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#### Abstract

W ithout additional resources, it is often im possible to transform one entangled quantum state into another with localquantum operations and classical com m unication. Jonathan and P lenio $\mathbb{P}$ hys. R ev. Lett. 83, 3566 (1999)] presented an interesting exam ple show ing that the presence of another state, called a catalyst, enables such a transform ation $w$ thout 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 sim plest case of 22 catalysts for transform ations from one 44 state to another, a necessary and su cient condition for existence is found. For the general case, we give an e cient polynom ial tim e algorithm to decide whether a $k$ k catalyst exists for two $n$ incom parable states, where $k$ is treated as a constant.


Index Terms $\mid Q$ uantum inform ation, entanglem ent states, entanglem ent transform ation, entanglem ent catalysts.

## 1 Introduction

Entanglem ent is a fundam ental quantum mechanical resouroe that can be shared am ong spatially separated parties. T he possibility of having entanglem ent is a distinguishing feature ofquantum $m$ echanics that does not exist in classicalm echanics. It plays a centralrole in som e striking applications of quantum com putation and quantum inform ation such as quantum teleportation quantum superdense coding and quantum cryotography A s a result, entanglem ent has been recognized as a usefiulphysical resource H ow ever, $m$ any fundam ental problem s conceming quantum entanglem ent are still unsolved. An im portant such problem concems the existence of entanglem ent transform ation. Suppose that A lice and Bob each have one part of a bi-partite state. T he question then is what

[^0]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 m ake use of local operations and classical com m unication (LOCC). Signi cant progress in the study of entanglem ent was m ade by B ennett, B emstein, P opescu and Schum acher in 1996. They proposed an entanglem ent concentration protocol which solved the entanglem ent transform ation problem in the asym ptotic case. In 1999, $N$ ielsen $m$ ade another im portant
 and Bob, w ith ordered Schm idt coe cients (O SC sfor short) $1 \quad P^{2} \quad p \quad n \quad 0$, and
 OSCs 12 n 2 . It wasproved that $j_{1} i!j_{2} i$ is possible under LOCC if and only if $1_{2}$, where $1_{1}$ and ${ }_{2}$ are the vectors of ordered Schm idt coe cients, i.e. ${ }_{1}=\left(1 ;::: n_{n}\right)$, $=\left(1 ;::: ; n_{2}\right)$, denotes the majorization relation i.e. for 1 l $n$;

| $X^{l}$ |  | $X^{l}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $i$ |  | $i$ |$\quad$;

w ith equality when $l=n$. This fundam ental contribution by $N$ ielsen provides us $w$ ith an extrem ely usefiulm athem atical tool for studying entanglem ent transform ation. A sim ple but signi cant fact im plied by $N$ ielsen's theorem is that there exist incom parable states $j_{1} i$
 N ielsen's work, a quite surprising phenom enon of entanglem ent, nam ely, entanglem ent catalysis, was discovered by Jonathan and P lenio. They gave an exam ple show ing that one $m$ ay use another entangled state jí, known as a catalyst, to $m$ ake an im possible transform ation ji! ji possible. Furtherm ore, the transform ation is in fact one of j i jici! ji ji, so that the catalyst ji is not modi ed in the process.

E ntanglem ent catalysis is another usefiul protocol that quantum $m$ echanics provides. $T$ herefore to exploit the full power of quantum inform ation processing, we rst have to solve the follow ing basic problem : given a pair of incom parable states $j_{1}$ i and $j_{2} i w$ ith
 $j_{1 i} \dot{c} i!j_{2} i \quad j \dot{c} i$. According to $N$ ielsen's theorem, solving the problem requires determ in ing whether there is a state ji forwhich them ajorization relation $\quad 1 \quad$ c $\quad 2 \quad$ c holds. A s pointed out by Jonathan and P lenio it is very di cult to nd an analytical and both necessary and su cient condition for the existence of a catalyst. The di culty is $m$ ainly due to lack of suitable $m$ athem atical tools to deal $w$ ith $m$ jorization of tensor product states, and especially the exible ordering of the O SC s of tensor products. In

