

# Multipartite Entanglement and Global Information

C. Kruszynska and B. Kraus

*Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Innsbruck, Austria*

We investigate the entanglement properties of pure quantum states describing  $n$  qubits. We characterize all multipartite states which can be maximally entangled to local auxiliary systems using controlled operations. A state has this property iff one can construct out of it an orthonormal basis by applying independent local unitary operations. This implies that those states can be used to encode locally the maximum amount of  $n$  bits. Examples of these states are the so-called stabilizer states, which are used for quantum error correction and one-way quantum computing. We give a simple characterization of these states and construct a complete set of commuting unitary observables which characterize the state uniquely. Furthermore we show how these states can be prepared and discuss their applications.

One of the challenges in quantum information theory is to get a better understanding of multipartite entanglement. Since bipartite entanglement measures are not sufficient to classify multipartite entangled states, several other measures of entanglement, like the tangle [1] or the localizable entanglement [2] and generalizations of it have been introduced to study the "true" multipartite entanglement [3]. Furthermore, different classes of entangled states have been identified [4, 5] and a normal form of multipartite states has been presented [6]. Several important applications of multipartite entangled states, like quantum error correction, quantum computing, but also applications within condensed matter physics have been found (for recent reviews see [7, 8, 9] and reference therein). Despite all these results, the properties of multipartite entangled states are far from being completely understood.

Here we use a different approach to gain a new insight into the entanglement properties of multipartite states. The idea is to determine how well the qubits can be locally entangled to auxiliary systems. Before we discuss the operational meaning of this let us precisely state the situation we investigate here. We consider an  $n$  qubit quantum state  $|\Psi\rangle$ . Each party uses an auxiliary qubit to entangle it to its system qubit in such a way that the global state is a maximally entangled state between the system and the auxiliary qubits [31]. The operations which are used by the parties are so-called controlled operations, which we denote by  $C_l$ , with  $C_l = \sum_i U_l^i \otimes |i\rangle_{l_a} \langle i|$ , where  $U_l^i$  are unitary operations acting on system  $l$  and  $|i\rangle_{l_a} \langle i|$  is acting on the auxiliary system attached to  $l$ . If there exist local control gates  $C_l$  such that the state  $C_1 \otimes C_2 \otimes \dots \otimes C_n |\Psi\rangle |+\rangle^{\otimes n}$ , with  $|+\rangle = 1/\sqrt{2}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$  is maximally entangled between the system and the auxiliary systems, we call the state  $|\Psi\rangle$  locally maximally entangleable, LME.

The motivations for investigating this class of states are the following: (1) The characterization of LME states (LMEs) gives a classification of multipartite entangled states according to their entanglement properties. To be more precise, let us assume that  $|\Psi\rangle$  is LME. After successfully attaching the auxiliary qubits locally, all the quantum information contained in  $|\Psi\rangle$  is washed out,

since the reduced state describing the system qubits is maximally mixed. Thus, by local operations it is possible to wash out all the global correlations of the state. Even though the local correlations can always be washed out in this way [32], there exist states, e.g. the  $|W\rangle$  state [4] for which it is not possible to wash out the global correlations in this way. Therefore, these states are fundamentally different from LMEs. (2) We will show that all LMEs can be used for maximal (local) encoding of classical bits. Let  $|\Psi\rangle$  be an  $n$ -qubit LME state. Then, each party can locally encode a single bit value by applying certain unitary operations to the qubit at his disposal. We will show that the states obtained in this way are all orthogonal. Thus, they form a maximal set ( $2^n$ ) of globally perfectly distinguishable states. However, no party can gain locally any information about the bits owned by the other parties. (3) LMEs can be used for gate teleportation [10], i.e. certain non-local operations can be implemented on an arbitrary state using LMEs. (4) Many applications of multipartite entangled states, like quantum error correction [11] or the one-way quantum computer [12] employ so-called stabilizer states [11] which are LME. Also the purification schemes studied in [13, 14, 15] purify to LMEs. Therefore, looking at multipartite entanglement from this different point of view might allow us to generalize these applications and to find new ones.

