Noname manuscript No.
(will be inserted by the editor)

Lower bound on concurrence for arbitrary-dimensional tripartite quantum states

Wei Chen · Shao-Ming Fei · Zhu-Jun Zheng

arXiv:1603.04716v3 [quant-ph] 30 Oct 2017

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract In this paper, we study the concurrence of arbitrary-dimensional tripartite quantum states. An explicit operational lower bound of concurrence is obtained in terms of the concurrence of substates. A given example show that our lower bound may improve the well known existing lower bounds of concurrence. The significance of our result is to get a lower bound when we study the concurrence of arbitrary $m \otimes n \otimes l$-dimensional tripartite quantum states.

Keywords Concurrence · Lower bound of concurrence · Tripartite quantum states · Substates

1 Introduction

As one of the most striking features of quantum phenomena[1], quantum entanglement has been identified as a key non-local resource in quantum information processing vary from quantum teleportation[2] and quantum cryptography[3] to dense coding[4]. These effects based on quantum entanglement have been demonstrated in many outstanding experiments.

An important issue in the theory of quantum entanglement is to recognize and quantify the entanglement for a given quantum state. Concurrence is one of the well-defined quantitative measures of entanglement[5]-[9]. For a mixed two-qubit state, an elegant formula of concurrence was derived analytically by Wootters in [9]. However, beyond bipartite qubit systems and some special symmetric states [10], there exists no explicit analytic formulas to show the concurrence of arbitrary high-dimensional mixed states. Instead of analytic formulas, some progress has been made toward the analytical lower bounds of concurrence. In recent years, there are many papers [11]-[22] to give the lower bounds of concurrence for bipartite quantum states by using different methods. All these bounds give rise to a good quantitative estimation of concurrence. They are usually supplementary in detecting quantum entanglement.

With the deepening research of the lower bound of bipartite concurrence, some nice algorithms and progress have been concentrated on possible lower bound of concurrence for tripartite quantum systems [23]-[26] and other multipartite quantum systems [27]-[29]. In Ref.[27,28], the authors obtained lower bounds of multipartite concurrence in terms of the concurrence of bipartite partitioned

Wei Chen
School of Automation Science and Engineering, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou 510641, China
E-mail: auwchen@scut.edu.cn

Shao-Ming Fei
School of Mathematical Sciences, Capital Normal University, Beijing 100048, China

Shao-Ming Fei
Max-Planck-Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences, Leipzig 04103, Germany

Zhu-Jun Zheng
School of Mathematics, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou 510641, China

states of the whole quantum system. In Ref.[30], a lower bound of concurrence for four-qubit systems has been presented by using tripartite concurrence. However, the lower bound (10) in [30] is in general not operationally computable. In order to get operationally lower bound for multipartite quantum systems, we need to give operationally lower bounds for $m \otimes n \otimes l$ $(m \neq n \neq l)$ tripartite quantum systems, which will be considered in this paper.

In Ref.[23], the analytic lower bounds of concurrence for three-qubit systems or for any $m \otimes n \otimes l$ $(m \leq n, l)$ tripartite quantum systems have been presented by using the generalized partial transposition(GPT) criterion. In Ref.[26], another analytic lower bounds of concurrence for $N \otimes N \otimes N$ tripartite quantum systems have been obtained in terms of the concurrence of substates.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. 2, we generalize the results in [23,26] and obtain some new operational lower bounds of concurrence for arbitrary $m \otimes n \otimes l$-dimensional $(m \neq n \neq l)$ tripartite quantum systems in terms of lower-dimensional systems. In Sec. 3, we present that our lower bound may be used to improve the known lower bounds of concurrence with an example. Conclusions are given in Sec. 4.

2 Lower bounds of concurrence for tripartite quantum systems of different dimensions

We first recall the definition of the tripartite concurrence. Let H_{A_1}, H_{A_2} and H_{A_3} be m-, n-, l-dimensional Hilbert spaces, respectively. In general, we can assume that $m \leq n \leq l$, any pure tripartite state $|\psi\rangle \in H_{A_1} \otimes H_{A_2} \otimes H_{A_3}$ has the form

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{l} a_{ijk} |ijk\rangle, \tag{1}$$

where $a_{ijk} \in \mathbb{C}, \sum_{ijk} |a_{ijk}|^2 = 1, \{|ijk\rangle\}$ is the basis of $H_{A_1} \otimes H_{A_2} \otimes H_{A_3}$.