Jonathan and Plenio only gave som e sim ple necessary conditions for the existence of catalysts, but no su cient condition was found. Those necessary conditions enabled them to show that entanglem ent catalysis can happen in the transform ation betw een two $n \quad n$ states $w$ ith $n$ 4. O ne of the $m$ ain aim $s$ of the present paper is to give a necessary and su cient condition for entanglem ent catalysis in the sim plest case of entanglem ent transform ation betw een 44 states w th a 22 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 altemative approach; that is, to seek som e e cient algorithm to decide catalyzability of entanglem ent transform ation. Indeed, an
algorithm to decide the existence of catalysts was already presented by B andyopadhyay and R oychow dhury Unfortunately, for twon $n$ incom parable states, to determ ine whether there exists a k k catalyst for them, their algorithm runs in exponential tim e $w$ th complexity $O\left([(n k)!]^{2}\right)$, and so it is intractable in practioe. The intractability of $B$ andyopadhyay and R oychow dhury's algorithm stim ulated us to nd a more e cient algorithm for the sam e purpose, and this is exactly the second aim of the present paper.

This paper is organized as follow s . In the second section we deal w ith entanglem ent catalysis in the sim plest case of $n=4$ and $k=2$. A necessary and su cient condition underwhich a 22 catalyst exists for an entanglem ent transform ation betw een $4 \quad 4$ states is presented. This condition is analytically expressed in term s of the O SC s of the states involved in the transform ation, and thus it is easily checkable. A lso, som e interesting exam ples are given to illustrate the use of this condition. The third section considers the general case. W e propose a polynom ial tim e algorithm to decide the existence of catalysts. Suppose $j_{1} i$ and $j 2_{2}$ are two given $n \quad n$ incom parable states, and $k$ is any
xed natural number. W ith the aid of our algorithm, one can quickly nd all $k \quad k$ catalysts for the transform ation $j_{1}$ i ! j $2^{i}$ using onlv $0\left(n^{2 k+3: 5}\right)$ time. Comparing to the tim e com plexity $O$ ( $\left.[(n k)!]^{2}\right)$ of the algorithm given in for constant $k$, our algorithm im proves the com plexity from superexponential to polynom ial. W e m ake conclusions in section 4, and som e open problem are also discussed.
To sim plify the presentation, in the rest of the paper, we identify the state $j i=$
 be clear from the context.

## 2 A necessary and su cient condition ofentanglem ent catalysis in the sim plest case ( $\mathrm{n}=4 ; \mathrm{k}=2$ )

Jonathan and P lenio [9] has shown that entanglem ent catalysis only occurs in transfor$m$ ations betw een $n \quad n$ states $w i t h n$ 4. In this section, we consider the sim plest case that a transform ation from one 44 state to another possesses a 22 catalyst.
 $13 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 0, \quad i=1 \quad i=1,1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 0$, and $\quad 4=1 \quad i=1$. The potential catalyst is supposed to be a 22 state, denoted by $j i=(c ; 1 \quad c)$, where c $2[0: 5 ; 1]$.

It wasproved in that if j $1 i 6$ j $2_{2}$, but $j_{1} i \quad j i!j_{2} i \quad j i t h e n$

$$
\begin{equation*}
1 \quad 1 ; 1+2>1+2 ; 1+2+31+2+3 i \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

or equivalently,

$$
\begin{equation*}
2+3+4 \quad 2+3+4 ; 3+4<3+4 i \quad 4 \quad 4: \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

$N$ ote that $f{ }_{i g}$ and $f i g$ are arranged in decreasing order, so we have

$$
\begin{array}{llllllll}
1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 3> & 3 & 4 & 4 \tag{3}
\end{array}
$$

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

Theorem 2.1 There exists a catalysts $j$ ifor two states ( $\left.j_{1} i_{i} j_{2} i\right) w i t h j_{1} i 6 j_{2} i$, if and only if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\max \frac{1+2 \quad 1}{2+3} ; 1 \frac{4 \quad 4}{3} 3 \quad m \text { in } \frac{1}{1+2} ; \frac{1}{2} ; 1 \frac{4}{3+4} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

and Eq. hold. In addition, for any c $2[0: 5 ; 1]$ such that

$$
\max \frac{1+2}{2+3} ; 1 \quad \frac{4}{3} \quad 3 \quad c \quad m \text { in } \frac{1}{1+2} ; \frac{1}{2} ; 1 \quad \frac{4}{3+4}
$$

$j i=(c ; 1 \quad c)$ is a catalyst for ( $j 1 i ; j 2 i)$.
 we know Eq. holds. So Eq. and Eq. hold too.

