

A Boolean Functions Theoretic Approach to Quantum Hypergraph States and Entanglement

Supriyo Dutta
Department of Theoretical Sciences
S. N. Bose National Centre for Basic Sciences
Email: dosupriyo@gmail.com

March 2, 2022

Abstract

We establish an one-to-one correspondence between the Boolean functions and hypergraph states, that are entangled multipartite pure quantum states corresponding to hypergraphs. We demonstrate several classes of hypergraphs and their corresponding Boolean functions, such that, every cut of equal length on the corresponding hypergraph states has equal amount of entanglement. Entanglement is numerically measured for a number of quantum hypergraph states.

1 Introduction

Quantum information is a rapidly expanding field of research due to the its theoretical successes in super-dense quantum coding, teleportation, fast algorithms, quantum error correction, and many more. Most of these protocols utilize entanglement in quantum states as a resource. Multipartite pure quantum states expand the applicability of these schema. The quantum hypergraph states, which were first introduced in [1], are multipartite, pure, entangled quantum states which are equal superposition of all possible states in the computational basis of a given order. Although a number of research works has been published in recent years, the combinatorial facets of these states are not “well understood” till date. In this article, we aim to preform a number of introductory steps by presenting a Boolean function corresponding to a hypergraph state. We hope that in this manner we may be able to make powerful statements constructing a bridge between the theory of hypergraphs, Boolean functions, and quantum states. We mention a constructive procedures to generate the Boolean function when a hypergraph state is given, as well as the Hypergraph when a Boolean function is given. We find certain classes of hypergraphs representing quantum states with equal entanglement with respect to all possible bipartitions.

The paper is divided into four sections. In Section 2, we introduce the notion of quantum hypergraph states and their corresponding Boolean functions. In

Theorem 1, we prove that given any Boolean function there is a quantum Hypergraph state and the converse is also true. Section 3 is dedicated to a study of entanglement in quantum hypergraph states. We have produced an alternative proof justifying the sufficiency of well know PPT criterion for separability of quantum hypergraph states. In this section, we construct a number of quantum hypergraph states with equal entanglement in all possible bipartitions. We use an eigenvalue based approach to measure the entanglement. Then we conclude this article with a discussion on future problems in this direction. Our reference for the hypergraph theory, Boolean function, and quantum information theory are [2], [3], and [4], respectively. For recent works on the quantum hypergraph states go through the references in [5].

2 Hypergraph quantum states and Boolean functions

Throughout this article, $[2^n]$ denotes a subset of non-negative integers, $[2^n] = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, (2^n - 1)\}$. Any integer $i \in [2^n]$ has an n -term binary $(0, 1)$ representation $\text{bin}(i) = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n)$, $i_j \in \{0, 1\}$. Clearly, $\text{bin}(i) \in \{0, 1\}^{\times n}$, which is the n -fold Cartesian product of $\{0, 1\}$ with itself. A normalised vector in the projective two dimensional complex Hilbert space \mathbb{C}_2 represents a qubit.

Following Dirac's notations, we denote the vectors $|0\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$, $|1\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$ and

$|+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$. An n -qubit state is represented by a normalised

vector belonging to $\mathbb{C}_2^{\otimes n} = \mathbb{C}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{C}_2$, which is an n -fold tensor product of \mathbb{C}_2 . For instance, $|\text{bin}(i)\rangle = |i_1\rangle \otimes |i_2\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |i_n\rangle$, $i \in [2^n]$ represents an n -qubit state. The set $\{|\text{bin}(i)\rangle : i \in [2^n]\}$ forms a basis of $\mathbb{C}^{\otimes n}$, which is called the computational basis of $\mathbb{C}^{\otimes n}$.

A hypergraph $G = (V(G), E(G))$, consists of a vertex set $V(G)$ and a set of hyperedges $E(G) = \{e : e \subset V(G)\}$. The cardinality of $V(G)$ is a finite natural number n throughout this article. A hyperedge e of cardinality $|e|$, $0 \leq |e| \leq n$, consists of the vertices $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{|e|}$, is denoted by $e = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{|e|})$. The elements of $\text{bin}(i)$, $i \in [2^n]$ and the n vertices of a hypergraph has an one-to-one correspondence. Therefore, $|\text{bin}(i)\rangle = |i_{v_1}\rangle \otimes |i_{v_2}\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |i_{v_n}\rangle$, where $i_{v_i} \in \{0, 1\}$.

The Pauli Z matrix is given by $Z = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$, such that $Z|0\rangle = |0\rangle$ and $Z|1\rangle = -|1\rangle$. Corresponding to a hyperedge $e = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{|e|})$ define a controlled- Z operator Z_e acting on $\mathbb{C}_2^{\otimes n}$, such that

$$Z_e |\text{bin}(i)\rangle = \begin{cases} -|\text{bin}(i)\rangle & \text{if } i_{v_j} = 1 \text{ for all } v_j \in e; \\ |\text{bin}(i)\rangle & \text{if } i_{v_j} = 0 \text{ for any } v_j \in e. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Lemma 1. *For any hyperedge e there are $2^{n-|e|}$ integers $i \in [2^n]$, such that, $Z_e |\text{bin}(i)\rangle = -|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$.*

Proof. Consider a hyperedge $e = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{|e|})$. Equation (1) indicates that $Z_e |\text{bin}(i)\rangle = -|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$ holds if $i_{v_1} = i_{v_2} = \dots = i_{v_{|e|}} = 1$. Remaining $n - |e|$ elements of $\text{bin}(i)$ may be selected in $2^{n-|e|}$ different ways from 0 and 1. Hence, given any hyperedge e , there are $2^{n-|e|}$ integers $i \in [2^n]$, such that $Z_e |\text{bin}(i)\rangle = -|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$. \square

Lemma 2. *For any hyperedge e , the operator Z_e is represented by a diagonal matrix whose diagonal entries belong to $\{1, -1\}$.*

Proof. If e is an empty set $Z_e |\text{bin}(i)\rangle = |\text{bin}(i)\rangle$, and hence, $Z_e = I_{2^n}$, which is the identity matrix of order 2^n . If $e = (v_j)$, then $Z_e |\text{bin}(i)\rangle = -|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$ holds for $\text{bin}(i) = (i_{v_1}, i_{v_2}, \dots, i_{v_j}, \dots, i_{v_n})$ if $i_{v_j} = 1$. Recall that, the Pauli Z matrix is given by $Z = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$: $Z|0\rangle = |0\rangle$ and $Z|1\rangle = -|1\rangle$. Therefore, $Z_e = I_2 \otimes I_2 \otimes \dots \otimes Z$ (v_j -th position) $\otimes \dots \otimes I_2$, where I_2 is the identity matrix of order 2. Corresponding to a hyperedge $e = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{|e|})$ there is a controlled- Z operation $C^{|e|} Z_e$ acting on a $|e|$ -qubit state $\phi = |\phi_{v_1}, \phi_{v_2}, \dots, \phi_{v_{|e|}}\rangle$ such that,

$$C^{|e|} Z_e |\phi\rangle = \begin{cases} -|\phi\rangle & \text{if } \phi_{v_i} = 1 \text{ for all } v_i \in e, \\ |\phi\rangle & \text{if } \phi_{v_i} = 0 \text{ for any } v_i \in e. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

