arXiv:2203.02525v3 [quant-ph] 20 Mar 2024

ROUNDING NEAR-OPTIMAL QUANTUM STRATEGIES FOR NONLOCAL GAMES TO STRATEGIES USING A MAXIMALLY ENTANGLED STATE

CONNOR PADDOCK

Abstract. We establish approximate rigidity results for boolean constraint system (BCS) nonlocal games. In particular, we show that near-perfect quantum strategies are approximate representations of the corresponding BCS algebra in the little Frobenius norm. Likewise, for the class of XOR nonlocal games, we show that near-optimal quantum strategies are approximate representations of the corresponding $*$-algebra associated with the game. In both cases, the norm of the approximate representations is independent of the quantum state employed in the strategy. We also show that approximate representations of the BCS (resp. XOR-algebra) are close to near-perfect (resp. near-optimal) quantum strategies employing a maximally entangled state for the corresponding game. As a corollary, any near-perfect BCS (resp. near-optimal XOR) quantum strategy is close to a near-perfect (resp. near-optimal) quantum strategy using a maximally entangled state. Lastly, we show that every synchronous algebra is $*$-isomorphic to a certain BCS algebra, allowing us to apply our results to the class of synchronous nonlocal games as well.

1. Introduction

A two-player nonlocal game is a scenario involving two players, commonly referred to as Alice and Bob, and a referee. In the game, the referee sends each player a question, and each player replies with an answer. The players are unable to communicate once the game begins, they can however, share a bipartite quantum state. They win the game if their answers satisfy the *rule predicate* of the game, otherwise they lose. The rule predicate is known to the players beforehand, allowing them to predetermine their strategy. The objective of the players is to maximizes their probability of winning the game. It is well-known that there are nonlocal games where by using entanglement the players can win with higher probability than if they had only classical resources. There are even examples of nonlocal games where the players can win *perfectly* (with probability one) using an entangled strategy, while any classical strategy for the game has a nonzero losing probability.

Detecting whether a nonlocal game admits a *quantum advantage* is not easy. Not only can it be hard to find the optimal winning probability with classical resources, it was recently shown that even approximating the optimal winning probability for a nonlocal game with entangled strategies is as hard as the famous *halting problem* [JNV+22]. Despite the hardness of finding these values in general, for several classes of nonlocal games the existence of optimal (or in some cases perfect) quantum

strategies can be characterized in terms of algebraic relations on the measurement operators. This notion is often referred to as the "rigidity properties" of optimal strategies for a nonlocal game, or more generally a family of correlations[1]. Taking a step back, one can view these abstract (rigidity) relations as generating a finitely-presented $*$-algebra that we can associate to the nonlocal game. By construction, the $*$-representations of this "nonlocal game algebra" correspond to the measurements for the optimal strategies.

The first instance of this correspondence between strategies and algebras was noted for XOR nonlocal games, and relied on the algebraic characterization of certain quantum correlations established by Tsirelson [Tsi85]. In particular, Tsirelson's result (which predates XOR nonlocal games) implied that the unique optimal quantum strategies for XOR games are representations of a certain Clifford algebra with a finite-dimensional tracial-state [Tsi87]. This algebraic view of XOR games was further investigated in [Slo11], where the author associated a finitely-presented $*$-algebra with each XOR game, whose representations along with a maximally entangled state corresponded to the optimal quantum strategies for the game. There are now several well-studied families of nonlocal games for which a correspondence between optimal quantum strategies and representations of the nonlocal game algebra has been established. This includes the class of $\mathbb{Z}_2$-linear constraint systems (LCS) games [CM14,CLS17], the class of synchronous games [PSS$^+$16], boolean constraint system (BCS) games [CM14, Ji13], and the more general class of imitation games [LMP$^+$20].

One application of the correspondence between optimal strategies and representations is in providing lower bounds on the amount of entanglement required to acheive the quantum value of the game, for example [Slo11, Slo18]. The connection between optimal strategies and representations can also allow an observer to infer information about the behaviour of a quantum state and measurements which cannot be observed directly. The formal study of this concept is known as self-testing and is an important ingredient in device-independent cryptography, see for example [MY04, WBMS16, BŠCA18a, BŠCA18b, Kan20].

With these applications in mind it is natural to wonder how the correspondence between optimal quantum strategies and representations (i.e. rigidity) behaves under the presence of small errors. If the *quantum value* is the highest probability of winning with a quantum strategey, then in this regime the players only achieve a winning probability *close* to the quantum value. More precisely, we say a quantum strategy is ϵ-optimal if the probability of winning is at most ϵ-away from the quantum value. In the case where the quantum value is one, we say a quantum strategy is ϵ-perfect if it wins with probablity at least $1-\epsilon$. In this regime, we will see that near-optimal strategies correspond not to representations but to *approximate representations*. Informally, an approximate representation or ϵ-representation of a finitely-presented $*$-algebra is a function from the generators to linear operators

[1]Here we interpret rigidity as a distinct but related concept to self-testing. In particular, we prefer using the term rigidity to refer to the algebraic relations enforced by a correlation, whereas self-testing refers to the uniqueness of the state-dependent representations achieving this correlation.

where the defining relations only hold approximately. The parameter $\epsilon > 0$ measures how far (according to a metric) the relations are from being satisfied.

In [Slo11], it was shown that the correspondence between optimal quantum strategies and representations of the XOR-algebra is robust, in the sense that ϵ-optimal strategies are $O(\epsilon^{1/8}d^{2/3})$-representations of the XOR-algebra, where d is the dimension of the local strategy Hilbert space H_A (or equivalently H_B). In the case of $\mathbb{Z}_2$-linear constraint systems (LCS) nonlocal games, Slofstra and Vidick, established that ϵ-perfect quantum strategies correspond to $O(\epsilon^{1/4})$-representations of the associated solution group [SV18]. Unlike the XOR game case, for LCS games, the quality of the approximate representation is independent of the dimension of the quantum strategy. This independence of dimension is a property that is much desired in the context of device independence.

Our main result is that the correspondence between perfect (or optimal in the XOR case) quantum strategies and representations is robust and dimension independent for the class of boolean constraint system (BCS), synchronous, and XOR nonlocal games.

Theorem 1.1.

(1) If $\mathcal{S}$ is an ϵ-perfect strategy for a BCS nonlocal game $\mathcal{G}$, then Bob's measurement operators are an $O(\epsilon^{1/4})$-representation of the BCS algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{G})$ on a non-zero subspace of the underlying local Hilbert space H_B.
(2) If $\mathcal{S}$ is an ϵ-perfect strategy for a synchronous nonlocal game $\mathcal{G}$, then Bob's measurement operators are an $O(\epsilon^{1/8})$-representation of the synchronous algebra $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{G})$ on a non-zero subspace of H_B.
(3) If $\mathcal{S}$ is an ϵ-optimal stratey for a XOR nonlocal game $\mathcal{G}$, then Bob's measurment operators are an $O(\epsilon^{1/8})$-representation of the XOR algebra $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G})$ on a non-zero subspace of H_B.

In the above theorem H_B is Bob's local Hilbert space in their employed strategy[2]. Point (3) in Theorem 1.1 improves on the result in [Slo11] by showing the approximate representation need not depend on the dimension of the quantum strategy. The precise definitions of a quantum strategy $\mathcal{S}$ and the nonlocal game algebras $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{G})$, and $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G})$ are given in Section 3, while approximate representation are fomally defined in Definition 4.1.

The proof of first theorem consists of two parts. First, we establish that every near-perfect (resp. near-optimal) strategy is an approximate representation of the BCS (resp. XOR) algebra with respect to a particular state-dependent semi-norm. The state-dependent semi-norm is determined by the quantum state in the entangled strategy employed by the players. The second step consists of showing that, for each state-dependent approximate representation (coming from a near-optimal strategy), one can "round" to an approximate representation in the little Frobenius norm. This removes the state dependence in the approximate representation.

[2]Due the symmetry between Alice and Bob's strategy in all these types of games, see e.g. [LMP$^+$20], one can also show that Alice's measurement operators must also be an approximate representation on a subspace of her local Hilbert space H_A.

The rounding of the state-dependent approximate representations from near-optimal quantum strategies to an approximate representation in the little Frobenius norm is achieved through Lemma 4.12. This approach can be thought of as generalizing the approach in [SV18] from groups to $*$-algebras.

Another contribution of this work is a connection between synchronous games and boolean constraint system (BCS) games. In Proposition 5.17, we establish that the synchronous algebra is isomorphic to the BCS algebra of a certain BCS nonlocal game we call the SyncBCS game. This isomorphism allows us to extend many of our results for BCS algebras to the class of synchronous algebras. Connections between synchronous and BCS games have been previously noted, but focussed almost exclusively on the case where the constraints are *linear* [KPS18,Gol21,Fri20]. Since the initial draft of this work, the connection between synchronous and BCS algebras has also been examined in [PS23].

Our second main result is a converse of sorts to Theorem 1.1. We show that approximate representations for certain game algebras are close to near-perfect (near-optimal in the XOR case) quantum strategies employing a maximally-entangled state.

Theorem 1.2.

(1) If ϕ is a ϵ-representation of the BCS algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{G})$ on a Hilbert space H, then ϕ is close to an $O(\epsilon^2)$-perfect strategy $\mathcal{S}$ for the BCS nonlocal game $\mathcal{G}$, in which they employ a maximally entangled state on $H \otimes H$.
(2) If ϕ is a ϵ-representation of the synchronous algebra $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{G})$ on a Hilbert space H, then ϕ is close to an $O(\epsilon^2)$-perfect strategy $\mathcal{S}$ for the synchronous nonlocal game $\mathcal{G}$, in which the players employ a maximally entangled state on $H \otimes H$.
(3) If ϕ is a ϵ-representation of the XOR algebra $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G})$ on a Hilbert space H, then ϕ is close to an $O(\epsilon^2)$-optimal strategy $\mathcal{S}$ for the XOR nonlocal game $\mathcal{G}$, in which the players employ a maximally entangled state on $H \otimes H$.

In the statement of Theorem 1.2 *close* means that each measurement operator in $\mathcal{S}$ is at most $O(\epsilon)$-away from the operators in the approximate representation with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_f$-norm. As a consequence of the proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 we obtain the following corollary:

Corollary 1.3.

(1) For any ϵ-perfect quantum strategy $\mathcal{S}$ for a BCS nonlocal game there is an $O(\epsilon^{1/2})$-perfect quantum strategy $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ using a maximally entangled state $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle$, such that each measurement in $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ is at most $O(\epsilon^{1/4})$-away from the measurement in $\mathcal{S}$ with respect to $\|\cdot\|_f$ on the local support of $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle$ on H_B.
(2) For any ϵ-perfect quantum strategy $\mathcal{S}$ for a synchronous nonlocal game, there is an $O(\epsilon^{1/4})$-perfect quantum strategy $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ using a maximally entangled state $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle$, such that each measurement in $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ is at most $O(\epsilon^{1/8})$-away from the measurement in $\mathcal{S}$ with respect to $\|\cdot\|_f$ on the local support of $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle$ on H_B.

(3) For any ϵ-optimal quantum strategy $\mathcal{S}$ for an XOR nonlocal game, there is an $O(\epsilon^{1/4})$-optimal quantum strategy $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ using a maximally entangled state $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle$, such that each measurement in $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ is at most $O(\epsilon^{1/8})$-away from the measurement in $\mathcal{S}$ with respect to $\|\cdot\|_f$ on the local support of $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle$ on H_B.

Informally, Corollary 1.3 says that each near-optimal quantum strategy is close to a near-optimal quantum strategy using a maximally entangled state. Notably this show that one can reduce the analysis of near-perfect (near-optimal in the XOR case) strategies with an arbitrary state to the analysis of near-perfect (near-optimal in the XOR case) strategies with a maximally-entangled state.

Recently independent but similar result for approximate synchronous correlations were established in [Vid22]. An advantage of the result in [Vid22] over Theorem 1.1(2) is that it applies to the more general case of synchronous correlations, and therefore to synchronous games as a special case. Both results are based on techniques in [SV18], but we emphasize that this work takes a more algebraic perspective and focus on BCS algebras rather than synchronous correlations. Additionally, it is not apparent that any of the results in [Vid22] apply to the case of XOR games.

The remainder of the paper is outlined as follows. Section 2 covers some mathematical preliminaries, while Section 3 reviews nonlocal games and quantum strategies. Section 4 covers the relevant concepts and results from approximate representation theory we use in the work, including the key rounding lemma (Lemma 4.12). Section 3 defines the nonlocal game algebras associated with BCS, synchronous, and XOR games, while in addition examining the connection between approximate representations and near-optimal strategies for those games. We conclude in Section 6 with proofs of the three main results stated above.

Aknowledgements

The author would like to thank William Slofstra, Yuming Zhao, Arthur Mehta, Kieran Mastel, and Richard Cleve for many helpful discussions. As well as the anonymous referees for valuable feedback and improvements to earlier drafts. This work was completed while the author was at the University of Waterloo and the Institute for Quantum Computing.

2. Preliminaries

Let S be a finite set, we let $\mathbb{C}^*\langle S\rangle$ denote the free (complex) $*$-algebra generated by S. Let $R \subset \mathbb{C}^*\langle X\rangle$ be a finite collection of elements of $\mathbb{C}^*\langle S\rangle$. The **finitely-presented $*$-algebra** $\mathscr{A} = \mathbb{C}^*\langle S : R\rangle$ is the quotient of $\mathbb{C}^*\langle S\rangle$ by $\langle\langle R\rangle\rangle$, where $\langle\langle R\rangle\rangle$ is the smallest (two-sided) $*$-ideal containing R. We call the pair (S, R) a finite **presentation** of the $*$-algebra $\mathscr{A}$. We write $\mathbb{1}$ to represent the unit in a $*$-algebra. A priori, elements of $\mathscr{A} = \mathbb{C}^*\langle S : R\rangle$ are not bounded in representations. To address this, let $\mathscr{A}_{sa} = \{a \in \mathscr{A} : a = a^*\}$ be the $*$-subalgebra of self-adjoint elements. Define the subset of **sums of squares (SOS)** to be the elements $\mathscr{A}_+ = \{a \in \mathscr{A} : a = \sum_{k\in K} b_k^* b_k\}$. In the language of [Oza13], the subset $\mathscr{A}_+ \subset \mathscr{A}$ is a **$*$-positive cone** for $\mathscr{A}$. The $*$-positive cone induces a partial order on the self-adoint

elements $\mathscr{A}_{sa}$, where $a \leq b$ if $a - b \in \mathscr{A}_+$. The $*$-subalgebra of bounded elements is defined as $\mathscr{A}_{bdd} = \{a \in \mathscr{A} : \exists\ \lambda > 0 \text{ such that } a^*a \leq \lambda \mathbb{1}\}$. A finitely presented $*$-algebra $\mathscr{A} = \mathbb{C}^*\langle S : R\rangle$ is said to be **archimedean** if $\mathscr{A} = \mathscr{A}_{bdd}$. In this case, we say that the relations R are archimedean. Additionally, whenever $\mathscr{A} = \mathscr{A}_{bdd}$ we say that $\mathscr{A}$ is a **semi-pre-C^*-algebra**. A **representation** of $\mathscr{A}$ is a $*$-homomorphism $\psi : \mathscr{A} \to B(H)$, where $B(H)$ are the bounded operators on a Hilbert space H. If $\mathscr{A}$ is archimedean then $\|\psi(a)\|_{op}$ is bounded for any representation ψ. Note that a finitely-presented $*$-algebra $\mathscr{A} = \mathbb{C}^*\langle S : R\rangle$ is archimedean if $S \subset \mathscr{A}_{bdd}$.

