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Suppose a set of \( m \)-partite, \( m \geq 3 \), pure orthogonal fully separable states is given. We consider the task of distinguishing the states perfectly by local operations and classical communication (LOCC) in different \( k \)-partitions, \( 1 < k < m \). Based on this task, it is possible to classify such sets into different classes. A complete classification for tripartite systems is given with explicit examples. Few important cases are also studied when the number of parties, \( m \geq 4 \) as these cases never appear for a tripartite system. The study of distinguishing the states by LOCC in different \( k \)-partitions is important as it helps to learn about how a resource state can be shared between the parties in order to distinguish a given LOCC indistinguishable set. As an interesting application of the present study, it is shown that starting from a set of product states, it is possible to constitute a protocol distributing bound entanglement between two spatially separated parties by sending a separable qubit.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum state discrimination problem is a well-known problem within the theory of quantum information. In this problem a quantum system is prepared in a state which is secretly chosen from a known set. The objective is to determine the state of the system. In brief, we say this as the problem of distinguishing a given set. If the states within a set are orthogonal to each other then by performing a measurement on the entire system, it is possible to distinguish the set. On the other hand, perfect discrimination of nonorthogonal states is not possible [1]. Nevertheless, even if a given set contains only orthogonal states, the problem may arise if the subsystems of a composite system are distributed among several spatially separated parties. This is because in a spatially separated configuration we consider that the parties are restricted to carry out measurements only on their own subsystems and they are allowed for any sequence of classical communication. This class of operations is known as local operations and classical communication (LOCC) [2].

In many research works [3–15], the authors considered the problem of distinguishing a given set when a composite quantum system is distributed among several spatially separated parties, that is, the parties are allowed to perform LOCC only. In brief, we say this as the problem of distinguishing a given set by LOCC. The states we consider here are orthogonal to each other. So, obviously, perfect discrimination of the states is studied. If a set is not perfectly distinguishable by LOCC then the set is an LOCC/locally indistinguishable set or simply a nonlocal set. If such a set forms a complete basis for any Hilbert space then the basis is an LOCC/locally indistinguishable basis or simply a nonlocal basis. The nonlocal sets can be used for practical purposes, for example, quantum secret sharing [16], data hiding [17, 18] etc. Furthermore, to study the nonlocal features of distributed quantum systems, the settings of different state discrimination problems by LOCC (in other words, local state discrimination problems) play a very crucial role.

If a complete basis contains only orthogonal entangled states then the basis must be locally indistinguishable, for example, the Bell basis [6]. However, there also exist complete bases which are nonlocal and contain only orthogonal product states. Clearly, such bases exhibit quantum nonlocality without entanglement as introduced for the very first time in Ref. [19]. Operationally, these bases correspond to separable measurements which cannot be accomplished by LOCC. Other than complete orthogonal product bases, there also exist other types of sets of orthogonal product states which are locally indistinguishable [20, 21]. Subsequently, many articles were written to understand the properties and the forms of orthogonal product states both for bipartite systems and also for multiparticle systems [22–50]. Nonetheless, the properties of multiparticle product states across every bipartition have been studied very recently [51, 52]. Particularly, in both the articles, tripartite sets of orthogonal product states which are locally indistinguishable across all bipartitions, have been constructed. Thus, for the completeness it is important to study those sets of \( m \)-partite (\( m \geq 3 \)) orthogonal product states which are locally distinguishable in some (or in all) \( k \)-partitions (\( 1 < k < m \)). In this context, it is important to mention that for a multipartite system if a particular partitioning of the parties is defined then two or more parties can come together in a single location. As a result of which those parties which belong to a single location, can perform quantum operations together under the setting of LOCC.

In order to distinguish a given nonlocal set, it is required to use entanglement as resource. There are several articles where pure state entanglement assisted local state discrimination problem was addressed [49, 53–63]. In Ref. [54], the author presented interesting entanglement assisted protocols to distinguish nonlocal sets of product states. After that article, both bipar-
tite [60, 63] and multipartite [49, 62, 63] protocols were constructed to distinguish product states. All these protocols are efficient protocols as they consume less entanglement with respect to the teleportation based schemes. Note that to make a protocol entanglement consumption wise efficient, it is important to share resource state(s) in a suitable way among the parties. In particular, if a given set of multipartite product states is locally indistinguishable in few of the k-partitions then there might be constraint on how the entangled resource state(s) should be shared among the parties in order to distinguish the states perfectly consuming less entanglement. Thus, to reduce the entanglement consumption we have to learn how a resource state should be shared among parties in a suitable way. Obviously, this implies the importance of the study of local (in)distinguishability of a set of product states across every k-partition.

