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#### Abstract

W e obtain analytical low er bounds on the concurrence of bipartite quantum system $s$ in arbitrary dim ensions related to the violation ofseparability conditions based on localuncertainty relations and on the $B$ loch representation of density $m$ atrices. W e also ilhustrate how these results com plem ent and im prove those recently derived $\mathbb{K}$. Chen, S.A $\mathbb{l}$ beverio, and S.M. Fei, Phys. R ev. Lett. 95, 040504 (2005)] by considering the P eres $H$ orodecki and the com putable cross norm or realignm ent criteria.


PACS num bers: 03.67 M n , 03.65 Ud

## I. INTRODUCTION

Entanglem ent is an essential ingredient in $m$ any applications of quantum inform ation theory such as dense coding, teleportation, quantum cryptography and quantum com puting [1]. Therefore, the characterization and quanti cation of entanglem ent are of great im portance in this eld. However, and despite $m$ any e orts in the last decade, a com pletely satisfactory solution to both problem s has not been found. Attending to the rst one (the so-called separability problem ), there exist, nevertheless, several su cient conditions for the detection of entanglem ent. T he m ost pow erfiul is know $n$ as the $P$ eresH orodecki or positive partial transpose (PPT) criterion [2], which is also necessary for low-dim ensional system $s$ $\begin{array}{lll}(2) & 2 \text { and } 2 & \text { 3) [3]. A nother rem arkable su cient condi- }\end{array}$ tion is given by the com putable cross nom [4] or realign$m$ ent [5] (C CNR) criterion, which allow s to detect $m$ any entangled states for which the PPT criterion fails. Recently, another criterion $w$ ith this property [6] has been developed by the authorw hich we shalldenote as correlation $m$ atrix (CM) criterion. There are also other im portant criteria, which, how ever, lack the operational character of the aforem entioned ones, since they are stated in term $s$ of $m$ ean values or variances of observables which have to be chosen wisely. This is the case of conditions based on entanglem ent witnesses (EW s) [3, 7] or uncertainty relations [8, 9]. In what com es to the quanti cation of entanglem ent, there exist a large variety of proposed $m$ easures [10]. H ow ever, the explicit com putation of these $m$ easures for arbitrary states is a very hard task, not only analytically but also from the com putational point of view since they require optim ization over a large num ber of param eters [31]. T he only $m$ easures for which an analytical expression is available is the entanglem ent of form ation [11] and the concurrence [12, 13], for which W ootters [12] derived a form ula in the case of tw o qubits. G iven the aforem entioned di culties for the evaluation of the concurrence for higher dim ensions, good bounds for the estim ation of this quantity have been sought. W hile, by construction, upper bounds are num erically a ordable, the derivation of low er bounds has dem anded a more thorough analysis [14]. A com pletely analyti-
cal and powerful low er bound for the concurrence w as found in [15] by relating this quantity $w$ ith the PPT and CCNR criteria, giving shape, therefore, to the intuitive idea that a stronger violation of a separability condition $m$ ay indicate a higher am ount of entanglem ent. In fact, a possible connection betw een the value of concurrence and the violation of a separability condition based on $10-$ cal uncertainty relations (LU R S) w as already suggested in [8] (see [16, 17] for further discussions on LU R s and the quanti cation of entanglem ent). The aim of this paper is to sharpen the bounds of [15] by relating concurrence and the LURs and CM criteria, giving as a by-product a deeper insight in the above idea. P artial im provem ents on these bounds have already been achieved in the particular case of $\mathrm{N} \quad \mathrm{N}$ quantum system $\mathrm{s} w$ ith even $\mathrm{N} \quad 4$ in [18] by considering an EW based separability criterion [19], but the approach here is valid for the general case. The bounds im posed by $m$ easurem ents of arbitrary EW $s$ on di erent entanglem ent $m$ easures have been recently studied in [20].

