

# Separability of mixed quantum states: linear contractions approach

Michał Horodecki<sup>(1)</sup>, Paweł Horodecki<sup>(2)</sup> and Ryszard Horodecki<sup>(1)</sup>

<sup>(1)</sup>*Institute of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics,  
University of Gdańsk, 80-952 Gdańsk, Poland and*

<sup>(2)</sup>*Faculty of Applied Physics and Mathematics, Technical University of Gdańsk*

Recently, a new and powerful separability criterion was introduced in [O. Rudolph, quant-ph/0202121] and [Chen *et al.*, quant-ph/0205017]. Composing the main idea behind the above criterion and the necessary and sufficient condition in terms of positive maps, we provide a characterization of separable states by means of linear contractions. The latter need not be positive maps. We extend the idea to multipartite systems, and find that, somewhat suprisingly, partial realignment (unlike partial transposition) can detect genuinely tripartite entanglement. We also show that for multipartite system any permutation of indices of density matrix leads to separability criterion.

Since the first paper concerning the problem of separability of mixed states [1] much effort has been done towards operational characterisation of separable states [2, 3]. Nevertheless, since 1996 when Peres designed the positive partial transpose (PPT) test [4], no better computable separability criterion has been provided for a long time. Only quite recently a new, strong criterion for separability (call it *realignment criterion*) was found by Rudolph [5] and Chen *et al.* [6]. It is independent of Peres criterion, and turns out to be strong enough to detect entanglement of almost all known states, for which the former criterion fails. Consequently, it can detect *bound entanglement* - a very subtle form of entanglement. For some states it is weaker than PPT one.

However, as it can be easily checked numerically, the two criteria even if taken together cannot detect entanglement of a bound entangled state given in [7] and [8] in broad range of parameters. So, even though we are now much closer to operational characterisation of entanglement, it is still an open problem.

There is a necessary and *sufficient* condition of separability [9] based on positive maps. However, the structure of the set of positive maps is still rather unknown, so that the condition is not operational. Yet, based on mathematical literature on positive maps, it allowed to find several families of entangled state satisfying PPT criterion.

The purpose of the paper is double. First we provide general framework for characterization of separability in terms of linear maps that do not increase trace norm on hermitean operators. Second, we treat multipartite states. We extend application of realignment criterion to detect entanglement of multipartite systems. It is then powerful enough to recognize genuinely tripartite entanglement. Finally we provide a scheme to produce separability criteria via permutations of matrix indices.

To begin with let us describe how the positive maps characterization arose out of Peres criterion. The core of the latter one is that one subjects a subsystem to a positive map – the one that preserve positivity of matrices, i.e. changes density matrices again into (possibly unnormalized) density matrixes. Consequently, for a positive

map  $\Lambda$ , if the total system is in product state  $\sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B$ , the resulting operator  $(I \otimes \Lambda)\sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B = \varrho_A \otimes \Lambda(\sigma_B)$  is still a positive operator. Then due to linearity also any separable state  $\varrho_{AB} = \sum_i p_i \varrho_A^i \otimes \varrho_B^i$  is mapped into some positive operator. If we take an initially entangled state, the resulting operator may be no longer positive. Thus the negativity of some eigenvalues of the resulting operator is indication of entanglement of the state. Of course, if the map  $I \otimes \Lambda$  is positive itself, then it will never recognize entanglement. Such maps are called *completely positive*. Thus the maps that can detect entanglement are the ones that are positive but *not* completely positive.

Let us now describe the result of the present paper. One can see that the essential point of realignment criterion from [5, 6] is some linear map  $L$  (acting on both subsystems) that does not increase trace norm of product states  $\|L(\sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B)\| \leq 1$ . Then by convexity of norm, also for separable states we will have  $\|L(\varrho_{AB}^{sep})\| \leq 1$ . Thus *any linear map that does not increase norm of product states constitute separability necessary condition for separability*. To be nontrivial, at least for some state it should happen that  $\|L(\varrho_{AB})\| > 1$ , and this is indication of entanglement.

The role of  $L$  in Refs. [5, 6] was played by the realignment map  $L^r$  acting on product operators as follows:  $L^r(A \otimes B) = |A\rangle\langle B^*|$ , where the latter involves bra-ket formalism of Hilbert Schmidt space of operators with scalar product  $\langle A|B\rangle = Tr(A^\dagger B)$ . The above map was previously discussed in context of general matrix algebra [10], completely positive and completely copositive maps [11] and positive maps theory [12].

