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#### Abstract

W e dem onstrate that $m$ ultiple copies of a bipartite entangled pure state can help an entanglem ent transform ation under LO C C to be im plem ented with certainty while a single copy can not. We nd that the com bination of m ultiple-copy transform ation and catalyst-assisted transform ation $m$ ay be strictly m ore powerfiul than pure one when the resource available is lim ited, a tradeo between the number of copies of source state and that of partial catalyst is also observed. O ur results can be generalized to probabilistic transform ation directly. Especially, we nd that for som e given entanglem ent transfom ation, the $m$ axim al conversion probability can be increased arbitrarily close to one under the com bination of $m$ ultiple-copy transform ation and catalyst-assisted transform ation although a determ in istic transform ation can never happen.


PACS num bers: 03.67.-a,03.67 M n,03.65.U d

## I. IN TRODUCTION

In recent yearsm ore and $m$ ore applications of quantum - Som ation processing, such as ntum cryptography quan superdense coding and quantum teleportation have led us to view quam entanglem ent as a new kind of physical resouroe. It is im portant to know under what conditions di erent entangled states could be transform ed into each other with local operation and classical com $m$ unicatir" «OCC for short) only. Bennett and his collaborators have $m$ ade a signi cant progress in attacking this cnallenging problem for the asym ptotic case. $W$ hile in com in istic $m$ anner, the
rst step w asm ade by N ielsen i where he found a necessary and su cient condition ior a bipartite entangled state shared between two separated parts to be transform ed into another entangled state betw een them, under the constraint of LO C C . M ore precisely, suppose A lice and Bob share an entangled state $j i$, and they want to transform it into another state $j$ i, allow ing only local operations on their own subsystem and classical com$m$ unication betw een them. N ielsen proved that the two parts can nish this task successfully, that is, ji! ji under LO C C , if and only if , , where and , denote the Schm idt coe cient vectors of $j$ i and $j$ i respectively, and the sym bol ' ' stands for m a jorization relation', which is a vast topic in linear alm, "cr details about $m$ a jorization, we refer to books:

A direct im plication of $N$ ielsen's result is the fact that there are tw o incom parable entangled states $j$ i and $j i$ such that nether ji! jinorji! jiunderLOCC. Fou nform ations between incom parable states, V ida: generalized N ielsen's result w ith a probabilistic

$m$ anner and found an explicit expression of the $m$ axim al conversion probalin for ji!jiunder LOCC. Jonathan and P lenio discovered a surprising phenom enon ofentanglem ent: som etim es, an entangled state can help in becom ing im possible entanglem ent transfor$m$ ations into possible w thout being consum ed at all. $T$ his phenom enon is now w idely know $n$ as entanglem ent catalysis or ELOCC fop short. A pim ple example is as
 W e know that jig ji under LOCC but if som eone lends the ow nerspof the states another entangled state $j i=\overline{0: 6} j 44 i+\overline{0: 4} j 5 i$, then the transform ation
ji ji! ji ji
can be realized w ith certainty because
$T$ he role of the state $j i$ in this transform ation is just as that of a catalyst in a chem ical process since it can help entanglem ent transform ation process w thout being consum ed. In the sam e paper, Jonathan and P lenio also show ed the use of catalyst can im prove the $m$ axim alconversion probability when the transform ation cannot re. w ith certainty even w ith the help of a catalyst. In
the $m$ athem atical structure of entanglem ent catalysis nas been thoroughly studied.
$B$ andy 1 nyay et al found another interesting phenom enon .There are pairs of incom parable bipartite entanglea states that are com parable when $m$ ultiple copies are provided. Such a phenom enon is called as honasym ptot partite pure-state entanglem ent transform ation' in $\quad M$ ore intuitively, this phenom enon can also be called m ultiple-copy entanglem ent transfor$m$ ation', or M LOCC for short. M LOCC $m$ ay be sim ply illustrated by the above states $j i$ and $j i$. It is not di cult to check that the transform ation

$$
\begin{equation*}
j i^{3}!j i^{3} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

occurs w ith certainty using $N$ ielsen's theorem. That is, $w$ hen A lioe and B ob prepare three copies of $j i$ instead of
just a single one, they can transform these three copies all together into three copies of $j$ i by LOCC. This sim ple exam plem eans that the ect of catalyst can, at least in the above situation, be im plem ented by preparing $m$ ore copies of the original state and transform ing these copies together. Som e im portan ects of M LOCC have already been investigated in

The major aim of this paper is to exam ine the possibility of com bining ELOCC w ith M LOCC.W hat was discovered by B andyopadhyay et al is that som etim es the $e$ ect of catalysis can be im plem ented by increasing the num ber of copies of source state. W hereas we present som e exam ples to show another interesting phenom enon that a large enough num ber of copies of entangled state $m$ ay act as a catalyst although a single copy cannot. Such entangled state can be called as partial catalyst. M ore explicitly, if $j i$ is not a catalyst for the transform ation $j$ i! $j$ i, but there is $p>1$ such that $j i^{p}$ is a catalyst for the sam e transform ation, then $j i$ is called as a partial catalyst for the transform ation from $j i$ to $j i$, when it is not necessary to tell clearly the direction of the transform ation, we can sim ply call $j$ i a partial catalyst for the pair $f j i ; j$ ig. (Tobe contrast, we often call the com $m$ only used phrase 'catalyst' as com plete catalyst.) A necessary condition for when a given entangled state can be a partial catalyst for two speci c incom parable entangled states is presented in section II.