The concurrence of a tripartite pure state $|\psi\rangle \in H_{A_1} \otimes H_{A_2} \otimes H_{A_3}$ is defined by [8]

$$C(|\psi\rangle) = \sqrt{3 - Tr(\rho_{A_1}^2 + \rho_{A_2}^2 + \rho_{A_3}^2)}, \tag{2}$$

where the reduced density matrix ρ_{A_1} (respectively, ρ_{A_2}, ρ_{A_3}) is obtained by tracing over the subsystems A_2 and A_3(respectively, A_1 and A_3, A_1 and A_2). When $m = n = l$, $C(|\psi\rangle)$ can be equivalently written as [6]

$$C(|\psi\rangle) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \sum (|a_{ijk}a_{pqt} - a_{ijt}a_{pqk}|^2 + |a_{ijk}a_{pqt} - a_{iqk}a_{pjt}|^2 + |a_{ijk}a_{pqt} - a_{pjk}a_{iqt}|^2)}. \tag{3}$$

When $m \neq n \neq l$, we can have the following result:

Theorem 1 *For any m, n, l, we have*

$$C^2(|\psi\rangle) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,p=1}^{m} \sum_{j,q=1}^{n} \sum_{k,t=1}^{l} (|a_{ijk}a_{pqt} - a_{ijt}a_{pqk}|^2 + |a_{ijk}a_{pqt} - a_{iqk}a_{pjt}|^2 + |a_{ijk}a_{pqt} - a_{pjk}a_{iqt}|^2). \tag{4}$$

Proof. For any m, n, l, a pure tripartite state $|\psi\rangle \in H_{A_1} \otimes H_{A_2} \otimes H_{A_3}$ has the form

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{l} a_{ijk} |ijk\rangle,$$

then we can compute

$$\rho_{A_1} = \sum_{i,p=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{l} a_{ijk} a_{pjk}^* |i\rangle\langle p|,$$

and

$$tr\rho_{A_1}^2 = \sum_{i,p=1}^{m}\sum_{j,q=1}^{n}\sum_{k,t=1}^{l} a_{ijk}a_{pjk}^{*}a_{pqt}a_{iqt}^{*},$$

hence we obtain

$$1 - tr\rho_{A_1}^2 = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,p=1}^{m}\sum_{j,q=1}^{n}\sum_{k,t=1}^{l} |a_{ijk}a_{pqt} - a_{pjk}a_{iqt}|^2.$$

Similarly, we have

$$1 - tr\rho_{A_2}^2 = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,p=1}^{m}\sum_{j,q=1}^{n}\sum_{k,t=1}^{l} |a_{ijk}a_{pqt} - a_{iqk}a_{pjt}|^2,$$

and

$$1 - tr\rho_{A_3}^2 = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,p=1}^{m}\sum_{j,q=1}^{n}\sum_{k,t=1}^{l} |a_{ijk}a_{pqt} - a_{ijt}a_{pqk}|^2.$$

Associated with (2), we get our result (4).

The concurrence for a tripartite mixed state ρ is defined by the convex roof,

$$C_N(\rho) = \min_{\{p_i,|\psi_i\rangle\}} \sum_i p_i C(|\psi_i\rangle), \tag{5}$$

where the minimum is taken over all possible convex decompositions of ρ into an ensemble $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$ of pure states with probability distribution $\{p_i\}$.

To evaluate $C(\rho)$, we project high-dimensional states to "lower-dimensional" ones. For a given $m\otimes n\otimes l$ pure state $|\psi\rangle$, we define its $s_1\otimes s_2\otimes s_3, s_1\le m, s_2\le n, s_3\le l$ pure substate $|\psi\rangle_{s_1\otimes s_2\otimes s_3} = \sum_{i=i_1}^{i_{s_1}}\sum_{j=j_1}^{j_{s_2}}\sum_{k=k_1}^{k_{s_3}} a_{ijk}|ijk\rangle = E_1\otimes E_2\otimes E_3|\psi\rangle$, where $E_1 = \sum_{i=i_1}^{i_{s_1}}|i\rangle\langle i|, E_2 = \sum_{j=j_1}^{j_{s_2}}|j\rangle\langle j|$ and $E_3 = \sum_{k=k_1}^{k_{s_3}}|k\rangle\langle k|$. We denote the concurrence $C^2(|\psi\rangle_{s_1\otimes s_2\otimes s_3})$ by

