

Generation of Maximally Entangled States by Lyapunov Control Based on Entanglement Measure

Yun-Yan Lee¹ and Ciann-Dong Yang²

Abstract—The quantum state with the greatest degree of entanglement has the highest value in quantum information processing. The existing quantum control methods treat the generation of the maximally entangled state (MES) as a problem of state transfer by specifying the desired MES as the target state. Current methods suffer from two major deficiencies: the structure of the MES to be prepared must be known in advance, and the quantum control can only be designed for one MES at a time, and when the target MES changes, the quantum control must be redesigned. In order to solve these two deficiencies, this paper proposes an improved quantum Lyapunov control method, in which the establishment of the Lyapunov function is based on the measure of quantum entanglement rather than the distance between two quantum states. This innovative approach allows us to prepare all MESs, whether their structures are known or unknown in advance, through a single control design. Since the control target is the scalar entanglement measure, not the quantum state vector, the entanglement control strategy proposed in this paper is not influenced by the number of entangled particles. The proposed method will be applied to bipartite pure states first to show that all Bell states and their equivalent states can be prepared through one control design. Secondly, it is applied to bipartite mixed states and multipartite states to show that this method has the ability to generate currently unknown MESs.

Index Terms— Quantum control, entanglement measure, Lyapunov function, maximally entangled state.

I. Introduction

Quantum entanglement is the essential physical resource for quantum computation [1] and quantum information processing (QIP), such as quantum teleportation [2, 3], quantum cryptography [4], superdense coding [5] quantum secure direct communication [6, 7], quantum cloning machine [8], and so on. To complete the above QIP tasks, maximally entangled states (MES) are usually required. For example, the MESs of two-qubit systems are called Bell states, which are powerful resources for quantum communication [9]. The MESs of multi-qubit systems, such as the $|\text{GHZ}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|000\rangle + |111\rangle)$ and $|\text{W}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|001\rangle + |010\rangle + |100\rangle)$, are the key ingredients of various quantum error correction codes and quantum communication protocols [10, 11]. These requirements from QIP tasks motivate and intensify the research in the preparation and manipulation of MES. The core value of MESs lies in the fact that they can be transformed deterministically into any other state via local operations assisted by classical communication (LOCC) [12]. As entanglement can only decrease under LOCC transformations, quantum states other than MES otherwise cannot be converted to MES through LOCC. Therefore, once we can generate a MES by any quantum control method, any other quantum state can be obtained by subsequent LOCC operations.

Great effort has been taken to study the generation of MES in the past decade. For example, continuous feedback control was used in [13, 14] to generate Bell state with a model consisting of two two-level atoms, which are placed in distant cavities and interacting through a radiation field in a dispersive way. Bell state could also be generated by open-loop Lyapunov control in a robust fashion [15-17]. The multipartite $|\text{GHZ}\rangle$ and $|\text{W}\rangle$ states were generated by using separate cavities and linear optical elements [18]. Zou et al. [19] have proposed a scheme to generate GHZ state of four separate atoms that are trapped in leaky cavities with the help of linear optical elements. From the

view point of control theory, the generation of MES involves open-loop methods and feedback ones. For either of the two approaches, a known MES, such as Bell state or $|\text{GHZ}\rangle$ state, has to be given as the target state ρ_d , and then control law is designed to ensure that the system state $\rho(t)$ converges to ρ_d asymptotically. Apparently, the prerequisite for the success of the current methods is that an explicit expression of the MES to be generated must be known in advance. Due to this prerequisite, the current quantum control methods are unable to generate MES whose structure is unknown.

In contrast to the MES of bipartite pure states, for which we have a complete knowledge about their characterization and entanglement measures, our knowledge about the MES of bipartite mixed states and multipartite states is far from satisfactory. Unfortunately, existing quantum control methods with the aforementioned constraint do not help us to explore those unknown MESs. Even for the known MESs, they have many different definitions. Because the notion of MES depends on the entanglement measure used, different entanglement measure will give rise to different MES. For a bipartite pure state, no matter what entanglement measure is used, the MES is always the Bell state or its equivalent state. However, in the multipartite case it happens that a given state is maximally entangled with respect to one measure, but other entanglement measure achieves its maximum for some other state [20]. For instance, among all three-qubit pure states the genuine three-party entanglement measured by three tangle [21] has its maximum for the $|\text{GHZ}\rangle$ state, while the two-tangle τ_2 and the persistence of entanglement [22] are largest for the $|\text{W}\rangle$ state.

Considering the dependence of MES on entanglement measures and the fact that there are still many MESs with unknown structures, we believe that the quantum control design used to generate MES should be based on the desired entanglement measure rather than a specific known MES. In this paper we propose an improved quantum Lyapunov control method, which is based on entanglement-dependent Lyapunov functions instead of distance-dependent Lyapunov functions, to generate the MESs that maximize the specified entanglement

¹ Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics, National Cheng Kung University, Taiwan. Email: d187108@gmail.com

² Professor, corresponding author, Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics, National Cheng Kung University, Taiwan. Email: cdyang@mail.ncku.edu.tw

measure. Quantum Lyapunov control proposed in the early 2000s is a potential candidate for quantum state transfer, which adopts a feedback design to determine control fields and then applies the designed fields to the system in an open-loop way [23]. Its convergence properties under non-degeneracy and degeneracy cases [24-29] and its various applications in quantum systems [15-17], [30-35] have been widely discussed in numerous literatures over the past two decades. In the existing quantum Lyapunov control methods, the Lyapunov function $V(\rho) \geq 0$ serves as some kind of measure of the distance between the current state ρ and the target state ρ_d , and the Lyapunov control law is designed to make $V(\rho)$ decrease strictly with time until $V(\rho) = 0$, at which the quantum state ρ reaches the target state ρ_d . Especially, if we set ρ_d equal to the Bell state, quantum Lyapunov control becomes a feasible solution for the preparation of MES. However, if the MES to be prepared has an unknown structure, usually in the case of bipartite mixed states and multipartite states, the existing Lyapunov control methods are useless.

Different from the existing definition, the Lyapunov function proposed here is used to measure the degree of entanglement of a quantum state ρ , defined as $V(\rho) = \mathcal{N} - E(\rho) \geq 0$, where $E(\rho)$ is the desired entanglement measure, and \mathcal{N} is the maximum of $E(\rho)$. The Lyapunov control law is to be designed so that $V(\rho)$ decreases (or equivalently, $E(\rho)$ increases) strictly with time until a steady state ρ_{ss} is reached, at which $\dot{\rho} = 0$ and $V(\rho_{ss}) = \mathcal{N} - E(\rho_{ss}) = 0$, that is, $E(\rho_{ss})$ reaches its maximum \mathcal{N} and the steady state ρ_{ss} turns out to be the desired MES. In this control process, we do not need to specify a certain ρ_{MES} as the target state, but let the control mechanism automatically generate the MES. Just because a target state is not specified, we do not need to require the steady state ρ_{ss} to be the only element in the LaSalle's invariant set, as in the existing quantum Lyapunov control. Instead, the LaSalle's invariant set constructed from $\dot{V}(\rho) = 0$ provides us all the steady states ρ_{ss} that maximize the entanglement measure $E(\rho)$, i.e., the LaSalle's invariant set just comprises all the MESs with respect to the measure $E(\rho)$.

In this paper, we will apply the entanglement-dependent Lyapunov function to generate the MESs for bipartite pure states, bipartite mixed states, and multipartite states, respectively. For the case of bipartite pure states, the analytical form of MES is known and hence can be used to verify the correctness and the effectiveness of the proposed method. We show that the Lyapunov control law derived from a generalized bipartite entanglement measure can drive the system state to the LaSalle's invariant set that is all composed of Bell states and their equivalent states. In the existing methods, all the initial states converge to the same Bell state specified as the target state, and the control field has to be redesigned, if another Bell state is specified. The proposed method otherwise generates all the Bell states and their equivalent states at one stroke. As to the bipartite mixed states, there is currently no quantum control method for preparing maximally entanglement mixed states (MEMS), because the analytical representation of MEMS with respect to the whole Hilbert space of bipartite mixed states is still unknown, except for some special cases. However, the control method proposed here can be used to generate MEMS, whose form is unknown in advance. For the case of multipartite

states, the form of MES depends on which entanglement measure is used. Although as the number of entangled particles increases, it becomes more difficult to accurately measure the degree of entanglement between them, but it brings no further difficulty to the proposed Lyapunov entanglement control. This is because the object to be controlled is not the multipartite states themselves, but the multipartite entanglement measure, which is always a scalar function. Consequently, the same Lyapunov entanglement control strategy derived for bipartite states can be used to prepare multipartite MES as long as we construct the Lyapunov function from the multipartite entanglement measure.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. After a brief mathematical preliminary given in Section II, Section III proposes the concept of Lyapunov entanglement function (LEF), which plays a dual role in this paper. On the one hand, LEF acts as a Lyapunov function to guide the control law design, and on the other hand, it acts as a quantitative index of entanglement. Based on the LEF, Section IV elucidates the design of Lyapunov control law for generating MES such that the controlled state converges to the LaSalle's invariant set comprised of all the Bell states and their equivalent states. Section V numerically demonstrates how all the Bell (equivalent) states can be generated by using only one control design with different initial states. The distribution of initial states converging to different Bell (equivalent) states are shown on a tetrahedron. In Section VI, the proposed Lyapunov entanglement control is extended to bipartite mixed states with the help of tilde decomposition method [36]. The correctness of the generated MEMS is verified by considering a class of mixed states whose MEMS has an analytical solution. Finally, two most common multipartite entanglement measures are considered in Section VII to show that regardless of which measure is used, multipartite MES can be generated by the proposed method.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Time evolution of pure and mixed states

The time evolution of the pure state $|\psi\rangle$ of a closed quantum system satisfies the Schrödinger equation:

$$i\hbar|\dot{\psi}(t)\rangle = \hat{H}|\psi(t)\rangle, \quad \hat{H} = \hat{H}_0 + \hat{H}_c, \quad (1)$$

where \hat{H}_0 is the internal Hamiltonian, and $\hat{H}_c = \sum_{k=1}^m \hat{H}_k u_k(t)$ is the time-dependent control Hamiltonian, which represents the interaction of the system with the control fields $u_k(t)$. The Hamiltonians \hat{H}_0 and \hat{H}_k have to be Hermitian operators. Conveniently, we will set \hbar to 1 by rewriting (1) as a dimensionless equation. It is easier to design the control field u_k under the interaction picture defined by $|\psi_I(t)\rangle = e^{i\hat{H}_0 t} |\psi(t)\rangle$, which satisfies

$$i\hbar|\dot{\psi}_I(t)\rangle = \hat{H}_{c,I}|\psi_I(t)\rangle, \quad \hat{H}_{c,I} = \sum_{k=1}^m \hat{A}_k u_k(t), \quad (2)$$

where \hat{A}_k is related to \hat{H}_k as $\hat{A}_k = e^{i\hat{H}_0 t/\hbar} \hat{H}_k$. Generally, a physical operator \hat{M}_I in the interaction picture is defined as $\hat{M}_I = e^{i\hat{H}_0 t/\hbar} \hat{M} e^{-i\hat{H}_0 t/\hbar}$ with \hat{M} being the related operator in the Schrodinger picture. It can be shown that the expectation in the interaction picture $\langle \hat{M}_I \rangle = \langle \psi_I(t) | \hat{M}_I | \psi_I(t) \rangle$ is equal to the expectation $\langle \hat{M} \rangle$ in the Schrodinger picture.

