

Total correlations and mutual information

Zbigniew Walczak*

*Department of Theoretical Physics, University of Lodz
Pomorska 149/153, 90-236 Łódź, Poland*

In quantum information theory it is generally accepted that quantum mutual information is an information-theoretic measure of total correlations of a bipartite quantum state. We argue that there exist quantum states for which quantum mutual information cannot be considered as a measure of total correlations. Moreover, for these states we propose a different way of quantifying total correlations.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 03.65.Ta

I. INTRODUCTION

In quantum information theory it is generally accepted that (i) total correlations of a bipartite quantum state are quantified by quantum mutual information (see e.g. [1–21])

$$\mathcal{T}(\rho^{AB}) = I(\rho^{AB}), \quad (1)$$

(ii) the total correlations $\mathcal{T}(\rho^{AB})$ can be decomposed into classical and quantum correlations (see e.g. [5–15, 17–19])

$$\mathcal{T}(\rho^{AB}) = \mathcal{C}(\rho^{AB}) + \mathcal{Q}(\rho^{AB}), \quad (2)$$

(iii) the quantum correlations are dominated by the classical correlations (see e.g. [7, 8, 10, 12–15, 17])

$$\mathcal{C}(\rho^{AB}) \geq \mathcal{Q}(\rho^{AB}). \quad (3)$$

Notice that the quantum correlations are not only limited to quantum entanglement, because separable quantum states can also have correlations which are responsible for the improvements of some quantum tasks that cannot be simulated by classical methods [22–28].

However, there are some results that may raise doubts as to whether the statements (i), (ii) and (iii) hold for all ρ^{AB} . In the following we briefly review and discuss a few of them. For example, it has been shown that there are quantum states for which statements (i) and (ii) cannot be simultaneously true, if quantum correlations are measured by relative entropy of entanglement while classical correlations are quantified by a measure based on the maximum information that could be extracted on one system by making a POVM measurement on the other one [7].

Recently, it has been shown that for certain quantum states the quantum correlations, as measured by entanglement of formation, exceed half of the total correlations, as measured by quantum mutual information,

$\mathcal{Q}(\rho^{AB}) \geq \frac{1}{2}I(\rho^{AB})$ [17]. If one assumes that statements (i), (ii) and (iii) hold for all ρ^{AB} , then one concludes that entanglement of formation cannot be considered as a measure of quantum correlations. However, if one assumes that entanglement of formation is a measure of quantum correlations and statements (ii) and (iii) hold, then it can be shown that for these quantum states $\mathcal{T}(\rho^{AB}) \geq I(\rho^{AB})$.

Moreover, it has been shown that for certain quantum states quantum correlations, as measured by entanglement of formation, exceed total correlations, as measured by quantum mutual information, $\mathcal{Q}(\rho^{AB}) \geq \mathcal{T}(\rho^{AB})$ [17, 29]. It means that entanglement of formation cannot be considered as a measure of quantum correlations, if one assumes that statements (i), (ii) and (iii) hold for all ρ^{AB} . However, if one assumes that entanglement of formation is a measure of quantum correlations and statements (ii) and (iii) hold, then again one comes to conclusion that for these quantum states $\mathcal{T}(\rho^{AB}) \geq I(\rho^{AB})$.

Furthermore, it has been shown that for some quantum states quantum correlations, as measured by entanglement of formation, exceed $I(\rho^{AB}) - \mathcal{Q}(\rho^{AB})$, i.e. $\mathcal{Q}(\rho^{AB}) \geq \frac{1}{2}I(\rho^{AB})$ [18]. If one assumes that statements (i) and (ii) hold for all ρ^{AB} , then one concludes that for these states $\mathcal{Q}(\rho^{AB}) \geq \mathcal{C}(\rho^{AB})$. However, if one assumes that entanglement of formation is a measure of quantum correlations and statements (ii) and (iii) hold, then once again one comes to conclusion that for these quantum states $\mathcal{T}(\rho^{AB}) \geq I(\rho^{AB})$.

These results suggest that statement (i) may not be true for all bipartite quantum states. It is clear that if (1) holds for all states, then one immediately concludes that quantum mutual information must be a measure of total correlations also in the case when the quantum state has only classical correlations. This implies that

$$\mathcal{C}(\rho^{AB}) = \mathcal{T}(\rho^{AB}) = I(\rho^{AB}) \quad (4)$$

for classically correlated quantum states.

