

Unmasking the Polygamous Nature of Quantum Nonlocality

Paweł Cieřliński,¹ Lukas Knips,^{2,3,4} Mateusz Kowalczyk,¹ Wiesław Laskowski,¹ Tomasz Paterek,^{1,5} Tamás Vértesi,⁶ and Harald Weinfurter^{1,2,3,4}

¹*Institute of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, University of Gdańsk, 80-308 Gdańsk, Poland*

²*Max Planck Institute for Quantum Optics, 85748 Garching, Germany*

³*Faculty of Physics, Ludwig Maximilian University, 80799 Munich, Germany*

⁴*Munich Center for Quantum Science and Technology, 80799 Munich, Germany*

⁵*School of Mathematics and Physics, Xiamen University Malaysia, 43900 Sepang, Malaysia*

⁶*MTA Atomki Lendület Quantum Correlations Research Group, Institute for Nuclear Research, 4001 Debrecen, Hungary*

Quantum mechanics imposes limits on the statistics of certain observables. Perhaps the most famous example is the uncertainty principle. Similar trade-offs also exist for the simultaneous violation of multiple Bell inequalities. In the simplest case of three observers, it has been shown that violating one Bell inequality precludes the violation of any other inequality, a property called monogamy of Bell violations. Forms of Bell monogamy have been linked to the no-signalling principle and the inability of simultaneous violations of all inequalities is regarded as their fundamental property. Here we show that the Bell monogamy does not hold universally and that in fact the only monogamous situation exists only for three observers. Consequently, the nature of quantum nonlocality is truly polygamous. We present a systematic methodology for identifying quantum states and tight Bell inequalities that do not obey the monogamy principle for any number of more than three observers. The identified polygamous inequalities are experimentally violated by the measurement of Bell-type correlations using six-photon Dicke states and may be exploited for quantum cryptography as well as simultaneous self-testing of multiple nodes in a quantum network.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum nonlocality is one of the most intriguing features of quantum theory. Starting from its beginnings and the famous EPR argument [1], through the first works of John Bell [2] to various experiments [3–12], it reveals the impossibility of a local-realistic description of quantum phenomena. Violation of a Bell inequality serves now not only as fundamental test for the statements about the nature of reality but also finds applications in many areas of modern quantum technologies [13–19]. One crucial concept in the study of quantum nonlocality is the monogamy principle, which states that it is impossible to simultaneously violate all k -partite ($k < N$) two-setting Bell inequalities among N different parties. After the early findings by Scarani and Gisin [20], and later by Toner and Verstraete [21] (see also [22, 23]), it became a fundamental result in the field and the subject of many extensive studies [24–38]. However, as shown here, the monogamy principle is not fundamental. Rather, it is a mere consequence of the specific mathematical structure of certain inequalities, which are not universal. To support our claim, we develop a systematic method to construct Bell inequalities among $N - 1$ observers that do not adhere to the monogamy principle for all $N > 3$. Furthermore, we provide an interesting minimalistic polygamous scenario based only on bipartite correlations between all pairs of observers. We show that the simultaneous violation of all inequalities is possible if the number of parties is $N = 18$. Recognising the practical challenges associated with generating high-fidelity quantum states in experimental setups, we could still identify inequalities that are violated experimentally by noisy six-qubit

Dicke states. The polygamous nature of quantum nonlocality is therefore proven theoretically and confirmed in experiments.

II. THREE PARTIES AND STRICT MONOGAMY

We begin by recalling the standard results on Bell monogamy between three observers. Consider a scenario in which party A tries to simultaneously violate the CHSH inequalities [39] with parties B and C using a three-qubit quantum state. We denote the value of the CHSH-Bell parameters by \mathcal{B}_{AB} and \mathcal{B}_{AC} , respectively. Quantum mechanics predicts that these parameters obey the relation [20, 21]

$$\mathcal{B}_{AB}^2 + \mathcal{B}_{AC}^2 \leq 2. \quad (1)$$

Note that if one of the inequalities is violated, e.g. $\mathcal{B}_{AB} > 2$, then the other one cannot be violated, $\mathcal{B}_{AC} < 2$. This is the statement of monogamy of Bell inequality violations. In the considered scenario, this relation is tight, in the sense that all the values of \mathcal{B}_{AB} and \mathcal{B}_{AC} that reach the bound are realised by quantum theory [21, 29]. To see this, consider a pure state given as

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\cos\theta|110\rangle + \sin\theta|101\rangle + |011\rangle), \quad (2)$$

with $\theta \in [0, \pi/2]$ and the following measurement settings described by the local Bloch vectors

