

# Multipartite quantum cryptography and bound entanglement

Remigiusz Augusiak\*

*Faculty of Applied Physics and Mathematics, Gdańsk University of Technology,  
Narutowicza 11/12, 80-952 Gdańsk, Poland and*

*ICFO-Institute Ciències Fotòniques, Mediterranean Technology Park, 08860 Castelldefels (Barcelona), Spain*

Paweł Horodecki†

*Faculty of Applied Physics and Mathematics, Gdańsk University of Technology, Narutowicza 11/12, 80-952 Gdańsk, Poland*

Recently it has been shown that quantum cryptography beyond pure entanglement distillation is possible and the paradigm for the associated protocols have been established. Here we systematically generalize all the paradigm to multipartite scenario. We provide constructions of new classes of multipartite bound entangled states, i.e., those with underlying twisted GHZ structure and nonzero distillable cryptographic key. We quantitatively estimate the key from below with help of privacy squeezing technique.

PACS numbers:

## I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum cryptography is one of the most successful applications of quantum physics in information theory. The original pioneering BB84 scheme [1] was based on sending nonorthogonal states through insecure quantum channel. Then the alternative approach (E91) [2] based on generating key from pure entangled quantum state have been proposed and later extended to the case of mixed states in quantum privacy amplification scheme [3] which exploited the idea of distillation of pure entangled quantum states from more copies of noisy entangled (mixed) states [4]. Much later it was realized that actually existence of (may be noisy) initial entanglement in the state is necessary for any type of protocols distilling secret key from quantum states [5, 6]. In a mean time the problem of unconditional security (security in the most unfriendly scenario when the eavesdropper may apply arbitrarily correlated measurements on the sent particles or, in entanglement distillation scheme, distribute states many particles in a single entangled quantum state) was further solved in Ref. [7] in terms of entanglement distillation showing equivalence between the two (BB84 and E91) ideas (see Ref. [8] for alternative proof). However, still the protocol worked only for entanglement that was possible to be distilled. Also, other protocols [9, 10] that exploited modern approach to secrecy (based on classical notions) also were used in cases when pure entanglement was distillable. It was known, however, for a relatively long time that there are states (called bound entangled) that can not be distilled to pure form [11]. In the above context it was quite natural to expect that bound entangled states cannot lead to private key. However, it happens not to be true [12]: one can extend entanglement distillation idea from distillation of pure states to

distillation of *private states* (in general mixed states that contain private bit) and further show that there are examples of bound entangled states from which secure key can be distilled. General paradigm has been systematically worked out in Refs. [13, 14] with further examples of secure key bound entanglement [15, 16] and interesting applications [17, 18, 19] provided. From quantum channels perspective the extended scheme [12] was secure key distillation with help of quantum channel with vanishing quantum capacity (i.e., impossible to transmit qubit states faithfully). Those channels [12, 16] were later used in discovery [20] of drastically not intuitive, fully nonclassical effect of mutual activation of zero capacity channels, which "unlock" each other allowing to transmit quantum information faithfully if encoded into entanglement across two channels inputs. On the other hand with help of seminal machinery exploiting the notion of almost productness in unconditionally secure quantum key distillation [21] it has been shown that unconditional security under channels that not convey quantum information is possible [22]. Here we would like to stress that we focus on approach to quantum cryptography based on private states rather than, to some extent complementary information theoretic approach which has been proven also very fruitful (see [9, 21, 23, 24, 25]).

The results discussed above concern bipartite states. The aim of the present paper, which, among others, concludes part of the analysis of [26], is to develop the general approach to distillation of secure key from multipartite state. Basically the content of the paper can be divided into two parts. In first part we systematically and in consistent way generalize approach from [13]. Here we base on the notion of multipartite p-dit that has been introduced and analyzed already in the previous paper [27].

It should be stressed here that, as extensively discussed in [14], other modifications of the paradigm are possible as far as so-called notion of "direct accessibility of cryptographic key" is considered. The p-dit approach is based on local von Neumann measurements, while it is possi-

---

\*Electronic address: remigiusz.augusiak@icfo.es

†Electronic address: pawel@mif.pg.gda.pl

ble also to consider local POVM-s [17]. Both approaches (and another single one) were proved to be equivalent in terms of amount of distillable key contained in a given bipartite state in Ref. [14]. While we leave this issue for further analysis we strongly believe that the abstract proofs of the latter work naturally extend to our multipartite case.

The first part of the present paper contains qualitatively new elements like conditions for closeness to p-dit state which was not known so far, and derivation of lower bound for multipartite key where additional analysis of distance to so called c-q states was needed. The second part of the paper contains constructions of novel states i.e. multipartite states that contain secure key though are bound entangled. The states are based on underlying (twisted)  $N$ -partite GHZ structure and are PPT under any  $N - 1$  versus one system partial transpose. The secret key content is bounded from below quantitatively with help of technique adopted form [16].

More specifically after basic definitions and generalization of modern definition (that already become standard) of distillation secure key form quantum state in Sec. II we pass to Sec. III where the notion of multipartite private-dit state (in short p-dit) and its properties are discussed including especially the condition for  $\epsilon$ -closeness to p-dit. Distillable cryptographic key in terms of p-dits is analyzed in section IV. Here upper bound in terms of relative entropy is proved in analogy to bipartite case. The lower bound on the key based on modification of one-way Devetak-Winter protocol [9, 10] to multipartite case is provided with help of natural lemma with somewhat involving proof. Also the application [16] of privacy squeezing [12] is naturally extended and applied here.

The next section is the longest one since it contains all the constructions of multipartite bound entanglement with cryptographic key. Note that the first construction being extension and modification of bipartite examples form [15] requires nontrivial coincidence of several conditions that are contained in Lemma V.3. They ensure that, on the one hand the state is PPT, but on the other it allows to be modified by LOCC recurrence protocol to the state that is close to multipartite p-dit which is equivalent to distillability. Independently the quantitative analysis is performed illustrating how the lower bound for distillable key becomes positive. The second class of bound entangled states (to some extent inspired by bipartite four-qubit states from [16]) involves hermitian unitary block elements of the density matrix. Here the construction is different and, in comparison to the first one, the observed secure key is much stronger. Finally we shortly recall the limitations of quantum cryptography [33, 35]. Section VI contains conclusions.

## II. BASIC NOTIONS AND THE STANDARD DEFINITION OF SECURE KEY

In what follows we shall be concerned with the scenario in which  $N$  parties  $A_1, \dots, A_N$  wish to obtain perfectly correlated strings of bits (or in general dits) that are completely uncorrelated to the eavesdropper Eve by means of local operations and public communication (LOPC). Let us recall that the difference between the standard local operations and classical communication (LOCC) and LOPC lies in the fact that in the latter we need to remember that any classical message announced by the involved parties may be registered by Eve. Therefore in comparison to LOCC paradigm in the LOPC paradigm one also includes the map (see e.g. Refs. [13, 19])

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho_{AA'BE} &= \sum_i \varrho_{ABE}^{(i)} \otimes |i\rangle\langle i|_{A'} \longrightarrow \varrho_{AA'BB'EE'} \\ &= \sum_i \varrho_{ABE}^{(i)} \otimes |i\rangle\langle i|_{A'} \otimes |i\rangle\langle i|_{B'} \otimes |i\rangle\langle i|_{E'}, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

From the quantum cryptographic point of view the common aim of all the parties  $A_1, \dots, A_N$  is to distill the following state

$$\varrho_{AE}^{(N,\text{id})} = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} |e_i^{(1)} \dots e_i^{(N)}\rangle\langle e_i^{(1)} \dots e_i^{(N)}| \otimes \varrho^E, \quad (2)$$

called hereafter *ideal c...cq (cq) state*, by means of LOPC. Here  $A \equiv A_1 \dots A_N$  and  $\{|e_i^{(j)}\rangle\}_{i=0}^{d-1}$  is some orthonormal basis in the Hilbert space (denoted hereafter by  $\mathcal{H}_j$ ) corresponding to the  $j$ th party. Their tensor product constitutes the product basis in  $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{H}_N$ , which we shall denote as

$$\mathcal{B}_N^{\text{prod}} = \left\{ |e_{i_1}^{(1)}\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |e_{i_N}^{(N)}\rangle \right\}_{i_1, \dots, i_N=0}^{d-1}. \quad (3)$$

In what follows we will be often assuming  $\{|e_i^{(j)}\rangle\}_{i=0}^{d-1}$  to be the standard basis in  $\mathcal{H}_j$ .

We may also define the general cq state to be

$$\varrho_{AE}^{(N,\text{cq})} = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_N=0}^{d-1} p_{i_1 \dots i_N} |e_{i_1}^{(1)} \dots e_{i_N}^{(N)}\rangle\langle e_{i_1}^{(1)} \dots e_{i_N}^{(N)}| \otimes \varrho_{i_1 \dots i_N}^E. \quad (4)$$

In the above considerations formula we could take different dimensions on each side, however, for simplicity we restrict to the case of equal dimensions. All the parties should have strings of the same length at the end of the protocol to make a key.

It should be also emphasized that in what follows the  $j$ th party is assumed to have an additional 'garbage' quantum system defined on some Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}'_j$ . Thus we will be assuming that usually the states shared by the parties are defined on the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}'$ , where  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{H}_N$  and  $\mathcal{H}' = \mathcal{H}'_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{H}'_N$  and  $\mathcal{B}_N^{\text{prod}}$  constitutes the product basis in  $\mathcal{H}$ .

Following e.g. Refs. [13, 19], using the notion of cq states, we may define the distillable cryptographic key in the multipartite scenario as follows.

*Definition II.1.* Let  $\varrho_{AE}$  be a state acting on  $\mathbb{C}^{d_A} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_N} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_E}$  and  $(P_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  be a sequence of LOPC operations such that  $P_n(\varrho_{AE}^{\otimes n}) = \varrho_{AE}^{(\text{cq},n)}$ , where  $\varrho_{AE}^{(\text{cq},n)}$  is a cq state with A part defined on  $(\mathbb{C}^{d_n})^{\otimes N}$ . The set of operations  $P = (P_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  is said to be the cryptographic key distillation protocol if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \varrho_{AE}^{(\text{cq},n)} - \varrho_{AE}^{(\text{id},n)} \right\|_1 = 0, \quad (5)$$

where  $\varrho_{AE}^{(\text{id},n)}$  is the ideal cq state defined on the same Hilbert space as  $\varrho_{AE}^{(\text{cq},n)}$ . We define the rate of the protocol  $P = (P_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  as

$$R_P(\varrho_{AE}) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log d_n}{n} \quad (6)$$

and the distillable classical key as

$$C_D(\varrho_{AE}) = \sup_P R_P(\varrho_{AE}). \quad (7)$$

If instead of  $\varrho_{AE}$  one has the purification  $|\psi_{AE}\rangle$  we write  $C_D(\varrho_A)$ .

Let us also mention that a good indicator of secrecy of our correlations as well as uniformity of the probability distribution  $p_{i_1 \dots i_N}$  is the trace norm distance  $\|\varrho_{AE}^{(\text{id})} - \varrho_{AE}^{(\text{cq})}\|_1$ .

### III. PRIVATE STATES

#### A. Definition and properties

Here we discuss the multipartite generalizations of two important concepts of the scheme from Refs. [12, 13]. Firstly we introduce the notion of twisting and then the notion of multipartite private states.

*Definition III.1.* Let  $U_{i_1 \dots i_N}$  be some unitary operations acting on  $\mathcal{H}'$ . Given the  $N$ -partite product basis  $\mathcal{B}_N^{\text{prod}}$  we define *multipartite twisting* to be the unitary operation given by the following formula

$$U_t = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_N=0}^{d-1} |e_1^{(1)} \dots e_{i_N}^{(N)}\rangle \langle e_1^{(1)} \dots e_{i_N}^{(N)}| \otimes U_{i_1 \dots i_N}. \quad (8)$$

This is an important notion since, as shown in the bipartite case in Ref. [13] and as it holds also for multipartite states, application of twisting to some state does not change its cq state with respect to the same product basis  $\mathcal{B}_N^{\text{prod}}$ .

We can now pass to the notion of multipartite private states. These are straightforward generalization of private states from Refs. [12, 13] and were defined already in Ref. [27].

*Definition III.2.* Let  $U_i$  be some unitary operations and  $\varrho_{AA'}$  acting on  $\mathcal{H}'$ . By *multipartite private state* or *multipartite pdit* we mean the following

$$\Gamma_{AA'}^{(d)} = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i,j=0}^{d-1} |e_i^{(1)} \dots e_i^{(N)}\rangle \langle e_j^{(1)} \dots e_j^{(N)}| \otimes U_i \varrho_{AA'} U_j^\dagger. \quad (9)$$

Naturally, for  $N = 2$  the above reproduces the bipartite private states  $\gamma_{ABA'B'}^{(d)}$  introduced in Ref. [13]. It follows from the definition that any multipartite private state may be written as  $\Gamma_{AA'}^{(d)} = U_t P_{d,N}^{(+)} \otimes \sigma_{A'} U_t^\dagger$ , where by  $P_{d,N}^{(+)}$  we shall be denoting the projector onto the so-called *GHZ* state [28] given by

$$|\psi_{d,N}^{(+)}\rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} |i\rangle^{\otimes N}. \quad (10)$$

In other words we say that multipartite private states are twisted *GHZ* states multiplied by some density matrix  $\sigma_{A'}$ .

As a simple but illustrative example of a multipartite pdit one may consider the following state

$$\Gamma_{\text{ex}} = \frac{1}{2D^N} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{1}_{D^N} & 0 & \dots & V_\pi^{(D)} \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ V_\pi^{(D)\dagger} & 0 & \dots & \mathbb{1}_{D^N} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

where  $V_\pi^{(D)}$  is a permutation operator defined as

$$V_\pi^{(D)} = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_N=0}^{D-1} |i_1\rangle \langle i_{\pi(1)}| \otimes |i_2\rangle \langle i_{\pi(2)}| \otimes \dots \otimes |i_N\rangle \langle i_{\pi(N)}| \quad (12)$$

with  $\pi$  being an arbitrary permutation of  $N$ -element set. Clearly  $V_\pi^{(D)}$  is unitary matrix for any permutation  $\pi$  and thus  $|V_\pi^{(D)}| = \mathbb{1}_{D^N}$ . This, in view of the Lemma A.1, means that  $\mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{1}_{D^N}, V_\pi^{(D)}) \geq 0$  for any  $\pi$  and hence  $\Gamma_{\text{ex}}$  represents quantum state. After comparison to Eq. (9) one easily finds that here we have  $d = 2$ , which means that the key part of the state has a qubit structure, i.e.,  $\mathcal{H} = (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes N}$ , while in the case of the shield part  $\mathcal{H}' = (\mathbb{C}^D)^{\otimes N}$ . Moreover,  $\Gamma_{\text{ex}}$  may be derived from the general form (9) by substituting  $\varrho_{AA'} = \mathbb{1}_{D^N}/D^N$ , i.e., maximally mixed state acting on  $(\mathbb{C}^D)^{\otimes N}$ . Finally, both unitary operations in Eq. (9) may be taken to be  $U_0 = V_\pi^{(D)}$  and  $U_1 = \mathbb{1}_{D^N}$ .

As multipartite private state constitute a central notion of our cryptographic scheme, below we shortly characterize multipartite private states. Firstly, we notice that any state of which cq state is the ideal one with respect to some basis  $\mathcal{B}_N$  must be of the form (9) and *vice versa*.

