

Strong NP-Hardness of the Quantum Separability Problem

Sevag Gharibian *

May 17, 2022

Abstract

Given the density matrix ρ of a bipartite quantum state, the quantum separability problem asks whether ρ is entangled or separable. In 2003, Gurvits showed that this problem is NP-hard if ρ is located within an inverse exponential (with respect to dimension) distance from the border of the set of separable quantum states. In this paper, we extend this NP-hardness to an inverse polynomial distance from the separable set. The result follows from a simple combination of works by Gurvits, Ioannou, and Liu. We apply our result to show (1) NP-hardness for the problem of determining whether a completely positive trace-preserving linear map is entanglement-breaking, and (2) an immediate lower bound on the maximum distance between a bound entangled state and the separable set (assuming $P \neq NP$).

1 Introduction

Once dubbed “the characteristic trait of quantum mechanics” [1], the phenomenon of quantum entanglement has been (theoretically) harnessed in a multitude of quantum computational tasks and areas, including quantum teleportation [2], superdense coding [3], quantum parallelism (e.g. as in Shor’s factoring algorithm [4]), quantum communication complexity [5, 6], and quantum cryptography [7]. In response, there has been an endless slew of proposed entanglement detection criteria and measures, such as the positive partial transpose (PPT) criterion [8, 9], von Neumann entropy of reduced states [10], entanglement of formation [11], relative entropy of entanglement [12], entanglement cost [11], distillable entanglement [11], negativity [13], and the first need for positive but not completely positive maps in physics [9], to name but a few (see [14, 15, 16] for surveys). Yet, the problem of determining whether an arbitrary quantum state is entangled or not (where in the latter case, the state is called *separable*), dubbed the Quantum Separability problem (QUSEP), was proven NP-hard by Gurvits in 2003 [17].

Formally, let $D(\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^N)$ denote the set of bipartite density operators acting on Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^M \otimes \mathcal{H}^N$, where M and N denote the dimensions of the respective subsystems. A quantum state $\rho \in D(\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^N)$ is called *separable* if and only if it can be written

$$\rho = \sum_k p_k |a_k\rangle\langle a_k| \otimes |b_k\rangle\langle b_k|, \quad (1)$$

for unit vectors $|a_k\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^M$ and $|b_k\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^N$, and real vector \mathbf{p} such that $p_k \geq 0$ for all k and $\sum_k p_k = 1$. Thus, the set of separable quantum states acting on $\mathcal{H}^M \otimes \mathcal{H}^N$ is the convex hull of

*School of Computer Science and Institute for Quantum Computing, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Canada

all pure product states $|a\rangle \otimes |b\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^M \otimes \mathcal{H}^N$. If we denote this convex set as $\mathcal{S}_{M,N}$, we can then consider the *Weak Membership* problem over the latter. Roughly, the Weak Membership problem (denoted $\text{WMEM}_\beta(K)$, and defined formally in Section 2) over a convex set $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ asks to decide whether a given point $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is in K , with the proviso that an algorithm is allowed to err on points lying within some fixed Euclidean distance $\beta > 0$ from the border of K (hence the name *Weak Membership*). Typically, β is strictly positive to account for the fact that real numbers can only be represented with finite precision with a computer. Observe that $\mathcal{S}_{M,N} \not\subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ as required for $\text{WMEM}_\beta(K)$ — we deal with this explicitly in Section 2 by more correctly letting $\mathcal{S}_{M,N}$ denote the set of real Bloch vectors [18] corresponding to the elements of $D(\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^N)$.

In 2003, Gurvits showed that the NP-complete problem PARTITION can be reduced via a polynomial time Turing reduction to $\text{WMEM}_\beta(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$, thereby proving the latter is NP-hard [17]. Intuitively, a Turing reduction describes how to solve a problem A (e.g. PARTITION) by running an algorithm for a second problem B (e.g. $\text{WMEM}_\beta(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$) possibly multiple times. PARTITION is defined as the problem of deciding whether a finite set of integers can be partitioned into two sets of equal sum. As observed by Aaronson and later documented by Ioannou [19], however, PARTITION is known to be NP-hard only if the magnitudes of the input integers are exponentially large with respect to input length — otherwise, the problem can be solved efficiently using a dynamic programming approach [20]. It follows [19] that the reduction of Ref. [17] shows NP-hardness for $\text{WMEM}_\beta(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$ only when $\beta \leq 1/\exp(M, N)$, i.e. when the input state is allowed to be exponentially close to the border of $\mathcal{S}_{M,N}$.

In an attempt to strengthen this result, Gurvits instead suggested [19] the following reduction from the NP-complete problem CLIQUE (defined in Section 2):

$$\text{CLIQUE} \leq_m \text{RSDF} \leq_m \text{WVAL}_\alpha(\mathcal{S}_{M,N}) \leq_T \text{WMEM}_\beta(\mathcal{S}_{M,N}). \quad (2)$$

Here, RSDF is the problem Robust Semidefinite Feasibility (defined in Section 2), $\text{WVAL}_\alpha(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$ is the problem Weak Validity [21] (which intuitively asks one to decide whether a given hyperplane is a separating hyperplane for a given convex set modulo some error $\alpha > 0$, and whose precise definition is not needed here), \leq_T denotes a Turing reduction, and \leq_m denotes a *many-one* reduction. A *many-one* reduction is a special case of a Turing reduction in which the algorithm for problem B is invoked only *once*, the output of which is immediately returned as the output for problem A. Unfortunately, the link $\text{WVAL}_\alpha(\mathcal{S}_{M,N}) \leq_T \text{WMEM}_\beta(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$ above is based on the Yudin-Nemirovskii theorem [22], which uses the shallow-cut ellipsoid method, and also results in exponential scaling for β [19]. Thus, this reduction again shows NP-hardness of $\text{WMEM}_\beta(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$ only for $\beta \leq 1/\exp(M, N)$.

The main result we show in this note is as follows.

Theorem 1. $\text{WMEM}_\beta(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$ is NP-hard for $\beta \leq 1/\text{poly}(M, N)$, i.e. is strongly NP-hard.

