

Distinguishability of complete and unextendible product bases

S. De Rinaldis^{1,2,3,*}

¹*NNL- National Nanotechnology Laboratory of INFN,*

via per Arnesano, 73100, Lecce, Italy;

²*ISUFI- Istituto Superiore Universitario per la Formazione Interdisciplinare,*

via per Arnesano, 73100, Lecce, Italy;

³*IBM T.J. Watson Research Center, P.O. Box 218,*

Yorktown Heights, New York 10598, USA

(Dated: September 26, 2018)

It is not always possible to distinguish multipartite orthogonal states if only local operation and classical communication (LOCC) are allowed. We prove that we cannot distinguish the states of an unextendible product bases (UPB) by LOCC even with infinite resources (infinite-dimensional ancillas, infinite number of operations). Moreover we give a necessary and sufficient condition for the LOCC distinguishability of a complete product bases.

*)*Electronic* mail: srinaldi@chem.utoronto.ca

Present address: Chemical Physics Theory Group, Department of Chemistry
University of Toronto, 80 St. George Street, Toronto, Ontario M5S 3H6, Canada

In quantum mechanics orthogonal quantum states can always be distinguished. This is not always true when we restrict the set of actions on the multipartite system to LOCC only. About this topic a number of result has been proved: three Bell states can never be distinguished [1], two orthogonal states can always be distinguished [2], a characterization of the $2 \times n$ states that can be distinguished by LOCC has been given [3], also conditions for LOCC unambiguos state discrimination have been derived [8]. Surprisingly there are pure orthogonal product vectors that can be distinguished only globally [4]. More recently this effect has been further studied in [5], with the result that set of states with less average entanglement than others (that are distinguishable by LOCC) can be undistinguishable. Also the impact of restricted classical communication on distinguishability has been recently investigated [6]. As an application of these concepts we mention a quantum communication

protocol called "data hiding" [7].

In this paper we prove that a class of product states, the unextendible product bases (UPB), cannot be distinguished by LOCC, and give a necessary and sufficient condition for the distinguishability of complete product bases. This fact proves that there is an entire class of separable superoperators that cannot be implemented by LOCC. The part on UPB is different from the proof given in [10], since there is no restriction to a finite number of rounds of communication and on the dimension of ancillary space exploited for performing generalized measurements (also in [8] the results are restricted to "finite" resources).

Definition 1. We say that we cannot distinguish "perfectly" a set of states by LOCC if we cannot distinguish between them even using an infinite number of resources (infinite number of LOCC "rounds", infinite dimensional ancillas, etc.) while "exact" distinguishability is defined when finite resources are used.

The distinction could appear of little importance if we think that in practical situations we never have an infinite amount of resources, but it seems significant if we restate it in terms of information. If we cannot distinguish exactly, but perfectly, between a set of states then we can acquire as much information as we want about the states, therefore we could optimize the amount of resources employed versus the information attainable. If the states cannot be distinguished perfectly, then the information we can obtain between them is upperbounded by a finite amount. In terms of superoperators theory this implies that we have found an entire class of separable superoperators that are not in the class of LOCC superoperators[9].

Definition 2. Consider a multipartite Hilbert space $H = H_1 \otimes H_2 \otimes \dots \otimes H_n$ and a product bases that span a space H_{PB} . An unextendible product bases (UPB) [10] is a product bases for which the complementary subspace H_{PB}^\perp does not contain product vectors.

Let us introduce the concept of "irreducible UPB".

Definition 3. An "irreducible UPB" is an unextendible product bases in $H_A \otimes H_B$ that cannot be divided in two set of vectors contained in the subspaces $H'_A \otimes H_B$ and $H_A \otimes H'_B$ or $H_A \otimes H'_B$ and $H_A \otimes H_B$.

