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The hierarchy of nonlocality and entanglement in multipartite systems is one of the fundamental problems in quantum physics. Existing studies on this topic to date were limited to the entanglement classification according to the numbers of particles enrolled. Equivalence under stochastic local operations and classical communication provides a more detailed classification, e. g. the genuine three-qubit entanglement being divided into W and GHZ classes. We construct two families of local models for the three-qubit Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ)-symmetric states, whose entanglement classes have a complete description. The key technology of construction the local models in this work is the GHZ symmetrization on tripartite extensions of the optimal local-hidden-state models for Bell diagonal states. Our models show that entanglement and nonlocality are inequivalent for all the entanglement classes (biseparable, W, and GHZ) in three-qubit systems.

I. INTRODUCTION

Several concepts of nonclassical correlations in composite quantum systems have been presented to reveal significant differences between the quantum and classical worlds [1–5]. Many of them can be traced back to the early days of quantum mechanics, and play key roles in different quantum information processes. In general, these correlations arise from coherent superposition of composite quantum systems, and are equivalent to each other in pure states. The classical probabilities in mixed states divide them into hierarchies, and thereby lead to different classical-quantum boundaries[5]. The hierarchy of quantum correlations is an important issue in both fundamental quantum theory and practical applications of quantum information.

Studies on the hierarchy of quantum correlations often need carefully examining their related classicality. Entanglement exists in nonseparable states, while a separable state is defined as the one can be expressed as a mixture of product states [2]. Nonlocality [3, 4] is demonstrated by the absence of local-hidden-variable (LHV) models for the outcomes of local measurements, which can be detected by the violation of Bell inequality. The nonlocal states are a strict subset of the entangled states, as all separable states and a part of entangled states can be modeled by LHV theories. The existence of LHV models for separable states is trivial, but for entangled states is an important progress, which is found by Werner [6] in a family of bipartite mixed states, nowadays known as the Werner states.

Since Werner putted forward his original results [6], the relation between entanglement and nonlocality for bipartite quantum systems has been intensively discussed in many directions, including performing general measurements nonsequentially [7] or sequentially [8] and in the schemes using several copies [9–13]. However very few works for multipartite systems have been reported. Here, the interesting also the difficult point is that multipartite states offer a richer variety of different types of entanglement and nonlocality. The notions of genuine multipartite entanglement (GME) and genuine multipartite nonlocality (GMNL) among a whole system have been proposed to distinguish them with the weak entanglement in subsystems. Research on the locality of multipartite entangled states was initiated by Tóth and Acín [14], who found a fully local model for a family of three-qubit states with GME. Recent two works extended the investigation to the systems with any number of parties. Augusiak et al. [15] showed GME and GMNL are inequivalent by constructing a bilocal model, in which the parties are separated into two groups, for a class of GME states. Bowles et al. [16] found that there exist states with GME admitting a fully LHV model, which can never lead to any Bell inequality violation for general nonsequential measurements.

On the other hand, Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) steering, the quantum correlation lying between nonlocality and entanglement, has been widely studied both theoretically and experimentally since its operational definition was provided by Wiseman et al. [17]. It exists in the entangled states whose unnormalized postmeasured states, after one-side local measurements, cannot be described by a local-hidden-state (LHS) model. A LHS model is a particular case of a LHV model with the hidden variable being a local state. The EPR steering is not only an important resource in quantum information processes [18–20], but also acts as a powerful tool in researches of entanglement and nonlocality, such as in the construction of counterexamples to the Peres conjecture [21–23], generalizing Gisin’s theorem[24, 25] and designing the algorithms for LHV models[26, 27]

In this work, we investigate the hierarchy of entanglement and nonlocality, considering arbitrary projective measurements, in the GHZ-symmetric states (GHZ is for Greenberger–Horne–Zeilinger) [28, 29], by using the optimal LHS model for Bell diagonal states [30, 31]. The GHZ-symmetric states are a two-parameter family of three-qubit states sharing the symmetries of the GHZ state. Eltschka and Siewert [28] gave a complete descrip-
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tion of their entanglement class with respect to stochastic local operations and classical communication (SLOCC) [32, 33]. The SLOCC classification is more detailed than the scheme according to the number of parties, for instance the GME in three-qubit states is divided into W and GHZ classes. One should expect interesting and novel phenomena due to the subtle structure of entanglement. In particular, a natural question is here whether a specific type of GME, W or GHZ, can serves as a sufficient condition for GMNL.

