Tradeo Between Multiple-copy Transform ation and Entanglem ent Catalysis with Limited Resources

Runyao Duan,¹, Yuan Feng,¹,^y X in $Li_r^{1,z}$ and M ingsheng Y ing^{1,x}

¹State Key Laboratory of Intelligent Technology and Systems,

Department of Computer Science and Technology Tsinghua University, Beijing, China, 100084

(D ated: June 12, 2022)

We demonstrate that multiple copies of a bipartite entangled pure state can help an entanglem ent transform ation under LOCC to be implemented with certainty while a single copy can not. We not that the combination of multiple-copy transform ation and catalyst-assisted transform ation may be strictly more powerful than pure one when the resource available is limited, a tradeo between the number of copies of source state and that of partial catalyst is also observed. Our results can be generalized to probabilistic transform ation directly. Especially, we nd that for some given entanglement transform ation, the maxim al conversion probability can be increased arbitrarily close to one under the combination of multiple-copy transform ation and catalyst-assisted transform ation although a determ inistic transform ation can never happen.

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

I. IN TRODUCTION

In recent yearsm ore and m ore applications of quantum inform ation processing, such as quantum cryptography [1], quantum superdense coding [2] and quantum teleportation [3], have led us to view quantum entanglem ent as a new kind of physical resource [4]. It is important to know under what conditions di erent entangled states could be transform ed into each other with local operation and classical communication (LOCC for short) only. Bennett and his collaborators [5] have made a signi cant progress in attacking this challenging problem for the asymptotic case. W hile in deterministic manner, the

rst step wasm ade by N jelsen in \$] where he found a necessary and su cient condition for a bipartite entangled state shared between two separated parts to be transform ed into another entangled state between them, under the constraint of LOCC. More precisely, suppose A ice and Bob share an entangled state j i, and they want to transform it into another state j i, allowing only local operations on their own subsystem and classical com munication between them . Nielsen proved that the two parts can nish this task successfully, that is, ji! ji under LOCC, if and only if , , where and , denote the Schmidt coe cient vectors of j i and j i respectively, and the symbol ` ' stands for majorization relation', which is a vast topic in linear algebra (for details about m a prization, we refer to books [9], [10]).

A direct in plication of N ielsen's result is the fact that there are two incomparable entangled states j i and j i such that neither j i! j i under LOCC. For transform ations between incomparable states, V idal [11] generalized N ielsen's result with a probabilistic m anner and found an explicit expression of the maximal conversion probability for j i ! j i under LOCC. Jonathan and Plenio [12] discovered a surprising phenom enon of entanglem ent: som etim es, an entangled state can help in becom ing im possible entanglem ent transformations into possible without being consumed at all. This phenom enon is now widely known as entanglem ent catalysis or ELOCC for short. A simple example is as follows. Suppose j i = $0.400i + \frac{0.40i}{0.25}i = \frac{0.400i}{0.25}i = \frac{0.$

can be realized with certainty because , . The role of the state j i in this transformation is just as that of a catalyst in a chemical process since it can help entanglement transformation process without being consumed. In the same paper, Jonathan and Plenio also showed the use of catalyst can improve the maxim alconversion probability when the transformation cannot realize with certainty even with the help of a catalyst. In [13], the mathematical structure of entanglement catalysis has been thoroughly studied.

Bandyopadhyay et al found another interesting phenom enon [14]. There are pairs of incom parable bipartite entangled states that are com parable when multiple copies are provided. Such a phenom enon is called as honasym ptotic bipartite pure-state entanglem ent transform ation' in [14]. M ore intuitively, this phenom enon can also be called 'multiple-copy entanglem ent transform 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

$$ji^{3}!j^{1}i^{3}$$
 (2)

occurs with certainty using Nielsen's theorem . That is, when A lice and B ob prepare three copies of j i instead of

E lectronic address: dry020 m ails.tsinghua.edu.cn

^yE lectronic address: fengy99g@ m ails.tsinghua.edu.cn

^zE lectronic address: x-li020 m ails.tsinghua.edu.cn

^xE lectronic address: yingm sh@ tsinghua.edu.cn

just a single one, they can transform these three copies all together into three copies of *j* i by LOCC. This simple example means that the e ect of catalyst can, at least in the above situation, be implemented by preparing more copies of the original state and transform ing these copies together. Som e important aspects of MLOCC have already been investigated in [14].

