

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 mathematical formulation 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 numbers: 03.67.-a, 03.65.-Ta

I. INTRODUCTION

Entanglement is an essential ingredient in the broad field 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 quantification of the resource [5,6,7,8], however, the good understanding is only limited in low-dimensional systems. The quantification 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 Cooman et al [9] introduced the so called residual entanglement for tripartite systems of qubits. The residual entanglement is independent on the permutation of the qubits, hence can be employed to measure genuine three-party entanglement, i.e. the tripartite entanglement, which opens the path to studying multipartite entanglement. Based on the motivation of generalizing the definition of the residual entanglement to higher dimensional systems and multipartite quantum systems, Alexander Wong et al [10] introduced the definition 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 find that the hyperdeterminant for higher dimensional systems and multipartite system can not be explicitly given conveniently. In particular, so far the

hyperdeterminant as an entanglement measure has not been able to be extended to mixed systems. Furthermore, a new method by constructing N -qubit entanglement monotones was introduced by Andreas Osterloh et al [12] for pure states to measure the n -partite entanglement, however, it is only confined to the systems of qubits and seems to be very difficult 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 dimensional mixed systems, which means that the expectable results for higher dimensional systems seem not to be obtained from the similar method to that in Ref. [9]. Hence, we provide an intuitive mathematical formulation to generalize the residual entanglement according to the tensor treatment 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 entanglement for convenience in the paper). Furthermore, the formulation for pure states can be conveniently extended to the case of mixed states by utilizing the kronecker product approximate technique [14,15]. However, it should be noted that the formulation is not an entanglement measure except that for tripartite systems 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 entanglement of some quasipure states, which shows that our criterion can be conveniently applied in these cases.

Electronic address: hssong@dlut.edu.cn

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 ABC (i.e. the tripartite entanglement measure) is given by

$$(j_{ABC}) = \frac{P}{\det R} = \frac{1}{j_1 - 2d_2 + 4d_3}; \quad (1)$$

where a constant factor is neglected and the element R_{ij} of the 2×2 matrix R is defined by

$$R_{ij} = \sum_{a_{klj} a_{mni} a_{pqr} a_{str} a_{skt} l}; \quad (2)$$

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

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

$$d_2 = a_{000} a_{111} a_{011} a_{100} + a_{000} a_{111} a_{101} a_{010} \\ + a_{000} a_{111} a_{110} a_{001} + a_{011} a_{100} a_{101} a_{010} \\ + a_{011} a_{100} a_{110} a_{001} + a_{101} a_{010} a_{110} a_{001};$$

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

What's more, the a terms in above equations are the coefficients in the standard basis defined by $j_{ABC} = \sum_{i,j,k=0}^1 a_{ijk} |j_{ijk}\rangle_{ABC}$. As mentioned in Ref. [9], the expression of (j_{ABC}) can be mentally pictured by imagining the eight coefficients a_{ijk} attached to the corners of a cube. The picture yields that (j_{ABC}) is invariant under permutations of the qubits, because a permutation of qubits corresponds to a reflection 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} corresponds to a tripartite entanglement measure (j_{ABC}) . For convenience, we employ $f(j_{ABC}) = (j_{ABC})^2$ to measure tripartite entanglement, which is equivalent to (j_{ABC}) from the viewpoint of entanglement measure. Obviously, $f(j_{ABC})$ has the same properties to (j_{ABC}) .

According to Ref. [13], a tripartite pure state in any dimension can be regarded as the tensor grid which includes tensor cubes. E.g. let $j_{ABC} = \sum_{i,j=0}^1 \sum_{k=0}^1 a_{ijk} |j_{ijk}\rangle_{ABC}$, the tensor grid of j_{ABC} can be pictured as figure 1, which includes three tensor cubes. In this sense, one can draw a conclusion that tensor cube is the unit of tensor grid. Since every tensor cube in a




FIG. 1: The tensor grid of the coefficients of a tripartite pure state in $2 \times 2 \times 3$ dimension.

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_{i} which includes M minimal units mentioned above, let the the non-normalized tripartite pure state of qubits corresponding to the i th unit be denoted by j_{i} , then the corresponding tripartite entanglement can be given by $f(j_{i})$. Define

$$F(j_i) = \sum_{i=1}^M f(j_i); \quad (4)$$

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 effectively test the existence of tripartite entanglement in j_i . Furthermore, a permutation of qudits corresponds to a reflection 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.

