

Relative entropy of entanglement for certain multipartite mixed states

Tzu-Chieh Wei¹

¹ *Institute for Quantum Computing and Department of Physics and Astronomy,
University of Waterloo, 200 University Avenue West, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G1*

(Dated: October 28, 2018)

We prove conjectures on the relative entropy of entanglement (REE) for two families of multipartite qubit states. Thus, analytic expressions of REE for these families of states can be given. The first family of states are composed of mixture of some permutation-invariant multi-qubit states. The results generalized to multi-qudit states are also shown to hold. The second family of states contain Dür's bound entangled states. Along the way, we have discussed the relation of REE to two other measures: robustness of entanglement and geometric measure of entanglement, slightly extending previous results.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud, 03.67.Mn.

I. INTRODUCTION

Entanglement, the characteristic trait of quantum mechanics according to Schrödinger, has been identified as a resource central to many of quantum information processing tasks [1]. There have been tremendous progress along the characterization and the quantification of entanglement using various methods in both bipartite and multipartite settings [2]. Entanglement has also been studied in many-body systems and connection to quantum phase transitions has also been explored [3]. The notion of entanglement has also found its application in density matrix of renormalization groups (DMRG) and has enabled much recent progress in numerical techniques of DMRG in low dimensions and dynamics [4].

Despite these advancements, the characterization and the quantification of entanglement are far from complete. For example, even for multipartite pure states, it has been a long standing question whether there exists a finite minimal reversible entanglement generating set (MREGS) [5]. The existence of MREGS would enable the generalization of the entanglement of distillation [6] and formation [7, 8] to multipartite systems [9] and would also provide a better characterization of multipartite entanglement. Given that the standard measures of entanglement, such as the entanglement of formation [7, 8] and distillation [7, 8] have not been properly generalized to multipartite settings, the study of quantifying multipartite entanglement via other measures is indispensable.

The relative entropy of entanglement (REE), introduced by Vedral et al. [10, 11], provides an alternative measure of entanglement. In bipartite settings, it is shown to be a lower bound for the entanglement of formation and an upper bound for the entanglement of distillation. Its regularized version has recently been shown to possess connection to the second law of thermodynamics [12]. Moreover, REE applies straightforwardly to multipartite settings, and thus its study in the multipartite settings is important. The calculation of REE [10, 11] by analytic means, however, is still a challenging task, even for *pure* states, and is often relied on numerical computation. Despite the progress made in two-qubit systems by Ishizaka [13], an analytic formula for REE is still elusive.

In this paper, we shall focus on the study of REE, complemented by two other measures. These other measures, the geometric measure of entanglement (based on the geometry of Hilbert space [14, 15, 16] and also based on the Grover search [17, 18], hence, also known as the Groverian entanglement) and the generalized robustness of entanglement [19], besides providing different perspectives of entanglement on their own, can also be used to provide connections to REE, or more precisely, lower and upper bounds, respectively. The main results of this paper are the establishment of the proof for conjectures for analytic expressions of REE for several families of multipartite mixed states, thus providing nontrivial examples where REE is obtained analytically.

The structure of the present paper is as follows. In Sec. II we review the three entanglement measures considered in the paper: the relative entropy of entanglement, the geometric measure of entanglement, and the robustness of entanglement. We explore connections among the three, in both pure- and mixed-state settings in Sec. III and Sec. IV, respectively. In Sec. V we prove the conjecture for multi-qubits [20] and we also generalize the result to the multi-qudit setting. With these analytic results, we discuss some applications in Sec. VII. In Sec. VIII we prove the analytic formula of REE for another family of multi-qubit mixed states [21], which include Dür's bound entangled states [22]. In Sec. IX we give some concluding remarks.

II. ENTANGLEMENT MEASURES

In this section we briefly review the three measures considered in the present paper: the relative entropy of entanglement, the general (global) robustness of entanglement and the geometric measure of entanglement.

A. Relative entropy of entanglement

The relative entropy $S(\rho||\sigma)$ between two states ρ and σ is defined via

$$S(\rho||\sigma) \equiv \text{Tr}(\rho \log_2 \rho - \rho \log_2 \sigma), \quad (1)$$

which is evidently not symmetric under exchange of ρ and σ , and is non-negative, i.e., $S(\rho||\sigma) \geq 0$. Note that the log function is base-2 throughout this paper. The relative entropy of entanglement (RE) for a mixed state ρ is defined to be the minimal relative entropy of ρ over the set of separable mixed states [10, 11]:

$$E_R(\rho) \equiv \min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{D}} S(\rho||\sigma) = \min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{D}} \text{Tr}(\rho \log_2 \rho - \rho \log_2 \sigma), \quad (2)$$

where \mathcal{D} denotes the set of all separable states.

The regularized relative entropy of entanglement is defined as

$$E_R^\infty(\rho) \equiv \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} E_R(\rho^{\otimes n}). \quad (3)$$

It is shown that in the bipartite settings the regularized relative entropy of entanglement plays an analogous role to the entropy in thermodynamics [12]. However, the calculation of the regularized relative entropy of entanglement is, in general, much more difficult than for the non-regularized case.

In general, the task of finding the REE for arbitrary states ρ involves a minimization over all separable states, and this renders the computation of the REE very difficult. For bipartite pure states, the REE is equal to the entanglement of formation and of distillation. But, despite recent progress [13], for mixed states—even in the simplest setting of two qubits—no analog of Wootters' formula [8] for the entanglement of formation has been found. Things are even worse in multipartite settings. Even for pure states, there has not been a systematic method for calculating their relative entropy of entanglement. It is thus worthwhile seeking cases in which one can explicitly obtain an expression for the REE.

An alternative definition of RE is to replace the set of separable states \mathcal{D} by the set of positive partial transpose (PPT) states \mathcal{D}^{ppt} :

$$\mathcal{D}^{ppt} = \{\sigma | \sigma^\dagger = \sigma, \sigma \geq 0, \text{Tr}(\sigma) = 1, \sigma^{PT} \geq 0\}, \quad (4)$$

where PT denotes partial transpose with respect to any bi-partition of parties. The REE thus defined, as well as its regularized version, gives a tighter bound on distillable entanglement. There has been important progress in calculating the RE (and its regularized version) with respect to PPT states for certain bipartite mixed states; see Refs. [23] for more detailed discussions. For multipartite settings one could also use this definition, and define the set of states to optimize over to be the set of states that are PPT with respect to certain or all bipartite partitionings. However, we shall use the first definition, i.e., optimization over the set of completely separable states, throughout the discussion of the present paper.

B. General robustness of entanglement

The general robustness of entanglement [19] is a measure of how sensitive the entanglement is to mixture of states. It is defined as

$$R(\rho) \equiv \min t \quad (5)$$

such that there exists a state Δ so as to render the following state separable:

$$\frac{1}{1+t}(\rho + t\Delta). \quad (6)$$

The logarithmic robustness of ρ is defined as

$$LR(\rho) \equiv \log_2(1 + R(\rho)). \quad (7)$$

C. Geometric measure of entanglement

We continue by briefly reviewing the formulation of the geometric measure in both pure-state and mixed-state settings. Let us start with a multipartite system comprising n parts, each of which can have a distinct Hilbert space. Consider a general n -partite pure state (expanded in the local bases $\{|e_{p_i}^{(i)}\rangle\}$):

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{p_1 \cdots p_n} \chi_{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_n} |e_{p_1}^{(1)} e_{p_2}^{(2)} \cdots e_{p_n}^{(n)}\rangle. \quad (8)$$

We can compare this state to the set of general separable pure state,

$$|\phi\rangle \equiv \bigotimes_{i=1}^n |\phi^{(i)}\rangle = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{p_i} c_{p_i}^{(i)} |e_{p_i}^{(i)}\rangle \right), \quad (9)$$

and define the maximal overlap of $|\psi\rangle$ with the closest product states as follows,

$$\Lambda_{\max}(\psi) = \max_{\phi} |\langle \phi | \psi \rangle|, \quad (10)$$

where $|\phi\rangle$ is an arbitrary separable pure state defined above. In Ref. [16], the particular form $E_{\sin^2} \equiv 1 - \Lambda_{\max}^2(\psi) = \sin^2 \theta_{\min}$ was defined to be the geometric measure of entanglement (GME) for any pure state $|\psi\rangle$. Here, we shall be concerned with the related quantity $E_{\log}(\psi) \equiv -2 \log_2 \Lambda_{\max}(\psi)$, which we shall show to be related to the two other measures.

We remark that an alternative perspective from the Grover search also leads to the geometric measure [17, 18], and it is also known as the Groverian entanglement. Furthermore, a hierarchy of entanglement can be obtained if one consider the separable states to be product states among an appropriate partition of particles into k -parties [15, 16]; see recent works by Shimoni and Biham [24] and by Blasone et al. [25]. But throughout this paper we shall focus on the completely product states, and the separable mixed states will refer to n -separable states.

Given the definition of entanglement for pure states just formulated, the extension to mixed states ρ can be built upon pure states via the *convex hull* construction (indicated by “co”), as was done for the entanglement of formation; see Ref. [8]. The essence is a minimization over all decompositions $\rho = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$ into pure states:

$$E(\rho) \equiv (\text{co}E_{\text{pure}})(\rho) \equiv \min_{\{p_i, \psi_i\}} \sum_i p_i E_{\text{pure}}(|\psi_i\rangle). \quad (11)$$

This convex hull construction ensures that the measure gives zero for separable states; however, in general it also complicates the task of determining mixed-state entanglement. The specific form that we are concerned in this paper is the following

$$E_{\log}(\rho) \equiv \min_{\{p_i, \psi_i\}} \sum_i p_i [-2 \log \Lambda_{\max}(\psi_i)]. \quad (12)$$

We remark that an alternative way to define the mixed-state entanglement measure via purification have been developed by Shapira et al. [26], continuing along the idea of maximizing the Groverian search outcome. But in the present paper, we shall focus mainly on the definition by Eq. (12).

