arXiv:quant-ph/0603243v2 27 Oct 2006

Inductive classi cation of multipartite entanglem ent under SLOCC

L. Lam ata, 1 , J. Leon, $^{1, y}$ D. Salgado, $^{2, z}$ and E. Solano^{x3,4, {}

¹Instituto de Matematicas y F sica Fundamental, CSIC, Serrano 113-bis, 28006 Madrid, Spain ²Dpto. F sica Teorica, Universidad Autonoma de Madrid, 28049 Cantoblanco, Madrid, Spain

³M ax-P lanck-Institut fur Q uantenoptik, H ans-K opferm ann-Strasse 1, 85748 G arching, G erm any

⁴ Seccion F sica, Departamento de Ciencias, Ponti cia Universidad Catolica del Peru, Apartado Postal 1761, Lima, Peru

(Dated: April 17, 2024)

We propose an inductive procedure to classify N partite entanglement under stochastic local operations and classical communication (SLOCC) provided such a classication is known for N 1 qubits. The method is based upon the analysis of the coe cient matrix of the state in an arbitrary product basis. We illustrate this approach in detail with the well-known bi- and tripartite systems, obtaining as a by-product a systematic criterion to establish the entanglement class of a given pure state without resourcing to any entanglement measure. The general case is proved by induction, allowing us to nd an upper bound for the number of N-partite entanglement classes in terms of the number of entanglement classes for N 1 qubits.

PACS num bers: 03.67 M n, 03.65 J d, 02.10 Y n K eywords: M ultipartite entanglem ent; coe cient m atrix, singular value decom position

I. IN TRODUCTION

Entanglem ent resides in the root of the most surprising quantum phenomena (cf.e.g. [1]). Furthermore, it is the main resource in the usage of quantum systems to process information [2] in tasks such as cryptographic key distribution [3], quantum computation [4, 5], quantum state teleportation [6], quantum communication [7] and dense coding [8]. However a comprehensive understanding of entanglem ent is still lacking, mainly because it is a highly counterintuitive feature of quantum system s (non-separability [9]) and because its analysis can be undertaken under di erent, although com plem entary, standpoints [10]. A s prom inent exam ples the sub jects of deciding in full generality whether a given state carries entanglem entornot and how much entanglem ent the system should be attributed to are vivid open questions (cf. e.g. [11] and references therein). This state of a airs is critical in multipartite systems, where most applications nd their desired utility.

Am ong others, part of the e orts are being dedicated to classify under diversely motivated criteria the types of entanglement which a multipartite system can show. It is in this sense desirable, independently of these criteria, to have classi cation methods valid for any number N of entangled systems. One of these most celebrated criteria to carry out such a classi cation was provided in [12]. In physical term s D ur et al. de ned an entanglement class as the set of pure states which can be interrelated through

stochastic local operations and classical communications (SLOCC hereafter) or equivalently, as those pure states which can carry out the same quantum -inform ational tasks with non-nullpossibly di erent probabilities. They also proved the m athem atical counterpart of this characterization: two states and of a given system belong to the sam e entanglem ent class if, and only if, there exist invertible local operators (ILO 's hereafter; that is, nonsingular matrices), which we agree on denoting as $F^{[1]}$ such that $= F^{[1]}$ ${}^{\mathbb{N}}F$ (). M oreover, they provided the rst classi cation under this criterion of tripartite multiqubit entanglem ent, giving birth to the two well-known genuine entanglem ent triqubit classes nam ed as G H Z and W classes. Later on, exploiting som e accidental facts in group theory, Verstraete et al. [13] gave rise to the classi cation of 4-qubit states.

Regretfully none of the previous works allowed one to succeed in obtaining a generalizable method. In the second case, the exploitation of a singular fact such as the isom orphism SU(2) SU(2) ' SO(4) is clearly useless in a general setting; in the st case, the use of quantitative entanglem ent m easures speci cally designed for three qubits, as the 3 tangle [14], to discern am ong different entanglem ent classes discourages one to follow up the same trend, since we would have to be able to build m ore generic entanglem ent m easures, per se a form idable task. However, Verstraete et al. [15] succeeded in this approach by introducing the so-called norm alform s, nam ely those pure states such that all reduced local operators are proportional to the identity matrix. These authors also provided a system atic, mostly num erical, constructive procedure to nd the LO's bringing an arbitrary pure state to a norm al form . Furtherm ore, the use of these norm al form s allowed them to introduce entanglem ent m easures (entanglem ent m onotones [16], indeed), which o ered the possibility to quantify the amount of entanglem ent in the original state. In this same trend, other alternatives can also be found in the literature

^xP resent address: P hysics D epartm ent, A SC, and C eN S, Ludw ig-M axim ilians-U niversitat, T heresienstrasse 37, 80333 M unich, G erm any

lam atal in a .cfm ac.csic.es

^yleon@ima .cfm ac.csic.es

^zdavid.salgado@uam.es

[{] enrique.solano@ physik.lm u.de

[17, 18, 19]. For completeness' sake let us recall that classi cation under SLOCC is coarser than that using only local unitaries, that is in which every $F^{[k]}$ is unitary. Nevertheless relevant results in this realm can also be found in the literature [20, 21, 22, 23].

Here we o er an alternative and complementary approach to the classi cation under SLOCC based on an analysis of the singular value decomposition (SVD) of the coe cient matrix of the pure state in an arbitrary product basis. The coe cient matrix is chosen according to the partition 172:::N with the subsequent goal of establishing a recursive procedure allowing one to elucidate the entanglem ent classes under SLOCC provided such a classi cation is known with one less qubit. The key feature in this scheme is the structure of the right singular subspace, i.e. of the subspace generated by the right singular vectors of the coe cient m atrix, set up according to the entanglem ent classes which its generators belong to. As a secondary long-term goal, the approach seeks possible connections to the matrix product state (MPS) formalism (cf. e.g. [24] and multiple references therein), which is becoming increasingly ubiquitous in di erent elds such as spin chains [25], classical sim ulations of quantum entangled system s [26], density-matrix renorm alization group techniques [27] and sequential generation of entangled multiqubit states [28].

