INEQUALITIES FOR THE SCHMIDT NUMBER OF BIPARTITE STATES

D. CARIELLO

Abstract. In this short note we show two completely opposite methods of constructing entangled states. Given a bipartite state \( \gamma \in M_k \otimes M_k \), define \( \gamma_S = (Id + F)\gamma(Id + F) \), \( \gamma_A = (Id - F)\gamma(Id - F) \), where \( F \in M_k \otimes M_k \) is the flip operator. In the first method, entanglement is a consequence of the inequality \( \text{rank}(\gamma_S) < \sqrt{\text{rank}(\gamma_A)} \). In the second method, there is no correlation between \( \gamma_S \) and \( \gamma_A \). These two methods show how diverse is quantum entanglement.

We prove that any bipartite state \( \gamma \in M_k \otimes M_k \) satisfies

\[
SN(\gamma) \geq \max \left\{ \frac{\text{rank}(\gamma_L)}{\text{rank}(\gamma)}, \frac{\text{rank}(\gamma_R)}{\text{rank}(\gamma)}, \frac{SN(\gamma_S)}{2}, \frac{SN(\gamma_A)}{2} \right\},
\]

where \( SN(\gamma) \) stands for the Schmidt number of \( \gamma \) and \( \gamma_L, \gamma_R \) are the marginal states of \( \gamma \).

We also present a family of PPT states in \( M_k \otimes M_k \), whose members have Schmidt number equal to \( n \), for any given \( 1 \leq n \leq \left\lfloor \frac{k-1}{2} \right\rfloor \). This is a new contribution to the open problem of finding the best possible Schmidt number for PPT states.

1. Introduction

The separability problem in Quantum Information Theory asks for a deterministic criterion to distinguish the entangled states from the separable states [3]. This problem is known to be a hard problem even for bipartite mixed states [4,5].

The Schmidt number of a state \( SN(\gamma) \) - Definition 2.1 - is a measure of how entangled a state is [10,11]. If its Schmidt number is 1 then the state is separable. If its Schmidt number is greater than 1 then the state is entangled. A method to compute the Schmidt Number is unknown.

Denote by \( M_k \) the set of complex matrices of order \( k \). The separability problem has been completely solved in \( M_2 \otimes M_2 \). A state in \( M_2 \otimes M_2 \) is separable if and only if it is positive under partial transposition or simply PPT (Definition 2.1) [6,9]. Therefore, the Schmidt number of a PPT state in \( M_2 \otimes M_2 \) is equal to 1. Recently, the Schmidt number of every PPT state of \( M_3 \otimes M_3 \) has been proved to be less or equal to 2 [2,12].

The authors of [8] left an open problem to determine the best possible Schmidt number for PPT states. They also presented a construction of PPT states in \( M_k \otimes M_k \) whose Schmidt numbers are greater or equal to \( \left\lfloor \frac{k-1}{4} \right\rfloor \). This was the first explicit example of a family of PPT states achieving a Schmidt number that scales linearly in the local dimension.

We investigate this matter. We present an explicit construction of PPT states in \( M_k \otimes M_k \), whose Schmidt numbers are equal to \( n \), for any given \( 1 \leq n \leq \left\lfloor \frac{k-1}{2} \right\rfloor \). This is a new contribution to their open problem.

We manage to compute the Schmidt number of these PPT states using the following inequality

\[
SN(\gamma) \geq \max \left\{ \frac{SN(\gamma_S)}{2}, \frac{SN(\gamma_A)}{2} \right\}, \tag{1.1}
\]

where \( \gamma_S = (Id + F)\gamma(Id + F) \), \( \gamma_A = (Id - F)\gamma(Id - F) \) and \( F \in M_k \otimes M_k \) is the flip operator (i.e., \( F(a \otimes b) = b \otimes a \), for every \( a, b \in \mathbb{C}^k \)).

We believe this is one of the simplest constructions of an entangled PPT state made so far.
Another inequality that we present here extends a result that was previously known for separable states ([7, Theorem 1]) to every state of $M_k \otimes M_m$. Denote by $\gamma_L$ and $\gamma_R$ the marginal states of a state $\gamma \in M_k \otimes M_m$ (Definition 2.1).

