

An additive and operational entanglement measure—the conditional entanglement of mutual information

Dong Yang⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾, Michał Horodecki⁽³⁾, and Z. D. Wang⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾*Department of Physics and Center of Theoretical and Computational Physics,
The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, China*

⁽²⁾*Laboratory for Quantum Information, China Jiliang University, Hangzhou, Zhejiang 310018, China*

⁽³⁾*Institute of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, University of Gdańsk, 80-952 Gdańsk, Poland*

(Dated: February 6, 2020)

Based on the monogamy of entanglement, we develop the technique of quantum conditioning to build an *additive* entanglement measure—the conditional entanglement of mutual information. Its *operational* meaning is elaborated to be the minimal net "flow of qubits" in the process of partial state merging. The result and conclusion can also be generalized to multipartite entanglement cases.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Mn, 03.67.Hk, 03.65.Ca

Entanglement, as a key resource and ingredient in quantum information and computation as well as communication, plays a crucial role in quantum information theory. It is necessary to quantify entanglement from different standpoints. A number of entanglement measures have been formulated, and their properties have been explored extensively (see, e.g., Ref.[1, 2] and references therein). Nevertheless several questions are needed to be answered, especially: i) how to systematically introduce new entanglement measures. It is likely accepted that an appropriate entanglement measure is necessarily non-increasing under local operations and classical communication (LOCC). But few approaches to construct entanglement measures are known. For example, the entanglement of formation E_f [3] is established via the technique of "convex roof" and the relative entropy of entanglement E_r [4] is based on a concept of "distance". ii) the operational meaning. Entanglement measures are largely studied by the monotonicity under LOCC operations, but little is known for the operational meaning except the distillable entanglement E_d [3] and entanglement of cost E_c [5]. Just recently, a new paradigm to explain entanglement measures is proposed based on quantum communication [6], where squashed entanglement E_{sq} [7] obtains its meaning. iii) additivity. Additivity is a very desirable property that can largely reduce the entanglement calculation. Since quantum mechanics is statistical, generally the entanglement measure has the operational meaning in an asymptotic regime of many copies. For additive measures, it is reduced to a single copy. Additivity holds for squashed entanglement E_{sq} [7] and logarithmic negativity E_N [8, 9], and is conjectured to hold for E_f , but E_r is nonadditive [10]. iv) multipartite entanglement. Multipartite entanglement is more intricate. So far, most of existing entanglement measures are constructed for bipartite state except that E_r and E_{sq} can be generalized to multipartite case [4, 11].

In this paper, based on the monogamy of entanglement, we develop the technique of quantum conditioning of correlation function to construct entanglement mea-

asures. Taking the quantum mutual information as the correlation function, we formulate a new entanglement measure—the conditional entanglement of mutual information. Remarkably, it is additive and has an operational meaning and can straightforwardly be generalized to multipartite cases.

Let's begin with the question how to build an entanglement measure. The monogamy of entanglement [12] is a good starting point. It tells that entanglement is a type of quantum correlation that cannot be shared. This feature is distinct from the classical correlation that can be shared. A simple example is the Bell state $|\Phi\rangle_{AB} = 1/\sqrt{2}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$ between Alice and Bob. Monogamy of the pure entangled state $|\Phi\rangle_{AB}$ excludes the possibility that any other party could correlate with. It is different for the classical correlated state $\rho_{AB} = 1/2(|00\rangle\langle 00| + |11\rangle\langle 11|)$. Obviously another party Charlie can share the correlation with the form $\rho_{ABC} = 1/2(|000\rangle\langle 000| + |111\rangle\langle 111|)$. The example is the extremal case in which quantum correlation and classical one are well separated. However it is not the case for a generic mixed state. A correlation function $f(A : B)$ [13, 14], for instance quantum mutual information, usually contains quantum correlation and classical one, and is 'dirty' in the sense that quantum correlation and classical one are interwound in a complex way that cannot be separated neatly. How can we 'distill' a 'neat' quantum correlation? The technique is quantum extension and quantum conditioning. Quantum extension means that given a state ρ_{AB} , we imbed it into a larger state $\rho_{AA'BB'}$ such that ρ_{AB} is the reduced state of $\rho_{AA'BB'}$, i.e. $\text{tr}_{A'B'}\rho_{AA'BB'} = \rho_{AB}$. Apparently $f(AA' : BB')$ is larger than $f(A : B)$. To return a correlation measure for ρ_{AB} , we simply take the form of $f(AA' : BB') - f(A' : B')$. Now the argument is: $f(AA' : BB')$ involves correlation for quantum and classical one in a complex way. So does $f(A' : B')$. Notice that quantum correlation in $A : B$ is unsharable means it only exists in $A : B$ and cannot in $A' : B'$. However classical correlation is sharable that means its existence