We have preferred the mathematical conventions. The canonical orthonormal basis in C^N will be denoted by $fe_jg_{j=1,...,N}$ (correspondingly in physics the kets jj 1i). Normalization is not relevant in elucidating the entanglement class which a state belongs to. Thus we will deal with unnormalized vectors and non-unit-determinant ILO's. In the SVD of an arbitrary matrix (cf. appendix), V and W will denote the left and right unitary matrix, whereas will stand for the diagonal possibly rectangular matrix with the singular values as entries. In the multiqubit cases, we will agree on denoting by small G reek letters ; ; ::: vectors belonging to C^2 , whereas capital G reek letters ; C^2 .

The paper is organized as follows. In section II the entanglement of two qubits is revisited with a reformulation of the Schmidt decomposition criterion in terms of the singular subspaces. In section III the extension to the three-qubit case is developed in detail and the principles of the generalization to multipartite and arbitrarydimension systems are discussed in section IV. We close with some concluding remarks in section V. An appendix with the relevant facts about the SVD is also included.

II. BIPARTITE ENTANGLEM ENT

A. The Schm idt decom position criterion revisited

The determ ination of entanglem ent of pure states of bipartite systems in any dimensions, in general, and in two dimensions (qubits), in particular, was solved long ago with the aid of the well-known Schm idt decom position [29, 30], by which any bipartite state can be written as a biorthogonal com bination

$$= \frac{\min (M_{1}; N_{2})}{n n n} \sum_{n=1}^{(1)} \sum_{n=1}^{(2)} ; \qquad (1)$$

where $_{1}$ $_{2}$ 0 for all n and Menotes the dimension of subsystem i. If $_{n} = 0$ except for only one index $_{1} \notin 0$, then the state is a product state; on the contrary, if $_{n} \notin 0$ for two orm one indices, then the state is an entangled state. Furtherm ore, $_{n}^{2}$ coincides with the common eigenvalues of both reduced density operators. Thus, to practically determ ine the entangled or separable character of a given pure state all we must do is to com – pute the spectrum of $_{1}$ or $_{2}$ or equivalently to analyze the dimensionality of their ranges. This is the backbone in the study of 3 partite entanglement carried out in [12].

Follow ingly in order to pave the way for a generalization to multipartite system s, we will reform ulate the Schmidt decomposition criterion for bipartite systems focusing upon the subspace generated by the singular vectors. We need the next

Denition II.1. We will denote by V (resp. W) the subspace generated by the left (resp. right) singular vectors, i.e. $V = \text{spanfv}_1; :::; v_k g$ (resp. $W = \text{spanfw}_1; :::; w_k g$).

W e can now state the following

Theorem II.1. Let $2 C^m C^n$ and C() denote the matrix of ∞ e cients of in an arbitrary ∞ mmon product basis. Then is a product state if and only if dim W = 1 (or alternatively dim V = 1).

Proof. Let $fe_ig_{i=1,...,m}$ and $ff_jg_{j=1,...,n}$ denote bases in C^m and C^n , respectively. Then any vector $2 C^m C^n$ can be written as

$$= \begin{array}{ccc} X^{n} & X^{n} \\ = & c_{ij}e_{i} & f_{j}; \\ & & \\$$

where $c_{i\,j}$ are the complex coe cients of $% i\,$, which we arrange as:

$$\begin{array}{c} 0 & & 1 \\ c_{11} & ::: & c_{1n} \\ C () & \begin{array}{c} B \\ \hline e \\ \vdots \\ c_{n \ 1} \\ ::: \\ G_{n \ n} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ C \end{array} (3)$$

The matrix C () C always admits a SVD, given by $C = V W^{y}$, where V and W are unitary matrices and is a diagonal matrix with entries $_{k}$ (the singular values, indeed). Thus

$$C_{ij} = \bigvee_{k=1}^{m \text{ in } jn} V_{ik} \quad k W_{jk} : \qquad (4)$$

Inserting (4) into (2) and identifying new bases $fe_ig_{i=1,2}$ and $ff_jg_{j=1,2}$ we arrive at the well-known Schm idt decomposition

$$= \sum_{\substack{k=1}}^{\min(m, n)} e_k e_k f_k :$$
 (5)

The number of non-null singular values coincides with the rank of , which in turn coincides with the dimensions of V and W (cf. appendix). $\hfill \Box$

From the proof we can deduce a practical method to recognize where a bipartite system is entangled or not:

C orollary II.1. Let $2 C^m C^n$ denote the state of a bipartite quantum system and C () its coe cient matrix in an arbitrary product basis. Then is a product state if, and only if, r(C()) = 1.

B. Classi cation of two-qubit entanglem ent under $${\tt SLOCC}$$

We only need one further tool to nd the classi cation of bipartite entanglem ent under SLOCC, which is established as follows:

P roposition II.1. Let ; $2 C^2 C^2$ denote two twoqubit states related by SLOCC, i.e.

$$= F^{[1]} F^{[2]}();$$
(6)

where F $^{[1]}$ and F $^{[2]}$ are non-singular operators upon C². Then their corresponding ∞ e cient matrices C;C in an arbitrary product basis are related through

$$C = (F^{[1]^{T}} V) (F^{[2]y}W)^{Y} :$$
(7)

P roof. Just substitute = $P_{i;j=1;2} c_{ij}e_i$ f_j in (6) and identify indices.

The key idea in our analysis is to recognize the e ect of the ILO's F^[i] upon the singular vectors. If v_j (resp.w_j) is a left (resp. right) singular vector for the matrix coefcient C, then F^{[L]T}(v_j) (resp. F^{[2]y}(w_j)) is a left (resp. right) \singular vector" [37] for the new matrix coe cient C. In order to ease the notation, we will agree hereafter on relating and through = F^{[L]T} F^{[2]y}(), which allows us to drop the transpose and Herm itian conjugation [38] in future considerations.

The case of two qubits is elementary, since there is no much space to discuss. The bases in which the coe cient matrix will be expressed are the canonical orthonormal basis $fe_1;e_2g$ in C^2 . Only two options are present: either dim W = 1 or dim W = 2. In the rst case, after choosing F^[1] such that

$$F^{[1]}(v_1) = \frac{1}{1}e_1;$$
 (8a)

$$F^{[2]}(w_1) = e_1;$$
 (8b)

the new coe cient matrix will turn into $C = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, which corresponds to the product state $= e_1 \quad e_1$. We will agree on stating that belongs to the entanglem ent class denoted by 00.