A problem is called *strongly NP-hard* if it is NP-hard even if the magnitudes of its numerical parameters are polynomially bounded in the length of its input [23]. To show Theorem 1, our approach is simple — we replace the last link of Equation (2) with a recent non-ellipsoidal Turing reduction of Liu [24] from the problem Weak Optimization (denoted $\text{WOPT}_\epsilon(K)$, and defined in Section 2) to $\text{WMEM}_\beta(K)$. We thus have the new reduction chain:

$$\text{CLIQUE} \leq_m \text{RSDF} \leq_m \text{WOPT}_\epsilon(\mathcal{S}_{M,N}) \leq_T \text{WMEM}_\beta(\mathcal{S}_{M,N}). \quad (3)$$

A few remarks are in order. The proof of $\text{RSDF} \leq \text{WOPT}_\epsilon(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$, given in Lemma 4, has its heavy lifting done by Ref. [19] — our contribution involves simple manipulation of convex sets to complete the proof and characterize scaling of the error parameter ϵ . The latter will be necessary to ensure that the entire reduction chain runs in polynomial time, as the last reduction, $\text{WOPT}_\epsilon(\mathcal{S}_{M,N}) \leq_T \text{WMEM}_\beta(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$ [24], runs in time polynomial in $1/\epsilon$ (as opposed to $\log(1/\epsilon)$). The relevant parts of Ref. [19] will be summarized and referenced as necessary. Second, we remark that there is a *randomized* Turing reduction from $\text{WVAL}_\alpha(K)$ to $\text{WMEM}_\beta(K)$ (whereas the approach here is deterministic) which follows from the random walk algorithm for convex optimization of Bertsimas and Vempala [25]. Whether this can improve our scaling for β obtained here is an interesting open question — we will see later, however, that the reduction $\text{CLIQUE} \leq_m \text{RSDF}$ used here already rules out the hope of showing NP-hardness for $\text{WMEM}_\beta(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$ for $\beta \in O(1)$, regardless of our choice of reduction from RSDF to $\text{WMEM}_\beta(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$.

This note is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce all necessary definitions and notation. Section 3 presents the proof of Theorem 1. In Section 4, we discuss two applications of Theorem 1. We first apply the positive partial transpose (PPT) entanglement detection criterion [26, 9] to obtain immediate lower bounds on the maximum Euclidean distance between a bound entangled [27] state and $\mathcal{S}_{M,N}$ (assuming $P \neq NP$). We next use the Jamiołkowski isomorphism [28] to show NP-hardness of the problem of determining whether a completely positive trace-preserving linear map (i.e. a quantum *channel*) is entanglement-breaking [29]. We conclude in Section 5.

2 Definitions and Notation

In this section, we formally define the following problems needed to show Theorem 1: CLIQUE, Robust Semidefinite Feasibility (RSDF), Weak Optimization ($\text{WOPT}_\epsilon(K)$), and Weak Membership ($\text{WMEM}_\beta(K)$). All norms are taken as the Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|_2$ (where $\|A\|_2$ corresponds to the Frobenius norm if A is a matrix). The letter \mathbb{Q} indicates the rational numbers. The notation $:=$ is used to indicate a definition. We denote (column) vector v by \mathbf{v} , its conjugate transpose as \mathbf{v}^\dagger , and its i th entry as v_i . We use the notation $\langle \alpha \rangle$ to signify the number of bits necessary to encode an entity α . Specifically, if $\alpha = a/b$ is rational, we define $\langle \alpha \rangle = \langle a \rangle + \langle b \rangle$, and for matrix A , we let $\langle A \rangle = \sum_{ij} \langle A_{ij} \rangle$ (similarly for vectors).

First, the NP-complete problem CLIQUE is stated as follows.

Definition 1 (CLIQUE). Given a simple graph G on n vertices, and $c \leq n$, for $n, c \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, decide, with respect to the complexity measure $\langle G \rangle + \langle c \rangle$:

If the number of vertices in the largest complete subgraph of G is at least c , output “YES”.
Otherwise, output “NO”.

Here, we take $\langle G \rangle = \langle A_G \rangle$, where A_G is the $n \times n$ adjacency matrix for G , such that $A_G[i, j] = 1$ if vertices i and j are connected by an edge, and $A_G[i, j] = 0$ otherwise. Next, we have the problem Robust Semidefinite Feasibility.

Definition 2 (Robust Semidefinite Feasibility (RSDF)). Given k rational, symmetric $l \times l$ matrices B_1, \dots, B_k , and $\zeta, \eta \in \mathbb{Q}$, with $\zeta, \eta \geq 0$, define $g(B_1, \dots, B_k) := \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^l, \|\mathbf{x}\|_2=1} \sum_{i=1}^k (\mathbf{x}^\top B_i \mathbf{x})^2$. Then, decide, with respect to the complexity measure $lk + \sum_{i=1}^k \langle B_i \rangle + \langle \zeta \rangle + \langle \eta \rangle$:

If $g(B_1, \dots, B_k) \geq \zeta + \eta$, output “YES”.
If $g(B_1, \dots, B_k) \leq \zeta - \eta$, output “NO”.




Figure 1: An intuitive picture of the sets $S(K, \delta)$ and $S(K, -\delta)$, respectively. We use the term “ $-\delta$ ” in the latter illustration to stress the fact that K is contracted.

We have assumed $\zeta \geq 0$ without loss of generality above, since $g(B_1, \dots, B_k) \geq 0$. This will be necessary later in Lemma 4, when we need to take $\sqrt{g(B_1, \dots, B_k)}$. We have also defined RSDf as a *promise* problem, meaning we are promised the input will fall into one of two disjoint cases which may be separated by a non-zero gap, and we must distinguish between the two cases. One could equivalently lift the promise and allow input falling in the “gap” region (i.e. $\zeta - \eta < g(B_1, \dots, B_k) < \zeta + \eta$) — for any such input, we would consider any output to be correct (i.e. “YES” or “NO”).

Moving on, in order to discuss the Weak Optimization and Weak Membership problems, we first require the following definitions. Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ be a convex and compact set, and define the sets $S(K, \delta) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \exists \mathbf{y} \in K \text{ s.t. } \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_2 \leq \delta\}$, and $S(K, -\delta) := \{\mathbf{x} \in K \mid S(\mathbf{x}, \delta) \subseteq K\}$. Roughly, $S(K, \delta)$ can be thought of as extending the border of K by δ in Euclidean distance, and $S(K, -\delta)$ can be thought of as taking the core of K , which is δ away from the border of K . The two sets are depicted in Figure 1. As per [21], we shall require that K be a *well-bounded p-centered* set, meaning that $K \subseteq S(\mathbf{0}, R)$ for $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ the origin and some rational $R > 0$, and $S(\mathbf{p}, r) \subseteq K$ for a known point $\mathbf{p} \in K$ and some rational $r > 0$. This ensures K is full-dimensional and bounded. Finally, we set the encoding size of K as $\langle K \rangle = m + \langle r \rangle + \langle R \rangle + \langle \mathbf{p} \rangle$ [17]. The presence of parameter m in this expression allows us to perform vector addition and scalar multiplication on elements of K in polynomial time. We can now formally define Weak Optimization and Weak Membership over the set K as follows.

Definition 3 (Weak Optimization ($\text{WOPT}_\epsilon(K)$)[24]). Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ be a convex, compact, and well-bounded p-centered set. Then, given $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{Q}^m$ with $\|\mathbf{c}\|_2 = 1$, and $\gamma, \epsilon \in \mathbb{Q}$, such that $\epsilon > 0$, decide, with respect to the complexity measure $\langle K \rangle + \langle \mathbf{c} \rangle + \langle \gamma \rangle + \langle \epsilon \rangle$:

- If there exists $\mathbf{y} \in S(K, -\epsilon)$ with $\mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{y} \geq \gamma + \epsilon$, then output “YES”.
- If for all $\mathbf{x} \in S(K, \epsilon)$, $\mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{x} \leq \gamma - \epsilon$, then output “NO”.

