Multi-User Distillation of Common Randomness and Entanglement from Quantum States

Farzin Salek and Andreas Winter

arXiv:2008.04964v1 [quant-ph] 11 Aug 2020

Abstract

We construct new protocols for the tasks of converting noisy multipartite quantum correlations into noiseless classical and quantum ones using local operations and classical communications (LOCC). For the former, known as common randomness (CR) distillation, two new lower bounds on the "distillable common randomness", an operational measure of the total genuine (classical) correlations in a quantum state, are obtained. Our proof relies on a generalization of communication for omniscience (CO) [Csiszár and Narayan, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory 50:3047-3061, 2004]. Our contribution here is a novel simultaneous decoder for the compression of correlated classical sources by random binning with quantum side information at the decoder. For the latter, we derive two new lower bounds on the rate at which Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) states can be asymptotically distilled from any given pure state under LOCC. Our approach consists in "making coherent" the proposed CR distillation protocols and recycling of resources [Devetak *et al.* IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory 54(10):4587-4618, 2008]. The first lower bound is identical to a recent result by Vrana and Christandl [IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory 65(9):5945-5958, 2019], which is based on a combinatorial method to achieve the same rate. Our second lower bound generalises and improves upon this result, and unifies a number of other known lower bounds on GHZ distillation.

I. Introduction and preliminaries

Interconversion between various resources is one of the big ongoing programs of quantum and classical information theory for a considerable time [2]. Within that broad class of questions, the transformations of multipartite quantum states into other forms has provided considerable inspiration. A particularly prototypical example of this is bipartite entanglement of pure states: in the asymptotic setting of many copies of a pure state, not only can each pure state $|\psi\rangle^{AB}$ be converted to EPR states $|\phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle|0\rangle + |1\rangle|1\rangle)$ at rate $E(\psi) = S(A)_\psi$ by local operations and classical communication (LOCC), where $S(A)_\rho = -\mathrm{Tr}\rho^A \log \rho^A$ is the von Neumann entropy of the reduced state of a quantum state ρ^{AB}, the same rate governs the reverse transformation from ϕ to ψ [3]. The story is far less satisfying for mixed states [4], nevertheless this raised certain expectations for multipartite pure states: while it is clear that there cannot be a single "gold standard" like the EPR state in the bipartite setting – as EPR states between any pair of m parties are inequivalent to EPR states between any other pair –, the question arose whether there is a "minimal reversible entanglement generating set" (MREGS) [5]. In the latter paper, it was shown that for $m \geq 4$ parties, also the GHZ state $|\Gamma_m\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle^{\otimes m} + |1\rangle^{\otimes m})$ needs to be part of an MREGS, and in [6] this was extended to $m = 3$. Since then, increasing lower bounds on the size of an MREGS have been proved, and it is conceivable that any MREGS is infinitely large. For a broad overview over the history and state of the art in multipartite entanglement, see the review [7].

In any case, the frustrated hope of the MREGS programme has made researchers reevaluate what we actually want from our theory of state conversions. One big component, rather than a universal normal form, is knowledge how, and how efficiently, to transform a given m-partite pure state $|\psi\rangle^{A_1\ldots A_m}$ into a specific desired target state. In the multipartite setting, this presents a problem of choice. There seem to be at least two canonical options: first, aim for EPR states between designated pairs of parties, and second, an m-party GHZ state. The first problem has an elegant solution, based on quantum state merging [8]. If EPR states are to be distilled between a specific pair of parties, say i and j, then the optimal rate (capacity) is the following number [9]:

$$C_{\mathrm{EPR}(i:j)}(\psi) = \min_I S(A_I)_\psi \text{ s.t. } i \in I \subseteq [m] \setminus j. \tag{1}$$

If we want to distill EPR states between different pairs of parties simultaneously, there are partial results, for example outer rate bounds from the subgroup entropies, all of which are monotones [5, Lemma 1 & Thm. 2], i.e. each $S(A_I)$, for $I \subseteq [m]$, is a monotone under asymptotic LOCC; furthermore, [6] gives asymptotic monotones for certain state conversions based on the quantum relative entropy. And there is the "entanglement combing" protocol that yields EPR pairs between a single party and each of the other $m-1$ [10]. These tasks of creating pairwise (EPP type) entanglement between nodes, assisted by the others, is very much tied to the objectives of the so-called quantum internet [11], [12]. As for GHZ distillation, also this is

The authors are with Física Teòrica: Informació i Fenòmens Quàntics, Departament de Física, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona), Spain.

FS is with Departamento de Teoría de la Señal y Comunicaciones (TSC), Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain. Email: farzin.salek@gmail.com

AW is with ICREA—Institució Catalana de Recerca i Estudis Avançats, Pg. Lluis Companys, 23, 08010 Barcelona, Spain. Email: andreas.winter@uab.cat

Dated: 10 August 2020. A short version of this work has been presented at ISIT 2020 [1].

evidently relevant for the quantum internet, but has received considerably less attention; we review some of the relevant prior work below.

In the present paper, we address this second-tier type of question via a two-pronged strategy. The first resource conversion we study is the task of converting noisy multipartite quantum correlations, i.e. an m-partite quantum state ($m \geq 2$), into noiseless m-partite classical correlations, i.e. common randomness (CR), under local operations and classical communications (LOCC). Intuitively, CR is a random variable that is uniformly distributed and known to all m parties. It is known that distillation of CR without additional classical communication is generically impossible [13]. On the other hand, since classical communication and CR are not "orthogonal" resources, allowing free classical communications is not appropriate, because it can be used to create unlimited CR. However, one can consider two interesting directions: imposing a secrecy requirement on CR, or limiting the classical communication. In this paper, we are concerned with the second direction; the first one, known as key distillation, was studied by Maurer [14], Ahlswede and Csiszár [15] and its quantum generalization in [16]. The problem of distilling CR from two correlated random variables under one-way classical communication of R bits per source observation was studied by Ahlswede and Csiszár [13] (see the paper for other models). Subsequently, their model was generalized in [17], introducing the *distillable CR*, the amount of CR generated in excess of the consumed classical communication. When the classical communication is one-way, the distillable CR is still an (asymmetric) measure of the total classical correlations in the state [18]. For a recent review of multi-party key distillation see [19].

In Section II we prove two lower bounds on the distillable CR from multipartite mixed quantum states. We do this by offering a generalization of a result in multi-terminal distributed lossless source coding and secret key agreement due to Csiszár and Narayan [20] known as *communication for omniscience* (CO). There, m parties observe a correlated discrete memoryless multiple source $X_{[m]} = (X_1, \ldots, X_m)$, the i-th node obtaining X_i. The nodes are allowed to communicate interactively over a public noiseless broadcast channel so that at the end they attain omniscience: each node reconstructs the whole vector of observations $X_{[m]}$. The objective is to minimise the overall communication to achieve this goal. We first apply the main result of [20] to the outcomes of local measurements on an m-partite quantum states, and then generalize this result to partial measurements, modelled as instruments, such that each party not only has a classical information X_i but also a quantum register A'_i containing containing correlated quantum side information. It uses a novel random binning coding and decoding strategy for the problem of correlated source compression with quantum side information at the decoder, presented in a concise way in the Appendix. The reason for the secrecy rate being exactly the difference between the entropy of $X_{[m]}$ and the total communication rate R_{CO} is that this is attained by privacy amplification. We note that the same rate is also an achievable rate for the distillable CR by the recycling of resources idea; for more on their relation see [21].

Our second problem concerns converting multipartite quantum correlation into noiseless quantum correlation, i.e. the so-called entanglement distillation task (Section III). The theory of asymptotic manipulation of multipartite entanglement is very complex, even in the pure state case a simple theory as is known for bipartite pure states, is probably forever beyond reach; for mixed states, already the bipartite case defies complete analysis, so much so that it is even open whether there are bound entangled states with non-positive partial transpose (NPT). For these reasons, for the task of entanglement distillation, we focus on the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) distillation problem, and on pure initial states. Very little previous work has concerned itself with the asymptotic rate of GHZ distillation, despite such states being evidently useful for cryptography [22]. The important exceptions are Smolin *et al.* [23], Fortescue and Lo [24] and Streltsov *et al.* [25]; furthermore [26] for stabilizer states and exact distillation. In [27], general upper rate bounds are established that go beyond the entropy and relative entropy bounds from [5], [6].

Motivated by the recent paper [28], which treats the distillation of multipartite GHZ states from many copies of a given multipartite pure state and presents an achievable rate based on a combinatorial construction, we realised that the same rate can be obtained and improved using off-the-shelf techniques of quantum Shannon theory from the early 2000s, namely the coherification of protocols for CR distillation. The first lower bound reproduces the result of Vrana and Christandl [28], and the second protocol improves upon this lower bound. To the best of our knowledge it is the best available bound, subsuming a number of other previous results.

In Section IV we conclude the paper with a brief discussion and three example states for which we can compare our new and the old achievable rates of GHZ distillation.

Notation. Capital letters X, Y, etc. denote random variables, whose realizations and the alphabets are shown by the corresponding small and calligraphic letters, respectively: $X = x \in \mathcal{X}$. Quantum systems A, B, etc. are associated with (finite-dimensional) Hilbert spaces A, B, etc. whose dimensions are denoted by $|A|$, $|B|$, etc. Multipartite systems $AB\ldots Z$ are described by tensor product Hilbert space $A \otimes B \otimes \cdots \otimes Z$. We identify states with their density operators and use superscripts to denote the systems on which the mathematical objects are defined. For any positive integer m, we use the notation $[m] = \{1, ..., m\}$. For conciseness, we denote the tuple $(X_1, .., X_m)$ by $X_{[m]}$. More generally, for a set L, we write $X_L = (X_i : i \in L)$. Throughout the paper, $\log$ denotes by default the binary logarithm.

Beyond the von Neumann entropy of a state, we also use the conditional von Neumann entropy of a bipartite state ρ^{AB}, defined as $S(A|B) = S(AB) - S(B)$, and the quantum mutual information $I(A : B) = S(A) + S(B) - S(AB)$. For classical systems (random variables), the von Neumann entropy reduces to the Shannon entropy, denoted $H(X)$.

II. Common randomness distillation and omniscience

We shall consider *common randomness distillation* (in the source model). This means that we have m spatially separated parties sharing $n \gg 1$ copies of an m-partite quantum state $\rho^{A_1\dots A_m}$, i.e. party i holds the subsystem A_i^n. All parties can communicate to each other through a public noiseless classical broadcast channel of unlimited capacity. The following definition is a generalization of the bipartite case in [29].

Definition 1 (Common randomness distillation protocol): Let ρ be a state on $A_{[m]} = A_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes A_m$, and consider the initial state $\rho^{\otimes n}$. Let r be the total number of rounds; for $i \in [m]$, let B_i be a local quantum system used by party i to store quantum information, originally in state $|0\rangle\langle 0|$; for $j \in [r]$, let $U_{i_j}^j$ be classical systems to store the classical communication of party i_j after round j.

