

Entanglement and private information in many-body thermal states

Samuel J. Garratt¹ and Max McGinley²

¹*Department of Physics, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, USA*

²*TCM Group, Cavendish Laboratory, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB3 0HE, UK*

(Dated: February 20, 2025)

Using concepts from quantum cryptography, we show how entanglement in many-body mixed states is reflected in standard correlation functions. Focusing on systems in thermal equilibrium with an environment, we ask whether the entanglement in the system can be used as a resource for distilling private keys—random classical bits that are shared by spatially separated observers but hidden from an eavesdropper having access to the environment. Since private keys cannot be generated using separable states, we can infer the presence of entanglement from the success of such protocols. We derive a simple relation between the information accessible to the eavesdropper and the linear response of the system. This relation allows us to determine which spatial correlations can be used to detect entanglement across wide varieties of physical systems, and provides a new experimental probe of entanglement. We also show that strong symmetries of a density matrix imply the existence of correlations that are always hidden from the environment. This result implies that, although grand canonical ensembles are separable above a finite temperature, canonical ensembles are generically entangled at all finite temperatures.

The study of entanglement has provided a unifying description of correlations in many-body quantum ground states [1–6]. Extending this program of research to finite temperatures promises similar conceptual advances. However, unlike pure states, mixed quantum states can exhibit correlations that are entirely classical, and distinguishing these from entanglement is a challenge in macroscopic systems [7–11]. In this Letter, we show how correlations between local observables in many-body thermal states can be related to entanglement through the operational task of *quantum key distillation* (QKD)—an important protocol in quantum cryptography [12].

Entangled states are useful in cryptography because entanglement is monogamous: the more entangled two degrees of freedom are, the less correlated they can be with any other parties who may be eavesdropping [13]. For instance, two parties who share Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) pairs can perform local measurements to generate a *private key* [12], a uniformly distributed random string of bits known only to the observers who perform the measurements, which can be used to encrypt messages. More generally, keys can be extracted from the private correlations contained within generic, noisy entangled states. This process, known as QKD, involves local operations as well as a ‘public’ communication channel to which eavesdroppers have access (see Fig. 1).

By considering QKD protocols, we introduce a framework to quantify the privacy of correlations in many-body quantum systems that are in thermal equilibrium with an environment. When privacy is defined relative to an eavesdropper having access to the environment degrees of freedom, the success of such a protocol implies that the system is entangled [14, 15]. Using these new methods, we show that privacy in the correlations between local observables is ubiquitous at low finite temperatures. Notably, QKD is possible in many situations where en-




FIG. 1. Left: In conventional few-body QKD protocols, two honest parties who have access to a bipartite entangled state ρ_{AB} and a public classical communication channel distill perfectly correlated random classical bits (a *key*) that are private from any eavesdropper E holding degrees of freedom such that Ψ_{ABE} is pure. Right: In the many-body setting, we instead consider QKD protocols that access two subregions A and B of a larger state ρ_{ABC} , with the eavesdropper holding degrees of freedom E such that Ψ_{ABCE} is pure. Successful distillation implies the presence of entanglement across all bipartitions $AC_1 : BC_2$ that separate A from B , where $C = C_1 C_2$.

tanglement distillation [16] (the generation of EPR pairs from the state) is not. This is because EPR pairs are necessarily uncorrelated with all degrees of freedom including any others within the system, whereas private keys need only be uncorrelated with the environment.

One of our central results is to relate the privacy of correlations, and hence entanglement, to standard probes of a thermal state’s linear response [17]. This relation allows us to explore the operational meaning of thermal entanglement throughout quantum phase diagrams. In the presence of conserved charges, we also reveal an essential

difference between canonical and grand canonical thermal ensembles, which respectively have strong and weak symmetry. In particular, we prove that mixed states with strong symmetries possess information that is perfectly shielded from the environment, which implies that arbitrarily weak correlations can be used for QKD. Using this result we show that canonical ensembles are generically nonseparable at high finite temperatures. Grand canonical ensembles are, on the other hand, exactly separable above a finite temperature [18].

Setup.— We consider two spatially separated ‘honest parties’ A and B who wish to communicate with one another while guaranteeing that no other party E (the eavesdropper) can read their message. They are given access to their respective parts of a state ρ_{ABC} , where C is the complement of AB in the system, while E holds degrees of freedom such that the global state $\Psi_{ABCE} \equiv |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$ is pure. This state can be generated repeatedly, and we denote the total number of copies used by R . In addition, A and B can use a public classical communication channel, which E can access but not modify. This setup is illustrated in Fig. 1.

Using these resources, the honest parties implement a QKD protocol, the aim of which is to generate a shared private key. The key $\vec{k} = k_1, \dots, k_{KR}$ is uniformly random over all 2^{KR} possible KR -bit strings and is accessible to both A and B ; here K is the *key rate*, with $0 \leq K \leq 1$. The key is private from the eavesdropper if all the information held by E at the end of the protocol (the quantum states and any publicly communicated data) is uncorrelated with \vec{k} [19]. Once A and B have generated this key, they can use it for one-time pad encryption over the public channel, enabling private classical communication between the two.

QKD protocol.—The strategies we consider have the following structure. In each of the R rounds, the parties A and B each perform binary local measurements on a single copy of their state. These can be described by positive operator-valued measures (POVM) $M_{A,a}$ and $M_{B,b}$, respectively, which are local operators such that e.g. the outcomes a of the measurement in A occur with probabilities $p_a = \text{Tr}[\rho_A M_a]$, where $\rho_A = \text{Tr}_{BE}[\rho_{ABE}]$, and the conditional states $\rho_{BE,a} = \text{Tr}_A[M_a \rho_{ABE}] / p_a$. Afterwards, A and B each has a random string of R independently and identically distributed bits, $\vec{a} = a_1, \dots, a_R$ and $\vec{b} = b_1, \dots, b_R$, while E has access to the corresponding conditional state $\rho_{E,a_1 b_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \rho_{E,a_R b_R}$, which they collect over the R rounds.

The amount of information that E can learn about the random variable \vec{a} using measurements on their states is upper bounded by $R\chi_E$, where

$$\chi_E = S(\rho_E) - \sum_a p_a S(\rho_{E,a}). \quad (1)$$

is the Holevo quantity [13]; here $S(\rho) = -\text{Tr}[\rho \log_2 \rho]$ denotes the von Neumann entropy. Likewise, a standard

result from classical Shannon theory implies that B can extract RI_{ab} bits’ worth of information about \vec{a} from their bitstring in the asymptotic limit $R \rightarrow \infty$, where $I_{ab} = H_a + H_b - H_{ab}$ is the mutual information, and e.g. $H_a = -\sum_a p_a \log_2 p_a$ is the Shannon entropy of a classical random variable a [20]. Heuristically, if $I_{ab} > \chi_E$, then the discrepancy $(I_{ab} - \chi_E)R$ represents the amount of information contained in \vec{a} that is available from \vec{b} , but inaccessible to E : the ‘private information’ [13].