For $A \in M_d(\mathbb{C})$, $\|A\|_{op}$ denotes the **operator norm** of A, while $\|A\|_F$ denotes the **Frobenius (or Hilbert-Schmidt) norm** of A. We write $\|\cdot\|$ when the matrix norm is left unspecified. For a finite-dimensional Hilbert space H, we denote by $\mathcal{L}(H)$ the set of linear operators from H to H. Whenever $H \cong \mathbb{C}^d$, we define $d = dim(H)$ and we have that $M_d(\mathbb{C}) \cong \mathcal{L}(H)$ is a Hilbert space with the **Frobenius (Hilbert-Schmidt) inner-product** $\langle A, B\rangle_F := \mathrm{tr}(A^*B)$, for $A, B \in \mathcal{L}(H)$. We also use the **little Frobenius (or normalized Hilbert-Schmidt) norm**, denoted by $\|A\|_f^2 := \tilde{\mathrm{tr}}(A^*A) = \frac{1}{d}\|A\|_F^2$, for $A \in M_d(\mathbb{C})$. The normalization in the little Frobenius norm ensures that $\|\mathbb{1}\|_f = 1$, in contrast to $\|\mathbb{1}\|_F = \sqrt{d}$. It's worth noting that unlike its unnormalized version, the Frobenius norm $\|\cdot\|_F$, the little Frobenius norm $\|\cdot\|_f$ is *not* submultiplicative. Recall that if P is an orthogonal projection then $\|PA\|_F \leq \|A\|_F$ for any $A \in M_d(\mathbb{C})$.

A (pure) **quantum state** $|\psi\rangle$ is a unit vector in a Hilbert space H. Each quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ gives rise to positive-semidefinite matrix with trace one, called a **density matrix** ρ, via the indentification $|\psi\rangle \mapsto |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| := \rho$. Density matrices can also represent ensembles or mixtures of pure states. The **state-induced semi-norm** (or **ρ-norm**) for a density operators $\rho \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is given by $\|T\|_\rho := \|T\rho^{1/2}\|_F$ for all $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$. The failure of positive definiteness in the ρ-norm is the result of ρ having a 0-eigenvalue. In the case where $\rho = \mathbb{1}/d$, the ρ-norm $\|\cdot\|_\rho$ coincides with the little Frobenius norm, that is $\|\cdot\|_f = \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{1}/d}$.

A bipartite quantum state is a unit vector $|\psi\rangle$ in the tensor product of Hilbert spaces $H_A \otimes H_B$. A state $|\psi\rangle \in H_A \otimes H_B$ is said to be **maximally entangled** if its reduced density matrix $\mathrm{tr}_{H_A}(\rho) = \rho_B$ on H_B (or $\rho_A = \mathrm{tr}_{H_B}(\rho)$ on H_A) is $\mathbb{1}/\dim(H_B)$ (or $\mathbb{1}/\dim(H_B)$). Thus, starting from a maximally entangled state the induced ρ-norm on H_B (or H_A) is the little Frobenius norm $\|\cdot\|_f$. Every bipartite vector state has a **Schmidt decomposition** $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i\in I} \alpha_i |u_i\rangle \otimes |v_i\rangle$, where $\{|u_i\rangle\}_{i\in I}$ and $\{|v_i\rangle\}_{i\in I}$ are orthonormal subsets of H_A and H_B respectively, and $\alpha_i > 0$ for all $i \in I$. The **support** of a bipartite vector state $|\psi\rangle$ is the image of $H_A \otimes H_B$ under the projection $\Pi = \sum_{i\in I} |u_i\rangle\langle u_i| \otimes |v_i\rangle\langle v_i|$. The support on H_A or H_B are the images under the local projections $\Pi_A = \sum_{i\in I} |u_i\rangle\langle u_i|$ and $\Pi_B = \sum_{i\in I} |v_i\rangle\langle v_i|$ respectively. The support Hilbert space is defined by $Im(\Pi) := \Pi H$. Note that for the maximally entangled state the local support projections are $Im(\mathbb{1}) = H_A$ and $Im(\mathbb{1}) = H_B$. We denote the maximally entangled state by $|\tau\rangle = \sum_{i\in I} |u_i\rangle \otimes |u_i\rangle$. For a self-adjoint matrix $A^* = A$ we observe that $A \otimes \mathbb{1}|\tau\rangle = \mathbb{1} \otimes A^\top|\tau\rangle = \mathbb{1} \otimes \overline{A}|\tau\rangle$, where the transpose is taken with respect to the Schmidt basis of $|\tau\rangle$, since $A^\top = (A^*)^\top = \overline{A}$.

For positive real functions $f, g : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ as $x \to 0$ we write $f(x) = O(g(x))$, if there exists constants $C, K > 0$ such that for all $x \in (0, C)$ we have that $f(x) \leq Kg(x)$. This is read as "f is big-Oh of g", and means for small x the behaviour of f is dominated by a constant times the function g.

3. Quantum strategies for nonlocal games

In this short section, we discuss near-optimal quantum strategies for nonlocal games. A two-player nonlocal game is a scenario involving two players, Alice and Bob, and a referee. In the game, Alice (resp. Bob) receive questions $i \in I_A$ (resp. $j \in I_B$) from the referee according to a probability distribution $\pi : I_A \times I_B \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Alice (resp. Bob) respond to each question with answers $a \in O_A$ (resp. $b \in O_B$). However, once they receive their questions they are not permitted to communicate with each other. The goal of the players is to satisfy the rule predicate $\mathcal{V} : O_A \times O_B \times I_A \times I_B \to \{0, 1\}$, function such that $\mathcal{V}(a, b, i, j) = 0$ indicates a loss and $\mathcal{V}(a, b, i, j) = 1$ a win. The description of the game and the predicate is known the players before the game begins. The goal of the players is to maximize their winning probability.

Although communication betweeen the players is not permitted once the game begins, the players can share a bipartite quantum state. In addition to this, the players can make local quantum measurements on their subsystem to obtain an answers. This allows the players to employ not only classical correlations, but the larger set of quantum correlations in their strategy to win the game. Strategies that employ quantum correlations are called quantum (or entangled) strategies, while strategies that use only classical correlations are called classical strategies.

Definition 3.1. A **quantum strategy** $\mathcal{S}$ for a nonlocal game $\mathcal{G}$ consists of:

(i) finite-dimensional Hilbert space H_A and H_B,
(ii) collections of orthogonal projections $\{\{P_a^i\}_{a \in A} : i \in I_A\}$ acting on H_A, such that $\sum_a P_a^i = \mathbb{1}_{H_A}$, for all $i \in I_A$, and a collection of orthogonal projections $\{\{Q_b^j\}_{b \in B} : j \in I_B\}$ acting on H_B, such that $\sum_b Q_b^j = \mathbb{1}_{H_B}$, for all $j \in J$, and
(iii) a quantum state $|\psi\rangle \in H_A \otimes H_B$.

These collections of projective-valued measures (PVMs) and bipartite state correspond to a general quantum strategy $\mathcal{S}$ in the sense that they model the conditional probabilities

$$p(a, b|i, j) = \langle \psi | P_a^i \otimes Q_b^j | \psi \rangle,$$

for all outcomes $a \in O_A$, $b \in O_B$, and inputs $i \in I_A$, and $j \in I_B$, which can occur in a round of the nonlocal game. More generally, quantum correlations can be modelled by positive-operator value-measures (or POVMs) and mixed states (i.e. density operators). However, in this work we restrict to the class of PVM strategies with pure states. This is justified by the fact that Naimark's dilation theorem tells us that any correlation achieved by a POVM on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space can be achieved by a projective-value-measure (PVM) on a larger (but still) finite-dimensional Hilbert space. Similarly, a straightforward purification

argument shows that any correlation achieved with a mixed state can be achieved with a pure state[3]. Players employing a quantum stratey $\mathcal{S}$ for a nonlocal game $\mathcal{G}$ win with probability

$$\omega(\mathcal{G};\mathcal{S}) = \sum_{i,j\in I\times J} \pi(i,j) \sum_{a,b\in A\times B} \mathcal{V}(a,b,i,j)\langle\psi|P_a^i \otimes Q_b^j|\psi\rangle. \tag{3.1}$$

The probability $\omega(\mathcal{G};\mathcal{S})$ is often refered to as the **value of $\mathcal{G}$ under $\mathcal{S}$**. While the optimal winning probability, which is the supremum over all quantum strategies, is often called the **quantum (or entangled) value** of the game, and is denoted by $\omega^*(\mathcal{G}) = \sup_{\mathcal{S}} \omega(\mathcal{G};\mathcal{S})$.

Definition 3.2. A strategy $\mathcal{S}$ for a nonlocal game $\mathcal{G}$ is **perfect** if $\omega(\mathcal{S};\mathcal{G}) = 1$. More generally, a strategy is **optimal** if $\omega(\mathcal{G};\mathcal{S}) = \omega^*(\mathcal{G})$. Our definition of near-optimal and near-perfect quantum strategies are similar. A quantum strategy $\mathcal{S}$ is **ϵ-optimal** if $|\omega(\mathcal{G};\mathcal{S}) - \omega^*(\mathcal{G})| \leq \epsilon$ and is **ϵ-perfect** $\omega(\mathcal{G};\mathcal{S}) \geq 1-\epsilon$.

We let

$$p_{ij}(\mathcal{S}) = \sum_{a,b} \mathcal{V}(a,b|i,j)p(a,b|i,j) \tag{3.2}$$

denote the probability of winning with strategy $\mathcal{S}$ given question pair $(i,j) \in I_A \times I_B$. It is not hard to see that a quantum strategy $\mathcal{S}$ is perfect if and only if $p_{ij}(\mathcal{S}) = 1$ for all questions (i,j). On the other hand, if a strategy is ϵ-perfect then on each question pair $(i,j) \in I_A \times I_B$ $p_{ij}(\mathcal{S}) \geq 1-\epsilon$. Note that the converse is false. As an illustration, suppose that $|I_A| = m$ and $|I_B| = n$, and let $\pi(i,j)$ be the uniform distribution over questions. In this case, any strategy $\mathcal{S}'$ with $p_{ij}(\mathcal{S}') = 1 - mn\epsilon$ for all $(i,j) \in I_A \times I_B$ will be ϵ-perfect. Nonetheless, if the distribution on questions is uniform then being ϵ-perfect for the game and winning on each questions with probability at least $1-\epsilon$ are equivalent up to a constant (which depends only on the size of the questions sets). In this respect, our definition of ϵ-perfect differs slightly from the one used in [SV18].

When analyzing strategies for nonlocal games it sometimes useful to consider the *bias* of a strategy $\mathcal{S}$ for a game $\mathcal{G}$, rather than the value. The bias is the probabilityof winning minus the probability of losing. We can express this by

$$\beta(\mathcal{G};\mathcal{S}) = \sum_{i,j\in I\times J} \pi(i,j) \sum_{a,b\in A\times B} (-1)^{\mathcal{V}(a,b,i,j)+1}\langle\psi|P_a^i \otimes Q_b^j|\psi\rangle. \tag{3.3}$$

For several families of nonlocal games it is possible to derive an even more succint expression for the bias. In the case of both XOR and BCS nonlocal games, considering the bias rather than the winning probability allows the operators in the quantum strategy to be viewed as commuting collections of ± 1-valued observables rather than orthogonal projections. This viewpoint has been quite convenient for analysing quantum strategies. We will discuss this more in Section 5.1.

[3]In fact, one can even find a pure state on the same dimensional Hilbert space as the mixed state [SVW16].

4. Approximate representation theory

In this section, we present the key definitions and conceps from approximate representation theory and establish our main technical result. Some of the preliminary results are likely known to experts, but we include them here for completeness. All of the Hilbert spaces in this section are assumed to be finite-dimensional unless stated otherwise. We also note that every finitely-presented $*$-algebra in this section is over the field of complex numbers $\mathbb{C}$.

4.1. State-dependent ϵ-representations.

We begin by pinning down our notion of a state-dependent approximate representation.

Definition 4.1. Let H be a Hilbert space, ρ a density operator on H, and $\mathscr{A} = \mathbb{C}^*\langle S : R\rangle$ a finitely-presented $*$-algebra. A **state-dependent ϵ-representation** of $\mathscr{A}$ or (ϵ, ρ)-representation is a $*$-homomorphism $\phi : \mathbb{C}^*\langle S\rangle \to \mathcal{L}(H)$ such that

$$\|\phi(r)\|_\rho \leq \epsilon,$$

for all $r \in R$. The set $D(\phi, \rho, \mathscr{A}) = \{\|\phi(r)\|_\rho : r \in R\}$ are called the *defects* of $(\phi, \mathscr{A})$.

Several other definitions of approximate representations[4] exist in the literature, see for example [GH17,Tho18]. Note that if the ρ-norm is non-degenerate then every $(0, \rho)$-representation descends to a $*$-homomorphism $\mathscr{A} \to \mathcal{L}(H)$ by the universal property of the free $*$-algebra. Moreover, if H has dimension d, then in the special case that $\rho = \mathbb{1}/d$ (is the maximally-mixed state) we see that the ρ-norm is the little Frobenius norm i.e. $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{1}/d} = \|\cdot\|_f$. That is, we say that an $(\epsilon, \mathbb{1}/d)$-representations ϕ is a **state-independent ϵ-representation**, or simply ϵ-representation (with the $\|\cdot\|_f$-norm used implicitly).

Sometimes an (ϵ, ρ)-representation may have the property that a subset of the defects are zero. That is, ϕ is an (ϵ, ρ)-representation of a finitely presented algebra $\mathscr{A} = \mathbb{C}^*\langle S : R\rangle$, and moreover, for a non-empty subset of relations $T \subset R$, we have that $\|\phi(r)\|_\rho = 0$ for all $r \in T$. In this case, we call such a subset of relations T the **exact** relations of ϕ for $\mathscr{A}$. Notably, certain relations can correspond to familiar functional analytic properties as highlighted by the following example.

Example 4.2. Consider an ϵ-representation ϕ of $\mathbb{C}^*\langle S : R\rangle$ such that $\|\phi(r)\|_f \leq \epsilon$ for all $r \in R$, with the additional property that that $\|\phi(s)\phi(s)^* - \mathbb{1}\|_f = \|\phi(s)^*\phi(s) - \mathbb{1}\|_f = 0$ for all $s \in S$. In this case, the subset of *unitary relations* $\{s^*s - 1, s^*s - 1 : s \in S\} \subset R$ are exact. In this case, we say that ϕ is a *unitary* ϵ-representation.

Similiar notions hold for other algebraic properties expressible as $*$-relations, such operators being self-adjoint, normal, idempotent, etc. With this in mind, given a Hilbert space H, and a finitely presented algebra $\mathscr{A} = \mathbb{C}^*\langle S : R\rangle$ containing the self-adjoint unitary relations $U = \{s^2 - 1, s^* - s \ : \ s \in S\} \subset R$. We call a $*$-homomorphism $\phi : \mathbb{C}^*\langle S\rangle \to \mathcal{L}(H)$ a **self-adjoint unitary (ϵ, ρ)-representation**

[4]The notion of approximate representation in Definition 4.1 can be viewed as a *worst case* notion of an approximate representation. This is contrasted with an *average case* notion where ϵ representes the average defect according to a measure on the relations, see for instance [CVY23].

of $\mathscr{A}$ if ϕ is a (ϵ, ρ)-representation of $\mathscr{A}$ and is exact for the relations U. Collections of self-adjoint unitaries arise in the context of quantum strategies for nonlocal games as *binary (or ± 1-valued) observables*. In later sections, we will see that these self-adjoint unitary (ϵ, ρ)-representations are related to near-optimal strategies for several well-studied familes of nonlocal games.

4.2. **Stability and replacement.** Another relevant concept from approximate representation theory we will need in this work is the notion of *stability*. Intuitively, stability is a property of a finitely-presented algebra that determines how close approximate representations are to actual representations. Despite our definition of state-dependent approximate representations, we will only need to define stability with respect to state-independent approximate representations.

Definition 4.3. Let $g : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a non-negative function. A finitely presented $*$-algebra $\mathscr{A} = \mathbb{C}^*\langle S : R\rangle$ is (g, C)**-stable** if for every ϵ-representation $\phi : \mathbb{C}^*\langle S\rangle \to \mathcal{L}(H)$ of $\mathscr{A}$ with $\epsilon \leq C$, there is a $*$-homomorphism $\psi : \mathbb{C}^*\langle S\rangle \to \mathcal{L}(H)$ of $\mathscr{A}$ such that

$$\|\phi(s) - \psi(s)\|_f \leq g(\epsilon),$$

for all $s \in S$. We say that $\mathscr{A}$ is g**-stable** if it is (g, C)-stable for all $\epsilon \geq 0$, and **strongly stable** if $g(\epsilon) = O(\epsilon)$.

