

Entanglement transitivity problems

Gelo Noel M. Tabia,^{1,2,3,*} Kai-Siang Chen,¹ Chung-Yun Hsieh,⁴ Yu-Chun Yin,¹ and Yeong-Cherng Liang^{1,2,†}

¹*Department of Physics and Center for Quantum Frontiers of Research & Technology (QFort), National Cheng Kung University, Tainan 701, Taiwan*

²*Physics Division, National Center for Theoretical Sciences, Taipei 10617, Taiwan*

³*Center for Quantum Technology, National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu 300, Taiwan*

⁴*ICFO - Institut de Ciències Fotòniques, The Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology, 08860 Castelldefels, Spain*

(Dated: August 26, 2022)

One of the goals of science is to understand the relation between a whole and its parts, as exemplified by the problem of certifying the entanglement of a system from the knowledge of its reduced states. Here, we focus on a different but related question: can a collection of marginal information reveal new marginal information? We answer this affirmatively and show that (non-) entangled marginal states may exhibit *(meta)transitivity of entanglement*, i.e., implying that a different target marginal must be entangled. By showing that the global n -qubit state compatible with certain two-qubit marginals in a tree form is unique, we prove that transitivity exists for a system involving an arbitrarily large number of qubits. We also completely characterize—in the sense of providing both the necessary and sufficient conditions—when (meta)transitivity can occur in a tripartite scenario when the two-qudit marginals given are either the Werner states or the isotropic states. Our numerical results suggest that in the tripartite scenario, entanglement transitivity is *generic* among the marginals derived from pure states.

INTRODUCTION

Entanglement [1] is a characteristic of quantum theory that profoundly distinguishes it from classical physics. The modern perspective considers entanglement as a resource for information processing tasks, such as quantum computation [2–6], quantum simulation [7], and quantum metrology [8]. With the huge effort devoted to scaling up quantum technologies [9], considerable attention has been given to the study of quantum many-body systems [10, 11], specifically the ability to prepare and manipulate large-scale entanglement in various experimental systems.

As the number of parameters to be estimated is huge, entanglement detection via the so-called state tomography is often impractical. Indeed, significant efforts have been made for detecting entanglement in many-body systems [10, 11] using limited marginal information. For example, some tackle the problem using properties of the reduced states [12–23], while others exploit directly the data from local measurements [24–35]. Despite their differences, they can all be seen as some kind of *entanglement marginal problem* (EMP) [36], where the entanglement of the global system is to be deduced from some (partial knowledge of the) reduced states.

The entanglement of the global system, nonetheless, is not always the desired quality of interest. For instance, in scaling up a quantum computer, one may wish to verify that a specific subset of qubits indeed get entangled, but this generally does not follow from the entanglement of the global state (recall, e.g., the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger states [37]). Thus, one requires a more general version of the problem: Given certain reduced states, can we certify the entanglement in some *other* target (marginal) state? We call this the *entanglement transitivity problem* (ETP).

Since the global system is a legitimate target system, ETPs include the EMP as a special case.

As a concrete example beyond EMPs, one may wonder whether a set of *entangled* marginals are *sufficient* to guarantee the entanglement of some *other* target subsystems. If so, inspired by the work [38] on *nonlocality transitivity* of *post-quantum* correlations [39], we say that such marginals exhibit *entanglement transitivity*. Indeed, one of the motivations for considering entanglement transitivity is that it is a prerequisite for the nonlocality transitivity of *quantum correlations*, a problem that has, to our knowledge, remained open.

More generally, one may also wonder whether *separable* marginals *alone*, or with some entangled marginals could imply the entanglement of other marginal(s). To distinguish this from the above phenomenon, we say that such marginals exhibit *metatransitivity*. Note that any instance of metatransitivity with only separable marginals represents a positive answer to the EMP. Here, we show that examples of both types of transitivity can indeed be found. Moreover, we completely characterize when two Werner-state [40] marginals and two isotropic-state [41] marginals may exhibit (meta)transitivity.

RESULTS

Formulation of the entanglement transitivity problems

Let us first stress that in an ETP, the set of given reduced states *must be* compatible, i.e., giving a positive answer to the quantum marginal problem [42, 43]. With some thought, one realizes that the simplest nontrivial ETP involves a three-qubit system where two of the two-qubit marginals are provided. Then, the problem of deciding if the remaining two-qubit marginal *can be* separable is an ETP different from EMPs.

More generally, for any n -partite system S , an instance of the ETP is defined by specifying a set $\mathcal{S} = \{S_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, k\}$ of k marginal systems S_i (each in its respective

* gelonoel-tabia@gs.ncku.edu.tw

† ycliang@mail.ncku.edu.tw

state σ_{S_i}) and a target system $T \notin \mathcal{S}$. Here, \mathcal{S} is a *strict* subset of all the 2^n possible combinations of at most n subsystems, i.e., $k < 2^n$. Then, $\sigma := \{\sigma_{S_i}\}$ exhibits entanglement (meta)transitivity in T if *for all* joint states ρ_S compatible with σ , the reduced state ρ_T is *always* entangled while (not) all given σ_{S_i} are entangled. Formally, the compatible requirement reads as: $\text{tr}_{S \setminus S_i}(\rho_S) = \sigma_{S_i}$ for all $S_i \in \mathcal{S}$ where $S \setminus S_i$ denotes the complement of S_i in the global system S .

Notice that for the problem to be nontrivial, there must be (1) some overlap among the subsystems specified by S_i 's, as well as with T , and (2) the global system S cannot be a member of \mathcal{S} . However, the target system T may be chosen to be S and if *all* σ_{S_i} are separable, we recover the EMP [36] (see also [19, 23] for some strengthened version of the EMP). Hereafter, we focus on ETPs beyond EMPs, albeit some of the discussions below may also find applications in EMPs.

Certification of (meta)transitivity by a linear witness

Let $\mathcal{W}(\rho)$ be an entanglement witness [26], i.e., $\mathcal{W}(\rho) \geq 0$ for all separable states in T , and $\mathcal{W}(\rho) < 0$ for some entangled states. We can certify the (meta)transitivity of \mathcal{S} in T if a negative optimal value is obtained for the following optimization problem:

$$\max_{\rho_S} \mathcal{W}(\rho_T), \text{ s.t. } \text{tr}_{S \setminus S_i}(\rho_S) = \sigma_{S_i} \forall S_i \in \mathcal{S}, \rho_S \succeq 0, \quad (1)$$

where $\text{tr}(\rho_S) = 1$ is implied by the compatibility requirement and " \succeq " denotes matrix positivity. Then, \mathcal{W} detects the entanglement in T from the given marginals in \mathcal{S} .

Consider now a linear entanglement witness, i.e., $\mathcal{W}(\rho_T) = \text{tr}[\rho_S(W_T \otimes \mathbb{I}_{S \setminus T})]$ for some Hermitian operator W_T , where $\rho_T = \text{tr}_{S \setminus T}(\rho_S)$ is the reduced state of ρ in T . In this case, Eq. (1) is a semidefinite program [44]. Interestingly, its dual problem [44] can be seen as the problem of minimizing the total interaction energies among the subsystems S_i while ensuring that the global Hamiltonian is non-negative, see Supplementary Note 1.

Hereafter, we focus, for simplicity, on T being a two-body system. Then, a convenient witness is that due to the positive-partial-transpose (PPT) criterion [45, 46], with $W_T = \eta_T^\Gamma$, where $\eta_T \succeq 0$ and Γ denotes the partial transposition operation. Further minimizing the optimum value of Eq. (1) over all η_T such that $\text{tr}(\eta_T) = 1$ gives an optimum λ^* that is provably the smallest eigenvalue of all compatible ρ_T^Γ (see Supplementary Note 1). Hence, $\lambda^* < 0$ is a sufficient condition for witnessing the entanglement (meta)transitivity of the given σ in T .

Three remarks are now in order. Firstly, the ETP defined above is straightforwardly generalized to include *multiple* target systems $\{T_j : j = 1, \dots, t\}$ with $T_j \notin \mathcal{S}$ for all j . A certification of the joint (meta)transitivity is then achieved by certifying each T_j separately. Secondly, other entanglement witnesses [26] may be considered. For instance, to certify the entanglement of a two-body ρ_T that is PPT [47], a witness based on the computable cross-norm/realignment (CCNR) criterion [48–51], may be employed. Finally, for a multipartite




FIG. 1. Tree graph. A tree graph is any undirected acyclic graph such that a unique path connects any two vertices. Graph (a) and (b) are the only two nonisomorphic trees with $(n - 1)$ edges for $n = 4$. Graph (c) is not a tree because it is disconnected and has a cycle.

target system, a witness tailored for detecting the genuine multipartite entanglement in ρ_T (see, e.g., Ref. [14, 16]) is surely of interest.

A family of transitivity examples with n qubits

As a first illustration, let $|\Psi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|10\rangle + |01\rangle)$ and consider:

$$\rho_n(\gamma) = \left(\frac{n-2\gamma}{n}\right) |00\rangle\langle 00| + \frac{2\gamma}{n} |\Psi^+\rangle\langle \Psi^+|, \quad n \geq 3, \quad (2)$$

which is a two-qubit reduced state of $\Omega_n(\gamma) = \gamma|W_n\rangle\langle W_n| + (1-\gamma)|0^n\rangle\langle 0^n|$, i.e., a mixture of $|0^n\rangle$ and an n -qubit W state $|W_n\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n |1_j\rangle$, where 1_j denotes an n -bit string with a 1 in position j and 0 elsewhere. Now, imagine drawing these n qubits as vertices of a tree graph [52] with $(n - 1)$ edges, see Fig. 1, such that every edge corresponds to a pair of qubits in the state $\rho_n(\gamma)$, that is,

$$\text{tr}_{S \setminus S_i}(\rho) = \sigma_{S_i} = \rho_n(\gamma) \forall S_i \in \mathcal{S}, \quad (3)$$

where \mathcal{S} represents the set of edges. Then we prove the following result:

Theorem 1. *For any tree graph with n vertices that satisfies Eq. (3), $\Omega_n(\gamma) = \gamma|W_n\rangle\langle W_n| + (1-\gamma)|0^n\rangle\langle 0^n|$ is the unique global state and all the two-qubit reduced states are $\rho_n(\gamma)$.*

The details of its proof can be found in Supplementary Notes 2. Thus, these $\rho_n(\gamma)$ exhibit transitivity for any of the $\frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2}$ pairs of qubits that are *not* linked by an edge. Indeed, the symmetry of $\Omega_n(\gamma)$ implies that all its two-qubit marginals are $\rho_n(\gamma)$, and the smallest eigenvalue of $\rho_n(\gamma)^\Gamma$ is $\lambda^* = \frac{(n-2\gamma) - \sqrt{(n-2\gamma)^2 + 4\gamma^2}}{2n} < 0$ for $\gamma \in (0, 1]$.

We should clarify that the transitivity exhibited by $\rho_n(\gamma)$ requires a tree graph only in that it represents the minimal amount of marginal information for the global state to be uniquely determined. Any other n -vertex graph with equivalent marginal information or more leads to the same conclusion.

These examples involve only entangled marginals. Next, we present examples where some of the given marginals are separable. In particular, we provide a *complete* solution of the ETPs with the input marginals being a Werner state [40] or an isotropic state [41].




FIG. 2. Parameter space for a pair of Werner state marginals with, respectively, weight v_{AB} and v_{AC} on the symmetric subspace. For $d \geq 3$ the compatible region for the pair is enclosed by the solid red line, but for $d = 2$ it is restricted to the portion above the dotted line. The blue curves (being parts of two parabolas) describe boundaries where the largest compatible v_{BC} is $\frac{1}{2}$. Regions exhibiting (meta)transitivity are shaded in (gray) cyan.

Metatransitivity from Werner state marginals

A Werner state [40] $W_d(v)$ is a two-qudit density operator invariant under arbitrary $U \otimes U$ unitary transformations, where U belongs to the set of d -dimensional unitaries \mathcal{U}_d for finite d . Let P_s^d (P_{as}^d) be the projection onto the symmetric (antisymmetric) subspace of $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$. Then we can write qudit Werner states as the one-parameter family [40]

$$W_d(v) = v \frac{2}{d(d+1)} P_s^d + (1-v) \frac{2}{d(d-1)} P_{as}^d, \quad v \in [0, 1]. \quad (4)$$

Consider a pair of Werner states $\sigma = \{W_d(v_{AB}), W_d(v_{AC})\}$ that are the marginals of some joint state ρ_{ABC} . Then the Werner-twirled state [53] $\tilde{\rho}_{ABC} = \int d\mu_U (U \otimes U \otimes U) \rho_{ABC} (U \otimes U \otimes U)^\dagger$, where μ_U is a uniform Haar measure over \mathcal{U}_d , is trivially verified to be a valid joint state for these marginals. Moreover, $\tilde{\rho}_{ABC}$ has a Werner state $W_d(v_{BC})$ as its BC marginal.

