

Compatibility conditions on local and global spectra for n -mode Gaussian states

J. Solomon Ivan* and R. Simon†

The Institute of Mathematical Sciences,

CIT Campus, Taramani, Chennai 600 113, India

(Dated: November 15, 2008)

Abstract

Compatibility conditions between the (global) spectrum of an n -mode Gaussian state and the spectra of the individual modes are presented, making optimal use of beam splitter and (two-mode) squeezing transformations. An unexpected by-product of our elementary approach is the result that every two-mode Gaussian state is uniquely determined, modulo local transformations, by its global spectrum and local spectra – a property shared not even by a pair of qubits.

arXiv:0812.2805v1 [quant-ph] 15 Dec 2008

*Electronic address: solomon@imsc.res.in

†Electronic address: simon@imsc.res.in

The quantum marginal problem has attracted considerable interest in quantum information theory [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]. Given a multipartite system, it asks: what kind of spectra for the subsystem density operators are consistent with a given spectrum for the density operator of the full system? The Gaussian quantum marginal problem (detailed below) has been solved recently [10, 11] (As noted in Ref. [11], the three-mode case was known earlier [12]). Our approach to this problem makes effective use of beam splitter and two-mode squeezing transformations. In the case of two modes it is shown that *every Gaussian state is uniquely determined, modulo local canonical transformations, by its global spectrum and local spectra; in particular, the entanglement is fully determined by these spectra.*

Consider a Gaussian state of a system of n -modes, represented by density operator $\hat{\rho}$. The mean values of the position and momentum variables q_j, p_j have no role to play in our considerations, and so we assume that these mean values vanish. Such a zero-mean Gaussian state is fully described by its $2n \times 2n$ covariance matrix V .

The reduced state $\hat{\rho}_j$ of the j^{th} mode, obtained by tracing out from $\hat{\rho}$ all other modes, is also a zero-mean Gaussian state. With the phase space variables assumed arranged in the order $q_1, p_1; q_2, p_2; \dots; q_n, p_n$ the j^{th} 2×2 block along the leading diagonal of V represents precisely the covariance matrix of the reduced state $\hat{\rho}_j$. Through (independent) local canonical transformations $\in Sp(2, R)$ on each mode we make all the 2×2 blocks along the diagonal of V multiples of identity. The covariance matrix of the j^{th} mode will then be of the form $\text{diag}(m_j, m_j)$. It corresponds to a thermal state, with temperature $T(m_j)$ which is a monotone increasing function of m_j . Being thermal, $\hat{\rho}_j$ has the spectral resolution $\hat{\rho}_j = [1 - \xi(m_j)] \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \xi(m_j)^{n_{jk}} |n_{jk}\rangle \langle n_{jk}|$. The parameter $\xi(m_j)$ is another monotone increasing function of m_j , and $|n_{jk}\rangle$'s are the energy eigenstates of the j^{th} oscillator. Clearly, the eigenvalue spectra of the $\hat{\rho}_j$'s are determined by, and determine, the *local spectral parameters* m_j .

Using an appropriate (nonlocal) canonical transformation $S \in Sp(2n, R)$ the covariance matrix V can be decoupled and brought into the canonical form $V^{(0)}$ of independent oscillators in thermal states [13]: $V^{(0)} = SVS^T = \text{diag}(\kappa_1, \kappa_1; \kappa_2, \kappa_2; \dots; \kappa_n, \kappa_n)$. The associated density operator $\hat{\rho}^{(0)}$ thus has the spectral decomposition

$$\hat{\rho}^{(0)} = \prod_{j=1}^n [1 - \xi(\kappa_j)] \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \xi(\kappa_j)^{n_{jk}} |n_{jk}\rangle \langle n_{jk}|. \quad (1)$$

Since $\hat{\rho}^{(0)}$ and the original $\hat{\rho}$ are unitarily related, the spectrum of $\hat{\rho}$ is the same as that

of $\hat{\rho}^{(0)}$. It is clear that this global spectrum and the n -tuple of *global spectral parameters* $(\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \dots, \kappa_n)$ determine each other.

