

Gisin's theorem for two d -dimensional systems based on the Collins-Gisin-Linden-Masser-Popescu inequality

Jing-Ling Chen,^{1,*} Dong-Ling Deng,¹ and Ming-Guang Hu¹

¹*Theoretical Physics Division, Chern Institute of Mathematics,
Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, People's Republic of China*

(Dated: October 26, 2018)

In this Rapid Communication, we show analytically that all pure entangled states of two d -dimensional systems (qudits) violate the Collins-Gisin-Linden-Masser-Popescu (CGLMP) inequality. Thus one has the Gisin's theorem for two qudits.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud, 03.67.Mn, 03.65.-w

In 1964, Bell published a celebrated inequality to show that quantum theory is incompatible with local realism [1]. He showed that any kinds of local hidden variable theories based on Einstein, Podolsky, and Rosen's notion of local realism [2] should obey this inequality, while it can be violated easily in quantum mechanics. Thus, Bell's inequalities made it possible for the first time to distinguish experimentally between local realism model and quantum mechanics. This applaudable progress for the foundation of quantum mechanics has stirred a great furor, and extensive earlier works on Bell inequalities have been done, including the Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt (CHSH) inequality [3] for bipartite system and the Mermin-Ardehali-Belinskii-Klyshko (MABK) inequalities for multipartite systems [4]. For more details about various kinds of Bell inequalities one can refer to [5] and references therein. Now Bell inequalities are widely used in many fields. Many experimenters use the Bell inequalities to check whether they have succeeded in producing entangled states [6]. Furthermore, Bell inequalities are also used to realize many tasks in quantum computation and quantum information, such as making the secure quantum communication and building quantum protocols to decrease the communication complexity [7].

However, many problems are still open [8], such as: (a) What are the most general Bell inequalities for N qudits? (b) Which quantum states violate these inequalities? and so on. For the problem (b), Gisin presented a theorem in 1991 that any pure entangled states of two spin-1/2 particles (qubits) violate the CHSH inequality [9]. Soon after, Gisin and Peres provided a more complete and simpler proof of this theorem for two arbitrary spin- j particles (i.e., the qudits) [10]. They have stressed an important topic indicating the relations between quantum entanglement and Bell inequality. In their paper, they constructed four observables, two for each subsystems and the eigenvalues of these observables are ± 1 . They proved that for any entangled states, the correlations involved in the quantum systems violate the CHSH inequality. The Gisin's theorem has also been successfully generalized to

three qubits. In 2004, Chen *et al.* showed that all pure entangled states of a three-qubit system violate a Bell inequality for probabilities [11]. This triumphant casus also reveals that the wisdom of Bell inequality as a necessary and sufficient condition to quantify the quantum entanglement is also held in a multi-particle system. Despite all that, whether Gisin's theorem can be generalized for N qudits or not remains open. There are two main difficulties: The first is the problem (a) mentioned above, namely, before checking the Gisin's theorem one has to firstly build a corresponding N -qudit Bell inequality; The second is that Schmidt decomposition is not valid for multipartite systems, consequently, the parameters needed to describe a pure state of multi-particle systems grow exponentially with the number of particles N and the dimension d . In fact, people don't know exactly how many Schmidt parameters are needed to describe a pure state of multi-particle systems, even for a three-qudit system.

There are renewed interests in studying the Gisin's theorem for a two-qudit system by using various kinds of Bell inequalities. The purpose of this Rapid Communication is to show analytically that all pure entangled two-qudit states violate the CGLMP inequality [12]. The brilliant idea of Gisin and Peres was based on the CHSH inequality [10], and at that time the tight Bell inequality for two qudits was not available until the CGLMP inequality appeared in 2002. Our method is based on the most recent CGLMP inequality, which is a natural generalization of the CHSH inequality from two qubits to two qudits. From this point of view, it is more natural to utilize the CGLMP inequality to investigate the Gisin's theorem of two-qudit than the CHSH one. In our method, we shall choose some special unitary transformation matrices to show that all the entangled states violate the CGLMP inequality. Since the CGLMP inequality is in the form of joint probabilities, one only needs to perform some projective measurements to calculate the joint probabilities, which may be more convenient for experiments.

