

# Strong quantum nonlocality without entanglement in $n$ -partite system with even $n$

Huaqi Zhou<sup>1</sup>, Ting Gao<sup>1,\*</sup> and Fengli Yan<sup>2†</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of Mathematical Sciences, Hebei Normal University, Shijiazhuang 050024, China

<sup>2</sup> College of Physics, Hebei Key Laboratory of Photophysics Research and Application, Hebei Normal University, Shijiazhuang 050024, China

In this paper, we consider the strong quantum nonlocality without entanglement. We generalize the orthogonal product set presented by He et al. [arXiv:2203.14503v1] to arbitrary  $n$ -partite system, where  $n$  is even, and analyze the differences and connections between these sets. Especially, the sets are asymmetric in the case of even  $n$ . We show that each of the sets has the strongest quantum nonlocality. It implies that the information cannot be completely accessed as long as it does not happen that all parties are together. The existence of such orthogonal product set also exhibits the phenomenon of strong quantum nonlocality without entanglement in multipartite quantum system.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum entanglement is one of the most intriguing feature of quantum mechanics. Entangled states provide strong evidence for the validity of quantum mechanics [1–4] and can be used for entanglement-assisted communication [5–9], quantum teleportation [10–12], quantum key distribution [13–16] and so on. When entangled pure states violate the Bell-type inequalities, they exhibit quantum nonlocality [17–24] which means that spatially separated systems may behave in a way that cannot be explained by any local theory. This is the most striking one of quantum nonlocality. Interestingly, there also exist other types of nonlocal behaviors, which are no longer restricted only to entangled systems [25, 26]. When a set of orthogonal quantum states cannot be distinguished by local operations and classical communication (LOCC), it reflects the fundamental feature of quantum mechanics which is also called nonlocality [25–27]. An elementary result in this area was presented by Bennett et al. who first showed a LOCC indistinguishable orthogonal product basis in  $\mathcal{C}^3 \otimes \mathcal{C}^3$  [25]. Subsequently, Walgate et al. proposed a very simple proof method for the nonlocality of the orthogonal product basis [28]. Inspired by this senior work of Bennett et al. on quantum nonlocality without entanglement, many orthogonal product sets (OPSs) with quantum nonlocality were provided in bipartite and multipartite systems [26, 27, 29–35]. These results also showed that the local indistinguishability has meaningful research value for quantum data hiding [36–38] and quantum secret sharing [39–44].

In 2019, Halder et al. [45] came up with the concept of strong quantum nonlocality without entanglement and showed the phenomenon by presenting two explicit strongly nonlocal orthogonal product bases on  $\mathcal{C}^3 \otimes \mathcal{C}^3 \otimes \mathcal{C}^3$  and  $\mathcal{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{C}^4$ , respectively. In their concept, a set of multiparty orthogonal product states is strongly nonlocal if it is locally irreducible in every bipartition. The locally irreducibility of multiparty orthogonal set means that it is not possible to locally eliminate one or more states from the set while

preserving orthogonality of the postmeasurement states [45]. Actually, local irreducibility is a stronger version of local indistinguishability. Because a locally irreducible set is locally indistinguishable and the inverse does not hold in general.

A positive operator-valued measure (POVM) is trivial means that all the POVM elements are proportional to the identity operator [28]. In general, one uses the triviality of orthogonality-preserving POVM to deduce the locally irreducibility and then obtain the quantum nonlocality. Recently, the study on strong quantum nonlocality has made great progress [46–56]. Yuan et al. [48] presented two strongly nonlocal OPSs in  $\mathcal{C}^d \otimes \mathcal{C}^d \otimes \mathcal{C}^d$  and  $\mathcal{C}^d \otimes \mathcal{C}^d \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d+1}$  and gave two explicit forms of strongly nonlocal orthogonal product basis on  $\mathcal{C}^3 \otimes \mathcal{C}^3 \otimes \mathcal{C}^3 \otimes \mathcal{C}^3$  and  $\mathcal{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{C}^4$ . Zhou et al. [49] proposed a strongly nonlocal OPS containing fewer quantum states in  $\mathcal{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_B} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_C}$  ( $d_A, d_B, d_C \geq 4$ ) and generalized the structures of known OPSs to any possible three and four-partite systems. Che et al. [50] constructed a strongly nonlocal unextendible product basis on quantum system  $\mathcal{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_B} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_C}$  ( $d_A, d_B, d_C \geq 3$ ). In general  $n$ -partite systems, several strongly nonlocal sets of orthogonal entangled states were showed by Shi et al. [52–54] and Li et al. [55]. For odd  $n$ , He et al. [56] presented a strongly nonlocal OPS in system  $\otimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{C}^{d_i}$  ( $n, d_i \geq 3$ ). The case where  $n$  is even has not been considered.

In this paper, we mainly consider the strong quantum nonlocality without entanglement in any  $n$ -partite ( $n$  is even) system. For simplicity, all product states are not normalized.

## II. THE OPS WITH STRONG NONLOCALITY IN $n$ -QUDIT ( $n$ IS EVEN)

According to the method of He et al. [56], we first construct a set of product states in the quantum system  $\otimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{C}^3$ , where  $n$  is even.

Let  $|\eta_{\pm}\rangle = |0 \pm 1\rangle$  and  $|\xi_{\pm}\rangle = |1 \pm 2\rangle$ .  $I_n$  is the index set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ .  $Q$  expresses a subset of  $I_n$  and  $|Q|$  is odd. For any fixed  $Q$ , there are two subsets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_Q &:= \{\mathcal{C}_Q^{(1)} \otimes \mathcal{C}_Q^{(2)} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{C}_Q^{(n)}\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_Q &:= \{\mathcal{D}_Q^{(1)} \otimes \mathcal{D}_Q^{(2)} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{D}_Q^{(n)}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

\*Electronic address: gaoting@hebtu.edu.cn

†Electronic address: flyan@hebtu.edu.cn

$\mathcal{P} \in \{\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}\}$	if $i \notin Q$	if $i \in Q$
if $\mathcal{P}_Q^{(i-1)} =  0\rangle_{i-1}$ or $ \eta_{\pm}\rangle_{i-1}$	$\mathcal{P}_Q^{(i)} =  0\rangle_i$	$\mathcal{P}_Q^{(i)} =  \xi_{\pm}\rangle_i$
if $\mathcal{P}_Q^{(i-1)} =  2\rangle_{i-1}$ or $ \xi_{\pm}\rangle_{i-1}$	$\mathcal{P}_Q^{(i)} =  2\rangle_i$	$\mathcal{P}_Q^{(i)} =  \eta_{\pm}\rangle_i$

TABLE I: The construction of  $\mathcal{C}_Q^{(i)}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_Q^{(i)}$  for  $2 \leq i \leq n$ .

