

Entanglement Measures for Intermediate Separability of Quantum States

Tsubasa Ichikawa, Toshihiko Sasaki, Izumi Tsutsui

High Energy Accelerator Research Organization (KEK), Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-0801, Japan

We present a family of entanglement measures R_m which act as indicators for separability of n -qubit quantum states into m subsystems for arbitrary $2 \leq m \leq n$. The measure R_m vanishes if the state is separable into m subsystems, and for $m = n$ it gives the Meyer-Wallach measure while for $m = 2$ it reduces to the one introduced recently by Love *et al.* The measures R_m are evaluated explicitly for the GHZ state and the W state (and its extensions, the W_k states) to show that these globally entangled states exhibit rather distinct behaviors under the measures, indicating the utility of the measures R_m for characterizing globally entangled states as well.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ta, 03.65.Ud, 03.67.Mn,

Quantum entanglement exhibits one of the most intriguing aspects of quantum mechanics, posing profound questions on our commonsensical comprehension of the physical world. The conceptual significance of entanglement was first pointed out in the celebrated EPR paper [1], where the nonlocal correlation of entangled states was regarded as a major obstacle for a complete, realistic theory. The question of nonlocal reality was later taken up by Bell [2, 3] who paved the way for its laboratory test. Since then, a variety of experiments have been conducted [4, 5, 6], and by now we are almost convinced that nonlocality occurs precisely as prescribed by quantum mechanics. Although the nonlocal correlation generated by quantum entanglement cannot be used for communication [7, 8], it still suggests the possible existence of nonlocal ‘influence’ exerted between distant partners at a speed exceeding that of light as demonstrated by a recent experiment [9].

In view of the striking characteristics, it is expected that quantum entanglement plays a vital role in our future technology including quantum computation and cryptography [10]. Successful application of entanglement will in general require the ability of manipulating and measuring entangled n -qubit states at a reasonable level of accuracy. Among them, characterization of entanglement is perhaps the most basic requisite, and for this we have already a number of suggestions such as the use of canonical forms, entanglement witnesses and entanglement measures [11, 12]. These tools are quite convenient for quantifying entanglement for a few small n cases, but they become almost intractable for large n due to the exponential increase in the number of distinct structures allowed for the entangled states [13]. It seems, therefore, inevitable that in order to quantify entanglement of generic n -qubit systems, we need to resort to means specifically designed for the aims to be achieved.

Among the many entanglement measures proposed so far (see, *i.e.*, [11, 12, 14, 15, 16]), the Meyer-Wallach (MW) measure [17] occupies a distinguished position in that it is capable of examining the *full separability* of states and is also easy to handle [18, 19]. Recently, Love *et al.* [20] proposed a measure which is ‘opposite’ to the MW measure in the sense that it can examine the *global entanglement* of states. In the present paper, we present

a set of new entanglement measures encompassing the two, that is, our measures R_m , $m = 2, 3, \dots, n$, can examine the *intermediate separability* as well, allowing us to see if the n -qubit state is separable into arbitrary m subsystems. In particular, the case $m = n$ gives exactly the MW measure whereas the case $m = 2$ corresponds, in effect, to the measure of [20]. Our measures can also be used to characterize globally entangled states in general, and this is illustrated by the two standard globally entangled states, the GHZ state [21] and the W state [13] in n -qubit systems, which show rather contrasting behaviors under the measures presented here. We evaluate the measures also for W_k states, which are introduced as modified W states, to show that the measures R_m with different m reveal distinct properties of the globally entangled states. We shall also see that under the MW measure R_n the $W_{n/2}$ state provides the maximally entangled state.

The system we consider is an n -qubit system whose quantum states are described by vectors in the Hilbert space \mathbb{C}^{2^n} . In order to discuss its arbitrary subsystems, we label the n constituent 1-qubit systems by integers so that any subsystem consisting of some of the constituent systems is specified by a subset of $\mathcal{T} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Let $\mathcal{P} = \{s_i\}_{i=1}^m$ be a partition of \mathcal{T} , *i.e.*, $\bigcup_{i=1}^m s_i = \mathcal{T}$ and $s_i \cap s_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$. Each subset s_i determines a corresponding subsystem of the total system \mathbb{C}^{2^n} , and hence we may use s_i to refer to the subsystem specified by the subset. We denote by \bar{s}_i the subset complementary to s_i in \mathcal{T} with $s_i \cup \bar{s}_i = \mathcal{T}$.