$$\begin{aligned} C^2(|\psi\rangle_{s_1\otimes s_2\otimes s_3}) = {} & \frac{1}{2}\sum_{u,x=1}^{s_1}\sum_{v,y=1}^{s_2}\sum_{w,z=1}^{s_3} |a_{i_u j_v k_w}a_{p_x q_y t_z} - a_{p_x j_v k_w}a_{i_u q_y t_z}|^2 \\ & + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{u,x=1}^{s_1}\sum_{v,y=1}^{s_2}\sum_{w,z=1}^{s_3} |a_{i_u j_v k_w}a_{p_x q_y t_z} - a_{i_u q_y k_w}a_{p_x j_v t_z}|^2 \\ & + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{u,x=1}^{s_1}\sum_{v,y=1}^{s_2}\sum_{w,z=1}^{s_3} |a_{i_u j_v k_w}a_{p_x q_y t_z} - a_{i_u j_v t_z}a_{p_x q_y k_w}|^2. \end{aligned}$$

In fact, there are $\binom{m}{s_1}\times\binom{n}{s_2}\times\binom{l}{s_3}$ different $s_1\otimes s_2\otimes s_3$ substates $|\psi\rangle_{s_1\otimes s_2\otimes s_3}$ for a given pure state $|\psi\rangle$, where $\binom{m}{s_1}, \binom{n}{s_2}$ and $\binom{l}{s_3}$ are the binomial coefficients. To avoid causing confusion, in the following we simply use $|\psi\rangle_{s_1\otimes s_2\otimes s_3}$ to denote one of such substates, as these substates will always be considered together.

For a mixed state $\rho\in H_{A_1}\otimes H_{A_2}\otimes H_{A_3}$, we define its $s_1\otimes s_2\otimes s_3$ mixed substates by $\rho_{s_1\otimes s_2\otimes s_3} = E_1\otimes E_2\otimes E_3\rho E_1^{\dagger}\otimes E_2^{\dagger}\otimes E_3^{\dagger}$, having the following matrices form:

$$\rho_{s_1\otimes s_2\otimes s_3} = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{i_1j_1k_1,i_1j_1k_1} & \cdots & \rho_{i_1j_1k_1,i_1j_1k_{s_3}} & \rho_{i_1j_1k_1,i_1j_2k_1} & \cdots & \rho_{i_1j_1k_1,i_{s_1}j_{s_2}k_{s_3}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \rho_{i_1j_1k_{s_3},i_1j_1k_1} & \cdots & \rho_{i_1j_1k_{s_3},i_1j_1k_{s_3}} & \rho_{i_1j_1k_{s_3},i_1j_2k_1} & \cdots & \rho_{i_1j_1k_{s_3},i_{s_1}j_{s_2}k_{s_3}} \\ \rho_{i_1j_2k_1,i_1j_1k_1} & \cdots & \rho_{i_1j_2k_1,i_1j_1k_{s_3}} & \rho_{i_1j_2k_1,i_1j_2k_1} & \cdots & \rho_{i_1j_2k_1,i_{s_1}j_{s_2}k_{s_3}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \rho_{i_1j_2k_{s_3},i_1j_1k_1} & \cdots & \rho_{i_1j_2k_{s_3},i_1j_1k_{s_3}} & \rho_{i_1j_2k_{s_3},i_1j_2k_1} & \cdots & \rho_{i_1j_2k_{s_3},i_{s_1}j_{s_2}k_{s_3}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \rho_{i_{s_1}j_{s_2}k_{s_3},i_1j_1k_1} & \cdots & \rho_{i_{s_1}j_{s_2}k_{s_3},i_1j_1k_{s_3}} & \rho_{i_{s_1}j_{s_2}k_{s_3},i_1j_2k_1} & \cdots & \rho_{i_{s_1}j_{s_2}k_{s_3},i_{s_1}j_{s_2}k_{s_3}} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{6}$$

which are unnormalized tripartite $s_1 \otimes s_2 \otimes s_3$ mixed states. The concurrence of $\rho_{s_1\otimes s_2\otimes s_3}$ is defined by $C(\rho_{s_1\otimes s_2\otimes s_3}) \equiv min \sum_i p_i C(|\psi_i\rangle_{s_1\otimes s_2\otimes s_3})$, minimized over all possible $s_1 \otimes s_2 \otimes s_3$ pure-state decompositions of $\rho_{s_1\otimes s_2\otimes s_3} = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle_{s_1\otimes s_2\otimes s_3}\langle\psi_i|$, with $\sum_i p_i = Tr(\rho_{s_1\otimes s_2\otimes s_3})$.