A routine calculation show $s$ that the Schm idt coe cients of $j_{1} i j i$ and $j 2 i j i$ are

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A=f{ }_{1} C ; \quad{ }_{2} C ; \quad{ }_{3} C ; \quad{ }_{4} C ; \quad{ }_{1}(1 \\
& \text { C); } 2 \text { ( } 1 \\
& \text { C); } 3 \text { ( } 1 \\
& \text { C) ; } 4 \text { ( } \\
& \text { C) } g
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{B}=\mathrm{f}{ }_{1} \mathrm{C} ;{ }_{2} \mathrm{C} ;{ }_{3} \mathrm{C} ;{ }_{4} \mathrm{C} ;{ }_{1}(1 \\
& \text { C) ; } 2^{(1} \\
& \text { C) ; } 3 \text { ( } 1 \\
& \text { C) ; } 4 \text { (1 } \\
& \text { C) } 9 \text {; }
\end{aligned}
$$

respectively. Sort the elem ents in A and B in decreasing order and denote the resulted sequences by a ${ }^{(1)} \quad a^{(2)} \quad{ }^{(8)}$ æand $b^{(1)} \quad b^{(2)} \quad{ }^{(8)} b$ It is clear that $a^{(1)}={ }_{1} \mathrm{C}$,
 theorem tells us that

$$
\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}=1}^{\mathrm{X}^{(i)}} \quad \mathrm{X}^{1} \mathrm{~b}^{(\mathrm{i})} \quad\left(\begin{array}{llll}
81 & 1 & 8
\end{array}\right)
$$

Since $f{ }_{i} g$ is ordered, and c 0:5, thus

N ow we are going to dem onstrate that

$$
{ }_{1} \mathrm{C} \quad 1(1 \quad \mathrm{C})>{ }_{2} \mathrm{C} \quad{ }_{3} \mathrm{C}>{ }_{2}\left(\begin{array}{lll}
1 & \mathrm{C}) & 3(1
\end{array} \mathrm{C}\right)>{ }_{4} \mathrm{C} \quad{ }_{4}\left(\begin{array}{lll}
1 & \mathrm{C} \tag{6}
\end{array}\right):
$$

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

First, by de nition of $f a^{(i)} g$ we have $a^{(1)}+a^{(2)} \quad 1 \mathrm{C}+\quad{ }_{2} \mathrm{C}$. So N ielsen's theorem leads to $b^{(1)}+b^{(2)} \quad a^{(1)}+a^{(2)} \quad{ }_{1} c+\quad 2 c$. From inequality $\quad 1+{ }_{2}>\quad 1+\quad 2$, so $\mathrm{b}^{(1)}+\mathrm{b}^{(2)}>\quad{ }_{1} \mathrm{C}+\quad{ }_{2} \mathrm{C}$, i.e. $\mathrm{b}^{(2)}>\quad{ }_{2} \mathrm{C}$. C ombining this w ith inequality , we see that the


Sim ilarly, we have

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

So it holds that

$$
\mathrm{b}^{(1)}+\mathrm{b}^{(2)}+\mathrm{b}^{(3)}+\mathrm{b}^{(4)} \quad \mathrm{a}^{(1)}+\mathrm{a}^{(2)}+\mathrm{a}^{(3)}+\mathrm{a}^{(4)} \quad 1+2>1+2:
$$


$N$ ow what rem ains is to determ ine the order betw een $b^{(5)}$ and $b^{(7)}$. W e consider $b^{(7)}$ rst. $N$ ielsen's theorem yields $b^{(7)}+b^{(8)} \quad a^{(7)}+a^{(8)}$. By de nition, we know that $a^{(7)}+a^{(8)} \quad 3\left(\begin{array}{ll}1 & C\end{array}\right)+4\left(\begin{array}{ll}1 & c\end{array}\right)$. Therefore,

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

the last inequality is due to . Since $\mathrm{b}^{(8)}={ }_{4}(1 \quad c)$, 近 follow S that $\mathrm{b}^{(7)}<3\left(\begin{array}{ll}1 & \mathrm{C})\end{array}\right.$. Furtherm ore, we obtain $\mathrm{b}^{(7)}=4 \mathrm{C} ; \mathrm{b}^{(6)}=3\left(\begin{array}{lll}1 & \text { C) , and } & 3(1\end{array}\right.$ C) $>4 \mathrm{C}$.