Now, given a pure state $|\psi\rangle$, let ρ_{s_i} be the reduced density matrix in the subsystem s_i obtained by taking the trace of the density matrix $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ over the complementary space \bar{s}_i . Letting also $|s_i|$ be the number of elements (constituents) in the subset s_i , we recall that the quantity

$$\eta_{s_i}(\psi) = N (1 - \text{tr} \rho_{s_i}^2), \quad N = 2^{|s_i|} (2^{|s_i|} - 1)^{-1}, \quad (1)$$

introduced in [20] vanishes $\eta_{s_i}(\psi) = 0$ iff the state $|\psi\rangle$ is separable with respect to s_i and \bar{s}_i . Here, the normalization factor $N = N(|s_i|)$ in (1) is chosen so that we have $\eta_{s_i}(\psi) = 1$ when the reduced state is maximally mixed $\rho_{s_i} = \frac{1}{2^{|s_i|}} I$. Since $\text{tr}(\rho_{s_i})^2 = \text{tr}(\rho_{\bar{s}_i})^2$, both $\eta_{s_i}(\psi)$ and

$\eta_{\bar{s}_i}(\psi)$ carry essentially the same content of information about the state. From the quantities η_{s_i} in (1) obtained for all the subsets s_i in \mathcal{P} , we evaluate the ‘average’ value for the partition \mathcal{P} by the arithmetic mean,

$$\xi_{\mathcal{P}}(\psi) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \eta_{s_i}(\psi). \quad (2)$$

Clearly, we have $\xi_{\mathcal{P}}(\psi) = 0$ iff the state $|\psi\rangle$ is separable according exactly to the partition \mathcal{P} of the total set \mathcal{T} .

Out of all possible partitions \mathcal{P} of \mathcal{T} , we may choose those \mathcal{P} consisting of m subsets for some m in the range $2 \leq m \leq n$, and evaluate the geometric mean of the quantities $\xi_{\mathcal{P}}(\psi)$. Namely, if $d(\mathcal{P})$ is the number of subsets of the partition \mathcal{P} , we consider

$$R_m(\psi) := \left(\prod_{d(\mathcal{P})=m} \xi_{\mathcal{P}}(\psi) \right)^{1/S(n,m)}, \quad (3)$$

where $S(n, m) = \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{(-1)^{m-k} k^{n-1}}{(k-1)! (m-k)!}$ is the Stirling number in the second kind [22], which represents the number of all possible partitions of the integer n into m subsets, or the number of partitions \mathcal{P} with $d(\mathcal{P}) = m$. The quantities $R_m(\psi)$ possess the important property: $R_m(\psi) = 0 \Leftrightarrow |\psi\rangle$ is separable (at least) in m subsystems in \mathbb{C}^{2^n} . Besides, since $R_m(\psi)$ are formed from $\eta_{s_i}(\psi)$ which are all entanglement monotones [20], each of them, $R_m(\psi)$, $m = 2, \dots, n$, qualifies as an entanglement measure. In particular, for $m = n$ where the subsets s_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, correspond to all the constituent subsystems, we have

$$R_n(\psi) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n 2 \{1 - \text{tr}(\rho_{s_i})^2\}, \quad (4)$$

which is precisely the MW measure [17, 18]. On the other hand, at the other end $m = 2$ we have the partitions $S = \{s_1 = s, s_2 = \bar{s}\}$. Choosing the subset s so that $|s| \leq |\bar{s}|$, and noting $S(n, 2) = 2^{n-1} - 1$, we find

$$R_2(\psi) = \left(\prod'_{1 \leq |s| \leq |\bar{s}|} c(s) \eta_s(\psi) \right)^{1/(2^{n-1}-1)}, \quad (5)$$

where the prime on the product symbol indicates that either one of the subsets s and \bar{s} is included when $|s| = |\bar{s}|$, and the coefficients $c(s)$ are given by $c(s) = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{2^{|\bar{s}|} - 2^{|s|}}{2^n - 2^{|s|}}$. The measure $R_2(\psi)$ is equivalent to the measure proposed by Love *et al.* [20], apart from the factor $c(s)$ which varies between the maximum $c(s) = 1$ for $|s| = |\bar{s}|$ and the minimum $c(s) = 1/2 + 1/(1 - 2^{1-n}) > 1/2$ for $|s| = 1$.

