

# Full Bell locality of a noisy state for $N \geq 3$ nonlocally entangled qudits

Elena R. Loubenets  
National Research University Higher School of Economics,  
Moscow, 101000, Russia

March 3, 2022

## Abstract

Bounds, expressed in terms of  $d$  and  $N$ , on *full Bell locality* of a quantum state for  $N \geq 3$  nonlocally entangled qudits (of a dimension  $d \geq 2$ ) mixed with white noise are known, to our knowledge, only within full separability of this noisy  $N$ -qudit state. For the maximal violation of general Bell inequalities by an  $N$ -partite quantum state, we specify the analytical upper bound expressed in terms of dilation characteristics of this state, and this allows us to find new general bounds in  $d, N$ , valid for all  $d \geq 2$  and all  $N \geq 3$ , on *full Bell locality* under generalized quantum measurements of (i) the  $N$ -qudit GHZ state mixed with white noise and (ii) an arbitrary  $N$ -qudit state mixed with white noise. The new full Bell locality bounds are beyond the known ranges for full separability of these noisy  $N$ -qudit states.

## 1 Introduction

Quantum nonlocality is now used in many quantum information processing tasks and though, in more than 50 years since the seminal papers [1, 2] of Bell, there is still no a unique conceptual view<sup>1</sup> on this notion, it is nowadays clear that quantum nonlocality does not mean propagation of interaction faster than light and is not [4] equivalent to quantum entanglement. Moreover, in quantum information, nonlocality of a multipartite quantum state is defined purely mathematically – *via violation by this state of a Bell inequality*, and it is specifically in this context quantum nonlocality is now used in experimental tasks and is discussed in the present article.

In applications, one, however, deals with noisy channels and, for a nonlocal  $N$ -partite quantum state, it is important to evaluate amounts of noise breaking the nonclassical character of its statistical correlations. Note that *full Bell locality* of an  $N$ -partite quantum state, in the sense of its nonviolation of Bell inequalities of any type and for arbitrary numbers of settings and outcomes per site, is *equivalent* (Proposition 6 in section VI of [5]) to the existence of a local hidden variable (LHV) model for *each* correlation scenario on this state. However, as we stressed in section 5 of [6], the latter does not necessarily imply the existence for all scenarios on this state of a single LHV model, that is, existence for an  $N$ -partite state of the LHV model formulated in [4].

---

<sup>1</sup>On conceptual and quantitative issues of Bell's nonlocality see the recent article [3] in Foundations of Physics and references therein.

Furthermore, one can be also interested in nonviolation by an  $N$ -partite state of only some specific class of Bell inequalities, for example, Bell inequalities for up to some specific numbers  $S_1, \dots, S_N$  of measurement settings at  $N$  sites. The latter type of *partial Bell locality* of an  $N$ -partite quantum state, the  $S_1 \times \dots \times S_N$ -setting Bell locality, was analyzed in a general setting in [6, 7, 8, 9, 5].

In the present paper, we analyze bounds on full Bell locality of an  $N$ -qudit state  $\rho_{d,N}$  mixed with white noise:

$$\beta \rho_{d,N} + (1 - \beta) \frac{\mathbb{I}_d^{\otimes N}}{d^N}, \quad 0 \leq \beta \leq 1. \quad (1)$$

Full separability of an  $N$ -partite quantum state implies its full locality and for  $N = 2$  bounds in terms of a qudit dimension  $d \geq 2$  on separability of a noisy state (1) were presented in [10, 11]: (i) for the two-qudit Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) state  $\rho_{d,2}^{(ghz)}$ , a noisy state (1) is separable [10] if and only if  $\beta \leq \beta_{sep}^{(ghz,d,2)} = \frac{1}{d+1}$ ; (ii) for an arbitrary two-qudit state  $\rho_{d,2}$ , a noisy state (1) is separable for all [11]  $\beta \leq \beta_{sep}^{(\rho_{d,2})}$ , where  $\beta_{sep}^{(\rho_{d,2})}$  varies in the range  $\frac{1}{d^2-1} \leq \beta_{sep}^{(\rho_{d,2})} \leq \frac{2}{d^2+2}$ .

For  $N \geq 3$ , bounds in  $d, N$  on full separability of a noisy  $N$ -qudit state (1) were analyzed in [11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 19, 21] and it was found that, for an arbitrary  $N$ -qubit state  $\rho_{2,N}$ , a noisy state (1) is fully separable for all [14]

$$\beta \leq \beta_{sep}^{(\rho_{2,N})} = \frac{1}{1 + 2^{2N-1}} \quad (2)$$

and, for the  $N$ -qubit GHZ state  $\rho_{2,N}^{(ghz)}$ , a noisy state (1) is fully separable if and only if [15, 17]

$$\beta \leq \beta_{sep}^{(ghz,2,N)} = \frac{1}{1 + 2^{N-1}}. \quad (3)$$

For higher qudit dimensions  $d \geq 3$ , it is now known that, for an arbitrary  $N$ -qudit state  $\rho_{d,N}$ , a noisy state (1) is fully separable if [19]

$$\beta \leq \beta_{sep}^{(\rho_{d,N})} = \frac{1}{1 + d^{2N-1}}, \quad (4)$$

and that there exist  $N$ -qudit states  $\rho_{d,N}$ , for which a mixed state (1) is fully nonseparable [20, 21] for all  $\beta > \frac{1}{1+d^{N-1}}$ . The latter is, in particular, the case for a noisy  $N$ -qudit GHZ state (1) – it is fully nonseparable if [19, 20, 21]

$$\beta > \frac{1}{1 + d^{N-1}}. \quad (5)$$

Therefore, in view of (4), (5), for all  $d \geq 3$ ,  $N \geq 3$ , the  $N$ -qudit GHZ state  $\rho_{d,N}^{(ghz)}$  mixed with white noise is fully separable for all  $\beta \leq \beta_{sep}^{(ghz,d,N)}$ , where the value  $\beta_{sep}^{(ghz,d,N)}$ ,  $d \geq 3$ ,  $N \geq 3$ , admits the bounds

$$\frac{1}{1 + d^{2N-1}} \leq \beta_{sep}^{(ghz,d,N)} \leq \frac{1}{1 + d^{N-1}}. \quad (6)$$

It was also proved [20] that, for prime  $d \geq 2$ , the value  $\beta_{sep}^{(ghz,d,N)}|_{\text{prime } d} = \frac{1}{1+d^{N-1}}$  and condition  $\beta \leq \frac{1}{1+d^{N-1}}$  is necessary and sufficient for full separability a noisy  $N$ -qudit GHZ state (1) with prime  $d$ .

*Beyond full separability*, bounds in  $d, N$  for full Bell locality of a noisy  $N$ -qudit state (1) were studied, to our knowledge, only in the two-qudit case, see [22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27] and references therein. For  $N \geq 3$ , the important analytical and numerical results on Bell locality of a noisy  $N$ -qudit state (1) were analysed in many papers but in the sense of *partial Bell locality*, see [28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36] and references therein.

In the present paper, we analyze bounds on full Bell locality of a noisy  $N$ -qudit state (1) via the LqHV (local quasi hidden variable) mathematical formalism, introduced and developed in [5, 37, 38, 39]. This allows us to derive general bounds in  $d, N$ , valid for all  $d \geq 2$  and all  $N \geq 3$ , on *full Bell locality* under generalized quantum measurements of (i) the  $N$ -qudit GHZ state  $\rho_{d,N}^{(ghz)}$  mixed with white noise and (ii) an arbitrary  $N$ -qudit state  $\rho_{d,N}$  mixed with white noise. The new full Bell locality bounds are beyond the known ranges (4), (6) for full separability of these noisy  $N$ -qudit states.

As we discuss above, to our knowledge, for arbitrary  $d \geq 2, N \geq 3$ , bounds in  $d, N$  on full Bell locality of a noisy  $N$ -qudit state (1) are known in the literature only within its full separability.