The outline of the paper is the following. First we introduce a standard form of multipartite entangled states. Then we show that a state  $|\Psi\rangle$  is LME iff there exist local unitary operators,  $U_l^{(i_l)}$  such that the set  $\{U_1^{(i_1)} \otimes \dots \otimes U_n^{(i_n)} |\Psi\rangle\}$  forms an orthonormal basis (ON-basis), for  $i_l \in \{0, 1\}$ . That is, a state is LME iff it can be extended to an ON-basis by independent local unitary operations. Using these results we derive a simple characterization of all LMEs. In fact, we will show that a state is LME iff it is local unitary equivalent (LU-equivalent) to a state  $|\Psi\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2^n}} \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_n=0}^1 e^{i\alpha_{i_1, \dots, i_n}} |i_1, \dots, i_n\rangle$ , where  $\alpha_{i_1, \dots, i_n} \in \mathbf{R}$ . The entanglement contained in this state is completely determined by the classical phases  $\alpha(\mathbf{i}) \equiv \alpha_{i_1, \dots, i_n}$  and their correlations. We show that all LMEs can be prepared using generalized phase gates,

where the number of qubits on which the phase gates are acting on depends on the correlations of the phases  $\alpha(\mathbf{i})$ . Next, we consider the unitary operators which correspond, via the Jamiolkowski isomorphism [16, 17], to the LMEs and show how non-local operations can be implemented with LMEs. Furthermore, for any LME state we construct a complete set of commuting unitary observables (the generalized stabilizer) which uniquely defines the state. This cannot only be used to construct Hamiltonians for which  $|\Psi\rangle$  is the unique ground state [9], but also to design dissipative processes for which  $|\Psi\rangle$  is the unique stationary state [18, 19]. We show that, for instance, the 3 qubit  $W$  state is not LME, implying that this state is fundamentally different than, for instance, a GHZ-state. Furthermore, we show that it is possible to entangle two qubits locally such that the third party is unable to entangle his system locally, even if we allow for an arbitrary two-qubit gate. Thus here, it is impossible to wash out the global correlations using local unitary operations.

Let us start by introducing our notation. By  $X, Y, Z$  we denote the Pauli operators. The subscript of an operator will always denote the system it is acting on, or the system it is describing. For instance  $\rho_i$  is the single qubit reduced state of system  $i$  of a state  $|\Psi\rangle$ , i.e.  $\rho_i = \text{tr}_{\text{all but } i}(|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|)$  and  $\langle W_i \rangle = \text{tr}(|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|W_i)$  denotes the expectation value of the operator  $W_i$  acting on system  $i$ .  $W^i$  denotes the  $i$ -th power of the operators  $W$  with  $W^0 \equiv \mathbf{1}$  for any operator,  $W$ . Since we will often consider local operators and product states we will denote by  $\mathbf{i}$  the classical bit-string  $(i_1, \dots, i_n)$  with  $i_k \in \{0, 1\} \forall k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , e.g.  $|\mathbf{0}\rangle = |0, \dots, 0\rangle$ . We say that a state,  $|\Psi\rangle$  is LU-equivalent to  $|\Phi\rangle$  ( $|\Psi\rangle \simeq_{LU} |\Phi\rangle$ ) if there exist local unitary operators,  $U_1, \dots, U_n$ , such that  $|\Psi\rangle = U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_n |\Phi\rangle$ .