We may now ask what are the constraints connecting the global spectrum of a Gaussian state to its local spectra. In view of the invertible relationships just noted this *Gaussian quantum marginal problem* is equivalent to seeking the compatibility constraints between the global spectral parameters $\{\kappa_j\}$ and the local spectral parameters $\{m_j\}$. Interestingly, the answer can be given in the form of necessary and sufficient conditions.

Theorem: Let $m = (m_1, m_2, m_3, \dots, m_n)$ and $\kappa = (\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \dots, \kappa_n)$ be the local and global spectral parameters of an n -mode Gaussian state, written in nondecreasing order. These are compatible iff

$$\sum_{j=1}^k m_j \geq \sum_{j=1}^k \kappa_j, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n, \quad (2)$$

$$m_n - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} m_j \leq \kappa_n - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \kappa_j. \quad (3)$$

Remarks: What this claim means can be clarified by stating it in two parts. Suppose a Gaussian state is given. Its local spectral parameters m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n , and global spectral parameters $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \dots, \kappa_n$ are certain to meet these inequalities (with $\kappa_1 \geq 1$). Conversely, given a set of local and global spectral parameters meeting these inequalities (with $\kappa_1 \geq 1$), we can certainly construct a physical Gaussian state with these parameters.

The first part of the theorem was essentially proved by Hiroshima [10]. But the full theorem in this form was formulated by Eisert et al. [11] who presented an inductive proof for the second part. Our proof of both parts will be seen to be constructive, consistent with the elementary nature of the theorem, and *it rests in an essential manner on a fuller appreciation of the two-mode situation.*

Given two vectors $m, \kappa \in R^n$, we will say κ *dominates* m if m and κ , *after their components are rearranged in the nondecreasing order*, obey the set of $n + 1$ inequalities (2), (3). This definition is such that *permutation of the components of m or κ does not affect dominance*. Thus $(9, 7, 8, 6, 12, 11, 10)$ is dominated by $(5, 2, 18, 4, 1, 12, 3)$, since $(1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 18)$ manifestly dominates $(6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)$. Further, dominance so defined is transitive: κ dominates m , and m dominates m' , together imply κ dominates m' .

In the Schur-Horn case [14] wherein m corresponds to the diagonal entries of a hermitian matrix and κ to its eigenvalues, the last inequality in (2) becomes an equality. It is clear

that (3) is subsumed by (2) in that case.

The case of two modes: This case is of interest in its own right. Further, it possesses an aspect which seems to be unique, not shared by any other system. Finally, our analysis of the n -mode case relies critically on repeated applications of the two-mode result. Hence we begin with a direct proof of the theorem in the two-mode case.

Lemma: The parameters $m_1 \leq m_2$ and $1 \leq \kappa_1 \leq \kappa_2$ are compatible for two-mode Gaussian states iff

$$\begin{aligned} m_1 + m_2 &\geq \kappa_1 + \kappa_2, \\ m_2 - m_1 &\leq \kappa_2 - \kappa_1. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Note that the condition $m_1 \geq \kappa_1$ is subsumed by (4).

Proof of Lemma: The covariance matrix can, through local unitary (canonical) transformation $\in Sp(2, R) \times Sp(2, R)$, be brought to the form

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} m_1 & 0 & k_x & 0 \\ 0 & m_1 & 0 & k_p \\ k_x & 0 & m_2 & 0 \\ 0 & k_p & 0 & m_2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5}$$

The global spectral parameters κ_1, κ_2 are related to the local m_1, m_2 through the symplectic invariants [13]

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\Omega V \Omega^T V) &= \kappa_1^2 + \kappa_2^2 = m_1^2 + m_2^2 + 2k_x k_p, \\ \det V &= (\kappa_1 \kappa_2)^2 = (m_1 m_2 - k_x^2)(m_1 m_2 - k_p^2). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

These immediately imply

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_1 \kappa_2 &\leq m_1 m_2, \\ \kappa_1^2 + \kappa_2^2 &\geq m_1^2 + m_2^2, \quad \text{if } k_x k_p \geq 0, \\ \kappa_1^2 + \kappa_2^2 &\leq m_1^2 + m_2^2, \quad \text{if } k_x k_p \leq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

equality in the first inequality holding if $k_x = 0 = k_p$. These inequalities imply

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_2 - \kappa_1 &\geq m_2 - m_1, \quad \text{when } k_x k_p \geq 0, \\ \kappa_2 + \kappa_1 &\leq m_2 + m_1, \quad \text{when } k_x k_p \leq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

This much is immediate from the symplectic invariants. What remain to be proved are : $\kappa_2 - \kappa_1 \geq m_2 - m_1$ when $k_x k_p \leq 0$ and $\kappa_2 + \kappa_1 \geq m_2 + m_1$ when $k_x k_p \geq 0$.

