

Distillability of Inseparable Quantum Systems

Michał Horodecki

Department of Mathematics and Physics
University of Gdańsk, 80-952 Gdańsk, Poland

Paweł Horodecki

Faculty of Applied Physics and Mathematics
Technical University of Gdańsk, 80-952 Gdańsk, Poland

Ryszard Horodecki

Institute of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics
University of Gdańsk, 80-952 Gdańsk, Poland

We apply the inseparability criterion for 2×2 systems, local filtering and Bennett et al. purification protocol [Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 722 (1996)] to show how to distill any inseparable 2×2 system. The extended protocol is illustrated geometrically by means of the state parameters in the Hilbert-Schmidt space.

PACS Numbers: 03.65.Bz

Quantum error correction is one of the fundamental problems of the quantum communication and quantum computation theory [1]. Within a recently discovered method of transmission of quantum information (teleportation) [2], this can be achieved indirectly by purification of an ensemble of pairs of particles used subsequently for asymptotically faithful teleportation [3]. Namely, Bennett et al. (BBPSSW) [3] considered a protocol which allows to obtain asymptotically a nonzero number of pairs of spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ particles in the singlet state from a large ensemble described by a density matrix, provided that the latter has fidelity greater than $1/2$. The fidelity is defined as [1]

$$f = \max_i \langle \psi_i | \rho | \psi_i \rangle \quad (1)$$

where the maximum is taken over all maximally entangled states. The crux of the method is employment of only local operations and classical communication between Alice and Bob who share the particles to be purified. Their protocol consists of performing bilateral unitary transformations and measurements over some number of pairs of particles. (The obtaining singlet states from ones under the two above conditions is called distillation or purification).

A similar protocol was used by Peres [4] in collective tests for nonlocality and by Deutsch et al [7] in the context of the security problem in quantum cryptography.

A way of obtaining more entangled states by using local operations and classical communication has been proposed by Gisin [5]. Similar method was used for concentrating of entanglement for pure states by Bennett et al

[3]. In Gisin's approach, Alice and Bob subject the particles to the action of local filters, and are able to obtain a mixture which violates Bell's inequality, despite the fact that the original state satisfied them.

Note that the BBPSSW protocol cannot be applied to all inseparable states. Indeed there are states with $f = 1/2$ which have nonzero entanglement of formation [1] (hence cannot be written as convex combinations of product states). On the other hand, filtering method, cannot be, in general, applied for direct production of singlets. However, intuitively one feels that it should be possible to distill an arbitrary inseparable state. It involves a subtle problem of nonlocality of mixed states satisfying standard Bell inequalities, first investigated by Werner [8] and Popescu [9,10]. Werner has found a family of states which are inseparable (he called them EPR-correlated ones) i. e. are not convex combinations of product states but still admit the local hidden variable model for single von Neumann measurement. He also conjectured that the model exists also for POVM's. However Popescu showed that most of Werner mixtures reveal nonlocality, if one takes into account the sequences of measurements. Then he raised the question whether all inseparable states are nonlocal. This question could be solved just by showing that each inseparable state can be distilled (the distillability of the state shows it to be nonlocal). The problem is that we do not have complete "operational" characterization of the inseparable mixed states. Fortunately, quite recently, an effective criterion of inseparability of mixed states for 2×2 and 2×3 systems has been found [6,11].

Here, using the criterion, filtering and BBPSSW protocol we will show that any inseparable mixed two spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ state can be purified to obtain asymptotically faithful teleportation. In particular, as we shall see, if one replaces filtering by generalized measurements (to avoid losing particles) higher efficiency of purification can be obtained by means a recursive process.