To make better analogy with our previous condition, consider  $L$  acting only on subsystem. If  $L$  is contraction in trace norm, i.e. if it does not increase the trace norm, then on product states we have  $\|(I \otimes L)(\sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B)\| = \|\sigma_A\| \|L(\sigma_B)\| \leq 1$ . Thus instead of positive map  $\Lambda$  we have contraction  $L$  and we check trace norm instead of positivity. Again, if a map  $I \otimes L$  is itself contraction, then it will be useless: simply all states will satisfy the criterion. Thus, the relevant maps are the contractions that are not *complete contractions*, i.e.  $I \otimes L$  is no longer a contraction. It should be noted here that to obtain

sufficient condition, we will need the set of maps that are contractions on hermitean operators.

Example of the map being *contraction but not complete contraction* is transposition  $T$  (which is at the same time positive map).  $I \otimes T$  acting on maximally entangled state of  $d \otimes d$  system results in operator of norm  $d$  (to deal with such oddities of trace norm, one designed so called completely bounded norm, see [13]). Below we will show that the set of such criteria constitutes necessary and sufficient condition. However, the map should have output dimension twice as much as the dimension of the subsystem.

To begin with, let us recall the positive maps condition [9].

**Theorem 1** *The following statements are equivalent.*

1. A state  $\varrho$  acting on Hilbert space  $C^d \otimes C^d$  is separable
2. For any positive map  $\Lambda : M_d \rightarrow M_d$

$$(I \otimes \Lambda)\varrho_{AB} \geq 0 \quad (1)$$

3. For any operator  $W \in M_d \otimes M_d$  which satisfies

$$\text{Tr}(W\sigma_{AB}^{sep}) \geq 0 \quad (2)$$

for all separable states  $\sigma_{AB}^{sep}$  we have

$$\text{Tr}W\varrho_{AB} \geq 0 \quad (3)$$

**Remark.** The operators  $W$  of item (3) which are non-positive give nontrivial necessary conditions for separability and are called *entanglement witnesses* (see e.g. [14]). Slightly abusing terminology, we will call  $W$  entanglement witnesses, even if we do not know if it is non-positive operator.

To pass from positive maps to linear contractions we need to show that it suffices to restrict to trace-preserving maps.

**Lemma 1** *A state  $\varrho$  acting on Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B = C^d \otimes C^d$  is separable iff for any trace preserving positive map  $\Lambda : M_d \rightarrow M_{2d}$*

$$(I \otimes \Lambda)\varrho_{AB} \geq 0 \quad (4)$$

**Remark.** Note that we need larger dimension of output of  $\Lambda$  than in the condition 2 of Theorem 1 where we do not require the map to be trace preserving. It may be worth to mention that there is a dual proposition [15] stating that bipartite states are completely characterised by identity preserving positive maps which does not require such output dimension enlargement.

**Proof.** It suffices to show that for any entangled state we will find a positive trace preserving map, such that

operator  $I \otimes \Lambda(\varrho_{AB})$  is not positive. We will follow techniques used in [15]. Let  $\varrho_{AB}$  be entangled. Then there exists entanglement witness  $W$  such that

$$\text{Tr}(W\varrho_{AB}) < 0. \quad (5)$$

Consider operator  $W_B$  being reduction of  $W$  (one can see that even though  $W$  is not a positive operator, its reduction is). Let  $P_B$  be the projector onto support of  $W_B$  and  $P_B^\perp$  the complementary one, so that  $P_B + P_B^\perp = I_B$ . We then introduce another witness  $W'$  given by

$$W' = W + I_A \otimes P_B^\perp. \quad (6)$$

One finds that  $W'$  satisfies the condition (2). It satisfies also

$$\text{Tr}(W'I_A \otimes \hat{P}_B \varrho_{AB}) < 0 \quad (7)$$

where we used notation  $I \otimes \hat{X} \varrho_{AB} = I \otimes X \varrho_{AB} I \otimes X^\dagger$ . Its reduction  $W'_B$  is now of full rank so that we can introduce a new witness  $W'' = I \otimes \sqrt{W'_B}^{-1} W' I \otimes \sqrt{W'_B}^{-1}$ . The witness  $W''$  has reduction  $W''_B$  equal to identity and satisfies

$$\text{Tr}(W'' I \otimes \hat{V} \varrho_{AB}) < 0 \quad (8)$$

where  $V = \sqrt{W'_B} P_B$ . Now we take positive map  $\Gamma$  satisfying  $(I \otimes \Gamma)dP_+ = W''$  [16], where  $P_+ = |\psi_+\rangle\langle\psi_+|$  with  $\psi_+ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_i |i\rangle \otimes |i\rangle$ . This implies