The optimal LHS models for Bell diagonal states provide a concise criteria for EPR steering for such family of two-qubit states [30]. Our technique in this work can be divided into two steps. First, by replacing the hidden state in the mentioned optimal model with a two-qubit state, we construct a local model for a tripartite state. Generally speaking, it is difficult to determine the entanglement class of the tripartite state. And the bilocal model offers a nagetive answer to the above question that, neither the W nor GHZ entanglement class and its local model simultaneously, and thereby perform the GHZ symmetrization [28, 29] on the tripartite state. Generally speaking, it is difficult to determine the sufficient condition for EPR steering for such family of two-qubit states [30]. Our technique in this work can provide a concise criteria for EPR steering for such family of GME, W or GHZ, can serves as a sufficient condition for the genuine tripartite nonlocality.

II. TWO-QUBIT GHZ-SYMMETRIC STATES

Let us begin with the two-qubit GHZ-symmetric states introduced by Siewert and Eltschka [29]. Although the LHV models we present in this part is trivially reformulated from the the existed LHS models, the following results will serve as important tools for the tripartite case.

The GHZ-symmetric states of a two-qubit system share the symmetries of the two Bell states $|\phi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle \pm |11\rangle)$ and can be written as

$$
\rho^S = (\sqrt{2}q + p) |\phi^+\rangle \langle \phi^+ | + (\sqrt{2}q - p) |\phi^-\rangle \langle \phi^- | + (1 - 2\sqrt{2}q) I_4,
$$

(1)

where the convex set that defines a triangle on the plane of $(p, q)$ is shown in Fig. 1. The separable boundary are two lines of $q = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \pm \sqrt{2}p$.

The optimal LHS models for Bell diagonal states are of the form $\rho_B = \frac{1}{4} (I + (T \vec{\sigma}) \cdot \vec{\sigma})$, with $\vec{\sigma} = (\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z)^T$ being the vector of Pauli operators. The matrices of GHZ-symmetric states (1) satisfy $T_x = -T_y = 2p$ and $T_z = 2\sqrt{2}q$.
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probability and the corresponding hidden state are given by
\[ \omega(\vec{\lambda}) = \frac{|T_0 \vec{\lambda}|}{2\pi}, \]
\[ P_A(a|x, \vec{\lambda}) = \frac{1}{2} [1 + a \text{sgn} (\vec{x} \cdot \vec{\lambda})], \]
\[ \rho_\lambda = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{1} + \vec{x} \cdot \vec{\sigma}), \]
with \( \vec{\lambda} = T_0 \vec{\lambda}/|T_0 \vec{\lambda}|. \) Substituting them into the integral (3), one can find that they satisfy \( \rho_s^\varphi = \rho^\text{LHV}, \) when the normalization condition
\[ \int |T_0 \vec{\lambda}| d\vec{\lambda} = 2\pi, \]
is fulfilled. And the EPR-steerable boundary is determined by the normalization condition (6). One can trivially construct a LHV model here by introducing the response function for part B
\[ P_B(b|q, \vec{\lambda}) = \text{Tr}(\Pi_B^p \rho_\lambda), \]
where the projection operator \( \Pi_B^p \) has the similar definition as \( \Pi_A^{x}. \) Then, the outcomes of local measurements can be simulated by the LHV model as
\[ P(a, b|x, q) = \text{Tr}(\Pi_A^{x} \otimes \Pi_B^p \rho^B) \]
\[ = \int \omega(\vec{\lambda}) P_A(a|x, \vec{\lambda}) P_B(b|q, \vec{\lambda}) d\vec{\lambda}. \]
(8)

We can explicitly solve the integral for the GHZ-symmetric states (1) and express it as
\[ \frac{1}{|2p|} = |w| + \frac{\text{arccosh} |w|}{\sqrt{w^2 - 1}}, \]
with \( w = \sqrt{2q}/p. \) It is the EPR-steerable boundary on the plane of \((p, q)\) displayed as the black curve in Fig. 1. The states between the curve and the separable boundary can be sufficiently determined to be entangled but without nonlocality.

