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Inspired by the definition of the non-Gaussian two-parametric continuous variable analogue of an isotropic state introduced by Mišta et al. [Phys. Rev. A, 65, 062315 (2002)], we propose a simple, but with respect to the correlation structure interesting example of a two-mode Gaussian analogue of an isotropic state. Unlike conventional isotropic states, which are defined as a convex combination of a thermal and an entangled density operator, our state is defined by a convex combination of the corresponding covariance matrices. This state is by construction Gaussian and can be understood as entangled pure state with additional Gaussian noise controlled by a mixing probability. Using various entanglement criteria and measures, we study the non-classical correlations contained in this state. Unlike the previously studied non-Gaussian isotropic state, the Gaussian state proposed here features a finite threshold in the parameter space where entanglement sets in. In addition, it turns out that it exhibits an analogous phenomenology as the finite-dimensional two-qubit isotropic state.

I. INTRODUCTION

Entanglement is one of the most intriguing phenomena in quantum physics and serves as a resource for many applications in quantum information processing, particularly in quantum communications [1]. A bipartite system is defined to be entangled if its joint quantum state is not separable. It is well known and experimentally confirmed that entangled systems exhibit quantum correlations which cannot be explained in solely classical terms. What is less known is that the opposite implication does not apply. In fact, it turned out that also separable, i.e. non-entangled states, can exhibit non-classical correlations, which are, for instance, relevant for quantum computational tasks [2–4].

In order to understand the difference between the two types of quantum correlations, it is useful to study simple bipartite quantum systems which cross over from a non-classical separable to an entangled state when a parameter is varied. Examples of this type include so-called Werner states [5] and isotropic states [6].

An isotropic states is defined as a convex combination of a totally mixed and a fully entangled state. More specifically, for a bipartite system consisting of two $d$-dimensional subsystems $A$ and $B$, the isotropic state is defined by

\[
\rho_i = p |+\rangle\langle+| + (1-p) \frac{1}{d^2}
\]

with a mixing parameter $p \in [0, 1]$, where

\[
|+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i=1}^{d} |i, i\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i=1}^{d} |i\rangle_A \otimes |i\rangle_B.
\]

This state depends on a single parameter $p \in [0, 1]$ which determines the balance between the mixed and the entangled component. Varying this parameter, it turns out that the isotropic state is separable below a certain finite threshold $p_c = \frac{1}{1+d}$ and entangled above $\frac{1}{2}$. In the range $0 < p \leq p_c$ the isotropic state offers an interesting example of a quantum state with zero entanglement which nevertheless exhibits quantum correlations that cannot be explained in classical terms, as will be discussed below.

Werner states are closely related to isotropic states. While isotropic states are defined to be invariant under local unitaries of the form $U \otimes U^*$, Werner states are invariant under $U \otimes U$. Werner states in finite-dimensional systems are known to exhibit similar properties as isotropic ones, in particular there is also a finite threshold for the control parameter from where on entanglement sets in. In the two-qubit case Werner and isotropic states are identical up to a local unitary transformation [6].

The most common measure for quantifying quantum correlations in mixed states is the so-called entanglement of formation (EOF) [7, 8]. Here the statistical ensemble described by the density matrix is decomposed into pure-state components and the corresponding entanglement entropy is then averaged according to the statistical weights. Since a mixed quantum state represents an equivalence class of many statistical ensembles, the result has to be minimized over all possible ensembles in this class, which is a technically difficult task.

Since the EOF vanishes on separable states, it is not suitable for quantifying the aforementioned quantum correlations in the separable region of the isotropic state. Contrarily, the so-called quantum discord (QD) is a measure that does also respond to quantum correlations in the separable region. The QD is defined as the difference between total correlations – measured by the quantum mutual information – and classical correlations – extractable via quantum measurement – maximized over...
all possible quantum measurements \[9\] \([10]\). In fact, for two-qubit isotropic states, the QD was found to be non-zero for all \(0 < p \leq 1\) \([12]\).

In quantum information theory, besides systems with finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces, infinite-dimensional systems with continuous variables (CV) are studied frequently \([11]\). Experimentally such systems arise naturally in quantum optics where quantum states can be realized by light modes. In this context Gaussian states play a central role since they are fully specified by a displacement vector and a finite-dimensional covariance matrix \([12]\). The relevance of Gaussian states in quantum information processing has been reviewed in Ref. \([13]\).

Given the importance of CV quantum systems both in theory and experiment, the question arises whether it is possible to define a continuous variant of isotropic and Werner states with similar properties. The first attempt in this direction was made by Mišta et al., who introduced a two-parametric CV analogue as a convex combination of a two-mode thermal and a two-mode squeezed state \([14]\). However, this CV isotropic state is generally non-Gaussian and therefore the well-established formalism for Gaussian states cannot be applied. Furthermore, it turns out that the suggested state does not feature a finite entanglement threshold, instead it is entangled for all \(p > 0\).

