

GHZ and W entanglement witnesses for the noninteracting Fermi gas

H. Habibian,^{1,2} J. W. Clark,^{1,3} N. Behbood,^{1,4} and K. Hinger¹

¹*Christian Doppler Labor für oberflächenoptische Methoden,
Johannes Kepler Universität, Linz A-4040, Austria*

²*Grup d'Òptica, Departament de Física, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Bellaterra E-08193, Barcelona, Spain*

³*Department of Physics, CB 1105, Washington University, St. Louis, MO-63130, USA*

⁴*ICFO-Institut de Ciències Fotoniques, Mediterranean Technology Park, Castelldefels E-08860, Barcelona, Spain*

(Dated: February 15, 2022)

The existence and nature of tripartite entanglement of a noninteracting Fermi gas (NIFG) is investigated. Three new classes of parameterized entanglement witnesses (EWs) are introduced to detect the presence of genuine tripartite entanglement in the three-body reduced density matrix of this system. By choosing appropriate EW operators, the problem of finding GHZ - and W -EWs is reduced to linear programming, with the goal of discriminating between two different non-convex types of genuine entangled density-matrix operators. Specifically, we devise new W -EWs based on a spin-chain model with periodic boundary conditions, and construct a class of parameterized GHZ -EWs as a symmetrized form containing all operators having nonvanishing expectation values with respect to $GHZ\setminus W$ entanglement. A third class of EWs is provided by a GHZ stabilizer operator capable of distinguishing $W\setminus B$ from $GHZ\setminus B$ entanglement, which is not possible with W -EWs. Implementing these classes of EWs, it is found that (i) all states containing genuine tripartite entanglement are of W type and (ii) states of $GHZ\setminus W$ genuine entanglement do not exist in the NIFG. Some positive partial transpose (PPT) genuine entangled states are detected with respect to some parties. Finally, it is demonstrated that a NIFG does not exhibit “pure” genuine $W\setminus B$ – i.e., three-party entanglement without any separable or biseparable admixture does not occur.

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

I. INTRODUCTION

The existence of entangled states is a distinctive signature of quantum mechanics of the most profound conceptual and practical importance. The phenomenon of entanglement promises to be the source of many far-reaching technological advances of the 21st century. A fundamental quantitative understanding of the nature of entanglement will therefore be instrumental to its exploitation in quantum information processing based on optical and condensed-matter systems. Moreover, such an understanding can provide new insights into the microscopic physics, statistical mechanics, and phenomenology of strongly interacting quantum many-body systems.

There is a growing body of work that seeks to establish the entanglement properties of the states of quantum many-body systems and the roles entanglement plays in the observed behavior of these systems. In particular, much progress has been made on the entanglement properties of spin-lattice models, stimulated by the pioneering studies of Osterloh *et al.* [1] and Osborne and Nielsen [2]. The recent review of Amico *et al.* [3] assesses the state of knowledge on bipartite and multipartite entanglement for diverse many-body systems including spin, fermion, and boson models. The great majority of examples studied involve spin systems and systems of particles made distinguishable by localization.

There is an ongoing debate on the nature of entanglement in systems of identical particles – just how does the indistinguishability of the particles impact the quantification of entanglement? Attempts at clarification of the various issues that arise when different Bose and Fermi systems with different degrees of freedom are studied [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13] has led to the examination of various quantities deemed to measure or detect entanglement in the presence of indistinguishability. Here we shall (i) focus on the noninteracting Fermi gas (NIFG) as represented by the three-fermion reduced density matrix of its ground state and (ii) adopt the entanglement witness (EW) criterion [14, 15] for analysis of the entanglement content of this tripartite state descriptor, which overcomes disadvantages of some of the earlier work. We shall introduce new classes of parameterized EW operators for indistinguishable fermions, to enable detection of $GHZ\setminus W$ and $W\setminus B$ genuine tripartite entanglement in the NIFG, if one or the other is present.

This paper is organized as follows: In Sec. II we review certain definitions basic to the discussion of entanglement in systems of distinguishable or indistinguishable particles, and some existing formalism and results from other authors relevant to characterization of the entanglement properties of the noninteracting Fermi gas [4, 5, 9, 10, 11]. Importantly, we display the general form obtained for the three-particle reduced density matrix of the NIFG, which will be the central quantity of our analysis. In Sec. III we consider the classes of tripartite entanglement identified for mixed three-qubit states by Acín *et al.* [15] and discuss the properties of entanglement witnesses (EWs) capable of signaling the presence of these classes. A general scheme for constructing parameterized GHZ and W -EWs via linear

programming (LP) is introduced as a special case of convex optimization. Sec. IV is devoted to explicit development and application of new classes of parameterized EWs designed to detect genuine tripartite entanglement in the NIFG. First, adapting ideas from the work of Gühne *et al.* [16] and Vértesi [13], we consider W entanglement witnesses based on a periodic spin-chain model. Second, we introduce a class of GHZ -EWs which are constructed symmetrically from density-matrix projectors corresponding to different classes of tripartite entanglement.

Third, in order to identify the type of genuine entanglement that is present, we apply a stabilizer-operator formalism. It is found that $GHZ \setminus W$ genuine entanglement is not generated in the ground state of the NIFG and that genuine W -type tripartite entanglement, although present, does not exist in the absence of bipartite entangled and/or separable states. On the other hand, some positive partial transpose (PPT) genuine entanglement with respect to some parties found to occur. These conclusions are summarized in Sec. VI. Some details relating to the most general form of quantum states in the W set are collected in an appendix.

II. INDISTINGUISHABILITY AND THE NONINTERACTING FERMI GAS

Consider a system consisting of n parties $\{M_i\}_{i=1}^n$. A k -partite split is a partition of the system into $k \leq n$ sets $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^k$, each of which 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 called m -separable if a convex decomposition of it can be found such that, in each pure-state term, at most m parties are mutually entangled, these not being entangled with any of the other $n - m$ parties. For example, every 1-separable density matrix 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 (separable) and can be written as

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

with $p_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_i p_i = 1$. The system is called entangled when the corresponding density matrix operator is not separable. According to these definitions, separable states necessarily form a convex set, since any convex combination of separable states is again separable, which is not the case for non-separable states. Beyond bipartite splittings, many different types of entanglement among the parties are possible, even for the case of distinguishable particles.

A schematic model involving two electrons located in a double-well was discussed in Refs. 3, 5, 6 to illustrate the consequences of indistinguishability for entanglement. (See especially the related treatment of Ref. 4.) The qubit is modeled by the spin degree of freedom (with states $|\uparrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\rangle$), and there are two spatial wave functions labeled $|\phi\rangle$ and $|\chi\rangle$, initially localized in the left and right potential well, respectively. For this bipartite system in a pure state, the authors considered the density operator $\rho_w = |w\rangle\langle w| \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{C}^{2K} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{2K})$. Denoting by f_a and f_a^\dagger the fermionic annihilation and creation operators for single-particle states $a = 1, \dots, 2K$ forming an orthonormal basis in \mathcal{C}^{2K} , the ket $|w\rangle$ can be represented as $|w\rangle = \sum_{a,b} w_{ab} f_a^\dagger f_b^\dagger |0\rangle$, with the $w_{ab} = -w_{ba}$ defining an antisymmetric matrix. For any complex antisymmetric $n \times n$ matrix $[w]_{ab}$, there exists a unitary transformation U such that $w' = UwU^T$ has nonzero entries only in 2×2 blocks along the diagonal [4], 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 matrix w' enables an expansion of the ket $|w\rangle$ in a basis of elementary Slater determinants with a minimum number r of non-vanishing terms, r being termed the fermionic Slater rank of $|w\rangle$. A Slater rank of at least two is required for qualification as an entangled state. While this model is illuminating, its extension to more than two particles becomes very cumbersome, obscuring the nature of the correlations involved.

An alternative description,[9, 10, 11, 13] more fruitful for our development, places the emphasis on reduced density matrices of a noninteracting gas of many identical spin-1/2 fermions (NIFG). By the Pauli exclusion principle, at most two such particles, with different spin values s , can occupy the same momentum state $p = \hbar k$. The ground state of the system can be expressed as

$$|\phi_0\rangle = \prod_{s,\mathbf{p}} b_s^\dagger(\mathbf{p})|0\rangle, \quad (3)$$

where $[b_s^\dagger(\mathbf{p}), b_t(\mathbf{q})]_+ = \delta_{st}\delta(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q})$ and $|0\rangle$ is the vacuum state.

Although the state of the system is written as product state, there are specific Pauli-exclusion correlations between the constituent fermions arising from the commutation rules of the creation and annihilation operators b^\dagger and b . For the bipartite and tripartite configurations relevant to our investigation, these correlations are made explicit by

deriving the two-body and three-body (two-fermion and three-fermion) reduced density matrices of the pure state (3). The two-fermion reduced density matrix is given by

$$\rho_{ss';tt'} = \langle \phi_0 | \psi_{t'}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \psi_t^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{s'}(\mathbf{r}') \psi_s(\mathbf{r}) | \phi_0 \rangle, \quad (4)$$

where $\psi_s^\dagger(\mathbf{r})$ [$\psi_s(\mathbf{r})$] creates [destroys] a particle with spin s at the location \mathbf{r} . With the transformation

$$\psi_s(\mathbf{r}) = \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}} b_s(\mathbf{k}), \quad (5)$$

it is straightforward to obtain the two-body reduced density matrix in the form

$$\rho_{ss';tt'} = n^2 [\delta_{st} \delta_{s't'} - \delta_{s't} \delta_{st'}] f^2(|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|), \quad (6)$$

where $n = k_F^3/6\pi^2$ is the density of particle of a given spin, and

$$f(|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|) = \int_0^{k_F} \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}')} \quad (7)$$

is known as the Slater factor.