*Theorem III.1.* Let  $\varrho_{AA'}$  be a state defined on  $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}'$  with  $\mathcal{H} = (\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes N}$  and arbitrary but finite  $\mathcal{H}'$ . Let also

$\varrho_{AE}^{(\text{cq})}$  denote the cq state obtained from the purification of  $\varrho_{AA'}$  upon the measurement of the A part in  $\mathcal{B}_N^{\text{prod}}$  and tracing out the A' part. Then  $\varrho_{AE}^{(\text{cq})}$  is of the form (2) if and only if  $\varrho_{AA'}$  is of the form (9), both with respect to  $\mathcal{B}_N^{\text{prod}}$ .

This fact may be proved in exactly the same way as its bipartite version from Ref. [13].

Secondly, it was shown in Ref. [27] that any multipartite private state is distillable providing also a lower bound on distillable entanglement them. For completeness it desirable to recall briefly this result. The lower bound may be stated as follows

$$E_D^{(ij)}(\Gamma_{AA'}^{(d)}) \geq a_{ij}^{\max} \left[ 1 - H \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\eta_{ij}}{2\sqrt{a_{ij}^{(1)} a_{ij}^{(2)}}} \right) \right] (\equiv \tilde{E}_D^{(ij)}),$$

where  $\eta_{ij}$ ,  $a_{ij}^{(1)}$ ,  $a_{ij}^{(2)}$ , and finally  $a_{ij}^{\max}$  are parameters characterizing the given private state  $\Gamma_{AA'}^{(d)}$ . They are defined as follows

$$\eta_{ij} = \max \left| \langle f_1 | \otimes \dots \otimes \langle f_N | U_i \varrho_{AA'} U_j^\dagger | g_1 \rangle \otimes \dots \otimes | g_N \rangle \right|, \quad (13)$$

where maximum is taken over a pair of pure product vectors  $|f_1\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |f_N\rangle$  belonging to  $\mathcal{H}'$ . Parameters  $a_{ij}^{(1)}$  and  $a_{ij}^{(2)}$  are given by

$$a_{ij}^{(1)} = \langle \tilde{f}_1^{(ij)} | \otimes \dots \otimes \langle \tilde{f}_N^{(ij)} | U_i \varrho_{AA'} U_j^\dagger | \tilde{f}_1^{(ij)} \rangle \otimes \dots \otimes | \tilde{f}_N^{(ij)} \rangle \quad (14)$$

and

$$a_{ij}^{(2)} = \langle \tilde{g}_1^{(ij)} | \otimes \dots \otimes \langle \tilde{g}_N^{(ij)} | U_j \varrho_{AA'} U_i^\dagger | \tilde{g}_1^{(ij)} \rangle \otimes \dots \otimes | \tilde{g}_N^{(ij)} \rangle, \quad (15)$$

where  $|\tilde{f}_1^{(ij)}\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\tilde{f}_N^{(ij)}\rangle$  and  $|\tilde{g}_1^{(ij)}\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\tilde{g}_N^{(ij)}\rangle$  are the vectors realizing the maximum in Eq. (13). Finally  $a_{ij}^{\max}$  denotes the larger of two numbers  $a_{ij}^{(1)}$  and  $a_{ij}^{(2)}$ .

It follows from Eqs. (13), (14), and (15) that  $\eta_{ij}$  is always positive and on the other hand  $\eta_{ij} \leq \sqrt{a_{ij}^{(1)} a_{ij}^{(2)}}$ . This means that  $a_{ij}^{\max} > 0$  and consequently any of the expression  $\tilde{E}_D^{(ij)}$  is always positive. We can obviously choose the best bound from  $\tilde{E}_D^{(ij)}$  having in this way the following lower bound

$$E_D(\Gamma_{AA'}^{(d)}) \geq \max_{\substack{i,j=0,\dots,d-1 \\ i < j}} \tilde{E}_D^{(ij)}. \quad (16)$$

Finally, we notice following Ref. [27] that for bipartite private states also other entanglement measures were bounded from below. Namely, it was shown that

$$E_C(\gamma_{ABA'B'}) \geq \log d \quad (17)$$

and, due to the fact that entanglement of formation is not smaller than the entanglement cost,  $E_F(\gamma_{ABA'B'}) \geq \log d$ .

## B. Conditions for closeness to multipartite private states

We provide here necessary and sufficient conditions allowing for judging how close to some multipartite private state is some given state  $\varrho_{AA'}$  defined on  $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}'$ .

Let us firstly notice that any state acting on  $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}'$  may be written in the following block form

$$\varrho_{AA'} = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_N=0}^{d-1} \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_N=0}^{d-1} |i_1 \dots i_N\rangle \langle j_1 \dots j_N| \otimes \Omega_{i_1, \dots, i_N}^{j_1, \dots, j_N}, \quad (18)$$

where  $\Omega_{i_1, \dots, i_N}^{j_1, \dots, j_N}$  are assumed to be square matrices defined on  $\mathcal{H}'$ . Then we can prove the following useful lemma.

*Lemma III.1.* Let  $\varrho_{AA'}$  be some density matrix acting on  $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}'$  with  $\mathcal{H} = (\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes N}$  and arbitrary finite-dimensional  $\mathcal{H}'$ . Then there exists such twisting  $U_t$  that for a fixed index  $i$  all the elements  $(\tilde{\varrho}_A)_{i \dots i}^{j \dots j}$  and  $(\tilde{\varrho}_A)_{j \dots j}^{i \dots i}$  ( $j = 0, \dots, d-1$ ) of the  $i$ -th row and column of  $\tilde{\varrho}_A = \text{Tr}_{A'}(U_t \varrho_{AA'} U_t^\dagger)$  equal  $\|\Omega_{i \dots i}^{j \dots j}\|_1$  and  $\|\Omega_{j \dots j}^{i \dots i}\|_1$ , respectively.

*Proof.* The proof is a simple extension of the one presented in Ref. [13]. Acting on the state  $\varrho_{AA'}$  with an unitary twisting  $U_t$  and tracing out the A' subsystem, one gets

$$\tilde{\varrho}_A = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_N=0}^{d-1} \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_N=0}^{d-1} \text{Tr} \left( U_{i_1 \dots i_N} \Omega_{i_1 \dots i_N}^{j_1 \dots j_N} U_{j_1 \dots j_N}^\dagger \right) \times |i_1 \dots i_N\rangle \langle j_1 \dots j_N|. \quad (19)$$

First of all let us mention that from Eq. (19) it follows that we do not need to care about blocks lying on the diagonal of  $\varrho_{AA'}$  as the blocks  $\Omega_{i_1 \dots i_N}^{i_1 \dots i_N}$  must be positive and the following holds

$$\text{Tr} \left( U_{i_1 \dots i_N} \Omega_{i_1 \dots i_N}^{i_1 \dots i_N} U_{i_1 \dots i_N}^\dagger \right) = \|\Omega_{i_1 \dots i_N}^{i_1 \dots i_N}\|_1. \quad (20)$$

Now, let us focus now on the matrices  $\Omega_{i \dots i}^{j \dots j}$  for some fixed  $i$  and any  $j \neq i$  (as the case of  $i = j$  has just been discussed). For simplicity and without any loss of generality we can choose  $i = 0$  and thus we need to prove the theorem for  $j = 1, \dots, d-1$ . At the beginning let us concentrate on the matrix  $\Omega_{0 \dots 0}^{1 \dots 1}$ . We can express it with the singular-value decomposition as  $\Omega_{0 \dots 0}^{1 \dots 1} = V_1 D_1 W_1^\dagger$ , where  $V_1$  and  $W_1$  are unitary matrices and  $D_1$  stands for a diagonal matrix containing singular values of  $\Omega_{0 \dots 0}^{1 \dots 1}$ , i.e., eigenvalues of  $|\Omega_{0 \dots 0}^{1 \dots 1}|$ . Then from Eq. (19) one infers that it suffices to take  $U_{0 \dots 0} = V_1^\dagger$  and  $U_{1 \dots 1} = W$  in the twisting  $U_t$  to get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} \left( U_{0 \dots 0} \Omega_{0 \dots 0}^{1 \dots 1} U_{1 \dots 1}^\dagger \right) &= \text{Tr}(V^\dagger V D W^\dagger W) \\ &= \text{Tr} D = \|\Omega_{0 \dots 0}^{1 \dots 1}\|_1. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Now we may proceed with the remaining matrices  $\Omega_{0 \dots 0}^{j \dots j}$  ( $j = 2, \dots, d-1$ ). We need to find such matrices in the

twisting  $U_t$  that Eq. (21) holds also for the remaining  $\Omega_{0\dots 0}^{j\dots j}$ . Notice that unitary matrices  $U_{0\dots 0}$  and  $U_{1\dots 1}$  have just been fixed, however, we have still some freedom provided by  $U_{j\dots j}$  ( $j = 2, \dots, d-1$ ). Using singular value decomposition of all  $\Omega_{0\dots 0}^{j\dots j}$  ( $j = 2, \dots, d-1$ ) we may write  $\Omega_{0\dots 0}^{j\dots j} = V_j D_j W_j^\dagger$ . This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} \left( U_{0\dots 0} \Omega_{0\dots 0}^{j\dots j} U_{j\dots j}^\dagger \right) &= \text{Tr} \left( V^\dagger \Omega_{0\dots 0}^{j\dots j} U_{j\dots j}^\dagger \right) \\ &= \text{Tr} \left( V^\dagger V_j D_j W_j^\dagger U_{j\dots j}^\dagger \right) \\ &= \text{Tr} \left( D_j W_j^\dagger U_{j\dots j}^\dagger V^\dagger V_j \right), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where we used the property of trace saying that  $\text{Tr} AB = \text{Tr} BA$ . It is clear from the above that to get the trace norm of  $\Omega_{0\dots 0}^{j\dots j}$  for any  $j = 2, \dots, d-1$  it suffices to choose  $U_{j\dots j}$  in such way that  $W_j^\dagger U_{j\dots j}^\dagger V_1^\dagger V_j = \mathbb{1}$ . This means that  $U_{j\dots j} = V_1^\dagger V_j W_j^\dagger$  ( $j = 2, \dots, d-1$ ). The remaining  $U_{i_1\dots i_N}$  appearing in the definition of  $U_t$  may be chosen at will. Concluding we showed that there exists such  $U_t$  that for a fixed  $i$  it holds  $(\tilde{\varrho}_A)_{i\dots i}^{j\dots j} = \|\Omega_{i\dots i}^{j\dots j}\|_1$  ( $j = 0, \dots, d-1$ ). The fact that also  $(\tilde{\varrho}_A)_{j\dots j}^{i\dots i} = \|\Omega_{i\dots i}^{j\dots j}\|_1$  follows obviously from hermiticity of  $\tilde{\varrho}_A$ . ■

This is a very useful lemma since due to the fact that twistings do not change the cq state it allows to concentrate on a particular form of a given state  $\varrho_{AA'}$ . In other words we can think about the state  $\varrho_{AA'}$  as if it has such a reduction to  $A$  subsystem that some of its elements in fixed row or column are trace norms of respective blocks of  $\varrho_{AA'}$  (obviously with respect to the same product basis  $\mathcal{B}_N^{\text{prod}}$ ). As an illustrative example we can consider  $\varrho_{AA'}$  with  $d = 2$ . Then from Eq. (18) it can be written as

$$\varrho_{AA'} = \begin{bmatrix} \Omega_{0\dots 0}^{0\dots 0} & \Omega_{0\dots 0}^{0\dots 1} & \dots & \Omega_{0\dots 0}^{1\dots 1} \\ \Omega_{0\dots 0}^{0\dots 1} & \Omega_{0\dots 0}^{1\dots 1} & \dots & \Omega_{0\dots 0}^{1\dots 1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \Omega_{1\dots 1}^{0\dots 0} & \Omega_{1\dots 1}^{0\dots 1} & \dots & \Omega_{1\dots 1}^{1\dots 1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (23)$$

where  $\Omega_{i_1\dots i_N}^{j_1\dots j_N} = (\Omega_{j_1\dots j_N}^{i_1\dots i_N})^\dagger$  and  $\Omega_{i_1\dots i_N}^{i_1\dots i_N} \geq 0$  for any  $i_k, j_k = 0, 1$ . In view of the Lemma 3.2 the above may be brought to the following state

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\varrho}_A &\equiv \text{Tr}_{A'} (U_t \varrho_{AA'} U_t^\dagger) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \|\Omega_{0\dots 0}^{0\dots 0}\|_1 & (\tilde{\varrho}_A)_{0\dots 0}^{0\dots 1} & \dots & \|\Omega_{0\dots 0}^{1\dots 1}\|_1 \\ (\tilde{\varrho}_A)_{0\dots 0}^{0\dots 1} & \|\Omega_{0\dots 0}^{0\dots 1}\|_1 & \dots & (\tilde{\varrho}_A)_{0\dots 0}^{1\dots 1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \|\Omega_{1\dots 1}^{0\dots 0}\|_1 & (\tilde{\varrho}_A)_{1\dots 1}^{0\dots 1} & \dots & \|\Omega_{1\dots 1}^{1\dots 1}\|_1 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Now we are prepared to provide the aforementioned conditions for closeness to multipartite private states (the bipartite case was discussed in Ref. [13]). Firstly we show that if a given  $\varrho_{AA'}$  is close to some multipartite pdit then (due to the above lemma) there exist such  $U_t$  that the

A subsystem has all the elements  $(\text{Tr}_{A'} U_t \varrho_{AA'} U_t^\dagger)_{i\dots i}^{j\dots j} = \|\Omega_{i\dots i}^{j\dots j}\|_1$  for  $j = 0, \dots, d-1$  are close to  $1/d$ .

*Theorem III.2.* Let  $\Omega_{i_1\dots i_N}^{j_1\dots j_N}$  be some matrices and  $\varrho_{AA'}$  be a  $N$ -partite state of the form (18) such that  $\|\varrho_{AA'} - \Gamma_{AA'}^{(d)}\|_1 \leq \epsilon$  for some multipartite private state  $\Gamma_{AA'}^{(d)}$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$ . Then for a fixed index  $i$  one has  $\left| \|\Omega_{i\dots i}^{j\dots j}\|_1 - (1/d) \right| \leq \epsilon$  and  $\left| \|\Omega_{j\dots j}^{i\dots i}\|_1 - (1/d) \right| \leq \epsilon$  for any  $j = 0, \dots, d-1$ .

*Proof.* The proof is a modification of the one given in Ref. [13]. Let  $U_t$  be such twisting that all the elements of  $(\tilde{\varrho}_A)_{i\dots i}^{j\dots j}$  of  $\tilde{\varrho}_A = \text{Tr}_{A'} (U_t \varrho_{AA'} U_t^\dagger)$  for fixed  $i$  and  $j = 0, \dots, d-1$  are just equal to  $\|\Omega_{i\dots i}^{j\dots j}\|_1$ . Then let us assume that it holds  $\|\varrho_{AA'} - \Gamma_{AA'}^{(d)}\|_1 \leq \epsilon$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$  and for some multipartite private state  $\Gamma_{AA'}^{(d)}$ . Then the following holds

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \tilde{\varrho}_A - P_{d,N}^{(+)} \right\|_1 &\leq \left\| \tilde{\varrho}_{AA'} - P_{d,N}^{(+)} \otimes \sigma_{A'} \right\|_1 \\ &= \left\| U_t \varrho_{AA'} U_t^\dagger - U_t \Gamma_{AA'}^{(d)} U_t^\dagger \right\|_1 \\ &= \left\| \varrho_{AA'} - \Gamma_{AA'}^{(d)} \right\|_1 \\ &\leq \epsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where the first inequality follows from non-increasing property of the trace norm under the partial trace and the first equality is a consequence of the invariance property of the trace norm on unitary operations.

