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We develop a systematic method to construct the Bell states of the qubit bipartite system while using SU(2) group as the basis group. Based upon the Bell-CHSH inequality, an alternative formulation of fidelity, called SU(2) fidelity, is proposed which in a natural way takes care of the desired Bell states contributing to the inequality and gives the explicit value of its upper bound. Taking analogy from the octet theory which is governed by the SU(3) group, it is shown that our method can be easily generalized to derive the complete set of maximally entangled states of the qutrit bipartite system. The analysis of the SU(3) fidelity further reveals the existence of multiple number of upper bounds even in absence of any well-defined inequality for such system.

1 Introduction

Entanglement is one of the most exquisite trait of quantum world which may en-route to some uncharted area of much-anticipated quantum technology in coming days. In very short, this phenomenon may be described in the following way: When an object is fragmented into two parts, then an innate correlation still survives between the fragmented parts. These subsystems, which locally behave randomly, exhibits a strong correlation between them due to a quantum superposition no matter whatever be their distance. Broadly speaking, such relational attachment is paraphrased as the entanglement.

Historically, soon after coining the word entanglement by Erwin Schrödinger in 1936 \cite{1,2}, it was confused with the ‘gauge particle’ which follows causal principle \cite{3}. This issue has been debated by many distinguished scientists \cite{3,4,5,6} for a long time till the underlying riddle of quantum mechanics is unearthed many years later. Historically, in 1951, Bohm \cite{7} reformulated the Einstein-Podolsky and Rosen’s (EPR) \cite{3} original work in a more pragmatic way which enabled J. H. Bell in 1964 \cite{8} and thereafter J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony and R. A. Holt (CHSH) in 1969 \cite{9} to point out the existence of an experimentally testable identity called Bell-CHSH inequality. This inequality was experimentally verified by Aspect et al \cite{10} in 1982 which was refined further by fixing several loopholes in recent times \cite{11,12,13}. Since then, various aspects of entanglement has been thoughtfully studied to exploit the quantum correlation as a rich resource in a more general framework. The idea of various protocols such as, quantum teleportation \cite{14}, quantum key distribution \cite{15,16,17}, quantum computer\cite{18,19}, superdense coding \cite{20}, various quantum search algorithm \cite{21,22,23,24} etc. \cite{19} fit into a fundamentally different paradigm of quantum mechanics called quantum information science, which may outperform the computational task of the conventional computers near future and change the existing landscape studying the natural science dramatically.

Simplest quantum system, which manifestly displays the intriguing character of entanglement, is probably the qubit bipartite system defined two qubit system in Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{AB}^{\otimes 2}$. From quantum-optical point of view, such system is modelled by the appropriate ramification of two nonlocal Jaynes-Cumming model where $SU(2)$ group plays the key role \cite{25,26,27,28}. Following Wootters, the non-classical correlation in such system is quantitatively measured by introducing the notion of concurrence \cite{29,30,31} which has eventually paved the way of studying the entanglement scenario in such system.
[25, 26, 32, 33]. Today, apart from Wootters’ definition of concurrence, there exists various methods such as, Hilbert-Schmidt measure [34], I-concurrence [35], quantum discord [36], entanglement witness [37, 38], various convex geometry based studies [39] etc, which give a quantitative measurement of the nonclassical correlation with different physical attributes.

On the other hand, study of the entanglement scenario for the qutrit bipartite system, defined with two qutrit system in Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{3\otimes3}_{AB}$, is quite nontrivial because of its possible relation with the three-level-like systems which inherently involves multiple configurations. In quantum optics, the idea to tackle the three-level system using $SU(3)$ group is not new [40, 41, 42] and recently we have discussed their classification, exact solution and their some interesting applications in detail [43, 44, 45]. However, in spite of several efforts by many authors [46, 47, 48, 49, 50], the entanglement scenario of the qutrit bipartite system and its possible connection with the $SU(3)$ group is not clear. In consequence, following key issues remain unaddressed: a) all possible basis states of the qutrit system is not available, b) the complete version Bell-CHSH-like inequality for the qutrit system is still obscure, although some studies have been made based on the CGLMP identity [51, 52, 53, 54], and c) the proper definition of concurrence vis-a-vis fidelity, which is the key parameter to characterize the quantum correlation of concurrence with fidelity, based on the inequality $\Lambda$ as well as qutrit $(N = 3)$ pure state bipartite systems, respectively.