in $A : B$ is probably shared in $A' : B'$. In short $f(A' : B')$ *cannot* have the quantum correlation in $A : B$ but *may* have the classical one in $A : B$. To obtain a quantum correlation measure, we take the infimum over all quantum extensions that means classical correlation is subtracted as much as possible. For a correlation function $f(\cdot)$, we have two candidates for its conditioned version

$$C_f^s(\rho_{AB}) = \inf[f(\rho_{AA':BB'}) - f(\rho_{A':B'})], \quad (1a)$$

$$C_f^a(\rho_{AB}) = \inf[f(\rho_{A:BE}) - f(\rho_{A:E})], \quad (1b)$$

where infimum is taken over all extensions $\rho_{AA'BB'}$ (ρ_{ABE}) of ρ_{AB} . $C_f^s(\cdot)$ is the symmetric conditioned version of f while $C_f^a(\cdot)$ the asymmetric one. Note that the above definition is similar to that of conditional entropy [15] $S(A|B) = S(AB) - S(B)$ with $S(\rho)$ as the von Neumann entropy $S(\rho) = -\text{Tr}\rho \log \rho$, and thus referred to as *conditional entanglement*. As a matter of fact, squashed entanglement can be constructed by taking asymmetric conditioning of mutual information, $E_{sq}(\rho_{AB}) = \frac{1}{2} \inf\{I(A : BE) - I(A : E)\} \equiv \frac{1}{2} \inf I(A : B|E)$, where $I(X : Y) = S(X) + S(Y) - S(XY)$ is quantum mutual information and $I(A : B|E) = S(AE) + S(BE) - S(ABE) - S(E)$ is conditional mutual information. It is notable that $I(A : BE) - I(A : E) = I(AE : B) - I(E : B)$ is symmetric w.r.t. systems AB though each term in the formula is asymmetric w.r.t. both parties. This gives the possibility to build symmetric entanglement measures by asymmetric conditioning. It is surprising that a 'neat' quantum correlation can be gotten by subtracting two 'dirty' functions. Does this approach really work? The answer is YES. We illustrate that a new entanglement measure can indeed be constructed by taking f to be quantum mutual information in the symmetric version. We add a factor 1/2 and denote it by E_I . Most intriguingly, we show below that E_I is additive, has an operational meaning, and can be directly generalized to multipartite states where the factor 1/2 has a good reason to exist.

Definition 1 Let ρ_{AB} be a mixed state on a bipartite Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$. The conditional entanglement of mutual information for ρ_{AB} is defined as

$$E_I(\rho_{AB}) = \inf \frac{1}{2} \{I(AA' : BB') - I(A' : B')\}, \quad (2)$$

where the infimum is taken over all extensions of ρ_{AB} , i.e., over all states satisfying the equation $\text{Tr}_{A'B'} \rho_{AA'BB'} = \rho_{AB}$.

To justify that E_I is an appropriate entanglement measure, we now elaborate that it does satisfy two essential axioms that an entanglement measure should obey [1].

1. *Entanglement does not increase under local operations and classical communication (LOCC) i. e. $E_I(\Lambda(\rho)) \leq E_I(\rho)$, for any LOCC operation Λ .* The monotonicity under LOCC implies that entanglement

remains invariant under local unitary transformations. This comes from the fact local unitary transformations are reversible LOCC. The convexity of entanglement used to be considered as a mandatory ingredient of the mathematical formulation of monotonicity [1, 16]. Now the convexity is merely a convenient mathematical property. Also there is a common agreement that the strong monotonicity—monotonicity *on average* under LOCC is unnecessary but useful [1, 16]. Many known existing entanglement measures are convex and satisfy the strong monotonicity. We will show that E_I satisfies the strong monotonicity.

