

# Cooperation and dependencies in multipartite systems

Waldemar Kłobus,<sup>1</sup> Marek Miller,<sup>2</sup> Mahasweta Pandit,<sup>1</sup> Ray Ganardi,<sup>1,3</sup> Lukas Knips,<sup>4,5,6</sup> Jan Dziewior,<sup>4,5,6</sup> Jasmin Meinecke,<sup>4,5,6</sup> Harald Weinfurter,<sup>4,5,6</sup> Wiesław Laskowski,<sup>1,3</sup> and Tomasz Paterek<sup>1,2,7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institute of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, Faculty of Mathematics, Physics and Informatics, University of Gdańsk, 80-308 Gdańsk, Poland*

<sup>2</sup>*School of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Nanyang Technological University, 637371 Singapore*

<sup>3</sup>*International Centre for Theory of Quantum Technologies, University of Gdańsk, 80-308 Gdańsk, Poland*

<sup>4</sup>*Max-Planck-Institut für Quantenoptik, Hans-Kopfermann-Straße 1, 85748 Garching, Germany*

<sup>5</sup>*Department für Physik, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Schellingstraße 4, 80799 München, Germany*

<sup>6</sup>*Munich Center for Quantum Science and Technology (MCQST), Schellingstraße 4, 80799 München, Germany*

<sup>7</sup>*MajuLab, International Joint Research Unit UMI 3654,*

*CNRS, Université Côte d'Azur, Sorbonne Université,*

*National University of Singapore, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore*

We propose an information-theoretic quantifier for the advantage gained from cooperation that captures the degree of dependency between subsystems of a global system. The quantifier is distinct from measures of multipartite correlations despite sharing many properties with them. It is directly computable for classical as well as quantum systems and reduces to comparing the respective conditional mutual information between any two subsystems. Secret sharing provides an exemplary cooperation task where this quantifier is beneficial. Based on the new quantifier we prove an inequality characterizing the lack of monotonicity of conditional mutual information under local operations and provide intuitive understanding for it.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Identifying and quantifying dependencies in multipartite systems enable their analysis and provides a better understanding of complex phenomena. The problem has been addressed by several communities, considering both classical and quantum systems. For example, in neuroscience and genetics measures of multipartite synergy were put forward [1–6], in quantitative sociology quantifiers of coordination were introduced [7], and in physics and information processing quantities aimed at characterizing genuine multiparty correlations were studied in depth [8–13]. The former quantifiers are motivated mathematically, keeping the combinatorial aspects of complex systems in mind, e.g., the synergy is the difference in the information all subsystems have about an extra system as compared to the total information contained in any subset of the systems. Many of the latter quantifiers involve difficult optimizations and are therefore hard to compute. Here, we introduce an operationally defined, simple and computable quantifier of multipartite dependency in terms of information gain from cooperation when some parties meet and try to deduce the variables of some of the remaining parties. We show how it differs from multipartite correlations, prove its essential properties and discuss the application to quantum secret sharing.

It turns out that, in order to compute the quantity introduced here, it is sufficient to consider the respective conditional mutual information between only two subsystems. Therefore, any operational meaning of the conditional mutual information, e.g., in terms of communication cost of quantum state redistribution [14, 15], applies to the dependence measure as well. In this context, we prove an inequality which characterizes the lack of monotonicity of quantum conditional mutual informa-

tion under general local operations.

## II. MULTIPARTITE DEPENDENCE

Let us begin by briefly recalling fundamental relationships, e.g., that two classical variables  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are statistically independent if their probabilities satisfy  $P(X_1|X_2) = P(X_1)$ . Alternatively, the statistical independence can be stated in terms of entropies with the help of both the Shannon entropy  $H(X) = -\sum_{i=1}^d P(x_i) \log_d P(x_i)$ , where  $d$  is the number of outcomes, and the conditional entropy  $H(X|Y) = -\sum_{i,j} P(x_i, y_j) \log_d \frac{P(x_i, y_j)}{P(y_j)}$ . As a measure of dependence of two variables  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  one introduces the corresponding entropic difference  $H(X_1) - H(X_1|X_2)$ , the so-called mutual information  $I(X_1 : X_2)$  [16]. Similarly, the quantum mutual information captures the dependence between quantum subsystems [17]. However, already in the case of three variables there are two levels of independence. The variable  $X_1$  can be independent of all other variables, i.e.,  $P(X_1|X_2X_3) = P(X_1)$ , or it can be conditionally independent of one of them, e.g.,  $P(X_1|X_2X_3) = P(X_1|X_2)$ . The former dependence is again captured by the mutual information  $I(X_1 : X_2X_3)$ , while the so-called conditional mutual information  $I(X_1 : X_3|X_2) = H(X_1|X_2) - H(X_1|X_2X_3)$  considers the latter. It is thus natural to define the *tripartite dependence* as the situation where any variable depends on all the other variables. This can be quantified as the worst case conditional mutual information

$$\mathcal{D}_3 \equiv \min[I(X_1 : X_2|X_3), I(X_1 : X_3|X_2), I(X_2 : X_3|X_1)]. \quad (1)$$

Due to strong subadditivity the conditional mutual information is non-negative and hence  $\mathcal{D}_3 \geq 0$  [18].  $\mathcal{D}_3$  vanishes if and only if there exists a variable such that already a subset of the remaining parties can gain the maximally accessible information about the variable in question. Note that this condition is also satisfied if a variable is not correlated with the rest of the system at all.

The value of  $\mathcal{D}_3$  can be interpreted using an alternative expression for conditional mutual information, e.g.,  $I(X_1 : X_3|X_2) = I(X_1 : X_2X_3) - I(X_1 : X_2)$ . Reformulating now (1), one recognizes that  $\mathcal{D}_3$  expresses the gain in information about the first subsystem that the second party has from *cooperating* with the third party. Accordingly, nonzero  $\mathcal{D}_3$  ensures that any two parties always gain through cooperation when accessing the knowledge about the remaining subsystem. The minimal gain over the choice of parties is an alternative way to compute  $\mathcal{D}_3$ .

In the context of quantum subsystems we can rewrite the conditional mutual information as  $I(X_1 : X_3|X_2) = S(X_1|X_2) + S(X_3|X_2) - S(X_1X_3|X_2)$ , where e.g.  $S(X_1|X_2)$  is the conditional entropy based on the von Neumann entropy  $S(\cdot)$ . Since  $S(X_1|X_2)$  is the entanglement cost of merging a state  $X_1$  with  $X_2$ , see Ref. [19], we can interpret the conditional mutual information as the extra cost of merging states one by one ( $X_1$  with  $X_2$  and  $X_3$  with  $X_2$ ) instead of altogether ( $X_1X_3$  with  $X_2$ ).  $\mathcal{D}_3$  is the minimum extra cost of this merging.

