# Measurement-Device-Independent Quantum Secret Sharing Networks with Linear Bell-State Analysis

Tianqi Liu,<sup>1</sup> Jiancheng Lai,<sup>1,2</sup> Zhenhua Li,<sup>1,2</sup> and Tao Li<sup>1,2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>MIIT Key Laboratory of Semiconductor Microstructure and Quantum sensing,

School of Physics, Nanjing University of Science and Technology, Nanjing 210094, China

<sup>2</sup>Engineering Research Center of Semiconductor Device Optoelectronic

Hybrid Integration in Jiangsu Province, Nanjing 210094, China

(Dated: November 1, 2024)

Quantum secret sharing (QSS) plays a pivotal role in multiparty quantum communication, ensuring the secure distribution of private information among multiple parties. However, the security of QSS schemes can be compromised by attacks exploiting imperfections in measurement devices. Here, we propose a reconfigurable approach to implement QSS based on measurement-device-independent (MDI) principles, utilizing linear two-photon Bell state analysis. By employing single-qubit conjugate operations for encoding private information, our approach offers reconfigurability, allowing for the inclusion of additional quantum network nodes without sacrificing efficiency. Furthermore, we demonstrate the robust security of our MDI-QSS scheme against inter-eavesdropping by dishonest participants and establish lower bounds for secure communication among three legitimate parties. This work presents a flexible configuration for implementing multiparty secure quantum communication with imperfect measurement devices and represents a significant advancement in the development of secure quantum communication technologies.

### I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum communication utilizes quantum physical principles to provide unconditional security for communicating parties [1]. Quantum key distribution (QKD) [2–6] and quantum secure direct communication (QSDC) [7– 12] are two prominent frameworks that enable point-topoint quantum communication and have demonstrated remarkable performance in practical applications [13–19]. In contrast, quantum secret sharing (QSS) is a multiparty quantum communication protocol [20-27] that enables the secure distribution of a secret among multiple parties, allowing only a designated subset of these parties, when collaborating, to reconstruct the secret [28-37]. However, the practical implementation of quantum communication protocols is often vulnerable to side-channel attacks due to imperfect apparatuses [38], particularly in scenarios where the trustworthiness of measurement devices cannot always be guaranteed [39–43]. These vulnerabilities represent a significant threat to the security of real-world quantum communication.

Measurement-device-independent (MDI) quantum communication [38] addresses this challenge and closes all potential loopholes for side-channel attacks by using postselected entanglement. It is initially introduced to implement MDI QKD protocols [44–48] and then extended to perform MDI-QSDC protocols [49– 52] for directly transmitting private information over quantum channels. MDI-QSS protocols [53–59] ensure the security of the secret sharing process among multiple parties by postselecting multiphoton Greenberger–Horne–Zeilinger (GHZ) states [60–62] and their security is independent of the results of the measurement devices involved. The essential building block of MDI quantum communication is entangled state analysis [63–65], which consisting of linear optical elements and single-photon detectors with an upper bound probability of  $1/2^{(n-1)}$  for implementing a GHZ-state analyzer (GSA) [66–68]. While the probability can, in principle, be improved to unity [69] when complex deterministic interfaces between single photons and individual atoms are used [70–72].

Here, we present a scalable and secure MDI-QSS protocol that uses a two-photon Bell-state analyzer (BSA) [63– [65] rather than multiphoton GSAs [66-68], which involve the interference of multiple photons generated by different sources [73–75]. Our protocol takes entangled photon pairs as data buses, with all communicating parties randomly performing two pairs of conjugate unitary operations on photons arriving at their nodes. Based on the BSA results broadcast by an untrusted ancillary node, a designated subset of legitimate parties can share private secrets using practical measurement devices. Furthermore, we demonstrate the security of our MDI-QSS protocol by using the Holevo theorem [76] and present analytical QSS generation rates for implementing a threeparty MDI-QSS protocol. Our MDI-QSS protocol provides a flexible configuration for implementing multiparty quantum communication networks and represents a significant advancement in the development of robust quantum communication technologies.

## **II. PROTOCOL DESCRIPTION**

The schematic of our MDI-QSS protocol for three parties is shown in Fig. 1 and consists of four individual nodes. Alice, Bob, and Charlie can share private infor-

<sup>\*</sup> tao.li@njust.edu.cn

2

mation with the help of an untrusted node, David. Alice randomly prepares photon pairs in one of four Bell states in two conjugate bases and sends two photons of each pair to Bob and Charlie. They perform four unitary operations, exchanging the state of photon pairs in the four Bell states, and send the photons to David for Bell-state measurements using a BSA [38]. In practice, the BSA can be constructed using linear optical elements and singlephoton detectors and distinguish two Bell states [44–47]. Based on the results of the BSA, Alice, Bob, and Charlie can share private information by postselecting cases that lead to a deterministic result of the BSM. Specifically, the MDI-QSS protocol is carried out in the following steps.

(1) Alice prepares entangled photon pairs in the Bell state  $|\psi^+\rangle = (|HV\rangle + |VH\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$  and then randomly evolves them into one of four Bell states, across two conjugate bases with

$$\begin{split} \left|\psi^{\pm}\right\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\left|HV\right\rangle \pm \left|VH\right\rangle),\\ \left|\varphi^{\pm}\right\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\left|HV\right\rangle \pm i\left|VH\right\rangle). \end{split} \tag{1}$$

This can be achieved by passing the photons through wave-plate (WP) units that are tuned to introduce one of the following local operations

$$U_{00} = |H\rangle \langle H| + |V\rangle \langle V|,$$
  

$$U_{01} = |H\rangle \langle H| - |V\rangle \langle V|,$$
  

$$U_{10} = |H\rangle \langle H| + i |V\rangle \langle V|,$$
  

$$U_{11} = |H\rangle \langle H| - i |V\rangle \langle V|.$$
(2)

The operator  $U_{ab}$  exchanges the states within the same basis,  $|\psi^{\pm}\rangle \leftrightarrow |\psi^{\mp}\rangle$  and  $|\varphi^{\pm}\rangle \leftrightarrow |\varphi^{\mp}\rangle$ , for a = 0, and changes the states into the other basis,  $|\psi^{\pm}\rangle \leftrightarrow |\varphi^{\pm}\rangle$  and  $|\varphi^{\pm}\rangle \leftrightarrow |\psi^{\pm}\rangle$ , for a = 1, while the superscript flips for b = 1 and remains unchanged for b = 0. Subsequently, Alice sends two photons of each entangled pair to Bob and Charlie.

(2) Bob and Charlie randomly encode information on the photon pairs by directing photons arriving at their nodes into WP units, which implement one of the four local operations  $U_{ab}$ , as shown in Eq. (2). For simplicity, we use a pair of binary  $\{a_i, b_i\}$ , where the subscript i = A, B, and C distinguishes the operations performed by Alice, Bob, and Charlie, respectively. Therefore,  $U_{ab}$ for  $a_i = 1$  transforms the state from one basis into another, while  $U_{ab}$  for  $b_i = 1$  modifies the superscripts, as illustrated at Alice's node. After both parties have completed encoding, they send their photons to the untrusted party David for measuring each photon pair in the Bell-state basis.

