

A linear optical scheme to demonstrate *genuine* multipartite entanglement for single-particle W states

Hyunchul Nha*

Department of Physics, Texas A & M University at Qatar, Doha, Qatar

(Dated: May 28, 2019)

We consider the entanglement witness operator to verify *genuine* multipartite entanglement for single-particle W states involving N parties. In particular, a linear optical scheme using photo detectors and beam splitters is proposed to implement the witness operator in experiment. The scheme is shown to detect genuine multipartite entanglement for the overall efficiency beyond $1 - 1/N$.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Mn, 03.65.Ud, 42.50.Dv

I. INTRODUCTION

Entanglement, an element of central importance in quantum information processing, is still far from our complete understanding despite a great number of efforts for the past decades. Earlier works on bipartite entanglement have been naturally extended to multipartite systems, and the multipartite entanglement has been identified as a resource to implement quantum information processing to larger extent, such as error correction [1], secret sharing [2], and one-way quantum computing [3], to name a few. Nevertheless, multipartite entanglement has been far less understood, and its generation/verification in experiment seems more demanding than the bipartite ones [4].

One of the important issues regarding many-body quantum systems is to verify *genuine* multipartite entanglement among the parties in one way or another. Genuine multipartite entanglement is distinguished from other type of entanglement by the participation of *all* parties in quantum correlations, and it is particularly distinct from biseparable entanglement: Consider an N -party quantum system represented by the state of form $|\Psi\rangle \otimes |\Phi\rangle$, where $|\Psi\rangle$ belongs to the Hilbert space $H^{\otimes m}$ (m parties) and $|\Phi\rangle$ to $H^{\otimes N-m}$ ($N - m$ parties). Although this system can show quantum correlations to some degree among m parties and $N - m$ parties, respectively, it is far from true N -partite entanglement. In general, a mixed state ρ is called biseparable if it is a mixture of pure biseparable states, with different bipartitions allowed for component states. Otherwise, the state is genuinely multipartite entangled. One example of biseparable states is the tripartite system represented in the number-state basis as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{123} = & \frac{1}{3}|B\rangle\langle B|_{12} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_3 + \frac{1}{3}|B\rangle\langle B|_{23} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_1 \\ & + \frac{1}{3}|B\rangle\langle B|_{31} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_2, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $|B\rangle$ is the Bell state of two parties and $|0\rangle$ the vacuum state of the third [5].

Given an N -body system, it is an important, but non-trivial, task to determine whether the system possesses

genuine multipartite entanglement. One possible approach to this problem is to set up the entanglement witness operator \mathcal{W} [6, 7, 8, 9, 10] in such a way that the ensemble average $\text{tr}\{\rho\mathcal{W}\}$ becomes positive or zero for all biseparable states [11]. If it takes a negative value, it thus becomes a clear signature of genuine multipartite entanglement. In this paper, we consider the detection of genuine multipartite entanglement for single-particle W states based on the entanglement witness [12]. Particularly, we are interested in the implementation of the idea in an optical experiment involving beamsplitters and photodetectors. Note that the same problem was previously investigated, but in a limited context [13]. Specifically, Nha and Kim showed that the pairwise entanglement between *arbitrarily* chosen two modes can be detected regardless of the photodetector efficiency [13] using the entanglement conditions derived for continuous variables [14, 15, 16, 17]. Of course, it may indicate the multipartite entanglement structure of the W states to some extent [18], however, it is not a rigorous proof of *genuine* multipartite entanglement [5]. A counter-example is the biseparable state in Eq. (1), for which *any* two modes, when the third mode is traced out, have *nonzero* pairwise entanglement.

In this paper, we consider the well-known type of entanglement witness operators for W states and propose how to implement it in practice for single-photon W states [19]. The proposed scheme involving beam splitters and nonideal photodetectors is shown to succeed in verifying genuine multipartite entanglement for the overall efficiency over $1 - 1/N$, where N is the total number of modes. In addition, we discuss the optimization of measurement scheme for the case of non-symmetric W states. The experimental proposal in this paper manifests the physical insight that detection of entangled state can be closely related to its generation protocol, more precisely, to the entangling unitary operation along with initial product states.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we briefly introduce the entanglement witness operator and specify it for the class of W states. In Sec. III, a general idea of measuring the quantum fidelity, which is essential for the implementation of witness operator, is presented

and applied to the case of single-photon W states. In Sec. IV, the proposed scheme is analyzed with some experimental inefficiencies incorporated, and in particular, the optimization of the detection scheme for the case of asymmetrical W states is discussed. Finally, the main results of this paper are summarized in Sec. V.