*Secret sharing.*—An example of an intuitive application of  $\mathcal{D}_3$  is (quantum) secret sharing [20–23]. In the tripartite setting, secret sharing requires collaboration of two parties in order to read out the secret of the remaining party. In the classical version of this problem the secret is a random variable, e.g., the measurement outcome of, say, the first observer. It is thus required that both, the second as well as the third party alone has only little or no information about the secret, i.e.,  $I(X_1 : X_2)$  and  $I(X_1 : X_3)$  are small, while both of them together can reveal the result of the first observer, i.e.,  $I(X_1 : X_2X_3)$  is large or unity. It is clear that the value of  $\mathcal{D}_3$  (close to its maximum) yields a measure for the working of secret sharing. Furthermore, due to the minimization in (1), the secret can be generated at any party. Below we derive the classical distributions with large  $\mathcal{D}_3$  as well as quantum states which achieve maximal dependence. Quite surprisingly these are *mixed* states belonging to the class of so-called  $k$ -uniform states [24]. It turns out that these states have perfect correlations along complementary local measurements and therefore, by following the protocol in [22], the quantum solution to the secret sharing problem offers additionally security against eavesdropping. In Appendix E we show that these states enable perfect sharing of a quantum secret (unknown quantum state) and that the value of dependence provides a lower bound on the quality of quantum secret sharing for a class of states. See Ref. [25] for an example of secret sharing with a class of pure  $k$ -uniform states.

*Correlations and dependence.*—Before we generalize to

an arbitrary number of parties and present the properties of the resulting  $\mathcal{D}_N$ , let us give a simple example that illustrates the difference between multipartite correlations and multipartite dependence. Consider three classical binary random variables described by the joint probability distribution  $P(000) = P(111) = \frac{1}{2}$ . All three variables are clearly correlated as confirmed, e.g., by quantifiers introduced in Refs. [12, 13]. However, the knowledge of, say, the first party about the third party does not increase if the first observer is allowed to cooperate with the second one. By examining her data, the first observer knows the variables of both remaining parties and any cooperation with one of them does not change this. There is no information gain and hence this distribution has vanishing tripartite dependence.

On the other hand, let us consider the joint probability distribution with  $P(000) = P(011) = P(101) = P(110) = \frac{1}{4}$ , which can describe also a classical system. Any two variables in this distribution are completely uncorrelated, but any two parties can perfectly decode the value of the remaining variable. Hence the gain from cooperation is 1 and so is the value of  $\mathcal{D}_3$ . This quantifier is thus very good for identifying the suitability of a system for secret sharing, where the secret could be at any party.

*Larger systems.*—Moving on to more complex systems, we note that there are more conditions to be considered already in order to define the four-partite dependence. In analogy to the tripartite case the first condition is to require that cooperation of any triple of parties provides more information about the remaining subsystem, e.g.,  $I(X_1 : X_2X_3X_4) - I(X_1 : X_2X_3)$  must be positive. But one should also impose that cooperation between any pair brings information gain about the two remaining variables, e.g.,  $I(X_1X_2 : X_3X_4) - I(X_1X_2 : X_3)$  must be positive. The former condition demands a positive conditional mutual information,  $I(X_1 : X_4|X_2X_3) > 0$ , while the latter one requires  $I(X_1X_2 : X_4|X_3) > 0$ . In order to compute  $\mathcal{D}_4$  one takes the minimum of these two conditional mutual informations over all permutations of subsystems. Note, however, that, e.g.,  $I(X_1X_2 : X_4|X_3) \geq I(X_1 : X_4|X_2X_3)$  and therefore it is sufficient to minimize over the conditional mutual information between two variables only. We emphasize that this step simplifies the computation significantly. The same argument applies for arbitrary  $N$  and leads to the definition of  $N$ -partite dependence

$$\mathcal{D}_N \equiv \min_{\text{perm}} I(X_1 : X_2|X_3 \dots X_N), \quad (2)$$

where the minimum is taken over all permutations of the subsystems. In the case of a quantum system in state  $\rho$  we obtain

$$\mathcal{D}_N(\rho) = \min_{j,k} [S(\text{Tr}_j \rho) + S(\text{Tr}_k \rho) - S(\text{Tr}_{jk} \rho) - S(\rho)], \quad (3)$$

where  $j, k = 1 \dots N$  and  $j \neq k$ .  $\text{Tr}_j \rho$  denotes a partial trace over the subsystem  $j$ . In general, calculating the  $N$ -partite dependence requires computation and comparison

of  $\binom{N}{2}$  values, i.e., scales polynomially as  $N^2$ , whereas for permutationally invariant systems it is straightforward.

One may also like to study  $k$ -partite dependencies within an  $N$ -partite system. To this aim we propose to apply the definitions above to any  $k$ -partite subsystem and take the minimum over the resulting values.

### III. PROPERTIES

The maximal  $N$ -partite dependence over classical distributions of  $d$ -valued variables is given by 1 (recall that our logarithms are base  $d$ ) and follows from the fact that classical mutual information cannot exceed the entropy of each variable. On the other hand, quantum mutual information is bounded by 2 and this is the bound on  $\mathcal{D}_N$  optimized over quantum states (see Appendix D). This bound is achieved by *mixed* states belonging to the class of  $k$ -uniform states, in particular for  $k = N - 1$  [24]. In the case of  $N$  qubits (for  $N$  even) the optimal states have the following form

$$\rho_{\max} = \frac{1}{2^N} \left( \sigma_0^{\otimes N} + (-1)^{N/2} \sum_{j=1}^3 \sigma_j^{\otimes N} \right), \quad (4)$$

where  $\sigma_j$  are the Pauli matrices and  $\sigma_0$  denotes the  $2 \times 2$  identity matrix. Note that  $\rho_{\max}$  is permutationally invariant and gives rise to perfect correlations or anticorrelations when all observers measure locally the same Pauli observable. These states are known as the generalized bound entangled Smolin states [26, 27]. They are a useful quantum resource for multipartite communication schemes [28] and were experimentally demonstrated in Refs. [29–34]. Per definition for  $(N - 1)$ -uniform states all reduced density matrices are maximally mixed, with vanishing mutual information, whereas the whole system is correlated. In Appendix D we provide examples of states which maximize  $\mathcal{D}_N$  for arbitrary  $d$  and show in general that the only states achieving the maximal quantum value of 2 are  $(N - 1)$ -uniform.