To achieve the aforesaid goal, remaining Sections of the paper are organized as follows: In Section II, we develop a heuristic scheme to obtain the Bell states from the Pauli matrices, the spin-half representation of $SU(2)$ group. In Section-III we prefer to review Wootters’ approach of deriving the concurrence in the computational, Bell and magic basis particularly to compare it with the $SU(2)$ fidelity which is developed in Section IV. In Section V, we extend our procedure to find the complete set of qutrit states where $SU(3)$ plays the key role and then proceed to discuss the $SU(3)$ fidelity at length in the computational, Bell and magic basis in Section VI, respectively. We conclude by recalling the essential results of the paper and discuss the outlook.

2 $SU(2)$ Group and Bell States:

Let $q_i^\alpha$ be the two dimensional spinor with components $\{u_i, d_i\}$ and site indices $i = A, B$, respectively. Our approach relies on the product of two non-local spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ spinors $\{\frac{1}{2}\}_A \otimes \{\frac{1}{2}\}_B = 3_{AB} \otimes 1_{AB}$ which corresponds to three triplet and one singlet entangled states defined in Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{2\otimes2}_{AB}$ [55]. To illustrate their construction, we take following heuristic route:

To start with we define the star product ($\ast$) of two non-local spinors in the Pauli basis, obtained by Wootters [30, 56],

\begin{equation}
\tilde{V} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} a_{ij} \Lambda_i \otimes \Lambda_j,
\end{equation}

with $a_{ij}$ be the constants and $\Lambda_i$ be the $SU(N)$ matrices, respectively. In this paper we shall develop an alternative formulation of fidelity, which we call $SU(N)$ fidelity, based on the inequality both for the qubit ($N = 2$) as well as qutrit ($N = 3$) pure state bipartite systems, respectively.

$$V = \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} a_{ij} \Lambda_i \otimes \Lambda_j,$$
\[
\sigma_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3}
\]

Then we follow two steps: i) promote the star product to tensor product, i.e., \(* \rightarrow \otimes\),

\[
\begin{align*}
u_A \ast u_B + d_A \ast d_B & \rightarrow |\sigma_0\rangle_{AB} := u_A \otimes u_B + d_A \otimes d_B, \quad \tag{4a} \\
u_A \ast d_B + d_A \ast u_B & \rightarrow |\sigma_1\rangle_{AB} := u_A \otimes d_B + d_A \otimes u_B, \quad \tag{4b} \\
u_A \ast d_B - d_A \ast u_B & \rightarrow |\sigma_2\rangle_{AB} := u_A \otimes d_B - d_A \otimes u_B, \quad \tag{4c} \\
u_A \ast u_B - d_A \ast d_B & \rightarrow |\sigma_3\rangle_{AB} := u_A \otimes u_B - d_A \otimes d_B, \quad \tag{4d}
\end{align*}
\]

and then, ii) express the spinor states \(\{u_i, d_i\}\) in terms of the qubit states \(\{|0\rangle_i, |1\rangle_i\}\), with the ancillary basis given by \(|0\rangle_i = (1, 0)^T_i, |1\rangle_i = (0, 1)^T_i\), respectively. Thus the normalized Bell states follows from Eq.(4) are given by,

\[
\begin{align*}
|\Phi^+\rangle_{AB} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle_A \otimes |0\rangle_B + |1\rangle_A \otimes |1\rangle_B) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^T, \quad \tag{5a} \\
|\Psi^+\rangle_{AB} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle_A \otimes |1\rangle_B + |1\rangle_A \otimes |0\rangle_B) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^T, \quad \tag{5b} \\
|\Psi^-\rangle_{AB} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle_A \otimes |1\rangle_B - |1\rangle_A \otimes |0\rangle_B) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^T, \quad \tag{5c} \\
|\Phi^-\rangle_{AB} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle_A \otimes |0\rangle_B - |1\rangle_A \otimes |1\rangle_B) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}^T, \quad \tag{5d}
\end{align*}
\]

where \(|\sigma_0\rangle_{AB} \equiv |\Phi^+\rangle_{AB}, |\sigma_1\rangle_{AB} \equiv |\Psi^+\rangle_{AB}, |\sigma_2\rangle_{AB} \equiv |\Psi^-\rangle_{AB}\) and \(|\sigma_3\rangle_{AB} \equiv |\Phi^-\rangle_{AB}\), respectively. In other words, whole set of four Bell states can be generated from two non-local spin-half irreducible representations of \(SU(2)\) group.

