The Existence of Quantum Entanglem ent Catalysts

Xiaom ing Sun^y Runyao Duan^z Mingsheng Ying^x

State K ey Laboratory of Intelligent Technology and System s, D epartm ent of C om puter Science and Technology, T singhua U niv., B eijing, 100084, C hina.

A bstract

W ithout additional resources, it is often in possible to transform one entangled quantum state into another with local quantum operations and classical communication. Jonathan and Plenio Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 3566 (1999)] presented an interesting example showing that the presence of another state, called a catalyst, enables such a transform ation without changing the catalyst. They also pointed out that in general it is very hard to nd an analytical condition under which a catalyst exists. In this paper we study the existence of catalysts for two incom parable quantum states. For the simplest case of 2 2 catalysts for transform ations from one 4 4 state to another, a necessary and su cient condition for existence is found. For the general case, we give an e cient polynom ial time algorithm to decide whether a k k catalyst exists for two n n incomparable states, where k is treated as a constant.

Index Term s Q uantum information, entanglement states, entanglement transformation, entanglement catalysts.

1 Introduction

Entanglem ent is a fundam ental quantum mechanical resource that can be shared among spatially separated parties. The possibility of having entanglem ent is a distinguishing feature of quantum mechanics that does not exist in classical mechanics. It plays a central role in some striking applications of quantum computation and quantum information such as quantum teleportation [1], quantum superdence coding [2] and quantum cryptography [3]. As a result, entanglem ent has been recognized as a useful physical resource [4]. How ever, many fundam ental problem s concerning quantum entanglem ent are still unsolved. An important such problem concerns the existence of entanglem ent transformation. Suppose that A lice and B ob each have one part of a bi-partite state. The question then is what

This work was partly supported by the National Foundation of Natural Sciences of China (Grant Nos: 60223004,60496321,60321002, and 60305005).

^yEm ail: sun_xm 970 m ails.tsinghua.edu.cn

^zEm ail: dry020 m ails.tsinghua.edu.cn

[×]Em ail: yingm sh@m ail.tsinghua.edu.cn

other states can they transform the entangled state into? Since an entangled state is separated spatially, it is natural to require that A lice and B ob can only make use of local operations and classical communication (LOCC). Signi cant progress in the study of entanglement was made by Bennett, Bernstein, Popescu and Schum acher [5] in 1996. They proposed an entanglement concentration protocol which solved the entanglement transform ation problem in the asymptotic case. In 1999, Nielsen [6] made another important advance. Suppose there is a bipartite state $j_1i = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \prod_{ijii_i}^{n} j_{iji_i}$ shared between A lice and B ob, with ordered Schmidt coe cients (OSCs for short) $\prod_{i=1}^{n} p_{iji_i} p$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X^1 & X^1 \\ i & i' \\ i=1 & i=1 \end{array}$$

with equality when l = n. This fundam ental contribution by N ielsen provides us with an extrem ely usefulm athem atical tool for studying entanglem ent transform ation. A simple but signi cant fact in plied by N ielsen's theorem is that there exist incom parable states j_{1i} and j_{2i} with both transform ations $j_{1i}! j_{2i}$ and $j_{2i}! j_{1i}$ im possible. Shortly after N ielsen's work, a quite surprising phenom enon of entanglem ent, nam ely, entanglem ent catalysis, was discovered by Jonathan and P lenio [9]. They gave an example showing that one m ay use another entangled state jci, known as a catalyst, to m ake an im possible transform ation j i ! j i possible. Furtherm ore, the transform ation is in fact one of j i jci! j i jci, so that the catalyst jci is not modi ed in the process.