Step 1) Terminal $i_1 \in [m]$ applies the completely positive instrument

$$\Phi_{i_1}^1 : A_{i_1}^n \otimes B_{i_1} \to A_{i_1}^n \otimes B_{i_1} \otimes U_{i_1}^1,$$

and broadcasts $U_{i_1}^1$ to the other parties. This means that the shared state $\rho^{\otimes n}$ is mapped to the state

$$\rho^{(1)} = \sum_u (\mathrm{id}_{A_{[m]\setminus i_1}^n} \otimes \Phi_{i_1}^1(u))(\rho^{\otimes n} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|^{B_{i_1}}) \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|^{B_{[m]\setminus i_1}} \otimes |u\rangle\langle u|^{U_{i_1}^1}$$

on $A_{[m]}^n \otimes B_{[m]} \otimes U_{i_1}^1$.

Step j) Terminal $i_j \in [m]$ applies a completely positive map

$$\Phi_{i_j}^j : A_{i_j}^n \otimes B_{i_j} \otimes U^{[j-1]} \to A_{i_j}^n \otimes B_{i_j} \otimes U^{[j]},$$

where we use the shorthand $U^{[j-1]} = U_{i_1}^1 U_{i_2}^2 \dots U_{i_{j-1}}^{j-1}$, and broadcasts $U_{i_j}^j$ to the rest of the parties. This maps the previous state $\rho^{(j-1)}$ to the new state $\rho^{(j)}$ on $A_{[m]}^n \otimes B_{[m]} \otimes U^{[j]}$.

Step r+1) After the last communication, each party $i \in [m]$, measures its systems by means of a POVM on $A_i^n \otimes B_i \otimes U^{[r]}$ and indexed by $\{1, \dots, |V|\}$, giving rise to a random variable V_i with distribution $p_i(v)$.

Let R_i denote the total rate of classical communication by the i-th party.

Remark 2: This CR distillation protocol is a general LOCC procedure, in which we explicitly keep track of the classical communication.

Definition 3: A number $R = \frac{1}{n}\log|V| - \sum_{i=1}^m R_i$ will be called an achievable distillable CR rate for common randomness distillation if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and sufficiently large n, there exists a common randomness distillation protocol where the total communication of party i is bounded by nR_i bits, such that $\{V_i\}_{i=1}^m$ satisfy

$$\Pr\{V_1 = \dots = V_m\} \geq 1 - \varepsilon, \tag{2}$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\|p_1 - u_V\|_1 = \frac{1}{2}\sum_v \left| p_1(v) - \frac{1}{|V|} \right| \leq \varepsilon, \tag{3}$$

where u_V denotes the uniform distribution. The maximal achievable rate for distillable CR is called the *distillable CR capacity* $D_{CR}(\rho)$.

Now, we prove two achievability results for the distillable CR rate, and in the next section two achievability results for the distillable GHZ rate, all based on a subclass of protocols with "non-interactive communication", which are called this way because each party broadcasts only one message to all others that depends only on their own local state. The proof of the distillable CR results is based on our generalization of the communication for omniscience (CO) [20]. We present two protocols for our achievability bounds. The first protocol uses full local measurements and communication; the second uses instruments that initially turn the state into a classical-quantum state, and then generalizes the first.

Theorem 4: Let $\rho^{A_1\dots A_m}$ be a quantum state and let $\{M_{x_i}^i\}_{x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i}$ denote a POVM used by party i. Define $p(x_{[m]})$ as the joint distribution of m random variables X_i recording the measurement outcomes on ρ:

$$p(x_1, \dots, x_m) = \mathrm{Tr}\rho(M_{x_1}^1 \otimes \cdots \otimes M_{x_m}^m).$$

The following is an achievable rate for the distillable CR:

$$R = H(X_{[m]}) - R_{\mathrm{CO}}^c,$$

where $R_{\mathrm{CO}}^c = \min_{R_{[m]} \in \mathcal{R}_c} \sum_{i=1}^m R_i$, and $\mathcal{R}_c$ is the rate region of tuples $R_{[m]} = (R_1, \dots, R_m)$ given as follows:

$$\forall L \subsetneq [m] \quad \sum_{j \in L} R_j \geq H(X_L | X_{[m]\setminus L}).$$

Proof: This really is an instance of the results of Csiszár and Narayan [20], who prove precisely that for the RVs $X_1, \ldots, X_m$, the set $\mathcal{R}_c$ is precisely the rate region of communication for omniscience, i.e. protocols at the end of which all users know $X_{[m]}$ up to arbitrarily small error probability. This shows that $R = H(X_{[m]}) - R_{\mathrm{CO}}^c$ is an achievable rate for distillable CR. Incidentally, in [20] it is actually shown to be the optimal CR rate for the given RVs. However, this is of less relevance for us, as different choices of local measurements lead to different tuples of RVs. The theorem is also a special case of Theorem 5 below. The basic idea of the coding procedure, referred to as *random binning*, is not much different than that of hash functions. Each classical sequence obtained from the local measurements is randomly and uniformly assigned a bin index; if the number of bins (the range of the hash function) is large enough compared to the jointly entropy-typical sets, a randomly selected mapping of classical sequences will suffer a collision with small probability. This means that the classical information can be extracted from their index set with high probability.

In detail, the i-th party assigns each sequence $x_i^n \in \mathcal{X}_i^n$ to one of 2^{nR_i} bins; all parties broadcast the bin index associated to their obtained sequence, $(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m) \in [M_1] \times \cdots \times [M_m]$, to the other parties. Then, the parties use joint typicality decoding to extract the sequences of other parties from their local information and $\mu_{[m]}$. That is, having received $\mu_{[m]\setminus i}$, the i-th party looks into the bins indexed $\mu_{[m]\setminus i}$ to find a unique tuple $\hat{x}^n_{[m]\setminus i}$ that is jointly typical with their observed x_i^n. An error occurs when one of the following events happen: the obtained sequence of tuples $x^n_{[m]}$ is not typical, or there is no jointly typical sequence $\hat{x}^n_{[m]\setminus i} x_i^n$, or there are two different jointly typical candidates $\hat{x}^n_{[m]\setminus i} x_i^n$ and $\check{x}^n_{[m]\setminus i} x_i^n$ in the correct bins. These in fact are the same conditions as for correct decodability in the Slepian-Wolf problem [30, Ch. 15.4], in the special case that $R_i = H(X_i) + \delta$, for some $\delta > 0$. The analysis there shows that the error probability goes indeed to zero, with high probability for a randomly chosen binning strategy, if for all $L \subseteq [m] \setminus i$ it holds $\sum_{j \in L} R_j \geq H(X_L | X_{[m]\setminus L}) + \delta$, for some $\delta > 0$.

As $\mathcal{R}_c$ consists of the rate tuples satisfying these conditions for all $i \in [m]$, it means that then all parties can decode $x^n_{[m]}$ with high probability correctly, as $n \to \infty$. ∎

Theorem 5: Let $\rho^{A_1 \ldots A_m}$ be a quantum state and let $\mathcal{E}^i : A_i \to A_i' \otimes X_i$ be an instrument used by party i, with quantum registers A_i' and classical registers X_i. Define $\omega^{X_1 A_1' \ldots X_m A_m'}$ as the cq-state after applying the local instruments:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega^{X_1 A_1' \ldots X_m A_m'} &= (\mathcal{E}^1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{E}^m)\rho \\ &= \sum_{x_{[m]}} \big|x_{[m]}\big\rangle\!\big\langle x_{[m]}\big|^{X_{[m]}} \otimes (\mathcal{E}^1_{x_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{E}^m_{x_m})\rho. \end{aligned}$$

The following is an achievable rate for the distillable CR:

$$R = H(X_{[m]}) - R_{\mathrm{CO}}^{cq},$$

where $R_{\mathrm{CO}}^{cq} = \min_{R_{[m]} \in \mathcal{R}_{cq}} \sum_{i=1}^m R_i$, and $\mathcal{R}_{cq}$ is the rate region given as follows:

$$\forall j \in [m]\ \forall L \subseteq [m] \setminus j \quad \sum_{i \in L} R_i \geq S(X_L | X_{[m]\setminus L} A_j'). \tag{4}$$

Proof: Each party j evaluates a function $U_j := f_j(X_j^n) \in \{0,1\}^{nR_j}$ of their input, and broadcasts U_j to all other parties. The objective for party j is then, knowing $U_{[m]\setminus j}$, that they can decode $X^n_{[m]}$ from $B_j^n := X_j^n {A_j'}^n$ by a suitable measurement.

Thus it is unsurprising that the answer should be given by a quantum version of Slepian-Wolf coding. Indeed, for each fixed j, the necessity and sufficiency of the rate conditions in Eq. (4) is proved in [31, Thm. IV.14 & Cor. IV.16], generalising [32]. However, this is not enough because we need a code (i.e. a set of encoding functions, one for each party) that works for all parties simultaneously, allowing each of the to recover $X^n_{[m]}$ for their A_j' and $U_{[m]}$. To achieve this, we use random binning: each party j uses a random function $F_j : \mathcal{X}_j^n \to \{0,1\}^{nR_j}$ (to be precise, we draw them independently from m 2-universal families). In the case of classical A_i', it is well-known that this strategy works as long as the rate conditions in Eq. (4) are satisfied, by using a joint typicality decoder, see the proof sketch of Theorem 4; cf. the discussion of Slepian-Wolf data compression in [30, Ch. 15.4]. In the general quantum case, joint typicality decoding presents considerable technical difficulties, but they were eventually overcome by Sen [33].

In Lemma 19 in the Appendix, we show how to use Sen's joint typicality construction to build a joint decoder that achieves small expected decoding error for party j, $\mathbb{E}_{F_{[m]\setminus j}} P_e(j) \leq \epsilon$, for any $\epsilon > 0$ and sufficiently large n, if the rates satisfy

$$\forall\ \emptyset \neq I \subset [m] \setminus j \quad \sum_{i \in I} R_i \geq H(X_I | X_{[m]\setminus j \setminus I} B_j) + \delta,$$

where $\delta > 0$ is an arbitrary constant. Thus, summing over all j, and recalling $B_j = X_j A_j'$, we get $\mathbb{E}_{F_{[m]}} \big(P_e(1) + \ldots + P_e(m)\big) \leq m\epsilon$ for all sufficiently large n, if the rates satisfy

$$\forall j \in [m]\ \forall L \subseteq [m] \setminus j \quad \sum_{i \in L} R_i \geq S(X_L | X_{[m]\setminus L} A_j') + \delta.$$

Since $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ are arbitrary, the claim follows.