It is worth noting that although both ways of enabling entanglem ent transform ation in and in the present paper are increasing num ber of copies of states, the di erence is that il the num ber of copies of source state while in this paper that of partial catalyst is increased. A lot of heuristic exam ples lead us to nd a tradeo betw een the num ber of copies of original entangled state and that of partial catalyst. T hem ore original state copies are provided, the less partial catalyst copies are needed, and vice versa. T wo extrem e cases are especially interesting. W hen no catalysts are available, a rather large num ber of copies of original state are needed in order to realize the transform ation. This is exactly the case of M LOCC.On the other hand, when only one copy of original state is provided, a com plete catalyst or a rather large num ber of partial catalysts are needed. $T$ his reduces to the case ofE LO C C . H ow ever, reductions to the two extrem e cases are not alw ays possible. W ith som e exam ples we show for certain incom parable pair, the role of a partial catalyst cannot be replaced by providing a suitable enough copies of the source state; on the other hand, even a very large num ber of copies of partial catalyst cannot serve as a com plete catalyst for a transform ation from a single copy of source state to a single copy of target state although it is a partial catalyst for $m$ ultiple copies of source state and target state. Thus, it is interesting to exam ine the combination of ELOCC and M LOCC.

An e ect sim ilar to partial catalyst also exists in the case of probabilistic entanglem ent transform ation. To present explicitly such e ect, the notion of com parable states is generalized to -com parable states w th as a
probabilistic threshold. W e also extend catalyst (partial catalyst) to -catalyst (resp. -partial catalyst). T hen $m$ any results in determ in istic case can be directly generalized to probabilistic case. E specially, we show that there exist two entangled states that are -com parable under ELOCC (MLOCC) although they are not com parable under LOCC. We further show that the combination of ELOCC and M LOCC can increase the $m$ axim al conversion probability dram atically. M ost surprisingly, for certain entanglem ent transform ation, we nd that the $m$ axim alconversion probability can be enhanced as close as possible to one under the combination of ELOCC and M LOCC while a determ inistic transform ation can never occur. W e also present a necessary condition of when the combination of $m$ ultiple-copy transform ation and catalyst-ass transform ation has an advantage over pure LO C C

For th ake oI convenience, we present here N ielsen's theorem as a lem $m$ a since it w illbe used in the sequel frequently in analyzing the possibility of entanglem ent transform ation:
 ${ }_{i=1}^{n}{ }_{i}$ i $\ddot{i j i}$ be pure bipartite states $w$ ith $S c h m$ idt co$\begin{array}{llllll}\text { e cients } 1 & \mathrm{n} & 0 \text { and } 1 & \mathrm{n} & 0\end{array}$ respectively. There exists a transform ation T that converts $j$ i into $j$ iw ith œertainty under LOCC ifand only if $f{ }_{i} g$ are $m$ ajorized by $f{ }_{i} g$, that is, ,

$$
\begin{array}{lllll}
X^{1} & X^{1} & & & \\
i=1 & & i=1 & 1 & n ;
\end{array}
$$

w ith equality when $l=n$. By $N$ ielsen's theorem, we can sim ply denote ji ji ifor
$T$ he rest part of the paper is organized as follow s . In section II, we study the combination of ELOCC and M LOCC in the determ inistic $m$ anner, while in section III, we generalize the results to probabilistic case. In section IV we draw a brief conchusion together with some open problem $s$ that $m$ ay be of interests for further study.

## II. COMBININGELOCCW ITH M LOCC: DETERM IN ISTIC CASE

There are $m$ any interesting exam ples in the literatures related to catalyst-assisted entanglem ent transform ation. W e reexam ine som e of them here and show that the role of the com plete catalyst in these exam ples can be im ple$m$ ented by $m$ ultiple copies of partial catalyst. E specially, the follow ing exam ple not only show s the existence of partial catalyst, but also tells that even under the situation that the transform ation ji! ji has no k k com plete catalyst, $k \quad k$ partial catalysts can still exist.

E xam ple 1. Suppose the original entangled state ow ned by $A$ lice and $B$ ob is

$$
\begin{equation*}
j i=P^{P} \overline{0: 4} j 00 i+{ }^{P} \overline{0: 4} \mathcal{1 1} i+{ }^{P} \overline{0: 1} 22 i+{ }^{P} \overline{0: 1} 333 i ; \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the nalstate they want to transform $j i$ into is

$$
j i=P \overline{0: 5 j 00 i+}{ }^{p} \overline{0: 25} 11 i+{ }^{p} \overline{0: 22} 22 i+{ }^{p} \overline{0: 03} j 33 i:
$$

This example is $v e$ ose to the original one that Jonathan and P lenic used to dem onstrate the e ect of catal- and one $m$ ay think that as in the original exam ple A lice and B ob can achieve the transform ation $j$ i! J iwith a 2 catalyst. Unfortunately, it is not the case, the sm all deviation violates the conditions of the existence of a 2 cataly nd there are not any 22 catalysts for $j i$ and $j$ i H ow ever, one can nd a 33 state

$$
\begin{equation*}
j_{1} i=\frac{r}{\frac{50}{103}} j 44 i+\frac{r}{\frac{30}{103}} j 5 i+\frac{r}{\frac{23}{103}} j 66 i \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { ji j1i ji j } j_{1} i \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

By a routine calculation we may observe that

$$
\begin{equation*}
j i^{k} \quad j i^{k} ; k=1 ; \quad ; 5 \text {; } \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

but

$$
\begin{equation*}
j i^{k} \quad j i^{k} ; k=6 ; 7 ; \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

do hold! This show s once again that the e ect of a catalyst can be im plem ented by increasing the num ber of copies of the source state in a transform ation. W e now further put

$$
\begin{equation*}
j_{2 i}=p \overline{0: 6 j 44 i+} \frac{p}{0: 4} \bar{j} 5 i: \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Asmentioned above, $j$ i and $j$ i has no 22 catalysts. Thus, $j_{2} i$ is certainly not a catalyst for them. A surprising thing here is that $j_{2} i{ }^{5}$ is a catalyst for $j i$ and $j$ i because an easy calculation show sthat

$$
\begin{equation*}
j i \quad j_{2 i}{ }^{5} \text { ji j2i }{ }^{5} \text { : } \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

O fcourse, $j_{2} i^{5}$ is not the optim alone in the sense that its dim ension is not the $m$ inim um am ong all catalysts (for exam ple, $j_{1}$ i). W hat this phenom enon indicates is that increasing the num ber of a pure entangled state can strictly broaden the pow er of its catalysis. T his can be intuitively interpreted as the resource in $k$ copies of an entangled state is $m$ ore than $k$ tim es the resource in a single copy in the sense of LO C C .