The fact that  $\|\tilde{\varrho}_A - P_{d,N}^{(+)}\|_1 \leq \epsilon$  means immediately that  $|\left| (\tilde{\varrho}_A)_{i\dots i}^{j\dots j} - 1/d \right| \leq \epsilon$  for any  $i, j = 0, \dots, d-1$ . On the other hand we know that for some fixed row  $i$  (or column)  $(\tilde{\varrho}_A)_{i\dots i}^{j\dots j} = \|\Omega_{i\dots i}^{j\dots j}\|_1$  and therefore

$$\left| \left\| \Omega_{i\dots i}^{j\dots j} \right\|_1 - \frac{1}{d} \right| \leq \epsilon \quad (j = 0, \dots, d-1). \quad (26)$$

Due to the hermiticity of  $\tilde{\varrho}_A$  the above holds also for the  $i$ th column of  $\tilde{\varrho}_A$ .

In the particular case of  $d = 2$ , discussed already in Ref. [13], the positivity of  $\tilde{\varrho}_A$  lead us to the fact that the  $2 \times 2$  matrix containing the elements  $\|\Omega_{i\dots i}^{j\dots j}\|_1$  with  $i, j = 0, 1$  must be also positive. Moreover, it has trace less or equal one. Thus we can exclude the case when  $\|\Omega_{0\dots 0}^{1\dots 1}\|_1 > 1/2$  and therefore  $\|\Omega_{0\dots 0}^{0\dots 0}\|_1 \geq 1/2 - \epsilon$  (the same holds obviously for  $\|\Omega_{0\dots 0}^{1\dots 1}\|_1$ ). ■

Interestingly, one may prove also a converse statement, namely if after applying respective twisting  $U_t$ , for some fixed row, say  $i$ th one, all  $\|\Omega_{i\dots i}^{j\dots j}\|_1$  are close to  $1/d$  then there exists some multipartite private state close to a given state  $\varrho_{AA'}$ . To prove it we need the fact that if in some positive matrix  $A$  such that  $\text{Tr} A \leq 1$  all elements lying in fixed row (equivalently column) are arbitrarily close to  $1/d$  then the whole matrix must be close to the projector  $(1/d) \sum_{i,j=0}^{d-1} |i\rangle\langle j|$  in the trace norm. The proof of this fact is rather technical and straightforward and we do not put it here as it could cover the real sense and meaning of this contribution.

*Theorem III.3.* Let  $\varrho_{AA'}$  given by Eq. (18) be such that for a fixed  $i$  blocks  $\Omega_{i\dots i}^{j\dots j}$  obey  $|\|\Omega_{i\dots i}^{j\dots j}\|_1 - 1/d| \leq \epsilon$  for any  $j = 0, \dots, d-1$  and  $0 < \epsilon < 1/d$ . Then there exists such a multipartite private state  $\Gamma_{AA'}^{(d)}$  that

$$\|\varrho_{AA'} - \Gamma_{AA'}^{(d)}\|_1 \leq \sqrt{\log 2 \left[ 2N\sqrt{d\eta(\epsilon)} \log d + H(2\sqrt{d\eta(\epsilon)}) \right]} + 2\sqrt{d\eta(\epsilon)}, \quad (27)$$

where  $\eta(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$  if  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  and consequently function on the right-hand side tends to zero whenever  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . To prove the theorem for the particular case of  $d = 2$  it suffices to assume that  $\|\Omega_{0\dots 0}^{1\dots 1}\|_1 \geq 1/2 - \epsilon$ .

*Proof.* The proof is based on the one given in Ref. [13]. Let  $U_t$  be such twisting that for fixed  $i$  it holds of  $(\tilde{\varrho}_A)_{i\dots i}^{j\dots j} = \|\Omega_{i\dots i}^{j\dots j}\|_1$  ( $j = 0, \dots, d-1$ ). Then since  $(\tilde{\varrho}_A)_{i\dots i}^{j\dots j} = [(\tilde{\varrho}_A)_{j\dots j}^{i\dots i}]^*$  with asteriks denoting complex conjugation, the Hilbert–Schmidt scalar product of  $\tilde{\varrho}_A$  and  $P_{D,N}^{(+)}$  may be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} \tilde{\varrho}_A P_{d,N}^{(+)} &= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i,j=0}^{d-1} (\tilde{\varrho}_A)_{i\dots i}^{j\dots j} \\ &= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} (\tilde{\varrho}_A)_{i\dots i}^{i\dots i} + \frac{2}{d} \sum_{i,j=0}^{d-1} \text{Re}(\tilde{\varrho}_A)_{i\dots i}^{j\dots j}. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

On the other hand from the positivity of  $\tilde{\varrho}_A$  one may prove the following inequality

$$\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} (\tilde{\varrho}_A)_{i\dots i}^{i\dots i} \geq \frac{2}{d-1} \sum_{\substack{i,j=0 \\ i < j}}^{d-1} \text{Re}(\tilde{\varrho}_A)_{i\dots i}^{j\dots j}, \quad (29)$$

which after substitution to Eq. (28) gives

$$\text{Tr} \tilde{\varrho}_A P_{d,N}^{(+)} \geq \frac{2}{d-1} \sum_{\substack{i,j=0 \\ i < j}}^{d-1} \text{Re}(\tilde{\varrho}_A)_{i\dots i}^{j\dots j}. \quad (30)$$

Now we can utilize the previously mentioned fact that if all elements in chosen row (equivalently column) of some positive matrix  $A = \sum_{i,j=0}^{d-1} a_i^j |i\rangle\langle j|$  obeying  $\text{Tr} A \leq 1$  are close to  $1/d$  then the matrix is close to  $(1/d) \sum_{i,j=0}^{d-1} |i\rangle\langle j|$ . More precisely assuming that  $|a_i^j - 1/d| \leq \epsilon$  for  $j = 0, \dots, d-1$  and an arbitrary fixed index  $i$ , we have that all elements  $a_i^j$  must obey  $|a_i^j - 1/d| \leq \eta(\epsilon)$  ( $i, j = 0, \dots, d-1$ ), where  $\eta(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$  whenever  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . This means that also real parts of any  $a_i^j$  satisfies the above condition. In

the light of the above we get from Eq. (30) that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} \tilde{\varrho}_A P_{d,N}^{(+)} &\geq \frac{2}{d-1} \sum_{\substack{i,j=0 \\ i < j}}^{d-1} \text{Re}(\tilde{\varrho}_A)_{i\dots i}^{j\dots j} \\ &\geq \frac{2}{d-1} \sum_{\substack{i,j=0 \\ i < j}}^{d-1} \left( \frac{1}{d} - \eta(\epsilon) \right) \\ &= \frac{2}{d-1} \frac{d(d-1)}{2} \left( \frac{1}{d} - \eta(\epsilon) \right) \\ &= 1 - d\eta(\epsilon), \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where the first equality follows from the fact that the respective sum contains  $d(d-1)/2$  elements. Now the proof goes along the same line as its bipartite version from Ref. [13] leading to the claimed inequality. ■

Concluding we obtained necessary and sufficient conditions for a given state  $\varrho_{AA'}$  to be close to some multipartite private state expressed in terms of the trace norm of some blocks of  $\varrho_{AA'}$  (see Eq. (18)). We keep this result for further considerations.

## IV. DISTILLABLE CRYPTOGRAPHIC KEY

### A. Definition

Having introduced the concept of multipartite private states we may pass to the definition of multipartite cryptographic key. The seminal fact behind the notion of multipartite private states is that as shown in Refs. [12, 13], one can think about quantum cryptography as a distillation of private states by means of LOCC. In other words, we have a standard distillation scheme (as entanglement distillation) in which we can forget about the eavesdropper.

*Definition IV.1.* Let  $\varrho_A$  denote a state acting on  $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_N}$  and  $(\Lambda_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  a sequence of LOCC operations giving  $\Lambda_n(\varrho_A^{\otimes n}) = \varrho_{AA'}^{(n)}$  with  $\varrho_{AA'}^{(n)}$  being a state acting on  $(\mathbb{C}^{d_n})^{\otimes N} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_N}$ . Then we say that  $\Lambda = (\Lambda_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  is a multipartite private state distillation protocol if the condition

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\varrho_{AA'}^{(n)} - \Gamma_{AA'}^{(d_n)}\|_1 = 0 \quad (32)$$

holds. A rate of the protocol  $\Lambda$  is defined as  $R_\Lambda(\varrho_A) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} [(1/n) \log d_n]$  and the distillable key as

$$K_D(\varrho_A) = \sup_{\Lambda} R_\Lambda(\varrho_A). \quad (33)$$

As shown in the bipartite case in Ref. [13], both the definitions Definition II.1 and Definition IV.1 are equivalent in the sense that if there exists LOCC protocol distilling some multipartite private state there also exists LOPC protocol distilling the ideal ccq state (when purification is considered) with the same rate. As the proof

from Ref. [13] may also be applied to the multipartite case, below provide the generalized version of the above fact.

*Theorem IV.1.* The following two implications hold. Assume that from a given state  $\varrho_A$  such that Eve has its purification  $|\psi_{AE}\rangle$  one may create by LOPC some cq state  $\varrho_{AE}^{(\text{cq})}$  (see Eq. (4)) obeying  $\|\varrho_{AE}^{(\text{cq})} - \varrho_{AE}^{(\text{id})}\|_1 \leq \epsilon$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$ . Then there exists such LOCC protocol that it is possible to distill a state  $\varrho_{AA'}$  from  $\varrho_A$  that satisfies  $\|\varrho_{AA'} - \Gamma_{AA'}^{(d)}\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{\epsilon}$  for some multipartite private state  $\Gamma_{AA'}^{(d)}$ . On the other hand if from  $\varrho_A$  one distills  $\varrho_{AA'}$  close to some pdit  $\Gamma_{AA'}^{(d)}$ , i.e., such that  $\|\varrho_{AA'} - \Gamma_{AA'}^{(d)}\|_1 \leq \epsilon$  then there exists a LOCC protocol distilling from  $\varrho_A$  a cq state such that  $\|\varrho_{AE}^{(\text{cq})} - \varrho_{AE}^{(\text{id})}\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{\epsilon}$ . Each subsystem of the A part of  $\varrho_{AE}^{(\text{cq})}$  and of the key part of  $\Gamma_{AA'}^{(d)}$  is defined on  $\mathbb{C}^d$ .

*Proof.* The proof goes directly along the same lines as the one from Ref. [13].

Interestingly, the distillable key  $K_D$  may be used to quantify entanglement among multipartite states. More precisely, from the definition it follows that  $K_D$  is monotonic under the action on LOCC operations (see e.g. [29]). Moreover, it vanishes on multipartite states that have at least one separable cut, which is a consequence of the straightforward multipartite generalization of the results from Ref. [5, 6] provided in Ref. [30]. Finally, as we shall show the distillable key is normalized on  $GHZ$  states  $P_{d,N}^{(+)}$  in the sense that  $K_D(P_{d,N}^{(+)}) = \log d$ . However, firstly we need to provide two bounds on  $K_D$ .

## B. Bounds on the distillable key

The first bound is a simple multipartite generalization of the upper bound provided in Ref. [13], while the second bound is a consequence of a multipartite adaptation of the Devetak–Winter protocol [9, 10]. Let us start from the upper bound.

*Theorem IV.2.* Let  $\varrho_A$  be some  $N$ -partite state. Then

$$K_D(\varrho_A) \leq E_r^\infty(\varrho_A), \quad (34)$$

where  $E_r^\infty(\varrho_A)$  is a regularized version of the relative entropy, i.e.,

$$E_r^\infty(\varrho_A) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \inf_{\varrho_A^{\text{sep}} \in \mathcal{D}} S(\varrho_A^{\otimes n} \| \varrho_A^{\text{sep}}) \quad (35)$$

and  $\mathcal{D}$  denotes the set of all  $N$ -partite fully separable states.

*Proof.* The proof can be taken as a generalization of the one from Ref. [13].

Interestingly, we may also bound  $K_D$  from below. For this purpose we need to prove the following theorem.

*Theorem IV.3.* Let  $\varrho_{AE}^{(\text{cq})}$  be some multipartite cq state acting on  $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes N} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_E}$ . Then it is arbitrarily close to the ideal cq state if and only if for a chosen party  $A_i$

all the reductions to three-partite systems  $A_i A_j E$  with  $j \neq i$  are arbitrarily close to the bipartite ideal cq state.

*Proof.* We proceed in two steps. In the first step we show that if the trace norm distance between some multipartite cq state  $\varrho_{AE}^{(\text{cq})}$  and the ideal one is bounded by some  $\epsilon > 0$  then any bipartite state arising by tracing out  $N - 2$  parties in the cq state is close to the bipartite ideal cq state. This part of the proof is relatively easy since it suffices to utilize the fact that the trace norm distance does not increase under the partial trace. The proof of the converse statement is much more sophisticated.

Let us assume that the following

$$\|\varrho_{AE}^{(\text{cq})} - \varrho_{AE}^{(N,\text{id})}\| \leq \epsilon \quad (36)$$

holds for some small  $\epsilon > 0$ . Then since the trace norm does not increase under the partial trace we have immediately the following set of inequalities

$$\left\| \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_N=0}^{d-1} p_{i_1 \dots i_N} |i_k i_l\rangle \langle i_k i_l| \otimes \varrho_{i_1 \dots i_N}^E - \varrho_{AE}^{(2,\text{id})} \right\|_1 \leq \epsilon \quad (37)$$

for any pair of indices  $k, l = 1, \dots, N$ . To end the first part of the proof it suffices to substitute  $\sum_{I \setminus \{k, l\}} p_{i_1 \dots i_N} \varrho_{i_1 \dots i_N}^E = q_{i_k i_l} \varrho_{i_1 \dots i_N}^E$ , where summation over  $I \setminus \{k, l\}$  means that we sum over all  $i_j$  but  $i_k$  and  $i_l$ .

