

A class of optimal positive maps in M_n

Anindita Bera, Gniewomir Sarbicki and Dariusz Chruściński
Institute of Physics, Faculty of Physics, Astronomy and Informatics
Nicolaus Copernicus University, Grudziądzka 5/7, 87-100 Toruń, Poland

It is proven that a certain class of positive maps in the matrix algebra M_n consists of optimal maps, i.e. maps from which one cannot subtract any completely positive map without losing positivity. This class provides a generalization of a seminal Choi positive map in M_3 .

I. INTRODUCTION

Let M_n denote a matrix algebra of $n \times n$ matrices over the complex field \mathbb{C} . For $X \in M_n$, denote by X^\dagger the Hermitian conjugation and by \bar{z} a complex conjugation of $z \in \mathbb{C}$. For $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^n$, we denote by $\langle x, y \rangle$ the canonical scalar product in \mathbb{C}^n , i.e. $\langle x, y \rangle = x^\dagger y$.

A linear map $\Phi : M_n \rightarrow M_m$ is called positive if $\Phi(X) \geq 0$ for $X \geq 0$ [1–8]. Equivalently, Φ is positive if $\Phi(xx^\dagger) \geq 0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$. Positive maps from M_n to M_m form a convex cone $\mathcal{P}_{n,m}$ and the structure of $\mathcal{P}_{n,m}$ in spite of the considerable effort is still rather poorly understood (for some recent works see [9–17]). Positive maps play an important role both in physics and mathematics providing generalization of $*$ -homomorphisms, Jordan homomorphisms and conditional expectations. Moreover, it provides a powerful tool for characterizing quantum entanglement [18] and hence plays a key role in various aspects of quantum information theory [19]. The notion of a positive map can be refined as follows [2–4]: $\Phi \in \mathcal{P}_{n,m}$ is k -positive if the extended map

$$\text{id} \otimes \Phi : M_k \otimes M_n \rightarrow M_k \otimes M_m, \quad (1)$$

is positive (cf. the recent paper [20]). Finally, Φ is completely positive (CP) if it is k -positive for all k . Actually, $\min\{n, m\}$ -positivity already guarantees CP. A linear positive map $\Phi : M_n \rightarrow M_m$ is called decomposable if

$$\Phi = \Phi_1 + \Phi_2 \circ T, \quad (2)$$

where Φ_1 and Φ_2 are completely positive, and T denotes transposition in M_n . It was proved by Woronowicz [21] that cones $\mathcal{P}_{2,2}$, $\mathcal{P}_{2,3}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{3,2}$ consist of decomposable maps only. A first example of a non-decomposable map in $\mathcal{P}_{3,3}$ was provided by Choi [22–25]

$$\Phi(X) = \begin{bmatrix} x_{00} + x_{11} & -x_{01} & -x_{02} \\ -x_{10} & x_{11} + x_{22} & -x_{12} \\ -x_{20} & -x_{21} & x_{22} + x_{00} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

with $X = (x_{ij}) \in M_3$. Interestingly Choi map turns out to be extremal in $\mathcal{P}_{3,3}$ (cf. also [26]). In this paper, we analyze another property of positive maps called optimality. Recall that $\mathcal{P}_{n,m}$ contains a convex cone $\mathcal{CP}_{n,m}$ of completely positive maps. Now, a map $\Phi \in \mathcal{P}_{n,m}$ is called optimal if for any map $\Psi \in \mathcal{CP}_{n,m}$ the map $\Phi - \Psi$ is no longer positive, i.e. does not belong to $\mathcal{P}_{n,m}$. This notion was introduced in mathematical physics in [27] in connection to quantum entanglement. It is clear that optimality is less restrictive than extremality. Any extremal map is optimal but the converse needs not be true [12, 14]. A simple example is provided by so-called reduction map in $\mathcal{P}_{n,n}$

$$R_n(X) = \mathbf{I}_n \text{Tr } X - X, \quad (4)$$

where \mathbf{I}_n stands for the identity matrix in M_n . It is well known [12, 14] that R_n is optimal for all $n \geq 2$ but it is extremal for $n = 2$ only. Authors of [27] provided the following sufficient condition for optimality.

Theorem 1. *Let $\Phi \in \mathcal{P}_{n,m}$. Consider a family of product vectors $x_i \otimes y_i \in \mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^m$ such that*

$$\langle y_i, \Phi(\bar{x}_i \bar{x}_i^\dagger) y_i \rangle = 0. \quad (5)$$

If $\{x_i \otimes y_i\}$ span $\mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^m$, then Φ is optimal.

Maps possessing a full spanning set $\{x_i \otimes y_i\}$ satisfying (5) are said to have *spanning property* [27]. Spanning property is therefore sufficient for optimality. However, there exist optimal maps without spanning property [28–31]. Again the Choi map serves as an example since there exists only 7 linearly independent product vectors $\{x_i \otimes y_i\}$ and the full spanning requires in this case 9 vectors [28, 29].

In this paper, we analyze optimality of a large class of positive maps in $\mathcal{P}_{n,n}$ which provides a generalization of the Choi map from $\mathcal{P}_{3,3}$. It is proven that maps in a particular subclass is optimal (cf. Theorem 3). Interestingly, these maps do not possess a spanning property (cf. Theorem 2). It is conjectured how to optimize maps outside this special subclass.

