

GHZ Entanglement Witnesses for Non-interacting Fermi Systems

H. Habibian,^{1,*} J. W. Clark,^{1,2} K. Hingerl,¹ and N. Behbood³

¹*Christian Doppler Labor für oberflächenoptische Methoden,
Johannes Kepler Universität Linz A4040 Austria*

²*Department of Physics, CB 1105, Washington University, St. Louis, MO 63130 USA*

³*Institut für Angewandte Physik, Johannes Kepler Universität Linz A4040 Austria*

(Dated: February 6, 2020)

In this paper we investigate $GHZ\setminus W$ entanglement for indistinguishable systems. For this, we introduce new classes of parameterized GHZ entanglement witnesses to identify two different classes of genuine entangled states for tripartite non-interacting Fermionic systems which lead to two different boundary conditions. Contrary to *Hahn-Banach* theorem, which requires convexity, by choosing proper operators the problem of finding GHZ entanglement witnesses can be reduced to linear programming problem. We see that a spin chain with periodic boundary conditions is a good model system to introduce new class of parameterized witnesses. Also, one can find the proper entanglement witness by generalizing entangled densities, here, using the mixed entangled density of a non-interacting Fermi gas leads to a proper GHZ witness. It is shown for three non-interacting Fermions that all types of entanglement as well as biseparable states exist. We also show PPT entangled states in non-interacting Fermi gas which can be detected by our optimal Non-decomposable GHZ witness. Finally we confirm that pure Bell states, i.e., three party entanglement without any biseparable mixture, do not exist in a non-interacting Fermi gas.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Mn, 03.65.Ud, 71.10.Ca, 05.30.Fk

I. INTRODUCTION

Entangled states are one of the most important distinguishing features of quantum mechanics. Entanglement is required for a detailed quantitative understanding of quantum entanglement as a resource, the impact of ideas from information theory on other areas of physics such as statistical mechanics, the development of innovative quantum applications and the investigation of novel ways to implement quantum information processing in quantum optical or condensed matter systems.

Recently many-body theorists have devoted much work to quantum entanglement. The study of the entanglement properties of correlated wave functions for spin lattices was motivated by the work of Osterloh et al. [1] and more especially that of Osborne and Nielsen [2]. These authors were the first to explore possible connections between quantum phase transitions and entanglement. Also, entanglement properties of the trial many-body wave functions in variational treatments of the transverse Ising model in two, three, and four dimensions are investigated in [3].

We usually think of entanglement as coupling different degrees of freedom of two or more particles. There has been a number of important advances recently in understanding entanglement in systems containing a small number of particles. If we want to use these appropriately, we need to extend our analysis to realistic systems containing a large number of particles. When it comes to large systems in quantum mechanics, the concept of a particle actually fades away and is replaced by the notion of "an excitation of a given mode of the field representing a particle". Individual particles actually become indistinguishable. In the absence of interaction, entanglement can be relevant due to the particle statistics ((fermions, bosons). The most convenient and appropriate formalism to deal with these issues involving a large number of particles is second quantization. [9, 10, 11, 12]. So we need to understand what entanglement means if we want to be able to harness solid state and condensed matter systems for information processing purposes. Another benefit of the second quantization is that it is also the correct formalism for the (relativistic) quantum field theory. We can therefore exploit some known results in this field in the hope of reaching a more complete understanding of entanglement.

There is an ongoing debate on which definition of entanglement for indistinguishable particles will be the most useful from a physical point of view. This uncertainty is responsible for the vast variety of quantities studied, when the entanglement of itinerant fermion and boson systems is discussed. Although many attempt was accomplished

*E-mail: hessam.habibian@students.jku.at

recently to find an appropriate criterion for detecting entanglement of indistinguishable systems [4, 5, 6, 7] but most of them are not applicable.

This paper is organized as follows: In Sec. II we first review some properties for distinguishable and indistinguishable particles and we consider a non-interacting Fermi gas in second quantization. According to [16], in Sec. III different kinds of entanglement witnesses as well as general scheme for constructing GHZ entanglement witnesses (EW) are studied. We see that non-convexity due to W vectors can be approximated by convex polygon. Then in Sec. IV we find new classes of parameterized GHZ EW which can detect $GHZ\setminus W$ states for tripartite non-interacting Fermi systems using a spin chain with periodic boundary condition. We could also detect positive partial transpose (PPT) $GHZ\setminus W$ entangled states in tripartite non-interacting Fermi gas for the equal separation of the Fermions. The other class is derived in Sec. V by considering the symmetric densities related to different classes of entanglement for tripartite systems. The novelty here is introducing EWs by the same process like convex optimization even though the domains are not convex. Also we confirm a genuine three party entanglement for $GHZ\setminus W$ states in a non-interacting Fermi gas by this class of witnesses with a new boundary condition for the fermions. We also see that we cannot have three party entanglement without two party entanglement, i.e., a Bell state in a non-interacting Fermionic system cannot exist. The paper concludes in Sec. VI with a brief summary of the results obtained.