In general the stability of a finitely-presented algebra can depend on the choice of presentation. However, changing the presentation will only effect the stability by a constant factor. This is a consequence of the following result, which first requires a definition.

Definition 4.4. If $\mathscr{A} = \mathbb{C}^*\langle S : R\rangle$ and $\mathscr{B} = \mathbb{C}^*\langle T : U\rangle$ are finitely presented $*$-algebras and $\psi : \mathscr{A} \to \mathscr{B}$ is a $*$-homomorphism, then the **lift** of ψ is the unique $*$-homomorphism $\tilde{\psi} : \mathbb{C}^*\langle S\rangle \to \mathbb{C}^*\langle T\rangle$ such that $\tilde{\psi}(r) = 0$ for all $r \in R$, in other words $\tilde{\psi}$ **descends** to ψ.

Proposition 4.5. Let $\mathscr{A} = \mathbb{C}^*\langle S : R\rangle$ and $\mathscr{B} = \mathbb{C}^*\langle T : U\rangle$ be finitely presented $*$-algebras and H a Hilbert space. There exists $C > 0$ such that if $\phi : \mathbb{C}^*\langle T\rangle \to \mathcal{L}(H)$ is an ϵ-representation and $\psi : \mathscr{A} \to \mathscr{B}$ a $*$-homomorphism, then $\phi \circ \tilde{\psi}$ is a $C\epsilon$-representation of $\mathscr{A}$, where $\tilde{\psi}$ is the lift of ψ.

Proof. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{C}^*\langle S\rangle \to \mathscr{A}$ and $\eta : \mathbb{C}^*\langle T\rangle \to \mathscr{B}$ be the quotient maps (surjective $*$-homomorphisms) by the $*$-ideals $\langle\langle R\rangle\rangle$ and $\langle\langle U\rangle\rangle$ respectively. Furthermore, let $\tilde{\psi}$ be the lift of the $*$-homomorphism $\psi : \mathscr{A} \to \mathscr{B}$. Since $\varphi \circ \psi(r) = \eta \circ \tilde{\psi}(r) = 0$ for all $r \in R$, we have that $\tilde{\psi}(r) \in \langle\langle U\rangle\rangle$ for all $r \in R$. Hence, for any $r \in R$ we have $\tilde{\psi}(r) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} w_i u_i v_i$ for some $w_i, v_i \in \mathbb{C}^*\langle T\rangle$, and $u_i \in U$, for some $i \in \mathcal{I}$. If $\phi : \mathbb{C}^*\langle T\rangle \to \mathcal{L}(H)$ is an ϵ-representation of $\mathscr{B}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\|\phi \circ \tilde{\psi}(r)\|_f &= \|\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \phi(w_i)\phi(u_i)\phi(v_i)\|_f \\ &\leq \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \|\phi(w_i)\|_{op}\|\phi(u_i)\|_f\|\phi(v_i)\|_{op}\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq |\mathcal{I}| \left(\max_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \{ \|\phi(w_i)\|_{op}, \|\phi(v_i)\|_{op} \} \right)^2 \epsilon,$$

for all $r \in R$. Hence, $\phi \circ \tilde{\psi}$ is a $C\epsilon$-representation of $\mathscr{A}$ with

$$C = |\mathcal{I}| \left(\max_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \{ \|\phi(w_i)\|_{op}, \|\phi(v_i)\|_{op} \} \right)^2.$$

□

As a corollary, approximate representations are not significantly affected by the choice of presentation in the asymptotic regime $\epsilon \to 0$, and therefore neither is our notion of stablility. We do remark that Proposition 4.5 is established in the case of state-independent approximate representations. Although, we believed that for many finitely-presented $*$-algebras an analogue of Proposition 4.5 holds in the state-dependent case, we leave this as an open problem to whether an analagous statement holds in general.

Returning to the topic at hand. It is convenient to discuss the stability of an algebra with respect to families of relations for which the quotient is stable. The following results give some basic examples of strongly stable relations, that is relations for which the quotients by such relations are stronly stable finitely-presented $*$-algebras.

Proposition 4.6. The $*$-algebra of self-adjoint matrices $\mathbb{C}^*\langle X_1, \cdots, X_n : X_i^* - X_i \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq n \}\rangle$ is $\epsilon/2$-stable.

Proof. It suffices to show that for any matrix X_i, there is a self-adjoint matrix Y_i such that

$$\|X_i - Y_i\|_f \leq \frac{1}{2} \|X_i - X_i^*\|_f.$$

Towards the claim, for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ let $Y_i = \frac{1}{2}(X_i^* + X_i)$, then $Y_i^* = \frac{1}{2}(X_i + X_i^*) = Y_i$ and $\|X_i - Y_i\|_f = \frac{1}{2}\|X_i - X_i^*\|_f$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. □

It follows that the $*$-algebra of self-adjoint matrices is stronlgy stable. Several other $*$-algebras consist of strongly stable relations as shown by the following examples of strongly stable relations.

Proposition 4.7. For any matrix X with $\|X\|_{op} \leq 1$, there is a unitary W such that

$$\|X - W\|_f \leq \|X^*X - \mathbb{1}\|_f.$$

Proof. Consider the singular value decomposition $X = U\Sigma V$ so that Σ is a diagonal matrix with non-negative singular values $\sigma_j \in [0, 1]$ for all $1 \leq j \leq d$. Define the unitary $W := UV$ and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|X - UV\|_f = \|U(\Sigma - \mathbb{1})V\|_f = \||\Sigma - \mathbb{1}|\|_f \\ \leq &\|\|(\Sigma - \mathbb{1})(\Sigma + \mathbb{1})|\|_f = \|\Sigma^2 - \mathbb{1}\|_f = \|V^*(\Sigma U^* U \Sigma - \mathbb{1})V\|_f \\ = &\|(V^*\Sigma^* U^*)U\Sigma V - V^*V\|_f = \|X^*X - \mathbb{1}\|_f, \end{aligned}$$

since $1 - \sigma_j^2 = (1 - \sigma_j)(1 + \sigma_j) \geq 1 - \sigma_j$ for all $\sigma_j \in [0, 1]$. □

If X is near-unitary and self-adjoint, then it suffices to pick W to be the unitary matrix in the polar decomposition $X = U|X|$, where $|X| := \sqrt{X^*X}$ is a positive-semidefinite matrix, and U is a unitary. In the case that $|X|$ is invertible, we can simply take $W = X|X|^{-1}$. However, even if $|X|$ is not invertible, we can take it's inverse on the support and complete the resulting matrix to a unitary that remains close to X.

Proposition 4.8 (Lemma 22 in [Slo19])**.** For any diagonal matrix X, there is a diagonal matrix Y with $Y^2 = \mathbb{1}$, and

$$\|X - Y\|_f \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right) \|X^2 - \mathbb{1}\|_f .$$

We refer the reader to the proof in [Slo19].

Lemma 4.9. Let X be a matrix. If $\|X - X^*\|_f \leq \epsilon$ and $\|X^2 - \mathbb{1}\|_f \leq \epsilon$, then there is a unitary Z such that $Z^2 = \mathbb{1}$ and a constant $C > 0$, such that

$$\|Z - X\|_f \leq C\epsilon.$$

Notably, C depends only on $\|X\|_{op}$.

Proof. Let $Y = (X^* + X)/2$ so that Y is self-adjoint and by Proposition 4.6 $\|X - Y\|_f \leq \epsilon/2$. Since Y is self-adjoint there is a unitary U that diagonalizes Y. By Proposition 4.8 there is diagonal matrix W with $W^2 = \mathbb{1}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|W - UYU^*\|_f &= \|U^*WU - Y\|_f \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right) \|UY^2U^* - \mathbb{1}\|_f \\
&= \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right) \|Y^2 - \mathbb{1}\|_f.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|Y^2 - \mathbb{1}\|_f &\leq \|Y^2 - X^2\|_f + \|X^2 - \mathbb{1}\|_f \\
&\leq \|Y^2 - XY\|_f + \|XY - X^2\|_f + \epsilon \\
&= \|(Y - X)Y\|_f + \|X(Y - X)\|_f + \epsilon \\
&\leq \|Y\|_{op}\epsilon/2 + \|X\|_{op}\epsilon/2 + \epsilon \\
&\leq (\|X\|_{op} + 1)\epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, letting $Z = U^*WU$ and $\|X\|_{op} = \tilde{C}$, we see that $Z^2 = U^*WUU^*WU = \mathbb{1}$ and $Z^* = (U^*WU)^* = U^*W^*U = Z$ since $W^* = W$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|Z - X\|_f &\leq \|Z - Y\|_f + \|Y - X\|_f \\
&\leq (1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}})\|Y^2 - \mathbb{1}\|_f + \epsilon/2 \\
&\leq (1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}})(\tilde{C} + 1)\epsilon + \epsilon/2.
\end{aligned}$$

Setting $C = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\tilde{C}(\sqrt{2}+1) + \frac{3\sqrt{2}+1}{2})$ completes the proof. □

The above results can be used to show that the $*$-algebra of self-adjoint unitaries is strongly stable. One example of the utility of strong stability comes in the form of the following lemma.

Lemma 4.10 (Replacement Lemma)**.** Let $\mathscr{A} = \mathbb{C}^*\langle S : R\rangle$ be finitely-presented and $R' \subset R$ is a subset of relations. There exists constants $K > 0$, such that if $\phi : \mathbb{C}^*\langle S\rangle \to \mathcal{L}(H)$ is an ϵ-representation of $\mathscr{A}$ on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space H and $\psi : \mathbb{C}^*\langle S\rangle \to \mathcal{L}(H)$ is a representation of the quotient $\mathbb{C}^*\langle S : R'\rangle$ with

$$\|\phi(s) - \psi(s)\|_f \leq \delta,$$

for all $s \in S$, then ψ is a $(K\delta + \epsilon)$-representation of $\mathscr{A}$.

Proof. We can write each relation $r \in R$ as a finite sum of monomials $w \in W$ in the generators $s \in S$, $r = \sum_{w\in W} c_w w$, where each c_w is a complex scalar. Let $D = \max_{s\in S}\{\|\phi(s)\|_{op}\}$ and $C = \max_{s\in S}\{\|\psi(s)\|_{op}\}$ be the maximal norm amongst all the generators in the image of ϕ and ψ. For any monomial w of length ℓ we see that

$$\|\phi(w) - \psi(w)\|_f = |\phi(s_{i_1})\dots\phi(s_{i_\ell}) - \psi(s_{i_1})\cdots\psi(s_{i_\ell})\|_f \leq (\sum_{k=0}^{\ell} C^k D^{n-k})\delta. \tag{4.1}$$

Hence, setting $M = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell-1} C^k D^{n-k}$, we see that $\|\psi(w) - \phi(w)\|_f \leq M\delta$ for any w of length ℓ. Hence,

$$\|\psi(r)\|_f \leq \|\psi(r) - \phi(r)\|_f + \epsilon \leq \sum_{w\in W} |c_w|\|\psi(w) - \phi(w)\|_f + \epsilon, \tag{4.2}$$

the result follows by letting $K = |W|\max_w\{|c_w|M\}$. □

Lemma 4.10 shows that if our finitely presented algebra has a strongly stable quotient algebra then *replacing* an approximate representation by a *nearby* approximate representation that descends to a $*$-homomorphism on the quotient will remain a $O(\epsilon)$-representation on any remaining relations, provided that the constant may be worse.

4.3. **Rounding and the approximate tracial property.** A property of state-dependent approximate representations that will be relevant in this work is the following approximate tracial property.

Definition 4.11. Let $\rho \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be a density matrix and $\mathscr{A} = \mathbb{C}^*\langle S : R\rangle$ a finitely presented $*$-algebra. An (ϵ, ρ)-representation $\phi : \mathbb{C}^*\langle S\rangle \to \mathcal{L}(H)$ is **δ-tracial** if

$$\|\phi(s)\sqrt{\rho} - \sqrt{\rho}\phi(s)\|_F \leq \delta,$$

for all $s \in S$. W

Remark that this property is stated in terms of the "big"' Frobenius norm. Furthermore, if an (ϵ, ρ)-representation ϕ is $(0, \rho)$-tracial, then the linear funtional $\mathrm{tr}(\phi(x)\rho)$ has the tracial property ($\mathrm{tr}(\phi(x)\phi(y)\rho) = \mathrm{tr}(\phi(y)\phi(x)\rho)$ for any $x, y \in X$).

Tracial states play an important role in the representation of finite-dimensional C^*-algebras and so it is not surprising to have something akin in the approximate case. The approximately tracial property gives a convenient way to state our main technical lemma.

For the applications to strategies and nonlocal games, it turns out to be sufficient to prove our results for a particular class of finitely-presented $*$-algebras. We say a finitely-presented $*$-algebra $\mathbb{C}^*\langle S : R\rangle$ is *generated by self-adjoint unitaries* if R contains the relations $s^2 - 1$ and $s^* - s$ for all $s \in S$. We can now present the rounding lemma:

Lemma 4.12 (Rounding Lemma)**.** Let H be a (finite-dimensional) Hilbert space, $\mathscr{G} = \mathbb{C}^*\langle S : R\rangle$ a finitely-presented $*$-algebra generated by self-adjoint unitaries. There exists a constant $C > 0$, and a non-zero subspace $\widetilde{H} \subset H$ such that if $\varphi : \mathbb{C}^*\langle S\rangle \to \mathcal{L}(H)$ is an self-adjoint unitary (ϵ, ρ)-representation of $\mathscr{G}$ (for sufficiently small ϵ) that is ϵ-tracial, then there exists a (state-independent) $C\epsilon^{1/2}$-representation $\phi : \mathbb{C}^*\langle S\rangle \to \mathcal{L}(\widetilde{H})$. Moreover, for all $s \in S$, we can choose each $\phi(s)$ to be a self-adjoint unitary on $\widetilde{H}$.

Before we prove Lemma 4.12, we collect some facts and definitions that will be helpful in the proof. Let χ_I be the indicator function for the real interval $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Given a self-adjoint operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ and measurable subset $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ we let $\chi_I(T)$ denote the spectral projection onto $I \cap spec(T)$, where $spec(T)$ is the spectrum of T. In particular, if X is positive semi-definite then by the spectral theorem we have $spec(T) \subset [0, +\infty)$. We define $(\geq \alpha) := [\alpha, +\infty)$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ so that we can express the spectral projection onto $spec(T) \cap [\alpha, +\infty)$ by $\chi_{\geq\alpha}(T)$.

Proposition 4.13. (Connes's "joint distribution trick" [Con76]) If λ and λ' are positive semi-definite operators on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space H, then

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \|\chi_{\geq\sqrt{\alpha}}(\lambda) - \chi_{\geq\sqrt{\alpha}}(\lambda')\|_F^2 d\alpha \leq \|\lambda - \lambda'\|_F \|\lambda + \lambda'\|_F. \tag{4.3}$$

Rather than giving the proof we direct the reader to the concise proof in [SV18]. Readers wishing to see the more general case can consult the seminal work of Connes [Con76]. Along with the above technical result, we require the following simple fact:

Proposition 4.14. Let λ be a positive semi-definite operator on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \chi_{\geq\sqrt{\alpha}}(\lambda) d\alpha = \lambda^2.$$

A short proof can be found in [SV18][Lemma 5.6].

We are now ready to establish Lemma 4.12. Our approach is based on the proof of Theorem 5.1 in [SV18].

