

Nonlinear entanglement witnesses for four qubits in mutually unbiased bases

K. Aghayar*

Physics Department, Urmia University, Urmia, Iran.

A. Heshmati†

*Department of Physics, Shabestar Branch,
Islamic Azad University, Shabestar, Iran.*

M. A. Jafarizadeh‡

*Department of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics,
University of Tabriz, Tabriz, Iran.*

Entanglement witness is a Hermitian operator detecting entanglement in a quantum system. Non-linear entanglement witnesses have wider range entanglement detection ability relative to the linear ones. Here we construct some entanglement witnesses for a four qubit mutually unbiased basis Bell diagonal density matrices. To this aim we specify the convex feasible region with positive partial transpose states. To reveal the entangled regions, we present some appropriate linear entanglement witnesses as the envelope of family of linear entanglement witnesses and in this case, the nonlinear witnesses have been nonlinear functional of linear witnesses. We also study thermal entanglement and show for some Hamiltonians the witnesses have ability to detect the entanglement at all temperatures. The results of this study are evaluated and assessed in the light of four qubit entanglement detection problem.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Mn, 03.65.Ud.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum entanglement is a physical phenomenon that occurs when pairs or groups of particles are generated or interact in ways such that the quantum state of each particle cannot be described independently instead, a quantum state may be given for the system as a whole [1, 2]. Mathematically, a state of a composite quantum system is called entangled if it cannot be written as a convex combination of product states [3]. Quantum entanglement has many physical application such as quantum key distribution in quantum cryptography [4, 5] with new experiments [6, 7], quantum dense coding [8], and quantum teleportation [9, 39]. In these applications there must be some physical observable acting on system state to detect the entanglement in the system. On of the observables detecting entanglement especially for system with three or more particles is entanglement witness (*EW*).

Entanglement witness is an observable which completely characterize separable states and detect entanglement in a system experimentally [11–15]. From geometrical point of view as the quantum mixed states family (density matrices) is a convex set so an *EW* can be describe by hyperplanes in the density matrix space. Now the *EW*, W is a Hermitian operator which have a non-negative value on all pure product states $Tr(W\rho_{Product}) \geq 0$ where $\rho_{Product} = |\psi_1\rangle\dots|\psi_n\rangle\langle\psi_n|\dots\langle\psi_1|$. The entanglement of ρ is detected

by *EW* if and only if $Tr(W\rho) \leq 0$ Although there is a necessary and sufficient condition for separability in $2 \otimes 2$ and $2 \otimes 3$ cases, called the positive partial transpose *PPT* criterion or Peres-Horodecki criterion [16], in general there is no such conditions for other cases and there are states that are entangled but *PPT* in all those cases which are called *PPT* entangled states. The another way for detecting entanglement for system with higher dimensions is using *EW*. Specially the *EWs* detecting *PPT* entangled states are in great importance. Usually these are non-decomposable *EWs*. One can consider linear *EWs* which is relatively simple to construct or nonlinear *EWs*

There are some nonlinear separability criteria in the literature. Generally these nonlinear *EWs* have wider range entanglement detection. In article [17], the author derive a family of necessary separability criteria for finite dimensional systems based on inequalities for variances of observables and formulate an equivalent criterion in terms of covariance matrices. The criteria may be applied from the regime of continuous variables to finite dimensional systems. Nonlinear *EWs* as an extension of linear witnesses with ability to detect the states with negative partial transpose has been presented in [18]. A general theorem as a necessary condition for the separability based on concave-function uncertainty relations has been derived for both finite and infinite dimensional systems in [19]. The author has been used the specific concave function method for a system with mutually unbiased bases (MUB), for entanglement detection as a special case of his approach. In some cases that approach leads to an analytic entanglement detection which is stronger than the Shannon entropic uncertainty relation and the

* k.aghayar@urmia.ac.ir

† heshmati@tabrizu.ac.ir

‡ jafarizadeh@tabrizu.ac.ir

Landau-Pollak uncertainty relation. Using appropriate class of uncertainty relations, the entanglement for the local quantum states of a pair of N -level systems have been defined in [20]. These uncertainty relations may be used as an experimental test of entanglement generation. A derivation of nonlinear EW s based on covariance matrices has been investigated in [21]. The nonlinear functions which improves the entanglement detection given by the linear ones is presented in [22] with explicit examples showing accessible nonlinear EW s detect more states than their linear ancestors.

The other way for constructing nonlinear EW s is based on the PPT entangled states detection by improving the linear EW s. In this approach for a given density matrix the PPT convex region is determined by the PPT inequalities of the density matrix. For some PPT states in this region which called feasible region, the PPT criterion is sufficient for separability. Then linear EW s introduce and the non decomposability for some of them is achieved. Then nonlinear EW s has been constructed from linear ones. This method has been applied for three qubit MUB diagonal entangled states in [23], for $2 \otimes 2 \otimes d$ bound entangled density matrices by exact convex optimization in [24], for general algorithm for manipulating nonlinear and linear entanglement witnesses by using exact convex optimization [25], and for bipartite $N \otimes N$ systems via exact convex optimization in [26].

In this paper we aim to determine the EW s for a given four qubit density matrix which have ability to detect the PPT entangled states. Then we are intended to provide the nonlinear EW s from the linear ones. To do this first we specify the PPT states for a given four qubit density matrix in the mutually unbiased basis (MUB). These states make a convex region called the feasible region (FR). By using the PPT inequalities we find some MUB diagonal states which for them the PPT criterion is necessary and sufficient for separability. Then we introduce the linear EW s family which detect the bound MUB diagonal density matrices. Then we present the nonlinear EW s with the nonlinear coefficients which have wider range detection. These nonlinear EW s are envelope the family of linear EW s. This framework helps to investigate the EW s for a given density matrix (here four qubit) and serves for in organizing the knowledge about entanglement of the system. In the last section we study temperature effects on the entanglement for an ensemble of four qubit systems in thermal equilibrium. Finally we compare entanglement detection of the nonlinear witnesses with state preparation fidelity. The result shows for special case our nonlinear witnesses can detect the entanglement at any temperature for some coupling constants while the fidelity method fails.

II. MUB DIAGONAL DENSITY MATRICES AND POSITIVE PARTIAL TRANSPOSE CONDITIONS

Mutually unbiased bases (MUB) in N dimensional Hilbert space are orthonormal bases $|v_i\rangle$ and $|w_j\rangle$ such that $|\langle v_i|w_j\rangle| = 1/\sqrt{N}$ for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. If one can find $N + 1$ mutually unbiased bases for a complex vector space of N dimensions, then the measurements corresponding to these bases provide an optimal means of determining the density matrix of an ensemble of systems [27–29]. These bases may be used for entanglement detection [30–32].

The Bell basis is an orthonormal basis for the two qubit Hilbert space and in terms of computational basis could be written as

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi^-\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle), & |\psi^+\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle + |10\rangle), \\ |\phi^-\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle - |11\rangle), & |\phi^+\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Bell state is any quantum state in the Bell basis. Density matrices which are diagonal in this basis are called Bell-diagonal. In the case of two qubit the Bell-diagonal state is

$$\rho_{2 \otimes 2} = p_1|\phi^+\rangle\langle\phi^+| + p_2|\psi^+\rangle\langle\psi^+| + p_3|\psi^-\rangle\langle\psi^-| + p_4|\phi^-\rangle\langle\phi^-| \quad (2)$$

where $0 \leq p_i \leq 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^4 p_i = 1$.