III. THREE-QUBIT GHZ-SYMMETRIC STATES

We now turn to the three-qubit GHZ-symmetric states. These states share the following symmetries of the two GHZ states \(|G_\pm\rangle = 1/\sqrt{2}(|000\rangle \pm |111\rangle)\): (i) qubit permutations, (ii) simultaneous three-qubit flips (i.e., application of \( \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x \)), (iii) qubit rotations about the \( z \) axis of the form \( U(\phi_1, \phi_2) = e^{i\phi_1 \sigma_z} \otimes e^{i\phi_2 \sigma_z} \otimes e^{-i(\phi_1 + \phi_2) \sigma_z}. \)

The standard GHZ states \(|G_{\pm}\rangle\) are located at the two upper corners, and the maximally mixed state \( 1/3 \mathbb{1} \) at the origin. Different classes of entanglement (separable, biseparable, W and GHZ) are indicated from yellow to red in order. Their boundary in order are defined by: \(|p| = -\sqrt{q^2 + q} \) (separable), \(|p| = -\sqrt{q^2 - q} \) (biseparable/biseparable), \(|p| = \sqrt{q^2 - q} \) (GHZ/W), and \(|p| = \sqrt{q^2 - q} \) (W/GHZ). The black solid curve corresponds to \( \rho^S[\rho_1(T_0)] \), which admits a bilocal model, and satisfies the equation (9) but with \( w = (2\sqrt{3q} - 1)/|2p| \). The dashed curve corresponds to \( \rho^S[\rho_2(T_1)] \), which admits a fully LHV model, and satisfies the parametric equation (23).

They are of the form
\[ \rho^S = \left( \frac{2q}{\sqrt{3}} + p \right) |G_+\rangle \langle G_+| + \left( \frac{2q}{\sqrt{3}} - p \right) |G_-\rangle \langle G_-| \]
\[ + \left( 1 - \frac{4q}{\sqrt{3}} \right) \frac{\mathbb{1}}{8}, \]
where the two parameters satisfy \( -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \leq q \leq \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \) and \(|p| \leq \frac{1}{8} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4} \). As shown in Fig. 2, this family of states forms an isosceles triangle in the state space. Two pure states \(|G_\pm\rangle\) locate at the two upper corners, and origin corresponds to the maximally mixed state \( 1/8 \). Eltschka and Siewert [28] divide the triangle into four regions according the entanglement classes as fully separable, biseparable, W, or GHZ, which are displayed by different colors in Fig. 2.

For an arbitrary three-qubit state \( \rho \), one can derive a corresponding GHZ-symmetric state by performing a GHZ symmetrization
\[ \rho^S(\rho) = \int du(u \rho u\dagger), \]
where the integral is to cover the entire GHZ symmetry group, i.e., the operations in (i), (ii), (iii) and their products. The coordinates of \( \rho^S(\rho) \) can be inferred from two
matrix elements of $\rho$ as
\[
p = \frac{1}{2} \left( \langle G_+ | \rho | G_+ \rangle - \langle G_- | \rho | G_- \rangle \right),
p = \frac{1}{2} \left( \langle G_+ | \rho | G_+ \rangle + \langle G_- | \rho | G_- \rangle - \frac{1}{4} \right).
\]
(12)

We make a remark here that, to obtain a state $\rho^S(\rho)$, the state $\rho$ does not need to be a state. Namely, the operator $\rho$ is required to be Hermitian and normalized, but the positive semi-definiteness can be replaced with the condition that its corresponding $(p, q)$ are in the physical region. In the following parts, we actually utilize such states to construct local GHZ-symmetric states.