Let us also offer an intuition for values of  $\mathcal{D}_N$  above the classical bound of one. As shown in Appendix G this can only happen for mixed quantum states. One could then consider an auxiliary system which purifies the mixed state. High values of  $\mathcal{D}_N$  correspond to learning simultaneously the variables of the subsystems and the auxiliary system. Note that making this statement mathematically precise may be difficult as the problem is equivalent to the interpretation of negative values of conditional entropy [19, 35, 36].

As we have already emphasized, multipartite dependence is different from multipartite correlations. Nevertheless, it does share a number of properties that are expected from measures of genuine multipartite correlations. Any such quantifier should satisfy a set of postulates put forward in Refs. [11, 13]. We now show that most of them also hold for  $\mathcal{D}_N$  and we precisely characterize the deviation from one of the postulates. In Ap-

pendices A-C we prove the following properties of the dependence:

- (i) If  $\mathcal{D}_N = 0$  and one adds a party in a product state then the resulting  $(N + 1)$ -party state has  $\mathcal{D}_N = 0$ .
- (ii) If  $\mathcal{D}_N = 0$  and one subsystem is split with two of its parts placed in different laboratories then the resulting  $(N + 1)$ -party state has  $\mathcal{D}_{N+1} = 0$ .
- (iii)  $\mathcal{D}_N$  can increase under local operations. Let us denote with the bar the quantities computed after local operations. We have the following inequality:

$$\bar{\mathcal{D}}_N \leq \mathcal{D}_N + I(X_1 X_2 : X_3 \dots X_N) - I(X_1 X_2 : \bar{X}_3 \dots \bar{X}_N), \quad (5)$$

where systems  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are the ones minimizing  $\mathcal{D}_N$ , i.e., before the operations were applied.

The properties (i) and (ii) hold for all quantifiers of multipartite correlations. It is expected that measures of multipartite correlations are also monotonic under local operations (though note that often this condition is relaxed in practice, see e.g. quantum discord). In the present case, the monotonicity property does not hold in general for  $\mathcal{D}_N$ , however, property (iii) puts a bound on its maximal violation. Moreover, it has a clear interpretation: local operations that uncorrelate a given subsystem from the others may lead to information gain when the less correlated party cooperates with other parties.

Let us explain this more quantitatively for the conditional mutual information between variables  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ . While it is well-known that this quantity is monotonic under local operations on subsystems not in the condition [37], we prove in Appendix C that the following inequality is satisfied under local operations on arbitrary subsystem (being the origin of property (iii)):

$$I(\bar{X}_1 : \bar{X}_2 | \bar{X}_3 \dots \bar{X}_N) \leq I(X_1 : X_2 | X_3 \dots X_N) + I(X_1 X_2 : X_3 \dots X_N) - I(X_1 X_2 : \bar{X}_3 \dots \bar{X}_N). \quad (6)$$

The second line is non-negative due to the data processing inequality and it quantifies how much the local operations have uncorrelated the variables  $X_3 \dots X_N$  from the variables  $X_1 X_2$ . This sets the upper bound to the lack of monotonicity of the conditional mutual information.

### IV. EXAMPLES

Multipartite dependence can be computed for both classical and quantum systems and is a generic quantifier of information gain from cooperation that can be used across science. Here we discuss a few exemplary calculations and applications of  $\mathcal{D}_N$  in quantum information.

*Pure states.*—First of all, for pure quantum states  $|\Psi\rangle$ , the dependence can be further simplified as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_N(|\Psi\rangle) &= \min_{i,j} [S(\text{Tr}_i|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|)] \\ &\quad + S(\text{Tr}_i|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|) - S(\text{Tr}_{ij}|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|) \\ &= \min_{i,j} [S(\rho_i) + S(\rho_j) - S(\rho_{ij})], \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where  $\rho_i$  is the state of the system after removing all but the  $i$ -th particle, i.e.,  $\mathcal{D}_N(|\Psi\rangle)$  is given by the smallest quantum mutual information in two-partite subsystems. Here, we made use of the fact that both subsystems of a pure state have the same entropy:  $S(\text{Tr}_i\rho) = S(\rho_i)$  for  $\rho = |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$ . In Appendix G we prove the following upper bound on  $\mathcal{D}_N$  for pure states

$$\mathcal{D}_N(|\Psi\rangle) \leq 1. \quad (8)$$

It is a consequence of the trade-off relation between the quantum mutual information for different two-particle subsystems of a pure global state and the definition of  $\mathcal{D}_N$  where the smallest conditional mutual information is chosen. In particular, the bound is achieved by  $N$ -qudit GHZ state  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}(|0\dots 0\rangle + \dots + |d-1\dots d-1\rangle)$ . Additionally, the quantum mutual information is bounded by 1 whenever the state  $\rho_{ij}$  is separable [38]. A comprehensive list of dependencies within standard classes of quantum states is given in Tab. I. The analytical formula for the  $N$ -qubit Dicke states with  $e$  excitations,  $|D_N^e\rangle$ , is presented in Appendix F. In short, if one fixes  $e$  and takes the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , the dependence  $\mathcal{D}_N$  vanishes. For  $e$  being a function of  $N$ , e.g.,  $e = N/2$ , the dependence  $\mathcal{D}_N$  tends to 1/2.

*Entanglement without dependence.*—An intriguing question in the theory of multipartite entanglement is whether entanglement can exist without classical multipartite correlations [10]. The examples of  $N$ -party entangled states with vanishing  $N$ -party classical correlations are known in the literature [39–43], though the corresponding notions of classical correlations do not satisfy all the postulates of Refs. [11, 13]. Here we ask whether there are genuinely multipartite entangled states with no multipartite dependence and whether multipartite dependence can exist without multipartite correlations and vice versa. It turns out that all of those combinations are possible. There exist even pure genuinely multipartite entangled states without multipartite dependence. Consider any  $N$ -qudit cluster state (including linear, ring, 2D, etc.) for  $N \geq 4$ . It was shown in Ref. [44] that all single-particle subsystems are completely mixed and there exists at least one pair of subsystems in the bipartite completely mixed state. The corresponding entropies are equal to  $S(\rho_i) = 1$  and  $S(\rho_{ij}) = 2$ , and lead to  $\mathcal{D}_N = 0$ , due to Eq. (7). Therefore, the information about a particular subsystem cannot be increased when other subsystems are brought together which explains the impossibility of the corresponding secret sharing task [45–47]. Note that there exist other subsets of observers who can successfully run secret sharing using a cluster