II. INDISTINGUISHABILITY AND NON-INTERACTING FERMION GAS

Consider a system consisting of n parties $\{M_i\}_{i=1}^n$. We call a k -partite split a partition of the system into $k \leq n$ sets $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^k$, where each may be composed of several original parties. A given state $\rho \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{d_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{H}_{d_k})$, associated with some k -partite split, is a m -separable state if it is possible to find a convex decomposition for it such that in each pure state term at most m parties are entangled among each other, but not with any member of the other group of $n - m$ parties. For example, every 1-separable density operator $\rho \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ (the Hilbert space of bounded operators acting on $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{d_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{H}_{d_n}$) is fully separable which can be written as

$$\rho_s = \sum_i p_i |\alpha_i^{(1)}\rangle\langle\alpha_i^{(1)}| \otimes |\alpha_i^{(2)}\rangle\langle\alpha_i^{(2)}| \otimes \dots \otimes |\alpha_i^{(n)}\rangle\langle\alpha_i^{(n)}| \quad (1)$$

with $p_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_i p_i = 1$. The system is called entangled when the corresponding density is not separable. So, in general, for more than bipartite systems we have different possibilities for entanglement between different part of systems even for distinguishable (labeled) particles.

A schematic view of two electrons located in a double-well was discussed in [6, 7, 8] to illustrate the consequences of indistinguishability for entanglement. For this illustration these authors assume that the qubit is modeled by the spin degree of freedom, which is denoted by $|\uparrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\rangle$ and two spatial wavefunctions labeled $|\phi\rangle$ and $|\chi\rangle$, initially localized in the left and in the right potential well, respectively. Then it was shown that the complete state-space is different to the one for distinguishable particles (or photon polarizations). For bipartite pure systems, the authors considered $\rho_w = |w\rangle\langle w| \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{C}^{2K} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{2K})$ and defined f_a and f_a^\dagger ($a = 1, \dots, 2K$) as the fermionic annihilation and creation operators of single-particle states forming an orthogonal basis in \mathcal{C}^{2K} . Each $|w\rangle$ can be represented as $|w\rangle = \sum_{a,b} w_{ab} f_a^\dagger f_b^\dagger |0\rangle$ where $w_{ab} = -w_{ba}$ is an antisymmetric matrix. For any complex antisymmetric $n \times n$ matrix $[w]_{ab}$ there is a unitary transformation U such that $w' = UwU^T$ has nonzero entries only in 2×2 blocks along the diagonal, i.e.,

$$w' = \text{diag}[Z_1, \dots, Z_r, Z_0], \quad Z_i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & z_i \\ -z_i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (2)$$

where $z_i > 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$ and Z_0 is the $(n - 2r) \times (n - 2r)$ null matrix. Each 2×2 block matrix Z_i corresponds to an elementary Slater determinant. The above matrix represents an expansion of $|w\rangle$ into a basis of elementary Slater determinants with a minimum number r of non-vanishing terms. This number is called fermionic Slater rank of $|w\rangle$. One needs a fermionic state of Slater rank two to form an entangled state. For bipartite pure bosonic systems, the expression for two bosons in an n -dimensional single-particle space reads $|v\rangle = \sum_{i,j} v_{ij} b_i^\dagger b_j^\dagger |0\rangle$ where $v_{ij} = v_{ji}$ is a symmetric matrix. For any complex symmetric $n \times n$ matrix $[v]_{ij}$ there is a unitary transformation U such that the resulting $v' = UvU^T$ is diagonal, i.e.,

$$v' = \text{diag}[z_1, \dots, z_r, 0, \dots, 0] \quad (3)$$

where $z_i \neq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$. We shall call the number r the bosonic Slater rank of $|v\rangle$. In contrast to the fermionic case, in the bosonic case one needs at least a state of Slater rank four to have an entangled state [6]. However,

extending this line of argumentation to more than two particles is unhandily and makes it cumbersome to find the characteristics of their entanglement. Roughly speaking, we cannot distinguish the nature of correlation.

One can ignore the above explicit form and just consider indistinguishability by quantum statistics of mixture of particles [9, 10, 11, 12]. Suppose we have a collection of (non-interacting) electrons in a metal. Pauli's exclusion principle tells us that there can be only two electrons with the same momentum p , having a different spin s . The state of system (electrons) can be written as:

$$|\phi_0\rangle = \prod_{s,p} b_s^\dagger(p)|0\rangle. \quad (4)$$

where $[b_s^\dagger(p), b_t(q)]_+ = \delta_{st}\delta(p-q)$

Although the state of the system is written as product state, there are specific correlations between the momenta of electrons, coming in from the commutation rules of the creation and annihilation operators. Suppose that the state $|\phi_0\rangle$ consists of 2 electrons. We now measure one electron at the position r and the other at the position r' . The density matrix describing also the spin state of the two electrons is given by

$$\rho_{ss';tt'} = \langle\phi_0|\psi_{t'}^\dagger(r')\psi_t^\dagger(r)\psi_{s'}(r')\psi_s(r)|\phi_0\rangle \quad (5)$$

where $\psi_t^\dagger(r)$ creates a particle of spin t at the location r . This is the same as computing the elements $|st\rangle\langle s't'|$ of the two-electron density matrix, where

$$\psi_s(r) = \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} e^{ipr} b_s(p) \quad (6)$$

We obtain the following form of the density matrix

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{ss';tt'} &= \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{d^3p'}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{d^3q'}{(2\pi)^3} e^{-i(p-p')r} e^{i(q-q')r'} \\ &\quad \times [(2\pi)^6 \delta_{st}\delta_{s't'}\delta(p-q)\delta(p'-q') \\ &\quad - (2\pi)^6 \delta_{s't}\delta_{s't'}\delta(p'-q)\delta(p-q)] \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

This now enables us to compute the density matrix, by observing that the density of electrons is given by $n = \int_0^{p_F} dp^3 / (2\pi)^3$ (where p_F is the Fermi momentum),

$$\rho_{ss';tt'} = n^2 [\delta_{st}\delta_{s't'} - \delta_{s't}\delta_{s't'} f^2(|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|)], \quad (8)$$

where

$$f(|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|) = \int_0^{p_F} \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} e^{-ip(|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|)} \quad (9)$$

is the exchange interaction term (Slater factor), and for 2D and 3D Fermi gases can be rewritten in terms of the first-order and spherical Bessel function of the first kind respectively as follows [14]

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(2D)}(|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|) &= \frac{2J_1(k_F|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|)}{k_F|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} \\ f^{(3D)}(|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|) &= \frac{3j_1(k_F|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|)}{k_F|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

with $k_F = p_F/\hbar$.