In the second case, where $_1$ $_2 > 0$, after choosing F ^[1] and F ^[2] such that

$$F^{[1]}(v_1) = \frac{1}{1}e_1;$$
 $F^{[1]}(v_2) = \frac{1}{2}e_2;$ (9a)

$$F^{[2]}(w_1) = e_1; F^{[2]}(w_2) = e_2; (9b)$$

the new coe cient m atrix will be $C = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, which corresponds to the entangled state $= e_1 \quad e_1 + e_2 \quad e_2$. Now we say that belongs to the class ⁺.

The reader can readily check by simple inspection how in the rst case the canonical matrix C has rank one, whereas in the second it has rank 2, as expected. In sum mary, only two classes are possible, namely 00 and $^+$.

III. TRIPARTITE ENTANGLEM ENT

The classi cation of tripartite pure states is perform ed along the same lines, namely choosing the ILO's F $^{\rm [i]}$ so that the nal coe cient matrix reduces to a canonical one. In order to nd such canonical matrices, we must be exhaustive in the considerations of all possibilities when discussing about V and W .

The analysis of tripartite entanglement can be undertaken upon three possible coe cient matrices, arising from the three di erent ways to group the indices, that is, since = $i_{i_1,i_2,i_3=1,2} C_{i_1,i_2,i_3} e_{i_1} e_{i_2} e_{i_3}$, where as before fekg denotes the canonical orthonorm alloasis in C², we have

$$C^{(1)} C_{1j23} = \begin{array}{cccc} C_{111} & C_{112} & C_{121} & C_{122} \\ C_{211} & C_{212} & C_{221} & C_{222} \end{array}; (10a)$$

$$C^{(2)} C_{2j13} = \begin{array}{cccc} C_{111} & C_{112} & C_{211} & C_{212} \\ C_{121} & C_{122} & C_{221} & C_{222} \end{array}; (10b)$$

$$C^{(3)} C_{3j12} = \begin{array}{cccc} C_{111} & C_{121} & C_{211} & C_{221} \\ C_{122} & C_{222} & C_{222} \end{array}; (10c)$$

There is no loss of generality in choosing one of them, since the analysis will be exhaustive. Hereafter we will choose $C = C^{(1)}$. Notice that now the left singular vectors of C belong to C^2 whereas the right singular vectors are in $C^2 - C^2$. Also, we immediately realize that only two possibles options arise, namely dim W = 1 or dim W = 2, since there are at most two positive singular values. The recursivity appears when classifying the different structures which the subspace W can show. The classication of these subspaces is performed according to the entanglement classes which their generators belong to. In order to do that we need the following result, which was rstly proved in the context of entanglement theory in [31]. We o er an alternative proof in order to illustrate our methods.

P roposition III.1. Any two-dimensional subspace in $C^2 - C^2$ contains at least one product vector.

Proof. Let V be a two-dimensional subspace of $C^2 = C^2$. W ith no loss of generality two entangled vectors can be chosen as generators of V with coe cient matrices given by $C_1 = I$ and C_2 being an arbitrary rank-2 matrix in the product canonical basis. Then it is always possible to nd non-null complex numbers and such that I+ C_2 has rank one [39].

In other words, this proposition shows that spanf $_1$; $_2$ g always equals either spanf $_1$ $_1$; $_2$ $_2$ g or spanf

; g, where in plicit are the assumptions that di erent indices denote linear independence and in the last case only one product unit vector can be found. Thus, with the same convention, the right singular subspace W can show six di erent structures, namely spanf g, spanf g, spanf 1; 2g, spanf 1 ; 2 g, spanf 1 1; 2 g and spanf ; g. W e pursue P rop. III.1 a step further:

Proposition III.2. Let W be a two-dimensional subspace in C^2 C^2 . Then W = spanf '; g if, and only if, W = spanf'; '+ 'g, where denotes linear independence.

' is the only product vector in W Proof. Suppose (up to norm alization factors). Its orthogonal vector in W will be an entangled vector with coordinates in a product basisf; g f'; g given by (0; 12; 21; 22), ie. it will be of the form '+ '+a ', with a 2 C. Since ' must be the only product vector in W , it necessarily has to be a = 0; otherwise could it always be possible to nd **′** + a ; 2 C such that **′** + **′** + is another product vector (= a). ' + Suppose now that W = f1; ' g, then ' + ' is a product vector if, and **′** + only if, = 0, i.e. if it is the original **′**.

W e can now state our result, already contained in [12] with di erent criteria:

Theorem III.1. Let $2 C^2 C^2 C^2$ be the pure state of a tripartite system. Then can be reduced through SLOCC to one of the following six states, which corresponds to the six possible entanglement classes, according to the following table:

		1				
C lass	C anonical vector	Canonicalm atrix W				
000	$e_1 e_1 e_1$	1000 0000,	spanf g			
0 ₁ ⁺ ₂₃	$e_1 e_1 e_1 + e_1 e_2 e_2$	1 0 0 1 0 0 0 0	spanf g			
0 ₂ ⁺ ₁₃	$e_1 e_1 e_1 + e_2 e_1 e_2$	1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0,	C ²			
0 ₃ ⁺ ₁₂	$e_1 e_1 e_1 + e_2 e_2 e_1$	1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0	C ²			
GΗΖ	$e_1 e_1 e_1 + e_2 e_2 e_2$	1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1	spanf 1 1; 2 2g			
W	$e_1 e_1 e_2 + e_1 e_2 e_1 + e_2 e_1 e_1$	0 1 1 0 1 0 0 0	spanf _{1 1} ; g			

Т

Proof. W e discuss depending on W :

1.
$$W = \text{spanf}$$
 g. In this case, $w_1 = \dots$ Choose
the ILO's F^[k], $k = 1;2;3$ so that

$$F^{[1]}(v_1) = \frac{1}{1}e_1;$$
 (11a)

$$F^{[2]}() = e_1;$$
 (11b)

$$F^{[3]}() = e_1:$$
 (11c)

Then the new coe cient matrix will be

which corresponds to the state $e_1 e_1 e_1$, and where the dots indicates the irrelevant character of that entry. 2. $W = \text{spanf g. In this case } w_1 = 1 + 2 2$. Choose the LLO's so that

$$F^{[1]}(v_1) = \frac{1}{1}e_1;$$
 (13a)

$$F^{[2]}(_{1}) = e_{1};$$
 $F^{[2]}(_{2}) = e_{2};$ (13b)

$$F^{[3]}(_{1}) = e_{1};$$
 $F^{[3]}(_{2}) = e_{2}:$ (13c)

