Naturally restricted subsets of nonsignaling correlations: typicality and convergence
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It is well-known that in a Bell experiment, the observed correlation between measurement outcomes—as predicted by quantum theory—can be stronger than that allowed by local causality, yet not fully constrained by the principle of relativistic causality. In practice, the characterization of the set of quantum correlations is often carried out through a converging hierarchy of outer approximations. On the other hand, some subsets of quantum correlations arising from additional constraints [e.g., originating from quantum states having positive partial transposition (PPT) or being finite-dimensional maximally entangled] turn out to be also amenable to similar numerical characterizations. How then, at a quantitative level, are all these naturally restricted subsets of nonsignaling correlations different? Here, we consider several bipartite Bell scenarios and numerically estimate their volume relative to that of the set of nonsignaling correlations. Among others, our findings allow us to (i) gain insight on the effectiveness of the so-called $Q_1$ and the almost quantum set in approximating $Q$, (ii) the rate of convergence among the first few levels of the aforementioned outer approximations, (iii) the typicality of the phenomenon of more nonlocality with less entanglement, and (2) identify a Bell scenario whose Bell violation by PPT states might be experimentally viable.

I. INTRODUCTION

The fact that Bell inequalities [1]—constraints derived from the assumption of Bell-locality [2]—can be violated by quantum theory indicates that the set of quantum correlations $Q$ is intrinsically different from the set of correlations $L$ allowed by a locally-causal theory [3]. However, it is also known—from the pioneering work of Popescu and Rohrlich [4]—that quantum theory is not the most Bell-nonlocal (hereafter abbreviated as nonlocal) among all physical theories that respect the principle of relativistic causality. In bipartite Bell scenarios, this principle gives rise to the so-called nonsignaling (NS) conditions [5], and hence a superset of $Q$ known as the nonsignaling polytope $NS$.

Since then, a lot of effort (see, e.g., [6–11]) has been devoted to understand if additional physical, or information-theoretic principles can be supplemented to recover from $NS$ the set of quantum correlations. In fact, the so-called almost-quantum set of correlations [11]—known to be a strict super-set to $Q$—apparently satisfies all information-theoretic principles proposed to date. Nonetheless, the extent to which this set, hereafter denoted by $Q_1$, differs from $Q$ itself is not well understood (see, however, [12]).

Indeed, to date, the only known means that we have in terms of characterizing $Q$ is via a hierarchy of outer approximations, such as that proposed by Navascués, Pironio, and Acín (NPA) [13]. The NPA hierarchy is known to converge [14] (see also [15])—in the asymptotic limit—to the set of correlations $Q_{[\ldots]}$ achievable assuming quantum theory and with the measurements between spatially separated parties modeled by commuting operators, rather than tensor products. Note that the two different formulations of spatially separated measurements generally lead to different [16] sets of correlations, i.e., $Q \neq Q_{[\ldots]}$ (see, however, [17]). Moreover, very little is known [18] regarding the rate of convergence of this hierarchy towards $Q_{[\ldots]}$.

On the other hand, a few other subsets of $Q$ are also of natural interest. For example, a somewhat different formulation [19] of the NPA hierarchy has made it possible to characterize—also via a converging hierarchy of outer approximations—the set of correlations $P$ arising from quantum states having positive partial transposition [20] (PPT). The original interest of this stems from a conjecture of Peres [21]—disproved in [22]—concerning the impossibility of bound entangled [23] states to violate Bell inequalities. Known counterexamples to Peres’ conjecture are however too fragile to be demonstrated in any experiment, thus making it desirable to understand how $P$, being a restricted subset of $Q$, differs from the set of Bell-local correlations $L$.

Besides, the fact that certain nonlocal features only seem to exist for partially entangled states is also intriguing. One of the first hints along this line lies in the discovery of the Hardy paradox [24]. Later, the existence of such correlations was explicitly shown, independently, in [25–27] (see also [28]), under the name of more nonlocality with less entanglement. Interestingly, the set of correlations $M$ arising from finite-dimensional maximally entangled states, or more precisely its convex hull—as with $Q$ and $P$—can also be characterized [29] via a hierarchy of outer approximations, each corresponding to the feasible set of a semidefinite program [30]. To achieve a better understanding of the precise relationship between entanglement and nonlocality, any quantitative estimate of the difference between $M$ and $Q$ is clearly welcome.

Apart from fundamental interest, nonlocal correlations also play an indispensable role in the context of device-independent (DI) quantum information [2, 31]. For instance,
from the observation of Bell violation itself, one can certify the generation of unpredictable random bits [32, 33], guarantee the sharing of truly unconditional secured keys [34], certify various desired features of the underlying systems (see, e.g., [19, 35–39]), measurements (see, e.g., [37, 40–42]) or even other more general types of operations [43, 44]. In its strongest form, one could achieve so-called self-testing [45], where the underlying system and measurements are uniquely identified, modulo unimportant local degrees of freedom. For a comprehensive review on this topic, see [46].

To this end, it is worth noting that, quantitative difference between the “size” of the Bell-local set \( \mathcal{L} \), the quantum set \( \mathcal{Q} \) and the nonsignaling set \( \mathcal{NS} \) has been investigated in [47–49]. Specifically, in the simplest Bell scenario involving two parties, each performing two binary-outcome measurements, the volume of \( \mathcal{L} \) and that of \( \mathcal{Q} \), relative to \( \mathcal{NS} \), in the subspace of “full” correlation functions [50] was first determined in [47]. Then, for the same Bell scenario, the analysis has been generalized [48] to include also the subspace spanned by marginal correlations. Beyond this, numerical estimation on the relative volume of \( \mathcal{L} \) to \( \mathcal{NS} \) was carried out in [49] for a few Bell scenarios with either two measurement settings or outcomes; some analytic results were also presented therein when restricted to the subspace of full correlations.

Here, we generalize the analysis of [47–49] in two directions. Firstly, we consider a more extensive list of Bell scenarios, including a few with both multiple measurement settings and multiple measurement outcomes, thereby allowing us to make observations that were not possible in prior works. Secondly, we consider not only \( \mathcal{L} \), \( \mathcal{Q} \) (approximated by relevant outer approximations), and \( \mathcal{NS} \), but also the set of correlations \( \mathcal{P} \) achievable by PPT quantum states, the (convex hull of the) set of correlations achievable by locally measuring finite-dimensional maximally entangled states with projective measurements \( \mathcal{M} \), the set \( \mathcal{Q}_1 \) associated with the principle of macroscopic locality [9], the almost-quantum set \( \mathcal{Q}_A \), and more generally the first few levels of the outer approximations of \( \mathcal{Q} \) given by the NPA hierarchy [13] as well as the hierarchy of Moroder et al. [19]. This last consideration, in particular, allows us to learn something about the rate of convergence for the first few levels of these outer approximations, which is clearly relevant for many of the analyses performed in a device-independent setting.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we introduce the notations used throughout the paper and the different Bell scenarios that we consider. Then, we present in Section III our main results on the relative volume for the different sets of correlations mentioned above. In Section IV, we give further discussions and comment on some possible directions for future research.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Notations and Naturally Restricted Subsets of \( \mathcal{NS} \)

Consider a bipartite Bell experiment where the spatially separated parties each has a choice over \( n_s \) measurement sets and each measurement results in \( n_{sa} \) possible outcomes. We shall denote such a Bell scenario by \( (n_s, n_{sa}) \). Correlation between the observed outcomes for given measurement settings of the two parties (conventionally called Alice and Bob) may be described by \( \bar{P} = \{ P(a, b|x, y) \}_{a,b,x,y} \) where we label the measurement settings and outcomes for Alice (Bob), respectively, as \( x \) (\( y \)) and \( a \) (\( b \)). In the rest of this paper, we consider only Bell scenarios where \( x, y, a, b \) take a finite number of values.

Our starting point is the set of nonsignaling correlations [4, 5], \( \mathcal{NS} \), which are all those \( \bar{P} \) that satisfy the so-called nonsignaling conditions [5]:

\[
\sum_a P(a, b|x, y) \stackrel{\mathcal{NS}}{=} \sum_a P(a, b|x', y) \quad \forall b, y, x, x',
\]

\[
\sum_b P(a, b|x, y) \stackrel{\mathcal{NS}}{=} \sum_b P(a, b|x', y') \quad \forall a, x, y, y'.
\]

(1)

Physically, these conditions are required to ensure that it is impossible to communicate faster than light—in a Bell experiment when all measurements are carried out in a spacelike separated manner—by making different choices \( x, y \) of local measurements. Since \( \mathcal{NS} \) is the intersection of a finite number of hyperplanes defined by Eq. (1) and the direct sum of \( n_s^2 \) probability simplices, it is a convex polytope.

An important subset of \( \mathcal{NS} \) is the set of \( \bar{P} \) that can be described by a local-hidden-variable model [1], or more generally a locally-causal model [3]. Mathematically, for any such \( \bar{P} \), there exists normalized weights \( q(\lambda) \geq 0 \) for all \( \lambda \) and \( \sum_\lambda q(\lambda) = 1 \) such that

\[
P(a, b|x, y) \equiv \sum_\lambda q(\lambda) \delta_{a, f_A(x, \lambda)} \delta_{b, f_B(y, \lambda)},
\]

(2)

for some choice of local response functions \( f_A(x, \lambda) \) and \( f_B(y, \lambda) \). Following the standard terminology [2], we refer to the set of correlations satisfying Eq. (2) as the Bell-local set \( \mathcal{L} \). Clearly, \( \mathcal{L} \) is convex. Since there are only finite possibilities of \( x, y, a, b \), the set \( \mathcal{L} \) forms [51] a convex polytope, with its extreme points correspond to local deterministic strategies given by the Kronecker deltas: \( \delta_{a, f_A(x, \lambda)} \) and \( \delta_{b, f_B(y, \lambda)} \).

Suppose now that the two parties share a quantum state \( \rho \), then quantum theory dictates that the observed correlation follows Born’s rule:

\[
P(a, b|x, y) \equiv \text{tr} \left[ \rho M^{(A)}_{a|x} \otimes M^{(B)}_{b|y} \right],
\]

(3)

where \( \{ M^{(A)}_{a|x} \}_a \) \( \{ M^{(B)}_{b|y} \}_b \) are positive-operator-valued measures (POVMs) associated with Alice’s (Bob’s) \( x \)-th (\( y \)-th) measurement. We denote the set of such correlations by \( \mathcal{Q} \). Importantly, in the definition of \( \mathcal{Q} \), there is no constraint imposed on the (local) Hilbert space dimension. This, in turn, guarantees the convexity [51] of \( \mathcal{Q} \) and the sufficiency of pure state \( \rho^2 = \rho \) and projective measurements—via Naimark’s extension [52]—in the membership test of \( \mathcal{Q} \). Even then, the characterization of \( \mathcal{Q} \) is by no means computationally easy.