In this Letter, we argue that there exist classically correlated quantum states for which quantum mutual information cannot be considered as a proper measure of total correlations and for these states we propose a different way of quantifying total correlations.

*Electronic address: Z.Walczak@merlin.phys.uni.lodz.pl

II. A TWO-QUBIT MIXED STATE

Assume that Alice and Bob share a pair of qubits in the following state

$$\rho^{AB} = \alpha|00\rangle\langle 00| + (1 - \alpha)|11\rangle\langle 11|, \quad (5)$$

where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. This state cannot have quantum correlations because it is separable and qubit A (B) is in the state $\rho^{A(B)} = \alpha|0\rangle\langle 0| + (1 - \alpha)|1\rangle\langle 1|$ which is a mixture of orthogonal states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$. Therefore, it is clear that the correlations between two orthogonal states of qubits A and B can be purely classical (see e.g. [9, 19, 30]).

Suppose now that Alice and Bob measure two observables $M_A = a_0|0\rangle\langle 0| + a_1|1\rangle\langle 1|$ and $M_B = b_0|0\rangle\langle 0| + b_1|1\rangle\langle 1|$, respectively. If the measurement outcome of M_A (M_B) is a_i (b_i), then qubit A (B) is certainly in the state $|i\rangle$. Therefore, it is clear that the classical correlations between two orthogonal states of qubits A and B are simply correlations between two classical random variables A and B corresponding to the measurement outcomes of M_A and M_B , respectively. Notice that A and B are random variables with alphabets $\mathcal{A} = \{a_0, a_1\}$, $\mathcal{B} = \{b_0, b_1\}$ and probability mass functions $p^{A(B)} = [p_i^{A(B)}]$, where $p_i^{A(B)} = \text{Tr}[|i\rangle\langle i|\rho^{A(B)}]$ denotes the probability that the measurement outcome of M_A (M_B) is a_i (b_i). In the case under consideration, it can be shown that

$$p^A = (\alpha, 1 - \alpha), \quad (6a)$$

$$p^B = (\alpha, 1 - \alpha). \quad (6b)$$

Assume now that first Alice performs a measurement of M_A and then Bob performs a measurement of M_B . If the measurement outcome of M_A is a_i , then the post-measurement state of the system is given by $\rho_i^{AB} = (|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes I)\rho^{AB}(|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes I)/p_i^A$. Therefore, the conditional probability that Bob's outcome is b_j provided that Alice's was a_i is $p_{j|i}^{B|A} = \text{Tr}[(I \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|)\rho_i^{AB}]$ while the joint probability that the measurement outcome of M_A and M_B is a_i and b_j , respectively is given by $p_{ij}^{AB} = \text{Tr}[(|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|)\rho^{AB}]$. In the case under consideration, it can be shown that

$$p^{B|A} = [p_{j|i}^{B|A}] = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (7)$$

and

$$p^{AB} = [p_{ij}^{AB}] = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 1 - \alpha \end{pmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

Thus, we see that random variables A and B are not independent and therefore there exist classical correlations between qubits A and B in the state (5).

Assume now, according to the statement (i), that total correlations of a bipartite quantum state are quantified by quantum mutual information which is defined in formal analogy to classical mutual information as

$$I(\rho^{AB}) = S(\rho^A) + S(\rho^B) - S(\rho^{AB}), \quad (9)$$




FIG. 1: This diagram shows that $B = f(A)$ and therefore random variables A and B are perfectly correlated in the information-theoretic sense, despite the fact that in this case the mutual information can be arbitrarily small.

where $S(\cdot)$ denotes the von Neumann entropy. Then, according to Eq. (4) the classical correlations between qubits A and B are measured by the quantum mutual information. In the case under consideration, it can be shown that $I(\rho^{AB})$ is just classical mutual information of random variables A and B given by

$$\begin{aligned} I(A : B) &= \sum_{i,j} p_{ij}^{AB} \log_2(p_{ij}^{AB} / (p_i^A p_j^B)) \\ &= -\alpha \log_2 \alpha - (1 - \alpha) \log_2(1 - \alpha). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Therefore, we see that the classical correlations content of the quantum state (5) can be arbitrarily small, as measured by classical mutual information, because $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

Now, we check if these correlations can be really arbitrarily small. From Eq. (7) it follows that if Alice's measurement outcome is a_i , then Bob's one is b_i , i.e. B is a one-to-one function of A , $B = f(A)$ (see Fig. 1). It means that the random variables A and B and what follows the states of qubits are perfectly correlated in the information-theoretic sense. Therefore, we see that in the general case quantum mutual information cannot be considered as a measure of total correlations in bipartite quantum states.

