gamma$  on  $W_2 \otimes W_2 \otimes W_{d-1}$  is defined by:

- for  $s \in \{a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i\}_{i=1}^{r+5}$ ,

$$\Psi(s) = \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \Psi_1(s);$$

- for  $f_i, g_i, m_i$  with  $i = 0, 1, 2$  and  $J$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi(f_0) &= \mathbb{1} \otimes X_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_{d-1}} \\
\Psi(f_1) &= X_{W_2} \otimes X_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_{d-1}} \\
\Psi(f_2) &= X_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_{d-1}} \\
\Psi(g_0) &= \mathbb{1} \otimes Z_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_{d-1}} \\
\Psi(g_1) &= Z_{W_2} \otimes Z_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_{d-1}} \\
\Psi(g_2) &= Z_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_{d-1}} \\
\Psi(m_0) &= Z_{W_2} \otimes X_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_{d-1}} \\
\Psi(m_1) &= X_{W_2} \otimes Z_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_{d-1}} \\
\Psi(m_2) &= Y_{W_2} \otimes Y_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_{d-1}} \\
\Psi(J) &= -\mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_{d-1}};
\end{aligned}$$

- for the generators involved in  $R_i$  with  $1 \leq i \leq r + 5$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi(p_{i,1}) &= X_{W_2} \otimes \Psi_1(b_i) \\
\Psi(p_{i,2}) &= |x_1\rangle\langle x_2| \otimes \Psi_1(b_i f_0) + |x_2\rangle\langle x_1| \otimes \Psi_1(f_0 b_i) \\
\Psi(p_{i,3}) &= |x_1\rangle\langle x_1| \otimes \Psi_1(b_i f_0 b_i) + |x_2\rangle\langle x_2| \otimes \Psi_1(f_0) \\
\Psi(p_{i,4}) &= |x_1\rangle\langle x_1| \otimes \Psi_1(b_i c_i) + |x_2\rangle\langle x_2| \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_{d-1}} \\
\Psi(p_{i,5}) &= |x_1\rangle\langle x_1| \otimes \Psi_1(b_i) + |x_2\rangle\langle x_2| \otimes \Psi_1(c_i);
\end{aligned}$$

- for the generators involved in  $R_c$  with  $c = (i, j, k) \in C(r)$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi(q_{c,1}) &= X_{W_2} \otimes \Psi_1(d_i) \\
\Psi(q_{c,2}) &= X_{W_2} \otimes \Psi_1(b_j) \\
\Psi(q_{c,3}) &= |x_1\rangle\langle x_2| \otimes \Psi_1(b_j d_i) + |x_2\rangle\langle x_1| \otimes \Psi_1(d_i b_j) \\
\Psi(q_{c,4}) &= |x_1\rangle\langle x_1| \otimes \Psi_1(b_j d_i b_j) + |x_2\rangle\langle x_2| \otimes \Psi_1(d_i) \\
\Psi(q_{c,5}) &= |x_1\rangle\langle x_1| \otimes \Psi_1(b_j c_k) + |x_2\rangle\langle x_2| \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{W_{d-1}} \\
\Psi(q_{c,6}) &= |x_1\rangle\langle x_1| \otimes \Psi_1(b_j) + |x_2\rangle\langle x_2| \otimes \Psi_1(c_k).
\end{aligned}$$

The validation of  $\Psi_1$  and  $\Psi$  were done in the proofs of Lemma 29 and Proposition 27 in [Slo19].

## C The proof of Theorem 4.1

This proof follows the same line of argument in Appendix A of [BP15]. We first find two sum-of-square decompositions of  $2\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 1}\mathbb{1} - \mathcal{I}_\alpha$ , where  $\mathcal{I}_\alpha$  is expressed in terms of  $\{M_x\}$  and  $\{N_y\}$ . The decompositions allow us to determine some key relations between Alice and Bob's observables and their shared state, which will be used to draw the conclusion.