Definition 4 (Weak Membership ($\text{WMEM}_\beta(K)$)). Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ be a convex, compact, and well-bounded p-centered set. Then, given $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Q}^m$, and error parameter $\beta \in \mathbb{Q}$, such that $\beta > 0$, decide, with respect to the complexity measure $\langle K \rangle + \langle \mathbf{y} \rangle + \langle \beta \rangle$:

- If $\mathbf{y} \in S(K, -\beta)$, then output “YES”.
- If $\mathbf{y} \notin S(K, \beta)$, then output “NO”.

Both of these problems are also stated as promise problems. Roughly speaking, the former asks whether there exists a point in the “core” of K that achieves a threshold value slightly higher than

γ for a linear function defined by \mathbf{c} . The latter asks to distinguish whether a given point \mathbf{y} is in the “core” of K or “far away” from K . We remark that unlike here, in Ref. [24] the inputs to $\text{WOPT}_\epsilon(K)$ and $\text{WMEM}_\beta(K)$ are real (as opposed to rational), and specified using $\text{poly}(m)$ bits of precision. The latter is because such precision suffices if one demands ϵ and β to be at least inverse polynomial in the input size [24], i.e. if one allows at least “moderate” error (which we will also demand here). It is easy to see that we can exactly represent any such $\text{poly}(m)$ -bit real numbers as rational numbers in poly-time using $\text{poly}(m)$ bits as well, and hence the case of Ref. [24] is a special case of our definitions here.

With the definitions above in place, we would like to show the reduction of Equation (3), i.e. that an instance of CLIQUE can be solved in polynomial time given an algorithm for $\text{WMEM}_\beta(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$. Since CLIQUE is NP-complete, this would imply NP-hardness of $\text{WMEM}_\beta(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$. We also require that $\epsilon, \beta \geq 1/\text{poly}(M, N)$ — the former is required for the reduction to run in polynomial time (due to the run-time of Theorem 5 in Section 3), and the latter is required to prove *strong* NP-hardness (since the case of $\beta \leq 1/\exp(M, N)$ is already known to be NP-hard [17]). Before proceeding, it remains for us to verify that the set of separable quantum states in $D(\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^N)$ satisfies our requirements on $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ in the definitions of $\text{WOPT}_\epsilon(K)$ and $\text{WMEM}_\beta(K)$.

To do so, we first represent our quantum states as real vectors in \mathbb{R}^m , for m set as follows. Let $H_{M,N}$ denote the set of Hermitian operators mapping $\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^N \mapsto \mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^N$. Then, via the isomorphism between $H_{M,N}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{M^2N^2}$, we can write any $\rho \in D(\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^N)$ as (e.g. [18]):

$$\rho = \frac{I}{MN} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{M^2N^2-1} r_i \sigma_i, \quad (4)$$

where we have chosen as a basis for $H_{M,N}$ the identity and the traceless Hermitian generators of $SU(MN)$, the latter denoted by σ_i and such that $\text{Tr}(\sigma_i \sigma_j) = 2\delta_{ij}$ (for δ_{ij} the Kronecker delta) [18]. The vector $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^{M^2N^2-1}$ is called the *Bloch vector* of ρ , whose terms are given by $r_i = \text{Tr}(\rho \sigma_i)$. Henceforth when referring to $\mathcal{S}_{M,N}$, we shall mean the convex set of Bloch vectors in $\mathbb{R}^{M^2N^2-1}$ corresponding to separable states in $D(\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^N)$. Having represented $\mathcal{S}_{M,N}$ in terms of real vectors, we require it to be \mathbf{p} -centered and well-bounded. This follows since $\mathcal{S}_{M,N}$ is contained in an origin-centered ball of radius $R = \sqrt{2(MN-1)/MN}$ [16], and contains an origin-centered ball of radius $r = \sqrt{2/MN(MN-1)}$ [30], where the origin $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{M^2N^2-1}$ corresponds to the maximally mixed state, and R and r are with respect to the Euclidean norm. We remark that the extra factor of $\sqrt{2}$ appearing in the expressions for r and R is due to switching from the density matrix to the Bloch vector representation (see Lemma 8 in Appendix A) — this scaling will not affect our analysis. We further require that $\mathcal{S}_{M,N}$ be compact, which holds since the set of pure product states is closed and bounded, and the convex hull of a convex compact set is also compact [31].

Finally, for concreteness, we remark that from the values of m , r , R , and \mathbf{p} above for $\mathcal{S}_{M,N}$, it follows that for Definitions 3 and 4, $\langle \mathcal{S}_{M,N} \rangle = m + \langle R \rangle + \langle r \rangle + \langle \mathbf{p} \rangle \leq \text{poly}(MN)$.

3 The Reduction

We now show Theorem 1 by demonstrating the polynomial-time Turing reduction of Equation (3) for $\beta \leq 1/\text{poly}(M, N)$. We proceed by considering each link of Equation (3) in order.

The first link in Equation (3) is given to us by the following theorem [19]. Unless otherwise stated, by a poly-time reduction, we mean with respect to the encoding size of the problem instance,

as defined in Section 2. We use the notation $\Pi = (\text{input parameters})$ to denote an instance Π of a given problem, with Π specified by the given input parameters.

Theorem 2 (Gurvits and Ioannou [19]). *There exists a poly-time many-one reduction which maps instance $\Pi_1 = (G, n, c)$ of CLIQUE to instance $\Pi_2 = (k, l, B_1, \dots, B_k, \zeta, \eta)$ of RSDF, such that $k = n(n-1)/2$, $l = n$, $B_i \in \mathbb{Q}^{n \times n}$ and $\|B_i\|_2 \in \Theta(1)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$, $\zeta = \Theta(1)$, $\eta \in \Omega(n^{-2})$.*

We refer the reader to Ref. [19] for the details of the proof of this theorem, but highlight that it relies heavily on the following theorem of Motzkin and Straus [32], which ties the maximum clique number of a graph to optimization of a square-free quadratic form over the unit simplex:

Theorem 3 (Motzkin and Straus [32]). *Denote by $(i, j) \in G$ an edge in graph G between vertices i and j , and let ω be the order of the maximal complete graph contained in G . Let Δ_n denote the simplex $\Delta_n := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_i \geq 0, \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 = 1\}$. Then*

$$\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_n} \sum_{(i,j) \in G} x_i x_j = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\omega} \right). \quad (5)$$

We remark that the matrices $B_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ from Theorem 2 will have the following structure — to each B_i , we uniquely assign an index (s, t) from the adjacency matrix A_G of G , $1 \leq s < t \leq n$, such that B_i has all entries zero, except for entries (s, t) and (t, s) , which are set to the (s, t) th entry of A_G . We hence require $k = n(n-1)/2$ matrices B_i , as claimed by Theorem 2.

We now demonstrate the second link in Equation (3).