Every UPB contains an "irreducible UPB" in one of its subspaces. It is trivial to prove that if this were not the case than the UPB would be a complete product bases. UPB have been studied for their properties related to bound entanglement [11]. Bennett et al. [4] have shown a set of nine orthogonal product states that cannot be perfectly distinguished by LOCC. This is the only example known to us. Are there other product states that are

not perfectly distinguishable? In this paper we answer to this question by showing a class of product states, the UPB, that can never be perfectly distinguished by LOCC. It has already been proven that UPB cannot be exactly distinguishable [12]. This is relevant because it proves that there is an entire class of separable superoperators that cannot be implemented by LOCC, i.e. the two classes are *not* equal except a few particular cases.

Theorem 1. We cannot perfectly distinguish an UPB (unextendible product bases) by LOCC operations.

Proof. Let us consider first a bipartite UPB: $\{|\psi_i\rangle = |\phi_i\rangle|\chi_i\rangle\}$. We will prove that the effect on every state of a POVM element we can apply, without creating nonorthogonal states, is either to eliminate a state or to create a state parallel to the previous one. Let us consider an Alice POVM element E . It is an hermitian operator, so it is diagonal in an orthonormal bases $|0\rangle\langle 0|, \dots, |N\rangle\langle N|$. We expand the set of vectors $\{|\phi_i\rangle\}$ in this bases:

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\psi_0\rangle &= |0\rangle c_{00}|\chi_0\rangle + |1\rangle c_{10}|\chi_0\rangle + \dots + |N\rangle c_{N0}|\chi_0\rangle \\
 &\quad \cdot \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \\
 |\psi_l\rangle &= |0\rangle c_{0l}|\chi_l\rangle + |1\rangle c_{1l}|\chi_l\rangle + \dots + |N\rangle c_{Nl}|\chi_l\rangle \\
 &\quad \cdot \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \\
 |\psi_k\rangle &= |0\rangle c_{0k}|\chi_k\rangle + |1\rangle c_{1k}|\chi_k\rangle + \dots + |N\rangle c_{Nk}|\chi_k\rangle
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Let us suppose that E is nonzero on $|\phi_0\rangle$. Since the resulting vectors $\{E \otimes I |\psi_i\rangle = (E|\phi_i\rangle)|\chi_i\rangle\}$ must remain orthogonal, the vectors orthogonal to $|\phi_0\rangle$ must remain orthogonal after the application of E , that is $\langle \phi_i | \phi_0 \rangle = 0 \implies \langle \phi_i | E^\dagger E | \phi_0 \rangle = 0$. We write E in the diagonal bases: $E = \lambda_0 |0\rangle\langle 0| + \dots + \lambda_N |N\rangle\langle N|$, where the $\{\lambda_j\}$ are real positive numbers less than one.

The orthogonality condition translates into the equations:

$$c_{0i}^* \lambda_0^2 c_{00} + \dots + c_{Ni}^* \lambda_N^2 c_{N0} = 0 \tag{2}$$

for all the vectors for which :