(3) David measures the received photon pairs using a BSA composed of linear optical elements and singlephoton detectors [44–47]. The BSA is configured to deterministically distinguish  $|\psi^+\rangle$  and  $|\psi^-\rangle$ , while producing unbiased outcomes for photon pairs in Bell states  $|\varphi^{\pm}\rangle$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\varphi^{+}\right\rangle &= \frac{1+i}{2}\left|\psi^{+}\right\rangle + \frac{1-i}{2}\left|\psi^{-}\right\rangle, \\ \left|\varphi^{-}\right\rangle &= \frac{1-i}{2}\left|\psi^{+}\right\rangle + \frac{1+i}{2}\left|\psi^{-}\right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$
(3)

Subsequently, David publicly discloses the results of the BSA.

(4) After receiving the measurement results, Alice randomly selects  $n_s$  photon pairs as samples and publicly discloses their positions. Subsequently, Bob and Charlie randomly disclose the corresponding  $\{a_B, b_B\}$  and  $\{a_C, b_C\}$  in any order they choose. Alice discards all data  $a_A \oplus a_B \oplus a_C = 1$ , and then analyzes the error rate of the remaining data to detect potential eavesdropping in the MDI-QSS protocol. If the error rate exceeds a predefined threshold, communication is immediately terminated. Otherwise, the protocol proceeds to the next process. In the ideal scenario, the correlations of the entangled states prepared by Alice, the encoding operations performed by Bob and Charlie, and the BSA results disclosed by David are shown in Tables I and II. The BSA results for cases where  $a_A \oplus a_B \oplus a_C = 1$  are denoted by "-" and should be discarded in subsequent analyses.



FIG. 1. Schematic of our three-party MDI-QSS protocol. WP denotes a waveplate unite. BS denotes a balanced beam splitter, while PBS denotes a polarizing beam splitter that transmits (reflects) photons in state  $|H\rangle$  ( $|V\rangle$ ).  $D_i$ (i = 1, 2, 3, 4) denotes a practical single-photon detector.

TABLE I. BSA results versus operations performed by Bob and Charlie when Alice prepares Bell states  $|\psi^{\pm}\rangle$  with  $U_{0_A 0_A}$ and  $U_{0_A 1_A}$ .

	$U_{0_{B}0_{B}}$	$U_{0_B 1_B}$	$U_{1_B 0_B}$	$U_{1_B 1_B}$
$U_{0_{C}0_{C}}$	$\left \psi^{\pm}\right\rangle$	$\left \psi^{\mp}\right\rangle$	_	_
$U_{0_C 1_C}$	$ \psi^{\mp}\rangle$	$\left \psi^{\pm}\right\rangle$	_	_
$U_{1_{C}0_{C}}$	_	_	$\left \psi^{\pm}\right\rangle$	$ \psi^{\mp}\rangle$
$U_{1_{C}1_{C}}$	_	_	$\left \psi^{\mp}\right\rangle$	$\left \psi^{\pm}\right\rangle$

(5) After the security check, Alice will request that Bob and Charlie publicly disclose the complete public keys of the remaining  $n - n_s$  photons and discard all data that do not satisfy  $a_A \oplus a_B \oplus a_C = 1$ . At this stage,

TABLE II. BSM results versus operations performed by Bob and Charlie when Alice prepares Bell states  $|\varphi^{\pm}\rangle$  with  $U_{1_A 0_A}$ and  $U_{1_A 1_A}$ .

	$U_{0_{B}0_{B}}$	$U_{0_B 1_B}$	$U_{1_B 0_B}$	$U_{1_B 1_B}$
$U_{0_{C}0_{C}}$	-	-	$\left \psi^{\mp}\right\rangle$	$\left \psi^{\pm}\right\rangle$
$U_{0_{C}1_{C}}$	-	-	$\left \psi^{\pm}\right\rangle$	$\left \psi^{\mp}\right\rangle$
$U_{1_C 0_C}$	$\left \psi^{\pm}\right\rangle$	$\left \psi^{\mp}\right\rangle$	_	_
$U_{1_C 1_C}$	$\left \psi^{\mp}\right\rangle$	$\left \psi^{\pm}\right\rangle$	_	_

the three parties will generate a key string of approximately length  $(n - n_s)/2$ . Subsequently, post-processing techniques, such as error correction and privacy amplification [38], are applied to obtain the final key.

#### III. SECURITY ANALYSIS

In this section, we present the security analysis of our MDI-QSS protocol. We provide the upper bound on the amount of information that can be obtained by an eavesdropper using collective attacks and present the QSS generation rate for practical parameters. We consider a potentially stronger internal eavesdropping scenario, assuming that one party, Bob, is dishonest and attempts to obtain private information by eavesdropping on the quantum channel. For simplicity, we disregard Bob and assume that he only implements the operation  $U_{00}$ , since he is dishonest and shares his operational information with Eve.

In our MDI-QSS protocol, Alice randomly prepares each photon pair in one of the four Bell states, as shown in Eq. (1), with an equal probability as the data bus to connect all nodes for secret sharing. Consequently, each photon pair prepared by Alice can be regarded as being in a mixed state [77]

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2} (|\psi^{+}\rangle \langle \psi^{+}| + |\psi^{-}\rangle \langle \psi^{-}|) = \frac{1}{2} (|\varphi^{+}\rangle \langle \varphi^{+}| + |\varphi^{-}\rangle \langle \varphi^{-}|),$$
(4)

with the two photons sent to Bob and Charlie, respectively.

Considering a collective attack, the most general quantum operation that Eve can perform on the forward channel from Alice to Charlie involves a joint operation  $U_C$ on the photons and an ancillary  $|\varepsilon\rangle$  belonging to Eve [38]. The combined system, consisting of the photons and the ancilla, evolves into

$$\rho^{AE} = U_C(\rho \otimes |\varepsilon\rangle \langle \varepsilon|) U_C^{\dagger}. \tag{5}$$

Then, Eve forwards the photon to Charlie while keeping the ancilla. After receiving the photon, Charlie randomly encodes it with one of four  $U_{a_Cb_C}$  operations, each with equal probability p = 0.25. After both parties have completed their encoding operations, the combined system consisting of the photon pair and the ancilla evolves into

$$\rho^{ACE} = \frac{1}{4} (\rho_{00}^{AE} + \rho_{01}^{AE} + \rho_{10}^{AE} + \rho_{11}^{AE}), \qquad (6)$$

where we have omitted the identity operation  $U_{0_B0_B}$  and the subsubscript of  $\rho_{ab}^{AE} = U_{a_Cb_C}U_C(\rho \otimes |\varepsilon\rangle \langle \varepsilon|)U_C^{\dagger}U_{a_Cb_C}^{\dagger}$ , for simplicity of notations. According to Tables I and II, only cases where  $a_A \oplus a_C = 0$  and  $a_B = 0$  contribute to the key generation. When Charlie applies the operation  $U_{00}$  or  $U_{01}$ , the photon pair state is considered to be in the X-basis  $\rho = (|\psi^+\rangle \langle \psi^+| + |\psi^-\rangle \langle \psi^-|)/2$ . Conversely, when Charlie applies the operation  $U_{10}$  or  $U_{11}$ , the photon pair is considered to be in the Y-basis  $\rho = (|\varphi^+\rangle \langle \varphi^+| + |\varphi^-\rangle \langle \varphi^-|)/2$ .