Note that our mathematical techniques is valid for all  $d \geq 2, N \geq 2$ . However, in this paper, we do not intend to reproduce or improve via this techniques the well known bounds (see in [25, 27]) for full Bell locality of a noisy state (1) in the two-qudit case ( $N = 2, d \geq 2$ ). Our main aim is to find general bounds on full Bell locality of noisy  $N$ -qudit states (1) valid for all  $d \geq 2, N \geq 3$  and to study their asymptotics for large  $N$  and  $d$ .

The paper is organized as follows.

In Section 2, we recall the notion of a general<sup>2</sup> Bell inequality and introduce [5] the parameters specifying for an  $N$ -partite quantum state the maximal violation of  $S_1 \times \cdots \times S_N$ -setting general Bell inequalities and the maximal violation of all general Bell inequalities.

In Section 3, for the maximal violation of general Bell inequalities by an  $N$ -partite quantum state, we present the analytical upper bound quantifying Bell nonlocality of an  $N$ -partite quantum state in terms of its dilation characteristics and this allows us to introduce a general condition (Theorem 1) sufficient for full Bell locality of an  $N$ -partite state under generalized quantum measurements.

In Section 4, we apply Theorem 1 for finding new general bounds on full Bell locality of (i) the  $N$ -qudit GHZ state mixed with white noise and (ii) an arbitrary  $N$ -qudit state mixed with white noise and study asymptotics of these new bounds for large  $N$  and  $d$ .

In Section 5, we discuss the derived results.

## 2 Preliminaries: quantum violation of general Bell inequalities

In this section, we shortly recall [40] the notion of a general Bell inequality and specify the parameters [5] defining the maximal violation by an  $N$ -partite quantum state of (i)  $S_1 \times \cdots \times S_N$ -setting general Bell inequalities for an arbitrary number of outcomes at each site and (ii) *all* general Bell inequalities.

This allows us to quantify analytically the  $S_1 \times \cdots \times S_N$ -setting Bell locality and full Bell locality of an  $N$ -partite quantum state.

---

<sup>2</sup>That is, a Bell inequality of any type, either on correlation functions or on joint probabilities or of a more complicated form, for details, see the general framework [40] for multipartite Bell inequalities.

Consider<sup>3</sup> a general  $N$ -partite correlation scenario where each  $n$ -th of  $N \geq 2$  parties performs  $S_n \geq 1$  measurements with outcomes  $\lambda_n \in \Lambda_n$  of an arbitrary spectral type. We label each measurement at  $n$ -th site by a positive integer  $s_n = 1, \dots, S_n$  and each  $N$ -partite joint measurement, induced by this correlation scenario and with outcomes

$$(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N) \in \Lambda = \Lambda_1 \times \dots \times \Lambda_N, \quad (7)$$

by an  $N$ -tuple  $(s_1, \dots, s_N)$ , where  $n$ -th component specifies a measurement at  $n$ -th site.

We denote by  $\mathcal{E}_{S,\Lambda}$ ,  $S = S_1 \times \dots \times S_N$ , a correlation scenario with  $S_n$  settings and outcomes  $\lambda_n \in \Lambda_n$  at each  $n$ -th site and by  $P_{(s_1, \dots, s_N)}^{(\mathcal{E}_{S,\Lambda})}$  – a joint probability distribution of outcomes  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N) \in \Lambda$  for an  $N$ -partite joint measurement  $(s_1, \dots, s_N)$  induced by this scenario.

For a general correlation scenario  $\mathcal{E}_{S,\Lambda}$ , consider a linear combination

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_{\Phi_{S,\Lambda}}^{(\mathcal{E}_{S,\Lambda})} &= \sum_{s_1, \dots, s_N} \langle f_{(s_1, \dots, s_N)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N) \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{S,\Lambda}}, \\ \Phi_{S,\Lambda} &= \{f_{(s_1, \dots, s_N)} : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid s_n = 1, \dots, S_n, \ n = 1, \dots, N\}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

of averages (expectations) of the most general form:

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle f_{(s_1, \dots, s_N)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N) \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{S,\Lambda}} \\ &= \int_{\Lambda} f_{(s_1, \dots, s_N)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N) P_{(s_1, \dots, s_N)}^{(\mathcal{E}_{S,\Lambda})} (d\lambda_1 \times \dots \times d\lambda_N), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

specified for each joint measurement  $(s_1, \dots, s_N)$  by a bounded real-valued function  $f_{(s_1, \dots, s_N)}(\cdot)$  of outcomes  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N) \in \Lambda$  at all  $N$  sites.

Depending on a choice of a function  $f_{(s_1, \dots, s_N)}$  for a joint measurement  $(s_1, \dots, s_N)$ , an average (9) may refer either to the joint probability of events observed under this joint measurement at  $M \leq N$  sites or, in case of real-valued outcomes, for example, to the expectation

$$\langle \lambda_1^{(s_1)} \dots \lambda_{n_M}^{(s_{n_M})} \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{S,\Lambda}} = \int_{\Lambda} \lambda_1 \dots \lambda_{n_M} P_{(s_1, \dots, s_N)}^{(\mathcal{E}_{S,\Lambda})} (d\lambda_1 \times \dots \times d\lambda_N) \quad (10)$$

of the product of outcomes observed at  $M \leq N$  sites or may have a more complicated form. In quantum information, the product expectation (10) is referred to as a correlation function. For  $M = N$ , a correlation function is called full.

Let the probabilistic description of a correlation scenario  $\mathcal{E}_{S,\Lambda}$  admit<sup>4</sup> a *LHV (local hidden variable) model*, that is, all its joint probability distributions

$$\left\{ P_{(s_1, \dots, s_N)}^{(\mathcal{E}_{S,\Lambda})}, \ s_n = 1, \dots, S_n, \ n = 1, \dots, N \right\} \quad (11)$$

admit the representation

$$\begin{aligned} &P_{(s_1, \dots, s_N)}^{(\mathcal{E}_{S,\Lambda})} (d\lambda_1 \times \dots \times d\lambda_N) \\ &= \int_{\Omega} P_{1,s_1}(d\lambda_1|\omega) \dots P_{N,s_N}(d\lambda_N|\omega) \nu_{\mathcal{E}_{S,\Lambda}}(d\omega) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

<sup>3</sup>For the general framework on the probabilistic description of an arbitrary correlation scenario, see [6].

<sup>4</sup>For the general statements on the LHV modelling, see section 4 in [6].

via a single probability distribution  $\nu_{\mathcal{E}_{S,\Lambda}}(d\omega)$  of some variables  $\omega \in \Omega$  and conditional probability distributions  $P_{n,s_n}(\cdot|\omega)$ , referred to as "local" in the sense that each  $P_{n,s_n}(\cdot|\omega)$  at  $n$ -th site depends only on the corresponding measurement  $s_n = 1, \dots, S_n$  at this site.

Then a linear combination (8) of its averages (9) satisfies the tight LHV constraints (see Theorem 1 in [40]):

$$\mathcal{B}_{\Phi,S,\Lambda}^{\inf} \leq \mathcal{B}_{\Phi,S,\Lambda}^{(\mathcal{E}_{S,\Lambda})}|_{l_{hv}} \leq \mathcal{B}_{\Phi,S,\Lambda}^{\sup} \quad (13)$$

with the LHV constants

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_{\Phi,S,\Lambda}^{\sup} &= \sup_{\lambda_n^{(s_n)} \in \Lambda_n, \forall s_n, \forall n} \sum_{s_1, \dots, s_N} f_{(s_1, \dots, s_N)}(\lambda_1^{(s_1)}, \dots, \lambda_N^{(s_N)}), \\ \mathcal{B}_{\Phi,S,\Lambda}^{\inf} &= \inf_{\lambda_n^{(s_n)} \in \Lambda_n, \forall s_n, \forall n} \sum_{s_1, \dots, s_N} f_{(s_1, \dots, s_N)}(\lambda_1^{(s_1)}, \dots, \lambda_N^{(s_N)}). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

From (13), it follows that, in the LHV case,

$$\left| \mathcal{B}_{\Phi,S,\Lambda}^{(\mathcal{E}_{S,\Lambda})}|_{l_{hv}} \right| \leq \mathcal{B}_{\Phi,S,\Lambda}^{l_{hv}} = \max \left\{ \left| \mathcal{B}_{\Phi,S,\Lambda}^{\sup} \right|, \left| \mathcal{B}_{\Phi,S,\Lambda}^{\inf} \right| \right\}. \quad (15)$$

Some the LHV inequalities in (13) may be fulfilled for a wider (than LHV) class of correlation scenarios. This is, for example, the case for the LHV constraints on joint probabilities following explicitly from nonsignaling<sup>5</sup> of probability distributions. Moreover, some of the LHV inequalities in (13) may be simply trivial, i. e. fulfilled for all correlation scenarios, not necessarily nonsignaling.