$$c_{0i}^* c_{00} + \dots + c_{Ni}^* c_{N0} = 0. \tag{3}$$

The condition above means that the product vector $|\psi'_0\rangle = |0\rangle\lambda_0^2c_{00}|\chi_0\rangle + |1\rangle\lambda_1^2c_{10}|\chi_0\rangle + \dots + |N\rangle\lambda_N^2c_{N0}|\chi_0\rangle$ is orthogonal to all the vectors to which $|\psi_0\rangle$ is orthogonal. The vector $|\psi'_0\rangle$ must be parallel to $|\psi_0\rangle$, because if not we could construct the vector $|\psi'_0\rangle - \langle\psi_0|\psi'_0\rangle|\psi_0\rangle$ that is orthogonal to all the vectors of the UPB, thus against the assumption that the product bases is unextendible. Even if until now we have considered only local measurement, i.e. we have restricted the set of Alice operators to POVM elements, our results holds also in the general case. In fact, Alice action is described by a superoperator and for every operation element S, from the polar decomposition theorem, S is a product of a unitary (U) and a positive (E) operator: $S=EU$ (right polar decomposition). We have $S|\phi_i\rangle = (EU|\phi_i\rangle = E|\phi'_i\rangle$ where the set $\{|\phi'_i\rangle\}$ is an UPB because an UPB is tranformed in another UPB with a unitary operation U. It is trivial to see that if we could extend the bases to a new orthogonal product vector then we could apply U^{-1} to this vector to obtain a new product vector orthogonal to the previous set, unextendible for assumption. Therefore there is no loss of generality in considering only local measurement. The new set of vector $\{E|\psi_i\rangle\}$ is an UPB in the subspace spanned by the vectors that constitute the base in which E is diagonal. In fact if we could extend the product bases in this subspace to another product vector, this vector would be orthogonal also to the ones eliminated by E and therefore the starting base would be extendible. In general the set $\{E|\psi_i\rangle\}$ could be a complete bases that, by definition, is a "trivial" UPB because it also has the property that we cannot find another product state orthogonal to all the member of the bases. However, in a local measurement with POVM elements $\{E_l\}$, since for what we have proved, the operators E_l are either orthogonal or proportional, not all the sets $\{E_l|\psi_i\rangle\}$ can be complete bases unless the starting set $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$ is a complete base. From the property of the set $\{E_l\}$, we notice that even if we have an infinite number of elements in the set, only a finite number of outcomes are different. To prove the theorem excluding that we could distinguish with an infinite number of rounds we notice that, since the only two operations that we can perform with a measurement on a state is either to leave the state unchanged or to eliminate it, if we want that they remain orthogonal, at some point, when we could not eliminate other states, the only POVM that we could apply is proportional to the identity. However it is not sufficient to show that at some point of the LOCC protocol the state must become nonorthogonal, because in principle an infinite set of weak measurement strategies [13] is possible and if the states at every protocol step are "nearly" orthogonal they could still be distinguished. This is

completely general, as proved by construction in [4], because any strategy involving weak and strong measurement can be replaced by a strategy involving only weak measurement. To complete the proof we must show that at some point if we want to acquire information about the states they should become nonorthogonal by a finite amount. At this point we will show that the mutual information between the measurement outcome and the state is less than the information obtainable by a nonlocal measurement. We will restrict the attention to an "irreducible UPB" and prove that the information attainable about the state of an irreducible UPB is upperbounded by $O(\delta)$ where δ is the maximum overlap between two vectors of the new set of states. Since every UPB contains an "irreducible UPB" then it will follow that also the set of states forming the UPB are not distinguishable by LOCC. Let us consider an irreducible UPB and the first Alice operation. If we want that the states remain orthogonal only an operator proportional to the identity is possible. In fact since we have proved that a POVM element either eliminate a vector or leave it unchanged, then we could either eliminate some vector or leave all unchanged. The first case leads to a contradiction because we could divide the set of states of the UPB in two sets: the vectors eliminated in $H'_A \otimes H_B$ and the others in $H'^1_A \otimes H_B$, in contrast to the definition of irreducible UPB. If we want to leave all the vector unchanged then we must apply an operator proportional to the identity. Therefore if we want that the states are "nearly" orthogonal we must use an operator of the form $E = \lambda I + \lambda \delta' A$, where λ is a real positive number less than one, δ' is an infinitesimal real positive number related to the maximum overlap among the new set of vectors and A is a positive operator. The maximum overlap between two states is:

$$\max_{i,j} \langle \phi_i | E^\dagger E | \phi_j \rangle = 2\delta' \langle \phi_i | A | \phi_j \rangle + \delta'^2 \langle \phi_i | A^\dagger A | \phi_j \rangle > 2\lambda^2 \delta' \langle \phi_i | A | \phi_j \rangle = \delta' c \quad (4)$$

where c is a real number. We define $p(\phi_i, m)$ as the probability that, once obtained the measurement result m , the state is $|\phi_i\rangle$. The probabilities before starting the protocol are all the same. We define:

$$\epsilon = \max_i p(\phi_i, m) - \frac{1}{n} \quad (5)$$

where ϵ is the maximum amount of information we can obtain about a state.