Illustrative examples: We examine some pure-state examples, whose mixture will be considered later in the paper. First, one can classify permutation-invariant pure states, as follows:

$$|S(n, k)\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{C_k^n}} \mathcal{S} | \underbrace{0 \cdots 0}_k \underbrace{1 \cdots 1}_{n-k} \rangle = \frac{\sqrt{C_k^n}}{n!} \sum_i \Pi_i | \underbrace{0 \cdots 0}_k \underbrace{1 \cdots 1}_{n-k} \rangle, \quad (13)$$

where \mathcal{S} represents symmetrization under permutations, Π_i denotes arbitrary permutation of n objects, and $C_k^n \equiv n!/k!(n-k)!$. Intuitively, as the amplitudes are all positive, one can assume that the closest separable (equivalently, Hartree) state is of the form (which is rigorously proved in Ref. [27])

$$|\phi\rangle = (\sqrt{p} |0\rangle + \sqrt{1-p} |1\rangle)^{\otimes n}, \quad (14)$$

for which the maximal overlap (w.r.t. p) gives the entanglement eigenvalue for $|S(n, k)\rangle$:

$$\Lambda_{\max}(n, k) = \sqrt{\frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!}} \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^{\frac{k}{2}} \left(\frac{n-k}{n}\right)^{\frac{n-k}{2}}. \quad (15)$$

More generally, for n parties each of which being a d -level system, the state

$$|S(n; \vec{k})\rangle \equiv \sqrt{\frac{k_1!k_2!\cdots k_d!}{n!}} \mathcal{S} | \underbrace{1\dots 1}_{k_1} \underbrace{2\dots 2}_{k_2} \dots \underbrace{d\dots d}_{k_d} \rangle \quad (16)$$

has the entanglement eigenvalue

$$\Lambda_{\max}(n; \vec{k}) = \sqrt{\frac{n!}{\prod_i (k_i!)}} \prod_{i=1; k_i \neq 0}^d \left(\frac{k_i}{n}\right)^{\frac{k_i}{2}}. \quad (17)$$

Although the above states were discussed in terms of the GME [16], we shall, in the following section, show the rather surprising fact that the LR and REE of these example states, are given by the corresponding expression: $-2 \log_2 \Lambda_{\max}$.

One of the main results of the present paper concerns the two following families of mixture of symmetric states:

$$\rho(\{\vec{p}\}) = \sum_{k=0}^n p_k |S(n, k)\rangle \langle S(n, k)|, \quad (18)$$

$$\rho(\{\vec{p}_{\vec{k}}\}) = \sum_{\vec{k}} p_{\vec{k}} |S(n, \vec{k})\rangle \langle S(n, \vec{k})|. \quad (19)$$

III. CONNECTION BETWEEN THE THREE MEASURES: PURE STATES

In bipartite systems, due to the existence of Schmidt decompositions, the relative entropy of entanglement of a pure state is simply the von Neumann entropy of its reduced density matrix. However, for multipartite systems there is, in general, no such decomposition, and how to calculate the relative entropy of entanglement for an arbitrary pure state remains an open question. We now connect the three measures by inequalities.

A. Relative entropy of entanglement and geometric measure of entanglement

Let us begin with the following inequality:

Inequality 1 [20, 28]: For any pure state $|\psi\rangle$ with entanglement eigenvalue $\Lambda_{\max}(\psi)$ the quantity $-2 \log_2 \Lambda_{\max}(\psi)$ is a lower bound on the relative entropy of entanglement of $|\psi\rangle$, i.e.,

$$E_{\text{R}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \geq -2 \log_2 \Lambda_{\max}(\psi). \quad (20)$$

Proof: From the definition (2) of the relative entropy of entanglement we have, for a pure state $|\psi\rangle$,

$$E_{\text{R}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = \min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{D}} -\langle\psi| \log_2 \sigma |\psi\rangle = -\max_{\sigma \in \mathcal{D}} \langle\psi| \log_2 \sigma |\psi\rangle. \quad (21)$$

Using the concavity of the log function, we have

$$\langle\psi| \log_2 \sigma |\psi\rangle \leq \log_2(\langle\psi| \sigma |\psi\rangle) \quad (22)$$

and, furthermore,

$$\max_{\sigma \in \mathcal{D}} \langle\psi| \log_2 \sigma |\psi\rangle \leq \max_{\sigma \in \mathcal{D}} \log_2(\langle\psi| \sigma |\psi\rangle). \quad (23)$$

We then conclude that

$$E_{\text{R}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \geq -\max_{\sigma \in \mathcal{D}} \log_2(\langle\psi| \sigma |\psi\rangle). \quad (24)$$

As any $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}$ can be expanded as $\sigma = \sum_i p_i |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|$, where $|\phi_i\rangle$'s are separable pure states, one has

$$\langle\psi| \sigma |\psi\rangle = \sum_i p_i |\langle\phi_i|\psi\rangle|^2 \leq \Lambda_{\max}^2(\psi), \quad (25)$$

and hence we arrive at the sought result

$$E_{\text{R}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \geq -2 \log_2 \Lambda_{\max}(\psi). \quad (26)$$

□

B. Geometric measure and generalized robustness

Cavalcanti has obtained the result that robustness of entanglement can be shown to provide an upper for the geometric measure [29]. The insight he provided is the connection of both measures to entanglement witness. We shall repeat his result for pure states here. The connection of the generalized robustness to entanglement witness is the result of Brandão [30]:

$$R(\rho) = \max\{0, -\min_W \text{Tr}(W\rho)\}, \quad (27)$$

where $M \leq \mathbb{1}$ and $\text{Tr}(\rho_{SE P}) \geq 0$. Here we shall be concerned with pure states, and hence

$$R(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = \max\{0, -\min_W \langle\psi|W|\psi\rangle\}. \quad (28)$$

The connection of the geometric measure of entanglement to entanglement witness is as follows. The operator

$$W = (\lambda^2 \mathbb{1} - |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)/\lambda^2 \quad (29)$$

satisfies the condition $\text{Tr}(W\rho_{SE P}) \geq 0$ as long as $\lambda^2 \geq \Lambda_{\max}^2(\psi)$ [16]. Using this and take $W^* = (\Lambda_{\max}(\psi)^2 \mathbb{1} - |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)/\Lambda_{\max}^2(\psi)$, it will provide a lower bound on $R(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$, and thus

$$R(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \geq \frac{1 - \Lambda_{\max}^2 \psi}{\Lambda_{\max}^2(\psi)}. \quad (30)$$

Equivalently, we have the following

Inequality 2 [29]:

$$LR(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \geq -\log_2 \Lambda_{\max}^2(\psi). \quad (31)$$

It turns out that a stronger lower bound on the robustness can be obtained using the relative entropy of entanglement, first proved by Hayashi et al.[31], which we now describe.

C. Generalized robustness and relative entropy of entanglement

We repeat here the proof that for any pure state $|\psi\rangle$ (with $\rho_\psi \equiv |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$), **Inequality 3** [31]:

$$E_R(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \leq LR(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|). \quad (32)$$

Proof. Suppose $R(\rho_\psi) = t_m$. There exists a state Δ such that the following state is separable

$$\sigma_S = \frac{1}{1+t_m} (|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + t_m \Delta). \quad (33)$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_R(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) &\leq S(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \parallel \sigma_S) = -\langle\psi| \log \frac{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + t_m \Delta}{1+t_m} |\psi\rangle \\ &\leq -\langle\psi| \log \frac{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|}{1+t_m} |\psi\rangle = -\log \frac{1}{1+t_m} = LR(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|). \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

□

Inequalities 1 to 3 summarize to **Inequality 3'**:

$$LR(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \geq E_R(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \geq -2 \log_2 \Lambda_{\max}(\psi). \quad (35)$$

The degree of difficulty of calculating the corresponding measures becomes higher from the r.h.s. to the l.h.s. Moreover, upper bounds on LR and E_R are easy to obtain, as they are defined via minimization. If one can construct an upper bound on these measures such that it matches $-2 \log_2 \Lambda_{\max}(\psi)$, the inequalities above become equalities. This is how the analytic expression of left two measures have been obtained for symmetric and antisymmetric states as well as some graph states [20, 27, 31, 32]. A very thorough analysis using group theory on whether the inequalities become inequality has been provided by Hayashi et al. [27].

