

Scalable & Noise-Robust Communication Advantage of Multipartite Quantum Entanglement

Ananya Chakraborty,^{*} Ram Krishna Patra, Kunika Agarwal, Samrat Sen, Pratik Ghosal, Sahil Gopalkrishna Naik, and Manik Banik
*Department of Physics of Complex Systems, S. N. Bose National Center for Basic Sciences,
Block JD, Sector III, Salt Lake, Kolkata 700106, India.*

Distributed computing, involving multiple servers collaborating on designated computations, faces a critical challenge in optimizing inter-server communication—an issue central to the study of communication complexity. Quantum resources offer advantages over classical methods in addressing this challenge. In this work, we investigate a distributed computing scenario with multiple senders and a single receiver, establishing a scalable advantage of multipartite quantum entanglement in mitigating communication complexity. Specifically, we demonstrate that when the receiver and the senders share a multi-qubit Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) state—a quintessential form of genuine multipartite entanglement—certain global functions of the distributed inputs can be computed with only one bit of classical communication from each sender. In contrast, without entanglement, two bits of communication are required from all but one sender. Consequently, quantum entanglement reduces communication overhead by $n - 1$ bits for n senders, allowing for arbitrary scaling with an increasing number of senders. We also show that the entanglement-based protocol exhibits significant robustness under white noise, thereby establishing the potential for experimental realization of this novel quantum advantage.

INTRODUCTION

Processing information with quantum systems offers significant advantages over traditional classical methods [1–4]. In particular, quantum entanglement – one of the most intriguing nonclassical features of multipartite quantum systems [5–9] – has profound implications for communication [10] and distributed computing [11]. For instance, Holevo’s theorem limits the classical capacity of a perfect quantum channel to that of its classical counterpart [12] (see also [13–16]). However, as demonstrated by the seminal superdense coding protocol [17] and subsequent studies [18–20], pre-existing entanglement between sender and receiver can enhance the classical capacity of quantum channels.

Pre-shared quantum entanglement can significantly reduce the need for classical communication in communication complexity problems [21–27]. In these problems, classical inputs are distributed across distant servers (or parties), and a global function of these inputs must be computed at a designated server. Nonlocal correlations [28–30] obtained from entangled quantum states play crucial role in minimizing classical communication requirements during function computation [31]. Notably, stronger than quantum nonlocal correlations can trivialize communication complexity problems, underscoring a clear distinction between quantum and post-quantum correlations [32–37].

In this work, we investigate how far the advantages of quantum entanglement can be extended in communication complexity tasks. Specifically, we examine the utility of multipartite quantum entanglement, with a particular focus on genuine multipartite entanglement [38–41].

We consider a communication complexity task, CC_n , involving n distant senders, denoted as $\{\text{Alice-}i\}_{i=1}^n$, and a computing server, Bob. The senders and the server are each provided with two-bit strings that satisfy a promise condition, and Bob’s task is to evaluate a specific global function of these input strings. We demonstrate that, when the senders and Bob share an $(n + 1)$ -qubit Greenberger–Horne–Zeilinger (GHZ) state, Bob can perfectly compute the function with only one bit of classical communication from each sender. In contrast, without entanglement, the CC_2 problem requires two bits of communication from one sender and one bit from the other. Thus, preshared entanglement provides a one-bit advantage in the CC_2 task. For the general CC_n task, without entanglement, two bits of communication are required from all but one sender. Therefore, preshared entanglement offers a reduction of $(n - 1)$ -bit communication overhead, which can be made arbitrarily large as the number of parties increases. Additionally, we analyze a noise-robust version of the task to assess the effectiveness of a noisy GHZ state in communication complexity. As it turns out GHZ state under white noise, exhibits the advantage for quite a large noise parameter.

PRELIMINARIES

Communication complexity.– Classical communication complexity addresses the question of minimizing the amount of classical communication required to compute a function with distributed inputs [42–44]. In its simplest form, two servers, commonly referred to as Alice and Bob, are provided randomly chosen bit strings,

$\mathbf{x} \in \{0,1\}^{\times m}$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \{0,1\}^{\times m'}$, respectively. Bob is tasked with computing a function $f : \mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{y} \mapsto \{0,1\}$ while minimizing the classical communication required from Alice. To achieve this goal Alice and Bob are typically allowed to use pre-shared classical correlations, also called shared randomness [45, 46]. Quantum communication complexity extends this framework by utilizing quantum resources. In the model introduced by Yao [47], Alice sends qubits to Bob, while in the entanglement-based model proposed by Cleve and Buhrman [22], the parties share entanglement and communicate using classical bits. The quantum advantage in the entanglement-based model utilizes the nonlocal feature of correlations obtained from the quantum entangled states [31]. In this work, we aim to explore the nontrivial advantages of genuine multipartite quantum entanglement in communication complexity by considering a multipartite variant of the task. Before presenting our main results, we briefly recall the notion of multipartite quantum entanglement.