To this end, NPA [13] first pointed out that \( \mathcal{Q} \), or more precisely, \( \mathcal{Q}[\cdot, \cdot] \) can be characterized [14] asymptotically (see
also [15]) by solving a hierarchy of semidefinite programs (SDPs). The feasible sets corresponding to these SDPs then define a series of outer approximations $Q_1 \supseteq Q_2 \supseteq \cdots \supseteq Q_\infty = Q_{[1]} \supset Q$, where $Q_k$ is conventionally referred to as NPA level $k$ with $k$ signifying the highest degree of the operator used in defining some matrix of moments (see [13, 14] for details). $Q_1$, incidentally, is exactly the set of correlations that respects the principle of macroscopic locality [9]. Note that intermediate levels can also be considered and a very important example of which is the so-called NPA level 1 + $AB$, which happens to be the lowest level of another converging hierarchy of outer approximations $Q_1 \supseteq Q_2 \supseteq \cdots \supseteq Q_\infty = Q_{[1]} \supset Q$ due to Moroder et al. [19]. The specific outer approximation $Q_{1+AB} = Q_1$ is known in the literature as the almost quantum [11] set of correlations, as it seems to satisfy all principles that have been proposed to date to distinguish $Q$ from $\mathcal{NS}$.

As Bell showed in his seminal work [1], there exist quantum correlations arising from entangled quantum state that do not admit a convex decomposition in the form of Eq. (2). At the same time, by considering trivial POVMs consisting only of the identity operator and the null operator, it is straightforward to see that all $\vec{P} \in \mathcal{L}$ can always be put in the form of Eq. (3). Similarly, all $\vec{P} \in Q$ can be easily seen to satisfy Eq. (1), while Popescu and Rohrlich [4] showed that there exists $\vec{P} \in \mathcal{NS}$ that is not in $Q$. Together, one arrives at the strict inclusion relations $\mathcal{L} \subseteq Q \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{NS}$.

Even if we restrict our attention to $Q$ itself, it is worth noting that its relationship with the set of quantum states has not been fully understood. For example, although entanglement is necessary [53] for the generation of Bell-nonlocal correlations, some entangled states (see, e.g., [53, 54]) are known to produce only $\vec{P} \in \mathcal{L}$. In fact, even if Alice and Bob are allowed to share an arbitrary finite-dimensional maximally entangled state $|\Psi_d\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i=1}^{d} |i\rangle |i\rangle$, it is impossible for them to reproduce all $\vec{P} \in Q$ [25–28]. To facilitate subsequent discussions, we shall denote by $\mathcal{M}^*$ the convex hull of the set of correlations attainable by performing projective measurements on $|\Psi_d\rangle$, with $d$ finite. On the contrary, even the weakest form of entanglement given by PPT entangled states is somehow capable of generating nonlocal correlations [22, 55]. Hereafter, we denote by $\mathcal{P}$ the subset of $Q$ which arises from $\rho$ being a PPT state, i.e., $\rho^{\mathcal{P}} \geq 0$ where $\rho^{\mathcal{P}}$ stands for the partial transposition operation on Alice’s Hilbert space.

A schematic diagram explaining the relationships among the various naturally restricted subsets $T$ of $\mathcal{NS}$ considered in this work is provided in Fig. 1.

### B. Membership Tests

Our goal is to estimate the relative volume of various subsets $T \in \{\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{M}^*, Q, \mathcal{Q}_1, \mathcal{Q}_1\}$ of $\mathcal{NS}$. To this end, we perform membership test $\vec{P} \in T$ for each sampled $\vec{P} \in \mathcal{NS}$ by solving the following optimization problem:

\[
\begin{align}
\text{sup} & \quad v \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad v\vec{P} + (1-v)\vec{P}_w \in T,
\end{align}
\]

where $\vec{P}_w$ is the uniform probability distribution, i.e., $P_w(a, b|x, y) = 1/n^2$ $\forall x, y$. As $\vec{P}_w$ lies strictly in $\mathcal{L}$, it must also lie in all sets $T$ that are of our interest. Hence, the above optimization problem, which we solve using the optimization software MOSEK implemented in MATLAB, is always feasible by setting $v = 0$. Also, if $\vec{P} \in T$ then all mixtures with $v \in [0, 1]$ are inside $T$, i.e., the optimum $v$ (denoted by $v^*$) would be greater than or equal to 1. Hence, $v^* < 1$ indicates that $\vec{P} \notin T$. Notice that $v^*$, often called the white-noise visibility, can be understood as the “maximal” weight that can be assigned to $\vec{P}$ when it is admixed with white noise while ensuring that the mixture lies within $T$. A smaller value of $v^*$, which corresponds to a larger value of $1 - v^*$, then indicates that the correlation is more robust (in terms of preserving its nonlocal nature) against the mixing with $\vec{P}_w$.

Among the different sets of interest, $\mathcal{L}$ is a convex polytope, and thus its membership test, cf. Eq. (4) is an instance of a linear program [30]. For relatively simple Bell scenarios, this optimization problem can be efficiently solved on a computer. In contrast, for the other sets of interest, including $T \in \{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{M}^*, Q\}$, we rely on a hierarchy of outer approximations, each of which is amenable to semidefinite programming characterizations. In the case of $Q$, we use both the NPA hierarchy [13, 14] and its variant due to Moroder et al. [19] for membership tests. For definiteness, we denote by $\mathcal{Q}_k$ and $\mathcal{Q}_l$, respectively, the level $k$ and the level $l$ outer approximation of $Q$ based on the NPA hierarchy and the hierarchy of Moroder et al. (a summary of both hierarchies can be found in Table V).
Appendix B of Ref. [56]). Note that by requiring the moment matrix associated with \( Q_k \) to be PPT, one immediately obtains a characterization of \( \mathcal{P}_k \), i.e., the level \( \ell \) outer approximation of \( \mathcal{P} \). For the set of correlations \( \mathcal{M}^r \) associated with local projective measurements on finite-dimensional maximally entangled states, we make use of a hierarchy adapted from that presented in Ref. [29], the details of which are given in Appendix A. We refer to the level \( h \) outer approximation of \( \mathcal{M}^r \) obtained thereof as \( \mathcal{M}^r_h \).

### C. Metrics and Relative Volume

The notion of volume for any given region in some space \( \mathcal{S} \) is evidently metric-dependent. Here, the \( \mathcal{S} \) of interest is that of conditional probability distributions \( \vec{P} = \{P(a|b, x, y)\}_{a,b,x,y} \) where \( a, b \in \{1, \ldots, n_o\} \) and \( x, y \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n_s\} \). Clearly, due to the normalization requirement \( \sum_{a,b} P(a|b, x, y) = 1 \) for all \( x, y \), \( \mathcal{S} \) is \((n_s(n_s^2 - 1))\)-dimensional. Moreover, we are only interested in \( \vec{P} \) that satisfy the nonsignaling constraints of Eq. (1). The nonsignaling polytope \( \mathcal{NS} \) and hence the various subsets of interest all lie in a \( d \)-dimensional subspace \( \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{NS}} \) of \( \mathcal{S} \) where [57] \( d = (n_o - 1)^2n_s^2 + 2n_s(n_o - 1) \).

A convenient, minimal parametrization of any \( \vec{P} \in \mathcal{NS} \) is given by [57]:

\[
\vec{P} = \{P(a|x), P(b|y), P(a, b|x, y)\}_{a,b,x,y}
\]

where \( P(a|x) = \sum_x P(a|x, y) \) and \( P(b|y) = \sum_x P(a, b|x, y) \) are, respectively, the marginal conditional probability distributions of Alice and Bob. Note that in this parameterization, the labels \( a, b \) in Eq. (5) only take values from \( \{1, \ldots, n_o - 1\} \). Indeed, the conditional probability distributions for the omitted outcome corresponding to \( a \) and/or \( b = n_o \) can be easily determined from the components \( P_i \) of \( \vec{P} \) in Eq. (5) via the normalization of probabilities and the nonsignaling conditions of Eq. (1).

In prior works [47–49], the relative volumes of interest were all estimated by implicitly adopting the Euclidean metric \( ds^2 \) in \( \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{NS}} \), i.e., one where all components of \( \vec{P} \) in Eq. (5) are treated on equal footing. Explicitly, this metric and its corresponding volume element \( dV \) are given, respectively, by:

\[
ds^2 = \sum_i dP_i^2 \quad \text{and} \quad dV = \prod_i dP_i.
\]

In this work, we adopt as well the Euclidean metric but will comment briefly on another possibility in Section IV. When there is no risk of confusion, the subscript \( \mathcal{E} \) is thus omitted to simplify the presentation.

We then define the relative volume (RV) for each set \( \mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{NS} \) as:

\[
RV(\mathcal{T}) \equiv \frac{V(\mathcal{T})}{V(\mathcal{NS})}
\]

where \( V(S) \) is the volume of a set \( S \) in accordance to the (Euclidean) metric. To numerically estimate these RVs, it suffices to sample points \( \vec{P} \in \mathcal{NS} \) uniformly according to the metric, and determine the fraction of such points that lie in \( \mathcal{T} \) via the method explained in Section II B. To this end, we make use of the MATLAB function \texttt{cprnd} developed by Benham [58], and in particular its \texttt{Gibbs sampler} algorithm to perform uniform sampling of \( \vec{P} \) in \( \mathcal{NS} \). In Appendix B, we give further details on how we generate uniform samples in \( \mathcal{NS} \) using the \texttt{cprnd} function.

For each Bell scenario considered, we estimate the RV of \( \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q}_k, \mathcal{P}_k \) and \( \mathcal{M}^r_h \). In Table I, we list all the bipartite Bell scenarios considered in this work, the number of samples used in estimating the RV of each target set, the highest level of each type of hierarchies considered, as well as the corresponding RVs. In Appendix C, we further provide the relevant parameters characterizing the size of the optimization problem. In the next section, we present our main results.