We can verify that, $C^{|e|} Z_e = \text{diag}(I_2, I_2, \dots, I_2(|e|-1)\text{-times}, Z)$. Now $Z_e |\text{bin}(i)\rangle = -|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$ holds when Z_e is a Kronecker product with I_2 , where I_2 acts on $|i_{v_j}\rangle$, such that $v_j \notin e$ and $C^{|e|} Z_e$. Note that, $C^{|e|} Z_e$ is a diagonal matrix, whose diagonal entries are 1 and -1 . Therefore, Z_e is a diagonal matrix whose diagonal entries are 1 and -1 . \square

The above lemma indicates that any two operators Z_{e_1} and Z_{e_2} commute. Hence, the set of all controlled- Z operators $\{Z_e : e \in E(G)\}$ forms a family of commuting normal matrices. Now corresponding to a hypergraph G there is an unique operator $\mathcal{U} = \prod_{e \in E(G)} Z_e$.

Definition 1. *Given any hypergraph G with n vertices, there is an n -qubit quantum state, called hypergraph state, which is denoted by $|G\rangle$ and defined by $|G\rangle = \mathcal{U} |+\rangle^{(\otimes n)}$.*

As \mathcal{U} is unique, we have an unique hypergraph state $|G\rangle$ for a hypergraph G . Note that,

$$|+\rangle^{\otimes n} = |+\rangle \otimes |+\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{i \in [2^n]} |\text{bin}(i)\rangle. \quad (3)$$

As \mathcal{U} is a product of controlled- Z operators, depending on the hyperedges in G , \mathcal{U} alters the sign of $|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$ only. Now, expanding $|G\rangle$ we get

$$|G\rangle = \mathcal{U} |+\rangle^{\otimes n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{i \in [2^n]} \mathcal{U} |\text{bin}(i)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{i \in [2^n]} (-1)^{f(\text{bin}(i))} |\text{bin}(i)\rangle, \quad (4)$$

where $f : \{0, 1\}^{\times n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a Boolean function depending on G .

Example 1. Let G be a hyperrgraph, such that $V(G) = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ and $E(G) = \{(1), (0, 2), (1, 3), (0, 1, 2)\}$. A hypergraph with four vertices represents a four qubit state. Here, for $i \in [2^4]$, $|\text{bin}(i)\rangle = |i_{v_0}\rangle \otimes |i_{v_1}\rangle \otimes |i_{v_2}\rangle \otimes |i_{v_3}\rangle$, $i_{v_i} \in \{0, 1\}$. The operator $\mathcal{U} = Z_{(1)} \times Z_{(0,2)} \times Z_{(1,3)} \times Z_{(1,2,3)}$. For instance, let $i = 14$, that is $\text{bin}(14) = (1, 1, 1, 0)$. Comparing we get $i_{v_0} = 1, i_{v_1} = 1, i_{v_2} = 1$ and $i_{v_3} = 0$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{U} |\text{bin}(14)\rangle &= Z_{(1)} \times Z_{(0,2)} \times Z_{(1,3)} \times Z_{(1,2,3)} |\text{bin}(14)\rangle \\
&= Z_{(1)} \times Z_{(0,2)} \times Z_{(1,3)} |\text{bin}(14)\rangle \text{ since } Z_{(1,2,3)} |\text{bin}(14)\rangle = |\text{bin}(14)\rangle \\
&= Z_{(1)} \times Z_{(0,2)} |\text{bin}(14)\rangle \text{ since } Z_{(1,3)} |\text{bin}(14)\rangle = |\text{bin}(14)\rangle \\
&= -Z_{(1)} |\text{bin}(14)\rangle \text{ since } Z_{(0,2)} |\text{bin}(14)\rangle = -|\text{bin}(14)\rangle \\
&= |\text{bin}(14)\rangle \text{ since } Z_{(1)} |\text{bin}(14)\rangle = -|\text{bin}(14)\rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Similarly, we can calculate $\mathcal{U} |\text{bin}(i)\rangle$ for all $i \in [2^4]$. Combining we get,

$$\begin{aligned}
|G\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^4}} [|\text{bin}(0)\rangle + |\text{bin}(1)\rangle + |\text{bin}(2)\rangle + |\text{bin}(3)\rangle - |\text{bin}(4)\rangle + |\text{bin}(5)\rangle \\
&\quad - |\text{bin}(6)\rangle + |\text{bin}(7)\rangle + |\text{bin}(8)\rangle + |\text{bin}(9)\rangle - |\text{bin}(10)\rangle \\
&\quad - |\text{bin}(11)\rangle - |\text{bin}(12)\rangle + |\text{bin}(13)\rangle + |\text{bin}(14)\rangle + |\text{bin}(15)\rangle]. \\
&= \frac{1}{4} [1, 1, 1, 1, -1, 1, -1, 1, 1, 1, -1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 1]^t
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

The Boolean function $f : \{0, 1\}^{\times 4} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is given by,

$$f(\text{bin}(i)) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i = 0, 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15; \\ 1 & \text{if } i = 4, 6, 10, 11, 12. \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

Theorem 1. Any Boolean function over n variables corresponds an n -qubit hypergraph states.

Proof. The domain of any Boolean function with n variables is $\{0, 1\}^{\times n}$, which consists of 2^n elements. Therefore, number of Boolean function of n variables is 2^{2^n} . Clearly, the following set of quantum states \mathcal{S} contains 2^{2^n} elements:

$$\mathcal{S} = \left\{ |\psi\rangle : |\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{i \in [2^n]} (-1)^{f(\text{bin}(i))} |\text{bin}(i)\rangle \right\}. \tag{8}$$

Given any hypergraph G , the hypergraph state $|G\rangle \in \mathcal{S}$. Number of all possible hypergraphs with n vertices is 2^{2^n} . Therefore, there is a bijection between the set of all possible hypergraph states and \mathcal{S} . It leads us to conclude that given any Boolean function f , there is a hypergraph G such that $|G\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{i \in [2^n]} (-1)^{f(\text{bin}(i))} |\text{bin}(i)\rangle$. \square

The above result assures an one-to-one correspondence between the Boolean functions and the set of quantum hypergraph states. Given an integer $i \in [2^n]$,

we define a set of vertices $\mathcal{O}(i) = \{v : i_v = 1, i_v \in \text{bin}(i)\}$. Clearly, $\mathcal{O}(0) = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{O}(2^n - 1) = V(G)$. Also, for any hyperedge e there is a unique integer i , such that $e = \mathcal{O}(i)$. Define a binary relation \subset on the set $[2^n]$, such that $i \subset j$ if $\mathcal{O}(i) \subset \mathcal{O}(j)$, which is a partial order relation. Note that, $([2^n], \subset)$ is an algebraic lattice [6].