The major aim of this paper is to examine the possibility of combining ELOCC with MLOCC.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 number 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. More explicitly, if j i is not a catalyst for the transform ation ji! ji, but there is p > 1 such that ji ^p is a catalyst for the same transform ation, then j i is called as a partial catalyst for the transform ation from jito ji, when it is not necessary to tell clearly the direction of the transform ation, we can simply call j i a partial catalyst for the pair fj i; j ig. (To be contrast, we often call the commonly used phrase 'catalyst' as complete 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 the ways of enabling entanglem ent transform ation in [14] and in the present paper are increasing the number of copies of states, the di erence is that in [4] the num ber of copies of source state while in this paper that of partial catalyst is increased. A lot of heuristic examples lead us to nd a tradeo between the number of copies of original entangled state and that of partial catalyst. The more original state copies are provided, the less partial catalyst copies are needed, and vice versa. Two 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 complete catalyst or a rather large num ber of partial catalysts are needed. This reduces to the case of ELOCC. How ever, reductions to the two extrem e cases are not always possible. With som e examples we show for certain incomparable 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 multiple 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 comparable states is generalized to -comparable states with as a

probabilistic threshold. W e also extend catalyst (partial catalyst) to -catalyst (resp. -partial catalyst). Then 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.W e further show that the combination of ELOCC and MLOCC can increase the maxim al conversion probability dram atically. Most surprisingly, for certain entanglement transformation, we did that the m axim alconversion probability can be enhanced as close as possible to one under the combination of ELOCC and MLOCC while a determ inistic transform ation can never occur. W e also present a necessary condition of when the combination of multiple-copy transformation and catalyst-assisted transform ation has an advantage over pure LOCC [15].

For the sake of convenience, we present here N ielsen's theorem [B] as a lem m a since it will be used in the sequel frequently in analyzing the possibility of entanglement transformation:

P Lemma 1. Let $j i = {P \atop i=1} {P \atop j=1} {p \atop j=1} {j \atop i=1} {j \atop i=1} {j \atop i=1} {i \atop j=1} {i$

The rest part of the paper is organized as follows. In section II, we study the combination of ELOCC and MLOCC in the determ inistic manner, while in section III, we generalize the results to probabilistic case. In section IV we draw a brief conclusion together with some open problem s that may be of interests for further study.

II. COMBINING ELOCC WITH MLOCC: DETERMINISTIC CASE

There are m any interesting exam ples in the literatures related to catalyst-assisted entanglem ent transform ation. We reexam ine some of them here and show that the role of the com plete catalyst in these exam ples can be im plem ented by multiple copies of partial catalyst. E specially, the following exam ple not only shows the existence of partial catalyst, but also tells that even under the situation that the transform ation j i ! j i has no k k com plete catalyst, k k partial catalysts can still exist.

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

$$j i = {}^{p} \overline{0:4} p 0 i + {}^{p} \overline{0:4} p 1 i + {}^{p} \overline{0:1} p 2 i + {}^{p} \overline{0:1} p 3 i; \quad (4)$$

and the nalstate they want to transform j i into is

$$j = {}^{p} \overline{0.5} 0 0 i + {}^{p} \overline{0.25} 1 1 i + {}^{p} \overline{0.22} 2 i + {}^{p} \overline{0.03} 3 i : (5)$$

This example is very close to the original one that Jonathan and Plenio [12] used to dem onstrate the e ect of catalysis, and one may think that as in the original example [12], A lice and B ob can achieve the transform ation ji! jiwith a 2 2 catalyst. Unfortunately, it is not the case, the sm all deviation violates the conditions of the existence of a 2 2 catalyst, and there are not any 2 2 catalysts for j i and j i [16]. However, one can

nd a 3 3 state

$$j_{1}i = \frac{r}{\frac{50}{103}} \dot{j}_{4}4i + \frac{r}{\frac{30}{103}} \dot{j}_{5}5i + \frac{r}{\frac{23}{103}} \dot{j}_{6}6i$$
 (6)

such that

By a routine calculation we may observe that

but

$$ji^{k}$$
 ji^{k} ; $k = 6;7;$ (9)

do hold! This shows once again that the e ect of a catalyst can be implemented by increasing the number of copies of the source state in a transform ation. W e now further put

$$j_{2}i = {}^{p}\overline{0:6}j_{4}4i + {}^{p}\overline{0:4}55i;$$
 (10)

Asmentioned above, jiand jihas no 2 2 catalysts. Thus, j₂i 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 shows that

Of course, $j_2 i^{5}$ is not the optim alone in the sense that its dimension is not the minimum among all catalysts (for example, j_1 i). W hat this phenom enon indicates is that increasing the number of a pure entangled state can strictly broaden the power of its catalysis. This can be intuitively interpreted as the resource in k copies of an entangled state is more than k times the resource in a single copy in the sense of LOCC.

In the next example, we combine ELOCC with MLOCC, and show that a tradeo exists between the num ber of copies of source state and that of partial catalyst. We also notice that at the end of [14], an interesting question was asked: are there pairs of fj i; j ig that are k-copy LOCC comparable, but the pairs fji^k';ji^k'g becom e ELOCC com parable for som e $k^0 < k$? We show that such incomparable pair do exist. Note that j i and j i are k-copy LOCC com parable means that fj i ^k; j i ^kg is comparable under LOCC,

while fji^{k°}; ji^{k°}g rem ain incom parable under LOCC for any $k^0 < k$.