In fact, Refs. [21, 22] present generic strategies for A and B to post-process their data such that each ends up with a copy of \vec{k} of length KR , where at large R the key rate K approaches

$$K = I_{ab} - \chi_E, \quad (2)$$

for $I_{ab} > \chi_E$, and $K = 0$ otherwise. This strategy (see [23] for an informal outline), which uses ‘one-way’ public communication from A to BE , is unconditionally private, in that there is no possible strategy for the eavesdropper to learn \vec{k} using their states and any data sent over the public channel. If party B is allowed to optimize their measurement strategy over POVMs acting on the state $\rho_{B,a_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \rho_{B,a_R}$ instead of simply applying a fixed POVM in each round, then I_{ab} is replaced by $\chi_B = S(\rho_B) - \sum_a p_a S(\rho_{B,a})$. Note that although we are considering R -round protocols (with R large) the rate in Eq. (2) is computed from properties of a single copy of the density matrix ρ_{ABE} .

Entanglement.—When E holds a purification of the mixed state, the success of this QKD protocol informs us about entanglement in ρ_{ABC} . Crucially, if ρ_{ABC} is separable between A and BC [24], then for any QKD protocol, including the one described above, the key rate $K = 0$ [14, 15, 23, 25, 26]. Therefore, if parties A and B are able to distill private keys from their local measurements, then there must be entanglement across all bipartitions of the kind shown on the right in Fig. 1. Although ρ_{ABC} must not be separable if we are to achieve $K > 0$, it is possible that ρ_{AB} is separable.

Thermal states.— We now turn to QKD from thermal states of a many-body system ABC with Hamiltonian H that is in thermal equilibrium with an environment (the eavesdropper) at finite temperature $T = 1/\beta$. The standard thermal density matrix of the system $\rho_\beta = Z_\beta^{-1} e^{-\beta H}$ where $Z_\beta = \text{Tr} e^{-\beta H}$. If H is invariant under global unitary transformations U , then ρ_β is said to have a weak symmetry $U \rho_\beta U^\dagger = \rho_\beta$. Identifying the symmetry sectors q with corresponding projectors Π_q , i.e. $H = \sum_q \Pi_q H \Pi_q$, another natural choice is to consider the thermal ensemble within a single sector, $\rho_{\beta,q} = Z_{\beta,q}^{-1} e^{-\beta H} \Pi_q$ with $Z_{\beta,q} = \text{Tr}[e^{-\beta H} \Pi_q]$, which is strongly symmetric $U \rho_{\beta,q} = \rho_{\beta,q} U \propto \rho_{\beta,q}$. When the symmetry corresponds to $U(1)$ charge conservation, ρ_β is known as a grand canonical ensemble, while $\rho_{\beta,q}$ is a canonical ensemble.

For a system density matrix ρ , which is here either ρ_β or $\rho_{\beta,q}$, the canonical purification on $ABCE$ is

$$|\Psi\rangle \propto [\sqrt{\rho} \otimes \mathbb{1}_E] |\Psi_0\rangle, \quad (3)$$

where $|\Psi_0\rangle$ is a maximally entangled state between ABC and E . By considering a scenario where party A performs weak measurements of a local operator \mathcal{O}_A , and working at the lowest nontrivial order in the strength μ of these measurements, we will relate χ_E and I_{ab} to the linear response of the thermal state and its spatial correlations, respectively.

A weak two-outcome measurement of \mathcal{O}_A can be represented by the POVM

$$M_{A,a} = \frac{1}{2}(1 + (-1)^a \mu \mathcal{O}_A), \quad (4)$$

where $a = 0, 1$ and $\mu \ll 1$. The post-measurement states of E are then $\rho_{E,a} = p_a^{-1} \rho^{1/2} M_{A,a} \rho^{1/2}$, where $p_a = \text{Tr}[\rho M_{A,a}]$. Expanding the expression for χ_E for such $M_{A,a}$ in powers of μ , we find that $\chi_E = \frac{1}{2} \mu^2 \partial_\mu^2 \chi_E + O(\mu^3)$ with [23]

$$[\ln 2]^{-1} \partial_\mu^2 \chi_E = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega [\beta \omega b(\beta \omega)] s_{\mathcal{O}_A}(\omega, \beta), \quad (5)$$

where $s_{\mathcal{O}_A}(\omega, \beta) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \langle \mathcal{O}_A(t) \mathcal{O}_A \rangle_{\beta,c} e^{i\omega t}$ is the spectral function of \mathcal{O}_A , defined here as the Fourier transform of the connected autocorrelation function [27], and $b(\beta \omega) = [e^{\beta \omega} - 1]^{-1}$ is the Bose function. To arrive at this expression we have used detailed balance $s_{\mathcal{O}_A}(-\omega, \beta) = s_{\mathcal{O}_A}(\omega, \beta) e^{-\beta \omega}$. Equation (5) is one of our central results: for thermal states (ρ_β or $\rho_{\beta,q}$) the information accessible to the eavesdropper is related to the relaxation of the observable \mathcal{O}_A .

The classical mutual information I_{ab} between outcomes of measurements in A and B depends on the measurement strategy. For the measurement of party B it is convenient to consider the POVM $M_{B,b} = \frac{1}{2}(1 + (-1)^b \mathcal{O}_B)$ with $b = 0, 1$, where we have scaled \mathcal{O}_B such that $\|\mathcal{O}_B\|_\infty = 1$. At small μ we then find $I_{ab} = \frac{1}{2} \mu^2 \partial_\mu^2 I_{ab} + O(\mu^3)$, where as above the derivative is evaluated at $\mu = 0$, and

$$[\ln 2]^{-1} \partial_\mu^2 I_{ab} = \frac{\langle \mathcal{O}_A \mathcal{O}_B \rangle_{\beta,c}^2}{1 - \langle \mathcal{O}_B \rangle_\beta^2}. \quad (6)$$

For ground states, and pure states more generally, any correlations $I_{ab} \neq 0$ between \mathcal{O}_A and \mathcal{O}_B imply entanglement across a bipartition separating A from B . Our results in Eqs. (5) and (6) generalize this statement to finite temperatures: If $\partial_\mu^2 I_{ab} > \partial_\mu^2 \chi_E$ then ρ_{ABC} is entangled across a bipartition separating A from B .

Remarkably, if the system is in a thermal state with respect to the Hamiltonian which generates its dynamics, Eqs. (5, 6) provide a straightforward way to measure the

lowest-order contribution to the key rate $\partial_\mu^2 K$ in experiment, and hence to detect bipartite entanglement.

Strong symmetry.—We now show that the information accessible to the eavesdropper often vanishes when ρ has a strong symmetry. Consider, for example, a binary POVM of the form in Eq. (4) with arbitrary μ . If U is a symmetry operator, such that $U\rho \propto \rho$, and \mathcal{O}_A is chosen such that $U\mathcal{O}_AU^\dagger = -\mathcal{O}_A$, it can be verified from the expression $\rho_{E,a} = p_a^{-1} \rho^{1/2} M_{A,a} \rho^{1/2}$ for the post-measurement states of E that $\rho_E = \rho_{E,0} = \rho_{E,1}$. From the definition of χ_E in Eq. (1) we then have $\chi_E = 0$. Therefore, in a strongly symmetric mixed state, any non-vanishing spatial correlations between symmetry-odd observables are private from E and imply bipartite entanglement.

