

Bounding conditional entropy of bipartite states with Bell operators

Jan Horodecki¹ and Piotr Mironowicz^{1,2,3}

¹*Faculty of Electronics, Telecommunications and Informatics,
Gdańsk University of Technology, 80-233 Gdańsk, Poland*

²*International Centre for Theory of Quantum Technologies, University of Gdańsk, 80-308 Gdańsk, Poland*

³*Department of Physics, Stockholm University, S-10691 Stockholm, Sweden*

(Dated: October 3, 2024)

Quantum information theory explores numerous properties that surpass classical paradigms, offering novel applications and benefits. Among these properties, negative conditional von Neumann entropy (CVNE) is particularly significant in entangled quantum systems, serving as an indicator of potential advantages in various information-theoretic tasks, despite its indirect observability. In this paper, we investigate the relationship between CVNE and the violation of Bell inequalities. Our goal is to establish upper bounds on CVNE through semi-definite programming applied to entangled qubits and qutrits, utilizing selected Bell operators.

Our findings reveal that a semi-device-independent certification of negative CVNE is achievable and could be practically beneficial. We further explore two types of robustness: robustness against detection efficiency loopholes, measured by relative violation, and robustness against white noise and imperfections in state preparation, measured by critical visibility. Additionally, we analyze parametrized families of Bell inequalities to identify optimal parameters for different robustness criteria.

This study demonstrates that different Bell inequalities exhibit varying degrees of robustness depending on the desired properties, such as the type of noise resistance or the target level of negative CVNE. By bridging the gap between Bell inequalities and CVNE, our research enhances understanding of the quantum properties of entangled systems and offers insights for practical quantum information processing tasks.

Keywords: conditional von Neumann entropy, Bell operators, semi-definite programming

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum mechanics and quantum information have profoundly expanded our understanding of the fundamental nature of reality, revealing astonishing and often counterintuitive properties. The discovery of Bell inequalities in the 1960s [1] marked the beginning of quantum information theory, providing a direct example of how quantum resources can surpass classical limits in performing elementary information processing tasks, particularly in generating correlations between subsystems [2]. More recently, these fields have also become powerful tools in cryptography, enabling secure communication and information processing through quantum methods. One particularly intriguing approach in quantum cryptography is device-independent cryptography [3]. This approach allows the certification of randomness and the unpredictability of outcomes in cryptographic protocols without relying on detailed knowledge or trust in the underlying devices, instead leveraging the fundamental principles of quantum mechanics to guarantee security. The device-independent framework has been successfully applied in key distribution and randomness generation protocols [4], where Bell inequalities are used as certificates to verify the non-local correlations exhibited by entangled quantum systems.

However, while the device-independent approach has been effective in certifying various aspects of quantum systems, the certification of negative conditional von Neumann entropy (CVNE) remains largely unex-

plored. The von Neumann entropy, a quantum analog of the Shannon entropy, is crucial in quantum information theory and quantum communication. It is used to quantify entanglement between quantum systems and to analyze the security of quantum cryptographic protocols. It also plays a key role in understanding the behavior and capacity of quantum channels for reliable quantum information transmission [5]. The discovery that CVNE in entangled quantum systems can take negative values [6] fundamentally altered our perspective on information flow and the thermodynamics of information processing [7]. Negative conditional information underlies dense coding protocols [8], quantum teleportation [9], and quantum state merging (QSM) [10, 11]. In information theory, conditional entropy measures the uncertainty of one variable given knowledge of another, and negative conditional entropy implies the presence of "negative information," a concept with profound implications.

To date, efficient certification of negative conditional entropy using the device-independent approach has not been fully developed, though preliminary results are available [12]. This gap presents both a challenge and an opportunity for further exploration in quantum information theory. Despite the fundamental significance of these phenomena, there has been no systematic effort to directly connect them. By developing methods to certify negative CVNE and linking it to other quantum non-locality manifestations, we can gain deeper insights into the properties of quantum systems and potentially unlock new cryptographic protocols and applications. This

paper investigates the relationship between two key quantum phenomena: Bell inequality violation and negative conditional entropy, which, as explained, are central to the essence of quantum information processing and communication.

Our research operates within the semi-device-independent (SDI) framework [13, 14], which explores relationships between directly observable quantities and significant, yet unobservable, quantities, such as the unpredictability of a sequence generated by a process—crucial for cryptography [15]. Unlike the device-independent approach, SDI allows for imposing weak, well-justified constraints on devices, such as limiting the dimension of underlying systems [16] or energy consumption [17]. Using the dimension constraint assumption, we establish a relationship between the observable quantity (Bell inequality violation) and the unobservable quantity (negative CVNE). This relationship could be foundational for developing new communication and information processing protocols, with potential importance for Information and Communications Technology (ICT). Some consequences of negative CVNE are discussed in [18, 19].

The primary tool used in modeling these phenomena is the method of semi-definite programming (SDP) [20–23], particularly the see-saw method [24], and relaxation methods that approximate the CVNE function using SDP [25, 26]. Our results include a direct quantitative relationship indicating how the observed magnitude of Bell inequality violation translates into an upper bound on CVNE between subsystems. Notably, for four selected inequalities, we observed that within a specific range of values, the upper limit for CVNE is negative. This observation means that by detecting the expected value of the Bell operator within a certain range, we can certify that CVNE must be negative.

II. METHODS

A. Bipartite quantum distributions

In our scenario, we work with a bipartite quantum state within the tensor product space of two-dimensional complex vector spaces, denoted as $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$. This bipartite state is represented by a density matrix ρ_{AB} . The two parties involved, commonly referred to as Alice and Bob, each have access to m_A and m_B different measurements, respectively. These measurements result in binary outcomes. We model these measurements using Positive Operator-Valued Measures (POVMs), denoted as M_{ik}^A for Alice’s measurements and M_{jl}^B for Bob’s measurements, where i ranges from 1 to m_A , j ranges from 1 to m_B (indicating the measurement settings), and k, l can be 0 or 1 (indicating the measurement outcomes).

A specific subset of POVMs is the projective measurements (PMs), characterized by measurement operators that are projectors. Particularly relevant for our work

are the binary PMs, which in a two-dimensional Hilbert space, are rank-1 operators. In the Bloch sphere representation, a vector in a two-dimensional space is determined by a pair of parameters, θ and ϕ , given by the expression:

$$\cos(\theta/2)|0\rangle + \sin(\theta/2)e^{i\phi}|1\rangle, \quad (1)$$

with $\theta \in [0, \pi]$ and $\phi \in [0, 2\pi)$. For binary PMs, the first matrix in the POVM is the projector onto the vector defined in equation (1), and the second matrix is its orthogonal complement.

