

Evolution of quantum entanglement of two finite dimensional systems

Markus Tiersch,* Fernando de Melo, and Andreas Buchleitner
*Physikalisches Institut, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg,
Hermann-Herder-Str. 3, D-79104 Freiburg, Germany*

We provide a relation which describes how the entanglement of two d -level systems, quantified by G-concurrence, evolves as either system undergoes an arbitrary physical process. The dynamics of the entanglement turns out to be of a simple form, and is fully captured by a single quantity.

The endeavour to construct quantum devices, able to carry out envisioned quantum information and computation tasks, requires to go beyond systems with only a few quantum states. However, the inevitable interaction of such devices with their environment causes typical quantum properties such as coherence and entanglement to fade away. In order to prevail, we first need to understand and profile characteristic quantum properties. But characterizing their dynamics will quickly render a tedious venture. For instance, entanglement measures, which quantify the amount of entanglement in the system, can only be computed from the system's statistical operator ρ , which contains all the information about the quantum system's state and is experimentally obtained by carrying out a full state tomography, i.e. statistics of a complete set of measurements. For a quantum system of d levels d^2 measurements are necessary to obtain its statistical operator, and therefore $(d \times d)^2$ measurements if the entanglement of two d -level systems is to be determined. While thus the required resources are minimal for pairs of qubits, it is of direct operational interest to describe the dynamics of the entanglement of $d > 2$ -level systems, which improve the performance of various quantum information and computation tasks, such as quantum cryptography [1, 2], and are employed in many implementations [3, 4].

Statements about the evolution of the entanglement of two quantum systems have up to recently [5] always required to determine the system's final state, from which subsequently the entanglement was computed. With a rapidly increasing number of parameters for general initial states and quantum processes virtually no general statements about the dynamics of entanglement were known. In this letter, we generalize the results for two two-level systems [5], the smallest system exhibiting entanglement, by extending it to the evolution of bipartite entanglement in arbitrarily many but finite degrees of freedom, i.e. of $(d \times d)$ -systems, under general dynamics without relying on the determination of the final state.

The setup we consider consists of two initially entangled d -level systems, of which one undergoes an arbitrary physical process, in general some open system dynamics in which it interacts with uncontrolled and not measurable degrees of freedom of its environment. Such pro-

cesses are often referred to as channels, maps or super-operators [6, 7, 8]. We denote them by $\$$. Starting with a pure state $|\chi\rangle$ the system's final state then takes the form

$$\rho' = (\mathbb{1} \otimes \$)|\chi\rangle\langle\chi|. \quad (1)$$

Thereafter, we quantify the entanglement still exhibited by the system using G-concurrence [9], which reduces to concurrence [10] when restricting to two two-level systems. For a pure state $|\chi\rangle$ it is the geometric mean of its d Schmidt coefficients λ_i ($i = 1, \dots, d$). However, when $|\chi\rangle$ is given as $|\chi\rangle = \sum_{i,j=1}^d A_{ij}|i\rangle|j\rangle$ with basis states $|i\rangle$ and $|j\rangle$ for the respective subsystems, G-concurrence is more conveniently evaluated by

$$G_d(|\chi\rangle) = d [\det(A^\dagger A)]^{1/d}. \quad (2)$$

For mixed states ρ G-concurrence is calculated through the usual minimization procedure of the ensemble's average, $G_d(\rho) = \inf \sum_i p_i G_d(|\phi_i\rangle)$, over all possible decompositions $\rho = \sum_i p_i |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|$ (with $p_i > 0$ and $\sum_i p_i = 1$). An attempt for an analytical result of this optimization procedure similar to the one done by Wootters for concurrence [10] yielded computable upper and lower bounds [11]. Although we consider a $(d \times d)$ -system, this framework also allows for the setup of a $(d \times f)$ -system (assuming $d \leq f$ without restricting generality) as well, since pure states (and the pure state vectors that form a decomposition of a mixed state) of such a system can exhibit entanglement in at most d levels, as for instance seen in their Schmidt-representation.