We show that every state $\gamma$ of $M_k \otimes M_m$ satisfies

$$\text{rank}(\gamma)SN(\gamma) \geq \max\{\text{rank}(\gamma_L), \text{rank}(\gamma_R)\}. \quad (1.2)$$

We can use this inequality to obtain a lower bound for the Schmidt number of low rank states. Next, through a series of very technical results, the author of [1] obtained the following lower bounds for the $\text{rank}(\gamma_S)$ of any separable state $\gamma \in M_k \otimes M_k$

$$\text{rank}(\gamma_S) \geq \max\left\{\frac{r}{2}, \frac{2}{r} \text{rank}(\gamma_A)\right\},$$

where $r$ is the marginal rank of $\gamma + F\gamma F$.

These inequalities can be combined into one inequality:

$$\text{rank}(\gamma_S) \geq \frac{2}{r} \text{rank}(\gamma_A) \geq \frac{\text{rank}(\gamma_A)}{\text{rank}(\gamma_S)}.$$

Hence, $\text{rank}(\gamma_S) \geq \sqrt{\text{rank}(\gamma_A)}$ for every separable state $\gamma \in M_k \otimes M_k$. Therefore, if $\text{rank}(\gamma_S) < \sqrt{\text{rank}(\gamma_A)}$ then $\gamma$ is entangled.

Next, we can combine equations 1.1 and 1.2 in order to obtain

$$SN(\gamma) \geq \frac{\text{rank}((\gamma_S)_L)}{2 \text{rank}(\gamma_S)} \quad \text{and} \quad SN(\gamma) \geq \frac{\text{rank}((\gamma_A)_L)}{2 \text{rank}(\gamma_A)}.$$  

We can easily create entangled states by satisfying $\frac{\text{rank}((\gamma_S)_L)}{\text{rank}(\gamma_S)} > 2$ or $\frac{\text{rank}((\gamma_A)_L)}{\text{rank}(\gamma_A)} > 2$ and no correlation between $\gamma_S$ and $\gamma_A$ is required.

These two methods of creating entangled states are completely opposite. One depends on a correlation between $\gamma_S, \gamma_A$ and the other does not. They show how diverse is quantum entanglement.

This paper is organized as follows.

• In Section II, we prove that $SN(\gamma) \geq \max\left\{\frac{SN(\gamma_S)}{2}, \frac{SN(\gamma_A)}{2}\right\}$ (Proposition 2.2) and we construct a PPT state whose Schmidt number is equal to $n$, for any given $n \in \{1, \ldots, \left\lceil \frac{k-1}{2} \right\rceil\}$ (Proposition 2.3).

• In Section III, we prove our main inequality $\text{rank}(\gamma)SN(\gamma) \geq \max\{\text{rank}(\gamma_L), \text{rank}(\gamma_R)\}$ (Theorem 3.1) and two corollaries $SN(\gamma) \geq \frac{\text{rank}((\gamma_S)_L)}{2 \text{rank}(\gamma_S)}$ and $SN(\gamma) \geq \frac{\text{rank}((\gamma_A)_L)}{2 \text{rank}(\gamma_A)}$ (Corollaries 3.2 and 3.3).

Notation: Given $x \in \mathbb{R}$, define $\lceil x \rceil = \min\{n \in \mathbb{Z}, n \geq x\}$. Identify $M_k \otimes M_m \simeq M_{km}$ and $\mathbb{C}^k \otimes \mathbb{C}^m \simeq \mathbb{C}^{km}$ via Kronecker product. Let us call a positive semidefinite Hermitian matrix of $M_{km}$ a (non-normalized bipartite) state of $M_k \otimes M_m$. Let $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$ denote the image of $\delta \in M_k \otimes M_m$ within $\mathbb{C}^k \otimes \mathbb{C}^m$. Given $w \in \mathbb{C}^k \otimes \mathbb{C}^m$ denote by $SR(w)$ its Schmidt rank (or tensor rank). Let the trace of a matrix $A \in M_k$ be denoted by $tr(A)$. 
2. Preliminary Inequalities

In this section we present two preliminary inequalities (Proposition 2.2). They have independent interest as we can see in Proposition 2.3. There we construct a family of PPT states in $M_k \otimes M_k$ whose members have Schmidt number equal to $n$, for any given $1 \leq n \leq \left\lfloor \frac{k-1}{2} \right\rfloor$.

Definition 2.1. Given a state $\delta = \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i \otimes B_i \in M_k \otimes M_m$, define

- the Schmidt number of $\delta$ as
  $$SN(\delta) = \min \left\{ \max_j \{SR(w_j)\}, \delta = \sum_{j=1}^{m} w_j \overline{w_j} \right\}$$
  (This minimum is taken over all decompositions of $\delta$ as $\sum_{j=1}^{m} w_j \overline{w_j}$).
- the partial transposition of $\delta$ as $\delta^T = \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i \otimes B_i^t$. Moreover, let us say that $\delta$ is positive under partial transposition or simply a PPT state if and only if $\delta$ and $\delta^T$ are states.
- the marginal states of $\delta$ as $\delta_L = \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i tr(B_i)$ and $\delta_R = \sum_{i=1}^{n} B_i tr(A_i)$.

