Quantum steering is the resource for secure tripartite Quantum State Sharing
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Quantum State Sharing (QSS) is a protocol by which a (secret) quantum state may be securely split, shared between multiple potentially dishonest players, and reconstructed. Crucially the players are each assumed to be dishonest, and so QSS requires that only a collaborating authorised subset of players can access the original secret state; any dishonest unauthorised conspiracy cannot reconstruct it. We analyse a QSS protocol involving three untrusted players and demonstrate that quantum steering is the required resource which enables the protocol to proceed securely. We analyse the level of steering required to share any single-mode Gaussian secret which enables the states to be shared with the optimal use of resources.

I. INTRODUCTION

Secret sharing is a process by which information can be securely shared between several players such that it is inaccessible to any individual player, but can be accessed when players collaborate [1–3]. By requiring collaboration, secret sharing provides guaranteed security against small groups of dishonest actors. Quantum State Sharing [24] schemes translate this to act on quantum secrets: the information describing a single quantum state is shared between the modes of a larger multipartite system. Since no individual mode contains enough information to reconstruct the original state, only certain authorised subsets of players can access the original state through collaboration [4, 5].

Quantum state sharing protocols aim at future uses in diverse quantum technology schemes. In secure distributed quantum computing, computations could be performed on each individual share without any single quantum computer having direct access to the underlying information [6]. The shares from different computers could then be recombined to produce the computation outcome. QSS may be viewed as a form of quantum error correction analogous to Reed-Solomon codes [7] and thus may also find uses in loss-tolerant quantum information distribution, either for the Quantum Internet [8] or for use within a quantum computing stack [9].

Any future application of QSS to quantum information processing would require the scheme to be secure, which is to say that the honest collaborating parties must be able to reconstruct a better copy of the original state than any adversaries. With perfect entanglement a QSS scheme is secure for the sharing of any single-mode Gaussian state. However, increased entanglement requires greater quantum resources and increases the cost of any implementation. For a scheme to be practical, then, it is important to minimise the entanglement resources required while maintaining security.

In this Paper we analyse the security of a fully Gaussian QSS protocol involving three potentially individually dishonest players and demonstrate that quantum steering is the resource required for the protocol to be secure. In particular, we show that any two-mode state which is one-way steerable can be used as a resource to securely share a coherent state, and we analyse the strength of steering required to share a general single-mode Gaussian state.

In the protocol we are interested in here, termed (2, 3)-threshold QSS, the information describing the secret state is split between three modes and can be reconstructed using any two of them. This is a particular case of the general (k, n)-threshold QSS, in which any k of a total n modes can reconstruct the secret state, presented for continuous-variable secrets using two-mode squeezed vacuum (TMSV) resource states by Tyc et al [10–12]. A number of possible implementation setups have since been proposed by Lance et al [13–15] for the (2, 3)-threshold case using TMSV states. The protocol we discuss here is an extended form of the (2, 3)-threshold Tyc et al protocol which allows for the use of any, in general asymmetric, two-mode Gaussian resource state.

After briefly reviewing the entanglement properties of two-mode Gaussian states in section II, we outline the details of (2, 3)-threshold quantum state sharing in sections III and IV. We then discuss the security of the protocol for coherent states in section V and for general single-mode Gaussian states in section VI. Additional technical results may be found in the supplementary material.

II. GAUSSIAN RESOURCE STATES

We begin with a brief review of the properties of entangled two-mode Gaussian states, which form the resource for this protocol. A Gaussian state is one whose Wigner function is Gaussian and consequently is fully characterised by its mean vector \( \bar{\mathbf{r}} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} \) and covariance matrix \( \mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n} \) [16]. We define elements of the covariance matrix as \( V_{i,j} = \frac{1}{2} \langle \{ \hat{X}_i \hat{X}_j \} \rangle \) where \( \{ \} \) represents the anticommutator and \( \hat{X}^+ = (\hat{a}^\dagger + \hat{a})/\sqrt{2} \) the \( X \) and \( P \) quadratures of each mode respectively.

As we show in section V, secure QSS requires a strict form of entanglement in which the measurement of one mode can affect the state of the second mode. This is known as EPR steering [17, 18]. The ability of one mode
of a two-mode state to EPR steer the other is quantified through the steering parameter [19]

$$E_{1/2}(g) = \Delta(\hat{X}_1^+ - g\hat{X}_2^+)\Delta(\hat{X}_1^- + g\hat{X}_2^-),$$

(1)

where \(\hat{X}_1^\pm\) represents the quadrature operators for each mode and \(\Delta^2(\hat{O})\) represents the variance of an operator \(\hat{O}\). Mode 2 can steer mode 1 whenever there exists a \(g = (g^+, g^-)^T \in \mathbb{R}^2\) such that \(E_{1/2}(g) < 1\) with greater EPR steering as \(E_{1/2} \to 0\). Notably, this quantity is directional so a state may be steerable from mode 2 \(\to 1\) but not from \(1 \to 2\). A state is said to be two-way steerable when it is steerable in both directions.

The steering parameter measures the correlation between \(\hat{X}_1^\pm\) and \(g^\pm\hat{X}_2^\pm\), in which \(g^\pm\) represents an effective scaling between the modes. Equivalently, \(E_{1/2}(g)\) represents the extent to which the two resource modes cancel when mixed as

$$\hat{X}_1^+ - g^+\hat{X}_2^+,$$

$$\hat{X}_1^- + g^-\hat{X}_2^-,$$

(2)

quantified by the smallness of the corresponding uncertainty.

For simplicity, we restrict our discussion to those resource states which exhibit equivalent entanglement properties in each quadrature, the \((X - P)\)-balanced states. For such states, the steering parameter reduces to

$$E_{1/2}(g) = \Delta^2(\hat{X}_1^+ - g\hat{X}_2^+) = \Delta^2(\hat{X}_1^- + g\hat{X}_2^-),$$

(3)

for \(g^+ = g^- := g\). Although this condition is presented here for any \(g \in \mathbb{R}\), it can be shown [25] that in our case, steering is only possible for \(g \in (0, \sqrt{2})\) and so it is this range that we will consider here [26].

III. TRIPARTITE QUANTUM STATE SHARING
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FIG. 1: Quantum State Sharing schemes consist of two distinct sub-protocols. In (2, 3)-threshold QSS, the secret state \(\psi\) is originally passed to a dealer who mixes it with an entangled resource state to produce three shares (dealer protocol), none of which contain a suitable amount of information about the secret state. Any two of these shares can then be recombined with a suitable reconstruction protocol to recover the original secret state.

We now turn our attention to the specific QSS protocol we are interested in. Threshold quantum state sharing consists of two distinct stages: the dealer protocol, in which the single-mode secret is split into multiple shares; and the reconstruction protocol, in which a subset of these shares are recombined to reproduce the original secret state. In (2, 3)-threshold QSS, the dealer mixes the secret state with one mode of the two-mode resource state to produce entangled system of three modes. Any two of these modes can then be used to reconstruct the original secret state, through a sub-protocol we denote \(i, j\) reconstruction when modes \(i\) and \(j\) are used. An overview of the QSS protocol is shown in figure 1, and an illustration of the Wigner functions representing each stage of the process is shown in figure 2.

a. Dealer protocol: The dealer constructs the three shares by interfering the secret state on a balanced beamsplitter with one mode of the two-mode entangled resource. The three output states are then related to the input states by

$$\hat{X}_1^+ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{X}_\psi^+ + \hat{X}_r^+),$$

(4)

$$\hat{X}_2^+ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{X}_\psi^+ - \hat{X}_r^+),$$

(5)

$$\hat{X}_3^+ = \hat{X}_r^+,$$

(6)

where \(\hat{X}_\psi^\pm\) are the quadrature operators representing the secret state and \(\hat{X}_r^\pm\) represents each mode of the resource state. Crucially, none of \(\hat{X}_r^{1,2,3}\) individually contain enough information to accurately reconstruct the original state. As shown in Ref. [14], the information obtainable from each share could be further reduced with the addition of correlated classical noise without impacting the reconstructed state. Each of the three modes are distributed to a player as labelled.