By performing the partial transposition and compute the resulting eigenvalues related to the density matrix and its partial transposition, for the region $f^2 > 1/2$ we have entanglement between two fermion, i.e., $0 \leq |\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'| < r_e$, where r_e is the value for cut-off radius for entanglement (rather than classical correlation) such that for 3D Fermi gases $j_1^2(k_F r_e) = 1/2$.

Now let's consider three electrons at positions $\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}''$ and they have some values of spin. There are six terms as there are six possible arrangements. The density is, therefore, given by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(s, s', s''; t, t', t'') &= \langle\phi_0|\psi_{t''}^\dagger(r'')\psi_{t'}^\dagger(r')\psi_t^\dagger(r)\psi_s(r')\psi_{s'}(r)\psi_{s''}(r'')|\phi_0\rangle \\ &= n^3 (\delta_{st}\delta_{s't'}\delta_{s''t''} - f_{12}f_{13}\delta_{st}\delta_{s't''}\delta_{s't'} - f_{13}f_{23}\delta_{st'}\delta_{s't}\delta_{s''t''} \\ &\quad - f_{12}f_{23}\delta_{st''}\delta_{s't'}\delta_{s''t} + f_{12}f_{13}f_{23}\delta_{st'}\delta_{s't''}\delta_{s''t} + f_{12}f_{13}f_{23}\delta_{st''}\delta_{s't}\delta_{s''t'}) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

There are three different f_{12}, f_{13}, f_{23} functions now as we have three arguments $|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}'|, |\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}''|$ and $|\mathbf{r}'-\mathbf{r}''|$ respectively. Consequently for a tripartite non-interacting Fermi gas, one can write the corresponding three particle density operator as:

$$\rho_3 = \begin{pmatrix} \eta & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \eta + \frac{p_{13}+p_{23}}{4} & \frac{-p_{23}}{4} & 0 & \frac{-p_{13}}{4} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{-p_{23}}{4} & \eta + \frac{p_{12}+p_{23}}{4} & 0 & \frac{-p_{12}}{4} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \eta + \frac{p_{12}+p_{13}}{4} & 0 & \frac{-p_{12}}{4} & \frac{-p_{13}}{4} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{-p_{13}}{4} & \frac{-p_{12}}{4} & 0 & \eta + \frac{p_{13}+p_{12}}{4} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{-p_{12}}{4} & 0 & \eta + \frac{p_{23}+p_{12}}{4} & \frac{-p_{23}}{4} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{-p_{13}}{4} & 0 & \frac{-p_{23}}{4} & \eta + \frac{p_{23}+p_{13}}{4} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \eta \end{pmatrix} \quad (12)$$

where $\eta = (1 - p_{12} - p_{13} - p_{23})/8$ and

$$p_{ij} = \frac{-f_{ij}^2 + f_{ij}f_{ik}f_{jk}}{-2 + f_{ij}^2 + f_{ik}^2 + f_{jk}^2 - f_{ij}f_{ik}f_{jk}} \quad (13)$$

As a consequence by the condition of two party entanglement, for three fermions a genuine three party entanglement would be certainly obtained when all f^2 are greater than $1/2$. In the following sections we derive new boundaries for η in two cases for the existence of genuine three party entanglement.

It was also shown in [13] that any multipartite entanglement in a non-interacting Fermi gas can be constructed from bipart entanglement

$$\rho_n = (1 - \sum_{ij} p_{ij}) \frac{\mathbf{I}}{2^n} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij, i \neq j} p_{ij} |\Psi_{ij}^-\rangle \langle \Psi_{ij}^-| \otimes \frac{\mathbf{I}}{2^{n-2}} \quad (14)$$

where $|\Psi_{ij}^-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)$ is the maximally entangled singlet state of the pair ij . Certainly Eq.(18) is a density operator where all $|f_{ij}| \leq 1$ and $a, b, c, a + b + c$ are varying between -1 and 1 [18]. This indicates that the n -particle density matrix can be written as a sum of all possible two-fermion antisymmetrized wave functions.

Despite the explicit form of density matrix in Eq. (14) of a non-interacting Fermi gas, it was shown in [18] that there is a genuine entanglement in this kind of systems but it is not yet clear if one can have tripartite entanglement without any bipartite entanglement. Also, it would be interesting to show the existence of two related classes of genuine entanglement, especially for tripartite entangled states as $W \setminus B$ and $GHZ \setminus W$ [16].

