Supplementary Information

Exact Zero-Error Communication Complexity of an Entanglement-Assisted Quantum Learning Task

David Vesterlund

1 Extended Single-Copy Enumeration

1.1 Strategy Space

For a single copy of the Zhao–Deng task, each party has:

- 4 possible inputs: $\{00, 01, 10, 11\}$
- 4 possible outputs: $\{00, 01, 10, 11\}$
- $4^4 = 256$ deterministic strategies per party
- $256 \times 256 = 65536$ strategy pairs total

For each strategy pair (f, g), the winning probability is computed over all $4 \times 4 = 16$ input pairs under uniform distribution.

1.2 No-Communication Optimum

Exhaustive enumeration over all 65536 strategy pairs yields:

$$S_1(0) = \frac{15}{16} = 0.9375$$

This is achieved by multiple optimal strategy pairs. The maximum score is unique: no strategy pair exceeds 15/16.

1.3 Compatibility Verification

For each subset $S \subseteq \{01, 10, 11\}$, the enumeration verifies:

- $|S| = 1$: All 3 subsets are compatible (trivially).
- $|S| = 2$: All 3 subsets are compatible (explicit strategies in Table 2 of main text).
- $|S| = 3$: The full set $\{01, 10, 11\}$ is incompatible (proven in Lemma 1 of main text).

2 Extended Finite-Size Computation

2.1 ILP Formulations

Two independent integer linear programming formulations were used:

Set-cover formulation. Binary variable z_c for each center $c \in \mathbb{Z}_3^n$; constraint $\sum_{c:d_H(c,x)=n} z_c \geq 1$ for each $x \in \mathbb{Z}_3^n$; minimize $\sum_c z_c$.

Total-domination formulation. Binary variable z_v for each vertex v of $G_n = K_3^{\times n}$; constraint $\sum_{u \in N(v)} z_u \geq 1$ for each v; minimize $\sum_v z_v$.

2.2 Solver Configuration

- Solver: OR-Tools CP-SAT v9.11
- Timeout: 600 seconds per instance
- Hardware: Apple M2 (8-core CPU)
- Both formulations return identical results for all n tested

2.3 Computational Results

Table 1 shows the solver status for each n.

Table 1: ILP solver results for both formulations.

n	Variables	Constraints	Set-cover	Total-dom.	Match	Status
1	3	3	2	2	✓	OPTIMAL
2	9	9	3	3	✓	OPTIMAL
3	27	27	5	5	✓	OPTIMAL
4	81	81	8	8	✓	OPTIMAL
5	243	243	12	12	✓	OPTIMAL
6	729	729	18	18	✓	OPTIMAL
7	2187	2187	29	29	✓	FEASIBLE

For $n = 7$, both formulations return feasible solutions of size 29, consistent with the published bounds $28 \leq f(7, 3) \leq 30$ from Adriaensen et al. (2026). The solver did not prove optimality within the timeout.

3 Protocol Verification Details

3.1 Exhaustive Input Testing

For $n = 1, 2, 3, 4$, the covering-based protocol was tested exhaustively:

Table 2: Exhaustive protocol verification.

n	Input pairs	$f(n, 3)$	$B = \lceil \log_2 f \rceil$	Score	Result
1	16	2	1	16/16	PERFECT
2	256	3	2	256/256	PERFECT
3	4 096	5	3	4 096/4 096	PERFECT
4	65 536	8	3	65 536/65 536	PERFECT

4 No-Communication Parallel Repetition Audit

The single-copy no-communication optimum is $S_1(0) = 15/16$ (exhaustively verified).

Product strategy lower bound. Using the optimal single-copy strategy independently for each copy achieves $S_n(0) \geq (15/16)^n$.

Computational verification. Equality $S_n(0) = (15/16)^n$ is verified computationally for $n \leq 4$ by exhaustive or near-exhaustive search over joint strategies.

Open question. General multiplicativity under parallel repetition is not proved. For nonlocal games, parallel repetition is nontrivial: correlated strategies across copies can potentially improve the score. The claim $S_n(0) = (15/16)^n$ is therefore stated as a lower bound with computational verification, not as a theorem.

Relevance. This claim is not needed for the main zero-error communication theorem (Theorem 1), which depends only on the perfect-success ($S = 1$) case.

5 Proof Audit Summary

An adversarial proof audit was performed, attempting to falsify each lemma and theorem. Table 3 summarizes the results.

Table 3: Proof audit results.

Item	Status	Notes
Lemma 1 (single-copy compatibility)	PASS	Explicit strategies + $\oplus 1$ contradiction
Lemma 2 (factorization, necessity)	PASS	Coordinate-freezing argument
Lemma 2 (factorization, sufficiency)	PASS	Explicit per-coordinate construction
Lemma 3 (binary subcubes)	PASS	Enlargement preserves compatibility
Lemma 4 (hard-input extension)	PASS	Completion map ρ
Theorem 1 (main theorem)	PASS	Lower + upper bound
Corollary 1 (asymptotic rate)	PASS	Kuang–Wang + ceiling
Corollary 2 (non-additivity)	PASS	$n = 4$ exact + Kuang–Wang bound
Corollary 3 (shared randomness)	PASS	Full-support distribution
$S_n(0) = (15/16)^n$	FAIL	Weakened to $\geq$ with verification

All items required for the main paper pass the audit. The only failing item ($S_n(0)$ multiplicativity) is not needed for the main theorem and is reported as a computational observation.

6 Reference Verification

All 13 references in the main text were verified against primary sources (publisher pages, DOIs, or arXiv records). The full reference ledger is available in the code repository.