## Device Independent Quantum Secret Sharing Using Multiparty Pseudo-telepathy Game

Santanu Majhi<sup>1,\*</sup> and Goutam Paul<sup>1,†</sup>
<sup>1</sup>Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata, India

Device-independent quantum secret sharing (DI-QSS) is a cryptographic protocol that overcomes the security limitations posed by untrusted quantum devices. We propose a DI-QSS protocol based on the multipartite pseudo-telepathy parity game, which achieves device-independence with simultaneous key generation without requiring dedicated test rounds, unlike CHSH-based schemes [Zhang et al., Phys. Rev. A, 2024]. Notably, the proposed scheme allows simultaneous device-independence verification and key-generation phases, achieving optimal performance for a seven-qubit GHZ state configuration. Further, we analyse the security of our protocol against collective attack and establish reduced resource requirement for the same length of the raw key compared to the previous protocol. Finally, we show that our protocol remains robust even in a noisy environment.

Quantum secret sharing (QSS) is a fundamental cryptographic primitive that enables a dealer to distribute a secret message  $\mathfrak{m}$  among  $\mathcal{P}$  participants such that the message can only be reconstructed from all, or a qualified subset of the shares. Individual shares reveal no information about  $\mathfrak{m}$ , thereby ensuring information theoretic security. The essential components of a QSS protocol are the secret sharing and secret reconstruction procedures, which together guarantee secure distribution and recovery of the secret. Chattopadhyay et al. [1] provides a detailed analysis and overview of types of quantum secret sharing schemes.

A seminal QSS scheme was introduced by Hillery et al. [2], employing Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) states to securely share information among three parties: Alice (the dealer) and two participants, Bob and Charlie, who collaborate to reconstruct the secret. This construction was inspired by the principles of quantum key distribution(QKD) [3], but extended to the multipartite setting. While early analysis of QKD suggested unconditional security, practical realizations soon revealed vulnerabilities. In particular, imperfect or adversarially prepared quantum devices can deviate from the ideal assumption of perfect entanglement, thereby opening security loopholes. Similar concerns in QKD motivated the development of device-independent (DI) protocols [4–10], which guarantee security even in the presence of noisy or untrusted devices.

Extending these ideas, it becomes crucial to investigate whether QSS protocols can be made device-independent. Hillery's protocol, based on GHZ correlations, assumes honest device behaviour, leaving it vulnerable if the source is provided by a potentially malicious third party. A measurement-device-independent QSS protocol was introduced [11], capable of withstanding attacks arising from imperfect measurement devices. Nevertheless, practical imperfections in photon sources may still lead to side-channel information leakage, posing a potential

threat to the protocol's security [12–14]. A DI framework offers a promising approach to close this gap, ensuring that QSS security does not rely on the internal functioning of the devices but only on observed statistical correlations.

A device-independent (DI) protocol is a cryptographic scheme in which security does not rely on the internal functioning of the devices but is instead certified solely by the observed input-output correlations, typically through a Bell-type test. In this black-box framework, the user provides only classical inputs and records outputs, without assumptions about the underlying quantum states, measurement operators, or Hilbert-space dimension. Security is guaranteed if the observed correlations exhibit non-locality, such as a Bell inequality violation, thereby certifying the presence of genuine entanglement. The first DI-QSS protocol was proposed by Roy and Mukhopadhyay [15] for arbitrary even dimensions, establishing correctness and completeness with respect to measurement devices. Subsequently, Moreno et al. [16] introduced a DI-QSS scheme based on stronger forms of Bell nonlocality, enhancing robustness against adversaries. More recently, Zhang et al. [17, 18] presented two DI-QSS schemes: one employing noise preprocessing and postselection for practical applications, and another introducing a refined method for random key generation.

Those works employed 12 combinations of measurement bases 3 for Alice, 3 for Bob, and 2 for Charlie, to perform device-independence verification and subsequent key generation. This naturally raises the question of whether a DI-QSS scheme can be realized with fewer resources, and, if so, how it differs from previously known approaches. In this Letter, we address this question by first reviewing the related work, including the recent DI-QSS protocols of Zhang et al., which rely on CHSH-inequality checks. We then present how to construct a DI-QSS scheme based on the pseudo-telepathy game, followed by an efficient variant that simultaneously achieves device verification and key generation. Moreover, we perform security analysis of our protocol against collective attacks and also analyse its robustness under white noise.

<sup>\*</sup> santanum\_r@isical.ac.in

<sup>†</sup> goutam.paul@isical.ac.in

Hillery's Scheme analysis.— Hillery et al. [2] introduced the first QSS protocol based on the Greenberger—Horne–Zeilinger (GHZ) state,

$$|\Psi\rangle = \frac{|000\rangle + |111\rangle}{\sqrt{2}},$$

shared among Alice, Bob, and Charlie. Each party holds one qubit of the triplet and randomly chooses to measure in either the  $\sigma_x$  or  $\sigma_y$  basis, with measurement settings corresponding to the eigenstates

$$\sigma_x \to \{\ket{+}, \ket{-}\}, \qquad \sigma_y \to \{\ket{+i}, \ket{-i}\}.$$

After performing their measurements, they publicly announce only the chosen bases. In roughly half of the rounds [Fig. I], the correlations of the GHZ state allow Bob and Charlie, by combining their outcomes, to infer Alice's result. This property enables Alice to establish a shared secret with Bob and Charlie, thereby laying the foundation of quantum secret sharing. Using the following basis representations,

$$|0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|+\rangle + |-\rangle), \quad |1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|+\rangle - |-\rangle),$$

the GHZ state  $|\Psi\rangle$  can be rewritten in terms of  $|+\rangle$  and  $|-\rangle$  as

$$|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \left[ (|+\rangle_A |+\rangle_B + |-\rangle_A |-\rangle_B)(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)_C + (|+\rangle_A |-\rangle_B + |-\rangle_A |+\rangle_B)(|0\rangle - |1\rangle)_C \right]. (1)$$

	Alice				
Measurement basis	$\ket{+x}_a$	$ -x angle_a$	$\ket{+y}_a$	$\ket{-y}_a$	
$\ket{+x}_b$	$\ket{+x}_c$	$ -x angle_c$	$ +y angle_c$	$ -y angle_c$	
$ -x angle_b$	$\ket{-x}_c$	$\ket{+x}_c$	$ -y angle_c$	$\ket{+y}_c$	
Bob	Charlie				

FIG. I. Relationships of three users' measurement results. Alice's measurement bases are shown in the first row, Bob's measurement bases are shown in the first column, and Charlie's measurement results appear in the boxes.

From the expression of  $|\Psi\rangle$ , it is evident that Charlie alone cannot determine the individual outcomes of Alice and Bob. At best, he can infer whether their outcomes are correlated or anti-correlated. However, the probability of either correlation or anti-correlation is  $\frac{1}{2}$ . Therefore, Charlie gains no advantage and has no option other than to make a random guess. The correlation structure among three users' bases plays a crucial role in advancing next-generation quantum secret sharing (QSS) schemes.

DI-QSS using CHSH inequality.— Zhang et al. [17] proposed improved versions of device-independent quantum secret sharing (DI-QSS), addressing a key limitation of earlier schemes: their inefficient use of entanglement. In conventional DI-QSS protocols, only a single basis setting is employed for key generation, while the outcomes from all other basis combinations are discarded. Such postselection leads to a substantial waste of entanglement resources and restricts overall efficiency. To overcome these drawbacks, Zhang et al. [17] introduced an enhanced DI-QSS framework that employs a refined strategy of randomly selecting key-generation bases. This approach improves noise tolerance while simultaneously lowering the requirements on global detection efficiency and entanglement consumption.

The protocol proceeds in five stages with the assumption that the three players must be legitimate and honest. First, a central source prepares n copies of tripartite GHZ states, distributing the three photons of each state to Alice, Bob, and Charlie, respectively for each copy. Each party thus receives a sequence of qubits, denoted  $E_1$ ,  $E_2$ , and  $E_3$ .

Second, the users independently and randomly choose measurement bases.

Alice: 
$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \sigma_x$$
,  $\mathcal{A}_2 = \sigma_y$ ,  
Charlie:  $\mathcal{C}_1 = \sigma_x$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_2 = -\sigma_y$ ,  
Bob:  $\mathcal{B}_1 = \sigma_x$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_2 = \frac{\sigma_x - \sigma_y}{\sqrt{2}}$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_3 = \frac{\sigma_x + \sigma_y}{\sqrt{2}}$ .

The measurement outcomes are recorded as  $a_j, b_j, c_j \in \{+1, -1\}$  for the jth round.