Importantly, the aforementioned twirling bringing ρ_{ABC} to $\tilde{\rho}_{ABC}$ is achievable by local operations and classical communications (LOCC). Since LOCC cannot create entanglement from none, if the BC marginal $\tilde{\rho}_{BC}$ of $\tilde{\rho}_{ABC}$ is entangled, so must the BC marginal ρ_{BC} of ρ_{ABC} . Conversely, since $\tilde{\rho}_{ABC}$ is a legitimate joint state of the given marginals σ , if $\tilde{\rho}_{BC}$ is separable, by definition, the given marginals σ cannot exhibit transitivity. Without loss of generality, we may thus restrict our attention to a Werner-twirled joint state $\tilde{\rho}_{ABC}$. Then, since a Werner state $W_d(v)$ is entangled *if and only if* (iff) [40] $v \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$, combinations of Werner state marginals $W_d(v_{AB})$ and $W_d(v_{AC})$ leading to $\tilde{\rho}_{BC} = W_d(v_{BC})$ with $v_{BC} < \frac{1}{2}$ must exhibit entanglement (meta)transitivity.

Next, let us recall from Ref. [54] the following characterization: three Werner states with parameters $\vec{v} = (v_{AB}, v_{AC}, v_{BC})$ are compatible *iff* the vector \vec{v} lies within




FIG. 3. Parameter space for a pair of isotropic state marginals with, respectively, fully entangled fraction p_{AB} and p_{AC} . The compatible region for the pair is enclosed by the solid red line. The blue curves (shown for the case of $d = 3$) marks the boundary where the largest compatible v_{BC} is $\frac{1}{2}$. Regions exhibiting metatransitivity are shaded in gray, which shrink with increasing d , as the upper red curve flattens towards the dashed black line and the blue curves approach the two axes.

the bicone given by $f(\vec{v}) \geq g(\vec{v})$ and $3 - f(\vec{v}) \geq g(\vec{v})$, where $f(\vec{v}) = v_{AB} + v_{AC} + v_{BC}$ and $g(\vec{v}) = \sqrt{3(v_{AC} - v_{AB})^2 + (2v_{BC} - v_{AB} - v_{AC})^2}$. To find the (meta)transitivity region for (v_{AB}, v_{AC}) , it suffices to determine the boundary where the largest compatible $v_{BC} = \frac{1}{2}$. These boundaries are found (see Supplementary Note 3) to be the two parabolas $(v_{AB} - v_{AC} - \frac{1}{2})^2 = 2(1 - v_{AB})$ and $(v_{AB} + v_{AC} - \frac{1}{2})^2 = 4v_{AB}v_{AC}$, mirrored along the line $v_{AB} + v_{AC} = 1$, as shown in Fig. 2. It also shows the compatible regions of (v_{AB}, v_{AC}) obtained directly from Ref. [54], and the desired (shaded) regions exhibiting the (meta)transitivity of these marginals. In particular, the lower-left region corresponds to (a) while the top-left and bottom-right regions correspond to (b) in Fig. 4. Remarkably, these results hold for arbitrary Hilbert space dimension $d \geq 2$ (but for $d = 2$, the lower-left shaded region does not correspond to compatible Werner marginals).

Metatransitivity from isotropic state marginals

An isotropic state [41] is a bipartite density operator in $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$ that is invariant under $U \otimes \bar{U}$ (or $\bar{U} \otimes U$) transformations for any unitary $U \in \mathcal{U}_d$; here, \bar{U} is the complex conjugation of U . We can write qudit isotropic states as a one-parameter family [41]

$$\mathcal{I}_d(p) = p |\Phi_d\rangle\langle\Phi_d| + \frac{1-p}{d^2-1} (\mathbb{I}_{d^2} - |\Phi_d\rangle\langle\Phi_d|), \quad (5)$$

where $|\Phi_d\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} |j\rangle|j\rangle$ and p gives the fully entangled fraction [55, 56] of $\mathcal{I}_d(p)$.

Consider now a pair of isotropic marginals $\sigma = \{\mathcal{I}_d(p_{AB}), \mathcal{I}_d(p_{AC})\}$ as the reduced states of some joint state

τ_{ABC} . Then the “twirled” state $\tilde{\tau}_{ABC} = \int d\mu_U(\bar{U} \otimes U \otimes U)_{\tau_{ABC}}(\bar{U} \otimes U \otimes U)^\dagger$, which has a Werner state marginal $W_d(v_{BC})$ in BC, is easily verified to be a valid joint state for the given marginals. As in the case of given Werner states marginals, it suffices to consider $\tilde{\tau}_{ABC}$ in determining the region of (p_{AB}, p_{AC}) that demonstrates metatransitivity.

To this end, note that two isotropic states and one Werner state with parameters $\vec{p} = (p_{AB}, p_{AC}, v_{BC})$ are compatible iff [54] the vector \vec{p} lies within the convex hull of the origin $\vec{p}_0 = (0, 0, 0)$ and the cone given by $\alpha_+ \leq 1 + \frac{1}{d}(\beta + 1)$ and $d\alpha_+ - \beta \geq d\sqrt{(\alpha_+ + \beta)^2 + \left(\frac{d+1}{d-1}\right)\alpha_-}$, where $\alpha_\pm = p_{AB} \pm p_{AC}$ and $\beta = 2(v_{BC} - 1)$. To find the metatransitivity region for (p_{AB}, p_{AC}) we again look for the boundary where the largest compatible $v_{BC} = \frac{1}{2}$, which we show in Supplementary Note 4 to be $4p_{AB}p_{AC} = (p_{AB} + p_{AC} - 1 + \frac{1}{d})^2$. The resulting regions of interest are illustrated for the $d = 3$ case in Fig. 3, and they correspond to (b) in Fig. 4.

Metatransitivity with only separable marginals

Curiously, none of the infinitely compatible pairs of marginals given above result in the most exotic type of metatransitivity, even though there are known examples where separable marginals imply a global entangled state (see, e.g., [12, 24, 25, 36]). In the following, we provide examples where the entanglement of a subsystem is implied by only separable marginals. This already occurs in the simplest case of a three-qubit system. Consider the rank-two mixed state $\chi_{ABC} = \frac{1}{4}|\chi_1\rangle\langle\chi_1| + \frac{3}{4}|\chi_2\rangle\langle\chi_2|$ where

$$\begin{aligned} |\chi_1\rangle &= \left(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{12}, -\frac{\sqrt{7}}{12}, 0, \frac{\sqrt{7}}{12}, -\frac{1}{3}, -\frac{3}{4}, \frac{1}{3}\right)^\top, \\ |\chi_2\rangle &= \left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{5}}{24}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{8}, -\frac{1}{3}, -\frac{3}{4}, \frac{\sqrt{5}}{24}, \frac{1}{8}\right)^\top. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

It can be easily checked that the AB and BC marginals of χ_{ABC} are PPT, which suffices [46] to guarantee their separability, while Eq. (1) with the PPT criterion can be used to confirm that AC is always entangled. Thus, this example corresponds to (c) in Fig. 4. Likewise, examples exhibiting different kinds of transitivity can also be found in higher dimensions (with bound entanglement [47]) or with more subsystems, see Supplementary Note 5 for details.

Here, we present one such example to illustrate some of the subtleties of ETPs in a scenario involving more than three subsystems. Consider the four-qubit pure state

$$|\xi\rangle_{ABCD} = \left(\frac{1}{45}, -\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{9}, \frac{2}{9}, -\frac{1}{4}, -\frac{2}{5}, \frac{1}{9}, \frac{\sqrt{10}}{36}, \frac{1}{9}, -\frac{1}{9}, -\frac{1}{4}, -\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{9}, -\frac{1}{9}, \frac{1}{3}\right)^\top. \quad (7)$$

One can readily check that its AB, BC, and CD marginals are PPT and are thus separable. At the same time, one can verify using Eq. (1) with the PPT criterion that these three marginals together imply the entanglement of *all* the three remaining two-qubit marginals. Thus, this corresponds to (d) in Fig. 4.




FIG. 4. A schematic diagram for the metatransitivity examples. Each row describes the known bipartite marginals in a 3- or 4-partite system and the target subsystems where metatransitivity are exhibited.

At this point, one may think that the entanglement in the AC marginal already follows from the given AB and BC marginals, analogous to the tripartite examples presented above. This is misguided: the CD marginal is essential to force the AC marginal to be entangled. Similarly, the AB marginal is indispensable to guarantee the entanglement of BD. Thus, the current metatransitivity example illustrates a genuine four-party effect that cannot exist in any tripartite scenario. For completeness, an example exhibiting the same four-party effect but where all input two-qubit marginals are entangled is also provided in Supplementary Note 5.

Metatransitivity from marginals of random pure states

Naturally, one may wonder how common the phenomena of (meta)transitivity is. Our numerical results based on pure states randomly generated according to the Haar measure suggest that transitivity *is* generic in the tripartite scenario: for local dimension up to five, *all* sampled pure states have only non-PPT marginals and demonstrate entanglement transitivity. However, with more subsystems, (meta)transitivity seems rare. For example, among the 10^5 sampled four-qubit states, only about 7.32% show transitivity while about 3.38% show metatransitivity. For a system with even more subsystems or with a higher d , we do not find any example of (meta)transitivity from random sampling (see Table I).

Next, notice that for the convenience of verification, some explicit examples that we provide actually involve marginals leading to a *unique* global state. However, uniqueness is not *a priori* required for entanglement (meta)transitivity. For example, among those quadripartite (meta)transitivity examples found for randomly sampled pure states, $> 73\%$ of them (see Supplementary Note 5) are *not* uniquely determined from three of its two-qubit marginals (cf. Ref. [57–59]). In contrast, most of the tripartite numerical examples found appear to be uniquely determined by two of their two-qubit marginals, a fact that may be of independent interest (see, e.g., Ref. [60–63]).

DISCUSSION

The example involving noisy W -state marginals demonstrate that the transitivity can occur for arbitrarily long chain of quantum systems. This leads us to consider metatransitivity with only separable marginals. Beyond the example given above, we present also in Supplementary Note 5 a five-qubit example with four separable marginals and discuss some possibility to extend the chain. For future work, it could be interesting to determine if such exotic metatransitivity examples exist at the two ends of an arbitrarily long chain of multipartite system. For the closely related EMP, we remind that an explicit construction for a state with only two-body separable marginals and an arbitrarily large number of subsystems is known [23] (see also Ref. [36]).

So far, we have discussed only cases where both the input marginals and the target marginal are for two-body subsystems. If entanglement can be deduced from two-body marginals, it is also deducible from higher-order marginals that include the former from coarse graining. Hence, the consideration of two-body input marginals allows us to focus on the crux of the ETP. As for the target system, we provide—as an illustration—in Supplementary Note 5 an example where the three two-qubit marginals of Fig. 1(b) imply the genuine three-qubit entanglement present in BCD. Evidently, there are many other possibilities to be considered in the future, as entanglement in a multipartite setting is known [1, 26] to be far richer.

Our metatransitivity examples also illustrate the disparity between the local compatibility of probability distributions and quantum states. Classically, probability distributions $P(A, B)$ and $P(B, C)$ compatible in $P(B)$ always have a joint distribution $P(A, B, C)$ (this extends to the multipartite case for marginal distributions that form a tree graph [64]). One may think that the quantum analogue of this is: compatible ρ_{AB} and ρ_{BC} must imply a separable joint state, and hence a separable ρ_{AC} . However, our metatransitivity example (as with nontrivial instances of tripartite EMPs), illustrates that this generalization does not hold. Rather, as we show in Supplementary Note 8, a possible generalization is given by classical-quantum states ρ_{AB} and ρ_{BC} sharing the same diagonal state in B — in this case, metatransitivity can never be established.

Evidently, there are many other possible research directions that one may take from here. For example, as with the W -states, we have also observed transitivity in $n \leq 3 \leq d \leq 6$ for qudit Dicke states [65–67], which seems to be also uniquely determined by its $(n-1)$ bipartite marginals. To our knowledge, this uniqueness remains an open problem and, if proven, may allow us to establish examples of transitivity for an arbitrarily high-dimensional quantum state that involves an arbitrary number of particles. From an experimental viewpoint, the construction of witnesses specifically catered for ETPs are surely welcome.

Finally, notice that while ETPs include EMPs as a special case, an ETP may be seen as an instance of the more general resource transitivity problem [68], where one wishes to certify the resourceful nature of some subsystem based on the infor-

mation of *other* subsystems. In turn, the latter can be seen as a special case of the even more general resource marginal problems [69], where resource theories are naturally incorporated with the marginal problems of quantum states.

