

A new parameterized monogamy relation between entanglement and equality

Zhi-Xiang Jin,^{1,2} Shao-Ming Fei,^{2,3,*} Xianqing Li-Jost,^{2,†} and Cong-Feng Qiao^{1,4,‡}

¹*School of Physics, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Yuquan Road 19A, Beijing 100049, China*

²*Max-Planck-Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences, Leipzig 04103, Germany*

³*School of Mathematical Sciences, Capital Normal University, Beijing 100048, China*

⁴*CAS Center for Excellence in Particle Physics, Beijing 100049, China*

We provide a generalized definition of the monogamy relation for entanglement measures. A monogamy equality rather than the usual inequality is presented based on the monogamy weight, from which we give monogamy relations satisfied by the α th ($\alpha > 0$) power of the entanglement measures. Taking concurrence as an example, we further demonstrate the significance and advantages of these relations. In addition, we show that monogamy relations can be recovered by considering multiple copies of states for every non-additive entanglement measure that violates the inequalities. We also demonstrate that the such relations for tripartite states can be generalized to multipartite systems.

PACS numbers:

Entanglement is essential in quantum communication and quantum information processing [1–8]. Among the properties of entanglement, the monogamy of entanglement is a non-intuitive phenomenon of quantum physics, which characterizes the fundamental differences between quantum and classical correlations and measures the shareability of entanglement in a composite quantum system. From the perspective of monogamy of quantum entanglement, a quantum system entangled with one of the other subsystems limits its entanglement with the remaining subsystems. The study of entanglement and its distribution is of great significance in many areas, such as quantum cryptography [9, 10], phase detection [11–13], and quantum key distribution [14, 15].

Over the last two decades, the precise quantitative formalization of the monogamy of entanglement has attracted much attention. Given any tripartite state ρ_{ABC} and bipartite entanglement measure E , the monogamy relation provided by Coffman, Kundu, and Wootters (CKW) [17] is quantitatively displayed as an inequality of the following form:

$$E(\rho_{A|BC}) \geq E(\rho_{AB}) + E(\rho_{AC}), \quad (1)$$

where $\rho_{AB} = \text{Tr}_C(\rho_{ABC})$, and $\rho_{AC} = \text{Tr}_B(\rho_{ABC})$. The inequality (1) states that the sum of the individual pairwise entanglements between A and each of the other parties B or C cannot exceed the entanglement between A and joint system BC . Such inequalities are not always satisfied by all entanglement measures for any state. The first monogamy relation was proven for three arbitrary qubit states for a squared concurrence [17]. Variations in the monogamy relation and generalizations to arbitrary multipartite systems have been established for a number of entanglement measures, like continuous-variable entanglement [18–25], squashed entanglement [16, 26, 27], entanglement negativity [28–35], Tsallis- q entanglement [36–38], and Renyi-entanglement [39–41].

Here, inequality (1) captures only the partial property of this measure of entanglement, as other measures of entanglement may not satisfy this relation. This implies that the inequality is not universal but depends on the specific choice of the measure E . In this study, we present a general approach for treating the monogamy of entanglement. This property is given by a family of monogamy relations:

$$E(\rho_{A|BC}) \geq f(E(\rho_{AB}), E(\rho_{AC})), \quad (2)$$

satisfied for any state ρ_{ABC} , where f is a continuous function of variables $E(\rho_{AB})$ and $E(\rho_{AC})$ as mentioned in [42]. For convenience, we denote $E(\rho_{A|BC}) = E_{A|BC}$ and $E(\rho_{AB}) = E_{AB}$. For a particular choice of the function $f(x, y) = x + y$, we recover the CKW inequality (1) from (2). If $f(x, y) = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}$, we obtain a monogamy relation satisfied by the squared concurrence. Therefore, one can obtain a family of monogamy inequalities based on the proper choice of the function f . Recalling that E is an entanglement monotone, we have $E_{A|BC} \geq \max\{E_{AB}, E_{AC}\}$ since it is non-increasing under partial traces. Therefore, the entanglement distribution is confined to a region smaller than a square with a side length $E_{A|BC}$. We say that it is monogamous if a nontrivial function f exists such that the generalized monogamy equality $E_{A|BC} = f(E_{AB}, E_{AC})$ is satisfied for any state ρ_{ABC} . To consider all cases of entanglement distribution, we use a linear function to traverse all points in a square with side length $E_{A|BC}$ for simplicity (see Fig. 1).

We consider the function $f(x, y) = x + y$ as a rubber band. For two fixed endpoints $(E_{A|BC}, 0)$ and $(0, E_{A|BC})$, one can obtain different types of functions by moving the point $(\frac{E_{A|BC}}{2}, \frac{E_{A|BC}}{2})$ to the point $(E_{A|BC}, E_{A|BC})$ or to the origin $(0, 0)$, as shown in Fig. 1. For any $0 < k \leq E_{A|BC}$ with (k, k) , that is, the points on the dotted line in Fig. 1, we have the following trade-

off between the values of E_{AB} and E_{AC} :

$$\begin{cases} \frac{E_{A|BC}-k}{k}E_{AB} + E_{AC} = E_{A|BC}, & E_{AB} \leq E_{AC} \\ E_{AB} + \frac{E_{A|BC}-k}{k}E_{AC} = E_{A|BC}, & E_{AC} \leq E_{AB}. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

In fact, we mainly consider the range of $\frac{E_{A|BC}}{2} < k \leq E_{A|BC}$ because the traditional monogamy inequality is always satisfied for $0 < k \leq \frac{E_{A|BC}}{2}$ (blue region in Fig. 1). From (3), we can define a monogamy relation without using an inequality as follows.