Finally, only $2\left(1 \quad\right.$ C) leaves, so b ${ }^{(5)}=2\left(\begin{array}{ll}1 & c\end{array}\right)$. C om bining the above argum ents, we nish the proof of ineorality
$C$ learly, inequality im plies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{2}{2+3}<c<\frac{1}{1+2} ; \frac{3}{3+4} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

$T$ his is needed in the rem ainder of the proof.
P Rem embering the order of B has been found out, it enaples us to calculate easily ${ }_{\mathrm{i}=1}^{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{b}^{(\mathrm{i})}$ for each 1 . The only rest problem is how to calculate ${ }_{\mathrm{i}=1}^{\mathrm{l}} \mathrm{a}^{(\mathrm{i})}$. To this end, we need the follow ing sim ple lem ma:

Lem ma 2.1 A ssume A = fa $;::: ; a_{n} g, B=f b_{1} ;:: ; b_{n} g$. Sort $B$ in decreasing order and denote the resulted sequence by $b^{(1)} \quad b^{(2)} \quad{ }^{(n)} b T$ hen $A \quad B$ if and only if for 11 n ,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\max _{A} \operatorname{ax}_{A \rightarrow A^{0} \dot{j} 1} \mathrm{X}_{a_{i} 2 A^{0}} a_{i} X^{1} \mathrm{X}^{1} b^{(i)} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

with equality when $\mathrm{l}=\mathrm{n}$.

P roof of Lem ma:The \if" part is obvious. For the \only if " part, we sort A in decreasing order and denote the resulted sequence by $a^{(1)} \quad a^{(2)} \quad{ }^{(n)} a \operatorname{Then} A \quad B$ if and only if for $1 \quad 1 \quad n$,

$$
\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}=1}^{\mathrm{X}^{1}} \mathrm{a}^{(\mathrm{i})} \quad \mathrm{X}^{1} \mathrm{~b}^{(\mathrm{i})}
$$

$$
X^{1} \quad X
$$



P roof of Theorem 2.1 (continued): N ow the above lem m a guarantees a quite easy way to dealw ith ${ }_{\mathrm{i}=1}^{\mathrm{l}} \mathrm{a}^{(i)}$ : enum erating sim ply all the possible cases. For exam ple, $a^{(1)}+a^{(2)}=$
 treatm ents for $\quad{ }_{i=1}^{3} a^{(i)} ;::: ; \quad{ }_{i=1}^{8} a^{(i)}$ are the sam $e . W_{P}$ hat we still need to do now is to solve system atically the inequalities of $P_{i=1}^{1} a^{(i)} \quad P_{i=1}^{l} b^{(i)} \quad\left(\begin{array}{lll}1 & 1 & 8\end{array}\right)$. W e put this daunting but routine part in the A ppendix.

The above theorem presents a necessary and su cient condition when a 22 catalyst exists for a transform ation from one 44 state to another. M oreover, it is also worth noting that the theorem is indeed constructive. The second part of it gives all 22 catalysts (if any) for such a transform ation. To ilhustrate the utility of the above theorem, let us see som e sim ple exam ples.

E xam ple 2.1 This exam ple is exactly the original exam ple that Jonathan and P lenic used to dem onstrate entanglem ent catalysis. Let $j_{1} i=(0: 4 ; 0: 4 ; 0: 1 ; 0: 1)$ and $j_{2} i=$ ( $0: 5 ; 0: 25 ; 0: 25 ; 0$ ). Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\max \frac{1+2}{2+3} ; 1 \quad \frac{4-4}{3} 3 & =m \operatorname{axf} 0: 6 ; 1 \quad 2=3 g=0: 6 ; \\
m \text { in } \frac{1}{1+2} ; \frac{1}{2} ; 1 & \frac{4}{3+4}
\end{aligned}
$$

Since 0:6<0:625, Theorem 2.1 gives us a continuous spectrum ji=( $c ; 1 \quad c)$ of catalysts for $j_{1} i$ and $j_{2} i$, where $c$ ranges over the interval [0:6;0:625]. Especially, when choosing $c=0: 6$, we get the catalyst $j i=(0: 6 ; 0: 4)$, which is the one given in