Third, parameter estimation is performed once the measurement bases are publicly announced. Depending on Bob's chosen basis, three cases arise. (i) If Bob selects  $\mathcal{B}_2$  or  $\mathcal{B}_3$ , all users reveal their outcomes to evaluate the Svetlichny polynomial  $S_{ABC}$ , which satisfies  $4 \leq S_{ABC} \leq 4\sqrt{2}$  in the presence of genuine tripartite nonlocal correlations. If  $S_{ABC} \leq 4$ , eavesdropping cannot be excluded, and the protocol is aborted. (ii) If Bob selects  $\mathcal{B}_1$ , Alice announces a subset of her outcomes, and Bob (or Charlie) compares with his results to estimate the quantum bit error rate (QBER) e. (iii) If the input combination corresponds to  $(A_1, B_1, C_2)$  or  $(A_2, B_2, C_1)$ , the results are discarded.

Fourth, error correction and privacy amplification are applied iteratively until a sufficient number of secure key bits is established. Finally, in the secret reconstruction phase, Bob and Charlie obtain keys  $K_B$  and  $K_C$ , respec-

tively, such that Alice's key satisfies

$$K_A = K_B \oplus K_C$$
.

DI-QSS Protocol with noise preprocessing and postselection.— This DI-QSS is based on the same DI-QSS presented previously with a variation in a sense that in this scheme the key generation takes place only if the basis configuration is  $A_1B_1C_1$ .

As a summary, if Bob chooses basis  $\mathcal{B}_2$  or  $\mathcal{B}_3$ , all parties use their outcomes to evaluate the Svetlichny polynomial. In contrast, when Bob selects  $\mathcal{B}_1$ , the round is used for key generation. The existing protocol therefore, requires eight basis combinations for device-independence testing and one combination for key generation. Our aim is to design a simpler scheme that achieves the same security guarantees while consuming fewer resources. Specifically, our objective is to minimize measurement overhead without compromising correctness or security.

Multiparty Pseudo-telepathy game.— A well known game [19] introduced by Mermin, and later studied in various contexts [20–27], is the multiparty Pseudo-telepathy game involving n players. Its general formulation is as follows:

Each player j receives an input, a bit string  $x_j \in \{0,1\}^l$ , which is also interpreted as an integer in binary, with the promise that  $\sum_j x_j$  is divided by  $2^l$ . The player must output a single bit  $y_j$  and the winning condition is

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} y_j = \frac{1}{2^l} \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j \pmod{2}.$$

For now, we restrict the game to l=1 [20, 21] (i.e. the input  $x_j$  is also a single bit).

For an *n*-party Pseudo-telepathy game, the players are denoted  $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n$ . The inputs  $x_j \in \{0, 1\}$  must satisfy the constraint

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j = 0 \pmod{2},$$

i.e., the input string  $x_1x_2...x_n$  contains an even number of ones. The winning condition requires that the outputs  $y_j \in \{0,1\}$  obey

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} y_j = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j \pmod{2}.$$

The best known classical strategy achieves a success probability of  $\frac{1}{2} + 2^{-\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$ , while the quantum strategy wins with certainty.

Quantum strategy — The perfect quantum protocol, in which the players always win, relies on shared entanglement. Before the game begins, the n players  $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n$  share the entangled state

$$\left|\Phi_{n}^{+}\right\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\left|0^{n}\right\rangle + \left|1^{n}\right\rangle\right),$$

with each player receiving one qubit. Upon receiving the classical input  $x_j$ , player  $A_j$  applies the unitary

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\pi/2} \end{bmatrix}$$

to their qubit if  $x_j = 1$ , such that

$$S |\beta_j\rangle \longrightarrow e^{i\pi x_j/2} |\beta_j\rangle$$
,

where  $|\beta_j\rangle$  is the qubit held by  $A_j$ . If p players apply S, then

$$|\Phi_n^+\rangle \longrightarrow \begin{cases} |\Phi_n^+\rangle, & \text{if } p \equiv 0 \pmod{4}, \\ |\Phi_n^-\rangle, & \text{if } p \equiv 2 \pmod{4}, \end{cases}$$

with  $|\Phi_n^-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0^n\rangle - |1^n\rangle)$ . Cases with  $p \equiv 1, 3 \pmod{4}$  do not occur, since the number of inputs  $x_j = 1$  is always even.

Next, each player applies a Hadamard transformation H to their qubit, yielding

$$H^{\otimes n} \left| \Phi_n^+ \right\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{n-1}}} \sum_{wt(y) \equiv 0 \pmod{2}} \left| y \right\rangle,$$

$$H^{\otimes n} \left| \Phi_n^- \right\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{n-1}}} \sum_{wt(y) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}} \left| y \right\rangle,$$

where wt(y) denotes the Hamming weight of y. Finally, each player measures their qubit in the  $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$  basis to obtain  $y_j$ , and the string  $y_1y_2...y_n$  constitutes the output corresponding to the input  $x_1x_2...x_n$ .

DI-QSS using Multiparty Pseudo-telepathy Game: Here, we will use the multiparty pseudo-telepathy game to propose a device-independent quantum secret sharing scheme. The scheme scenario is the same as the Pseudo-telepathy game: Consider for n parties, where  $A_1$  is the dealer, and the rest of the participants are  $A_2, A_3, \ldots, A_n$  who receive shares from the dealer. The scheme should be designed to incorporate two phases simultaneously: (i) Checking phase, (ii) Share and Reconstruction phase. The checking phase ensures device independence, while the share and reconstruction phase distributes the secret among the parties and enables its recovery. The key challenge lies in designing the protocol so that these two phases operate seamlessly in parallel.

The steps of our DI-QSS protocol are as follows:

1. Dealer D and the participants Bob and Charlie share an n-partite state

$$|\Phi_n\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|00\dots0\rangle + |11\dots1\rangle]$$

among themselves.

2. The dealer  $A_1$  and each participant  $A_2, A_3, \ldots A_n$  receive one qubit (photon) from the shared n-partite GHZ state  $|\Phi_n\rangle$ .

Each party now has a single qubit of the shared state.

- 3. The dealer and the participants now proceed to play the Pseudo-telepathy game. They will choose randomly input bits  $x_1$  (held by the dealer) and  $x_j$  (held by participant  $A_j$ ) for  $j = 2, 3, \ldots, n$ .
- 4. They obtain their respective outputs  $y_1$  (for the dealer) and  $y_j$  (for participant  $A_j$ ) as a result of playing the pseudo-telepathy game.
- 5. The parties publicly announce their input bits. The combined input string is denoted by  $x_1x_2...x_n$ . If the number of 1's in this string is odd, the corresponding input is discarded from further consideration.
- 6. In this manner, all the parties repeat the steps N times.
- 7. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the set of all non-discarded inputs.
- 8. Dealer  $A_1$  randomly chooses  $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{A}$  of size  $\gamma |\mathcal{A}|$ , where  $0 < \gamma \le 1$ .
- 9. The parties discuss their inputs and corresponding outputs to verify whether the winning condition of the Pseudo-telepathy game is satisfied.

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} y_j = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j \pmod{2}.$$


If the fraction of successful rounds falls below  $1 - \nu$ , the dealer aborts the protocol for that instance.

10. If the DI checking is passed successfully, the next phase is secret reconstruction, followed by key generation.

The (3,3) approach.— Let us create a scenario where the entire secret sharing scheme involves three parties: Alice, Bob, and Charlie. So, here we are considering n=3, similar to Hillery's scheme of secret sharing. The case n=3 is being considered to make a comparison with previously proposed device-independent secret sharing schemes. As the original Hillery's scheme is for 3 parties and the device independent version is also of 3 parties.

Assume Alice is the dealer and Bob and Charlie are two participants to whom the secret is being shared. Each one has a black box access denoted by  $BB_1^A$ ,  $BB_2^B$ ,  $BB_3^C$  respectively for Alice, Bob and Charlie. Each box can take a classical bit  $x_i \in \{0,1\}$  and produce an output  $y_i \in \{0,1\}$  [Fig. II]. This is the input-output scenario of the Pseudo-telepathy game. Just like other device-independent protocols, it is assumed that the devices obey the laws of quantum mechanics and are specially isolated from each other and from any adversary.

At the beginning Alice, Bob and Charlie share N many GHZ-state  $|GHZ\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|000\rangle + |111\rangle]_{ABC}$  that some third party supplies. Three particles are each received by the three parties Alice, Bob, and Charlie. Subsequently, each party chooses their respective input classical bit  $x_1, x_2, x_3 \stackrel{\$}{\leftarrow} \{0, 1\}$ . After selecting the inputs they will no be allowed to communicate among themselves.



Output depends on received qubit and classical inputs.

FIG. II. Multiparty pseudotelepathy game

And once they receive the inputs, they will follow the respective steps according to the Pseudo-telepathy game. At last they will get the outputs  $y_1, y_2, y_3$ .

After the measurement results, three parties will discuss their respective choices of inputs publicly, accepting only those choices where an even number of 1's are present in the input string  $x_1x_2x_3$ . From the valid input sets Alice(dealer) will choose any random subset and discuss the input-output results with all the parties and check what fraction of these inputs satisfy the multiparty pseudo-telepathy game condition  $\left[\sum y_i = \frac{1}{2}\sum x_i \pmod{2}\right]$ . If the success probability is less than some predefined threshold bound, they will discard the protocol.