Both the density matrix ρ_{AB} and the POVM matrices are examples of Hermitian positive semi-definite matrices. In our analysis, we impose these constraints within the SDP framework. The specific constraints are:

1. $\rho_{AB} \succeq 0$: The density matrix ρ_{AB} must be positive semi-definite.
2. $M_{ik}^A \succeq 0$ and $M_{jl}^B \succeq 0$: Similarly, for all i and k , the POVM matrices M_{ik}^A and M_{jl}^B , corresponding to Alice’s and Bob’s measurements respectively, must be positive semi-definite.
3. The completeness conditions $\sum_k M_{ik}^A = \mathbb{1}$ and $\sum_l M_{jl}^B = \mathbb{1}$ ensure that the sum of the POVM matrices for each party equals the identity matrix.
4. The density matrix ρ_{AB} is normalized, meaning its trace is equal to 1, which is necessary for the proper normalization of probabilities.

Using these SDP constraints, we can effectively model and solve various optimization problems in quantum information theory involving bipartite states and their associated measurements. Specifically, the joint probability of Alice and Bob obtaining outcomes a and b for the measurement settings x and y , respectively, is calculated as $P(a, b|x, y) = \text{Tr}[\rho_{AB} M_{xa}^A M_{yb}^B]$.

We use the notation $\mathcal{S}_{AB}(d_A, d_B)$ to denote the set of density operators σ_{AB} on the composite Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, where $\dim(\mathcal{H}_A) = d_A$ and $\dim(\mathcal{H}_B) = d_B$. Each element $\sigma_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}_{AB}(d_A, d_B)$ satisfies:

1. $\sigma_{AB} \succeq 0$ (positivity),
2. $\text{Tr}(\sigma_{AB}) = 1$ (normalization).

B. Entropy of quantum systems

The CVNE quantifies the amount of information that remains unknown or missing about one quantum system when the state of another quantum system is known. To comprehend CVNE, it is important to first establish the concept of von Neumann entropy. Von Neumann’s entropy, also referred to as quantum entropy or simply entropy, originates from classical information theory and was extended to the domain of quantum mechanics by John von Neumann. It serves as a means to quantify

the degree of uncertainty or randomness associated with a quantum system. Mathematically, the von Neumann entropy of a quantum system can be expressed as:

$$S(\rho) \equiv -\text{Tr}(\rho \log_2(\rho)), \quad (2)$$

where, $S(\rho)$ denotes the von Neumann entropy of the density matrix ρ , Tr represents the trace operation, and \log_2 denotes the matrix logarithm with base 2.

Now, let's consider two quantum systems, A and B , described by the joint density matrix ρ_{AB} . The CVNE of ρ_{AB} is defined as:

$$S_{A|B}[\rho_{AB}] \equiv S(\rho_{AB}) - S(\rho_B), \quad (3)$$

where $S(\rho_{AB})$ represents the von Neumann entropy of the joint density matrix ρ_{AB} describing both subsystems A and B together, and $S(\rho_B)$ represents the von Neumann entropy of subsystem B alone. If $S_{A|B}[\rho_{AB}]$ is low, it indicates that knowing the state of subsystem B provides a lot of information about subsystem A , and vice versa. For instance, it can be shown that for the two-qubit Werner state $\rho_2^{wer}(p) \equiv \frac{1}{4} (\mathbb{1}_4 - p \sum_{i=1}^3 \sigma_i \otimes \sigma_i)$ the CVNE $S_{A|B}[\rho_2^{wer}(p)]$ is equal

$$-3 \frac{1-p}{4} \log_2 \frac{1-p}{4} - \frac{1+3p}{4} \log_2 \frac{1+3p}{4} - 1, \quad (4)$$

and thus the CVNE is negative for $p > 0.747614$ [27–29]. Similar formula can be obtained e.g. for Gisin states [28, 30].

For any state ρ_{AB} with negative CVNE one may construct a negative CVNE witness as

$$W_\rho \equiv -\log \rho_{AB} + \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \log \rho_B. \quad (5)$$

To be more specific, if we take a value $T < 0$ and a bipartite state ρ_{AB} with $S_{A|B}[\rho_{AB}] < 0$ and construct the witness W_ρ , then some states σ_{AB} with CVNE lower than T could be separated with linear constraint from the state space [31, Theorem 3]:

$$\text{Tr}[W_\rho \sigma_{AB}] \leq T \quad \Rightarrow \quad S_{A|B}[\sigma_{AB}] \leq T. \quad (6)$$

The problem of witnessing the so-called Absolute CVNE Non-Negative class was investigated in [27]. Lower and upper bounds on CVNE depending on the entropy were given in [32].

C. Bell Operators and self-testing

In this work, we analyze four specific Bell operators, which quantify the correlations between measurement results in Bell tests. We define these Bell operators based on the outcomes $R_i, R_j \in \{-1, +1\}$ of measurements M_i^A, M_j^B and the correlation

$$C_{i,j} = \mathbb{E}(R_i \cdot R_j). \quad (7)$$

The first Bell operator we consider is the CHSH operator (CHSH), which is defined as the sum of four correlations:

$$\text{CHSH} \equiv C_{1,1} + C_{1,2} + C_{2,1} - C_{2,2}. \quad (8)$$

This operator originates from the work of Clauser, Horne, Shimony, and Holt [33]. For CHSH, the maximal value of this operator allowed in quantum mechanics, i.e. the Tsirelson bound, is $2\sqrt{2}$, whereas the maximal value possible in classical physics, called the local bound, is 2. The Tsirelson bound is attained with the maximally entangled state and with the measurements specified by angles $\theta_1^A = 0$ and $\theta_2^A = \pi/2$ for Alice, and by $\theta_1^B = \pi/4$ and $\theta_2^B = -\pi/4$ for Bob; and $\phi = 0$.