Out of the four states, we have three states are the symmetric state, \([27]\), i.e.,

\[
|\Phi^+\rangle_{AB} = |\Phi^+\rangle_{BA}, \quad |\Psi^+\rangle_{AB} = |\Psi^+\rangle_{BA}, \quad \tag{6a} \\
|\Phi^-\rangle_{AB} = |\Phi^-\rangle_{BA}, \quad |\Psi^-\rangle_{AB} = |\Psi^-\rangle_{BA}, \quad \tag{6b}
\]

while the remaining one,

\[
|\Psi^-\rangle_{AB} = - |\Psi^-\rangle_{BA} \equiv |\Phi^-\rangle_{BA}, \quad \tag{7}
\]

be an antisymmetric singlet state, respectively.

### 3 Review of Wootters’ Construction of Concurrence:

Before going into the definition of the \(SU(2)\) fidelity which is based on the Bell-CHSH in-
equality, let us recall the essence of the derivation of concurrence using conventional approach [30, 56, 57, 58]. The generic form of Wootters’ concurrence in higher dimensional Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H}_{AB}^{d \otimes d} \) is given by,

\[
C^{d \otimes d}(\rho_{AB}) = \sqrt{\text{Tr}[R_{AB}^2]},
\]

where \( R_{AB} \) is given by,

\[
R_{AB} = \rho_{AB} \bar{\rho}_{AB},
\]

with \( \rho_{AB} \) be the density matrix of the \( d \)-dimensional system and \( \bar{\rho}_{AB} = \hat{V}^\dagger \cdot \rho_{AB}^* \cdot \hat{V} \).

Here \( \rho_{AB}^* \) be the complex conjugate of the density matrix and \( \hat{V} \) be the transformation matrix which is not necessary to be a spin-flipped matrix as argued earlier in Eq.(1). For the qubit bipartite system \((d = 2)\), it is customary to work with following spin-flip operator [30],

\[
\hat{V} = \sqrt{2} \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2,
\]

and below we have compared the wave function and concurrence in the Computational, Bell and Magic basis, respectively.

The qubit wave function in the computational basis is given by,

\[
| \psi^C \rangle_{AB} = c_{00} | 0_A \rangle \otimes | 0_B \rangle + c_{01} | 0_A \rangle \otimes | 1_B \rangle + c_{10} | 1_A \rangle \otimes | 0_B \rangle + c_{11} | 1_A \rangle \otimes | 1_B \rangle.
\]

Using Eq.(5) we can express it in the Bell basis, namely,

\[
| \psi^B \rangle_{AB} = b_{00} | \Phi^+ \rangle_{AB} + b_{01} | \Psi^+ \rangle_{AB} + b_{10} | \Phi^- \rangle_{AB} + b_{11} | \Psi^- \rangle_{AB},
\]

where,

\[
b_{00} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{00} + c_{11}), \quad b_{01} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{01} + c_{10}),
\]

\[
b_{10} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{01} - c_{10}), \quad b_{11} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{00} - c_{11}),
\]

respectively. It is easy to see that the density matrix of the qubit states satisfies the pure state condition, i.e., \( \rho_{AB}^2 = \rho_{AB} \) and \( \rho_{AB}^* = \rho_{AB} \). Finally defining the magic basis [30],

\[
| e^0 \rangle_{AB} = i | \Phi^+ \rangle_{AB}, \quad | e^1 \rangle_{AB} = | \Psi^+ \rangle_{AB},
\]

\[
| e^2 \rangle_{AB} = i | \Psi^- \rangle_{AB}, \quad | e^3 \rangle_{AB} = | \Phi^- \rangle_{AB},
\]

the wave function becomes,

\[
| \psi^A \rangle_{AB} = \mu_{00} | e^0 \rangle_{AB} + \mu_{01} | e^1 \rangle_{AB} + \mu_{10} | e^2 \rangle_{AB} + \mu_{11} | e^3 \rangle_{AB},
\]

where,

\[
\mu_{00} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{00} + c_{11}), \quad \mu_{01} = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{01} + c_{10}),
\]

\[
\mu_{10} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{01} - c_{10}), \quad \mu_{11} = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{00} - c_{11}),
\]

respectively. From above states, it is straightforward to evaluate corresponding concurrences given by,

\[
C^{2 \otimes 2}(\rho_{AB}^C) = 2|c_{00}c_{11} - c_{01}c_{10}|,
\]