### III. NUMERICAL ESTIMATES OF RELATIVE VOLUMES

In this section, we present our results comparing the various relative volumes. A summary of \( RV(\mathcal{T}) \) for \( \mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{Q}_k, \mathcal{P}_k, \mathcal{M}^r_h\} \) and certain approximations to \( \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}, \) and \( \mathcal{M}^r \) for the Bell scenarios that we have considered can be found in Table I. In the following subsections, we describe in details how the relative volume of these subsets of \( \mathcal{NS} \) changes in different Bell scenarios. In particular, we start with \( RV(\mathcal{L}) \) and then focus on how the various outer approximations \( \mathcal{Q}_k, \mathcal{Q}_\ell \) appear to converge in different Bell scenarios. With the tightest approximation to \( \mathcal{Q} \) (denoted by \( \mathcal{Q}_s \)), determined therefrom, we proceed to illustrate how \( RV(\mathcal{Q}_s) \) varies in different Bell scenarios. Finally, we present our results comparing the difference between \( \mathcal{M}^r_s \) (the tightest approximation to \( \mathcal{M}^r \) that we are able to compute) and \( \mathcal{Q}_s \), as well as the difference between \( \mathcal{P}_s \) (the tightest approximation to \( \mathcal{P} \) that we are able to compute) and \( \mathcal{L} \). To best illustrate these trends, we make use of line plots showing how each of these relative volumes varies with respect to the relevant parameters.

#### A. \( \mathcal{L} vs \mathcal{NS} \)

Quantitative estimate of \( RV(\mathcal{L}) \) in the 8-dimensional space of \( \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{NS}} \) for the (2,2) Bell scenario was first determined in Ref. [48]. This analysis was then generalized in Ref. [49] to include the (3,2), (4,2), (5,2), (2,3), and the (2,4) Bell scenarios. Among their findings is the observation that for \( n_o = 2 \), \( RV(\mathcal{L}) \) rapidly decreases as \( n_s \) increases from 2 to 5. Our findings, as can be seen in Fig. 2, show that this trend continues to hold for the other Bell scenarios that we have investigated. For example, in the \( n_o = 2 \) case, we observe that \( RV(\mathcal{L}) \) decreases from about 94.15\% (for \( n_s = 2 \)) to approximately 0.15\% (for \( n_s = 6 \)), likewise for the \( n_o = 3 \) case, which decreases from 93.84\% (for \( n_s = 2 \)) to 0.01\% (for \( n_s = 6 \)), etc.

Before we proceed to discuss this observed trend, it is important to note that our estimate for \( RV(\mathcal{L}) \) in the (2,2) and (3,2) Bell scenario is consistent with that obtained analytically from the software \texttt{irs} [59], which gives \( RV(\mathcal{L}) = \frac{16}{17} \approx \frac{4}{5} \).
Table I. Summary of the numerically estimated relative volume $\text{RV}(\mathcal{T})$ for various naturally restricted subsets $\mathcal{T}$ of the set of nonsignaling correlations $\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{S}$. The second column gives the number of $\bar{P}$ uniformly sampled from $\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{S}$ using cpnsd. From the third column to the rightmost column, we have, respectively, the estimated relative volume (RV) for the macroscopically local set $Q_1$, the RV for the almost quantum set $Q_2$, the RV for $Q_3$, (our tightest approximation to $Q$ based on outer approximations of Moroder et al. [19]), the RV for $Q_4$ (our tightest approximation to $Q$ based on outer approximations of Moroder et al. [19]), the RV for $P_1$, (our tightest approximation to $P$), the RV for $M_1^c \cap Q_2$, and the RV for the Bell-local set $\mathcal{L}$. In the fifth to the eighth column, we also include in bracket the highest level of the SDP hierarchy used in the computation (for an explanation of the various levels and the complexity involved in the computation, see Appendix B). In particular, our best approximation to RV($Q$), given either in the fifth or the sixth column, is highlighted in yellow. For example, in our characterization of $Q$ in the (2,3) Bell scenario, due to limitations in computational resource, we are not able to go beyond $Q_3$ nor $Q_4$, neither of which is, a priori, a subset of the other. However, since $Q_3$ gives a smaller RV (see Table III), we have used it as our $Q_3$, in this Bell scenario. We use 100.00% to denote entries where the estimated $\text{RV}(\mathcal{T})$ satisfies $0 < 100\% - \text{RV}(\mathcal{T}) < 0.005\%$. For each Bell scenario, the same set of $N_{\text{rat}}$ sampled correlations $\tilde{P}$ generated were used to determine $\text{RV}(\mathcal{T})$ for the different $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{N}/\mathcal{S}$. The only exceptions to this are $\text{RV}(P_1)$ for the (5,4) and the (6,3) Bell scenario where the estimates were obtained, respectively, using a subset of 4723 (marked with $^1$) and 161 617 (marked with $^2$) sampled $\tilde{P}$. Here and below, entries marked with “*” means we did not perform the respective computation and hence do not have the corresponding data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$(n_s, n_o)$</th>
<th>$N_{\text{rat}}$ ($\times 10^3$)</th>
<th>$Q_1$</th>
<th>$\hat{Q}_1$</th>
<th>$Q_2$</th>
<th>$\hat{Q}_2$</th>
<th>$P_1$</th>
<th>$M_1^c \cap Q_2$</th>
<th>$\mathcal{L}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2,2)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99.80%</td>
<td>99.25%</td>
<td>99.17%</td>
<td>99.17%</td>
<td>99.15%</td>
<td>94.15%</td>
<td>98.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,3)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99.98%</td>
<td>99.80%</td>
<td>99.74%</td>
<td>99.74%</td>
<td>99.74%</td>
<td>93.84%</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,4)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>99.99%</td>
<td>99.99%</td>
<td>99.99%</td>
<td>99.99%</td>
<td>97.41%</td>
<td>99.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,5)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,6)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,7)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.98%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,8)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,9)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,2)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>97.23%</td>
<td>92.11%</td>
<td>91.19%</td>
<td>91.19%</td>
<td>62.18%</td>
<td>62.18%</td>
<td>88.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,3)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99.78%</td>
<td>97.90%</td>
<td>97.52%</td>
<td>97.90%</td>
<td>59.88%</td>
<td>95.16%</td>
<td>59.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,4)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>99.93%</td>
<td>99.91%</td>
<td>99.93%</td>
<td>81.27%</td>
<td>99.65%</td>
<td>79.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,5)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,6)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,7)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4,2)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
<td>69.45%</td>
<td>67.80%</td>
<td>69.45%</td>
<td>21.14%</td>
<td>21.14%</td>
<td>61.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4,3)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>98.39%</td>
<td>88.69%</td>
<td>98.39%</td>
<td>88.69%</td>
<td>20.22%</td>
<td>88.69%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4,4)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99.99%</td>
<td>99.59%</td>
<td>99.99%</td>
<td>99.59%</td>
<td>50.16%</td>
<td>99.59%</td>
<td>41.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4,5)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5,2)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53.47%</td>
<td>34.49%</td>
<td>32.35%</td>
<td>34.49%</td>
<td>3.09%</td>
<td>27.12%</td>
<td>2.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5,3)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>89.91%</td>
<td>59.29%</td>
<td>89.91%</td>
<td>59.29%</td>
<td>59.29%</td>
<td>59.29%</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5,4)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99.94%</td>
<td>97.03%</td>
<td>99.94%</td>
<td>97.03%</td>
<td>17.76%</td>
<td>97.03%</td>
<td>6.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6,2)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.11%</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
<td>7.73%</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>5.93%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6,3)</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>56.67%</td>
<td>17.20%</td>
<td>56.67%</td>
<td>17.20%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>17.20%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

94.12% and $\text{RV}(\mathcal{L}) = \frac{18.176}{16.58} \approx 62.24\%$ respectively. Similarly, our estimate of $\text{RV}(\mathcal{L})$ in the (2,3) Bell scenario (see Table I) is consistent with that determined from the software vinci [60], giving $\text{RV}(\mathcal{L}) \approx 93.82\%$.

To appreciate the mentioned decreasing trend, let us first note that for any Bell scenario $(n'_s, n_o)$ with $n'_s > n_s$, any sub-correlation $\tilde{P}$ extracted from $\tilde{P}$ by considering only $n_s$ out of the $n'_s$ measurement settings (for both Alice and Bob) is a legitimate correlation for the simpler Bell scenario $(n_s, n_o)$. Moreover, for $\tilde{P}$ to be in $\mathcal{L}$, it must be that all these $N = \binom{n'_s}{n_s}$ sub-correlations $\tilde{P}$ extractable from $\tilde{P}$ are also Bell-local. Note also that $\text{RV}(\mathcal{L})$ can be understood as the probability of finding a Bell-local correlation when we sample uniformly from the $\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{S}$ polytope.

Let $\text{RV}(\mathcal{L}) = p$ in the $(n_s, n_o)$ Bell scenario. If all such $\tilde{P}$ that may be extracted from $\tilde{P}$ could be thought of as being sampled independently and uniformly from the $\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{S}$ polytope in the $(n_s, n_o)$ Bell scenario, the probability of $\tilde{P}$, defined for the $(n'_s, n_o)$ Bell scenario, to be Bell-local would scale as

$$p^N = p^{(n'_s)^2/n_s^2} = p^{(n'_s)^2/(n'_s-n_s)^2}$$. (8)

Applying this naïve reasoning to the (2,2) and the (3,2) Bell scenario would suggest a decrease of $\text{RV}(\mathcal{L})$ from $\frac{18}{16} \approx 0.176$.
94.12% to 57.95%, which is to not too far off from our exact finding that \( \text{RV}(L) = \frac{18}{29} \approx 62.44\% \) in the (3,2) case. Clearly, part of this discrepancy stems from the fact the various sub-correlations \( P \) that may be extracted from \( P^{\ell} \) are not entirely independent – all these different \( P \) share a common input with the other \( P^{\ell} \). An additional complication arises from the fact even if all these sub-correlations \( P \) are Bell-local, \( P^{\ell} \) may still be Bell-nonlocal.

On the other hand, for Bell scenarios with fixed \( n_s \), \( \text{RV}(L) \) appears to increase (albeit not monotonically) with increasing \( n_o \), which is in stark contrast with the just-mentioned trend observed for increasing \( n_s \) (see Fig. 2 and Table II). In fact, for \( n_s \in \{2, 3, 4, 5\} \), we consistently observe a decrease in \( \text{RV}(L) \) when \( n_o \) changes from 2 to 3 before it increases steadily with \( n_o \). Lastly, since the way \( \text{RV}(L) \) changes with increasing \( n_o \) is opposite to that with increasing \( n_s \), it is natural to wonder how \( \text{RV}(L) \) changes when \( n_s = n_o = k \) increases. Our results show that as \( k \) increases from 2 to 4, the effect of increasing \( n_s \) appears to be dominant since \( \text{RV}(L) \) still decreases with increasing \( k \).