In the next example, we combine ELOCC with M LOCC, and show that a tradeo exists between the num ber of copies of source state and that artial catalyst. W e also notioe that at the end of an interesting question was asked: are there pairs of $f j i ; j$ ig that are $k$-copy LOCC comparable , but the pairs fj i ${ }^{k^{0}}{ }^{j}{ }^{j}$ i $^{k^{0}}{ }^{\prime}$ b become ELOCC comparable for some $k^{0}<k$ ? We show that such incom parable pair do exist. N ote that $j i$ and $j$ i are $k$-copy LO C C comparable $m$ eans that $f j i^{k} ; \jmath^{j} i^{k} g$ is comparable under LOCC,
while fji $\mathrm{k}^{0}$; j i ${ }^{k^{0}}$ g rem ain incom parable under LO C C for any $k^{0}<k$.

E xam ple 2. Suppose that A lico and Bob share som e copies of source state $j i$ as in Eq and they want to transform it into the sam e num ber ol copies of

$$
j i={ }^{p} \overline{0: 5 j 00 i+}{ }^{p} \overline{0: 25} j 1 i+{ }^{p} \overline{0: 2} 22 i+{ }^{p} \overline{0: 05} 333 i: \quad \text { (12) }
$$

through LOCC.W e suppose the only states they can bormw from a catalyst banker are some copies of $j_{2} i$ Eq . C ould A lice and B ob realize their task with a m in m alcost? N otioe that

$$
\begin{equation*}
j i^{5} 6 \mathrm{j}^{5}{ }^{5} \text { butji }{ }^{6} \mathrm{j}^{6} \text { : } \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

This $m$ eans if the num ber of available copies of $j i$ is larger than or equalto $6, A$ lice and $B$ ob could realize their task them selves w thout borrow ing any catalysts. B ut if they only own 5, say, copies of $j i$, they cannot realize the transform ation under LO C C even joint operations on the 5 copies are perform ed. W e would like to point out that borrow ing one copy of $j_{2} i$ w ill be enough for A lioe and B ob's task because it holds that

$$
\begin{equation*}
j^{i^{5}} j_{2 i} j^{5} i^{5} \quad j_{2} \text { : } \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Sim ilarly, when they only own 4 copies of $j$ i, it is su cient to borrow 2 copies ofj ${ }_{2} i$ to do the task successfully. For the case that 3 copies of $j$ i are ow ned by A lice and Bob, it is easy to see that 3 copies of $j_{2} i$ are not enough and the $m$ in $i m$ al num ber of $j{ }_{2} i$ for their purpose is 4 . Finally, when A lige and B ob own only one copy of $j i$, using 6; ;10 copies ofijcannot achieve the task, we conclude that they must borrow at leat 11 copies of $j_{2} i$ from the catalyst banker since the relation

$$
\begin{equation*}
j i j_{2} i^{k} \quad j i j_{2} i^{k} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

holds only for $k$ 11. A lice and Bob m ust pay an expensive cost to com plete the transform ation in this extrem e case. Perhaps the $m$ ost econom ic strategy for A $1-$ ioe and Bob is to prepare some appropriate num ber of copies of $j$ i (2 or 3), and then borrow som e suitable num ber of copies of $j_{2} i(5$ or 4) as catalysts. This exam ple illustrates a tradeo betw een the num ber of original state copies needed to be transform ed and the num ber of copies ofpartialcatalyst. It also suggests that them echanism of com bining catalyst-assi ransform ationsw ith m ultiple-copy ones proposed in and in this paper is very useful in $m$ any situations.

A ccording to Exam ple 2, it seem s that if an entangled state $j i$ is a partial catalyst for a transform ation from $j$ i to $j i$, then either $j i$ is a partial catalyst for the originalpair, or a su ciently large copies of original pair becom es com parable under LO C C . H ow ever, such state$m$ ents are not correct, as show $n$ in the follow ing exam ple.

E xam ple 3. Take the source state as

$$
\begin{equation*}
j() i=p \frac{1}{1+}\left(j i+P_{-j 44 i)} ;\right. \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

while the target is

$$
\begin{equation*}
j() i=p \frac{1}{1+}\left(j i+p^{j}-j 4 i\right) ; \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $j i$ and $j i$ are de ned as Ed and Eq respectively, $=0: 01 . \mathrm{We}$ also choose

$$
\begin{equation*}
j_{3} i=p \overline{0: 7} \sqrt{55 i+} p \overline{0: 3} j 66 i: \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e can easily check that $j_{3} i$ is a catalyst for 5-copy transform ation (i.e., a transform ation from $j() i^{5}$ to $\left.j() i^{5}\right), j_{3} i^{2}$ is a catalyst for 4-copy transform ation, also for 3-copy transform ation. H ow ever, by $T$ heorem 1 in the follow ing $j 3^{i}$ is not a partial catalyst for $j() i$ and $\jmath^{\prime}() i$. In fact, any transform ation

$$
\begin{equation*}
j() i j_{3} i^{q}!j() i \quad j_{3} i^{q} \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

for arbitrary large $q$ cannot be achieved $w$ ith certainty. On the other hand, it seem s im possible to transform $j$ ( )i into $\mathrm{J}^{\prime}(\mathrm{)}$ i with certainty only using M LOCC.By a num erical calculation, we can deduce that the follow ing relation

$$
\begin{equation*}
j() i^{q} \quad j() i^{q} \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

cannot hold for any q 50. This example dem onstrates that the combination of ELOCC and M LOCC is som etim es strictly $m$ ore pow erfiul than $m$ ere ELO C C and M LOCC in the case when the num ber of copies of catalyst states and that of the source state are lim ited.

