

# Strong quantum nonlocality from hypercubes

Fei Shi,<sup>1,\*</sup> Mao-Sheng Li,<sup>2,3,\*</sup> Mengyao Hu,<sup>4</sup> Lin Chen,<sup>5,6</sup>

Man-Hong Yung,<sup>2,7</sup> Yan-Ling Wang,<sup>8,†</sup> and Xiande Zhang<sup>9,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*School of Cyber Security, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, 230026, People's Republic of China*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics, Southern University of Science and Technology, Shenzhen 518055, China*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, China*

<sup>4</sup>*School of Mathematical Sciences, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, China*

<sup>5</sup>*LMIB and School of Mathematical Sciences, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, China*

<sup>6</sup>*International Research Institute for Multidisciplinary Science, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, China*

<sup>7</sup>*Institute for Quantum Science and Engineering, and Department of Physics, Southern University of Science and Technology, Shenzhen, 518055, China*

<sup>8</sup>*School of Computer Science and Technology, Dongguan University of Technology, Dongguan, 523808, China*

<sup>9</sup>*School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, 230026, People's Republic of China*

A set of multipartite orthogonal product states is strongly nonlocal if it is locally irreducible in every bipartition. Most known constructions of strongly nonlocal orthogonal product set (OPS) are limited to tripartite systems, and they are lack of intuitive structures. In this work, based on the decomposition for the outermost layer of an  $n$ -dimensional hypercube for  $n = 3, 4, 5$ , we successfully construct strongly nonlocal OPSs in any possible three, four and five-partite systems, which answers an open question given by Halder *et al.* [*Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 040403 (2019)] and Yuan *et al.* [*Phys. Rev. A* **102**, 042228 (2020)] for any possible three, four and five-partite systems. Our results build the connection between hypercubes and strongly nonlocal OPSs, and exhibit the phenomenon of strong quantum nonlocality without entanglement in multipartite systems.

**Keywords:** strong quantum nonlocality, orthogonal product sets, hypercubes

## I. INTRODUCTION

A set of multipartite orthogonal quantum states is locally indistinguishable if it is not possible to optimally distinguish the states by any sequence of local operations and classical communications (LOCC). When the classical message is encoded in such multipartite states, it cannot be completely retrieved under LOCC. It requires global operations to retrieve the message. Subsequently, local indistinguishability can be used for quantum data hiding [1–4] and quantum secret sharing [5–7]. Bennett *et al.* provided a locally indistinguishable orthogonal product basis in  $3 \otimes 3$  [8], which shows the phenomenon of quantum nonlocality without entanglement. Later, the locally indistinguishable orthogonal product states and orthogonal entangled states have attracted much attention [9–25].

Recently, Halder *et al.* introduced the concept of locally irreducible set [26]. An OPS is locally irreducible means that it is not possible to eliminate one or more states from the set by orthogonality-preserving local measurements. Local irreducibility ensures local indistinguishability, while the converse is not true usually. An effective way to prove that an OPS is locally irreducible is to show that only trivial orthogonality-preserving local measurement can be performed to this set. An OPS is strongly nonlocal if it is locally irreducible in every bipartition. They also showed two strongly nonlocal orthogonal product bases in  $3 \otimes 3 \otimes 3$  and  $4 \otimes 4 \otimes 4$ , respectively, which shows the phenomenon of strong quantum nonlocality without entanglement. After that, based on the local irreducibility in some multipartitions, Zhang *et al.* generalized the strong quantum nonlocality and gave some explicit examples [27]. Yuan *et al.* showed a strongly nonlocal OPS in  $d \otimes d \otimes d$ ,  $d \otimes d \otimes (d+1)$ ,  $3 \otimes 3 \otimes 3 \otimes 3$  and  $4 \otimes 4 \otimes 4 \otimes 4$  for  $d \geq 3$  [28]. Further, Shi *et al.* constructed a strongly nonlocal orthogonal entangled basis which is not a genuinely entangled basis in  $d \otimes d \otimes d$  for  $d \geq 3$  [29], and they also showed that a strongly nonlocal unextendible product basis (UPB) in  $d \otimes d \otimes d$  exists for  $d \geq 3$  [30]. Recently, Wang *et al.* showed a genuinely orthogonal entangled set that is strongly nonlocal in  $d \otimes d \otimes d$  for  $d \geq 3$  [31]. The authors in Refs. [26, 28] also proposed an open question. Whether one can construct strongly nonlocal OPSs in multipartite systems? In this paper, we shall solve this question for any possible three, four and five-partite systems.

Most of the known constructions of strongly nonlocal OPSs are lack of intuitive structures, and it is not easy to generalize them to multipartite systems. In this work, based on the decomposition for the outermost layer of an  $n$ -dimensional hypercube for  $n = 3, 4, 5$ , we successfully construct strongly nonlocal OPSs with “well structure” of

---

\*F. Shi and M.-S. Li contributed equally to this work.

†Corresponding authors: drzhangx@ustc.edu.cn, wangylmath@yahoo.com

size  $d_A d_B d_C - (d_A - 2)(d_B - 2)(d_C - 2)$  in  $d_A \otimes d_B \otimes d_C$ , size  $d_A d_B d_C d_D - (d_A - 2)(d_B - 2)(d_C - 2)(d_D - 2)$ , and size  $d_A d_B d_C d_D d_E - (d_A - 2)(d_B - 2)(d_C - 2)(d_D - 2)(d_E - 2)$  in  $d_A \otimes d_B \otimes d_C \otimes d_D \otimes d_E$  for  $d_A, d_B, d_C, d_D, d_E \geq 3$ , respectively. Our results answers an open question given in [26, 28] for any possible three, four and five-partite systems.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

In this paper, we only consider pure states and positive operator-valued measurement (POVM), and we do not normalize states and operators for simplicity. A local measurement performed to distinguish a set of multipartite orthogonal states is called an *orthogonality-preserving local measurements*, if the postmeasurement states remain orthogonal. An OPS in  $d_1 \otimes d_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes d_n$  is *locally irreducible* if it is not possible to eliminate one or more states from the set by orthogonality-preserving local measurements [26]. Further, in  $d_1 \otimes d_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes d_n$ ,  $n \geq 3$  and  $d_i \geq 3$ , an OPS is *strongly nonlocal* if it is locally irreducible in every bipartition, which shows the phenomenon of strong quantum nonlocality without entanglement [26].

An OPS is said to be of *the strongest nonlocality* if only trivial orthogonality-preserving POVM can be performed on it for each bipartition of the subsystems [30]. A measurement is *trivial* if all the POVM elements are proportional to the identity operator. By definition, an OPS that is of the strongest nonlocality must be strongly nonlocal. However, the converse is not true usually. For example, a strongly nonlocal OPS in  $3 \otimes 3 \otimes 3$  can be viewed as a strongly nonlocal OPS in  $4 \otimes 4 \otimes 4$ . Then Alice can perform a nontrivial orthogonality-preserving POVM  $\{|3\rangle\langle 3|, \mathbb{I} - |3\rangle\langle 3|\}$  to this OPS. There exists an efficient way to check whether an OPS is of the strongest nonlocality [30]. Consider an OPS  $\{|\psi\rangle\} \subset \otimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}_{A_i}$ . Let  $B_1 = \{A_2 A_3 \dots A_n\}$ ,  $B_2 = \{A_3 \dots A_n A_1\}$ ,  $B_3 = \{A_4 \dots A_n A_1 A_2\}$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $B_n = \{A_1 \dots A_{n-1}\}$ . If the party  $B_i$  can only perform a trivial orthogonality-preserving POVM for any  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , then the OPS  $\{|\psi\rangle\}$  is of the strongest nonlocality. We will use this method throughout the paper.

