

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

Huaqi Zhou¹, Ting Gao^{1,*} and Fengli Yan^{2†}

¹ School of Mathematical Sciences, Hebei Normal University, Shijiazhuang 050024, China

² 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 do 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] and 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 an extremely striking quantum nonlocality, Bell 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]. A 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]. 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 [26–34]. These results also showed that the local indistinguishability has meaningful research value for quantum data hiding [35–37] and quantum secret sharing [38–43].

In 2019, Halder et al. [44] 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 [44]. Actually, local irreducibility is a stronger version of local in-

distinguishability. 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 [45]. In general, one uses the triviality of orthogonality-preserving POVM to deduce the local irreducibility and then obtain the quantum nonlocality [44]. 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 possible 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 $\Theta := \{Q \subseteq I_n | |Q| \text{ is odd}\}$. 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 $\Lambda := \{K \subseteq I_{n+1} | |K| \text{ is even}\}$. 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. Unless otherwise specified, \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{O} refer to the sets in n and $(n+1)$ -qutrit quantum systems, respectively.

It is known that 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 subsystem 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}_1 . Then we remove the particles of the $(n+1)$ th subsystem in the set \mathcal{E}_1 . The resulting quantum states form a new set \mathcal{E}_2 . Interestingly, this new set happens to be the set \mathcal{E} . Moreover, if one repeats the above two steps to remove the n th subsystem of 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 example to illustrate.

Example 1. In 5-qutrit quantum system, the set \mathcal{O} is de-

scribed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{K_1} &:= \{|0\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2 |0\rangle_3 |0\rangle_4 |0\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_{K_2} &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2 |2\rangle_3 |2\rangle_4 |2\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_{K_3} &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3 |2\rangle_4 |2\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_{K_4} &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2 |0\rangle_3 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_4 |2\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_{K_5} &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2 |0\rangle_3 |0\rangle_4 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_{K_6} &:= \{|0\rangle_1 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3 |0\rangle_4 |0\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_{K_7} &:= \{|0\rangle_1 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2 |2\rangle_3 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_4 |0\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_{K_8} &:= \{|0\rangle_1 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2 |2\rangle_3 |2\rangle_4 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_{K_9} &:= \{|0\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_4 |0\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_{K_{10}} &:= \{|0\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3 |2\rangle_4 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_{K_{11}} &:= \{|0\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2 |0\rangle_3 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_4 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_{K_{12}} &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_4 |2\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_{K_{13}} &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3 |0\rangle_4 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_{K_{14}} &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2 |2\rangle_3 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_4 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_{K_{15}} &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_4 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_{K_{16}} &:= \{|0\rangle_1 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_4 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_5\} \\ \mathcal{D}_{K_1} &:= \{|2\rangle_1 |2\rangle_2 |2\rangle_3 |2\rangle_4 |2\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{K_2} &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2 |0\rangle_3 |0\rangle_4 |0\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{K_3} &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1 |2\rangle_2 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3 |0\rangle_4 |0\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{K_4} &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1 |2\rangle_2 |2\rangle_3 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_4 |0\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{K_5} &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1 |2\rangle_2 |2\rangle_3 |2\rangle_4 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{K_6} &:= \{|2\rangle_1 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3 |2\rangle_4 |2\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{K_7} &:= \{|2\rangle_1 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2 |0\rangle_3 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_4 |2\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{K_8} &:= \{|2\rangle_1 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2 |0\rangle_3 |0\rangle_4 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{K_9} &:= \{|2\rangle_1 |2\rangle_2 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_4 |2\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{K_{10}} &:= \{|2\rangle_1 |2\rangle_2 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3 |0\rangle_4 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{K_{11}} &:= \{|2\rangle_1 |2\rangle_2 |2\rangle_3 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_4 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{K_{12}} &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_4 |0\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{K_{13}} &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3 |2\rangle_4 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{K_{14}} &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2 |0\rangle_3 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_4 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{K_{15}} &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1 |2\rangle_2 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_4 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{K_{16}} &:= \{|2\rangle_1 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3 |\eta_{\pm}\rangle_4 |\xi_{\pm}\rangle_5\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here,