From a symmetry consideration, it is sufficient to prove that E_I is non-increasing under a measurement on subsystem A, namely, $E_I(\rho_{AB}) \geq \sum_k p_k E_I(\tilde{\rho}_{AB}^k)$, where $\tilde{\rho}_{AB}^k = A_k \rho_{AB} A_k^\dagger / p_k$, $p_k = \text{tr} A_k \rho_{AB} A_k^\dagger$, and $\sum_k A_k^\dagger A_k = I_A$. Another way to describe the measurement process is as following. First, one attaches two ancillary systems A_0 and A_1 in states $|0\rangle_{A_0}$ and $|0\rangle_{A_1}$ to system AB . Secondly, a unitary operation $U_{AA_0A_1}$ on AA_0A_1 is performed. Thirdly, the system A_1 is traced out to get the state as $\tilde{\rho}_{A_0AB} = \sum_k A_k \rho_{AB} A_k^\dagger \otimes (|k\rangle\langle k|)_{A_0}$. Now for any extension state $\rho_{AA'BB'}$, we get the state after the measurement on A, $\tilde{\rho}_{A_0AA'BB'} = \sum_k A_k \rho_{AA'BB'} A_k^\dagger \otimes (|k\rangle\langle k|)_{A_0} = \sum_k p_k \tilde{\rho}_{AA'BB'}^k \otimes (|k\rangle\langle k|)_{A_0}$. Most crucially, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & I(\rho_{AA':BB'}) - I(\rho_{A':B'}) \\ &= I(0_{A_0A_1} \otimes \rho_{AA':BB'}) - I(\rho_{A':B'}) \end{aligned} \quad (3a)$$

$$= I(U_{A_0A_1A}(0_{A_0A_1} \otimes \rho_{AA':BB'})) - I(\rho_{A':B'}) \quad (3b)$$

$$\geq I(\tilde{\rho}_{A_0AA':BB'}) - I(\tilde{\rho}_{A':B'}) \quad (3c)$$

$$= \sum_k p_k [I(\tilde{\rho}_{AA':BB'}^k) - I(\tilde{\rho}_{A':B'}^k)]$$

$$+ \sum_k p_k I(\tilde{\rho}_{A':B'}^k) - I(\tilde{\rho}_{A':B'})$$

$$+ S(\tilde{\rho}_{BB'}) - \sum_k p_k S(\tilde{\rho}_{BB'}^k)$$

$$= \sum_k p_k [I(\tilde{\rho}_{AA':BB'}^k) - I(\tilde{\rho}_{A':B'}^k)]$$

$$+ \chi(BB') + \chi(A'B') - \chi(A') - \chi(B')$$

$$\geq \sum_k p_k [I(\tilde{\rho}_{AA':BB'}^k) - I(\tilde{\rho}_{A':B'}^k)] \quad (3d)$$

where $\chi(\rho) = S(\rho) - \sum_k p_k S(\rho^k)$ is the Holevo quantity of the ensemble $\{p_k, \rho^k\}$. The equality of (3b) comes from that quantum mutual information is invariant under local unitary operation, while the inequalities of (3c) and (3d) stem from, respectively, the facts that quantum mutual information and the Holevo quantity are non-increasing by tracing subsystem. Consequently, we prove that E_I is non-increasing on average under LOCC operation.

2. *Entanglement is not negative and is zero for separable states.* The inequality $E_I \geq 0$ comes from the fact that the quantum mutual information is non-increasing

under tracing subsystems of both sides. For a separable state ρ_{AB} , it can always be decomposed into a separable form: $\rho_{AB} = \sum_{i,j} p_{ij} \phi_A^i \otimes \phi_B^j$. An extension state may be chosen to be $\rho_{AA'BB'} = \sum_{i,j} p_{ij} \phi_A^i \otimes (|i\rangle\langle i|)_{A'} \otimes \phi_B^j \otimes (|j\rangle\langle j|)_{B'}$. It is obvious that $I(AA' : BB') = I(A' : B')$, and thus $E_I = 0$ for separable states.

Continuity. The conditional entanglement of mutual information is asymptotically continuous, i.e. if $|\rho_{AB} - \sigma_{AB}| \leq \epsilon$, then $|C_I(\rho) - C_I(\sigma)| \leq K\epsilon \log d + O(\epsilon)$, where $|\cdot|$ is the trace norm for matrix, K is a constant, $d = \dim \mathcal{H}_{AB}$, and $O(\epsilon)$ is any function that depends only on ϵ (in particular, it does not depend on dimension) and satisfies $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} O(\epsilon) = 0$.

The proof of the asymptotic continuity is similar to that for squashed entanglement and is presented in the Appendix of Ref.[17].

Convexity. E_I is convex, i.e., $E_I(\lambda\rho + (1-\lambda)\sigma) \leq \lambda E_I(\rho) + (1-\lambda)E_I(\sigma)$ for $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$.

Proof For any extension states $\rho_{AA'BB'}$ and $\sigma_{AA'BB'}$, we consider the extension state $\tau_{AA'A''BB'B''} = \lambda\rho_{AA'BB'} \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0|)_{A''} \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0|)_{B''} + (1-\lambda)\sigma_{AA'BB'} \otimes (|1\rangle\langle 1|)_{A''} \otimes (|1\rangle\langle 1|)_{B''}$, and have $I(\tau_{AA'A''BB'B''}) - I(\tau_{A'A''B''B''}) = \lambda[I(\rho_{AA'BB'}) - I(\rho_{A':B'})] + (1-\lambda)[I(\sigma_{AA'BB'}) - I(\sigma_{A':B'})]$. This implies E_I is convex.