Entanglem ent catalysis is another useful protocol that quantum mechanics provides. Therefore to exploit the full power of quantum information processing, we st have to solve the following basic problem : given a pair of incom parable states j_1 and j_2 i with j_1 i j_2 i and j_2 i j_1 i, determ ine whether there exists a catalyst jci such that j 1 j 2 j 2 j j 2 j j 2 j j 2 j j 2 j j 2 j j 2 j j 2 determining whether there is a state jui for which the majorization relation 1 C 2 C holds. As pointed out by Jonathan and Plenio [9], it is very dicult to nd an analytical and both necessary and su cient condition for the existence of a catalyst. The di culty is mainly due to lack of suitable mathematical tools to deal with majorization of tensor product states, and especially the exible ordering of the 0 SCs of tensor products. In [9], Jonathan and Plenio only gave some simple necessary conditions for the existence of catalysts, but no su cient condition was found. Those necessary conditions enabled them to show that entanglement catalysis can happen in the transformation between 4. One of the main aims of the present paper is to give n states with n two n a necessary and su cient condition for entanglem ent catalysis in the simplest case of entanglem ent transform ation between 4 4 states with a 2 2 catalyst. For general case, the fact that an analytical condition under which incom parable states are catalyzable is not easy to nd leads us naturally to an alternative approach; that is, to seek some e cient algorithm to decide catalyzability of entanglem ent transform ation. Indeed, an

algorithm to decide the existence of catalysts was already presented by Bandyopadhyay and Roychow dhury [10]. Unfortunately, for two n n incomparable states, to determ ine whether there exists a k k catalyst for them, their algorithm runs in exponential time with complexity O ([(nk)!]²), and so it is intractable in practice. The intractability of Bandyopadhyay and Roychow dhury's algorithm stimulated us to nd a more e cient algorithm for the same purpose, and this is exactly the second aim of the present paper.

This paper is organized as follows. In the second section we deal with entanglement catalysis in the simplest case of n = 4 and k = 2. A necessary and su cient condition under which a 2 2 catalyst exists for an entanglement transformation between 4 4 states is presented. This condition is analytically expressed in terms of the OSCs of the states involved in the transformation, and thus it is easily checkable. A lso, some interesting examples are given to illustrate the use of this condition. The third section considers the general case. We propose a polynomial time algorithm to decide the existence of catalysts. Suppose j₁i and j₂i are two given n in incomparable states, and k is any

xed natural number. W ith the aid of our algorithm, one can quickly nd all k k catalysts for the transformation $j_1 i ! j_2 i$ using only O ($n^{2k+3:5}$) time. Comparing to the time complexity O ($[(nk)!]^2$) of the algorithm given in [10], for constant k, our algorithm in proves the complexity from superexponential to polynomial. We make conclusions in section 4, and some open problem are also discussed.

To simplify the presentation, in the rest of the paper, we identify the state j = 1 $\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{ijiji} w$ ith the vector of its Schm idt coe cients (1; 2;:::; n), the meaning will be clear from the context.

2 A necessary and su cient condition of entanglem ent catalysis in the simplest case (n = 4; k = 2)

Jonathan and Plenio [9] has shown that entanglem ent catalysis only occurs in transformations between n n states with n 4. In this section, we consider the simplest case that a transformation from one 4 4 state to another possesses a 2 2 catalyst. Assume $j_1i = (1; 2; 3; p^4)$ and $j_2i = (1; 2; 3; 4)$ are two 4 4 states, where $1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \ 0, \ i=1 \ i=1, \ 1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \ 0, \ and \ i=1 \ i=1.$ The potential catalyst is supposed to be a 2 2 state, denoted by $j_1i = (c; 1 \ c)$, where $c \ge [0; 5; 1]$.

It was proved in [9] that if j₁i 6 j₂i, but j₁i ji! j₂i ji then

$$1 \quad 1; \quad 1 + 2 > 1 + 2; \quad 1 + 2 + 3 \quad 1 + 2 + 3; \tag{1}$$

or equivalently,

2 + 3 + 4 2 + 3 + 4; 3 + 4 < 3 + 4; 4 4: (2)

Note that f ig and f ig are arranged in decreasing order, so we have

 $1 \quad 1 \quad 2 > 2 \quad 3 > 3 \quad 4 \quad 4 \tag{3}$

These inequalities are merely necessary conditions for the existence of catalyst j i, and it is easy to see that they are not su cient. In the following theorem we give a condition which is both necessary and su cient.