This shows that the rate tuples $(R_1, \ldots, R_m) \in \mathcal{R}_{cq}$ are all achievable to provide omniscience of the $X_{[m]}^n$ among all m parties. Concentrating the randomness in the shared random variables into uniform randomness, yielding a rate of $H(X_{[m]})$, and subtracting the communication $\sum_i R_i$, completes the proof that $R = H(X_{[m]}) - R_{\text{CO}}^{cq}$ is an achievable rate for distillable CR. ■

Remark 6: It is easy to see, via the Slepian-Wolf connection made in the above proof, that given the cq-state $\omega^{X_{[m]}A'_{[m]}}$, any non-interactive protocol to achieve omniscience of $X_{[m]}$, by which party j broadcasts at asymptotic rate R_j, must necessarily satisfy $(R_1, \ldots, R_m) \in \mathcal{R}_{cq}$.

Indeed, focusing on party j for the moment, for them to be able to reconstruct $X_1^n, \ldots, X_{j-1}^n, X_{j+1}^n, \ldots, X_m^n$ using $X_j^n {A'_j}^n$ and communications U_i from party $i \in [m] \setminus j$ at rate R_i, is precisely the task of correlated classical source coding with quantum side information at the decoder [31], [32]. For this, the conditions in Eq. (4) for the given j are necessary and sufficient. Since they have to hold for all j, it follows that $\mathcal{R}_{cq}$ is precisely the achievable region of rates for CO.

III. GHZ DISTILLATION FROM PURE STATES

Now, we move on to using the above results on distillable CR to derive two lower bounds for the distillable entanglement from pure quantum states. The first, Theorem 12, re-derives the result of [28], with a different, information theoretic, proof, by making the protocol of Theorem 4 coherent. The second, which improves upon the preceding result, is obtained by making the protocol of Theorem 5 coherent. We use lessons learned in [16], [34]–[36], and observations of [37] regarding making protocols coherent.

In short, the first idea of making protocols coherent is that classical symbols x become basis states $|x\rangle$ of the Hilbert space. Functions $f : x \to f(x)$ thus induce linear operators on Hilbert space, but only permutations (resp. one-to-one functions) are really interesting, since they give rise to unitaries (resp. isometries). The second idea is thus to make classical computations first reversible, by extending them into one-to-one functions. The last step is to use the local decoding operations that exist by the "classical" theorems, which are cptp maps, in the form of their isometric Stinespring dilations [38]. In summary, "making coherent" means we can take a classical protocol working on letters and turn it into a bunch of unitaries acting as permutations on the basis states, and that we can run perfectly well on superpositions.

As in CR distillation, we have m spatially separated parties, now sharing $n \gg 1$ copies of an m-partite *pure* quantum state $|\psi\rangle^{A_1 \ldots A_m}$, i.e. party i holds the subsystem A_i^n. All parties can communicate to each other through a public noiseless classical broadcast channel of unlimited capacity.

Definition 7 (GHZ distillation protocol): The m parties, to convert the state $\psi^{\otimes n}$ to k copies of the GHZ state $|\Gamma_m\rangle$, they perform LOCC channels interactively in r rounds. Let $\sigma^{B_1^k \ldots B_m^k}$ denote the final state after LOCC channels, where B_i denotes qubit systems. If

$$\frac{1}{2} \left\| \sigma^{B_1^k \ldots B_m^k} - |\Gamma_m\rangle\langle\Gamma_m|^{\otimes k} \right\|_1 \leq \varepsilon,$$

we call the protocol ε-accurate and the GHZ conversion rate is k/n. We call a number R an achievable rate for GHZ distillation if there exists an ε-accurate protocol with conversion rate $R - \varepsilon$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$. The supremum of all achievable rates is the GHZ distillation capacity, $C_{\text{GHZ}}(\psi)$.

At the time of writing, there is no formula known for $C_{\text{GHZ}}(\psi)$ for a general state, however various protocols (giving lower bounds) and upper bounds have been developed. Regarding the latter, this involves finding LOCC monotones that have certain requisite additivity and continuity properties. For example, in [5, Lemma 1 & Thm. 2] it was shown that for multipartite pure state transformation, all the $S(A_I)_\psi$, $I \subset [m]$, are such monotones, thus limiting the conversion rate for any target state. In the case of a GHZ state, which has $S(A_I)_{\Gamma_m} = 1$ for all $\emptyset \neq I \subsetneq [m]$, this leads to

$$C_{\text{GHZ}}(\psi) \leq \min_{\emptyset \neq I \subsetneq [m]} S(A_I)_\psi. \tag{5}$$

Incidentally, the right hand side equals the minimum of $C_{\text{EPR}(i:j)}(\psi)$ over all $i \neq j$, according to Eq. (1), which even gives an operational meaning to the bound, since from a GHZ-state between m parties an EPR-state between any pair of parties can be obtained by LOCC.

In the introduction we have already referenced several GHZ distillation protocols. Here we briefly review a protocol based on *entanglement combing* [10], which results in a simple protocol and basic lower bound on the rate of GHZ distillation. The following lemma is also going to be invoked in the proofs of our main results.

Lemma 8: Let $|\psi\rangle^{B_1 \ldots B_m}$ be a pure state shared among m parties. The following rate of GHZ state is distillable from $|\psi\rangle$ under LOCC:

$$R_{\text{comb}} = \max_{i \in [m]} \left\{ \min_{I \subseteq [m] \setminus i} \frac{S(B_I)}{|I|} \right\}. \tag{6}$$

In particular, if $|\psi\rangle$ is genuinely multi-party entangled (i.e. it is not a product state w.r.t. any bipartite cut), then $R_{\text{comb}} > 0$.

Proof: The entanglement combing protocol [10] turns the given state into bipartite entanglement shared between a distinguished party, say i, and each of the other parties $j \in [m] \setminus i$. Let R_j denote the rate of the EPR pairs distilled between the distinguished party B_i and another party B_j. The following rate region is proven optimal for this task:

$$\forall I \subseteq [m] \setminus i \quad \sum_{j \in I} R_j \leq S(B_I). \tag{7}$$

By means of LOCC one can turn the combed entanglement into GHZ states shared between all parties. This can be done by letting party i teleport their information using the EPR pairs. In this case, the rates have to be equal, i.e. $R_1 = \ldots = R_m =: R_{\text{comb}}$. Thus, from the rate region for combing Eq. (7), we have as a necessary and sufficent condition

$$\forall I \subseteq [m] \setminus i \quad |I| R_{\text{comb}} \leq S(B_I), \tag{8}$$

which is satisfied by $R_{\text{comb}} := \min_{I \subseteq [m] \setminus i} \frac{S(B_I)}{|I|}$. Finally, we optimise over the choice of distinguished party. ∎

Remark 9: The preceding result shows that unless the state is a product state across some bipartite cut, the GHZ-rate is always positive. Such states are called "bi-separable", in which case evidently no GHZ states can be distilled, cf. Eq. (5). The rate R_{comb} is the baseline against which to compare any new protocol.

It can be far from optimal, for example even if the initial $|\psi\rangle = |\Gamma_m\rangle$ is a GHZ state, then $R_{\text{comb}} = \frac{1}{m-1}$, while obviously $C_{\text{GHZ}}(\Gamma_m) = 1$.

In the proofs of our GHZ distillation protocols, we shall use the following rules from the resource calculus of quantum Shannon theory [2], where '$\geq$' means that the resources on the left hand side can be transformed asymptotically to the resources on the right hand side by local operations only; o is an arbitrarily small positive number.

Lemma 10 (Cancellation lemma [2, Lemma 4.6]): For resources α, β, γ, if $\alpha + \gamma \geq \beta + \gamma$, then $\alpha + o\gamma \geq \beta$. ∎

Lemma 11 (Removal of o terms [2, Lemma 4.5]): For resources, α, β, γ, if $\alpha + o\gamma \geq \beta$ and $\alpha \geq z\gamma$ for some real $z > 0$, then $\alpha \geq \beta$. ∎

Theorem 12 (Vrana and Christandl [28, Thm. 1]): Let $|\psi\rangle = \sum \psi_{x_1 \ldots x_m} \left|x_{[m]}\right\rangle$ be a pure state written in the computational basis, and define $p(x_1, \ldots, x_m) = |\psi_{x_1 \ldots x_m}|^2$, the probability distribution of measuring ψ in the computational bases locally. Define the region $\mathcal{R}_c$ as the set of rate tuples $R_{[m]} = (R_1, \ldots, R_m)$ satisfying the following conditions,

$$\forall I \subsetneq [m] \quad \sum_{j \in I} R_j \geq H(X_I | X_{[m] \setminus I}). \tag{9}$$

Finally, let $R^c_{\text{CO}} := \min_{R_{[m]} \in \mathcal{R}_c} \sum_{j=1}^m R_j$. Then,

$$C_{\text{GHZ}}(\psi) \geq H(X_{[m]}) - R^c_{\text{CO}}.$$

Proof: The m terminals share n copies of the pure state $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{x_1 \ldots x_m} \psi_{x_1 \cdots x_m} |x_1\rangle \cdots |x_m\rangle$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi\rangle^{\otimes n} &= \sum_{x_1^n \ldots x_m^n} \psi_{x_1^n \ldots x_m^n} |x_1^n\rangle \cdots |x_m^n\rangle \,, \text{ where} \\ \psi_{x_1^n \ldots x_m^n} &= \prod_{t=1}^n \psi_{x_{1,t} \cdots x_{m,t}} \text{ and} \\ \left|x_j^n\right\rangle &= |x_{j,1}\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |x_{j,n}\rangle \,. \end{aligned}$$

Let $f_j : \mathcal{X}_j^n \to \mathcal{U}_j$ be the Slepian-Wolf hash function used by party j in the classical part of the protocol of Theorem 4 (omniscience), and $(\Delta^{(j,u_{[m]})}_{x^n_{[m]}} : x^n_{[m]})$ the POVM (decision rule) that they use to recover $x^n_{[m]}$ when the classical messages $u_{[m]}$ are broadcast.