As an application of this result, we now show that the canonical ensembles of generic $U(1)$ -symmetric systems are nonseparable at all finite temperatures. Here the canonical ensemble $\rho_{\beta,q} \propto \Pi_q e^{-\beta H} \Pi_q$ where Π_q is a projector into a sector having fixed $U(1)$ charge q . In contrast, it was recently shown that the grand canonical ensemble $\rho_\beta \propto e^{-\beta H}$ of a locally interacting system is separable for $\beta < \beta_s$ with β_s finite [18]. In generic many-body quantum systems the Hamiltonian H includes terms $\mathcal{O}_A \mathcal{O}_B$ where \mathcal{O}_A and \mathcal{O}_B act on different degrees of freedom and are odd under certain $U(1)$ symmetry transformations U . For example, in a system of qubits indexed by j for which $[H, \sum_j Z_j] = 0$, H may feature contributions $X_j X_k + Y_j Y_k$ which are odd under $U = \exp[i(\pi/2) \sum_j Z_j]$. Choosing, for example, $\mathcal{O}_A = X_j$ and $\mathcal{O}_B = X_k$, at small β we then have

$$\partial_\mu^2 I_{ab} \propto \beta^2 \text{Tr}[\rho_{0,q} \mathcal{O}_A^2 \mathcal{O}_B^2] + O(\beta^3). \quad (7)$$

Since $\chi_E = 0$ we have $K = O(\mu^2 \beta^2)$ at small μ and β , but any $K > 0$ implies that ρ_{ABC} is nonseparable across a bipartition separating A and B . Without fine-tuning, canonical ensembles are therefore entangled at large finite β .

It is clear that similar arguments apply for symmetry groups besides $U(1)$, and we offer a complementary perspective in Ref. [23]. We note also that a strong *non-abelian* global symmetry implies correlations between symmetry-odd observables even in infinite temperature states, so the condition $K > 0$ detects the bipartite entanglement recently discovered in that setting [28, 29].

Low temperatures.—We now discuss the behavior of $\partial_\mu^2 \chi_E$ and $\partial_\mu^2 I_{ab}$ for $\rho \propto e^{-\beta H}$ when H has a disordered, quantum critical, or long-range ordered ground state. Universal behavior is anticipated when the correlation length ξ of the system is much larger than microscopic length scales, and so in the following we will focus on this regime. For concreteness, we consider a system which undergoes a continuous quantum phase transition from an ordered to a disordered ground state as a parameter g is increased through a critical point g_c .




FIG. 2. QKD from thermal states of infinite transverse field Ising chains. The Hamiltonian $H = -\sum_j (Z_j Z_{j+1} + g X_j)$, with $g = 1$ a quantum critical point, $\mathcal{O}_A = X_0$, and $\mathcal{O}_B = X_x$ with $x \neq 0$. Solid lines in the main panel show the behavior of $\partial_\mu^2 \chi_E / \ln 2$ for various g (legend) and dotted lines show $\partial_\mu^2 I_{ab} / \ln 2$ for $g = 1.1$ and $x = 2, 4, 8$ (top to bottom). The black dashed line shows the scaling $\partial_\mu^2 \chi_E \sim T^2$ expected at $g = 1$. The inset shows the key length x_K , the largest x for which $\partial_\mu^2 K > 0$, as a function of $\beta = 1/T$.

At low temperatures on the disordered side ($g > g_c$), χ_E is controlled by the gap $\epsilon \sim (g - g_c)^{z\nu}$ to excitations. Here ν is the critical exponent characterizing the divergence of the $T = 0$ correlation length $\xi \sim (g - g_c)^{-\nu}$ and z is the dynamic critical exponent, with $z \geq 1$ in locally interacting systems [30]. At $T \ll \epsilon$ the contributions to $s_{\mathcal{O}_A}(\omega, \beta)$ for $0 < \omega < \epsilon$ are associated with transitions from the first excited state to higher energy states, and these contributions are suppressed by the Boltzmann weight $\sim e^{-\beta\epsilon}$ in $s_{\mathcal{O}_A}(\omega, \beta)$. Contributions from transitions across the gap, for which $s_{\mathcal{O}_A}(\omega, \beta)$ may be of order unity, are meanwhile suppressed by $b(\epsilon) \approx e^{-\beta\epsilon}$. Therefore,

$$\partial_\mu^2 \chi_{E,\text{dis.}} \sim e^{-\beta\epsilon}, \quad \partial_\mu^2 I_{ab,\text{dis.}} \sim e^{-2x/\xi}, \quad (8)$$

at low temperatures and large x , where x is the separation between A and B . The length scale x_K out to which QKD is possible, which we refer to as the key length, diverges with decreasing temperature as $x_K \sim \beta(g - g_c)^{(z-1)\nu}$ at large β .

If the ground state of H spontaneously breaks a global symmetry, and for \mathcal{O}_A and \mathcal{O}_B local (scalar) order parameters, there is a zero frequency contribution to the spectral function $s_{\mathcal{O}_A}(\omega, \beta) = \mathcal{O}_{\text{ord.}}^2 \delta(\omega) + \dots$; here $\mathcal{O}_{\text{ord.}}$ is the (β -dependent) expectation value of the order parameter in an infinitesimal symmetry-breaking field, and the ellipsis denotes contributions from nonzero ω . The implication is that, in ordered phases,

$$\partial_\mu^2 \chi_{E,\text{ord.}} \approx \mathcal{O}_{\text{ord.}}^2, \quad \partial_\mu^2 I_{ab,\text{ord.}} \approx \mathcal{O}_{\text{ord.}}^4, \quad (9)$$

where we write approximate equalities because we have omitted contributions which vanish as $T \rightarrow 0$ and $x \rightarrow$

∞ , respectively. Recalling that $\|\mathcal{O}_B\|_\infty = 1$, in general we have $\mathcal{O}_{\text{ord.}}^2 < 1$. Therefore, at large x , the lowest order contribution to the key rate $\partial_\mu^2 K = 0$ even as T is decreased to zero: in weakly symmetric ordered systems, long-distance correlations are not private from the environment. By contrast, if parties A and B measure the order parameter in a strongly symmetric system we have $\chi_E = 0$, so long-range order implies finite K at arbitrarily large x .

For systems with quantum critical ground states we can infer the behavior of $\partial_\mu^2 \chi_E$ by dimensional analysis. For \mathcal{O}_A which relaxes as $\langle \mathcal{O}_A(t) \mathcal{O}_A \rangle_{\beta,c} \sim t^{-2\Delta/z}$ for times $t \ll \beta$, with faster decay beyond this time [30], the integral in Eq. (5) scales as $\beta^{-2\Delta/z}$ at low temperatures. If \mathcal{O}_B is related to the local operator \mathcal{O}_A by translation, then quite generally the connected correlations between the two operators decay as $\sim x^{-2\Delta}$ for $x \ll \xi$, where the finite-temperature correlation length $\xi \sim \beta^{1/z}$. Comparing $\partial_\mu^2 \chi_E \sim \beta^{-2\Delta/z}$ with $\partial_\mu^2 I_{ab}$ reveals that, at low temperatures, the key length $x_K \sim \beta^{1/(2z)} \ll \xi$. In the regime where $\partial_\mu^2 K > 0$ we therefore have

$$\partial_\mu^2 \chi_{E,\text{crit.}} \sim \beta^{-2\Delta/z}, \quad \partial_\mu^2 I_{ab,\text{crit.}} \sim x^{-4\Delta}. \quad (10)$$

The behavior outlined above is surprising: at finite temperatures, the power law correlations characteristic of the quantum critical system persist out to a distance $\sim \beta^{1/z}$, but at low temperatures these correlations can only be used to detect entanglement (via QKD) out to a parametrically smaller distance $\sim \beta^{1/(2z)}$.