Lemma 4. *There exists a poly-time many-one reduction which maps instance $\Pi_1 = (k, l, B_1, \dots, B_k, \zeta, \eta)$ of RSDF to instance $\Pi_2 = (\mathbf{c}, \gamma)$ of $\text{WOPT}_\epsilon(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$, where we define for convenience $\Delta := \sqrt{2 \sum_{i=1}^k \|B_i\|_2^2}$, and such that:*

- $M = k + 1$
- $N = \frac{l(l-1)}{2} + 1$
- $\mathbf{c} = \hat{\mathbf{c}} / \|\hat{\mathbf{c}}\|_2$ for some $\hat{\mathbf{c}} \in \mathbb{Q}^m$ with $\|\hat{\mathbf{c}}\|_2 \in O(m^{1/2} \Delta)$ and $m = M^2 N^2 - 1$
- $\gamma = \frac{1}{2\|\hat{\mathbf{c}}\|_2} (\sqrt{\zeta + \eta} + \sqrt{\zeta - \eta})$
- $\epsilon \leq \frac{\sqrt{\zeta + \eta} - \sqrt{\zeta - \eta}}{4\|\hat{\mathbf{c}}\|_2(MN-1)+1}$

Proof. The heart of the mapping from Π_1 to Π_2 is given in Refs. [17, 19], and involves rephrasing the function $g(B_1, \dots, B_k)$ from RSDF in terms of convex optimization over the set of separable density matrices acting on $\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^N$. We briefly summarize this here for later reference. Let $M = k + 1$, $N = \frac{l(l-1)}{2} + 1$, and consider the matrix $C \in \mathbb{R}^{MN \times MN}$, such that

$$C := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & A_1 & \dots & A_{M-1} \\ A_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A_{M-1} & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

where each $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ is symmetric and all zeroes except for its upper-left $l \times l$ -dimensional submatrix, which we set to B_i . It is easy to see that $\|C\| = \Delta$, as defined in the statement of our claim. One can then write (Proposition 6.5 in Ref. [17]):

$$\sqrt{g(B_1, \dots, B_k)} = \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N, \|\mathbf{x}\|_2=1} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{M-1} (\mathbf{x}^T A_i \mathbf{x})^2} = \max_{\rho_{\text{sep}} \in D(\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^N)} \text{Tr}(C \rho_{\text{sep}}), \quad (7)$$

where ρ_{sep} denotes a separable density matrix. Thus, Π_1 is reduced to optimizing the linear objective function $\text{Tr}(C\rho)$ over all separable density matrices $\rho_{\text{sep}} \in D(\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^N)$. This concludes the referenced work of [17, 19].

What remains is to explicitly rephrase the problem in terms of Bloch vectors and apply simple convex geometric arguments to complete the reduction, as well as characterize scaling of the error parameter ϵ . To do so, first use Equation (4) and the fact that $\text{Tr}(C) = 0$ to write:

$$\text{Tr}(C\rho) = \text{Tr} \left(C \left(\frac{I}{MN} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{M^2 N^2 - 1} r_i \sigma_i \right) \right) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{M^2 N^2 - 1} r_i \cdot \text{Tr}(C \sigma_i) = \hat{\mathbf{c}}^T \mathbf{r}, \quad (8)$$

for σ_i the generators of $SU(MN)$, $\hat{c}_i := \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(C \sigma_i)$, and \mathbf{r} the Bloch vector of ρ . Set $m = M^2 N^2 - 1$, $\mathbf{c} = \hat{\mathbf{c}} / \|\hat{\mathbf{c}}\|_2$. In terms of Bloch vectors, our objective function $\text{Tr}(C\rho)$ in Equation (7) can hence be rephrased as $f(\mathbf{r}) := \mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{r}$, with $f_{\max} := \max_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}_{M,N}} f(\mathbf{r})$. We remark that unless C is the zero matrix (i.e. the input graph to CLIQUE has no edges), we have $\|\hat{\mathbf{c}}\|_2 > 0$. Also, since $\text{Tr}(\sigma_i \sigma_j) = 2\delta_{ij}$, it follows from Equation (8) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality that $\|\hat{\mathbf{c}}\|_2 \in O(m^{1/2} \Delta)$.

To complete the reduction, we now must show the following (for γ and ϵ to be chosen as needed): If $f_{\max} \geq \|\hat{\mathbf{c}}\|_2^{-1} \sqrt{\zeta + \eta}$, then there exists an $\mathbf{r} \in S(\mathcal{S}_{M,N}, -\epsilon)$ such that $f(\mathbf{r}) \geq \gamma + \epsilon$ (i.e. a ‘‘YES’’ instance of RSDF implies a ‘‘YES’’ instance of $\text{WOPT}_\epsilon(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$). If $f_{\max} \leq \|\hat{\mathbf{c}}\|_2^{-1} \sqrt{\zeta - \eta}$, then for all $\mathbf{r} \in S(\mathcal{S}_{M,N}, \epsilon)$, $f(\mathbf{r}) \leq \gamma - \epsilon$ (i.e. a ‘‘NO’’ instance of RSDF implies a ‘‘NO’’ instance of $\text{WOPT}_\epsilon(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$). The $\|\hat{\mathbf{c}}\|_2^{-1}$ term in these expressions follows from our definition of \mathbf{c} , and the square root in $\sqrt{\zeta + \eta}$ follows from the square root in Equation (7). We proceed case by case. Set $\gamma = \frac{1}{2\|\hat{\mathbf{c}}\|_2} (\sqrt{\zeta + \eta} + \sqrt{\zeta - \eta})$, and let us choose ϵ as needed.

- Case 1: $f_{\max} \geq \frac{1}{\|\hat{\mathbf{c}}\|_2} \sqrt{\zeta + \eta}$.

Let $\mathbf{r}^* \in \mathcal{S}_{M,N}$ be such that $f(\mathbf{r}^*) = f_{\max}$. To find an $\mathbf{r} \in S(\mathcal{S}_{M,N}, -\epsilon)$ such that $f(\mathbf{r}) \geq \gamma + \epsilon$, we first use the fact that for any well-bounded origin-centered convex set $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, it holds that for all $\mathbf{x} \in K$, there exists a $\mathbf{y} \in S(K, -\epsilon)$ such that $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_2 \leq 2\epsilon R/r$ [21] (where R and r are the radii of the ball containing K and the origin-centered ball contained within K , respectively). Plugging in the definitions of r and R for $\mathcal{S}_{M,N}$ from Section 2, it follows that there exists an $\mathbf{r} \in S(\mathcal{S}_{M,N}, -\epsilon)$ such that $\|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}^*\|_2 \leq 2(MN - 1)\epsilon$. Since f is linear, we can write:

$$|f(\mathbf{r}) - f(\mathbf{r}^*)| = |\mathbf{c}^T (\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}^*)| \leq \|\mathbf{c}\|_2 \|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}^*\|_2 \leq 2(MN - 1)\epsilon, \quad (9)$$

where the first inequality follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Thus, in order to have $f(\mathbf{r}) \geq \gamma + \epsilon$ as desired, it suffices to have

$$f(\mathbf{r}) \geq f_{\max} - 2(MN - 1)\epsilon \geq \gamma + \epsilon, \quad (10)$$

into which substitution of our values for γ and f_{\max} gives that setting

$$\epsilon \leq \frac{\sqrt{\zeta + \eta} - \sqrt{\zeta - \eta}}{4 \|\hat{\mathbf{c}}\|_2 (MN - 1) + 1} \quad (11)$$

suffices to conclude we have a “YES” instance of $\text{WOPT}_\epsilon(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$.