Let us make a brief survey for the CGLMP inequality first. Consider the standard Bell-type experiment: two spatially separated observers, Alice and Bob, share a copy of a pure two-qudit state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$ on the composite system. Suppose that Alice and Bob both

*Electronic address: chenjl@nankai.edu.cn

have choices to perform two different projective measurements, each of which can have d possible outcomes. Namely, let A_1, A_2 denote the measurements of Alice, B_1, B_2 denote the measurements of Bob, and each measurement may have d possible outcomes: $A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 =$

$0, \dots, d-1$. Note that each observer can choose his/her measurements independently of what the other distant observer does (or has done or will do). Then any local variable theories must obey the well-known CGLMP inequality [12]:

$$I_d = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor d/2 \rfloor - 1} \left(1 - \frac{2k}{d-1}\right) \{ [P(A_1 = B_1 + k) + P(B_1 = A_2 + k + 1) + P(A_2 = B_2 + k) + P(B_2 = A_1 + k)] - [P(A_1 = B_1 - k - 1) + P(B_1 = A_2 - k) + P(A_2 = B_2 - k - 1) + P(B_2 = A_1 - k - 1)] \} \leq 2. \quad (1)$$

Here $\lfloor x \rfloor$ denotes the integer part of x , and we denote the joint probability $P(A_a = B_b + m)$ ($a, b = 1, 2$) as

$$P(A_a = B_b + m) = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} P(A_a = j, B_b = j - m), \quad (2)$$

in which the measurements A_a and B_b have outcomes that differ by m (modulo d). In the case of $d = 2$, inequality (1) reduces to the famous CHSH inequality. It was shown in [13] that the CGLMP inequality (1) is a facet of the convex polytope generated by all local-realistic joint probabilities of d outcomes, that is, the inequality is tight. This means that inequality (1) for two-qudit is optimal. Our main result is the following Theorem.

Theorem. Let $|\psi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$ be a pure entangled two-qudit state, then it violates the CGLMP inequality for any $d \geq 2$.

Proof. The quantum prediction of the joint probability $P(A_a = k, B_b = l)$ when A_a and B_b are measured in the state $|\psi\rangle$ is given by

$$P(A_a = k, B_b = l) = |\langle kl|U(A) \otimes U(B)|\psi\rangle|^2 = \text{Tr}\{[U(A)^\dagger \otimes U(B)^\dagger] \hat{\Pi}_k \otimes \hat{\Pi}_l \times [U(A) \otimes U(B)]|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\}, \quad (3)$$

where $U(A), U(B)$ are the unitary transformation matrices, and $\hat{\Pi}_k = |k\rangle\langle k|, \hat{\Pi}_l = |l\rangle\langle l|$ are the projectors for systems A and B, respectively.

We shall follow three steps to prove this theorem. First, the case with $d = 2$ is considered. The two-qubit state reads $|\psi\rangle_{\text{qubits}} = \cos\theta_1|00\rangle + \sin\theta_1|11\rangle$. We choose the unitary transformation matrices as

$$U(A) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\zeta_a & \sin\zeta_a e^{-i\phi_a} \\ \sin\zeta_a e^{i\phi_a} & -\cos\zeta_a \end{pmatrix},$$

$$U(B) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\eta_b & \sin\eta_b e^{-i\varphi_b} \\ \sin\eta_b e^{i\varphi_b} & -\cos\eta_b \end{pmatrix}.$$