The upper bound on the mutual information between Alice and Eve can be obtained by the Holevo theorem [76] and is described as

$$I(A:E) \le \max_{\{U\}} \{ S(\rho^{ACE}) - \frac{1}{4} S(\rho^{AE}_{00}) - \frac{1}{4} S(\rho^{AE}_{00}) - \frac{1}{4} S(\rho^{AE}_{01}) - \frac{1}{4} S(\rho^{AE}_{11}) - \frac{1}{4} S(\rho^{AE}_{11}) \},$$
(7)

where  $S(\rho) = -\text{Tr}(\rho \log_2 \rho)$  denotes the von Neumann entropy. Furthermore, the maximum mutual information between Alice and Eve, as shown in the Appendix, can be specified as

$$I(A:E) \le Q_{\text{Eve}} h(e_x + e_y),\tag{8}$$

where  $h(x) = -x \log_2 x - (1-x) \log_2(1-x)$  is the binary Shannon entropy,  $e_x(e_y)$  is the bit flip error in the X(Y) basis, corresponding to the probability that a photon pair, prepared by Alice in the Bell state  $|\psi^{\pm}\rangle (|\varphi^{\pm}\rangle)$ , flips to the Bell state  $|\psi^{\mp}\rangle (|\varphi^{\mp}\rangle)$  when reaching Charlie's node,  $Q_{\text{Eve}}$  represents the maximum probability that Eve can access to the photon pairs.

For an error rate e occurring during photon pair transmission and measurement processes, thereby violating the correlations outlined in Tables I and II, the final QSS generation rate for three parties can be described as

$$R = I(A : BC) - I(A : E) = Q[1 - h(e)] - Q_{\text{Eve}}h(e_x + e_y),$$
(9)

where Q represents the probability that the photon pairs produced by Alice reach David's node and are successfully click the single-photon detectors there. In the ideal scenario,  $Q = Q_{\text{Eve}} = 1$  can be achieved under the assumption of perfect quantum channels and flawless single-photon detectors. However, in practical applications, inherent imperfections, such as photon loss during channel transmission and the non-unity efficiency of single-photon detectors, must be considered.

The success of the BSA applied on two photons in node David is heralded by the simultaneous click of two singlephoton detectors. The loss of either photon leads to an erroneous response of the detectors, thereby preventing the key generation among three communication parties. The efficiency to generate a 1-bit key with the transmission of a single photon pair is

$$\eta_0 = \eta_t^4 \eta_d^2 \eta_D, \tag{10}$$

where  $\eta_d$  denotes the efficiency of the single-photon detectors,  $\eta_D$  denotes the internal efficiency of David's apparatus, and  $\eta_t$  denotes the photon transmission efficiency, i.e.,  $\eta_t = 10^{-\alpha L/10}$ . Here  $\alpha$  denotes the channel loss rate, and L is the channel length, assumed to be equal for the four quantum channels. Therefore, we can take  $Q = Q_{\text{Eve}} = \eta_0$  for practical analysis.

The relationship between the error rates e,  $e_x$ , and  $e_y$  can be expressed as follows:

$$e = e_x(1 - e_x) + \frac{1}{2}e_y(1 - e_x) + \frac{1}{2}(1 - e_y)e_x$$
  
=  $\frac{3}{2}e_x + \frac{1}{2}e_y - e_x^2 - e_xe_y,$  (11)

where an error in the X-basis or Y-basis during transmission from Alice to Bob and Charlie, followed by an X-basis error, leads to a correct BSA result, while an error in the X-basis or Y-basis contributes to e. For unbiased error rates with  $e_x = e_y$ , the overall error rate of the system simplifies to

$$e = 2e_x(1 - e_x).$$
 (12)

The QSS generation rate of our MDI-QSS protocol, after inserting Eq. (12), can be expressed as

$$R = Q[1 - h(e) - h(1 - \sqrt{1 - 2e})], \qquad (13)$$

which, as a function of the communication distance L for three different error rates, is shown in Fig. 2. Here, we assume that the internal efficiency of David's apparatus is  $\eta_D = 93\%$ , the efficiency of the detectors is  $\eta_d = 87.63\%$ , and the loss rate of the fiber is  $\alpha = 0.19$  dB/km for a telecommunication wavelength of around 1550 nm. The QSS generation rate R decays exponentially with an increasing communication distance. However, larger fidelity with a lower error rate always yields a larger R. For a threshold channel fidelity of  $P_{\rm th} = 0.943$ , the QSS generation rate is R = 0, indicating that the three communication parties can share a private key through channels with fidelities larger than  $P_{\rm th}$ .

In the previous discussion, the influence of the dark count of single-photon detectors was neglected. In fact, two types of dark counts contribute to the error rate: (I) two of the four single-photon detectors simultaneously click due to the dark counts, and the BSM result aligns with the correlation described in Tables I and II; (II) one detector clicks due to a dark count rather than being triggered by the expected photon. Therefore, the additional error rates introduced by dark counts are

$$e_{d_1} = 4p_d^2(1-p_d)^2,$$
  

$$e_{d_2} = 4\eta_t^2\eta_D\eta_d p_d(1-p_d)^2(1-\eta_t^2\eta_d),$$
 (14)



FIG. 2. QSS generation rate R versus the communication distance L. Here, we set  $\eta_d = 93\%$ ,  $\eta_D = 87.63\%$ ,  $\alpha = 0.19 \text{ dB/km}$ , and P = (1 - e) is the channel fidelity.

where  $p_d$  is the dark-count rate of the single-photon detector, assumed to be identical for four detectors for simplicity. The total error rate  $e_{\text{tot}}$ , considering both dark counts and bit-flip errors e in transmission channels, is

$$e_{\text{tot}} = \frac{e_{d_1} + 0.5e_{d_2} + eQ}{e_{d_1} + e_{d_2} + Q}.$$
(15)

The modified QSS generation rate of our MDI-QSS protocol can be obtained by substituting e in Eq. (13) with  $e_{\text{tot}}$ . The modified QSS generation rate R as a function of the communication distance is shown in Fig. 3, where we assume a practical dark count rate of  $p_d = 10^{-7}$ , and the other parameters are P = 0.99,  $\eta_D = 93\%$ ,  $\eta_d = 87.63\%$ , and  $\alpha = 0.19$  dB/km [15, 37, 58]. The communication distance L reaches its limit at approximately 164 km, as shown by the dash-dotted curve in Fig. 3.