$N$	state	$\mathcal{D}_3$	$\mathcal{D}_4$	$\mathcal{D}_5$	$\mathcal{D}_6$
3	$\{P_{\text{same}}\}$	0	-	-	-
3	$\{P_{\text{even}}\}$	1	-	-	-
3	GHZ	1	-	-	-
3	$D_3^1$	0.9183	-	-	-
3	$\rho_{\text{nc}}$	0.5033	-	-	-
4	GHZ	0	1	-	-
4	$D_4^1$	0.3774	0.62256	-	-
4	$D_4^2$	0.5033	0.7484	-	-
4	$L_4$	1	0	-	-
4	3-uniform	2	0	-	-
5	GHZ	0	0	1	-
5	$D_5^1$	0.2490	0.2490	0.4729	-
5	$D_5^2$	0.3245	0.3245	0.6464	-
5	$L_5$	0	0	0	-
5	$R_5$	1	1	0	-
5	AME(5,2)	1	1	0	-
6	GHZ	0	0	0	1
6	$D_6^1$	0.1866	0.1634	0.1866	0.3818
6	$D_6^2$	0.2566	0.1961	0.2566	0.5637
6	$D_6^3$	0.2729	0.1961	0.2729	0.6291
6	$L_6$	0	0	0	0
6	$R_6$	0	0	0	0
6	AME(6,2)	0	2	0	0
6	5-uniform	0	0	0	2

TABLE I. Values of the dependence for several quantum states and probability distributions.  $\{P_{\text{same}}\}$  stands for  $P(000) = P(111) = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\{P_{\text{even}}\}$  for  $P(000) = P(110) = P(101) = P(011) = \frac{1}{4}$ .  $D_N^k$  denotes the  $N$ -partite Dicke states with  $k$  excitations  $\sim |1\dots 10\dots 0\rangle + \dots + |0\dots 01\dots 1\rangle$ , with  $k$  ones,  $\rho_{\text{nc}}$  denotes the genuinely multipartite entangled state without multipartite correlations [10], the GHZ state is described in the text,  $L_4$  stands for the linear cluster of four qubits and  $\Psi_4$  is discussed in [48].  $k$ -uniform states are states where all  $k$ -partite marginals are maximally mixed, whereas AME( $n,d$ ), so-called absolutely maximally entangled states, refers to  $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ -uniform states of  $d$  dimensions [25].

state. This state also illustrates nicely that full correlations can exist without multipartite dependence. Conversely, the state  $\rho_{\text{nc}} = \frac{1}{2}|D_N^1\rangle\langle D_N^1| + \frac{1}{2}|D_N^{N-1}\rangle\langle D_N^{N-1}|$  has the property of being  $N$ -partite entangled without  $N$ -partite correlation functions [10], yet its  $\mathcal{D}_N$  is finite. This again shows that multipartite dependence is distinct from multipartite correlations and captures other properties of genuinely multipartite entangled systems.

*Increasing  $\mathcal{D}$  with local operations.*—We now give an analytical example where  $\mathcal{D}_3$  increases under local operation on the system in the condition. Consider the following classical state

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \frac{1}{2}|000\rangle\langle 000| + \frac{1}{8}|101\rangle\langle 101| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{8}|110\rangle\langle 110| + \frac{1}{4}|111\rangle\langle 111|. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$N$	state	$\mathcal{D}_3$	$\mathcal{D}_4$	$\mathcal{D}_5$	$\mathcal{D}_6$
3	$D_3^1$	0.87 (0.92)	-	-	-
3	$\rho_{\text{nc}}$	0.45 (0.50)	-	-	-
4	GHZ	0.06 (0.00)	0.95 (1.00)	-	-
4	$D_4^2$	0.42 (0.50)	0.67 (0.75)	-	-
4	$L_4$	0.90 (1.00)	0.09 (0.00)	-	-
4	$\Psi_4$	0.33 (0.42)	0.39 (0.42)	-	-
5	$\rho_{\text{nc}}$	0.25 (0.17)	0.16 (0.65)	0.171 (0.47)	-
6	$D_6^3$	0.21 (0.27)	0.13 (0.20)	0.14 (0.27)	0.21 (0.63)

TABLE II. Illustrative values of dependence for several experimental quantum states. In brackets we give theoretical predictions for ideal states.

One verifies that its 3-dependence equals  $\mathcal{D}_3(\rho) = I(X_2 : X_3|X_1) = 0.06$ , i.e., conditioning on  $X_1$  gives the smallest conditional mutual information. The application of an amplitude-damping channel with Kraus operators

$$K_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1/\sqrt{2} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad K_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (10)$$

on subsystem  $X_1$  produces the state  $\bar{\rho}$ , for which one computes  $\mathcal{D}_3(\bar{\rho}) = I(\bar{X}_1 : X_2|X_3) = I(\bar{X}_1 : X_3|X_2) = 0.19$ . Note the change in the conditioned system minimizing the dependence. The local operation on  $X_1$  has increased the information  $I(X_2 : X_3|\bar{X}_1)$  above the other two conditional mutual informations.

*Experimental states.*—Finally, we move to multipartite dependence in quantum optics experiments. Table II gathers quantum states prepared with photonic qubits in Refs. [40, 49–53]. The dependencies were extracted from experimental density matrices obtained via state tomography using the evaluation described in Ref. [54]. We have chosen to present the states illustrating the properties discussed above.

The experimental data is in good agreement with the theoretical calculations. Deviations for the six qubit state  $D_6^3$  result from reduced fidelities due to contributions of higher order noise in the state preparation. The same applies to the five qubit state  $\rho_{\text{nc}}$  derived from  $D_6^3$ . Indeed, the states denoted as  $\rho_{\text{nc}}$ , which have vanishing correlation functions between all  $N$  observers [40], clearly show a non-vanishing value for  $\mathcal{D}_N$ . Hence, these states are examples for “entanglement without correlations” and “dependence without correlations”. Similarly, the experimental data of the linear cluster state  $L_4$  indicates “entanglement without dependence” and “correlations without dependence”. In the experiment, the GHZ state  $\sim |0000\rangle + |1111\rangle$  achieves the highest dependence of all considered states and is close to the theoretical dependence  $\mathcal{D}_4 = 1$ , which is maximal over all pure states. The small value of  $\mathcal{D}_3$  for the four-partite GHZ state reflects its property of having vanishing dependence for all tripartite classically correlated subsystems.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

We have introduced a quantity, the multipartite dependence, in order to determine whether and by what amount cooperation between any subsystems brings additional information about the remaining subsystems. It is expected that this tool, which can be used in classical as well as in quantum domains, will be of broad relevance as it is directly calculable and has a clear interpretation. Furthermore, it offers an alternative to the characterization of multipartite properties via multipartite correlations.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Krzysztof Szczygielski for valuable discussions. The work is supported by DFG (Germany) and NCN (Poland) within the joint funding initiative “Beethoven2” (2016/23/G/ST2/04273, 381445721), by the Singapore Ministry of Education Academic Research Fund Tier 2 Project No. MOE2015-T2-2-034, and by Polish National Agency for Academic Exchange NAWA Project No. PPN/PPO/2018/1/00007/U/00001. W.L. and R.G. acknowledge partial support by the Foundation for Polish Science (IRAP project, ICTQT, Contract No. 2018/MAB/5, cofinanced by EU via Smart Growth Operational Programme). JD and LK acknowledge support from the PhD programs IMPRS-QST and ExQM, respectively. JDMA is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany’s Excellence Strategy - EXC-2111 - 390814868.