*Each of the tight LHV inequalities in (13) that may be violated under a non-LHV scenario is referred to as a Bell (or Bell-type) inequality.*

Let, under an  $S_1 \times \dots \times S_N$ -setting correlation scenario, each  $N$ -partite joint measurement  $(s_1, \dots, s_N)$  be performed on a quantum state  $\rho$  on a complex Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{H}_N$  and be described by the joint probability distribution

$$\text{tr}[\rho \{M_{1,s_1}(d\lambda_1) \otimes \dots \otimes M_{N,s_N}(d\lambda_N)\}], \quad (16)$$

where each  $M_{n,s_n}(d\lambda_n)$  is a normalized positive operator-valued (POV) measure, representing on a complex Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_n$  a generalized quantum measurement  $s_n$  at  $n$ -th site. For a POV measure  $M_{n,s_n}$ , all its values  $M_{n,s_n}(F_n)$ ,  $F_n \subseteq \Lambda_n$ , are positive operators on  $\mathcal{H}_n$  and  $M_{n,s_n}(\Lambda_n) = \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}_n}$ . For concreteness, we specify this  $S_1 \times \dots \times S_N$ -setting quantum correlation scenario by symbol  $\mathcal{E}_{M,S,\Lambda}^{(\rho)}$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} M_{S,\Lambda} &= \{M_{n,s_n}, s_n = 1, \dots, S_n, n = 1, \dots, N\}, \\ S &= S_1 \times \dots \times S_N, \quad \Lambda = \Lambda_1 \times \dots \times \Lambda_N, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

is a collection of POV measures at all  $N$ -sites.

It is well known [1] that the probabilistic description of a quantum correlation scenario  $\mathcal{E}_{M,S,\Lambda}^{(\rho)}$  does not need to admit a LHV model. Therefore, under correlation scenarios  $\mathcal{E}_{M,S,\Lambda}^{(\rho)}$  on an  $N$ -partite quantum state  $\rho$ , Bell inequalities in (13) may be violated and, in view of (15) the parameter [5]

$$\Upsilon_{S_1 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(\rho)} = \sup_{\Lambda, \Phi_{S,\Lambda}, M_{S,\Lambda}} \frac{1}{\mathcal{B}_{\Phi,S,\Lambda}^{l_{hv}}} \left| \mathcal{B}_{\Phi,S,\Lambda}^{(\mathcal{E}_{M,S,\Lambda}^{(\rho)})} \right| \geq 1 \quad (18)$$

---

<sup>5</sup>On this general notion, see section 3 in [6].

specifies the maximal violation by an  $N$ -partite state  $\rho$  of all  $S_1 \times \cdots \times S_N$ -setting general Bell inequalities while the parameter [5]

$$\Upsilon_\rho = \sup_{S_1, \dots, S_N} \Upsilon_{S_1 \times \cdots \times S_N}^{(\rho)} \geq 1 \quad (19)$$

– the maximal violation of *all* general Bell inequalities.

Clearly, an  $N$ -partite quantum state  $\rho$  is the  $S_1 \times \cdots \times S_N$ -setting Bell local iff

$$\Upsilon_{S_1 \times \cdots \times S_N}^{(\rho)} = 1 \quad (20)$$

and fully Bell local iff

$$\Upsilon_\rho = 1. \quad (21)$$

### 3 Quantifying Bell nonlocality

In this section, we present the analytical upper bound on the maximal Bell violation parameters (18), (19). In view of (20), (21), this allows us to specify full Bell locality of an  $N$ -partite quantum state via its dilation characteristics (see Theorem 1 below).

Recall that, according to Proposition 1 in [8] for a bipartite case and Proposition 1 in [5] for an arbitrary  $N$ -partite case, *for every state  $\rho$  on a complex Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_N$  and arbitrary integers  $S_1, \dots, S_N \geq 1$ , there exists an  $S_1 \times \cdots \times S_N$ -setting source operator  $T_{S_1 \times \cdots \times S_N}^{(\rho)}$  – that is, a self-adjoint trace class operator on the Hilbert space*

$$(\mathcal{H}_1)^{S_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes (\mathcal{H}_N)^{S_N} \quad (22)$$

satisfying the relation

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{tr} \left[ T_{S_1 \times \cdots \times S_N}^{(\rho)} \left\{ \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}_1^{\otimes k_1}} \otimes X_1 \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}_1^{\otimes (S_1-1-k_1)}} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}_N^{\otimes k_N}} \otimes X_N \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}_1^{\otimes (S_N-1-k_N)}} \right\} \right] \\ &= \text{tr} [\rho \{X_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes X_N\}], \\ & k_1 = 0, \dots, (S_1 - 1), \dots, k_N = 0, \dots, (S_N - 1), \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

for all bounded linear operators  $X_1, \dots, X_N$  on Hilbert spaces  $\mathcal{H}_1, \dots, \mathcal{H}_N$ , respectively. Here, we set  $\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}_n^{\otimes k}} \otimes X_n|_{k=0} = X_n \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}_n^{\otimes k}}|_{k=0} = X_n$ .

Clearly,  $T_{1 \times \cdots \times 1}^{(\rho)} \equiv \rho$  and  $\text{tr}[T_{S_1 \times \cdots \times S_N}^{(\rho)}] = 1$ .

By definition (23), an  $S_1 \times \cdots \times S_N$ -setting source operator  $T_{S_1 \times \cdots \times S_N}^{(\rho)}$  constitutes a *self-adjoint trace class dilation of a state  $\rho$  on  $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_N$  to the Hilbert space (22)*.

Note that, in general, a source operator does not need to be either positive or invariant with respect to permutations of spaces  $\mathcal{H}_n$  in  $(\mathcal{H}_n)^{S_n}$ , see in the proof of Proposition 1 in [8]. Therefore, the notion of a symmetric  $(S_1, S_2)$  extension, introduced for a bipartite state in [7], constitutes an  $S_1 \times S_2$ -setting source operator of a particular type – positive and symmetric. For *every*  $N$ -partite state  $\rho$  and *arbitrary integers*  $S_1, \dots, S_N \geq 1$ , a symmetric  $(S_1, \dots, S_N)$  extension does not need to exist while an  $S_1 \times \cdots \times S_N$ -setting source operator does always exist.

Due to the analytical upper bound (53) proved in Lemma 3 of [5], we have the following general statement quantifying Bell nonlocality of an  $N$ -partite quantum state in terms of its dilation characteristics.

**Proposition 1** *Under generalized  $N$ -partite joint quantum measurements (16), the maximal Bell violation parameters (18), (19) are upper bounded by*

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_{S_1 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(\rho)} &\leq \inf_{T_{S_1 \times \dots \times \underset{\uparrow n}{1} \times \dots \times S_N}, \forall n} \|T_{S_1 \times \dots \times \underset{\uparrow n}{1} \times \dots \times S_N}^{(\rho)}\|_{cov}, \\ \Upsilon_\rho &\leq \sup_{S_1, \dots, S_N} \inf_{T_{S_1 \times \dots \times \underset{\uparrow n}{1} \times \dots \times S_N}, \forall n} \|T_{S_1 \times \dots \times \underset{\uparrow n}{1} \times \dots \times S_N}^{(\rho)}\|_{cov}, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where infimum is taken over all source operators  $T_{S_1 \times \dots \times \underset{\uparrow n}{1} \times \dots \times S_N}^{(\rho)}$  with only one setting at some  $n$ -th site and over all sites  $n = 1, \dots, N$  and notation  $\|T\|_{cov}$  means the covering norm of a self-adjoint trace class operator  $T$  on space (22) – a new type of a norm introduced by relation (11) in [5] for self-adjoint trace class operators on an arbitrary complex Hilbert space  $\mathcal{G}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{G}_m$ .