Theorem 2.1 There exists a catalysts j i for two states (j $_1$ i; j $_2$ i) with j $_1$ i 6 j $_2$ i, if and only if

$$\max \quad \frac{1+2}{2+3}; 1 \quad \frac{4}{3}; 4 \quad \min \quad \frac{1}{1+2}; \frac{1}{2}; \frac{1}{2}; 1 \quad \frac{4}{3+4}$$
(4)

and Eq. (1) hold. In addition, for any c2 [0:5;1] such that

$$\max \frac{1+2}{2+3}; 1 \frac{4}{3} \frac{4}{3} c \min \frac{1}{1+2}; \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}; 1 \frac{4}{3+4}$$

ji = (c; 1 c) is a catalyst for $(j_1i; j_2i)$.

Proof: Assumej₁i & j₂ibutj₁i ji! j₂i jiunder LOCC.From Eq. (8) in [9] we know Eq. (1) holds. So Eq. (2) and Eq. (3) hold too.

A routine calculation shows that the Schm idt coe cients of j_1 i j i and j_2 i j i are

 $A = f_{1}c_{2}c_{3}c_{4}c_{1}(1 c); 2(1 c); 3(1 c); 4(1 c)g$

and

$$B = f_{1}c; _{2}c; _{3}c; _{4}c; _{1}(1 c); _{2}(1 c); _{3}(1 c); _{4}(1 c)g;$$

respectively. Sort the elements in A and B in decreasing order and denote the resulted sequences by $a^{(1)} a^{(2)} = {}^{(8)}aand b^{(1)} b^{(2)} = {}^{(8)}b$ It is clear that $a^{(1)} = {}_{1}c$, $a^{(8)} = {}_{4}(1 c)$, $b^{(1)} = {}_{1}c$, and $b^{(8)} = {}_{4}(1 c)$. Since $j_{1}i ji! j_{2}i ji$, Nielsen's theorem tells us that

$$\begin{array}{cccc} x^{1} & x^{1} \\ a^{(i)} & b^{(i)} & (81 \ 1 \ 8) \\ & & & \\ i=1 & & i=1 \end{array}$$

Since f_{ig} is ordered, and c 0:5, thus

$$_{1}$$
C $_{2}$ C $_{3}$ C $_{4}$ C; $_{1}$ (1 C) $_{2}$ (1 C) $_{3}$ (1 C) $_{4}$ (1 C); $_{i}$ C $_{i}$ (1 C) (5)

Now we are going to dem onstrate that

$$_{1}C_{1}(1 c) > _{2}C_{3}C > _{2}(1 c)_{3}(1 c) > _{4}C_{4}(1 c):$$
 (6)

and consequently x the ordering of B. The key idea is: the sum of the biggest lnum bers in a set is greater than or equal the sum of any lnum bers in this set.

First, by de nition of $fa^{(1)}g$ we have $a^{(1)} + a^{(2)}$ $_1C + _2C$. So N ielsen's theorem leads to $b^{(1)} + b^{(2)}$ $a^{(1)} + a^{(2)}$ $_1C + _2C$. From inequality (1), $_1 + _2 > _1 + _2$, so $b^{(1)} + b^{(2)} > _1C + _2C$, i.e. $b^{(2)} > _2C$. Combining this with inequality (5), we see that the only case is $b^{(2)} = _1(1 - C)$, $b^{(3)} = _2C$ and $_1(1 - C) > _2C$.

Sim ilarly, we have

$$a^{(1)} + a^{(2)} + a^{(3)} + a^{(4)}$$
 1c+ 2c+ 1(1 c) + 2(1 c) = 1 + 2

So it holds that

$$b^{(1)} + b^{(2)} + b^{(3)} + b^{(4)} = a^{(1)} + a^{(2)} + a^{(3)} + a^{(4)} = 1 + 2 > 1 + 2$$

This implies $b^{(4)} > _2$ (1 c): Then it must be that $b^{(4)} = _3c$, and $_3c > _2$ (1 c).