### B. \( Q \) vs \( N_S \) and \( L \)

#### 1. Convergence of outer approximations towards \( Q_{[\ell]} \)

Before we move on to investigate the relative volume of the quantum set \( Q \), it is worth reminding that a closed-form characterization of \( Q \) has remained elusive. Henceforth, we rely on outer approximations based on the hierarchy of SDPs proposed in [13, 19] for its characterization. For this purpose, it is clear that we should first gain some insight on how well these approximations are, for example, by investigating how the first few levels of these hierarchies appear to converge. In the present context, this amounts to investigating, for any given Bell scenario, how \( \text{RV}(T) \) changes and hence converges when we consider approximations \( T \) of \( Q \) that are of increasing complexity. For definiteness, we make use of the number of real moment variables involved in the SDP characterization of \( T \) to serve as our measure of complexity.

Recall from our discussion in Section III.A that \( L \) makes up a substantial fraction of \( N_S \) for many of the Bell scenarios considered. Thus, to better manifest the convergence graphically, it would make sense to focus on the nonlocal region of \( N_S \), i.e., \( N_S \setminus L \). In other words, for any given outer approximation \( T = Q_k \) or \( Q_\ell \), we are interested in the volume of \( T \setminus L \) relative to that of \( N_S \setminus L \), i.e.,

\[
  f(T) = \frac{\text{RV}(T \setminus L)}{\text{RV}(N_S \setminus L)} = \frac{\text{RV}(T \setminus L)}{1 - \text{RV}(L)}.
\]

Due to limited computational power, for each given Bell scenario, there is some \( Q_k \) or \( Q_\ell \) giving the smallest \( f(T) \) that we have estimated from each hierarchy. Denoting them, respectively, by \( Q_k \) and \( Q_\ell \), then our tightest approximation to \( Q \) is simply \( Q_{*+} := \arg\min_{T \in (Q_k, Q_\ell)} f(T) \). For each Bell scenario, whether \( Q_{*+} \) is \( Q_k \) for some \( k \) or \( Q_\ell \) for some \( \ell \) can be read off from the corresponding highlighted entry in Table I. We show in Fig. 3 how \( f(T) \) changes with \( T \) for all those Bell scenarios where we have computed at least two different approximations \( T \)’s to \( Q \). For all these scenarios, we thus have \( Q_{*+} \subseteq Q_1 \).

As is evident from the plots (see also Table III), the first level of the NPA hierarchy \( Q_1 \) (corresponding to the first filled symbol on each line) generally does not serve as a very good approximation to \( Q \). However, for Bell scenarios with, say, \( n_o \geq 4 \), the quality of this approximation (in comparison with that provided by \( Q_{*+} \)) does appear to be acceptable. More precisely, for the few scenarios with \( n_o \geq 4 \) that we have investigated, the difference \( f(Q_1) - f(Q_{*+}) \) is always less than 3.11%. In fact, this difference is even less than 0.5% if we further focus on Bell scenarios with \( n_s \leq 3 \).

From the plots and Table III, it can also be seen that the almost quantum set \( Q_1 \) (corresponding to the first hollow symbol on each line) generally offers a much better approximation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( n_o )</th>
<th>( n_s = 2 )</th>
<th>( n_s = 3 )</th>
<th>( n_s = 4 )</th>
<th>( n_s = 5 )</th>
<th>( n_s = 6 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II. Summary of the number of sampled correlations \( P \in N_S \) found to be inside \( N_S \setminus L \), i.e., being nonlocal. Except for the (5,4) and the (6,3) Bell scenarios, the total number of sampled correlations \( N_{tot} \) is \( 10^5 \) in each Bell scenario. In these two exceptional cases, we have, respectively, \( N_{tot} = 3.05 \times 10^7 \) (for the entry marked with †) and \( N_{tot} = 7.85 \times 10^7 \) (for the entry marked with ‡).
Figure 3. Numerically estimated value of $f(T) = \frac{RV(T) \cdot \varphi}{1 - RV(T)}$ for various outer approximations $T$ of $Q$, where $T$ is either $Q_k$ or $\tilde{Q}_\ell$ for some integer value of $k$ or $\ell$. In each plot, we use filled markers to represent $Q_k$ and hollow markers for $\tilde{Q}_\ell$. The leftmost filled marker corresponds to the first level of the NPA hierarchy $[13] Q_1$, while the leftmost hollow marker corresponds to the first level $\tilde{Q}_1$ of the hierarchy introduced by Moroder et al. $[19]$. When an increasingly higher level of either hierarchy is considered, the respective SDP characterization involves an increasingly larger number of real (optimization) moment variables (see Appendix C), thus giving rise to markers that are placed more and more to the right of the plot. Plots for the $(2,6)$ and $(2,7)$ Bell scenario have been omitted as $f(T) = 100\%$ for all approximations that we have considered for these Bell scenarios. As guide for the eye, we have also included the fitting curve (dotted line) for three of the simplest Bell scenarios. Writing $y = f(T)$ and $10^x$ the number of real moment variables, the equation for these fitting curves are, $y = (9.6118 x + 17.9342)10^{-5.1859x+2.9697} + 10^{-0.0024x+0.0620}$, $y = (0.4657 x + 0.3384)10^{-0.1114x+0.0616} + 10^{-0.8416x+0.4301}$, and $y = (0.3139 x + 2.6845)10^{-2.9987x+2.6717} + 10^{-0.0077x-0.0925}$, respectively, for the $(2,2)$, $(2,3)$, and the $(3,2)$ Bell scenario. The corresponding least-square residues are $9.3591 \times 10^{-6}$, $4.6373 \times 10^{-6}$, and $2.1718 \times 10^{-6}$. 
Table III. Summary of the number of correlations $\vec{P}$ excluded from one approximation of $Q_{1\downarrow}$ to a tighter one. The leftmost column gives the Bell scenario. Except for the Bell scenario (5,3) and (6,3), the total number $N_{\text{tot}}$ of correlations sampled from $NS$ is $10^6$ (see Table I). Further to the right, we have, respectively, the number of $\vec{P} \in NS$ that lie outside $Q_1$, the number of $\vec{P} \in Q_3$ that lie outside $Q_1$, the number of $\vec{P} \in Q_2$ that lie outside $Q_1$, the number of $\vec{P} \in Q_3$ that lie outside $Q_2$, the number of $\vec{P} \in Q_4$ that lie outside $Q_3$, the number of $\vec{P} \in Q_2$ that lie outside $Q_4$, and the number of nonlocal $\vec{P}$ that lie in our tightest approximation $Q_{\ast\ast}$ (see Table I). For the Bell scenario (2,2), we have also performed the membership test for $Q_3$, $Q_4$ and $Q_5$. However, among all the $10^6 \vec{P} \in NS$ sampled, no further $\vec{P}$ was excluded by considering these higher-level relaxations to $Q_{1\downarrow}$.

For a graphical representation of these results focussing on the nonlocal region, see Fig. 3.

to $Q$ than $Q_1$ does. For instance, in all the $n_o = 2$ scenarios that we have considered, $f(Q_1) - f(Q_1')$ ranges from about 9% to nearly 20%. For the details on how the visibilities $v^s$ to $Q$ are distributed among those $\vec{P}$ lies in our tightest approximation $Q_{\ast\ast}$ (see Table I). Even though this gap is small, it should not be taken to mean that $Q_1$ faithfully represents $Q$ for all practical purposes. In fact, it is evident from the plots that, in general, there may be a long tail before the sequence of $f(T)$ converges to $f(Q_{1\downarrow})$. However, if $Q_{\ast\ast}$ is indeed a sufficiently good approximation of $Q$, i.e., $RV(Q_{\ast\ast}) \approx RV(Q)$, then our findings below for the particular $Q_{\ast\ast}$ may also be applicable to $Q$ itself.

2. $Q_{\ast\ast}$ vs $NS$

The trend of how $RV(Q_{\ast\ast})$ changes, with $L$ included, is similar to that of $L$ shown in Fig. 2. For example, we see Table IV. Summary of sample statistics associated with the distribution of $v^s$ to $Q_1$ for all those $\vec{P}$ found to lie in $Q_1 \setminus L$.

from Fig. 4 that for scenarios with fixed $n_o$, $RV(Q_{\ast\ast})$ appears to decrease monotonically with increasing $n_o$. On the other hand, if we fix $n_s$ instead, then $RV(Q_{\ast\ast})$ seems to increase monotonically with $n_o$. Notice that since $L$ is a strict subset of $Q \subset Q_{\ast\ast}$, this latter observation may, to some extent, be anticipated from how $RV(L)$ changes with $n_o$ for fixed $n_s$, cf. Fig. 2.

![Figure 4](image-url)

Despite these similarities, there are also subtle differences. For example, even though for fixed $n_s$, $RV(L)$ generally increases with $n_o$, it does so after a dip when $n_o$ increases from 2 to 3. In contrast, the increase in $RV(Q_{\ast\ast})$ with $n_o$ appears to be monotonic. More importantly, for Bell scenarios...
with \( n_s = n_o = k \), while \( \text{RV}(\mathcal{L}) \) appears to decrease monotonically with increasing \( k \), \( \text{RV}(\mathcal{Q}_s) \) never seems to get far away from 1. Bearing in mind of the discussion given in Section III B 1, we take these observations to be indicative that for any given \( n_s \), if \( n_o \geq n_s \) is large enough, \( \mathcal{N}S \) is essentially densely filled by \( \tilde{P} \in \mathcal{Q} \). In other words, the current observation suggests that when \( n_o \) is sufficiently large, the relative volume of the set of post-quantum correlations, i.e., \( \text{RV}(\mathcal{N}S \setminus \mathcal{Q}) \) may become vanishingly small.

3. \( \mathcal{Q}_s \) vs \( \mathcal{L} \)

What about the set of quantum correlations that are Bell-
nonlocal, i.e., \( \mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{L} \)? As can be seen from Fig. 5, for all \( n_s \) investigated, \( \text{RV}(\mathcal{Q}_s \setminus \mathcal{L}) = \text{RV}(\mathcal{Q}_s) - \text{RV}(\mathcal{L}) \) first increases when \( n_s \) increases from 2 to 3. However, for \( n_s \leq 4 \), this relative volume decreases for subsequent values of \( n_s \). Since this is in agreement with the trend of \( \text{RV}(\mathcal{L}) \) shown in Fig. 2, the current observation suggests that the trend of \( \text{RV}(\mathcal{Q}_s \setminus \mathcal{L}) \) for fixed \( n_s \leq 4 \) is dominated by the trend of \( \text{RV}(\mathcal{L}) \). In contrast, the behavior of \( \text{RV}(\mathcal{Q}_s \setminus \mathcal{L}) \) for varying \( n_s \) does not seem to follow immediately from that of \( \text{RV}(\mathcal{Q}_s) \) nor \( \text{RV}(\mathcal{L}) \). In particular, for both the \( n_o = 2 \) and the \( n_o = 3 \) case, we see that \( \text{RV}(\mathcal{Q}_s \setminus \mathcal{L}) \) first increases with \( n_s \) (from 2 to 4) but decreases monotonically after that. This means, in particular, that for both these cases, there exists an optimal value of \( n_s \) (= 4) such that \( \text{RV}(\mathcal{Q}_s \setminus \mathcal{L}) \) is the largest.