II. ENTANGLEMENT WITNESS OPERATORS FOR W -CLASS STATES

In this section, we briefly introduce the entanglement witness operator to detect genuine multipartite entanglement and specify it for the class of N -partite W states. Suppose that one has produced a certain multipartite state ρ , presumably entangled and most likely mixed due to experimental imperfections, close to a *target* pure entangled state $|\Psi\rangle$. A witness operator \mathcal{W} can then be constructed in a form

$$\mathcal{W} = \alpha I - |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|, \quad (2)$$

where the constant α is taken as the maximum possible overlap of a pure biseparable state $|\phi\rangle$ with the genuine multipartite entangled state $|\Psi\rangle$. Namely,

$$\alpha = \max_{|\phi\rangle \in \mathcal{B}} |\langle\phi|\Psi\rangle|^2, \quad (3)$$

where \mathcal{B} represents the set of biseparable states [9]. It is now straightforward to see $\text{tr}\{\rho\mathcal{W}\} \geq 0$ for every biseparable state $\rho = \rho_{\mathcal{B}\mathcal{S}}$ so that only genuine multipartite entangled states can take a negative value over the witness operator \mathcal{W} . This is generally true for mixed states due to the linearity of the witness operator and the convexity of separable states.

Although it seems very demanding to find out the value of α for a given state $|\Psi\rangle$ through optimization in Eq. (3), Bourennane *et al.* identified the constant α with the maximum Schmidt coefficient of $|\Psi\rangle$ with respect to all bipartite settings [9]. More concretely, in a fixed bipartition of all parties, say $\mathcal{B}^{(k)}$ (k -th bipartition), one may choose an orthonormal product basis $|ij\rangle$, where $|i\rangle$ and $|j\rangle$ belong to the Hilbert spaces of two parties, respectively. Then, the target state $|\Psi\rangle$ is represented in the same basis as $|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{ij} C_{ij}^{(k)} |ij\rangle$ and the maximum singular value $\lambda_{\max}^{(k)}$ of the matrix $C_{ij}^{(k)}$ can be evaluated for the k -th bipartition. The same steps must be taken to obtain λ_{\max} for every possible bipartition and α corresponds to the maximum among those $\lambda_{\max}^{(k)}$.

Let us now consider the class of N -partite W states, which is represented by a form

$$|W\rangle = c_1|1, 0, \dots, 0\rangle + c_2|0, 1, \dots, 0\rangle + \dots + c_N|0, 0, \dots, 1\rangle. \quad (4)$$

Then, the constant α in Eq. (3) is evaluated as

$$\alpha = 1 - \min\{|c_i|^2\}, \quad (5)$$

where $\min\{|c_i|^2\}$ is the minimum among all $|c_i|^2$. Given the number of parties N , the constant α takes the smallest value $1 - 1/N$ for the class of symmetric W states ($c_i = 1/\sqrt{N}$ for all i), which may be thus less demanding to detect than asymmetric W states.

III. FIDELITY MEASUREMENT

In this section, we first present a general idea to implement the witness operator in experiment and then apply it to the class of single-photon W states. Once the constant α is identified in Eq. (3), the remaining task is to measure the fidelity between the reference state $|\Psi\rangle$ and the state ρ in question, namely, $\langle\Psi|\rho|\Psi\rangle$ [20], as the quantum average of the witness operator becomes $\text{tr}\{\rho\mathcal{W}\} = \alpha - \langle\Psi|\rho|\Psi\rangle$.

For the case of continuous variables, Kim *et al.* have proposed an experimental scheme to measure fidelity by mixing the two fields at a beam splitter and measuring the Wigner function of the output [21]. In particular, they considered homodyne detection to measure the fidelity of two Gaussian field states [22]. However, this approach, which needs the preparation of two states to compare, may not be suited to the case of witness operator: The reference state $|\Psi\rangle$ in the witness operator is only a target and one shall have produced instead a mixed state ρ in reality. In other words, one has no reference state to compare with the subject ρ . In this paper, another method to experimentally evaluate the fidelity, which does not rely on the preparation of reference state and proceeds only with the state ρ , is proposed as follows.