Now what remains is to determ ine the order between $b^{(5)}$ and $b^{(7)}$. We consider $b^{(7)}$ rst. Nielsen's theorem yields $b^{(7)} + b^{(8)} = a^{(7)} + a^{(8)}$. By de nition, we know that $a^{(7)} + a^{(8)} = {}_{3}(1 - c) + {}_{4}(1 - c)$. Therefore,

$$b^{(7)} + b^{(8)}$$
 3 (1 c) + 4 (1 c) = (3 + 4) (1 c) < (3 + 4) (1 c);

the last inequality is due to (2). Since $b^{(8)} = _4 (1 \text{ c})$, it follows that $b^{(7)} < _3 (1 \text{ c})$. Furthermore, we obtain $b^{(7)} = _4c$; $b^{(6)} = _3 (1 \text{ c})$, and $_3 (1 \text{ c}) > _4c$.

Finally, only $_2$ (1 c) leaves, so $b^{(5)} = _2$ (1 c). C on bining the above arguments, we nish the proof of inequality 6).

C learly, inequality (6) in plies that

$$\frac{2}{2+3} < c < \frac{1}{1+2}; \frac{3}{3+4}$$
(7)

This is needed in the remainder of the proof.

P Remembering the order of B has been found out, it enables us to calculate easily $\lim_{i=1}^{l} b^{(i)}$ for each l. The only rest problem is how to calculate $\lim_{i=1}^{l} a^{(i)}$. To this end, we need the following simple lemma:

Lem m a 2.1 A ssum e A = fa_1 ;:::; a_n g, B = fb_1 ;:::; b_n g. Sort B in decreasing order and denote the resulted sequence by $b^{(1)}$ $b^{(2)}$ (n) b Then A B if and only if for 1 l n,

$$\begin{array}{cccc} X & X^{1} \\ \max & a_{i} & b^{(i)} \\ A^{0} & A; A^{0} \neq 1 \\ a_{i} \geq A^{0} & i = 1 \end{array}$$

$$(8)$$

with equality when l = n.

Proof of Lemma: The \iff" part is obvious. For the \only if " part, we sort A in decreasing order and denote the resulted sequence by $a^{(1)} = a^{(2)}$ (n) a Then A B if and only if for 1 l n,

It is easy to see that
$$\begin{aligned} X^{1} & X^{1} \\ a^{(i)} & b^{(i)} \\ & i=1 \\ & i=1 \end{aligned}$$

$$X \\ a^{(i)} = \max_{A^{0} A; A^{0} \neq 1} a_{i2A^{0}} a_{i}, \text{ so the lem m a holds}$$

Proof of Theorem 2.1 (continued): Now the above lem m a guarantees a quite easy way to deal with $\prod_{i=1}^{1} a^{(i)}$: enumerating simply all the possible cases. For example, $a^{(1)} + a^{(2)} = 1C + 1(1 + C)$ or $1C + 2C_{p}$ i.e. $a^{(1)} + a^{(2)} = m \exp (1C + 1)(1 + C)$; $1C + 2C_{p}$. The treatments for $\prod_{i=1}^{3} a^{(i)}$; :::; $\prod_{i=1}^{8} a^{(i)}$ are the same. W hat we still need to do now is to solve system atically the inequalities of $\prod_{i=1}^{1} a^{(i)} = \prod_{i=1}^{1} b^{(i)}$ (1 1 8). We put this daunting but routine part in the Appendix.

The above theorem presents a necessary and su cient condition when a 2 2 catalyst exists for a transform ation from one 4 4 state to another. Moreover, it is also worth noting that the theorem is indeed constructive. The second part of it gives all 2 2 catalysts (if any) for such a transform ation. To illustrate the utility of the above theorem, let us see som e simple examples.

