## Entanglement of formation for two-mode Gaussian states

Paulina Marian and Tudor A. Marian
Centre for Advanced Quantum Physics,
University of Bucharest, P.O.Box MG-11,
R-077125 Bucharest-Măgurele, Romania
(Dated: February 24, 2019)

## Abstract

We write the optimal pure-state decomposition of any two-mode Gaussian state and show that its entanglement of formation coincides with the Gaussian one. This enables us to develop an insightful approach of evaluating the exact entanglement of formation. Its additivity is finally proven.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud, 03.67.Mn, 42.50.Dv

In quantum mechanics of continuous-variable systems, two-mode Gaussian states of the radiation field (TMGSs) are important from both theoretical and experimental standpoints. For quantum information processing they represent an accessible prototype of a bipartite quantum state. Their usefulness in this field was recently reviewed in Refs. [1]. Formulation of the Simon separability criterion [2] stimulated the definition of Gaussian-type measures of entanglement. By a Gaussian approach, the reference set of states involved in the definition of any accepted entanglement measures is restricted to the Gaussian ones. Thus, following the earlier distance-type proposal for quantifying entanglement due to Vedral and co-workers [3], several evaluations using the relative entropy [4] or the Bures metric [5, 6, 7] could be performed with respect to the subset of separable Gaussian states identified with the abovementioned separability criterion [2]. The exact evaluation of the entanglement of formation (EF) for a symmetric TMGS [8] inspired further the definition of a *Gaussian* EF for a general TMGS by analyzing its optimal decomposition in pure Gaussian states [9]. Following the prescription of Ref. 9, evaluation of the Gaussian EF was performed for special states: squeezed thermal states in Ref. [10] and Gaussian states having extremal negativity at fixed global and local purities [11].

The aim of the present work is threefold. First we prove that the EF for TMGSs coincides with their Gaussian EF. We answer thus an open problem in continuous-variable quantum information [8, 9]. Second, we give a more comprehensible approach to the problem of the Gaussian EF in terms of covariance matrices (CMs). This enables us to get explicit results in all particular cases of interest and to write the EF equations in the general case. Third, based on this approach, we prove the additivity of the EF for two-mode Gaussian states.

Before proceeding we recall several useful properties of TMGSs. Owing to the exponential form of the density operator  $\rho_G$  of a TMGS, we find it convenient to describe such a special state in terms of its characteristic function (CF),

$$\chi_G(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) := \operatorname{Tr}[\rho_G D_1(\lambda_1) D_2(\lambda_2)],\tag{1}$$

where  $D(\alpha) := \exp(\alpha a^{\dagger} - \alpha^* a)$  is a Weyl displacement operator. The CF of an undisplaced TMGS is  $\chi_G(x) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}x^T \mathcal{V}x\right)$ . Here  $x^T$  denotes a real row vector  $(x_1 \ x_2 \ x_3 \ x_4)$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  is the symmetric and positive  $4 \times 4$  CM that completely describes the state. Its entries are the second-order moments of the canonical operators  $q_j = (a_j + a_j^{\dagger})/\sqrt{2}$ ,  $p_j = (a_j - a_j^{\dagger})/(\sqrt{2}i)$ , where  $a_j$  and  $a_j^{\dagger}$ , (j = 1, 2), are the amplitude operators of the modes. Gaussian states whose CMs are connected by local symplectic transformations form an equivalence class and have the same *amount of entanglement*. Their CMs are locally similar to a CM in a *scaled standard form*,

$$\mathcal{V}(u_1, u_2) = \begin{pmatrix} b_1 u_1 & 0 & c_{\sqrt{u_1 u_2}} & 0 \\ 0 & b_1/u_1 & 0 & d/\sqrt{u_1 u_2} \\ c_{\sqrt{u_1 u_2}} & 0 & b_2 u_2 & 0 \\ 0 & d/\sqrt{u_1 u_2} & 0 & b_2/u_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$
 (2)