The ratio between the Bell value and the local bound and is referred to as the 'violation ratio', or 'relative violation'. This ratio is used to quantify the extent to which a physical system violates the local realism assumption, as described by Bell's inequalities, compared to e.g. the maximum violation predicted by Tsirelson's bound. To be more specific, for the Bell expression value I with the local bound β_C , the violation ratio is defined as I/β_C [34, 35]. Local correlations are often considered as a free resource, as that can be established between different parts of a quantum system without the need for any shared entanglement [32, 36, 37]. Thus the violation ratio is a relevant quantifier of the cost of other resources, such as the negative CVNE considered herein. We note that a drawback of violation ratio is that it is sensitive to rescaling and adding constants to Bell expressions.

An alternative normalized measure for evaluating the required level of violation of a Bell inequality can be considered instead of relative violation. For this purpose, we model the noisy entangled state using the Werner state framework [38]:

$$\rho(v) = v |\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|_{AB} + (1-v) \frac{\mathbb{1}_{AB}}{D^2}, \quad (9)$$

where v represents the visibility, and $|\Phi\rangle_{AB}$ denotes the maximally entangled state of two subsystems, each of dimension D . The critical visibility is defined as the minimum value of v required to achieve a specified Bell violation value, assuming perfect implementation of the measurement settings.

Notably, when Bell operators, achieving the Tsirelson bound for maximally entangled states, are expressed as a linear combination of correlators as in Eq. (7), the Bell violation vT is realized if and only if the underlying state has a visibility characterized by v . Here, T signifies the Tsirelson bound of the Bell operator. This formulation allows for a precise quantification of the visibility required in the presence of noise to observe quantum correlations that exceed classical bounds. In this work we consider both quantities, violation ratio and visibility, as reference.

If a Bell expression requires only a low relative violation, this suggests that the certification process will be robust against detector inefficiency attacks [39]. This robustness is due to the fact that, with appropriate deterministic outcome assignments [40], any reduction in

the observed Bell violation will not be significant enough to hinder the certification of the negative CVNE. Conversely, if the critical visibility is low, the experimental setup is resilient to white noise and imperfections in state preparation. Depending on the specific context, one can choose the type of robustness that is more pertinent.

Self-testing of a quantum state refers to the process of verifying the properties of a quantum state without having complete knowledge about the measurement devices used [41]. It allows for the estimation of the state's fidelity and other relevant parameters solely based on the observed measurement outcomes. Self-testing using CHSH allows for the estimation of the state's fidelity without requiring knowledge about the specific measurement devices used by Alice and Bob. It relies on the fact that certain quantum states and measurements are uniquely associated with violating the CHSH inequality. The observation that the maximum violation of the CHSH inequality can only be achieved by utilizing a maximally entangled pair of qubits $|\Psi\rangle_{AB} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle_{AB} + |11\rangle_{AB})$ was made in [42–45]. Therefore, by observing the violation of the inequality, one can infer the properties of the underlying quantum state. This observation inspires our approach for robust certification of negative CVNE, as $S_{A|B}[|\Psi\rangle_{AB}] = -1$. It is worth noting that self-testing is not limited to CHSH inequalities, and the self-testing protocols may differ in terms of robustness [41, 46–52]. There are other Bell inequalities and self-testing protocols that can be used to characterize different aspects of quantum states and measurements. These protocols often involve more complex setups and analyses but provide more detailed information about the quantum system under consideration.

The second Bell operator we examine is denoted as BC_3 , which is part of the Braunstein-Caves series of inequalities [53]. The Tsirelson and local bounds are $3\sqrt{3} \approx 5.1962$ and 4, respectively. The self-testing properties of this expression were given in [54]. The BC_3 operator is defined by the following expression:

$$BC_3 \equiv C_{1,1} + C_{1,2} + C_{2,2} + C_{2,3} + C_{3,3} - C_{3,1}. \quad (10)$$

The Tsirelson bound for BC_3 is attained with the maximally entangled state and with the measurements specified by angles $\theta_1^A = \pi/6$, $\theta_2^A = \pi/2$ and $\theta_3^A = 5\pi/6$ for Alice, and by $\theta_1^B = 0$, $\theta_2^B = \pi/3$ and $\theta_3^B = 2\pi/3$ for Bob; and $\phi = 0$.

The third Bell operator we consider is a modified version of the CHSH operator called MCHSH. It includes an additional term and different measurement settings for the party represented by Bob. Its Tsirelson bound is equal to $2\sqrt{2} + 1$, and the local bound is 3. Its definition is as follows:

$$MCHSH \equiv C_{1,2} + C_{1,3} + C_{2,1} + C_{2,2} - C_{2,3}. \quad (11)$$

The modified CHSH operator MCHSH was introduced in a previous study [55], where both BC_3 and MCHSH revealed to be very efficient in terms of robust certified

for quantum randomness. They were further analyzed as certificates in [56, 57]. Its Tsirelson bound is achieved with the maximally entangled state and with the measurements specified by angles $\theta_1^A = 0$ and $\theta_2^A = \pi/2$ for Alice, and by $\theta_1^B = \pi/2$, $\theta_2^B = \pi/4$ and $\theta_3^B = -\pi/4$ for Bob; and $\phi = 0$.

The fourth Bell operator we analyze is denoted as I_1 . It is defined by the following expression:

$$I_1 \equiv C_{1,2} - C_{1,3} - C_{2,1} - C_{2,2} + C_{3,1} + C_{3,3} + C_{4,1}. \quad (12)$$

The I_1 operator was also introduced in the same study [55] and further analyzed in [58]. Its local bound is 5, and the Tsirelson bound is $1 + 3\sqrt{3}$. The angles defining the optimal measurements are $\theta_1^A = 0$, $\theta_2^A = 4\pi/3$, $\theta_3^A = 2\pi/3$, and $\theta_4^A = \pi/2$ for Alice, and by $\theta_1^B = \pi/2$, $\theta_2^B = \pi/6$ and $\theta_3^B = 5\pi/6$ for Bob; and $\phi = 0$.

These four Bell operators have been revealed to have different robustness against noise for application scenarios of min-entropy certification [55] or (non-conditional) von Neumann entropy certification [57], and are essential for the analysis in this work. We examine each of the four Bell operators using three different methods, which are detailed in secs III A, III B, and III C.

