

Generic Framework to Detect and Quantify Nonclassical Correlations

Akira SaiToh,^{1,2,*} Robabeh Rahimi,^{2,†} and Mikio Nakahara^{3,2,‡}

¹*Department of Systems Innovation, Graduate School of Engineering Science,
Osaka University, Toyonaka, Osaka 560-8531, Japan*

²*Research Center for Quantum Computing, Interdisciplinary Graduate School of Science and Engineering,
Kinki University, Higashi-Osaka, Osaka 577-8502, Japan*

³*Department of Physics, Kinki University, Higashi-Osaka, Osaka 577-8502, Japan*

We introduce the concept of eigenvalue-preserving-but-not-completely-eigenvalue-preserving (EnCE) maps. Such a map preserves the eigenvalues of a density matrix when it is acting as a global operator but it may not when acting as a local operator. We point out that EnCE maps are useful for detecting and quantifying nonclassical correlations on the basis of the paradigm claiming that a bipartite quantum system described by a density matrix having no biproduct eigenbasis possesses a nonclassical correlation. A subadditive measure of nonclassical correlations is also introduced; it is defined as a sort of logarithmic fidelity.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Mn, 03.65.Ta, 03.65.Ud

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum physics is governed by completely positive maps (CP maps). Any map which is not CP (nCP) is considered to be physically unfeasible. There is, however, a class of nCP maps which are useful for characterizing entanglement. These maps are in the class of positive-but-not-completely-positive maps (PnCP maps). It has been more than a decade since the Peres-Horodecki criterion opened the mathematical study of PnCP maps [1, 2, 3]. A PnCP map Λ_{PnCP} is positive when acting as a global operator but nonpositive when acting as $I \otimes \Lambda_{\text{PnCP}}$ on a system. It maps a separable state $\rho_{\text{sep}} = \sum_i w_i \rho_i^A \otimes \rho_i^B$ of a bipartite system AB with nonnegative weights w_i to a certain (physically feasible) state, while it does not necessarily map an inseparable state to a non-negative Hermitian matrix. Thus one finds a density matrix inseparable if one detects a negative eigenvalue of the matrix obtained after acting with $I \otimes \Lambda_{\text{PnCP}}$ on the density matrix. The PnCP map theory has gathered a broad interest in relation to detecting entanglement (See, *e.g.*, Ref. [4]).

One might be curious to find an analogue of the PnCP map theory to detect nonclassical correlations often defined in different ways [5, 6, 7] than that of entanglement. We pursue the analogous theory to detect nonclassical correlations on the basis of the Oppenheim-Horodecki definition [7, 8]. They defined the class of (properly) classically correlated states as follows: A quantum bipartite system consisting of subsystems A and B is (properly) classically correlated if and only if it is de-

scribed by a density matrix having a biproduct eigenbasis, $\rho^{\text{AB}} = \sum_{j,k=1,1}^{d^A,d^B} e_{jk} |v_j^A\rangle\langle v_j^A| \otimes |v_k^B\rangle\langle v_k^B|$, where d^A (d^B) is the dimension of the Hilbert space of A (B), e_{jk} is the eigenvalue of ρ corresponding to the eigenvector $|v_j^A\rangle \otimes |v_k^B\rangle$. Thus, a quantum bipartite system consisting of subsystems A and B is nonclassically correlated if and only if it is described by a density matrix having no biproduct eigenbasis.

This definition was introduced in their discussions on an information that can be localized by applying closed LOCC (CLOCC, a branch family of the LOCC [9]) operations. The CLOCC protocol allows only local unitary operations, attaching ancillas in separable pure states, and operations to send subsystems through a complete dephasing channel. The classical/nonclassical separation is linked to a localizable information under the zero-way CLOCC protocol [7, 8] in which coherent terms are deleted completely by local players before communicating under the CLOCC protocol. A state with a biproduct eigenbasis carries information completely localizable under zero-way CLOCC and such a state can be generated and/or recovered by locally thermodynamically reversible process [7]. Other measures [10, 11] were later proposed on the basis of the same definition of classical/nonclassical correlations. In particular, Piani *et al.* [12] recently designed a measure which vanishes if and only if a state has a product eigenbasis. It is in a similar form as quantum discord [6] and defined as a distance of two different quantum mutual informations that is minimized over local maps associated with local POVMs.

This paper provides a general class of maps that can be used to detect nonclassical correlations. It is the class of eigenvalue-preserving-but-not-completely-eigenvalue-preserving (EnCE) maps. Its definition (see Definition 4 in the next section) is analogous to that of PnCP maps. What is significant is that this class includes the transposition map, a subset of CLOCC operations, and operations used to define one of the measures given by Groisman *et al* [10]. We will also introduce several

*Electronic address: saitoh@qc.ee.es.osaka-u.ac.jp; Present address: Research Center for Quantum Computing, Interdisciplinary Graduate School of Science and Engineering, Kinki University, Higashi-Osaka, Osaka 577-8502, Japan; Present electronic address: saitoh@alice.math.kindai.ac.jp

†Electronic address: rahimi@alice.math.kindai.ac.jp

‡Electronic address: nakahara@math.kindai.ac.jp

measures of nonclassical correlations on the basis of this class of maps.