Now, we show why the classical mutual information $I(A : B)$ does not capture all the correlations between random variables A and B , except the case when $\alpha = 1/2$. We know that Shannon entropy of random variable B , $H(B) = -\sum_j p_j^B \log_2 p_j^B$, is a measure of Alice's *a priori* uncertainty about the measurement outcome of M_B and if the measurement outcome of M_A is a_i , then Alice's uncertainty about the measurement outcome of M_B is changed, preferably reduced, to $H(B|A = a_i) = -\sum_j p_{j|i}^{B|A} \log_2 p_{j|i}^{B|A}$. Therefore, the information she gained about the measurement outcome of M_B due to the measurement of M_A is given by $H(B) - H(B|A = a_i)$. Thus, the average information gain about the measurement outcome of M_B due to the knowledge of the measurement outcome of M_A is $\sum_i p_i^A (H(B) - H(B|A = a_i)) = H(B) - H(B|A)$, and it can be shown that it is equal to $I(A : B)$. Therefore, we see that the average information gain about one random variable due to the knowledge of other one can be arbitrarily small although they are perfectly correlated.

Thus it is clear that classical mutual information is not a measure of correlations between two random variables, it is rather a measure of their mutual dependency.

This conclusion leads us to the following question: What is an information-theoretic measure of correlations between random variables A and B ? For a pair of random variables with identical probability mass functions Cover and Thomas [31] define it in the following way

$$\mathcal{C}(A, B) = \frac{I(A : B)}{H(A)}. \quad (11)$$

The basic properties of $\mathcal{C}(A, B)$ are as follows [31] (i) $\mathcal{C}(A, B) = \mathcal{C}(B, A)$, (ii) $0 \leq \mathcal{C}(A, B) \leq 1$, (iii) $\mathcal{C}(A, B) = 0$ if and only if A and B are independent, and (iv) $\mathcal{C}(A, B) = 1$ if and only if A and B are perfectly correlated in the information-theoretic sense.

In the case under consideration, $p^A = p^B$ and it can be shown that $I(A : B) = H(A)$, therefore $\mathcal{C}(A, B) = 1$, i.e. A and B are perfectly correlated for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. In the next section we show how to extend this definition to the case when the probability mass functions are not identical.

III. A TWO-QUTRIT MIXED STATE

Assume now that Alice and Bob share a pair of qutrits in the following separable state

$$\rho^{AB} = \frac{1}{3}|11\rangle\langle 11| + \frac{1}{3}|20\rangle\langle 20| + \frac{1}{3}|22\rangle\langle 22| \quad (12)$$

in which orthogonal states of qutrits A and B are classically correlated. Notice that $\rho^A = \frac{1}{3}|1\rangle\langle 1| + \frac{2}{3}|2\rangle\langle 2|$ and $\rho^B = \frac{1}{3}|0\rangle\langle 0| + \frac{1}{3}|1\rangle\langle 1| + \frac{1}{3}|2\rangle\langle 2|$. Suppose now that Alice and Bob measure two observables $M_A = a_0|0\rangle\langle 0| + a_1|1\rangle\langle 1| + a_2|2\rangle\langle 2|$ and $M_B = b_0|0\rangle\langle 0| + b_1|1\rangle\langle 1| + b_2|2\rangle\langle 2|$. It can be easily shown that the probability mass functions p^A and p^B are not identical, and they are given by

$$p^A = (0, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}), \quad (13a)$$

$$p^B = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}). \quad (13b)$$

Assume now that first Alice performs a measurement of M_A and then Bob performs a measurement of M_B . It can be shown that

$$p_{0|1}^{B|A} = 0, \quad p_{1|1}^{B|A} = 1, \quad p_{2|1}^{B|A} = 0, \quad (14a)$$

$$p_{0|2}^{B|A} = \frac{1}{2}, \quad p_{1|2}^{B|A} = 0, \quad p_{2|2}^{B|A} = \frac{1}{2}, \quad (14b)$$

and

$$p^{AB} = [p_{ij}^{AB}] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{3} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{3} & 0 & \frac{1}{3} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (15)$$

Thus, we see that the random variables A and B are not independent, and from Eqs. (14) it follows that Bob's