Here

$$\mathcal{C}_Q^{(1)} := \begin{cases} |0\rangle_1, & \text{if } 1 \notin Q, \\ |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1, & \text{if } 1 \in Q, \end{cases} \quad \mathcal{D}_Q^{(1)} := \begin{cases} |2\rangle_1, & \text{if } 1 \notin Q, \\ |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1, & \text{if } 1 \in Q. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

For  $2 \leq i \leq n$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_Q^{(i)}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_Q^{(i)}$  are defined as table I. Naturally, we have the set

$$\mathcal{E} := \bigcup_{Q \in \Theta, \mathcal{P} \in \{\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}\}} \mathcal{P}_Q, \quad (3)$$

where  $\Theta := \{Q \subseteq I_n \mid |Q| \text{ is odd}\}$ . It is easy to know that  $|\Theta| = 2^{n-1}$ . So, there are  $2^n$  subsets  $\mathcal{P}_Q$ . Moreover, each subset  $\mathcal{P}_Q$  contains  $2^{|Q|}$  vectors. Hence  $\mathcal{E}$  contains

$$2 \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} C_n^{2i-1} 2^{2i-1} = 3^n - 1 \quad (4)$$

vectors. In particular, when  $n = 2$ ,  $\mathcal{E}$  is the set of the eight special product states presented by Bennett et al. [25].

In  $\otimes_{i=1}^{n+1} \mathcal{C}^3$ , He et al. [56] given the OPS  $\mathcal{O} := \bigcup_{K \in \Lambda, \mathcal{P} \in \{\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}\}} \mathcal{P}_K$  with strongly quantum nonlocality, where  $n$  is even and  $\Lambda := \{K \subseteq I_{n+1} \mid |K| \text{ is even}\}$ . The difference between these two sets  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{O}$  behaves in the difference of index sets  $Q$  and  $K$ . Now, we analyze the relationship between these two sets. The set  $\mathcal{O}$  is symmetric. That is, it is invariant under cyclic permutation of the parties. Without loss of generality, we consider removing the  $(n+1)$ th quantum system of set  $\mathcal{O}$ . We first remove the quantum states with  $|0\rangle_{n+1}$  and  $|2\rangle_{n+1}$  from  $\mathcal{O}$  and mark the set of the remaining quantum states as  $\mathcal{E}'$ . Then we remove the particles of the  $(n+1)$ th subsystem in the set  $\mathcal{E}'$ . The resulting quantum states form a new set  $\mathcal{E}''$ . Interestingly, this new set happens to be the set  $\mathcal{E}$ . Moreover, if one repeats the above two steps for the set  $\mathcal{E}$ , one can get the set  $\mathcal{O}$  in  $(n-1)$ -qutrit quantum system. For the detailed explanation please refer to Appendix A. To help one understand even better, we give a simple case to illustrate.

Case 1. In 5-qutrit quantum system, set  $\mathcal{O}$  is equal to the set  $\bigcup_{j=1}^{16} (\mathcal{C}_j \cup \mathcal{D}_j)$  given by Ref. [53]. We consider removing the 5th quantum system.

Step 1. Removing the quantum states with  $|0\rangle_5$  and  $|2\rangle_5$ ,

the remaining subsets are as following

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}'_1 &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1 |2\rangle_2 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_4 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{D}'_2 &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2 |0\rangle_3 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_4 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{D}'_3 &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3 |2\rangle_4 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{D}'_7 &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1 |2\rangle_2 |2\rangle_3 |2\rangle_4 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{D}'_9 &:= \{|2\rangle_1 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_4 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{D}'_{12} &:= \{|2\rangle_1 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2 |0\rangle_3 |0\rangle_4 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{D}'_{15} &:= \{|2\rangle_1 |2\rangle_2 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3 |0\rangle_4 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{D}'_{16} &:= \{|2\rangle_1 |2\rangle_2 |2\rangle_3 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_4 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{C}'_1 &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_4 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{C}'_2 &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2 |2\rangle_3 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_4 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{C}'_3 &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3 |0\rangle_4 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{C}'_7 &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2 |0\rangle_3 |0\rangle_4 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{C}'_9 &:= \{|0\rangle_1 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_4 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{C}'_{12} &:= \{|0\rangle_1 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2 |2\rangle_3 |2\rangle_4 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{C}'_{15} &:= \{|0\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3 |2\rangle_4 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{C}'_{16} &:= \{|0\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2 |0\rangle_3 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_4 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_5\}. \end{aligned}$$

Their union is the set  $\mathcal{E}'$ .