It has been shown [6,11] that a state ρ of 2×2 system is inseparable if and only if its partial transposition [12] is not a positive operator. Suppose now that ρ is

inseparable, and let ψ be an eigenvector associated with some negative eigenvalue of ρ^{T_2} . Since in the process of purification Alice and Bob can perform U_1, U_2 transformations, we can assume without loss of generality that ψ is of the form

$$\psi = a e_1 \otimes e_1 + b e_2 \otimes e_2; \quad (2)$$

where e_i form the standard basis in C^2 and $a, b \geq 0$. Now $\langle \psi, \rho^{T_2} \psi \rangle < 0$ implies

$$\langle \psi, W^{-1} \rho^{T_2} W^{-1} \psi \rangle < 0 \quad (3)$$

where $\rho_2 = \frac{1}{2} (e_1 \otimes e_1 + e_2 \otimes e_2)$ and

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & b \end{pmatrix} : \quad (4)$$

Let us denote by ρ the state emerging after performing the operation given by $I \otimes W$

$$\rho = \frac{I \otimes W \rho^{T_2} I \otimes W}{\text{Tr}(I \otimes W \rho^{T_2} I \otimes W)} : \quad (5)$$

This state describes the subensemble of the pairs of particles, which passed the local filter described by the operator W . Now the inequality (3) implies

$$\text{Tr} \rho_2^{T_2} \rho < 0; \quad (6)$$

where $\rho_2 = \langle \psi, \rho^{T_2} \psi \rangle$ (note that $\rho_2^{T_2}$ is equal to the operator V given by $V \sim \sim$, which was used by Werner [8] in the necessary condition $\text{Tr} \rho \rho_2 = 0$ for separability). However, the above inequality implies [13]

$$\text{Tr} \rho_0 \rho > \frac{1}{2}; \quad (7)$$

where ρ_0 denotes the singlet state and the state ρ can be purified by the BBPSSW protocol.

To summarize, given suitably many pairs of particles in an inseparable state Alice and Bob can distill from it a nonzero number of singlets. To this end, they first perform a measurement by means of complete set of product observables on some number of particles, to get the matrix elements of the state describing the ensemble (it still involves only local operations and classical communication). Then they perform a suitable of product unitary transformations. Subsequently, Alice directs her particles toward a filter the parameters of which can be derived from the density matrix describing the ensemble. Then Alice informs Bob, which particles have not been absorbed by the filter, so that he can discard the particles which lost their counterparts. The subensemble obtained in this way can be now subjected to the BBPSSW protocol to distill singlets. If the efficiency (the number of purified pairs divided by the number of noisy pairs) of the latter protocol is given by η , then the efficiency η' of the whole process is given by

$$\eta' = \eta \eta'; \quad (8)$$

where $\eta = \text{Tr}(I \otimes W \rho^{T_2} I \otimes W)$ is probability of passing the filter i.e. the efficiency is product of the efficiencies of two stages: filtering and BBPSSW protocol.

Although the purification protocol described above is effective in the sense that given any inseparable state one can always distill a nonzero number of singlets, it does not have to be the best possible one. It seems that for the inseparable states with $f = 1/2$ the best possible protocol should certainly consist of filtering as the first stage, nevertheless, better efficiency of this stage can be obtained. Consider for example the family of states introduced in the context of inseparability and Bell inequalities [14]

$$\rho = p |j_1 i\rangle \langle j_1| + (1-p) |j_2 i\rangle \langle j_2|; \quad (9)$$

where $|j_1 i\rangle = c e_1 \otimes e_1 + d e_2 \otimes e_2$, $|j_2 i\rangle = c e_1 \otimes e_2 + d e_2 \otimes e_1$ where $c, d > 0$; $p \in [0, 1/2]$, and e_i form the standard basis in C^2 . All the above states are inseparable. Here, one should not follow the protocol described above, but rather to apply the filter

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} c & 0 \\ 0 & d \end{pmatrix} : \quad (10)$$

The efficiency of the first stage can be also raised by replacing the filter with the generalized measurement one of the outcomes of which would produce the same result as filtering. The generalized measurement is given by a partition of unity $\sum V_i V_i^\dagger = I$. After i -th outcome obtained (provided nondegeneracy of the measurement) the state ρ collapses into

$$\rho_i = \frac{V_i \rho V_i^\dagger}{\text{Tr}(V_i \rho V_i^\dagger)} : \quad (11)$$

Thus instead of filter, one can use generalized measurement, and choose the particles which produced suitable outcome k . The advantage here is that if some other outcome was obtained, the particle is not lost as in the case of filtering. It may be the case that the ensemble of the particles which did not produce the required outcome would still be described by some inseparable density matrix. Then one can repeat the procedure, changing suitably the partition of unity, to purify the subensemble. In this way we obtain a recursive process, the efficiency of which is higher than in the case of single filtering.