In the first step, each party j will apply an isometry based on the mappings $x_j^n \longmapsto (f_j(x_j^n), x_j^n)$ for $j \in [m]$, namely

$$V_j = \sum_{x_j^n} \left|f_j(x_j^n), x_j^n\right\rangle\!\left\langle x_j^n\right| ,$$

where $|u\rangle = \left|f_j(x_j^n)\right\rangle$ are computational basis for some Hilbert space $U_j = \text{span}\{|u\rangle : u \in \mathcal{U}_j\}$. The state at the end of the first step is

$$|\psi'\rangle = \sum_{x_1^n \ldots x_m^n} \psi_{x_1^n \ldots x_m^n} |x_1^n, f_1(x_1^n)\rangle \cdots |x_m^n, f_m(x_m^n)\rangle \,.$$

Next comes the coherent transmission of the hash value u_j to other parties, which in fact is implementing a multi-receiver cobit channel [37], i.e. party j wishes to implement the isometry $|u_j\rangle \longmapsto |u_j\rangle^{\otimes m}$. This multi-receiver cobit channel can be

implemented by teleportation through GHZ states. In order to coherently transmit nR_j bits, where $R_j \coloneqq \frac{1}{n}\log|U_j|$, nR_j GHZ states are needed, i.e. the following state:

$$|\Gamma_m\rangle^{\otimes nR_j} = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle^{\otimes m} + |1\rangle^{\otimes m})\right)^{\otimes nR_i}.$$

After implementing the multi-receiver cobit channel, the j-th party owns its initial share $\left|x_j^n\right\rangle$ as well as all the hash values broadcast to it. Thus, the overall state is

$$\left|\widetilde{\psi}\right\rangle = \sum_{x_1^n \dots x_m^n} \psi_{x_1^n \dots x_m^n} \left|x_1^n, f_1(x_1^n) \dots f_m(x_m^n)\right\rangle \cdots \left|x_m^n, f_1(x_1^n) \dots f_m(x_m^n)\right\rangle.$$

Having received the hash values, each party proceeds to recovering $x_{[m]}^n$. Each party locally runs its Slepian-Wolf decoder in a coherent fashion to work out the $\left|x_j^n\right\rangle$ of the other $m-1$ parties. More precisely, the j-th party applies the following controlled isometry on its corresponding systems:

$$\sum_{u_{[m]}} \left|u_{[m]}\right\rangle\!\left\langle u_{[m]}\right| \otimes V_D^{(j,u_{[m]})},$$

where the coherent measurement isometry of the j-th party is defined as:

$$V_D^{(j,u_{[m]})} = \sum_{\forall i \in [m]\, x_i^n \in f_i^{-1}(u_i)} \sqrt{\Delta_{x_{[m]}^n}^{(j,u_{[m]})}} \otimes \left|x_{[m]}^n\right\rangle, \tag{10}$$

with $\Delta_{x_{[m]}^n}^{(j,u_{[m]})}$ the POVM elements of the j-th decoder acting on A_j^n. The classical result of Csiszár and Narayan [20], i.e. Theorem 4 in the diagonal case, ensures successful decoding if the rates $R_{[m]}$ satisfy the conditions (9). The state after each party applied their decoding isometry is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\overline{\psi}\right\rangle = \sum_{x_1^n \dots x_m^n} \psi_{x_m^n \dots x_m^n} &\left(\sum_{\forall i \in [m]\, \xi_i^n \in f_i^{-1}(u_i)} \sqrt{\Delta_{\xi_{[m]}^n}^{(1,u_{[m]})}} \left|x_1^n\right\rangle \left|f_1(x_1^n) \dots f_m(x_m^n)\right\rangle \left|\xi_{[m]}^n\right\rangle\right) \\ &\otimes \cdots \\ &\otimes \left(\sum_{\forall i \in [m]\, \xi_i^n \in f_i^{-1}(u_i)} \sqrt{\Delta_{\xi_{[m]}^n}^{(m,u_{[m]})}} \left|x_m^n\right\rangle \left|f_1(x_1^n) \dots f_m(x_m^n)\right\rangle \left|\xi_{[m]}^n\right\rangle\right).\end{aligned}$$

After decoding, by the coherent gentle measurement lemma [39], [40], the state will be $\sqrt{2m\varepsilon}$-close in trace distance to the following state:

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\widehat{\psi}\right\rangle = \sum_{x_{[m]}^n} \psi_{x_1^n \dots x_m^n} &\left|x_1^n, f_1(x_1^n) \dots f_m(x_m^n)\right\rangle \left|x_{[m]}^n\right\rangle \\ &\otimes \cdots \otimes \left|x_m^n, f_1(x_1^n) \dots f_m(x_m^n)\right\rangle \left|x_{[m]}^n\right\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

The details of the application of the coherent gentle measurement lemma are as follows. The coherent gentle measurement lemma ensures that for all parties $j \in [m]$

$$\sum_{\forall i \in [m]\, x_i^n \in f_i^{-1}(u_i)} \sqrt{\Delta_{x_{[m]}^n}^{(j,u_{[m]})}} \left|x_j^n\right\rangle \otimes \left|x_{[m]}^n\right\rangle$$

is $2\sqrt{\varepsilon(2-\varepsilon)}$ close in trace distance to $\left|x_j^n\right\rangle \otimes \left|x_{[m]}^n\right\rangle$ provided that the decoding error is not bigger than ε Theorem 4. This implies

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle\widehat{\psi}\middle|\overline{\psi}\right\rangle &= \sum_{x_1^n \dots x_m^n} |\psi_{x_1^n \dots x_m^n}|^2 \left\langle x_1^n\right| \sqrt{\Delta_{x_{[m]}^n}^{(1,u_{[m]})}} \left|x_1^n\right\rangle \cdots \left\langle x_m^n\right| \sqrt{\Delta_{x_{[m]}^n}^{(m,u_{[m]})}} \left|x_m^n\right\rangle \\ &\geq \sum_{x_1^n \dots x_m^n} |\psi_{x_1^n \dots x_m^n}|^2 \left\langle x_1^n\right| \Delta_{x_{[m]}^n}^{(1,u_{[m]})} \left|x_1^n\right\rangle \cdots \left\langle x_m^n\right| \Delta_{x_{[m]}^n}^{(m,u_{[m]})} \left|x_m^n\right\rangle \\ &\geq (1-\varepsilon)^m \geq 1 - m\varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

where the equality follows by substitution, the first inequality follows since $\sqrt{\Delta^{(m,u_{[m]})}_{x^n_{[m]}}} \geq \Delta^{(m,u_{[m]})}_{x^n_{[m]}}$ for $\Delta^{(m,u_{[m]})}_{x^n_{[m]}} \leq \mathbb{1}$ and the second inequality follows from the assumption. Then, for the trace distance of pure states,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\widehat{\psi} - \overline{\psi}\right\|_1 &= 2\sqrt{1 - \left|\left\langle \widehat{\psi} \middle| \overline{\psi} \right\rangle\right|^2} \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{1-(1-\varepsilon)^{2m}} \leq \sqrt{2m\varepsilon}.\end{aligned}$$

All parties now clean up their $U_{[m]}$-registers and their original A^n_j-register by virtue of local unitaries, to arrive at the following state, up to trace norm error $\sqrt{2m\varepsilon}$:

$$|\widehat{\gamma}\rangle = \sum_{x^n_{[m]}} \psi_{x^n_1 \dots x^n_m} \left|x^n_{[m]}\right\rangle \cdots \left|x^n_{[m]}\right\rangle \tag{11}$$

To do that, note that the partial Slepian-Wolf isometries $V_j : \left|x^n_j\right\rangle |0\rangle^E \mapsto \left|x^n_j\right\rangle \left|f_j(x^n_j)\right\rangle$ can be made a unitary by declaring $\left|x^n_j\right\rangle |i\rangle^E \mapsto \left|x^n_j\right\rangle \left|i + f_j(x^n_j)\right\rangle$, where the addition is that of an abelian group on the ancillary register (e.g. integers modulo $|U_j|$). Once we have a unitary, the inverse is also a unitary, and can be applied locally.

The above state can now be turned into a standard GHZ state at rate $nH(X_{[m]})$ via the well-known entanglement concentration protocol, just like the bipartite case [3]. This involves measuring the *type* t of $x^n_{[m]}$, and noting that the phase and amplitude factors are constant along each type class, resulting in GHZ-type states after the measurement. To see that, let $\mathcal{T}^n_t$ denote the set of sequences of the same type t, and let Π_t be the projector onto the subspace spanned by $\mathcal{T}^n_t$, i.e.

$$\Pi_t = \sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{T}^n_t} |x^n\rangle\langle x^n| .$$

If the type resulting from the measurement does not belong to a typical type, then the protocol ends; with the properties of the type projectors, this happens with asymptotically small probability. Finally, we thus obtain approximately the following state resulting from the type class measurement (which is close to the initial state)

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\Pi_t \otimes \cdots \otimes \Pi_t |\widehat{\gamma}\rangle}{\sqrt{p^n(\mathcal{T}^n_t)}} &= \sum_{x^n_{[m]} \in \mathcal{T}^n_t} \sqrt{\widetilde{p}(x^n_{[m]})} \left|x^n_{[m]}\right\rangle \cdots \left|x^n_{[m]}\right\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{T}^n_t|}} \sum_{x^n_{[m]} \in \mathcal{T}^n_t} \left|x^n_{[m]}\right\rangle \cdots \left|x^n_{[m]}\right\rangle ,\end{aligned}$$

where $p^n(\mathcal{T}^n_t) = |\langle\widehat{\gamma}| \Pi_t \otimes \cdots \otimes \Pi_t |\widehat{\gamma}\rangle|$, $\widetilde{p}(x^n_{[m]}) = \frac{p(x^n_{[m]})}{p^n(\mathcal{T}^n_t)}$ and $|\mathcal{T}^n_t| \sim 2^{nH(X_{[m]})}$ for large n.

The protocol so far proves the following resource inequality:

$$\psi + R_{\text{CO}}[GHZ] + \infty[c \to c] \geq H(X_{[m]})[GHZ], \tag{12}$$

where R_{CO} is the minimum of the sum of all rates of GHZ states used by parties to communication hash values. By using the Cancellation Lemma 10, this implies now

$$\psi + o[GHZ] + \infty[c \to c] \geq (H(X_{[m]}) - R_{\text{CO}})[GHZ]. \tag{13}$$

In order to remove the o term from the left-hand side of the resource inequality, we need Lemma 11, which demands the following resource inequality to be true, for some $\alpha > 0$:

$$\psi + \infty[c \to c] \geq \alpha[GHZ]. \tag{14}$$

Note that we need the asymptotic resource inequality, not some single-copy transformation (which might or might not imply the former), as prerequisite of the cancellation lemma. In Lemma 8 we have actually proven this inequality by virtue of entanglement combing. Therefore, we can remove the o term and we have the result as we wished. ■

Theorem 13: Let $|\psi\rangle^{A_1 \dots A_m}$ be a pure state shared by m spatially separated parties, and let $\mathcal{E}^i : A_i \to A_i \otimes X_i$ denote an instrument of party i, consisting of pure CP maps $\mathcal{E}^i_x(\sigma) = E^i_x \sigma (E^i_x)^\dagger$ (which is why we may assume $A'_i = A_i$). Then, with the notation of Theorem 5,

$$C_{\text{GHZ}}(\psi) \geq H(X_{[m]}) - R^{cq}_{\text{CO}},$$

where $R^{cq}_{\text{CO}} = \min_{R_{[m]} \in \mathcal{R}_{cq}} \sum_{i=1}^m R_i$, and $\mathcal{R}_{cq}$ is the rate region given as follows:

$$\forall j \in [m] \ \forall L \subseteq [m] \setminus j \quad \sum_{i \in L} R_i \geq S(X_L | X_{[m]\setminus L} A'_j).$$

Proof: The proof follows from the techniques used in Theorem 12, and the result of Theorem 5: making the protocol coherent and recycling.