Example 2.1 This example is exactly the original example that Jonathan and Plenio [9] used to demonstrate entanglement catalysis. Let $j_1i = (0.4; 0.4; 0.1; 0.1)$ and $j_2i = (0.5; 0.25; 0.25; 0.25; 0.1)$. Then

$$\max \frac{1+2}{2+3}; 1 \frac{4}{3} \frac{4}{3} = \max 10:6; 1 2=3g = 0:6;$$

$$\min \frac{1}{1+2}; \frac{1}{2}; 1 \frac{4}{3} = \min 15=8; 2=3; 1 0g = 0:625:$$

Since 0.6 < 0.625, Theorem 2.1 gives us a continuous spectrum ji= (c;1 c) of catalysts for j₁i and j₂i, where c ranges over the interval [0.6;0.625]. Especially, when choosing c = 0.6, we get the catalyst ji= (0.6;0.4), which is the one given in [9].

Example 2.2 We also consider the example in [10]. Let $j_1i = (0:4;0:36;0:14;0:1)$ and $j_2i = (0:5;0:25;0:25;0)$. The catalyst for j_1i and j_2i given there is = (0:65;0:35). Note that

 $\max \frac{1+2}{2+3}; 1 \frac{4}{3} \frac{4}{3} = \max 10.52; 1 10=11g = 0.52;$ $\min \frac{1}{1+2}; \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}; 1 \frac{4}{3+4} = \min 125=38; 10=11; 1 \quad 0g = 25=38;$

and 0.52 < 0.65 < 25=38, Theorem 2.1 guarantees that j i is really a catalyst; and it allow sus to nd much more catalysts j i = (c; 1 c) with c 2 [0:52;25=38].

3 An e cient algorithm for deciding existence of catalysts

In the last section, we was able to give a necessary and su cient condition under which a 2 2 catalyst exists for an transform ation between 4 4 states. The key idea enabling us to obtain such a condition is that the order among the Schmidt coe cients of the tensor product of the catalyst and the target state in the transform ation is uniquely determ ined by Nielsen's Theorem . However, the same idea does not work when we deal with higher

dimensional states, and it seems very hard to nd an analytical condition for existence of catalyst in the case of higher dimension. On the other hand, existence of catalysts is a dominant problem in exploiting the power of entanglement catalysis in quantum information processing. Such a dilemma forces us to explore alternatively the possibility of nding an e cient algorithm for deciding existence of catalysts. The main purpose is to give a polynomial time algorithm to decide whether there is a k k catalyst for two incomparable n n states $j_1i; j_2i$, where k 2 is a xed natural number.

To explain the intuition behind our algorithm more clearly, we rst cope with the case of k = 2. Assume $j_1 i = (1; ...; n)$, and $j_2 i = (1; ...; n)$ are two n n states, and assume that the potential catalyst for them is a 2 2 state = (x; 1 x). The Schmidt coe cients of $j_1 i j_1 i and j_2 i j_1 i are then given as$

$$A_x = f_{1}x_{i_{2}}x_{i_{3}}\cdots x_{i_{n}}x_{i_{n}}(1 x)_{i_{n}}\cdots x_{i_{n}}(1 x)q$$

and

$$B_x = f_1x; 2x; ...; nx; 1(1 x); ...; n(1 x)g;$$

respectively. Sort them in decreasing order and denote the resulting sequences by $a^{(1)}(x) = a^{(2)}(x)$ (2nd (x) and $b^{(1)}(x) = b^{(2)}(x)$ (2nd (x). By N ielsen's theorem we know that a necessary and su cient condition for $j_1 j_1 j_2 j_1 j_1 j_2$

$$X^{1}$$
 X^{1} $a^{(i)}(x)$ $b^{(i)}(x)$ (l= 1;:::;2n):
i=1 i=1

Now the di culty arises from the fact that we do not know the exact order of elements in A and B. Let us now consider this problem in a di erent way. If we x x to some constant x_0 , we can calculate the elements in A, B and sort them. Then if we moves x slightly from x_0 to $x_0 + \cdot$, the order of the elements in A (or B) does not change, except the case that x goes through a point x with $i(1 \times i) = i(1 \times i$