The Bell basis can be generalized, specifically consider a system of four qubit spins, the generalized 16 elements can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_1\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0000\rangle + |1111\rangle), & |\psi_2\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0000\rangle - |1111\rangle) \\ |\psi_3\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0001\rangle + |1110\rangle), & |\psi_4\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0001\rangle - |1110\rangle) \\ |\psi_5\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0010\rangle + |1101\rangle), & |\psi_6\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0010\rangle - |1101\rangle) \\ |\psi_7\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0011\rangle + |1100\rangle), & |\psi_8\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0011\rangle - |1100\rangle) \\ |\psi_9\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0100\rangle + |1011\rangle), & |\psi_{10}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0100\rangle - |1011\rangle) \\ |\psi_{11}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0101\rangle + |1010\rangle), & |\psi_{12}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0101\rangle - |1010\rangle) \\ |\psi_{13}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0110\rangle + |1001\rangle), & |\psi_{14}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0110\rangle - |1001\rangle) \\ |\psi_{15}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0111\rangle + |1000\rangle), & |\psi_{16}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0111\rangle - |1000\rangle) \end{aligned}$$

(other basis choices are possible, for example see [33, 34]). The diagonal Hamiltonian in this bases is

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^{16} E_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \quad (3)$$

where E_i is the energy eigenvalue of the $|\psi_i\rangle$ state. In terms of Pauli spin matrices

$$\begin{aligned}
H = & c_0 IIII + c_1 I\sigma_z\sigma_z I + c_2 I\sigma_z I\sigma_z + c_3 II\sigma_z\sigma_z + \\
& c_4 \sigma_z II\sigma_z + c_5 \sigma_z I\sigma_z I + c_6 \sigma_z \sigma_z II + c_7 \sigma_z \sigma_z \sigma_z \sigma_z + \\
& c_8 \sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_x + c_9 \sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_x + c_{10} \sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_x \sigma_y + \\
& c_{11} \sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_y + c_{12} \sigma_y \sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_x + c_{13} \sigma_y \sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_y + \\
& c_{14} \sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_x \sigma_x + c_{15} \sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_y
\end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

(the tensor product sign is omitted for simplicity, for example the fourth term $\sigma_z II\sigma_z$ means $\sigma_z \otimes I \otimes I \otimes \sigma_z$) here c_i s can be driven in terms of E_i s and characterize the coupling strength among qubits. The first term represent no interaction at all (a constant term), the next six terms represent pair z component spin interaction (Ising like), and the remaining terms represent the four party interactions.

Now suppose we have a large number (theoretically, infinite) of four qubit molecules in thermodynamic equilibrium (canonical ensemble). If we assume that the intermolecular interactions are negligible, then the total system is in a product state, $\rho \otimes \dots \otimes \rho$, it follows from the additive property of entanglement that the total entanglement present in the system is N times the entanglement present in a single molecule, where N is the total number of molecules present in the system [35].

For a canonical ensemble of four qubits in the thermal equilibrium the state of this system in the Bell-diagonal bases can be written as

$$\rho = \sum_{i=1}^{16} p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \quad (5)$$

here

$$p_i = \frac{e^{-\beta E_i}}{\sum_{j=1}^{16} e^{-\beta E_j}} \quad (6)$$

is the probability of finding the system in the state $|\psi_i\rangle$, and $\beta = \frac{1}{k_B T}$, k_B is the Boltzmann constant, T is the temperature and $\sum_{i=1}^{16} p_i = 1$.

We can write the density matrix in terms of two dimensional Pauli matrices as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho = & \frac{1}{16} \left(IIII + r_1 I\sigma_z\sigma_z I + r_2 I\sigma_z I\sigma_z + r_3 II\sigma_z\sigma_z + \right. \\
& r_4 \sigma_z II\sigma_z + r_5 \sigma_z I\sigma_z I + r_6 \sigma_z \sigma_z II + \\
& r_7 \sigma_z \sigma_z \sigma_z \sigma_z + r_8 \sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_x + r_9 \sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_x + \\
& r_{10} \sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_x \sigma_y + r_{11} \sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_y + r_{12} \sigma_y \sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_x + \\
& \left. r_{13} \sigma_y \sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_y + r_{14} \sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_x \sigma_x + r_{15} \sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_y \right) \quad (7)
\end{aligned}$$

where the coefficients are

$$\begin{aligned}
r_1 &= p_1 + p_2 + p_3 + p_4 - p_5 - p_6 - p_7 - p_8 - p_9 - p_{10} \\
&\quad - p_{11} - p_{12} + p_{13} + p_{14} + p_{15} + p_{16} \\
r_2 &= p_1 + p_2 - p_3 - p_4 + p_5 + p_6 - p_7 - p_8 - p_9 - p_{10} \\
&\quad + p_{11} + p_{12} - p_{13} - p_{14} + p_{15} + p_{16} \\
r_3 &= p_1 + p_2 - p_3 - p_4 - p_5 - p_6 + p_7 + p_8 + p_9 + p_{10} \\
&\quad - p_{11} - p_{12} - p_{13} - p_{14} + p_{15} + p_{16} \\
r_4 &= p_1 + p_2 - p_3 - p_4 + p_5 + p_6 - p_7 - p_8 + p_9 + p_{10} \\
&\quad - p_{11} - p_{12} + p_{13} + p_{14} - p_{15} - p_{16} \\
r_5 &= p_1 + p_2 + p_3 + p_4 - p_5 - p_6 - p_7 - p_8 + p_9 + p_{10} \\
&\quad + p_{11} + p_{12} - p_{13} - p_{14} - p_{15} - p_{16} \\
r_6 &= p_1 + p_2 + p_3 + p_4 + p_5 + p_6 + p_7 + p_8 - p_9 - p_{10} \\
&\quad - p_{11} - p_{12} - p_{13} - p_{14} - p_{15} - p_{16} \\
r_7 &= p_1 + p_2 - p_3 - p_4 - p_5 - p_6 + p_7 + p_8 - p_9 - p_{10} \\
&\quad + p_{11} + p_{12} + p_{13} + p_{14} - p_{15} - p_{16} \\
r_8 &= p_1 - p_2 + p_3 - p_4 + p_5 - p_6 + p_7 - p_8 + p_9 - p_{10} \\
&\quad + p_{11} - p_{12} + p_{13} - p_{14} + p_{15} - p_{16} \\
r_9 &= -p_1 + p_2 - p_3 + p_4 + p_5 - p_6 + p_7 - p_8 + p_9 - p_{10} \\
&\quad + p_{11} - p_{12} - p_{13} + p_{14} - p_{15} + p_{16} \\
r_{10} &= -p_1 + p_2 + p_3 - p_4 - p_5 + p_6 + p_7 - p_8 + p_9 - p_{10} \\
&\quad - p_{11} + p_{12} + p_{13} - p_{14} - p_{15} + p_{16} \\
r_{11} &= -p_1 + p_2 + p_3 - p_4 + p_5 - p_6 - p_7 + p_8 - p_9 + p_{10} \\
&\quad + p_{11} - p_{12} + p_{13} - p_{14} - p_{15} + p_{16} \\
r_{12} &= -p_1 + p_2 - p_3 + p_4 + p_5 - p_6 + p_7 - p_8 - p_9 + p_{10} \\
&\quad - p_{11} + p_{12} + p_{13} - p_{14} + p_{15} - p_{16} \\
r_{13} &= -p_1 + p_2 + p_3 - p_4 - p_5 + p_6 + p_7 - p_8 - p_9 + p_{10} \\
&\quad + p_{11} - p_{12} - p_{13} + p_{14} + p_{15} - p_{16} \\
r_{14} &= -p_1 + p_2 - p_3 + p_4 - p_5 + p_6 - p_7 + p_8 + p_9 - p_{10} \\
&\quad + p_{11} - p_{12} + p_{13} - p_{14} + p_{15} - p_{16} \\
r_{15} &= p_1 - p_2 - p_3 + p_4 - p_5 + p_6 + p_7 - p_8 - p_9 + p_{10} \\
&\quad + p_{11} - p_{12} + p_{13} - p_{14} - p_{15} + p_{16}
\end{aligned}$$