In Eq. (2)  $u_1 \ge 1, u_2 \ge 1$  are one-mode scaling factors. The standard form  $\mathcal{V}(1, 1)$  of the CM, introduced in Ref.[12], is expressed in terms of the parameters  $b_1$ ,  $b_2$ , c, d: all of them are local invariants and determine the entanglement properties of the whole equivalence class. The matrix (2) is a CM for a TMGS if and only if the Robertson-Schrödinger uncertainty inequality holds:

$$\mathcal{V} + \frac{i}{2}\Omega \ge 0, \quad \Omega := i(\sigma_2 \oplus \sigma_2),$$
(3)

where we have used the  $\sigma_2$  Pauli matrix. It is instructive to develop Eq. (3) as locally invariant conditions:

$$b_1 \ge 1/2, \quad b_2(b_1b_2 - c^2) - \frac{b_1}{4} \ge 0,$$
  

$$b_2 \ge 1/2, \quad b_1(b_1b_2 - c^2) - \frac{b_2}{4} \ge 0,$$
(4)

$$\mathcal{D} := \det(\mathcal{V} + \frac{i}{2}\Omega) \ge 0 \tag{5}$$

Also locally invariant is the necessary and sufficient condition for separability of a TMGS in the approach of Simon [2]:  $\tilde{\mathcal{V}} + \frac{i}{2}\Omega \ge 0$ , with  $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}$  denoting the CM of the partially transposed density operator. This matrix inequality reduces to the Simon separability condition [2]:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{D}} := \det(\tilde{\mathcal{V}} + \frac{i}{2}\Omega) = \det \mathcal{V} - \frac{1}{4}(b_1^2 + b_2^2 + 2c|d|) + \frac{1}{16} \ge 0.$$
(6)

The concept of classicality (existence of the Glauber-Sudarshan P representation of the density operator) is central in our present treatment of the EF. For a classical scaled TMGS, the matrix  $\mathcal{V}(u_1, u_2) - \frac{1}{2}I_4$ , where  $I_4$  is the  $4 \times 4$  identity matrix, has to be non-negative. This statement is equivalent to the non-negativity of all its principal minors.

Now, recall that the EF of a mixed bipartite state  $\rho$  is defined as an infimum taken over all normalized pure-state convex decompositions of the given state  $\rho$  [13]:

$$E_F(\rho) := \inf_{\{p_k, |\Psi_k\rangle\}} \sum_k p_k E_0(|\Psi_k\rangle \langle \Psi_k|), \ \rho = \sum_k p_k |\Psi_k\rangle \langle \Psi_k|$$

Here  $E_0(|\Psi_k\rangle\langle\Psi_k|)$  is the entanglement of the pure state  $|\Psi_k\rangle$ , namely the von Neumann entropy of its reductions [3]. Pure-state decompositions of a mixed TMGS  $\rho_G$  in the continuousvariable settings are convex combinations of the type

$$\rho_G = \int d^2 \beta_1 d^2 \beta_2 P(\beta_1, \beta_2) |\Psi(\beta_1, \beta_2)\rangle \langle \Psi(\beta_1, \beta_2)|.$$
(7)

 $P(\beta_1, \beta_2)$  is a non negative normalized distribution and  $|\Psi(\beta_1, \beta_2)\rangle$  describes a pure state depending on the complex variables  $\beta_1, \beta_2$ . In accordance to the EF definition, the pure states in the above continuous combination should realize an optimal decomposition of the given state. To this end, we now apply an important theorem regarding the ranking of entanglement among pure states proved in a recent paper of Giedke, Wolf, Krüger, Werner, and Cirac [8]: at given EPR-correlations, the minimal entanglement over the whole class of pure states is reached by a Gaussian one: the squeezed vacuum state (SVS). This important result leads to the *key idea* of our treatment: in Eq. (7), we are allowed from the very beginning to restrict ourselves to equally entangled pure states obtained by displacing a unique SVS:

$$|\Psi(\beta_1,\beta_2)\rangle = D_1(\beta_1)D_2(\beta_2)|\Psi_0\rangle.$$

The SVS  $\rho_0 = |\Psi_0\rangle \langle \Psi_0|$  is to be chosen as having the minimal entanglement over the whole class of SVSs, *i. e.*, the least entangled pure states. The convex sum