D. Illustrative examples

We now examine illustrative states in the light of the above discussions, thus obtaining the expression of the three different entanglement measures. We begin with the permutation-invariant states $|S(n, k)\rangle$ of Eq. (13), for which Λ_{\max} was given in Eq. (15). The above theorem guarantees that $E_{\text{R}}(|S(n, k)\rangle) \geq -2 \log_2 \Lambda_{\max}(n, k)$. To find an *upper* bound we construct a separable mixed state

$$\sigma^* \equiv \int \frac{d\phi}{2\pi} |\xi(\phi)\rangle \langle \xi(\phi)|, \quad (36a)$$

$$|\xi(\phi)\rangle \equiv \left(\sqrt{p}|0\rangle + e^{i\phi} \sqrt{1-p}|1\rangle \right)^{\otimes n}, \quad (36b)$$

with p chosen to maximize $\| \langle \xi | S(n, k) \rangle \| = \sqrt{C_k^n p^k (1-p)^{n-k}}$, which gives $p = k/n$. Direct evaluation then gives

$$\sigma^* = \sum_{j=0}^n C_j^n p^j (1-p)^{(n-j)} |S(n, j)\rangle \langle S(n, j)| = \Lambda_{\max}^2(n, k) |S(n, k)\rangle \langle S(n, k)| + \tau^\perp, \quad (37)$$

and $S(\rho || \sigma) = -2 \log_2 \Lambda_{\max}(n, k)$, where $\rho = |S(n, k)\rangle \langle S(n, k)|$, $\Lambda_{\max}(n, k)$ is given in Eq. (15), and we have used τ^\perp to denote the those terms with $(j \neq k)$. The upper and lower bounds on E_{R} coincide, and hence we have that

$$E_{\text{R}}(|S(n, k)\rangle) = -2 \log_2 \Lambda_{\max}(n, k). \quad (38)$$

Moreover, from the perspective of the generalized robustness, we immediately have an upper bound t_m on the robustness,

$$\frac{1}{1+t_m} = \Lambda_{\max}^2(n, k). \quad (39)$$

Hence, we obtain an upper bound on LR ,

$$LR(n, k) \leq \log_2(1+t_m) = -2 \log_2 \Lambda_{\max}(n, k). \quad (40)$$

This then gives equality to all three measures for the symmetric state $|S(n, k)\rangle$. The same consideration also holds for $|S(n, \vec{k})\rangle$, namely,

$$LR(n, \vec{k}) = E_{\text{R}}(n, \vec{k}) = -2 \log_2 \Lambda_{\max}(n, \vec{k}). \quad (41)$$

IV. CONNECTION AMONG THE THREE MEASURES: MIXED STATES

Cavalcanti and Hayashi et al. have provided inequalities relating these three measures for general mixed states. In their inequalities, the geometric measure is generalized to

$$G(\rho) \equiv -\log_2 \left\{ \max_{\sigma \in \mathcal{D}} \text{Tr}(\rho\sigma) \right\}. \quad (42)$$

We shall see below that inequalities in terms of E_{\log} can also be derived and shall provide an alternative inequality.

Let us first review the inequality shown by Cavalcanti [29]:

Inequality 4 [29]:

$$LR(\rho) \geq G(\rho). \quad (43)$$

Recall that we take \mathcal{D} to be the set of separable states of the form

$$\sum_i p_i |\phi_i^A\rangle \langle \phi_i^A| \otimes |\phi_i^B\rangle \langle \phi_i^B| \otimes \dots, \quad (44)$$

and hence $G(\rho)$ can be simplified to be

$$G(\rho) = -\log_2 \left\{ \max_{\phi \in \text{Prod}} \langle \phi | \rho | \phi \rangle \right\}, \quad (45)$$

where Prod denotes completely product states.

Proof: Again, we use the relation (27) for the robustness and the entanglement witness obtained by Brandão [30]. For any state ρ , construct a witness

$$W_\lambda = \mathbb{1} - \frac{1}{\lambda^2}\rho, \quad (46)$$

where $\lambda^2 \geq \lambda_{\max}^2 \equiv \max_{\sigma \in \mathcal{D}} \text{Tr}(\rho\sigma)$, in order for the condition $\text{Tr}(W_\lambda\sigma) \geq 0$ to be satisfied. Plug in the above expression for witness into Eq. (27), we obtain

$$R(\rho) \geq -\text{Tr}(W_{\lambda_{\max}}) = -1 + \frac{1}{\lambda_{\max}^2}. \quad (47)$$

This is equivalent to

$$LR(\rho) \geq -\log_2 \lambda_{\max}^2 = G(\rho). \quad (48)$$

□

The inequality derived by Hayashi et al. is as follows,

Inequality 5 [31]:

$$\log_2 r(\rho) \geq E_R(\rho) + S(\rho) \geq G(\rho), \quad (49)$$

where, instead of the robustness of ρ itself, the robustness of the support of ρ is considered:

$$r(\rho) \equiv |P_\rho|[1 + R(P_\rho/|P_\rho|)], \quad (50)$$

where P_ρ is the support of ρ , namely

$$P_\rho = \sum_{\lambda_i \neq 0} |\lambda_i\rangle\langle\lambda_i|, \quad (51)$$

where ρ has the spectral decomposition $\rho = \sum_i \lambda_i |\lambda_i\rangle\langle\lambda_i|$, and $|P_\rho| \equiv \text{Tr}(P_\rho)$.

We now slightly extend the first part of the inequality. By the definition of robustness, there exist a state Δ such that the state

$$\omega = \frac{\rho + t\Delta}{1+t} \quad (52)$$

is a separable state, where $t = R(\rho)$ for convenience. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} E_R(\rho) + S(\rho) &= \min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{D}} -\text{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma) \\ &\leq -\text{Tr}(\rho \log \omega) \\ &= -\text{Tr} \left(\rho \log \frac{\rho + t\Delta}{1+t} \right) \\ &\leq -\text{Tr} \left(\rho \log \frac{\rho}{1+t} \right) \\ &= S(\rho) + LR(\rho). \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

This gives

$$LR(\rho) \geq E_R(\rho), \quad (54)$$

where the l.h.s. is given by the logarithmic robustness of ρ , rather than that of its support $P_\rho/|P_\rho|$. The second inequality of Hayashi et al. is elementary to prove:

$$E_R(\rho) + S(\rho) = -\max_{\sigma \in \mathcal{D}} \text{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma) \geq -\log \left\{ \max_{\sigma \in \mathcal{D}} \text{Tr}(\rho\sigma) \right\}, \quad (55)$$

where we have used $\text{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma) \leq \log \text{Tr}(\rho\sigma)$.

We can also provide an alternative of the second-part of Inequality 5:

$$E_R(\rho) \geq E_{\log}(\rho) - S(\rho). \quad (56)$$

Proof:

Suppose $\rho = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$ is the optimal decomposition for $E_{\log}(\rho)$, namely,

$$E_{\log}(\rho) = - \sum_i p_i \log_2 \Lambda_{\max}^2(\psi_i). \quad (57)$$

Using the definition of REE, we have

$$E_R(\rho) + S(\rho) = - \max_{\sigma \in \mathcal{D}} \text{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma) \geq - \max_{\sigma_i \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_i p_i \text{Tr}(|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \log \sigma_i). \quad (58)$$

Using

$$\max_{\sigma_i \in \mathcal{D}} \text{Tr}(|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \log \sigma_i) = \log \Lambda_{\max}^2(\psi_i), \quad (59)$$

we have

$$E_R(\rho) + S(\rho) \geq - \sum_i p_i \log \Lambda_{\max}^2(\psi_i) = E_{\log}(\rho). \quad (60)$$

□

Summing up we have proved

Inequality 6:

$$LR(\rho) \geq E_R(\rho) \geq E_{\log}(\rho) - S(\rho). \quad (61)$$

Let us compare Inequality 6 to Inequality 5, especially the first parts. Viewed as an upper bound on E_R , the Inequality 5 can be rewritten as

$$\log_2 r(\rho) - S(\rho) \geq E_R(\rho). \quad (62)$$

It can happen that the r.h.s. is zero whereas the l.h.s. is still nonzero, as exemplified for the two-qubit Werner state,

$$\rho_W(\gamma) = \gamma |\psi^-\rangle\langle\psi^-| + \frac{1-\gamma}{4} \mathbb{1}_{4 \times 4}, \quad (63)$$

where $|\psi^-\rangle$ is the two-qubit singlet state. The state is entangled for $\gamma > 1/3$, and unentangled for $\gamma \leq 1/3$. For $0 \leq \gamma < 1$, the support of ρ_W is $P_W = \mathbb{1}_{4 \times 4}$, and the corresponding state is a completely mixed state, hence, possessing no entanglement. This leads to $r(\rho_W) = 4$, and

$$S(\rho_W(\gamma)) = - \frac{1+3\gamma}{4} \log_2 \frac{1+3\gamma}{4} - \frac{3(1-\gamma)}{4} \log_2 \frac{1-\gamma}{4}. \quad (64)$$

At $\gamma = 1/3$, $E_R(\rho_W) = 0$, but $\log_2 r(\rho) - S(\rho) = 1 - \log_2(3)/2 \approx 0.208$. Although $LR(\rho)$ is generally not easy to calculate, it becomes zero when ρ becomes separable. For the second-part of Inequality 6, we remark that for the states in Eqs. (18), (19) and (144) the lower bound can be tightened to

$$E_R(\rho) \geq E_{\log}(\rho), \quad (65)$$

which will be shown later. Therefore, Inequality 6 slightly extends previous results by Cavalcanti [29] and Hayashi et al. [31].