Definition Let E be a measure of entanglement. E is said to be monogamous if for any state ρ_{ABC} , it satisfies

$$E_{A|BC} = \mu E_{AB} + E_{AC} \quad (4)$$

for some $\mu (\mu > 0)$, where $E_{AB} \leq E_{AC}$. We call μ the monogamy weight with respect to the entanglement measure E .

Remark In Ref. [42] the authors addressed the generalized monogamy inequality $E(\rho_{A|BC}) \geq f(E(\rho_{AB}), E(\rho_{AC}))$, which is satisfied for any state ρ_{ABC} with a nontrivial function f . The monogamy relation (4) includes this generalized monogamy inequality as a special case. In general, (4) should be given in the form $E(\rho_{A|BC}) = f(\mu E(\rho_{AB}), E(\rho_{AC}))$ with a monogamy weight μ for any state ρ_{ABC} . For any given function f , either $E(\rho_{A|BC}) \geq f(E(\rho_{AB}), E(\rho_{AC}))$ or $E(\rho_{A|BC}) < f(E(\rho_{AB}), E(\rho_{AC}))$, for any state ρ_{ABC} , it is always possible to find some μ such that $E(\rho_{A|BC}) = f(\mu E(\rho_{AB}), E(\rho_{AC}))$. Therefore, the monogamy equality (4) is more powerful than the generalized monogamy inequality. In fact, one can use any function f that traverses all points in a square with side length $E_{A|BC}$, as shown in Fig. 1. For simplicity, we use a linear function that gives rise to (4).

(4) yields a generalized monogamy relation without inequality. The monogamy weight μ defined in Eq. (4) establishes the connections among $E_{A|BC}$, E_{AB} , and E_{AC} for a tripartite state. If $\mu \geq 1$, then the monogamy inequality (1) is obviously true from (4). The corresponding entanglement distribution is confined to the blue region, as shown in Fig. 1. The case of $0 < \mu < 1$ is beyond the CKW inequality. The corresponding regions of the entanglement distribution are the orange, yellow, and white regions in Fig. 1. Specifically, it reduces to the CKW inequality (1) when $\mu = 1$. When $\mu = 0$, we have $E_{A|BC} = E_{AC} \geq E_{AB} > 0$, according to definition (4). In this situation, we say that the entanglement measure E is non-monogamous. The corresponding entanglement distribution is located at the boundary of the square, except for the coordinate axis, as shown in Fig. 1. That is, when $\mu \rightarrow 0$, E is not likely to be monogamous. On the contrary, $\mu \rightarrow 1$ implies that E is more likely to be monogamous.

Therefore, the parameter μ has an operational interpretation of the ability to be monogamous for entanglement measure E . Given two entanglement measures, E'




FIG. 1: For any tripartite state ρ_{ABC} and entanglement measure E , one gets the CKW inequality (1) for $f(x, y) = x + y$, which holds with the range of values of E_{AB} and E_{AC} given by the blue triangular. In the blue region, the equality (4) also holds for $\mu \geq 1$. In the red, yellow, and white regions, the CKW inequality is no longer satisfied. However, the relation (4) holds for $0 < \mu < 1$: the orange region matches $\frac{1}{2} \leq \mu < 1$, the yellow region matches $\frac{1}{3} \leq \mu < \frac{1}{2}$, and the white region matches $0 < \mu < \frac{1}{3}$. In other words, any measure E is monogamous in the sense of (4) if the entanglement distribution is confined to a region strictly smaller than the square with side length $E_{A|BC}$.

and \tilde{E} , with monogamy weights μ_1 and μ_2 , respectively, we say that E' has a higher monogamy score than \tilde{E} if $\mu_1 \geq \mu_2$ and $E' \succeq \tilde{E}$ or $\tilde{E} \preceq E'$. Thus, μ is closely related to the monogamy inequality for a given measure, E . For E^α ($\alpha > 0$), we have the following familiar relation (see the proof in the Appendix).

Theorem 1 Let E be a measure of entanglement. E is monogamous according to definition (4) if and only if $\alpha > 0$ exists, such that

$$E_{A|BC}^\alpha \geq E_{AB}^\alpha + E_{AC}^\alpha, \quad (5)$$

for any state ρ_{ABC} .

In the following, we consider the entanglement measure tangle as an application to illustrate the advantages of (4) and the calculation of the monogamy weight μ . The tangle of the bipartite pure state $|\psi\rangle_{AB} \in \mathbb{H}_A \otimes \mathbb{H}_B$ is given by $\tau(|\psi\rangle_{AB}) = 2[1 - \text{Tr}(\rho_A^2)]$ [17], where $\rho_A = \text{Tr}_B(|\psi\rangle_{AB}\langle\psi|)$ is the reduced density matrix obtained by tracing the subsystem B . The tangle for a bipartite mixed state ρ_{AB} is defined by the convex roof extension: $\tau(\rho_{AB}) = \min_{\{p_i, |\psi_i\rangle\}} \sum_i p_i \tau(|\psi_i\rangle)$, where the minimum is taken over all possible pure-state decompositions of $\rho_{AB} = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$, where $p_i \geq 0$, $\sum_i p_i = 1$, and $|\psi_i\rangle \in \mathbb{H}_A \otimes \mathbb{H}_B$.