To prove these we reinterpret (6) as simultaneous expressions for k_x, k_p in terms of $\kappa_1, \kappa_2; m_1, m_2$:

$$k_x k_p = [(\kappa_1^2 + \kappa_2^2) - (m_1^2 + m_2^2)]/2, \quad (9)$$

$$k_x^2 + k_p^2 = \frac{1}{m_1 m_2} [m_1^2 m_2^2 - \kappa_1^2 \kappa_2^2 + k_x^2 k_p^2]. \quad (10)$$

It is clear that real solutions for k_x and k_p will exist iff ‘ $k_x^2 + k_p^2$ ’ \geq ‘ $2|k_x k_p|$ ’. That is, iff

$$m_1 m_2 - |k_x k_p| \geq \kappa_1 \kappa_2. \quad (11)$$

With use of (9) for $k_x k_p$, this last condition reads

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_2 - \kappa_1 &\geq m_2 - m_1, \quad \text{when } k_x k_p \leq 0, \\ \kappa_2 + \kappa_1 &\leq m_2 + m_1, \quad \text{when } k_x k_p \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Proof of the Lemma is thus complete.

Two types of simple transformations on any pair of modes characterised by annihilation operators a_j, a_k deserve particular mention; they play a key role in our proof of the theorem. The first, S_θ , corresponds to the *compact* transformations $a_j \rightarrow \cos \theta a_j + \sin \theta a_k, a_k \rightarrow -\sin \theta a_j + \cos \theta a_k$, and therefore is represented by $S_\theta = \cos \theta \sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_0 + \sin \theta i \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_0 \in Sp(4, R)$, $0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$, where σ_0 is the 2×2 unit matrix and σ_2 is the antisymmetric Pauli matrix. Physically, S_θ is a *beam splitter with transmittivity* $\cos^2 \theta$. The second one, S_μ , is *noncompact* and corresponds to squeezing transformations $a_j \rightarrow \cosh \mu a_j + \sinh \mu a_k^\dagger, a_k \rightarrow \cosh \mu a_k + \sinh \mu a_j^\dagger$, and is represented by $S_\mu = \cosh \mu \sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_0 + \sinh \mu \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_3 \in Sp(4, R)$, $0 \leq \mu < \infty$.

It is easily verified that when the covariance matrix V , Eq. (5), has $k_p = k_x \equiv k$, it can be diagonalized by the beam splitter transformation $V \rightarrow S_\theta V S_\theta^T$, with θ fixed through $\tan 2\theta = 2k/(m_2 - m_1)$. And $\kappa_2 + \kappa_1$ will precisely equal $m_2 + m_1$ in this case. Similarly, if $k_p = -k_x = k > 0$, then V is diagonalized by the squeezing transformation $V \rightarrow S_\mu V S_\mu^T$, with $\tanh 2\mu = 2k/(m_2 + m_1)$, and one will find $\kappa_2 - \kappa_1 = m_2 - m_1$ in this case.

Conversely, suppose we start with the canonical form $V^{(0)} = \text{diag}(\kappa_1, \kappa_1; \kappa_2, \kappa_2)$, and we wish to achieve through symplectic congruence $V^{(0)} \rightarrow S V^{(0)} S^T$, $S \in Sp(4, R)$, a covariance matrix with diagonals m_1, m_2 . If $m_1 < m_2$ are such that $m_2 < \kappa_2$ and $\kappa_2 + \kappa_1 = m_2 + m_1$,

such a *redistribution* of κ_1, κ_2 among m_1, m_2 can always be achieved through a beam splitter transformation S_θ . Under S_θ we have $m_2 + m_1 = \kappa_2 + \kappa_1$ and $m_2 - m_1 = \cos 2\theta (\kappa_2 - \kappa_1)$. On the other hand, if $m_2 > \kappa_2$ and $\kappa_2 - \kappa_1 = m_2 - m_1$, so that κ_1 and κ_2 are enhanced by equal amounts to m_1, m_2 , this can be achieved through a squeezing transformation S_μ . Under S_μ we have $m_2 - m_1 = \kappa_2 - \kappa_1$ and $m_2 + m_1 = \cosh 2\mu (\kappa_2 + \kappa_1)$.