Now we will discuss our purification protocol by means of geometrical representation of the state [15]. For this purpose note that an arbitrary two spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ state can be represented in the Hilbert-Schmidt (H-S) space of all operators acting on $C^2 \otimes C^2$ as follows

$$\rho = \frac{1}{4} (I \otimes I + r \sum_{n=1}^3 \sigma_n \otimes \sigma_n + s \sum_{n=1}^3 \sigma_n \otimes \sigma_{n+2} + \sum_{m,n=1}^3 t_{nm} \sigma_m \otimes \sigma_n) : \quad (12)$$

Here I stands for identity operator, r, s belong to \mathbb{R}^3 , $f_n g_{n=1}^3$ are the standard Pauli matrices, $r = \sum_{i=1}^3 r_i \sigma_i$. The coefficients $t_{mn} = \text{Tr}(\rho_n \sigma_m)$ form a real matrix denoted by T . The vectors r and s describes local properties of the state while the T matrix describes a kind of projection of ρ onto the set of states generated by maximally entangled projectors. (see Ref. [15] and references therein for more details concerning the formalism of the H-S space of 2×2 system). Thus the T matrix determines whether the state can be directly subjected to BBPSSW protocol to produce nonzero asymptotic singlets. Indeed, basing on the results of Ref. [15] one obtains that $f > 1/2$ if and only if $N(\rho) > 1$ where $N(\rho) = \text{Tr} T^T T$, and then

$$f = \frac{1}{4} (1 + N(\rho)) \quad (13)$$

For example, many of the states (9) have $N(\rho) = 1$ hence they cannot be purified by the BBPSSW protocol itself. To find the Bell operator [16] basis in which a given state has the highest fraction of a maximally entangled vector, it suffices to find rotations which diagonalize the T matrix. Subsequently, using the homomorphism between the group unitary transformations of two level systems and rotation group [17], one can find the suitable product unitary transformation which will convert the standard Bell basis into the best one for the considered state.

Further, we will assume that T is diagonal so that it can be treated as a vector in \mathbb{R}^3 . It has been proven [15] that if ρ is a state then T must belong to the tetrahedron T with vertices $(1; 1; 1), (1; 1; 1), (1; 1; 1), (1; 1; 1)$ (see in this context [1]). Again, if ρ is separable then T must belong to the octahedron L which is a cross-section of T and T (see Fig. 1).

For the states with $r = s = 0$ (we call them T -states) the above conditions are also sufficient [15], hence the set of T states is equal to the tetrahedron T and the set of separable T states can be identified with the octahedron L (note that L is described by inequality $N(\rho) \leq 1$ [15]).

Consider now the following case, when the T matrix of a given state lies outside the octahedron (we will say that the state lies outside the octahedron). Then according to [15] there exists some maximally entangled state

such that $\langle j | \rho | j \rangle > 1/2$. Thus, the state can be purified by the BBPSSW protocol. Suppose now that the state lies inside the octahedron. Then the first step of the BBPSSW protocol (random bilateral unitary transformations) will destroy any inseparability of the state. Indeed, there are two consequences of this step. First one is that local parameters become $r = s = 0$ (as a consequence of random rotations of vectors r, s inside of Bloch sphere). The second, very important one, is that after the randomizing procedure the T matrix still remains inside the octahedron (taking into account remarks from the previous paragraph it is easy to see that otherwise one could produce inseparable T -states from separable T -states by

use of local operations which is obviously impossible). Thus, according to the characterization of T -states, the output state will be separable.