Even though we choose a much more general setup than in the proof for the simple case of a (2×2) -system [5], we will largely argue along the same lines, exploiting some specific algebraic properties of G-concurrence. In order to evaluate the entanglement of the final state ρ' , we first need to express the initial pure state $|\chi\rangle$ as the result of a so-called filtering operation M_χ [12] acting on either party of a maximally entangled state $|\Phi\rangle$, i.e.

$$|\chi\rangle = (M_\chi \otimes \mathbb{1})|\Phi\rangle, \quad (3)$$

with $M_\chi = \sqrt{d} \sum_{i,j=1}^d A_{ij}|i\rangle\langle j|$ here acting on the first subsystem of $|\Phi\rangle = \sum_{n=1}^d |n\rangle|n\rangle/\sqrt{d}$. Note that such filtering is always possible, for arbitrary $|\chi\rangle$, given its matrix representation A_{ij} . The channel represented by

*Electronic address: markus.tiersch@physik.uni-freiburg.de

the filtering operation M_χ and the state $|\chi\rangle$ are isomorphic [13].

Given the filtering M_χ and the channel $\$,$ which act on different and possibly spatially separated parts of the system, the temporal order of their execution must not be of influence to the final state, and we can exchange their order in our representation of ρ' ,

$$\rho' = (M_\chi \otimes \mathbb{1})\rho_{\S}(M_\chi^\dagger \otimes \mathbb{1}), \quad (4)$$

where we introduced the result of the channel $\$$ acting on the maximally entangled state, $\rho_{\S} = (\mathbb{1} \otimes \$)|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|$, which is mixed in general. Again, state ρ_{\S} and channel $\$$ are related to each other via the Jamiołkowski isomorphism [13]. Summarizing these two steps above, we have transformed the initial setup via the Jamiołkowski isomorphism into the dual one, where the role of states (ρ_{\S} replaces $|\chi\rangle$) and channels (M_χ replaces $\$$) is interchanged. As in [5] one may also arrive at this point by inserting an intermediate teleportation procedure before the d -level system undergoes the action of the channel.

Having arrived at this particular form (4) of the final state ρ' , our chosen entanglement measure, G-concurrence for a $(d \times d)$ -system, factorizes much as concurrence does for the (2×2) -case [5]. That is, G-concurrence exhibits the particular property that a single operator acting on either one of the subsystems simply factors out [9, 14]: $G_d[(M \otimes \mathbb{1})|\psi\rangle] = |\det(M)|^{2/d} G_d(|\psi\rangle)$. Applying this to the dual form of the final state (4) (in this very form [15]) and realizing that the determinant of M_χ relates to the G-concurrence of the initial state $|\chi\rangle$, yields our core result

$$G_d[(\mathbb{1} \otimes \$)|\chi\rangle\langle\chi|] = G_d(|\chi\rangle) G_d[(\mathbb{1} \otimes \$)|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|]. \quad (5)$$

The entanglement of two d -level systems in terms of G-concurrence evolves equally for all pure states $|\chi\rangle$, is solely given by the evolution of a maximally entangled state, and merely rescaled by the initial entanglement. This effectively reduces the vast space of initial conditions to a single one.

For general, i.e. mixed, initial states ρ_0 and/or two one-sided channels $\$_1 \otimes \$_2$ one arrives, due to the convexity property of entanglement monotones [9, 16, 17], at an inequality with an upper bound

$$G_d[(\$_1 \otimes \$_2)\rho_0] \leq G_d(\rho_0) G_d[(\$_1 \otimes \$_2)|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|]. \quad (6)$$

Here equality holds, for example, in case of pure initial states and two channels, if the filtering operation M_χ and either of the channels, $\$_1$ or $\$_2$, commute – such that the order of the execution of the channels and of the filtering can be interchanged, in order to achieve a factorization as found above for one-sided channels.