## II. NEW LOW ER BOUNDSON CONCURRENCE

W e start by recalling the de nitions of the concepts and quantities we are dealing with. Let $H_{A}{ }^{\prime} C^{M}$ and $H_{B}$ ' $C^{N}$ denote the H ibert spaces of subsystem $S A$ and B (M N). Then, the quantum state of the totalsystem is characterized by the density operator $2 \mathrm{~B}\left(\mathrm{H}_{A} \quad \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{B}}\right)$, where $B(H)$ stands for the realvector space of $H$ em itian operators acting on H , which is a H ibert-Schm idt space ( w th inner product h ; $\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{H}} \mathrm{S}=\operatorname{Tr}\left({ }^{\mathrm{y}}\right)$ ). The state is said to be separable (entangled) if it can (cannot) be w ritten ${ }_{P}$ as a convex com bination of produgt states [21], i. $\mathrm{e} .={ }_{i} p_{i}{ }_{i}^{A} \quad{ }_{i}^{B}$ where $0 \quad p_{i} \quad 1,{ }_{i} p_{i}=1$, and A $\binom{B}{i}$ denotes a pure state density $m$ atrix acting on $H_{A}\left(H_{B}\right)$. The generalized de nition [13] for the concurrence of a pure state is given by $C()=P \overline{2(1} \begin{array}{ll}\left.\operatorname{Tr}_{A}^{2}\right)\end{array}$, where the reduced density $m$ atrix $A$ is obtained by tracing out subsystem $B\left(_{A}=\operatorname{Tr}_{B} j\right.$ ih $j$. Notioe that $0 \quad C$ ( ) $\overline{2(M 1)=M}$, the lower bound being attained by product states and the upper bound by max -
im ally entangled states. The de nition is extended to generalm ixed states by the convex roof,

C onsequently, C ( ) = 0 if , and only if, is a separable state. The PPT and CCNR criteria can be form ulated in several ways. B asically, they state that certain rearrangem ents of the $m$ atrix elem ents of [22], nam ely, the partialtranspose $T_{\text {A }}$ () (PPT criterion) and the realign$m$ ent R ( ) (C CNR criterion), are such that for separable states $\dot{j} \Gamma_{A}() \ddot{j}=1$ and $j R() \ddot{j} \quad 1$, where here, and throughout the paper, ij $\ddot{j}$ stands for the trace nom (i.e. the sum of the singular values). By directly relating both criteria and concurrence by $m$ eans of the Schm idt coe cients of a pure state it w as found in [15] that

A. LUR s criterion

O ne of the $m$ ost interesting separability criteria based on uncertainty relations is that of LURs [8], since it can detect PPT entanglem ent [23, 24]. It states that if $\mathrm{fA}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{g}$ and $f B_{i} g$ are observables acting on $H_{\Phi}$ and $H_{B}$ respectively, ful lling uncertainty relations $i^{2}\left(A_{i}\right) \quad C_{A}$ and ${ }_{i}{ }^{2}\left(B_{i}\right) \quad C_{B} \quad\left(C_{A} ; C_{B} 0\right)$, then,

$$
\begin{gather*}
X \\
i \tag{3}
\end{gather*} \quad{ }^{2}\left(A_{i} \quad I+I \quad B_{i}\right) \quad C_{A}+C_{B}
$$

holds for separable states [8]. The variance 2 is given by $\quad{ }^{2}(M)=h M^{2} i \quad h M i^{2}$, where $\mathrm{hM} i=\operatorname{Tr}(M)$ is the expectation value of the observable M . A particularly interesting choice for the observables is that of local orthogonal observables ( LOO s) [25], that is, orthonor$m$ al bases of $B\left(H_{A}\right)$ and $B\left(H_{B}\right)$, which we shall denote $f G_{i}^{A} g_{i=1}^{M}$ and $f G_{i}^{B} g_{i=1}^{N^{2}}$. In this case Eq. (3) reads [24]

$$
X_{i=1}^{N^{2}} \quad{ }^{2}\left(G_{i}^{A} \quad I+I \quad G_{i}^{B}\right) \quad M+N \quad 2
$$

since

$$
{ }^{X^{2}=1} \begin{array}{lllllll}
2 & \left(G_{i}^{A}\right) & M & 1 ; & X^{2} & { }^{2}\left(G_{i}^{B}\right) & N \tag{5}
\end{array}
$$