- Case 2: $f_{\max} \leq \frac{1}{\|\hat{\mathbf{c}}\|_2} \sqrt{\zeta - \eta}$.

We must show that for an appropriate choice of ϵ , we have $f(\mathbf{r}) \leq \gamma - \epsilon$ for all $\mathbf{r} \in S(\mathcal{S}_{M,N}, \epsilon)$. Set $\mathbf{r} \in S(\mathcal{S}_{M,N}, \epsilon)$. Then by the definition of $S(\mathcal{S}_{M,N}, \epsilon)$, there exists some $\mathbf{r}' \in \mathcal{S}_{M,N}$ such that $\|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'\|_2 \leq \epsilon$. By Equation (9), it follows that

$$|f(\mathbf{r}) - f(\mathbf{r}')| \leq \epsilon. \quad (12)$$

In the worst case, one has $f(\mathbf{r}') = f_{\max}$. Hence, by Equation (12), we have that $f(\mathbf{r}) \leq f_{\max} + \epsilon$ for any $\mathbf{r} \in S(\mathcal{S}_{M,N}, \epsilon)$. To achieve $f(\mathbf{r}) \leq \gamma - \epsilon$ then, set $f_{\max} + \epsilon \leq \gamma - \epsilon$, into which substitution of our values for γ and f_{\max} yields that choosing

$$\epsilon \leq \frac{\sqrt{\zeta + \eta} - \sqrt{\zeta - \eta}}{2 \|\hat{\mathbf{c}}\|_2 + 2} \quad (13)$$

suffices to conclude we have a “NO” instance of $\text{WOPT}_\epsilon(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$.

□

Observe that combining Theorem 2 and Lemma 4 gives $M = N = \frac{n(n-1)}{2} + 1$. Following an argument of Ioannou (Section 2.2.5 of Ref. [19]), one can likewise show Lemma 4 for $M \geq N$ by padding the matrix C from its proof with extra $N \times N$ -dimensional zero matrices. Thus, the hardness result we show for $\text{WMEM}_\beta(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$ by building on this link will be valid for $M \geq N$.

The last link of Equation (3) is given by applying the non-ellipsoidal Turing reduction of Liu [24], which holds for an arbitrary p -centered well-bounded compact convex set $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$.

Theorem 5 (Proposition 2.8 of Ref. [24]). *Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ be a convex, compact, and well-bounded p -centered set. Given an instance $\Pi = (K, \mathbf{c}, \gamma, \epsilon)$ of $\text{WOPT}_\epsilon(K)$, for K with associated parameters (R, r) , and $0 < \epsilon < 1$, there exists an algorithm which runs in time $\text{poly}(\langle K \rangle, R, \lceil 1/\epsilon \rceil)$, and solves Π using an oracle for $\text{WMEM}_\beta(K)$ with $\beta = r^3 \epsilon^3 / [2^{13} 3^3 m^5 R^4 (R + r)]$.*

The proof of this theorem is based largely on results by Grötschel *et al* [21] regarding convex optimization. Observe the dependence on $\lceil 1/\epsilon \rceil$ in the runtime of this reduction. We thus must be able to choose $\epsilon \geq 1/\text{poly}(m) \geq 1/\text{poly}(M, N)$ in order for our reduction chain of Equation (3) to run in polynomial time, where $m = M^2 N^2 - 1$ for $\mathcal{S}_{M,N}$. Let us show that we can solve our instance of CLIQUE with such a choice of ϵ . Specifically, by Lemma 4, we can set

$$\epsilon = \frac{\sqrt{\zeta + \eta} - \sqrt{\zeta - \eta}}{4 \|\hat{\mathbf{c}}\|_2 (MN - 1) + 1}. \quad (14)$$

Piecing together Lemma 2 and Lemma 4, we first immediately have $\zeta \in \Theta(1)$ and $\eta \in \Omega(1/N)$. It follows that for some positive constants $c_1, c_2, N_1,$ and $N_2,$ we have:

$$\sqrt{\zeta + \eta} - \sqrt{\zeta - \eta} \geq \sqrt{c_1 + \frac{c_2}{N}} - \sqrt{c_1 - \frac{c_2}{N}} \quad \forall N \geq \max(N_1, N_2) \quad (15)$$

$$= \frac{(c_1 + \frac{c_2}{N}) - (c_1 - \frac{c_2}{N})}{\sqrt{c_1 + \frac{c_2}{N}} + \sqrt{c_1 - \frac{c_2}{N}}} \quad (16)$$

$$\geq \frac{2c_2}{N(\sqrt{c_1 + c_2} + \sqrt{c_1})}. \quad (17)$$

Hence, $\sqrt{\zeta + \eta} - \sqrt{\zeta - \eta} \in \Omega(1/N)$. With a little thought, we also have that $\|\hat{\mathbf{c}}\|_2 \in O(\sqrt{N})$ (see Appendix A, Lemma 8). Plugging these bounds into Equation (14) yields that we can solve an instance of CLIQUE with $\epsilon \in \Omega(M^{-1}N^{-5/2})$, as desired.

Combining Theorem 2, Lemma 4, and Theorem 5, we thus have a polynomial time Turing reduction from CLIQUE to $\text{WMEM}_\beta(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$. To show that this implies *strong* NP-hardness of $\text{WMEM}_\beta(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$, it remains to ensure that $\beta \geq 1/\text{poly}(M, N)$. Substituting our values for $r, R,$ and m for $\mathcal{S}_{M,N}$ into the expression for β in Theorem 5, we have $\beta = \text{poly}(M^{-1}, N^{-1}, \epsilon)$. By our choice of ϵ above, we thus have $\beta \geq 1/\text{poly}(M, N)$, as required. We hence state:

Theorem 6. *Given instance $\Pi = (G, n, c)$ of CLIQUE, there exists an algorithm which solves Π in time $\text{poly}(n)$ using an oracle for $\text{WMEM}_\beta(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$ with parameters $M = N = \frac{n(n-1)}{2} + 1$ and some $\beta \in \Omega(n^{-73})$. More generally, for $N = \frac{n(n-1)}{2} + 1$ and any choice of $M \geq N$, the result holds for some $\beta \in \Omega(M^{-16}N^{-20.5})$.*

Theorem 1 (revised). $\text{WMEM}_\beta(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$ is NP-hard for $M \geq N$ and $\beta \leq \text{poly}(M^{-16}N^{-20.5})$, or equivalently, is strongly NP-hard.