Ising chain.— In Fig. 2 we probe the distinction between quantum critical and disordered regimes using exact results [31] for the one-dimensional transverse field Ising model, having Hamiltonian $H = -\sum_j (Z_j Z_{j+1} + g X_j)$ with X_j and Z_j Pauli operators acting on qubit j . The ground state of this model undergoes a quantum phase transition, with $z = 1$, from a state with long-range to short-range Z correlations as g is increased through $g_c = 1$ [30]. Our focus will be on privacy in the correlations between spatially separated transverse field operators, i.e. $\mathcal{O}_A = X_0$ and $\mathcal{O}_B = X_x$.

The main panel of Fig. 2 shows the increase of $\partial_\mu^2 \chi_E$ with T for $g \geq g_c$; results for $g < g_c$ are similar. At $g = g_c$ and $T = 0$, two-point spatial and temporal correlations between transverse field operators decay with exponent $2\Delta = 2$, and at small T the exact result in Fig. 2 is in good agreement with the behavior $\partial_\mu^2 \chi_E \sim T^2$ predicted in Eq. (10). As expected, for $g > g_c$ we see a sharp decrease of $\partial_\mu^2 \chi_E$ as the temperature is decreased. In the inset of Fig. 2 we calculate x_K from a comparison between $\partial_\mu^2 \chi_E$ and $\partial_\mu^2 I_{ab}$. As expected, at $g = g_c$ the large low-frequency spectral weight causes x_K to increase more slowly with β than for $g > g_c$.

Other entanglement measures.— Having shown that local operations can reveal bipartite entanglement in the full many-body state, we now discuss alternative probes

of mixed-state entanglement. A task naturally related to QKD is entanglement distillation, where instead of private keys one distills EPR pairs from multiple copies of ρ_{AB} using local operations and classical communication [16, 32]. This is a strictly more demanding task: if EPR pairs can be prepared, one can always generate private keys by measuring these pairs in a fixed basis [22].

A computable and protocol-independent upper bound on the entanglement distillation rate is provided by the logarithmic negativity $N_{AB} := \log \|\rho_{AB}^{T_A}\|_1$ [33]. Here T_A denotes a partial transpose on A , and $\|X\|_1 := \text{Tr} \sqrt{X^\dagger X}$ is the trace norm. Even in the ground states of physical many-body systems the negativity between small subregions A and B generally vanishes when their separation x exceeds a finite value [34, 35], with entanglement distillation impossible beyond this point. Heuristically, this is because the distillation of EPR pairs by parties A and B amounts to the creation of correlations that are private not only from E but also from C . In physical many-body systems, where correlations generally decay with separation, the strong correlations between A (or B) and its immediate surroundings in C mean that the degree of decoupling necessary for entanglement distillation cannot be achieved using simple local operations. In contrast, this does not preclude key distillation in our setup, which only requires privacy from E .

Our probe of entanglement, which acquires operational meaning through cryptography, is complementary to the quantum Fisher information F , which plays an important role in metrology and which can detect multipartite entanglement [36, 37]. For pure states and for an operator \mathcal{O} we have $F = \langle \mathcal{O}^2 \rangle_c$, while for thermal states $F = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega e^{-\beta\omega} [f(\beta\omega)/b^2(\beta\omega)] s_{\mathcal{O}}(\omega, \beta)$ [38], with $f(\beta\omega) = [e^{\beta\omega} + 1]^{-1}$ the Fermi function. To compare F with our probe of bipartite entanglement consider $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_A + \mathcal{O}_B$, with \mathcal{O}_A and \mathcal{O}_B Pauli operators: the conditions $F > 2$ and $\partial_\mu^2 K > 0$ both imply entanglement across a bipartition separating A from B . Interestingly, these conditions differ even when the state is pure.

Discussion.— In this work we have shown that the distillation of private classical correlations provides an operational characterization of the entanglement intrinsic to many-body quantum systems at finite temperatures. By considering weak measurements, we showed that the information accessible in the environment is encoded in the system’s linear response. Through this relation we have shown that if spatial correlations between two observables exceed a temperature-dependent threshold, which itself vanishes in the limit where the thermal state is pure, then the state must be entangled.

In contrast to practical, few-body QKD schemes [39] (including those using small thermal states [40, 41]), in our work the eavesdropper’s state purifies a large many-body state to which A and B have only local access. This formulation of a cryptographic task is targeted at

developing a theoretical understanding of the role of local correlations in the entanglement of physical systems. Recent studies of quantum games have provided complementary operational approaches to this problem [42–44].

Using our new methods, we also reveal a general relationship between symmetries and entanglement in mixed states: strongly symmetric states are separable only in extreme cases where all correlations between symmetry-odd observables vanish [23]. This contrasts with a recent result showing that weakly symmetric thermal states become exactly separable above a finite temperature [18]. Our result also provides a general perspective on the mixed-state entanglement recently identified in the steady state of a dissipative system with strong \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry [45].

While our focus has been on thermal states describing systems at equilibrium, our methods can be adapted to the study of mixed states generated by nonequilibrium quantum dynamics. It is natural to ask when private correlations can be distilled in that setting.

Acknowledgements.— The authors are grateful to Ehud Altman, Vir Bulchandani, Sarang Gopalakrishnan and Zack Weinstein for useful comments and discussions. S.J.G. is supported by the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation. M.M. acknowledges support from Trinity College, Cambridge, and from the US National Science Foundation (NSF) Grant Number 2201516 under the Accelerated program of Office of International Science and Engineering (OISE).Material

-
- [1] G. Vidal, J. I. Latorre, E. Rico, and A. Kitaev, Entanglement in quantum critical phenomena, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 227902 (2003).
 - [2] P. Calabrese and J. Cardy, Entanglement entropy and quantum field theory, *J. Stat. Mech.: Theory Exp.* **2004** (06), P06002.
 - [3] A. Kitaev and J. Preskill, Topological entanglement entropy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 110404 (2006).
 - [4] F. Verstraete, M. M. Wolf, D. Perez-Garcia, and J. I. Cirac, Criticality, the area law, and the computational power of projected entangled pair states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 220601 (2006).
 - [5] M. B. Hastings, An area law for one-dimensional quantum systems, *J. Stat. Mech.: Theory Exp.* **2007** (08), P08024.
 - [6] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, and X.-G. Wen, Local unitary transformation, long-range quantum entanglement, wave function renormalization, and topological order, *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 155138 (2010).
 - [7] C. Castelnuovo and C. Chamon, Entanglement and topological entropy of the toric code at finite temperature, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 184442 (2007).
 - [8] M. M. Wolf, F. Verstraete, M. B. Hastings, and J. I. Cirac, Area laws in quantum systems: Mutual information and correlations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 070502 (2008).

