

IEGULDĪJUMS TAVĀ NĀKOTNĒ

Quantum strategies are better than classical for almost any non-local game

Andris Ambainis*, Artūrs Bačkurs*, Kaspars Balodis*, Dmitry Kravchenko*, Juris Smotrovs*, Madars Virza⁺

*University of Latvia +MIT



Referee asks questions a, b to Alice, Bob;
Alice and Bob reply by sending x, y;
Alice, Bob win if a condition P_{a, b}(x, y) satisfied.



Winning conditions for Alice and Bob (a = 0 or b = 0) → x = y. (a = b = 1) → x ≠ y.

Example 2

 Alice and Bob attempt to "prove" that they have a 2-coloring of a 5-cycle; Referee may ask one question about color of some vertex to each of them.

Referee either:

Example 2

- asks ith vertex to both Alice and Bob; they win if answers equal.
- Asks the ith vertex to Alice, (i+1)st to Bob, they win if answers different.

Non-local games in quantum world



 Shared quantum state between Alice and Bob:

Does not allow them to communicate;
Allows to generate correlated random bits.

Corresponds to shared random bits
in the classical case.



Winning condition:Winning probability:• $(a = 0 \text{ or } b = 0) \rightarrow x = y.$ • 0.75 classically.• $(a = b = 1) \rightarrow x \neq y.$ • 0.85... quantumly.

A simple way to verify quantum mechanics.

Example: 2-coloring game

- Alice and Bob claim to have a 2-coloring of ncycle, n- odd;
- 2n pairs of questions by referee.

Winning probability: • $1 - \frac{1}{2n}$ classically. • $1 - \frac{C}{n^2}$ quantumly.

Random non-local games



a, b ∈ {1, 2, ..., N};
x, y ∈ {0, 1};
Condition P(a, b, x, y) - random;

Computer experiments: quantum winning probability larger than classical.

XOR games

- The winning condition P(a, b, x, y), depends on x = y, but not on actual values of x and y.
- XOR game:
 - $(x = y) \leftrightarrow (x \oplus y = 0);$
 - $(x \neq y) \leftrightarrow (x \oplus y = 1).$

XOR games

For each (a, b), exactly one of x = y and x ≠ y is a winning outcome for Alice and Bob.

 $A_{ab} = \begin{cases} 1 & x = y & wins \\ -1 & x \neq y & wins \end{cases}$ $A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} & \dots & A_{1n} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} & \dots & A_{2n} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ A_{n1} & A_{n2} & \dots & A_{nn} \end{pmatrix}$

The main results

- Let n be the number of possible questions to Alice and Bob.
- Classical winning probability p_{cl} satisfies

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{0.6394...}{\sqrt{N}} \le p_{cl} \le \frac{1}{2} + \frac{0.8325...}{\sqrt{N}}$$

Quantum winning probability p_q satisfies

$$p_q = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1 + o(1)}{\sqrt{N}}$$

Another interpretation

• Value of the game $= p_{win} - (1-p_{win})$.

$$\frac{1.2788...}{\sqrt{N}} \le v_{cl} \le \frac{1.6651...}{\sqrt{N}}$$

$$v_q = \frac{2 + o(1)}{\sqrt{N}}$$

• Quantum advantage:

$$1.2011... \le \frac{v_q}{v_{cl}} \le 1.5638...$$

Comparison

• Random XOR game:

• CHSH game:

$$\frac{v_q}{v_{cl}} \le 1.5638...$$

 $\frac{v_q}{v_{cl}} = \sqrt{2} = 1.4142...$

Best XOR game:

 $\frac{v_q}{v} = K_G, \quad 1.676... \le K_G \le 1.782...$

Methods: quantum

- Tsirelson's theorem, 1980:
- Alice's strategy vectors $u_1, ..., u_n$, $||u_1|| = ... = ||u_n|| = 1$.
- Bob's strategy vectors $v_1, ..., v_n, ||v_1|| = ... = ||v_n|| = 1.$

Quantum advantage

$$p_{\text{win}} - p_{\text{los}} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{n^2} A_{ij}(u_i, v_j)$$

Random matrix question

What is the value of

$$\max_{\|v_i\|=\|u_j\|=1} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{1}{n^2} A_{ij}(u_i,v_j)$$

for a random ±1 matrix A?

Can be upper-bounded by $||A||=(2+o(1)) n \sqrt{n}$

Lower bound $\|A\| = (2 - o(1))n\sqrt{n}$

• There exists u: $||Au|| = (2 - o(1))n\sqrt{n}$

 There are many such u: a subspace of dimension f(n), for any f(n)=o(n).

Combine them to produce u_i, v_i:

$$\max_{\|v_i\|=\|u_j\|=1} \sum_{i,j=1}^n A_{ij}(u_i, v_j) \ge (2 - o(1))n\sqrt{n}$$

Classical results

- Let n be the number of possible questions to Alice and Bob.
- <u>Theorem</u> Classical winning probability p_{cl} satisfies

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{0.6394...}{\sqrt{N}} \le p_{cl} \le \frac{1}{2} + \frac{0.8325...}{\sqrt{N}}$$

Methods: classical

Alice's strategy - numbers

u₁, ..., u_n ∈ {-1, 1}.

Bob's strategy - numbers

v₁, ..., v_n ∈ {-1, 1}.

Quantum advantage

$$p_{\text{win}} - p_{\text{los}} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{n^2} A_{ij} u_i v_j$$

Interpretation I



We are allowed:

(number of +1) – (number of -1)= $\sum A_{ij}u_iv_j$ i, j=1

Interpretation II

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} A_{ij} u_{i} v_{j} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ij} v_{j} \right) u_{i} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ij} v_{j} \right|$$

- Let $v = (v_i)$.
- We are given that $||v||_1 = 1$.
- We should maximize $||Av||_{\infty}$.

What is
$$||A||_{\infty \to 1} = \max_{v} \frac{||Av||_{\infty}}{||v||_{1}}$$
 for random A?

Classical upper bound

$$p_{\text{win}} - p_{\text{los}} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{n^2} A_{ij} u_i v_j$$

If A_{ij} – random, A_{ij}u_iv_j – also random.
Sum of independent random variables;
Chernoff: sum exceeds 1.65... n √n for any u_i, v_i, with probability o(1/4ⁿ).



Grothendiek's constant

Implies
$$\max_{u_i, v_j \in \{+1, -1\}} \sum_{i, j=1}^n \frac{1}{n^2} A_{ij} u_i v_j \ge \frac{2}{K_G} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$$

Complicated random walk argument: $\geq \frac{1.23...}{\sqrt{n}}$

Conclusion

- We studied random XOR games with n questions to Alice and Bob.
- For both quantum and classical strategies, the best winning probability $\rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$.
- Quantumly: $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1 + o(1)}{\sqrt{n}}$

2

Classically:

 $=, 0.6394... \le C \le 0.8325...$

Open problems

1. We have

$$1.27...N\sqrt{N} \le ||A||_{\infty \to 1} \le 1.65...N\sqrt{N}$$

What is the exact order?

Gaussian A_{ij}? Different probability distributions?
 Random games for other classes of non-local games?