To proceed with the second part of the proof we assume that one chosen party, say  $A_1$ , shares with the remaining  $N - 1$  parties state that is close to the bipartite ideal cq state. In other words we assume that for any  $j = 2, \dots, N$  the following inequalities

$$\left\| \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_N=0}^{d-1} p_{i_1 \dots i_N} |i_1 i_j\rangle \langle i_1 i_j| \otimes \varrho_{i_1 \dots i_N}^E - \varrho_{AE}^{(2,\text{id})} \right\|_1 \leq \epsilon \quad (38)$$

are satisfied. Basing on this set of inequalities we will show that the left-hand side of Eq. (36) is bounded from above by some linear function of  $\epsilon$  vanishing for  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . For this purpose let us denote the left-hand side of Eq. (36) by LHS and notice that it can be split into two sums (see Eqs. (2) and (4)), namely the one containing the elements for  $i_1 = \dots = i_N$  and the rest ones. In this light, denoting by  $I$  the set of sequences  $(i_1, \dots, i_N)$  obtained by removing all those with  $i_1 = \dots = i_N$  from the set of all possible sequences, we can write

$$\text{LHS} = \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_N) \in I} p_{i_1 \dots i_N} + \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \left\| p_{i \dots i} \varrho_{i \dots i}^E - \frac{1}{d} \varrho^E \right\|_1 \quad (39)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LHS} = & \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_N) \in I} p_{i_1 \dots i_N} + \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} p_{i \dots i} \|\varrho_{i \dots i}^E - \varrho^E\|_1 \\ & + \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \left| p_{i \dots i} - \frac{1}{d} \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where the inequality comes from the fact that the term  $p_{i \dots i} \varrho_{i \dots i}^E$  was added and subtracted in the second term in the first line and from the inequality  $\|A + B\|_1 \leq \|A\|_1 + \|B\|_1$ . The last equality is a simple consequence of the fact that the trace norm of any density matrix is just one. In what follows, using the inequalities (38), we show that all the three terms appearing in the above are bounded by linear functions of  $\epsilon$  vanishing for  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . With this aim, utilizing once more the fact that the trace norm does not increase under the partial trace, we can infer from Eq. (38) that

$$\left\| \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_N=0}^{d-1} p_{i_1 \dots i_N} |i_1 i_j\rangle \langle i_1 i_j| - \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} |ii\rangle \langle ii| \right\|_1 \leq \epsilon \quad (41)$$

for  $j = 2, \dots, N$ . Now we can divide all the terms appearing in the first sum into two groups, namely, the one for  $i_1 = i_j$  and the remaining terms. This, after calculating the respective norms, leads to the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \left| \sum_{i_2, \dots, i_{j-1}, i_{j+1}, \dots, i_N=0}^{d-1} p_{ii_2 \dots i_{j-1} i_{j+1} \dots i_N} - \frac{1}{d} \right| \\ & + \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_N=0 \\ i_1 \neq i_j}}^{d-1} p_{i_1 \dots i_N} \leq \epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Obviously, since both terms in the above are nonnegative, any of them must be less or equal to  $\epsilon$ . The first such inequality leads us to

$$\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \left| p_{i \dots i} - \frac{1}{d} + \sum_{\substack{i_2, \dots, i_{j-1}, i_{j+1}, \dots, i_N=0 \\ (i_2, \dots, i_{j-1}, i_{j+1}, \dots, i_N) \in \mathcal{I}_i}}^{d-1} p_{ii_2 \dots i_{j-1} i_{j+1} \dots i_N} \right| \leq \epsilon, \quad (43)$$

where  $\mathcal{I}_i$  denotes the strings of  $N - 2$  indices  $(i_2, \dots, i_{j-1}, i_{j+1}, \dots, i_N)$  such that at least one of them is different from  $i$ . Utilizing a simple inequality  $|z_1 - z_2| \geq |z_1| - |z_2|$  satisfied by all  $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \left| p_{i \dots i} - \frac{1}{d} \right| & \leq \epsilon + \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \sum_{(i_2, \dots, i_{j-1}, i_{j+1}, \dots, i_N) \in \mathcal{I}_i}^{d-1} p_{ii_2 \dots i_{j-1} i_{j+1} \dots i_N} \\ & = \epsilon + \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_N) \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_j} p_{i_1 \dots i_N}, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_j$  denotes the string of  $N$  indices such that the first and  $j$ th ones are equal ( $i_1 = i_j$ ) and at least one of the remaining ones is different from  $i_1$ . One sees that the second term on the right-hand side of Eq. (44) may be bounded from above in the following way

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_N) \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_j} p_{i_1 \dots i_N} & \leq \sum_{k=2}^{j-1} \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_N=0 \\ i_k \neq i_1}}^{d-1} p_{i_1 \dots i_N} \\ & + \sum_{k=j+1}^N \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_N=0 \\ i_k \neq i_1}}^{d-1} p_{i_1 \dots i_N} \\ & \leq \sum_{k=2}^{j-1} \epsilon + \sum_{k=j+1}^N \epsilon \\ & = (N - 2)\epsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where the second inequality is a consequence of the inequality given in Eq. (42). Finally, application of Eq. (45) to Eq. (44), gives

$$\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \left| p_{i \dots i} - \frac{1}{d} \right| \leq (N - 1)\epsilon. \quad (46)$$

This is a quite natural conclusion saying that if the measurement outcomes between fixed party (here  $A_1$ ) and each of the remaining ones are almost perfectly correlated then the measurement outcomes are almost perfectly correlated among all the parties.

We have still two terms in Eq. (39) unbounded. Using ones again the inequality  $|z_1 - z_2| \geq |z_1| - |z_2|$  ( $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ ) and the fact that  $p_{i_1 \dots i_N}$  represents some probability distribution we may write

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_N) \in I} p_{i_1 \dots i_N} & = 1 - \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} p_{i \dots i} \\ & \leq 1 - [1 - (N - 1)\epsilon] \\ & = (N - 1)\epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Thus, the only thing we need is to bound from above the last term in Eq. (39). Remarkably, to achieve this aim it suffices to utilize a single inequality from the whole set (38), say the one for  $j = 2$ . Then we can write



$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_N=0}^{d-1} p_{i_1 \dots i_N} |i_1 i_2\rangle\langle i_1 i_2| \otimes \varrho_{i_1 \dots i_N}^E - \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} |ii\rangle\langle ii| \otimes \varrho^E \right\|_1 \\
&= \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} p_{i \dots i} |ii\rangle\langle ii| \otimes \varrho_{i \dots i}^E - \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} |ii\rangle\langle ii| \otimes \varrho^E + \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_N) \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_2} p_{i_1 \dots i_N} |i_1 i_1\rangle\langle i_1 i_1| \otimes \varrho_{i_1 \dots i_N}^E + \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_N=0 \\ i_1 \neq i_2}}^{d-1} p_{i_1 \dots i_N} |i_1 i_2\rangle\langle i_1 i_2| \otimes \varrho_{i_1 \dots i_N}^E \right\|_1. \tag{48}
\end{aligned}$$

Then, due to the fact that  $\|A - B\|_1 \geq \|A\|_1 - \|B\|_1$ , we may rewrite the above as

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} p_{i \dots i} |ii\rangle\langle ii| \otimes \varrho_{i \dots i}^E - \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} |ii\rangle\langle ii| \otimes \varrho^E \right\|_1 &\leq \epsilon + \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_N) \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_2} p_{i_1 \dots i_N} + \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_N=0 \\ i_1 \neq i_2}}^{d-1} p_{i_1 \dots i_N} \\
&\leq \epsilon + (N - 2)\epsilon + \epsilon = N\epsilon, \tag{49}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Eqs. (42) and (45) (with  $j = 2$ ). On the other hand, we can easily show that

$$\left\| \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} p_{i \dots i} |ii\rangle\langle ii| \otimes \varrho_{i \dots i}^E - \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} |ii\rangle\langle ii| \otimes \varrho^E \right\|_1 \geq \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} p_{i \dots i} \|\varrho_{i \dots i}^E - \varrho^E\|_1 - \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \left| p_{i \dots i} - \frac{1}{d} \right|. \tag{50}$$

Comparison of Eqs. (46), (49) and (50) allows us to write

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} p_{i \dots i} \|\varrho_{i \dots i}^E - \varrho^E\|_1 &\leq N\epsilon + \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \left| p_{i \dots i} - \frac{1}{d} \right| \\
&\leq N\epsilon + (N - 1)\epsilon \\
&= (2N - 1)\epsilon. \tag{51}
\end{aligned}$$

Putting now all the puzzles together, that is, substituting Eqs. (46), (47), and (51) to Eq. (39), we finally have

$$\left\| \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_N=0}^{d-1} p_{i_1 \dots i_N} |i_1 \dots i_N\rangle\langle i_1 \dots i_N| \otimes \varrho_{i_1 \dots i_N}^E - \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} |i\rangle\langle i|^{\otimes N} \otimes \varrho^E \right\|_1 \leq (4N - 3)\epsilon. \tag{52}$$

Noting that for the fixed  $N$  it holds  $(4N - 3)\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  whenever  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  we finish the proof. ■

It should be mentioned that as it follows from the second part of the proof, we do not need to assume the whole set of inequalities given in (38). Actually it suffices to assume that a single inequality from the set (38) holds and the remaining ones from the set given in Eq. (41). In other words it suffices to assume that the measurement outcomes between a fixed party and any from the other parties are almost perfectly correlated and that Eve is almost completely uncorrelated from the measurement outcomes of a single pair. This is in full agreement with our intuition. Namely, if the measurement outcomes of any pair  $A_i A_j$  (with fixed  $i$  and arbitrary  $j \neq i$ ) are perfectly correlated and Eve has a full knowledge about the measurement outcomes of just a single party, she actu-

ally has the knowledge about measurement outcomes of all parties. Therefore if all the parties have perfect correlations and Eve is completely uncorrelated from a single party, she must be completely uncorrelated from all the parties. Consequently, it is sufficient to assume that a single pair shares state that is close to a ccq state and other chosen pairs have almost perfect correlations.

Now we are prepared provide a lower bound on the multipartite distillable key in the LOPC paradigm. We achieve this by extending of the Devetak–Winter protocol to the multipartite case. We do this by applying the bipartite Devetak–Winter protocol to  $N - 1$  pair of parties of some state  $\varrho_{AE}$  such that each of them consist of one chosen party, say  $A_1$ , and one of the remaining ones. Everything works as in the standard Devetak–Winter protocol, i.e., the party  $A_1$  performs the measurement in some

basis, e.g. the standard one obtaining the so-called cq state (classical–quantum–...–quantum)

$$\varrho_{AE}^{(\text{cq})} = \sum_i p_i |i\rangle\langle i|_{A_1} \otimes \varrho_{A_2 \dots A_N E}^{(i)}. \quad (53)$$

Then she announces the number of code to the remaining parties, who then applied the corresponding POVM to their particles (see Refs. [9, 10]). The only difference is that we need to put  $\min_{j=2, \dots, N} I(A_1 : A_j)(\varrho_{A_1 A_j E}^{(\text{cqq})})$  in the definition of  $M$  (see Ref. [10]). Here  $\varrho_{A_1 A_j E}^{(\text{cqq})}$  denotes the so-called cqq state, which arises from (53) by tracing out all the parties but the first and  $j$ th one and Eve. Consequently, the rate of the protocol is

$$\min_{j=2, \dots, N} I(A_1 : A_j)(\varrho_{A_1 A_j E}^{(\text{cqq})}) - I(A_1 : E)(\varrho_{A_1 A_j E}^{(\text{cqq})}) \quad (54)$$

and therefore, the multipartite distillable key satisfies

$$C_D(\varrho_{AE}) \geq \min_{j=2, \dots, N} I(A_1 : A_j)(\varrho_{A_1 A_j E}^{(\text{cqq})}) - I(A_1 : E)(\varrho_{A_1 A_j E}^{(\text{cqq})}). \quad (55)$$

We have still some freedom in choosing the distributing party and therefore we can always choose the one for which the rate out the extended Devetak–Winter protocol is highest. In this way we get the lower bound on  $C_D$  of the form

$$C_D(\varrho_{AE}) \geq \max_{i=1, \dots, N} \left[ \min_{\substack{j=1, \dots, N \\ j \neq i}} I(A_i : A_j)(\varrho_{A_i A_j E}^{(\text{cqq})}) - I(A_i : E)(\varrho_{A_i A_j E}^{(\text{cqq})}) \right], \quad (56)$$

Let us finally mention that due to the Theorem IV.1 we can also bound from below  $K_D$  using (56). Namely, since  $K_D(\varrho_A) = C_D(|\psi_{AE}\rangle)$ , we have the following

$$K_D(\varrho_A) \geq \max_{i=1, \dots, N} \left[ \min_{\substack{j=1, \dots, N \\ j \neq i}} I(A_i : A_j) - I(A_i : E) \right]. \quad (57)$$

where the respective quantities are calculated from e.g. cq state following the purification of  $\varrho_A$ .

Now we can go back to the definition of  $K_D$ . As previously mentioned, it holds that  $K_D(P_{d,N}^{(+)}) = \log d$ . To show it explicitly, on the one hand we can utilize the above bound. We know from Theorem IV.1 that  $K_D(P_{d,N}^{(+)}) = C_D(|\psi_{AE}^{(+)}\rangle)$ , where  $|\psi_{AE}^{(+)}\rangle$  is a purification of  $P_{d,N}^{(+)}$  and obviously has the form  $|\psi_{d,N}^{(+)}\rangle_A |E\rangle$  with  $|E\rangle$  being some state kept by Eve. Measurement of  $A$  subsystem of  $|\psi_{AE}^{(+)}\rangle$  with respect to the standard basis leads us to the ideal cq state  $\varrho_{AE}^{(\text{cq})} = \omega_A^{(d,N)} \otimes |E\rangle\langle E|$ , where

$$\omega_A^{(d,N)} = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} |i\rangle\langle i|^{\otimes N}, \quad (58)$$

which has all the quantities  $I(A_i : A_j) = \log d$  ( $i, j = 1, \dots, N$ ) and  $I(A_i : E) = 0$  ( $i = 1, \dots, N$ ). Substituting both these facts to Eq. (56) gives us  $K_D(P_{d,N}^{(+)}) \geq \log d$ .

On the other hand we can utilize the bound given in Eq. (34). Firstly, notice that  $S(\rho^{\otimes n} \|\sigma^{\otimes n}) = nS(\rho \|\sigma)$  for two an arbitrary natural number  $n$  and arbitrary density matrices  $\rho$  and  $\sigma$ . Secondly, one easily finds that (see e.g. Ref. [31])

$$S(P_{d,N}^{(+)} \|\omega_A^{(d,N)}) = \log d \quad (59)$$

and consequently the following estimation holds

$$\begin{aligned} K_D(P_{d,N}^{(+)}) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \inf_{\varrho_A^{\text{sep}} \in \mathcal{D}} S(P_{d,N}^{(+)\otimes n} \|\varrho_A^{\text{sep}}) \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} S(P_{d,N}^{(+)\otimes n} \|\omega_A^{(d,N)\otimes n}) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} n S(P_{d,N}^{(+)} \|\omega_A^{(d,N)}) \\ &= \log d. \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Thus  $K_D(P_{d,N}^{(+)}) \leq \log d$  and taking into account previously obtained inequality  $K_D(P_{d,N}^{(+)}) \leq \log d$  we infer  $K_D(P_{d,N}^{(+)}) = \log d$ . Thus, as states previously, the multipartite distillable key may be considered as a entanglement measure.

Let us discuss the last issue of this section. As it follows e.g. from Eq. (56), to apply the extended Devetak–Winter successfully, that is to get a nonzero rate, one has to have obviously the right–hand side of Eq. (56) positive. One knows from Theorem IV.1 that distillation of some multipartite private state by means of LOCC is equivalent to the distillation of an ideal cq state by means of LOPC. This in turn means that the closer is some particular state  $\varrho_{AA'}$  to some multipartite private state, the closer is a cq state obtained from it *via* its purification. Then, from Theorem IV.3 it follows that the closer some cq state is to the ideal cq state the closer are its bipartite reductions to the bipartite ideal cq state. Both these facts means that distilling some multipartite private state from copies of a given state we can make the right–hand side of Eq. (56) (equivalently Eq. (57)) positive. Consequently, concatenating some LOCC protocol distilling multipartite private state and the extended Devetak–Winter protocol introduces a subtle effect here. Namely, on the one hand, using more copies in the LOCC protocol producing a state that is closer to some multipartite private state makes the right–hand side of Eq. (56) larger. On the other hand spending more copies decreases the success probability which needs to be included in the overall rate of the protocol. This issue will become more clear when in the next section some particular classes of states will be investigated.

### C. Multipartite privacy squeezing

Concluding the discussion concerning the distillable key we need to mention the multipartite of the so-called *privacy squeezing* [12, 13] together with its application in recent important method [16] of bounding the secret key from below. Following Lemma III.1 we know that having some state  $\varrho_{AA'}$  expressed in the form (18), there always exists a twisting  $U_t$  that the state  $\tilde{\varrho}_A = \text{Tr}_{A'}(U_t \varrho_{AA'} U_t^\dagger)$  has some special form. Namely, in some chosen row (column) some of its entries are trace norms of respective blocks of  $\varrho_{AA'}$ . The state  $\tilde{\varrho}_A$  obtained in this way we will call *privacy squeezed state*. Furthermore, we already know that twistings do not change the cq state with respect to some basis  $\mathcal{B}_N^{\text{prod}}$ .

