Existence Criterion of Genuine Tripartite Entanglement

Chang-shui Yu and He-shan Song
Department of Physics, Dalian University of Technology,
Dalian 116024, China
(Dated: April 1, 2022)

In this paper, an intuitive m athem atical form ulation is provided to generalize the residual entanglement for tripartite systems of qubits (Phys. Rev. A 61,052306 (2000)) to the tripartite systems in higher dimension. The spirit lies in the tensor treatment of tripartite pure states (Phys. Rev. A 72,022333 (2005)). A distinct characteristic of the present generalization is that the formulation for higher dimensional systems is invariant under permutation of the subsystems, hence is employed as a criterion to test the existence of genuine tripartite entanglement. Furthermore, the formulation for pure states can be conveniently extended to the case of mixed states by utilizing the kronecker product approximate technique. As applications, we give the analytic approximation of the criterion for weakly mixed tripartite quantum states and consider the existence of genuine tripartite entanglement of some weakly mixed states.

PACS num bers: 03.67.-a, 03.65.-Ta

I. INTRODUCTION

Entanglement is an essential ingredient in the broad eld of quantum information theory. It is the basis of a lot of quantum protocols, such as quantum computation [1], quantum cryptography [2], quantum teleportation [3], quantum dense coding [4] and so on. It has been an important physical resource. Recently, many efforts have been made on the quantication of the resource [5,6,7,8], however, the good understanding is only limited in low-dimensional systems. The quantication of entanglement for higher dimensional systems and multipartite quantum systems remains to be an open question.

Since the remarkable concurrence was presented [5], it has been shown to be a useful entanglement measure for the systems of qubit. More interestingly, based on the concurrence, Valerie Co man et al [9] introduced the so called residual entanglem ent for tripartite system s of qubits. The residual entanglement is independent on the permutation of the qubits, hence can be employed to m easure genuine three-party entanglement, i.e. the tripartite entanglement, which opens the path to studying multipartite entanglement. Based on the motivation of generalizing the de nition of the residual entanglement to higher dim ensional systems and multipartite quantum system s, A lexander W ong et al [10] introduced the de nition of the n-tangle for n qubits with n even, however, the n-tangle itself is not a measure of the n-partite entanglement. Later, hyperdeterminant in Ref. [11] has been shown to be an entanglement monotone and represent the genuine multipartite entanglement. However, it is easy to nd that the hyperdeterm inant for higher dim ensional systems and multipartite system can not be explicitly given conveniently. In particular, so far the

hyperdeterm inant as an entanglem ent m easure has not been able to be extended to mixed systems. Furthermore, a new method by constructing N-qubit entanglement monotones was introduced by Andreas O sterioh et al [12] for pure states to measure the n-partite entanglement, however, it is only conned to the systems of qubits and seems to be very dicult to extend to the case of mixed states analogously to Ref. [11].

In this paper, we introduce a new approach to generalize the residual entanglement for tripartite systems of qubits to the tripartite systems in higher dimension. One knows that the key to obtaining the explicit $_{ABC}$ in Ref. [9] is the analytic expression of the concurrence in mixed systems of qubits. However, so far no one has been able to obtain an analytic expression of concurrence (or concurrence vector) for higher dim ensionalm ixed system s, which means that the expectable results for higher dim ensional systems seems not to be obtained from the sim ilar method to that in Ref. [9]. Hence, we provide an intuitive mathematical formulation to generalize the residual entanglem ent according to the tensor treatm ent of tripartite pure states presented in Ref. [13]. A distinct characteristic of the present generalization is that the formulation for higher dimensional systems is invariant under permutation of the subsystems (i.e. the qudits), hence can be employed as a criterion to test existence of the genuine tripartite entanglement (also called tripartite entanglem ent for convenience in the paper). Furtherm ore, the form ulation for pure states can be conveniently extended to the case of mixed states by utilizing the kronecker product approxim at technique [14,15]. However, it should be noted that the formulation is not an entanglem ent m easure except that for tripartite system s of qubits due to the variance under local unitary operations. As applications, we give the analytic approximation of the criterion for weakly mixed tripartite quantum states (quasipure states) and consider the existence of tripartite entanglem ent of som e quasipure states, which shows that our criterion can be conveniently applied in these cases.