Substituting them into the inequality (1), and choosing the following setting $\zeta_1 = 0, \zeta_2 = \pi/4, \phi_1 = 0, \phi_2 = 0, \varphi_1 = 0, \varphi_2 = 0$, we get $I_2 = \cos 2\eta_1 - \sin 2\theta_1 \sin 2\eta_1 + \cos 2\eta_2 + \sin 2\theta_1 \sin 2\eta_2 \leq 2\sqrt{1 + \sin^2(2\theta_1)}$. The equal sign occurs at $\eta_1 = -\eta_2 = -\tan^{-1}[\sin(2\theta_1)]$. Obviously, the CGLMP inequality is violated for any $\theta_1 \neq 0$ or $\pi/2$. Second, we consider the case with $d = 3$. The two-qudit state reads $|\psi\rangle_{\text{qudits}} = \cos\theta_2(\cos\theta_1|00\rangle + \sin\theta_1|11\rangle) + \sin\theta_2|22\rangle$. We choose the unitary transformation matrix of particle A as: $U(A) = \cos\zeta_a|0\rangle\langle 0| + \sin\zeta_a e^{-i\phi_a}|0\rangle\langle 1| + \sin\zeta_a e^{i\phi_a}|1\rangle\langle 0| - \cos\zeta_a|1\rangle\langle 1| + |2\rangle\langle 2|$, or in the matrix form:

$$U(A) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\zeta_a & \sin\zeta_a e^{-i\phi_a} & 0 \\ \sin\zeta_a e^{i\phi_a} & -\cos\zeta_a & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

The unitary transformation matrix $U(B)$ has the same form as $U(A)$. Substituting them into the CGLMP inequality, and choosing the following setting $\zeta_1 = 0, \zeta_2 = \pi/4, \phi_1 = 0, \phi_2 = 0, \varphi_1 = 0, \varphi_2 = 0$, we get $I_3 = \frac{1}{4}(2 + 3\cos 2\eta_1 - 3\sin 2\theta_1 \sin 2\eta_1 + 3\cos 2\eta_2 + 3\sin 2\theta_1 \sin \eta_2) \cos^2 \theta_2 + 2\sin^2 \theta_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}(1 + 3\sqrt{1 + \sin^2 2\theta_1}) \cos^2 \theta_2 + 2\sin^2 \theta_2$. The equal sign occurs at $\eta_1 = -\eta_2 = -\tan^{-1}[\sin(2\theta_1)]$. It is obvious that $1 + 3\sqrt{1 + \sin^2 2\theta_1}$ is larger than 4, so the maximal value of I_3 is larger than 2, which means the CGLMP inequality is violated for any $\theta_1 \neq 0$ or $\pi/2$. Finally, the case with $d \geq 4$ is considered. The state of two qudits ($d \geq 4$) reads

$$|\psi\rangle_{\text{qudits}} = \cos\theta_2(\cos\theta_1|00\rangle + \sin\theta_1|11\rangle) + \sin\theta_2(\sin\theta_3 \sin\theta_4 \cdots \sin\theta_{d-1}|22\rangle + \sin\theta_3 \sin\theta_4 \cdots \cos\theta_{d-1}|33\rangle + \sin\theta_3 \sin\theta_4 \cdots \cos\theta_{d-2}|44\rangle + \cdots + \sin\theta_3 \cos\theta_4|d-2, d-2\rangle + \cos\theta_3|d-1, d-1\rangle). \quad (5)$$

We now choose the unitary transformation matrix of particle A as: $U(A) = \cos \zeta_a |0\rangle\langle 0| + \sin \zeta_a e^{-i\phi_a} |0\rangle\langle 1| + \sin \zeta_a e^{i\phi_a} |1\rangle\langle 0| - \cos \zeta_a |1\rangle\langle 1| + \sum_{n=2}^{d-1} |n\rangle\langle n|$, or in the matrix form

$$U(A) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \zeta_a & \sin \zeta_a e^{-i\phi_a} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \sin \zeta_a e^{i\phi_a} & -\cos \zeta_a & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