When a quantum system is composed of multiple particles in different pure states, the system state becomes mixed and is described by the density operator

$$\hat{\rho} = \sum p_k |\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k| = \sum p_k \hat{\rho}_k, \quad (3)$$

where p_i represents the weight of the component state $|\psi_k\rangle$ in the mixed state. For closed quantum systems, the time evolution of the density operator $\hat{\rho}$ satisfies the von Neumann equation,

$$i\hbar\dot{\hat{\rho}}(t) = \hat{H}\hat{\rho}(t) - \hat{\rho}(t)\hat{H} \triangleq [\hat{H}, \hat{\rho}(t)], \quad (4)$$

The time evolution of $\hat{\rho}(t)$ described by (4) is unitary (isospectral) by noting that $\hat{\rho}(t)$ can be expressed as $\hat{\rho}(t) = \hat{U}(t)\hat{\rho}(0)\hat{U}^\dagger(t)$, where the unitary operator \hat{U} satisfies the following equation

$$i\hbar\dot{\hat{U}}(t) = \hat{H}\hat{U}(t), \quad \hat{U}(0) = I. \quad (5)$$

The task of Lyapunov entanglement control amounts to finding all the unitary operators \hat{U} to transform each initial state $\hat{\rho}(0)$ to the ρ_{MES} achieving maximum entanglement. The unitary transformation involved in $\rho_{MES} = \hat{U}\hat{\rho}(0)\hat{U}^\dagger$ is a global one that acts simultaneously on all the particles in the system and is different from the unitary local transformation that only works on some of the particles and cannot increase the entanglement of $\hat{\rho}(0)$. Under the interaction picture, (4) becomes

$$i\hbar\dot{\hat{\rho}}_I(t) = [\sum_{k=1}^m \hat{A}_k u_k(t), \hat{\rho}_I(t)], \quad (6)$$

with \hat{A}_k defined in (2) and $\hat{\rho}_I = e^{i\hat{H}_0 t/\hbar} \rho e^{-i\hat{H}_0 t/\hbar}$. Hereafter, we will focus on the control of $\hat{\rho}_I$ and still denote $\hat{\rho}_I$ as $\hat{\rho}$.

B. Matrix and vector representations

The matrix representation of a quantum operator $\hat{A} \in \mathcal{H}$ is denoted by A , whose element is given by $A_{ij} = \langle e_i | \hat{A} | e_j \rangle$ with $|e_i\rangle$ being the basis of the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . In this paper, we will treat A and \hat{A} as equivalent expressions, such as $\hat{\rho} \triangleq \rho$ and $\hat{H} \triangleq H$. Similarly, a quantum state $|v\rangle$ is equivalent to its vector representation v with element given by $v_i = \langle e_i | v \rangle$, and its dual state $\langle v |$ is equivalent to $(v^*)^T \triangleq v^\dagger$. Matrix A (the associated operator \hat{A}) is said to be Hermitian, if $A = (A^*)^T \triangleq A^\dagger$, whose eigenvalues are all real. Matrix A is said to be skew-Hermitian, if it satisfies $A^\dagger = -A$, whose eigenvalues are all on the imaginary axis. The density matrix $\rho = \sum p_k |\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|$ is Hermitian and positive semidefinite with unit trace $\text{Tr}(\rho) = 1$. If ρ contains only one state (pure state), we further have $\text{Tr}(\rho^2) = 1$; otherwise, $\text{Tr}(\rho^2) < 1$. This property is useful to distinguish whether a density matrix ρ represents a pure state or a mixed state.

C. Normal Matrix and its Spectral decomposition

Matrix A is said to be normal, if A and A^\dagger are commutative, i.e., $[A, A^\dagger] = AA^\dagger - A^\dagger A = 0$. A normal matrix has a spectral decomposition $A = V\Lambda V^\dagger$, where Λ is a diagonal matrix composed by the eigenvalues λ_k of A , and $V = [v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n]$ is a unitary matrix containing the eigenvectors v_k of A . When expressed by v_k , the spectral decomposition $A = V\Lambda V^\dagger$ becomes $A = \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k v_k v_k^\dagger$, which has an alternative expression in terms of the Dirac notation,

$$A = \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k |\lambda_k\rangle\langle\lambda_k|, \quad (7)$$

where $|\lambda_k\rangle$ corresponds to the eigenvector v_k and $\langle\lambda_k|$ to its conjugate transpose v_k^\dagger . Both Hermitian and skew-Hermitian matrices are normal and possess spectral decompositions, which provides a convenient way to evaluate the function of a normal matrix:

$$f(A) = \sum_{k=1}^n f(\lambda_k) |\lambda_k\rangle\langle\lambda_k|. \quad (8)$$

D. Schmidt decomposition and partial trace

A bipartite pure state described by $|\psi_{AB}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{AB} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ is said to be separable, if and only if it can be expressed as a direct product of the states in the two subsystems:

$$|\psi_{AB}\rangle = |\psi_A\rangle \otimes |\psi_B\rangle, \quad (9)$$

where $|\psi_A\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_A$ and $|\psi_B\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_B$. In terms of the orthogonal basis $|e_k^A\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_A$ and $|e_k^B\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_B$, any pure state $|\psi_{AB}\rangle$ has a Schmidt decomposition [43] as

$$|\psi_{AB}\rangle = \sum_{k=1}^r \sqrt{\alpha_k} |e_k^A\rangle \otimes |e_k^B\rangle. \quad (10)$$

where r is the Schmidt rank of ψ_{AB} and the Schmidt coefficient $\alpha_k > 0$ is in decreasing order with $\sum_k \alpha_k = 1$. A bipartite pure state ψ_{AB} is separable, if and only if its Schmidt rank r is equal to one, for which (10) reduces to (9). The density matrix of $|\psi_{AB}\rangle$ is $\rho_{AB} = |\psi_{AB}\rangle\langle\psi_{AB}|$ with $|\psi_{AB}\rangle$ given by (10). ρ_A is called the reduced matrix of ρ_{AB} obtained by taking the partial trace of ρ_{AB} over the basis $|e_k^B\rangle$ of \mathcal{H}_B , i.e.,

$\rho_A \triangleq \text{Tr}_B(\rho_{AB}) = \sum_{k=1}^r (I_A \otimes \langle e_k^B |) \rho_{AB} (I_A \otimes |e_k^B\rangle)$, (11) where I_A is the identity matrix in \mathcal{H}_A . Since $\rho_A = \rho_B \triangleq \text{Tr}_A(\rho_{AB})$, we will denote both of them as ρ_M . In general, the notation $(\cdot)_M$ used in the following will denote the partial trace operation of the concerned matrix. For multipartite states, the notation ρ_j denotes the reduced density matrix obtained by taking partial trace for all the particles except the j th particle.

E. LOCC operations

LOCC refers to a local quantum operation performed on part of the system, and the result of that operation is communicated classically to another part of the system, where another local operation is performed on the information received. Any LOCC does not increase the entanglement of the states. Nielsen [37] gave a convenient criterion to judge whether a given operation Λ is a LOCC operation. Let $\Lambda|\psi_1\rangle = |\psi_2\rangle$, with $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$ expressed by their Schmidt decompositions: $|\psi_1\rangle = \sum_k \sqrt{\alpha_k} |e_k^A\rangle \otimes |e_k^B\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle = \sum_k \sqrt{\alpha'_k} |e_k^{A'}\rangle \otimes |e_k^{B'}\rangle$. Then Λ is a LOCC operation, if and only if $\{\alpha_k\}$ is majorized in $\{\alpha'_k\}$, i.e., for every l with $1 \leq l < n$, we have $\sum_{k=1}^l \alpha_k \leq \sum_{k=1}^l \alpha'_k$. According to the Nelson's LOCC criterion, once we obtain a MES, we can transform it to any target state $|\sigma\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{AB}$ by a LOCC operation Λ . This property shows that the preparation of MES is far more important than the preparation of other quantum states.

III. LYAPUNOV ENTANGLEMENT FUNCTION (LEF)

In this section, we will propose an class of entanglement measures suitable for Lyapunov entanglement control by axiomatic approach [38,39]. A bipartite entanglement measure $E(\rho)$ is a mapping from density matrices into positive real numbers, which represents the intensity of entanglement of ρ . If the density matrix ρ is separable, then $E(\rho) = 0$. Entanglement measure E does not increase by a LOCC operation Λ , i.e., $E(\Lambda\rho) \leq E(\rho)$. Vidal [39] characterized the entanglement measure $E(\rho)$ in terms of an entanglement monotone function h , which satisfies the following two properties.

1. $h(\rho)$ is invariant under any unitary local transformation U_L , i.e. $h(U_L \rho U_L^\dagger) = h(\rho)$.

2. $h(\rho)$ is concave downward, i.e. $h(\rho) \geq \lambda h(\rho_1) + (1 - \lambda)h(\rho_2)$ for $\rho = \lambda\rho_1 + (1 - \lambda)\rho_2$, $\lambda \in [0, 1]$.

A class of entanglement measure satisfying the above property of entanglement monotone can be characterized explicitly as

$$E_G(\rho) = G(\text{Tr}(f(\rho_M))), \quad (12)$$

where ρ_M is the reduced matrix of ρ and the trace operation of $f(\rho_M)$ makes $E_G(\rho)$ invariant under any unitary local transformation. The remaining properties of a qualified entanglement measure $E_G(\rho)$ are satisfied by imposing proper conditions on the continuously differentiable functions G and f , as will be derived in the following.

Firstly, we consider a bipartite pure state described by $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ and express its reduced matrix by the spectral decomposition:

$$\rho_M = \lambda_1 |\lambda_1\rangle\langle\lambda_1| + \lambda_2 |\lambda_2\rangle\langle\lambda_2|. \quad (13)$$

With the condition $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 1$, it is convenient to denote $\lambda_1 = \lambda$ and $\lambda_2 = 1 - \lambda$ with $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ so that the general entanglement measure $E_G(\rho)$ in (12) becomes a function of the eigenvalue λ :

$$E_G(\rho) = G(X(\lambda)), \quad X(\lambda) = \text{Tr}(f(\rho_M)). \quad (14)$$

Using (8) and (14), the function $X(\lambda)$ can be evaluated explicitly as

$$\begin{aligned} X(\lambda) &= \text{Tr}(f(\rho_M)) = \text{Tr}(f(\lambda_1)|\lambda_1\rangle\langle\lambda_1| + f(\lambda_2)|\lambda_2\rangle\langle\lambda_2|) \\ &= f(\lambda) + f(1 - \lambda). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where we note $\text{Tr}(|\lambda_k\rangle\langle\lambda_k|) = \langle\lambda_k|\lambda_k\rangle = 1$. As a result, we obtain a simple expression for the general entanglement measure $E_G(\rho)$ as

$$E_G(\rho) = G(X(\lambda)) = G(f(\lambda) + f(1 - \lambda)). \quad (16)$$

Based on this concise expression, the required conditions on G and f to ensure $E_G(\rho)$ as a qualified entanglement measure can be derived straightforwardly as follows.

1. $E_G(\lambda) = 0$ for separable states. When the quantum state is separable, the rank of ρ_M is 1, corresponding to $\lambda = 0$ or $\lambda = 1$. With (16), the requirement of $E_G(0) = E_G(1) = 0$ turns out to be

$$G(f(0) + f(1)) = 0. \quad (17)$$

2. The positivity of $E_G(\lambda)$. $E_G(\lambda)$ must be positive for all entangled states, i.e. $E_G(\lambda) > 0, \forall \lambda \in (0, 1)$. This requirement is equivalent to

$$G(X) > 0, \quad \forall X \neq f(0) + f(1). \quad (18)$$

3. $E'_G(\lambda) = 0$ as $\rho = \rho_{MES}$. When the quantum state ρ is the MES, its reduced density matrix becomes [40]

$$(\rho_{MES})_M = \begin{pmatrix} 1/2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (19)$$

i.e., $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 1/2$. This property requires that the derivative of $E_G(\lambda)$ must be zero at $\lambda = 1/2$. This requirement is satisfied automatically by evaluating

$$E'_G(\lambda) = \frac{dG(X)}{dX} \frac{\partial X}{\partial \lambda} = G'(X)(f'(\lambda) - f'(1 - \lambda)), \quad (20)$$

at $\lambda = 1/2$ to give $E'_G(1/2) = 0$.