Our Lemma is similar to Lemma 5 of Ref. [11], but our proof is direct and constructive. There is an important distinction in content as well: while theirs claims that $m_2 - m_1 = \kappa_2 - \kappa_1$ iff $m_2 = \kappa_2$ and $m_1 = \kappa_1$, we have just demonstrated that if $m_2 - m_1 = \kappa_2 - \kappa_1$ then $m_2 + m_1$ could equal $\cosh 2\mu (\kappa_2 + \kappa_1)$ for any $0 \leq \mu < \infty$, not just $\mu = 0$. Indeed, this distinction is central to Stage 2 of our proof of the second part of the main theorem, the part which distinguishes the present symplectic situation from the Schur-Horn case.

Returning to Eq. (10), if we are given values for the expressions ‘ $a^2 + b^2$ ’ and ‘ ab ’ with $a^2 + b^2 \geq 2|ab|$, the solution for (a, b) is *unique* [(a, b) and (b, a) are not distinct solutions for our purpose]. This innocent looking observation leads to a surprising conclusion.

Proposition: Specification of the local and global spectra of a two-mode Gaussian state determines *uniquely* the state itself, modulo local unitary transformations.

States of a pair of qubits share a similarity with two-mode Gaussian states in important respects. For instance, positivity under partial transpose is a necessary and sufficient condition for separability and nondistillability in both cases. But a statement analogous to the above proposition is not true for a pair of qubits!

Proof of main theorem: Assume we are given a (zero-mean) Gaussian state, or equivalently, an acceptable covariance matrix V , the 2×2 blocks along the leading diagonal of V being of the form $\text{diag}(m_j, m_j)$. The global spectral parameters $\{\kappa_j\}$ are immediately defined by V [13]. It is assumed that $m = (m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n)$ and $\kappa = (\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \dots, \kappa_n)$ are arranged in nondecreasing order. Let P_κ denote the product $\kappa_1 \kappa_2 \dots \kappa_n$ and let $P_m = m_1 m_2 \dots m_n$. Clearly, $P_\kappa = \det V \leq P_m$, equality holding iff V is diagonal, i.e., iff $m_j = \kappa_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Our task is to prove that κ dominates m .

Choose a pair $1 \leq j < k \leq n$ such that the 2×2 block (in the off-diagonal location) connecting the j^{th} and k^{th} modes is nonzero. We can arrange (through local rotations) this block to be diagonal. Let us ‘diagonalize’ this 4×4 part of the covariance matrix using an appropriate two-mode canonical transformation $\in Sp(4, R)$, so that m_j and m_k are transformed to \tilde{m}_j and \tilde{m}_k respectively, the other diagonal parameters remaining unaffected.

It is be noted that the new m dominates the original m . That this is so follows, in the case $k < n$, from the facts $\tilde{m}_j < m_j$ and $\tilde{m}_j + \tilde{m}_k \leq m_j + m_k$. In the case $k = n$ it follows from the additional fact that if \tilde{m}_k is less than m_k it is so by a magnitude which does not exceed the magnitude by which \tilde{m}_j is less than m_j ($\tilde{m}_k - \tilde{m}_j \geq m_k - m_j$). Further, $\tilde{m}_j \tilde{m}_k < m_j m_k$.

Denote by m' the new diagonal m -parameters arranged in nondecreasing order by correspondingly permuting the oscillators. Since $\tilde{m}_j \tilde{m}_k < m_j m_k$ we have $P_{m'} < P_m$.

For purpose of clarity, let us carry out this process one more time. The parameters m' will then go to m'' dominating m' , with $P_{m''} < P_{m'}$. It follows from the transmitivity of dominance that m'' dominates m .