Recall, that, by Lemma 1 in [5], for every self-adjoint trace class operator  $W$  on  $\mathcal{G}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{G}_m$ , the covering norm  $\|W\|_{cov}$  satisfies the relation

$$|\text{tr}[W]| \leq \|W\|_{cov} \leq \|W\|_1, \quad (25)$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_1$  is the trace norm. The relation  $\|W\|_{cov} = |\text{tr}[W]|$  is fulfilled if a self-adjoint trace class operator  $W$  is tensor positive (see the general definition 2 in [5]), that is, satisfies the relation<sup>6</sup>

$$\text{tr}[W\{X_1 \otimes \dots \otimes X_m\}] \geq 0 \quad (26)$$

for all positive bounded operators  $X_j$  on  $\mathcal{G}_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, m$ .

Every positive operator on  $\mathcal{G}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{G}_m$  is tensor positive but not vice versa. For example, the permutation (flip) operator  $V_d(\psi_1 \otimes \psi_2) := \psi_2 \otimes \psi_1$ ,  $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \mathbb{C}^d$ , on  $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$  is tensor positive but is not positive. Its trace norm is  $\|V_d\|_1 = d^2$  while the covering norm  $\|V_d\|_{cov} = d$ .

Note that the notion of tensor positivity [5] for a bounded linear operator on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{G}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{G}_m$ , which reminds the notion of positivity on an arbitrary Hilbert space, is more general than the concept of an entanglement witness used in quantum information for determining entanglement of a state on  $\mathcal{G}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{G}_m$ . Namely, an entanglement witness constitutes a tensor positive self-adjoint bounded linear operator on  $\mathcal{G}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{G}_m$  which is not positive.

For each source operator  $T_{S_1 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(\rho)}$ , its trace  $\text{tr}[T_{S_1 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(\rho)}] = 1$ . Therefore, by (25),  $\|T_{S_1 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(\rho)}\|_{cov} \geq 1$  and is equal to one  $\|T_{S_1 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(\sigma)}\|_{cov} = 1$  if a source operator  $T_{S_1 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(\rho)}$  is tensor positive. This and relations (18), (24), (25) imply the following general statement [5].

**Lemma 1** *If, for an  $N$ -partite quantum state  $\rho$  on  $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{H}_N$ , there exists a tensor positive source operator  $T_{S_1 \times \dots \times \underset{\uparrow n}{1} \times \dots \times S_N}^{(\rho)}$  for some  $n = 1, \dots, N$ , then, under generalized  $N$ -partite joint quantum measurements, this state is  $S_1 \times \dots \times \widetilde{S}_n \times \dots \times S_N$ -setting Bell local for an arbitrary number  $\widetilde{S}_n$  of settings at  $n$ -th site.*

<sup>6</sup>For a finite dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{G}_1 \otimes \mathcal{G}_2$ , our notion of tensor positivity is similar by its meaning to "block-positivity" introduced in [41] for a bipartite case. We, however, consider that, for a tensor product of *any number of arbitrary* Hilbert spaces, *possibly infinite dimensional*, our term "tensor positivity" is more suitable.

This statement, introduced in [5] by Proposition 5, generalizes Theorems 1, 2 in [8] to a multipartite case, also, Theorem 2 in [7] formulated for a bipartite case and symmetric  $(S_1, S_2)$  quasi-extensions.

Note that a symmetric  $(S_1, S_2)$  quasi-extension, introduced for a bipartite state in [7], constitutes an  $S_1 \times S_2$ -setting source operator of a particular type – tensor positive and symmetric. In this connection, we stress once again that a source operator  $T_{S_1 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(\rho)}$  *does exist* for every  $N$ -partite state  $\rho$  and all integers  $S_1, \dots, S_N \geq 1$ , but it does not need to be either tensor positive or symmetric (in the sense of [7]).

By Proposition 1, Lemma 1 and condition (21), we come to the following general theorem.

**Theorem 1** *If, for a state  $\rho$ , a tensor positive source operator  $T_{S_1 \times \dots \times \underset{\uparrow n}{1} \times \dots \times S_N}^{(\rho)}$  for an arbitrary  $n = 1, \dots, N$ , exists for any integers  $S_1, \dots, S_N \geq 1$ , then the maximal violation by this state of all general Bell inequalities is equal to one:  $\Upsilon_\rho = 1$ , so that, under all generalized  $N$ -partite joint quantum measurements, this  $N$ -partite quantum state  $\rho$  is fully Bell local.*

For a fully separable  $N$ -partite quantum state  $\rho_{sep}$ , tensor positive  $S_1 \times \dots \times S_N$ -setting source operators exist [8, 5] for all integers  $S_1, \dots, S_N \geq 1$ . However, a fully nonseparable  $N$ -partite state can also [8, 5] have tensor positive  $S_1 \times \dots \times S_N$ -setting source operators.

## 4 New bounds

In this section, we apply Theorem 1 for finding values of  $\beta$  for which a noisy  $N$ -qudit state (1) is fully Bell local under all generalized  $N$ -partite joint quantum measurements.

We stress that our mathematical techniques is valid for all  $N \geq 2$ . However, in this article, we do not intend to search for a tensor positive source operator that, in view of Theorem 1, could reproduce or improve the known bounds (see in [25, 27]) for full Bell locality of a noisy two-qudit state (1). Our main aim is to find general bounds on full Bell locality of a noisy  $N$ -qudit state (1) which are valid for all  $d \geq 2, N \geq 3$  and to study their asymptotics for large  $N$  and  $d$ . As we discuss this in Introduction, for  $d \geq 2, N \geq 3$ , bounds on full Bell locality of a noisy  $N$ -qudit state (1) are known only within its full separability.

### 4.1 The $N$ -qudit GHZ state

Let  $\{e_m, m = 1, \dots, d\}$  be an orthonormal base in  $\mathbb{C}^d$  and

$$\rho_{d,N}^{(ghz)} = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j,j_1} (|e_j\rangle\langle e_{j_1}|)^{\otimes N}, \quad d \geq 2, \quad N \geq 3, \quad (27)$$

be the  $N$ -qudit GHZ state on  $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes N}$ . Consider values of a parameter  $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$ , for which the  $N$ -qudit GHZ state mixed with white noise:

$$\beta \rho_{d,N}^{(ghz)} + (1 - \beta) \frac{\mathbb{I}_d^{\otimes N}}{d^N} \quad (28)$$

has a tensor positive  $1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N$ -setting source operator for all integers  $S_2, \dots, S_N \geq 1$  and is, therefore, *fully Bell local* by Theorem 1.



