

Activation of genuine multipartite entanglement: beyond the single-copy paradigm of entanglement characterisation

Hayata Yamasaki,^{1,2,*} Simon Morelli,^{1,2,†} Markus Miethlinger,¹
Jessica Bavaresco,^{1,2} Nicolai Friis,^{1,2,‡} and Marcus Huber^{2,1,§}

¹*Institute for Quantum Optics and Quantum Information — IQOQI Vienna,
Austrian Academy of Sciences, Boltzmannngasse 3, 1090 Vienna, Austria*

²*Atominstytut, Technische Universität Wien, 1020 Vienna, Austria*

(Dated: November 13, 2021)

Entanglement shared among multiple parties presents complex challenges for the characterisation of different types of entanglement. One of the most basic insights is the fact that some mixed states can feature entanglement across every possible cut of a multipartite system, yet can be produced via a mixture of partially separable states. To distinguish states that genuinely cannot be produced from mixing partially separable states, the term *genuine multipartite entanglement* was coined. All these considerations originate in a paradigm where only a single copy of the state is distributed and locally acted upon. In contrast, advances in quantum technologies prompt the question of how this picture changes when multiple copies of the same state become locally accessible. Here we show that multiple copies unlock genuine multipartite entanglement from partially separable states, even from undistillable ensembles, and even more than two copies can be required to observe this effect. With these findings, we characterise the notion of partial separability in the paradigm of multiple copies and conjecture a strict hierarchy of activatable states and an asymptotic collapse of hierarchy.

Entanglement shared among multiple parties is acknowledged as one of the fundamental resources driving the second quantum revolution [1], for instance, as a basis of quantum network proposals [2–5], as a key resource for improved quantum sensing [6] and quantum error correction [7] or as generic ingredient in quantum algorithms [8] and measurement-based quantum computation [9, 10]. Yet, its detection and characterisation is complicated by several factors: among them, the computational hardness of deciding whether any given system even exhibits any entanglement at all [11] as well as the fact that the usual paradigm of local operations and classical communication (LOCC) lead to infinitely many types of entanglement [12–16] already for single copies of multipartite states. Significant effort has thus been devoted to devising practical means of entanglement certification from limited experimental data [17, 18].

One of the principal challenges for the characterisation of multipartite entanglement lies in distinguishing between *biseparability* and its counterpart, *genuine multipartite entanglement* (GME). Here, a multipartite state is called partially separable if it is separable with respect to some partition of the parties into two or more groups, and any mixture of partially separable states is called biseparable, whereas any state that cannot be decomposed in this way has GME (see Fig. 1). This distinction arises naturally when considering the resources required to create a specific state: any biseparable state can be produced via LOCC in setups where all parties share classical randomness and subsets of parties share en-




FIG. 1. **GME and (partial) separability for three qubits.** All three-qubit states separable w.r.t. to one of the three bipartitions, $\mathcal{A}_1|\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{A}_3$ (yellow), $\mathcal{A}_2|\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{A}_3$ (darker green), and $\mathcal{A}_3|\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{A}_2$ (background), form convex sets, whose intersection contains all fully separable states $\mathcal{A}_1|\mathcal{A}_2|\mathcal{A}_3$ (blue). The convex hull of these partially separable states contains all biseparable states. All states that are not biseparable are GME. States with k -copy activatable GME are contained in the set of biseparable but not partially separable states (lighter green areas). The horizontal line represents the family of isotropic GHZ states $\rho(p)$, containing the maximally mixed state ($p = 0$) and the GHZ state ($p = 1$). The values $p_{\text{GME}}^{(k)}$ indicate k -copy GME activation thresholds, which we discuss in the following.

tangled states (which are thus partially separable states w.r.t. all parties). One of the counter-intuitive features of biseparable states is the possibility for bipartite entanglement across every possible cut (cf. [19, footnote on p. 4]). Consequently, the notion of bipartite entan-

* hayata.yamasaki@oeaw.ac.at

† simon.morelli@oeaw.ac.at

‡ nicolai.friis@univie.ac.at

§ marcus.huber@univie.ac.at




FIG. 2. **Activation of GME from biseparable states.** (a) Separable bipartite states remain separable, no matter how many copies are shared, e.g., if $\rho_{\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{A}_2}$ and $\rho_{\mathcal{B}_1\mathcal{B}_2}$ are separable w.r.t. the bipartitions $\mathcal{A}_1|\mathcal{A}_2$ and $\mathcal{B}_1|\mathcal{B}_2$, then so is $\rho_{\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{A}_2} \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{B}_1\mathcal{B}_2}$. (b) In contrast, the joint state of multiple copies of biseparable states, e.g., $\rho_{\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N}$, $\rho_{\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2, \dots, \mathcal{B}_N}$, and $\rho_{\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2, \dots, \mathcal{C}_N}$, can be GME w.r.t. the partition $\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{B}_1\mathcal{C}_1|\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{B}_2\mathcal{C}_2|\dots|\mathcal{A}_N\mathcal{B}_N\mathcal{C}_N$.

glement is insufficient to capture the complexity of the state space, and conventional methods, such as positive maps [20, 21], cannot be straightforwardly applied to reveal GME [22, 23], which results in additional challenges compared to the —relatively— simpler scenario of detecting bipartite or partial entanglement (e.g., as in [24]).

An assumption inherent in the above is that all parties locally act only on a single copy of the distributed state. However, in many experiments where quantum states are distributed among (potentially distant) parties, multiple independent but identically prepared copies of states are (or at least, can be) shared. A prominent example of such a situation is found in photonic experiments based on down-conversion sources, see, e.g., [25]. Even limited access to quantum memories or signal delays then allows one to act on multiple copies of the distributed states, which is a recurring theme also in research on quantum networks [26, 27]. Characterising properties of GME in multi-copy scenarios is thus not only of fundamental theoretical importance but also a crucial problem for practical applications.