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &= \emptyset, & K_9 &= \{3, 4\}, \\ K_2 &= \{1, 2\}, & K_{10} &= \{3, 5\}, \\ K_3 &= \{1, 3\}, & K_{11} &= \{4, 5\}, \\ K_4 &= \{1, 4\}, & K_{12} &= \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \\ K_5 &= \{1, 5\}, & K_{13} &= \{1, 2, 3, 5\}, \\ K_6 &= \{2, 3\}, & K_{14} &= \{1, 2, 4, 5\}, \\ K_7 &= \{2, 4\}, & K_{15} &= \{1, 3, 4, 5\}, \\ K_8 &= \{2, 5\}, & K_{16} &= \{2, 3, 4, 5\}. \end{aligned}$$

We consider removing the 5th subsystem.

Step 1. Removing the quantum states with $|0\rangle_5$ and $|2\rangle_5$, actually, is removing the subsets whose corresponding index sets do not contain element 5. Then, the remaining subsets

are as following

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C}_{K_5} &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1|0\rangle_2|0\rangle_3|0\rangle_4|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_{K_8} &:= \{|0\rangle_1|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2|2\rangle_3|2\rangle_4|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_{K_{10}} &:= \{|0\rangle_1|0\rangle_2|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3|2\rangle_4|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_{K_{11}} &:= \{|0\rangle_1|0\rangle_2|0\rangle_3|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_4|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_{K_{13}} &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3|0\rangle_4|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_{K_{14}} &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2|2\rangle_3|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_4|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_{K_{15}} &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1|0\rangle_2|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_4|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_{K_{16}} &:= \{|0\rangle_1|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_4|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_{K_5} &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1|2\rangle_2|2\rangle_3|2\rangle_4|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_{K_8} &:= \{|2\rangle_1|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2|0\rangle_3|0\rangle_4|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_{K_{10}} &:= \{|2\rangle_1|2\rangle_2|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3|0\rangle_4|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_{K_{11}} &:= \{|2\rangle_1|2\rangle_2|2\rangle_3|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_4|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_{K_{13}} &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3|2\rangle_4|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_{K_{14}} &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2|0\rangle_3|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_4|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_{K_{15}} &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1|2\rangle_2|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_4|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_5\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_{K_{16}} &:= \{|2\rangle_1|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_4|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_5\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Their union is the set \mathcal{E}_1 . It is a subset of the set \mathcal{O} in 5-qutrit quantum system.

Step 2. We remove the particles of the 5th subsystem in set \mathcal{E}_1 and get the set \mathcal{E}_2 . It is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C}'_{K'_5} &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1|0\rangle_2|0\rangle_3|0\rangle_4\}, \\
\mathcal{C}'_{K'_8} &:= \{|0\rangle_1|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2|2\rangle_3|2\rangle_4\}, \\
\mathcal{C}'_{K'_{10}} &:= \{|0\rangle_1|0\rangle_2|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3|2\rangle_4\}, \\
\mathcal{C}'_{K'_{11}} &:= \{|0\rangle_1|0\rangle_2|0\rangle_3|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_4\}, \\
\mathcal{C}'_{K'_{13}} &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3|0\rangle_4\}, \\
\mathcal{C}'_{K'_{14}} &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2|2\rangle_3|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_4\}, \\
\mathcal{C}'_{K'_{15}} &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1|0\rangle_2|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_4\}, \\
\mathcal{C}'_{K'_{16}} &:= \{|0\rangle_1|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_4\}, \\
\mathcal{D}'_{K'_5} &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1|2\rangle_2|2\rangle_3|2\rangle_4\}, \\
\mathcal{D}'_{K'_8} &:= \{|2\rangle_1|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2|0\rangle_3|0\rangle_4\}, \\
\mathcal{D}'_{K'_{10}} &:= \{|2\rangle_1|2\rangle_2|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3|0\rangle_4\}, \\
\mathcal{D}'_{K'_{11}} &:= \{|2\rangle_1|2\rangle_2|2\rangle_3|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_4\}, \\
\mathcal{D}'_{K'_{13}} &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3|2\rangle_4\}, \\
\mathcal{D}'_{K'_{14}} &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2|0\rangle_3|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_4\}, \\
\mathcal{D}'_{K'_{15}} &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1|2\rangle_2|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_4\}, \\
\mathcal{D}'_{K'_{16}} &:= \{|2\rangle_1|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_4\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, the index sets become as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
K'_5 &= \{1\}, & K'_{13} &= \{1, 2, 3\}, \\
K'_8 &= \{2\}, & K'_{14} &= \{1, 2, 4\}, \\
K'_{10} &= \{3\}, & K'_{15} &= \{1, 3, 4\}, \\
K'_{11} &= \{4\}, & K'_{16} &= \{2, 3, 4\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We find that the collection $\{K'_5, K'_8, K'_{10}, K'_{11}, K'_{13}, K'_{14}, K'_{15}, K'_{16}\}$ of these index sets happens to be the index collection Θ in 4-qutrit quantum system. So, the set \mathcal{E}_2 is equal to the set \mathcal{E} in 4-qutrit quantum system.