Theorem 2. *Let $f : \{0, 1\}^{\times n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be the Boolean function determining the quantum hypergraph state $|G\rangle$ corresponding to the hypergraph G . Then, $f(\text{bin}(i)) = |E_i| \pmod{2}$ where $E_i = \{e : e \in E(G), e \subset \mathcal{O}(i)\}$.*

Proof. Recall that, given any integer $i \in [2^n]$ and a hyperedge e , $Z_e |\text{bin}(i)\rangle = -|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$ holds, if $e \subset \mathcal{O}(i)$, defined above. The operator \mathcal{U} is the product of all operators Z_e . Now only the hyperedges belonging to the set E_i alter the sign of $|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$ when we apply \mathcal{U} on $|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$. Therefore, $f(\text{bin}(i)) = |E_i| \pmod{2}$. \square

Corollary 1. *Let $G = (V(G), E(G))$ be a hypergraph with n vertices and $E(G) = \{(V(G))\}$, then*

$$|G\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \left[\sum_{i=0}^{2^n-2} |\text{bin}(i)\rangle - |11\dots 1\rangle \right]. \quad (9)$$

Proof. The hypergraph has only one hyperedge $e = (V(G))$. Therefore, $E_i = \emptyset$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, 2^n - 2$ and $E_{2^n-1} = \{V(G)\}$. Hence, $f(\text{bin}(i)) = 1$ for $i = 2^n - 1$; and $f(\text{bin}(i)) = 0$ otherwise. It leads us to the result. \square

The following calculations need a partitions on the algebraic lattice $([2^n], \subset)$ into n subsets as follows:

$$C_k = \{i : |\mathcal{O}(i)| = k\}, \text{ where } k = 0, 1, \dots, n. \quad (10)$$

For instance, elements in $[2^4]$ can be partitioned as: $C_0 = \{0\}$, $C_1 = \{1, 2, 4, 8\}$, $C_2 = \{3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12\}$, $C_3 = \{7, 11, 13, 14\}$, and $C_4 = \{15\}$. It is easy to check that $\mathcal{O}(j) = i$ for all elements $j \in C_i$. Note that, no two elements in C_k are related by the partial order relation \subset . An element in C_s , $s > k$ is related to $\binom{s}{k}$ elements in C_k . Hence, an element in C_k is related to $\binom{k}{k-1} = k$ elements in the cluster C_{k-1} for $k \geq 1$. Also, an element of C_k is related to $\binom{n-k}{1} = (n-k)$ elements in the cluster C_{k+1} for $k \geq 0$.

Now we shall work out the Boolean function determining the hypergraph states for a particular classes of Hypergraphs. A k -graph is a hypergraph, such that cardinality of every hyperedge is k . A simple combinatorial graph is a special class of hypergraphs where every hyperedge contains only two vertices. Therefore, a simple combinatorial graph is a 2-graph. A complete k -graph is a k -graph containing all possible hyperedges of cardinality k . We have the following lemma for these hypergraphs.

Corollary 2. Let G be a complete k -graph with n vertices, then $|G\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}}$ $\sum_{i \in [2^n]} (-1)^{f(\text{bin}(i))} |\text{bin}(i)\rangle$, where the Boolean function f is given by

$$f(\text{bin}(i)) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \in C_s, s < k; \\ \binom{s}{k} \bmod 2 & \text{if } i \in C_s, s \geq k. \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

Proof. There is no hyperedge with cardinality less than k . Hence, there is no operator Z_e , such that $Z_e |\text{bin}(i)\rangle = -|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$, for $|\mathcal{O}(i)| < k$; that is $f(\text{bin}(i)) = 1$ for all $i \in C_s, s < k$. All possible hyperedges of cardinality k are available in $E(G)$. Hence, for any $i \in C_k$, there is an operators Z_e , such that $Z_e |\text{bin}(i)\rangle = -|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$. Therefore, $f(\text{bin}(i)) = 1 = \binom{k}{k} \bmod 2$, for all $i \in C_k$. Also, there is no hyperedge of cardinality greater than k . An element in $C_s, s > k$ is related to $\binom{s}{k}$ elements in C_k . All these relations corresponds a controlled-Z operator acting on $|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$. Therefore, the operator \mathcal{U} generates $-1 \binom{s}{k}$ times in the coefficient of $|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$. Therefore, $f(\text{bin}(i)) = \binom{s}{k} \bmod 2$ for $i \in C_s, s > k$. \square

If G is a complete graph, more precisely a complete 2-graph with n vertices, then

$$f(\text{bin}(i)) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \in C_s, s < 2; \\ \binom{s}{2} \bmod 2 & \text{if } i \in C_s, s \geq 2. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

A subhypergraph $H = (V(H), E(H))$ of a hypergraph $G = (V(G), E(G))$ is a hypergraph, such that $V(H) \subset V(G)$ and $E(H) \subset \{e \cup V(H) : e \in V(G)\}$.

Corollary 3. Let G be a hypergraph such that, the set of hyperedges $E(G) = E_1 \cup E_2 \cup \dots \cup E_p$ where the hypergraph $(V(G), E_s)$ is a complete k_s -graph for distinct values of $s = 1, 2, \dots, p$ and $0 < k_1 < k_2 < \dots < k_p$. Then the Boolean function corresponding to the hypergraph G can be written as

$$f(\text{bin}(i)) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \in C_s, s < k_1; \\ \binom{s}{k_1} \bmod 2 & \text{if } i \in C_s, k_1 \leq s < k_2; \\ \binom{s}{k_1} + \binom{s}{k_2} \bmod 2 & \text{if } i \in C_s, k_2 \leq s < k_3; \\ \vdots & \\ \binom{s}{k_1} + \binom{s}{k_2} + \dots + \binom{s}{k_p} \bmod 2 & \text{if } i \in C_{k_p}. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Using the Lemma 2 we can justify that

$$f(\text{bin}(i)) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \in C_s, s < k_1; \\ \binom{s}{k_1} \bmod 2 & \text{if } i \in C_s, k_1 \leq s < k_2. \end{cases}$$

Below, we discuss the proof for $p = 2$ which can be extended for bigger values of p . An element $i \in C_s$ for $s \geq k_2$ has connections with the elements in C_{k_1} and C_{k_2} . Each of these connections introduces a controlled-Z operator on the elements of C_s . Therefore, we may conclude that, $f(\text{bin}(i)) = \binom{s}{k_1} + \binom{s}{k_2} \bmod 2$ if $i \in C_s, k_2 \leq s$. \square

The least cardinality of a non-empty hyperedge is the co-rank of a hypergraph. If co-rank of G is k , there is an operator Z_e , such that $Z_e |\text{bin}(i)\rangle = -|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$ where $i \in C_k$. If f is the Boolean function corresponding the hypergraph state $|G\rangle$ then $f(\text{bin}(i)) = 1$. The hypergraph does not contain any hyperedge of cardinality less than r . Thus, $f(\text{bin}(i)) = 0$ for $i \in C_s$, where $s < k$.