The paper is organized as follows. Firstly, we give the intuitive generalization of the residual entanglement for pure states; secondly, we extend it to mixed states and discuss the existence of tripartite entanglement of some quasipure states; the conclusions are drawn in the end.

II. EXISTENCE CRITERION OF TRIPARTITE ENTANGLEMENT FOR PURE STATES

The residual entanglement for tripartite systems of qubits or $_{\rm A\,B\,C}$ (i.e. the tripartite entanglement measure) is given by

$$(j_{ABC}i) = p \frac{p}{\det R} = jd_1 \quad 2d_2 + 4d_3j;$$
 (1)

where a constant factor is neglected and the element R $_{\rm ij}$ of the 2 $\,$ 2 m atrix R is de $\,$ ned by

$$R_{ij} = X a_{klj} a_{m ni m p nq} a_{pqr} a_{str sk tl}; \qquad (2)$$

with the sum being over all the repeated indices, $_{01} = _{10} = 1$ and $_{00} = _{11} = 1$;

$$d_1 = a_{000}^2 a_{111}^2 + a_{001}^2 a_{110}^2 + a_{010}^2 a_{101}^2 + a_{100}^2 a_{011}^2;$$

$$\begin{array}{lll} d_2 & = & a_{000}a_{111}a_{011}a_{100} + a_{000}a_{111}a_{101}a_{010} \\ & & + a_{000}a_{111}a_{110}a_{001} + a_{011}a_{100}a_{101}a_{010} \\ & & + a_{011}a_{100}a_{110}a_{001} + a_{101}a_{010}a_{110}a_{000}; \end{array}$$

$$d_3 = a_{000}a_{110}a_{101}a_{011} + a_{111}a_{001}a_{010}a_{100};$$
 (3)

W hat's more, the a terms in above equations are the coe cients in the standard basis de ned by $j_{ABC}i=$

 $i_{jj;k=0}$ a_{ijk} $j_{ijk}i_{ABC}$. As mentioned in Ref. [9], the expression of $(j_{ABC}i)$ can be mentally pictured by in agining the eight coexcients a_{ijk} attached to the corners of a cube. The picture yields that i_{ijk} is invariant under permutations of the qubits, because a permutation of qubits corresponds to a rejection or rotation of the cube. It happens that the picture is consistent to the tensor cube introduced in Ref. [13]. In other words, a tensor cube of $j_{ABC}i$ corresponds to a tripartite entanglement measure $(j_{ABC}i)$. For convenience, we employ $f(j_{ABC}i)=j(j_{ABC}i)$ to measure tripartite entanglement, which is equivalent to $(j_{ABC}i)$ from the view-point of entanglement measure. Obviously, $f(j_{ABC}i)$ has the same properties to $(j_{ABC}i)$.

A coording to Ref. [13], a tripartite pure state in any dimension can be regarded as the tensor grid which includes tensor cubes. E.g. let $j_{ABC}i=$ $j_{ABC}i=$




FIG. 1: The tensor grid of the ∞ e cients of a tripartite pure state in 2 2 3 dim ension.

tensor grid can be considered as an non-normalized tripartite pure state of qubits, one can get that every unit corresponds to the tripartite entanglement measure of the non-normalized pure state. Namely, the tensor cube corresponds to the minimal unit of describing the tripartite entanglement. Therefore, whether there exist some genuine tripartite entanglement can be determined by all the minimal units.