In order to investigate the LMEs we introduce the trace decomposition of multipartite states. Let  $|\Psi\rangle$  be an  $n$  qubit state with single qubit reduced states  $\{\rho_i\}$ . We write each single qubit reduced state  $\rho_i$  in its spectral decomposition,  $\rho_i = U_i^\dagger D_i U_i$ , with  $D_i = \text{diag}(\lambda_1^i, \lambda_2^i)$ , where  $\lambda_k^i$  are the Schmidt coefficients of the bipartite splitting qubit  $i$  and the rest. We call any such decomposition,  $U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_n |\Psi\rangle$ , trace decomposition of  $|\Psi\rangle$ . The trace-decomposition has the property that the reduced states are all diagonal in the computational basis, i.e.  $\langle X_i \rangle = \langle Y_i \rangle = 0$ . In this paper we will only make use of the trace decomposition. However, it should be noted that this decomposition can be used to define a unique standard form of multipartite states [20]. For  $D_i \not\propto \mathbf{1} \forall i$  the trace decomposition can be easily made unique, by requiring that  $\lambda_1^i \geq \lambda_2^i$ , and imposing certain conditions on the phases of the coefficients of the states in the computational basis. If  $\rho_i = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}$ , for some system  $i$ , the standard form can be defined as  $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} |\Psi(\epsilon)\rangle$ , where  $|\Psi(\epsilon)\rangle$  denotes the unique standard form of  $\sqrt{1-\epsilon}|\Psi\rangle + \sqrt{\epsilon}|0\rangle^n$  [33]. Any state can be transformed by local unitary operations into its standard form [20]. Thus, it is easy to verify that if the standard forms of two states are equivalent,

then the states are LU-equivalent. Note that this standard form coincides for the simplest case of two qubits with the Schmidt decomposition [21] and can be generalized to  $d$ -level systems.

Let us now characterize the LMEs. We show that a state is LME iff it is extendable by independent local unitary operations to an ON-basis.

**Lemma 1.** *An  $n$ -qubit state  $|\Psi\rangle$  is LME iff there exists for each party  $l$  a unitary operation  $U_l$  such that the set*

$$\{U_1^{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes U_n^{i_n} |\Psi\rangle\}_{i_i=0,1}, \quad (1)$$

*forms an ON-basis.*

*Proof.* Only if: If  $|\Psi\rangle$  is LME then there exist control operations  $C_l = \sum_i V_l^{(i)} \otimes |i\rangle_{l_a} \langle i|$  such that  $|\Phi\rangle = C_1 \otimes C_2 \otimes \dots \otimes C_n |\Psi\rangle |+\rangle^{\otimes n}$  is maximally entangled in the splitting system versus auxiliary systems. Applying  $(V_l^{(0)})^\dagger$  to each system  $l$  does not change the entanglement properties and therefore  $\rho_{1,\dots,n} = \frac{1}{2^n} \mathcal{E}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{E}_n(|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|) = \frac{1}{2^n} \mathbf{1}$ , where  $\mathcal{E}_l(\rho) = \rho + U_l \rho U_l^\dagger$ , with  $U_l = (V_l^{(0)})^\dagger V_l^{(1)}$ . Since  $\mathcal{E}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{E}_n(|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|) = \sum_{\mathbf{i}} |\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}\rangle\langle\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}|$ , with  $|\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}\rangle = U_1^{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes U_n^{i_n} |\Psi\rangle$  is a sum of  $2^n$  projectors, this can only be fulfilled if  $\{|\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}\rangle\}$  is an ON-basis [34]. To see the inverse, one only has to define  $C_l = \mathbf{1} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| + U_l \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|$ .  $\square$