Theorem 2 *For any $m \otimes n \otimes l$ tripartite mixed quantum state $\rho \in H_{A_1} \otimes H_{A_2} \otimes H_{A_3}$, assume $2 \le m \le n \le l$, then the concurrence $C(\rho)$ satisfies*

$$C^2(\rho) \ge c_{s\otimes s\otimes s} \sum_{P_{s\otimes s\otimes s}} C^2(\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s}) \equiv \tau_{s\otimes s\otimes s}(\rho), \tag{7}$$

where $m \ge s \ge 2, c_{s\otimes s\otimes s} = [\binom{m-2}{s-2} \times \binom{n-2}{s-2} \times \binom{l-1}{s-1}]^{-1}, \sum_{P_{s\otimes s\otimes s}}$ stands for summing over all possible $s\otimes s\otimes s$ mixed substates, and $\tau_{s\otimes s\otimes s}(\rho)$ denotes the lower bound of $C^2(\rho)$ with respect to the $s\otimes s\otimes s$ subspaces.

Proof. For any $m \otimes n \otimes l$ tripartite pure quantum state$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{k=1}^{l} a_{ijk}|ijk\rangle$, and any given term

$$|a_{i_0j_0k_0}a_{p_0q_0t_0} - a_{i_0j_0t_0}a_{p_0q_0k_0}|^2, i_0 \ne p_0, \tag{8}$$

in Eq.(4).

If $j_0 \ne q_0$ and $k_0 \ne t_0$, then there are $\binom{m-2}{s-2}\times\binom{n-2}{s-2}\times\binom{l-2}{s-2}$ different $s\otimes s\otimes s$ substates $|\psi\rangle_{s\otimes s\otimes s} = E_1\otimes E_2\otimes E_3|\psi\rangle$, with $E_1 = |i_0\rangle\langle i_0| + |p_0\rangle\langle p_0| + \sum_{i=i_3}^{i_s}|i\rangle\langle i|, E_2 = |j_0\rangle\langle j_0| + |q_0\rangle\langle q_0| + \sum_{j=j_3}^{j_s}|j\rangle\langle j|, E_3 = |k_0\rangle\langle k_0| + |t_0\rangle\langle t_0| + \sum_{k=k_1}^{k_s}|k\rangle\langle k|$, where $\{|i\rangle\}_{i=i_3}^{i_s} \subseteq \{|i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{m}$, $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=j_3}^{j_s} \subseteq \{|j\rangle\}_{j=1}^{n}$ and $\{|k\rangle\}_{k=k_3}^{k_s} \subseteq \{|k\rangle\}_{k=1}^{l}$, such that the term (8) appears in the concurrence of $|\psi\rangle_{s\otimes s\otimes s} = E_1\otimes E_2\otimes E_3|\psi\rangle$.

If $j_0 \ne q_0$ and $k_0 = t_0$, then there are $\binom{m-2}{s-2}\times\binom{n-2}{s-2}\times\binom{l-1}{s-1}$ different $s\otimes s\otimes s$ substates $|\psi\rangle_{s\otimes s\otimes s} = E_1\otimes E_2\otimes F_3|\psi\rangle$, with $F_3 = |k_0\rangle\langle t_0| + \sum_{k=k_2}^{k_s}|k\rangle\langle k|$, where $\{|k\rangle\}_{k=k_2}^{k_s} \subseteq \{|k\rangle\}_{k=1}^{m}$, such that the term (8) appears in the concurrence of $|\psi\rangle_{s\otimes s\otimes s} = E_1\otimes E_2\otimes F_3|\psi\rangle$.

Otherwise, if $j_0 = q_0$ and $k_0 \ne t_0$, then there are $\binom{m-2}{s-2}\times\binom{n-1}{s-1}\times\binom{l-2}{s-2}$ different $s\otimes s\otimes s$ substates $|\psi\rangle_{s\otimes s\otimes s} = E_1\otimes F_2\otimes E_3|\psi\rangle$, with $F_2 = |j_0\rangle\langle j_0| + \sum_{j=j_2}^{j_s}|j\rangle\langle j|$, where $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=j_2}^{j_s} \subseteq \{|j\rangle\}_{j=1}^{n}$, such that the term (8) appears in the concurrence of $|\psi\rangle_{s\otimes s\otimes s} = E_1\otimes F_2\otimes E_3|\psi\rangle$.