We interest to the positive partial transposition (*PPT*) region. If we consider the following notation

$$\mathbf{Set}(p_i, p_j, p_k, p_l) := \begin{cases} p_i + p_j + p_k - p_l \geq 0 \\ p_i + p_j - p_k + p_l \geq 0 \\ p_i - p_j + p_k + p_l \geq 0 \\ -p_i + p_j + p_k + p_l \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

then the positivity conditions for the eigenvalues of ρ^{TA} are

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{Set}(p_1, p_2, p_{15}, p_{16}) \\ \mathbf{Set}(p_3, p_4, p_{13}, p_{14}) \\ \mathbf{Set}(p_5, p_6, p_{11}, p_{12}) \\ \mathbf{Set}(p_7, p_8, p_9, p_{10}) \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

for the eigenvalues of ρ^{TB}

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{Set}(p_1, p_2, p_9, p_{10}) \\ \mathbf{Set}(p_3, p_4, p_{11}, p_{12}) \\ \mathbf{Set}(p_5, p_6, p_{13}, p_{14}) \\ \mathbf{Set}(p_7, p_8, p_{15}, p_{16}) \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

for the eigenvalues of ρ^{TC}

$$\begin{cases} \text{Set}(p_1, p_2, p_5, p_6) \\ \text{Set}(p_3, p_4, p_7, p_8) \\ \text{Set}(p_9, p_{10}, p_{13}, p_{14}) \\ \text{Set}(p_{11}, p_{12}, p_{15}, p_{16}) \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

for the eigenvalues of ρ^{TD}

$$\begin{cases} \text{Set}(p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4) \\ \text{Set}(p_5, p_6, p_7, p_8) \\ \text{Set}(p_9, p_{10}, p_{11}, p_{12}) \\ \text{Set}(p_{13}, p_{14}, p_{15}, p_{16}) \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

for the eigenvalues of ρ^{TAB}

$$\begin{cases} \text{Set}(p_1, p_2, p_7, p_8) \\ \text{Set}(p_3, p_4, p_5, p_6) \\ \text{Set}(p_9, p_{10}, p_{15}, p_{16}) \\ \text{Set}(p_{11}, p_{12}, p_{13}, p_{14}) \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

for the eigenvalues of ρ^{TAC}

$$\begin{cases} \text{Set}(p_1, p_2, p_{11}, p_{12}) \\ \text{Set}(p_3, p_4, p_9, p_{10}) \\ \text{Set}(p_5, p_6, p_{15}, p_{16}) \\ \text{Set}(p_7, p_8, p_{13}, p_{14}) \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

and finally for the eigenvalues of ρ^{TAD}

$$\begin{cases} \text{Set}(p_1, p_2, p_{13}, p_{14}) \\ \text{Set}(p_3, p_4, p_{15}, p_{16}) \\ \text{Set}(p_5, p_6, p_9, p_{10}) \\ \text{Set}(p_7, p_8, p_{11}, p_{12}) \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

The total set of the above $4 \times 4 \times 7 = 112$, inequalities define the *PPT* region of the four qubit Bell diagonal states (5).

A. Feasible regions

Let us consider the feasible region which satisfy *PPT* conditions with details. To do this we can consider p_i 's, that was ordered into eight pairs

$$(p_1, p_2), (p_3, p_4), (p_5, p_6), (p_7, p_8),$$

$$(p_9, p_{10}), (p_{11}, p_{12}), (p_{13}, p_{14}), (p_{15}, p_{16})$$

Now if we choose one pair such as (p_1, p_2) , then we can specify the feasible region in (p_1, p_2) plane with the following three inequalities (*PPT* conditions)

$$\begin{cases} p_1 \leq p_2 + p_3 + p_4 \\ p_1 \leq p_2 + p_5 + p_6 \\ p_1 \leq p_2 + p_7 + p_8 \\ p_1 \leq p_2 + p_9 + p_{10} \\ p_1 \leq p_2 + p_{11} + p_{12} \\ p_1 \leq p_2 + p_{13} + p_{14} \\ p_1 \leq p_2 + p_{15} + p_{16} \end{cases}$$




FIG. 1. The *PPT* feasible region for four qubit Bell diagonal states. For all points in the shadow region all eigenvalues of the density matrix (5), and all partial transposes are positive. The region is for inequalities (16) and (17).

Adding both sides of above inequalities together and noting $p_1 + \dots + p_{16} = 1$, yields the following inequality

$$8p_1 - 6p_2 \leq 1 \quad (16)$$

similarly,

$$8p_2 - 6p_1 \leq 1 \quad (17)$$

This region is illustrated in Fig.1. According to Fig.1, if we consider vertex points $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$, $(\frac{1}{8}, 0)$, $(0, \frac{1}{8})$ and $(0, 0)$, because this points satisfy *PPT* conditions and feasible region is convex, then all of the points inside the shape fulfill the *PPT* conditions.

We can find other feasible regions in the (p_1, p_3) plane, concerning the following inequalities

$$\begin{cases} p_1 \leq p_2 + p_5 + p_6 \\ p_1 \leq p_2 + p_7 + p_8 \\ p_1 \leq p_2 + p_9 + p_{10} \\ p_3 \leq p_4 + p_{11} + p_{12} \\ p_3 \leq p_4 + p_{13} + p_{14} \\ p_3 \leq p_4 + p_{15} + p_{16} \end{cases} \Rightarrow 4(p_1 + p_3) \leq 2(p_2 + p_4) + 1 \quad (18)$$

similarly we obtain

$$4(p_2 + p_4) \leq 2(p_1 + p_3) + 1 \quad (19)$$

from inequalities (18) and (19) we have

$$4(p_1 + p_3) \leq 2(p_2 + p_4) + 1 \leq p_1 + p_3 + \frac{3}{2} \quad (20)$$

or

$$p_1 + p_3 \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad (21)$$

so we have presented a new perspective from the spatial shape in two-dimension.