We also consider one of the families of Bell expressions introduced in [59]. The family is parametrized by $\delta \in (0, \pi/6]$, and is defined with the following formula:

$$I_\delta \equiv C(0, 0) + \frac{1}{\sin \delta} (C(0, 1) + C(1, 0)) - \frac{1}{\cos 2\delta} C(1, 1). \quad (13)$$

The Tsirelson bound of I_δ is

$$2 \cos^3(\delta) / (\cos(2\delta) \times \sin(\delta)), \quad (14)$$

whereas the local bound is

$$-1 + \frac{2}{\sin(\delta)} + \frac{1}{\cos(2\delta)}. \quad (15)$$

D. Semi-definite optimization and approximation

Each of the methods used in this context relies on a mathematical framework of SDP. A common form of SDPs is given by John Watrous [60]. For two complex Euclidean spaces \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} , a semi-definite program in the Watrous form is defined as a triple (Φ, A, B) , where Φ is a Hermitian and trace-preserving map from operators on \mathcal{X} to operators on \mathcal{Y} , and A and B are Hermitian operators on \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} . The so-called primal problem in the Watrous form is:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize } \text{Tr}(AX) \\ & \text{subject to } \Phi(X) = B, \\ & X \text{ is positive semi-definite.} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

The values of the Bell operators are multilinear with respect to the state density matrix, Alice's POVMs, and Bob's POVMs. This means that they are linear in each

of these three types of terms. To formulate the Bell operators as semi-definite objectives, we employ two different approaches:

1. In the **Fixed measurements** approach, described in secs III A and III B for each Bell operator we use the measurements which for the maximally entangled states reach the Tsirelson bound. Specifically, we use projectors onto computational and Hadamard bases for the CHSH operator and projectors defined in [55] for the other operators. In this approach, the only unknown variable is the density matrix, while the measurements are treated as constants.
2. The **Seesaw method** involves cyclic optimization over the three groups of variables: state density matrix, Alice's POVMs, and Bob's POVMs. In each iteration of the optimization, one group of variables is treated as the variable, while the other two groups are treated as constants. This method is described in detail in sec. III C.

By employing these two approaches, we can effectively formulate the Bell operators as semi-definite objectives, enabling us to analyze their properties and optimize them according to our desired criteria. Comparing the approaches we verify the hypothesis, that for any level of noise, for the states of a given negative CVNE, the optimal measurement maximizing the Bell operator value is equal to those which are optimal also for the noiseless case.

Gauss-Radau quadrature is a numerical integration technique that aims to approximate definite integrals by using a weighted sum of function values at specific points within the integration interval. The parameters of the Gauss-Radau quadrature include the quadrature points, weights, and degree of accuracy. The degree of accuracy in the Gauss-Radau quadrature refers to how well the method approximates the integral. It is determined by the number of quadrature points used in the approximation. The more quadrature points employed, the higher the degree of accuracy achieved. Using the Gauss-Radau quadrature it is possible to express both lower-bounds (denoted as $\text{apx} = -1$) and upper-bounds (denoted as $\text{apx} = +1$) on the matrix logarithm function using SDP [61].

III. RESULTS

The generic element of the performed optimizations is the following. The aim is to certify that the value of CVNE is equal to or less than a certain number H , $H < 0$. Suppose that for a given Bell operator B we are able to show that the maximal value it attains over states with CVNE greater or equal H is ω_H . In such case, if we observe $B \geq \omega_H$ then can conclude that the CVNE of the underlying state is equal at most H . Thus, if we

are able to show this property for B , then we obtain a certificate for CVNE.

A. Bell operator value maximization with entropy witnesses bounds and constant measurements

We employ an iterative approach to bound the state space, focusing on one witness $W^{(i)}$ at a time and incorporating the corresponding constraint $\text{Tr} W^{(i)} \sigma_{AB} \geq H$ into the constraint set for subsequent iterations. The iteration process terminates when we can no longer find a state with a conditional entropy lower than H . At this point, we consider the maximized value as the maximum operator value for CVNE greater or equal to H with fixed measurements.

To clarify the implications of relation (6), we can draw the following conclusion. Consider any state $\rho_{AB}^{(i)}$ such that $S_{A|B}[\rho_{AB}^{(i)}] < 0$. Let $W^{(i)} = W_{\rho_{AB}^{(i)}}^{(i)}$ be the CVNE witness constructed from $\rho_{AB}^{(i)}$ using (5). According to (6), for any given state σ_{AB} , if $S_{A|B}[\sigma_{AB}] > H$, then $\text{Tr}[W^{(i)} \sigma_{AB}] > H$. This fact allows us to relax the constraint $S_{A|B}[\sigma_{AB}] > H$.

To proceed, we fix the dimensions d_A and d_B of the subsystems. We choose a target value H that we want to certify as an upper bound on CVNE if a Bell certificate reaches at least a certain value ω_H , which we want to determine. Let $\mathcal{W}^{(i)}$ denote the set of CVNE witnesses used in the i -th iteration, where $\mathcal{W}^{(1)} \equiv \emptyset$. In each iteration i , we maximize B , the Bell violation, as a function of σ_{AB} (with measurements fixed to those for the Tsirelson bound) under the following relaxed constraints:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize } B[\sigma_{AB}] \\ & \text{subject to } \forall W \in \mathcal{W}^{(i)}, \text{Tr}(W \sigma_{AB}) \geq H, \\ & \text{over } \sigma_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}_{AB}(d_A, d_B). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Let $\omega^{(i)}$ be the value obtained from this maximization problem (17), and let $\sigma_{AB}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{S}_{AB}(d_A, d_B)$ be the state that achieves the Bell value $\omega^{(i)}$. The relaxed constraints are satisfied by all states $\sigma_{AB}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{S}_{AB}(d_A, d_B)$ such that $S_{A|B}[\sigma_{AB}^{(i)}] \geq H$, and potentially by some states with a CVNE less than H . Thus, $\omega^{(i)} \geq \omega_H$. As $\mathcal{W}^{(i)} \subseteq \mathcal{W}^{(i+1)}$, the optimization region becomes more restrictive with increasing i , leading to a decrease in the values of $\omega^{(i)}$, i.e., $\omega^{(i+1)} \leq \omega^{(i)}$. If the iterative process is stopped at some \tilde{i} , then $\omega_H \leq \omega^{(\tilde{i})}$, and the observation of the Bell value $\omega^{(\tilde{i})}$ ensures that the CVNE is at most H .

If, for some i , it turns out that $S_{A|B}[\sigma_{AB}^{(i)}] = H$, we conclude that $\omega_H = \omega^{(i)}$ and terminate the iterative process. Otherwise, we set $\rho_{AB}^{(i)} = \sigma_{AB}^{(i)}$ and update $\mathcal{W}^{(i+1)} \equiv \mathcal{W}^{(i)} \cup \{W^{(i)}\}$, with $W^{(i)}$ calculated from $\sigma_{AB}^{(i)}$ with (5), continuing the iterative process until the criterion $S_{A|B}[\sigma_{AB}^{(i)}] = H$ or another stopping condition is met.