From above three exam ples, we can see it will be very usefiulto know when a given entangled state can be a partial catalyst for a speci centanglem ent transform ation. Unfortunately, such a characterization is not known at the present. W e give a necessary condition for the existence of partial catalyst. The follow ing lem m a is interesting of its own right, it gives us a set of necessary conditions for when an entangled state $j i$ can serve as a com plete catalyst for the incom parable pair fj $i ; j$ ig, where jihas Schm idt coe cients $1 \quad 2 \quad$ k 0 : In what follow $s$ we denote $x^{\#}$ as the vector that is obtained by rearranging the com ponents of $x$ into the nonincreasing order. $W$ e also use the sym bol to denote the Schm idt coe cients vector of $j$ i, i.e, $=(1 ; n)$. For incom parable pair $f j i ; j$ ig, we denote

$$
\begin{equation*}
L \quad i^{\prime}=f l: 1 \quad l \quad n ; X_{j=1}^{X^{1}}>_{j=1}^{X^{1}}{ }_{j} 9 \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

as the set of the index that the majorization $j$ i $j$ is violated.

Lem m a 2. Suppose jiand $j$ i are two incom parable states, if the transform ation $j$ i! $j$ i has a com plete catalyst $j$ i, then for any $i=1 ; \quad ; k$ and 12 ; L,

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{1}={ }_{i}>{ }_{1}=1+1 \text { or } i_{i}={ }_{i+1}<l_{1} \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { i+ } 1=k>l_{k}=1 \text { or } i={ }_{i+1}<1+1=n \text { : } \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here any constraint having $m$ eaningless term $s$ such as $k+1$ w illbe satis ed autom atically.

P roof. W e prove this lem m by show inc that for any $k \quad k$ pure state $j i$, if the conditions in Eq are not satis ed, then $j$ i cannot be a com plete catalyst for the transform ation $j i$ to $j i$.

Suppose there exista 1 i $k$ and 12 L ;' such that either Eq. or Eq. does not hold. D ecom pose into two shorter vectors and ${ }^{\infty}$, that is $=\left({ }^{0} ;{ }^{\infty}\right)$, such that ${ }^{0}=(1 ;::: ; 1)$ and $\infty=\left(1+1 ;::: ; n_{n}\right)$. Sim ilarly, we have ${ }^{\prime}=\left({ }^{0} ;^{\prime}{ }^{\infty}\right)$. A lso we decom pose $=$
 The case when $i=k$ is simple since then $=0$ and $\infty$ disappears.

N otice that

$$
\left(^{\prime} \quad\right)^{\#}=\left(\begin{array}{lllll}
\left(^{0}\right. & 0, \prime^{0} & \infty, \prime^{\prime} & 0, \prime^{\prime} & \infty
\end{array}\right)^{\#}: \quad \text { (24) }
$$

Them inim alcom ponent of ${ }^{0}{ }^{0}$ is 1 i while the $\mathrm{max}-$ im al components of ${ }^{0} \quad \infty, \infty \quad 0$ and $r^{\infty} \quad \infty$ am 1 i+1, $1+1$ and $1+1$ i+1, respectively. So if Eo is not satis ed, that is

$$
\begin{equation*}
1=i_{i} \quad 1=1+1 \text { and } i=i+1 \quad 1=1 ; \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

then


$$
\begin{align*}
& <\left(_{j=1}^{X^{1}}{ }_{j}\right)\left(_{j=1}^{X^{i}} \quad\right)_{j=1}^{X^{i l}}(\quad)_{j}^{\#} ; \tag{27}
\end{align*}
$$

where the rst strict inequality is from $\frac{1}{P} 2 \mathrm{~L},{ }^{\prime}$, while the last inequality is by the de nition of ${ }^{P}{ }_{j=1}^{i l}(\quad)_{j}^{\#}$. It follow sthat ji ji i $i$.

On the other hand, if Eq is not satis ed, then it can be checked that the least ( $k$ i) ( $n$ l) com ponents of ( $\left.{ }^{\prime} \quad\right)^{\#}$ are just the com ponents of $r^{\infty} \quad \infty$. So we can also conclude that $j i \quad j i \quad j i \quad j i b y$ considering the sum of least $\left(\begin{array}{lll}k & i\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{ll}n & l\end{array}\right)$ components of $\quad$ with a sim ilar argum ents like above. W ith that we com plete the proof of theorem.

N ow we can present a necessary condition for the existence of partial catalyst, as follow ing theorem indicates:

Theorem 1. If $j i$ is a partial catalyst of the incom parable states $j$ i and $j$ i, then for any 12 L ;'

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{1}={ }_{2}<1=1 \text { and }{ }_{k}=_{k}<1+1={ }_{n} \tag{28}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. IfEq does not holds, i.e,

$$
\begin{equation*}
1=2 \quad 1={ }_{1} \text { or } k \quad 1=k \quad 1+1=n \tag{29}
\end{equation*}
$$

is satis ed for somel2 $\mathrm{L} ;^{\prime}$, then Eq or Eq w ill be violated. W e conclude that

$$
\begin{equation*}
j i j i^{m} \text { ji ji }{ }^{m} \tag{30}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any positive integer $m$ since

$$
(\mathrm{m})_{1}^{\#}=(\mathrm{m})_{2}^{\#}={ }_{1}^{\mathrm{m}}=\left(\begin{array}{lll}
2 & \mathrm{~m} & 1 \tag{31}
\end{array}\right)={ }_{1}=2
$$

and
whatevor the value $m$ takes, which violate $w$ ith Eq and Eq again after replace $j$ iw ith $j i^{m}$, it follow $s$ that $j 1$ " cannot be a catalyst for $j i$ and $j i$ iwhatever $m$ takes. $W$ ith that we com plete the proof of $T$ heorem 1.

Noticing when $k=2$ and $n=4$, for incom parable states $j$ i and $j \mathrm{j}$, $\mathrm{L} ;{ }^{\prime}=\mathrm{f} 2 \mathrm{~g}$, we have the following consequence of $T$ heorem 1 .