Let us now proceed with stating some of the conclusion following both the above facts. As previously mentioned we have that  $K_D(\varrho_A) = C_D(|\psi_{AE}\rangle)$ , where  $|\psi_{AE}\rangle$  denotes the purification of  $\varrho_A$ . Assuming that all the parties share some state  $\varrho_{AA'}$  defined on  $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}'$  and denoting by  $|\psi_{AA'E}\rangle$  the purification of  $\varrho_{AA'}$ , we have

$$K_D(\varrho_{AA'}) = C_D(|\psi_{AA'E}\rangle) \geq C_D(\varrho_{AE}) \geq C_D(\varrho_{AE}^{(\text{cq})}). \quad (61)$$

Here  $\varrho_{AE} = \text{Tr}|\psi_{AA'E}\rangle\langle\psi_{AA'E}|$  and  $\varrho_{AE}^{(\text{cq})}$  stands for a cq state obtained upon the measurement of the A subsystem in  $\mathcal{B}_N^{\text{prod}}$ . The first inequality follows from the fact that throwing out the A' subsystem one can only lower the key as it could be treated 'virtually' as giving it to Eve. The second inequality is a consequence of the fact that measurement in some product basis leads to classical state on the A part of the state (notice that such measurement is LOPC operation which due to the definition of  $C_D$  can only lower its value).

Now we can formulate and prove the following theorem as a multipartite generalization of the bipartite considerations from Ref. [16] (cf. [14]) which exploit privacy squeezing to bound the secure key form below.

*Theorem IV.4.* Let  $\varrho_{AA'}$  be some  $N$ -partite state defined on  $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}'$ . Then

$$K_D(\varrho_{AA'}) \geq C_D(\tilde{\varrho}_{AE}^{(\text{cq})}), \quad (62)$$

where  $\tilde{\varrho}_{AE}^{(\text{cq})}$  is a cq state derived from purification  $|\tilde{\varrho}_{AE}\rangle$  of privacy squeezed state  $\tilde{\varrho}_A = \text{Tr}_{A'}(U_t \varrho_{AA'} U_t^\dagger)$ .

*Proof.* Denoting by  $|\psi_{AA'E}\rangle$  the purification of  $\varrho_{AA'}$ , we have immediately from Eq. (61) that  $K_D(\varrho_{AA'}) \geq C_D(\varrho_{AE}^{(\text{cq})})$  with  $\varrho_{AE}^{(\text{cq})}$  standing for a cq state being a result of the measurement of A part in  $\mathcal{B}_N^{\text{prod}}$  and tracing A' part of  $|\psi_{AA'E}\rangle$ . Then, as already stated, for any twisting  $U_t$  (in  $\mathcal{B}_N^{\text{prod}}$ ) the states  $\varrho_{AA'}$  and  $\tilde{\varrho}_{AA'} \equiv U_t \varrho_{AA'} U_t^\dagger$  have the same cq states with respect to the basis  $\mathcal{B}_N^{\text{prod}}$ . Consequently,  $C_D(\varrho_{AE}^{(\text{cq})}) = C_D(\sigma_{AE}^{(\text{cq})})$  with  $\sigma_{AE}^{(\text{cq})}$  being a cq state derived from the twisted state  $U_t \varrho_{AA'} U_t^\dagger$  (obviously *via* its purification). Now, we can consider the situation in which the A' subsystem is given to Eve. This means

that instead of taking 'huge' purification  $|\tilde{\psi}_{AA'E}\rangle$  of the privacy squeezed state  $\tilde{\varrho}_A = \text{Tr}_{A'} \tilde{\varrho}_{AA'} = \text{Tr}_{A'}(U_t \varrho_{AA'} U_t^\dagger)$  we can take a 'smaller' version denoted by  $|\tilde{\varrho}_{AE}\rangle$  (more precisely to purify some density matrix acting on  $\mathcal{H}$  it suffices to use a Hilbert space of lower dimensionality than to purify a state acting on  $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}'$ ). The new purification obviously must obey  $\tilde{\varrho}_A = \text{Tr}_E |\tilde{\varrho}_{AE}\rangle\langle\tilde{\varrho}_{AE}|$ . Now comparing these two situations we infer that  $C_D(\sigma_{AE}^{(\text{cq})}) \geq C_D(\tilde{\varrho}_{AE}^{(\text{cq})})$  holds, where  $\tilde{\varrho}_{AE}^{(\text{cq})}$  is cq state appearing upon measurement of A subsystem of  $|\tilde{\varrho}_{AE}\rangle$  in  $\mathcal{B}_N^{\text{prod}}$ . The inequality is a consequence of the fact that in the case of the first cq state the A' part unused, however, kept by the parties. In turn, in the second situation the A' subsystem is treated as it would be given to Eve when deriving  $\tilde{\varrho}_{AE}^{(\text{cq})}$ . Giving some part of state can only lower the secrecy as in this case, roughly speaking, she gains some information about what is shared by the parties. This concludes the proof. ■

## V. CONSTRUCTIONS

In this section we present two constructions of multipartite bound entangled states with nonzero distillable cryptographic key. Both are based on the structure exhibited by the GHZ states and therefore the scheme of secure key distillation presented above easily applies here.

Before we start it is desirable to establish the notation that we will use extensively below. By  $\mathcal{P}_0^{(N)}$  we shall denote a projector onto the  $N$ -partite pure state  $|\psi_0^{(N)}\rangle = |0\rangle^{\otimes N}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_i^{(N)}$  ( $i = 1, \dots, N$ ) is a projector onto the  $N$ -partite state  $|\psi_i^{(N)}\rangle$ , in which the  $i$ th party possesses  $|1\rangle$ , while other particles are in the  $|0\rangle$  state. For instance  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(4)}$  denotes the projector onto the four-partite pure state  $|\psi_2^{(4)}\rangle = |0100\rangle$ . Moreover, let  $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_0^{(N)}$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_i^{(N)}$  denote projectors obtained from  $\mathcal{P}_0^{(N)}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_i^{(N)}$ , respectively, by exchanging all zeros and ones. Thus, for example  $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_2^{(4)}$  is the projector onto  $|\overline{\psi}_2^{(4)}\rangle = |1011\rangle$ . In the analogous way by  $|\psi_{ij}^{(N)}\rangle$  ( $|\overline{\psi}_{ij}^{(N)}\rangle$ ) we will denote a  $N$ -qubit pure state, in which  $i$ th and  $j$ th qubit are in the  $|1\rangle$  ( $|0\rangle$ ) state and the rest ones are in the  $|0\rangle$  ( $|1\rangle$ ) state. Then by  $\mathcal{P}_{ij}^{(N)}$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_{ij}^{(N)}$  we denote projectors onto  $|\psi_{ij}^{(N)}\rangle$  and  $|\overline{\psi}_{ij}^{(N)}\rangle$ , respectively.

Let also  $T_i$  denote the partial transposition with respect to  $i$ th party (with the exception that  $T_0$  denotes identity map). Here we usually assume that each party has two subsystems of a given state  $\varrho_{AA'}$  and sometimes  $T_i$  will be denoting the partial transposition with respect to one or both subsystems. It will be, however, clear from the context which of the subsystems are partially transposed. Concatenation of partial transpositions with respect to some subset of parties, say  $A_1, \dots, A_k$  will be denoted by  $T_{1, \dots, k}$ .

### A. Recursive LOCC protocol distilling multipartite private states

Here we generalize the recursive LOCC protocol discussed in Ref. [13] to an arbitrary number of parties. Assume then that  $N$  parties  $A_1, \dots, A_N$  have  $k$  copies of some state  $\rho_{AA'}$  in their possession. In  $i$ th step each party performs the following operations.

- Take the state  $\rho_{AA'}^{(i-1)}$  (where  $\rho_{AA'}^{(0)} = \rho_{AA'}$ ) and one of the remaining  $k - i$  copies of  $\rho_{AA'}$ .
- Treating A part of  $\rho_{AA'}^{(i-1)}$  ( $\rho_{AA'}$ ) as source (target) qubits, perform CNOT operations.
- Finally, the parties perform the measurement in computational basis on the target qubits and compare the results: in the case of the same results (all zeros or all ones) the parties keep the state, otherwise they get rid of it.

In this way, spending  $k$  copies of some state  $\rho_{AA'}$ , all the parties can distill a state  $\varrho_{AA'}^{(k)}$  that is closer to some multipartite private state than the initial one, i.e.,  $\rho_{AA'}$ .

### B. Two GHZ-based constructions

The first construction is a straightforward generalization of the bipartite construction presented in Ref. [15]. Therefore, for comparative purposes, we present also a plot containing a lower bound on distillable key in the bipartite case. The second construction is completely new and in comparison to the first one allows to get a higher lower bound on distillable key than the first one.

#### 1. The first construction

Here we assume that the key part on each side is of qubit structure, while the shield part is arbitrarily dimensional, however, with the same dimension on each side. More precisely, we have  $\mathcal{H}_i = \mathbb{C}^2$  and  $\mathcal{H}'_i = \mathbb{C}^D$  ( $i = 1, \dots, N$ ).

Now, let us introduce the following matrix

$$X_D^{(N)} = \frac{1}{D^N + 2D - 4} \left[ (D - 2)P_{D,N}^{(+)} - 2P_D^{(N)} + Q_D^{(N)} \right], \quad (63)$$

where, as previously,  $P_{D,N}^{(+)}$  denotes a projector onto the  $N$ -partite  $D$ -dimensional GHZ state (see Eq. (10)), and  $P_D^{(N)}$  and  $Q_D^{(N)}$  are projectors defined as

$$P_D^{(N)} = R_D^{(N)} - P_{D,N}^{(+)}, \quad Q_D^{(N)} = \mathbb{1}_{D^N} - R_D^{(N)}, \quad (64)$$

where

$$R_D^{(N)} = \sum_{i=0}^{D-1} |i\rangle\langle i|^{\otimes N}. \quad (65)$$

The projectors  $P_D^{(N)}$  and  $Q_D^{(N)}$  are chosen in such a way that each operator from the triple  $P_{D,N}^{(+)}$ ,  $P_D^{(N)}$ , and  $Q_D^{(N)}$  is defined on orthogonal support. Furthermore, the denominator in Eq. (63) is chosen such that the matrix  $X_D^{(N)}$  is normalized in the trace norm.

The states under consideration are of the form

$$\varrho_{AA'}^{(D,N)} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_D^{(N)}} \left[ \sum_{i=0}^N \left( \mathcal{P}_i^{(N)} + \overline{\mathcal{P}}_i^{(N)} \right)_A \otimes \left( |X_D^{(N)T_i}\rangle^{T_i} \right)_{A'} + (|0\rangle\langle 1|^{\otimes N} + |1\rangle\langle 0|^{\otimes N})_A \otimes \left( X_D^{(N)} \right)_{A'} \right], \quad (66)$$

where the subscripts A and A' are indicated to distinguish their key and shield parts, respectively. However, for the sake of clarity, in further considerations these subscripts will be omitted.

The normalization factor  $\mathcal{N}_D^{(N)}$  appearing in Eq. (66) is given by

$$\mathcal{N}_D^{(N)} = 2 \frac{(N+1)D^N + 2D - 4}{D^N + 2D - 4}. \quad (67)$$

At the beginning we need to show that the matrices  $\varrho_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$  really represent quantum states, i.e., they are positive (the normalization condition is already satisfied). Firstly, let us notice that the blocks corresponding to  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_0$  and the two off-diagonal blocks in Eq. (66) constitute a matrix of the form  $\mathcal{M}_2(|X_D^{(N)}\rangle, X_D^{(N)})$  (see Lemma A.1 for the definition of  $\mathcal{M}_N$ ), positivity of which is guaranteed by Lemma A.1. Thus the only thing we need to deal with is to show that the remaining blocks lying on the diagonal of  $\varrho_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$  are positive. To achieve this goal, below we prove a more general lemma.

*Lemma V.1.* Let  $X_D^{(N)}$  be defined by Eq. (63). Then the matrices  $|X_D^{(N)T_k}\rangle^{T_k}$  are positive semi-definite for all  $k, l = 1, \dots, N$ .

*Proof.* Noticing that  $R_D^{(N)}$  is diagonal for arbitrary  $D$  and  $N$ , the partial transposition of  $X_D^{(N)}$  with respect to the  $k$ -th subsystem may be written as  $X_D^{(N)T_k} = [1/(D^N + 2D - 4)](S_D^{(N)T_k} - R_D^{(N)})$ , where  $S_D^{(N)}$  is defined as

$$S_D^{(N)} = \mathbb{1}_{D^N} + DP_{D,N}^{(+)} - 2R_D^{(N)}. \quad (68)$$

As we will see below  $S_D^{(N)T_k}$  is positive for any  $k = 1, \dots, N$  and  $S_D^{(N)T_k} R_D^{(N)} = 0$ . Consequently, the absolute value of  $X_D^{(N)T_k}$  may be obtained by simple changing the sign before the projector  $R_D^{(N)}$ . To prove positivity of  $S_D^{(N)T_k}$  let  $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_N}^{D-1} \alpha_{i_1 \dots i_N} |i_1 \dots i_N\rangle$  denote arbitrary vector from  $(\mathbb{C}^D)^{\otimes N}$  written in the standard basis

of  $(\mathbb{C}^D)^{\otimes N}$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi | S_D^{(N)T_k} | \psi \rangle &= \sum_{i \neq j} \alpha_{i\dots j\dots i}^* \alpha_{j\dots i\dots j} + \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_N) \in I} |\alpha_{i_1 \dots i_N}|^2 \\ &= \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_N) \in I_k} |\alpha_{i_1 \dots i_N}|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} |\alpha_{i\dots j\dots i} + \alpha_{j\dots i\dots j}|^2 \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

Here the notation  $\alpha_{i\dots j\dots i}$  means that all indices of  $\alpha$ s excluding the  $k$ -th one ( $k$  stands for the number of subsystem being partially transposed) are equal. Moreover, as previously  $I$  denotes the set of all sequences  $(i_1, \dots, i_N)$  except the cases when  $i_1 = \dots = i_N$ , while  $I_k$  is the set  $I$  minus all sequences in which all indices but the one on  $k$ -th position are equal.

As the value of  $k$  is not specified, the above considerations holds for any  $k = 1, \dots, N$ . Furthermore, using the same reasoning one can also prove positiveness of  $S_D^{(N)}$  being transposed with respect to any subset of different subsystems (besides the full transposition). This fact will be utilized in subsequent utilized.

By virtue of the positiveness of  $S_D^{(N)T_k}$  we have that  $|X_D^{(N)T_k}| = [1/(D^N + 2D - 4)](S_D^{(N)T_k} + R_D^{(N)})$  for any  $k = 1, \dots, N$ . Therefore the partial transposition of the latter with respect to the  $l$ -th subsystem gives

$$\left| X_D^{(N)T_k} \right|^{T_l} = \frac{1}{D^N + 2D - 4} \left( S_D^{(N)T_{k,l}} + R_D^{(N)} \right), \quad (70)$$

where  $T_{k,l}$  denotes the partial transposition with respect to two single subsystems  $A'_k$  and  $A'_l$ . Now we can dis-

tinguish two cases, namely, if  $k = l$  and  $k \neq l$ . In the first one, double partial transpositions with respect to the same subsystem is just an identity map. Consequently from Eqs. (64), (65), and (68), one has

$$\left| X_D^{(N)T_k} \right|^{T_k} = \frac{1}{D^N + 2D - 4} \left( Q_D^{(N)} + DP_{D,N}^{(+)} \right), \quad (71)$$

Now the right-hand side of Eq. (71) is a linear combination of two positive operators and thus is positive. We have still left the second case, that is, when  $k \neq l$ . To resolve it we may use the remark made above, saying that the partial transposition of  $S_D^{(N)}$  with respect to arbitrary non only one-partite subsystem is a positive matrix. This ends the proof. ■

Thus we have just proven that  $\varrho_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$  indeed represent quantum states. Now, our aim is to prove that on the one hand they are bound entangled and on the other hand they have nonzero distillable key. This purpose will be achieved in two steps. Firstly we show that partial transposition with respect to any elementary subsystem  $(A_i A'_i)$  of  $\varrho_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$  is positive. Obviously, this does not confirm that the states are bound entangled since we do not even know they are entangled. However, the latter may be proven by showing that  $K_D$  of these states is nonzero for  $D \geq 3$ .