Other than entanglement assisted state discrimination, there are many instances where shared entanglement can be used as resource, for example, teleportation [64], superdense coding [65], cryptography [66], etc. Therefore, it is prerequisite to distribute entanglement among spatially separated parties in order to use entanglement as resource. Interestingly, it is possible to distribute entanglement between two spatially separated parties by sending a separable qubit [67]. Thereafter, various related articles (both theoretical and experimental) were written to understand such phenomena in a better way [68–79]. To the best of our knowledge, in all the scenarios where entanglement has been distributed by sending a separable qubit, so far, the finally distributed entangled state is negative under partial transpose in the desired bipartition. Therefore, it is worth raising the question whether it is possible to distribute entangled state which is positive under partial transpose by sending a separable qubit. Clearly, this implies the distribution of bound entanglement by sending a separable qubit. It is worth mentioning here that though it is yet to be known how an arbitrary bound entangled state can be used as resource but there are instances where a few particular classes of bound entangled states can be used as resource, for example, secure key distillation [80–82], quantum metrology [83], quantum steering [84], quantum nonlocality [85, 86], etc.

In this work we consider LOCC (in)distinguishability of a set of multipartite orthogonal product state in different k-partitions. To understand the present results, we give basic assumptions and the notations in Sec. II. Next, in Sec. III, different distinguishability classes of tripartite sets of product states are presented. This classification is based on the LOCC (in)distinguishability of the sets in different bipartitions. Along with the classification explicit examples are also given. After that few multipartite (number of parties, \( m \geq 4 \)) cases which do not appear for a tripartite system, are also studied in Sec. IV. It is also explained how LOCC (in)distinguishability of a set of product states in different k-partitions are connected with the sharing of resource state(s) among the parties in order to distinguish a given set perfectly. As an interesting consequence of the present study, it is shown in Sec. V that starting from a particular type of tripartite set of orthogonal product state, it is possible to constitute a protocol distributing bound entanglement between two spatially separated parties by sending a separable qubit. Such a protocol is an indirect one to establish entanglement [79]. Now, for an indirect protocol to establish entanglement it is necessary to consider at least three particles as introduced in Ref. [67] and discussed in a greater details in Ref. [70]. The present protocol also consists of only three particles. After the description of the protocol finally, in Sec. VI, the conclusion is drawn.

II. ASSUMPTIONS AND NOTATIONS

We consider here that the states to be distinguished, are pure multipartite (number of parties, \( m \geq 3 \)) fully separable states, that is, such a state has the form \(|\alpha_1\rangle \otimes |\alpha_2\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |\alpha_m\rangle \equiv |\alpha_1\rangle |\alpha_2\rangle \cdots |\alpha_m\rangle\). These states are pairwise orthogonal to each other and thus, the perfect discrimination of these states is considered. If the states \(|\alpha_1\rangle |\alpha_2\rangle \cdots |\alpha_m\rangle \in \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_m\), then \(|\alpha_1\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_1\), \(|\alpha_2\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2\) etc. Throughout the manuscript we use the abbreviation \(|\alpha_1 \pm |\alpha_2 \rangle \cdots \rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\alpha_1 \rangle \pm |\alpha_2 \rangle \cdots \rangle\). N is the normalization constant. For simplicity, we ignore these normalization constants in many scenarios where these constants do not play any important role. Note that a given set may or may not be a complete basis in the corresponding Hilbert space and the states within a given set are equally probable. Unless, it is described clearly, consider that all the parties are spatially separated and thus, they are restricted to perform measurements on their respective subsystems only. If there are many parties in a single location then those parties can perform measurements together under the setting of LOCC. For a tripartite system, there are only bipartitions, so, when a bipartition is considered, two parties come together in a single location. But when the number of parties, \( m \geq 4 \) then there are k-partitions (\( 1 < k < m \)), that is, the number of parties which can come together, may depend on the partition. It is also important to mention that in case of entanglement-assisted discrimination of a given nonlocal set, we consider only pure entangled states as resource. These entangled states can be bipartite or multipartite depending on the situation. We now proceed to analyze different examples of tripartite systems.

III. TRIPARTITE SYSTEMS

Consider three parties A(lice), B(ob), and C(harlie) and corresponding Hilbert space is given by \( \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C = \mathbb{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_B} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_C} \), where \( d_A, d_B, \) and
\(d_C\) are the dimensions of the subsystems possessed by Alice, Bob, and Charlie respectively. In this section we use an abbreviation \(i|j/k\) which stands for a bipartition: \(i\) versus \(j\) and \(k\) are in a single location). For tripartite systems, there are three bipartitions - \(A|BC\), \(B|CA\), and \(C|AB\). Based on these bipartitions, the sets of tripartite orthogonal product states can be classified into the following categories (different distinguishability classes): (i) locally indistinguishable across every bipartition, that is, such a set is a genuinely nonlocal set, (ii) locally indistinguishable across only two bipartitions, (iii) locally indistinguishable across only one bipartition, (iv) distinguishable across all of the bipartitions.