Repeating above two steps to remove the 4th subsystem of set \mathcal{E} in 4-qutrit quantum system, we obtain the following subsets

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C}''_{K''_{11}} &:= \{|0\rangle_1|0\rangle_2|0\rangle_3\}, \\
\mathcal{C}''_{K''_{14}} &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2|2\rangle_3\}, \\
\mathcal{C}''_{K''_{15}} &:= \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1|0\rangle_2|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3\}, \\
\mathcal{C}''_{K''_{16}} &:= \{|0\rangle_1|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_2|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3\}, \\
\mathcal{D}''_{K''_{11}} &:= \{|2\rangle_1|2\rangle_2|2\rangle_3\}, \\
\mathcal{D}''_{K''_{14}} &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2|0\rangle_3\}, \\
\mathcal{D}''_{K''_{15}} &:= \{|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_1|2\rangle_2|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_3\}, \\
\mathcal{D}''_{K''_{16}} &:= \{|2\rangle_1|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_2|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_3\},
\end{aligned}$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned}
K''_{11} &= \emptyset, & K''_{15} &= \{1, 3\}, \\
K''_{14} &= \{1, 2\}, & K''_{16} &= \{2, 3\}.
\end{aligned}$$

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 the i th ($i \in I_n$) subsystem of set \mathcal{E} , we can get a new set \mathcal{O}_2 . 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. According to the set \mathcal{O} , we know that \mathcal{E}_1 is an OPS and is also the union of all \mathcal{P}_K satisfying that $\mathcal{P}_K^{(n+1)}$ is equal to $|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_{n+1}$ or $|\xi_{\pm}\rangle_{n+1}$. Suppose Λ_1 is the collection of all index sets K without element $n+1$, we have $\mathcal{E}_1 = \cup_{K \in \Lambda_1, \mathcal{P} \in \{\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}\}} \mathcal{P}_K$. Meanwhile, $\mathcal{E} = \cup_{K \in \Lambda_1, \mathcal{P} \in \{\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}\}} \mathcal{P}_K^{(N)}$, where $\mathcal{P}_K^{(N)} = \{\mathcal{P}_K^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{P}_K^{(n)}\}$.

For any two different index sets $K_1, K_2 \in \Lambda_1$, it is obvious that \mathcal{P}_{K_1} and \mathcal{P}_{K_2} are mutually orthogonal but $\mathcal{P}_{K_1}^{(n+1)}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{K_2}^{(n+1)}$ are not. (Here we say two sets S_1 and S_2 are mutually orthogonal if ${}_1\langle\varphi|\varphi\rangle_2 = 0$ for any two states $|\varphi\rangle_1 \in S_1$ and $|\varphi\rangle_2 \in S_2$.) Then, we can deduce that $\mathcal{P}_{K_1}^{(N)}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{K_2}^{(N)}$ are mutually orthogonal. In addition, because each $\mathcal{P}_K^{(N)}$ is an OPS. So, any two states in set \mathcal{E} are mutually orthogonal. That is, the set \mathcal{E} is also an OPS. \square

Theorem 2. In the quantum system $\otimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{C}^3$ ($n > 3$), the set \mathcal{E} is strongly nonlocal.

