

Concurrence of Stochastic 1-Qubit Maps

Meik Hellmund

*Mathematisches Institut, Universität Leipzig, Johannisgasse 26, D-04103 Leipzig, Germany**

Armin Uhlmann

*Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Leipzig,
Vor dem Hospitaltore 1, D-04103 Leipzig, Germany†*

(Dated: October 12, 2021)

Explicit expressions for the concurrence of all positive and trace-preserving (“stochastic”) 1-qubit maps are presented. By a new method we find the relevant convex roof pattern. We conclude that two component optimal decompositions always exist.

Our results can be transferred to $2 \times n$ -quantum systems providing the concurrence for all rank two density operators as well as a lower bound for their entanglement of formation.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 03.67.Mn

INTRODUCTION

In quantum physics a system in a pure state $\pi = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ may have subsystems in states which are not pure but mixed. These mixed substates are typically correlated in a non-local and non-classical way. The use of this phenomenon of entanglement as a resource for communication and computation is a main feature of quantum information theory [1]. This makes the search for a quantitative understanding and characterization of entanglement a central issue [2, 3]. Entanglement measures ought to describe single-use or asymptotic capabilities of quantum systems and channels just as the von Neumann entropy $S(\rho) = -\text{Tr} \rho \log \rho$ is an asymptotic measure for information content. They are, similar to entropy, non-linear and unitarily invariant functions on the space of states.

Bennett et al. [4] introduced the *entanglement of formation* $E_F(\rho)$ as the asymptotic number of ebits (maximally entangled qubit pairs) needed to prepare the entangled bipartite state ρ by local operations and classical communication (LOCC) and showed that

$$E_F(\rho) = \min \sum p_j S(\text{Tr}_B(\pi_j)) \quad (1)$$

where Tr_B is the partial trace over one of the two subsystems and the minimum is taken over all possible convex ($\sum p_j = 1, p_j > 0$) decompositions of the state ρ into pure states

$$\rho = \sum p_j \pi_j, \quad \pi_j \text{ pure.} \quad (2)$$

Closed formulas for the entanglement of formation, i.e., analytic solutions to the global optimization problem (1) are only known for certain classes of highly symmetric states [5, 6] and for the case of a pair of qubits (2×2

system). In the latter case, the analytic formula for the entanglement of formation was obtained first for special states [4, 7] and later proved for all states of a qubit pair [8]. It expresses $E_F(\rho)$ in terms of another entanglement measure $C(\rho)$ which was named *concurrence* in [7]. The concurrence appeared to be an interesting quantity in itself [9]. Many authors, e.g. [10, 11, 12], have obtained bounds for the concurrence of larger bipartite systems.

In the present paper we obtain analytic expressions for the concurrence for general stochastic 1-qubit maps and therefore for *general $2 \times n$ bipartite systems provided the input state ρ has rank two*. For this we employ the *convex roof* construction [13, 14] as a way to study global optimization problems of the type (1). Our main results are given by Theorems 2 and 3.

Let Φ be a positive and trace-preserving (i. e., stochastic) map from a general quantum system into a 1-qubit-system. This setup includes as special case the partial trace Tr_B which maps states of a bipartite $2 \times n$ system to states of the subsystem. For pure input states $\pi = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ the concurrence is defined as

$$C_\Phi(\pi) = 2\sqrt{\det \Phi(\pi)} \quad (3)$$

and for a general mixed input state ρ one defines

$$C_\Phi(\rho) = \min \sum p_j C_\Phi(\pi_j), \quad (4)$$

where the minimum is again taken over all possible convex decompositions into pure states. Let us consider the case where ρ has rank 2 and is therefore supported by a 2-dimensional input subspace. Then we have to consider in (2) only pure states supported in the same 2-dimensional supporting input space. By unitary equivalence we are allowed to identify input and output subspaces. Hence, calculating the concurrence of a rank two density operator $\rho = \sum_{i,j=1}^2 \rho_{ij} |v_i\rangle\langle v_j|$ of a $2 \times n$ system is equivalent to computing the concurrence of a certain 1-qubit stochastic map. This map is completely positive and explicitly given by $\Phi(\rho) = \sum_{i,j} \rho_{ij} D_{ij}$ with $D_{ij} = \text{Tr}_B |v_i\rangle\langle v_j|$.