$$\rho_G = \int d^2 \beta_1 d^2 \beta_2 P(\beta_1, \beta_2) D_1(\beta_1) D_2(\beta_2) \rho_0 D_2^{\dagger}(\beta_2) D_1^{\dagger}(\beta_1), \qquad (8)$$

reduces the exact EF of the given mixed two-mode state  $\rho_G$  to the amount of entanglement of the SVS  $\rho_0$ 

$$E_F(\rho_G) = E(\rho_0). \tag{9}$$

Thus the quantity (9) is the absolute minimum of the amount of entanglement of pure states occurring in Eq. (7). To evaluate the EF (9), one has to be able to determine the optimal decomposition (8), *i.e.*, both its distribution function  $P(\beta_1, \beta_2)$  and the SVS  $\rho_0$ . In what follows we show that this can be effectively done for any TMGS. Equation (10) displays therefore the first result of our work: the entanglement of formation for two-mode Gaussian states coincides with the Gaussian entanglement of formation.

We stress that decompositions of the type (8) have a clear interpretation in quantum optics starting with Glauber's seminal work on the coherent states of the electromagnetic field [14]. According to Ref.[14], Eq. (8) gives the density operator  $\rho_G$  of a superposition of two fields: one is is in a classical state  $\rho_C$  having the regular P representation  $P(\beta_1, \beta_2)$  and the other in the pure state  $\rho_0$ . By using the CF-definition and writing the P-representation as the Fourier transform of the normally-ordered CF,  $\chi^{(N)}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) := \exp[(|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2)/2]\chi(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ , Eq. (8) leads to [15]

$$\chi_G(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \chi_0(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \chi_C(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \exp\left(-\frac{|\lambda_1|^2}{2} - \frac{|\lambda_2|^2}{2}\right),$$
(10)

with  $\chi_C$  denoting the CF of the classical state  $\rho_C$  of the superposed field. The multiplication law of the CFs (10) can be obviously generalized to arbitrary multimode states. The only condition of its existence is the classicality of the state  $\rho_C$  [16].

In order to find the required optimal decomposition we deal with an inseparable state  $\rho_G$  having the CM in a scaled standard form (2): the four standard-form parameters  $b_1, b_2, c \ge |d| = -d$  are given, while the scaling factors  $u_1, u_2$  are unknown. Recall now that a SVS is an unscaled Gaussian state,  $u_1 = u_2 = 1$  in Eq. (2), whose standard-form parameters  $b_1 = b_2 =: x > 1/2, c = -d =: y > 0$  are subjected to the purity condition

$$x^2 - y^2 = 1/4. (11)$$

It follows that the CF  $\chi_C(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$  in Eq. (10) is also Gaussian and we have the following relation between the corresponding CMs of the Gaussian states involved:

$$\mathcal{V}(u_1, u_2) = \mathcal{V}_0 + \mathcal{V}_C - \frac{1}{2}I_4.$$
(12)

For the optimal superposition, Eq. (12) is satisfied and  $\rho_C$  has to be classical. As the entanglement of a SVS is the von Neumann entropy of its one-mode reductions,

$$E(\rho_0) = \left(x + \frac{1}{2}\right)\ln\left(x + \frac{1}{2}\right) - \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right)\ln\left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right),\tag{13}$$

it is an increasing and concave function of the variable  $x \ge \frac{1}{2}$ . Our method towards finding the optimal pure-state decomposition is to concentrate on the properties of the added classical state  $\rho_C$ . Property 1: The superposed classical state  $\rho_C$  is at the classicality threshold. Indeed, for the optimal superposition, the CM  $\mathcal{V}(u_1, u_2)$  should be as close as possible to  $\mathcal{V}_0$ . This happens when the principal minors of rank 3 and 4 of the matrix  $\mathcal{V}(u_1, u_2) - \mathcal{V}_0 = \mathcal{V}_C - \frac{1}{2}I_4$ are zero, namely when the Gaussian state  $\rho_C$  is at the border of classicality. Explicitly, the condition det $(\mathcal{V}_C - \frac{1}{2}I_4) = 0$  is expressed as a product of two vanishing factors:

$$(b_1u_1 - x)(b_2u_2 - x) - (c\sqrt{u_1u_2} - y)^2 = 0,$$
(14)

$$(b_1/u_1 - x)(b_2/u_2 - x) - (|d|/\sqrt{u_1u_2} - y)^2 = 0.$$
 (15)