In this paper we propose a different kind of CV isotropic state. In contrast to the non-Gaussian state introduced here, the previously studied state does exhibit a finite threshold in the parameter space where entanglement sets in. Furthermore, it turns out that the Gaussian state proposed here displays analogies to the finite-dimensional two-qubit isotropic state. The aim of the present work is to study the correlation structure of this state and to understand the quantum nature of the correlations in the separable domain.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section we briefly review the common notations of CV systems. Sect. \([11]\) reviews the non-Gaussian isotropic state introduced by Mišta et al., which was defined as a convex combination of two density matrices, the state proposed here is defined as a convex combination of the covariance matrices and hence it is Gaussian by construction. Unlike the previously studied state it does exhibit a finite threshold in the parameter space where entanglement sets in. Furthermore, it turns out that the Gaussian state proposed here displays analogies to the finite-dimensional two-qubit isotropic state. The aim of the present work is to study the correlation structure of this state and to understand the quantum nature of the correlations in the separable domain.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section we briefly review the common notations of CV systems. Sect. \([11]\) reviews the non-Gaussian isotropic state introduced by Mišta et al., which was defined as a convex combination of two density matrices, the state proposed here is defined as a convex combination of the covariance matrices and hence it is Gaussian by construction. Unlike the previously studied state it does exhibit a finite threshold in the parameter space where entanglement sets in. Furthermore, it turns out that the Gaussian state proposed here displays analogies to the finite-dimensional two-qubit isotropic state. The aim of the present work is to study the correlation structure of this state and to understand the quantum nature of the correlations in the separable domain.

II. GAUSSIAN STATES

Before starting let us briefly recall some common notations for CV systems. A quantum N-mode system is given by \(N\) pairs of canonical observables
\[
\hat{x}_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\hat{a}_k + \hat{a}_k^\dagger), \quad \hat{p}_k = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} (\hat{a}_k^\dagger - \hat{a}_k)
\]
with \([\hat{a}_k, \hat{a}_k^\dagger] = \delta_{kl}\). Arranging them in a vector
\[
\vec{R} = (\hat{x}_1, \hat{p}_1, ..., \hat{x}_N, \hat{p}_N) = (R_1, ..., R_{2N})
\]
they obey the commutation relations \([R_k, R_l] = i\Omega_{kl}\), where
\[
\Omega = \bigoplus_{k=1}^N \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}
\]
denotes the symplectic matrix. Any quantum state \(\hat{\rho}\) of such a CV system can be expressed as an integral over all points \(\vec{r} = (r_1, ..., r_{2N}) = (x_1, p_1, ..., x_N, p_N)\) in phase space by
\[
\hat{\rho} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^N} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d^{2N} r \chi(\vec{r}) \hat{D}(\vec{r}),
\]
where \(\hat{D}(\vec{r}) = e^{-i\vec{r}^T \vec{a}}\) is the displacement operator and \(\chi(\vec{r}) = \text{Tr}[\hat{D}^\dagger(\vec{r})]\) is the characteristic function.

A quantum state \(\hat{\rho}\) is called Gaussian if its characteristic function can be written in the quadratic form
\[
\chi_{\hat{\rho}}(\vec{r}) = \exp \left(i\vec{r}^T \Omega \vec{a} - \frac{1}{4} \vec{r}^T \Omega^T \gamma \Omega \vec{r} \right).
\]
This means that a Gaussian state is completely determined by its first two cumulants, namely, the displacement \(\vec{d} = \langle \vec{R} \rangle\) and the covariance matrix (CM) \(\gamma\) with the components \(\gamma_{kl} = \langle R_k R_l + R_l R_k \rangle - 2 \langle R_k \rangle \langle R_l \rangle\). The uncertainty relation manifests itself in the fact that all valid quantum states fulfill the condition \([15]\)
\[
\gamma + i\Omega \geq 0
\]
in the sense that the matrix sum on the l.h.s. has only non-negative eigenvalues. For Gaussian states this condition is both necessary and sufficient for physicality.

When discussing correlation properties of Gaussian states the displacement \(\vec{d}\) is usually not relevant, meaning that the CM \(\gamma\) alone characterizes the correlation structure of the state. Moreover, for two-mode Gaussian states we can use local symplectic transformations to convert a given CM into the following standard form \([16]\)
\[
\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & c_1 & 0 \\ 0 & a & 0 & c_2 \\ c_1 & 0 & b & 0 \\ 0 & c_2 & 0 & b \end{pmatrix}, \quad a, b, c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}.
\]
If \(a = b\) the two-mode Gaussian state is said to be symmetric. In addition, according to the Williamson theorem, a general \(N\)-mode CM can always be brought into the so-called canonical or normal form
\[
\gamma_n = \text{diag}(\nu_1, \nu_1, ..., \nu_N, \nu_N)
\]
by global symplectic transformations, where the \( \nu_k \geq 1 \)
are the symplectic eigenvalues which can be obtained
as eigenvalues of \(|\Omega|\) (see \cite{12} and references therein). In case of two-mode Gaussian states these symplectic
eigenvalues are functions of the entries in Eq. (9). For
two-mode Gaussian states all correlation properties, such as entanglement and Gaussian quantum discord, can be
fully discussed in terms of these matrix entries or the symplectic
eigenvalues \cite{12,17}.