4. $E'_G(\lambda) \neq 0, \forall \lambda \neq 1/2$. This property is to ensure that $E_G(\lambda)$ has only one extreme point in the range $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$. From (20), this property requires $G'(X) \neq 0$, and $f'(\lambda) \neq f'(1 - \lambda), \forall \lambda \neq 1/2$. Hence, $G(X)$ and $f'(\lambda)$ have to be strictly increasing or decreasing in their definition domains.

5. $E''_G(\lambda) < 0$ at $\lambda = 1/2$. This property ensures that $E_G(\lambda)$ is concave downward at the extreme point. From (20), the second derivative of $E_G(\lambda)$ reads

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 E_G(\lambda)}{\partial \lambda^2} &= G''(X)(f'(\lambda) - f'(1 - \lambda))^2 \\ &\quad + G'(X)(f''(\lambda) + f''(1 - \lambda)), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

The evaluation of $\partial^2 E_G / \partial \lambda^2$ at $\lambda = 1/2$ gives $E''_G(1/2) = 2G'(2f(1/2)) \cdot f''(1/2)$. Therefore, the downward concavity of $E_G(\lambda)$ at $\lambda = 1/2$ requires

$$G'(2f(1/2)) \cdot f''(1/2) < 0. \quad (22)$$

Together with condition 4, we then come to a conclusion that if f is concave downward, G must be strictly increasing; on the contrary, if f is concave upward, G must be strictly decreasing.

Condition 1 and condition 2 are the basic requirements for the entanglement measure $E_G(\lambda)$ to ensure that except for the separable states, $E_G(\lambda)$ must be a positive function. Condition 3 to condition 5 require that $E_G(\lambda)$ must have a unique extreme point at $\lambda = 1/2$, which is the global maximum in the range $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$. When all the five conditions are satisfied, the general entanglement measure $E_G(\rho)$ achieves its global maximum at $\lambda = 1/2$:

$$\max_{\text{all pure } \rho} E_G(\rho) = \max_{\lambda \in [0, 1]} G(X(\lambda)) = G(2f(1/2)). \quad (23)$$

The general entanglement measure $E_G(\rho)$ comprises a wide class of entanglement measures, including concurrence, Renyi entropy, and entropy of entanglement, etc.

Example 1: Concurrence

Concurrence [41] is a common entanglement measure defined by

$$E_C(\rho) = \sqrt{2(1 - \text{Tr}(\rho_M^2))}. \quad (24a)$$

The corresponding $G(X)$ and $f(\lambda)$ functions for $E_C(\rho)$ are

$$G(X) = \sqrt{2(1 - X)}, \quad f(\lambda) = \lambda^2.$$

When expressed by $G(X)$ and $f(\lambda)$, $E_C(\rho)$ becomes a scalar function of λ :

$$E_C(\rho) = G(f(\lambda) + f(1 - \lambda)) = 2\sqrt{\lambda(1 - \lambda)}. \quad (24b)$$

It can be checked that $G(X)$ and $f(\lambda)$ satisfy the above five conditions. The maximum of $E_C(\rho)$ is found from (23) as $E_C(\rho_M^*) = G(2f(1/2)) = G(1/2) = 1$, and the downward concavity of $E_C(\rho)$ at the extreme point is confirmed by $E''_C(1/2) = 2G'(2f(1/2)) \cdot f''(1/2) = -4 < 0$. \square

Example 2: Renyi entropy

Renyi entropy is defined by

$$E_\alpha(\rho) = \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \ln \text{Tr}(\rho_M^\alpha), \quad \alpha > 0, \quad (25)$$

whose related functions of $G(X)$ and $f(\lambda)$ are

$$G(X) = \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \ln X, \quad f(\lambda) = \lambda^\alpha,$$

In terms of λ , $E_\alpha(\rho)$ becomes

$$E_\alpha(\lambda) = \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \ln(\lambda^\alpha + (1 - \lambda)^\alpha).$$

The maximum of $E_\alpha(\lambda)$ is $E_\alpha(1/2) = G(2f(1/2)) = \ln 2$ and its downward concavity is confirmed by $E''_\alpha(1/2) = -4\alpha < 0$. A special case of Renyi entropy is the entropy of entanglement $E_E(\rho)$, which is the limit value of $E_\alpha(\rho)$ at $\alpha = 1$ obtained by the L'Hôpital's rule,

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} E_\alpha(\rho) = -\frac{1}{\ln 2} \text{Tr}(\rho_M \ln \rho_M) = E_E(\rho). \quad (26)$$

Based on the general entanglement measure $E_G(\rho)$, now we can construct a class of Lyapunov functions for entanglement control as

$$V_G(\rho) = \mathcal{N} - E_G(\rho) = \mathcal{N} - G(\text{Tr}(f(\rho_M))), \quad (27)$$

where $\mathcal{N} = G(2f(1/2))$ is the maximum of $E_G(\rho)$ to ensure $V_G(\rho) \geq 0$. The Lyapunov function $V_G(\rho)$ constructed from $E_G(\rho)$ is called Lyapunov entanglement function (LEF) to highlight its dual role. On the one hand, LEF plays the role of a Lyapunov function and determines the control strategy to make $\dot{V}_G(\rho) < 0$. On the other hand, it plays the role of an entanglement measure, guiding the control process toward the direction of maximum entanglement. Combining the two roles together, the control strategy $\dot{V}_G(\rho) < 0$ drives ρ to the equilibrium state ρ_{eq} with $V_G(\rho_{eq}) = 0$, which then gives $E_G(\rho_{eq}) = \mathcal{N}$ from (27), indicating that the achieved equilibrium state ρ_{eq} is the MES.

IV. LYAPUNOV CONTROL BASED ON LEF

In this section, we will derive the control field u_k in (6) to make $\dot{V}_G(\rho) < 0$. First we will discuss the entanglement control of pure states in this section, and then the control of mixed states in the following section.

The first step is to find the time derivative of $V_G(\rho)$ from (27):

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_G(\rho) &= -G'(\text{Tr}(f(\rho_M)))\text{Tr}(f'(\rho_M)\dot{\rho}_M) \\ &= iG'(\text{Tr}(f(\rho_M)))\text{Tr}(f'(\rho_M) \cdot (H\rho - \rho H)_M) \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where $\dot{\rho}$ is given by (6) and $(\cdot)_M$ denotes the partial trace operation. Next, we use the expression of Hamiltonian H under the interaction picture to rewrite (28) as:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_G(\rho) &= iG'(\text{Tr}(f(\rho_M))) \\ &\cdot \sum_k u_k \text{Tr}(f'(\rho_M) \cdot (A_k\rho - \rho A_k)_M). \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

On designing the control law u_k to render $\dot{V}_G(\rho) < 0$, the following theorem is helpful.

Theorem 4.1 $\text{Tr}(f'(\rho_M) \cdot (A_k\rho - \rho A_k)_M)$ is an imaginary number.

Proof. Since ρ_M is Hermitian, $f'(\rho_M)$ is also Hermitian and can be expressed generally as

$$f'(\rho_M) = \begin{bmatrix} H_{11} & H_{12} \\ H_{12}^* & H_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (30)$$

where H_{11} and H_{22} are real numbers, and H_{12} is a complex number. With the Hermitian property of A_k and ρ , we have

$$(A_k\rho - \rho A_k)^\dagger = \rho A_k - A_k\rho = -(A_k\rho - \rho A_k). \quad (31)$$

In other words, $A_k\rho - \rho A_k$ is a skew-Hermitian matrix. In the next step of proof, we apply the rules of trace operation: $\text{Tr}(A+B) = \text{Tr}(A) + \text{Tr}(B)$ and $\text{Tr}(AB) = \text{Tr}(BA)$ to obtain $\text{Tr}(A_k\rho - \rho A_k) = \text{Tr}(A_k\rho) - \text{Tr}(\rho A_k) = 0$. Combining the skew-Hermitian and zero-trace properties of $A_k\rho - \rho A_k$, we now can express $(A_k\rho - \rho A_k)_M$ explicitly as

$$(A_k\rho - \rho A_k)_M = \begin{bmatrix} \eta_k & \zeta_k \\ -\zeta_k^* & -\eta_k \end{bmatrix}, k = 1, 2, \dots, m, \quad (32)$$

where η_k is a pure imaginary number, and ζ_k is a complex number. Therefore, the combination of (30) and (32) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(f'(\rho_M) \cdot (A_k\rho - \rho A_k)_M) &= \text{Tr} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{11} & H_{12} \\ H_{12}^* & H_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \eta_k & \zeta_k \\ -\zeta_k^* & -\eta_k \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &= (H_{11} - H_{22})\eta_k + H_{12}^*\zeta_k - (H_{12}^*\zeta_k)^*. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Noting that $H_{11} - H_{22}$ is real, and $\eta_k, H_{12}^*\zeta_k - (H_{12}^*\zeta_k)^*$ are pure imaginary, we then prove $\text{Tr}(f'(\rho_M) \cdot (A_k\rho - \rho A_k)_M)$ to be a pure imaginary number. \square

The other factor affecting the sign of $\dot{V}_G(\rho)$ in (29) is $G'(\text{Tr}(f(\rho_M)))$. We have shown in Section III that for a qualified entanglement measure $E_G(\rho) = G(\text{Tr}(f(\rho_M)))$, the function $G(X)$ must be either strictly increasing, or strictly decreasing. In either case, it can be sure that $G'(X)$ will not change sign in its domain of definition.

With Theorem 4.1 and the monotonic property of $G'(X)$, we now can design the Lyapunov control law u_k in terms of a new variable

$$x_k = i \cdot \text{Tr}(f'(\rho_M) \cdot (A_k\rho - \rho A_k)_M). \quad (34)$$

According to Theorem 4.1, x_k is a real variable and can be physically realized. Let $h_k(x_k)$ be a function of x_k satisfying the relation

$$h_k(x_k) \cdot x_k \geq 0, \quad h_k(x_k) = 0, \text{ iff } x_k = 0. \quad (35)$$

Obviously, the curve $y_k = h_k(x_k)$ passes through the origin of the $x_k - y_k$ plane and is located in the first or third quadrant. Then, the real function $h_k(x_k)$ serves as a feedback signal in the proposed control field

$$u_k = -\text{sgn}(G'(X))r_k h_k(x_k), \quad (36)$$

where r_k is a positive gain to adjust the control amplitude. Applying the control law (36) to (29), we achieve the goal of Lyapunov control

$$\dot{V}_G(\rho) = -|G'(X)| \sum_k r_k h_k(x_k) \cdot x_k \leq 0. \quad (37)$$

by noting $h_k(x_k) \cdot x_k \geq 0$ from (35). Our next task is to show that $\dot{V}_G(\rho) = 0$ occurs only at the equilibrium state $\rho = \rho_{eq}$ and $\dot{V}_G(\rho) < 0, \forall \rho \neq \rho_{eq}$. The dual role of the LEF $V_G(\rho)$ ensures that the minimum of V_G and the maximum of E_G are achieved simultaneously at $\rho = \rho_{eq}$.