METHODS

Metatransitivity certified using separability criteria

As mentioned before, we can certify the entanglement (meta)transitivity of a given set of marginals in a bipartite target system T by demonstrating the violation of the PPT separability criterion. We can show this by solving the following convex optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\rho_S} \quad \lambda \\ \text{subj. to} \quad & \text{tr}_{S \setminus S_i}(\rho_S) = \sigma_{S_i} \quad \forall S_i \in \mathcal{S}, \\ & \rho_S \succeq 0, \quad \rho_T^\Gamma \succeq \lambda \mathbb{I}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

which directly optimizes over the joint state ρ_S with marginals σ_{S_i} such that the smallest eigenvalue λ of ρ_T^Γ is maximized. Because a bipartite state that is *not* PPT is entangled [45, 46], if the optimal λ (denoted by λ^* throughout) is negative, the marginal state in T of all possible joint states ρ_S must be entangled.

In the Supplementary Notes, we compute the Lagrange dual problem to Eq. (1) with a linear witness W_T . A similar calculation for Eq. (8) shows that it is equivalent to a dual problem with $W = \eta_T^\Gamma$, where η_T being an additional optimization variable subjected to the constraint of $\eta_T \succeq 0$ and $\text{tr}(\eta_T) = 1$.

Meanwhile, to certify genuine tripartite entanglement in the target tripartite marginal T , we use a simple criterion introduced in [70]. Consider the density operator ρ_{AB} on $\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$ to be an $m \times m$ block matrix of $n \times n$ matrices $\rho^{(i,j)}$. Let $\widetilde{\rho_{AB}}$ denote the realigned matrix obtained by transforming each block $\rho^{(i,j)}$ into rows. The CCNR criterion [48, 49] dictates that for separable σ_{AB} , $\|\widetilde{\sigma_{AB}}\|_1 \leq 1$.

Now, let $A|BC$ denote a partition of a tripartite system ABC into a bipartite system with parts A and BC . Finally, for any tripartite state ρ_{ABC} on $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$, define

$$\begin{aligned} M(\rho_{ABC}) &:= \frac{1}{3} (\|\rho_{ABC}^{\tau_A}\|_1 + \|\rho_{ABC}^{\tau_B}\|_1 + \|\rho_{ABC}^{\tau_C}\|_1) \\ N(\rho_{ABC}) &:= \frac{1}{3} (\|\widetilde{\rho_{A|BC}}\|_1 + \|\widetilde{\rho_{B|CA}}\|_1 + \|\widetilde{\rho_{C|AB}}\|_1), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where τ_X means a partial transposition with respect to the subsystem X . It was shown in [70] that for any biseparable ρ_{ABC} , we must have

$$\max\{M(\rho_{ABC}), N(\rho_{ABC})\} \leq \frac{1+2d}{3}. \quad (10)$$

This means that if any of $M(\rho_{ABC}), N(\rho_{ABC})$ is larger than $\frac{1+2d}{3}$, ρ_{ABC} must be genuinely tripartite entangled.

Therefore in the metatransitivity problem, we can use this, cf. Eq. (8) for the bipartite target system, for detecting genuine tripartite entanglement. This is done by minimizing M and N of the target marginal and taking the larger of the two

minima. To this end, note that the minimization of the trace norm can be cast as an SDP [71]. Further details can be found in Supplementary Notes 1.

Certifying the uniqueness of a global compatible (pure) state

A handy way of certifying the (meta)transitivity of marginals $\{\sigma_{S_i}\}$ known to be compatible with some pure state $|\psi\rangle$ is to show that the global state ρ_S compatible with these marginals is *unique*, i.e., ρ_S is necessarily $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$. This can be achieved by solving the following SDP:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\rho_S} \quad & \langle\psi|\rho_S|\psi\rangle \\ \text{subj. to} \quad & \text{tr}_{S\setminus S_i}(\rho_S) = \sigma_{S_i} \quad \forall S_i \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } \rho_S \succeq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The objective function here is the fidelity of ρ_S with respect to the pure state $|\psi\rangle$. If this minimum is 1, then by the property of the Uhlmann-Jozsa fidelity [72], we know that the only compatible ρ_S is indeed given by $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$.

For the numerical results that show how typical transitivity is for the bipartite marginals of a pure global state, the marginals are obtained from a uniform random n -qudit state, which is obtained by taking the first column of a d^n -dimensional Haar-random unitary.

DATA AVAILABILITY

All relevant data supporting the main conclusions and figures of the document are available on request. Please refer to Gelo Noel Tabia at gelonoel-tabia@gs.ncku.edu.tw.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Antonio Acín and Otfried Gühne for helpful comments. CYH is supported by ICFOstepstone (the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Co-fund GA665884), the Spanish MINECO (Severo Ochoa SEV-2015-0522), the Government of Spain (FIS2020-TRANQI and Severo Ochoa CEX2019-000910-S), Fundació Cellex, Fundació Mir-Puig, Generalitat de Catalunya (SGR1381 and CERCA Programme), the ERC AdG CERQUTE, and the AXA Chair in Quantum Information Science. We also acknowledge support from the Ministry of Science and Technology, Taiwan (Grants No. 107-2112-M-006-005-MY2, 109-2627-M-006-004, 109-2112-M-006-010-MY3), and the National Center for Theoretical Sciences, Taiwan.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

GNT, CYH, and YCL formulated the problem and developed the theoretical ideas. GNT, YCL, and YCY carried out the numerical calculations. All explicit examples are due to GNT and KSC. GNT and YCL prepared the manuscript with

help from KSC and CYH. All authors were involved in the discussion and interpretation of results.

(n, d)	N_{sample} ($\times 10^3$)	NPT (%)	PPT (%)	NPT \Rightarrow NPT (%)	PPT \Rightarrow NPT (%)	NPT + PPT \Rightarrow NPT (%)	Max $(1 - \mathcal{F})$	$1 - \mathcal{F} < \epsilon$ (%)	$1 - \mathcal{F} < 10^{-6}$ among \Rightarrow NPT (%)
(3,2)	1000	100	0	100	0 (-)	0 (-)	1.21×10^{-9}	100; 100; 100	100
(3,3)	100	100	0	100	0 (-)	0 (-)	1.73×10^{-6}	25.51; 69.55; 99.99	99.99
(3,4)	10	100	0	100	0 (-)	0 (-)	1.33×10^{-6}	72.77; 85.47; 99.84	99.84
(3,5)	10	100	0	100	0 (-)	0 (-)	1.29×10^{-6}	83.64; 94.31; 99.79	99.79
(4,2)	100	46.74	2.64	7.32 (15.66)	0.02 (0.87)	3.36 (6.64)	1^\dagger	0.29; 1.50; 3.20	26.18
(4,3)	10	99.93	0	0 (0)	0 (-)	0 (0)	1^\dagger	0.00; 0.00; 0.00	-
(5,2)	10	0.35	45.75	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1^\dagger	0.00; 0.00; 0.00	-
(5,3)	1.030	0.10	54.85	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1^\dagger	0.00; 0.00; 0.00	-

TABLE I. Summary of various features of uniformly sampled n -partite pure states of local dimension d according to the Haar measure. The second column gives the number of pure states sampled N_{sample} in each scenario (n, d) . The next two columns list the fraction of states giving $(n - 1)$ neighboring two-body marginals that are, respectively, *all* NPT (i.e., none of which being PPT) and *all* PPT. The next three columns summarize how generic the phenomenon of (meta)transitivity is among such states when the target system T lie at the two ends of an n -body chain. We give from left to right, respectively, the fraction among all sampled states exhibiting transitivity (i.e., with *only* entangled marginals), metatransitivity with *only* separable marginals, and metatransitivity with mixed marginals. Enclosed in each bracket is the corresponding fraction among samples having the associated kind of marginals. The next two columns summarize the extent to which the $(n - 1)$ two-body marginals lead to a unique global pure state. These are expressed in terms of the *largest* value of the infidelity $1 - \mathcal{F}$, where $\mathcal{F} = \min_{\rho_S} \langle \psi | \rho_S | \psi \rangle$ and $|\psi\rangle$ is the sampled pure state; the three numbers listed in the second last column are, respectively, for $\epsilon = 10^{-8}, 10^{-7}$ and 10^{-6} . The final column shows the fraction of (meta)transitivity examples having a *unique* global state (with an infidelity threshold set to 10^{-6}). Throughout, we use 1^\dagger to represent a number that differs from 1 by less than 10^{-8} .

- [1] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 865 (2009).
- [2] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- [3] R. Jozsa and N. Linden, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A.* **459**, 2011 (2003).
- [4] G. Vidal, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 147902 (2003).
- [5] J. Preskill, *Quantum* **2**, 79 (2018).
- [6] S. McArdle, S. Endo, A. Aspuru-Guzik, S. C. Benjamin, and X. Yuan, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **92**, 015003 (2020).
- [7] I. M. Georgescu, S. Ashhab, and F. Nori, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **86**, 153 (2014).
- [8] L. Pezzè, A. Smerzi, M. K. Oberthaler, R. Schmied, and P. Treutlein, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **90**, 035005 (2018).
- [9] T. D. Ladd, F. Jelezko, R. Laflamme, Y. Nakamura, C. Monroe, and J. L. O'Brien, *Nature* **464**, 45 (2010).
- [10] G. De Chiara and A. Sanpera, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **81**, 074002 (2018).
- [11] J. I. Cirac, Many-Body Physics with Ultracold Gases: Lecture Notes of the Les Houches Summer School: volume 94, July 2010 **94**, 161 (2012).
- [12] G. Tóth, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 010301 (2005).
- [13] M. Navascués, M. Owari, and M. B. Plenio, *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 052306 (2009).
- [14] B. Jungnitsch, T. Moroder, and O. Gühne, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 190502 (2011).
- [15] A. Sawicki, M. Oszmaniec, and M. Kuś, *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 040304 (2012).
- [16] J. Sperling and W. Vogel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 110503 (2013).
- [17] M. Walter, B. Doran, D. Gross, and M. Christandl, *Science* **340**, 1205 (2013).
- [18] L. Chen, O. Gittsovich, K. Modi, and M. Piani, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 042314 (2014).
- [19] N. Miklin, T. Moroder, and O. Gühne, *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 020104(R) (2016).
- [20] F. Bohnet-Waldraff, D. Braun, and O. Giraud, *Phys. Rev. A* **96**, 032312 (2017).
- [21] A. W. Harrow, A. Natarajan, and X. Wu, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **352**, 881 (2017).
- [22] S. Gerke, W. Vogel, and J. Sperling, *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 031047 (2018).
- [23] M. Paraschiv, N. Miklin, T. Moroder, and O. Gühne, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 062102 (2018).
- [24] G. Tóth, C. Knapp, O. Gühne, and H. J. Briegel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 250405 (2007).
- [25] G. Tóth, C. Knapp, O. Gühne, and H. J. Briegel, *Phys. Rev. A* **79**, 042334 (2009).
- [26] O. Gühne and G. Tóth, *Phys. Rep.* **474**, 1 (2009).
- [27] O. Gittsovich, P. Hyllus, and O. Gühne, *Phys. Rev. A* **82**, 032306 (2010).
- [28] J. I. de Vicente and M. Huber, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 062306 (2011).
- [29] J.-D. Bancal, N. Gisin, Y.-C. Liang, and S. Pironio, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 250404 (2011).
- [30] M. Li, J. Wang, S.-M. Fei, and X. Li-Jost, *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 022325 (2014).
- [31] Y.-C. Liang, D. Rosset, J.-D. Bancal, G. Pütz, T. J. Barnea, and N. Gisin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 190401 (2015).
- [32] F. Baccari, D. Cavalcanti, P. Wittek, and A. Acín, *Phys. Rev. X* **7**, 021042 (2017).
- [33] H. Lu, Q. Zhao, Z.-D. Li, X.-F. Yin, X. Yuan, J.-C. Hung, L.-K. Chen, L. Li, N.-L. Liu, C.-Z. Peng, Y.-C. Liang, X. Ma, Y.-A. Chen, and J.-W. Pan, *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 021072 (2018).
- [34] I. Frérot and T. Roscilde, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 040401 (2021).
- [35] I. Frérot, F. Baccari, and A. Acín, *PRX Quantum* **3**, 010342 (2022).
- [36] M. Navascués, F. Baccari, and A. Acín, *Quantum* **5**, 589 (2021).
- [37] D. M. Greenberger, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and A. Zeilinger, *Am. J. Phys.* **58**, 1131 (1990).
- [38] S. Coretti, E. Hänggi, and S. Wolf, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 100402 (2011).

