arXiv:quant-ph/0504013v1 4 Apr 2005

Quantum entanglement and wedge product

Hoshang Heydari
Institute of Quantum Science, Nihon University,
1-8, Kanda-Surugadai, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 101- 8308, Japan

Abstract

In this paper, I will derive a measure of entanglement that coincides with the generalized concurrence for a general pure bi-and three-partite state based on wedge product. I will show that a further generalization of this idea to a general pure multipartite state with more than three subsystems will fail to quantify entanglement, but it defines the set of separable state for such composite state.

1 Introduction

Quantum entanglement is one of the most interesting properties of quantum mechanics. It has become an essential resource for the quantum information (including quantum communication and quantum computing) developed in recent years, with some potential applications such as quantum cryptography [1, 2]and quantum teleportation [3]. Quantification of a multipartite state entanglement [4, 5] is quite difficult and is directly linked to linear algebra, geometry, and functional analysis. The definition of separability and entanglement of a multipartite state was introduced in[6], following the definition for bipartite states, given by Werner [7]. One of widely used measure of entanglement of a pair of qubits, is entanglement of formation and the concurrence, that gives an analytic formula for the entanglement of formation [8, 9, 10]. In resent years, there have been some proposals to generalize this measure to general bipartite state [11, 12, 13, 14] and to multipartite state [15, 16, 17]. In this paper, I will derive a measure of entanglement that coincides with the generalized concurrence for a general pure bi-and three-partite state based on an algebraic and geometric point of view, using wedge product, a useful tool from multi linear algebra, which is mostly used in differential geometry and topology in relation with differential forms. For a multipartite state with more than three subsystems, this idea will not completely quantify the entanglement of such a quantum state, but it does define set of separable state for any general pure multipartite state. To make this note self-contained, I will give a short introduction to multi-linear algebra.

2 Quantum entanglement

In this section we will define separable state and entangled state as well as give some example of entangled state. Let us denote a general pure composite

quantum system $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}_m^p(N_1, N_2, \ldots, N_m) = \mathcal{Q}_1\mathcal{Q}_2\cdots\mathcal{Q}_m$ with m subsystems, consisting of a state

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{i_1=1}^{N_1}\sum_{i_2=1}^{N_2}\cdots\sum_{i_m=1}^{N_m}\alpha_{i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_m}|i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_m\rangle \tag{1}$$

defined on a Hilbert space

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{Q}} &= \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{Q}_1}\otimes\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{Q}_2}\otimes\cdots\otimes\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{Q}_m} \\ &= \mathbf{C}^{N_1}\otimes\mathbf{C}^{N_2}\otimes\cdots\otimes\mathbf{C}^{N_m},\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where the dimension of jth Hilbert space is given by $N_j = \dim(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{Q}_j})$. We are going to use this notation through this paper, i.e., we denote a pure pair of qubits by $\mathcal{Q}_2^p(2,2)$. Next,let $\rho_{\mathcal{Q}}$ denote a density operator acting on the $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{Q}}$. Then $\rho_{\mathcal{Q}}$ is said to be separable, which we will denote by $\rho_{\mathcal{Q}}^{sep}$, with respect to the Hilbert space decomposition, if it can be written as

$$\rho_{\mathcal{Q}}^{sep} = \sum_{k=1}^{N} p_k \bigotimes_{j=1}^{m}\rho_{\mathcal{Q}_j}^k,\ \sum_{k=1}^{N} p_k = 1 \tag{3}$$

for some positive integer N, where p_k are positive real numbers and ρ_j^k denote a density operator on Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{Q}_j}$. If $\rho_{\mathcal{Q}}^p$ represents a pure state, then the quantum system is separable if $\rho_{\mathcal{Q}}^p$ can be written as $\rho_{\mathcal{Q}}^{sep} = \bigotimes_{j=1}^m \rho_{\mathcal{Q}_j}$, where $\rho_{\mathcal{Q}_j}$ is a density operator on $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{Q}_j}$. If a state is not separable, then it is called an entangled state. Some of the most important entangled states are called the Bell states or EPR states.