II. CLASS OF MAPS

In this section, we study a class of positive maps in $\mathcal{P}_{n,n}$ being a generalization of the Choi map (3). Let $\varepsilon : M_n \rightarrow M_n$ be the canonical projection of M_n to the diagonal part

$$\varepsilon(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \text{Tr}[X e_{ii}] e_{ii}, \quad (6)$$

where e_{ij} denotes the matrix units in M_n . Let $\{e_0, e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}\}$ be the canonical orthonormal basis in \mathbb{C}^n and let σ be a permutation defined by

$$\sigma e_i = e_{i+1}, \quad (\text{mod } n), \quad (7)$$

for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$. The following maps $\tau_{n,k} : M_n \rightarrow M_n$

$$\tau_{n,k}(X) = (n-k)\varepsilon(X) + \sum_{i=1}^k \varepsilon(\sigma^i X \sigma^{\dagger i}) - X, \quad X \in M_n, \quad (8)$$

for $k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$, were proved to be positive [32–34]. From now on, the summation in the indices of matrices are considered to be mod n . It is easy to see that $\tau_{n,0}$ is completely positive and $\tau_{n,n-1}$ is nothing but the reduction map (4) which is completely copositive (i.e. R_n composed with transposition is completely positive). It has been shown [33] that the map $\tau_{n,k}$ is atomic and non-decomposable for $n \geq 3$ and $k = 1, 2, \dots, n-2$. Recall, that a map is said to be an atomic map if it cannot be decomposed into a sum of a 2-positive and 2-copositive maps.

Let us write the map $\tau_{n,k}(X)$ explicitly in the following matrix form

$$[\tau_{n,k}(X)]_{ii} = (n-k-1)x_{ii} + x_{i+1,i+1} + \dots + x_{i+k,i+k}, \quad [\tau_{n,k}(X)]_{ij} = -x_{ij}, \quad (i \neq j). \quad (9)$$

Formula (9) reduces to (3) for $n = 3$ and $k = 1$. Interestingly, the family of maps (8) satisfies the following covariance property

$$U \tau_{n,k}(X) U^\dagger = \tau_{n,k}(U X U^\dagger), \quad (10)$$

where $U \in M_n$ is an arbitrary diagonal unitary matrix. Hence $\tau_{n,k}$ is covariant w.r.t. maximal commutative subgroup of the special unitary group $SU(n)$. Covariant maps were recently analyzed in [35–37].

III. SPANNING PROPERTY FOR THE MAPS $\tau_{n,k}$

Denote by Σ_n a linear subspace of $\mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$ spanned by vectors $x \otimes \bar{x}$, where $x = (e^{it_0}, \dots, e^{it_{n-1}})^T$ with real phases t_k .

Lemma 1. Any vector $y \in \mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$ orthogonal to Σ_n has the following form

$$y = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} y_k e_k \otimes e_k, \quad (11)$$

with $\sum_k y_k = 0$.

It is clear that the subspace Σ_n^\perp of such y 's is $(n-1)$ -dimensional and hence $\dim \Sigma_n = n^2 - n + 1$.

Lemma 2. If $x = (e^{it_0}, \dots, e^{it_{n-1}})^T$ with real t_k , then

$$\overline{x}^\dagger \tau_{n,k}(\overline{x}^\dagger) \overline{x} = 0. \quad (12)$$

One easily checks (12) by direct calculation. It is, therefore, clear that one has at least $n^2 - n + 1$ vectors $x \otimes y$ satisfying (5). Now, we show that actually there are no more linearly independent vectors with this property apart from the reduction map [38]. Particularly, in the below theorem, we now show that if $k < n-1$, then the map $\tau_{n,k}$ does not have a spanning property.

Theorem 2. Let $k < n-1$. If

$$y^\dagger \tau_{n,k}(\overline{xy}^\dagger) y = 0, \quad (13)$$

then $x \otimes y \in \Sigma_n$.

Proof: note that if $\{x \otimes y\}$ satisfies (13), then $y \in \ker\{\tau_{n,k}(\overline{xy}^\dagger)\} \subset \mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$. The kernel is non-trivial if and only if

$$\det[\tau_{n,k}(\overline{xy}^\dagger)] = 0. \quad (14)$$

The matrix $\tau_{n,k}(\overline{xy}^\dagger)$ has the following form

$$\tau_{n,k}(\overline{xy}^\dagger) = A - B, \quad (15)$$

where

$$A = \text{Diag}[D_0, D_1, \dots, D_{n-1}], \quad (16)$$

with

$$D_i = (n-k)X_i + X_{i+1} + \dots + X_{i+k}, \quad X_i := |x_i|^2, \quad (17)$$

and $B = \overline{xy}^\dagger$. Let us represent the matrices A and B via the corresponding columns

$$A = [A_0 \mid A_1 \mid \dots \mid A_{n-1}], \quad B = [B_0 \mid B_1 \mid \dots \mid B_{n-1}].$$

Note that the determinant is a multilinear function in each column, hence one obtains 2^n summands. Simple algebra leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \det[\tau_{n,k}(\overline{xy}^\dagger)] &= \det[A_0 - B_0 \mid A_1 - B_1 \mid \dots \mid A_{n-1} - B_{n-1}] \\ &= \det[A_0 \mid A_1 \mid \dots \mid A_{n-1}] - \det[B_0 \mid A_1 \mid A_2 \mid \dots \mid A_{n-1}] - \dots - \det[A_0 \mid A_1 \mid \dots \mid A_{n-2} \mid B_{n-1}] \\ &= \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} D_i - \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} X_j \prod_{\substack{i=0 \\ i \neq j}}^{n-1} D_i. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Case 1 ($\det A > 0$): If the determinant $\det A = \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} D_i > 0$, i.e.

$$D_i = (n-k)X_i + X_{i+1} + \dots + X_{i+k} > 0, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (19)$$

then formula (18) implies

$$\det [\tau_{n,k}(\overline{xx}^\dagger)] = \det A \left(1 - \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{X_j}{D_j} \right). \quad (20)$$

Assuming $D_i > 0$ for all i , let us define a function

$$f_{n,k}(X_0, \dots, X_{n-1}) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{X_i}{D_i} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{X_i}{(n-k)X_i + X_{i+1} + \dots + X_{i+k}}. \quad (21)$$

Actually, positivity of $\tau_{n,k}$ implies [34] that $f_{n,k} \leq 1$. One finds that $\det [\tau_{n,k}(\overline{xx}^\dagger)] = 0$ if and only if

$$f_{n,k}(X_0, \dots, X_{n-1}) = 1. \quad (22)$$

To find the maximum of the function $f_{n,k}$ in the region (X_0, \dots, X_{n-1}) where $D_i > 0$, one has to analyze the property of the corresponding Hessian matrix. One finds that

$$\frac{\partial^2 f_{n,k}(X_0, \dots, X_{n-1})}{\partial X_i \partial X_j} = -\hat{S}_{ij}. \quad (23)$$

