

# Mutually Unbiased Bases and Orthogonal Latin Squares

Tomasz Paterek,<sup>1</sup> Borivoje Dakić,<sup>1,2</sup> and Časlav Brukner<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institute for Quantum Optics and Quantum Information,  
Austrian Academy of Sciences, Boltzmannngasse 3, A-1090 Vienna, Austria*

<sup>2</sup>*Faculty of Physics, University of Vienna, Boltzmannngasse 5, A-1090 Vienna, Austria*  
(Dated: April 20, 2019)

Mutually unbiased bases encapsulate the concept of complementarity in the formalism of quantum theory. Although this concept is at the heart of quantum mechanics, the number of these bases is unknown except for systems of dimension being a power of a prime. We develop the relation between this physical problem and the mathematical problem of finding the number of mutually orthogonal Latin squares. We use already existing knowledge about the squares to derive in a simple way all known results about the unbiased bases, find the lower bound on their number, and disprove the existence of certain forms of the bases in dimensions different than power of a prime. Our results can be used to construct hidden-variable models which efficiently simulate results of complementary measurements on quantum systems with arbitrary dimension.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ta, 02.10.Ox

*Introduction.* Complementarity is a fundamental principle of quantum physics which forbids simultaneous knowledge of certain observables, such as position and momentum. This phenomenon is manifested already for the simplest quantum mechanical system — a spin  $\frac{1}{2}$  particle. If the system is in a definite state of, say, spin along  $x$ , the spin along  $y$  or  $z$  is completely unknown, i.e. the outcomes “spin up” and “spin down” occur with the same probability. The eigenbases of  $\hat{\sigma}_x$ ,  $\hat{\sigma}_y$  and  $\hat{\sigma}_z$  Pauli operators form so-called *mutually unbiased bases* (MUBs): every vector from one basis has equal overlap with all the vectors from other bases. MUBs encapsulate the concept of complementarity in the quantum formalism. Although complementarity is one of the fundamental features of quantum physics, the question about the number of MUBs remains unanswered. Apart from being of foundational interest, MUBs find applications in quantum state tomography [1], quantum-key distribution [2] and the Mean King problem [3].

A  $d$ -level quantum system can have at most  $d + 1$  MUBs, and such a set is referred to as the complete set of MUBs. In 1981 Ivanović proved by construction that there are indeed  $d + 1$  complementary measurements for  $d$  being a prime number [4]. This result was generalized by Wootters and Fields to cover powers of primes [1]. For other dimensions the number of MUBs is unknown, the simplest case being dimension six. A considerable amount of work was done towards understanding this problem. New proofs of previous results were established [5, 6, 7] and the problem was linked with other unsolved problems [8, 9]. It was also noticed that it is similar in spirit to certain problems in combinatorics [10, 11] and finite geometry [12]. Here, we build upon these relations.

We describe the problem of the number of orthogonal Latin squares (OLSs), which was initiated by Euler in the 1780’s and still attracts lots of attention in mathematics. Although this problem is not solved yet, more is known about it than about the number of MUBs. We show that from every OLS of order being a power of a prime one can derive a MUB. This link from a purely mathematical object (OLS) to quantum mechanical one (MUB) is established using a device which en-

codes physically information contained in a Latin square. For dimension six, our method gives three MUBs, which is the maximal number found by the numerical research [9, 10]. Using known results for OLSs we derive a minimal number of MUBs, and disprove the existence of certain forms of MUBs for arbitrary  $d$ . Finally, we show that OLSs allow a construction of hidden-variable models efficiently simulating results of complementary quantum measurements, and that Spekkens’ model [13] is a special case of this approach.

*Orthogonal Latin squares.* A Latin square of order  $d$  is an array of numbers  $\{0, \dots, d - 1\}$  where every row and every column contains each number exactly once. Two Latin squares,  $A = [A_{ij}]$  and  $B = [B_{ij}]$ , are orthogonal if all *ordered* pairs  $(A_{ij}, B_{ij})$  are distinct. There are at most  $d - 1$  OLSs and this set is called complete. A set of orthogonal Latin squares can be augmented by two other orthogonal squares, which are not Latin: in the first square  $A_{ij} = i$ , and in the second  $A_{ij} = j$ . From the augmented set one can build a *combinatorial design* called a *net* [14]. It has the form of a table with as many rows as squares in the augmented set, i.e.  $M = L + 2$ , where  $M$  is the number of rows and  $L$  is the number of OLSs [20].