Proof of Lemma 4.12. Suppose $\mathscr{G} = \mathbb{C}^*\langle S : R\rangle$ is a finitely presented $*$-algebra and $\varphi : \mathbb{C}^*\langle S\rangle \to \mathcal{L}(H)$; sending $s_j \mapsto X_j$, is a self-adjoing unitary (ϵ, ρ)-representation that is ϵ-tracial. Let $\varphi(r)$ represent the image of the polynomial relations $r \in R$

in the self-adjoint unitary representatives $\{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}$. We begin by showing that there is a non-zero orthogonal projection P on H for which:

$$\|X_j P - P X_j\|_F = O(\epsilon^{1/2})\mathrm{tr}(P)^{1/2} \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq n, \text{ and} \tag{4.4}$$

$$\|\varphi(r)P\|_F = O(\epsilon^{1/2})\mathrm{tr}(P)^{1/2} \text{ for all } r \in R. \tag{4.5}$$

We establish both claims using Proposition 4.13. For each $1 \leq j \leq n$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{+\infty} \|X_j \chi_{\geq\sqrt{\alpha}}(\lambda) - \chi_{\geq\sqrt{\alpha}}(\lambda) X_j\|_F^2 d\alpha \\
&= \int_0^{+\infty} \|\chi_{\geq\sqrt{\alpha}}(\lambda) - X_j^* \chi_{\geq\sqrt{\alpha}}(\lambda) X_j\|_F^2 d\alpha \\
&\leq \|\lambda - X_j^* \lambda X_j\|_F \|\lambda + X_j^* \lambda X_j\|_F \\
&= \|X_j \lambda - \lambda X_j\|_F \|X_j \lambda + \lambda X_j\|_F \\
&\leq 2\|X_j \lambda - \lambda X_j\|_F \\
&= O(\epsilon),
\end{aligned}$$

by the ϵ-tracialness of the approximate representation φ. Additionally, by Proposition 4.14 we have

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \|\varphi(r)\chi_{\geq\sqrt{\alpha}}(\lambda)\|_F^2 d\alpha = \|\varphi(r)\|_\rho^2 = O(\epsilon^2),$$

for each of the relations $r \in R$. Recall that for $\epsilon \leq 1$, we have $\epsilon^2 \leq \epsilon$. Hence for sufficiently small ϵ we have that $O(\epsilon^2) = O(\epsilon)$. Therefore, averaging over all relations $r \in R$ we see that

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \|\chi_{\geq\sqrt{\alpha}}(\lambda) - X_j^* \chi_{\geq\sqrt{\alpha}}(\lambda) X_j\|_F^2 + \sum_{r\in R} \|\varphi(r)\chi_{\geq\sqrt{\alpha}}(\lambda)\|_F^2 \right) d\alpha \tag{4.6}$$

$$= O(\epsilon) \int_0^{+\infty} \mathrm{tr}\left(\chi_{\geq\sqrt{\alpha}}(\lambda)\right) d\alpha, \tag{4.7}$$

holds for any $\alpha \geq 0$. Moreover, each integrand is zero if $\alpha > \|\lambda\|_{op}^2$ by the definition of $\chi_{\geq\sqrt{\alpha}}(\lambda)$. So there exists a value $0 < \alpha_0 \leq \|\lambda\|_{op}^2$ such that if we set $P := \chi_{\geq\sqrt{\alpha_0}}(\lambda)$, then P is a non-zero projection and

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \|X_j P - P X_j\|_F^2 + \sum_{r\in R} \|\varphi(r)P\|_F^2 = O(\epsilon)\mathrm{tr}(P). \tag{4.8}$$

This in turn, bounds each summand on the left hand side of equation (4.8) by $O(\epsilon)\mathrm{tr}(P)$ as all the terms are positive, establishing that both (4.4) and (4.5) hold.

We now show that the following holds:

(a) the operator $\widetilde{X}_j := PX_jP|PX_jP|^{-1}$ is unitary on $Im(P)$ and $\|\widetilde{X}_j - X_jP\|_F = O(\epsilon^{1/2})\mathrm{tr}(P)$, and

(b) if $X_{j_1}\cdots X_{j_k}$ for $1 \leq j_1, \cdots, j_k \leq n$ is a word of length k, then

$$\|X_{j_1}\cdots X_{j_k}P - \widetilde{X}_{j_1}\cdots\widetilde{X}_{j_k}\|_F = O(\epsilon^{1/2})\mathrm{tr}(P) \tag{4.9}$$

where the constant depends only on k, for each $1 \leq j \leq n$.

We begin by proving (a), since $(PX_jP)^* = PX_jP$, we have that

$$\|(PX_jP)^2 - P\|_F = \|PX_jPX_jP - P^3\|_F \leq \|X_jPX_j - P\|_F = \|PX_j - X_jP\|_F,$$

is $O(\epsilon^{1/2})\mathrm{tr}(P)^{1/2}$ using the unitary invariance of $\|\cdot\|_F$ along with the fact that $P = P^*P \leq \mathbb{1}$. Now, observe that $\|PX_jP\|_{op} \leq \|X_j\|_{op} \leq 1$, hence using Proposition 4.7 we can conclude that

$$\|\widetilde{X}_j - PX_jP\|_F = O(\epsilon^{1/2})\mathrm{tr}(P). \tag{4.10}$$

Moreover, the matrix $\widetilde{X}_j$ is a unitary by noting its the unitary part of PX_jP. Before continuing, observe that we can rewrite (4.10) to show that

$$\|PX_jP - X_jP\|_F = O(\epsilon^{1/2})\mathrm{tr}(P)^{1/2}, \tag{4.11}$$

and by the triangle inequality:

$$\|\widetilde{X}_j - X_jP\|_F \leq \|\widetilde{X}_j - PX_jP\|_F + \|PX_jP - X_jP\|_F = O(\epsilon^{1/2})\mathrm{tr}(P)^{1/2}. \tag{4.12}$$

The result follows since $(PX_jP)^*(PX_jP)$ is almost the identity on $Im(P)$.

For (b) we note that $\widetilde{X}_j = P\widetilde{X}_j$ for any $1 \leq j \leq n$, and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\|X_{j_1}\cdots X_{j_k}P - \widetilde{X}_{j_1}\cdots\widetilde{X}_{j_k}\|_F \leq\ & O(\epsilon^{1/2})\mathrm{tr}(P)^{1/2} \\ & + \|X_{j_1}\cdots X_{j_{k-1}}P\widetilde{X}_{j_k} - \widetilde{X}_{j_1}\cdots\widetilde{X}_{j_{k-1}}\|_F.\end{aligned}$$

The result follows by induction on $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

We now conclude the proof by showing that the map $\phi : \mathbb{C}^*\langle S\rangle \to \mathcal{L}(Im(P))$ sending $s_j \mapsto \widetilde{X}_j$ is an $O(\epsilon^{1/2})$-representation on $Im(P) \subset H$ with respect to $\|\cdot\|_f$. We have already seen that $\widetilde{X}_j$ is unitary on $Im(P)$. Our next task is to show that $\|\widetilde{X}_j^2 - P\|_f = O(\epsilon^{1/2})$. The result follows by the triangle inequality, by combining the observation that

$$\|\widetilde{X}_j^2 - (PX_jP)^2\|_F \leq \|\widetilde{X}_j - PX_jP\|_F\|\widetilde{X}_j + PX_jP\|_F = O(\epsilon^{1/2})\mathrm{tr}(P)^{1/2},$$

and $\|(PX_jP)^2 - P\|_F = O(\epsilon^{1/2})\mathrm{tr}(P)^{1/2}$, along with the fact that $\|X\|_f = \frac{1}{\mathrm{tr}(P)^{1/2}}\|X\|_F$ on $Im(P)$.

For the remaining relations $r \in R$ of $\mathscr{G}$, the image of each relation is a polynomial $\phi(r) = \sum_{M\subset[n]}\gamma_M\prod_{j\in M}\varphi(s_j)$, with coefficients $\gamma_M \in \mathbb{C}$. By the triangle inequality is suffices to bound each of the monomials. We note that any monomial is bounded by the proofs of claims (a) and (b). Therefore, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\phi(r)\|_f &= \frac{1}{\mathrm{tr}(P)^{1/2}}\|\phi(r)\|_F \leq \frac{1}{\mathrm{tr}(P)^{1/2}}\left(\|\phi(r) - \varphi(r)P\|_F + \|\varphi(r)P\|_F\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\mathrm{tr}(P)^{1/2}}\sum_{M\subset[n]}\gamma_M\|\prod_{j\in M}\widetilde{X}_j - \prod_{j\in M}X_jP\|_F + O(\epsilon^{1/2})\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\mathrm{tr}(P)^{1/2}} \sum_{M\subset[n]} |\gamma_M| \sum_{j\in M} \|\widetilde{X}_j - X_j P\|_F + O(\epsilon^{1/2})$$
$$\leq \sum_{M\subset[n]} |\gamma_M| \sum_{j\in M} O(\epsilon^{1/2}) + O(\epsilon^{1/2})$$

is $O(\epsilon^{1/2})$ completing the proof. □

The assumption on size of ϵ in Lemma 4.12 depends on the relationship between the quantities in Eq. (4.6). In particular, for the regime of interest (as $\epsilon \to 0$) we take the larger of the two quantities. One could imagine a version of Lemma 4.12 with an (ϵ, ρ)-representation that is δ-tracial. The resulting approximate representation would ultimately depend on both ϵ and δ. However, in the application to strategies for nonlocal games, we always obtain an approximate representation where δ and ϵ are related.

5. Nonlocal game algebras

In this section we define BCS, synchronous, and XOR nonlocal games, along with their associated nonlocal game algebras. In each case, we show that near-optimal strategies correspond to state-dependent approximate representations satisfying certain approximate tracial conditions. We also show that approximate representations give rise to near-opmital quantum strategies for such games.

5.1. **BCS nonlocal games.**

Boolean constraint system (BCS) nonlocal games have previously been called "binary constraint" nonlocal games, see [CM14]. However, we prefer the term "boolean constraint" as it avoids any confusion with the subclass of "2-ary" constraints (those containing only two variables). Before we define the BCS nonlocal game, we review the formal concept of a boolean constraint system.

To begin, we adopt the multiplicative convention and associate -1 with the boolean TRUE value and 1 with the boolean FALSE. A k-ary **boolean relation** $\mathscr{R}$ is a subset of $\{\pm 1\}^k$ for $k > 0$. Given a set of boolean variables $V = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$, a **constraint** $\mathscr{C}$ is a pair $(\mathscr{U}, \mathscr{R})$ where the the **context** $\mathscr{U}_i$ is the subset of variables V that make up the constraint $\mathscr{C}_i$, and $\mathscr{R}$ is a k-ary boolean relation. A satisfying assignment to a constraint $\mathscr{C}$ is a function $\phi : V \to \{\pm 1\}$ such that $\phi(\mathscr{U}) \in \mathscr{R}$. A **boolean constraint system** $\mathscr{B}$ is a pair $(V, \{\mathscr{C}_i\}_{i=1}^m)$, where V is a set of variables and $\{\mathscr{C}_i\}_{i=1}^m$ is a collection of constraints. An assignment to a BCS $\mathscr{B}$ is a function $\phi : V \to \{\pm 1\}$. The function ϕ is a satisfying assignment if $\phi(\mathscr{U}_i) \in \mathscr{R}_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. A BCS is **satisfiable** if it has a satisfying assignment. For a single constraint $\mathscr{C}_i$ we denote the set of satisfying assignments by $sat(\mathscr{C}_i) = \{\phi : \mathscr{U}_i \to \{\pm 1\} : \phi(\mathscr{S}_i) \in \mathscr{R}_i\}$.

For $z \in \{\pm 1\}^k$, and each k-ary relation $\mathscr{R}$ we can associate the **indicator function** $f_{\mathscr{R}} : \{\pm 1\}^k \to \{\pm 1\}$ that evaluates to $f(z) = -1$ whenever $z \in \mathscr{R}$ and 1 otherwise. Given an indicator function $f_{\mathscr{R}}$ for a k-ary relation $\mathscr{R}$ we define the

indicator polynomial

$$\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{R}}(V) = \sum_{z\in\{\pm1\}^k} f_{\mathscr{R}}(z) \prod_{j\in\mathscr{U}} \frac{(1+z_j x_j)}{2} = \sum_{M\subseteq\mathscr{U}_i} \gamma_M \prod_{j\in M} x_j, \tag{5.1}$$

for some coefficients $\gamma_M \in \mathbb{R}$. In other words, the indicator polynomial for a constraint $\mathscr{C}$ is a real multilinear polynomial in V.

For a constraint $\mathscr{C}$, the indicator polynomial $\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{R}}(V)$ takes on the value -1 whenever it is evaluated on satisfying assignment for $\mathscr{C}$. Hence, any propositional formula over the boolean domain has a representation as a multilinear polynomial. We give a few simple examples:

Example 5.1. For $x, y \in \{\pm1\}$, the indicator polynomial for NOT is $\mathscr{F}_{\mathsf{NOT}}(x) = -x$, and the XOR polynomial is given by $\mathscr{F}_{\mathsf{XOR}}(x,y) = xy$. The polynomial $\mathsf{AND}(a_1,a_2) = a_1a_2$ becomes the ±1 values polynomial $\widetilde{\mathsf{AND}}(x_1,x_2) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + x_1 + x_2 - x_1x_2)$.

Given a BCS $\mathscr{B}$ we can define a two player **BCS nonlocal game** $\mathcal{G}(\mathscr{B})$. In the game, Alice receives a constraint $\mathscr{C}_i$ for some $1 \le i \le m$ and must reply with a satisfying assignment ϕ to $\mathscr{C}_i$. Meanwhile Bob receives a single variable x_j for $1 \le j \le n$ and replies with an assignment $\varphi \in \{\pm1\}$. They win the game if their assignment are consistent, that is $\phi(x_j) = \varphi$ for all $x_j \in \mathscr{U}_i$, otherwise they lose. The probability distribution for the game describes the probability of Alice being given the constraint $\mathscr{C}_i$ and Bob the variable x_j. If ϕ is a satisfying assignment for $\mathscr{B}$, then the players can always win with probability 1 by employing the strategy where they both use ϕ to obtain their outputs.

For a BCS nonlocal game the questions and answers are indexed by $I = [m]$, $J = [n]$, $A = sat(\mathscr{C}_i)$, and $B = \{\pm1\}$. In this work we will assume the distribution of questions is uniform on the variables and constraints. A quantum strategy $\mathcal{S}$ for a BCS game consists of PVMs $\{\{P_a^i\}_{a\in sat(\mathscr{C}_i)} : 1 \le i \le m\}$ and $\{\{Q_b^j\}_{b\in\mathbb{Z}_2} : 1 \le j \le n\}$. That is Alice has a projective measurement systems over satisfying assignments to each constraint, and Bob has projective measurement system over the ±1-assignment to each variable.

As mentioned earlier, a convenient way to analyse quantum strategies for BCS nonlocal games is in terms of the **bias** rather than the winning probability. Recall that the bias of a strategy $\mathcal{S}$ is the probability of winning minus the probability of losing. When considering the bias of a quantum strategy for a BCS nonlocal game, the relevant ±1-valued observables are:

$$Y_{ij} = \sum_{a\in sat(\mathscr{C}_i)} a_j P_a^i, \text{ and } X_j = \sum_{b\in\mathbb{Z}_2} b Q_b^j. \tag{5.2}$$

To see why, recall that the winning probability on inputs (i,j) is given by

$$p_{ij}(\mathcal{S}) = \sum_{b\in\mathbb{Z}_2} \sum_{\substack{a\in sat(\mathscr{C}_i)\\ a_j=b}} p(a,b|i,j). \tag{5.3}$$

Let $\beta_{ij}(\mathcal{S}) = \langle\psi|Y_{ij} \otimes X_j|\psi\rangle$ be the bias on question (i,j) with quantum strategy $\mathcal{S}$ and observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\psi|Y_{ij} \otimes X_j|\psi\rangle &= \sum_{a\in sat(\mathscr{C}_i)} \sum_{b\in\mathbb{Z}_2} a_j \cdot b\langle\psi|P_a^i \otimes Q_b^j|\psi\rangle \\ &= 2\left[\sum_{b\in\mathbb{Z}_2} \sum_{\substack{a\in sat(\mathscr{C}_i)\\ a_j=b}} p(a,b|i,j)\right] - 1 \\ &= 2p_{ij}(\mathcal{S}) - 1.\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\beta_{ij}(\mathcal{S}) = 1$ if and only if $p_{ij}(\mathcal{S}) = 1$, hence we can characterize perfect quantum strategies in terms of these ± 1-valued observables.