Example 2. Suppose that A lice and B ob share some copies of source state j i as in Eq.(4), and they want to transform it into the same number of copies of

$$J = {}^{p} \overline{0.5} \mathcal{D}0i + {}^{p} \overline{0.25} \mathcal{J}1i + {}^{p} \overline{0.2} \mathcal{J}2i + {}^{p} \overline{0.05} \mathcal{B}3i: (12)$$

through LOCC. We suppose the only states they can borrow from a catalyst banker are some copies of j₂i (Eq.(10)). Could A lice and Bob realize their task with a m in im alcost? Notice that

This means if the number of available copies of j i is larger than or equal to 6, A lice and B ob could realize their task them selves without borrowing any catalysts. But if they only own 5, say, copies of j i, they cannot realize the transform ation under LOCC even joint operations on the 5 copies are performed. We would like to point out that borrowing one copy of j₂iwill be enough for A lice and Bob's task because it holds that

Similarly, when they only own 4 copies of ji, it is su cient to borrow 2 copies of j₂ i to do the task successfully. For the case that 3 copies of j i are owned by A lice and Bob, it is easy to see that 3 copies of j 2 i are not enough and the m in in al num ber of j_2 i for their purpose is 4. Finally, when A lice and B ob own only one copy of j i, ;10 copies of ijcannot achieve the task, we using 6; conclude that they must borrow at leat 11 copies of j_{2i} from the catalyst banker since the relation

holds only for k 11. A lice and Bob must pay an expensive cost to complete the transform ation in this extrem e case. Perhaps the most econom ic strategy for A ice and Bob is to prepare some appropriate number of copies of j i (2 or 3), and then borrow some suitable num ber of copies of j₂i (5 or 4) as catalysts. This exam ple illustrates a tradeo between the number of original state copies needed to be transform ed and the num ber of copies of partial catalyst. It also suggests that the mechanism of combining catalyst-assisted transform ations with multiple-copy ones proposed in [14] and in this paper is very useful in m any situations.

A coording to Exam ple 2, it seems 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 original pair, or a su ciently large copies of original pair becom es com parable under LOCC. However, such statem ents are not correct, as shown in the following example.

E xam ple 3. Take the source state as

$$j()i = \frac{1}{p_{1+}}(ji + \frac{p_{-}}{j44i});$$
 (16)

while the target is

$$j'()i = \frac{p}{1+}(j'i + p'-j44i);$$
 (17)

where j i and j i are de ned as Eq.(4) and Eq.(12) respectively, = 0.01. We also choose

$$j_{3}i = {}^{p}\overline{0:7}5i + {}^{p}\overline{0:3}6i:$$
 (18)

We can easily check that $j_{3}i$ is a catalyst for 5-copy transformation (i.e., a transformation from j () i⁵ to j' () i⁵), $j_{3}i^{2}$ is a catalyst for 4-copy transformation, also for 3-copy transformation. However, by Theorem 1 in the following $j_{3}i$ is not a partial catalyst for j () i and j' () i. In fact, any transformation

$$j()i j_3 i^q ! j()i j_3 i^q$$
 (19)

for arbitrary large q cannot be achieved with certainty. On the other hand, it seems impossible to transform j ()i into j ()i with certainty only using M LOCC.By a num erical calculation, we can deduce that the following relation

$$j()i^{q} j'()i^{q}$$
 (20)

cannot hold for any q 50. This example demonstrates that the combination of ELOCC and MLOCC is sometimes strictly more powerful than mere ELOCC and MLOCC in the case when the number of copies of catalyst states and that of the source state are limited.

From above three examples, we can see it will be very usefulto know when a given entangled state can be a partial catalyst for a speci c entanglem ent transform ation. Unfortunately, such a characterization is not known at the present. We give a necessary condition for the existence of partial catalyst. The following lemma 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 j i has Schm idt coe cients $_1$ $_2$ k 0: In what follows we denote $x^{\#}$ as the vector that is obtained by rearranging the components of x into the nonincreasing order. We also use the symbol to denote the Schmidt coe cients vector of j i, ie, = $(_1;$ n). For incom parable pair fj i; j ig, we denote

L ; = fl:1 l n;
$$j > jg$$
 (21)
 $j = 1$ j = 1

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

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

$$_{1}=_{i}>_{l}=_{l+1}$$
 or $_{i}=_{i+1}<_{l}=_{1}$ (22)

and

$$_{i+1} = _k > _{l} = _{l+1}$$
 or $_{i} = _{i+1} < _{l+1} = _n$: (23)

Here any constraint having meaningless terms such as $_{k+1}$ will be satis ed automatically.

P roof. We prove this kem m a by showing that for any k k pure state j i, if the conditions in Eq.(22) or Eq.(23) are not satisfied, then j i cannot be a complete catalyst for the transform ation j i to j i.

Suppose there exists 1 i k and 12 L ; such that either Eq. (22) or Eq. (23) does not hold. Decompose into two shorter vectors ⁰ and ⁰⁰, that is = (⁰; ⁰⁰), such that ⁰ = (₁;:::;₁) and ⁰⁰ = (₁₊₁;:::;_n). Similarly, we have ' = ('⁰;'⁰⁰). Also we decompose = (⁰; ⁰⁰), where ⁰ = (₁;:::;₁) and ⁰⁰ = (₁₊₁;:::;_k). The case when i = k is simple since then = ⁰ and ⁰⁰ disappears.