The nonlocality (GMNL, bilocality or full locality) of $\rho$ is preserved by the operations in (i), (ii) and (iii), which are local unitary or permutations. Consequently, the GHZ symmetrization only could reduce or preserve the nonlocality. Here to change means to reduce the nonlocality into a weaker one, e.g., to change GMNL into bilocality or full locality. Said a different way, if the state $\rho$ admits a LHV model, by symmetrizing the model, we can construct a one for $\rho^S(\rho)$. Based on this idea and the results in two-qubit case, we have the following models for $\rho_S$ and sufficient criterions for its locality.

### A. Bilocal model

A direct result can be obtained by replacing the basis $\{(00), (11)\}$ of $B$ in two-qubit GHZ symmetric states with $\{(00), (11)\}$ of system $B$ and $C$. This leads to a family of three-qubit states for $ABC$

\[
\rho_1(T) = \frac{1}{4} \left[ \mathbb{I} \otimes \Sigma_0 + (T \vec{\sigma}) \cdot \vec{\Sigma} \right],
\]
(13)

where $\Sigma_0 = |00\rangle \langle 00| + |11\rangle \langle 11|$, $\Sigma_x = |00\rangle \langle 11| + |11\rangle \langle 00|$, $\Sigma_y = -i|00\rangle \langle 11| + i|11\rangle \langle 00|$, and $\Sigma_z = |00\rangle \langle 00| - |11\rangle \langle 11|$. The generalized Pauli matrices in the subspace of $\{|00\rangle, |11\rangle\}$.

When $T = T_0$ satisfy the normalization condition (6) and thereby on the EPR-steerable boundary, The tripartite states naturally admit a family of LHV models as

\[
P_b(a, b, c|\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \vec{z}) = \text{Tr} \left[ \Pi^{x}_a \otimes \Pi^{y}_b \otimes \Pi^{z}_c \rho_1(T_0) \right]
\]
(14)

where $P_B(b, c|\vec{y}, \vec{z}, \vec{X}) = \text{Tr} (\Pi^{y}_b \otimes \Pi^{z}_c \rho^{BC}_{\lambda})$, $\rho^{BC}_{\lambda} = \frac{1}{4} (\Sigma_0 + \vec{X} \cdot \vec{\Sigma})$, and other parameters and functions are defined in (20). Since the bipartite state $\rho^{BC}_{\lambda}$ is an entangled pure state in general, the response function $P_B(b, c|\vec{y}, \vec{z}, \vec{X})$ can not be further decomposed. The models are bilocal, which exclude GMNL in the states but allow bipartite nonlocality between $B$ and $C$.

One can now symmetrize the states $\rho_1(T_0)$ into the GHZ symmetric family. Actually, only the permutations are necessary, as the states are invariant under three-qubit flips and the rotations $U(\phi_1, \phi_2)$. The corresponding GHZ-symmetric states $\rho^S[\rho_1(T_0)]$ draw a curve, which can also be parameterized as the equation (9) but with $w = (\sqrt{3}q - 1/4)/p$, on the plane of $(p, q)$ as shown in Fig. 2. They admit a bilocal model which can be expressed as an average of the one in (14) and its two permutations of $A \leftrightarrow B$ and $A \leftrightarrow C$. We omit the formula here.

The convex combinations of $\rho^S[\rho_1(T_0)]$ and fully separable states form the region under the curve for $\rho^S[\rho_1(T_0)]$ in the triangle, in which the GMNL is certainly excluded. It is worth noting that curve passes through both W and GHZ entanglement, although it is just marginally higher than the W/GHZ boundary near the state $\rho^S = \frac{1}{2} (|G_+\rangle \langle G_+| + |G_-\rangle \langle G_-|)$. Consequently, both the two classes of genuine three-qubit entanglement, W and GHZ, are inequivalent to genuine three-qubit nonlocality.

