

On orthogonal product sets with strong quantum nonlocality on plane structure

Huaqi Zhou¹, Ting Gao^{1,*} and Fengli Yan^{2†}

¹ *School of Mathematical Sciences, Hebei Normal University, Shijiazhuang 050024, China*

² *College of Physics, Hebei Key Laboratory of Photophysics Research and Application, Hebei Normal University, Shijiazhuang 050024, China*

In this paper, we consider the orthogonal product set (OPS) with strong quantum nonlocality. Based on the decomposition of plane geometry, we present a sufficient condition for the triviality of orthogonality-preserving POVM on fixed subsystem and partially answer an open question given by Yuan et al. [*Phys. Rev. A* **102**, 042228 (2020)]. The connection between the nonlocality and the plane structure of OPS is established. We successfully construct a strongly nonlocal OPS in $\mathcal{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_B} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_C}$ ($d_A, d_B, d_C \geq 4$), which contains fewer quantum states, and generalize the structures of known OPSs to any possible three and four-partite systems. In addition, we present several entanglement-assisted protocols for perfectly local discrimination the sets. It is shown that the protocols without teleportation use less entanglement resources on average and these sets can always be discriminated locally with multiple copies of 2-qubit maximally entangled states. These results also exhibit nontrivial signification of maximally entangled states in the local discrimination of quantum states.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum nonlocality, as one fundamental property and the most celebrated manifestations of quantum mechanics arises from entangled states. Quantum entanglement has received extensive attention, and many results have been obtained [1–3]. Since entangled states violate Bell type inequalities, so they are nonlocal [4–11]. However, in 1999, Bennett et al. [12] proposed a complete orthogonal product bases with nonlocality, i.e., each of which cannot be reliably discriminated by local operations and classical communication (LOCC) while it only can be identified by a global measurement. It means that nonlocal properties are no longer restricted only to entangled systems. Later, this phenomenon, quantum nonlocality without entanglement, has aroused a wide research [13–21]. Zhang et al. [14] gave a class of nonlocal orthogonal product bases in the quantum system of $\mathcal{C}^d \otimes \mathcal{C}^d$, where d is odd. Wang et al. [15] presented a small set with only $3(m+n) - 9$ orthogonal product states in an arbitrary bipartite quantum system $\mathcal{C}^m \otimes \mathcal{C}^n$ and proved that these states are LOCC indistinguishable. Xu et al. [17] presented a locally indistinguishable set of multipartite orthogonal product states of size $2n$, which can be projected to quantum system $\otimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{C}^2$ in essence. Jiang et al. [21] proposed a simple method to construct a nonlocal set of orthogonal product states in $\otimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{C}^{d_i}$ ($n \geq 3, d_i \geq 2$) quantum system. It is also shown that local indistinguishability is a crucial primitive for quantum data hiding [22–24] and quantum secret sharing [25–30].

Recently, the concept of quantum nonlocality without entanglement was further developed [31–41]. Halder et al. [31] presented a stronger manifestation of this kind of nonlocality in multipartite systems. Specifically, an orthogonal product set (OPS) on $\otimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{C}^{d_i}$ ($n \geq 3, d_i \geq 3$) is defined to be strongly nonlocal if it is locally irreducible in every bipartition. The local irreducibility means that it is not possible to

eliminate one or more states from the set by orthogonality-preserving local measurements [31]. Immediately, Zhang et al. [33] gave a more general definition of strong quantum nonlocality for multipartite quantum states, where the set is strongly nonlocal if it is locally irreducible in every $(n-1)$ -partition. Naturally, the set of orthogonal quantum states which is locally irreducible in every bipartition is the strongest manifestation of nonlocality.

It is well known that entanglement is a very valuable resource which allows remote parties to communicate [42, 43] as in teleportation [44–46]. In fact, the set of orthogonal quantum states with quantum nonlocality can always be perfectly discriminated by sharing additional entangled resource among the parties [32, 47–52]. Most generally, by using enough entanglement resource, we can teleport the full multipartite state to one of the parties by LOCC, then these states can be determined by performing suitable measurement. In 2008, Cohen [48] presented a method to distinguish certain classes of unextendible product bases (UPBs) and proved that the method is resource efficient as it consumes less entanglement in comparison to the teleportation-based method. Rout et al. [32] studied local state discrimination protocols with Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) state and Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) state. Zhang et al. [50, 52] presented several protocols to locally distinguish particular UPBs by using different entanglement resource and proved that some sets can also be locally distinguished with multiple copies of EPR states.

In this paper, we study the OPSs with strong nonlocality. In Sec. II, we introduce some notations and required preliminary concepts and results. In Sec. III, we connect the plane structure, study the sufficient condition for local irreducibility of OPS and illustrate the smallest size of OPS under some specific constraints. Next, in Sec. IV, we generalize the structure of given sets to higher dimension systems and construct a smaller OPS with the strongest quantum nonlocality in $\mathcal{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_B} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_C}$ ($d_A, d_B, d_C \geq 4$). Furthermore, we also investigate local distinguishability of our OPSs by using different entanglement resource in Sec. V. Finally, we conclude the paper with a brief summary in Sec. VI.

*Electronic address: gaoting@hebtu.edu.cn

†Electronic address: flyan@hebtu.edu.cn

II. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we introduce some basic definitions, lemmas and some necessary notations about strong quantum nonlocality without entanglement. They are used throughout the paper.

Definition 1 [53]. A measurement is trivial if all the POVM elements are proportional to the identity operator. Otherwise, the measurement is nontrivial.

In an n -partite system, a set $\{|\varphi\rangle\}$ of orthogonal states is locally irreducible if the orthogonality-preserving POVM [31] on any party can only be trivial. The inverse does not hold in general. Define $X_1 = \{2, 3, \dots, n\}$, $X_2 = \{3, \dots, n, 1\}$, $X_3 = \{4, \dots, n, 1, 2\}, \dots, X_n = \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$. One has the following lemma.

Lemma 1 [37]. If X_i party can only perform a trivial orthogonality-preserving POVM for any $1 \leq i \leq n$, then the set $\{|\varphi\rangle\}$ has of the strongest nonlocality [33].

Let a $d \times d$ matrix $E = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in \mathcal{Z}_d}$ be the matrix representation of an operator $E = M^\dagger M$ under the basis $\mathcal{B} = \{|0\rangle, \dots, |d-1\rangle\}$. Suppose that \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} are two nonempty subsets of \mathcal{B} , define

$${}_S E_{\mathcal{T}} = \sum_{|i\rangle \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{|j\rangle \in \mathcal{T}} a_{ij} |i\rangle \langle j|. \quad (1)$$

Specially, $E_{\mathcal{S}}$ represents ${}_S E_{\mathcal{S}}$. Assume that $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}_{i=0}^{s-1}$ and $\{|\phi_j\rangle\}_{j=0}^{t-1}$ are two orthogonal sets spanned by \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} , respectively. Here $s = |\mathcal{S}|$ and $t = |\mathcal{T}|$. Then one has the following conclusions.

Lemma 2 [37]. If subsets \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} are disjoint and $\langle \psi_i | E | \phi_j \rangle = 0$ for any $i \in \mathcal{Z}_s, j \in \mathcal{Z}_t$, then ${}_S E_{\mathcal{T}} = \mathbf{0}$ and ${}_{\mathcal{T}} E_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{0}$.

Lemma 3 [37]. Assume that $\langle \psi_i | E | \psi_j \rangle = 0$ for any $i \neq j \in \mathcal{Z}_s$. If there exists a state $|i_0\rangle \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\{ |i_0\rangle \} E_{\mathcal{S} \setminus \{ |i_0\rangle \}} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\langle i_0 | \psi_j \rangle \neq 0$ for any $j \in \mathcal{Z}_s$, then $E_{\mathcal{S}} \propto I_{\mathcal{S}}$.

We use S to denote a class of OPS in $\mathcal{C} = \otimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{C}^{d_i}$. It is required that the set is the union of bases S_r ($r \in Q = \{1, \dots, q\}$) of disjoint subspaces and each component of the vector in S_r is nonzero under the computation basis of corresponding subspace. Moreover, we call the set S symmetric if it is invariant under cyclic permutation of the parties.

Let $\mathcal{B} = \{|i\rangle\}_{i=0}^{d-1}$ be the computation basis of whole composite quantum system. Given a subset X of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and its complement $Y = \bar{X}$, we represent by $\mathcal{B}^X = \{|i\rangle_X\}_{i=0}^{d_X-1}$ the computation basis of the complex Euclidean space corresponding to X party and analogously with $\mathcal{B}^Y = \{|i\rangle_Y\}_{i=0}^{d_Y-1}$. Under the basis \mathcal{B} , the projection set of S_r on τ ($\tau = X, Y$) party is expressed as $S_r^{(\tau)} = \{\text{Tr}_{\bar{\tau}}(|i\rangle) \mid |i\rangle \in \mathcal{B} \text{ and } \langle i | \phi^r \rangle \neq 0 \text{ for any } |\phi^r\rangle \in S_r\}$. Naturally, the projection set $S_r^{(\tau)}$ is a subset of basis \mathcal{B}^τ . For a fixed $i \in \mathcal{Z}_{d_X}$, we denote $\mathcal{B}_i^X := \{|k\rangle_X\}_{k=i}^{d_X-1}$, $V_i := \{\cup_v S_v^{(Y)} \mid |i\rangle_X \in S_v^{(X)}\}$ and $\tilde{S}_{V_i} := \{\cup_s S_s^{(X)} \mid S_s^{(Y)} \cap V_i \neq \emptyset\}$. In order to facilitate the illustration, we present the following two definitions.

Definition 2. A family of projection sets $\{S_r^{(\tau)}\}_{r \in Q}$ is connected if it cannot be divided into two groups of sets

$\{S_k^{(\tau)}\}_{k \in T}$ ($T \subsetneq Q$) and $\{S_l^{(\tau)}\}_{l \in Q \setminus T}$ such that

$$\left(\bigcup_{k \in T} S_k^{(\tau)} \right) \cap \left(\bigcup_{l \in Q \setminus T} S_l^{(\tau)} \right) = \emptyset. \quad (2)$$

Definition 3. We call $R_r = \cup_{r' \in T'} S_{r'}$ ($r \notin T' \subset Q$) the projection inclusion (PI) set of S_r on X party if these subsets satisfy $\cap_{r' \in T'} S_{r'}^{(Y)} \neq \emptyset$ and $S_r^{(X)} \subset \cup_{r' \in T'} S_{r'}^{(X)}$. Specially, R_r is called a more useful projection inclusion (UPI) set if there exists a subset $S_{r'} \subset R_r$ such that $|S_r^{(X)} \cap S_{r'}^{(X)}| = 1$.

As can be seen from the definition, the PI set of a subset S_r may not be unique. About set S , if there exists a subset which has UPI set, we can construct a set sequence $\{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_s\}$. In the sequence, the sets are pairwise disjoint and the union of all sets is S . The set G_1 denoted as $\cup_{r_1 \in T_1} S_{r_1}$ is the union of all subsets that have UPI sets. The remaining sets G_2, \dots, G_s are expressed by $\cup_{r_2 \in T_2} S_{r_2}, \dots, \cup_{r_s \in T_s} S_{r_s}$, respectively. For any subset $S_{r_{x+1}} \subset G_{x+1}$ ($x = 1, \dots, s-1$), there is always a subset $S_{r_x} \subset G_x$ such that $S_{r_{x+1}}^{(X)} \cap S_{r_x}^{(X)} \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, for any $S_{r_x} \subset G_x$, we have $S_{r_x}^{(X)} \cap S_{r_y}^{(X)} = \emptyset$, where S_{r_y} is an arbitrary subset in G_y for all $y = x+2, \dots, s$. In addition, we call S_{r_x} included (IC) subset about set G_x ($x = 1, \dots, s$), if there is a subset $S_{r'_x} \subset G_x$ such that $S_{r_x}^{(X)} \subsetneq S_{r'_x}^{(X)}$. Otherwise, it is called non-included (NIC) subset.

III. THE SUFFICIENT CONDITION FOR POVM TRIVIALITY AND THE SMALLEST SIZE OF OPS UNDER SOME CONSTRAINTS

It is an important way to illustrate the irreducibility of OPS by proving that the orthogonality-preserving POVM on the subsystems can only be trivial [21, 31, 33–35, 37]. Here, we will present a sufficient condition for POVM trivality. On plane structure, the condition is efficient for constructing OPS and demonstrating the irreducibility.

Theorem 1. For the given set S , any orthogonality-preserving POVM performed on X party can only be trivial if the following conditions are satisfied.

i) There is an inclusion relationship $\mathcal{B}_i^X \subset \tilde{S}_{V_i}$ for any $i \in \mathcal{Z}_{d_X-1}$.

ii) For any subset S_r , there exists a corresponding PI set R_r on X party.

iii) There is a set sequence $\{G_1, \dots, G_s\}$. Moreover, for each NIC subset $S_{r_{x+1}} \subset G_{x+1}$, there exist a subset $S_{r_x} \subset G_x$ and a subset $S_{r'_{x+1}} \subset R_{r_{x+1}}$ such that $S_{r_x}^{(X)} \cap S_{r'_{x+1}}^{(X)} \supset S_{r_{x+1}}^{(X)} \cap S_{r'_{x+1}}^{(X)}$ with $x = 1, 2, \dots, s-1$.

iv) The family of sets $\{S_r^{(X)}\}_{r \in Q}$ is connected.

Proof. Let $\{E\}$ be an any orthogonality-preserving POVM performed on X . Without loss of generality, we assume

$$E = \begin{pmatrix} a_{00} & a_{01} & \cdots & a_{0(d_X-1)} \\ a_{10} & a_{11} & \cdots & a_{1(d_X-1)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{(d_X-1)0} & a_{(d_X-1)1} & \cdots & a_{(d_X-1)(d_X-1)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

in the computation basis \mathcal{B}^X . Because the postmeasurement states should be mutually orthogonal, for any two states $|\psi_1\rangle_X|\phi_1\rangle_Y$ and $|\psi_2\rangle_X|\phi_2\rangle_Y$ in S , we have ${}_X\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle_X\langle\phi_1|\phi_2\rangle_Y = 0$. If $\langle\phi_1|\phi_2\rangle_Y \neq 0$, then ${}_X\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle_X = 0$.

Let $S_r^\tau = \{\text{Tr}_\tau(|\phi^r\rangle)|\phi^r\rangle \in S_r\}$ ($\tau = X, Y$) express the set of reduced density matrices. For any two different subsets S_{q_1} and S_{q_2} , if $S_{q_1}^{(Y)} \cap S_{q_2}^{(Y)} \neq \emptyset$, then $S_{q_1}^{(X)} \cap S_{q_2}^{(X)} = \emptyset$ and there always exist two states $|\phi_{q_1}\rangle_Y \in S_{q_1}^Y$ and $|\phi_{q_2}\rangle_Y \in S_{q_2}^Y$ such that $\langle\phi_{q_1}|\phi_{q_2}\rangle_Y \neq 0$. Due to the orthogonality-preserving property, we obtain ${}_X\langle\psi_{q_1}|\psi_{q_2}\rangle_X = 0$ for all $|\psi_{q_1}\rangle_X \in S_{q_1}^X$ and $|\psi_{q_2}\rangle_X \in S_{q_2}^X$. According to the lemma 2, we deduce ${}_{S_{q_1}^{(X)}}E_{S_{q_2}^{(X)}} = \mathbf{0}$. By using this result, we can show that $E \propto \mathcal{I}$ as follows.