Proposition 5.2. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be an ϵ-perfect quantum strategy for a BCS game $\mathcal{G}(\mathscr{B})$ with vector state $|\psi\rangle \in H_A \otimes H_B$. Then there is a collections of ± 1-valued observables $\{Y_{ij}\}_{i,j\in[m]\times[n]}$ in $\mathcal{L}(H_A)$ and $\{X_j\}_{j=1}^n$ in $\mathcal{L}(H_B)$ such that $[Y_{ij}, Y_{ik}] = 0$ for all j,k, and $\langle\psi|Y_{ij} \otimes X_j|\psi\rangle \geq 1 - O(\epsilon)$, whenever $\mathcal{V}(a,b,i,j) = 1$, for all $i,j \in [m]\times[n]$.

Proof. Take Y_{ij} and X_j to be the operators defined in equation (5.2) for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$. By construction each Y_{ij} and X_j is a self-adjoint unitary. Moreover, the commutation relations $[Y_{ij}, Y_{ik}] = 0$ hold, since each Y_{ij} and Y_{ik} is a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-linear combinations of orthogonal projections $P_{\underline{a}}^i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. Lastly, if there is an ϵ-perfect strategy then $p_{ij}(\mathcal{S}) \geq 1 - \epsilon$ and

$$\langle\psi|Y_{ij} \otimes X_j|\psi\rangle = 2p_{ij}(\mathcal{S}) - 1 \geq 1 - 2\epsilon, \tag{5.4}$$

whenever $\mathcal{V}(a,b,i,j) = 1$, for all $i,j \in [m]\times[n]$ as desired. □

Cleve and Mittal observed that the collection of mutually commuting ± 1-valued observables X_j derived from a perfect quantum strategy for a BCS nonlocal game satisfy the multilinear polynomials in equation (5.1), see [CM14][Theorem 1]. Hence, perfect quantum strategies for a BCS game correspond to a *matrix-valued* satisfying assignments to the BCS.

Definition 5.3. Given a BCS $\mathscr{S}$ a *matrix-valued satisfying assignment* for $\mathscr{B}$ is a collection of mutually commuting ± 1-valued observables $\{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}$ such that

$$\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{R}_i}(X_{j_1}, \ldots, X_{j_k}) = -\mathbb{1}, \tag{5.5}$$

for all constraints $(\mathscr{U}_i, \mathscr{R}_i)$, where $j_1, \ldots, j_k \in \mathscr{U}_i$ is an abuse of notation to indicated the index of the variables appearing in $\mathscr{U}_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq m$. Moreover, it is not hard to see that we can write the constraint polynomial as a difference of projections

$$\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{R}_i}(\mathscr{U}_i) = \sum_{\phi(\mathscr{U}_i)\notin\mathscr{R}_i} \prod_{j\in\mathscr{U}_i} \frac{\mathbb{1} + \phi(x_j)X_j}{2} - \sum_{\phi(\mathscr{U}_i)\in\mathscr{R}_i} \prod_{j\in\mathscr{U}_i} \frac{\mathbb{1} + \phi(x_j)X_j}{2} \tag{5.6}$$

$$= 2 \sum_{\phi(\mathscr{U}_i)\notin\mathscr{R}_i} \prod_{j\in\mathscr{U}_i} \frac{\mathbb{1} + \phi(x_j)X_j}{2} - \mathbb{1}. \tag{5.7}$$

For convenience, we will denote the orthogonal projections

$$\Pi_{\phi,i}(X_j) = \prod_{j \in \mathscr{U}_i} \frac{\mathbb{1} + \phi(x_j)X_j}{2}, \tag{5.8}$$

where $\phi : \mathscr{U}_i \to \{\pm 1\}$ and $1 \leq i \leq m$.

It is not hard to see that the converse is also true. Specifically, given a matrix satisfying assignment of ± 1-valued observables $\{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}$ of dimension d, the BCS nonlocal game can be played perfectly using a strategy where Bob employs the observables $\mathbb{1} \otimes X_j$, Alice employs the observables $Y_{ij} \otimes \mathbb{1} = {X_j}^\top \otimes \mathbb{1}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$, and they share a maximally entangled state $|\tau\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{d} |i\rangle \otimes |i\rangle$. We refer the reader to the details in [CM14, Ji13].

The BCS algebra is based on the observation that polynomial constraint relations abstractly define perfect strategies for BCS nonlocal games.

Definition 5.4. The **BCS algebra** $\mathcal{B}$ of a boolean constraint system $\mathscr{B}$ is the algebra $\mathbb{C}^*\langle V \rangle$ subject to the following algebraic relations:

(1) $x_j^* = x_j$ and $x_j^2 = 1$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$,
(2) $\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{R}_i}(\mathscr{U}_i) = -1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, and
(3) $x_j x_\ell = x_\ell x_j$ whenever $x_j, x_\ell \in \mathscr{U}_i$, for all $1 \leq i \leq m$.

Each $\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{R}_i}(V) = \mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{R}_i}(\mathscr{U}_i)$ is the multilinear indicator polynomial for the constraint $\mathscr{C}_i$ with context $\mathscr{U}_i$.

In a perfect strategy for BCS nonlocal games one can show that Alice and Bobs measurement operators must be the same on the support of the state up to transposition (in the Schmidt basis of the state vector). For self-adjoint operators the transpose is equivalent to the conjugate (in that basis). The following lemma shows that a similiar result will hold in the approximate case:

Lemma 5.5. Let X and Y be self-adjoint unitary operators on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space H and $|\psi\rangle \in H \otimes H$. Then,

$$\langle \psi | X \otimes Y | \psi \rangle \geq 1 - O(\epsilon), \tag{5.9}$$

if and only if

$$\| Y\lambda - \lambda \overline{X} \|_F \leq O(\epsilon^{1/2}), \tag{5.10}$$

where λ is the square-root of the reduced density matrix ρ for the state $|\psi\rangle$. Moreover, if any case where the above holds we also have that

(i) $\| Y\lambda - \lambda Y \|_F \leq O(\epsilon^{1/2})$, and
(ii) $\| \overline{X}\lambda - \lambda \overline{X} \|_F \leq O(\epsilon^{1/2})$

hold.

The proof can be found in [SV18][Proposition 5.4]. By combining this result with Proposition 5.2 we obtain a simple corollary.

Corollary 5.6. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a quantum strategy for a BCS game $\mathcal{G}(\mathscr{B})$ presented in terms of ± 1-valued observables $\{Y_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^{m,n}$, and $\{X_j\}_{j=1}^{n}$, along with a maximally entangled state $|\psi\rangle \in H_A \otimes H_B$. If

$$\|Y_{ij}^{\top} - X_j\|_f \leq \epsilon, \tag{5.11}$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, and $1 \leq j \leq n$, then $\mathcal{S}$ is $O(\epsilon^2)$-perfect.

We now show that Bob's (analogously Alice's) operators in any ϵ-perfect strategy to the BCS game are a state-dependant approximate representation of the BCS algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{G})$. In the remainder of the section, we assume that the state $|\psi\rangle$ is fully supported on the spaces H_A and H_B. In this case, the ρ-seminorm is a norm on the space H_B (or H_A).

Proposition 5.7. Let $\rho = \lambda^*\lambda$ on H_B be the reduced density matrix of the state $|\psi\rangle \in H_A \otimes H_B$ on H_B. If $(\{Y_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^{m,n}, \{X_j\}_{j=1}^{n}, |\psi\rangle \in H_A \otimes H_B)$ is an ϵ-perfect strategy for the BCS game $\mathcal{G}$, then $\{X_j\}_{j=1}^{n}$ is an $(O(\epsilon^{1/2}), \rho)$-representation of the BCS algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{G})$. Moreover, the approximate representation is $O(\epsilon^{1/2})$-tracial.

Proof. A priori each X_j is a self-adjoint unitary, so all that remains is to establish that:

(a) $\|\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{R}_i}(V) + \mathbb{1}\|_\rho \leq O(\epsilon^{1/2})$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, and
(b) $\|X_\ell X_j - X_j X_\ell\|_\rho \leq O(\epsilon^{1/2})$ whenever $X_\ell, X_k \in \mathscr{U}_i$, for all $1 \leq i \leq m$.

For (a), abusing some notation we let $\mathscr{U}_i$ be the variables that appear in the ith constraint polynomial $\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{R}_i}$. For convenience, we define $Z_{ij} := \overline{Y_{ij}}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$. Then, it is not to hard to show that

$$\left\| \prod_{j \in \mathscr{U}_i} X_j \lambda - \lambda \prod_{j \in \mathscr{U}_i} Z_{ij} \right\|_F \leq \sum_{j \in \mathscr{U}_i} \|X_j \lambda - \lambda Z_{ij}\|_F, \tag{5.12}$$

for any $M \subset V$. Since Alice's observables are a matrix valued satisfying assignment, we have that $\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{R}_i}(Z_{i_1}, \ldots, Z_{i_k}) = -\mathbb{1}$. Thus, since $\|X_j\lambda - \lambda Z_{ij}\|_F \leq O(\epsilon^{1/2})$ for each $j \in M$ by Lemma 5.5, we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathscr{F}_{\mathscr{R}_i}(\mathscr{U}_i) + \mathbb{1}\|_\rho &\leq \left\| \sum_{S \subset \mathscr{U}_i} \gamma_M \prod_{j \in M} X_j \lambda - \lambda(-\mathbb{1}) \right\|_F \\ &\leq \sum_{S \subset \mathscr{U}_i} |\gamma_M| \left\| \prod_{j \in M} X_j \lambda - \lambda \prod_{j \in M} Z_{ij} \right\|_F = O(\epsilon^{1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

As desired. To see that (b) holds, we observe that

$$\|X_k X_j - X_j X_k\|_\rho \leq \|X_k X_j \lambda - \lambda Z_{ij} Z_{ik}\|_F + \|X_j X_k \lambda - \lambda Z_{ik} Z_j\|_F, \tag{5.13}$$

since the variables $\{Z_j : j \in \mathscr{U}_i\}$ all commute by virtue of Alice employing a valid quantum strategy. Now we apply the inequality from equation (5.12) to equation (5.13) and we see that (b) holds by Lemma 5.5. Lastly, the approximate tracial

property $\|X_j\lambda - \lambda X_j\|_F^2 = O(\epsilon)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$ follows directly from the second statement of Lemma 5.5. □

We immediately obtain that:

Corollary 5.8. If the state $|\psi\rangle \in H_A \otimes H_B$ in the ϵ-perfect strategy $\mathcal{S}$ for a BCS game $\mathcal{G}$ is maximally entangled, then the operators $\{X_j\}_{j=1}^n$ are an $O(\epsilon^{1/2})$-representation of the BCS algebra $\mathcal{B}$ on H_B (with respect to $\|\cdot\|_f$).

Proof of Theorem 1.1 (1). The proof follows from Proposition 5.14, Proposition 5.7 and Proposition 5.23 as we can apply Lemma 4.12 to the approximate representations of the BCS algebra. □

Our next objective is to show that ϵ-representations of the BCS algebra can be used to obtain near-perfect strategies for the corresponding BCS nonlocal game (provided the players share a maximally entangled state). For this result, we appeal to the strong stability of the group algebra $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}_2^k] = \mathbb{C}^*\langle z_1, \ldots, z_k : z_i^* = z_i, z_i^2 = 1, \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq k, z_i z_j = z_j z_i \text{ for all } 1 \leq i < j \leq k\rangle$, which is established in [Slo19][Lemma 8].

Proposition 5.9. If ϕ is an ϵ-representation of the BCS algebra $\mathcal{B}$ on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space H_B, then there is a $O(\epsilon^2)$-perfect strategy to the BCS game $\mathcal{G}$ using the maximally entangled state $|\tau\rangle \in H_B \otimes H_B$.

Proof. Let φ be an ϵ-representation of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{G})$ on H_B. For a fixed constraint $\mathscr{C}_i$, consider the ϵ-representation restricted to the context $\mathscr{U}_i$. On these variables φ is an ϵ-representation of $\mathbb{Z}_2^{|\mathscr{U}_i|}$. Since the group algebra $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}_2^k]$ is strongly stable for any $k > 0$, there is an exact representation ψ_i of $\mathbb{Z}_2^{|\mathscr{U}_i|}$ such that $\|\varphi(x_j) - \psi_i(x_j)\|_f \leq O(\epsilon)$ for all $j \in \mathscr{U}_i$. Define the ± 1-observables $W_{ij} = \psi_i(x_j)$ for all $j \in \mathscr{U}_i$. The collection of observables $\{W_{ij}\}_{j \in \mathscr{U}_i}$ correspond to measuring an assignment $\phi : \mathscr{U}_i \to \{\pm 1\}$, however, it not necessarily a satisfying assignment for $\mathscr{C}_i$. In particular, if we let $\Pi_{\phi,i}(W_{ij}) = \prod_{j \in \mathscr{U}_i} \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{1} + \phi(x_j)W_{ij})$ then the projection onto unsatisfying assignmnets $\sum_{\phi(\mathscr{U}_i) \notin \mathscr{R}_i} \Pi_{\phi,i}(W_{ij})$ may be non-zero. However, this happens if and only if an irreducible block of W_{ij} with corresponding weight $\nu(x_j) \in \{\pm 1\}$ does not agree with $\phi(x_j)$. Thus, if we multiply each unsafisying irreducible block in each W_{ij} by -1 (leaving the other blocks untouched) we obtain a new ± 1-observable Y_{ij}. Doing this for each W_{ij} gives us a new collection of observables for which $\sum_{\phi(\mathscr{U}_i) \notin \mathscr{R}_i} \Pi_{\phi,i}(Y_{ij}) = 0$. More precisely, define the new collection of observables

$$Y_{ij}^\top = \sum_{\phi(\mathscr{U}_i) \notin \mathscr{R}_i} (\mathbb{1} - \Pi_{\phi,i}(W_{ij}))W_{ij} - \Pi_{\phi,i}(W_{ij})W_{ij}, \tag{5.14}$$

for all $j \in \mathscr{U}_i$. In addition to these new observables being a satisfying assignment, we have that

$$\|W_{ij} - Y_{ij}^\top\|_f = \|W_{ij} - \sum_{\phi(\mathscr{U}_i) \notin \mathscr{R}_i} (\mathbb{1} - \Pi_{\phi,i}(W_{ij}))W_{ij} + \Pi_{\phi,i}(W_{ij})W_{ij}\|_f$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \|\mathbb{1} - \sum_{\phi(\mathscr{U}_i)\notin\mathscr{R}_i} (\mathbb{1} - \Pi_{\phi,i}(W_{ij})) + \Pi_{\phi,i}(W_{ij})\|_f \\
&= \|2 \sum_{\phi(\mathscr{U}_i)\notin\mathscr{R}_i} \Pi_{\phi,i}(W_{ij})\|_f \\
&\leq 2\| \sum_{\phi(\mathscr{U}_i)\notin\mathscr{R}_i} \Pi_{\phi,i}(W_{ij}) - \sum_{\phi(\mathscr{U}_i)\notin\mathscr{R}_i} \Pi_{\phi,i}(X_j))\|_f + \|2 \sum_{\phi(\mathscr{U}_i)\notin\mathscr{R}_i} \Pi_{\phi,i}(X_j)\|_f \\
&\leq 2 \sum_{\phi(\mathscr{U}_i)\notin\mathscr{R}_i} \|\Pi_{\phi,i}(W_{ij}) - \Pi_{\phi,i}(X_j)\|_f + \epsilon \\
&\leq 2 \sum_{j\in\mathscr{U}_i} \|W_{ij} - X_j\|_f + \epsilon \\
&\leq 2 \sum_{j\in\mathscr{U}_i} \|\psi_i(x_j) - \varphi(x_j)\|_f + \epsilon \\
&= O(\epsilon),
\end{aligned}
$$

for all $j \in \mathscr{U}_i$. This means that the number of assignments in W_{ij} that we had to correct was not to large (for small ϵ). Now, consider the strategy consisting of observables $\{X_j\}_{j=1}^n$, $\{Y_{ij}\}_{i=1,j=1}^{m,n}$ and a maximally entangled state $|\tau\rangle \in H_B \otimes H_B$. By Corollary 5.6 the stratgy is $O(\epsilon^2)$-perfect, since $\|Y_{ij}^\top - X_j\|_f \leq \|Y_{ij}^\top - W_{ij}\|_f + \|W_{ij} - X_j\|_f = O(\epsilon)$, for all $1 \leq j \leq n$, and $1 \leq i \leq m$. □

5.2. **Synchronous nonlocal games.** Synchronous games are class of nonlocal games introduced in [PSS+16]. In a synchronous nonlocal game $\mathcal{G}$, the set of questions and answers are the same for each player, i.e. $I = J$ and $A = B$. Additionally, in a synchronous game the players lose if they give different answers to the same question. This latter property is called the **synchronous condition**. In this paper, we will assume the probability distribution is uniform on the questions.

