

Using non positive maps to construct entanglement witnesses

Marek Mozrzyński¹, Adam Rutkowski^{2,3}, Michał Studziński^{2,3}

¹ *Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Wrocław, 50-204 Wrocław, Poland*

² *Faculty of Mathematics, Physics and Informatics, University of Gdańsk, 80-952 Gdańsk, Poland*

³ *Quantum Information Centre of Gdańsk, 81-824 Sopot, Poland*

(Dated: April 12, 2024)

In this paper we present the new method for entanglement witnesses construction. We show that to construct such object we can deal with maps which are not positive on whole domain, but only on certain sub-domain. In our approach crucial role play such maps which are surjective between sets \mathcal{P}_k^d of $k \leq d$ rank projectors and the set \mathcal{P}_1^d of rank one projectors acting in the d dimensional space. In second part of this paper we show that inverse reduction map satisfies this requirement and using it we can obtain bunch of new entanglement witnesses.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Mn

Keywords: separability, entanglement, entanglement witness, positive map

I. INTRODUCTION

It is well known that quantum entanglement is the most important resource in the field of quantum information theory. Is worth to mention here such significant achievements as quantum cryptography [1], quantum teleportation [2], quantum dense coding [3], quantum error corrections codes and many others important application of this phenomena. Thanks to this it is obvious that knowledge when we deal with entangled states together with their classification plays crucial role. However still one of the biggest problem in the field remains open. Namely up to now we do not have satisfactory criteria to decide whether given quantum state is separable or entangled. Full answer delivers famous Peres-Horodecki criterion [5, 6] based on idea of partial transposition, which gives necessary and sufficient criteria for separability for bipartite $2 \otimes 2, 2 \otimes 3$ systems, but unfortunately for higher dimensions this criterion is not conclusive. The problem is even more complicated if we lift it to multipartite case, but of course there are several approach to detection entanglement (separability) in general [9–11]. Despite this difficulties, fortunately there is one of the most general method to decide when quantum composite state is entanglement is based on the concept of entanglement witness firstly introduced in [7] based on famous Hahn-Banach theorem. This approach allows us to detect entanglement without full knowledge about the quantum state. What is the most important any entangled state has corresponding entangled witness, so this property makes mentioned method somehow universal. Exploring theory of entanglement witnesses from mathematical point of view, there is well known connection between them and the theory of positive maps [8], which allows us to understand much deeper the structure of the set of quantum states.

Let us say here a few words more about notation used in this manuscript. In this section and also in our further considerations by $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ (respectively $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$) we denote the algebra of all bounded linear operators on \mathbb{C}^d (respectively on \mathcal{H}). Using this notation let us define the following set:

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) = \{\rho \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \mid \rho \geq 0, \text{Tr} \rho = 1\}, \quad (1)$$

which is set of all states on space \mathcal{H} . Suppose now that we are dealing with two finite dimensional Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K} . State in the bipartite composition system $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K})$ is said to be separable if it can be written as $\rho = \sum_i p_i \rho_i \otimes \sigma_i$, where ρ_i, σ_i are states on \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} respectively, and p_i are some positive numbers satisfying $\sum_i p_i = 1$. Otherwise we say that state ρ is entangled.

Now we are ready to present definition of entanglement witness and basics ideas connected with these objects. Let us start from the definition of entanglement witness [5], [7]:

Definition 1. *The operator $W \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d)$ is called entanglement witness when:*

1. $W \not\geq 0$,
2. $\text{Tr}(\sigma W) \geq 0$ for all separable states σ .

There is well known theorem [5] which states that for every entangled state ρ there exists corresponding entangled witness W , such that $\text{Tr}(W\rho) < 0$. Reader notices that this condition is equivalent to first condition from the above definition. From Definition 1 we see that any entanglement witness corresponds to some hermitian operator, which thanks to Jamiołkowski isomorphism [16] is connected with some positive, but not completely positive linear map $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$, such that:

$$W = (\mathbf{1} \otimes \Lambda) P_d^+, \quad (2)$$

where P_d^+ is the projector on maximally entangled state $|\psi_+^d\rangle = (1/\sqrt{d}) \sum_i |ii\rangle$.

In this point for more information about entanglement witnesses and their properties we refer here reader to excellent review paper treating this topic [17].