Firstly, we concentrate on the positivity of all partial transpositions of  $\varrho_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$ . To gain a better look on the problem let us consider a particular example of such a partial transposition, namely,  $\varrho_{AA'}^{(D,3)T_3}$ . From Eq. (66) it follows that

$$\varrho_{AA'}^{(D,3)T_3} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_D^{(3)}} \begin{bmatrix} \left| X_D^{(3)} \right|^{T_3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \left| X_D^{(3)T_3} \right| & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & X_D^{(3)T_3} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \left| X_D^{(3)T_2} \right|^{T_{2,3}} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \left| X_D^{(3)T_1} \right|^{T_{1,3}} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \left| X_D^{(3)T_1} \right|^{T_{1,3}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \left| X_D^{(3)T_2} \right|^{T_{2,3}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & X_D^{(3)T_3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \left| X_D^{(3)T_3} \right| & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \left| X_D^{(3)} \right|^{T_3} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (72)$$

As, due to Lemma A.1, the square matrix consisting of two diagonal and two off-diagonal blocks of  $\varrho_{AA'}^{(D,N)T_i}$  (cf. Eq. (72)) i.e., the matrix  $\mathcal{M}_2(|X_D^{(N)T_i}|, |X_D^{(N)T_i}|)$ , is already positive, what we need to prove is positivity of  $|X_D^{(N)T_i}|$  and  $|X_D^{(N)T_i}|^{T_{j,k}}$  for any  $i, j, k =$

$1, \dots, N$ . Let us therefore prove the following lemma.

*Lemma V.2.* Let  $X_D^{(N)}$  be given by Eq. (63). Then for any  $i, j, k = 1, \dots, N$  it holds that

$$\left| X_D^{(N)} \right|^{T_i} \geq 0, \quad \left| X_D^{(N)T_i} \right|^{T_{j,k}} \geq 0. \quad (73)$$

*Proof.* Due to the definition of  $X_D^{(N)}$  its absolute value may be calculated simply by changing a sign before  $P_D^{(N)}$ , giving

$$\left| X_D^{(N)} \right| = \frac{1}{D^N + 2D - 4} \left[ (D - 2)P_{D,N}^{(+)} + 2P_D^{(N)} + Q_D^{(N)} \right]. \quad (74)$$

Application of partial transposition with respect to the  $i$ th subsystem followed by substitution of Eq. (64) leads us to

$$\left| X_D^{(N)} \right|^{T_i} = \frac{1}{D^N + 2D - 4} \left[ \mathbb{1}_D + R_D^{(N)} + (D - 4)P_{D,N}^{(+T_i)} \right] \quad (75)$$

for any  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . It is known fact that spectrum of any Hermitian matrix  $A$  is contained in the interval  $[-\|A\|, \|A\|]$ . Moreover, the operator norm of some Hermitian matrix  $A$  is maximal absolute value of eigenvalues of  $A$  and it holds  $\|A^2\| = \|A\|^2$ . Therefore, since straightforward calculations show that  $\|(P_{D,N}^{(+T_i)})^2\| = 1/D^2$ , we get that  $\|P_{D,N}^{(+T_i)}\| = 1/D$ . In result the operator  $(D - 4)P_{D,N}^{(+T_i)}$  has eigenvalues not smaller than  $-1$  resulting in a positivity of  $\mathbb{1}_D + (D - 4)P_{D,N}^{(+T_i)}$  for any  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Due to the fact that  $R_D^{(N)} \geq 0$ , this also implies positivity of  $|X_D^{(N)}|^{T_i}$  for any  $i = 1, \dots, N$ .

The second fact of the lemma may be proven just by noting that by virtue of Eq. (70) it holds

$$\left| X_D^{(N)T_i} \right|^{T_{j,k}} = \frac{1}{D^N + 2D - 4} \left( S_D^{(N)T_{i,j,k}} + R_D^{(N)} \right). \quad (76)$$

As stated previously in the proof of Lemma V.1, the partial transposition of  $S_D^{(N)}$  with respect to arbitrary subsystems is positive. This concludes the proof. ■

The above lemma proves actually that all the partial transpositions  $\varrho_{AA'}^{(D,N)T_i}$  ( $i = 1, \dots, N$ ) are positive. This means that if  $\varrho_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$  are entangled they have to be also bound entangled as the positivity of all the elementary partial transpositions makes impossible to distill entanglement between any pair of parties and thus also  $k \leq N$ -partite GHZ state among any  $k$ -partite group of parties.

Let us now pass to the proof that any state  $\varrho_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$  for  $D \geq 3$  has nonzero  $K_D$ . For this purpose we show that using the protocol from Section V A we can produce a state that is closer to some multipartite state out of copies of  $\varrho_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$ . As we will show below we need to use as many copies as it is necessary to make the quantity appearing on the right-hand side of Eq. (57) strictly positive.

Application of the recursive LOCC protocol presented in Section V A to  $k$  copies of  $\varrho_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$  gives with probability

$p_{D,N}^{(k)} = 2^{k-1} \mathcal{N}_{D,N}^{(k)} / (\mathcal{N}_{D,N}^{(1)})^k$  the following state

$$\Theta_{AA'}^{(N,k)} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_{D,N}^{(k)}} \left[ \sum_{i=0}^N \left( \mathcal{P}_i^{(N)} + \overline{\mathcal{P}}_i^{(N)} \right) \otimes \left( \left| X_D^{(N)T_i} \right|^{T_i} \right)^{\otimes k} + (|0\rangle\langle 1|^{\otimes N} + |1\rangle\langle 0|^{\otimes N}) \otimes \left( X_D^{(N)} \right)^{\otimes k} \right], \quad (77)$$

where  $\mathcal{N}_{D,N}^{(k)}$  is a normalization factor given by

$$\mathcal{N}_{D,N}^{(k)} = 2 \left[ 1 + N \left( \frac{D^N}{D^N + 2D - 4} \right)^k \right]. \quad (78)$$

Now, to simplify the considerations we can utilize the privacy squeezing (see Section IV C) to the obtained states  $\Theta_{AA'}^{(N,k)}$ . Namely, due to Lemma III.1 there exist such twistings  $U_t^{(k)}$  that after application to  $\Theta_{AA'}^{(N,k)}$  and tracing out the  $A'$  subsystem one arrives at the following class of  $N$ -qubit states

$$\tilde{\Theta}_A^{(N,k)} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_{D,N}^{(k)}} \left[ \sum_{i=0}^N \left( \mathcal{P}_i^{(N)} + \overline{\mathcal{P}}_i^{(N)} \right) \left\| \left| X_D^{(N)T_i} \right|^{T_i} \right\|_1^k + (|0\rangle\langle 1|^{\otimes N} + |1\rangle\langle 0|^{\otimes N}) \left\| X_D^{(N)} \right\|_1^k \right]. \quad (79)$$

In other words, after 'rotation' with  $U_t^{(k)}$  and throwing out the  $A'$  subsystem we get so-called privacy squeezed state, i.e., the one in which blocks are replaced with their norms. We also know from Theorem IV.4 that the distillable key of the cq state obtained from the privacy squeezed state  $\tilde{\Theta}_A^{(N,k)}$  (measurement is performed in the same basis as twisting) cannot be greater than the distillable key of  $\Theta_{AA'}^{(N,k)}$ .

From Eq. (78) it follows that since  $D^N + 2D - 4 > D^N$  for any  $D \geq 3$  one has  $\mathcal{N}_{D,N}^{(k)} \rightarrow 2$ , while for  $D = 2$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_{2,N}^{(k)} \rightarrow 2(N + 1)$ . In turn this means that for the off-diagonal elements of  $\tilde{\Theta}_A^{(N,k)}$  one has that

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_{D,N}^{(k)}} \left\| X_D^{(N)} \right\|_1^k = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_{D,N}^{(k)}} \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \quad (80)$$

with  $D \geq 3$ . By virtue of Theorem III.3 one infers that the more copies of  $\varrho_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$  we put into the recurrence protocol, the closer we are to some multipartite private state. This also means that with  $k \rightarrow \infty$  the sequence of states  $\tilde{\Theta}_A^{(N,k)}$  goes to GHZ state  $P_{2,N}^{(+)}$ , however, for  $D \geq 3$ .

Now, to bound from below the distillable key of  $\Theta_{AA'}^{(N,k)}$  according to the prescription given above we need to find a cq state of the privacy squeezed state  $\tilde{\Theta}_A^{(N,k)}$ . Simple

algebra gives

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Theta}_{AE}^{(\text{cq})} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_{D,N}^{(k)}} & \left[ R_2^{(N)} \otimes |E_0\rangle\langle E_0| + \left( \frac{D^N}{D^N + 2D - 4} \right)^k \right. \\ & \left. \times \sum_{j=1}^N \left( P_j^{(N)} \otimes |E_j\rangle\langle E_j| + \bar{P}_j^{(N)} \otimes |\bar{E}_j\rangle\langle \bar{E}_j| \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

where  $|E_0\rangle$ ,  $|E_j\rangle$ , and  $|\bar{E}_j\rangle$  constitute a set of orthonormal states held by Eve. One notices immediately that  $\tilde{\Theta}_{AE}^{(\text{cq})}$  tends to the multipartite ideal cq state (see Eq. (2)) for any natural  $D \geq 3$  whenever  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

To find a lower bound on distillable key of  $\tilde{\Theta}_A^{(N,k)}$  we utilize Eq. (56). However, according to Eq. one needs to calculate the quantities  $I(A_i : A_j)$  for  $i \neq j$  and  $I(A_i : E)$  for the respective reductions of  $\Theta_{AE}^{(\text{cq})}$ . Fortunately, the initial states  $\varrho_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$  have such symmetrical structure, preserved by the recurrence protocol and the privacy squeezing, that makes all the quantities  $I(A_i : A_j)$  ( $i \neq j$ ) equal (the same holds for  $I(A_i : E)$ ). Consequently, in view of the above, using Eq. (56) and Theorem IV.4 (see Eq. (62)), we infer the following inequality

$$K_D(\Theta_{AA'}^{(N,k)}) \geq I(A_1 : A_2)(\Theta_{A_1 A_2 E}^{(\text{ccq})}) - I(A_1 : E)(\Theta_{A_1 A_2 E}^{(\text{ccq})}). \quad (82)$$


irrespectively of number of parties  $N$ . Exemplary behaviour of the right-hand side of Eq. (82) (denoted by  $K_{DW}$ ) in the function of  $k$  and  $D$  for  $N = 3$  is shown in Fig. 1a. It is clear from Figure 1a that it is possible to distill even one secure bit of key from bound entangled states  $\Theta_{AA'}^{(N,k)}$  for sufficiently large  $k$ . For comparison, Fig. 1b contains a lower bound of the distillable key in the case of  $N = 2$  discussed in Ref. [15].

We can also investigate the lower bound on  $K_D$  for the initial states  $\varrho_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$ . However, in this case we need to take into account the probability  $p_{D,N}^{(k)}$ . In this way we arrive at


$$K_D(\varrho_{AA'}^{(D,N)}) \geq p_{D,N}^{(k)} \left[ I(A_1 : A_2)(\Theta_{A_1 A_2 E}^{(\text{ccq})}) - I(A_1 : E)(\Theta_{A_1 A_2 E}^{(\text{ccq})}) \right]. \quad (83)$$

Figure 2a presents exemplary behaviour of the function appearing on the right-hand side of Eq. (83) (denoted by  $\tilde{K}_{DW}$ ) for  $N = 3$ . For comparison, in Figure 2b it is also plotted the same function in the case of  $N = 2$  (this case was discussed in Ref. [27]).

We end the first construction discussing some conditions that matrices  $X_D^{(N)}$  must obey to be useful for purposes of the construction. What is important here is the fact that the trace norm of  $X_D^{(N)}$  is strictly larger than the trace norm of  $|X_D^{(N)T_i}\rangle^{T_i}$  for any  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . This condition makes the sequence  $\{\Theta_{AA'}^{(N,k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$  convergent to some multipartite private state in the trace norm.



(a)




(b)

FIG. 1: An exemplary plot of  $K_{DW} \equiv I(A_1 : A_2)(\Theta_{A_1 A_2 E}^{(\text{ccq})}) - I(A_1 : E)(\Theta_{A_1 A_2 E}^{(\text{ccq})})$  with  $N = 3$  (a) and for comparison in the case of  $N = 2$  (b), which was discussed in Ref. [27]. For the sake of clarity, zero is put whenever the plotted function is less than zero. Notice also that even though  $k$  and  $D$  are discrete parameters, the graph is made as if  $K_{DW}$  were a function of continuous parameters. It follows from both the figures that the number of parties  $N$  significantly influences the obtained lower bound. Namely, for  $N = 3$  one needs to spend more copies of a given state to get nonzero values of  $K_{DW}$ .


The next crucial conditions are  $|X_D^{(N)T_i}\rangle^{T_i} \geq 0$  and  $|X_D^{(N)}\rangle^{T_i} \geq 0$  for any  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Recall that the first one is necessary for  $\varrho_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$  to be positive, while the second one allows to prove that  $\varrho_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$  are PPT states with respect to any elementary party. Basing on these conditions we shall prove the following lemma.

*Lemma V.3.* Assume that

- (i)  $\|X_D^{(N)}\|_1 > \left\| |X_D^{(N)T_i}\rangle^{T_i} \right\|_1$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$ .
- (ii)  $|X_D^{(N)T_i}\rangle^{T_i} \geq 0$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$ .
- (iii)  $|X_D^{(N)}\rangle^{T_i} \geq 0$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$ .



(a)



(b)

FIG. 2: An exemplary plot of  $\tilde{K}_{DW} \equiv p_{D,3}^{(k)} \left[ I(A_1:A_2)(\Theta_{A_1A_2E}^{(ccq)}) - I(A_1:E)(\Theta_{A_1A_2E}^{(ccq)}) \right]$  with  $N = 3$ . For comparison it is also presented the case of  $N$  (b). For the sake of clarity, zero is put whenever the plotted function is less or equal to zero. Also, though both the parameters  $k$  and  $D$  are natural, for convenience, the function  $\tilde{K}_{DW}$  is plotted as if it were a function of continuous  $k$  and  $D$ . It is clear that for  $N = 3$  the lower bound on distillable key is considerably smaller.

Then  $X_D^{(N)} \not\geq 0$  and  $X_D^{(N)T_i} \not\geq 0$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$ .

*Proof. (ad absurdum)* We divide the proof into three parts:

- (i) Assume that  $X_D^{(N)} \geq 0$  and  $X_D^{(N)T_i} \not\geq 0$  for any  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Then one can see that  $|X_D^{(N)}|^{T_i} = X_D^{(N)T_i} \not\geq 0$  for any choice of  $i$ . However, this contradicts the third assumption.
- (ii) Assume that  $X_D^{(N)} \not\geq 0$  and there exists such  $k$  that  $X_D^{(N)T_k} \geq 0$ . Now, one obtains  $|X_D^{(N)T_k}|^{T_k} =$

$X_D^{(N)} \not\geq 0$ . Of course, this is in contradiction to the second assumption.

- (iii) Finally, assume that  $X_D^{(N)} \geq 0$  and that there exists such  $k$  that  $X_D^{(N)T_k} \geq 0$ . Then  $\left\| |X_D^{(N)T_k}|^{T_k} \right\|_1 = \left\| X_D^{(N)} \right\|_1$ . This contradicts the first assumption. ■

This lemma says that a particular matrix can be used in this construction it and all its elementary partial transpositions cannot be. Thus, in particular, any density matrix is not suitable for this construction.