3 Multi linear algebra

In this section we will establish a relation between Wedge product and concurrence of a general multipartite state. Let us consider the complex vector spaces $\mathrm{V}_1, \mathrm{V}_2, \ldots, \mathrm{V}_m$ be vector spaces, where $\dim(\mathrm{V}_j) = N_j,\ \forall j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Then we define a tensor of type (m, n) on $\mathrm{V}_1, \mathrm{V}_2, \ldots, \mathrm{V}_m$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{T}_n^m(\mathrm{V}_1, \mathrm{V}_2, \ldots, \mathrm{V}_m) &= \mathcal{L}(\mathrm{V}_1, \mathrm{V}_2, \ldots, \mathrm{V}_m; \mathrm{V}_1^*, \mathrm{V}_2^*, \ldots, \mathrm{V}_n^*) \\ &= \mathrm{V}_1\otimes\mathrm{V}_2\otimes\cdots\otimes\mathrm{V}_m\otimes\mathrm{V}_1^*\otimes\mathrm{V}_2^*\otimes\cdots\otimes\mathrm{V}_n^*,\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $\mathrm{V}_j^* = \mathcal{L}(\mathrm{V}_j; \mathbf{C})\ \forall j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$ is the space of linear applications $\mathrm{V}_j \longrightarrow \mathbf{C}$ and is called dual of V_j. For any basis e_i of V_j and e^j the dual basis of e_i defined by $e^j(e_i) = \delta_i^j$, we have the following linear representation

$$T = T^{i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_m}_{j_1,j_2,\ldots,j_n} e_{i_1}\otimes e_{i_2}\otimes\cdots\otimes e_{i_m}\otimes e^{j_1}\otimes e^{j_2}\otimes\cdots\otimes e^{j_n}. \tag{5}$$

I.e., we have $\mathcal{T}_0^1(\mathrm{V}_1, \mathrm{V}_2, \ldots, \mathrm{V}_m) = \mathrm{V}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_1^0(\mathrm{V}_1, \mathrm{V}_2, \ldots, \mathrm{V}_m) = \mathrm{V}_1^*$. Let S_m be group of permutations $(1, 2, \ldots, m)$. Then we call the tensor $v_1\otimes v_2\otimes\cdots\otimes v_m \in \mathcal{T}_0^m(\mathrm{V}_1, \mathrm{V}_2, \ldots, \mathrm{V}_m)$ symmetric if

$$v_1\otimes v_2\otimes\cdots\otimes v_m = v_{\pi(1)}\otimes v_{\pi(2)}\otimes\cdots\otimes v_{\pi(m)}, \tag{6}$$

for all $\pi \in S_m$. The space of symmetric tensor is denoted by $\mathcal{S}_0^m(\mathrm{V}_1, \mathrm{V}_2, \ldots, \mathrm{V}_m)$. Moreover, we call the tensor $v_1 \otimes v_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_m \in \mathcal{T}_0^m(\mathrm{V}_1, \mathrm{V}_2, \ldots, \mathrm{V}_m)$ skew-symmetric if

$$v_1 \otimes v_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_m = \epsilon(\pi) v_{\pi(1)} \otimes v_{\pi(2)} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{\pi(m)}, \tag{7}$$

for all $\pi \in S_m$, where $\epsilon(\pi)$ is the signature of permutation π. The space of symmetric tensor is denoted by $\Lambda_0^m(\mathrm{V}_1, \mathrm{V}_2, \ldots, \mathrm{V}_m)$. Furthermore, we have the following mapping