Step 2. We remove the particles of the 5th subsystem in set  $\mathcal{E}'$  and get the following subsets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}''_1 &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1 |2\rangle_2 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_4\}, \\ \mathcal{D}''_2 &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2 |0\rangle_3 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_4\}, \\ \mathcal{D}''_3 &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3 |2\rangle_4\}, \\ \mathcal{D}''_7 &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1 |2\rangle_2 |2\rangle_3 |2\rangle_4\}, \\ \mathcal{D}''_9 &:= \{|2\rangle_1 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_4\}, \\ \mathcal{D}''_{12} &:= \{|2\rangle_1 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2 |0\rangle_3 |0\rangle_4\}, \\ \mathcal{D}''_{15} &:= \{|2\rangle_1 |2\rangle_2 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3 |0\rangle_4\}, \\ \mathcal{D}''_{16} &:= \{|2\rangle_1 |2\rangle_2 |2\rangle_3 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_4\}, \\ \mathcal{C}''_1 &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_4\}, \\ \mathcal{C}''_2 &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2 |2\rangle_3 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_4\}, \\ \mathcal{C}''_3 &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3 |0\rangle_4\}, \\ \mathcal{C}''_7 &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2 |0\rangle_3 |0\rangle_4\}, \\ \mathcal{C}''_9 &:= \{|0\rangle_1 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_4\}, \\ \mathcal{C}''_{12} &:= \{|0\rangle_1 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2 |2\rangle_3 |2\rangle_4\}, \\ \mathcal{C}''_{15} &:= \{|0\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3 |2\rangle_4\}, \\ \mathcal{C}''_{16} &:= \{|0\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2 |0\rangle_3 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_4\}. \end{aligned}$$

We find that each subset above corresponds to a subset of  $\mathcal{E}$  in 4-qutrit quantum system. Moreover, set  $\mathcal{E}$  contains 16 subsets  $\mathcal{P}_Q$ . Therefore, the set  $\mathcal{E}$  is their union, that is, set  $\mathcal{E}''$ .

Repeating above two steps for the set  $\mathcal{E}$ , we obtain the new

subsets

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}_1 &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1|2\rangle_2|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_2 &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2|0\rangle_3\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_9 &:= \{|2\rangle_1|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_{16} &:= \{|2\rangle_1|2\rangle_2|2\rangle_3\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_1 &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1|0\rangle_2|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_2 &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2|2\rangle_3\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_9 &:= \{|0\rangle_1|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_{16} &:= \{|0\rangle_1|0\rangle_2|0\rangle_3\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Obviously, set  $\mathcal{O}$  in 3-qutrit quantum system is the union of these new subsets.  $\square$

It is worth noting that the set  $\mathcal{E}$  is asymmetric and each of its cyclic permutations under the parties can be obtained by removing different subsystem of the set  $\mathcal{O}$ . Additionally, by removing  $i$ th ( $i \in I_n$ ) subsystem of set  $\mathcal{E}$ , we can get a new set  $\mathcal{O}''$ . It will become the set  $\mathcal{O}$  in  $(n-1)$ -qutrit quantum system, when we transform  $|0\rangle_j$  and  $|2\rangle_j$  to  $|2\rangle_j$  and  $|0\rangle_j$  for all  $j > i$ , respectively. Appendix B has the detailed illustration. By using the relationship, we can obtain the following two theorems.

**Theorem 1.** The set  $\mathcal{E}$  is an OPS.

*Proof.* It is known that  $\langle\psi|\phi\rangle = 0$  for any two quantum states  $|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle_1|\psi\rangle_2 \cdots |\psi\rangle_{n+1}$  and  $|\phi\rangle = |\phi\rangle_1|\phi\rangle_2 \cdots |\phi\rangle_{n+1}$  in  $\mathcal{E}'$ . Because  $|\psi\rangle_{n+1}$  and  $|\phi\rangle_{n+1}$  are equal to  $|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_{n+1}$  or  $|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_{n+1}$ , therefore  $\langle\psi|\phi\rangle_{n+1} \neq 0$ . Thus we have  $\langle\psi|\phi\rangle_1\langle\psi|\phi\rangle_2 \cdots \langle\psi|\phi\rangle_n = 0$ . Hence the quantum states in the set  $\mathcal{E}$  are mutually orthogonal.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.** In the quantum system  $\otimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{C}^3$  ( $n > 3$ ), the set  $\mathcal{E}$  has the strongest quantum nonlocality.

The strongest quantum nonlocality refers to the fact that the set of orthogonal quantum states is locally irreducible in every bipartition [47]. Consider the strongest quantum nonlocality of OPS  $\mathcal{E}$ , we only need to show that the orthogonality-preserving POVM performed on any  $(n-1)$ -partite subsystem can only be trivial [53]. Each subset  $\mathcal{P}_Q$  is an orthogonal product basis of a subspace of  $n$ -qutrit complex Euclidean space. We can prove the triviality of orthogonality-preserving POVM by using [49, Theorem 1].

Let  $X = \{2, \dots, n\}$ . Consider the orthogonality-preserving POVM on  $X$  party. Fig.1 is the plane structure of the set  $\mathcal{E}$  in  $1|X$  bipartition. It is not difficult to find that we can achieve our goal as long as the connectedness (C1) of a family of subsets  $\{\mathcal{P}_Q\}_{Q \in \Theta, \mathcal{P} \in \{\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}\}}$  on  $X$  party is proved. This can be associated with the strongly nonlocality of  $\mathcal{O}$  in system  $\otimes_{i=2}^n \mathcal{C}^3$ . For other  $(n-1)$ -partite subsystems, we have similarly conclusions. The detailed proof is given in Appendix C.




FIG. 1: The corresponding  $3 \times 3^{n-1}$  grid of  $\{\mathcal{P}_{Q^i}\}$  given by set  $\mathcal{E}$  in  $1|X$  bipartition.