Then the new coe cient matrix will be

which corresponds to the state $e_1 \quad e_1 + e_1 \\ e_2 \quad e_2 \, .$

3. $W = C^2 = \text{spanf}_{1}$; 2g. In this case $w_1 = 11$ 1 + 12 2 and $w_2 = 21$ 1 + 22 w_1 and w_2 are linear independent (orthonormal, indeed). Choose the ILO's so that

$$F_{1}^{[1]}(v_{1}) = \frac{1}{1}e_{1}; \quad F_{1}^{[1]}(v_{2}) = \frac{1}{2}e_{2};$$
 (15a)

$$F_{2}^{[1]} = F_{2}^{[1]}(e_{1}) F_{2}^{[1]}(e_{2})] = [i_{j}]^{-1};$$
(15b)

$$F^{[1]} = F_2^{[1]} F_1^{[1]};$$
 (15c)

$$F^{[2]}() = e_1;$$
 (15d)

$$F^{[3]}(_1) = e_1; \quad F^{[3]}(_2) = e_2:$$
 (15e)

Then the new coe cient matrix will be

which corresponds to the state $e_1 = e_1 + e_2 = e_1 - e_2$.

4. $W = C^2$ = spanf 1; 2 g. In this case $w_1 = {}_{11} 1$ + ${}_{12} 2$ and $w_2 = {}_{21} 1$ + ${}_{22} 2$, where the matrix [${}_{ij}$] has rank 2, since w_1 and w_2 are linear independent (orthonormal, indeed). Choose the ILO 's so that

$$F_{1}^{[L]}(v_{1}) = \frac{1}{1}e_{1}; \quad F_{1}^{[L]}(v_{2}) = \frac{1}{2}e_{2}; \quad (17a)$$

$$F_{2}^{[L]} = F_{2}^{[L]}(e_{1}) F_{2}^{[L]}(e_{2})] = [\dots]^{-1}; \quad (17b)$$

$$F_2^{[1]} = [F_2^{[1]}(e_1) F_2^{[1]}(e_2)] = [_{ij}]^{-1};$$
 (17b)

$$F^{[1]} = F_2^{[1]} F_1^{[1]};$$
 (17c)

$$F^{[2]}(_1) = e_1; \quad F^{[2]}(_2) = e_2; \quad (17d)$$

 $F^{[3]}() = e_1:$ (17e)

Then the new coe cient matrix will be

which corresponds to the state $e_1 \quad e_1 + e_2 \\ e_2 \quad e_1 \, .$

5. W = spanf $_1$ $_1$; $_2$ $_2$ g. In this case $w_1 = 11 1 1 1 + 12 2 2$ and $w_2 = 21 1 1 + 22 2$, where the matrix $[i_j]$ has rank 2, since w_1 and w_2 are linear independent (orthonormal, indeed). Choose the ILO's so that

$$F_{1}^{[1]}(v_{1}) = \frac{1}{1}e_{1}; \quad F_{1}^{[1]}(v_{2}) = \frac{1}{2}e_{2};$$
 (19a)

$$\mathbf{F}_{2}^{[1]} = \left[\mathbf{F}_{2}^{[1]}(\mathbf{e}_{1}) \mathbf{F}_{2}^{[1]}(\mathbf{e}_{2}) \right] = \left[\begin{array}{c} \\ \text{ij} \end{array} \right]^{-1}; \quad (19b)$$

$$F^{[1]} = F_2^{[1]} F_1^{[1]};$$
 (19c)

$$F^{[2]}(_{1}) = e_{1}; \quad F^{[2]}(_{2}) = e_{2}; \quad (19d)$$

$$F^{[3]}(_{1}) = e_{1}; \quad F^{[3]}(_{2}) = e_{2}: \quad (19e)$$

Then the new coe cient matrix will be

which corresponds to the state $e_1 = e_1 + e_2$ $e_2 = e_2$. 6. W = spanf₁ ; g. In this notation, remember that implicit is the assumption that only one product unit vector can be found in W. In this case can be chosen so that = 1 2 + 2 1 (this is the statement in Prop. III2). Thus the singular vectors can always be expressed as w₁ = 11 (1 2 + 2 1) + 12 1 1 and w₂ = 21 (1 2 + 2 1) + 22 1 1, where the matrix [ij] has rank 2, since w₁ and w₂ are linear independent (orthonorm al, indeed). Choose the ILO's so that

$$F_{1}^{[L]}(v_{1}) = \frac{1}{1}e_{1}; \qquad F_{1}^{[L]}(v_{2}) = \frac{1}{2}e_{2};$$
 (21a)

$$F_{2}^{[l]} = F_{2}^{[l]}(e_{1}) F_{2}^{[l]}(e_{2})] = [i_{j}]^{-1};$$
(21b)

$$F^{[1]} = F_2^{[1]} F_1^{[1]};$$
 (21c)

$$F^{[2]}(_1) = e_1 \qquad F^{[2]}(_2) = e_2;$$
 (21d)

$$F^{[3]}(_1) = e_1 \qquad F^{[3]}(_2) = e_2$$
: (21e)

Then the new coe cient matrix will be

which corresponds to the state $e_1 = e_1 + e_2 + e_1$ $e_2 = e_1 + e_2 = e_1 + e_1$.

Since there is no more options for the subspace ${\tt W}\;$ we have already considered all possible alternatives.

In conclusion, we have found that there are six classes of entanglem ent, nam ed after [12] as $000, 0_{i_1} \stackrel{+}{}_{i_2 i_3}$, G H Z and W. The theorem also indicates how to practically classify a given state : compute the SVD of its coe - cient m atrix and elucidate the structure of spanfw₁;w₂g. W e include a further proposition comprising the practical im plem entation of this result. W e need to introduce the following de nition.