In Table I we present the possible input-output pairs for n=3. Now, according to the strategy of the pseudo-telepathy game, there are four inputs for which the input-output pairs are valid to run the device independence test, but only the input (0,0,0) has passed the key generation step for the QSS protocol, shown in Table I. Whereas for the input (0,0,0), the output sequence  $y_1y_2y_3$  exhibits a special property: Charlie's output  $y_3$  alone cannot fully determine the outputs of Alice and Bob. Instead, it only indicates whether Alice's and Bob's outputs are correlated or anti-correlated, which is exactly the same pattern shown in previous DI-QSS schemes using CHSH based inequality.

A General Approach.— Now, a natural question arises for the case n=3: only one out of the four possible cases is valid for both checking device independence and performing key generation after the QSS protocol. Thus, the corresponding probability is 0.25. This leads to the question of whether the protocol functions effectively with only a single valid input-output instance, or whether we should seek a more efficient approach that allows a larger set of cases where device-independence verification and key generation occur simultaneously. First, we turn our attention to a general notion for an arbitrary number

${\bf Input}$			Possible Output			Operation
Cond: Even no. of 1's			$\sum y_i = \frac{\sum x_i}{2} \pmod{2}$		$K_a = K_b \oplus K_c$	
Alice $(x_1)$	<b>Bob</b> $(x_2)$	Charlie $(x_3)$	Alice $(y_1$	) Bob $(y_2)$ (	Charlie $(y_3)$	$y_1 = y_2 \oplus y_3$
0	0	0	0	0	0	$0 = 0 \oplus 0$
			0	1	1	$0=1\oplus 1$
			1	0	1	$0=0\oplus 1$
			1	1	0	$0=1\oplus 0$
0	1	1	0	0	1	$0 \neq 0 \oplus 1$
			0	1	0	$0 \neq 1 \oplus 0$
			1	0	0	$0 \neq 0 \oplus 1$
			1	1	1	$1 \neq 1 \oplus 1$
1	0	1	1	0	0	$1 \neq 0 \oplus 0$
			0	1	0	$0 \neq 1 \oplus 0$
			0	0	1	$0 \neq 0 \oplus 1$
			1	1	1	$1 \neq 1 \oplus 1$
1	1	0	0	1	0	$0 \neq 1 \oplus 0$
			0	0	1	$0 \neq 0 \oplus 1$
			1	0	0	$1 \neq 0 \oplus 0$
			1	1	1	$1 \neq 1 \oplus 1$

TABLE I. Strategy of DI-QSS for n = 3

of parties. Let there are n parties, including the dealer. First question is what kind of inputs  $x_1x_2x_3...x_n$  are considered as a valid input for the Pseudo-telepathy game and the output of the corresponding input also satisfies the key generation condition i.e.  $K_1 = K_2 \oplus K_3 \oplus ... \oplus K_n$ . Theorem 1. Let  $x_i$  denote the input bit of  $i^{th}$  participant. The Hamming weight of the input string  $x_1x_2...x_n$  is a multiple of 4 if and only if the corresponding output string of the Pseudo-telepathy game  $y_1y_2...y_n$  has an even number of 1's and it satisfies the key generation condition simultaneously.

*Proof:* Let  $x_1x_2x_3...x_n$  be the input bit string chosen by the participants, whose Hamming weight is a multiple of 4

Then  $x_1x_2x_3...x_n$  contains 4k number of 1's, where k = 0, 1, 2, 3...

$$\therefore \frac{1}{2} \sum x_i = \frac{1}{2} \times 4k = 2k.$$

[if there is 4k number of 1's, then sum would be 4k]

$$\therefore \frac{1}{2} \sum x_i \pmod{2} = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \sum y_i \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$$

 $\Rightarrow y_i$  should have even number of 1's.

Now, let  $y_1y_2...y_n$  be the output string. Here,  $y_1$  is considered Alice's output, corresponding to  $x_1$ , which is taken as Alice's (the dealer's) input.

As  $y_1y_2...y_n$  contains even number of 1's that implies

- If  $y_1 = 1$  then  $y_2 y_3 \dots y_n$  is containing odd number of 1's. Hence  $y_1 = 1 = y_2 \oplus y_3 \oplus \dots \oplus y_n = 1$ .
- If  $y_1 = 0$  then  $y_2 y_3 \dots y_n$  is containing even number of 1's. Hence  $y_1 = 0 = y_2 \oplus y_3 \oplus \dots \oplus y_n = 0$ .

Hence, if  $x_1x_2x_3...x_n$  the input bit string contains 4k number of 1's then it satisfies both the results simultaneously.

Conversely, let  $y_1y_2y_3...y_n$  contains even number of 1's then it also satisfies  $y_1 = y_2 \oplus y_3 \oplus \cdots \oplus y_n$ . As we only consider those pairs that satisfy the Pseudotelepathy condition  $\frac{1}{2}\sum_i x_i = \sum_i y_i \pmod{2}$ . So,

$$\sum_{i} y_i = 0 \pmod{2},$$

$$\sum_{i} \frac{x_i}{2} = 0 \pmod{2},$$

$$\sum_{i} x_i = 0 \pmod{4}.$$

Hence, the Hamming weight of  $x_1x_2...x_n$  is 4k, where k = 0, 1, 2, ...

We can now address our first query: to satisfy the key generation condition, it is sufficient to consider only those input strings whose Hamming weight is a multiple of 4. In other words, the verification process for key generation does not require examining all possible inputs; instead, it can be restricted to this specific subset, thereby simplifying the protocol without compromising correctness. The second query concerns the total number of valid input-output pairs for the Pseudo-telepathy game. This

is straightforward to compute. For an n-party scheme, there are  $2^{n-1}$  possible choices of the input string  $(x_1x_2...x_n)$  such that the number of 1's in the string is even and this is the primary condition of the Pseudotelepathy game. Among these  $2^{n-1}$  strings, we are specifically interested in those where the Hamming weight is of the form 4k, i.e., the number of 1's is a multiple of 4. We need to count all input-output pairs (x, y) with  $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ .

We introduce the code here as an algorithm:

1. The input x has Hamming weight that is a multiple of 4, i.e.,

$$\operatorname{wt}(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$$
.

2. The output y satisfies

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i \equiv \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \pmod{2}.$$

3. The output satisfies the key generation condition.

$$y_1 = y_2 \oplus y_3 \oplus \cdots \oplus y_n$$
.

Input: An integer n > 0. Output:

1. pair\_count = number of valid (x, y) pairs.

2. ratio = 
$$\frac{\text{pair\_count}}{2^{2(n-1)}}$$
.

The ratio values for different integers n reveal a notable pattern as shown in Fig.III.

From the results, we observe that the ratio reaches its maximum at n=7, and then gradually decreases, reaching 0.5 at n=10.

Now, a natural question arises: why are we assuming that n=7 gives the maximum? Is there any value of n for which the ratio exceeds 0.5625? Or is there any proof that the maximum is attained at n=7.

First consider the function f(n) which takes the input n, and outputs the ratio

$${\rm ratio} = \frac{{\rm input\text{-}output\ pairs\ satisfying\ both\ the\ conditions}}{{\rm total\ valid\ input\text{-}output\ pairs}}.$$

As it is clear, for each input of size n, there are a total of  $2^{(n-1)}$  possible outputs. Then we just consider the input pairs to calculate the ratio. The ratio can be written as

$${\rm ratio} = \frac{{\rm input\ with\ Hamming\ weight\ as\ a\ multiple\ of\ 4}}{{\rm number\ of\ valid\ inputs\ satisfying\ Pseudo-telepathy\ game}}$$

The inputs having the Hamming weight as the multiple of 4 can be calculated as  $\binom{n}{0} + \binom{n}{4} + \binom{n}{8} + \cdots + \binom{n}{4k}$ , where  $4k \leq n$ 

The idea behind it is to choose the positions that are multiples of 4 and fill them with 1's, while the remaining positions are filled with 0's.

TABLE II. Mathematical formulation for counting valid input—output pairs for n parties.

- 1. Let n > 0 be an integer. Define the sets
- 2.  $\mathcal{X} = \{ x \in \{0, 1\}^n : \text{wt}(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{4} \}$
- 3.  $\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1\}^n$

where wt(x) denotes the Hamming weight of x.

4. For each  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , set

$$s_x = \sum_i x_i, \quad \operatorname{res}_x = \left(\frac{s_x}{2} \mod 2\right).$$

5. For each  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ , set

$$res_y = \sum_i y_i \pmod{2}.$$

6. Then the total number of valid input—output pairs is given by

$$pair\_count = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \delta_{res_x, res_y},$$

where,  $\delta_{a,b}$  is the Kronecker delta.