$N$ otice that if $M<N$, in Eq. (4) (and throughout the paper) it is understood that $G_{i}^{A}=0$ for $M^{2}+1 \quad i$ $\mathrm{N}^{2}$. The standard set of LOOs is given by $\mathrm{fG}_{\mathrm{i}}^{\mathrm{A}} \mathrm{g}=$
$f g_{j} ; g_{j k}^{+} ; g_{j k} g$ where

$$
\begin{align*}
& g_{j}=\text { j̈ihjj (0 j } \quad \text { M } 1 \text { ); } \\
& g_{j k}^{+}=\frac{1}{P_{2}}\binom{j i h k j+}{k i h j j} \quad\left(\begin{array}{lllll}
0 & j<k & M & 1
\end{array}\right) \text {; } \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

and sim ilarly for $\mathrm{fG}_{i}^{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{g}$. The im portance of the LURs condition form ulated in term s of LOO s relies on that it is strictly stronger than the CCNR condition [24]. Furtherm ore, it can detect entangled states for which both the PPT and CCNR criteria fail [24]. In order to relate concurrence and LUR swith LO O s analogously as in Eq. (2) we start w ith the follow ing lem $m$ a:

Lem ma1 For any set of LOOs fG ${ }_{i}^{A} g$ and $f G_{i}^{B} g$ and any $M \quad N \quad\left(M_{P} \quad N\right)$ pure state $w$ ith Schm idt decom position $j i=\underset{j=0}{\mathrm{M}} \mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{j}} \mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{j} A} \mathrm{j}_{B} i_{\text {, }}$

$$
X_{i=1}^{X^{2}} \quad 2\left(G_{i}^{A} \quad I+I \quad G_{i}^{B}\right) \quad M+N \quad 2 \quad 4 \sum_{j<k}^{X k} \overline{j k}
$$

holds. $T$ he bound is attained when $f G_{i}^{A} g=f g_{j} ; g_{j k}^{+} ; g_{j k} g$ and $\mathrm{fG}_{i}^{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{g}=\mathrm{f} \mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{j}} ; \mathrm{g}_{j \mathrm{k}}^{+} ; \mathrm{g}_{j \mathrm{k}} \mathrm{g}$ (constructed from the corresponding Schm idt basis).

Proof. W e have that

where

$$
\left(G_{i}^{A} ; G_{i}^{B}\right)=h G_{i}^{A} \quad G_{i}^{B} i \quad 2 h G_{i}^{A} i_{A} h G_{i}^{B} i_{B}:
$$

 $N$ otice that sep is a separable state and that its reductions are the sam e as those of $\quad\left({ }_{A}^{\text {sep }}=A,{ }_{B}^{\text {sep }}=B\right)$. Thus,

$$
\left(G_{i}^{A} ; G_{i}^{B}\right)=\operatorname{Tr}\left(G_{i}^{A} \quad G_{i}^{B}\right)+\operatorname{sep}\left(G_{i}^{A} ; G_{i}^{B}\right):
$$

N ow , since LU R s hold for separable states we have that

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
2_{i}^{X} \quad \operatorname{sep}\left(G_{i}^{A} ; G_{i}^{B}\right) & M+N \\
& X \\
& { }_{i}^{2}\left(G_{i}^{A}\right)+{ }_{B}^{2}\left(G_{i}^{B}\right)
\end{array}
$$

and then,
X $\quad 2\left(G_{i}^{A} \quad I_{B}+I_{A} \quad G_{i}^{B}\right) \quad M+N \quad 2+2^{X} \quad \operatorname{Tr}\left(G_{i}^{A} \quad G_{i}^{B}\right)$;