It is now clear that when this process is iterated, m goes through a sequence of intermediate values, the value at every stage dominating the previous value, and correspondingly P_m steadily decreasing, until P_m reaches P_κ or, equivalently, until V becomes diagonal. This completes proof of the first part of the theorem.

The elementary nature of our proof may be compared with that of Ref. [10]. P_m played the role of ‘profit function’ monitoring progress of this diagonalization process.

To prove the second part assume, conversely, that we are given the global and local spectral parameters $\kappa, m \in R^n$. Assume that these are compatible: i.e., κ dominates m , with $\kappa_1 \geq 1$. Our task is to construct a Gaussian state with these properties. In other words we have to present a canonical transformation $S \in Sp(2n, R)$ which acting on a covariance matrix $V = \text{diag}(\kappa_1, \kappa_1; \kappa_2, \kappa_2; \dots; \kappa_n, \kappa_n)$ will produce a covariance matrix SVS^T with the target diagonal values m . We build such an S as a product of $n - 1$ *specific* two-mode transformations, evolving $m^{(0)} \equiv \kappa$ successively through a sequence of intermediates $m^{(1)}, m^{(2)}, \dots$ to finally $m^{(n-1)} = m$. It will be manifestly clear that $m^{(k)}$ dominates $m^{(k+1)}$ at each stage. For clarity, this process is implemented through four elementary stages.

Stage 1: Since $m^{(0)} \equiv \kappa$ dominates m , we have $m_1 \geq m_1^{(0)} = \kappa_1$. Suppose $m_1 = m_1^{(0)} + \epsilon_1$, $\epsilon_1 > 0$ (one will move to the next step if $m_1 = m_1^{(0)}$). Let j_1 be the least integer $< n$ such that $m_{j_1}^{(0)} \geq m_1$. Carry out a beam splitter transformation S_θ between the first and j_1^{th} mode so that the corresponding diagonal elements $(m_1^{(0)}, m_{j_1}^{(0)})$ get redistributed to $(m_1^{(0)} + \epsilon_1, m_{j_1}^{(0)} - \epsilon_1) = (m_1, m_{j_1}^{(0)} - \epsilon_1)$, with no change in the other diagonal entries: $m^{(0)} = (m_1^{(0)}, m_2^{(0)}, \dots, m_n^{(0)}) \rightarrow m^{(1)} = (m_1, m_2^{(0)}, \dots, m_{j_1}^{(0)} - \epsilon_1, \dots, m_n^{(0)}) \equiv (m_1, m_2^{(1)}, m_3^{(1)}, \dots, m_n^{(1)})$.

We can repeat this process. Let $m_2 = m_2^{(1)} + \epsilon_2$. By hypothesis $\epsilon_2 \geq 0$ (this is so even if

j_1 had equalled 2). Assume $\epsilon_2 > 0$ (if $\epsilon_2 = 0$, one moves to the next step). Let j_2 be the smallest integer $< n$ such that $m_{j_2}^{(1)} \geq m_2$ [Clearly, j_2 can be as small as j_1 , but not any smaller]. Carry out a beam splitter transformation on the 2nd and j_2^{th} modes so that the corresponding diagonal elements $(m_2^{(1)}, m_{j_2}^{(1)})$ get redistributed to $(m_2, m_{j_2}^{(1)} - \epsilon_2)$ to produce $m^{(2)}$, leaving the other diagonals unaffected.

If we are able to repeat this process only ℓ times we have, at the end of it,

$$m^{(\ell)} = (m_1, m_2, \dots, m_\ell; m_{\ell+1}^{(\ell)}, m_{\ell+2}^{(\ell)}, \dots, m_n^{(\ell)}), \quad (13)$$

with $m_j^{(\ell)} < m_j, \forall \ell + 1 \leq j \leq n - 1$, and $m_n^{(\ell)} = m_n^{(0)} = \kappa_n$. What we have done so far is identical to what one would have done in the Schur-Horn situation. Clearly, the beam splitter transformations carried out so far affected neither the sum of the diagonal entries of $m^{(\cdot)}$ nor its n^{th} entry. Consequently, the difference $m_n^{(k)} - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} m_j^{(k)}$ has remained the same for all $0 \leq k \leq \ell$.