At the end of this introductory section we present the structure of our paper. Namely in the Section II the main result of our work which is contained. In the Theorem 1 we show that to construct entanglement witness we do not have to restrict to positive maps on whole domain, but only its certain subset. In particular such map has to be at least surjection between set of the rank $k \leq d$ projectors \mathcal{P}_k^d and set of rank one projectors \mathcal{P}_1^d acting in the d dimensional space.

After that we present two short sections with examples which illustrate how our method works in practice. We start from the Section III where we show that inverse reduction map satisfies all requirements from the Section II, then in the Section IV we show a illustrative example of entanglement witnesses obtained thanks to inverse reduction map.

Finally at the end of this paper we present also Appendix A where we explain basic properties of unitary spaces which are necessary to discussion about inverse reduction map in the Section III, then in the Appendix B we formulate Propositions 3 and 4 which together with the Remark 5 are necessary in the proof of Theorem 1 and its formulation itself and also play very important role in the analysis of inverse reduction map from the Section III.

II. GENERAL CONSTRUCTION OF ENTANGLEMENT WITNESS FROM NON-POSITIVE MAP

In this section we present our main result which is contained in the Theorem 1. We show that to construct entanglement witnesses we do not have to restrict only to positive maps on the whole domain in general, but only on some specific subset. To do so we can use map $\Lambda^\dagger : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$, which is surjective between set \mathcal{P}_k^d of rank k projectors and the set \mathcal{P}_1^d of rank one projectors, which is given in the Proposition 3 contained in the Appendix A. Having this knowledge we are in the position to formulate the following:

Theorem 1. *Let $W \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d)$, $W = W^\dagger$, $W \not\geq 0$ and W is such that $\widetilde{W} = (\mathbf{1} \otimes \Lambda)W \geq 0$ for some linear map $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$. We assume also that map $\Lambda^\dagger : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ is not positive on whole domain but only maps surjectively set \mathcal{P}_k^d of rank k projectors on the set \mathcal{P}_1^d of rank one projectors, then we have:*

$$\forall |\psi\rangle, |\phi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d : \|\psi\| = \|\phi\| = 1 \quad 0 \leq \text{Tr}(W|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \otimes |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|), \quad (3)$$

so the operator W is a entanglement witness.

Proof. Let $W \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$, $W = W^\dagger$, $W \not\geq 0$ and W is such that $\widetilde{W} = (\mathbf{1} \otimes \Lambda)W \geq 0$, so we can write [18]:

$$0 \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i = \min_{\widetilde{P} \in \mathcal{P}_k^{d^2}} \text{Tr}(\widetilde{W}\widetilde{P}), \quad (4)$$

where $0 \leq \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_{d-1} \leq \dots \leq \lambda_{d^2}$ are eigenvalues of \widetilde{W} and here $\mathcal{P}_k^{d^2} = \{P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d) : P^2 = P, \quad P^\dagger = P, \quad \text{Tr}(P) = k\}$. Now we choose a particular orthogonal projector $P = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \otimes \sum_{i=1}^k |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i| = \sum_{i=1}^k |\omega_i\rangle\langle\omega_i|$ from the Proposition 4 we get

$$0 \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i = \min_{\widetilde{P} \in \mathcal{P}_k^{d^2}} \text{Tr}(\widetilde{W}\widetilde{P}) \leq \text{Tr}(\widetilde{W}P) = \text{Tr}((\mathbf{1} \otimes \Lambda)WP). \quad (5)$$

Now we can continue rewriting right hand side of the formula (5) as

$$0 \leq \text{Tr}((\mathbf{1} \otimes \Lambda)WP) = \text{Tr}(W(\mathbf{1} \otimes \Lambda^\dagger)|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \otimes \sum_{i=1}^k |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|) = \text{Tr}(W|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \otimes \Lambda^\dagger(\sum_{i=1}^k |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|)), \quad (6)$$

where by Λ^\dagger we denote adjoint¹ map to Λ . The projectors $\sum_{i=1}^k |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|$ of rank k generate the set $\mathcal{P}_k^d = \{P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) : P^2 = P, \quad P^\dagger = P, \quad \text{Tr}(P) = k\}$, thus from the assumptions it follows that $\{\Lambda^\dagger(\sum_{i=1}^k |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|) : \langle\phi_i|\phi_j\rangle =$