Let us consider a three-qubit state $|\psi\rangle$ in the generalized Schmidt decomposition form

$$|\psi\rangle = \lambda_0|000\rangle + \lambda_1 e^{i\varphi}|100\rangle + \lambda_2|101\rangle + \lambda_3|110\rangle + \lambda_4|111\rangle, \quad (6)$$

where $\lambda_i \geq 0$, $i = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$, in descending order and $\sum_{i=0}^4 \lambda_i^2 = 1$. From this definition, we obtain $\tau_{A|BC} = 4\lambda_0^2(\lambda_2^2 + \lambda_3^2 + \lambda_4^2)$, $\tau_{AB} = 4\lambda_0^2\lambda_2^2$, and $\tau_{AC} = 4\lambda_0^2\lambda_3^2$. According to the monogamy relation (4), we have

$$\mu_\tau = 1 + \left(\frac{\lambda_4}{\lambda_3}\right)^2, \quad (7)$$

with $\lambda_2 \geq \lambda_3 \geq \lambda_4 \geq 0$. Thus, we obtain $\mu_\tau = \min\{1 + (\lambda_4/\lambda_3)^2\} = 1$, where the minimum is taken over all the states in (6). It can be verified that the W-type states ($\lambda_4 = 0$ in (6)) saturate the inequality. For another quantum entanglement measure, we consider the concurrence defined by $C(|\psi\rangle_{AB}) = \sqrt{\tau(|\psi\rangle_{AB})} = \sqrt{2[1 - \text{Tr}(\rho_A^2)]}$ for a bipartite pure state $|\psi\rangle_{AB}$. The concurrence of a mixed state is given by the convex roof extension $C(\rho_{AB}) = \min_{\{p_i, |\psi_i\rangle\}} \sum_i p_i C(|\psi_i\rangle)$. Consider the state (6). One obtains

$$\mu_C = \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_3}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\lambda_4}{\lambda_3}\right)^2} - \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_3}. \quad (8)$$

Let $f(x, y) = \sqrt{1 + x^2 + y^2} - x$, with $x = \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_3} \geq 1$ and $y = \frac{\lambda_4}{\lambda_3} \in [0, 1]$. We obtain that $\mu_C = f_{\min}(x, y) \leq f_{\min}(1, 0) = \sqrt{2} - 1$. Therefore, in this case, $C \preceq \tau$ is $\mu_C < \mu_\tau$.

In [32], the authors proved that the α power of concurrence for the W -class states does not satisfy the monogamy inequality (1) for $1 \leq \alpha < 2$. From the monogamy relation (4), we can obtain $C_{A|BC}^\alpha \geq (\sqrt{2} - 1)^\alpha C_{AB}^\alpha + C_{AC}^\alpha$ for W -class states for $1 \leq \alpha < 2$, which solves the problem raised in Ref. [32]. Moreover, for states beyond qubits, the monogamy inequality (1) does not apply for concurrence. For example, for the three-qutrit state [43], $|\Psi\rangle_{ABC} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(|123\rangle - |132\rangle + |231\rangle - |213\rangle + |312\rangle - |321\rangle)$, one has $C_{AB} = C_{AC} = 1$ and $C_{A|BC} = \frac{4}{3}$, which violates (1). Nevertheless, from (4) and (5), we find that $|\Psi\rangle_{ABC}$ satisfies the monogamy relations for $\mu_C = \frac{1}{3}$ or $\alpha = 5$.

The monogamy property depends on both the entanglement measure and quantum states. Some special classes of states, for example, the generalized n -partite GHZ-class states admitting the multipartite Schmidt decomposition [44, 45], $|\psi\rangle_{A_1 A_2 \dots A_n} = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i |i_1\rangle \otimes |i_2\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |i_n\rangle$, $\sum_i \lambda_i^2 = 1$, $\lambda_i > 0$, always satisfy monogamous relations for any entanglement measures, since one always has $E(|\psi\rangle_{A_1 | A_2 \dots A_n}) > 0$ and $E(\rho_{A_1 A_i}) = 0$ for all $i = 2, \dots, n$ and any entanglement measure E . For a general entanglement measure




FIG. 2: a) The entanglement E with respect to a tripartite state ρ_{ABC} violates the CKW inequality (1), which corresponds to the regions with $0 < \mu < 1$ in Fig. 1. b) Certain m -copy states of ρ_{ABC} satisfy the monogamy relation; namely, the states corresponding to the orange, yellow, and white regions in Fig. 1 may move to the blue region under m copies.