C orollary 1. If 22 state $j i$ is a partial catalyst for the incom parable states $j$ i and $j$ i then

$$
\begin{equation*}
1<{ }_{1}={ }_{2}<\operatorname{minf}{ }_{1}={ }_{2} ; 3={ }_{4} g \text { : } \tag{33}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e now tend to analyze an interesting phenom enon and try to give an intenpretation. From the exam ples in previous discussion, it seem sthat the relation of $m$ ajorization under tensor product is $m$ onotone in the sense that if $j i^{k} \quad j i^{k}$ then $j i^{(k+1)} \quad j i^{(k+1)}$ for any bipartite entangled state $j i$ and $j i$ and for any positive integer $k$. $T$ his desirable erty was rstm entioned by $B$ andyopadhyay ${ }^{-1}$ in In general, how ever, this is not true. In Leung and Sm olin disproved this con jecture by giving explicit counterexam ples. B ecause of this, onewill nd that the follow ing theorem becom es very useful, it tells us to check whether j i ${ }^{p} \quad j^{p}$ hold for any $p \quad k$, one only needs to check $k$ values of $p$, i.e., $\mathrm{p}=\mathrm{k} ; \quad$; $2 \mathrm{k} \quad 1:$

Theorem 2. For any twon n entangled pure states $j$ i and $j^{i}$. Suppose that $k$ 1. Then $j^{p}{ }^{p}$ ! jip for all $p \quad k$ by LOCC if and only if $j^{p}{ }^{p}!j^{p}$ for allk p 2k 1 by LOCC.

P roof. The only if' part is very sim ple. W e only deal $w$ ith the 'if' part. For any positive integers $p \quad 2 k$ and $k$, there exist non-negative integers $r$ and $s$ such that

$$
p=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
r & 1 \tag{34}
\end{array}\right) k+(k+s) ; r \quad 2 ; s \quad k \quad 1:
$$

N ow an explicit protocol to achieve the transform ation j i ${ }^{\mathrm{p}}$ ! j i $^{\mathrm{p}}$ under LOCC consists two steps:
1). Perform ( $r$ 1) tim es transform ation

$$
\begin{equation*}
j i^{k}!j i^{k} ; \tag{35}
\end{equation*}
$$

2). Perform one tim e transform ation

$$
\begin{equation*}
j i^{(k+s)}!j^{(k+s)}: \tag{36}
\end{equation*}
$$

By the conditionswhen $k \quad p \quad 2 k \quad 1$, the transform ation $j i^{p}$ ! $j^{p}{ }^{p}$ can be implem ented $w$ ith certainty under LOCC, we know that the transform ations in 1) and 2) both can be realized w ith certainty.
$T$ hat com pletes the proof of $T$ heorem 2 .
Fortunately, we can easily check that all exam ples in this paper satisfy the conditions of $T$ heorem 2. As exam ple, let

$$
\begin{equation*}
j i=p \overline{0: 408 j 00 i+}{ }^{p} \overline{0: 4} 222 i+{ }^{p} \overline{0: 1 j 33 i+} p \overline{0: 092} \dot{j} 44 i \tag{37}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
j i=P \overline{0: 5} j 00 i+P \overline{0: 25} 11 i+P \overline{0: 25} 22 i: \tag{38}
\end{equation*}
$$

A simple calculation show sthat $j^{3}{ }^{3} j^{3}{ }^{3}, j i^{5}$ $j i^{5}$, but $j i^{4} j^{4} i^{4}$ ! In fact, with the aid of $T$ heorem 2, one can easily prove that j i ${ }^{k} \quad j^{k}{ }^{k}$ does hold for all $k 3$ except $k=4$. In other words, if we restrict entanglem ent transform ations by allow ing only LO C C an ${ }^{-1}$ mobibit any other aids, such as cata sented in or multiple-copy one proposed in we w illm eet a transparent paradox: we can transform unree ( ve) copies of $j$ i into three (resp. ve) copies of $j i$, but we cannot transform four copies of $j i$ into the sam $e$ num ber of ${ }^{\prime}$ i's. In a sense, this is not reasonable because under such situation, the entanglem ent in four copies of $j i$ is still larger than that in four copies of $j i$. In the follow ing, we show that if we allow entanglem ent transform ations to be realized w ith the aid of catalysts, we can avoid the paradox presented above.

In fact, if we extend LOCC into ELOCC, we can hope that $j i$ and $j$ i are ELOCC-com parable by the hint of Example 2, that is, if $j i$ and $j i$ are $k$-copy LO C C com parable state, then they are $\mathrm{k}^{0}$-copy E LO C C com parable for $k^{0}<k$, 辻 follow $s$ that for any $k>1$, of course for $k=4, j i^{k}$ and $j i^{k}$ becom- FLOCC com parable. In fact, we nd that $j_{2} i$ in Equ is indeed a catalyst for the transform ation $j^{4}{ }^{4}$ ! J ll. In generalw e con jecture that for any two xed positive integers $m$ and $n$, $j i^{m}$ and $j i^{m}$ are ELOCC-com parable is equivalent to that $j i^{n}$ and $j^{j} i^{n}$ are ELOCC-com parable, where $j$ i and $j$ i are two anbitrary bipartite entangled pure states. $T$ he $m$ otivation behind this con jecture is that all these relations express the sam e fact: the entanglem ent am ount in $j i$ is $m$ ore than that in $j i$ in a determ in istic $m$ anner.

## III. COMBININGELOCCW ITH MLOCC: PROBABILISTIC CASE

W hat concems us in the last section are transform ations with certainty. This section will exam ine some transform ations w ith probability strictly less than 1. If the $m$ axim al conversion probability from $j$ i to $j$ iunder LOCC is not less than, where $2(0 ; 1]$, we say that $j i$ is -OCC comparable to $j i$, or shortly, $j i$ is comparable to $\mathfrak{j}$ i. we simply call that fji; $\mathrm{j}^{\mathrm{j}} \mathrm{ig}$
is -com parable if one of the pair is -com parable to the other, otherw ise is -incom parable. T he term inology
ELOCC comparable is a direct extension of the case ELOC C, i.e., there exists entangled state $j$ i such that $j$ i jiand $j^{i} j$ iare -comparableunderLOCC.The de nition of M LOCC com parable should be treated more carefiully! fj $i ; j$ ig is M LOCC comparable if there is som epositive integerk such that $j i^{k}$ and $j i^{k}$ are ${ }^{k}$-com parable under LOCC.Them otivation behind such de nition is that the collective operations are always not less pow erful than individual operations. Like the com plete catalyst and partial catalyst in the deter$m$ inistic case, we callj i a -catalyst for -LOCC incom parablepairfj $i ; j$ ig ifthe pairfji $j i ; j i \quad j$ igbecomes ŁOCC com parable. Sim ilarly, $j$ i is a -partial catalyst ifm ultiple copies of $j$ i can serve as a -catalyst for ff $i ; j$ ig while a single copy of $j i$ is not a -catalyst. It is obvious that a 1-catalyst is just a com plete catalyst, while a 1-partial catalyst is a partial catalyst.