Figure 5. Plots of estimated \( \text{RV}(\mathcal{Q}_s \setminus \mathcal{L}) \) vs \( n_o \in \{2, 3, \ldots, 7\} \) for \( n_s \in \{2, 3, \ldots, 6\} \). Here \( \mathcal{Q}_s = \mathcal{Q}_1 \) for the (4,3), (4,4), (3,3), (5,4), and (6,3) Bell scenario whereas \( \mathcal{Q}_s \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_1 \) for all the other Bell scenarios considered.

From the figure, it also seems like \( \text{RV}(\mathcal{Q}_s \setminus \mathcal{L}) \) for the (5,4) Bell scenario does not fit into any of the trends (for varying \( n_s \) or \( n_o \)) mentioned above. A possible cause for this is that for this and presumably more complex Bell scenarios, even \( \mathcal{Q}_1 \) does not give a very good approximation to \( \mathcal{Q} \). Alternatively, it could also be that somehow \( \text{RV}(\mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{L}) \) follows a different trend once \( n_s \) is larger than or equal to 5.

Let us further remark that when comparing different Bell scenarios, the value of \( \text{RV}(\mathcal{Q}_s \setminus \mathcal{L}) \) is not necessarily correlated with the nonlocality of the correlations contained therein. For example, one might na"ively expect that the larger \( \text{RV}(\mathcal{Q}_s \setminus \mathcal{L}) \), the stronger is the average resistance of the associated nonlocal correlations to white noise \( \tilde{P}_w \). If so, then one should expect the correlations in \( \mathcal{Q}_s \setminus \mathcal{L} \) for the (5,4) scenario to display the smallest average white-noise visibility [cf. Eq. (4)]. However, as can be seen from Table V, nonlocal correlations in the \( (n_s, 2) \) scenarios, on average, tolerate a higher level of white noise (i.e., giving a smaller value of \( v^\ast \)) than all other Bell scenarios sharing the same value of \( n_s \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>( \sigma )</th>
<th>Within 1 ( \sigma )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2,2)</td>
<td>( \mathcal{Q}_1 )</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.7300</td>
<td>0.9265</td>
<td>0.0538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,3)</td>
<td>( \mathcal{Q}_2 )</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.7429</td>
<td>0.9411</td>
<td>0.0461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,4)</td>
<td>( \mathcal{Q}_2 )</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.7529</td>
<td>0.9540</td>
<td>0.0393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,5)</td>
<td>( \mathcal{Q}_2 )</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.7964</td>
<td>0.9653</td>
<td>0.0308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,6)</td>
<td>( \mathcal{Q}_2 )</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.8265</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>0.0261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,7)</td>
<td>( \mathcal{Q}_2 )</td>
<td>0.9999</td>
<td>0.8742</td>
<td>0.9789</td>
<td>0.0226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,2)</td>
<td>( \mathcal{Q}_2 )</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.7214</td>
<td>0.9144</td>
<td>0.0563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,3)</td>
<td>( \mathcal{Q}_2 )</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.7303</td>
<td>0.9318</td>
<td>0.0482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,4)</td>
<td>( \mathcal{Q}_2 )</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.7286</td>
<td>0.9519</td>
<td>0.0394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4,2)</td>
<td>( \mathcal{Q}_2 )</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.7179</td>
<td>0.8979</td>
<td>0.0572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4,3)</td>
<td>( \mathcal{Q}_2 )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7241</td>
<td>0.9136</td>
<td>0.0489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4,4)</td>
<td>( \mathcal{Q}_2 )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7267</td>
<td>0.9439</td>
<td>0.0411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5,2)</td>
<td>( \mathcal{Q}_2 )</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.7195</td>
<td>0.8810</td>
<td>0.0538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5,3)</td>
<td>( \mathcal{Q}_2 )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7336</td>
<td>0.8936</td>
<td>0.0416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5,4)</td>
<td>( \mathcal{Q}_2 )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7468</td>
<td>0.9265</td>
<td>0.0403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6,2)</td>
<td>( \mathcal{Q}_2 )</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.7252</td>
<td>0.8672</td>
<td>0.0471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6,3)</td>
<td>( \mathcal{Q}_2 )</td>
<td>0.9998</td>
<td>0.7464</td>
<td>0.8833</td>
<td>0.0301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table V. Summary of sample statistics associated with the distribution of \( v^\ast \) to \( \mathcal{L} \) for all those \( \tilde{P} \) found to lie in \( \mathcal{Q}_s \setminus \mathcal{L} \).

An illustration of how various supersets \( \mathcal{T} \) of \( \mathcal{L} \) contribute towards \( \mathcal{N}S \setminus \mathcal{L} \), as measured according to \( f(\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{L}) = f(\mathcal{T}) - f(\mathcal{L}) \), can be found in the stacked bar chart displayed in Fig. 6.

C. Other Naturally Restricted Subsets of \( \mathcal{Q} \)

Next, let us consider two naturally restricted subsets of \( \mathcal{Q} \), denoted by \( \mathcal{M}^\ast \) and \( \mathcal{P} \) in Section II. They allow us to gain insights on the set of correlations attainable, respectively, by maximally entangled states and PPT entangled states.

1. \( \mathcal{Q}_s \) vs \( \mathcal{M}^\ast \)

Formally, as introduced in Section II, \( \mathcal{M}^\ast \) is the convex hull of the set of correlations attainable using finite-dimensional maximally entangled states in conjunction with projective measurements. As was first noted in [29], a hierarchy of (increasingly tighter) outer approximations to \( \mathcal{M} \) (the analog of
Figure 6. Stacked bar charts showing contributions of various subsets $T \subseteq N\mathcal{S}$ towards $T \setminus \mathcal{L}$ where $T$ is either $\mathcal{M}^*$ or any of the subsets listed in the chain of inclusion relations $\mathcal{P}_1 \subseteq \bar{Q}_1 \subseteq \bar{Q}_3 \subseteq \bar{Q}_4 \subseteq N\mathcal{S}$. The RV of a given $T$ in the nonlocal region, and hence $f(T)$, is the sum over that due to the other sets contained within it. For example, in the $(2,2)$ Bell scenario, $f(\bar{Q}_1)$ corresponds to the orange bar as well as all the other bars (turquoise and blue) stacked below it. As $\mathcal{M}^*$ and $\bar{Q}_2$ are not directly comparable to some of the aforementioned sets, we use, respectively, dashed and dotted line to represent them separately. Note also that we have only performed computation for higher levels from the hierarchy of Moroder et al. for the $(2,2)$, $(2,3)$, and $(3,2)$ Bell scenarios.

$\mathcal{M}^*$ without the assumption of measurements being projective (or any of the subsets listed in the chain of inclusion relations $\mathcal{P}_1 \subseteq \bar{Q}_1 \subseteq \bar{Q}_3 \subseteq \bar{Q}_4 \subseteq N\mathcal{S}$). The RV of a given $T$ in the nonlocal region, and hence $f(T)$, is the sum over that due to the other sets contained within it. For example, in the $(2,2)$ Bell scenario, $f(\bar{Q}_1)$ corresponds to the orange bar as well as all the other bars (turquoise and blue) stacked below it. As $\mathcal{M}^*$ and $\bar{Q}_2$ are not directly comparable to some of the aforementioned sets, we use, respectively, dashed and dotted line to represent them separately. Note also that we have only performed computation for higher levels from the hierarchy of Moroder et al. for the $(2,2)$, $(2,3)$, and $(3,2)$ Bell scenarios.

Note that the hierarchy of SDPs used for the computation of $\bar{Q}_2$ and that of $\mathcal{M}^*$ are independent. Consequently, the two sets $\mathcal{M}^*$ and $\bar{Q}_2$ are generally incomparable, i.e., not of them is necessarily included in the other, despite the fact that $\mathcal{M}^* \subseteq \mathcal{M} \subseteq \bar{Q}$. To gain insights on the difference between $\bar{Q}$ and $\mathcal{M}^*$, we thus focus on the difference between $\bar{Q}_2$ and $\mathcal{M}^*$ to get around the aforementioned incomparability, i.e., membership test of any given $\bar{P}$ with respect to $\mathcal{M}^*$ is carried out only when it passes the membership test with respect to $\bar{Q}_2$.