An immediate corollary of convexity is that $E_I \leq E_f$ and furthermore $E_I \leq E_c$ due to the following additivity.

Proposition 1 $E_I(\rho_{AB} \otimes \sigma_{CD}) = E_I(\rho_{AB}) + E_I(\sigma_{CD})$.

Proof On the one hand, for any extension states $\rho_{AA'BB'}$ and $\sigma_{CC'DD'}$, $\rho_{AA'BB'} \otimes \sigma_{CC'DD'}$ is an extension state of $\rho_{AB} \otimes \sigma_{CD}$.

$$\begin{aligned} & I(AA'CC' : BB'DD') - I(A'C' : B'D') \\ &= I(AA' : BB') - I(A' : B') \\ &+ I(CC' : DD') - I(C' : D'). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

So $E_I(\rho_{AB} \otimes \sigma_{CD}) \leq E_I(\rho_{AB}) + E_I(\sigma_{CD})$ holds.

On the other hand, for extension states $\tau_{ACE':BDF'}$ of $\rho_{AB} \otimes \sigma_{CD}$, $\tau_{ACE':BDF'}$ is an extension state of ρ_{AB} and $\tau_{CE':DF'}$ is an extension state of σ_{CD} . Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} & I(ACE' : BDF') - I(E' : F') \\ &= I(ACE' : BDF') - I(CE' : DF') \\ &+ I(CE' : DF') - I(E' : F'). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

This means that $E_I(\rho_{AB} \otimes \sigma_{CD}) \geq E_I(\rho_{AB}) + E_I(\sigma_{CD})$. So we have finally the additivity equality.

It is quite remarkable that the property of additivity is rather easy to prove for conditional entanglement while it is extremely tough for other candidates. The reason lies in that the conditional entanglement is naturally super-additive while others are usually sub-additive.

Before we elaborate the operational meaning of the measure E_I , we briefly recall that of quantum conditional mutual information [18], in which the quantum mutual




FIG. 1: Quantum state redistribution

information one [19] corresponds to a special case. Quantum conditional mutual information is given the operational meaning in the process of quantum state redistribution [18]. The situation is depicted in FIG 1: Initially XY is with Alice, Z with Bob. R is the reference system such that Φ_{RXYZ} is pure. The task is that Alice sends Y to Bob while the final state is still in the pure state Φ_{RXYZ} . Alice and Bob share infinite entanglement and have an ideal quantum channel to communicate. No classical communication is allowed. To accomplish the task, the minimal amount of qubits that are required to transfer from Alice to Bob is $Q = 1/2I(R : Y|Z)$.

In a recent paper [6], the squashed entanglement is given the operational meaning with the aid of that of conditional mutual information. It is heuristic for finding the operational meaning for E_I since it can be regarded as a measure constructed in the same spirit. Does the conditional function $\frac{1}{2}\{I(AA' : BB') - I(A' : B')\}$ have an operational meaning? Luckily enough it does and more luckily it is a conservative quantity dependent only on the initial and final state. The scenario where it works is a process called partial state merging. Here we take the name—partial state merging that is somewhat different from the original one in [15]. The situation of the partial state merging is depicted in FIG 2: Initially AA' is with Alice and BB' with Bob, E is with the merging center, and the whole state $\Phi_{AA'BB'E}$ is pure. The task is to transfer A and B to the center while the final state remains the same. There is infinite entanglement and an ideal quantum channel between Alice (Bob) and the center. But no entanglement and no channel exists between Alice and Bob. No classical communication is allowed between Alice (Bob) and the center. To accomplish the task, the minimal net flow of qubits to the center is none other than $Q = \frac{1}{2}\{I(AA' : BB') - I(A' : B')\}$, where the flow into the center is regarded as positive flow while that out is negative one. There are many different routes to merge A and B . Dramatically, the net flow is a conservative quantity independent of the different routes of merging. Without loss of generality, we take the two typical routes in FIG 3 to show this. In the routes I and II ,




FIG. 2: Partial state merging




FIG. 4: Partial state merging for tripartite




FIG. 3: Two typical routes

the net flow of qubits to E is calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} Q_I &= 1/2\{I(BB' : A|E) + I(A' : B|EA)\} \\ &= 1/2\{I(AA' : BB') - I(A' : B')\}, \\ Q_{II} &= 1/2\{I(BB' : AA') + 0 - I(A' : B')\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the relation $S(X) = S(Y)$ is used when XY is in a pure state. Of course there are other routes, however the net flow to the center is the same.