$w$ here in the last step we have used that $a^{2}+b^{2} \quad 2 \dot{j} b j$. ${ }_{P}^{N}$ ow, the result follows because $P$ i h $j_{A} J_{i}^{A} k_{A} i^{2}=$ ${ }^{\mathrm{P}}{ }_{i} h j_{B} \mathrm{JG}_{i}^{B} \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{B}} i^{2}=18 \mathrm{j} ; \mathrm{k}$ for any set of $\mathrm{LOO} \mathrm{s} \mathrm{fG}_{\mathrm{i}}^{\mathrm{A}} \mathrm{g}$ and $f G_{i}^{B} g$. To see this, consider that $B\left(H_{A}\right)$ is iso$m$ orphic to $C^{M^{2}}$ w the the standard inner product, so that the $f G_{i}^{A} g$ can be arranged as colum $n$ vectors which give an orthonorm al basis of this space. This colum $n$ yectors together give rise to a unitary $m$ atrix $U$, and ${ }_{i} h j_{A} j_{G}^{A} j_{A} i^{2}$ corresponds to sum $m$ ing the squared m odulus of the elem ents of certain row of $U$ and, therefore, it equals unity. O bviously the sam e reasoning holds for ${ }^{P}{ }_{i}{ }_{h} j_{B} j_{G}{ }_{i} j_{B} i^{2}$. It rem ains to check that the bound is attained by the abopve stated set of LOO s. U sing that ${ }_{i}\left(G_{i}^{A}\right)^{2}=M$ I and ${ }_{i}\left(G_{i}^{B}\right)^{2}=N$ [24], it is straightforw ard to nd that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{X}^{2} \\
& 2\left(G_{i}^{A} \quad I+I \quad G_{i}^{B}\right)=M+N+2^{X} \quad h G_{i}^{A} \quad G_{i}^{B} i \\
& \mathrm{i}=1 \\
& \text { X hG } \quad \mathrm{I}+\mathrm{I} \quad G_{i}^{B} i^{2}:
\end{aligned}
$$

Considering that any pure density $m$ atrix achieves its Scpm idt decom position for the standard LOO s, i.e.
it follows that ${ }_{i} \mathrm{hG}_{\mathrm{i}}^{\mathrm{A}} \quad \mathrm{G}_{i}^{B} \mathrm{i}=1 \quad 2{ }_{j<k}^{\mathrm{P}} \frac{\mathrm{j} k}{\mathrm{j}}$ and that hG ${ }_{i}^{A}$ I + I $G_{i}^{B} i=08 i$ for the set of LOO s m entioned in the statem ent of the lem m a, and the result is thus proved.

N ow, we can prove our main result.
Theorem 1 For any $M \quad N(M \quad N)$ quantum state ,

$$
\begin{equation*}
C \text { () } \frac{\left.M+N \quad 2 P^{P} \frac{i^{2}\left(G_{i}^{A}\right.}{2 M(M)} 1\right)}{\text { I I } \left.\quad G_{i}^{B}\right)} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

holds for any set of LOOsfG ${ }_{i}^{A} g$ and $f G_{i}^{B} g$.
Proof. Let ${ }^{P}{ }_{n} p_{n} j_{n}$ ih ${ }_{n} j$ be the decom position of for whidp the $m$ inim um in Eq. (1) is attained, so that, $C()={ }_{n} p_{n} C\left(n_{n}\right)$. Since the concurrence of a pure state is diregtly related to its Schm idt coe cients [13]: $C^{2}(\mathrm{n})=4 \quad \mathrm{j}<\mathrm{k} \quad \mathrm{j} \mathrm{k}$, and [15]


Figure 1: Low er bounds on concurrence for the the state \%. Solid line: B ound given by the LUR s criterion w ith the LO O s that achieve the bound in Eq. (7) for the state. D otted line: B ound given by the P P T criterion. D ashed line: B ound given by the CCNR criterion. (T he last tw o bounds overlap).
we have that C ( $n$ ) Now, the use of Lemmal and the fact that ${ }^{2}(\mathbb{M})$
${ }_{n} p_{n}{ }_{n}^{2}(M)$ for any observableM (see e.g. [8]) proves the desired result.