V. RELATIVE ENTROPY OF ENTANGLEMENT FOR MIXTURE OF SYMMETRIC STATES

A. Multi-qubits

In Ref. [16] the procedure was given to find the geometric measure of entanglement, E_{\sin^2} , for the mixed state comprising symmetric states:

$$\rho(\{p\}) = \sum_k p_k |S(n, k)\rangle\langle S(n, k)|. \quad (66)$$

Here, we focus instead on the quantity E_{\log} , but the basic procedure is the same. The key point is to find the entanglement eigenvalue $\Lambda_n(\{q\})$ for the pure state

$$\sum_k \sqrt{q_k} |S(n, k)\rangle, \quad (67)$$

thus arriving at the quantity

$$\mathcal{E}(\{q\}) \equiv -2 \log_2 \Lambda_n(\{q\}). \quad (68)$$

Then the quantity E_{\log} for the mixed state (66) is actually the convex hull of the expression (68):

$$E_{\log_2}(\rho(\{p\})) = \text{co } \mathcal{E}(\{p\}). \quad (69)$$

In Ref. [20], an attempt to calculate the REE for the states (66) was made and a conjecture for the REE was made. In this section, we review the construction of the conjecture and prove it to be correct. Let us consider the state formed by mixing the separable pure states $|\xi(\theta, \phi)\rangle$:

$$\sigma(\theta) = \int \frac{d\phi}{2\pi} |\xi(\theta, \phi)\rangle \langle \xi(\theta, \phi)| = \sum_{k=0}^n C_k^n \cos^{2k} \theta \sin^{2(n-k)} \theta |S(n, k)\rangle \langle S(n, k)|, \quad (70)$$

where

$$|\xi(\theta, \phi)\rangle \equiv (\cos \theta |0\rangle + e^{i\phi} \sin \theta |1\rangle)^{\otimes n}. \quad (71)$$

Allowing θ to vary, we then minimize the relative entropy between $\rho(\{p\})$ and $\sigma(\theta)$,

$$S(\rho(\{p\}) || \sigma(\theta)) = \sum_k p_k \log \frac{p_k}{C_k^n \cos^{2k} \theta \sin^{2(n-k)} \theta}, \quad (72)$$

with respect to θ . We arrive at the stationarity condition

$$\tan^2 \theta \equiv \frac{\sum_k p_k (n-k)}{\sum_k p_k k}. \quad (73)$$

Due to the convexity of the relative entropy, namely,

$$S\left(\sum_i q_i \rho_i || \sum_i q_i \sigma_i\right) \leq \sum_i q_i S(\rho_i || \sigma_i), \quad (74)$$

we can further tighten the expression of the relative entropy by taking its convex hull. The convexification process also results in the corresponding separable state, i.e., the knowledge of the coefficients r_k 's in σ^*

$$\sigma^* = \sum_k r_k |S(n, k)\rangle \langle S(n, k)|. \quad (75)$$

The arrived upper bound on REE for the mixed state $\rho(\{p\})$ was conjectured (shall be proved below) in Ref. [20] to be the exact REE:

Theorem 1:

$$E_R(\rho(\{p\})) = \text{co } F(\{p\}), \quad (76)$$

where

$$F(\{p\}) \equiv \sum_k p_k \log_2 \frac{p_k}{C_k^n \cos^{2k} \theta \sin^{2(n-k)} \theta} = \sum_k p_k \log_2 \frac{p_k n^n}{C_k^n \alpha^k (n-\alpha)^{n-k}}, \quad (77)$$

where the angle θ satisfies Eq. (73), $C_k^n \equiv n!/(k!(n-k)!)$, and $\alpha \equiv \sum_k p_k k$.

B. Proof of the theorem

1. Symmetry considerations

We shall discuss the symmetries possessed by the states $\rho(\{p\})$, and these shall reduce the set of separable states that we need to consider. We begin by noting that the states $\rho(\{p\})$ are invariant under the projection

$$P_1 : \rho \rightarrow \int \frac{d\phi}{2\pi} U(\phi)^{\otimes n} \rho U(\phi)^{\dagger \otimes n} \quad (78)$$

with $U(\phi)\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\} \rightarrow \{|0\rangle, e^{-i\phi}|1\rangle\}$. Vollbrecht and Werner [33] have shown that in order to find the closest separable mixed state for a state that is invariant under projections such as P_1 , it is only necessary to search within the separable states that are also invariant under the projection.

We can further reduce the set of separable states to be searched by invoking another symmetry property possessed by $\rho(\{p\})$: these states are also, by construction, invariant under permutations of all parties. Let us denote by Π_i one of the permutations of parties, and by $\Pi_i(\rho)$ the state obtained from ρ by permuting the parties under Π_i . We now show that the set of separable states to be searched can be reduced to the separable states that are invariant under the permutations. To see this, suppose that ρ is a mixed state in the family (66), and that σ^* is one of the closest separable states to ρ , i.e.,

$$E_R(\rho) \equiv \min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{D}} S(\rho||\sigma) = S(\rho||\sigma^*). \quad (79)$$

As ρ is invariant under all Π_i , we have

$$E_R(\rho) = \frac{1}{N_\Pi} \sum_i S(\rho||\Pi_i(\sigma^*)), \quad (80)$$

where $N_\Pi = n!$ is the number of permutations. By using the convexity of the relative entropy we have

$$E_R(\rho) \geq S\left(\rho \left\| \left[\sum_i \Pi_i(\sigma^*) / N_\Pi \right] \right.\right). \quad (81)$$

However, because of the extremal property, Eq. (79), the inequality must be saturated, as the left-hand side is already minimal. This shows that the state under the projection

$$P_2 : \sigma^* \rightarrow \frac{1}{N_\Pi} \sum_i \Pi_i(\sigma^*) \quad (82)$$

is also a closest separable mixed state to ρ , and is manifestly invariant under all permutations (noting that P_2 preserves separability). Thus, we only need to search within this restricted family of separable states, namely separable states invariant under P_1 and P_2 .

In fact, one can use the group representation theory (see, e.g. Ref. [27, 34]) to characterize all states that invariant under P_1 and P_2 . It turns out that any such state (invariant under both P_1 and P_2) can be written as mixture of all $|S(n, k)\rangle$ and those other basis states belonging to other irreducible representations for the group S_n . However, we have not been able to prove our theorem using only symmetry argument, for it is not trivial to characterize all separable states of this form. But we can prove it by an algebraic approach already developed by Vedral and Plenio [11].

It is not difficult to see that the set \mathcal{D}_S of all separable mixed states that are diagonal in the basis of $\{|S(n, k)\rangle\}$ (basis states for the totally symmetric subspace \mathcal{D}_S) can be constructed from a convex mixture of separable states in Eq. (70). That is, for any $\sigma_s \in \mathcal{D}_S$ we have a decomposition

$$\sigma_s = \sum_i t_i \sigma(\theta_i), \quad (83)$$

where $t_i \geq 0$, $\sum_i t_i = 1$, and $\sigma(\theta_i)$ is of the form (70). This is because the separability of the states (66) implies that there exists a decomposition into pure states such that each pure state is a separable state. Furthermore, because $\{|S(n, k)\rangle\}$ are eigenstates of $\rho(\{p\})$, the most general form of the pure state in its decomposition is

$$\sum_k \sqrt{q_k} e^{i\phi_k} |S(n, k)\rangle. \quad (84)$$

This pure state is separable if and only if it is of the form (71), up to an overall irrelevant phase. As $\rho(\{p\})$ is invariant under the projection P_1 (78), a pure state in Eq. (71) will be projected to the mixed state in Eq. (70) under P_1 . Thus, every separable state that is diagonal in $\{|S(n, k)\rangle\}$ basis can be expressed in the form (83).

Hence, our construction of σ^* (via any necessary convexification) ensures that it achieves at least the minimum (of the relative entropy) when the separable mixed states are restricted to \mathcal{D}_S . However, in order to prove the conjecture, one would still need to show that the expression is also the minimum when the restriction to \mathcal{D}_S is relaxed to the set of separable states invariant under P_1 and P_2 , unless we can employ further argument, symmetry or not, to reduce to \mathcal{D}_S the set of separable states that we need to consider.

2. The proof

The symmetry considerations presented in the previous section only reduce the set of separable states to a smaller one possessing symmetry. In particular, any state that is invariant under (1) any permutation of the n parties and (2) projection under average of local phase as in Eq. (78) can be written as a mixture of the basis states in all the irreducible representations of $U(2)$. However, the symmetry alone has not led us to the proof of our theorem. Here, we provide a more direct algebraic proof.

Since we have shown that σ^* gives minimum of $S(\rho||\sigma)$ when the separable states are restricted to being diagonal in $|S(n, k)\rangle$'s, we now show that it is indeed a local minimum when we lift that restriction. According to the discussions by Vedral and Plenio [11], this means that we need to show that adding any separable state σ_s : $\sigma(x) = (1-x)\sigma^* + x\sigma_s$, the quantity f ,

$$f(x, \sigma_s) \equiv S(\rho||((1-x)\sigma^* + x\sigma_s)), \quad (85)$$

has a local minimum at $x = 0$. This is equivalent to show that

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(0, \sigma_s) \geq 0. \quad (86)$$

It is straightforward to calculate the l.h.s. of the above expression, as was done in Ref. [11], which gives

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(0, \sigma_s) = 1 - \int_0^\infty dt \text{Tr}[\rho(\sigma^* + t)^{-1} \sigma_s (\sigma^* + t)^{-1}]. \quad (87)$$

Taking σ^* as in Eq. (75) and ρ in Eq. (66), we have

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(0, \sigma_s) = 1 - \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{p_k}{r_k} \langle S(n, k) | \sigma_s | S(n, k) \rangle. \quad (88)$$

As σ^* is constructed to be the minimum in the restricted (i.e., the totally symmetric) subspace, this means that for $|\Phi_s\rangle = (\cos\theta|0\rangle + \sin\theta|1\rangle)^{\otimes n}$ in this subspace, we automatically have by construction

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(0, |\Phi_s\rangle\langle\Phi_s|) = 1 - \sum_k \frac{p_k}{r_k} C_k^n \cos^{2k} \theta \sin^{2(n-k)} \theta \geq 0. \quad (89)$$

As $\partial f(0, \sigma)/\partial x$ is linear in σ , namely,

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(0, \sum_i p_i \sigma_i) = \sum_i p_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(0, \sigma_i), \quad (90)$$

in order to show that $\partial f(0, \sigma)/\partial x \geq 0$ holds for arbitrary separable state σ , it is sufficient to show that it holds for arbitrary pure separable state $\sigma = |\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|$, which is what we are about to do. To be more explicit, we shall show that for any arbitrary separable pure state

$$|\Phi\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^n (\sqrt{q_j}|0\rangle + \sqrt{1-q_j}e^{i\phi_j}|1\rangle), \quad (91)$$

we also have

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(0, |\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|) = 1 - \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{p_k}{r_k} \langle S(n, k) | \Phi \rangle \langle \Phi | S(n, k) \rangle \geq 0. \quad (92)$$




FIG. 1: Comparison of F (solid curve), $E_R = \text{co} F$ (partly dashed line, when convexification is necessary) and the numerical value of E_R (dots) for the states $\rho_{3;0,1}(s)$, $\rho_{3;0,2}(s)$, and $\rho_{3;1,2}(s)$ (from top to bottom).