We now evaluate the amount of entanglement possessed by the two familiar globally entangled states, the GHZ and the W states, using the measures $R_m(\psi)$ introduced above. These are particular states which are invariant under all permutations of constituent subsystems, and this exchange symmetry facilitates our computation considerably. To proceed, we first note that for




FIG. 1: The entanglement measures R_m evaluated for the GHZ state $|\text{GHZ}\rangle$ (above) and the W state $|\text{W}\rangle$ (below) as functions of m for various n with $3 \leq n \leq 50$. Each curve represents R_m for m in the range $2 \leq m \leq n$ with a fixed value of n which can be read off from the right end value of m of the curve.

those symmetric states the quantity η_{s_i} in (1) depends only on the number of the elements $|s_i|$ of the subset s_i , not on the choice of the elements in s_i . To find the value of the measure $R_m(\psi)$, we need to consider all possible partitions \mathcal{P} with $d(\mathcal{P}) = m$ to get the quantity $\xi_{\mathcal{P}}(\psi)$ in (2), but again the exchange symmetry implies that $\xi_{\mathcal{P}}(\psi)$ depends only on the way the partition \mathcal{P} is formed in terms of the set of numbers $|s_i|$ of the elements in the subsets s_i comprising \mathcal{P} . To be more explicit, let us choose the numbering of the subsets s_i in the order $|s_1| \leq |s_2| \leq \dots \leq |s_m|$ and introduce the notation, $|\mathcal{P}| := \{|s_1|, |s_2|, \dots, |s_m|\}$. Note that $|\mathcal{P}|$ furnishes an ordered partition of the integer n into $d(\mathcal{P}) = m$ non-vanishing integers. For n and m with $2 \leq m \leq n$, let $\mathcal{G}(n, m)$ be the set of all distinct ordered partitions of the integer n into m nonvanishing integers. Given some $|\mathcal{P}| \in \mathcal{G}(n, m)$, we denote by $h(|\mathcal{P}|)$ the total number of partitions \mathcal{P} sharing the same ordered partition $|\mathcal{P}|$. The measure $R_m(\psi)$ in (3) can then be calculated by the product of $\xi_{\mathcal{P}}(\psi)$ for all different $|\mathcal{P}|$ in $\mathcal{G}(n, m)$, *i.e.*,

$$R_m(\psi) = \left(\prod_{|\mathcal{P}| \in \mathcal{G}(n, m)} \{\xi_{|\mathcal{P}|}(\psi)\}^{h(|\mathcal{P}|)} \right)^{1/S(n, m)}, \quad (6)$$

where we have written $\xi_{|\mathcal{P}|}(\psi)$ for $\xi_{\mathcal{P}}(\psi)$ to stress that it is dependent only on $|\mathcal{P}|$.

Now we consider the n -qubit GHZ state, $|\text{GHZ}\rangle =$

$(|11\dots 1\rangle + |00\dots 0\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. The GHZ state is quite special since it has $\text{tr}(\rho_{s_i})^2 = 1/2$ for all subsystems s_i , and from this we obtain

$$\eta_{s_i}(\text{GHZ}) = N/2 \quad (7)$$

with N given in (1). To illustrate our procedure for evaluating the measures, we choose, for instance, the case $n = 4$, $m = 2$ for which the set $\mathcal{G}(4,2)$ consists of the two elements, $|\mathcal{P}\rangle = \{1,3\}$ and $\{2,2\}$. The numbers of partitions with the same $|\mathcal{P}\rangle$ are, respectively, $h(\{1,3\}) = 4!/(1!3!) = 4$ and $h(\{2,2\}) = 4!/(2!2!) = 3$, yielding $S(4,2) = \sum_{|\mathcal{P}\rangle \in \mathcal{G}(4,2)} h(|\mathcal{P}\rangle) = 7$. We then find $R_2(\text{GHZ}) \approx 0.732$. This procedure can be applied for any n and m , and the results up to $n = 50$ are shown in Figure 1.

Next, we consider the W state, $|\text{W}\rangle = (|100\dots 0\rangle + |010\dots 0\rangle + \dots + |000\dots 1\rangle)/\sqrt{n}$, which has

$$\eta_{s_i}(\text{W}) = 2Nn^{-2}|s_i|(n - |s_i|). \quad (8)$$

For comparison, we again choose the case $n = 4$, $m = 2$ to find $R_2(\text{W}) \approx 0.621$, which is less than the value of the GHZ state. As in the GHZ case, the results up to $n = 50$ are shown in Figure 1.