- [9] I. Frérot and T. Roscilde, Reconstructing the quantum critical fan of strongly correlated systems using quantum correlations, *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 577 (2019).
- [10] T.-C. Lu and T. Grover, Structure of quantum entanglement at a finite temperature critical point, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **2**, 043345 (2020).
- [11] T. Kuwahara and K. Saito, Exponential clustering of bipartite quantum entanglement at arbitrary temperatures, *Phys. Rev. X* **12**, 021022 (2022).
- [12] A. K. Ekert, Quantum cryptography based on Bell's theorem, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 661 (1991).
- [13] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum computation and quantum information* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- [14] M. Curty, M. Lewenstein, and N. Lütkenhaus, Entanglement as a precondition for secure quantum key distribution, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 217903 (2004).
- [15] H. Häsel, T. Moroder, and N. Lütkenhaus, Testing quantum devices: Practical entanglement verification in bipartite optical systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 032303 (2008).
- [16] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Mixed-state entanglement and quantum error correction, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 3824 (1996).
- [17] R. Kubo, The fluctuation-dissipation theorem, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **29**, 255 (1966).
- [18] A. Bakshi, A. Liu, A. Moitra, and E. Tang, **High-temperature Gibbs states are unentangled and efficiently preparable** (2024), [arXiv:2403.16850 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.16850).
- [19] For a fixed finite R , the key produced by a given QKD protocol will only be approximately private and uniform; however, the protocol is asymptotically successful if an arbitrarily good approximation can be achieved by using sufficiently large R [22].
- [20] T. Cover and J. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory* (John Wiley & Sons, 2005).
- [21] N. Cai, A. Winter, and R. W. Yeung, Quantum privacy and quantum wiretap channels, *Probl. Inf. Transm.* **40**, 318 (2004).
- [22] I. Devetak and A. Winter, Distillation of secret key and entanglement from quantum states, *Proc. R. Soc. A* **461**, 207 (2005).
- [23] Supplemental information.
- [24] A density matrix that is separable across A and BC has the structure $\rho_{ABC} = \sum_i w_i \rho_{A,i} \otimes \rho_{BC,i}$, with $w_i \geq 0$ and both $\rho_{A,i}$ and $\rho_{BC,i}$ valid density matrices for all values of the index i .
- [25] A. Acín and N. Gisin, Quantum correlations and secret bits, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 020501 (2005).
- [26] K. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and J. Oppenheim, General paradigm for distilling classical key from quantum states, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **55**, 1898 (2009).
- [27] Thermal averages are denoted $\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle_\beta = \text{Tr}[\rho_\beta \mathcal{O}]$ while connected correlation functions between operators \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{O}' are defined by $\langle \mathcal{O} \mathcal{O}' \rangle_{\beta,c} \equiv \text{Tr}[\rho_\beta \mathcal{O} \mathcal{O}'] - \text{Tr}[\rho_\beta \mathcal{O}] \text{Tr}[\rho_\beta \mathcal{O}']$.
- [28] Y. Li, F. Pollmann, N. Read, and P. Sala, **Highly-entangled stationary states from strong symmetries** (2024), [arXiv:2406.08567 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.08567).
- [29] A. Moharramipour, L. A. Lessa, C. Wang, T. H. Hsieh, and S. Sahu, Symmetry-enforced entanglement in maximally mixed states, *PRX Quantum* **5**, 040336 (2024).
- [30] S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- [31] T. Niemeijer, Some exact calculations on a chain of spins 1/2, *Physica* **36**, 377 (1967).
- [32] D. Deutsch, A. Ekert, R. Jozsa, C. Macchiavello, S. Popescu, and A. Sanpera, Quantum privacy amplification and the security of quantum cryptography over noisy channels, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 2818 (1996).
- [33] G. Vidal and R. F. Werner, Computable measure of entanglement, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 032314 (2002).
- [34] Y. Javanmard, D. Trapin, S. Bera, J. H. Bardarson, and M. Heyl, Sharp entanglement thresholds in the logarithmic negativity of disjoint blocks in the transverse-field Ising chain, *New J. Phys.* **20**, 083032 (2018).
- [35] G. Perez and W. Witczak-Krempa, Entanglement negativity between separated regions in quantum critical systems, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **6**, 023125 (2024).
- [36] P. Hyllus, W. Laskowski, R. Krischek, C. Schwemmer, W. Wieczorek, H. Weinfurter, L. Pezzé, and A. Smerzi, Fisher information and multiparticle entanglement, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 022321 (2012).
- [37] G. Tóth, Multipartite entanglement and high-precision metrology, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 022322 (2012).
- [38] P. Hauke, M. Heyl, L. Tagliacozzo, and P. Zoller, Measuring multipartite entanglement through dynamic susceptibilities, *Nat. Phys.* **12**, 778 (2016).
- [39] V. Scarani, H. Bechmann-Pasquinucci, N. J. Cerf, M. Dušek, N. Lütkenhaus, and M. Peev, The security of practical quantum key distribution, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 1301 (2009).
- [40] E. Newton, A. Ghesquière, F. L. Wilson, B. T. H. Varcoe, and M. Moseley, Quantum secrecy in thermal states, *J. Phys. B: At., Mol. Opt. Phys.* **52**, 125501 (2019).
- [41] A. Walton, A. Ghesquiere, G. Brumpton, D. Jennings, and B. Varcoe, Thermal state quantum key distribution, *J. Phys. B: At., Mol. Opt. Phys.* **54**, 185501 (2021).
- [42] A. K. Daniel and A. Miyake, Quantum computational advantage with string order parameters of one-dimensional symmetry-protected topological order, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 090505 (2021).
- [43] V. B. Bulchandani, F. J. Burnell, and S. L. Sondhi, Playing nonlocal games with phases of quantum matter, *Phys. Rev. B* **107**, 045412 (2023).
- [44] O. Hart, D. T. Stephen, D. J. Williamson, M. Foss-Feig, and R. Nandkishore, **Playing nonlocal games across a topological phase transition on a quantum computer** (2024), [arXiv:2403.04829 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.04829).
- [45] Y. Kim, A. Lavasani, and S. Vijay, **Persistent topological negativity in a high-temperature mixed-state** (2024), [arXiv:2408.00066 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.00066).
- [46] E. H. Lieb, Convex trace functions and the Wigner-Yanase-Dyson conjecture, *Adv. Math.* **11**, 267 (1973).

QUANTUM KEY DISTILLATION PROTOCOL

In this appendix, we outline a generic QKD protocol that achieves the key rate $K = \chi_B - \chi_E$ quoted in the main text. This protocol was introduced and analyzed in full detail in Refs. [21, 22], but here we will aim to provide a simple picture of its structure.

As explained in the main text, the scenario we consider features two observers, A and B , each of who have access to non-overlapping (but not necessarily complementary) subregions of a thermal state ρ , and an eavesdropper E , who has access to some environment degrees of freedom which purify the entire state ρ . The QKD protocol consumes R copies of the state and generates a KR -bit private key \vec{k} for each of A and B . Each \vec{k} is generated with probability $\approx 2^{-KR}$. The protocol is designed such that the final state held by the eavesdropper, a tensor product over R density matrices, is uncorrelated with \vec{k} .