- [39] S. Popescu and D. Rohrlich, *Found. Phys.* **24**, 379 (1994).
- [40] R. F. Werner, *Phys. Rev. A* **40**, 4277 (1989).
- [41] M. Horodecki and P. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 4206 (1999).
- [42] A. A. Klyachko, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **36**, 72 (2006).
- [43] T. Tyc and J. Vlach, *Eur. Phys. J. D* **69**, 209 (2015).
- [44] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization* (Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- [45] A. Peres, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 1413 (1996).
- [46] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, *Phys. Lett. A* **223**, 1 (1996).
- [47] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 5239 (1998).
- [48] O. Rudolph, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **4**, 219 (2005).
- [49] K. Chen and L.-A. Wu, *Quantum Info. Comput.* **3**, 193 (2003).
- [50] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, *Open Syst. Inf. Dyn.* **13**, 103 (2006).
- [51] J. Shang, A. Asadian, H. Zhu, and O. Gühne, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 022309 (2018).
- [52] E. A. Bender and S. G. Williamson, *Lists, Decisions and Graphs* (UC San Diego, 2010) p. 171.
- [53] T. Eggeling and R. F. Werner, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 042111 (2001).
- [54] P. D. Johnson and L. Viola, *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 032323 (2013).
- [55] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. A* **60**, 1888 (1999).
- [56] S. Albeverio, S.-M. Fei, and W.-L. Yang, *Phys. Rev. A* **66**, 012301 (2002).
- [57] N. S. Jones and N. Linden, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 012324 (2005).
- [58] F. Huber and O. Gühne, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 010403 (2016).
- [59] N. Wyderka, F. Huber, and O. Gühne, *Phys. Rev. A* **96**, 010102(R) (2017).
- [60] N. Linden, S. Popescu, and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 207901 (2002).
- [61] N. Linden and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 277906 (2002).
- [62] L. Diósi, *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 010302(R) (2004).
- [63] Y.-J. Han, Y.-S. Zhang, and G.-C. Guo, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 054302 (2005).
- [64] M. M. Wolf, F. Verstraete, and J. I. Cirac, *Int. J. Quantum Inf.* **01**, 465 (2003).
- [65] R. H. Dicke, *Phys. Rev.* **93**, 99 (1954).
- [66] T.-C. Wei and P. M. Goldbart, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 042307 (2003).
- [67] A. Aloy, M. Fadel, and J. Tura, *New J. Phys.* **23**, 033026 (2021).
- [68] C.-Y. Hsieh, G. N. M. Tabia, and Y.-C. Liang, Resource transitivity (in preparation).
- [69] C.-Y. Hsieh, G. N. M. Tabia, Y.-C. Yin, and Y.-C. Liang, Resource marginal problems (2022), [arXiv:2202.03523](https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.03523) [quant-ph].
- [70] M. Li, J. Wang, S. Shen, Z. Chen, and S.-M. Fei, *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 17274 (2017).
- [71] A. Ben-Tal and A. Nemirovskii, *Lectures on Modern Convex Optimization: Analysis, Algorithms, and Engineering Applications*, MPS-SIAM series on optimization (SIAM, 2001).
- [72] Y.-C. Liang, Y.-H. Yeh, P. E. M. F. Mendonça, R. Y. Teh, M. D. Reid, and P. D. Drummond, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **82**, 076001 (2019).
- [73] J. Watrous, *The Theory of Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2018).
- [74] G. Zauner, *Int. J. Quantum Inf.* **09**, 445 (2011).
- [75] J. M. Renes, R. Blume-Kohout, A. J. Scott, and C. M. Caves, *J. Math. Phys.* **45**, 2171 (2004).
- [76] A. J. Scott and M. Grassl, *J. Math. Phys.* **51**, 042203 (2010).
- [77] C. A. Fuchs, M. C. Hoang, and B. C. Stacey, *Axioms* **6** (2017).
- [78] P. Parashar and S. Rana, *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 012319 (2009).
- [79] X. Wu, G.-J. Tian, W. Huang, Q.-Y. Wen, S.-J. Qin, and F. Gao, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 012317 (2014).
- [80] M. Smaczyński, W. Roga, and K. Życzkowski, *Open Syst. Inf. Dyn.* **23**, 1650014 (2016).
- [81] R. Horodecki and M. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 1838 (1996).
- [82] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, T. Mor, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and B. M. Terhal, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 5385 (1999).
- [83] D. P. DiVincenzo, T. Mor, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and B. M. Terhal, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **238**, 379 (2003).

Supplementary Note 1. VARIOUS OPTIMIZATION PROBLEMS

1.1. Certification of entanglement (meta)transitivity via a linear witness

Lagrange dual problem to Eq. (1)

For the optimization problem in Eq. (1) where

$$\mathcal{W}(\rho_T) = \text{tr}[\rho_S(W_T \otimes \mathbb{I}_{S \setminus T})] \quad (12)$$

and W_T is some Hermitian operator, we can construct the Lagrangian [44]

$$\mathcal{L}(\rho_S, H_{S_i}, Z) = \langle W_T, \rho_T \rangle - \sum_{i=1}^k \langle H_{S_i}, \rho_{S_i} - \sigma_{S_i} \rangle + \langle Z, \rho_S \rangle,$$

where the Lagrange multipliers H_{S_i} are Hermitian and $Z \succeq 0$. For convenience, let

$$\zeta_S := \sum_i H_{S_i} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{S \setminus S_i} - W_T \otimes \mathbb{I}_{S \setminus T}, \quad (13)$$

the dual function [44] $g(H_{S_i}, Z) := \sup_{\rho_S} \mathcal{L}(\rho_S, H_{S_i}, Z)$ is

$$g(H_{S_i}, Z) = \sup_{\rho_S} \langle Z - \zeta_S, \rho_S \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^k \langle H_{S_i}, \sigma_{S_i} \rangle. \quad (14)$$

Thus, unless $Z = \zeta_S$, the dual function becomes unbounded, i.e., $g(H_{S_i}, Z) = +\infty$ by choosing ρ_S to be an eigenstate of $Z - \zeta_S$ with non-vanishing eigenvalue and by making the norm of that eigenstate arbitrarily large. Incorporating the non-negativity of Z and eliminating it from the problem then gives the Lagrange dual problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\{H_{S_i}\}_{S_i \in \mathcal{S}}} & \sum_{i=1}^k \text{tr}(\sigma_{S_i} H_{S_i}) \\ \text{subj. to} & H_{S_i} = H_{S_i}^\dagger \quad \forall S_i \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } \zeta_S \succeq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Manifestation of (meta)transitivity by Eq. (15)

Here it will be convenient to follow Proposition 1.19 on page 55 of Ref. [73]. For this, we will need to write the primal semidefinite program (SDP) in the form

$$\max_X \langle A, X \rangle \quad \text{subj. to } \Phi(X) = B \text{ and } X \succeq 0, \quad (16)$$

where $\langle M_1, M_2 \rangle = \text{tr}(M_1^\dagger M_2)$. This means the dual SDP can be expressed as

$$\min_Y \langle B, Y \rangle \quad \text{subj. to } \Phi^\dagger(Y) \succeq A \text{ and } Y = Y^\dagger. \quad (17)$$

When strong duality holds, i.e., when the primal value $\langle A, X \rangle$ coincides with the dual value $\langle B, Y \rangle$ for some X and Y , com-

plementary slackness dictates that [73] (see also Ref. [44])

$$[\Phi^\dagger(Y) - A]X = 0. \quad (18)$$

It is straightforward to verify that Eq. (1) with linear witness given by Eq. (12) can be written in the form of Eq. (16) by taking $A = W_T \otimes \mathbb{I}_{S \setminus T}$, $X = \rho_S$ with

$$B = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k \sigma_{S_i}, \quad \Phi(X) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k \text{tr}_{S \setminus S_i}(X).$$

Similarly, Eq. (15) is in the form of Eq. (17) by setting

$$Y = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k H_{S_i}, \quad \Phi^\dagger(Y) = \sum_{i=1}^k H_{S_i} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{S \setminus S_i}, \quad A = W_T \otimes \mathbb{I}_{S \setminus T}$$

where we used the fact that the adjoint channel of partial trace is tensoring by identity. Finally, from Eq. (18) we have that if strong duality holds then

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^k H_{S_i}^* \otimes \mathbb{I}_{S \setminus S_i} - W_T \otimes \mathbb{I}_{S \setminus T} \right) \rho_S^* = \zeta_S^* \rho_S^* = 0 \quad (19)$$

for the optimal joint state ρ_S^* and optimal dual variables $H_{S_i}^*$. The last equality, in particular, implies that the pair (ζ_S^*, ρ_S^*) satisfies $\text{tr}(\rho_S^* \zeta_S^*) = 0$. Since $\zeta_S \succeq 0$, this last equality further implies that whenever strong duality holds, ρ_S^* must be a (mixture) of ground states of the Hamiltonian ζ_S .

Finally, when metatransitivity is certified by the witness \mathcal{W} , i.e., $\mathcal{W}(\rho_T) < 0$, the local interaction energy at T must satisfy

$$E_T = -\text{tr}(\rho_S W_T \otimes \mathbb{I}_{S \setminus T}) = -\text{tr}(\rho_T W_T) = -\mathcal{W}(\rho_T) > 0.$$

1.2. SDPs for certifying entanglement (meta)transitivity via a violation of some separability criterion

The PPT separability criterion

As mentioned in the main text, if we take in Eq. (1) $W_T = \eta_T^\Gamma$ with $\eta_T \succeq 0$, where Γ denotes the partial transposition operation, and optimize over all such η , we end up with a witness that allows us to certify the entanglement transitivity via a violation of the PPT separability criterion. Such an optimization is, however, bilinear in ρ_S and η , and thus does not fit into the framework of a convex optimization problem.

To circumvent this problem, one can make use of the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\rho_S} & \lambda \\ \text{subj. to} & \text{tr}_{S \setminus S_i}(\rho_S) = \sigma_{S_i} \quad \forall S_i \in \mathcal{S}, \\ & \rho_S \succeq 0, \quad \rho_T^\Gamma \succeq \lambda \mathbb{I}, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

which directly optimizes over the joint state ρ_S with marginals σ_{S_i} such that the smallest eigenvalue λ of ρ_T^Γ is maximized. Since a bipartite state that is *not* PPT is entangled [45, 46],

if the optimal λ (denoted by λ^* throughout) is negative, the marginal state in T of all possible joint states ρ_S must be entangled. By following a calculation similar to the one given above, one can show that the Lagrange dual problem to Eq. (20) takes exactly the same form as Eq. (15), but with $W = \eta_T^\Gamma$, and with η_T being an additional optimization variable subjected to the constraint of $\eta_T \succeq 0$ and $\text{tr}(\eta_T) = 1$.

Some other means of certifying entanglement transitivity

To certify the entanglement in T , we may use different kinds of entanglement detection criteria. For example, if we employ the so-called ESIC criterion based on symmetric informationally complete positive operator-valued measures (SIC-POVMs) [51], which is similar to the computable cross-norm or realignment (CCNR) criterion [48–50] except that each set of local orthogonal observables is replaced by a single SIC-POVM. Then for the target system $T = (t, t')$ we can instead compute

$$\min_{\rho_S} \|\mathcal{P}^T\|_1, \text{ subject to } \text{tr}_{S \setminus S_i}(\rho_S) = \sigma_{S_i} \forall S_i \in \mathcal{S},$$

$$\rho_S \geq 0, \mathcal{P}_{ij}^T = \text{tr}(\rho_T E_i^t \otimes E_j^{t'}), \forall i, j, \quad (21)$$

where $\|M\|_1 := \text{tr}\sqrt{M^\dagger M}$ is the trace norm (i.e., the sum of the singular values) of M , and the operators $E_i^t = \sqrt{\frac{d+1}{2d}} |\psi_i^t\rangle\langle\psi_i^t|$ are constructed from the set $\{|\psi_i^t\rangle : i = 1, \dots, d\}$ whose projectors correspond to a SIC-POVM [74–77]. For this criterion, we can certify the entanglement in T when the optimal $\|\mathcal{P}\|_1 > 1$, which is independent of the chosen $\{E_j^t\}$ for each target subsystem [51].

The PPT and CCNR criterion for genuine tripartite entanglement

Here, we explain a simple criterion for detecting genuine tripartite entanglement introduced in [70]. To this end, we first briefly recall from [49] the realignment operation, which is based upon $\text{vec}(\mathcal{M})$, the operation of rearranging the columns of the matrix \mathcal{M} into a column vector (i.e., for standard basis vectors $|i\rangle$, $\text{vec}(|i\rangle\langle j|) = |j\rangle|i\rangle$).

Given a bipartite density operator ρ_{AB} acting on $\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$, we may write it as an $m \times m$ block matrix,

$$\rho_{AB} = \begin{pmatrix} \rho^{(11)} & \rho^{(12)} & \dots & \rho^{1m} \\ \rho^{(21)} & \rho^{(22)} & \dots & \rho^{2m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \rho^{(m1)} & \dots & \dots & \rho^{(mm)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (22)$$

where each $\rho^{(ij)}$ is an $n \times n$ matrix. Then, we can construct a

$m^2 \times n^2$ realigned matrix $\widetilde{\rho_{AB}}$

$$\widetilde{\rho_{AB}} = \begin{pmatrix} \text{vec}(\rho^{(11)})^\top \\ \text{vec}(\rho^{(21)})^\top \\ \vdots \\ \text{vec}(\rho^{(mm)})^\top \end{pmatrix}. \quad (23)$$

In other words, the realigned matrix is obtained by turning the $m \times m$ blocks into rows. The CCNR criterion [48, 49] dictates that for separable σ_{AB} , $\|\widetilde{\sigma_{AB}}\|_1 \leq 1$.