It is clear from Figure 1 that the GHZ and the W states exhibit rather contrasting behaviours for the entanglement measures R_m . Namely, for the GHZ state, R_m is a monotonically increasing function of m confined within $1/2 < R_m \leq 1$ and approaches the value $R_n = 1$ at the right end $m = n$. In contrast, for the W state, R_m is basically a decreasing function of m confined in $0 < R_m < 1/2$, except for the small $n < 9$ for which R_m can exceed the value $1/2$. These can also be seen directly from the formulae (7) and (8). In a sense, this agrees with our intuitive picture of the GHZ state being more globally entangled than the W state for all n . On the other hand, it is known that the entanglement of the W state is ‘more robust’ than that of the GHZ state [13, 23] in the sense that the reduced density matrices of the W state are more entangled than those of the GHZ state. This propensity of robustness is not observed in the values of the present measures R_m .

Note that the lower bound $1/2$ of the measures R_m for the GHZ state indicates that the GHZ state cannot be approximated well by a state which is separable in m subsystems for any number of m . On the other hand, for the W state we observe that the values of R_m with m closer to n approach zero for larger n , and in particular, the value R_n (*i.e.*, the MW measure) has the vanishing limit, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} R_n(\text{W}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (n-1)/4n^2 = 0$. This, however, does not mean that the W state $|\text{W}\rangle$ becomes fully separable in the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$. One can see this by considering the maximum value of the fidelity between the W state and fully separable states. Indeed, parametrizing an arbitrary fully separable n -qubit state as $|\chi\rangle = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n (\cos \theta_i |0\rangle_i + e^{i\phi_i} \sin \theta_i |1\rangle_i)$, and varying the angle parameters in $|\chi\rangle$, one finds that the maximum value of fidelity $|\langle \text{W} | \chi \rangle|$ with the W state is achieved




FIG. 2: The entanglement measures R_m evaluated for the W_{10} state (above) and the W_{20} state (below) as functions of m for various n with $k+1 \leq n \leq 50$. Each curve represents R_m for m in the range $2 \leq m \leq n$ with a fixed value of n which can be read off from the right end value of m of the curve.

when $\sin^2 \theta_i = 1/n$ for all i and $\phi_i = \phi_j$ for all i, j . Hence, in the limit the maximal value of fidelity becomes

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\chi} |\langle \text{W} | \chi \rangle| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{e}}, \quad (9)$$

which shows an intriguing fact that despite the vanishing limit of the MW measure $R_n(\text{W})$, the W state does not approach a definite fully separable state in the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$. This indicates that the connection (3) between the vanishing measure and the separability, which is perfectly valid for finite n , does not apply to the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$.

We may further examine the property of our measures by considering a set of states which are totally symmetric with more than one $|1\rangle$ states in the constituent subsystems. To be explicit, we introduce the ‘ W_k states’ for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ by

$$|\text{W}_k\rangle := \binom{n}{k}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\underbrace{|11\dots 1}_{k} \underbrace{|00\dots 0}_{n-k} + \text{perm.} \right), \quad (10)$$

where ‘perm.’ means that all possible distinct terms possessing k ‘1’s and $(n-k)$ ‘0’s obtained by permutations of the first term are included. The modified W state for $k=1$ gives the standard W state $|\text{W}_1\rangle = |\text{W}\rangle$, while for $k > 1$ they become slightly more involved but are still manageable thanks to the symmetry.




FIG. 3: The entanglement measures R_m evaluated for the W_k states as functions of m and k under the fixed value of $n = 40$.

To evaluate the measures, we first implement an appropriate unitary transformations to $|W_k\rangle$ so that, for a given subsystem s_i , the state in s_i is represented by the left $|s_i|$ qubits in the n -qubit state $|*\rangle = |*\rangle_{s_i} |*\rangle_{\bar{s}_i}$. To proceed, it is also convenient to specify each of the terms in $|W_k\rangle$ by the number of ‘1’s, which is k for $|W_k\rangle$, and an integer σ for $1 \leq \sigma \leq \binom{n}{k}$ labeling the distinct terms appearing in the permutations. Clearly, the same notation can be employed for both of the subsystems s_i and \bar{s}_i as well, and we may write an arbitrary term in (10) as a product of states in the two subsystems as $|k, \sigma\rangle = |r, \tau\rangle_{s_i} |k-r, \tau'\rangle_{\bar{s}_i}$, where $|r, \tau\rangle_{s_i}$ is a state of the subsystem s_i with r ‘1’s and the label τ runs for $1 \leq \tau \leq \binom{|s_i|}{r}$, and similarly $|k-r, \tau'\rangle_{\bar{s}_i}$ is a state of the subsystem \bar{s}_i with the label τ' running over $1 \leq \tau' \leq \binom{n-|s_i|}{k-r}$. This allows us to rewrite the W_k state (10) in the form, $|W_k\rangle = \binom{n}{k}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_r \sum_{\tau, \tau'} |r, \tau\rangle_{s_i} |k-r, \tau'\rangle_{\bar{s}_i}$ from which the reduced density matrix is found as