Starting with a pure state, as in the proof of Theorem 12, each party applies their instrument coherently on its system, resulting in isometries $V_i : A_i \hookrightarrow A_i \otimes X_i$ defined as $V_i = \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}_i} E_x^i \otimes |x\rangle$. The isometries act as follows on a single copy:

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\widehat{\psi}\right\rangle &= (V_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes V_m)\,|\psi\rangle^{A_{[m]}} \\ &= \sum_{x_{[m]}} (E_{x_1}^1 \otimes \cdots \otimes E_{x_m}^m)\,|\psi\rangle^{A_{[m]}} \otimes \left|x_{[m]}\right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{x_{[m]}} \sqrt{p(x_{[m]})}\left|\widetilde{\psi}_{x_{[m]}}\right\rangle^{A_{[m]}} \otimes \left|x_{[m]}\right\rangle,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$p(x_{[m]}) = \langle\psi|\,(E_{x_1}^1 \otimes \cdots \otimes E_{x_m}^m)^\dagger (E_{x_1}^1 \otimes \cdots \otimes E_{x_m}^m)\,|\psi\rangle,$$

and

$$\left|\widetilde{\psi}_{x_{[m]}}\right\rangle^{A_{[m]}} = \frac{(E_{x_1}^1 \otimes \cdots \otimes E_{x_m}^m)\,|\psi\rangle^{A_{[m]}}}{\sqrt{p(x_{[m]})}}.$$

With n copies of the initial pure state, we want to distill GHZ states from n copies of $\left|\widehat{\psi}\right\rangle$, i.e.

$$\left|\widehat{\psi}\right\rangle^{\otimes n} = \sum_{x_{[m]}^n} \sqrt{p^n(x_{[m]}^n)}\,|x_1^n\rangle \cdots |x_m^n\rangle \otimes \left|\widetilde{\psi}_{x_{[m]}^n}\right\rangle^{A_{[m]}^n},$$

where $\left|\widetilde{\psi}_{x_{[m]}^n}\right\rangle^{A_{[m]}^n}$ is the quantum side information at the disposal of the parties to help them with their decodings.

Similar to Theorem 12, in the first step each party coherently computes its hash value and broadcasts it coherently to the other parties via GHZ states. By applying the decoder of Theorem 5 in a coherent fashion, each party decodes $\left|x_{[m]}^n\right\rangle$ where the minimum rate of initial GHZ states is R_{CO}^{cq}. After the uncomputing of the hash value information and the local X_j^n, the state is approximately

$$\left|\widehat{\theta}\right\rangle = \sum_{x_{[m]}^n} \sqrt{p(x_{[m]}^n)}\left|x_{[m]}^n\right\rangle \cdots \left|x_{[m]}^n\right\rangle \otimes \left|\psi_{x_{[m]}^n}\right\rangle^{A_{[m]}^n}, \tag{15}$$

with residual states $\left|\psi_{x_{[m]}^n}\right\rangle$ on $A_{[m]}^n$. At the end, the parties implement the entanglement concentration protocol to get a standard GHZ state. That is, each one measures the joint type t of $x_{[m]}^n$, i.e. they apply the projectors Π_t from the proof of Theorem 12. If the result is a non-typical type, they abort the protocol; if it is typical, they proceed as follows to decouple the $A_{[m]}^n$-registers: all sequences $x_{[m]}^n$ from the type class $\mathcal{T}_t^n$ are obtained by a permutation $\pi(x_{[m]}^n) \in S_n$ of a fiducial string $x_t^n \in \mathcal{T}_t^n \subset \mathcal{X}_{[m]}^n$. The unitary $U_{\pi(x_{[m]}^n)}$ permuting the n systems of $A_{[m]}^n$ do the same with a fiducial vector $|\psi_t\rangle = \left|\psi_{x_t^n}\right\rangle$, i.e. $\left|\psi_{x_{[m]}^n}\right\rangle = U_{\pi(x_{[m]}^n)}\,|\psi_t\rangle$. Party j now applies the controlled permutation

$$U_j = \sum_{x_{[m]}^n \in \mathcal{T}_t^n} |x_{[m]}^n\rangle\langle x_{[m]}^n| \otimes (U_{\pi(x_{[m]}^n)})^{\dagger A_j^n},$$

which maps the state to an approximation of

$$\left|\widetilde{\theta}\right\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|T_t^n|}} \sum_{x_{[m]}^n \in \mathcal{T}_t^n} \left|x_{[m]}^n\right\rangle \cdots \left|x_{[m]}^n\right\rangle \otimes |\psi_t\rangle^{A_{[m]}^n}, \tag{16}$$

The last part, $|\psi_t\rangle^{A_{[m]}^n}$, is decoupled, as it only depends on t, and the remaining state is the desired GHZ state. ■

Remark 14: The above protocol typically leaves some entanglement behind, in the form of the states $|\psi_t\rangle$. This entanglement could potentially be still useful for m-party GHZ distillation, but a more common situation is that it contains only entanglement between fewer ($\leq m-1$) parties, perhaps even only EPR states between a pair of parties.

To distill it, essentially the same kind of protocol as in Theorem 13 can be applied, because $|\psi_t\rangle = \left|\psi_{x_t^n}\right\rangle$ is a product state across the n m-partite systems, and by grouping identical states we can treat it as a collection of i.i.d. states.

IV. Conclusion

We have derived two achievability bounds for the distillable common randomness from mixed multipartite state and by making them coherent, we found two achievability bounds for the rate of GHZ distillation from a multipartite pure state. The first bound reproduces a recent result by Vrana and Christandl with genuinely quantum Shannon theoretic methods, and the second improves on it in a truly quantum way.

To our knowledge, it is the best currently known general bound. Note that it includes the lower bound from [23], which was formulated for tripartite state ψ^{ABC}, and is obtained by choosing a measurement basis $\{|x\rangle\}$ for A and trivial (identity) instruments for B and C in Theorem 13; this gives a pure state decomposition $\psi^{BC} = \sum_x \lambda_x |\psi_x\rangle\langle\psi_x|^{BC}$. Let $\overline{E}_{BC} = \sum_x \lambda_x E(|\psi_x\rangle\langle\psi_x|)$ be the average bipartite entanglement of the pure state decomposition. Define finally

$$\chi = \min\{S(B), S(C)\} - \overline{E}_{BC},$$

Then χ is an achievable rate of three-party GHZ distillation, but in addition also EPR pairs between B and C at rate $\overline{E}_{BC}$ are distilled [23]. This is consistent with our Theorem 13 and Remark 14, too: following through the proof, the leftover state, there denoted $|\psi_t\rangle$, is precisely a tensor product of $|\psi_x\rangle$, with x appearing $\sim n\lambda_x$ times.

Example 15: Consider the three-qubit W-state

$$|W\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|001\rangle + |010\rangle + |100\rangle).$$

Entanglement combing (Lemma 8) results in a GHZ rate of $R_{\text{comb}} = \frac{1}{2}H(\frac{2}{3}, \frac{1}{3}) \approx 0.4591$, but already the very simple yet ingenious protocol of [24] achieves $R_{FL} = 0.5$, because it extracts an EPR pair deterministically from every copy of the W-state, albeit randomly distributed over the three possible pairs. Theorem 12, applied with the local computational bases, gets up to $R_{VC} = \log 3 - 1 \approx 0.585$. Namely, note that the omniscience information $X_1X_2X_3$ is jointly uniformly distributed over the set $\{001, 010, 100\}$, and so the conditions for communication for omniscience in Theorem 12 are $R_1 \geq H(X_1|X_2X_3) = 0$ and cyclic, and $R_1 + R_2 \geq H(X_1X_2|X_3) = \frac{2}{3}$ and cyclic. Thus, $R^c_{\text{CO}} = \min R_1 + R_2 + R_3 = 3 \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{2}{3} = 1$.

The result from [23] (recall that it is a special case of Theorem 13) however yields the seemingly very bad $R_{SVW} = \log 3 - \frac{4}{3} \approx 0.2516$, until we remember that as a bonus we get a rate of $\frac{2}{3}$ of EPR states – by the symmetry of the W-state between any prescribed pair of parties, AB or BC or AC. Pairs of these, from different pairs, can be fused to get an additional rate of $\frac{1}{3}$ for GHZ generation, thus matching the total of $R_{VC} = \log 3 - 1$.

We do not know, however, if this rate is optimal under general LOCC procedures, or even restricted to non-interactive communication protocols.

Example 16: Consider the tripartite fully antisymmetric state, also known as "determinant state",

$$|\alpha_3\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(|123\rangle + |231\rangle + |312\rangle - |132\rangle - |213\rangle - |321\rangle).$$

Similar to the previous example, we can evaluate the rate resulting from entanglement combing (Lemma 8), $R_{\text{comb}} = \frac{1}{2}\log 3 \approx 0.7925$, because all three marginal qutrit states are maximally mixed. But Theorem 12, applied with the local computational bases, yields the much better $R_{VC} = \log 3 - \frac{1}{2} \approx 1.085$. This is straightforward after realising that the computational bases measurements result in the uniform distribution of $X_1X_2X_3$ over all 6 permutations $\{123, 231, 312, 132, 213, 321\}$. The conditions for communication for omniscience in Theorem 12 are $R_1 \geq H(X_1|X_2X_3) = 0$ and cyclic, and $R_1 + R_2 \geq H(X_1X_2|X_3) = 1$ and cyclic. Thus, $R^c_{\text{CO}} = \min R_1 + R_2 + R_3 = \frac{3}{2}$.

The result from [23] gives the seemingly disappointing value $R_{SVW} = \log 3 - 1 \approx 0.585$; but as before, we can salvage a rate of 1 of EPR states between any prescribed pair of parties, thus contributing an additional rate of $\frac{1}{2}$ for GHZ generation, once again matching the total of $R_{VC} = \log 3 - \frac{1}{2}$.

Again, we do not know whether this is optimal, in particular whether there is a better way of applying Theorem 13.

Example 17: The *flower state* [41],

$$|\varphi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2d}} \sum_{i=1}^{d} \sum_{j=0}^{1} |ij\rangle^A |ij\rangle^B (H^j |i\rangle)^C,$$

where $H^0 = \mathbb{1}$ and H^1 is the d-dimensional quantum Fourier transform, provides an example where Theorem 13 is better than Vrana-Christandl. The former, by simply letting A or B measure and broadcast j, so that C can undo the unitary H^j, yields the clearly optimal $R_{SVW} = \log d$ (it is the local entropy of C, which is an upper bound on the distillable GHZ rate under arbitrary LOCC protocols).