A lgorithm 1 1. $_{i;j}$ $\frac{_{i}}{_{i}^{+}}_{j}$; $_{i;j}$ $\frac{_{i}}{_{i}^{+}}_{j}$; 1 i < j n2. Sort f $_{i;j}g[f_{i;j}g[n nondecreasing order, the resulted sequence is denoted by ⁽¹⁾$ $(2) <math>_{(n^{2}-n)}^{(n^{2}-n+1)}$ 1 3. ⁽⁰⁾ 0.5; $^{(n^{2}-n+1)}$ 1 4. For i = 0 to n^{2} n do 5. $c -\frac{_{(i)_{+}}^{(i+1)}}{2}$ 6. Determ ine the order of elements in A_c and B_c, respectively 7. Solve the system of inequalities: $P_{\substack{i=1\\j=1}}^{1}a_{(i)}^{(i)}(x) P_{\substack{i=1\\j=1}}^{1}b^{(i)}(x) (l = 1; :::;2n)$ 8. OUTPUT: Catalysts do not exist, if for all $i \ge 10; 1; :::;n^{2}$ ng, the solution set of the above inequalities is empty; catalyst (x; 1 x), if for some i the inequalities

It is easy to see that this algorithm runs in $O(n^3)$ time. In [10], an algorithm for the same purpose was also given, but it runs in O(n!) time.

By generalizing the idea explained above to the case of k k catalyst, we obtain:

Theorem 3.1 For any two n n states $j_1 i = (1; ...; n)$ and $j_2 i = (1; ...; n)$, the problem whether there exists a k k catalyst $j_1 i = (x_1; ...; x_k)$ for them can be decided in polynom ial time about n. Further more, if there exists a k k catalyst, our algorithm can nd all the catalysts in O ($n^{2k+3:5}$) time.

P roof. The algorithm is similar to the one for the case k = 2. Now the Schmidt coe cients of j₁ i j i and j₂ i j i are

 $A_x = f_1 x_1; ...; x_1; x_2; ...; x_2; ...; x_k g$

and

has solution.

$$B_x = f_1 x_1; ...; x_1; x_2; ...; x_2; ...; x_k g:$$

If we move x in the k dimensional space R^k , the order of the elements in A_x (or B_x) will change if and only if x goes through a hyperplane $_{i_1}x_{i_2} = _{j_1}x_{j_2}$ ($_{i_1}x_{i_2} = _{j_1}x_{j_2}$) for some $i_1 < j_1$ and $i_2 > j_2$. (Indeed, the area that x ranges over should be (k 1) dimensional because we have a constrain of $k_{i=1}^k x_i = 1$.) So rst we can write down all the equations of these hyperplanes

 $= f_{i_1} x_{i_2} = j_1 x_{j_2} j j_1 < j_1; i_2 > j_2 g [f_{i_1} x_{i_2} = j_1 x_{j_2} j j_1 < j_1; i_2 > j_2 g;$

where $j = 2 \frac{k}{2} \frac{n}{2} = 0$ (n²). In the k dimensional space R^k , these 0 (n²) hyperplanes can at most divide the whole space into 0 (0 (n²)^k) = 0 (n^{2k}) di erent parts. Note the number of parts generated by these hyperplanes is a polynom ial of n. Now we enumerate all these possible parts. In each part, for di erent x, the elements in A_x (or B_x) has the same order. Then we can solve the inequalities

$$\begin{array}{cccc} X^{1} & & X^{1} \\ & a^{(i)}(x) & & b^{(i)}(x) & (1 & 1 & nk) \\ & & & & \\ i = 1 & & & i = 1 \end{array}$$

and check the order constrains by linear program m ing. Follow ing the well-known result that linear program m ing is solvable in $O(n^{3.5})$ time, our algorithm runs in $O(n^{2k+3.5})$ time, it is a polynom ial time of n whenever k is a given constant.