The first step of the protocol is for A to perform a measurement on each copy of the state. For simplicity, we restrict ourselves to binary measurements, which can be described by a two-outcome POVM $\{M_0, M_1\}$, with $M_1 = \mathbb{1} - M_0$. Writing $a_r = 0, 1$ for the measurement outcome on the r^{th} copy, the probability that A observes a string of measurement outcomes $\vec{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_R)$ is $p_{\vec{a}} = \prod_{r=1}^R \text{Tr}[M_{a_r} \rho_A]$, and the corresponding conditional states of B and E are, respectively,

$$\rho_{B, \vec{a}} \equiv \bigotimes_{r=1}^R \rho_{B, a_r}, \quad \rho_{E, \vec{a}} \equiv \bigotimes_{r=1}^R \rho_{E, a_r} \quad (11)$$

In the subsequent steps, A and B use a *codebook* $\{c\}$ to extract their copies of the key \vec{k} ; this codebook is known in advance to all parties. The codebook is a system for categorizing the 2^R possible bitstrings \vec{a} into bins referred to as codes c . Each code c in the codebook is a set of $\sim 2^{KR}$ distinct bitstrings, and we say that the bitstring \vec{a} is a codeword of c if $\vec{a} \in c$. To each codeword \vec{a} of c we associate a distinct key $\vec{k} = \vec{k}(c, \vec{a})$, a bitstring of length KR . This means that any party who knows both the code and the codeword can infer \vec{k} .

Upon finding the measurement outcomes \vec{a} , the honest party A randomly selects a code c of which \vec{a} is a codeword. They then publicly communicate the choice c of code, but do not declare \vec{a} . Party B then chooses a c -dependent measurement scheme such that they find outcome \vec{k} with high probability. Meanwhile, the initial correlations in ρ between subregions A and E are such that, when party E knows c , there is no measurement scheme that they can choose which generates \vec{k} with high probability (at large R). Since the maximum mutual information between \vec{a} and the outcomes of measurements performed by party B (E) is the Holevo quantity χ_B (χ_E), it is natural to expect that $K = 0$ unless $\chi_B > \chi_E$.

A technical result of Refs. [21, 22] shows that for any $K < \chi_B - \chi_E$ there always exists a codebook such that, with high probability, a code c will be announced satisfying the following properties

1. The conditional probabilities of the codewords $p(\vec{a}|c)$ are approximately uniform (*evenness*).
2. For all codewords $\vec{a} \in c$, the corresponding conditional states on B are near-perfectly distinguishable, i.e. there exists a c -dependent measurement process on B , described by a POVM with $\sim 2^{KR}$ elements $\Pi_{\vec{k}'}^{(c)}$ indexed by \vec{k}' , such that $\text{Tr}[\Pi_{\vec{k}'}^{(c)} \rho_{B, \vec{a}}] \approx \delta_{\vec{k}' \vec{k}}$, where $\vec{k} = \vec{k}(c, \vec{a})$ (*goodness*).
3. For all $\vec{a} \in c$, the corresponding conditional states on E are approximately indistinguishable, i.e. knowledge of c alone is not enough for party E to determine \vec{a} and hence \vec{k} : $\rho_{E, \vec{a}} \approx \sum_{\vec{a}' \in c} p(\vec{a}'|c) \rho_{E, \vec{a}'}$ (*secrecy*)

If these conditions are met, then at the end, all three parties will know c , but only the honest parties A and B have the means to learn which codeword of c occurred. Only with this information can A and B compute \vec{k} , which is therefore private from E .

Note that in the above arguments, we have been imprecise with the degree of accuracy with which the above conditions must be met, as well as the probability with which these events must happen. We refer interested readers to Ref. [22], but roughly speaking, the protocol can achieve arbitrary degrees of accuracy and certainty for any constant $K < \chi_B - \chi_E$, as long as R is taken to be correspondingly large. This demonstrates that the key rate $K = \chi_B - \chi_E$ is *asymptotically* achievable. Note that even though this protocol involves many copies of ρ , its asymptotic rate can be calculated using the single copy (or ‘single-letter’) quantities χ_B and χ_E .

Achieving the rate $\chi_B - \chi_E$ generally requires party B to optimize their measurement strategy over all operations on $\rho_{B, \vec{a}}$, a tensor product over R density matrices for subregion B . To relate the key rate to standard correlations, and to simplify this problem, we can prescribe a (suboptimal) single-copy measurement strategy for party B . In that

case, χ_B is replaced by the classical mutual information between the outcomes of measurements performed by the honest parties A and B . To see this in a simple example, suppose that party B applies a two-outcome POVM having elements $M_b = \frac{1}{2}(1 + (-1)^b \mathcal{O}_B)$ in each round and only records the outcome b . The corresponding channel acts as $\rho_{B,a} \rightarrow \sum_{b=0,1} \text{Tr}[M_b \rho_{B,a}] |b\rangle \langle b|$. After acting with this channel, the Holevo quantity χ_B for the state held by party B is exactly $I_{ab} = H_a + H_b - H_{ab}$ where e.g. $H_{ab} = -\sum_{ab} p_{ab} \log_2 p_{ab}$ is the Shannon entropy for the probability distribution $p_{ab} = \text{Tr}[M_a M_b \rho]$. Within such a scheme, we can therefore achieve a key rate $K = I_{ab} - \chi_E$. Note that, because χ_B is the maximum of the classical mutual information optimized over all measurement strategies, $I_{ab} \leq \chi_B$.

NONZERO KEY RATE IMPLIES ENTANGLEMENT

In this appendix we present a self-contained derivation of the fact that $K = \chi_B - \chi_E = 0$ for separable states. This is a simple application of the quantum data processing inequality [13]. A state of the system that is separable across the bipartition $A\bar{A}$, with $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\bar{A}}$, has the form

$$\rho = \sum_i p_i |i_A\rangle \langle i_A| \otimes |i_{\bar{A}}\rangle \langle i_{\bar{A}}|, \quad (12)$$

with $p_i \geq 0$ and e.g. $\langle i_A | i'_{\bar{A}} \rangle \neq \delta_{ii'}$ in general. Here $\bar{A} = B \cup C$, where B is the subregion accessed by B , and C is the complement of A and B within the system. A purification of this state, on $A\bar{A}E$ is $|\Phi\rangle = \sum_i p_i^{1/2} |i_A\rangle |i_{\bar{A}}\rangle |e_i\rangle$. Here $|e_i\rangle$ are a set of orthogonal states on E : $\langle e_i | e_{i'} \rangle = \delta_{ii'}$.

When party A performs their measurements and records the outcome a , the resulting classical-quantum-quantum state is

$$\sum_a |a\rangle \langle a| \otimes \sqrt{M_a} |\Phi\rangle \langle \Phi| \sqrt{M_a} = \sum_a |a\rangle \langle a| \otimes \sum_{ii'} (p_i p_{i'})^{1/2} \langle i'_A | M_a | i_A \rangle |i_{\bar{A}}\rangle \langle i'_{\bar{A}}| \otimes |e_i\rangle \langle e_{i'}|, \quad (13)$$

where M_a are the elements of the (Hermitian) POVM. The Holevo quantities χ_B and χ_E are computed from this state; note that the tensor product on the right-hand side is here ordered as $A\bar{A}E$.