Note that the proof implies that if  $|\Psi\rangle$  is LME then there exist local unitary operations,  $U_i$  such that  $\rho_i + U_i \rho_i U_i^\dagger = \mathbf{1}$ . That is, the local operations which wash out the global correlations must also wash out the local correlations. We are going to show now that these unitary operations are of a special form. Note that  $\{U_1^{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes U_n^{i_n} |\Psi\rangle\}_{i_i=0,1}$  is an ON-basis iff  $\{(V_1 U_1 V_1^\dagger)^{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes (V_n U_n V_n^\dagger)^{i_n} V_1 \otimes \dots \otimes V_n |\Psi\rangle\}_{i_i=0,1}$  is an ON-basis, implying that a state is LME iff any LU-equivalent state is LME. Therefore, we can restrict ourselves to some trace decompositions of the state  $|\Psi\rangle$ , which we denote by  $|\Psi_t\rangle$ . For  $\rho_i \not\propto \mathbf{1}$  and  $\rho_i$  diagonal the necessary condition,  $\rho_i + U_i \rho_i U_i^\dagger = \mathbf{1}$ , can only be fulfilled by  $U_i = e^{i\alpha_i/2Z_i} X_i e^{-i\alpha_i/2Z_i}$ . For  $\rho_i \propto \mathbf{1}$ , we also find that  $U_i = V_i X_i V_i^\dagger$  for some unitary  $V_i$  (up to a global phase) since  $\text{tr}(U_i) = 0$  follows for the fact that  $U_i |\Psi\rangle$  must be orthogonal to  $|\Psi\rangle$  (Lemma 1). Thus, we only have to consider  $X$  operations which implies that a state  $|\Psi\rangle$  is LME iff  $|\Psi\rangle \simeq_{LU} |\Phi\rangle$ , where  $\{X^{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes X^{i_n} |\Phi\rangle\}$ , is an ON-basis, i.e.  $\langle\Phi| X^{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes X^{i_n} |\Phi\rangle = 0 \forall \mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{0}$ . Using all that it is now easy to show the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.** *A state  $|\Phi\rangle$  is LME iff  $|\Phi\rangle$  is LU-equivalent to a state  $|\Psi\rangle$  with*

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2^n}} \sum_{\mathbf{i}} e^{i\alpha_{\mathbf{i}}} |\mathbf{i}\rangle \equiv U_{ph}^\Psi |+\rangle^{\otimes n}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\alpha_{\mathbf{i}} \in \mathbf{R}$  and  $U_{ph}^\Psi$  denotes the diagonal unitary operator with the entries  $e^{i\alpha_{\mathbf{i}}}$  [35].

*Proof.* As we have seen before,  $|\Phi\rangle$  is LME iff  $|\Phi\rangle \simeq_{LU} |\Psi\rangle$  with  $\langle\Psi|X^{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes X^{i_n}|\Psi\rangle = 0 \forall \mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{0}$  or, equivalently,  $|\Phi\rangle \simeq_{LU} |\Psi\rangle$  with  $\langle\Psi|Z^{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes Z^{i_n}|\Psi\rangle = 0 \forall \mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{0}$ . We write  $|\Psi\rangle$  in the computational basis,  $|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{i}} \lambda_{\mathbf{i}} |\mathbf{i}\rangle$  and use that  $|\mathbf{i}_k\rangle \langle \mathbf{i}_k| = 1/2(\mathbf{1} + (-1)^{i_k} Z)_k$ . Then we have  $|\lambda_{\mathbf{i}}|^2 = \langle \mathbf{i} | \mathbf{i} \rangle = 2^{-n} \langle (\mathbf{1} + (-1)^{i_1} Z)_1 \otimes \dots \otimes (\mathbf{1} + (-1)^{i_n} Z)_n \rangle$ . Since all expectation values of the operators where at least one  $Z$  operator occurs vanish we have  $|\lambda_{\mathbf{i}}|^2 = 2^{-n}$ .  $\square$

Thus, a state is LME iff there exists a product basis such that all the coefficients of the state in this basis are phases. The control gates to create the maximally entangled state between the system (described by  $|\Psi\rangle$  in Eq. (2)) and auxiliary qubits are the two-qubit  $\pi$ -phase gates,  $C = |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \mathbf{1} + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes Z$ . Note that, given an  $n$  qubit LME state (Eq. (2)) one can construct an  $n+1$  qubit LME state by entangling an additional qubit via  $C$  to some system  $j$ . The phases would change to  $\alpha_{i_1, \dots, i_{n+1}} = \alpha_{i_1, \dots, i_n} + \pi i_j i_{n+1}$ . In this way one can attach arbitrarily many qubits.