(We focus here on the NIFG in three dimensions.)

To evaluate the bipartite entanglement corresponding to the two-fermion reduced density matrix, one performs a partial transposition and determines the eigenvalues of the density matrix and its partial transpose [9]. Entanglement exists for two-fermion configurations such that $f^2 > 1/2$, i.e., for $0 \leq |\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'| < r_e$, where r_e is cut-off radius for entanglement (rather than classical correlation). For the 3D NIFG, r_e is determined by $j_1^2(k_F r_e) = 1/2$, where j_1 the first-order spherical Bessel function.

The same steps may be used to derive the reduced three-fermion density matrix of the NIFG as a function of particle locations $\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}''$ and spins s, s', s'' . Six possible arrangements give rise to six terms:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(s, s', s''; t, t', t'') &= \langle \phi_0 | \psi_{t''}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}'') \psi_{t'}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \psi_t^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_s(\mathbf{r}') \psi_{s'}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{s''}(\mathbf{r}'') | \phi_0 \rangle \\ &= n^3 (\delta_{st} \delta_{s't'} \delta_{s''t''} - f_{12} f_{13} \delta_{st} \delta_{s't''} \delta_{s''t'} - f_{13} f_{23} \delta_{st'} \delta_{s't} \delta_{s''t''} \\ &\quad - f_{12} f_{23} \delta_{st''} \delta_{s't'} \delta_{s''t} + f_{12} f_{13} f_{23} \delta_{st'} \delta_{s't''} \delta_{s''t} + f_{12} f_{13} f_{23} \delta_{st''} \delta_{s't} \delta_{s''t'}). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The three functions f_{12} , f_{13} , and f_{23} carry the respective arguments $|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|$, $|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}''|$, and $|\mathbf{r}' - \mathbf{r}''|$.

The 9×9 matrix defined by Eq. (8) takes the form

$$\rho_3 = \begin{pmatrix} \eta & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \eta + \frac{p_{13}+p_{23}}{4} & \frac{-p_{23}}{4} & 0 & \frac{-p_{13}}{4} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{-p_{23}}{4} & \eta + \frac{p_{12}+p_{23}}{4} & 0 & \frac{-p_{12}}{4} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \eta + \frac{p_{12}+p_{13}}{4} & 0 & \frac{-p_{12}}{4} & \frac{-p_{13}}{4} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{-p_{13}}{4} & \frac{-p_{12}}{4} & 0 & \eta + \frac{p_{13}+p_{12}}{4} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{-p_{12}}{4} & 0 & \eta + \frac{p_{23}+p_{12}}{4} & \frac{-p_{23}}{4} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{-p_{13}}{4} & 0 & \frac{-p_{23}}{4} & \eta + \frac{p_{23}+p_{13}}{4} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \eta & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

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

$$p_{ij} = \frac{-f_{ij}^2 + f_{ij} f_{ik} f_{jk}}{-2 + f_{ij}^2 + f_{ik}^2 + f_{jk}^2 - f_{ij} f_{ik} f_{jk}}. \quad (10)$$

Lunkes *et al.* [11] have provided the following general expression for the n -body reduced density matrix of the NIFG,

$$\rho_n = (1 - \sum_{ij} p_{ij}) \frac{\mathbf{I}}{2^n} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij, i \neq j} p_{ij} |\Psi_{ij}^-\rangle \langle \Psi_{ij}^-| \otimes \frac{\mathbf{I}}{2^{n-2}}, \quad (11)$$

which is constructed from biseparable entangled density operators. Here, $|\Psi_{ij}^-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)$ is the maximally entangled singlet state of the pair ij , and $|f_{ij}| \leq 1$ for all ij . Consequently $|p_{ij}| \leq 1$ and $0 \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{4}$, so we have




FIG. 1: Plotting a and b versus c for different values of distance $k_F x$. The simulation is accomplished for $k_F r$ between 0.1 to 5 (from black to light gray) with the steps of 0.1 for 1-d configuration. For $k_F r \geq 4.5$ three p 's reach to positive values which is out of the regime of genuine entangled states for NIFG.

$|p_{12} + p_{13} + p_{23}| \leq 1$ [13]. This indicates that the density matrix operator of n noninteracting fermions can be written in terms of antisymmetric density matrices of fermionic pairs, albeit not in a convex combination. Considering the aforementioned entanglement condition for two-fermion configurations, entanglement would be present when all f^2 factors are greater than $1/2$. Despite the explicit form (11) of the n -body reduced density matrix of the NIFG as a combination of biseparable states, the existence of genuine tripartite entanglement in this system was established in [13].

Here and in the following sections, we shall build upon this important result, by introducing new classes of three-qubit entanglement witnesses (EWs) and demonstrating that the corresponding noninteracting fermionic tripartite density matrix

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_3 &= \eta \mathbf{I} + a |\Psi_{12}^- \rangle \langle \Psi_{12}^-| \otimes \frac{\mathbf{I}}{2} + b |\Psi_{13}^- \rangle \langle \Psi_{13}^-| \otimes \frac{\mathbf{I}}{2} + c |\Psi_{23}^- \rangle \langle \Psi_{23}^-| \otimes \frac{\mathbf{I}}{2} \\ &= \frac{1}{8} \mathbf{I} - \frac{a}{8} (\sigma_x \sigma_x \mathbf{I} + \sigma_y \sigma_y \mathbf{I} + \sigma_z \sigma_z \mathbf{I}) - \frac{b}{8} (\sigma_x \mathbf{I} \sigma_x + \sigma_y \mathbf{I} \sigma_y + \sigma_z \mathbf{I} \sigma_z) - \frac{c}{8} (\mathbf{I} \sigma_x \sigma_x + \mathbf{I} \sigma_y \sigma_y + \mathbf{I} \sigma_z \sigma_z) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

(with relabelings $a = p_{12}$, $b = p_{13}$, and $c = p_{23}$, can be detected by our proposed witness operators. Obviously, ρ_3 cannot possess genuine entanglement for the case of simultaneous positive values of p_{12} , p_{13} , and p_{23} , due to the definition of biseparable states.

It would be interesting to study the behavior of the coefficients a , b , and c in ρ_3 . Consider one-dimensional case where the distance between the first fermion and the second one is x and suppose that the third particle is moving between the two where the distance regarding the first fermions and the third one is r . In FIG. (1), we have plotted the behavior of a and b versus c for the different values of $0.1 \leq k_F r \leq 5$. Also for 2-d configuration, we have plotted the behavior of the coefficients in ρ_3 for NIFG in FIG. (2) where the second particle is confined on the surface of a sphere (or circle). We see that for the region $4.5 \leq k_F r \leq 5$ one cannot generate genuine tripartite entangled state in NIFG.

It is useful to mention at the end of this section that forgetting NIFG's, for ensuring Eq. (12) as a density matrix operator, the coefficients can achieve larger region in the space of a , b , c which follows

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{8}(a + b + c) \pm \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{a^2 + b^2 + c^2 - ab - bc - ac} &\geq 0, \\ a^2 + b^2 + c^2 &\geq ab + bc + ac, \\ \eta &\geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

related to positive semi-definite eigenvalues for ρ_3 . Note that considering the definition for biseparable states, only for negative values of the coefficients one can generate genuine entanglement in ρ_3 .




FIG. 2: Plotting a and b versus c for 2-d configuration of three particles where we consider particle 2 is moving through the surface of a circle (or sphere) for a fixed r where $x_{12} = r \cos(\frac{\theta}{2})$ and $x_{23} = r \sin(\frac{\theta}{2})$. The behavior has plotted for k_{FR} between 0.1 to 5 (from black to light gray) with the steps of $\frac{1}{10}$.

III. ENTANGLEMENT WITNESSES

The existence of an entanglement witness (EW) for any entangled state is a direct consequence of the Hahn-Banach theorem [17] and the fact that a 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 in the analysis of mixed three-qubit states in Ref. 15, one can categorize the different kinds of general quantum mixed states into:

- (i) The class S of fully separable states,
- (ii) The class B of biseparable states including any mixture of the three different biseparable state (12-3, 13-2 and 1-23) and separable 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 (states) according to

$$|\psi_W\rangle = \lambda_0|000\rangle + \lambda_1|100\rangle + \lambda_2|101\rangle + \lambda_3|110\rangle, \quad (14)$$

where $\lambda_i \geq 0$, $\sum_i \lambda_i^2 = 1$ together with any locally unitary transformed state, and finally

- (iv) The class of GHZ states, defined by

$$|\psi_{GHZ}\rangle = \lambda_0|000\rangle + \lambda_1 e^{i\theta}|100\rangle + \lambda_2|101\rangle + \lambda_3|110\rangle + \lambda_4|111\rangle \quad (15)$$

with $\theta \in [0, \pi]$ and any of its locally unitary transformed state.