Next, by extending the dimension of the grid in fig.1,

$\mathcal{P} \in \{\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}\}$	if $t \notin Q$	if $t \in Q$
if $\mathcal{P}_Q^{f(t-1)} =  0\rangle_{t-1}$ or $\{ \alpha_i\rangle_{t-1}\}$	$\mathcal{P}_Q^{f(t)} =  0\rangle_t$	$\mathcal{P}_Q^{f(t)} = \{ \beta_j\rangle_t\}$
if $\mathcal{P}_Q^{f(t-1)} =  d_{t-1}-1\rangle_{t-1}$ or $\{ \beta_j\rangle_{t-1}\}$	$\mathcal{P}_Q^{f(t)} =  d_t-1\rangle_t$	$\mathcal{P}_Q^{f(t)} = \{ \alpha_i\rangle_t\}$

TABLE II: The construction of  $\mathcal{C}_Q^{f(t)}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_Q^{f(t)}$  for  $2 \leq t \leq n$ .

we can generalize the structure of the set  $\mathcal{E}$  to any finite dimension. We just need to replace  $|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_t$ ,  $|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_t$  and  $|2\rangle_t$  with  $\{|\alpha_i\rangle_t\} := \{\sum_{u=0}^{d_t-2} \omega_{d_t-1}^{iu} |u\rangle\}_{i=0}^{d_t-2}$ ,  $\{|\beta_j\rangle_t\} := \{\sum_{u=0}^{d_t-2} \omega_{d_t-1}^{ju} |u+1\rangle\}_{j=0}^{d_t-2}$  and  $|d_t-1\rangle_t$ , respectively. Here  $d_t$  is the dimension of the  $t$ th subsystem,  $\omega_{d_t-1} := e^{\frac{2\pi i}{d_t-1}}$ . For any fixed  $Q$ , there are two subsets

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C}_Q^f &:= \mathcal{C}_Q^{f(1)} \otimes \mathcal{C}_Q^{f(2)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{C}_Q^{f(n)}, \\
\mathcal{D}_Q^f &:= \mathcal{D}_Q^{f(1)} \otimes \mathcal{D}_Q^{f(2)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{D}_Q^{f(n)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C}_Q^{f(1)} &:= \begin{cases} |0\rangle_1, & \text{if } 1 \notin Q, \\ \{|\alpha_i\rangle_1\}, & \text{if } 1 \in Q, \end{cases} \\
\mathcal{D}_Q^{f(1)} &:= \begin{cases} |d_1-1\rangle_1, & \text{if } 1 \notin Q, \\ \{|\beta_j\rangle_1\}, & \text{if } 1 \in Q. \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

For  $2 \leq t \leq n$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_Q^{f(t)}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_Q^{f(t)}$  are defined as table II.

**Theorem 3.** In the quantum system  $\otimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{C}^{d_i}$  ( $n > 3$ ,  $d_i \geq 3$ ), the OPS  $\mathcal{F} := \bigcup_{Q \in \Theta, \mathcal{P} \in \{\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}\}} \mathcal{P}_Q^f$  has the strongest quantum nonlocality and

$$|\mathcal{F}| = d_1 d_2 \cdots d_n - (d_1 - 2)(d_2 - 2) \cdots (d_n - 2).$$

Because the set  $\mathcal{F}$  has the same structure as the set  $\mathcal{E}$ , the four conditions of [49, Theorem 1] still hold. Therefore, the set  $\mathcal{F}$  is an OPS with the strongest nonlocality.

### III. CONCLUSION

In summary, we provide the OPS with strongly quantum nonlocality in any  $n$ -partite system, where  $n$  is even, based on the structure introduced by He et al. [56]. Moreover, we analyze the differences and connections between the set given by He et al. [56] and our set. We hope that our results will help one better understand the strongly nonlocality without entanglement in multipartite quantum system.

### Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 12071110, the Hebei Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. A2020205014, and funded by the Science and Technology Project of Hebei Education Department under Grant Nos. ZD2020167 and ZD2021066.

### Appendix A: Remove the $(n + 1)$ th subsystem of set $\mathcal{O}$

In  $(n + 1)$ -qutrit quantum system, let us first consider the case where every index  $K$  contains  $n$  elements. Here  $n$  is even. Obviously, there are  $C_{n+1}^n$  such index  $K$  and  $C_n^0$  index  $K$  without element  $n + 1$ . We get rid of the index  $K$  without element  $n + 1$ . Then we remove the element  $n + 1$  in the remaining  $K$ . At this point, each of the resulting new index  $K'$  is an arbitrary combination of  $n - 1$  elements in  $I_n$  and there are  $C_n^{n-1} = C_{n+1}^n - C_n^0$  index  $K'$ . This happens to be all the indexes  $Q$  which contain  $n - 1$  elements in  $n$ -qutrit quantum system. Similarly, we have same conclusion for the  $K$  containing  $2, \dots, n - 2$  elements, respectively. So, the new set  $\mathcal{E}''$  is the same as the set  $\mathcal{E}$ . By the same way, we can know that the set  $\mathcal{O}$  in  $(n - 1)$ -qutrit quantum system can be obtained by removing the  $n$ th subsystem of set  $\mathcal{E}$ .

### Appendix B: The relationship between the sets $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{O}$

The cyclic permutation of the parties is defined as

$$P_j^C(|\psi\rangle_1|\psi\rangle_2 \cdots |\psi\rangle_{n+1}) \\ = |\psi\rangle_j|\psi\rangle_{j+1} \cdots |\psi\rangle_{n+1}|\psi\rangle_1|\psi\rangle_2 \cdots |\psi\rangle_{j-1},$$

for  $j \in \mathcal{Z}_{n+1}$ . Here  $n$  is even. Evidently  $P_1^C$  is an identity permutation. Let  $(k_1 k_2 \cdots k_{n+1})$  express an arrangement of parties, where  $k_i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n + 1\}$ .

We consider the set  $\mathcal{O}$  on arrangement  $(12 \cdots (n + 1))$ . Because of the symmetry, for a fixed  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , set  $P_{i+1}^C(\mathcal{O})$  is the same as set  $\mathcal{O}$ . Meanwhile, it corresponds to the arrangement  $((i + 1) \cdots (n + 1)1 \cdots i)$ . When we remove the  $i$ th subsystem of set  $P_{i+1}^C(\mathcal{O})$ , the new set is  $\mathcal{E}$  on the arrangement  $((i + 1) \cdots (n + 1)1 \cdots (i - 1))$ , according to the known result above. Hence, the set  $\mathcal{O}$  removing the  $i$ th subsystem is the set  $P_i^C(\mathcal{E})$  on the arrangement  $(1 \cdots (i - 1)(i + 1) \cdots (n + 1))$ .