Let us contemplate the physical content of eq. (5): Since G-concurrence – computed from the product of *all* Schmidt-coefficients of a state – vanishes if at least one of the Schmidt coefficients is zero, it measures entanglement in exactly d levels. Whenever the bipartite

system under study undergoes some dynamics which induce a redistribution of amplitudes to strictly less than d levels, G-concurrence vanishes, while entanglement on a strict subset of levels may prevail. For a channel with a continuous time evolution, e.g. governed by a Lindblad-type equation, the system's state evolves continuously within the set of states. Thus, when initially prepared in a state with non-vanishing G-concurrence, it is guaranteed to exhibit non-vanishing G-concurrence at least during an initial, *finite* time interval, and the time evolution of entanglement during this period is described by our result (5). At later times, one has to rely on a hierarchy of entanglement monotones $C_k(|\psi\rangle)$, for example those which were defined along with G-concurrence (being the last member of the hierarchy $G_d \equiv C_d$) [9]. Similarly to G-concurrence, they are computed from the sum of all different products of k Schmidt coefficients, and hence capture the entanglement of exactly k levels. For them we similarly derive

$$C_k[(\mathbb{1} \otimes \$)|\chi\rangle\langle\chi|] \leq C_k(|\chi\rangle) C_k[(\mathbb{1} \otimes \$)|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|] \binom{d}{k}^{1/k}, \quad (7)$$

with an additional binomial coefficient [18] which accounts for the different possibilities to select k out of d levels.

Finally, we conclude with a remarkable observation which suggests that the time evolution of G-concurrence is intimately related to the evolution of the entanglement as quantified by concurrence [19]: For this we choose an entangled pure state with non-vanishing G-concurrence and expose one of the d -level systems for a time t to a depolarizing environment. In such environments all possible errors occur with the same rate Γ . The dynamics of G-concurrence during this procedure is then, by virtue of (5), entirely determined by the dynamics of the maximally entangled state. Depolarizing one subsystem thereof produces isotropic states [20], which can be parameterized by

$$\rho_F = \frac{1-F}{d^2-1}(\mathbb{1} - |\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|) + F|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|. \quad (8)$$

The dynamics of the state along this line segment can for instance be obtained from solving the Lindblad-equation (Markovian environment assumed) which then results in $F(t) = [1 + (d^2 - 1)\exp(-2d\Gamma t)]/d^2$. Thus, the state starts out as a maximally entangled state with $F(0) = 1$, and closes in towards the totally mixed state $1/d^2$, at $F = 1/d^2$, asymptotically in time. The condition that an isotropic state be of Schmidt number k [21, 22], namely if and only if $k - 1 < Fd \leq k$ [22], then determines the points in time when the Schmidt number drops. Thus, the drop from Schmidt number $k + 1$ to k occurs at time $t_k = \log[(d^2 - 1)/(dk - 1)]/(2d\Gamma)$ and hence entanglement measures measuring only entanglement in *more* than k levels vanish. In particular, for $F(t_1) = 1/d$ with $t_1 = \log(d + 1)/(2d\Gamma)$, the state turns separable, whereas for $F(t_{d-1}) = (d - 1)/d$, at time




FIG. 1: Evolution of concurrence and Schmidt number as one party of the maximally entangled state $|\Phi\rangle$ ($d = 5$) passes through a depolarizing channel with rate Γ (resulting in isotropic states). The initial decay of entanglement is well approximated (linearly) by the entanglement at time 0 (C_{max}) and when the Schmidt number drops for the first time (here from 5 to 4, with the initial entanglement reduced by a fraction $1/(d - 1)$), which is exactly when G-concurrence vanishes.

$t_{d-1} = \log[(d^2 - 1)/(d^2 - d - 1)]/(2d\Gamma)$, G-concurrence disappears. The inverse of this depletion time of G-concurrence then constitutes a characteristic rate Γ_G for the decay of G-concurrence, and we have to compare this value to the decay rate Γ_C of the generalized concurrence C [19] (which vanishes if and only if the state is separable). Due to the high symmetry of isotropic states the

infimum optimization can be carried out analytically [23], and, when normalized, yields