Notice that

$$(')^{\#} = ('^{0})^{0}; '^{0})^{0}; '^{0})^{0}; '^{0})^{\#}: (24)$$

Them inim alcomponent of ${}^{\prime 0} {}^{0}$ is ${}_{1 \text{ i}}$ while them axim al components of ${}^{\prime 0} {}^{\circ 0}$, ${}^{\prime 0} {}^{\circ 0}$ and ${}^{\prime 0} {}^{\circ 0}$ are ${}_{1 \text{ i}+1}$, ${}_{l+1} {}_{1}$ and ${}_{l+1} {}_{i+1}$, respectively. So if Eq.(22) is not satis ed, that is

$$_{1}=_{i}$$
 $_{l}=_{l+1}$ and $_{i}=_{i+1}$ $_{1}=_{l}$; (25)

then

$$1 i maxf_{1} i+1; i+1 i; i+1 i+1g: (26)$$

By Eq.(26) and Eq.(24), the largest il components of $(')^{\dagger}$ are just the components of $(')^{\circ}$. So

where the st strict inequality is from $12 L_{i'}$, while the last inequality is by the denition of $P_{j=1}^{il}$ ($P_{j=1}^{il}$). It follows that j i j i j i.

On the other hand, if Eq.(23) is not satisfield, then it can be checked that the least (k i) (n l) components of (')[#] are just the components of '⁰⁰. So we can also conclude that j i j i j'i j i by considering the sum of least (k i) (n l) components of ' with a similar arguments like above. W ith that we complete the proof of theorem.

Now we can present a necessary condition for the existence of partial catalyst, as following 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 ;

$$_{1}=_{2}<_{1}=_{1}$$
 and $_{k}_{1}=_{k}<_{l+1}=_{n}$ (28)

Proof. If Eq. (28) does not holds, ie,

$$_{1}=_{2}$$
 $_{1}=_{1}$ or $_{k}$ $_{1}=_{k}$ $_{l+1}=_{n}$ (29)

is satis ed for som e l 2 L ; , then Eq.(22) or Eq.(23) will be violated. We conclude that

for any positive integer m since

$$\binom{m}{1} = \binom{m}{2} = \binom{m}{2} = \binom{m}{1} = \binom{m}{2} = \binom{m}{1} = \binom{m}{1} = \binom{m}{2} = \binom{m}{2}$$
(31)

and

$$\binom{m}{k^{m}}_{k^{m}} = \binom{m}{k^{m}}_{k^{m}} = \binom{m}{k}_{k} = \binom{m}{k}_{k} = \binom{m}{k}_{k} = \binom{m}{k}_{k} = \binom{m}{k}_{k} = \binom{m}{k}_{k}$$
(32)

whatever the value m takes, which violate with Eq.(22) and Eq.(23) again after replace jiwith ji ^m, it follows that ji ^m cannot be a catalyst for j i and j iwhatever m takes. With that we complete the proof of Theorem 1.

Noticing when k = 2 and n = 4, for incomparable states j i and j i, L ; = f2g, we have the following consequence of Theorem 1.

C orollary 1. If 2 2 state j i is a partial catalyst for the incom parable states j i and j i then

$$1 < _{1} = _{2} < m \inf _{1} = _{2}; _{3} = _{4}g:$$
 (33)

We now tend to analyze an interesting phenom enon and try to give an interpretation. From the examples in previous discussion, it seems that the relation of maprization under tensor product is monotone in the sense that if ji^k ji^k then ji^(k+1) ji^(k+1) for any bipartite entangled state j i and j i and for any positive integer k. This desirable property was rstm entioned by Bandyopadhyay et al in [17]. In general, however, this is not true. In [18], Leung and Smolin disproved this conjecture by giving explicit counterexamples. Because of this, one will nd that the following theorem becomes very useful, it tells us to check whether j i ^p j i^p hold for any p k, one only needs to check k values of p, i.e., p = k;;2k 1:

Theorem 2. For any twon n entangled pure states jiand ji. Suppose that k 1. Then ji^p! ji^p for all p k by LOCC if and only if ji^p! ji^p for all k p 2k 1 by LOCC.

P roof. The 'only if' part is very simple. We only deal with the 'if' part. For any positive integers p 2k and k, there exist non-negative integers r and s such that

$$p = (r \ 1)k + (k + s); r \ 2; s \ k \ 1:$$
 (34)

Now an explicit protocol to achieve the transform ation j i p! j i p under LOCC consists two steps:

1). Perform (r 1) tim es transform ation

2). Perform one time transform ation

$$j i^{(k+s)} ! j' i^{(k+s)}$$
: (36)

By the conditions when k p 2k 1, the transform ation j i ^p! j i ^p can be implemented with certainty under LOCC, we know that the transformations in 1) and 2) both can be realized with certainty.

That com pletes the proof of Theorem 2.