### Appendix A: Proof of property (i)

If  $\mathcal{D}_N = 0$  and one adds a party in a product state then the resulting  $(N + 1)$ -partite state has  $\mathcal{D}_N = 0$ .

*Proof.* Per definition, we are minimizing the conditional mutual information over all  $N$ -partite subsystems of the total  $(N + 1)$ -party state. If one takes the  $N$ -partite subsystem that excludes the added party, by assumptions  $\mathcal{D}_N = 0$ .  $\square$

In other words, if the cooperation of  $N - 1$  parties within the  $N$ -partite system does not help in gaining additional knowledge about any other remaining party, then the cooperation with any additional independent system will not help either.

### Appendix B: Proof of property (ii)

If  $\mathcal{D}_N = 0$  and one subsystem is split with two of its parts placed in different laboratories then the resulting  $(N + 1)$ -party state has  $\mathcal{D}_{N+1} = 0$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality and in order to simplify notation let us consider an initially tri-partite system where the third party is in possession of two variables labeled  $X_3$  and  $X_4$ . The splitting operation places these variables in separate laboratories producing a four-partite system. By assumption  $\mathcal{D}_3 = 0$ , but this does not specify which conditional mutual information in Eq. (1) vanishes. If this is the mutual information where the variables  $X_3$  and  $X_4$  of the third party enter in the condition, then this mutual information is also minimizing  $\mathcal{D}_4$ , and hence the latter vanishes. The second possibility is that the variables of the third party enter outside the condition, e.g., the vanishing conditional mutual information could be  $I(X_1 : X_3 X_4 | X_2)$ . From the chain rule for mutual information,  $0 = I(X_1 : X_3 X_4 | X_2) \geq I(X_1 : X_4 | X_2 X_3)$ . Finally, from strong subadditivity follows  $\mathcal{D}_4 = 0$ . In the  $N$ -partite case one writes more variables in the conditions and follows the same steps.  $\square$

### Appendix C: Proof of property (iii)

Consider a state  $\rho$  that is processed by general local operations (CPTP maps) to a state  $\bar{\rho}$ . The following upper bound on the multipartite dependence after local operations holds:

$$\bar{\mathcal{D}}_N \leq \mathcal{D}_N + I(X_1 X_2 : X_3 \dots X_N) - I(X_1 X_2 : \bar{X}_3 \dots \bar{X}_N), \quad (\text{C1})$$

where systems  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are the ones minimizing  $\mathcal{D}_N$ , i.e., before the operations were applied.

Let us begin with a lemma characterizing the lack of monotonicity of conditional mutual information under local operations.

**Lemma 1.** *The following inequality holds:*

$$I(\bar{X}_1 : \bar{X}_2 | \bar{X}_3 \dots \bar{X}_N) \leq I(X_1 : X_2 | X_3 \dots X_N) + I(X_1 X_2 : X_3 \dots X_N) - I(X_1 X_2 : \bar{X}_3 \dots \bar{X}_N), \quad (\text{C2})$$

where bars denote subsystems transformed by arbitrary local CPTP maps.

*Proof.* The conditional mutual information is already known to be monotonic under operations on systems not in the condition [37]:

$$I(\bar{X}_1 : \bar{X}_2 | \bar{X}_3 \dots \bar{X}_N) \leq I(X_1 : X_2 | \bar{X}_3 \dots \bar{X}_N) \quad (\text{C3})$$

Now we continue as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & I(X_1 : X_2 | \bar{X}_3 \dots \bar{X}_N) + I(X_1 X_2 : \bar{X}_3 \dots \bar{X}_N) \\ &= I(X_1 : X_2 \bar{X}_3 \dots \bar{X}_N) + I(X_2 : X_1 \bar{X}_3 \dots \bar{X}_N) - I(X_1 : X_2) \\ &\leq I(X_1 : X_2 X_3 \dots X_N) + I(X_2 : X_1 X_3 \dots X_N) - I(X_1 : X_2) \\ &= I(X_1 : X_2 | X_3 \dots X_N) + I(X_1 X_2 : X_3 \dots X_N), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equation is obtained by manipulating entropies such that the mutual informations containing barred subsystems come with positive sign, next we used the data processing inequality and in the last step we

reversed the manipulations on entropies. This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

To complete the proof of property (iii) we write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_N &= I(X_1 : X_2 | X_3 \dots X_N) \\ &\geq I(\bar{X}_1 : \bar{X}_2 | \bar{X}_3 \dots \bar{X}_N) - I(X_1 X_2 : X_3 \dots X_N) \\ &\quad + I(X_1 X_2 : \bar{X}_3 \dots \bar{X}_N) \\ &\geq \bar{\mathcal{D}}_N - I(X_1 X_2 : X_3 \dots X_N) + I(X_1 X_2 : \bar{X}_3 \dots \bar{X}_N), \end{aligned}$$

where in the first line we denote the subsystems such that the conditional mutual information  $I(X_1 : X_2 | X_3 \dots X_N)$  achieves minimum in  $\mathcal{D}_N$ . Next, the first inequality follows from Lemma 1, and the second inequality from the fact that  $I(\bar{X}_1 : \bar{X}_2 | \bar{X}_3 \dots \bar{X}_N)$  may not be the one minimizing  $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_N$ .

