

# Multipartite Bell-inequality violation using randomly chosen triads

Shih-Xian Yang,<sup>1</sup> Gelo Noel Tabia,<sup>2,1</sup> Pei-Sheng Lin,<sup>1</sup> and Yeong-Cherng Liang<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics and Center for Quantum Frontiers of Research & Technology (QFort),  
National Cheng Kung University, Tainan 701, Taiwan*

<sup>2</sup>*Center for Quantum Technology and Department of Physics,  
National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu 300, Taiwan*

The experimental demonstration of non-Bell-local (hereafter abbreviated as nonlocal) correlations between measurement outcomes is not only crucial for a test of local causality, but is also the basis for device-independent quantum information. Typically, such a demonstration requires the spatially separated experimenters to perform local measurements in certain specifically chosen bases. This, in turn, requires the experimenters to share a global reference frame.

Inspired by the work of [1, 2], we investigate the possibility of demonstrating nonlocal correlations by each party performing three randomly chosen, but mutually-unbiased qubit measurements on the  $n$ -qubit Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger state. Following [2], we refer to each of these three mutually unbiased qubit measurement bases as a triad, as they define three mutually orthogonal vectors on the Bloch sphere.

Importantly, in the work of [2] (where they considered the specific case of  $n = 2$ ), the probability of finding a Bell-inequality-violating pair of triads—apart from a set of measure zero—is unity. Here, we aim to investigate the extent to which this holds in the multipartite case, for  $n$  up to 8, as well as the likelihood of revealing beyond 2-body entanglement by the observed correlations alone.

More specifically, for  $n = 3, \dots, 8$ , we randomly generate, for each party, a certain number of triads  $N_n$  on the Bloch sphere according to the Haar measure. For each chosen set of triads, we calculate the largest Bell value (for a few different two-setting Bell inequalities) by considering all possible combinations of two (out of three) settings per party and check if it is greater than the various  $k$ -producible bounds [3]. If the Bell value is greater than the corresponding  $k$ -producible bound ( $k \leq n - 1$ ) then it indicates that the underlying quantum state is, at least,  $(k + 1)$ -body entangled. From the number of instances where a certain  $k$ -producible bound is violated, we can then estimate the probability of certifying, in a device-independent manner, that the underlying state has at least  $(k + 1)$ -body entanglement.

The probability of successfully demonstrating at least, 2, 3, and  $n$ -body entanglement using the MABK [4–7] Bell inequality are summarized in Table I. In contrast with previous studies for  $n \leq 5$  [8], our results suggest that the chance of witnessing nonlocality by the MABK inequality is unity in all but the tripartite case, whereas the chance of witnessing 3-partite entanglement is unity for all scenarios with more than 4 parties. Among others, we have also investigated (not shown) the robustness of these protocols in the presence of white noise.

Number of Parties ( $n$ )	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Number of Simulations $N_n$	N/A	$4 \times 10^6$	$5 \times 10^6$	$2 \times 10^6$	$4 \times 10^5$	$3 \times 10^5$	$1.05 \times 10^5$
Probability of Bell violation	100%	99.99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Probability of revealing 3-partite entanglement	N/A	45.89%	99.11%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Probability of revealing $n$ -partite entanglement	100%	45.89%	22.54%	8.83%	2.86%	0.81%	0.22%
Sufficiency to consider MABK	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

TABLE I. Numerical estimation of the probability of Bell violations and the probability of revealing 3-body and  $n$ -body entanglement for correlations obtained by measurements performed in random chosen triads for  $n = 3, \dots, 8$ .

[1] Y.-C. Liang *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 050401 (2010).  
 [2] P. Shadbolt *et al.*, Scientific Reports **2**, 470 (2012).  
 [3] Y.-C. Liang *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 190401 (2015).  
 [4] N. D. Mermin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 1838 (1990).

[5] S. M. Roy *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 2761 (1991).  
 [6] M. Ardehali, Phys. Rev. A **46**, 5375 (1992).  
 [7] A. V. Belinskii *et al.*, Physics-Uspekhi **36**, 653 (1993).  
 [8] C. Furkan Senel *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 052118 (2015).