Equations (14)– (15) are in agreement to the Gaussian optimality conditions written in the pioneering work Ref.[9] on different grounds. By using the three algebraic equations (11), (14), and (15), we can impose to the one-variable function  $x = x(u_1, u_2(u_1))$  the minimization condition  $\frac{dx}{du_1} = 0$ . We get thus another independent algebraic equation

$$\frac{b_1u_1 - x}{b_1/u_1 - x} = \frac{b_2u_2 - x}{b_2/u_2 - x},\tag{16}$$

which implies the following property of the classical state  $\rho_C$ :

Property 2: The superposed classical state  $\rho_C$  is at the separability limit as well. To prove this statement, we use Eqs. (11), (14), and (15) to evaluate the Simon invariant (6) of the Gaussian state  $\rho_C$ . We easily find that, owing to Eq. (16), the Simon invariant of  $\rho_C$ vanishes.

Evaluation of the required EF reduces to solving a system of four algebraic equations with four unknowns. Let us denote by  $w_1, w_2, x_m, y_m$  the solution of this system. Remark that important particular cases (defined by special relations between standard-form parameters) are easily solved by simple inspection of Eqs. (14)– (16).

As a first example, we consider an entangled symmetric TMGS, whose standard-form parameters are  $b_1 = b_2 =: b$ ,  $c \ge |d| = -d > 0$ . The smallest symplectic eigenvalue  $\tilde{\kappa}_-$  of the CM for the partially transpose density operator is in this case  $\tilde{\kappa}_- = \sqrt{(b-c)(b-|d|)}$ . In agreement with the results of the remarkable work Ref.[8], Eqs. (14)–(16) and (11) give

$$w_1 = w_2 = \sqrt{\frac{b - |d|}{b - c}}, \quad x_m = \frac{\tilde{\kappa}_-^2 + 1/4}{2\tilde{\kappa}_-}.$$

A second salient example is that of an inseparable squeezed thermal state (STS), with the standard-form parameters  $b_1 \ge b_2$ , c = |d| = -d > 0. This case was also considered in

Refs.[10, 11], where the prescription of Ref.[9] to evaluate the Gaussian EF was followed. From our results,

$$w_1 = w_2 = 1, x_m = \frac{(b_1 + b_2)(b_1b_2 - c^2 + 1/4) - 2c\sqrt{D}}{(b_1 + b_2)^2 - 4c^2}$$

one can see that  $x_m$  is not determined only by the lowest symplectic eigenvalue,  $\tilde{\kappa}_- = \frac{1}{2}[b_1 + b_2 - \sqrt{(b_1 - b_2)^2 + 4c^2}]$ . The standard-form parameters of an entangled STS can be written in terms of the thermal mean occupancies  $\bar{n}_1 \ge 0, \bar{n}_2 \ge 0$  and the squeeze factor r > 0, [5]:

$$b_{1} = (\bar{n}_{1} + \frac{1}{2})(\cosh r)^{2} + (\bar{n}_{2} + \frac{1}{2})(\sinh r)^{2},$$
  

$$b_{2} = (\bar{n}_{2} + \frac{1}{2})(\cosh r)^{2} + (\bar{n}_{1} + \frac{1}{2})(\sinh r)^{2},$$
  

$$c = (\bar{n}_{1} + \bar{n}_{2} + 1)\sinh r \cosh r.$$
(17)

When using Eqs. (17) and denoting by  $r_s$  the value of the squeeze factor at the separability border [5], our formulae become more insightful:

$$x_m = \frac{1}{2} \cosh[2(r - r_s)], \ y_m = \frac{1}{2} \sinh[2(r - r_s)].$$

A rather special case is that of a SVS, which is the unique pure STS ( $\bar{n}_1 = \bar{n}_2 = 0 : r_s = 0, b_1 = b_2 =: b$ ). As expected, the optimal SVS  $\rho_0$  in Eq. (8) coincides with the given one  $\rho_G$ :

$$x_m = b = \frac{1}{2}\cosh(2r), \ y_m = c = \frac{1}{2}\sinh(2r)$$

A third example is that of a TMGS at the separability boundary:  $\tilde{\mathcal{D}} = 0 \iff \tilde{\kappa}_{-} = \frac{1}{2}$ . We get:  $x_m = \frac{1}{2}, y_m = 0$ , and

$$w_1 = \left[\frac{b_2(b_1b_2 - d^2) + b_1/4}{b_2(b_1b_2 - c^2) + b_1/4}\right]^{1/2}, w_2 = w_1(b_1 \leftrightarrow b_2).$$