III. ENTANGLEMENT WITNESSES

The existence of an entanglement witness (EW) for any entangled state is a direct consequence of the Hahn-Banach theorem [19] and the fact that the set of fully separable density operators is convex and closed. Consequently an EW can be defined as a Hermitian operator \mathcal{W} such that $Tr(\mathcal{W}\rho_s) \geq 0$ for all fully separable states ρ_s and there exists at least one entangled state ρ_e which can be detected by the condition $Tr(\mathcal{W}\rho_e) < 0$. Note that in the aforementioned definition of EWs, we can not distinguish the different kinds of entanglement for more than bipartite systems. As it was introduced for three partite systems in [16], one can classify the different kinds of general quantum mixed states as: (i) the class S of fully separable states, (ii) the class B of biseparable states, (iii) the class of W states, i.e., those that can be expressed as a convex sum of projectors onto product, biseparable, and W -type vectors defined by

$$|\psi_W\rangle = \lambda_0|000\rangle + \lambda_1|100\rangle + \lambda_2|101\rangle + \lambda_3|110\rangle \quad (15)$$

where $\lambda_i \geq 0, \sum_i \lambda_i^2 = 1$; (iv) the class of GHZ states, defined by

$$|\psi_{GHZ}\rangle = \lambda_0|000\rangle + \lambda_1 e^{i\theta}|100\rangle + \lambda_2|101\rangle + \lambda_3|110\rangle + \lambda_4|111\rangle \quad (16)$$

for $\theta \in [0, \pi]$. All these sets are convex and compact, and satisfy $S \subset B \subset W \subset GHZ$.

No genuine three-party entanglement is needed to prepare entangled states in the subset $B \setminus S$. The formation of entangled states in $W \setminus B$ requires W -type vectors with three-party entanglement, but zero tangle [17], which is an entanglement monotone decreasing under local operations and classical communication. Finally, the class GHZ

contains all types of entanglement, and, in particular, GHZ -type vectors are needed to prepare states from $GHZ \setminus W$. The introduced classes are invariant under local unitary or invertible nonunitary operations.

Due to the above classification one can define EWs related to different classes called GHZ -EWs and W -EWs despite the fact that the B , W and GHZ classes are not convex. The W -EW is an operator \mathcal{W}_W such that $Tr(\mathcal{W}_W \rho_B) \geq 0$ holds $\forall \rho_B \in B$, but for which there exists a $\rho_W \in W \setminus B$ such that $Tr(\mathcal{W}_W \rho_W) < 0$, i.e. separating the the sets of ρ_B and ρ_W . For GHZ -EW consequently one can define an operator for which $Tr(\mathcal{W}_{GHZ} \rho_W) \geq 0$ for any W state where we have some $GHZ \setminus W$ states with negative expectation value.

A general scheme for detecting entanglement by EW operators was introduced in [20, 21]. Now, for identifying genuine entanglement one needs to emphasize on GHZ -EWs. For constructing GHZ -EW via linear programming (LP), the overall process is the following: First we consider a Hermitian operator \mathcal{W} with some negative eigenvalues

$$\mathcal{W} = \sum_i a_i \hat{Q}_i \quad (17)$$

where \hat{Q}_i are positive operators with $x \leq Tr(\hat{Q}_i \rho_W) \leq y$ and $x, z \in \mathbb{R}$ for any density operator $\rho_W \in W$. The parameters $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$ must be determined such that \mathcal{W} be a GHZ -EW. As ρ_W varies over W states, the map $P_i = Tr(\hat{Q}_i \rho_W)$ maps W vectors into a non convex region. Our second task is to define proper operators \hat{Q}_i for finding an approximated convex polygon surrounding the non convex region spanned by P_i (so-called feasible region for our LP optimization). Now, using the approximated convex polygon we determine the real parameters a_i such that the expectation value the operator \mathcal{W} given in Eq. (17) over any W state be non-negative and possesses at least one negative eigenvalue.

Therefore, for determination of GHZ -EWs of type Eq. (17), one needs to determine the minimum value of $\sum_i a_i P_i$ over the convex (feasible) region and hence the problem reduces to the optimization of the linear function $\sum_i a_i P_i$.

As it was shown in [18] there are genuine entangled states in non-interacting Fermi gas. So, here and in the following sections, we introduce new classes of three qubit GHZ -EWs and then show that the corresponding non-interacting Fermionic density matrix

$$\rho_3 = \eta \mathbf{I} + a |\Psi_{12}^-\rangle \langle \Psi_{12}^-| \otimes \frac{\mathbf{I}}{2} + b |\Psi_{13}^-\rangle \langle \Psi_{13}^-| \otimes \frac{\mathbf{I}}{2} + c |\Psi_{23}^-\rangle \langle \Psi_{23}^-| \otimes \frac{\mathbf{I}}{2} \quad (18)$$

with redefined $a := p_{12}$, $b := p_{13}$, $c := p_{23}$, can be detected by our witness operators.

IV. GHZ -EW OF PERIODIC SPIN CHAIN

Gühne *et al.* [15] were the first to introduce an EW operator for a spin chain for detecting genuine tripartite entanglement in a non-interacting Fermi gas [18]. Due to indistinguishability, for identifying genuine entanglement in Non-interacting Fermi gases, we introduce symmetric GHZ -EWs with respect to exchange particles for a periodic spin chain. For this, we start with the following operator

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_{GHZ}^{(sp)} = & a_0 \mathbf{I}_8 + a_1 (\sigma_x^{(1)} \sigma_x^{(2)} \mathbf{I}^{(3)} + \sigma_x^{(1)} \mathbf{I}^{(2)} \sigma_x^{(3)} + \mathbf{I}^{(1)} \sigma_x^{(2)} \sigma_x^{(3)}) \\ & + a_2 (\sigma_y^{(1)} \sigma_y^{(2)} \mathbf{I}^{(3)} + \sigma_y^{(1)} \mathbf{I}^{(2)} \sigma_y^{(3)} + \mathbf{I}^{(1)} \sigma_y^{(2)} \sigma_y^{(3)}) \\ & + a_3 (\sigma_z^{(1)} \sigma_z^{(2)} \mathbf{I}^{(3)} + \sigma_z^{(1)} \mathbf{I}^{(2)} \sigma_z^{(3)} + \mathbf{I}^{(1)} \sigma_z^{(2)} \sigma_z^{(3)}) \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

by using the symmetric operators in the brackets (and calling them $\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_2, \hat{Q}_3$) and multiplying them with the parameters a_1, a_2 and a_3 , where the upper labels show the parties.