b. \(\{1, 2\}\) reconstruction: Players 1 and 2 may trivially reconstruct their state by passing each share through a second balanced beamsplitter. This will effectively reverse the beamsplitter used in the dealer protocol, reproducing the original separable system and leaving in one of the beamsplitter outputs the state

$$\hat{X}_{out}^\pm = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{X}_1^\pm + \hat{X}_2^\pm) = \hat{X}_\psi^\pm.$$

(7)

In the ideal case, with no transmission or component losses, \(\hat{X}_\psi^\pm\) will be reconstructed perfectly regardless of the resource state used.

c. \(\{1, 3\}\) and \(\{2, 3\}\) reconstruction: Reconstructing the original state using share 3 requires a more complex disentanglement process to separate \(\hat{X}_\psi^\pm\) from the resource state. We focus here on \(\{1, 3\}\) reconstruction; the \(\{2, 3\}\) case follows with only minor changes. Recalling from equation (3) that the resource state is entangled such that the modes cancel maximally when mixed with ratio \(\hat{X}_{r_1}^\pm + g\hat{X}_{r_2}^\pm\) for some \(g \in \mathbb{R}\), it becomes clear that in order to recover \(\hat{X}_\psi^\pm\) we wish to implement the trans-
We derive $\eta$ in the supplementary material to preserve the canonical commutation relations. We show in the supplementary material [20] that to preserve the canonical commutation relations, and thus satisfy the uncertainty theorem, this reconstruction must impose a gain of $\eta = 1/\sqrt{2 - g^2}$ on the secret state. Clearly, then, this reconstruction protocol amplifies the original state for all $g > 1$ and de-amplifies it for all $g < 1$ - the original state is only reproduced with unity-gain for $g = 1$.

### IV. Unity-Gain Quantum State Sharing

When the protocol is implemented for $g = 1$, the output state $\hat{\rho}_{\text{out}}$ is reproduced with the same mean $\bar{r}$ as the secret state and with covariance $V_{\text{out}} = V_{\psi} + E_{1/2}(g) I$. The accuracy of this reconstruction can be quantified by the fidelity $F = \langle \psi | \hat{\rho}_{\text{out}} | \psi \rangle$ between the original secret state $\psi$ and the output state. When the output and input states have the same mean amplitude $\bar{r}$, this fidelity can be expressed in terms of the covariance matrices as $F = 2/\sqrt{\det(V_{\psi} + V_{\text{out}})}$. The ideal fidelity for QSS implemented for $g = 1$ is then

$$F_{g=1} = \frac{2}{2 + E_{1/2}(g = 1)}. \tag{9}$$

In general, for $g \neq 1$, the protocol as outlined in section III will not reproduce the mean $\bar{r}$ of the input state exactly. To correct for the change in $\bar{r}$ introduced by the protocol, and so reconstruct the original state with unity-gain, we augment it with an additional pre-amplification or post-attenuation step. These are similar corrections to those introduced for quantum teleportation by Ref. [21] and so we also describe them as late-stage attenuation (lsatt) and early-stage amplification (esa) QSS.

#### A. Late-stage attenuation (lsatt)

When the output state is an amplified copy of the input state (when $\eta > 1$, $g > 1$), the optimum correction is to attenuate the output state after the QSS reconstruction protocol. Modelling this attenuation as an ideal beamsplitter with transmissivity $\tau = 1/\eta^2$ with a vacuum environment this implements the transformation

$$\hat{X}_{\text{out}}^\pm \rightarrow \frac{1}{\eta} \hat{X}_{\text{out}}^\pm + \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{\eta^2}} \hat{X}_{\text{vac}}^\pm. \tag{10}$$

The corrected output state then has mean $\bar{r}_{\text{out}} = \bar{r}_{\text{in}}^2$ and covariance matrix $V_{\text{out}} = V_{\text{in}} + (E_{1/2}(g) + 1 - 1/\eta^2) I$

For the specific case of a coherent state secret with covariance matrix $V_{\text{in}} = I$, the secret state is reproduced with a fidelity of

$$F_{\text{lsatt}} = \frac{2}{3 - 1/\eta^2 + E_{1/2}(g)}. \tag{10}$$
B. Early-stage amplification (esa)

When the output state is a de-amplified copy of the input state (when \( \eta < 1, g < 1 \)), the optimum correction is to instead amplify the input secret state prior to the dealer protocol. We model this process as an ideal amplifying channel; in practice such an amplification could be achieved by a phase-insensitive amplifier [16]. Denoting the original secret state by \( \psi \), the amplified input to the QSS protocol can be written \( \tilde{\psi} = \eta \psi \), where \( 1/\eta > 1 \). Following the de-amplifying QSS protocol, the output state will have mean \( \tilde{r}_{\text{out}} = \eta \tilde{r}_{\text{in}} = \eta \tilde{r} \) and covariance matrix \( V_{\text{out}} = \eta^2 V_{\text{in}} + \eta^2 E_{1|2}(g) I = V_\psi + \eta^2 E_{1|2}(g) + 1 - \eta^2 \).

For a coherent state secret, the secret state is reproduced with a fidelity of

\[
F_{\text{esa}} = \frac{2}{3 - \eta^2 + \eta^2 E_{1|2}(g)} \quad (11)
\]

Of course, the introduction of an amplification stage prior to the dealer protocol would require a corresponding de-amplification correction for \{1,2\}-reconstruction. However, since, under equal conditions, \{1,2\}-reconstruction will always have higher fidelity than \{2,3\} or \{1,3\}-reconstruction, this would not affect our analysis of the security of the protocol.

V. SECURITY ANALYSIS FOR COHERENT-STATE QSS

For a quantum state sharing scheme to be considered secure it must be guaranteed that the collaborating parties obtain more information about the original secret than any adversary can. This security requirement can be certified through the uncertainty theorem, which imposes that only one copy of a single quantum state can exceed a fidelity of \( F = 2/3 \) - a condition termed the cloning limit [22]. Should the collaborators reconstruct the state with a fidelity above this limit, it follows immediately that no other party can obtain as much information as them and so the protocol is secure.

To certify security for the whole protocol, each possible reconstruction (\{1,2\}, \{1,3\}, \{2,3\}) must individually be provably secure. Since the reconstruction fidelity obtained using shares 1 and 2 is strictly greater than any reconstruction involving share 3, it suffices to check the fidelity only for the latter case.

We have seen that whenever player 3 is involved, the general reconstruction fidelity for a given resource state, using the optimal unity-gain reconstruction protocols discussed in Sec. IV is

\[
F = \begin{cases} 
2/(3 - \eta^2 + \eta^2 E_{1|2}(g)) & g < 1 \quad (\eta < 1) \\
2/(2 + E_{1|2}(g)) & g = 1 \quad (\eta = 1) \\
2/(3 - 1/\eta^2 + E_{1|2}(g)) & 1 < g < \sqrt{2} \quad (\eta > 1) 
\end{cases}
\]

where \( \eta(g) = 1/\sqrt{2-g^2} \) and \( g \in (0, \sqrt{2}) \) is chosen to maximise fidelity.

Comparing this reconstruction fidelity to the cloning limit, \( F > 2/3 \), we reach our first result defining the entanglement requirements for secure QSS:

Result 1. A sufficient condition for a two-mode resource state to be useful for secure \{2,3\}-threshold QSS with coherent state secret is that there exist a \( g \in (0, \sqrt{2}) \) such that the steering parameter satisfies

\[
E_{1|2}(g) < \begin{cases} 
1 & g < 1 \\
2 - g^2 & g > 1 
\end{cases} \quad (13)
\]

Notably, while this result shows that any resource state exhibiting EPR-steering for some \( g < 1 \) is useful for secure QSS, a greater magnitude of steering is required when the resource is steerable only for \( g > 1 \). This seeming asymmetry is due to where in the process the amplification correction is implemented. In \textit{batch} QSS setups, the secret state is first mixed with the resource mode with both amplified by the QSS scheme before being attenuated afterwards - leaving both secret and resource contribution with no net amplification. However, in \textit{esa} QSS setups, the amplification correction occurs \textit{before} the secret is mixed with the resource, and so the resource contribution is de-amplified by the QSS protocol without a corresponding amplification. The secret state is reproduced with unity-gain while the resource contributions are attenuated, reducing their impact on the noise in the output state. Consequently a higher fidelity can be achieved through \textit{esa}.