Fortunately, we can easily check that all examples in this paper satisfy the conditions of Theorem 2. As example, let

$$j i = {}^{p} \overline{0.408} j 0 i + {}^{p} \overline{0.4} j 2 i + {}^{p} \overline{0.1} j 3 i + {}^{p} \overline{0.092} j 4 i$$
(37)

and

$$J i = {}^{p} \overline{0.5} j 0 i + {}^{p} \overline{0.25} j 1 i + {}^{p} \overline{0.25} j 2 i; \qquad (38)$$

A simple calculation shows that ji^3 ji^3 , ji^5 ji⁵, but ji⁴ ji⁴! In fact, with the aid of Theorem 2, one can easily prove that j i kji^k does hold for all k = 4. In other words, if we restrict entanglem ent transform ations by allowing only LOCC and prohibit any other aids, such as catalysis presented in [12] or multiple-copy one proposed in [14], we willmeet a transparent paradox: we can transform three (ve) copies of j i into three (resp. ve) copies of j i, but we cannot transform four copies of j i into the same num ber of '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 following, we show that if we allow entanglement transform ations to be realized with 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 LOCC com parable state, then they are k^0 -copy ELOCC com parable for $k^0 < k$, it follows that for any k > 1, of course for $k = 4, j i^{k}$ and $j i^{k}$ become ELOCC comparable. In fact, we nd that $j_2 i$ in Equ.(10) is indeed a catalyst for the transform ation j i 4 ! j i 4 . In general we conjecture that for any two xed positive integers m and n, ji^m and j^{im} are ELOCC-comparable is equivalent to that j i ⁿ and j i ⁿ are ELOCC-com parable, where j i and j i are two arbitrary bipartite entangled pure states. The motivation behind this conjecture is that all these relations express the same fact: the entanglem ent amount in j i is more than that in j i in a determ inistic manner.

III. COMBINING ELOCCWITHMLOCC: PROBABILISTICCASE

W hat concerns us in the last section are transform ations with certainty. This section will exam ine some transform ations with probability strictly less than 1. If the maximal conversion probability from j i to j i under LOCC is not less than , where 2 (0;1], we say that j i is -LOCC comparable to j i, or shortly, j i is -comparable to j i. we simply call that fj i; j ig

is -comparable if one of the pair is -comparable to the other, otherwise is -incom parable. The term inology -ELOCC comparable is a direct extension of the case ELOCC, i.e., there exists entangled state j i such that ji jiand ji jiare -com parable under LOCC. The de nition of -MLOCC comparable should be treated more carefully! fj i; j ig is -M LOCC comparable if there is some positive integer k such that j i k and j i k are ^k-com parable under LOCC. The motivation behind such de nition is that the collective operations are always not less powerful than individual operations. Like the complete catalyst and partial catalyst in the deterministic case, we call jia -catalyst for -LOCC in com parable pair fji; jig if the pair fji ji; ji jig becom es -LOCC com parable. Sim ilarly, j i is a -partial catalyst if multiple copies of j i can serve as a -catalyst forfji; jig while a single copy of ji is not a -catalyst. It is obvious that a 1-catalyst is just a complete catalyst, while a 1-partial catalyst is a partial catalyst.

Our discussions in the determ inistic transform ations can be directly extended into the probabilistic ones. The following example not only demonstrates 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 maxim al conversion probability dram atically.

Examples 4. Let us see two incomparable 3 3 states j i = 0.500i + 0.211i + 0.222i and j i = 0.500i + 0.411i + 0.122i. They were already considered by Jonathan and Plenio in [12]. Recall from Vidal's theorem [11] that the maximal conversion probability of j i ! j i under LOCC is given by

$$P_{m ax} (j i! j'i) = m in_{1 l} \frac{E_{1}(j i)}{E_{1}(j'i)}; \quad (39)$$

where $E_1(j i) = 1$ $P_{1 i 1}$ i. So for the states given above, we have $P_{m ax}(j i ! j i) = 0.80$. And then j i and j i are not 0.9-com parable. However, as shown in $\frac{12}{10}$, with the aid of an entangled state j i = 0.65; $\frac{1}{33}$ i + 0.35; $\frac{1}{44}$, the m axim al conversion probability becomes $P_{m ax}(j i j i ! j i j i) = 0.904$. So j i and j i are 0.9-ELOCC comparable and j i is a 0.9-catalyst for fj i; j ig. How about if A lice and B ob want to increase their conversion probability to 0.985? The hardness of the problem is how to nd a 0.985-catalyst. A careful analysis shows that j i and j i do not have any 2 2 state as a 0.985-catalyst [19]. Fortunately, a calculation show s that if we borrow 19 copies of j i then j i is 0.985-ELOCC com parable to j i since the relation

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

$$P_{max}(ji^2 ! j'i^2) = 0.8533:$$
 (41)