De nition III.1. Let $w_j = e_1 \quad w_{j1} + e_2 \quad w_{j2} \ 2 \ C^2 \quad C^2$ be an arbitrary vector. We associate a two-dimensional matrix W_j to w_j by de ning

$$W_{j} = [w_{j1} w_{j2}]$$
: (23)

This de nition will be mainly applied to the right singular vectors of the ∞ e cient matrix C . As usual, the

singular values of C will be denoted by $_k$, in nonincreasing order, and (A) denotes the spectrum of a matrix A. O ur proposal to implement the preceding result is

Theorem III.2. Let denote the pure state of a tripartite system and C $^{(i)}$ its coe cient matrix according to the partitions ijjk (cf. (10a)-(10c)). Then

- belongs to the 000 class if, and only if, r(C ⁽ⁱ⁾) = 1 for all i = 1;2;3.
- 2. belongs to the $0_1 \stackrel{+}{_{23}}$ class if, and only if, $r(C^{(1)}) = 1$ and $r(C^{(k)}) = 2$ for k = 2;3.
- 3. belongs to the $0_2 \stackrel{+}{}_{13}$ class if, and only if, $r(\mathbb{C}^{(2)}) = 1$ and $r(\mathbb{C}^{(k)}) = 2$ for k = 1;3.
- 4. belongs to the 0₃ $^+_{12}$ class if, and only if, r(C $^{(3)}$) = 1 and r(C $^{(k)}$) = 2 for k = 1;2.
- 5. belongs to the G H Z class if, and only if, one of the following situations occurs:
 - i. r(C ⁽ⁱ⁾) = 2 for all i = 1;2;3 and r(W₁) = r(W₂) = 1.
 ii. r(C ⁽ⁱ⁾) = 2 for all i = 1;2;3, r(W₁) = 2, r(W₂) = 1 and (W₁⁻¹W₂) is non-degenerate.
 iii. r(C ⁽ⁱ⁾) = 2 for all i = 1;2;3, r(W₂) = 2, r(W₁) = 1 and (W₂⁻¹W₁) is non-degenerate.
 iv. r(C ⁽ⁱ⁾) = 2 for all i = 1;2;3, r(W₁) = 2, r(W₂) = 2 and (W₁⁻¹W₂) is non-degenerate.
- 6. belongs to the W class if, and only if, one of the following situations occurs:
 - i. $r(C^{(i)}) = 2$ for all $i = 1;2;3, r(W_1) = 2, r(W_2) = 1$ and $(W_1^{-1}W_2)$ is degenerate.
 - ii. $r(C^{(i)}) = 2$ for all $i = 1;2;3, r(W_1) = 1, r(W_2) = 2$ and $(W_2^{-1}W_1)$ is degenerate.
 - iii. $r(C^{(i)}) = 2$ for all $i = 1;2;3, r(W_1) = 2, r(W_2) = 2$ and $(W_1^{-1}W_2)$ is degenerate.

Proof. We will exclusively concentrate upon the sufciency, since the necessity directly follows from the canonical form of each class.

The rst four cases are elementary, since it is a matter of detection of the vector which factorizes. The naltwo cases correspond to true tripartite entangled states. If $r(W_k) = 1$ for k = 1;2, it is clear that there exist two product vectors belonging to W, thus belongs to the GHZ class. If $r(W_1) = 2$ and $r(W_2) = 1$ we need to check whether an ILO applied upon the rst qubit can reduce the rank of the transform ed W₁. As it can be deduced from the preceding proofs, an ILO upon the rst qubit am ounts to constructing a linear combination between the two right singular vectors, which is equivalent to nd new matrices W_j = $F_{1j}^{[1]}W_1 + F_{2j}^{[1]}W_2$, with j = 1;2. If

 $r(W_1) = 2$, then by multiplying this expression to the left by W_1^{-1} , we have

$$F_{1j}^{[1]}I + F_{2j}^{[1]}W_{1}^{W_{2}}$$
: (24)

It is immediate to realize that it is possible to reduce the rank of W₁ to 1 and to choose $F_{ij}^{[L]}$ such that $F^{[L]}$ is nonsingular provided the spectrum of W₁¹W₂ is non-degenerate, in which case belongs to the GHZ class. If the spectrum is degenerate, thus both eigenvalues being null, no further reduction is possible and belongs to the W class. The symmetric case runs along parallel lines.

Finally if $r(W_1) = r(W_2) = 2$, reasoning along similar lines if both eigenvalues of $W_1^{-1}W_2$ are equal, only one rank can be reduced keeping the nonsingularity of $F^{[1]}$ and belongs again to the W class, whereas if the eigenvalues are di erent, both ranks can be reduced to 1 keeping the nonsingularity of $F^{[1]}$ and belongs to the G H Z class.

As a nalremark let us indicate how close, despite the apparent di erences in the approach, our analysis runs parallel to that performed in [12]: the ranges of the reduced density operators are indeed generated by the corresponding singular vectors, and the study of these ranges drove them and has driven us to the same nal result. The change of method is motivated by the attempt to nd a generalizable criterion not using entanglement measures speci cally built upon the number of qubits of the system, such as the 3 tangle [14]. With this approach it is not necessary to consider at any stage the reduced density matrices and entanglement measures upon them. A strongly related approach can be found in [32, 33].

IV. GENERALIZATIONS (N 4)

The generalization of the preceding approach to pure states of arbitrary multipartite system s is two-folded. On one hand, the generalization to multiqubit states can be im plemented inductively:

Theorem IV.1. If the entanglement classes under SLOCC are known for N qubits, the corresponding entanglement classes for N + 1 qubits are also known.

P roof. W e proceed by induction. W e have proved in preceding sections that this statem ent is true for N = 2 and have explicitly found the entanglem ent classes for N = 3. For a given (N + 1)-qubit system, write the coe cient matrix C_{1i2} N + 1 C . Because of the induction hypothesis one knows in advance the classi cation of the right singular subspaces of C according to $W = \text{spanf}_{ig}$ if dim W = 1 and W =spanf i; jg if dim W = 2, where each $_{\rm i}$ and $_{\rm j}$ belong to one (possibly the same) of the entanglem ent classes of N qubits. Choose the ILO's F ^[2] ${}^{[\!\!N} F^{\!\!\!\!} \, {}^{1]}$ so that the two $\,$ rst columns of W (the transform ed right singular vectors) are expressed as linear combinations of the canonical vectors of the entanglem ent classes corresponding to the structure of W and choose the ILO F $^{[l]}$ so that V W y drops out as m any non-null entries as possible (typically $F^{[1]}$ will be the inverse of a rank 2 submatrix of W^{y}). The result is the canonicalm atrix for an entanglem ent class of N + 1 qubits.