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{a}_1 = \vec{x}, & & \vec{b}_1 = \vec{c}_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\vec{x} + \vec{y}), \\ \vec{a}_2 = \vec{y}, & & \vec{b}_2 = \vec{c}_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\vec{x} - \vec{y}). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Using them, one can evaluate the corresponding two-party Bell parameters as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B}_{AB} &\equiv E_{110} + E_{120} + E_{210} - E_{220} = 2\sqrt{2}\sin\theta, \\ \mathcal{B}_{AC} &\equiv E_{101} + E_{102} + E_{201} - E_{202} = 2\sqrt{2}\cos\theta,\end{aligned}$$

where E_{klm} stands for the correlation function (average of the product of local results) and index 0 indicates the party whose measurement outcomes are not included to compute the correlations. This clearly realises all the values in (1) that saturate the bound and gives rise to the circle depicted in Fig 1. The whole circumference is obtained without any permutation of observers and measurement outcomes. However, this is the only scenario where none of the involved inequalities can be violated (see [33] for the case of three inequalities).




FIG. 1. Visual representation of monogamy between CHSH inequality violations for three parties. *a*) Schematic of the arrangement where three observers (A , B , C) try to violate two inequalities (red and orange edges). *b*) Accessible values of Bell parameters \mathcal{B}_{AB} and \mathcal{B}_{AC} for parties AB and AC . According to local realistic models, the bound on each inequality is given by 2 and hence its predictions are confined to the square with a side length of 4. From (1), quantum predictions lie within a circle of a radius $2\sqrt{2}$. The angle θ in (2) for which both inequalities are simultaneously maximised has been explicitly denoted. The principle of monogamy is clearly satisfied since such a state saturates both local realistic bounds and any attempt to violate one of the CHSH inequalities leads to classically achievable correlations on the other one.

III. FOUR AND MORE PARTIES AND POLYGAMY

To demonstrate the polygamous nature of Bell nonlocality, we generalise the Toner-Verstraete scenario [21] to the case of N observers where each of them can perform measurements of two dichotomic observables $A_1^{(i)}, A_2^{(i)}$ ($i = 1, \dots, N$). Then, we analyze the simultaneous violation of Bell inequalities between $N - 1$ observers in all possible N configurations (see Fig. 2). Later, we provide an inequality where each of the Bell tests includes measurements between pairs of observers only. Following these results, we present an inequality for $N = 6$ qubits




FIG. 2. Exemplary configurations showing Bell polygamy. Each colour corresponds to a different choice of $N - 1$ observers taking part in the Bell test. Panels *a*) and *b*) picture the possible configurations of all three and four-qubit inequalities, respectively. According to our findings, in all such configurations with $N > 3$ one can simultaneously violate all N suitably designed Bell inequalities, each involving $k = N - 1$ observers.

and demonstrate that using an experimentally observed six-photon Dicke-state one indeed can violate such an inequality for all six five-party subsystems simultaneously.

A. Polygamy of Mermin inequalities

One strategy to find Bell inequalities that do not satisfy the monogamy principle is by imposing permutation symmetry. Let N observers share an N -qubit quantum state that is permutationally invariant, and they perform measurements of the same observables on it, i.e., $A_j^{(i)} = A_j^{(1)}$ ($j = 1, 2; i = 2, \dots, N$). In such a situation, if we find a Bell inequality that is violated by the reduced state, it immediately implies that all inequalities under consideration are violated. This does not necessarily exclude correlation trade-offs, but it clearly rules out monogamy.

Let us now use this framework to show that the violation of multi-particle Mermin inequalities is polygamous. To demonstrate this, we consider a general permutation-symmetric pure N -qubit state shared by all N observers

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{e=0}^N d_e |D_N^e\rangle, \quad (4)$$

where $|D_N^e\rangle$ is the N -qubit Dicke state with e excitations and $\sum_{e=0}^N |d_e|^2 = 1$. Now, we let each of the N observers simultaneously measure a Mermin parameter \mathcal{M}_{N-1} [40] involving $N - 1$ parties. Correspondingly, there are N such parameters. For simplicity, we perform further calculations for observers labelled as $1, 2, \dots, N - 1$ only. As argued before, due to the problem's symmetry, results for the other configurations will be equal as well. The

Mermin operator can be written as [41]:

$$M_{N-1} = 2^{(N-2)/2} \left(|GHZ^+\rangle_{N-1} \langle GHZ^+| \quad (5) \right. \\ \left. - |GHZ^-\rangle_{N-1} \langle GHZ^-| \right),$$

where $|GHZ^\pm\rangle_{N-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\dots 0\rangle_{N-1} \pm |1\dots 1\rangle_{N-1})$. For all local realistic models, the expectation value satisfies $\mathcal{M}_{N-1} = \langle M_{N-1} \rangle \leq 1$. Rewriting (5) in terms of the Dicke states ($|0\dots 0\rangle_{N-1} = |D_{N-1}^0\rangle$, $|1\dots 1\rangle_{N-1} = |D_{N-1}^{N-1}\rangle$), we get

$$M_{N-1} = 2^{(N-2)/2} (|D_{N-1}^0\rangle \langle D_{N-1}^{N-1}| \quad (6) \\ + |D_{N-1}^{N-1}\rangle \langle D_{N-1}^0|).$$