Multipartite entanglement.— State of a quantum system S associated with a complex Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_S is described by a density operator ρ_S , a trace-one positive semidefinite matrix, within the set $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_S)$ of all such operators. For finite dimensions, \mathcal{H}_S is isomorphic to a complex Euclidean space \mathbb{C}^{d_S} , where d_S represents the dimension of the Hilbert space. States with $\text{Tr}[\rho_S^2] = 1$ are called pure states, corresponding to normalized ray vectors $|\psi\rangle_S \in \mathbb{C}^{d_S}$. Multipartite quantum systems are associated with the tensor product of their subsystems' Hilbert spaces. A state $|\psi\rangle_{A_1 \dots A_K} \in \otimes_{j=1}^K \mathbb{C}^{d_j}$ is fully product if it can be expressed as $|\psi\rangle_{A_1 \dots A_K} = \otimes_{j=1}^K |\phi\rangle_{A_j}$, where $|\phi\rangle_{A_j} \in \mathbb{C}^{d_j}$; otherwise, $|\psi\rangle_{A_1 \dots A_K}$ contains some form of multipartite entanglement [48, 49]. For $K > 2$, various forms of entanglement are possible, with genuine entanglement being the most intricate one [38–41]. A state $|\psi\rangle_{A_1 \dots A_K}$ is called genuinely entangled if it cannot be decomposed into a product form across any bipartition, i.e., $|\psi\rangle_{A_1 \dots A_K} \neq |\phi\rangle_P \otimes |\chi\rangle_{P^C}$ for all non-empty subsets $P \subsetneq \{A_1, \dots, A_K\}$ where $P^C := \{A_1, \dots, A_K\} \setminus P$. A canonical example of a genuinely entangled K -qubit state, that will be used in this work, is the GHZ state $|G_K\rangle := (|0\rangle^{\otimes K} + |1\rangle^{\otimes K})/\sqrt{2} \in (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes K}$, originally introduced while studying multipartite variant of Bell nonlocality [50] (see also [51–53]).

RESULTS

We start by defining the communication complexity task CC_n , that involves n distant senders $\{\text{Alice-}i\}_{i=1}^n$ and a computing server Bob. Each party receives bit

strings $\mathbf{x}_1 = x_1^0 x_1^1$, $\mathbf{x}_2 = x_2^0 x_2^1$, ..., $\mathbf{x}_n = x_n^0 x_n^1$, and $\mathbf{y} = y^0 y^1$, respectively. The bits x_1^1, \dots, x_n^1 , and y^1 are sampled independently and uniformly at random, while the strings otherwise satisfy a constraint known to be the promise condition, that is $(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^0 + y^0)$ must be an even number. Bob's goal is to compute the function $f_n : \mathbf{y} \times \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \mapsto \{0,1\}$, defined as $f_n(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{y}) := \oplus_{i=1}^n x_i^1 \oplus y^1 \oplus \mathbb{P}[(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^0 + y^0)/2]$, where ' \oplus ' denotes the binary XOR operation, and $\mathbb{P} : \mathbb{N} \mapsto \{0,1\}$ is defined as $\mathbb{P}(r) = 1$ when r is odd and $\mathbb{P}(r) = 0$ otherwise. The collaborative goal of the parties is to compute the function f_n , with minimum possible collaboration. For this we now discuss an efficient protocol utilizing multi-qubit GHZ state apriori shared among the parties.

Theorem 1. *The function f_n can be computed exactly by Bob with 1-bit of classical communication from each of the Alices when the GHZ state $|G_{n+1}\rangle$ is shared among them.*

Proof. The protocol proceeds as follows: Each party performs Pauli-X (σ_1) or Pauli-Y (σ_2) measurement on their respective shares of $|G_{n+1}\rangle$ state, depending on whether the first bit of their respective strings is 0 or 1. Each of the Alices then communicates XOR of their measurement outcome and the second bit of their respective input strings to Bob. Bob's final output of the desired computation is XOR of all the communications received from Alices, his second bit, and outcome of his Pauli measurement.

To demonstrate that this protocol correctly evaluates the function f_n , we begin by recalling an interesting property (say \mathcal{P}) of the GHZ state [54]:

$$\sigma_{1+\bar{z}} |G_{n+1}\rangle = \begin{cases} (-1)^{\frac{S_z}{2}} |G_{n+1}\rangle, & \text{for even } S_z; \\ (-1)^{\frac{S_z+1}{2}} i |G_{n+1}^-\rangle, & \text{for odd } S_z, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $\sigma_{1+\bar{z}} := \otimes_{i=1}^n \sigma_{1+x_i^0} \otimes \sigma_{1+y^0}$, $S_z := \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^0 + y^0$, and $|G_K^-\rangle := (|0\rangle^{\otimes K} - |1\rangle^{\otimes K})/\sqrt{2}$. Notably, in CC_n game, the promise condition ensures S_z to be even always. Let $\mathcal{O}(x_i^0) \in \{0,1\}$ denotes outcome of i^{th} Alice's local measurement $\sigma_{1+x_i^0}$, and similarly let $\mathcal{O}(y^0) \in \{0,1\}$ denotes Bob's outcome of the local measurement σ_{1+y^0} . According to the protocol, i^{th} Alice communicates $c_i = \mathcal{O}(x_i^0) \oplus x_i^1$ to Bob. Bob's final computation thus becomes, $\oplus_{i=1}^n c_i \oplus y^1 \oplus \mathcal{O}(y^0) = \oplus_{i=1}^n [\mathcal{O}(x_i^0) \oplus x_i^1] \oplus y^1 \oplus \mathcal{O}(y^0) = [\oplus_{i=1}^n x_i^1 \oplus y^1] \oplus [\oplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{O}(x_i^0) \oplus \mathcal{O}(y^0)] = \oplus_{i=1}^n x_i^1 \oplus y^1 \oplus \mathbb{P}[S_z/2] = f_n(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{y})$. Here, the step $\oplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{O}(x_i^0) \oplus \mathcal{O}(y^0) = \mathbb{P}[S_z/2]$ follows from property \mathcal{P} . This completes the proof. ■

To establish advantage of GHZ in computing the function f_n in CC_n task we now analyze its computability without the resource $|G_{n+1}\rangle$. We start by analyzing the case of CC_2 .