Theorem 1: For any a tripartite pure state j iwhich includes M m in in all units mentioned above, let the the non-normalized tripartite pure state of qubits corresponding to the ith unit be denoted by j_i , then the corresponding tripartite entanglement can be given by $f(j_i)$. De ne

$$F (j i) = {\overset{V}{\overset{u}{\overset{u}{\overset{u}{\overset{v}{\overset{-}}{\overset{-}}{\overset{-}}{\overset{-}}}}}}} f (j'_{i}i);$$
 (4)

for the state j i, then if there does not exist genuine tripartite entanglement in j i, F (j i) = 0.

Proof. It is obvious that F (j i) = 0 means that f (j i) = 0 holds for all 'i, vice versa. Since the tensor cube corresponds to the minimal unit of describing the tripartite entanglement, F (j i) = 0 shows that there does not exist genuine three-party entanglement in j i. That is to say, F (j i) can electively test the existence of tripartite entanglement in j i. Furthermore, a permutation of qudits corresponds to a relection or rotation of the tensor grid, which is similar to that in Ref. [9], hence all the tensor cubes in the tensor grid are invariant except the relative positions in the grid. Namely, F (j i) is invariant under permutations of the qudits.

pressed as the function of j i, i.e.

$$F (j i) = {\overset{V}{\overset{U}{U}}} \frac{\overset{V}{\overset{U}{X}_{1}} \overset{X}{\overset{X}_{2}} \overset{X}{\overset{X}_{3}}}{\underset{=1}{\overset{=1}{\text{f}}}} f ((s \ s \ s \ s) j i); (5)$$

where N $_p$ = $\frac{n_p \; (n_p \; 1)}{2}$ with p = 1;2;3; s $_q$, q = ; ; ; denotes 2 n_p m atrix with p corresponding to q. If the generator of the group SO (n_p) is denoted by S $_p$, s $_q$ can be derived from $_p^3$ j by deleting the row where all the elements are zero, where j j denotes the absolute value of the m atrix elements.

Because eq. (2) can also be written in the standard basis by

$$R_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} X^{1} \\ (a_{00j}a_{11r} + a_{11j}a_{00r} & a_{01j}a_{10r} & a_{10j}a_{01r}) \\ r = 0 \\ (a_{0i}a_{11r} + a_{11i}a_{00r} & a_{01i}a_{10r} & a_{10i}a_{01r}); (6) \end{pmatrix}$$

and f (j $_{ABC}$ i) = detR , F (j i) can be expanded by

$$F (j i) = f$$

$$= 1 = 1 = 1$$

$$X^{1}$$

$$[h jS^{T} jj0ii(_{y} _{y})hkjjS ji^{2}$$

$$k = 0$$

$$X^{1} h jS^{T} jjlii(_{y} _{y})hkjjS ji^{2}$$

$$k = 0$$

$$X^{1} (h jS^{T} jj0ii(_{y} _{y})hkjjS ji$$

$$k = 0$$

$$h jS^{T} jjlii(_{y} _{y})hkjjS ji$$

$$K^{1} (h jS^{T} jjlii(_{y} _{y})hkjjS ji$$

$$K^{2} (h jS^{T} jjlii(_{y} _{y})hkjjS ji$$

$$K^{3} (h jS^{T} jjlii(_{y} _{y})hkjjS ji$$

$$K^{2} (h jS^{T} jjlii(_{y} _{y})hkjjS ji$$

$$K^{3} (h jS^{T} jjlii(_{y} _{y})hkjjS ji$$

 $(jjii)^T$ and the superscript T denotes transposition operation. Note that F $(j\ i) = \frac{1}{2}(F\ (j\ i) + F\ (j\ i))$. Although the expanded F $(j\ i)$ is a bit tedious, it is in portant for the extension of F $(j\ i)$ to mixed states.