*Electronic address: Meik.Hellmund@math.uni-leipzig.de

†Electronic address: Armin.Uhlmann@itp.uni-leipzig.de

However, our construction of the concurrence works for all stochastic 1-qubit maps, not only for completely positive ones. It is therefore suggestive, but not the topic of the present paper, to ask for applications to the entanglement witness problem [15].

In some cases the convex roof for the concurrence appears to be a *flat convex roof*. In these cases optimal decompositions for the concurrence also provide optimal decompositions for the entanglement of formation and therefore $E_F(\rho)$ can be expressed as a function of the concurrence $C(\rho)$, exactly as in the case of a pair of qubits [8]. If the roof of the concurrence is not flat, our results for the concurrence provide a lower bound for the entanglement of formation.

We illustrate our procedure by explicit formulas for the cases of bistochastic and of axial symmetric 1-qubit maps. In both cases the result is of a surprising transparency.

THE CONVEX ROOF CONSTRUCTION

In the following, all linear combinations are understood as convex combinations, i.e., the $\{p_j\}$ always satisfy $\sum p_j = 1$ and $p_j > 0$. Solutions to the optimization problem eq. (4,2) can be characterized as so-called *convex roofs*: Let Ω denote the convex set of density operators ρ and let $g(\pi)$ be a continuous real-valued function on the set of pure states.

Theorem 1 (see [13, 14]). There exists exactly one function $G(\rho)$ on Ω which can be characterized uniquely by each one of the following two properties:

1. $G(\rho)$ is the solution of the optimization problem

$$G(\rho) = \min_{\rho = \sum p_j \pi_j} \sum p_j g(\pi_j). \quad (5)$$

2. $G(\rho)$ is convex [16] and a *roof*, i.e., for every $\rho \in \Omega$ exists an extremal decomposition $\rho = \sum p_j \pi_j$ such

that

$$G(\rho) = \sum p_j g(\pi_j). \quad (6)$$

Furthermore, given ρ , the function G is linear on the convex hull of all those pure states π_j which appear in the decomposition (6) of ρ . Therefore, G provides a foliation of Ω into leaves such that a) each leaf is the convex hull of some pure states and b) G is linear on each leaf. If G is not only linear but even constant on each leaf, it is a *flat roof*.

STOCHASTIC 1-QUBIT MAPS

The space \mathcal{M}_2 of hermitian 2×2 matrices $\rho = \begin{pmatrix} x_{00} & x_{01} \\ x_{01}^* & x_{11} \end{pmatrix}$ is isomorphic to Minkowski space $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ via

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x} = (x_0, \vec{x}) &\iff \rho = \frac{1}{2}(x_0 I + \vec{x} \cdot \vec{\sigma}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} x_0 + x_3 & x_1 + ix_2 \\ x_1 - ix_2 & x_0 - x_3 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

We have $\det \rho = \frac{1}{4}(x_0^2 - x_1^2 - x_2^2 - x_3^2) = \frac{1}{4} \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{x}$ where the dot between 4-vectors denotes the Minkowski space inner product and $\text{Tr} \rho = x_0$. Therefore the cone of positive matrices is just the forward light cone and the state space Ω of a qubit, the Bloch ball, is the intersection of this cone with the hypersurface V defined by $x_0 = 1$. In this picture mixed states correspond to time-like vectors and pure states to light-like vectors, both normalized to $x_0 = 1$.

A trace-preserving positive linear map $\Phi : \mathcal{M}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_2$ can be parameterized as [17]

$$\Phi(\rho) = \Phi \left(\frac{1}{2}(x_0 I + \vec{x} \cdot \vec{\sigma}) \right) = \frac{1}{2} (x_0 I + (x_0 \vec{t} + \mathbf{\Lambda} \vec{x}) \cdot \vec{\sigma}) \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is a 3×3 matrix and \vec{t} a 3-vector.