Proposition 2.2. Every state $\gamma \in M_k \otimes M_k$ satisfies $SN(\gamma) \geq \max \left\{ \frac{SN(\gamma_S)}{2}, \frac{SN(\gamma_A)}{2} \right\}$.

Proof. By definition 2.1 there is a subset $\{w_1, \ldots, w_n\} \subset \mathbb{C}^k \otimes \mathbb{C}^k$ such that $\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i \overline{w_i}$ and $SR(w_i) \leq SN(\gamma)$, for every $i$.

Therefore, $(Id \pm F)\gamma(I \pm F) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i \overline{v_i}$, where $v_i = (Id \pm F)w_i$. Notice that, for every $i$,

$$SR(v_i) = SR(w_i \pm Fw_i) \leq 2SR(w_i) \leq 2SN(\gamma).$$

Hence, $SN((Id \pm F)\gamma(I \pm F)) \leq 2SN(\gamma)$.

Proposition 2.3. Let $v = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \otimes b_i$, where $\{a_1, \ldots, a_n, b_1, \ldots, b_n\}$ is a linearly independent subset of $\mathbb{C}^k$. Define

$$\gamma = Id + F + \epsilon(v \overline{v}) \in M_k \otimes M_k.$$

(1) For every $\epsilon > 0$, $SN(\gamma) = n$. Notice that $1 \leq n \leq \left\lfloor \frac{k-1}{2} \right\rfloor$.

(2) There is $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\gamma$ is positive under partial transposition.

Proof. (1) Notice that $\gamma_A = (Id - F)\gamma(Id - F) = \epsilon(aa^t)$, where $a = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \otimes b_i - b_i \otimes a_i$.

Since $\{a_1, \ldots, a_n, b_1, \ldots, b_n\}$ is linearly independent then $SR(v) = n$ and $SR(a) = 2n$. Hence,

$$SN(\epsilon(v \overline{v})) = SR(v) = n$$

and $SN(\gamma_A) = SR(a) = 2n$.

Thus, $SN(\gamma) \geq \frac{SN(\gamma_A)}{2} = n$, by Proposition 2.2.

Next, the separability of $Id + F \in M_k \otimes M_k$ is a well known fact, therefore $SN(Id + F) = 1$.

Finally, $SN(\gamma) \leq \max\{SN(Id + F), SN(\epsilon(v \overline{v}))\} = \max\{1, n\} = n$. Therefore, $SN(\gamma) = n$.

(2) Notice that $(Id + F)^T = Id + uu^t$, where $u = \sum_{i=1}^{k} e_i \otimes e_i$ and $\{e_1, \ldots, e_k\}$ is the canonical basis of $\mathbb{C}^k$. So $(Id + F)^T$ is positive definite and, for a small $\epsilon$, $(Id + F)^T + \epsilon(v \overline{v})^T$ is positive definite too.
3. Main Inequality

In this section, we present our main result (Theorem 3.1) and two corollaries (Corollaries 3.2 and 3.3).

**Theorem 3.1.** If \( \gamma \in M_k \otimes M_m \) is a state then \( \text{rank}(\gamma)SN(\gamma) \geq \max\{\text{rank}(\gamma_L), \text{rank}(\gamma_R)\} \).

*Proof.* The proof is an induction on \( \text{rank}(\gamma) \). The case \( \text{rank}(\gamma) = 0 \) is trivial. If \( \text{rank}(\gamma) = 1 \) then \( SN(\gamma) = \text{rank}(\gamma_L) = \text{rank}(\gamma_R) \).

Let \( \text{rank}(\gamma) > 1 \) and assume that this result is valid for states \( \delta \in M_k \otimes M_m \) satisfying \( \text{rank}(\delta) < \text{rank}(\gamma) \).

Since \( \Im(\gamma) \subset \Im(\gamma_L \otimes \gamma_R) \) then \( \gamma \) can be embedded in \( M_{\text{rank}(\gamma_L)} \otimes M_{\text{rank}(\gamma_R)} \). The embedding does not change its rank or its Schmidt number. Thus, we can assume without loss of generality that \( \text{rank}(\gamma_L) = k \) and \( \text{rank}(\gamma_R) = m \).