Note that $|\Phi\rangle$ is the most general separable multi-qubit pure state (up to an irrelevant global phase).
The key point is then to evaluate

$$\Phi_k \equiv \langle S(n, k) | \Phi \rangle. \quad (93)$$

Note that

$$\sqrt{C_k^n} |S(n, k)\rangle = \frac{1}{k!(n-k)!} \sum_{\Pi_i \in S_n} |\underbrace{\Pi_i(0, \dots, 0)}_k, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{n-k}\rangle. \quad (94)$$

This gives

$$\Phi_k \equiv \langle S(n, k) | \Phi \rangle = \frac{\sqrt{C_k^n}}{n!} \sum_{\Pi_i} \sqrt{q_{\Pi_i(1)}} \cdots \sqrt{q_{\Pi_i(k)}} \sqrt{1 - q_{\Pi_i(k+1)}} \cdots \sqrt{1 - q_{\Pi_i(n)}} e^{i\phi_{\Pi_i(k+1)}} \cdots e^{i\phi_{\Pi_i(n)}}. \quad (95)$$

Thus,

$$|\Phi_k| \leq \frac{\sqrt{C_k^n}}{n!} \sum_{\Pi_i} \sqrt{q_{\Pi_i(1)}} \cdots \sqrt{q_{\Pi_i(k)}} \sqrt{1 - q_{\Pi_i(k+1)}} \cdots \sqrt{1 - q_{\Pi_i(n)}}, \quad (96)$$

and

$$|\Phi_k|^2 \leq \frac{C_k^n}{(n!)^2} \left[\sum_{\Pi_i} q_{\Pi_i(1)} \cdots q_{\Pi_i(k)} \right] \left[\sum_{\Pi_i} (1 - q_{\Pi_i(k+1)}) \cdots (1 - q_{\Pi_i(n)}) \right], \quad (97)$$

where we have used the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Using the Maclaurin inequality [38]:

$$\frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\Pi_i} x_{\Pi_i(1)} \cdots x_{\Pi_i(k)} \leq \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{n} \right)^k, \quad (98)$$

we have that

$$|\Phi_k|^2 \leq C_k^n (\bar{q})^k (1 - \bar{q})^{n-k} = C_k^n \cos^{2k} \theta \sin^{2(n-k)} \theta, \quad (99)$$

for $\cos^2 \theta = \bar{q}$. This means that

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(0, |\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|) = 1 - \sum_k \frac{p_k}{r_k} |\Phi_k|^2 \geq 1 - \sum_k \frac{p_k}{r_k} C_k^n \cos^{2k} \theta \sin^{2(n-k)} \theta \geq 0, \quad (100)$$

and that σ^* is indeed the closest separable state to ρ in Eq. (66). Hence, Theorem 1 is proved.

C. Examples

We illustrate the established expression of REE for the state $\rho(\{p\})$, making the restriction to mixtures of two distinct n -qubit states $|S(n, k_1)\rangle$ and $|S(n, k_2)\rangle$ (with $k_1 \neq k_2$):

$$\rho_{n;k_1,k_2}(s) \equiv s|S(n, k_1)\rangle\langle S(n, k_1)| + (1-s)|S(n, k_2)\rangle\langle S(n, k_2)|. \quad (101)$$

We first investigate the two-qubit (i.e. $n = 2$) case. Besides the trivial mixture, $\rho_{2;0,2}$, there is only one inequivalent mixture, $\rho_{2;0,1}(s)$ [which is equivalent to $\rho_{2;2,1}(s)$], which is the so-called *maximally entangled mixed state* [36, 37] (for a certain range of s)

$$\rho_{2;0,1} = s|11\rangle\langle 11| + (1-s)|\Psi^+\rangle\langle\Psi^+|, \quad (102)$$

where $|\Psi^+\rangle \equiv (|01\rangle + |10\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ is one of the four Bell states. The function F for this state [denoted by $F_{2;0,1}(s)$] is

$$F_{2;0,1}(s) = s \log_2 \frac{4s}{(1+s)^2} + (1-s) \log_2 \frac{2}{1+s}, \quad (103)$$

which is convex in s . Hence, it is exactly the expression for the relative entropy of entanglement for the state $\rho_{2;0,1}$ found by Vedral and Plenio [11].

For $n = 3$ there are three nontrivial inequivalent mixtures: $\rho_{3;0,1}(s)$ [equivalent to $\rho_{3;3,2}(s)$], $\rho_{3;0,2}(s)$ [to $\rho_{3;3,1}(s)$], and $\rho_{3;1,2}(s)$ [to $\rho_{3;2,1}(s)$]. In Fig. 1 we compare the function F in Eq. (77), its convex hull $\text{co } F$, and numerical values of E_R obtained using the general scheme described in Ref. [11] extended beyond the two-qubit case.

For $n = 4$ there are five inequivalent nontrivial mixtures: $\rho_{4;0,1}(s)$, $\rho_{4;0,2}(s)$, $\rho_{4;0,3}(s)$, $\rho_{4;1,2}(s)$, and $\rho_{4;1,3}(s)$. In Figs. 3 and 2 we again compare the function F in Eq. (77), its convex hull $\text{co } F = E_R$, and numerical values of E_R .

For the states that we have just considered, we now explicitly give the formulas for E_R suggested by the theorem. For the three-qubit mixed state $\rho_{3;2,1}(s)$, its E_R is

$$s \log_2 \frac{9s}{(1+s)^2(2-s)} + (1-s) \log_2 \frac{9(1-s)}{(2-s)^2(1+s)}. \quad (104a)$$

For $\rho_{3;0,1}(s)$, it is

$$s \log_2 \frac{27s}{(2+s)^3} + (1-s) \log_2 \frac{9}{(2+s)^2}. \quad (104b)$$

For $\rho_{4;0,1}(s)$, it is

$$s \log_2 \frac{256s}{(3+s)^4} + (1-s) \log_2 \frac{64}{(3+s)^3}. \quad (105a)$$

For $\rho_{4;1,2}(s)$, it is

$$s \log_2 \frac{64s}{(2-s)(2+s)^3} + (1-s) \log_2 \frac{128(1-s)}{3(2-s)^2(2+s)^2}. \quad (105b)$$




FIG. 2: Comparison of F (solid), its convex hull, i.e., E_R and the numerical value of E_R for the states $\rho_{4;0,1}(s)$, $\rho_{4;1,2}(s)$, and $\rho_{4;1,3}(s)$ (from top to bottom). In these cases, $E_R = F$.

For $\rho_{4;1,3}(s)$, it is

$$s \log_2 \frac{64s}{(3-2s)(1+2s)^3} + (1-s) \log_2 \frac{64(1-s)}{(3-2s)^3(1+2s)}. \quad (105c)$$

These states above are exemplified in Figs. 1 and 2. For states such as $\rho_{3;0,2}$, $\rho_{4;0,2}$, and $\rho_{4;0,3}$, convexifications (i.e. convex hull constructions) are needed; see Figs. 1 and 3.

D. Multi-qudits

Now we consider multipartite qudit systems, in particular, the family of mixed states

$$\rho(\{p_{\vec{k}}\}) \equiv \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{N}^d; \sum_i k_i = n} p_{\vec{k}} |S(n; \vec{k})\rangle \langle S(n; \vec{k})|. \quad (106)$$

The closest separable state that is in the symmetric subspace is of the form

$$\sigma^* = \sum_{\vec{k}} r_{\vec{k}} |S(n; \vec{k})\rangle \langle S(n; \vec{k})|, \quad (107)$$

and it can be constructed from the convex hull of product states

$$\sum_i t_i |\phi_i\rangle \langle \phi_i|^{\otimes n}. \quad (108)$$




FIG. 3: Comparison of F (solid), its convex hull, i.e., E_R (partly dashed line, when convexification is necessary), and the numerical value of E_R for the states $\rho_{4;0,2}(s)$ (top) and $\rho_{4;0,3}(s)$ (bottom).

Let us now describe how it is constructed and how the formula for the REE is obtained in a similar to the qubit case.

$$|\Phi(\vec{u}, \vec{\phi})\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^n \left(\sum_{l=1}^d \sqrt{u_l} e^{i\phi_l} |l\rangle \right)_j = \sum_{\vec{k}} \sqrt{\frac{n!}{k_1! \dots k_d!}} (\sqrt{u_1})^{k_1} \dots (\sqrt{u_d})^{k_d} e^{i\phi_1 + \dots + i\phi_d} |S(n; \vec{k})\rangle. \quad (109)$$

Construct a separable mixed state by averaging over all phases,

$$\sigma(\vec{u}) \equiv \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi_1 \dots \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi_d |\Phi(\vec{u}, \vec{\phi})\rangle \langle \Phi(\vec{u}, \vec{\phi})| = \sum_{\vec{k}} C_{\vec{k}}^n u_1^{k_1} \dots u_d^{k_d} |S(n; \vec{k})\rangle \langle S(n; \vec{k})|, \quad (110)$$

where, for the sake of convenience, we have defined $C_{\vec{k}}^n \equiv n! / k_1! \dots k_d!$. The relative entropy between ρ and σ becomes

$$S(\rho||\sigma) = \sum_{\vec{k}} p_{\vec{k}} \log \frac{p_{\vec{k}}}{C_{\vec{k}}^n u_1^{k_1} \dots u_d^{k_d}}. \quad (111)$$

Minimizing this w.r.t. u 's with the constraint $\sum_i u_i = 1$, we arrive at the solution

$$\bar{u}_j \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\vec{k}} p_{\vec{k}} k_j. \quad (112)$$

This leads us to define the function

$$F(p_{\vec{k}}) \equiv \sum_{\vec{k}} p_{\vec{k}} \log \frac{p_{\vec{k}}}{C_{\vec{k}}^n \bar{u}_1^{k_1} \dots \bar{u}_d^{k_d}}. \quad (113)$$

The relative entropy of entanglement for $\rho(p_{\vec{k}})$ is then conjectured to be the convex hull of the above expression,

Theorem 2:

$$E_R(\rho(p_{\vec{k}})) = \text{co} F(p_{\vec{k}}), \quad (114)$$

and the closest separable state will be the corresponding convex hull of $\sigma(\vec{u})$. Whenever the function F is convex, there is no need for the last convexification procedure, and $E_R = F$.