All these sets are convex and compact, and satisfy $S \subset B \subset W \subset GHZ$ but none of the subsets related to non-separable states, i.e., $B \setminus S$, $W \setminus S$, $W \setminus B$, $GHZ \setminus S$, $GHZ \setminus B$, $GHZ \setminus W$ form a convex set.

A three-qubit state has genuine three-party entanglement when it does not belong to class of biseparable states B , i.e., $GHZ \setminus W$ and $W \setminus B$ states are tripartite genuine entangled states. 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 [18], 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 also classify EWs related to detect different classes of tripartite entangled states, so-called GHZ -EWs and W -EWs. 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 $\rho_{GHZ \setminus B} \in GHZ \setminus B$ such that $Tr(\mathcal{W}_W \rho_{GHZ \setminus B}) < 0$, i.e. separating the sets of ρ_B and $\rho_{GHZ \setminus B}$. For GHZ -EW consequently one can define an operator for which $Tr(\mathcal{W}_{GHZ} \rho_W) \geq 0$ for any W states where we have some $GHZ \setminus W$ states with negative expectation value. Furthermore, an EW can be devised to identify genuine entangled states $GHZ \setminus W$ and $W \setminus B$ by defining an EW for detecting $W \setminus B$ entanglement, as will be done in the following section.

A general scheme of manipulating EW operators for detecting $GHZ \setminus S$ entangled states has been introduced in [19, 20]. Now, for identifying genuine entanglement one has to use W - or GHZ -EWs. For constructing parameterized GHZ -EW (similarly for W -EW) via linear programming (LP), the overall process is the following: first we consider a Hermitian operator \mathcal{W} with some negative eigenvalues

$$\mathcal{W} = \sum_i a_i \hat{P}_i \quad (16)$$

where \hat{P}_i 's are Hermitian operators with $x \leq Tr(\hat{P}_i \rho_W) \leq y$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ for any density operator $\rho_W \in W$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$ are the parameters whose ranges must be determined such that \mathcal{W} be a GHZ -EW. As ρ_W varies over W states $P_i^W = Tr(\hat{P}_i \rho_W)$ maps W vectors into a convex region since we have a linear function which maps the convex domain (W class) to a convex region. Now our task is to find proper operators \hat{P}_i 's for finding (approximated) convex polygon surrounding convex region spanned by P_i^W 's (so-called feasible region for our LP optimization). The word "approximated" stands for the fact that in general all the points in the convex polygon is not produced by the expectation values of \hat{P}_i 's over W states. Now, by using the approximated convex polygon we determine the real parameters a_i 's such that the expectation value of the operator \mathcal{W} given in (16) over all W state be non-negative and possesses at least one negative value. Therefore, for determination of GHZ -EWs of type (16), one needs to find the minimum value of $\sum_i a_i P_i^W$ over the feasible region and hence the problem reduces to the optimization of the linear function $\sum_i a_i P_i^W$ over the convex set of feasible region which was approximated by a convex polygon.

One of the interesting research for a general density operator of NIFG is genuine PPT entangled state. Rather than bipartite systems, one can study PPT entangled state with respect to some parties for three particle systems. Indeed the decomposability and non-decomposability of an EW depend on particles which may be required. Therefore we define: an EW is partial decomposable with respect to i -th party iff there exists positive operators \hat{P}, \hat{Q} such that $\mathcal{W} = \hat{P} + \hat{Q}^{T_i}$ where $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ where T_i stands for partial transposition with respect to i -th party. Thereby, an EW is called partial non-decomposable EW with respect to the specific system party iff there exists at least one PPT entangled state related to that party, i.e., $\rho^{T_i} \geq 0$ when $Tr(\mathcal{W} \rho) < 0$. The necessity of these definitions will be clear afterwards when we encounter with EWs that must be explicitly marked on which particles the decomposability of EW is intended. For leading to PPT states with respect to specific party we derive the following condition for the parameters in ρ_3 : having positive values for ρ^{T_1} , imposes

$$\begin{aligned} a^2 + b^2 + c^2 + ac + bc - ab &\geq 0 \\ 2\sqrt{a^2 + b^2 + c^2 + ac + bc - ab} - 1 &\leq -a - b + c \leq 1 \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

For $\rho^{T_2} \geq 0$ we should have

$$\begin{aligned} a^2 + b^2 + c^2 - ac + bc + ab &\geq 0 \\ 2\sqrt{a^2 + b^2 + c^2 - ac + bc + ab} - 1 &\leq -a + b - c \leq 1 \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

and finally for the PPT states with respect to third particle, i.e., $\rho^{T_3} \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} a^2 + b^2 + c^2 + ac - bc + ab &\geq 0 \\ 2\sqrt{a^2 + b^2 + c^2 + ac - bc + ab} - 1 &\leq a - b - c \leq 1 \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

should be satisfied. These condition together with detection of the state by EW operators yield PPT entangled state with respect to the selected party. Apparently, only a partial non-decomposable EW related the selected party can detect PPT entangled state with respect to that specific party.

IV. EW OPERATORS FOR NIFG

Following the discussion in [20], our task is to find proper EW with LP method for identifying a given class of entangled density matrices. In this section, in order to identify genuine entanglement in NIFG, first a spin chain

model together with a more general case of periodic spin chain for constructing W -EW operators is studied. Then we have used symmetric density operators for introducing GHZ -EWs. Afterwards, we emphasize on stabilizer operators to identify different classes of genuine entanglement.

A. Spin chain model

Gühne *et al.* [16] were the first to introduce an EW operator (W -EW) based on a macroscopic spin chain model to detect genuine tripartite entanglement. The explicit form of this EW is

$$\mathcal{W}^{(genuine)} = (1 + \sqrt{5})\mathbf{I} + \widehat{P}_{12} + \widehat{P}_{23} \quad (20)$$

where $\widehat{P}_{ij} = \sigma^{(i)} \cdot \sigma^{(j)}$ and more rigorously

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{P}_{12} &:= \sigma^{(1)} \cdot \sigma^{(2)} = \sigma_x^{(1)}\sigma_x^{(2)}\mathbf{I}^{(3)} + \sigma_y^{(1)}\sigma_y^{(2)}\mathbf{I}^{(3)} + \sigma_z^{(1)}\sigma_z^{(2)}\mathbf{I}^{(3)} \\ \widehat{P}_{23} &:= \sigma^{(2)} \cdot \sigma^{(3)} = \mathbf{I}^{(1)}\sigma_x^{(2)}\sigma_x^{(3)} + \mathbf{I}^{(1)}\sigma_y^{(2)}\sigma_y^{(3)} + \mathbf{I}^{(1)}\sigma_z^{(2)}\sigma_z^{(3)} \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where the superscripts show the parties and $\sigma := (\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z)$. Regarding their definition, $\mathcal{W}^{(genuine)}$ has positive expectation value with respect to all the states belong to B and has some negative expectation values with respect to genuine entangled states in $GHZ \setminus B$.

Implementing the EW of Gühne *et al.* [16], Vértesi [13] has shown that in a particular three-fermion configuration, there exists genuine tripartite entanglement in the NIFG. Our goal is to identify the type of genuine tripartite entanglement present in a NIFG. We introduce EW operators suitable for our system and try to find boundary conditions for separated fermions exploiting our witness operators.

By starting from spin chain model for finding GHZ -EW related to Eq. (20), we consider the following operator

$$\mathcal{W}_1 = c_0 \mathbf{I} + \widehat{P}_{12} + \widehat{P}_{23} \quad (22)$$

To find c_0 for leading \mathcal{W}_1 to be a GHZ -EW, one should evaluate the minimum value of the expectation values for $\widehat{P}_{12} + \widehat{P}_{23}$ with respect to all the states in W set. For spanning all the region in W class, we should consider the explicit general form of $|\psi_W\rangle$ in Eq. (14) together with any local $SU(2)$ transformation. By expanding a general locally transformed W -vectors as $|\Psi_W\rangle = \sum_{i,j,k=0,1} A_{ijk}|ijk\rangle$, one can find the coefficient A_{ijk} and consequently the expectation values of P_{ij}^W over $|\Psi_W\rangle$ (see appendix).

It is easy to see that the witness \mathcal{W}_1 can only detect $W \setminus B$ states since the eigenvector related to the minimum eigenvalue -4 of $\widehat{P}_{12} + \widehat{P}_{23}$ belongs to W states, so it can never be a GHZ -EW.