Given the set  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $(12 \cdots n)$  party, we consider to remove its  $i$ th subsystem where  $i \in \{1, \dots, n - 1\}$ . We first consider the index  $Q$  containing  $n - 1$  elements. There are  $C_n^{n-1}$  such indexes  $Q$ . We remove the index  $Q$  without element  $i$  and there are  $C_{n-1}^0$  such index in total. Then, we remove the element  $i$  in the remaining  $Q$ . Each new index  $Q$  is a combination of  $n - 2$  elements in  $\{1, \dots, i - 1, i + 1, \dots, n\}$  and has  $C_{n-1}^{n-2} = C_n^{n-1} - C_{n-1}^0$  such indexes. We have similar conclusion for the  $Q$  containing  $1, \dots, n - 3$  elements, respectively. They can exactly correspond to all indexes  $K$  belonging to  $\Lambda$  in  $(n - 1)$ -partite system. According to the construction method of sets  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{O}$ , to turn  $\mathcal{O}''$  to  $\mathcal{O}$ , we only need to transform  $|0\rangle_j$  and  $|2\rangle_j$  to  $|2\rangle_j$  and  $|0\rangle_j$  for all  $j > i$ , respectively.

### Appendix C: The proof of theorem 2

Before proving the theorem 2, we need to introduce some notations and one useful theorem given in [49]. Let  $S_r = \{|\phi^r\rangle\}$  express an orthogonal product basis of a subspace in Hilbert space of the whole system and satisfy that each

component of the vector  $|\phi^r\rangle$  is nonzero under the computation basis of corresponding subspace. A class of OPS is the union of these bases  $S_r$  ( $r \in T = \{1, \dots, t\}$ ), where the subspaces corresponding to these bases are orthogonal to each other. We use  $S$  to represent it.

Given a subset  $X$  of  $I_n = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ .  $\mathcal{B} = \{|\i\rangle\}_{i=0}^{d-1}$  and  $\mathcal{B}^X = \{|\i\rangle_X\}_{i=0}^{d_X-1}$  are the computation basis of the complex Euclidean space corresponding to whole composite system and  $X$  party subsystem, respectively. Under the computation basis of whole system, the projection set of  $S_r$  on  $\tau$  ( $\tau = X, \bar{X}$ ) party is expressed as  $S_r^{[\tau]} = \{\text{Tr}_{\bar{\tau}}(|\i\rangle\langle\i|) \mid |\i\rangle \in \mathcal{B} \text{ and } \langle\i|\phi^r\rangle \neq 0 \text{ for any } |\phi^r\rangle \in S_r\}$ . For a fixed  $i \in \mathcal{Z}_{d_X}$ , we denote  $\mathcal{B}_i^X := \{|\k\rangle_X\}_{\k=i}^{d_X-1}$ ,  $V_i := \{\cup_v S_v^{[\bar{X}]} \mid |\i\rangle_X \in S_v^{[X]}\}$  and  $\tilde{S}_{V_i} := \{\cup_s S_s^{[X]} \mid S_s^{[\bar{X}]} \cap V_i \neq \emptyset\}$ . Besides, the following definitions are also needed.

Definition 1 [49]. If a family of projection sets  $\{S_r^{[X]}\}_{r \in T}$  cannot be divided into two groups of sets  $\{S_k^{[X]}\}_{k \in O}$  ( $O \subsetneq T$ ) and  $\{S_l^{[X]}\}_{l \in T \setminus O}$  such that

$$\left(\bigcup_{k \in O} S_k^{[X]}\right) \cap \left(\bigcup_{l \in T \setminus O} S_l^{[X]}\right) = \emptyset, \quad (\text{C1})$$

then we call it connected.

Definition 2 [49]. About a subset  $S_r$ , if there are some subsets  $\{S_{r'}\}_{r' \in T'}$  ( $r \notin T' \subset T$ ) satisfy  $S_r^{[X]} \subset \cup_{r' \in T'} S_{r'}^{[X]}$  and  $\cap_{r' \in T'} S_{r'}^{[\bar{X}]} \neq \emptyset$ , then their union  $R_r = \cup_{r' \in T'} S_{r'}$  is called the projection inclusion (PI) set of  $S_r$  on  $X$  party. Specially, if there exists a subset  $S_{r'} \subset R_r$  such that  $|S_r^{[X]} \cap S_{r'}^{[X]}| = 1$ , then  $R_r$  is called a more useful projection inclusion (UPI) set.

Next, we introduce a set sequence  $\{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_s\}$  about set  $S$  [49]. The set  $G_1$  denoted as  $\cup_{r_1 \in T_1} S_{r_1}$  is the union of all subsets that have UPI sets. The remaining sets  $G_2, \dots, G_s$  are expressed by  $\cup_{r_2 \in T_2} S_{r_2}, \dots, \cup_{r_s \in T_s} S_{r_s}$ , respectively. Moreover, these sets meet the following three conditions.

1)  $G_x \cap G_y = \emptyset$  for any  $x, y \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$  and the union  $\cup_{x=1}^s G_x$  is equal to the set  $S$ .

2) For any subset  $S_{r_{x+1}} \subset G_{x+1}$  ( $x = 1, \dots, s - 1$ ), there is always a subset  $S_{r_x} \subset G_x$  such that  $S_{r_{x+1}}^{[X]} \cap S_{r_x}^{[X]} \neq \emptyset$ .

3) For any  $S_{r_x} \subset G_x$  ( $x = 1, \dots, s - 2$ ), we have  $S_{r_x}^{[X]} \cap S_{r_y}^{[X]} = \emptyset$ , where  $S_{r_y}$  is an arbitrary subset in  $G_y$  for all  $y = x + 2, \dots, s$ .

In addition, we call  $S_{r_x}$  included (IC) subset about set  $G_x$  ( $x = 1, \dots, s$ ), if there is a subset  $S_{r'_x} \subset G_x$  such that  $S_{r_x}^{[X]} \subsetneq S_{r'_x}^{[X]}$ . Otherwise, it is called non-included (NIC) subset. The following theorem shows a sufficient condition for orthogonality-preserving POVM triviality.