Theorem 2. *With one bit of classical communication from each of the Alices, Bob cannot compute the function f_2 exactly, even in assistance with classical shared randomness.*

Proof. For the CC_2 task, the promise condition simplifies to $x_1^0 \oplus x_2^0 \oplus y^0 = 0$, and the function Bob needs to evaluate becomes $f_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{y}) = x_1^1 \oplus x_2^1 \oplus y^1 \oplus (x_1^0 \vee x_2^0 \vee y^0)$. Clearly, Bob can compute f_2 if and only if he can compute $f_2'(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, y^0) = x_1^1 \oplus x_2^1 \oplus (x_1^0 \vee x_2^0 \vee y^0)$. Given the promise condition, f_2' can be rewritten as:

$$f_2'(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, 0) = x_1^1 \oplus x_2^1 \oplus (x_1^0 \vee x_2^0), \text{ with } x_1^0 = x_2^0; \quad (2a)$$

$$f_2'(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, 1) = x_1^1 \oplus x_2^1 \oplus 1, \quad \text{with } x_1^0 \neq x_2^0. \quad (2b)$$

A general function $g : \{0,1\}^{\times 2} \mapsto \{0,1\}$ can be expressed as $g^{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta}(u, v) := \alpha u \oplus \beta v \oplus \gamma uv \oplus \delta$, with $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, u, v \in \{0,1\}$. Consequently, the communication from the i^{th} Alice to Bob can be represented as $c_i := \mathcal{E}_i(x_i^0, x_i^1) = \alpha_i x_i^0 \oplus \beta_i x_i^1 \oplus \gamma_i x_i^0 x_i^1 \oplus \delta_i$. To compute the desired function in Eq. (2), Bob applies a generic decoding function to the communication bits c_1 and c_2 received from Alice-1 and Alice-2, respectively. Notably, Bob's decoding can depend on the input y^0 . Denoting the respective decoding functions as $\mathcal{D}_j(c_1, c_2) = \alpha_j^i c_1 \oplus \beta_j^i c_2 \oplus \gamma_j^i c_1 c_2 \oplus \delta_j^i$ for $j \in \{0,1\}$, exact computability of f_2 thus demands

$$\mathcal{D}_0 = f_2'(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, 0) \quad \& \quad \mathcal{D}_1 = f_2'(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, 1). \quad (3)$$

A lengthy but straightforward calculation results yields:

(i) For $y^0 = 1$, we have the restrictions $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3^1 = \alpha_3^1 = 1$, $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \gamma_3^1 = 0$ and $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$;

(ii) For $y^0 = 0$, we have the restrictions $\alpha_3^0 = \beta_3^0 = 1$, $\gamma_3^0 = 0$, $\delta_1 = \delta_2 \oplus \delta_3^0$ and $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$.

Since the restrictions in (i) and (ii) are not consistent with each other, therefore no consistent encodings $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ and decodings $\mathcal{D}_0, \mathcal{D}_1$ exist that can evaluate the function f_2 exactly. Having no deterministic strategy their probabilistic mixtures also fail to compute the function f_2 . This completes the proof. ■

Evidently, the function f_2 can be evaluated with classical resources if each Alice communicates 2 bits to Bob. However, as demonstrated in our subsequent result, a more efficient classical protocol is available.

Proposition 1. *The function f_2 can be evaluated exactly with 2 bits of classical communication from one Alice and 1 bit from the other.*

Proof. With 2 bits let Alice-1 classically communicates her string \mathbf{x}_1 to Bob, while Alice-2, using 1 bit channel, communicates her second bit x_2^1 only. The promise condition, $x_1^0 \oplus x_2^0 \oplus y^0 = 0$, allows Bob to evaluate x_2^0 from




Figure 1. Impossibility of evaluating f_n in \overline{CC}_n scenario implies impossibility of evaluating f_n in CC_n scenario, for any α channels.

the information of y^0 and x_1^0 , and therefore the function f_2 can be computed exactly. ■

Proposition 1, along with Theorem 1 and 2, demonstrates that the multipartite entangled state $|G_3\rangle$ provides a 1-bit communication advantage in evaluating the function f_2 in the CC_2 task. We now proceed to establish a scalable communication advantage of multipartite entanglement by considering the CC_n task. Using a similar argument as in Proposition 1, it is evident that the function f_n can be evaluated exactly with 1 bit of communication from one Alice and 2 bits from each of the others, requiring a total of $(2n - 1)$ bits of communication. Referring to Theorem 1, we can thus conclude that the multipartite entangled state $|G_{n+1}\rangle$ reduces the communication overhead by $(n - 1)$ bits when evaluating the function f_n . In other words, the communication advantage of multipartite entanglement can be made arbitrarily large by involving more number of senders in the communication complexity task CC_n .

Theorem 3. *For $n \geq 2$, the function f_n cannot be evaluated by Bob exactly, if two or more Alices are limited to share only 1-bit of classical channel with Bob.*

Proof. To prove the theorem, it suffices to consider the case of two Alices (Alice-1 and Alice-2), each sharing a 1-bit classical channel with Bob. Motivated by the task

CC_n , where all parties are spatially separated. Let us define another task \overline{CC}_n , where Alice-3 through Alice- n are located in Bob's laboratory [see Fig. 1]. Evidently, if a function cannot be evaluated in \overline{CC}_n scenario with 1-bit communication from both Alice-1 and Alice-2 to Bob, then this function cannot be evaluated in the CC_n scenario with the same amount of classical communication from both Alice-1 and Alice-2 to Bob, independent of the fact what other resources are allowed between Bob and the remaining Alices. In the \overline{CC}_n scenario, consider the sub-task of evaluating f_n^o where $\mathbf{x}_j = 00$ for all $j \geq 3$. A perfect evaluation of f_n^o implies a perfect evaluation of f_2 in the CC_2 task with 1-bit communication from both Alice-1 and Alice-2 to Bob, which has already been shown to be impossible in Theorem 2. This concludes the proof of present theorem. ■