Our findings (see Table I) reveal that the difference between the relative volume of these sets, i.e., $\text{RV}(\bar{Q}_2) - \text{RV}(\mathcal{M}^* \cap \bar{Q}_2)$ is rather small. In particular, among the different Bell scenarios that we have considered, the largest difference (approximately 6.05%) is found for the Bell scenario $(4,2)$. For all the other Bell scenarios considered, the difference is less than 5.24%, several of which are even less than 1%. However, if we restrict our attention to only the nonlocal region of $N\mathcal{S}$, then the difference as quantified by $f(\bar{Q}_2) - f(\mathcal{M}^* \cap \bar{Q}_2)$ is most pronounced ($\approx 8.2\%$) in the $(2,2)$ Bell scenario, where the original Hardy paradox [24] was proposed, see Fig. 6. For completeness and ease of reference, we provide a summary of $\bar{Q}_2$, $\mathcal{M}^*$ involved in the calculation and sample statistics associated with the distribution of $\nu^*$ to $\mathcal{M}^*$ in Table VI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>$\bar{Q}_2$</th>
<th>$\mathcal{M}^*$</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
<th>Within 1 $\sigma$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$(2,2)$</td>
<td>$\bar{Q}_2$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{M}^*$</td>
<td>1.3268</td>
<td>0.9405</td>
<td>1.0434</td>
<td>0.0459</td>
<td>77.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(2,3)$</td>
<td>$\bar{Q}_2$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{M}^*$</td>
<td>1.223</td>
<td>0.9419</td>
<td>1.0247</td>
<td>0.0262</td>
<td>82.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(2,4)$</td>
<td>$\bar{Q}_2$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{M}^*$</td>
<td>1.1437</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>1.0145</td>
<td>0.0151</td>
<td>85.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(2,5)$</td>
<td>$\bar{Q}_2$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{M}^*$</td>
<td>1.0942</td>
<td>0.9574</td>
<td>1.0094</td>
<td>0.0096</td>
<td>86.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(2,6)$</td>
<td>$\bar{Q}_2$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{M}^*$</td>
<td>1.0462</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0064</td>
<td>0.0066</td>
<td>85.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(2,7)$</td>
<td>$\bar{Q}_2$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{M}^*$</td>
<td>1.0353</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0054</td>
<td>0.0055</td>
<td>87.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(3,2)$</td>
<td>$\bar{Q}_2$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{M}^*$</td>
<td>1.3526</td>
<td>0.9312</td>
<td>1.0364</td>
<td>0.0403</td>
<td>77.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(3,3)$</td>
<td>$\bar{Q}_2$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{M}^*$</td>
<td>1.2109</td>
<td>0.9343</td>
<td>1.0155</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>81.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(3,4)$</td>
<td>$\bar{Q}_2$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{M}^*$</td>
<td>1.1167</td>
<td>0.9298</td>
<td>1.0084</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>85.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(4,2)$</td>
<td>$\bar{Q}_2$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{M}^*$</td>
<td>1.3296</td>
<td>0.9348</td>
<td>1.0283</td>
<td>0.0339</td>
<td>78.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(4,3)$</td>
<td>$\bar{Q}_2$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{M}^*$</td>
<td>1.1658</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0125</td>
<td>0.0124</td>
<td>85.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(4,4)$</td>
<td>$\bar{Q}_2$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{M}^*$</td>
<td>1.0741</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0056</td>
<td>0.0056</td>
<td>86.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(5,2)$</td>
<td>$\bar{Q}_2$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{M}^*$</td>
<td>1.2661</td>
<td>0.9368</td>
<td>1.0204</td>
<td>0.0275</td>
<td>78.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(5,3)$</td>
<td>$\bar{Q}_2$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{M}^*$</td>
<td>1.1157</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0093</td>
<td>0.0092</td>
<td>84.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(5,4)$</td>
<td>$\bar{Q}_2$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{M}^*$</td>
<td>1.048</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0039</td>
<td>0.0039</td>
<td>86.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(6,2)$</td>
<td>$\bar{Q}_2$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{M}^*$</td>
<td>1.2116</td>
<td>0.9412</td>
<td>1.0141</td>
<td>0.0218</td>
<td>78.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(6,3)$</td>
<td>$\bar{Q}_2$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{M}^*$</td>
<td>1.0815</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0075</td>
<td>0.0073</td>
<td>83.98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table VI. Summary of sample statistics associated with the distribution of $\nu^*$ to $\mathcal{M}^*$ of all those $\bar{P}$ found to lie in $\bar{Q}_2$. The notation for $\mathcal{M}$ is further explained in Appendix C.

D. $\mathcal{P}_1$ vs $\mathcal{L}$

Finally, let us focus on the difference between the set of Bell-local correlations $\mathcal{L}$ and that attainable by locally mea-
The notation adopted here for this asymmetric Bell scenario follows that introduced in Ref. [62].
any given $\vec{P}$, removing all its components associated with a subset of measurement settings still gives rise to a legitimate correlation $\vec{P}'$ relevant to a simpler Bell scenario. Moreover, for $\vec{P}$ to lie in $\mathcal{L}$, $\mathcal{Q}_{k}$ or $\mathcal{Q}_{\ell}$ (for any $k, \ell \geq 1$), all these sub-correlations $\vec{P}'$ derived from $\vec{P}$ must also lie, respectively, in $\mathcal{L}$, $\mathcal{Q}_{k}$ or $\mathcal{Q}_{\ell}$ for the simpler Bell scenario (see Section IIIA for a more quantitative argument in the case of $\mathcal{L}$).

Similarly, the authors of Ref. [49] have also remarked that $\text{RV}(\mathcal{L})$ seems to be increasing from the (2,3) to the (2,4) Bell scenario. For $n_{o} \leq 5$ and $n_{e} \geq 3$, our results confirm that when $n_{o}$ is fixed, $\text{RV}(\mathcal{L})$ not only increases monotonically, but also rapidly (towards 100%) with an increasing value of $n_{o}$. From Table I, we see that this convergence towards unity is even more pronounced for both $\text{RV}(\mathcal{Q}_{1})$ and the relative volume associated with the almost quantum set $\text{RV}(\mathcal{Q}_{1})$. These observations, and the fact that $\mathcal{Q}$ is sandwiched between $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{S}$ suggest that as $n_{o}$ becomes sufficiently large, it may become more and more difficult to distinguish a generic $\vec{P} \in (\mathcal{L}^{S} \setminus \mathcal{Q})$ from those in $\mathcal{Q}$. Of course, an analytic treatment would be required if we wish to confirm that this intriguing trend is indeed present in any generic Bell scenario where $n_{o} \gg n_{s}$.

On the other hand, a precise characterization of $\mathcal{Q}$ is long known to be formidable. However, research progress on device-independent certifications often relies on a decent approximation to $\mathcal{Q}$ given by one of $\mathcal{Q}_{1}$, $\mathcal{Q}_{\ell}$, or some other relaxations (see, e.g., Refs. [37, 56]). So how well do low-level approximations of $\mathcal{Q}$ from these hierarchies work? Our results suggest that for Bell scenarios with two measurement settings ($n_{e} = 2$), $\mathcal{Q}_{1}$ is an exceptionally good approximation, with $\text{RV}(\mathcal{Q}_{1}) - \text{RV}(\mathcal{Q}_{\ast}) < 0.7\%$. Even for other Bell scenarios with $n_{e} \leq n_{o}$, $\mathcal{Q}_{1}$ also appears to be a fairly decent approximation, with $\text{RV}(\mathcal{Q}_{1}) - \text{RV}(\mathcal{Q}_{\ast}) < 2.3\%$, see Table IX.

Since $\mathcal{Q}_{1} \subset \mathcal{Q}$, this approximation to $\mathcal{Q}$ can clearly be tightened by considering, instead, $\mathcal{Q}_{1}$. In particular, for Bell scenarios with $n_{e} \leq n_{o}$, our findings give $\text{RV}(\mathcal{Q}_{1}) - \text{RV}(\mathcal{Q}_{\ast}) < 0.5\%$, which shows a slight improvement over $\mathcal{Q}_{1}$. In contrast, for Bell scenarios with fixed $n_{e}$, but with $n_{o} > n_{o}$, we have observed appreciable improvements offered by $\mathcal{Q}_{1}$. For examples, in the (4,2), (5,2), (5,3), and the (6,3) Bell scenario, the difference $\text{RV}(\mathcal{Q}_{1}) - \text{RV}(\mathcal{Q}_{1})$ ranges approximately from 15% to 39%. While these results may serve as a useful reference for each Bell scenario with $n_{o} \approx \infty$, the difference between $\mathcal{Q}_{1}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ and that between $\mathcal{Q}_{1}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ for general Bell scenarios remain to be clarified. Despite the above observation, let us remind that the approximations of $\mathcal{Q}_{1} \subset \mathcal{Q}$ (let alone $\mathcal{Q}$) via these hierarchies are known to have their limitation (see, e.g., [18]).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$(n_{o}, n_{e})$</th>
<th>$\mathcal{Q}<em>{1} \setminus \mathcal{Q}</em>{\ast}$</th>
<th>$\mathcal{Q}<em>{1} \setminus \mathcal{Q}</em>{\ast}$</th>
<th>$\mathcal{Q}<em>{1} \setminus \mathcal{Q}</em>{\ast}$</th>
<th>$\mathcal{P}_{e} \setminus \mathcal{L}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2,2)</td>
<td>0.6344%</td>
<td>0.0886%</td>
<td>0.4817%</td>
<td>0.012%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,3)</td>
<td>0.2412%</td>
<td>0.0631%</td>
<td>0.2429%</td>
<td>0.0001%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,4)</td>
<td>0.0097%</td>
<td>0.0012%</td>
<td>0.0364%</td>
<td>0.012%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,5)</td>
<td>0.0001%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0016%</td>
<td>0.0017%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,6)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0003%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,7)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,2)</td>
<td>6.0394%</td>
<td>0.9185%</td>
<td>3.06%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,3)</td>
<td>2.2655%</td>
<td>0.3889%</td>
<td>2.3560%</td>
<td>0.004%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,4)</td>
<td>0.9391%</td>
<td>0.0259%</td>
<td>0.2601%</td>
<td>1.4790%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4,2)</td>
<td>16.8167%</td>
<td>1.6481%</td>
<td>6.0515%</td>
<td>0.0001%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4,3)</td>
<td>9.6990%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.641%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4,4)</td>
<td>0.3982%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9.0878%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5,2)</td>
<td>21.2212%</td>
<td>2.1394%</td>
<td>5.2313%</td>
<td>0.1267%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5,3)</td>
<td>30.6120%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.9341%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5,4)</td>
<td>2.9124%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6,2)</td>
<td>10.3875%</td>
<td>1.0792%</td>
<td>1.7932%</td>
<td>0.067%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6,3)</td>
<td>39.4714%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IX. Summary of the difference between the relative volume (RV) of several sets of interest. The leftmost column gives the Bell scenario considered. From the second to the rightmost column, we have, respectively, the difference in the RV between the set associated with the principle of macroscopic locality $\mathcal{Q}_{1}$ and our tightest approximation to the quantum set $\mathcal{Q}_{\ast}$, the difference in the RV between the almost quantum set $\mathcal{Q}_{1}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{\ast}$, the difference in the RV between $\mathcal{Q}_{\ast}$ and our tightest approximation of the set producible by maximally entangled states with projective measurements $M_{\ast}$, and the difference in the RV between our tightest approximation to the set $\mathcal{P}_{e}$ producible by PPT quantum states and the Bell-local set $\mathcal{L}$.

Moving on to naturally restricted subsets of $\mathcal{Q}$, it is known from the work of Ref. [25] and Ref. [26] that $M_{\ast} \subseteq M \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$, respectively, in the (2,2) and the (3,2) Bell scenarios. Our results indicate that for fixed $n_{e}$, the difference between these subsets, i.e., between what is achievable by a general quantum strategy and that restricted to a finite-dimensional maximally
entangled state with projective measurements, may diminish following the increase in $n_o$. If so, it could mean that for device-independent quantum information processing in a Bell scenario where $n_x \ll n_o$, it may be sufficient to consider only finite-dimensional maximally entangled states in conjunction with projective measurements. However, our observation should not be taken to imply that $\mathcal{M}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ for any Bell scenario with large enough $n_o$, see, e.g., Ref. [27].