Since $\binom{l-2}{s-2} \le \binom{l-1}{s-1}$ and $\binom{n-1}{s-1}\times\binom{l-2}{s-2} \le \binom{n-2}{s-2}\times\binom{l-1}{s-1}$, we have the following relation:

$$\binom{m-2}{s-2}\times\binom{n-2}{s-2}\times\binom{l-1}{s-1}C^2(|\psi\rangle) \ge \sum_{P_{s\otimes s\otimes s}} C^2(|\psi\rangle_{s\otimes s\otimes s}) \tag{9}$$

equivalently,

$$C^2(|\psi\rangle) \ge c_{s\otimes s\otimes s} \sum_{P_{s\otimes s\otimes s}} C^2(|\psi\rangle_{s\otimes s\otimes s}) \tag{10}$$

Therefore, for mixed state $\rho = \sum p_i|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
C(\rho) &= min \sum_i p_i C(|\psi_i\rangle) \\
&\ge \sqrt{c_{s\otimes s\otimes s}} min \sum_i p_i (\sum_{P_{s\otimes s\otimes s}} C^2(|\psi_i\rangle_{s\otimes s\otimes s}))^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\ge \sqrt{c_{s\otimes s\otimes s}} min [\sum_{P_{s\otimes s\otimes s}} (\sum_i p_i C(|\psi_i\rangle_{s\otimes s\otimes s}))^2]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\ge \sqrt{c_{s\otimes s\otimes s}} [\sum_{P_{s\otimes s\otimes s}} (min \sum_i p_i C(|\psi_i\rangle_{s\otimes s\otimes s}))^2]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \sqrt{c_{s\otimes s\otimes s}} [\sum_{P_{s\otimes s\otimes s}} C^2(\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s})]^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the relation $[\sum_j (\sum_i x_{ij})^2]^{\frac{1}{2}} \le \sum_i (\sum_j x_{ij}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ has been used in the second inequality, the first three minimizations run over all possible pure-state decompositions of the mixed state ρ, while

the last minimization runs over all $s \otimes s \otimes s$ pure-state decompositions of $\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s} = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$ associated with ρ.

Equation (7) gives a lower bound of $C(\rho)$. One can estimate $C(\rho)$ by calculating the concurrence of the substates $\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s}, 2 \leq s < m$. Different choices of s may give rise to different lower bounds. A convex combination of these lower bounds is still a lower bound. So, generally we have the following:

Corollary 1 *For any $m \otimes n \otimes l$ tripartite mixed quantum state $\rho \in H_{A_1} \otimes H_{A_2} \otimes H_{A_3}, s \geq 2$, assume $2 \leq m \leq n \leq l$, then the concurrence $C(\rho)$ satisfies*

$$C^2(\rho) \geq \sum_{s=2}^{m} p_s \tau_{s\otimes s\otimes s}(\rho), \tag{11}$$

where $0 \leq p_s \leq 1, s = 2, \cdots, m$ and $\sum_{s=2}^{m} p_s = 1$.

Theorem 3 *For any $s \otimes s \otimes s$ tripartite mixed quantum state $\rho \in H_{A_1} \otimes H_{A_2} \otimes H_{A_3}, s \geq 2$, then the concurrence $C(\rho)$ satisfies*

$$C^2(\rho) \geq c_{\lambda\otimes\mu\otimes\nu} \sum_{P_{\lambda\otimes\mu\otimes\nu}} C^2(\rho_{\lambda\otimes\mu\otimes\nu}) \equiv \tau_{\lambda\otimes\mu\otimes\nu}(\rho), \tag{12}$$

where $1 < \lambda \leq \mu \leq \nu \leq s, c_{\lambda\otimes\mu\otimes\nu} = [\binom{s-1}{\lambda-1} \times \binom{s-2}{\mu-2} \times \binom{s-2}{\nu-2}]^{-1}, \sum_{P_{\lambda\otimes\mu\otimes\nu}}$ stands for summing over all possible $\lambda \otimes \mu \otimes \nu$ mixed substates, and $\tau_{\lambda\otimes\mu\otimes\nu}(\rho)$ denotes the lower bound of $C^2(\rho)$ with respect to the $\lambda \otimes \mu \otimes \nu$ subspace.

Proof. The proof is as same as Theorem 2.