Examples of tripartite genuinely nonlocal sets of product states can be found in Ref. [51, 52]. In particular, in Ref. [52], a classification of genuinely nonlinear product bases and their entanglement assisted discrimination protocols were presented. However, in this work we focus on those sets which are locally distinguishable in at least one bipartition. If such a set is locally indistinguishable in at least one bipartition then that set is a bidistinguishable set. Moreover, a fully bidistinguishable set is distinguishable across every bipartition but it is locally indistinguishable when all the parties are spatially separated. Again, a fully distinguishable (or simply distinguishable) set is locally distinguishable when all the parties are spatially separated. A computational basis in any given Hilbert space is an example of fully distinguishable sets of product states. We now present an important proposition which was previously discussed in Refs. [20, 21].

Proposition 1. Any set of orthogonal product states in \(C^2 \otimes C^d\) can be perfectly distinguished by LOCC and therefore, such a set can be extended to a complete basis.

By the above proposition it is clear that all sets of three-qubit orthogonal product states can be perfectly distinguished by LOCC across every bipartition. Therefore, the three-qubit product basis constructed in Ref. [19] is locally distinguishable across every bipartition but such a set can show local indistinguishability when all the parties are spatially separated. Thus, this set is an example of a fully bidistinguishable set. Nevertheless, in higher dimensions (when the dimension of each subsystem, \(d \geq 3\)) Proposition 1 does not work. So, it is important to find fully bidistinguishable sets in higher dimensions. We identify that a particular type of tripartite sets in \((C^d)^{\otimes 3}\), \(d \geq 3\), given in Ref. [49] are fully bidistinguishable. The states of the sets are given as the following:

\[
\begin{align*}
|\psi_{1i}\rangle &= |0\rangle|i\rangle|0+i\rangle, & |\psi_{1i}^+\rangle &= |0\rangle|i\rangle|0-i\rangle, \\
|\psi_{2i}\rangle &= |i\rangle|0+i\rangle|0\rangle, & |\psi_{2i}^+\rangle &= |i\rangle|0-i\rangle|0\rangle, \\
|\psi_{3i}\rangle &= |0+i\rangle|0\rangle|i\rangle, & |\psi_{3i}^+\rangle &= |0-i\rangle|0\rangle|i\rangle,
\end{align*}
\]

where \(i = 1, 2, \ldots, (d-1)\). The proof of Local indistinguishability of the above set when all the parties are spatially separated can be found in Ref. [49]. Here we prove that the above set is distinguishable across every bipartition by constructing an explicit protocol.

**Protocol 1.** Consider any two parties together: \(AB, BC\), or \(CA\) (in the cyclic order). These two parties can perform a measurement, described by the projectors: \(P_i = |0\rangle\langle 0|, P_f = \sum_i P_i; i = 1, 2, \ldots, (d-1)\). Corresponding to each outcome \(i^*\), there are two orthogonal pure states left, which can be perfectly distinguished by LOCC [4]. For the outcome \(f^*\), the other party (who stands alone) performs a measurement in computational basis and corresponding to each outcome, there are two orthogonal pure states left which can be perfectly distinguished by LOCC [4]. Here the protocol completes and it is proved that the above sets are the examples of fully bidistinguishable sets.

In Ref. [49], it was already shown that a two-qubit maximally entangled state is sufficient to distinguish the sets of Eq. (1). Interestingly, the resource state can be shared between any two parties. This is because of the following facts: (a) For a fixed \(d\), the set and the resource state together generate a new set in higher dimension. (b) The resource state can be shared between any two parties but each time the newly generated set captures the same structure when all three parties are spatially separated. Thus, the local discrimination of the newly generated set implies that the resource state can be shared between any two parties. However, if a given tripartite set is not fully bidistinguishable, then which pair of parties shares the resource may play a vital role. Subsequently, we show that though bipartite entanglement can be sufficient to distinguish a given tripartite set but the resource must not be shared between particular pair(s) of parties. For any fully bidistinguishable tripartite set the following remark can be made:

**Remark 1.** If a fully bidistinguishable set in \(C^d_A \otimes C^d_B \otimes C^d_C\), \(d_A \geq d_B \geq d_C\), is given then a maximally entangled bipartite state in \(C^d \otimes C^d\), \(d = d_A\), shared between any two parties is sufficient to distinguish the set.