Theorem 4.2 Under the Lyapunov control law (36), a pure bipartite state $\rho(t)$ asymptotically converges to the equilibrium state ρ_{eq} such that $V_G(\rho)$ reaches its minimum $V_G(\rho_{eq}) = 0$ and the general entanglement measure $E_G(\rho)$ reaches its maximum $E_G(\rho_{eq}) = \mathcal{N}$.

Proof. According to the LaSalle's invariance principle, the condition $\dot{V}_G(\rho) \leq 0$ guarantees that the state trajectory $\rho(t)$ converges to the invariant set

$$\Omega_G = \{\rho | \dot{V}_G(\rho) = 0, \rho \in \mathcal{H}_{AB}\}. \quad (38)$$

From the property of $h_k(x_k) \cdot x_k \geq 0$ in (35), the condition of $\dot{V}_G(\rho) = -|G'(X)| \sum_k r_k h_k(x_k) \cdot x_k = 0$ occurs only at $x_k = 0, k = 1, 2, \dots, m$, where m is the number of control field u_k used in (6). With $x_k = 0$, (36) gives $u_k = -\text{sgn}(G'(X)) \cdot r_k h_k(x_k) = 0$, because of $h_k(0) = 0$. Applying $u_k = 0$ to (6) then yields the equilibrium condition $\dot{\rho}(t) = 0$. Therefore, the invariant set Ω_G defined in (38) contains the equilibrium states ρ_{eq} of the von Neumann equation (6), and the state trajectory $\rho(t)$ converges asymptotically to ρ_{eq} such that $\dot{V}_G(\rho_{eq}) = 0$.

The proof of the other half of the theorem is about the properties of the equilibrium state ρ_{eq} , which can be derived from the equilibrium condition $x_k = 0$. In terms of (33), the equilibrium condition $x_k \triangleq i\text{Tr}(f'(\rho_M) \cdot (A_k\rho - \rho A_k)_M) = 0$ can be expressed by

$$(H_{11} - H_{22})\eta_k + H_{12}^*\zeta_k - (H_{12}^*\zeta_k)^* = 0, k = 1, 2, \dots, m \quad (39)$$

(39) has to be satisfied for all η_k and ζ_k , in order to achieve the condition $x_k = 0$, and the only possibility is $H_{11} = H_{22}$ and $H_{12} = 0$, which in turn is substituted into (30) to yield

$$f'((\rho_{eq})_M) = \begin{bmatrix} H_{11} & H_{12} \\ H_{12}^* & H_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} H_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & H_{11} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (40)$$

Because f' is either strictly increasing or strictly decreasing as proved in Section III, its inverse function $[f']^{-1}$ always exists and the equilibrium state can be solved as

$$(\rho_{eq})_M = \begin{bmatrix} [f']^{-1}(H_{11}) & 0 \\ 0 & [f']^{-1}(H_{11}) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1/2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (41)$$

where the identity $\text{Tr}(\rho_M) = 1$ has been used to determine the value of $[f']^{-1}(H_{11})$. Comparing (41) with (19), we obtain the main result of this theorem that the equilibrium state ρ_{eq} achieved by the Lyapunov control law (36) is identical to ρ_{MES} . Because of $E_G(\rho_{MES}) = \mathcal{N}$, the Lyapunov function evaluated at the equilibrium state becomes $V_G(\rho_{eq}) = \mathcal{N} - E_G(\rho_{eq}) = \mathcal{N} - E_G(\rho_{MES}) = 0$. \square

This theorem shows that the proposed Lyapunov control law (36) can drive the quantum state to the MES, which maximizes the general entanglement measure $E_G(\rho)$. It is noted that the MESs generated by the the Lyapunov entanglement control are not limited to Bell states but contain all the ρ_{MES} that achieve $E_G(\rho_{MES}) = \mathcal{N}$.

V. NUMERICAL VERIFICATION OF MAXIMUM ENTANGLEMENT CONTROL

In this section, we will numerically verify the Lyapunov entanglement control method derived in the previous section. We will consider a model representing two atoms each located in a remote cavity connected by a closed-loop optical fiber. One of the two atoms is given a coherent input field of amplitude A_m , and the output of each cavity enters the other. By eliminating the radiation field, the internal Hamiltonian is chosen as $H_0 = 2J\sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z$, where the spin-spin coupling constant J changes with the frequency of the applied radiation field and $J = 0.5$ is used in the computation.

The control Hamiltonian $H_c = \sum_{k=1}^3 H_k u_k(t)$ is synthesized by a local laser and the coupling Hamiltonian H_k is a combination of Pauli matrices $\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z$. Here we choose $H_1 = \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_y + \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z$, $H_2 = \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_z + \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_x$, and $H_3 = \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_z + \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_y$. With the given H_k , the time evolution of the density matrix is described by (6), and the control field u_k is given by (36), where the feedback signal is chosen to be the simplest form $h_k(x_k) = x_k$ with gain $r_k = 5$. The density matrix ρ for pure states is described by $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ with the quantum state $|\psi(t)\rangle$ expressed in terms of the basis as

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = \alpha|00\rangle + \beta|01\rangle + \gamma|10\rangle + \delta|11\rangle. \quad (42)$$

The reduced matrix ρ_M of the pure state $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ can be computed in terms of the coefficients of $|\psi(t)\rangle$ as

$$\rho_M = \begin{bmatrix} |\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 & \beta\bar{\delta} + \alpha\bar{\gamma} \\ \delta\bar{\beta} + \gamma\bar{\alpha} & |\gamma|^2 + |\delta|^2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (43)$$

which is then used in $E_G(\rho) = G(\text{Tr}(f(\rho_M)))$ to compute the entanglement measure. As mentioned in Section III, any qualified entanglement measure $E_G(\rho)$ has a common property of $E_G(\rho_0) = 0$ for all separable states ρ_0 . This property causes a numerical problem that if the entanglement control starts from a separable state ρ_0 , the initial control field $u_k(0)$ will inevitably become zero and nullify the control process. Therefore, a small perturbation is required to excite the control process, if a separable initial state is given. Once the control process is activated, it will asymptotically converge to a MES regardless of the initial states. What we are interested in is, from what

initial states, the obtained MES just has the form of Bell states, i.e.,

$$|\beta_{00}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle), \quad |\beta_{01}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle - |11\rangle), \quad (44a)$$

$$|\beta_{10}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle + |10\rangle), \quad |\beta_{11}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle). \quad (44b)$$

Firstly, we will consider the initial state $|\psi_0\rangle = (1 + \epsilon)|\beta_{00}\rangle + |\beta_{01}\rangle \approx |00\rangle$, which has a small perturbation ϵ from the separable state $|00\rangle$. The other purpose of introducing ϵ is to examine the influence of the perturbation of initial states on the convergence to Bell states.




Figure 1: Asymptotical convergence of the state population from the initial state $|00\rangle$ to the Bell state $|\beta_{00}\rangle$ based on three entanglement measures: concurrence $E_C(\rho)$, entropy of entanglement $E_E(\rho)$, and Renyi entropy $E_\alpha(\rho)$ with $\alpha = 1.5$.




Figure 2: The time responses of the control field used to drive the state from $|00\rangle$ to $|\beta_{00}\rangle = (|00\rangle + |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ based on three entanglement measures.

In Fig.1, we show the time response of the population in each basis state under the maximum entanglement control by using three entanglement measures: concurrence $E_C(\rho)$, entropy of entanglement $E_E(\rho)$, and Renyi entropy $E_\alpha(\rho)$ with $\alpha = 1.5$, as introduced in the previous section. It can be seen that the quantum states starting from $|00\rangle$ all converge asymptotically to the Bell state $|\beta_{00}\rangle = (|00\rangle + |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ by using three different entanglement measures. The different

convergent speeds observed from Fig. 1 can be explained by the time responses of the related control fields shown in Fig. 2. The control field generated by the entropy of entanglement $E_E(\rho)$ activates first and drives the quantum state to the Bell state faster than that by using the control field generated by the concurrence $E_C(\rho)$, which is the last of the three control fields to be activated. Although the three control fields are activated at different moments, their magnitudes are the same.

The initial state $|\psi_0\rangle = (1 + \epsilon)|\beta_{00}\rangle + |\beta_{01}\rangle \approx |00\rangle$ considered previously has a slightly larger weight on $|\beta_{00}\rangle$ than $|\beta_{01}\rangle$ and causes the state to converge to $|\beta_{00}\rangle$. Now we add the perturbation ϵ to $|\beta_{01}\rangle$, instead of $|\beta_{00}\rangle$, to form a different initial state $|\psi_0\rangle = |\beta_{00}\rangle + (1 + \epsilon)|\beta_{01}\rangle \approx |00\rangle$. By applying the same Lyapunov entanglement control, the terminal state turns out to be $|\beta_{01}\rangle$. It appears that the terminal Bell state is very sensitive to the way how the quantum state departs from the initial state. Table 1 lists the initial states with different perturbation and their corresponding terminal states under the same Lyapunov entanglement control. The results of this table show that if the initial state is close to the four basis states, the achieved MES appears to be one of the Bell states. Furthermore, if the initial state is perturbed towards a certain Bell state, it will cause the quantum state to evolve towards this Bell state.

Table 1: Initial states and the related final states under the same Lyapunov entanglement control.

Initial state	Initial deviation	final state	
1	$ 00\rangle$	$(1 + \epsilon) \beta_{00}\rangle + \beta_{01}\rangle$	$ \beta_{00}\rangle$
2	$ 00\rangle$	$ \beta_{00}\rangle + (1 + \epsilon) \beta_{01}\rangle$	$ \beta_{01}\rangle$
3	$ 11\rangle$	$(1 + \epsilon) \beta_{00}\rangle - \beta_{01}\rangle$	$ \beta_{00}\rangle$
4	$ 11\rangle$	$ \beta_{00}\rangle - (1 + \epsilon) \beta_{01}\rangle$	$ \beta_{01}\rangle$
5	$ 01\rangle$	$(1 + \epsilon) \beta_{10}\rangle + \beta_{11}\rangle$	$ \beta_{10}\rangle$
6	$ 01\rangle$	$ \beta_{10}\rangle + (1 + \epsilon) \beta_{11}\rangle$	$ \beta_{11}\rangle$
7	$ 10\rangle$	$(1 + \epsilon) \beta_{10}\rangle - \beta_{11}\rangle$	$ \beta_{11}\rangle$
8	$ 10\rangle$	$ \beta_{10}\rangle - (1 + \epsilon) \beta_{11}\rangle$	$ \beta_{11}\rangle$

In order to understand the global convergence range of Bell states, we select a large number of initial states at random and identify their terminal states under the same maximum entanglement control. For this purpose, a quantum state is represented as a linear combination of four Bell states

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = \beta_\alpha|\beta_{00}\rangle + \beta_\beta|\beta_{01}\rangle + \beta_\gamma|\beta_{10}\rangle + \beta_\delta|\beta_{11}\rangle, \quad (45)$$

where the coefficients satisfy the normalization condition. Graphically, the four Bell states can be thought of as the four vertices of a regular tetrahedron, and the coefficient set $\{\beta_\alpha, \beta_\beta, \beta_\gamma, \beta_\delta\}$ determines the position of the corresponding quantum state in the tetrahedron, as shown in Fig. 3. We make use of different colors to distinguish regions converging to different Bell states in such a way that a blue dot represents an initial state, which converges to the Bell state $|\beta_{00}\rangle$, and cyan, yellow, and green dots represent those initial states converging to $|\beta_{10}\rangle$, $|\beta_{01}\rangle$, and $|\beta_{11}\rangle$, respectively. The red dots, which cover most of the tetrahedron, correspond to the initial states converging to the MESs not in the form of Bell states, which are called Bell equivalent states, i.e., they are equivalent to Bell states under unitary local transformation.