One can observe the deviations of $\rho^S[\rho_1(T_0)]$ from the entanglement boundaries by deriving its entanglement degrees, shown in Fig. 3. We adopt three measures for the entanglement in GHZ-symmetric states. The three-tangle is a natural choice to quantify the GHZ entanglement, as Siewert and Eltschka [29] have derived its analytical results for the GHZ-symmetric states. Given a state with coordinates $(p, q)$ ($p \geq 0$, without loss of generality), its three-tangle is given by

\[
\tau_3(p, q) = \max \left\{ 0, p - \frac{p^W}{2} - p^W \right\}
\]
(15)

where $p^W$ is the $p$ coordinate of the intersection point of the straight line, connecting $(p, q)$ and the corner for $|G_+\rangle$, and the W/GHZ boundary. The GHZ-symmetric states belong to the family of three-qubit X matrices. Their total entanglement (opposite to full separability) and GME can be measured by two generalizations of
The parameter and matrix in the states are determined by the first part of the LHV model, by modifying the hidden state \( \{ |\lambda, \mu, \lambda \rangle \} \) corresponding to the two opposite triangles. As shown in Fig. 3, the GHZ state as

\[ p_{BC}(b,c|\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \vec{z}) = \frac{1}{2} \int \omega(\vec{\lambda}) |\lambda, \mu, \lambda \rangle \rho_{BC}(b,c|\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \vec{z}) d\vec{\mu}, \]

with a hidden variable \( \vec{\mu} \) and a distribution \( \tau(\vec{\mu}, \vec{\lambda}) \), the integral in (14) presents a fully LHV model as

\[ P_f(a,b,c|\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \vec{z}) = \int \omega(\vec{\lambda}) P_A(a|\vec{x}, \vec{\lambda}) P_f(b,c|\vec{y}, \vec{\lambda}) d\vec{\lambda}. \]

Here, the hidden variable is \( (\vec{x}, \vec{\mu}) \) in a joint distribution \( \Omega(\vec{x}, \vec{\mu}) = \omega(\vec{\lambda}) \tau(\vec{\mu}, \vec{\lambda}) \).

To analytically construct a fully local model for GHZ-symmetric states, we extend the three-qubit states (13) to the form

\[ \rho_2(T) = \frac{1}{4} \left[ b \otimes \Sigma_0 + (T \bar{r}) \cdot \bar{S} \right] + \frac{1}{2} (1 - t) T \otimes D_{01}, \]

where \( t \in [0, 1] \) and \( D_{01} \) is a normalized diagonal state in the subspace of \( \{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\} \). The coordinates of \( \rho^S(\rho_2(T)) \) are determined by the first part of \( \rho_2(T) \) as

\[ p = \frac{1}{2} T_x, \quad q = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} \left( t + T_x - \frac{1}{2} \right). \]

We now present a one-parameter family of fully LHV models corresponding to a family of states in above form. Suppose that the parameter and matrix in the states are \( t = t_1 \) and \( T = T_1 \). The hidden variable is still choose as a vector \( \vec{\lambda} \) on a unit sphere. We define its distribution, the conditional probability and the corresponding hidden state as

\[ \omega(\vec{\lambda}) = \frac{|T_1 \vec{\lambda}|}{2\pi} \left[ 1 + g(\vec{\lambda}) \right] , \]

\[ P_A(a|\vec{x}, \vec{\lambda}) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + a \text{sgn}(\vec{x} \cdot \vec{\lambda}) \right] , \]

\[ \rho_{BC} = \frac{1}{1 + q(\lambda)} \left[ \left( \Sigma_0 + \vec{x} \otimes \vec{y} \otimes \vec{z} \right) + q(\vec{\lambda})D_{01} \right] , \]

where \( \vec{x} = T_1 \vec{\lambda}/|T_1 \vec{\lambda}| \), \( q(\vec{\lambda}) \in [0, 1] \) and \( q(-\vec{\lambda}) = q(\vec{\lambda}) \).