7. The corresponding ratio is defined as

$$\mathrm{ratio} = \frac{\mathrm{pair\_count}}{2^{\,2(n-1)}}.$$




FIG. III. Variation of the ratio with the number of parties n. For n=3, the ratio is 0.25. For n=4, the ratio remains 0.25. For n=5, the ratio increases to 0.375. For n=6, it further rises to 0.5. For n=7, the ratio reaches 0.5625, and it remains the same for n=8. For n=9, the ratio slightly decreases to 0.53125, and for n=10, it returns to 0.5.

Proposition 2. If f(n) is the function that takes input n and outputs the corresponding ratio of input with Hamming weight multiple of 4 and number of valid inputs satisfying Pseudo-telepathy game. Then f(n) attains its maximum at n = 7.

*Proof.* As the function yields the aforementioned ratio for a given n. So that f(n) is maximal is the same as saying that the proportion is maximal at a particular point.

Let

$$f(n) = \frac{1 + \binom{n}{4} + \binom{n}{8} + \dots + \binom{n}{4k}}{2^{n-1}}$$
 where  $4k \le n$ .

This sum is the total of binomial coefficients with indices divisible by 4.

For  $\omega = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{4}}$  and the polynomial  $F(x) = (1+x)^n$  if we apply the root of unity filter [28], then we obtain

$$\sum_{j\equiv 0 \pmod{4}} \binom{n}{j} = \frac{1}{4} \left[ (1+1)^n + (1+i)^n + (1-1)^n + (1-i)^n \right]$$

Simplifying gives

$$\sum_{j\equiv 0\pmod 4} \binom{n}{j} = \frac{1}{4} \left[ 2^n + 2(\sqrt{2})^n \cos\left(\frac{n\pi}{4}\right) \right].$$

Therefore,

$$f(n) = \frac{1}{2} + 2^{-n/2} \cos(\frac{n\pi}{4}).$$

Now, the only question remains whether the maximum value occurs at n=7 or not.

• For n=1,

$$f(1) = \frac{1}{2} + 2^{-1/2} \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right) = 1,$$

which is the global maximum.

• If we restrict to  $n \ge 3$  (as is common in quantum secret sharing scenarios), then the maximum occurs when  $\cos(\frac{n\pi}{4}) = 1$ , i.e., n = 8, or when n = 7.

In particular, for n = 7 or n = 8,

$$f(n) \approx \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{16} = \frac{9}{16} = 0.5625,$$

which is the maximum for n > 3.

Here, we consider the case for n = 7 and the rest of the protocol is based on n = 7.

This observation raises the question: can the case n=7 be leveraged to design a more efficient scheme consisting of 3 parties that simultaneously ensures a high success ratio for winning the Pseudo-telepathy game and satisfies the key generation condition?

Design of a (3,3) scheme using n=7 qubit GHZ state.— Now, we aim to propose a (3,3) scheme by utilizing all the inputs corresponding to the case n=7. The underlying idea is that, in order to design such a scheme, the inputs must be distributed among the participants in a way that ensures two essential properties: (i) the distribution remains equally likely for all parties, and (ii) the scheme produces the desired outcome consistent with the original secret sharing construction.

As the case n = 7 the GHZ state is

$$|GHZ\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [|0000000\rangle + |11111111\rangle]$$

and for this case it provides the highest probability of satisfying the key generation condition  $K_A = K_B \oplus K_C$  successfully, it is natural to explore how this setting can be adapted for a (3,3) secret sharing scheme. Now, for a 7-bit GHZ state, the parties need 7 input bits for each qubit to play the Pseudo-telepathy game. In particular, we can consider decomposing the 7 input bits into shares distributed among the three participants in such a way that each party receives an equal portion of information while still preserving the desired relation for key generation. If the input of all parties is X then

$$X = x_1 \quad x_2 x_3 x_4 \quad x_5 x_6 x_7$$

We assign the first input bit  $x_1$  to Alice, the next three bits  $x_2, x_3, x_4$  to Bob, and, in a similar manner, the last three bits  $x_5, x_6, x_7$  to Charlie.

$$X = \underbrace{x_1}_{\text{Alice}} \quad \underbrace{x_2 \ x_3 \ x_4}_{\text{Bob}} \quad \underbrace{x_5 \ x_6 \ x_7}_{\text{Charlie}}$$

The protocol proceeds as follows. Each participant independently selects input bits and feeds them into their corresponding device to obtain outputs  $y_i$ . Specifically, Alice chooses  $x_1$ , Bob selects three bits  $x_2, x_3, x_4$ , and Charlie selects three bits  $x_5, x_6, x_7$ , all uniformly at random. Next, the participants publicly announce their input bits and verify that the total number of ones among  $\{x_i\}$  is even. If this parity condition is satisfied, they check the input–output relation

$$\sum_{i=1}^{7} y_i \equiv \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{7} x_i \pmod{2}.$$

When this condition holds, the outputs are used to generate the shared key. Alice's key is

$$K_A = y_1$$
,

Bob's key is

$$K_B = y_2 \oplus y_3 \oplus y_4$$

and Charlie's key is

$$K_C = y_5 \oplus y_6 \oplus y_7$$
.

It follows that the keys satisfy

$$K_A = K_B \oplus K_C$$

as in general

$$y_1 = \bigoplus_{j=1}^7 y_j.$$

Table III shows that all inputs with a Hamming weight that is a multiple of 4 satisfy the key generation condition. Moreover, for all such inputs, the output set y is identical and contains an even number of 1's, and due to

Input		Output		Operation		
Alice	Bob	Charlie	Alice	Bob	Charlie	$K_a = K_b \oplus K_c$
$x_1$	$x_2, x_3, x_4$	$x_5, x_6, x_7$	$y_1$	$y_2, y_3, y_4$	$y_5, y_6, y_7$	
0	0, 0, 0	0, 0, 0	0	0, 0, 0	0, 0, 0	$0 = 0 \oplus 0$
			0	0, 0, 0	0, 1, 1	$0 = 0 \oplus 0$
			0	0, 0, 0	1, 0, 1	$0 = 0 \oplus 0$
			:	•	:	<u>:</u>
			1	1, 1, 1	1, 1, 0	$1 = 1 \oplus 0$
0	0, 0, 1	1, 1, 1	0	0, 0, 0	0, 0, 0	$0 = 0 \oplus 0$
			0	0, 0, 0	0, 1, 1	$0 = 0 \oplus 0$
			0	0, 0, 0	1, 0, 1	$0 = 0 \oplus 0$
			:	:	:	i :
			1	1, 1, 1	1, 1, 0	$1 = 1 \oplus 0$
	:			:		i:
1	1, 1, 1	0, 0, 0	0	0, 0, 0	0, 0, 0	$0 = 0 \oplus 0$
			0	0, 0, 0	0, 1, 1	$0 = 0 \oplus 0$
			0	0, 0, 0	1, 0, 1	$0 = 0 \oplus 0$
			:	•	:	:
			1	1, 1, 1	1, 1, 0	$1 = 1 \oplus 0$

TABLE III. Updated design of DI-QSS scheme using 7-bit input

this property, the key generation condition is satisfied in accordance with *Theorem1*.

A pertinent question arises as to why the seven-qubit system is decomposed into subsystems of dimensions 1, 3, and 3. This issue is addressed in the following theorem.

Theorem 3. If a 7-qubit state is distributed among three parties Alice, Bob, and Charlie in the partition (1, k, 6 - k), then the output views of two participants are indistinguishable when k = 3.

*Proof.* The 7-qubit GHZ state distributed among three parties (Alice with one qubit, Bob with j qubits, and Charlie with 6-j qubits) is

$$|\mathrm{GHZ}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( |0\rangle_A \ |0\rangle_B^{\otimes j} \ |0\rangle_C^{\otimes (6-j)} + |1\rangle_A \ |1\rangle_B^{\otimes j} \ |1\rangle_C^{\otimes (6-j)} \right)$$

The corresponding density operators are

$$\begin{split} \rho_{ABC} &= \tfrac{1}{2} \left( |0\rangle_A \ |0\rangle_B^{\otimes j} \ |0\rangle_C^{\otimes (6-j)} \ + \ |1\rangle_A \ |1\rangle_B^{\otimes j} \ |1\rangle_C^{\otimes (6-j)} \right) \\ & \left( \langle 0|_A \ \langle 0|_B^{\otimes j} \ \langle 0|_C^{\otimes (6-j)} \ + \ \langle 1|_A \ \langle 1|_B^{\otimes j} \ \langle 1|_C^{\otimes (6-j)} \right). \end{split}$$

Tracing out AB gives

$$\rho_C = \text{Tr}_{AB}(\rho_{ABC}) = \frac{1}{2} \left( |0\rangle\langle 0|^{\otimes j} + |1\rangle\langle 1|^{\otimes j} \right)_C$$

Similarly, tracing out AC gives

$$\rho_B = \frac{1}{2} \left( |0\rangle\langle 0|^{\otimes(6-j)} + |1\rangle\langle 1|^{\otimes(6-j)} \right)_B.$$

Hence,  $\rho_B$  and  $\rho_C$  are identical only when

$$j = 6 - j \implies j = 3.$$

DI-QSS via Pseudo-telepathy game for Seven Qubits.— We now turn our attention to the final version of the device-independent quantum secret sharing (DI-QSS) protocol. This scheme is constructed by systematically combining all the tools and ideas that have been introduced in the preceding sections. In particular, it integrates the input-output conditions, the Pseudo-telepathy framework, and the key-generation requirements into a unified protocol that ensures both device independence and successful generation of shared secret keys. Here, we design the protocol.