In contrast, our results do suggest that the difference between $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{L}$ may become noticeable only when the Bell scenario involved is sufficiently complex. In particular, for the $(n_x, 2)$ and $(2, n_o)$ Bell scenarios that we have investigated, the respective $\text{RV}(\mathcal{P}_x) - \text{RV}(\mathcal{L})$ is always found to be upper bounded by 0.13%. For all but one of the remaining Bell scenarios, this difference is also never more than 3.7%. That leaves us with the $(4, 4)$ Bell scenario—among all those computed—as the most promising candidate for an experimental demonstration of the Peres conjecture violation. Still, even though we get $\text{RV}(\mathcal{P}_x) - \text{RV}(\mathcal{L}) \approx 9\%$ and a minimum visibility of $\approx 0.90$ for this Bell scenario, further investigation is clearly needed to confirm its experimental viability.

Apart from this, a few other closely-related research directions may be worth pursuing. For example, even though both $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{M}^d$ are known to be subsets of $\mathcal{Q}$, their precise relationship is not known. Intuitively, one would expect $\mathcal{P}$ to be a strict subset of $\mathcal{M}^d$, which is supported by our observation that $\text{RV}(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{PSD}}) - \text{RV}(\mathcal{M}^d)$ and $\text{RV}(\mathcal{P}_x) - \text{RV}(\mathcal{L})$ are typically small, but proving this does not seem to be trivial. Evidently, a comprehensive estimation of the relative volume of various naturally restricted subsets in the multipartite setting is also desirable. Notice that due to the rich structure in multipartite entanglement [63] and multipartite nonlocality [64], there will be many more natural subsets of $\mathcal{N}_S$ to consider for any given Bell scenario.

Another direction that deserves further investigation is that related to the choice of metric in our sampling. In this work, we have opted for the Euclidean metric defined in the space of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{N}_S}$. However, since the space of interest $\mathcal{P}$ is a probability space, an arguably more natural [65] metric is the so-called Fisher (information) metric $d_{\mathcal{F}}$. For a set of unconditional probability distributions $q_i$ such that $q_i \geq 0$ and \( \sum_i q_i = 1 \), the Fisher metric and hence the corresponding volume element are given, respectively, by [66]:

$$d_{\mathcal{F}}^2 = \sum_i \frac{dq_i^2}{q_i} \quad \text{and} \quad dV = \prod_i \left( \frac{dq_i}{\sqrt{q_i}} \right). \quad (10)$$

Recall from Section II that we are interested in conditional distributions lying in the non-signaling subspace, cf. Eq. (1). These requirements, together with a nontrivial dependence of the metric on the coordinate in $\mathcal{P}$, however, make it unclear how we can perform a uniform sampling according to this metric (e.g., using an existing software package like cprnd). Similarly, a careful reader would have noticed that if we work in the space of $\mathcal{P}$, the uniform distribution $\tilde{P}_w$ has the same Euclidean distance to all extreme points of $\mathcal{L}$ (see Appendix D) but if we make use of the parametrization given in Eq. (5), then this invariance is lost. As such, it would be interesting to find a parameterization of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{N}_S}$ where this invariance is preserved and repeat the calculation performed here.

Finally, recall that in our studies of convergence of the outer approximations of $\mathcal{Q}$ (see Section III B 1), we have made use the hierarchies of SDPs defined by NPA [13] as well as those given in Moroder et al. [19]. These are, however, by no means the only outer approximations of $\mathcal{Q}$ that have been considered. For example, the SDPs defined by Berta et al. [67] are also known to define a converging hierarchy of outer approximations. Moreover, in comparison with the NPA hierarchy, the approximations of Berta et al. are known to be (possibly) tighter as they include further non-negativity requirement of certain elements of the moment matrix (see also Ref. [68]). It could thus also be interesting to investigate, how this, and other hierarchies of outer approximations (e.g., those discussed in [56]) appear to converge.
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**Appendix A: Approximation to the $\mathcal{M}^d$**

In this section, we explain how our approximations to the convex hull of the set of correlations attainable by finite-dimensional maximally entangled quantum states $\mathcal{M}$ are defined. As was pointed out in Ref. [29], $\mathcal{M}$ can be outer approximated by a hierarchy of correlations, each amenable to an SDP characterization. Here, we focus on a subset $\mathcal{M}^d$ of $\mathcal{M}$, where the local POVM elements are further assumed to projectors.

To appreciate how the hierarchy works, let us first remind that for any local POVM element $E_{a|x} \otimes E_{b|y}$ acting on a bipartite $d$-dimensional maximally entangled state $|\Psi_{d}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i=1}^{d} |i\rangle \langle i|$, we have:

$$P(a, b|x, y) = \text{tr}(|\Psi_{d}\rangle \langle \Psi_{d}| E_{a|x} \otimes E_{b|y})$$

$$= \frac{1}{d} \text{tr} \left( E_{a|x} E_{b|y}^{\dagger} \right), \quad (A1)$$

where $\langle \cdot \rangle^\dagger$ denotes transposition.

The essence of the characterization of $\mathcal{M}$, and hence of our characterization of $\mathcal{M}^d$, is an approximation of the trace func-
tion in Eq. (A1) by a linear function acting on the POVM elements. To this end, let us define \( \mathcal{M}_d = \{ \mathbb{1}_d \} \), which is the set consisting of only the \( d \)-dimensional identity operator, and its union with a set of projective POVM elements

\[
M_1 = \{ \mathbb{1}_d \} \cup \{ \hat{E}_{a|x} \}_{a,x} \cup \{ \hat{E}_{b|y} \}_{b,y} \tag{A2}
\]

where \( a, b = 1, 2, \ldots, n_a - 1, x, y = 1, 2, \ldots, n_s \). Here, the projective nature of the POVM elements implies

\[
\hat{E}_{a|x} \hat{E}_{a'|x} = \hat{E}_{a|x} \delta_{a,a'}, \quad \hat{E}_{b|y} \hat{E}_{b'|y} = \hat{E}_{b|y} \delta_{b,b'} . \tag{A3}
\]

More generally, for any positive integer \( k > 1 \), let us define the set of operators of degree \( k \) or less as

\[
M_k = \cup_k \left\{ \Pi_i \left( \hat{E}^1 \cdots \hat{E}^k \right) \right\} ,
\]

where the union is over all possible permutations \( \Pi_i \) of \( k \)-fold product of operators chosen from \( M_1 \). Notice that as both \( \hat{E}_{a|x} \) and \( \hat{E}_{b|y} \) act on the same Hilbert space, they generally do not commute.

Now, in analogy to the work of Ref. [29], we define a bipartite correlation \( \hat{P} \) to be a member of \( \mathcal{M}_d^* \), \( k \geq 1 \), if there exists an integer \( d \geq 2 \) and a linear functional \( L : M_k \times M_k \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{NS} \) such that the following properties hold:

1. \( L(\mathbb{1}_d) = 1 \).
2. \( L(f f^\dagger) \geq 0 \) for any \( f \in M_k \).
3. \( L(f \hat{E}_{a|x} f^\dagger), L(f \hat{E}_{b|y} f^\dagger) \geq 0 \) for any \( f \in M_{k-1} \).
4. \( L(f \hat{E}_{a|x} f^\dagger \hat{E}_{a'|x}), L(f \hat{E}_{b|y} f^\dagger \hat{E}_{b'|y}) \geq 0 \) and \( L(f \hat{E}_{a|x} f^\dagger \hat{E}_{b|y}), L(f \hat{E}_{b|y} f^\dagger \hat{E}_{a|x}) \geq 0 \) for any \( f \in M_{k-1} \).
5. \( L(ST) = L(TS) \) where \( ST \in M_{2k} \).
6. \( L(\hat{E}_{a|x} \hat{E}_{b|y}) = P(a, b|x, y) \) for all \( a, b, x, y \).

Clearly, if \( \hat{P} \in \mathcal{M}_d^* \), then by Eq. (A1), a linear functional satisfying all the above properties is guaranteed to exist by taking \( L(\cdot) = 1/2 \text{tr}(\cdot) \) while setting \( \hat{E}_{a|x} = E_{a|x} \) and \( \hat{E}_{b|y} = E_{b|y} \). In other words, \( \hat{P} \in \mathcal{M}_d^* \implies \hat{P} \in \mathcal{M}_d^* \) for all \( k \geq 1 \). Importantly, for any given integer \( k \geq 1 \), the membership of any given \( \hat{P} \in \mathcal{M}_d^* \) can be determined by solving an SDP that amounts to requiring the existence of a positive semidefinite moment matrix \( \Gamma \) with its entries given by \( \Gamma_{ij} = L(f_i f_j^\dagger) \) where \( f_i, f_j \in M_k \) and where all these entries are required to satisfy the six linear equality or inequality constraints listed above.

A few remarks are now in order. Firstly, as oppose to the NPA hierarchy where the convexity of \( \mathcal{Q}_{\Gamma_{ij}} \) (and hence of \( \mathcal{Q}_k \)) is promised by not restricting the underlying Hilbert space dimension, convexity has to be assumed in the formulation of \( \mathcal{M} \) or \( \mathcal{M}_d^* \) by considering the convex hull of the set of correlations attainable from \( |V_d \rangle \). Secondly, in the formulation of \( \mathcal{M} \), the projective nature of the POVM elements cannot be taken for granted, since a naïve application of Naimark’s extension [52] does not guarantee that the state to which the extended projective POVM elements are applied is maximally entangled.

Consequently, our characterization differs from that given in Ref. [29] in two aspects: (1) our formulation assumes that \( \hat{E}_{a|x} \) and \( \hat{E}_{b|y} \) are projective while that of Ref. [29] does not (2) the formulation given in Ref. [29] actually imposes in property 3, above the more stringent requirement that \( f \) can be any linear combination of elements in \( M_{k-1} \). Since one of these differences is more constraining while the other is less constraining, our hierarchy \( \mathcal{M}_d^* \) is neither a subset nor a superset of the corresponding set \( \mathcal{Q}_d^k \) defined in Ref. [29].

Empirically, we have also found that if we keep difference (2) and drop the assumption of \( \hat{E}_{a|x}, \hat{E}_{b|y} \) being projective, then the resulting relaxation of \( \mathcal{Q}_d^k \) appears to be hardly constraining. Finally, notice that except for some additional positivity requirement due to property 4 above, the SDP for \( \mathcal{M}_1^* \) is the same as that for NPA level 1.

