

Classification of the separable maps which preserve Werner states

¹Haidong Yuan*,²Lluís Masanes

¹Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139

²ICFO-Institut de Ciències Fòtoniques, 08860 Castelldefels (Barcelona), Spain

(Dated: January 10, 2019)

We classify the completely-positive maps acting on two d -dimensional systems which commute with all $U \otimes U$ unitaries, where $U \in SU(d)$. This set of operations map Werner states to Werner states. We find a simple condition for a map being implementable by stochastic local operations and classical communication (SLOCC). We show that all PPT-preserving maps can be implemented by SLOCC. This can be used to prove that the entanglement of Werner states cannot be stochastically increased, even if we allow PPT entanglement for free.

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

Entanglement play a crucial role in the application of quantum information science, such as quantum key distribution [1], superdense coding [2], quantum teleportation [3] and quantum error correction [4] etc. Among several bipartite entangled states, Werner states [5] provide the simplest example of mixed states possessing entanglement and they play an important role in entanglement purification [7], nonlocality [5], entanglement measures [8], etc. Werner states are a useful family of states depending on a single parameter, more theoretical investigations on Werner states can be seen in [6].

On the other hand, it is often of interest in quantum information processing to determine if a given state can be transformed to some other desired state by local operations. Indeed, convertibility between two (entangled) states using local quantum operations assisted by classical communication (LOCC) is closely related to the problem of quantifying the entanglement associated to each quantum system. Intuitively, one expects that a (single copy) entangled state can be locally and deterministically transformed to a less entangled one but not the other way round. In this paper we consider transformations whose success probability can be smaller than one, but of course, it has to be strictly larger than zero. This set of transformations is called *stochastic local operations and classical communication* (SLOCC), then in general it is possible to transform the state the other way around, i.e., transform a less entangled state to a more entangled state with some success probability. However in this paper, by studying the separable maps that transfer from Werner states into Werner states, we show that the entanglement of Werner states can not increase under these maps even they can be stochastic local operations and classical communication(SLOCC).

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: In following two sections, we give a brief introduction of the Werner states and separable maps. We then give our

classification of the separable maps that preserve the set of Werner states, which is, by Jamiołkowski theorem, equivalent to the classification of a class of symmetric states. In section V we present an application of this classification.

II. WERNER STATES

Consider a tensor-product Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, where $\mathcal{H}_A = \mathcal{H}_B = C^d$. The swap unitary matrix F is defined as $F|\psi\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle = |\phi\rangle \otimes |\psi\rangle$ for all $|\psi\rangle, |\phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_A$. The symmetric and antisymmetric projectors are respectively

$$S = \frac{I + F}{2}, \quad (1)$$

$$A = \frac{I - F}{2}, \quad (2)$$

where I is the identity matrix acting on \mathcal{H}_A . Analogously the symmetric and antisymmetric normalized states are $\hat{S} = S/\text{tr}S$ and $\hat{A} = A/\text{tr}A$.

Werner states, denoted ω_ν , are the ones that commute with all unitaries of the form $U \otimes U$ [5, 10], where U acts on C^d , and can be written as

$$\omega_\nu = \nu \hat{A} + (1 - \nu) \hat{S}, \quad (3)$$

where $\nu \in [0, 1]$. We define the depolarization map as

$$\Lambda[\rho] = \hat{A} \text{tr} \rho A + \hat{S} \text{tr} \rho S. \quad (4)$$

which is just projection to the Werner states. This map can be physically implemented by LOCC in the following way

$$\Lambda[\rho] = \int dU U \otimes U \rho (U \otimes U)^\dagger, \quad (5)$$

where dU is the Haar measure over $SU(d)$. It is known that ω_ν is separable for $\nu \in [0, 1/2]$ and entangled for $\nu \in (1/2, 1]$ [5, 10].