### Appendix D: Quantum qudit states maximizing $\mathcal{D}_N$

Let us consider a quantum state of  $N$  qudits, for  $N$  being a multiple of  $d$  and  $N \geq 3$ , defined as the common eigenstate of the generators

$$G_1^{(d)} = \bigotimes_{i=1}^N X^{(d)}, \quad G_2^{(d)} = \bigotimes_{i=1}^N Z^{(d)}, \quad (\text{D1})$$

composed of  $d$ -dimensional Weyl-Heisenberg matrices  $X^{(d)} = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} |j\rangle\langle j+1|$ , and  $Z^{(d)} = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \omega^j |j\rangle\langle j|$ , with  $\omega = e^{i2\pi/d}$ . The explicit form of the state can be calculated in the following way:

$$\rho_N^{(d)} = \frac{1}{d^N} \sum_{i,j=0}^{d-1} (G_1^{(d)})^i (G_2^{(d)})^j. \quad (\text{D2})$$

The state (D2) belongs to the class of  $k$ -uniform mixed states defined in [24], with  $k = N - 1$ .

It is known that for  $N$  even the state  $\rho_N^{(d)}$  has  $d^{N-2}$  eigenvalues equal to  $\frac{1}{d^{N-2}}$ , so the entropy  $S(\rho_N^{(d)})$  is equal to

$$S(\rho_N^{(d)}) = N - 2. \quad (\text{D3})$$

Since the state is  $(N - 1)$ -uniform, all reduced density matrices are proportional to identity matrices giving

$$S(\text{Tr}_i \rho_N^{(d)}) = N - 1, \quad (\text{D4})$$

$$S(\text{Tr}_{i,j} \rho_N^{(d)}) = N - 2. \quad (\text{D5})$$

Therefore, for  $N$  even

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_N(\rho_N^{(d)}) &= S(\text{Tr}_i \rho_N^{(d)}) + S(\text{Tr}_j \rho_N^{(d)}) \\ &\quad - S(\text{Tr}_{i,j} \rho_N^{(d)}) - S(\rho_N^{(d)}) = 2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D6})$$

In the case of  $N$  odd, however, the state  $\rho_N^{(d)}$  has  $d^{N-1}$  eigenvalues equal to  $\frac{1}{d^{N-1}}$ , and by analogous calculations we get

$$\mathcal{D}_N(\rho_N^{(d)}) = 1, \quad (\text{D7})$$

for  $(N - 1)$ -uniform states.

Now we show that the  $(N - 1)$ -uniform states are the only ones that can achieve  $\mathcal{D}_N = 2$ . The requirement is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_N &= I(X_1 : X_2 | X_3 \dots X_N) \\ &= I(X_1 : X_2 X_3 \dots X_N) - I(X_1 : X_3 \dots X_N) \\ &= 2,\end{aligned}\quad (\text{D8})$$

where  $X_i$  stands for individual subsystem. Since in the definition of  $\mathcal{D}_N$  we minimize over all permutations, the same equation holds for all permutations of subsystems. Due to subadditivity, the only way to satisfy (D8) is

$$I(X_1 : X_3 \dots X_N) = 0, \quad (\text{D9})$$

$$I(X_1 : X_2 X_3 \dots X_N) = 2. \quad (\text{D10})$$

From the first equation we conclude that

$$\rho_{13\dots N} = \rho_1 \otimes \rho_{3\dots N}, \quad (\text{D11})$$

which also holds for all permutation of indices. After tracing out all but the 1st and 3rd subsystem, we arrive at

$$\rho_{13} = \rho_1 \otimes \rho_3, \quad (\text{D12})$$

which means that every pair of subsystems is described by a tensor product state. It follows that any  $N - 1$  particle subsystem is described by a simple tensor product, e.g.,

$$\rho_{13\dots N} = \rho_1 \otimes \rho_3 \otimes \dots \otimes \rho_N. \quad (\text{D13})$$

Using (D10) we write

$$S(X_1) - S(X_1 | X_2 X_3 \dots X_N) = 2. \quad (\text{D14})$$

Since for the quantum conditional entropy we have

$$-S(X_1 | X_2 X_3 \dots X_N) \leq S(X_1), \quad (\text{D15})$$

the bound is achieved if

$$\begin{aligned}2 &= S(X_1) - S(X_1 | X_2 X_3 \dots X_N) \\ &\leq S(X_1) + S(X_1),\end{aligned}$$

i.e., for  $S(X_1) = 1$ . Hence, taking into account (D13), all  $N - 1$  particle subsystems are maximally mixed, i.e., the total state is  $(N - 1)$ -uniform.

### Appendix E: Quantum secret sharing

After introducing the  $(N - 1)$ -uniform states, which are maximizing the  $N$ -dependence, we now show that they naturally feature in the task of quantum secret sharing.

Suppose Alice has a quantum state  $\rho$ , called the secret, that she wants to split into  $n$  shares such that the secret is recoverable only when a party has all  $n$  shares. A quantum secret sharing scheme [23] is a map  $\mathcal{E}_n : A \rightarrow X^{\otimes n}$  such that,

$$C_Q(\text{Tr}_k \circ \mathcal{E}_n) = 0 \quad (\text{E1})$$

where  $\text{Tr}_k$  is the partial trace over an arbitrary set of subsystems and  $C_Q(\Lambda)$  is the quantum capacity of the channel  $\Lambda$ . The rate of a secret sharing scheme is given by the quantum capacity of the channel  $\mathcal{E}_n$ .

Consider that Alice prepares a quantum secret in the state  $\rho = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_0 + \sum_j s_j \sigma_j)$  of a single qubit, where  $s_j$  are the components of the Bloch vector. Her encoding map has the  $(N - 1)$ -uniform state as the Choi state [55], and one verifies that it leads to the outcome

$$\mathcal{E}_N(\rho) = \frac{1}{2^N} \left( \sigma_0^{\otimes N} \text{Tr} \rho + (-1)^{N/2} \sum_{j=1}^3 \sigma_j^{\otimes N} \text{Tr}(\sigma_j^T \rho) \right). \quad (\text{E2})$$

Since for any  $\rho$  we have  $(\text{Tr}_k \circ \mathcal{E}_N)(\rho) \propto \mathbf{1}$ , it follows that  $C_Q(\text{Tr}_k \circ \mathcal{E}_N) = 0$ , i.e., no subset of observers can recover the quantum secret. All of them, however, can recover it perfectly with the decoding map

$$\mathcal{D}_N(\rho_N) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sigma_0 + (-1)^{N/2} \sum_j \text{Tr}(\sigma_j^{\otimes N} \rho_N) \sigma_j \right)^T, \quad (\text{E3})$$

where  $\rho_N = \mathcal{E}_N(\rho)$ .