Let us go on to prove this. As σ^* in Eq. (107) is constructed as the closest separable state to $\rho(\{p_{\vec{k}}\})$ when restricted in the symmetric subspace, we have in particular that

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(0, |\Phi_s\rangle\langle\Phi_s|) \geq 0, \quad (115)$$

for any $|\Phi_s\rangle$ of the form

$$|\Phi_s\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^n \left(\sum_{l=1}^d \sqrt{q_l} |l\rangle \right)_j = \sum_{\vec{k}} \sqrt{C_{\vec{k}}^n} (\sqrt{q_1})^{k_1} \dots (\sqrt{q_d})^{k_d} |S(n; \vec{k})\rangle. \quad (116)$$

This means that

$$1 - \sum_{\vec{k}} \frac{p_{\vec{k}}}{r_{\vec{k}}} C_{\vec{k}}^n (q_1)^{k_1} \dots (q_d)^{k_d} \geq 0, \quad (117)$$

for all $q_j \geq 0$ and $\sum_{j=1}^d q_j = 1$. Similar to the qubit case, if we can show that

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(0, |\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|) \geq 0, \quad (118)$$

for arbitrary product state $|\Phi\rangle$,

$$|\Phi\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^n \left(\sum_{l=1}^d \sqrt{q_{j,l}} e^{i\phi_{j,l}} |l\rangle \right)_j, \quad (119)$$

for $\sum_{l=1}^d q_{j,l} = 1$. We thus need to evaluate

$$\Phi_{\vec{k}} \equiv \langle S(n; \vec{k}) | \Phi \rangle. \quad (120)$$

Note that

$$\sqrt{C_{\vec{k}}^n} |S(n; \vec{k})\rangle = \frac{1}{k_1! \dots k_d!} \sum_{\Pi_i \in S_n} |\Pi_i(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{k_1}, \underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_{k_2}, \dots, \underbrace{d, \dots, d}_{k_d})\rangle. \quad (121)$$

This gives

$$\Phi_{\vec{k}} = \frac{\sqrt{C_{\vec{k}}^n}}{n!} \sum_{\Pi_i} \sqrt{q_{\Pi_i(1),1}} e^{i\phi_{\Pi_i(1),1}} \dots \sqrt{q_{\Pi_i(k_1),1}} e^{i\phi_{\Pi_i(k_1),1}} \sqrt{q_{\Pi_i(k_1+1),2}} e^{i\phi_{\Pi_i(k_1+1),2}} \dots \sqrt{q_{\Pi_i(n),d}} e^{i\phi_{\Pi_i(n),d}}. \quad (122)$$

Taking the absolute value, we have

$$|\Phi_{\vec{k}}| \leq \frac{\sqrt{C_{\vec{k}}^n}}{n!} \sum_{\Pi_i} (\sqrt{q_{\Pi_i(1),1}} \dots \sqrt{q_{\Pi_i(k_1),1}}) (\sqrt{q_{\Pi_i(k_1+1),2}} \dots \sqrt{q_{\Pi_i(k_1+k_2),2}}) \dots (\sqrt{q_{\Pi_i(n-k_d+1),d}} \dots \sqrt{q_{\Pi_i(n),d}}). \quad (123)$$

Recently, Carlen, Loss and Lieb [35] have shown an inequality regarding the permanent of a matrix. Using their results, the following inequality is easily seen to hold:

$$\frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\Pi_i} (\sqrt{q_{\Pi_i(1),1}} \dots \sqrt{q_{\Pi_i(k_1),1}}) (\sqrt{q_{\Pi_i(k_1+1),2}} \dots \sqrt{q_{\Pi_i(k_1+k_2),2}}) \dots (\sqrt{q_{\Pi_i(n-k_d+1),d}} \dots \sqrt{q_{\Pi_i(n),d}}) \leq (\bar{q}_1)^{k_1/2} \dots (\bar{q}_d)^{k_d/2}, \quad (124)$$

where $\bar{q}_i = \sum_{j=1}^n q_{j,i}/n$. With this, our conjecture is thus proved.




FIG. 4: Comparison of F (solid), its convex hull, i.e., E_R (dashed) for the state $\rho_{ab}(s)$.

E. Examples

Let us first at a three-qutrit example: $n = 3$, $d = 4$, and involving only two vectors $\vec{a} = (2, 0, 0, 1)$ and $\vec{b} = (1, 1, 1, 0)$, to which the corresponding states are

$$|\vec{a}\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{3}(|114\rangle + |141\rangle + |411\rangle), \quad (125)$$

$$|\vec{b}\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{6}(|123\rangle + |132\rangle + |213\rangle + |231\rangle + |312\rangle + |321\rangle). \quad (126)$$

From Eq. (41) their REE are $2 \log_2(3) - 2 \approx 1.17$ and $2 \log_2(3) - 1 \approx 2.17$, respectively. We shall now consider the mixture

$$\rho_{ab}(s) \equiv s|\vec{a}\rangle\langle\vec{a}| + (1-s)|\vec{b}\rangle\langle\vec{b}|. \quad (127)$$

According to Eq. (113), the corresponding F function is

$$F_{ab}(s) = s \log_2 \frac{9}{(1+s)^2} + (1-s) \log_2 \frac{9}{2(1-s^2)}, \quad (128)$$

which is, however, not convex. This means that we need to construct its convex hull in order to obtain its REE,

$$E_R(s) = \text{co } F_{ab}(s) = F_{ab}(1) + (1-s)(F_{ab}(0) - F_{ab}(1)). \quad (129)$$

This is shown in Fig. 4.

As another example, let us consider additionally the state associated with $\vec{c} = (1, 0, 0, 2)$ defined via

$$|\vec{c}\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{3}(|441\rangle + |414\rangle + |144\rangle). \quad (130)$$

The state mixture of $|\vec{a}\rangle$ and $|\vec{c}\rangle$,

$$\rho_{ac}(s) = s|\vec{a}\rangle\langle\vec{a}| + (1-s)|\vec{c}\rangle\langle\vec{c}|, \quad (131)$$

can be seen to possess REE equal to that of $\rho_{3;1,2}(s)$.

VI. $E_{\log} \leq E_R$?

Recall that for pure states we found the inequality $E_{\log} \leq E_R$. Does this inequality hold for mixed states? We do not know the complete answer to this question. From Inequality 6, we only have $E_{\log}(\rho) - S(\rho) \leq E_R(\rho)$. However, we shall show that $E_{\log} \leq E_R$ indeed holds for the two families of mixed states in Eqs. (66) and (106), as well as Eq. (144).

A. Multi-qubits

Let us begin with the multi-qubit states (66). We first establish that the quantity $\mathcal{E}(\{q\})$ that is used to obtain E_{\log} is a lower bound on $F(\{q\})$, which is used to obtain E_R . Recall that [20]

$$\mathcal{E}(\{p\}) = -2 \log_2 \left[\max_{\theta} \sum_k \sqrt{p_k} \sqrt{C_k^n} \cos^k \theta \sin^{n-k} \theta \right]. \quad (132a)$$

By the concavity of log, we then have

$$-2 \log_2 \left[\sum_k \sqrt{p_k} \sqrt{C_k^n} \cos^k \theta \sin^{n-k} \theta \right] \leq \sum_k p_k \log_2 \frac{p_k}{C_k^n \cos^{2k} \theta \sin^{2(n-k)} \theta}. \quad (132b)$$

Hence

$$\min_{\theta} -2 \log_2 \left[\sum_k \sqrt{p_k} \sqrt{C_k^n} \cos^k \theta \sin^{n-k} \theta \right] \leq \min_{\theta} \sum_k p_k \log_2 \frac{p_k}{C_k^n \cos^{2k} \theta \sin^{2(n-k)} \theta}, \quad (132c)$$

or equivalently

$$\mathcal{E}(\{p\}) \leq F(\{p\}). \quad (132d)$$

By using theorem 1 and by taking the convex hull of both sides of this inequality we have

$$E_{\log} \leq E_R \quad (133)$$

for the family of states (66).

B. Multi-qudits

Similarly, the relation $E_{\log} \leq E_R$ also holds true for the multi-qudit states (106), and the proof is similar. Following the same idea in Ref. [20], to calculate E_{\log} for states (106), one first consider

$$\mathcal{E}(\{p_{\vec{k}}\}) = -2 \log_2 \left[\max_{\vec{u}} \sum_{\vec{k}} \sqrt{p_{\vec{k}}} \sqrt{C_{\vec{k}}^n} (\sqrt{u_1})^{k_1} \dots (\sqrt{u_d})^{k_d} \right]. \quad (134a)$$

By the concavity of log, we then have

$$-2 \log_2 \left[\sum_{\vec{k}} \sqrt{p_{\vec{k}}} \sqrt{C_{\vec{k}}^n} (\sqrt{u_1})^{k_1} \dots (\sqrt{u_d})^{k_d} \right] \leq \sum_{\vec{k}} p_{\vec{k}} \log_2 \frac{p_{\vec{k}}}{C_{\vec{k}}^n u_1^{k_1} \dots u_d^{k_d}}. \quad (134b)$$

Hence

$$\min_{\vec{u}} -2 \log_2 \left[\sum_{\vec{k}} \sqrt{p_{\vec{k}}} \sqrt{C_{\vec{k}}^n} (\sqrt{u_1})^{k_1} \dots (\sqrt{u_d})^{k_d} \right] \leq \min_{\vec{u}} \sum_{\vec{k}} p_{\vec{k}} \log_2 \frac{p_{\vec{k}}}{C_{\vec{k}}^n u_1^{k_1} \dots u_d^{k_d}}, \quad (134c)$$

or equivalently

$$\mathcal{E}(\{p_{\vec{k}}\}) \leq F(\{p_{\vec{k}}\}). \quad (134d)$$

By using theorem 1 and by taking the convex hull of both sides of this inequality we have

$$E_{\log} \leq E_R \quad (135)$$

for the family of states (66).