Protocol 1. Pseudo-telepathy game based DI-QSS protocol.

1. **Setup.** Start with R copies of the 7-qubit GHZ state

$$|\mathrm{GHZ}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle^{\otimes 7} + |1\rangle^{\otimes 7}),$$

and distribute one qubit to Alice and three qubits each to Bob and Charlie.

2. Round i = 1, ..., R. The parties independently choose inputs

$$x_1 \in \{0,1\}, \quad x_2, x_3, x_4 \in \{0,1\}, \quad x_5, x_6, x_7 \in \{0,1\},$$

use them on their (untrusted) devices, and obtain outputs  $y_1, \ldots, y_7 \in \{0, 1\}$ . For the  $j^{\text{th}}$  qubit, the

device applies the unitaries S and H, where

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{\frac{i\pi}{2}} \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix},$$

then measures in the computational basis  $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ .

- 3. **Sifting.** The parties publish their inputs for all rounds and retain only those rounds whose input Hamming weight is a multiple of 4. Denote the set of retained rounds by A.
- 4. **Test.** Alice randomly selects a subset  $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{A}$  of size  $\gamma |\mathcal{A}|$  ( $0 < \gamma < 1$ ) and announces the input–output pairs for rounds in  $\mathcal{B}$ . Bob and Charlie do likewise. They compute the empirical success probability of the pseudo-telepathy parity condition:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{7} y_j \equiv \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{7} x_j \pmod{2}.$$

If the observed success probability is less than  $1-\eta$ , they abort.

5. **Key generation.** From the remaining rounds  $A \setminus \mathcal{B}$ , each kept round yields raw key bits:

$$K_A=y_1, \qquad K_B=y_2\oplus y_3\oplus y_4, \qquad K_C=y_5\oplus y_6\oplus y_7,$$
 which satisfy  $K_A=K_B\oplus K_C$  in ideal runs.

From Table III, it is evident that for all inputs whose Hamming weight is of the form 4k  $(k=0,1,2,\ldots)$ , the classical output bit on Alice's side satisfies the XOR relation with the sum of the classical output bits of Bob and Charlie. In other words, Alice's output  $y_1(K_A)$  is always equal to  $K_B \oplus K_C$ .

Bitwise improvement over the CHSH-based DI-QSS scheme.— Initially, let both schemes be executed over R rounds to obtain the final result. In the earlier approach to device independence proposed by Zhang et al. [17], the three users Alice, Bob, and Charlie are assigned the following measurement bases

Alice: 
$$\{A_1 = \sigma_x, A_2 = \sigma_y\}$$
,  
Bob:  $\{B_1 = \sigma_x, B_2 = \frac{\sigma_x - \sigma_y}{\sqrt{2}}, B_3 = \frac{\sigma_x + \sigma_y}{\sqrt{2}}\}$ ,  
Charlie:  $\{C_1 = \sigma_x, C_2 = -\sigma_y\}$ .

They independently and randomly select a measurement basis to measure their received photons. There are 3 cases based on their measurement basis selection:

Case 1: Bob chooses the basis  $B_2$  or  $B_3$ . Total eight basis combinations are there  $\{A_1B_2C_1,A_2B_2C_1,\ldots,A_2B_3C_2\}$ . Dedicatedly use for constructing the CHSH polynomial and checking device independence.

Case 2: When the measurement basis combination is  $A_1B_1C_1$ , then the users retain their measurement results

as the raw key bits.

Case 3: For the basis combinations  $A_1B_1C_2$ ,  $A_2B_1C_1$ , and  $A_2B_1C_2$ , the users discard their measurement results.

Thus, in total, 12 valid combinations of measurement bases remain available for Alice, Bob, and Charlie. Among these, 8 combinations are used for estimating the CHSH polynomial S, while only 1 combination is employed for key generation from the measurement outcomes.

According to the previous protocol, R rounds require a total of R GHZ states in order to complete all the steps. In each round, the participants independently and uniformly choose their respective measurement bases at random. As a consequence of this random basis selection, only a fraction of the states contribute to the final key generation. In particular, it is expected that only  $\frac{1}{12}$  of the total GHZ states are actually valid for key generation, while the remaining states are utilized either for checking the device independence or are discarded depending on the chosen basis combination.

Let among all the rounds  $\alpha$  be the fraction (0 <  $\alpha$  < 1) such that  $\alpha R$  is the number of rounds where three participants publicly announce their measurement results for checking the CHSH polynomial. The remaining cases will therefore be for key generation. Hence, from  $(R - \alpha R)$  is the total cases available for key generation.

$$\frac{1}{12}(R - \alpha R)$$
: the expected number of cases for key generation.

Now, for our protocol, if we consider the same total number of rounds R, only  $\frac{R}{2}$  of them correspond to inputs with an even number of 1's. Among these  $\frac{R}{2}$  cases, a fraction  $\beta$  (with  $0 < \beta < 1$ ) is reserved for the checking phase, i.e.,  $\frac{\beta R}{2}$  rounds are for checking the device independence. The remaining  $\frac{(R-\beta R)}{2}$  rounds are used for the key generation. Furthermore, the updated Pseudo-telepathy game ensures that 56.25% of these cases are valid simultaneously for both satisfying the Pseudo-telepathy winning condition and for key generation. Hence,

$$\frac{0.5625}{2}(R-\beta R)$$
: expected number of cases for key generation and satisfies the Pseudo-telepathy game winning condition.

Now if we can choose the fraction  $\beta$  as close as the previous fraction  $\alpha$  then those two factors  $R - \alpha R$  is very close to the  $R - \beta R$ . Hence we can compare these two cases easily. Therefore, the advantage is

$$\frac{\frac{0.5625}{2}(R - \beta R)}{\frac{1}{12}(R - \alpha R)} = 3.375 \left(\frac{1 - \beta}{1 - \alpha}\right).$$

 $\alpha \approx \beta$  will imply the advantage will be near 3.375.

Security analysis.— We described the entire DI-QSS scheme has been described, it is essential to perform a comprehensive security analysis. In order to formally

define secrecy in this context, the analysis must carefully address three key aspects: Correctness, Completeness and Security.

Correctness— After successfully passing the checking phase (i.e., satisfying the winning condition of the Pseudo-telepathy game), Alice, Bob, and Charlie each obtain their respective measurement outcomes by measuring in the computational basis  $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ . Let the corresponding classical outputs be denoted by  $y_A$ ,  $y_B$ , and  $y_C$  for Alice, Bob, and Charlie, respectively. Now the input size of Bob and Charlie is 3. So the output can be written as  $y_B = y_{B_1}y_{B_2}y_{B_3}$  and we denote  $K_B = y_{B_1} \oplus y_{B_2} \oplus y_{B_3}$ . Similarly for Charlie it is  $K_C = y_{C_1} \oplus y_{C_2} \oplus y_{C_3}.$ 

These outputs satisfy the special relation

$$y_A = K_B \oplus K_C$$
,

which ensures that the shared secret can be recovered perfectly.

From the sharing of the GHZ state up to the reconstruction phase, via the steps of the proposed scheme, the fact that the secret is perfectly recovered demonstrates the correctness of the scheme. We restate the correctness as per the protocol Mukhopadhyay et al. [15] as follows:

Definition 1: Correctness:— A quantum secret sharing protocol is said to be  $\epsilon_{cor}$ -correct if, for any adversary, the original secret S and the reconstructed secret  $\hat{S}$  are  $\epsilon_{\rm cor}$ -indistinguishable, i.e.,

$$\Pr_{S \in \mathcal{S}}[S = \hat{S}] \ge 1 - \epsilon_{\text{cor}}.$$

where S is the set of all possible secrets.

As mentioned earlier, if the fraction of successful rounds falls below  $1 - \nu$ , the dealer aborts the protocol. Thus, an error tolerance of  $\nu$  is allowed in this protocol, which is evaluated by the dealer after all rounds are completed. The dealer fixes the length of the key in advance, and this key length serves as a parameter in defining the correctness of the scheme.