*Proof.* The first step is to find a sum-of-square decomposition of the following Bell expression

$$\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\alpha = 2\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 1}\mathbb{1} - \mathcal{I}_\alpha = \frac{2}{\sin(\mu)}\mathbb{1} - \frac{\cos(\mu)}{\sin(\mu)}(M_1 N_1 + M_1 N_2) - M_2 N_1 + M_2 N_2. \quad (98)$$

With the notation  $c := \cos(\mu)$ ,  $s := \sin(\mu)$ , we define

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_A &:= M_1 & X_A &:= M_2 \\
Z_B &:= \frac{N_1 + N_2}{2c} & X_B &:= \frac{N_1 - N_2}{2s}.
\end{aligned}$$

The two SOS decompositions that we use are

$$\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\alpha = \frac{s\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\alpha^2 + 4sc^2(Z_A X_B + X_A Z_B)^2}{4}, \quad (99)$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\alpha = \frac{c^2}{s}(Z_A - Z_B)^2 + s(X_A - X_B)^2. \quad (100)$$

The verification is omitted here. From the SOS decomposition, we can prove eqs. (26) to (31).

We first define

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \frac{\sqrt{s}}{2} \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\alpha, & S_2 &= \sqrt{sc}(Z_A X_B + X_A Z_B), \\ S_3 &= \frac{c}{\sqrt{s}}(Z_A - Z_B), & S_4 &= \sqrt{s}(X_A - X_B) \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\alpha = S_1^2 + S_2^2 = S_3^2 + S_4^2. \quad (101)$$

The fact that the quantum strategy  $(|\psi\rangle, \{M_x\}_{x=1,2}, \{N_y\}_{y=1,2})$  achieves that  $\langle \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\alpha \rangle \leq \epsilon$  implies that

$$\langle \psi | S_i^2 | \psi \rangle \leq \epsilon,$$

and equivalently,

$$\|S_i |\psi\rangle\| \leq \sqrt{\epsilon}$$

for  $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ . From the definitions of  $S_i$ 's, we can get that

$$\|(X_A Z_B + X_B Z_A) |\psi\rangle\| \leq \frac{1}{c\sqrt{s}} \sqrt{\epsilon} \quad (102)$$

$$\|(Z_A - Z_B) |\psi\rangle\| \leq \frac{\sqrt{s}}{c} \sqrt{\epsilon} \quad (103)$$

$$\|(X_A - X_B) |\psi\rangle\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{s}} \sqrt{\epsilon}, \quad (104)$$

which proves eqs. (26) and (27). Equations (102) and (103) give us that

$$\|[Z_A(\mathbb{1} + X_B) - (\mathbb{1} - X_A)Z_B] |\psi\rangle\| \leq \|(X_A Z_B + X_B Z_A) |\psi\rangle\| + \|(Z_A - Z_B) |\psi\rangle\| \leq \frac{s+1}{c\sqrt{s}} \sqrt{\epsilon},$$

which proves eq. (28). Similarly, eqs. (102) and (104) give us that

$$\|[X_A(\mathbb{1} + Z_B) - X_B(\mathbb{1} - Z_A)] |\psi\rangle\| \leq \frac{c+1}{c\sqrt{s}} \sqrt{\epsilon},$$

which proves eq. (29). Since  $Z_A X_A + X_A Z_A = \frac{S_2}{c\sqrt{s}} + \frac{\sqrt{s} \tilde{X}_A S_3}{c} + \frac{\tilde{Z}_A S_4}{\sqrt{s}}$ , we can deduce that

$$\|(Z_A X_A + X_A Z_A) |\psi\rangle\| \leq \frac{1+c+s}{c\sqrt{s}} \sqrt{\epsilon},$$

as in eq. (30). To prove eq. (31), we switch to the approximate relation form and derive that

$$X_A Z_A |\psi\rangle \simeq \frac{1+c+s}{c\sqrt{s}} \sqrt{\epsilon} - Z_A X_A |\psi\rangle \quad (105)$$

$$\simeq \frac{\sqrt{s}}{c} \sqrt{\epsilon} - Z_A X_B |\psi\rangle \quad (106)$$

$$\simeq \frac{1}{s^{3/2}} \sqrt{\epsilon} - X_B Z_B |\psi\rangle, \quad (107)$$

where in the last line we use the fact  $\|X_B\| \leq 1/s$ .