Our theory starts from definitions of new classes of maps presented in Sec. II. The section provides several propositions and remarks for the use of the classes, especially for the use of the EnCE class to detect nonclassical correlations. Section III introduces measures of nonclassical correlations based on the EnCE class. Discussions and a summary is given in Sec. IV.

II. CLASSES OF MAPS AND THEIR USE

We aim to introduce an analogy of the PnCP map theory to the present paradigm of classical/nonclassical separation. For this purpose, we define our new classes of maps.

Definition 1. An eigenvalue-preserving map (EP map) Λ_{EP} is a map acting on a general $d \times d$ density matrix $\rho = \sum_{k=1}^d e_k |v_k\rangle\langle v_k|$ (here, e_k and $|v_k\rangle\langle v_k|$ are the k th eigenvalue and the corresponding projector, respectively) such that

$$\rho = \sum_{k=1}^d e_k |v_k\rangle\langle v_k| \xrightarrow{\Lambda_{\text{EP}}} \rho' = \sum_{k=1}^d e_k |v'_k\rangle\langle v'_k|,$$

where $\{|v_k\rangle\}_k$ and $\{|v'_k\rangle\}_k$ are both complete orthonormal systems (CONSs). The dimension of ρ' is equal to d .

Alternatively, we may define the EP map in the following way:

Definition 2. An EP map Λ_{EP} acting on a quantum system S is a bijection between the set of projectors $\{|v_k\rangle\langle v_k|\}_{k=1}^d$ generated from the vectors $|v_k\rangle$ of a CONS to the set of projectors $\{|v'_k\rangle\langle v'_k|\}_{k=1}^d$ generated from the vectors $|v'_k\rangle$ of a CONS for any CONS $\{|v_k\rangle\}_{k=1}^d$ of the Hilbert space of S .

Remark 1. We have not imposed linearity to EP maps. Thus it should be a common question as to how $I \otimes \Lambda_{\text{EP}}$ acts on a system if Λ_{EP} is nonlinear. It is a natural assumption that an EP map acting as a local operation $I^A \otimes \Lambda_{\text{EP}}^B$ for a composite system AB has an access to its target subsystem B only. This suggests that, given a density matrix σ^{AB} of a composite system, $I^A \otimes \Lambda_{\text{EP}}^B$ should map an eigenbasis of $\text{Tr}_A \sigma^{AB}$ to another CONS of the subsystem B . This should be true for both linear and nonlinear EP maps. Therefore, in general, we first consider an action of Λ_{EP} when it acts on a reduced density matrix of a target subsystem. It is easy to find an action of $I \otimes \Lambda_{\text{EP}}$ if such an action of Λ_{EP} can be decomposed into certain steps of linear operations that possibly depend on $\text{Tr}_A \sigma^{AB}$. If this is not the case, one has to define individually how Λ_{EP} is extended to $I \otimes \Lambda_{\text{EP}}$. An arbitrariness of a definition of such an extension is not a problem for the purpose of detecting and/or quantifying nonclassical correlations as far as a result of detection and/or quantification is unique for any density matrix.

A class of EP maps analogous to CP is defined as follows.

Definition 3. An EP map Λ is a complete EP map (CEP map) if and only if $I \otimes \Lambda$ is also an EP map for identity map I of arbitrary dimension. We denote such Λ as Λ_{CEP} .

Observation 1. One of the simplest CEP maps is $\tilde{U}(d) : \rho \rightarrow \tilde{u}\rho\tilde{u}^\dagger$ where \tilde{u} is an element of a flag manifold $\tilde{U}(d) = \text{U}(d)/\text{U}(1)^{\times d}$ (here, $\text{U}(d)$ is the d -dimensional unitary group).

We now define the PnCP analogy in the following way.

Definition 4. An EP map Λ is an EP-but-not-completely-EP map (EnCE map) if and only if there exists an identity map I of some dimension, for which $I \otimes \Lambda$ is not an EP map. We denote such Λ as Λ_{EnCE} .

We have not defined an EnCE map as a linear map. This is due to the following proposition.

Proposition 1. Any linear EP map can be decomposed into unitary transformations and a transposition. Hence any linear EnCE map can be decomposed into unitary transformations and a transposition.

Proof. Consider a linear EP map Λ_{lin} and two pure states $|x\rangle\langle x|$ and $|y\rangle\langle y|$ ($|x\rangle$ and $|y\rangle$ can be nonorthogonal to each other). Let $|x'\rangle\langle x'| = \Lambda_{\text{lin}}(|x\rangle\langle x|)$ and $|y'\rangle\langle y'| = \Lambda_{\text{lin}}(|y\rangle\langle y|)$. Consider a state $\tau = |x\rangle\langle x| + |y\rangle\langle y|$ represented under a certain CONS. As Λ_{lin} changes this CONS to a certain CONS, $\langle x|\tau|x\rangle$ is equal to $\langle x'|\Lambda_{\text{lin}}(\tau)|x'\rangle$. This suggests that $|\langle x|y\rangle| = |\langle x'|y'\rangle|$ since Λ_{lin} is a linear map. Note that this is true for any linear EP map Λ_{lin} and any two pure states $|x\rangle$ and $|y\rangle$. Therefore, by Wigner's unitary-antiunitary theorem [13], there are only two possible types for Λ_{lin} , namely, unitary and antiunitary [14] transformations acting on a target density matrix. Hence the proposition holds. \square