Exam ple 2.2 W e also consider the exam ple in Let $j_{1} i=(0: 4 ; 0: 36 ; 0: 14 ; 0: 1)$ and $j_{2} i=(0: 5 ; 0: 25 ; 0: 25 ; 0)$. The catalyst for $j_{1} i$ and $j_{2} i$ given there is $=(0: 65 ; 0: 35)$. N ote that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\max \frac{1+2}{2+3} ; 1 \quad \frac{4}{3} 3 & =\operatorname{maxf} 0: 52 ; 1 \quad 10=11 \mathrm{~g}=0: 52 ; \\
m \text { in } \frac{1}{1+2} ; \frac{1}{2} ; 1 \quad \frac{4}{3+4} & =m \operatorname{mnf} 25=38 ; 10=11 ; 1 \quad 0 g=25=38 ;
\end{aligned}
$$

and $0: 52<0: 65<25=38$, $T$ heorem 2.1 guarantees that $j i$ is really a catalyst; and it allows us to nd much m ore catalysts $j i=(c ; 1 \quad c)$ with c $2[0: 52 ; 25=38]$.

## 3 An e cient algorithm for deciding existence of catalysts

In the last section, we w as able to give a necessary and su cient condition under which a 22 catalyst exists for an transform ation betw een 44 states. T he key idea enabling us to obtain such a condition is that the order am ong the Schm idt coe cients of the tensor product of the catalyst and the target state in the transform ation is uniquely determ ined by N ielsen's Theorem. H ow ever, the sam e idea does not work when we deal w th higher
dim ensional states, and it seem s very hard to nd an analytical condition for existence of catalyst in the case of higher dim ension. On the other hand, existence of catalysts is a dom inant problem in exploiting the power of entanglem ent catalysis in quantum inform ation proœssing. Such a dilem $m$ a foroes us to explore altematively the possibility of nding an e cient algorithm for deciding existence of catalysts. The $m$ ain purpose is to give a polynom ial tim e algorithm to decide whether there is a $k \quad k$ catalyst for two incom parable $n$ n states $j_{1} i_{i} j 2 i$, where $k \quad 2$ is a xed natural num ber.

To explain the intuition behind our algorithm more clearly, we rst cope with the case of $k=2$. Assume $j_{1} i=\left(1 ;::: ;_{n}\right)$, and $j_{2} i=\left(1 ;::: ;_{n}\right)$ are twon $n$ states, and assum e that the potential catalyst for them is a 22 state $=(x ; 1 \quad x)$. The Schm idt coe cients of $\mathrm{j}_{1} \mathrm{ij} \mathrm{i}$ and $\mathrm{j}_{2} \mathrm{ij} \mathrm{i}$ are then given as

$$
A_{x}=f 1 x ; 2 x ;::: ; n x ; 1(1 \quad x) ;::: ; n_{n}(1 \quad x) g
$$

and
respectively. Sort them in decreasing order and denote the resulting sequences by a ${ }^{(1)}$ ( x ) $a^{(2)}(x) \quad \quad\left(2 n_{d}(x)\right.$ and $b^{(1)}(x) \quad b^{(2)}(x) \quad \quad(2 n b(x)$. By $N$ ielsen's theorem we know that a necessary and su cient condition for $\mathrm{j}_{1} \mathrm{ij} \mathrm{i}$ ! $\mathrm{j}_{2} \mathrm{ij} \mathrm{i}$ is

$$
{ }_{i=1}^{x^{1}} a^{(i)}(x) \quad X_{i=1}^{x^{1}} b^{(i)}(x)(l=1 ;::: ; 2 n):
$$

Now the di culty arises from the fact that we do not know the exact order of elem ents in $A$ and $B$. Let us now consider this problem in a di erent way. If we $\mathrm{x} x$ to some constant $x_{0}$, we can calculate the elem ents in $A, B$ and sort them. Then if we $m$ oves $x$ slightly from $x_{0}$ to $x_{0}+$, the order of the elem ents in A (or B) does not change, except the case that x goes through a point x with $\mathrm{i}(1 \mathrm{x})=\mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{x}}$ (or $\left.\mathrm{i}^{(1} \mathrm{x}\right)=\mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{x}}$ ), i.e. $x=\frac{i}{i^{+}{ }_{j}}$ (resp. $\mathrm{x}=\frac{i}{\mathrm{i}^{+}{ }_{j}}$ ) for some $\mathrm{i}<j$. T his observation leads us to the follow ing algorithm :