Equation (8) becomes now the P representation for the density operator  $\rho_G$  of a state at the border of separability and classicality as well.

A fourth class of entangled states consists of those TMGSs whose CMs have the smallest symplectic eigenvalue  $\kappa_-$ :  $\mathcal{D} = 0 \iff \kappa_- = \frac{1}{2}$ . These states were studied as having minimal negativity at fixed local and global purities [17]. Under the assumption that  $b_1 \ge b_2$ ,  $c \ge$ |d| = -d > 0, we found two sets of solutions determined by the sign of the quantity  $b_2c-b_1|d|$ :

$$b_2 c - b_1 |d| \le 0$$
:  $x_m = \frac{b_1^2 - b_2^2}{8[\det(\mathcal{V}) - 1/16]}$ 

$$w_{1} = \left[\frac{b_{2}(b_{1}b_{2} - d^{2}) - b_{1}/4}{b_{2}(b_{1}b_{2} - c^{2}) - b_{1}/4}\right]^{1/2}, \quad w_{2} = w_{1}(b_{1} \leftrightarrow b_{2})$$
$$b_{2}c - b_{1}|d| > 0: \quad x_{m} = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{b_{1}b_{2}}{b_{1}b_{2} - d^{2}}},$$
$$w_{1} = 2\sqrt{\frac{b_{1}}{b_{2}}(b_{1}b_{2} - d^{2})}, \quad w_{2} = w_{1}(b_{1} \leftrightarrow b_{2}).$$

The above formulae are in agreement with those derived in other parametrization in Ref.[11], following the methods of Ref.[9].

In the general case, an analytical evaluation of the EF is possible by solving a quartic equation for the product  $p := u_1 u_2$ :

$$\sum_{n=0}^{4} \mathcal{A}_n p^n = 0. \tag{18}$$

The coefficients of the quartic polynomial in the l.h.s. of Eq. (18) are quite simple polynomials in the four standard-form parameters of the given inseparable TMGS:

$$\mathcal{A}_{0} = (b_{1}b_{2} - d^{2}) \left[ b_{1}(b_{1}b_{2} - d^{2}) - b_{2}/4 \right] \left[ b_{2}(b_{1}b_{2} - d^{2}) - b_{1}/4 \right],$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{1} = - \left[ c(b_{1}b_{2} - d^{2}) + |d|/4 \right] \left\{ (b_{1}^{2} + b_{2}^{2}) \left[ c(b_{1}b_{2} - d^{2}) + |d|/4 \right] - 2b_{1}b_{2} \left[ |d|(b_{1}b_{2} - d^{2}) + c/4 \right] \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{2} = \left( \det \mathcal{V} + 1/16 \right) \left[ 2(b_{1}c - b_{2}|d|)(b_{1}|d| - b_{2}c) - b_{1}b_{2}(2b_{1}b_{2} - c^{2} - d^{2}) \right] + \frac{1}{2}(b_{1}^{2} + b_{2}^{2})(b_{1}^{2}b_{2}^{2} - c^{2}d^{2}) - b_{1}b_{2}c|d|(2b_{1}b_{2} - c^{2} - d^{2}),$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{3} = \mathcal{A}_{1}(c \leftrightarrow |d|), \ \mathcal{A}_{4} = \mathcal{A}_{0}(c \leftrightarrow |d|). \tag{19}$$

Had we got a solution for p, this could be used to give an expression for the optimal  $x_m$  by solving a quadratic equation. We mention that in the four particular cases just discussed before, we have recovered the above-presented results by use of Eqs. (18) and (19).