Now, let $A|BC$ denote a bipartition of a tripartite system ABC into a bipartite system with parts A and BC . Then, a biseparable state ρ_{ABC}^{bs} is a convex mixture of states separable with respect to the different bipartitions, i.e.,

$$\rho_{ABC}^{\text{bs}} = \sum_i \alpha_i \rho_A^{(i)} \otimes \rho_{BC}^{(i)} + \sum_j \beta_j \rho_B^{(j)} \otimes \rho_{CA}^{(j)} + \sum_k \gamma_k \rho_C^{(k)} \otimes \rho_{AB}^{(k)},$$

$$\alpha_i, \beta_j, \gamma_k \geq 0, \quad \sum_i \alpha_i + \sum_j \beta_j + \sum_k \gamma_k = 1, \quad (24)$$

where $\rho_A^{(i)}, \rho_{BC}^{(i)}, \rho_B^{(j)}, \rho_{CA}^{(j)}, \rho_C^{(k)}, \rho_{AB}^{(k)}$ are normalized density matrices.

Furthermore, let ρ_{ABC} be a three-qudit density operator acting on $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$ and

$$M(\rho_{ABC}) = \frac{1}{3} (\|\rho_{ABC}^{\tau_A}\|_1 + \|\rho_{ABC}^{\tau_B}\|_1 + \|\rho_{ABC}^{\tau_C}\|_1)$$

$$N(\rho_{ABC}) = \frac{1}{3} (\|\widetilde{\rho_{A|BC}}\|_1 + \|\widetilde{\rho_{B|CA}}\|_1 + \|\widetilde{\rho_{C|AB}}\|_1), \quad (25)$$

where τ_X means a partial transposition with respect to the subsystem X . In these notations, it was shown [70] that for any biseparable ρ_{ABC} , cf. Eq. (24), we must have

$$\max\{M(\rho_{ABC}), N(\rho_{ABC})\} \leq \frac{1+2d}{3}. \quad (26)$$

This means that if any of $M(\rho_{ABC}), N(\rho_{ABC})$ is larger than $\frac{1+2d}{3}$, ρ_{ABC} must be genuinely tripartite entangled.

Therefore in the metatransitivity problem, we can use this, cf. Eq. (20) for the bipartite target system, for detecting genuine tripartite entanglement. This is done by minimizing M and N of the target marginal and taking the larger of the two minima. To this end, note that the minimization of the trace norm can be cast as an SDP [71]. One approach is to recognize that the singular values of a matrix M can be obtained from the nonzero eigenvalues of the symmetric matrix $\Omega = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & M \\ M^\dagger & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. More precisely, if M has singular values m_i then Ω will have nonzero eigenvalues $\omega_i = \pm m_i$. This means that minimizing the trace norm of M is equivalent to minimizing half of the ℓ_1 -norm $\|\vec{\omega}\|_1 = \sum_i |\omega_i|$ of the vector of eigenvalues $\vec{\omega}$ of Ω . This in turn can be solved by the SDP

$$\min_{\Omega^+, \Omega^-} \frac{1}{2} (\text{tr}(\Omega^+) + \text{tr}(\Omega^-)), \text{ subj. to } \Omega = \Omega^+ - \Omega^-,$$

$$\Omega^+ \geq 0 \text{ and } \Omega^- \geq 0. \quad (27)$$

Supplementary Note 2. A FAMILY OF n -QUBIT STATES EXHIBITING TRANSITIVITY

For all integers $n \geq 3$, consider the n -qubit mixed state:

$$\Omega_n(\gamma) = \gamma |W_n\rangle\langle W_n| + (1 - \gamma) |0^n\rangle\langle 0^n|, \quad \gamma \in (0, 1], \quad (28)$$

which is a mixture of $|0^n\rangle\langle 0^n|$ and the n -qubit W state. It is straightforward to verify that its two-qubit reduced states are:

$$\rho_n(\gamma) = \left(\frac{n-2\gamma}{n}\right) |00\rangle\langle 00| + \frac{2\gamma}{n} |\Psi^+\rangle\langle \Psi^+|, \quad (29)$$

where $|\Psi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|10\rangle + |01\rangle)$. In what follows, we show that for any n -vertex tree graph whose edges correspond to the bipartite marginals $\rho_n(\gamma)$, i.e.,

$$\text{tr}_{S \setminus S_i}(\rho) = \sigma_{S_i} = \rho_n(\gamma) \quad \forall S_i \in \mathcal{S}, \quad (30)$$

the global state ρ compatible with these marginals in tree form is *unique* and hence given by $\Omega_n(\gamma)$. We begin by proving a lemma pertaining to the structure of the eigenstates of ρ .

Lemma 2. *Let S be the global system, $S_i \in \mathcal{S}$ be any two-qubit subsystem with marginal specified as $\rho_n(\gamma)$, and*

$$|\Psi_\ell\rangle = \sum_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n=0,1} \alpha_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n}^{(\ell)} |i_1 i_2 \dots i_n\rangle, \quad (31)$$

be an eigenstate of ρ with nonzero eigenvalue, then

- (i) all amplitudes $\alpha_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n}^{(\ell)}$ with two “1” at the positions of S_i vanish;
- (ii) the amplitudes $\alpha_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n}^{(\ell)}$ with one “1” and one “0” at the positions of S_i are identical.

Proof. Let us write the global state ρ in its spectral decomposition:

$$\rho = \sum_{\ell} c_{\ell} |\Psi_{\ell}\rangle\langle \Psi_{\ell}|, \quad (32)$$

where $\langle \Psi_i | \Psi_j \rangle = 0 \quad \forall i \neq j$, $\sum_i c_i = 1$, and $c_i > 0 \quad \forall i$ are the nonzero eigenvalues of ρ .

Without loss of generality, let S_i be the first two qubits (otherwise, reorder the particles to make them so), then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \langle 11 | \rho_n(\gamma) | 11 \rangle = \langle 11 | \text{tr}_{S \setminus S_i}(\rho) | 11 \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\ell} c_{\ell} \langle 11 | \text{tr}_{S \setminus S_i}(|\Psi_{\ell}\rangle\langle \Psi_{\ell}|) | 11 \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\ell} c_{\ell} \text{tr}_{S \setminus S_i} \left[\left(\langle 11 |_{S_i} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{S \setminus S_i} \right) |\Psi_{\ell}\rangle\langle \Psi_{\ell}| \left(|11\rangle_{S_i} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{S \setminus S_i} \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{\ell} c_{\ell} |\alpha_{1,1,i_3,\dots,i_n}^{(\ell)}|^2 \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from Eq. (29), second equality follows from Eq. (30), third equality follows from Eq. (32), and the last equality follows from Eq. (31). Since the last expression is a convex sum of non-negative terms, the fact that the sum vanishes means that each $\alpha_{1,1,i_3,\dots,i_n}^{(\ell)}$ is zero for

all $\ell, i_3, i_4, \dots, i_n$ and S_i as claimed.

For the proof of (ii), similar steps with $|01\rangle - |10\rangle$ playing the role of $|11\rangle$ lead to:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \sum_{\ell} c_{\ell} \text{tr}_{S \setminus S_i} \left\{ \left[\left(\langle 01 | - \langle 10 | \right)_{S_i} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{S \setminus S_i} \right] |\Psi_{\ell}\rangle\langle \Psi_{\ell}| \times \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left[\left(|01\rangle - |10\rangle \right)_{S_i} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{S \setminus S_i} \right] \right\} \\ &= \sum_{\ell} c_{\ell} \left| \alpha_{0,1,i_3,\dots,i_n}^{(\ell)} - \alpha_{1,0,i_3,\dots,i_n}^{(\ell)} \right|^2 \end{aligned}$$

This means that $\alpha_{0,1,i_3,\dots,i_n}^{(\ell)} = \alpha_{1,0,i_3,\dots,i_n}^{(\ell)}$ for all $\ell, i_3, i_4, \dots, i_n$ and S_i . Hence, in the expansion of Eq. (31), if there is a term $|i_1 \dots 01 \dots i_n\rangle$ where the “01” appear at positions corresponding to an S_i , there must also be a term $|i_1 \dots 10 \dots i_n\rangle$ with exactly the same amplitude. \square

Theorem 3. *For any tree graph with n vertices that satisfies Eq. (30), $\Omega_n(\gamma) = \gamma |W_n\rangle\langle W_n| + (1 - \gamma) |0^n\rangle\langle 0^n|$ is the unique global state and all the two-qubit reduced states are $\rho_n(\gamma)$.*

Proof. For convenience, we define $|m_1, m_2, \dots, m_l\rangle_n$ as the n -qubit state with a “1” at positions m_1, m_2, \dots, m_l and 0 elsewhere. We first start with a linear chain, and suppose it has n nodes and all of the $(n - 1)$ edges are $\rho_n(\gamma)$. By Lemma 2, we know that if any of the eigenstates $|\Psi_{\ell}\rangle$ has a contribution from $|m_1, m_2, \dots, m_l\rangle_n$ (where $m_1 < m_2 < \dots < m_l$), there must also be an equal-amplitude contribution from both $|m_1 - 1, m_2, \dots, m_l\rangle_n$ and $|m_1 + 1, m_2, \dots, m_l\rangle_n$. Repeating this argument iteratively eventually leads to the conclusion that there must also be a contribution from the term $|m_2 - 1, m_2, \dots, m_l\rangle_n$ in $|\Psi_{\ell}\rangle$, which contradicts the part (i) of Lemma 2. This means that each $|\Psi_{\ell}\rangle$ must lie in the span of $|0^n\rangle$ and $\{|i\rangle_k\}_{i=1,\dots,n}$ and by part (ii) of Lemma 2, all $\{|i\rangle_n\}_{i=1,\dots,n}$ must occur at the same time with the same amplitude, thereby giving

$$|\Psi_{\ell}\rangle = \beta_0^{(\ell)} |0^n\rangle + \beta_1^{(\ell)} |W_n\rangle, \quad |\beta_0|^2 + |\beta_1|^2 = 1. \quad (33)$$

Again, imagine that S_i being the first two qubits, then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \langle 00 | \rho_n(\gamma) | \Psi^+ \rangle = \langle 00 | \text{tr}_{S \setminus S_i}(\rho) | \Psi^+ \rangle \\ &= \text{tr}_{S \setminus S_i} \left[\left(\langle 00 |_{S_i} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{S \setminus S_i} \right) \rho \left(| \Psi^+ \rangle_{S_i} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{S \setminus S_i} \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{\ell} c_{\ell} \text{tr}_{S \setminus S_i} \left[\left(\langle 00 |_{S_i} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{S \setminus S_i} \right) |\Psi_{\ell}\rangle \left(\langle \Psi_{\ell} | \Psi^+ \rangle_{S_i} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{S \setminus S_i} \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{\ell} c_{\ell} \beta_0^{(\ell)} \sqrt{\frac{2}{n}} \beta_1^{(\ell)*} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have the constraint:

$$\sum_{\ell} c_{\ell} \beta_0^{(\ell)} \beta_1^{(\ell)*} = \sum_{\ell} c_{\ell} \beta_0^{(\ell)*} \beta_1^{(\ell)} = 0 \quad (34)$$

Consequently, we see from Eq. (32) and Eq. (33), and Eq. (34)

that the global state is:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \sum_{\ell} c_{\ell} \left[|\beta_0^{(\ell)}|^2 |0^n\rangle\langle 0^n| + |\beta_1^{(\ell)}|^2 |W_n\rangle\langle W_n| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \beta_0^{(\ell)} \beta_1^{(\ell)*} |0^n\rangle\langle W_n| + \beta_1^{(\ell)*} \beta_0^{(\ell)} |W_n\rangle\langle 0^n| \right] \\ &= \sum_{\ell} c_{\ell} \left[|\beta_0^{(\ell)}|^2 |0^n\rangle\langle 0^n| + |\beta_1^{(\ell)}|^2 |W_n\rangle\langle W_n| \right], \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

which is a convex mixture of $|0^n\rangle\langle 0^n|$ and $|W_n\rangle\langle W_n|$. Finally, using Eq. (30) and equating the two-qubit reduced states of ρ with that required in Eq. (29) immediately lead to:

$$\sum_{\ell} c_{\ell} |\beta_0^{(\ell)}|^2 = 1 - \gamma, \quad \sum_{\ell} c_{\ell} |\beta_1^{(\ell)}|^2 = \gamma, \quad \gamma \in [0, 1].$$

Hence, the global state is necessarily

$$\rho = \Omega_n(\gamma) = \gamma |W_n\rangle\langle W_n| + (1 - \gamma) |0^n\rangle\langle 0^n|. \quad (36)$$

The above argument also holds for any n -node tree graph with all its $n - 1$ edges set to $\rho_n(\gamma)$. To see this, it suffices to note that in a tree graph, there is always a unique path (chain) connecting any two nodes. We can then apply the above arguments for a chain to each of these paths to complete the analysis. As ρ is clearly invariant under an arbitrary permutation of the n subsystems, all its two-qubit reduced states are $\rho_n(\gamma)$. In particular, if $T \notin \mathcal{S}$ is a two-qubit marginal, we must also have $\rho_T = \rho_n(\gamma)$. \square

Note that our Theorem 3 generalizes the uniqueness result of [78, 79] where the global state is the n -qubit W -state $|W_n\rangle$.