It is natural to ask how robust is the quantum advantage established in Theorems 2 and 3 against the noise. Often in experiment the ideal GHZ state becomes noisy as $G_{n+1}^{(p)} := (1-p)|G_{n+1}\rangle\langle G_{n+1}| + p(\mathbb{I}_2/2)^{\otimes n+1}$ due to the presence of white noise, where $p \in [0, 1]$. Recall that a classical strategy \mathcal{S} consists of an encoding-decoding tuple $\mathcal{S} \equiv \{c_i = \mathcal{E}_i(\mathbf{x}_i), \mathcal{D}_0(c_1, \dots, c_n), \mathcal{D}_1(c_1, \dots, c_n)\}$. Let 'b' denote the bit value evaluated by Bob under strategy \mathcal{S} , and the success of this strategy is quantified as

$$P_{\mathcal{S}}^n := \sum_{\{\mathbf{x}_i\}, \mathbf{y}} p(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{y}) p(b = f_n | \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{y}).$$

Given the classical resource $\mathcal{R} \equiv \{\text{Each Alice} \rightarrow \text{Bob} : 1 \text{ bit channel}\}$ and classical shared randomness, the parties can implement various strategies $\{\mathcal{S}_k\}$. The optimal success with resource \mathcal{R} is then defined as $P_{\mathcal{R}}^n := \max_{\{\mathcal{S}_k\}} P_{\mathcal{S}_k}^n$. A quantum strategy \mathcal{Q} using resources $\{\mathcal{R} \cup \psi_{A_1 \dots B}\}$ will exhibit an advantage in the communication complexity task CC_n if $P_{\mathcal{Q}}^n > P_{\mathcal{R}}^n$. In such a case, it is evident that the nonclassicality of the shared quantum state $\psi_{A_1 \dots B} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^{d_{A_1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_B})$ underlies the quantum advantage. With this we can now prove our next result.

Theorem 4. *For $n \geq 2$, the states $G_{n+1}^{(p)}$, with $0 \leq p < 1/2$, offer an advantage in evaluating the function f_n when supplemented with the classical resource \mathcal{R} .*

Proof. We start by deriving nontrivial bounds on the optimal success probability $P_{\mathcal{R}}^n$ when the parties avail classical resource \mathcal{R} only:

$$P_{\mathcal{R}}^n \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\lceil 2^{(n+1)/2} \rceil} := P_{\text{lower}}^n,$$

$$P_{\mathcal{R}}^n \leq \frac{3}{4} := P_{\text{upper}}^n, \text{ equality for } n = 2, 3.$$

To establish the lower bound P_{lower}^n for generic n , it suffices to present an explicit protocol utilizing the resource \mathcal{R} . As demonstrated in Theorem 1, the function $f_n = \oplus_{i=1}^n x_i^1 \oplus y^1 \oplus \mathbb{P}[(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^0 + y^0)/2]$ can be exactly evaluated with the resource $\{\mathcal{R} \cup |G_{n+1}\rangle\}$, since the condition $\oplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{O}(x_i^0) \oplus \mathcal{O}(y^0) = \mathbb{P}[S_z/2]$ is perfectly satisfied by the GHZ state. Recall that, this particular condition is the requirement of $(n+1)$ -player Pseudo-Telepathy game introduced by Mermin [54], where the maximum achievable success probability with classical correlation is bounded above by P_{lower}^n (see also [55]), thereby establishing that $P_{\mathcal{R}}^n \geq P_{\text{lower}}^n$ for all $n \geq 2$.

To determine the upper bound, let us first consider the case $n = 2$. Only a limited number of extreme encoding-decoding strategies are possible in this case. A systematic analysis reveals that $P_{\mathcal{R}}^2 \leq 3/4$ (see Appendix), hence $P_{\text{upper}}^2 = 3/4$. For $n \geq 3$, we can apply a similar reasoning as of Theorem 3. Namely, instead of CC_n if we consider the task \overline{CC}_n , then P_{upper}^n in the barred task can be at most $3/4$; otherwise it will imply that $P_{\text{upper}}^2 > 3/4$, a contradiction. Therefore in the CC_n task too we have $P_{\text{upper}}^n \leq 3/4$. Notably, for $n = 3$ this bound is achievable as it matches with P_{lower}^3 . However, for $n > 3$ it remains to be analyzed further whether the value $3/4$ can be achieved with resource \mathcal{R} .

Now, with the resource $\{\mathcal{R} \cup G_{n+1}^{(p)}\}$ and following the protocol from Theorem 1, the success probability is given by $P_{\mathcal{Q}} = (2-p)/2$. Considering the optimal success $P_{\mathcal{R}}^n$ of CC_n to be its upper bound $3/4$, we obtain that the resource $\{\mathcal{R} \cup G_{n+1}^{(p)}\}$ is advantageous over \mathcal{R} , i.e., $P_{\mathcal{Q}} > 3/4$ for the parameter range $p \in [0, 1/2)$. This completes the proof. ■

The states $G_{n+1}^{(p)}$ are known to be fully separable if and only if $1/[1+2^{-n}] \leq p \leq 1$ [56, 57], whereas they are genuinely multipartite entangled if and only if $0 \leq p < 1/[2-2^{-n}]$ [58]. Therefore, the advantage established in Theorem 4 is confined to the parameter range associated with genuinely multipartite entanglement. However, the potential for advantage with non-genuine states remains open. For $n \geq 4$, if $P_{\mathcal{R}}^{(n)} < 3/4$, advantage may still be achieved with non-genuine but inseparable $G_{n+1}^{(p)}$ (see Fig. 2).