We now present the examples of tripartite bidistinguishable sets. It is easy to construct a tripartite set which is locally distinguishable in only one bipartition. By Proposition 1, one can infer that to construct such a set, at least two of the subsystems must have dimensions \(\geq 3\), while the dimension of the other subsystem is 2. Now, consider a basis \(\{|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}\rangle|j\rangle_C\}\) in \(C^3 \otimes C^2 \otimes C^2\), \(j = 0, 1\), and \(|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}\) are the bipartite locally indistinguishable product states in \(C^3 \otimes C^2\), constructed in Ref. [19], \(\forall i = 0, 1, \ldots, 8\). The tripartite set \(\{|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}\rangle|j\rangle_C\}\) is locally distinguishable in only one bipartition, that is, \(AB|C\) bipartition. Interestingly, to distinguish this set, a sufficiently entangled bipartite state is sufficient but that state must not be shared between Alice and Charlie or between Bob and Charlie. Notice that the local indistinguishability of this set is solely because of the states \(|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}\), placed between Alice and Bob. Therefore, the resource state must be shared between Alice and Bob. From the construction, it is clear...
that this technique is not applicable to produce a tripartite set which is locally indistinguishable in a particular bipartition. So, the structure of such a set must be non-trivial. For such a set to exist, dimension of one of the subsystems must be $\geq 3$, while the dimensions of the other two subsystems can be 2. We now construct a tripartite set of product states in $C^3 \otimes C^2 \otimes C^2$ which is locally indistinguishable in a particular bipartition. The set is given as the following:

$$\left\{ |\psi_1\rangle = |0-1\rangle|0\rangle|0\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle = |0+1\rangle|0\rangle|0\rangle, |\psi_3\rangle = |2-0\rangle|1\rangle|0\rangle, |\psi_4\rangle = |2+0\rangle|1\rangle|0\rangle, |\psi_5\rangle = |1\rangle|0\rangle|0-1\rangle, |\psi_6\rangle = |1\rangle|1\rangle|0+1\rangle, |\psi_7\rangle = |1-2\rangle|0\rangle|1\rangle, |\psi_8\rangle = |1+2\rangle|0\rangle|1\rangle, |\psi_9\rangle = |0\rangle|0-1\rangle|1\rangle, |\psi_{10}\rangle = |0\rangle|0+1\rangle|1\rangle \right\}$$

Notice that the dimension for which the above set is constructed is the minimum one for such a set to exist. By Proposition 1, the above set is locally distinguishable in $B|CA$ and in $C|AB$ bipartitions. Here we prove that the above set is locally indistinguishable in $A|BC$ bipartition. For that purpose, we consider the above set in $C^3 \otimes C^4$ and relabel the 4-dimensional vectors as $|10\rangle \rightarrow |0\rangle, |11\rangle \rightarrow |1\rangle, |01\rangle \rightarrow |2\rangle, |00\rangle \rightarrow |3\rangle$. After relabeling one can easily check that the states $\{ |\psi_i\rangle \}_{i=1}^{10}$ turn into the states: $\{ |2+0\rangle |0\rangle, |1\rangle |0+1\rangle, |1+2\rangle |2\rangle, |0\rangle |1+2\rangle \}$. These states are similar as the locally indistinguishable states in $C^3 \otimes C^3$, constructed by Bennett et al. in Ref. [19].

We mention that though in the tripartite case, these states are the dimensions of the subsystems possessed by $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m$ respectively. To realize a $k$-partition, we use the notation $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_h, A_h, \ldots, A_c, A_c, \ldots, A_{c_1}, A_{c_1}, \ldots$, where $d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_m$ are the dimensions of the subsystems of the sets of orthogonal product states: The outer most circle contains all tripartite sets of product states. Inside that there are three other circles of medium size. Each of which contains sets that are locally distinguishable in at least one bipartition (label of the bipartition is mentioned on the circle). Intersection of any two such circles difference intersection of all three such circles generates each of the regions labeled as 1, 2, 3. These regions contain sets which are locally distinguishable in only two bipartitions. However, intersection of all three circles (of medium size) is labeled as 4. This region contains those sets which are distinguishable across all the bipartitions. Inside region 4, there is a small circle labeled as 5, this region represents all fully distinguishable tripartite sets. Next, if one takes the difference the difference between the outer most circle and the union of three circles (of medium size) then there is region 6, which contains only the genuinely nonlocal sets.

IV. MULTIPARTITE SYSTEMS

FIG. 1. (Color online) Classification of tripartite sets of orthogonal product states: The outer most circle contains all tripartite sets of product states. Inside that there are three other circles of medium size. Each of which contains sets that are locally distinguishable in at least one bipartition (label of the bipartition is mentioned on the circle). Intersection of any two such circles difference intersection of all three such circles generates each of the regions labeled as 1, 2, 3. These regions contain sets which are locally distinguishable in only two bipartitions. However, intersection of all three circles (of medium size) is labeled as 4. This region contains those sets which are distinguishable across all the bipartitions. Inside region 4, there is a small circle labeled as 5, this region represents all fully distinguishable tripartite sets. Next, if one takes the difference the difference between the outer most circle and the union of three circles (of medium size) then there is region 6, which contains only the genuinely nonlocal sets.