In order to calculate the expectation value of the Mermin operator, it is convenient to express the state (4) in the following way

$$|\psi\rangle = d_0 |D_{N-1}^0\rangle |0\rangle \quad (7) \\ + \frac{d_1}{\sqrt{N}} |D_{N-1}^0\rangle |1\rangle + d_1 \sqrt{\frac{N-1}{N}} |D_{N-1}^1\rangle |0\rangle \\ + \dots \\ + \frac{d_{N-1}}{\sqrt{N}} |D_{N-1}^{N-1}\rangle |0\rangle + d_{N-1} \sqrt{\frac{N-1}{N}} |D_{N-1}^{N-2}\rangle |1\rangle \\ + d_N |D_{N-1}^{N-1}\rangle |1\rangle,$$

where we omitted the terms that do not contribute to the expectation value. Finally, we obtain

$$\mathcal{M}_{N-1} = \langle \psi | M_{N-1} \otimes \mathbb{1} | \psi \rangle \quad (8) \\ = \frac{2^{(N-2)/2+1}}{\sqrt{N}} (d_0 d_{N-1} + d_1 d_N).$$

This value is maximal if $d_0 = d_{N-1} = 0$ and $d_1 = d_N = 1/\sqrt{2}$ or vice versa. Both solutions are locally unitarily equivalent, thus, we choose only the one stated explicitly above. The corresponding state is given as

$$|\psi_{\max}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|D_N^1\rangle + |1\dots 1\rangle). \quad (9)$$

It leads to the violation of the Mermin inequality equal to

$$\mathcal{M}_{N-1}^{\max} = \frac{2^{(N-2)/2}}{\sqrt{N}}. \quad (10)$$

Note that for $N = 3$ and $N = 4$ our result is consistent with [21] and [29], and we do not observe simultaneous violation of the Mermin inequalities. However, already from $N = 5$ onwards such a violation is possible and it increases exponentially with the number of qubits. Remarkably, in the limit of many particles, not only is there no monogamy of violations, but in fact every inequality is violated maximally.

B. Polygamy for four parties

As shown in the previous subsection, it is not possible to violate all four three-qubit Mermin inequalities for observers (ABC, ABD, ACD, BCD) in a four-party system (A,B,C,D), where for simplicity $A^{(1)} \equiv A$, $A^{(2)} \equiv B$, etc. However, it is possible to find another set of two-setting Bell inequalities that have this feature.

Using an original method based on linear programming (see Appendix A) we found a three-qubit inequality $\langle I_{ABC} \rangle \leq 6$, where

$$I_{ABC} = 2 \text{sym}[A_1] - \text{sym}[A_1 B_1] - \text{sym}[A_1 B_2] \quad (11) \\ + \text{sym}[A_2 B_2] + 2A_1 B_1 C_1 + \text{sym}[A_2 B_1 C_1] \\ - 2 \text{sym}[A_2 B_2 C_1] - A_2 B_2 C_2.$$

We use here a compact notation for symmetrising over different observers

$$\text{sym}[A_k B_l C_m] = \sum_{\pi(k,l,m)} A_k B_l C_m, \quad (12)$$

where the sum is over all permutations of (k, l, m) , denoted as $\pi(k, l, m)$, assuming $A_0 = B_0 = C_0 = 1$, e.g., $\text{sym}[A_1 B_1] = A_1 B_1 + A_1 C_1 + B_1 C_1$ being the permutations of $k = 1, l = 1, m = 0$. Analogous expressions can be formulated for I_{ABD} , I_{ACD} , I_{BCD} inequalities. It can be directly verified that all of them are simultaneously violated by the four-qubit state of the form $|\psi\rangle = \cos \theta |D_4^1\rangle + \sin \theta |1111\rangle$. Note that this state lies in the same subspace as $|\psi_{\max}\rangle$ in (9). The maximal violation of $6.154 > 6$ is observed for $\theta = 0.144$, and observables lying in the xz plane, $A_i = B_i = C_i = D_i = \cos \phi_i \sigma_x + \sin \phi_i \sigma_z$ with $\phi_1 = 2.739, \phi_2 = 0.847$. It is worth noting that these inequalities can also be simultaneously violated ($6.064 > 6$) by the Dicke $|D_4^1\rangle$ state ($\theta = 0$) if the angles were chosen as $\phi_1 = 2.640, \phi_2 = 0.986$. We emphasise the relative simplicity, as every observer measures the same set of two observables. The above example shows that, already for a system of four particles, one can define inequalities involving three observers such that all of them are simultaneously violated.