The lower bound of concurrence of ρ in equation (12) is given by the concurrence of sub-matrix $\rho_{\lambda\otimes\mu\otimes\nu}$. Choosing different λ, μ and ν would result in different lower bounds. Generally, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2 *For any $s \otimes s \otimes s$ tripartite mixed quantum state $\rho \in H_{A_1} \otimes H_{A_2} \otimes H_{A_3}, s \geq 2$, then the concurrence $C(\rho)$ satisfies*

$$C^2(\rho) \geq \sum_{\lambda=2}^{s} \sum_{\mu\geq\lambda}^{s} \sum_{\nu\geq\mu}^{s} p_{\lambda\mu\nu} \tau_{\lambda\otimes\mu\otimes\nu}(\rho), \tag{13}$$

where $0 \leq p_{\lambda\mu\nu} \leq 1, 1 < \lambda \leq \mu \leq \nu \leq s$ and $\sum_{\lambda=2}^{s} \sum_{\mu\geq\lambda}^{s} \sum_{\nu\geq\mu}^{s} p_{\lambda\mu\nu} = 1$.

3 Lower bounds of concurrence for tripartite quantum systems from lower bounds

The lower bounds (7) and (12) are in general not operationally computable, as we still have no analytical results for concurrence of lower-dimensional states. If we replace the computation of concurrence of lower-dimensional substates $\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s}$ and $\rho_{\lambda\otimes\mu\otimes\nu}$ by that of the lower bounds of three-qubit mixed quantum substates, Eq.(7) and (12) give an operational lower bound based on known lower bounds. The lower bound obtained in this way should be the same or better than the previously known lower bounds. Hence (7) and (12) can be used to improve all the known lower bounds of concurrence by associating with some analytical lower bounds for three-qubit mixed quantum states [23,26] in this sense.

Assume $g(\rho)$ is any lower bound of concurrence, i.e. $C(\rho) \geq g(\rho)$. Then for a given mixed state ρ, the concurrence of the projected lower-dimensional mixed state $\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s}$ satisfies

$$C(\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s}) = tr(\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s}) C((tr\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s})^{-1} \rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s}) \geq tr(\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s}) g((tr\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s})^{-1} \rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s}). \tag{14}$$

Associated with (7), we get

$$C^2(\rho) \geq c_{s\otimes s\otimes s} \sum_{P_{s\otimes s\otimes s}} C^2(\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s}) \geq c_{s\otimes s\otimes s} \sum_{P_{s\otimes s\otimes s}} (tr(\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s}))^2 g^2((tr\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s})^{-1} \rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s}). \tag{15}$$

Here if we choose $\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s}$ to be the given mixed state ρ itself, the inequality reduces to $C(\rho)\geq g(\rho)$ again. Generally, the lower bound $g(\rho)$ may be improved if one takes into account all the lower-dimensional mixed states $\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s}$.

In the following, we will first present an analytical lower bound for $2\otimes 2\otimes 2$ mixed quantum substates like $\rho_{2\otimes 2\otimes 2}$ by using the Theorem 2 in [26] and (15).

Theorem 4 *For any $m\otimes n\otimes l$ tripartite mixed quantum state $\rho\in H_{A_1}\otimes H_{A_2}\otimes H_{A_3}$, assume $2\leq m\leq n\leq l$, let $\rho_{2\otimes 2\otimes 2}$ be a $2\otimes 2\otimes 2$ mixed quantum sub-state, then we have*

$$C^2(\rho_{2\otimes 2\otimes 2})\geq \frac{1}{2}max[\sum_{j=1}^{3}(||\rho_{2\otimes 2\otimes 2}^{\mathcal{T}_j}||-tr(\rho_{2\otimes 2\otimes 2}))^2,\sum_{j=1}^{3}(||R_{j,\bar{j}}(\rho_{2\otimes 2\otimes 2})||-tr(\rho_{2\otimes 2\otimes 2}))^2], \quad (16)$$

and

$$C^2(\rho)\geq \frac{1}{l-1}\sum_{P_{2\otimes 2\otimes 2}}\frac{1}{2}max[\sum_{j=1}^{3}(||\rho_{2\otimes 2\otimes 2}^{\mathcal{T}_j}||-tr(\rho_{2\otimes 2\otimes 2}))^2,\sum_{j=1}^{3}(||R_{j,\bar{j}}(\rho_{2\otimes 2\otimes 2})||-tr(\rho_{2\otimes 2\otimes 2}))^2] \quad (17)$$

where $\rho_{2\otimes 2\otimes 2}^{\mathcal{T}_j}$ stands for partial transposition of $\rho_{2\otimes 2\otimes 2}$ with respect to the jth sub-system A_j, $R_{j,\bar{j}}(\rho_{2\otimes 2\otimes 2})$ is the realignment of $\rho_{2\otimes 2\otimes 2}$ with respect to the bipartite partition between jth and the rest systems, and $||A||=Tr\sqrt{AA^{\dagger}}$ is the trace norm of a matrix.