Historically, although the original theory for detecting entanglement started from linear PnCP maps and witnesses, recently nonlinear optimizations of witnesses are proposed for achieving wider detecting ranges [15, 16]. The theory of EnCE maps, in contrast, should involve nonlinear maps from the beginning owing to the limitation of linear EnCE maps shown in Proposition 1.

Observation 2. A unique nontrivial linear EnCE map is the transposition Λ_{T} , according to the above proposition. As an example of detecting a nonclassical correlation, consider the density matrix of a two-qubit pseudo-entangled (PS) state,

$$\rho_{\text{ps}} = (1-p)I/4 + p|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \quad (1)$$

with $|\psi\rangle = (|00\rangle + |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and $0 \leq p \leq 1$. It has a nondegenerate eigenvalue $(1+3p)/4$ and a degenerate eigenvalue $(1-p)/4$ with multiplicity 3. Its partial

transposition, $(I \otimes \Lambda_T)\rho_{ps}$, has a nondegenerate eigenvalue $(1 - 3p)/4$ and a degenerate eigenvalue $(1 + p)/4$ with multiplicity 3. These two sets of eigenvalues are different for $p > 0$, indicating the existence of a nonclassical correlation.

It should be noted that having different eigenvalues after partial transposition is a sufficient but not necessary condition for a state to have no biproduct eigenbasis. For example, a 2-qubit state

$$\rho_{0+} = \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle\langle 00| + |++\rangle\langle ++|) \quad (2)$$

with $|+\rangle = (|0\rangle + |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ has no biproduct eigenbasis because $|0\rangle\langle 0|$ and $|+\rangle\langle +|$ cannot be diagonalized simultaneously. It is clear that the partial transposition does not change the state and hence it does not detect a nonclassical correlation. We may use, instead, a nonlinear map Λ_G defined later in order to detect a nonclassical correlation of this state.

We have defined a class of EnCE maps and observed an example. As is similar to the usage of a PnCP map, the usage of an EnCE map is to find a certain change of eigenvalues of a density matrix by applying the map to a local subsystem. This is based on the following proposition.

Proposition 2. *Both $I^A \otimes \Lambda_{\text{EnCE}}^B$ and $\Lambda_{\text{EnCE}}^A \otimes I^B$ preserve the eigenvalues of a density matrix of a system AB if the density matrix has a biproduct eigenbasis.*

Proof. Let the density matrix with a biproduct eigenbasis $\{|v_j^A\rangle|v_k^B\rangle\}_{j,k=1,1}^{d^A, d^B}$ be

$$\sigma^{\text{AB}} = \sum_{j,k=1,1}^{d^A, d^B} e_{jk} |v_j^A\rangle\langle v_j^A| \otimes |v_k^B\rangle\langle v_k^B|,$$

where e_{jk} is the (jk) th eigenvalue corresponding to the (jk) th projector $|v_j^A\rangle\langle v_j^A| \otimes |v_k^B\rangle\langle v_k^B|$. As we discussed in Remark 1, any EP map acting as a local operation should map an eigenbasis of the reduced density matrix of a target subsystem to another CONS. Therefore, it is obvious that

$$(I^A \otimes \Lambda_{\text{EnCE}}^B)\sigma^{\text{AB}} = \sum_{j,k=1,1}^{d^A, d^B} e_{jk} |v_j^A\rangle\langle v_j^A| \otimes |v'_k{}^B\rangle\langle v'_k{}^B|,$$

where $\{|v'_k{}^B\rangle\}_k$ is a CONS of the Hilbert space of B, which may be different from $\{|v_k^B\rangle\}_k$. It is trivial to show the same proof applies to $\Lambda_{\text{EnCE}}^A \otimes I^B$. \square

Corollary 1. *A density matrix ρ^{AB} has no biproduct eigenbasis if either $(I^A \otimes \Lambda_{\text{EnCE}}^B)\rho^{\text{AB}}$ or $(\Lambda_{\text{EnCE}}^A \otimes I^B)\rho^{\text{AB}}$ has eigenvalues different from those of ρ^{AB} .*

Proof. This is the contraposition of Proposition 2. \square

Remark 2. There are states called *one-way classically correlated states* [8], in the form $\sum_i |i^x\rangle\langle i^x| \otimes \sigma_i^y$ with $|i^x\rangle$ a CONS of $x = A$ or B and y the remaining system; σ_i^y density operators acting on y , dependent on the index i . Such a state may have no biproduct eigenbasis but testing a change in the eigenvalues under $I^x \otimes \Lambda_{\text{EnCE}}^y$ for a single side is not enough to detect it. Therefore we need to test for both $(x, y) = (A, B)$ and $(x, y) = (B, A)$.