*Qubit.* Consider the squares for  $d = 2$ . We link them with complementary measurements of a qubit. The augmented set of orthogonal squares reads

$$\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{array} \quad (1)$$

The right square is Latin, the left and middle square are orthogonal to each other and to the Latin square. These three squares lead to the net design on the left, in which numbers are represented by pairs  $mn$  in modulo-two decomposition:

$$\begin{array}{c|c} b = 0 & b = 1 \\ \hline 00 & 01 \\ \hline 00 & 10 \\ \hline 00 & 11 \\ \hline 01 & 00 \\ \hline 01 & 01 \\ \hline 01 & 10 \\ \hline 10 & 00 \\ \hline 10 & 01 \\ \hline 10 & 10 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} m = b? \\ n = b? \\ m + n = b? \end{array} \quad (2)$$

On the right, we write down the *complementary questions* as-

sociated with each row. They are answered by pairs  $mn$  in the left and right column of the net design (left column  $\rightarrow$  answer 0, right column  $\rightarrow$  answer 1).

The complementary questions can be answered in quantum experiments involving MUBs. Consider a device encoding the parameters  $m$  and  $n$  via application of the unitary  $\hat{U} = \hat{\sigma}_x^m \hat{\sigma}_z^n$ . When it acts on  $|z\pm\rangle$  states, they get a phase dependent on  $n$  and are flipped  $m$  times. Thus, knowing the initial state, a final measurement in the  $\hat{\sigma}_z$  eigenbasis reveals  $m$ , giving the answer to the first complementary question. Similar reasoning applied to  $|x\pm\rangle$  and  $|y\pm\rangle$  states shows that they answer the second and the third complementary question, respectively.

*Prime dimensions.* For prime  $d$  the net has  $d + 1$  rows. Let us arrange it such that the non-Latin squares correspond to the first two rows. Their entries are the answers to the questions about the values of  $m$  and  $n$ . This time, each entry takes on one of  $d$  values. The entries in all other rows are generated from the following formula

$$n = am + b, \quad (3)$$

where the integer  $a = 1, \dots, d - 1$  enumerates the rows of the table other than those corresponding to the non-Latin squares, while the integer  $b = 0, \dots, d - 1$  enumerates different columns, and the sum is modulo  $d$ . The origin of Eq. (3) will be clear soon. The table is built in the following way: (i) choose the row,  $a$ , and the column,  $b$ ; (ii) vary  $m = 0, \dots, d - 1$  and compute  $n$  according to (3); (iii) write pairs  $mn$  in the cell. For example, for  $d = 3$ , one has

$b = 0$	$b = 1$	$b = 2$	
00 01 02	10 11 12	20 21 22	$m = b?$
00 10 20	01 11 21	02 12 22	$n = b?$
00 11 22	01 12 20	02 10 21	$n = m + b?$
00 12 21	01 10 22	02 11 20	$n = 2m + b?$

(4)

The complementary questions, of Eq. (3), are given on the right. Different values of  $a$  enumerate these questions and different values of  $b$  enumerate possible answers.

We shall see, again, that the complementary questions can be answered using MUBs. Consider encoding of parameters  $m$  and  $n$  via application of  $\hat{U} = \hat{X}^m \hat{Z}^n$ , where  $\hat{X}^m \hat{Z}^n$  span a unitary operator basis [15]. In the basis of  $\hat{Z}$ , denoted as  $|\kappa\rangle$ , the two *elementary operators* are defined by

$$\hat{Z}|\kappa\rangle = \eta_d^\kappa |\kappa\rangle, \quad \hat{X}|\kappa\rangle = |\kappa + 1\rangle, \quad (5)$$