We consider the quadratic form q on \mathcal{M}_2 defined by

$$q_w^\Phi(\mathbf{x}) = 4(\det \Phi(\rho) - w \det \rho) = \Phi(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \Phi(\mathbf{x}) - w \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{x} = \sum_{i,j=0}^3 q_{ij} x_i x_j \quad (9)$$

where w is some real parameter. For pure states, i.e., on the boundary of the Bloch ball where $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{x} = 0$, the form $q(\mathbf{x})$ equals the square of the concurrence $C = 2\sqrt{\det \Phi(\rho)}$.

Furthermore, we denote by Q the linear map $Q : x_i \mapsto \sum q_{ij} x_j$ corresponding to the quadratic form q via polar-

ization:

$$Q_w^\Phi = Q_0^\Phi - w \eta_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - |\vec{t}|^2 - w & -\vec{t} \mathbf{\Lambda} \\ -(\vec{t} \mathbf{\Lambda})^T & w \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{\Lambda}^T \mathbf{\Lambda} \end{pmatrix} \quad (10)$$

The central result of this paper are the following two statements:

Theorem 2. Let the quadratic form q and therefore the matrix Q be positive semidefinite and degenerate, i.e., $Q \geq 0$ and $\dim \text{Ker } Q > 0$. If $\text{Ker } Q$ contains a non-zero vector \mathbf{n} which is space-like or light-like, $\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{n} \leq 0$, then $q^{1/2}$ is a *convex roof*. Furthermore, this roof is *flat* if such an \mathbf{n} exists with $n_0 = 0$.

Theorem 3. For every positive trace-preserving map Φ exists a unique value w_0 for the parameter w such that the conditions of Theorem 2 are fulfilled. Therefore the concurrence of an arbitrary stochastic 1-qubit map Φ is given by $C_\Phi(\rho) = \sqrt{q_{w_0}^\Phi(\rho)}$.

Let us sketch the proof of Theorems 2 and 3. The square root \sqrt{q} of a positive semidefinite form q on a linear space provides a seminorm on this space and is therefore convex. According to Theorem 1 we need to show that it is also a roof, i.e., there is a foliation of the space into leaves such that $q^{1/2}$ is linear on each leaf. Let $\mathbf{n} = (n_0, \vec{n})$ be a non-zero vector in $\text{Ker } Q$. Then for all vectors \mathbf{m} we have

$$q(\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{n}) = (\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{n})Q(\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{n}) = \mathbf{m}Q\mathbf{m} = q(\mathbf{m}). \quad (11)$$

Let us start with the case where \mathbf{n} can be chosen to have $n_0 = 0$. Then \vec{n} gives a direction in V along which q is constant. Therefore, \sqrt{q} is a *flat convex roof*.




FIG. 1: The embedding of the Bloch ball into \mathcal{M}_2 and its foliation by a flat convex roof.

Let us now consider the case where $\text{Ker } Q$ does not contain a vector \mathbf{n} with $n_0 = 0$. Then we have $\dim \text{Ker } Q = 1$ and this line intersects V in one point which we call \mathbf{n} . Every other point \mathbf{m} in V can be connected to the point \mathbf{n} by a line lying in V . Then $q^{1/2}$ is linear along the half-line $\mathbb{R}^+ \ni s \mapsto s\mathbf{m} + (1-s)\mathbf{n}$ since

$$\begin{aligned} q(s\mathbf{m} + (1-s)\mathbf{n}) &= (s\mathbf{m} + (1-s)\mathbf{n})Q(s\mathbf{m} + (1-s)\mathbf{n}) \\ &= s^2q(\mathbf{m}) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.

For the proof of Theorem 3 we note that the space \mathcal{P} of stochastic maps is itself a convex space. It can be parameterized as follows [18]: Let $\vec{\xi}$ be a unit 3-vector and




FIG. 2: The foliation of the Bloch ball in the case $n_0 \neq 0$.