$$C(\rho_F) = (Fd - 1)/(d - 1), \quad (9)$$

for $1/d \leq F \leq 1$, and $C(\rho_F) = 0$ otherwise. For the chosen dynamics, that are encoded in $F(t)$, it decays exponentially with a small offset, that guarantees it to vanish at time t_1 . Its time derivative then determines the rate $\Gamma_C(t)$ at which concurrence decays. Comparing the decay rate Γ_G of G-concurrence to the decay rate $\Gamma_C(t)$ of concurrence, at short times as illustrated in Fig. 1, yields a *state-independent* proportionality factor which only depends on the system dimension:

$$\frac{\Gamma_G}{\Gamma_C(0)} = \frac{d}{(d - 1) \log\left(\frac{d^2 - 1}{d^2 - d - 1}\right)} \stackrel{d \gg 1}{\approx} d. \quad (10)$$

This indicates that the dynamics of G-concurrence and concurrence are much interrelated with one-another although G-concurrence detects only a very specific type of entanglement, that is entanglement in exactly d levels. It also suggests that G-concurrence already exhibits most properties of the evolution of entanglement in general – in particular at short times, when entanglement control is most crucial for possible applications.

Helpful discussions and comments by M. Piani, J. Eisert, and F. Brandão are gratefully acknowledged. F. de M. also acknowledges the financial support by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

-
- [1] T. Durt, N. Cerf, N. Gisin, and Marek Żukowski, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 012311 (2003).
- [2] S. P. Walborn, D. S. Lemelle, M. P. Almeida, and P. H. Souto Ribeiro, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 090501 (2006).
- [3] S. Bartlett, H. de Guise, and B. Sanders, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 052316 (2002).
- [4] A. Bishop and M. Byrd, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 012314 (2008).
- [5] T. Konrad, F. de Melo, M. Tiersch, Ch. Kasztelan, A. Aragão, and A. Buchleitner, Nature Physics **4**, 99 (2008).
- [6] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [7] K. Kraus, *States, Effects and Operations: Fundamental Notions of Quantum Theory*, Springer Berlin, 1983.
- [8] J. Preskill, *Lecture Notes on Quantum Information and Computation*, <http://www.theory.caltech.edu/people/preskill/ph219>
- [9] G. Gour, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 012318 (2005).
- [10] W. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998).
- [11] G. Gour, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 042318 (2005).
- [12] N. Gisin, Phys. Lett. A **210**, 151 (1996).
- [13] A. Jamiolkowski, Rep. Math. Phys. **3**, 275 (1972).
- [14] F. Verstraete, J. Dehaene, and B. DeMoor, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 010101(R) (2001).
- [15] The factorization itself occurs inside the optimization procedure for the mixed state ρ_S : The G-concurrence of the final state evaluates as $G_d(\rho') = \inf_{\{p_i, |\phi_i\rangle\}} \sum_i p_i G_d[(M_\chi \otimes \mathbb{1})|\phi_i\rangle]$, where the $\{p_i, |\phi_i\rangle\}$ define a pure state decomposition of ρ_S . It is sufficient to optimize over a pure state decomposition of ρ_S instead of ρ' (given by $\{p_i, (M_\chi \otimes \mathbb{1})|\phi_i\rangle\}$) if the M_χ are invertible – which is the case if $|\chi\rangle$ is entangled in d -levels.
- [16] C. Bennett, D. DiVincenzo, J. Smolin, and W. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824 (1996).
- [17] G. Vidal, J. Mod. Opt. **47**, 355, (2000).
- [18] We used the definition of C_k in terms of the k -th compound matrix in [9]. The resulting Hilbert–Schmidt norm is then factorized using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality.
- [19] P. Rungta, V. Bužek, C. Caves, M. Hillery, and G. J. Milburn, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 042315 (2001).
- [20] M. Horodecki and P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 4206 (1999).
- [21] Mixed states with Schmidt number k cannot be decomposed into pure states which all have Schmidt rank smaller than k ; formally: $k = \min_{\{p_i, |\phi_i\rangle\}} [\max_i k(|\phi_i\rangle)]$.
- [22] B. Terhal and P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 040301(R) (2000).

[23] P. Rungta and C. Caves, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 012307 (2003).