

# Local Identification of Subsets of Quantum states: A Stronger Quantum Nonlocality

Pratik Ghosal,<sup>1</sup> Arkaprabha Ghosal,<sup>1</sup> Subhendu B. Ghosh,<sup>2</sup> and Amit Mukherjee<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Physics, Bose Institute, Unified Academic Campus,  
EN 80, Sector V, Bidhan Nagar, Kolkata 700 091, India

<sup>2</sup>Physics and Applied Mathematics Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata, 203 B. T. Road, Kolkata 700108, India

Nonlocality makes quantum theory nontrivially sacred and useful in the paradigm of information theoretic tasks. Apart from Bell nonlocality, which deals with measurement outcome statistics of spatially separated agents, there is also another kind of quantum nonlocality, that is associated with perfect distinguishability of quantum states by local operations and classical communication (LOCC). We propose a distributed task: perfect identification of subsets of a known set of multipartite orthogonal states by LOCC, namely, *local subset identification*. Failure in accomplishing this task guarantees a new notion of quantum nonlocality, viz., *local subset unidentifiability*. Here, we show that both local distinguishability and local markability of quantum states implies local subset identifiability, but the converse is not necessarily true. This makes local subset unidentifiability a stronger quantum nonlocal phenomenon than its predecessors – local indistinguishability and local unmarkability. Moreover, we also present an even stronger version of local subset unidentifiability involving more than two spatially separated parties namely, *genuine local subset unidentifiability*, where a given subset becomes identifiable if and only if all the parties come together in a common lab.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In any operational theory, if two or more spatially separated communicating agents are able to perform a distributed task then it is trivially executable when they come together and collaborate in the same lab. The converse statement is true in classical world. Interestingly, in quantum regime, the scenario gets more complex. There exist distributed quantum tasks that can not be successfully accomplished locally, even though they are accomplishable when the agents collaborate. This phenomenon exhibits a stark deviation of quantum theory from its classical counterpart. Usually, this anomaly is termed as *quantum nonlocality*. In general, there are two kinds of such non-classical phenomena: one manifests nonlocality with the help of exotic structure and topology of quantum state space solely, the other deals with the incapability of explaining correlations by *locality* and *realism*. Customarily, the later one was named after John Bell as Bell nonlocality [1]. However, both of them have huge foundational and application-based significance in the current development of quantum theory. In this work, we are especially interested in the *quantum nonlocality* of the first kind. One such celebrated phenomenon is the perfect indistinguishability of certain mutually orthogonal multipartite quantum states via local operations and classical communication (LOCC). In the past decades, a plethora of interesting results were developed along this line [2–39]. Very recently, some other distributed quantum tasks have also been developed that manifest a stronger form of quantum nonlocality, e.g., local irreducibility [40], local unmarkability [41] etc. In this work, we present an even stronger form of quantum nonlocality exhibited by certain sets of mutually orthogonal entangled states. Here, the concerned distributed task, namely, *local subset identification* (LSI), is to perfectly locally identify the elements of a strict sub-

set (having cardinality greater than one), chosen from a known set of mutually orthogonal multipartite states by a number of spatially separated, classically communicating agents. More precisely, from a known set of mutually orthogonal states, *more than one* state will be chosen and shared among multiple spatially separated agents. The winning condition / objective of the task is to perfectly identify the shared states via LOCC. We show here that the incapability of accomplishing this task for a set exhibits an even stronger quantum nonlocal phenomenon than that discussed in the existing literature.

The nearest related distributed task to the one proposed here is local state marking (LSM) [41]. However, there are many obvious and crucial differences between these two. For example, take a set of bipartite orthogonal states  $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^N$ . Here, the well known task of local state discrimination (LSD) raise the question of perfectly locally distinguishing a state that is chosen from the above set and shared among spatially separated agents. However, LSM deals with a different question. For example, consider that *any two* states from the set are shared between spatially separated agents. At this point, local state marking asks to perfectly locally *recognize* these two states as well as specify the *order* of the shared states, that is, whether the shared states are  $|\psi_j\rangle \otimes |\psi_k\rangle$  or  $|\psi_k\rangle \otimes |\psi_j\rangle$  for any  $j \neq k$ . If for a specific set of states this distributed task can not be achieved perfectly locally, the set is said to exhibit a stronger quantum nonlocality than the local indistinguishability. This is denoted as local unmarkability [41]. However, in case of LSI, the question is to perfectly locally recognize just the *identity* of the states, *not* the order. For example, unlike the previous task, the agents only need to perfectly identify which  $|\psi_j\rangle$  and  $|\psi_k\rangle$  are provided from the original set  $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^N$  via LOCC. Clearly, the complexity of this proposed task is weaker than that of the LSM. Therefore, inability to accomplish this task for a specific set demonstrates a form of quantum nonlocality that is even stronger than lo-

cal unmarkability as well as local state indistinguishability. We termed this nonlocal phenomenon as *local subset unidentifiability*. More importantly, this stronger non-locality emerges due to the presence of locally indistinguishable subspaces of rank not necessarily restricted to one, whereas, local unmarkability appears because of the existence of higher dimensional indistinguishable vectors.