It would be interesting to know to what extent $E_{\log} \leq E_R$ holds.

VII. SOME APPLICATIONS

We know that the W state $|W\rangle \equiv (|001\rangle + |010\rangle + |100\rangle)/\sqrt{3}$ is more robust than $|GHZ\rangle \equiv (|000\rangle + |111\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ against losing one of their constituent parties. This is also true for the particular family of n -qubit pure states $\{|S(n, k)\rangle\}$, the relative entropy of entanglement of which we have given in Eq. (38). Now, if we trace over one party we get a mixed $(n-1)$ -qubit state:

$$\text{Tr}_1 |S(n, k)\rangle\langle S(n, k)| = \frac{n-k}{n} |S(n-1, k)\rangle\langle S(n-1, k)| + \frac{k}{n} |S(n-1, k-1)\rangle\langle S(n-1, k-1)|. \quad (136)$$

We have also given an expression for the relative entropy of entanglement for this mixed state. If we trace over m parties, the reduced mixed state would be a mixture of $\{|S(n-m, q)\rangle\}$ [with $q \leq (n-m)$], and again we have its relative entropy of entanglement. For example, if we start with $|S(4, 1)\rangle$, and trace over one party and then another, we get the sequence:

$$|S(4, 1)\rangle \rightarrow \rho_{3;0,1}(1/4) \rightarrow \rho_{2;0,1}(1/2), \quad (137)$$

for which we have given the corresponding relative entropies of entanglement in Eqs. (38), (104b) and (103). The entanglement at each stage is

$$3 \log_2 \left(\frac{4}{3} \right) \rightarrow \log_2 \left(\frac{16}{9 \cdot 3^{1/4}} \right) \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \log_2 \left(\frac{32}{27} \right), \quad (138)$$

or numerically,

$$1.24511 \rightarrow 0.433834 \rightarrow 0.122556. \quad (139)$$

Unlike n -GHZ states, these states can still remain entangled even if some of the qubits are lost along the way.

Plenio and Vedral [9] have derived a lower bound on the REE of a tripartite pure state $\rho_{ABC} = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ in terms of the entropies and REE of the reduced states of two parties:

$$\max\{E_R(\rho_{AB}) + S(\rho_{AB}), E_R(\rho_{AC}) + S(\rho_{AC}), E_R(\rho_{BC}) + S(\rho_{BC})\} \leq E_R(\rho_{ABC}), \quad (140)$$

where $\rho_{AB} = \text{Tr}_C(\rho_{ABC})$ (and similarly for ρ_{AC} and ρ_{BC}) and $S(\rho) \equiv -\text{Tr}\rho \log_2 \rho$ is the von Neumann entropy. They have further found that this lower bound is saturated by $|GHZ\rangle$ and $|W\rangle$. Based on Theorem 1, we can actually show that for $\rho_{12\dots n} = |S(n, k)\rangle\langle S(n, k)|$ the inequality

$$\max_i \{E_R(\rho_{12\dots\hat{i}\dots n}) + S(\rho_{12\dots\hat{i}\dots n})\} \leq E_R(\rho_{12\dots n}) \quad (141)$$

is saturated, where $\rho_{12\dots\hat{i}\dots n} \equiv \text{Tr}_i(\rho_{12\dots n})$ is the reduced density matrix obtained from $\rho_{12\dots n}$ by tracing out the i -th party. The proof is as follows. As $|S(n, k)\rangle$ is permutation-invariant, there is no need to maximize over all parties, and we can simply take $i = 1$, obtaining the reduced state $\rho_{n-1; k-1, k}(k/n)$ as in Eq. (136). As the corresponding function $F_{n-1; k-1, k}(s)$ of $\rho_{n-1; k-1, k}(s)$ is convex for $s \in [0, 1]$, we immediately obtain from Theorem 1 that, for $\rho_{n-1; k-1, k}(k/n)$,

$$E_R(\rho_{n-1; k-1, k}(k/n)) = -\log_2 \left[C_k^n \left(\frac{k}{n} \right)^k \left(\frac{n-k}{n} \right)^{n-k} \right] + \frac{k}{n} \log_2 \frac{k}{n} + \frac{n-k}{n} \log_2 \frac{n-k}{n} \quad (142a)$$

$$= E_R(|S(n, k)\rangle) - S(\rho_{n-1; k-1, k}(k/n)). \quad (142b)$$

Therefore, the bound in Eq. (141) is saturated for $\rho_{12\dots n} = |S(n, k)\rangle\langle S(n, k)|$.

We remark that there are other applications that our results can be useful, such as (i) providing bounds on state discrimination by separable operations and (ii) constructing optimal entanglement witness, which have been discussed by Hayashi et al. [27], and we refer readers to their paper.

VIII. ANOTHER FAMILY OF MULTI-QUBIT MIXED STATES: DÜR'S STATES

Dür [22] found that for $N \geq 4$ the following state is bound entangled:

$$\rho_N \equiv \frac{1}{N+1} \left(|\Psi_G\rangle\langle\Psi_G| + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^N (P_k + \bar{P}_k) \right), \quad (143)$$

where $|\Psi_G\rangle \equiv (|0^{\otimes N}\rangle + e^{i\alpha_N}|1^{\otimes N}\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ is a N -partite GHZ state; $P_k \equiv |u_k\rangle\langle u_k|$ is a projector onto the state $|u_k\rangle \equiv |0\rangle_1|0\rangle_2 \dots |1\rangle_k \dots |0\rangle_N$; and $\bar{P}_k \equiv |v_k\rangle\langle v_k|$ projects on to $|v_k\rangle \equiv |1\rangle_1|1\rangle_2 \dots |0\rangle_k \dots |1\rangle_N$. For $N \geq 8$ this state violates the (two-setting) Mermin-Klyshko-Bell inequality [22]; violation was pushed down to $N \geq 7$ by Kaszlikowski et al. [39] for a three-setting Bell inequality; it was pushed further down to $N \geq 6$ by Sen *et al.* [40] for a functional Bell inequality. The phase α_N in $|\Psi_G\rangle$ can be eliminated by local unitary transformations, and hence we shall take $\alpha_N = 0$ in the following discussion.

This state has been extended to the following family by Wei et al. [21],

$$\rho_N(x) \equiv x|\Psi_G\rangle\langle\Psi_G| + \frac{1-x}{2N} \sum_{k=1}^N (P_k + \bar{P}_k), \quad (144)$$

and they found that for $N \geq 4$ the state is bound entangled if $0 < x \leq 1/(N+1)$ and is still entangled but not bound entangled if $1/(N+1) < x \leq 1$. They calculated the negativity and the geometric measure for this family of states, e.g.,

$$E_{\log}(\rho_N(x)) = \log_2 \frac{2}{2-x}, \quad (145)$$

and conjectured their relative entropy of entanglement to be $E_R(x) = x$, for $N \geq 4$, with one closest separable mixed state being

$$\sigma^*(x) = \frac{x}{2} (|\Psi_G\rangle\langle\Psi_G| + |\Psi_G^-\rangle\langle\Psi_G^-|) + \frac{1-x}{2N} \sum_{k=1}^N (P_k + \bar{P}_k), \quad (146)$$

where

$$|\Psi_G^-\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0^{\otimes N}\rangle - |1^{\otimes N}\rangle). \quad (147)$$

We prove their conjecture here. As before we define the quantity

$$f(z, \sigma_s) \equiv S(\rho_N(x) || (1-z)\sigma^*(x) + z\sigma_s), \quad (148)$$

where σ_s is any separable state. In order to show that $\rho^*(x)$ is indeed the closest separable state to $\rho_N(x)$, it is sufficient to show that

$$\frac{\partial f(0, |\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|)}{\partial z} = 1 - \int_0^\infty dt \operatorname{Tr}[(\sigma^* + t)^{-1} \rho_N (\sigma^* + t)^{-1} |\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|] \geq 0, \quad (149)$$

where $|\Phi\rangle$ is any separable pure state, which can be parametrized as follows,

$$|\Phi\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^n (\cos \theta_j |0\rangle_j + \sin \theta_j e^{i\phi_j} |1\rangle_j), \quad (150)$$

and, without loss of generality, we can restrict ourselves to $\cos \theta_j, \sin \theta_j \geq 0$. By direct calculation, we have

$$\int_0^\infty dt (\sigma^* + t)^{-1} \rho_N (\sigma^* + t)^{-1} = 2|\Psi_G\rangle\langle\Psi_G| + \sum_{k=1}^N (P_k + \bar{P}_k), \quad (151)$$

and hence

$$\frac{\partial f(0, |\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|)}{\partial z} = 1 - g_N \geq 0 \quad (152)$$

is valid for $N \geq 4$, as (see Ref. [21] for the proof)

$$g_N \equiv (c_1 \dots c_N + s_1 \dots s_N)^2 + \sum_{k=1}^N \{(c_1 \dots s_k \dots c_N)^2 + (s_1 \dots c_k \dots s_N)^2\} \leq 1, \quad (153)$$

where we have simplified the notation by using $c_i \equiv \cos \theta_i$ and $s_i \equiv \sin \theta_i$. Therefore, $\sigma^*(x)$ is indeed the closest separable state to $\rho_N(x)$ and hence $E_R(\rho_N(x)) = x$ for $N \geq 4$.