However, we demonstrate here that, unlike the distinction between separable and entangled states, the distinction between biseparability and GME is not maintained in the transition from one to many copies. As we show, for N parties $1, \dots, N$, there exist multipartite quantum states $\rho_{\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N}$ that are biseparable, but which can be *activated* in the sense that sharing two copies results in a GME state, i.e., such that $\rho_{\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N} \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2, \dots, \mathcal{B}_N}$ is not biseparable with respect to the partition $\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{B}_1|\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{B}_2|\dots|\mathcal{A}_N\mathcal{B}_N$, see Fig. 2. That such an activation of GME is in principle possible had previously only been noted in [28], where it was observed that two copies of a particular four-qubit state that is itself almost fully separable can become GME. Here, we systematically investigate this phenomenon of

multi-copy GME activation. As the first main result, we show that the property of biseparability is not tensor stable in general by identifying a family of N -qubit isotropic Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) states with two-copy activatable GME for all N . We further demonstrate the existence of biseparable states within this family for which two copies are not enough to activate GME, but three copies are. Moreover, we show that the bound for partial separability coincides with the asymptotic (in terms of the number of copies) GME-activation bound for isotropic GHZ states.

Multi-copy GME activation is particularly remarkable —and may appear surprising at first— because it is in stark contrast to bipartite entanglement: sharing two copies of any bipartite separable state always results in a bipartite separable state. In other words, if $\rho_{\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{A}_2}$ and $\rho_{\mathcal{B}_1\mathcal{B}_2}$ are separable with respect to the bipartitions $\mathcal{A}_1|\mathcal{A}_2$ and $\mathcal{B}_1|\mathcal{B}_2$, respectively, then $\rho_{\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{A}_2} \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{B}_1\mathcal{B}_2}$ is always separable with respect to the bipartition $\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{B}_1|\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{B}_2$. However, from the perspective of entanglement distillation —the concentration of entanglement from many weakly entangled (copies of) states to few strongly entangled ones— such an activation seems more natural. After all, if one party shares bipartite maximally entangled states with each other party, these could be used to establish any GME state among all N parties via standard teleportation, thus distributing GME by sharing only two-party entangled states. Nevertheless, such a procedure would require at least $N - 1$ copies of these bipartite entangled states (in addition to a local copy of the GME state to be distributed), and already the example from [28] suggests that other mechanisms can be exploited. While we have seen that the phenomenon of GME activation is more than just distillation, one may still be tempted to think that distillable entanglement is required for GME activation. That is, it is known that there exist bound entangled states —entangled states that do not admit distillation of entanglement no matter how many copies are provided. In particular, all entangled states with positive partial transpose (PPT) across a given cut are undistillable since any number of copies is also PPT. One might thus suspect that GME activation should not be possible for biseparable states that are PPT across every cut and hence have no distillable entanglement. As another main result we show that this is not the case by constructing a biseparable state that is PPT w.r.t. every cut yet two copies of the state are indeed GME. Together, our results thus support the following conjectures:

- (i) There exists a hierarchy of states with k -copy activatable GME, i.e., for all $k \geq 2$ there exists a biseparable but not partially separable state ρ such that $\rho^{\otimes k-1}$ is biseparable, but $\rho^{\otimes k}$ is GME.
- (ii) GME may be activated for any biseparable but not partially separable state (light green areas in Fig. 1) of any number of parties as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

In the following, we first provide the formal definitions

for biseparability and GME before turning to the family of N -qubit isotropic GHZ states. For all biseparable states in this family we provide upper bounds on the minimal number of copies required to activate GME. We then consider the case of three qubits ($N = 3$), for which we can show that the bound on three-copy GME activation is tight in the sense that we identify all states in the family for which one requires at least three copies to activate GME, while two copies remain biseparable. Subsequently, we construct an explicit example for two-copy GME activation from biseparable states with no distillable bipartite entanglement. Finally, we analyse the implications of our results and discuss open questions.

Separability & GME. Formally, a pure quantum state of an N -partite system with Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{(N)} = \otimes_{i=1}^N \mathcal{H}_i$ is separable w.r.t. a k -partition $\{\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \dots, \mathcal{A}_k\}$, with $\mathcal{A}_i \subset \mathbb{N}_N := \{1, 2, 3, \dots, N\}$ and $\bigcup_{i=1}^k \mathcal{A}_i = \mathbb{N}_N$ such that $\otimes_{i=1}^k \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_i} = \mathcal{H}^{(N)}$, if it can be written as

$$|\Phi^{(k)}\rangle = \bigotimes_{i=1}^k |\phi_{\mathcal{A}_i}\rangle, \quad |\phi_{\mathcal{A}_i}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_i}. \quad (1)$$

When generalising to density matrices, it is common not to specify all possible partitions, but to use the notion of k -separability instead: A density operator is called k -separable if it can be decomposed as a convex sum of pure states that are all separable w.r.t. to *some* k -partition, i.e., if it is of the form

$$\rho^{(k)} = \sum_i p_i |\Phi_i^{(k)}\rangle\langle\Phi_i^{(k)}|. \quad (2)$$

Crucially, each $|\Phi_i^{(k)}\rangle$ may be k -separable w.r.t. a different k -partition. Consequently, k -separability does not imply separability of $\rho^{(k)}$ w.r.t. a specific partition, except when $\rho^{(k)}$ is a pure state or when $k = N$. In the latter case the state is called *fully separable*. To make this distinction more explicit, we refer to all (at least) biseparable states that are actually separable w.r.t. to some partition as *partially separable*. At the other end of this separability spectrum one encounters *biseparable states* ($k = 2$), while all states that are not at least biseparable (formally, $k = 1$) are called *genuinely N -partite entangled*. To simplify the discussion, we will here use the term GME for the case $k = 1$. The operational reason for this definition of GME is easily explained: any biseparable state of the form of Eq. (2) can be created by N parties purely by sharing partially separable states of the form of Eq. (1) and some classical randomness. In addition, this conveniently results in a convex notion of biseparability (as illustrated for the example in Fig. 1) amenable to entanglement witness techniques, which inherently rely on convexity.