Since there are  $2^n$  real parameters many multipartite states have the property of being LME. For instance any two-qubit state is LME. This can be easily verified using the Schmidt decomposition (standard form) of the state,  $|\Psi\rangle = \alpha|00\rangle + \sqrt{1-\alpha^2}|11\rangle$ , with  $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}, \alpha \geq 0$  and choosing  $U_1 = X$  and  $U_2 = Y$ . Prominent examples of LMEs are the stabilizer states (which are LU-equivalent to the graph states) and the weighted graph states [11, 22]. There the phases  $\alpha_{\mathbf{i}}$  are quadratic functions of the index  $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_n)$ , i.e.  $\alpha_{\mathbf{i}} = \pi \mathbf{i}^T \Gamma \mathbf{i}$ , where the  $n \times n$  matrix  $\Gamma$  is the so-called adjacency matrix of the mathematical graph corresponding to the graph state [22]. Note that any product state is LME, however, it is very simple to distinguish product states from entangled states using this notion. If  $|\Psi\rangle$  is a product state then the state  $C_1 \otimes \dots \otimes C_n |\Psi\rangle |+\rangle^n$  is maximally entangled between the system and the auxiliary systems iff each party creates a maximally entangled state (locally). Thus, considering the difference between the local entanglement (each qubit with its auxiliary system) and the global entanglement allows us to distinguish product states from entangled states. Similar arguments can be used to distinguish biseparable states from truly multipartite entangled states [20]. In the following we consider the general LME state  $|\Psi\rangle$  given in Eq. (2) and denote by  $|\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}\rangle \equiv |\Psi_{i_1, \dots, i_n}\rangle = Z^{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes Z^{i_n} |\Psi\rangle$  the elements of the ON-basis ( $|\Psi\rangle \equiv |\Psi_{\mathbf{0}}\rangle$ ) [36].

Let us now discuss some applications of LMEs. An LME state can be used to encode classical information locally. If  $n$  parties share the LME state  $|\Psi\rangle$  (Eq. (2)), each party can encode a single bit value by applying either  $\mathbf{1}$  (corresponding to the bit value 0), or  $Z$  (corresponding to the bit value 1), to the qubit at his possession. The  $2^n$  states obtained in this way are globally perfectly distinguishable (since they are all orthogonal due to Lemma 1), but locally, no information can be gained. Note that for instance for the  $|W\rangle$  state, which is not LME, as

we shall see below, it is possible to find local unitary operations  $V_i \otimes W_i \otimes U_i$  such that  $\{V_i \otimes W_i \otimes U_i |W\rangle\}$  is an ON-basis [23]. However, in this case the unitary operators which generate the ON-basis depend on each other which prevents us from using the state to encode locally  $n$  independent classical bits. Apart from that, LMEs can also be used to implement certain non-local unitary operations. In order to see that, we use the Jamiolkowski isomorphism which is a one-to-one mapping between quantum states and quantum operations [16, 17]. For an LME state  $|\Psi\rangle$ , the operation which corresponds to the state  $C_1 \otimes \dots \otimes C_n |\Psi\rangle |+\rangle^n$ , where  $C$  is the two-qubit  $\pi$ -phase gate, is unitary and has the form  $U_{\Psi} = \sum_{\mathbf{i}} |\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}\rangle \langle \mathbf{i}| = U_{ph}^{\Psi} H^{\otimes n}$ , where  $H$  is the Hadamard transformation. This implies that having an LME state  $|\Psi\rangle$  at ones disposal, one can implement (up to local Pauli operators) the unitary operation  $U_{\Psi}$  on an arbitrary state using only local operations [16, 17]. Note that  $|\Psi\rangle$  can also be employed to implement certain transformations on a state describing less than  $n$  qubits. For instance, the one-way quantum computer proposed in [24] uses Cluster states [25], for which  $U_{ph}^{\Psi}$  is a product of two-qubit  $\pi$ -phase gates only. Due to the structure of these LMEs, it was possible to show that any unitary operator (and therefore quantum computing) can be implemented in this way.