E , such as concurrence, the CKW inequality (1), is usually not satisfied, whereas relation (4) holds. We show the connection between the CKW inequality (1) and relation (4) in Fig. 2. For convenience, we denote by $\rho_{A_1 A_2 \dots A_n}^{\otimes m} = \rho_{A_{11} A_{12} \dots A_{1m} A_{21} \dots A_{2m} \dots A_{n1} \dots A_{nm}}$ and $\rho_{A_1 A_i}^{\otimes m} = \rho_{A_{11} \dots A_{1m} A_{i1} \dots A_{im}}$, where A_{ij} is the i th party of the j th copy of $\rho_{A_1 A_2 \dots A_n}$. Let $E(\rho_{A_1 | A_2 \dots A_n}^{\otimes m}) = E(\rho_{A_{11} A_{12} \dots A_{1m} | A_{21} \dots A_{2m} \dots A_{n1} \dots A_{nm}})$ denote the entanglement of the m copies of $\rho_{A_1 A_2 \dots A_n}$ between the first party and the other ones, i.e., the entanglement between $A_{11} A_{12} \dots A_{1m}$ and $A_{21} \dots A_{2m} \dots A_{n1} \dots A_{nm}$; then $E(\rho_{A_1 A_i}^{\otimes m}) = E(\rho_{A_{11} \dots A_{1m} | A_{i1} \dots A_{im}})$ is the entanglement between the first party and the i th party. We consider entanglement measures that are nonadditive because for an additive entanglement measure E , one trivially obtains $E(\rho \otimes \delta) = E(\rho) + E(\delta)$.

Theorem 2 A nonadditive measure of entanglement E is monogamous according to definition (4) if and only if there exists an integer m ($m \geq 1$) such that

$$E(\rho_{A|BC}^{\otimes m}) \geq E(\rho_{AB}^{\otimes m}) + E(\rho_{AC}^{\otimes m}) \quad (9)$$

for any state ρ_{ABC} .

See Appendix for the proof of Theorem 2.

Corollary 1 For a nonadditive entanglement measure E satisfying (4), but not the monogamy relation (1), there exists an integer m ($m \geq 1$) such that

$$E(\rho_{A|BC}^{\otimes m}) \geq E(\rho_{AB}^{\otimes m}) + E(\rho_{AC}^{\otimes m}) \quad (10)$$

for any tripartite state ρ_{ABC} .

From definition (4) and the derivation of Theorem 2, we have $\mu = \frac{1-E_{AC}/E_{A|BC}}{E_{AB}/E_{A|BC}}$. Either $E_{AC}/E_{A|BC}$ or $E_{AB}/E_{A|BC}$ should increase when μ decreases. In other words, $E_{AC}/E_{A|BC}$ or $E_{AB}/E_{A|BC}$ increases as μ decreases. Therefore, the minimal number of required copies increases to reactivate the monogamy relationship. In other words, the monogamy weight μ and the integer m are roughly inversely proportional. For entanglement measures E , such as the tangle τ [17], whose monogamy weight is $\mu_\tau \geq 1$, that is, $\tau_{A|BC} \geq \kappa\tau_{AC} + \tau_{AB}$ ($0 < \kappa \leq \mu_\tau$), for any three qubit states, it is obvious that $m_\tau = 1$. Concerning measures E such that $0 < \mu < 1$, let us consider concurrence C . Since the negativity $N(|\psi\rangle_{AB}) = \|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|^{T_B} - 1\| = 2\sqrt{\lambda_0\lambda_1} = \sqrt{2(1 - \text{Tr}\rho_A^2)} = C(|\psi\rangle_{AB})$, where $|\psi\rangle_{AB} = \sqrt{\lambda_0}|00\rangle + \sqrt{\lambda_1}|11\rangle$, by using the results in [46, 47] we have $C(|W\rangle_{ABC}^{\otimes m_C}) = \frac{1}{2}[(1 + \frac{4\sqrt{2}}{3})^{m_C} - 1]$, $C(\rho_{AB}^{\otimes m_C}) = C(\rho_{AC}^{\otimes m_C}) = \frac{1}{2}[(1 + \frac{4}{3})^{m_C} - 1]$ for m copies of the W states, $|W\rangle_{ABC} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|100\rangle + |010\rangle + |001\rangle)$, where ρ_{AB} and ρ_{AC} are the reduced states of $|W\rangle_{ABC}$. It can be observed that $C(|W\rangle_{ABC}^{\otimes m_C}) \geq C(\rho_{AB}^{\otimes m_C}) + C(\rho_{AC}^{\otimes m_C})$ if $m_C \geq 4$. Here, the monogamy weight of $|W\rangle_{ABC}$ for the concurrence is $\mu_C = \sqrt{2} - 1$ from (8). Therefore, in this case, we have $C \leq \tau$ as $\mu_C < \mu_\tau$, whereas $m_C \geq m_\tau$.

The monogamy relation defined in (4) can be generalized to multipartite systems. For any N -partite state $\rho_{AB_1 \dots B_{N-1}}$, we obtain the following result if E satisfies (4) for any tripartite state (see the proof in the appendix).