For an $m$-partite system, we label the parties as $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m$ and corresponding Hilbert space is given by $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathcal{H}_m = C^{d_1} \otimes C^{d_2} \otimes \ldots \otimes C^{d_m}$, where $d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_m$ are the dimensions of the subsystems of the sets of product states of the sets of Eq. (1) for any number of parties, $m \geq 4$. We mention here that this generalization of $m$-qudit case is originally given in Ref. [38], while the $m$-qudit case is given in Ref. [49]. We first discuss that though in the tripartite case, these sets are fully bidistinguishable but when the number of parties increases, such a set may not be a fully bidistinguishable. Remember that because of the construction, if any two adjacent parties come together in single location and perform measurements together then the sets become distinguishable. This can be easily shown following the same technique as given in Protocol 1 for any number of parties and for any dimension of the subsystems. Therefore, the question arises what happens when the parties coming together are not adjacent. If the number of par-
Notice that in the above basis first few states are twisted and other states are simple product states. We now write the generalized set for $m = 4$ in a particular bipartition, that is, $A_1 A_3 A_2 A_4$ bipartition and it is given as the following:

$$|0i⟩|00 ± 0i⟩, |00 ± 0i⟩|0⟩,$$

Thus, for $m = 4$, the generalized set of Eq. (1) forms a fully bidistinguishable set but there are tripartitions in which this set can show local indistinguishability, for example, $A_1 A_3 |A_2 A_4⟩ A_5$ tripartition as in case of this tripartition no adjacent parties are coming together. This leads us to the following observation:

**Observation 1.** A fully bidistinguishable set can show local indistinguishability across a $k$-partition, where $2 < k < m$.

To distinguish this generalized set, a bipartite entangled state can be sufficient but that state must be shared between any two adjacent parties. In general, if a $m$-partite nonlocal set is given which is locally distinguishable across all bipartitions and also across all multipartitions (for $2 < k < m$) then there exists a bipartite resource state which can be shared between any two parties and is also sufficient to distinguish the set perfectly by LOCC. It will be interesting if it is possible to construct such sets for higher $m$ ($m > 4$). In the discussion, so far, we have seen many examples of multipartite nonlocal sets for which a bipartite entangled state can be sufficient to distinguish the sets perfectly. On the other hand, there are multipartite nonlocal sets to distinguish which perfectly by LOCC entangled resources across every bipartition is necessary [42, 51, 52]. Therefore, the intermediate question is that whether it is possible to construct an $m$-partite nonlocal set, $m > 4$, to distinguish which an $m'$-partite entangled resource is necessary, where $2 < m' < m$. Obviously, this particular question is connected with those $m'$-partite nonlocal sets for which any $m'$ parties come together then the sets become distinguishable. In fact, **Observation 1** indicates that there is a possibility to construct a $m'$-partite set, $m > 4$, which is indistinguishable across every $k$-partition, $2 < k < m$, while the set may show local distinguishability in certain bipartitions. Here, it is important to mention that if a set is locally indistinguishable across every bipartition then the set must be indistinguishable across every $k$-partition. We now construct a set which forms a complete basis in $(C^3)^{⊗4}$. The basis is given as the following:

$$
\begin{align*}
|0⟩|0⟩|0⟩|0⟩, & |0⟩|0⟩|0⟩|1⟩, |0⟩|0⟩|0⟩|0⟩, |1⟩|0⟩|0⟩|0⟩, |0⟩|1⟩|0⟩|0⟩, \\
|0⟩|0⟩|0⟩|0⟩, & |0⟩|0⟩|1⟩|0⟩, |0⟩|0⟩|0⟩|1⟩, |0⟩|1⟩|0⟩|0⟩, |0⟩|0⟩|0⟩|0⟩, \\
|0⟩|1⟩|2⟩|2⟩, & |0⟩|2⟩|0⟩|1⟩, |1⟩|0⟩|0⟩|0⟩, |0⟩|2⟩|0⟩|2⟩, |0⟩|0⟩|2⟩|2⟩, \\
|0⟩|1⟩|0⟩|1⟩, & |0⟩|1⟩|0⟩|1⟩, |0⟩|0⟩|2⟩|0⟩, |0⟩|2⟩|0⟩|2⟩, |1⟩|0⟩|2⟩|2⟩, \\
|2⟩|0⟩|0⟩|0⟩, & |2⟩|0⟩|0⟩|0⟩, |2⟩|0⟩|0⟩|0⟩, |2⟩|0⟩|0⟩|0⟩, |2⟩|0⟩|0⟩|0⟩.
\end{align*}
$$

Notice that in the above basis first few states are twisted and other states are simple product states. We now
present the following proposition for the above basis.