It is quite evident that any exotic non-classical feature that evolves from quantum mechanics gets more complex when multipartite scenario comes into the picture. In case of LSI, we also explore the scenario involving more than two spatially separated agents. Interestingly, we come up with a further stronger version of the non-locality we are introducing here. In a scenario involving more than two agents, we present a set of tripartite states and a set of four party states which are locally unidentifiable when all the agents are spatially separated. Surprisingly, we also show that these sets are locally unidentifiable in all possible bi-partitions. Therefore, to perfectly accomplish the LSI task, all the agents need to come together or they must resort to additional quantum resources. This certainly exhibits a stronger form of non-locality than its bipartite version. We term it as *genuine local subset unidentifiability*. It is important to mention here that, although the LSM task has been formally defined for more than two spatially separated agents, till now there are no examples in the existing literature, of *genuine* local unmarkability, in the sense discussed above. By presenting our example of genuine locally unidentifiable subsets of a particular set, we also provide the first example of genuine locally unmarkable subsets. This is because, as shown later in this paper, local unidentifiability of a subset naturally implies its local unmarkability.

Our manuscript is presented in the following way. In section II, we introduce the concerned distributed task: LSI and present its elegance over LSM. In section III, we discuss the stronger version local subset unidentifiability in multipartite framework. Followed by in section IV, we conclude with a discussion and possible open directions.

## II. LOCAL SUBSET IDENTIFICATION

We are now in a position to articulate the formal definition of our task – local subset identification.

**Definition 1** ( $(n, |\mathcal{S}'|)$ -Local Subset Identification). *Consider a set  $\mathcal{S} = \{|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle, \dots, |\psi_n\rangle\} \subset \bigotimes_{k=1}^N \mathbb{C}^{d_k}$  of  $n$   $N$ -party orthogonal quantum states. A subset  $\mathcal{S}' \subset \mathcal{S}$  containing  $1 \leq |\mathcal{S}'| < n$  quantum states is randomly chosen and distributed among spatially separated agents keeping the identities of the states hidden. The task of  $(n, |\mathcal{S}'|)$ -local identification is to perfectly determine the elements of the set  $\mathcal{S}'$ .*

We call a set  $\mathcal{S}$  to be  $(n, |\mathcal{S}'|)$ -identifiable if all possible subsets of  $\mathcal{S}$ , having the same cardinality as  $|\mathcal{S}'|$ , are locally identifiable. It is evident that  $|\mathcal{S}'| = n$  is a trivial

question in local state identification framework, as the elements of the entire set  $\mathcal{S}$  is already known to the agents. On the other extreme, when  $|\mathcal{S}'| = 1$ , this boils down to a well known problem:

**Lemma 1.** *For a given set  $\mathcal{S}$  the task of  $(n, 1)$ -LSI corresponds to the well-known task of Local State Discrimination (LSD).*

The reader may also wonder how LSI is related with the LSM task. But before delving into that, let us first formally define the LSM task. Consider the same set  $\mathcal{S}$  of  $n$   $N$ -party orthogonal quantum states and a subset  $\mathcal{S}'$  having  $|\mathcal{S}'|$  quantum states is randomly chosen from it and distributed among spatially separated agents keeping the identities of the states hidden. The task of  $(n, |\mathcal{S}'|)$ -LSM is to perfectly determine the *order* of the elements of the set  $\mathcal{S}'$  [41] as given to the  $N$  agents. From definition of these two tasks the next lemma follows directly.

**Lemma 2** ( $(n, m)$ -LSM  $\Rightarrow$   $(n, m)$ -LSI). *If a set  $\mathcal{S}$  is  $(n, m)$ -markable, then it readily follows that it is also  $(n, m)$ -identifiable.*

If the  $N$  spatially separated agents can locally determine the order of the states of the given subset  $\mathcal{S}'$ , then the identity of the states is trivially known to them. However, the converse of this statement is not necessarily true.

**Theorem 1.** *If a set  $\mathcal{S}$  is  $(n, m)$ -identifiable, then it is not necessarily  $(n, m)$ -markable.*

*Proof.* The proof is constructive. Consider a set of three Bell states, say,  $\mathcal{S} = \{|B_1\rangle, |B_2\rangle, |B_3\rangle\}_{AB} \subset \mathbb{C}_A^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}_B^2$ , where  $|B_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$ ,  $|B_2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle - |11\rangle)$ ,  $|B_3\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle + |10\rangle)$ . A subset containing two distinct Bell states from the set  $\mathcal{S}$  can be chosen in  $\binom{3}{2} = 3$  ways, namely,  $\mathcal{S}'_1 = \{|B_1\rangle, |B_2\rangle\}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}'_2 = \{|B_2\rangle, |B_3\rangle\}$ , and  $\mathcal{S}'_3 = \{|B_3\rangle, |B_1\rangle\}$ . Note that, the order of the elements of the subsets is not important. One such subset is randomly selected and the elements are distributed among two spatially separated agents, Alice and Bob.

$(3, 2)$ -*identifiability*: Alice and Bob can successfully identify the shared subset locally, using the following protocol. Each agent performs the following measurement  $\mathcal{M}_\alpha := \{P_i^\alpha | \sum_{i=1}^4 P_i^\alpha = \mathbb{I}_4\}$ , where  $P_i^\alpha := |B_i\rangle_\alpha \langle B_i|$ ,  $\alpha \in \{A_1A_2, B_1B_2\}$ , on their respective share of two qubits. Afterwards, the agents can know the identity of the shared subset by tallying their measurement outcomes via classical communication.