According to our de nition of -MLOCC, the Eq.(1) means that j i and j i are in fact, $(0.8533)^{1=2}$ -

com parable, or m ore explicitly, 0:9237-com parable under M LOCC. If we take catalyst-assisted transform ations and multiple-copy ones together, the m axim al conversion probability can increase dram atically. This is shown by the equation

$$P_{max}(ji^2 ji^3! ji^2 ji^3) = 0.9535;$$
 (42)

which implies that j i and j i are 0:9765-comparable under the combination of the ELOCC and MLOCC.Four copies of j i with three copies of j i attains a probability at 0:9568 which shows that j i is 0:9854-comparable to j i under the combination of ELOCC and MLOCC. Also we can check that a pure MLOCC manner needs 7 copies of j i to do collective operations together to attain 0:985-MLOCC comparable. So, in the probabilistic case, the combination of ELOCC and MLOCC 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 example, since j i cannot be transform ed into j i with certainty even under the combination of ELOCC and M LOCC (see [12] and [14]), we cannot nd a catalyst for them and the maximal conversion probability from j i to j i will be 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 MLOCC, for example transform 13 copies of j i to the sam e num ber of the copies of j i can be achieved with a probability 0:9957¹³. This strange phenom enon indicates that j i can be transform ed into j i with very sm all unsuccessful probability with the aid of ELOCC (MLOCC). We can expect the supremum of them axim alconversion probability of the transform ation under ELOCC or M LOCC achieves one, take ELOCC as an example, it may hold,

$$\sup_{k=1} P_{max}(ji ji^{k}! ji ji^{k}) = 1;$$
 (43)

Intuitively say, with the aid of enough copies of j i, j i can be transformed into j' i with a successful probability arbitrarily close to 1 (that is, ! 1 when k ! +1). W hen can this phenom enon occur? We seek some necessary conditions for it. First notice that

$$E (j i) = 1:3710 > 1:3610 = E (j i);$$
 (44)

where E (j i) = $P_{n} \log_{2} i$ is the entropy of entanglement of j i. Eq.(44) is very reasonable since otherwise one can use such quantum catalysis e ect to increase the entropy of entanglement on average by using a large number of copies of j i to obtain the same number of copies of j i with probability close to one. But only Eq.(44) certainly cannot guarantee the validity of Eq.(43). The another necessary condition is 3 3. M ore generally, we have the following proposition:

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

$$E(ji) E(j'i) and n n:$$
 (45)

We can nd that the condition n in Eq.(45) are more weaker than that in determ inistic manner (see Eq.(46)). This indicates that Eq.(43) is possible although j i cannot be transformed into j i with certainty in a determ inistic manner. We think the key dimensioner between probabilistic transform ation and determ inistic transformation lies in the asymmetry of the roles of the largest and the smallest components in probabilistic transform ation. More precisely, to ensure transforming j i into j i with certainty under ELOCC, a necessary condition [12] such that

$$1$$
 1 and n n (46)

is needed. The condition in Eq.(46) should be held even when the transform ation can only be achieved with certainty with aid of an in nite dimensional catalyst. While to ensure transforming j i into J i with probability 2 (0;1) under ELOCC, a necessary condition is as follows

the largest components are in fact not involved, when tends to 1 from the left, i.e., ! 1 , the condition in Eq.(47) turns into n = n, this cannot be reduced to the condition in Eq.(46). So the existence of the pair in Eq.(43) can be con med although such pair does not satisfy the condition in Eq.(46). Roughly speaking, it may hold that -ELOCC com parable is discontinuous when tends to 1, that is, j i is -ELOCC comparable to j i for any 2 (0;1) does not imply that it is also 1-ELOCC com parable to j i, the latter needs m ore stronger conditions [20]. It may be of great interests to nd out such conditions m ore than that in Eq. (45) to to ensure that Eq. (43) is held or to prove that the condition in Eq. (45) is also su cient in the case n = 3, since this can certainly help us to understand the measure of entanglem ent in the probabilistic transform ation under ELOCC.

In the determ inistic case, we have seen an example such that j i ^k j i ^k but j i ^(k+1) j i ^(k+1) in previous section. Such examples are at least 4 4-dimensional, since in the case 3 3, j i ^k j i^k for any xed k implies that j i j i. To one's surprise, a similar phenom enon can occur in the case 3 3 when we consider probabilistic transformation. That is, for any 2 (0;1), there exists 3 3 pair f j i; j ig such that for som e k > 1, j i ^k and j i ^k are ^k-com parable while j i ^(k+1) and j i ^(k+1) are ^{k+1}-incom parable. We give a concrete example to demonstrate this fact.

Example 5. Take the same source state and target state with Example 4. If we set = 0:9917, by a direct calculation, then we can that nd that $j i^8$ and $j i^8$ are ⁸-com parable since

$$P_{max}(ji^{8}! ji^{8}) = 0;9918^{8} > {}^{8};$$
 (48)

while ji⁹ and jⁱ⁹ are ⁹-incom parable since

$$P_{max}(ji^{9}! j'i^{9}) = 0.9916^{9} < {}^{9}:$$
 (49)

A similar result like the determ inistic case can be stated into the following theorem .