For any positive integer  $n \geq 2$ , we denote  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  as the set  $\{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ , and denote  $w_n = e^{\frac{2\pi\sqrt{-1}}{n}}$ . We assume that  $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, \dots, |n-1\rangle\}$  is the computational basis of the  $n$  dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_n$ . For any operator  $M$  acting on  $\mathcal{H}_n$ , we denote the matrix  $M$  as the matrix representation of the operator  $M$  under the computational basis. In general, we do not distinguish the operator  $M$  and its matrix representation  $M$ . Given any  $n \times n$  matrix  $E := \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} a_{i,j} |i\rangle\langle j|$ , we define

$${}_S E_{\mathcal{T}} := \sum_{|s\rangle \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{|t\rangle \in \mathcal{T}} a_{s,t} |s\rangle\langle t|,$$

where  $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T} \subseteq \{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, \dots, |n-1\rangle\}$ . It means that  ${}_S E_{\mathcal{T}}$  is a submatrix of  $E$  with row coordinates  $\mathcal{S}$  and column coordinates  $\mathcal{T}$ . In the case  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{T}$ , we denote

$$E_{\mathcal{S}} := {}_S E_{\mathcal{S}}$$

for simplicity. Finally, we introduce two basic lemmas which are from [30], and they are useful for showing that an OPS is of the strongest nonlocality. Assume a set  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, \dots, |n-1\rangle\}$ . An orthogonal set  $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_s}$  is *spanned* by  $\mathcal{S}$ , if for any  $i \in \mathbb{Z}_s$ ,  $|\psi_i\rangle$  is a linear combination of the states from  $\mathcal{S}$ .

**Lemma 1 (Block Zeros Lemma [30])** *Let an  $n \times n$  matrix  $E = (a_{i,j})_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}_n}$  be the matrix representation of an operator  $E = M^\dagger M$  under the basis  $\mathcal{B} := \{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, \dots, |n-1\rangle\}$ . Given two nonempty disjoint subsets  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $\mathcal{B}$ , assume that  $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_s}$ ,  $\{|\phi_j\rangle\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_t}$  are two orthogonal sets spanned by  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  respectively, where  $s = |\mathcal{S}|$ , and  $t = |\mathcal{T}|$ . If  $\langle \psi_i | E | \phi_j \rangle = 0$  for any  $i \in \mathbb{Z}_s, j \in \mathbb{Z}_t$ , then  ${}_S E_{\mathcal{T}} = \mathbf{0}$  and  ${}_{\mathcal{T}} E_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{0}$ .*

**Lemma 2 (Block Trivial Lemma [30])** *Let an  $n \times n$  matrix  $E = (a_{i,j})_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}_n}$  be the matrix representation of an operator  $E = M^\dagger M$  under the basis  $\mathcal{B} := \{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, \dots, |n-1\rangle\}$ . Given a nonempty subset  $\mathcal{S} := \{|u_0\rangle, |u_1\rangle, \dots, |u_{s-1}\rangle\}$  of  $\mathcal{B}$ , let  $\{|\psi_j\rangle\}_{j=0}^{s-1}$  be an orthogonal set spanned by  $\mathcal{S}$ . Assume that  $\langle \psi_i | E | \psi_j \rangle = 0$  for any  $i \neq j \in \mathbb{Z}_s$ . If there exists a state  $|u_t\rangle \in \mathcal{S}$ , such that  $\{_{|u_t\rangle} E_{\mathcal{S} \setminus \{|u_t\rangle\}} = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\langle u_t | \psi_j \rangle \neq 0$  for any  $j \in \mathbb{Z}_s$ , then  $E_{\mathcal{S}} \propto \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{S}}$ .*

## III. OPSs OF THE STRONGEST NONLOCALITY

In this section, we give some constructions for OPSs of the strongest nonlocality in three, four, and five-partite systems. One notes that the OPSs we constructed are all with “well structure” under the following sense: the states are exactly corresponding to the outermost layer of an  $n$ -dimensional hypercube. Through some decompositions for the outermost layer, we can construct the desired OPSs. We use this idea to construct three, four and five-partite OPSs of the strongest nonlocality.

### A. OPSs of the strongest nonlocality in three-partite systems

We start the construction OPSs of the strongest nonlocality by an example. Given a 3-dimensional hypercube with coordinates  $\{0, 1, 2\}_A \times \{0, 1, 2\}_B \times \{0, 1, 2\}_C$ , the outermost layer is  $\{0, 1, 2\}_A \times \{0, 1, 2\}_B \times \{0, 1, 2\}_C \setminus \{\{1\}_A \times \{1\}_B \times \{1\}_C\}$ . We can decompose the outermost layer in this way:  $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{1, 2\}_A \times \{0\}_B \times \{0, 1\}_C$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_2 = \{1, 2\}_A \times \{0, 1\}_B \times \{2\}_C$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_3 = \{2\}_A \times \{1, 2\}_B \times \{0, 1\}_C$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_4 = \{2\}_A \times \{2\}_B \times \{2\}_C$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_1 = \{0, 1\}_A \times \{2\}_B \times \{1, 2\}_C$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_2 = \{0, 1\}_A \times \{1, 2\}_B \times \{0\}_C$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_3 = \{0\}_A \times \{0, 1\}_B \times \{1, 2\}_C$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_4 = \{0\}_A \times \{0\}_B \times \{0\}_C$ . See also Fig. 1. We can obtain an OPS from the decomposition as follows,




FIG. 1: The decomposition for the outermost layer of a 3-dimensional hypercube with coordinates  $\{0, 1, 2\}_A \times \{0, 1, 2\}_B \times \{0, 1, 2\}_C$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{C}_1 &:= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |\eta_j\rangle_C \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2\}, \\
 \mathcal{C}_2 &:= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |\eta_j\rangle_B |2\rangle_C \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2\}, \\
 \mathcal{C}_3 &:= \{|2\rangle_A |\xi_i\rangle_B |\eta_j\rangle_C \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2\}, \\
 \mathcal{C}_4 &:= \{|2\rangle_A |2\rangle_B |2\rangle_C\}, \\
 \mathcal{D}_1 &:= \{|\eta_i\rangle_A |2\rangle_B |\xi_j\rangle_C \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2\}, \\
 \mathcal{D}_2 &:= \{|\eta_i\rangle_A |\xi_j\rangle_B |0\rangle_C \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2\}, \\
 \mathcal{D}_3 &:= \{|0\rangle_A |\eta_i\rangle_B |\xi_j\rangle_C \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2\}, \\
 \mathcal{D}_4 &:= \{|0\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |0\rangle_C\},
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where  $|\eta_s\rangle_X = |0\rangle_X + (-1)^s |1\rangle_X$ ,  $|\xi_s\rangle_X := |1\rangle_X + (-1)^s |2\rangle_X$  for  $s \in \mathbb{Z}_2$ , for any  $X \in \{A, B, C\}$ . Now, we show that  $\cup_{i=1}^4 (\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i)$  is of the strongest nonlocality.

**Example 1** In  $3 \otimes 3 \otimes 3$ , the set  $\cup_{i=1}^4 (\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i)$  given by Eq. (1) is an OPS of the strongest nonlocality. The size of this set is 26.

**Proof.** Let  $B$  and  $C$  come together to perform a joint orthogonality-preserving POVM  $\{E = M^\dagger M\}$ , where  $E = (a_{ij, k\ell})_{i,j,k,\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_3}$ . Then the postmeasurement states  $\{\mathbb{I}_A \otimes M|\psi\rangle \mid |\psi\rangle \in \cup_{i=1}^4 (\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i)\}$  should be mutually orthogonal. That is,

$$0 = {}_A \langle \phi_1 |_B \langle \phi_2 |_C \langle \phi_3 | \mathbb{I}_A \otimes E |\psi_1\rangle_A |\psi_2\rangle_B |\psi_3\rangle_C = \langle \phi_1 | \psi_1 \rangle_A ({}_B \langle \phi_2 |_C \langle \phi_3 | E |\psi_2\rangle_B |\psi_3\rangle_C) \tag{2}$$

whenever  $|\phi_1\rangle_A |\phi_2\rangle_B |\phi_3\rangle_C$  and  $|\psi_1\rangle_A |\psi_2\rangle_B |\psi_3\rangle_C$  are two different states from the set  $\cup_{i=1}^4 (\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i)$ . Observing that if  $\langle \phi_1 | \psi_1 \rangle_A \neq 0$ , one can also get that  ${}_B \langle \phi_2 |_C \langle \phi_3 | E |\psi_2\rangle_B |\psi_3\rangle_C = 0$ . Our aim is to show that  $E \propto \mathbb{I}$  by use this observation.