¹Suppose that we are given with liner map $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$, then adjoint map is defined as $\text{Tr}(\Lambda\Lambda(B)) = \text{Tr}(B\Lambda^\dagger(A))$, $\forall A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$. We also say that linear map Λ is self-adjoint when $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ $\text{Tr}(\Lambda\Lambda(B)) = \text{Tr}(B\Lambda(A))$. Moreover if Λ is positive map then also Λ^\dagger

$\delta_{ij}\} = \mathcal{P}_1^d = \{P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) : P^2 = P, \quad P^\dagger = P, \quad \text{Tr}(P) = 1\}$. It means that $W \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d)$, $W = W^\dagger$, $W \not\geq 0$ takes non-negative expectations values on separable states. This finishes the proof. \square

Remark 1. Form the proof of Theorem 1 it follows that the operator W cannot take negative values on the product states.

III. INVERSE REDUCTION MAP AS AN EXAMPLE

In the previous section we have considered general maps Λ with certain properties. Now natural question arises: Do we know any examples of the maps which satisfy required demanding? The goal of this paragraph is to present such example. Let us consider the following linear map

Definition 2.

$$R^{-1} : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d), \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) \quad R^{-1}(A) = \frac{1}{d-1} \text{Tr}(A) \mathbf{1} - A. \quad (7)$$

The linear map R^{-1} acts in the linear space $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ which a Hilbert space with respect to the standard Hilbert-Schmidt scalar product

$$\forall A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) \quad (A, B) \equiv \text{Tr}(A^\dagger B), \quad (8)$$

where \dagger is the hermitian conjugation.

Remark 2. Reduction map [13] is defined as

$$R : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}), \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \quad R(A) = \text{Tr}(A) \mathbf{1} - A. \quad (9)$$

Indeed reader can check that for arbitrary $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ we have $R^{-1} \circ R(A) = R \circ R^{-1}(A) = A$, which means that $\ker(R^{-1}) = \{0\}$, and we have $\forall A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) \quad R(A) = \text{Tr}(A) \mathbf{1} - A$. Note that if $d = 2$, then $R = R^{-1}$. In this case both maps R, R^{-1} are positive.

Proposition 1. The map R^{-1} has the following properties:

1. The map R^{-1} is self-adjoint with respect to the Hilbert-Schmidt scalar product i.e. we have

$$(R^{-1}(A), B) = (A, R^{-1}(B)). \quad (10)$$

2. Suppose that $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ is an orthogonal projector of rank $d-1$ i.e. $A^2 = A$, $A^\dagger = A$ and $\text{Tr}(A) = d-1$, then

$$R^{-1}(A) = \mathbf{1} - A \Rightarrow R^{-1}(A)^2 = R^{-1}(A), \quad R^{-1}(A)^\dagger = R^{-1}(A), \quad \text{Tr} R^{-1}(A) = 1, \quad (11)$$

so the image of the map R^{-1} on any orthogonal projector of rank $d-1$ is an orthogonal projector of rank 1. Moreover the map R^{-1} establishes a bijective correspondence between the set of all orthogonal projectors of rank $d-1$ and the set of all orthogonal projectors of rank 1.

3. If $\forall X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ we have $R^{-1}(X) \geq 0$ then $X \geq 0$.

The proof of above statements can be directly deduced from facts contained in the Appendix A.

Corollary 1. The operator $\mathbf{1} \otimes R^{-1}$ is also self-adjoint with respect to the tensor product scalar product

$$\forall A, B, X, Y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) \quad (A \otimes B, X \otimes Y) \equiv (A, X)(B, Y), \quad (12)$$

where $(A, B) \equiv \text{Tr}(A^\dagger B)$.