Let us now briefly discuss how LMEs can be generated. We write any LME state  $|\Psi\rangle$  as

$$|\Psi\rangle = U_{1, \dots, n} \prod U_{i_{k_1}, \dots, i_{k_{n-1}}} \dots \prod U_i |+\rangle^n, \quad (3)$$

where all the operators are phase gates acting on up to  $n$  qubits. For instance,  $U_{123}$  maps  $|111\rangle_{123}$  to  $e^{i\phi_{123}} |111\rangle_{123}$ , with  $\phi_{123} \in \mathbf{R}$  and leaves the rest unchanged. It is straightforward to see that in this way the  $2^n$  phases  $\alpha_{\mathbf{i}}$  can be generated. Thus, any LME state can be prepared using generalized phase gates, which could result from a generalized Ising interaction. If  $\alpha(\mathbf{i})$  is a polynomial of degree  $k$  (as a function of  $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_n)$ ) then the corresponding state can be prepared using only  $k$ -body interactions. E.g. graph states or weighted graph state, where the phases  $\alpha_{\mathbf{i}}$  are polynomials of degree 2 can be created using only two-qubit phase gates. This shows that the correlations in the coefficients are directly related to a preparation scheme and therefore to the entanglement contained in the state.

In order to discuss different methods for the preparation of any LME state  $|\Psi\rangle$ , we construct a complete set of commuting unitary and hermitian operators,  $\{W_1, \dots, W_n\}$  which uniquely define  $|\Psi\rangle$  (generalized stabilizers [11]). We define  $W_k = U_{\Psi} Z_k U_{\Psi}^{\dagger} = U_{ph}^{\Psi} X_k (U_{ph}^{\Psi})^{\dagger}$ . Then  $W_k |\Phi\rangle = |\Phi\rangle \forall k$  iff  $|\Phi\rangle = |\Psi\rangle$  [37]. Note that all these unitary observables have as a common eigenbasis the basis  $\{|\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}\rangle\}$  and that  $W_k^2 = \mathbf{1}$ . Let  $\mathcal{W}$  denote the group generated by  $\{W_1, \dots, W_n\}$ . Then we have, similarly to the stabilizer states,  $\sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}} W = |\Psi\rangle \langle \Psi|$  [38]. Depending only on the phases  $\alpha_{\mathbf{i}}$ , which define the LME,  $|\Psi\rangle$ , the generalized stabilizer operators can be quasi-

local, i.e. act non trivially on a small set of (neighboring) qubits [20]. In this case, the methods developed in [18, 19] can be employed to derive a quasi-local dissipative process for which the unique stationary state is  $|\Psi\rangle$ . Apart from that, one can also easily construct Hamiltonians for which the unique ground-state is  $|\Psi\rangle$ , e.g.  $H = \mathbf{1} - \sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}} W$ .

As an example of a state which is not LME we consider the three qubit  $W$ -state,  $|W\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|001\rangle + |010\rangle + |100\rangle)$ . Due to the fact that  $|W\rangle$  is already in its standard decomposition, the unitary operations we have to consider are of the form  $U_i = e^{i\alpha_i Z_i} X_i e^{-i\alpha_i Z_i}$ . Since  $\langle U_i \otimes U_j \rangle \propto \cos(\alpha_i - \alpha_j)$  it is impossible that all these expectation values vanish for any pair of unitary operations. As a consequence, it is only possible to choose  $U_1, U_2$  such that the set  $\{|W\rangle, U_1 \otimes \mathbf{1}|W\rangle, \mathbf{1} \otimes U_2|W\rangle, U_1 \otimes U_2|W\rangle\}$  is orthogonal, for instance with  $U_1 = X, U_2 = Y$ . This means, that it is impossible for the third party to entangle an auxiliary system such that the 3 system qubits are maximally entangled to the 3 auxiliary qubits. One can also show that if two parties maximally entangled their system qubit with a local auxiliary qubit then the third party cannot adequately entangle his auxiliary qubit to his system qubit, even if he would apply a general two-qubit gate [39]. Thus, two of the three parties can lock some information in the state by entangling their system to auxiliary systems.

