

Feats, Features and Failures of the PR-box

Valerio Scarani

Group of Applied Physics, University of Geneva
20, rue de l'Ecole-de-Médecine, CH-1211 Genève 4, Switzerland

One of the most intriguing features of quantum physics is the non-locality of correlations that can be obtained by measuring entangled particles. Recently, it has been noticed that non-locality can be studied without reference to the Hilbert space formalism. I review here the properties of the basic mathematical tool used for such studies, the so called Popescu-Rohrlich-box, in short PR-box. Among its feats, are the simulation of the correlations of the singlet and of other non-local probability distributions. Among its features, the "anomaly of non-locality" and a great power for information-theoretical tasks. Among its failures, the impossibility of reproducing all multi-partite distributions and the triviality of the allowed dynamics.

I. INTRODUCTION

This article is a review of recent investigations about non-locality in physics. Here, non-locality is taken in the following precise sense:

Non-locality: *There exist in nature channels connecting two (or more) distant partners, that can distribute correlations which can neither be caused by the exchange of a signal (the channel does not allow signalling, and moreover, a hypothetical signal should travel faster than light), nor be due to pre-determined agreement (because the correlations violate the so-called "Bell's inequalities").*

Any physicist knows that the "channel" that distributes such non-local correlations are "entangled quantum particles". The historical path to the discovery of quantum non-locality has been reviewed many times — and one of the common points I share with GianCarlo Ghirardi is that each of us has written a book for a broad audience whose core is precisely this discovery [1,2]. To appreciate the scope of the approach to non-locality reviewed here, it is useful to stress that non-local correlations are *an observed phenomenon*. As such, they have some independence of quantum physics. This implies: First, even if one day quantum physics is overcome by a more general theory, non-local correlations shall always be part of nature; just as apples go on falling on earth, be it because of their "quality", because of a "gravitational field", or because of the "curvature of space-time". Second, although to date entangled quantum particles are the only physical systems we can use to distribute non-local correlations, it is a priori conceivable that one will discover other physical processes leading to the same result.

In short, it is meaningful to *approach non-locality independently of the formalism of Hilbert space*. This topic has acquired growing importance in the last two years, and is still very active at the moment of writing. I shall concentrate here on what has been done with the basic mathematical tool developed to study non-locality, the so-called *PR-box*. This simple mathematical object has achieved several feats, uncovers interesting features of non-locality, but cannot be the universal building block of non-local correlations as one might have hoped; this failure paves the way for generalizations and deeper investigations.

II. THE PR-BOX




FIG. 1. Pictorial representation of the PR-box.

The PR-box has been named this way because it was introduced with a physical meaning in 1994 by Popescu and Rohrlich [3], although actually its first appearance in the context of non-locality dates back to mathematical works by Tsirelson [4]. It is a channel with two inputs (x for Alice and y for Bob) and two outputs (a for Alice and b for Bob), as schematically drawn in Fig. 1. Each of the inputs and the outputs is a bit, i.e. can take the values $\{0, 1\}$; in all what follows, all sums of two or more bits are to be taken modulo 2. The channel is defined by three requirements: (I) The no-signalling (ns) condition is satisfied:

$$\sum_{b=0,1} P(a, b|x, y) \equiv P(a|x, y) \stackrel{ns}{=} P(a|x), \quad (1)$$

$$\sum_{a=0,1} P(a, b|x, y) \equiv P(b|x, y) \stackrel{ns}{=} P(b|y), \quad (2)$$

i.e. the marginals of Alice (Bob) don't depend on the input used by Bob (Alice).

(II) Alice's and Bob's marginals are the completely random distributions for both values of the input:

$$P(a|x) = P(b|y) = \frac{1}{2}. \quad (3)$$

(III) Alice's and Bob's outcomes are perfectly correlated according to

$$a + b = xy. \quad (4)$$

Explicitly, this means that $a = b$ when either $x = 0$ or $y = 0$ or both, while $a \neq b$ for $x = y = 1$.