in the computational basis,

\[
C^{2 \otimes 2}(\rho_{AB}^B) = |b_{00}^2 - b_{01}^2 + b_{10}^2 - b_{11}^2|,
\]

in the Bell basis and

\[
C^{2 \otimes 2}(\rho_{AB}^\mu) = |\mu_{00}^2 + \mu_{01}^2 + \mu_{10}^2 + \mu_{11}^2|,
\]

in the magic basis, respectively. The recovery of the normalization condition in the magic basis \((\sum_{i,j=0}^{1} \mu_{ij}^2 = 1)\) shows that the qubit bipartite system is essentially a pure state system which is not manifested in other basis.

4 \quad \text{SU}(2) Fidelity:

The Bell-CHSH inequality is an experimentally realizable identity for the qubit bipartite system which has been thoroughly investigated by many workers [10, 13, 11, 12]. The correlation tensor read off from the inequality is given by [19],

\[
\hat{B}_2 = \hat{R} + \hat{Q}, \quad \hat{T}_B = \hat{R} - \hat{Q},
\]

where \( \hat{R}_A = \sigma_1, \hat{Q}_A = \sigma_3, \hat{S}_B = -\sqrt{2}(\sigma_3 + \sigma_1) \) and \( \hat{T}_B = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\sigma_3 - \sigma_1) \), respectively. This setting can be equivalently expressed as,

\[
\hat{B}_2 = -\sqrt{2}(\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_1 + \sigma_3 \otimes \sigma_3),
\]

\[
= \begin{pmatrix}
-2\sqrt{2} & 0 & 0 & -2\sqrt{2} \\
0 & 2\sqrt{2} & -2\sqrt{2} & 0 \\
0 & -2\sqrt{2} & 2\sqrt{2} & 0 \\
-2\sqrt{2} & 0 & 0 & -2\sqrt{2}
\end{pmatrix}.
\]
It is worth noting that above correlation tensor, having the structure of X-state, precisely gives four Bell states (5) as its eigen vectors. It addition, we have following expectation values,

\[ AB\langle \Phi^+ | B_2 | \Phi^+ \rangle_{AB} = -2\sqrt{2}, \quad (22a) \]
\[ AB\langle \Psi^+ | B_2 | \Psi^+ \rangle_{AB} = 0, \quad (22b) \]
\[ AB\langle \Psi^- | B_2 | \Psi^- \rangle_{AB} = 2\sqrt{2}, \quad (22c) \]
\[ AB\langle \Phi^- | B_2 | \Phi^- \rangle_{AB} = 0. \quad (22d) \]

Now, if we identify the transformation operator in Eq.(1) with the Bell-CHSH correlation tensor Eq.(21), i.e.,

\[ \hat{V} = B_2, \quad (23) \]

then the \( SU(2) \) fidelity of the qubit bipartite system is given by,

\[ F_2^{\otimes 2}(\psi_{AB}^C) = \sqrt{2}|c_{00} + c_{11}|^2 - (c_{01} - c_{10})^2|, \quad (24) \]

in the computational basis,

\[ F_B^{\otimes 2}(\psi_{AB}^B) = 2\sqrt{2}|\rho_{00}^B - \rho_{10}^B|, \quad (25) \]

in the Bell basis and

\[ F_\mu^{\otimes 2}(\psi_{AB}^\mu) = 2\sqrt{2}|\mu_{00}^\mu - \mu_{10}^\mu|, \quad (26) \]

in the magic basis, respectively. The \( SU(2) \) fidelity in the Bell basis given by Eq.(25) (equivalently from Eq.(22)) reveals two interesting features of the qubit bipartite system: i) it gives which of the Bell states are contributing in the Bell-CHSH inequality, i.e., \( \psi^i = \{ \Phi^+, \Psi^- \} \) in the present case, and ii) it precisely gives the upper bound called Bell-CHSH inequality, i.e.,

\[ \left| \langle \psi^i | \hat{B}_2 | \psi^j \rangle \right| \leq 2\sqrt{2}. \quad (27) \]

In the following Section we shall use this procedure to find the contributing states and corresponding upper bounds of the qutrit bipartite system.