Theorem 3. Assume that, for any N -partite state $\rho_{AB_1 \dots B_{N-1}}$, $E_{AB_i} \geq E_{A|B_{i+1} \dots B_{N-1}}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$, and $E_{AB_j} \leq E_{A|B_{j+1} \dots B_{N-1}}$ for $j = m+1, \dots, N-2$, $\forall 1 \leq m \leq N-3$, $N \geq 4$. If E satisfies relation (4), then for the tripartite states, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & E_{A|B_1 B_2 \dots B_{N-1}} \\ & \geq E_{AB_1} + \Gamma_1 E_{AB_2} + \dots + \Gamma_{m-1} E_{AB_m} \\ & + \Gamma_m (\mu_{m+1} E_{AB_{m+1}} + \dots + \mu_{N-2} E_{AB_{N-2}} + E_{AB_{N-1}}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_k = \prod_{i=1}^k \mu_i$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, N-2$, and μ_i denotes the monogamy weight of the $(N+1-i)$ -partite state $\rho_{AB_1 \dots B_{N-i}}$.

In Theorem 3 we have assumed that some $E_{AB_i} \geq E_{A|B_{i+1} \dots B_{N-1}}$ and some $E_{AB_j} \leq E_{A|B_{j+1} \dots B_{N-1}}$ for the N -partite state $\rho_{AB_1 \dots B_{N-1}}$. If all $E_{AB_i} \geq E_{A|B_{i+1} \dots B_{N-1}}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N-2$, then we have $E_{A|B_1 \dots B_{N-1}} = E_{AB_1} + \Gamma_1 E_{AB_2} + \dots + \Gamma_{N-2} E_{AB_{N-1}}$.

The monogamy weight μ functions as a bridge for characterizing the monogamous ability of different entanglement measures. An entanglement measure E is more likely to become monogamous as μ increases. Then, μ provides the physical meaning of the coefficients introduced in Ref. [31] for the weighted monogamy relations. Furthermore, monogamy has emerged as an ingredient in the security analysis of quantum key distributions [49]. From Theorem 2, we can see that the monogamy relation

can be reactivated by finite m copies of ρ for nonadditive entanglement measures. In other words, they can still be used for secure communication against individual attacks by the eavesdropper by reactivating the monogamy property of ρ .

Thus, entanglement monogamy is a fundamental property of multipartite systems. We introduced a new definition of the relation for entanglement measures that characterizes the precise division of the entanglement distribution for a given entanglement measure, E (Fig. 1). The non-monogamous entanglement distribution is only located on the boundary of the square (except for the coordinate axis): the blue region for both our notion of monogamy (4) and the conventional one (1), whereas the orange, yellow, and white regions violate (1), but still work for our notion of monogamy (4). Our definition of monogamy is based on equality (4) rather than previous inequalities (1). The advantage of our notion of monogamy is that one can distinguish which entanglement measure is more easily monogamous by comparing the monogamy weights. We have used concurrence and tangle as examples, showing that tangle is more likely monogamous than concurrence because the weight of the tangle is larger than that of concurrence, corresponding to previous results [17, 48]. However, using E^α for some $\alpha > 0$, we have shown that the definition of our monogamy relation can reproduce conventional monogamy inequalities such as (1). We then showed that every nonadditive entanglement measure that violates the conventional monogamy inequalities but satisfies our definition can be recovered as monogamous if one allows for many copies of the state, that is, corresponding to the orange, yellow, and white regions in Fig. 1. Our definition can also be generalized to multipartite systems. Theorem 3 provides a general relation for N -partite states. Our results may shed light on monogamy properties related to other quantum correlations.

Acknowledgments This work was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) under Grants 11847209, 12075159, 11975236, 12075159, and 11635009; Beijing Natural Science Foundation (Grant No. Z190005), Academy for Multidisciplinary Studies, Capital Normal University, Shenzhen Institute for Quantum Science and Engineering, Southern University of Science and Technology (No. SIQSE202001), Academician Innovation Platform of Hainan Province, China Postdoctoral Science Foundation funded project No. 2019M650811, and China Scholarship Council No. 201904910005.