The eight subsets  $\cup_{i=1}^4 \{\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i\}$  in  $A|BC$  bipartition correspond to eight blocks of the  $3 \times 9$  grid in Fig. 2. For example,  $\mathcal{C}_1$  corresponds to the  $2 \times 2$  grid  $\{(1, 2) \times (00, 01)\}$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{C}_i$  is symmetrical to  $\mathcal{D}_i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq 4$ ).

We used some notations introduced in [30]. Let  $\mathcal{S} = \{|\psi_1\rangle_A |\psi_2\rangle_B |\psi_3\rangle_C\}$  be a tripartite orthogonal product set. Define

$$\mathcal{S}(|\psi\rangle_A) := \{|\psi_2\rangle_B |\psi_3\rangle_C \mid |\psi\rangle_A |\psi_2\rangle_B |\psi_3\rangle_C \in \mathcal{S}\}.$$




FIG. 2: The corresponding  $3 \times 9$  grid of  $\cup_{i=1}^4 \{\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i\}$  given by Eq. (1) in  $A|BC$  bipartition. For example,  $\mathcal{C}_1$  corresponds to the  $2 \times 2$  grid  $\{(1,2) \times (00,01)\}$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{C}_i$  is symmetrical to  $\mathcal{D}_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 4$ .

Moreover, define  $\mathcal{S}^{(A)}$  as the support of  $\mathcal{S}(|\psi\rangle_A)$  which spans  $\mathcal{S}(|\psi\rangle_A)$ . For example, in Eq. (1),  $\mathcal{C}_1 := \{|\xi_i\rangle_A | 0\rangle_B |\eta_j\rangle_C \mid (i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{C}_1(|\xi_1\rangle_A) = \{|0\rangle_A |\eta_j\rangle_C\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_2}$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_1^{(A)} = \{|0\rangle_B | 0\rangle_C, |0\rangle_B | 1\rangle_C\}$ , and  $\mathcal{C}_1(|\xi_1\rangle_A)$  is spanned by  $\mathcal{C}_1^{(A)}$ . Actually,  $\{\mathcal{C}_i^{(A)}, \mathcal{D}_i^{(A)}\}_{i=1}^4$  can be easily observed by Fig. 2. They are the projection sets of  $\{\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i\}_{i=1}^4$  in  $BC$  party in Fig. 2.

Let  $\mathcal{V} := \{|j\rangle_B | k\rangle_C \mid j, k \in \mathbb{Z}_3\}$  be the computational basis of the  $BC$  party. One finds that  $\mathcal{V}$  is a disjoint union of the subsets  $\mathcal{C}_1^{(A)}, \mathcal{C}_2^{(A)}, \mathcal{C}_3^{(A)}, \mathcal{C}_4^{(A)}$ . That is,

$$\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{C}_1^{(A)} \cup \mathcal{C}_2^{(A)} \cup \mathcal{C}_3^{(A)} \cup \mathcal{C}_4^{(A)}, \quad \text{and } \mathcal{C}_i^{(A)} \cap \mathcal{C}_j^{(A)} = \emptyset$$

whenever  $i \neq j$ .

**Step 1** Considering any  $|\Phi_1\rangle \in \mathcal{C}_1(|\xi_0\rangle_A)$ ,  $|\Phi_2\rangle \in \mathcal{C}_2(|\xi_0\rangle_A)$ ,  $|\Phi_3\rangle \in \mathcal{C}_3(|2\rangle_A)$ ,  $|\Phi_4\rangle \in \mathcal{C}_4(|2\rangle_A)$ . Since  $|\xi_0\rangle_A, |\xi_1\rangle_A, |2\rangle_A, |2\rangle_A$  are mutually non-orthogonal, by Eq. (2), we have

$$\langle \Phi_i | E | \Phi_j \rangle = 0, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \neq j \leq 4. \quad (3)$$

Note that  $\mathcal{C}_1(|\xi_0\rangle_A)$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_2(|\xi_0\rangle_A)$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_3(|2\rangle_A)$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_4(|2\rangle_A)$  are spanned by  $\mathcal{C}_1^{(A)}, \mathcal{C}_2^{(A)}, \mathcal{C}_3^{(A)}, \mathcal{C}_4^{(A)}$  respectively. Applying Lemma 1 to any two sets of  $\mathcal{C}_1(|\xi_0\rangle_A)$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_2(|\xi_0\rangle_A)$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_3(|2\rangle_A)$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_4(|2\rangle_A)$ , we obtain

$$_{\mathcal{C}_i^{(A)}} E_{\mathcal{C}_j^{(A)}} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \neq j \leq 4. \quad (4)$$

Therefore,  $E$  is a block diagonal matrix of the form

$$E = E_{\mathcal{C}_1^{(A)}} \oplus E_{\mathcal{C}_2^{(A)}} \oplus E_{\mathcal{C}_3^{(A)}} \oplus E_{\mathcal{C}_4^{(A)}}. \quad (5)$$

See also Fig. 3 (I).

**Step 2** Applying Lemma 1 to  $\mathcal{D}_4(|0\rangle_A)$  and  $\mathcal{D}_3(|0\rangle_A)$ , we have  $\{|0\rangle_B | 0\rangle_C\} E_{\mathcal{D}_3^{(A)}} = \mathbf{0}$ . We can also obtain  $\{|0\rangle_B | 0\rangle_C\} E_{\mathcal{C}_1^{(A)} \setminus \{|0\rangle_B | 0\rangle_C\}} = \mathbf{0}$  as  $\mathcal{C}_1^{(A)} \setminus \{|0\rangle_B | 0\rangle_C\} \subset \mathcal{D}_3^{(A)}$ . Applying Lemma 2 to the set  $\mathcal{C}_1(|\xi_0\rangle_A)$ , we obtain

$$E_{\mathcal{C}_1^{(A)}} = a \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}_1^{(A)}}. \quad (6)$$

See also Fig. 3 (II).

**Step 3** By Fig. 3 (II), we can obtain the equality  $\{|0\rangle_B | 1\rangle_C\} E_{\mathcal{D}_3^{(A)} \setminus \{|0\rangle_B | 1\rangle_C\}} = \mathbf{0}$ . Applying Lemma 2 to the set  $\mathcal{D}_3(|0\rangle_A)$ , we have  $E_{\mathcal{D}_3^{(A)}} = b \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{D}_3^{(A)}}$ . Note that  $\mathcal{D}_3^{(A)} \cap \mathcal{C}_1^{(A)} \neq \emptyset$ . Then  $b = a$ . Therefore

$$E_{\mathcal{C}_1^{(A)} \cup \mathcal{D}_3^{(A)}} = a \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}_1^{(A)} \cup \mathcal{D}_3^{(A)}}. \quad (7)$$

See also Fig. 3 (III).

**Step 4** By the symmetry of Fig. 2, we can obtain that  $E = a \mathbb{I}$ . Thus  $E$  is trivial. See also Fig. 3 (IV).

Further, since the eight subsets  $\cup_{i=1}^4 \{\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i\}$  in any bipartition of  $\{A|BC, C|AB, B|CA\}$  correspond to a similar grid as Fig. 2, it implies that  $AB$  or  $CA$  can only perform a trivial orthogonality-preserving POVM. Thus, the OPS  $\cup_{i=1}^4 (\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i)$  given by Eq. (1) is of the strongest nonlocality.  $\square$

The above construction and its proof can be straightforwardly extended to the high dimensional systems. We can give a similar decomposition for the outermost layer of a 3-dimensional hypercube with coordinates  $\{0, 1, \dots, d_A -$





FIG. 3: Proving steps of the strongest nonlocality in Example 1.