It is not hard to become convinced that no pre-determined strategy can fulfill this rule [5], so the PR-box is a no-signalling and non-local channel, just like quantum particles. But in fact, this innocent-looking probability distribution is more non-local than any correlation that can be distributed using quantum states. To prove this, we can refer to the Bell-type inequality derived by Clauser, Horne, Shimony and Holt [6], that reads

$$CHSH = E(0, 0) + E(0, 1) + E(1, 0) - E(1, 1) \leq 2 \quad (5)$$

where $E(x, y)$ is the correlation coefficient of the outcomes of Alice and Bob for corresponding inputs. It is proven that quantum physics can violate this inequality up to $CHSH_{QM} = 2\sqrt{2}$ and not more. Conversely, the PR-box reaches up to $CHSH_{PR} = 4$, the largest possible violation, since by definition $E(x, y) = 1$ when one of the inputs is 0, and $E(1, 1) = -1$. In this perspective, it is natural to ask, why can't this violation be reached using quantum physics. The answer is not known, but some hints will be given in what follows.

III. FEATS OF THE PR-BOX

The PR-box slept as a mathematical curiosity for approximately ten years. Its re-discovery was motivated by a result in the context of "simulation of entanglement". This is the obvious starting point for a review of the feats of the PR-box.

A. Simulation of the singlet

The first attempt of simulation of entanglement was the hidden-variable program: can one reproduce quantum correlations using only shared randomness? The negative answer given by John Bell in 1964 is one of the main results of physics. It took almost forty years to make the next step: if local resources are not enough to simulate entanglement, what amount of *non-local resources* should be supplemented? In quantum information, where entanglement is a resource, this becomes natural question. The first idea for a non-local resource was communication: we know that communication is not a good physical explanation, but still, it is something we can quantify, and thus provides a "measure of non-locality". After some partial results we have reviewed elsewhere [7] came the remarkable result of Toner and Bacon [8]: to simulate the correlations of the singlet (maximally entangled state of two qubits), it is enough to supplement hidden variables with *a single bit of communication*.




FIG. 2. Schematic representation of the procedure for the simulation of the correlations of the singlet with a single use of the PR-box. See text for the explicit protocol.

Inspired by this result, Cerf, Gisin, Massar and Popescu [9] demonstrated that in fact the correlations of the singlet can be simulated by supplementing hidden variables with *a single use of the PR-box* (Fig. 2). Although mathematically based on the Toner-Bacon result, this work is a major conceptual improvement: the PR-box is a strictly weaker resource than a bit of communication, in particular because it does not allow signalling. Since this is the triggering result for the present-day interest in the PR-box, I give the procedure explicitly, following Ref. [10].

Alice receives \vec{a} , a unit vector representing the direction along which her spin $\frac{1}{2}$ must be measured; she must output $r_A \in \{+1, -1\}$. Similarly, Bob receives \vec{b} and must output $r_B \in \{+1, -1\}$. The goal is to achieve the statistics of the measurement on the singlet state: $\langle r_A \rangle = \langle r_B \rangle = 0$, $\langle r_A r_B \rangle = -\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}$. We suppose Alice and Bob share a PR-box and local variables, in the form of unit vectors randomly distributed on the sphere, which will be used in pairs $(\vec{\lambda}_0, \vec{\lambda}_1)$. Here are the procedures [11]:

Alice's procedure. Alice verifies if $|\vec{a} \cdot \vec{\lambda}_0| \geq |\vec{a} \cdot \vec{\lambda}_1|$; if it holds, she inputs $x = 0$ in the PR-box; if the opposite holds, she inputs $x = 1$ in the PR-box. From her output a , she computes $\vec{\lambda}_A = (-1)^a \vec{\lambda}_x$ for the chosen x . Finally, she outputs $r_A = \text{sign}(\vec{a} \cdot \vec{\lambda}_A)$.

Bob's procedure. Bob verifies if $\text{sign}(\vec{b} \cdot \vec{\lambda}_0) = \text{sign}(\vec{b} \cdot \vec{\lambda}_1)$; if it holds, he inputs $y = 0$ in the PR-box; if the opposite holds, he inputs $y = 1$ in the PR-box. From his output b , he computes $\vec{\lambda}_B = (-1)^b \vec{\lambda}_0$. Finally, he outputs $r_B = -\text{sign}(\vec{b} \cdot \vec{\lambda}_B)$.