There is an important remark in the preceding inductive construction, already stated in [12] and explicitly shown in [13]: there will be a continuous range of states with a sim ilar right singular subspace but with no ILO 's connecting them . Let us illustrate this peculiar fact with an explicit example. W hen considering 4 partite entanglem ent, there will exist 45 a priori structures of the right singular subspace of the coe cient matrix, arising from 6 possible one-dimensional right singular subspaces W =spanf g, where belongs to one of the six entanglem ent classes of N = 3, tim es 4 possible sites for the fourth added qubit, plus 21 possible bidim ensional right singular subspaces $W = \text{spanf}_{1}; 2g, \text{cor-}$ responding to the ${6+2 \atop 2}$ 1 ways to choose the classes for N = 3 which 1 and 2 belong to. A n example will be W =spanf000; G H Z g, with the already convention that only one product vector and no $\mathbf{0}_{i \quad jk}$ belongs to W , i.e. $W = spanf_{1} '_{1} _{1} _{1} '_{2} '_{2} _{2} + _{2} '_{2}$ 29, where the vectors with are pairwise linearly independent. In order to only have one product vector and the rest being GHZ vectors, we must have [40] (up to permutations) $W = \text{spanf}' ^{0}; ' + '$ g, with °€ ; .

Recalling that

$$w_{1} = {}_{11} ' {}^{0} + {}_{12} ' + ' ;$$
(25a)
$$w_{2} = {}_{21} ' {}^{0} + {}_{22} ' + ' ;$$
(25b)

where the matrix $[_{ij}]$ $(_{21}^{11} _{22}^{12})$ will be non-singular, it is immediate to nd LLO's F^[2]; F^[3]; F^[4] such that

F ^[2]	F ^[3]	$F^{[4]}(w_1) =$	11e1	e_2	+	12 (e 1	e_1	$e_1 + e_2$	e_2	e ₂);	(26a)
F ^[2]	F ^[3]	$\mathrm{F}^{[4]}$ (w $_2$) =	₂₁ e ₁	e_2	+	22 (e 1	e_1	$e_1 + e_2$	e_2	e ₂)	(26b)

which corresponds to a coe cient matrix given by

where the coe cients $_{\rm i}$ corresponds to the coordinates of the transform ed $^{\rm 0}$ in the canonical basis. Choosing

F $^{[1]}$ so that

$$V = [_{ij}]^{1};$$
 (28)

we arrive at

$$C = \begin{array}{c} 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{array};$$
(29)

which corresponds to the canonical vector

$$e_{1} e_{2} + e_{2} e_{1} e_{1} + e_{2} e_{2} e_{2} e_{2} = (\ \ e_{1}; e_{2})$$

= j01 i+ j000i+ j111i (j i \ j0; j1; j1i) (30)

Thus, dierent will yield dierent entanglem ent classes under non-singular local operators F $^{[1]}$ ₽₽. Notice that this vector belongs neither to the GHZ $_4$ class nor to the W $_4$ class nor to the $_4$ class (containing the cluster state of four qubits -see below). It is a peculiar feature that two in nitesimally close states could belong to distinct entanglement classes, so a deeper elucidation of this point is on due and will be carried out also elsewhere. For the time being, we will agree on attributing all states reducible to (30) by ILO's F^[1] ^{[4}]; independently of the particular vector , the sam e entanglem ent properties under SLOCC and analogously for arbitrary N -partite multiqubit system s. This allows us to nd an upper bound for the number of genuine (N + 1)-partite entanglem ent classes. Firstly, notice that e.g. the right singular subspace W = spanf000;000g in the 4 partite case actually contains structures with dierent properties, namely [41] $W = ' C^2$ (and permutations), $W = spanf \prime_1 \quad _1; \quad \prime_2 \quad _2g \text{ (and permutations)}$ and $W = \text{spanf}_1 \quad \prime_1 \quad _1; \quad _2 \quad \prime_2 \quad _2g. \text{ All of}$ them drives us to at least one factor qubit in the nal canonical state, except one, that is, there will correspond one right singular subspace structure spanf 1; 2g to each genuine (N + 1) entanglem ent class.

This is rigorously proved in the following

P roposition IV .1. Let W $_{\rm N}$ be the right singular subspace of the coe cient matrix in an arbitrary product basis of an N -qubit pure state. If W $_{\rm N}$ is supported in a product space W $_{\rm N}$ = W $_{\rm N}$ 1, then the state belongs to a product class 0₂, where denotes a class of (N 1)-partite entanglement.

Proof. Under the above assumption, $w_j = w_j$, j = 1; 2, with 2 C² and w_j 2 C² (N²). We can always nd

an ILO F [2] such that

$$w_{j} ! e_{1} w_{j};$$
 (31)

where also $\hat{w}_j \ 2 \ C^{2(N-2)}$, hence $W_N = E_{11} \ W_{N-1}$, where E_{11} denotes the W eylm atrix $E_{11} = \frac{1}{2} e_1 i h e_1 j$. Since we can always write $N = E_{11} \ N n$, the coe cient matrix can always be written as

$$C_{N} = V_{N}W^{Y} = V(E_{11} N_{1})E_{11}W_{N_{1}}^{Y}$$
$$= E_{11}V_{N_{1}}W_{N_{1}}^{Y} : (32)$$

The remaining ILO 's F $^{[1]}$ and F $^{[j]}$, j > 2, can always be chosen so that

$$C_{N} = E_{11} \quad C_{N-1};$$
 (33)

where C_{N-1} denotes a canonical matrix of an (N-1)-partite entanglement class. This proves that the second qubit factorizes, as the reader may check.

W ith appropriate permutations, this result applies to any qubit. If we denote by M (N) the number of N partite entanglem ent classes, there will be at most

$$\begin{array}{cccc} M (N) + 2 & 1 \\ 2 & & = \frac{1}{2} M (N) + 1 \end{bmatrix} M (N)$$
(34)

genuine entanglem ent classes for N + 1 qubits. Besides, the number of degenerate (N + 1) entanglem ent classes will be at most (N + 1) M (N) (corresponding to the N + 1 possible factor positions which the (N + 1)th qubit can occupy), thus

C orollary IV .1. Let M (N) denote the number of N $\,$ partite entanglem ent classes under SLOCC . Then

$$M (N + 1) \frac{1}{2} M (N) [M (N) + 2N + 3]: (35)$$

The equality will be in general unattainable, since, as in the case of tripartite entanglem ent, only a few distinct true entanglem ent classes exist, com ing out from the only actually di erent structures which the right singular subspace can adopt (only two in the case of tripartite system s; cf. proposition III.1).