If a Boolean function $f : \{0, 1\}^{\times n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is given, one can calculate the n -qubit state $|G\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_i (-1)^{f(\text{bin}(i))} |\text{bin}(i)\rangle$. Now we like to discuss the construction of the corresponding hypergraph G . Clearly, G has n vertices. Note that, for a hyperedge $e = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{|e|})$ there is an integer k , such that $\mathcal{O}(k) = e$. The non-empty set of integers $(e) = \{i : e \subset \mathcal{O}(i)\}$ corresponds a chain under the partial order relation \subset , with infimum $|e|$ and supremum $(2^n - 1)$. Determining a hyperedge in $E(G)$ is equivalent to identifying one such chain in the algebraic lattice $([2^n], \subset)$. The Boolean function f can also be expressed in terms of these chains. If an integer i belongs to an intersection of k different chains, $f(\text{bin}(i)) = k \pmod{2}$. The following example will illustrate our approach to determine the hyperedges in $E(G)$.

Example 2. *The Horn function is a well-known class of Boolean functions. Consider a Horn function $f(x_1, x_2, x_3) = x_1 \bar{x}_2 \vee x_1 \bar{x}_3 \vee x_2 x_3$. The truth table of this function is given below*


x_1	x_2	x_3	f
0	0	0	0
0	0	1	0
0	1	0	0
0	1	1	1
1	0	0	1
1	0	1	1
1	1	0	1
1	1	1	1

Therefore, the corresponding quantum Hypergraph state is:

$$|G\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} [|000\rangle + |001\rangle + |010\rangle - |011\rangle - |100\rangle - |101\rangle - |110\rangle - |111\rangle]. \quad (13)$$

As $|G\rangle$ is a three qubit state, the hypergraph G has three vertices that is $V(G) = \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$. We can partition $[2^3]$ into subsets C_0, C_1, C_2 and C_3 , whose entries can be represented in binary form as $\{(0, 0, 0)\}$, $\{(0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 0), (1, 0, 0)\}$, $\{(0, 1, 1), (1, 0, 1), (1, 1, 0)\}$, and $\{1, 1, 1\}$, respectively. In the expression of $|G\rangle$, the coefficient of $|100\rangle$ has a negative sign. Clearly, $(1, 0, 0) \in C_1$ and no other element of C_0 or C_1 has negative coefficient. Note that, $Z_{e_1} |100\rangle = -|100\rangle$ holds if $e_1 = (v_1) \in E(G)$. Elements in the chain $(e_1) = \{i : e_1 \subset \mathcal{O}(i)\}$ in binary form are $\{(1, 0, 1), (1, 1, 0), (1, 1, 1)\}$. Coefficients of $|101\rangle$, $|110\rangle$, and $|111\rangle$ are negative in $|G\rangle$. Also, the coefficient of $|011\rangle$ is negative but $(0, 1, 1) \notin (e_1)$. Note that, $Z_{e_2} |011\rangle = -|011\rangle$ holds if $e_2 = (v_2, v_3) \in E(G)$. But $(1, 1, 1) \in$

$(e_1) \cap (e_2)$, and $Z_{e_1} Z_{e_2} |111\rangle = |111\rangle$. Therefore, we need one more hyperedge $e_3 = (v_1, v_2, v_3)$ such that $Z_{e_3} |111\rangle = -|111\rangle$. Now, note that $\mathcal{U} |+\rangle^{\otimes 3} = |G\rangle$ where $\mathcal{U} = Z_{e_1} Z_{e_2} Z_{e_3}$. Therefore, $E(G) = \{(v_1), (v_2, v_3), (v_1, v_2, v_3)\}$. The lattice $([2^3], \subset)$ and the chains $(e_1), (e_2), (e_3)$ are depicted in the figure below.



The Boolean function corresponding to $|G\rangle$ can also be determined by the incidence matrix of the hypergraph [2]. The vertex-edge incidence matrix $M = (m_{v,e})_{n \times m}$ of G with n vertices and m hyperedges is given by,

$$m_{v,e} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } v \in e, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Clearly, $\sum_{v=1}^n m_{v,e} = |e|$, the cardinality of hyperedge e . Therefore given all one column vector j_n of dimension n , we have $M^t j_n = (|e_1|, |e_2|, \dots, |e_m|)^t$.

Theorem 3. Let M be the vertex-edge incidence matrix of a hypergraph G . Let j_n is the all one column vector of dimension n . For an integer $i \in [2^n]$ let $\text{bin}(i)$ denotes row vector of dimension n indicating the binary representation of i . Let k be the number of zeros in the vector $M^t(j_n - \text{bin}(i)^t)$. If f is the Boolean function determining $|G\rangle$ then $f(\text{bin}(i)) = k \pmod{2}$.

Proof. A hyperedge $e = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{|e|})$ corresponds to the e -th row in M^t which has 1 in the $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{|e|}$ -th positions and remaining all elements are zeros. The e -th row of $M^t j_n$ is $|e|$. If $e \subset \mathcal{O}(i)$, then $Z_e |\text{bin}(i)\rangle = -|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$. For this i , the e -th element of $M^t \text{bin}(i)$ is again $|e|$. Hence, the e -th element of $M^t(j_n - \text{bin}(i)^t) = 0$. Now \mathcal{U} is the product of all these controlled- Z operators. The number of hyperedges e such that Z_e alters the sign of $|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$ is k , which is the number of zero elements in $M^t(j_n - \text{bin}(i)^t)$. Therefore, $f(\text{bin}(i)) = k \pmod{2}$. \square

3 Hypergraph states with equal entanglement in every bipartition

A cut set $T = \{k_0, k_1, \dots, k_{(m-1)} : 0 \leq k_i \leq 2^n - 1, \text{ and } m < n\}$ is a set of indices which partitions the qubits into two subsystems: one containing the qubits whose indices are in T and the other with remaining qubits. Let $\mathbb{C}_2^{(T)}$ and

$\mathbb{C}_2^{(\overline{T})}$ denote the Hilbert spaces corresponding these subsystems, respectively. A quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ is separable with respect to the cut set T if $|\psi\rangle = |\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\psi_2\rangle$ where $|\psi_1\rangle \in \mathbb{C}_2^{(T)}$ and $|\psi_2\rangle \in \mathbb{C}_2^{(\overline{T})}$. Otherwise $|\psi\rangle$ is entangled. A fully entangled state is entangled with respect to all possible cut sets.

Recall that, there is an one-to-one correspondence between the vertices of the hypergraph and the qubits of $|G\rangle$. Therefore, a cut set T also partitions the vertices into two subsets: $V_T = \{v_k : k \in T\}$ and $V_{\overline{T}} = \{v_k : k \notin T\}$. The cut set T also partitions the set of hyperedges $E(G)$ into three classes $\{e : e \cap V_T = \emptyset\}$, $\{e : e \cap V_{\overline{T}} = \emptyset\}$, and $\{e : e \cap V_T \neq \emptyset, e \cap V_{\overline{T}} \neq \emptyset\}$. Also, for $i \in [2^n]$ we have a quantum state $|\text{bin}(i)\rangle \in \mathbb{C}_2^{\otimes n}$, such that $|\text{bin}(i)\rangle = |i_{v_1}\rangle \otimes |i_{v_2}\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |i_{v_n}\rangle$. Considering the cut set T we can express $|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$ as, $|\text{bin}(i)\rangle = |i_{v_1}\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |i_{v_{k_0}}\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |i_{v_{k_1}}\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |i_{v_{k_{m-1}}}\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |i_{v_n}\rangle$.