FIG. 2: This diagram shows that the random variables A and B are not perfectly correlated in the information-theoretic sense.

measurement outcomes are correlated with Alice's ones, but they are not perfectly correlated (see Fig. 2). Now, we show how to quantify these correlations. We know from classical information theory that for any two random variables A and B (i) $H(B|A) \leq H(B)$ with equality if and only if they are independent, and (ii) $H(B|A) \geq 0$ with equality if and only if $B = f(A)$, i.e. B is perfectly correlated with A in the information-theoretic sense. Therefore, it is clear that if $H(B) > 0$, then

$$1 \geq H(B|A)/H(B) \geq 0. \quad (16)$$

Notice that this inequality can be rewritten in the following form

$$0 \leq I(A : B)/H(B) \leq 1. \quad (17)$$

Therefore, the correlations between A and B can be measured by $I(A : B)/H(B)$. In the case under consideration, it can be shown that $I(A : B) = \log_2 3 - \frac{2}{3}$, $H(B) = \log_2 3$ and therefore

$$\frac{I(A : B)}{H(B)} = 1 - \frac{2}{3}(\log_2 3)^{-1}. \quad (18)$$

Assume now that first Bob performs a measurement of M_B and then Alice performs a measurement of M_A . If the measurement outcome of M_B is b_i , then the post-measurement state of the system is given by $\rho_i^{AB} = (I \otimes |i\rangle\langle i|)\rho^{AB}(I \otimes |i\rangle\langle i|)/p_i^B$. Therefore, the conditional probability that Alice's outcome is a_j provided that Bob's was b_i is $p_{j|i}^{A|B} = \text{Tr}[(|j\rangle\langle j| \otimes I)\rho_i^{AB}]$ while the joint probability that the measurement outcome of M_A and M_B is a_j and b_i , respectively is given by $p_{ji}^{AB} = \text{Tr}[(|j\rangle\langle j| \otimes |i\rangle\langle i|)\rho^{AB}]$. In this case, the joint probabilities are given by (15) while the conditional probabilities are as follows

$$p^{A|B} = [p_{j|i}^{A|B}] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (19)$$

Thus, we see that Alice's measurement outcomes are perfectly correlated with Bob's ones (see Fig. 3). Now, we




FIG. 3: This diagram shows the perfect correlations, in the information-theoretic sense, between random variables A and B , $A = f(B)$, despite the fact that the mutual information $I(A : B) = H(A) \simeq 0.918$.

explain why this is the case. We know that for any two random variables A and B (i) $H(A|B) \leq H(A)$ with equality if and only if they are independent, and (ii) $H(A|B) \geq 0$ with equality if and only if $A = f(B)$, i.e. A is perfectly correlated with B . Therefore, it is clear that if $H(A) > 0$, then

$$1 \geq H(A|B)/H(A) \geq 0. \quad (20)$$

Notice that this inequality can be rewritten in the following form

$$0 \leq I(A : B)/H(A) \leq 1. \quad (21)$$

Therefore, the correlations between A and B can be measured by $I(A : B)/H(A)$. In the case under consideration, it can be shown that $I(A : B) = H(A)$ and therefore

$$\frac{I(A : B)}{H(A)} = 1. \quad (22)$$

Thus, we see that the correlations between two random variables A and B corresponding to the measurement outcomes of M_A and M_B depend on the temporal order of the measurements performed by Alice and Bob. Therefore, in order to capture all classical correlations that can be observed in the state (12), we propose to define a measure of correlations between two random variables A and B in the following way

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}(A, B) &= \text{Max} \left(\frac{I(A : B)}{H(A)}, \frac{I(A : B)}{H(B)} \right) = \\ &= \frac{I(A : B)}{\text{Min}(H(A), H(B))}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

It is easy to note that (23) has the following properties (i) $\mathcal{C}(A, B) = \mathcal{C}(B, A)$, (ii) $0 \leq \mathcal{C}(A, B) \leq 1$, (iii) $\mathcal{C}(A, B) = 0$ if and only if A and B are independent, and (iv) $\mathcal{C}(A, B) = 1$ if and only if A and B are perfectly correlated in the information-theoretic sense. The first