## 2. The second construction

The crucial ideas behind the second construction are actually the same as in the case of the first one, however, considerations will be a little bit more sophisticated.

Let us first define the analog of  $X_D^{(N)}$  from the first construction to be

$$\tilde{X}_D^{(N)} = \sum_{i,j=0}^{D-1} u_{ij} |i\rangle\langle j|^{\otimes N}, \quad (84)$$

where we assume that  $u_{ij}$  are elements of some  $D \times D$  unitary or unitary Hermitian matrix, hereafter denoted by  $U_D$ . Thus  $\tilde{X}_D^{(N)}$  is an embedding of  $U_D \in M_d(\mathbb{C})$  in  $M_{d^N}(\mathbb{C})$  and therefore

$$\left| \tilde{X}_D^{(N)} \right| = R_D^{(N)}. \quad (85)$$

For further simplicity we also impose the condition that  $|u_{ij}| = 1/\sqrt{D}$  for  $i, j = 0, \dots, D-1$ , however whenever possible all proofs will be given assuming that  $U_D$  is in general unitary matrix.

It should be also pointed out that the distinction on unitary or unitary and Hermitian matrices  $U_D$  made above plays important role here. This comes from the LOCC protocol presented in Section V A as in the case of unitary but not Hermitian matrices it needs to be slightly modified. Namely, in its last step all the parties keep the state only if all zeros occurred.

Particular example of a unitary but in general not Hermitian matrix satisfying the above condition is the matrix  $\tilde{V}_D = (1/\sqrt{D})V_D$ , where  $V_D$  denotes the Vandermonde matrix (hereafter denoted by  $V_D$ ) of solutions to the equation  $z^D - 1 = 0$  with  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ . As one knows the solutions are of the form  $\omega_k = e^{2\pi i k/D}$  ( $k = 0, \dots, D-1$ ). It is then clear that  $\tilde{V}_D$  is a unitary matrix for any  $D \geq 2$ , however not always a Hermitian one. For instance, in the particular case of  $D = 2$  one easily recognizes that  $\tilde{V}_2$  is the known Hadamard matrix. A good example of some unitary and Hermitian matrix is  $k$ th tensor power of  $\tilde{V}_2$ . Since  $\tilde{V}_2$  is unitary and Hermitian also any matrix of the form  $\tilde{V}_2^{\otimes k}$  is also unitary and Hermitian.



Now, let us consider following family of matrices

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\varrho}_{AA'}^{(D,N)} = \frac{1}{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_D^{(N)}} & \left[ \sum_{j=0}^N (\mathcal{P}_j^{(N)} + \bar{\mathcal{P}}_j^{(N)}) \otimes \sum_{i=1}^N |\tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(N)T_j}| \right. \\ & \left. + |0\rangle\langle 1|^{\otimes N} \otimes \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(N)} + |1\rangle\langle 0|^{\otimes N} \otimes \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(N)\dagger} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

where  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_D^{(N)}$  stands for the normalization factor, which for arbitrary unitary  $U_D$  is given by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_D^{(N)} = 2N \left( D + N \sum_{i,j=0}^{D-1} |u_{ij}| \right). \quad (87)$$

Obviously for  $\tilde{X}_D^{(N)}$  that comes from unitary Hermitian  $U_D$  the conjugation in the last term in Eq. (86) may be omitted. Moreover, taking into account the assumption that  $|u_{ij}| = 1/\sqrt{D}$ , the normalization factor becomes  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_D^{(N)} = 2ND(1 + N\sqrt{D})$ .

As in the case of the first construction, we need to prove that  $\tilde{\varrho}_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$  represent quantum states. Moreover, we show also that they have positive partial transpositions with respect to any elementary subsystem. From Eq. (86) it follows that to prove positivity of  $\tilde{\varrho}_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$  one has to show that the inequalities

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(N)} \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^N |\tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(N)}| \quad (88)$$

are satisfied. In this case we could simply utilize Lemma A.1 to the square matrix consisting of two blocks corresponding to  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_0$  and two off-diagonal blocks to show that  $\tilde{\varrho}_{AA'}^{(D,N)} \geq 0$  (notice that the remaining blocks lying on the diagonal of  $\tilde{\varrho}_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$  are positive by definition).

To deal with the problem of positivity of partial transpositions let us look on the particular example of form of  $\tilde{\varrho}_{AA'}^{(D,3)T_3}$ . From Eq. (86) one infers that

$$\tilde{\varrho}_{AA'}^{(D,3)T_3} = \frac{1}{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_D^{(3)}} \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^3 |\tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(3)}| & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sum_{i=1}^3 |\tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(3)T_3}| & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \sum_{i=1}^3 \tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(3)T_3} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sum_{i=1}^3 |\tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(3)T_2}| & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \sum_{i=1}^3 |\tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(3)T_1}| & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \sum_{i=1}^3 |\tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(3)T_1}| & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \sum_{i=1}^3 |\tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(3)T_2}| & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sum_{i=1}^3 \tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(3)T_3\dagger} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \sum_{i=1}^3 |\tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(3)T_3}| & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \sum_{i=1}^3 |\tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(3)}| \end{bmatrix}, \quad (89)$$

where we used the fact that  $|\tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(n)T_j}|$  are diagonal in the standard basis and therefore do not feel the action of partial transposition.

To show positivity of  $\tilde{\varrho}_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$  as well as its partial transpositions we prove the following lemma.

*Lemma V.4.* Let  $\tilde{X}_D^{(N)}$  be defined as in Eq. (84). Then

the following operator inequalities holds

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(N)} \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^N |\tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(N)}| \quad (90)$$

and

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(N)T_j} \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(N)T_j} \right| \quad (j = 1, \dots, N). \quad (91)$$

*Proof.* Firstly we start by proving Eq. (90). For this purpose let us notice that its left-hand side may be written as

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(N)} \right| = \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=0}^{D-1} u_{kk} |k\rangle\langle k|^{\otimes N} + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{\substack{k,l=0 \\ k \neq l}}^{D-1} u_{kl} (|k\rangle\langle l|^{\otimes N})^{T_i} \right| \quad (92)$$

Straightforward algebra shows that the sum over number of parties may be drawn out from the sign of absolute value finishing the proof.

To show Eq. (91) we need to perform a little bit more sophisticated analysis. With the same reasoning as in the case of the first inequality we can reduce the claimed inequalities to the following

$$\left| \tilde{X}_D^{(N)} + (N-1) \sum_{k=0}^{D-1} u_{kk} |k\rangle\langle k|^{\otimes N} \right| \leq R_D^{(N)} + (N-1) \sum_{k=0}^{D-1} |u_{kk}| |k\rangle\langle k|^{\otimes N}, \quad (93)$$

where we utilized Eq. (85). One notices that the above inequality may be further reduced to

$$|U_D + (N-1)\mathcal{D}| \leq \mathbb{1}_D + (N-1)|\mathcal{D}|, \quad (94)$$

where  $\mathcal{D}$  denotes a diagonal matrix containing the diagonal elements of  $U_D$ . Utilizing the fact that  $|u_{ij}| = 1/\sqrt{D}$  for any  $i, j = 0, \dots, D-1$ , we infer that  $|\mathcal{D}| = (1/\sqrt{D})\mathbb{1}_D$  and therefore

$$|U + (N-1)\mathcal{D}| \leq [1 + (N-1)/\sqrt{D}]\mathbb{1}_D. \quad (95)$$

To prove this inequality we can utilize the polar decomposition to its left-hand side. More precisely we can write  $|U + (N-1)\mathcal{D}| = V^\dagger U + (N-1)V^\dagger \mathcal{D}$  with  $V$  denoting some unitary matrix. This allows us to write

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi | |U + (N-1)\mathcal{D}| | \Psi \rangle &= \langle \Psi | |U + (N-1)\mathcal{D}| | \Psi \rangle \\ &\leq \langle \Psi | V^\dagger U | \Psi \rangle \\ &\quad + (N-1) \langle \Psi | V^\dagger \mathcal{D} | \Psi \rangle \\ &\leq 1 + (N-1) \langle \Psi | V^\dagger |\mathcal{D}| W | \Psi \rangle \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{N-1}{\sqrt{D}}, \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

where  $|\Psi\rangle$  is an arbitrary normalized vector from  $\mathbb{C}^D$ .

The second and third inequality are consequences of the fact that product of unitary matrices is unitary and that for any normalized  $|\psi\rangle$  and unitary  $U$  it holds that  $|\langle \psi | U | \psi \rangle| \leq 1$ . Moreover, we put here the polar decomposition of  $\mathcal{D}$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{D} = |\mathcal{D}|W$  for some unitary  $W$ . The

last inequality is a result of application of aforementioned fact that  $|\mathcal{D}| = (1/\sqrt{D})\mathbb{1}_D$ . We also utilized once more the fact used to infer the second inequality.

Now it suffices to mention that the resulting inequality is equivalent to (95) finishing the proof. ■

From the above lemma it clearly follows that  $\tilde{\varrho}_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$  represent quantum states for any  $D \geq 2$  and  $N \geq 2$ , and they have positive partial transpositions with respect to all elementary subsystems. The last thing we need to prove is that the distillable key of  $\tilde{\varrho}_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$  is surely nonzero. This would also imply that  $\tilde{\varrho}_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$  represent entangled states.

Let us then apply the recursive protocol described previously in Section V A to  $k$  copies of  $\tilde{\varrho}_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$ , obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Theta}_{AA'}^{(N,k)} &= \frac{1}{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{D,N}^{(k)}} \left[ \sum_{j=0}^N (\mathcal{P}_j^{(N)} + \overline{\mathcal{P}}_j^{(N)}) \otimes \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(N)T_j} \right| \right)^{\otimes k} \right. \\ &\quad + |0\rangle\langle 1|^{\otimes N} \otimes \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(N)} \right)^{\otimes k} \\ &\quad \left. + |1\rangle\langle 0|^{\otimes N} \otimes \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(N)\dagger} \right)^{\otimes k} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

with the normalization factor given by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{D,N}^{(k)} = 2 \left( ND\sqrt{D} \right)^k + 2ND^k \left[ 1 + (N-1)\sqrt{D} \right]^k. \quad (98)$$

Notice that as previously mentioned, the LOCC protocol should be modified in case when  $\tilde{X}_D^{(N)}$  follows from in general unitary  $U_D$ . Due to the modification of the LOCC protocol, the probability of obtaining  $\tilde{\Theta}_{AA'}^{(N,k)}$  in the case of unitary and unitary Hermitian  $U_D$  is different. Namely, in the case of unitary Hermitian matrices amounts to

$$\tilde{p}_{D,N}^{(k,1)} = 2^{k-1} \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{D,N}^{(k)} / (\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{D,N}^{(1)})^k, \quad (99)$$

while in the case of unitary nonHermitian the probability of success is considerably smaller and is given by

$$\tilde{p}_{D,N}^{(k,2)} = \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{D,N}^{(k)} / (\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{D,N}^{(1)})^k. \quad (100)$$

Now the multipartite privacy squeezing (see Section IV C) allows us to change blocks in Eq. (97) with their norms, obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\theta}_A^{(N,k)} &= \frac{1}{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{D,N}^{(k)}} \left[ \sum_{j=0}^N (\mathcal{P}_j^{(N)} + \overline{\mathcal{P}}_j^{(N)}) \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(N)T_j} \right| \right\|_1^k \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (|0\rangle\langle 1|^{\otimes N} + |1\rangle\langle 0|^{\otimes N}) \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{X}_{D,i}^{(N)} \right\|_1^k \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

Calculating the respective norms in the above, one may rewrite Eq. (101) as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\theta}_A^{(N,k)} &= \frac{D^k}{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{D,N}^{(k)}} \left[ 2(N\sqrt{D})^k P_{2,N}^{(+)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + [1 + (N-1)\sqrt{D}]^k \sum_{j=1}^N \left( \mathcal{P}_j^{(N)} + \bar{\mathcal{P}}_j^{(N)} \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (102)$$

From Eqs. (98) and (102) one easily infers that  $\tilde{\theta}_A^{(N,k)} \rightarrow P_{2,N}^{(+)}$  for  $k \rightarrow \infty$  for any  $D \geq 2$ , which in virtue of Theorem III.3 means that the recursive protocol when applied to copies of  $\tilde{\varrho}_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$  produces state that is arbitrarily close to some multipartite pdit in the limit of  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . In fact, as the probabilities of success  $\tilde{p}_{D,N}^{(k,1)}$  and  $\tilde{p}_{D,N}^{(k,2)}$  (see Eqs. (99) and (100)) are positive, according to the definition of  $K_D$  (see Definition IV.1) the above method leads to distillation of secure key from  $\tilde{\varrho}_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$ . Below we provide also plots of lower bounds on  $K_D$  of  $\tilde{\varrho}_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$ .

For this purpose we can find the purification of  $\tilde{\varrho}_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$  and then the cq state in the standard basis. The latter has the form

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Theta}_{AE}^{(\text{cq})} &= a_{D,N}^{(k)} R_2^{(N)} \otimes |E_0\rangle\langle E_0| + b_{D,N}^{(k)} \\ &\quad \times \sum_{j=1}^N \left( \mathcal{P}_j^{(N)} \otimes |E_j\rangle\langle E_j| + \bar{\mathcal{P}}_j^{(N)} \otimes |\bar{E}_j\rangle\langle \bar{E}_j| \right), \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

where  $|E_0\rangle$ ,  $|E_j\rangle$ , and  $|\bar{E}_j\rangle$  ( $j = 1, \dots, N$ ) are orthonormal states kept by Eve and  $a_{D,N}^{(k)}$ , and  $b_{D,N}^{(k)}$  are given by

$$a_{D,N}^{(k)} = \frac{(ND\sqrt{D})^k}{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{D,N}^{(k)}} \quad b_{D,N}^{(k)} = \frac{D^k}{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{D,N}^{(k)}} [1 + (N-1)\sqrt{D}]^k. \quad (104)$$

One can see from the above that the limit of  $k \rightarrow \infty$  leads us to the ideal cq state. Now we can apply the bound given in Eq. (57). It is easy to verify that here all the quantities  $I(A_i : A_j)$  are equal here (the same holds for  $I(A_i : E)$ ) and therefore we can rewrite Eq. (57) as

$$K_D(\tilde{\Theta}_{AA'}^{(N,k)}) \geq I(A_1 : A_2)(\tilde{\Theta}_{A_1 A_2 E}^{(\text{ccq})}) - I(A_1 : E)(\tilde{\Theta}_{A_1 A_2 E}^{(\text{ccq})}) \quad (105)$$

Exemplary plot of the function appearing on the right-hand side of Eq. (105) (denoted as  $K_{DW}$ ) is presented in Figure 3. The behavior of  $K_{DW}$  (see Fig. 3) confirms the previous analysis, namely, the more copies we spend the closer state to some multipartite private state we obtain using the recursive protocol. Thus the higher key rate we can get from the obtained state  $\tilde{\Theta}_{AA'}^{(N,k)}$ .

We can also get the lower bound on distillable key of the initial states  $\tilde{\varrho}_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$ . Here we need to take into account the probability of success ( $\tilde{p}_{D,N}^{(k,1)}$  and  $\tilde{p}_{D,N}^{(k,2)}$ ) in the recursive protocol.




FIG. 3: The function appearing on the right-hand side of Eq. (105) (denoted here by  $K_{DW}$ ) in the function of number of copies  $k$  and the dimension  $D$ . Zero is put whenever the function is less than zero. Notice that both the parameters  $k$  and  $D$  are discrete, however, continuous plot is made to indicate better the behavior of  $K_{DW}$ . It is clear from the plot that for larger  $k$  the distillable key of  $\tilde{\theta}_A^{(N,k)}$  approaches one bit (this is actually a maximal value obtainable from two-qubit states) and the convergence depends on  $D$ . Namely, for higher dimensions  $D$  the convergence to the maximal value is faster.