Because of the symmetry related to the exchange of particles in $\mathcal{W}_{GHZ}^{(sp)}$ one can easily trace it over the W -vectors by considering them as

$$|\psi_W\rangle = \kappa_0 |000\rangle + \kappa_1 (|100\rangle + |101\rangle + |110\rangle) \quad ; \kappa_0, \kappa_1 \in \mathbb{R} \quad (20)$$

together with any corresponding local unitary transformations, where $\kappa_0^2 + 3\kappa_1^2 = 1$. Again due to symmetry, such rotations can be parameterized for all parties as $|0\rangle \rightarrow \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$, $|1\rangle \rightarrow \beta^*|0\rangle - \alpha^*|1\rangle$ with $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$ which is related to the $SU(2)$ transformation like

$$\begin{pmatrix} \beta^* & \alpha \\ -\alpha^* & \beta \end{pmatrix}$$

Expanding W -vectors as $|\psi_W\rangle = \sum_{i,j,k=0,1} A_{ijk}|ijk\rangle$ yields the following coefficients

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{000} &= \kappa_0 \alpha^3 + 3\kappa_1 \beta^* \alpha^2 \\
A_{001} &= \kappa_0 \alpha^2 \beta + \kappa_1 (2\alpha|\beta|^2 - \alpha^2 \alpha^*) \\
A_{010} &= \kappa_0 \alpha^2 \beta + \kappa_1 (2\alpha|\beta|^2 - \alpha|\alpha|^2) \\
A_{011} &= \kappa_0 \alpha \beta^2 + \kappa_1 (-2\beta|\alpha|^2 + \beta|\beta|^2) \\
A_{100} &= \kappa_0 \alpha^2 \beta + \kappa_1 (2\alpha|\beta|^2 - \alpha|\alpha|^2) \\
A_{101} &= \kappa_0 \alpha \beta^2 + \kappa_1 (-2\beta|\alpha|^2 + \beta|\beta|^2) \\
A_{110} &= \kappa_0 \alpha \beta^2 + \kappa_1 (-2\beta|\alpha|^2 + \beta^2 \beta^*) \\
A_{111} &= \kappa_0 \beta^3 - 3\kappa_1 \alpha^* \beta^2
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Consequently the expectation values for the $\widehat{Q}_1, \widehat{Q}_2, \widehat{Q}_3$ operators over W -vectors would be

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_1 &:= \langle \psi_W | \widehat{Q}_1 | \psi_W \rangle = A_{000}^* (A_{011} + A_{101} + A_{110}) + A_{001}^* (A_{010} + A_{100} + A_{111}) + A_{010}^* (A_{001} + A_{100} + A_{111}) \\
&\quad + A_{011}^* (A_{000} + A_{101} + A_{110}) + A_{100}^* (A_{001} + A_{010} + A_{111}) + A_{101}^* (A_{000} + A_{011} + A_{110}) \\
&\quad + A_{110}^* (A_{000} + A_{011} + A_{101}) + A_{111}^* (A_{001} + A_{010} + A_{100}) \\
Q_2 &:= \langle \psi_W | \widehat{Q}_2 | \psi_W \rangle = -A_{000}^* (A_{011} + A_{101} + A_{110}) + A_{001}^* (A_{010} + A_{100} - A_{111}) + A_{010}^* (A_{001} + A_{100} - A_{111}) \\
&\quad + A_{011}^* (-A_{000} + A_{101} + A_{110}) + A_{100}^* (A_{001} + A_{010} - A_{111}) + A_{101}^* (-A_{000} + A_{011} + A_{110}) \\
&\quad + A_{110}^* (-A_{000} + A_{011} + A_{101}) - A_{111}^* (A_{001} + A_{010} + A_{100}) \\
Q_3 &:= \langle \psi_W | \widehat{Q}_3 | \psi_W \rangle = 3|A_{000}|^2 - |A_{001}|^2 - |A_{010}|^2 - |A_{011}|^2 - |A_{100}|^2 - |A_{101}|^2 - |A_{110}|^2 + 3|A_{111}|^2
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

A straightforward calculation for Q 's by lagrange multipliers yields the three dimensional region which is spanned by Q_1, Q_2, Q_3 can be approximated as

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq Q_1 + Q_2 + Q_3 \leq 3 \\
-5 &\leq Q_1 - Q_2 - Q_3 \leq 3 \\
-5 &\leq -Q_1 - Q_2 + Q_3 \leq 3 \\
-5 &\leq -Q_1 + Q_2 - Q_3 \leq 3
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