property follows directly from (23). The second one follows from inequality $0 \leq I(A : B) \leq \text{Min}(H(A), H(B))$. The third property holds because $I(A : B) = 0$ if and only if A and B are independent. And the last property can be derived in the following way. If $A = f(B)$ then $H(A|B) = 0$ and $I(A : B) = H(A)$. Thus $\mathcal{C}(A, B) = H(A)/\text{Min}(H(A), H(B))$ and taking into account that $H(f(B)) \leq H(B)$ we get $\mathcal{C}(A, B) = 1$. In the similar way one can show that if $B = f(A)$ then also $\mathcal{C}(A, B) = 1$. Conversely, assume that $\mathcal{C}(A, B) = 1$. Then $I(A : B) = \text{Min}(H(A), H(B))$. If $\text{Min}(H(A), H(B)) = H(A)$ then $H(A|B) = 0$ and this implies that $A = f(B)$. And if $\text{Min}(H(A), H(B)) = H(B)$ then $H(B|A) = 0$ and this implies that $B = f(A)$. Moreover, it is easy to note that $\mathcal{C}(A, B)$ is equal to $I(A : B)$ if and only if $I(A : B) = 0$ or $\text{Min}(H(A), H(B)) = 1$.

If a state ρ^{AB} has only classical correlations then the way of finding the correlations between two random variables A and B corresponding to the measurement outcomes of M_A and M_B can be considerably simplified by noting that in this case the Shannon entropies are just equal to the von Neumann entropies and from Eqs. (4) and (23) it follows that

$$\mathcal{T}(\rho^{AB}) = \frac{I(\rho^{AB})}{\text{Min}(S(\rho^A), S(\rho^B))}. \quad (24)$$

Thus, we see that for the classically correlated quantum states ρ^{AB} —in the general case it is difficult to see whether the state is classically correlated or entangled one—total correlations should be quantified by (24) instead of quantum mutual information, except these cases for which $\text{Min}(S(\rho^A), S(\rho^B)) = 1$.

Now, it is natural to ask a fundamental question: Can we apply our results for entangled states? Before we answer this question we should recall that beyond analyzing the correlations in the simplest examples of states, the Bell-like states and the Bell states, still very little is known in this complex subject.

In [3] a measure of the total correlations based on the correlation coefficient was introduced and it was shown that for the Bell-like state $|\psi^+\rangle = \sqrt{\alpha}|01\rangle + \sqrt{1-\alpha}e^{i\varphi}|10\rangle$ this measure of the total correlations and quantum mutual information have a single maximum at $\alpha = 1/2$, and they are equal to zero when $\alpha = 0$ or $\alpha = 1$. Of course, this important result does not mean that the quantum mutual information is a measure of the total correlations in the Bell-like state. This suggests only a possible connection between these two quantities. Moreover, we do not even know whether this property holds for other two-qubit states.

Recently, in [14] it has been shown that for the Bell state $|\phi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$ the quantum mutual information is equal to the amount of randomness which is necessary to completely erase all the correlations in $|\phi^+\rangle$. This remarkable result gives us an operational interpretation for the quantum mutual information, at least for the Bell state. Moreover, it may shed new light on the con-

nection between the total correlations and the quantum mutual information.

Now, let us apply our results to the entangled states $|\psi^+\rangle$ and $|\phi^+\rangle$. Assume now that (i) Alice and Bob share a pair of qubits in the state $|\psi^+\rangle$, (ii) Alice and Bob measure two observables $M_A = a_0|0\rangle\langle 0| + a_1|1\rangle\langle 1|$ and $M_B = b_0|0\rangle\langle 0| + b_1|1\rangle\langle 1|$, respectively, and (iii) first Alice performs a measurement of M_A and then Bob performs a measurement of M_B . In this case, it can be easily shown that (i) the probability mass functions p^A and p^B are given by

$$p^A = (\alpha, 1 - \alpha), \quad (25a)$$

$$p^B = (1 - \alpha, \alpha), \quad (25b)$$

(ii) the conditional probabilities are as follows

$$p^{B|A} = [p_{j|i}^{B|A}] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (26)$$

and (iii) the joint probabilities are given by

$$p^{AB} = [p_{ij}^{AB}] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \alpha \\ 1 - \alpha & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (27)$$

Thus, we see that Alice's measurement outcomes are perfectly correlated with Bob's ones in the information-theoretic sense, which follows directly from (26). Moreover, it can be shown that this result will be the same if the sequence of measurements is opposite. Therefore, the total correlations in the state $|\psi^+\rangle$, understood as correlations between the measurement outcomes of M_A and M_B , are maximal for all α and φ , not only for $\alpha = 1/2$ and all φ , as it was suggested in [3].