For a strict implementation of this protocol as described in section III, the dealer has access to both resource modes and may choose which mode to mix with the secret state. This free choice of resource mode (i.e. a choice of relabelling modes 1 \( \leftrightarrow \) 2) allows the dealer to decide in which direction this protocol utilises the steering of the resource state, leading to a more general view on the requirements for secure QSS:

Result 2. All EPR steerable states (one-way and two-way) are useful for the secure sharing of a coherent-state secret with a suitable dealer allocation of resource modes.

Proof. All resource states steerable from mode 2 to mode 1 for some \( g \leq 1 \) are useful for secure QSS from result 1. Suppose instead the state is steerable only for \( g > 1 \): such a state is steerable in the opposite direction for \( \tilde{g} = 1/g < 1 \). Hence this state can be made useful for secure QSS simply by swapping the modes used in the dealer protocol. \( \square \)

This result requires the dealer to be able to arbitrarily swap resource modes, which we assume to be possible in most implementations and discuss further in the supplementary material [20]. We note that when such swapping is not permitted, result 2 does not imply that any EPR steerable state can be used for secure QSS. For example,
if it were desired to distribute one mode of the resource state prior to the other being used in the dealer protocol, one would need to be careful in the choice of resource mode and in any asymmetric degradation of the shares during distribution.

The lower steering requirement when \( g \leq 1 \) also hints at another asymmetry: we show in the supplemental material [20] that whenever a resource state is steerable in one direction for some \( g > 1 \), it is always preferable to swap the modes and instead utilise steering in the opposite direction for \( g = 1/g \).

**VI. SHARING OTHER GAUSSIAN SECRETS**

The quantum state sharing scheme outlined above generalises naturally to the sharing of any single-mode Gaussian state. We now explore briefly the effectiveness of this protocol for some more general forms of single-mode states. A fuller account of QSS for these states is provided in the supplementary material [20].

### A. Sharing squeezed vacuum states

We first consider the case of sharing an undisplaced squeezed vacuum state with squeezing parameter \( \zeta \in \mathbb{R} \). At \( \theta = 0 \) squeezing angle such a state has covariance matrix \( \mathbf{V} = \text{diag}(e^{-2\zeta}, e^{2\zeta}) \), in which the uncertainty in one quadrature is reduced below the quantum limit with a corresponding increase in the other quadrature [16]. Assuming all noise sources to be unsqueezed, the squeezing angle can always be reproduced exactly in the reconstructed state, while the degree of squeezing is necessarily reduced to

\[
\zeta \to \frac{1}{4} \ln \frac{e^{2\zeta} + E_{1|2}(g)}{e^{-2\zeta} + E_{1|2}(g)} \leq \zeta. \tag{14}
\]

In the absence of perfect entanglement in the resource, the output state will be a mixed state with purity dependent on the magnitude of the resource state’s steering. When the squeezed secret has not been displaced from the vacuum, any gain imposed by the protocol acts only to increase the variance of the output state and does not change the position of the mean in phase-space and so the correction used for coherent states is not required here.

### B. Sharing arbitrary pure states

We now return to considering states with an arbitrary mean displacement \( \bar{\mathbf{r}} \in \mathbb{R}^2 \). The most general pure single-mode Gaussian state is a squeezed coherent state, which shares the covariance matrix of the squeezed vacuum state. With non-zero mean we again need to correct for the gain imposed by the QSS reconstruction through the additional pre-amplification or post-attenuation described in section IV. As these corrections all involve phase-independent processes, the squeezing angle is unaffected and will be reproduced perfectly in the output. The addition of unsqueezed vacuum variance from each of these processes, however, will further reduce the squeezing magnitude in the output.

The reconstruction fidelity for these states is a generally complex function of \( E_{1|2}(g) \) and \( \zeta \) which is shown in the supplemental material [20]. From this fidelity we can again derive a simple condition on the steering parameter:

**Result 3.** To securely share a pure Gaussian secret state with a squeezing of up to \( \zeta_{\text{max}} \) requires a resource state with steering of

\[
E_{1|2}(g) < \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{1}{\pi} \Gamma(\zeta_{\text{max}}) & g \leq 1 \ (\eta \leq 1) \\ \frac{1}{\pi} - \Gamma(\zeta_{\text{max}}) & g \geq 1 \ (\eta \geq 1) \end{cases}, \tag{15}
\]

for some \( g \in (0, \sqrt{2}) \) where \( 1/\eta^2 = 2 - g^2 \) and

\[
\Gamma(\zeta) = 1 + 2 \cosh(2\zeta) - \sqrt{4 \cosh^2(2\zeta) + 5} \geq 0 \tag{16}
\]

is a monotonically increasing function of \( \zeta \) with \( \Gamma(0) = 0 \).

This result is derived in the supplementary material [20].

Comparing this condition to that for coherent states in equation (13), the effect of squeezing the secret state on QSS becomes apparent. To securely share a secret state with one quadrature squeezed below the vacuum limit requires a corresponding increase in entanglement. This increase in entanglement requirements is shown in figure 3. Notably, the required extra steering tends to \( \Gamma = 1 \) as \( \zeta \to \infty \) so even highly squeezed states, and in the limit quadrature states, can be shared securely with a suitably entangled resource state.

### C. Sharing arbitrary mixed states

Finally, we discuss the sharing of the most general possible single-mode Gaussian state, a squeezed displaced thermal state. Such a state has arbitrary mean \( \bar{\mathbf{r}} \in \mathbb{R}^2 \) and covariance matrix \( \mathbf{V} = (2\bar{n} + 1) \text{diag}(\exp(-2\zeta), \exp(2\zeta)) \), where \( \bar{n} \) represents the average number of photons in the state and \( \zeta \) again represents the quadrature squeezing.

We show in the supplementary material that the fidelity for securely sharing such states depends on the values of \( \bar{n} \) and \( \zeta \) but as for coherent states not on the mean amplitude \( \bar{\mathbf{r}} \). For each of the two unity-gain corrections this reconstruction fidelity is
Fig. 3: Minimum resource-state steering $E_{1/2}(g)$ required to securely share single-mode Gaussian states with fidelity $F > 2/3$ as shown in results 3 and 4. Lower values of $E_{1/2}(g)$ imply a greater degree of steering is required. Contours display lines of constant minimum steering requirement as marked on the legend. (a), (b) The resource state requirements to share (a) pure squeezed states and (b) unsqueezed thermal states. In both cases, the lowest steering requirements for a given state, and the greatest tolerable increase in squeezing / photon number for a given steering level, occurs at $g = 0$ when no amplification correction is required to reconstruct the original state. (c) Steering requirements for a squeezed thermal state when QSS is implemented for $g = 0$. Notably, even in the limit of infinite squeezing and photon number secure QSS can still be achieved with a suitably entangled resource state.

\[
F = \begin{cases}
\frac{2}{\sqrt{4 + 4(2\bar{n} + 1) \cosh(2\zeta)(1 + \eta^2E_{1/2}(g) - \eta^2)}} + (2\bar{n} + 1)^2(1 + \eta^2E_{1/2}(g) - \eta^2)^2 & \eta \leq 1 \\
\frac{2}{\sqrt{4 + 4(2\bar{n} + 1) \cosh(2\zeta)(1 + E_{1/2}(g) - 1/\eta^2)}} + (2\bar{n} + 1)^2(1 + E_{1/2}(g) - 1/\eta^2)^2 & \eta \geq 1
\end{cases}
\]  

which represents the most general measure of ideal reconstruction fidelity for a single-mode Gaussian state. Imposing the no-cloning condition that $F > 2/3$ on this fidelity yields a condition on the entanglement required to securely share any single-mode Gaussian state.