On the other hand the extreme values for the eigenvalues lead to the range between -1 and 3 for the expectation value of \widehat{Q}_i 's and the following condition

$$\begin{aligned}
-3 &\leq \langle \psi | \widehat{Q}_1 + \widehat{Q}_2 + \widehat{Q}_3 | \psi \rangle \leq 3 \\
-5 &\leq \langle \psi | \widehat{Q}_1 - \widehat{Q}_2 - \widehat{Q}_3 | \psi \rangle \leq 3 \\
-5 &\leq \langle \psi | -\widehat{Q}_1 - \widehat{Q}_2 + \widehat{Q}_3 | \psi \rangle \leq 3 \\
-5 &\leq \langle \psi | -\widehat{Q}_1 + \widehat{Q}_2 - \widehat{Q}_3 | \psi \rangle \leq 3
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

with respect to arbitrary state $|\psi\rangle$. Evidently this shows the possibility for detecting some $GHZ \setminus W$ entangled states with reference to the first statement in (23) and in (24). Now our problem to find the GHZ -EW would be reduced to LP optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{minimize} && a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^3 a_i Q_i \\
&\text{subject to} && \begin{cases} 0 \leq Q_1 + Q_2 + Q_3 \leq 3 \\ -5 \leq Q_1 - Q_2 - Q_3 \leq 3 \\ -5 \leq -Q_1 - Q_2 + Q_3 \leq 3 \\ -5 \leq -Q_1 + Q_2 - Q_3 \leq 3 \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

From the intersection of the constraints planes one can obtain the values for the parameters a_1, a_2 and a_3 as

$$\begin{aligned}
|a_1 - a_2| &\leq a_0, & |a_1 - a_3| &\leq a_0, & |a_2 - a_3| &\leq a_0, \\
a_0 + 3a_1 &\geq 0, & a_0 + 3a_2 &\geq 0, & a_0 + 3a_3 &\geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
a_0 + 2a_1 + 3a_2 &\geq 0, & a_0 + 2a_1 + 3a_3 &\geq 0, \\
a_0 + 2a_2 + 3a_3 &\geq 0, & a_0 + 3a_1 + 2a_2 &\geq 0, \\
a_0 + 3a_1 + 2a_3 &\geq 0, & a_0 + 3a_2 + 2a_3 &\geq 0
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

provided that $\mathcal{W}_{GHZ}^{(sp)}$ is positive for all the states in W set. In addition to the above constraints for the parameters, for leading the operator $\mathcal{W}_{GHZ}^{(sp)}$ to a GHZ -EW at least one of the following eigenvalues E_i , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}
E_1 &= a_0 - a_1 - a_2 - a_3 \\
E_{2,3} &= \frac{1}{2}(2a_0 + 5a_1 + 2a_2 - a_3 \pm \sqrt{13a_1^2 - 28a_1a_2 + 16a_2^2 + 2a_1a_3 - 4a_2a_3 + a_3^2}) \\
E_{4,5} &= a_0 + a_1 + a_2 + a_3 \pm 2\sqrt{a_1^2 - a_1a_2 + a_2^2 - a_1a_3 - a_2a_3 + a_3^2}
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

must be negative.

By considering inequalities (23) and (24) for tripartite non-interacting Fermionic systems, the following operator is defined as a GHZ -EW

$${}^0\mathcal{W}_{GHZ}^{(sp)} := \widehat{Q}_1 + \widehat{Q}_2 + \widehat{Q}_3 \tag{28}$$

Calculating the trace of the above witness over the density operator of Eq. (18) follows

$$Tr({}^0\mathcal{W}_{GHZ}^{(sp)}\rho_3) = 3(8\eta - 1) \tag{29}$$

which should be negative due to detect $GHZ \setminus W$ entanglement in ρ_3 .

It is easy to see that with some values for the parameters, e.g. $a = b = \frac{2}{3}, c = -\frac{1}{3}$, Eq. (29) has negative values which yields the existence of a genuine entanglement even for the $GHZ \setminus W$ set. The numerical case $a = b = c = \frac{1}{3}$ where the particles are separated by equal distances could not be detected in with other criteria as well as spin chain witness [18]. By noting the definition of a PPT entangled state in [20, 21] one can easily find that the density operator for tripartite Non-interacting Fermi gas with $a = b = c = \frac{1}{3}$ is PPT entangled state with respect to any subsystems rather than the case $a = b = \frac{2}{3}, c = -\frac{1}{3}$. Consequently the Eq. (28) indicates Non-decomposable GHZ -EW.

After constructing the EW operator by periodic spin chain, in the next section we apply the approach of reducing it to linear programming problem by considering the operators related to the different classes of entanglement in tripartite systems (given symmetric operators), to find $GHZ \setminus W$ genuine entanglements in Non-interacting Fermi systems.

V. NEW CLASS OF GHZ -EW

For detecting entanglement in different classes of biseparable (A-BC, B-AC and C-AB) or genuine entangled states (W -vectors or GHZ -vectors), the EW should be built from the operators with nonvanishing expectation value with respect to the selected class for detection. Due to this, we introduce the following operator

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}_{GHZ} &= a_0\mathbf{I}_8 + a_1(|\Psi_{12}^-\rangle\langle\Psi_{12}^-| \otimes \mathbf{I} + |\Psi_{13}^-\rangle\langle\Psi_{13}^-| \otimes \mathbf{I} + |\Psi_{23}^-\rangle\langle\Psi_{23}^-| \otimes \mathbf{I}) \\
&\quad + a_2|W_1\rangle\langle W_1| + a_3|W_2\rangle\langle W_2| + a_4|\Psi_{123}^-\rangle\langle\Psi_{123}^-|
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

which contains the representation of the related classes of tripartite systems and which is symmetric with respect to the particles where

$$\begin{aligned}
|W_1\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|001\rangle + |010\rangle + |100\rangle) \\
|W_2\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|011\rangle + |110\rangle + |101\rangle) \\
|\Psi_{123}^-\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|000\rangle - |111\rangle).
\end{aligned}$$

First we should impose the positivity for expectation values of Eq. (30) with W states. Due to the exchange symmetry of particles in \mathcal{W}_{GHZ} , we similarly use $|\psi_W\rangle$ of Eq. (20).