### III. NON-GAUSSIAN CV ISOTROPIC STATE

Let us briefly review the CV isotropic state introduced
by Mišta et al. in Ref. \cite{14}. In order to define a CV analogue of the isotropic state in Eq. (1), they proposed
to consider a convex combination of a two-mode squeezed
and a two-mode thermal state

\[
\hat{\rho}_c := p\hat{\rho}_{TMS} + (1-p)\hat{\rho}_{TMT}, \quad p \in [0,1]. \tag{11}
\]

Here the entangled component \( \hat{\rho}_{TMS} \) is a pure two-mode squeezed (TMS) vacuum state \( |0\rangle \)
which can be represented in the Fock basis \(|m,n\rangle = |m\rangle_A \otimes |n\rangle_B \) of the two
modes \( A \) and \( B \) by

\[
\hat{\rho}_{TMS} = (1-\lambda_1) \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_1^{\frac{m+n}{2}} |m,n\rangle\langle m,n|, \tag{12}
\]

where \( \lambda_1 = \tanh^2 r \) depends on the so-called squeeze
ing parameter \( r \in \mathbb{R} \). The physical meaning of this parameter is that it controls the average particle number \( \bar{n} = \sinh^2 r \). It is important to note that \( \hat{\rho}_{TMS} \) itself is
only partially entangled and becomes fully entangled only
in the limit \( r \to \infty \), but this limit is unphysical since then
the particle number diverges and the state is no longer normalizable. For this reason one has to keep \( r \) as a free parameter.

The separable mixed component \( \hat{\rho}_{TMT} \) is a two-mode thermal (TMT) state, given as product of two identical thermal modes

\[
\hat{\rho}_{TMT} = (1-\lambda_2) \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_2^{m+n} |m,n\rangle\langle m,n|, \tag{13}
\]

where \( \lambda_2 = \tanh^2 s \) is another parameter controlling the average particle number \( \bar{n} = \sinh^2 s \).

Thus the proposed state in Eq. (11) depends on three parameters, \( r, s, \) and \( p \). However, in order to establish a close analogy with the finite-dimensional case, it is sufficient
to restrict the analysis to the case \( r = s \) since then both components, the TMT and the TMS state, involve the same average number of particles. Moreover, this choice ensures that the TMT state is just twice the reduced TMS state, i.e.

\[
\hat{\rho}_{TMT} = \text{Tr}_B[\hat{\rho}_{TMS}] \otimes \text{Tr}_A[\hat{\rho}_{TMS}], \tag{14}
\]

analogous to Eq. (1) where a similar relation holds. With
this restriction the state is controlled by only two param-
eters \( r \) and \( p \).

In Ref. \cite{14} Mišta et al. showed that the two-
parametric CV isotropic state exhibits two important
properties. Firstly, it is non-Gaussian for all \( 0 < p < 1 \)
so that it can no longer be described in terms of the CM matrix alone. Secondly, the state is entangled (non-
separable) for all \( p > 0 \) irrespective of \( r \). At a first glance
this is surprising since in the finite-dimensional case one
observes a finite threshold \( p > p_c = 1/2 \) from where on
entanglement sets in. Yet the result is consistent if we
recall that a CV system involves infinitely many degrees
of freedom, which would correspond to taking the limit
\( d \to \infty \).

However, we should keep in mind that a direct analogy
between the finite-dimensional and the CV case is only
valid in the limit \( r \to \infty \) where \( \hat{\rho}_{TMS} \) becomes maximally
entangled and \( \hat{\rho}_{TMT} \) becomes maximally mixed. Never-
theless, \( \hat{\rho}_c \) is entangled for all \( p > 0 \) independent of the
squeezing parameter \( r \). This means that in contrast to
the finite-dimensional isotropic state, the CV state in-
duced by Mišta et al. does not feature an extended
region in the parameter space where the state is non-
entangled but nevertheless non-classical. If one is pri-
marily interested in understanding the ‘quantumness’ of
such non-entangled states and the transition into the en-
tangled regime, the CV isotropic state defined in Eq. (11)
is perhaps less interesting as the finite-dimensional one.

### IV. GAUSSIAN ISOTROPIC STATE

Since the isotropic state introduced by Mišta et al. has
the drawback of being non-Gaussian and entangled for
all \( p > 0 \), we now define a different kind of interpolation
between \( \hat{\rho}_{TMT} \) and \( \hat{\rho}_{TMS} \). The idea is very simple: instead
of taking a convex combination of the density matrices, we
consider a convex combination of the corresponding
covariance matrices

\[
\gamma_{GI} := p\gamma_{TMS} + (1-p)\gamma_{TMT} \tag{15}
\]

and use this combination to define a Gaussian state \( \hat{\rho}_{GI} \)
via Eqs. (6)-(7) that interpolates between a thermal and
an entangled squeezed state. Like \( \hat{\rho}_c \), this state depends
on two parameters, namely, the mixing parameter \( p \in [0,1] \)
and the squeezing parameter \( r \in \mathbb{R} \).

To construct the CM \( \gamma_{GI} \) we note that \( \gamma_{TMS} \) is already
given in the standard form \cite{0} with \( a = b = \cosh(2r) \)
and \( c_1 = c_2 = \sinh(2r) \) \cite{12,18}. Concerning \( \gamma_{TMT} \) it is
known that an \( N \)-mode thermal state has a diagonal CM
of the form \cite{14}, where the symplectic eigenvalues are
related to the average number of mode-excitations via
\( \nu_k = 2\bar{n}_k + 1 \) \cite{19}. Since we consider two identical
thermal states which are the reduced states of the TMS state, we have \( \nu_1 = \nu_2 = 1 + 2\sinh^2 r = \cosh(2r) \). Combining
Any mixed Gaussian state can be thought as being composed of a pure Gaussian state with additional Gaussian noise, i.e. $\gamma_{\text{mixed}} = \gamma_{\text{pure}} + \gamma_{\text{noise}}$. In Hilbert space this can be understood as convolution of a pure density operator with a classical Gaussian probability distribution [22]. In the case of $\gamma_{\text{GI}}$, Eq. (15), we have just an entangled pure TMS state with additional thermal noise, where the weighting of the two contributions is controlled by the parameter $p$.