where  $\eta_d = \exp(i2\pi/d)$  is a complex  $d$ th root of unity. For the same reasons as for a qubit, the first two questions are answered by applying  $\hat{U}$  on an eigenstates of  $\hat{Z}$  and  $\hat{X}$  operators, and then by measuring the emerging state in these bases. In all other cases, the action of the device is, up to a global phase,  $\hat{U} \propto (\hat{X}\hat{Z}^a)^m \hat{Z}^b$ , which follows from Eq. (3) and the commutation relation for the elementary operators,  $\hat{Z}\hat{X} = \eta_d \hat{X}\hat{Z}$ . The eigenstates of the  $\hat{X}\hat{Z}^a$  operator, expressed in the  $\hat{Z}$  basis, are given by  $|j\rangle_a = (1/\sqrt{d}) \sum_{\kappa=0}^{d-1} \eta_d^{-j\kappa - a s_\kappa} |\kappa\rangle$ ,

where  $s_\kappa = \kappa + \dots + (d - 1)$  [5], and the  $\hat{Z}$  operator shifts them:  $\hat{Z}|j\rangle_a = |j - 1\rangle_a$ . After the device,  $|j\rangle_a$  is shifted exactly  $b$  times and subsequent measurement in this basis reveals the answer to the  $a$ th question. On the other hand, the eigenbases of  $\hat{X}\hat{Z}^a$  for  $a = 1, \dots, d - 1$  and eigenbases of  $\hat{X}$  and  $\hat{Z}$  are known to form a complete set of MUBs [5]. Not only the number of MUBs is the same as the number of OLSs, but they are indexed by the same variable,  $a$ . This is the relation we were looking for.

*Powers of primes.* If  $d$  is a power of a prime, a complete set of OLSs is obtained using operations in the finite field of  $d$  elements, and one expects that a complete set of MUBs also follows from the existence of the field. Indeed, explicit formulae for MUBs in terms of the field operations were presented by Durt [7]. Here, we prove this result in a simple way related to [16], using the theorem of Bandyopadhyay *et al.* [5]: *If there is a set of orthogonal unitary matrices, which can be partitioned into  $M$  subsets of  $d$  commuting operators, then there are at least  $M$  MUBs* [21]. Joint eigenbases of the  $d$  commuting operators form MUBs.

To illustrate the idea, consider again prime  $d$ . The complete set of OLSs is obtained from the field using Eq. (3):  $n$  is the number which stands at position  $(m, b)$  of the  $a$ th square. Take the orthogonal unitary operators  $\hat{S}_{mn} = \hat{X}^m \hat{Z}^n$  with their powers  $mn$  taken from the first column of the net. The cell of the first and second row corresponds to the eigenbases of  $\hat{Z}$  and  $\hat{X}$ , respectively, whereas the other rows are defined by  $b = 0$ , i.e.  $n = am$ . According to the commutation rule of the elementary operators  $\hat{X}$  and  $\hat{Z}$ ,  $\hat{S}_{mn}$  and  $\hat{S}_{m'n'}$  commute if and only if  $mn' - m'n = 0 \pmod{d}$ . Thus, for a fixed row, i.e. fixed  $a$ , the set of  $d$  operators  $\hat{S}_{mn}$  commute, because  $m(am') - m'(am) = 0$ , and, due to the mentioned theorem, there is a set of  $d + 1$  MUBs.

For  $d = p^r$  being a power of a prime, the OLSs and the net are generated by the formula

$$n = a \odot m \oplus b, \quad (6)$$

where  $\odot$  and  $\oplus$  denote multiplication and addition in the field,  $a, b, m, n \in \mathbb{F}_d$  are field elements, and  $a \neq 0$ . The first two rows of the table are defined by  $m = b$  and  $n = b$ . In the case of  $d = 4$ , the four elements  $\{0, 1, \omega, \omega + 1\}$  of the field  $\mathbb{F}_4$  ( $\omega$  is the root of  $x^2 + x + 1$  [16]), when indexed with the numbers  $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ , lead to the following net design:

00 01 02 03	10 11 12 13	20 21 22 23	30 31 32 33
00 10 20 30	01 11 21 31	02 12 22 32	03 13 23 33
00 11 22 33	01 10 23 32	02 13 20 31	03 12 21 30
00 12 23 31	01 13 22 30	02 10 21 33	03 11 20 32
00 13 21 32	01 12 20 33	02 11 23 30	03 10 22 31

(7)

We shall use the concept of a basis in the finite field. The basis in the field  $\mathbb{F}_d$  consists of  $r$  elements  $e_i$ , with  $i = 1, \dots, r$ . Every basis has a unique dual basis,  $\bar{e}_j$ , such that  $\text{tr}(e_i \odot \bar{e}_j) = \delta_{ij}$ , where the trace in the field,  $\text{tr}(x)$ , maps elements of  $\mathbb{F}_d$  into the elements of the prime field  $\mathbb{F}_p$ . It has the following useful

properties:  $\text{tr}(x \oplus y) = \text{tr}(x) + \text{tr}(y)$ , and  $\text{tr}(a \odot x) = a \text{tr}(x)$ , where operations on the right-hand side are modulo  $p$  and  $a$  is in the prime field. We decompose  $m$  in the basis  $e_i$ ,  $m = m_1 \odot e_1 \oplus \dots \oplus m_r \odot e_r$ , where  $m_i = \text{tr}(m \odot \bar{e}_i)$ , and  $n$  in the dual basis,  $n = n_1 \odot \bar{e}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus n_r \odot \bar{e}_r$ , with  $n_i = \text{tr}(n \odot e_i)$ . Due to the properties of the trace in the field and the dual basis

$$\text{tr}(m \odot n) = \sum_{i=1}^r m_i n_i = \vec{m} \cdot \vec{n}, \quad (8)$$

where  $\vec{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_r)$  and  $\vec{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_r)$  have components in the prime field, i.e. numbers  $\{0, \dots, p-1\}$ .

Consider operators defined by the decomposition of  $m$  and  $n$ ,  $\hat{S}_{\vec{m}\vec{n}} = \hat{X}_p^{m_1} \hat{Z}_p^{n_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \hat{X}_p^{m_r} \hat{Z}_p^{n_r}$ , where e.g.  $X_p^{m_i}$  is the unitary operator acting on the  $i$ th  $p$ -dimensional subspace of the global  $d$ -dimensional space. Operators  $\hat{S}_{\vec{m}\vec{n}}$  form an orthogonal basis. They commute, if and only if  $\vec{m} \cdot \vec{n}' - \vec{m}' \cdot \vec{n} = 0 \pmod{p}$ . Take the operators corresponding to a fixed row of the first column of the net, i.e.  $a$  is fixed,  $b = 0$  and therefore  $n = a \odot m$ . From Eq. (8), all these  $d$  operators commute if  $\text{tr}(m \odot a \odot m') = \text{tr}(m' \odot a \odot m)$ , which is satisfied due to associativity and commutativity of multiplication in the field. Therefore, their eigenbases define MUBs. Again, each row of the table is linked with the MUB.

Reconsider the example of  $d = 4$ . Choose  $(e_1, e_2) = (\omega, 1)$  as a basis in the field, such that the numbers  $m$  are decomposed into pairs  $m \rightarrow m_1 m_2$  in the usual way:  $0 \rightarrow 00, 1 \rightarrow 01, 2 \rightarrow 10, 3 \rightarrow 11$ . The dual basis reads  $(\bar{e}_1, \bar{e}_2) = (1, \omega + 1)$ , which implies that the numbers  $n$  are decomposed into pairs  $n \rightarrow n_1 n_2$  as follows:  $0 \rightarrow 00, 1 \rightarrow 10, 2 \rightarrow 11, 3 \rightarrow 01$ . Each pair of numbers of table (7) is now written vertically as a combination of two pairs of numbers:

00 01 01 00	00 01 01 00	10 11 11 10	10 11 11 10
00 00 01 01	10 10 11 11	00 00 01 01	10 10 11 11
00 00 10 10	01 01 11 11	01 01 11 11	00 00 10 10
00 10 00 10	00 10 00 10	01 11 01 11	01 11 01 11
00 01 11 10	01 00 10 11	01 00 10 11	00 01 11 10
00 10 01 11	00 10 01 11	01 11 00 10	01 11 00 10
00 01 10 11	01 00 11 10	01 00 11 10	00 01 10 11
00 11 01 10	00 11 01 10	01 10 00 11	01 10 00 11
00 00 11 11	01 01 10 10	01 01 10 10	00 00 11 11
00 11 00 11	00 11 00 11	01 10 01 10	01 10 01 10

MUBs are formed by the eigenbases of operators  $\hat{\sigma}_x^{m_1} \hat{\sigma}_z^{n_1} \otimes \hat{\sigma}_x^{m_2} \hat{\sigma}_z^{n_2}$ , where the powers are taken from the first column of this table. The result is in agreement with other methods [5, 6]. The complementary questions answered by the states of these MUBs are formulated in terms of individual bits  $m_1, m_2, n_1, n_2$ , which are encoded by  $\hat{U} = \hat{\sigma}_x^{m_1} \hat{\sigma}_z^{n_1} \otimes \hat{\sigma}_x^{m_2} \hat{\sigma}_z^{n_2}$ . E.g., the question of the last row is about the values of  $m_1 + n_1$  and  $m_2 + n_2$ .

*General dimension.* Tarry was the first to prove that no two OLSs of order six exist [17], i.e. the net for  $d = 6$  has

only three rows. The operators  $\hat{X}^m \hat{Z}^n$  commute for numbers  $m$  and  $n$  from the first cell of these rows and the corresponding MUBs are the eigenbases of  $\hat{X}, \hat{Z}$  and  $\hat{X}\hat{Z}$ .

More generally, the lower bound on the number of OLSs was given by MacNeish [18]. If two squares of order  $a$  are orthogonal,  $A \perp B$ , and two squares of order  $b$  are orthogonal,  $C \perp D$ , then the squares obtained by a direct product, of order  $ab$ , are also orthogonal,  $A \times C \perp B \times D$ . This implies that the number of OLSs,  $\mathcal{L}$ , of order  $d = p_1^{r_1} \dots p_n^{r_n}$ , with  $p_i$  being prime factors of  $d$ , is at least  $\mathcal{L} \geq \min_i(p_i^{r_i} - 1)$ , where  $p_i^{r_i} - 1$  is the number of OLSs of order  $p_i^{r_i}$ . A parallel result holds for MUBs. If  $|a\rangle$  and  $|b\rangle$  are the states of two MUBs in dimension  $d_1$ , and  $|c\rangle$  and  $|d\rangle$  are the states of MUBs in dimension  $d_2$ , then the tensor product bases  $|a\rangle \otimes |c\rangle$  and  $|b\rangle \otimes |d\rangle$  form MUBs in dimension  $d_1 d_2$ . Thus, for  $d = p_1^{r_1} \dots p_n^{r_n}$  there are at least  $\min_i(p_i^{r_i} + 1)$  MUBs.

In general, we know more about the number of OLSs than about the number of MUBs [14]. We shall use this knowledge to derive conditions which restrict the form of MUBs. First we introduce operators, defined by the complete set of MUBs, which are orthogonal if and only if there exists a complete set of OLSs. Since there is no complete set of OLSs for dimension six, there is no complete set of MUBs for which these operators are orthogonal. The operators are defined as

$$\hat{B}_{n_0 \dots n_d} = \mathbb{1} + \sum_{m=0}^d \sum_{\xi=1}^{d-1} n_d^{m\xi} S_m^\xi, \quad (10)$$