The matrix $\hat{S} = [\hat{S}_{ij}]$ is defined as follows

$$\hat{S} = s'(S + S^T) - 2S^T S, \quad (24)$$

where the matrix S is actually the matrix A defined in (16), and $s' > 0$ is the common eigenvalue of S and S^T corresponding to the eigenvector $\mathbb{1} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$. Then the function $f_{n,k}(X_0, \dots, X_{n-1})$ has a unique extremum attained at $X_0 = X_1 = \dots = X_{n-1}$. This is due to the following lemma mentioned by Yamagami [34]:

Lemma 3. *Let $S = [S_{ij}]$ be an invertible $n \times n$ matrix with non-negative real entries such that S and its transpose S^T admit $\mathbb{1} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$ as an eigenvector corresponding to the common eigenvalue $s' > 0$. If the matrix \hat{S} defined in (24) is positive semidefinite and its kernel is spanned by $\mathbb{1} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$, then $\mathbb{1}$ is a unique (up to scalar factor) point that gives a local maximum in the region (X_0, \dots, X_{n-1}) where $D_i > 0$, of the function $f_{n,k}$ defined in Eq. (21).*

Due to Lemma 6 in [34], the matrix \hat{S} is positive semidefinite. Therefore, in the region (X_0, \dots, X_{n-1}) where $D_i > 0$, the function $f_{n,k}(X_0, \dots, X_{n-1}) = 1$ if and only if

$$X_0 = X_1 = \dots = X_{n-1},$$

and hence (up to a factor) one has $x = (e^{it_0}, \dots, e^{it_{n-1}})$. Note, that for such vector, $\tau_{n,k}(\overline{xx}^\dagger) = \|x\|^2 \mathbf{I}_n - \overline{xx}^\dagger$. Hence, $[\tau_{n,k}(\overline{xx}^\dagger)]y = 0$ if and only if $y = \overline{x}$. This proves that $x \otimes y = x \otimes \overline{x} \in \Sigma_n$.

Case 2 ($\det A = 0$): Consider now the complementary region, i.e. when there exists at least one i such that $D_i = 0$. Suppose, for example, $D_0 = 0$ and $D_j > 0$ for $j > 0$. It implies

$$X_0 = X_1 = \dots = X_k = 0. \quad (25)$$

One finds the following block diagonal structure

$$\tau_{n,k}(\overline{xx}^\dagger) = \begin{bmatrix} A' & & \\ & A'' & \\ & & A''' \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} B' & & \\ & B'' & \\ & & B''' \end{bmatrix}. \quad (26)$$

First 1×1 blocks A' and B' vanish. The second $k \times k$ block A'' has the following form:

$$A'' = \text{Diag}[X_{k+1}, X_{k+1} + X_{k+2}, \dots, X_{k+1} + \dots + X_{2k}],$$

whereas the other $k \times k$ block $B'' = 0$. The remaining $(n - k - 1) \times (n - k - 1)$ blocks A''' and B''' have the following form

$$A''' = \text{Diag}\left[(n - k)X_{k+1} + X_{k+2} + \dots + X_{2k+1}, \dots, (n - k)X_{n-k} + X_{n-k+1} + \dots + X_{n-1}, \dots, (n - k)X_{n-2} + X_{n-1}, (n - k)X_{n-1}\right], \quad (27)$$

and

$$B''' = \begin{bmatrix} X_{k+1} & \bar{x}_{k+1}x_{k+2} & \dots & \dots & \bar{x}_{k+1}x_{n-1} \\ \bar{x}_{k+2}x_{k+1} & X_{k+2} & \bar{x}_{k+2}x_{k+3} & \dots & \bar{x}_{k+2}x_{n-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \bar{x}_{n-1}x_{k+1} & \bar{x}_{n-1}x_{k+2} & \dots & \dots & X_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (28)$$

Now, since $A' = B' = 0$, one has $y = [1, 0, 0, \dots, 0]^T \in \ker \tau_{n,k}(\bar{x}\bar{x}^\dagger)$ and additional spanning vectors appear. Observe however, that $x \otimes y \in \Sigma_n$, since $x \in \text{span}\{e_{k+1}, \dots, e_{n-1}\}$ and $y = e_0$ and hence $x \otimes y \perp e_i \otimes e_i$ for all $i = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$.

Now, the second block $A'' - B'' = A''$ is positive definite and provides no additional spanning vectors. Finally, the determinant of the third block, $A''' - B'''$ reads

$$\det[\tau_{n,k}(\bar{x}\bar{x}^\dagger)] = 1 - \frac{X_{k+1}}{(n - k)X_{k+1} + X_{k+2} + \dots + X_{2k+1}} - \dots - \frac{X_{n-k}}{(n - k)X_{n-k} + X_{n-k+1} + \dots + X_{n-1}} - \dots - \frac{X_{n-2}}{(n - k)X_{n-2} + X_{n-1}} - \frac{X_{n-1}}{(n - k)X_{n-1}}. \quad (29)$$

It is bounded from below by the following quantity

$$\det[\tau_{n,k}(\bar{x}\bar{x}^\dagger)] \geq 1 - \frac{X_{k+1}}{(n - k)X_{k+1}} - \dots - \frac{X_{n-k}}{(n - k)X_{n-k}} - \dots - \frac{X_{n-2}}{(n - k)X_{n-2}} - \frac{X_{n-1}}{(n - k)X_{n-1}} \geq 1 - \frac{n - k - 1}{n - k} > 0, \quad (30)$$

where we assumed that $k < n - 1$. Hence the matrix $A''' - B'''$ is positive definite which implies the trivial kernel and no additional spanning vectors.