[1] ¹haidong@mit.edu, ²masanes@damtp.cam.ac.uk

III. SEPARABLE MAPS AND SLOCC

In this section, we give an brief introduction of the separable maps and SLOCC, we follow the treatment in [12]. To begin with, a separable complete positive map(CPM), denoted by \mathcal{E}_s takes the following form [13, 14]

$$\mathcal{E}_s : \rho \rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n (A_i \otimes B_i) \rho (A_i^\dagger \otimes B_i^\dagger), \quad (6)$$

where ρ acts on $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{in}}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{in}}}$, A_i acts on $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{in}}}$, B_i acts on $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{in}}}$. If, moreover,

$$\sum_i (A_i \otimes B_i)^\dagger (A_i \otimes B_i) = \mathbb{I}, \quad (7)$$

the map is trace-preserving, i.e., if ρ is normalized, so is the output of the map $\mathcal{E}_s(\rho)$. Equivalently, the trace-preserving condition demands that the transformation from ρ to $\mathcal{E}_s(\rho)$ can always be achieved with certainty. It is well-known that all LOCC transformations are of the form Eq. (6) but the converse is not true [16].

However, if we allow the map $\rho \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_s(\rho)$ to fail with some probability $p < 1$, the transformation from ρ to $\mathcal{E}_s(\rho)$ can always be implemented probabilistically via LOCC. In other words, if we do not impose Eq. (7), then Eq. (6) represents, up to some normalization constant, the most general LOCC possible on a bipartite quantum system. These are the SLOCC transformations [15].

Let us also recall the Choi-Jamiolkowski isomorphism [11] between CPM and quantum states: for every (not necessarily separable) CPM $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{in}}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{in}}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{out}}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{out}}}$ there is a unique – again, up to some positive constant α – quantum state $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}$ corresponding to \mathcal{E} :

$$\rho_{\mathcal{E}} = \alpha \mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{I} (|\Phi^+\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{in}}} \langle \Phi^+| \otimes |\Phi^+\rangle_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{in}}} \langle \Phi^+|), \quad (8)$$

where $|\Phi^+\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{in}}} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{d_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{in}}}} |i\rangle \otimes |i\rangle$ is the unnormalized maximally entangled state of dimension $d_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{in}}}$ (likewise for $|\Phi^+\rangle_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{in}}}$). In Eq. (8), it is understood that \mathcal{E} only acts on half of $|\Phi^+\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{in}}}$ and half of $|\Phi^+\rangle_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{in}}}$. Clearly, the state $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}$ acts on a Hilbert space of dimension $d_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{in}}} \times d_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{out}}} \times d_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{in}}} \times d_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{out}}}$, where $d_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{out}}} \times d_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{out}}}$ is the dimension of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{out}}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{out}}}$.

Conversely, given a state $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}$ acting on $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{out}}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{out}}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{in}}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{in}}}$, the corresponding action of the CPM \mathcal{E} on some ρ acting on $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{in}}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{in}}}$ reads:

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{in}}\mathcal{B}_{\text{in}}} [\rho_{\mathcal{E}} (\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{out}}\mathcal{B}_{\text{out}}} \otimes \rho^T)], \quad (9)$$

where ρ^T denote transposition of ρ in some local bases of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{in}}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{in}}}$. For a trace-preserving CPM, it then follows that we must have $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{out}}\mathcal{B}_{\text{out}}}(\rho_{\mathcal{E}}) = \alpha \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{in}}\mathcal{B}_{\text{in}}}$. A point that should be emphasized now is that \mathcal{E} is a separable map [c.f. Eq. (6)] if and only if the corresponding $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}$ given by Eq. (8) is separable across $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{in}}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{out}}}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{in}}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{out}}}$ [17]. Moreover, at the risk of repeating ourselves, the map $\rho \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(\rho)$ derived from a separable

$\rho_{\mathcal{E}}$ can always be implemented locally, although it may only succeed with some (nonzero) probability. Hence, if we are only interested in transformations that can be performed locally, and not the probability of success in mapping $\rho \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(\rho)$, the normalization constant α as well as the normalization of $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}$ becomes irrelevant. This is the convention that we will adopt for the rest of this section.