On the other hand, Theorem 12 with the computational bases for A and B (which seems like the evident choice, but we have no full proof that it is optimal), and *any* measurement of C, results in a rate $R_{VC} \leq \frac{1}{2}\log d$. This follows from Maassen-Uffink's entropic uncertainty relation [42], which reads as $I(X_1X_2; X_3) = I(X_1; X_3) \leq \frac{1}{2}\log d$ (cf. [41]) and some

elementary algebraic manipulations. In detail, we have $H(X_1) = H(X_2) = 1 + \log d$, and $H(X_3) \geq \log d$. On the other hand, the conditions for communication for omniscience in Theorem 12 are $R_1 \geq H(X_1|X_2X_3) = 0$, $R_2 \geq H(X_2|X_1X_3) = 0$ and $R_3 \geq H(X_3|X_1X_2) \geq \frac{1}{2}\log d$; furthermore $R_1 + R_2 \geq H(X_1X_2|X_3) \geq 1 + \frac{1}{2}\log d$, and the now redundant $R_1 + R_3 \geq H(X_1X_3|X_2) = H(X_3|X_2) \geq \frac{1}{2}\log d$ and $R_2 + R_3 \geq H(X_2X_3|X_1) = H(X_3|X_1) \geq \frac{1}{2}\log d$. Now for the net rate, we can reason

$$\begin{aligned} H(X_1X_2X_3) - (R_1 + R_2 + R_3) &\leq H(X_1X_2X_3) - H(X_3|X_1X_2) - H(X_1X_2|X_3) \\ &= H(X_1X_2) - H(X_1X_2|X_3) \\ &= I(X_1X_2; X_3) \leq \frac{1}{2}\log d \end{aligned}$$

using the lower bounds for R_3 and $R_1 + R_2$ in the first line, the chain rule for the entropy in the second line, and finally the entropic uncertainty relation.

In future work we are going to apply the machinery developed in this paper to secret key distillation against an adversary who is initially correlated and eavesdrops on the public classical communication between the parties, and to the distillation of GHZ states from *mixed* initial states. Regarding the former, we can quite evidently apply Theorem 5 to a general state $\rho^{A_1\dots A_mE}$ and local instruments $\mathcal{E}_i : A_i \to A_i'X_i$, to first attain omniscience $X_{[m]}$ at all legal parties, and then hashing this information down using privacy amplification [43], resulting in a lower bound

$$C_S(\rho) \geq S(X_{[m]}|E) - R_{\text{CO}}^{cq}$$

on the distillable secret key. Regarding GHZ distillation, we would apply these protocols to a purification $|\psi\rangle^{A_1\dots A_mE}$ of $\rho^{A_1\dots A_m}$, and for pure instruments as in Theorem 13 we expect to obtain the lower bound

$$C_{\text{GHZ}}(\rho) \geq S(X_{[m]}|E) - R_{\text{CO}}^{cq}$$

on the distillable GHZ rate. This will require a generalization of the techniques from [16] to the multi-party setting with non-interactive communication, of turning a privacy amplification step into a decoupling procedure.

Furthermore, note that we have focused our attention on non-interactive protocols, but it seems evident that in general there is an advantage in protocols using interactive communication, i.e. of fully general CR distillation, cf. [44], [45]. In this context it is an important question to determine which class of interactive communication protocols, when applied to a quantum state, can be made coherent and thus yields achievable rates for GHZ distillation.

Acknowledgments. AW thanks Clarice Starling for illuminating discussions regarding several aspects of public and secret information. The authors acknowledge financial support by the Baidu-UAB collaborative project "Learning of Quantum Hidden Markov Models", the Spanish MINECO (project FIS2016-86681-P) with the support of FEDER funds, and the Generalitat de Catalunya (project 2017-SGR-1127). FS also supported by the Catalan Government 001-P-001644 QuantumCAT within the ERDF Program of Catalunya.

APPENDIX

CLASSICAL CORRELATED SOURCE CODING WITH SIDE INFORMATION AT THE DECODER

The analysis of multi-party common randomness distillation via our omniscience protocol leads quite naturally to the consideration of classical source coding with quantum side information at the decoder [31], [32]. Here we present the necessary definitions, and prove a new coding theorem for achieving all points of the rate region directly by random binning and a quantum joint typicality decoder, rather than successive decoding and time sharing as in the cited previous works.

A multipartite correlated classical-quantum (cq-)source is given by a cq-state

$$\rho^{X_1\dots X_kB} = \sum_{x_{[k]}} p(x_{[k]})|x_1\rangle\langle x_1|^{X_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes |x_k\rangle\langle x_k|^{X_k} \otimes \rho_{x_{[k]}}^B, \tag{17}$$

where X_i (which we can identify with a classical random variable) is observed by the i-th encoder, who sends a function of X_i to the decoder. The decoder has the quantum system B and by measuring it depending on all the messages received from the k encoders attempts to reconstruct $X_{[k]}$ with high probability.

Definition 18: An n-block coding scheme with quantum side information at the decoder for the cq-source $\rho^{X_{[k]}B}$ consists of k encoding functions $f_i : \mathcal{X}_i^n \to [M_i]$ and decoding POVMs $\Lambda^{(\mu_{[k]})}$ on B^n, one for each $\mu_{[k]} = \mu_1 \dots \mu_k \in [M_1] \times \cdots \times [M_k]$, and indexed by $\mathcal{X}_1^n \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{X}_k^n$. Its rates are the numbers $\frac{1}{n}\log M_i$, and its average error probability is

$$P_e := 1 - \sum_{x_{[k]}^n} p^n(x_{[k]}^n) \text{Tr} \rho_{x_{[k]}^n}^{B^n} \Lambda_{x_{[k]}^n}^{\left(f_{[k]}(x_{[k]}^n)\right)}.$$

Here, $f_{[k]}(x^n_{[k]}) = f_1(x^n_1)\dots f_k(x^n_k)$ is the k-tuple of compressed data.

A k-tuple $(R_1,\dots,R_k)$ is called an achievable rate tuple if there exists n-block coding schemes for all n, such that its error probability converges to zero, $P_e \to 0$, and the rates $\frac{1}{n}\log|M_i|$ converge to R_i. The set of achievable rate tuples is called the rate region of the compression problem described by $\rho^{X_{[k]}B}$.

By definition, the rate region is a closed subset of the positive orthant $\mathbb{R}^k_{\geq 0}$, that is closed under increasing individual vector components. By the time sharing principle, it is also convex. Necessary and sufficient conditions for the rate region were proved in [31, Thm. IV.14 & Cor. IV.16], which are the ones expected from Slepian-Wolf coding:

$$\forall\ I \subseteq [k] \quad \sum_{i\in I} R_i \geq S(X_I|X_{[k]\setminus I}B). \tag{18}$$

While the necessity of these conditions is rather straightforward, we will be concerned here with their sufficiency. In the cited PhD thesis, this is obtained by showing that the extreme points of the polytope (18) can be achieved, which in turn is done by successive decoding of the j-th sender's information X^n_j, in an order given by the extreme point in question, of which there are $k!$, one for each permutation of the parties $[k]$. The rest follows by the convexity and openness-above of the rate region.

The following lemma shows that it is possible to construct a code by random binning and with a simultaneous decoding scheme that achieves directly every point in the rate region. This is essential in applications, such as ours, where there are multiple decoders with different side informations for the same compressed data.

Lemma 19 (Simultaneous quantum decoder): With the above notation, suppose the rates $R_i = \frac{1}{n}\log|M_i|$ satisfy the following inequalities for some $\delta > 0$,

$$\forall\ \emptyset \neq I \subseteq [k] \quad \sum_{i\in I} R_i \geq S(X_I|X_{[k]\setminus I}B) + \delta,$$

where the entropies are with respect to the state (17).

Then, for independent 2-universal random functions $F_i : \mathcal{X}^n_i \to [M_i]$, there exists simultaneous decoding POVMs $\left(\Lambda^{(\mu_{[k]})}_{x^n_{[k]}}\right)$ such that the expectation of the average error probability over all codes converges to zero: $\mathbb{E}_{F_1\dots F_k} P_e \to 0$, as $n\to\infty$.

Proof: We will use Sen's construction of jointly typical POVM elements [33, Sec. 5], which is stated as Lemma 20 below, in the simplified form in which we need it.

Consider $\left(\rho^{X_{[k]}B}\right)^{\otimes n} = \rho^{X^n_{[k]}B^n}$ and for the RVs $X^n_1,\dots,X^n_k$ denote the set of jointly entropy-typical sequences by $\mathcal{T}$. This means that $\Pr\{X^n_{[k]} \in \mathcal{T}\} \geq 1-\eta \to 1$ as $n\to\infty$ and that for every $x^n_{[k]} \in \mathcal{T}$ and all $I \subseteq [k]$,

$$2^{-nH(X_I)-n\beta} \leq p^n(x^n_I) \leq 2^{-nH(X_I)+n\beta},$$

with an arbitrarily chosen $\beta > 0$.

Next we apply Lemma 20 to the $(k+1)$-party state $\rho^{X^n_{[k]}B^n}$ to obtain first an "augmented" state $\rho^{X^n_{[k]}B^n}\otimes\tau^{C^n}$ for a suitable system C and a universal state τ^C (actually the maximally mixed state), where we think of BC as a new quantum system $\widetilde{B}$, so that the augmented state is still a $(k+1)$-party cq-state. Note that τ^C can be created locally at B. Lemma 20 then gives us an approximation $\widetilde{\rho}^{X^n_1\dots X^n_k\widetilde{B}^n}$ and a POVM element E with the properties stated in the lemma. Importantly, both this state and the POVM element share the original cq-structure:

$$\widetilde{\rho}^{X^n_1\dots X^n_k\widetilde{B}^n} = \sum_{x^n_{[k]}} p^n(x^n_{[k]})|x^n_{[k]}\rangle\langle x^n_{[k]}|^{X^n_{[k]}} \otimes \widetilde{\rho}^{\widetilde{B}^n}_{x^n_{[k]}},$$
$$E = \sum_{x^n_{[k]}} |x^n_{[k]}\rangle\langle x^n_{[k]}|^{X^n_{[k]}} \otimes E_{x^n_{[k]}}.$$

By restricting the latter to typical $x^n_{[k]}$, we obtain

$$E' := \sum_{x^n_{[k]}\in\mathcal{T}} |x^n_{[k]}\rangle\langle x^n_{[k]}|^{X^n_{[k]}} \otimes E_{x^n_{[k]}},$$

which does not affect property 1 in Lemma 20, and preserves property 3, while property 2 becomes the only slightly worse $\mathrm{Tr}\widetilde{\rho}^{X^n_{[k]}\widetilde{B}^n}E' \geq 1-2\gamma-\gamma'-\eta$.