DISCUSSIONS

Quantum advantages are quite difficult to establish and even more challenging to validate experimentally. For instance, while quantum computing is anticipated to offer exponential speedups, such as in integer factorization, these expectations rest on unproven mathematical assumptions and require the development of fault-

tolerant quantum computers – an exceedingly difficult task at present [59]. In contrast, quantum resources often promise demonstrable advantages in communication complexity problems involving distributed computing tasks [60–63]. Within this setup, our study reveals a scalable advantage of multipartite entanglement, specifically the multi-qubit GHZ states, in reducing communication overhead while evaluating functions with inputs distributed across multiple distant servers. Remarkably, this advantage persists even under noisy conditions. Multiple research groups have already generated GHZ states across various architectures, with ongoing progress toward scaling subsystem numbers [64–69]. The robustness of the present protocol against noise highlights its strong potential for practical experimental implementation in these systems.

Our study opens several promising directions for future research. For instance, exploring the robustness of

Theorem 4 across generic CC_n tasks could yield deeper insights into the nonclassical resources underpinning the observed advantages. Additionally, the perfect advantage demonstrated in Theorem 1 likely requires an $(n + 1)$ -qubit GHZ state. A potential route to prove this could involve extending the concept of self-testing [70], where quantum states and corresponding measurements are uniquely determined (up to local isomorphism) based on Bell game statistics [71]. Notably, GHZ game statistics have been shown to self-test the GHZ state [72]. Extending this framework from Bell games to scenarios involving limited communication may provide a basis for proving that the $(n + 1)$ -qubit GHZ state is necessary for achieving perfect advantage in CC_n tasks. Another compelling question is whether the 3-qubit GHZ state can further reduce communication complexity, as suggested by Theorems 1 and 2 – an issue which has been addressed positively in [73].

APPENDIX

Optimal success in CC_2 with the resource \mathcal{R}

As already mentioned, a function $g : \{0, 1\}^{\times 2} \mapsto \{0, 1\}$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} g^{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta}(u, v) &:= (\alpha \wedge u) \oplus (\beta \wedge v) \oplus (\gamma \wedge u \wedge v) \oplus \delta \\ &= \alpha u \oplus \beta v \oplus \gamma uv \oplus \delta, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

with $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, u, v \in \{0, 1\}$. We can denote $g^{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta}$ as g^m , where $m := (2)^3\alpha + (2)^2\beta + (2)^1\gamma + (2)^0\delta$. Accordingly

$\mathcal{E}_1 \backslash \mathcal{E}_2$	\mathcal{E}_2^0	P_S	\mathcal{E}_2^8	P_S	\mathcal{E}_2^4	P_S	\mathcal{E}_2^{12}	P_S	\mathcal{E}_2^{14}	P_S	\mathcal{E}_2^2	P_S	\mathcal{E}_2^6	P_S	\mathcal{E}_2^{10}	P_S
\mathcal{E}_1^0	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$
\mathcal{E}_1^8	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$
\mathcal{E}_1^4	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^{13}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{12}, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{12}, \mathcal{D}_1^{13}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{13}, \mathcal{D}_1^{13}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{12}, \mathcal{D}_1^{13}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{12}, \mathcal{D}_1^{12}$	$\frac{3}{4}$
\mathcal{E}_1^{12}	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{12}, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^{12}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{12}, \mathcal{D}_1^{12}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{12}, \mathcal{D}_1^{13}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{12}, \mathcal{D}_1^{12}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{13}, \mathcal{D}_1^{12}$	$\frac{3}{4}$
\mathcal{E}_1^{14}	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{12}, \mathcal{D}_1^{13}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{12}, \mathcal{D}_1^{12}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{12}, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{5}{8}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^{13}$	$\frac{5}{8}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{12}, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{5}{8}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^{12}$	$\frac{5}{8}$
\mathcal{E}_1^2	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{13}, \mathcal{D}_1^{13}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{12}, \mathcal{D}_1^{13}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^{13}$	$\frac{5}{8}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{13}, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{5}{8}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^{13}$	$\frac{5}{8}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{12}, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{5}{8}$
\mathcal{E}_1^6	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{12}, \mathcal{D}_1^{13}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{12}, \mathcal{D}_1^{12}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{12}, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{5}{8}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^{13}$	$\frac{5}{8}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{12}, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{5}{8}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^{12}$	$\frac{5}{8}$
\mathcal{E}_1^{10}	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{12}, \mathcal{D}_1^{12}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{13}, \mathcal{D}_1^{12}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^{12}$	$\frac{5}{8}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{12}, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{5}{8}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_1^{12}$	$\frac{5}{8}$	$\mathcal{D}_0^{13}, \mathcal{D}_1^0$	$\frac{5}{8}$

Table I. The optimal success of the CC_2 task using the resource \mathcal{R} . For each encoding pair $(\mathcal{E}_1^p, \mathcal{E}_2^q) \in \mathcal{G}_E^{x_1} \times \mathcal{G}_E^{x_2}$, we provide a corresponding decoding pair and the associated optimal success probability. Strategies achieving the maximum success rate of $3/4$ are highlighted. For all other encoding strategies, the success probability is strictly lower than this optimal value.




Figure 2. **Noise tolerance of entanglement-based protocol:** We consider the white noise model for noisy GHZ states, defined as $G_{n+1}^{(p)} := (1-p)|G_{n+1}\rangle\langle G_{n+1}| + p(\mathbb{I}_2/2)^{\otimes n+1}$. These states are fully separable if and only if $1/[1+2^{-n}] \leq p \leq 1$, and they remain genuinely multipartite entangled if and only if $0 \leq p < 1/[2-2^{-n}]$ [56–58]. For any $n > 2$, the states provide an advantage in the corresponding CC_n task for $p \in [0, 1/2]$. For $n = 2$ and $n = 3$, this advantage is not possible for $p > 1/2$. However, for larger n , such possibilities are not excluded, and the quantum protocol may exhibit greater noise robustness. Furthermore, robustness analysis of the quantum protocol can also be extended to colored noise models.