**Result 4.** To securely share a generally squeezed thermal Gaussian secret state with squeezing of up to $\xi_{\text{max}}$ and average photon number of up to $\bar{n}_{\text{max}}$ requires a resource state with steering of

\[
E_{1/2}(g) < \begin{cases}
\frac{1 - \frac{1}{\eta} \Gamma(\xi_{\text{max}}, \bar{n}_{\text{max}})}{\eta^2} & \eta \leq 1 \\
\frac{1}{\eta^2} - \Gamma(\xi_{\text{max}}, \bar{n}_{\text{max}}) & \eta \geq 1
\end{cases},
\]

for some $g \in (0, \sqrt{2})$ where $1/\eta = 2 - g^2$ and

\[
\Gamma(\zeta, \bar{n}) = 1 + \frac{1}{(2\bar{n} + 1)} \left(2\cosh(2\zeta) - \sqrt{4\cosh^2(2\zeta) + 5}\right)
\]

is a monotonically increasing function of the squeezing $\zeta$ and photon number $\bar{n}$ with $\Gamma(\zeta = 0, \bar{n} = 0) = 0$.

Notably, in the limit of infinite secret-state squeezing and thermal photon number ($\zeta \to \infty$, $\bar{n} \to \infty$), $\Gamma(\zeta, \bar{n}) \to 0$ and so any single-mode Gaussian state can be shared securely with a suitably entangled resource state.

**VII. CONCLUSION**

We have shown here that the secure sharing of coherent states between three players is possible using a resource state exhibiting any form of EPR steering. Notably, this is a looser requirement than those for secure quantum teleportation, where a resource state must be two-way steerable to be useful [19]. Consequently, QSS could be considered a competitive alternative to quantum teleportation for secure state distribution when a set of communication channels can be trusted only collectively.

Going beyond coherent states, we have analysed the QSS protocol for any single-mode Gaussian state including squeezed states and thermal states. We have shown that while increased resource steering is required to share states with increasing squeezing or average photon number, any single-mode Gaussian state is securely sharable with a suitably entangled resource state. Future work on this subject could involves a suitable generalisation to securely share the wider class of multi-mode Gaussian secret states. In such a case it will be of critical importance to preserve correlations between modes of the secret state. Additionally, the practical implementations of the analogous $(k, n)$-threshold QSS should be consid-
There is also potential for QSS schemes to find uses among blind quantum computation [6] or as quantum Reed-Solomon codes for error correction [7]. By splitting the original state into shares, and transmitting the shares separately, the original state can be reconstructed even should some of the shares lose fidelity in the transmission. Quantum error correction is an important sub-routine both in quantum computing and in quantum state distribution. QSS schemes then may contribute to the practical implementation of a future quantum internet [8].
This Supplementary Material discusses further several of the results which are used in the main paper, and presents their derivations. In section I we demonstrate the form the Gaussian channel for reconstructing the state using player 3’s share takes. In section II, we then demonstrate that this channel can be implemented by a practical setup involving a feed-forward loop, and show some of the setup parameters for the reconstruction step. The corresponding result from section I form the basis of our quantitative results in the main paper. In section III we demonstrate an interesting asymmetry present in this protocol where it is always preferable to swap the resource modes so the steering can be used for $g < 1$, regardless of whether a better steering parameter is achievable in the other direction for $g > 1$. Finally, we derive in full the results for general one-mode Gaussian secret states, which are described in section VI of the main paper. These are derived in section IV for squeezed vacuum states, section V for general Gaussian pure states, and section VI for general Gaussian mixed states.
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### I. QUANTUM CHANNEL REPRESENTING RECONSTRUCTION INVOLVING PLAYER 3

In this section we derive the quantum channel representation of the state reconstruction protocol involving player 3. The results from this section form the basis of all subsequent analyses of the protocol.

As described in section III of the main body of the paper, the optimum reconstruction process for shares 1 and 3
is represented by the operation
\[
\hat{X}_{\text{out}}^\pm \rightarrow \eta \left( \sqrt{2} \hat{X}_1^\pm + g \hat{X}_3^\pm \right) \\
= \eta \left( \hat{X}_2^\pm + (\hat{X}_1^\pm + g \hat{X}_3^\pm) \right), \tag{1}
\]
where \(g > 0\) represents an adjustable experimental parameter and \(\eta\) an as-yet unspecified gain on the output state. A similar operation exists for shares 2 and 3. We will show here that this gain must be of the form \(\eta = 1/\sqrt{2 - g^2}\). While this operation can be represented by a Gaussian unitary, we will model it instead as a general Gaussian quantum channel to demonstrate that no more-efficient channel exists.

An arbitrary Gaussian quantum channel can be represented through its effect on the mean and covariance matrices of a Gaussian state as [1]
\[
\mathbf{r} \rightarrow \mathbf{T} \mathbf{r}, \quad \mathbf{V} \rightarrow \mathbf{T} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{T}^T + \mathbf{N}, \tag{2}
\]
where \(\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}\) represents the mixing of the modes imparted by the channel and \(\mathbf{N} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}\) represents additional environment noise introduced by the channel. For this channel to be trace-preserving and satisfy the uncertainty principle, it is required that
\[
\mathbf{N} + i\mathbf{\Omega} - i\mathbf{T} \mathbf{\Omega} \mathbf{T}^T \succeq \mathbf{0}, \tag{3}
\]
where \(\mathbf{O} \succeq \mathbf{0}\) represents the positive semi-definiteness condition that \(\mathbf{z}^\dagger \mathbf{O} \mathbf{z} \geq 0 \forall \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^{2n}\) and \(\mathbf{\Omega}\) is the standard symplectic form representing the canonical commutation relations
\[
\mathbf{\Omega} = \bigoplus_n \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4}
\]

The operation described by eq. (1) can be represented as
\[
\mathbf{T} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2} & 0 & -g & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{2} & 0 & g \\ a & 0 & c & 0 \\ 0 & b & 0 & d \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5}
\]
where \(a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}\) represent the second output of this channel and are left unspecifed and we have set \(\mathbf{N} = \mathbf{0}\) to remove unnecessary environment noise sources. The condition for this channel to be physical then becomes
\[
i\mathbf{\Omega} - i\mathbf{T} \mathbf{\Omega} \mathbf{T}^T = i \begin{pmatrix} 0 & g^2 \eta^2 - 2\eta^2 + 1 & \eta(dg - \sqrt{2}b) \\ -g^2 \eta^2 + 2\eta^2 - 1 & 0 & \eta(\sqrt{2}a + cg) \\ 0 & \eta(-\sqrt{2}a - cg) & 0 \\ \eta(\sqrt{2}b - dg) & 0 & ab + cd - 1 \end{pmatrix} \succeq \mathbf{0}. \tag{6}
\]

Taking an arbitrary \(\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^4\), which we write as \(\mathbf{x} + i\mathbf{y}\) for \(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^4\), we can calculate
\[
\mathbf{z}^\dagger (i\mathbf{\Omega} - i\mathbf{T} \mathbf{\Omega} \mathbf{T}^T) \mathbf{z} = x_1 \left( 2 \left((2 - g^2)\eta^2 - 1\right) y_2 + 2\eta \left(\sqrt{2}b - dg\right) y_4 \right) \\
- x_2 \left( 2 \left((2 - g^2)\eta^2 - 1\right) y_1 + 2\eta \left(\sqrt{2}a + cg\right) y_3 \right) \\
+ x_3 \left( 2\eta \left(\sqrt{2}a + cg\right) y_2 + 2(ab + cd - 1) y_4 \right) \\
- x_4 \left( 2\eta \left(\sqrt{2}b - dg\right) y_1 + 2(ab + cd - 1) y_3 \right) \tag{7}
\]
Clearly, for this expression to be non-negative for all \(\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^4\) the coefficients of each permutation of \(x_i y_j\) must be individually zero. Hence, for \(\mathbf{T}\) to represent a gaussian channel, the following four conditions must be satisfied.
\[
\sqrt{2}b - dg = 0, \tag{8}
\sqrt{2}a + cg = 0, \tag{9}
1 - ab - cd = 0, \tag{10}
1 - \eta^2(2 - g^2) = 0. \tag{11}
\]
FIG. 1: One possible (2,3)-threshold QSS setup, sketching \( \{1,2\} \)-reconstruction and \( \{2,3\} \)-reconstruction. The \( \{1,3\} \)-reconstruction scheme is identical to \( \{2,3\} \)-reconstruction. The three shares are produced by the dealer by mixing the secret state with one mode of a two-mode resource state. Shares 1 and 2 can be combined in a second balanced beamsplitter to reconstruct the original state. Shares 1 and 3 or 2 and 3 can be used to reconstruct the state with a feed-forward process. The shares are first mixed on a beamsplitter with transmissivity \( \tau \) to get the desired mixing in one quadrature, and then a feed-forward process is used to obtain the desired mixing in the other quadrature.