We now show that any  $(N + 1)$ -partite state  $\rho_c$  with maximally mixed marginals and non-classical dependence  $\mathcal{D}_{N+1}(\rho_c) > 1$  is useful for quantum secret sharing. Consider the encoding map  $\mathcal{E}_c : A \rightarrow X^{\otimes N}$  with the Choi state given by  $\rho_c$ , i.e.,  $(\mathbf{1} \otimes \mathcal{E}_c)(|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|) = \rho_c$ , where  $|\Phi\rangle$  is the maximally entangled state. The rate of quantum secret sharing admits the lower bound

$$R = C_Q(\mathcal{E}_c) \quad (\text{E4a})$$

$$\geq \sup_{\phi_{AN}} -S_{A|X_1\dots X_N}((\mathbf{1} \otimes \mathcal{E}_c)(\phi_{AN})) \quad (\text{E4b})$$

$$\geq -S_{A|X_1\dots X_N}(\rho_c) \quad (\text{E4c})$$

$$= I(A : X_1 | X_2 \dots X_N) - S(A | X_2 \dots X_N) \quad (\text{E4d})$$

$$\geq I(A : X_1 | X_2 \dots X_N) - 1 \quad (\text{E4e})$$

$$\geq \mathcal{D}_{N+1}(\rho_c) - 1. \quad (\text{E4f})$$

The steps are justified as follows. The first line follows from definition. Ineq. (E4b) is the result of computing the quantum capacity of a channel [56–61], (E4c) follows because the maximally entangled state is a particular choice of  $\phi_{AN}$ , and the Choi state of  $\mathcal{E}_c$  is  $\rho_c$ . Eqs. (E4d) and (E4e) follow from the properties of entropy recalling that our logarithms are base  $d$ . Finally, the dependence is the worst case conditional mutual information.

Since the marginals of  $\rho_c$  are maximally mixed, the same holds for the encoded state  $\rho_N = \mathcal{E}_c(\rho)$ , i.e., no subset of parties can recover the quantum secret alone, yet for all of them together  $R > 0$  holds for  $\mathcal{D}_{N+1}(\rho_c) > 1$ .

### Appendix F: Dependence of Dicke states

We now present an analytical formula for  $\mathcal{D}_N^e$  in  $N$ -qubit Dicke states with  $e$  excitations. For that state it is

given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_N(D_N^e) &= \binom{N}{e}^{-1} \left[ -\frac{2(N-1)! \log\left(\frac{e}{N}\right)}{(e-1)!(N-e)!} \right. \\ &\quad - 2\binom{N-1}{e} \log\left(1 - \frac{e}{N}\right) + \binom{N-2}{e-2} \log\left(\frac{\binom{N-2}{e}}{\binom{N}{e}}\right) \quad (\text{F1}) \\ &\quad \left. + 2\binom{N-2}{e-1} \log\left(\frac{2\binom{N-2}{e-1}}{\binom{N}{e}}\right) + \binom{N-2}{e} \log\left(\frac{\binom{N-2}{e}}{\binom{N}{e}}\right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This comes from the fact that for a general Dicke state with  $e$  excitations all one-partite reduced density matrices  $\{\rho_i\}$  have the two non-zero eigenvalues  $e/N$  and  $(N-e)/N$ , while all two-partite reduced states  $\{\rho_{ij}\}$  have the three non-vanishing eigenvalues  $e(e-1)/N(N-1)$ ,  $2e(N-e)/N(N-1)$ , and  $(N-e-1)(N-e)/N(N-1)$ . For  $e$  as a function of the number of parties,  $e = N/k$ , in the limit of  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , the  $N$ -dependence converges to a finite value, i.e.,  $\mathcal{D}_N(D_N^e)$  tends to  $2(k-1)/k^2$ . The maximally achievable dependence of  $1/2$  is reached for  $e = N/2$ . For an arbitrarily chosen constant  $e$  (e.g., for the W state,  $e = 1$ ),  $\mathcal{D}_N(D_N^e)$  tends to 0 for  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

These results allow to answer the following question: If  $\mathcal{D}_N \leq 1$ , are there local measurements on the subsystems with classical outcomes having conditional mutual information equal to  $\mathcal{D}_N$ ? The answer is negative. We have optimized the conditional informations over local measurements for Dicke states with  $N = 3, 4$  and  $0 < e < N$ , and observed that the values obtained are always smaller than  $\mathcal{D}_N$ .

## Appendix G: Bounds on mutual $N$ -dependence

### a. Bound on mixed states

The subadditivity of quantum entropy states that for the reduced quantum states we have

$$S(\text{Tr}_j \rho) \leq S(\text{Tr}_{ij} \rho) + S(\rho_i), \quad (\text{G1})$$

$$S(\text{Tr}_i \rho) - S(\rho_i) \leq S(\rho), \quad (\text{G2})$$

where  $\rho_i$  is the reduced state of the  $i$ -th particle. Using the above inequalities we write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_N(\rho) &\leq S(\text{Tr}_i \rho) - S(\rho) + S(\text{Tr}_j \rho) - S(\text{Tr}_{ij} \rho) \\ &\leq S(\rho_i) + S(\rho_j) \\ &\leq 2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G3})$$

### b. Bounds on pure states

Now we prove that for pure states we have  $\mathcal{D}_N(\rho) \leq 1$ . Note that due to Eq. (7) from the main text we need to find the smallest mutual information  $I(\rho_i : \rho_j)$ , where  $\rho_i, \rho_j$  are subsystems of the pure state  $\rho$ . Consider

$$I(\rho_i : \rho_j) + I(\rho_j : \rho_k) \quad (\text{G4})$$

$$= S(\rho_i) + S(\rho_j) - S(\rho_{ij}) + S(\rho_j) + S(\rho_k) - S(\rho_{jk})$$

$$\leq 2S(\rho_j)$$

$$\leq 2, \quad (\text{G5})$$

where the first inequality comes from the strong subadditivity of entropy

$$S(\rho_i) + S(\rho_k) \leq S(\rho_{ij}) + S(\rho_{jk}). \quad (\text{G6})$$

Hence, this monogamy relation with respect to mutual information proves that there is always a bipartite subsystem with mutual information bounded by 1.