In cases where it is not possible to construct a witness for a given state $\rho_{AB}^{(i)}$ due to eigenvalues approaching zero, (which is common for pure entangled states), we resort to bisection over states $c \cdot \rho_{AB} + (1 - c) \frac{\mathbb{1}_{AB}}{4}$, where $c \in [0, 1]$. This enables us to find a mixed state with slightly lower entropy than H and construct a witness and constraint for that state instead. The existence of such c helps us circumvent numerical issues within the range $[H - 10^{-9}, H)$.

B. Operator value maximization with entropy approximations and constant measurements

The second method does not involve iteratively building up constraints. Instead, it utilizes a semi-definite approximation of CVNE to bound the state space in an SDP with fixed measurements. This technique is based on the SDP approximation of CVNE [25, 26]. In our framework, we incorporate the cvxquad library [61], which leverages the Gauss-Radau quadrature to achieve two possible approximations: a lower bound and an upper bound on CVNE. For our experiments, we set both the m and k parameters of the approximation to 3. We execute each experiment using this semi-definite approximation twice: once for the lower bound (apx = -1) and once for the upper bound (apx = +1) approximation. The results exhibit only slight differences, indicating that the contribution of the approximation to the overall error is minimal.

C. Operator value maximization with entropy approximations – see-saw

The third method differs from the previous two in that it is a heuristic approach, which means it may converge to local maxima. We categorize the variables into three groups: the state, Alice’s POVMs, and Bob’s POVMs. We begin with the state as the variable and treat the remaining groups as constants and initialize them randomly. Without loss of generality, we can assume that the computational basis for both Alice and Bob corresponds to the eigenbasis of their first measurement operators. Furthermore, we restrict these measurements to be projective since, in the case of binary outcomes with qubits, projectors are sufficient to achieve the maximum violation of a Bell operator [62]. This assumption helps improve the numerical convergence of the see-saw computations.

The see-saw optimization proceeds by cycling through steps until the absolute difference between the maximized values in two consecutive cycles is smaller than 10^{-7} . Similar to the previous method, we utilize the SDP approximations of CVNE to bound it to the given value H in each sub-optimization of the see-saw algorithm. We repeat each see-saw optimization procedure 100 times, each time initializing the measurements with new random values. We perform this process twice, once for the

lower bound (apx = -1) approximation and once for the upper bound (apx = +1) approximation, resulting in a total of 200 iterations for each H value. The initial randomization of the measurements is performed as follows: four real numbers are drawn from a uniform distribution on the interval $[0, 1)$ to form a vector $v \in \mathbb{C}^2$. From this vector, we construct the projectors $P_1 = vv^\dagger$ and $P_2 = \mathbb{1} - P_1$. For each value of H and apx = ± 1 , we repeat the see-saw optimization procedure 100 times and select the maximum attained Bell operator value as the result.

D. Discussion of the results

Fig. 1 illustrates the relationship between the entropy upper bound and the achieved values of the Bell operator. The obtained results remain consistent for both fixed and arbitrary measurements in the case of CHSH. However, slight differences are observed for BC_3 when the CVNE value is close to 0. Notably, more significant deviations are noticeable for MCHSH and I_1 , indicating that the measurements optimal for maximum violation are not necessarily optimal for states with constrained CVNE. This means that the bounds assuming a particular form of the measurements are stronger than the bounds without this presumption, suggesting the possibility of improvement in the form of the source-device-independent certification [63, 64]. It is worth noting that the see-saw method proved to be considerably slower for operators with a larger number of measurement settings, particularly for I_1 . In such cases, a single see-saw trial often required several thousand optimization cycles to converge.

The role of CVNE was elucidated in [10], where the problem of transferring an unknown quantum state distributed over two quantum systems to a single system using quantum communication was investigated. The amount of quantum communication needed for this task is quantified with CVNE, which had been previously understood theoretically but lacked a practical interpretation. If CVNE is positive, the sender needs to communicate this amount of quantum bits to the receiver. However, when CVNE is negative, both the sender and receiver gain a corresponding potential for future quantum communication. To achieve an optimal transfer of partial information, the so-called QSM protocol, which efficiently transfers partial information given by CVNE from one system to another, can be used. The results provided in Fig. 1 show that for separated parties sharing an entangled state of a given upper bound on the conditional entropy, the QSM protocol can be applied. Thus the upper bounds based on Bell expression values provide an SDI certificate on the performance of the QSM protocol, or super dense coding protocols [8, 65, 66].

The results for the case of CHSH comply with those stated in [12, Lemma 5] where the upper bound on CVNE




FIG. 1. (Color online) Conditional entropy upper bounds for two qubits bipartite state given that we measured some x as Bell operator value. For methods with fixed measurement, the results coincide. A substantial difference emerges between fixed measurements and arbitrary measurements (see-saw) for MCHSH and BC_3 operators.

Bell operator	local bound	viol. ratio for negative CVNE	viol. ratio for -0.9 CVNE	critical visibility
CHSH	2	1.1030 (2.2060)	1.3984 (2.7967)	0.9888
MCHSH	3	1.0258 (3.0773)	1.2641 (3.7923)	0.9906
BC_3	4	1.0140 (4.0559)	1.0276 (5.1379)	0.9888
I_1	5	1.0031 (5.0155)	1.0219 (6.1315)	0.9896

TABLE I. The violation ratio for the four investigated Bell operators needed to obtain a certification that the conditional von Neumann entropy (CVNE) is negative (column III), or less than -0.9 (columns IV). The values in the parentheses show the values of Bell operators needed for the relevant cases. The last column shows the critical visibility for -0.9 CVNE certification, as a reference. It can be observed that the robustness in terms of relative violation of the other Bell operators has been significantly improved compared to CHSH, but on the other hand, the critical visibility for all Bell operators remains almost the same.

of the form

$$2 \text{h} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{8} \cdot I \right) - 1, \quad (18)$$

where $\text{h}(\cdot)$ is the binary entropy, was obtained using different methods, cf. [67, eq. (13)]. Our calculations show that the bound (18) is not only tight but also exact (up

to numerical precision). We tried curve fitting analysis to reproduce the numerical results of Fig. 1 for the function of the form $p_1 \cdot \text{h}(p_2 - p_3 \cdot I) - p_4$, but the algorithm did not converge. In Tab. I we compare the violation ratio required to certify the two cases: when the CVNE is negative, and when it is less than -0.9 . It can be observed that for the three Bell operators MCHSH, BC_3 , and I_1 , the violation ratio is in both cases significantly lower than for CHSH, but the critical visibility for all Bell operators remain very similar. Recent experiments indicate that the visibilities above 0.99, as needed for certification of -0.9 bits of CVNE, are feasible with the current technology [68]. This shows that the robustness of the certification of negative CVNE may be facilitated, e.g. using a proper post-processing [40]. This robustness for SDI certification plays the role of one-shot distillable entanglement protocols [12] or distributed private randomness distillation [69].