Remark 3. The map $R^{-1} : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ is not positive but R^{-1} restricted to the set \mathcal{P}_{d-1}^d is a positive map. Indeed, as an example let us take matrix \mathbb{I} which is filled only by ones and it is positive. Now acting by R^{-1} we have $A = R^{-1}(\mathbb{I}) = \frac{d}{d-1} \mathbf{1} - \mathbb{I}$, with $\text{spec}(A) = \left\{ \frac{d(2-d)}{d-1}, \frac{d}{d-1}, \dots, \frac{d}{d-1} \right\}$. We notice that whenever $d > 2$, then $\frac{d(2-d)}{d-1} < 0$, so A is no longer positive. Summarizing when R, R^{-1} are not equal (for $d \geq 3$, see Remark 2), then the main difference between them is that R is positive but R^{-1} is not in general.

Summarizing inverse reduction map R^{-1} satisfies all conditions from the assumptions of the Theorem 1, so it can be used for the entanglement witness construction. Moreover thanks to Proposition 1 point 1) this map is self-adjoint, so it satisfies even stronger conditions that we require.

IV. EXPLICIT EXAMPLES OF ENTANGLEMENT WITNESSES

In this section we use Theorem 1 together with the Definition 2 of the inverse reduction map from the previous section to present explicit construction of entanglement witnesses. To do so let us consider positive semi-definite operator $0 \leq \widetilde{W} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d)$ in the standard operators basis $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) \ni e_{ij} = |i\rangle\langle j|$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, d$:

$$\widetilde{W} = \sum_{i,j=1}^d e_{ij} \otimes \widetilde{W}_{ij}. \quad (13)$$

Let $S \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ be a shift operator defined as:

$$S|i\rangle := |i+1\rangle \quad \text{mod } d,$$

then using above definition we can write operators \widetilde{W}_{ij} from formula (13) in the following way:

$$\widetilde{W}_{ii} = S^{i-1} \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & a_2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & a_d \end{pmatrix} S^{(i-1)\dagger}, \quad a_i \geq 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, d, \quad (14)$$

and for all off-diagonal elements i.e for all indices satisfying $i \neq j$.

$$\widetilde{W}_{ij} = S^{i-1} \begin{pmatrix} x & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix} S^{(j-1)\dagger}, \quad a_i \geq 0 \quad \text{for } i, j = 1, \dots, d. \quad (15)$$

Using form of our operator \widetilde{W} from equation (13) together with conditions on \widetilde{W}_{ij} given in formulas (14) and (15) we are able to write explicit conditions for positivity of state \widetilde{W} in terms of parameters a_i and x . Namely we have the following:

Remark 4. Operator $\widetilde{W} \geq 0$ if and only if submatrix A is positive semidefinite

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & x & \cdots & x \\ x & a_1 & \cdots & x \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x & x & \cdots & a_1 \end{pmatrix} \geq 0, \quad (16)$$

it means that $x \in \left[\frac{-a_1}{d-1}, a_1 \right]$.

Now we are in the position to use all what we have learnt from the Section III and use the inverse reduction map to construct some appropriate example of entanglement witness:

Let us use as map the inverse of reduction map i.e $R^{-1} : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ defined as follows

$$R^{-1}(O) = \frac{1}{d-1} \text{Tr}(O) - O. \quad (17)$$

Above map is not positive map in general. As operator W from Theorem 1 let us take $W = (\mathbf{1} \otimes R^{-1}) \widetilde{W}$, then the following conditions should satisfy

$$\begin{cases} x \notin \left[\frac{-a_1}{d-1}, a_1 \right] \\ x \in \left[-y_1, \frac{y_1}{d-1} \right] \\ y_k \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, d, \quad (18)$$

where $y_k = \frac{1}{d-1} \sum_{i=1}^d a_i - a_k$, for $k = 1, \dots, d$.

At the end of this section we give explicit example of the operator $W \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^3 \otimes \mathbb{C}^3)$ with particularly choosen parameters. Namely let us take $a_1 = 2\epsilon, a_2 = a_3 = \epsilon + 1$ and $x = \epsilon$, which satisfy conditions from the formula (18), then whenever $\epsilon > 1/2$ operator W is entanglement witness:

$$W = \left(\begin{array}{ccc|ccc|ccc} 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & -\epsilon & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & -\epsilon \\ \cdot & \epsilon & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \epsilon & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \hline \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \epsilon & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ -\epsilon & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & -\epsilon \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \epsilon & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \hline \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \epsilon & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \epsilon & \cdot \\ -\epsilon & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & -\epsilon & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 \end{array} \right), \quad (19)$$

where dots denote zeros.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have shown that to construction of entanglement witnesses is enough to consider maps which are not necessary positive on whole domain, but only on some sub-domain. Namely we can consider in general non-positive map (see Theorem 1) which is the surjective function from the set \mathcal{P}_k^d of k rank projectors to the set \mathcal{P}_1^d of rank one projectors (see Corollary 2, Proposition 3 and Remark 5). Our illustrative example is the inverse reduction map for which we have presented explicit