III. EXISTENCE CRITERION OF TRIPARTITE ENTANGLEMENT FOR MIXED STATES

A. K ronecker product approxim ation technique

We st introduce the kronecker product approxim ation technique [14,15]. For any a matrix M = $[m_{ij}]$, with

entries m $_{ij}$, de $% _{ij}$ ned in $C_{d_{1}}$ $C_{d_{2}}$, M $^{\sim}$ can be de $% _{ij}$ ned [16] by

$$M^{\sim} = V_{12}^{L} (M V_{12}^{R})^{T_{2}};$$
 (8)

where the superscript T_2 denotes partial transposition on the second space [17], $V_{12}^{L,iR}$ are left (right) hand side swap operators de ned as $V_{12} = V_{12}^{L,iR}$ are left (right) hand side swap operators de ned as $V_{12} = V_{12}^{L,iR}$ and the left one is de ned in C_{d_1} and the left one is de ned in C_{d_2} and the left one is de ned in

$$M^{\sim} = U \quad V^{y} = \sum_{i=1}^{X^{r}} u_{i} v_{i}^{y}; \qquad (9)$$

where u_i , v_i are the ith columns of the unitary matrices U and V, respectively; is a diagonal matrix with elements i decreasing for i=1; ;r; r is the rankMof. Based on Ref. [14,15], M can be written by

$$M = \begin{array}{c} X^{r} \\ (X_{i} \quad Y_{i}); \end{array} (10)$$

with $V \operatorname{ec}(X_i) = P_{iu_i}$ and $V \operatorname{ec}(Y_i) = P_{iv_i}$, where $V \operatorname{ec}(A) = [a_{11}; p_1; a_{12}; p_2; a_{14}; p_4; \overline{A}; (11)]$ for any a $p \in A$ atrix $A = [a_{ij}]$ with entries a_{ij} [18].

B. Extension of existence criterion to mixed states

Consider F (j i) of pure states, the corresponding quantity of mixed states $\,$ is then given as the convex of

$$F () = \inf_{i} p_{i}F (j_{i}i)$$
 (12)

of all possible decompositions into pure states j $_{i}$ i w ith

$$= \sum_{i}^{X} p_{i} j_{i} ih_{i} j_{i} p_{i} \quad 0:$$
 (13)

F () vanishes if and only if does not include any genuine three-party entanglem ent. A coording to the matrix notation [7] of equation (13), one can obtain $= W^{-\gamma}$, where W is a diagonal matrix with $W_{ii} = p_i$, the columns of the matrix correspond to the vectors $j_{-i}i$. Due to the eigenvalue decomposition: $= M^{-\gamma}$, where M is a diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements are the eigenvalues of , and is a unitary matrix whose columns are the eigenvectors of , one can obtain $W^{1=2} = M^{1=2}U$, where $U \ge C^{r-N}$ is a Right-unitary matrix, with N and r being the column number of and the rank of . Therefore, based on the matrix notation and eq. (7), eq. (12) can be rewritten as

$$F () = \inf_{U}^{X^{N}} ([U^{T} U^{Y} U^{Y} U^{T}] U^{Y})$$

X A (U U U U)
$$l_{1i;i1}^{ii;ii}$$
) $l_{1i}^{1=4}$; (14)

w here

$$A = \frac{1}{2} \quad ^{1=2} \quad ^{T} \quad S^{T} \quad \text{ji.i.} \quad _{y} \text{ hhR jjS} \qquad ^{1=2}$$

de ned in C_{dd} C_{dd} C_{dd} C_{dd} , and is de ned in C_{dd} , with

$$^{1=2}=$$
 M $^{1=2}$ T M $^{1=2}$ Y M $^{1=2}$ T M $^{1=2}$ Y

jR ii = (hh00jj+ hh11jj) (hh00jj+ hh11jj);

$$y = \begin{cases} 8 \\ j = 1 \end{cases} y;$$

and

If the form ertwo subspaces and the latter two pnessare regarded as a doubled subspace, respectively. A can be considered to be de ned in $C_{d^2\ d^2}$ $C_{d^2\ d^2}$. It is easy to nd that A is invariant under the exchange of two doubled subspaces. Hence, based on the kronecker product approximation technique, A can be written by