1. The first case

Let us consider the (p_1, p_2) and (p_3, p_4) planes. The *PPT* conditions for (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4) inequalities according to the following lines are satisfied

$$\begin{cases} 8p_1 - 6p_2 = 1 \\ 8p_3 - 6p_4 = 1 \end{cases} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} p_1 = 3p_2/4 + 1/8 \\ p_3 = 3p_4/4 + 1/8 \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

Similarly the *PPT* conditions for following cases

$$\begin{aligned} & (p_1, p_2, p_5, p_6), (p_1, p_2, p_7, p_8), (p_1, p_2, p_9, p_{10}), \\ & (p_1, p_2, p_{11}, p_{12}), (p_1, p_2, p_{13}, p_{14}), (p_1, p_2, p_{15}, p_{16}), \\ & (p_3, p_4, p_5, p_6), (p_3, p_4, p_7, p_8), (p_3, p_4, p_9, p_{10}), \\ & (p_3, p_4, p_{11}, p_{12}), (p_3, p_4, p_{13}, p_{14}), (p_3, p_4, p_{15}, p_{16}) \end{aligned}$$

are satisfied unless for the following cases

$$\begin{aligned} -p_1 + p_2 + p_5 + p_6 &\geq 0 \\ -p_1 + p_2 + p_7 + p_8 &\geq 0 \\ -p_1 + p_2 + p_9 + p_{10} &\geq 0 \\ -p_1 + p_2 + p_{11} + p_{12} &\geq 0 \\ -p_1 + p_2 + p_{13} + p_{14} &\geq 0 \\ -p_1 + p_2 + p_{15} + p_{16} &\geq 0 \\ -p_3 + p_4 + p_5 + p_6 &\geq 0 \\ -p_3 + p_4 + p_7 + p_8 &\geq 0 \\ -p_3 + p_4 + p_9 + p_{10} &\geq 0 \\ -p_3 + p_4 + p_{11} + p_{12} &\geq 0 \\ -p_3 + p_4 + p_{13} + p_{14} &\geq 0 \\ -p_3 + p_4 + p_{15} + p_{16} &\geq 0 \end{aligned} \Rightarrow \quad (23)$$

$$\begin{cases} p_5 + p_6 + p_2/4 \geq 1/8 \\ p_7 + p_8 + p_2/4 \geq 1/8 \\ p_9 + p_{10} + p_2/4 \geq 1/8 \\ p_{11} + p_{12} + p_2/4 \geq 1/8 \\ p_{13} + p_{14} + p_2/4 \geq 1/8 \\ p_{15} + p_{16} + p_2/4 \geq 1/8 \\ p_5 + p_6 + p_4/4 \geq 1/8 \\ p_7 + p_8 + p_4/4 \geq 1/8 \\ p_9 + p_{10} + p_4/4 \geq 1/8 \\ p_{11} + p_{12} + p_4/4 \geq 1/8 \\ p_{13} + p_{14} + p_4/4 \geq 1/8 \\ p_{15} + p_{16} + p_4/4 \geq 1/8 \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

Adding the above inequalities yield to

$$2 \sum_{i=5}^{16} p_i + \frac{3}{2}(p_2 + p_4) \geq \frac{3}{2} \quad (25)$$

and using the normalization condition for p_i 's yield

$$2[1 - (p_1 + p_2 + p_3 + p_4)] + \frac{3}{2}(p_2 + p_4) \geq \frac{3}{2} \Rightarrow -\frac{1}{2}(p_2 + p_4) \geq 0 \quad (26)$$

so we must have $p_2 = p_4 = 0 \Rightarrow p_1 = p_3 = \frac{1}{8}$. So the *PPT* conditions take the following simpler form

$$\begin{cases} p_5 + p_6 \geq 1/8 \\ p_7 + p_8 \geq 1/8 \\ p_9 + p_{10} \geq 1/8 \\ p_{11} + p_{12} \geq 1/8 \\ p_{13} + p_{14} \geq 1/8 \\ p_{15} + p_{16} \geq 1/8 \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

2. The second case

In this case we consider if $p_2 = 0$ and $8p_3 - 6p_4 = 1$, then

$$p_1 - p_3 + p_4 \geq 0 \Rightarrow p_1 + \frac{p_4}{4} \geq \frac{1}{8} \quad (28)$$

so the *PPT* conditions for (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4) are satisfied.

Adding the following *PPT* conditions

$$\begin{cases} -p_3 + p_4 + p_5 + p_6 \geq 0 \\ -p_3 + p_4 + p_7 + p_8 \geq 0 \\ -p_3 + p_4 + p_9 + p_{10} \geq 0 \\ -p_3 + p_4 + p_{11} + p_{12} \geq 0 \\ -p_3 + p_4 + p_{13} + p_{14} \geq 0 \\ -p_3 + p_4 + p_{15} + p_{16} \geq 0 \end{cases} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} p_5 + p_6 + p_4/4 \geq 1/8 \\ p_7 + p_8 + p_4/4 \geq 1/8 \\ p_9 + p_{10} + p_4/4 \geq 1/8 \\ p_{11} + p_{12} + p_4/4 \geq 1/8 \\ p_{13} + p_{14} + p_4/4 \geq 1/8 \\ p_{15} + p_{16} + p_4/4 \geq 1/8 \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

gives

$$p_5 + \dots + p_{16} + \frac{3}{2}p_4 \geq \frac{3}{4} \quad (30)$$

Now if we set $p_1 = \frac{1}{8} - \frac{p_4}{4} + \epsilon$, where $\epsilon \geq 0$, the normalization condition, $\sum_{i=1}^{16} p_i = 1$, and $p_2 = 0$, $8p_3 - 6p_4 = 1$ yield to

$$\epsilon + \frac{3}{2}p_4 + p_5 + p_6 + \dots + p_{16} = \frac{3}{4} \quad (31)$$

by applying (30), we have $-\epsilon \geq 0 \Rightarrow \epsilon = 0$, and $p_1 = \frac{1}{8} - \frac{p_4}{4}$. Finally

$$\begin{cases} p_5 + p_6 + p_4/4 = 1/8 \\ p_7 + p_8 + p_4/4 = 1/8 \\ p_9 + p_{10} + p_4/4 = 1/8 \\ p_{11} + p_{12} + p_4/4 = 1/8 \\ p_{13} + p_{14} + p_4/4 = 1/8 \\ p_{15} + p_{16} + p_4/4 = 1/8 \end{cases} \Rightarrow \quad (32)$$

$$\begin{cases} p_1 = p_5 + p_6 = p_7 + p_8 \\ = p_9 + p_{10} = p_{11} + p_{12} \\ = p_{13} + p_{14} = p_{15} + p_{16} \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

B. *MUB* diagonal states which the *PPT* criterion is necessary and sufficient condition for separability

In this section we investigate some *MUB* diagonal states which the *PPT* criterion is the necessary and sufficient condition for the separability of them. To this end, we write p_i in the following pairs

$$\begin{aligned} & (p_1, p_2), (p_3, p_4), (p_5, p_6), (p_7, p_8), \\ & (p_9, p_{10}), (p_{11}, p_{12}), (p_{13}, p_{14}), (p_{15}, p_{16}) \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Note that when any pair is zero then the two components of others are equal and the *PPT* criterion is necessary and sufficient for separability of the *MUB* diagonal density matrix. For example, if we set $p_1 = p_2 = 0$ in the

first pair, then $p_3 = p_4, p_5 = p_6, p_7 = p_8, p_9 = p_{10}, p_{11} = p_{12}, p_{13} = p_{14}$ and $p_{15} = p_{16}$. Now we can write the MUB diagonal density matrix in the following form

$$\rho = \frac{1}{8} \left[2p_3(|\psi_3\rangle\langle\psi_3| + |\psi_4\rangle\langle\psi_4|) + 2p_5(|\psi_5\rangle\langle\psi_5| + |\psi_6\rangle\langle\psi_6|) \right. \\ \left. + 2p_7(|\psi_7\rangle\langle\psi_7| + |\psi_8\rangle\langle\psi_8|) + 2p_9(|\psi_9\rangle\langle\psi_9| + |\psi_{10}\rangle\langle\psi_{10}|) \right. \\ \left. + 2p_{11}(|\psi_{11}\rangle\langle\psi_{11}| + |\psi_{12}\rangle\langle\psi_{12}|) + 2p_{13}(|\psi_{13}\rangle\langle\psi_{13}| \right. \\ \left. + |\psi_{14}\rangle\langle\psi_{14}|) + 2p_{15}(|\psi_{15}\rangle\langle\psi_{15}| + |\psi_{16}\rangle\langle\psi_{16}|) \right] \quad (35)$$

which is a separable state.