To verify that this procedure gives the desired statistics, one has to integrate over the uniformly distributed $\vec{\lambda}$'s; see [8,10] for this last technical step.

B. Simulation of other probability distributions

A great hope stems out of the previous result: does the PR-box play the same role in a general non-local formalism, as the singlet does in quantum physics? Shared singlets allow to distribute all quantum states: can all non-local distributions be constructed by sharing PR-boxes? Although the final answer is negative (as we shall discover later), the cases with positive answer add to the feats of the PR-box. For instance:

- Any bipartite two-outcome correlation (i.e., a and b are still bits but x and y can belong to larger alphabets) can be simulated using PR-boxes (the number of instances is related to some measure of complexity of the distribution) [12,13];
- Some multi-partite correlations which arise in quantum physics can be simulated using PR boxes. More generally, with the use of PR-boxes one can build correlations that reach the algebraic maximum for a large family of multipartite Bell's inequalities, thus generalizing the relation between the PR-box and the CHSH inequality [14–16].

For instance, one can simulate the correlations of the 3-party Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) argument [17] with local variable plus one PR-box shared between (say) Alice and Bob [15]. These correlations are (all the sums are modulo 2):

$$\begin{aligned}
a_0 + b_0 + c_1 &= 0 \\
a_0 + b_1 + c_0 &= 0 \\
a_1 + b_0 + c_0 &= 0 \\
a_1 + b_1 + c_1 &= 1
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where a_x is the outcome of Alice when her input was x , and so on. No shared randomness can fulfill all four conditions. Suppose Alice, Bob and Charlie share random variables $\lambda \equiv \{\alpha_x, \beta_y, \gamma_z\}$ that fulfill the first three relations; then $\alpha_1 + \beta_1 + \gamma_1 = 0$, contradicting the fourth requirement. But it is easy to overcome this difficulty if we provide Alice and Bob with a PR-box: Alice and Bob input x and y in a PR-box; the outcomes of the box are a and b . Alice outputs $a_x = \alpha_x + a$, Bob outputs $b_y = \beta_y + b$, and Charlie $c_z = \gamma_z$. By construction, $a_x + b_y + c_z = \alpha_x + \beta_y + \gamma_z + xy$: the correlations of the shared randomness are modified only when $x = y = 1$, thus fulfilling the fourth relation.

It is important to stress that this result and the analog ones obtained for multi-partite distributions are much weaker than the one about the simulation of the singlet: here, we require only to be able to simulate the result of some very specific (albeit highly interesting) measurements on quantum states.

C. Monogamy of non-locality, and no-cloning




FIG. 3. The transformation corresponding to perfect cloning of Bob's input-output channel. The new box allows signalling from Alice to Bob.

The violation of the CHSH inequality is monogamous in quantum physics: there exists no three-partite quantum state $\rho_{ABB'}$ such that both (say) ρ_{AB} and $\rho_{AB'}$ violate CHSH [18]. The statement actually holds in general [20]: there exists no no-signalling three-partite probability distribution $P(a, b, b'|x, y, y')$, such that both bipartite marginals $P(a, b|x, y)$ and $P(a, b'|x, y')$ violates CHSH. This theorem (and its generalizations) imply in particular that any no-signalling non-local theory contains a *no-cloning theorem* [20,21], generalizing the well-known tenet of quantum physics [19]. In other words, the no-cloning theorem can be demonstrated without any reference to the linearity of Hilbert spaces.

The general proofs go beyond the scope of this paper, but we can easily show the no-cloning theorem with the PR-box. Suppose that Alice shares a PR-box with Bob ($a + b = xy$), and that Bob can "clone" his part of the box in order to obtain another input-output channel correlated with Alice according to $a + b' = xy'$ (Fig. 3). This cloning procedure opens the possibility of signalling from Alice to Bob, because Bob can compute $b + b'$ and this is equal to $x(y + y')$: since everything but x is known to Bob, he obtains the value of Alice's input. Thus, exactly as is the case in quantum physics, perfect cloning of boxes would lead to signalling.