$$\text{Tr}(P_+(I \otimes \Gamma^\dagger \hat{V}) \varrho_{AB}) < 0 \quad (9)$$

Since  $W''_B = I$ , the map  $\Gamma$  is identity preserving, so that its dual map  $\Gamma^\dagger$  is trace preserving. We have not yet obtained the thesis of the theorem, as there is still the operator  $V$  involved. We have thus proved that for any entangled state  $\varrho$  there exists a trace preserving map  $\Gamma$  and an operator (local filter [17, 18])  $V$  such that  $(I \otimes \Gamma \hat{V})\varrho_{AB}$  is not positive. We build the needed map  $\Lambda$  as follows. We add a qubit on Bob's side, and consider the following CP map

$$\Lambda_{cp}(\cdot) = \hat{V}(\cdot) \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| + \hat{V}'(\cdot) \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1| \quad (10)$$

where  $V'$  is so chosen that  $V'^\dagger V' + V^\dagger V = I$ . The map is thus simply generalized measurement on Bob's system with writing record on the qubit. After the map  $\Lambda_{cp}$  we perform the map  $\Gamma$ . Since after the first map the state is separable against Bob's systems and ancillar qubit, the composition  $\Lambda = \Gamma \Lambda_{cp}$  is positive map. Moreover we have  $\text{Tr}[(I \otimes \Lambda)\varrho_{AB}](P_+ \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|) < 0$ . The new map is composition of trace-preserving maps, so that it is itself trace preserving. Thus we have found the needed map for arbitrary entangled state, which ends the proof.

Now, to pass to maps that do not need to be positive any longer, we need to formulate of the above condition by means of trace norm. It is possible, because we

have restricted to trace preserving maps. In result the operator  $(I \otimes \Lambda)_{\varrho_{AB}}$  has unit trace, and its positivity is equivalent to having unit trace norm. Thus we have obtained

**Corrolary 1** *A state  $\varrho$  acting on Hilbert space  $C^d \otimes C^d$  is separable iff for any trace preserving positive map  $\Lambda : M_d \rightarrow M_{2d}$*

$$\|(I \otimes \Lambda)_{\varrho_{AB}}\| \leq 1 \quad (11)$$

Instead of equality  $\|(I \otimes \Lambda)_{\varrho_{AB}}\| = 1$  we put inequality, which is irrelevant for the requirement, but allows us to give up the positivity condition. Namely we have

**Theorem 2** *A state  $\varrho_{AB}$  acting on Hilbert space  $C^d \otimes C^d$  is separable iff for any linear map  $L : M_d \rightarrow M_{2d}$  which is contraction on hermitean operators one has*

$$\|(I \otimes L)_{\varrho_{AB}}\| \leq 1 \quad (12)$$

**Remark.** Instead of contraction on hermitean operators, we could take contractions on positive operators (or just on projectors).

**Proof.** The sufficiency is obvious, as the condition is certainly no weaker than that of lemma 1. Indeed it is well known that a positive trace preserving map does not increase trace norm on hermitean operators. To show the necessity we note as in Ref. [6]. Due to convexity of norm, it suffices to consider only product states  $\sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B$ . Since  $\|\sigma_A\| = \|\sigma_B\| = 1$  we obtain

$$\|(I \otimes L)(\sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B)\| = \|\sigma_A\| \|L(\sigma_B)\| \leq 1. \quad (13)$$

where we used the fact that  $L$  is contraction hermitean (hence also positive) operators. This ends the proof.

The condition has similar structure as the conditions based on positive maps. In the latter one, the key role was played by the maps that are positive but are not completely positive i.e.  $\Lambda$  is positive, but  $I \otimes \Lambda$  is not. Here the analogous role is played by the contractions that are not completely-contracting, i.e. such that  $L$  is contraction, but  $I \otimes L$  is not. Example is transposition (see, e.g. [13]).

One can also express the characterization of separable states by means of linear maps that are contractions on product states. The necessary and sufficient condition then has the form: *the state  $\varrho_{AB}$  is separable iff for any linear map  $L$  satisfying  $\|L(\sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B)\| \leq 1$  for all states  $\sigma_A, \sigma_B$  one has*

$$\|L(\varrho_{AB})\| \leq 1. \quad (14)$$

Example of  $L$  can be product of contractions, but  $L$  need not be product this time. Example of nonproduct map is just the map  $L^r$  of Refs. [5, 6] we recalled in introduction.