V. GENERAL PROPERTIES

In the following we summarize some basic properties of the proposed Gaussian isotropic state. The symplectic eigenvalues of the CM defined in (16) are

$$\nu := \nu_1 = \nu_2 = \sqrt{\cosh^2(2r) - p^2 \sinh^2(2r)} \geq 1,$$

so that the purity of the state is given by (see [23])

$$\mu = Tr[\hat{\rho}^2_{\text{GI}}] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det \gamma_{\text{GI}}}} = \frac{1}{\nu^2}.\tag{19}$$

The Rényi entropy of the state can be expressed as [24]

$$S_\alpha = \frac{\ln Tr[\hat{\rho}^\alpha_{\text{GI}}]}{1 - \alpha} = \frac{\sum_k \ln F_\alpha(v_k)}{\alpha - 1} = \frac{2 \ln F_\alpha(\nu)}{\alpha - 1},\tag{20}$$

where

$$F_\alpha(\nu) = \left(\frac{\nu + 1}{2}\right)^\alpha - \left(\frac{\nu - 1}{2}\right)^\alpha.\tag{21}$$

In the limit $\alpha \to 1$ the Rényi entropy tends to the usual von-Neumann entropy [23]

$$S = -\ln Tr[\hat{\rho} \ln \hat{\rho}] = \sum_k f(v_k) = 2f(\nu),\tag{22}$$

where

$$f(\nu) = \left(\frac{\nu + 1}{2}\right)\ln\left(\frac{\nu + 1}{2}\right) - \left(\frac{\nu - 1}{2}\right)\ln\left(\frac{\nu - 1}{2}\right).\tag{23}$$

Another special case is the Rényi-2 entropy which turns out to be related to the purity by

$$S_2 = -\ln Tr[\hat{\rho}^2_{\text{GI}}] = 2 \ln \nu = -\ln \mu.\tag{24}$$

The reduced density matrices $\hat{\rho}_{\text{GI}}^A = Tr_{B}[\hat{\rho}_{\text{GI}}]$ of the two modes correspond to the reduced covariance matrices

$$\gamma_{\text{GI}}^A = \gamma_{\text{GI}}^B = \begin{pmatrix} \cosh(2r) & 0 \\ 0 & \cosh(2r) \end{pmatrix},\tag{25}$$

independent of the control parameter $p$. Hence, without classical communication between the modes, this parameter has no influence on local measurements. The corresponding Rényi entropy of the reduced states reads

$$S_\alpha^A = S_\alpha^B = \frac{\ln \left(\cosh^{2\alpha}(r) - \sinh^{2\alpha}(r)\right)}{\alpha - 1},\tag{26}$$

reducing to the von-Neumann entropy for $\alpha \to 1$, i.e.

$$S^A = S^B = 2 \cosh^2(r) \ln \cosh(r) - 2 \sinh^2(r) \ln \sinh(r).\tag{27}$$
VI. ENTANGLEMENT CRITERIA

A. PPT criterion

In this Section we investigate the correlation properties of the state defined in Eqs. (16)-(17). First we apply the Peres–Horodecki criterion [25] which is also known as positive partial transpose (PPT) criterion. This criterion has been reformulated for CV systems in Ref. [26] and proven to be necessary and sufficient for all bipartite \( 1 \times N \)-mode Gaussian states in Ref. [27, 28]. For states in standard form, the PPT criterion yields a very simple expression which in the case of Eq. (16) reads

\[
\left( \cosh^2(2r) - \sinh^2(2r) \right)^2 - 2 \left( \cosh^2(2r) + \sinh^2(2r) \right) + 1 \geq 0. 
\]

If this inequality holds for a given set of parameters \((p, r)\), the criterion tells us that the resulting state \( \hat{\rho}_{\text{GI}} \) is separable, otherwise it is entangled. This inequality can be rewritten as

\[
\cosh(2r) - p \sinh(2r) \geq 1 \iff p \leq \tanh(r),
\]

where the l.h.s. is the smallest symplectic eigenvalue of the partially transposed covariance matrix \( \gamma_{\text{GI}} \) [12]. The separable domain and its boundary is shown in Fig. 2. Obviously, as \( r \) increases, the larger \( p \) must be to obtain an entangled state. We will come back to this observation in the following section. In the limit \( r \rightarrow \infty \) the r.h.s. of Eq. (28) equals 1, meaning that the state becomes separable for all \( p \).