$$X B_{i} B_{i} = X^{r^{0}} B_{i} B_{i} = X^{r^{0}} B_{i}^{0} B_{i}^{0}; (15)$$

with B_i , B_i^0 de ned in $C_{d\,d}$ $P_{d\,d}^0$ and P_i^0 the corresponding singular value. P_i^0 which can be obtained following the procedure in above subsection is not given explicitly. Furthermore, P_i^0 is the rank of the matrix P_i^0 de ned in above subsection. Due to eq. (15), eq. (14) can be rewritten by

$$F () = \inf_{U \atop i} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ X^{N} & Q^{T^{0}} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \qquad U^{T} \quad U^{Y} B_{j} (U \quad U) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1i \end{pmatrix}^{2} A :$$

(16)

It is also obvious that A is converted into A , if the form er two subspaces and the latter two ones are exchanged simultaneously. Based on the kronecker product approximation technique again, one can obtain that

$$B_{j} = \begin{array}{c} X^{\infty} \\ (C_{j})_{i} \\ (C_{j})_{i} \end{array} \quad (C_{j})_{i} = \begin{array}{c} X^{\infty} \\ (C_{j})_{i} \\ (C_{j})_{i} \end{array} \quad C_{j}^{0} \\ (C_{j})_{i} \end{array}$$

holds for any j, with $(C_j)_i$, C_j^0 de ned in C_{dd} , C_j^0 the corresponding singular value and $(C_j)_i = \begin{bmatrix} C_{dd} & C_{dd} \\ 0 & C_j \end{bmatrix}_i$. A nalogously, c_j^0 is the rank of C_j^0 . Hence, eq. (16) can be rew ritten by

$$F () = \inf_{U \text{ in } f} {\overset{0}{\underset{i}{\text{ }}}} {\overset{0}{\underset{j}{\text{ }}}} {\overset{X^{0}}{\underset{m}{\text{ }}}} {\overset{U^{\text{T}}}{\underset{m}{\text{ }}}} {\overset{C}{\underset{j}{\text{ }}}} {\overset{1}{\underset{j}{\text{ }}}} {\overset{1}{\underset{m}{\text{ }}}} {\overset{1}{\underset{j}{\text{ }}}} {\overset{1}{\underset{m}{\text{ }}}} {\overset{1}{\underset{i}{\text{ }}}} {\overset{1}{\underset{j}{\text{ }}}} {\overset{1}{\underset{m}{\text{ }}}} {\overset{1}{\underset{i}{\text{ }}}}$$

The in mum can be employed to test the existence of tripartite entanglement of .

where $z_j = x_j \exp(i_j)$, with $x_j = 0$, $p_j x_j^4 = 1$; and $z_{jm} = y_{jm} \exp(i'_{jm})$, with $y_{jm} = 0$, $p_j x_j^4 = 1$; and $z_{jm} = y_{jm} \exp(i'_{jm})$, with $y_{jm} = 0$, $p_j x_j^2 = 1$. Eq. (18) has the similar form to that in Ref. [7], even though it is a little more complex. Therefore the in mum of eq. (18) can be given by max $p_j = 0$. The property $p_j = 0$ where $p_j = 0$ where $p_j = 0$ are the singular values of $p_j = 0$.

P $P_{x^{0}}^{j>1}P_{x^{0}}^{i}(z;Z), \text{ where } j(z;Z) \text{ are the singular values of } P_{x^{0}}^{j>1}P_{x^{0}}^{i}Z_{j} Z_{jm} (C_{j})_{m} \text{ in decreasing order [7], with } Z = [Z_{1};Z_{2}; P_{x^{0}}]z Z_{jm} Z_{jm$

In term softhe inequality $\sum_{i=1}^{P} \mathbf{x}_{i} + \sum_{i=1}^{P} \mathbf{x}_{i} = \sum_{i=1}^{P} \mathbf{x}_$

The in mum can be obtained by $\frac{1}{r^0}^{1=4}$ max $_1(Z)$ $_{i>1}$ $_{i>1}$ $_{i}(Z)$, where $_{j}(Z)$ are the singular values of $_{j}^{P}$ $_{m}^{r^0}$ $_{m}^{P}$ $_{m}^{r^0}$ $_{m}^{Q}$ $_{m}^{Q}$ in decreasing order. Both the two cases can provide the necessary condition for the existence of tripartite entanglement of a mixed state, but the su ciency of them may be di erent.