5 \( SU(3) \) Group and Qutrit States:

To calculate the qutrit states in Hilbert space \( H_{AB}^{3\otimes 3} \), we consider the unit vector and Gellmann matrices,

\[
\lambda_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\lambda_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda_5 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\lambda_6 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda_7 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -i & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda_8 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2 \end{pmatrix},
\]

where lambda matrices are normalized as \( \lambda_i \lambda_j = \delta_{ij} + d_{ijl} \lambda_l + f_{ijm} \lambda_m \) with \( d_{ijk} \) and \( f_{ijk} \) (\( i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, 8 \)) as the completely symmetric and completely antisymmetric tensors, respectively [59].

Similar to the previous section, taking two non-local triplet states \( q_A^i \) to be \( (u_i, d_i, s_i)^T \) with \( i = A, B \), we define following nine star product in the \( SU(3) \) basis,
\[ q^\alpha_T \lambda_0 \ast q_0^\alpha \rightarrow \ket{\lambda_0}_{AB} := (u_A \otimes u_B + d_A \otimes d_B + s_A \otimes s_B), \quad (29a) \]
\[ q^\alpha_T \lambda_1 \ast q_0^\alpha \rightarrow \ket{\lambda_1}_{AB} := u_A \otimes d_B + d_A \otimes u_B, \quad (29b) \]
\[ q^\alpha_T \lambda_2 \ast q_0^\alpha \rightarrow \ket{\lambda_2}_{AB} := u_A \otimes d_B - d_A \otimes u_B, \quad (29c) \]
\[ q^\alpha_T \lambda_3 \ast q_0^\alpha \rightarrow \ket{\lambda_3}_{AB} := u_A \otimes u_B - d_A \otimes d_B, \quad (29d) \]
\[ q^\alpha_T \lambda_4 \ast q_0^\alpha \rightarrow \ket{\lambda_4}_{AB} := u_A \otimes s_B + s_A \otimes u_B, \quad (29e) \]
\[ q^\alpha_T \lambda_5 \ast q_0^\alpha \rightarrow \ket{\lambda_5}_{AB} := u_A \otimes s_B - s_A \otimes u_B, \quad (29f) \]
\[ q^\alpha_T \lambda_6 \ast q_0^\alpha \rightarrow \ket{\lambda_6}_{AB} := d_A \otimes s_B + s_A \otimes d_B, \quad (29g) \]
\[ q^\alpha_T \lambda_7 \ast q_0^\alpha \rightarrow \ket{\lambda_7}_{AB} := d_A \otimes s_B - s_A \otimes d_B, \quad (29h) \]
\[ q^\alpha_T \lambda_8 \ast q_0^\alpha \rightarrow \ket{\lambda_8}_{AB} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(u_A \otimes u_B + d_A \otimes d_B - 2s_A \otimes s_B), \quad (29i) \]

respectively. Finally, by choosing each of the states \( \{q_i^\alpha\} \) to be \( \{\ket{0}_i, \ket{1}_i, \ket{2}_i\} \), where each of the three-state ancillary basis are given by,

\[
|0\rangle_i = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad |1\rangle_i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad |2\rangle_i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (30)
\]

we can readily construct the following normalized Bell-like qutrit states (We set, \( \ket{\lambda_a}_{AB} \equiv \ket{\psi_a}_{AB} \)
\((a = 0, 1, 2, 3 \ldots 8)));

\[
|\psi_0\rangle_{AB} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(\ket{0}_A \otimes \ket{0}_B + \ket{1}_A \otimes \ket{1}_B + \ket{2}_A \otimes \ket{2}_B),
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^T, \quad (31a)
\]
\[
|\psi_1\rangle_{AB} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\ket{0}_A \otimes \ket{1}_B + \ket{1}_A \otimes \ket{0}_B),
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^T, \quad (31b)
\]
\[
|\psi_2\rangle_{AB} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\ket{0}_A \otimes \ket{1}_B - \ket{1}_A \otimes \ket{2}_B),
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^T, \quad (31c)
\]

6
respectively. Eq.(31) shows that the qutrit system has following decomposition \( \{|3\}_A \otimes \{|3\}_B \rangle = 8_{AB} \oplus 1_{AB} \) with eight octet and one singlet entangled states, respectively. It is worth mentioning here that most works with the qutrit system primarily deals with the singlet qutrit state \( \psi_0 \) given by Eq.(30a) only \([47, 51, 53]\). The Schmidt number of each state is greater than one indicating that they are essentially entangled states. Among them, the symmetric states are given by,

\[
| \psi_a \rangle_{AB} = | \psi_a \rangle_{BA}, \quad \text{with} \quad a = 0, 1, 3, 4, 6, 8
\]  

(32)

while the remaining antisymmetric states are,

\[
| \psi_b \rangle_{AB} = - | \psi_b \rangle_{BA}, \quad \text{with} \quad b = 2, 5, 7
\]  

(33)

respectively.