From the definition we have:

$$p(\phi_i, m) = \frac{\langle \phi_i | E_m^\dagger E_m | \phi_i \rangle}{\sum_j \langle \phi_j | E_m^\dagger E_m | \phi_j \rangle} \quad (6)$$

If we define $a_j = 2\langle \phi_j | A | \phi_j \rangle$ we have, neglecting the terms in δ'^2 :

$$p(\phi_i, m) = \frac{1 + \delta' a_i}{n + \delta' \sum_j a_j} \leq \frac{1}{n} + \frac{\delta' \sum_j a_j}{n^2} + \frac{\delta' a_i}{n} \quad (7)$$

Therefore

$$\epsilon = p(\phi_i, m) - \frac{1}{n} \leq \delta' \left(\frac{\sum_j a_j}{n^2} + \frac{a_i}{n} \right) \quad (8)$$

This last equation means that if we want to acquire a finite amount of information then also the states are nonorthogonal by a finite amount. Let us consider N rounds of measurement. We can write a general operation element implemented by LOCC as [14] :

$$S_m = A_m \otimes B_m \quad (9)$$

$$A_m = E_N E_{N-1} \dots E_1 \quad (10)$$

$$B_m = F_N F_{N-1} \dots F_1 \quad (11)$$

where E_i and F_i are positive operators. We can consider only product of positive operators. In fact let us consider a general separable operator $S'_m = A'_m \otimes B'_m$ with $A'_m = H_N H_{N-1} \dots H_1$ and $B'_m = K_N K_{N-1} \dots K_1$. We can construct an operator $S_m = A_m \otimes B_m$ (with positive operators, notation as in equations 9, 10, 11) such that $\langle \phi_i | S_m^\dagger S'_m | \phi_i \rangle = \langle \phi_i | S_m^\dagger S_m | \phi_i \rangle$. We use first a left polar decomposition : $H_i = U_i E'_i$ and we have: $H_m = U_N E'_N U_{N-1} E'_{N-1} \dots U_1 E_1$, then we take all the unitary operators to the left, thanks to the fact that every linear operator has a left and a right polar decomposition: $E'_1 U_1 = U_2 E'_2$. After some steps we arrive at a "generalized" polar decomposition: $A'_m = U_N U_{N-1} \dots U_1 E_N E_{N-1} \dots E_1$ (similarly for B'_m). Therefore the result is formally equivalent to a product of positive operators.

To maintain the states nearly orthogonal in every round we must have: $E_i = \lambda_i I + \lambda_i \delta' A_i$ and $F_i = \rho_i I + \rho_i \delta' B_i$. Following the same procedure of the single step case we have that the overlap between two states is (neglecting the terms superior to first order in δ'):

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &= \max_{j,k} \delta_{jk} = \max_{j,k} \langle \phi_j | S^\dagger S | \phi_k \rangle = \\ & \max_{j,k} \sum_i (2\delta' \langle \phi_j | A_i \otimes I | \phi_k \rangle + 2\delta' \langle \phi_j | I \otimes B_i | \phi_k \rangle) = \max_{j,k} \delta' \sum_i (a_{ijk} + b_{ijk}) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $a_{ijk} = 2\langle \phi_j | A_i \otimes I | \phi_k \rangle$ and $b_{ijk} = 2\langle \phi_j | I \otimes B_i | \phi_k \rangle$

Following the same calculations that lead to equation (8) we can find that:

$$\epsilon = p(\phi_j, m) - \frac{1}{n} \leq \delta' \sum_i (c_{ij} + d_{ij}) \quad (13)$$

where $c_{ij} = \frac{\sum_i a_{ij}}{n^2} + \frac{a_{ij}}{n}$ and $d_{ij} = \frac{\sum_i b_{ij}}{n^2} + \frac{b_{ij}}{n}$ ($a_{ij} = 2\langle \phi_j | A_i \otimes I | \phi_j \rangle$ and $b_{ij} = 2\langle \phi_j | I \otimes B_i | \phi_j \rangle$).