A lgorithm 1

1. $i ; j \quad \frac{i}{i^{+}}{ }_{j} ; i ; j \quad \frac{i}{i^{+} j} ; 1 \quad i<j \quad n$
 (2) $\left(n^{2} n\right)$
2. (0) $0: 5 ;\left(n^{2} n+1\right) \quad 1$
3. For $i=0$ to $n^{2} n$ do
4. C $\frac{{ }^{(\mathrm{i})}+{ }^{(\mathrm{i}+1)}}{2}$
5. D eterm ine the order of elem ents in $A_{C}$ and $B_{c}$, respectively
6. Solve the system of inequalities:

$$
\mathrm{P}_{\substack{\mathrm{i}=1 \\(\mathrm{i})}}^{\mathrm{a}^{(\mathrm{i})}} \underset{\mathrm{x}}{(\mathrm{x})} \mathrm{P}_{(\mathrm{i}+1)}^{\mathrm{P}} \mathrm{l}_{\mathrm{i}=1} \mathrm{~b}^{(\mathrm{i})}(\mathrm{x}) \quad(\mathrm{l}=1 ;::: ; 2 \mathrm{n})
$$

8. O U TP U T : C atalysts do not exist, if for all i2 f0; $1 ;::: ;^{\prime} n^{2} \quad n g$, the solution set of the above inequalities is em pty; catalyst ( $x ; 1 \quad x$ ), if for som $e$ i the inequalities has solution.

It is easy to see that this algorithm runs in $O\left(n^{3}\right)$ tim e. In an algorithm for the sam e purpose w as also given, but it runs in 0 ( $n$ !) tim e.

By generalizing the idea explained above to the case of $k$ 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 $k$ catalyst $j i=\left(x_{1} ;::: ; x_{k}\right)$ for them can be decided in polynom ial tim e about $n$. Further m ore, if there exists a $k \quad k$ catalyst, our algorithm can nd all the catalysts in $O\left(n^{2 k+3: 5}\right)$ tim $e$.

P roof. The algorithm is sim ilar to the one for the case $k=2 . N$ ow the $S c h m$ idt coe cients of j 1 ij iand j 2 ij iare

$$
A_{x}=f{ }_{1} x_{1} ;::: ;{ }_{n} x_{1} ;{ }_{1} x_{2} ;::: ;{ }_{n} x_{2} ;::: ;{ }_{n} x_{k} g
$$

and

$$
\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{x}}=\mathrm{f}_{1} \mathrm{x}_{1} ;::: ; \mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{x}_{1} ;{ }_{1} \mathrm{x}_{2} ;::: ;{ }_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{X}_{2} ;::: ;{ }_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{k}} \mathrm{~g}:
$$

If we m ove $x$ in the $k$ dim ensionalspace $R^{k}$, the order of the elem ents in $A_{x}$ (or $B_{x}$ ) will change ifand only ifx goesthrough a hypenplane $i_{1} x_{i_{2}}=j_{1} x_{j_{2}}\left(i_{1} x_{i_{2}}=j_{j_{1}} x_{j_{2}}\right)$ forsome $i_{1}<\dot{j}_{1}$ and $i_{2}>j_{2}$. (Indeed, the area that $x$ ranges over should be ( $k$ 1) dim ensional
 of these hyperplanes

$$
=\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{i}_{1}} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}_{2}}=\mathrm{j}_{1} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{j}_{2}} \ddot{\mathrm{H}}_{1}<\dot{j}_{1} ; \dot{i}_{2}>\dot{j}_{2} g\left[\mathrm{f} \mathrm{i}_{1} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}_{2}}=\mathrm{j}_{1} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{j}_{2}} \ddot{\mathrm{H}}_{1}<\dot{j}_{1} ; i_{2}>\dot{j}_{2} g ;\right.
$$