If more diagonal elements vanish, the block $A' - B'$ will be bigger, but still the spanning vectors it provides belong to Σ_n . The blocks $A'' - B''$ and $A''' - B'''$ are again non singular and provide no spanning vectors. Therefore we conclude that the total number of linearly independent spanning vectors for the map $\tau_{n,k}$ is $n^2 - n + 1$ and all of them belong to Σ_n . \square

It should be stressed that the very condition $k < n - 1$ is essential for the proof, that is, the theorem is not true for the reduction map $R_n = \tau_{n,n-1}$ which has the spanning property [38]. Hence, apart R_n all maps $\tau_{n,k}$ do not have the spanning property. For example, the original Choi map $\tau_{3,1}$ allows only 7 linearly independent vectors satisfying (5) in $\mathbb{C}^3 \otimes \mathbb{C}^3$ [28, 29].

IV. OPTIMALITY OF THE MAP $\tau_{n,k}$

Maps $\tau_{n,k}$ do not have a spanning property which is sufficient for optimality [27]. Interestingly, there exists a special subclass which is nevertheless optimal. Let us denote the greatest common divisor of n and k by $\gcd(n, k)$. The main result of this section consists in the following

Theorem 3. *If $\gcd(n, k) = 1$, then $\tau_{n,k}$ is optimal.*

Note that if $\tau_{n,k}$ is not optimal, then one can always subtract some CP map Λ such that $\tau_{n,k} - \Lambda$ is still positive. Since $\bar{x}^\dagger \tau_{n,k}(\bar{x} \bar{x}^\dagger) \bar{x} = 0$ for all $x \otimes \bar{x} \in \Sigma_n$, then the CP map Λ needs to satisfy: $\bar{x}^\dagger \Lambda(\bar{x} \bar{x}^\dagger) \bar{x} = 0$ for all $x \otimes \bar{x} \in \Sigma_n$.

Proposition 1. *Let $\Lambda : M_n \rightarrow M_n$ be a CP map. One has*

$$\bar{x}^\dagger \Lambda(\bar{x} \bar{x}^\dagger) \bar{x} = 0, \quad (31)$$

for all $x \otimes \bar{x} \in \Sigma_n$ if and only if

$$\Lambda(X) = \sum_{k,l=0}^{n-1} L_{kl} e_{kk} X e_{ll} \quad (32)$$

together with $\sum_{k,l} L_{kl} = 0$, that is, $\Lambda(X) = L \circ X$ it is a Hadamard product of X with a positive semi-definite matrix $[L_{kl}]$.

Proof: Consider an arbitrary CP map represented as follows [40]

$$\Lambda(X) = \sum_{i,j,k,l} C_{ij,kl} e_{ij} X e_{kl}^\dagger, \quad (33)$$

with positive semi-definite matrix $[C_{ij,kl}] \in M_n \otimes M_n$. Actually, $C_{ij,kl}$ is the Choi matrix of the map Λ [40]. Taking $x = (e^{it_0}, \dots, e^{it_{n-1}})^T$ with real t_k , one finds

$$\Lambda(\bar{x} \bar{x}^\dagger) = \sum_{i,j,k,l} C_{ij,kl} e^{-i(t_j - t_l)} e_{ik}, \quad (34)$$

and hence

$$\bar{x}^\dagger \Lambda(\bar{x} \bar{x}^\dagger) \bar{x} = \sum_{i,j,k,l} e^{i(t_i - t_j)} C_{ij,kl} e^{-i(t_k - t_l)}. \quad (35)$$

Now, in order to have $\bar{x}^\dagger \Lambda(\bar{x} \bar{x}^\dagger) \bar{x} = 0$ for all possible t_k , one has

$$C_{ij,kl} = L_{ik} \delta_{ij} \delta_{kl} + a_{ij} \delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} (1 - \delta_{ij}), \quad (36)$$

The remaining entries of $C_{ij,kl}$ are multiplied by a non-vanishing arbitrary phase hence has to vanish and consequently, we have the following equation

$$\bar{x}^\dagger \Lambda(\bar{x} \bar{x}^\dagger) \bar{x} = \sum_{i,k} L_{ik} + \sum_{i \neq j} a_{ij}, \quad (37)$$

and the condition (31) implies $\sum_{i,k} L_{ik} + \sum_{i \neq j} a_{ij} = 0$.

On the other hand, a_{ij} are non-negative as diagonal elements of C and the matrix L , being a diagonal block of C is positive semi-definite, in particular $\mathbb{1}^\dagger L \mathbb{1} = \sum_{i,k} L_{ik} \geq 0$. These implies $\sum_{i,k} L_{ik} = 0$ and $\forall i \neq j, a_{ij} = 0$. In this way we obtain that the map Λ is of the form (32) and Λ is a completely positive map if and only if the matrix $L = [L_{kl}]$ is positive semi-definite [3, 39].

□

Proof of the Theorem 3: If the map $\tau_{n,k}$ is not optimal one can always subtract a CP map satisfying the properties of Proposition 1 with a rank one positive matrix $C = \alpha \alpha^\dagger$ such that

$$\tau_{n,k}^{(\alpha)}(X) := \tau_{n,k}(X) - \alpha \alpha^\dagger \circ X \geq 0, \quad (38)$$

for all $X \geq 0$, where $\sum_i \alpha_i = 0$. Consider now $X = uu^\dagger$, where

$$u = (1, s, s^2, \dots, s^{n-k-1}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_k)^T, \quad (39)$$

and $s \in \mathbb{R}$. One finds

$$\tau_{n,k}^{(\alpha)}(X) = \begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}, \quad (40)$$

where $B \in M_k$ is evidently positive semi-definite, and $A \in M_{n-k}$ is defined as follows

$$A = \sum_{i=0}^{n-k-1} \left[(n-k)s^{2i} + \sum_{j=i+1}^{\min\{i+k, n-k-1\}} s^{2j} \right] e_{ii} - P(X + \alpha\alpha^\dagger \circ X)P, \quad (41)$$

with $P : M_n \rightarrow M_{n-k}$, canonical embedding.