IV. SYMMETRIC MAPS

Let us consider completely positive maps that transform Werner states into Werner states in $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$. By using the Jamiolkowsky theorem [11], each of this maps \mathcal{E} has associated a state $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}$ acting on $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B'}$, where also $\mathcal{H}_{A'} = \mathcal{H}_{B'} = C^d$. The action of the map \mathcal{E} associated to $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}$ is the following

$$\mathcal{E}[\rho] = \text{tr}_{AB} (\rho_{\mathcal{E}} (I_{A'B'} \otimes \rho^T)). \quad (10)$$

Because of this rule, we refer to $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ as the input space, and to $\mathcal{H}_{A'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B'}$ as the output space. One can see that the states $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}$ associated to these maps commute with all unitaries of the form [5, 10]

$$U \otimes U \otimes V \otimes V, \quad (11)$$

where U and V act on C^d . From the Jamiolkowsky theorem we know that a map \mathcal{E} is separable if, and only if, its associated state $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}$ is separable across $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A'}$ and $\mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B'}$ [17]. In the following we classify all separable states of this kind.

The states that commute with the group (11) are of the form [5, 10]

$$\xi = \lambda_1 \hat{A} \otimes \hat{A} + \lambda_2 \hat{A} \otimes \hat{S} + \lambda_3 \hat{S} \otimes \hat{A} + \lambda_4 \hat{S} \otimes \hat{S}, \quad (12)$$

with $\lambda_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_i \lambda_i = 1$, where the tensor is across subspace AB and $A'B'$. In the following we specify states with four-dimensional vectors $\vec{\lambda}$. Let us see that the following five states are separable.

$$\vec{\lambda}^{(1)} = (0, 0, 0, 1) \quad (13)$$

$$\vec{\lambda}^{(2)} = \left(0, \frac{1}{2}, 0, \frac{1}{2}\right) \quad (14)$$

$$\vec{\lambda}^{(3)} = \left(0, 0, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right) \quad (15)$$

$$\vec{\lambda}^{(4)} = \left(\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}\right) \quad (16)$$

$$\vec{\lambda}^{(5)} = \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2d}, 0, 0, \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2d}\right) \quad (17)$$

The states $\vec{\lambda}^{(1)}, \dots, \vec{\lambda}^{(4)}$ are separable because they are products of the two separable Werner states ω_0 and $\omega_{1/2}$. The state $\vec{\lambda}^{(5)}$ is separable because it is the output of the LOCC map

$$\Delta[\rho] = \int dU \int dV U \otimes U \otimes V \otimes V \rho (U \otimes U \otimes V \otimes V)^\dagger \quad (18)$$

when the input is the product state $\sum_{ks=1}^d |ks\rangle_{AB} \otimes |ks\rangle_{A'B'}/d$. The map Ξ associated to the state $\vec{\lambda}^{(5)}$ is precisely the depolarization map (4,5).

Let us denote by \mathcal{P} the convex polytope generated by $\vec{\lambda}_1, \dots, \vec{\lambda}_5$. Clearly, all points in \mathcal{P} correspond to separable states. Let us see that only these states are the separable ones. The set \mathcal{P} can be characterized by a finite number of linear inequalities of the form

$$\vec{\lambda} \cdot \vec{\mu} \geq 0. \quad (19)$$

We can chose the constant in the right-hand side of the inequalities to be zero because all the points in \mathcal{P} are inside the normalization hyperplane. Some of the inequalities $\vec{\mu}$ correspond to the positivity conditions of $\vec{\lambda}$, the rest (the relevant ones) are

$$\vec{\mu}^{(1)} = (1, -1, -1, 1), \quad (20)$$

$$\vec{\mu}^{(2)} = (-d-1, d+1, -d+1, d-1), \quad (21)$$

$$\vec{\mu}^{(3)} = (-d-1, -d+1, d+1, d-1). \quad (22)$$

The vectors $\vec{\mu}^{(i)}$ are the extreme points of the dual polytope of \mathcal{P} . In general one can find them with standard software, but this case is simple enough for doing it by hand.