GME of isotropic GHZ states. To overcome the difficulty in analyzing GME, the crucial technique here is to use states in X -form, i.e., those with nonzero entries of density operators only on the main diagonal and main anti-diagonal w.r.t. the computational basis. Let us now

consider a family of mixed N -qubit states, *isotropic GHZ states*, given by

$$\rho(p) = p |\text{GHZ}_N\rangle\langle\text{GHZ}_N| + (1-p) \frac{1}{2^N} \mathbb{1}_{2^N}, \quad (3)$$

obtained as convex combination of the N -qubit maximally mixed state $\frac{1}{2^N} \mathbb{1}_{2^N}$ and a pure N -qubit GHZ state

$$|\text{GHZ}_N\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle^{\otimes N} + |1\rangle^{\otimes N}). \quad (4)$$

with real mixing parameter $p \in [-1/(2^N - 1), 1]$. Since states in this family are in X -form w.r.t. the N -qubit computational basis, we can straightforwardly calculate the *genuine multipartite* (GM) *concurrence* [29, 30]. For any N -qubit density operator ρ_X in X -form, i.e., $\rho_X = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{a} & \tilde{z} \tilde{d} \\ \tilde{d} \tilde{z}^\dagger & \tilde{b} \tilde{d} \end{pmatrix}$, where $\tilde{a} = \text{diag}\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$, $\tilde{b} = \text{diag}\{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$, and $\tilde{z} = \text{diag}\{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$ are diagonal $n \times n$ matrices with $n = 2^{N-1}$, $a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and $z_i \in \mathbb{C}$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, and $\tilde{d} = \text{antidiag}\{1, 1, \dots, 1\}$ is antidiagonal, the GM concurrence is given by

$$C_{\text{GM}}(\rho_X) = 2 \max\{0, \max_i \{|z_i| - \sum_{j \neq i}^n \sqrt{a_j b_j}\}\}, \quad (5)$$

and provides a necessary and sufficient condition for GME (or, more specifically, genuine N -partite entanglement) whenever $C_{\text{GM}} > 0$. In the case of the state $\rho(p)$ from Eq. (3), we have $a_i = b_i = \frac{1-p}{2^N} + \delta_{i1} \frac{p}{2}$ and $z_i = \delta_{i1} \frac{p}{2}$, such that

$$C_{\text{GM}}[\rho(p)] = \max\{0, |p| - (1-p)(1 - 2^{1-N})\}. \quad (6)$$

Thus, $\rho(p)$ is GME if and only if

$$p > p_{\text{GME}}^{(1)}(N) := \frac{2^{N-1} - 1}{2^N - 1}, \quad (7)$$

i.e., if and only if p surpasses the single-copy threshold $p_{\text{GME}}^{(1)}$. Conversely, we can be certain that $\rho(p)$ is not GME for $p \leq (2^{N-1} - 1)/(2^N - 1)$, and hence at least biseparable (generally, k -separable for some $k \in \{2, 3, \dots, N\}$).

Multi-copy GME criterion. Our first goal is then to check if two copies of $\rho(p)$ are GME. Although we do not have a necessary and sufficient criterion available to check $\rho(p)^{\otimes 2}$ (which is not of X -form even if a single copy is) for GME, we can make use of the fact that stochastic LOCC (or SLOCC) does not allow one to create GME from a biseparable state. To construct a sufficient GME criterion, we use a map \mathcal{E}_\circ such that for any states ρ and σ on \mathcal{H} , the state $\rho \otimes \sigma$ is mapped to

$$\mathcal{E}_\circ[\rho \otimes \sigma] = \frac{\rho \circ \sigma}{\text{Tr}(\rho \circ \sigma)} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{H}, \quad (8)$$

where “ \circ ” denotes the Hadamard product (or Schur product), i.e., the component-wise multiplication of the two matrices. The map \mathcal{E}_\circ can be implemented via

SLOCC [31]. What is useful for us here is that the Hadamard product of two X -matrices results in an X -matrix. Consequently, we can directly calculate the GM concurrence for the state resulting from applying the ‘Hadamard-product map’ \mathcal{E}_o to two copies of an originally biseparable state. If the GM concurrence of $\mathcal{E}_o[\rho(p)^{\otimes 2}]$ is nonzero, we can conclude that two copies of $\rho(p)$ are GME, even if a single copy is not. To decide whether $\mathcal{E}_o[\rho(p)^{\otimes 2}]$ is GME or not, i.e., whether the GM concurrence is nonzero or not, we can ignore the normalization and just consider $\rho(p) \circ \rho(p) = \rho(p)^{\circ 2}$. Moreover, in the maximization over the index i in Eq. (5), the maximum is obtained for $i = 1$. We can thus conclude that $\rho(p)^{\otimes 2}$ is GME if

$$|z_1^2| - \sum_{j \neq 1}^n \sqrt{a_j^2 b_j^2} = \frac{p^2}{4} - (2^{N-1} - 1) \left(\frac{1-p}{2^N}\right)^2 > 0, \quad (9)$$

which translates to the condition $p/(1-p) > \sqrt{2^{N-1}-1}/2^{N-1}$, and in turn can be reformulated to the condition

$$p > p_{\text{GME}}^{(2)}(N) := \frac{\sqrt{2^{N-1}-1}}{2^{N-1} + \sqrt{2^{N-1}-1}}. \quad (10)$$

As we see, we have $p_{\text{GME}}^{(1)} > p_{\text{GME}}^{(2)}$ for all $N \geq 3$, confirming that *there exist biseparable states* with values $p < p_{\text{GME}}^{(1)}$ for which two copies are GME, i.e., such that $p > p_{\text{GME}}^{(2)}$.