Finally, for the encoding by independent 2-universal functions F_j, after the receiver obtains $\mu_1\dots\mu_k$, we need a decoding POVM for recovering $x^n_{[k]} \in \mathcal{T}\cap F_1^{-1}(\mu_1)\times\dots\times F_k^{-1}(\mu_k)$ from $\rho^{B^n}_{x^n_{[k]}}\otimes\tau^{C^n}$. We use the square-root measurement $(\Lambda_{x^n_{[k]}})$ constructed from the $E_{x^n_{[k]}}$, $x^n_{[k]} \in \mathcal{T}\cap F^{-1}_{[k]}(\mu_{[k]})$:

$$\Lambda_{x^n_{[k]}} = \left(\sum_{x'^n_{[k]}\in\mathcal{T}\cap F^{-1}_{[k]}(F_{[k]}(x^n_{[k]}))} E_{x'^n_{[k]}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} E_{x^n_{[k]}} \left(\sum_{x'^n_{[k]}\in\mathcal{T}\cap F^{-1}_{[k]}(F_{[k]}(x^n_{[k]}))} E_{x'^n_{[k]}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

To upper bound its error probability, we employ the Hayashi-Nagaoka operator inequality, stated below as Lemma 21:

$$\begin{aligned}
P_e &\leq 1 - p^n(\mathcal{T}) + \sum_{x^n_{[k]}\in\mathcal{T}} p^n(x^n_{[k]})\mathrm{Tr}(\rho^{B^n}_{x^n_{[k]}}\otimes\tau^{C^n})\Lambda_{x^n_{[k]}} \\
&\leq \eta + \gamma + \sum_{x^n_{[k]}\in\mathcal{T}} p^n(x^n_{[k]})\mathrm{Tr}\widetilde{\rho}^{\widetilde{B}^n}_{x^n_{[k]}}\Lambda_{x^n_{[k]}} \\
&\leq \eta + \gamma + \sum_{x^n_{[k]}\in\mathcal{T}} p^n(x^n_{[k]})\left(2\,\mathrm{Tr}\widetilde{\rho}^{\widetilde{B}^n}_{x^n_{[k]}}(\mathbb{1} - E_{x^n_{[k]}}) + 4\sum_{x'^n_{[k]}\in\mathcal{T}\cap F_{[k]}^{-1}(F_{[k]}(x^n_{[k]}))\setminus x^n_{[k]}} \mathrm{Tr}\widetilde{\rho}^{\widetilde{B}^n}_{x^n_{[k]}}E_{x'^n_{[k]}}\right) \\
&\leq \eta + 5\gamma + 2\gamma' + 4\sum_{x'^n_{[k]}\in\mathcal{T}} \mathrm{Tr}E_{x'^n_{[k]}}\left(\sum_{x^n_{[k]}\in\mathcal{T}\cap F_{[k]}^{-1}(F_{[k]}(x'^n_{[k]}))\setminus x'^n_{[k]}} p^n(x^n_{[k]})\widetilde{\rho}_{x^n_{[k]}}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the first line we declare an error for non-typical $x^n_{[k]}$, and in the second line have used property 1 in Lemma 20; in the third line, we used Lemma 21, applied to $T = E_{x^n_{[k]}}$ and $S = \sum_{x'^n_{[k]}\in\mathcal{T}\cap F_{[k]}^{-1}(F_{[k]}(x^n_{[k]}))\setminus x^n_{[k]}} E_{x'^n_{[k]}}$; finally, in the fourth line we use property 2 in Lemma 20 for the first term in the bracket, and for the second term simply reorganise the double sum.

Thus, to bound the expected error probability, over the random choice of the F_j, we need a bound on the expected state in the round brackets in the last line of the above chain of inequalities. To do so, we distinguish the different cases of coordinates $\emptyset \neq I \subseteq [k]$ in which $x^n_{[k]}$ and $x'^n_{[k]}$ differ:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{F_{[k]}}\left(\sum_{x^n_{[k]}\in\mathcal{T}\cap F_{[k]}^{-1}(F_{[k]}(x'^n_{[k]}))\setminus x'^n_{[k]}} p^n(x^n_{[k]})\widetilde{\rho}_{x^n_{[k]}}\right) &\leq \sum_{\emptyset\neq I\subseteq[k]} \frac{1}{\prod_{i\in I} M_i} \sum_{\substack{x^n_{[k]}\in\mathcal{T} \\ \text{s.t. } x^n_{I^c}=x'^n_{I^c}}} p^n(x^n_{[k]})\widetilde{\rho}_{x^n_{[k]}} \\
&=: \sum_{\emptyset\neq I\subseteq[k]} \frac{1}{\prod_{i\in I} M_i} p(x'^n_{I^c})\widetilde{\rho}_{x'^n_{I^c}},
\end{aligned}$$

with the shorthand notation $I^c = [k]\setminus I$ for the set complement. Furthermore, in the first line we have used the 2-universality of the F_j, as well as their independence, and in the second line note that the probabilities and states $p(x'^n_{I^c})\widetilde{\rho}_{x'^n_{I^c}}$ appear in the marginal

$$\widetilde{\rho}^{X^n_{I^c}\widetilde{B}^n} = \sum_{x^n_{I^c}} p(x^n_{I^c})|x^n_{I^c}\rangle\langle x^n_{I^c}|^{X^n_{I^c}}\otimes\widetilde{\rho}^{\widetilde{B}^n}_{x^n_{I^c}}.$$

This means that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{F_{[k]}}P_e &\leq \eta + 5\gamma + 2\gamma' + 4\sum_{\emptyset\neq I\subseteq[k]} \frac{1}{\prod_{i\in I} M_i} \sum_{x'^n_{[k]}\in\mathcal{T}} \mathrm{Tr}\, p(x'^n_{I^c})\widetilde{\rho}_{x'^n_{I^c}}E_{x'^n_{[k]}} \\
&\leq \eta + 5\gamma + 2\gamma' + 4\sum_{\emptyset\neq I\subseteq[k]} \frac{2^{nH(X_I)+n\beta}}{\prod_{i\in I} M_i} \sum_{x'^n_{[k]}\in\mathcal{T}} \mathrm{Tr}\, p(x'^n_I)p(x'^n_{I^c})\widetilde{\rho}_{x'^n_{I^c}}E_{x'^n_{[k]}} \\
&= \eta + 5\gamma + 2\gamma' + 4\sum_{\emptyset\neq I\subseteq[k]} \frac{2^{nH(X_I)+n\beta}}{\prod_{i\in I} M_i} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\widetilde{\rho}^{X^n_I}\otimes\widetilde{\rho}^{X^n_{I^c}\widetilde{B}^n}\right)E' \\
&\leq \eta + 5\gamma + 2\gamma' + 4\sum_{\emptyset\neq I\subseteq[k]} \frac{2^{nH(X_I)+n\beta}}{\prod_{i\in I} M_i} 2^{-D^\epsilon_h\left(\rho^{X^n_{[k]}B^n}\,\middle\|\,\rho^{X^n_I}\otimes\rho^{X^n_{I^c}B^n}\right)} \\
&\leq \eta + 5\gamma + 2\gamma' + 4\sum_{\emptyset\neq I\subseteq[k]} \frac{2^{nH(X_I)+n\beta}}{\prod_{i\in I} M_i} 2^{-nI(X_I:X_{I^c}B)+n\beta} \\
&\leq \eta + 5\gamma + 2\gamma' + 4\sum_{\emptyset\neq I\subseteq[k]} 2^{n\left(H(X_I|X_{I^c}B)+2\beta-\sum_{i\in I}R_i\right)},
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second line we use entropy typicality of the $x'^n_{[k]}$; to get the third line simply insert the forms of $\widetilde{\rho}$ and E above; in the fourth line we use property 3 in Lemma 20, and in the fifth we invoke the asymptotic equipartition property (AEP) for the hypothesis testing relative entropy, stated as Lemma 22 below.

Hence, choosing $\beta = \delta/3$, we obtain as an upper bound on the expected error probability $\mathbb{E}_{F_{[k]}}P_e \leq \eta + 5\gamma + 2\gamma' + 2^{k+2}2^{-n\delta/3}$, which converges to 0 as $n\to\infty$ (and $\epsilon\to 0$ sufficiently slowly). ■

Here follow the technical lemmas from the literature invoked in the proof.

Lemma 20 (Sen's jointly typical operators [33, Lemma 1 in Sec. 5, cf. Sec. 1.3]): Let $X_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes X_k \otimes B$ be a $(k+1)$-partite classical-quantum system with finite-dimensional classical system X_i and a finite-dimensional quantum system B, and $\epsilon > 0$. Then there exists a Hilbert space C and a state τ^C on it such that for any cq-state $\sigma^{X_1 \dots X_k B}$, there is a cq-state $\widetilde{\sigma}^{X_1 \dots X_k \widetilde{B}}$ and a POVM element E (also of cq-form) on $X_1 \dots X_k \widetilde{B}$, where $\widetilde{B} = B \otimes C$, with the following properties:

1) $\frac{1}{2} \left\| \widetilde{\sigma}^{X_{[k]}\widetilde{B}} - \sigma^{X_{[k]}B} \otimes \tau^C \right\|_1 \leq \gamma$,
2) $\mathrm{Tr} \widetilde{\sigma}^{X_{[k]}\widetilde{B}} E \geq 1 - 2\gamma - \gamma'$,
3) for all $\emptyset \neq I \subseteq [k]$, $\mathrm{Tr}\left(\widetilde{\sigma}^{X_I} \otimes \widetilde{\sigma}^{X_{[k]\setminus I}\widetilde{B}} \right) E \leq 2^{-D_h^\epsilon\left(\sigma^{X_{[k]}B} \middle\| \sigma^{X_I} \otimes \sigma^{X_{[k]\setminus I}B}\right)}$.

Here, $\gamma = \sqrt{2}^{k+1} \sqrt[4]{\epsilon}$ and $\gamma' = 2^{k+2^{k+5}} \sqrt{\epsilon}$. ■

Lemma 21 (Hayashi and Nagaoka [46]): For a POVM element $0 \leq T \leq \mathbb{1}$ and a positive operator $S > 0$,

$$\mathbb{1} - (S+T)^{-\frac{1}{2}} T (S+T)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq 2(\mathbb{1} - T) + 4S.$$ ■

Lemma 22 (Hiai and Petz [47]; Ogawa and Nagaoka [48]): For any two states ρ and σ, and $0 < \epsilon < 1$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} D_h^\epsilon\left(\rho^{\otimes n} \middle\| \sigma^{\otimes n}\right) = D(\rho\|\sigma),$$

where $D(\rho\|\sigma) = \mathrm{Tr}\rho(\log\rho - \log\sigma)$ is the Umegaki quantum relative entropy. ■

Using the joint decoder for independent random binning we obtain a new proof for the achievability of the rate region (18) for correlated classical source coding with quantum side information at the decoder [31, Thm. IV.14 & Cor. IV.16], which does away with the successive decoding of the different parts of the source. This detail allows the solution of a more demanding problem that was out of reach of the methods in [31], correlated source coding for multiple decoders with quantum side information. Rather than giving the formal definition, let us just indicate the changes to Definition 18: the source is given by a cq-state

$$\rho^{X_{[k]}B_{[q]}} = \sum_{x_{[k]}} p(x_{[k]}) |x_1\rangle\langle x_1|^{X_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes |x_k\rangle\langle x_k|^{X_k} \otimes \rho_{x_{[k]}}^{B_{[q]}} \tag{19}$$

with q quantum systems $B_1, \dots, B_q$. A block code for this system is still given by encoding function f_i for each user $i \in [k]$, such that $\mu_i = f_i(x_i^n)$ is broadcast to all q decoders; but now we need a decoding POVM $\Lambda^{(j;\mu_{[k]})}$ on B_j^n for each decoder $j \in [q]$ that satisfy all the decoding error probability criterion for the cq-source $\rho^{X_{[k]}B_j}$. The random binning protocol of Lemma 19 then shows that the region

$$\forall\ j \in [q]\ \forall\ I \subseteq [k] \quad \sum_{i\in I} R_i \geq S(X_I | X_{[k]\setminus I} B_j) \tag{20}$$

is achievable for rates at which all decoders can successfully decode $X_{[k]}$ simultaneously. That the above conditions are necessary is also evident, so Eq. (20) is precisely the rate region.