Indeed, Theorem 3.1 is constructive too, and its proof gives an algorithm which is able not only to decide whether a catalyst of a given dimension exists but also to nd all such catalysts when they do exist. The algorithm before this theorem is just a more explicit presentation of the proof for the case of k = 2.

4 Conclusion and discussion

In this paper, we investigate the problem concerning existence of catalysts for entanglement transformations. It is solved for the simplest case in an analytical way. We give a necessary and su cient condition for the existence of a 2 2 catalyst for a pair of two incomparable 4 4 states. For the general case (k k catalysts for n n states), although we fail to give an analytical condition, an elicient polynomial time algorithm is found when k is treated as a constant. However, if k is a variable, ranging over all positive integers, the problem of determining the existence of catalysts still remains open. We believe it is NP-hard, since the set $A_x = f_{1}x_{1}; :::; nx_{1}; 1x_{2}; :::; nx_{k}g$ in the proof of Theorem 3.1 potentially has exponential kind of dimensional states.

A cknow ledgem ents: The authors are very grateful to the anonym ous referees for their invaluable comments and suggestions that helped to improve the presentation in this paper.

References

- [1] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, R. Josza, A. Peres, and W. K. Wooters, \Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen channels", Phys. Rev. Lett., vol. 70, pp. 1895 [1899, Mar. 1993.
- [2] C.H.Bennett and S.J.W iesner, \Communication via one-and two-particle operators on Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen states", Phys. Rev. Lett., vol. 69, pp. 2881{2884, Nov. 1992.

- [3] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard, \Quantum cryptography: Public key distribution and coin tossing," In Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computers, System s, and Signal Processing, pp. 175{179, IEEE, New York, 1984.
- [4] M.A.Nielsen and I.L.Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [5] C.H.Bennett, H.J.Bennstein, S.Popescu, and B.Schum acher, \Concentrating partial entanglem ent by local operations," Phys.Rev. A, vol. 53, pp. 2046{2052, Apr. 1996.
- [6] M A. Nielsen, \C onditions for a C lass of Entanglem ent Transform ations," Phys. Rev. Lett., vol. 83, pp. 436{439, Jul. 1999.
- [7] A.W. Marshall and I.O kin, Inequalities: Theory of Majorization and Its Applications, Academ ic Press, New York, 1979.
- [8] P.A Iberti and A.Uhlmann, Stochasticity and Partial Order: Doubly Stochastic Maps and Unitary Mixing, Dordrecht, Boston, 1982.
- [9] D. Jonathan and M. B. Plenio, \Entanglem ent-Assisted Local Manipulation of Pure Quantum States", Phys. Rev. Lett., vol. 83, pp. 3566{3569, Oct. 1999.
- [10] S. Bandyopadhyay and V. Roychow dhury, \E cient entanglem ent-assisted transform ation for bipartite pure states", Phys. Rev. A, vol. 65(4), Art. No. 042306, Apr. 2002.

5 Appendix: Proof of Theorem 2.1

Proof of Theorem 2.1 (remaining part): We need to solve the system of inequalities $\lim_{i=1}^{1} a^{(i)}$ $\lim_{i=1}^{1} b^{(i)}$ (1 1 8). This is carried out by the following item s: (1) First, we have:

$$a^{(1)} b^{(1)}$$
 () $_{1}c _{1}c$ () $_{1} _{1}$; (9)

(2) The inequality $a^{(1)} + a^{(2)} + b^{(1)} + b^{(2)}$ may be rewritten as

 $m \operatorname{axf}_{1}c + _{1}(1 c); _{1}c + _{2}cg _{1}c + _{1}(1 c) ()$ (10)

c
$$\frac{1}{1+2}$$
; 1 1: (11)