Introduce on the complex Hilbert space

$$\mathbb{C}^d \otimes (\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes S_2} \otimes \dots \otimes (\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes S_N} \quad (29)$$

the self-adjoint operator

$$T_{1 \times S_2 \times \dots \otimes S_N}^{(ghz)} = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j, j_1} |e_j\rangle\langle e_{j_1}| \otimes W_{jj_1}^{(d, S_2)} \otimes \dots \otimes W_{jj_1}^{(d, S_N)}, \quad (30)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} W_{jj}^{(d, S_n)} &= (|e_j\rangle\langle e_j|)^{\otimes S_n}, \\ 2W_{jj_1}^{(d, S_n)}|_{j \neq j_1} &= \frac{(|e_j + e_{j_1}\rangle\langle e_j + e_{j_1}|)^{\otimes S_n}}{2^{S_n}} - \frac{(|e_j - e_{j_1}\rangle\langle e_j - e_{j_1}|)^{\otimes S_n}}{2^{S_n}} \\ &\quad + i \frac{(|e_j + ie_{j_1}\rangle\langle e_j + ie_{j_1}|)^{\otimes S_n}}{2^{S_n}} - i \frac{(|e_j - ie_{j_1}\rangle\langle e_j - ie_{j_1}|)^{\otimes S_n}}{2^{S_n}} \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

are operators on  $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes S_n}$ , which are invariant with respect to permutations of spaces  $\mathbb{C}^d$  in  $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes S_n}$  and satisfy the relations

$$\left(W_{jj_1}^{(d, S_n)}\right)^* = W_{j_1 j}^{(d, S_n)}, \quad \text{tr}_{(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes (S_n-1)}} \left[W_{jj_1}^{(d, S_n)}\right] = |e_j\rangle\langle e_{j_1}|. \quad (32)$$

It is easy to verify

$$\text{tr}_{(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes (S_2-1)} \otimes \dots \otimes (\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes (S_N-1)}} \left[T_{1 \times S_2 \times \dots \otimes S_N}^{(ghz)}\right] = \rho_{d, N}^{(ghz)}, \quad (33)$$

so that, by definition (23), the self-adjoint operator (30) constitutes a  $1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N$ -setting source operator for the  $N$ -qudit GHZ state  $\rho_{d, N}^{(ghz)}$ .

On space (29) introduce also the positive operator

$$T_{1 \times S_2 \times \dots \otimes S_N}^{(1)} = C \sum_{j \neq j_1} \mathbb{I}_d \otimes \widetilde{W}_{jj_1}^{(d, S_2)} \otimes \sum_{l > l_1} \widetilde{W}_{ll_1}^{(d, S_3)} \otimes \dots \otimes \sum_{k > k_1} \widetilde{W}_{kk_1}^{(d, S_N)} \quad (34)$$

with a constant  $C > 0$  and positive operators

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{W}_{jj}^{(d, S_2)} &= (|e_j\rangle\langle e_j|)^{\otimes S_2}, \\ 2\widetilde{W}_{jj_1}^{(d, S_n)}|_{j \neq j_1} &= \frac{(|e_j + e_{j_1}\rangle\langle e_j + e_{j_1}|)^{\otimes S_n}}{2^{S_n}} + \frac{(|e_j - e_{j_1}\rangle\langle e_j - e_{j_1}|)^{\otimes S_n}}{2^{S_n}} \\ &\quad + \frac{(|e_j + ie_{j_1}\rangle\langle e_j + ie_{j_1}|)^{\otimes S_n}}{2^{S_n}} + \frac{(|e_j - ie_{j_1}\rangle\langle e_j - ie_{j_1}|)^{\otimes S_n}}{2^{S_n}} \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

on  $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes S_n}$ , invariant with respect to permutations of spaces  $\mathbb{C}^d$  in  $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes S_n}$  and satisfying the relations

$$\widetilde{W}_{jj_1}^{(d, S_n)} = \widetilde{W}_{j_1 j}^{(d, S_n)}, \quad \text{tr}_{(\mathbb{C}^d)^{S_n-1}} \left[\widetilde{W}_{jj_1}^{(d, S_n)}\right] = \delta_{jj_1} |e_j\rangle\langle e_j| + (1 - \delta_{jj_1}) (|e_j\rangle\langle e_j| + |e_{j_1}\rangle\langle e_{j_1}|). \quad (36)$$

Note that, for operators (31), (35), the relation

$$\left| \text{tr} \left[ X W_{jj_1}^{(d, S_n)} \right] \right| \leq \text{tr} \left[ X \widetilde{W}_{jj_1}^{(d, S_n)} \right] \quad (37)$$

holds for all positive operators  $X$  on  $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes S_n}$  and all  $j, j_1 = 1, \dots, d$ .

In view of (35), (36), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l > l_1} \text{tr}_{(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes (S_n-1)}} \widetilde{W}_{ll_1}^{(d, S_n)} &= (d-1) \mathbb{I}_d, \\ \sum_{l \neq l_1} \text{tr}_{(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes (S_n-1)}} \widetilde{W}_{ll_1}^{(d, S_n)} &= 2(d-1) \mathbb{I}_d. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{tr}_{(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes (S_2-1)} \otimes \dots \otimes (\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes (S_N-1)}} \left[ T_{1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(1)} \right] \\ &= 2C(d-1)^{N-1} \mathbb{I}_d^{\otimes N}, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

so that if

$$C = C_{d,N} := \frac{1}{2d^N(d-1)^{N-1}}, \quad (40)$$

then, by definition (23), the self-adjoint operator  $T_{1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(1)}$  is a  $1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N$ -setting source operator for the maximally mixed state  $\mathbb{I}_d^{\otimes N}/d^N$ .

From relations (33), (39) it follows that, for all integers  $S_2, \dots, S_N \geq 1$ , the self-adjoint operator

$$\beta T_{1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(ghz)} + (1-\beta) T_{1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(1)}, \quad 0 \leq \beta \leq 1, \quad (41)$$

constitutes a  $1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N$ -setting source operator for a noisy GHZ state (28).

In Lemma 2 of Appendix, we find the range of  $\beta$ , for which the  $1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N$ -setting source operator (41) is tensor positive. This range does not depend on integers  $S_2, \dots, S_N \geq 1$ , so that, by Lemma 1 and Theorem 1, we have the following new result.

**Proposition 2** *Under generalized  $N$ -partite joint quantum measurements, the  $N$ -qudit GHZ state  $\rho_{d,N}^{(ghz)}$ ,  $d \geq 2, N \geq 3$ , mixed with white noise is fully Bell local for all*

$$\beta \leq \beta_{loc}^{(ghz, d, N)} = \frac{1}{1 + 2d^{N-1}(d-1)^{N-1}}. \quad (42)$$

For  $N = 2$ , the full locality bound (42) is, of course, also true but it falls into the known range [25, 27] for separability of the two-qudit GHZ state mixed with white noise and is not, therefore, interesting.

For large  $N$  and  $d$ , asymptotics of this new bound have the forms:

$$\beta_{loc}^{(ghz, d, N)} \underset{N \gg 1}{\simeq} \frac{1}{2d^{N-1}(d-1)^{N-1}}, \quad \beta_{loc}^{(ghz, d, N)} \underset{d \gg 1}{\simeq} \frac{1}{2d^{2N-2}}. \quad (43)$$

## 4.2 Arbitrary nonlocal $N$ -qudit state

Let us now find a bound on full Bell locality of a noisy  $N$ -qudit state (1) for an arbitrary state  $\rho_{d,N}$ . We first analyze a bound for a pure state  $|\psi_{d,N}\rangle\langle\psi_{d,N}|$ ,  $d \geq 2, N \geq 3$ , and further by convexity extend the derived result to an arbitrary  $\rho_{d,N}$ .

Every pure state on  $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes N}$  admits the decomposition

$$|\psi_{d,N}\rangle\langle\psi_{d,N}| = \sum \varsigma_{mj\dots k} \varsigma_{m_1j_1\dots k_1}^* |e_m\rangle\langle e_{m_1}| \otimes |e_j\rangle\langle e_{j_1}| \otimes \dots \otimes |e_k\rangle\langle e_{k_1}| \quad (44)$$

where  $\sum_{m,j,\dots,k} |\varsigma_{mj\dots k}|^2 = 1$ . By introducing the normalized vectors

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{j\dots k} &= \frac{1}{\alpha_{j\dots k}} \sum_m \varsigma_{mj\dots k} e_m, & \|\phi_{j\dots k}\| &= 1, \\ \alpha_{j\dots k} &= \left( \sum_m |\varsigma_{mj\dots k}|^2 \right)^{1/2}, & \sum_{\underbrace{j,\dots,k}_{N-1}} (\alpha_{j\dots k})^2 &= 1, \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

we rewrite decomposition (44) in the form

$$|\psi_{d,N}\rangle\langle\psi_{d,N}| = \sum \alpha_{j\dots k} \alpha_{j_1\dots k_1} |\phi_{j\dots k}\rangle\langle\phi_{j_1\dots k_1}| \otimes |e_j\rangle\langle e_{j_1}| \otimes \dots \otimes |e_k\rangle\langle e_{k_1}| \quad (46)$$

where all coefficients  $\alpha_{j\dots k}$  are nonnegative.