It can be written as follows

$$A = \text{Diag}[1, s, s^2, \dots, s^{n-k-1}] \tilde{A} \text{Diag}[1, s, s^2, \dots, s^{n-k-1}], \quad (42)$$

where

$$\tilde{A} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-k-1} \left[(n-k) + \sum_{j=i+1}^{\min\{i+k, n-k-1\}} s^{2(j-i)} \right] e_{ii} - \mathbb{J}_{n-k} - \tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\alpha}^\dagger, \quad (43)$$

$\tilde{\alpha} = P\alpha$, and $\mathbb{J}_m \in M_m$ is defined via $(\mathbb{J}_m)_{kl} = 1$. Clearly, $A \geq 0$ if and only if $\tilde{A} \geq 0$. If the map $\tau_{n,k}^{(\alpha)}$ is positive, then \tilde{A} has to be positive for all s , hence it is positive in the limit $s \rightarrow 0$

$$(n-k)\mathbb{I}_{n-k} - \mathbb{J}_{n-k} - \tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\alpha}^\dagger \geq 0. \quad (44)$$

Note that the matrix $(n-k)\mathbb{I}_{n-k} - \mathbb{J}_{n-k}$ is positive semi-definite and

$$[(n-k)\mathbb{I}_{n-k} - \mathbb{J}_{n-k}]\beta = 0, \quad (45)$$

with $\beta = (1, \dots, 1)^T$. Hence, a necessary condition for positivity of \tilde{A} is orthogonality of β and $\tilde{\alpha}$, that is,

$$\beta^\dagger \tilde{\alpha} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-k-1} \alpha_i = 0. \quad (46)$$

Similar analysis may be performed for a vector $\sigma^j u$ (with u defined in (39)). It implies

$$\sum_{i=j}^{n+j-k-1} \alpha_i = 0, \quad (47)$$

for arbitrary $j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$. Hence, the vector $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^n$ has to satisfy the following condition

$$\mathbf{M}\alpha = 0, \quad (48)$$

where \mathbf{M} is the following circulant matrix

$$\mathbf{M} = \begin{bmatrix} m_0 & m_1 & \dots & m_{n-1} \\ m_{n-1} & m_0 & \dots & m_{n-2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ m_1 & m_2 & \dots & m_0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (49)$$

with

$$m_0 = \dots = m_{n-k-1} = 1, \quad m_{n-k} = \dots = m_{n-1} = 0.$$

It is, therefore, clear that α , for which $\tau_{n,k}^\alpha$ in (38) is positive, defines an eigenvector of \mathbf{M} to zero eigenvalue. The eigenvalues of the circulant matrix \mathbf{M} read as follows

$$\lambda_j = 1 + \omega^j + \omega^{2j} + \dots + \omega^{(n-k-1)j}, \quad (50)$$

for $j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$, with $\omega = e^{2\pi i/n}$. Now, using

$$1 + \omega^j + \omega^{2j} + \dots + \omega^{(n-1)j} = 0, \quad (51)$$

one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_j &= 1 + \omega^j + \omega^{2j} + \dots + \omega^{(n-k-1)j} = -\left(\omega^{(n-k)j} + \omega^{(n-k+1)j} + \dots + \omega^{(n-1)j}\right) \\ &= -\omega^{(n-1)j} \left(1 + (1/\omega)^j + \dots + (1/\omega)^{(k-1)j}\right) =: -\omega^{(n-1)j} \cdot g_j. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Hence $\lambda_j = 0$ if and only if $g_j = 0$. Assuming that $j \neq 0$ one has that $g_j = 0$ if and only if

$$\left((1/\omega)^j - 1\right)g_j = (1/\omega)^{kj} - 1 = 0. \quad (53)$$

Observe that $\lambda_0 = n - k$. If $j \neq 0$, we have the following condition

$$k \cdot j = 0, \quad (\text{mod } n). \quad (54)$$

The above linear congruence has exactly $\gcd(n, k)$ solutions for a number ‘ j ’. In particular, there are $\gcd(n, k) - 1$ non-zero solutions. It implies that, if n and k are relatively prime, then the matrix \mathbf{M} in Eq. (48) is non-singular and there are no non-zero solutions of Eq. (48). Hence, there does not exist a vector $\alpha \neq 0$ such that the map $\tau_{n,k}^{(\alpha)}(X) = \tau_{n,k}(X) - \alpha\alpha^\dagger \circ X$ remains positive. It proves, therefore, that the map $\tau_{n,k}$ is optimal whenever $\gcd(n, k) = 1$. \square

In the appendix A, we show the optimality for three simple examples: $\tau_{3,1}$, $\tau_{4,3}$ and $\tau_{5,3}$.

Corollary 1. *Note that $\gcd(n, 1) = 1$ for any n . Hence $\tau_{n,1}$ is always optimal. Choi map $\tau_{3,1}$ serves as an example. If $k = n - 2$ and n is odd, then $\gcd(n, n - 2) = 1$ and hence $\tau_{n,n-2}$ is optimal. In particular, it applies for the original Choi map $\tau_{3,1}$. Moreover, $\gcd(n, n - 1) = 1$ for any n and hence $\tau_{n,n-1}$ is always optimal. Since $\tau_{n,n-1} = R_n$ (reduction map) this result recovers well known fact that R_n is optimal for any $n \geq 2$. It is extremal only for $n = 2$.*

V. BEYOND OPTIMALITY: $\gcd(n, k) \geq 2$

In general, if $d = \gcd(n, k)$, then the linear congruence (54) has exactly $d - 1$ non-zero solutions:

$$j = r \cdot (n/d) \pmod{n}, \quad r = 1, 2, \dots, d - 1, \quad (55)$$

and exactly $d - 1$ eigenvalues λ_j ’s are equal to zero. The corresponding eigenvectors read

$$v_r = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(1, \omega^{\frac{n}{d}r}, (\omega^{\frac{n}{d}r})^2, \dots, (\omega^{\frac{n}{d}r})^{n-1}\right)^T, \quad r = 1, 2, \dots, d - 1. \quad (56)$$

The subspace spanned by $\{v_1, \dots, v_{d-1}\}$ defines the kernel of \mathbf{M} . In this case any nontrivial solution of (48) is a linear combination of v_r . Assuming normalization $\|\alpha_r\| = 1$, one may expect that

$$\tau_{n,k}(X) - \left(a_1 \alpha_1 \alpha_1^\dagger \circ X + \dots + a_{d-1} \alpha_{d-1} \alpha_{d-1}^\dagger \circ X\right), \quad (57)$$

gives rise to an optimal positive map for a suitable choice of non-negative parameter $\{a_1, \dots, a_{d-1}\}$.