Considering the matrix notation of $j_i = \sum_{i=0}^{n_1-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n_2-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n_3-1} a_{ijk} |j_{ijk}\rangle$, $F(j_i)$ can be ex-

$$X_A = (U_1 U_2 U_3 U_4)_{ii,ii}^{ii,ii}; \quad (14)$$

where

$$A = \frac{1}{2} \begin{matrix} 1=2 \\ S^T \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} \text{jj} \\ \text{ii} \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} \text{hh} \\ \text{rr} \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} \text{jj} \\ \text{ss} \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} 1=2 \\ \end{matrix}$$

defined in $C_{d,d}$, $C_{d,d}$, $C_{d,d}$, $C_{d,d}$, and is defined in $C_{d,d}$, with

$$1=2 = \begin{matrix} M^{1=2} \\ T \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} M^{1=2} \\ Y \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} M^{1=2} \\ T \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} M^{1=2} \\ Y \end{matrix};$$

$$\text{jj} \text{ii} = \text{jj}011\text{ii} + \text{jj}100\text{ii} - \text{jj}110\text{ii} - \text{jj}001\text{ii};$$

$$\text{jj} \text{rr} = (\text{hh}00\text{jj} + \text{hh}11\text{jj}) - (\text{hh}00\text{jj} + \text{hh}11\text{jj});$$

$$y = \sum_{j=1}^8 y_j;$$

$$S = \sum_{j=1}^4 S_j;$$

and

$$\text{jj} \text{abodii} = \text{jj} \text{aii} - \text{jj} \text{pii} - \text{jj} \text{cii} - \text{jj} \text{dii};$$

If the former two subspaces and the latter two ones are regarded as a doubled subspace, respectively. A can be considered to be defined in $C_{d^2,d^2} = C_{d^2,d^2}$. It is easy to find that A is invariant under the exchange of two doubled subspaces. Hence, based on the kronecker product approximation technique, A can be written by

$$X_A = \begin{matrix} X^0 \\ B_i \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} B_i \\ X^0 \end{matrix} = \begin{matrix} X^0 \\ B_i^0 \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} B_i^0 \\ X^0 \end{matrix}; \quad (15)$$

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

$$F(\cdot) = \inf_U \begin{matrix} X^N \\ @ \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} X^0 \\ \end{matrix} U^T \begin{matrix} U^Y \\ B_j \end{matrix} (U_1 U_2)_{ii}^{ii} \begin{matrix} 2 \\ A \end{matrix}; \quad (16)$$

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

$$B_j = \begin{matrix} X^0 \\ (C_j)_i \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} (C_j)_i \\ X^0 \end{matrix} = \begin{matrix} X^0 \\ j_i \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} 0 \\ C_j^0 \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} C_j^0 \\ j_i \end{matrix}$$

holds for any j , with $(C_j)_i, C_j^0$ defined in $C_{d,d}$, C_j^0 the corresponding singular value and $(C_j)_i = \frac{0}{j_i} C_j^0$. Analogously, r^0 is the rank of B_j . Hence, eq. (16) can be rewritten by

$$F(\cdot) = \inf_U \begin{matrix} X^N \\ @ \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} X^0 \\ \end{matrix} U^T (C_j)_m U_{ii}^{ii} \begin{matrix} 2 \\ A \end{matrix}; \quad (17)$$

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

In terms of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality $\sum_i x_i^2 \sum_i y_i^2 > \sum_i x_i y_i$ and $\sum_i x_i y_i \sum_j x_i x_j$, $F(\cdot)$ can also be expressed by

$$F(\cdot) = \inf_U \begin{matrix} X^N \\ @ \end{matrix} U^T \begin{matrix} X^0 \\ \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} X^0 \\ \end{matrix} \sum_j z_j \sum_m (C_j)_m A U_{ii}; \quad (18)$$