**Proposition 2.** If any two parties come together then also the above basis shows local indistinguishability. Therefore, the basis must be indistinguishable across all tripartitions.

The proof is given in the Appendix A. However, it is easy to check that if three parties come together then the basis can be perfectly distinguished by LOCC. Furthermore, because of the construction if a party stands alone then no state can be eliminated by orthogonality-preserving LOCC [49]. Therefore, a resource state distributed among three parties is necessary to distinguish the basis. Nevertheless, the resource related discussion so far lead us to the following important observation:

**Observation 2.** Given an $m$-partite nonlocal set. If to distinguish the set perfectly by LOCC an $m'$-partite ($2 \leq m' \leq m$) resource is necessary then the number $m'$ must be minimized over all $k$-partitions, $1 < k < m$.

The above observation clearly indicates a threshold problem of distinguishability: If a set of $m$-partite orthogonal product states is given then what is the minimum number of parties which have to come together in a single location such that the set becomes perfectly distinguishable. Note that the multipartite sets which are indistinguishable in a particular bipartition, may have application in case of entanglement distribution. A particular such scenario regarding entanglement distribution by sending a separable qubit is presented in the following section.

V. BOUND ENTANGLEMENT DISTRIBUTION

Here we discuss the problem of distributing bound entanglement by sending a separable qubit. The protocol we describe here consists of minimum number of particles. A schematic diagram is given in Fig. 2. We start with a set of product states. To construct the set first consider few of the states given in Eq. (2). We consider only the states $\{|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle, |\psi_3\rangle, |\psi_4\rangle, |\psi_5\rangle, |\psi_6\rangle\}$. Along with these states we add another state $|s\rangle = |0 + 1 + 2\rangle |0 + 1\rangle |0 + 1\rangle$. By Proposition 1, the new set must be locally distinguishable across $B|CA$ and $C|AB$ bipartitions (these symbols contain usual meaning as defined in Sec. III). Next, we define a tripartite mixed state in $C^3 \otimes C^2 \otimes C^2$ and it is given as:

$$\rho_{ABC} = \frac{1}{6} (I - \sum_{i=1}^{6} |\psi_i\rangle \langle \psi_i|),$$

where the states $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{6}$ are the normalized version of the states $\{|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle, |\psi_3\rangle, |\psi_4\rangle, |\psi_5\rangle, |\psi_6\rangle\}$ respectively and $I$ is the identity operator acting on the corresponding Hilbert space. Initially, this state is shared between Alice and Bob in a way that Alice possesses the particles $A$ and $C$, and Bob possesses the particle $B$. Then Alice sends the particle $C$ to Bob to establish bound entanglement between them. We say that the initial entanglement is $E_{fin}$ which is $E_{AC|B}$, that is, the amount of entanglement contained in the state $\rho_{ABC}$ in $AC|B$ bipartition. Similarly, the amount of entanglement which is communicated is $E_{com}$ which is $E_{C|AB}$, that is, the amount of entanglement contained in the state $\rho_{ABC}$ in $C|AB$ bipartition. Finally, after the communication of the particle, the entanglement is $E_{fin}$, that is, the amount of entanglement contained by the state $\rho_{ABC}$ in $A|BC$ bipartition. Here, we show that the state $\rho_{ABC}$ is separable in $B|AC$, $C|AB$ bipartitions but entangled with positive partial transpose in $A|BC$ bipartition. These implies that $E_{fin} > 0$ while $E_{fin} = E_{com} = 0$. In this way, bound entanglement can be distributed by sending a separable qubit. Notice that by Proposition 1, the set $\{|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle, |\psi_5\rangle, |\psi_6\rangle, |\psi_9\rangle, |s\rangle\}$ must be extended to a complete orthogonal product basis in $B|AC$, $C|AB$ bipartitions. Therefore, the state $\rho_{ABC}$ must be separable in those two bipartitions. We now proceed to prove that the state $\rho_{ABC}$ is entangled in $A|BC$ bipartition. For this purpose, we first consider the state $\rho_{ABC}$ in $C^3 \otimes C^4$. Because of the construction, the state $\rho_{ABC}$ must remain positive under partial transpose operation. To detect the entanglement of the state $\rho_{ABC}$ in that bipartition, we apply the technique described in Ref. [87, 88]. We use the celebrated Choi map [86], $\Lambda : M_3 \rightarrow M_3$, and a unitary operator $\mathcal{U}$ for the purpose of the detection of entanglement. Action of the Choi map (along with the unitary operator) is described below:

$$\left(\Lambda_{\mathcal{U}} \otimes \mathbb{I}\right) \rho_{ABC} = (\Lambda \otimes \mathbb{I})(\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathbb{I})\rho_{ABC} (\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathbb{I})^\dagger,$$