Step 1. When $i = 0$, we know $V_0 = \{\cup_v S_v^{(Y)} \mid |0\rangle_X \in S_v^{(X)}\}$. For each $|j\rangle_Y \in V_0$, let $\{S_{j_s}\}_{j_s \in Q_j}$ ($Q_j \subset Q$) represent the all subsets whose Y party projection sets include the state $|j\rangle_Y$. Suppose S_{j_1} is the subset satisfied $|0\rangle_X \in S_{j_1}^{(X)}$. Obviously, we have ${}_{S_{j_1}^{(X)}}E_{S_{j_s}^{(X)}} = \mathbf{0}$ for any s ($s \neq 1$). By the definition and condition i), it is easy to know that $\cup_{j_s \in Q_j} S_{j_s}^{(X)} = \tilde{V}_{V_0} = \mathcal{B}_0^X = \{|i\rangle_X\}_{i=0}^{d_X-1}$. Thus, we get $a_{0k_0} = a_{k_0 0} = 0$ for $|k_0\rangle_X \notin \tilde{V}_0$, where $\tilde{V}_0 = \{\cup_v S_v^{(X)} \mid |0\rangle_X \in S_v^{(X)}\}$.

Similarly, when $i = 1, \dots, d_X - 2$, we get $a_{ik_i} = a_{k_i i} = 0$ for $|k_i\rangle_X \notin \tilde{V}_i$ and $k_i > i$. Here $\tilde{V}_i = \{\cup_v S_v^{(X)} \mid |i\rangle_X \in S_v^{(X)}\}$.

Step 2. According to the condition ii), for each S_r , we have the corresponding PI set $R_r = \cup_{r' \in T'} S_{r'}$. Because $\cap_{r' \in T'} S_{r'}^{(Y)} \neq \emptyset$ and $S_r^{(X)} \subset \cup_{r' \in T'} S_{r'}^{(X)}$, for any two different indexes r' and r'' in T' , it is not difficult to deduce that $a_{kl} = a_{lk} = 0$ with $|k\rangle_X \in S_{r'}^{(X)} \cap S_{r''}^{(X)}$ and $|l\rangle_X \in S_{r'}^{(X)} \cap S_{r''}^{(X)}$ for $k \neq l$.

Step 3. Pick any subset S_{r_1} in G_1 , the corresponding set R_{r_1} is UPI set. We have $|S_{r_1}^{(X)} \cap S_{r'_1}^{(X)}| = 1$ for a certain subset $S_{r'_1} \subset R_{r_1}$. Let $|k\rangle_X = S_{r_1}^{(X)} \cap S_{r'_1}^{(X)}$, we obtain $a_{kl} = 0$ for $|l\rangle_X \in S_{r_1}^{(X)} \setminus |k\rangle_X$. Because each component of the vector in S_{r_1} is nonzero under the computation basis of corresponding subspace, it is easy to know $\langle k|\psi\rangle_X \neq 0$ for any $|\psi\rangle_X \in S_{r_1}^X$. According to the lemma 3, we deduce $E_{r_1} = E_{S_{r_1}^{(X)}} \propto \mathcal{I}$.

Look the condition iii), for each NIC subset $S_{r_2} \subset G_2$, there exist a subset $S_{r_1} \subset G_1$ and a subset $S_{r'_2} \subset R_{r_2}$ such that $S_{r_1}^{(X)} \cap S_{r_2}^{(X)} \supset S_{r_2}^{(X)} \cap S_{r'_2}^{(X)}$. Then $a_{kl} = 0$ for $|k\rangle_X, |l\rangle_X \in S_{r_2}^{(X)} \cap S_{r'_2}^{(X)}$ and $k \neq l$. Combining with the step 2, we have $a_{kl} = 0$ for $|k\rangle_X \in S_{r_2}^{(X)} \cap S_{r'_2}^{(X)}$, $|l\rangle_X \in S_{r_2}^{(X)}$ and $k \neq l$. Using the lemma 3 again, we get $E_{r_2} = E_{S_{r_2}^{(X)}} \propto \mathcal{I}$. For each IC subset $S_{r'_2}$, there is always a corresponding NIC subset S_{r_2} that satisfies the inclusion relationship $S_{r'_2}^{(X)} \subsetneq S_{r_2}^{(X)}$. Thus, $E_{r'_2} = E_{S_{r_2}^{(X)}} \propto \mathcal{I}$. In the same way, it is easy to know that $E_r \propto \mathcal{I}$ for each r . That is $E_r = b_r \mathcal{I}$, b_r is a coefficient.

Step 4. For any $x, y \in Q$, if $S_x^{(X)} \cap S_y^{(X)} \neq \emptyset$, then

$b_x = b_y$. Because the family of sets $\{S_r^{(X)}\}_{r \in Q}$ is connected, these coefficients b_r are all equal. Thus, the POVM element can only be proportional to the unit operator \mathcal{I} .

The proof of this theorem is completed. \square

Note that it is obvious that $E_r \propto \mathcal{I}$ for each $r \in Q$, if the set G_1 is equal to the set S . That is, when the set sequence only has a set G_1 , we still say that the condition iii) is valid. Next we will provide an example to show the application of this theorem on plane structure.

Example 1. We revisit the quantum nonlocality of the following OPS [34] in $\mathcal{C}^3 \otimes \mathcal{C}^3 \otimes \mathcal{C}^3$

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \{|0\rangle|1\rangle|0 \pm 1\rangle\}, & S_7 &= \{|0\rangle|2\rangle|0 \pm 2\rangle\}, \\ S_2 &= \{|1\rangle|0 \pm 1\rangle|0\rangle\}, & S_8 &= \{|2\rangle|0 \pm 2\rangle|0\rangle\}, \\ S_3 &= \{|0 \pm 1\rangle|0\rangle|1\rangle\}, & S_9 &= \{|0 \pm 2\rangle|0\rangle|2\rangle\}, \\ S_4 &= \{|1\rangle|2\rangle|0 \pm 1\rangle\}, & S_{10} &= \{|2\rangle|1\rangle|0 \pm 2\rangle\}, \\ S_5 &= \{|2\rangle|0 \pm 1\rangle|1\rangle\}, & S_{11} &= \{|1\rangle|0 \pm 2\rangle|2\rangle\}, \\ S_6 &= \{|0 \pm 1\rangle|1\rangle|2\rangle\}, & S_{12} &= \{|0 \pm 2\rangle|2\rangle|1\rangle\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

2	S_8	S_5	S_9	S_{10}	S_5	S_{10}	S_8	S_{12}	
1	S_2		S_{11}	S_2			S_4		S_{11}
0		S_3	S_9	S_1		S_6	S_7	S_{12}	S_7
	00	01	02	10	11	12	20	21	22

FIG. 1: The corresponding 3×9 grid of $\{S_r\}_{r=1}^{12}$ given by Eq.(4) in $A|BC$ bipartition.

Due to the lemma 1 and the symmetry of OPS given by Eq.(4), we only need to consider the orthogonality-preserving POVM performed on BC party. Fig. 1 is the plane structure of OPS in $A|BC$ bipartition. By observing this tile graph, we can easily obtain the four conditions in the theorem 1.

First, because the projection set $\cup_r S_r^{(ABC)}$ differs from the computation basis \mathcal{B} only by states $|000\rangle$, $|111\rangle$ and $|222\rangle$. It is obvious that $\tilde{S}_{V_{ij}} = \mathcal{B}^{BC}$ for $i, j \in \mathcal{Z}_3$. Here \mathcal{B}^{BC} is the computation basis on subsystem BC . Naturally, $\mathcal{B}_{ij}^{BC} \subset \tilde{S}_{V_{ij}}$. The condition i) holds.

Second, for each subset S_r , we have the corresponding PI sets $R_1 = S_5 \cup S_{10}$, $R_2 = S_8 \cup S_{10}$, $R_3 = S_5$, $R_4 = S_8 \cup S_{12}$, $R_5 = S_1 \cup S_3$, $R_6 = S_{10}$, $R_7 = S_4 \cup S_{11}$, $R_8 = S_2 \cup S_4$, $R_9 = S_{11}$, $R_{10} = S_1 \cup S_6$, $R_{11} = S_7 \cup S_9$ and $R_{12} = S_4$. The condition ii) is demonstrated.

Furthermore, for any two subsets S_x and S_y , we have $|S_x^{(BC)} \cap S_y^{(BC)}| \leq 1$. So, each R_r is a UPI set, i.e., G_1 is the union of all subsets. It is obvious that the condition iii) holds.

Final, we find a sequence of projection sets $(S_5^{(BC)}, S_{10}^{(BC)}) \rightarrow S_1^{(BC)} \rightarrow S_2^{(BC)} \rightarrow S_8^{(BC)} \rightarrow S_4^{(BC)} \rightarrow S_7^{(BC)} \rightarrow S_{11}^{(BC)}$. In this sequence, the intersection of the sets on both sides of the arrow is not empty and the union of these sets is the computation basis \mathcal{B}^{BC} . So, it is impossible to divide all projection sets into disjoint two

groups of projection sets. That is, the family of projection sets $\{S_r^{(BC)}\}_{r=1}^{12}$ is connected. The condition iv) is satisfied.

According to the theorem 1, we deduce the POVM performed on BC party can only be trivial. Therefore, the OPS given by Eq.(4) has the strongest quantum nonlocality.

For the same set as stated in the theorem 1, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 1. In any orthogonality-preserving POVM element performed on X party can only be proportional to the identity operator, then the set $\cup_{r \in Q} S_r^{(X)}$ is the basis \mathcal{B}^X and the family of projection sets $\{S_r^{(X)}\}_{r \in Q}$ is connected.

By using the corollary 1, in systems $\mathcal{C}^3 \otimes \mathcal{C}^3 \otimes \mathcal{C}^3$ and $\mathcal{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{C}^4$, we can discuss the minimum size of OPS under the specific restrictions. Let N express the maximum size of all subsets, i.e., $N = \max_r |S_r|$. We have the following two theorems.

Theorem 2. In $\mathcal{C}^3 \otimes \mathcal{C}^3 \otimes \mathcal{C}^3$, for a given set S being symmetric, if any orthogonality-preserving POVM performed on BC party can only be trivial, then the smallest size of this set is 24.

Theorem 3. In $\mathcal{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{C}^4$, for a given set S is symmetric, when $N = 2$, if any orthogonality-preserving POVM element performed on BC party can only be proportional to identity, then the smallest size of this set S is 48.

For the detailed proofs please refer to Appendix A and B, respectively. Theorems 2 and 3 show the minimum sizes of this two kinds of OPSs, respectively. They are a partial answer for an open question in Ref.[34].

IV. OPS WITH THE STRONGEST QUANTUM NONLOCALITY IN $\mathcal{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_B} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_C}$ AND $\mathcal{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_B} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_C} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_D}$

From the theorem 1, we know that the nonlocality of OPS is closely related to its plane structure. In this section, we will provide several nonlocal OPSs in three and four-partite systems.

By extending the dimension of the grid in fig. 1, we can generalize the structure of the set (4) to any finite dimension. The OPS in $\mathcal{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_B} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_C}$ is described as

$$\begin{aligned}
H_1 &= \{|0\rangle_A |\xi_i\rangle_B |\eta_j\rangle_C\}_{i,j}, \\
H_2 &= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |\eta_j\rangle_B |0\rangle_C\}_{i,j}, \\
H_3 &= \{|\eta_j\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |\xi_i\rangle_C\}_{i,j}, \\
H_4 &= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |d'_B\rangle_B |\eta_j\rangle_C\}_{i,j}, \\
H_5 &= \{|d'_A\rangle_A |\eta_j\rangle_B |\xi_i\rangle_C\}_{i,j}, \\
H_6 &= \{|\eta_j\rangle_A |\xi_i\rangle_B |d'_C\rangle_C\}_{i,j}, \\
H_7 &= \{|0\rangle_A |d'_B\rangle_B |0 \pm d'_C\rangle_C\}, \\
H_8 &= \{|d'_A\rangle_A |0 \pm d'_B\rangle_B |0\rangle_C\}, \\
H_9 &= \{|0 \pm d'_A\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |d'_C\rangle_C\}, \\
H_{10} &= \{|d'_A\rangle_A |\xi_i\rangle_B |0 \pm d'_C\rangle_C\}_i, \\
H_{11} &= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |0 \pm d'_B\rangle_B |d'_C\rangle_C\}_i, \\
H_{12} &= \{|0 \pm d'_A\rangle_A |d'_B\rangle_B |\xi_i\rangle_C\}_i,
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $|\xi_i\rangle_\tau = \sum_{u=0}^{d_\tau-3} \omega_{d_\tau-2}^{iu} |u+1\rangle$, $|\eta_j\rangle_\tau = \sum_{u=0}^{d_\tau-2} \omega_{d_\tau-1}^{ju} |u\rangle$, $d'_\tau = d_\tau - 1$ for $i \in \mathcal{Z}_{d_\tau-2}$, $j \in \mathcal{Z}_{d_\tau-1}$,

and $\tau = A, B, C$. Here and below, we use the notation $\omega_n := e^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}$ for any positive integer n .

In $A|BC$ bipartition, this OPS allows representation as in fig. 2. We will explain its nonlocality in the following theorem.

d_A'	H_8	H_5	H_9	H_{10}	H_5	H_{10}	H_8	H_{12}	
i	H_2		H_{11}	H_2			H_4		H_{11}
0		H_3	H_9	H_1		H_6	H_7	H_{12}	H_7
	00	$0i$	$0d_B'$	$i0$	ii	id_C'	$d_B'0$	$d_B'i$	$d_B'd_C'$

FIG. 2: The corresponding $d_A \times d_B d_C$ grid of $\{H_i\}_{i=1}^{12}$ given by Eq.(5) in $A|BC$ bipartition.

Theorem 4. In $\mathcal{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_B} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_C}$, the set $\cup_{i=1}^{12} H_i$ given by Eq.(5) is of the strongest nonlocality. The size of this set is $2[(d_A d_B + d_B d_C + d_A d_C) - 2(d_A + d_B + d_C) + 3]$.

Proof. Similarly, we only need to discuss the POVM performed on BC party. The tile structure is shown in the fig. 2. Because the set $\cup_{i=1}^{12} H_i$ has the same structure as the set $\cup_{i=1}^{12} S_i$ given by Eq.(4), the conditions i), ii) and iv) are obvious. Correspondingly, let R_i have the same grids. We consider the condition iii).