Moreover, we can now concatenate multiple uses of the SLOCC channel \mathcal{E}_o . For instance, we can identify the threshold value $p_{\text{GME}}^{(3)}$ of p at which the state $\mathcal{E}_o[\rho(p) \otimes \mathcal{E}_o[\rho(p)^{\otimes 2}]]$ resulting from 2 applications of \mathcal{E}_o to a total of 3 copies of $\rho(p)$ is GME, or, more generally, the corresponding threshold value $p_{\text{GME}}^{(k)}$ for which k copies result in a GME state after applying the map \mathcal{E}_o a total of $k-1$ times. From Eq. (9) it is easy to see that these threshold values are obtained as the solutions of

$$\frac{p^k}{2^k} = (2^{N-1} - 1) \left(\frac{1-p}{2^N}\right)^k, \quad (11)$$

which results in

$$p_{\text{GME}}^{(k)}(N) := \frac{\sqrt[k]{2^{N-1}-1}}{2^{N-1} + \sqrt[k]{2^{N-1}-1}}. \quad (12)$$

Hierarchy of k -copy activatable states? The threshold values $p_{\text{GME}}^{(k)}$ provide upper bounds on the minimal number of copies required to activate GME: a value p satisfying $p_{\text{GME}}^{(k)} < p < p_{\text{GME}}^{(k-1)}$ for $k \geq 2$ implies that k copies are enough to activate GME. But since the map \mathcal{E}_o (does not create and) may reduce GME, save for the case $k = 2$, it does not imply that k copies are actually needed; up to this point, there is a possibility that two copies are all it takes. However, at least for the case of three qubits ($N = 3$) and three copies ($k = 3$), we find that this is not the case. That is, for all isotropic three-qubit GHZ states with $p \leq p_{\text{GME}}^{(2)}(N = 3) = \sqrt{3}/(4 + \sqrt{3})$, we find that two copies are still biseparable, and thus at least three copies are required to activate GME. The explicit biseparable decomposition of two copies

of the states in this range is presented in Appendix A. Although it does not constitute conclusive proof, this result nevertheless supports Conjecture (i), i.e., that there exists a hierarchy of k -copy activatable states for which k copies are indeed required to obtain GME.

Activatable & non-activatable states. The conjectured existence of a hierarchy of biseparable states with k -copy activatable GME means that states become less and less ‘valuable’ as the number of copies k required to obtain GME increases. At the same time, it is also clear that all partially separable states cannot be used to activate GME because separability w.r.t. any fixed partition is tensor stable. But it is not clear where exactly the boundary between activatable and non-activatable states really lies (see Fig. 1). To shed light on this question, let us again examine the isotropic GHZ states from Eq. (3) with regards to partial separability w.r.t. the bipartition separating the first from the remaining $N-1$ qubits. That is, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(p) &= p |\Phi^+\rangle\langle\Phi^+|_{\mathcal{A}_1 \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2} + \frac{1-p}{2^N} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2} + \frac{1-p}{2^N} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2} \\ &= \frac{1+p}{2} \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{A}_1 \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2} + \frac{1-p}{2} \frac{1}{2^{N-1}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2}, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $|\Phi^+\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_1 \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_1} |\tilde{0}\rangle_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2} + |1\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_1} |\tilde{1}\rangle_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2})$ with $|\tilde{i}\rangle_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2} = \bigotimes_{j=2}^N |i\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_j}$ for $i = 0, 1$, $\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2} = \sum_{i=0,1} |\tilde{i}\rangle\langle\tilde{i}|$ and $\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2} = \mathbb{1}_{2^{N-1}} - \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2}$. From this decomposition, it becomes clear that the state can be written as a convex sum of a two-qubit state $\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{A}_1 \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2}$, where the second qubit $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2$ is defined on the two-dimensional subspace spanned by the states $|\tilde{i}\rangle$ for $i = 0, 1$, and diagonal terms proportional to $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2}$ with support in an orthogonal subspace $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2^\perp$ of the qubits $\mathcal{A}_2, \mathcal{A}_3, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N$. The latter trivially have a separable decomposition w.r.t. the bipartition $\mathcal{A}_1 | \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2$. For the two-qubit state $\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{A}_1 \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2}$, the PPT criterion offers a necessary and sufficient separability criterion, and one easily finds that the partial transpose of $\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{A}_1 \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2}$ is non-negative if $p \leq p_{\text{crit}} := 1/(1 + 2^{N-1})$ (see Appendix B). Further taking into account its qubit exchange symmetry, we thus find that $\rho(p)$ is separable w.r.t. to any bipartition for $p \leq p_{\text{crit}}$. At the same time, we find that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} p_{\text{GME}}^{(k)}(N) = p_{\text{crit}}$, which implies that any isotropic GHZ state with $p > p_{\text{crit}}$ features k -copy activatable GME, at least asymptotically as $k \rightarrow \infty$, and is thus also not partially separable. Consequently, Conjecture (ii) holds for isotropic GHZ states. But does it hold in general?