We stress the phrase “*some $\beta \in \Omega(n^{-73})$ ”* in the statement of Theorem 6 above — specifically, we cannot have $\beta \in O(1)$ in our reduction, due, for example, to the expression for ϵ in Lemma 4. We remark that the major contributor to the large negative exponent on n in the estimate for β is the reduction of Theorem 5. In Section 5, we briefly discuss a possible alternate reduction from $\text{WOPT}_\epsilon(K)$ to $\text{WMEM}_\beta(K)$ based on random walks, as suggested by Liu [24], which may lead to a better estimate for β .

4 Applications

We propose two applications of Theorem 6, both of which benefit from improved hardness estimates for β such as those shown here, and to our knowledge were not previously known. In this section, for simplicity of exposition we revert back to letting $\mathcal{S}_{M,N}$ denote the set of density matrices corresponding to separable quantum states in $D(\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^N)$. By Lemma 8 in Appendix A, distances in the respective spaces are asymptotically equivalent. First, one immediately has a lower bound on the maximum distance a bound entangled state can have from $\mathcal{S}_{M,N}$, assuming $\text{P} \neq \text{NP}$. To see this, recall that bound entangled states are mixed entangled quantum states from which no pure (state) entanglement can be distilled [27], and are the only entangled states whose entanglement is capable of escaping detection by the Peres-Horodecki Positive Partial Transpose (PPT) [26, 9]

criterion¹. Theorem 1 implies that unless $P = NP$, any test of membership for $\mathcal{S}_{M,N}$ must be unable to efficiently resolve $\mathcal{S}_{M,N}$ within distance $\beta \in \Omega(M^{-16}N^{-20.5})$ of its border in the general case. It follows that unless $P = NP$, there must exist bound entangled state(s) $\rho_{be} \in D(\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^N)$ such that for any separable state $\rho_{sep} \in \mathcal{S}_{M,N}$, $\|\rho_{be} - \rho_{sep}\|_2 \in \Omega(M^{-16}N^{-20.5})$ — if not, one could determine the separability of any quantum state within this region using the PPT test, contradicting Theorem 1. Further improvements to our hardness estimate for β would directly benefit this application.

Second, via the Jamiolkowski isomorphism [28], we show that the problem of determining whether a completely positive (CP) trace-preserving (TP) linear map (i.e. a quantum channel) is entanglement-breaking (EB) is NP-hard. Intuitively, an EB map is one which, given any density operator as input, outputs a separable density operator. EB channels are well-studied [33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38]. To define the Jamiolkowski isomorphism, let $H_{MN,MN}$ denote the set of linear operators mapping $(\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^N) \otimes (\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^N)$ to itself, where the second tensor product is between subsystems A and B , and let $\mathcal{S}_{MN,MN} \subset H_{MN,MN}$ denote the subset of separable density operators. Then, for any linear map $\Phi : H_{M,N} \mapsto H_{M,N}$, there exists a unique operator in $H_{MN,MN}$ given by the Jamiolkowski isomorphism [28], denoted $J(\Phi)$, such that:

$$J(\Phi) := [\Phi \otimes I] (|\phi^+\rangle\langle\phi^+|), \quad (18)$$

where $|\phi^+\rangle$ is the maximally entangled state $|\phi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{MN}} \sum_{k=0}^{MN-1} |k\rangle \otimes |k\rangle$, for $\{|k\rangle\}_{k=0}^{MN-1}$ an arbitrary orthonormal basis for $\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^N$. If and only if Φ is CP, then $J(\Phi)$ is positive semidefinite [39], and if and only if Φ is TP, then $\text{Tr}_A(J(\Phi)) = I/MN$ [16].

We can now relate EB maps to separable states by formally defining the former.

Definition 5 (Entanglement-Breaking (EB) Map [29]). Given a CP linear map $\Phi : H_{M,N} \mapsto H_{M,N}$, the following are equivalent:

1. Φ is entanglement-breaking (EB).
2. $J(\Phi)$ is separable.
3. Φ can be written $\Phi(\rho) = \sum_i \sigma_i \text{Tr}(F_i \rho)$, for σ_i density matrices and $\{F_i\}_i$ positive semidefinite.
4. Φ can be written $\Phi(\rho) = \sum_i K_i \rho K_i^\dagger$ for Kraus operators [40] K_i strictly of rank 1, and such that $\sum_i K_i^\dagger K_i < I$.
5. $\Gamma \circ \Phi$ and $\Phi \circ \Gamma$ are completely positive for all positive maps Γ .

By point (2) of Def. 5 and Theorem 6, determining whether a given CP (but not necessarily TP) map Φ has any of the above properties is immediately strongly NP-hard — this includes determining if Φ is EB. The question remains whether this hardness result still holds for the restricted case of quantum channels, i.e. when we demand that Φ also be TP. The latter are an important case of interest, as channels correspond to physically realizable processes. In the above definition, demanding that Φ be TP adds the following constraints (to each point, respectively) [29]: $\text{Tr}_A(J(\Phi)) = I/MN$, $\{F_i\}_i$ is a Positive Operator Valued Measure, $\sum_i K_i^\dagger K_i = I$, and Γ is TP.

¹The converse question of whether *all* bound entangled states escape such detection by the PPT test is, however, a major open question [14].

Showing the desired NP-hardness result for EB channels thus reduces to determining whether QUSEP remains NP-hard when subsystem B of the input is promised to be maximally mixed.

To show NP-hardness for QUSEP in this restricted case, we sketch a many-one reduction from determining separability of an arbitrary quantum state to determining separability of a state with a maximally mixed subsystem. Specifically, given a quantum state $\rho \in D(\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^N)$, and an oracle Q which efficiently determines whether any quantum state $\sigma \in D(\mathbb{C}^{M'} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{N'})$ with $\text{Tr}_A(\sigma) = I/M'N'$ (for any $M', N' \geq 2$) is separable or not, we can determine the separability of ρ as follows (omitting normalization for simplicity):

1. If $\text{Tr}_A(\rho) = I$, input ρ into Q and return Q 's answer.
2. Else, consider the map $\Phi(\rho) := (1-p)|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \rho + p|1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes I$, where $p \in (0, 1)$, and the added ancilla is a single qubit system. Let the joint system of the ancilla and A be denoted A' , and set $\rho' = \Phi(\rho)$.
3. Let $\rho'_B = \text{Tr}_{A'}(\rho')$. Consider the stochastic map $\Upsilon(\rho') = \left(I \otimes \rho'_B^{-1/2}\right) \rho' \left(I \otimes \rho'_B^{-1/2}\right)$. Call Q with input $\Upsilon(\rho')$, and return Q 's answer.