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Alt}^m : \mathcal{T}_0^m(\mathrm{V}_1, \mathrm{V}_2, \ldots, \mathrm{V}_m) & \longrightarrow & \Lambda_0^m(\mathrm{V}_1, \mathrm{V}_2, \ldots, \mathrm{V}_m) \\ v_1 \otimes v_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_m & \longmapsto & v_1 \wedge v_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_m \end{array}, \tag{8}$$

where $v_1 \wedge v_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_m = \frac{1}{m!} \sum_{\pi \in S_m} \epsilon(\pi) v_{\pi(1)} \otimes v_{\pi(2)} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{\pi(m)}$. For example for $m = 2$ we have

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Alt}^2 : \mathcal{T}_0^2(\mathrm{V}_1, \mathrm{V}_2) & \longrightarrow & \Lambda_0^2(\mathrm{V}_1, \mathrm{V}_2) \\ v_1 \otimes v_2 & \longmapsto & v_1 \wedge v_2 = v_1 \otimes v_2 - v_2 \otimes v_1 \end{array}. \tag{9}$$

4 Measure of entanglement for general bipartite state based on wedge product

From the wedge product, we can define a measure of entanglement for a general pure bipartite quantum system $\mathcal{Q}_2^p(N_1, N_2)$ as

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{Q}_2^p(N_1, N_2)) = \left(\mathcal{N} \sum_{1\mu<\nu}^{N_1} C_{\mu,\nu} \overline{C}_{\mu,\nu} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{10}$$

,where $C_{\mu,\nu} = v_\mu \wedge v_\nu$, $v_\mu = (\alpha_{\mu,1}, \alpha_{\mu,2}, \ldots, \alpha_{\mu,N_2})$, $v_\nu = (\alpha_{\nu,1}, \alpha_{\nu,2}, \ldots, \alpha_{\nu,N_2})$ and $\overline{C}_{\mu,\nu}$ denote the complex conjugate of $C_{\mu,\nu}$. That is, for a quantum system $\mathcal{Q}_2^p(N_1, N_2)$, if we write the coefficients α_{i_1,i_2}, for all $1 \leq i_1 \leq N_1$ and $1 \leq i_2 \leq N_2$ in form of a $N_1 \times N_2$ matrix as below

$$\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1} & \alpha_{1,2} & \cdots & \alpha_{1,N_2} \\ \alpha_{2,1} & \alpha_{2,2} & \cdots & \alpha_{2,N_2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \alpha_{N_1,1} & \alpha_{N_1,2} & \cdots & \alpha_{N_1,N_2} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{11}$$

then the vectors v_μ and v_ν refer to different rows of this matrix. As an example let us look at the quantum system $\mathcal{Q}_2^p(2,2)$ representing a pair of qubits. Then an expression for a measure of entanglement for such state using the above equation (10) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{Q}_2^p(2,2)) &= \left(\mathcal{N} C_{1,2} C_{1,2}^*\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \left(2\mathcal{N} |\alpha_{1,1}\alpha_{2,2} - \alpha_{2,1}\alpha_{1,2}|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= 2|\alpha_{1,1}\alpha_{2,2} - \alpha_{2,1}\alpha_{1,2}|, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where $C_{1,2}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} C_{1,2} &= v_1 \wedge v_2 \\ &= (\alpha_{1,1}, \alpha_{1,2}) \otimes (\alpha_{2,1}, \alpha_{2,2}) - (\alpha_{2,1}, \alpha_{2,2}) \otimes (\alpha_{1,1}, \alpha_{1,2}) \\ &= (0, \alpha_{1,1}\alpha_{2,2} - \alpha_{2,1}\alpha_{1,2}, \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1} - \alpha_{2,2}\alpha_{1,1}, 0) \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

for $\mathcal{N}=2$. The measure of entanglement for the general bipartite state defined in equation (10) coincides with the generalized concurrence defined in [11, 12, 13, 14] and in particular equation (12) that gives the concurrence of a pair of qubits, first time defined in [9, 10].