Lemma 3. *Given any set of indices $T = \{k_0, k_1, \dots, k_{(m-1)} : 0 \leq k_i \leq 2^n - 1$, and $m < n\}$ there is a permutation p which maps the qubits corresponding to T of an n qubits state to the set of qubits corresponding to $\mathcal{I} = \{0, 1, \dots, (m-1) : m \leq n\}$.*

Proof. Consider the permutation

$$p = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & \dots & m-1 & m & \dots & n-1 \\ \uparrow & \uparrow & \dots & \uparrow & \uparrow & \dots & \uparrow \\ k_0 & k_1 & \dots & k_{(m-1)} & \square & \dots & \square \end{pmatrix}. \quad (15)$$

These \square positions can be filled up by elements of $\{0, 1, \dots, (n-1)\} - T$ in arbitrary order. Consider an n -qubit state $|\text{bin}(i)\rangle = |i_1\rangle \otimes |i_2\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |i_n\rangle$ with $i_j \in \{0, 1\}$. Define swap operators $S_{ij} : \mathbb{C}_2^{\otimes n} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_2^{\otimes n}$ such that $S_{ij} |\text{bin}(i)\rangle = |i_0\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |i_j\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |i_i\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |i_{(n-1)}\rangle$. Note that, S_{ij} is a permutation operator. Now we observe that, the permutation p on the set of n -qubit states can be expressed as $P = S_{0k_0} S_{1k_1} \dots S_{(m-1)k_{(m-1)}} \dots$, which is also a permutation matrix. Hence the proof. \square

Now for any $i \in [2^n]$ and a cut set T we can $|\text{bin}(i)\rangle = \bigotimes_{v \in V_T} |i_v\rangle \otimes \bigotimes_{v \in V_{\overline{T}}} |i_v\rangle = P \bigotimes_{j=0}^{m-1} |i_j\rangle \otimes \bigotimes_{k=m}^n |i_k\rangle$, where P is the permutation matrix discussed in the above lemma. Here we can observe carefully that, $\{\bigotimes_{v \in V_T} |i_v\rangle : i \in [2^n]\}$ and $\{\bigotimes_{v \in V_{\overline{T}}} |i_v\rangle : i \in [2^n]\}$ forms the computational basis of $\mathbb{C}_2^{(T)}$ and $\mathbb{C}_2^{(\overline{T})}$, respectively. The computation basis of $\mathbb{C}_2^{(T)}$ and $\mathbb{C}_2^{(\overline{T})}$ can also be given by $\{|\text{bin}(j)\rangle : j = 0, 1, \dots, (2^m - 1)\}$ and $\{|\text{bin}(k)\rangle : k = 0, 1, \dots, (2^{(n-m)} - 1)\}$, respectively. Therefore $|\text{bin}(j)\rangle = \bigotimes_{v \in V_T} |i_v\rangle$ and $|\text{bin}(k)\rangle = \bigotimes_{v \in V_{\overline{T}}} |i_v\rangle$ for some i, j , and k . Elements of the computational basis of $\mathbb{C}_2^{\otimes n}$ can be expressed as a product of elements of these two sets under some permutation. Note that,

$$|+\rangle^{\otimes n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{i \in [2^n]} |\text{bin}(i)\rangle = P \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^m}} \sum_{j=0}^{2^m-1} |\text{bin}(j)\rangle \right) \otimes \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{(n-m)}}} \sum_{k=0}^{(2^{(n-m)}-1)} |\text{bin}(k)\rangle \right), \quad (16)$$

for some permutation matrix P depending on the cut set T .

Theorem 4. *The quantum hypergraph state $|G\rangle$ is entangled with respect to the cut set $T = \{k_0, k_1, \dots, k_{(m-1)}\}$ if there is a hyperedge $\epsilon \in E(G)$, such that, $\epsilon \cap V_T \neq \emptyset$ and $\epsilon \cap V_{\overline{T}} \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Let $|G\rangle$ is a seperable state with respect to the cut T , that is there are quantum states $|\psi_1\rangle$, and $|\psi_2\rangle$ in $\mathbb{C}^{(T)}$ and $\mathbb{C}^{(\overline{T})}$, such that $|G\rangle = |\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\psi_2\rangle$. In terms of the computational basis

$$|\psi_1\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{2^m-1} a_j |\text{bin}(j)\rangle \text{ and } |\psi_2\rangle = \sum_{k=0}^{2^{(n-m)}-1} b_k |\text{bin}(k)\rangle, \quad (17)$$

where $a_j, b_k \in \mathbb{C}$, such that $\sum_{j=0}^{2^m-1} |a_j|^2 = 1$, and $\sum_{k=0}^{2^{(n-m)}-1} |b_k|^2 = 1$. Here, $\text{bin}(j)$ is m -term binary representation of j , as well as $\text{bin}(k)$ is $(n-m)$ term binary representation of k . Consider the integer $i \in [2^n]$, such that $\mathcal{O}(i) = \epsilon$. Now there are $|\text{bin}(j)\rangle$ and $|\text{bin}(k)\rangle$ in $\mathbb{C}^{(T)}$ and $\mathbb{C}^{(\overline{T})}$ satisfying $|\text{bin}(i)\rangle = |\text{bin}(j)\rangle \otimes |\text{bin}(k)\rangle$. Comparing the coefficients of $|G\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\psi_2\rangle$, after expanding them in computation basis we have $a_j b_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} (-1)^{f(\text{bin}(i))}$.

We have seen that every hyperedge e introduces a chain in $([2^n], \subset)$ which is denoted by (e) . Theorem 2 suggests that, $f(\text{bin}(i)) = |E_i| \pmod{2}$ where $E_i = \{e : e \in E(G), e \subset \mathcal{O}(i)\}$. The cut set T partitions E_i into three classes: $E_1 = \{e : e \subset V_T\}$, $E_2 = \{e : e \subset V_{\overline{T}}\}$, and $E_3 = \{e : e \cap V_T \neq \emptyset, e \cap V_{\overline{T}} \neq \emptyset\}$. Clearly, $|E_i| = |E_1| + |E_2| + |E_3|$. Therefore, $a_j b_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} (-1)^{(|E_1| + |E_2| + |E_3|)}$.