Now we introduce the isometries  $\Phi_A$  and  $\Phi_B$  mentioned in the theorem. They are the same as the ones used in [BP15]. To construct  $\Phi_A$  and  $\Phi_B$  we need to regularize  $Z_B$  and  $X_B$  to make sure the corresponding operations are unitary in the isometries. We define  $Z_B^*$  to be the operator obtained from  $Z_B$  by changing all the 0-eigenvalues to 1, then we define

$$Z'_B := Z_B^* |Z_B^*|^{-1},$$

where  $|Z_B^*|$  is obtained from  $Z_B^*$  by replacing all negative eigenvalues by its absolute value. In a similar way, we define  $X_B^*$  and  $X'_B$ . On Alice's side, since  $Z_A$  and  $X_A$  are unitaries already, we define  $Z'_A := Z_A$  and  $X'_A = X_A$ . The isometries are illustrated in the figure below.




Figure 3: The isometries  $\Phi_A$  and  $\Phi_B$ .

To bound  $e_{xy} := \|(\Phi_A \otimes \Phi_B)(\tilde{M}_x \otimes \tilde{N}_y)|\tilde{\psi}\rangle - |\text{junk}\rangle \otimes (M_x \otimes N_y)|\Sigma^{(2)}\rangle\|$ , there are some intermediate steps. Since the derivations are the same as in [BP15], we only record the key relations here.

$$\|(Z'_B - Z_B)|\tilde{\psi}\rangle\| \leq \frac{\sqrt{s}}{c} \sqrt{\epsilon},$$

$$\|(Z'_B - Z'_A)|\tilde{\psi}\rangle\| \leq 2 \frac{\sqrt{s}}{c} \sqrt{\epsilon},$$

$$\|(X'_B - X_B)|\tilde{\psi}\rangle\| \leq \frac{c+1}{s^{3/2}} \sqrt{\epsilon} := \delta_1 \sqrt{\epsilon},$$

$$\|(X'_B Z'_B + Z'_B X'_B)|\tilde{\psi}\rangle\| \leq \left[ \frac{2\sqrt{s}}{c} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{s}} + 2\delta_1 + \left(\sqrt{2} + \frac{1}{c}\right) \left(2 \frac{\sqrt{s}}{c} + \frac{1+c+s}{c\sqrt{s}}\right) \right] \sqrt{\epsilon} := \delta_2 \sqrt{\epsilon}.$$

Then we can calculate that

$$e_{00} = e_{10} = 2\delta_2 \sqrt{\epsilon}$$

$$e_{20} = 2 \left( \frac{1+c+s}{c\sqrt{s}} + \delta_2 \right) \sqrt{\epsilon}$$

$$e_{01} = e_{02} = e_{11} = e_{12} = \left[ \sqrt{s} + s \left( 2 \frac{1+c+s}{c\sqrt{s}} + \delta_1 \right) + 2\delta_2 \right] \sqrt{\epsilon}$$

$$e_{21} = e_{22} = \left[ 2 \frac{1+c+s}{c\sqrt{s}} + \sqrt{s} + s \left( 2 \frac{1+c+s}{c\sqrt{s}} + \delta_1 \right) + 2\delta_2 \right] \sqrt{\epsilon},$$

so an upper bound of the error is that

$$e_{xy} \in O\left(\left(\frac{1}{c^2 s^{1/2}} + \frac{1}{s^{3/2}}\right) \sqrt{\epsilon}\right) \quad \forall x, y \in \{0, 1, 2\}. \quad (108)$$

□