O ur discussions in the determ inistic transform ations can be directly extended into the probabilistic ones. The follow ing exam ple not only dem onstrates the existence of -partial catalysts, but also shows in the probabilistic case, the presence of -partial catalyst and multiple copies of source state can increase the $m$ axim al conversion probability dram atically.

E xamplesp 4. Let us see two ipcom parable 3 states $j i=\bar{p} \overline{0.6} j 00 i+\frac{0.2}{p} 11 i+\quad \overline{0.2} 22 i$ and $j i=$ sidered by $J{ }^{1}$ an and $P$ lenio in $\quad$ Recall from $V$ idal's theorem that the m axim alconversion probabilty of j i! J lunder LOCC is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{\max }(j i!j i)=m \operatorname{in}_{1} 1 \mathrm{n} \frac{E_{1}(j i)}{E_{1}(j i)} \tag{39}
\end{equation*}
$$

 above, we have $P_{m a x}(j i!j i)=0: 80$. A nd then $j i$ and $j$ i are not $0: 9$-com parable. H ow ever, aps show $n$ in $w$ ith the aid ofan entangled state $j i=\overline{0: 65} j 33 i+$ 0:35j44i, the maxim al conversion probability becom es $P_{\max }(j i \quad j i!j i j i)=0: 904$. So ji and $j i$ are $0: 9 \mathrm{ELOCC}$ com parable and $j i$ is a $0: 9$-catalyst for fj i; $\jmath^{\prime}$ ig. How about if A lige and Bob want to increase their conversion probability to $0: 985$ ? T he hardness of the problem is how to nd a 0:985-catalyst. A careful analysis shows that $j$ i ${ }^{\prime} i$ do not have any 2 state as a 0:985-catalyst Fortunately, a calculation show sthat ifw eborrow 19 copies of $j i$ then $j$ is $0: 985-$ ELOCC com parable to $j$ i since the relation

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{\max }\left(j i \quad j i^{k}!j i \quad j i^{k}\right) \quad 0: 985 \tag{40}
\end{equation*}
$$

holds for $k$ 19. If A lice and B ob share two copies of $j$ i, then we can easily check that

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{\max }\left(j i^{2}!j^{2}\right)=0: 8533: \tag{41}
\end{equation*}
$$

A coording to our de nition of M LOCC , the E $m$ eans that $j i$ and $j i$ are in fact, $(0: 8533)$
com parable, or m ore explicitly, 0:9237-com parable underM LO C C. Ifw e take catalyst-assisted transform ations and $m$ ultiple-copy ones together, the $m$ axim alconversion probability can increase dram atically. This is show $n$ by the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{\max }\left(j i^{2} \quad j i^{3}!j^{2} \quad j i^{3}\right)=0: 9535 ; \tag{42}
\end{equation*}
$$

which implies that $j i$ and $j i$ are 0:9765-com parable under the com bination of the E LO CC and M LO CC.Four copies of $j$ i with three copies of $j$ i attains a probability at $0: 9568$ which show s that $j$ is $0: 9854$-com parable to $J$ iunder the com bination ofE LO C C and M LO C C.A lso we can check that a pure M LO C C m anner needs 7 copies of $j$ i to do collective operations together to attain $0: 985-$ M LO C C com parable. So, in the probabilistic case, the combination ofELOCC and M LOCC is also very useful and it can really help us to nd a tradeo between the num ber of copies of partial catalyst and that of source state.

In above exam ple, since j i cannot be transform ed into $j$ iw th certainty un he com bination ofE LO C C andMLOCC (see anc , we cannot nd a catalyst for them and the maxim al conversion probability from $j$ i to $j$ iw illbe strictly less than one. To our surprise, we nd that them axim alconversion probability from $j i$ to $j$ i can get close to one very quickly under the com bination of ELOCC and M LOCC, for exam ple transform 13 copies of $j$ ito the sam e num ber of the copies of $j i$ can be ach ieved w ith a probability $0: 9957^{13}$. T his strange phenom enon indicates that $j$ i can be transform ed into $j$ iw th very sm all unsuccessfulprobability w ith the aid of ELOCC (M LOCC).W e can expect the suprem um of them axim alconversion probability of the transform ation underELOCC orM LOCC achieves one, take ELOCC as an exam ple, it $m$ ay hold,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{k}{ }_{1} P_{\max }\left(j i \quad j i^{k}!j i \quad j i^{k}\right)=1 \text { : } \tag{43}
\end{equation*}
$$

Intuitively say, with the aid of enough copies of $j i, j i$ can be transform ed into $j$ i w ith a successfulprobability arbitrarily close to 1 (that is, ! 1 when k ! +1). W hen can this phenom enon occur? W e seek som e necessary conditions for it. First notice that

$$
\begin{equation*}
E(j \text { i) }=1: 3710>1: 3610=E(j \text { i); } \tag{44}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $E(j i)=P_{n} \quad \log _{2} i$ is the entropy of entanglem ent of $j$ i. Eq is very reasonable since otherw ise one can use sucn quantum catalysis e ect to increase the entropy of entanglem ent on average by using a large num ber of copies of $j$ i to obtain the sam e num ber of conioc of $j$ i w th probability close to one. But on ly Fo certainly cannot guarantee the validity of M ore generally, we have the follow ing proposition:

Proposition 1. If $j i$ is ELOCC comparable to $j i$ for any $2[0 ; 1)$ then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { E (j i) E (j i) and } n{ }_{n} \text { : } \tag{45}
\end{equation*}
$$