* Corresponding author: feishm@cnu.edu.cn

† Corresponding author: xianqing.li-jost@mis.mpg.de

‡ Corresponding author: qiaocf@ucas.ac.cn

- [1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [2] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Quantum entanglement, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 81, 865 (2009).
- [3] F. Mintert, M. Kuś, and A. Buchleitner, Concurrence of Mixed Bipartite Quantum States in Arbitrary Dimensions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 92, 167902 (2004).
- [4] K. Chen, S. Albeverio, and S. M. Fei, Concurrence of Arbitrary Dimensional Bipartite Quantum States, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 95, 040504 (2005).
- [5] H. P. Breuer, Separability criteria and bounds for entanglement measures, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* 39, 11847 (2006).
- [6] H. P. Breuer, Optimal Entanglement Criterion for Mixed Quantum States, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 97, 080501 (2006).
- [7] J. I. de Vicente, Lower bounds on concurrence and separability conditions, *Phys. Rev. A* 75, 052320 (2007).
- [8] C. J. Zhang, Y. S. Zhang, S. Zhang, and G. C. Guo, Optimal entanglement witnesses based on local orthogonal observables, *Phys. Rev. A* 76, 012334 (2007).
- [9] J. M. Renes and M. Grassl, Phys, Generalized decoding, effective channels, and simplified security proofs in quantum key distribution, *Rev. A* 74, 022317 (2006).
- [10] L. Masanes, Universally composable privacy amplification from causality constraints, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 102, 140501 (2009).
- [11] X. S. Ma, B. Dakic, W. Naylor, A. Zeilinger, and P. Walther, Quantum simulation of the wavefunction to probe frustrated Heisenberg spin systems, *Nat. Phys.* 7, 399 (2011).
- [12] K. Meichanetzidis, J. Eisert, M. Cirio, V. Lahtinen, and J. K. Pachos, Diagnosing topological edge states via entanglement monogamy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 116, 130501 (2016).
- [13] S. M. Giampaolo, G. Gualdi, A. Monras, and F. Illuminati, Characterizing and quantifying frustration in quantum many-body systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 107, 260602 (2011).
- [14] V. Scarani, S. Iblisdir, N. Gisin, and A. Acín, Quantum cloning, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 77, 1225 (2005).
- [15] M. Pawłowski, Security proof for cryptographic protocols based only on the monogamy of Bell's inequality violations, *Phys. Rev. A* 82, 032313 (2010).
- [16] M. Koashi and A. Winter, Monogamy of quantum entanglement and other correlations, *Phys. Rev. A* 69, 022309 (2004).
- [17] V. Coffman, J. Kundu, and W. K. Wootters, Distributed entanglement, *Phys. Rev. A* 61, 052306 (2000).
- [18] G. Adesso and F. Illuminati, Continuous variable tangle, monogamy inequality, and entanglement sharing in Gaussian states of continuous variable systems, *New J. Phys.* 8, 15 (2006).
- [19] T. Hiroshima, G. Adesso, and F. Illuminati, Monogamy inequality for distributed Gaussian entanglement, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 98, 050503 (2007).
- [20] G. Adesso and F. Illuminati, Strong monogamy of bipartite and genuine multipartite entanglement: the Gaussian case, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 99, 150501 (2007).
- [21] G. Adesso, D. Girolami, and A. Serafini, Measuring Gaussian quantum information and correlations using the Rényi entropy of order 2, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 109, 190502 (2012).
- [22] Y.-K. Bai, Y.-F. Xu, and Z. D. Wang, General monogamy relation for the entanglement of formation in multiqubit systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 113, 100503 (2014).
- [23] Y. Guo, L. Zhang, Multipartite entanglement measure and complete monogamy relation, *Phys. Rev. A* 101, 032301 (2020).
- [24] Z. X. Jin and S. M. Fei, Finer distribution of quantum correlations among multiqubit systems, *Quantum Inf Process* 18, 21 (2019).
- [25] G. Gour and Y. Guo, Monogamy of entanglement without inequalities, *Quantum* 2, 81 (2018).
- [26] M. Christandl and A. Winter, Squashed entanglement: an additive entanglement measure, *J. Math. Phys.* 45, 829 (2004).
- [27] D. Yang, et al, Squashed entanglement for multipartite states and entanglement measures based on the mixed convex roof, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* 55, 3375 (2009).
- [28] Y. C. Ou and H. Fan, Monogamy inequality in terms of negativity for three-qubit states, *Phys. Rev. A* 75, 062308 (2007).
- [29] J. S. Kim, A. Das, and B. C. Sanders, Entanglement monogamy of multipartite higher-dimensional quantum systems using convex-roof extend negativity, *Phys. Rev. A* 79, 012329 (2009).
- [30] H. He and G. Vidal, Disentangling theorem and monogamy for entanglement negativity, *Phys. Rev. A* 91, 012339 (2015).
- [31] Z. X. Jin and S. M. Fei, Tighter entanglement monogamy relations of qubit systems, *Quantum Inf Process* 16:77 (2017).
- [32] X. N. Zhu and S. M. Fei, Entanglement monogamy relations of qubit systems, *Phys. Rev. A* 90, 024304 (2014).
- [33] Z. X. Jin, S. M. Fei, Tighter monogamy relations of quantum entanglement for multiqubit W-class states, *Quantum Inf Process* 17:2 (2018).
- [34] J. H. Choi and J. S. Kim, Negativity and strong monogamy of multiparty quantum entanglement beyond qubits, *Phys. Rev. A* 92, 042307 (2015).
- [35] Y. Luo and Y. Li, Monogamy of α -th power entanglement measurement in qubit system, *Ann. Phys.* 362, 511 (2015).
- [36] J. S. Kim, Tsallis entropy and entanglement constraints in multiqubit systems, *Phys. Rev. A* 81, 062328 (2010).
- [37] J. S. Kim, Generalized entanglement constraints in multiqubit systems in terms of Tsallis entropy, *Annals of Physics*, 373, 197-206, (2016).
- [38] Z. X. Jin, J. Li, T. Li, S. M. Fei, Tighter monogamy relations in multiqubit systems, *Phys. Rev. A* 97, 032336 (2018).
- [39] J. S. Kim and B. C. Sanders, Monogamy of multi-qubit entanglement using Rényi entropy, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* 43, 445305 (2010).
- [40] M. F. Cornelio and M. C. de Oliveira, Strong superadditivity and monogamy of the Renyi measure of entanglement, *Phys. Rev. A* 81, 032332 (2010).
- [41] Y. X. Wang, L. Z. Mu, V. Vedral, and H. Fan, Entanglement Rényi-entropy, *Phys. Rev. A* 93, 022324 (2016).
- [42] C. Lancien, S. Martino, M. Huber, M. Piani, G. Adesso, and A. Winter, Should entanglement measures be monogamous or faithful? *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 117, 060501 (2016).
- [43] Y. C. Ou, Violation of monogamy inequality for higher-dimensional objects, *Phys. Rev. A* 75, 034305 (2007).
- [44] D. Bouwmeester, J. W. Pan, M. Daniell, H. Wein-

furter, and A. Zeilinger, Observation of Three-Photon Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger Entanglement, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 82, 1345, 1999.