$1\}_A \times \{0, 1, \dots, d_B - 1\}_B \times \{0, 1, \dots, d_C - 1\}_C$ . Then we can obtain an OPS from the decomposition as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{C}_1 &:= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |\eta_j\rangle_C \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1}\}, \\
 \mathcal{C}_2 &:= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |\eta_j\rangle_B |d_C - 1\rangle_C \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1}\}, \\
 \mathcal{C}_3 &:= \{|d_A - 1\rangle_A |\xi_i\rangle_B |\eta_j\rangle_C \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1}\}, \\
 \mathcal{C}_4 &:= \{|d_A - 1\rangle_A |d_B - 1\rangle_B |d_C - 1\rangle_C\}, \\
 \mathcal{D}_1 &:= \{|\eta_i\rangle_A |d_B - 1\rangle_B |\xi_j\rangle_C \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1}\}, \\
 \mathcal{D}_2 &:= \{|\eta_i\rangle_A |\xi_j\rangle_B |0\rangle_C \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1}\}, \\
 \mathcal{D}_3 &:= \{|0\rangle_A |\eta_i\rangle_B |\xi_j\rangle_C \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1}\}, \\
 \mathcal{D}_4 &:= \{|0\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |0\rangle_C\},
 \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where  $|\eta_s\rangle_X = \sum_{t=0}^{d_X-2} w_{d_X-1}^{st} |t\rangle_X$ , and  $|\xi_s\rangle_X = \sum_{t=0}^{d_X-2} w_{d_X-1}^{st} |t+1\rangle_X$  for  $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_X-1}$ , and  $X \in \{A, B, C\}$ . Therefore, we have the following theorem.

FIG. 4: The corresponding  $d_A \times d_B d_C$  grid of  $\cup_{i=1}^4 \{\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i\}$  given by Eq. (8) in  $A|BC$  bipartition. Moreover,  $\mathcal{C}_i$  is symmetrical to  $\mathcal{D}_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 4$ .

**Theorem 1** In  $d_A \otimes d_B \otimes d_C$ ,  $d_A, d_B, d_C \geq 3$ , the set  $\cup_{i=1}^4 (\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i)$  given by Eq. (8) is an OPS of the strongest nonlocality. The size of this set is  $d_A d_B d_C - (d_A - 2)(d_B - 2)(d_C - 2)$ .

**Proof.** The eight subsets  $\cup_{i=1}^4 \{\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i\}$  in  $A|BC$  bipartition correspond to eight blocks of the  $d_A \times d_B d_C$  grid in Fig. 4. Note that

$$\mathcal{D}_3^{(A)} \cap \mathcal{C}_j^{(A)} \neq \emptyset \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, 3; \quad \mathcal{D}_4^{(A)} \cap \mathcal{C}_1^{(A)} \neq \emptyset. \tag{9}$$

Since the eight subsets  $\cup_{i=1}^4 \{\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i\}$  in any bipartition of  $\{A|BC, C|AB, B|CA\}$  correspond to a similar grid as Fig. 4, we only need to consider Fig. 4. Let  $B$  and  $C$  come together to perform a joint orthogonality-preserving POVM  $\{E =$

$M^\dagger M\}$ , where  $E = (a_{ij,k\ell})_{i,k \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_B}, j, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_C}}$ . Then the postmeasurement states  $\{\mathbb{I}_A \otimes M|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle \in \cup_{i=1}^4 (\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i)\}$  should be mutually orthogonal. By Lemma 1, similar as the step 1 of Example 1, via  $\mathcal{C}_1(|\xi_0\rangle_A), \mathcal{C}_2(|\xi_0\rangle_A), \mathcal{C}_3(|d_A-1\rangle), \mathcal{C}_4(|d_A-1\rangle)$  we can get

$$E = E_{\mathcal{C}_1^{(A)}} \oplus E_{\mathcal{C}_2^{(A)}} \oplus E_{\mathcal{C}_3^{(A)}} \oplus E_{\mathcal{C}_4^{(A)}}.$$

We can complete the proof similar as the other steps of Example 1. See Eq. (10) for a sketch of the analysis,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_4(|0\rangle_A), \mathcal{D}_3(|0\rangle_A) &\xrightarrow{\text{Lemma 1}}_{\mathcal{D}_4^{(A)}} E_{\mathcal{D}_3^{(A)}} = \mathbf{0}, \\ \mathcal{C}_1(|\xi_0\rangle_A) &\xrightarrow{\text{Lemma 2}}_{\mathcal{C}_1^{(A)}} E_{\mathcal{C}_1^{(A)}} = a\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}_1^{(A)}}, \\ \mathcal{D}_3(|0\rangle_A) &\xrightarrow{\text{Lemma 2}}_{\mathcal{D}_3^{(A)}} E_{\mathcal{D}_3^{(A)}} = b\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{D}_3^{(A)}}, \\ \mathcal{C}_1^{(A)} \cap \mathcal{D}_3^{(A)} \neq \emptyset &\longrightarrow E_{\mathcal{C}_1^{(A)} \cup \mathcal{D}_3^{(A)}} = a\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}_1^{(A)} \cup \mathcal{D}_3^{(A)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

By the symmetry of Fig. 2, we can obtain that  $E = a\mathbb{I}$ . Thus  $E$  is trivial.  $\square$

Very fortunately, we find that the above idea for constructing strongest nonlocal set of product states can be extended to four and five-partite systems. However, the structure of the states are more complex and difficult than the tripartite cases.

### B. OPSs of the strongest nonlocality in four-partite systems

First, we need to consider the decomposition for the outermost layer of a 4-dimensional hypercube with coordinates  $\{0, 1, \dots, d_A - 1\}_A \times \{0, 1, \dots, d_B - 1\}_B \times \{0, 1, \dots, d_C - 1\}_C \times \{0, 1, \dots, d_D - 1\}_D$ . The decomposition can be shown in the following OPS

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_1 &:= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |\eta_j\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |\xi_k\rangle_D \mid (i, j, k) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1}\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_2 &:= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |d_B-1\rangle_B |\eta_j\rangle_C |\eta_k\rangle_D \mid (i, j, k) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1}\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_3 &:= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |\xi_j\rangle_B |\xi_k\rangle_C |d_D-1\rangle_D \mid (i, j, k) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1}\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_4 &:= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |d_B-1\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |d_D-1\rangle_D \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1}\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_5 &:= \{|d_A-1\rangle_A |\eta_i\rangle_B |\xi_j\rangle_C |\eta_k\rangle_D \mid (i, j, k) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1}\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_6 &:= \{|d_A-1\rangle_A |\eta_i\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |0\rangle_D \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1}\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_7 &:= \{|d_A-1\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |\xi_i\rangle_C |d_D-1\rangle_D \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1}\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_8 &:= \{|d_A-1\rangle_A |d_B-1\rangle_B |d_C-1\rangle_C |\eta_i\rangle_D \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1}\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_1 &:= \{|\eta_i\rangle_A |\xi_j\rangle_B |d_C-1\rangle_C |\eta_k\rangle_D \mid (i, j, k) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1}\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_2 &:= \{|\eta_i\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |\xi_j\rangle_C |\xi_k\rangle_D \mid (i, j, k) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1}\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_3 &:= \{|\eta_i\rangle_A |\eta_j\rangle_B |\eta_k\rangle_C |0\rangle_D \mid (i, j, k) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1}\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_4 &:= \{|\eta_i\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |d_C-1\rangle_C |0\rangle_D \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1}\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_5 &:= \{|0\rangle_A |\xi_i\rangle_B |\eta_j\rangle_C |\xi_k\rangle_D \mid (i, j, k) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1}\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_6 &:= \{|0\rangle_A |\xi_i\rangle_B |d_C-1\rangle_C |d_D-1\rangle_D \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1}\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_7 &:= \{|0\rangle_A |d_B-1\rangle_B |\eta_i\rangle_C |0\rangle_D \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1}\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_8 &:= \{|0\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |\xi_i\rangle_D \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1}\}, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where  $|\eta_s\rangle_X = \sum_{t=0}^{d_X-2} w_{d_X-1}^{st} |t\rangle_X$ , and  $|\xi_s\rangle_X = \sum_{t=0}^{d_X-2} w_{d_X-1}^{st} |t+1\rangle_X$  for  $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_X-1}$ , and  $X \in \{A, B, C, D\}$ . Now, we show that the above OPS is of the strongest nonlocality.