Let's consider then an example of imperfect cloning, the one described in Ref. [20]. We look for the three-partite no-signalling box $P(a, b, b'|x, y, y')$ such that $P(a, b|x, y)$ and $P(a, b'|x, y')$ are the same distribution, and are "as close as possible" to the PR-box. Let's assume the isotropic form

$$P(a, b|x, y) = \frac{V}{2} \delta(a + b = xy) + \frac{1 - V}{4}. \tag{7}$$

It is easily verify that this distribution gives $CHSH = 4V$. By the monogamy of the violation of CHSH, we know that P cannot violate CHSH, whence $V \leq \frac{1}{2}$. On the other hand, $V = \frac{1}{2}$ can be reached by a no-signalling distribution, because it can be reached by quantum physics: the corresponding distribution is the one that is obtained by applying a symmetric quantum cloning machine to half of a singlet. Interestingly, the quantum cloning machine which should be used here is not the universal one, but one which clones optimally the states on the equator of the Bloch sphere (the so-called "phase-covariant" cloner).

IV. FEATURES OF THE PR-BOX

The results reviewed above are clearly feats of the PR-box. Other features have a more "neutral" character: we are content with them, we'd have also been content if they had been different.

A. Anomaly of non-locality

In the last years, an "anomaly of non-locality" has been found: it seems that, no matter which measure you use to quantify non-locality, non-maximally entangled states are more non-local than maximally entangled ones. All these results have been reviewed recently [7].

This anomaly manifests itself in particular when the amount of non-locality is measured by the number of PR-boxes required to simulate correlations obtained from quantum states. It has in fact been proved that a single instance of the PR-box is *not* sufficient to simulate non-maximally entangled states of two qubits [22]. I note here that the simulation of these states is one of the open problems of the whole field; the best result to date [23] uses a signalling resource strictly stronger than one bit of communication, therefore in particular the procedure is asymmetric in time (Alice must do something before Bob); and no simulation with no-signalling resources has been found.

As mentioned, the appearance of the anomaly of non-locality with PR-boxes cannot be considered as a failure, because all the measures of non-locality known to date share this feature.

B. Information-theoretical power

Physicists are not the only community interested in PR-boxes: theoretical computer scientists would be very glad to have one of these magic boxes as a primitive!

Van Dam was the first to notice the power of the PR-box in an information-theoretical context [24]: he noticed that, with such a resource, *communication complexity* would become trivial. The scenario is the following: Alice and Bob receive each a string (\vec{x}, \vec{y}) of n bits; we require Bob to output a bit $f(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$. According to the definition of f , this task requires some amount of communication. A particularly hard case is the choice $f(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) = \sum_{k=1}^n x_k y_k$: it can be proved (but it is a quite intuitive result) that Alice must send Bob n bits, i.e. all her string, in order for him to give the correct output. Moreover, no improvement is obtained when allowing Alice and Bob to share entangled quantum states. However, the task becomes very easy if Alice and Bob share a PR-box: they input sequentially all the bits of their strings in the PR-box, and obtain outcomes a_k and b_k such that

$$f(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) = A + B \equiv \sum_k a_k + \sum_k b_k. \quad (8)$$

Thus, whatever the length n of the string, Alice should send Bob just one bit, $A = \sum_k a_k$. Van Dam suggests that the collapse of communication complexity is an "implausible consequence": in other words, that his result provides an argument to explain why quantum physics does not reach up to the mathematical maximum of non-locality. In fact, it is tempting to assume that the non-locality of quantum physics is defined precisely by the point, where communication complexity becomes non-trivial; at the moment of writing, this is still a conjecture [25].