C. Polygamy with two-body correlators

The violation of monogamy is by no means limited to the case of higher-order correlations. Here we focus on a minimalist scenario based on the measurements between each pair of observers. Again, we approach this problem through the linear programming technique described in Appendix A. As a result, the $(N-1)$ -partite two-body Bell inequality was found to be $\langle I_{N-1} \rangle \geq 0$. The corresponding Bell operator is given as

$$I_{N-1} = L + \alpha (\text{sym}[A_1] + \text{sym}[A_2]) \quad (13) \\ + \text{sym}[A_1 B_1] + 4 \text{sym}[A_1 B_2] + \text{sym}[A_2 B_2],$$

where L and α are defined by $L = 3((N - 4)^2 + N - 2)$ and $\alpha = -3(N - 4)$, respectively. Note that Eq. (13) fits into the permutationally invariant form of the two-body Bell expressions introduced in [42]. However, I_{N-1} differs from the two classes of Bell parameters defined in that paper.

Notably, it is easy to verify the validity of the local realistic bound of zero for (13) up to large N (e.g. up to 10^4). To do this, first note that we can restrict the parties to use deterministic strategies. For a given classical deterministic strategy, let a_{++} , a_{+-} , a_{-+} , and a_{--} denote the number of parties whose classical expectation values $\langle A_k^{(i)} \rangle$ (for $k = 1, 2$) are $\{1, 1\}$, $\{1, -1\}$, $\{-1, 1\}$, and $\{-1, -1\}$, respectively. By definition, we have $a_{++} + a_{+-} + a_{-+} + a_{--} = N$. Due to the symmetry of (13), every classical deterministic strategy can be mapped to the four-tuple $(a_{++}, a_{+-}, a_{-+}, a_{--})$. In this way, we reduce the 2^N -dimensional correlation space to the dimension of 3, and the number of classical deterministic strategies is reduced from 2^{2N} to $2(N^2 + 1)$, which is a significant reduction in the complexity of the problem (for more details, see Tura et al. [42]).

To determine the violation of (13) one has to minimize the Bell expression in (13) for the $N - 1$ -partite reduced state of some N -partite symmetric state, e.g., $|D_N^1\rangle$, using observables in the xz plane,

$$A_k = \cos \phi_k \sigma_x + \sin \phi_k \sigma_z, \quad (14)$$

where we assume that all observers measure the same pair of observables, i.e. $A_k^{(i)} = A_k$ for all i .

Since I_{N-1} in (13) is permutationally invariant, $|D_N^1\rangle$ is symmetric, and $A_k^{(i)} = A_k$, this greatly simplifies the problem of computing the quantum violation. In fact, we only need to consider the following two-qubit reduced Bell operator

$$I_{A_1 A_2} = L \mathbb{1}_4 + \alpha(N - 1)(A_1 \otimes \mathbb{1}_2 + A_2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_2) + \binom{N - 1}{2}(A_1 \otimes A_1 + 4A_1 \otimes A_2 + A_2 \otimes A_2), \quad (15)$$

along with the reduced two-qubit state of $|D_N^1\rangle$:

$$\rho_2 = \frac{2}{N} |\psi_+\rangle \langle \psi_+| + \left(1 - \frac{2}{N}\right) |00\rangle \langle 00|, \quad (16)$$

where $|\psi_+\rangle = (1/\sqrt{2})(|01\rangle + |10\rangle)$.

Now, by substituting $N = 18$ and plugging in the observables defined by the angles

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_1 &= \pi - \arcsin(21/22), \\ \phi_2 &= \arcsin(21/22). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

we obtain

$$\langle I_{A_1 A_2} \rangle_{\rho_2} = -\frac{4}{99}. \quad (18)$$

Therefore, the two-body Bell inequality (13) is clearly violated. This implies that the 18-qubit state $|D_{18}^1\rangle$ can simultaneously violate all 17-qubit two-body Bell inequalities and thus the monogamy principle does not hold. Note that here any exchange of information happens only between the pairs of observers.

IV. EXPERIMENTAL DEMONSTRATION OF BELL POLYGAMY

Although the polygamous character of Bell inequality violations is already present in four-qubit systems, an experimental demonstration of such phenomena would require an experiment with very low experimental errors. The critical visibility, i.e. the minimal admixture of entangled three-qubit state to the white noise equals $6/6.154 = 0.975$. For this reason, we construct five-party inequalities for $N = 6$ observers with far less demanding visibility requirement and demonstrate in an optical experiment that they are violated in all six five-party subsystems. Again, by the linear programming method used before we arrive at the five-qubit inequality $\langle I_{ABCDE} \rangle \leq 6$ with

$$\begin{aligned} I_{ABCDE} &= -\text{sym}[A_1 B_1] - \text{sym}[A_2 B_2] \\ &+ \text{sym}[A_1 B_1 C_1 D_1] + \text{sym}[A_1 B_1 C_1 D_2] \\ &- \text{sym}[A_1 B_2 C_2 D_2] + \text{sym}[A_2 B_2 C_2 D_2]. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