- [45] Y. Guo, Y. Jia, X. Li, Multipartite unextendible entangled basis, *Quantum Inf. Process.* 14, 3553 (2015).
- [46] Z. X. Jin and S. M. Fei, Superactivation of monogamy relations for nonadditive quantum correlation measures, *Phys. Rev. A* 99, 032343 (2019).
- [47] S. Roy, T. Das, A. Kumar, A. Sen(De), and U. Sen, Activation of nonmonogamous multipartite quantum states, *Phys. Rev. A* 98, 012310 (2018).
- [48] A. Kumar, Conditions for monogamy of quantum correlations in multipartite systems, *Phys. Lett. A*, 380, 3044-3050, (2016).
- [49] M. Pawłowski, Security proof for cryptographic protocols based only on the monogamy of bells inequality violations, *Phys. Rev. A* 82, 032313 (2010).

APPENDIX

Proof of Theorem 1

Let E be a monogamous measure of the entanglement that satisfies (4). If $E_{A|BC} = 0$, the result is clear. We assume $E_{A|BC} > 0$. As E is a measure of quantum entanglement, it is non-increasing under a partial trace, and $E_{AC} \geq E_{AB}$ for $\mu > 0$ according to (4). We have $E_{A|BC} > E_{AC} \geq E_{AB}$ for any state ρ_{ABC} . Set $x_1 = E_{AB}/E_{A|BC} \in [0, 1)$ and $x_2 = E_{AC}/E_{A|BC} \in [0, 1)$. Clearly, γ exists such that

$$x_1^\gamma + x_2^\gamma \leq 1, \quad (\text{A1})$$

since x_1^γ and x_2^γ decrease when γ increases. Set $f(\rho_{ABC}) := \inf_\gamma \{\gamma | x_1^\gamma + x_2^\gamma \leq 1, x_1, x_2 \in [0, 1)\}$. Owing to the compactness of the set of tripartite states ρ_{ABC} and the continuity of E , there always exists a state ρ_1 , such that $\max_\rho x_1(\rho) = x_1(\rho_1) < 1$ for $x_1(\rho) \in [0, 1)$. Similarly, there exists a state ρ_2 such that $\max_\rho x_2(\rho) = x_2(\rho_2) < 1$. Therefore, there exists a sufficiently large N independent of ρ_{ABC} , such that $x_1^N(\rho) + x_2^N(\rho) \leq 1$ as $x_i^N(\rho) \rightarrow 0$, $i = 1, 2$, for a sufficiently large N . Thus, we can always obtain a sufficiently large N independent of ρ , such that $x_1^N(\rho_0) + x_2^N(\rho_0) \leq x_1^N(\rho_1) + x_2^N(\rho_2) \leq 1$, where $x_i(\rho_i) = \max_\rho x_i(\rho) < 1$, $i = 1, 2$.

Next, we prove that $f(\rho_{ABC})$ is bounded uniformly. It is only necessary to prove that $f(\rho_{ABC}) \leq N$ for any ρ_{ABC} . If there exists a state ρ_0 such that $f(\rho_0) > N$, then on one hand, by the definition of $f(\rho_{ABC})$, i.e., $x_1^{f(\rho_0)}(\rho_0) + x_2^{f(\rho_0)}(\rho_0) \leq 1$, one has $x_1^N(\rho_0) + x_2^N(\rho_0) > 1$ as $f(\rho_0) > N$. In contrast, $x_1^N(\rho_0) + x_2^N(\rho_0) \leq x_1^N(\rho_1) + x_2^N(\rho_2) \leq 1$, where $x_i(\rho_i) = \max_\rho x_i(\rho) < 1$, $i = 1, 2$, which gives rise to a contradiction. Therefore, $f(\rho_{ABC})$ is bounded uniformly. Setting $\alpha = \sup_{\rho_{ABC}} f(\rho_{ABC})$, we prove the inequality (5).

Moreover, without loss of generality, we assume that $E_{AC} \geq E_{AB}$ from Eq. (5), if $E_{A|BC} = E_{AC}$, then

$E_{AB} = 0$ for the pure state $|\psi\rangle_{ABC}$. Otherwise, $E_{A|BC} > \max\{E_{AB}, E_{AC}\}$. Obviously, in any case, there always exists a constant μ such that $E_{A|BC} = \mu E_{AB} + E_{AC}$ because we can always choose $\mu = \min_{\rho_{ABC}} \frac{E_{A|BC} - E_{AC}}{E_{AB}}$ for the latter case.