B. Steerability criterion

Quantum steering in a bipartite system \( \hat{\rho}_{AB} \) describes the ability of subsystem \( A \) to influence the quantum state of subsystem \( B \) by performing local measurements exclusively on its own subsystem (see [29] for a review). Clearly, steerability requires that the joint quantum state is entangled. In the case of Gaussian states, if one restricts the allowed measurements to Gaussian measurements, it has been shown in [30, 31] that a state is steerable from \( A \) to \( B \) if and only if

\[
\gamma + i (0_A \oplus \Omega_B) \geq 0
\]

is positive definite. Here, \( 0_A \) is a zero matrix in the subspace of \( A \) and \( \Omega_B \) is the symplectic matrix for subsystem \( B \). In the case of \( \gamma_{\text{GI}} \) we are then led to the symmetric steering condition

\[
p > \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \cosh(2r)}}.
\]

The corresponding region is shown in Fig. 2. As expected, it is a subset of the entangled region.

C. Realignment criterion

For completeness let us compare the PPT criterion with the computable cross norm or realignment (CCNR) criterion [32, 33]. The realignment criterion states that for any separable state the trace norm of the realigned density matrix obeys the inequality \( \|\rho^R\| \leq 1 \). Conversely, \( \|\rho^R\| > 1 \) implies that the state is entangled. Zhang et al. [34] reformulated the realignment criterion for Gaussian states, showing that for two-mode Gaussian states with a CM in the standard form (9) we have

\[
\|\rho^R\| = \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{(\sqrt{ab} - |c_1|)(\sqrt{ab} - |c_2|)}},
\]

so that

\[
\|\hat{\rho}_{\text{GI}}^R\| = \frac{1}{2(\cosh(2r) - p \sinh(2r))}.
\]

Consequently this criterion tells us that the inequality

\[
p > \frac{1}{4} \coth(r) + 3 \tanh(r)
\]

implies that the state is entangled. As can be seen in Fig. 2, the CCNR is compatible with the PPT criterion although it is clearly less predictive in this case.
since for stronger squeezing the TMS component in our state becomes more entangled and thus we would expect that more noise is needed to destroy the entanglement, i.e., the values of \( p \) should decrease along the boundary with increasing \( r \). Contrarily, the figure suggests that the entanglement in a weakly entangled TMS state was more robust against added noise as in a strongly entangled one. This apparent contradiction is resolved by observing that also the intensity of added thermal noise increases with \( r \), and that this increase dominates the parameter dependence.

B. Quantum discord

Next we want to investigate \( \hat{\rho}_{\text{GAI}} \) with respect to possible quantum correlations beyond entanglement. To this end we analyze the quantum discord (QD) \cite{Girolami02,Albarelli09,Ates12}, a measure that is known to detect correlations that are due to quantum physical effects even in the absence of quantum entanglement. While the EOF reflects the average correlations of pure-state components in the statistical ensemble, minimizing over all possible compositions of the ensemble, the QD is defined as the total correlation given by the quantum mutual information minus the classical correlation extractable via measurement, maximizing over all possible quantum measurements:

\[
D(\hat{\rho}) = S^B - S^{AB} + \inf_{\{\Pi_i\}} H(\Pi_i) (A|B). \tag{37}
\]

The last term denotes the average conditional entropy of \( A \) after a generalized measurement \( \{\Pi_i\} \) has been performed on \( B \).

A Gaussian version of the QD for all two-mode Gaussian states has been introduced in Ref. \cite{Girolami02}. Here the authors imposed the restriction that the aforementioned maximization is carried out over Gaussian measurements only, yielding a closed formula in terms of the entries of the CM in Eq. \cite{Girolami02}. In the case of \( \gamma_{\text{GAI}} \) this so-called Gaussian quantum discord is given by

\[
D_G = f(\cosh 2r) + f\left(p^2 - (p^2 - 1) \cosh 2r\right) - 2f\left(\sqrt{\cosh^2(2r) - p^2 \sinh^2(2r)}\right), \tag{38}
\]

where \( f(\nu) \) is defined in Eq. \cite{Girolami02}.

While the EOF vanishes in an extended region of the parameter space, the QD is non-zero everywhere except for the boundaries \( r = 0 \) and \( p = 0 \). This is reasonable because for \( r = 0 \) the CM \( \gamma_{\text{GAI}} \) is simply the product of two coherent states while for \( p = 0 \) it is the product of two thermal states. In fact, the QD is known to vanish only on product states, as has been proven in Ref. \cite{Girolami02} independently of the restriction to Gaussian measurements.

The behavior of the QD for constant squeezing parameter \( r \) is shown in Fig. 4. As can be seen, the Gaussian QD increases with \( p \). In contrast to the EOF, the QD is

VII. MEASURES OF NON-CLASSICAL CORRELATIONS

A. Entanglement of formation

To quantify the amount of entanglement contained in \( \hat{\rho}_{\text{GAI}} \), we compute the EOF defined by \cite{Girolami02}

\[
E_F(\hat{\rho}) = \min_{\{\rho_i, |\psi_i\rangle\}} \left\{ \sum_i p_i S(|\psi_i\rangle \langle \psi_i|) \mid \hat{\rho} = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle \langle \psi_i| \right\}, \tag{35}
\]

where \( S(|\psi_i\rangle \langle \psi_i|) \) is the von-Neumann entropy of the pure-state components of the statistical ensemble yielding \( \hat{\rho} \). The minimization has been explicitly solved for all symmetric two-mode Gaussian states in Ref. \cite{Girolami02}. In this case the EOF is given by the analytical expression

\[
E_F = \frac{(1 + x)^2}{4x} \ln \left( \frac{(1 + x)^2}{4x} \right) - \frac{(1 - x)^2}{4x} \ln \left( \frac{(1 - x)^2}{4x} \right), \tag{36}
\]

with \( x = \min[1, \nu] \), where \( \nu \) is the smallest symplectic eigenvalue of the partially transposed CM. For \( \hat{\rho}_{\text{GAI}} \) we have \( \nu = \cosh(2r) - p \sinh(2r) \). Note that the PPT criterion \cite{Peres96} is compatible with this measure.