We remark that for this family of states, the relation $E_{\log} \leq E_R$ holds, as $\log_2(2/(2-x)) \leq x$ for $0 \leq x \leq 1$.

IX. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We have proved conjectures on the relative entropy of entanglement (REE) for two families of multipartite qubit states. Thus, analytic expressions of REE for these families of states can be straightforwardly obtained. The first family of states we consider are composed of mixture of some permutation-invariant multi-qubit states. We have also generalized the results generalized to permutation-invariant multi-qudit states, and have given the expression for their relative entropy of entanglement. The second family of states contain Dür's multipartite bound entangled states. Along the way, we have reviewed inequalities connecting the relative entropy of entanglement to the robustness of entanglement and the geometric measure of entanglement, and have slightly extended previous discussions.

It is possible that our results on the relative entropy of entanglement can be applied to the checking of the consistency of some equalities and inequalities [9, 41, 42] regarding minimal reversible entanglement generating sets (MREGSs). These equalities and inequalities concerning MREGS usually involve only the von Neumann entropy and the regularized (i.e. asymptotic) relative entropy of entanglement of the pure state and its reduced density matrices. The results we have in the present Paper concern only the non-regularized version of the relative entropy of entanglement, and hence, can only reach weaker conclusion. Therefore, a major challenge is to extend the ideas contained in the present Paper to the considerations of the regularized version of the relative entropy of entanglement. Moreover, knowledge of the regularized version is also important for providing bounds on the random bipartite entanglement recently investigated by Fortescue and Lo [43].

In Ref. [16] the geometric measure of entanglement was known for not only the family of mixed states $\sum_k p_k |S(n, k)\rangle\langle S(n, k)|$ but also the family of pure states (formed by superposition) $\sum_k \alpha_k |S(n, k)\rangle$. For the relative entropy of entanglement, we still do not yet have analytic expressions for the latter, except for the basis states $|S(n, k)\rangle$. It will be desirable to consider how we can obtain the relative entropy of entanglement for this family of pure multi-qubit states, as well as the corresponding family of pure multi-qudit states $\sum_{\vec{k}} \alpha_{\vec{k}} |S(n, \vec{k})\rangle$.

Indeed, investigating the relative entropy of entanglement for states in this family $\sum_{\vec{k}} \alpha_{\vec{k}} |S(n, \vec{k})\rangle$ can serve as a first step towards obtaining the regularized version of the relative entropy of entanglement for states such as $|S(n, k)\rangle$ and $|S(n, \vec{k})\rangle$, as we now illustrate. Let us consider two copies of the W state (shared among parties A, B, and C),

$$|W^{\otimes 2}\rangle = |W\rangle_{A_1 B_1 C_1} \otimes |W\rangle_{A_2 B_2 C_2}, \quad (154)$$

where

$$|W\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|001\rangle + |010\rangle + |100\rangle). \quad (155)$$

We can expand $|W^{\otimes 2}\rangle$ and re-label the states as follows

$$|0\rangle_{A_1} \otimes |0\rangle_{A_2} \rightarrow |1\rangle_A, \quad (156a)$$

$$|0\rangle_{A_1} \otimes |1\rangle_{A_2} \rightarrow |2\rangle_A, \quad (156b)$$

$$|1\rangle_{A_1} \otimes |0\rangle_{A_2} \rightarrow |3\rangle_A, \quad (156c)$$

$$|1\rangle_{A_1} \otimes |1\rangle_{A_2} \rightarrow |4\rangle_A, \quad (156d)$$

and similarly for parties B and C. This gives us

$$|W^{\otimes 2}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|\vec{a}\rangle_{ABC} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3}}|\vec{b}\rangle_{ABC}, \quad (157)$$

where $|\vec{a}\rangle$ and $|\vec{b}\rangle$ are defined in Eqs. (125) and (126), respectively. Thus, the two copies of the W -state is identical to a superposition of two four-level three-party states, exactly of the form $\sum_{\vec{k}} \alpha_{\vec{k}} |S(n, \vec{k})\rangle$. In general, a state with m copies of, say, $|S(n, k)\rangle$ is also of this form, and hence, the knowledge of the relative entropy of entanglement for the former enables the knowledge of the regularized relative entropy of entanglement for the latter.

In discussing the symmetry of the separable states, we have essentially characterized the family of states invariant under such symmetry (P_1 and P_2). It would be desirable to quantify the entanglement of such family. This family includes states that are generalizations of Werner states, which invariant under average action of $U(d)^{\otimes n}$ in multipartite systems. An interesting question arises: can we characterize the distillability of multipartite states just as in bipartite case, where the question can be reduced to that for Werner states?

Acknowledgments

We thank Tobias Moroder, Robert Raussendorf, Simone Severini and Rolando Somma for useful discussions. This work was supported by IQC, NSERC, and ORF.

-
- [1] See, e.g., M. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
 - [2] See, e.g., the review by R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, arXiv eprint:quant-ph/0702225.
 - [3] See, e.g., the review by L. Amico, R. Fazio, A. Osterloh, and V. Vedral. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*
 - [4] See, e.g., the review by U. Schollwöck, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **77**, 259 (2005).
 - [5] C. H. Bennett, S. Popescu, D. Rohrlich, J. A. Smolin, and A. V. Thapliyal, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 012307 (2001).
 - [6] C. H. Bennett, H. J. Bernstein, S. Popescu, and B. Schumacher, *Phys. Rev. A* **53**, 2046 (1996).
 - [7] C. H. Bennett, D. DiVincenzo, J. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. A* **53**, 3824 (1996).
 - [8] W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 2245 (1998).
 - [9] M. B. Plenio and V. Vedral, *J. Phys. A* **34**, 6997 (2001).
 - [10] V. Vedral, M. B. Plenio, M. A. Rippin, and P. L. Knight, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 2275 (1997).
 - [11] V. Vedral and M. B. Plenio, *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, 1619 (1998).
 - [12] F. G. S. L. Brandão and M. B. Plenio, eprint arXiv:0710.827 (2007).
 - [13] S. Ishizaka, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 060301 (2003).
 - [14] A. Shimony, *Ann. NY. Acad. Sci.* **755**, 675 (1995).
 - [15] H. Barnum and N. Linden, *J. Phys. A* **34**, 6787 (2001).
 - [16] T.-C. Wei and P. M. Goldbart, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 042307 (2003).
 - [17] A. Miyake and M. Wadati, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 042317 (2001).
 - [18] O. Biham, M. A. Nielsen, and T. J. Osborne, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 062312 (2002).
 - [19] G. Vidal and R. Tarrach, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 141 (1999).
 - [20] T.-C. Wei, M. Ericsson, P. M. Goldbart, and W. J. Munro, *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **4**, 252 (2004).
 - [21] T.-C. Wei, J. B. Altepeter, P. M. Goldbart, and W. J. Munro, *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 022322 (2004).
 - [22] W. Dür, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 230402 (2001).
 - [23] K. Audenaert, J. Eisert, E. Jané, M. B. Plenio, S. Virmani, and B. De Moor, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 217902 (2001); K. Audenaert, M. B. Plenio, and J. Eisert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 027901 (2003).
 - [24] Y. Shimoni and O. Biham, *Phys. Rev. A* **75**, 022308(2007).
 - [25] M. Blasone, F. Dell'Anno, S. De Siena, F. Illuminati, e-print arXiv:0712.4085 (2007).
 - [26] D. Shapira, Y. Shimoni, and O. Biham, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 044301 (2006).
 - [27] M. Hayashi, D. Markham, M. Muraio, M. Owari, and S. Virmani, *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 012104 (2008).
 - [28] A. Acín, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac, *Quantum Inf. and Comput.* **3**, 55 (2003). G. Vidal and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 5803 (2001).
 - [29] D. Cavalcanti, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 044302 (2006).
 - [30] F. G. S. L. Brandão, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 022310 (2005).
 - [31] M. Hayashi, D. Markham, M. Muraio, M. Owari, and S. Virmani, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 040501 (2006).
 - [32] D. Markham, A. Miyake, and S. Virmani, *New J. Phys.* **9**, 194 (2007).
 - [33] K. G. H. Vollbrecht and R. F. Werner, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 062307 (2001).
 - [34] M. Keyl and R. F. Werner, e-print arXiv:quant-ph/0206086 (2002).
 - [35] E. Carlen, E. H. Lieb, and M. Loss, *Methods Appl. Anal.* **13**, 1 (2006).
 - [36] W. J. Munro, D. F. V. James, A. G. White, and P. G. Kwiat, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 030302 (2001).
 - [37] T.-C. Wei, K. Nemoto, P. M. Goldbart, P. G. Kwiat, W. J. Munro, and F. Verstraete, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 022110 (2003).
 - [38] G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood, and G. Pólya, *Inequalities*, Cambridge Univ. Press, New York, 1934.
 - [39] D. Kaszlikowski, L. C. Kwek, J. Chen, and C. h. Oh, *Phys. Rev. A* **66**, 052309 (2002).
 - [40] A. Sen(De), U. Sen, and M. Żukowski, *Phys. Rev. A* **66**, 062318 (2002).
 - [41] S. Wu and Y. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 012308 (2000).
 - [42] E. F. Galvao, M. B. Plenio, and S. Virmani, *J. Phys. A* **33**, 8809 (2000).
 - [43] B. Fortescue and H.-K. Lo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 260501 (2007).