By evaluating the expectation value of (22) over ρ_3 we obtain

$$Tr(\mathcal{W}_1\rho_3) = c_0 - 3(a + c) \quad (23)$$

which can not be negative regarding the condition $a + b + c < 1$ for NIFG. For investigating the existence of genuine entanglement, we take more general form $\rho'_3 = U\rho_3U^\dagger$ where $U = \begin{pmatrix} \beta^* & \alpha \\ -\alpha^* & \beta \end{pmatrix}^{\otimes 3}$ is related to any local transformation for the density operator for a NIFG (where we have assumed same transformation for three fermions) with $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$. Then we have

$$Tr(\mathcal{W}_1\rho'_3) = c_0 + (2 - 2b - 7a - 7c)|\beta^2\alpha^4| - 9(a + c)|\alpha^2\beta^4| - (a + c)|\alpha|^6 - 3(a + c)|\beta|^6 \quad (24)$$

In FIG. (3), we have plotted for one-dimensional configuration (as a scheme in FIG. (1)), the value of $Tr\{(\widehat{P}_{12} + \widehat{P}_{23})\rho'_3\}$ versus $k_F r$ for $k_F r = 0.1$. It shows that for the values $0.02 \leq k_F r \leq 0.06$ we can generate $W \setminus B$ for NIFG.

Due to indistinguishability, for identifying genuine entanglement in NIFG, let's consider more general case and considering parameterized operator regarding periodic spin chain model, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{W}^{(sp)} = a_0 \mathbf{I} + a_{12}\widehat{P}_{12} + a_{13}\widehat{P}_{13} + a_{23}\widehat{P}_{23} \quad (25)$$

where for equal values of the real parameters $a_{12} = a_{13} = a_{23}$, $\mathcal{W}^{(sp)}$, Eq. (25) reduces to $\mathcal{W}^{(sp)} = a_0\mathbf{I}_8 + a_{12}(\widehat{P}_{12} + \widehat{P}_{13} + \widehat{P}_{23})$ which reminds a spin chain model with periodic boundary condition. Now, we search for the possibility of leading $\mathcal{W}^{(sp)}$ of the Eq. (25) to W -EW or even GHZ -EW by checking the constraints on the parameters.




FIG. 3: Plotting of $T := Tr\{(\hat{P}_{12} + \hat{P}_{23})\rho'_3\}$ versus $k_F x$ for steps of $\frac{1}{100}$ with $k_{FR} = 0.1$ for $-4 \leq T \leq -3$.

First, we focus on W -EW. Our task is to find a convex polygon spanning by P_{ij}^B 's where P_{ij}^B 's are the expectation values of \hat{P}_{ij} (see appendix) in order to detect genuine entangled states. Regarding the eigenvalues of \hat{P}_{ij} 's, our first conjecture is the following region

$$\begin{aligned}
 -3 &\leq P_{12}^B, P_{13}^B, P_{23}^B \leq 1 \\
 -P_{12}^B - P_{13}^B + P_{23}^B &\leq 3 \\
 -P_{12}^B + P_{13}^B - P_{23}^B &\leq 3 \\
 P_{12}^B - P_{13}^B - P_{23}^B &\leq 3
 \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

but this polygon does not embrace the region spanned by P_{ij}^B 's. By parallel shifting the boundaries in (26), one can find the proper approximated convex polygon for reducing the problem of finding W -EW to LP as below (analytical proof in appendix)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{minimize} \quad & a_0 + a_{12}P_{12}^B + a_{13}P_{13}^B + a_{23}P_{23}^B \\
 \text{subject to} \quad & \begin{cases} -3 \leq P_{12}^B, P_{13}^B, P_{23}^B \leq 1 \\ -P_{12}^B - P_{13}^B + P_{23}^B \leq 1 + \sqrt{8} \\ -P_{12}^B + P_{13}^B - P_{23}^B \leq 1 + \sqrt{8} \\ P_{12}^B - P_{13}^B - P_{23}^B \leq 1 + \sqrt{8} \end{cases}
 \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Referring maximum eigenvalues, the expectation values of $-\hat{P}_{12} - \hat{P}_{13} + \hat{P}_{23}$, $-\hat{P}_{12} + \hat{P}_{13} - \hat{P}_{23}$ and $\hat{P}_{12} - \hat{P}_{13} - \hat{P}_{23}$ reach 5 and therefore the optimization problem in (27) leads to a region to form $\mathcal{W}^{(sp)}$ as a witness operator. For solving the LP problem, we look for the intersection of the constraints in Eq. (27) and find the vertices of the convex

polygon. After solving the LP problem, one can obtain the values for the parameters a_0 , a_{12} , a_{13} and a_{23} as

$$\begin{aligned}
a_0 + (3 - \sqrt{8})a_{12} - 3a_{13} + a_{23} &\geq 0 \\
a_0 - 3a_{12} + (3 - \sqrt{8})a_{13} + a_{23} &\geq 0 \\
a_0 - 3a_{12} - 3a_{13} + (-5 + \sqrt{8})a_{23} &\geq 0 \\
a_0 + (3 - \sqrt{8})a_{12} + a_{13} - 3a_{23} &\geq 0 \\
a_0 - 3a_{12} + a_{13} + (3 - \sqrt{8})a_{23} &\geq 0 \\
a_0 - 3a_{12} + (-5 + \sqrt{8})a_{13} - 3a_{23} &\geq 0 \\
a_0 + a_{12} - 3a_{13} + (3 - \sqrt{8})a_{23} &\geq 0 \\
a_0 + a_{12} + (3 - \sqrt{8})a_{13} - 3a_{23} &\geq 0 \\
a_0 + (-5 + \sqrt{8})a_{12} - 3a_{13} - 3a_{23} &\geq 0 \\
a_0 + a_{12} + a_{13} + a_{23} &\geq 0 \\
a_0 + a_{12} + a_{13} - 3a_{23} &\geq 0 \\
a_0 - 3a_{12} + a_{13} + a_{23} &\geq 0 \\
a_0 + a_{12} - 3a_{13} + a_{23} &\geq 0 \\
a_0 - 3a_{12} - 3a_{13} - 3a_{23} &\geq 0
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

provided that the expectation value of $\mathcal{W}^{(sp)}$ is positive for all quantum states in W set. In addition for leading the operator $\mathcal{W}^{(sp)}$ to a W -EW, at least one of the eigenvalues E_i

$$\begin{aligned}
E_1 &= a_0 + a_{12} + a_{13} + a_{23} \\
E_{2,3} &= a_0 - a_{12} - a_{13} - a_{23} \pm \sqrt{a_{12}^2 + a_{13}^2 + a_{23}^2 - a_{12}a_{13} - a_{12}a_{23} - a_{13}a_{23}}
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

must be negative, i.e., $\min(E_i) < 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. This imposes extra constraints to (28) for the parameters to guarantee $\mathcal{W}^{(sp)}$ to be W -EW.

In order to separate different classes of genuine entanglement, we need to find the parameters such that $\mathcal{W}^{(sp)}$ be a GHZ -EW. Similarly we try to find a proper polygon spanning by P_{ij}^W (appendix). We see that the maximum values of $-P_{12}^W - P_{13}^W + P_{23}^W$, $-P_{12}^W + P_{13}^W - P_{23}^W$ and $P_{12}^W - P_{13}^W - P_{23}^W$ reaches 5 which is the maximum eigenvalue of the corresponding operators. So, $\mathcal{W}^{(sp)}$ can never be a GHZ -EW for any order of the parameters.

Note that constructing witness operator from $\mathcal{W}^{(sp)}$ is similar to the case where the parameterized EW operator manipulated by the density operators $|\Psi_{ij}^-\rangle\langle\Psi_{ij}^-| \otimes \mathbf{I}^{(k)}$ which are present in the expansion of ρ_3 in Eq. (12) since one can rewrite

$$|\Psi_{ij}^-\rangle\langle\Psi_{ij}^-| \otimes \mathbf{I}^{(k)} = \frac{1}{4}(\mathbf{I} - \sigma^{(i)} \cdot \sigma^{(j)}) \tag{30}$$

Now, we return to our task to study genuine entanglement in tripartite NIFG. Among the boundary we try

$${}^0\mathcal{W}_W^{(sp)} = (1 + \sqrt{8})\mathbf{I} + \hat{P}_{12} + \hat{P}_{13} - \hat{P}_{23} \tag{31}$$

By calculating the trace of the product of ${}^0\mathcal{W}_W^{(sp)}$ and ρ_3 for NIFG we obtain

$$\text{Tr}({}^0\mathcal{W}_W^{(sp)}\rho_3) = (1 + \sqrt{8}) - 3(a + b - c) \tag{32}$$

which should be negative due to detect $W \setminus B$ entanglement in ρ_3 . Calculation shows that for NIFG the maximum value of $a + b - c$ is 1. As a matter of fact, forgetting NIFG, a general ρ_3 as a density operator in Eq. (12), can be detected by ${}^0\mathcal{W}_W^{(sp)}$ for some value of coefficients regarding the constraints in (13) but this is not the case for NIFG. It should be emphasized that all the states detected by ${}^0\mathcal{W}_W^{(sp)}$ from a general density matrix belongs to $W \setminus B$ states rather than the other type of genuine entangled states, i.e., $GHZ \setminus W$. For a general density matrix ρ'_3

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Tr}({}^0\mathcal{W}_W^{(sp)}\rho'_3) &= (1 + \sqrt{8}) + (-a - 3b + c)|\alpha|^6 + (-3a - 3b + 3c)|\beta|^6 \\
&+ (-8a - 9b + 6c)|\alpha^4\beta^2| + (-9a - 9b + 9c)|\alpha^2\beta^4| < 0
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

should be satisfied.