Theorem 4. The proposed device-independent secretsharing scheme is  $\varepsilon_{\text{cor}}$ -correct, where  $\varepsilon_{\text{cor}} > 1 - X$ , and

$$X = {\binom{R_l}{(1-\nu)R_l}} p_m^{(1-\nu)R_l} (1-p_m)^{\nu R_l}.$$

Where,

- $R_l$  denotes the number of rounds fixed by the dealer to obtain a final key of length l,
- $\bullet$   $\nu$  denotes the allowed proportion of deviation, and
- $p_m$  is the probability that Alice's bit matches Bob $\oplus$ Charlie's output after one round of the protocol.

*Proof.* Let  $\nu$  be the proportion of deviation allowed.

The correctness definition states that the dealer and the two participants must satisfy

$$y_A = K_B \oplus K_C \tag{2}$$

 $y_A = K_B \oplus K_C \eqno(2)$  If  $R_l$  is the number of rounds Alice wants to run the protocol, where l is the desired key length, then in those R-l rounds, we need to identify where the equation (2) satisfies and where there is a mismatch. So,  $(1-\nu)R_l$ is the total cases where equation (2) satisfies and  $\nu R_l$  is the cases where condition (2) not holds.

... The probability of matching with equation (2) after  $R_l$  rounds is

$$\binom{R_l}{(1-\nu)R_l} p_m^{(1-\nu)R_l} (1-p_m)^{\nu R_l}$$

Now, from the definition of Correctness

$$\binom{R_l}{(1-\nu)R_l} p_m^{(1-\nu)R_l} (1-p_m)^{\nu R_l} > 1 - \varepsilon_{\text{cor}}$$

i.e. 
$$\varepsilon_{\rm cor} > 1 - X$$

Where 
$$X = \binom{R_l}{(1-\nu)R_l} p_m^{(1-\nu)R_l} (1-p_m)^{\nu R_l}$$

Security Analysis— The principal security challenge in a device-independent quantum secret sharing (DI-QSS) protocol arises from the possibility of an eavesdropper. We begin by assuming that all devices operate in accordance with the principles of quantum mechanics. Let  $\mathcal{H}_A$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_B$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_C$ , and  $\mathcal{H}_E$  denote the separable Hilbert spaces corresponding to Alice, Bob, Charlie, and Eve, respectively. Now consider the scenario in which, at the start of each round, a shared quantum state  $\rho_{ABCE}$  is distributed among the four systems. Upon receiving their respective inputs x, the devices of Alice, Bob, and Charlie perform measurements described by predefined POVM's  $\{M_{y_1|x_1}\}_A$ ,  $\{N_{y_2y_3y_4|x_2x_3x_4}\}_B$ , and  $\{P_{y_5y_6y_7|x_5x_6x_7}\}_C$  where,  $(M_{y|x}$  denotes the measurement done by Alice when the input bit is x.), producing corresponding outputs. The exact forms of these states and measurements are unknown to the users but may be fully accessible to Eve. The framework of device-independent security is designed precisely to address such scenarios, ensuring security even when the measurement devices are under Eve's control.

The joint conditional distribution of their outputs can be written as

Here,  $X = x_1x_2...x_7$  is the input randomly selected by Alice Bob, and Charlie for their respected measurement devices.  $y_1$  denotes the key bit generated from Alice's input  $x_1$  and corresponding output  $y_1$ , with analogous definitions for Bob and Charlie. After completion of one round Eve's quantum system is described by

$$\rho_E^{yx} = Tr_{ABC} \left[ \rho_{ABCE} (M_A \otimes N_B \otimes P_C \otimes I_E) \right].$$

 $\rho_E^{yx}$  represents Eve's information associated with the keys of the three parties.

The key generation rate of the DI-QSS protocol can thus be expressed as follows:

$$r = I(A; B, C) - I(A; E)$$

$$= H(A) - H(A|B, C) - H(A) + H(A|E)$$

$$= H(A|E)_{\rho_E} - H(A|B, C)_{\rho_E}.$$
(3)

Equation 3 is known as the Devetak-Winter bound [29] and that is a universal method for calculating the key rate in the quantum cryptography field, which has been widely used in QKD and QSS systems [30, 31]. H(A|E) measures how uncertain Eve is about Alice's key, showing how secret the key is from her. Similarly, H(A|B,C) measures how much error Bob and Charlie have when trying to match Alice's key during their measurements.

The security of the protocol must account for all possible  $\rho_{ABCE}$ , implying that the final key is determined by the worst-case scenario over all admissible quantum strategies. To demonstrate that the protocol can successfully generate correct and secure keys, it must be shown that the key rate remains positive when the protocol is implemented using those quantum strategies. In the ideal scenario, the protocol begins with the quantum state  $|GHZ\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle^{\otimes 7} + |1\rangle^{\otimes 7})$ . Since the winning probability of the pseudotelepathy game equals one for valid input pairs, the dealer sets the error parameter  $\eta$  to zero. The inputs selected by the parties are independent and random, and as long as they adhere to the prescribed steps of the protocol, it will not be aborted. The output string  $y = y_1 y_2 y_3 y_4 y_5 y_6 y_7$  has a special property (Table III) that it contains an even number of 1's. The output set remains invariant with respect to the input set, implying that the input strings cannot be inferred from the outputs. For any 7-bit input, the possible output set is identical, allowing any output string to occur. Now consider two possible outputs:

$$\underbrace{1}_{\text{Alice}} \quad \underbrace{000}_{\text{Bob}} \quad \underbrace{001}_{\text{Charlie}} \quad \text{and} \quad \underbrace{0}_{\text{Alice}} \quad \underbrace{000}_{\text{Bob}} \quad \underbrace{000}_{\text{Charlie}}$$

Both have an even number of 1's. Here, the first entry corresponds to the output of Alice's device, the second block of three bits corresponds to the output of Bob's device, and the third block of three bits corresponds to the output of Charlie's device. If we compare these two outputs, it becomes evident that Bob's portion of the output remains identical in both cases. This means that Bob's information alone is insufficient to distinguish between

the two possible global outputs. In other words, Bob cannot, by himself, predict or determine the complete outcome of the system. The overall output depends on the combined contributions of all three parties, and no single participant has enough information to reconstruct the global output independently.

Now from Charlie's point of view suppose we consider two different outputs

$$1$$
 001 000 and 0 101 000  
Alice Bob Charlie Alice Bob Charlie

Both the outputs contain an even number of 1's, and hence they are valid outputs. From Charlie's perspective, however, his share of the outputs is the same bitstring 000 in both cases. This information alone is insufficient for him to reconstruct or infer the complete output string. This scenario is identical to that observed in Hillery's bases (eqn.1), where neither Charlie's nor Bob's basis alone can determine Alice's outcome; they can only guess whether the outcomes are correlated or anticorrelated. For  $y = y_1 y_2 y_3 y_4 y_5 y_6 y_7$ , the condition for validity requires that the sum of the output bits be even, i.e.,  $\sum_{i} y_i$  is even. The possible values of this sum are  $\sum_{i} y_i \in \{0, 2, 4, 6\}$ . The corresponding partitions among Alice, Bob, and Charlie's subsystems can be expressed as  $(y_1, \sum y_{B_i}, \sum y_{C_i})$ , and they are shown in Table IV. In this case, the XOR of Charlie's output yields 0 or 1, guessing whether it is correlated or anticorrelated with Alice's outcome. Hence, for Bob, it follows that  $H(A|B) = \frac{1}{2}$ , an analogous relation holds for Charlie as well. But whenever Bob and Charlie meet and combine their outcomes, because for any partition (a,b,c) shown above  $a=b\oplus c\pmod 2$  is satisfied. Consequently, H(A|B,C)=0 is the required result, and it follows for all output bits generated from the proposed multiparty pseudo-telepathy based DI-QSS scheme.

Given the output bits of Bob and Charlie, there is no uncertainty in determining Alice's output bit. To achieve the key rate fully i.e., r = 1, it is therefore necessary to show that H(A|E) = 1. The GHZ state is a maximally entangled multipartite quantum state shared among the legitimate parties. Consequently, it cannot be correlated with the eavesdropper, who constitutes the fourth subsystem. The non-ideal case considers scenarios in which arbitrary quantum strategies may be employed. In this setting, the key rate r can be bounded for all valid input-output pairs (x,y). To establish a lower bound on the key rate r, it suffices to bound the conditional entropy  $H(A|E)_{\rho_E}$ . The recently developed quasirelative entropy technique [32] provides a means to derive such a lower bound on  $H(A|E)_{\rho_E}$ . A precise lower bound for  $H(A|E)_{\rho_E}$  is derived in [32] as

$$H(A|E) \ge c_m + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} c_i \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}} \inf_{Z_y \in E} \operatorname{Tr} \left\{ \rho_{AE} \left[ M_{y|x} \otimes \Gamma + t_i \left( I_A \otimes Z_y Z_y^{\dagger} \right) \right] \right\}.$$
(4)