III. WITNESSES DETECTING BOUND MUB DIAGONAL DENSITY MATRICES

We introduce our linear four qubit entanglement witnesses that have the following generic form

$$W = A_0 IIII \pm B_0 \sigma_z \sigma_z II + \\ A_1 (\sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_x + \sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_y) + \\ A_2 (\sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_x \sigma_x + \sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_y) + \\ A_3 (\sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_x + \sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_x \sigma_y) + \\ A_4 (\sigma_y \sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_x + \sigma_y \sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_y) \quad (36)$$

In order to investigate whether such operator really is an entanglement witness we must first prove its expectation value over separable states is nonnegative. To do so we evaluate the trace of witness over a pure product state [?] which for four qubits state may be written as $\rho_s = |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha| \otimes |\beta\rangle\langle\beta| \otimes |\gamma\rangle\langle\gamma| \otimes |\lambda\rangle\langle\lambda|$. The trace takes the following form

$$Tr(W\rho_s) = A_0 \pm B_0 a_3 b_3 + \\ A_1 (a_1 b_1 c_1 d_1 + a_1 b_1 c_2 d_2) + \\ A_2 (a_2 b_2 c_1 d_1 + a_2 b_2 c_2 d_2) + \\ A_3 (a_1 b_2 c_2 d_1 + a_1 b_2 c_1 d_2) + \\ A_4 (a_2 b_1 c_2 d_1 + a_2 b_1 c_1 d_2) \quad (37)$$

where

$$Tr(|\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|\sigma_i) = a_i, \quad Tr(|\beta\rangle\langle\beta|\sigma_i) = b_i, \\ Tr(|\gamma\rangle\langle\gamma|\sigma_i) = c_i, \quad Tr(|\lambda\rangle\langle\lambda|\sigma_i) = d_i$$

for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and σ_i 's are spin 1/2 Pauli matrices. With definitions

$$a_1 = \sin\theta_1 \cos\varphi_1, \quad a_2 = \sin\theta_1 \sin\varphi_1, \quad a_3 = \cos\theta_1 \\ b_1 = \sin\theta_2 \cos\varphi_2, \quad b_2 = \sin\theta_2 \sin\varphi_2, \quad b_3 = \cos\theta_2 \\ c_1 = \sin\theta_3 \cos\varphi_3, \quad c_2 = \sin\theta_3 \sin\varphi_3, \quad c_3 = \cos\theta_3 \\ d_1 = \sin\theta_4 \cos\varphi_4, \quad d_2 = \sin\theta_4 \sin\varphi_4, \quad d_3 = \cos\theta_4$$

the $Tr(W\rho_s)$, takes the following simpler form

$$Tr(W\rho_s) = A_0 \pm B_0 \cos\theta_1 \cos\theta_2 + \\ \sin\theta_1 \sin\theta_2 \sin\theta_3 \sin\theta_4 \left\{ \right. \\ \cos(\varphi_3 - \varphi_4) \\ (A_1 \cos\varphi_1 \cos\varphi_2 + A_2 \sin\varphi_1 \sin\varphi_2) + \\ \sin(\varphi_3 + \varphi_4) \\ \left. (A_3 \cos\varphi_1 \sin\varphi_2 + A_4 \cos\varphi_2 \sin\varphi_1) \right\} \quad (38)$$

If we define new parameters

$$h_1 = \frac{A_1 + A_2}{2}, \quad h_2 = \frac{A_1 - A_2}{2}, \\ h_3 = \frac{A_3 + A_4}{2}, \quad h_4 = \frac{A_3 - A_4}{2} \quad (39)$$

then

$$Tr(W\rho_s) = A_0 \pm B_0 \cos\theta_1 \cos\theta_2 + \\ \sin\theta_1 \sin\theta_2 \sin\theta_3 \sin\theta_4 \left\{ \right. \\ \cos(\varphi_3 - \varphi_4) \\ \left[h_1 \cos(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2) + h_2 \cos(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2) \right] + \\ \sin(\varphi_3 + \varphi_4) \\ \left. \left[h_3 \sin(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2) + h_4 \sin(\varphi_2 - \varphi_1) \right] \right\}$$

By appropriate choice of the angles, one can minimize above expression, where its minimum value must be zero. For this purpose we set $\theta_3 = \theta_4 = \frac{\pi}{2}$, $\varphi_3 = \varphi_4 = \frac{\pi}{4}$, and define new parameters

$$\cos\psi_1 = \frac{h_1}{\sqrt{h_1^2 + h_4^2}}, \quad \cos\psi_2 = \frac{h_2}{\sqrt{h_2^2 + h_3^2}}, \\ \sin\psi_1 = \frac{h_4}{\sqrt{h_1^2 + h_4^2}}, \quad \sin\psi_2 = \frac{h_3}{\sqrt{h_2^2 + h_3^2}}$$

then

$$Tr(W\rho_s) = A_0 \pm B_0 \cos\theta_1 \cos\theta_2 + \sin\theta_1 \sin\theta_2 \left\{ \right. \\ \sqrt{h_1^2 + h_4^2} \cos(\psi_1 - \varphi_1 + \varphi_2) + \\ \left. \sqrt{h_2^2 + h_3^2} \cos(\psi_2 - \varphi_1 - \varphi_2) \right\}$$

Setting $\psi_1 = \varphi_1 - \varphi_2$ and $\psi_2 = \varphi_1 + \varphi_2$,

$$Tr(W\rho_s) = A_0 \pm B_0 \cos\theta_1 \cos\theta_2 + \\ \sin\theta_1 \sin\theta_2 \left\{ \sqrt{h_1^2 + h_4^2} + \sqrt{h_2^2 + h_3^2} \right\}$$

Using the identity

$$-\sqrt{\eta^2 + \delta^2} \leq \eta \cos\theta_2 + \delta \sin\theta_2 \leq \sqrt{\eta^2 + \delta^2}$$

where η and δ are coefficients of $\cos \theta_2$ and $\sin \theta_2$ respectively, we have

$$\text{Tr}(W\rho_s) \geq A_0 \mp \left\{ B_0^2 \cos^2 \theta_1 + \left(\sqrt{h_1^2 + h_4^2} + \sqrt{h_2^2 + h_3^2} \right)^2 \sin^2 \theta_1 \right\}^{1/2}$$

choosing

$$A_0 = B_0 = \sqrt{h_1^2 + h_4^2} + \sqrt{h_2^2 + h_3^2} \quad (40)$$

yields to

$$\text{Tr}(W\rho_s) \geq 0$$

and the entanglement witness becomes

$$W = A_0 \left[IIII \pm \sigma_z \sigma_z II + \frac{A_1}{A_0} (\sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_x + \sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_y) + \frac{A_2}{A_0} (\sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_x \sigma_x + \sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_y) + \frac{A_3}{A_0} (\sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_x + \sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_x \sigma_y) + \frac{A_4}{A_0} (\sigma_y \sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_x + \sigma_y \sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_y) \right]$$

we note that

$$\frac{A_1}{A_0} = \frac{h_1 + h_2}{A_0} = \frac{\cos \psi_1 \sqrt{h_1^2 + h_4^2} + \cos \psi_2 \sqrt{h_2^2 + h_3^2}}{A_0}$$

and if

$$p = \frac{1}{A_0} \sqrt{h_1^2 + h_4^2} = \frac{1}{2A_0} \sqrt{2(A_1^2 + A_2^2)} \quad (41)$$

then we have

$$\frac{A_1}{A_0} = p \cos \psi_1 + (1-p) \cos \psi_2, \quad \frac{A_2}{A_0} = p \cos \psi_1 - (1-p) \cos \psi_2$$

$$\frac{A_3}{A_0} = p \sin \psi_1 + (1-p) \sin \psi_2, \quad \frac{A_4}{A_0} = -p \sin \psi_1 + (1-p) \sin \psi_2$$

and the entanglement witness, W , can be written as the following form (without loss of generality we divide the W by A_0)

$$W = IIII \pm \sigma_z \sigma_z II + [p \cos \psi_1 + (1-p) \cos \psi_2] (\sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_x + \sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_y) + [p \cos \psi_1 - (1-p) \cos \psi_2] (\sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_x \sigma_x + \sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_y) + [p \sin \psi_1 + (1-p) \sin \psi_2] (\sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_x + \sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_x \sigma_y) + [-p \sin \psi_1 + (1-p) \sin \psi_2] (\sigma_y \sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_x + \sigma_y \sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_y) \quad (42)$$