Fig. 3 shows \( E_F \) as a function of the parameters \( r \) and \( p \), where we limited the range of the squeezing parameter \( r \) to \([0,2]\) since experimentally reachable squeezing values are currently limited to \( r \approx 1.5 \), see \cite{Bourennane03, Kim03}. The parameter \( p \) controls the relative weight of the entangled component and the thermal noise in Eq. \cite{Girolami02}. The black solid line marks the boundary between separable and entangled states according to Eq. \cite{Peres96}.

In the figures we clearly see the competitive influence of the two parameters: the larger the squeezing \( r \) is, the larger the probability \( p \) must be to obtain an entangled state. At first glance this behavior is counterintuitive
non-zero in the separable region, responding to the quantumness of the correlations. Thus, for a fixed value of \( r \), the qualitative behavior of EOF and QD is the same as in a two-qubit isotropic state [9].

Keeping instead \( p \) fixed and varying \( r \) (not shown here), the Gaussian QD first rises. For large values of \( r \), however, it behaves similar to the EOF in the sense that it becomes negligibly small except for probabilities close to one. For experimentally achievable squeezing values, however, we can always chose the probability parameter such that the EOF is zero while QD has a considerable finite value. Therefore, in contrast to the non-Gaussian CV isotropic state, which is entangled for all finite value. Therefore, in contrast to the non-Gaussian CV isotropic state, which is entangled for all \( p > 0 \), the Gaussian version proposed here can serve as an interesting test bed to study non-classical correlations in separable states within the Gaussian setting.

Another analogy between \( \tilde{\rho}_{\text{GI}} \) and the finite-dimensional isotropic state shows up when comparing EOF and mutual information which for Gaussian states can be calculated using the expression for the von-Neumann entropy [23]. In Fig. 5 we demonstrate that for certain values of the parameters the EOF exceeds half the mutual information. This is probably an artifact of the EOF if we accept the mutual information as a proper measure of total correlations in a quantum state, as has been discussed in detail for the finite-dimensional isotropic and Werner states in Ref. [39].

VIII. GAUSSIAN CHANNEL

In Ref. [40] the class of all physical Gaussian operations has been characterized with the help of the isomorphism between completely positive maps and bipartite states [41]. According to Ref. [40] a map \( \mathcal{G} \) is a Gaussian completely positive map if the bipartite state \( \mathcal{G} \) isomorphic to \( \mathcal{G} \) is determined by a proper CM \( \Gamma \) (fulfilling the physicality condition [8]). Conversely, to each such Gaussian state \( \hat{\rho} \) corresponds a Gaussian completely positive map \( \mathcal{G} \). Such a map acts on the CM \( \gamma \) of a Gaussian input state as follows [40]:

\[
\gamma \rightarrow \gamma' = \tilde{\Gamma}_{11} - \tilde{\Gamma}_{12} \left( \tilde{\Gamma}_{22} + \gamma \right)^{-1} \tilde{\Gamma}_{12}^T, \tag{39}
\]

where \( \tilde{\Gamma} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\Gamma}_{11} & \tilde{\Gamma}_{12} \\ \tilde{\Gamma}_{12}^T & \tilde{\Gamma}_{22} \end{pmatrix} \)

is the partial transpose of the CM describing the Gaussian state isomorphic to the map \( \mathcal{G} \). Note that \( \Gamma \) is twice as large as \( \gamma \) which characterizes the input state of the Gaussian channel described by \( \mathcal{G} \).

Obviously, such a relation also holds for \( \hat{\rho}_{\text{GI}} \) [21] which is isomorphic to the map \( \mathcal{G}_{\text{GI}} \) that acts on single-mode Gaussian systems. Computing the partial transpose of \( \gamma_{\text{GI}} \), Eq. [16], and applying Eq. [39], we directly obtain the output mode of the Gaussian channel described by \( \mathcal{G}_{\text{GI}} \). Taking as input a coherent state with CM \( \sigma_{\text{coh}} = \mathbb{1}_2 \), the output reads

\[
\sigma'_{\text{coh}} = p^2 \mathbb{1}_2 + (1 - p^2) \cosh(2r) \mathbb{1}_2. \tag{40}
\]

This is a convex combination of the original CM and the CM of a thermal mode. We therefore see another analogy to the finite-dimensional isotropic state which is known to be isomorphic to the depolarizing channel [22]. This channel maps a state \( \hat{\rho} \) onto a convex combination of itself and the maximally mixed state. However, we emphasize that the expression in Eq. [40] is not a convex combination of two density operators but of two CMs and the second term is a partially mixed state, where the degree of mixness depends on the squeezing parameter \( r \).