Figure 3: Distribution of initial states converging to different Bell states on a tetrahedron. Blue, cyan, yellow, and green regions represent initial states converging to $|\beta_{00}\rangle$, $|\beta_{10}\rangle$, $|\beta_{01}\rangle$, and $|\beta_{11}\rangle$, respectively. The red region covers those initial states converging to the Bell equivalent states. Graph (b) and (c) are the results of observing the tetrahedron in graph (a) from different orientations.

It can be seen from Fig.3 that the initial states close to the Bell states at the four corners of the tetrahedron tend to converge to their nearby Bell states. Besides the regions close to the four corners, initial states distributing along the line connecting $|\beta_{00}\rangle$ and $|\beta_{01}\rangle$ and the line connecting $|\beta_{10}\rangle$ and $|\beta_{11}\rangle$ also tend to converge to the Bell states. This finding is consistent with the result of Table 1 by noting that the combination of $|\beta_{00}\rangle$ and $|\beta_{01}\rangle$ yields the first four Bell states in Table 1 and the combination of $|\beta_{10}\rangle$ and $|\beta_{11}\rangle$ yields the next four Bell states in Table 1.

The Lyapunov entanglement control ensures that all the initial states converge to the MESs, which include Bell states and Bell equivalent states, as shown in Fig. 3. The MES for a bipartite pure state has a general expression as

$$|MES_\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(p|00\rangle + q|01\rangle \mp q^*|10\rangle \pm p^*|11\rangle). \quad (46)$$

This general expression can be confirmed by substituting the coefficients of $|MES_\pm\rangle$ into Eq. (43) to yield the reduced matrix

$$\rho_M = \begin{bmatrix} |\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 & \beta\bar{\delta} + \alpha\bar{\gamma} \\ \delta\bar{\beta} + \gamma\bar{\alpha} & |\gamma|^2 + |\delta|^2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1/2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (47)$$

which recovers the reduced matrix of the MES given by (19). If either p or q is equal to zero in (46), $|MES_\pm\rangle$ becomes Bell state; if both p and q are not equal to zero, $|MES_\pm\rangle$ is a Bell equivalent state.

When the Lyapunov entanglement control converges to a Bell equivalent state, all the populations of the four basis states are not zero according to (46). This is different from the case of a Bell state, which has only two basis states with non-zero populations.




Figure 4: Time evolution of the component populations from an initial state to a terminal Bell equivalent state with components $|\alpha|^2 = |\delta|^2$ and $|\beta|^2 = |\gamma|^2$ for three entanglement measures: concurrence (solid line), entropy of entanglement (dashed line), and Renyi entropy with $\alpha = 1.5$ (dotted line).

The convergence of Lyapunov entanglement control to a Bell equivalent state is shown in Fig. 4, where the initial state is randomly chosen from the red region in Fig. 3 so that the achieved terminal state is a Bell equivalent state. The obtained Bell equivalent state has four non-zero components with $|\alpha|^2 = |\delta|^2$ and $|\beta|^2 = |\gamma|^2$, which is different from the Bell state with $|\alpha|^2 = |\delta|^2 = 1/2$ and $|\beta|^2 = |\gamma|^2 = 0$ as shown in Fig. 1.




Figure 5: The convergence of three entanglement measures under the Lyapunov control to the Bell equivalent state considered in Fig. 4.

Regardless of whether the terminal state is a Bell state or a Bell equivalent state, the Lyapunov entanglement control method proposed here ensures that all the initial states can converge to the MES. A numerical verification of Theorem 4.2 is shown in Fig. 5, where the degree of entanglement of the quantum state undergoing Lyapunov entanglement control is monitored by three entanglement measures. The initial state is chosen the same as that in Fig. 4 so that the terminal state is a Bell equivalent state instead of a Bell state. It can be seen that all the three entanglement measures converge to their maximum value, confirming the role of the obtained Bell equivalent state as a MES.

VI. LYAPUNOV ENTANGLEMENT CONTROL FOR MIXED STATES

For pure-state quantum control of a bipartite system, the Lyapunov control methods proposed in the literature can be used to generate the desired MES by specifying it as the target state ρ_d . Once the target state changes, the Lyapunov control has to be redesigned. In contrast, the present method generates all the MESs through one control design. Treating the generation of MES as a problem of state transfer becomes invalid for bipartite mixed states, because an analytical expression for the maximally entangled mixed states (MEMS) is still unknown. Nevertheless, the present method can be used to automatically search for the MEMS without specifying it in advance.

For a bipartite mixed state ρ , there are many different ways to decompose it into the component pure states as $\rho = \sum_k p_k |\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|$. The degree of entanglement of a mixed state ρ then can be measured by the concurrence of its component pure states as

$$E_c(\rho) = \min_{\{p_k, \psi_k\}} \sum_k p_k E_c(|\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|), \quad (48)$$

where the minimization is over all possible ways of decomposition of ρ . In other words, the entanglement measure of a mixed state is defined to be smallest sum of the entanglement measure of its component pure states. The same idea can be applied to other entanglement measures by extending their definitions from pure states to mixed states.

In fact, any qualified mixed-state entanglement measure can be used in the maximum entanglement control, and the MEMS obtained by them is the same. The reason is that there exists a monotonic mapping between any two qualified entanglement measures. For example, the entanglement measure for mixed state can be defined in terms of the general entanglement measure $E_G(\rho)$ as

$$E_G(\rho) = \min_{\{p_k, |\psi_k\rangle\}} \sum_k p_k E_G(|\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|). \quad (49)$$

It is not surprising that the minimal decomposition involved in (49) is the same as (48), because monotonic mapping exists between the concurrence E_c and the general entanglement measure E_G , which can be derived from Eq. (24b) as

$$E_G = G(f(\lambda) + f(1 - \lambda)), \quad \lambda = (1 + \sqrt{1 - E_c^2})/2, \quad (50)$$

where G is a monotonic function as verified in Section III. Therefore, the result of maximum entanglement control based on the measure E_G is identical to that based on the measure E_c . Since the acquisition of MEMS is independent of the entanglement measure used, we will employ the concurrence E_c as a demonstration of applying Lyapunov entanglement control to two-qubit mixed states.

The MEMS over the entire \mathcal{H}_{AB} space is still unknown in the literature. Ishizaka [43] proposed a special class of MEMS for two-qubit systems, whose concurrence E_c is maximized over all mixed states with given spectrum $\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4\}$. This class of MEMS can be generated by applying unitary local transformations to the kernel MEMS

$$\rho_{MEMS} = \lambda_1 |\beta_{11}\rangle\langle\beta_{11}| + \lambda_2 |00\rangle\langle 00| + \lambda_3 |\beta_{10}\rangle\langle\beta_{10}| + \lambda_4 |11\rangle\langle 11|, \quad (51)$$

where λ_i 's are the eigenvalues of ρ_{MEMS} in decreasing order with $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4 = 1$. All the MEMSs in this class have the same concurrence given by

$$E_c(\rho_{MEMS}) = E_c^* = \max\{0, \lambda_1 - \lambda_3 - 2\sqrt{\lambda_2\lambda_4}\}, \quad (52)$$

which is proved to be the maximum concurrence that can be achieved for all mixed states with given spectrum $\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4\}$. The role of ρ_{MEMS} in the mixed state is similar to that of Bell state in the pure state; however, no quantum control has been proposed to generate this Bell-like mixed state till now. The Lyapunov entanglement control developed in Section IV is particularly suitable for this task, because the operation involved in von Neumann equation (4) is just a unitary transformation for ρ so that its spectrum remains unchanged during the control process. In the following, we will apply the Lyapunov entanglement control to drive an initial state ρ_0 with specified spectrum $\{\lambda_i\}$ to ρ_{MEMS} , which maximize the entanglement measure $E_c(\rho)$.

Like (27), the LEF for mixed state is chosen as

$$V_c(\rho) = \mathcal{N} - E_c(\rho) = \mathcal{N} - \min_{\{p_k, \psi_k\}} \sum_k p_k E_c(|\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|), \quad (53)$$

where \mathcal{N} is a constant, which can be set to the maximum of $E_c(\rho)$, i.e., $\mathcal{N} = E_c^*$, to ensure $V_c(\rho) \geq 0$. However, the MEMS is determined by the condition $\dot{V}_c(\rho) = 0$, which is independent of the actual value of \mathcal{N} . In other words, the maximum entanglement measure E_c^* need not be specified in advance in the Lyapunov entanglement control. Once ρ_{MEMS} is obtained by the entanglement control, $E_c(\rho_{MEMS})$ automatically gives the value of E_c^* . The analytical expression of E_c^* introduced in (52) is only for the purpose of comparing with the E_c^* obtained by the proposed entanglement control.

For a given mixed state ρ , the evaluation of concurrence $E_c(\rho)$ involves a minimum decomposition process (48), which causes a difficulty in expressing $\dot{V}_c(\rho)$ as an explicit function of ρ . Fortunately, this difficulty can be overcome by the method of tilde decomposition introduced by Wootters [36]. In terms of the tilde orthogonal basis $|y_k\rangle$, the minimum decomposition of ρ can be expressed directly by

$$\rho = p_1 |y_1\rangle\langle y_1| - \sum_{k=2}^4 p_k |y_k\rangle\langle y_k|, \quad (54)$$

where p_k is the weight corresponding to the states $|y_k\rangle$. Under this minimum decomposition, the concurrence of ρ turns out to be the summation of the concurrence of the component pure state $Y_k = |y_k\rangle\langle y_k|$ as

$$E_c(\rho) = p_1 E_c(Y_1) - \sum_{k=2}^4 p_k E_c(Y_k). \quad (55)$$

For the convenience of expression, we define the new states $|z_1\rangle = \sqrt{p} |y_1\rangle$ and $|z_k\rangle = i\sqrt{p_k} |y_k\rangle$, $k = 2, 3, 4$, to rewrite (54) as $\rho = \sum_k |z_k\rangle\langle z_k|$ and (55) as

$$E_c(\rho) = \sum_k E_c(|z_k\rangle\langle z_k|) = \sum_k E_c(Z_k). \quad (56)$$

Substituting (56) into (53) and using the definition of concurrence for pure states given by (24a), we obtain

$$V_c(\rho) = \mathcal{N} - \sum_k E_c(Z_k) \\ = \mathcal{N} - \sum_k \sqrt{2(1 - \text{Tr}((Z_k)_M^2))}. \quad (57)$$

In the following, the Lyapunov control law $u_k(\rho)$ will be derived from (57) in terms of ρ 's component pure state Y_k to achieve the control goal $\dot{V}_c(\rho) < 0$, $\forall \rho \neq \rho_{eq}$ and $\dot{V}_c(\rho_{eq}) = 0$.