Considering the coefficients of $|\text{bin}(j)\rangle \otimes |0\rangle^{\otimes(n-m)}$ and $|0\rangle^{\otimes m} \otimes |\text{bin}(k)\rangle$ in both side of the equation $|G\rangle = |\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\psi_2\rangle$, we get $a_j b_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} f(\text{bin}(j), 0, 0, \dots, 0(n-m)\text{-times})$, and $a_0 b_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} f(0, 0, \dots, 0(m\text{-times}), \text{bin}(k))$. Observe that, $Z_e |\text{bin}(j), 0, 0, \dots, 0\rangle = -|\text{bin}(j), 0, 0, \dots, 0\rangle$, if and only if $e \in E_1$. Note that, $f(\text{bin}(j), 0, 0, \dots, 0(n-m)\text{-times}) = |E_1|$, and similarly $f(0, 0, \dots, 0(m\text{-times}), \text{bin}(k)) = |E_2|$. Therefore $a_j b_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} (-1)^{|E_1|}$, and $a_0 b_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} (-1)^{|E_2|}$. The leading term of $|G\rangle = |\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\psi_2\rangle$ indicates that $a_0 b_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}}$. A small manipulation indicates that, $a_j b_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} (-1)^{(|E_1| + |E_2|)}$, which contradicts to the existence of ϵ . Therefore $|G\rangle$ is entangled with respect to the cut set T . \square

A quantum state is also represented by a density matrix, which is a positive semidefinite, Hermitian, and trace-one matrix. As quantum hypergraph states are pure states, its density matrix is given by $\rho_G = |G\rangle \langle G|$, that is ρ_G is the usual matrix product of the vector $|G\rangle$ and its conjugate transpose $\langle G|$. Expanding $|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$ and $|\text{bin}(j)\rangle$ in the expression of $\rho_G = |G\rangle \langle G|$, we obtain

$$\rho_G = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{i \in [2^n]} \sum_{j \in [2^n]} (-1)^{f(\text{bin}(i)) + f(\text{bin}(j))} |i_1 i_2 \dots i_n\rangle \langle j_1 j_2 \dots j_n|. \quad (18)$$

Therefore, if $\rho_G = (\rho_{i,j})_{2^n \times 2^n}$, then $\rho_{i,j} = (-1)^{f(\text{bin}(i)) + f(\text{bin}(j))}$. If $\rho_{1,j} < 0$, then $\rho_{j,1} < 0$. Now, for this j , $\rho_{i,j} > 0$ if $\rho_{1,i} < 0$.

The partial transpose with respect to the cut set $T = \{k_0, k_1, \dots, k_{(m-1)} : 0 \leq k_i \leq 2^n - 1, \text{ and } m \leq n\}$ on ρ_G is given by,

$$\rho_G^{\tau_T} = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{i \in [2^n]} \sum_{j \in [2^n]} (-1)^{f(\text{bin}(i)) + f(\text{bin}(j))} |i_1 \dots i_{k_0-1} j_{k_0} i_{k_0+1} \dots i_{k_{(m-1)}-1} j_{k_{(m-1)}} i_{k_{(m-1)}+1} \dots i_n\rangle \langle j_1 \dots j_{k_0-1} i_{k_0} j_{k_0+1} \dots j_{k_{(m-1)}-1} i_{k_{(m-1)}} j_{k_{(m-1)}+1} \dots j_n|. \quad (19)$$

Clearly, the partial transpose with respect to the index $k, 0 \leq k \leq (2^n - 1)$ is the partial transpose with respect to the cut set $\{k\}$, defined by:

$$\rho_G^{\tau_k} = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{i \in [2^n]} \sum_{j \in [2^n]} (-1)^{f(\text{bin}(i)) + f(\text{bin}(j))} |i_1 i_2 \dots j_k \dots i_n\rangle \langle j_1 j_2 \dots i_k \dots j_n|. \quad (20)$$

It is observed that partial transpose is transpose over the individual blocks of the density matrix. These blocks depend on the cut chosen for partial transpose. For instance partial transpose for cut set $T = \{0\}$ is transpose on the individual blocks where the density matrix is partitioned into four blocks. As ρ is symmetric the partial transpose keep the diagonal blocks always unaltered.

A necessary condition for separability of a quantum state is that the partial transpose of its density matrix has only non-negative eigenvalues. It is the well known Positive Partial Transpose (PPT) criterion [7, 8], which is both necessary and sufficient for the states in $\mathbb{C}_2 \otimes \mathbb{C}_2$, and $\mathbb{C}_2 \otimes \mathbb{C}_3$, as well as for all hypergraph states, that we prove here. Although there is an alternative approach using Smidth decomposition [9, 10], we find a number of new combinatorial aspects.

The Sylvester's criterion [11] for positive semidefinite matrices says that, A Hermitian matrix is positive semidefinite if and only if all its principle minors are non-negative. Therefore an indefinite matrix must have a negative principle minor. It infers the next theorem.

Theorem 5. *Let the density matrix ρ_G represents a hypergraph state which is entangled with respect to the cut set T . Then the partial transpose $\rho_G^{\tau_T}$ of ρ_G with respect to the cut T has at least one negative eigenvalue.*

Proof. Recall that $\rho_G = (\rho_{i,j})_{2^n \times 2^n}$. Let j is the least integer such that $\rho_{1,j} < 0$. We have mentioned that the partial transpose is transpose over the individual blocks of the density matrix. Size of the blocks depends on the cut T . Also, The diagonal blocks remain unchanged due to symmetry of ρ . Let R_{ii} is a diagonal block of ρ containing $\rho_{j,j}$. Consider the submatrix generated by the blocks $R_{i-1,i-1}, R_{i,i-1}, R_{i-1,i}$, and $R_{i,i}$. It provides a negative principle minor. Therefore, $\rho_G^{\tau_T}$ is not positive semidefinite and has at least one negative eigenvalue. \square

Equation (18) indicates that the density matrix ρ_G is a constant multiple of a $(1, -1)$ -matrix, whose diagonal entries all all 1. Thus, a principle minor is

the determinant of a symmetric matrix whose diagonal elements are all 1. Note that there is no $(1, -1)$ -matrix of order 2 with positive diagonal and negative determinant. In order 3 we can identify only four such matrices, which are:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (21)$$

To prove $\rho_G^{\tau_T}$ has a negative eigenvalue we need to show that one of its principle minors is the determinant of any of the above matrices.

Example 3. Consider a hypergraph $G = (V(G), E(G))$, such that $V(G)$ contains four vertices and $E(G) = \{(1), (0, 2), (1, 3), (0, 1, 2)\}$. The corresponding quantum hypergraph state is

$$|G\rangle = \frac{1}{4}(1, 1, 1, 1, -1, 1, -1, 1, 1, 1, -1, -1, 1, -1, 1)^t \quad (22)$$

Hence, the density matrix $\rho_G =$

$$\frac{1}{16} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (23)$$

Its partial transpose with respect to the cut set $T = \{0, 3\}$ is $\rho_G^{\tau T} =$

$$\frac{1}{16} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (24)$$

If we partition ρ_G into blocks of size 2×2 and transpose on the individual blocks, we shall obtain $\rho_G^{\tau T}$. At the first row, the first negative sign occurs at the fifth position, that is $\rho_{1,5} < 0$. Note that $\rho_{5,5} \in R_{3,3}$, where $R_{i,j}$ are 2×2 blocks of $\rho_G^{\tau T}$. Consider the submatrix generated by $R_{2,2}, R_{2,3}, R_{3,2}$ and $R_{3,3}$ which

is $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$. It contains the third matrix mentioned in the equation

(21) is a submatrix. Therefore, the Sylvester's criterion suggests that $\rho_G^{\tau T}$ is not positive semi-definite and has a negative eigenvalue.

If ρ_G represents a fully entangled state then $\rho_G^{\tau T}$ has negative eigenvalues for all possible cut T . Therefore, the above result allows us to use the PPT based measures of entanglement, in this work.