FIG. 6. To see how the proof above applies to any tree graph, suppose we start from node P_0 in this example. Then we build up the possible eigenstate by applying Lemma 2 to all nodes P_k^j that are distance k away from P_0 . Because there is a unique path between P_0 and any other node in the tree graph, this leads to the same conclusion as a linear chain.

Supplementary Note 3. FINDING THE (META)TRANSITIVITY REGION OF OVERLAPPING WERNER STATES

Consider a qudit tripartite system ABC for $d \geq 3$. Ref. [54] describes the conditions for three Werner states in AB , AC , and BC to be compatible. In Ref. [54], they parameterize the

Werner state according to

$$W_d(\psi^-) = \frac{d}{d^2-1} \left[(d - \psi^-) \frac{1}{d^2} \mathbb{I} + (\psi^- - \frac{1}{d}) \frac{1}{d} V \right] \quad (37)$$

where V is the swap operator $V|\alpha\rangle|\beta\rangle = |\beta\rangle|\alpha\rangle$ and

$$\psi^- = \text{tr}[VW_d(\psi^-)]. \quad (38)$$

Ref. [54] showed that three qudit Werner states ψ_{AB}^- , ψ_{AC}^- , ψ_{BC}^- are compatible if and only if the point $(\psi_{AB}^-, \psi_{BC}^-, \psi_{AC}^-)$ lies within the bicone described by

$$1 \pm \psi_{\text{ave}}^- \geq \frac{2}{3} |\psi_{BC}^- + \omega \psi_{AC}^- + \omega^2 \psi_{AB}^-|, \quad (39)$$

where $\omega = \exp(\frac{2\pi i}{3})$ and

$$\psi_{\text{ave}}^- = \frac{1}{3} (\psi_{AB}^- + \psi_{AC}^- + \psi_{BC}^-). \quad (40)$$

In terms of the parameter v in Eq. (3), we have $\psi^- = 2v - 1$, so the compatibility conditions become

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{3} (v_{AB} + v_{AC} + v_{BC}) &\geq \mathcal{F} \\ 2 - \frac{2}{3} (v_{AB} + v_{AC} + v_{BC}) &\geq \mathcal{F} \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where

$$\mathcal{F} := \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{3(v_{AC} - v_{AB})^2 + (2v_{BC} - v_{AB} - v_{AC})^2} \quad (42)$$

To find the metatransitivity region, we need to find the range of compatible v_{BC} when given v_{AB} and v_{AC} and solve for when the boundary $v_{BC} = \frac{1}{2}$.

For the first inequality in Eq. (41), if we square both sides and simplify, we obtain

$$v_{BC}^2 - 2v_{BC}(v_{AB} + v_{AC}) + (v_{AB} - v_{AC})^2 \leq 0. \quad (43)$$

Next we complete the square for v_{BC} to get

$$[v_{BC} - (v_{AB} + v_{AC})]^2 \leq 4v_{AB}v_{AC}. \quad (44)$$

The desired boundary is given by taking the equality and substituting $v_{BC} = \frac{1}{2}$.

Similarly, for the second inequality in Eq. (41), if we square both sides and simplify, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} v_{BC}^2 + 2v_{BC} - 2v_{BC}(v_{AB} + v_{AC}) + (v_{AB} - v_{AC})^2 \\ \leq 3 - 2(v_{AB} + v_{AC}). \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

This time we complete the square for $(v_{BC} + 1)$ to get

$$[(v_{BC} + 1) - (v_{AB} + v_{AC})]^2 \leq 4(1 - v_{AB})(1 - v_{AC}). \quad (46)$$

The desired boundary is given by taking the equality and substituting $v_{BC} = \frac{1}{2}$.

Ref. [54] specifies the compatible region for a pair of Werner states obtained from projecting the bicone onto a plane. This compatible region is given by $\psi_{AB}^-, \psi_{AC}^- \geq -\frac{1}{2}$ or




FIG. 7. Parameter space for a pair of Werner state marginals with, respectively, weight v_{AB} and v_{AC} on the symmetric subspace. The plot here shows the parabolas of Eq. (44) and Eq. (46) as well as the ellipse of Eq. (48). Fig. 2 is a simplified version of the current plot.

$\psi_{AB}^-, \psi_{AC}^- \leq \frac{1}{2}$, or the pair satisfies

$$(\psi_{AB}^- + \psi_{AC}^-)^2 + \frac{1}{3}(\psi_{AB}^- - \psi_{AC}^-)^2 \leq 1. \quad (47)$$

In our parameters, this translates to the convex hull of the points $(0, 0)$, $(1, 1)$ and all the points contained in the ellipse

$$(v_{AB} + v_{AC} - 1)^2 + \frac{1}{3}(v_{AB} - v_{AC})^2 = \frac{1}{4}. \quad (48)$$

Finally we find that the parabolas will divide the compatible region into seven areas. It is enough to check if a point inside each area to determine if the area exhibits metatransitivity.

For $d = 2$, only the cone given by the minus sign in Eq. (39) is compatible. This leads to a compatible region for $(\psi_{AB}^-, \psi_{AC}^-)$ that is given by $\psi_{AB}^-, \psi_{AC}^- \geq -\frac{1}{2}$ or Eq. (47). This translates to the convex hull of $(1, 1)$ and the ellipse of Eq. (48). To understand why this happens, observe that the projection onto the qubit antisymmetric subspace corresponds to the maximally entangled singlet state $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)$, so for small values of v_{AB} and v_{AC} , monogamy of entanglement prohibits them from being compatible.

Supplementary Note 4. FINDING THE METATRANSITIVITY REGION OF OVERLAPPING ISOTROPIC STATES

Consider a qudit tripartite system ABC for $d \geq 3$. Ref. [54] describes the conditions for two isotropic states in AB and AC, and BC to be compatible. In Ref. [54], they parameterize the isotropic state according to

$$\mathcal{I}_d(\phi^+) = \frac{d}{d^2-1} \left[(d - \phi^+) \frac{1}{d^2} \mathbb{I} + (\phi^+ - \frac{1}{d}) |\Phi_d\rangle\langle\Phi_d| \right] \quad (49)$$

where $|\Phi_d\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_i |i, i\rangle$ and $d\phi^+ = \langle\Phi_d|\mathcal{I}_d(p)|\Phi_d\rangle$ is, up to a constant of d , the fully entangled fraction of $\mathcal{I}_d(\phi^+)$. Meanwhile the Werner state in BC is written in terms of ψ^- in Eq. (38). Ref. [54] showed that for $d \geq 3$ the ϕ_{AB}^+, ϕ_{AC}^+ and

ψ_{BC}^- are compatible if the point $(\phi_{AB}^+, \phi_{AC}^+, \psi_{BC}^-)$ lies within the convex hull of $(0, 0, -1)$ and the cone given by

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{AB}^+ + \phi_{AC}^+ - \psi_{BC}^- &\leq d, \\ 1 + \phi_{AB}^+ + \phi_{AC}^+ - \psi_{BC}^- &\geq \left| d(\psi_{BC}^- - 1) + \sqrt{\frac{2d}{d-1}} (e^{i\theta} \phi_{AB}^+ + e^{-i\theta} \phi_{AC}^+) \right|, \\ e^{\pm i\theta} &= \pm i \sqrt{\frac{d+1}{2d}} + \sqrt{\frac{d-1}{2d}}. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

In terms of the fully entangled fraction $p = \frac{1}{d}\phi^+$ for the isotropic states and $v = \frac{1}{2}(\psi^- + 1)$ for the Werner states, the compatibility conditions become

$$\begin{aligned} p_{AB} + p_{AC} - \frac{1}{d}(2v_{BC} - 1) &\leq 1, \\ 2 + d(p_{AB} + p_{AC}) - 2v_{BC} &\geq \sqrt{\mathcal{R}_1 + \mathcal{R}_2}, \\ \mathcal{R}_1 &= [d(p_{AB} + p_{AC}) + d(2v_{BC} - 2)]^2, \\ \mathcal{R}_2 &= \frac{d^2(d+1)}{d-1} (p_{AB} - p_{AC})^2. \end{aligned} \quad (51a, 51b)$$

Similar to what we did for the Werner states, we want to solve for the condition on p_{AB} and p_{AC} such that $v_{BC} = \frac{1}{2}$ is on the boundary of the compatible Werner states. Let $\mathcal{V} = 2v_{BC} - 2$ and $\mathcal{P} = d(p_{AB} + p_{AC})$. Taking Eq. (51b) and squaring both sides, we obtain

$$(\mathcal{V} - \mathcal{P})^2 \geq (d\mathcal{V} + \mathcal{P})^2 + \frac{d+1}{d-1} \mathcal{P}^2 - \left(\frac{d+1}{d-1}\right) 4d^2 p_{AB} p_{AC}. \quad (52)$$

After some algebra this can be simplified into

$$[\mathcal{P} + (d-1)\mathcal{V}]^2 \leq 4d^2 p_{AB} p_{AC}. \quad (53)$$

The desired boundary is obtained by taking the equality and setting $v_{BC} = \frac{1}{2}$, which implies $\mathcal{V} = -1$ and leads to the parabola

$$p_{AB} p_{AC} = \left[\frac{d(p_{AB} + p_{AC}) - (d-1)}{2d} \right]^2. \quad (54)$$

Ref. [54] specifies the compatible region for a pair of isotropic states to be the region given by the convex hull of $(\phi_{AB}^+, \phi_{AC}^+) = (0, 0)$ and the ellipse

$$\frac{(\frac{1}{d}\phi_{AB}^+ + \frac{1}{d}\phi_{AC}^+ - 1)^2}{\frac{1}{d^2}} + \frac{(\frac{1}{d}\phi_{AB}^+ - \frac{1}{d}\phi_{AC}^+)^2}{\frac{d^2-1}{d^2}} = 1, \quad (55)$$

which in our parameters becomes the convex hull of the point $(p_{AB}, p_{AC}) = (0, 0)$ and the ellipse

$$(p_{AB} + p_{AC} - 1)^2 + \frac{1}{d^2-1} (p_{AB} - p_{AC})^2 = \frac{1}{d^2}. \quad (56)$$

Finally, we verify that the parabola in Eq. (54) divides the compatible region into four areas, and that the metatransitivity region obtained with this parabola matches the one that is obtained numerically for $d \leq 5$ up to numerical precision.




FIG. 8. Parameter space for a pair of isotropic state marginals with, respectively, fully entangled fraction p_{AB} and p_{AC} . The compatible region for the pair is enclosed by the solid red line. The plot here shows the parabolae of Eq. (54) and the ellipse of Eq. (55). Fig. 3 is a simplified version of the current plot.

Supplementary Note 5. OTHER EXPLICIT EXAMPLES

For ease of reference, we summarize in Table II the nature of the various explicit examples presented in this Appendix.

Example	n	d_{S_i}	$\sigma_{S_i}^\Gamma \succeq 0?$	d_T	$ 1 - \min_{\rho_S} \langle \psi \rho_S \psi \rangle $
5.1	3	2	None	2×2	0
5.2	4	2	None	$\{2 \times 2\}^3$	$\approx 10^{-11}$
5.3	4 to 7	2	All	2×2	-
5.4	3	3	All	3×3	-
5.5	4	2	All	$2 \times 2 \times 2$	$\approx 10^{-9}$

TABLE II. Table summarizing various aspects of the explicit examples of (meta)transitivity presented in Section Supplementary Note 5. From left to right, we list the subsection in which the example is presented, the local Hilbert space dimension d_{S_i} of the input marginal σ_{S_i} , whether these input marginals are PPT, the dimensions d_T of the target system Hilbert space (e.g., 2×2 means T is a two-qubit system, whereas $\{2 \times 2\}^3$ means three different two-qubit target systems have been considered), and if applicable, the minimum compatible fidelity of the joint state ρ_S with respect to a known compatible pure state $|\psi\rangle$.

5.1. Three-qubit transitivity from symmetric extensions

Apart from the Werner state and the isotropic state marginals, here, we show that ETP can also be solved for a four-parameter family of two-qubit marginals. To this end,

consider the two-qubit state

$$\sigma_{AB} = \begin{pmatrix} a_0^2 & 0 & 0 & a_0 \frac{b}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & a_1^2 & e^{it} a_1 \frac{b}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-it} a_1 \frac{b}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{b^2}{2} & 0 \\ a_0 \frac{b}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & \frac{b^2}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (57)$$

where $a_0, a_1, b \in [-1, 1]$ and $t \in [0, 2\pi]$. It can be shown that Eq. (57) is, up to normalization, the Choi representation of a single-qubit selfcomplementary quantum operation [80].