we have $\mathcal{G}^{uv} := \mathcal{G}_E^{uv} \cup \mathcal{G}_O^{uv}$, where

$$\mathcal{G}_E^{uv} := \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} g^0(u, v) = 0; & g^2(u, v) = u \wedge v; \\ g^4(u, v) = v; & g^6(u, v) = \bar{u} \wedge v; \\ g^8(u, v) = u; & g^{10}(u, v) = u \wedge \bar{v}; \\ g^{12}(u, v) = u \oplus v; & g^{14}(u, v) = u \vee v \end{array} \right\}, \quad (5a)$$

$$\mathcal{G}_O^{uv} := \left\{ g^{2k+1}(u, v) = \overline{g^{2k}(u, v)} \mid k \in \{0, \dots, 7\} \right\}. \quad (5b)$$

While evaluating the function $f_2(x_1, x_2, y)$ in CC_2 task by Bob with the help of 1 bit communication each from Alice-1 and Alice-2, they can follow a deterministic strategy as specified by a four tuple

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}(p, q, r, s) &\equiv (\mathcal{E}_1^p, \mathcal{E}_2^q, \mathcal{D}_0^r, \mathcal{D}_1^s) \in \mathcal{G}^{x_1} \times \mathcal{G}^{x_2} \times \mathcal{G}^c \times \mathcal{G}^c, \\ \mathbf{c} &:= c_1 c_2, \quad c_1 := \mathcal{E}_1^p(x_1^0, x_1^1) \ \& \ c_2 := \mathcal{E}_2^q(x_2^0, x_2^1). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Note that the function $g^{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta}$ in Eq.(4) have the following property:

$$g^{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta}(u, v) = g^{\alpha \oplus \gamma, \beta, \gamma, \delta \oplus \beta}(u, \bar{v}) \quad (7a)$$

$$= g^{\alpha, \beta \oplus \gamma, \gamma, \delta \oplus \alpha}(\bar{u}, v) \quad (7b)$$

$$= g^{\alpha \oplus \gamma, \beta \oplus \gamma, \gamma, \delta \oplus \alpha \oplus \beta \oplus \gamma}(\bar{u}, \bar{v}). \quad (7c)$$

Due to property (7), without loss of any generality, we can restrict Alices' encoding $(\mathcal{E}_1^p, \mathcal{E}_2^q)$ in $\mathcal{G}_E^{x_1} \times \mathcal{G}_E^{x_2}$, while decodings on Bob's end being arbitrary. Therefore, we can restrict our analysis only for the strategies

$$\mathcal{S}(p, q, r, s) \in \mathcal{G}_E^{x_1} \times \mathcal{G}_E^{x_2} \times \mathcal{G}^c \times \mathcal{G}^c. \quad (8)$$

Given a fixed encoding pair $(\mathcal{E}_1^{p^*}, \mathcal{E}_2^{q^*})$ for Alices, Bob needs to choose suitable decodings $(\mathcal{D}_0^*, \mathcal{D}_1^{s^*})$ that optimize the success probability $P_{S^*}^2$ of evaluating the function $f_2(x_1, x_2, y)$.

Case study: Consider that both Alice-1 and Alice-2 transmit the second bit of their respective input strings, i.e., $c_1 = \mathcal{E}_1^4$ and $c_2 = \mathcal{E}_2^4$. The promise condition $x_1^0 \oplus x_2^0 \oplus y^0 = 0$ imposes restrictions on inputs and outputs:

$$y^0 = 0 : \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x_1^0 x_2^0 = \{00, 11\}, \\ f_2(0x_1^1, 0x_2^1, 0) = x_1^1 \oplus x_2^1, \\ f_2(1, x_1^1, 1x_2^1, 0) = x_1^1 \oplus x_2^1 \oplus 1 \end{array} \right\}, \quad (9a)$$

$$y^0 = 1 : \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x_1^0 x_2^0 = \{01, 10\}, \\ f_2(0x_1^1, 1x_2^1, 1) = x_1^1 \oplus x_2^1 \oplus 1, \\ f_2(1x_1^1, 0x_2^1, 1) = x_1^1 \oplus x_2^1 \oplus 1 \end{array} \right\}. \quad (9b)$$

For $y^0 = 1$, Bob can perfectly evaluate the function using communication from the Alices and the knowledge of promise condition by selecting the decoding strategy \mathcal{D}_1^{13} . However, for $y^0 = 0$, with the functions $x_1^1 \oplus x_2^1$ and $x_1^1 \oplus x_2^1 \oplus 1$ being balanced and complementary, Bob can only evaluate the function with a success probability at most 1/2. In this case, Bob may choose different decoding, such as $\mathcal{D}_0^0, \mathcal{D}_0^1, \mathcal{D}_0^{12}$, or \mathcal{D}_0^{13} . Therefore, the strategy $S(4, 4, 0/1/12/13, 13)$ yields a maximum average success probability $P_S = 3/4$.

A similar analysis can be applied for any encoding pair $(\mathcal{E}_1^p, \mathcal{E}_2^q) \in \mathcal{G}_E^p \times \mathcal{G}_E^q$, and the optimal success probability can be efficiently determined through computational methods. As shown in Table I, the success probability is upper bounded by 3/4 in each case.

Acknowledgment: KA acknowledges support from the CSIR project 09/0575(19300)/2024-EMR-I. SGN acknowledges support from the CSIR project 09/0575(15951)/2022-EMR-I. MB acknowledges funding from the National Mission in Interdisciplinary Cyber-Physical systems from the Department of Science and Technology through the I-HUB Quantum Technology Foundation (Grant no: I-HUB/PDF/2021-22/008).