Theorem 3. For any twon n pure states jiand jiand 2 (0;1]. Suppose that k 1. Then ji^p and ji^p are ^p-comparable for all p k if and only if ji^p and ji^p are ^p-comparable for all k p 2k 1.

Proof. Similar with Theorem 2, details om itted.

Now let us turn to another interesting question: is it always useful when combining catalyst-assisted transformation with multiple-copy transformation? Example 3 and Example 4 give some hints to a positive answer to the question. However, we can show that such an improvement does not always happen as the following theorem indicates. This theorem is a generalization of Lemma 4 in [12] which says that the presence of catalysts cannot always increase conversion probability. We should point out that a similar result has been obtained in [14].

Theorem 4. Let j i and j i be two quantum states with Schmidt coe cients vectors (1; n) and (1; n) respectively, and let the maximal conversion probability of the transformation j i ! j i under LOCC be P_{max} (j i ! j i). Let P_{max}^{E} (j i ^p ! j i ^p) be the maximal conversion probability of the transform ation j i ^p ! j i ^p under ELOCC, where p is a positive integer. Then

P roof. The left inequality is obtained by performing the transformation j i ^p! j i ^p under LOCC one by one. The right part of the inequality can be proven as follows. Suppose j i is any quantum entangled state with Schmidt coe cients $_{1}$ $_{2}$ $_{k}$ 0, q is a positive integer. By the de nition we can have that P_{max}^{E} (j i ^p! j i ^p) is equal to

where supremum takes over j i 2 C^k C^k , k 1, q 1. On the other hand, by V idal's theorem, we obtain that

$$= \min_{1 \ 1 \ n^{p}k^{q}} \frac{E_{1}(j i^{p} j i^{q})}{E_{1}(j^{r} i^{p} j i^{q})}$$
(53)

$$\frac{E_{n^{p}k^{q}}(j i p^{p} j i q)}{E_{n^{p}k^{q}}(j i p^{p} j i q)} = \frac{p_{q}}{n_{k}} = \left(\frac{n}{n}\right)^{p}; \quad (54)$$

where we have used that $E_{n^{p}k^{q}}$ (j i ^p j i ^q) = $p_{n k}^{q}$. The left part of Equ.(50) follows by combining Eq.(51) with Eq.(52). That completes the proof of theorem . C orollary 2. Conditions as above, if P_{max} (j i ! j' i) = $\frac{n}{n}$, then P_{max}^{E} (j i ^p ! j i ^p) = $(\frac{n}{n})^{p}$. In other words, in this case, even the multiple-copy or catalyst assisted transformation cannot increase the conversion probability. In fact, collective operations in this case has no advantages over individual operations.

An interesting application of C orollary 2 is to cope with the case when j i is a maxim alentangled state, that is, $j = \frac{p_{1}}{n} = \frac{1}{j_{i=1}} j_{i=1} j_{i=1}$

When n < n, by Theorem 4, we always have that $P_{m ax}^{E}(j i^{p} ! j^{j} i^{p}) (\frac{n}{n})^{p}$. Whether MLOCC is strictly powerful that LOCC in such situation? We give a last example to show even $P_{m ax}^{E}(j i^{p} ! j^{i})$ is exponentially deceasing when p is increased, MLOCC can be still strictly powerful than mere LOCC.

E xam ple 6. Suppose the source state ow ned by A lice and B ob is

$$j = p \overline{0.4} p 0i + p \overline{0.4} p 11i + p \overline{0.13} p 2i + p \overline{0.07} p 3i;$$
 (55)

and they want to transform them into the same number of copies of

$$j i = {}^{p} \overline{0.5} p_{0i} + {}^{p} \overline{0.25} p_{1i} + {}^{p} \overline{0.17} p_{2i} + {}^{p} \overline{0.08} p_{3i}$$
(56)

It is easy to check out that $P_{m ax}$ (j i! j i) = 0.8, while $P_{m ax}$ (j i²! j i²) = 0.6875, so

$$P_{max}(ji^{2}! ji^{2}) < P_{max}(ji! ji);$$
 (57)

If we restrict ourselves to do the transform ation one by one, only a successful probability 0.8^2 can be achieved, which is, of course, strictly less than to do collective transform ation j i ² ! j i ². So we have demonstrated another property of M LOCC :multiple-copy transform ation can be also more strictly powerful than pure LOCC if $P_{m ax}$ (j i ! j i) < m inf $_n = _n$; 1g although the m axim al conversion probability from j i ^k to j i ^k is decreased exponentially if $_n < _n$ (bounded by $(_n = _n)^k$) [15].