IV. NON-LINEAR ENTANGLEMENT WITNESSES

We showed that how one can find the *PPT* feasible region and introduced the linear *EW*s. Now we can




FIG. 2. Non linear *EW* is the envelope of a family of linear *EW*s. The gray region is the *PPT* entangled or feasible region. Each linear *EW* separates the separable region from the entangled one. The set of such linear *EW*s is a family of curves which their envelope can be considered as a nonlinear *EW*.

construct nonlinear entanglement witnesses for the four qubit *MUB* diagonal states using the envelope of a family of curves definition.

Let $F : \mathfrak{R} \times \mathfrak{R}^r \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$ be a smooth map and t, x_1, \dots, x_r coordinates on the left. Consider F as a family of functions of x , parameterized by t . The envelope, of the family F is the set [38]

$$\Omega_F = \{x \in \mathfrak{R}^r : \text{there exists } t \in \mathfrak{R} \text{ with } F(t, x) = \partial F(t, x) / \partial t = 0\} \quad (43)$$

Using this definition we can find the envelope of our linear *EW*s. This envelope corresponds to a nonlinear *EW*. To do so, we consider the trace of *EW* over four qubit *MUB* diagonal state, (5), as a family of functions (linear *EW*s)

$$\text{Tr}(W\rho) = 1 \pm r_6 + (p \cos \psi_1 + (1-p) \cos \psi_2)(r_8 + r_{11}) + (p \cos \psi_1 - (1-p) \cos \psi_2)(r_{14} + r_{15}) + (p \sin \psi_1 + (1-p) \sin \psi_2)(r_9 + r_{10}) + (-p \sin \psi_1 + (1-p) \sin \psi_2)(r_{12} + r_{13}) \quad (44)$$

or in terms of p_i

$$\text{Tr}(W\rho) = 1 \pm \left(1 - 2 \sum_{j=9}^{16} p_j \right) + 4p \left[(p_{11} - p_{12} + p_{13} - p_{14}) \cos \psi_1 + (p_9 - p_{10} - p_{15} + p_{16}) \sin \psi_1 \right] + 4(1-p) \left[(p_3 - p_4 + p_5 - p_6) \cos \psi_2 - (p_1 - p_2 - p_7 + p_8) \sin \psi_2 \right] \quad (45)$$

This family of functions has two parameters, ψ_1 and ψ_2 and the condition $\partial \text{Tr}(W\rho) / \partial \psi_1 = 0$ yields

$$\psi_1 = \arctan \left(\frac{p_9 - p_{10} - p_{15} + p_{16}}{p_{11} - p_{12} + p_{13} - p_{14}} \right) \quad (46)$$

similarly $\partial Tr(W\rho)/\partial\psi_2 = 0$ leads to

$$\psi_2 = \arctan\left(\frac{-p_1 + p_2 + p_7 - p_8}{p_3 - p_4 + p_5 - p_6}\right) \quad (47)$$

now if we insert equations (46) and (47) in (44) and simplify the result then

$$\begin{aligned} Tr(W\rho) = & 1 + a_0 \left(1 - 2 \sum_{j=9}^{16} p_j\right) \\ & + 4p a_1 \left[(p_{11} - p_{12} + p_{13} - p_{14})^2\right. \\ & \left. + (p_9 - p_{10} - p_{15} + p_{16})^2\right]^{1/2} \\ & \times \mathbf{sgn}(p_{11} - p_{12} + p_{13} - p_{14}) \\ & + 4(1-p) a_2 \left[(p_3 - p_4 + p_5 - p_6)^2\right. \\ & \left. + (p_1 - p_2 - p_7 + p_8)^2\right]^{1/2} \\ & \times \mathbf{sgn}(p_3 - p_4 + p_5 - p_6) \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where $a_0 = \pm 1$, \mathbf{sgn} is the sign function, $p = \frac{1}{2A_0} \sqrt{2(A_1^2 + A_2^2)}$, and if $2\pi k - \frac{\pi}{2} \leq \psi_i \leq 2\pi k + \frac{\pi}{2}$ then a_i is $+1$, otherwise a_i is -1 for $i = 1, 2$. Now the envelope equation is $Tr(W\rho) = 0$. The following example is given to indicate the full idea and details of the envelope approach for nonlinear witnesses.

Example

Let us consider a simple example of envelope algorithm in operation for a special case where

$$p = 1/10, p_i = 0 \text{ for } i \geq 4, p_3 = 1 - p_1 - p_2$$

From equation (45) and taking the plus sign in the second term, we have

$$Tr(W\rho) = 2 + \frac{18}{5}(p_2 - p_1) \sin \psi_2 + \frac{18}{5}(1 - p_1 - p_2) \cos \psi_2 \quad (49)$$

where p_1, p_2 are variables of the density matrix with constraints $0 \leq p_1 \leq 1, 0 \leq p_2 \leq 1, 0 \leq p_1 + p_2 \leq 1$, and $0 \leq \psi_2 \leq 2\pi$, is a witness parameter. Solving $Tr(W\rho) = 0$ in terms of p_2 yields to

$$p_2 = \frac{\cos \psi_2 - p_1(\cos \psi_2 + \sin \psi_2) + 5/9}{\cos \psi_2 - \sin \psi_2} \quad (50)$$

Now any value of ψ_2 corresponds to a linear witness. Fig. 3 shows 50 of these linear witnesses for $\psi_2 = \{\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2} + \frac{\pi}{50}, \frac{\pi}{2} + \frac{2\pi}{50}, \dots, \frac{3\pi}{2}\}$, in the region restricted to constraints $0 \leq p_1 \leq 1, 0 \leq p_2 \leq 1$, and $0 \leq p_1 + p_2 \leq 1$. We can find the envelope equation of these linear witnesses using definition, (43). If we obtain ψ_2 from $\partial Tr(W\rho)/\partial\psi_2 = 0$ and insert it in Eq. (50) then

$$p_2 = \frac{1}{18} \left(9 - \sqrt{324p_1(1-p_1) - 31}\right)$$




FIG. 3. Linear Entanglement Witnesses. Any point in the shaded region represents a possible four qubits density matrix. Each line shows a linear witness separating the entangled density matrices from separable. Here we plotted 50 linear witnesses for various values of $\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \psi_2 \leq \frac{3\pi}{2}$.

for the interval, $\frac{1}{18} (9 - 5\sqrt{2}) \leq p_1 \leq \frac{7}{9}$, and

$$p_2 = \frac{1}{18} \left(9 + \sqrt{324p_1(1-p_1) - 31}\right)$$

for the interval, $\frac{1}{18} (9 - 5\sqrt{2}) \leq p_1 \leq \frac{2}{9}$.