If the input is not a coherent but a thermal mode, the output does not display the clear superposition of original and thermal CM. Rather, one can then observe that – depending on \( r \) and \( p \) – the output mode can be less noisy than the input mode. We assume that the action of the channel described by \( \mathcal{G}_{\text{GI}} \) – adding or blocking of classical noise in dependence of \( r \) and \( p \) – is related to the
correlation structure of the state $\hat{\rho}_{G_{1}}$ isomorphic to $G_{1}$. However, figuring out the exact relation requires further investigation.

**IX. DISCUSSION**

In this paper we have analyzed a Gaussian version of an isotropic state which is controlled by a mixing parameter $0 \leq p \leq 1$ and a squeezing parameter $r \geq 0$. Unlike the non-Gaussian isotropic state introduced by Mišta et al., the Gaussian version studied here features a finite threshold $p_{c} = \tanh r$ where entanglement sets in. Below this threshold the state is separable but it still exhibits quantum correlations, as can be detected by the quantum discord.

To understand the quantum nature in the separable region $0 < p \leq p_{c}$ it is instructive to compare the situation with the two-qubit isotropic state (cf. Eq. (1))

$$\hat{\rho}_{1} = p |+\rangle\langle+| + (1 - p) \frac{14}{4}$$

(41)

with $|\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|00\rangle \pm |11\rangle)$, where $p_{c} = \frac{1}{3}$.

Entanglement means that local operations on one of the subsystems influence the other subsystem. In the fully entangled case $p = 1$, where $\hat{\rho}_{1} = |+\rangle\langle+|$ is just a Bell state, any local operation $C$ on one side can be swapped to the other side by means of

$$(C \otimes \mathbb{1}_{2}) |+\rangle = (\mathbb{1}_{2} \otimes C^{T}) |+\rangle .$$

(42)

Decreasing $p$ this simple shift is replaced by the possibility of quantum steering, describing the control of part $B$ by local operations in part $A$ and vice versa, which is possible in the range $\frac{1}{2} < p \leq 1$. Decreasing $p$ further there is a non-steerable but entangled region $\frac{1}{3} < p \leq \frac{1}{2}$. In this range one-sided steering is no longer possible, but quantum correlations can still be detected by two-sided local operations assisted by classical communication. Finally, for $p \leq \frac{1}{3}$ the state becomes separable, i.e., it can be written in the form

$$\hat{\rho}_{1} = \sum_{i} p_{i} |\psi_{i}^{A}\rangle\langle\psi_{i}^{A}| \otimes |\psi_{i}^{B}\rangle\langle\psi_{i}^{B}|$$

(43)

with probabilities $0 \leq p_{i} \leq 1$ normalized by $\sum_{i} p_{i} = 1$. If such a representation is found, it does provide a practical description how to generate the quantum state exclusively by local operations and classical communication, hence it is clear that it cannot be used for mutual quantum control. Nevertheless such a state can be non-classical in the sense that the $|\psi_{i}^{A}\rangle$ and $|\psi_{i}^{B}\rangle$ are not necessarily orthogonal in the respective subsystems. This is also reflected in the eigenvalue decomposition

$$\hat{\rho}_{1} = \frac{1 + 3p}{4} |+\rangle\langle+| + \frac{1 - p}{4} |\rangle\langle\rangle$$

+ \frac{1 - p}{4} \left( |01\rangle\langle01| + |10\rangle\langle10| \right) .$$

(44)

As can be seen, the decomposition involves the fully entangled Bell states $|\pm\rangle$, but for small $p$ they increasingly compensate one another so that quantum communication of both sides is no longer possible. However, the non-classicality is still detectable by means of the quantum discord.

The Gaussian CV isotropic state proposed in this paper exhibits completely analogous phenomenology (see Fig. 2 and Fig. 1) and provides an example where the onset of entanglement can be studied by similar means. In this context it would be interesting to find the separable representation in the regime $p \leq \tanh r$, as outlined in Ref. 19.

Moreover, a more detailed study of the Gaussian channel isomorphic to the Gaussian CV isotropic state – exhibiting another analogy to the finite-dimensional isotropic state when a coherent state is considered as input – could lead to further insights into the effects of the quantum correlations contained in this state.
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**Appendix A: Calculation of the density matrix**

In this Appendix we outline how the density matrix $\hat{\rho}_{G_{1}}$ in Eq. (17) can be computed explicitly. To this end we first determine the matrix elements $\langle \mu \nu | \hat{\rho}_{G_{1}} | \kappa \tau \rangle$ in the coherent representation

$$\langle \mu \nu | = [\hat{D}(\mu) \otimes \hat{D}(\nu)] |00\rangle ,$$

(4A)

where $|0,0\rangle$ is the two-mode vacuum state and $\hat{D}(\alpha) = e^{a\hat{a}^{\dagger} - a^{\dagger}\hat{a}}$ is the displacement operator for a single mode. With $\alpha = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (x_{1} + ip_{1})$ and $\beta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (x_{2} + ip_{2})$ the density matrix [17] can be written as

$$\hat{\rho}_{G_{1}} = \frac{1}{\pi^{2}} \int d^{2}\alpha \int d^{2}\beta \chi(\alpha, \beta) \hat{D}(\alpha, \beta)$$