where $j \quad j=2_{2}^{k}{ }_{2}^{n}=O\left(n^{2}\right)$. In the $k$ dimensional space $R^{k}$, these $O\left(n^{2}\right)$ hypenplanes can at most divide the whole space into $O\left(O\left(n^{2}\right)^{k}\right)=O\left(n^{2 k}\right)$ di erent parts. N ote the num ber of parts generated by these hypenplanes is a polynom ial of $n$. N ow we enum erate all these possible parts. In each part, for di erent $x$, the elem ents in $A_{x}$ (or $B_{x}$ ) has the sam e order. T hen we can solve the inequalities
$\sum_{i=1}^{X^{1}} \quad a^{(i)}(x) \quad X^{1} \quad b^{(i)}(x) \quad(1 \quad 1 \quad n k)$
and check the order constrains by linear program ming. Follow ing the well-known result that linear program $m$ ing is solvable in $O\left(n^{3: 5}\right)$ tim e, our algorithm runs in $O\left(n^{2 k+3: 5}\right)$ tim $e$, it is a polynom ial tim e of $n$ whenever $k$ is a given constant.

Indeed, $T$ heorem 3.1 is constructive too, and its proofgives an algorithm which is able not only to decide whether a catalyst of a given dim ension exists but also to nd all such catalysts when they do exist. The algorithm before this theorem is just a m ore explicit presentation of the proof for the case of $k=2$.

## 4 C onclusion and discussion

In this paper, we investigate the problem conceming existence of catalysts for entanglem ent transform ations. It is solved for the sim plest case in an analyticalw ay. W e give a necessary and su cient condition for the existence of a 22 catalyst for a pair of two incom parable 44 states. For the general case ( $k \quad k$ catalysts for $n \quad n$ states), although we fail to give an analytical condition, an e cient polynom ial tim e algorithm is found when $k$ is treated as a constant. H ow ever, if $k$ is a variable, ranging over all positive integers, the problem of determ ining the existence of catalysts still rem ains open. W e believe it is NP hard, since the set $A_{x}=f{ }_{1} x_{1} ;::: ;{ }_{n} x_{1} ;{ }_{1} x_{2} ;::: ;{ }_{n} x_{2} ;::: ;{ }_{n} x_{k} g$ in the proof of $T$ heorem 3.1 potentially has exponentialkind of di erent orders.
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## 5 A ppendix: Proof of $T$ heorem

Broof of Theorem 2.1 (rem aining part): W e need to solve the system of inequalities $l_{i=1}^{l} a^{(i)} \quad l_{i=1}^{l} b^{(i)}\left(\begin{array}{lll}1 & 1 & 8\end{array}\right)$. This is carried out by the follow ing item $s:$
(1) First, we have:

$$
\mathrm{a}^{(1)} \quad \mathrm{b}^{(1)} \quad\left(\begin{array}{lllll} 
& 1 \mathrm{C} & 1 \mathrm{C} & () & 1 \tag{9}
\end{array}\right.
$$

(2) The inequalty $a^{(1)}+a^{(2)} \quad b^{(1)}+b^{(2)} m$ ay be rew ritten $a s$ $m$ axf ${ }_{1} C+{ }_{1}(1 \quad C) ;{ }_{1} C+{ }_{2} \mathrm{Og} \quad{ }_{1} C+{ }_{1}\left(\begin{array}{ll}1 & C)\end{array}\right)$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { c } \quad \frac{1}{1+2} ; \quad 1 \quad 1:(11) \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

(3) $W$ e now consider $a^{(1)}+a^{(2)}+a^{(3)} \quad b^{(1)}+b^{(2)}+b^{(3)}$. It is equivalent to

$$
\operatorname{maxf}{ }_{1} \mathrm{C}+{ }_{1}(1 \quad \mathrm{C})+{ }_{2} \mathrm{C} ;{ }_{1} \mathrm{C}+{ }_{2} \mathrm{C}+{ }_{3} \mathrm{Cg} \quad{ }_{1} \mathrm{C}+{ }_{1}(1 \quad \mathrm{C})+{ }_{2} \mathrm{C}
$$

C

(4) It holds that

$$
\begin{equation*}
a^{(1)}+a^{(2)}+a^{(3)}+a^{(4)} b^{(1)}+b^{(2)}+b^{(3)}+b^{(4)} \tag{}
\end{equation*}
$$



$$
\begin{align*}
& { }_{1} \mathrm{C}+{ }_{2} \mathrm{C}+{ }_{3} \mathrm{C}+{ }_{4} \mathrm{Cg} \quad{ }_{1} \mathrm{C}+{ }_{1}(1 \quad \mathrm{C})+{ }_{2} \mathrm{C}+{ }_{3} \mathrm{C} \quad() \tag{13}
\end{align*}
$$