Theorem 4 [49]. For the given set  $S$ , any orthogonality-preserving POVM performed on  $X$  party can only be trivial if the following conditions are satisfied.

i) There is an inclusion relationship  $\mathcal{B}_i^X \subset \tilde{S}_{V_i}$  for any  $i \in \mathcal{Z}_{d_X-1}$ .

ii) For any subset  $S_r$ , there exists a corresponding PI set  $R_r$  on  $X$  party.

iii) There is a set sequence  $\{G_1, \dots, G_s\}$ . Moreover, for each NIC subset  $S_{r_{x+1}} \subset G_{x+1}$ , there exist a subset  $S_{r_x} \subset G_x$  and a subset  $S_{r'_{x+1}} \subset R_{r_{x+1}}$  such that  $S_{r_x}^{[X]} \cap S_{r'_{x+1}}^{[X]} \supset S_{r_{x+1}}^{[X]} \cap S_{r'_{x+1}}^{[X]}$  with  $x = 1, 2, \dots, s-1$ .

iv) The family of sets  $\{S_r^{[X]}\}_{r \in T}$  is connected.

Next we will prove Theorem 2 by using Theorem 4.

We first consider the orthogonality-preserving POVM performed on  $X$  party. Here  $X = \{2, \dots, n\}$ . The plane structure of the set  $\mathcal{E}$  in  $1|X$  bipartition is shown in fig.1. By observing this tile graph, we will show that the four conditions in Theorem 4 are satisfied.

The conditions i) and ii) are obvious. When  $Q = \{1\}$ , we have  $\mathcal{C}_Q = \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2 \dots |0\rangle_n\}$ . So, there is at least one subset which has UPI set. If condition iv) holds, we have the set sequence  $\{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_s\}$ . Because of the special plane structure, the set  $R_D = \cup_{Q \in \Theta} \mathcal{D}_Q$  is a PI set of any subset  $\mathcal{C}_Q$ . Corresponding, the set  $R_C = \cup_{Q \in \Theta} \mathcal{C}_Q$  is a PI set of any subset  $\mathcal{D}_Q$ . For any subset  $\mathcal{C}_{Q_{x+1}}$  (or  $\mathcal{D}_{Q_{x+1}}$ ) in  $G_{x+1}$  ( $x = 1, \dots, s-1$ ), there exists a corresponding subset  $\mathcal{D}_{Q_x}$  (or  $\mathcal{C}_{Q_x}$ ) in set  $G_x$  such that  $\mathcal{D}_{Q_x}^{[X]} \cap \mathcal{C}_{Q_{x+1}}^{[X]} \neq \emptyset$  (or  $\mathcal{C}_{Q_x}^{[X]} \cap \mathcal{D}_{Q_{x+1}}^{[X]} \neq \emptyset$ ). Meanwhile, the subset  $\mathcal{D}_{Q_x}$  (or  $\mathcal{C}_{Q_x}$ ) is also contained in the set  $R_D$  (or  $R_C$ ). This means  $G_x \cap R_D \neq \emptyset$  (or  $G_x \cap R_C \neq \emptyset$ ). Obviously, these subsets satisfy the relationship of condition iii). That is, the condition iii) holds when condition iv) is satisfied.

About the set  $\mathcal{O}$  in  $\otimes_{i=2}^n \mathcal{C}^3$  system, He et al. [56] have proven that any orthogonality-preserving POVM performed on  $X' (= \{3, \dots, n\})$  party can only be trivial. According to the [49, Corollary 1], the set  $\cup_{\mathcal{P}, K} \mathcal{P}_K^{[X']}$  is the computation basis  $\mathcal{B}^{X'}$  corresponding to subsystem  $X'$  and the family of projection sets  $\{\mathcal{P}_K^{[X']}\}_{\mathcal{P}, K}$  is connected.

For simplicity, we use  $\mathcal{P}_K^{(X')}$  to denote  $\mathcal{P}_K^{(3)} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{P}_K^{(n)}$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}_{\Lambda_1} = |0\rangle_2 \otimes \mathcal{C}_{\Lambda_1}^{(X')} = \{|0\rangle_2 \otimes \mathcal{C}_K^{(X')}\}_{K \in \Lambda_1}$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{\Lambda_2} = |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2 \otimes \mathcal{C}_{\Lambda_2}^{(X')} = \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2 \otimes \mathcal{C}_K^{(X')}\}_{K \in \Lambda_2}$ , where  $\Lambda_1 = \{K | K \in \Lambda \text{ and } 2 \notin K\}$  and  $\Lambda_2 = \Lambda \setminus \Lambda_1$ . Correspondingly, we have  $\mathcal{D}_{\Lambda_1} = |2\rangle_2 \otimes \mathcal{D}_{\Lambda_1}^{(X')}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{\Lambda_2} = |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2 \otimes \mathcal{D}_{\Lambda_2}^{(X')}$ . From this, we give the plane tile of set  $\mathcal{O}$  in  $2|X'$  bipartition as shown in fig.2.




FIG. 2: The plane tile of set  $\mathcal{O}$  in  $2|X'$  bipartition.