After studying a periodic spin chain model, in the following subsection, we apply another approach for reducing the problem of finding an EW operator to LP by considering the symmetric operators (given symmetric density operators) belonging to different classes of entangled density matrices in tripartite systems in a NIFG.

B. GHZ-EWs by using density matrix operators

In this section, we develop new class of proper GHZ-EWs with the aid of positive operators (density matrices) corresponding to the different entangled density operators arising in tripartite systems. For the detection of tripartite entanglement related to different classes of biseparables (A-BC, B-AC or C-AB) or genuine entangled states ($W \setminus B$ and $GHZ \setminus W$), an EW should be constructed from operators with non-vanishing expectation value with respect to selected entangled class which should be detected. One cannot build a GHZ-EW with positive operators if any density matrix operator from $GHZ \setminus W$ class is excluded.

Due to this fact, we introduce the operator

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_{GHZ}^d = & a_0 \mathbf{I}_8 + a_1 (|\Psi_{12}^- \rangle \langle \Psi_{12}^-| \otimes \mathbf{I} + |\Psi_{13}^- \rangle \langle \Psi_{13}^-| \otimes \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{I} \otimes |\Psi_{23}^- \rangle \langle \Psi_{23}^-|) \\ & + a_2 |W_1 \rangle \langle W_1| + a_3 |W_2 \rangle \langle W_2| + a_4 |\Psi_{123}^- \rangle \langle \Psi_{123}^-|, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

which contains the representative operator from all the different classes of tripartite systems, where

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

and a_i 's are real parameters. First, for ensuring operator (34) to be a GHZ-EW, we should impose the positivity in expectation value of \mathcal{W}_{GHZ}^d with respect to W states. We consider $|\Psi_W \rangle$ as the form mentioned in the previous subsection. For simplicity we define

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P}_1 &:= 2 \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} |\Psi_{ij}^- \rangle \langle \Psi_{ij}^-| \otimes \mathbf{I}, \\ \hat{P}_2 &:= 3 |W_1 \rangle \langle W_1|, \quad \hat{P}_3 := 3 |W_2 \rangle \langle W_2|, \\ \hat{P}_4 &:= 2 |\Psi_{123}^- \rangle \langle \Psi_{123}^-| \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

which are operators and P_i 's ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$) which are the corresponding expectation values with respect to W -vectors as functions of A_{ijk} (see appendix). One can simply find that the maximum eigenvalues for $\hat{P}_1, \hat{P}_2, \hat{P}_3$ is 3 and is 2 for \hat{P}_4 . A straightforward calculation shows that P_1^W, P_2^W, P_3^W can reach their maximum possible value 3 but for P_4^W finding the maximum overlap of $\langle \Psi_{123}^- | \psi_W \rangle$ leads to $\frac{3}{2}$.

For the problem of finding the parameters a_i 's such that \mathcal{W}_{GHZ}^d be a GHZ-EW operator and reducing the problem to LP one, we need to find the feasible region. Contrary to the above values, the extremum points

$$(P_1^W, P_2^W, P_3^W, P_4^W) = (0, 0, 0, 0), (3, 0, 0, 0), (0, 3, 0, 0), (0, 0, 3, 0), (0, 0, 0, \frac{3}{2}) \quad (36)$$

cannot be vertices for the feasible region of our LP problem since there are some points out of the convex polygon (connecting hyperplanes by the points in (36)) which yield negative expectation values for \mathcal{W}_{GHZ}^d , as checked by numerics. So we extend our region by parallel shifting the boundary hyperplanes and reduce the problem to LP as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minimize} \quad & a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^4 a_i P_i^W \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \begin{cases} 0 \leq P_1^W, P_2^W, P_3^W \leq 3, \\ 0 \leq P_4^W \leq 2, \\ 0 \leq P_1^W + P_2^W + P_3^W + 2P_4^W \leq \frac{15}{4} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Imposing the constraints of (37), \mathcal{W}_{GHZ}^d operator can still have some negative expectation values since the range of the expectation value of $\hat{P}_1 + \hat{P}_2 + \hat{P}_3 + 2\hat{P}_4$ is bounded between 0 and 4. Now, we have the approximated domain (feasible region) which comes from the intersection of the rectangular range related to the possible values for P_i^W 's and the constraint $P_1^W + P_2^W + P_3^W + 2P_4^W \leq \frac{15}{4}$ (see FIG. (4) which is projected on P_1^W). The word ‘‘approximated’’ stands for the region which does not entirely belong to the region spanned by P_i^W 's coming from W states.




FIG. 4: The feasible region of LP problem projected on P_1^W : overlapping domain of approximated region spanning by P_2^W, P_3^W, P_4^W and the possible range for expectation values of $\hat{P}_2, \hat{P}_3, \hat{P}_4$ which is inside the above rectangular.

This convex polygon has the following vertices

$$\begin{aligned}
 (P_1^W, P_2^W, P_3^W, P_4^W) = & (0, 0, 0, 0), (3, 0, 0, 0), (3, 0, 0, \frac{3}{8}), (3, 0, \frac{3}{4}, 0), \\
 & (3, \frac{3}{4}, 0, 0), (0, 3, 0, 0), (0, 3, 0, \frac{3}{8}), (0, 3, \frac{3}{4}, 0), (\frac{3}{4}, 3, 0, 0), \\
 & (0, 0, 3, 0), (0, 0, 3, \frac{3}{8}), (0, \frac{3}{4}, 3, 0), (\frac{3}{4}, 0, 3, 0), (0, 0, 0, \frac{15}{8})
 \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

After solving the LP problem in (37), we obtain the constraints for a_i 's as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
 a_0 \geq 0, \quad a_0 + 3a_1 \geq 0, \quad a_0 + 3a_2 \geq 0, \quad a_0 + 3a_3 \geq 0, \quad a_0 + \frac{15}{8}a_4 \geq 0, \\
 a_0 + 3a_1 + \frac{3}{8}a_4 \geq 0, \quad a_0 + 3a_2 + \frac{3}{8}a_4 \geq 0, \quad a_0 + 3a_3 + \frac{3}{8}a_4 \geq 0, \\
 a_0 + 3a_1 + \frac{3}{4}a_2 \geq 0, \quad a_0 + 3a_1 + \frac{3}{4}a_3 \geq 0, \quad a_0 + 3a_2 + \frac{3}{4}a_3 \geq 0, \\
 a_0 + 3a_2 + \frac{3}{4}a_1 \geq 0, \quad a_0 + 3a_3 + \frac{3}{4}a_1 \geq 0, \quad a_0 + 3a_3 + \frac{3}{4}a_2 \geq 0
 \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

bounded due to the positivity for the trace of EW operator over all W states. These constraints together with at least one negative eigenvalue among the following ones

$$a_0, a_0 + 3a_1, a_0 + 3a_2, a_0 + 3a_3, a_0 + 2a_4 \tag{40}$$

guarantee that \mathcal{W}_{GHZ}^d be a GHZ -EW. Considering the inequalities in (39), among the eigenvalues of (40) only a_0 cannot take negative value and the rest can fulfill the negativity for the eigenvalues of \mathcal{W}_{GHZ}^d .

At this point, we are interested to search for $GHZ \setminus W$ states in NIFG. As an optimal case of our constructed GHZ -EW, the inequality related to the last boundary plane in Eq. (37) yields the following GHZ -EW operator

$${}^0\mathcal{W}_{GHZ}^d = \frac{15}{4}\mathbf{I}_8 - 2 \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} |\Psi_{ij}^-\rangle \langle \Psi_{ij}^-| - 3|W_1\rangle \langle W_1| - 3|W_2\rangle \langle W_2| - 4|\Psi_{123}^-\rangle \langle \Psi_{123}^-| \tag{41}$$

Now, we would like to use ${}^0\mathcal{W}_{GHZ}^d$ for finding boundary condition for separation distances of fermions due for detecting $GHZ \setminus W$ states in NIFG. By calculating the expectation value of the above witness with respect to tripartite noninteracting fermions we have

$$Tr({}^0\mathcal{W}_{GHZ}^d \rho_3) = \frac{1}{2} + 2\eta \tag{42}$$

which should be negative in order to detect some $GHZ \setminus W$ entanglement. The values for η in ρ_3 can not reach to




FIG. 5: Plotting η versus θ in radiant for 2-d configuration where $0.1 \leq kFr \leq 5$ (exceeding from black to gray) with steps of 0.2.

negative ones in order to be detected by \mathcal{W}_{GHZ}^d (FIG. (5)). Also calculation shows for the rotated ρ'_3 , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} Tr(^0\mathcal{W}_{GHZ}^d \rho'_3) = & \frac{15}{4} + \left(\frac{|\alpha^4 \beta^2|}{4} + \frac{|\alpha^2 \beta^4|}{4} \right) (-33 + 9a - 3b + 9c) \\ & - \left(\frac{|\alpha|^6}{4} + \frac{|\beta|^6}{4} \right) (11 + a + b + c) + \left(\frac{\alpha^{*3} \beta^3}{2} + \frac{\beta^{*3} \alpha^3}{2} \right) (1 - a - b - c) \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

that we cannot have negative values in Eq. (43) for NIFG.