This is the envelope equation with constraints $0 \leq p_1 + p_2 \leq 1$. As this is a nonlinear function we call such envelope as *nonlinear entanglement witness*. The *PPT* region, the detected entangled region, and the nonlinear *EW* as the envelope are plotted in Fig. 4. The *PPT* region has obtained from (16) and (17) which is $8p_1 - 6p_2 \leq 1$ and $8p_2 - 6p_1 \leq 1$ (See Fig. 1). As can be seen the nonlinear witness has wider detection range of entanglement. The region enclosed with the bold lines corresponds to the positive partial transpose entangled states (density matrices) which can be detected by nonlinear witnesses, that is to say, $Tr(W\rho) < 0$.

Consequently, we achieved the nonlinear *EWs* for some four qubit *MUB* diagonal density matrices and the negativity of (48) is the evidence of four qubit entanglement in the system. At the end we present other nonlinear




FIG. 4. The PPT region (the dotted light gray region, see also Fig. 1), detected entanglement (the dark gray region), and nonlinear EW as the envelope (the dashed curve) is plotted for special case which $a_0 = +1$, $a_1 = +1$, $a_2 = -1$, $p = \frac{1}{10}$, $p_i = 0$ for $i \geq 4$. The nonlinearity of EW is obvious and in this case is a semicircle. We see that the nonlinear EW detects more entangled density matrices.

EWs families. These have the following form

$$\begin{aligned}
 W_{\{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4\}} = & IIII \pm O_j \\
 & + \left[\sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_x + (-1)^{i_1} \sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_y \right] A_1 / A_0 \\
 & + \left[\sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_x \sigma_x + (-1)^{i_2} \sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_y \right] A_2 / A_0 \\
 & + \left[\sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_x + (-1)^{i_3} \sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_x \sigma_y \right] A_3 / A_0 \\
 & + \left[\sigma_y \sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_x + (-1)^{i_4} \sigma_y \sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_y \right] A_4 / A_0
 \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

here

$$\begin{aligned}
 \{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4\} \in \\
 \{ \{0, 0, 0, 0\}, \{0, 0, 1, 1\}, \{1, 1, 0, 0\}, \{1, 1, 1, 1\} \},
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 O_j \in \left[\sigma_z \sigma_z II, II \sigma_z \sigma_z, I \sigma_z I \sigma_z, I \sigma_z \sigma_z I, \right. \\
 \left. \sigma_z \sigma_z II, \sigma_z I \sigma_z I, \sigma_z II \sigma_z, \sigma_z \sigma_z \sigma_z \sigma_z \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly one can show that all 64 relations of (51) are nonlinear EWs. Furthermore if we consider the notation $P(m, n)$ for permutation of m th and n th Pauli matrices of the eight terms in the brackets of (51), then the permutation $P(1, 2)$, $P(1, 3)$, $P(1, 4)$, $P(2, 3)$, and $P(3, 4)$ gives new nonlinear EWs. Therefore we have in total $64 \times 5 = 320$ nonlinear EWs.

V. THERMAL ENTANGLEMENT AND STATE PREPARATION FIDELITY

Here we consider a canonical ensemble of four qubits identical systems in thermal equilibrium and we find the entanglement detection condition at temperature, T . We will show while the fidelity criterion fails to detect the entanglement, our nonlinear witnesses can detect the entanglement.

From (48) one can find the entanglement dependence on the temperature. Rewriting this condition in terms of the temperature (here we set $k_B = 1$),

$$\begin{aligned}
 Tr(W\rho) = & 1 + a_0 \left(1 - \frac{2}{Z} \sum_{j=9}^{16} e^{-E_j/T} \right) + \\
 & \frac{4pa_1}{Z} \left[\left(e^{-\frac{E_{11}}{T}} - e^{-\frac{E_{12}}{T}} + e^{-\frac{E_{13}}{T}} - e^{-\frac{E_{14}}{T}} \right)^2 + \right. \\
 & \left. \left(e^{-\frac{E_9}{T}} - e^{-\frac{E_{10}}{T}} - e^{-\frac{E_{15}}{T}} + e^{-\frac{E_{16}}{T}} \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} \\
 & \times \text{sgn} \left(\frac{e^{-\frac{E_{11}}{T}} - e^{-\frac{E_{12}}{T}} + e^{-\frac{E_{13}}{T}} - e^{-\frac{E_{14}}{T}}}{Z} \right) + \\
 & \frac{4(1-p)a_2}{Z} \left[\left(e^{-\frac{E_3}{T}} - e^{-\frac{E_4}{T}} + e^{-\frac{E_5}{T}} - e^{-\frac{E_6}{T}} \right)^2 + \right. \\
 & \left. \left(e^{-\frac{E_1}{T}} - e^{-\frac{E_2}{T}} - e^{-\frac{E_7}{T}} + e^{-\frac{E_8}{T}} \right)^2 \right] \\
 & \times \text{sgn} \left(\frac{e^{-\frac{E_3}{T}} - e^{-\frac{E_4}{T}} + e^{-\frac{E_5}{T}} - e^{-\frac{E_6}{T}}}{Z} \right)
 \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

in this expression

$$Z = \sum_{j=1}^{16} e^{-\frac{E_j}{T}} \tag{53}$$

is the partition function of the system. For a given E_j s, the negativity of (52) for a temperature interval, is the sufficient entanglement condition.

For example we consider the following Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned}
 H = & -J \left(\sigma_z \sigma_z II + I \sigma_z \sigma_z I + II \sigma_z \sigma_z \right. \\
 & \left. + \sigma_z II \sigma_z + \sigma_z I \sigma_z I + I \sigma_z I \sigma_z \right) \\
 & + h \left(\sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_x \sigma_x + \sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma_y + \sigma_z \sigma_z \sigma_z \sigma_z \right)
 \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

the first part shows the pair coupling between four qubits with coupling constant J , the second part represents some spin interactions among all four qubits with strength h . This Hamiltonian in the Bell-diagonal bases is diagonal with energy eigenvalues

$$\begin{aligned}
 E_1 = & 3h - 6J, \quad E_2 = -h - 6J, \\
 E_3 = & E_4 = E_5 = E_6 = E_9 = E_{10} = E_{15} = E_{16} = -h, \\
 E_7 = & E_{11} = E_{13} = 3h + 2J, \\
 E_8 = & E_{12} = E_{14} = -h + 2J
 \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$




FIG. 5. The entanglement detection in terms of temperature, T for three values of $J = -1, -2, -3, -\infty$. Entanglement is detected for $\text{Tr}(W\rho) \leq 0$. Here we choose $a_0 = a_1 = p = h = 1$.

TABLE I. Threshold temperature for Hamiltonian (54).

J	-1	-2	-3	$-\infty$
T_{th}	2.6135	3.6232	4.3418	7.8305

and the partition function of the canonical ensemble of four qubits systems at equilibrium temperature, T , is

$$Z = 8e^{\frac{h}{T}} + 3e^{\frac{-3h-2J}{T}} + 3e^{\frac{h-2J}{T}} + e^{\frac{-3h+6J}{T}} + e^{\frac{h+6J}{T}} \quad (56)$$

Now one can use (52) for calculating the entanglement detection condition at temperature T . The $\text{Tr}(W\rho)$ is equal with

$$\left[1 + \frac{a_0 \left(1 + e^{\frac{4h}{T}}\right) \left(-1 + e^{\frac{8J}{T}}\right) + 8a_1 p \left(1 - e^{\frac{4h}{T}}\right)}{3 + 3e^{\frac{4h}{T}} + 8e^{\frac{2(2h+J)}{T}} + \left(1 + e^{\frac{4h}{T}}\right) e^{\frac{8J}{T}}} \right] \quad (57)$$

Using the negativity of this, we can estimate the threshold temperature, T_{th} , for entanglement in the thermodynamic limit. Fig. 5 shows the plot of this condition in terms of temperature for $a_0 = a_1 = p = h = 1$, and three values of $J = -1, -2, -3, -\infty$. For $T < T_{th}$, the entanglement has been detected by our nonlinear witness (48). These threshold temperature is represented in Table. I. It is seen that threshold temperature increases and reaches to its maximum with the decrease of J .