It is worth noting that although these inequalities are defined for five qubits (they constitute the facet of a five-party Bell-Pitovsky polytope), they do not involve five-qubit correlations. Interestingly, the reduced five-qubit state of the Dicke state $|D_6^3\rangle$:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{nc} &= \text{Tr}_F(|D_6^3\rangle_{ABCDEF} \langle D_6^3|) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(|D_5^2\rangle_{ABCDE} \langle D_5^2| + |D_5^3\rangle_{ABCDE} \langle D_5^3|) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

does not contain any five-qubit correlations [43, 44]. It can be verified that the inequality I_{ABCDE} , as well as all of the other inequalities obtained by exchanging the indices, are theoretically violated by the state (20) with a value of $7.8215 > 6$ for the settings $A_i = B_i = C_i = D_i = E_i = F_i = \cos \phi_i \sigma_x + \sin \phi_i \sigma_z$, with $\phi_1 = 1.26042$, $\phi_2 = 2.77953$. The maximal possible violation of (19) by any six-qubit state is comparable with the violation for the Dicke state and is equal to 7.8771. The critical visibility required to observe the violation of inequality (19) with the state ρ_{nc} in Eq. (20) is 76.71%.

We experimentally demonstrate the existence of polygamous Bell-type correlations using five-party subsystems of a six-qubit Dicke state $|D_6^3\rangle$ prepared with polarisation entangled photons. For this purpose, we use a pulsed laser ($\lambda = 390$ nm) in an enhancement cavity to exploit the third order of spontaneous parametric down-conversion (SPDC) in a BBO crystal. By postselecting on six-fold detection events of this collinear type-II SPDC




FIG. 3. The average violation of inequalities (19) plotted as a function of measurement angles ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 . Panel *a*) shows the theoretical predictions arising from calculating the violation of inequalities using ideal state ρ_{nc} in Eq. (20). Due to the symmetry of the six-qubit Dicke state, the average violation is equivalent to the violation obtained by any set of five parties. The average violation of all inequalities based on the experimental data is presented in panel *b*). Despite the apparent symmetry, due to the imperfections and statistics, not all inequalities are simultaneously violated in the coloured region. It is the area inside the bold line in panel *c*) where all six inequalities are violated simultaneously.

TABLE I. Experimental polygamy of nonlocality. Simultaneous violation of all six five-party Bell inequalities (19), with the local realistic bound of 6, where each observer measures the same settings in the xz plane parameterised by $\phi_1 = 1.29244$ and $\phi_2 = 2.79605$. All inequalities are violated by at least one standard deviation.

Partition	ABCDE	ABCDF	ABCEF	ABDEF	ACDEF	BCDEF
Violation	6.315	6.204	6.479	6.307	6.146	6.128
Std. dev.	0.133	0.131	0.137	0.137	0.125	0.128

process, we obtain the desired polarization-encoded six-qubit Dicke state with three excitations. Due to the stochastic nature of SPDC the observed events are contaminated by even higher order emissions resulting in a mixture of $|D_6^3\rangle$ with states of 6 photons traced from $|D_8^4\rangle$.

A detailed description of the experimental setup can be found in Refs. [45, 46]. To obtain the density matrices of five-qubit marginals of this state, we evaluate five-fold coincidence events for all subsets of five observers. This provides better measurement statistics compared with tracing out one qubit. All matrices were obtained using permutation-invariant tomography [47]. Due to the different number of detection events and different efficiencies of individual detectors, the five-qubit reduced states are not identical but show small variations. The average fidelity (averaged over different five-party subsystems) to the ideal ρ_{nc} state in Eq. (20) is measured to be $91.2\% \pm 0.6\%$ (between $90.4\% \pm 0.2\%$ and $91.9\% \pm 0.2\%$).

The five-qubit experimental states also show $4.9\% \pm 0.6\%$ average fidelity (between $4.6\% \pm 0.2\%$ and $5.1\% \pm 0.2\%$) to an even mixture of $|D_5^1\rangle$ and $|D_5^4\rangle$ states, originating in the higher-order SPDC emissions. This noise contributes negative values of the Bell parameter in (19) reducing the violations. Still, all six five-party Bell inequalities are simultaneously violated (see Table I) by at least one standard deviation using the same settings parameterised by $\phi_1 = 1.29244$, $\phi_2 = 2.79605$. The observed average violation is $37.5787/6 > 6$.

Figure 3 shows how the violation depends on the choice of measurement settings (the same for every observer) both for the theoretical prediction as well as for the experimentally prepared and measured state. A small, yet clearly visible, region of settings shows where the simultaneous violation of all inequalities is indeed possible.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We showed that quantum nonlocality can be shared among arbitrarily many particles if the number of observers is $N > 3$. Using an original linear programming method we found several interesting inequalities that do not satisfy the monogamy principle. These include polygamous inequalities for $N = 4$, inequalities based on two-body correlators for $N = 18$ and experimentally verified inequalities for $N = 6$, where all six five-party subsets of observers violated the Bell inequality simultaneously.