**Appendix B: Sampling methods**

To obtain uniformly sampled correlations in \( \mathcal{NS} \) using the cprnd function, we make use of the minimal parametrization given in Eq. (5). For this purpose, it suffices to input to cprnd (1) the total number of samples \( N_{NS} \) required (2) the sampling algorithm to be employed, and (3) a complete description of the nonsignaling polytope \( \mathcal{NS} \) in terms of its positivity (facet) constraints.

Explicitly, these positivity constraints are

\[
P(a|x) \geq 0, \quad P(b|y) \geq 0, \quad P(a, b|x, y) \geq 0 , \tag{B1}
\]

in addition to

\[
P(a = n_o|x) = 1 - \sum_{a' = 1}^{n_o - 1} P(a'|x) \geq 0,
\]

\[
P(b = n_o|y) = 1 - \sum_{b' = 1}^{n_o - 1} P(b'|y) \geq 0,
\]

\[
P(a, b = n_o|x, y) = P(a|x) - \sum_{b' = 1}^{n_o - 1} P(a, b'|x, y) \geq 0,
\]

\[
P(a = n_o, b|x, y) = P(b|y) - \sum_{a' = 1}^{n_o - 1} P(a', b|x, y) \geq 0,
\]

\[
P(a = n_o, b = n_o|x, y) = 1 - \sum_{a' = 1}^{n_o - 1} P(a'|x) - \sum_{b' = 1}^{n_o - 1} P(b'|y) + \sum_{a', b' = 1}^{n_o - 1} P(a', b'|x, y) \geq 0
\]

for all \( a, b \in \{1, \ldots, n_o - 1\} \) and \( x, y \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n_s\} \).

\[\text{Footnote text here.} \]

2 In our work, we use “Gibbs” sampler that gives, empirically, better convergence properties than the default “hit-and-run” sampler.
Table X. Summary of the Bell scenarios considered in this work (leftmost column), the highest level of the SDP relaxation considered (second, fourth, sixth, and the eighth column), and the corresponding parameters characterizing the complexity of the computation (third, fifth, seventh, and the ninth column). In particular, for the NPA hierarchy (the second and third column), the Moroder hierarchy for P (the fourth and fifth column), the Moroder hierarchy for Q (the fourth and fifth column), the Moroder hierarchy for P (the eighth and ninth column), we provide in bracket the size of the respective moment matrix D and the number of (real) moment variables involved in the corresponding optimization. Similarly, for the hierarchy of SDPs characterizing $M^P$ (the fifth and sixth column), we provide in bracket the size of the respective moment matrix $D^P$, the number of (real) moment variables $N^P$ involved in the corresponding optimization, and the number of moments that are further required to be non-negative $N_{\text{rel}}^{\geq 0}$. In the last column, we list, accordingly, the key parameters characterizing the complexity of the linear program involved in solving the membership problem $\bar{P} \in \mathcal{P}$, i.e., the size $D_c$ of $\bar{P}$, which equals to the dimension $d$ of $\mathcal{NS}$ and the number of extreme points $N_{\text{rel}}^\mathcal{P}$ of the respective local polytope $\mathcal{L}$. For completeness, we also include in gray the parameters characterizing the complexity of the various level-1 SDPs for the (2,8), (2,9), (3,5), (3,6), (3,7) Bell scenarios that we did not compute.

### Appendix C: Bell scenarios considered and the complexity involved in the characterization of various sets

We consider bipartite Bell scenarios where each party has $n_s$ measurement settings and where each measurement gives $n_o$ outcomes. Bearing in mind that the generating POVM elements may be chosen to projectors, the size of the Moroder [19] level $\ell$ moment matrix, denoted by $D_{Q_{\ell}}$, can be shown to be:

$$D_{Q_{\ell}} = \left[ 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} n_s (n_s - 1)^{\ell-1} (n_o - 1)^j \right]^2.$$ (C1)

Similarly, the size of the NPA level $k$ moment matrix, denoted by $D_{Q_k}$ can be shown to be:

$$D_{Q_k} = 1 + 2n_s \sum_{j=1}^{k} (n_s - 1)^{j-1} (n_o - 1)^j + n_s^2 \sum_{j=2}^{k} (j-1)(n_s - 1)^{j-2} (n_o - 1)^j,$$ (C2)

where the first sum consists of only contributions of $k$-fold products of operators from the same party, the last sum consists of $k$-fold products of operators originating from both parties, and the factor $(j-1)$ in the last sum accounts for different possibilities in terms of the number of Alice’s and Bob’s operators.

Finally, the size of the moment matrix corresponding to the
characterization of level \( h \) of \( \mathcal{M}^\ell \), denoted by \( D_{\mathcal{M}^\ell_h} \) is:

\[
D_{\mathcal{M}^\ell_h} = 1 + 2n_s \sum_{j=1}^h (2n_s - 1)^{j-1}(n_o - 1)^j.
\]

(C3)

From the expressions given above, it is clear that for all these hierarchies, the size of the SDP moment matrix increases exponentially with the level of the hierarchy. As such, due to limitation in computational resources, it is also expedient to consider intermediate, non-integer level of these hierarchies in order to obtain a tighter approximation.

For both hierarchies of SDPs due to Moroder et al., let

\[
D_{\text{local},\ell} = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^\ell n_s (n_s - 1)^{j-1}(n_o - 1)^j.
\]

(C4)

Furthermore, let us denote by \( |q\rangle \) be the integer part of a positive number \( q \geq 1 \). Then, we say that an outer approximation is of level \( q \) if the considered moment matrix \( \Gamma_q \) contains \( \Gamma_{|q\rangle} \) as a submatrix while \( \Gamma_q \) itself is a submatrix of \( \Gamma_{|q\rangle +1} \). Moreover, the moment matrix of \( \Gamma_q \) is formed by considering only (approximately) the first \( (q - |q\rangle)(D_{\text{local},|q\rangle +1} - D_{\text{local},|q\rangle}) \) level-(\(|q\rangle + 1\) ) local operators in addition to all the level-(\(|q\rangle\) ) local operators.\(^3\)

In a similar manner, for the hierarchy defined in Appendix A, we say that an outer approximation for \( \mathcal{M}^\ell \) is of an intermediate level \( q \) if the considered moment matrix \( \Gamma_q \) contains \( \Gamma_{|q\rangle} \) as a submatrix while \( \Gamma_q \) itself is a submatrix of \( \Gamma_{|q\rangle +1} \). Moreover, the moment matrix of \( \Gamma_q \) is formed by taking the upper-left submatrix of \( \Gamma_{|q\rangle +1} \) with (approximately) \( D_{\mathcal{M}^\ell_{|q\rangle}} + (q - |q\rangle)(D_{\mathcal{M}^\ell_{|q\rangle +1}} - D_{\mathcal{M}^\ell_{|q\rangle}}) \) rows and columns.\(^4\)

Of course, the size of the moment matrix \( D_T \) for a set \( T \) is not only the parameter that determines the computational resource required to solve each of these SDPs. In particular, for the membership test corresponding to \( T \in \{ \mathcal{Q}_k, \mathcal{Q}_\ell, \mathcal{M}^h_k, \mathcal{P}_2 \} \), the number \( N_T \) of real variables (independent moments) involved in the corresponding moment matrix also plays a crucial role. In the case of \( \mathcal{M}^\ell_h \), the number \( N_{\mathcal{M}^\ell_h}^\geq0 \) of moments that are further required to be non-negative also play a part in the complexity of the problem. In Table X, we provide a summary of the Bell scenarios considered in this work as well as these key parameters relevant to solving the corresponding optimization problems.

### Appendix D: Distance from \( \tilde{P}_w \) to extreme points of \( \mathcal{N}S \)

In the probability space \( \mathcal{S}_P \) parametrized by all the full conditional distributions \( \{ P(a, b|x, y) \}_{a,b,x,y} \), the Euclidean distance between two correlations \( \tilde{P}_1 \) and \( \tilde{P}_2 \) is given by:

\[
\mathcal{D}_E(\tilde{P}_1|\tilde{P}_2) = \sqrt{\sum_{a,b,x,y} [P_1(a,b|x,y) - P_2(a,b|x,y)]^2}.
\]

(D1)

In any Bell scenario, any Bell-local extreme point of \( \mathcal{N}S \), which is also an extreme point of \( \mathcal{L} \), can be obtained from

\[
P_L(a, b|x, y) = \delta_{n,o} \delta_{h,1}
\]

via a relabeling of measurement settings, outcomes, and/or parties. Since the uniform distribution \( P_w(a, b|x, y) = \frac{1}{n^2} \) is always invariant under such a relabeling, we see that their Euclidean distance is invariant under relabeling, and is easily shown to be \( \mathcal{D}_E(\tilde{P}_1|\tilde{P}_w) = n_s \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{n_c^2}} \).

Similarly, in the \((2, n_o)\) Bell scenarios, all nonlocal extreme points of \( \mathcal{N}S \) can be obtained from one of the following via a relabeling [5]:

\[
P_{\mathcal{N}S}^k(a, b|x, y) = \frac{1}{k} \delta_{(b-a) \mod k, xy}, \quad k = 2, \ldots, n_o.
\]

(D3)

It then follows from Eq. (D1) that \( \mathcal{D}_E(\tilde{P}_1|\tilde{P}_{\mathcal{N}S}^k) = 2 \sqrt{\frac{1}{k} - \frac{1}{n_c^2}} \).

Comparing with \( \mathcal{D}_E(\tilde{P}_1|\tilde{P}_w) \), we thus see that all nonlocal extreme points in the \((2, n_o)\) Bell scenario are actually nearer to \( \tilde{P}_w \) than the local ones.


\(^3\) Note that our level-\( \ell \) local operators \( A_{a_1|x_1}A_{a_2|x_2} \cdots A_{a_x|x_x} \) are ordered by first increasing the index of \( a_1 \), followed by \( x_1 \), followed by \( a_2 \), etc.

\(^4\) Here, our level-\( h \) operators \( A_{a_1|x_1} \cdots A_{a_h|x_h} \) are ordered by first increasing the index of \( a_h \), followed by \( x_h \), followed by \( a_{h-1} \), etc. Moreover, we adopt the convention that \( A_{a_i|x_i} = B_{a_i|x_i-n_s} \) for \( x_i > n_s \) where \( A_{a|x} \leftrightarrow E_{a|x}, B_{b|y} \leftrightarrow E_{b|y} \), see Appendix A.