Proof. For the three-qubit mixed quantum state ρ, by Theorem 2 in [26], we have

$$C^2(\rho)\geq \frac{1}{2}max[\sum_{j=1}^{3}(||\rho^{\mathcal{T}_j}||-1)^2,\sum_{j=1}^{3}(||R_{j,\bar{j}}(\rho)||-1)^2]=:g^2(\rho).$$

From (14), we get

$$C^2(\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s})\geq (tr(\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s}))^2 g^2((tr\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s})^{-1}\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s})$$

$$\geq (tr(\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s}))^2\frac{1}{2}max[\sum_{j=1}^{3}(||(tr\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s})^{-1}\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s}^{\mathcal{T}_j}||-1)^2,\sum_{j=1}^{3}(||R_{j,\bar{j}}((tr\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s})^{-1}\rho_{s\otimes s\otimes s})||-1)^2]$$

$$=\frac{1}{2}max[\sum_{j=1}^{3}(||\rho_{2\otimes 2\otimes 2}^{\mathcal{T}_j}||-tr(\rho_{2\otimes 2\otimes 2}))^2,\sum_{j=1}^{3}(||R_{j,\bar{j}}(\rho_{2\otimes 2\otimes 2})||-tr(\rho_{2\otimes 2\otimes 2}))^2].$$

Then, associated with (15), we obtain (17).

(17) gives an operational lower bound of concurrence for any $m\otimes n\otimes l$ tripartite mixed quantum state. We will show the power of (17) by the following example:

Example 1 *We consider the $2\otimes 2\otimes 4$ quantum mixed state $\rho=\frac{1-t}{16}I_{16}+t|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$, with $|\phi\rangle=\frac{1}{2}(|000\rangle+|003\rangle+|110\rangle+|113\rangle)$, where $0\leq t\leq 1$ and I_{16} denotes the 16×16 identity matrix. According to (17), we obtain*

$$C^2(\rho)\geq\begin{cases}0, & 0\leq t\leq\frac{1}{9},\\ \frac{81t^2-18t+1}{96}, & \frac{1}{9}<t\leq\frac{1}{5},\\ \frac{181t^2-58t+5}{96}, & \frac{1}{5}<t\leq 1.\end{cases}$$

So our result can detect the entanglement of ρ when $\frac{1}{9}<t\leq 1$, see Fig.1. While the lower bound of Theorem 2 in [23] is $C^2(\rho)\geq 0$, which can not detect the entanglement of the above ρ.




Fig. 1 Color line for the lower bound of ρ for $\frac{1}{9} < t \leq 1$ from (17), dashed line for the lower bound from Theorem 2 in [23].

4 Conclusion

In summary, we have perform a method of constructing some new lower bounds of concurrence for tripartite mixed states in terms of the concurrence of substates. By an example we have shown that this bound is better for some states than other existing lower bounds of concurrence. Also the approach can be readily generalized to arbitrary dimensional multipartite systems.

Acknowledgements

This project is supported by NSFC through Grants No. 11571119, 11405060, 11475178 and 11275131.