In a number of cases, a many-body entangled state $|\Psi\rangle$ can be generated from an initial product state $|\phi_1\rangle|\phi_2\rangle\cdots|\phi_N\rangle$ which subsequently undergoes some entangling unitary operations collectively represented by U . Namely,

$$|\Psi\rangle = U|\phi\rangle \equiv U|\phi_1\rangle|\phi_2\rangle\cdots|\phi_N\rangle. \quad (6)$$

Then, the fidelity of our concern can be expressed as

$$\langle\Psi|\rho|\Psi\rangle = \langle\phi|\rho'|\phi\rangle, \quad (7)$$

where

$$\rho' \equiv U^\dagger\rho U. \quad (8)$$

Consider the case that the initial product state is a collection of number states, i.e., $|\phi\rangle = |\phi_1\rangle|\phi_2\rangle\cdots|\phi_N\rangle = |n_1\rangle|n_2\rangle\cdots|n_N\rangle$. Given the multimode state ρ , the fidelity is then reduced to the photon counting distribution of the transformed state $\rho' \equiv U^\dagger\rho U$.

More precisely, the state ρ is first subjected to the *inverse* unitary operation U^\dagger to create a new state $\rho' = U^\dagger\rho U$. Next, one measures the joint probability $P_{n_1 n_2 \dots n_N}$ that the photodetector at mode i counts n_i photons for the state ρ' , that is,

$$P_{n_1 n_2 \dots n_N} = \langle n_1 | \langle n_2 | \cdots \langle n_N | \rho' | n_1 \rangle | n_2 \rangle \cdots | n_N \rangle. \quad (9)$$

This probability corresponds to the fidelity of our concern.

Let us apply the above idea to the case of single-photon W states. An arbitrary N -partite W -state of the form in Eq. (4) can be prepared by injecting a single photon into an array of beam splitters as shown in Fig. 1 [13]. Namely, $|W\rangle = U|1, 0, \dots, 0\rangle$, where the unitary operator U is a series of beam splitter actions, $U = B_{\{N-1N\}} \cdots B_{\{12\}}$. The beam splitter operator $B_{\{jj+1\}}$ transforms two adjacent modes $\{a_j, a_{j+1}\}$ into $\{a'_j, a'_{j+1}\}$ as

$$\begin{pmatrix} a'_j \\ a'_{j+1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \sin \theta_j & -\cos \theta_j \\ \cos \theta_j & \sin \theta_j \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_j \\ a_{j+1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (10)$$

where $\cos \theta_i$ ($\sin \theta_i$) denote the transmissivity (reflectivity) of the beam splitter [23]. The coefficients c_i in Eq. (4) are then given by

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 &= \sin \theta_1, \\ c_2 &= \cos \theta_1 \sin \theta_2, \\ &\vdots \\ c_j &= \left[\prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \cos \theta_i \right] \sin \theta_j, \\ &\vdots \\ c_N &= \left[\prod_{i=1}^{N-1} \cos \theta_i \right], \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

at the output. If a phase shift is additionally carried out with the amount ϕ_j at the j -th output mode, the coefficients become $\tilde{c}_j = c_j e^{-i\phi_j}$ ($j = 1, \dots, N$).

The above generation scheme suggests that the fidelity $\langle W|\rho|W\rangle = \langle 1, 0, \dots, 0|U^\dagger \rho U|1, 0, \dots, 0\rangle$ can be measured by injecting a given state ρ to the series of beam splitter in *reverse* order to produce the state $U^\dagger \rho U$ and then measuring the counting probability $P_{10\dots 0}$ that only the first detector counts one photon and the others no photons.

IV. DETECTION OF MIXED W STATES IN AN OPTIMIZED SETTING

In this section, we analyze the detection of genuine multipartite entanglement of the W -state in Eq. (4) based on the scheme outlined in Sec. III. In particular, we take into account the experimental imperfections such as non-perfect single photon source and inefficient photo detectors.