A. Control Law Design

According to (57), the first-order time derivative of $V_c(\rho)$

is

$$\dot{V}_c(\rho) = -2i \sum_j [E_c(Z_j)]^{-1} \text{Tr}((Z_j)_M \cdot (HZ_j - Z_j H)_M). \quad (58)$$

With the Hamiltonian H expressed under the interaction picture (6), $\dot{V}_c(\rho)$ can be further simplified to

$$\dot{V}_c(\rho) = -2i \sum_k u_k \sum_j [E_c(Z_j)]^{-1} (\text{Tr}((Z_j)_M$$

$$\cdot (A_k Z_j - Z_j A_k)_M)). \quad (59)$$

By a similar way taken by Theorem 4.1, we can show that $\text{Tr}((Z_j)_M \cdot (A_k Z_j - Z_j A_k)_M)$ is a pure imaginary number. Thus the following quantity appears to be real-valued:

$$x_k = i \sum_j [E_c(Z_j)]^{-1} \text{Tr}((Z_j)_M \cdot (A_k Z_j - Z_j A_k)_M). \quad (60)$$

Like the case of pure-state control, a real function $h_k(x_k)$ of x_k is introduced to satisfy the conditions $h_k(x_k) \cdot x_k \geq 0$, and $h_k(x_k) = 0$, iff $x_k = 0$. The feedback signal for the mixed-state Lyapunov control then can be constructed as

$$u_k = r_k h_k(x_k), \quad r_k > 0. \quad (61)$$

Substitution of (61) into (59) yields the desired goal of Lyapunov control

$$\dot{V}_c(\rho) = -2 \sum_k r_k h_k(x_k) \cdot x_k \leq 0. \quad (62)$$

Therefore, the control law (61) ensures that the LEF $V_c(\rho)$ is decreasing and meanwhile the entanglement measure $E_c(\rho)$ is increasing due to the relation $V_c(\rho) = \mathcal{N} - E_c(\rho)$.

B. Asymptotical Stability

The mixed state ρ controlled by (61) converges to the invariant set characterized by $\dot{V}_c(\rho) = 0$, and from (62) the only solution is $x_k = 0$ because of $h_k(x_k) = 0$, iff $x_k = 0$. For arbitrary $x_k \neq 0$, we have $\dot{V}_c(\rho) < 0$. With $x_k = 0$, the control law (61) then gives $u_k = 0$, which in turn yields $\dot{\rho} = 0$ from (6). Hence, the invariant set contains only the equilibrium states ρ_{eq} of the von Neumann equation (6), which implies that the mixed state ρ controlled by (61) converges asymptotically to the equilibrium state ρ_{eq} . According to the properties $\dot{V}_c(\rho) < 0$ and $\dot{E}_c(\rho) > 0$, $\forall \rho \neq \rho_{eq}$, and $\dot{V}_c(\rho_{eq}) = \dot{E}_c(\rho_{eq}) = 0$, it appears that the equilibrium state ρ_{eq} is the state that minimizes the LEF $V_c(\rho)$ and meanwhile maximizes the entanglement measure $E_c(\rho)$, i.e., $\rho_{eq} = \rho_{MEMS}$. Of significance is that the value of $E_c(\rho_{eq})$ automatically gives the maximum entanglement measure E_c^* , and we do not need to specify it in advance. In the following numerical verification, ρ_{MEMS} will be generated by the Lyapunov entanglement control and the achieved maximum entanglement measure $E_c^* = E_c(\rho_{MEMS})$ will be compared with the analytical solution (52).

C. Numerical Verification

The Lyapunov entanglement control (61) with $h_k(x_k) = x_k$ will be employed to obtain the MEMS. The feedback signal x_k defined by (60) is generated by the von Neumann equation (6) with the process of tilde decomposition. The internal Hamiltonian is chosen as $H_0 = \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z$ and the control Hamiltonian H_k is constructed in the form of

$$H_k = i(|m\rangle\langle n| - |n\rangle\langle m|), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, 6, \quad (63)$$

where $|m\rangle, |n\rangle \in \{|00\rangle, |01\rangle, |10\rangle, |11\rangle\}$. The number of the control Hamiltonian H_k is related to the number of available control fields. Compared with the control for pure states, more control fields are required for the control of mixed states. It can be seen that the control Hamiltonian H_k (63) deals with the intertransfer between the two bases $|m\rangle$ and $|n\rangle$. A general state transfer may comprise all possible intertransfers between any two bases in the set $\{|00\rangle, |01\rangle, |10\rangle, |11\rangle\}$. Since there are six different ways of intertransfer between the two bases, the number of H_k must be at least six to cover the entire range of state transfer. An equivalent matrix expression of the control

Hamiltonian H_k (63) is given by the tensor products of Pauli matrices

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 &= \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_x, & H_2 &= \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_y, & H_3 &= \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_z, \\ H_4 &= \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_z, & H_5 &= \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y, & H_6 &= \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x, \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

which are the linear combinations of the H_k in (63). With the specified H_k , the time evolution of the density matrix under the interaction picture is described by (6) as $i\dot{\rho}(t) = [\sum_{k=1}^6 u_k A_k, \rho(t)]$, where the control signal u_k is determined by (61) with gain $r_k = 5$. Figure 6 shows the time responses of the concurrence $E_c(\rho)$ by the proposed Lyapunov entanglement control for three initial states with the same spectrum $\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4\} = \{0.4932, 0.3485, 0.1301, 0.0282\}$.

It can be seen that the time responses of the concurrence $E_c(\rho(t))$ all converge to the same steady state ρ_{ss} with $E_c(\rho_{ss}) = 0.1648$, which is consistent with the theoretical value $E_c^* = \lambda_1 - \lambda_3 - 2\sqrt{\lambda_2\lambda_4}$ as given by (52) with the specified spectrum λ_i . The three curves in Fig. 6 correspond to three representative initial states ρ_0 . The lower curve starting from $E_c(\rho_0) = 0$ is generated by a separable initial state ρ_0 . The upper flat curve achieving a constant concurrence at E_c^* is generated by an initial state identical to ρ_{MEMS} given by (51), and the middle curve is generated by a randomly selected initial state between the separable state ρ_0 and ρ_{MEMS} .




Figure 6: The time responses of the mixed-state concurrence $E_c(\rho(t))$ under the Lyapunov entanglement control law (61) for three initial states: $\rho_0 = \rho_{MEMS}$ (upper flat curve), separable ρ_0 (lower curve), and a randomly selected ρ_0 between the separable ρ_0 and ρ_{MEMS} (middle curve).

The proposed entanglement control law (61) is capable of searching for the MEMS from the set of the density matrices that share the same spectrum specified by $\{\lambda_i\}$. When the specified spectrum changes, the MEMS obtained by the control law (61) changes accordingly. Table 2 compares the steady-state concurrence $E_c(\rho_{ss})$ with the theoretical value E_c^* given by (52) for ten sets of spectrum. For each spectrum, Table 2 lists the steady-state values of p_i and $E_c(Y_i)$, from which the steady-state concurrence can be computed by $E_c(\rho_{ss}) = p_1 E_c(Y_1) - p_2 E_c(Y_2) - p_3 E_c(Y_3) - p_4 E_c(Y_4)$ as given by (55). The last column in Tab. 2 compares the computed $E_c(\rho_{ss})$ with the theoretical value E_c^* given by (52).

Table 2: The comparison of the steady-state concurrence $E_c(\rho_{ss})$ with the theoretical value E_c^* for ten sets of spectrum.

No	$\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4$	p_1	p_2	p_3	p_4	E_c^*
		$E_c(Y_1)$	$E_c(Y_2)$	$E_c(Y_3)$	$E_c(Y_4)$	$E_c(\rho_{ss})$
1	0.4497, 0.2978, 0.2498, 0.0026,	0.4497	0.2502	0.1458	0.1544	0.1442
		0.9999	0.9998	0.1868	0.1868	0.1434
2	0.5326, 0.2953, 0.1624, 0.0096,	0.5323	0.1625	0.1516	0.1536	0.2637
		1.0000	0.9999	0.3538	0.3538	0.2618
3	0.5939, 0.2516, 0.1266, 0.0278,	0.5935	0.1289	0.1431	0.1344	0.3000
		0.9999	0.9906	0.6025	0.6033	0.2985
4	0.5467, 0.3363, 0.1099, 0.0070,	0.5466	0.1112	0.1743	0.1679	0.3398
		0.9999	0.9921	0.2852	0.2846	0.3387
5	0.5155, 0.3716, 0.1118, 0.0010,	0.5155	0.1124	0.1907	0.1815	0.3651
		1.0000	0.9967	0.1082	0.1082	0.3632
6	0.6607, 0.1901, 0.1083, 0.0409,	0.6605	0.1050	0.1177	0.1168	0.3761
		1.0000	0.9654	0.7678	0.7891	0.3766
7	0.5884, 0.2693, 0.1398, 0.0024,	0.5884	0.1287	0.1419	0.1409	0.3978
		1.0000	0.9963	0.1888	0.1888	0.4068
8	0.6465, 0.2604, 0.0659, 0.0271,	0.6465	0.0663	0.1397	0.1476	0.4126
		1.0000	0.9916	0.5851	0.5880	0.4122
9	0.6122, 0.3039, 0.0714, 0.0125,	0.6120	0.0718	0.1566	0.1596	0.4175
		1.0000	0.9957	0.3967	0.3961	0.4152
10	0.7760, 0.1800, 0.0294, 0.0146,	0.7756	0.0297	0.0870	0.1077	0.6441
		0.9999	0.9822	0.5370	0.5368	0.6418

If we ignore the small deviations caused by the numerical truncation errors, we find that Table 2 reveals some significant regularities. For a given spectrum $\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4\}$ with decreasing order, the steady-state value of $E_c(Y_k)$ given by Tab. 2 demonstrates the following regularity

$$\begin{aligned} E_c(Y_1) &= E_c(Y_2) = 1, \\ E_c(Y_3) &= E_c(Y_4) = 2\sqrt{\lambda_2\lambda_4}/(\lambda_2 + \lambda_4). \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

Meanwhile, the steady-state weight p_k of $E_c(Y_k)$ shows the following regularity

$$p_1 = \lambda_1, \quad p_2 = \lambda_3, \quad p_3 = p_4 = (\lambda_2 + \lambda_4)/2. \quad (66)$$

The combination of (65) and (66) gives an error-free prediction of $E_c(\rho_{ss})$ as

$$\begin{aligned} E_c(\rho_{ss}) &= p_1 E_c(Y_1) - p_2 E_c(Y_2) - p_3 E_c(Y_3) - p_4 E_c(Y_4) \\ &= \lambda_1 - \lambda_3 - 2\sqrt{\lambda_2\lambda_4}, \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

which recovers the theoretical result (52).

By comparing with the analytical solution, the above numerical results confirm that the proposed Lyapunov entanglement control can precisely generate the MEMS. More importantly, we do not need to specify in advance the MEMS to be generated during the control process. It is because of this property that we can discover more different forms of MEMS not belonging to the known class generated by the kernel mixed state (51).

The tilde decomposition of the MEMS in the class generated by (51) possesses the properties expressed by (65) and (66). However, there are many MEMS outside this class. For example, considering the following MEMS

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \lambda_1 |\beta_{00}\rangle\langle\beta_{00}| + \sqrt{\lambda_2\lambda_4} |\beta_{10}\rangle\langle\beta_{10}| \\ &\quad + \lambda_3 |\beta_{01}\rangle\langle\beta_{01}| + \sqrt{\lambda_2\lambda_4} |\beta_{11}\rangle\langle\beta_{11}|, \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

we find that its tilde decomposition has the property $E_c(Y_1) = E_c(Y_2) = E_c(Y_3) = E_c(Y_4) = 1$, which is different from the pattern specified by (65). Obviously, the MEMS given by (68)

does not belong to the class generated by (51); however, it still achieves the maximum concurrence E_c^* given by (52).

Table 3 lists the MEMS generated by the Lyapunov entanglement control law, which otherwise can not be obtained by applying any local unitary transformation to (51). It can be checked that the steady-state values of p_i and $E_c(Y_i)$ listed in Tab. 3 do not have the regularities expressed by (65) and (66), indicating that the class of MEMS in Tab. 3 is different from the class covered by Tab. 2. Nevertheless, we note that although the MEMSs in Tab.2 and Tab. 3 belong to different classes, they all attain the maximum concurrence $E_c^* = \lambda_1 - \lambda_3 - 2\sqrt{\lambda_2\lambda_4}$ within the numerical accuracy. The last column in Tab. 3 compares the computed $E_c(\rho_{ss}) = p_1 E_c(Y_1) - \sum_{k=2}^4 p_k E_c(Y_k)$ with the theoretical value E_c^* .