Apart from being useful for communication complexity, a PR-box would also allow building *Oblivious Transfer (OT)*, an important primitive of information theory [26]. This primitive is defined as follows: Alice inputs two bits, x_0 and x_1 . Later, Bob inputs a bit c ; he must receive x_c as output, while $x_{(c+1)}$ is forgotten. Note that OT is signalling, therefore a signalling resource must be added to the PR-box: here, a bit of communication. Specifically, the implementation is: Alice inputs $x = x_0 + x_1$ in the PR-box; she gets a and sends to Bob $m = a + x_0$. Bob inputs $y = c$ in the PR-box, he receives $b = a + (x_0 + x_1)c$. Upon receiving the bit of communication m , Bob can compute $m + b = x_0 + c(x_0 + x_1) = x_c$. Note however that this construction does not define "unconditional" OT: it relies on the fact that Alice and Bob want to use the OT to cooperate, or, in other words, that both partners trust the other. This can be the case for the simulation of a quantum channel [23]. In applications that involve an untrusted partner, like *bit-commitment*, one cannot guarantee that the other partner has not replaced the PR-box with a more complex box [27]. This is similar to the situation of bit-commitment in quantum physics: it is possible only provided one can trust that the other partner has not used ancillae to enlarge his/her Hilbert space, but unconditional bit commitment is impossible.

V. FAILURES OF THE PR-BOX

We have anticipated that the story of the PR-box is not only a success-story: this nice mathematical tool cannot do everything we'd like it to do. The failures are reviewed here. I don't consider them as a reason for pessimism: rather, they indicate the way to go for a deeper understanding of non-locality and of quantum physics.

A. Simulation of multi-partite distributions

We had said above that the correlations of the 3-party GHZ argument can be simulated by sharing bipartite PR-boxes [14,15]. Other non-local multi-partite distributions, however, cannot be simulated by bipartite boxes, even allowing an arbitrary large amount of them [12].

Consider the following three-partite correlations for bits:

$$\begin{aligned}
 a_0 + b_1 &= 0 \\
 b_0 + c_1 &= 0 \\
 c_0 + a_1 &= 0 \\
 a_0 + b_0 + c_0 &= 0 \\
 a_1 + b_1 + c_1 &= 1.
 \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

It is rapidly verified that a GHZ-like argument holds for this distribution, so it is non-local. The claim is that this correlation cannot be simulated using bipartite PR-boxes.

Here is a sketch of the proof. Assume first that each pair of partners share a single PR-box, that they can use only once. Suppose now that Alice receives the input $x = 1$: it can be the third or the fifth relation. If it is the third, Alice must not use PR_{AB} , the PR-box she shares with Bob: if she uses it, her outcome will contain a random element, which is not compensated because Bob's outcome is not taken into account — and a random element without correlations cannot give perfect correlations at the end. In summary, to avoid mistakes, when Alice receives $x = 1$ she can at most use PR_{AC} . But we can repeat the same reasoning for Bob and Charlie, and we shall find that, when everyone receives the input 1, no common PR-box can be used. In conclusion, in order to avoid mistakes, the PR-boxes shall never be used. The general proof is slightly more involved: basically, the idea is that in a scenario with many PR-boxes and many possible calls, there must be a last step: then, one applies the argument we have sketched to the last step of the protocol and reaches the same contradiction.

The origin of the problem is clear: we are considering correlations, some of which involve only two out of three partners. Thus, each partner cannot make up his/her mind, whether he/she should use a given PR-box or not. Note that the correlations (9) cannot be obtained by measuring quantum states. The simplest correlations known to date, which arises from quantum physics and cannot be simulated with PR-boxes, are five-partite and constructed on a similar basis [12]: they correspond to the stabilizer of the five-qubit cluster state, plus a derived correlation that defines a GHZ-like paradox.

In summary, the PR-box is *not* the universal building block, allowing to distribute all possible non-local correlations. This negative result can be seen as ruling out a nonlocal-realistic theory whose "elements of reality" would be local variables and PR-boxes. In itself, this is not a dramatic problem: there is no reason a priori why every non-local correlation should be derivable from the simplest bipartite non-local box. Still, this is in contrast with the role of the singlet state of quantum physics: if n partners share a sufficient number of singlets pairwise, any quantum state can be distributed among them. How? Well, by teleportation: one partner prepares the state on his own, then applies the teleportation protocol to distribute it to the others. This remark suggests that there is no analog of teleportation for PR-boxes — which is indeed the heart of the matter as long as failures are concerned. The next paragraph is devoted to it.

B. Swapping and other dynamics

Instead of focusing on teleportation, it is more natural to consider whether the analog of *entanglement swapping* can be defined. Take a first box defined by $a + b = xy$, and a second box defined by $c + d = zw$. One can tentatively define a "coupler" to apply to the extremities B and C, whose output is the box $a + d = xw$ shared between A and D (plus possibly some other outcome on which to condition, the analog of the outcome of the Bell-state measurement).