Suppose that one creates a single photon source with a success probability p_S represented by a mixed state $\rho_{\text{single}} = p_S|1\rangle\langle 1| + (1 - p_S)|0\rangle\langle 0|$ [24], which is injected to the beam-splitter array in Fig. 1. Then, the output state generated becomes

$$\rho = p_S|W\rangle\langle W| + (1 - p_S)|0 \cdots 0\rangle\langle 0 \cdots 0|, \quad (12)$$

and one wishes to detect the genuine multipartite entanglement of this mixed state.




FIG. 1: (a) Experimental scheme for generating an arbitrary single-photon W -state in Eq. (4). A single-photon at one input is injected into an array of beam splitters with the transmissivity of the j -th beam splitter given by $\cos \theta_j$. Then, the coefficients c_i in Eq. (4) are given as those in Eq. (11). (b) Experimental scheme for detecting *genuine* multipartite entanglement based on the W -class witness operator. A given N -partite state ρ , with each mode represented by b_i , is inversely injected as shown and each photo detector (PD) counts the photons at the output. See main text.

When this output entangled state is subjected to the inverse array of beam splitters in the *same* configuration as the one used in its generation (Fig. 1), the counting probability $P_{10\dots 0}$ becomes ηp_S , where η is the efficiency of the photodetectors. Now, the detection of genuine multipartite entanglement turns out to be a success under the condition

$$\alpha < \eta p_S, \quad (13)$$

where the constant α is specified in Eq. (5). In particular, for the symmetric W states, the above condition reads as

$$1 - \frac{1}{N} < \eta p_S, \quad (14)$$

in which the requirement of the overall efficiency, ηp_S , becomes the least demanding.

In the above analysis, we have considered the *same* configuration of the beam splitters to generate and detect the multipartite W states. That is, the pure W state component of the actual state ρ in Eq. (12) is the same

as the W state used as the reference in the witness operator \mathcal{W} . On the other hand, for the case of the states ρ asymmetrical under permutations, one can try to optimize the detection scheme by adjusting the reference state as follows. Given the actual state ρ in Eq. (12), which is a mixture of the target state $|W\rangle$ and the vacuum state, one may choose a different witness operator \mathcal{W}' with other W state $|W'\rangle$ in Eq. (2) as reference. Then the condition for the overall efficiency to detect genuine multipartite entanglement becomes

$$\frac{\alpha'}{|\langle W|W'\rangle|^2} < \eta p s, \quad (15)$$

where α' is the constant for the state $|W'\rangle$ in Eq. (3). Now, given the target state $|W\rangle$, it is desired to minimize the value $\frac{\alpha'}{|\langle W|W'\rangle|^2}$ by finding out the optimal reference state $|W'\rangle$.

As an example, let us consider an asymmetric tripartite W state, $|W_a\rangle = \frac{1}{2}|1, 0, 0\rangle + \frac{1}{2}|0, 1, 0\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|0, 0, 1\rangle$. The constant α for this state is $3/4=0.75$ from Eq. (5), so if one uses the state $|W_a\rangle$ itself as the reference in the witness operator, the requirement becomes $0.75 < \eta p s$. On the other hand, by minimizing the value of $\frac{\alpha'}{|\langle W_a|W'\rangle|^2}$ in Eq. (15), one finds $12 - 8\sqrt{2} \approx 0.686 < \eta p s$ with the symmetric W state $|W_s\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|1, 0, 0\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|0, 1, 0\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|0, 0, 1\rangle$ as the reference, $|W'\rangle = |W_s\rangle$.

For a fixed number of parties, N , however, one can readily show that the value of $\frac{\alpha'}{|\langle W|W'\rangle|^2}$ is tightly bounded as

$$\frac{\alpha'}{|\langle W|W'\rangle|^2} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{N}. \quad (16)$$

The equality in Eq. (16) holds for the symmetric W states, $|W\rangle = |W'\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}|1, 0, \dots, 0\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}|0, 1, \dots, 0\rangle + \dots + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}|0, \dots, 0, 1\rangle$. Therefore, in the present scheme, the overall efficiency $\eta p s$ must be greater than $1 - 1/N$ to detect genuine N -partite entanglement and the choice of symmetric W states is regarded as best from a practical point of view.