GME activation of PPT entangled states. A situation where one might imagine Conjecture (ii) to fail is the situation of biseparable (but not partially separable) states with PPT entanglement across every bipartition. For isotropic GHZ states, the PPT criterion across every cut coincides exactly with the threshold p_{crit} for partial separability (and GME activation), as one can confirm by calculating the eigenvalues of the partial transpose of $\rho(p)$ (see Appendix B). We thus turn to a different family of states, for which this is not the case. Specifically, as we

show in detail in Appendix C, we construct a family of biseparable three-party states

$$\rho_{\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{A}_3} = \sum_{\substack{i,j,k=1 \\ i \neq j \neq k \neq i}}^3 p_i \rho_{\mathcal{A}_i} \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{A}_j\mathcal{A}_k}^{\text{PPT}} \quad (14)$$

where the $\rho_{\mathcal{A}_j\mathcal{A}_k}^{\text{PPT}}$ are (different) two-qutrit states with PPT entanglement across the respective cuts $\mathcal{A}_j|\mathcal{A}_k$ for $j \neq k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $\sum_i p_i = 1$. Via SLOCC, three copies (labelled \mathcal{A} , \mathcal{B} , and \mathcal{C} , respectively) of $\rho_{\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{A}_3}$ can be converted to what we call *PPT-triangle states* of the form $\rho_{\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{A}_3}^{\text{PPT}} \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{B}_1\mathcal{B}_3}^{\text{PPT}} \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{C}_1\mathcal{C}_2}^{\text{PPT}}$. Using a GME witnesses based on the lifted Choi map (cf. [22, 23]), we show that there exists a parameter range where these PPT-triangle states are GME.

Conclusion and Outlook. Our results show that a modern theory of entanglement in multipartite systems, which includes the potential to locally process multiple copies of distributed quantum states, exhibits a rich structure that goes beyond the convex structure of single copies. While we conjecture that asymptotically, an even simpler description might be possible, i.e., separability in multipartite systems collapses to a simple bipartite concept of separability, we show that two copies are certainly

not sufficient for reaching this simple limit, thus leaving the practical certification a rich problem to be studied.

Indeed, our results show that GME is a resource with a complex relationship to bipartite entanglement in the context of local operations and shared randomness (cf. [32]). An array of important open questions arises from our results, which can thus be considered to establish an entirely new direction of research: first and foremost, this includes the quest for conclusive evidence for or against our conjectures. Besides determining whether these conjectures are ultimately correct or not, it will be of high interest to determine which properties (of the biseparable decompositions) of given states permit or prevent GME activation with a certain number of copies. Another open question is the minimal local dimension necessary for GME activation from biseparable states with PPT entanglement across every cut. And from a practical point of view it will be desirable to develop a theory of k-copy multipartite entanglement witnesses that are non-linear expressions of density matrices and allow for a more fine-grained characterisation of multipartite entanglement in networks with memory.

Acknowledgments. We acknowledge support from the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) through the START project Y879-N2 and the project P 31339-N27. H.Y. was supported by JSPS Overseas Research Fellowships and JST, PRESTO Grant Number JPMJPR201A, Japan.

-
- [1] Jonathan P. Dowling and Gerard J. Milburn, *Quantum technology: the second quantum revolution*, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A* **361**, 1655 (2003), arXiv:quant-ph/0206091.
 - [2] Michael Epping, Hermann Kampermann, Chiara Macchiavello, and Dagmar Bruß, *Multi-partite entanglement can speed up quantum key distribution in networks*, *New J. Phys.* **19**, 093012 (2017), arXiv:1612.05585.
 - [3] Matej Pivoluska, Marcus Huber, and Mehul Malik, *Layered quantum key distribution*, *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 032312 (2018), arXiv:1709.00377.
 - [4] J r my Ribeiro, Gl ucia Murta, and Stephanie Wehner, *Fully device-independent conference key agreement*, *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 022307 (2018), arXiv:1708.00798.
 - [5] Stefan B uml and Koji Azuma, *Fundamental limitation on quantum broadcast networks*, *Quantum Sci. Technol.* **2**, 024004 (2017), arXiv:1609.03994.
 - [6] G za T th, *Multipartite entanglement and high-precision metrology*, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 022322 (2012), arXiv:1006.4368.
 - [7] Andrew J. Scott, *Multipartite entanglement, quantum-error-correcting codes, and entangling power of quantum evolutions*, *Phys. Rev. A* **69**, 052330 (2004), arXiv:quant-ph/0310137.
 - [8] Dagmar Bru  and Chiara Macchiavello, *Multipartite entanglement in quantum algorithms*, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 052313 (2011), arXiv:1007.4179.
 - [9] Robert Raussendorf and Hans J. Briegel, *A One-Way Quantum Computer*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 5188 (2001), arXiv:quant-ph/0010033.
 - [10] Hans J. Briegel and Robert Raussendorf, *Persistent Entanglement in Arrays of Interacting Particles*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 910 (2001), arXiv:quant-ph/0004051.
 - [11] Leonid Gurvits, *Classical complexity and quantum entanglement*, *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* **69**, 448 (2004), Special Issue on STOC 2003, arXiv:quant-ph/0303055.
 - [12] Julio I. de Vicente, Cornelia Spee, and Barbara Kraus, *Maximally Entangled Set of Multipartite Quantum States*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 110502 (2013), arXiv:1305.7398.
 - [13] Katharina Schwaiger, David Sauerwein, Mart  Cuquet, Julio I. de Vicente, and Barbara Kraus, *Operational Multipartite Entanglement Measures*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 150502 (2015), arXiv:1503.00615.
 - [14] Julio I. de Vicente, Cornelia Spee, David Sauerwein, and Barbara Kraus, *Entanglement manipulation of multipartite pure states with finite rounds of classical communication*, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 012323 (2017), arXiv:1607.05145.
 - [15] C. Spee, J. I. de Vicente, D. Sauerwein, and B. Kraus, *Entangled Pure State Transformations via Local Operations Assisted by Finitely Many Rounds of Classical Communication*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 040503 (2017), arXiv:1606.04418.
 - [16] David Sauerwein, Nolan R. Wallach, Gilad Gour, and Barbara Kraus, *Transformations among Pure Multipartite Entangled States via Local Operations are Almost Never Possible*, *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 031020 (2018), arXiv:1711.11056.
 - [17] G za T th and Otfried G hne, *Entanglement detection in the stabilizer formalism*, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 022340 (2005), arXiv:quant-ph/0501020.