Let us call reader's attention on the fact that these results allow us to view all state space of N qubits divided into blocks, each one param etrized by a right singular subspace structure and corresponding to our broad-sense entanglem ent classes, and within which the di erence between states stem s from a (possibly several) continuous param eter. The num ber of these blocks for N + 1 qubits is upperly bounded by the recursive relation (35).

A nother bene t of the present approach arises when deciding whether two states belong to the sam e entanglem ent class or not. This is stated as a corollary:

C orollary IV 2. Let ; 2 (C 2) ^N. Let W and W be their respective right singular subspaces. Then a necessary and su cient condition for ; to belong to the same broad-sense entanglem ent class under SLOCC is that W and W have the same structure, i.e. that they are generated by entanglem ent-equivalent vectors.

Proof. The result follows immediately both from construction and from the convention on the denition of the broad-sense entanglement classes. $\hfill\square$

As an example, let us include a one-line proof that the 4 qubit GHZ state jGHZ4i $\frac{1}{p-2}$ (j0000i+j1111i) and the cluster state j₄i $\frac{1}{2}$ (j0000i+ j0011i+ j100i j1111i) [34] do not belong to the sam e class [35]. Their respective right singular subspaces are $W_{GHZ_4} = \text{spanfe}_1 \quad e_1 \quad e_2$ e_2 e2g and $W_4 = \text{spanfe}_1 + \text{;e}_2$ g, where denote two-qubit Bell states. It is immediate to conclude that they are dierent, since none $e_i e_i$ e_i belong to W 4 (write the coe cient matrix of a generic vector in W _ in terms of two coordinates and and check that it is impossible to choose the latter so that the matrix corresponds to $e_i e_j$. These states belong to the respective so-called [42] $G H Z_4$ and $_4$ classes, characterized by the above right singular subspaces.

On the other hand, to nd a wider generalization one can focus upon arbitrary dimensional entangled systems. The leit motiv is still the same, with the important exception that the dimension of the right singular subspace can grow up to the dimension of the Hilbert space of the rst subsystem. Thus the analysis of the possible structures which W may adopt is now much more complex.

We include as an illustrative immediate example the analysis of all entanglement classes under SLOCC of any bipartite (N₁ N₂)-dimensional system: there exist min (N₁;N₂) entanglement classes, which can be denoted as 00 $\stackrel{+}{_{1}}$, $\stackrel{+}{_{2}}$, $\stackrel{+}{_{3}}$, :::, $\stackrel{+}{_{pmin}}$ in (N₁;N₂), whose canonical states will elementarily be $\stackrel{+}{_{i=1}}$ e_i, for each class

Theorem IV.2. Let $2 C^{N_1} C^{N_2}$ be the pure state of a bipartite quantum system with coe cient matrix in an arbitrary product basis denoted by C (). Then belongs to the $_k^+$ class, k = 1;2;:::;m in $(N_1;N_2)$, if, and only if, r(C ()) = $k = \dim V = \dim W$.

$$F^{[1]}(_{k}) = \frac{1}{_{k}}e_{k};$$
 (36)

$$F^{[2]}('_{k}) = e_{k}$$
: (37)

Then the coe cient matrix (in blocks) will turn out to be

$$C = \frac{I_n \quad O_{N_2 \quad n}}{O_{N_1 \quad n} \quad O_{N_1 \quad n; N_2 \quad n}} :$$
(38)

For m ore general cases, the di erence stem s solely in the higher computational complexity.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have developed a recursive inductive criterion to classify entanglem ent under SLOCC in multipartite system s in pure states which allow s one to nd the entanglem ent classes for N + 1 qubits provided this classi cation is known for N qubits. The method rests on the analysis of the right singular subspace of their coe cient matrix, which is chosen according to the partition 1 12 ::: N, hence a 2 2^{N-1} rectangular matrix. Then one must elucidate the classi cation of the one- and two-dim ensional right singular subspaces according to the entanglem ent classes which their generators belong to. As a consequence, this construction reveals a system atic way to detect the entanglem ent class of a given state without resorting to quantitative m easures of entanglem ent. In arbitrary-dimensional generalizations, the same scheme must be followed with the exception that the dimension of the right singular subspaces is higher and their structure now depends on several generators.

For N 4 it has been showed that within each right singular subspace structure, there could exist a continuous in nity of states not connected through invertible local operators. A dditionally, up to this continuous degree of freedom within each right singular subspace structure, we have found an upper bound for the num ber of classes on N + 1 qubits in terms of the num ber of classes of N qubits.

As a nalremark, let us conjecture that a possible connection with the MPS formalism is probable to exist. In this form alism (cf. [24] and multiple references therein) any pure state is written as

$$= \begin{array}{c} X \\ \underset{i_1 ::: i_N}{\times} tr A_1^{[i_1]} ::: A_N^{[i_N]} e_{i_1} \\ \end{array} e_{i_1} e_{i_1}$$

so that adjoining a further (N + 1)-th qubit amounts to adjoining a further $A_{N+1}^{[i_{N}+1]}$ matrix in the trace giving the coe cients. In the analysis carried out above, this last added qubit is equivalent to increase the dimension of the right singular subspace dim W_N ! dim W_{N+1} = 2 dim W_N . Our conjecture is that the structure of W_N should be read from the properties of the N matrices $A_k^{[i_k]}$, so that the succession of structures of W_N should run parallel to that of the matrices $A_1^{[i_1]}$; :::; $A_N^{[i_N]}$.

APPENDIX A: THE SINGULAR VALUE DECOMPOSITION

We include the relevant properties of the SVD of an arbitrary matrix and suggest the interested reader to consult e.g. [36] for a comprehensive analysis of this decomposition with the corresponding proofs. The set of m n complex matrices will be denoted as usual by M $_{m,n}$ (C) M $_{m,n}$ and the group of unitary matrices of dimension k will be denoted by U (k). The main result can be stated as

Theorem A.1. (Singular Value Decomposition) Let $Q \ge M_{m,m}$. Then Q can always be decomposed as

$$Q = V W^{\gamma}; \qquad (A1)$$

where V 2 U (m), W 2 U (n) and 2 M $_{m;n}$ is a diagonal matrix with non-negative entries, i.e. $_{ij} = _{i \ ij}$, with i = 1; :::;m, j = 1; :::;n and $_k$ 0 for all k.