The hermitian matrices corresponding to the vectors $\vec{\mu}$ are

$$W_{\vec{\mu}} = \mu_1 A \otimes A + \mu_2 A \otimes S + \mu_3 S \otimes A + \mu_4 S \otimes S. \quad (23)$$

Notice that in order to make

$$\text{tr} \xi W = \vec{\lambda} \cdot \vec{\mu} \quad (24)$$

we must write projectors A and S instead of normalized states \hat{A} and \hat{S} . Up to an unimportant proportionality factor we can be write the hermitian matrices associated to (23) as

$$W^{(1)} = F \otimes F, \quad (25)$$

$$W^{(2)} = dI \otimes F - F \otimes F, \quad (26)$$

$$W^{(3)} = dF \otimes I - F \otimes F. \quad (27)$$

In what follows, we prove that these three operators are entanglement witnesses, that is, their expected values with product states are non-negative:

$$\langle \alpha | \otimes \langle \beta | W^{(i)} | \alpha \rangle \otimes | \beta \rangle \geq 0 \quad (28)$$

for all $|\alpha\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A'}$, $|\beta\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B'}$. For doing this the following identities are useful,

$$\langle \alpha_{AA'} \beta_{BB'} | I \otimes F | \alpha_{AA'} \beta_{BB'} \rangle = \text{tr} (\alpha^\dagger \alpha \beta^\dagger \beta),$$

$$\langle \alpha_{AA'} \beta_{BB'} | F \otimes I | \alpha_{AA'} \beta_{BB'} \rangle = \text{tr} (\alpha \alpha^\dagger \beta \beta^\dagger),$$

$$\langle \alpha_{AA'} \beta_{BB'} | F \otimes F | \alpha_{AA'} \beta_{BB'} \rangle = |\text{tr} \alpha \beta^\dagger|^2,$$

where the matrix α_{ij} is defined as $|\alpha_{AA'}\rangle = \sum_{ij} \alpha_{ij} |i\rangle_A \otimes |j\rangle_{A'}$, and analogously for β . From the last equality, one

can straightforwardly see that $W^{(1)}$ is a witness. To prove that $W^{(2)}$ is also a witness we define the matrix $\gamma = \alpha \beta^\dagger$ and write the expected with an arbitrary product state as

$$\langle \alpha \beta | W^{(2)} | \alpha \beta \rangle = d \text{tr} \gamma^\dagger \gamma - |\text{tr} \gamma|^2 \geq 0. \quad (29)$$

The inequality comes from Cauchy-Schwarz inequality as we can write d as $\text{tr} I^\dagger I$ and $\text{tr} \gamma$ as $\text{tr} I \gamma$. Similarly, one can prove that $W^{(3)}$ is an entanglement witness.

The fact that $W^{(1)}$, $W^{(2)}$ and $W^{(3)}$ are witnesses implies that all points outside the polytope \mathcal{P} are nonseparable. Concluding, \mathcal{P} is the set of separable symmetric states.

Remark 1 One can see that the partial transpositions of S and A are

$$S^\Gamma = \frac{I + d\Phi}{2}, \quad (30)$$

$$A^\Gamma = \frac{I - d\Phi}{2}, \quad (31)$$

where Φ stands for the projector onto the maximally entangled state $|\Phi\rangle = \sum_{d=1}^d |kk\rangle$. If one performs the partial transposition on the generic state (12), and imposes that the result is positive semi-definite, one obtains the three inequalities associated to $\vec{\mu}^{(1)}$, $\vec{\mu}^{(2)}$, $\vec{\mu}^{(3)}$, in (20). This means that the set of symmetric PPT (positive partial transpose) states is also \mathcal{P} , which means the set of PPT preserve maps which preserve Werner states coincide with the set of separable maps which preserve the Werner states. So we actually also classified the PPT preserve maps which preserve Werner states.

V. APPLICATIONS

We can use our classification of separable symmetric maps to prove that the entanglement of Werner states cannot increase under stochastic local operations and classical communication (SLOCC). It is known that all separable maps can be physically implemented with SLOCC, and obviously, all SLOCC are separable maps. Then, what we want to prove is that, if

$$\Xi[\nu \hat{A} + (1 - \nu) \hat{S}] = \nu' \hat{A} + (1 - \nu') \hat{S}, \quad (32)$$

where $\nu \geq 1/2$ and Ξ is a separable map, then $\nu' \leq \nu$.