Let us now pass to multipartite systems. One can immediately see that the method can be applied to this case. In

Ref. [19] we have provided characterisation of entanglement of multipartite states which employed positive maps on product states. Here we will employ linear maps that are contractions on product states. Consider  $n$ -partite system. Thus any given linear map  $L$  acting on  $k \leq n$ , which is contraction on product states  $P_1 \otimes \dots \otimes P_k$  gives rise to the following separability criterion: if a state  $\varrho$  is separable, then

$$\|L_{(k)} \otimes I_{(n-k)} \varrho\| \leq 1 \quad (15)$$

where the indices mean that we act by  $L$  on chosen  $k$  subsystems, while leave untouched the remaining  $n - k$  subsystems. We are not able to prove here that criteria of this type constitute sufficient condition. However, strong criteria can be obtained in this way.

To show the power of such approach we recall that due to a richer structure, the multipartite systems can exhibit a peculiar phenomenon: there are tripartite states that are separable under any bipartite cut (*biseparable*), but nevertheless are entangled (are not mixtures of fully product states  $|\psi_1\rangle|\psi_2\rangle|\psi_3\rangle$ ). They contain genuinely tripartite entanglement, and must be necessary mixed: pure states cannot share such feature. Such entanglement cannot be detected by methods involving linear map acting on one subsystem. Indeed, such a map will detect only the bipartite entanglement between the subsystem and the cluster of all other subsystems. Partial transpose even if applied to several systems can also detect only bipartite entanglement. The realignment map  $L^r$  acts however on two systems and it is a contraction on product states, hence it is a good candidate to detect genuinely tripartite entanglement. First example of entangled biseparable state was given in Ref. [20] where also it was pointed out that it represent so called bound entanglement. The example is a three-qubit state of the form

$$\tilde{\varrho}_{ABC} = \frac{1}{8} (I - \sum_{i=1}^4 |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|) \quad (16)$$

where  $\psi_i$ 's are given by

$$|0, 1, +\rangle, |1, +, 0\rangle, |+, 1, 0\rangle, |-, -, -\rangle \quad (17)$$

with  $|\pm\rangle = 1/\sqrt{2}(|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)$ . The above state is called biseparable (or semiseparable) because it is separable under any bipartite cut  $A|BC$ ,  $B|CA$ ,  $C|AB$ . Still it is entangled. Apart from, in general not easy, range analysis (see [20]) basing on tripartite version of range separability criterion [21] there was no method to detect its entanglement. Here we report fully operational criterion doing that: it is a particular form of (15) namely application of the realignment map to any of two qubits. Indeed we found numerically that the norm  $\|[I_A \otimes L_{BC}^r](\tilde{\varrho}_{ABC})\|$  amounts to 1.08649.

Finally, we will exhibit a general method of producing separability criteria for multipartite systems. For bipartite systems it will produce only Peres criterion and the realignment one. For multipartite systems we leave the problem of equivalence of criteria open, though we hope that many of them will be non-equivalent to each other. We will explain the idea on bipartite systems, since it immediately generalizes to general case. The idea is to take linear map as any permutation  $\tau$  of density matrix indices, if written in a product basis (such permutations were considered recently in the context of separability in Ref. [12]). Such a linear map can be represented by its action on basic operators of the form  $|i\rangle\langle j| \otimes |k\rangle\langle l|$ :

$$L(|i\rangle\langle j| \otimes |k\rangle\langle l|) = |\tau(i)\rangle\langle\tau(j)| \otimes |\tau(k)\rangle\langle\tau(l)| \quad (18)$$

To show that  $L$  gives rise to the criterion, it suffices to note that it keeps norm for pure product states. Indeed the latter are belong to the set of operators of the general form  $|\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_2| \otimes |\psi_3\rangle\langle\psi_4|$ .  $L$  transforms such operators into  $|\psi_{\tau(1)}^\# \rangle\langle\psi_{\tau(2)}^\#| \otimes |\psi_{\tau(3)}^\# \rangle\langle\psi_{\tau(4)}^\#|$ , where  $\psi_i^\# = \psi_i^*$  if  $\tau(i)$  has a different parity than  $i$  and  $\psi_i^\# = \psi_i$  otherwise. Thus the output is of the same general form as the input, which, in turn has unit norm, due to the fact that trace norm  $\|X\|$  does not change under transformation  $X \rightarrow UXV$  where  $U, V$  are unitary.