In view of this decomposition, introduce on the Hilbert space (29) the self-adjoint operator

$$T_{1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(\psi_{d,N})} = \sum_{j,\dots,k} \alpha_{j\dots k} \alpha_{j_1\dots k_1} |\phi_{j\dots k}\rangle\langle\phi_{j_1\dots k_1}| \otimes W_{jj_1}^{(d,S_2)} \otimes \dots \otimes W_{kk_1}^{(d,S_N)} \quad (47)$$

where operators  $W_{ll_1}^{(d,S_n)}$  are defined by (31). It is easy to verify

$$\text{tr}_{(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes(S_2-1)} \otimes \dots \otimes (\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes(S_N-1)}} \left[ T_{1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(\psi_{d,N})} \right] = |\psi_{d,N}\rangle\langle\psi_{d,N}|, \quad (48)$$

so that, by definition (23) the self-adjoint operator  $T_{1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(\psi_{d,N})}$  constitutes a  $1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N$ -setting source operator for a pure state  $|\psi_{d,N}\rangle\langle\psi_{d,N}|$ .

On the space (29) consider also the positive operator

$$T_{1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(2)} = \tilde{C} \sum_{(j,\dots,k) \neq (j_1,\dots,k_1)} \mathbb{I}_d \otimes \widetilde{W}_{jj_1}^{(d,S_2)} \otimes \dots \otimes \widetilde{W}_{kk_1}^{(d,S_N)} \quad (49)$$

with a constant  $\tilde{C} > 0$  and positive operators  $\widetilde{W}_{ll_1}^{(d,S_n)}$  on  $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes S_n}$  defined by (35). Taking into account that  $\sum_j \text{tr}_{(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes(S_n-1)}} \widetilde{W}_{jj}^{(d,S_n)} = \mathbb{I}_d$  and

$$\sum_{j, j_1} \text{tr}_{(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes(S_n-1)}} \widetilde{W}_{jj_1}^{(d,S_n)} = (2d-1)\mathbb{I}_d, \quad (50)$$

we derive

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{tr}_{(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes(S_2-1)} \otimes \dots \otimes (\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes(S_N-1)}} \left[ T_{1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(2)} \right] \\ &= \tilde{C} \{ (2d-1)^{N-1} - 1 \} \mathbb{I}_d^{\otimes N}. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Hence, if

$$\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}_{d,N} := \frac{1}{d^N \{ (2d-1)^{N-1} - 1 \}} \quad (52)$$

then, by (23), the operator  $T_{1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(2)}$  constitutes a  $1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N$ -setting source operator for the maximally mixed state  $\mathbb{I}_d^{\otimes N}/d^N$ .

From relations (48), (51) it follows that the self-adjoint operator

$$\beta T_{1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(\psi_{d,N})} + (1 - \beta) T_{1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(2)} \quad (53)$$

constitutes a  $1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N$ -setting source operator for a mixture (1) of a pure state  $|\psi_{d,N}\rangle\langle\psi_{d,N}|$  with white noise.

In Lemma 3 of Appendix, we find a range of  $\beta$ , for which this source operator is tensor positive. This range does not depend on integers  $S_2, \dots, S_N \geq 1$ , so that, by Lemma 3 and Theorem 1, an arbitrary pure state  $|\psi_{d,N}\rangle\langle\psi_{d,N}|$ ,  $d \geq 2$ ,  $N \geq 2$ , mixed with white noise is fully Bell local for all

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &\leq \beta_{loc}^{(\psi_{d,N})} = \frac{1}{1 + d^N \{(2d - 1)^{N-1} - 1\} \gamma_{\psi_{d,N}}^{\max}}, \\ \gamma_{\psi_{d,N}}^{\max} &= \max_{j, \dots, k} \alpha_{j \dots k}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Taking further into account relation  $\gamma_{\psi_{d,N}}^{\max} \geq \frac{1}{d^{N-1}}$  valid for all pure states  $|\psi_{d,N}\rangle\langle\psi_{d,N}|$  and that, for each mixed state  $\rho_{d,N} = \sum_j \xi_j |\psi_{d,N}^{(j)}\rangle\langle\psi_{d,N}^{(j)}|$ ,  $\xi_j > 0$ ,  $\sum_j \xi_j = 1$ , the sum  $\sum_j \xi_j T_{1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(\psi_{d,N}^{(j)})}$  is a  $1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N$ -setting source operator for state  $\rho_{d,N}$ , we come by Theorem 1 to the following new result.

**Proposition 3** *Under generalized  $N$ -partite joint quantum measurements, an arbitrary  $N$ -qudit state  $\rho_{d,N}$ ,  $d \geq 2$ ,  $N \geq 3$ , mixed with white noise is fully Bell local for all  $\beta \leq \beta_{loc}^{(\rho_{d,N})}$  where*

$$\frac{1}{d^N(2d - 1)^{N-1} - d^N + 1} \leq \beta_{loc}^{(\rho_{d,N})} \leq \frac{1}{d(2d - 1)^{N-1} - d + 1}. \quad (55)$$

For  $N = 2$ , the full locality bound (55) is also true but it falls into the known range [25] for separability of an arbitrary two-qudit state  $\rho_{d,2}$  mixed with white noise and is not, therefore, interesting.

For large  $N$  and  $d$ , asymptotics of this new bound have the forms:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{d^N(2d - 1)^{N-1}} &\underset{N \gg 1}{\lesssim} \beta_{loc}^{(\rho_{d,N})} \underset{N \gg 1}{\lesssim} \frac{1}{d(2d - 1)^{N-1}}, \\ \frac{1}{2^{N-1}d^{2N-1}} &\underset{d \gg 1}{\lesssim} \beta_{loc}^{(\rho_{d,N})} \underset{d \gg 1}{\lesssim} \frac{1}{2^{N-1}d^N}. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

## 5 Discussion

In the present paper, we have presented Theorem 1, specifying the sufficient condition for full Bell locality of an  $N$ -partite quantum state via its dilation characteristics, and, due to this condition, we have derived for all  $d \geq 2$  and all  $N \geq 3$  a new bound (42) on full Bell locality of the  $N$ -qudit GHZ state mixed with white noise and a new bound (55) for full Bell locality of an arbitrary  $N$ -qudit state mixed with white noise.

As we discuss this in Introduction, to our knowledge, for arbitrary  $d \geq 2$ ,  $N \geq 3$ , bounds in  $d$ ,  $N$  on full Bell locality of a noisy  $N$ -qudit state (1) have been known in the literature only within its full separability.

Let us now compare our new full Bell locality bounds (42), (55) with full separability bounds (2)–(6) known for a noisy  $N$ -qudit state (1) with  $N \geq 3$ .

For a prime  $d \geq 2$  and an arbitrary  $N \geq 3$ , the full Bell locality bound  $\beta_{loc}^{(ghz,d,N)}$  in (42) for a noisy  $N$ -qudit GHZ state (28) falls into the range for its full separability:  $\beta \leq \beta_{sep}^{(ghz,d,N)}|_{prime\ d} = \frac{1}{1+d^{N-1}}$ , and is not, therefore, interesting.