There is no apparent inconsistency in this definition: the new box is obviously no-signalling, and we don't bother to find a "realization" of the coupler, it can be taken as a new primitive of the theory.

However, it is natural to require that the coupler act consistently, not only on the product of two PR-boxes, but *on the whole set* of no-signalling probability distributions of the form $P(a, b|x, y) \times P(c, d|z, w)$ — just like in quantum physics, where coherent measurements are defined independently on the state they act on. This requirement turns out to be impossible to fulfill [28]. The proof is rather involved, consisting basically of checking all possible couplers and verifying that no one acts consistently in the whole set of probability distribution (apart from the trivial coupler that amounts at just forgetting B and C, giving completely uncorrelated A and D).

Thus, no analog of the Bell-state measurement (and more generally, of coherent measurements) seems to exist for PR-boxes. A similar conclusion can be drawn from the fact that one needs $\sim 2^n$ PR-boxes in order to simulate some tasks Alice and Bob can perform by sharing n singlets [15]. In fact, the exponential gains in quantum information come from the possibility of performing coherent measurements.

Other failures related to the dynamics have been discovered:

- No analog of the single-qubit Hadamard gate, and in fact of most one-qubit rotations, can be defined on PR-boxes [21].
- The correlations of the PR-box, and actually all those that are more non-local than allowed by quantum physics, cannot be derived from a reversible no-signalling unitary evolution [29].

C. Entanglement vs boxes

The way out of these failures is not known. In fact, we don't know if one can define a no-signalling non-local theory with "interesting" dynamics which is different from quantum physics, and possibly out of which quantum physics could "emerge".

A few observations may be useful for a better understanding of the difference between entanglement and non-local boxes. The non-local boxes are built to describe the "measurement process": you put an input and get a result; conversely, a quantum state can be defined without assuming that it is going to be measured. In spite of being non-local and intrinsically non-deterministic, PR-boxes are "classical" channels, on which it has no meaning to define a superposition principle or a coherent measurement.

There is something else. Entanglement cannot increase if the partners apply local operations and if they communicate classically; that is, classical information is a resource that can be used along with entanglement, without (so to say) changing the rules of the game. This is clearly not the case for non-local boxes: the few possible local operations do not increase non-locality, but classical communication is by definition forbidden: it increases non-locality... and its signalling! This remark can be summarized by saying that, in its present formulation, the theory of non-local boxes is *poorer in resources* than entanglement processing, because it does not have a "free resource" to be used alongside with the boxes.

VI. CONCLUSION

"[L'universo] non potr essere letto finché non avremo imparato il linguaggio e avremo familiarizzato con i caratteri con cui è scritto. E' scritto in linguaggio matematico, e le lettere sono triangoli, cerchi e altre figure geometriche, senza le quali è umanamente impossibile comprendere una singola parola." This is Galileo's celebrated quotation from *Il Saggiatore*, stressing that Nature is written in mathematical language. In this text, Galileo proposes also the Alphabet for this language: "triangles, circles and other geometrical figures". Four centuries later, there is still a lively discussion about this Alphabet, the building blocks of the description of Nature. Since we know that Nature is non-local, one or more non-local objects must belong to the Alphabet.

In this paper, I have presented the simplest non-local object, the PR-box. Is it a letter of the Alphabet, or is there any other non-local primitive with better properties, or is the mathematical path sketched here bound to fail? Why is quantum physics non-local, but *less non-local* than would be allowed a priori by no-signalling [3]? These are cards in God's play at which we hope to sneak a look soon [1].

I thank Nicolas Gisin and André Méthot for insightful comments on a first draft of this review. I acknowledge financial support from the Swiss NCCR "Quantum Photonics" and from the European Project QAP (IST-FET FP6-015848).