Total Sum $(\sum_i y_i)$	Partitions $(y_1, \sum y_{B_i}, \sum y_{C_i})$	$\mathbf{y_1} = (\sum \mathbf{y_{B_i}}) \oplus (\sum \mathbf{y_{C_i}}) \pmod{2}$
	(1, 3, 2)	$1 = 3 \oplus 2 \equiv 1 \oplus 0 = 1$
6	(1,2,3)	$1 = 2 \oplus 3 \equiv 0 \oplus 1 = 1$
	(0,3,3)	$0 = 3 \oplus 3 \equiv 1 \oplus 1 = 0$
	(1, 3, 0)	$1 = 3 \oplus 0 \equiv 1 \oplus 0 = 1$
	(1,0,3)	$1 = 0 \oplus 3 \equiv 0 \oplus 1 = 1$
	(0,2,2)	$0 = 2 \oplus 2 \equiv 0 \oplus 0 = 0$
4	(0,1,3)	$0 = 1 \oplus 3 \equiv 1 \oplus 1 = 0$
	(0,3,1)	$0 = 3 \oplus 1 \equiv 1 \oplus 1 = 0$
	(1,1,2)	$1 = 1 \oplus 2 \equiv 1 \oplus 0 = 1$
	(1, 2, 1)	$1 = 2 \oplus 1 \equiv 0 \oplus 1 = 1$
	(1,0,1)	$1 = 0 \oplus 1 \equiv 0 \oplus 1 = 1$
	(1,1,0)	$1 = 1 \oplus 0 \equiv 1 \oplus 0 = 1$
2	(0,1,1)	$0 = 1 \oplus 1 \equiv 1 \oplus 1 = 0$
	(0,2,0)	$0 = 2 \oplus 0 \equiv 0 \oplus 0 = 0$
	(0, 0, 2)	$0 = 0 \oplus 2 \equiv 0 \oplus 0 = 0$
0	(0,0,0)	$0 = 0 \oplus 0 \equiv 0 \oplus 0 = 0$

TABLE IV. Partitioning of Output Sums  $(\sum_i y_i)$  into Alice, Bob, and Charlie's Subsystems

where  $\Gamma = (Z_y + Z_y^{\dagger} + (1 - t_i)Z_y^{\dagger}Z_y),$ 

 $c_m = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} c_i$ , and  $c_i = \frac{w_i}{t_i(\ln 2)}$ .  $M_{y|x}$  denotes the measurement done by Alice when the input bit is x.

 $\rho_{ABCE}$  initial quantum state, so  $\rho_{AE} = \text{Tr}_{BC}(\rho_{ABCE})$ . Also,  $\{(t_i, w_i) | i = 1, 2, \dots m\}$  a set of m nodes and weights of the Gauss-Radau quadrature.  $Z_y$  is an arbitrary operator.

This result implies that H(A|E) is always bounded below by a positive quantity, whatever be the specific states employed by Eve through the state  $\rho_{ABCE}$ . Consequently, in the noiseless scenario, the key rate r remains strictly positive, indicating that the protocol is capable of generating secure keys. Performance of the DI-QSS under noisy condition.— Over long distance photon transmission channels, photon loss, and decoherence caused by channel noise can significantly destroy entanglement and weaken the non-local correlations among the users' measurement results during practical quantum communication.

We adopt the white-noise model, which is standard in device-independent QKD protocols [33–35]. Within this model, the ideal 7-qubit GHZ state is transformed into a uniform mixture over the full set of  $2^7=128$  GHZ-type states. We further assume a global detection efficiency  $\eta$ , so that the probability of a no-click (non-detection) event is  $1-\eta=\bar{\eta}$ . Finally, the mixed state of Alice, Bob and Charlie for a 7-qubit state is

$$\rho_{ABC} = \eta^{7} \left( F \left| GHZ \right\rangle \left\langle GHZ \right| + \frac{1 - F}{2^{7}} I_{2^{7}} \right)$$

$$+ \sum_{k=1}^{6} {7 \choose k} \eta^{(7-k)} (\bar{\eta})^{k} \frac{1}{2} \left( |0^{\otimes (7-k)}\rangle \left\langle 0^{\otimes (7-k)} \right| + |1^{\otimes (7-k)}\rangle \left\langle 1^{\otimes (7-k)} \right| \right)$$

$$+ \bar{\eta}^{7} \left| \operatorname{vac} \right\rangle \left\langle \operatorname{vac} \right|.$$
(5)

F denotes the probability that the photon state is error-free, and  $\mathbb{I}_{27}$  represents the density operator corresponding to the uniform mixture of all  $2^7$  possible GHZ states on seven qubits. According to the multiparty pseudotelepathy game, all  $|GHZ_7^-\rangle$  states are not fit for the game because the final output of those states consists of an odd number of 1's [19]. Therefore, for the decoher-

ence, the QBER is

$$Q_1 = 2^6 \left(\frac{1-F}{2^7}\right) \eta^7 = \left(\frac{1-F}{2}\right) \eta^7.$$
 (6)

We now evaluate the effect of photon loss on the DI-QSS protocol, noting that the valid outputs always contain an even number of 1's. First, we consider the case of no photon loss.

(i) No photon loss: In this case, the probability that the

7 qubit output string contains an even number of 1s is

Pr[even number of 1s] = 
$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\eta\right)\left(\frac{1}{2}\eta\right)\cdots\left(\frac{1}{2}\eta\right)\eta$$
  
=  $\left(\frac{1}{2}\eta\right)^6\eta$ .

Now the number of such output bits are  $\frac{2^7}{2} = 2^6$ . Therefore, the overall probability of obtaining an even-parity output in the no photon loss scenario is  $2^6 \cdot \left(\frac{\eta^7}{2^6}\right) = \eta^7$ .

The quantum bit error rate (QBER) is defined as

$$QBER = \frac{Number\ of\ erroneous\ bits}{Total\ number\ of\ transmitted\ bits}.$$

If we restrict attention to the events in which photon loss occurs, then there are 7 distinct loss configurations, including the case in which all photons are lost. So, (ii) One photon loss: Here the probability is

Pr[one photon lost] = 
$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\eta\right)\left(\frac{1}{2}\eta\right)\cdots\left(\frac{1}{2}\eta\right)\overline{\eta}$$
  
=  $\left(\frac{1}{2}\eta\right)^{6}\overline{\eta}$ . (7)

The number of such output bits are  $7 \cdot 2^6$ .

(ii) Two photon loss: The probability is

$$\Pr[\text{two photon lost}] = \left(\frac{1}{2}\eta\right)^5 \bar{\eta}. \tag{8}$$

The number of such output bits are  $\binom{7}{2} \cdot 2^5$ .

Proceeding in this manner, we obtain a total of 7 cases, including the scenario where all photons are lost. Hence, combining all these, where photon lost happens the QBER  $Q_2$  is

$$Q_2 = 1 - \eta^7$$
.

Now the total bit error rate combining the decoherence and photon loss is

$$Q = Q_1 + Q_2 = \left(\frac{1 - F}{2}\right) \eta^7 + (1 - \eta^7)$$
$$= 1 - \frac{\eta^7}{2} - \frac{F}{2} \eta^7$$
(9)

Therefore, in the noisy model H(A|B,C) turned into

$$H(A|B,C) = h(Q).$$

Previously, in the ideal scenario, we had H(A|B,C) = h(0) = 0. After introducing errors, this value becomes h(Q). The Mermin-Klyshko inequality [36] for an N qubit state is

$$|\langle \mathcal{M}_N \rangle_C| \le 2^{\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor},$$

And for quantum non-local correlation it is

$$|\langle \mathcal{M}_N \rangle_Q| = 2^{N - \frac{1}{2}},$$

where  $\mathcal{M}_N$  is the Mermin polynomial [37].

As per the  $\rho_{ABC}$  is defined above the theoretical value of  $\mathcal{M}_N$  between Alice and Bob is always

$$\mathcal{M}_N = 2\sqrt{2}F\eta^7$$
.

If Alice holds a single qubit while Bob holds three qubits of a multipartite entangled state, and each party measures two dichotomic observables with outcomes in  $\{0,1\}$ , then the bound remains  $2\sqrt{2}$ . Notably, this upper bound does not increase with the dimension of Bob's local Hilbert space.

Hence, the observation from [8] we have the key rate as

$$r \ge 1 - h\left(\frac{\sqrt{M_7^2/4 - 1}}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\right) - h(Q)$$

$$= 1 - h\left(\frac{\sqrt{2F^2\eta^{14} - 1}}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\right) - h\left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\eta^7 - \frac{F}{2}\eta^7\right)$$
(10)

Now from this to get a positive key rate r, we consider two cases

Case 1: When F = 1 there is no decoherence,

$$r \ge 1 - h(\frac{\sqrt{2\eta^{14} - 1}}{2} + \frac{1}{2}) - h(1 - \eta^7)$$
 (11)

Then the  $\eta > 0.9517$  and for  $\eta = 0.99$  it gives always a positive key rate.

Case 2: When there is some decoherence *i.e.*  $F \neq 1$ , the minimum F possible is 0.86, and for that the key rate will remain positive when  $\eta^7 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2F}}$ , *i.e.* when  $\eta \approx 0.99$ .