The matrix $U(B)$ has the same form as $U(A)$. Substitute them into the CGLMP inequality, and let $\zeta_1 = 0$, $\zeta_2 = \pi/4$, $\phi_1 = 0$, $\phi_2 = 0$, $\varphi_1 = 0$, $\varphi_2 = 0$, one obtains $I_d = \frac{1}{2}(2 + \cos 2\eta_1 - \sin 2\theta_1 \sin 2\eta_1 + \cos 2\eta_2 + \sin 2\theta_1 \sin 2\eta_2) \cos^2 \theta_2 + 2 \sin^2 \theta_2 \leq (1 + \sqrt{1 + \sin^2(2\theta_1)}) \cos^2 \theta_2 + 2 \sin^2 \theta_2$. Similarly, the equal sign occurs at $\eta_1 = -\eta_2 = -\tan^{-1}[\sin(2\theta_1)]$. Obviously, since $1 + \sqrt{1 + \sin^2(2\theta_1)}$ is larger than 2, as a result, the maximal value of I_d is larger than 2. In other words, the CGLMP inequality is violated for any $\theta_1 \neq 0$ or $\pi/2$. In the second and the third step, we have assumed that $\theta_1 \neq 0$ or $\pi/2$ (i.e., the coefficients of $|00\rangle$ and $|11\rangle$ are not zero), which is reasonable because for any entangled two-qudit state there are at least two nonzero coefficients. Therefore, we can choose any two of them. For simplicity and convenience, we assume that the coefficients of $|00\rangle$ and $|11\rangle$ are not zero. This ends the proof of Gisin's theorem for two qudits.

It is worth mentioning that there are other equivalent simplified versions of the CGLMP inequality [14], for example,

$$P(A_2 < B_1) - P(A_2 < B_2) - P(B_2 < A_1) - P(A_1 < B_1) \leq 0, \quad (7)$$

where $P(A_2 < B_1)$ is understood as $P(A_2 = 0, B_1 = 1) + P(A_2 = 0, B_1 = 2) + P(A_2 = 1, B_1 = 2)$ when the dimension $d = 3$. Following the similar procedure developed above, one may also complete the proof of the Gisin's theorem for two qudits based on the elegant simplified inequality (7).

Nevertheless, the above Gisin's theorem only indicates that any pure entangled state of two qudits violates the CGLMP inequality. It does not give us further information about the maximal quantum violations of a given state. One notices that the unitary transformations used in the proof are only $SU(2)$ matrices [see Eqs. (4)(6)], which are only parts of the full $SU(d)$ transformations. If we apply the full $SU(d)$ transformations to the CGLMP inequality, it is expected that stronger quantum violations for a given two-qudit state can be obtained. In this case, generally, it is hard to have an analytical proof of the Gisin's theorem because of too many parameters involved in the $SU(d)$ transformations. Instead, we may have a numerical proof. For instance, in Fig. 1, we have




FIG. 1: (Color online) Numerical proof of the Gisin's theorem for two qutrits. The two-qutrit state in the Schmidt-decomposition form reads $|\psi\rangle_{\text{qutrits}} = \kappa_0|00\rangle + \kappa_1|11\rangle + \kappa_2|22\rangle$, where $\kappa_0 = \sin \beta \cos \xi$, $\kappa_1 = \sin \beta \sin \xi$, $\kappa_2 = \cos \beta$. The state $|\psi\rangle_{\text{qutrits}}$ violates the CGLMP inequality for all the parameters β and ξ (except the points with $\beta = \pi/2$, $\xi = 0$ or $\xi = \pi/2$). In the figure we have plotted the curves with $\beta = \pi/12, \pi/6, \pi/4, \pi/3, 5\pi/12$ and $\pi/2$. One may have an empirical formula numerically fitting the curves as $I_3^{\text{rough}} \simeq 0.5491 + 0.9344 \times \mathcal{I}_1^{2.3682} + 2.5871 \times \mathcal{I}_2^{-0.031} - 2.0636 \times \mathcal{I}_1^{2.6375} \times \mathcal{I}_2^{-0.6455}$, where $\mathcal{I}_1 = \kappa_0^4 + \kappa_1^4 + \kappa_2^4$ and $\mathcal{I}_2 = \kappa_0^6 + \kappa_1^6 + \kappa_2^6$. For any $\beta \neq \pi/2$ and $\xi = 0$ (or $\xi = \pi/2$), one has $I_3^{\text{rough}} \geq 2$. For instance, in the case of $\beta = \pi/6$ and $\xi = 2\pi/15$, one has $I_3^{\text{rough}} \simeq 2.5366$, which violates the CGLMP inequality.

provided a numerical proof of the Gisin's theorem for two qutrits.