$$\Lambda : \left\{ (a_{ij}) \right\} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} + a_{22} & -a_{12} & -a_{13} \\ -a_{21} & a_{22} + a_{33} & -a_{23} \\ -a_{31} & -a_{32} & a_{33} + a_{11} \end{bmatrix} ,$$

where $\mathcal{U}$ is a unitary operator and $\mathbb{I}$ is the identity operator acting on the subsystems $BC$ together. Here, we
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FIG. 2. (Color online) Initially Alice possesses both the particles $A$ and $C$ and Bob possesses the particle $B$. Initially there is no entanglement between Alice and Bob. Thereafter, Alice communicates the particle $C$ to Bob via a noiseless quantum channel. Communicated entanglement is also zero. Finally, after the communication of $C$, there is bound entanglement between Alice and Bob.
apply the following unitary operator:

\[
U = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 \\
-\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

One can easily check that the minimum eigenvalue of the operator \((A_{\mathcal{U}} \otimes I)\rho_{A|B|C}\) is negative which confirms that the state \(\rho_{ABC}\) is entangled in \(A|B|C\) bipartition. Thus, the protocol of distributing bound entanglement by sending a separable qubit is successfully accomplished. In the next section the conclusion is drawn.

VI. CONCLUSION

We have considered here the local distinguishability of multipartite orthogonal product states across the bipartitions and also across the multipartitions. A complete classification of tripartite systems has been given. Few multipartite cases have also been studied which never occur in case of tripartite systems. This study is important to understand how a resource state can be shared among parties in order to distinguish a nonlocal set perfectly. As a useful consequence of the present study, it has been shown that the sets which are locally indistinguishable across a particular bipartition, may have application to constitute protocols for the distribution of bound entanglement by sending separable qubits. An explicit scenario has been shown considering minimum number of particles. However, there are few open problems which can be considered for further studies. For example, a generalized scenario is required to construct, for the distribution of higher dimensional bound entanglement starting from locally indistinguishable product states. Furthermore, it will also be interesting to explore if there are other applications of the multipartite mixed entangled states which are bound entangled only in a particular bipartition.
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Appendix A

Before we present the details of the proof of Proposition 2, it is required to give the definition of a nontrivial orthogonality-preserving measurement (NOPM). In this regard also see Refs. [22, 23].

**Definition 1.** Suppose a set of orthogonal quantum states is given and to distinguish these states a measurement is performed. If after performing that measurement the post measurement states remain orthogonal then such a measurement is an orthogonality-preserving measurement. Furthermore, if all the positive operator valued measure (POVM) elements describing that measurement are proportional to an identity operator then such a measurement is a trivial orthogonality-preserving measurement. Otherwise, it is a nontrivial orthogonality-preserving measurement.

We now proceed to prove that if \(A_1\) and \(A_2\) (the notations which we use in this appendix section, contain usual meaning as defined in Sec. IV) come together in a single location then they are not able to begin with a NOPM in order to distinguish the basis of Eq. (4). For this purpose we consider the basis in \(A_1A_2|A_3A_4\) bipartition \(C^9 \otimes C^3 \otimes C^3\) and relabel it in the following way: \(|00\rangle \rightarrow |0\rangle, |01\rangle \rightarrow |1\rangle, |02\rangle \rightarrow |2\rangle, |10\rangle \rightarrow |3\rangle, |11\rangle \rightarrow |4\rangle, |12\rangle \rightarrow |5\rangle, |20\rangle \rightarrow |6\rangle, |21\rangle \rightarrow |7\rangle, |22\rangle \rightarrow |8\rangle\). The relabeled basis is given as:

\[
\begin{align*}
|0\rangle & \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 \end{bmatrix}, |1\rangle & \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 0 \end{bmatrix}, |2\rangle & \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 0 \end{bmatrix}, |3\rangle & \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 0 \end{bmatrix}, |4\rangle & \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 \end{bmatrix}, |5\rangle & \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 \end{bmatrix}, |6\rangle & \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 \end{bmatrix}, |7\rangle & \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 \end{bmatrix}, |8\rangle & \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 \end{bmatrix},
\end{align*}
\]