For example, if  $\mathcal{S}'_1$  is distributed among the agents then their shared two states can be either of the following two orders— $|B_1\rangle_{A_1B_1} \otimes |B_2\rangle_{A_2B_2}$  or,  $|B_2\rangle_{A_1B_1} \otimes |B_1\rangle_{A_2B_2}$ . However, we can write,

$$\begin{aligned} |B_1\rangle_{A_1B_1} |B_2\rangle_{A_2B_2} &= |B_1\rangle_{A_1A_2} |B_2\rangle_{B_1B_2} + |B_2\rangle_{A_1A_2} |B_1\rangle_{B_1B_2} \\ &+ |B_3\rangle_{A_1A_2} |B_4\rangle_{B_1B_2} + |B_4\rangle_{A_1A_2} |B_3\rangle_{B_1B_2}, \end{aligned}$$

and,

$$\begin{aligned} |B_2\rangle_{A_1B_1} |B_1\rangle_{A_2B_2} &= |B_1\rangle_{A_1A_2} |B_2\rangle_{B_1B_2} + |B_2\rangle_{A_1A_2} |B_1\rangle_{B_1B_2} \\ &\quad - |B_3\rangle_{A_1A_2} |B_4\rangle_{B_1B_2} - |B_4\rangle_{A_1A_2} |B_3\rangle_{B_1B_2}. \end{aligned}$$

It readily follows that if Alice and Bob perform  $\mathcal{M}_{A_1A_2}$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{B_1B_2}$  respectively, then their corresponding outcomes will never be able to reveal the order of  $|B_1\rangle$  and  $|B_2\rangle$ , but can distinguish between different  $\mathcal{S}'_i$ 's (See Table I).

$\mathcal{S}'_1$	$\mathcal{S}'_2$	$\mathcal{S}'_3$
(1, 2)	(1, 4)	(1, 3)
(2, 1)	(2, 3)	(2, 4)
(3, 4)	(3, 2)	(3, 1)
(4, 3)	(4, 1)	(4, 2)

TABLE I. Here,  $(\clubsuit, \spadesuit)$  denotes that the outcome of Alice's measurement is  $P_{\clubsuit}^{A_1A_2}$  and Bob's is  $P_{\spadesuit}^{B_1B_2}$ . The table states that for a specific subset, say,  $\mathcal{S}'_i$ , the outcomes at Alice's and Bob's site can be any of (1, 2), (2, 1), (3, 4), (4, 3).

A similar protocol can always be devised to identify two of any three Bell states.

(3, 2)–*unmarkability*: However, Alice and Bob can never be able to locally mark (i.e., distinguish between the orders of) two states from any set of three Bell states. This is because, this task tantamounts to distinguishing a state from a set of six ( ${}^3P_2 = 6$ )  $\mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathbb{C}^4$  maximally entangled states, which is impossible according to Ref. [42].  $\square$

The above example already establishes the fact that, the complexity of the LSI task is essentially weaker than that of LSM. Nevertheless, LSI provides the ground to demonstrate a hitherto unrevealed stronger form of quantum nonlocality. If any set is incapable of accomplishing LSI then that must be an example of stronger nonlocality than local unmarkability. Below we provide some examples of sets which shows this strong form of nonlocality, namely, *local unidentifiability*.

**Theorem 2.** *The set of four two-qubit maximally entangled states is (4,2)-unidentifiable.*

*Proof.* If a subset  $\mathcal{S}'_i$  containing two states from a set  $\mathcal{S}$  of four two-qubit Bell states is shared among two spatially separated agents, Alice and Bob, they will never be able to locally distinguish between the  $\mathcal{S}'_i$ 's, i.e., they will never be able to know the identity of the two given Bell states, let alone their ordering. Following is the detailed proof.

Consider that  $\mathcal{S} := \{|B_1\rangle, |B_2\rangle, |B_3\rangle, |B_4\rangle\}$ , where,  $|B_4\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)$ . A subset containing any two Bell states can be chosen in  $\binom{4}{2}$ , or six ways, namely,  $\mathcal{S}'_1 := \{|B_1\rangle, |B_2\rangle\}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}'_2 := \{|B_1\rangle, |B_3\rangle\}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}'_3 := \{|B_1\rangle, |B_4\rangle\}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}'_4 := \{|B_2\rangle, |B_3\rangle\}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}'_5 := \{|B_2\rangle, |B_4\rangle\}$ ,

$\mathcal{S}'_6 := \{|B_3\rangle, |B_4\rangle\}$ . Precisely, for example, if  $\mathcal{S}'_1$  is distributed among the agents then they actually share a mixed state,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1 &:= \frac{1}{2} |B_1\rangle \langle B_1|_{A_1B_1} \otimes |B_2\rangle \langle B_2|_{A_2B_2} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} |B_2\rangle \langle B_2|_{A_1B_1} \otimes |B_1\rangle \langle B_1|_{A_2B_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, other five states corresponding to the subsets are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_2 &:= \frac{1}{2} |B_1\rangle \langle B_1|_{A_1B_1} \otimes |B_3\rangle \langle B_3|_{A_2B_2} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} |B_3\rangle \langle B_3|_{A_1B_1} \otimes |B_1\rangle \langle B_1|_{A_2B_2}, \\ \rho_3 &:= \frac{1}{2} |B_1\rangle \langle B_1|_{A_1B_1} \otimes |B_4\rangle \langle B_4|_{A_2B_2} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} |B_4\rangle \langle B_4|_{A_1B_1} \otimes |B_1\rangle \langle B_1|_{A_2B_2}, \\ \rho_4 &:= \frac{1}{2} |B_2\rangle \langle B_2|_{A_1B_1} \otimes |B_3\rangle \langle B_3|_{A_2B_2} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} |B_3\rangle \langle B_3|_{A_1B_1} \otimes |B_2\rangle \langle B_2|_{A_2B_2}, \\ \rho_5 &:= \frac{1}{2} |B_2\rangle \langle B_2|_{A_1B_1} \otimes |B_4\rangle \langle B_4|_{A_2B_2} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} |B_4\rangle \langle B_4|_{A_1B_1} \otimes |B_2\rangle \langle B_2|_{A_2B_2}, \\ \rho_6 &:= \frac{1}{2} |B_3\rangle \langle B_3|_{A_1B_1} \otimes |B_4\rangle \langle B_4|_{A_2B_2} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} |B_4\rangle \langle B_4|_{A_1B_1} \otimes |B_3\rangle \langle B_3|_{A_2B_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, the task of locally distinguishing the subsets  $\{\mathcal{S}'_i\}_{i=1}^6$  is equivalent to distinguishing between the mixed states  $\{\rho_i\}_{i=1}^6$  by LOCC. We now prove our claim by *reductio ad absurdum*.