There is the set sequence

$$\begin{aligned}
G_1 &= H_2 \cup H_7 \cup H_8 \cup H_{11}, \\
G_2 &= H_1 \cup H_4 \cup H_9 \cup H_{10}, \\
G_3 &= H_5 \cup H_6 \cup H_{12}, \\
G_4 &= H_3.
\end{aligned}$$

Here each H_i is a NIC subset. For $H_1 \subset G_2$, by observing the fig. 2 we find that there are $H_2 \subset G_1$ and $H_{10} \subset R_1$ such that $H_1^{(BC)} \cap H_2^{(BC)} = H_1^{(BC)} \cap H_{10}^{(BC)}$. For $H_4 \subset G_2$, there is $H_8 = G_1 \cap R_4$. Naturally, it satisfies the relationship of condition iii). For the subsets $H_9, H_{10}, H_5, H_6, H_{12}$ and H_3 , there are $H_{11} = G_1 \cap R_9$, $H_2 = G_1 \cap R_{10}$, $H_1 = G_2 \cap R_5$, $H_{10} = G_2 \cap R_6$, $H_4 = G_2 \cap R_{12}$ and $H_5 = G_3 \cap R_3$, respectively. The condition iii) holds.

According to the theorem 1, the orthogonality-preserving POVM performed on BC party can only be trivial. Therefore, the set $\cup_{i=1}^{12} H_i$ given by Eq.(5) has the strongest nonlocality. \square

Through the application of the theorem 1 on plane geometry, we construct a new OPS which contains fewer quantum states in the system $\mathcal{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{C}^4$ and prove that the new OPS has the strongest quantum nonlocality. The specific OPS is

given by

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{11} &= \{|0\rangle|1\rangle|2 \pm 3\rangle\}, & S_{51} &= \{|1\rangle|3\rangle|2 \pm 3\rangle\}, \\
S_{12} &= \{|1\rangle|2 \pm 3\rangle|0\rangle\}, & S_{52} &= \{|3\rangle|2 \pm 3\rangle|1\rangle\}, \\
S_{13} &= \{|2 \pm 3\rangle|0\rangle|1\rangle\}, & S_{53} &= \{|2 \pm 3\rangle|1\rangle|3\rangle\}, \\
S_{21} &= \{|0\rangle|2\rangle|1 \pm 2\rangle\}, & S_{61} &= \{|2\rangle|3\rangle|1 \pm 2\rangle\}, \\
S_{22} &= \{|2\rangle|1 \pm 2\rangle|0\rangle\}, & S_{62} &= \{|3\rangle|1 \pm 2\rangle|2\rangle\}, \\
S_{23} &= \{|1 \pm 2\rangle|0\rangle|2\rangle\}, & S_{63} &= \{|1 \pm 2\rangle|2\rangle|3\rangle\}, \\
S_{31} &= \{|0\rangle|3\rangle|0 \pm 2\rangle\}, & S_{71} &= \{|3\rangle|0\rangle|2 \pm 3\rangle\}, \\
S_{32} &= \{|3\rangle|0 \pm 2\rangle|0\rangle\}, & S_{72} &= \{|0\rangle|2 \pm 3\rangle|3\rangle\}, \\
S_{33} &= \{|0 \pm 2\rangle|0\rangle|3\rangle\}, & S_{73} &= \{|2 \pm 3\rangle|3\rangle|0\rangle\}, \\
S_{41} &= \{|1\rangle|0\rangle|0 \pm 1\rangle\}, & S_{81} &= \{|3\rangle|1\rangle|0 \pm 1\rangle\}, \\
S_{42} &= \{|0\rangle|0 \pm 1\rangle|1\rangle\}, & S_{82} &= \{|1\rangle|0 \pm 1\rangle|3\rangle\}, \\
S_{43} &= \{|0 \pm 1\rangle|1\rangle|0\rangle\}, & S_{83} &= \{|0 \pm 1\rangle|3\rangle|1\rangle\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Theorem 5. In $\mathcal{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{C}^4$, the set $\cup_{i=1}^8 (\cup_{j=1}^3 S_{ij})$ given by Eq.(6) has the strongest nonlocality. The size of this set is 48.

The detailed proof is shown in Appendix C. In the same way, we generalize the structures of OPSs given by Eq.(6) and Ref.[34] to higher dimensional systems $\mathcal{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_B} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_C}$ and $\mathcal{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_B} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_C} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_D}$, respectively. In $\mathcal{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_B} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_C}$ ($d_A, d_B, d_C \geq 4$), we consider the following OPS

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{11} &= \{|0\rangle_A |1\rangle_B |\alpha_3^l\rangle_C\}l, \\
H_{12} &= \{|1\rangle_A |\alpha_3^l\rangle_B |0\rangle_C\}l, \\
H_{13} &= \{|\alpha_3^l\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |1\rangle_C\}l, \\
H_{21} &= \{|0\rangle_A |\alpha^i\rangle_B |\alpha_1^k\rangle_C\}i,k, \\
H_{22} &= \{|\alpha^i\rangle_A |\alpha_1^k\rangle_B |0\rangle_C\}i,k, \\
H_{23} &= \{|\alpha_1^k\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |\alpha^i\rangle_C\}i,k, \\
H_{31} &= \{|0\rangle_A |d'_B\rangle_B |\alpha_0^j\rangle_C\}j, \\
H_{32} &= \{|d'_A\rangle_A |\alpha_0^j\rangle_B |0\rangle_C\}j, \\
H_{33} &= \{|\alpha_0^j\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |d'_C\rangle_C\}j, \\
H_{41} &= \{|1\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |0 \pm 1\rangle_C\}, \\
H_{42} &= \{|0\rangle_A |0 \pm 1\rangle_B |1\rangle_C\}, \\
H_{43} &= \{|0 \pm 1\rangle_A |1\rangle_B |0\rangle_C\}, \\
H_{51} &= \{|1\rangle_A |d'_B\rangle_B |\alpha_3^l\rangle_C\}l, \\
H_{52} &= \{|d'_A\rangle_A |\alpha_3^l\rangle_B |1\rangle_C\}l, \\
H_{53} &= \{|\alpha_3^l\rangle_A |1\rangle_B |d'_C\rangle_C\}l, \\
H_{61} &= \{|\alpha^i\rangle_A |d'_B\rangle_B |\alpha_1^k\rangle_C\}i,k, \\
H_{62} &= \{|d'_A\rangle_A |\alpha_1^k\rangle_B |\alpha^i\rangle_C\}i,k, \\
H_{63} &= \{|\alpha_1^k\rangle_A |\alpha^i\rangle_B |d'_C\rangle_C\}i,k, \\
H_{71} &= \{|d'_A\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |\alpha_3^l\rangle_C\}l, \\
H_{72} &= \{|0\rangle_A |\alpha_3^l\rangle_B |d'_C\rangle_C\}l, \\
H_{73} &= \{|\alpha_3^l\rangle_A |d'_B\rangle_B |0\rangle_C\}l, \\
H_{81} &= \{|d'_A\rangle_A |1\rangle_B |0 \pm 1\rangle_C\}, \\
H_{82} &= \{|1\rangle_A |0 \pm 1\rangle_B |d'_C\rangle_C\}, \\
H_{83} &= \{|0 \pm 1\rangle_A |d'_B\rangle_B |1\rangle_C\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Here $|\alpha^i\rangle_\tau = \sum_{u=0}^{d_\tau-4} \omega_{d_\tau-3}^{iu} |u+2\rangle$, $|\alpha_0^j\rangle_\tau = |0\rangle + \sum_{u=1}^{d_\tau-3} \omega_{d_\tau-2}^{ju} |u+1\rangle$, $|\alpha_1^k\rangle_\tau = \sum_{u=0}^{d_\tau-3} \omega_{d_\tau-2}^{ku} |u+1\rangle$, $|\alpha_3^l\rangle_\tau = \sum_{u=0}^{d_\tau-3} \omega_{d_\tau-2}^{lu} |u+2\rangle$, $d'_\tau = d_\tau - 1$ for $i \in \mathcal{Z}_{d_\tau-3}$, $j, k, l \in \mathcal{Z}_{d_\tau-2}$ and $\tau = A, B, C$. We find that this OPS also has the strongest nonlocality.

Theorem 6. In $\mathcal{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_B} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_C}$, the set $\cup_{i=1}^8 (\cup_{j=1}^3 H_{ij})$ given by Eq.(7) is an OPS of the strongest nonlocality. The size of this set is $2[(d_A d_B + d_B d_C + d_A d_C) - 3(d_A + d_B + d_C) + 12]$.

For the detailed proof please see the Appendix D. When $d_A = d_B = d_C = d \geq 4$, the size of the strongly nonlocal OPS in this theorem is strictly less than the size $6(d-1)^2$ of the strongly nonlocal OPS in Ref.[34]. Define the following OPS in $\mathcal{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_B} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_C} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_D}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
U_{11} &= \{|0\rangle_A |\xi_i\rangle_B |\eta_j\rangle_C |0 \pm d'_D\rangle_D\}i,j, \\
U_{12} &= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |\eta_j\rangle_B |0 \pm d'_C\rangle_C |0\rangle_D\}i,j, \\
U_{13} &= \{|\eta_j\rangle_A |0 \pm d'_B\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |\xi_i\rangle_D\}i,j, \\
U_{14} &= \{|0 \pm d'_A\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |\xi_i\rangle_C |\eta_j\rangle_D\}i,j, \\
U_{21} &= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |d'_B\rangle_B |\gamma_k\rangle_C |\eta_j\rangle_D\}i,j,k, \\
U_{22} &= \{|d'_A\rangle_A |\gamma_k\rangle_B |\eta_j\rangle_C |\xi_i\rangle_D\}i,j,k, \\
U_{23} &= \{|\gamma_k\rangle_A |\eta_j\rangle_B |\xi_i\rangle_C |d'_D\rangle_D\}i,j,k, \\
U_{24} &= \{|\eta_j\rangle_A |\xi_i\rangle_B |d'_C\rangle_C |\gamma_k\rangle_D\}i,j,k, \\
U_{31} &= \{|d'_A\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |0 \pm d'_C\rangle_C |\gamma_k\rangle_D\}k, \\
U_{32} &= \{|0\rangle_A |0 \pm d'_B\rangle_B |\gamma_k\rangle_C |d'_D\rangle_D\}k, \\
U_{33} &= \{|0 \pm d'_A\rangle_A |\gamma_k\rangle_B |d'_C\rangle_C |0\rangle_D\}k, \\
U_{34} &= \{|\gamma_k\rangle_A |d'_B\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |0 \pm d'_D\rangle_D\}k, \\
U_{41} &= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |\xi_i\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |\gamma_k\rangle_D\}i|_A, i|_B, k, \\
U_{42} &= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |\gamma_k\rangle_C |\xi_i\rangle_D\}i|_A, i|_D, k, \\
U_{43} &= \{|0\rangle_A |\gamma_k\rangle_B |\xi_i\rangle_C |\xi_i\rangle_D\}i|_C, i|_D, k, \\
U_{44} &= \{|\gamma_k\rangle_A |\xi_i\rangle_B |\xi_i\rangle_C |0\rangle_D\}i|_B, i|_C, k, \\
U_{51} &= \{|d'_A\rangle_A |d'_B\rangle_B |\xi_i\rangle_C |0 \pm d'_D\rangle_D\}i, \\
U_{52} &= \{|d'_A\rangle_A |\xi_i\rangle_B |0 \pm d'_C\rangle_C |d'_D\rangle_D\}i, \\
U_{53} &= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |0 \pm d'_B\rangle_B |d'_C\rangle_C |d'_D\rangle_D\}i, \\
U_{54} &= \{|0 \pm d'_A\rangle_A |d'_B\rangle_B |d'_C\rangle_C |\xi_i\rangle_D\}i, \\
U_{61} &= \{|0\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |d'_C\rangle_C |\eta_j\rangle_D\}j, \\
U_{62} &= \{|0\rangle_A |d'_B\rangle_B |\eta_j\rangle_C |0\rangle_D\}j, \\
U_{63} &= \{|d'_A\rangle_A |\eta_j\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |0\rangle_D\}j, \\
U_{64} &= \{|\eta_j\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |d'_D\rangle_D\}j, \\
U_{71} &= \{|0\rangle_A |\xi_i\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |\xi_i\rangle_D\}i|_B, i|_D, \\
U_{72} &= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |\xi_i\rangle_C |0\rangle_D\}i|_A, i|_C, \\
U_{81} &= \{|0\rangle_A |d'_B\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |d'_D\rangle_D\}, \\
U_{82} &= \{|d'_A\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |d'_C\rangle_C |0\rangle_D\}, \\
U_{91} &= \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |d'_B\rangle_B |\xi_i\rangle_C |d'_D\rangle_D\}i|_A, i|_C, \\
U_{92} &= \{|d'_A\rangle_A |\xi_i\rangle_B |d'_C\rangle_C |\xi_i\rangle_D\}i|_B, i|_D,
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where $|\xi_i\rangle_\tau = \sum_{u=0}^{d_\tau-3} \omega_{d_\tau-2}^{iu} |u+1\rangle$, $|\eta_j\rangle_\tau = \sum_{u=0}^{d_\tau-2} \omega_{d_\tau-1}^{ju} |u\rangle$, $|\gamma_k\rangle_\tau = \sum_{u=0}^{d_\tau-2} \omega_{d_\tau-1}^{ku} |u+1\rangle$, $d'_\tau = d_\tau - 1$ for $i \in \mathcal{Z}_{d_\tau-2}$, $j, k \in \mathcal{Z}_{d_\tau-1}$, and $\tau = A, B, C, D$. We have the following theorem.

Theorem 7. In the system $\mathcal{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_B} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_C} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_D}$, the

set $\{\cup_{i=1}^6(\cup_{j=1}^4 U_{ij})\} \cup \{\cup_{i=7}^9(\cup_{j=1}^2 U_{ij})\}$ given by Eq.(8) is an OPS of the strongest nonlocality. The size of this set is $d_A d_B d_C d_D - (d_A - 2)(d_B - 2)(d_C - 2)(d_D - 2) - 2$.

The detailed proof is given in Appendix E. It is worth noting that the OPS (8) still has the strongest nonlocality even though it lacks some quantum states compared with the set in Ref.[34]. Moreover, its size is smaller than that of the strongly nonlocal OPS in Ref.[37].

V. ENTANGLEMENT-ASSISTED DISCRIMINATION

The above OPSs cannot be distinguished one or more quantum states under LOCC even if any $n - 1$ parties are allowed to come together. However, it is possible while we equip enough entanglement resource. We denote the quantum state $|\phi^+(d)\rangle$ as the maximally entangled state $\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} |ii\rangle$ in $\mathcal{C}^d \otimes \mathcal{C}^d$. In this section, we will present several different entanglement-assisted discrimination protocols. Because of the symmetry, from now, we only consider in the case $d_A \geq d_B \geq d_C \geq d_D$.

Theorem 8. The entanglement resource configuration $\{(1, |\phi^+(2)\rangle_{AB}); (1, |\phi^+(d_C)\rangle_{BC})\}$ is sufficient for local discrimination of the set (5).

The detailed process is provided in Appendix F. In this protocol, we use quantum teleportation one time and consume $(1 + \log d_C)$ -ebit entanglement resource in total. It is strictly less than the amount consumed in the protocol which teleports all subsystems to one party. Next, we discuss the local discrimination of OPS (5) without teleportation.

Theorem 9. When all the parties are separated, the set $\cup_{i=1}^{12} H_i$ given by Eq.(5) can be locally distinguished by using the entanglement resource $\{(s, |\phi^+(2)\rangle_{AB}); (1, |\phi^+(2)\rangle_{AC})\}$, where $s = 1 + \frac{e-3f+6}{2e-4f+6}$ for $e = d_A d_B + d_A d_C + d_B d_C$ and $f = d_A + d_B + d_C$.