As we mentioned, the present theory enables a comprehensive description involving previously-defined schemes to evaluate nonclassical correlations of a bipartite system. This will be elucidated in the followings.

Groisman *et al.* [10] defined one of their measures of nonclassical correlations for a state ρ^{AB} of a bipartite system in the following way:

- (i) Find a basis that diagonalizes the state $\text{Tr}_B \rho^{\text{AB}} \otimes \text{Tr}_A \rho^{\text{AB}}$.
- (ii) Write ρ^{AB} with respect to the basis found in (i) and delete all off-diagonal elements. Denote this state as ρ' .
- (iii) The measure is calculated by a certain distance between ρ^{AB} and ρ' .

Here, we show that this measure can be written in terms of a nonlinear EnCE map.

We define an EnCE map Λ_G in the following way for this purpose. Let $\mathcal{U}_d \in \{\tilde{\mathcal{U}}(d)\}$ be an ordinary diagonalizing operation of a given Hermitian matrix and \mathcal{V} be the operation to delete all off-diagonal elements of a given matrix. Note that this diagonalization process is nonlinear. A proper unitary transformation must be found for a given density matrix of a system to act on. We set $\Lambda_G \equiv \mathcal{V} \circ \mathcal{U}_d$. It is clear that Λ_G preserves the eigenvalues of a density matrix while $I \otimes \Lambda_G \equiv (I \otimes \mathcal{V}) \circ (I \otimes \mathcal{U}_d)$ in general does not (here, this \mathcal{U}_d is an operation to diagonalize the reduced density matrix of a target subsystem). The above density matrix ρ' can be generated from ρ^{AB} by acting $\Lambda_G^A \otimes \Lambda_G^B \equiv (I^A \otimes \Lambda_G^B)(\Lambda_G^A \otimes I^B)$. Thus the measure can be written in terms of an EnCE map.

To use $I \otimes \Lambda_G$ for quantification of nonclassical correlations, one has to pay attention to the basis on which \mathcal{V} acts, in particular when there are multiple \mathcal{U}_d 's. When there are multiple \mathcal{U}_d 's for the reduced density matrix of a target subsystem, there are two possible cases: (i) For two \mathcal{U}_d 's diagonalizing a target density matrix, there exists a permutation operation (permutation of eigenvectors of a unitary matrix) that changes one to the other. (ii) a target density matrix represents a maximally mixed state. Case (i) does not cause any problem in applying \mathcal{V} since a permutation operation does no effect on resultant eigenvalues. Nevertheless, Case (ii) does effect on the resultant eigenvalues: first, one can write

$$(I^A \otimes \Lambda_G^B)(\rho^{\text{AB}}) = \sum_{i=1}^{d^B} \langle v_i^B | \rho^{\text{AB}} | v_i^B \rangle |i^B\rangle\langle i^B|$$

where ρ^{AB} is a state of a composite system AB and $\{|v_i^B\rangle\}$ is the basis on which $\text{Tr}_A \rho^{\text{AB}}$ is diagonal. Case (ii) makes the eigenvalues of the resultant state dependent on the

choice of $\{|v_i^B\rangle\}$ (the choice is totally arbitrary in the case). Therefore, one needs to impose the condition as written in the following note.

Note 1. The map \mathcal{U}_d should be set to an identity map (i.e., the dephasing operation \mathcal{V} should be performed on a computational basis) if the target subsystem of Λ_G (acting as a local operation) is represented by a maximally mixed state.

In addition, it should be notable that there is a close similarity between the map $I \otimes \Lambda_G$ and the CLOCC protocol. The operations \mathcal{U}_d and \mathcal{V} are two of the three CLOCC operations. The only missing one is attaching pure separable states as ancillas (let us denote this operation as \mathcal{E}_a). Both the composite map $\mathcal{V} \circ \mathcal{U}_d$ and the operation \mathcal{E}_a do not change eigenvalues of a density matrix although the original dimension can be altered due to ancilla attachments. We neglect the extended fraction in dimension since projectors onto this fraction correspond to vanishing eigenvalues in the system of our interest. One can find that the subset of CLOCC, $\{\mathcal{V} \circ \mathcal{U}_d, \mathcal{V} \circ \mathcal{U}_d \circ \mathcal{E}_a, \mathcal{E}_a \circ \mathcal{V} \circ \mathcal{U}_d\}$, is included in the class of EnCE.

In relation to the map Λ_G , one can prove the following proposition.

Proposition 3. *Having either the set of the eigenvalues of $(I^A \otimes \Lambda_G^B)\rho^{AB}$ or that of $(\Lambda_G^A \otimes I^B)\rho^{AB}$ different from that of ρ^{AB} is a necessary and sufficient condition for the density matrix ρ^{AB} of a bipartite system AB to have no biproduct eigenbasis.*

Proof. Proof of the sufficiency is trivial from Corollary 1.

Next, we show that it is a necessary condition. This is achieved by showing that ρ^{AB} has a biproduct eigenbasis if both $(I^A \otimes \Lambda_G^B)\rho^{AB}$ and $(\Lambda_G^A \otimes I^B)\rho^{AB}$ have the same eigenvalues as those of ρ^{AB} .