$W$ e can nd that the condition $n \quad n$ in $E q$ are $m$ ore weaker than that in dotorm in istic $m$ anner (see Eq $\quad$ This indicates that Eq is possible although $j 1$ cannot be transform ed into $J 1$ With certainty in a determ inistic $m$ anner. $W$ e think the key di erence betw een probabilistic transform ation and determ inistic transfor$m$ ation lies in the asym $m$ etry of the roles of the largest and the sm allest com ponents in probabilistic transform ation. M ore precisely, to ensure transform ing $j i$ ints ; w ith certainty under ELO C C , a necessary condition such that
$1 \quad 1$ and $n$
is needed. The condition in Eq should be held even when the transform ation can only be achieved w ith certainty with aid of an in nite dim ensional catalyst. $W$ hile to ensure transform ing $j$ i into $j$ i w ith probability $2(0 ; 1)$ under ELOCC, a necessary condition is as follow s

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{n} \quad \mathrm{n} ; \tag{47}
\end{equation*}
$$

the largest com ponents are in fact not involved, when tendeto 1 from the left, i.e., ! 1 , the condition in Eq the condition in Eq
Eq be con med isfly une condition in Eq n , this cannot be reduced to So the existence of the pair in hough such pair does not satR oughly speaking, it m ay hold that ELOCC comparable is discontinuousw hen tends to 1 , that is, $j i$ is ELOCC comparable to $j i$ for any $2(0 ; 1)$ does not im ply that it is also 1モLOC C com $\mathrm{F}^{-1 \mathrm{l}}$ le to j , the latter needs $m$ ore stronger conditions It may be of great intemots to nd out such cond is held or to prove that the condition in Eq. is also su cient in the case $\mathrm{n}=3$, since this can certainly help us to understand the $m$ easure ofentangle$m$ ent in the probabilistic transform ation under ELO C C .

In the determ in istic case, w e have seen an exam ple such that j i ${ }^{k} j^{k}{ }^{k}$ but j i ${ }^{(k+1)} j^{i^{(k+1)}}$ in previous section. Such exam ples are at least 4 4-dim ensional, since in the case 3 3, j i ${ }^{k} \quad j^{k} i^{k}$ forany $x e d k i m p l i e s$ that $j$ i $j$ i. To one's surprise, a sim ilar phenom enon can occur in the case $3 \quad 3$ when we consider probabilistic transform ation. That is, for any $2(0 ; 1)$, there exists 33 pair fj $i ; j$ ig such that for som ek> $1, j i^{k}$ and $\mathrm{j}^{\mathrm{k}}{ }^{\mathrm{k}}$ are ${ }^{\mathrm{k}}$-com parable while j $\mathrm{i}^{(k+1)}$ and j $\mathrm{i}^{(k+1)}$ are ${ }^{k+1}$-incom parable. W e give a concrete exam ple to dem onstrate this fact.

E xam ple 5. Take the sam e source state and target state w th E xam ple 4. If we set $=0: 9917$, by a direct calculation, then we can that nd that $j i^{8}$ and $j^{8}{ }^{8}$ are ${ }^{8}$-com parable since

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{\max }\left(j i^{8}!j i^{8}\right)=0: 9918^{8}>{ }^{8} ; \tag{48}
\end{equation*}
$$

while j i ${ }^{9}$ and $j^{j}$ i $^{9}$ are ${ }^{9}$-incom parable since

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{\max }\left(j i^{9}!\text { j }^{9}\right)=0: 9916^{9}<{ }^{9}: \tag{49}
\end{equation*}
$$

A sim ilar result like the determ inistic case can be stated into the follow ing theorem .

Theorem 3. For any twon $n$ pure states $j i$ and $j i$ and $2(0 ; 1]$. Suppose that $k \quad 1$. Then $j i^{p}$ and $j^{\mathrm{j}}{ }^{\mathrm{p}}$ are ${ }^{\mathrm{p}}$-com parable forallp k ifand only if $\mathrm{j}^{\mathrm{i}}{ }^{\mathrm{p}}$ and $j^{\mathrm{j}} \mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{p}}$ are ${ }^{\mathrm{p}}$-com parable for all $\mathrm{k} \quad \mathrm{p} 2 \mathrm{k} \quad 1$.

Proof. Sim ilar w ith Theorem 2, details om itted.

N ow let us tum to another interesting question: is it alw ays usefulw hen com bining catalyst-assisted transfor$m$ ation $w$ ith $m$ ultiple-copy transform ation? Exam ple 3 and Exam ple 4 give som e hints to a positive answ er to the question. H ow ever, we can show that such an im prove$m$ ent does not alw ays happen as the follow ing theorem in ${ }^{-1-1 e s . ~ T h i s ~ t h e o r e m ~ i s ~ a ~ g e n e r a l i z a t i o n ~ o f ~ L e m ~ m ~ a ~} 4$ in which says that the presence of catalysts cannot alw ays increase conversion probability. W e sh ${ }^{-1,1}$ point out that a sim ilar result has been obtained in

Theorem 4. Let $j i$ and $j i$ be two quantum states w ith Schm idt coe cients vectors ( 1 ; $n$ ) and ( 1 ; $n$ ) respectively, and let the maxim al conversion probability of the transform ation ji! jiunder LOCC be $P_{\max }(j i!j i) . \operatorname{Let} P_{\max }^{E}\left(j i^{p}!j i{ }^{p}\right)$ be the $m$ axim alconversion probability of the transform ation ji $p$ ! $j i{ }^{p}$ under ELOCC, where $p$ is a positive integer. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(P_{\max }(j \text { i ! j i) })^{p} \quad P_{\max }^{E}\left(j i^{p}!j^{p}\right) \quad\left(\frac{n}{n}\right)^{p}:\right. \tag{50}
\end{equation*}
$$