$\alpha, \beta, \omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3$ be parameters taking values between zero and one: $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$; $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$; $0 \leq \omega_1 \leq \omega_2 \leq \omega_3 = 1$. With the abbreviation $\nu = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^3 \xi_i^2 \omega_i^2}$ we can represent stochastic maps (8) up to orthogonal transformations by $\vec{t} = (t_1, t_2, t_3)$, $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ where

$$t_i = \beta \xi_i (1 - \alpha \omega_i^2) \quad (13)$$

$$\lambda_i = \alpha \beta \nu \omega_i \quad (14)$$

Furthermore, the boundary $\partial\mathcal{P}$ is given by $\beta = 1$. In this case, the unit vector $\vec{\xi}$ represents the touching point (or one of the touching points in more degenerate cases) between the unit sphere and its image. Let $\Phi \in \partial\mathcal{P}$, so $\beta = 1$. Then it is easy to check that $w_0 = \alpha \nu^2$ makes Q positive semidefinite since it permits a Cholesky decomposition $Q = RR^T$ into a triangular matrix with a zero on the diagonal:

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\omega_1 \xi_1 \mu_1 & \nu \mu_1 & 0 & 0 \\ -\omega_2 \xi_2 \mu_2 & 0 & \nu \mu_2 & 0 \\ -\omega_3 \xi_3 \mu_3 & 0 & 0 & \nu \mu_3 \end{pmatrix} \quad (15)$$

where $\mu_i = \sqrt{\alpha(1 - \alpha \omega_i^2)}$. Furthermore, $\mathbf{n} = (1, \frac{1}{\nu} \xi_i \omega_i)$ is a lightlike vector in $\text{Ker } Q$.

In the general case $\beta < 1$ we have

$$Q_w^{\Phi_\beta} = \beta^2 Q_{w/\beta^2}^{\Phi_{(\beta=1)}} + (1 - \beta^2) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (16)$$

Therefore, $Q_{w_0/\beta^2}^{\Phi_\beta}$ as a sum of two positive semidefinite terms is either positive semidefinite or positive definite. In the first case we are done with $w_0 = \alpha \beta^2 \nu^2$. In the other case we must adjust w_0 . It is clear that Q is not positive for $w \rightarrow \pm\infty$. Therefore due to continuity, we can make Q positive semidefinite and degenerate by increasing or decreasing w . Let $w_1 < w_2$ be the points of degeneration and $\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2$ corresponding vectors in $\text{Ker } Q_{w_i}$. Then (eq. (10)) $\mathbf{n}_1 Q_0 \mathbf{n}_1 = w_1 \mathbf{n}_1^2$ and $\mathbf{n}_2 Q_0 \mathbf{n}_2 = w_2 \mathbf{n}_2^2$.

Furthermore, no nonzero vector can be both in $\text{Ker } Q_{w_1}$ and $\text{Ker } Q_{w_2}$. So, $\mathbf{n}_1 Q_0 \mathbf{n}_1 > w_2 \mathbf{n}_1^2$ and $\mathbf{n}_2 Q_0 \mathbf{n}_2 > w_1 \mathbf{n}_2^2$, providing $(w_2 - w_1) \mathbf{n}_1^2 < 0$ and $(w_2 - w_1) \mathbf{n}_2^2 > 0$. Therefore, increasing w will make $\text{Ker } Q$ time-like and decreasing w will make it space-like. This proves the claim of Theorem 3, existence of a suitable w_0 . Uniqueness can be shown easily. It also follows indirectly from the uniqueness of the convex roof extension, Theorem 1. More details can be found in [19].

EXPLICIT EXAMPLES

Let us demonstrate our construction on some examples.

Bistochastic maps or unital channels

Unital 1-qubit channels are quite trivial. We have $\vec{t} = 0$, $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ and therefore $w = \max(\lambda_1^2, \lambda_2^2, \lambda_3^2)$ fulfills the conditions of Theorem 2 and provides the roof

$$C(\rho) = q^{1/2}(\rho) = \sqrt{(1-w)x_0^2 + \sum_{i=1}^3 (w - \lambda_i^2) x_i^2} \quad (17)$$

which is flat in one direction since one of the terms in the sum vanishes.

Nevertheless, this case includes channels of all Kraus lengths between 1 and 4.