The first three of these conditions define the form of the second output of the channel as

\[
\begin{align*}
    b &= \frac{g^2}{a(g^2 - 2)}, \\
    c &= -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{g} a, \\
    d &= \frac{\sqrt{2}g}{a(g^2 - 2)},
\end{align*}
\]

for any \( a \in \mathbb{R} \). The final condition gives the gain which the channel must impart on the secret state as

\[
\eta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 - g^2}}.
\]

We show in the next section that this gain \( \eta \) is reproduced by a physical setup implementing the operation in eq. (1).

II. AN EXAMPLE \( \{1,3\} \) RECONSTRUCTION SETUP

In this section we discuss one possible implementation of the \( \{1,3\} \) reconstruction operation required for eq. (1). A number of different implementations have been proposed for this operation, and a full discussion of each of these for the unity-gain \( g = 1 \) case can be found in Ref. [2]. Any of these, with suitable adjustments, can be used for arbitrary \( g \in (0, \sqrt{2}) \) QSS.

A. Dealer protocol

The dealer process, fig. 1 is identical regardless of the physical setup used to reconstruct the secret. The secret state is passed through a balanced beamsplitter with one mode of the 2-mode resource state to produce three shares.
of the form

\[ \hat{X}_1^\pm = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{X}_\psi^\pm + \hat{X}_{r1}^\pm), \]
\[ \hat{X}_2^\pm = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{X}_\psi^\pm - \hat{X}_{r1}^\pm), \]
\[ \hat{X}_3^\pm = \hat{X}_{r2}^\pm, \]

where \( \hat{X}_\psi^\pm \) represents the secret state and \( \hat{X}_{r1}^\pm \) the two modes of the resource.

**B. State reconstruction through single feed-forward process**

The difficulty in implementing the operation from eq. (1) lies in the opposing mixing in the \( \hat{X}_+ \) and \( \hat{X}_- \) quadratures - which is to say that the output quadratures have components \( \hat{X}_1^+ - g\hat{X}_2^+ \) and \( \hat{X}_1^- + g\hat{X}_2^- \). The approach taken in this implementation, shown in fig. 1, is to first use an unbalanced beamsplitter to get the correct mixing in one quadrature and then use a single-quadrature digital feed-forward step to correct the other quadrature.

After the beamsplitter the two shares are combined such that

\[ \hat{X}_A^\pm = \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{2}} \left( \hat{X}_\psi^\pm + (\hat{X}_{r1}^\pm - \sqrt{\frac{2 - 2\tau}{\tau}} \hat{X}_{r2}^\pm) \right), \]
\[ \hat{X}_B^\pm = \sqrt{\frac{1 - \tau}{2}} \left( \hat{X}_\psi^\pm + (\hat{X}_{r1}^\pm + \sqrt{\frac{2\tau}{1 - \tau}} \hat{X}_{r2}^\pm) \right), \]

where \( \tau \in [0,1] \) represents the transmissivity of the beamsplitter. By selecting \( \tau \) such that \( \sqrt{(2 - 2\tau)/\tau} = g \), which is always possible for the range \( g \in (0, \sqrt{2}) \) for which steering is possible, one can see that \( \hat{X}_A^\pm \) is proportional to the desired form of eq. (1) in the \( \hat{X}_+ \) quadrature.

The \( \hat{X}_B^\pm \) quadrature is then measured and the \( \hat{X}_A^- \) quadrature displaced by the corresponding value with a gain \( G \in \mathbb{R} \), giving

\[ \hat{X}_A^- \rightarrow \hat{X}_A^- + G\hat{X}_B^- \]
\[ = \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{2}} \left( \hat{X}_\psi^- + (\hat{X}_{r1}^- - \sqrt{\frac{2 - 2\tau}{\tau}} \hat{X}_{r2}^-) \right) + G\sqrt{\frac{1 - \tau}{2}} \left( \hat{X}_\psi^- + (\hat{X}_{r1}^- + \sqrt{\frac{2\tau}{1 - \tau}} \hat{X}_{r2}^-) \right) \]
\[ = (\sqrt{\frac{\tau}{2}} + G\sqrt{\frac{1 - \tau}{2}}) \left( \hat{X}_\psi^- + \hat{X}_{r1}^- + \sqrt{\frac{2G\sqrt{\tau} - \sqrt{1 - \tau}}{G\sqrt{\tau} + \sqrt{1 - \tau}}} \hat{X}_{r2}^- \right), \]

with \( \hat{X}_A^+ \) left unaltered. Selecting \( G \) such that

\[ \sqrt{\frac{2G\sqrt{\tau} - \sqrt{1 - \tau}}{G\sqrt{\tau} + \sqrt{1 - \tau}}} = g, \]

which is again always possible for any \( g \in (0, \sqrt{2}) \), this output state becomes

\[ \hat{X}_\text{out}^+ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 + g^2}}(\hat{X}_\psi^+ + \hat{X}_{r1}^+ - g\hat{X}_{r2}^+), \]
\[ \hat{X}_\text{out}^- = \frac{\sqrt{2 + g^2}}{2 - g^2}(\hat{X}_\psi^- + \hat{X}_{r1}^- + g\hat{X}_{r2}^-). \]

By applying an ideal squeezing operation to this state, we can equalise the pre-factors and reach an output in the same form as expected from the previous section,

\[ \hat{X}_\text{out}^\pm = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 - g^2}} \left( \hat{X}_\psi^\pm + (\hat{X}_{r1}^\pm + g\hat{X}_{r2}^\pm) \right). \]
The values of $\tau$ and $G$ which correspond to a given $g \in (0, \sqrt{2})$ are

$$\tau = \frac{2}{2 + g^2},$$

$$G = \frac{2\sqrt{2}g}{2 - g^2}. \quad (28)$$

III. SWAPPING RESOURCE MODES

In this section we demonstrate that while QSS can be implemented for any $g \in (0, \sqrt{2})$, it is always preferable to use $g \leq 1$ even if a resource state would be better steerable for $g > 1$. This can be achieved in most setups through the dealer swapping the labelling of the modes. The results of this section underpin Result 2 of the main paper.

The key point in our argument is that any state steerable in one direction for $g > 1$ is also necessarily steerable in the other direction for $\bar{g} := 1/g$ with steering parameter

$$E_{2|1}(\bar{g}) = \frac{1}{g^2}E_{1|2}(g). \quad (30)$$

This can be shown trivially by considering the expansion the steering parameter $E_{1|2}(g) = \Delta^2(\hat{X}_1^\pm \mp g\hat{X}_2^\pm)$ in terms of the variance of each mode and the covariance between them in each case.

Let us consider then QSS implemented for $g > 1$ for a given resource with steering $E_{1|2}(g)$. Using the general output derived later in this document in section VI, the state will then be reconstructed with fidelity

$$\mathcal{F}_{1|2} = 2/\sqrt{4 + 4(2\bar{n} + 1)\cosh(2\zeta)(1 + E_{1|2}(g) - 1/\eta^2) + (2\bar{n} + 1)^2(1 + E_{1|2}(g) - 1/\eta^2)^2}, \quad (31)$$

for $\eta = 1/\sqrt{2 - g^2}$.

Should the dealer decide instead to swap the resource modes and utilise the steering in the opposite direction for $\bar{g}$, then the state would be reconstructed with fidelity

$$\mathcal{F}_{2|1} = 2/\sqrt{4 + 4(2\bar{n} + 1)\cosh(2\zeta)(1 + \bar{n}^2E_{2|1}(\bar{g}) - \bar{\eta}^2) + (2\bar{n} + 1)^2(1 + \bar{n}^2E_{2|1}(\bar{g}) - \bar{\eta}^2)^2}, \quad (32)$$

for $\bar{\eta} = 1/\sqrt{2 - \bar{g}^2}$.