Table 3: Several MEMSs obtained by the Lyapunov entanglement control but not belonging to the class covered by Tab. 2.

No	λ_1, λ_2 λ_3, λ_4	p_1	p_2	p_3	p_4	E_c^*
		$E_c(Y_1)$	$E_c(Y_2)$	$E_c(Y_3)$	$E_c(Y_4)$	$E_c(\rho_{ss})$
1	0.6523, 0.2515, 0.0768, 0.0194,	0.6516	0.1108	0.1223	0.1153	0.4358
		0.9996	0.5565	0.6762	0.6542	0.4316
2	0.6099, 0.3298, 0.0522, 0.0082,	0.6097	0.1385	0.1402	0.1116	0.4537
		1.0000	0.3920	0.3722	0.4560	0.4523
3	0.6385, 0.3130, 0.0433, 0.0052,	0.6378	0.1089	0.1424	0.1109	0.5145
		0.9990	0.4420	0.2963	0.3284	0.5104
4	0.7336, 0.2303, 0.0321, 0.0040,	0.7330	0.0867	0.1138	0.0665	0.6412
		0.9986	0.4379	0.2661	0.4015	0.6370
5	0.8069, 0.1686, 0.0229, 0.0016	0.8064	0.0478	0.0678	0.0780	0.7516
		0.9978	0.5117	0.1987	0.2433	0.7477
6	0.8428, 0.1348, 0.0210, 0.0011	0.8422	0.0391	0.0463	0.0724	0.7974
		1.0000	0.6232	0.2511	0.2195	0.7903
7	0.8437, 0.1507, 0.0050, 0.0006,	0.8433	0.0752	0.0764	0.0052	0.8197
		0.9999	0.2302	0.1841	0.4753	0.8094




Figure 7: The convergence of the concurrence $E_c(\rho(t))$ to $E_c(\rho_{MEMS})$ with the MEMS not belonging to the class generated by (51) for the three sets of spectrum listed in Tab. 3.

Figure 7 shows the convergence of the concurrence $E_c(\rho(t))$ to $E_c(\rho_{MEMS})$ with the MEMS not belonging to class generated by (51) for three sets of spectrum listed in Tab. 3. It can be seen that the steady-state concurrence $E_c(\rho_{ss})$

approaches the theoretical prediction E_c^* labelled by the dashed line within the numerical accuracy.

Regarding the maximum entanglement control for mixed states, Table 2 and Table 3 present two of the major results of this paper. The former shows that the MEMS obtained by the proposed method is completely consistent with the analytical solution mentioned in the literature, and the latter shows that our control method can also be used to generate new forms of MEMS not known in the literature.

VII. LYAPUNOV ENTANGLEMENT CONTROL FOR MULTIPARTITE SYSTEMS

The same entanglement control strategy that has been used for the pure state and the mixed state of bipartite systems can be equally applied to multipartite systems. For multipartite systems, the biggest difficulty lies not in the formulation of the Lyapunov entanglement control, but in that the currently available multipartite entanglement measures can only determine a lower bound, but not the exact entanglement of a multipartite state. Furthermore, the MES of multipartite systems is not unique, because using different entanglement measures may result in different MES, such as W state or GHZ state, between which there is no unitary local transformation.

Since Lyapunov entanglement control is only responsible for the adopted entanglement measure, the obtained multipartite MES can only maximize the entanglement measure adopted in the Lyapunov function, but it may not be the MES, when evaluated by other entanglement measures; meanwhile, the entanglement measure that has been maximized by the Lyapunov control may merely represents a lower bound of the true entanglement. In this section, two entanglement measures for multipartite systems, i.e., generalized concurrence and genuine multipartite entanglement, will be employed in the Lyapunov entanglement control to generate the multipartite MES.

A. Two Entanglement measures for multipartite states

Generalized concurrence [44] provides a lower bound of the degree of multipartite entanglement. Let \mathcal{H}_j denote a Hilbert space with dimension d , whose basis is given by $|k_j\rangle$, $k_j = 1, 2, \dots, d$. A N -partite pure state in the space of $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{H}_N$ is represented by

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{k_1=1}^d \sum_{k_2=1}^d \dots \sum_{k_N=1}^d a_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_N} |k_1, k_2, \dots, k_N\rangle. \quad (69)$$

Let α and α' (resp. β and β') be the subsets of the index set $\{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_N\}$, which are associated with the same Hilbert spaces but with different summing indices, so that $\{\alpha, \beta\} = \{\alpha', \beta'\} = \{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_N\}$. Then the generalized concurrence of $|\psi\rangle$ is given by

$$E_{GC} = \sqrt{\frac{d}{2^{m(d-1)}} \sum_p \sum_{\{\alpha, \alpha', \beta, \beta'\}} |a_{\alpha\beta} a_{\alpha'\beta'} - a_{\alpha\beta'} a_{\alpha'\beta}|^2}, \quad (70)$$

where $m = 2^{N-1} - 1$ and the outer summation is over all possible combinations of the two subsets α and β . For a N -bit state $|\psi\rangle$, we have $d = 2$, for which (70) can be simplified to

$$E_{GC}(\rho) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2^{N-1}-1} (N - \sum_{j=1}^N \text{Tr}(\rho_j^2))}, \quad (71)$$

where $\rho_j = \text{Tr}_j(\rho)$ is the reduced matrix of $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ obtained by taking the partial trace for all the particles except the j th particle. When $N = 2$, (71) reduces to (24a) for bipartite

pure states by noting $\rho_1 = \rho_2 = \rho_M$. The LEF for $E_{GC}(\rho)$ can be chosen as

$$V_{GC}(\rho) = \mathcal{N} - E_{GC}(\rho), \quad (72)$$

where \mathcal{N} is a trivial constant. The multipartite Lyapunov control will be derived from the condition $\dot{V}_{GC} = -\dot{E}_{GC} \leq 0$ to drive $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ from an arbitrary state ρ_0 to the steady state ρ_{eq} , at which E_{GC} achieves its maximum.

The same control strategy can be applied to other qualified entanglement measure for multipartite systems, such as genuine-multipartite-entanglement (GME) concurrence [45], [46], which searches for the minimum bipartition of the system. A pure N-partite state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{H}_N$ is said to be biseparable, if it can be written as $|\psi\rangle = |\psi_A\rangle \otimes |\psi_B\rangle$, where $|\psi_A\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_A = \mathcal{H}_{j_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{H}_{j_k}$ and $|\psi_B\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_B = \mathcal{H}_{j_{k+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{H}_{j_N}$; otherwise, it is said to be genuinely N-partite entangled. Supposing $\{\gamma_k|\gamma'_k\} = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k|j_{k+1}, \dots, j_N\}$ is a bipartition of the index set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, GME concurrence searches for the particular bipartition of the system to minimize the concurrence:

$$E_{GME}(\rho) = \min_{\{\gamma_k|\gamma'_k\}} \sqrt{2(1 - \text{Tr}(\rho_{\gamma'_k}^2))}, \quad (73)$$

where $\rho_{\gamma'_k}$ is the reduced density matrix obtained by taking the partial trace of ρ over the subsystem indexed by γ'_k and the minimization is over all possible bipartitions $\{\gamma_k|\gamma'_k\}$. Similarly, the LEF for $E_{GME}(\rho)$ can be chosen as

$$V_{GME}(\rho) = \mathcal{N} - E_{GME}(\rho). \quad (74)$$

The aim of Lyapunov control is to drive $E_{GME}(\rho)$ to its maximum and to compare with theoretical maximum achieved by the |GHZ⟩ state. However, we find that |GHZ⟩ is not the unique MES of $E_{GME}(\rho)$, and there are MESs other than |GHZ⟩, which still achieve the maximum of $E_{GME}(\rho)$.

B. Designing Lyapunov entanglement control laws

Once a qualified LEF is chosen for multipartite states, the design of Lyapunov entanglement control is the same as that of bipartite states without additional difficulty. We start with the LEF of the general concurrence $V_{GC}(\rho)$ given by (72), whose first-order time derivative can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_{GC} &= \frac{E_{GC}^{-1}}{2^{N-1-1}} \sum_{j=1}^N \text{Tr}(\rho_j \dot{\rho}_j) \\ &= -i \frac{E_{GC}^{-1}}{2^{N-1-1}} \sum_{j=1}^N \text{Tr}(\rho_j \cdot (H\rho - \rho H))_j. \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

The system Hamiltonian H under the interaction picture is given by (6) with which the relation of \dot{V}_{GC} to the control field u_k can be derived as

$$\dot{V}_{GC} = -i \frac{E_{GC}^{-1}}{2^{N-1-1}} \sum_{k=1}^r u_k \sum_{j=1}^N \text{Tr}(\rho_j (A_k \rho - \rho A_k))_j. \quad (76)$$

No matter how many particles the system has, the Hermitian property of the density matrix ρ and its reduced form ρ_j does not change. As a result, we can show by the same way used in Theorem 4.1 that $\sum_j \text{Tr}(\rho_j \cdot (A_k \rho - \rho A_k))_j$ is an imaginary number. In terms of the real-valued variable,

$$x_k = i \cdot \sum_{j=1}^N \text{Tr}(\rho_j (A_k \rho - \rho A_k))_j, \quad (77)$$

the desired Lyapunov control law now can be constructed as $u_k = r_k h_k(x_k)$, where $h_k(x_k)$ satisfies the relation (35) and r_k is a positive control gain. With $u_k = r_k h_k(x_k)$, the time derivative of V_{GC} becomes

$$\dot{V}_{GC} = -\frac{E_{GC}^{-1}}{2^{N-1-1}} \sum_{k=1}^r r_k x_k h_k(x_k) \leq 0, \forall t \geq 0. \quad (78)$$

It can be shown from the property of $h_k(x_k)$ that $\dot{V}_{GC} = \dot{E}_{GC} = 0$ occurs only at the equilibrium state ρ_{eq} , and $\dot{V}_{GC} = -\dot{E}_{GC} < 0, \forall \rho \neq \rho_{eq}$. Therefore, the proposed control law drives ρ to the equilibrium state ρ_{eq} , where V_{GC} reaches its minimum and E_{GC} reaches its maximum, i.e., ρ_{eq} is the MES of E_{GC} .

Next we consider the entanglement control of GME-concurrence defined by (73). Let γ_m be the partition γ_k that attains the minimum in Eq. (73) at time t , then the first-order time derivative of V_{GME} at time t can be expressed as

$$\dot{V}_{GME} = -2i E_{GME}^{-1} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^r u_k \text{Tr}(\rho_{\gamma_m} \cdot (A_k \rho - \rho A_k)_{\gamma_m}). \quad (79)$$

To ensure $\dot{V}_{GME} \leq 0$, the control law $u_k = r_k h_k(x_k)$ is applied again with the real-valued feedback signal x_k defined by

$$x_k = i \cdot \text{Tr}(\rho_{\gamma_m} \cdot (A_k \rho - \rho A_k)_{\gamma_m}). \quad (80)$$

This control law yields

$$\dot{V}_{GME} = -\dot{E}_{GME} = -2 \sum_{k=1}^r r_k x_k h_k(x_k) \leq 0, \forall t \geq 0, \quad (81)$$

which drives E_{GME} to its maximum at the equilibrium state.