According to the relationship between the sets  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{O}$ , it is easy to know that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{\Theta_1} &= |2\rangle \otimes |\eta_{\pm}\rangle \otimes \mathcal{C}_{\Lambda_1}^{(X')}, & \mathcal{C}_{\Theta_1} &= |0\rangle \otimes |\xi_{\pm}\rangle \otimes \mathcal{D}_{\Lambda_1}^{(X')}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{\Theta_2} &= |2\rangle \otimes |2\rangle \otimes \mathcal{D}_{\Lambda_2}^{(X')}, & \mathcal{C}_{\Theta_2} &= |0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \otimes \mathcal{C}_{\Lambda_2}^{(X')}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{\Theta_3} &= |\xi_{\pm}\rangle \otimes |2\rangle \otimes \mathcal{D}_{\Lambda_1}^{(X')}, & \mathcal{C}_{\Theta_3} &= |\eta_{\pm}\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \otimes \mathcal{C}_{\Lambda_1}^{(X')}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{\Theta_4} &= |\xi_{\pm}\rangle \otimes |\eta_{\pm}\rangle \otimes \mathcal{C}_{\Lambda_2}^{(X')}, & \mathcal{C}_{\Theta_4} &= |\eta_{\pm}\rangle \otimes |\xi_{\pm}\rangle \otimes \mathcal{D}_{\Lambda_2}^{(X')}. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $\Theta_1 = \{Q \in \Theta | 1 \notin Q \text{ and } 2 \in Q\}$ ,  $\Theta_2 = \{Q \in \Theta | 1, 2 \notin Q\}$ ,  $\Theta_3 = \{Q \in \Theta | 1 \in Q \text{ and } 2 \notin Q\}$ ,  $\Theta_4 = \{Q \in \Theta | 1, 2 \in Q\}$ . Then the plane structure of the set  $\mathcal{E}$  also can be shown as fig.3.




FIG. 3: The plane structure of the set  $\mathcal{E}$  in  $1|X$  bipartition. Here  $i$ th ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ) expresses the  $i$ th subsystem.

Due to the connectedness of the family of projection sets  $\{\mathcal{P}_K^{[X']}\}_{\mathcal{P}, K}$ , it is not difficult to know that the group of projection sets  $\{\mathcal{D}_{\Theta_1}^{[X]}, \mathcal{C}_{\Theta_1}^{[X]}, \mathcal{D}_{\Theta_4}^{[X]}, \mathcal{C}_{\Theta_4}^{[X]}\}$  is connected. Meanwhile, we find that the union of these four projection sets is the computation basis on  $X$  party. That is, the family of projection sets  $\{\mathcal{P}_Q^{[X]}\}_{\mathcal{P}, Q}$  about  $\mathcal{E}$  cannot be divided into two groups of sets  $\{\mathcal{P}_Q^{[X]}\}_{\mathcal{P}_Q \subset \mathcal{E}_1}$  ( $\mathcal{E}_1 \subsetneq \mathcal{E}$ ) and  $\{\mathcal{P}_Q^{[X]}\}_{\mathcal{P}_Q \subset \mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{E}_1}$  such that

$$\left( \bigcup_{\mathcal{P}_Q \subset \mathcal{E}_1} \mathcal{P}_Q^{[X]} \right) \cap \left( \bigcup_{\mathcal{P}_Q \subset \mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{E}_1} \mathcal{P}_Q^{[X]} \right) = \emptyset.$$

So, the family of projection sets  $\{\mathcal{P}_K^{[X]}\}_{\mathcal{P}, K}$  is connected. The condition iv) is shown.

Therefore, any orthogonality-preserving POVM performed on  $X$  party can only be proportional to the identity operator. For the other subsystems  $X_2 = \{3, \dots, n, 1\}, \dots, X_n = \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ , by the same way, it is easy to illustrate that any orthogonality-preserving POVM performed on  $X_i$  ( $i = 2, \dots, n$ ) party can only be trivial. The proof of this theorem is completed.  $\square$

- [1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, N. Rosen, Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?, *Phys. Rev.* **47**, 777 (1935).  
 [2] R. F. Werner, Quantum states with Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen correlations admitting a hidden-variable model, *Phys. Rev. A* **40**, 4277 (1989).

- [3] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Quantum entanglement, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 865 (2009).  
 [4] T. Gao, F. L. Yan, and S. J. van Enk, Permutationally invariant part of a density matrix and nonseparability of  $N$ -qubit states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 180501 (2014).