On the other hand we define

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{P}_1 &:= 2 \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} |\Psi_{ij}^- \rangle \langle \Psi_{ij}^-| \otimes \mathbf{I}, \\
\widehat{P}_2 &:= 3|W_1\rangle\langle W_1|, \quad \widehat{P}_3 := 3|W_2\rangle\langle W_2|, \\
\widehat{P}_4 &:= 2|\Psi_{123}^- \rangle \langle \Psi_{123}^-|
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

and P_i 's as their expectation values with respect to W -vectors as functions of A_{ijk} . One finds that the expectation value of $P_1 = \langle \psi_W | \widehat{P}_1 | \psi_W \rangle$ is always equal to zero but

$$\begin{aligned}
P_2 &= 3|\langle \psi_W | W_1 \rangle|^2 = (A_{001}^* + A_{010}^* + A_{100}^*) \times (A_{001} + A_{010} + A_{100}) \\
P_3 &= 3|\langle \psi_W | W_2 \rangle|^2 = (A_{011}^* + A_{110}^* + A_{101}^*) \times (A_{011} + A_{110} + A_{101})
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

can reach the maximum eigenvalue of 3. For P_4 the maximum overlap of $\langle \Psi_{123}^- | \psi_W \rangle$ is found using Lagrange multipliers. An optimal choice of parameters leads to $\frac{3}{2}$ for P_4 where

$$P_4 = 2|\langle \Psi_{123}^- | \psi_W \rangle|^2 = (A_{000}^* - A_{111}^*)(A_{000} - A_{111}). \tag{33}$$

For reducing the problem to LP and finding the parameters of Eq. (30) leading to GHZ -EWs operators, we search the feasible region. Contrary to the above values, the extremum points

$$\begin{aligned}
&(P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4) \\
&(0, 0, 0, 0) \\
&(0, 3, 0, 0) \\
&(0, 0, 3, 0) \\
&(0, 0, 0, \frac{3}{2})
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

cannot be vertices of the feasible region since there exist some points out of the convex polygon (connecting planes) which yield negative expectation values, as checked by numerics. So we extend our region by parallel shifting the planes to the following boundaries

$$\begin{aligned}
P_1 &\equiv 0, \\
0 &\leq P_2, P_3 \leq 3, \\
0 &\leq P_4 \leq 2, \\
0 &\leq P_2 + P_3 + 2P_4 \leq \frac{15}{4}
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

and reduce the problem to LP. Since on the other hand the eigenvalues of $\widehat{P}_2 + \widehat{P}_3 + 2\widehat{P}_4$ are bound between 0 and 4, the operator \mathcal{W}_{GHZ} of Eq. (30) is a witness. We find the domain (feasible region) which comes from the intersection of the possible rectangular range for P_i 's and the polygon of Eq. (35) with the following vertices (see FIG.)

$$\begin{aligned}
&(P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4) \\
&(0, 0, 0, 0) \\
&(0, 3, 0, 0) \\
&(0, 3, 0, \frac{3}{8}) \\
&(0, 3, \frac{3}{4}, 0) \\
&(0, 0, 3, 0) \\
&(0, 0, 3, \frac{3}{8}) \\
&(0, \frac{3}{4}, 3, 0) \\
&(0, 0, 0, \frac{15}{8})
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

Now it is straight forward to obtain the constraints for a_2, a_3, a_4 as

$$\begin{aligned}
a_0 &\geq 0, \quad a_0 + 3a_2 \geq 0, \\
a_0 + 3a_2 + \frac{3}{8}a_4 &\geq 0, \quad a_0 + 3a_2 + \frac{3}{4}a_3 \geq 0, \\
a_0 + 3a_3 &\geq 0, \quad a_0 + 3a_3 + \frac{3}{8}a_4 \geq 0, \\
a_0 + \frac{3}{4}a_2 + 3a_3 &\geq 0, \quad a_0 + \frac{15}{8}a_4 \geq 0
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

and arbitrary a_1 together with at least one negative following eigenvalues

$$\frac{1}{2}(2a_0 + 3a_1), a_0 + a_2, a_0 + a_3, a_0 + a_4 \quad (38)$$

to guarantee that the \mathcal{W}_{GHZ} have positive expectation values over all W states.

For having proper parameterized EWs for any class of entanglement constructed by some positive operators (or density matrices), there should be some densities included from the upper class, e.g., one cannot have a GHZ -EW with positive operators excluding any density operator from $GHZ \setminus W$ class.

Finally, as a special case of our constructed GHZ -EW, the inequality related to the last boundary plane in Eq. (35) yields the following operator

$${}^0\mathcal{W}_{GHZ} = \frac{15}{4}\mathbf{I}_8 + a_1\hat{P}_1 - 3|W_1\rangle\langle W_1| - 3|W_2\rangle\langle W_2| - 4|\Psi_{123}^-\rangle\langle\Psi_{123}^-| \quad (39)$$

By calculating its expectation for a tripartite non-interacting fermion system we obtain

$$Tr({}^0\mathcal{W}_{GHZ}\rho_3) = \frac{15}{4} - 10\eta + \frac{3}{2}a_1(1 - 4\eta) \quad (40)$$