The specific process is given in Appendix G. The entanglement consumed in this protocol is $(1 + s)$ -ebit, due to $s < 1.5 < \log d_C$, which is less than the resource used in the theorem 8. Since the set (6) is a special case of (7) and they have the same structure, we only need to consider the entanglement-assisted discrimination protocols for the set (7).

Theorem 10. The set $\cup_{i=1}^8(\cup_{j=1}^3 H_{ij})$ given by Eq.(7) can be locally distinguished by using the entanglement resource configuration $\{(1, |\phi^+(2)\rangle_{AB}); (1, |\phi^+(d_C)\rangle_{BC})\}$.

Theorem 11. The set $\cup_{i=1}^8(\cup_{j=1}^3 H_{ij})$ given by Eq.(7) can be locally distinguished by using the entanglement resource configuration $\{(1, |\phi^+(4)\rangle_{AB}); (1, |\phi^+(2)\rangle_{AC})\}$.

The detailed proofs of the theorems 10 and 11 are given in Appendix H and I, respectively. The protocol in the theorem 10 uses teleportation while the protocol in the theorem 11 does not. Clearly $1 + \log d_C$ ebits entanglement is consumed in the previous protocol, which is not less than the amount used 3 ebits in the latter protocol because $d_C \geq 4$. In other word, the latter resource configuration is more effective when the smallest dimension d_C is greater than 4. Next, by the method presented by Zhang et al. in Ref.[52], using multiple copies of EPR states instead of high-dimensional entangled states, we can get a new resource configuration.

Theorem 12. The entanglement resource configuration $\{(3, |\phi^+(2)\rangle_{AB}); (1, |\phi^+(2)\rangle_{AC})\}$ is sufficient for local discrimination of the set $\cup_{i=1}^8(\cup_{j=1}^3 H_{ij})$ given by Eq.(7).

In fact, using three EPR states has the same effect as using one maximally entangled state $|\phi^+(4)\rangle_{AB}$, for the detailed procedure please refer to the Appendix J. Although more resources are used in this protocol, the method should be relatively easier to implement in real experiment because it only requires a device which can produce 2-qubit maximally entangled states. Similarly, we get several entanglement resource configurations to discriminate the set (8) by LOCC.

Theorem 13. The entanglement resource configuration $\{(1, |\phi^+(3)\rangle_{AB}); (1, |\phi^+(d_C)\rangle_{BC}); (1, |\phi^+(d_D)\rangle_{BD})\}$ is sufficient for local discrimination of the set $\{\cup_{i=1}^6(\cup_{j=1}^4 U_{ij})\} \cup \{\cup_{i=7}^9(\cup_{j=1}^2 U_{ij})\}$ given by Eq.(8).

The protocol of the theorem 13 is given in Appendix K.

Theorem 14. Any one of the resource configurations $\{(1, |\phi^+(3)\rangle_{AB}); (1, |\phi^+(3)\rangle_{AC}); (1, |\phi^+(3)\rangle_{AD})\}$ and $\{(2, |\phi^+(2)\rangle_{AB}); (2, |\phi^+(2)\rangle_{AC}); (2, |\phi^+(2)\rangle_{AD})\}$ is sufficient for local discrimination of the set (8).

We will not repeat the protocol of the theorem 14, because it is similar to that of theorems 11 and 12. In the theorem 13, we perform quantum teleportation twice and consume $\log 3d_C d_D$ ebits entanglement resource. In comparison, the first configuration of the theorem 14 is more effective because $\log 27 \leq \log 3d_C d_D$, and the second configuration is simpler because it only needs multiple EPR states.

VI. CONCLUSION

We have investigated the OPS with strong quantum nonlocality through the decomposition of plane geometry. We presented the sufficient condition that the POVM performed on subsystem can only be trival and shown the smallest OPSs under some restrictions in $\mathcal{C}^3 \otimes \mathcal{C}^3 \otimes \mathcal{C}^3$ and $\mathcal{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{C}^4$. Furthermore, we successfully constructed a smaller OPS which has the strongest nonlocality in $\mathcal{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_B} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{d_C}$ ($d_A, d_B, d_C \geq 4$) and generalized the previous known structures of strongly nonlocal OPSs to any possible three and four-partite systems. Interestingly, we studied local discrimination protocols for our OPSs with different types of entangled resources. Among them, we have three protocols which only need multiple copies of EPR states. We found that the protocols without teleportation can be more efficient on average. More than that, our results could also be helpful in better understanding of the properties of maximally entangled states.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 12071110, the Hebei Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. A2020205014, the Science and Technology Project of Hebei Education Department under Grant Nos. ZD2020167 and ZD2021066, and funded by School of Mathematical Sciences of Hebei Normal University under Grant No.

2021sxbs002.

Appendix A: The proof of theorem 2

According to the corollary 1, we know the union $\cup_r S_r^{(BC)}$ of all projection sets is the basis \mathcal{B}^{BC} and the family of projection sets $\{S_r^{(BC)}\}_r$ is connected.

When $N = 1$, it is obvious that the set S is locally distinguishable. When $N = 2$, due to the symmetry, there is the collection $\{S_{t_1}, S_{t_2}, S_{t_3}\}$ including 6 quantum states, which satisfies $|S_{t_1}| = |S_{t_2}| = |S_{t_3}| = 2$, $|S_{t_1}^{(BC)}| = |S_{t_2}^{(BC)}| = 2$ and $|S_{t_3}^{(BC)}| = 1$. Moreover, the collection is invariant under the cyclic permutation of the parties. According to the completeness and connectedness of projection sets, the set S contains at least 8 subsets whose projection sets on BC party have two elements. That is, we have no less than 4 disjoint collections with above form. In other words, when $N = 2$, the size of set S cannot be less than 24.

In the case $N = 3$, there must be a subset satisfying $|S_t^{(A)}| = 3$ and $|S_t^{(BC)}| = 1$. Meanwhile, $S_t^{(A)} = \mathcal{B}^A$. We have $S_t^{(BC)} \cap (\cup_{t' \in Q \setminus \{t\}} S_{t'}^{(BC)}) = \emptyset$. Hence, the family of projection sets $\{S_r^{(BC)}\}_r$ is unconnected. There is a contradiction. Similarly, the cases $N = 6, 9$ do not exist.

In the case $N = 4$, because of symmetry, there is a collection $\{S_{u_1}, S_{u_2}, S_{u_3}\}$ including 12 quantum states, which satisfies $|S_{u_1}| = |S_{u_2}| = |S_{u_3}| = 4$, $|S_{u_1}^{(BC)}| = 4$ and $|S_{u_2}^{(BC)}| = |S_{u_3}^{(BC)}| = 2$, and the collection is symmetric under the parties. Similarly, due to the completeness and connectedness of projection sets, there are at least one other subset whose projection set on BC party has four elements or three additional subsets whose projection sets on BC party have two elements. In either case, it means that the size of set S is not less than 24.

It is obvious that $|S_r| \neq 5$ or 7 for any $r \in Q$. If there is a subset such that $|S_r| = 8$, then we have $S_r \cap P_c(S_r) \neq \emptyset$. Here P_c is a cyclic permutation of the parties. Consequently, the cases $N = 5, 7, 8$ do not hold.

On the other hand, the symmetric OPS given by Eq.(4) has 24 quantum states and has been proved that any orthogonality-preserving POVM performed on BC party can only be trivial. Thus, in $\mathcal{C}^3 \otimes \mathcal{C}^3 \otimes \mathcal{C}^3$, the minimum size of the set S is 24. The proof is completed.

Appendix B: The proof of theorem 3


Because the set is symmetric and the maximum size of all subsets is 2, there is a collection $\{S_{t_1}, S_{t_2}, S_{t_3}\}$ including 6 quantum states. It satisfies the same requirements as above. Due to the completeness and connectedness of projection sets, there are at least 15 subsets whose projection sets on BC party have size 2. So, we have no less than 8 disjoint collections which include 6 quantum states. That is, the set S contains at least 48 quantum states. On the other side, we find the OPS given by Eq.(6) satisfies all conditions

TABLE I: Corresponding PI set R_{ij} for each subset S_{ij} .

Subset	PI set	Subset	PI set
S_{11}	$R_{11} = S_{53} \cup S_{62}$	S_{51}	$R_{51} = S_{31} \cup S_{72}$
S_{12}	$R_{12} = S_{32} \cup S_{73}$	S_{52}	$R_{52} = S_{21} \cup S_{83}$
S_{13}	$R_{13} = S_{41}$	S_{53}	$R_{53} = S_{11}$
S_{21}	$R_{21} = S_{52} \cup S_{62}$	S_{61}	$R_{61} = S_{51} \cup S_{83}$
S_{22}	$R_{22} = S_{32} \cup S_{81}$	S_{62}	$R_{62} = S_{11} \cup S_{21}$
S_{23}	$R_{23} = S_{71}$	S_{63}	$R_{63} = S_{72}$
S_{31}	$R_{31} = S_{12} \cup S_{51}$	S_{71}	$R_{71} = S_{23} \cup S_{82}$
S_{32}	$R_{32} = S_{12} \cup S_{41}$	S_{72}	$R_{72} = S_{51} \cup S_{63}$
S_{33}	$R_{33} = S_{82}$	S_{73}	$R_{73} = S_{12}$
S_{41}	$R_{41} = S_{13} \cup S_{32}$	S_{81}	$R_{81} = S_{42} \cup S_{43}$
S_{42}	$R_{42} = S_{13} \cup S_{81}$	S_{82}	$R_{82} = S_{11} \cup S_{33}$
S_{43}	$R_{43} = S_{81}$	S_{83}	$R_{83} = S_{61}$

and the size is 48. Therefore, the minimum size of set S is 48.

Appendix C: The proof of theorem 5

FIG. 3: The corresponding 4×16 grid of $\{S_{ij}\}$ given by Eq.(6) in $A|BC$ bipartition.

According to the lemma 1 and the cyclic permutation invariance of the set (6), we only need to discuss the orthogonal-preserving measurement on BC party. The tile structure can be shown in fig. 3. It is obvious $\tilde{S}_{V_{kl}} = \mathcal{B}^{BC}$ for any $k, l \in \mathcal{Z}_4$. So, we have $\mathcal{B}_{kl}^{BC} \subset \tilde{S}_{V_{kl}}$. Hence the condition i) holds.

For each subset S_{ij} , there is the corresponding PI set R_{ij} . Hence, the condition ii) is satisfied. The details are presented in table I.

It is not difficult to find $|S_{ij}^{(BC)} \cap S_{i'j'}^{(BC)}| \leq 1$ for any two subsets S_{ij} and $S_{i'j'}$. So, each R_{ij} is a UPI set. Therefore G_1 is the union of all subsets. It is natural that the condition iii) is proven.

We find a sequence of projection sets $S_{41}^{(BC)} \rightarrow S_{42}^{(BC)} \rightarrow S_{81}^{(BC)} \rightarrow S_{22}^{(BC)} \rightarrow S_{12}^{(BC)} \rightarrow S_{31}^{(BC)} \rightarrow S_{51}^{(BC)} \rightarrow S_{72}^{(BC)} \rightarrow S_{61}^{(BC)} \rightarrow S_{52}^{(BC)} \rightarrow S_{21}^{(BC)} \rightarrow S_{62}^{(BC)} \rightarrow S_{11}^{(BC)} \rightarrow S_{82}^{(BC)} \rightarrow S_{71}^{(BC)}$. In this sequence, the intersection of the sets on both sides of the arrow is not empty. Note that the set $S_{72}^{(BC)}$ in the brackets is only related to the previous set $S_{51}^{(BC)}$. Moreover, the union of these sets is the computation basis \mathcal{B}^{BC} . So, it is impossible to divide all projection sets into disjoint two groups of projection sets. That is, the family of projection sets $\{S_{ij}^{(BC)}\}_{ij}$ is connected. The condition iv) holds.

Due to the theorem 1, we deduce the POVM performed

TABLE II: The intersection of set G_{x-1} and PI set R_t about NIC subset $H_t \subset G_x$ ($x = 2, \dots, 9$).

Subset	Intersection	Subset	Intersection
$H_{12} \subset G_2$	$H_{32} = G_1 \cap R_{12}$	$H_{21} \subset G_4$	$H_{52} = G_3 \cap R_{21}$
$H_{13} \subset G_2$	$H_{41} = G_1 \cap R_{13}$	$H_{62} \subset G_5$	$H_{21} = G_4 \cap R_{62}$
$H_{22} \subset G_2$	$H_{32} = G_1 \cap R_{22}$	$H_{11} \subset G_6$	$H_{62} = G_5 \cap R_{11}$
$H_{31} \subset G_2$	$H_{51} = G_1 \cap R_{31}$	$H_{82} \subset G_7$	$H_{11} = G_6 \cap R_{82}$
$H_{61} \subset G_2$	$H_{51} = G_1 \cap R_{61}$	$H_{71} \subset G_8$	$H_{82} = G_7 \cap R_{71}$
$H_{63} \subset G_2$	$H_{72} = G_1 \cap R_{63}$	$H_{23} \subset G_9$	$H_{71} = G_8 \cap R_{23}$
$H_{73} \subset G_3$	$H_{12} = G_2 \cap R_{73}$		

on BC party can only be trivial. Therefore, the OPS (6) has the strongest quantum nonlocality.

Appendix D: The proof of theorem 6

Similarly, we only need to consider the orthogonality-preserving POVM on BC . Because the set (7) has the same structure as the set (6), the conditions i), ii) and iv) are obvious. Let R_{ij} have the corresponding grids. Furthermore, we have the set sequence

$$\begin{aligned}
 G_1 &= H_{32} \cup H_{41} \cup H_{42} \cup H_{51} \cup H_{72} \cup H_{81}, \\
 G_2 &= H_{12} \cup H_{13} \cup H_{22} \cup H_{31} \cup H_{43} \cup H_{61} \cup H_{63}, \\
 G_3 &= H_{73} \cup H_{52} \cup H_{83}, \\
 G_4 &= H_{21}, G_5 = H_{62}, G_6 = H_{11}, \\
 G_7 &= H_{82} \cup H_{53}, G_8 = H_{33} \cup H_{71}, G_9 = H_{23}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{D1}$$

Here H_{43} , H_{83} , H_{53} and H_{33} are IC subsets, which we will not consider. For $H_{52} \subset G_3$, we find there are $H_{61} \subset G_2$ and $H_{83} \subset R_{52}$ such that $H_{52}^{(BC)} \cap H_{61}^{(BC)} = H_{52}^{(BC)} \cap H_{83}^{(BC)}$. For the other subset $H_t \subset G_x$ ($x = 2, \dots, 9$), we have the intersection of set G_{x-1} and PI set R_t . The details are presented in table II. This shows that condition iii) holds.

The set (7) satisfies all conditions in the theorem 1, so it is locally irreducible in every bipartition. That is, the OPS (7) has the strongest nonlocality.

Appendix E: The proof of theorem 7

FIG. 4: The corresponding 3×27 grid of $\{U_{ij}\}$ given by Eq.(8) in $A|BCD$ bipartition.