Noting that $\bar{n} \geq 0$ and $\cosh(2\zeta) \geq 1$, it is clear that $\mathcal{F}_{2|1} > \mathcal{F}_{1|2}$ if and only if

$$1 + \bar{n}^2E_{2|1}(\bar{g}) - \bar{\eta}^2 < 1 + E_{1|2}(g) - 1/\eta^2. \quad (33)$$

Recalling eq. (30) and that $\bar{g} = 1/g$, we can rewrite this condition as

$$\frac{1 + E_{1|2}(g) - 1/\eta^2}{2g^2 - 1} < 1 + E_{1|2}(g) - 1/\eta^2, \quad (34)$$

which is trivially satisfied for all $g > 1$.

Consequently, whenever a resource state is optimally steerable in one direction for $g > 1$, it is always preferable to swap the order of the modes and instead utilise the steering in the opposite direction.

IV. SQUEEZED VACUUM STATES

In this section we derive the fidelity of our QSS protocol when sharing a squeezed vacuum state secret. The results from this section form the basis of section VI.A of the main paper.

Our starting point is a squeezed vacuum state with zero mean and covariance matrix

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-2\zeta} \cos \theta + e^{2\zeta} \sin \theta & 2 \sinh(2\zeta) \cos \theta \sin \theta \\ 2 \sinh(2\zeta) \cos \theta \sin \theta & e^{2\zeta} \cos \theta + e^{-2\zeta} \sin \theta \end{pmatrix}, \quad (35)$$
where $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$ is the squeezing parameter and $\theta$ the squeezing angle. Since the players should be unaware of the nature of the state which they are sharing, no adjustments are made to the QSS protocol for squeezed states. The ideal output of the protocol is therefore given by equation 8 of the main body of the paper:

$$X_{\text{out}}^\pm = \eta(\hat{X}^\pm + \hat{X}^0_{r1} + g\hat{X}^0_{r2}).$$

This output state clearly still has zero mean, and we can derive its covariances by direct calculation

$$\nu_{\text{out}}^\pm = \frac{1}{2} \langle \{\hat{X}^\pm_{\text{out}} ; \hat{X}^\pm_{\text{out}}\} \rangle = \eta^{2}\frac{1}{2} \langle \{\hat{X}^\pm_{\psi} ; \hat{X}^\pm_{\psi}\} \rangle + \eta^{2}\frac{1}{2} \langle \{\hat{X}^\pm_{r1} + g\hat{X}^\pm_{r2} ; \hat{X}^\pm_{r1} + g\hat{X}^\pm_{r2}\} \rangle$$

$$= \eta^{2}(\epsilon^{2\zeta}\cos \theta + \epsilon^{2\zeta}\sin \theta + E_{1/2}(g))$$

and so the output state has covariance matrix

$$V = \eta^{2}\begin{pmatrix}
\epsilon^{-2\zeta}\cos \theta + \epsilon^{2\zeta}\sin \theta + E_{1/2}(g) & 2\sinh(2\zeta)\cos \theta \sin \theta \\
2\sinh(2\zeta)\cos \theta \sin \theta & \epsilon^{2\zeta}\cos \theta + \epsilon^{-2\zeta}\sin \theta + E_{1/2}(g)
\end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \eta^{2}\begin{pmatrix}
\epsilon^{-2\zeta}\cos \theta \sin \theta + \epsilon^{2\zeta}\sin \theta & 2\sinh(2\zeta)\cos \theta \\
2\sinh(2\zeta)\cos \theta & \epsilon^{-2\zeta}\cos \theta + \epsilon^{2\zeta}\sin \theta + E_{1/2}(g)
\end{pmatrix} + \eta^{2}\begin{pmatrix}
E_{1/2}(g) & 0 \\
0 & E_{1/2}(g)
\end{pmatrix}.$$

### A. Squeezing angle

This output state is of the form of a squeezed thermal state with the original squeezing parameter $\zeta$ and angle $\theta$ mixed with a further unsqueezed thermal state. Consequently, the original squeezing angle is preserved by this process. As both the additional noise contribution from the unsqueezed thermal state and the amplification $\eta$ are independent of the squeezing angle, it is also clear that the squeezing angle has no impact on the reconstruction efficacy.

### B. Squeezing parameter

We now find the degree of squeezing in the output state, $\zeta' < \zeta$. Knowing that the reconstruction efficacy is independent of the squeezing angle, we set $\theta = 0$ without loss of generality. The covariance matrix of this output squeezed thermal state is then

$$V = \eta^{2}\begin{pmatrix}
\epsilon^{-2\zeta} + E_{1/2}(g) & 0 \\
0 & \epsilon^{2\zeta} + E_{1/2}(g)
\end{pmatrix} = \eta^{2}\begin{pmatrix}
\epsilon^{-2\zeta'} & 0 \\
0 & \epsilon^{2\zeta'}
\end{pmatrix},$$

in which the new degree of squeezing must satisfy

$$\epsilon^{2\zeta'} = \epsilon^{2\zeta} + E_{1/2}(g)$$

$$\epsilon^{-2\zeta'} = \epsilon^{-2\zeta} + E_{1/2}(g).$$

Solving for $\zeta'$ then gives the squeezing in the output state as

$$\zeta' = \frac{1}{4}\ln \frac{\epsilon^{2\zeta} + E_{1/2}(g)}{\epsilon^{-2\zeta} + E_{1/2}(g)} < \zeta.$$
FIG. 2: Reconstruction fidelity for increasing resource steering for pure Gaussian states with (a) 0 dB (no squeezing), (b) 6 dB, (c) 10 dB squeezing levels respectively. The colour denotes the best attainable reconstruction fidelity when QSS is implemented for $g$ using a resource state with steering parameter $E_{1|2}(g)$. The dashed line denotes $F = 2/3$, above which secure QSS is possible. The empty area denotes fidelities below 1/2, for which our protocol does not outperform a classical scenario. The region of allowable resource states shrinks as the squeezing of the secret state increases.

As the amplification imparted by the QSS protocol now moves the position of this state in phase-space, we again introduce the $esa$ and $lsatt$ corrections described in section IV of the main body of the paper. Again, both the QSS protocol and the correction stages remain unchanged from the coherent state case described in section IV of the paper and so the covariance matrix of the output state is still given by

$$\mathbf{V}_{\text{out}} = \mathbf{V}_{\text{in}} + \begin{cases} (\eta^2 E_{1|2}(g) + 1 - \eta^2) \mathbf{I} & g \leq 1 \\ (E_{1|2}(g) + 1 - 1/\eta^2) \mathbf{I} & g \geq 1 \end{cases},$$

where $\mathbf{V}_{\text{in}}$ is the squeezed state covariance matrix given in eq. (35).

As shown in section IV, the effectiveness of this protocol is independent of the squeezing angle and so we again set $\theta = 0$ for the following analysis without loss of generality.

### A. Fidelity and security conditions

#### 1. $esa$ QSS for pure Gaussian states

We first explore the case when $g \leq 1$ ($\eta \leq 1$) in which the secret state is pre-amplified before being attenuated by the QSS protocol. From eq. (47), we can calculate the reconstruction fidelity as

$$F = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\det(\mathbf{V}_{\text{in}} + \mathbf{V}_{\text{out}})}}$$

$$= \frac{2}{\sqrt{(2e^{2\zeta} + (1 - \eta^2) + \eta^2 E_{1|2}(g))(2e^{-2\zeta} + (1 - \eta^2) + \eta^2 E_{1|2}(g))}}. \quad (48)$$