For example partial transpose (on right subsystem) corresponds to permutation  $\tau = (34)$ . This gives  $|i\rangle\langle j| \otimes |k\rangle\langle l| \rightarrow |i\rangle\langle j| \otimes |l\rangle\langle k|$ , and, consequently  $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \otimes |\phi\rangle\langle\phi| \rightarrow |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \otimes |\phi^*\rangle\langle\phi^*|$ . Realignment corresponds to permutation  $\tau = [1234 \rightarrow 2413]$  which produces transformation  $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \otimes |\phi\rangle\langle\phi| \rightarrow |\psi^*\rangle\langle\phi| \otimes |\psi\rangle\langle\phi^*|$ . Using the fact that trace norm is invariant under full transpose and the map  $X \rightarrow UXV$  one can find that all permutations are equivalent to either realignment or partial transpose or identity (which does not, of course, produce separability criterion). For example a permutation  $\tau = (23)$  gives rise to a map which is equivalent to original realignment.

It is obvious that the method works also for multipartite case. For tripartite systems one can find that non-trivial permutations can be chosen as  $[12**** \rightarrow 1*2***]$  or  $[12**** \rightarrow 12****]$ . The notation has to be understood as follows: in the first case  $\tau(1) = 1$  and  $\tau(2) = 3$  and in the second case  $\tau(1) = 1$  and  $\tau(2) = 2$ . It is yet not clear which of them are nonequivalent. To have some function that would indicate joint power of the criteria, one can take  $E = \sup_\tau \|\varrho_{\tau(i)}\|$  where  $i$  stands for multiindex denoting all indices of  $\varrho$  in product basis. It remains open question whether  $E$  can be good entanglement measure, though it definitely indicates all entanglement that can be detected by permutation criteria.

To conclude, we were able to extract a general struc-

ture behind the realignment criterion. We then provided framework that incorporates the latter one as well as partial transpose. As a result we provided a method to produce a whole bunch of separability criteria for multipartite systems. Example of such criterion is realignment applied to two subsystems of tripartite systems. It is powerful enough to detect a genuinely tripartite entanglement.

We would like to thank Robert Alicki, Piotr Badziąg, Karol Horodecki and Karol Życzkowski for useful discussions.

- 
- [1] R. Werner, Phys. Rev. **A 40**, 4277 (1989).
  - [2] G. Alber, T. Beth, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, M. Rotteler, H. Weinfurter, R. Werner, and A. Zeilinger, *Quantum Information: An Introduction to Basic Theoretical Concepts and Experiments* (Springer, 2001).
  - [3] D. Bruss, J. I. Cirac, P. Horodecki, F. Hulpke, B. Kraus, M. Lewenstein, and A. Sanpera, (to appear in J. Mod. Opt.), quant-ph/0110081.
  - [4] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 1413 (1996).
  - [5] O. Rudolph, quant-ph/0202121.
  - [6] K. Chen, L.-A. Wu, and L. Yang, quant-ph/0205017.
  - [7] P. Horodecki and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett **85**, 2657 (2000), quant-ph/0001035.
  - [8] D. Bruss and A. Peres, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 30301(R) (2000), quant-ph/9911056.
  - [9] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Lett **223**, 1 (1996), quant-ph/9605038.
  - [10] C. J. Oxenrider and R. D. Hill, Lin. Alg. Appl. **69**, 205 (1985).
  - [11] D. A. Yopp and R. D. Hill, Lin. Alg. Appl. **312**, 1 (2000).
  - [12] K. Życzkowski, preprint 2001, (unpublished).
  - [13] R. F. Werner and A. S. Holevo, quant-ph/9912067.
  - [14] B. M. Terhal, Phys. Lett. A. **271**, 319 (2000), quant-ph/9911057.
  - [15] P. Horodecki, in *Proceedings of NATO ARW: "Decoherence and its Implications in Quantum Computation and Information Transfer"*, edited by T. Goni and P. E. A. Turchi (IOS press, 2001), Series III - Comp. and Sci. Sys., p. 299.
  - [16] A. Jamiolkowski, Rep. Math. Phys. **3**, 275 (1972).
  - [17] C. H. Bennett, H. Bernstein, S. Popescu, and B. Schumacher, Phys. Rev. A **53**, 2046 (1996), quant-ph/9511030.
  - [18] N. Gisin, Phys. Lett. A **210**, 151 (1996).
  - [19] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **283**, 1 (2001), quant-ph/0006071.
  - [20] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, T. Mor, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and B. M. Terhal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53**, 5385 (1999), quant-ph/9808030.
  - [21] P. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **232**, 333 (1997).