Obviously, we only need to consider the orthogonality-preserving measurement on subsystem BCD . The tile structure can be shown in fig. 4. It is obvious $\tilde{S}_{V_{jkl}} = \mathcal{B}^{BCD}$ for any $j, k, l \in \mathcal{Z}_3$. So, we have $\mathcal{B}_{jkl}^{BC} \subset \tilde{S}_{V_{jkl}}$. The condition i) holds.

TABLE III: Corresponding PI set R_{ij} for each subset U_{ij} .

Subset	PI set	Subset	PI set
U_{11}	$R_{11} = U_{12} \cup U_{23} \cup U_{41} \cup U_{44}$	U_{44}	$R_{44} = U_{11}$
U_{12}	$R_{12} = U_{33} \cup U_{63} \cup U_{82}$	U_{51}	$R_{51} = U_{32} \cup U_{62}$
U_{13}	$R_{13} = U_{22} \cup U_{31}$	U_{52}	$R_{52} = U_{11} \cup U_{24}$
U_{14}	$R_{14} = U_{42} \cup U_{72}$	U_{53}	$R_{53} = U_{32}$
U_{21}	$R_{21} = U_{22} \cup U_{33} \cup U_{51} \cup U_{54}$	U_{54}	$R_{54} = U_{21}$
U_{22}	$R_{22} = U_{13} \cup U_{43} \cup U_{71}$	U_{61}	$R_{61} = U_{12} \cup U_{42}$
U_{23}	$R_{23} = U_{11} \cup U_{32}$	U_{62}	$R_{62} = U_{34} \cup U_{51}$
U_{24}	$R_{24} = U_{52} \cup U_{92}$	U_{63}	$R_{63} = U_{12}$
U_{31}	$R_{31} = U_{13} \cup U_{42} \cup U_{53} \cup U_{64}$	U_{64}	$R_{64} = U_{31}$
U_{32}	$R_{32} = U_{23} \cup U_{53} \cup U_{91}$	U_{71}	$R_{71} = U_{41}$
U_{33}	$R_{33} = U_{12} \cup U_{21}$	U_{72}	$R_{72} = U_{14}$
U_{34}	$R_{34} = U_{62} \cup U_{81}$	U_{81}	$R_{81} = U_{34}$
U_{41}	$R_{41} = U_{11} \cup U_{71}$	U_{82}	$R_{82} = U_{12}$
U_{42}	$R_{42} = U_{14} \cup U_{61}$	U_{91}	$R_{91} = U_{32}$
U_{43}	$R_{43} = U_{22}$	U_{92}	$R_{92} = U_{24}$

TABLE IV: The intersection of set G_{x-1} and PI set R_t about NIC subset $U_t \subset G_x$ ($x = 2, 3, 4$).

Subset	Intersection	Subset	Intersection
$U_{11} \subset G_2$	$U_{12} = G_1 \cap R_{11}$	$U_{52} \subset G_3$	$U_{11} = G_2 \cap R_{52}$
$U_{23} \subset G_2$	$U_{32} = G_1 \cap R_{23}$	$U_{62} \subset G_3$	$U_{51} = G_2 \cap R_{62}$
$U_{31} \subset G_2$	$U_{53} = G_1 \cap R_{31}$	$U_{64} \subset G_3$	$U_{31} = G_2 \cap R_{64}$
$U_{33} \subset G_2$	$U_{12} = G_1 \cap R_{33}$	$U_{14} \subset G_4$	$U_{42} = G_3 \cap R_{14}$
$U_{51} \subset G_2$	$U_{32} = G_1 \cap R_{51}$	$U_{22} \subset G_4$	$U_{13} \subset G_3 \cap R_{22}$
$U_{61} \subset G_2$	$U_{12} = G_1 \cap R_{61}$	$U_{24} \subset G_4$	$U_{52} = G_3 \cap R_{24}$
$U_{13} \subset G_3$	$U_{31} = G_2 \cap R_{13}$	$U_{34} \subset G_4$	$U_{62} = G_3 \cap R_{34}$
$U_{21} \subset G_3$	$U_{33} \subset G_2 \cap R_{21}$	$U_{54} \subset G_4$	$U_{21} = G_3 \cap R_{54}$
$U_{41} \subset G_3$	$U_{11} = G_2 \cap R_{41}$	$U_{72} \subset G_5$	$U_{14} = G_4 \cap R_{72}$
$U_{42} \subset G_3$	$U_{61} = G_2 \cap R_{42}$	$U_{81} \subset G_5$	$U_{34} = G_4 \cap R_{81}$
$U_{44} \subset G_3$	$U_{11} = G_2 \cap R_{44}$	$U_{92} \subset G_5$	$U_{24} = G_4 \cap R_{92}$

For each subset U_{ij} , we have the corresponding PI set R_{ij} . Hence, the condition ii) holds. The details are given in table III.

Furthermore, we construct the set sequence

$$\begin{aligned}
 G_1 &= U_{12} \cup U_{32} \cup U_{53} \cup U_{63}, \\
 G_2 &= U_{11} \cup U_{23} \cup U_{31} \cup U_{33} \cup U_{51} \cup U_{61} \cup U_{82} \cup U_{91}, \\
 G_3 &= U_{13} \cup U_{21} \cup U_{41} \cup U_{42} \cup U_{44} \cup U_{52} \cup U_{62} \cup U_{64}, \\
 G_4 &= U_{14} \cup U_{22} \cup U_{24} \cup U_{34} \cup U_{43} \cup U_{54} \cup U_{71}, \\
 G_5 &= U_{72} \cup U_{81} \cup U_{92}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{E1}$$

Here U_{82} , U_{91} , U_{43} and U_{71} are IC subsets. For the other subset $U_t \subset G_x$ ($x = 2, \dots, 5$), we have the intersection of set G_{x-1} and PI set R_t . The details are presented in table IV. This shows that the condition iii) is satisfied.

In addition, we find the tree sequence of projection sets $U_{12}^{(BCD)} \rightarrow U_{61}^{(BCD)} \rightarrow U_{42}^{(BCD)} \rightarrow U_{14}^{(BCD)} \rightarrow U_{31}^{(BCD)} \rightarrow U_{32}^{(BCD)} \rightarrow U_{51}^{(BCD)} \rightarrow U_{62}^{(BCD)} \rightarrow U_{34}^{(BCD)} \rightarrow U_{21}^{(BCD)} \rightarrow U_{22}^{(BCD)} \rightarrow U_{41}^{(BCD)}$

$U_{11}^{(BCD)} \rightarrow U_{52}^{(BCD)} \rightarrow U_{24}^{(BCD)}$. Note that the subsequence in parentheses is a branch of the previous adjacent set. In this sequence, the intersection of the sets on both sides of the arrow is not empty and the union of these sets is the computation basis \mathcal{B}^{BCD} . So, the family of projection sets $\{U_{ij}^{(BCD)}\}_{ij}$ is connected. The condition iv) is proven.

By the theorem 1, we deduce the POVM performed on BCD party can only be trivial. Therefore, the OPS (8) has the strongest quantum nonlocality.

Appendix F: The proof of theorem 8

By taking advantage of entangled resource $|\phi^+(d_C)\rangle$, Charlie first teleports his subsystem to Bob. Let subindex \tilde{B} represent the union of the two parties B and C . Whereafter, to locally discriminate the states, the EPR state $|\phi^+(2)\rangle_{ab}$ is shared between Alice and Bob. The initial state is

$$|\psi\rangle_{A\tilde{B}} \otimes |\phi^+(2)\rangle_{ab}, \quad (\text{F1})$$

where $|\psi\rangle_{A\tilde{B}}$ is the state belonging to the set (5), a and b are ancillary systems of Alice and Bob, respectively. Because each subset H_r ($r \in Q$) is LOCC distinguishable, we only need to locally distinguish these subsets. Now the discrimination protocol proceeds as follows.

Step 1. Alice performs the measurement

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_1 \equiv \{ & M_{11} := P[(|0\rangle, \dots, |d'_A - 1\rangle)_A; |0\rangle_a] \\ & + P[|d'_A\rangle_A; |1\rangle_a], \\ & M_{12} := I - M_{11} \}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose the outcome corresponding to M_1 clicks, the resulting postmeasurement states are

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 &\rightarrow \{|0\rangle_A |\xi_i \circ \eta_j\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\}, \\ H_2 &\rightarrow \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |\eta_j \circ 0\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\}, \\ H_3 &\rightarrow \{|\eta_j\rangle_A |0 \circ \xi_i\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\}, \\ H_4 &\rightarrow \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |d'_B \circ \eta_j\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\}, \\ H_5 &\rightarrow \{|d'_A\rangle_A |\eta_j \circ \xi_i\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |11\rangle_{ab}\}, \\ H_6 &\rightarrow \{|\eta_j\rangle_A |\xi_i \circ d'_C\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\}, \\ H_7 &\rightarrow \{|0\rangle_A |d'_B \circ (0 \pm d'_C)\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\}, \\ H_8 &\rightarrow \{|d'_A\rangle_A |(0 \pm d'_B) \circ 0\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |11\rangle_{ab}\}, \\ H_9 &\rightarrow \{(|0\rangle_A |00\rangle_{ab} \pm |d'_A\rangle_A |11\rangle_{ab}) |0 \circ d'_C\rangle_{\tilde{B}}\}, \\ H_{10} &\rightarrow \{|d'_A\rangle_A |\xi_i \circ (0 \pm d'_C)\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |11\rangle_{ab}\}, \\ H_{11} &\rightarrow \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |(0 \pm d'_B) \circ d'_C\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\}, \\ H_{12} &\rightarrow \{(|0\rangle_A |00\rangle_{ab} \pm |d'_A\rangle_A |11\rangle_{ab}) |d'_B \circ \xi_i\rangle_{\tilde{B}}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here and below, symbol ‘ \circ ’ represents the union of the parties, for example, $|\psi_1 \circ \psi_2\rangle_{\tilde{B}} = |\psi_1\rangle_B \otimes |\psi_2\rangle_C$ for any two quantum states $|\psi_1\rangle_B$ and $|\psi_2\rangle_C$. Specially, let $|(0, \dots, d_B - 1) \circ (0, \dots, d_C - 1)\rangle_{\tilde{B}}$ express $(|00\rangle, \dots, |0(d_C - 1)\rangle, |10\rangle, \dots, |(d_B - 1)(d_C - 1)\rangle)_{\tilde{B}}$.

Step 2. Bob performs the measurement

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_2 \equiv \{ & M_{21} := P[|0 \circ (1, \dots, d'_C - 1)\rangle_{\tilde{B}}; |0\rangle_b], \\ & M_{22} := P[|(1, \dots, d'_B - 1) \circ d'_C\rangle_{\tilde{B}}; |0\rangle_b], \\ & M_{23} := P[|(0, d'_B) \circ 0\rangle_{\tilde{B}}; |1\rangle_b], \\ & M_{24} := P[|(0, \dots, d'_B - 1) \circ (1, \dots, d'_C - 1)\rangle_{\tilde{B}}; \\ & \quad |1\rangle_b], \\ & M_{25} := P[|(1, \dots, d'_B - 1) \circ (0, d'_C)\rangle_{\tilde{B}}; |1\rangle_b], \\ & M_{26} := I - M_1 - M_2 - M_3 - M_4 - M_5 \}. \end{aligned}$$

If the corresponding operations M_{21} , M_{22} , M_{23} , M_{24} and M_{25} click, we can distinguish the subsets H_3 , H_6 , H_8 , H_5 and H_{10} , respectively. If M_{26} clicks, the given state is belonging to one of the remaining seven subsets $\{H_1, H_2, H_4, H_7, H_9, H_{11}, H_{12}\}$. At this point, we move on to the next step.

Step 3. Alice performs the measurement

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_3 \equiv \{ & M_{31} := P[|0\rangle_A; |0\rangle_a] + P[|d'_A\rangle_A; |1\rangle_a], \\ & M_{32} := I - M_{31} \}. \end{aligned}$$

If M_{31} clicks, we can determine the four subsets $\{H_1, H_7, H_9, H_{12}\}$. Otherwise, the subset is one of the remaining three $\{H_2, H_4, H_{11}\}$. Moreover, they are all perfectly LOCC distinguishable.

In addition, if M_{12} clicks in step 1, we can find a similar protocol where these states can be perfectly LOCC distinguished.

Appendix G: The proof of theorem 9

Naturally, we only need to locally distinguish these subsets. To this end, let Alice and Bob share an EPR state $|\phi^+(2)\rangle_{a_1 b_1}$, meanwhile Alice and Charlie share the EPR state $|\phi^+(2)\rangle_{a_2 c_1}$. Therefore, the initial states is

$$|\psi\rangle_{ABC} \otimes |\phi^+(2)\rangle_{a_1 b_1} \otimes |\phi^+(2)\rangle_{a_2 c_1},$$

where the state $|\psi\rangle_{ABC}$ is one of the states from the set $\cup_{r=1}^{12} H_r$ (5), a_1 and a_2 are ancillary systems of Alice, b_1 and c_1 are ancillary systems of Bob and Charlie, respectively. The specific process is as follows.

Step 1. Bob performs the measurement

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_1 \equiv \{ & M_{11} := P[(|0\rangle, \dots, |d'_B - 1\rangle)_B; |0\rangle_{b_1}] \\ & + P[|d'_B\rangle_B; |1\rangle_{b_1}], \\ & M_{12} := I - M_{11} \}, \end{aligned}$$

and Charlie performs the measurement

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_2 \equiv \{ & M_{21} := P[(|0\rangle, \dots, |d'_C - 1\rangle)_C; |1\rangle_{c_1}] \\ & + P[|d'_C\rangle_C; |0\rangle_{c_1}], \\ & M_{22} := I - M_{21} \}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose M_{11} and M_{21} click, the resulting postmeasurement

states are

$$\begin{aligned}
H_1 &\rightarrow \{|0\rangle_A |\xi_i\rangle_B |\eta_j\rangle_C |00\rangle_{a_1 b_1} |11\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_2 &\rightarrow \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |\eta_j\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |00\rangle_{a_1 b_1} |11\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_3 &\rightarrow \{|\eta_j\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |\xi_i\rangle_C |00\rangle_{a_1 b_1} |11\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_4 &\rightarrow \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |d'_B\rangle_B |\eta_j\rangle_C |11\rangle_{a_1 b_1} |11\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_5 &\rightarrow \{|d'_A\rangle_A |\eta_j\rangle_B |\xi_i\rangle_C |00\rangle_{a_1 b_1} |11\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_6 &\rightarrow \{|\eta_j\rangle_A |\xi_i\rangle_B |d'_C\rangle_C |00\rangle_{a_1 b_1} |00\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_7 &\rightarrow \{|0\rangle_A |d'_B\rangle_B |11\rangle_{a_1 b_1} (|0\rangle_C |11\rangle_{a_2 c_1} \pm \\
&\quad |d'_C\rangle_C |00\rangle_{a_2 c_1})\}, \\
H_8 &\rightarrow \{|d'_A\rangle_A (|0\rangle_B |00\rangle_{a_1 b_1} \pm |d'_B\rangle_B |11\rangle_{a_1 b_1}) \\
&\quad |0\rangle_C |11\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_9 &\rightarrow \{|0 \pm d'_A\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |d'_C\rangle_C |00\rangle_{a_1 b_1} |00\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_{10} &\rightarrow \{|d'_A\rangle_A |\xi_i\rangle_B |00\rangle_{a_1 b_1} (|0\rangle_C |11\rangle_{a_2 c_1} \pm \\
&\quad |d'_C\rangle_C |00\rangle_{a_2 c_1})\}, \\
H_{11} &\rightarrow \{|\xi_i\rangle_A (|0\rangle_B |00\rangle_{a_1 b_1} \pm |d'_B\rangle_B |11\rangle_{a_1 b_1}) \\
&\quad |d'_C\rangle_C |00\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_{12} &\rightarrow \{|0 \pm d'_A\rangle_A |d'_B\rangle_B |\xi_i\rangle_C |11\rangle_{a_1 b_1} |11\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Step 2. Alice performs the measurement

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_3 &\equiv \{M_{31} := P[(|0\rangle, \dots, |d'_A - 1\rangle)_A; |0\rangle_{a_1}; |1\rangle_{a_2}], \\
&\quad M_{32} := P[(|1\rangle, \dots, |d'_A - 1\rangle)_A; |1\rangle_{a_1}; |1\rangle_{a_2}], \\
&\quad M_{33} := I - M_{31} - M_{32}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

If M_{31} clicks, the given subset is one of $\{H_1, H_2, H_3\}$. It is obvious that the subsets can not be perfectly distinguished by LOCC. Let Alice and Bob share the maximally entangled state $|\phi^+(2)\rangle_{a_3 b_2}$. Moreover, Bob performs the measurement $\mathcal{M}'_3 \equiv \{M'_{31} := P[|0\rangle_B; I_{b_1}; |0\rangle_{b_2}] + P[(|1\rangle, \dots, |d'_B\rangle)_B; I_{b_1}; |1\rangle_{b_2}], M'_{32} := I - M'_{31}\}$. When M'_{31} clicks, Alice performs the measurement $\mathcal{M}''_3 \equiv \{M''_{31} := P[|0\rangle_A; I_{a_1}; I_{a_2}; |1\rangle_{a_3}], M''_{32} := I - M''_{31}\}$. The results corresponding to operators M''_{31} and M''_{32} are H_1 and $\{H_2, H_3\}$, respectively. The collection $\{H_2, H_3\}$ is LOCC distinguishable. Similarly, when M'_{32} clicks, the task of local discrimination can also be accomplished. If M_{32} clicks, the subset is H_4 . Otherwise, the subset is one of the remaining eight.