ρ_{eq} .

C. Numerical verification

In this section the convergence of the proposed Lyapunov entanglement control to the MES will be demonstrated through tripartite quantum states. Firstly, the internal Hamiltonian H_0 and the control Hamiltonian H_k adopt the same setting values as in Section V. The LEFs for the two entanglement measures E_{GC} and E_{GME} with $N = 3$ are given, respectively by (72) and (74) as

$$V_{GC} = \mathcal{N} - \sqrt{(3 - \sum_{k=1}^3 \text{Tr}(\rho_k^2))/3}, \quad (82a)$$

$$V_{GME} = \mathcal{N} - \min_{k \in \{1, 2, 3\}} \sqrt{2(1 - \text{Tr}(\rho_k^2))}. \quad (82b)$$

The same Lyapunov control law $u_k = r_k h_k(x_k) = 5x_k$ is applied to the two entanglement measures, where the feedback signal x_k for V_{GC} and V_{GME} is calculated from (77) and (80), respectively. Two initial states are tested in the numerical demonstration: one is the separable state $\rho_0 = |000\rangle$, and the other is a randomly selected inseparable state. The resulting time responses of $E_{GC}(t)$ and $E_{GME}(t)$ are shown in Fig. 8a. As expected, the proposed Lyapunov control law drives both $E_{GC}(t)$ and $E_{GME}(t)$ to their maximum, which is equal to that achieved theoretically by the |GHZ⟩ state. $E_{GC}(t)$ converges faster than $E_{GME}(t)$, but consumes much more control energy, as shown in Fig. 8b.

The other noticeable observation from Fig. 8 is that the Lyapunov entanglement control starting from different initial state ρ_0 may converge to different MES with different convergence speed. Obviously, the convergence to the MES from the randomly selected ρ_0 is slower than that from $\rho_0 = |000\rangle$. Collecting all the MESs generated by the Lyapunov entanglement control from different initial states forms a class of MES whose entanglement measure is equal to that of |GHZ⟩. Although the degree of entanglement of the obtained MESs is the same as that of |GHZ⟩, it does not mean that we can apply the LOCC operation to convert these MESs into the |GHZ⟩ state. Because the equivalent class is based on the equivalence of Schmidt decomposition, which is no longer applicable to 3-qubit states, we cannot classify all the MESs obtained by the Lyapunov control into the equivalent class of the |GHZ⟩ state. This is the main difference from the bipartite entanglement

control, for which all the obtained MESs can be made equivalent to the Bell state by LOCC operation.

systems to clarify the influence of external interactions on the preparation of MES.




Figure 8: The time responses of $E_{GC}(t)$ and $E_{GME}(t)$ and their control magnitudes $u_{GC}(t)$ and $u_{GME}(t)$ starting from two initial states. Both $E_{GC}(t)$ and $E_{GME}(t)$ converge to the theoretical maximum equal to 1, with the former converging faster than the latter.

VIII. CONCLUSION

By constructing Lyapunov function from an entanglement measure $E(\rho)$, this paper proposes a Lyapunov control design to drive all the initial states of the system to the LaSalle's invariant set, which is composed of all the MESs maximizing the entanglement measure $E(\rho)$. The advantage of this innovative method for generating MES is that it is not necessary to know the form of MES in advance, and all the possible MESs can be generated through one control design. This method of preparing MES is not limited by the number of entangled particles, as long as the entanglement measure $E(\rho)$ used can exactly describe the degree of entanglement of the quantum state ρ . Here we only verify the feasibility of the proposed new idea, and further in-depth investigations are needed to make the method more complete. Further analysis of the LaSalle's invariant set, for example, will help to understand the general structure of the generated MES, especially for multipartite systems. The illustrated examples here only consider the simplest structure of Lyapunov entanglement control, and further improvement of Lyapunov control law will help to increase the convergence speed of MES. Another topic worth discussing is the application of this method to open quantum

REFERENCES

- [1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, MA, 2000.
- [2] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, W. K. Wootters, "Teleporting an Unknown Quantum State via Dual Classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen Channels," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* vol. 70, pp. 1895-1899, Mar. 1993.
- [3] G. Gordon, G. Rigolin, "Generalized teleportation protocol," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 73, 042309, Apr. 2006.
- [4] A. K. Ekert, "Quantum Cryptography Based on Bell's Theorem," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 67, pp. 661-663, Apr. 1991.
- [5] J. T. Barreiro, T. C. Wei, and P. G. Kwiat, "Beating the channel capacity limit for linear photonic superdense coding," *Nature Physics*, vol. 4, pp. 282-286, Mar. 2008.
- [6] A. D. Zhu, Y. Xia, Q. B. Fan, and S. Zhang, "Secure direct communication based on secret transmitting order of particles," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 73, 022338, Feb. 2006.
- [7] Y. Xia, and H. S. Song, "Controlled quantum secure direct communication using a non-symmetric quantum channel with quantum superdense coding," *Phys. Lett. A*, vol. 364, pp. 117-122, Apr. 2007.
- [8] N. Gisin, S. Massar, "Optimal Quantum Cloning Machines," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 79, pp. 2153-2156, Sep. 1997.
- [9] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, "Quantum entanglement," *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, vol. 81, pp. 865-942, June 2009.
- [10] D. Schlingemann and R. F. Werner, "Quantum error-correcting codes associated with graphs," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 65, 012308, Dec. 2001.
- [11] G. Gour and N. R. Wallach, "Entanglement of subspaces and error-correcting codes," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 76, 042309, Oct. 2007.
- [12] C. Spee, J. I. de Vicente, and B. Kraus, "The maximally entangled set of 4-qubit states," *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, vol. 57, 052201, May 2016.
- [13] S. Mancini, and S. Bose, "Engineering an interaction and entanglement between distant atoms," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 70, 022307, Aug. 2004.
- [14] S. Mancini, J. Wang, "Towards feedback control of entanglement," *The European Physical Journal D*, vol. 32, pp. 257-260, Feb. 2005.
- [15] W. Yang, and J. Sun, "One Lyapunov control for quantum systems and its application to entanglement generation," *Physics Letters A*, vol. 377, pp. 851-854, May 2013.
- [16] F. Yang and S. Cong, "Preparation of entanglement states in a two-spin system by Lyapunov-based method," *Journal of Systems Science and Complexity*, vol. 25, pp. 451-462, Jun. 2012.
- [17] X. T. Wang and S. G. Schirmer, "Entanglement generation between distant atoms by Lyapunov control," *Physical Review A*, vol. 80, 042305, Oct. 2009.
- [18] C. S. Yu, X. X. Yi, H. S. Song, and D. Mei, "Robust preparation of Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger and W states of three distant atoms," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 75, 044301, Apr. 2007.
- [19] X. B. Zou, K. Pahlke, and W. Mathis, "Conditional generation of the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger state of four distant atoms via cavity decay," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 68, 024302, Aug. 2003.
- [20] M. Enríquez, I. Wintrowicz and K. Życzkowski, "Maximally Entangled Multipartite States: A Brief Survey," *Journal of Physics, Conference Series* 698, 012003, Oct. 2016.
- [21] V. Coffman, J. Kundu, and W. K. Wootters, "Distributed entanglement," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 61 052306, Apr. 2000.
- [22] H. J. Briegel, and R. Raussendorf, "Persistent entanglement in arrays of interacting particles," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 86, pp. 910-913, Jan. 2001.
- [23] S. Cong and F. F. Meng, "A Survey of Quantum Lyapunov Control Methods," *The Scientific World Journal*, vol. 2013, 967529, May, 2013.
- [24] M. Mirrahimi, P. Rouchon, and G. Turinici, "Lyapunov control of bilinear Schrödinger equations," *Automatica*, vol. 41, pp. 1987-1994, Nov. 2005.
- [25] S. Kuang, S. Cong, and Y. Lou, "Population control of quantum states based on invariant subsets under a diagonal Lyapunov function," *IEEE Xplore*, pp. 2486-2491, Dec. 2009.
- [26] X. Wang and S. G. Schirmer, "Analysis of Lyapunov method for control of quantum states," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 55, pp. 2259-2270, Oct. 2010.
- [27] X. Wang and S. Schirmer, "Analysis of effectiveness of Lyapunov control for non-generic quantum states," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 55, pp. 1406-1411, Jun. 2010.

- [28] K. Beauchard, J. M. Coron, M. Mirrahimi, and P. Rouchon, "Implicit Lyapunov control of finite dimensional Schrödinger equations," *Systems Control Letters*, vol. 56, pp. 388–395, May 2007.
- [29] S. Zhao, H. Lin, J. Sun, and Z. Xue, "An implicit Lyapunov control for finite-dimensional closed quantum systems," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 22, pp. 1212–1228, May 2011.
- [30] J. Sharifi and H. Momeni, "Lyapunov control of squeezed noise quantum trajectory," *Physics Letters A*, vol. 375, pp. 522–528, Jan. 2011.
- [31] X. X. Yi, X. L. Huang, C. F. Wu, and C. H. Oh, "Driving quantum systems into decoherence-free subspaces by Lyapunov control," *Physical Review A*, vol. 80, 052316, Nov. 2009.
- [32] W. Wang, L. C. Wang, and X. X. Yi, "Lyapunov control on quantum open systems in decoherence-free subspaces," *Physical Review A*, vol. 82, 034308, Sep. 2010.
- [33] S. Cong and F. Yang, "Control of quantum states in decoherence-free subspaces," *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, vol. 46, 075305, Feb. 2013.
- [34] Du Ran, Zhi-Cheng Shi, Jie Song, and Yan Xia, "Speeding up adiabatic passage by adding Lyapunov control," *Physical Review A*, vol. 96, 033803, Sep. 2017.
- [35] X. Guan, S. Kuang, X. Lu, and J. Yan, "Lyapunov Control of High-Dimensional Closed Quantum Systems Based on Particle Swarm Optimization," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 49765–49774, Mar. 2020.
- [36] W. K. Wootters, "Entanglement of formation of an arbitrary state of two qubits," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 80, pp. 2245–2248, Mar. 1998.
- [37] M. A. Nielsen, "Conditions for a class of entanglement transformations," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 83, pp. 436–439, Jul. 1999.
- [38] M. Plenio and S. Virmani, "An introduction to entanglement measures," *Quantum Information and Computation*, vol. 7, pp. 1–51, 01 2007.
- [39] G. Vidal, "Entanglement monotones," *Journal of Modern Optics*, vol. 47, pp. 355–376, 02 2000.
- [40] J. Preskill, "Lecture notes for physics 219: Quantum computation," Jan. 1999.
- [41] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, "Quantum entanglement," *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, vol. 81, pp. 865–942, Jun. 2009.
- [42] K. Chen, S. Albeverio, and S.-M. Fei, "Entanglement of formation of bipartite quantum states," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 95, Nov. 2005.
- [43] S. Ishizaka and T. Hiroshima, "Maximally entangled mixed states under nonlocal unitary operations in two qubits," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 62, Jul. 2000.
- [44] M. Li, S. M. Fei, and Z. X. Wang, "A lower bound of concurrence for multipartite quantum states," *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, vol. 42, p. 145303, 03 2009.
- [45] Z.-H. Ma, Z.-H. Chen, J.-L. Chen, C. Spengler, A. Gabriel, and M. Huber, "Measure of genuine multipartite entanglement with computable lower bounds," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 83, Jun. 2011.
- [46] Z.-H. Chen, Z.-H. Ma, J.-L. Chen, and S. Severini, "Improved lower bounds on genuine-multipartite-entanglement concurrence," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 85, Jun. 2012.