5 General multipartite state and wedge product

Unfortunately, I couldn't directly generalize this result, using equation (8), to a general pure multipartite state. I.e., for a general three-partite quantum system $\mathcal{Q}_2^p(N_1,N_2,N_3)$ with the coefficients α_{i_1,i_2,i_3}, for all $1\leq i_1\leq N_1$, $1\leq i_2\leq N_2$ and $1\leq i_3\leq N_3$, we cannot identify the vectors v_μ, v_ν and v_τ. But generally, it could be possible for a quantum system with even number subsystems, i.e., $m=2,4,\ldots$. To be able to define a expression for degree of entanglement of a general pure multipartite state, I will construct a "artificial" wedge product between each subsystem in a composite system as in the case of the bipartite state. So, let us consider the quantum system $\mathcal{Q}_m^p(N_1,N_2,\ldots,N_m)$ and define

$$\mathcal{C}_{k_1l_1,k_2l_2,\ldots,k_ml_m} = \alpha_{k_1,k_2,\ldots,k_m}\alpha_{l_1,l_2,\ldots,l_m}. \tag{14}$$

Then, a wedge product between each pair of subsystem takes the following form

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}_{k_1l_1,k_2l_2,\ldots,k_j\wedge l_j,\ldots,k_ml_m} &= \alpha_{k_1,k_2,\ldots,k_j,\ldots,k_m}\alpha_{l_1,l_2,\ldots,l_j,\ldots,l_m} \\ &\quad -\alpha_{k_1,k_2,\ldots,l_j,\ldots,k_m}\alpha_{l_1,l_2,\ldots,k_j,\ldots,l_m}.\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Now, we can define a measure of entanglement as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{Q}_m^p(N_1,\ldots,N_m)) &= \left(\mathcal{N}\sum_{\forall K,L}\sum_{\forall j}\mathcal{C}_{k_1l_1,\ldots,k_j\wedge l_j,\ldots,k_ml_m}\overline{\mathcal{C}}_{k_1l_1,\ldots,k_j\wedge l_j,\ldots,k_ml_m}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= (\mathcal{N}\sum_{\forall K,L}\sum_{\forall j}|\alpha_{k_1,k_2,\ldots,k_m}\alpha_{l_1,l_2,\ldots,l_m} \\ &\quad -\alpha_{k_1,k_2,\ldots,k_{j-1},l_j,k_{j+1},\ldots,k_m}\alpha_{l_1,l_2,\ldots,l_{j-1},k_j,l_{j+1},\ldots,l_m}|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}},\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where $j=1,2,\ldots,m$ and multi-index $K=(k_1,k_2,\ldots,k_m)$, $L=(l_1,l_2,\ldots,l_m)$. As an example, let us look at the general pure three-partite quantum system $\mathcal{Q}_2^p(N_1,N_2,N_3)$. The above measure of entanglement gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{Q}_3^p(N_1,N_2,N_3)) &= \left(\mathcal{N}\sum_{k_1,l_1;k_2,l_2;k_3,l_3}\sum_{j=1}^{3}\left|\mathcal{C}_{k_1l_1,k_j\wedge l_j,k_3l_3}\overline{\mathcal{C}}_{k_1l_1,k_j\wedge l_j,k_3l_3}\right|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= (\mathcal{N}\sum_{k_1,l_1;k_2,l_2;k_3,l_3}(|\alpha_{k_1,k_2,k_3}\alpha_{l_1,l_2,l_3}-\alpha_{k_1,k_2,l_3}\alpha_{l_1,l_2,k_3}|^2 \\ &\quad +|\alpha_{k_1,k_2,k_3}\alpha_{l_1,l_2,l_3}-\alpha_{k_1,l_2,k_3}\alpha_{l_1,k_2,l_3}|^2 \\ &\quad +|\alpha_{k_1,k_2,k_3}\alpha_{l_1,l_2,l_3}-\alpha_{l_1,k_2,k_3}\alpha_{k_1,l_2,l_3}|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}.\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

This measure of entanglement coincides with the generalized concurrence [15] and is equivalent, but not equal, to our entanglement tensor based on joint