where  $n_m = 0, \dots, d-1$  and  $S_m^\xi = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \eta_d^{j\xi} |j\rangle_m \langle j|$  have MUBs as eigenbases,  $m = 0, \dots, d$ . The trace scalar product  $\text{Tr}(\hat{B}_{n_0 \dots n_d}^\dagger \hat{B}_{n'_0 \dots n'_d})$  is given by  $d^2(k-1)$ , where  $k$  denotes the sum of Kronecker deltas,  $k \equiv \delta_{n_0 n'_0} + \dots + \delta_{n_d n'_d}$ . Operators  $\hat{B}_{n_0 \dots n_d}$  and  $\hat{B}_{n'_0 \dots n'_d}$  are orthogonal if and only if  $k = 1$ , i.e.  $n_m = n'_m$  for exactly one  $m$ . This condition applied to  $d^2$  orthogonal operators, defines a complete set of orthogonal squares. Take  $d^2$  orthogonal operators  $\hat{B}_{n_0(b) \dots n_d(b)}$  with  $b = 1, \dots, d^2$  and consider  $d+1$  squares defined by their indices  $n_m(b)$  for a fixed  $m$ . If the squares were not orthogonal, one could find at least two identical pairs,  $(n_m(b), n_{m'}(b)) = (n_m(b'), n_{m'}(b'))$ , implying that operators (10) are not orthogonal ( $k \geq 2$ ).

The second condition is obtained by noting that a net defines ‘‘orthogonal’’ functions,  $F_a(m, n)$ , which give the column of the  $a$ th row where the pair  $mn$  is entered. The orthogonality means that for the pairs  $mn$  for which the function  $F_a(m, n)$  has a fixed value, the function  $F_{a'}(m, n)$  acquires all its values. We show that if  $d^2$  unitaries,  $\hat{U}_{mn}$ , shift (up to a phase) the states of different bases in accordance with the net

$$\hat{U}_{mn}|j\rangle_a \propto |j + F_a(m, n)\rangle_a, \quad (11)$$

then these bases are MUBs. For the proof, note that  $\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} |\langle i|i'\rangle_a|^2 = 1$ . From orthogonality of the functions, this sum can be written as  $\sum_S |\langle j + F_a(m, n)|j' + F_{a'}(m, n)\rangle_a|^2 = 1$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is the set of pairs  $mn$  for which  $F_a(m, n)$  has a fixed value. By (11), the last is  $\sum_S |\langle j| \hat{U}_{mn}^\dagger \hat{U}_{mn} |j'\rangle_a|^2$ , which due to unitarity,  $\hat{U}_{mn}^\dagger \hat{U}_{mn} = \mathbb{1}$ , is the sum of  $d$  identical terms

$|_a\langle j|j'\rangle_a|^2$ . Therefore,  $|_a\langle j|j'\rangle_a|^2 = 1/d$ . Further, given  $d^2$  unitaries with property (11), one recovers the table in the following experiment: prepare  $|0\rangle_a$ , act on it with  $\hat{U}_{mn}$ , measure in the same basis, and write the pair  $mn$  in the  $a$ th row and the column corresponding to the result. Thus, in dimension six, there cannot be 36 unitaries satisfying (11), with the orthogonal functions, for more than three bases, because otherwise one could construct more than three orthogonal squares of order six, which is impossible.

*Ontic models.* OLSs or net designs can be used to construct hidden-variable models which simulate results of complementary measurements on certain states. Recently, Spekkens showed that only four ‘‘ontic states’’ (hidden variables) are sufficient to simulate complementary measurements of a qubit prepared in a state of a MUB [13]. In his model, quantum states of MUBs correspond to the ‘‘epistemic states’’ satisfying the knowledge balance principle: the amount of knowledge one possesses about the ontic state is equal to the amount of knowledge one lacks [13]. This principle lies behind the net design. Left table of (2) corresponds to the original Spekkens’ model: the numbers enumerate ontic states, cells correspond to the epistemic states and rows to the complementary measurements. All other tables generalize the model. To identify the ontic state one needs two dits of information (there are  $d^2$  ontic states), whereas the epistemic state is defined by a single dit, leaving the other one unknown.

The ontic states, for  $d$  being a power of a prime, are naturally represented in the discrete phase space of Ref. [16]. This space is a finite affine plane: it consists of  $d^2$  points connected with  $d(d+1)$  lines, which can be partitioned into  $d+1$  sets of  $d$  parallel lines. The points of the plane correspond to the ontic states, the lines to the epistemic states, parallel lines correspond to distinguishable epistemic states and different sets of parallel lines to the complementary measurements. Each point lies on exactly  $d+1$  lines belonging to all the complementary measurements and therefore has a well-defined outcome for all of them. The quantum states that have an ontic model are described by the positive discrete Wigner functions. These states require (a classical mixture of) only two dits to model  $d$  outcomes of  $d+1$  quantum complementary measurements.