Next we present a couple of exam ples which ilhustrate how this result can im prove on the bounds of [15]. $F$ irst, consider the case of PPT entangled states. In this case any non-trivial bound on concurrence given by Eq. (2) must rely on the CCNR criterion. However, the LURs criterion can identify states of this kind which are not detected by the C CNR criterion and, therefore, place a non-trivialbound on concurrence where the previous approach failed (see [24]). Furtherm ore, Eq. (8) can im prove the estim ation of PPT entanglem ent of Eq. (2) even when the latter supplies a non-trivial bound. For instance, consider the follow ing 33 PPT entangled state constructed in [26] $\mathrm{P}^{\text {from }}$ unextendible product bases (UPB): $p=1=4$ (I $j_{i} j_{i h}{ }_{i}$ ), where

 $j_{4} i=(j 0 i+j 1 i+2 i)(j 0 i+j 1 i+2 i)=3$. While Eq. (2) yields C () 0:050 [15], Theorem 1 w th the LO O s used in [24] to im prove the detection of $m$ ixed $w$ ith white noise gives C () 0:052. A nother interesting exam ple is to consider the 23 state $\frac{\circ}{\mathrm{p}}=\mathrm{pj}$ in $j+(1 \quad \mathrm{p})$ ) $01 \mathrm{ih} 01 j$ where $j i=(j 00 i+j 1 i)={ }^{P} \overline{2}$, which show sthat (8) can give a better bound for the concurrence than (2) even though the PP T criterion characterizes entanglem ent optim ally in this case (see Fig. 1).

## B. CM criterion

B esides its P P T entanglem ent detection capability, the $C M$ criterion can be stronger than the CCNR criterion when $M \in N$ [6], so it seem $s$ worthw hile to derive an
analogous result relying on this criterion. It is based on the $B$ loch representation of density $m$ atrices which is achieved by expanding $w$ th respect to a particular set of unnorm alized LOOs, nam ely, the identity and the traceless Herm itian generators of $S U(M)$ and $S U(\mathbb{N})$ (denoted $f{ }_{i}^{A} g_{i=P}^{M^{2}}{ }^{1}$ and $f{ }_{i}^{B} g_{i P 1}^{N^{2}}{ }^{1}$ hereafter), i.e. $\quad=1=\mathrm{MN}\left(\mathrm{I} \quad \mathrm{I}+\quad{ }_{i} r_{i}{ }_{i}^{A} \quad \mathrm{I}+{ }_{j} \mathrm{~S}_{j} \mathrm{I} \quad \underset{j}{B}+\right.$
$\left.{ }_{i ; j} \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{ij}}{ }_{\mathrm{i}}^{A} \quad{ }_{j}^{B}\right)$. The generators $f{ }_{i}^{A} g=\mathrm{fw}_{1} ; \mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{jk}} ; \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{jk}} \mathrm{g}$ of SU (M) can be constructed from any orthonorm albasis in $H_{A}$ [27],

$u_{j k}=p \overline{2}_{2 g_{k}^{+}} ; \quad v_{j k}=p \overline{2}_{2}^{2} g_{j k} ;$
where 0 l $M \quad 2$ and $0 \quad j<k \quad M \quad$ 1. The $B$ loch representation has tw o kind of param eters: $\mathrm{fr}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{g}$ and $f s_{i} g$, which are local since they are the $B$ loch param eters of the reductions $\left({ }_{A}=1=M\left(I+\quad i r_{i}^{A}\right),{ }_{i}^{A}=\right.$ $\left.1=N\left(I+\quad{ }_{i} S_{i}{ }_{i}^{B}\right)\right)$; and $f t_{i j} g=M N=4 f h{ }_{i}^{A} \quad{ }_{j}^{B} i g$, which are responsible for the possible correlations between the subsystem s . These last coe cients can be arranged to form the $C M,(T)_{i j}=t_{i j}$. The CM criterion a ms that there is an upper bound to the correlations inherent in a separable state since ji j j $K_{M N}=$
$\overline{M N(M 1)}(\mathbb{N} \quad 1)=2 \mathrm{~m}$ ust hold for these states [6].
Theorem 2 For any $\mathrm{M}(\mathrm{M} \quad \mathrm{N})$ quantum state ,

C ()