- [18] Nicolai Friis, Giuseppe Vitagliano, Mehul Malik, and Marcus Huber, *Entanglement Certification From Theory to Experiment*, *Nat. Rev. Phys.* **1**, 72 (2019), arXiv:1906.10929.
- [19] Nicolai Friis, Oliver Marty, Christine Maier, Cornelius Hempel, Milan Holzäpfel, Petar Jurcevic, Martin B. Plenio, Marcus Huber, Christian Roos, Rainer Blatt, and Ben Lanyon, *Observation of Entangled States of a Fully Controlled 20-Qubit System*, *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 021012 (2018), arXiv:1711.11092.
- [20] Michał Horodecki, Paweł Horodecki, and Ryszard Horodecki, *Separability of mixed states: necessary and sufficient conditions*, *Phys. Lett. A* **223**, 25 (1996), arXiv:quant-ph/9605038.
- [21] Asher Peres, *Separability Criterion for Density Matrices*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 1413 (1996), arXiv:quant-ph/9604005.
- [22] Marcus Huber and Ritabrata Sengupta, *Witnessing Genuine Multipartite Entanglement with Positive Maps*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 100501 (2014), arXiv:1404.7449.
- [23] Fabien Clivaz, Marcus Huber, Ludovico Lami, and Gláucia Murta, *Genuine-multipartite entanglement criteria based on positive maps*, *J. Math. Phys.* **58**, 082201 (2017), arXiv:1609.08126.
- [24] Andrea Rodriguez-Blanco, Alejandro Bermudez, Markus Müller, and Farid Shahandeh, *Efficient and Robust Certification of Genuine Multipartite Entanglement in Noisy Quantum Error Correction Circuits*, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 020304 (2021), arXiv:2010.02941.
- [25] Siddarth Koduru Joshi, Djeylan Aktas, Sören Wengerowsky, Martin Lončarić, Sebastian Philipp Neumann, Bo Liu, Thomas Scheidl, Guillermo Currás Lorenzo, Željko Samec, Laurent Kling, Alex Qiu, Mohsen Razavi, Mario Stipčević, John G. Rarity, and Rupert Ursin, *A trusted node-free eight-user metropolitan quantum communication network*, *Sci. Adv.* **6** (2020), arXiv:1907.08229.
- [26] Hayata Yamasaki, Alexander Pirker, Mio Muraio, Wolfgang Dür, and Barbara Kraus, *Multipartite entanglement outperforming bipartite entanglement under limited quantum system sizes*, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 052313 (2018), arXiv:1808.00005.
- [27] Tristan Kraft, Sébastien Designolle, Christina Ritz, Nicolas Brunner, Otfried Gühne, and Marcus Huber, *Quantum entanglement in the triangle network*, *Phys. Rev. A* (accepted, 2020), arXiv:2002.03970.
- [28] Marcus Huber and Martin Plesch, *Purification of genuine multipartite entanglement*, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 062321 (2011), arXiv:1103.4294.
- [29] Seyed Mohammad Hashemi Rafsanjani, Marcus Huber, Curtis J. Broadbent, and Joseph H. Eberly, *Genuinely multipartite concurrence of N -qubit X matrices*, *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 062303 (2012), arXiv:1208.2706.
- [30] Zhi-Hao Ma, Zhi-Hua Chen, Jing-Ling Chen, Christoph Spengler, Andreas Gabriel, and Marcus Huber, *Measure of genuine multipartite entanglement with computable lower bounds*, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 062325 (2011), arXiv:1101.2001.
- [31] Ludovico Lami and Marcus Huber, *Bipartite depolarizing channels*, *J. Math. Phys.* **57**, 092201 (2016), arXiv:1603.02158.
- [32] David Schmid, Denis Rosset, and Francesco Buscemi, *The type-independent resource theory of local operations and shared randomness*, *Quantum* **4**, 262 (2020),

arXiv:1909.04065

Appendix A: Biseparable decomposition of two-copy three-qubit isotropic GHZ states

In this appendix we analyse which values of the parameter p allow for a biseparable decomposition of two copies of the three-qubit isotropic GHZ states. To be more precise, we look for a biseparable decomposition w.r.t. the partition $\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{B}_1|\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{B}_2|\mathcal{A}_3\mathcal{B}_3$ of the state $\rho_3(p)^{\otimes 2}$, where

$$\rho_3(p) = p |\text{GHZ}_3\rangle\langle\text{GHZ}_3| + (1-p) \frac{1}{2^3} \mathbb{1}_{2^3} \quad (\text{A1})$$

is the three-qubit isotropic GHZ state from Eq. (3).

To construct a biseparable decomposition, we first find separable states defined on two- or four-qubit subspaces. We then extend these states in different ways and group them together to define biseparable states for the whole six-qubit system. This allows us to rewrite the state $\rho_3(p)^{\otimes 2}$ as a convex sum of these biseparable states and a diagonal matrix. Finally, we find conditions for which this diagonal matrix has only non-negative entries, i.e., is positive semi-definite and thus itself a state. In the following the subsystems are reordered from $\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{A}_3\mathcal{B}_1\mathcal{B}_2\mathcal{B}_3$ to $\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{B}_1\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{B}_2\mathcal{A}_3\mathcal{B}_3$.