Consider now that the states  $\{\rho_i\}_{i=1}^6$  are locally distinguishable. Consequently, their supports are also distinguishable via LOCC [43]. Hence, any set of pure states  $\{|\xi_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^6$ , where  $\forall i |\xi_i\rangle \in \text{Support}(\rho_i)$ , must also be locally distinguishable. On the other hand, it is easy to see that the set  $\{|B_j\rangle_{A_1B_1} \otimes |B_k\rangle_{A_2B_2}\}_{j < k}$  for  $j, k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ , is locally indistinguishable [42]. But, each element of the above set of maximally entangled states belongs to the support of six different  $\rho_i$ 's. This readily contradicts our assumption that  $\{\rho_i\}_{i=1}^6$  are locally distinguishable and, thereby, concludes our proof.  $\square$

We also come up with a number of sets containing orthogonal general maximally entangled states which fails to accomplish the LSI task and thereby, shows local subset unidentifiability. We discuss this in the following.

**Theorem 3.** *Consider a complete basis set  $\mathcal{S}$  of maximally entangled states in  $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$ . There are  $\binom{d^2}{k}$  possible subsets, each containing  $k$  distinct states from  $\mathcal{S}$ . The set  $\mathcal{S}$  is  $(d^2, k)$ -unidentifiable, if  $\binom{d^2}{k} > d^k$ . Moreover, the set of  $D$  maximally entangled states ( $D < d^2$ ) will also be  $(D, k)$ -unidentifiable, provided  $\binom{D}{k} > d^k$ .*

*Proof.* Consider a maximally entangled state in  $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$   $|\Gamma\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j=1}^d |jj\rangle$ . A complete basis of orthonormal maximally entangled states can be generated from  $|\Gamma\rangle$  as  $\mathcal{S} = \{(\mathcal{U}_i \otimes \mathbb{I})|\Gamma\rangle\}$ , where the set  $\{\mathcal{U}_i\}_{i=1}^{d^2}$  forms a basis of Hilbert-Schmidt orthogonal unitaries. A subset of  $k$  distinct maximally entangled states can be chosen from




FIG. 1. The bigger set corresponds to the set of all orthogonal set that shows local unmarkability, whereas the small one contains all orthogonal sets that shows local subset unidentifiability. The examples considered in Theorem 2 and 3 reside in the darkly shaded smaller set, whereas the example dealt in Theorem 1 resides in the lightly shaded region outside the small one.

$\mathcal{S}$  in  $\kappa := \binom{d^2}{k}$  ways. We denote the subsets as  $\mathcal{S}_i^{(d^2, k)}$ , where  $i = 1$  to  $\kappa$ .

Now, the objective is to distinguish the subsets via LOCC. This actually amounts to locally distinguishing corresponding mixed states  $\{\rho_i^m\}_{i=1}^{\kappa}$ , where each state  $\rho_i^m$  is an equal classical mixture of all possible permutations of the composition of the  $k$  pure states from  $\mathcal{S}_i^{(d^2, k)}$ . These mixed states are clearly orthogonal to each other because, by construction, each subset contains at least one different element from the other. If the  $\rho_i^m$ s are distinguishable, then any set of  $\kappa$  vectors, each chosen from the support of different  $\rho_i^m$ s in  $\mathbb{C}^{d^k} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d^k}$ , are also distinguishable. However, any  $\kappa$  pure maximally entangled states in  $\mathbb{C}^{d^k} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d^k}$  are locally indistinguishable if  $\kappa > d^k$  [42]. Clearly, the set  $\{\rho_i^m\}_{i=1}^{\kappa}$  is locally indistinguishable, otherwise it leads to a contradiction. Evidently, if we consider a set of  $D$  ( $< d^2$ ) maximally entangled states, it can be easily shown following a similar approach as above, that the set will be  $(D, k)$ -unidentifiable for  $\binom{D}{k} > d^k$ . This completes our proof.  $\square$

In the spirit of the theorem that any complete basis set of MES is locally indistinguishable [42], the subsequent corollary follows.

**Corollary 3.1.** *Any two distinct states given from a complete basis set of MES of arbitrary dimensions are locally unidentifiable.*

*Proof.* Consider  $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$  MES. Complete basis has  $d^2$  such states. any two states given from it can occur in  $\binom{d^2}{2} = \frac{d^2(d^2-1)}{2}$  ways. This is always greater than  $d^2$  for  $d \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus \{1\}$ . Hence, locally unidentifiable.  $\square$

In the above, the Theorem 1 deals with an example of perfectly locally identifiable set. It is obviously a nontrivial example as it is not locally distinguishable or markable. There also exist other orthogonal sets which are  $(n, |S'|)$ -identifiable, for example, consider a set of four

two-qubit Bell states. Now, if we explore the  $(4, 3)$ -LSI task it is easy to see that the set is  $(4, 3)$ -identifiable. Here, each agent possesses three qubits in their respective labs. They need to perform a joint projective measurement in three-qubit GHZ basis on their respective three-qubit composite subsystems. At the end, tallying of their measurement outcomes will perfectly reveal the identity, but not the order, of the three shared Bell states. In fact, the set of four two-qubit Bell states are  $(4, 3)$ -unmarkable which directly follows from its  $(4, 4)$ -unmarkability [41]. There are also examples of trivially identifiable sets. In general, any orthogonal set which is locally distinguishable or even locally markable can be safely considered as perfectly identifiable via LOCC.