In the next part of the section, we will introduce another class of EWs using GHZ stabilizer operators which is able to identify two different kind of genuine entangled states in tripartite systems and we will show that $GHZ \setminus W$ state does not exist in NIFG.

C. Stabilizer EWs

Following Ref. 20, stabilizer EWs are robust to detect entanglement. Here, we apply GHZ stabilizer operators to define a parameterized EW for detecting quantum state close to GHZ entangled state and we also identify different type of genuine entanglement in tripartite systems. For this, we introduce

$$\mathcal{W}^{(stab)} = b_0 \mathbf{I} + b_1 \hat{S}_1 + b_2 \hat{S}_2 + b_{1,2} \hat{S}_{1,2} \quad (44)$$

where $\hat{S}_1 = \sigma_x^{(1)} \sigma_x^{(2)} \sigma_x^{(3)}$, $\hat{S}_2 = \sigma_z^{(1)} \sigma_z^{(2)} \mathbf{I}^{(3)}$ and $\hat{S}_{1,2} = \hat{S}_1 \times \hat{S}_2$ are GHZ stabilizer operators and b_i 's are real parameters.

To specify the range of the parameters such that $\mathcal{W}^{(stab)}$ be a W -EW, we should find the region spanning by S_i^B 's where the superscript B represents for the expectation value of \hat{S}_i over biseparable set. The calculation shows that our problem can reduce to the following problem (see appendix)

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} \quad b_0 + b_1 S_1^B + b_2 S_2^B + b_{12} S_{12}^B \\ & \text{subject to} \quad \begin{cases} (-1)^{i_1} S_1^B + (-1)^{i_2} S_2^B + (-1)^{i_1+i_2} S_{1,2}^B \leq \sqrt{2} \\ (-1)^{i_1} S_1^B + (-1)^{i_2} S_2^B + (-1)^{i_1+i_2+1} S_{1,2}^B \leq 1 \end{cases} \quad ; \quad \forall (i_1, i_2) \in \{0, 1\}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

spanning by biseparable states. Noting that the boundaries which come from separable states (see Ref. [20]) could not exceed 1. The corresponding operators related to second cluster of the constraints in (45) form positive operators and cannot form EW operators. By solving the LP problem in (45), we derive the following constraints

$$\begin{aligned}
& b_0 + \sqrt{2}(b_1 + b_2 - b_{1,2}) \geq 0, & b_0 + \sqrt{2}(b_1 - b_2 + b_{1,2}) \geq 0, \\
& b_0 + \sqrt{2}(-b_1 + b_2 + b_{1,2}) \geq 0, & b_0 - \sqrt{2}(b_1 + b_2 + b_{1,2}) \geq 0, \\
& b_0 + b_1 - b_2 - b_{1,2} \geq 0, & b_0 - b_1 - b_2 + b_{1,2} \geq 0, \\
& b_0 - b_1 + b_2 - b_{1,2} \geq 0, & b_0 + b_1 + b_2 + b_{1,2} \geq 0 \\
& b_0 + \sqrt{2}b_1 + \frac{1-\sqrt{2}}{2}b_2 + \frac{-1+\sqrt{2}}{2}b_{1,2} \geq 0, & b_0 + \sqrt{2}b_1 + \frac{-1+\sqrt{2}}{2}b_2 + \frac{1-\sqrt{2}}{2}b_{1,2} \geq 0, \\
& b_0 + \frac{-1+\sqrt{2}}{2}b_1 + \sqrt{2}b_2 + \frac{1-\sqrt{2}}{2}b_{1,2} \geq 0, & b_0 + \frac{1-\sqrt{2}}{2}b_1 + \sqrt{2}b_2 + \frac{-1+\sqrt{2}}{2}b_{1,2} \geq 0, \\
& b_0 + \frac{-1+\sqrt{2}}{2}b_1 + \frac{1-\sqrt{2}}{2}b_2 + \sqrt{2}b_{1,2} \geq 0, & b_0 + \frac{-1+\sqrt{2}}{2}b_1 + \frac{1-\sqrt{2}}{2}b_2 + \sqrt{2}b_{1,2} \geq 0, \\
& b_0 + \frac{1-\sqrt{2}}{2}b_1 + \frac{1-\sqrt{2}}{2}b_2 - \sqrt{2}b_{1,2} \geq 0, & b_0 + \frac{-1+\sqrt{2}}{2}b_1 + \frac{-1+\sqrt{2}}{2}b_2 - \sqrt{2}b_{1,2} \geq 0, \\
& b_0 + \frac{1-\sqrt{2}}{2}b_1 - \sqrt{2}b_2 + \frac{1-\sqrt{2}}{2}b_{1,2} \geq 0, & b_0 + \frac{-1+\sqrt{2}}{2}b_1 - \sqrt{2}b_2 + \frac{-1+\sqrt{2}}{2}b_{1,2} \geq 0, \\
& b_0 - \sqrt{2}b_1 + \frac{1-\sqrt{2}}{2}b_2 + \frac{1-\sqrt{2}}{2}b_{1,2} \geq 0, & b_0 - \sqrt{2}b_1 + \frac{-1+\sqrt{2}}{2}b_2 + \frac{-1+\sqrt{2}}{2}b_{1,2} \geq 0
\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

to ensure $\mathcal{W}^{(stab)}$ be positive with all biseparable states. For having a W -EW, in addition to the above constraints, we should have at least one negative eigenvalue from the following ones

$$b_0 + (-1)^{i_1}b_1 + (-1)^{i_2}b_2 + (-1)^{i_1+i_2}b_{1,2} ; \quad \forall(i_1, i_2) \in \{0, 1\}^2 \tag{47}$$

For identifying the different kinds of genuine entangled states, we need GHZ -EW. Therefore we should find b 's in $\mathcal{W}^{(stab)}$ such that Eq. (44) be positive with all the states in W class and has some negative eigenvalues. First, we search for a polygon spanning by S_1^W , S_2^W and $S_{1,2}^W$ which are the functions of A_{ijk} in $|\Psi_W\rangle$. Thereby, we arrive to the following LP problem

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} & b_0 + b_1S_1^W + b_2S_2^W + b_{12}S_{12}^W \\
& \text{subject to} & \begin{cases} (-1)^{i_1}S_1^W + (-1)^{i_2}S_2^W + (-1)^{i_1+i_2}S_{1,2}^W \leq 2.98 \\ (-1)^{i_1}S_1^W + (-1)^{i_2}S_2^W + (-1)^{i_1+i_2+1}S_{1,2}^W \leq 1 \end{cases} ; \quad \forall(i_1, i_2) \in \{0, 1\}^2
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

Like the previous case, just the corresponding operators related to the first cluster of the constraints can be EW operators. Now, here solving the LP problem in (48) yields new constraints for the parameters as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
& b_0 + 2.98(b_1 + b_2 - b_{1,2}) \geq 0, & b_0 + 2.98(b_1 - b_2 + b_{1,2}) \geq 0, \\
& b_0 + 2.98(-b_1 + b_2 + b_{1,2}) \geq 0, & b_0 - 2.98(b_1 + b_2 + b_{1,2}) \geq 0, \\
& b_0 + b_1 - b_2 - b_{1,2} \geq 0, & b_0 - b_1 - b_2 + b_{1,2} \geq 0, \\
& b_0 - b_1 + b_2 - b_{1,2} \geq 0, & b_0 + b_1 + b_2 + b_{1,2} \geq 0 \\
& b_0 + 2.98b_1 - 0.99b_2 + 0.99b_{1,2} \geq 0, & b_0 + 2.98b_1 + 0.99b_2 - 0.99b_{1,2} \geq 0, \\
& b_0 + 0.99b_1 + 2.98b_2 - 0.99b_{1,2} \geq 0, & b_0 - 0.99b_1 + 2.98b_2 + 0.99b_{1,2} \geq 0, \\
& b_0 + 0.99b_1 - 0.99b_2 + 2.98b_{1,2} \geq 0, & b_0 - 0.99b_1 + 0.99b_2 + 2.98b_{1,2} \geq 0, \\
& b_0 - 0.99b_1 - 0.99b_2 - 2.98b_{1,2} \geq 0, & b_0 + 0.99b_1 + 0.99b_2 - 2.98b_{1,2} \geq 0, \\
& b_0 - 0.99b_1 - 2.98b_2 - 0.99b_{1,2} \geq 0, & b_0 + 0.99b_1 - 2.98b_2 + 0.99b_{1,2} \geq 0, \\
& b_0 - 2.98b_1 - 0.99b_2 - 0.99b_{1,2} \geq 0, & b_0 - 2.98b_1 + 0.99b_2 + 0.99b_{1,2} \geq 0
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

in $\mathcal{W}^{(stab)}$ for having positive expectation values over W class.

For having an EW operator $\mathcal{W}^{(stab)}$ which can only detect and identify genuine entangled state $W \setminus B$ from $GHZ \setminus W$ we should impose an intermediate constraints for the parameters as we had before in (46) and (49), i.e., the constraints (46) together with the violation of the constraints in (49). Apparently, to fulfill the requirement for having negative expectation values for the detection, one of the eigenvalues in (47) should be negative.