- 
- [1] T. Gawne and B. Richmond, *Journal of Neuroscience* **13**, 2758 (1993).  
[2] I. Gat and N. Tishby, in *Proceedings of the 1998 Conference on Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, 1999) pp. 111–117.  
[3] E. Schneidman, W. Bialek, and M. J. Berry, *Journal of Neuroscience* **23**, 11539 (2003).  
[4] E. Schneidman, S. Still, M. J. Berry, and W. Bialek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 238701 (2003).  
[5] V. Varadan, I. Miller, David M., and D. Anastassiou, *Bioinformatics* **22**, e497 (2006).  
[6] D. Anastassiou, *Molecular Systems Biology* **3**, 83 (2007).  
[7] D. Trendafilov, D. Polani, and R. Murray-Smith, *2015 17th UKSim-AMSS International Conference on Modelling and Simulation (UKSim)*, , 361 (2015).  
[8] D. L. Zhou, B. Zeng, Z. Xu, and L. You, *Phys. Rev. A* **74**, 052110 (2006).  
[9] D. L. Zhou, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 180505 (2008).  
[10] D. L. Zhou, B. Zeng, Z. Xu, L. You, V. Vedral, and A. Winter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 070502 (2008).  
[11] C. H. Bennett, A. Grudka, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 012312 (2011).  
[12] G. L. Giorgi, B. Bellomo, F. Galve, and R. Zambrini, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 190501 (2011).  
[13] D. Girolami, T. Tufarelli, and C. E. Susa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 140505 (2017).  
[14] I. Devetak and J. Yard, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 230501 (2008).  
[15] F. G. S. L. Brandao, A. W. Harrow, J. Oppenheim, and S. Strelchuk, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 050501 (2015).



- [16] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory* (Wiley-Interscience, 2006).
- [17] K. Modi, T. Paterek, W. Son, V. Vedral, and M. Williamson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 080501 (2010).
- [18] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- [19] M. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, and A. Winter, *Nature* **436**, 673 (2005).
- [20] A. Shamir, *ACM* **22**, 612 (1979).
- [21] G. R. Blakley, *Proceedings of AFIPS'79* **48**, 313 (1979).
- [22] M. Hillery, V. Bužek, and A. Berthiaume, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 1829 (1999).
- [23] H. Imai, J. Müller-Quade, A. C. A. Nascimento, P. Tuyls, and A. Winter, *Quantum Info. Comput.* **5**, 69 (2005).
- [24] W. Kłobus, A. Burchardt, A. Kołodziejcki, M. Pandit, T. Vértesi, K. Życzkowski, and W. Laskowski, *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 032112 (2019).
- [25] W. Helwig, W. Cui, J. I. Latorre, A. Riera, and H.-K. Lo, *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 052335 (2012).
- [26] J. A. Smolin, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 032306 (2001).
- [27] R. Augusiak and P. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 012318 (2006).
- [28] R. Augusiak and P. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. A* **74**, 010305R (2006).
- [29] E. Amselem and M. Bourennane, *Nat. Phys.* **5**, 748 (2009).
- [30] J. Lavoie, R. Kaltenbaek, M. Piani, and K. J. Resch, *Nat. Phys.* **6**, 827 (2010).
- [31] E. Amselem and M. Bourennane, *Nat. Phys.* **6**, 827 (2010).
- [32] J. Lavoie, R. Kaltenbaek, M. Piani, and K. J. Resch, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 130501 (2010).
- [33] J. Barreiro, P. Schindler, O. Gühne, T. Monz, M. Chwalla, C. F. Roos, M. Hennrich, and R. Blatt, *Nat. Phys.* **6**, 943 (2010).
- [34] E. Amselem, M. Sadiq, and M. Bourennane, *Sci. Rep.* **3**, 1966 (2013).
- [35] L. del Rio, J. Aberg, R. Renner, O. Dahlsten, and V. Vedral, *Nature* **474**, 61 (2011).
- [36] T. K. Chuan, J. Maillard, K. Modi, T. Paterek, M. Paternostro, and M. Piani, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 070501 (2012).
- [37] M. M. Wilde, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **51**, 374002 (2018).
- [38] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 865 (2009).
- [39] W. Laskowski, M. Markiewicz, T. Paterek, and M. Wieśniak, *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 032105 (2012).
- [40] C. Schwemmer, L. Knips, M. C. Tran, A. de Rosier, W. Laskowski, T. Paterek, and H. Weinfurter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 180501 (2015).
- [41] S. Designolle, O. Giraud, and J. Martin, *Phys. Rev. A* **96**, 032322 (2017).
- [42] M. C. Tran, M. Zuppardo, A. de Rosier, L. Knips, W. Laskowski, T. Paterek, and H. Weinfurter, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 062331 (2017).
- [43] W. Kłobus, W. Laskowski, T. Paterek, M. Wieśniak, and H. Weinfurter, *Eur. Phys. J. D* **73**, 29 (2019).
- [44] P. Hyllus, O. Gühne, and A. Smerzi, *Phys. Rev. A* **82**, 012337 (2010).
- [45] D. Markham and B. C. Sanders, *Phys. Rev. A* **78**, 042309 (2008).
- [46] A. Keet, B. Fortescue, D. Markham, and B. C. Sanders, *Phys. Rev. A* **82**, 062315 (2010).
- [47] D. Markham and B. C. Sanders, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 019901 (2010).
- [48] H. Weinfurter and M. Żukowski, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 010102 (2001).
- [49] N. Kiesel, C. Schmid, G. Toth, E. Solano, and H. Weinfurter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 063604 (2007).
- [50] G. Toth, W. Wieczorek, D. Gross, R. Krischek, C. Schwemmer, and H. Weinfurter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 250403 (2010).
- [51] R. Krischek, W. Wieczorek, A. Ozawa, N. Kiesel, P. Michelberger, T. Udem, and H. Weinfurter, *Nat. Photonics* **4**, 170 (2010).
- [52] R. Krischek, C. Schwemmer, W. Wieczorek, H. Weinfurter, P. Hyllus, L. Pezze, and A. Smerzi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 080504 (2011).
- [53] L. Knips, C. Schwemmer, N. Klein, M. Wieśniak, and H. Weinfurter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 210504 (2016).
- [54] L. Knips, C. Schwemmer, N. Klein, J. Reuter, G. Tóth, and H. Weinfurter, *ArXiv e-prints* (2015), arXiv:1512.06866 [quant-ph].
- [55] M.-D. Choi, *Linear Alg. Appl.* **10**, 285 (1975).
- [56] B. Schumacher, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 2614 (1996).
- [57] B. Schumacher and M. A. Nielsen, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 2629 (1996).
- [58] H. Barnum, M. A. Nielsen, and B. Schumacher, *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, 4153 (1998).
- [59] H. Barnum, E. Knill, and M. A. Nielsen, *IEEE Trans. Info. Theor.* **46**, 1317 (2000).
- [60] S. Lloyd, *Phys. Rev. A* **55**, 1613 (1997).
- [61] I. Devetak, *IEEE Trans. Info. Theor.* **51**, 44 (2005).