At this point, the above results establish that our concerned task (LSI) is distinct from LSM. Moreover, the incapability of accomplishing LSI designates a stronger version of quantum nonlocality compared to the local unmarkability. More precisely, a clear set inclusion relation can be established here (see Fig. 1). All the orthogonal sets which are locally unidentifiable (Theorem 2 and 3) must also be locally unmarkable. However, the opposite is not necessarily true (Theorem 1).

Hitherto, we have discussed examples in the bipartite framework. It is quite an intriguing question to delve into the status of quantum nonlocality in multipartite framework. Earlier works explored the notion of local indistinguishability and local irreducibility in multipartite scenario [40, 44, 45]. Complex structure of the quantum state space in multiparty framework empowers stronger notions of such quantum nonlocal phenomena. However, local unmarkability in multiparty structure is not explored in existing literature. We are now at a position to delve into the analysis of local subset unidentifiability in multipartite framework.

### III. GENUINE LOCAL SUBSET UNIDENTIFIABILITY

In this section, we analyze the status of LSI in multiparty scenario. We provide an example of a class of tripartite orthogonal set that exhibits a stronger form of local unidentifiability over its bipartite version. Moreover, our example also serves as an stronger version of the existing notion of local bipartite unmarkability.

We term this multipartite notion of unidentifiability as *genuine* because we show that even when *all but one* agents come together in a same laboratory to perfectly accomplish the LSI task, they fail. Of course, in this case, the collaborating agents are allowed to perform the strongest possible operation jointly on their composite subsystems. Nevertheless, this freedom does not empower the agents enough to perfectly achieve their goal. Consider a set  $\mathcal{S} := \{|G_\alpha\rangle\}_{\alpha=1}^8$  of eight 3-qubit GHZ states, where

$$|G_{1,2}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|000\rangle \pm |111\rangle) \quad (1)$$

$$|G_{3,4}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|001\rangle \pm |110\rangle) \quad (2)$$

$$|G_{5,6}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|010\rangle \pm |101\rangle) \quad (3)$$

$$|G_{7,8}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|100\rangle \pm |011\rangle). \quad (4)$$

**Theorem 4.** *The set  $\mathcal{S}$  is locally  $(D, k)$ -unidentifiable if  $\binom{D}{k} > 2^{2k}$  (where  $D \in (2, 8]$  and  $k \in (1, D)$ ) even when two out of three parties come together in a same lab.*

*Proof.* Firstly, note that elements of the set  $\mathcal{S}$  follow the relation below,

$$|G_\alpha\rangle = (\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{U}_{\alpha\beta}) |G_\beta\rangle, \quad \alpha, \beta \in \{1, \dots, 8\}, \quad (5)$$

where,  $\mathbb{U}_{\alpha\beta}$  is a unitary acting on two qubits and  $\mathbb{I}$  is the identity operator acting on  $\mathbb{C}^2$ . Naturally, any subset of  $\mathcal{S}$  inherits the same property.

Let  $\bar{\mathcal{S}} := \{|G_\alpha\rangle\}_{\alpha=1}^D$ ,  $2 < D \leq 8$ . There are  $\kappa := \binom{D}{k}$  different ways in which  $k$  states can be chosen from  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$  to form subsets that we label as  $\mathcal{S}'_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, \kappa$ . Locally identifying  $\mathcal{S}'_i$  tantamounts to locally distinguishing the set of mixed states  $\{\rho_i\}_{i=1}^\kappa$  where

$$\rho_i := \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\mu=1}^{k!} |\Phi_\mu^i\rangle \langle \Phi_\mu^i|, \quad (6)$$

$$|\Phi_\mu^i\rangle = \text{Perm}_\mu |G_{\alpha_1}\rangle |G_{\alpha_2}\rangle \dots |G_{\alpha_k}\rangle, \quad \mu = 1, \dots, k!,$$

$$\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2 \dots \neq \alpha_k \in \{1, \dots, D\},$$

such that,  $|G_{\alpha_1}\rangle, |G_{\alpha_2}\rangle, \dots, |G_{\alpha_k}\rangle \in \mathcal{S}'_i$ .