Our findings demonstrate that contrary to current belief, Bell inequality violation is an inherently polygamous

phenomenon. In fact, only the scenario with three particles obeys strict monogamy relations. For more observers, any trade-offs between the values of Bell parameters result from a specific mathematical formulation of a given inequality. Among others, this conclusion has a potentially significant impact on the monogamy-based quantum security protocols and self-testing. If the possible three (or more) party communication scheme's safety relied on the Bell monogamy, then it becomes inequality-dependent since there always exists an inequality that can be violated without influencing the other subsystems. On the other hand, self-testing methods using the violation of Bell inequalities for certification could be employed for large networks and validate them for multiple stations at the same time.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

LK likes to thank Christian Schwemmer for stimulating discussions. PC and WL are supported by the National Science Centre (NCN, Poland) within the Preludium Bis project (Grant No. 2021/43/O/ST2/02679). LK and HW acknowledge support by the DFG under Germany's Excellence Strategy EXC-2111-390814868 and by the BMBF project QuKuK (16KIS1621). TP acknowledges Xiamen University Malaysia Research Fund (Grant No. XMUMRF/2022-C10/IPHY/0002). TV acknowledges the support of the EU (QuantERA eDICT), and the National Research, Development and Innovation Office NKFIH (Grants No. K145927, No. 2019-2.1.7-ERA-NET-2020-00003).

Appendix A: Linear programming method for constructing Bell inequalities that reveal polygamy

We give a brief description of our method, which is based on linear programming. We illustrate it with permutationally invariant (PI) Bell inequalities with two dichotomic settings per party, and we focus here on three-party inequalities. However, this method can be easily generalized to arbitrary Bell inequalities (with any number of settings, parties, and outcomes).

We choose a PI four-qubit pure state $\rho_4 = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$. Let us denote its three-qubit reduced density matrix by ρ_3 . We focus on measurements in the xz plane of the Bloch

sphere,

$$A_k = \cos \phi_k \sigma_x + \sin \phi_k \sigma_z \quad (\text{A1})$$

for $k = 1, 2$. It is also assumed that all three parties perform the same two measurements, that is, $A_k = B_k = C_k$. Let us define $A_0 = B_0 = C_0 = \mathbf{1}$. Then we can write a generic two-setting PI Bell operator for three parties as follows:

$$I_{ABC} = \sum_{0 \leq k \leq l \leq m \leq 2} \alpha_{k,l,m} \text{sym}[A_k B_l C_m], \quad (\text{A2})$$

where as before $\text{sym}[X]$ means the symmetrization of the expression X , and $\alpha_{k,l,m}$ are the Bell coefficients. We identify $-\alpha_{0,0,0} = L$ with the local bound, and then the Bell inequality is given by $\langle I_{ABC} \rangle \leq 0$.

Our goal is to find the Bell coefficients $\alpha_{k,l,m}$ of the Bell inequality that give rise to the largest quantum per local bound Q/L , where the symmetrized quantum expectation values

$$E_Q(k, l, m) = \text{Tr}(\rho_3 \text{sym}[A_k \otimes B_l \otimes C_m]) \quad (\text{A3})$$

are completely determined by the state ρ_3 and the observables A_k, B_k and C_k ($k = 1, 2$). On the other hand, a local deterministic strategy λ is given by a particular choice of $A_k = \pm 1, B_k = \pm 1$ and $C_k = \pm 1, i = 1, 2$ (and $A_0 = B_0 = C_0 = 1$). We compute the symmetrized products

$$E_\lambda(k, l, m) = \text{sym}[A_k B_l C_m] \quad (\text{A4})$$

for $0 \leq k \leq l \leq m \leq 2$, which amount to 10 components. There are 64 different λ strategies, however, due to the symmetry in (A4) only $\binom{6}{3} = 20$ give distinct values in the set of polynomials (A4).

Without loss of generality, we set $\alpha_{0,0,0} = -L = -1$ and solve the following linear programming task to obtain the maximum quantum per local ratio $(Q/L) = q + 1$ along with the Bell coefficients $\alpha_{k,l,m}$:

$$q \equiv \text{maximize} \sum_{0 \leq k \leq l \leq m \leq 2} \alpha_{k,l,m} E_Q(k, l, m), \quad (\text{A5})$$

such that

$$\sum_{0 \leq k \leq l \leq m \leq 2} \alpha_{k,l,m} E_\lambda(k, l, m) \leq 0, \quad \forall \lambda, \quad (\text{A6})$$

where maximization takes place over $\alpha_{k,l,m}, 0 \leq k \leq l \leq m \leq 2$ with the exception of $\alpha_{0,0,0} = -1$.

A solution $q > 0$ in the above optimization problem gives a PI Bell inequality with coefficients $\alpha_{k,l,m}$, which can be violated with the reduced three-qubit state ρ_3 and observables (A1) specified by the angles ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 .