The simplest scenario corresponds to $d = \gcd(n, k) = 2$. In this case there exists a single eigenvector v_1 spanning the kernel of \mathbf{M}

$$v_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(1, \omega^{\frac{n}{d}}, (\omega^{\frac{n}{d}})^2, \dots, (\omega^{\frac{n}{d}})^{n-1} \right)^T = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(1, -1, 1, -1, \dots, 1, -1 \right)^T. \quad (58)$$

Proposition 2. *Let $n = 2p$ and $k = 2q$. If the map*

$$\tau'_{n,k}(X) = \tau_{n,k}(X) - t v_1 v_1^\dagger \circ X, \quad (59)$$

is positive, then $t \leq n - k$.

Proof: let $\mu = (1, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 1, 0)^T \in \mathbb{C}^n$, and let $X = \mu \mu^\dagger$. Consider now the $p \times p$ submatrix \mathbf{N} of $\tau'_{n,k}(X)$ consisting of even rows and columns, that is, $\mathbf{N}_{ij} = [\tau'_{n,k}(X)]_{2i, 2j}$. One easily finds

$$\mathbf{N} = (2p - q) \mathbf{I}_p - \left(1 + \frac{t}{n} \right) \mathbb{J}_p. \quad (60)$$

The eigenvalue of \mathbf{N} corresponding to the eigenvector $(1, 1, \dots, 1)^T$ reads

$$(2p - q) - p \left(1 + \frac{t}{n} \right) = \frac{1}{2} (2(p - q) - t) = \frac{1}{2} ((n - k) - t),$$

and hence $t \leq n - k$ to ensure positivity. \square

Conjecture 1. *If $\gcd(n, k) = 2$, we conjecture that*

$$\tau'_{n,k}(X) = \tau_{n,k}(X) - (n - k) v_1 v_1^\dagger \circ X, \quad (61)$$

is a positive optimal map. It is clear, that whenever $\tau'_{n,k}$ is positive it has to be optimal since there is no room for subtraction of another CP map. Our conjecture is strongly supported by the numerical analysis.

In particular, for $\gcd(4, 2) = 2$, it was proved [31] that the map

$$\tau_{4,2}(X) = \begin{bmatrix} x_{00} + x_{11} + x_{22} & -x_{01} & -x_{02} & -x_{03} \\ -x_{10} & x_{11} + x_{22} + x_{33} & -x_{12} & -x_{13} \\ -x_{20} & -x_{21} & x_{22} + x_{33} + x_{00} & -x_{23} \\ -x_{30} & -x_{31} & -x_{32} & x_{33} + x_{00} + x_{11} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (62)$$

is not optimal. However, the *corrected* map

$$\tau'_{4,2}(X) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2}x_{00} + x_{11} + x_{22} & -\frac{1}{2}x_{01} & -\frac{3}{2}x_{02} & -\frac{1}{2}x_{03} \\ -\frac{1}{2}x_{10} & \frac{1}{2}x_{11} + x_{22} + x_{33} & -\frac{1}{2}x_{12} & -\frac{3}{2}x_{13} \\ -\frac{3}{2}x_{20} & -\frac{1}{2}x_{21} & \frac{1}{2}x_{22} + x_{33} + x_{00} & -\frac{1}{2}x_{23} \\ -\frac{1}{2}x_{30} & -\frac{3}{2}x_{31} & -\frac{1}{2}x_{32} & \frac{1}{2}x_{33} + x_{00} + x_{11} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (63)$$

is positive. Proposition 2 implies

Corollary 2. *The map $\tau'_{4,2}$ is optimal.*

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, it is proved that the class of positive maps $\tau_{n,k}$ is optimal whenever $\gcd(n, k) = 1$. This class of maps provides generalization of a seminal Choi map $\tau_{3,1}$ which was proved to be extremal and hence optimal. In particular, for any n , all maps $\tau_{n,1}$ are optimal and for odd n , all maps $\tau_{n,n-2}$ are optimal. We have proved that maps $\tau_{n,k}$ do not have a spanning property (apart from the reduction map $\tau_{n,n-1}$). The optimality of maps without the spanning property is rather exceptional. Besides Choi map $\tau_{3,1}$ and $\tau_{4,2}$ (analyzed recently in [31]), we are aware of only one additional example constructed in [30].

If $\gcd(n, k) > 1$, then in general $\tau_{n,k}$ is not optimal. In particular, for $\gcd(n, k) = 2$, we have provided a conjecture which says that the map $\tau_{n,k}$ can be optimized by subtracting a CP map being a Hadamard product with $(n - k)v_1v_1^\dagger$. We have shown it for $(n, k) = (4, 2)$ scenario. For $\gcd(n, k) > 2$, the situation is more complicated since there is two-dimensional kernel of the matrix \mathbf{M} and there is more freedom to subtract CP maps.

It would be very interesting to analyze which optimal maps $\tau_{n,k}$ are also extremal. Here we propose the following

Conjecture 2. $\tau_{n,k}$ is extremal if and only if $\gcd(n, k) = 1$.

We postpone this problem for the future research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank the anonymous referee for his/her fruitful comments which helped us to improve the clarity of the paper. The work was supported by the Polish National Science Centre project No. 2018/30/A/ST2/00837.