(42)

where we used the usual notations $\hat{D}(\alpha, \beta) = \hat{D}(\alpha) \otimes \hat{D}(\beta)$ and $\int d^{2}\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \int dx \int dp$. The desired matrix elements are then given by

$$\langle \mu \nu | \hat{\rho}_{G_{1}} | \kappa \tau \rangle = \langle 0,0 | \hat{D}(\mu, \nu) \hat{\rho}_{G_{1}} \hat{D}(\kappa, \tau)|0,0 \rangle$$

(3A)

$$= \frac{1}{\pi^{2}} \int d^{2}\alpha \int d^{2}\beta \chi(\alpha, \beta) \times$$

$$(0|\hat{D}(\mu) \hat{D}(\alpha) \hat{D}(\kappa)|0) \times$$

$$(0|\hat{D}(\nu) \hat{D}(\beta) \hat{D}(\tau)|0) .$$


Inserting the CM (16) into (7) and setting $d = 0$ the characteristic function reads

$$
\chi(\alpha, \beta) = \exp\left[\frac{1}{2}(\alpha^* \beta + \beta^* \alpha) \cosh(2r) + \frac{p}{2}(\alpha \beta + \alpha^* \beta^*) \sinh(2r)\right].
$$

(A4)

If we insert this expression into (A3), and if we apply the relations $\hat{D}^\dagger(\alpha) = \hat{D}(\alpha)$ and

$$
\langle 0|\hat{D}(\alpha)\hat{D}(\beta)\hat{D}(\gamma)|0\rangle = e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\alpha^* \beta + \beta^* \gamma + \gamma^* \alpha) - \alpha \beta - \alpha^* \gamma - \beta^* \gamma}
$$

we get the expression

$$
\langle \mu \nu | \hat{\rho}_{\text{Gi}} | \kappa \tau \rangle = e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\mu \nu^* + \kappa \kappa^* + \nu \nu^* + \tau \tau^*) + \mu^* \kappa + \nu^* \tau - \frac{\kappa \mu^*}{\cosh^2(r)}} - \frac{(\nu^* - p \kappa \tan h(r))(\tau - p \nu^* \tan h(r))}{\cosh^2(r) - p^2 \sinh^2(r)}.
$$

(A7)

For the special case $p = 0$ this expression reduces to

$$
\langle \mu \nu | \hat{\rho}_{\text{Gi}} | \kappa \tau \rangle = \frac{1}{\cosh^2(r)} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}(\mu \nu^* + \kappa \kappa^* + \nu \nu^* + \tau \tau^*) + (\kappa \mu^* + \nu \nu^*) \tan h^2(r)\right],
$$

(A8)

while for $p = 1$ we get

$$
\langle \mu \nu | \hat{\rho}_{\text{Gi}} | \kappa \tau \rangle = \frac{1}{\cosh^2(r)} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}(\mu \nu^* + \kappa \kappa^* + \nu \nu^* + \tau \tau^*) + (\mu^* \nu^* + \kappa \tau) \tan h(r)\right].
$$

(A9)

For these special cases it is straightforward to arrive at the more common representation in the Fock basis. For $p = 0$ the state factorizes into

$$
\hat{\rho}_{\text{Gi}} = \hat{\rho}_0 \otimes \hat{\rho}_0
$$

(A10)

where

$$
\hat{\rho}_0 = \frac{1}{\cosh^2(r) \pi^2} \int d^2 \mu \int d^2 \kappa |\mu \rangle |\kappa \rangle \langle \mu | \langle \kappa | \times \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\mu \kappa^* + \kappa \mu^*) + \mu^* \kappa \tan h^2 r\right).
$$

(A11)

In order to express $\hat{\rho}_{\text{Gi}}$ in the Fock basis, we have to perform a suitable basis transformation. For $p = 0$ this transformation can be carried out separately in each ten-
carried out using Eq. (A6), giving \( \pi^2 e^{\alpha \beta \tanh^2 r} \), hence

\[
\hat{\rho}_0 = \frac{1}{\cosh^2(r)} \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} \frac{|m\rangle\langle n|}{\sqrt{m!n!}} \times \left( \hat{\rho}_{m,n}^\alpha (\alpha \tanh^2(r))^n e^{\alpha \beta \tanh^2 r} \right) |_{\alpha = \beta = 0} \tag{A14}
\]

Carrying out the differentiation one can see that only terms with \( m = n \) contribute, leading us to the final result

\[
\hat{\rho}_0 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\sinh^2(r))^n}{(\cosh^2(r))^{n+1}} |n\rangle\langle n| \tag{A15}
\]

which is a one-mode thermal state. As expected, for \( p = 0 \) we have \( \hat{\rho}_{\text{GI}} = \hat{\rho}_0 \otimes \hat{\rho}_0 = \hat{\rho}_{\text{TMS}} \).

For \( p = 1 \) the calculation follows similar lines, the difference being that the entangled state does not factorize, instead we have to perform the basis transformation described above for the bra- and ket-vector of \( \hat{\rho}_{\text{GI}} \), respectively. Using the same methods as outlined above, one can show that for \( p = 1 \) we obtain

\[
\hat{\rho}_{\text{GI}} = (1 - \tanh^2(r)) \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} \tanh^{m+n}(r) |m, m\rangle\langle n, n| \tag{A16}
\]

that is, we get indeed \( \hat{\rho}_{\text{GI}} \approx \hat{\rho}_{\text{TMS}} \).

---