An orthogonality-preserving measurement performed by \(A_1\) and \(A_2\) together can be described by a set of positive operator valued measure (POVM) elements \(\{\Pi_i\}\), where \(\sum \Pi_i = I\). The matrix form of any such POVM element can be written in a basis \(\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8\}\). Notice that the dimension of the joint system of \(A_1\) and \(A_2\) is nine and thus, it is obvious that the POVM elements which describe a measurement performed by \(A_1\)
and $A_2$ together, must be $9 \times 9$ matrices. The matrix form of any $\Pi_i = M_i^\dagger M_i$ is given as the following:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
a_{00} & a_{01} & a_{02} & a_{03} & a_{04} & a_{05} & a_{06} & a_{07} & a_{08} \\
a_{10} & a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} & a_{14} & a_{15} & a_{16} & a_{17} & a_{18} \\
a_{20} & a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} & a_{24} & a_{25} & a_{26} & a_{27} & a_{28} \\
a_{30} & a_{31} & a_{32} & a_{33} & a_{34} & a_{35} & a_{36} & a_{37} & a_{38} \\
a_{40} & a_{41} & a_{42} & a_{43} & a_{44} & a_{45} & a_{46} & a_{47} & a_{48} \\
a_{50} & a_{51} & a_{52} & a_{53} & a_{54} & a_{55} & a_{56} & a_{57} & a_{58} \\
a_{60} & a_{61} & a_{62} & a_{63} & a_{64} & a_{65} & a_{66} & a_{67} & a_{68} \\
a_{70} & a_{71} & a_{72} & a_{73} & a_{74} & a_{75} & a_{76} & a_{77} & a_{78} \ \\
a_{80} & a_{81} & a_{82} & a_{83} & a_{84} & a_{85} & a_{86} & a_{87} & a_{88} 
\end{pmatrix}
\] (A2)

Keeping post-measurement states orthogonal if $A_1$ and $A_2$ together want to perform a nontrivial measurement then not all the POVM elements $\Pi_i$ should be proportional to an identity operator. Now, we examine the off-diagonal entries of the above matrix. Because the post-measurement states are orthogonal to each other so $\left< 0 1 \right> \left< 0 + 1 \right> = 0$. So, $a_{01} = a_{10} = 0$. Repeating the same method, it is possible to show that all off-diagonal entries of the above matrix are zero (given in the following table):

**TABLE I. Off-diagonal entries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. no.</th>
<th>entries</th>
<th>Sl. no.</th>
<th>entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 0</td>
<td>$a_{01} = a_{10} = 0$</td>
<td>(2) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0</td>
<td>$a_{02} = a_{20} = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{03} = a_{30} = 0$</td>
<td>(4) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 0</td>
<td>$a_{04} = a_{40} = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{05} = a_{50} = 0$</td>
<td>(6) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{06} = a_{60} = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{07} = a_{70} = 0$</td>
<td>(8) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{08} = a_{80} = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{12} = a_{21} = 0$</td>
<td>(10) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{13} = a_{31} = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{14} = a_{41} = 0$</td>
<td>(12) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{15} = a_{51} = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{16} = a_{61} = 0$</td>
<td>(14) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{17} = a_{71} = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{18} = a_{81} = 0$</td>
<td>(16) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{19} = a_{91} = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{24} = a_{42} = 0$</td>
<td>(18) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{25} = a_{52} = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{26} = a_{62} = 0$</td>
<td>(20) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{27} = a_{72} = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{28} = a_{82} = 0$</td>
<td>(22) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{29} = a_{92} = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{35} = a_{53} = 0$</td>
<td>(24) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{36} = a_{63} = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{37} = a_{73} = 0$</td>
<td>(26) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{38} = a_{83} = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{45} = a_{54} = 0$</td>
<td>(28) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{46} = a_{64} = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{47} = a_{74} = 0$</td>
<td>(30) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{48} = a_{84} = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{56} = a_{85} = 0$</td>
<td>(32) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{57} = a_{75} = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{58} = a_{86} = 0$</td>
<td>(34) 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>$a_{67} = a_{76} = 0$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, we examine the diagonal entries. Considering the inner product $\left< 0 + 1 \right| 2 \right| 1 \right| \Pi_i \otimes \Pi_i \otimes I \otimes I | 0 + 1 | 0 | 0 = 0$, we get $a_{00} = a_{11}$. Repeating the same approach we get that all diagonal entries of the above matrix are equal (given in the following table):

**TABLE II. Diagonal entries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>states</th>
<th>entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>3 \pm 4 \rangle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>0 \pm 1 \rangle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>0 \pm 3 \rangle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>2 \pm 5 \rangle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, it is proved that the POVM elements $\{ \Pi_i \}$ are proportional to an identity operator. As a result of which $A_1$ and $A_2$ together cannot begin with a NOPM. This implies if $A_1$ and $A_2$ come together in a single location then it does not contribute to the local distinguishability of the considered basis (see Refs. [22, 23]). Now, this holds
true for all pair of adjacent parties as the basis captures a particular type of symmetry. For non adjacent pairs of parties like $A_1 A_3$ and $A_2 A_4$, they cannot help for perfect discrimination by coming together and it is because of the first 16 states of the basis (see Eq. (4)): first two columns in first row). For the proof see Sec. IV. Thus, if any two parties come together then also the basis shows local indistinguishability which implies that the basis is locally indistinguishable across all tripartitions. Here the proof is completed.