W hat's more, compared with the procedure in Ref. [8], it is very possible that $(C_j)_{m=m \text{ ax}}$ corresponding to the maximal $(C_j)_{m=m \text{ ax}}$ corresponding to the in mum of eq. (18). That is to say the lower bound of F () can be given by C_j is with C_j the singular values of C_j is C_j in C_j in

C. Examples

In above subsection, we have provided three dierent lower bounds for any mixed state, which can be employed as necessary conditions to test the existence of tripartite entanglement in principal. However, by analysis, one cannd that the numerical realization to calculate the bounds for a mixed state requires the eigenvalue decomposition of a matrix dened in the same dimension to that of $^4_{i=1}$, which reduces the eciency of calculation. In order to avoid the similar problem, an analytic approximation method was introduced for quasipure states in Ref. [19]. By utilizing the analogous method, one will not that eq. (17) can be simplied signicantly, hence our criterion can work well for quasipure states. Before the examples, we retly give the analytic approximation of eq. $\mbox{\em flower}$

Let A in eq. (14) be denoted by A. Analogous to Ref. [19], the tensor A can be obtained by

$$\begin{array}{l} A_{1^0m}^{lm}, j)_{k^0} \\ \\ = & X^{l} X^{l} X^{l} X^{l} X^{l} \\ \\ = & P_{l} & \frac{1}{2} X^{l} \\ \\ & P_{l} & \frac{1}{2} P_{l} & \frac{1}{2} P_{l} \\ \\ & P_$$

where denotes the theigenvector and all the other quantities are dened similar to those in eq. (7). According to the symmetry of A and the kronecker product approximation technique in above section, A can be formally written as

$$A_{1^0m}^{lm},_{0;j^0k^0}^{jk} = \begin{array}{c} X \\ & &$$

The density matrix of quasi pure states has one single eigenvalue $_1$ that is much larger than all the others, which induces a natural order in term softhe smalleigenvalues $_i$, i > 1. Due to the same reasons to those in Ref. [19], here we consider the second order elements of type

 $A_{11:11}^{lm}$. Therefore, one can have the approximation

$$A_{1^0m^0;j^0k^0}^{lm;jk} ' \qquad _{lm} \quad _{1^0m^0\;jk} \quad _{j^0k^0} \; w \; ith \quad _{lm} \; = \; \frac{A_{11;11}^{lm;11}}{A_{11;11}^{11;11}} ;$$

In this sense, eq. (17) and eq. (18) can be simplied signicantly:

F()'
$$F_a() = \inf_{U_i}^{X} U^T U_{ii}$$
:

Fa() can be given by

where $_{\rm i}$ is the singular value of $_{\rm in}$ decreasing order. The tripartite m ixed states introduced in Ref.[20]

w here

$$j_{S} H Z i = \frac{1}{p \frac{1}{2}} (j_{0}00i + j_{1}11i);$$


$$j_{W} i = \frac{1}{p \frac{1}{3}} (j_{0}01i + j_{1}10i + j_{1}00i);$$

$$W^{E} = \frac{1}{p \frac{1}{3}} (j_{1}10i + j_{1}1ii + j_{1}01i);$$

can be considered as a quasi pure state for x>1=3. $F_a\left(\ (x)\right)$ is shown in Fig. 2, which indicates the consistent conclusion to that in Ref. [20]. What's more, for the quasi pure states generated by the mixture of maximally mixed state (identity matrix) and tripartite GHZ state (The cases in 3 3 3 dimension is included.), the corresponding $F_a\left(\ \right)$ is not monotone in higher dimension, the corresponding gures are not given here.