In order to find a relation analog to equation (4) we notice that formally we are in the same situation but with the operator $O(N) = \sum_{i=1}^N A_i \otimes I + I \otimes B_i$ and we find, analog to (8):

$$\epsilon_N \leq \delta' \left(\frac{\sum a_j}{n^2} + \frac{a_i}{n} \right) = \delta' M_N \quad (14)$$

where $a_j = \langle \phi_j | O(N) | \phi_j \rangle$ and :

$$\max_{j,k} \langle \phi_j | S^\dagger S | \phi_k \rangle = \delta = \delta' c_N \quad (15)$$

where $c_N = \max_{j,k} \langle \phi_j | O(N) | \phi_k \rangle$. We arrive a the final expression:

$$\epsilon_N \leq \delta \frac{M_N}{c_N} \quad (16)$$

Let us consider the behaviour of $O(N)$ when $N \rightarrow \infty$. We examine the different cases. If $\|O(N)\| \rightarrow \infty$ we can write $O(N) = K_N O'(N)$ where $K_N \rightarrow \infty$ and $\|O'(N)\| \rightarrow a$ a real number, so the ratio $\frac{M_N}{c_N}$ is finite because the K_N in the ratio cancel. The same argument holds if $\|O(N)\| \rightarrow 0$. If $O(N)$ tends to a multiple of the identity when $N \rightarrow \infty$ then $c_N \rightarrow 0$ but not M_N , so we cannot bound ϵ with a multiple of δ as in (16). However we can easily see that in this case we do not need the bound (16) because it is easy to see that we cannot extract a finite amount of information about the states. In fact from (5) and (6) we can easily calculate that $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ [15]. We conclude that if we maintain the states nonorthogonal by an infinitesimal amount we cannot reach a finite amount of information about them. The generalization to N-parties states is straightforward. It simply leads to a redefinition of $O(N)$;

for example for three parties it becomes: $O(N) = \sum_{i=1}^N A_i \otimes I \otimes I + I \otimes B_i \otimes I + I \otimes I \otimes C_i$ and the conclusions are the same.

Now let us consider the case in which the state are nonorthogonal by a finite amount δ at Nth measurement round, that we consider stage I. The stage II is when the protocol is completed. We will generalize the argument in [4], that, indeed, is very general, i.e. do not depends neither on the number of parties nor on the number of states, finding a bound for the mutual information attainable. We use the same notation of [4]; M_I (M_{II}) is the random variable describing the stage-I (stage-II) outcomes; W is the variable that figures out which of the states has been measured; $I(W; M_I, M_{II})$ is the mutual information between the measurement outcomes M_I , M_{II} and W . Using the additivity property and the definition of mutual information we find:

$$I(W; M_I, M_{II}) = \log_2 n - \sum_{m_I} p(m_I) [H(W|m_I) - I(W; M_{II}|m_I)] \quad (17)$$

where n is the number of states to be distinguished, $p(m_I)$ is the probability of outcome m_I of the measurement in stage I, H is the entropy function. At the end of stage I the states are $\rho_i = |\phi_{i,m_I}\rangle\langle\phi_{i,m_I}|$ with probabilities $q_i = p(\psi_i|m_I)$ and $\{M_b\}$ is a positive operator valued measure performed in stage II. Let us consider the two states that are nonorthogonal at stage I $\langle\phi_{1,m_I}|\phi_{2,m_I}\rangle = \delta$ and divide the density operator in two part:

$$\tau_1 = \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{q_i}{s_1} \rho_i, \quad \tau_2 = \sum_{i=3}^n \frac{q_i}{s_2} \rho_i \quad (18)$$

with $s_1 = q_1 + q_2$ and $s_2 = 1 - s_1$. We have $\rho = s_1 \tau_1 + s_2 \tau_2$. Using the concavity of Shannon entropy and removing the dependence of all the states except the first two we arrive at the expression:

$$\begin{aligned} H(W|m_I) - I(W; M_{II}|m_I) &\geq 2\left[\frac{1}{n} - (n-1)\epsilon\right] \cdot \\ [1 + \sum_b (tr \tau_1 M_b) \log_2 (tr \tau_1 M_b) - \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{1}{2} \sum_b (tr \rho_i M_b) \log_2 (tr \rho_i M_b)] &\quad (19) \end{aligned}$$

Minimizing the expression above as in [4] we find:

$$H(W|m_I) - I(W; M_{II}|m_I) \geq 2\left[\left(\frac{1}{n} - (n-1)\epsilon\right) h\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{1-\delta^2}\right)\right] \quad (20)$$

The quantity in (20) is strictly positive if $\delta > 0$.

Therefore we conclude that $I(W; M_I, M_{II}) < \log_2 n$ if the states at some stage of the protocol are nonorthogonal by a finite amount. Note that the part (iii) of the proof is valid for a general set of states and measurements. The extension to the multipartite case is immediate. This completes the proof.

Theorem 2 [16].

A complete product bases is distinguishable by LOCC *if and only if* it does not contain an "irreducible UPB". Moreover, if a complete product bases is distinguishable by LOCC, then it is distinguishable by a protocol consisting only in von Neumann measurements.

Proof. The proof follows from the results on UPB; in fact a complete bases is a trivial UPB because it has the property that we cannot find another product state orthogonal to all the member of the bases. Therefore, as we have proven for Theorem 1, if the complete bases contains an irreducible UPB, then the information attainable about that set of states is less, by a finite amount, than the maximum information. If a complete product bases does not contain an "irreducible UPB", by definition, we can divide the states in two set of vectors contained in the subspaces $H'_A \otimes H_B$ and $H_A^\perp \otimes H_B$ or $H_A \otimes H'_B$ and $H_A \otimes H_B^\perp$. This fact gives a procedure for distinguishing the states by a protocol consisting only in von Neumann measurements: we use the projectors P_A and P_A^\perp (or P_B and P_B^\perp) that project, respectively, on subspace $H'_A \otimes H_B$ and $H_A^\perp \otimes H_B$ (or $H_A \otimes H'_B$ and $H_A \otimes H_B^\perp$). We can iterate this procedure until only one state remains, so we have successfully completed the task. This completes the proof.

Remark. Since it can be not always obvious to check if a complete bases contains or not an "irreducible UPB", we can give a method to check the perfect distinguishability of a complete bases with a simple algorithm, without involving lenght calculations. The method works as follows: let us first consider the Alice vector and construct an ensemble; we start with one vector and find all the vectors that are nonorthogonal to it; we have now a set of vectors; we expand this set performing a series of steps in each one we find the vectors nonorthogonal to at least one member of the set. Since a POVM element that is nonzero on one vector of this set must have as eigenvectors all the vectors of the set for construction, then it could be only the identity in the subspace spanned by the vectors of the set. Thus if this protocol finds all the vectors of the bases, then the only POVM element we can apply is the identity. If the same holds also for Bob vectors, then whatever POVM elements we

apply (except the identity) we create nonorthogonal states and therefore we cannot perfectly distinguish the states. In general if we find only a subset of the total set of vectors, with a von Neumann measurement we split in two the total set of states. After that the protocol continues with classical communication to Bob; now Bob repeats the same procedure. This protocol continues until either we distinguish the states or we arrive at a point where only the identity can be applied (that means that we have found an "irreducible UPB").