It is interesting to consider the detection condition for extreme limits of J and h ,

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty, J \rightarrow -\infty} \text{Tr}(W\rho) = \left[1 - \frac{1}{3}(a_0 + 8a_1 p) \right] < 0 \quad (58)$$

or $(a_0 + 8a_1 p) > 3$. This result is independent of temperature and for values such as $a_0 = a_1 = p = 1$, not only the system is entangled in any temperature but also we have a witness detecting this entanglement.




FIG. 6. The fidelity as a function of temperature for Hamiltonian (54), with $h = 1$. Please note $F(T) \rightarrow 0$ as $J \rightarrow -\infty$. There is no entanglement detection at any temperature.

Now we compare the state preparation fidelity F of a N -qubit state to investigate the four qubits Bell diagonal state entanglement. The fidelity is defined as [39]

$$F(\rho) = \langle \psi_{GHZ} | \rho | \psi_{GHZ} \rangle \quad (59)$$

where for four qubits, $|\psi_{GHZ}\rangle = (|0000\rangle + |1111\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, and ρ is our four qubit Bell diagonal density matrix. The sufficient condition for four qubits entanglement is [39, 40]

$$F(\rho) > \frac{1}{2} \quad (60)$$

Using definition (59) we calculate the fidelity for the previous example with $h = 1$. The result is

$$F(T) = \frac{e^{\frac{8J}{T}}}{3 + 3e^{\frac{4}{T}} + 8e^{\frac{2(2+J)}{T}} + e^{\frac{8J}{T}} \left(1 + e^{\frac{4}{T}}\right)} \quad (61)$$

Fig. 6 shows the fidelity for some values of J . Clearly fidelity is zero as $J \rightarrow -\infty$. We see that for negative values of J , $\lim F(T) \rightarrow 1/16$ when $T \rightarrow \infty$. In other words, the fidelity criterion fails to detect the entanglement for this example.

VI. CONCLUSION

We have constructed linear and nonlinear entanglement witnesses with wider detection region for four qubits systems in mutually unbiased bases. These witnesses may detect the entangled positive partial transpose density matrices. We have extended them to a canonical ensemble consisting of infinite number of four qubits in thermal equilibrium and have detected the entanglement at any temperature for a special case. Results shows that these witnesses also can detect the entanglement in an ensemble consisting four qubits systems for

some Hamiltonians while another method, state preparation fidelity, fails to detect.

Our results highlight the potential of this method and may be of considerable practical value. Building on this success one can begin other trial systems for entanglement investigation. Accurately observing entanglement is a demanding task from the experimental point of view and further studies will probe fundamental aspects of usefulness of nonlinear *EWs*. In this area of study much

practical research such as detecting entanglement in teleportation, quantum cryptography, and quantum algorithms remains to be done. In conclusion, this paper has explored the nonlinear *EWs* family for detecting the *PPT* states of a given four qubit density matrix. Our study focus on the aspects of wider range detection of entanglement with nonlinear *EWs* and building them with linear *EWs*.

-
- [1] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 865–942 (2009)
- [2] J. M. Raimond, M. Brune, and S. Haroche, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **73**, 565 (2001)
- [3] R. F. Werner, *Phys. Rev. A* **40**, 4277 (1989)
- [4] A. K. Ekert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 661 (1991)
- [5] R. Ursin, *et al. Nature Physics* **3**, 481–486 (2007)
- [6] D. Bunandar, Z. Zhang, J. H. Shapiro, and D. R. Englund, *Phys. Rev. A* **91**, 022336 (2015)
- [7] T. Sasaki, Y. Yamamoto, and M. Koashi, *Nature* **509**, 475–478 (2014)
- [8] R. Nepal, R. Prabhu, A. Sen(De), and U. Sen, *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 032336 (2013)
- [9] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1895 (1993)
- [10] Xi-Lin Wang, *et al., Nature* **518**, 516–519 (2015)
- [11] M. Bourennane *et al., Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 087902 (2004)
- [12] F. Monteiro *et al., Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 170504 (2015)
- [13] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, *Phys. Lett. A* **223**, 1 (1996)
- [14] B. M. Terhal, *Phys. Lett. A* **271**, 319 (2000)
- [15] C. Y. Koh and L. C. Kwek, *Physica A* **420**, 324–330 (2015)
- [16] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, *Physics Letters A* **223**, 1–8 (1996)
- [17] O. Gühne, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 117903 (2004)
- [18] O. Gühne and N. Lütkenhaus, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 170502 (2006)
- [19] Y. Huang, *Phys. Rev. A* **82**, 012335 (2010)
- [20] H. F. Hofmann, and S. Takeuchi, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 032103 (2003)
- [21] O. Gühne and N. Lütkenhaus, *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.* **67**, 012004 (2007)
- [22] J. M. Arrazola, O. Gittsovich, and N. Lütkenhaus, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 062327 (2012)
- [23] M. A. Jafarizadeh, M. Mahdian, A. Heshmati, and K. Aghayar, *Eur. Phys. J. D* **50**, 107–121 (2008)
- [24] M. A. Jafarizadeh, Y. Akbari, K. Aghayar, A. Heshmati, and M. Mahdian, *Phys. Rev. A* **78**, 032313 (2008)
- [25] M. A. Jafarizadeh, K. Aghayar, and A. Heshmati, *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 052307 (2009)
- [26] M. A. Jafarizadeh, A. Heshmati, and K. Aghayar, *QIC* **10** No. 7 & 8, 0562–0579 (2010)
- [27] W. K. Wootters and B. D. Fields, *Ann. Phys.* **191**, 363–381 (1989)
- [28] T. Durt *et al., Int. J. Quantum Inf.* **08**, 535–640 (2010)
- [29] A. Klappenecker and M. Rötteler, *Finite Fields and Applications Lecture Notes in Computer Science* **2948**, 137–144. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (2004)
- [30] C. Spengler *et al., Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 022311 (2012)
- [31] B. Chen, T. Ma, and S. M. Fei, *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 064302 (2014)
- [32] X. S. Ma *et al., Nature* **489**, 269–273 (2012)
- [33] G. Jaeger, *Physics Letters A*, **329**, 425–429 (2004)
- [34] G. Jaeger and A. Sergienko, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **47**, 2120–2125 (2008)
- [35] M. A. Nielsen, PhD Thesis, University of New Mexico, pp 153, (1998), quant-ph/0011036
- [36] R. A. Bertlmann *et al., Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 052331 (2005)
- [37] M. Lewenstein *et al., J. Mod. Opt.* **47**, 2841 (2000)
- [38] J. W. Bruce and P. J. Giblin, *Curves and singularities*, 76. Cambridge University Press, New York (1984)
- [39] X. Wang, *Phys. Rev. A* **66**, 044305 (2002)
- [40] C.A. Sackett *et al., Nature (London)* **404**, 256 (2000)