As outlined in section V of the paper, we consider the QSS protocol secure when the fidelity exceeds $F = 2/3$. Applying this threshold to eq. (49) we can derive a condition on the steering required to share an arbitrary squeezed state as

$$F > \frac{2}{3} \implies \frac{4}{9} > \frac{(2e^{2\zeta} + (1 - \eta^2) + \eta^2 E_{1|2}(g))(2e^{-2\zeta} + (1 - \eta^2) + \eta^2 E_{1|2}(g))}{(2e^{2\zeta} + (1 - \eta^2) + \eta^2 E_{1|2}(g))(2e^{-2\zeta} + (1 - \eta^2) + \eta^2 E_{1|2}(g))}$$

$$\implies (2e^{2\zeta} + (1 - \eta^2) + \eta^2 E_{1|2}(g))(2e^{-2\zeta} + (1 - \eta^2) + \eta^2 E_{1|2}(g)) < 9 \quad (50)$$

$$\implies \eta^2 E_{1|2}(g) + 2E_{1|2}(g) \left[ 2 \cosh(2\zeta) + 1 - \eta^2 \right] + \left[ \eta^2 - \frac{4}{\eta^2} + 2 \cosh(2\zeta) \left( \frac{1}{\eta^2} - 1 \right) - 2 \right] < 0 \quad (51)$$
Solving for $E_{1|2}(g)$ then gives the security condition
\begin{equation}
E_{1|2}(g) < 1 - \frac{1}{\eta^2} \left[ 1 + 2 \cosh(2\zeta) - \sqrt{4 \cosh^2(2\zeta) + 5} \right] \quad (53)
\end{equation}

2. \textit{lsatt QSS for pure Gaussian states}

For the case when $g \geq 1$ ($\eta \geq 1$) we can calculate the fidelity as
\begin{equation}
\mathcal{F} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\text{det}(\mathbf{V}_{\text{in}} + \mathbf{V}_{\text{out}})}} \quad (54)
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
= \frac{2}{\sqrt{(2e^{2\kappa} + (1 - 1/\eta^2) + E_{1|2}(g))(2e^{-2\kappa} + (1 - 1/\eta^2) + E_{1|2}(g))}} \quad (55)
\end{equation}

Again, imposing the security condition of $\mathcal{F} > 2/3$ gives the steering condition
\begin{equation}
(2e^{2\kappa} + (1 - 1/\eta^2) + E_{1|2}(g))(2e^{-2\kappa} + (1 - 1/\eta^2) + E_{1|2}(g)) < 9, \quad (56)
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\implies E_{1|2}^2(g) + 2E_{1|2}(g) \left[ 2 \cosh(2\zeta) + 1 - \frac{1}{\eta^2} \right] + \frac{1}{\eta^4} - \frac{2}{\eta^2} + 2 \cosh(2\zeta)(1 - \eta^2) - 4 < 0, \quad (57)
\end{equation}

and solving for $E_{1|2}(g)$ gives
\begin{equation}
E_{1|2}(g) < \frac{1}{\eta^2} - \left[ 1 + 2 \cosh(2\zeta) - \sqrt{4 \cosh(2\zeta) + 5} \right] \quad (58)
\end{equation}

3. \textit{Overview}

The security condition for pure squeezed Gaussian states can then be expressed for any two-mode Gaussian resource state as
\begin{equation}
E_{1|2}(g) < \begin{cases} 
1 - \frac{1}{\eta^2} \Gamma(\zeta) & \eta \leq 1 \\
\frac{1}{\eta^2} - \Gamma(\zeta) & \eta \geq 1
\end{cases}, \quad (59)
\end{equation}

where
\begin{equation}
\Gamma(\zeta) = 1 + 2 \cosh(2\zeta) - \sqrt{4 \cosh^2(2\zeta) + 5}, \quad (60)
\end{equation}

which gives result 3 of the main paper. The effect of squeezing on the reconstruction fidelity for pure Gaussian states is shown in fig. 2.

\section*{B. Squeezing reconstruction}

We now analyse briefly the degree to which the squeezing of the original state is reconstructed by this process. As both the pre-amplification and post-attenuation processes are phase-insensitive, the squeezing angle will be unaffected by both and be reconstructed perfectly.

From eq. (47), we know the output state from pre-amplified QSS has covariance given by
\begin{equation}
\mathbf{V}_{\text{out}} = \mathbf{V}_{\text{in}} + \begin{cases} 
(\eta^2 E_{1|2}(g) + 1 - \eta^2) \mathbf{I} & g \leq 1 \\
(E_{1|2}(g) + 1 - 1/\eta^2) \mathbf{I} & g \geq 1
\end{cases}, \quad (61)
\end{equation}

which is again equivalent to the original squeezed state mixed with an unsqueezed thermal state. Consequently, as in supplementary section IV we can rewrite this in the form of a squeezed thermal state with the same squeezing angle and squeezing parameter
\begin{equation}
\zeta' = \begin{cases} 
\dfrac{1}{4} \ln \left[ \frac{e^{\kappa} + \eta^2 E_{1|2}(g) + 1 - \eta^2}{e^{-\kappa} + \eta^2 E_{1|2}(g) + 1 - \eta^2} \right] & g \leq 1 \\
\dfrac{1}{4} \ln \left[ \frac{e^{\kappa} + E_{1|2}(g) + 1 - \eta^2}{e^{-\kappa} + E_{1|2}(g) + 1 - \eta^2} \right] & g \geq 1
\end{cases}, \quad (62)
\end{equation}

which is always less than the original squeezing $\zeta$.\n\section*{IV. Supplementary Section}

We now analyse briefly the degree to which the squeezing of the original state is reconstructed by this process. As both the pre-amplification and post-attenuation processes are phase-insensitive, the squeezing angle will be unaffected by both and be reconstructed perfectly.

From eq. (47), we know the output state from pre-amplified QSS has covariance given by
\begin{equation}
\mathbf{V}_{\text{out}} = \mathbf{V}_{\text{in}} + \begin{cases} 
(\eta^2 E_{1|2}(g) + 1 - \eta^2) \mathbf{I} & g \leq 1 \\
(E_{1|2}(g) + 1 - 1/\eta^2) \mathbf{I} & g \geq 1
\end{cases}, \quad (61)
\end{equation}

which is again equivalent to the original squeezed state mixed with an unsqueezed thermal state. Consequently, as in supplementary section IV we can rewrite this in the form of a squeezed thermal state with the same squeezing angle and squeezing parameter
\begin{equation}
\zeta' = \begin{cases} 
\dfrac{1}{4} \ln \left[ \frac{e^{\kappa} + \eta^2 E_{1|2}(g) + 1 - \eta^2}{e^{-\kappa} + \eta^2 E_{1|2}(g) + 1 - \eta^2} \right] & g \leq 1 \\
\dfrac{1}{4} \ln \left[ \frac{e^{\kappa} + E_{1|2}(g) + 1 - \eta^2}{e^{-\kappa} + E_{1|2}(g) + 1 - \eta^2} \right] & g \geq 1
\end{cases}, \quad (62)
\end{equation}

which is always less than the original squeezing $\zeta$.\n\section*{V. Discussion}

The security condition for pure squeezed Gaussian states can then be expressed for any two-mode Gaussian resource state as
\begin{equation}
E_{1|2}(g) < \begin{cases} 
1 - \frac{1}{\eta^2} \Gamma(\zeta) & \eta \leq 1 \\
\frac{1}{\eta^2} - \Gamma(\zeta) & \eta \geq 1
\end{cases}, \quad (59)
\end{equation}

where
\begin{equation}
\Gamma(\zeta) = 1 + 2 \cosh(2\zeta) - \sqrt{4 \cosh^2(2\zeta) + 5}, \quad (60)
\end{equation}

which gives result 3 of the main paper. The effect of squeezing on the reconstruction fidelity for pure Gaussian states is shown in fig. 2.
FIG. 3: The achievable reconstruction fidelity for QSS with single-mode Gaussian states of varying average thermal photon number $\bar{n}$ and squeezing. Dashed lined denotes the no-cloning threshold $F = 2/3$, above which the protocol can be deemed to be secure. Empty areas denotes space for which $F < 1/2$ for which the protocol does not beat the classical limit. (a), (b) show the effect of squeezing on reconstruction fidelity for thermal states with average photon number $\bar{n} = 0.5$. (c), (d) show the same for $\bar{n} = 1$. In each case increasing the thermal photon number $\bar{n}$ and the squeezing shrinks the region in this parameter space for which the reconstruction is secure. Arbitrarily high reconstruction fidelity can be achieved, though, at $g = 1$ as the steering parameter $E_{1/2}(g)$ approached 0 - the perfect entanglement limit.