Computing the eigenvalues of the partial transpose of Eq. (57), the smallest eigenvalue is given by $\lambda_{\min} = \frac{1}{4} \left(2a_i^2 + b^2 - \sqrt{4a_i^4 + 8a_j^2 b^2 - 4a_i^2 b^2 + b^4} \right)$ for $i = 0, j = 1$ and vice-versa. Thus, Eq. (57) is entangled when $|b| \in (0, 1)$ and $|a_0| \neq |a_1|$ for $|a_0|, |a_1| \in [0, 1)$. Next, we prove that entangled σ_{AB} has the pure, unique symmetric extension

$$|\Psi\rangle_{ABC} = a_0|000\rangle + a_1 e^{it}|011\rangle + b|1\rangle|\Psi^+\rangle, \quad (58)$$

where $|\Psi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle + |10\rangle)$. It is easy to check that $|\Psi\rangle$ has the correct marginals, so it remains to show that it is unique. For this, we show that the eigenstates of an arbitrary qubit tripartite state ρ_{ABC} must have a particularly structure in order to produce the correct marginal states $\rho_{AB} = \sigma_{AB} = \rho_{AC}$. The proof may be of independent interest but so as to not detract attention from the discussion here, we postpone the details to Supplementary Note Supplementary Note 8.

Finally, because Eq. (58) is the unique joint state, we obtain transitivity by solving for the case when its BC marginal is non-PPT. It is straightforward to verify that the characteristic polynomial of ρ_{BC}^Γ can be factorized into $\left(\frac{b^2}{2} \pm a_0 a_1 - x\right)$ and $\left[a_0^2 a_1^2 - \frac{b^2}{2} - (a_0^2 + a_1^2)x + x^2\right]$, which yields a negative root when $|b| \neq \sqrt{2|a_0 a_1|}$.

5.2. Genuine four-qubit transitivity with entangled marginals

For completeness, we provide here a four-qubit state $|\chi\rangle_{ABCD}$ with entangled marginals for AB, BC, and CD such that they exhibit the same kind of genuine four-party effect displayed by the example with all separable marginals (case (d) in Fig. 4) given by Eq. (6) of the main text:

$$|\chi\rangle_{ABCD} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left(-\frac{1}{5}, -\frac{1}{12}, -\frac{1}{93}, -\frac{2}{9}, \frac{3}{10}, \frac{1}{6}, -\frac{1}{4}, -\frac{2}{3}, \frac{1}{11}, -\frac{3}{11}, \frac{1}{7}, -\frac{1}{6}, -\frac{1}{6}, -\frac{1}{4}, \frac{2}{9}, \frac{1}{7} \right)^T, \quad (59)$$

where N is a normalization constant. Imposing the AB, BC, and CD marginals of $|\chi\rangle_{ABCD}$ in Eq. (20) leads, respectively, to $\lambda_{AD}^* \approx -0.0788$, $\lambda_{AC}^* \approx -0.1344$, and $\lambda_{BD}^* \approx -0.0553$. These can also be verified by noting that $|\chi\rangle_{ABCD}$ appears to be the unique state compatible with these marginals.

5.3. k -qubit metatransitivity with separable marginals for k from 4 to 7

Next, we present some examples that may be extended to a more complicated setting. We begin with a four-qubit metatransitivity example where the separable marginals AB, BC, and CD can be used to infer the entanglement in AD. Let $\mathcal{B}(\vec{w})$ be a Bell-diagonal two-qubit state where \vec{w} is the vector of convex weights of the Bell states $\{|\Phi^\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle \pm |11\rangle), |\Psi^\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle \pm |10\rangle)\}$, in that order. Take the marginal states $\mathcal{B}(\vec{w}_{AB}), \mathcal{B}(\vec{w}_{BC}),$ and $\mathcal{B}(\vec{w}_{CD})$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{w}_{AB} &= \frac{1}{10^4} (1363, 4552, 610, 3475), \\ \vec{w}_{BC} &= \frac{1}{10^4} (1819, 4153, 3957, 71), \\ \vec{w}_{CD} &= \frac{1}{10^4} (4440, 3209, 2028, 323).\end{aligned}\quad (60)$$

These marginals are separable because a Bell-diagonal state is separable *iff* all w_i are less than $\frac{1}{2}$ [81]. Using Eq. (20), we obtain $\lambda_{AD}^* \approx -0.0020$. Since the optimal joint state has separable Bell-diagonal states in AC and BD, the metatransitivity of entanglement is not possible in those marginals.

Remarkably, the same Bell-diagonal states can be used to exhibit 5-qubit metatransitivity by taking the marginals $\mathcal{B}(\vec{z})$:

$$\vec{z}_{AB} = \vec{w}_{AB}, \quad \vec{z}_{BC} = \vec{z}_{CD} = \vec{w}_{BC}, \quad \vec{z}_{DE} = \vec{w}_{CD}. \quad (61)$$

Indeed, we obtain $\lambda_{AE}^* \approx -0.1165$, thus exhibiting metatransitivity between the ends of the chain from A to E in Fig. 9.

We next present an example of five-qubit metatransitivity that may be extended in a different manner. The four input Bell-diagonal marginals $\mathcal{B}(\vec{q})$ are

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{q}_{AB} &= \frac{1}{10^4} (566, 4203, 3933, 1298), \\ \vec{q}_{BC} &= \frac{1}{10^4} (3252, 4614, 2068, 66), \\ \vec{q}_{CD} &= \frac{1}{10^4} (4324, 3437, 323, 1916), \\ \vec{q}_{DE} &= \frac{1}{10^4} (818, 4430, 503, 4249).\end{aligned}\quad (62)$$

From Eq. (20) we obtain $\lambda_{AE}^* \approx -0.0379$. Interestingly, we can use these Bell-diagonal states to get metatransitivity examples for six and seven qubits from a tree graph (see Fig. 9) of separable marginals. For the six-qubit example, we keep the marginals of Eq. (62) and add another node F with $\vec{q}_{BF} = \vec{q}_{BC}$, which again gives $\lambda_{AE}^* \approx -0.0379$. In the seven-qubit case, we keep all these marginals and add a node G with $\vec{q}_{BG} = \vec{q}_{BC}$, this time around giving $\lambda_{AE}^* \approx -0.0402$. We also note that Eq. (62) does not show metatransitivity in the other bipartite marginals, as can be seen from the separable marginals in the optimal global state for the metatransitivity in AE.

5.4. Three-qutrit transitivity from bound entangled states

Here we provide two examples of transitivity involving marginal states that are PPT bound entangled [47]. For this,




FIG. 9. A tree graph showing how the metatransitivity example of Eq. (62) for qubits A, B, C, D, and E may be extended to six and seven qubits. The entanglement in AE can be certified by specifying the chain of neighboring two-qubit marginals from A to E alone, or together with BF and/or BG.

we consider the bound entangled state obtained from the unextendible product basis (UPB) known as Tiles [82]:

$$\begin{aligned}|T_0\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|0\rangle(|0\rangle - |1\rangle), & |T_2\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|2\rangle(|1\rangle - |2\rangle), \\ |T_1\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle)|2\rangle, & |T_3\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|1\rangle - |2\rangle)|0\rangle, \\ |T_4\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle + |2\rangle)(|0\rangle + |1\rangle + |2\rangle).\end{aligned}\quad (63)$$

The bound entangled state ρ_{Tiles} is obtained by taking the normalized projector onto the subspace complementary to the Tiles UPB: $\rho_{\text{Tiles}} = \frac{1}{4} \left(\mathbb{I} - \sum_{i=0}^4 |T_i\rangle\langle T_i| \right)$. Now if we employ Eq. (20) with marginals $\sigma_{AB} = \sigma_{BC} = \rho_{\text{Tiles}}$, we find the optimal value $\lambda_{AC}^* \approx -0.1194$, thus certifying the transitivity in AC given marginal states in AB and BC that are bound entangled.

For the second example, we consider the UPB known as Pyramid, which is given by

$$|P_j\rangle = |p_j\rangle \otimes |p_{2j \bmod 5}\rangle, \quad j = 0, \dots, 4, \quad (64)$$

where $|p_j\rangle$ are states that form the base of a regular pentagonal pyramid in \mathbb{R}^3 :

$$|p_j\rangle = \frac{2}{\sqrt{5+\sqrt{5}}} \left(\cos \frac{2\pi j}{5}, \sin \frac{2\pi j}{5}, \frac{\sqrt{1+\sqrt{5}}}{2} \right)^T, \quad j = 0, \dots, 4. \quad (65)$$

The corresponding bound entangled state is $\rho_{\text{Pyramid}} = \frac{1}{4} \left(\mathbb{I} - \sum_{j=0}^4 |P_j\rangle\langle P_j| \right)$. Solving Eq. (20) with marginals $\sigma_{AB} = \sigma_{BC} = \rho_{\text{Pyramid}}$, we obtain $\lambda_{AC}^* \approx -0.1094$.

Interestingly, we observe a similar type of transitivity with the marginals $\sigma_{AB} = \sigma_{BC}$ set to any of the 10^5 randomly generated bound entangled states from the six-parameter family of all two-qutrit UPBs [83].

5.5. Four-qubit transitivity for genuine tripartite entanglement

Here, we give an example where a collection of two-qubit marginals imply the presence of genuine tripartite entanglement in a three-qubit marginal. To this end, consider the AB,

AC, and AD marginals arising from the four-qubit state

$$|\Psi\rangle_{ABCD} = \left(\frac{1}{12}, \frac{1}{9}, 0, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{9}, \frac{1}{9}, 0, 0, 0, \frac{\sqrt{42}}{9}, \right. \\ \left. -\frac{1}{3}, -\frac{1}{12}, -\frac{1}{4}, -\frac{1}{12}, -\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3} \right)^T. \quad (66)$$

For these marginals, the smallest compatible values of M and N defined in Eq. (25), respectively, are

$$M(\rho_{BCD}) \approx 1.8606 \text{ and } N(\rho_{BCD}) \approx 1.8008. \quad (67)$$

In this case, however, the biseparable upper bound for the criterion of [70], see Section 1.2, is $\beta = \frac{1+2d}{3} = \frac{5}{3} \approx 1.667$, which is clearly violated. Thus, the BCD marginal given the aforementioned marginals of AB, AC, and AD must be genuinely tripartite entangled. Note that the global state compatible with these marginals again appear to be unique, see Table II.

Supplementary Note 6. EXTENDING METATRANSITIVITY EXAMPLES TO MORE PARTIES

Here we show how to extend an example of metatransitivity for n -parties to one involving $n+k$ parties, for arbitrary k . Suppose we have an n -partite system S with marginal states $\mathcal{S} = \{\sigma_{S_i}\}$ and let T be some target marginal system in S such that for some entanglement witness \mathcal{W} we have that $\rho_T = \text{tr}_{S \setminus T}(\rho_S)$ and $\mathcal{W}(\rho_T) < 0$ for all joint states ρ_S compatible with \mathcal{S} . Let ρ_S^* denote the joint state with

$$\lambda := \max_{\rho_S} \mathcal{W}[\text{tr}_{S \setminus T}(\rho_S)] = \mathcal{W}[\text{tr}_{S \setminus T}(\rho_S^*)] \quad (68)$$

from Eq. (20). We assume metatransitivity in T , so $\lambda < 0$.

Let R be the $(n+k)$ -partite system such that $R \setminus S = K$, that is, K is the k -partite marginal system of R that is disjoint from the n -partite S . Let $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{K}$ where $\mathcal{K} = \{\tau_{R_i}\}$ and R_i are marginal systems of R that are distinct (but not necessarily disjoint) from the marginal systems involved in \mathcal{S} . To avoid trivial situations, we assume the marginals specified in \mathcal{K} are compatible with those already given in \mathcal{S} .