The preceding analysis assumes that the four quantum channels connecting Alice and David, mediated by Bob and Charlie, are of equal length L. For a modified communication framework, in which nodes Bob and Charlie are closer to node David, the channel losses in these two channels can thus be neglected. The dark count rate of  $e_{d_2}$  is modified to  $e'_{d_2} = 4\eta_t\eta_D\eta_dp_d(1-p_d)^2(1-\eta_t\eta_d)$ , while  $e_{d_1}$  remains unchanged. The QSS generation rate can be calculated accordingly and the maximum transmission distance extends further to approach 327 km, as shown by the solid curve in Fig. 3.

#### IV. DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

In our work, we use an entangled photon pair as a data bus connecting all communicating parties, who randomly perform two pairs of conjugate unitary operations to participate in the MDI-QSS protocol. The communication distance of our protocol can, in principle, be extended by incorporating quantum memories [78, 79] to eliminate



FIG. 3. QSS generation rate R of our protocol versus the transmission distance L with dark counts. We set the dark count rate to  $p_d = 10^{-7}$ , the channel fidelity to P = 0.99, and the other parameters are consistent with those used in Fig. 2.

the synchronization required for performing BSAs based on linear optical elements [63–65]. Long-distance MDI-QSS is possible when additional entangled channels are preset and incorporated into our MDI-QSS via quantum repeaters [80–83]. The untrusted measurement device is the BSA rather than the GSA, leading to an upper bound efficiency of 1/2 that is independent of the number of communicating parties, which is significantly important for intra-city multiparty quantum communications. In contrast, the upper bound efficiency of MDI-QSS protocols based on the GSA decreases by 1/2 when an additional party is introduced [53-59]. The number of photons interfering simultaneously at a GSA equals the number of parties [53-59]. This efficiency decrease corresponds to a loss of approximately 3 dB, which, in practice, corresponds to transmitting a photon over a fiber of length 15.8 km with an attenuation coefficient of 0.19 dB/km. Meanwhile, the communication parties can perform the MDI-QSS protocol without the requirement of single-photon state preparation and thus the indistinguishability of these single photons [84–86].

In summary, we have presented an MDI-QSS protocol using two-photon BSA. The parties encode private information by performing conjugate operations on an entangled photon pair instead of preparing single photons in conjugate bases. Our MDI-QSS protocol can therefore be flexibly extended to incorporate more parties without decreasing the efficiency by post-selecting two-photon Bell states with efficiency 1/2, independent of the party number. Furthermore, we have presented the upper bound of the mutual information between the communication parties and the eavesdropper and shown the analytical QSS generation rate among three parties. We believe that the MDI-QSS protocol can contribute significantly to the development of multiparty quantum communication technologies.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grants No. 11904171 and No. 62221004).

#### V. APPENDIX

The upper bound of mutual information between Alice and Eve can be obtained by using the Hovelo theorem [76] and then can be described as

$$\begin{split} I(A:E) &\leq \max_{\{U\}} \{ S(\rho^{ACE}) - \frac{1}{4} S(\rho^{AE}_{00}) - \frac{1}{4} S(\rho^{AE}_{01}) \\ &- \frac{1}{4} S(\rho^{AE}_{10}) - \frac{1}{4} S(\rho^{AE}_{11}) \}, \end{split}$$
(A1)

where  $\rho_{ab}^{AE} = U_{ab}U_C(\rho \otimes |\varepsilon\rangle \langle\varepsilon|)U_C^{\dagger}U_{ab}^{\dagger}$  with different subscripts are determined by the unitary operations  $U_{ab}$ of Charlie, and  $S(\rho^{ACE})$  is the combined state of Alice, Charlie, and Eve, shown in Eq. (6). We have  $S(\rho_{ab}^{AE}) = S(\rho) = 1$  [77], since  $\rho_{ab}^{AE}$  and  $\rho^{AE}$  can be converted to  $\rho \otimes |\varepsilon\rangle \langle\varepsilon|$  by unitary transformations and the von Neumann entropy of  $\rho$ , shown in Eq. (4), is  $S(\rho) = 1$ . Therefore, the mutual information between Alice and Eve can be simplified to

$$I(A:E) \le \max_{\{U\}} \{ S(\rho^{ACE}) \} - 1,$$
 (A2)

which is limited by the density matrix  $\rho^{ACE}$ .

To obtain  $\rho^{ACE}$ , we consider state evolutions of the photons sent to Charlie and express four Bell states, shown in Eq. (1), as follows:

$$\left|\psi^{+}\right\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\left|+\right\rangle_{B}\left|+\right\rangle_{C} - \left|-\right\rangle_{B}\left|-\right\rangle_{C}),\tag{A3a}$$

$$\left|\psi^{-}\right\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(-\left|+\right\rangle_{B}\left|-\right\rangle_{C} + \left|-\right\rangle_{B}\left|+\right\rangle_{C}),\tag{A3b}$$

$$\left|\varphi^{+}\right\rangle = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(\left|+\right\rangle_{B}\left|-i\right\rangle_{C} - \left|-\right\rangle_{B}\left|+i\right\rangle_{C}),\tag{A3c}$$

$$\left|\varphi^{-}\right\rangle = -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(\left|+\right\rangle_{B}\left|+i\right\rangle_{C} - \left|-\right\rangle_{B}\left|-i\right\rangle_{C}),\qquad(A3d)$$

where two basis states in the X-basis and Y-basis are  $|\pm\rangle = (|H\rangle \pm |V\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$  and  $|\pm i\rangle = (|H\rangle \pm i |V\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ , respectively. Meanwhile, Eve's unitary operation  $U_C$  transforms four different states as follows:

$$U_{C} |+\rangle |\varepsilon\rangle = |+\rangle |\varepsilon_{++}\rangle + |-\rangle |\varepsilon_{+-}\rangle, \qquad (A4a)$$

$$U_C \left|-\right\rangle \left|\varepsilon\right\rangle = \left|+\right\rangle \left|\varepsilon_{-+}\right\rangle + \left|-\right\rangle \left|\varepsilon_{--}\right\rangle,$$
 (A4b)

$$U_C |+i\rangle |\varepsilon\rangle = |+i\rangle |\varepsilon_{+y-y}\rangle + |-i\rangle |\varepsilon_{+y+y}\rangle, \qquad (A4c)$$

$$U_C |-i\rangle |\varepsilon\rangle = |+i\rangle |\varepsilon_{-y-y}\rangle + |-i\rangle |\varepsilon_{-y+y}\rangle.$$
 (A4d)

For two quantum states in the X-basis, due to the orthogonality and normalization of unitary transformations, we have the following equations:

$$\langle \varepsilon_{++} | \varepsilon_{++} \rangle + \langle \varepsilon_{+-} | \varepsilon_{+-} \rangle = 1,$$
 (A5a)

$$\langle \varepsilon_{--} | \varepsilon_{--} \rangle + \langle \varepsilon_{-+} | \varepsilon_{-+} \rangle = 1,$$
 (A5b)

$$\langle \varepsilon_{++} | \varepsilon_{-+} \rangle + \langle \varepsilon_{+-} | \varepsilon_{--} \rangle = 0.$$
 (A5c)