Among the above EWs, we try the following one

$$\begin{aligned}
& {}^0\mathcal{W}_W^{(stab)} = \sqrt{2} \mathbf{I} + \widehat{S}_1 + \widehat{S}_2 - \widehat{S}_{12} \\
& {}^0\mathcal{W}_{GHZ}^{(stab)} = 2.98 \mathbf{I} + \widehat{S}_1 + \widehat{S}_2 - \widehat{S}_{12}
\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

To detect genuine entangled state in NIFG, we evaluate the expectation value

$$\text{Tr}({}^0\mathcal{W}_W^{(stab)} \rho_3) = \sqrt{2} - 2a \tag{51}$$

which should be negative due to detect $GHZ \setminus B$ and yields to $a > \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$: going back to Fig. (2), we see for 2-d configuration, this would occur for negative b . Furthermore, detecting $GHZ \setminus W$ states in NIFG

$$\text{Tr}({}^0\mathcal{W}_{GHZ}^{(stab)} \rho_3) = 2.98 - 2a \tag{52}$$




FIG. 6: Plotting $T' := Tr\{(\widehat{S}_1 + \widehat{S}_2 - \widehat{S}_{12})\rho_3\}$ versus θ in radian for 2-d configuration where $0.1 \leq k_{Fr} \leq 5$ (exceeding from black to gray) with steps of 0.2.




FIG. 7: $T' := Tr\{(\widehat{S}_1 + \widehat{S}_2 - \widehat{S}_{12})\rho_3\}$ is studied for PPT entangled W state with respect to third particle. For 1-d configuration of the fermions T' is plotted versus k_{Fx} for $k_{Fr} = 3, 3.5$ and for 2-d versus θ for $3 \leq k_{Fr} \leq 4$ for the steps of 0.25 (exceeding from black to gray).

should reach negative values which is not possible since $|a| < 1$. Considering EWs in Eq. (50), for detecting $W \setminus B$ entangled states, the expectation value of $\widehat{S}_1 + \widehat{S}_2 - \widehat{S}_{12}$ should be between $\sqrt{2}$ and 2.98. Hereby, for having $W \setminus B$ entanglement in NIFG, $-1.49 < a < -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ should be fulfilled. According to the plotting in FIG. (6), we confirm that $GHZ \setminus W$ entangled state does not exist in NIFG and all the states which ${}^0\mathcal{W}_{GHZ}^{(stab)}$ can detect, belongs to $GHZ \setminus W$.

One of the advantages of EW operators rather than Negativity [11] is to distinguish PPT entangled states. Regarding the condition for the coefficients in (19) for PPT entanglement with respect to third particle in NIFG and ${}^0\mathcal{W}_W^{(stab)}$, one can find the region for PPT genuine W entangled state with respect to third fermion in NIFG. The behavior for $k_{Fr} = 3, 3.5$ are shown in FIG. (7) for 1-d and also 2-d configuration. Hence ${}^0\mathcal{W}_W^{(stab)}$ is partial non-decomposable W -EW for the third party since it could detect some PPT states with respect to third particle.

Note that the eigenvectors related to the eigenvalues of ρ_3 in (13) belong to $W \setminus B$ class rather than $GHZ \setminus W$ which confirms non-existence of genuine $GHZ \setminus W$ in NIFG. For proving this, we rewrite $\rho_3 = \sum_i d_i |\alpha_i\rangle\langle\alpha_i|$ where due to be a density operator $d_i \geq 0$. We assume that there exist a GHZ -EW operator \mathcal{W}_{GHZ} such that

$$Tr(\mathcal{W}_{GHZ}\rho_3) = \sum_i d_i Tr(\mathcal{W}_{GHZ}|\alpha_i\rangle\langle\alpha_i|) \quad (53)$$

be negative. This assumption leads to contradiction if there is no contribution of $GHZ \setminus W$ state in the eigenvectors of ρ_3 .

Still one question remains: can we have a pure genuine three party W -type entangled states in NIFG even though there is no mixture of separable or biseparable entanglement, i.e., can we have a pure state belongs to $W \setminus B$ subset? This can be investigated by finding the maximum trace value of the product of tripartite NIFG density operator and a general density operators related to $W \setminus B$ as follows: for finding the maximum overlap related to $W \setminus B$ states and

considering the antisymmetry due to the exchange of particles in ρ_3 , it is sufficient to work with the density operator

$$\varrho^W = |W_1\rangle\langle W_1| = \frac{1}{3}(|001\rangle + |010\rangle + |100\rangle)(\langle 001| + \langle 010| + \langle 100|) \quad (54)$$

together with any local unitary transformed as

$$\varrho'^W = \left(\begin{array}{cc} \beta^* & \alpha \\ -\alpha^* & \beta \end{array} \right)^{\otimes 3} \varrho^W \left(\begin{array}{cc} \beta & -\alpha \\ \alpha^* & \beta^* \end{array} \right)^{\otimes 3} \quad (55)$$

where ϱ'^W defines any pure W -like genuine entangled states. We have checked by numerics that the value for $Tr(\varrho'^W \rho_3)$ is always less than one. These calculations show that in general it is not possible to write ρ_3 as we have for tripartite NIFG in a form of pure ϱ'^W . This can be also confirmed by explicit form of Eq. (8) which was as a conjecture in [9]. Consequently, one can conclude that in tripartite NIFG, having a genuine three party entanglement imposes a mixed state containing entangled or separable states in other parties as well, i.e., one cannot generate pure genuine entanglement in these systems.

V. CONCLUSION

We have introduced new classes of EWs for identifying genuine entanglement, i.e., $W \setminus B$ and $GHZ \setminus W$ states in the reduced tripartite density matrix of NIFG. In order to find a proper EW, we could reduce the problem of finding parameterized EWs for detecting genuine entanglement to LP. We have shown by helping from a periodic spin chain model, density operators related to different classes of tripartite systems and also GHZ stabilizer operators that all the genuine entangled states in NIFG are related to $W \setminus B$ states. This can be confirmed by the eigenvectors of a general density matrix of NIFG. We have seen that pure genuine tripartite entanglement does not exist in tripartite NIFG and always appears in the mixtures of other kinds of entanglement as well. We could also detect PPT genuine $W \setminus B$ entangled state with respect to the third party in NIFG with our partial non-decomposable EW. The approach of this paper can also be repeated for larger dimensions of Hilbert spaces for indistinguishable interacting or NIFG (as well as bosonic) to identify the different types of entanglement in correspondent mixture.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank D. Bruß and T. Vértesi, for the useful comments and M. A. Jafarizadeh, G. Najarbashi and B. Dastmalchi for the motivation and discussion. This research has been supported by the European Community project "N2T2".

Appendix

For obtaining most general form of quantum states in W set, we should consider the explicit general form of $|\psi_W\rangle$ in Eq. (14) together with any local $SU(2)$ transformation $|0\rangle_i \rightarrow \alpha_i|0\rangle_i + \beta_i|1\rangle_i$ and $|1\rangle_i \rightarrow \beta_i^*|0\rangle_i - \alpha_i^*|1\rangle_i$ for different parties (subscripts for the kets stand for the parties) where $|\alpha_i|^2 + |\beta_i|^2 = 1$. By expanding a general locally transformed W -vectors as $|\Psi_W\rangle := V|\psi_W\rangle$ where

$$V = \left(\begin{array}{cc} \beta_1^* & \alpha_1 \\ -\alpha_1^* & \beta_1 \end{array} \right) \otimes \left(\begin{array}{cc} \beta_2^* & \alpha_2 \\ -\alpha_2^* & \beta_2 \end{array} \right) \otimes \left(\begin{array}{cc} \beta_3^* & \alpha_3 \\ -\alpha_3^* & \beta_3 \end{array} \right) \quad (A-1)$$

and rewriting $|\Psi_W\rangle = \sum_{i,j,k=0,1} A_{ijk}|ijk\rangle$, the coefficients A_{ijk} 's are

$$\begin{aligned} A_{000} &= \lambda_0 \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \alpha_3 + \lambda_1 \beta_1^* \alpha_2 \alpha_3 + \lambda_2 \beta_1^* \alpha_2 \beta_3^* + \lambda_3 \beta_1^* \beta_2^* \alpha_3 \\ A_{001} &= \lambda_0 \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \beta_3 + \lambda_1 \beta_1^* \alpha_2 \beta_3 - \lambda_2 \beta_1^* \alpha_2 \alpha_3^* + \lambda_3 \beta_1^* \beta_2^* \beta_3 \\ A_{010} &= \lambda_0 \alpha_1 \beta_2 \alpha_3 + \lambda_1 \beta_1^* \beta_2 \alpha_3 + \lambda_2 \beta_1^* \beta_2 \beta_3^* - \lambda_3 \beta_1^* \alpha_2^* \alpha_3 \\ A_{011} &= \lambda_0 \alpha_1 \beta_2 \beta_3 + \lambda_1 \beta_1^* \beta_2 \beta_3 - \lambda_2 \beta_1^* \beta_2 \alpha_3^* - \lambda_3 \beta_1^* \alpha_2^* \beta_3 \\ A_{100} &= \lambda_0 \beta_1 \alpha_2 \alpha_3 - \lambda_1 \alpha_1^* \alpha_2 \alpha_3 - \lambda_2 \alpha_1^* \alpha_2 \beta_3^* - \lambda_3 \alpha_1^* \beta_2^* \alpha_3 \\ A_{101} &= \lambda_0 \beta_1 \alpha_2 \beta_3 - \lambda_1 \alpha_1^* \alpha_2 \beta_3 + \lambda_2 \alpha_1^* \alpha_2 \alpha_3^* - \lambda_3 \alpha_1^* \beta_2^* \beta_3 \\ A_{110} &= \lambda_0 \beta_1 \beta_2 \alpha_3 - \lambda_1 \alpha_1^* \beta_2 \alpha_3 - \lambda_2 \alpha_1^* \beta_2 \beta_3^* + \lambda_3 \alpha_1^* \alpha_2^* \alpha_3 \\ A_{111} &= \lambda_0 \beta_1 \beta_2 \beta_3 - \lambda_1 \alpha_1^* \beta_2 \beta_3 + \lambda_2 \alpha_1^* \beta_2 \alpha_3^* + \lambda_3 \alpha_1^* \alpha_2^* \beta_3 \end{aligned} \quad (A-2)$$