Here,  $\text{Perm}_\mu |G_{\alpha_1}\rangle |G_{\alpha_2}\rangle \dots |G_{\alpha_k}\rangle$  means different possible permutations of the state  $|G_{\alpha_1}\rangle |G_{\alpha_2}\rangle \dots |G_{\alpha_k}\rangle$ . For example,  $\text{Perm}_1 |G_1\rangle |G_4\rangle |G_7\rangle = |G_1\rangle |G_4\rangle |G_7\rangle$ ,  $\text{Perm}_2 |G_1\rangle |G_4\rangle |G_7\rangle = |G_7\rangle |G_4\rangle |G_1\rangle$ ,  $\text{Perm}_3 |G_1\rangle |G_4\rangle |G_7\rangle = |G_4\rangle |G_7\rangle |G_1\rangle$ , etc. We examine the identifiability of  $\mathcal{S}'_i$ s (equivalently, distinguishability of the  $\rho_i$ s) when two out of the three qubits of each of the  $k$   $|G_\alpha\rangle$ s are in the same lab. Under such condition, it is possible to transform one permutation to any other by implementing local unitaries on the two qubits of each of the  $k$   $|G_\alpha\rangle$ s. Therefore,

$$|G_{\alpha'_1}\rangle |G_{\alpha'_2}\rangle \dots |G_{\alpha'_k}\rangle$$

$$= (\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{U}_{\alpha'_1\alpha_1}) |G_{\alpha_1}\rangle (\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{U}_{\alpha'_2\alpha_2}) |G_{\alpha_2}\rangle \dots (\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{U}_{\alpha'_k\alpha_k}) |G_{\alpha_k}\rangle. \quad (7)$$

Clearly, the set  $\{|\Phi_\mu^i\rangle\}_{i=1}^\kappa \subset \mathbb{C}^{2^k} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{2^{2k}}$  has the property:  $|\Phi_\mu^i\rangle = (\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{U}_{ij,\mu\nu}) |\Phi_\nu^j\rangle$  for  $i, j = 1, \dots, \kappa$ ,  $\mu, \nu = 1, \dots, k!$  where  $\mathbb{U}_{ij,\mu\nu}$ s are  $2k$ -qubit unitaries. So, if  $\kappa > 2^{2k}$ ,  $\{|\Phi_\mu^i\rangle\}_{i=1}^\kappa$  is not perfectly distinguishable [46].

On the other hand, if we assume that  $\rho_i$ s are distinguishable, then so are their supports. This implies that the set  $\{|\Phi_\mu^i\rangle\}_{i=1}^\kappa$  is also distinguishable, as for each  $i$ ,  $|\Phi_\mu^i\rangle \in \text{Support}(\rho_i)$ . But this leads to contradiction for  $\kappa > 2^{2k}$ . So, the  $\mathcal{S}'_i$ s are locally unidentifiable in each bipartition, provided  $\binom{D}{k} > 2^{2k}$ , that is, the sets  $\mathcal{S}'_i$ s are *genuinely* unidentifiable.  $\square$

Note that unidentifiability of  $\mathcal{S}'_i$ s in every bipartition

readily rules out the identifiability when the three parties are separated. This is because when two parties collaborate they are able to perform strongest possible joint operations on the qubits in their possession, whereas in the later case, the parties are only allowed to perform a relatively weak operation - LOCC.

While the last result exhibits genuine local unidentifiability in three-party systems in every possible bi-partitions that are related by party permutations, number of bi-partitions that are not related by party permutations increases as we consider multipartite systems consisting of more than three parties. This can be easily demonstrated by considering four-party systems. In a four-party system, there are two classes of bi-partitions that are not connected by party permutation viz., 1 party vs. 3 parties (1 : 3), and 2 parties vs. 2 parties (2 : 2), each class containing bi-partitions that are related by party permutations. Sets of orthogonal four-party states that exhibits local unidentifiability in *all* such possible bi-partitions represent stronger nonlocality than that exhibited by three parties. Consider the set  $\mathcal{S} := \{|G_\alpha^{(4)}\rangle\}_{\alpha=1}^{16}$ , where

$$|G_{1,2}^{(4)}\rangle = \frac{1}{2} (|0000\rangle \pm |0111\rangle + |1010\rangle \pm |1101\rangle),$$

$$|G_{3,4}^{(4)}\rangle = \frac{1}{2} (|0000\rangle \pm |0111\rangle - |1010\rangle \mp |1101\rangle),$$

$$|G_{5,6}^{(4)}\rangle = \frac{1}{2} (|0001\rangle \pm |0110\rangle + |1011\rangle \pm |1100\rangle),$$

$$|G_{7,8}^{(4)}\rangle = \frac{1}{2} (|0001\rangle \pm |0110\rangle - |1011\rangle \mp |1100\rangle),$$

$$|G_{9,10}^{(4)}\rangle = \frac{1}{2} (|0010\rangle \pm |0101\rangle + |1000\rangle \pm |1111\rangle),$$

$$|G_{11,12}^{(4)}\rangle = \frac{1}{2} (|0010\rangle \pm |0101\rangle - |1000\rangle \mp |1111\rangle),$$

$$|G_{13,14}^{(4)}\rangle = \frac{1}{2} (|0011\rangle \pm |0100\rangle + |1001\rangle \pm |1110\rangle),$$

$$|G_{15,16}^{(4)}\rangle = \frac{1}{2} (|0011\rangle \pm |0100\rangle - |1001\rangle \mp |1110\rangle). \quad (8)$$

**Theorem 5.** *The set  $\mathcal{S}$  is locally  $(D, k)$ -unidentifiable if  $\binom{D}{k} > 2^{3k}$  (where  $D \in (2, 16]$  and  $k \in (1, D)$ ) in all 1 : 3 as well 2 : 2 bi-partitions.*