Consider the following metatransitivity problems for R :

$$\mu_1 := \max_{\rho_R} \mathcal{W}[\text{tr}_{R \setminus T}(\rho_R)], \text{ s.t. } \text{tr}_{R \setminus S_i}(\rho_R) = \sigma_{S_i} \forall S_i \in \mathcal{S}, \\ \text{tr}_{R \setminus R_i}(\rho_R) = \tau_{R_i} \forall R_i \in \mathcal{K}, \rho_R \succeq 0, \quad (69)$$

and

$$\mu_2 := \max_{\rho_R} \mathcal{W}[\text{tr}_{R \setminus T}(\rho_R)], \text{ s.t. } \text{tr}_{R \setminus S_i}(\rho_R) = \sigma_{S_i} \forall S_i \in \mathcal{S}, \\ \rho_R \succeq 0. \quad (70)$$

We have that $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2$ since the former optimization has more constraints. However, note that T, S_i are subsystems in S , and

$$\text{tr}_{R \setminus S_i} = \text{tr}_{S \setminus S_i} \circ (\text{tr}_{R \setminus S}), \quad \text{tr}_{R \setminus T} = \text{tr}_{S \setminus T} \circ (\text{tr}_{R \setminus S}). \quad (71)$$

Hence, we can rewrite the latter problem as

$$\max_{\rho_R} \mathcal{W}[\text{tr}_{S \setminus T}(\rho_S)], \text{ s.t. } \text{tr}_{S \setminus S_i}(\rho_S) = \sigma_{S_i} \forall S_i \in \mathcal{S}, \rho_R \succeq 0. \quad (72)$$

But now we see that the objective function and marginal constraints depend only on the subsystem S of R and because partial trace is a positivity-preserving map, we can replace the last constraint with $\rho_S \succeq 0$ and the optimization over ρ_R with the optimization over ρ_S . Thus, we have that

$$\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 = \lambda < 0. \quad (73)$$

This means we can extend any metatransitivity example to more parties as long as the additional constraints have a compatible global state.

Supplementary Note 7. LOCAL COMPATIBILITY IMPLIES JOINT COMPATIBILITY FOR CLASSICAL-QUANTUM MARGINALS

Here we show that in the tripartite case, for two classical-quantum states that overlap in a classical subsystem (i.e., its density matrix is diagonal in the computational basis), then compatibility in the overlapping subsystem leads to joint compatibility. We show this by constructing one of the possible global states.

Let $\{|x\rangle : x = 1, \dots, d\}$ be an orthonormal basis for a d -dimensional Hilbert space. Consider the following bipartite states with local dimension d :

$$\sigma_{AB} = \sum_{i=1}^q \sigma_A^i \otimes \sum_{x=1}^d \beta_x^i |x\rangle\langle x|, \quad (74)$$

$$\tau_{BC} = \sum_{j=1}^r \sum_{x=1}^d \tilde{\beta}_x^j |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes \tau_C^j. \quad (75)$$

for some $\sigma_A^i, \tau_C^j \geq 0$ and $\text{tr}(\sigma_A^i) = \text{tr}(\tau_C^j) = 1$. This requires $\beta_x^i \geq 0$ and $\tilde{\beta}_x^j \geq 0$. If σ_{AB} and τ_{BC} are compatible in B then we have that

$$\rho_B = \sum_{x=1}^d \rho_{B,x} |x\rangle\langle x|, \quad \rho_{B,x} = \sum_{i=1}^q \beta_x^i = \sum_{j=1}^r \tilde{\beta}_x^j, \forall x. \quad (76)$$

Now we can introduce β_x^{ij} such that $\sum_j \beta_x^{ij} = \beta_x^i$ and $\sum_i \beta_x^{ij} = \tilde{\beta}_x^j$. Then we can choose

$$\beta_x^{ij} = \begin{cases} \beta_x^i \tilde{\beta}_x^j, & \text{if } \rho_{B,x} \neq 0. \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (77)$$

Then we can construct the tripartite state

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{ABC} &= \sum_{ij} \sigma_A^i \otimes \sum_x \beta_x^{ij} |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes \tau_C^j, \\ &= \sum_{i,j,x} \beta_x^{ij} \left(\sigma_A^i \otimes |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes \tau_C^j \right).\end{aligned}\quad (78)$$

which is a valid density operator since this is a convex mixture of unit-trace, positive semidefinite operators.

The result can be easily extended to the multipartite case for marginal states that form a tree graph and where all overlapping subsystems are classical.

Supplementary Note 8. UNIQUENESS OF SYMMETRIC EXTENSIONS FOR THE CHOI STATES OF SELF-COMPLEMENTARY QUBIT OPERATIONS

Here we will prove that the Choi state of a qubit self-complementary operation in Eq. (57) has a unique and pure symmetric extension. Our approach will be to consider an arbitrary qubit tripartite state $\rho_{ABC} = \sum_i c_i |\Psi_i\rangle\langle\Psi_i|$ and determine the form the eigenstates $|\Psi_i\rangle$ must take to produce the correct marginals in AB and AC.

It is useful to observe that Eq. (57) can be written as $\sigma_{AB} = |\varphi_0\rangle\langle\varphi_0| + |\varphi_1\rangle\langle\varphi_1|$ where

$$|\varphi_0\rangle = a_0|00\rangle + \frac{b}{\sqrt{2}}|11\rangle, \quad |\varphi_1\rangle = a_1 e^{it}|01\rangle + \frac{b}{\sqrt{2}}|10\rangle,\quad (79)$$

are the unnormalized eigenvectors. This means we may examine separately the contributions to σ_{AB} in the orthogonal subspaces $\mathcal{V}_0 = \text{span}\{|00\rangle, |11\rangle\}$ and $\mathcal{V}_1 = \text{span}\{|01\rangle, |10\rangle\}$.

First, let us consider the contribution from \mathcal{V}_0 to the AC marginal state. It has the general form

$$\alpha_0|000\rangle + \beta_0|101\rangle + \alpha_1|010\rangle + \beta_1|111\rangle,\quad (80)$$

where to match $|\varphi_0\rangle$ after we trace out system B, we require

$$a_0^2 = \alpha_0^2 + \alpha_1^2 = \|\vec{\alpha}\|^2, \quad \frac{b^2}{2} = \beta_0^2 + \beta_1^2 = \|\vec{\beta}\|^2,\quad (81)$$

where $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1)$ and $\vec{\beta} = (\beta_0, \beta_1)$. We see that

$$\frac{a_0 b}{\sqrt{2}} = \alpha_0^* \beta_0 + \alpha_1^* \beta_1 = \langle \vec{\alpha}, \vec{\beta} \rangle.\quad (82)$$

This means that $\vec{\alpha}$ and $\vec{\beta}$ saturate the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\left| \langle \vec{\alpha}, \vec{\beta} \rangle \right|^2 = \|\vec{\alpha}\|^2 \|\vec{\beta}\|^2,\quad (83)$$

which implies that $\vec{\alpha}$ and $\vec{\beta}$ must be linearly dependent, i.e., $\gamma = \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_0} = \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_0}$. This suggests that the contribution should have the form $\alpha_0(|000\rangle + \gamma|010\rangle) + \beta_0(|101\rangle + \gamma|111\rangle)$. However, since the AB and AC must be the same state, we need to add terms to make it symmetric with respect to B and C:

$\alpha_0(|000\rangle + \gamma|010\rangle + \gamma|001\rangle) + \beta_0(|101\rangle + |110\rangle + \gamma|111\rangle)$. Finally, we notice this is a superposition of terms with and without the factor γ that can be independent, so the contributions from \mathcal{V}_0 have the form

$$\begin{aligned}|\Psi_0\rangle &\in \{\alpha_0|000\rangle + \beta_0(|101\rangle + |110\rangle), \\ &\quad \alpha_0(|010\rangle + |001\rangle) + \beta_0|111\rangle\}.\end{aligned}\quad (84)$$

Next we consider the contribution from \mathcal{V}_1 . But we observe that $|\varphi_1\rangle$ essentially has the same form as $|\varphi_0\rangle$ so we can make the same argument just by substituting

$$(|00\rangle, |11\rangle, a_0, \alpha_0, \beta_0, \gamma) \mapsto (|01\rangle, |10\rangle, a_1 e^{it}, \alpha_1, \beta_1, \delta).\quad (85)$$

Thus, the contribution from \mathcal{V}_1 can be immediately written as

$$\begin{aligned}|\Psi_1\rangle &\in \{\alpha_1|011\rangle + \beta_1(|101\rangle + |110\rangle), \\ &\quad \alpha_1(|010\rangle + |001\rangle) + \beta_1|100\rangle\}.\end{aligned}\quad (86)$$

Now we will combine the contributions from \mathcal{V}_0 and \mathcal{V}_1 . Observe that the respective first states in Eq. (84) and Eq. (86) have a common term ($|110\rangle + |101\rangle$). This term needs $|000\rangle$ and $|011\rangle$ to produce the correct marginals in \mathcal{V}_0 and \mathcal{V}_1 , respectively. This suggests that they should appear together and with $\beta_0 = \beta_1$ we have the candidate eigenstate

$$|\Psi\rangle = \alpha_0|000\rangle + \alpha_1|011\rangle + \beta_0(|110\rangle + |101\rangle)\quad (87)$$

similarly, by taking the respective second states in Eq. (84) and Eq. (86), we see that they share the term ($|101\rangle + |001\rangle$). This term needs $|111\rangle$ and $|100\rangle$ to produce the correct marginals in \mathcal{V}_0 and \mathcal{V}_1 , respectively. This gives the other candidate eigenstate

$$|\bar{\Psi}\rangle = \alpha'_0(|101\rangle + |001\rangle) + \beta'_0|111\rangle + \beta'_1|100\rangle).\quad (88)$$

At this point, the global state is in $\text{span}\{|\Psi\rangle, |\bar{\Psi}\rangle\}$, so the only two eigenstates can be written as $|\Psi_1\rangle = \mu|\Psi\rangle + \nu|\bar{\Psi}\rangle$ and $|\Psi_2\rangle = \nu|\Psi\rangle - \mu|\bar{\Psi}\rangle$, where $|\mu|^2 + |\nu|^2 = 1$. We first consider when the global state is rank-2: $\rho_{ABC} = c|\Psi_1\rangle\langle\Psi_1| + (1-c)|\Psi_2\rangle\langle\Psi_2|$, $c \in (0, 1)$. To satisfy $\text{tr}(\sigma_{AB}|10\rangle\langle 10|) = \text{tr}(\sigma_{AB}|11\rangle\langle 11|)$, we have $\beta'_0 = \beta'_1$. Here we define

$$\tilde{\rho}_{AB} = \text{tr}_C(\rho_{ABC}) = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\rho}_{11} & \tilde{\rho}_{12} & \tilde{\rho}_{13} & \tilde{\rho}_{14} \\ \tilde{\rho}_{21} & \tilde{\rho}_{22} & \tilde{\rho}_{23} & \tilde{\rho}_{24} \\ \tilde{\rho}_{31} & \tilde{\rho}_{32} & \tilde{\rho}_{33} & \tilde{\rho}_{34} \\ \tilde{\rho}_{41} & \tilde{\rho}_{42} & \tilde{\rho}_{43} & \tilde{\rho}_{44} \end{pmatrix},\quad (89)$$

Looking at the subspace spanned by $|01\rangle$ and $|10\rangle$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\rho}_{22} &= |\vec{v}_1|^2, & \tilde{\rho}_{23} &= \vec{v}_1 \cdot \vec{v}_2^*, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{32} &= \vec{v}_1^* \cdot \vec{v}_2, & \tilde{\rho}_{33} &= |\vec{v}_2|^2,\end{aligned}\quad (90)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 &= \left(\alpha'_0 \sqrt{(1-c)|\mu|^2 + c|\nu|^2}, \alpha_1 \sqrt{c|\mu|^2 + (1-c)|\nu|^2} \right)^\top, \\ v_2 &= \left(\beta'_0 \sqrt{(1-c)|\mu|^2 + c|\nu|^2}, \beta_0 \sqrt{c|\mu|^2 + (1-c)|\nu|^2} \right)^\top. \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

However, comparing this with the corresponding sub-matrix in σ_{AB} , the two vectors should saturate the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, which implies $v_1 = \eta v_2$ for some constant η . Thus, we have $\frac{\alpha'_0}{\beta'_0} = \frac{\alpha_1}{\beta_0}$. Similarly for the subspace spanned by $|00\rangle$

and $|11\rangle$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_{11} &= |\vec{v}_3|^2, & \tilde{\rho}_{14} &= \vec{v}_3 \cdot \vec{v}_4^*, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{41} &= \vec{v}_3^* \cdot \vec{v}_4, & \tilde{\rho}_{44} &= |\vec{v}_4|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} v_3 &= \left(\alpha'_0 \sqrt{(1-c)|\mu|^2 + c|\nu|^2}, \alpha_0 \sqrt{c|\mu|^2 + (1-c)|\nu|^2} \right)^\top, \\ v_4 &= \left(\beta'_0 \sqrt{(1-c)|\mu|^2 + c|\nu|^2}, \beta_0 \sqrt{c|\mu|^2 + (1-c)|\nu|^2} \right)^\top, \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

so $\frac{\alpha'_0}{\beta'_0} = \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0}$. However, this means $\alpha_0 = \alpha_1$, which will imply that $\tilde{\rho}_{11} = \tilde{\rho}_{22}$. However, this means that $|a_0| = |a_1|$ and this leads to a separable σ_{AB} . Therefore, for entangled σ_{AB} , the global state cannot be rank-2. For all the possible rank-1 global states $\rho_{ABC} = |\Psi_1\rangle\langle\Psi_1|$, we can use the same argument above (setting $c = 1$) to exclude the situation when $\nu \neq 0$. As a result, $\rho_{ABC} = |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$ is the unique global state.