Since ρ is known by all parties in advance, the eavesdropper can adopt the following strategy. Given that the state has the form in Eq. (13), party E performs a measurement in the orthogonal basis $|e_i\rangle$. If they find the outcome indexed by i , they prepare $|i_{\bar{A}}\rangle$. Following this, the density matrices of $A\bar{A}$ and AE are identical: party E has copied the conditional states of \bar{A} . Since the Holevo quantity for party E cannot increase under the action of a channel by the data processing inequality, we therefore have $\chi_{\bar{A}} \leq \chi_E$.

Finally, observe that since $B \subseteq \bar{A}$, the density matrix accessible to party B is obtained by ‘tracing out’ subregion C . This operation is itself a quantum channel: the data processing inequality implies $\chi_B \leq \chi_{\bar{A}}$. Combining these inequalities we have

$$K = \chi_B - \chi_E \leq \chi_{\bar{A}} - \chi_{\bar{A}} = 0. \quad (14)$$

Conversely, if $\chi_B > \chi_E$, the state ρ must not be separable across a bipartition separating A from B .

HOLEVO INFORMATION FOR PARTY E

Here we determine the leading-order behavior of the Holevo information for E in the case of a weak measurement of strength μ in subregion A . As in the main text, we write the POVM for this measurement as $M_a = \frac{1}{2}(I + (-1)^a \mu \mathcal{O}_A)$, with $a = 0, 1$. Because χ_E is non-negative and vanishes at $\mu = 0$, the leading contribution is second order in μ . Accordingly, we aim to evaluate the second derivative $\partial_\mu^2 \chi_E$ at $\mu = 0$.

Since E consists of degrees of freedom that purify the state ρ of the system, the post-measurement density matrices of E are $\rho_{E,a} = p_a^{-1} \sqrt{\rho} M_a \sqrt{\rho}$ with $p_a = \text{Tr}[M_a \rho]$. The Holevo quantity $\chi_E = S(\rho) - \sum_a p_a S(\rho_{E,a})$ depends only on the eigenvalues of ρ and $\rho_{E,a}$, and it is clear that $\rho_{E,a}$ is isospectral with $p_a^{-1} M_a \rho$ (assuming ρ is non-singular). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} [\ln 2]^{-1} \partial_\mu^2 \chi_E &= \partial_\mu^2 \sum_a p_a \text{Tr}[(p_a^{-1} M_a \rho) \ln(p_a^{-1} M_a \rho)] \\ &= -\partial_\mu^2 \sum_a p_a \ln p_a + \partial_\mu^2 \sum_a \text{Tr}[M_a \rho \ln(M_a \rho)], \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where a factor $[\ln 2]^{-1}$ appears on the left because we define entropies in units of bits. It is straightforward to verify that the first term on the right-hand side of the second line is $-\partial_\mu^2 \sum_a p_a \ln p_a|_{\mu=0} = -\text{Tr}[\rho \mathcal{O}_A]^2$.

The second term can be differentiated with respect to μ once using the trace identity $\partial_\mu \text{Tr}[f(X)] = \text{Tr}[(\partial_\mu X)f'(X)]$ for a differentiable function f and μ -dependent matrix X . We find

$$\partial_\mu \text{Tr}[M_a \rho \ln(M_a \rho)] = \frac{1}{2}(-1)^a \text{Tr}\left[\mathcal{O}_A \rho \left(1 + \ln(M_a \rho)\right)\right]. \quad (16)$$

Setting $\mu = 0$ in this expression it can be verified that, as stated above, $\partial_\mu \chi_E|_{\mu=0} = 0$. To differentiate (16) again, following Ref. [46], we use the integral representation of the natural logarithm of a matrix X ,

$$\ln X = \int_0^\infty dz [(1+z)^{-1} \mathbb{1} - (X+z\mathbb{1})^{-1}] \quad (17)$$

combined with $\partial_\mu[X^{-1}] = -X^{-1}[\partial_\mu X]X^{-1}$. Differentiating, setting $\mu = 0$, and summing over a we get

$$\partial_\mu^2 \sum_a \text{Tr}[M_a \rho \ln(M_a \rho)]|_{\mu=0} = \int_0^\infty dz \text{Tr}\left[\mathcal{O}_A \rho (\rho + z\mathbb{1})^{-1} \mathcal{O}_A \rho (\rho + z\mathbb{1})^{-1}\right]. \quad (18)$$

Inserting the spectral decomposition of the initial density matrix $\rho = \sum_j \lambda_j |j\rangle \langle j|$ we then find

$$[\ln 2]^{-1} \partial_\mu^2 \chi_E|_{\mu=0} = \sum_{jk} |\langle j|\mathcal{O}_A|k\rangle|^2 \lambda_j \lambda_k \frac{\ln \lambda_k - \ln \lambda_j}{\lambda_k - \lambda_j} - \text{Tr}[\rho \mathcal{O}_A]^2. \quad (19)$$

For $\lambda_j = \lambda_k$ the summand should be understood as its limit for $\lambda_j \rightarrow \lambda_k$, i.e. as $|\langle j|\mathcal{O}_A|k\rangle|^2 \lambda_j$. Since the limit $\lambda_j \rightarrow 0$ is well-defined, this expression can also be applied to cases where ρ is singular.

For thermal states we can relate χ_E to the system's dynamics. In that case, $\lambda_i = e^{-\beta E_i}/Z_\beta$ where the partition $Z_\beta = \sum_i e^{-\beta E_i}$. We define the spectral function $s_{\mathcal{O}_A}(\omega, \beta)$ for the observable \mathcal{O}_A as the Fourier transform of the connected autocorrelation function $\text{Tr}[\mathcal{O}_A(t)\mathcal{O}_A\rho] - \text{Tr}[\mathcal{O}_A\rho]^2$:

$$s_{\mathcal{O}_A}(\omega, \beta) = 2\pi \sum_{ij} \frac{e^{-\beta E_i}}{Z_\beta} \delta(E_i - E_j + \omega) |\langle i|\mathcal{O}_A|j\rangle|^2 - 2\pi \delta(\omega) \text{Tr}[\rho \mathcal{O}_A]^2, \quad (20)$$

where the dependence on β is implicit. Using the spectral function to replace the sum over eigenstates with an integral over frequencies ω , we finally obtain

$$[\ln 2]^{-1} \partial_\mu^2 \chi_E|_{\mu=0} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^\infty d\omega \frac{\beta \omega}{e^{\beta \omega} - 1} s_{\mathcal{O}_A}(\omega, \beta). \quad (21)$$

From detailed balance, $s_{\mathcal{O}_A}(-\omega, \beta) = e^{-\beta \omega} s_{\mathcal{O}_A}(\omega, \beta)$, we see that the integrand is symmetric under $\omega \rightarrow -\omega$.