Stage 2: Define $\delta^{(k)} = \sum_{j=1}^n m_j - \sum_{j=1}^n m_j^{(k)}$. It is clear that $\delta^{(k)} = \delta^{(0)}$, for $k = 1, 2, \dots, \ell$. In the Schur-Horn situation $\delta^{(0)}$ vanishes by hypothesis. We will now employ two-mode squeezing transformations S_μ to rectify this ‘departure’ from the Schur-Horn situation.

We know that $\delta^{(\ell)} = \delta^{(0)}$ is nonnegative. Assume $\delta^{(0)} > 0$ (if $\delta^{(0)} = 0$, one will move directly to Stage 4, as will become evident below). Define $\epsilon_{\ell+1} = m_{\ell+1} - m_{\ell+1}^{(\ell)}$. Assume $\delta^{(\ell)} \geq 2\epsilon_{\ell+1}$ (if this is not the case one will move to Stage 3). Carry out a two-mode squeezing transformation S_μ between the $(\ell + 1)^{\text{th}}$ and n^{th} modes, raising the corresponding diagonal entries $m_{\ell+1}^{(\ell)}, m_n^{(\ell)} = m_n^{(0)} = \kappa_n$ by equal magnitude to $m_{\ell+1}, m_n^{(\ell)} + \epsilon_{\ell+1}$ with no change in the other diagonal entries, so that

$$\begin{aligned} m^{(\ell+1)} &= (m_1, \dots, m_{\ell+1}, m_{\ell+2}^{(\ell+1)}, \dots, m_n^{(\ell+1)}), \\ m_j^{(\ell+1)} &= m_j^{(\ell)}, \quad \forall \ell + 2 \leq j \leq n - 1, \\ m_n^{(\ell+1)} &= m_n^{(\ell)} + \epsilon_{\ell+1} = \kappa_n + \epsilon_{\ell+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

We can now repeat this kind of two-mode squeezing transformation between the $(\ell + 2)^{\text{th}}$ mode and the n^{th} mode, and so on. Assume we are able to carry out this process only r times. We will have, at the end of it,

$$\begin{aligned} m^{(\ell+r)} &= (m_1, \dots, m_{\ell+r}, m_{\ell+r+1}^{(\ell+r)}, \dots, m_n^{(\ell+r)}), \\ m_j^{(\ell+r)} &= m_j^{(\ell)}, \quad \forall \ell + r + 1 \leq j \leq n - 1, \\ m_n^{(\ell+r)} &= \kappa_n + \epsilon_{\ell+1} + \epsilon_{\ell+2} + \dots + \epsilon_{\ell+r}, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

so that $\delta^{(\ell+r)} = \delta^{(0)} - 2(\epsilon_{\ell+1} + \epsilon_{\ell+2} + \dots + \epsilon_{\ell+r})$. Clearly, $0 \leq \delta^{(\ell+r)} < 2\epsilon_{\ell+r+1} = 2(m_{\ell+r+1} - m_{\ell+r+1}^{(\ell+r)})$ (the last inequality encodes the fact that we could not carry out the Stage 2 operation one more time).

Stage 3: Assume $\delta^{(\ell+r)} > 0$ (if $\delta^{(\ell+r)} = 0$, we move directly to Stage 4). Carry out a two-mode canonical transformation between the $(\ell + r + 1)^{\text{th}}$ mode and the n^{th} mode, taking the corresponding diagonal entries $m_{\ell+r+1}^{(\ell+r)}, m_n^{(\ell+r)}$ to $m_{\ell+r+1} = m_{\ell+r+1}^{(\ell+r)} + \epsilon_{r+\ell+1}$ and $m_n^{(\ell+r+1)} = m_n^{(\ell+r)} + \delta^{(\ell+r)} - \epsilon_{r+\ell+1}$ respectively, leaving the other diagonals invariant, so that we have

$$\begin{aligned} m^{(\ell+r+1)} &= (m_1, \dots, m_{\ell+r+1}, m_{\ell+r+2}^{(\ell+r+1)}, \dots, m_n^{(\ell+r+1)}), \\ m_j^{(\ell+r+1)} &= m_j^\ell < m_j, \quad \forall \ell + r + 2 \leq j \leq n - 1, \\ \sum_{j=\ell+r+2}^n m_j^{(\ell+r+1)} &= \sum_{j=\ell+r+2}^n m_j. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

i.e., the situation in respect of the remaining $n - (\ell + r + 1)$ (or $n - \ell - r$ if $\delta^{(\ell+r)} = 0$) modes is precisely of the Schur-Horn type, suggesting that we deploy the beam splitter transformation $n - \ell - r - 2$ (or $n - \ell - r - 1$) times.