Step 3. Charlie performs the measurement

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_4 &\equiv \{M_{41} := P[(|1\rangle, \dots, |d'_C - 1\rangle)_C; |1\rangle_{c_1}], \\
&\quad M_{42} := I - M_{41}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

If M_{41} clicks, the given subset is one of $\{H_5, H_{12}\}$. Obviously, it is locally distinguishable.

Step 4. Alice performs the measurement

$$\mathcal{M}_5 \equiv \{M_{51} := P[|0\rangle_A; |1\rangle_{a_1}; I_{a_2}], M_{52} := I - M_{51}\}.$$

If M_{51} clicks, the subset is H_7 . Otherwise, the subset is one of $\{H_6, H_8, H_9, H_{10}, H_{11}\}$.

Step 5. Bob performs the measurement

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_6 &\equiv \{M_{61} := P[|0\rangle_B; |0\rangle_{b_1}] + P[|d'_B\rangle_B; |1\rangle_{b_1}], \\
&\quad M_{62} := I - M_{61}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The results corresponding to operators M_{61} and M_{62} are $\{H_8, H_9, H_{11}\}$ and $\{H_6, H_{10}\}$, respectively. They are all locally distinguishable.

If in the step 1 other operators click, we can find similar protocols to distinguish these subsets perfectly by LOCC.

Appendix H: The proof of theorem 10

Because $d_C \leq d_B$, we teleport subsystem C to Bob by using the entanglement resource $|\phi^+(d_C)\rangle_{BC}$, and the new union subsystem is represented by \tilde{B} . To locally discriminate the states, Alice and Bob should share a maximally entangled state $|\phi^+(2)\rangle_{ab}$. The discrimination protocol proceeds as follows.

Step 1. Alice performs the measurement

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_1 &\equiv \{M_{11} := P[(|0\rangle, |1\rangle)_A; |0\rangle_a] + P[(|2\rangle, \dots, |d'_A\rangle)_A; |1\rangle_a], \\
&\quad M_{12} := I - M_{11}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Suppose M_{11} clicks, the resulting postmeasurement states are

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{11} &\rightarrow \{|0\rangle_A |1 \circ \alpha_3^l\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
H_{12} &\rightarrow \{|1\rangle_A |\alpha_3^l \circ 0\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
H_{13} &\rightarrow \{|\alpha_3^l\rangle_A |0 \circ 1\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |11\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
H_{21} &\rightarrow \{|0\rangle_A |\alpha^i \circ \alpha_1^k\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
H_{22} &\rightarrow \{|\alpha^i\rangle_A |\alpha_1^k \circ 0\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |11\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
H_{23} &\rightarrow \{(|1\rangle_A |00\rangle_{ab} + |\alpha_1^{k,2}\rangle_A |11\rangle_{ab}) |0 \circ \alpha^i\rangle_{\tilde{B}}\}, \\
H_{31} &\rightarrow \{|0\rangle_A |d'_B \circ \alpha_0^j\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
H_{32} &\rightarrow \{|d'_A\rangle_A |\alpha_0^j \circ 0\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |11\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
H_{33} &\rightarrow \{(|0\rangle_A |00\rangle_{ab} + |\alpha_0^{j,2}\rangle_A |11\rangle_{ab}) |0 \circ d'_C\rangle_{\tilde{B}}\}, \\
H_{41} &\rightarrow \{|1\rangle_A |0 \circ (0 \pm 1)\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
H_{42} &\rightarrow \{|0\rangle_A |(0 \pm 1) \circ 1\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
H_{43} &\rightarrow \{|0 \pm 1\rangle_A |1 \circ 0\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
H_{51} &\rightarrow \{|1\rangle_A |d'_B \circ \alpha_3^l\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
H_{52} &\rightarrow \{|d'_A\rangle_A |\alpha_3^l \circ 1\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |11\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
H_{53} &\rightarrow \{|\alpha_3^l\rangle_A |1 \circ d'_C\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |11\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
H_{61} &\rightarrow \{|\alpha^i\rangle_A |d'_B \circ \alpha_1^k\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |11\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
H_{62} &\rightarrow \{|d'_A\rangle_A |\alpha_1^k \circ \alpha^i\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |11\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
H_{63} &\rightarrow \{(|1\rangle_A |00\rangle_{ab} + |\alpha_1^{k,2}\rangle_A |11\rangle_{ab}) |\alpha^i \circ d'_C\rangle_{\tilde{B}}\}, \\
H_{71} &\rightarrow \{|d'_A\rangle_A |0 \circ \alpha_3^l\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |11\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
H_{72} &\rightarrow \{|0\rangle_A |\alpha_3^l \circ d'_C\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
H_{73} &\rightarrow \{|\alpha_3^l\rangle_A |d'_B \circ 0\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |11\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
H_{81} &\rightarrow \{|d'_A\rangle_A |1 \circ (0 \pm 1)\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |11\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
H_{82} &\rightarrow \{|1\rangle_A |(0 \pm 1) \circ d'_C\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
H_{83} &\rightarrow \{|0 \pm 1\rangle_A |d'_B \circ 1\rangle_{\tilde{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $|\alpha_0^{j,2}\rangle_A = \sum_{u=1}^{d_A-3} \omega_{d_A-2}^{ju} |u+1\rangle$ and $|\alpha_1^{k,2}\rangle_A = \sum_{u=1}^{d_A-3} \omega_{d_A-2}^{ku} |u+1\rangle$.

Step 2. Bob performs the measurement

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_2 &\equiv \{M_{21} := P[(|1, \dots, d'_B - 1\rangle \circ (2, \dots, d'_C - 1)\rangle_{\bar{B}} \\
&\quad ; |1\rangle_b], \\
M_{22} &:= P[(|(2, \dots, d'_B) \circ (0, d'_C)\rangle, |d'_B \circ (2, \dots, \\
&\quad d'_C - 1)\rangle)_{\bar{B}}; |0\rangle_b] + P[(|(2, \dots, d'_B - 1) \\
&\quad \circ d'_C\rangle_{\bar{B}}; |1\rangle_b], \\
M_{23} &:= P[|01\rangle_{\bar{B}}; |1\rangle_b], \\
M_{24} &:= P[(|(0, \dots, d'_B - 1) \circ 0\rangle, |11\rangle)_{\bar{B}}; |1\rangle_b], \\
M_{25} &:= P[|1d'_C\rangle_{\bar{B}}; |1\rangle_b], \\
M_{26} &:= P[(|(2, \dots, d'_B) \circ 1\rangle, |d'_B 2\rangle)_{\bar{B}}; |1\rangle_b], \\
M_{27} &:= P[|d'_B 0\rangle_{\bar{B}}; |1\rangle_b], \\
M_{28} &:= P[(|00\rangle, |01\rangle, |11\rangle)_{\bar{B}}; |0\rangle_b], \\
M_{29} &:= P[|10\rangle_{\bar{B}}; |0\rangle_b], \\
M_{210} &:= P[|d'_B 1\rangle_{\bar{B}}; |0\rangle_b], \\
M_{211} &:= P[(|(2, \dots, d'_B - 1) \circ (1, \dots, d'_C - 1)\rangle_{\bar{B}} \\
&\quad ; |0\rangle_b], \\
M_{212} &:= I - \sum_{i=1}^{11} M_{2i}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the operator M_{2i} ($i = 1, \dots, 12$), the result of postmeasurement is

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{21} &\Rightarrow H_{62}, & M_{22} &\Rightarrow H_{12}, H_{31}, H_{51}, H_{72}, H_{63}, \\
M_{23} &\Rightarrow H_{13}, & M_{24} &\Rightarrow H_{22}, H_{32}, H_{81}, \\
M_{25} &\Rightarrow H_{53}, & M_{26} &\Rightarrow H_{52}, H_{61}, \\
M_{27} &\Rightarrow H_{73}, & M_{28} &\Rightarrow H_{41}, H_{42}, \\
M_{29} &\Rightarrow H_{43}, & M_{210} &\Rightarrow H_{83}, \\
M_{211} &\Rightarrow H_{21}, & M_{212} &\Rightarrow H_{11}, H_{23}, H_{33}, H_{71}, H_{82}.
\end{aligned}$$

It obvious that $\{H_{52}, H_{61}\}$ and $\{H_{41}, H_{42}\}$ are locally distinguishable. If M_{22} clicks, Alice performs the measurement $\mathcal{M}'_2 \equiv \{M'_{21} := P[|0\rangle_A; |0\rangle_a], M'_{22} := I - M'_{21}\}$. The outcomes corresponding to the operators M'_{21} and M'_{22} are $\{H_{31}, H_{72}\}$ and $\{H_{12}, H_{51}, H_{63}\}$, respectively. They are also locally distinguishable. If M_{24} clicks, Alice performs the measurement $\mathcal{M}''_2 \equiv \{M''_{21} := P[(|2\rangle, \dots, |d'_A - 1\rangle)_A; |1\rangle_a], M''_{22} := I - M''_{21}\}$. The outcomes corresponding to the operators M''_{21} and M''_{22} are H_{22} and $\{H_{32}, H_{81}\}$, respectively. Moreover, $\{H_{32}, H_{81}\}$ is a LOCC distinguishable collection. If M_{212} clicks, we proceed to the next step.

Step 3. Alice performs the measurement

$$\mathcal{M}_3 \equiv \{M_{31} := P[|d'_A\rangle_A; |1\rangle_a], M_{32} := I - M_{31}\}.$$

If M_{31} clicks, the subset is H_{71} . If M_{32} clicks, the subset is one of the remaining four.

Step 4. Bob performs the measurement

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_4 &\equiv \{M_{41} := P[|0 \circ (2, \dots, d'_C - 1)\rangle_{\bar{B}}; I_b], \\
M_{42} &:= I - M_{41}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

If M_{41} clicks, the subset is H_{23} . If M_{42} clicks, the result is one of the three remaining subsets.

Step 5. Alice performs the measurement

$$\mathcal{M}_5 \equiv \{M_{51} := P[|1\rangle_A; |0\rangle_a], M_{52} := I - M_{51}\}.$$

If M_{51} clicks, the subset is H_{82} . If M_{52} clicks, the subset is one of $\{H_{33}, H_{11}\}$, which is locally distinguishable.

On the other hand, we can similarly find the distinction protocol when M_{12} clicks in the step 1.

Appendix I: The proof of theorem 11

To locally distinguish the set (7), let Alice and Bob share a maximally entangled state $|\phi^+(4)\rangle_{a_1 b_1}$, while Alice and Charlie share an EPR state $|\phi^+(2)\rangle_{a_2 c_1}$.

Step 1. Bob performs the measurement

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_1 &\equiv \{M_{11} := P[|0\rangle_B; |0\rangle_{b_1}] + P[|1\rangle_B; |1\rangle_{b_1}] \\
&\quad + P[(|2\rangle, \dots, |d'_B - 1\rangle)_B; |2\rangle_{b_1}] \\
&\quad + P[|d'_B\rangle_B; |3\rangle_{b_1}], \\
M_{12} &:= P[|0\rangle_B; |1\rangle_{b_1}] + P[|1\rangle_B; |2\rangle_{b_1}] \\
&\quad + P[(|2\rangle, \dots, |d'_B - 1\rangle)_B; |3\rangle_{b_1}] \\
&\quad + P[|d'_B\rangle_B; |0\rangle_{b_1}], \\
M_{13} &:= P[|0\rangle_B; |2\rangle_{b_1}] + P[|1\rangle_B; |3\rangle_{b_1}] \\
&\quad + P[(|2\rangle, \dots, |d'_B - 1\rangle)_B; |0\rangle_{b_1}] \\
&\quad + P[|d'_B\rangle_B; |1\rangle_{b_1}], \\
M_{14} &:= I - M_{11} - M_{12} - M_{13}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Charlie performs the measurement

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_2 &\equiv \{M_{21} := P[(|0\rangle, |1\rangle)_C; |0\rangle_{c_1}] + P[(|2\rangle, \\
&\quad \dots, |d'_C\rangle)_C; |1\rangle_{c_1}], \\
M_{22} &:= I - M_{21}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Suppose the outcomes corresponding to M_{11} and M_{21} click, the resulting postmeasurement states are