Consider strong nonlocality of OPS \mathcal{E} , we only need to show that each $X_i (= I_n \setminus \{i\}, i \in I_n)$ party can only perform a trivial orthogonality-preserving POVM [53]. This can be proved by using [49, theorem 1] because every \mathcal{P}_Q is a basis spanned by the computation basis $\mathcal{P}_Q^{[1]} \otimes \mathcal{P}_Q^{[2]} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{P}_Q^{[n]}$ of the corresponding subspace and every component of the quantum state in \mathcal{P}_Q is nonzero under the computation basis of the corresponding subspace. Here $\mathcal{P}_Q^{[i]}$ ($i \in I_n$) is a subset of the computation basis of the i th subsystem. The detailed definition is shown in table II.


if $\mathcal{P}_Q^{(i)}$ is	$ 0\rangle_i$	$ 2\rangle_i$	$ \eta\rangle_i$	$ \xi\rangle_i$
then $\mathcal{P}_Q^{[i]}$ is	$\{ 0\rangle_i\}$	$\{ 2\rangle_i\}$	$\{ 0\rangle_i, 1\rangle_i\}$	$\{ 1\rangle_i, 2\rangle_i\}$

TABLE II: The definition of $\mathcal{P}_Q^{[i]}$ for $i \in I_n$.

We first consider the orthogonality-preserving POVM on X_1 party. $\mathcal{P}_Q^{[X_1]} = \mathcal{P}_Q^{[2]} \otimes \mathcal{P}_Q^{[3]} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{P}_Q^{[n]}$ represents the projection set of \mathcal{P}_Q on X_1 party. If a family of projection sets $\{\mathcal{P}_Q^{[X_1]}\}_{\mathcal{P}_Q \in \mathcal{E}}$ satisfies

$$\left(\bigcup_{\mathcal{P}_Q \in \mathcal{E}'} \mathcal{P}_Q^{[X_1]} \right) \cap \left(\bigcup_{\mathcal{P}_Q \in \mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{E}'} \mathcal{P}_Q^{[X_1]} \right) \neq \emptyset, \quad (5)$$

for all $\mathcal{E}' \subsetneq \mathcal{E}$, then we call it connected, or we can say that $\{\mathcal{P}_Q\}_{\mathcal{P}_Q \in \mathcal{E}}$ is connected on X_1 party [49]. Fig. 1 shows the plane structure of the set \mathcal{E} in $1|X_1$ bipartition. By observing the simple structure, it is not difficult to find that we can achieve our goal as long as the connectedness of this family of subsets $\{\mathcal{P}_Q\}_{Q \in \Theta, \mathcal{P} \in \{\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}\}}$ on X_1 party is proved. This can be associated with the strong nonlocality of \mathcal{O} in system $\otimes_{i=2}^n \mathcal{C}^3$. For other X_i ($i = \{2, \dots, n\}$) party, we can use similar methods. 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 $1|X_1$ bipartition.

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

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_Q^f &:= \mathcal{C}_Q^{f(1)} \otimes \mathcal{C}_Q^{f(2)} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{C}_Q^{f(n)}, \\ \mathcal{D}_Q^f &:= \mathcal{D}_Q^{f(1)} \otimes \mathcal{D}_Q^{f(2)} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{D}_Q^{f(n)}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_Q^{f(1)} &:= \begin{cases} |0\rangle_1, & \text{if } 1 \notin Q, \\ \{|\alpha_i\rangle_1\}, & \text{if } 1 \in Q, \end{cases} \\ \mathcal{D}_Q^{f(1)} &:= \begin{cases} |d_1-1\rangle_1, & \text{if } 1 \notin Q, \\ \{|\beta_j\rangle_1\}, & \text{if } 1 \in Q. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

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

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

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

$\mathcal{P} \in \{\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}\}$	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 III: The construction of $\mathcal{C}_Q^{f(t)}$ and $\mathcal{D}_Q^{f(t)}$ for $2 \leq t \leq n$.

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 strong quantum nonlocality in any possible 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 strong 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 indexes K and C_n^n 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 indexes K' is an arbitrary combination of $n-1$ elements in I_n and there are $C_n^{n-1} = C_{n+1}^n - C_n^n$ indexes 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 $2, 4, \dots, n-2$ elements, respectively. So, the new set \mathcal{E}_2 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

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

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 $k_i \in I_{n+1}$.

We consider the set \mathcal{O} on arrangement $(12 \cdots (n+1))$. Because of the symmetry, for a fixed $i \in I_n$, 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 $P_{n+2-i}^C(\mathcal{E})$ on the arrangement $(1 \cdots (i-1)(i+1) \cdots (n+1))$.