Based on the calculations presented, the DI-QSS protocol requires high global detection efficiency and exhibits low resistance to noise, thereby substantially increasing the difficulty of its experimental implementation. A natural direction for future work is to improve these bounds on detection efficiency and to develop variants of the protocol that offer greater robustness against noise.

Discussion—In this work, we propose a simple deviceindependent quantum secret sharing scheme based on the multi-party pseudo-telepathy game. The simplicity of the protocol lies in the fact that it does not require different measurement bases; a single test suffices for both device-independence verification and the security of the generated key bits. In contrast to earlier secret-sharing schemes, which rely on the Svetlichny inequality, we introduce a three-party protocol using seven-qubit GHZ states. This construction ensures that the same test is sufficient for verifying device independence as well as for the successful regeneration of the secret key bits. Moreover, we have shown that our protocol, while requiring fewer resources, remains secure against collective attacks. It also provides certain bitwise advantages over previously proposed device-independent protocols. Also, we have shown how our scheme behaves in the white noise model and gives a positive key rate for certain fidelity and global detection efficiency. In order to create scalable and more general schemes that expand the pseudotelepathy game framework beyond the three-party setting and open the door to feasible multi-party quantum

secret sharing, it is promising that future research will

focus on developing sophisticated methods for enhancing noise robustness.

- Arup Kumar Chattopadhyay, Sanchita Saha, Amitava Nag, and Sukumar Nandi. Secret sharing: A comprehensive survey, taxonomy and applications. *Computer Science Review*, 51:100608, 2024.
- [2] Mark Hillery, Vladimír Bužek, and André Berthiaume. Quantum secret sharing. *Phys. Rev. A*, 59:1829–1834, Mar 1999.
- [3] Charles H. Bennett and Gilles Brassard. Quantum cryptography: Public key distribution and coin tossing. In Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems and Signal Processing, pages 175–179, Bangalore, India, 1984.
- [4] Umesh Vazirani and Thomas Vidick. Fully deviceindependent quantum key distribution. Phys. Rev. Lett., 113:140501, Sep 2014.
- [5] Antonio Acin, Nicolas Gisin, and Lluis Masanes. From bell's theorem to secure quantum key distribution. *Physical review letters*, 97(12):120405, 2006.
- [6] Antonio Acin, Serge Massar, and Stefano Pironio. Efficient quantum key distribution secure against no-signalling eavesdroppers. New Journal of Physics, 8(8):126, 2006.
- [7] Antonio Acín, Nicolas Brunner, Nicolas Gisin, Serge Massar, Stefano Pironio, and Valerio Scarani. Deviceindependent security of quantum cryptography against collective attacks. *Physical Review Letters*, 98(23):230501, 2007.
- [8] Stefano Pironio, Antonio Acín, Nicolas Brunner, Nicolas Gisin, Serge Massar, and Valerio Scarani. Device-independent quantum key distribution secure against collective attacks. New Journal of Physics, 11(4):045021, 2009.
- [9] Lluis Masanes, Stefano Pironio, and Antonio Acín. Secure device-independent quantum key distribution with causally independent measurement devices. *Nature com*munications, 2(1):238, 2011.
- [10] Lluis Masanes, Renato Renner, Matthias Christandl, Andreas Winter, and Jonathan Barrett. Full security of quantum key distribution from no-signaling constraints. IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 60(8):4973–4986, 2014.
- [11] Yao Fu, Hua-Lei Yin, Teng-Yun Chen, and Zeng-Bing Chen. Long-distance measurement-device-independent multiparty quantum communication. *Physical review let*ters, 114(9):090501, 2015.
- [12] Gilles Brassard, Norbert Lütkenhaus, Tal Mor, and Barry C Sanders. Limitations on practical quantum cryptography. *Physical review letters*, 85(6):1330, 2000.
- [13] Dominic Mayers. Unconditional security in quantum cryptography. Journal of the ACM (JACM), 48(3):351– 406, 2001.
- [14] Peter W Shor and John Preskill. Simple proof of security of the bb84 quantum key distribution protocol. *Physical review letters*, 85(2):441, 2000.
- [15] Sarbani Roy and Sourav Mukhopadhyay. Deviceindependent quantum secret sharing in arbitrary even dimensions. *Phys. Rev. A*, 100:012319, Jul 2019.

- [16] M. G. M. Moreno, Samuraí Brito, Ranieri V. Nery, and Rafael Chaves. Device-independent secret sharing and a stronger form of bell nonlocality. *Phys. Rev. A*, 101:052339, May 2020.
- [17] Qi Zhang, Wei Zhong, Ming-Ming Du, Shu-Ting Shen, Xi-Yun Li, An-Lei Zhang, Lan Zhou, and Yu-Bo Sheng. Device-independent quantum secret sharing with noise preprocessing and postselection. *Phys. Rev. A*, 110:042403, Oct 2024.
- [18] Qi Zhang, Jia-Wei Ying, Zhong-Jian Wang, Wei Zhong, Ming-Ming Du, Shu-Ting Shen, Xi-Yun Li, An-Lei Zhang, Shi-Pu Gu, Xing-Fu Wang, Lan Zhou, and Yu-Bo Sheng. Device-independent quantum secret sharing with advanced random key generation basis. *Phys. Rev. A*, 111:012603, Jan 2025.
- [19] Gilles Brassard, Anne Broadbent, and Alain Tapp. Multi-party pseudo-telepathy. In Frank Dehne, Jörg-Rüdiger Sack, and Michiel Smid, editors, Algorithms and Data Structures, pages 1–11, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2003. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [20] Gilles Brassard, Andre A Methot, and Alain Tapp. Minimum entangled state dimension required for pseudotelepathy. arXiv preprint quant-ph/0412136, 2004.
- [21] Gilles Brassard, Anne Broadbent, and Alain Tapp. Recasting mermin's multi-player game into the framework of pseudo-telepathy. arXiv preprint quant-ph/0408052, 2004.
- [22] Daniel M Greenberger, Michael A Horne, Abner Shimony, and Anton Zeilinger. Bell's theorem without inequalities. American Journal of Physics, 58(12):1131– 1143, 1990.
- [23] N David Mermin. What's wrong with these elements of reality? *Physics Today*, 43(6):9–11, 1990.
- [24] Asher Peres. Quantum theory: concepts and methods. Springer, 2002.
- [25] Renato Renner and Stefan Wolf. Quantum pseudotelepathy and the kochen-specker theorem. In *Inter*national Symposium on Information Theory, 2004. ISIT 2004. Proceedings., pages 322–322. IEEE, 2004.
- [26] N David Mermin. Quantum mysteries revisited. Am. J. Phys, 58(8):731–734, 1990.
- [27] Richard Cleve, Peter Hoyer, Benjamin Toner, and John Watrous. Consequences and limits of nonlocal strategies. In *Proceedings. 19th IEEE Annual Conference on Computational Complexity*, 2004., pages 236–249. IEEE, 2004.
- [28] Jacopo Francesco Riccati. Ciii. the invention of a general method for determining the sum of every 2d, 3d, 4th, or 5th, &c. term of a series, taken in order; the sum of the whole series being known. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, 50:601-618, 1757.
- [29] Igor Devetak and Andreas Winter. Distillation of secret key and entanglement from quantum states. Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 461(2053):207–235, 2005.
- [30] Ruoyang Qi, Haoran Zhang, Jiancun Gao, Liuguo Yin, and Gui-Lu Long. Loophole-free plug-and-play quantum

- key distribution. New Journal of Physics, 23(6):063058, jun 2021.
- [31] Remigiusz Augusiak and Pawel Horodecki. Multipartite secret key distillation and bound entanglement. *Phys. Rev. A*, 80:042307, Oct 2009.
- [32] Peter Brown, Hamza Fawzi, and Omar Fawzi. Deviceindependent lower bounds on the conditional von Neumann entropy. *Quantum*, 8:1445, August 2024.
- [33] E. Woodhead, A. Acín, and S. Pironio. Deviceindependent quantum key distribution with asymmetric CHSH inequalities. *Quantum*, 5, 2021.
- [34] M. Masini, S. Pironio, and E. Woodhead. Simple and

- practical DIQKD security analysis via BB84-type uncertainty relations and Pauli correlation constraints. Quantum, 6, 2022.
- [35] P. Sekatski, J.-D. Bancal, X. Valcarce, E. Y.-Z. Tan, R. Renner, and N. Sangouard. Device-independent quantum key distribution from generalized CHSH inequalities. *Quantum*, 5, 2021.
- [36] A. A. Klyshko. Bell's theorem for n particles. *Physics Letters A*, 172(6):399–400, 1993.
- [37] N. David Mermin. Extreme quantum entanglement in a one-dimensional chain of spin-1/2 particles. *Physical Review Letters*, 65(15):1838–1840, 1990.