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{11} &\rightarrow \{|0\rangle_A |1\rangle_B |\alpha_3^l\rangle_C |11\rangle_{a_1 b_1} |11\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_{12} &\rightarrow \{|1\rangle_A (|\alpha_3^{l,1}\rangle_B |22\rangle_{a_1 b_1} + |\alpha_3^{l,2}\rangle_B |33\rangle_{a_1 b_1}) \\
&\quad |0\rangle_C |00\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_{13} &\rightarrow \{|\alpha_3^l\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |1\rangle_C |00\rangle_{a_1 b_1} |00\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_{21} &\rightarrow \{|0\rangle_A |\alpha^i\rangle_B |22\rangle_{a_1 b_1} (|1\rangle_C |00\rangle_{a_2 c_1} + |\alpha_1^{k,2}\rangle_C \\
&\quad |11\rangle_{a_2 c_1})\}, \\
H_{22} &\rightarrow \{|\alpha^i\rangle_A (|1\rangle_B |11\rangle_{a_1 b_1} + |\alpha_1^{k,2}\rangle_B |22\rangle_{a_1 b_1}) \\
&\quad |0\rangle_C |00\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_{23} &\rightarrow \{|\alpha_1^k\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |\alpha^i\rangle_C |00\rangle_{a_1 b_1} |11\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\},
\end{aligned} \tag{II}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{31} &\rightarrow \{|0\rangle_A |d'_B\rangle_B |33\rangle_{a_1 b_1} (|0\rangle_C |00\rangle_{a_2 c_1} + |\alpha_0^{j,2}\rangle_C \\
&\quad |11\rangle_{a_2 c_1})\}, \\
H_{32} &\rightarrow \{|d'_A\rangle_A (|0\rangle_B |00\rangle_{a_1 b_1} + |\alpha_0^{j,2}\rangle_B |22\rangle_{a_1 b_1}) \\
&\quad |0\rangle_C |00\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_{33} &\rightarrow \{|\alpha_0^j\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |d'_C\rangle_C |00\rangle_{a_1 b_1} |11\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_{41} &\rightarrow \{|1\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |0 \pm 1\rangle_C |00\rangle_{a_1 b_1} |00\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_{42} &\rightarrow \{|0\rangle_A (|0\rangle_B |00\rangle_{a_1 b_1} \pm |1\rangle_B |11\rangle_{a_1 b_1}) |1\rangle_C \\
&\quad |00\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_{43} &\rightarrow \{|0 \pm 1\rangle_A |1\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |11\rangle_{a_1 b_1} |00\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_{51} &\rightarrow \{|1\rangle_A |d'_B\rangle_B |\alpha_3^l\rangle_C |33\rangle_{a_1 b_1} |11\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_{52} &\rightarrow \{|d'_A\rangle_A (|\alpha_3^{l,1}\rangle_B |22\rangle_{a_1 b_1} + |\alpha_3^{l,2}\rangle_B |33\rangle_{a_1 b_1}) \\
&\quad |1\rangle_C |00\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_{53} &\rightarrow \{|\alpha_3^l\rangle_A |1\rangle_B |d'_C\rangle_C |11\rangle_{a_1 b_1} |11\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_{61} &\rightarrow \{|\alpha^i\rangle_A |d'_B\rangle_B |33\rangle_{a_1 b_1} (|1\rangle_C |00\rangle_{a_2 c_1} + |\alpha_1^{k,2}\rangle_C \\
&\quad |11\rangle_{a_2 c_1})\}, \\
H_{62} &\rightarrow \{|d'_A\rangle_A (|1\rangle_B |11\rangle_{a_1 b_1} + |\alpha_1^{k,2}\rangle_B |22\rangle_{a_1 b_1}) \\
&\quad |\alpha^i\rangle_C |11\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_{63} &\rightarrow \{|\alpha_1^k\rangle_A |\alpha^i\rangle_B |d'_C\rangle_C |22\rangle_{a_1 b_1} |11\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_{71} &\rightarrow \{|d'_A\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |\alpha_3^l\rangle_C |00\rangle_{a_1 b_1} |11\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_{72} &\rightarrow \{|0\rangle_A (|\alpha_3^{l,1}\rangle_B |22\rangle_{a_1 b_1} + |\alpha_3^{l,2}\rangle_B |33\rangle_{a_1 b_1}) \\
&\quad |d'_C\rangle_C |11\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_{73} &\rightarrow \{|\alpha_3^l\rangle_A |d'_B\rangle_B |0\rangle_C |33\rangle_{a_1 b_1} |00\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_{81} &\rightarrow \{|d'_A\rangle_A |1\rangle_B |0 \pm 1\rangle_C |11\rangle_{a_1 b_1} |00\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_{82} &\rightarrow \{|1\rangle_A (|0\rangle_B |00\rangle_{a_1 b_1} \pm |1\rangle_B |11\rangle_{a_1 b_1}) |d'_C\rangle_C \\
&\quad |11\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\}, \\
H_{83} &\rightarrow \{|0 \pm 1\rangle_A |d'_B\rangle_B |1\rangle_C |33\rangle_{a_1 b_1} |00\rangle_{a_2 c_1}\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $|\alpha_0^{j,2}\rangle_\tau = \sum_{u=1}^{d_\tau-3} \omega_{d_\tau-2}^{ju} |u+1\rangle$, $|\alpha_1^{k,2}\rangle_\tau = \sum_{u=1}^{d_\tau-3} \omega_{d_\tau-2}^{ku} |u+1\rangle$, $|\alpha_3^{l,1}\rangle_\tau = \sum_{u=0}^{d_\tau-4} \omega_{d_\tau-2}^{lu} |u+2\rangle$ and $|\alpha_3^{l,2}\rangle_\tau = \omega_{d_\tau-2}^{l(d_\tau-3)} |d_\tau-1\rangle$ for $j, k, l \in \mathcal{Z}_{d_\tau-2}$ and $\tau = B, C$.

Step 2. Alice performs the measurement

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_3 &\equiv \{M_{31} := P[|d'_A\rangle_A; |0\rangle_{a_1}; |1\rangle_{a_2}], \\
&\quad M_{32} := P[|1\rangle_A; |0\rangle_{a_1}; |0\rangle_{a_2}], \\
&\quad M_{33} := P[|2\rangle, \dots, |d'_A-1\rangle_A; (|1\rangle, |2\rangle)_{a_1}; |0\rangle_{a_2}], \\
&\quad M_{34} := P[|0\rangle_A; |1\rangle_{a_1}; |1\rangle_{a_2}], \\
&\quad M_{35} := P[|d'_A\rangle_A; |1\rangle_{a_1}; |0\rangle_{a_2}], \\
&\quad M_{36} := P[(|1\rangle, \dots, |d'_A-1\rangle_A); |2\rangle_{a_1}; |1\rangle_{a_2}], \\
&\quad M_{37} := P[|1\rangle_A; |3\rangle_{a_1}; |1\rangle_{a_2}], \\
&\quad M_{38} := I - \sum_{i=1}^7 M_{3i}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The result of postmeasurement, corresponding to the operator M_{3i} ($i = 1, \dots, 7$) is

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{31} &\Rightarrow H_{71}, \quad M_{32} \Rightarrow H_{41}, \quad M_{33} \Rightarrow H_{22}, \quad M_{34} \Rightarrow H_{11}, \\
M_{35} &\Rightarrow H_{81}, \quad M_{36} \Rightarrow H_{63}, \quad M_{37} \Rightarrow H_{51}.
\end{aligned}$$

If M_{38} clicks, we proceed to the next step.

Step 3. Charlie performs the measurement

$$\mathcal{M}_4 \equiv \{M_{41} := P[|d'_C\rangle_C; |1\rangle_{c_1}], M_{42} := I - M_{41}\}.$$

If M_{41} clicks, the given subset is one of $\{H_{33}, H_{53}, H_{72}, H_{82}\}$. It is locally distinguishable. Otherwise, we continue to the next step.

Step 4. Alice performs the measurement

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_5 &\equiv \{M_{51} := P[(|0\rangle, |1\rangle)_A; (|0\rangle, |1\rangle)_{a_1}; |0\rangle_{a_2}], \\
&\quad M_{52} := P[(|2\rangle, \dots, |d'_A\rangle)_A; (|1\rangle, |2\rangle)_{a_1}; |1\rangle_{a_2}], \\
&\quad M_{53} := P[(|1\rangle, \dots, |d'_A-1\rangle)_A; |0\rangle_{a_1}; |1\rangle_{a_2}], \\
&\quad M_{54} := P[|0\rangle_A; |2\rangle_{a_1}; I_{a_2}], \\
&\quad M_{55} := P[(|0\rangle, |1\rangle)_A; |3\rangle_{a_1}; |0\rangle_{a_2}] + P[|0\rangle_A; \\
&\quad \quad |3\rangle_{a_1}; |1\rangle_{a_2}] + P[|1\rangle_A; |2\rangle_{a_1}; |0\rangle_{a_2}], \\
&\quad M_{56} := I - \sum_{i=1}^5 M_{5i}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Corresponding to the operator M_{5i} ($i = 1, \dots, 6$), we have the following result.

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{51} &\Rightarrow H_{43}, H_{42}, \quad M_{54} \Rightarrow H_{21}, \\
M_{52} &\Rightarrow H_{62}, \quad M_{55} \Rightarrow H_{12}, H_{31}, H_{83}, \\
M_{53} &\Rightarrow H_{23}, \quad M_{56} \Rightarrow H_{13}, H_{32}, H_{52}, H_{61}, H_{73}.
\end{aligned}$$

If M_{55} clicks, then Charlie performs the measurement $\mathcal{M}'_5 \equiv \{M'_{51} := P[|1\rangle_C; |0\rangle_{c_1}], M'_{52} := I - M'_{51}\}$. The outcomes corresponding to the operators M'_{51} and M'_{52} are H_{83} and $\{H_{12}, H_{31}\}$, respectively. It obvious that $\{H_{42}, H_{43}\}$ and $\{H_{12}, H_{31}\}$ are locally distinguishable. If M_{56} clicks, we move on to the next step.

Step 5. Charlie performs the measurement

$$\mathcal{M}_6 \equiv \{M_{61} := P[|0\rangle_C; |0\rangle_{c_1}], M_{62} := I - M_{61}\}.$$

Corresponding to the operators M_{61} and M_{62} , the subsets of postmeasurement are $\{H_{32}, H_{73}\}$ and $\{H_{13}, H_{52}, H_{61}\}$, respectively. They are all LOCC distinguishable.

If in the step 1 other operator clicks, we can also find similar entanglement-assisted discrimination protocol.

Appendix J: The proof of theorem 12

Let Alice and Bob share three EPR states $|\phi^+(2)\rangle_{a_1 b_1} |\phi^+(2)\rangle_{a_2 b_2} |\phi^+(2)\rangle_{a_3 b_3}$, while Alice and Charlie share an EPR state $|\phi^+(2)\rangle_{a_4 c_1}$.

Bob performs the measurement

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_1 &\equiv \{M_{11} := P[|0\rangle_B; |0\rangle_{b_1}; |0\rangle_{b_2}; |0\rangle_{b_3}] \\
&\quad + P[|1\rangle_B; |1\rangle_{b_1}; |0\rangle_{b_2}; |0\rangle_{b_3}] \\
&\quad + P[|(2), \dots, |d'_B - 1\rangle_B; |0\rangle_{b_1}; |1\rangle_{b_2}; |0\rangle_{b_3}] \\
&\quad + P[|d'_B\rangle_B; |0\rangle_{b_1}; |0\rangle_{b_2}; |1\rangle_{b_3}], \\
M_{12} &:= P[|0\rangle_B; |1\rangle_{b_1}; |0\rangle_{b_2}; |0\rangle_{b_3}] \\
&\quad + P[|1\rangle_B; |0\rangle_{b_1}; |1\rangle_{b_2}; |0\rangle_{b_3}] \\
&\quad + P[|(2), \dots, |d'_B - 1\rangle_B; |0\rangle_{b_1}; |0\rangle_{b_2}; |1\rangle_{b_3}] \\
&\quad + P[|d'_B\rangle_B; |0\rangle_{b_1}; |0\rangle_{b_2}; |0\rangle_{b_3}], \\
M_{13} &:= P[|0\rangle_B; |0\rangle_{b_1}; |1\rangle_{b_2}; |0\rangle_{b_3}] \\
&\quad + P[|1\rangle_B; |0\rangle_{b_1}; |0\rangle_{b_2}; |1\rangle_{b_3}] \\
&\quad + P[|(2), \dots, |d'_B - 1\rangle_B; |0\rangle_{b_1}; |0\rangle_{b_2}; |0\rangle_{b_3}] \\
&\quad + P[|d'_B\rangle_B; |1\rangle_{b_1}; |0\rangle_{b_2}; |0\rangle_{b_3}], \\
M_{14} &:= P[|0\rangle_B; |0\rangle_{b_1}; |0\rangle_{b_2}; |1\rangle_{b_3}] \\
&\quad + P[|1\rangle_B; |0\rangle_{b_1}; |0\rangle_{b_2}; |0\rangle_{b_3}] \\
&\quad + P[|(2), \dots, |d'_B - 1\rangle_B; |1\rangle_{b_1}; |0\rangle_{b_2}; |0\rangle_{b_3}] \\
&\quad + P[|d'_B\rangle_B; |0\rangle_{b_1}; |1\rangle_{b_2}; |0\rangle_{b_3}], \\
M_{15} &:= P[|0\rangle_B; |1\rangle_{b_1}; |1\rangle_{b_2}; |1\rangle_{b_3}] \\
&\quad + P[|1\rangle_B; |0\rangle_{b_1}; |1\rangle_{b_2}; |1\rangle_{b_3}] \\
&\quad + P[|(2), \dots, |d'_B - 1\rangle_B; |1\rangle_{b_1}; |0\rangle_{b_2}; |1\rangle_{b_3}] \\
&\quad + P[|d'_B\rangle_B; |1\rangle_{b_1}; |1\rangle_{b_2}; |0\rangle_{b_3}], \\
M_{16} &:= P[|0\rangle_B; |0\rangle_{b_1}; |1\rangle_{b_2}; |1\rangle_{b_3}] \\
&\quad + P[|1\rangle_B; |1\rangle_{b_1}; |0\rangle_{b_2}; |1\rangle_{b_3}] \\
&\quad + P[|(2), \dots, |d'_B - 1\rangle_B; |1\rangle_{b_1}; |1\rangle_{b_2}; |0\rangle_{b_3}] \\
&\quad + P[|d'_B\rangle_B; |1\rangle_{b_1}; |1\rangle_{b_2}; |1\rangle_{b_3}], \\
M_{17} &:= P[|0\rangle_B; |1\rangle_{b_1}; |0\rangle_{b_2}; |1\rangle_{b_3}] \\
&\quad + P[|1\rangle_B; |1\rangle_{b_1}; |1\rangle_{b_2}; |0\rangle_{b_3}] \\
&\quad + P[|(2), \dots, |d'_B - 1\rangle_B; |1\rangle_{b_1}; |1\rangle_{b_2}; |1\rangle_{b_3}] \\
&\quad + P[|d'_B\rangle_B; |0\rangle_{b_1}; |1\rangle_{b_2}; |1\rangle_{b_3}], \\
M_{18} &:= I - \sum_{i=1}^7 M_{1i}.
\end{aligned}$$

Charlie performs the measurement

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_2 &\equiv \{M_{21} := P[|(0), |1\rangle_C; |0\rangle_{c_1}] + P[|(2), \\
&\quad \dots, |d'_C\rangle_C; |1\rangle_{c_1}], \\
M_{22} &:= I - M_{21}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of the theorem 11, the outcomes only need to change assisted system a_1 and b_1 of (II) into $a_1 a_2 a_3 a_4$ and $b_1 b_2 b_3$, respectively. It is easy to prove that these postmeasurement states are also locally distinguishable.

Appendix K: The proof of theorem 13

Due to $d_C, d_D \leq d_B$. By using the maximally entangled states $|\phi^+(d_C)\rangle_{BC}$ and $|\phi^+(d_D)\rangle_{BD}$ we teleport subsystems C and D to Bob and let \bar{B} represent their union. In addition, to locally discriminate the set (8), Alice and Bob

share a maximally entangled state $|\phi^+(3)\rangle_{ab}$. The specific protocol is as follows.