Like BCS nonlocal games there is a finitely presented $*$-algebra we can associated with each synchronous game. Unlike BCS algebras, the associated *synchronous algebra* is typically presented in terms of collections of orthogonal projections:

Definition 5.10. The **synchronous algebra** $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{G})$ of a synchronous game $\mathcal{G}$ is the finitely-presented $*$-algebra $\mathbb{C}^*\langle\, p_a^i : (i,a) \in I \times A\rangle$ satisfying the following relations:

(1) ${p_a^i}^2 = p_a^i = {p_a^i}^*$, for all $(i,a) \in I \times A$,
(2) $\sum_{a\in A} p_a^i = 1$, for all $i \in I$, and
(3) if $\mathcal{V}(a,b,i,j) = 0$, then $p_a^i p_b^j = 0$.

The synchronous condition implies $\mathcal{V}(a,b,i,j) = 0$ whenever $i = j$ and $a \neq b$. In the $*$-algebra this translates to ensuring the fundamental orthogonality relations $p_a^i p_b^i = 0$ in $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{G})$ for all $i \in I$ and $a \neq b \in A$. The class of synchronous algebras is well studied in the literature, and typically in the context of the more general commuting-operator strategies, see for instance [PT15, DP16, HMPS19].

It is clear that whenever a synchronous nonlocal game has a perfect quantum strategy $\mathcal{S}$, Bob's PVM measurement operators $\{\{Q_a^i\}_{a\in A} : i \in I\}$ restricted to the

support of the reduced density matrix ρ_B form a representation of the synchronous algebra associated with $\mathcal{G}$. To analyze near-perfect strategies for synchronous games, we need the following simple lemma.

Lemma 5.11 (Lemma 4.1 in [Slo11])**.** If E and F are self-adjoint operators on Hilbert spaces H_A and H_B respectively with $\rho = \lambda^*\lambda$ the reduced density matrix of $|\psi\rangle$ on H_B, then

$$\|(E \otimes \mathbb{1} - \mathbb{1} \otimes F)|\psi\rangle\| = \|\lambda\overline{E} - F\lambda\|_F,$$

where $\overline{E}$ is the entry-wise conjugate taken with respect to the basis of $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}(H_B)$. Therefore, if $\|(E \otimes \mathbb{1} - \mathbb{1} \otimes F)|\psi\rangle\|_{H_A \otimes H_B} \leq \epsilon$, then $\|E\lambda - \lambda\overline{F}\|_F \leq \epsilon$.

Proposition 5.12. Suppose $\mathcal{G}$ is a synchronous nonlocal game with the uniform distribution on questions. If $\{\{E_a^i\}_{a\in A} : i \in I\}$ and $\{\{F_a^i\}_{a\in A} :\in I\}$ are Alice and Bob PVM's from an ϵ-perfect strategy for $\mathcal{G}$, using the state $|\psi\rangle$, then we have that $\|E_a^i\lambda - \lambda\overline{F_a^i}\|_F \leq O(\epsilon^{1/2})$ for all $i \in I$, $a \in A$.

Proof. If $\mathcal{S}$ is an ϵ-perfect strategy then for any pair of inputs (i, j) we have that $\sum_{a,b\in A\times B} \mathcal{V}(a, b, i, j)p(a, b|i, j) \geq 1 - mn\epsilon$. In particular $\mathcal{V}(a, b, i, j) = 0$ whenever $a \neq b$, so for $\mathcal{S}$ to be ϵ-perfect it must be true that $\sum_{a\neq b}\langle\psi|E_a^i \otimes F_b^i|\psi\rangle \leq mn\epsilon$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. Hence, we see that $\|(E_a^i \otimes \mathbb{1} - \mathbb{1} \otimes F_a^i)|\psi\rangle\|^2 = \sum_{b\neq a}\langle\psi|E_a^i \otimes F_b^i|\psi\rangle + \sum_{a'\neq a}\langle\psi|E_{a'}^i \otimes F_a^i|\psi\rangle \leq 2mn\epsilon$, and the result follows from Lemma 5.11. □

A synchronous nonlocal game is **symmetric** if $\mathcal{V}(b, a, j, i) = 0$ whenever $\mathcal{V}(a, b, i, j) = 0$, for all $a, b \in A$, $i, j \in I$. Although not every synchronous predicate is symmetric, it is not hard to show that every perfect quantum strategy is symmetric. That is, if $\mathcal{V}(a, b, i, j) = 0$ and $\mathcal{S}$ is a perfect quantum strategy, then $p_{\mathcal{S}}(a, b|i, j) = p_{\mathcal{S}}(b, a|j, i) = 0$, see e.g. Corollary 2.2 in [HMPS19].

Proposition 5.13. Let $\mathcal{S} = (\{\{E_a^i\}_{a\in A} : i \in I\}, \{\{F_a^i\}_{a\in A} :\in I\}, |\psi\rangle)$ be a ϵ-perfect strategy for a synchronous nonlocal game $\mathcal{G}$, where λ^2 is the reduced density matrix of $|\psi\rangle$ on H_B. If $\mathcal{V}(a, b, i, j) = 0$ for $a, b \in A$, $i, j \in I$, then $p(b, a|j, i) = p(a, b|i, j) + O(\epsilon^{1/2})$.

Proof. We observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
p(b, a|i, j) &= \langle\psi|E_b^j \otimes F_a^i|\psi\rangle \\
&= \langle\psi|(E_b^j \otimes \mathbb{1})^*(F_a^i \otimes \mathbb{1})|\psi\rangle \\
&= \langle\psi|(E_b^j \otimes \mathbb{1} - \mathbb{1} \otimes F_b^j)^*(\mathbb{1} \otimes F_a^i - E_a^i \otimes \mathbb{1})|\psi\rangle + \langle\psi|E_a^i \otimes F_b^j|\psi\rangle \\
&+ \langle\psi|(\mathbb{1} \otimes F_b^j)^*(\mathbb{1} \otimes F_a^i - E_a^i \otimes \mathbb{1})|\psi\rangle + \langle\psi|(E_b^j \otimes \mathbb{1} - \mathbb{1} \otimes F_b^j)^*(E_a^i \otimes \mathbb{1})|\psi\rangle \\
&\leq \|E_b^j\lambda - \lambda{F_b^j}^T\|_F\|\lambda{E_b^j}^T - F_b^j\lambda\|_F + \|E_b^j\lambda - \lambda{F_b^j}^T\|_F + \|\lambda{E_b^j}^T - F_b^j\lambda\|_F \\
&+ p(a, b|i, j),
\end{aligned}$$

the result follows from Proposition 5.12. □

Proposition 5.14. If $\mathcal{S} = (\{\{E_a^i\}_{a\in A} : i \in I\}, \{\{F_a^i\}_{a\in A} :\in I\}, |\psi\rangle)$ is an ϵ-perfect strategy for a synchronous game $\mathcal{G}$, where ρ is the reduced density matrix of $|\psi\rangle$

on H_B, then $\{\{F_a^i\}_{a\in A} :\in I\}$ is an $O(\epsilon^{1/4})$-representation of the synchronous game algebra in $\mathcal{L}(H_B)$ with respect to the state-induced semi-norm $\|\cdot\|_\rho$. Moreover, the $O(\epsilon^{1/4})$-representation is $(O(\epsilon^{1/2}), \lambda)$-tracial.

Proof. Since $\mathcal{S}$ is ϵ-perfect, whenever $\mathcal{V}(a,b,i,j) = 0$ we have that

$$p(a,b|i,j) = \langle\psi|E_a^i \otimes F_b^j|\psi\rangle = \mathrm{tr}(\overline{E_a^i}\lambda F_b^j\lambda) \leq n^2\epsilon = O(\epsilon).$$

So, by Proposition 5.13 we have $p(b,a|j,i) = \mathrm{tr}(\overline{E_b^j}\lambda F_a^i\lambda) = O(\epsilon^{1/2})$. From Cauchy-Schwarz we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|F_a^iF_b^j\|_\rho^2 &= \|F_a^iF_b^j\lambda\|_F^2 \\
&= \mathrm{tr}(\lambda F_b^jF_a^iF_b^j\lambda) \\
&= \mathrm{tr}(\lambda F_b^jF_a^i(F_b^j\lambda - \lambda\overline{E_b^j})) + \mathrm{tr}(\lambda F_b^jF_a^i\lambda\overline{E_b^j}) \\
&\leq \|F_a^iF_b^j\lambda\|_F\|F_b^j\lambda - \lambda\overline{E_b^j}\|_F + \mathrm{tr}(F_a^i\lambda\overline{E_b^j}\lambda F_b^j)) \\
&= \|F_a^iF_b^j\lambda\|_F\|F_b^j\lambda - \lambda\overline{E_b^j}\|_F + \mathrm{tr}(F_a^i\lambda\overline{E_b^j}(\lambda F_b^j - \overline{E_b^j}\lambda)) + \mathrm{tr}(F_a^i\lambda\overline{E_b^j}^2\lambda) \\
&\leq \|F_a^iF_b^j\lambda\|_F\|F_b^j\lambda - \lambda\overline{E_b^j}\|_F + \|\overline{E_b^j}\lambda F_a^i\|_F\|\lambda F_b^j - \overline{E_b^j}\lambda\|_F + \mathrm{tr}(\overline{E_b^j}\lambda F_a^i\lambda) \\
&\leq \|F_b^j\lambda - \lambda\overline{E_b^j}\|_F + \|\lambda F_b^j - \overline{E_b^j}\lambda\|_F + \mathrm{tr}(\overline{E_b^j}\lambda F_a^i\lambda) \\
&= O(\epsilon^{1/2}),
\end{aligned}$$

using Proposition 5.12. Since $\{\{F_a^i\}_{a\in A} : i \in I\}$ is a PVM, that is each F_a^i is an orthogonal projection such that $\sum_{a\in A} F_a^i = \mathbb{1}_{H_B}$ for each $i \in I$, the remaining relations in Definition 5.10 hold automatically. The fact that the approximate representation is $O(\epsilon^{1/2}, \lambda)$-tracial follow from the second part of Lemma 5.5, by letting $X_a^i = \mathbb{1} - 2E_a^i$ and $Y_a^i = \mathbb{1} - 2F_a^i$ we obtain self-adjoint unitaries satisfying $\|Y_a^i\lambda - \lambda\overline{X}_a^i\|_F \leq O(\epsilon^{1/2})$ for all $i \in I$ and $a \in A$, completing the proof. □

We leave it as an open problem whether this bound on the state-dependent approximate representation is tight in the degree of ϵ. It seems plausible that Proposition 5.13 could be improved to $O(\epsilon)$, which would lead to an $O(\epsilon^{1/2})$-representation in Proposition 5.14. Despite this issue, we obtain an immediate corollary when the state in the employed stategy is maximally entangled.

Corollary 5.15. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be an ϵ-perfect strategy for a synchronous nonlocal game $\mathcal{G}$. If the state $|\psi\rangle$, from the strategy $\mathcal{S}$, is maximally entangled with Schmidt rank equal to $dim(H_B)$, then Bob's measurement operators $\{\{F_a^i\}_{a\in A} : i \in I\}$ are an $O(\epsilon^{1/4})$-representation of the synchronous algebra on $\mathcal{L}(H_B)$ with respect to $\|\cdot\|_f$.

5.3. **The SynchBCS algebra of a synchronous nonlocal game.** Although synchronous and BCS games initially appear quite different, they are actually quite related. Firstly, there is a synchronous version of any BCS game by considering the game where Alice and Bob each receive a constraint $\mathscr{C}_i$ and $\mathscr{C}_j$ and must reply with satisfying assignments to the constraints' variables. In this "synchronized" version of the BCS game, they win if and only if their assignment to all non-zero variables

x_j contained in the context of both constraints are the same. On the other hand, given a synchronous nonlocal game $\mathcal{G}$ consider the BCS game where:

- for each input $i \in I$ and output $a \in A$ there is an associated $\{\pm 1\}$-valued indeterminate $z_{x,a}$,
- whenever $\mathcal{V}(a,b,i,j) = 0$ in the synchronous game add the constraint
$$\widetilde{\text{AND}}(z_{i,a}, z_{j,b}) = 1,$$
- and finally, to ensure that each z_a^i comes from a single measurement (i.e. for any $i \in I$ the subset of z_a^i's are jointly measurable, and exactly one of them outputs a -1), add the constraint $\widetilde{\text{XOR}}_{a\in A}(z_{i,a}) = -1$ for each $i \in I$.

This last constraint prevents two different 1's from each question while ensuring at least one -1 output is given for each input i. In this BCS game, the players can receive any of these constraints and they must reply with a satisfying assignment to the variables in the context. We call this BCS version of the synchronous nonlocal game the *SynchBCS game* associated to a synchronous game. Furthermore, this BCS game has a particular BCS algebra, which we will now consider.

Definition 5.16. The **SynchBCS algebra** of the synchronous nonlocal game is the finitely presented algebra $\mathbb{C}^*\langle z_a^i, \text{ for each pair } (i,a) \in I \times A\rangle$, with relations:

(1) $z_a^i = z_a^{i\,*}$
(2) $z_a^{i\,2} = 1$
(3) If $\mathcal{V}(a,b|i,j) = 0$ then $\widetilde{\mathsf{AND}}(z_a^i, z_b^j) = 1$,
(4) $\prod_{a\in A} z_a^i = -1$ for all $i \in I$
(5) $z_a^i z_{a'}^i = z_{a'}^i z_a^i$ whenever $a, a' \in A$.

By construction, finite-dimensional representations of the SynchBCS algebras give quantum satisfying assignment to the associated SychBCS nonlocal game. Hence, there is a BCS nonlocal game for each synchronous nonlocal game. In [Fri20, Gol21], the authors showed that the synchronous LCS game algebra is isomorphic to the synchronous algebra of projections. We demonstrate that there is an isomorphism in the more general BCS case.

Proposition 5.17. The synchronous game algebra $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{G})$ is isomorphic to the SynchBCS algebra $\mathscr{B}(\mathcal{G})$ as a finitely presented $*$-algebra.

Proof. We begin by describing the $*$-homomorphism $\phi : \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{G}) \to \mathscr{B}(\mathcal{G})$. Define the map on the generators $p_a^i \mapsto (1 - z_a^i)/2$, which extends to a $*$-homomorphism on the free algebra. We now check that it descends to a homomorphism from $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{G})$ to $\mathscr{B}(\mathcal{G})$. First note that $\phi(p_a^i)$ is an an orthogonal projection, since $z_a^{i\,*} = z_a^i$, $z_a^{i\,2} = 1$, and $z_a^i z_{a'}^i = z_{a'}^i z_a^i$ for all $a, a' \in A$. Moreover, the $\widetilde{\mathsf{AND}}$ relation implies that $1 - z_a^i - z_b^j + z_a^i z_b^j = 0$ whenever $\mathcal{V}(a,b|i,j) = 0$, and thus

$$\phi(p_a^i)\phi(p_b^i) = \frac{(1 - z_a^i)}{2}\frac{(1 - z_{j,b})}{2} = 0$$

is satisfied whenever $\mathcal{V}(a,b|i,j) = 0$.