Axial symmetric channels

Every channel commuting with rotations about the x_3 -axis is of the form

$$\Phi(\rho) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha x_{00} + (1-\gamma)x_{11} & \beta x_{01} \\ \beta x_{10} & \gamma x_{11} + (1-\alpha)x_{00} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (18)$$

This corresponds to $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \text{diag}(\beta, \beta, \alpha + \gamma - 1)$ and $\vec{t} = (0, 0, \alpha - \gamma)$. This family includes many standard channels, e.g.,

- the amplitude-damping channel (length 2, non-unital) for $\gamma = 1$, $\beta^2 = \alpha$;
- the phase-damping channel (length 2, unital) for $\alpha = \gamma = 1$ and
- the depolarizing channel (length 4, unital) for $\alpha = \gamma$, $\beta = 2\alpha - 1$.

Here we find that $q_w^{1/2}$ is a convex roof for $w = \max(\beta^2, \beta_c^2)$ with

$$\beta_c^2 = 1 + 2\alpha\gamma - \alpha - \gamma - 2\sqrt{\alpha(1-\alpha)\gamma(1-\gamma)}. \quad (19)$$

In the case $\beta^2 \geq \beta_c^2$ we have $\text{Ker } Q = \text{Span}\{e_x, e_y\}$ and the resulting roof is flat. In the other case we have a one-dimensional $\text{Ker } Q$ generated by $\mathbf{n} = (1, 0, 0, z_0)$ with $z_0 = \frac{\sqrt{\gamma(1-\gamma)} + \sqrt{\alpha(1-\alpha)}}{\sqrt{\gamma(1-\gamma)} - \sqrt{\alpha(1-\alpha)}}$ and a non-flat roof.

CONCLUSION

We calculated the concurrence C_Φ of all trace-preserving positive 1-qubit maps and therefore for general $2 \times n$ bipartite systems with rank-2 input states.

The concurrence is real linear on each member of a unique bundle of straight lines crossing the Bloch ball. The bundle consists either of parallel lines or the lines meet at a pure state, or they meet at a point outside the Bloch ball. Furthermore, C_Φ turns out to be the restriction of a Hilbert semi-norm to the state space.

More details and applications, including the entanglement of formation in $2 \times n$ systems and the Holevo capacity [20] of channels will be given in [19].

-
- [1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2000).
 - [2] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki (2007), quant-ph/0702225.
 - [3] I. Bengtsson and K. Życzkowski, *Geometry of Quantum States* (Cambridge University Press, 2006).
 - [4] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Physical Review A **54**, 3824 (1996), quant-ph/9604024.
 - [5] B. M. Terhal and K. G. H. Vollbrecht, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2625 (2000).
 - [6] K. G. H. Vollbrecht and R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 062307 (2001), quant-ph/0010095.
 - [7] S. Hill and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 5022 (1997), quant-ph/9703041.
 - [8] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998), quant-ph/9709029.
 - [9] W. K. Wootters, Quantum Information and Computation **1**, 27 (2001).
 - [10] A. Łoziński, A. Buchleitner, K. Życzkowski, and T. Wellens, Europhysics Letters **62**, 168 (2003), quant-ph/0302144.
 - [11] K. Chen, S. Albeverio, and S.-M. Fei, Physical Review Letters **95**, 040504 (2005), quant-ph/0506136.
 - [12] Y.-C. Ou, H. Fan, and S.-M. Fei (2007), arXiv:0711.2865.
 - [13] F. Benatti, H. Narnhofer, and A. Uhlmann, Rep. Math. Phys. **38**, 123 (1996).
 - [14] A. Uhlmann, Open Sys. Information Dyn. **5**, 209 (1998), quant-ph/9701014.
 - [15] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **223**, 1 (1996).
 - [16] R. T. Rockafellar, *Convex Analysis* (Princeton University Press, 1970).
 - [17] C. King and M. B. Ruskai, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **47**, 192 (2001), quant-ph/9911079.

- [18] V. Gorini and E. C. G. Sudarshan, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **46**, 43 (1976).
- [19] M. Hellmund and A. Uhlmann (2008), in preparation.
- [20] B. Schumacher and M. D. Westmoreland, *Phys. Rev. A* **56**, 131 (1997).