By using the Jamiolkowski isomorphism we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Xi[\nu \hat{A} + (1 - \nu) \hat{S}] = \\ & 2 \frac{\nu}{d(d-1)} [\lambda_1 \hat{A} + \lambda_2 \hat{S}] + 2 \frac{1-\nu}{d(d+1)} [\lambda_3 \hat{A} + \lambda_4 \hat{S}]. \end{aligned}$$

The new value of the parameter is

$$\nu' = \frac{2 \frac{\nu}{d(d-1)} \lambda_1 + 2 \frac{1-\nu}{d(d+1)} \lambda_3}{2 \frac{\nu}{d(d-1)} [\lambda_1 + \lambda_2] + 2 \frac{1-\nu}{d(d+1)} [\lambda_3 + \lambda_4]} \quad (33)$$

Now, let us assume $\nu' > \nu$. After some algebra we transform $\nu' > \nu$ into

$$(d-1)[\eta\lambda_4 - \eta^2\lambda_3] + (d+1)[\lambda_2 - \eta\lambda_1] < 0, \quad (34)$$

where $\eta = (1 - \nu)/\nu$. Because $0 < \eta < 1$ then $-\eta\lambda_3 \leq -\eta^2\lambda_3$ and $\eta\lambda_2 \leq \lambda_3$. Therefore, if the above inequality is true we have

$$(d-1)[\lambda_4 - \lambda_3] + (d+1)[\lambda_2 - \lambda_1] < 0, \quad (35)$$

which is precisely $\vec{\lambda} \cdot \vec{\mu}^{(2)} < 0$. This is in contradiction with the fact that Ξ is separable, therefore $\nu' \leq \nu$ must hold.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In summary, we have explicitly characterized the complete positive maps acting on two d -dimensional systems which commute with all $U \otimes U$ unitaries. A simple condition is also given on those maps which can be imple-

mented by SLOCC. We achieved this by using the Jamiolkowski theorem: instead of characterizing the complete positive maps directly, we equivalently characterized the states of four d -dimensional systems which commute with all $U \otimes U \otimes V \otimes V$ unitaries, where $U, V \in SU(d)$. This enabled us giving conditions on the separable and PPT preserve maps which preserve the Werner states. With these conditions, we showed that the entanglement of Werner states cannot be increased under SLOCC.

The fact that the entanglement of Werner states cannot be increased under SLOCC has been the key to prove that each bipartite entangled state can increase the teleportation power of another state [18]. Establishing that all entangled states are useful for quantum information processing.

Acknowledgements. The authors are thankful to Andrew Doherty for valuable comments. This work has been financially supported by the EU project QAP (IST-3-015848), the spanish MEC (FIS2005-04627, FIS2007-60182, Consolider QOIT), and Caixa Manresa.

-
- [1] A. K. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 661 (1991).
 [2] C. H. Bennett and S. J. Wiesner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2881 (1992).
 [3] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895 (1993).
 [4] D. Gottesman, e-print quant-ph/0004072.
 [5] R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 4277 (1989).
 [6] J. Lee and M. S. Kim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 4236 (2000); T. Hiroshima and S. Ishizaka, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 044302 (2000); A. O. Pittenger and M. H. Rubin, e-print quant-ph/0001110 (2000); S. Bose and V. Vedral, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 040101(R) (2000); S. Ishizaka and T. Hiroshima, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 022310 (2000); A. Felicetti, S. Mancini, and P. Tombesi, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 062107 (2002).
 [7] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, S. Popescu, B. Schumacher, J. A. Smolin and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 722 (1996).
 [8] P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and B. M. Terhal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2681 (2001).
 [9] Vlad Gheorghiu and Robert B. Griffiths, e-print quant-ph/0705.0369 (2007).
 [10] K.G. H. Vollbrecht and R.F. Werner, e-print quant-ph/0010095 (2001).
 [11] A. Jamiolkowski; Rep. Math. Phys. **3**, 275 (1972).
 [12] Yeong-Cherng Liang, Lluis Masanes and Andrew C. Doherty, e-print quant-ph/0710.5350v1.
 [13] E. M. Rains, e-print quant-ph/9707002.
 [14] V. Vedral and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 1619 (1998).
 [15] W. Dür, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 062314 (2000).
 [16] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, C. A. Fuchs, T. Mor, E. Rains, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 1070 (1999).
 [17] J. I. Cirac, W. Dür, B. Kraus, and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 544 (2001).
 [18] Ll. Masanes; Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 150501 (2006).