For each $i \in I$ with $|A| = n$, observe that the unit 1 can be expanded as the sum of indicator polynomials in the variables z_a^i, giving us

$$1 = \sum_{(e_1,\ldots,e_n)\in\{\pm 1\}^n} \prod_{a\in A} \frac{(1+e_a z_a^i)}{2}. \tag{5.15}$$

However, upon enforcing (r.3) we notice that $\prod_{a\in A} \frac{(1+e_a z_a^i)}{2} = 0$, whenever there is a pair $a, a' \in A$ with $e_a = e_{a'} = -1$. Thus, there are only two cases we need to consider, the first is when $e_a = 1$ for all $a \in A$. In this case we have the term

$$\prod_{a\in A} \frac{(1+z_a^i)}{2} = \frac{1}{2^n}\left(\sum_{S\subseteq[n]} \prod_{a\in S} z_a^i\right), \tag{5.16}$$

where $|A| = n$. Now, recall that (r.4) ensures that $\prod_{a\in A} z_a^i = -1$, and observe that this has the following consequence,

$$\prod_{a\in S} z_a^i + \prod_{a\in[n]\setminus S} z_a^i = 0, \tag{5.17}$$

for any $S \subseteq [n]$, by recalling that each ${z_a^i}^2 = 1$, from (r.2). It follows that equation (5.16) is 0 because each subset $S \subseteq [n]$ is in bijection with its complementary subset $S^c = [n]\setminus S$, and so by equation (5.17) each term with an S product cancels out with the term for S^c product. In the other case, the remaining terms are those with is exactly one $a \in A$ with $e_a = -1$. In this case let $f_a^i = (1-z_a^i)/2$ and $f_{a'}^i = (1-z_{a'}^i)/2$ and observe that f_a^i and $f_{a'}^i$ are self-adjoint orthogonal projections with $f_a^i f_{a'}^i = 0$, and therefore $f_a^i(1-f_{a'}^i) = f_a^i - f_a^i f_{a'}^i = f_a^i$. Then, noting $1 - f_{a'}^i = (1+z_{a'}^i)/2$, it follows that $f_a^i\left[\prod_{a'\neq a}(1-f_{a'}^i)\right] = f_a^i$. With these being the only remaining terms in (5.15), we see that

$$1 = \sum_{a\in A} \frac{(1-z_a^i)}{2} \prod_{a'\neq a} \frac{(1+z_{a'}^i)}{2} = \sum_{a\in A} \frac{(1-z_a^i)}{2} = \sum_{a\in A} \phi(p_a^i),$$

for all $i \in I$, as desired. This shows that indeed ϕ a $*$-homomorphism of unital $*$-algebras.

On the other hand, consider the map $\varphi : \mathscr{B}(\mathcal{G}) \to \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{G})$ defined by sending the generators $z_a^i \mapsto (1_{\mathcal{A}} - 2p_a^i)$. Recalling that $p_a^i p_b^i = 0$ for all $a \neq b$, we see that

$$\prod_{a\in A} \varphi(z_a^i) = \prod_{a\in A}(1-2p_a^i) = \sum_{S\subset A}(-2)^{|S|} \prod_{a\in S} p_a^i = 1_{\mathcal{A}} + (-2)\sum_{a\in A} p_a^i = -1_{\mathcal{A}},$$

by recalling relation (r.2) in $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{G})$. Now, if $\mathcal{V}(a,b|i,j) = 0$ then we have that $p_a^i p_b^j = 0$, hence

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\mathsf{AND}}(\varphi(z_a^i),\varphi(z_b^i)) = \frac{1}{2}\big(&1_{\mathcal{A}} + (1+2p_a^i) + (1_{\mathcal{A}} + 2p_b^j)\\ &- (1_{\mathcal{A}} + 2p_a^i)(1_{\mathcal{A}} + 2p_b^j)\big)\end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}\left(2 \cdot 1_{\mathcal{A}} + 2p_a^i + 2p_b^j - 2p_a^i - 2p_b^j - 4p_a^i p_b^j\right)$$
$$= 1_{\mathcal{A}}.$$

Lastly, since $V(a,b|i,i) = 0$ then we have that $\varphi(z_a^i)\varphi(z_b^i) = (1_{\mathcal{A}} + 2p_a^i)(1_{\mathcal{A}} + 2p_b^i) = 1_{\mathcal{A}} + 2p_a^i + 2p_b^i = \varphi(z_b^i)\varphi(z_a^i)$ for all $a \neq b$ as desired.

It remains to show that φ and ϕ are mutual inverses. Observe that,

$$\varphi\left(\phi(p_a^i)\right) = \varphi\left(\frac{1 - z_a^i}{2}\right) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\varphi(1) - \varphi(z_a^i)\right) = \frac{1}{2}\left(1_{\mathcal{A}} - (1_{\mathcal{A}} - 2p_a^i)\right) = p_a^i.$$

Similarly,

$$\phi\left(\varphi(z_a^i)\right) = \phi(1_{\mathcal{A}} - 2p_a^i) = \phi(1_{\mathcal{A}}) - 2\phi(p_a^i) = 1 - 2\frac{(1 - z_a^i)}{2} = z_a^i,$$

thus $\varphi \circ \phi = id_{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{G})}$ and $\phi \circ \varphi = id_{\mathscr{B}(\mathcal{G})}$, and the result follows. □

Recall that for a BCS nonlocal game, starting from an ϵ-perfect strategy with an arbitrary state, our rounding result will give us an $O(\epsilon^{1/4})$-representation of the BCS algebra in the $\|\cdot\|_f$-norm. To apply our rounding result in the synchronous algebra case we need to ensure that, under the isomorphism in Proposition 5.17, an ϵ-representation of the synchronous algebra $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{G})$ gives us an $O(\epsilon)$-representation of the SynchBCS algebra in the ρ-norm. We cannot use Proposition 4.5 here because the approximate representation is not state-idependent. Nevertheless, it is still true in this case.

Proposition 5.18. If ψ is an ϵ-representation of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{G})$ in the ρ-norm, then under the $*$-homorphism $\phi : \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{G}) \to \mathscr{B}(\mathcal{G})$ from Proposition 5.17 we have that $\phi \circ \psi$ is a $(O(\epsilon), \rho)$-representation of $\mathscr{B}(\mathcal{G})$.

Proof of Proposition 5.18. It is easy to see that if $\|{F_a^i}^2 - F_a^i\|_\rho \leq \epsilon$ and $\|{F_a^i}^* - F_a^i\|_\rho \leq \epsilon$, then $\|{X_a^i}^2 - \mathbb{1}\|_\rho \leq 4\epsilon$ and $\|{X_a^i}^* - X_a^i\|_\rho \leq 2\epsilon$. So it remains to show that (3), (4), and (5) hold.

If $\mathcal{V}(a,b|i,j) = 0$ and $\|F_a^i F_b^j\|_\rho \leq \epsilon$, and we set $X_i^a = \mathbb{1} - 2F_a^i$. Note that $\|\widetilde{\mathsf{AND}}(z_a^i, z_b^j) - 1\|_\rho = \|1 - z_a^i - z_b^j + z_a^i z_b^j\|_\rho$. Then,

$$\|\mathbb{1} - X_a^i - X_b^j + X_a^i X_b^j\|_\rho = 4\left\|\frac{(\mathbb{1} - X_a^i)}{2}\frac{(\mathbb{1} - X_b^j)}{2}\right\|_\rho = 4\|F_a^i F_b^j\|_\rho \leq 4\epsilon.$$

Lastly,

$$\left\|\prod_{a\in A} X_a^i + \mathbb{1}\right\|_\rho = \left\|\prod_{a\in A}(\mathbb{1} - 2F_a^i) + \mathbb{1}\right\|_\rho$$
$$= \left\|\sum_{\alpha\subset A}(-2)^{|\alpha|}\prod_{a\in\alpha} F_a^i + \mathbb{1}\right\|_\rho$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \left\| \sum_{|\alpha|=1} (-2) F_a^i + 2\mathbb{1} + \sum_{|\alpha|>1} (-2)^{|\alpha|} \prod_{a\in\alpha} F_a^i \right\|_\rho \\
&\leq 2\|\mathbb{1} - \sum_a F_a^i\|_\rho + \sum_{|\alpha|>1} 2^{|\alpha|} \| \prod_{a\in\alpha} F_a^i\|_\rho \\
&\leq 2\epsilon + \sum_{|\alpha|>1} 2^{|\alpha|} \prod_{a''\in\alpha\setminus\{a,a'\}} \|F_{a''}^i\|_{op} \|F_{a'}^i F_a^i\|_\rho \\
&\leq 2\epsilon + \sum_{|\alpha|>1} |2|^{|\alpha|} C^{|\alpha|-1} \|F_a^i F_{a'}^i\|_\rho \\
&\leq 2\epsilon + 2^{2|A|} C^{|A|-1} \epsilon \\
&= O(\epsilon),
\end{aligned}
$$

where C is the constant that bounds the operator norm of each F_a^i. Now, we ensure that the commutation relation holds for all $a \neq a'$, $i \in I$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|X_a^i X_{a'}^i - X_{a'}^i X_a^i\|_\rho &= \|(\mathbb{1} - 2F_a^i)(\mathbb{1} - 2F_{a'}^i) - (\mathbb{1} - 2F_{a'}^i)(\mathbb{1} - 2F_a^i)\|_\rho \\
&\leq 4(\|F_a^i F_{a'}^i\|_\rho + \|F_{a'}^i F_a^i\|_\rho) \\
&= O(\epsilon),
\end{aligned}
$$

as desired. □

Although Proposition 5.18 works for arbitrary ϵ-representations, for our applications the approximate representation of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{G})$ in the ρ-norm is *exact* on relations (1),(2), and (3) in Definition 5.10 because they begin as measurements from some quantum strategy. Moreover, if $X_a^i = \mathbb{1} - 2F_a^i$ is the ± 1-valued observable assigned to the orthogonal projection onto outcome (i, a) then under the isomorphism in Proposition 5.17 the collection of observables $\{X_a^i\}_{(i,a)\in I\times A}$ generate an $O(\epsilon^{1/2})$-representation the SynchBCS algebra $\mathscr{B}(\mathcal{G})$. It is clear that the relations (1),(2),(4), and (5) in Definition 5.16 hold exactly in this approximate representation due to the fact $\mathcal{S}$ is a PVM strategy. Therefore it only remains to check that relation (3) in Definition 5.16 holds approximately, which we leave to reader to verify. Lastly, we see that since the projections satisfy the property in Proposition 5.12, we see that their corresponding observables satisfy the hypothesis of Lemma 5.5, and we see the following holds.

Corollary 5.19. If $\mathcal{S}$ is an ϵ-perfect synchronous strategy for a synchronous nonlocal game $\mathcal{G}$, then the corresponding $(O(\epsilon^{1/4}), \rho)$-representation of the SynchBCS algebra is $O(\epsilon^{1/2})$-tracial.

Corollary 5.19 will allow us to apply our rounding result to synchronous algebras by first moving to the synchBCS algebra. Our final task in this subsection is to show that approximate representations of the synchrounous algebra give rise to nearby near-perfect quantum strategies.

Proposition 5.20. Given an ϵ-representation of the synchronous algebra $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{G})$ on a Hilbert space H, there is a nearby $O(\epsilon^2)$-perfect synchronous strategy using a maximally entangled state.

Proof. Suppose that ϕ is an ϵ-representation of the synchronous algebra on a Hilbert space H. By the strong stability of the complete orthogonal projection algebra (see [KPS18]), there exists self-adjoing projections $\{\{\Pi_a^i : a \in A\} : i \in I\}$, such that $\sum_a \Pi_a^i = \mathbb{1}$ for all $i \in I$, $\Pi_a^i \Pi_b^i = 0$ for $a \neq b$, for all $i \in$I, and $\|\Pi_a^i - \phi(p_a^i)\|_f = O(\epsilon)$, for all $i \in I$, $a \in A$. Moreover, by Lemma 4.10 these projections also satisfy $\|\Pi_a^i \Pi_b^j\|_f = O(\epsilon)$, whenever $\mathcal{V}(a,b|i,j) = 0$. Consider the quantum strategy where Alice employs the PVMs $\{\{P_a^i = {\Pi_a^i}^\top : a \in A\} : i \in I\}$ (the transpose is taken with respect to the standard basis), Bob uses PVMs $\{\{Q_b^j = \Pi_a^i : b \in A\} : j \in I\}$, and they share the maximally entangled state $|\tau\rangle \in H \otimes H$. For this strategy, the probability of losing on question pair (i,j) is

$$\sum_{a,b:\mathcal{V}(a,b|i,j)=0} \langle\psi|P_a^i \otimes Q_b^j|\psi\rangle = \sum_{a,b:\mathcal{V}(a,b|i,j)=0} \widetilde{\mathrm{tr}}({P_a^i}^\top Q_b^j) = \sum_{a,b:\mathcal{V}(a,b|i,j)=0} \|\Pi_a^i \Pi_b^j\|_f^2 = O(\epsilon^2).$$

It follows that the strategy is $O(\epsilon^2)$-perfect.

□

5.4. **XOR nonlocal games.** An XOR game is a nonlocal game where Alice and Bob are given questions $i \in [m]$ and $j \in [m]$ according to a distribution $\pi(i,j)$, and they respond with 1-bit answers a and b. The predicate is determined by the XOR of the answers bits. For an XOR game, we can describe the predicate by an $m \times n$ $\{0,1\}$-matrix T with entries $(T)_{i,j} = t_{ij}$, such that

$$\mathcal{V}(a,b,i,j) = \begin{cases} 1, \text{ if } a \oplus b = t_{ij}, \\ 0, \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}. \tag{5.18}$$

Letting $w_{ij} = (-1)^{t_{ij}} \pi(i,j)$, we obtain the **cost matrix** W for an XOR game. Given the cost matrix of a game one can conveniently express the **bias** of an XOR game under a strategy $\mathcal{S}$ consisting of ± 1-valued observables $\{Y_1, \ldots, Y_m\}$ for Alice, $\{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}$ for Bob, and a vector state $|\psi\rangle \in H_A \otimes H_B$, as

$$\beta(\mathcal{G};\mathcal{S}) = \sum_{i=1,j=1}^{m,n} w_{ij} \langle\psi|Y_i \otimes X_j|\psi\rangle. \tag{5.19}$$

The supremum over all quantum strategies $\mathcal{S}$ gives the **optimal bias** denoted by $\beta_q(\mathcal{G})$ for the XOR game $\mathcal{G}$.

To recover the typical PVM strategy, we can view each ± 1-observable as the difference of a 2-outcome projection. That is, for an XOR game where Alice has a PVM strategy $\{\{P_a^i\}_{a\in\{0,1\}} : 1 \leq i \leq m\}$ we have $Y_i = P_0^i - P_1^i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, and if Bob has a set of PVMs $\{\{Q_a^i\}_{b\in\{0,1\}} : 1 \leq j \leq n\}$ we have $X_j = Q_0^j - Q_1^j$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$. Note that since these are 2-outcome measurements, and sinc $P_0^i + P_1^i = \mathbb{1}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, the PVMs are uniquely determined by each Y_i (and similarly for

Bob's projections given X_j). Like in the BCS case, the bias relates to the value of an XOR game by $\beta(\mathcal{G};\mathcal{S}) = 2\omega(\mathcal{G};\mathcal{S}) - 1$.

A result of Tsirelson shows that the quantum value of an XOR game can be computed using a semi-definite program [CHTW10, Weh06, CSUU08]. Unlike the BCS case, this characterization makes finding and describing the optimal strategies for XOR game computationally tractable. In particular, using this formulation it was shown in [Slo11] that if a strategy $\mathcal{S}$ for an XOR game is optimal, then the measurement observables satisfy the following *rigidity* property

$$\sum_j w_{ij} X_j \lambda = r_i \lambda \overline{Y}_i, \tag{5.20}$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, where each r_i is the **marginal row biases** associated with $1 \leq i \leq m$, and λ is the square root of the reduced density matrix of the strategy quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ on H_B. With this equation in mind, the author of [Slo11] defined the XOR-algebra associated to an XOR nonlocal game $\mathcal{G}$ in terms of abstract relations resembling equation (5.20) along with the ± 1-valued observable relations.

Definition 5.21. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an XOR game with an $m \times n$ cost matrix W, and marginal row biases $\{r_i \in \mathbb{R} : 1 \leq i \leq m\}$. The **XOR algebra** $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G})$ is the finitely presented algebra $\mathbb{C}^*\langle x_1, \ldots, x_n\rangle$ subject to the relations:

(1) $x_j = x_j^*$ and $x_j^2 = 1$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$,

(2) $\left(\sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij} x_j\right)^2 = r_i^2 \cdot 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$.