It is also worth to mention here about one open problem connected with our construction. Namely it would be interesting to check whether entanglement witnesses obtained from the inverse reduction map are decomposable. We can ask about the connection between decomposability property and the structure of the chosen map or chosen operator W (see Theorem 1).

Acknowledgments

A. Rutkowski was supported by a postdoc internship decision number DEC-2012/04/S/ST2/00002, from the Polish National Science Center. M. Studziński is supported by grant 2012/07/N/ST2/02873 from National Science Centre. M. Mozrzyk is supported by ERC Project no. 291348 QOLAPS and National Science Centre project MaestroDEC-2011/02/A/ST2/00305. M. Mozrzyk would like to thanks Quantum Information Centre of Gdańsk, where some part of this work was done.

Appendix A: Some important facts about unitary spaces

In this appendix we recall same basic properties of unitary spaces which are important to understand our results contained in the Section II and the properties of the inverse reduction map from the Section III.

Proposition 2. *Let P be an orthogonal projector i.e.*

$$P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) : P^2 = P, \quad P^\dagger = P, \quad \text{Tr}(P) = d - 1, \quad (A1)$$

then P gives a unique decomposition of the space \mathbb{C}^d of the form

$$\mathbb{C}^d = \text{Im } P \oplus \ker P : \ker P = (\text{Im } P)^\perp \quad (\text{A2})$$

and $\dim(\ker P) = 1$, $\dim(\text{Im } P) = d - 1$ so $\text{Im } P$ is a hyperplane. Moreover if $\{|\psi\rangle_i\}_{i=1}^{d-1}, \{|\phi\rangle_i\}_{i=1}^{d-1} \subset \text{Im } P$ are two orthonormal bases in the subspace $\text{Im } P$ then

$$P = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|. \quad (\text{A3})$$

So the spectral decomposition of the projector P does not depend on the choice of the orthonormal basis in $\text{Im } P$.

It is known that any set of orthonormal vectors in \mathbb{C}^d (or in any linear space) may be extended to a basis of the space \mathbb{C}^d . Such extensions are not unique. The structure of the extensions of orthonormal bases of the space $\text{Im } P$ to bases of the space \mathbb{C}^d describe the following:

Lemma 1. Let $\{|\psi\rangle_i\}_{i=1}^{d-1}, \{|\psi'\rangle_i\}_{i=1}^{d-1} \subset \text{Im } P$ are two orthonormal bases in the subspace $\text{Im } P$ and $\{|\psi\rangle_i\}_{i=1}^d, \{|\psi'\rangle_i\}_{i=1}^d \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ are their extensions to orthonormal bases in \mathbb{C}^d , then

$$|\psi'_d\rangle = e^{i\varphi} |\psi_d\rangle, \quad \varphi \in [0, 2\pi), \quad (\text{A4})$$

where $|\psi'_d\rangle, |\psi_d\rangle \in \ker P$. So it means that for a given orthonormal projector P of rank $d - 1$ there exist a vector $|\psi\rangle \in \ker P$ such that $\|\psi\| = 1$ and the extension of any orthonormal basis $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{d-1}$ in $\text{Im } P$ to a basis in \mathbb{C}^d has the following form

$$\{|\psi_1\rangle, \dots, |\psi_{d-1}\rangle, e^{i\varphi} |\psi\rangle\}. \quad (\text{A5})$$

Any vector of the form $e^{i\varphi} |\psi\rangle$ where $|\psi\rangle \in \ker P$, $\|\psi\| = 1$ form an orthonormal basis in one-dimensional subspace $\ker P$.