Lemma 4. Let P be the permutation which maps the qubits in the set $T = \{k_0, k_1, \dots, k_{(m-1)} : 0 \leq k_i \leq 2^n - 1, \text{ and } m \leq n\}$ to $\mathcal{I} = \{0, 1, \dots, (m-1) : m \leq n\}$. Given a hypergraph G with n vertices and exactly one hyperedge which contains all the vertices, we have $P|G\rangle = |G\rangle$.

Proof. Recall from corollary 1 that $|G\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \left[\sum_{i=0}^{2^n-2} |\text{bin}(i)\rangle - |11\dots 1\rangle \right]$. Note that, $P|11\dots 1\rangle = |11\dots 1\rangle$ for all permutation matrix P . Also P alters the elements of $|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$ for $0 \leq i \leq (2^n - 2)$ from one to another keeping their coefficients fixed. Therefore, $P|G\rangle = |G\rangle$. \square

Lemma 5. Let P be the permutation which maps the qubits in the set $T = \{k_0, k_1, \dots, k_{(m-1)} : 0 \leq k_i \leq 2^n - 1, \text{ and } m \leq n\}$ to $\mathcal{I} = \{0, 1, \dots, (m-1) : m \leq n\}$. Given a complete k -graph G with n vertices, we have $P|G\rangle = |G\rangle$.

Proof. The hypergraph state corresponding to complete k -graph is discussed in lemma 2. Expanding it we have

$$|G\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \left[\sum_{i \in C_0 \cup \dots \cup C_{k-1}} \text{bin}(i) - \sum_{i \in C_k} \text{bin}(i) + (-1)^{\binom{k+1}{k}} \sum_{i \in C_{k+1}} \text{bin}(i) + \dots + (-1)^{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{i \in C_n} \text{bin}(i) \right] \quad (25)$$

Recall that, for all clusters C_s , we have $|\mathcal{O}(i)| = |\mathcal{O}(j)|$ for any two i and $j \in C_s$. Now let $P|(\text{bin}(i))\rangle = P|(\text{bin}(j))\rangle$. Note that, as P only replaces the respective positions of the elements in $\text{bin}(i)$. Also, $\text{bin}(i)$ and $\text{bin}(j)$ have equal number of 1s. Hence, $i, j \in C_s$ for some s . Also, $P \sum_{i \in C_s} \text{bin}(i) = \sum_{i \in C_s} \text{bin}(i)$ for all $s \in [n-1]$. Combining, we get $P|G\rangle = |G\rangle$. \square

Corollary 4. *Let G be a hypergraph, such that the set of hyperedges $E(G) = E_1 \cup E_2 \cup \dots \cup E_p$ where the hypergraph $(V(G), E_s)$ is a complete k_s -graph for distinct values of $s = 1, 2, \dots, p$ and $0 < k_1 < k_2 < \dots < k_p$. Let P be the permutation which maps the qubits in the set $T = \{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_{(m-1)} : 0 \leq t_i \leq 2^n - 1, \text{ and } m \leq n\}$ to $\mathcal{I} = \{0, 1, \dots, (m-1) : m \leq n\}$. Then $P|G\rangle = |G\rangle$.*

Proof. The expression of these hypergraph states are discussed in the corollary of lemma 2. Note that, for all $i \in C_s$ the state $|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$ in $|G\rangle$ has equal coefficients and P changes position of 1 in the expression of $|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$ keeping the number of 1s unchanged. Thus, the permutation P keeps all the sums $\sum_{i \in C_k} |\text{bin}(i)\rangle$ unaltered. Hence, $P|G\rangle = |G\rangle$. \square

Theorem 6. *Let G be a hypergraph, such that $P|G\rangle = |G\rangle$, where P is any permutation which maps the qubits in a set $T = \{k_0, k_1, \dots, k_{(m-1)} : 0 \leq k_i \leq 2^n - 1, \text{ and } m \leq n\}$ to $\mathcal{I} = \{0, 1, \dots, m : m \leq n\}$. We can express $E(G)$ as an union of the hyperedges of a number of complete k -graphs for distinct values of k .*

Proof. As $P|G\rangle = |G\rangle$, the operation P keeps coefficients $|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$ unaltered for all i . The permutation P also keeps number of 1s unchanged to map the qubits in a set T to \mathcal{I} . Combining we get $P|i\rangle = |j\rangle$ for $i, j \in C_s$ for some s . Also, $|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$ must have equal coefficients for all $i \in C_s$. To have all $|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$ with equal sign, we need all the sets of hyperedges with equal cardinalities. Therefore, we can express $E(G)$ as an union of the hyperedges of a number of complete k -graphs for distinct values of k . \square

Theorem 7. *Let G be a hypergraph with n vertices, such that, $P|G\rangle = |G\rangle$, where P is a permutation which maps the qubits belonging to a set $T = \{k_0, k_1, \dots, k_{(m-1)} : 0 \leq k_i \leq 2^n - 1, \text{ and } m \leq n\}$ to $\mathcal{I} = \{0, 1, \dots, m : m \leq n\}$. Given any cut T of length m , all the partial transposes of $|G\rangle$, $\rho_G^{T\mathcal{I}}$, have equal sets of eigenvalues.*

Proof. Let $\rho_G^{T\mathcal{I}}$ and $\rho_G^{\mathcal{I}T}$ be the partial transposes of density matrix $\rho_G = |G\rangle\langle G|$ with respect to the cut set $\mathcal{I} = \{0, 1, \dots, (m-1)\}$, and $T = \{k_0, k_1, \dots, k_{(m-1)}\}$, respectively. We need to prove $\rho_G^{T\mathcal{I}}$ and $\rho_G^{\mathcal{I}T}$ share equal set of eigenvalues.

There is a permutation matrix P such that $P\rho_G P^t$ is the density matrix of a state where $k_0, k_1, \dots, k_{(m-1)}$ qubits ρ_G acts as $0, 1, \dots, (m-1)$ qubits. Let ρ_1 be the partial transpose on $P\rho_G P^t$ with respect to the cut set \mathcal{I} . Therefore, $P^t \rho_1 P$ is the partial transpose on ρ_G with respect to the cut set T . Symbolically, $\rho_G^{\tau T} = P^t \rho_1 P$.

We have assume that $P|G\rangle = |G\rangle$, that is $P\rho_G P^t = \rho_G$. Therefore, ρ_1 is partial transpose on ρ_G with respect to \mathcal{I} . Symbolically, $\rho_1 = \rho_G^{\tau \mathcal{I}}$.

Combining all these we get, $\rho_G^{\tau T} = P^t \rho^{\tau \mathcal{I}} P$, for some unitary matrix P . Therefore, $\rho_G^{\tau \mathcal{I}}$ and $\rho_G^{\tau T}$ have same set of eigenvalues. \square

These observations provide us a computational advantage. For checking negativity of the above classes of hypergraph states, we do not calculate the partial transpose with respect to all the cuts. If the cut contains k elements we shall calculate partial transpose with respect to first k elements. Calculation for other cuts of equal length is redundant. In [12], a measure of entanglement is proposed based on PPT criterion. It takes the negation of the sum of all the negative eigenvalues of $\rho^{\tau T}$, a measure of entanglement with respect to the cut set T of the given state ρ . In the literature of entanglement, it is conventional to define an entanglement measure to lie between zero (no entanglement) and one (maximally entangled), that is we need to normalize by dividing with the maximum value of entanglement. However, this maximum value is unknown and this normalization is unnecessary for numerical explorations. Hence, we choose the negated sum of negative eigenvalues as the measure, and denote it with E_{NPT} . Now, we have the following immediate corollaries which can be proved by combining the theorem 7 and the earlier lemmas.