*Proof.* The set  $\mathcal{S}$  has the property that

$$|G_\alpha^{(4)}\rangle = (\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{U}_{\alpha\beta}) |G_\beta^{(4)}\rangle,$$

$$= (\mathbb{I}' \otimes \mathbb{U}'_{\alpha\beta}) |G_\beta^{(4)}\rangle, \quad (9)$$

where,  $\mathbb{U}_{\alpha\beta}$  is a unitary acting on three qubits,  $\mathbb{I}$  is the identity operator acting on  $\mathbb{C}^2$ ,  $\mathbb{U}'_{\alpha\beta}$  acts on two qubits and  $\mathbb{I}'$  is the identity operator acting on  $\mathbb{C}^4$ . Now, following the same arguments as given in the proof of Theorem 4, it can be easily proved that a subset containing  $k$  states, chosen from a set  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$  containing known  $D$  states of  $\mathcal{S}$  is locally unidentifiable in 2 : 2 bi-partitions if  $\binom{D}{k} > 2^{2k}$  and 1 : 3 bi-partitions if  $\binom{D}{k} > 2^{3k}$ . Thus, for  $\binom{D}{k} > 2^{3k}$

the subset can be identified if and only if all four parties come in the same lab.  $\square$

Furthermore, Theorems 4 and 5 also present examples of the stronger form of local unmarkability. The concerned sets are locally unmarkable in all possible bipartitions.

#### IV. DISCUSSION

In summary, we have introduced a novel distributed task - local subset identification. The task is to be played among multiple agents who are allowed to perform LOCC only. The main aim of the task for spatially separated agents is to perfectly identify the elements of a randomly chosen subset from a known orthogonal set of quantum states, shared between them. We have proved that, this task is distinct from the tasks / games explored earlier in the genre of local state discrimination. The significance of this specific task is also intriguing. Inability to perfectly accomplish the task certifies the presence of a novel quantum nonlocal feature in the concerned orthogonal set, that is, local subset unidentifiability. Both in bipartite and multipartite scenario, we have explored examples of such nonlocal phenomenon. Specifically, in  $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$  bipartite system, subsets of cardinality  $k$  chosen from a set of orthogonal general maximally entangled states is shown to be locally unidentifiable for some condition on  $d$  and  $k$ , that is, the set is  $(d^2, k)$ -unidentifiable. Moreover, we have also established that local subset unidentifiability is stronger than its nearest neighbouring species - local unmarkability. This also makes local subset unidentifiability the strongest one along this line as yet. Further, we have explored the multipartite version of this new nonlocality and come up with an

even stronger form of it, where the set would remain locally unidentifiable in *all possible* bipartitions. We denote it as genuine local subset unidentification. We have also provided examples involving tripartite GHZ states in  $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^3$  and four party genuine entangled states in  $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^4$ . As established in this article – locally unidentifiable subsets are necessarily locally unmarkable, these also serves as examples of genuine local unmarkability – strongest version of local unmarkability as yet. Throughout the work, we have explored the local subset unidentifiability only in orthogonal entangled states. However, we believe that it is not necessarily the exclusive feature of entanglement. It would be quite interesting if the same feature can also be exhibited in sets of orthogonal product states. Furthermore, the local subset identification task deals with the problem of perfectly discriminating mutually orthogonal subspaces of rank more than one, whereas the previous tasks in the state discrimination genre *e.g.*, local reducibility [40, 44], local markability [41] dealt only with the rank one vectors. We, therefore, also believe that the local subset unidentifiability will be a more prospective resource in various quantum information processing protocols, such as, data hiding or secret sharing protocols.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Guruprasad Kar, Somshubhro Bandyopadhyay, Sibasish Ghosh and Manik Banik for stimulating discussions. PG would like to thank Department of Science & Technology, Government of India for financial support. AG would like to thank IMSc, Chennai for hospitality. AM acknowledges NASI for Research Associate Fellowship.

- 
- [1] J. S. Bell, On the einstein podolsky rosen paradox, *Physics Physique Fizika* **1**, 195 (1964).
  - [2] S. Virmani, M. F. Sacchi, M. B. Plenio, and D. Markham, Optimal local discrimination of two multipartite pure states, *Phys. Lett. A* **288**, 62 (2001).
  - [3] B. Groisman and L. Vaidman, Nonlocal variables with product-state eigenstates, *J. Phys. A Math. Gen.* **34**, 6881 (2001).
  - [4] J. Walgate, A. J. Short, L. Hardy, and V. Vedral, Local distinguishability of multipartite orthogonal quantum states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 4972 (2000).
  - [5] M. Horodecki, A. Sen(De), U. Sen, and K. Horodecki, Local indistinguishability: More nonlocality with less entanglement, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 047902 (2003).
  - [6] H. Fan, Distinguishability and indistinguishability by local operations and classical communication, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 177905 (2004).
  - [7] S. Ghosh, G. Kar, A. Roy, and D. Sarkar, Distinguishability of maximally entangled states, *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 022304 (2004).
  - [8] S. De Rinaldis, Distinguishability of complete and unextendible product bases, *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 022309 (2004).
  - [9] J. Watrous, Bipartite subspaces having no bases distinguishable by local operations and classical communication, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 080505 (2005).
  - [10] J. Niset and N. J. Cerf, Multipartite nonlocality without entanglement in many dimensions, *Phys. Rev. A* **74**, 052103 (2006).
  - [11] M.-Y. Ye, W. Jiang, P.-X. Chen, Y.-S. Zhang, Z.-W. Zhou, and G.-C. Guo, Local distinguishability of orthogonal quantum states and generators of  $\text{su}(N)$ , *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 032329 (2007).
  - [12] H. Fan, Distinguishing bipartite states by local operations and classical communication, *Phys. Rev. A* **75**, 014305 (2007).
  - [13] R. Duan, Y. Feng, Z. Ji, and M. Ying, Distinguishing arbitrary multipartite basis unambiguously using local operations and classical communication, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 230502 (2007).