Let us write eigenbases of systems A , B , and AB as $\{|e_j^A\rangle\}_j$, $\{|e_i^B\rangle\}_i$, and $\{|e_{kl}^{AB}\rangle\}_{kl}$, respectively. Then we can write

$$(I^A \otimes \Lambda_G^B)\rho^{AB} = \sum_{k=1}^{d^A} \sum_{l=1}^{d^B} e_{kl}^{AB} \sum_{i=1}^{d^B} |x_{ikl}^A\rangle\langle x_{ikl}^A| \otimes |i^B\rangle\langle i^B|$$

with $|x_{ikl}^A\rangle = \langle e_i^B|e_{kl}^{AB}\rangle$ and

$$(\Lambda_G^A \otimes I^B)\rho^{AB} = \sum_{k=1}^{d^A} \sum_{l=1}^{d^B} e_{kl}^{AB} \sum_{j=1}^{d^A} |j^A\rangle\langle j^A| \otimes |y_{jkl}^B\rangle\langle y_{jkl}^B|$$

with $|y_{jkl}^B\rangle = \langle e_j^A|e_{kl}^{AB}\rangle$.

Let us suppose that the set of the eigenvalues of $(I^A \otimes \Lambda_G^B)\rho^{AB}$ and that of $(\Lambda_G^A \otimes I^B)\rho^{AB}$ are both equal to that of ρ^{AB} . Then, there exist eigenbases $\{|\tilde{e}_{kl}^{AB}\rangle\}_{kl}$ and $\{|\tilde{e}_{kl}^{AB}\rangle\}_{kl}$ such that

$$|\tilde{e}_{kl}^{AB}\rangle\langle \tilde{e}_{kl}^{AB}| = \sum_{i=1}^{d^B} |x_{ikl}^A\rangle\langle x_{ikl}^A| \otimes |i^B\rangle\langle i^B|$$

and

$$|\tilde{e}_{kl}^{AB}\rangle\langle \tilde{e}_{kl}^{AB}| = \sum_{j=1}^{d^A} |j^A\rangle\langle j^A| \otimes |y_{jkl}^B\rangle\langle y_{jkl}^B|.$$

These are pure states, implying that $|x_{ikl}^A\rangle$ ($|y_{jkl}^B\rangle$) should vanish except for a single particular value of i (j), for every k and l . This also implies $\langle x_{ikl}^A|x_{ikl}^A\rangle = \langle y_{jkl}^B|y_{jkl}^B\rangle = 1$. Consequently, we have

$$\langle x_{ikl}^A|x_{ikl}^A\rangle = \langle x_{ikl}^A|\langle e_i^B|e_{kl}^{AB}\rangle = 1$$

and

$$\langle y_{jkl}^B|y_{jkl}^B\rangle = \langle e_j^A|\langle y_{jkl}^B|e_{kl}^{AB}\rangle = 1.$$

These equations imply

$$|e_{kl}^{AB}\rangle = |x_{ikl}^A\rangle|e_i^B\rangle = |e_j^A\rangle|y_{jkl}^B\rangle$$

neglecting difference in global phases. Thus we have $|x_{ikl}^A\rangle = |e_j^A\rangle$ and $|y_{jkl}^B\rangle = |e_i^B\rangle$. Because of orthogonality among $|e_{kl}^{AB}\rangle$'s, $j = k$ and $i = l$ holds neglecting a sorting (Note that a classical correlation between the sequence $\{i\}$ and $\{j\}$ does not affect the fact that the basis $\{|j\rangle|i\rangle\}$ is a product basis.) Therefore, an eigenbasis $\{|e_{kl}^{AB}\rangle\}_{kl}$ of ρ^{AB} is written as the product basis $\{|e_k^A\rangle\}_k \times \{|e_l^B\rangle\}_l$ under the given condition that the eigenvalues of ρ^{AB} are preserved under both $I^A \otimes \Lambda_G^B$ and $\Lambda_G^A \otimes I^B$. \square

III. QUANTIFICATION OF NONCLASSICAL CORRELATIONS

For the next step, we define a measure of nonclassical correlations based on the theory we have seen. Note that, according to the definition, the set of classically correlated states is a nonconvex subset of the set of separable states. Thus it is not motivating to impose convexity on a measure of nonclassical correlations. We may, however, impose a family of additivity properties [17]. In particular, subadditivity will be assessed in the following.

We first define a non-subadditive measure of nonclassical correlations for a given EnCE map Λ_{EnCE} as follows. Suppose we want to quantify a nonclassical correlation of a bipartite system AB described by a density matrix ρ^{AB} . Then, we may consider the quantity with subscript R (L) indicating that the right (left) component is acted by Λ_{EnCE} :

$$D_{\text{R,L}}(\Lambda_{\text{EnCE}}, \rho^{AB}) = \sum_x |e_x - e'_x|,$$

where e_x 's are the eigenvalues of ρ^{AB} while e'_x 's are those of $(I^A \otimes \Lambda_{\text{EnCE}}^B)\rho^{AB}$ for "R" [$(\Lambda_{\text{EnCE}}^A \otimes I^B)\rho^{AB}$ for "L"]; e_x 's and e'_x 's are aligned, say, in the descending order. It is obvious that D vanishes if ρ^{AB} has a biproduct eigenbasis.