Appendix A: Simple cases for Theorem 3

1. The map $\tau_{3,1}$

First we consider one of the simple example $\tau_{3,1}$, for $n = 3$ and $k = 1$. Due to the Definition in Eq. (8), $\tau_{3,1}$ can be expressed as

$$\tau_{3,1}(X) = \begin{bmatrix} 2x_{00} + x_{11} & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & 2x_{11} + x_{22} & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & 2x_{22} + x_{00} \end{bmatrix} - X. \quad (\text{A1})$$

Now, according to Eqs. (38) and (39), we take $X = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & s & \cdot \\ s & s^2 & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{bmatrix}$. Then

$$\tau_{3,1}^\alpha(X) = \begin{bmatrix} 2 + s^2 & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & 2s^2 & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & 1 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 1 & s & \cdot \\ s & s^2 & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{bmatrix} - \alpha\alpha^\dagger \circ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & s & \cdot \\ s & s^2 & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A & \cdot \\ \cdot & B \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where $B \in M_1$ is evidently positive semi-definite, and $A \in M_2$ is defined as follows

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 2 + s^2 & \cdot \\ \cdot & 2s^2 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 1 & s \\ s & s^2 \end{bmatrix} - \alpha\alpha^\dagger \circ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & s \\ s & s^2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cdot \\ \cdot & s \end{bmatrix} \left(2\mathbb{I}_2 + \begin{bmatrix} s^2 & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \end{bmatrix} - \mathbb{J}_2 - \tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\alpha}^\dagger \right) \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cdot \\ \cdot & s \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Now, the matrix in the middle has to be positive semi-definite for all values of s , hence also in the limit of $s \rightarrow 0$: $2\mathbb{I}_2 - \mathbb{J}_2 - \tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\alpha}^\dagger \geq 0$. The matrix $2\mathbb{I}_2 - \mathbb{J}_2$ is a projector of the orthogonal complement of one-dimensional subspace spanned by $[1, 1]$, hence $2\mathbb{I}_2 - \mathbb{J}_2 - \tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\alpha}^\dagger$ is positive-semidefinite iff $[1, 1]\tilde{\alpha} = 0 \Leftrightarrow [1, 1, 0]\alpha = 0$.

Proceeding analogously taking X to be projector on vectors $[0, 1, s]$ and $[s, 0, 1]$ we obtain a system of equations:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdot \\ \cdot & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \cdot & 1 \end{bmatrix} \alpha = 0 \implies \alpha = 0, \quad (\text{A4})$$

due to non-singularity of the system matrix. Hence no map of the type (32) can be subtracted from the original map $\tau_{3,1}$. It proves that the map $\tau_{3,1}$ is optimal.

2. The map $\tau_{4,3}$

Now we consider the map $\tau_{4,3}$ for $n = 4$ and $k = 3$ (the reduction map). From the definition, $\tau_{4,3}$ can be expressed as

$$\tau_{4,3}(X) = \begin{bmatrix} x_{00} + x_{11} + x_{22} + x_{33} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & x_{11} + x_{22} + x_{33} + x_{00} & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & x_{22} + x_{33} + x_{00} + x_{11} & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & x_{33} + x_{00} + x_{11} + x_{22} \end{bmatrix} - X. \quad (\text{A5})$$

Just like the above subsection, according to Eqs. (38) and (39), we take $X = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{bmatrix} = e_{00}$. Then

$$\tau_{4,3}^\alpha(X) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{bmatrix} - \alpha\alpha^\dagger \circ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A & \cdot \\ \cdot & B \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{A6})$$

where $B \in M_3$ is evidently positive semi-definite, and $A \in M_1$ can be written as $A = -\alpha\alpha^\dagger \circ [1]$. Therefore $-\alpha\alpha^\dagger \geq 0 \Leftrightarrow \tilde{\alpha} = 0 \Leftrightarrow [1, 0, 0, 0]\alpha = 0$. Proceeding analogously taking X to be e_{11} , e_{22} , and e_{33} , we obtain a system of equations:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 \end{bmatrix} \alpha = 0 \implies \alpha = 0, \quad (\text{A7})$$

due to non-singularity of the system matrix. Hence no map of the type (32) can be subtracted from the original map $\tau_{4,3}$. It proves that the map $\tau_{4,3}$ is optimal.

3. The map $\tau_{5,3}$

Now we consider the map $\tau_{5,3}$ for $n = 5$ and $k = 3$. From the definition, $\tau_{5,3}$ can be expressed as

$$\tau_{5,3}(X) = \begin{bmatrix} 2x_{00} + \sum_{i=1}^3 x_{ii} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & 2x_{11} + \sum_{i=2}^4 x_{ii} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & 2x_{22} + \sum_{i=3}^4 x_{ii} + x_{00} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 2x_{33} + x_{44} + \sum_{i=0}^1 x_{ii} & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 2x_{44} + \sum_{i=0}^2 x_{ii} & \cdot \end{bmatrix} - X. \quad (\text{A8})$$

according to Eqs. (38) and (39), we take $X = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & s & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ s & s^2 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{bmatrix}$. Then

$$\tau_{5,3}^\alpha(X) = \begin{bmatrix} 2 + s^2 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & 2s^2 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 + s^2 & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 + s^2 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 1 & s & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ s & s^2 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{bmatrix} - \alpha\alpha^\dagger \circ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & s & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ s & s^2 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A & \cdot \\ \cdot & B \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{A9})$$

where $B \in M_3$ is evidently positive semi-definite, and $A \in M_2$ is defined as follows

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 2 + s^2 & \cdot \\ \cdot & 2s^2 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 1 & s \\ s & s^2 \end{bmatrix} - \alpha\alpha^\dagger \circ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & s \\ s & s^2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cdot \\ \cdot & s \end{bmatrix} \left(2\mathbb{I}_2 + \begin{bmatrix} s^2 & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \end{bmatrix} - \mathbb{J}_2 - \tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\alpha}^\dagger \right) \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cdot \\ \cdot & s \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{A10})$$

Now, the matrix in the middle has to be positive semi-definite for all values of s , hence also in the limit of $s \rightarrow 0$: $2\mathbb{I}_2 - \mathbb{J}_2 - \tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\alpha}^\dagger \geq 0$. The matrix $2\mathbb{I}_2 - \mathbb{J}_2$ is a projector of the orthogonal complement of one-dimensional subspace spanned by $[1, 1]$, hence $2\mathbb{I}_2 - \mathbb{J}_2 - \tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\alpha}^\dagger$ is positive-semidefinite iff $[1, 1]\tilde{\alpha} = 0 \Leftrightarrow [1, 1, 0, 0, 0]\alpha = 0$.