Applying the positivity on the trace of the above witness leads to the following constraint for a_1

$$a_1 > -\frac{5}{3} \quad (41)$$

For choosing $a = b = \frac{2}{3}$, $c = -\frac{1}{3}$ we should have $a_1 < -\frac{5}{2}$ for detection which is not possible regarding the constraint for a_1 . But for the following constraint for η

$$a_1(1 - 4\eta) < \frac{1}{6}(40\eta - 15) \quad (42)$$

together with the constraint for a_1 , the expectation value of ${}^0\mathcal{W}_{GHZ}$ can take negative values for this restriction on η

$$\frac{1}{4} < \eta \leq 1 \quad (43)$$

where the values for η cannot reach to negative ones in order to be detected by ${}^0\mathcal{W}_{GHZ}$. So, this witness confirms the existence of $GHZ \setminus W$ genuine tripartite entangled states in a non-interacting Fermi gas. Note, that the constraint for η here in Eq. (43) which comes from the new GHZ witness is different from the previous one which comes from the negativity of Eq. (29), which arise from different boundary conditions for the cut off radius.

Still a question remains: Can we have a three party entangled state in a non-interacting Fermi gas even though there is no two party entanglement? The answer is "No" since it is not possible to write a Bell state $|\Psi_{123}^-\rangle$ as a convex sum of three different classes of bientangled (2-separable) states as in Eq.(18); i.e., one cannot obtain a density matrix related to $\rho^{Bell} = |\Psi_{123}^-\rangle\langle\Psi_{123}^-|$ by any local transformation of ρ_3 . This can be proven by finding the maximum trace of ρ_3 over any locally transformed density of ρ^{Bell}

$$\rho'^{Bell} = \begin{pmatrix} \beta & -\alpha \\ \alpha^* & \beta^* \end{pmatrix} \rho^{Bell} \begin{pmatrix} \beta^* & \alpha \\ -\alpha^* & \beta \end{pmatrix} \quad (44)$$

with $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$ which never reaches the identity, i.e.,

$$Tr(\rho'^{Bell}\rho_3) < 1 \quad (45)$$

This can also be confirmed by explicit form of Eq. (11) which was as a conjecture in [12]. Consequently in a non-interacting tripartite Fermion systems, having three party entanglement imposes a mixture of entangled states in other parties as well.

VI. CONCLUSION

We have introduced two new classes of GHZ -EWs for a non-interacting Fermi gas which are able to detect some $GHZ \setminus W$ states in a non-interacting Fermionic tripartite system as well as PPT states with respect to any parties. These two different types of GHZ -EWs lead to different cut off radii for $GHZ \setminus W$ entanglement between three

Fermions. Here, in spite of the non-convexity of entangled densities, we found parameterized *GHZ* entanglement witnesses to distinguish two classes of genuine entanglement. The non-convexity of non-separable states does not play any role for introducing EW for detecting different classes of systems larger than bipartite systems. It is proven that Bell states in these systems do not exist. The approach of this paper can also be applied for larger dimensions of Hilbert spaces for indistinguishable Fermionic systems (as well as Bosonic) to identify of different types of entanglement in correspondent mixtures.

-
- [1] A. Osterloh, L. Amico, G. Falci, and R. Fazio, *Nature* **416**, 608 (2002).
 - [2] T. J. Osborne and M. A. Nielsen, *Phys. Rev. A* **66**, 032110 (2002).
 - [3] J. W. Clark, A. Mandilara and M. L. Ristig, CMT29 proceedings, e-print: cond-mat/0512558 (2005).
 - [4] J. Schliemann, J. I. Cirac, M. Kus, M. Lewenstein, and D. Loss, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 022303 (2001).
 - [5] A. Sanpera, D. Bruß and M. Lewenstein, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 050301 (2001).
 - [6] G. Ghirardi, L. Marinatto, T. Weber, *J. Statistical Phys.* **108**, 49-122 (2002).
 - [7] K. Eckert, J. Schliemann, D. Bruß and M. Lewenstein, *Annals of Phys.* **299**, 88-127 (2002).
 - [8] L. Amico, R. Fazio, A. Osterloh, V. Vedral, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80**, 517 (2008).
 - [9] N. Paunković, Y. Omar, S. Bose, V. Vedral, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 187903 (2002).
 - [10] P. Zanardi, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 042101 (2002).
 - [11] S. J. van Enk, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 022303 (2003).
 - [12] V. Vedral, *Cent. Eur. J. Phys.* **1**, 2, 289-306 (2003).
 - [13] C. Lunkes, Č. Brukner and V. Vedral, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 030503 (2005).
 - [14] S. Oh, J. Kim, *Phys. Rev. A* **69**, 054305 (2004).
 - [15] O. Gühne, G. Tóth, H. Briegel, *New J Phys.* **7**, 229 (2005).
 - [16] A. Acín, D. Bruß, M. Lewenstein and A. Sanpera, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 040401 (2001).
 - [17] V. Coffman, J. Kundu, and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 052306 (2000).
 - [18] T. Vértesi, *Phys. Rev. A* **75**, 042330 (2007).
 - [19] W. Rudin, *Functional Analysis*, McGraw-Hill, Singapore (1991).
 - [20] M. A. Jafarizadeh, G. Najarbashi, H. Habibian, *Phys. Rev. A* **75**, 052326 (2007).
 - [21] M. A. Jafarizadeh, G. Najarbashi, Y. Akbari, H. Habibian, *Eur. Phys. J. D* **47**, 233-255 (2008).

Figure Caption:

The feasible region of LP problem which comes from the overlapping domain of approximated region spanning by P_2, P_3, P_4 and the possible range for expectation values of $\hat{P}_2, \hat{P}_3, \hat{P}_4$ which is inside the above rectangular.