IV. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In sum mary, we have introduced an intuitive mathematical formulation to generalize the original tripartite entanglement to higher dimensional tripartite systems according to the tensor treatment of a tripartite pure state. A distinct characteristic of the present generalization is that the formulation for higher dimensional systems is invariant under permutation of the qudits. When the formulation is reduced to tripartite systems of qubits, there exists an exponent $\frac{1}{2}$ different from the original one, but the change of exponent provides convenience for the generalization to mixed states. The formulation for pure states can be conveniently extended to the case of



m ixed states by utilizing the kronecker product approximate technique. We have presented three dierent lower bounds for F () of mixed states. The form s of the three results for mixed states are similar to those of bipartite entanglement [7,8]. All of them can provide necessary

conditions to test the existence of tripartite entanglement, but the su ciency of them may be di erent. However, because the dim ension of A ism uch higher than that corresponding to bipartite entanglement, it seems to be a bit di cult to directly apply to test the existence of tripartite entanglement of a general quantum m ixed state. Fortunately, for the weakly m ixed states, i.e. quasipure states, one can nd that our criterion can be conveniently applied and is even a su cient condition for the existence of tripartite entanglement. In particular, our criterion can provide an analytic approximation. Since the 3-tangle is an entanglement measure, F_a () is not only an existence criterion, but also an e ective tripartite entanglem ent indicator. Even though there exist som e questions left open, the intuitive m athem atical formulation of tripartite entanglement and the convenient extension to mixed states will play an important role in the further understanding of multipartite entanglement m easure.

V. ACKNOW LEDGEMENT

This work was supported by the NationalNaturalScience Foundation of China, under Grant No. 60472017.

- [1] M . A . N ielsen and I. L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
- [2] M. Zukowski, A. Zeilinger, M. A. Home, and A. K. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 4287 (1993).
- [3] C.H.Bennett, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 1895 (1993).
- [4] C.H.Bennett and S.W iesner, Phys.Rev.Lett.69, 2881 (1992).
- [5] W .K.W ootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 2245 (1998).
- [6] A JJhlm ann, Phys. Rev. A 62, 032307 (2000).
- [7] K. Audenaert, F. Werstraete and De Moor, Phys. Rev. A 64, 052304 (2001).
- [8] Florian M intert, M arek K us, and Andreas Buchleitner, Phys.Rev.Lett.92,167902 (2004).
- [9] Valerie Coman, Joydip Kundu, and William K.Wootters, Phys.Rev.A 61,052306 (2000).
- [10] A lexander W ong and N elson Christensen, Phys. Rev. A 63, 044301 (2001).
- [11] A.M iyake, Phys. Rev. A 67, 012108 (2003).

- [12] Andreas O sterloh, Jens Siewert, Phys. Rev. A 72,012337 (2005).
- [13] Chang-shui Yu, He-shan Song, Phys. Rev. A 72, 022333 (2005).
- [14] N. P. Pitsianis, PhD. thesis, Cornell University, New York, 1997.
- [15] C.F.Van Loan and N.P.Pitsianis, in Linear Algebra for Large Scale and RealTime Applications, edited by M.S. Moonen and G.H.Golub (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1993), pp. 293-314.
- [16] Heng Fan, e-print quant-ph/0210168.
- [17] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 1413 (1996).
- [18] R.A.Horn and C.R.Johnson, Matrix Analysis (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1985).
- [19] Florian Mintert, Andre R.R. Carvalho, Marek Kus, and Andreas Buchleitner, Physics Report 415, 207 (2005).
- [20] T zu-Chieh W ei and Paul M. goldbart, Phys. Rev. A 68, 042307 (2003).