Let us briefly discuss why this works. Step 1 is straightforward. In Step 3, the stochastic local operations and classical communication (LOCC) map Υ is an example of a *local filter* (as first considered in [41]), and ensures $\text{Tr}_{A'}(\Upsilon(\rho')) = I/2MN$, allowing us to call the oracle on its output. Observe that since Υ can be inverted with non-zero probability, $\Upsilon(\rho')$ is entangled if and only if ρ' is, since LOCC operations cannot create entanglement from scratch. It remains to analyze Step 2. Observe that if $\text{Tr}_A(\rho)$ is full rank and does not have a high condition number², then ρ_B could be inverted directly in Step 3, skipping Step 2. This will not in general be the case, however, and so the LOCC map Φ in Step 2 maps ρ to a higher dimensional state for which $\text{Tr}_{A'}(\rho')$ is full rank and as well-conditioned as we like (since one can choose any $p \in (0, 1)$), allowing us to execute Step 3. Further, Φ is reversible with non-zero probability by performing a von Neumann measurement on the ancilla system in the computational basis. Hence, $\Phi(\rho)$ is entangled across the A'/B split if and only if ρ is entangled across the A/B split (observe that the addition of the ancilla in this fashion cannot generate entanglement between the ancilla and system A). Given Q , this procedure hence determines the separability of any $\rho \in D(\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^N)$. Thus, QUSEP is still NP-hard if its input has a maximally mixed subsystem, and so determining if a quantum channel is EB is also NP-hard.

A few remarks are in order. The argument above shows NP-hardness of determining whether a channel is EB. To extend this to strong NP-hardness, one must formulate a more rigorous argument based on the Weak Membership formulations of these problems. Specifically, given a promise that the input ρ is β away from the border of $\mathcal{S}_{M,N}$, one must lower bound the distance of $\Upsilon(\rho')$ from the border of $\mathcal{S}_{2M,N}$ in order to determine the size of the hardness gap for the latter problem. This may prove difficult, as ρ' lives in a different space than ρ . We leave this as an open problem.

Finally, we remark that although we have assumed here that the input map Φ is specified in Jamiołkowski form, it is typically straightforward to move to another representation, such as the Kraus representation. For example, the canonical³ way to determine a Kraus representation for Φ

²The condition number [42] of a matrix C can be defined $\kappa(C) = \|C\| \|C^{-1}\|$, where (for example) $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the operator norm. It is used as an indicator of how prone a linear system $C\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$ is to error upon inverting C . The lower the condition number, the better, with singular C having by convention $\kappa(C) = \infty$.

³Unlike the Jamiołkowski representation, the Kraus representation is not unique.

given the Jamiołkowski form $J(\Phi)$ is to reshuffle the eigenvectors of $J(\Phi)$ into matrices (i.e. Kraus operators) K_i . We refer the reader to [16] for further details.

5 Concluding Comments

We have shown that the problem of Weak Membership over the set of separable quantum states $\mathcal{S}_{M,N}$ is strongly NP-hard, implying it is NP-hard even if one allows “moderate” error, i.e. $\beta \leq 1/\text{poly}(M, N)$. This shows that it is NP-hard to determine whether an arbitrary quantum state within an inverse polynomial distance from the separable set is entangled. The main open problem we pose is whether $\text{WMEM}_\beta(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$ remains NP-hard for $\beta \in O(1)$. More ambitiously, of course, one could ask whether it is possible to determine *precisely* how large β can be before NP-hardness of $\text{WMEM}_\beta(\mathcal{S}_{M,N})$ ceases to hold.

One possible approach to improving our estimate for β , following a suggestion of Liu [24], may be to replace the reduction of Theorem 5 with the Bertsimas-Vempala random walk algorithm for convex optimization [25]. The latter solves optimization problems over a convex set K given a membership oracle for K . This alone, however, would *not* suffice to improve our hardness estimate to $\beta \in O(1)$, as an inverse dependence on the dimension is already introduced in reducing CLIQUE to RSDF (i.e. the first link of the reduction chain). We refer the interested reader to [25, 24] for further details regarding this alternate approach.

6 Acknowledgements

We thank the following: Ben Toner for ideas which spurred this line of thought, Richard Cleve and Stephen Vavasis for helpful discussions, John Watrous and Marco Piani for bringing local filters to our attention, and anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments in shaping this work. This work was partially supported by Canada’s NSERC, CIAR and MITACS.

Note: Shortly after we first posted the results herein, Beigi [43] showed a reduction from 2-out-of-4 SAT which can also be used to obtain a result similar to Theorem 1. The question of NP-hardness for $\beta \in O(1)$, however, unfortunately remains open.

A Appendix

Lemma 7. *Given density operators $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in D(\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^N)$, with corresponding Bloch vectors $\vec{\alpha}$ and $\vec{\beta}$ given by equations $\rho_1 = \frac{I}{MN} + \frac{1}{2}\vec{\alpha} \cdot \vec{\sigma}$ and $\rho_2 = \frac{I}{MN} + \frac{1}{2}\vec{\beta} \cdot \vec{\sigma}$ (as per Equation (4)), respectively, we have $\|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \|\vec{\alpha} - \vec{\beta}\|_2$.*

Proof. Via straightforward manipulation and the fact that $\text{Tr}(\sigma_i \sigma_j) = 2\delta_{ij}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_2 &= \frac{1}{2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{M^2 N^2 - 1} (\alpha_i - \beta_i) \sigma_i \right\|_2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\text{Tr} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{M^2 N^2 - 1} (\alpha_i - \beta_i) \sigma_i \right)^\dagger \left(\sum_{j=1}^{M^2 N^2 - 1} (\alpha_j - \beta_j) \sigma_j \right) \right]} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1, j=1}^{M^2 N^2 - 1} (\alpha_i - \beta_i)(\alpha_j - \beta_j) 2\delta_{ij}} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \|\vec{\alpha} - \vec{\beta}\|_2
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 8. *Combining Theorem 2 and Lemma 4 gives $\|\hat{\mathbf{c}}\|_2 \in O(\sqrt{N})$.*

Proof. By definition, we have:

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{c}}\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \left[\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(C \sigma_i) \right]^2}, \quad (19)$$

where $m = M^2 N^2 - 1$. Recall now the definition of C from Equation (6), where in our case, each $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ is all zeroes except for its upper left corner, which is set to submatrix $B_i \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l}$ from Theorem 2. Each B_i in turn is all zeroes, except for some index (k, l) (and hence (l, k) , by symmetry), $1 \leq k < l \leq n$, which is set to the (k, l) th entry of the adjacency matrix A_G of graph G (see Theorem 2 and ensuing discussion). We also require an explicit construction for the generators σ_i of $SU(MN)$, given for example in [18], where $\{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^{M^2 N^2 - 1} = \{U_{pq}, V_{pq}, W_r\}$, such that for $1 \leq p < q \leq MN$ and $1 \leq r \leq MN - 1$, and $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^{MN}$ an orthonormal basis for Hilbert space \mathcal{H}^{MN} :

$$U_{pq} = \mathbf{x}_p \mathbf{x}_q^\dagger + \mathbf{x}_q \mathbf{x}_p^\dagger \quad (20)$$

$$V_{pq} = -i \mathbf{x}_p \mathbf{x}_q^\dagger + i \mathbf{x}_q \mathbf{x}_p^\dagger \quad (21)$$

$$W_r = \sqrt{\frac{2}{r(r+1)}} \left[\left(\sum_{k=1}^r \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\dagger \right) - r \mathbf{x}_{r+1} \mathbf{x}_{r+1}^\dagger \right]. \quad (22)$$