**Theorem 2** In  $d_A \otimes d_B \otimes d_C \otimes d_D$ ,  $d_A, d_B, d_C, d_D \geq 3$ , the set  $\cup_{i=1}^8 (\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i)$  given by Eq. (11) is an OPS of the strongest nonlocality. The size of this set is  $d_A d_B d_C d_D - (d_A - 2)(d_B - 2)(d_C - 2)(d_D - 2)$ .




FIG. 5: The corresponding  $d_A \times d_B d_C d_D$  grid of  $\cup_{i=1}^8 \{\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i\}$  given by Eq. (11) in  $A|BCD$  bipartition. Moreover,  $\mathcal{C}_i$  is symmetrical to  $\mathcal{D}_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 8$ .

**Proof.** The 16 subsets  $\cup_{i=1}^8 \{\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i\}$  in  $A|BCD$  bipartition correspond to 16 blocks of the  $d_A \times d_B d_C d_D$  grid in Fig. 5. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_5^{(A)} \cap \mathcal{C}_j^{(A)} &\neq \emptyset \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5; \\ \mathcal{D}_6^{(A)} \cap \mathcal{C}_3^{(A)} &\neq \emptyset; \\ \mathcal{D}_7^{(A)} \cap \mathcal{C}_2^{(A)} &\neq \emptyset; \\ \mathcal{D}_8^{(A)} \cap \mathcal{C}_1^{(A)} &\neq \emptyset. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Since the 16 subsets  $\cup_{i=1}^8 \{\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i\}$  in any bipartition of  $\{A|BCD, D|ABC, C|DAB, B|CDA\}$  correspond to a similar grid as Fig. 5, we only need to consider Fig. 5. Let  $B$ ,  $C$  and  $D$  come together to perform a joint orthogonality-preserving POVM  $\{E = M^\dagger M\}$ , where  $E = (a_{ijk,lmn})_{i,\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_B}, j,m \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_C}, k,n \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_D}}$ . Then the postmeasurement states  $\{\mathbb{I}_A \otimes M|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle \in \cup_{i=1}^8 (\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i)\}$  should be mutually orthogonal.

**Step 1** Applying Lemma 1 to any two elements of  $\{\{\mathcal{C}_i(|\xi_0\rangle_A)\}_{j=1}^4, \{\mathcal{C}_j(|d_A-1\rangle)\}_{j=5}^8\}$ , we have

$$E = \oplus_{j=1}^8 E_{\mathcal{C}_j^{(A)}}. \tag{13}$$

**Step 2** By Eq. (13), we know that  $_{\mathcal{C}_4^{(A)}} E_{\mathcal{D}_5^{(A)} \setminus \mathcal{C}_4^{(A)}} = \mathbf{0}$ . Note that  $|\mathcal{C}_4^{(A)}| = 1$ , more exactly,  $\mathcal{C}_4^{(A)} = \{|d_B-1\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |d_D-1\rangle_D\}$ . Applying Lemma 2 to  $\mathcal{D}_5(|0\rangle_A)$ , we have

$$E_{\mathcal{D}_5^{(A)}} = a \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{D}_5^{(A)}}. \tag{14}$$

Next, applying Lemma 1 to  $\mathcal{D}_5(|0\rangle_A)$  and  $\mathcal{D}_i(|0\rangle_A)$  for  $i = 6, 7, 8$ , we obtain

$$_{\mathcal{D}_5^{(A)}} E_{\mathcal{D}_i^{(A)}} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{for } i = 6, 7, 8. \tag{15}$$

**Step 3** Note that  $\mathcal{D}_6^{(A)} = \mathcal{C}_3^{(A)} \setminus \mathcal{D}_5^{(A)}$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_7^{(A)} = \mathcal{C}_2^{(A)} \setminus \mathcal{D}_5^{(A)}$ , and  $\mathcal{D}_8^{(A)} = \mathcal{C}_1^{(A)} \setminus \mathcal{D}_5^{(A)}$ . By Eqs. (14) and (15), we know that for any  $|j\rangle_B |k\rangle_C |\ell\rangle_D \in \mathcal{D}_5^{(A)} \cap \mathcal{C}_i^{(A)}$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ,  $\{ |j\rangle_B |k\rangle_C |\ell\rangle_D \} E_{\mathcal{C}_i^{(A)} \setminus \{ |j\rangle_B |k\rangle_C |\ell\rangle_D \}} = \mathbf{0}$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Applying Lemma 2 to  $\mathcal{C}_i(|\xi_0\rangle_A)$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Then we have

$$E_{\mathcal{C}_i^{(A)}} = a_i \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}_i^{(A)}} \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, 3. \tag{16}$$

Since  $\mathcal{D}_5^{(A)} \cap \mathcal{C}_i^{(A)} \neq \emptyset$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , it implies  $a_i = a$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Thus

$$E_{\{\cup_{i=1}^3 \mathcal{C}_i^{(A)}\} \cup \mathcal{D}_5^{(A)}} = a \mathbb{I}_{\{\cup_{i=1}^3 \mathcal{C}_i^{(A)}\} \cup \mathcal{D}_5^{(A)}}. \tag{17}$$

**Step 4** By the symmetry of Fig. 5, we can obtain that  $E = a \mathbb{I}$ . Thus  $E$  is trivial.  $\square$

### C. OPSs of the strongest nonlocality in five-partite systems

Consider the cyclic permutation of the eight sets  $\{|0\rangle_A |\xi_i\rangle_B |\eta_j\rangle_C |\xi_k\rangle_D |\eta_\ell\rangle_E\}$ ,  $\{|0\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |\xi_i\rangle_C |d-1\rangle_D |\eta_j\rangle_E\}$ ,  $\{|0\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |\xi_i\rangle_D |\eta_j\rangle_E\}$ ,  $\{|0\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |0\rangle_D |0\rangle_E\}$ ,  $\{|d-1\rangle_A |\eta_i\rangle_B |\xi_j\rangle_C |\eta_k\rangle_D |\xi_\ell\rangle_E\}$ ,  $\{|d-1\rangle_A |d-1\rangle_B |\eta_i\rangle_C |0\rangle_D |\xi_j\rangle_E\}$ ,