Using the characterization of optimal strategies in terms of the semi-definite program, Slofstra was able to establish the following approximate rigidity result.

Theorem 5.22 (Theorem 3.1 in [Slo11])**.** For every XOR game $\mathcal{G}$ there exists a collection of constants $r_i \geq 0$ such that if $\mathcal{S} = (\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{X_j\}_{j=1}^n, |\psi\rangle)$ is an ϵ-optimal strategy of ± 1-valued observables, with $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{4(m+n)}$, then

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij} (\mathbb{1} \otimes X_j) - r_i (Y_i \otimes \mathbb{1}) \right) |\psi\rangle \right\| = O(\epsilon^{1/4}), \tag{5.21}$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, and the constants hidden in the $O(\epsilon^{1/4})$ depend only on the size of the input sets m and n.

In other words, Theorem 5.22 establishes that near-optimal strategies are state-dependent approximate reprentations of the XOR algebra (given in Definition 5.21). With this fact, we can establish the following result:

Proposition 5.23. Let $\mathcal{S} = (\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{X_j\}_{j=1}^n, |\psi\rangle \in H_A \otimes H_B)$ be an ϵ-optimal strategy to an XOR game $\mathcal{G}$ where $|\psi\rangle$ has reduced density matrix $\rho = \in \mathcal{L}(H_B)$, then the observables $\{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}$ are an $(O(\epsilon^{1/4}), \rho)$-representation of the solution algebra $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G})$. Additionally, the $(O(\epsilon^{1/4}), \rho)$-representation is $(O(\epsilon^{1/4}), \rho)$-tracial.

Proof. If $\mathcal{S}$ is an ϵ-optimal strategy for the XOR game $\mathcal{G}$ and $\rho = \lambda^*\lambda$ is the reduced dentity matrix of the state on H_B, then since each X_j is a self-adjoint unitary, it only remains to show relation (2) in Definition 5.21 holds approximately. That is,

$$\left\| r_i^2 \mathbb{1} - \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{ij} X_j \right)^2 \right\|_\rho = O(\epsilon^{1/4}),$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. By Theorem 5.22 and Lemma 5.5 we can see that in general

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{ij} X_j \lambda - \lambda r_i \overline{Y_i} \right\|_F = O(\epsilon^{1/4}). \tag{5.22}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| r_i^2 \lambda - \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{ij} X_j \right)^2 \lambda \right\|_F \\
\leq &\left\| r_i^2 \lambda - \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{ij} X_j r_i \lambda \overline{Y}_i \right\|_F + \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{ij} X_j r_i \lambda \overline{Y}_i - \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{ij} X_j \right)^2 \lambda \right\|_F \\
\leq &\left\| r_i^2 \lambda \overline{Y}_i - \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{ij} X_j r_i \lambda \right\|_F + \sum_{j=1}^{n} |w_{ij}| \left\| X_j \left(r_i \lambda \overline{Y}_i - \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{ij} X_j \lambda \right) \right\|_F \\
\leq &|r_i| \left\| r_i \lambda \overline{Y}_i - \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{ij} X_j \lambda \right\|_F + \sum_{j=1}^{n} |w_{ij}| \left\| r_i \lambda \overline{Y}_i - \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{ij} X_j \lambda \right\|_F
\end{aligned}$$

is $O(\epsilon^{1/4})$ by equation (5.22). That this approximate representation is $(O(\epsilon^{1/4}), \lambda)$-tracial, follows again from Lemma 5.5 and equation (5.22). □

Corollary 5.24. If the state $|\psi\rangle$ in the ϵ-optimal strategy $\mathcal{S}$ for the XOR nonlocal game $\mathcal{G}$ is maximally entangled with rank equal to $dim(H_B)$ then $\{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}$ is a (state-independent) $O(\epsilon^{1/4})$-representation of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G})$ on $\mathcal{L}(H_B)$ (with respect to $\|\cdot\|_f$).

Our last task is to determine the optimality of strategies arising from ϵ-representations in the $\|\cdot\|_f$-norm of the XOR algebra.

Proposition 5.25. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an XOR game. Given a ϵ-representations of the solution algebra $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G})$ on a Hilbert space H, there is an $O(\epsilon^2)$-optimal strategy for the corresponding XOR game using a maximally entangled state.

Proof. Let ϕ be an ϵ-representation of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G})$. Start by defining the operators $\phi(x_j)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$ on the Hilbert space H_B. We note that theses may not be true ± 1-valued observables. However, by Lemma 4.9, we can find a nearby ± 1-valued observables X_j such that $\|X_j - \phi(s_j)\|_f \leq O(\epsilon)$, for all $1 \leq j \leq n$. Let $\{X_1, \ldots, X_j\}$

be Bob's quantum strategy. Now, define

$$Z_i^\top = \frac{1}{r_i}\sum_j w_{ij}X_j,$$

for each $1 \leq i \leq m$. Again by Lemma 4.9, since

$$\|Z_i^2 - \mathbb{1}\|_f = \frac{1}{|r_i^2|}\left\|\left(\sum_j w_{ij}X_j\right)^2 - r_i^2\mathbb{1}\right\|_f \leq O(\epsilon),$$

we can find a self-adjoint unitary Y_i such that $Y_i^2 = \mathbb{1}$, $Y_i^* = Y_i$ and $\|Z_i^\top - Y_i\|_f \leq O(\epsilon)$. Then define Alice's strategy to consist of the operators $\{Y_1, \ldots, Y_m\}$ as defined for each $1 \leq i \leq m$. If the maximally entangled state on $H_B \otimes H_B$ is employed by the players, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\beta_q(\mathcal{G}) - \beta(\mathcal{S};\mathcal{G})| &= \left|\sum_i r_i - \sum_{ij} w_{ij}\langle\psi|Y_i \otimes X_j|\psi\rangle\right| \\
&\leq \sum_i r_i \left|1 - \langle\psi|Y_i \otimes {Z_i}^\top|\psi\rangle\right| \\
&\leq \sum_i \frac{r_i}{2}\left|\tilde{\mathrm{tr}}(2\mathbb{1} - 2{Y_i}^\top Z_i)\right| \\
&\leq \sum_i \frac{r_i}{2}\|{Y_i}^\top - Z_i\|_f^2 \\
&= O(\epsilon^2)
\end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

6. Proofs of main results

In this brief section, we outline how the results of the previous sections culminate to establish Theorem 1.1, Theorem 1.2, and Corollary 1.3 stated in Section 1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. To establish the BCS case (1), it follows from Proposition 5.7 that any ϵ-perfect strategy for a BCS game $\mathcal{G}$ with reduced density matrix ρ, gives a state-dependent $(O(\epsilon^{1/2}), \rho)$-representation of the BCS algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{G})$ that is $O(\epsilon^{1/2})$-tracial. Since the operators in any strategy are ± 1-valued observables the approximate representation is exact for the self-adjoint unitary relations. Hence, the result follows by applying Lemma 4.12, which results in an $O(\epsilon^{1/4})$-representation of the BCS algebra in the $\|\cdot\|_f$-norm.

The synchronous case (2) is similiar. By Proposition 5.14 any ϵ-perfect strategy for a synchronous game $\mathcal{G}$ with reduced density matrix ρ gives a state-dependent $(O(\epsilon^{1/4}, \rho)$-representation of the synchronous algebra $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{G})$ that is $O(\epsilon^{1/2})$-tracial. By Corollary 5.19, this state-depenent approximate representation is a $O(\epsilon^{1/2})$-tracial $(O(\epsilon^{1/4}, \rho)$-representation of the synchBCS algebra $\mathscr{B}(\mathcal{G})$ that is exact on the self-adjoing unitary relations. Again, by applying Lemma 4.12, we obtain a

$O(\epsilon^{1/8})$-representation in the $\|\cdot\|_f$-norm of the synchBCS algebra. Finally, by the $*$-isomorphism described in Proposition 5.17 combined with Proposition 4.5, we obtain a state-independent $O(\epsilon^{1/8})$-representation of the synchronous algebra.

For the XOR case (3), Proposition 5.23 establishes that any ϵ-perfect strategy for an XOR game $\mathcal{G}$ results in an $O(\epsilon^{1/4})$-tracial $(O(\epsilon^{1/4}, \rho)$-representation of the XOR algebra $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G})$. Again, because the operators are ± 1-valued observables, the approximate representation is exact for the self-adjoint unitary relations. Hence, by Lemma 4.12 we obtain a state-indepenent $O(\epsilon^{1/8})$-representation of the XOR algebra. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. The BCS case (1) follows directly from Proposition 5.9. The synchrounous case (2) follows from Proposition 5.20. Lastly, the XOR case (3) follows from Proposition 5.25. □

Proof of Corollary 1.3. For the BCS (1), synchronous (2), and XOR (3) case, the proof of Theorem 1.1 shows that any ϵ-perfect (resp. ϵ-optimal in the XOR case) can be rounded to a state-independent approximate representation. Given that state-independent approximate representation the quality (in terms of ϵ) of the resulting near-perect (resp. near optimal) strategy using the maximally entangled state follows from Theorem 1.2 in all three cases.

It only remains to show that the measurement operators in the rounded strategy using the maximally entangled state are not to far from the operators in the original ϵ-perfect (resp. ϵ-optimal) stratgy. Towards this point, in the proof of Lemma 4.12 we see that on the support of the projection P each unitary $\widetilde{X}_j$ is close to the starting self-adjoing unitary X_j (see Equation (4.12)). In particular, this distance depends on the parameters of the initial approximate representation. In the BCS case, we conclude that the measurement operators in the rounded quantum strategy are $O(\epsilon^{1/4})$-away from the initial measurement operators in the $\|\cdot\|_f$-norm on the subspace $\widetilde{H}$. In the synchronous and XOR case we obtain that measurements are at most $O(\epsilon^{1/8})$-away in the $\|\cdot\|_f$-norm on the subspaces $\widetilde{H}$ obtained from Lemma 4.12 in both cases. Finally, in the proof of Theorem 1.2 we note that whenever we obtain a stratgy for the corresponding nonlocal game from an $O(\epsilon')$-representation, the measurement operators are never more than $O(\epsilon')$-away from the measurement operator in the initial strategy. □

References

[BŠCA18a] Joseph Bowles, Ivan Šupić, Daniel Cavalcanti, and Antonio Acín. Device-independent entanglement certification of all entangled states. *Physical review letters*, 121(18):180503, 2018.

[BŠCA18b] Joseph Bowles, Ivan Šupić, Daniel Cavalcanti, and Antonio Acín. Self-testing of Pauli observables for device-independent entanglement certification. *Physical Review A*, 98(4):042336, 2018.

[CHTW10] Richard Cleve, Peter Hoyer, Ben Toner, and John Watrous. Consequences and limits of nonlocal strategies. *arXiv:quant-ph/0404076*, Jan 2010. arXiv: quant-ph/0404076.

[CLS17] Richard Cleve, Li Liu, and William Slofstra. Perfect commuting-operator strategies for linear system games. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 58(1):012202, Jan 2017. arXiv: 1606.02278.

[CM14] Richard Cleve and Rajat Mittal. Characterization of binary constraint system games. In *Automata, Languages, and Programming: 41st International Colloquium, ICALP 2014, Copenhagen, Denmark, July 8-11, 2014, Proceedings, Part I 41*, pages 320–331. Springer, 2014.

[Con76] Alain Connes. Classification of injective factors cases ii_1, ii_∞, $iii_{\lambda,\lambda\neq 1}$. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 73–115, 1976.

[CSUU08] Richard Cleve, William Slofstra, Falk Unger, and Sarvagya Upadhyay. Strong parallel repetition theorem for quantum xor proof systems. *arXiv:quant-ph/0608146*, Apr 2008. arXiv: quant-ph/0608146.

[CVY23] Michael Chapman, Thomas Vidick, and Henry Yuen. Efficiently stable presentations from error-correcting codes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.04681*, 2023.

[DP16] Kenneth J Dykema and Vern Paulsen. Synchronous correlation matrices and connes' embedding conjecture. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 57(1):015214, 2016.

[Fri20] Tobias Fritz. Quantum logic is undecidable. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, Sep 2020. arXiv: 1607.05870.

[GH17] William Timothy Gowers and Omid Hatami. Inverse and stability theorems for approximate representations of finite groups. *Sbornik: Mathematics*, 208(12), 2017.

[Gol21] Adina Goldberg. Synchronous linear constraint system games. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 62(3):032201, 2021.

[HMPS19] J William Helton, Kyle P Meyer, Vern I Paulsen, and Matthew Satriano. Algebras, synchronous games, and chromatic numbers of graphs. *New York J. Math*, 25:328–361, 2019.

[Ji13] Zhengfeng Ji. Binary constraint system games and locally commutative reductions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1310.3794*, 2013.

[JNV+22] Zhengfeng Ji, Anand Natarajan, Thomas Vidick, John Wright, and Henry Yuen. Mip*= re. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.04383v3*, 2022.

[Kan20] Jedrzej Kaniewski. Weak form of self-testing. *Physical Review Research*, 2, 2020.

[KPS18] Se-Jin Kim, Vern Paulsen, and Christopher Schafhauser. A synchronous game for binary constraint systems. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 59(3):032201, 2018.

[LMP+20] Martino Lupini, Laura Mančinska, Vern I Paulsen, David E Roberson, Giannicola Scarpa, Simone Severini, Ivan G Todorov, and Andreas Winter. Perfect strategies for non-local games. *Mathematical Physics, Analysis and Geometry*, 23(1):7, 2020.

[MY04] Dominic Mayers and Andrew Yao. Self testing quantum apparatus. *Quantum Info. Comput.*, 4(4):273–286, jul 2004.

[Oza13] Narutaka Ozawa. About the connes embedding conjecture: algebraic approaches. *Japanese Journal of Mathematics*, 8(1):147–183, 2013.

[PS23] Connor Paddock and William Slofstra. Satisfiability problems and algebras of binary constraint systems games. *in preparation*, 2023.

[PSS+16] Vern I. Paulsen, Simone Severini, Daniel Stahlke, Ivan G. Todorov, and Andreas Winter. Estimating quantum chromatic numbers. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 270(6):2188–2222, Mar 2016.

[PT15] Vern I Paulsen and Ivan G Todorov. Quantum chromatic numbers via operator systems. *The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics*, 66(2):677–692, 2015.

[Slo11] William Slofstra. Lower bounds on the entanglement needed to play XOR non-local games. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 52(10):102202, 2011.

[Slo18] William Slofstra. A group with at least subexponential hyperlinear profile. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.05267*, 2018.

[Slo19] William Slofstra. The set of quantum correlations is not closed. *Forum of Mathematics, Pi*, 7:e1, 2019.

[SV18] William Slofstra and Thomas Vidick. Entanglement in non-local games and the hyperlinear profile of groups. *Annales Henri Poincaré*, 19(10):2979–3005, 2018.

[SVW16] Jamie Sikora, Antonios Varvitsiotis, and Zhaohui Wei. Minimum dimension of a Hilbert space needed to generate a quantum correlation. *Physical Review Letters*, 117(6):060401, 2016.

[Tho18] Andreas Thom. Finitary approximations of groups and their applications. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians (ICM 2018) (In 4 Volumes) Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians 2018*, pages 1779–1799. World Scientific, 2018.

[Tsi85] BS Tsirelson. Quantum analogues of bell's inequalities. the case of two spatially divided domains. *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov.(LOMI)*, 142:174–194, 1985. In Russian.

[Tsi87] BS Tsirelson. Quantum analogues of bell's inequalities. the case of two spatially divided domains. *Journal of Soviet Mathematics*, 36(4):557–570, 1987. Translated from Russian.

[Vid22] Thomas Vidick. Almost synchronous quantum correlations. *Journal of mathematical physics*, 63(2):022201, 2022.

[WBMS16] Xingyao Wu, Jean-Daniel Bancal, Matthew McKague, and Valerio Scarani. Device-independent parallel self-testing of two singlets. *Physical Review A*, 93(6), 2016.

[Weh06] Stephanie Wehner. Tsirelson bounds for generalized Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt inequalities. *Physical Review A*, 73(2):022110, 2006.

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Ottawa, Canada
Email address: cpaulpad@uottawa.ca