- [5] C. H. Bennett, C. A. Fuchs, and J. A. Smolin, *Quantum Communication, Computing, and Measurement* (Plenum, New York, 1997).
- [6] H. Buhrman, R. Cleve, and A. Wigderson, *Proceedings of the 30th Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing* (ACM, Los Alamitos, 1998).
- [7] F. G. Deng, G. L. Long, X. S. Liu, Two-step quantum direct communication protocol using the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen pair block, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 042317 (2003).
- [8] T. Gao, F. L. Yan, and Z. X. Wang, Quantum secure direct communication by EPR pairs and entanglement swapping, *Il Nuovo Cimento* **119B**, 313 (2004).
- [9] T. Gao, F. L. Yan, and Z. X. Wang, Deterministic secure direct communication using GHZ states and swapping quantum entanglement, *J. Phys. A* **38**, 5761 (2005).
- [10] 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, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1895 (1993).
- [11] T. Gao, F. L. Yan, and Y. C. Li, Optimal controlled teleportation, *Europhys. Lett.* **84**, 50001 (2008).
- [12] T. Gao, F. L. Yan, and Z. X. Wang, Controlled quantum teleportation and secure direct communication, *Chin. Phys.* **14**, 893 (2005).
- [13] H. K. Lo and H. F. Chau, Unconditional security of quantum key distribution over arbitrarily long distances, *Science* **283**, 2050 (1999).
- [14] A. K. Ekert, Quantum cryptography based on Bell's theorem, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 661 (1991).
- [15] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, and N. D. Mermin, Quantum cryptography without Bell's theorem, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 557 (1992).
- [16] Y. H. Zhou, Z. W. Yu, and X. B. Wang, Making the decoy-state measurement-device-independent quantum key distribution practically useful, *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 042324 (2016).
- [17] J. S. Bell, On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox, *Physics* **1**, 195 (1964); On the problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **38**, 447 (1966).
- [18] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 880 (1969).
- [19] S. J. Freedman and J. F. Clauser, Experimental test of local hidden-variable theories, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **28**, 938 (1972).
- [20] F. L. Yan, T. Gao, and E. Chitambar, Two local observables are sufficient to characterize maximally entangled states of  $N$  qubits, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 022319 (2011).
- [21] H. X. Meng, J. Zhou, Z. P. Xu, H. Y. Su, T. Gao, F. L. Yan, and J. L. Chen, Hardy's paradox for multisetting high-dimensional systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 062103 (2018).
- [22] Z. Q. Chen, Bell-Klyshko inequalities to characterize maximally entangled states of  $n$  qubits, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 110403 (2004).
- [23] D. Ding, Y. Q. He, F. L. Yan, and T. Gao, Quantum nonlocality of generic family of four-qubit entangled pure states, *Chin. Phys. B* **24**, 070301 (2015).
- [24] D. Ding, Y. Q. He, F. L. Yan, and T. Gao, Entanglement measure and quantum violation of Bell-type inequality, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **55**, 4231 (2016).
- [25] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, C. A. Fuchs, T. Mor, E. Rains, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Quantum nonlocality without entanglement, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 1070 (1999).
- [26] J. Niset and N. J. Cerf, Multipartite nonlocality without entanglement in many dimensions, *Phys. Rev. A* **74**, 052103 (2006).
- [27] Z. C. Zhang, K. J. Zhang, F. Gao, Q. Y. Wen, and C. H. Oh, Construction of nonlocal multipartite quantum states, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 052344 (2017).
- [28] J. Walgate and L. Hardy, Nonlocality, asymmetry, and distinguishing bipartite states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 147901 (2002).
- [29] Y. Feng and Y. Y. Shi, Characterizing locally indistinguishable orthogonal product states, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **55**, 2799 (2009).
- [30] Z. C. Zhang, F. Gao, G. J. Tian, T. Q. Cao, and Q. Y. Wen, Nonlocality of orthogonal product basis quantum states, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 022313 (2014).
- [31] Y. L. Wang, M. S. Li, Z. J. Zheng, and S. M. Fei, Nonlocality of orthogonal product-basis quantum states, *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 032313 (2015).
- [32] G. B. Xu, Q. Y. Wen, S. J. Qin, Y. H. Yang, and F. Gao, Quantum nonlocality of multipartite orthogonal product states, *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 032341 (2016).
- [33] Y. L. Wang, M. S. Li, Z. J. Zheng, and S. M. Fei, The local indistinguishability of multipartite product states, *Quant. Info. Proc.* **16**, 5 (2017).
- [34] S. Halder, Several nonlocal sets of multipartite pure orthogonal product states, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 022303 (2018).
- [35] D. H. Jiang and G. B. Xu, Nonlocal sets of orthogonal product states in an arbitrary multipartite quantum system, *Phys. Rev. A* **102**, 032211 (2020).
- [36] B. M. Terhal, D. P. DiVincenzo, and D. W. Leung, Hiding bits in Bell states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 5807 (2001).
- [37] D. P. DiVincenzo, D. W. Leung, and B. M. Terhal, Quantum data hiding, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **48**, 580 (2002).
- [38] T. Eggeling and R. F. Werner, Hiding classical data in multipartite quantum states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 097905 (2002).
- [39] M. Hillery, V. Bužek, and A. Berthiaume, Quantum secret sharing, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 1829 (1999).
- [40] G. P. Guo, C. F. Li, B. S. Shi, J. Li, and G. C. Guo, Quantum key distribution scheme with orthogonal product states, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 042301 (2001).
- [41] L. Y. Hsu and C. M. Li, Quantum secret sharing using product states, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 022321 (2005).
- [42] D. Markham and B. C. Sanders, Graph states for quantum secret sharing, *Phys. Rev. A* **78**, 042309 (2008).
- [43] R. Rahaman and M. G. Parker, Quantum scheme for secret sharing based on local distinguishability, *Phys. Rev. A* **91**, 022330 (2015).
- [44] J. Wang, L. Li, H. Peng, and Y. Yang, Quantum-secret-sharing scheme based on local distinguishability of orthogonal multi-qudit entangled states, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 022320 (2017).
- [45] S. Halder, M. Banik, S. Agrawal, and S. Bandyopadhyay, Strong quantum nonlocality without entanglement, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 040403 (2019).
- [46] S. Rout, A. G. Maity, A. Mukherjee, S. Halder, and M. Banik, Genuinely nonlocal product bases: Classification and entanglement-assisted discrimination, *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 032321 (2019).
- [47] Z. C. Zhang and X. D. Zhang, Strong quantum nonlocality in multipartite quantum systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **99**, 062108 (2019).
- [48] P. Yuan, G. J. Tian, and X. M. Sun, Strong quantum nonlocality without entanglement in multipartite quantum systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **102**, 042228 (2020).
- [49] H. Q. Zhou, T. Gao, and F. L. Yan, On orthogonal product sets with strong quantum nonlocality on plane structure, [arXiv:2205.10813](https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.10813).
- [50] B. C. Che, Z. Dou, M. Lei, and Y. X. Yang, Strong nonlocal sets of UPB, [arXiv:2106.08699v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.08699v2).
- [51] A. Bhunia, I. Chattopadhyay, and D. Sarkar, Non-

- locality without entanglement: Party asymmetric case, [arXiv:2111.14399v1](#).
- [52] F. Shi, M. Y. Hu, L. Chen, and X. D. Zhang, Strong quantum nonlocality with entanglement, *Phys. Rev. A* **102**, 042202 (2020).
- [53] F. Shi, M. S. Li, M. Y. Hu, L. Chen, M. H. Yung, Y. L. Wang, and X. D. Zhang, Strongly nonlocal unextendible product bases do exist, *Quantum* **6**, 619 (2022); Strong quantum nonlocality from hypercubes, [arXiv:2110.08461](#).
- [54] F. Shi, Z. Ye, L. Chen, and X. D. Zhang, Strong quantum nonlocality in  $N$ -partite systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **105**, 022209 (2022).
- [55] M. S. Li and Y. L. Wang, Strong quantum nonlocality in general multipartite quantum systems, [arXiv:2202.09034v1](#).
- [56] Y. Y. He, F. Shi, and X. D. Zhang, Strong quantum nonlocality and unextendibility without entanglement in  $N$ -partite systems with odd  $N$ , [arXiv:2203.14503v1](#).