[1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered

complete?, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777 (1935).

- [2] J. S. Bell, On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox, *Phys. Phys. Fiz.* **1**, 195–200 (1964).
- [3] A. Aspect, J. Dalibard, and G. Roger, Experimental test of Bell’s inequalities using time-varying analyzers, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49**, 1804 (1982).
- [4] G. Weihs, T. Jennewein, C. Simon, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zeilinger, Violation of Bell’s inequality under strict Einstein locality conditions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 5039 (1998).
- [5] M. A. Rowe, D. Kielpinski, V. Meyer, C. A. Sackett, W. M. Itano, C. Monroe, and D. J. Wineland, Experimental violation of a Bell’s inequality with efficient detection, *Nature* **409**, 791–794 (2001).
- [6] J.-W. Pan, D. Bouwmeester, M. Daniell, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zeilinger, Experimental test of quantum nonlocality in three-photon Greenberger–Horne–Zeilinger entanglement, *Nature* **403**, 515 (2000).
- [7] P. Walther, M. Aspelmeyer, K. J. Resch, and A. Zeilinger, Experimental violation of a cluster state Bell inequality, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 020403 (2005).
- [8] B. Hensen, H. Bernien, A. E. Dréau, A. Reiserer, N. Kalb, M. S. Blok, J. Ruitenber, R. F. L. Vermeulen, R. N. Schouten, C. Abellán, W. Amaya, V. Pruneri, M. W. Mitchell, M. Markham, D. J. Twitchen, D. Elkouss, S. Wehner, T. H. Tamini, and R. Hanson, Loophole-free Bell inequality violation using electron spins separated by 1.3 kilometres, *Nature* **526**, 682–686 (2015).
- [9] M. Giustina, M. A. M. Versteegh, S. Wengerowsky, J. Handsteiner, A. Hochrainer, K. Phelan, F. Steinlechner, J. Kofler, J.-A. Larsson, C. Abellán, W. Amaya, V. Pruneri, M. W. Mitchell, J. Beyer, T. Gerrits, A. E. Lita, L. K. Shalm, S. W. Nam, T. Scheidl, R. Ursin, B. Wittmann, and A. Zeilinger, Significant-loophole-free test of Bell’s theorem with entangled photons, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115** (2015).
- [10] L. K. Shalm, E. Meyer-Scott, B. G. Christensen, P. Bierhorst, M. A. Wayne, M. J. Stevens, T. Gerrits, S. Glancy, D. R. Hamel, M. S. Allman, K. J. Coakley, S. D. Dyer, C. Hodge, A. E. Lita, V. B. Verma, C. Lambrocco, E. Tortorici, A. L. Migdall, Y. Zhang, D. R. Kumor, W. H. Farr, F. Marsili, M. D. Shaw, J. A. Stern, C. Abellán, W. Amaya, V. Pruneri, T. Jennewein, M. W. Mitchell, P. G. Kwiat, J. C. Bienfang, R. P. Mirin, E. Knill, and S. W. Nam, Strong loophole-free test of local realism, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115** (2015).
- [11] W. Rosenfeld, D. Burchardt, R. Garthoff, K. Redeker, N. Ortégel, M. Rau, and H. Weinfurter, Event-ready Bell test using entangled atoms simultaneously closing detection and locality loopholes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119** (2017).
- [12] D. Rauch, J. Handsteiner, A. Hochrainer, J. Gallicchio, A. S. Friedman, C. Leung, B. Liu, L. Bulla, S. Ecker, F. Steinlechner, R. Ursin, B. Hu, D. Leon, C. Benn, A. Ghedina, M. Cecconi, A. H. Guth, D. I. Kaiser, T. Scheidl, and A. Zeilinger, Cosmic Bell test using random measurement settings from high-redshift quasars, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121** (2018).
- [13] A. K. Ekert, Quantum cryptography based on Bell’s theorem, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 661 (1991).
- [14] D. Mayers and A. C.-C. Yao, Self testing quantum apparatus, *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **4**, 273 (2003).
- [15] J. Barrett, L. Hardy, and A. Kent, No signaling and quantum key distribution, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 010503 (2005).
- [16] S. Pironio, A. Acín, S. Massar, A. B. de la Giroday, D. N. Matsukevich, P. Maunz, S. Olmschenk, D. Hayes, L. Luo, T. A. Manning, and C. Monroe, Random numbers certified by Bell’s theorem, *Nature* **464**, 1021 (2010).
- [17] H. Buhman, R. Cleve, S. Massar, and R. de Wolf, Nonlocality and communication complexity, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82**, 665 (2010).
- [18] N. Brunner, D. Cavalcanti, S. Pironio, V. Scarani, and S. Wehner, Bell nonlocality, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **86**, 419 (2014).
- [19] I. Šupić and J. Bowles, Self-testing of quantum systems: a review, *Quantum* **4**, 337 (2020).
- [20] V. Scarani and N. Gisin, Quantum communication between N partners and Bell’s inequalities, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 117901 (2001).
- [21] B. Toner and F. Verstraete, Monogamy of Bell correlations and Tsirelson’s bound, arXiv:quant-ph/0611001 (2006), preprint at <https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0611001>.
- [22] B. Toner, Monogamy of non-local quantum correlations, *Proc.R.Soc.A* **465**, 59 (2009).
- [23] B. F. Toner, *Quantifying quantum nonlocality*, Ph.D. thesis, California Institute of Technology (2007).
- [24] D. Collins and N. Gisin, A relevant two qubit Bell inequality inequivalent to the CHSH inequality, *J. Phys. A* **37**, 1775 (2004).
- [25] J. Barrett, A. Kent, and S. Pironio, Maximally nonlocal and monogamous quantum correlations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 170409 (2006).
- [26] M. Seevinck, Classification and monogamy of three-qubit biseparable Bell correlations, *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 012106 (2007).
- [27] M. Pawłowski and C. Brukner, Monogamy of Bell’s inequality violations in nonsignaling theories, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 030403 (2009).
- [28] M. Pawłowski, Security proof for cryptographic protocols based only on the monogamy of Bell’s inequality violations, *Phys. Rev. A* **82**, 032313 (2010).
- [29] P. Kurzyński, T. Paterek, R. Ramanathan, W. Laskowski, and D. Kaszlikowski, Correlation complementarity yields Bell monogamy relations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 180402 (2011).
- [30] L. Aolita, R. Gallego, A. Cabello, and A. Acín, Fully nonlocal, monogamous, and random genuinely multipartite quantum correlations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 100401 (2012).
- [31] R. Augusiak, M. Demianowicz, M. Pawłowski, J. Tura, and A. Acín, Elemental and tight monogamy relations in nonsignaling theories, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 052323 (2014).
- [32] R. Ramanathan and P. Horodecki, Strong monogamies of no-signaling violations for bipartite correlation Bell inequalities, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 210403 (2014).
- [33] M. C. Tran, R. Ramanathan, M. McKague, D. Kaszlikowski, and T. Paterek, Bell monogamy relations in arbitrary qubit networks, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 052325 (2018).
- [34] R. Augusiak, Simple and tight monogamy relations for a class of Bell inequalities, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 012113 (2017).
- [35] M. Wieśniak, Symmetrized persistency of Bell correlations for Dicke states and GHZ-based mixtures: studying the limits of monogamy (2021), preprint at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.08141>, arXiv:2102.08141.
- [36] R. Silva, N. Gisin, Y. Guryanova, and S. Popescu, Multiple observers can share the nonlocality of half of an entangled pair by using optimal weak measurements, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 250401 (2015).
- [37] S. Cheng, L. Liu, T. J. Baker, and M. J. W. Hall, Lim-