(3) We now consider $a^{(1)} + a^{(2)} + a^{(3)} + b^{(1)} + b^{(2)} + b^{(3)}$. It is equivalent to

 $maxf_{1}c+_{1}(1 c)+_{2}c;_{1}c+_{2}c+_{3}cg$ $_{1}c+_{1}(1 c)+_{2}c$ ()

С

$$\frac{1}{1+2+3};\frac{1}{2};$$

(4) It holds that

$$a^{(1)} + a^{(2)} + a^{(3)} + a^{(4)} \qquad b^{(1)} + b^{(2)} + b^{(3)} + b^{(4)} \quad ()$$

maxf₁c+ ₁(1 c)+ ₂c+ ₂(1 c); ₁c+ ₂c+ ₃c+ ₁(1 c);
1c+ ₂c+ ₃c+ ₄cg ₁c+ ₁(1 c)+ ₂c+ ₃c ()
$$\frac{1+2}{2+3} c \qquad \frac{1}{1-2}; \frac{1}{2+3}; \frac{1}{2+3} \frac{1}{2-3}; (13)$$

(5)

$$a^{(1)} + a^{(2)} + a^{(3)} + a^{(4)} + a^{(5)} b^{(1)} + b^{(2)} + b^{(3)} + b^{(4)} + b^{(5)} ()$$

$$a^{(6)} + a^{(7)} + a^{(8)} b^{(6)} + b^{(7)} + b^{(8)} ()$$
minf₂(1 c) + ₃(1 c) + ₄(1 c); ₃(1 c) + ₄c + ₄(1 c)g
₃(1 c) + ₄c + ₄(1 c) ()
1 $\frac{4}{3} \frac{4}{3} c 1 \frac{4}{2^{+} 3^{+} 4} \frac{4}{3}$
(14)

(6)

(7) W e have

Combining Eq. (7, 9-16) we obtain

$$C \qquad \frac{1}{1+2}; \frac{3}{3+4}; \frac{1}{1+2}; \frac{1}{1+2+3}; \frac{1}{2+2+3}; \frac{1}{2}; \frac{1}{2}; \frac{1}{1+2+3}; \frac{1}{2+3}; \frac{1}{2+3+4}; \frac{$$

and

c
$$\frac{1+2}{2+3}$$
; 1 $\frac{4}{3}$ (18)

Sinœ

$$1 \quad 1 \quad 2 > 2 \quad 3 > 3 \quad 4 \quad 4; \quad 1 + 2 > 1 + 2;$$

¹ if $_2$ + $_3$ $_2$ $_3$ 0, this term is useless.

it follows that

$$\frac{1}{1+2} > \frac{1}{1+2};$$

$$\frac{3}{3+4} = 1 \quad \frac{4}{3+4} > 1 \quad \frac{4}{3+4};$$

$$\frac{1}{1+2} < \frac{1}{1+2+(3-2)};$$

$$\frac{1}{1+2} < \frac{1}{1+2} < \frac{1}{1+4} = \frac{1}{1-2-3};$$

$$1 \quad \frac{4}{2+3+4-3} > 1 \quad \frac{4}{3+4};$$

$$\frac{1}{2+3-2-3} \quad \frac{1}{2-2}:$$

and

$$\max \frac{1+2}{2+3}; 1 \frac{4}{3} \frac{4}{3} c \min \frac{1}{1+2}; \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}; 1 \frac{4}{3+4}:$$

Therefore, Eq. (4) is a necessary condition for the existence of catalyst.

On the other hand, we claim that Eq. (1) and Eq. (4) are the su cient conditions. Indeed, if we choose a c satis es Eq. (2.1), then c satis es Eq. (17) and (18). From Eq. (9-16) we know that $\lim_{i=1}^{k} a^{(i)}$ $\lim_{i=1}^{k} b^{(i)}$, i.e. $j_1 i j_i ! j_2 i j_i$ under LOCC. This completes the proof.