In summary, we have shown analytically that all pure entangled states of two d -dimensional systems violate the CGLMP inequality. Thus one has the Gisin's theorem for two qudits. Recently, a coincidence Bell inequality for three three-dimensional systems (three qutrits) has been proposed (see inequality (4) of Ref. [15]). This probabilistic Bell inequality possesses some remarkable properties: (i) It is a tight inequality; (ii) It can be reduced to the CGLMP inequality for two-qutrit when the measurement outcomes of the third observer are set to zero; (iii) It can be reduced to the Bell inequality for three-qubit based on which one has the Gisin's theorem for three qubits (see inequality (6) of Ref. [11]) when each observer's measurement outcomes are restricted to 0 and 1. Therefore, the Bell inequality (4) in Ref. [15] is a very good candidate for proving the Gisin's theorem of three qutrits. We have randomly chosen thousands of points for the pure three-qutrit states to find that the Gisin's theorem for three-qutrit holds. An analytical proof of the Gisin's theorem for three-qutrit is under development, which we shall investigate subsequently.

This work is supported in part by NSF of China

(Grants No. 10575053 and 10605013), Program for New Century Excellent Talents in University, and the Project-

sponsored by SRF for ROCS, SEM.

-
- [1] J. S. Bell, *Physics* (Long Island City, N. Y.) **1**, 195(1964).
 [2] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, *Phys. Rev.* **47**, 777 (1935).
 [3] J. Clauser, M. Horne, A. Shimony, R. Holt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 880 (1969).
 [4] N. D. Mermin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 1838 (1990); M. Ardehali, *Phys. Rev. A* **46**, 5375 (1992); A. V. Belinskii and D. N. Klyshko, *Phys. Usp.* **36**, 653 (1993); D. N. Klyshko, *Phys. Lett. A* **172**, 399 (1993).
 [5] A. Peres, *Found. Phys.* **29**, 589 (1999); R. F. Werner and M. M. Wolf, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 032112 (2001); R. F. Werner and M. M. Wolf, *Quantum Inf. Comp.* **1**, 1 (2002); M. Żukowski and Č. Brukner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 210401 (2002). M. Genovese, *Phys. Rep.* **413**, 319 (2005); T. Paterek, W. Laskowski, and M. Żukowski, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **21**, 111 (2006).
 [6] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2000).
 [7] Č. Brukner, M. Żukowski, and A. Zeilinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 197901 (2002); A. Acín, N. Gisin, and L. Masanes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 120405 (2006);
 [8] N. Gisin, Contribution to a Festschrift dedicated to Abner Shimony, arXiv: quant-ph/0702021v2.
 [9] N. Gisin, *Phys. Lett. A* **154**, 201 (1991);
 [10] N. Gisin and A. Peres, *Phys. Lett. A* **162**, 15 (1992); S. Popescu and D. Rohrlich, *Phys. Lett. A* **166**, 293 (1992).
 [11] J. L. Chen, C. F. Wu, L. C. Kwek, and C. H. Oh, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 140407 (2004).
 [12] D. Collins, N. Gisin, N. Linden, S. Massar, and S. Popescu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 040404 (2002); A. Acín, T. Durt, N. Gisin, and J. I. Latorre, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 052325 (2002).
 [13] L. Masanes, *Quantum Information and Computation*, Vol.3, No.4, 345 (2002).
 [14] A. Acín, R. D. Gill, and N. Gisin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95** 210402 (2005); S. Zohren and R. D. Gill, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 120406 (2008).
 [15] A. Acín, J. L. Chen, N. Gisin, D. Kaszlikowski, L. C. Kwek, C. H. Oh, and M. Żukowski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 250404 (2004).