We conducted similar optimizations for a state entangling two qutrits. Figure 2 illustrates the robustness of the certification of negative CVNE using four different Bell inequalities, plotted as a function of visibility. The most robust inequality, in terms of visibility, is I_1 , as defined in (12). Comparing these results with Table I, we observe that as the dimension of the entangled state increases, different Bell certificates may prove to be the most robust.




FIG. 2. (Color online) Robustness of the certification of negative conditional von Neumann entropy using four different Bell inequalities, shown as a function of visibility. The upper bound on the dimension of the entangled state is set at two qutrits. The most robust inequality in terms of visibility is I_1 , as defined in Eq. (12).

Next, we address the problem of identifying the Bell operator best suited for our scenario, either in terms of relative Bell violation or critical visibility, depending on the desired certification of negative CVNE. Specifically, we examine the family of Bell expressions given in (13). We determine the optimal value of the parameter δ based on the desired robustness properties.




FIG. 3. (Color online) Required relative violation of various Bell inequalities from the family (13) to certify the negativity of conditional von Neumann entropy. Lower relative violation indicates greater robustness against the detection efficiency loophole, making the protocol more resilient. Smaller values of δ correspond to higher robustness in these terms.

In Figure 3, the relative violation of various Bell inequalities from the family (13) is presented, which is necessary to certify the negativity of CVNE. A smaller re-

quired relative violation indicates greater ease in circumventing the detection efficiency loophole, thereby making the protocol more robust. Hence, smaller values of δ exhibit greater robustness in this regard.




FIG. 4. (Color online) Critical visibility required to certify the negativity of conditional von Neumann entropy using the Bell expressions from the family (13). Lower critical visibility indicates greater robustness of the certification against white noise and imperfections in the preparation of the entangled state. The results show that larger values of δ provide more robust certification.

Figure 4 shows the critical visibility required to certify negative CVNE using the Bell expressions from the same family (13). Lower critical visibility implies that the certification is more robust against white noise and imperfections in the preparation of the entangled state. It can be observed that larger values of δ provide greater robustness. Therefore, by comparing Figures 3 and 4, we conclude that depending on the type of robustness sought and the desired value of certified negative CVNE, different representatives from the family (13) may be optimal. In particular, from Figure 3 we conclude that the I_δ certificate is most robust in terms of required relative violation for low values of δ parameter. On the other hand, from Figure 4 we see that the robustness in terms of required critical visibility is optimal for high values of δ parameter.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we presented an analysis of the relationship between the violation of four selected Bell inequalities and the upper bound on the conditional entropy of the corresponding quantum states. To achieve this, we maximized each Bell operator over all possible entangled two-part states, specifically considering both qubits and qutrits, with the condition that the conditional von Neumann entropy (CVNE) is greater than a specific threshold. Our findings demonstrate that if a Bell value exceeds

a determined threshold, CVNE must necessarily be less than the specified value. Consequently, for each investigated inequality, there exists a range of values that certify the necessity of negative CVNE.

We explored two types of robustness across four different Bell inequalities: robustness against detection efficiency attacks (measured by relative violation) and robustness against white noise and state preparation imperfections (measured by critical visibility). Additionally, we examined the behavior of parametrized families of Bell inequalities in terms of these robustness measures. This dual examination provides a nuanced understanding of how different Bell inequalities respond to different types of noise and imperfections in experimental setups.

Our analysis shows that the violation of a Bell inequality indicates the presence of entanglement in the quantum system. Although all states with negative CVNE are entangled [70], it is crucial to note that not all entangled states exhibit negative CVNE. Therefore, our investigation offers a quantitative distinction and interconnection between these two quantum phenomena. This approach complements the work of [30, 71], where the conditional amplitude operator [72] was used to infer the existence of entanglement from the negativity of CVNE, akin to the PPT criterion [73, 74].

As anticipated, certification of negative CVNE was only possible above the classical threshold for violating the inequalities. Moreover, since each considered inequality possesses the self-test property for the maximally entangled state [41], the certified negativity reached a value of -1 at maximum violation. Interestingly, the threshold for certifying negativity was consistently above the classi-

cal bound, indicating that the relationship between Bell violation and negative CVNE is non-trivial. However, the different Bell operators exhibited varying degrees of robustness depending on the type of robustness considered.

Our study assumed that the entangled quantum state has a dimension of two or three, situating our work within a semi-device-independent framework. Future research could systematically explore the analogous relationship between the value of the Bell operator and the required negativity of conditional entropy to achieve full device-independent certification. Additionally, it would be valuable to identify Bell inequalities that are more robust for certification purposes and to investigate whether any Bell inequalities can be maximally violated without resulting in negative CVNE.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation through the Wallenberg Centre for Quantum Technology (WACQT), and NCBiR QUANTERA/2/2020 (www.quantera.eu) an ERA-Net co-fund in Quantum Technologies under the project eDICT.

The source code used for conducting the experiments in this work is publicly available to be accessed and downloaded from the following URL: https://git.pg.edu.pl/eti/bellop_cond_entropy. It has been implemented using libraries [75–77].