We can easily calculate $D_{R,L}(\Lambda_{\text{EnCE}}, \rho^{\text{AB}})$. For example, it is easy to calculate [20] $D_{\text{R}}(\Lambda_{\text{T}}, \rho_{\text{ps}}) = 2p$ for the two-qubit state ρ_{ps} defined in Eq. (1).

Another simple example is the quantification of a non-classical correlation for the bipartite state ρ_{0+} which has been introduced in Eq. (2). The quantity $D_{\text{R}}(\Lambda_{\text{T}}, \rho_{0+})$ vanishes while $D_{\text{R}}(\Lambda_{\text{G}}, \rho_{0+})$ does not vanish: $(I \otimes \Lambda_{\text{G}})\rho_{0+}$ has the eigenvalues $(3 \pm 2\sqrt{2})/8$ and $1/8$ (with multiplicity two) which are different from the eigenvalues of ρ_{0+} , $3/4$, $1/4$, and 0 (with multiplicity two). This results in [21] $D_{\text{R}}(\Lambda_{\text{G}}, \rho_{0+}) = 1 - 1/\sqrt{2}$.

As mentioned, these measures are neither additive nor subadditive. Additive or subadditive measures are desirable if one needs to compare systems with different dimensions. Here, a subadditive measure will be introduced. Let us formally begin with the definition of subadditivity [17].

Definition 5. Let $F(\rho^{\text{AB}})_{\text{A|B}}$ be a measure of correlations between subsystems A and B of a bipartite system AB, where A|B denotes splitting between A and B. Then, $F(\rho^{\text{AB}})_{\text{A|B}}$ is called a subadditive measure if and only if the relation $F(\rho^{\text{AB}} \otimes \sigma^{\text{CD}})_{\text{AC|BD}} \leq F(\rho^{\text{AB}})_{\text{A|B}} + F(\sigma^{\text{CD}})_{\text{C|D}}$ holds.

We find that the following quantities Q_{R} and Q_{L} satisfy the subadditivity condition if we choose the map Λ_{EnCE} properly. We define them as

$$Q_{\text{R,L}}(\Lambda_{\text{EnCE}}, \rho^{\text{AB}}) = -\log_2 \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_x \sqrt{e_x \tilde{e}_x} \right),$$

where e_x 's are the eigenvalues of ρ^{AB} and \tilde{e}_x 's are the absolute values of the eigenvalues of $(I^{\text{A}} \otimes \Lambda_{\text{EnCE}}^{\text{B}})\rho^{\text{AB}}$ for ‘‘R’’ [$(\Lambda_{\text{EnCE}}^{\text{A}} \otimes I^{\text{B}})\rho^{\text{AB}}$ for ‘‘L’’]; e_x 's and \tilde{e}_x 's are both sorted, say, in descending order; $N = \sqrt{\sum_x \tilde{e}_x}$ is a normalization factor which guarantees $Q_{\text{R,L}} \geq 0$. The measures $Q_{\text{R,L}}$ vanish if $\{e_x\} = \{\tilde{e}_x/N^2\}$. As for subadditivity, we can prove the following proposition.

Proposition 4. *The measure $Q_{\text{R}}(\Lambda_{\text{EnCE}}, \rho^{\text{AB}})$ is subadditive if the set of the eigenvalues of $(I^{\text{AC}} \otimes \Lambda_{\text{EnCE}}^{\text{BD}})(\rho^{\text{AB}} \otimes \sigma^{\text{CD}})$ are given by $\{\tilde{a}_j \tilde{b}_k\}_{jk}$ with the eigenvalues \tilde{a}_j of $(I^{\text{A}} \otimes \Lambda_{\text{EnCE}}^{\text{B}})\rho^{\text{AB}}$ and the eigenvalues \tilde{b}_k of $(I^{\text{C}} \otimes \Lambda_{\text{EnCE}}^{\text{D}})\sigma^{\text{CD}}$.*

Proof. The proof consists of two steps (i) and (ii).

(i) Consider the two sequences $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^d$ and $\{q_i\}_{i=1}^d$ of nonnegative real numbers p_i and q_i . Suppose they are sorted: $p_1 \geq p_2 \geq \dots \geq p_d$ and $q_1 \geq q_2 \geq \dots \geq q_d$. Then, a fidelity $\sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{p_i q_i}$ for these sorted sequences is larger than that for any two unsorted sequences whose entries are p_i 's and q_i 's, respectively. This is because, for real numbers $a_1, a_2, b_1,$ and b_2 such that $a_1 > a_2$ and $b_1 > b_2$, the relation $a_1 b_1 + a_2 b_2 \geq a_1 b_2 + a_2 b_1$ holds.