Given the operational meaning of the quantity $Q = \frac{1}{2}\{I(AA' : BB') - I(A' : B')\}$, we immediately obtain the operational meaning of E_I .

Proposition 2 For a generic mixed state ρ_{AB} to be merged to a center, the conditional entanglement of mutual information is the minimal net flow of qubits to the center with the optimal side-information $\rho_{A'B'}$.

Notice that for separable state ρ_{AB} , there always exist the side-information $\rho_{A'B'}$ such that the net flow of qubits to the center is zero. More entangled ρ_{AB} , more flow of qubits to the merging center.

The result and conclusion can be straightforwardly generalized to the multipartite case where the multipartite version of E_I is defined as $E_I = \inf \frac{1}{2}\{I_n(A_1A'_1 : \dots : A_nA'_n) - I_n(A'_1 : \dots : A'_n)\}$, and $I_n = \sum_i S(A_i) - S(A_1 \dots A_n)$ is the multipartite mutual information [20].

Proposition 3 The conditional entanglement for multipartite mutual information is additive,

$$E_I(\rho_{A_1 \dots A_n} \otimes \sigma_{B_1 \dots B_n}) = E_I(\rho_{A_1 \dots A_n}) + E_I(\sigma_{B_1 \dots B_n}).$$

Proposition 4 For a multipartite mixed state $\rho_{A_1 \dots A_n}$ to be merged to a center, the conditional entanglement of mutual information is the minimal net flow of qubits to the center with the optimal side-information $\rho_{A'_1 \dots A'_n}$.

In FIG 4, we depict the partial state merging for tripartite state. It's easy to see that the factor $1/2$ remains throughout calculating the flow of qubits. This gives an operational ground that the factor is $1/2$ even for multipartite entanglement. Notice that if only the monotonicity under LOCC is required, the factor can be taken for example $1/n$ for the n-partite case that is also reduced to the same formula for bipartite case. However it does not match the operational meaning.

In summary, we have constructed an additive entanglement measure—the conditional entanglement of mutual information, and showed its operational meaning as the minimal net flow of qubits with the optimal side-information in the process of partial state merging. The conclusions are generalized to multipartite entanglement where an additive and operational multipartite entanglement measure is provided for the first time and the factor $1/2$ is justified.

Acknowledgement This work is supported by the RGC of Hong Kong (HKU 7051/06 and HKU 3/05C), the URC fund of Hong Kong, the National Natural Science Foundation of China (10429401), and the State Key Program for Basic Research of China (2006CB0L1001). MH acknowledge funding by the Polish Ministry of Science and Information Technology - grant PBZ-MIN-008/P03/2003 and the EU IP SCALA.

-
- [1] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, quant-ph/0702225.
 - [2] M.B. Plenio and S. Virmani, Quant. Inf. Comp. **7**, 1 (2007).
 - [3] C.H. Bennett, D.P. DiVincenzo, J.A. Smolin, W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824 (1996).
 - [4] V. Vedral, M.B. Plenio, M.A. Rippin, and P.L. Knight, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 2275 (1997).
 - [5] P.M. Hayden, M. Horodecki, and B.M. Terhal, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **34**(35), 6891 (2001).
 - [6] J. Oppenheim, arXiv:0801.0458v1.

- [7] M. Christandl and A. Winter, *J. Math. Phys.* **45** (3), 829 (2004).
- [8] K. Życzkowski et al., *Phys. Rev. A* **58**, 883 (1998).
- [9] G. Vidal and R.F. Werner, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 032314 (2002).
- [10] K. G. H. Vollbrecht and R. F. Werner, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 062307 (2001).
- [11] D. Yang, K. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, and W. Song, arXiv:0704.2236.
- [12] R. F. Werner, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **17**, 359 (1989).
- [13] A measure of correlations is required at least to be non-increasing under local operations, see [14].
- [14] L. Henderson and V. Vedral, *J. Phys A: Math. Gen.* **34**, 6899 (2001), quant-ph/0105028.
- [15] M. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, and A. Winter, *Nature* **436**, 673 (2005).
- [16] M. B. Plenio, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 090503 (2005).
- [17] D. Yang, M. Horodecki, and Z. D. Wang, quant-ph/0701149.
- [18] I. Devetak and J. Yard, quant-ph/0612050v1.
- [19] A. Abeyesinghe, I. Devetak, P. Hayden, and A. Winter, quant-ph/0606225v1.
- [20] N. J. Cerf et al., *Phys. Rev. A* **66**, 042309 (2002).