Investigating the entanglement properties of LMEs

might lead to an insight to the entanglement properties of arbitrary many-body states, since the class we consider is very large ( $2^n$  real parameters). Due to the simplicity of the form of the states and the underlying physical picture it might be possible to define new operational entanglement measures. It might also be feasible to define the MREGS, i.e. the minimal set of reversible entangled states, for LMEs [26, 27]. Furthermore, this notion can also be used to study the separability problem [20]. We are planning to generalize the known quantum informational tasks, which use LMEs, like quantum computing, and quantum communication tasks [28] employing more general LMEs than stabilizer states and weighted graph states. This might allow us to find new applications of multipartite systems and therefore new operational entanglement measures. Apart from that, considering a restricted set of LMEs, where for instance only certain three qubit phases gates are required to generate the states, might allow us to generalize the well-known Gottesman-Knill theorem [21]. Identifying a large enough subset of these states might also be relevant for the simulation of quantum systems [29, 30]. Furthermore, the states which are not LME might be used for locking information and avoiding certain errors.

B. K. would like to thank J. I. Cirac for interesting discussions. We acknowledge support of the FWF (Elise Richter Program) and the European Union (OLAQUI, SCALA, QICS).

- 
- [1] V. Coffman, J. Kundu, and W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 052306 (2000).
  - [2] F. Verstraete, M. Popp, and J.I Cirac, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 027901 (2004).
  - [3] see for instance A. Miyake and F. Verstraete, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 012101 (2004); A. Osterloh, J. Siewert, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 012337 (2005).
  - [4] W. Dür, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 062314 (2000).
  - [5] F. Verstraete, J. Dehaene, B. De Moor, and H. Verschelde, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 052112 (2002).
  - [6] F. Verstraete, J. Dehaene, and B. De Moor, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 012103 (2003).
  - [7] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, quant-ph/0702225.
  - [8] L. Amico, R. Fazio, A. Osterloh, and V. Vedral, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 517 (2008).
  - [9] D. Perez-Garcia, F. Verstraete, M.M. Wolf, and J. I. Cirac, Quantum Inf. Comput. **7**, 401 (2007).
  - [10] M. A. Nielsen, Phys. Lett. A **308**, 96 (2003).
  - [11] see for instance, D. Gottesman, Ph.D. Thesis, quant-ph/9705052.
  - [12] R. Raussendorf and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5188 (2001).
  - [13] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, S. Popescu, B. Schumacher, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 722 (1996).
  - [14] W. Dür, H. Aschauer, and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 107903 (2003).
  - [15] C. Kruszynska, A. Miyake, H. J. Briegel, and W. Dür, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 052316 (2006).
  - [16] J. I. Cirac, W. Dür, B. Kraus, and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 544 (2001).
  - [17] W. Dür, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 012317 (2001).
  - [18] F. Verstraete, M. M. Wolf, and J. I. Cirac, quant-ph/08031447.
  - [19] B. Kraus, H. P. Büchler, S. Diehl, A. Kantian, A. Micheli, and P. Zoller, quant-ph/08031463.
  - [20] C. Kruszynska, M. Grassl, and B. Kraus, in preparation.
  - [21] M. A. Nielsen, and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2000).
  - [22] M. Hein, W. Dür, J. Eisert, R. Raussendorf, M. Van den Nest, and H.-J. Briegel, International School of Physics Enrico Fermi (Varenna, Italy), Quantum computers, algorithms and chaos **162** (Eds.: P. Zoller, G. Casati, D. Shepelyansky, G. Benenti) (2006).
  - [23] A. Miyake and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 220501 (2005).
  - [24] R. Raussendorf, and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5188 (2001).
  - [25] H. J. Briegel, R. Raussendorf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 910 (2001).
  - [26] C. H. Bennett, S. Popescu, S. Rohrlich, D. Smolin, A. John, and A. V. Thapliyal, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 012307 (2000).