* ananyaphys.c@gmail.com

- [1] J. P. Dowling and G. J. Milburn, Quantum technology: the second quantum revolution, *Philos. Trans., Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* **361**, 1655–1674 (2003).
- [2] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information: 10th Anniversary Edition* (Cambridge University Press, 2012).
- [3] I. H. Deutsch, Harnessing the Power of the Second Quantum Revolution, *PRX Quantum* **1**, 020101 (2020).
- [4] A. Aspect, The Second Quantum Revolution: From Basic Concepts to Quantum Technologies, *Photonic Quantum Technologies* **1**, 7–30 (2023).
- [5] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality Be Considered Complete?, *Phys. Rev.* **47**, 777 (1935).
- [6] N. Bohr, Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality be Considered Complete?, *Phys. Rev.* **48**, 696 (1935).
- [7] E. Schrödinger, Discussion of Probability Relations between Separated Systems, *Math. Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc.* **31**, 555–563 (1935).
- [8] E. Schrödinger, Probability relations between separated systems, *Math. Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc.* **32**, 446–452 (1936).
- [9] J. S. Bell, On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox, *Physique Fizika* **1**, 195 (1964).
- [10] M. M. Wilde, *Quantum Information Theory* (Cambridge University Press, 2013).
- [11] N. Linden, S. Popescu, A. J. Short, and A. Winter, Quantum nonlocality and beyond: Limits from nonlocal computation, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 180502 (2007).
- [12] A. S. Holevo, Bounds for the Quantity of Information Transmitted by a Quantum Communication Channel, *Probl. Inf. Transm.* **9**, 177 (1973).
- [13] P. E. Frenkel and M. Weiner, Classical Information Storage in an n-Level Quantum System, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **340**, 563–574 (2015).
- [14] M. Dall’Arno, S. Brandsen, A. Tosini, F. Buscemi, and V. Vedral, No-Hypersignaling Principle, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 020401 (2017).
- [15] S. G. Naik, E. P. Lobo, S. Sen, R. K. Patra, M. Alimuddin, T. Guha, S. S. Bhattacharya, and M. Banik, Composition of Multipartite Quantum Systems: Perspective from Time-like Paradigm, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 140401 (2022).
- [16] R. K. Patra, S. G. Naik, E. P. Lobo, S. Sen, G. L. Sidhardh, M. Alimuddin, and M. Banik, Principle of Information Causality Rationalizes Quantum Composition, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 110202 (2023).
- [17] C. H. Bennett and S. J. Wiesner, Communication via one- and two-particle operators on Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 2881 (1992).
- [18] C. Adami and N. J. Cerf, von Neumann capacity of noisy quantum channels, *Phys. Rev. A* **56**, 3470 (1997).
- [19] C. H. Bennett, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and A. V. Thapliyal, Entanglement-Assisted Classical Capacity of Noisy Quantum Channels, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 3081 (1999).
- [20] C. H. Bennett, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and A. V. Thapliyal, Entanglement-assisted capacity of a quantum channel and