VI. GENERAL SINGLE-MODE GAUSSIAN STATES: SQUEEZED THERMAL STATES

In this section we derive the conditions under which any single-mode mixed Gaussian state may be securely shared in our QSS protocol. The results from this section form the basis for section VI.C of the main paper.

To proceed, let us introduce the average thermal photon number $\bar{n}$. The corresponding state is the most general single-mode Gaussian state, with mean vector $\bar{r}_\psi \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and covariance matrix

$$\mathbf{V}_\psi = (2\bar{n} + 1) \begin{pmatrix} e^{-2\zeta} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{2\zeta} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\bar{n}$ represents the average number of photons in the state and $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$ represents the squeezing parameter. For the reasons outlined for squeezed coherent states in section IV A, the squeezing angle $\theta$ is always reproduced exactly and does not impact the reconstruction fidelity and so we here have set it to $\theta = 0$ for convenience without loss of generality.
A. Purification

To enable us to later calculate the fidelity of the reconstructed output state, we first purify the input state \( \psi \) by considering it as one part of a two-mode pure state \( \Phi \) such that \( \text{Tr}_B(\Phi) = \psi \). The pure two-mode state which reduces to a single-mode thermal state is the two-mode squeezed thermal state. To purify a squeezed thermal state, then, we consider the two-mode squeezed state with each mode further squeezed by \( \exp(2\zeta) \) in opposing quadratures.

This two-mode state has mean \( \bar{r}_\Phi = \bar{r}_\psi \otimes \mathbf{0}_2 \), where we have chosen that the second mode have zero mean, and covariance matrix

\[
V_\Phi = \begin{pmatrix}
\hat{n}e^{-2\zeta} & 0 & \sqrt{\hat{n}^2 - 1} & 0 \\
0 & \hat{n}e^{2\zeta} & 0 & -\sqrt{\hat{n}^2 - 1} \\
\sqrt{\hat{n}^2 - 1} & 0 & \hat{n}e^{2\zeta} & 0 \\
0 & -\sqrt{\hat{n}^2 - 1} & 0 & \hat{n}e^{-2\zeta}
\end{pmatrix},
\] (64)

where \( \hat{n} = 2\bar{n} + 1 \). This state clearly satisfies \( \text{Tr}_B(\Phi) = \psi \).

We now consider the QSS protocol as a two-mode protocol which affects only on the first mode, leaving the second mode unchanged. This is to say we are considering the operation \( \Pi \otimes \mathbf{I} \) where \( P_i \) represents the original one-mode QSS protocol. This protocol will leave the reconstructed output state in the form

\[
\hat{X}^\pm_{\text{out}} = \eta \left( \hat{X}^\pm_{\psi} + \hat{X}^\pm_{r_1} + g\hat{X}^\pm_{r_2} \right),
\] (65)

which we then normalise to unity-gain (\( \eta = 1 \)) through the corrections outlined in section IV of the main paper. After normalising the state, the first mode of the output state will be of the form \( \hat{X}^\pm_{\text{out}} = \hat{X}^\pm_{\in} + \hat{X}^\pm_{r_1} + g\hat{X}^\pm_{r_2} + f(X^\pm_{\text{env}}) \) where \( f \) is some function of the environment modes and so one can show through direct calculation (as in section IV) that the inter-mode covariance remains \( \sqrt{\hat{n}^2 - 1} \) after the protocol has acted on the first mode.

B. \( \text{esa} \) QSS for squeezed thermal states

The normalised output of \( \text{early-stage amplification} \) QSS is

\[
\hat{X}^\pm_{\text{out}} = \hat{X}^\pm_{\in} + \eta \left( \hat{X}^\pm_{r_1} + g\hat{X}^\pm_{r_2} \right) + \sqrt{1 - \eta^2}\hat{X}^\pm_{\text{vac}}
\] (66)

The wider 2-mode state after the QSS protocol has acted on the first mode then has covariance matrix

\[
V_{\text{out}} = V_{\text{in}} + (\eta^2 E_{1|2}(g) + 1 - \eta^2)\mathbf{I}_2 \otimes \mathbf{0}_2,
\] (67)

where \( \mathbf{0}_2 \) represents the zero-matrix.

We can now calculate the fidelity of this reconstructed state using the two-mode form of the expression for Gaussian states [1]

\[
\mathcal{F} = \frac{2^2}{\sqrt{\det(V_{\text{in}} + V_{\text{out}})}}
\] (68)

\[
= \frac{2}{\sqrt{4 + 4\hat{n} \cosh(2\zeta)(1 + \eta^2 E_{1|2}(g) - \eta^2) + \hat{n}^2(1 + \eta^2 E_{1|2}(g) - \eta^2)^2}}.
\] (69)

If we then impose the no-cloning condition that \( \mathcal{F} > 2/3 \) we get

\[
4\hat{n} \cosh(2\zeta)(1 + \eta^2 E_{1|2}(g) - \eta^2) + \hat{n}^2(1 + \eta^2 E_{1|2}(g) - \eta^2)^2 - 5 < 0.
\] (70)

Solving for \( E_{1|2}(g) \) then gives the required level of resource steering for the protocol to be considered secure for thermal states as

\[
E_{1|2}(g) < 1 - \frac{1}{\eta^2} - \frac{1}{(2\bar{n} + 1)\eta^2} \left( 2\cosh(2\zeta) - \sqrt{4\cosh^2(2\zeta) + 5} \right)
\] (71)

when \( \eta \leq 1 \).
C. *lsatt* QSS for squeezed thermal states

The normalised output of *late-stage attenuation* QSS is

$$\hat{X}_{\text{out}}^{\pm} = \hat{X}_{\text{in}}^{\pm} + g\hat{X}_{r1}^{\pm} + \sqrt{1 - 1/\eta^2} \hat{X}_{\text{vac}}^{\pm}$$  \hspace{1cm} (72)

The wider 2-mode state after the QSS protocol has acted on the first mode then has covariance matrix

$$\mathbf{V}_{\text{out}} = \mathbf{V}_{\text{in}} + (E_{1|2}(g) + 1 - 1/\eta^2)\mathbf{I}_2 \oplus \mathbf{0}_2,$$  \hspace{1cm} (73)

where \( \mathbf{0}_2 \) again represents the zero matrix.

We can again calculate the fidelity of this reconstructed state as

$$\mathcal{F} = \frac{2^{2}}{\sqrt{\det(\mathbf{V}_{\text{in}} + \mathbf{V}_{\text{out}})}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (74)

$$= \frac{2}{\sqrt{4 + 4\bar{n} \cosh(2\zeta)(1 + E_{1|2}(g) - 1/\eta^2) + \bar{n}^2(1 + E_{1|2}(g) - 1/\eta^2)^2}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (75)

If we then impose the no-cloning condition that \( \mathcal{F} > 2/3 \) we get

$$4\bar{n} \cosh(2\zeta)(1 + E_{1|2}(g) - 1/\eta^2) + \bar{n}^2(1 + E_{1|2}(g) - 1/\eta^2)^2 - 5 < 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (76)

Solving for \( E_{1|2}(g) \) then gives the required level of resource steering for the protocol to be considered secure for thermal states as

$$E_{1|2}(g) < \frac{1}{\eta^2} - 1 - \frac{1}{(2\bar{n} + 1)} \left( 2 \cosh(2\zeta) - \sqrt{4 \cosh^2(2\zeta) + 5} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (77)

when \( \eta \geq 1. \)

D. Overview

Taken together, the condition on security for QSS with squeezed thermal states can be written as

$$E_{1|2}(g) < \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{1}{\eta} \Gamma(\zeta, \bar{n}) & \eta \leq 1 \\ \frac{1}{\eta^2} - \Gamma(\zeta, \bar{n}) & \eta \geq 1 \end{cases},$$  \hspace{1cm} (78)

where

$$\Gamma(\zeta, \bar{n}) = 1 + \frac{1}{(2\bar{n} + 1)} \left( 2 \cosh(2\zeta) - \sqrt{4 \cosh^2(2\zeta) + 5} \right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (79)

which gives result 4 of the main paper. The effect of photon number and squeezing on the reconstruction fidelity for thermal states is shown in fig. 3.