The two-qubit state

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{4} (2|\Phi^+\rangle\langle\Phi^+| + |01\rangle\langle 01| + |10\rangle\langle 10|) \quad (\text{A2})$$

is biseparable, as it can be rewritten in the form

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{4} (|++\rangle\langle ++| + |--\rangle\langle --| + |rl\rangle\langle rl| + |lr\rangle\langle lr|). \quad (\text{A3})$$

Every two-qubit subsystem $\mathcal{CD} \subset \mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{B}_1\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{B}_2\mathcal{A}_3\mathcal{B}_3$ is spanned by a set of the form $\{|00i_1i_2i_3i_4\rangle, |01i_1i_2i_3i_4\rangle, |10i_1i_2i_3i_4\rangle, |11i_1i_2i_3i_4\rangle\}$, with i_j fixed, or a permutation of the entries thereof. The indices $m_1m_2m_3m_4$ going from 1 to 64 define a two-qubit subsystem uniquely and we can write the state $\gamma(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4) = \gamma_{\mathcal{CD}} \otimes |i_1i_2i_3i_4\rangle\langle i_1i_2i_3i_4|_{\mathcal{CD}^c}$, where i_1, \dots, i_4 have to be chosen appropriately. Note that not all combinations $m_1m_2m_3m_4$ define a two-qubit subspace and among all subspaces we only use those pertaining to different parties. This is the case in the following definitions

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_1 = & \frac{1}{24} [\gamma(2, 10, 36, 44) + \gamma(2, 12, 34, 44) + \gamma(33, 37, 50, 54) \\ & + \gamma(3, 7, 20, 24) + \gamma(3, 8, 19, 24) + \gamma(5, 7, 45, 47) \\ & + \gamma(5, 15, 37, 47) + \gamma(9, 10, 29, 30) + \gamma(9, 14, 25, 30) \\ & + \gamma(18, 20, 58, 60) + \gamma(18, 28, 50, 60) + \gamma(41, 45, 58, 62) \\ & + \gamma(41, 46, 57, 62) + \gamma(21, 29, 55, 63) + \gamma(21, 31, 53, 63) \\ & + \gamma(35, 36, 55, 56) + \gamma(35, 40, 51, 56) + \gamma(6, 8, 46, 48) \\ & + \gamma(6, 14, 40, 48) + \gamma(11, 12, 31, 31) + \gamma(11, 15, 28, 32) \\ & + \gamma(17, 19, 57, 59) + \gamma(17, 25, 51, 59) + \gamma(33, 34, 53, 54)], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_2 = & \frac{1}{12} [\gamma(1, 2, 21, 22) + \gamma(1, 5, 18, 22) + \gamma(1, 6, 17, 22) \\ & + \gamma(1, 3, 41, 43) + \gamma(1, 9, 35, 43) + \gamma(1, 11, 33, 43) \\ & + \gamma(22, 24, 62, 64) + \gamma(22, 30, 56, 64) + \gamma(22, 32, 54, 64) \\ & + \gamma(43, 44, 63, 64) + \gamma(43, 47, 60, 64) + \gamma(43, 48, 59, 64)]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

Using $|+\rangle = (|0\rangle + |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, $|-\rangle = (|0\rangle - |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, $|r\rangle = (|0\rangle - i|1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and $|l\rangle = (|0\rangle + i|1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, we write the four-qubit separable state

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma = & \frac{1}{16} (|++++\rangle\langle++++| + |+-+-\rangle\langle+-+-| + |-+-\rangle\langle-+-| \\ & + |-----\rangle\langle-----| + |r+r\rangle\langle r+r| + |l+r\rangle\langle l+r| \\ & + |-r-l\rangle\langle -r-l| + |-l-r\rangle\langle -l-r| + |r+l\rangle\langle r+l| \\ & + |r-l\rangle\langle r-l| + |l+r\rangle\langle l+r| + |l-r\rangle\langle l-r| \\ & + |rrll\rangle\langle rrll| + |rllr\rangle\langle rllr| + |lrrl\rangle\langle lrrl| + |llrr\rangle\langle llrr|), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6})$$

shared between three parties. It can be split in three different ways: $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{B}_1\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{A}_3}$, $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{B}_2\mathcal{A}_3}$ and $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{A}_3\mathcal{B}_3}$. Next, we define the biseparable six-qubit state

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma = & \frac{1}{3} (U_1 \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{B}_1\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{A}_3} U_1^\dagger + U_2 \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{B}_2\mathcal{A}_3} U_2^\dagger \\ & + U_3 \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{A}_3\mathcal{B}_3} U_3^\dagger) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$

where U_k are isometries of the form $U_1 |ij\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{A}_3} = |iij\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{B}_2\mathcal{A}_3\mathcal{B}_3}$, $U_2 |ij\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{A}_3} = |iij\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{B}_1\mathcal{A}_3\mathcal{B}_3}$ and $U_3 |ij\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{A}_2} = |iij\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{B}_1\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{B}_2}$.

With this we can finally rewrite the two copies of the original state as

$$\rho(p)^{\otimes 2} = (1-2p)^2 \rho_{\text{diag}} + p(3-7p)\Gamma_1 + p(1-p)\Gamma_2 + 4p^2\Sigma, \quad (\text{A8})$$

where ρ_{diag} is a normalized diagonal matrix. The matrix $64(1-2p)^2 \rho_{\text{diag}}$ has the following entries:

m	$\rho_{\text{diag}}(m, m)$
1, 22, 43, 64 :	$(1-p)^2$
2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 17, 18, 21, 24, 30, 32, 33,	
35, 41, 44, 47, 48, 54, 56, 59, 60, 62, 63 :	$1-10/3p+7/3p^2$
4, 13, 16, 23, 26, 27, 38, 39, 42, 49, 52, 61 :	$1-2p-13/3p^2$
7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 15, 19, 20, 25, 28, 29, 31,	
34, 36, 37, 40, 45, 46, 50, 51, 53, 55, 57, 58 :	$1-6p+31/3p^2$

The terms $(1-p)^2$ and $1-6p+31/3p^2$ are positive for all values of p . The term $1-10/3p+7/3p^2$ is non-negative for $p \leq 3/7$ and $p \geq 1$ and finally the term $1-2p-13/3p^2$ is non-negative for $(3-4\sqrt{3})/13 \leq p \leq (3+4\sqrt{3})/13$. With this we have found a biseparable decomposition for all values $-1/7 \leq p \leq (3+4\sqrt{3})/13$. From Eq. (10) we know that all values above this bound are already GME.