The last issue we are here interested in is the additivity of the EF for TMGSs. Our present approach gives a straightforward specific answer to this open question [18]. We consider a four-mode product state  $\rho_G \otimes \sigma_G$ , where  $\rho_G$  and  $\sigma_G$  are entangled TMGSs. We denote the minimally entangled SVSs entering the optimal decompositions of the type (8) for both factors by  $\rho_0$  and  $\sigma_0$ . Their tensor product  $\rho_0 \otimes \sigma_0$  is the least entangled product of any two-mode pure states. Therefore, it enters the optimal convex decomposition of the four-mode state  $\rho_G \otimes \sigma_G$ . It follows the identity  $E_F(\rho_G \otimes \sigma_G) = E(\rho_0 \otimes \sigma_0)$ . The well-known additivity property of the von Neumann entropy,  $E(\rho_0 \otimes \sigma_0) = E(\rho_0) + E(\sigma_0)$ , yields the additivity of the EF for TMGS:

$$E_F(\rho_G \otimes \sigma_G) = E_F(\rho_G) + E_F(\sigma_G).$$

Consequences of this property on evaluating other measures of entanglement are largely discussed in Ref.[18].

To sum up, we have reformulated the problem of the EF for two-mode Gaussian states in terms of CFs and CMs. We have shown that the exact EF coincides for such states with the Gaussian one. Then we have retrieved in a unitary way some previous special results. Although an analytic solution in the general case seems to be more complicated, it can be found, however, by solving a quartic equation. Based on our approach, we have finally proven the additivity of the EF for two-mode Gaussian states.

Note that during the completion of this paper, an interesting treatment of the EF for a TMGS was given in Ref.[19]. Its relation to our present work will be discussed elsewhere.

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Romanian Ministry of Education and Research through Grant No. IDEI-995/2007 for the University of Bucharest.

- S. L. Braunstein and P. Van Loock, Rev. Mod. Phys. 77, 513 (2005); G. Adesso and F. Illuminati, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 40, 7821 (2007).
- [2] R. Simon, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 2726 (2000).
- [3] V. Vedral, M. B. Plenio, M. A. Rippin, and P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 2275 (1997);
   V. Vedral, M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. A 57, 1619 (1998); V. Vedral, Revs. Mod. Phys. 74, 197 (2002).
- [4] S. Scheel and D.-G. Welsch, Phys. Rev. A 64, 063811 (2001).
- [5] Paulina Marian, T. A. Marian, and H. Scutaru, Phys. Rev. A 68, 062309 (2003).
- [6] Paulina Marian and T. A. Marian, Phys. Rev. A 77, 062319 (2008).
- [7] Paulina Marian and T. A. Marian, Eur. Phys. J. Special Topics 160, 281 (2008).

- [8] G. Giedke, M. M. Wolf, O. Krüger, R. F. Werner, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 107901 (2003).
- [9] M. M. Wolf, G. Giedke, O. Krüger, R. F. Werner, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A 69, 052320 (2004).
- [10] Li-Zhen Jiang, Int. J. Quantum Inf. 2, 273 (2004).
- [11] G. Adesso and F. Illuminati, Phys. Rev. A 72, 032334 (2005).
- [12] L.-M. Duan, G. Giedke, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 2722 (2000).
- [13] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K.Wootters, Phys. Rev. A 54, 3824 (1996).
- [14] R. J. Glauber, Phys. Rev. **131**, 2766 (1963).
- [15] Paulina Marian and T. A. Marian, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 29, 6233 (1996).
- [16] In Ref.[14], only the case of superpositions of classical fields was considered and the convolution law of the well-behaved P representations was derived. In our paper [15] the multiplication of the CFs was derived and the influence of thermal noise on nonclassical properties of one-mode states was studied.
- [17] G. Adesso, A. Serafini, and F. Illuminati, Phys. Rev. Lett.92, 087901 (2004); G. Adesso, A. Serafini, and F. Illuminati, Phys. Rev. A 70, 022318 (2004).
- [18] M. B. Plenio and S. Virmani, Quantum Information and Computation 7, 001 (2007).
- [19] J. Solomon Ivan and R. Simon, arXiv:0808.1658.