Corollary 5. *Let G be a hypergraph with n vertices and exactly one hyperedge containing all the vertices. Given any cut T of length m , all the partial transposes of $|G\rangle$, $\rho_G^{\tau T}$, have equal sets of eigenvalues.*

This corollary indicates all the cuts of length m in $|G\rangle$ has equal eigenvalues. Therefore, all the cuts of $|G\rangle$ has equal value of E_{NPT} . Below, we mention E_{ENT} for cuts with different lengths in a hypergraph containing exactly one hyperedge containing all the vertices.

		Length of cuts					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Number of vertices	2	2.0					
	3	3.4641					
	4	5.2915	6.0				
	5	7.746	9.1652				
	6	11.1355	13.4164	14.0			
	7	15.8745	19.2873	20.4939			
	8	22.5389	27.4955	29.4618	30.0		
	9	22.1108	32.7755	37.909	40.2092		
	10	31.4883	46.8466	54.3568	57.9142	59.329	
	11	44.7465	66.7373	77.5852	82.8611	85.2378	

	12	63.4941	94.8609	110.4123	118.0756	121.7194	123.1735
--	----	---------	---------	----------	----------	----------	----------

In the above table, we notice that entanglement increases with the number of nodes as well as the length of the cuts.

Corollary 6. *Let G be a complete k -graph. Given any cut T of length k , all the partial transposes of $|G\rangle$, ρ_G^{TT} , has equal sets of eigenvalues.*

In the table below we mention the value of E_{ENT} for different values of the number of vertices, k , and length of cut sets.

		k	Length of cuts					
			1	2	3	4	5	6
Number of vertices	3	2	2.1723					
	4	2	3.3982	4.5815				
		3	3.3982	4.5815				
	5	2	5.0877	7.1738				
		3	5.0877	7.1738				
		4	5.0877	7.1738				
	6	2	7.4521	10.751	12.0162			
		3	7.4521	10.751	12.0162			
		4	7.4521	10.751	12.0162			
		5	7.4521	10.751	12.0162			
	7	2	10.7802	15.7611	17.9526			
	8	2	15.4764	22.8167	26.2464	27.5979		
	9	2	22.1108	32.7755	37.909	40.2092		
	10	2	31.4883	46.8466	54.3568	57.9142	59.329	
	11	2	44.7465	66.7373	77.5852	82.8611	85.2378	
12	2	63.4941	94.8609	110.4123	118.0756	121.7194	123.1735	

This table infers a number of properties of entanglement in $|G\rangle$. Entanglement increases with the number of vertices as well as the length of cuts. Given the number of vertices n , values of k varies from 2 to $n - 1$. These k -graphs have equal value of entanglement if the length of cuts are equal. Hence, we have not mentioned the values for all k -graphs, when $n \geq 7$. The following corollary is the generalised version of earlier corollaries.

Corollary 7. *Let G be a hypergraph, such that the set of hyperedges $E(G) = E_1 \cup E_2 \cup \dots \cup E_p$ where the hypergraph $(V(G), E_s)$ is a complete k_s -graph for distinct values of $s = 1, 2, \dots, p$ and $0 < k_1 < k_2 < \dots < k_p$. Given any cut T of length k , all the partial transposes of $|G\rangle$, ρ_G^{TT} , has equal sets of eigenvalues.*

In general, for any cut T eigenvalues of ρ_G^{TT} and $\rho_G^{T\bar{T}}$ are different. Two cuts of equal lengths T may have different negative eigenvalues. Consider the following example

Example 4. *Consider the hypergraph G with the set of vertices $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ and the set of hyperedges $\{(0, 1), (0, 2), (0, 1, 3)\}$. The corresponding hypergraph*

state is $|G\rangle = \frac{1}{4}[1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, -1, -1, -1, 1, 1, -1]^t$. The set of non-zero eigenvalues of $\rho_G^{T_0}$, and $\rho_G^{T_1}$ are $\{8, 8, 8, -8\}$, and $\{4, 12, 6.92, -6.92\}$ respectively.

4 Conclusion

In conclusion, we like to say that this is the first study in the interface of Boolean function, hypergraphs, and quantum states. We establish a connection between the Boolean functions and the hypergraph states. Using this connection we have discussed the relations between the coefficients of the hypergraph state and the structure of underlined hypergraph for a number of hypergraph classes, such as the complete k graph and their generalizations. We have identified different classes of hypergraphs whose corresponding quantum states have equal negativity for cuts with equal lengths. The connection between the Boolean functions and hypergraph states will be interesting due to the application of Boolean functions in classical information and cryptography. Hence, every Boolean function based classical cryptographic protocol might have a counterpart in quantum information theory via hypergraph states. Interested reader may approach further in this direction.

Acknowledgement

This work was partially carried out at IISER Kolkata. The author is thankful to Prof. Prasanta K. Panigrahi for hosting him there, and providing him a financial support from his ARF grant.

References

- [1] Ri Qu, Juan Wang, Zong-shang Li, and Yan-ru Bao. Encoding hypergraphs into quantum states. *Physical Review A*, 87(2):022311, 2013.
- [2] Alain Bretto. Hypergraph theory. *An introduction. Mathematical Engineering. Cham: Springer*, 2013.
- [3] Yves Crama and Peter L Hammer. *Boolean functions: Theory, algorithms, and applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [4] David McMahon. *Quantum computing explained*. John Wiley & Sons, 2007.
- [5] Supriyo Dutta, Ramita Sarkar, and Prasanta K Panigrahi. Geometry of entanglement in hypergraph state under generalized concurrence. 2018. Under preparation.
- [6] Rudolf Lidl and Günter Pilz. *Applied abstract algebra*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

- [7] Asher Peres. Separability criterion for density matrices. *Physical Review Letters*, 77(8):1413, 1996.
- [8] Michał Horodecki, Paweł Horodecki, and Ryszard Horodecki. Separability of n-particle mixed states: necessary and sufficient conditions in terms of linear maps. *Physics Letters A*, 283(1-2):1–7, 2001.
- [9] Erhard Schmidt. Zur theorie der linearen und nichtlinearen integralgleichungen. *Mathematische Annalen*, 63(4):433–476, 1907.
- [10] Artur Ekert and Peter L Knight. Entangled quantum systems and the schmidt decomposition. *American Journal of Physics*, 63(5):415–423, 1995.
- [11] Roger A Horn and Charles R Johnson. *Matrix analysis*. Cambridge university press, 1990.
- [12] Iain DK Brown, Susan Stepney, Anthony Sudbery, and Samuel L Braunstein. Searching for highly entangled multi-qubit states. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 38(5):1119, 2005.