Similarly, for two quantum states in the Y-basis, we have

$$\langle \varepsilon_{+y-y} \mid \varepsilon_{+y-y} \rangle + \langle \varepsilon_{+y+y} \mid \varepsilon_{+y+y} \rangle = 1,$$
 (A6a)

$$\langle \varepsilon_{-y+y} \mid \varepsilon_{-y+y} \rangle + \langle \varepsilon_{-y-y} \mid \varepsilon_{-y-y} \rangle = 1,$$
 (A6b)

$$\langle \varepsilon_{+y-y} \mid \varepsilon_{-y-y} \rangle + \langle \varepsilon_{+y+y} \mid \varepsilon_{-y+y} \rangle = 0.$$
 (A6c)

The density matrix  $\rho^{ACE}$  can thus be represented as a mixed state consisting of eight pure quantum states, when Charlie randomly applies four encoding unitary operations  $U_{ab}$  on one photon of the entangled photon pair that are in state  $|\varphi^+\rangle (|\psi^+\rangle)$  or  $|\varphi^-\rangle (|\psi^-\rangle)$  with an equal probability, and can be described as

$$\rho^{ACE} = \sum_{i=0}^{7} p_i |\phi_i\rangle \langle\phi_i|, \qquad (A7)$$

where the state  $|\phi_i\rangle$  for i = 2(2a + b) can be represented as

$$|\phi_i\rangle = \frac{1}{2}U_{ab}U_C(|+\rangle |+\rangle_C - |-\rangle |-\rangle_C) |\varepsilon\rangle, \qquad (A8)$$

while the state  $|\phi_i\rangle$  for i = 2(2a+b)+1 can be represented as

$$|\phi_i\rangle = \frac{1}{2} U_{ab} U_C(-|+\rangle |-\rangle_C + |-\rangle |+\rangle_C) |\varepsilon\rangle.$$
 (A9)

$$|\phi_{0}\rangle = \frac{1}{2}[|+\rangle (|+\rangle_{C} |\varepsilon_{++}\rangle + |-\rangle_{C} |\varepsilon_{+-}\rangle) - |-\rangle (|+\rangle_{C} |\varepsilon_{-+}\rangle + |-\rangle_{C} |\varepsilon_{--}\rangle)], \qquad (A10a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_1\rangle &= -\frac{1}{2} [|+\rangle \left(|+\rangle_C |\varepsilon_{-+}\rangle + |-\rangle_C |\varepsilon_{--}\rangle \right) \\ &+ |-\rangle \left(|+\rangle_C |\varepsilon_{++}\rangle + |-\rangle_C |\varepsilon_{+-}\rangle \right)], \end{aligned}$$
(A10b)

$$|\phi_{2}\rangle = \frac{1}{2}[|+\rangle (|-\rangle_{C} |\varepsilon_{++}\rangle + |+\rangle_{C} |\varepsilon_{+-}\rangle) - |-\rangle (|-\rangle_{C} |\varepsilon_{-+}\rangle + |+\rangle_{C} |\varepsilon_{--}\rangle)], \qquad (A10c)$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_{3}\rangle &= -\frac{1}{2}[|+\rangle \left(|-\rangle_{C} |\varepsilon_{-+}\rangle + |+\rangle_{C} |\varepsilon_{--}\rangle\right) \\ &+ |-\rangle \left(|-\rangle_{C} |\varepsilon_{++}\rangle + |+\rangle_{C} |\varepsilon_{+-}\rangle\right)], \end{aligned}$$
(A10d)

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_4\rangle &= \frac{1}{2} [|+\rangle \left(|-\rangle_C |\varepsilon_{-y-y}\rangle + |+\rangle_C |\varepsilon_{-y+y}\rangle \right) \\ &- |-\rangle \left(|-\rangle_C |\varepsilon_{+y-y}\rangle + |+\rangle_C |\varepsilon_{+y+y}\rangle \right)], \quad (A10e) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_5\rangle &= -\frac{1}{2}[|+\rangle \left(|-\rangle_C \left|\varepsilon_{+y-y}\right\rangle + |+\rangle_C \left|\varepsilon_{+y+y}\right\rangle\right) \\ &+ |-\rangle \left(|-\rangle_C \left|\varepsilon_{-y-y}\right\rangle + |+\rangle_C \left|\varepsilon_{-y+y}\right\rangle\right)], \end{aligned}$$
(A10f)

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_{6}\rangle &= \frac{1}{2} [|+\rangle \left(|+\rangle_{C} |\varepsilon_{-y-y}\rangle + |-\rangle_{C} |\varepsilon_{-y+y}\rangle \right) \\ &- |-\rangle \left(|+\rangle_{C} |\varepsilon_{+y-y}\rangle + |-\rangle_{C} |\varepsilon_{+y+y}\rangle \right)], \quad \text{(A10g)} \\ |\phi_{7}\rangle &= -\frac{1}{2} [|+\rangle \left(|+\rangle_{C} |\varepsilon_{+y-y}\rangle + |-\rangle_{C} |\varepsilon_{+y+y}\rangle \right) \\ &+ |-\rangle \left(|+\rangle_{C} |\varepsilon_{-y-y}\rangle + |-\rangle_{C} |\varepsilon_{-y+y}\rangle \right)]. \quad \text{(A10h)} \end{aligned}$$

The corresponding Gram matrix of  $\rho^{ACE}$ , shown in Eq. (A7), with  $G_{ij} = \sqrt{p_i p_j} \langle \phi_i | \phi_j \rangle$ [87], can be explicitly represented as:

	( 2	0	$2\alpha$	$-2\beta$	$1 + \beta - i\alpha$	$-\alpha + i - i\beta$	$\alpha + i - i\beta$	$-1 - \beta - i\alpha$	١.
	0	2	$-2\beta$	$2\alpha$	$-\alpha + i - i\beta$	$1 + \beta - i\alpha$	$-1-\beta-i\alpha$	$\alpha + i - i\beta$	
	$2\alpha$	$-2\beta$	2	0	$\alpha+i-i\beta$	$-1 - \beta - i \alpha$	$1+\beta-i\alpha$	$-\alpha + i - i\beta$	
C = 1	$-2\beta$	$2\alpha$	0	2	$-1 - \beta - i\alpha$	$\alpha + i - i\beta$	$-\alpha + i - i\beta$	$1 + \beta - i\alpha$	
$G = \frac{16}{16}$	$1 + \beta + i\alpha$	$-\alpha - i + i\beta$	$\alpha - i + i\beta$	$-1 - \beta + i\alpha$	2	0	$2\alpha$	$-2\beta$	,
	$-\alpha - i + i\beta$	$1 + \beta + i\alpha$	$-1-\beta+i\alpha$	$\alpha - i + i\beta$	0	2	$-2\beta$	$2\alpha$	
	$\alpha - i + i\beta$	$-1 - \beta + i\alpha$	$1 + \beta + i\alpha$	$-\alpha - i + i\beta$	$2\alpha$	$-2\beta$	2	0	
	$\sqrt{-1-\beta+i\alpha}$	$\alpha - i + i\beta$	$-\alpha - i + i\beta$	$1 + \beta + i\alpha$	$-2\beta$	$2\alpha$	0	2 /	/
								(A11)	