Proof of Theorem 2

Let λ_i and $|i\rangle$ be the eigenvalues and eigenstates of state $\rho_{AB'}$ in systems A and B' , respectively. We can always introduce a third system B'' . The systems B' and B'' together constitute the system B . Provided the dimension of the system B'' is not smaller than that of AB' , there exists an orthonormal basis $|\hat{i}\rangle$ of B'' such that $|\psi\rangle = \sum_i \sqrt{\lambda_i} |i\rangle |\hat{i}\rangle$ is a pure state of the tripartite system $AB'B''$. Thus $\rho_{AB'} = \text{tr}_{B''} |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, where $\text{tr}_{B''}$ is the partial trace over B'' . As $\text{tr}_{B''}$ is a local operation performed on B'' , one has $E(\rho_{AB'}) \leq E(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$. As $\rho_A = \text{tr}_B |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| = \text{tr}_{B'} \rho_{AB'}$, the Schmidt coefficients of $|\psi\rangle$ are $\sqrt{\lambda_i(\rho_A)}$. Hence, the quantum entanglement has the form

$$E(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = f(\vec{\lambda}(\rho_A)),$$

where f is a function of $\vec{\lambda}(\rho_A)$ given by the nonzero eigenvalues of state ρ_A . Thus, $E(\rho_{AB'})$ depends only on ρ_A and $E(\rho_{AB'}) \leq f(\vec{\lambda}(\rho_A))$. Therefore, there exists a positive number $0 \leq L \leq 1$, such that $E(\rho_{AB'}) = Lf(\vec{\lambda}(\rho_A))$. Note that $\rho_{AB'}^{\otimes m}$ is shortest for $\rho_{A_1 B'_1} \otimes \rho_{A_2 B'_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_{A_m B'_m}$. The eigenvalues of $\rho_{AB'}^{\otimes m}$ are $\{\prod_{j=1}^m \lambda_{i_j}\}$. Hence, a function g exists such that $E(\rho_{AB'}^{\otimes m}) = g^m[E(\rho_{AB'})]$. Then, $E(\rho_{AB'}^{\otimes m}) = g^m[Lf(\vec{\lambda}(\rho_A))] = L^m g^m[f(\vec{\lambda}(\rho_A))]$. Similar to $E(\rho_{AB'})$, assuming that $E(\rho_{AB''}) = Mf(\vec{\lambda}(\rho_A))$ with $0 \leq M \leq 1$, we have $E(\rho_{AB''}^{\otimes m}) = M^m g^m[f(\vec{\lambda}(\rho_A))]$ and $E(\rho_{A|B'B''}^{\otimes m}) = g^m[f(\vec{\lambda}(\rho_A))]$. According to definition (4), one gets that $M = 0$ if $L = 1$ and $L = 0$ if $M = 1$ for the pure state $|\psi\rangle$. Otherwise, $E(\rho_{A|B'B''}^{\otimes m}) > \max\{E(\rho_{AB'}^{\otimes m}), E(\rho_{AB''}^{\otimes m})\}$.

We consider the cases of $0 < L < 1$ and $0 < M < 1$. To obtain (9), it is sufficient to determine the minimum integer m such that

$$L^m + M^m \leq 1. \quad (\text{A2})$$

From Theorem 1, there always exists a positive integer m such that inequality (A2) holds.

In the following, we prove that if E is monogamous in tripartite pure states $|\psi\rangle$, then it is also monogamous in tripartite mixed states. Let $\rho_{ABC} = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|_{ABC}$ be the optimal decomposition such that $E(\rho_{ABC}) = \sum_i p_i E(|\psi_i\rangle_{ABC})$. Denote $\rho_{iAB} = \text{Tr}_C(|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|_{ABC})$ and

$\rho_{iAC} = \text{Tr}_B(|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|_{ABC})$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} E(\rho_{ABC}) &= \sum_i p_i E(|\psi_i\rangle_{ABC}) \\ &\geq \sum_i p_i E(\rho_{iAB}) + \sum_i p_i E(\rho_{iAC}) \\ &\geq E(\rho_{AB}) + E(\rho_{AC}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the convexity of measure E , $\rho_{AB} = \sum_i p_i \rho_{iAB}$, and $\rho_{AC} = \sum_i p_i \rho_{iAC}$.

Proof of Theorem 3

From (4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &E_{A|B_1 B_2 \cdots B_{N-1}} \\ &= E_{AB_1} + \mu_1 E_{A|B_2 \cdots B_{N-1}} \\ &= E_{AB_1} + \mu_1 E_{AB_2} + \mu_1 \mu_2 E_{A|B_3 \cdots B_{N-1}} \\ &= \cdots \\ &= E_{AB_1} + \mu_1 E_{AB_2} + \cdots + \mu_1 \mu_2 \cdots \mu_{m-1} E_{AB_m} \\ &\quad + \mu_1 \mu_2 \cdots \mu_m E_{A|B_{m+1} \cdots B_{N-1}}. \end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

Similarly, because $E_{AB_j} \leq E_{A|B_{j+1} \cdots B_{N-1}}$ for $j = m+1, \dots, N-2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &E_{A|B_{m+1} \cdots B_{N-1}} \\ &= \mu_{m+1} E_{AB_{m+1}} + E_{A|B_{m+2} \cdots B_{N-1}} \\ &= \mu_{m+1} E_{AB_{m+1}} + \cdots + \mu_{N-2} E_{AB_{N-2}} \\ &\quad + E_{AB_{N-1}}. \end{aligned} \tag{A4}$$

By combining (A3) and (A4), we have Theorem 3.