Proof. $|\psi'_d\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^d x_i |\psi_i\rangle$. From $|\psi'_d\rangle \perp |\psi_i\rangle$, $i = 1, \dots, d - 1$ we get $|\psi'_d\rangle = x_d |\psi_d\rangle$ and from the normalization of basis vectors we get $|x_d| = 1$. \square

From this Lemma and Proposition 1 we get

Corollary 2. Let us define

$$\mathcal{P}_{d-1}^d = \{P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) : P^2 = P, \quad P^\dagger = P \quad \text{Tr}(P) = d - 1\}, \quad (\text{A6})$$

$$\mathcal{P}_1^d = \{P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) : P^2 = P, \quad P^\dagger = P \quad \text{Tr}(P) = 1\}. \quad (\text{A7})$$

There exist a bijective correspondence between the elements of the sets \mathcal{P}_{d-1}^d and \mathcal{P}_1^d . The bijective correspondence between the elements of the sets \mathcal{P}_{d-1}^d and \mathcal{P}_1^d can be expressed as follows

$$\forall P \in \mathcal{P}_{d-1}^d \quad \exists! Q \in \mathcal{P}_1^d \quad P = \mathbf{1} - Q, \quad (\text{A8})$$

$$\forall Q \in \mathcal{P}_1^d \quad \exists! P \in \mathcal{P}_{d-1}^d \quad Q = \mathbf{1} - P, \quad (\text{A9})$$

where $\exists!$ means : there exist unique.

Moreover if $P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) : P^2 = P, \quad P^\dagger = P, \quad \text{Tr}(P) = d - 1$ then there exist a unique orthonormal projector $Q \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) : Q^2 = Q, \quad Q^\dagger = Q, \quad \text{Tr}(Q) = 1$ such that

$$\mathbf{1} = P + Q : Q = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|, \quad (\text{A10})$$

where $|\psi\rangle \in \ker P$ is any orthonormal basis vector of $\ker P$ and $\text{Im } Q = \ker P$, $\ker Q = \text{Im } P$ and $PQ = QP = 0$.

Proof. To prove second statement let us consider orthonormal basis $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^d$ in \mathbb{C}^d we have

$$\mathbf{1} = \sum_{i=1}^d |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|. \quad (\text{A11})$$

In particular it holds for orthonormal bases of \mathbb{C}^d that are extensions of the orthonormal bases of $\text{Im } P$ e.i. for the bases of the form $\{|\psi_1\rangle, \dots, |\psi_{d-1}\rangle, |\psi\rangle\}$, where $\{|\psi_1\rangle, \dots, |\psi_{d-1}\rangle\}$ is an orthonormal basis in $\text{Im } P$ and $|\psi\rangle \in \ker P : \|\psi\| = 1$ forms an orthonormal basis in one-dimensional $\ker P$ so we have

$$\mathbf{1} = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| + |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \equiv P + Q, \quad (\text{A12})$$

where $Q = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ and from Proposition 1 we know that the orthogonal projectors does not depend on the choice of bases in the range of these projectors so Q does not depend on the choice of the basis vector $|\psi\rangle$ and is unique. \square

Appendix B: Auxiliary lemmas

After short introductory to the topic of unitary spaces contained in the Section A we are ready to present some conclusion which is contained in the two following propositions. First the Proposition 3 contains generalization of the bijection from the Corollary 2 for the rank k projectors, which allows us to formulate general statement contained in the Theorem 1. Finally the Proposition 4 is some auxiliary result important in the proof of above-mentioned theorem.

Proposition 3. *Let P be an orthogonal projector i.e.*

$$P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) : P^2 = P, \quad P^\dagger = P \quad \text{Tr}(P) = k, \quad k = 1, \dots, d-1, \quad (\text{B1})$$

then P gives a unique decomposition of the space \mathbb{C}^d of the form

$$\mathbb{C}^d = \text{Im } P \oplus \ker P : \ker P = (\text{Im } P)^\perp \quad (\text{B2})$$

and $\dim(\ker P) = d - k$, $\dim(\text{Im } P) = k$. Moreover for any such P there exist a unique orthogonal projector

$$Q \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) : Q^2 = Q, \quad Q^\dagger = Q, \quad \text{Tr}(Q) = d - k, \quad (\text{B3})$$

such that

$$\mathbf{1} = P + Q, \quad (\text{B4})$$

where $\text{Im } Q = \ker P$, $\ker Q = \text{Im } P$ and $PQ = QP = 0$, so we have

$$\forall k = 1, \dots, d-1 \quad \forall P \in \mathcal{P}_k^d \quad \exists! Q \in \mathcal{P}_{d-k}^d \quad P = \mathbf{1} - Q, \quad (\text{B5})$$

where $\mathcal{P}_k^d = \{P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) : P^2 = P, \quad P^\dagger = P, \quad \text{Tr}(P) = k\}$.