In the qutrit computational basis, the qutrit wave function is given by,

\[
| \psi^T_{C} \rangle_{AB} = c_0 | 0_A \rangle \otimes | 0_B \rangle + c_1 | 0_A \rangle \otimes | 1_B \rangle + c_2 | 0_A \rangle \otimes | 2_B \rangle + c_3 | 1_A \rangle \otimes | 0_B \rangle + c_4 | 1_A \rangle \otimes | 1_B \rangle + c_5 | 1_A \rangle \otimes | 2_B \rangle + c_6 | 2_A \rangle \otimes | 0_B \rangle + c_7 | 2_A \rangle \otimes | 1_B \rangle + c_8 | 2_A \rangle \otimes | 2_B \rangle
\]  

(34)

Using Eq.(31), the Bell-like basis qutrit wave function is found to be,
\begin{align*}
| \psi_B^T \rangle_{AB} &= b_0 | \psi_0 \rangle_{AB} + b_1 | \psi_1 \rangle_{AB} + b_2 | \psi_2 \rangle_{AB}, \\
&+ b_3 | \psi_3 \rangle_{AB} + b_4 | \psi_4 \rangle_{AB} + b_5 | \psi_5 \rangle_{AB}, \\
&+ b_6 | \psi_6 \rangle_{AB} + b_7 | \psi_7 \rangle_{AB} + b_8 | \psi_8 \rangle_{AB}, \\
\end{align*}

(35)

where, the normalized amplitudes are given by,

\begin{align*}
b_0 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} (c_0 - \sqrt{2} c_8), & b_1 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (c_1 - c_2), & b_2 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (c_4 - c_5), \\
b_3 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (c_1 + c_2), & b_4 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (\sqrt{2} c_0 - \sqrt{3} c_3 + c_8), & b_5 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (c_6 - c_7), \\
b_6 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (c_4 + c_5), & b_7 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (c_6 + c_7), & b_8 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (\sqrt{2} c_0 + \sqrt{3} c_3 + c_8), \\
\end{align*}

(36)

respectively. We emphasize that, similar to qubit system, the density matrix satisfies the pure state condition, namely, \( \rho_C^T = \rho_C^T \) and \( \rho_B^T = \rho_B^T \). Furthermore, in the magic basis the qutrit state is given by,

\begin{align*}
| \psi_\mu^T \rangle_{AB} &= \mu_0 | e_0 \rangle_{AB} + \mu_1 | e_1 \rangle_{AB} + \mu_2 | e_2 \rangle_{AB}, \\
&+ \mu_3 | e_3 \rangle_{AB} + \mu_4 | e_4 \rangle_{AB} + \mu_5 | e_5 \rangle_{AB}, \\
&+ \mu_6 | e_6 \rangle_{AB} + \mu_7 | e_7 \rangle_{AB} + \mu_8 | e_8 \rangle_{AB}, \\
\end{align*}

(37)

where, the magic states are given by,

\begin{align*}
| e_0 \rangle_{AB} &= \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} | \psi_0 \rangle_{AB}, & | e_1 \rangle_{AB} &= | \psi_1 \rangle_{AB}, & | e_2 \rangle_{AB} &= i | \psi_2 \rangle_{AB}, \\
| e_3 \rangle_{AB} &= | \psi_3 \rangle_{AB}, & | e_4 \rangle_{AB} &= | \psi_4 \rangle_{AB}, & | e_5 \rangle_{AB} &= i | \psi_5 \rangle_{AB}, \\
| e_6 \rangle_{AB} &= | \psi_6 \rangle_{AB}, & | e_7 \rangle_{AB} &= i | \psi_7 \rangle_{AB}, & | e_8 \rangle_{AB} &= | \psi_8 \rangle_{AB}, \\
\end{align*}

(38)

with corresponding amplitudes,

\begin{align*}
\mu_0^T &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} (c_0^T - \sqrt{2} c_8^T), & \mu_1^T &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (c_1^T - c_2^T), & \mu_2^T &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (c_4^T - c_5^T), \\
\mu_3^T &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (c_1^T + c_2^T), & \mu_4^T &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (\sqrt{2} c_0^T - \sqrt{3} c_3^T + c_8^T), & \mu_5^T &= \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} (c_6^T - c_7^T), \\
\mu_6^T &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (c_4^T + c_5^T), & \mu_7^T &= \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} (c_6^T + c_7^T), & \mu_8^T &= \frac{i}{\sqrt{6}} (\sqrt{2} c_0^T + \sqrt{3} c_3^T + c_8^T), \\
\end{align*}

(39)

respectively.