Alice performs the measurement

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_1 &\equiv \{M_{11} := P[|0\rangle_A; |0\rangle_a] + P[|(1), \dots, |d'_A - 1\rangle_A; \\
&\quad |1\rangle_a] + P[|d'_A\rangle_A; |2\rangle_a], \\
M_{12} &:= P[|0\rangle_A; |1\rangle_a] + P[|(1), \dots, |d'_A - 1\rangle_A; \\
&\quad |2\rangle_a] + P[|d'_A\rangle_A; |0\rangle_a], \\
M_{13} &:= I - M_{11} - M_{12}.
\end{aligned}$$

Suppose the outcome corresponding to M_{11} clicks, the resulting postmeasurement states are

$$\begin{aligned}
U_{11} &\rightarrow \{|0\rangle_A |\xi_i \circ \eta_j \circ (0 \pm d'_D)\rangle_{\bar{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
U_{12} &\rightarrow \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |\eta_j \circ (0 \pm d'_C) \circ 0\rangle_{\bar{B}} |11\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
U_{13} &\rightarrow \{(|0\rangle_A |00\rangle_{ab} + |\eta_j^1\rangle_A |11\rangle_{ab}) | (0 \pm d'_B) \circ 0 \\
&\quad \circ \xi_i\rangle_{\bar{B}}\}, \\
U_{14} &\rightarrow \{(|0\rangle_A |00\rangle_{ab} \pm |d'_A\rangle_A |22\rangle_{ab}) | 0 \circ \xi_i \circ \eta_j\rangle_{\bar{B}}\}, \\
U_{21} &\rightarrow \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |d'_B \circ \gamma_k \circ \eta_j\rangle_{\bar{B}} |11\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
U_{22} &\rightarrow \{|d'_A\rangle_A |\gamma_k \circ \eta_j \circ \xi_i\rangle_{\bar{B}} |22\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
U_{23} &\rightarrow \{(|\gamma_k^1\rangle_A |11\rangle_{ab} + |\gamma_k^2\rangle_A |22\rangle_{ab}) | \eta_j \circ \xi_i \circ d'_D\rangle_{\bar{B}}\}, \\
U_{24} &\rightarrow \{(|0\rangle_A |00\rangle_{ab} + |\eta_j^1\rangle_A |11\rangle_{ab}) | \xi_i \circ d'_C \circ \gamma_k\rangle_{\bar{B}}\}, \\
U_{31} &\rightarrow \{|d'_A\rangle_A |0 \circ (0 \pm d'_C) \circ \gamma_k\rangle_{\bar{B}} |22\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
U_{32} &\rightarrow \{|0\rangle_A | (0 \pm d'_B) \circ \gamma_k \circ d'_D\rangle_{\bar{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
U_{33} &\rightarrow \{(|0\rangle_A |00\rangle_{ab} \pm |d'_A\rangle_A |22\rangle_{ab}) | \gamma_k \circ d'_C \circ 0\rangle_{\bar{B}}\}, \\
U_{34} &\rightarrow \{(|\gamma_k^1\rangle_A |11\rangle_{ab} + |\gamma_k^2\rangle_A |22\rangle_{ab}) | d'_B \circ 0 \circ (0 \\
&\quad \pm d'_D)\rangle_{\bar{B}}\}, \\
U_{41} &\rightarrow \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |\xi_i \circ 0 \circ \gamma_k\rangle_{\bar{B}} |11\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
U_{42} &\rightarrow \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |0 \circ \gamma_k \circ \xi_i\rangle_{\bar{B}} |11\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
U_{43} &\rightarrow \{|0\rangle_A |\gamma_k \circ \xi_i \circ \xi_i\rangle_{\bar{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
U_{44} &\rightarrow \{(|\gamma_k^1\rangle_A |11\rangle_{ab} + |\gamma_k^2\rangle_A |22\rangle_{ab}) | \xi_i \circ \xi_i \circ 0\rangle_{\bar{B}}\}, \\
U_{51} &\rightarrow \{|d'_A\rangle_A |d'_B \circ \xi_i \circ (0 \pm d'_D)\rangle_{\bar{B}} |22\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
U_{52} &\rightarrow \{|d'_A\rangle_A |\xi_i \circ (0 \pm d'_C) \circ d'_D\rangle_{\bar{B}} |22\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
U_{53} &\rightarrow \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |(0 \pm d'_B) \circ d'_C \circ d'_D\rangle_{\bar{B}} |11\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
U_{54} &\rightarrow \{(|0\rangle_A |00\rangle_{ab} \pm |d'_A\rangle_A |22\rangle_{ab}) | d'_B \circ d'_C \circ \xi_i\rangle_{\bar{B}}\}, \\
U_{61} &\rightarrow \{|0\rangle_A |0 \circ d'_C \circ \eta_j\rangle_{\bar{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
U_{62} &\rightarrow \{|0\rangle_A |d'_B \circ \eta_j \circ 0\rangle_{\bar{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
U_{63} &\rightarrow \{|d'_A\rangle_A |\eta_j \circ 0 \circ 0\rangle_{\bar{B}} |22\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
U_{64} &\rightarrow \{(|0\rangle_A |00\rangle_{ab} + |\eta_j^1\rangle_A |11\rangle_{ab}) | 0 \circ 0 \circ d'_D\rangle_{\bar{B}}\}, \\
U_{71} &\rightarrow \{|0\rangle_A |\xi_i \circ 0 \circ \xi_i\rangle_{\bar{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
U_{72} &\rightarrow \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |0 \circ \xi_i \circ 0\rangle_{\bar{B}} |11\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
U_{81} &\rightarrow \{|0\rangle_A |d'_B \circ 0 \circ d'_D\rangle_{\bar{B}} |00\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
U_{82} &\rightarrow \{|d'_A\rangle_A |0 \circ d'_C \circ 0\rangle_{\bar{B}} |22\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
U_{91} &\rightarrow \{|\xi_i\rangle_A |d'_B \circ \xi_i \circ d'_D\rangle_{\bar{B}} |11\rangle_{ab}\}, \\
U_{92} &\rightarrow \{|d'_A\rangle_A |\xi_i \circ d'_C \circ \xi_i\rangle_{\bar{B}} |22\rangle_{ab}\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $|\eta_j^1\rangle_A = \sum_{u=1}^{d_A-2} \omega_{d_A-1}^{ju} |u\rangle$, $|\gamma_k^1\rangle_A = \sum_{u=0}^{d_A-3} \omega_{d_A-1}^{ku} |u+1\rangle$ and $|\gamma_k^2\rangle_A = \omega_{d_A-1}^{k(d_A-2)} |d_A-1\rangle$ for $j, k \in \mathcal{Z}_{d_A-1}$. Obviously, they can be perfectly distinguished by LOCC. For all other cases a similar protocol follows.

-
- [1] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Quantum entanglement, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 865 (2009).
- [2] Y. H. Zhou, Z. W. Yu, and X. B. Wang, Making the decoy-state measurement-device-independent quantum key distribution practically useful, *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 042324 (2016).
- [3] T. Gao, F. L. Yan, and S. J. van Enk, Permutationally invariant part of a density matrix and nonseparability of N -qubit states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 180501 (2014).
- [4] J. S. Bell, On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox, *Physics* **1**, 195 (1964); On the problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **38**, 447 (1966).
- [5] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 880 (1969).
- [6] S. J. Freedman and J. F. Clauser, Experimental test of local hidden-variable theories, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **28**, 938 (1972).
- [7] F. L. Yan, T. Gao, and E. Chitambar, Two local observables are sufficient to characterize maximally entangled states of N qubits, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 022319 (2011).
- [8] H. X. Meng, J. Zhou, Z. P. Xu, H. Y. Su, T. Gao, F. L. Yan, and J. L. Chen, Hardy's paradox for multisetting high-dimensional systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 062103 (2018).
- [9] Z. Q. Chen, Bell-Klyshko inequalities to characterize maximally entangled states of n qubits, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 110403 (2004).
- [10] D. Ding, Y. Q. He, F. L. Yan, and T. Gao, Quantum nonlocality of generic family of four-qubit entangled pure states, *Chin. Phys. B* **24**, 070301 (2015).
- [11] D. Ding, Y. Q. He, F. L. Yan, and T. Gao, Entanglement measure and quantum violation of Bell-type inequality, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **55**, 4231 (2016).
- [12] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, C. A. Fuchs, T. Mor, E. Rains, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Quantum nonlocality without entanglement, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 1070 (1999).
- [13] Y. Feng and Y. Y. Shi, Characterizing locally indistinguishable orthogonal product states, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **55**, 2799 (2009).
- [14] Z. C. Zhang, F. Gao, G. J. Tian, T. Q. Cao, and Q. Y. Wen, Nonlocality of orthogonal product basis quantum states, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 022313 (2014).
- [15] Y. L. Wang, M. S. Li, Z. J. Zheng, and S. M. Fei, Nonlocality of orthogonal product-basis quantum states, *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 032313 (2015).
- [16] J. Niset and N. J. Cerf, Multipartite nonlocality without entanglement in many dimensions, *Phys. Rev. A* **74**, 052103 (2006).
- [17] G. B. Xu, Q. Y. Wen, S. J. Qin, Y. H. Yang, and F. Gao, Quantum nonlocality of multipartite orthogonal product states, *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 032341 (2016).
- [18] Y. L. Wang, M. S. Li, Z. J. Zheng, and S. M. Fei, The local indistinguishability of multipartite product states, *Quant. Info. Proc.* **16**, 5 (2017).
- [19] Z. C. Zhang, K. J. Zhang, F. Gao, Q. Y. Wen, and C. H. Oh, Construction of nonlocal multipartite quantum states, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 052344 (2017).
- [20] S. Halder, Several nonlocal sets of multipartite pure orthogonal product states, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 022303 (2018).
- [21] D. H. Jiang and G. B. Xu, Nonlocal sets of orthogonal product states in an arbitrary multipartite quantum system, *Phys. Rev. A* **102**, 032211 (2020).
- [22] B. M. Terhal, D. P. DiVincenzo, and D. W. Leung, Hiding bits in Bell states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 5807 (2001).
- [23] D. P. DiVincenzo, D. W. Leung, and B. M. Terhal, Quantum data hiding, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **48**, 580 (2002).
- [24] T. Eggeling and R. F. Werner, Hiding classical data in multipartite quantum states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 097905 (2002).
- [25] M. Hillery, V. Bužek, and A. Berthiaume, Quantum secret sharing, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 1829 (1999).
- [26] G. P. Guo, C. F. Li, B. S. Shi, J. Li, and G. C. Guo, Quantum key distribution scheme with orthogonal product states, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 042301 (2001).
- [27] L. Y. Hsu and C. M. Li, Quantum secret sharing using product states, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 022321 (2005).
- [28] D. Markham and B. C. Sanders, Graph states for quantum secret sharing, *Phys. Rev. A* **78**, 042309 (2008).
- [29] R. Rahaman and M. G. Parker, Quantum scheme for secret sharing based on local distinguishability, *Phys. Rev. A* **91**, 022330 (2015).
- [30] J. Wang, L. Li, H. Peng, and Y. Yang, Quantum-secret-sharing scheme based on local distinguishability of orthogonal multi-qubit entangled states, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 022320 (2017).
- [31] S. Halder, M. Banik, S. Agrawal, and S. Bandyopadhyay, Strong quantum nonlocality without entanglement, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 040403 (2019).
- [32] S. Rout, A. G. Maity, A. Mukherjee, S. Halder, and M. Banik, Genuinely nonlocal product bases: Classification and entanglement-assisted discrimination, *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 032321 (2019).
- [33] Z. C. Zhang and X. D. Zhang, Strong quantum nonlocality in multipartite quantum systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **99**, 062108 (2019).
- [34] P. Yuan, G. J. Tian, and X. M. Sun, Strong quantum nonlocality without entanglement in multipartite quantum systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **102**, 042228 (2020).
- [35] A. Bhunia, I. Chattopadhyay, and D. Sarkar, Nonlocality without entanglement: Party asymmetric case, [arXiv:2111.14399v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.14399v1).
- [36] F. Shi, M. Y. Hu, L. Chen, and X. D. Zhang, Strong quantum nonlocality with entanglement, *Phys. Rev. A* **102**, 042202 (2020).
- [37] F. Shi, M. S. Li, M. Y. Hu, L. Chen, M. H. Yung, Y. L. Wang, and X. D. Zhang, Strongly nonlocal unextendible product bases do exist, *Quantum* **6**, 619 (2022); Strong quantum nonlocality from hypercubes, [arXiv:2110.08461](https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.08461).
- [38] B. C. Che, Z. Dou, M. Lei, and Y. X. Yang, Strong nonlocal sets of UPB, [arXiv:2106.08699v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.08699v2).
- [39] F. Shi, Z. Ye, L. Chen, and X. D. Zhang, Strong quantum nonlocality in N -partite systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **105**, 022209 (2022).
- [40] M. S. Li and Y. L. Wang, Strong quantum nonlocality in general multipartite quantum systems, [arXiv:2202.09034v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.09034v1).
- [41] Y. Y. He, F. Shi, and X. D. Zhang, Strong quantum nonlocality and unextendibility without entanglement in N -partite systems with odd N , [arXiv:2203.14503v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.14503v1).
- [42] T. Gao, F. L. Yan, and Z. X. Wang, Quantum secure direct communication by EPR pairs and entanglement swapping, *Il Nuovo Cimento* **119B**, 313 (2004).
- [43] T. Gao, F. L. Yan, and Z. X. Wang, Deterministic secure direct communication using GHZ states and swapping quantum entanglement, *J. Phys. A* **38**, 5761 (2005).
- [44] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, Teleporting an unknown quantum state

- via dual classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen channels, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1895 (1993).
- [45] T. Gao, F. L. Yan, and Y. C. Li, Optimal controlled teleportation, *Europhys. Lett.* **84**, 50001 (2008).
- [46] T. Gao, F. L. Yan, and Z. X. Wang, Controlled quantum teleportation and secure direct communication, *Chin. Phys.* **14**, 893 (2005).
- [47] S. M. Cohen, Local distinguishability with preservation of entanglement, *Phys. Rev. A* **75**, 052313 (2007).
- [48] S. M. Cohen, Understanding entanglement as resource: Locally distinguishing unextendible product bases, *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 012304 (2008).
- [49] S. Bandyopadhyay, S. Halder, and M. Nathanson, Optimal resource states for local state discrimination, *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 022314 (2018).
- [50] 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* **97**, 022334 (2018).
- [51] L. J. Li, F. Gao, Z. C. Zhang, and Q. Y. Wen, Local distinguishability of orthogonal quantum states with no more than one ebit of entanglement, *Phys. Rev. A* **99**, 012343 (2019).
- [52] Z. C. Zhang, X. Wu, and X. D. Zhang, Locally distinguishing unextendible product bases by using entanglement efficiently, *Phys. Rev. A* **101**, 022306 (2020).
- [53] J. Walgate and L. Hardy, Nonlocality, asymmetry, and distinguishing bipartite states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 147901 (2002).