$P$ roof. T he left inequality is obtained by perform ing the transform ation j i p ! j i p under LO C C one by one. $T$ he right part of the inequality can be proven as follow s. Suppose j i is any quantum entangled state w ith Schm idt coe cients $12 k 0, q$ is a positive integer. By the de nition we can have that $P_{m a x}^{E}\left(j i p^{p}\right.$ ! j ${ }^{p}$ ) is equal to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{; k ; q} P_{\max }\left(j i^{p} \quad j i^{q}!j^{p} \quad j i^{q}\right) \text {; } \tag{51}
\end{equation*}
$$

where suprem um takes over ji2 $C^{k} C^{k}, \mathrm{k} \quad 1, \mathrm{q} \quad 1$. O n the other hand, by $V$ idal's theorem, we obtain that

$$
\begin{align*}
& P_{\text {max }}\left(j i^{p} \quad j i^{q}!j i^{p} \quad j i^{q}\right) \tag{52}
\end{align*}
$$

Where we have used that $\left.\mathrm{E}_{n^{p} k^{q}(j i p \quad j} i^{q}\right)=p \mathrm{q}$
The left mant of Equ
follow by combining $E q$ w ith Eq T hat com pletes the proof of theorem

C orollary 2. Conditions as above, if $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{m}}$ ax (j i ! $j i)=\frac{n}{n}$, then $P_{m a x}^{E}\left(j i^{p}!j^{p}\right)=\left(\frac{n}{n}\right)^{p}$. In other words, in this case, even the multiple-copy or catalyst assisted transform ation cannot increase the conversion probability. In fact, collective operations in this case has no advantages over individual operations.

An interesting application of Corollary 2 is to cope $w$ ith the case ${ }_{P}{ }_{n}$ hen $j$ is a $m$ axim alentangled state, that
 ability which reads $P_{m}$ ax $=n n_{n}$ cannot be increased by any com bination of catalyst-assisted and multiple-copy transform ations. E xam ple 4 gives another application. In fact, for any two 3 states $j i$ and $j$ iw ith Schm idt coe cients vectors ( $1 ; 2$; 3 ) and ( $1 ; 2$; 3 ) respectively, if $3<3$ then $m$ axim al conversion probability $P_{m a x}\left(j i^{k}!j^{k}\right)$ will be $\left(\frac{3}{3}\right)^{k}$ which is an exponential decreasing of $k$ as pointed in

W hen $n<n$, by Theorem 4, we alw ays have that $P_{m a x}^{E}\left(j i^{p}\right.$ ! j $\left.i^{p}\right)\left(\frac{n}{n}\right)^{p}$. W hether MLOCC is strictly pow erful that LOCC in such situation? W e give a last example to show even $P_{m}^{E}{ }_{\text {ax }}\left(j i^{p}\right.$ ! j $i^{p}$ ) is exponentially deceasing $w$ hen $p$ is increased, M LO C C can be still strictly pow erfiul than m ere LO C C .

E xam ple 6 . Suppose the source state ow ned by A lige and Bob is
and they want to transform them into the sam e num ber of copies of

$$
\begin{equation*}
j i=p \overline{0: 5 j 00 i+} P \overline{0: 25} j 1 i+P \overline{0: 17} j 2 i+P \overline{0: 08} j 33 i: \tag{56}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is easy to check out that $P_{m}$ ax $(j$ i! ji) $=0: 8$, while $P_{\text {max }}\left(j i^{2}!j^{2}\right)=0: 6875$, so

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{m a x}\left(j i^{2}!j i^{2}\right)<P_{m a x}(j i!j i) ; \tag{57}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we restrict ourselves to do the transform ation one by one, only a successfiul probability $0: 8^{2}$ can be achieved, which is, of course, strictly less than to do collective transform ation $j^{2}{ }^{2}$ ! j $i^{2}$. So we have dem onstrated another property of L LO C C :m ultiple-copy transform ation can be also $m$ ore strictly powerfulthan pure LO C C if $P_{m a x}(j i!j i)<m \inf { }_{n}=_{n}$; 1 g although the $m a x-$ im al conversion probability from $j i^{k}$ to $\mathrm{J}^{i^{k}}$ is de....sed exponentially if $n<n$ (bounded by $\left.\left({ }_{n}={ }_{n}\right)^{k}\right)$
a catalyst although only one copy cannot, such state has been term ed as partialcatalyst'. In general, we have analyzed the possibility of com bing ELOCC w ith M LOCC. M oreover, under the situation when resources available are lim ited, that is, the num ber of copies of source state and that of auxiliary entangled state which can be used as possible partial catalyst are lim ited, we have show n that even when both pure catalyst-assisted transform ations and multiple-copy ones cannot be used to realize entanglem ent transform ations w ith certainty, the com bination of these tw o still can. O ur results in the determ inistic case then have been directly generalized to probabilistic case. M ost interestingly, we have show $n$ that M LOCC is always not less powerful than pure LOCC, even in the case when the $m$ axim al conversion probability from $k$ copies of source state to the sam e num ber of copies of target state is decreased exponentially when $k$ is increased. O ur results, in fact provide a possible w ay to seek a catalyst for given incom parable pairs from a possible partial catalyst. (N ote there are no any analytical way to nd a catalys given in parable pair except som e special case also see . A very strange phenom enon also has.oeen observed: there is œrtain entangled pair such that the $m$ axim al conversion probability from one to another under ELOCC can be arbitrarily close to one although they are incom parable in a determ inistic $m$ anner even under the com bination of ELOCC and M LOCC.W ebelieve that such phenom enon in fact discovers an essential di erence betw een probabilistic transform ation and determ inistic transform ation under ELOCC and M LOCC.

There are $m$ any open problem $s$ that $m$ ay be of relevance. The m ost interesting one is, of course, what is the precise relation betw een ELO C C and M LO CC ? Furtherm ore, is the combination of ELOCC and M LOCC ${ }^{-2}$ y. ys strictly powerfulthan pure E LO C C and M LO C C

The another interesting one is to give a su cient condition for when a given entangled state can serve as partial catalyst for another given incom parable pair.
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> IV . CONCLUSION

To sum m arize, $W$ e have dem onstrated that in som e cases $m$ ultiple copies of an entangled state can serve as
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