- itations on sharing Bell nonlocality between sequential pairs of observers, *Phys. Rev. A* **104**, L060201 (2021).
- [38] S. S. Mahato and A. K. Pan, Sharing nonlocality in a quantum network by unbounded sequential observers, *Phys. Rev. A* **106**, 042218 (2022).
- [39] 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).
- [40] N. D. Mermin, Extreme quantum entanglement in a superposition of macroscopically distinct states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 1838 (1990).
- [41] A. V. Belinskii and D. N. Klyshko, Interference of light and Bell's theorem, *Phys.-Uspekhi* **36**, 653 (1993).
- [42] J. Tura, R. Augusiak, A. B. Sainz, T. Vértesi, M. Lewenstein, and A. Acín, Detecting nonlocality in many-body quantum states, *Science* **344**, 1256 (2014).
- [43] C. Schwemmer, L. Knips, M. C. Tran, A. de Rosier, W. Laskowski, T. Paterek, and H. Weinfurter, Genuine multipartite entanglement without multipartite correlations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 180501 (2015).
- [44] M. C. Tran, M. Zuppardo, A. de Rosier, L. Knips, W. Laskowski, T. Paterek, and H. Weinfurter, Genuine n -partite entanglement without n -partite correlation functions, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 062331 (2017).
- [45] W. Wieczorek, R. Krischek, N. Kiesel, P. Michelberger, G. Tóth, and H. Weinfurter, Experimental entanglement of a six-photon symmetric dicke state, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 020504 (2009).
- [46] R. Krischek, W. Wieczorek, A. Ozawa, N. Kiesel, P. Michelberger, T. Udem, and H. Weinfurter, Ultraviolet enhancement cavity for ultrafast nonlinear optics and high-rate multiphoton entanglement experiments, *Nat. Photonics* **4**, 170–173 (2010).
- [47] G. Tóth, W. Wieczorek, D. Gross, R. Krischek, C. Schwemmer, and H. Weinfurter, Permutationally invariant quantum tomography, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** (2010).