Given the set \mathcal{E} on arrangement $(12 \cdots n)$, we consider to remove its i th subsystem where $i \in I_{n-1}$. We first consider the Q containing $n-1$ elements. There are C_{n-1}^{n-1} such indexes Q . We remove the index Q without element i and there are C_{n-1}^{n-1} such indexes 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 $C_{n-1}^{n-2} = C_{n-1}^{n-1} - C_{n-1}^{n-1}$ such indexes. We have similar conclusion for the Q containing $1, 3, \dots, n-3$ elements, respectively. They can exactly correspond to all indexes K belonging to Λ in $(n-1)$ -qutrit system. \mathcal{O}_2 expresses the new set after we remove the i th subsystem of set \mathcal{E} . According to the construction method of sets \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{O} , to turn \mathcal{O}_2 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, we need to introduce some notations and concepts given in [49]. Let X denote a subset of I_n . About the subset \mathcal{P}_Q , if there are some subsets \mathcal{P}'_Q different from it that satisfy $\mathcal{P}_Q^{[X]} \subset \cup \mathcal{P}'_Q^{[X]}$ and $\cap \mathcal{P}'_Q^{[X]} \neq \emptyset$, then their union $R_{\mathcal{P},Q} = \cup \mathcal{P}'_Q$ is called the projection inclusion (PI) set of \mathcal{P}_Q on X party. Specially, if there exists a subset $\mathcal{P}'_Q \subset R_{\mathcal{P},Q}$ such that $|\mathcal{P}_Q^{[X]} \cap \mathcal{P}'_Q^{[X]}| = 1$, then $R_{\mathcal{P},Q}$ is called a more useful projection inclusion (UPI) set [49].

Next, we introduce a set sequence G_1, G_2, \dots, G_s about set \mathcal{E} [49]. It is a partition of set \mathcal{E} . Here each set G_x ($x = 1, \dots, s$) is a union of some different subsets \mathcal{P}_Q and they satisfy the following four conditions.

- 1) The set G_1 is the union of all subsets that have UPI sets.
- 2) The intersection of any two sets in this set sequence is empty set and the union $\cup_{x=1}^s G_x$ is equal to the set \mathcal{E} .
- 3) For any \mathcal{P}_Q contained in G_{x+1} , there is at least one \mathcal{P}'_Q contained in G_x such that $\mathcal{P}_Q^{[X]} \cap \mathcal{P}'_Q^{[X]} \neq \emptyset$.
- 4) For any \mathcal{P}'_Q contained in G_x and all \mathcal{P}''_Q contained in G_y ($y = x+2, \dots, s$), we have $\mathcal{P}'_Q^{[X]} \cap \mathcal{P}''_Q^{[X]} = \emptyset$.

Let $\mathcal{B}^X = \{|i\rangle_X\}_{i=0}^{d_X-1}$ represent the computation basis of X party. For each $i \in \mathcal{Z}_{d_X}$, we define $\mathcal{B}_i^X := \{|k\rangle_X\}_{k=i}^{d_X-1}$, $V_i := \{\cup \mathcal{P}_Q^{[X]} \mid |i\rangle_X \in \mathcal{P}_Q^{[X]}\}$ and $\tilde{S}_{V_i} := \{\cup \mathcal{P}_Q^{[X]} \mid \mathcal{P}_Q^{[X]} \cap V_i \neq \emptyset\}$. Ref. [49] has the detailed examples to explain these symbols. Next we will prove theorem 2 by using [49, theorem 1].

For simplicity, let X express $X_1 = \{2, \dots, n\}$. We first consider the orthogonality-preserving POVM performed on X party. We need to show that the four conditions in [49, theorem 1] are satisfied. The following are the specific conditions.

- i) For any $i \in \mathcal{Z}_{d_X-1}$, there is a relationship $\mathcal{B}_i^X \subset \tilde{S}_{V_i}$.
- ii) For any subset \mathcal{P}_Q , there exists a corresponding PI set $R_{\mathcal{P},Q}$ on X party.
- iii) There is a set sequence G_1, \dots, G_s satisfying 1)-3). For each $\mathcal{P}_Q \subset G_{x+1}$ with $x = 1, \dots, s-1$, there exist a $\mathcal{P}'_Q \subset G_x$ and a $\mathcal{P}''_Q \subset R_{\mathcal{P},Q}$ such that $\mathcal{P}_Q^{[X]} \cap \mathcal{P}'_Q^{[X]} \supset \mathcal{P}_Q^{[X]} \cap \mathcal{P}''_Q^{[X]}$.
- iv) The family of sets $\{\mathcal{P}_Q^{[X]}\}_{\mathcal{P}_Q \subset \mathcal{E}}$ is connected.