Thereby for expectation values of \widehat{P}_{ij} 's in Eq. (21) over W set, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{12}^W &:= \langle \Psi_W | \widehat{P}_{12} | \Psi_W \rangle = |A_{000}|^2 + |A_{001}|^2 - |A_{010}|^2 - |A_{011}|^2 - |A_{100}|^2 - |A_{101}|^2 + |A_{110}|^2 + |A_{111}|^2 \\
&\quad + (A_{010}A_{100}^* + A_{011}A_{101}^* + c.c.) \\
P_{23}^W &:= \langle \Psi_W | \widehat{P}_{23} | \Psi_W \rangle = |A_{000}|^2 - |A_{001}|^2 - |A_{010}|^2 + |A_{011}|^2 + |A_{100}|^2 - |A_{101}|^2 - |A_{110}|^2 + |A_{111}|^2 \\
&\quad + (A_{001}A_{010}^* + A_{101}A_{110}^* + c.c.) \\
P_{13}^W &:= \langle \Psi_W | \widehat{P}_{13} | \Psi_W \rangle = |A_{000}|^2 - |A_{001}|^2 + |A_{010}|^2 - |A_{011}|^2 - |A_{100}|^2 + |A_{101}|^2 - |A_{110}|^2 + |A_{111}|^2 \\
&\quad + (A_{000}A_{101}^* + A_{001}A_{100}^* + A_{010}A_{111}^* + A_{011}A_{110}^* + c.c.)
\end{aligned} \tag{A-3}$$

and for \widehat{S}_i 's, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
S_1^W &:= (A_{000}A_{111}^* + A_{001}A_{110}^* + A_{010}A_{101}^* + A_{011}A_{100}^* + c.c.) \\
S_2^W &:= |A_{000}|^2 + |A_{001}|^2 - |A_{010}|^2 - |A_{011}|^2 - |A_{100}|^2 - |A_{101}|^2 + |A_{110}|^2 + |A_{111}|^2 \\
S_{1,2}^W &:= (-A_{000}A_{110}^* - A_{001}A_{111}^* + A_{010}A_{100}^* + A_{011}A_{101}^* + A_{100}A_{010}^* + A_{101}A_{011}^* - A_{110}A_{000}^* - A_{111}A_{001}^* + c.c.)
\end{aligned} \tag{A-4}$$

Also for \widehat{P}_i 's, the expectation values over the states in W class read

$$\begin{aligned}
P_1^W &= 2\langle \Psi_W | (|\Psi_{12}^-\rangle\langle \Psi_{12}^-| \otimes \mathbf{I} + |\Psi_{13}^-\rangle\langle \Psi_{13}^-| \otimes \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{I} \otimes |\Psi_{23}^-\rangle\langle \Psi_{23}^-|) | \Psi_W \rangle \\
&= (A_{001}^* + A_{010}^* + A_{100}^*) \times (A_{001} + A_{010} + A_{100}) \\
P_2^W &= 3|\langle \Psi_W | W_1 \rangle|^2 = (A_{001}^* + A_{010}^* + A_{100}^*) \times (A_{001} + A_{010} + A_{100}) \\
P_3^W &= 3|\langle \Psi_W | W_2 \rangle|^2 = (A_{011}^* + A_{110}^* + A_{101}^*) \times (A_{011} + A_{110} + A_{101}) \\
P_4^W &= 2|\langle \Psi_{123}^- | \Psi_W \rangle|^2 = (A_{000}^* - A_{111}^*) \times (A_{000} - A_{111})
\end{aligned} \tag{A-5}$$

Similarly one can define P_{ij}^B , S_i^B and P_i^B for the expectation value with respect to biseparable class B . According [16], for explaining how to find the boundaries in LP problem of (27), we prove one of them as follows (the rest is similar)

$$\begin{aligned}
| -P_{12}^B - P_{13}^B + P_{23}^B | &= |\langle \psi_B | \sigma_x^{(1)} \sigma_x^{(2)} + \sigma_y^{(1)} \sigma_y^{(2)} + \sigma_z^{(1)} \sigma_z^{(2)} + \sigma_x^{(3)} + \sigma_y^{(3)} + \sigma_z^{(3)} + \sigma_x^{(2)} \sigma_x^{(3)} + \sigma_y^{(2)} \sigma_y^{(3)} + \sigma_z^{(2)} \sigma_z^{(3)} | \psi_B \rangle | \\
&\leq |\langle \psi_B | \sigma_x^{(2)} + \sigma_y^{(2)} + \sigma_z^{(2)} + \sigma_x^{(3)} + \sigma_y^{(3)} + \sigma_z^{(3)} | \psi_B \rangle| + |\langle \psi_B | \sigma_x^{(2)} \sigma_x^{(3)} + \sigma_y^{(2)} \sigma_y^{(3)} + \sigma_z^{(2)} \sigma_z^{(3)} | \psi_B \rangle| \\
&\leq 1 + \sqrt{8}
\end{aligned} \tag{A-6}$$

where $|\psi_B\rangle = |\psi_1\rangle|\psi_{23}\rangle$ is an arbitrary biseparable state which has entanglement among second and third parties and we have used Schwartz inequality for going to the second line. Similarly for the boundaries related to stabilizer operators in (45) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
| -S_1^B + S_2^B - S_{12}^B | &= |\langle \psi_B | -\sigma_x^{(1)} \sigma_x^{(2)} \sigma_x^{(3)} + \sigma_z^{(1)} \sigma_z^{(2)} + \sigma_y^{(1)} \sigma_y^{(2)} \sigma_x^{(3)} | \psi_B \rangle | \\
&\leq |\langle \psi_B | \sigma_x^{(2)} \sigma_x^{(3)} | \psi_B \rangle| + |\langle \psi_B | \sigma_z^{(2)} | \psi_B \rangle| + |\langle \psi_B | \sigma_y^{(2)} \sigma_x^{(3)} | \psi_B \rangle| \leq \sqrt{2}
\end{aligned} \tag{A-7}$$

where once more we have applied Schwartz inequality for going to the second line. The proof of the rest is similar.

-
- [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] L. Amico, R. Fazio, A. Osterloh, V. Vedral, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80**, 517 (2007).
 - [4] J. Schliemann, J. I. Cirac, M. Kus, M. Lewenstein, and D. Loss, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 022303 (2001).
 - [5] K. Eckert, J. Schliemann, D. Bruß and M. Lewenstein, *Annals of Phys.* **299**, 88-127 (2002).
 - [6] G. Ghirardi, L. Marinatto, T. Weber, *J. Statistical Phys.* **108**, 49-122 (2002).
 - [7] N. Paunković, Y. Omar, S. Bose, V. Vedral, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 187903 (2002).
 - [8] P. Zanardi, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 042101 (2002).
 - [9] V. Vedral, *Cent. Eur. J. Phys.* **1**, 2, 289-306 (2003).
 - [10] S. Oh, J. Kim, *Phys. Rev. A* **69**, 054305 (2004).

- [11] C. Lunkes, Č. Brukner and V. Vedral, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 030503 (2005).
- [12] M. R. Dowling, A. C. Doherty, and H. M. Wiseman, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 052323 (2006).
- [13] T. Vértesi, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 042330 (2007).
- [14] M. Lewenstein, B. Kraus, J. I. Cirac, and P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 052310 (2000).
- [15] A. Acín, D. Bruß, M. Lewenstein and A. Sanpera, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 040401 (2001).
- [16] O. Gühne, G. Tóth, H. Briegel, New J. Phys. **7**, 229 (2005).
- [17] W. Rudin, Functional Analysis, McGraw-Hill, Singapore (1991).
- [18] V. Coffman, J. Kundu, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 052306 (2000).
- [19] M. A. Jafarizadeh, G. Najarbashi, H. Habibian, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 052326 (2007).
- [20] M. A. Jafarizadeh, G. Najarbashi, Y. Akbari, H. Habibian, Eur. Phys. J. D **47**, 233-255 (2008).