where the auxiliary parameters are  $\alpha = \operatorname{Re}(\langle \varepsilon_{++} | \varepsilon_{+-} \rangle + \langle \varepsilon_{-+} | \varepsilon_{--} \rangle) = 0$  and  $\beta = \operatorname{Re}(\langle \varepsilon_{++} | \varepsilon_{--} \rangle + \langle \varepsilon_{+-} | \varepsilon_{-+} \rangle)$ . The eight eigenvalues of Gram matrix G can be directly obtained by solving the characteristic function  $\det |G - \lambda_i I| = 0$  with I being the  $8 \times 8$  identity matrix, and can be specified as follows:

$$\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = \lambda_4 = 0, \qquad (A12a)$$

$$\lambda_5 = \lambda_6 = \frac{1}{4}(1 - \beta), \qquad (A12b)$$

$$\lambda_7 = \lambda_8 = \frac{1}{4}(1+\beta). \tag{A12c}$$

The von Neumann entropy  $S(\rho^{ACE}) = \sum_{i=1}^{8} \lambda_i \log_2 \lambda_i$ is thus the function of  $\beta$  and is determined by the quantum bit error rates  $e_x$  and  $e_y$  for X-basis and Y-basis states:

$$e_x = \langle \varepsilon_{+-} \mid \varepsilon_{+-} \rangle = \langle \varepsilon_{-+} \mid \varepsilon_{-+} \rangle,$$
 (A13a)

$$e_{y} = \langle \varepsilon_{+y+y} \mid \varepsilon_{+y+y} \rangle = \langle \varepsilon_{-y-y} \mid \varepsilon_{-y-y} \rangle$$
(A13b)

$$= \frac{1}{2} [1 + \operatorname{Re}(\langle \varepsilon_{+-} \mid \varepsilon_{-+} \rangle - \langle \varepsilon_{++} \mid \varepsilon_{--} \rangle)] \quad (A13c)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} [1 - \beta + 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle \varepsilon_{+-} | \varepsilon_{-+} \rangle], \qquad (A13d)$$

According to the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we have  $|\langle \varepsilon_{+-} | \varepsilon_{-+} \rangle|^2 \leq |\langle \varepsilon_{+-} | \varepsilon_{+-} \rangle| |\langle \varepsilon_{-+} | \varepsilon_{-+} \rangle|$ , and then  $-e_x \leq \operatorname{Re}\langle \varepsilon_{+-} | \varepsilon_{-+} \rangle \leq e_x$ , leading to the bounds for  $\beta$  with  $1 - 2e_x - 2e_y \leq \beta \leq 1 + 2e_x - 2e_y$ . Under the condition that guarantees  $e_x + e_y \leq 1/2$ , the maximum von Neumann entropy  $S(\rho^{ACE})_{\text{max}}$  is achieved for

 $\beta = 1 - 2e_x - 2e_y$  with  $S(\rho^{ACE})_{\text{max}} = 1 + h(e_x + e_y)$ . Therefore, the mutual information between Alice and Eve is

$$I(A:E) = h(e_x + e_y), \tag{A14}$$

which decreases the QSS generation rate R, as shown in Eq. (9).

- N. Gisin and R. Thew, Quantum communication, Nature Photon. 1, 165 (2007).
- [2] H.-K. Lo, M. Curty, and K. Tamaki, Secure quantum key distribution, Nature Photon. 8, 595 (2014).
- [3] F. Del Santo and B. Dakić, Two-way communication with a single quantum particle, Phys. Rev. Lett. 120, 060503 (2018).
- [4] T. Shang, Y. Tang, R. Chen, and J. Liu, Full quantum one-way function for quantum cryptography, Quantum Eng. 2, e32 (2020).
- [5] Y.-M. Xie, Y.-S. Lu, C.-X. Weng, X.-Y. Cao, Z.-Y. Jia, Y. Bao, Y. Wang, Y. Fu, H.-L. Yin, and Z.-B. Chen, Breaking the rate-loss bound of quantum key distribution with asynchronous two-photon interference, PRX Quantum 3, 020315 (2022).
- [6] Y. Zhou, R.-Q. Wang, C.-M. Zhang, Z.-Q. Yin, Z.-H. Wang, S. Wang, W. Chen, G.-C. Guo, and Z.-F. Han, Sending-or-not-sending twin-field quantum key distribution with advantage distillation, Phys. Rev. Appl. 21, 014036 (2024).
- [7] G.-L. Long and X.-S. Liu, Theoretically efficient highcapacity quantum-key-distribution scheme, Phys. Rev. A 65, 032302 (2002).
- [8] F.-G. Deng, G. L. Long, and X.-S. Liu, Two-step quantum direct communication protocol using the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen pair block, Phys. Rev. A 68, 042317 (2003).
- [9] J. H. Shapiro, D. M. Boroson, P. B. Dixon, M. E. Grein, and S. A. Hamilton, *Quantum low probability of intercept*, J. Opt. Soc. Am. B **36**, B41 (2019).
- [10] L. Zhou, Y.-B. Sheng, and G.-L. Long, Deviceindependent quantum secure direct communication against collective attacks, Sci. Bull. 65, 12 (2020).
- [11] T. Li and G.-L. Long, Quantum secure direct communication based on single-photon Bell-state measurement, New J. Phys. 22, 063017 (2020).
- [12] Y. B. Sheng, L. Zhou, and G. L. Long, One-step quantum secure direct communication, Sci. Bull. 67, 367 (2022).
- [13] Y.-A. Chen et al., An integrated space-to-ground quantum communication network over 4,600 kilometres, Nature 589, 214 (2021).
- [14] S. Wang et al., Twin-field quantum key distribution over 830-km fibre, Nature Photon. 16, 154 (2022).
- [15] W. Li et al., High-rate quantum key distribution exceeding, Nature Photon. 17, 416 (2023).
- [16] J.-Y. Hu, B. Yu, M.-Y. Jing, L.-T. Xiao, S.-T. Jia, G.-Q. Qin, and G.-L. Long, *Experimental quantum secure direct* communication with single photons, Light Sci. Appl. 5, e16144 (2016).
- [17] W. Zhang, D.-S. Ding, Y.-B. Sheng, L. Zhou, B.-S. Shi, and G.-C. Guo, *Quantum secure direct communication*

with quantum memory, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 220501 (2017).