$\{|d-1\rangle_A |d-1\rangle_B |d-1\rangle_C |\eta_i\rangle_D |\xi_j\rangle_E\}$ ,  $\{|d-1\rangle_A |d-1\rangle_B |d-1\rangle_C |d-1\rangle_D |d-1\rangle_E\}$ . Then we can obtain a decomposition with 32 blocks for the outermost layer of a 5-dimensional hypercube with coordinates  $\{0, 1, \dots, d-1\}_A \times \{0, 1, \dots, d-1\}_B \times \{0, 1, \dots, d-1\}_C \times \{0, 1, \dots, d-1\}_D \times \{0, 1, \dots, d-1\}_E$ . Similarly, we can obtain a decomposition with 32 blocks for the outermost layer of a 5-dimensional hypercube with coordinates  $\{0, 1, \dots, d_A-1\}_A \times \{0, 1, \dots, d_B-1\}_B \times \{0, 1, \dots, d_C-1\}_C \times \{0, 1, \dots, d_D-1\}_D \times \{0, 1, \dots, d_E-1\}_E$  as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C}_1 &:= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |d_B-1\rangle_B |\eta_j\rangle_C |\xi_k\rangle_D |\eta_\ell\rangle_E \mid (i, j, k, \ell) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_E-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_2 &:= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |\eta_j\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |\xi_k\rangle_D |\eta_\ell\rangle_E \mid (i, j, k, \ell) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_E-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_3 &:= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |\eta_j\rangle_B |\xi_k\rangle_C |d_D-1\rangle_D |\eta_\ell\rangle_E \mid (i, j, k, \ell) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_E-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_4 &:= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |\eta_j\rangle_B |\xi_k\rangle_C |\eta_\ell\rangle_D |0\rangle_E \mid (i, j, k, \ell) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_5 &:= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |d_B-1\rangle_B |d_C-1\rangle_C |\eta_j\rangle_D |0\rangle_E \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_6 &:= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |d_B-1\rangle_B |\eta_j\rangle_C |0\rangle_D |0\rangle_E \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_7 &:= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |d_B-1\rangle_B |d_C-1\rangle_C |d_D-1\rangle_D |\eta_j\rangle_E \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_E-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_8 &:= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |\eta_j\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |0\rangle_D |0\rangle_E \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_9 &:= \{|d_A-1\rangle_A |\eta_i\rangle_B |\xi_j\rangle_C |\eta_k\rangle_D |\xi_\ell\rangle_E \mid (i, j, k, \ell) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_E-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_{10} &:= \{|d_A-1\rangle_A |d_B-1\rangle_B |d_C-1\rangle_C |d_D-1\rangle_D |d_E-1\rangle_E\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_{11} &:= \{|d_A-1\rangle_A |\eta_i\rangle_B |\xi_j\rangle_C |d_D-1\rangle_D |d_E-1\rangle_E \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_{12} &:= \{|d_A-1\rangle_A |\eta_i\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |0\rangle_D |\xi_j\rangle_E \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_E-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_{13} &:= \{|d_A-1\rangle_A |\eta_i\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |\xi_j\rangle_D |d_E-1\rangle_E \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_{14} &:= \{|d_A-1\rangle_A |d_B-1\rangle_B |\eta_i\rangle_C |\xi_j\rangle_D |d_E-1\rangle_E \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_{15} &:= \{|d_A-1\rangle_A |d_B-1\rangle_B |\eta_i\rangle_C |0\rangle_D |\xi_j\rangle_E \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_E-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{C}_{16} &:= \{|d_A-1\rangle_A |d_B-1\rangle_B |d_C-1\rangle_C |\eta_i\rangle_D |\xi_j\rangle_E \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_E-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_1 &:= \{|\eta_i\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |\xi_j\rangle_C |\eta_k\rangle_D |\xi_\ell\rangle_E \mid (i, j, k, \ell) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_E-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_2 &:= \{|\eta_i\rangle_A |\xi_j\rangle_B |d_C-1\rangle_C |\eta_k\rangle_D |\xi_\ell\rangle_E \mid (i, j, k, \ell) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_E-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_3 &:= \{|\eta_i\rangle_A |\xi_j\rangle_B |\eta_k\rangle_C |0\rangle_D |\xi_\ell\rangle_E \mid (i, j, k, \ell) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_E-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_4 &:= \{|\eta_i\rangle_A |\xi_j\rangle_B |\eta_k\rangle_C |\xi_\ell\rangle_D |d_E-1\rangle_E \mid (i, j, k, \ell) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_5 &:= \{|\eta_i\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |\xi_j\rangle_D |d_E-1\rangle_E \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_6 &:= \{|\eta_i\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |\xi_j\rangle_C |d_D-1\rangle_D |d_E-1\rangle_E \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_7 &:= \{|\eta_i\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |0\rangle_D |\xi_j\rangle_E \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_E-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_8 &:= \{|\eta_i\rangle_A |\xi_j\rangle_B |d_C-1\rangle_C |d_D-1\rangle_D |d_E-1\rangle_E \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_A-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_9 &:= \{|0\rangle_A |\xi_i\rangle_B |\eta_j\rangle_C |\xi_k\rangle_D |\eta_\ell\rangle_E \mid (i, j, k, \ell) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_E-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_{10} &:= \{|0\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |0\rangle_D |0\rangle_E\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_{11} &:= \{|0\rangle_A |\xi_i\rangle_B |\eta_j\rangle_C |0\rangle_D |0\rangle_E \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_{12} &:= \{|0\rangle_A |\xi_i\rangle_B |d_C-1\rangle_C |d_D-1\rangle_D |\eta_j\rangle_E \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_E-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_{13} &:= \{|0\rangle_A |\xi_i\rangle_B |d_C-1\rangle_C |\eta_j\rangle_D |0\rangle_E \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_B-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_{14} &:= \{|0\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |\xi_i\rangle_C |\eta_j\rangle_D |0\rangle_E \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_{15} &:= \{|0\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |\xi_i\rangle_C |d_D-1\rangle_D |\eta_j\rangle_E \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_C-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_E-1}\}, \\
\mathcal{D}_{16} &:= \{|0\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |\xi_i\rangle_D |\eta_j\rangle_E \mid (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_D-1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{d_E-1}\},
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where  $|\eta_s\rangle_X = \sum_{t=0}^{d_X-2} w_{d_X-1}^{st} |t\rangle_X$ , and  $|\xi_s\rangle_X = \sum_{t=0}^{d_X-2} w_{d_X-1}^{st} |t+1\rangle_X$  for  $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_X-1}$ , and  $X \in \{A, B, C, D, E\}$ . Then we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 3** *In  $d_A \otimes d_B \otimes d_C \otimes d_D \otimes d_E$ ,  $d_A, d_B, d_C, d_D, d_E \geq 3$ , the set  $\cup_{i=1}^{16} (\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i)$  given by Eq. (18) is an OPS of the strongest nonlocality. The size of this set is  $d_A d_B d_C d_D d_E - (d_A - 2)(d_B - 2)(d_C - 2)(d_D - 2)(d_E - 2)$ .*

**Proof.** The 32 subsets  $\cup_{i=1}^{16} \{\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i\}$  in  $A|BCDE$  bipartition correspond to 32 blocks of the  $d_A \times d_B d_C d_D d_E$  grid






FIG. 6: The corresponding  $d_A \times d_B d_C d_D d_E$  grid of  $\cup_{i=1}^{16} \{\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i\}$  given by Eq. (18) in  $A|BCDE$  bipartition. Moreover,  $\mathcal{C}_i$  is symmetrical to  $\mathcal{D}_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 16$ .

in Fig. 6. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{D}_9^{(A)} \cap \mathcal{C}_j^{(A)} &\neq \emptyset \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, 3, 4, 9; \\
 \mathcal{D}_{10}^{(A)} \cap \mathcal{C}_8^{(A)} &\neq \emptyset; \\
 \mathcal{D}_{11}^{(A)} \cap \mathcal{C}_j^{(A)} &\neq \emptyset \quad \text{for } j = 4, 6, 8; \\
 \mathcal{D}_{12}^{(A)} \cap \mathcal{C}_j^{(A)} &\neq \emptyset \quad \text{for } j = 3, 7; \\
 \mathcal{D}_{13}^{(A)} \cap \mathcal{C}_j^{(A)} &\neq \emptyset \quad \text{for } j = 4, 5; \\
 \mathcal{D}_{14}^{(A)} \cap \mathcal{C}_4^{(A)} &\neq \emptyset; \\
 \mathcal{D}_{15}^{(A)} \cap \mathcal{C}_3^{(A)} &\neq \emptyset; \\
 \mathcal{D}_{16}^{(A)} \cap \mathcal{C}_2^{(A)} &\neq \emptyset.
 \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Since the 32 subsets  $\cup_{i=1}^{16} \{\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i\}$  in any bipartition of  $\{A|BCDE, E|ABCD, D|EABC, C|DEAB, B|CDEA\}$  correspond to a similar grid as Fig. 6, we only need to consider Fig. 6. Let  $B, C, D$  and  $E$  come together to perform a joint orthogonality-preserving POVM  $\{E = M^\dagger M\}$ , where  $E = (a_{ijkl, mnst})_{i, m \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_B}, j, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_C}, k, s \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_D}, \ell, t \in \mathbb{Z}_{d_E}}$ . Then the postmeasurement states  $\{\mathbb{I}_A \otimes M|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle \in \cup_{i=1}^{16} (\mathcal{C}_i, \mathcal{D}_i)\}$  should be mutually orthogonal.