The corresponding bounds on the distillable keys of  $\tilde{\varrho}_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$  are

$$\begin{aligned} K_D^{(1(2))}(\tilde{\varrho}_{AA'}^{(D,N)}) &\geq \tilde{p}_{D,N}^{(k,1(2))} \left[ I(A_1 : A_2)(\tilde{\Theta}_{A_1 A_2 E}^{(\text{ccq})}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - I(A_1 : E)(\tilde{\Theta}_{A_1 A_2 E}^{(\text{ccq})}) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (106)$$

Exemplary plots of the right-hand side of the above (denoted by  $\tilde{K}_{DW}^{(1(2))}$ ) both in the case of a unitary Hermitian matrix (e.g.  $\tilde{V}_D^{\otimes k}$ ) and only a unitary matrix (e.g.  $\tilde{V}_D$ ) are given in Figure 4a and 4b.

## VI. LIMITATIONS IN MULTIPARTITE QUANTUM CRYPTOGRAPHY

So far, we discussed the general scheme allowing for distilling secure key from multipartite states. It is desirable however to discuss also what are the limitations of multipartite secure key distillation.

An interesting effect, which we shall recall here, was reported in Ref. [33], namely, it was shown that though maximal violation of some Bell inequality it is impossible to distill secure key from the so-called Smolin state [34]:

$$\varrho_{ABCD}^S \equiv \varrho^S = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=0}^3 |\psi_i^B\rangle\langle\psi_i^B| \otimes |\psi_i^B\rangle\langle\psi_i^B|, \quad (107)$$

where  $|\psi_i^B\rangle$  ( $i = 0, \dots, 3$ ) are the so-called Bell states




FIG. 4: Lower bounds on  $K_D$  of  $\tilde{\varrho}_{AA'}^{(D,N)}$  in the function of  $k$  and  $D$ . The upper plot (a) presents lower bound (denoted here by  $\tilde{K}_{DW}^{(1)}$ ) on  $K_D$  in the case of unitary Hermitian matrices  $U_D$ , while in the second plot (b) lower bound ( $\tilde{K}_{DW}^{(2)}$ ) in the case of unitary but not Hermitian matrices is given. Both are just a product of probability  $\tilde{p}_{D,N}^{(k,1)}$  (left) or  $\tilde{p}_{D,N}^{(k,2)}$  (right) and  $K_{DW}$  plotted in Figure 3. One infers that in the case of unitary but not Hermitian matrix  $U_D$  the region of nonzero values of the plotted function is wider than in the case of unitary Hermitian matrices.

given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\psi_0^B\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|01\rangle - |10\rangle), & |\psi_1^B\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|00\rangle - |11\rangle), \\
 |\psi_2^B\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|00\rangle + |11\rangle), & |\psi_3^B\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|01\rangle + |10\rangle).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{108}$$

This conclusion may be also inferred for the generalizations of the Smolin state provided in Ref. [35] and independently in Ref. [36] (see also Ref. [37] for further

generalizations). These are states of the form

$$\begin{aligned}
 \varrho_2 &= |\psi_0^B\rangle\langle\psi_0^B|, \\
 \varrho_4^S &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{m=0}^3 U_2^{(m)} \varrho_2 U_2^{(m)\dagger} \otimes U_2^{(m)} \varrho_2 U_2^{(m)\dagger} \equiv \varrho^S, \\
 \varrho_6^S &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{m=0}^3 U_4^{(m)} \varrho_4 U_4^{(m)\dagger} \otimes U_2^{(m)} \varrho_2 U_2^{(m)\dagger}, \\
 &\vdots \\
 \varrho_{2(n+1)}^S &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{m=0}^3 U_2^{(m)} \varrho_{2n} U_2^{(m)\dagger} \otimes U_2^{(m)} \varrho_2 U_2^{(m)\dagger} \tag{109}
 \end{aligned}$$

The state  $\varrho_2$  is just one of the Bell states, while  $\varrho_4$  is the Smolin state. All states  $\varrho_{2n}$  for  $n \geq 2$  are bound entangled and all states for  $n \geq 1$  violate the Bell inequality

$$|E_{1\dots 11} + E_{1\dots 12} + E_{2\dots 21} - E_{2\dots 22}| \leq 2 \tag{110}$$

maximally. On the other hand, due to the results of Refs. [5, 6], and Ref. [30], one may show that it is impossible to distill secure key from states for  $n \geq 2$ . This contradicts the conclusion one can draw from the Ekert's paper [2] saying that in the case of two qubits maximal violation of CHSH–Bell inequality [38] guarantees secrecy.

## VII. CONCLUSIONS

Quantum cryptography beyond entanglement distillation is a very young subject. Until recent times it was natural to expect that the latter is impossible. While there were significant developments concerning bipartite scenario the general formulation for multipartite case was missing. The present paper fills this gap by not only generalizing the scheme, but also by providing new constructions of multipartite bound entangled states which is really nontrivial. However there are many questions unsolved. First it seems to be true that unconditional security proof [22] can be extended here at a cost of the number of estimated local observables, but the exact analysis of this issue is needed. Moreover, given fixed number of parties, it is not known what is the minimal dimension of elementary system of PPT like bound entangled state that allows one-way secure key distillation. Does it increase with number of particles and if so - how the dependence looks like? Are there bound entangled states with multipartite cryptographic key with underlying structure corresponding to other classes of pure states like graph states (see Ref. [39]). One may ask why we have considered only bound entanglement in multipartite scenario. This is when the generalized scheme is necessary to be applied. Otherwise qualitatively (though may be not quantitatively - see subsequent discussion) just pure entanglement distillation is enough tool. Quite natural is a question of interplay between the two approaches in distilling key - to what extent can we abandon distillation of p-dits? Can the two processes be finally always

separated in optimal key distillation scheme: in a sense that one gets some number of singlet states and some large p-dit which is bound entangled). If it were so, the two parts might serve as a natural measures of free and bound entanglement in the system. Most likely this is impossible, but one needs the proof. The closely related question is the one concerning additivity, convexity and lockability of the secure key  $K_D$ . While this seems to be very hard question in case of bipartite states (though lockability with respect to Eve has already been ruled out in Ref. [19]) it may happen to be easier within the multipartite paradigm presented here (in analogy to classical bound information which is known only in asymptotic bipartite form [40] but naturally emerges from bound entanglement in multipartite case [41]. In this context novel upper and lower bounds on  $K_D$  are needed (for recent development see Ref. [42]). Finally note that analysis of  $K_D$  in this type of contexts is interesting itself since it represents entanglement measure. Further analysis of  $K_D$  and finding its multi-coordinate extensions to help in characterization of multipartite entanglement seems to be rich program for future research. Needless to say due to Choi–Jamiołkowski isomorphism [43] the present analysis provides new classes of multiparty quantum channels for which natural questions on superactivation of the type found in bipartite case [20] and other possible effects of similar type arise.

### Acknowledgments

This work was supported by UE IP project SCALA. Partial support from LFPPI network is also acknowledged. R.A. gratefully acknowledges the support from support from Ingenio 2010 QOIT and Foundation for Polish Science.

### APPENDIX A: SOME USEFUL LEMMAS

*Lemma A.1.* Assume that a given  $d \times d$  matrix  $B$  is normal. If  $A \geq |B|$  then the matrices

$$\mathcal{M}_N(A, B) = \begin{bmatrix} (N-1)A & B & \dots & B \\ B^\dagger & (N-1)A & \dots & B \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ B^\dagger & B^\dagger & \dots & (N-1)A \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{A1})$$

and

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_N(A, B) = \begin{bmatrix} (N-1)A & B & B & \dots & B \\ B^\dagger & A & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ B^\dagger & 0 & A & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ B^\dagger & 0 & 0 & \dots & A \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{A2})$$

are positive.

*Proof.* We prove the lemma only for  $\mathcal{M}_N(A, B)$  as the proof for  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_N(A, B)$  goes along the same lines.

The matrix  $\mathcal{M}_N(A, B)$  consists of  $N^2$  blocks  $d \times d$  each and consequently the whole matrix has the dimensions  $Nd \times Nd$ . Thus to prove positiveness we need to show that for any  $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^{Nd}$  the inequality  $\langle \Psi | \mathcal{M}_N(A, B) | \Psi \rangle \geq 0$  holds. It is clear that an arbitrary vector  $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^{Nd}$  may be written as

$$|\Psi\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} |x_1\rangle \\ \vdots \\ |x_N\rangle \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

where each  $|x_i\rangle$  belongs to  $\mathbb{C}^d$ . Then a rather straightforward algebra leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi | \mathcal{M}_N(A, B) | \Psi \rangle &= (N-1) \sum_{i=1}^N \langle x_i | A | x_i \rangle \\ &+ 2 \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i < j}}^N \text{Re} \langle x_i | B | x_j \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

By virtue of the assumption that  $A \geq |B|$  and the inequality  $\text{Re} z \geq -|z|$  satisfied for any  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi | \mathcal{M}_N(A, B) | \Psi \rangle &\geq (N-1) \sum_{i=1}^N \langle x_i | |B| | x_i \rangle \\ &- 2 \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i < j}}^N |\langle x_i | B | x_j \rangle|, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

Since  $B$  is assumed to be a normal matrix it may be given as  $B = \sum_k \lambda_k |\varphi_k\rangle\langle\varphi_k|$  with  $\{\lambda_k\}$  being, in general, the complex eigenvalues of  $B$ , while  $\{|\varphi_k\rangle\}$  its orthonormal eigenvectors. Putting the spectral decomposition of  $B$  into Eq. (A5), introducing  $a_{ik} = |\langle x_i | \varphi_k \rangle| \geq 0$ , and taking into account the fact that  $|\sum_i \xi_i| \leq \sum_i |\xi_i|$ , we obtain

$$\langle \Psi | \mathcal{M}_N(A, B) | \Psi \rangle \geq \sum_k |\lambda_k| \left( \sum_{i=1}^N a_{ik}^2 - 2 \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i < j}}^N a_{ik} a_{jk} \right). \quad (\text{A6})$$

It is clear from Eq. (A6) that to show nonnegativity of  $\langle \Psi | \mathcal{M}_N(A, B) | \Psi \rangle$  for any  $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^{Nd}$ , one has to prove that for all  $k$  the term in brackets in Eq. (A6) is nonnegative. This, however, follows from the fact that

$$\sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i < j}}^N (a_{ik} - a_{jk})^2 \geq 0, \quad (\text{A7})$$

finishing the proof. ■

- 
- [1] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard, Quantum cryptography: Public key distribution and coin tossing. In Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems and Signal Processing, pp. 175179, Bangalore, India, December, 1984, IEEE Computer Society Press, New York.
- [2] A. K. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett., **67** 661 (1991).
- [3] D. Deutsch, A. Ekert, R. Jozsa, C. Macchiavello, S. Popescu, and A. Sanpera, Phys. Rev. Lett., **77** 2818 (1996).
- [4] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, S. Popescu, B. Schumacher, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 722 (1996).
- [5] M. Curty, M. Lewenstein, and N. Lütkenhaus, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 217903 (2004).
- [6] M. Curty, O. Gühne, M. Lewenstein, and N. Lütkenhaus, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 022306 (2005).
- [7] H.-K. Lo and H. F. Chau, Science **283**, 2050 (1999).
- [8] P. W. Shor and J. Preskill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 441 (2000).
- [9] I. Devetak and A. Winter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 080501 (2004).
- [10] I. Devetak and A. Winter, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A **461**, 207 (2005).
- [11] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 5239 (1998).
- [12] K. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and J. Oppenheim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 160502 (2005).
- [13] K. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and J. Oppenheim, arXiv:quant-ph/0506189, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, in press.
- [14] K. Horodecki, *General paradigm for distilling classical key from quantum states - on quantum entanglement and security*, PhD Thesis, submitted to Faculty of Mathematics, Informatics and Mechanics, University of Warsaw, May 2008.
- [15] P. Horodecki and R. Augusiak, *On quantum cryptography with bipartite bound entangled states*, in Quantum Information Processing: From Theory to Experiment, proceedings of the NATO Advanced Study Institute on Quantum Computation and Quantum Information, eds. D. G. Angelakis, M. Christandl, A. Ekert, M. Kay, and S. Kulik, NATO Science Series, III: Computer and Systems Sciences, vol. 199, 19-29, IOS Press, Amsterdam, 2006.
- [16] K. Horodecki, L. Pankowski, M. Horodecki, and P. Horodecki, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **54**, 2621 (2008).
- [17] J. M. Renes and G. Smith, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 020502, 2007.
- [18] J. M. Renes, J.-Ch. Boileau, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 032335 (2008).
- [19] M. Christandl, A. Ekert, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, and R. Renner *Unifying classical and quantum key distillation*, in *Proceedings of the 4th Theory of Cryptography Conference*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science vol. 4392, pp. 456-478, 2007.
- [20] G. Smith and J. Yard, Science **231**, 1812 (2008).
- [21] R. Renner, Int. J. Quant. Inf. **6**, 1 (2008); see also quant-ph/0512258.
- [22] K. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, D. Leung, J. Oppenheim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 110502 (2008); IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **54** 2604 (2008).
- [23] R. Renner and R. König, *Universally composable privacy amplification against quantum adversaries* in Proc. of TCC 2005, LNCS, Springer, vol. 3378 (2005), pp. 407-425 (arXiv:quant-ph/0403133).
- [24] R. Renner, N. Gisin, and B. Kraus, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 012332 (2005); B. Kraus, N. Gisin, and R. Renner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 080501 (2005);
- [25] T. Moroder, M. Curty, N. Lütkenhaus, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 052301 (2006).
- [26] R. Augusiak, *On the distillation of secure key form multipartite entangled quantum states*, PhD thesis, Gdańsk, Poland, 2008.
- [27] P. Horodecki and R. Augusiak, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 010302(R) (2006).
- [28] D. M. Greenberger, M. Horne, and A. Zeilinger, in *Bells Theorem, Quantum Theory, and Conceptions of the Universe*, ed. M. Kafatos, Kluwer Academic, Dodrecht, 1989.
- [29] M. Horodecki, Quant. Inf. Comp. **1**, 3 (2001).
- [30] P. Horodecki, *Bound entanglement*, in *Lectures on Quantum Information*, eds. D. Bruss and G. Leuchs, Wiley-VCH Verlag, Weinheim, 2007, p. 209.
- [31] V. Vedral, M. B. Plenio, M. A. Rippin, and P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 2275 (1997).
- [32] M. B. Ruskai, Rev. Math. Phys. **6**, 1147 (1994).
- [33] R. Augusiak and P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 010305(R) (2006).
- [34] J. A. Smolin, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 032306 (2001).
- [35] R. Augusiak and P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 012318 (2006).
- [36] S. Bandyopadhyay, I. Chattopadhyay, V. P. Roychowdhury, and D. Sarkar, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 062317 (2005).
- [37] G. Wang and M. Ying, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 052332 (2007).
- [38] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **23**, 880 (1969).
- [39] R. Raussendorf, D. E. Browne, and H.-J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 022312 (2003).
- [40] R. Renner and S. Wolf, *Towards proving the existence of "bound" information in Proceedings of 2002 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (IEEE)*, Lausanne, Switzerland, June 30 - July 5, 2002, p. 103.
- [41] A. Acin, J. I. Cirac, and L. Masanes, Phys. Rev. Lett **92**, 107903 (2003).
- [42] D. Yang, K. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, and W. Song, *Squashed entanglement for multipartite states and entanglement measures based on the mixed convex roof*, arXiv:0704.2236.
- [43] M.-D. Choi, Linear Alg. Appl. **10**, 285 (1975); A. Jamiołkowski, Rep. Math. Phys. **3**, 275 (1972).