- [18] F. Massa, A. Moqanaki, A. Baumeler, F. Del Santo, J. A. Kettlewell, B. Dakić, and P. Walther, *Experimental two-way communication with one photon*, Adv. Quantum Technol. 2, 1900050 (2019).
- [19] Z. Qi, Y. Li, Y. Huang, J. Feng, Y. Zheng, and X. Chen, A 15-user quantum secure direct communication network, Light Sci. Appl. 10, 183 (2021).
- [20] M. Hillery, V. Buzek, and A. Berthiaume, *Quantum secret sharing*, Phys. Rev. A 59, 1829 (1999).
- [21] A. Karlsson, M. Koashi, and N. Imoto, *Quantum entan-glement for secret sharing and secret splitting*, Phys. Rev. A 59, 162 (1999).
- [22] R. Cleve, D. Gottesman, and H.-K. Lo, How to share a quantum secret, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 648 (1999).
- [23] L. Xiao, G.-L. Long, F.-G. Deng, and J.-W. Pan, Efficient multiparty quantum-secret-sharing schemes, Phys. Rev. A 69, 052307 (2004).
- [24] Z.-J. Zhang, Y. Li, and Z.-X. Man, Multiparty quantum secret sharing, Phys. Rev. A 71, 044301 (2005).
- [25] Z. J. Zhang and Z. X. Man, Multiparty quantum secret sharing of classical messages based on entanglement swapping, Phys. Rev. A 72, 022303 (2005).
- [26] T. Gao, F.-L. Yan, and Z.-X. Wang, Controlled quantum teleportation and secure direct communication, Chin. Phys. 14, 893 (2005).
- [27] T. Gao, F.-L. Yan, and Z.-X. Wang, Deterministic secure direct communication using GHZ states and swapping quantum entanglement, J. Phys. A 38, 5761 (2005).
- [28] H. Lu, Z. Zhang, L. K. Chen, Z. D. Li, C. Liu, L. Li, N. L. Liu, X. F. Ma, Y. A. Chen, and J. W. Pan, *Secret sharing of a quantum state*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 030501 (2016).
- [29] I. Kogias, Y. Xiang, Q. He, and G. Adesso, Unconditional security of entanglement-based continuous-variable quantum secret sharing, Phys. Rev. A 95, 012315 (2017).
- [30] M. Habibidavijani and B. C. Sanders, Continuousvariable ramp quantum secret sharing with Gaussian states and operations, New J. Phys. 21, 113023 (2019).
- [31] B. P. Williams, J. M. Lukens, N. A. Peters, B. Qi, and W. P. Grice, *Quantum secret sharing with polarizationentangled photon pairs*, Phys. Rev. A **99**, 062311 (2019).
- [32] J. Gu, X. Y. Cao, H. L. Yin, and Z. B. Chen, *Differential phase shift quantum secret sharing using a twin field*, Opt. Express 29, 9165 (2021).
- [33] X. D. Wu, Y. J. Wang, and D. Huang, *Passive continuous-variable quantum secret sharing using a ther-mal source*, Phys. Rev. A **101**, 022301 (2020).
- [34] Y. Ouyang, K. Goswami, J. Romero, B. C. Sanders, M. H. Hsieh, and M. Tomamichel, *Approximate recon-*

- [35] Y. Qin, J. Cheng, J. Ma, D. Zhao, Z. Yan, X. Jia, C. Xie, and K. Peng, *Efficient and secure quantum secret sharing* for eight users, Phys. Rev. Res. 6, 033036 (2024).
- [36] Y. Tian, J. Wang, G. Bian, J. Chang, and J. Li, Dynamic multi-party to multi-party quantum secret sharing based on bell states, Adv. Quantum Technol. 7, 2400116 (2024).
- [37] Y.-R. Xiao, Z.-Y. Jia, Y.-C. Song, Y. Bao, Y. Fu, H.-L. Yin, and Z.-B. Chen, Source-independent quantum secret sharing with entangled photon pair networks, Opt. Lett. 49, 4210 (2024).
- [38] F. Xu, X. Ma, Q. Zhang, H.-K. Lo, and J.-W. Pan, Secure quantum key distribution with realistic devices, Rev. Mod. Phys. 92, 025002 (2020).
- [39] Y.-A. Chen, A.-N. Zhang, Z. Zhao, X.-Q. Zhou, C.-Y. Lu, C.-Z. Peng, T. Yang, and J.-W. Pan, *Experimental quan*tum secret sharing and third-man quantum cryptography, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 200502 (2005).
- [40] C. Schmid, P. Trojek, M. Bourennane, C. Kurtsiefer, M. Żukowski, and H. Weinfurter, *Experimental single qubit quantum secret sharing*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 230505 (2005).
- [41] S. Gaertner, C. Kurtsiefer, M. Bourennane, and H. Weinfurter, Experimental demonstration of four-party quantum secret sharing, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 020503 (2007).
- [42] Y. Y. Zhou, J. Yu, Z. H. Yan, X. J. Jia, J. Zhang, C. D. Xie, and K. C. Peng, *Quantum secret sharing among four players using multipartite bound entanglement of an optical field*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **121**, 150502 (2018).
- [43] A. Shen, X. Y. Cao, Y. Wang, Y. Fu, J. Gu, W. B. Liu, C. X. Weng, H. L. Yin, and Z. B. Chen, *Experimental quantum secret sharing based on phase encoding of coherent states*, Sci. China: Phys. Mech. Astron. 66, 260311 (2023).
- [44] H.-K. Lo, M. Curty, and B. Qi, Measurement-deviceindependent quantum key distribution, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108, 130503 (2012).
- [45] S. L. Braunstein and S. Pirandola, Side-channel-free quantum key distribution, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108, 130502 (2012).
- [46] X. F. Ma and M. Razavi, Alternative schemes for measurement-device-independent quantum key distribution, Phys. Rev. A 86, 062319 (2012).
- [47] F. H. Xu, M. Curty, B. Qi, and H. K. Lo, Practical aspects of measurement-device-independent quantum key distribution, New J. Phys. 15, 113007 (2013).
- [48] M. Sun, C. H. Zhang, H. J. Ding, X. Y. Zhou, J. Li, and Q. Wang, Practical decoy-state memory-assisted measurement-device-independent quantum key distribution, Phys. Rev. Appl. 20, 024029 (2023).
- [49] T. Li, Z. Gao, and Z. Li, Measurement-deviceindependent quantum secure direct communication: Direct quantum communication with imperfect measurement device and untrusted operator, EPL 131, 60001 (2020).
- [50] Z.-R. Zhou, Y.-B. Sheng, P.-H. Niu, L.-G. Yin, G.-L. Long, and L. Hanzo, *Measurement-device-independent* quantum secure direct communication, Sci. China Phys. Mech. Astron. **63**, 230362 (2020).
- [51] Z. Gao, T. Li, and Z. Li, Long-distance measurementdevice-independent quantum secure direct communication, EPL 125, 40004 (2019).