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.\frac{8}{\mathrm{M}^{3} \mathrm{~N}^{2} \mathrm{M}} \quad 1\right) \\
& \left(\mathrm{j} \Gamma \mathrm{j} \mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{MN}}\right) \tag{11}
\end{align*}
$$

holds.
P roof. A s before, let us rst relate 帄 $\vec{j}$ of a pure state to its Schm idt coe cients. Follow ing the notation of the proof of Lem m a 1 we w rite the pure state density $m$ atrix as $=\operatorname{sep}+=\operatorname{sep}+1=2{ }_{j<k}^{p} \varlimsup_{j k}\left(u_{j k} \quad u_{j k}\right.$ $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{jk}} \quad \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{jk}}$ ). Since sep is diagonal, its B loch representation is just given in term sof the identity and the $w_{1}$ 's. T here-
 H ence, using again Eq. (9) we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { C() }
\end{aligned}
$$

Let ${ }^{\mathrm{P}}{ }_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{n}}$ ih ${ }_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{j}^{2}$ denpte the ensemble decom position of forwhich C() = ${ }_{n} p_{n} C\left(n_{n}\right)$. Then, we can use the above inequality for evepy $n$ togetherp $w$ ith the tri-
 to prove the claim .

Regrettably, to nd exam ples in which Eq. (11) im proves the bound given by Eq. (2) is harder than in the case of LURs. This is, am ong other reasons, because the nom of the CM of a pure state is related to the Schm idt coe cients through an inequality, while in the

PPT and CCNR cases this kind of relation was given by equality. Thus, Theorem 2 is only expected to im prove on the result of [15] for states which are detected by the CM criterion but not by the PPT and CCNR criteria, or, $m$ ore generally, in situations where the form er criterion is stronger than both the later criteria at the sam e tim e [29].

## III. CONCLUSIONS

W e have derived an analytical lower bound for the concurrence related to the LURs criterion for separability. W e have show $n$ by considering explicit exam ples how this result can im prove the bounds given in [15], which rely on the PPT and CCNR criteria. W e have also shown that this new result can yield better bounds for the estim ation of concurrence even in situations where the PPT criterion is optim al for the detection of entanglem ent. H ow ever, Eq. (8) should not be considered to render Eq. (2) obsolete but rather as a com plem ent of it that can be used to re ne the bounds that (2) provides when a suitable choice of LOOs is made. To determ ine what set of LOO s yields the best bound for a given state is left as an interesting open problem. We also think that this result helps to understand the relation betw een entanglem ent quanti cation and the LURS criterion. Like the results of [15] our bound can be attained by states having a particular optim al ensem ble decom position. This is the case of isotroppic_states [28] when $\mathrm{fG}_{\mathrm{i}}^{\mathrm{A}} \mathrm{p}=\mathrm{fI}=\bar{M}_{\mathrm{p}}^{\prime} ; \mathrm{w}_{1}=\overline{2} ; \mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{p} k}=\overline{2} ; \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{pjk}}=\overline{2} \mathrm{~g}$ and $\mathrm{fG}_{\mathrm{i}}^{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{g}=\mathrm{f} \mathrm{I}=\overline{\mathrm{N}} ; \quad \mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{l}}=\overline{2} ; \quad \mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{jk}}=\overline{2} ; \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{jk}}=\overline{2} \mathrm{~g}$ are the chosen LOOs, and, hence, this explains the coincidence of concurrence and violation of LUR s pointed out in [8].
W e have also provided a sim ilar lower bound on concurrence in term $s$ of violations of the CM criterion for separability. A though this result is not as powerfiul as the one based on LU R s, since it only seem sto yield better bounds than what can be obtained using Eq. (2) in situations where the CM criterion has a stronger entangle$m$ ent detection capability than both the PPT and CCNR criteria jointly, it provides a rigorous relation between concurrence and a correlation-based localunitary invariant $m$ easure, which is convenient from the experim ental point of view as discussed in [17].

Finally, let us m ention that the results presented here can be extended straightforw ardly to yield low er bounds for the entanglem ent of form ation by using the ideas of [30].
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