-
- [1] G.C. Ghirardi, *Sneaking a Look at God's Cards*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2003.
- [2] V. Scarani, *Quantum Physics: A First Encounter*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006.
- [3] S. Popescu and D. Rohrlich, *Found. Phys.* **24**, 379–385 (1994).
- [4] L.A. Khalif, B.S. Tsirelson, in: P. Lathi, P. Mittelstaedt (eds), *Symposium on the Foundations of modern Physics*, World Scientific, Singapore, 1985, pp. 441-460; B. S. Tsirelson, *Hadronic J. Suppl.* **8**, 329–345 (1993).
- [5] For a presentation in terms of "games" that can be understood by a broad audience, see: N. Gisin, quant-ph/0512168.
- [6] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, R. A. Holt, *Physical Review Letters* **23**, 880–884 (1969).
- [7] A.A. Méthot, V. Scarani, quant-ph/0601210.
- [8] B. F. Toner, D. Bacon, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 187904 (2003).
- [9] N. Cerf, N. Gisin, S. Massar, S. Popescu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 220403 (2005).
- [10] J. Degorre, S. Laplante, J. Roland, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 062314 (2005).
- [11] Two remarks: (I) Contrary to what happens in quantum physics, the procedure presented here (and in fact all the simulation procedures found to date) treats Alice and Bob in an asymmetric way. (II) In Ref. [10], r_B is defined with the opposite sign. This gives rise to the correlations $\langle r_A r_B \rangle = \vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}$, that cannot be obtained by direct measurement in quantum physics (the corresponding "density matrix" would have negative eigenvalues on some entangled states), but that can be easily produced in the lab by assuming that Bob systematically flips his result.
- [12] J. Barrett, S. Pironio, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 140401 (2005).
- [13] N.S. Jones, L. Masanes, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 052312 (2005).
- [14] J. Barrett, N. Linden, S. Massar, S. Pironio, S. Popescu, D. Roberts, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 022101 (2005).
- [15] A. Broadbent and A. A. Méthot, quant-ph/0504136; to appear in *Theoretical Computer Science C*.
- [16] S. Kunkri, G. Kar, S. Ghosh, A. Roy, quant-ph/0602064.
- [17] D. M. Greenberger, M. A. Horne and A. Zeilinger, in: M. Kafatos (ed.), *Bell's Theorem, Quantum Theory, and Conceptions of the Universe*, Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1989, pp. 69–72.
- [18] V. Scarani, N. Gisin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 117901 (2001). This is not universal: double violations have been shown as possible for a bipartite inequality [D. Collins, N. Gisin, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **37** 1775 (2004)] and for some multipartite ones [V. Scarani, N. Gisin, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 012311 (2001), Appendix B].
- [19] All the meaningful references can be found in the two recent reviews: V. Scarani, S. Iblisdir, N. Gisin, A. Acín, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **77**, 1225-1256 (2005); N.J. Cerf, J. Fiurasek, quant-ph/0512172, invited contribution to *Progress in Optics*, Ed. E. Wolf, in press.
- [20] L. Masanes, A. Acín, N. Gisin, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 012112 (2006).
- [21] J. Barrett, quant-ph/0508211.
- [22] N. Brunner, N. Gisin, V. Scarani, *New J. Phys.* **7**, 88 (2005).
- [23] N. Gisin, S. Popescu, V. Scarani, S. Wolf and J. Wullschleger, quant-ph/0601157.
- [24] W. van Dam, quant-ph/0501159.
- [25] A bound that approaches the quantum limit from above, but does not reach it, has been given in: G. Brassard, H. Buhrman, N. Linden, A.A. Méthot, A. Tapp, F. Unger, quant-ph/0508042.
- [26] S. Wolf, J. Wullschleger, quant-ph/0502030.
- [27] This is the reason why, on one day in April 2005, two papers were posted on the ArXiv server supporting apparently opposite conclusions: H. Buhrman, M. Christandl, F. Unger, S. Wehner, A. Winter, quant-ph/0504133; and T. Short, N. Gisin, S. Popescu, quant-ph/0504134. The authors of the first paper claimed bit commitment to be possible because they trusted the presence of a true PR-box in the OT; the authors of the second claimed it impossible, because they did not accept trusting it.
- [28] A.J. Short, S. Popescu, N. Gisin, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 012101 (2006).
- [29] H. Buhrman, S. Massar, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 052103 (2005).