However, comparing the full Bell locality bound (42) for a noisy  $N$ -qudit GHZ state (28) with the lower bound in (6) on its full separability, we have

$$\beta_{loc}^{(ghz,d,N)} = \frac{1}{1+2d^{N-1}(d-1)^{N-1}} > \frac{1}{1+d^{2N-1}}, \quad \forall d \geq 2, N \geq 3. \quad (57)$$

This means that, for a non-prime  $d > 3$  and an arbitrary  $N \geq 3$ , a noisy  $N$ -qudit GHZ state (28) is fully Bell local for all  $\beta \leq \frac{1}{1+2d^{N-1}(d-1)^{N-1}}$ , whereas it is definitely known to be fully separable if  $\beta \leq \frac{1}{1+d^{2N-1}}$ . This new result on full Bell locality of a noisy  $N$ -qudit GHZ state (28) for a non-prime  $d > 3$  and an arbitrary  $N \geq 3$  does not, however, specify either in the interval

$$\frac{1}{1+d^{2N-1}} < \beta \leq \frac{1}{1+2d^{N-1}(d-1)^{N-1}}, \quad (58)$$

this noisy state is fully separable or fully nonseparable. As we discuss in Introduction, for a non-prime  $d > 3$  and an arbitrary  $N \geq 3$ , it is only known [19, 20, 21] that a noisy  $N$ -qudit GHZ state (28) is fully nonseparable for all  $\beta > \frac{1}{1+d^{2N-1}}$ .

For an arbitrary  $N$ -qudit state  $\rho_{d,N}$  mixed with white noise, the lower bound in (55) is within the known full separability range in (4) while the upper bound in (55) is essentially out of this full separability range for all  $d \geq 2, N \geq 3$ . This means that, for some  $N$ -qudit state  $\rho_{d,N}$  mixed with white noise, a possible gap between the bound in (55) on its full Bell locality and the known bound (4) on its full separability can reach the value

$$\Delta_{\rho_{d,N}}^{\max} = \frac{1}{d(2d-1)^{N-1}-d+1} - \frac{1}{d^{2N-1}+1}, \quad d \geq 2, N \geq 3. \quad (59)$$

For example, for  $N = 3, d = 2$ , this gap is equal to  $0.94\beta_{sep}^{(\rho_{2,3})}$ . Therefore, for some three-qudit state  $\rho_{2,3}$ , the full Bell locality bound  $\beta_{loc}^{(\rho_{2,3})}$  in (55) can be almost twice more than the known full separability bound  $\beta_{sep}^{(\rho_{2,3})}$  in (2).

We note that, in section 4, our choices (34), (49) of  $1 \times S_2 \times \cdots \times S_N$ -setting source operators for the maximally mixed state  $\mathbb{I}_d^{\otimes N}/d^N$  are definitely not optimal, the same concerns our evaluation of tensor positivity in Lemmas 2, 3. This allows us to believe that the derived full Bell locality bounds can be further considerably improved.

In conclusion, we have derived new general bounds, expressed in terms of  $d, N$  and valid for all  $d \geq 2$  and all  $N \geq 3$ , on full Bell locality under generalized quantum measurements of (i) the  $N$ -qudit GHZ state mixed with white noise and (ii) an arbitrary  $N$ -qudit state mixed with white noise. The new full locality bounds are beyond the known ranges for full separability of these noisy states.

## 6 Appendix

**Lemma 2** For arbitrary  $d \geq 2$ ,  $N \geq 2$ , the source operator (41) on space (29) is tensor positive for all

$$\beta \leq \frac{1}{1 + 2d^{N-1}(d-1)^{N-1}}. \quad (\text{A1})$$

**Proof.** In view of (26) and the structure of operators  $T_{1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(ghz)}$  and  $T_{1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(1)}$ , given by relations (30), (34), for finding a range of tensor positivity of the source operator (41), we need to find  $\beta$  for which the expression

$$(1 - \beta) \operatorname{tr} \left[ T_{1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(1)} (X_1 \otimes X_{S_2} \otimes \dots \otimes X_{S_N}) \right] + \beta \operatorname{tr} \left[ T_{1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(ghz)} (X_1 \otimes X_{S_2} \otimes \dots \otimes X_{S_N}) \right] \quad (\text{A2})$$

is nonnegative for all positive operators  $X_1$  on  $\mathbb{C}^d$  and  $X_{S_n}$  on  $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes S_n}$ ,  $n = 1, \dots, N$ .

Moreover, since in decomposition (30) the term with  $j = j_1$  is positive, it is suffice to evaluate nonnegativity of

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = & (1 - \beta) C_{d,N} \sum_{j \neq j_1} \operatorname{tr}[X_1] \operatorname{tr}[\widetilde{W}_{jj_1}^{(d,S_2)} X_{S_2}] \sum_{l > l_1} \operatorname{tr}[\widetilde{W}_{ll_1}^{(d,S_3)} X_{S_3}] \dots \sum_{k > k_1} \operatorname{tr}[\widetilde{W}_{kk_1}^{(d,S_N)} X_{S_N}] \\ & + \frac{\beta}{d} \sum_{j \neq j_1} \langle e_j | X_1 | e_{j_1} \rangle \operatorname{tr}[W_{jj_1}^{(d,S_2)} X_{S_2}] \dots \operatorname{tr}[W_{jj_1}^{(d,S_N)} X_{S_N}]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A3})$$

Taking into account (37), relations  $|\langle e_j | X_1 | e_{j_1} \rangle| \leq \operatorname{tr}[X_1]$  and  $\widetilde{W}_{jj_1}^{(d,S_2)} = \widetilde{W}_{j_1 j}^{(d,S_2)}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j \neq j_1} \operatorname{tr}[X_1] \operatorname{tr}[\widetilde{W}_{jj_1}^{(d,S_2)} X_{S_2}] \cdot \sum_{l > l_1} \operatorname{tr}[\widetilde{W}_{ll_1}^{(d,S_3)} X_{S_3}] \dots \sum_{k > k_1} \operatorname{tr}[\widetilde{W}_{kk_1}^{(d,S_N)} X_{S_N}] \quad (\text{A4}) \\ \geq & \sum_{j \neq j_1} \operatorname{tr}[X_1] \operatorname{tr}[\widetilde{W}_{jj_1}^{(d,S_2)} X_{S_2}] \operatorname{tr}[\widetilde{W}_{jj_1}^{(d,S_3)} X_{S_3}] \dots \operatorname{tr}[\widetilde{W}_{jj_1}^{(N)} X_{S_N}] \\ \geq & \sum_{j \neq j_1} |\langle e_j | X_1 | e_{j_1} \rangle| \left| \operatorname{tr}[W_{jj_1}^{(d,S_2)} X_{S_2}] \right| \dots \left| \operatorname{tr}[W_{jj_1}^{(N)} X_{S_N}] \right|. \end{aligned}$$

From (A3), (A4) it follows

$$\Delta \geq \left\{ (1 - \beta) C - \frac{1}{d} \beta \right\} \sum_{j \neq j_1} \operatorname{tr}[X_1] \operatorname{tr}[\widetilde{W}_{jj_1}^{(d,S_2)} X_{S_2}] \dots \operatorname{tr}[\widetilde{W}_{jj_1}^{(N)} X_{S_N}]. \quad (\text{A5})$$

for all  $X_1 \geq 0$  on  $\mathbb{C}^d$  and  $X_{S_n} \geq 0$  on  $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes S_n}$ . Recall that, due to their definition (35), all operators  $\widetilde{W}_{jj_1}^{(d,S_n)}$  are positive. Therefore, if

$$(1 - \beta) C_{d,N} - \frac{1}{d} \beta \geq 0 \Leftrightarrow \beta \leq \frac{d C_{d,N}}{1 + d C_{d,N}}, \quad (\text{A6})$$

then  $\Delta \geq 0$  and the source operator (41) is tensor positive. In view of (40), this proves the statement. ■

**Lemma 3** For arbitrary  $d \geq 2$ ,  $N \geq 2$ , the source operator (53) is tensor positive for all

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &\leq \beta_{loc}^{(\psi_{d,N})} = \frac{1}{1 + d^N \left\{ (2d-1)^{N-1} - 1 \right\} \gamma_{\psi_{d,N}}^{\max}}, \\ \gamma_{\psi_{d,N}}^{\max} &= \max_{j,\dots,k} \alpha_{j\dots k}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (A7)$$

**Proof.** Quite similarly to our proof in Lemma 2, let us analyse nonnegativity of the expression

$$\begin{aligned} &(1 - \beta) \operatorname{tr} \left[ T_{1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(2)} (X_1 \otimes X_{S_2} \otimes \dots \otimes X_{S_N}) \right] \\ &+ \beta \operatorname{tr} \left[ T_{1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_N}^{(\psi_{d,N})} (X_1 \otimes X_{S_2} \otimes \dots \otimes X_{S_N}) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (A8)$$

for all positive  $X_1$  on  $\mathbb{C}^d$  and  $X_{n,S_n}$  on  $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes S_n}$ ,  $n = 1, \dots, N$ .