where $z_j = x_j \exp(i\phi_j)$, with $x_j \geq 0$, $\sum_j x_j^4 = 1$; and $Z_{jm} = y_{jm} \exp(i\phi'_{jm})$, with $y_{jm} \geq 0$, $\sum_{jm} y_{jm}^2 = 1$. Eq. (18) has the similar form to that in Ref. [7], even though it is a little more complex. Therefore the minimum of eq. (18) can be given by $\max_{z,Z} \lambda(z;Z)$ $\sum_{z,Z} \lambda(z;Z)$, where $\lambda(z;Z)$ are the singular values of $\sum_{j,m} \frac{1}{r^0} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i^2 z_j \sum_m (C_j)_m$ in decreasing order [7], with $z = [z_1; z_2; \dots; z_{r^0}]$ and $Z = [Z_{11}; Z_{12}; \dots; Z_{r^0, r^0}]$.

In terms of the inequality $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^n y_i^2 \geq (\sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i)^2$, a more analogous form about eq. (17) to that in Ref. [7] can be given by

$$F(\cdot) = \inf_U \frac{1}{r^0} \sum_i \begin{matrix} X^N \\ @ \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} X^0 \\ \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} X^0 \\ \end{matrix} \sum_{j,m} Z_{jm} (C_j)_m A U_{ii}; \quad (19)$$

The minimum can be obtained by $\frac{1}{r^0} \sum_{j,m} Z_{jm} \lambda(z;Z)$, where $\lambda(z;Z)$ are the singular values of $\sum_{j,m} \frac{1}{r^0} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i^2 Z_{jm} (C_j)_m$ in decreasing order. Both the two cases can provide the necessary condition for the existence of tripartite entanglement of a mixed state, but the sufficiency of them may be different.

What's more, compared with the procedure in Ref. [8], it is very possible that $(C_j)_{m \max}$ corresponding to the maximal $(\frac{0}{j})_m$ can give the main contribution to the minimum of eq. (18). That is to say the lower bound of $F(\cdot)$ can be given by $\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N x_i^2$ with j the singular values of $(C_j)_{m \max}$.




FIG. 2: $F_a(x)$ of the mixed state $(x) = x|GHZ\rangle\langle GHZ| + (1-x)|\Psi^+\rangle\langle\Psi^+|$ vs x , $x \in [0, 1]$ ($l=3; 1$):

mixed states by utilizing the kronecker product approximate technique. We have presented three different lower bounds for $F(x)$ of mixed states. The forms 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 sufficiency of them may be different. However, because the dimension of A is much higher than that corresponding to bipartite entanglement, it seems to be a bit difficult to directly apply to test the existence of tripartite entanglement of a general quantum mixed state. Fortunately, for the weakly mixed states, i.e. quasipure states, one can find that our criterion can be conveniently applied and is even a sufficient condition for the existence of tripartite entanglement. In particular, our criterion can provide an analytic approximation. Since the 3-tangle is an entanglement measure, $F_a(x)$ is not only an existence criterion, but also an effective tripartite entanglement indicator. Even though there exist some questions left open, the intuitive mathematical formulation of tripartite entanglement and the convenient extension to mixed states will play an important role in the further understanding of multipartite entanglement measure.

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China, under Grant No. 60472017.

-
- [1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
 - [2] M. Żukowski, A. Zeilinger, M. A. H. 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. Wiesner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 2881 (1992).
 - [5] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 2245 (1998).
 - [6] A. J. H. Mann, Phys. Rev. A 62, 032307 (2000).
 - [7] K. Audenaert, F. Verstraete and D. Moor, Phys. Rev. A 64, 052304 (2001).
 - [8] Florian Mintert, Marek Kuś, and Andreas Buchleitner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 167902 (2004).
 - [9] Valerie Cooman, Joydip Kundu, and William K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A 61, 052306 (2000).
 - [10] Alexander Wong and Nelson Christensen, Phys. Rev. A 63, 044301 (2001).
 - [11] A. Miyake, Phys. Rev. A 67, 012108 (2003).
 - [12] Andreas Osterloh, 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, Ph.D. thesis, Cornell University, New York, 1997.
 - [15] C. F. Van Loan and N. P. Pitsianis, in Linear Algebra for Large Scale and Real Time 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 Kuś, and Andreas Buchleitner, Physics Report 415, 207 (2005).
 - [20] Tzu-Chieh Wei and Paul M. Goldbart, Phys. Rev. A 68, 042307 (2003).