IV. CONCLUSION

To summarize, W e have demonstrated that in some cases multiple copies of an entangled state can serve as

a catalyst although only one copy cannot, such state has been term ed as 'partial catalyst'. In general, we have analyzed the possibility of combing ELOCC with MLOCC. 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 limited, we have shown that even when both pure catalyst-assisted transform ations and multiple-copy ones cannot be used to realize entanglem ent transform ations with certainty, the com bination of these two still can. Our results in the determ inistic case then have been directly generalized to probabilistic case. Most interestingly, we have shown that MLOCC is always not less powerful than pure LOCC, even in the case when the maximal conversion probability from k copies of source state to the same num ber of copies of target state is decreased exponentially when k is increased. Our results, in fact provide a possible way to seek a catalyst for given incom parable pairs from a possible partial catalyst. Note there are no any analytical way to nd a catalyst for given incom parable pair except som e special case [16], also see [21]). A very strange phenom enon also has been observed: there is certain entangled pair such that the maxim al conversion probability from one to another under ELOCC can be arbitrarily close to one although they are incom parable in a determ inistic manner even under the combination of ELOCC and MLOCC.We believe that such phenom enon in fact discovers an essential di erence between probabilistic transform ation and determ inistic transform ation under ELOCC and M LOCC.

There are many open problems that may be of relevance. The most interesting one is, of course, what is the precise relation between ELOCC and MLOCC? Furtherm ore, is the combination of ELOCC and MLOCC always strictly powerfulthan pure ELOCC and MLOCC [21]? 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.

A cknow ledgem ent: W e thank Som shubhro Bandyopadhyay for inform ing us valuable references. The acknow ledgem ent is also given to Sha Huang for helpful discussion about majorization. This work was partly supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China (G rant No. 60273003).

^[1] C.H.Bennett and G.Brassard, Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems, and

- [2] C.H.Bennett and S.J.W iesner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 2881 (1992).
- [3] C.H.Bennett, G.Brassard, C.Crepeau, R.Jozsa, A. Peres, and W.K.W ootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 1895 (1993).
- [4] M.A.Nielsen and I.L.Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
- [5] C.H.Bennett, H.J.Bernstein, S.Popescu, and B.Schumacher, PhysRev.A 53, 2046 (1996).
- [6] C.H.Bennett, G.Brassard, S.Popescu, B Schum acher, J.A.Smolin, and W.K.Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 722 (1996) [SPIRES].
- [7] C.H.Bennett, D.P.D Wincenzo, J.A.Smolin, and W. K.Wootters, Phys. Rev. A 54, 3824 (1996) [SPIRES].
- [8] M.A.Nielsen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 436 (1999)
- [9] A. W. Marshall and I. O kin, Inequalities: Theory of Majorization and Its Applications (A cademic Press, New York, 1979).
- [10] P.M. A lberti and A.Uhlm ann, Stochasticity and PartialO rder: D oubly Stochastic M aps and Unitary M ixing (D ordrecht, Boston, 1982).
- [11] G.Vidal, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 1046 (1999).
- [12] D. Jonathan and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 3566 (1999)
- [13] S. Daftuar and M. K limesh, Phys. Rev. A 64, 042314 (2001)
- [14] S.Bandyopadhyay, V.Roychow dhury, and U.Sen, Physical Review A, Vol 65, 052315
- [15] The recent works of som e of the authors show that such a condition is also su cient. That is, if $P_{m ax}$ (j i! j'i) < m inf $_{n} = _{n}$; 1g, then there always exists p > 1 such that $P_{m ax}$ (j i p ! j'i p) > ($P_{m ax}$ (j i ! j'i))^p. The same condition has been proven by Feng et al to be also su cient in the ELOCC case, to appear in Physical Review A, also see quant-ph/0403170.
- [16] X.M. Sun and some of the authors have found a necessary and su cient condition when 4 4-dimensional

entangled states adm it a 2 2 state as complete catalyst.For a general n n-dimensional incomparable pair, we are able to prove that the problem whether it has a k k-dimensional bipartite state as catalyst can be solved in polynom ial time about n.For the details, see quant-ph/0311133

- [17] S. Bandyopadhyay, V. Roychowdhury, and U. Sen, quant-ph/0103131
- [18] D.W. Leung and J.A. Sm olin, quant-ph/0103158
- [19] G iven two 3 3-dimensinalentangled pure states, the precise expression in term s of Schm idt coe cents of j i and j i of the maximal conversion probability of the transform ation from j i to j i with the aid of a 2 2 entangled pure state as catalyst is obtained by some of us. W ith that result, we can calculate the maximal conversion probability from j i to j i with the aid of a 2 2 entangled state as catalyst is $\frac{5+p}{985} \pm 90.96\%$:
- [20] To prove this discontinuous property in a rigorous way, a careful investigatation on the mathematical structure of -ELOCC comparable is necessary. If -ELOCC com parable is not reduced to 1-ELOCC comparable when tends to 1 from the left, this discountinous property will open an essential di erence between determ inistic transformation and probabilistic transformation when the presence of entanglm ent catalysis or multiple-copy transformation is under the consideration. It also im plies very di erent measures of enanglem ent should be used when we consider determ inistic transformation and probabilistic transformation respectively under the ELOCC and MLOCC.
- [21] The recent works of the authors can give a complete answer about the relationship between ELOCC and the combination of ELOCC and MLOCC, a partial answer for the relationship between ELOCC and MLOCC is also obtained. These results, together with our results about the mathematical structure of MLOCC, will be presented som ewhere else.