CLASSICAL MUTUAL INFORMATION BETWEEN MEASUREMENTS IN A AND B

In this appendix we calculate the classical mutual information between binary measurements performed by A and B . If A applies a two-element POVM with elements $M_a = \frac{1}{2}(1 + (-1)^a \mu \mathcal{O}_A)$ and B applies a two-element POVM $M_b = \frac{1}{2}(1 + (-1)^b \mathcal{O}_B / \|\mathcal{O}_B\|_\infty)$, the mutual information between the outcomes a and b is related to connected correlations between \mathcal{O}_A and \mathcal{O}_B in the initial thermal state ρ . Note that M_b is a positive operator because we have rescaled by the spectral norm $\|\mathcal{O}_B\|_\infty$. The joint probability distribution of a and b is

$$p(s_A, s_B) = \frac{1}{4} \left(1 + b \langle \mathcal{O}_B \rangle + \mu a [\langle \mathcal{O}_A \rangle + b \langle \mathcal{O}_A \mathcal{O}_B \rangle]\right), \quad (22)$$

and the (classical) mutual information is defined by $I_{ab} = H_a + H_b - H_{ab}$ with e.g. $H_a = -\sum_a p_a \log_2 p_a$. It can be verified that $\partial_\mu I_{ab}|_{\mu=0} = 0$ and

$$[\ln 2]^{-1} \partial_\mu^2 I_{ab}|_{\mu=0} = \frac{(\langle \mathcal{O}_A \mathcal{O}_B \rangle - \langle \mathcal{O}_A \rangle \langle \mathcal{O}_B \rangle)^2}{\|\mathcal{O}_B\|_\infty^2 - \langle \mathcal{O}_B \rangle^2}. \quad (23)$$

For example, if a and b are unbiased (but in general correlated) random bits, corresponding to $\langle \mathcal{O}_A \rangle = \langle \mathcal{O}_B \rangle = 0$, this formula reduces to $[\ln 2]^{-1} \partial_\mu^2 I_{ab}|_{\mu=0} = \langle \mathcal{O}_A \mathcal{O}_B \rangle^2$.

CANONICAL ENSEMBLES ARE ENTANGLED AT HIGH FINITE TEMPERATURES

Here we provide a simple alternative proof of our result that any correlations between symmetry odd operators in a canonical ensemble imply nonseparability of the density matrix. Consider a qubit system and a density matrix ρ with strong $U(1)$ symmetry with generator $\sum_j Z_j$, such that $e^{i\theta \sum_j Z_j} \rho = e^{im\theta} \rho$ for integer m . Our proof is by contradiction. Suppose that the state ρ of $A\bar{A}$ is separable across A and \bar{A} ,

$$\rho = \sum_i p_i |i_A\rangle \langle i_A| \otimes |i_{\bar{A}}\rangle \langle i_{\bar{A}}|. \quad (24)$$

Defining $Z_A = \sum_{j \in A} Z_j$ and $Z_{\bar{A}} = \sum_{j \in \bar{A}} Z_j$, the strong symmetry implies $e^{i\theta Z_A} |i_A\rangle = e^{i\theta m_{A,i}} |i_A\rangle$ and $e^{i\theta Z_{\bar{A}}} |i_{\bar{A}}\rangle = e^{i\theta m_{\bar{A},i}} |i_{\bar{A}}\rangle$, where the integers $m_{A,i}$ and $m_{\bar{A},i}$ satisfy $m_{A,i} + m_{\bar{A},i} = m$. Now suppose that ρ has nonvanishing correlations between symmetry odd operators, such as X_j and X_k with $j \in A$ and $k \in \bar{A}$, i.e. $\text{Tr}[\rho X_j X_k] \neq 0$. If the Hamiltonian has a contribution $X_j X_k + Y_j Y_k$, correlations $\text{Tr}[\rho X_j X_k] \neq 0$ appear at first order in the high temperature expansion of the thermal density matrix. However, assuming ρ has the form indicated above, we have

$$\text{Tr}[\rho X_j X_k] = \sum_i p_i \langle i_A | X_j | i_A \rangle \langle i_{\bar{A}} | X_k | i_{\bar{A}} \rangle = 0, \quad (25)$$

which follows from the fact that e.g. $e^{i\theta Z_A} |i_A\rangle = e^{i\theta m_{A,i}} |i_A\rangle$. Because $|i_A\rangle$ has well-defined eigenvalue with respect to Z_A , the matrix elements $\langle i_A | X_j | i_A \rangle = 0$. Therefore, if ρ has strong $U(1)$ symmetry and nonvanishing correlations of any odd operators across the bipartition $A\bar{A}$, it cannot be separable across that bipartition. The implication is that, without fine tuning, canonical ensembles are nonseparable at all finite temperatures.

EXACT CALCULATIONS IN THE ISING CHAIN

Here we describe the calculations of $\partial_\mu^2 \chi_E$ and $\partial_\mu^2 I_{ab}$ in infinite one-dimensional Ising chains $H = -\sum_j (Z_j Z_{j+1} + g X_j)$, with $\mathcal{O}_A = X_0$ and $\mathcal{O}_B = X_x$. These calculations are based on the exact results for two-point correlation functions of the transverse field operator in Ref. [31]. To determine $\partial_\mu^2 \chi_E$ we use Eq. (5) and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle X_0(t) X_0 \rangle_{\beta,c} &= \left(\int_0^\pi \frac{d\varphi}{\pi} \left[\cos[\Lambda(\varphi)t] - i \sin[\Lambda(\varphi)t] \tanh[\beta\Lambda(\varphi)/2] \right] \right)^2 \\ &\quad - \left(\int_0^\pi \frac{d\varphi}{\pi} \cos[2\lambda(\varphi)] \left[i \sin[\Lambda(\varphi)t] - \cos[\Lambda(\varphi)t] \tanh[\beta\Lambda(\varphi)/2] \right] \right)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where φ is a momentum. The dispersion of excitations $\Lambda(\varphi) = 2\sqrt{(\cos\varphi - g)^2 + \sin^2\varphi}$, and $\tan[2\lambda(\varphi)] = \sin\varphi/(\cos\varphi - g)$ with $0 \leq \lambda(\varphi) \leq \pi$. Fourier transforming the above expression we find the spectral function $s_A(\omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i\omega t} \langle X_0(t) X_0 \rangle_{\beta,c}$ from which we can then calculate

$$\begin{aligned} [\ln 2]^{-1} \partial_\mu^2 \chi_E|_{\mu=0} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^\pi d\varphi \int_0^\pi d\varphi' \left[B(\Lambda(\varphi) + \Lambda(\varphi')) (1 - C(\varphi)C(\varphi')) (1 + D(\varphi))(1 + D(\varphi')) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + B(-\Lambda(\varphi) - \Lambda(\varphi')) (1 - C(\varphi)C(\varphi')) (1 - D(\varphi))(1 - D(\varphi')) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2B(\Lambda(\varphi) - \Lambda(\varphi')) (1 + C(\varphi)C(\varphi')) (1 + D(\varphi))(1 - D(\varphi')) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where for brevity we have defined $B(\omega) = \beta\omega/(e^{\beta\omega} - 1)$, $C(\varphi) = \cos[2\lambda(\varphi)]$ and $D(\varphi) = \tanh[\beta\Lambda(\varphi)/2]$. Our results for $\partial_\mu^2 \chi_E$ are based on the numerical evaluation of the double integral on the right-hand side of Eq. (27). To determine $\partial_\mu^2 I_{ab}$ using Eq. (6) we require $\langle X_0 \rangle_\beta = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi d\varphi C(\varphi)D(\varphi)$ and, defining $S(\varphi) = \sin[2\lambda(\varphi)]$,

$$\langle X_0 X_{x \neq 0} \rangle_{\beta,c} = - \left(\int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\varphi}{2\pi} e^{ix\varphi} C(\varphi)D(\varphi) \right)^2 - \left(\int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\varphi}{2\pi} e^{ix\varphi} S(\varphi)D(\varphi) \right)^2. \quad (28)$$