$$\rho_{s_i} = \binom{n}{k}^{-1} \sum_r \binom{n-|s_i|}{k-r} \sum_{\tau, \tau'} |r, \tau\rangle_{s_i} \langle r, \tau'|, \quad (11)$$

where the summation of r is for $\max(|s_i| - (n-k), 0) \leq$

$r \leq \min(|s_i|, k)$. It is now straightforward to evaluate η_{s_i} to find

$$\eta_{s_i}(W_k) = N \left\{ 1 - \binom{n}{k}^{-2} \sum_r \binom{|s_i|}{r}^2 \binom{n-|s_i|}{k-r}^2 \right\}. \quad (12)$$

Based on the result (12), one can obtain the values of the measures R_m for the W_k states, and the outcomes are shown in Figure 2 for the two cases $k = 10$ and $k = 20$. It is seen that both of the W_{10} and W_{20} states exhibit distinctive behaviours which are also different from those of the GHZ states and W states discussed before, and in particular we notice that the measure R_m achieves the upper limit $R_m = 1$ at $n = m = 2k$. This can also be confirmed from (12) since for symmetric states, $n = m$ implies $R_m(\psi) = \eta_{s_i}(\psi)$ with $|s_i| = 1$, which is 1 for $n = 2k$. We therefore see that the n -qubit $W_{n/2}$ state furnishes the maximally entangled state for the MW measure.

It is also interesting to look at the behaviours of the R_m measures for the W_k states as functions of k with some fixed n . This can be done in Figure 3, where we plot the values of R_m for W_k in the range $2 \leq m \leq 40$ and $1 \leq k \leq 20$ for $n = 40$. We observe there that R_m are monotonically increasing functions of k for all m , indicating that the W_k states are ‘more entangled’ for larger $k \leq n/2$ under all measures R_m . Moreover, we see that the change in the values of the measure is in general more prominent for R_m with higher m , which suggests that variation of k alters the W_k states in their entanglement property of higher separability.

To summarise, our results show that the measures R_m introduced in this paper are useful not only for examining the intermediate separability but also for gaining a finer picture of entanglement of states. Clarification of the physical and operational meaning of the measures, apart from the separability, will be important for their utility in quantum information sciences.

-
- [1] A. Einstein, *et. al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **47** (1935) 777.
[2] J. S. Bell, *Physics* **1** (1964) 195.
[3] J. F. Clauser *et. al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23** (1969) 880.
[4] A. Aspect *et. al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49** (1982) 1804.
[5] G. Weihs *et. al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81** (1998) 5039.
[6] M. Rowe *et. al.*, *Nature* **409** (2001) 791.
[7] P.H. Eberhard, *Nuovo Cimento* **B46** (1978) 392.
[8] G.C. Ghirardi *et. al.*, *Lett. Nuovo Cimento* **27** (1980) 293.
[9] D. Salart *et. al.*, *Nature* **454** (2008) 861.
[10] M. C. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge university press, Cambridge, 2000.
[11] R. Horodecki *et. al.*, quant-ph/0702225.
[12] M. B. Plenio and S. Virmani, *Quant. Inf. Comput.* **7**(2007) 1.
[13] W. Dür *et. al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **A62** (2000) 062314.
[14] J. Eisert and H. J. Briegel *Phys. Rev.* **A64** (2001) 022306.
[15] D. Yang *et. al.*, quant-ph/0804.3683.
[16] A. S. M. Hassan and P. S. Joag, *Phys. Rev.* **A77** (2008) 062334.
[17] D. A. Meyer and N. R. Wallach, *J. Math. Phys.* **43** (2002) 4273.
[18] G. K. Brennen, *Quant. Inf. Comput.* **6**(2003) 619.
[19] A. J. Scott, *Phys. Rev.* **A69** (2004) 052330.
[20] P. J. Love *et al.* *Quant. Inf. Processing* **6** (2007) 187.
[21] D.M. Greenberger, M.A. Horne, A. Shimony and A. Zeilinger, *Am. J. Phys.* **58**(1990) 1131.
[22] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions*

[23] M. Koashi *et. al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **A62** (2000) 050302