Remark 5. *Reader notices that for our purposes in the Theorem 1 we can choose bijection which establishes one to one correspondence between set \mathcal{P}_k^d of rank k projectors and the set \mathcal{P}_1^d of rank one projectors.*

In the following we will need also an easy to check

Proposition 4. *Let $|\psi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d$ and $|\phi_i\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d$, $i = 1, \dots, d-1$ are such that*

$$\langle\psi|\psi\rangle = 1, \quad \langle\phi_i|\phi_j\rangle = \delta_{ij}. \quad (\text{B6})$$

Then

$$P = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \otimes \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i| = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} |\omega_i\rangle\langle\omega_i| \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d), \quad (\text{B7})$$

where $\omega_i = |\psi\rangle \otimes |\phi_i\rangle$, is an orthogonal projector of rank $d-1$ (in fact $P \in \mathcal{P}_{d-1}^{d^2}$) and it is generated by simple tensors ω_i , so it is of particular form. Note that

$$\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i| : \langle\phi_i|\phi_j\rangle = \delta_{ij} \right\} = \mathcal{P}_{d-1}^d \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d). \quad (\text{B8})$$

-
- [1] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard *Quantum Cryptography: Public key distribution and coin tossing*, Proc. Internat. Conf. Computer Systems and Signal Processing, Bangalore, **175**, (1984).
 - [2] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, W. K. Wootters, *Teleporting an Unknown Quantum State via Dual Classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen Channels*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70** 1895-1899 (1993).,
 - [3] C. H. Bennett, S. Wiesner *Communication via one- and two-particle operators on Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen states*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69** (20), 2881, (1992).
 - [4] S. J. Cho, S-H. Kye i S. G. Lee. *Generalized choi maps in three-dimensional matrix algebra*, Linear Algebra Appl. **171**, 213, (1992).
 - [5] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki and R. Horodecki, *Separability of mixed states: Necessary and sufficient conditions*, Phys. Lett. A, vol. **223**, pp. 1-8, 1996
 - [6] A. Peres, *Separability criterion for density matrices*, Phys. Rev. Lett., vol. **77**, pp. 1413-1415, 1996
 - [7] B. M. Terhal, *Bell inequalities and separability criterion*, Phys. Lett. A **271**, 319 (2000)
 - [8] P. Horodecki, *Separability criterion and inseparable mixed states with positive partial transposition*, Phys. Rev. Lett. A **232**, 333, (1997).
 - [9] A. C. Doherty, P. A. Parrilo, and F. M. Spedalieri *Distinguishing separable and entangled states* , Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 187904 (2002).
 - [10] A. C. Doherty, P. A. Parrilo, and F. M. Spedalieri, *A complete family of separability criteria*, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 022308 (2004)
 - [11] O. Gühne, G. Tóth, *Entanglement detection*, Phys. Rep. **474**, 1 (2009)
 - [12] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki and K. Horodecki, *Quantum entanglement*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865, (2009)
 - [13] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki and R. Horodecki, *Reduction criterion of separability and limits for a class of distillation protocols*, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 4206, (1999).
 - [14] J. Sperling and W. Vogel, *Necessary and sufficient conditions for bipartite entanglement*, Phys. Rev. **79**, 022318, (2009).
 - [15] G. Tóth, *Entanglement witnesses in spin models*, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 010301(R), (2005).
 - [16] A. Jamiołkowski, *Linear transformations which preserve trace and positive semi-definiteness of operator*, Rep. Math. Phys. **3**, 267-278, (1972).
 - [17] D. Chruściński, G. Sarbicki, *Entanglement witnesses: construction, analysis and classification*, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **47**, 483001, (2014).
 - [18] R. A. Horn, Ch. R. Johnson *Topics in Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, 1991