In [33], [49] it was shown that the joint typicality Lemma 20 leads to simultaneous, joint-typicality decoders for the classical-quantum multiple access channel (cq-MAC), in fact essentially optimal one-shot bounds. Using a well-known reduction of MAC to Slepian-Wolf, we can also derive the iid rate region from the present result Eq. (20), even in the presence of multiple receivers, cf. [50]. Namely, for the k-sender, q-receiver cq-MAC that takes input $x_{[k]} = x_1 \dots x_k$ to $\rho_{x_{[k]}}^{B_{[q]}}$, and in the simplest case a product distribution $p(x_{[k]}) = p_1(x_1) \cdots p_k(x_k)$, consider the cq-state as in Eq. (19). For block length n and the random code as in Lemma 19, consider the bins restricted to the typical sequences, for sender i this is $\mathcal{T}_i$, the sequences typical for the probability distribution p_i, and denote their respective cardinalities by $N_i = 2^{nR_i'}$. Then, we have with high probability that most of the bins are good codes for all decoders and that for most of the bins in turn $\left|R_i' - (H(X_i) - R_i)\right| \leq \frac{1}{k}\delta$, and so $\sum_{i\in I} R_i' \leq \min_j I(X_I : B_j | X_{[k]\setminus I}) - 2\delta$ for all $\emptyset \neq I \subseteq [k]$. For any rate tuple satisfying these constraints there exists thus asymptotically good codes.

To get the full rate region, we also need an auxiliary random variable U such that $X_1, \dots, X_k$ are independent conditionally on U; then, every tuple of rates R_i' such that

$$\forall\ I \subseteq [k] \quad \sum_{i\in I} R_i' \leq \min_j I(X_I : B_j | X_{[k]\setminus I} U),$$

is asymptotically achievable for transmitting k independent messages from the separate senders to all receivers B_j, $j \in [q]$. The proof is quite similar to the sketch above and is omitted.

REFERENCES

[1] F. Salek and A. Winter, "Multi-User Distillation of Common Randomness and Entanglement from Quantum States," in *Proc. 2020 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT), 21-26 June 2020, Los Angeles, CA*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1967–1972.

[2] I. Devetak, A. W. Harrow, and A. Winter, "A Resource Framework for Quantum Shannon Theory," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 54, no. 10, pp. 4587–4618, Oct 2008.

[3] C. H. Bennett, H. J. Bernstein, S. Popescu, and B. Schumacher, "Concentrating partial entanglement by local operations," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 53, pp. 2046–2052, Apr 1996.

[4] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, "Quantum entanglement," *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, vol. 81, no. 2, pp. 865–942, 2009.

[5] C. H. Bennett, S. Popescu, D. Rohrlich, J. A. Smolin, and A. V. Thapliyal, "Exact and asymptotic measures of multipartite pure-state entanglement," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 63, p. 012307, 2000.

[6] N. Linden, S. Popescu, B. Schumacher, and M. Westmoreland, "Reversibility of local transformations of multiparticle entanglement," *Quantum Inf. Proc.*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 241–250, 2005.

[7] M. Walter, D. Gross, and J. Eisert, "Multipartite Entanglement," in *Quantum Information: From Foundations to Quantum Technology Applications*, D. Bruss and G. Leuchs, Eds., 2016, ch. 14, pp. 293–330.

[8] M. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, and A. Winter, "Partial quantum information," *Nature*, vol. 436, pp. 673–676, 2005.

[9] ——, "Quantum State Merging and Negative Information," *Commun. Math. Phys.*, vol. 269, no. 1, pp. 107–136, 2007.

[10] D. Yang and J. Eisert, "Entanglement Combing," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 103, p. 220501, Nov 2009.

[11] H. J. Kimble, "The quantum internet," *Nature*, vol. 453, pp. 1023–1030, 2008.

[12] M. Skotiniotis and A. Winter, "Quantum Godwin's Law," 2020, arXiv[quant-ph]:2003.13715.

[13] R. Ahlswede and I. Csiszar, "Common randomness in information theory and cryptography. II. CR capacity," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 225–240, Jan 1998.

[14] U. M. Maurer, "Secret Key Agreement by Public Discussion from Common Information," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 733–742, 1993.

[15] R. Ahlswede and I. Csiszár, "Common randomness in information theory and cryptography. I. Secret sharing," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 1121–1132, July 1993.

[16] I. Devetak and A. Winter, "Distillation of secret key and entanglement from quantum states," *Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A*, vol. 461, no. 2053, pp. 207–235, Jan 2005, arXiv:quant-ph/0306078.

[17] ——, "Distilling common randomness from bipartite quantum states," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 50, no. 12, pp. 3183–3196, Dec 2004.

[18] L. Henderson and V. Vedral, "Classical, quantum and total correlations," *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, vol. 34, no. 35, pp. 6899–6905, 2001.

[19] G. Murta, F. Grasselli, H. Kampermann, and D. Bruss, "Quantum Conference Key Agreement: A Review," 2020, arXiv[quant-ph]:2003.10186.

[20] I. Csiszár and P. Narayan, "Secrecy capacities for multiple terminals," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 50, no. 12, pp. 3047–3061, Dec 2004.

[21] R. García-Patrón, W. Matthews, and A. Winter, "Quantum Enhancement of Randomness Distribution," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 64, no. 6, pp. 4664–4673, June 2018.

[22] M. Hillery, V. Bužek, and A. Berthiaume, "Quantum secret sharing," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 59, pp. 1829–1834, Mar 1999.

[23] J. A. Smolin, F. Verstraete, and A. Winter, "Entanglement of assistance and multipartite state distillation," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 72, p. 052317, Nov 2005.

[24] B. Fortescue and H.-K. Lo, "Random Bipartite Entanglement from W and W-Like States," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 98, p. 260501, 2007.

[25] A. Streltsov, C. Meignant, and J. Eisert, "Rates of multi-partite entanglement transformations and applications in quantum networks," 2019, arXiv[quant-ph]:1709.09693v2.

[26] S. Bravyi, D. Fattal, and D. Gottesman, "GHZ extraction yield for multipartite stabilizer states," *J. Math. Phys.*, vol. 47, p. 062106, 2006.

[27] M. Takeoka, E. Kaur, W. Roga, and M. M. Wilde, "Multipartite entanglement and secret key distribution in quantum networks," 2019, arXiv[quant-ph]:1910.10658.

[28] P. Vrana and M. Christandl, "Distillation of Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger States by Combinatorial Methods," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 65, no. 9, pp. 5945–5958, Sep 2019.

[29] R. Wilmink, "Quantum Broadcast Channels and Cryptographic Applications for Separable States," Ph.D. dissertation, Universität Bielefeld, Department of Mathematics, 2003. [Online]. Available: https://pub.uni-bielefeld.de/download/2303480/2303483/dissertation_wilmink_publikation.pdf

[30] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory (2nd ed.)*. Wiley Interscience, 2006.

[31] A. Winter, "Coding Theorems of Quantum Information Theory," Ph.D. dissertation, Universität Bielefeld, Department of Mathematics, July 1999, arXiv:quant-ph/9907077.

[32] I. Devetak and A. Winter, "Classical data compression with quantum side information," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 68, p. 042301, Oct 2003.

[33] P. Sen, "Simultaneous decoding, unions, intersections and a one-shot quantum joint typicality lemma," 2018, arXiv[quant-ph]:1806.07278v2.

[34] I. Devetak, "The private classical capacity and quantum capacity of a quantum channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 44–55, Jan 2005.

[35] I. Devetak and A. Winter, "Relating Quantum Privacy and Quantum Coherence: An Operational Approach," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 93, p. 080501, Aug 2004.

[36] I. Devetak, A. W. Harrow, and A. Winter, "A Family of Quantum Protocols," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 93, p. 230504, Dec 2004.

[37] A. W. Harrow, "Coherent Communication of Classical Messages," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 92, p. 097902, Mar 2004.

[38] W. F. Stinespring, "Positive Functions on C^*-Algebras," *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 211–216, 1955.

[39] A. Winter, "Coding theorem and strong converse for quantum channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 45, no. 7, pp. 2481–2485, Nov 1999.

[40] M.-H. Hsieh, I. Devetak, and A. Winter, "Entanglement-Assisted Capacity of Quantum Multiple-Access Channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf.Theory*, vol. 54, no. 7, pp. 3078–3090, July 2008.

[41] K. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and J. Oppenheim, "Locking Entanglement with a Single Qubit," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 94, p. 200501, 2005.

[42] H. Maassen and J. B. M. Uffink, "Generalized Entropic Uncertainty Relations," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 60, no. 12, pp. 1103–1106, 1988.

[43] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, and U. M. Maurer, "Generalized Privacy Amplification," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 1915–1923, 1995.

[44] H. Tyagi and P. Narayan, "How Many Queries Will Resolve Common Randomness?" *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 9, pp. 5363–5378, 2013.

[45] A. A. Gohari and V. Anantharam, "Information-Theoretic Key Agreement of Multiple Terminals: Part I," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 8, pp. 3973–3996, 2010.

[46] M. Hayashi and H. Nagaoka, "General formulas for capacity of classical-quantum channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 49, no. 7, pp. 1753–1768, 2003.

[47] F. Hiai and D. Petz, "The proper formula for relative entropy and its asymptotics in quantum probability," *Commun. Math. Phys.*, vol. 143, no. 1, pp. 99–114, 1991.

[48] T. Ogawa and H. Nagaoka, "Strong Converse and Stein's Lemma in Quantum Hypothesis Testing," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 46, no. 7, pp. 2428–2433, 2000.

[49] P. Sen, "Inner bounds via simultaneous decoding in quantum network information theory," 2018, arXiv[quant-ph]:1806.07276.

[50] R. Ahlswede, "The Capacity Region of a Channel with Two Senders and Two Receivers," *Ann Probab.*, vol. 2, no. 5, pp. 805–814, 1974.