Notice that in the similar way it can be shown that the total correlations in the state $|\phi^+\rangle$ are also maximal.

Of course, our result does not contradict the result presented in [14], because in general for two maximally correlated quantum states the amount of randomness needed to erase all the correlations may be different. For example, it can be shown that for the maximally correlated two-qubit state of the form (5) we need 1 bit of randomness if $\alpha = 1/2$, and 2 bits of randomness if $\alpha \neq 1/2$.

IV. CONCLUSION

In this Letter, we have shown that for bipartite quantum systems there exist quantum states for which quantum mutual information cannot be considered as a universal measure of total correlations, understood as the correlations between the measurement outcomes of two local observables. Moreover, for these states we have proposed a different way of quantifying total correlations, which takes into account that the correlations can depend on the temporal order of the measurements. Furthermore, we have shown that this way of quantifying total correlations can be successfully applied in the case of the simplest examples of entangled states, which were studied in the literature from the other points of view. However, it remains an open question whether the same can be done for other non-classically correlated bipartite quantum states.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the University of Lodz Grant and by LFPPI network.

-
- [1] R. L. Stratonovich, *Probl. Inf. Transm.* 2 (1966) 35.
 - [2] W. H. Zurek, in: P. Meystre, M. O. Scully (Eds.), *Quantum Optics, Experimental Gravitation and Measurement Theory*, Plenum, New York, 1983, pp. 87–116.
 - [3] S. M. Barnett, S. J. D. Phoenix, *Phys. Rev. A* 40 (1989) 2404.
 - [4] S. M. Barnett, S. J. D. Phoenix, *Phys. Rev. A* 44 (1991) 535.
 - [5] N. J. Cerf, C. Adami, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 79 (1997) 5194.
 - [6] N. J. Cerf, C. Adami, *Physica D* 120 (1998) 62.
 - [7] L. Henderson, V. Vedral, *J. Phys. A* 34 (2001) 6899.
 - [8] V. Vedral, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 74 (2002) 197.
 - [9] H. Ollivier, W. H. Zurek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 88 (2002) 017901.
 - [10] V. Vedral, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 90 (2003) 050401.
 - [11] J. Oppenheim, K. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. A* 68 (2003) 022307.
 - [12] S. Hamieh, J. Qi, D. Siminovitch, M. K. Ali, *Phys. Rev. A* 67 (2003) 014301.
 - [13] S. Hamieh, R. Kobes, H. Zaraket, *Phys. Rev. A* 70 (2004) 052325.
 - [14] B. Groisman, S. Popescu, A. Winter, *Phys. Rev. A* 72 (2005) 032317.
 - [15] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, A. Sen(De), U. Sen, B. Synak-Radtke, *Phys. Rev. A* 71 (2005) 062307.
 - [16] B. Schumacher, M. D. Westmoreland, *Phys. Rev. A* 74 (2006) 042305.
 - [17] N. Li, S. Luo, *Phys. Rev. A* 76 (2007) 032327.
 - [18] W.-L. Chan, J.-P. Cao, D. Yang, S.-J. Gu, *J. Phys. A* 40 (2007) 12143.
 - [19] S. Luo, *Phys. Rev. A* 77 (2008) 022301.
 - [20] M. M. Wolf, F. Verstraete, M. B. Hastings, J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 100 (2008) 070502.
 - [21] A. R. Usha Devi, A. K. Rajagopal, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 100 (2008) 140502.
 - [22] S. L. Braunstein, C. M. Caves, R. Jozsa, N. Linden, S. Popescu, R. Schack, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 83 (1999) 1054.
 - [23] D. A. Meyer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 85 (2000) 2014.

- [24] E. Biham, G. Brassard, D. Kenigsberg, T. Mor, *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 320 (2004) 15.
- [25] E. Knill, R. Laflamme, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 81 (1998) 5672.
- [26] A. Datta, S. T. Flammia, C. M. Caves, *Phys. Rev. A* 72 (2005) 042316.
- [27] A. Datta, G. Vidal, *Phys. Rev. A* 75 (2007) 042310.
- [28] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, C. A. Fuchs, T. Mor, E. Rains, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. A* 59 (1999) 1070.
- [29] P. Hayden, D. W. Leung, A. Winter, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 265 (2006) 95.
- [30] A. Datta, A. Shaji, C. M. Caves, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 100 (2008) 050502.
- [31] T. M. Cover, J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*, John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, New Jersey, 2006.