6 \quad SU(3) Fidelity for Qutrit System:

Finally we proceed to evaluate the \( SU(3) \) fidelity for the qutrit bipartite system using the qutrit states obtained above. It is worth mentioning
here that, in absence of any Bell-type inequality for the qutrit system, finding the correlation tensor in the form $B_3 = \sum_{i,j=0}^{8} a_{ij} \lambda_i \otimes \lambda_j$ is quite tricky and lengthy job. After an extensive search it is found to be,

$$B_3 = -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \lambda_3 \otimes \lambda_3 + \sqrt{2} \lambda_4 \otimes \lambda_4 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \lambda_5 \otimes \lambda_5 +$$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \lambda_7 \otimes \lambda_7 + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_8 \otimes \lambda_0 + \lambda_0 \otimes \lambda_8) +$$

$$\frac{5}{2\sqrt{2}} \lambda_8 \otimes \lambda_8 - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}} (\lambda_3 \otimes \lambda_8 + \lambda_8 \otimes \lambda_3) - \sqrt{2} \lambda_2 \otimes \lambda_2 - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} (\lambda_0 \otimes \lambda_3 + \lambda_3 \otimes \lambda_0),$$

which has some nontrivial implication.

We now proceed to derive the $SU(3)$ fidelity of qutrit system using the methodology developed above. Identifying the transformation operator $\hat{V} = \hat{B}_3$, the $SU(3)$ fidelity for the bipartite qutrit system is given by,

$$\mathcal{F}_C^{3\otimes 3}(\psi_{AB}^C) = \sqrt{2}|(c_1 - c_3)^2 - (c_2 - c_6)^2 - (c_5 - c_7)^2 +$$

$$(c_0 + c_3)^2 + (c_1 + c_8)^2 - 2c_0^2|,$$

in the computational basis,

$$\mathcal{F}_B^{3\otimes 3}(\psi_{AB}^B) = \sqrt{2}|2b_0^2 - 2b_2^2 + b_3^2 - 2b_5^2 + 2b_7^2 - b_8^2|,$$
in the qutrit Bell-like basis and

\[ \mathcal{F}_{\mu}^{\otimes 3}(\psi_{AB}) = \sqrt{2}[2\mu_0^2 + 2\mu_2^2 + \mu_3^2 + 2\mu_5^2 + 2\mu_7^2 + \mu_8^2], \]  

(43)

in the qutrit magic basis, respectively. Finally from the Bell-like fidelity in Eq.(43) (also from Eq.(42)), it is easy to see that we have two upper bounds,

\[ |\langle \psi_i | B_3 | \psi_i \rangle| \leq 2\sqrt{2}, \quad (i = 0, 2, 5, 7) \]  

(44a)

\[ |\langle \psi_j | B_3 | \psi_j \rangle| \leq \sqrt{2}, \quad (j = 3, 8) \]  

(44b)

which correspond to two sets of qutrit states, \( \{\psi_0, \psi_2, \psi_5, \psi_7\} \) and \( \{\psi_3, \psi_8\} \), respectively. Thus the qutrit bipartite system described by the \( SU(3) \) group predicts two class of inequalities.

7 Conclusion:

In this paper we have developed a general framework of constructing the maximally entangled states for the pure qubit and pure qutrit bipartite systems from the \( SU(2) \) and \( SU(3) \) group, respectively. An alternative formulation of fidelity is proposed which is based on the Bell-CHSH inequality of the qubit bipartite system and have extended it for the qutrit system even in absence of any inequality for such system. The emergence of the correlation tensor in terms of the direct product of the Gellmann matrices is possibly the most interesting outcome of our analysis which gives multiple number of Bell-type inequalities with different upper bounds. The properties of the qutrit states discussed here may be useful to address the entanglement of formation, mixed states and various protocols related to such system. In conclusion, the complete set of the qutrit states obtained by using the tenet of the octet theory may shed some light on the unexplored territory of the higher dimensional entangled systems.
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