-
- [1] J. S. Bell, On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox, *Physics Physique Fizika* **1**, 195 (1964).
 - [2] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Quantum entanglement, *Reviews of modern physics* **81**, 865 (2009).
 - [3] D. Mayers and A. Yao, Quantum cryptography with imperfect apparatus, in *Proceedings 39th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (Cat. No. 98CB36280)* (IEEE, 1998) pp. 503–509.
 - [4] S. Pirandola, U. L. Andersen, L. Banchi, M. Berta, D. Bunandar, R. Colbeck, D. Englund, T. Gehring, C. Lupo, C. Ottaviani, J. L. Pereira, M. Razavi, J. Shamsul Shaari, M. Tomamichel, V. C. Usenko, G. Vallone, P. Villoresi, and P. Wallden, *Advances in quantum cryptography, Advances in optics and photonics* **12**, 1012 (2020).
 - [5] M. M. Wilde, *Quantum information theory*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2017).
 - [6] N. J. Cerf and C. Adami, Negative entropy and information in quantum mechanics, *Physical Review Letters* **79**, 5194 (1997).
 - [7] L. Del Rio, J. Åberg, R. Renner, O. Dahlsten, and V. Vedral, The thermodynamic meaning of negative entropy, *Nature* **474**, 61 (2011).
 - [8] C. H. Bennett and S. J. Wiesner, Communication via one-and two-particle operators on Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen states, *Physical Review Letters* **69**, 2881 (1992).
 - [9] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen channels, *Physical Review Letters* **70**, 1895 (1993).
 - [10] M. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, and A. Winter, Partial quantum information, *Nature* **436**, 673 (2005).
 - [11] M. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, and A. Winter, Quantum state merging and negative information, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **269**, 107 (2007).
 - [12] R. Arnon-Friedman and J.-D. Bancal, Device-independent certification of one-shot distillable entanglement, *New Journal of Physics* **21**, 033010 (2019).
 - [13] M. Pawłowski and N. Brunner, Semi-device-independent security of one-way quantum key distribution, *Physical Review A* **84**, 010302 (2011).
 - [14] M. Pivoluska, M. Plesch, M. Farkas, N. Ružičková, C. Flegel, N. H. Valencia, W. McCutcheon, M. Malik, and E. A. Aguilar, Semi-device-independent random number generation with flexible assumptions, *npj Quantum Information* **7**, 50 (2021).
 - [15] L. Dorrendorf, Z. Gutterman, and B. Pinkas, Cryptanalysis of the random number generator of the windows operating system, *ACM Transactions on Information and*

- System Security (TISSEC) **13**, 1 (2009).
- [16] N. Brunner, M. Navascués, and T. Vértesi, Dimension witnesses and quantum state discrimination, *Physical Review Letters* **110**, 150501 (2013).
- [17] T. Van Himbeek, E. Woodhead, N. J. Cerf, R. García-Patrón, and S. Pironio, Semi-device-independent framework based on natural physical assumptions, *Quantum* **1**, 33 (2017).
- [18] C. A. Chatzidimitriou-Dreismann, Experimental implications of negative quantum conditional entropy—H₂ mobility in nanoporous materials, *Applied Sciences* **10**, 8266 (2020).
- [19] K. Sheshadri and A. Chainani, Unconventional superfluidity in a model of Fermi-Bose mixtures, arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.08513 (2021).
- [20] L. Vandenberghe and S. Boyd, Semidefinite programming, *SIAM review* **38**, 49 (1996).
- [21] P. Skrzypczyk and D. Cavalcanti, *Semidefinite Programming in Quantum Information Science*, 2053-2563 (IOP Publishing, 2023).
- [22] P. Mironowicz, Semi-definite programming and quantum information, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **57**, 163002 (2024).
- [23] A. Tavakoli, A. Pozas-Kerstjens, P. Brown, and M. Araújo, Semidefinite programming relaxations for quantum correlations, arXiv:2307.02551 (2023).
- [24] K. F. Pál and T. Vértesi, Maximal violation of a bipartite three-setting, two-outcome Bell inequality using infinite-dimensional quantum systems, *Physical Review A* **82**, 022116 (2010).
- [25] H. Fawzi and O. Fawzi, Efficient optimization of the quantum relative entropy, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **51**, 154003 (2018).
- [26] H. Fawzi, J. Saunderson, and P. A. Parrilo, Semidefinite approximations of the matrix logarithm, *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* **19**, 259 (2019).
- [27] S. Patro, I. Chakrabarty, and N. Ganguly, Non-negativity of conditional von Neumann entropy and global unitary operations, *Physical Review A* **96**, 062102 (2017).
- [28] J. Luc, Quantumness of states and unitary operations, *Foundations of Physics* **50**, 1645 (2020).
- [29] K. Kumar and N. Ganguly, Quantum conditional entropies and steerability of states with maximally mixed marginals, *Physical Review A* **107**, 032206 (2023).
- [30] N. Friis, S. Bulusu, and R. A. Bertlmann, Geometry of two-qubit states with negative conditional entropy, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **50**, 125301 (2017).
- [31] M. Vempati, N. Ganguly, I. Chakrabarty, and A. K. Pati, Witnessing negative conditional entropy, *Physical Review A* **104**, 012417 (2021).
- [32] M. Vempati, S. Shah, N. Ganguly, and I. Chakrabarty, A-unital operations and quantum conditional entropy, *Quantum* **6**, 641 (2022).
- [33] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories, *Physical Review Letters* **23**, 880 (1969).
- [34] L. Masanes, S. Pironio, and A. Acín, Secure device-independent quantum key distribution with causally independent measurement devices, *Nature communications* **2**, 238 (2011).
- [35] M. Karczewski, G. Scala, A. Mandarino, A. B. Sainz, and M. Żukowski, Avenues to generalising Bell inequalities, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **55**, 384011 (2022).
- [36] J. Barrett, N. Linden, S. Massar, S. Pironio, S. Popescu, and D. Roberts, Nonlocal correlations as an information-theoretic resource, *Physical Review A* **71**, 022101 (2005).
- [37] M. Horodecki and J. Oppenheim, (Quantumness in the context of) resource theories, *International Journal of Modern Physics B* **27**, 1345019 (2013).
- [38] R. F. Werner, Quantum states with Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen correlations admitting a hidden-variable model, *Physical Review A* **40**, 4277 (1989).
- [39] J. Wilms, Y. Disser, G. Alber, and I. C. Percival, Local realism, detection efficiencies, and probability polytopes, *Physical Review A* **78**, 032116 (2008).
- [40] M. Czechlewski and M. Pawłowski, Influence of the choice of postprocessing method on Bell inequalities, *Physical Review A* **97**, 062123 (2018).
- [41] I. Šupić and J. Bowles, Self-testing of quantum systems: a review, *Quantum* **4**, 337 (2020).
- [42] S. J. Summers and R. Werner, Maximal violation of Bell's inequalities is generic in quantum field theory, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **110**, 247 (1987).
- [43] S. Popescu and D. Rohrlich, Which states violate Bell's inequality maximally?, *Physics Letters A* **169**, 411 (1992).
- [44] S. L. Braunstein, A. Mann, and M. Revzen, Maximal violation of Bell inequalities for mixed states, *Physical Review Letters* **68**, 3259 (1992).
- [45] B. S. Tsirelson, Some results and problems on quantum Bell-type inequalities, *Hadronic Journal Supplement* **8**, 329 (1993).
- [46] W. Slofstra, Lower bounds on the entanglement needed to play XOR non-local games, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **52** (2011).
- [47] C. A. Miller and Y. Shi, Optimal robust self-testing by binary nonlocal XOR games, in *8th Conference on the Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication and Cryptography (TQC 2013)* (Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2013).
- [48] R. Ramanathan, D. Goyeneche, S. Muhammad, P. Mironowicz, M. Grünfeld, M. Bourennane, and P. Horodecki, Steering is an essential feature of non-locality in quantum theory, *Nature communications* **9**, 4244 (2018).
- [49] P. Mironowicz and M. Pawłowski, Experimentally feasible semi-device-independent certification of four-outcome positive-operator-valued measurements, *Physical Review A* **100**, 030301 (2019).
- [50] X. Valcarce, P. Sekatski, D. Orsucci, E. Oudot, J.-D. Bancal, and N. Sangouard, What is the minimum CHSH score certifying that a state resembles the singlet?, *Quantum* **4**, 246 (2020).
- [51] M. Smania, P. Mironowicz, M. Nawareg, M. Pawłowski, A. Cabello, and M. Bourennane, Experimental certification of an informationally complete quantum measurement in a device-independent protocol, *Optica* **7**, 123 (2020).
- [52] X. Valcarce, J. Zivy, N. Sangouard, and P. Sekatski, Self-testing two-qubit maximally entangled states from generalized Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt tests, *Physical Review Research* **4**, 013049 (2022).
- [53] S. L. Braunstein and C. M. Caves, Information-theoretic Bell inequalities, *Physical Review Letters* **61**, 662 (1988).
- [54] I. Šupić, R. Augusiak, A. Salavrakos, and A. Acín, Self-testing protocols based on the chained Bell inequalities,