Stage 4 : Note that at the end of Stage 3 we have $m_n^{(\ell+r+1)}$ larger than m_n precisely by the sum of the amounts by which $m_{\ell+r+1+j}^{(\ell+r+1)}$, for $1 \leq j \leq n - \ell - r - 2$, are less than $m_{\ell+r+1+j}$. Therefore, for each value of j in this range, we effect a beam splitter transformation connecting the $(\ell + r + 1 + j)^{\text{th}}$ mode to the n^{th} mode, raising $m_{\ell+r+1+j}^{(\ell+r+1)}$ to m_j and correspondingly pulling $m_n^{(\ell+r+1+j)}$ down by an equal amount. It is clear that at the end of these $n - \ell - r - 2$ (or $n - \ell - r - 1$) redistributions, the diagonals will be precisely m . That is, $m^{(n-1)} = m$. This completes proof of the theorem.

We have taken maximal advantage of the simpler two-mode transformations S_θ, S_μ . The former was deployed r times in Stage 1 and $n - \ell - r - 2$ (or $n - \ell - r - 1$) times in Stage 4, and the latter ℓ times in Stage 2. The more general two-mode transformation was deployed (at the most) once in Stage 3.

As illustration, and for comparison with Ref. [11], we apply our procedure to the example noted after the statement of the theorem. The difference between $\sum_{j=1}^7 m_j = 63$ and $\sum_{j=1}^7 \kappa_j = 45$ indicates the amount of squeezing that will have to be deployed at Stages 3 and 4. We have $m^{(0)} \equiv \kappa = (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 18)$; $m^{(1)} = (6, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 18)$; $m^{(2)} = (6, 7, 3, 4, 5, 2, 18)$; $m^{(3)} = (6, 7, 8, 4, 5, 2, 23)$; $m^{(4)} = (6, 7, 8, 9, 5, 2, 26)$; $m^{(5)} =$

$(6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 2, 21)$; and $m^{(6)} = (6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12) = m$. The number of two-mode transformations required at the four stages are 2, 1, 1, and 2 respectively. Note that $m^{(k)}$ dominates $m^{(k+1)}$, for $k = 0, 1, \dots, 5$.

- [1] A. Higuchi, A. Sudbery, and J. Szulc, Phys. Rev.Lett. **90**, 107902 (2003).
- [2] S. Bravyi, Quant. Inf. Comp. **4**, 12 (2004).
- [3] A.A. Klyachko, <http://arxiv.org/list/quant-ph/0409113>.
- [4] Y.-J. Han, Y.-S. Zhang, and G.-C. Guo, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 052306 (2005).
- [5] M. Christandl, A. Harrow, and G. Mitchison, Commun. Math. Phys. **270**, 575 (2007).
- [6] W. Hall, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 032102 (2007).
- [7] Y.-K. Liu, M. Christandl, and F. Verstraete, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 110503 (2007).
- [8] M.A. Nielsen and J. Kempe, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5184 (2001).
- [9] T. Hiroshima, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 057902 (2003).
- [10] T. Hiroshima, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 012330 (2006).
- [11] J. Eisert, T. Tyc, T. Rudolph, and B.C. Sanders, Commun. Math. Phys. **280**, 263–280 (2008).
- [12] G. Adesso, A. Serafini, and F. Illuminati, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 032345 (2006); G. Adesso, A. Serafini, and F. Illuminati, New J. Phys. **9**, 60 (2007).
- [13] R. Simon, N. Mukunda, and B. Dutta, Phys. Rev. A **49**, 1567 (1994); R. Simon, S. Chaturvedi, and V. Srinivasan, J. Math. Phys. **40**, 3632 (1999); R. Simon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2726 (2000).
- [14] A. Horn, Amer. J. Math. **76**, 620–630 (1954).