The columns of V and W and the positive entries of receive a special name:

Denition A.1. The columns of V = $[v_1 \ v_2 \ ::: v_m]$ (resp. W = $[w_1 \ w_2 \ ::: w_n]$) are the left (resp. right) singular vectors of Q. The positive entries of are the singular values of Q.

Notice that with this de nition any m n dimensional m atrix will have m left singular vectors and n right singular vectors; since the relevant singular vectors will be those associated to non-null singular values, we agree, as usual, on referring as singular vectors only to the latter, i.e. to those v_k and w_k for which $_k > 0$. A nother com - m on convention is the decreasing order of the singular values in the diagonal of : $_1 _ 2 = 0$. The singular vectors are highly nonunique or equivalently there always exist another unitary m atrices \hat{V} and \hat{W} such that $Q = \hat{V} = \hat{W}^{y}$, where these new unitary m atrices depend of the form er V and W and the multiplicities of each singular value [36]. How ever this fact has not been exploited in the text.

One of the main consequences of the SVD is that the rank of a given matrix Q coincides with the rank of , i.e. with the num ber of positive singular values, which, in turn, coincides with the dimension of the subspace generated by the left (or right) singular vectors. This is the basis to the analysis of entanglem ent of a pure state upon its coe cient matrix in a product basis perform ed in the text.

ACKNOW LEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge nancial support from the Spanish MEC projects No.FIS2005-05304 (LL.and JL.) and No.FIS2004-01576 (D.S.) and from EU RESQ, EuroSQ IP, and DFG SFB 631 projects (E.S.).LL.also acknowledges support from the FPU grant No.AP2003-0014.

- [L] A. Peres, Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods (K luwer, D ordrecht, 1993).
- [2] C H. Bennett and D. D iV incenzo, Nature 404, 247 (2000).
- [3] M. Dusek, N. Lutkenhaus, and M. Hendrych, To appear in E. W olf (ed.) Progress in Optics, vol. 49 (2006).
- [4] D.Deutsch and A.Ekert, Phys.W orld 11, 47 (1998).
- [5] R.Raussendorf and H.Briegel, Phys.Rev.Lett.86, 5188 (2001).
- [6] D. Bouwmeester, A. Ekert, and A. Zeilinger, eds., The Physics of Quantum Information (Springer, Berlin, 2000).
- [7] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Quantum Information: An Introduction to Basic Theoretical Concepts and Experiments (Springer, Berlin, 2001), chap.

M ixed-state entanglem ent and quantum communication, Springer Tracts in M odern Physics.

- [8] C.H. Bennett and S.W iesner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 2881 (1992).
- [9] J.Bell, Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987).
- [10] J.Eisert and D.G ross, quant-ph/0505149.
- [11] D.Bru , J.M ath.Phys.43,4237 (2002).
- [12] W . Dur, G. Vidal, and J.I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A 62, 062314 (2000).
- [13] F. Verstraete, J. Dehaene, B. De Moor, and H. Verschelde, Phys. Rev. A 65, 052112 (2002).
- [14] V.Coman, J.Kundu, and W.Wooters, Phys. Rev. A 61, 052306 (2000).
- [15] F. Verstraete, J. Dehaene, and B. De Moor, Phys. Rev.

A 68,012103 (2003).

- [16] G.Vidal, J.M od. Opt. 47, 355 (2000).
- [17] A. O sterloch, and J. Siewert, Phys. Rev. A 72, 012337 (2005).
- [18] P.J. Love, A.M. aasen van den Brink, A.Yu.Smirnov, M.H.S.Amin, M.Grajcar, E.Il'ichev, A.Izmalkov, and A.M.Zagoskin, quant-ph/0602143.
- [19] G. Rigolin, T.R. de O liveira, and M.C. de O liveira, quant-ph/0603215.
- [20] M.Grassl, M.Rotteler, and T.Beth, Phys. Rev. A 58, 1833 (1998).
- [21] A.Acn, A.Andrianov, L.Costa, E.Jane, J.I. Latorre, and R.Tarrach, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 1560 (2000).
- [22] H.Carteret, A.Higuchi, and A.Sudbery, J.M ath. Phys. 41, 7932 (2002).
- [23] X. Gao, S. Albeverio, S. Fei, and Z. W ang, Commun. Theor. Phys. 45, 267 (2006).
- [24] M. Eckholt, Master's thesis, Technische Universitat Munchen/Max-Planck-Institut fur Quantenoptik, Garching (2005).
- [25] I. A eck, T. Kennedy, E. Lieb, and H. Tasaki, Phys. Rev.Lett. 59, 799 (1987).
- [26] G.Vidal, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 147902 (2003).
- [27] F. Verstraete, D. Porras, and J.I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 227205 (2004).
- [28] C. Schon, E. Solano, F. Verstraete, J.I. Cirac, and M.W olf, Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 110503 (2005).
- [29] E.Schmidt, Math.Ann.63,433 (1907).

- [30] A. Ekert and P.L. Knight, Am. J. Phys. 63, 415 (1995).
- [31] A. Sanpera, R. Tarrach, and G. Vidal, Phys. Rev. A 58, 826 (1998).
- [32] L. Chen, and Y.-X. Chen, Phys. Rev. A 73, 052310 (2006).
- [33] L.Chen, Y.-X.Chen, and Y.-X.Mei, quant-ph/0604184.
- [34] H. Briegel and R. Raussendorf, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 910 (2005).
- [35] S.W u and Y.Zhang, Phys.Rev.A 63, 012308 (2000).
- [36] R. Horn and C. Johnson, Topics in Matrix Analysis (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991).
- [37] Notice that they cannot rigorously be singular vectors, since the ILO's are not in general unitary, thus they do not preserve the orthogonality of fv_jg and fw_jg .W e will understand these \singular vectors" in a loose sense, in which they substitute the original singular vectors in the SVD of the coe cient matrix.
- [38] The transpose and H erm itian conjugation are referred to the chosen product basis in which C is constructed.
- [39] Notice that = must be chosen to be an eigenvalue of C₂.
- [40] A detailed account of the classi cation of 4 qubit entanglem ent using this m ethod is under preparation and w ill appear elsew here.
- [41] A s usual, di erent indices denote linear independence.
- [42] The rst one is named by a natural extension of the tripartite case; the second, after its representative j 4 i.