- New Journal of Physics **18**, 035013 (2016).
- [55] P. Mironowicz and M. Pawłowski, Robustness of quantum-randomness expansion protocols in the presence of noise, *Physical Review A* **88**, 032319 (2013).
- [56] P. J. Brown, S. Ragy, and R. Colbeck, A framework for quantum-secure device-independent randomness expansion, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **66**, 2964 (2019).
- [57] Y. Xiao, X. Li, J. Wang, M. Li, and S.-M. Fei, Device-independent randomness based on a tight upper bound of the maximal quantum value of chained inequality, *Physical Review A* **107**, 052415 (2023).
- [58] D.-D. Li, F. Gao, Y. Cao, and Q.-Y. Wen, The critical detection efficiency for closing the detection loophole of some modified Bell inequalities, *Quantum Information Processing* **18**, 1 (2019).
- [59] L. Woollerton, P. Brown, and R. Colbeck, Tight analytic bound on the trade-off between device-independent randomness and nonlocality, *Physical Review Letters* **129**, 150403 (2022).
- [60] J. Watrous, CS 867/QIC 890 Semidefinite Programming in Quantum Information (2011), lecture notes.
- [61] H. Fawzi, Rational lower/upper bounds on log, https://github.com/hfawzi/cvxquad/blob/master/doc/log_approx_bounds.pdf, accessed: 2022-01-28.
- [62] T. Vértesi and E. Bene, Two-qubit Bell inequality for which positive operator-valued measurements are relevant, *Physical Review A* **82**, 062115 (2010).
- [63] D. G. Marangon, G. Vallone, and P. Villoresi, Source-device-independent ultrafast quantum random number generation, *Physical review letters* **118**, 060503 (2017).
- [64] M. Avesani, D. G. Marangon, G. Vallone, and P. Villoresi, Source-device-independent heterodyne-based quantum random number generator at 17 Gbps, *Nature communications* **9**, 5365 (2018).
- [65] D. Bruś, G. M. D'Ariano, M. Lewenstein, C. Macchiavello, A. Sen, U. Sen, *et al.*, Distributed quantum dense coding, *Physical Review Letters* **93**, 210501 (2004).
- [66] R. Prabhu, A. K. Pati, A. Sen, U. Sen, *et al.*, Exclusion principle for quantum dense coding, *Physical Review A* **87**, 052319 (2013).
- [67] S. Pironio, A. Acín, N. Brunner, N. Gisin, S. Massar, and V. Scarani, Device-independent quantum key distribution secure against collective attacks, *New Journal of Physics* **11**, 045021 (2009).
- [68] A. J.-M. Seguinard, A. Piveteau, P. Mironowicz, and M. Bourennane, Experimental certification of more than one bit of quantum randomness in the two inputs and two outputs scenario, *New Journal of Physics* **25**, 113022 (2023).
- [69] D. Yang, K. Horodecki, and A. Winter, Distributed private randomness distillation, *Physical review letters* **123**, 170501 (2019).
- [70] N. J. Cerf and C. Adami, Quantum extension of conditional probability, *Physical Review A* **60**, 893 (1999).
- [71] N. Friis, G. Vitagliano, M. Malik, and M. Huber, Entanglement certification from theory to experiment, *Nature Reviews Physics* **1**, 72 (2019).
- [72] N. J. Cerf, C. Adami, and R. M. Gingrich, Quantum conditional operator and a criterion for separability, arXiv preprint quant-ph/9710001 (1997).
- [73] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Separability of mixed states: necessary and sufficient conditions, *Physics Letters A* **223**, 1 (1996).
- [74] A. Peres, Separability criterion for density matrices, *Physical Review Letters* **77**, 1413 (1996).
- [75] A python interface to conic optimization solvers, <https://picos-api.gitlab.io/picos/index.html>, accessed: 2022-01-28.
- [76] M. Andersen, J. Dahl, Z. Liu, L. Vandenbergh, S. Sra, S. Nowozin, and S. J. Wright, Interior-point methods for large-scale cone programming, *Optimization for machine learning* **5583** (2011).
- [77] M. ApS, *The MOSEK optimization toolbox for MATLAB manual. Version 9.0.* (2019).