- the reverse Shannon theorem, *IEEE Tran. Inf. Theory* **48**, 2637–2655 (2002).
- [21] A. Ambainis, Communication complexity in a 3-computer model, *Algorithmica* **16**, 298–301 (1996).
- [22] R. Cleve and H. Buhrman, Substituting quantum entanglement for communication, *Phys. Rev. A* **56**, 1201 (1997).
- [23] H. Buhrman, R. Cleve, and A. Wigderson, Quantum vs. classical communication and computation, in *Proceedings of the thirtieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing - STOC '98*, STOC '98 (ACM Press, 1998) p. 63–68.
- [24] R. Cleve, W. van Dam, M. Nielsen, and A. Tapp, Quantum Entanglement and the Communication Complexity of the Inner Product Function, in *Quantum Computing and Quantum Communications* (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1999) p. 61–74.
- [25] H. Buhrman, W. van Dam, P. Høyer, and A. Tapp, Multi-party quantum communication complexity, *Phys. Rev. A* **60**, 2737 (1999).
- [26] H. Buhrman, R. Cleve, and W. van Dam, Quantum Entanglement and Communication Complexity, *SIAM J. Comput.* **30**, 1829–1841 (2001).
- [27] H. Buhrman, R. Cleve, J. Watrous, and R. de Wolf, Quantum Fingerprinting, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 167902 (2001).
- [28] J. S. Bell, On the Problem of Hidden Variables in Quantum Mechanics, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **38**, 447 (1966).
- [29] N. D. Mermin, Hidden variables and the two theorems of John Bell, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **65**, 803 (1993).
- [30] N. Brunner, D. Cavalcanti, S. Pironio, V. Scarani, and S. Wehner, Bell nonlocality, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **86**, 419 (2014).
- [31] H. Buhrman, R. Cleve, S. Massar, and R. de Wolf, Nonlocality and communication complexity, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82**, 665 (2010).
- [32] W. van Dam, Implausible consequences of superstrong nonlocality, *Natural Computing* **12**, 9–12 (2012).
- [33] G. Brassard, H. Buhrman, N. Linden, A. A. Méthot, A. Tapp, and F. Unger, Limit on Nonlocality in Any World in Which Communication Complexity Is Not Trivial, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 250401 (2006).
- [34] S. G. Naik, G. L. Sidhardh, S. Sen, A. Roy, A. Rai, and M. Banik, Distilling Nonlocality in Quantum Correlations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 220201 (2023).
- [35] P. Botteron, A. Broadbent, and M.-O. Proulx, Extending the Known Region of Nonlocal Boxes that Collapse Communication Complexity, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**, 070201 (2024).
- [36] G. L. Sidhardh and M. Banik, One-time-pad encryption model for nonlocal correlations, *Phys. Rev. A* **110**, 012229 (2024).
- [37] S. B. Ghosh, S. R. Chowdhury, G. Kar, A. Roy, T. Guha, and M. Banik, Quantum Nonlocality: Multicopy Resource Interconvertibility and Their Asymptotic Inequivalence, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**, 250205 (2024).
- [38] W. Dür, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac, Three qubits can be entangled in two inequivalent ways, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 062314 (2000).
- [39] F. Verstraete, J. Dehaene, B. De Moor, and H. Verschelde, Four qubits can be entangled in nine different ways, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 052112 (2002).
- [40] S. Puliyil, M. Banik, and M. Alimuddin, Thermodynamic Signatures of Genuinely Multipartite Entanglement, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 070601 (2022).
- [41] J. Joshi, M. Alimuddin, T. S. Mahesh, and M. Banik, Experimental verification of many-body entanglement using thermodynamic quantities, *Phys. Rev. A* **109**, L020403 (2024).
- [42] A. C.-C. Yao, Some complexity questions related to distributive computing (preliminary report), in *Proceedings of the eleventh annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing - STOC '79*, STOC '79 (ACM Press, 1979) p. 209–213.
- [43] E. Kushilevitz and N. Nisan, *Communication Complexity* (Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- [44] E. Kushilevitz, Communication Complexity, in *Advances in Computers* (Elsevier, 1997) p. 331–360.
- [45] M. Bavarian, D. Gavinsky, and T. Ito, On the Role of Shared Randomness in Simultaneous Communication, in *Automata, Languages, and Programming* (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2014) p. 150–162.
- [46] C. L. Canonne, V. Guruswami, R. Meka, and M. Sudan, Communication with Imperfectly Shared Randomness, in *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science*, ITCS'15 (ACM, 2015).
- [47] A. C.-C. Yao, Quantum circuit complexity, in *Proceedings of 1993 IEEE 34th Annual Foundations of Computer Science*, SFCS-93 (IEEE, 1993) p. 352–360.
- [48] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Quantum entanglement, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 865 (2009).
- [49] O. Gühne and G. Tóth, Entanglement detection, *Physics Reports* **474**, 1–75 (2009).
- [50] D. M. Greenberger, M. A. Horne, and A. Zeilinger, Going Beyond Bell's Theorem, in *Bell's Theorem, Quantum Theory and Conceptions of the Universe* (Springer Netherlands, 1989) p. 69–72.
- [51] N. D. Mermin, Quantum mysteries revisited, *Am. J. Phys.* **58**, 731–734 (1990).
- [52] D. M. Greenberger, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and A. Zeilinger, Bell's theorem without inequalities, *Am. J. Phys.* **58**, 1131–1143 (1990).
- [53] 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**, 515–519 (2000).
- [54] N. D. Mermin, Extreme quantum entanglement in a superposition of macroscopically distinct states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 1838 (1990).
- [55] G. Brassard, A. Broadbent, and A. Tapp, Multi-party Pseudo-Telepathy, in *Algorithms and Data Structures* (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2003) p. 1–11.
- [56] W. Dür and J. I. Cirac, Classification of multiqubit mixed states: Separability and distillability properties, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 042314 (2000).
- [57] R. Schack and C. M. Caves, Explicit product ensembles for separable quantum states, *J. Mod. Opt.* **47**, 387–399 (2000).
- [58] O. Gühne and M. Seevinck, Separability criteria for genuine multiparticle entanglement, *New J. Phys.* **12**, 053002 (2010).
- [59] C. Gidney and M. Ekerå, How to factor 2048 bit rsa integers in 8 hours using 20 million noisy qubits, *Quantum* **5**, 433 (2021).
- [60] C. Brukner, M. Żukowski, J.-W. Pan, and A. Zeilinger,

- Bell's inequalities and quantum communication complexity, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 127901 (2004).
- [61] H. Yamasaki, A. Pirker, M. Muraio, W. Dür, and B. Kraus, Multipartite entanglement outperforming bipartite entanglement under limited quantum system sizes, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 052313 (2018).
- [62] A. Tavakoli, M. Żukowski, and C. Brukner, Does violation of a bell inequality always imply quantum advantage in a communication complexity problem?, *Quantum* **4**, 316 (2020).
- [63] J. H. et al., Entanglement-based quantum communication complexity beyond bell nonlocality, *npj Quantum Information* **8**, 13 (2022).
- [64] W.-B. G. et al., Experimental demonstration of a hyper-entangled ten-qubit schrödinger cat state, *Nature Physics* **6**, 331–335 (2010).
- [65] H.-S. Z. et al., 12-Photon Entanglement and Scalable Scattershot Boson Sampling with Optimal Entangled-Photon Pairs from Parametric Down-Conversion, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 250505 (2018).
- [66] A. O. et al., Generation and manipulation of Schrödinger cat states in Rydberg atom arrays, *Science* **365**, 570–574 (2019).
- [67] C. S. et al., Generation of multicomponent atomic Schrödinger cat states of up to 20 qubits, *Science* **365**, 574–577 (2019).
- [68] I. P. et al., Compact Ion-Trap Quantum Computing Demonstrator, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 020343 (2021).
- [69] Z. B. et al., Schrödinger cats growing up to 60 qubits and dancing in a cat scar enforced discrete time crystal, [arXiv:2401.08284](https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.08284) (2024).
- [70] D. Mayers and A. Yao, Self testing quantum apparatus, *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **4**, 273–286 (2004).
- [71] I. Šupić and J. Bowles, Self-testing of quantum systems: a review, *Quantum* **4**, 337 (2020).
- [72] S. Breiner, A. Kalev, and C. A. Miller, Parallel self-testing of the ghz state with a proof by diagrams, *EPTCS* **287**, 43–66 (2019).
- [73] A. Chakraborty, K. Agarwal, S. G. Naik, and M. Banik, Stronger Nonlocality in GHZ States: A Step Beyond the Conventional GHZ Paradox, [arXiv.2409.14711](https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.14711) (2024).