V. SUMMARY

In this paper, the approach based on the witness operator was considered to detect *genuine* multipartite entanglement for the single-photon N -partite W states. In particular, the experimental scheme using the photodetectors and the beam splitters was proposed to implement the witness operator and the threshold overall efficiency was found to be $1 - 1/N$ for the symmetrical mixed W states. The proposed scheme therefore becomes increasingly hard with the number of parties N and the tripartite case needs the modest efficiency of $2/3$ for the success of entanglement detection. It was also discussed that one can optimize the witness operator by adjusting the reference state for asymmetrical mixed W states, which usually requires higher efficiency to successfully detect entanglement.

The author is very grateful to Otfried Gühne for alerting him with the notion of genuine multipartite entanglement with the state in Eq. (1) and also to M. Suhail Zubairy for useful discussions. This work is supported by a grant from the Qatar National Research Fund.

*email:hyunchul.nha@qatar.tamu.edu

-
- [1] P. Shor, Phys. Rev. A **52**, R2493 (1995).
[2] R. Cleve, D. Gottesman, and H.-K. Lo Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 648 (1999).
[3] R. Raussendorf and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5188 (2001).
[4] Z.-W. Pan *et al.*, Nature (London) **403**, 515 (2000); C. A. Sackett *et al.*, *ibid* **404**, 256 (2000); O. Mandel *et al.*, *ibid* **425**, 937 (2003); Z. Zhao *et al.*, *ibid* **430**, 54 (2004); D. Bouwmeester, J.-W. Pan, M. Daniell, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zeilinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1345 (1999); A. Rauschenbeutel *et al.*, Science **288**, 2024 (2000); K. J. Resch, P. Walther, and A. Zeilinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 070402 (2005).
[5] O. Gühne, private communications, who remarked that the state in Eq. (1) is known among some researchers in the community.
[6] A. Acin, D. Bruss, M. Lewenstein, and A. Sanpera, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 040401 (2001).
[7] M. Lewenstein, B. Kraus, J. I. Cirac, and P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 052310 (2000).
[8] O. Gühne and P. Hyllus, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **42**, 1001 (2003).
[9] M. Bourennane *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 087902 (2004).
[10] G. Toth and O. Gühne, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 060501 (2005).
[11] Another possible method is to show much stronger violation of Bell inequalities for true N -qubit entangled states. N. Gisin and B. Bechmann-Pasquinucci, Phys. Lett. A **246**, 1 (1998); D. Collins *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 170405 (2002).
[12] The W states involving polarization-entangled photons were experimentally demonstrated in M. Eibl, N. Kiesel, M. Bourennane, C. Kurtsiefer, and H. Weinfurter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 077901 (2004); H. Mikami, Y. Li, K. Fukuoka, and T. Kobayashi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 150404 (2005); C. F. Roos *et al.*, Science **304**, 1478 (2004).
[13] H. Nha and J. Kim, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 012326 (2007).
[14] H. Nha and J. Kim, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 012317 (2006).
[15] H. Nha, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 014305 (2007).
[16] M. Hillery and M. S. Zubairy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 050503 (2006).
[17] See also E. Shchukin and W. Vogel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 230502 (2005); G. S. Agarwal and A. Biswas, New J. Phys. **7**, 211 (2005).
[18] W. Dur, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A **62**,

- 62314 (2000).
- [19] Two-party single-photon entanglement and nonlocality were experimentally demonstrated. E. Lombardi, F. Sciarrino, S. Popescu, and F. De Martini, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 070402 (2002); B. Hessmo, P. Usachev, H. Heydari, and G. Bjork, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 180401 (2004).
- [20] R. Jozsa, *J. Mod. Opt.* **41**, 2315 (1994); A. Uhlmann, *Re. Math. Phys.* **9**, 273 (1976).
- [21] M. S. Kim, J. Lee, and W. J. Munro, *Phys. Rev. A* **66**, 030301 (2002).
- [22] See also H. Nha and H. J. Carmichael, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 032336 (2005).
- [23] R. A. Campos, B. E. A. Saleh, and M. C. Teich, *Phys. Rev. A* **40**, 1371 (1989).
- [24] A. I. Lvovsky *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 050402 (2001); A. I. Lvovsky and J. Mlynek, *ibid.* **88**, 250401 (2002).