Due to the symmetry of C and the fact that $\text{Tr}(C) = 0$, it is clear that only the generators of the form U_{pq} will contribute to the sum in Equation (19). Further, for each edge in G , $\text{Tr}(C U_{pq}) = 2$ for each U_{pq} whose non-zero indices match those of the entries in C corresponding to that edge. Since each edge contributes four (symmetrically placed) entries of 1 to C , we hence have $\|\hat{\mathbf{c}}\|_2 = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(2\hat{e})^2} = \sqrt{2\hat{e}}$, where \hat{e} denotes the number of edges in G . Since $\hat{e} \in O(n^2)$ (n the number of vertices in G), and $N \in \Theta(n^2)$, we have $\|\hat{\mathbf{c}}\|_2 \in O(\sqrt{N})$, as required. □

References

- [1] E. Schrödinger. Discussion of probability relations between separated systems. *Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc.*, 31:555–563, 1935.
- [2] C. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Josza, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters. Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen channels. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 70:1895–1899, 1993.
- [3] C. H. Bennett and S. J. Wiesner. Communication via one- and two-particle operators on Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen states. *Phys. Rev.*, 47:777, 1935.
- [4] P. Shor. Algorithms for quantum computation: discrete logarithms and factoring. In *Proc. of 35th Ann. Symp. on Found. of Comp. Sci.*, pages 124–134, 1994.
- [5] R. Cleve and H. Buhrman. Substituting quantum entanglement for communication. *Phys. Rev. A*, 56:1201–1204, 1997.
- [6] L. K. Grover. Quantum telecomputation. arXiv:quant-ph/9704012v2, 1997.
- [7] A. Ekert. Quantum cryptography based on Bell’s theorem. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 67:661–663, 1991.
- [8] A. Peres. Separability criterion for density matrices. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 77(8), 1996.
- [9] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki. Separability of mixed states: necessary and sufficient conditions. *Phys. Lett. A*, 223(1):1–8, 1996.
- [10] M. J. Donald, M. Horodecki, and O. Rudolph. The uniqueness theorem for entanglement measures. *J. Math. Phys.*, 43:4252–4272, 2002.
- [11] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters. Mixed-state entanglement and quantum error correction. *Phys. Rev. A*, 54:3824, 1996.
- [12] V. Vedral, M. B. Plenio, M. A. Rippin, and P. L. Knight. Quantifying entanglement. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 78:2275, 1997.
- [13] G. Vidal and R. F. Werner. Computable measure of entanglement. *Phys. Rev. A*, 65:032314, 2002.
- [14] D. Bruß. Characterizing entanglement. *J. of Math. Phys.*, 43(9), 2002.
- [15] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki. Quantum entanglement. arXiv:quant-ph/0702225v2, 2007.
- [16] I. Bengtsson and K. Życzkowski. *Geometry of Quantum States: An Introduction to Quantum Entanglement*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [17] L. Gurvits. Classical deterministic complexity of edmonds problem and quantum entanglement. In *Proc. of the 35th ACM symp. on Theory of comp.*, pages 10–19, New York, 2003. ACM Press.
- [18] G. Kimura. The Bloch vector for N-level systems. *Phys. Lett. A*, 314(5):339–349, 2003.

- [19] L. Ioannou. Computational complexity of the quantum separability problem. *Quant. Inf. and Comp.*, 7(4):335, 2007.
- [20] M. Garey and D. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-completeness*. W.H. Freeman and Company, New York, 1979.
- [21] M. Grötschel, L. Lovász, and A. Schrijver. *Geometric Algorithms and Combinatorial Optimization*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988.
- [22] D. B. Yudin and A. S. Nemirovskii. Informational complexity and efficient methods for the solution of convex extremal problems (in Russian). *Ekonomika i Matematicheskie Metody*, 12:357–369, 1976.
- [23] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the theory of NP-completeness*. W. H. Freeman and Company, New York, 1979.
- [24] Y.K. Liu. The complexity of the consistency and N-representability problems for quantum states. <http://arxiv.org/abs/0712.3041>, 2007. PhD Thesis.
- [25] D. Bertsimas and S. Vempala. Solving convex programs by random walks. *J. of the ACM*, 51(4), 2004.
- [26] A. Peres. Separability criterion for density matrices. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 77:1413, 1996.
- [27] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki. Mixed-state entanglement and distillation: Is there a “bound” entanglement in nature? *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 80(24):5239–5242, 1998.
- [28] A. Jamiołkowski. Linear transformations which preserve trace and positive semi-definiteness of operators. *Rep. Math. Phys.*, 3:275, 1972.
- [29] M. Horodecki, P. W. Shor, and M. B. Ruskai. Entanglement breaking channels. *Rev. Math. Phys.*, 15:629, 2003.
- [30] L. Gurvits and H. Barnum. Largest separable balls around the maximally mixed bipartite quantum state. *Phys. Rev. A*, 66(6):062311, 2002.
- [31] E. B. Vinberg. *Linear Representations of Groups*. Birkhäuser Basel, 1989.
- [32] T. S. Motzkin and E. G. Straus. Maxima for graphs and a new proof of a theorem of Túrán. *Canadian J. Math.*, 17:533–540, 1965.
- [33] M. B. Ruskai. Qubit entanglement breaking channels. *Rev. Math. Phys.*, 15:643, 2003.
- [34] C. King. Maximization of capacity and lp norms for some product channels. *J. Math. Phys.*, 43:1247, 2002.
- [35] P. Shor. Additivity of the classical capacity of entanglement-breaking quantum channels. *J. Math. Phys.*, 43:4334, 2002.
- [36] C. King. Maximal p-norms of entanglement breaking channels. *Quant. Inf. and Comp.*, 3:186, 2003.

- [37] A. S. Holevo, M. E. Shirokov, and R. F. Werner. Separability and entanglement-breaking in infinite dimensions. *Russian. Math Surveys*, 60, 2005.
- [38] A. S. Holevo. Entanglement-breaking channels in infinite dimensions. arXiv:0802.0235v1, 2008.
- [39] M.-D. Choi. Completely positive linear maps on complex matrices. *Linear Alg. Appl.*, 10:285, 1975.
- [40] K. Kraus. General state changes in quantum theory. *Ann. Phys.*, 64:311, 1971.
- [41] N. Gisin. Hidden quantum nonlocality revealed by local filters. *Phys. Lett. A*, 210(3):151–156(6), 1996.
- [42] L. Hogben (editor). *Handbook of Linear Algebra*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2007.
- [43] S. Beigi. NP vs QMA_{log}(2). arXiv:0810.5109v1, 2008.