Appendix B: PPT criterion for isotropic GHZ states

The isotropic GHZ states from Eq. (3) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(p) = & p |\Phi^+\rangle\langle\Phi^+|_{\mathcal{A}_1\bar{\mathcal{A}}_2} + \frac{1-p}{2^N} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_2} + \frac{1-p}{2^N} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_2} \\ = & \frac{1+p}{2} \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{A}_1\bar{\mathcal{A}}_2} + \frac{1-p}{2} \frac{1}{2^{N-1}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B1})$$

where $|\Phi^+\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_1\bar{\mathcal{A}}_2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_1} |\tilde{0}\rangle_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_2} + |1\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_1} |\tilde{1}\rangle_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_2})$ with $|\tilde{i}\rangle_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_2} = \bigotimes_{j=2}^N |i\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_j}$ for $i = 0, 1$, $\mathbb{1}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_2} = \sum_{i=0,1} |\tilde{i}\rangle\langle\tilde{i}|$ and $\mathbb{1}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_2} = \mathbb{1}_{2^{N-1}} - \mathbb{1}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_2}$. We are now interested in checking for which values of p the partial transpose of the two-qubit state $\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{A}_1\bar{\mathcal{A}}_2}$ is positive semi-definite. Since the normalisation is irrelevant for this calculation, we can instead consider the partial transpose of the unnormalised operator $\frac{1+p}{2} \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{A}_1\bar{\mathcal{A}}_2}$ whose partial transpose is given by

$$\frac{1+p}{2} \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{A}_1\bar{\mathcal{A}}_2} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1-p}{2^N} & \frac{p}{2} \\ \frac{p}{2} & \frac{1-p}{2^N} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B2})$$

The only potentially negative eigenvalue of this matrix is $(1-p)/2^N - p/2$ and we hence find that $\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{A}_1\bar{\mathcal{A}}_2}$ is positive semi-definite for $p \leq p_{\text{crit}} := 1/(1+2^{N-1})$. Since $\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{A}_1\bar{\mathcal{A}}_2}$ is a two-qubit state, the PPT criterion is necessary and sufficient for separability, and the state $\rho(p)$ hence has a separable decomposition with respect to the bipartition $\mathcal{A}_1|\mathcal{A}_2 \dots \mathcal{A}_N$ for $p \leq p_{\text{crit}}$.

Since $\rho(p)$ is invariant under exchanges of any qubits, this separability threshold applies for any bipartition of separating any one qubit from the remaining $N-1$ qubits. Moreover, it is easy to see that the arguments presented above hold also for any bipartition into M and $N-M$ qubits by choosing suitable single-qubit subspaces in both the M -qubit and $(N-M)$ -qubit Hilbert spaces.

We also note that the threshold value p_{crit} for partial separability trivially coincides with the PPT threshold for any chosen bipartition of $\rho(p)$ because the only non-diagonal 2×2 -block of the partial transpose is always of the form of the right-hand side of Eq. (B2). In particular, this implies that all states $\rho(p)$ are NPT entangled across any bipartition for $p > p_{\text{crit}}$ and separable below this value. Consequently, there are no PPT entangled isotropic GHZ states.

Appendix C: PPT-triangle states and GME activation

To investigate whether multi-copy GME activation is possible from bound entanglement, we first consider a biseparable three-party state with no distillable bipartite entanglement across any bipartition, i.e., the state is positive under partial transposition across all cuts. Since the set of PPT states is convex, we may construct such a state as a convex combination of terms where one party

We see that for certain values of x , y and z the expected value of the witness can be negative, e.g., for states of the form $\rho_{\mathcal{D}_1\mathcal{D}_2\mathcal{D}_3}^{\Delta\text{PPT}}(1, y, y)$ with $0 < y < \sqrt{2} - 1$, thus detecting GME in this range.

Finally, an observation that we can make about the PPT triangle states in Eq. (C5) is that the third tensor factor $\rho_{\mathcal{C}_1\mathcal{C}_2}^{\text{PPT}}(z)$ is not even necessary to obtain GME. Indeed, the state

$$\rho_{\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{A}_3\mathcal{B}_1\mathcal{B}_3}^{\wedge\text{PPT}}(x, y) = \rho_{\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{A}_3}^{\text{PPT}}(x) \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{B}_1\mathcal{B}_3}^{\text{PPT}}(y) \quad (\text{C7})$$

is GME for certain values of x and y . To show this it again suffices detecting GME on a subspace. Consider

the projection onto the three-qutrit subspace spanned by $\{|\otimes i\rangle_{\mathcal{B}_1} \otimes |j\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_2} |kk\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_3\mathcal{B}_3}\}_{i,j,k=0,1,2}$ and denote the resulting state by $\rho_{\mathcal{D}_1\mathcal{D}_2\mathcal{D}_3}^{\wedge\text{PPT}}(x, y)$. With the same witness W_3 as before we obtain

$$\text{Tr}[W_3 \cdot \rho_{\mathcal{D}_1\mathcal{D}_2\mathcal{D}_3}^{\wedge\text{PPT}}(x, y)] = \frac{3}{\mathcal{N}_x\mathcal{N}_y} (x + y + xy - 1). \quad (\text{C8})$$

For instance, for $x = y < \sqrt{2} - 1$, this expression becomes negative, thus detecting GME. We can thus conclude that PPT entanglement across two out of the three cuts and two copies of the original state are already enough for GME activation.