arXiv:1902.11069v3 [math-ph] 9 Mar 2019

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 γ_S and γ_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 γ and γ_L, γ_R are the marginal states of γ.

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 $1 \leq n \leq \lceil \frac{k-1}{2} \rceil$. This is a new contribution to the open problem of finding the best possible Schmidt number for PPT states.

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 $\lceil \frac{k-1}{4} \rceil$. 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 $1 \leq n \leq \lceil \frac{k-1}{2} \rceil$. 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 γ_L and γ_R the marginal states of a state $\gamma \in M_k \otimes M_m$ (Definition 2.1).

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

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

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 $\operatorname{rank}(\gamma_S)$ of any separable state $\gamma \in M_k \otimes M_k$

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

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

These inequalities can be combined into one inequality:

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

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

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

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

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

These two methods of creating entangled states are completely opposite. One depends on a correlation between γ_S, γ_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 $n \in \{1, \ldots, \lceil \frac{k-1}{2} \rceil\}$ (Proposition 2.3).
- In Section III, we prove our main inequality $\operatorname{rank}(\gamma) SN(\gamma) \geq \max\{\operatorname{rank}(\gamma_L), \operatorname{rank}(\gamma_R)\}$ (Theorem 3.1) and two corollaries $SN(\gamma) \geq \frac{\operatorname{rank}((\gamma_S)_L)}{2\operatorname{rank}(\gamma_S)}$ and $SN(\gamma) \geq \frac{\operatorname{rank}((\gamma_A)_L)}{2\operatorname{rank}(\gamma_A)}$ (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 $\Im(\delta)$ 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 $1 \leq n \leq \left\lceil \frac{k-1}{2} \right\rceil$.

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

Therefore, $(Id \pm F)\gamma(I \pm F) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i \overline{v_i}^t$, 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*

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

(1) *For every $\epsilon > 0$, $SN(\gamma) = n$. Notice that $1 \leq n \leq \left\lceil \frac{k-1}{2} \right\rceil$.*
(2) *There is $\epsilon > 0$ such that γ is positive under partial transposition.*

Proof. (1) Notice that $\gamma_A = (Id - F)\gamma(Id - F) = \epsilon(a\overline{a}^t)$, 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,

$$SN(\epsilon(v\overline{v}^t)) = SR(v) = n \text{ and } SN(\gamma_A) = SR(a) = 2n.$$

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

(2) Notice that $(Id + F)^\Gamma = Id + uu^t$, 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 $(Id + F)^\Gamma$ is positive definite and, for a small ϵ, $(Id + F)^\Gamma + \epsilon(v\overline{v}^t)^\Gamma$ 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 $rank(\gamma)SN(\gamma) \geq \max\{rank(\gamma_L), rank(\gamma_R)\}$.*

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 γ 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 $(U \otimes Id)v = 0$. Define $\delta = (U \otimes Id)\gamma(U^* \otimes Id)$. Note that $\text{rank}(\delta) \leq \text{rank}(\gamma) - 1$, since $\Im(\delta) \subset (U \otimes Id)(\Im(\gamma))$ and $(U \otimes Id)v = 0$.

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

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 $\delta_L = U\gamma_L U^*$. Since γ_L is positive definite then $\text{rank}(\delta_L) = \text{rank}(U) = k - SN(\gamma)$.

- If $k < m$ then $\delta_R = U\gamma_R U^*$. Since γ_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. □

Corollary 3.2. *If $\gamma \in M_k \otimes M_k$ is a state then $SN(\gamma) \geq \dfrac{rank((\gamma_A)_L)}{2\ rank(\gamma_A)}$.*

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

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

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

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 $\text{rank}(\gamma_S)SN(\gamma) \geq \frac{1}{2}\text{rank}(\gamma_S)SN(\gamma_S) \geq \frac{\text{rank}((\gamma_S)_L)}{2}$, 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 $1 \leq n \leq \left\lceil \frac{k-1}{2} \right\rceil$. This is a new contribution to the open problem of finding the best possible Schmidt number for PPT states.

References

[1] D. Cariello, *A gap for PPT entanglement*, Linear Algebra and its Applications **529** (2017), 89-114.

[2] L. Chen, Y. Yang, and W. S. Tang, *Schmidt number of bipartite and multipartite states under local projections*, Quantum Information Processing **16** (2017), no. 3, 75.

[3] O. Gühne and G Tóth, *Entanglement detection*, Physics Reports **474** (2009), no. 1-6, 1–75.

[4] L. Gurvits, *Classical deterministic complexity of Edmonds' Problem and quantum entanglement*, Proceedings of the thirty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing; Jun 9-11; San Diego, CA, USA. New York: ACM press, 2003, pp. 10–19.

[5] ———, *Classical complexity and quantum entanglement*, Journal of Computer and System Sciences **69** (2004), no. 3, 448–484.

[6] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, *Separability of mixed states: necessary and sufficient conditions*, Phys. Lett. A. **223** (1996), 1–8.

[7] P. Horodecki, J. A. Smolin, B. M. Terhal, and A. V. Thapliyal, *Rank two bipartite bound entangled states do not exist*, Theoretical Computer Science **292** (2003), no. 3, 589–596.

[8] M. Huber, L. Lami, C. Lancien, and A. Müller-Hermes, *High-dimensional entanglement in states with positive partial transposition.*, arXiv:1802.04975 (2018).

[9] A. Peres, *Separability criterion for density matrices*, Physical Review Letters **77** (1996), no. 8, 1413.

[10] J. Sperling and W. Vogel, *The Schmidt number as a universal entanglement measure.*, Physica Scripta **83** (2011), no. 4, 045002.

[11] B. M. Terhal and P. Horodecki, *Schmidt number for density matrices*, Phys. Rev. A **61** (2000), no. 4, 040301.

[12] Y. Yang, D. H. Leung, and W. S. Tang, *All 2-positive linear maps from M3 (C) to M3 (C) are decomposable*, Linear Algebra and its Applications **503** (2016), 233-247.

Faculdade de Matemática,
Universidade Federal de Uberlândia,
38.400-902 Uberlândia, Brazil.
E-mail address: dcariello@ufu.br