Let \( v \in \Im(\gamma) \setminus \{0\} \) be such that \( SR(v) = SN(\gamma) \).

- If \( k \geq m \) then choose \( U \in M_k \) satisfying \( \text{rank}(U) = k - SN(\gamma) \) and \( (U \otimes \text{Id})v = 0 \). Define \( \delta = (U \otimes \text{Id})\gamma(U^* \otimes \text{Id}) \). Note that \( \text{rank}(\delta) \leq \text{rank}(\gamma) - 1 \), since \( \Im(\delta) \subset (U \otimes \text{Id})(\Im(\gamma)) \) and \( (U \otimes \text{Id})v = 0 \).

- If \( k < m \) then choose \( U \in M_m \) satisfying \( \text{rank}(U) = m - SN(\gamma) \) and \( (\text{Id} \otimes U)v = 0 \). Define \( \delta = (\text{Id} \otimes U)\gamma(\text{Id} \otimes U^*) \). Note that \( \text{rank}(\delta) \leq \text{rank}(\gamma) - 1 \), since \( \Im(\delta) \subset (\text{Id} \otimes U)(\Im(\gamma)) \) and \( (\text{Id} \otimes U)v = 0 \).

In any case, by induction hypothesis, \( \text{rank}(\delta)SN(\delta) \geq \max\{\text{rank}(\delta_L), \text{rank}(\delta_R)\} \).

- If \( k \geq m \) then \( \delta_L = U\gamma_LU^* \). Since \( \gamma_L \) is positive definite then \( \text{rank}(\delta_L) = \text{rank}(U) = k - SN(\gamma) \).

- If \( k < m \) then \( \delta_R = U\gamma_RU^* \). Since \( \gamma_R \) is positive definite then \( \text{rank}(\delta_R) = \text{rank}(U) = m - SN(\gamma) \).

Since \( \text{rank}(\delta) \leq \text{rank}(\gamma) - 1 \) and \( SN(\delta) \leq SN(\gamma) \) then

- \( (\text{rank}(\gamma) - 1)SN(\gamma) \geq k - SN(\gamma) \), if \( k \geq m \). Therefore, \( \text{rank}(\gamma)SN(\gamma) \geq k \).

- \( (\text{rank}(\gamma) - 1)SN(\gamma) \geq m - SN(\gamma) \), if \( k < m \). Therefore, \( \text{rank}(\gamma)SN(\gamma) \geq m \).

The induction is complete. \( \square \)

**Corollary 3.2.** If \( \gamma \in M_k \otimes M_k \) is a state then \( SN(\gamma) \geq \frac{\text{rank}(\gamma_AL)}{2 \text{rank}(\gamma_A)} \).

*Proof.* First, notice that \( (\gamma_A)_L = (\gamma_A)_R \). Therefore, \( \text{rank}(\gamma_AL) = \text{rank}(\gamma_A)_R \).
Next, since $SN(\gamma_A) \leq 2SN(\gamma)$, by Proposition 2.2 then $\text{rank}(\gamma_A)SN(\gamma) \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{rank}(\gamma_A)SN(\gamma) \geq \frac{\text{rank}((\gamma_A)_L)}{2}$, by Theorem 3.1.

Corollary 3.3. If $\gamma \in M_k \otimes M_k$ is a state then $SN(\gamma) \geq \frac{\text{rank}((\gamma_S)_L)}{2}$.  

Proof. First, notice that $(\gamma_S)_L = (\gamma_S)_R$. Therefore, $\text{rank}((\gamma_S)_L) = \text{rank}((\gamma_S)_R)$.

Since $SN(\gamma_S) \leq 2SN(\gamma)$, by Proposition 2.2 then $\text{rank}(\gamma_S)SN(\gamma) \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{rank}(\gamma_S)SN(\gamma) \geq \frac{\text{rank}((\gamma_S)_L)}{2}$, by Theorem 3.1.

**Summary and Conclusion**

We presented an inequality that relates the marginal ranks of any bipartite state of $M_k \otimes M_m$ to its rank and its Schmidt number. Using this inequality, we described a method of constructing entangled states which is not based on any correlation between $\text{rank}(\gamma_A)$ and $\text{rank}(\gamma_S)$. This form of entanglement differs completely from the entanglement derived from the inequality $\text{rank}(\gamma_S) < \sqrt{\text{rank}(\gamma_A)}$. We also constructed a family of PPT states whose members have Schmidt number equal to $n$, for any given $1 \leq n \leq \lceil \frac{k-1}{2} \rceil$. This is a new contribution to the open problem of finding the best possible Schmidt number for PPT states.
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