**Step 1** Applying Lemma 1 to any two elements of  $\{\{\mathcal{C}_j(|\xi_0\rangle_A)\}_{j=1}^8, \{\mathcal{C}_j(|d_A-1\rangle_A)\}_{j=9}^{16}\}$ , we have

$$E = \oplus_{j=1}^{16} E_{\mathcal{C}_j^{(A)}}. \tag{20}$$

**Step 2** Applying Lemma 1 to any two elements of  $\{\mathcal{D}_i(|0\rangle_A)\}_{i=9}^{16}$ , we have

$$\mathcal{D}_{i_1}^{(A)} E_{\mathcal{D}_{i_2}^{(A)}} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{for } 9 \leq i_1 \neq i_2 \leq 16. \tag{21}$$

Next, since  $\mathcal{C}_8^{(A)} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{10}^{(A)} \subset \mathcal{D}_{11}^{(A)}$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_{10}^{(A)} E_{\mathcal{C}_8^{(A)} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{10}^{(A)}} = \mathbf{0}$ . Note that  $|\mathcal{D}_{10}^{(A)}| = 1$ , more exactly,  $\mathcal{D}_{10}^{(A)} = \{|0\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |0\rangle_D |0\rangle_E\}$ . Applying Lemma 2 to  $\mathcal{C}_8(|\xi_0\rangle_A)$ , we obtain

$$E_{\mathcal{C}_8^{(A)}} = a \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}_8^{(A)}}. \tag{22}$$

**Step 3** By Eqs. (20) and (22), we know that for any  $|j\rangle_B |k\rangle_C |\ell\rangle_D |m\rangle_E \in \mathcal{D}_{11}^{(A)} \cap \mathcal{C}_8^{(A)}$ ,  $\{|j\rangle_B |k\rangle_C |\ell\rangle_D |m\rangle_E\} E_{\mathcal{D}_{11}^{(A)} \setminus \{|j\rangle_B |k\rangle_C |\ell\rangle_D |m\rangle_E\}} = \mathbf{0}$ . Applying Lemma 2 to  $\mathcal{D}_{11}(|0\rangle_A)$ , we have

$$E_{\mathcal{D}_{11}^{(A)}} = a \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{D}_{11}^{(A)}}. \tag{23}$$

Next, by Eqs. (21) and (23), we know that for any  $|j\rangle_B |k\rangle_C |\ell\rangle_D |m\rangle_E \in \mathcal{D}_{11}^{(A)} \cap \mathcal{C}_4^{(A)}$ ,  $\{|j\rangle_B |k\rangle_C |\ell\rangle_D |m\rangle_E\} E_{\mathcal{C}_4^{(A)} \setminus \{|j\rangle_B |k\rangle_C |\ell\rangle_D |m\rangle_E\}} = \mathbf{0}$ . Applying Lemma 2 to  $\mathcal{C}_4(|\xi_0\rangle_A)$ , we have

$$E_{\mathcal{C}_4^{(A)}} = a \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}_4^{(A)}}. \tag{24}$$

**Step 4** By Eqs. (20) and (24), we know that for any  $|j\rangle_B |k\rangle_C |\ell\rangle_D |m\rangle_E \in \mathcal{D}_i^{(A)} \cap \mathcal{C}_4^{(A)}$  for  $i = 9, 13$ ,  $\{|j\rangle_B |k\rangle_C |\ell\rangle_D |m\rangle_E\} E_{\mathcal{D}_i^{(A)} \setminus \{|j\rangle_B |k\rangle_C |\ell\rangle_D |m\rangle_E\}} = \mathbf{0}$ . Applying Lemma 2 to  $\mathcal{D}_i(|0\rangle_A)$  for  $i = 9, 13$ , we have

$$E_{\mathcal{D}_i^{(A)}} = a \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{D}_i^{(A)}} \quad \text{for } i = 9, 13. \tag{25}$$

Next, By Eqs. (21) and (25), we know that for any  $|j\rangle_B|k\rangle_C|\ell\rangle_D|m\rangle_E \in \mathcal{D}_9^{(A)} \cap \mathcal{C}_i^{(A)}$  for  $i = 2, 3$ ,  $\{|j\rangle_B|k\rangle_C|\ell\rangle_D|m\rangle_E\} E_{\mathcal{C}_i^{(A)} \setminus \{|j\rangle_B|k\rangle_C|\ell\rangle_D|m\rangle_E\}} = \mathbf{0}$ . Applying Lemma 2 to  $\mathcal{C}_i(|\xi_0\rangle_A)$  for  $i = 2, 3$ , we have

$$E_{\mathcal{C}_i^{(A)}} = a\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}_i^{(A)}} \quad \text{for } i = 2, 3. \quad (26)$$

**Step 5** By Eqs. (20) and (26), we know that for any  $|j\rangle_B|k\rangle_C|\ell\rangle_D|m\rangle_E \in \mathcal{D}_{12}^{(A)} \cap \mathcal{C}_3^{(A)}$ ,  $\{|j\rangle_B|k\rangle_C|\ell\rangle_D|m\rangle_E\} E_{\mathcal{D}_{12}^{(A)} \setminus \{|j\rangle_B|k\rangle_C|\ell\rangle_D|m\rangle_E\}} = \mathbf{0}$ . Applying Lemma 2 to  $\mathcal{D}_{12}(|0\rangle_A)$ , we have

$$E_{\mathcal{D}_{12}^{(A)}} = a\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{D}_{12}^{(A)}}. \quad (27)$$

Thus, above all,

$$E_{\{\cup_{i=1}^8 \mathcal{C}_i^{(A)}\} \cup \mathcal{D}_9^{(A)}} = \mathbb{I}_{\{\cup_{i=1}^8 \mathcal{C}_i^{(A)}\} \cup \mathcal{D}_9^{(A)}} \quad (28)$$

as  $\{\cup_{i=1}^8 \mathcal{C}_i^{(A)}\} \cup \mathcal{D}_9^{(A)}$  is equal to  $\mathcal{C}_8^{(A)} \cup \mathcal{D}_{11}^{(A)} \cup \mathcal{C}_4^{(A)} \cup \mathcal{D}_9^{(A)} \cup \mathcal{D}_{13}^{(A)} \cup \mathcal{C}_2^{(A)} \cup \mathcal{C}_3^{(A)} \cup \mathcal{D}_{12}^{(A)}$ .

**Step 6** By the symmetry of Fig. 6, we can obtain that  $E = a\mathbb{I}$ . Thus  $E$  is trivial.  $\square$

Any of our OPS in three, four and five-partite systems can be extended to a complete orthogonal product basis (COPB). We only need to add the product states which lie in the inside layer of the hypercube. Thus, our results solve an open question asked by the authors in Refs. [26, 28]. That is, strongly nonlocal OPSs and COPBs do exist in all possible three, four and five-partite systems. However, we are unable to generalize this structure to any  $n$ -partite system for  $n > 5$ . There are several difficulties. First, we cannot obtain a general expression of the OPS from the outermost layer of an  $n$ -dimensional hypercube, from which the OPS has a similiar structure in the bipartitions  $\{A_1|A_2A_3 \cdots A_n, A_2|A_3 \cdots A_nA_1, \dots, A_n|A_1A_2 \cdots A_{n-1}\}$ . Second, all of our proofs for the strongest nonlocality of the OPSs are based on the grid representations of the OPSs in the bipartition  $A_1|A_2A_3 \cdots A_n$ , like Figs. 4, 5 and 6, and we do not know the grid representations in the bipartition  $A_1|A_2A_3 \cdots A_n$  when  $n > 5$ . Third, we may take more steps to arrive at the statement  $E \propto \mathbb{I}$ . Therefore, it's more difficult to constructing OPSs of strong nonlocality for quantum system with more parties. However, we believe that our method can be generalized to  $n$ -partite systems for  $n > 5$ .

#### IV. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

We have constructed strongly nonlocal OPSs in three, four and five-partite systems. This result has answered an open question in Refs. [26, 28] for any possible three, four and five-partite systems. There are some interesting problems left. How to generalize our constructions to  $n$ -partite systems for  $n > 5$ ? Can we construct UPBs from our structures?

One can use entanglement as a resource to finish the locally distinguished protocol when the given set is locally indistinguishable. Such protocol is called the entanglement-assisted discrimination [29, 32–40]. It is also to quantify how many entanglement resource are needed to local distinguish the strongly nonlocal set constructed here in all bipartitions.