Since in decomposition (47) the term with  $(j, \dots, k) = (j_1, \dots, k_1)$  is positive, it is suffice to evaluate

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta &= (1 - \beta) \tilde{C}_{d,N} \sum_{(j,\dots,k) \neq (j_1,\dots,k_1)} \operatorname{tr}[X_1] \operatorname{tr}[\tilde{W}_{jj_1}^{(d,S_2)} X_{S_2}] \cdot \dots \cdot \operatorname{tr}[\tilde{W}_{kk_1}^{(d,S_N)} X_{S_N}] \\ &+ \beta \sum_{(j,\dots,k) \neq (j_1,\dots,k_1)} \alpha_{j\dots k} \alpha_{j_1\dots k_1} \langle \phi_{j_1\dots k_1} | X_1 | \phi_{j\dots k} \rangle \operatorname{tr}[W_{jj_1}^{(d,S_2)} X_{S_2}] \cdot \dots \cdot \operatorname{tr}[W_{kk_1}^{(d,S_N)} X_{S_N}]. \end{aligned} \quad (A9)$$

Taking into account (37) and relation  $|\langle \phi_{j_1\dots k_1} | X_1 | \phi_{j\dots k} \rangle| \leq \operatorname{tr}[X_1]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{(j,\dots,k) \neq (j_1,\dots,k_1)} \operatorname{tr}[X_1] \operatorname{tr}[\tilde{W}_{jj_1}^{(d,S_2)} X_{S_2}] \cdot \dots \cdot \operatorname{tr}[\tilde{W}_{kk_1}^{(d,S_N)} X_{S_N}] \\ &\geq \sum_{(j,\dots,k) \neq (j_1,\dots,k_1)} \left| \langle \phi_{j_1\dots k_1} | X_1 | \phi_{j\dots k} \rangle \right| \left| \operatorname{tr}[W_{jj_1}^{(d,S_2)} X_{S_2}] \right| \cdot \dots \cdot \left| \operatorname{tr}[W_{kk_1}^{(d,S_N)} X_{S_N}] \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (A10)$$

so that

$$\Delta \geq \left\{ (1 - \beta) \tilde{C}_{d,N} - \gamma_{\psi_{d,N}}^{\max} \beta \right\} \sum_{(j,\dots,k) \neq (j_1,\dots,k_1)} \operatorname{tr}[X_1] \operatorname{tr}[\tilde{W}_{jj_1}^{(d,S_2)} X_{S_2}] \cdot \dots \cdot \operatorname{tr}[\tilde{W}_{kk_1}^{(d,S_N)} X_{S_N}] \quad (A11)$$

for all  $X_1 \geq 0$  on  $\mathbb{C}^d$  and  $X_{S_n} \geq 0$  on  $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes S_n}$ . Recall, that, due to their definition (35), all operators  $\tilde{W}_{jj_1}^{(d,S_n)}$  are positive. Therefore, if

$$(1 - \beta) \tilde{C}_{d,N} - \gamma_{\psi_{d,N}}^{\max} \beta \geq 0 \Leftrightarrow \beta \leq \frac{\tilde{C}_{d,N}}{\gamma_{\psi_{d,N}}^{\max} + \tilde{C}_{d,N}}, \quad (A12)$$

then the source operator (53) is tensor positive. In view of (52), this proves the statement. ■

## References

- [1] Bell J S 1964 *Physics* **1** 195
- [2] Bell J S 1966 *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **38** 447

- [3] Loubenets E R 2017 *Found. Phys.* **47** 1100-1114
- [4] Werner R F 1989 *Phys. Rev. A* **40** 4277
- [5] Loubenets E R 2012 *J. Math. Phys.* **53** 02220
- [6] Loubenets E R 2008 *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **41** 445303
- [7] Terhal B M, Doherty A C and Schwab D 2003 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90** 157903
- [8] Loubenets E R 2006 *Banach Center Publ.* **73** 325, arXiv:quant-ph/0406139
- [9] Loubenets E R 2006 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **39** 5115
- [10] Horodecki M and Horodecki P 1999 *Phys. Rev. A* **59** 4206
- [11] Gurvits L and Barnum H 2002 *Phys. Rev. A* **66**, 062311
- [12] Zyczkowski K, Horodecki P, Sanpera A, and Lewenstein M 1998 *Phys. Rev. A* **58** 883
- [13] Vidal G and Tarrach R 1999 *Phys. Rev. A* **59** 141
- [14] Braunstein S L, Caves C M, Jozsa R, Linden N, Popescu P and Schack R 1999 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83** 1054
- [15] Dur M, Cirac J I, R Tarrach R 1999 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 3562
- [16] Schack R , Caves C M. 2000 *Journal of Modern Optics* **47**, 387
- [17] Dur M, Cirac J I 2000 *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 042314
- [18] Deuar P, Munro W J, Nemoto K 2000 *J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass. Opt.* **2** 225
- [19] Rungta P, Munro W J, Nemoto K, Deuar P, Milburn G J and Caves C M (2001), in *Directions in Quantum Optics: A Collection of Papers Dedicated to the Memory of Dan Walls*, Eds Carmichael H, Glauber R, and Scully M *Springer Lecture Notes in Physics* **561**, 149 (quant-ph/0001075)
- [20] Pittenger A O and Rubin M H 2000 *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 032313
- [21] Ananth N, Chandrasekar V K, Senthilvelan M (2015) *The European Physical Journal D* **69**, 56
- [22] Acin A, Durt T, Gisin N and Latorre J I 2002 *Phys. Rev. A* **65** 052325
- [23] Collins D, Gisin N, Linden N, Massar S and Popescu S 2002 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88** 040404
- [24] Acin A, Gisin N and Toner D 2006 *Phys. Rev. A* **73** 062105
- [25] Almeida M L, Pironio S, Barrett J, Toth G and Acin A 2007 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99** 040403
- [26] Wiseman H M, Jones S J and Doherty A C 2007 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98** 140402
- [27] Brunner N, Cavalcanti D, Pironio S, Scarani V and Wehner S 2014 *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **86**, 419



- [28] Zukowski M 1993 *Phys. Lett. A* **177**, 290
- [29] Zukowski M and Kaszlikowski D 1997 *Phys. Rev. A* **56**, R1682
- [30] Sen De S A, Sen U, Wiesniak M, Kaszlikowski D, Zukowski M 2003 *Phys. Rev. A*, 68, 062306
- [31] Aolita L, Chaves R, Cavalcanti D, Acin A, Davidovich L 2008 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 10
- [32] Chaves R., Cavalcanti D, Aolita L, and Acin A 2012, *Phys. Rev. A* 86, 012108
- [33] Brunner N, Sharam J, Vertesi T 2012 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 108 110501
- [34] Laskowski W, Vertesi T, Wiesniak M 2015 *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **48**, 465301
- [35] Sohbi A, Zaquine I, Diamanti E, Markham D 2015 *Phys. Rev. A* 91 022101;
- [36] Barnea T J, Putz G, Brask J B, Brunner N, Gisin N, Liang Y C 2015 *Phys. Rev. A* 91 032108
- [37] Loubenets E R 2012 *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **45** 185306
- [38] Loubenets E R 2015 *J. Math. Phys.* **56** 032201
- [39] Loubenets E R 2016 *Intern. J. of Quantum Information* **14** 1640010
- [40] Loubenets E R 2008 *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **41** 445304
- [41] Skowronek I, Stormer E, Zyczkowski K, *J. Math. Phys.* **50**, 062106 (2009)