Note that at most $\sum n_j$ steps (therefore $(\sum n_j) - 1$ bits of classical communication), where n_j are the dimensions of the multipartite Hilbert space, are necessary to distinguish between the states, since every step must eliminate at least one dimension of the total space. Therefore the number of bits grows at most linearly, whereas the number of states grows exponentially with the number of parties.

Example. As a corollary of Theorem 2 we can answer to the question (posed in [4]) of LOCC distinguishability of the Lagarias-Shor 1024 state ten-parties complete bases [18]. Every party has a qubit which is one state out of $|0\rangle$, $|1\rangle$, $|0 + 1\rangle$, $|0 - 1\rangle$. Since for every party in the set of 1024 states there are all the four states above, then the states cannot be divided in two orthogonal subspaces, therefore this complete bases is an irreducible UPB. We conclude that this bases is not perfectly distinguishable by LOCC.

I. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The main part of this work was completed at IBM T.J. Watson research center. I would like to thank the Quantum information group at IBM for their hospitality, Dr. David DiVincenzo for useful discussion, advice and careful reading of the manuscript, Dr. Charles Bennett and Dr. Barbara Terhal for helpful discussions.

-
- [1] S. Ghosh, G. Kar, A. Roy, A. Sen (De), and U. Sen , *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87** , 277902 (2001).
 - [2] J. Walgate, A. J. Short, L. Hardy, and V. Vedral, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85** , 4972 (2000).
 - [3] J. Walgate, and L.Hardy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89** , 147901 (2002).
 - [4] C.H.Bennett, D.P.DiVincenzo, T.Mor, P.W.Shor, J.A.Smolin, and B.M.Terhal, *Phys. Rev. A* **59** , 1070 (1999).
 - [5] M. Horodecki, A. Sen (De), U. Sen, K. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 047902 (2003).

- [6] M. Hillery, J. Mimih, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 042304 (2003).
- [7] B. M. Terhal, D. P. DiVincenzo, D. W. Leung, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 5807 (2001); D. P. DiVincenzo, D. W. Leung, B. M. Terhal, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **48**, 580 (2002); F. Vestraete, J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 10404 (2003).
- [8] A. Chefles, *quant-ph/0302066*.
- [9] E. Rains, *Phys. Rev. A* **60**, 173 (1999).
- [10] C.H. Bennett, D.P.DiVincenzo, T.Mor, P.W.Shor, J.A.Smolin, and B.M.Terhal, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 5385 (1999).
- [11] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 5239 (1998).
- [12] D.P.DiVincenzo, T.Mor, P.W.Shor, J.A.Smolin, and B.M.Terhal, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **238**, 379 (2003).
- [13] Y. Aharonov, D. Z. Albert and L. Vaidman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, 1351 (1988); Y. Aharonov, L. Vaidman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **41**, 11 (1990).
- [14] This is only a necessary condition for writing a LOCC operator. Actually in the proof we never use neither that in every round the POVM element must sum to the identity nor classical communication. In fact the Part II of the proof is valid for separable operators, but only for the ones "near" the identity, since a complete product bases is always distinguishable by separable superoperators.
- [15] The fact, proved in part I, that there are not POVM elements (except multiples of the identity) of the form $A \otimes I$ or $I \otimes B$ (note that it is also true for operators of the form $A \otimes I + I \otimes B$ as $O(N)$) that keeps the states orthogonal, is essential. If not we could have $\epsilon > 0$ and $\delta = 0$ after stage I.
- [16] In the particular case of the nine domino-like state of [4], in [3] and [17] a similar argument is applied showing that a POVM different from the unitary operator leads to nonorthogonality of states. However it requires to write the equations for the specific case and to prove that they have no solutions.
- [17] B. Groisman, L.Vaidman, *quant-ph/0103084*.
- [18] J. C. Lagarias and P. Shor, *Bull. Am. Math. Soc.* **27**, 279 (1992); *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **11**, 359 (1994).