(ii) Let us write the eigenvalues of ρ^{AB} as a_j and those of σ^{CD} as b_k . The fidelity $F' = \sum_{j=1}^{d^{\text{A}}} \sum_{k=1}^{d^{\text{B}}} \sqrt{(a_j b_k)(\tilde{a}_j \tilde{b}_k)}/N$ with $N = \sqrt{\sum_{jk} \tilde{a}_j \tilde{b}_k}$ involves two possibly unsorted sequences $\{(a_j b_k)\}$ and

$\{(\tilde{a}_j \tilde{b}_k)\}$; these are unsorted in general even when $\{a_j\}, \{b_k\}, \{\tilde{a}_j\},$ and $\{\tilde{b}_k\}$ are individually sorted. Let us write the fidelity after sorting $\{(a_j b_k)\}$ and $\{(\tilde{a}_j \tilde{b}_k)\}$ as F . Then, $F' \leq F \leq 1$ holds according to the fact (i). Therefore, $0 \leq -\log_2 F \leq -\log_2 F' = -\log_2 F_a - \log_2 F_b$ holds with $F_a = \sum_j \sqrt{a_j \tilde{a}_j} / \sqrt{\sum_j \tilde{a}_j}$ and $F_b = \sum_k \sqrt{b_k \tilde{b}_k} / \sqrt{\sum_k \tilde{b}_k}$, where $\{a_j\}, \{b_k\}, \{\tilde{a}_j\},$ and $\{\tilde{b}_k\}$ are individually sorted. \square

It is trivial to find a similar condition for $Q_{\text{L}}(\Lambda_{\text{EnCE}}, \rho^{\text{AB}})$ to be subadditive. In addition, it is clear that $Q_{\text{R,L}}$ vanish if ρ^{AB} has a biproduct eigenbasis. These measures are a sort of logarithmic fidelity and is reminiscent of logarithmic negativity [18]. We will find that choosing Λ_{EnCE} from the maps Λ_{T} and Λ_{G} introduced in the previous section satisfies the condition of Proposition 4. As for other additivity properties, $Q_{\text{R,L}}$ is not additive or weakly additive in general owing to sortings of the eigenvalues. This is clear from the following example: For the state ρ_{0+} defined in Eq. (2), we have $Q_{\text{R}}(\Lambda_{\text{G}}, \rho_{0+}^{\text{AB}} \otimes \rho_{0+}^{\text{CD}})_{\text{AC|BD}} \simeq 0.179$; this is less than $2Q_{\text{R}}(\Lambda_{\text{G}}, \rho_{0+}^{\text{AB}})_{\text{A|B}} \simeq 0.253$.

As we have mentioned above, one map that makes the measure $Q_{\text{R,L}}$ subadditive is the transposition Λ_{T} . The subadditivity is easily verified according to the fact that $I^{\text{AC}} \otimes \Lambda_{\text{T}}^{\text{BD}} = (I^{\text{A}} \otimes \Lambda_{\text{T}}^{\text{B}})(I^{\text{C}} \otimes \Lambda_{\text{T}}^{\text{D}})$. In addition, the measures $Q_{\text{R,L}}(\Lambda_{\text{T}}, \rho^{\text{AB}})$ are invariant under local unitary operations [22].

It is also easy to find that Λ_{G} makes $Q_{\text{R,L}}$ subadditive. We know that the diagonalizing unitary transformation $\mathcal{U}_{\text{d}}^{\text{BD}}$ acting on the subsystem BD can be decomposed into $\mathcal{U}_{\text{d}}^{\text{B}} \otimes \mathcal{U}_{\text{d}}^{\text{D}}$ if the subsystem is represented by the product density matrix in the form of $\rho^{\text{B}} \otimes \rho^{\text{D}}$. Owing to this fact, we have

$$(I^{\text{AC}} \otimes \Lambda_{\text{G}}^{\text{BD}})(\rho^{\text{AB}} \otimes \sigma^{\text{CD}}) = (I^{\text{A}} \otimes \Lambda_{\text{G}}^{\text{B}})\rho^{\text{AB}} \otimes (I^{\text{C}} \otimes \Lambda_{\text{G}}^{\text{D}})\sigma^{\text{CD}}.$$

Therefore $Q_{\text{R}}(\Lambda_{\text{G}}, \rho^{\text{AB}})$ is a subadditive measure [and $Q_{\text{L}}(\Lambda_{\text{G}}, \rho^{\text{AB}})$ either]. It is invariant under local unitary operations because we first find an diagonalizing operation acting on a component system.

The problem is that Q_{R} and Q_{L} are different in general. To solve this problem, we suggest to use the average

$$\tilde{Q}(\Lambda_{\text{EnCE}}, \rho^{\text{AB}}) = \frac{Q_{\text{R}}(\Lambda_{\text{EnCE}}, \rho^{\text{AB}}) + Q_{\text{L}}(\Lambda_{\text{EnCE}}, \rho^{\text{AB}})}{2}.$$

This becomes subadditive and invariant under local unitary operations if both Q_{R} and Q_{L} are subadditive and invariant under local unitary operations. It is easy to find that Λ_{T} and Λ_{G} are both useful for this purpose.

IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We have seen several different usages of the EnCE map theory. We believe that this theory works as a useful template to detect and quantify nonclassical correlations

based on the Oppenheim-Horodecki separation of classical/nonclassical correlations. The separation can be regarded as a paradigm different from the separability paradigm; an increasing number of theoretical investigations has been made [8, 10, 11, 12, 19] on the basis of the separation.

The EnCE map theory has been constructed in analogy to the PnCP map theory in the present paper. One important difference between these theories is that the class of EnCE maps includes nonlinear EnCE maps. This is because linear EnCE maps are very limited due to the fact that any linear EP map can be decomposed into unitary operations and a transposition (Proposition 1). Nonlinearity of a map is not a significant problem as far as $I \otimes \Lambda_{\text{EnCE}}$ (and $\Lambda_{\text{EnCE}} \otimes I$) is defined clearly for an EnCE map Λ_{EnCE} , for linearity is not a prerequisite condition to detect a nonclassical correlation using Corollary 1. We have discussed on this issue in Remark 1 in detail.

It is also beneficial to discuss the merit to employ a paradigm different from the separability paradigm. The mathematical difficulty to detect and quantify entanglement would be a motivation to use a classical/nonclassical separation that is easy to handle. As we have seen, an EnCE map giving the necessary and sufficient condition for a state to have no biproduct eigenbasis is available (Proposition 3). The use of this map enables

a simple and deterministic way of detecting nonclassical correlations. We are still far from wrapping up long-standing discussions on the classical/nonclassical separation. What can be said is that a valid definition is dependent on a context and it is expected that mathematical complexity should be taken into account.

In summary, a comprehensive framework, called the EnCE map theory, to detect and quantify nonclassical correlations of a bipartite system has been proposed. We have seen that some different schemes are included in this framework. The average logarithmic fidelity $\tilde{Q}(\Lambda_{\text{EnCE}}, \rho^{\text{AB}})$ has been proposed as a subadditive measure for a properly-chosen EnCE map Λ_{EnCE} .

Acknowledgments

AS and RR are supported by the Grant-in-Aids from JSPS (Grant No. 1808962 and Grant No. 1907329). MN would like to thank a partial support of the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research from JSPS (Grant No. 19540422). MN and AS are also supported by ‘‘Open Research Center’’ Project for Private Universities: matching fund subsidy from MEXT.

-
- [1] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1413 (1996).
 [2] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **223**, 1 (1996).
 [3] P. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **232**, 333 (1997).
 [4] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, quant-ph/0702225.
 [5] 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).
 [6] H. Ollivier and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 017901 (2001).
 [7] J. Oppenheim, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 180402 (2002).
 [8] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, A. Sen(De), U. Sen, and B. Synak-Radtke, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 062307 (2005).
 [9] M. B. Plenio and S. Virmani, Quant. Inf. Comp. **7**, 1 (2007).
 [10] B. Groisman, D. Kenigsberg, and T. Mor, e-print quant-ph/0703103.
 [11] A. SaiToh, R. Rahimi, and M. Nakahara, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 052101 (2008).
 [12] M. Piani, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 090502 (2008).
 [13] E. P. Wigner, J. Math. Phys. **1**, 414 (1960); C. S. Sharma and D. F. Almeida, Ann. Phys. **197**, 300 (1990).
 [14] E. P. Wigner, J. Math. Phys. **1**, 409 (1960).
 [15] O. Guhne and N. Lutkenhaus, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 170502 (2006).
 [16] C-J. Zhang, Y-S. Zhang, S. Zhang, and G-C. Guo, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 012334 (2007).
 [17] C. H. Bennett, A. W. Harrow, D. W. Leung, and J. A. Smolin, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **49**, 1895 (2003).
 [18] M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 090503 (2005); K. Życzkowski, P. Horodecki, A. Sanpera, and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 883 (1998); G. Vidal and R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 032314 (2002).
 [19] L. Pankowski and B. Synak-Radtke, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor., **41**, 075308 (2008).
 [20] The calculation is as follows. $D_R(\Lambda_T, \rho_{\text{ps}}) = [(1+3p)/4 - (1+p)/4] + 2 \times [(1+p)/4 - (1-p)/4] + [(1-p)/4 - (1-3p)/4] = 2p$.
 [21] The calculation is as follows. $D_R(\Lambda_G, \rho_{0+}) = [3/4 - (3+2\sqrt{2})/8] + [1/4 - 1/8] + 1/8 + (3-2\sqrt{2})/8 = 1 - 1/\sqrt{2}$.
 [22] Its invariance under local unitary operations (say, U^{B}) follows from $(I^{\text{A}} \otimes \Lambda_{\text{T}}^{\text{B}})(I^{\text{A}} \otimes U^{\text{B}} \rho^{\text{AB}} I^{\text{A}} \otimes U^{\dagger \text{B}}) = (I^{\text{A}} \otimes U^{*\text{B}})(I^{\text{A}} \otimes \Lambda_{\text{T}}^{\text{B}} \rho^{\text{AB}})(I^{\text{A}} \otimes U^{\dagger \text{B}})$.