- [14] S. Bandyopadhyay and J. Walgate, Local distinguishability of any three quantum states, *J. Phys. A Math. Theor.* **42**, 072002 (2009).
- [15] Y. Feng and Y. Shi, Characterizing locally indistinguishable orthogonal product states, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **55**, 2799 (2009).
- [16] R. Duan, Y. Xin, and M. Ying, Locally indistinguishable subspaces spanned by three-qubit unextendible product bases, *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 032329 (2010).
- [17] N. Yu, R. Duan, and M. Ying, Four locally indistinguishable ququad-ququad orthogonal maximally entangled states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 020506 (2012).
- [18] Y.-H. Yang, F. Gao, G.-J. Tian, T.-Q. Cao, and Q.-Y. Wen, Local distinguishability of orthogonal quantum states in a  $2 \otimes 2 \otimes 2$  system, *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 024301 (2013).
- [19] A. M. Childs, D. Leung, L. Mančinska, and M. Ozols, A framework for bounding nonlocality of state discrimination, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **323**, 1121 (2013).
- [20] 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).
- [21] S. Yu and C. H. Oh, Detecting the local indistinguishability of maximally entangled states (2015), [arXiv:1502.01274 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1502.01274).
- [22] Z.-C. Zhang, F. Gao, S.-J. Qin, Y.-H. Yang, and Q.-Y. Wen, Nonlocality of orthogonal product states, *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 012332 (2015).
- [23] 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).
- [24] J. Chen and N. Johnston, The minimum size of unextendible product bases in the bipartite case (and some multipartite cases), *Commun. Math. Phys.* **333**, 351 (2015).
- [25] Y.-H. Yang, F. Gao, G.-B. Xu, H.-J. Zuo, Z.-C. Zhang, and Q.-Y. Wen, Characterizing unextendible product bases in qutrit-ququad system, *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 11963 (2015).
- [26] Z.-C. Zhang, F. Gao, Y. Cao, S.-J. Qin, and Q.-Y. Wen, Local indistinguishability of orthogonal product states, *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 012314 (2016).
- [27] 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).
- [28] X. Zhang, X. Tan, J. Weng, and Y. Li, LOCC indistinguishable orthogonal product quantum states, *Sci. Rep.* **6** (2016).
- [29] G.-B. Xu, Y.-H. Yang, Q.-Y. Wen, S.-J. Qin, and F. Gao, Locally indistinguishable orthogonal product bases in arbitrary bipartite quantum system, *Sci. Rep.* **6** (2016).
- [30] Y.-L. Wang, M.-S. Li, S.-M. Fei, and Z.-J. Zheng, Constructing unextendible product bases from the old ones (2017), [arXiv:1703.06542 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1703.06542).
- [31] 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).
- [32] G.-B. Xu, Q.-Y. Wen, F. Gao, S.-J. Qin, and H.-J. Zuo, Local indistinguishability of multipartite orthogonal product bases, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **16** (2017).
- [33] Y.-L. Wang, M.-S. Li, Z.-J. Zheng, and S.-M. Fei, The local indistinguishability of multipartite product states, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **16** (2017).
- [34] X. Zhang, J. Weng, X. Tan, and W. Luo, Indistinguishability of pure orthogonal product states by LOCC, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **16** (2017).
- [35] X. Zhang, C. Guo, W. Luo, and X. Tan, Local distinguishability of quantum states in bipartite systems (2017), [arXiv:1712.08830 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1712.08830).
- [36] X. Zhang, Local distinguishability of quantum states in multipartite system (2017), [arXiv:1712.08970 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1712.08970).
- [37] S. Croke and S. M. Barnett, Difficulty of distinguishing product states locally, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 012337 (2017).
- [38] S. B. Ghosh, T. Gupta, A. V. Ardra, A. Das Bhowmik, S. Saha, T. Guha, and A. Mukherjee, Activating strong nonlocality from local sets: An elimination paradigm, *Phys. Rev. A* **106**, L010202 (2022).
- [39] T. Gupta, S. B. Ghosh, A. V. Ardra, A. D. Bhowmik, S. Saha, T. Guha, R. Rahaman, and A. Mukherjee, **Genuine activation of quantum nonlocality: Stronger than local indistinguishability** (2022).
- [40] S. Halder, M. Banik, S. Agrawal, and S. Bandyopadhyay, Strong quantum nonlocality without entanglement, *Physical review letters* **122**, 040403 (2019).
- [41] S. Sen, E. P. Lobo, S. G. Naik, R. K. Patra, T. Gupta, S. B. Ghosh, S. Saha, M. Alimuddin, T. Guha, S. S. Bhattacharya, *et al.*, Local quantum state marking, *Physical Review A* **105**, 032407 (2022).
- [42] M. Hayashi, D. Markham, M. Muraio, M. Owari, and S. Virmani, Bounds on multipartite entangled orthogonal state discrimination using local operations and classical communication, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 040501 (2006).
- [43] S. Bandyopadhyay, Entanglement, mixedness, and perfect local discrimination of orthogonal quantum states, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 042319 (2012).
- [44] S. Rout, A. G. Maity, A. Mukherjee, S. Halder, and M. Banik, Genuinely nonlocal product bases: Classification and entanglement-assisted discrimination, *Physical Review A* **100**, 032321 (2019).
- [45] S. Rout, A. G. Maity, A. Mukherjee, S. Halder, and M. Banik, Multiparty orthogonal product states with minimal genuine nonlocality, *Physical Review A* **104**, 052433 (2021).
- [46] M. Nathanson, Distinguishing bipartite orthogonal states using locc: Best and worst cases, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **46**, 062103 (2005), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1914731>.