Substituting them into (17) and requiring

\[ P_f(a,b,c|\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \vec{z}) = \text{Tr} \left[ \Pi_0^T \otimes \Pi_0^T \otimes \Pi_0^T \rho_2(T) \right] , \]

one can obtain the relations

\[ \int \frac{|T_1 \vec{\lambda}|}{2\pi} d\vec{\lambda} = t_1, \quad \int \frac{|T_1 \vec{\lambda}|}{2\pi} q(\vec{\lambda}) d\vec{\lambda} = 1 - t_1. \]

Therefore, a given form of \( q(\vec{\lambda}) \) can determine a curve on the triangle. We choose \( q(\vec{\lambda}) = \min\{\sin \theta''(\vec{\lambda}, c = 1 - w_c) \} \), where \( \theta'' \) is the angle between the positive z-axis and \( \vec{\lambda}^T \), and \( w_c \approx 0.354 \) is the value of \( w \) on the intersection point of the curve (9) and the side of the triangle for two-qubit case. The definition of \( D_{01} \) corresponding to the two options is \( D_{01} = (|1\rangle\langle 0| + |0\rangle\langle 1|)/2 \) for \( \vec{\lambda} = \sin \theta'' \) and \( D_{01} = \cos^2 \theta'' |0\rangle\langle 0| + \sin^2 \theta'' |1\rangle\langle 1| \) for \( \vec{\lambda} = 1 - w_c \).

In the first case, \( \rho_{BC} \) is separable. In the second case, \( \rho_{BC} \) is unsteerable, as it is equivalent to the state on the above-mentioned intersection point, under the local positive linear map \( M = (e^{i\theta''} \sin \theta'' |0\rangle\langle 0| + \cos \theta'' |1\rangle\langle 1|) \otimes 1 \).

The two integrals in (22) can be explicitly solved, even though \( q(\vec{\lambda}) \) is a piecewise function. Direct calculation gives the coordinates of \( \rho^S(\rho(T_1)) \) as a parametric equation

\[ p = \frac{1}{2G(v)}, \quad q = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} \left[ \frac{G_0(v) + v}{G(v)} - \frac{1}{2} \right], \]

where \( G(v) = G_0(v) + G_1(v), \) and \( G_0(v) \) and \( G_1(v) \) are two functions of \( v, \) given by

\[ G_0(v) = \frac{v^2 \arctan \sqrt{1 - v^2}}{\sqrt{1 - v^2}} + 1, \]

\[ G_1(v) = \frac{c^2 v \sqrt{v^2 (v^2 - 1)} + \frac{\arccosh \sqrt{c^2 (v^2 - 1) + 1}}{2 c v \sqrt{v^2 - 1}} + \arctan \frac{\sqrt{1 - c^2}}{c v} + \frac{c v \sqrt{1 - c^2}}{c^2 (v^2 - 1) + 1}}{2 c^2 (v^2 - 1) + 1}. \]

The one-parameter family of states \( \rho^S(\rho(T_1)) \) draws a curve on the triangle, the region under which are of fully local states. This shows that the bipartite entanglement is not equivalent to bipartite nonlocality in the GHZ-
symmetric states.

IV. SUMMARY

We investigate the relations between entanglement and nonlocality in multipartite systems considering the SLOCC classification of entanglement. However, both determining entanglement properties and constructing local models for a given set of multipartite states are two challenges in theoretic studies. We adopt a two-parameter family of three-qubit states, the so called GHZ-symmetric states, as a research object, as the entanglement of these states has an exact description. By performing the GHZ symmetrization on the tripartite extensions of two-qubit local model, we present two one-parameter families of LHV models. These models show that both the bipartite entanglement and genuine tripartite entanglement are inequivalent to the nonlocality at the same level. In particular, neither the W GME nor the GHZ GME can serve as a sufficient condition for genuine tripartite nonlocality.

A natural open question left here is that whether both the W and GHZ type entangled states can admit a fully local model. One can try to symmetrize the fully local state $\rho_F$ constructed by Bowles et al. [16] with $N = 3$ into the GHZ-symmetric form, however the result is a seperable state. Development of new methods to construct fully LHV models for GHZ-symmetric states with GME is still necessary. An alternative approach may be to determine the entanglement class for a fully local state, such as the mentioned $\rho_F$ and $\rho_2(T_1)$ in our results. The approach of the convex characteristic curve [29, 40] offers a possible solution to classify the genuine tripartite entanglement by calculating the amount of three-tangle.
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