Proceeding analogously taking X to be projector on vectors $[0, 1, s, 0, 0]$, $[0, 0, 1, s, 0]$, $[0, 0, 0, 1, s]$ and $[s, 0, 0, 0, 1]$ we obtain a system of equations:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & 1 & 1 & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & 1 & 1 & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 \end{bmatrix} \alpha = 0 \implies \alpha = 0, \quad (\text{A11})$$

due to non-singularity of the system matrix. Hence no map of the type (32) can be subtracted from the original map $\tau_{5,3}$. It proves that the map $\tau_{5,3}$ is optimal.

[1] E. Størmer, Positive linear maps on operator algebras, Acta Mathematica **110**, 233 (1963).

[2] E. Størmer, *Positive Linear Maps of Operator Algebras*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics (Springer, New York, 2013).

- [3] R. Bhatia, *Positive Definite Matrices*, (Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 2007).
- [4] V. Paulsen, *Completely Bounded Maps and Operator Algebras* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003).
- [5] D. E. Evans, Positive linear maps on operator algebras, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **48**, 15 (1976).
- [6] T. Takasaki and J. Tomiyama, On the geometry of positive maps in matrix algebras, *Math. Z.* **184**, 101 (1983).
- [7] J. Tomiyama, On the geometry of positive maps in matrix algebras. II, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **69**, 169 (1985).
- [8] K. Tanahashi and J. Tomiyama, Indecomposable positive maps in matrix algebras, *Canad. Math. Bull.* **31**, 308 (1988).
- [9] W. A. Majewski and M. Marciniak, On a characterization of positive maps, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **34**, 5863 (2001).
- [10] D. Chruściński and A. Kossakowski, On the structure of entanglement witnesses and new class of positive indecomposable maps, *Open Syst. Inf. Dyn.* **14**, 275 (2007).
- [11] D. Chruściński and A. Kossakowski, Spectral conditions for positive maps, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **290**, 1051 (2009).
- [12] S.-H. Kye, Facial structures for various notions of positivity and applications to the theory of entanglement, *Rev. Math. Phys.* **25**, 1330002 (2013).
- [13] K.-C. Ha and S.-H. Kye, Optimality for indecomposable entanglement witnesses, *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 034301 (2012).
- [14] D. Chruściński and G. Sarbicki, Entanglement witnesses: construction, analysis and classification, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **47**, 483001 (2014).
- [15] M. Marciniak and A. Rutkowski, Merging of positive maps: a construction of various classes of positive maps on matrix algebras, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **529**, 215 (2017).
- [16] A. Majewski, On the structure of the set of positive maps, *Positivity* **24**, 799 (2020).
- [17] A. Bera, G. Scala, G. Sarbicki, and Dariusz Chruściński, Generalizing Choi map in M_3 beyond circulant scenario, *arXiv:2212.03807*.
- [18] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Quantum entanglement, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 865 (2009).
- [19] M.A. Nielsen and I.L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) (2000).
- [20] B. Collins, H. Osaka, and G. Sapiro, On a family of linear maps from $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ to $M_{n^2}(\mathbb{C})$, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **555**, 398 (2018).
- [21] S. L. Woronowicz, Positive maps of low dimensional matrix algebras, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **10**, 165 (1976).
- [22] M.-D. Choi, Positive Linear Maps on C^* -Algebras, *Canad. J. Math.* **24**, 520 (1972).
- [23] M.-D. Choi, Positive semidefinite biquadratic forms, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **12**, 95 (1975).
- [24] M.-D. Choi, Some assorted inequalities for positive linear maps on C^* -algebras, *J. Oper. Theory* **4**, 271 (1980).
- [25] M.-D. Choi and T.-Y. Lam, Extremal positive semidefinite forms, *Math. Ann.* **231**, 1 (1977).
- [26] K.-C. Ha, Notes on extremality of the Choi map, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **439**, 3156 (2013).
- [27] M. Lewenstein, B. Kraus, J. I. Cirac, and P. Horodecki, Optimization of entanglement witnesses, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 052310 (2000).
- [28] C. Ha and S.-H. Kye, One-parameter family of indecomposable optimal entanglement witnesses arising from generalized Choi maps, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 024302 (2011).
- [29] D. Chruściński and G. Sarbicki, Optimal Entanglement Witnesses for Two Qutrits, *Open Sys. Inf. Dyn.* **20**, 1350006 (2013).
- [30] R. Augusiak, G. Sarbicki, and M. Lewenstein, Optimal decomposable witnesses without the spanning property, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 052323 (2011).
- [31] A. Bera, F. A. Wudarski, G. Sarbicki, and D. Chruściński, Class of Bell-diagonal entanglement witnesses in $\mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathbb{C}^4$: Optimization and the spanning property, *Phys. Rev. A* **105**, 052401 (2022).
- [32] T. Ando, Positivity of certain maps, *Seminar Notes*, 1985 (cited in [33]).
- [33] K.-C. Ha, Atomic positive linear maps in matrix algebras, *Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ.*, **34**, 591 (1998).
- [34] S. Yamagami, Cyclic inequalities, *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.* **118**, 521 (1993).
- [35] P. Kopszak, M. Mozrzymas, and M. Studziński, Positive maps from irreducibly covariant operators, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **53**, 395306 (2020).
- [36] S. Singh and I. Nechita, Diagonal unitary and orthogonal symmetries in quantum theory, *Quantum* **5**, 519 (2021).
- [37] S. Singh and I. Nechita, The PPT^2 Conjecture Holds for All Choi-Type Maps, *Ann. Henri Poincaré* (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00023-022-01166-0>
- [38] D. Chruściński, J. Pytel, and G. Sarbicki, Constructing optimal entanglement witnesses, *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 062314 (2009).
- [39] R. A. Horn and C.R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [40] M.-D. Choi, Completely positive linear maps on complex matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **10**, 285 (1975).