#### Acknowledgments

FS and XZ were supported by NSFC under Grant No. 11771419, the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, and Anhui Initiative in Quantum Information Technologies under Grant No. AHY150200. MSL and MHY were supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (12005092, 11875160, and U1801661), the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (2020M681996), the Natural Science Foundation of Guang-dong Province (2017B030308003), the Key R&D Program of Guangdong province (2018B030326001), the Guang-dong Innovative and Entrepreneurial Research TeamProgram (2016ZT06D348), the Science, Technology and Innovation Commission of Shenzhen Municipality (JCYJ20170412152620376 and JCYJ20170817105046702 and KYTDPT20181011104202253), the Economy, Trade and Information Commission of Shenzhen Municipality (201901161512). YLW is supported by the NSFC under Grant No. 11901084 and the Research startup funds of DGUT under Grant No. GC300501-103. LC and MH were supported by the NNSF of China (Grant No. 11871089), and the Fundamental Research Funds for the

- 
- [1] B. M. Terhal, D. P. Divincenzo, and D. Leung, “Hiding bits in bell states,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 86, no. 25, pp. 5807–5810, 2001.
  - [2] D. P. Divincenzo, D. Leung, and B. M. Terhal, “Quantum data hiding,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 580–598, 2002.
  - [3] T. Eggeling and R. F. Werner, “Hiding classical data in multipartite quantum states,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 89, no. 9, p. 097905, 2002.
  - [4] W. Matthews, S. Wehner, and A. Winter, “Distinguishability of quantum states under restricted families of measurements with an application to quantum data hiding,” *Commun. Math. Phys.*, vol. 291, no. 3, pp. p.813–843, 2009.
  - [5] D. Markham and B. C. Sanders, “Graph states for quantum secret sharing,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 78, no. 4, pp. 144–144, 2008.
  - [6] M. Hillery, V. Buzek, and A. Berthiaume, “Quantum secret sharing,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 59, p. 1829, 1999.
  - [7] R. Rahaman and M. G. Parker, “Quantum scheme for secret sharing based on local distinguishability,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 91, p. 022330, 2015.
  - [8] C. H. Bennett, D. P. Divincenzo, C. A. Fuchs, T. Mor, E. M. Rains, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, “Quantum nonlocality without entanglement,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 1070–1091, 1999.
  - [9] D. P. Divincenzo, T. Mor, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and B. M. Terhal, “Unextendible product bases, uncompletable product bases and bound entanglement,” *Commun. Math. Phys.*, vol. 238, no. 3, pp. 379–410, 2003.
  - [10] Y. Feng and Y. Shi, “Characterizing locally indistinguishable orthogonal product states,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 6, pp. p.2799–2806, 2009.
  - [11] J. Niset and N. J. Cerf, “Multipartite nonlocality without entanglement in many dimensions,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 74, p. 052103, 2006.
  - [12] Y. Yang, F. Gao, G. Tian, T. Cao, and Q. Wen, “Local distinguishability of orthogonal quantum states in a  $2 \otimes 2 \otimes 2$  system,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 88, no. 2, p. 024301, 2013.
  - [13] S. Halder, “Several nonlocal sets of multipartite pure orthogonal product states,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 98, p. 022303, 2018.
  - [14] G. Xu, Q. Wen, F. Gao, S. Qin, and H. Zuo, “Local indistinguishability of multipartite orthogonal product bases,” *Quantum Inf. Process.*, vol. 16, no. 11, p. 276, 2017.
  - [15] Y.-L. Wang, M.-S. Li, Z.-J. Zheng, and S.-M. Fei, “The local indistinguishability of multipartite product states,” *Quantum Inf. Process.*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 1–13, 2017.
  - [16] Z.-C. Zhang, K.-J. Zhang, F. Gao, Q.-Y. Wen, and C. H. Oh, “Construction of nonlocal multipartite quantum states,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 95, p. 052344, 2017.
  - [17] S. Ghosh, G. Kar, A. Roy, and D. Sarkar, “Distinguishability of maximally entangled states,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 70, p. 022304, 2004.
  - [18] H. Fan, “Distinguishability and indistinguishability by local operations and classical communication,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 92, p. 177905, 2004.
  - [19] M. Nathanson, “Distinguishing bipartite orthogonal states using locc: Best and worst cases,” *J. Math. Phys.*, vol. 46, no. 6, p. 062103, 2005.
  - [20] N. Yu, R. Duan, and M. Ying, “Any  $2 \otimes n$  subspace is locally distinguishable,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 84, p. 012304, 2011.
  - [21] R. Duan, Y. Feng, Z. Ji, and M. Ying, “Distinguishing arbitrary multipartite basis unambiguously using local operations and classical communication,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 98, p. 230502, 2007.
  - [22] S. Bandyopadhyay, S. Ghosh, and G. Kar, “Locc distinguishability of unilaterally transformable quantum states,” *New J. Phys.*, vol. 13, no. 12, p. 123013, 2011.
  - [23] A. Cosentino, “Positive-partial-transpose-indistinguishable states via semidefinite programming,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 87, no. 1, 2013.
  - [24] N. Yu, R. Duan, and M. Ying, “Four locally indistinguishable ququad-ququad orthogonal maximally entangled states,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 109, no. 2, p. 020506, 2012.
  - [25] S. Bandyopadhyay, “Entanglement, mixedness, and perfect local discrimination of orthogonal quantum states,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 85, p. 042319, 2012.
  - [26] S. Halder, M. Banik, S. Agrawal, and S. Bandyopadhyay, “Strong quantum nonlocality without entanglement,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 122, no. 4, p. 040403, 2019.
  - [27] Z.-C. Zhang and X. Zhang, “Strong quantum nonlocality in multipartite quantum systems,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 99, p. 062108, 2019.
  - [28] P. Yuan, G. Tian, and X. Sun, “Strong quantum nonlocality without entanglement in multipartite quantum systems,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 102, p. 042228, 2020.
  - [29] F. Shi, M. Hu, L. Chen, and X. Zhang, “Strong quantum nonlocality with entanglement,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 102, p. 042202, 2020.
  - [30] F. Shi, M.-S. Li, M. Hu, L. Chen, M.-H. Yung, Y.-L. Wang, and X. Zhang, “Strongly nonlocal unextendible product bases do exist,” *arXiv:2101.00735v2*, 2021.
  - [31] Y.-L. Wang, M.-S. Li, and M.-H. Yung, “Graph-connectivity-based strong quantum nonlocality with genuine entangle-

- ment,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 104, p. 012424, 2021.
- [32] S. Ghosh, G. Kar, A. Roy, A. Sen, U. Sen *et al.*, “Distinguishability of bell states,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 87, no. 27, p. 277902, 2001.
  - [33] S. M. Cohen, “Understanding entanglement as resource: Locally distinguishing unextendible product bases,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 77, no. 1, p. 012304, 2008.
  - [34] S. Bandyopadhyay, S. Halder, and M. Nathanson, “Entanglement as a resource for local state discrimination in multipartite systems,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 94, no. 2, p. 022311, 2016.
  - [35] Z.-C. Zhang, F. Gao, T.-Q. Cao, S.-J. Qin, and Q.-Y. Wen, “Entanglement as a resource to distinguish orthogonal product states,” *Sci. Rep.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1–7, 2016.
  - [36] Ö. Güngör and S. Turgut, “Entanglement-assisted state discrimination and entanglement preservation,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 94, no. 3, p. 032330, 2016.
  - [37] Z.-C. Zhang, Y.-Q. Song, T.-T. Song, F. Gao, S.-J. Qin, and Q.-Y. Wen, “Local distinguishability of orthogonal quantum states with multiple copies of  $2 \otimes 2$  maximally entangled states,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 97, no. 2, p. 022334, 2018.
  - [38] S. Rout, A. G. Maity, A. Mukherjee, S. Halder, and M. Banik, “Genuinely nonlocal product bases: Classification and entanglement-assisted discrimination,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 100, no. 3, p. 032321, 2019.
  - [39] Z.-C. Zhang, X. Wu, and X. Zhang, “Locally distinguishing unextendible product bases by using entanglement efficiently,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 101, no. 2, p. 022306, 2020.
  - [40] F. Shi, X. Zhang, and L. Chen, “Unextendible product bases from tile structures and their local entanglement-assisted distinguishability,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 101, no. 6, p. 062329, 2020.