- [52] J. W. Ying, L. Zhou, W. Zhong, and Y. B. Sheng, Measurement-device-independent one-step quantum secure direct communication, Chin. Phys. B **31**, 120303 (2022).
- [53] Y. Fu, H.-L. Yin, T.-Y. Chen, and Z.-B. Chen, Long-distance measurement-device-independent multiparty quantum communication, Phys. Rev. Lett. 114, 090501 (2015).
- [54] Z. Gao, T. Li, and Z. Li, Deterministic measurementdevice-independent quantum secret sharing, Sci. China-Phys. Mech. Astron. 63, 120311 (2020).
- [55] S. Das, S. Bäuml, M. Winczewski, and K. Horodecki, Universal limitations on quantum key distribution over a network, Phys. Rev. X 11, 041016 (2021).
- [56] Y. Wei, S. Wang, Y. Zhu, and T. Li, Sendercontrolled measurement-device-independent multiparty quantum communication, Front. Phys. 17, 21503 (2022).
- [57] X. X. Ju, W. Zhong, Y. B. Sheng, and L. Zhou, Measurement-device-independent quantum secret sharing with hyper-encoding, Chin. Phys. B 31, 100302 (2022).
- [58] C.-L. Li, Y. Fu, W.-B. Liu, Y.-M. Xie, B.-H. Li, M.-G. Zhou, H.-L. Yin, and Z.-B. Chen, Breaking the ratedistance limitation of measurement-device-independent quantum secret sharing, Phys. Rev. Res. 5, 033077 (2023).
- [59] C. Zhang, Q. Zhang, W. Zhong, M.-M. Du, S.-T. Shen, X.-Y. Li, A.-L. Zhang, L. Zhou, and Y.-B. Sheng, Memory-assisted measurement-device-independent quantum secret sharing (2024), arXiv:2405.16970.
- [60] W.-Q. Liu, H.-R. Wei, and L.-C. Kwek, Universal quantum multi-qubit entangling gates with auxiliary spaces, Adv. Quantum Technol. 5, 2100136 (2022).
- [61] H. Zhou, T. Li, and K. Xia, Parallel and heralded multiqubit entanglement generation for quantum networks, Phys. Rev. A 107, 022428 (2023).
- [62] J. Li, Z. Xie, Y. Li, Y. Liang, Z. Li, and T. Li, Heralded entanglement between error-protected logical qubits for fault-tolerant distributed quantum computing, Sci. China-Phys. Mech. Astron. 67, 220311 (2024).
- [63] Y.-B. Sheng, F.-G. Deng, and G. L. Long, Complete hyperentangled-Bell-state analysis for quantum communication, Phys. Rev. A 82, 032318 (2010).
- [64] B.-C. Ren, F.-F. Du, and F.-G. Deng, Hyperentanglement concentration for two-photon four-qubit systems with linear optics, Phys. Rev. A 88, 012302 (2013).
- [65] M. K. Bhaskar et al., Experimental demonstration of memory-enhanced quantum communication, Nature 580, 60 (2020).
- [66] J.-W. Pan and A. Zeilinger, Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger-state analyzer, Phys. Rev. A 57, 2208 (1998).
- [67] C.-Y. Lu, T. Yang, and J.-W. Pan, Experimental multiparticle entanglement swapping for quantum networking, Phys. Rev. Lett. 103, 020501 (2009).
- [68] G. Avis, F. Rozpędek, and S. Wehner, Analysis of multipartite entanglement distribution using a central quantum-network node, Phys. Rev. A 107, 012609 (2023).
- [69] T. Li, A. Miranowicz, K. Xia, and F. Nori, Resourceefficient analyzer of Bell and Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger states of multiphoton systems, Phys. Rev. A 100, 052302 (2019).
- [70] A. Reiserer and G. Rempe, Cavity-based quantum networks with single atoms and optical photons, Rev. Mod. Phys. 87, 1379 (2015).
- [71] T. Li, A. Miranowicz, X. Hu, K. Xia, and F. Nori, Quan-

9

tum memory and gates using a  $\Lambda$ -type quantum emitter coupled to a chiral waveguide, Phys. Rev. A **97**, 062318 (2018).

- [72] H. K. C. Beukers, M. Pasini, H. Choi, D. Englund, R. Hanson, and J. Borregaard, *Remote-entanglement pro*tocols for stationary qubits with photonic interfaces, PRX Quantum 5, 010202 (2024).
- [73] M. Ruf, N. H. Wan, H. Choi, D. Englund, and R. Hanson, Quantum networks based on color centers in diamond, J. Appl. Phys. 130, 070901 (2021).
- [74] C. Zhang, Y. F. Huang, B. H. Liu, C. F. Li, and G. C. Guo, Spontaneous parametric down-conversion sources for multiphoton experiments, Adv. Quantum Technol. 4, 2000132 (2021).
- [75] X. Wang, J. Fu, S. Liu, Y. Wei, and J. Jing, Self-healing of multipartite entanglement in optical quantum networks, Optica 9, 663 (2022).
- [76] A. S. Holevo, Bounds for the quantity of information transmitted by a quantum communication channel, Probl. Peredachi Inf. 9, 3 (1973).
- [77] R. Qi, Z. Sun, Z. Lin, P. Niu, W. Hao, L. Song, Q. Huang, J. Gao, L. Yin, and G.-L. Long, *Implementation and se*curity analysis of practical quantum secure direct communication, Light Sci. Appl. 8, 22 (2019).
- [78] C. M. Knaut et al., Entanglement of nanophotonic quantum memory nodes in a telecom network, Nature 629, 573 (2024).
- [79] Y. Wang, J. Li, S. Zhang, K. Su, Y. Zhou, K. Liao, S. Du, H. Yan, and S. L. Zhu, *Efficient quantum memory for* single-photon polarization qubits, Nat. Photonics 13, 346

(2019).

- [80] K. Azuma, S. E. Economou, D. Elkouss, P. Hilaire, L. Jiang, H.-K. Lo, and I. Tzitrin, *Quantum repeaters: From quantum networks to the quantum internet*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **95**, 045006 (2023).
- [81] W. J. Munro, K. Azuma, K. Tamaki, and K. Nemoto, *Inside quantum repeaters*, IEEE J. Sel. Top. Quant. 21, 6400813 (2015).
- [82] J. Dias, M. S. Winnel, W. J. Munro, T. C. Ralph, and K. Nemoto, *Distributing entanglement in first*generation discrete- and continuous-variable quantum repeaters, Phys. Rev. A **106**, 052604 (2022).
- [83] G.-L. Jiang, J.-B. Yuan, W.-Q. Liu, and H.-R. Wei, Efficient and deterministic high-dimensional controlled-swap gates on hybrid linear optical systems with high fidelity, Phys. Rev. Appl. 21, 014001 (2024).
- [84] A. Hochrainer, M. Lahiri, M. Erhard, M. Krenn, and A. Zeilinger, *Quantum indistinguishability by path identity and with undetected photons*, Rev. Mod. Phys. 94, 025007 (2022).
- [85] J. Tang, L. Tang, H. Wu, Y. Wu, H. Sun, H. Zhang, T. Li, Y. Lu, M. Xiao, and K. Xia, *Towards on-demand heralded single-photon sources via photon blockade*, Phys. Rev. Appl. 15, 064020 (2021).
- [86] H. Azuma, W. J. Munro, and K. Nemoto, *Heralded single-photon source based on superpositions of squeezed states*, Phys. Rev. A **109**, 053711 (2024).
- [87] R. Jozsa and J. Schlienz, Distinguishability of states and von neumann entropy, Phys. Rev. A 62, 012301 (2000).