(5)

$$
\begin{array}{r}
a^{(1)}+a^{(2)}+a^{(3)}+a^{(4)}+a^{(5)} b^{(1)}+b^{(2)}+b^{(3)}+b^{(4)}+b^{(5)} \\
a^{(6)}+a^{(7)}+a^{(8)} b^{(6)}+b^{(7)}+b^{(8)}
\end{array}
$$

$m \inf 2(1$
C) +3 (1
c) $+\quad{ }_{4}(1$
C); $3(1 \quad \mathrm{C})+{ }_{4} \mathrm{C}+{ }_{4}\left(\begin{array}{ll}1 & \mathrm{C}\end{array}\right) \mathrm{g}$ $3(1 \quad \mathrm{C})+{ }_{4} \mathrm{C}+{ }_{4}\left(\begin{array}{ll}\mathrm{C} & \mathrm{C})\end{array}()\right.$

$$
1 \begin{array}{lllllll} 
& 4 & 4  \tag{14}\\
\cline { 2 - 4 } & 3 & \text { C } & 1 & 4 \\
2+3+4 & 3
\end{array}
$$

(6)

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
P_{i=1}^{6} a^{(i)} & P_{i=1}^{6} b^{(i)} \\
a^{(7)}+a^{(8)} & b^{(7)}+b^{(8)} \tag{}
\end{array}
$$

$m \inf 3(1$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { c) }+{ }_{4}\left(\begin{array}{ll}
1 & C
\end{array}\right) ;{ }_{4} C+{ }_{4}\left(\begin{array}{ll}
1 & C
\end{array}\right) g \quad{ }_{4} C+{ }_{4}\left(\begin{array}{ll}
1 & C
\end{array}\right) \quad() \\
& \text { C } 1 \frac{4}{3+4} ; \quad 4 \quad 4 \tag{15}
\end{align*}
$$

(7) W e have

$$
\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}=1}^{\mathrm{a}^{7}} \quad \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}=1} \mathrm{~b}^{(\mathrm{i})} \quad()^{7} \quad a^{(8)} \quad \mathrm{b}^{(8)} \quad() \quad 4
$$

Combining Eq. we obtain

C


$$
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 1 & 1  \tag{17}\\
2+3 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
2+3+4 & \frac{4}{3+4}
\end{array}
$$

and

$$
\text { c } \quad \frac{1+2}{+2+3} ; 1 \quad \begin{array}{ll}
4 & 4  \tag{18}\\
& 3
\end{array}
$$

Since
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}1 & 1 & 2> & 2 & 3> & 3 & 4 & 4 ; & 1+ & 2> & 1+ & 2 \text {; }\end{array}$
${ }^{1}$ if $2+3 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 0$, this term is useless.
it follow $s$ that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{1+2}>\frac{1}{1+2} \text {; } \\
& \frac{3}{3+4}=1 \quad \frac{4}{3+4}>1 \quad \frac{4}{3+4} ; \\
& \left.\frac{1}{1+2}<\frac{1}{1+2+(3} 2\right) ; \\
& \frac{1}{1+2}<\frac{1}{1+2}<\frac{1}{1+4}=\frac{1}{13} \\
& 1 \frac{4}{2+3+4 \quad 3}>1 \frac{4}{3+4} \text {; }
\end{aligned}
$$

and
 so we can om it them. Now we Th is indicates that there are six useless term $s$ in Eq . get

$$
\max \frac{1+2}{2+3} ; 1 \quad \frac{4-4}{3} \quad 3 \quad c \quad m \text { in } \frac{1}{1+2} ; \frac{1}{2} ; 1 \frac{1}{3+4} \quad:
$$

$T$ herefore, Eq . is a necessary condition for the existence of catalyst.
On the other hand, we claim that F.a. and Eq. are the su cient conditions.
Indeed if we choose a $C_{P}$ satis es Eg Eq. we know that ${ }_{i=1}^{k} a^{(i)} \quad \underset{i=1}{ } b^{(i)}$, ie. j 1 iji! j 1 ij i under LOCC.This com pletes the proof.
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