To conclude, we have shown a one-to-one relation between OLSs and MUBs, if  $d$  is a power of a prime. In future it will be interesting to find if this relation remains unchanged in general. Some insight into this question can be gained from considerations of specific dimensions in which the MacNeish’s bound on OLSs is not tight [19].

*Acknowledgments.* T.P. would like to thank Gabriele

Uchida and Johannes Kofler. This work is supported by the Austrian Science Foundation FWF (Project No. P19570-N16), the European Commission, Project QAP (No. 015846), and the FWF project CoQuS (No. W1210-N16).

- 
- [1] W. K. Wootters and B. D. Fields, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **191**, 363 (1989).
  - [2] N. Gisin *et al.*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**, 145 (2002).
  - [3] L. Vaidman, Y. Aharonov, and D. Z. Albert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **58**, 1385 (1987); Y. Aharonov and B.-G. Englert, *Z. Naturforsch.* **56**, 16 (2001); P. K. Aravind, *Z. Naturforsch.* **58A**, 2212 (2003).
  - [4] I. D. Ivanović, *J. Phys. A* **14**, 3241 (1981).
  - [5] S. Bandyopadhyay *et al.*, *Algorithmica* **34**, 512 (2002).
  - [6] Č. Brukner and A. Zeilinger, *J. Mod. Opt.* **47**, 2233 (2000); J. Lawrence, Č. Brukner, and A. Zeilinger, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 32320 (2002).
  - [7] T. Durt, *J. Phys. A* **38**, 5267 (2005).
  - [8] P. O. Boykin *et al.*, arXiv: quant-ph/0506089.
  - [9] I. Bengtsson *et al.*, *J. Math. Phys.* **48**, 52106 (2007).
  - [10] G. Zauner, (Dissertation, Universität Wien, 1999).
  - [11] I. Bengtsson, quant-ph/0406174 (2004).
  - [12] M. Saniga, M. Planat, and H. Rosu, *J. Opt. B* **6**, L19 (2004); W. K. Wootters, *Found. Phys.* **36**, 112 (2006).
  - [13] R. W. Spekkens, *Phys. Rev. A* **75**, 32110 (2007).
  - [14] C. J. Colbourn and J. H. Dinitz (eds.), *The CRC Handbook of Combinatorial Designs*, (CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida 1996).
  - [15] H. Weyl, *The Theory of Groups and Quantum Mechanics*, (Dover, New York, 1950); J. Schwinger, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* **46**, 570 (1960).
  - [16] K. S. Gibbons, M. J. Hoffman, and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 62101 (2004).
  - [17] G. Tarry, *Comptes Rendu de l’Association Francaise pour l’Avancement de Science Naturel* **1**, 122 (1900); **2** 170 (1901).
  - [18] H. F. MacNeish, *Ann. Math.* **23**, 221 (1921).
  - [19] M. Wojtas, *J. Comb. Des.* **4**, 153 (1996).
  - [20] Here is an algorithm for construction of a net from OLSs: (i) Write the squares in the standard form, i.e. the numbers of the first column are in ascending order (by permuting the entries, it is always possible to write the set of OLSs in the standard form without compromising Latinness and orthogonality). (ii) Augment the set of OLSs by the two orthogonal non-Latin squares  $A_{ij} = i$  and  $A_{ij} = j$ . (iii) Write the rows of the squares as cells in a single row of the table. The number of the table’s rows is now equal to the number of squares in the augmented set. (iv) In the row of the table which corresponds to the square  $A_{ij} = j$  replace the number  $n$  in the  $m$ th cell by  $md + n$ , where  $d$  is the order of the square. (v) For all the other table’s rows, replace the number  $n$  on position  $k$  in each cell by  $kd + n$ .
  - [21] As stated here, the theorem is slightly more general than the theorem 3.2 of Ref. [5]. Its proof does not differ from the one presented there.