In $1|X$ bipartition, the plane structure of the set \mathcal{E} is shown in fig. 1. By observing this tile graph, the conditions i) and ii) are obvious.

When $Q = \{1\}$, we have $\mathcal{C}_Q = \{|\eta_{\pm}\rangle_1|0\rangle_2 \cdots |0\rangle_n\}$. 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 $\mathcal{D}_{Q_{x+1}}$) of G_{x+1} ($x = 1, \dots, s-1$), there exists a corresponding subset \mathcal{D}_{Q_x} (or \mathcal{C}_{Q_x}) of 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 $\cup_{\mathcal{P}_K \subset \mathcal{O}} \mathcal{P}_K^{[X']}$ is the computation basis $\mathcal{B}^{X'}$ corresponding to subsystem X' and the family of projection sets $\{\mathcal{P}_K^{[X']}\}_{\mathcal{P}_K \subset \mathcal{O}}$ is connected.

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

According to the relationship between the sets \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{O} , it




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

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 $\{\mathcal{P}_K^{[X']}\}_{\mathcal{P}_K \subset \mathcal{O}}$, 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 $\{\mathcal{P}_Q^{[X]}\}_{\mathcal{P}_Q \subset \mathcal{E}}$ cannot be divided into two groups of sets $\{\mathcal{P}_Q^{[X]}\}_{\mathcal{P}_Q \subset \mathcal{E}'}$ ($\mathcal{E}' \subsetneq \mathcal{E}$) and $\{\mathcal{P}_Q^{[X]}\}_{\mathcal{P}_Q \subset \mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{E}'}$ such that

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

So, the family of projection sets $\{\mathcal{P}_Q^{[X]}\}_{\mathcal{P}_Q \subset \mathcal{E}}$ 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, \dots, X_n , 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, and 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, and 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] Y. Feng and Y. Y. Shi, Characterizing locally indistinguishable orthogonal product states, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **55**, 2799 (2009).
- [29] 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).
- [30] 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).
- [31] 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).
- [32] 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).
- [33] S. Halder, Several nonlocal sets of multipartite pure orthogonal product states, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 022303 (2018).
- [34] 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).
- [35] B. M. Terhal, D. P. DiVincenzo, and D. W. Leung, Hiding bits in Bell states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 5807 (2001).
- [36] D. P. DiVincenzo, D. W. Leung, and B. M. Terhal, Quantum data hiding, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **48**, 580 (2002).
- [37] T. Eggeling and R. F. Werner, Hiding classical data in multipartite quantum states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 097905 (2002).
- [38] M. Hillery, V. Bužek, and A. Berthiaume, Quantum secret sharing, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 1829 (1999).
- [39] 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).
- [40] L. Y. Hsu and C. M. Li, Quantum secret sharing using product states, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 022321 (2005).
- [41] D. Markham and B. C. Sanders, Graph states for quantum secret sharing, *Phys. Rev. A* **78**, 042309 (2008).
- [42] R. Rahaman and M. G. Parker, Quantum scheme for secret sharing based on local distinguishability, *Phys. Rev. A* **91**, 022330 (2015).
- [43] J. Wang, L. Li, H. Peng, and Y. Yang, Quantum-secret-sharing scheme based on local distinguishability of orthogonal multipartite entangled states, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 022320 (2017).
- [44] S. Halder, M. Banik, S. Agrawal, and S. Bandyopadhyay, Strong quantum nonlocality without entanglement, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 040403 (2019).
- [45] J. Walgate and L. Hardy, Nonlocality, asymmetry, and distinguishing bipartite states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 147901 (2002).
- [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 states 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, Nonlocality without entanglement: Party asymmetric case, [arXiv:2111.14399v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/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](https://arxiv.org/abs/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](https://arxiv.org/abs/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](https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.14503v1).