POVMs on phase space [18]. For a general multipartite state, that is, for $m \geq 4$ this measure $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{Q}_m^p(N_1, \ldots, N_m))$ is not invariant under local operations. To show it, let us consider the quantum system $\mathcal{Q}_4^p(2,2,2,2)$. In this case we can have seven types of separability between different subsystems as below: It may be possible to factor $\mathcal{Q}_1$, $\mathcal{Q}_2$, $\mathcal{Q}_3$, or $\mathcal{Q}_4$ from the composite system. To check this we need to make four different permutation of indices and it is exactly what the measure $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{Q}_4^p(2,2,2,2))$ does. But there are other types of separability in this four-qubits state, namely if it is possible to factor out $\mathcal{Q}_1\mathcal{Q}_2$, $\mathcal{Q}_1\mathcal{Q}_3$, $\mathcal{Q}_1\mathcal{Q}_4$, $\mathcal{Q}_2\mathcal{Q}_3$, $\mathcal{Q}_2\mathcal{Q}_4$, or $\mathcal{Q}_3\mathcal{Q}_4$. These six possible factorizations can be reduced to three checks of separability since if we test for separability of, i.e., $\mathcal{Q}_1\mathcal{Q}_2$, we have simultaneously tested $\mathcal{Q}_3\mathcal{Q}_4$. For these types of separability we do need to perform more than one simultaneous permutation of indices. We have discussed these separabilities in relation with Segre variety [19].

6 Conclusion

In this paper, I have derived a measure of entanglement that coincides with concurrence of a general pure bipartite state based on mapping of a tensor product space to an alternating tensor product space defined by a wedge product. Moreover, I derived an expression for degree of entanglement for a multipartite state, which again coincides with generalize concurrence for a general pure three-partite state, but this measure fail to quantify entanglement for a composite system with more than three subsystems. However, this expression defines a set of separable states of a general multipartite state.

Acknowledgments: The author acknowledge useful discussions with Gunnar Björk. The author also would like to thank Jan Bogdanski. This work was supported by the Wenner-Gren Foundations.

References

[1] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard, *Proc. IEEE Int. Conference on Computers, Systems and Signal Processing* (IEEE, New York, 1984); C. H. Bennett, F. Bessette, G. Brassard, L. Salvail, and J. Smolin, J. Cryptology **5**, 3 (1992).

[2] A. K. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 661 (1991).

[3] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895 (1993).

[4] M. Lewenstein, D. Bruß, J. I. Cirac, B. Kraus, M. Kuś, J. Samsonowicz, A. Sanpera, and R. Tarrach, J. Mod. Opt. **47**, 2841 (2000).

[5] W. Dür, J. I. Cirac, and R. Tarrach, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3562 (1999).

[6] V. Vedral, M. B. Plenio, M. A. Rippin, and P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 2275 (1997).

[7] R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 4277 (1989).

[8] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824 (1996).

[9] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998).

[10] W. K. Wootters, Quantum Information and Computaion, Vol. 1, No. 1 (2000) 27-44, Rinton Press.

[11] A. Uhlmann Phys. Rev. A **62**, 032307 (2000).

[12] K. Audenaert, F. Verstraete, and B. De Moor, Phys. Rev. A **64** 012316 (2001) .

[13] P. Rungta, V. Bužek, C. M. Caves, M. Hillery, and G. J. Milburn, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 042315 (2001).

[14] E. Gerjuoy, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 052308 (2003).

[15] S. Albeverio and S. M. Fei, J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass. Opt. **3**, 223 (2001).

[16] D. D. Bhaktavatsala Rao and V. Ravishankar, e-print quant-ph/0309047.

[17] S. J. Akhtarshenas, e-print quant-ph/0311166.

[18] H. Heydari and G. Björk, Quantum Information and Computation **5**, No. 2, 146-155 (2005)

[19] H. Heydari and G. Björk, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **38**, 3203-3211 (2005).