References

1. Peres, A.: Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht (1993)
2. Bennett, C.H., Brassard, G., Crepeau, C., Jozsa, R., Peres, A., Wootters, W.K.: Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen channels. Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 1895(1993)
3. Ekert, A.K.: Quantum cryptography based on Bells theorem. Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 661(1991)
4. Bennett, C.H., Wiesner, S.J.: Communication via one- and two-particle operators on Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen states. Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 2881(1992)
5. Uhlmann, A.: Fidelity and concurrence of conjugated states. Phys. Rev. A 62, 032307(2000); Rungta, P., Bužek, V., Caves, C.M., Hillery, M., Milburn, G.J.: Universal state inversion and concurrence in arbitrary dimensions. Phys. Rev. A 64, 042315(2001)
6. Albeverio, S., Fei, S.M.: A note on invariants and entanglements. J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclassical Opt. 3, 223(2001)
7. Meyer, D.A., Wallach, N.R.: Global entanglement in multiparticle systems. J. Math. Phys. 43,4237(2002)
8. Carvalho, A.R.R., Mintert, F., Buchleitner, A.: Decoherence and multipartite entanglement. Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 230501(2004)
9. Wootters, W.K.: Entanglement of formation of an arbitrary state of two qubits. Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 2245(1998)
10. Terhal, B.M., Vollbrecht, K.G.H.: Entanglement of formation for isotropic states. Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 2625(2000); Fei, S.M., Jost, J., Li-Jost, X.Q., Wang, G.F.: Entanglement of formation for a class of quantum states. Phys. Lett. A 310, 333(2003); Fei, S.M., Li-Jost, X.Q.: A class of special matrices and quantum entanglement. Rep. Math. Phys. 53, 195(2004); Fei, S.M., Wang, Z.X., Zhao, H.: A note on entanglement of formation and generalized concurrence. Phys. Lett. A 329, 414(2004); Rungta, P., Caves, C.M.: Concurrence-based entanglement measures for isotropic states. Phys. Rev. A 67, 012307(2003)
11. Mintert, F., Kuś, M., Buchleitner, A.: Concurrence of mixed bipartite quantum states in arbitrary dimensions. Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 167902(2004)

12. Chen, K., Albeverio, S., Fei, S.M.: Concurrence of arbitrary dimensional bipartite quantum states. Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 040504(2005)
13. Breuer, H.P.: Separability criteria and bounds for entanglement measures. J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 39, 11847 (2006)
14. Breuer, H.P.: Optimal entanglement criterion for mixed quantum states. Phys. Rev. Lett. 97, 080501(2006)
15. de Vicente, J.I.: Lower bounds on concurrence and separability conditions. Phys. Rev. A 75, 052320(2007)
16. Horodecki, R., Horodecki, P., Horodecki, M., Horodecki, K.: Quantum entanglement. Rev. Mod. Phys. 81, 865(2009)
17. Zhang, C.J., Zhang, Y.S., Zhang, S., Guo, G.C.: Optimal entanglement witnesses based on local orthogonal observables. Phys. Rev. A 76, 012334(2007)
18. Gerjuoy, E.: Lower bound on entanglement of formation for the qubit-qudit system. Phys. Rev. A 67,052308(2003)
19. Ou, Y.C., Fan, H., Fei, S.M.: Proper monogamy inequality for arbitrary pure quantum states. Phys, Rev. A 78, 012311(2008)
20. Zhao, M.J., Zhu, X.N., Fei, S.M., Li-Jost, X.Q.: Lower bound on concurrence and distillation for arbitrary-dimensional bipartite quantum states. Phys, Rev. A 84, 062322(2011)
21. Li, X.S., Gao, X.H., Fei, S.M.: Lower bound of concurrence based on positive maps. Phys, Rev. A 83, 034303(2011)
22. Mintert, F., Buchleitner, A.: Observable entanglement measure for mixed quantum states. Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 140505(2007)
23. Gao, X.H., Fei, S.M., Wu, K.: Lower bounds of concurrence for tripartite quantum systems. Phys. Rev. A 74, 050303(2006)
24. Gao, X.H., Fei, S.M.: Estimation of concurrence for multipartite mixed states. Eur.Phys. J. Special Topics 159, 71(2008)
25. Yu, C.S., Song, H.S.: Measurable entanglement for tripartite quantum pure states of qubits. Phys. Rev. A 76, 022324(2007)
26. Zhu, X.N., Zhao, M.J., Fei, S.M.: Lower bound of multipartite concurrence based on subquantum state decomposition. Phys, Rev. A 86, 022307(2012)
27. Li, M., Fei, S.M., Wang, Z.X.: Bounds for multipartite concurrence. Rep. Math. Phys. 65, 289-296(2010)
28. Zhu, X.N., Li, M., Fei, S.M.: Lower bounds of concurrence for multipartite states. Aip Conf. Proc. Advances in Quan. Theory, 1424(2012)
29. Zhu, X.N., Fei, S.M.: Lower bound of concurrence for qubit systems. Quantum Inform. Processing 13, 815-823(2014)
30. Chen, W., Zhu, X.N., Fei, S.M., Zheng, Z.J.: Lower bound of multipartite concurrence based on sub-partite quantum systems. arXiv:1501.02316(2015)