- [27] A. Acin, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac, *Quantum Inf. Comp.* **3**, 55 (2003).
- [28] see for instance J. Kempe, *Phys. Rev. A* **60**, 910 (1999).
- [29] F. Verstraete, D. Porras, and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 227205 (2004).
- [30] S. Anders, M. B. Plenio, W. Dur, F. Verstraete, and H. J. Briegel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 107206 (2006).
- [31] We allow only one qubit per site, because, if we would consider a 4-level system per site, each party could implement a completely depolarizing map leading to a maximally entangled state between the auxiliary systems and the system qubits.
- [32] That is for any single qubit state  $\rho$  there exists a unitary operator  $U$ , such that  $\rho + U\rho U^\dagger = \mathbf{1}$ .
- [33] Note that there always exists an  $\epsilon_0 > 0$  such that for all  $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$  non of the reduced states is proportional to the identity. Since  $|\Psi(\epsilon)\rangle$  is a continuous function of  $\epsilon$  in this region, the limit exists.
- [34] This can only be fulfilled by orthogonal states since the range of  $\sum_{i=1}^{dim(\mathcal{H})} |\Psi_i\rangle\langle\Psi_i|$  spans the whole Hilbert space,  $\mathcal{H}$ , iff  $\{|\Psi_i\rangle\}$  is linearly independent. Then,  $(\sum_{i=1}^{dim(\mathcal{H})} |\Psi_i\rangle\langle\Psi_i|)|\Psi_j\rangle = |\Psi_j\rangle$  iff all states are orthogonal.
- [35] Note that these states can be easily transformed to a trace decomposition by applying the local unitary operations  $HU_i$  with  $H$  the Hadamard transformation and  $U_i$  such that  $U_i|0\rangle = e^{ix_i}|0\rangle$  and  $U_i|1\rangle = |1\rangle$ , where  $\cot(x_i) = \frac{\langle X_i \rangle}{\langle Y_i \rangle}$ .
- [36] For any LU-equivalent state the same results apply.
- [37] Using the Theorem, it is straight forward to show that  $W_k = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_n} e^{i\beta_{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_n}} \times |i_1\rangle\langle i_1| \otimes \dots \otimes |0\rangle_k \langle 1| \otimes \dots \otimes |i_n\rangle\langle i_n| + h.c.$ , with  $\beta_{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_n} = \alpha_{i_1, \dots, i_k=0, \dots, i_n} - \alpha_{i_1, \dots, i_k=1, \dots, i_n}$ . These operators correspond to local operators iff for all  $k$  the phases  $e^{i\beta_{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_n}}$  can be factorized, i.e.  $e^{i\beta_{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_n}} = e^{if_1(i_1)} \dots e^{if_n(i_n)}$ , for some functions  $f_i$ . This is for instance the case for graph states, where all the operators  $W_k$  are of the form  $V_1 \otimes \dots \otimes X_k \otimes \dots \otimes V_n$ , where each  $V_i \in \{\mathbf{1}, Z\}$ .
- [38] This can be easily seen by noting that  $\sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}} W = U_\Psi \sum_i Z^{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes Z^{i_n} U_\Psi^\dagger$  and  $\langle k_1, \dots, k_n | \sum_i Z^{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes Z^{i_n} |k_1, \dots, k_n\rangle = \prod_{l \in \{1, \dots, n\}} ((1) + (-1)^{k_l}) = \prod_{l \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \delta_{k_l, 0}$ .
- [39] Here, one needs to consider instead of the local unitary operators local POVMs  $\{E_k^{i_k}\}$  with  $(E_j^0)^\dagger E_j^0 + (E_j^1)^\dagger E_j^1 = \mathbf{1}$ . The state would be locally entangleable iff  $\langle (E_1^{i_1})^\dagger E_1^{j_1} \otimes \dots \otimes (E_1^{i_n})^\dagger E_1^{j_n} \rangle = \delta_{i_1, j_1} \dots \delta_{i_n, j_n} 1/2^n$  [20].