Now, the role of filtering becomes clear. Namely, this procedure allows one to transfer the entanglement hidden in the relations between r, s and T to the T matrix itself. If the input state is inseparable, but still lies inside the octahedron, the process of filtering will move it outside it, so that the BBPSSW protocol will produce a nonzero number of singlets.

Thus we have shown that any inseparable mixed two-spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ state can be distilled by using local operations and exchange of classical information. It solves completely the problem of nonlocality of 2×2 systems.

Finally, it is interesting to note that distillability of an arbitrary inseparable mixed state of 2×2 system is exactly connected with the negative eigenvalue of partial transposition of the state. Thus the possibility of purification may be here interpreted as a nonlocal effect "produced" by the eigenvalue.

We would like to thank Asher Peres for stimulating discussions and useful comments. We are also grateful Charles Bennett and Sandu Popescu for useful remarks.

E-mail address: zrh@univ.gda.pl

- [1] C. H. Bennett, D. P. Di Vincenzo, J. Smolin and W. K. Wootters, "Mixed State Entanglement and Quantum Error Correction", e-print archive, quant-ph/9604024.
- [2] C. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 1895 (1993).
- [3] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, S. Popescu, B. Schumacher, J. Smolin and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 722 (1996).
- [4] A. Peres, "Collective Tests for Quantum Nonlocality", to appear in Phys. Rev. A, vol. 54; e-print archive quant-ph/9603023.
- [5] N. Gisin, Phys. Lett. A 210, 151 (1996).
- [6] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. Lett. vol 76 (1996) 1413.
- [7] D. Deutsch, A. Ekert, R. Jozsa, C. Macchiavello, S. Popescu and A. Sanpera, "Quantum privacy amplification and the security of quantum cryptography over noisy channels"; e-print archive, quant-ph/9604039, to appear in Phys. Rev. Lett.
- [8] R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A 40, 4277 (1989).
- [9] S. Popescu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 797 (1994).
- [10] S. Popescu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 2619 (1995).
- [11] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki and R. Horodecki, "Separability of Mixed States: Necessary and Sufficient Conditions", e-print archive, quant-ph/9605038, to appear in Phys. Lett. A.
- [12] The matrix elements of the partially transposed state are

given by $\sum_m |e_m\rangle\langle e_m| = \sum_m |e_m\rangle\langle e_m|$ where $|e_i\rangle$ form the standard basis in \mathbb{C}^2 .

- [13] This can be easily seen within the geometrical representation of the state as discussed further.
- [14] R. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A 210, 223 (1996).
- [15] R. Horodecki and M. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A, vol. 54 (1996) 1836.
- [16] S.L. Braunstein, A. Mann, M. Revzen, Phys. Rev. Lett., 68, 3259 (1992).
- [17] The homomorphism is given by $U \hat{n} U^\dagger = (O \hat{n})$ where $U \in SU(2)$ and $O \in O^+(3)$ is a rotation. Thus under product unitary transformation $U_1 \otimes U_2$ the parameters of the state transform as follows: $r^0 = O_1 r$, $s^0 = O_2 s$, $T^0 = O_1 T O_2^T$, where O_1, O_2 are given by the homomorphism.

FIG. 1. For the states with diagonal T matrix the latter can be treated as a vector in \mathbb{R}^3 . In particular, the projectors P_i corresponding to the Bell operator basis are uniquely represented by the points $A = (1; 1; 1)$, $B = (1; 1; -1)$, $C = (1; -1; 1)$ and $D = (-1; 1; 1)$. Then i) for any state its T matrix must belong to the tetrahedron ABCD via the condition $\text{Tr} P_i \geq 0$; ii) for a separable state, T must belong to the bold-line-contoured octahedron, by virtue of the additional condition $\text{Tr} P_i^{T_2} \geq 0$. Random bilateral unitary transformations "project" the T matrix onto the dashed line. For a state with $\text{Tr} P_0 > 1/2$ then the outputs of the subsequent iterations of the BBPSSW protocol will lie on the line, closer and closer to the singlet state represented by the point A.