

# Geometric measure of quantum discord and total quantum correlations in a N-partite quantum state.

Ali Saif M. Hassan<sup>1,\*</sup> and Pramod S. Joag<sup>2,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, University of Amran, Amran, Yemen*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics, University of Pune, Pune, India-411007.*

(Dated: November 23, 2018)

Quantum discord, as introduced by Olliver and Zurek [Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 017901 (2001)], is a measure of the discrepancy between quantum versions of two classically equivalent expressions for mutual information and is found to be useful in quantification and application of quantum correlations in mixed states. It is viewed as a key resource present in certain quantum communication tasks and quantum computational models without containing much entanglement. An early step toward the quantification of quantum discord in a quantum state was by Dakic, Vedral, and Brukner [Phys. Rev. Lett. 105,190502 (2010)] who introduced a geometric measure of quantum discord and derived an explicit formula for any two-qubit state. Recently, Luo and Fu [Phys. Rev. A **82**, 034302 (2010)] introduced a generic form of the geometric measure of quantum discord for a bipartite quantum state. We extend these results and find generic forms of the geometric measure of quantum discord and total quantum correlations in a general N-partite quantum state. Further, we obtain computable exact formulas for the geometric measure of quantum discord and total quantum correlations in a N-qubit quantum state. The exact formulas for the N-qubit quantum state are experimentally implementable.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud;75.10.Pq;05.30.-d

## I. INTRODUCTION

In quantum information theory, the problem of characterization of correlations present in a quantum state has been a fundamental problem generating intense research effort during the last two decades [1, 2]. Correlations in quantum states, with far reaching implications for quantum information processing, are usually studied in the entanglement-versus-separability framework [1, 3]. However, some results showed that quantum correlations cannot be only limited to entanglement, because separable quantum states can also have correlations which are responsible for the improvements of some quantum tasks that cannot be achieved by classical means [4-10]. An alternative classification for correlations based on quantum measurements has arisen in recent years and also plays an important role in quantum information theory [11-14]. This is the quantum-versus-classical paradigm for correlations. The first attempts in this direction were made by Ollivier and Zurek [15] and by Henderson and Vedral [16], who studied quantum correlations from a measurement perspective and introduced quantum discord as a measure of quantum correlations which has generated increasing interest [17-47]. Recently, it was suggested that the quantum discord  $D(\rho)$  can be expressed alternatively as the minimal loss of correlations caused by the non-selective von Neumann projective measurement given by the set of orthogonal  $1D$  projectors  $\{\Pi_i^a\}$  acting on one part of the system [48],

$$D(\rho) = \min_{\Pi^a} \{I(\rho) - I(\Pi^a(\rho))\}, \quad (1)$$

where

$$\Pi^a(\rho) = \sum_i (\Pi_i^a \otimes I^b) \rho (\Pi_i^a \otimes I^b).$$

---

\*Electronic address: alisaif73@gmail.com

†Electronic address: pramod@physics.unipune.ac.in

Here the minimum is over von Neumann measurements  $\Pi^a = \{\Pi_i^a\}$  on a part say  $a$  of a bipartite system  $ab$  in a state  $\rho$  with reduced density operators  $\rho^a$  and  $\rho^b$  and  $\Pi^a(\rho)$  is the resulting state after the measurement.  $I(\rho) = S(\rho^a) + S(\rho^b) - S(\rho)$  is the quantum mutual information,  $S(\rho) = -\text{tr}(\rho \ln \rho)$  is the von Neumann entropy and  $I^b$  is the identity operator on part  $b$ .

The definition of quantum discord in terms of quantum mutual information has the disadvantage that it is very difficult to generalize to the multipartite case [49]. We can overcome this hurdle by introducing a geometric measure of quantum discord as the distance of the given state to the closest classical quantum (or the zero discord) state (see Eq.(6)). Dakic et al. [50] introduced a geometric measure of quantum discord given by

$$D(\rho) = \min_{\chi \in \Omega_0} \|\rho - \chi\|^2, \quad (2)$$

where  $\Omega_0$  denotes the set of zero-discord states and  $\|\rho - \chi\|^2 := \text{tr}(\rho - \chi)^2$  is the square norm in the Hilbert-Schmidt space of linear operators acting on the state space of the system.

Dakic et al [50] also obtained an easily computable exact expression for the geometric measure of quantum discord for a two qubit system, which can be described as follows. Consider a two-qubit state  $\rho$  expressed in its Bloch representation (see section III) as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho = & \frac{1}{4} (I^a \otimes I^b + \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 (x_\alpha \sigma_\alpha \otimes I^b + I^a \otimes y_\alpha \sigma_\alpha) \\ & + \sum_{\alpha, \beta=1}^3 t_{\alpha\beta} \sigma_\alpha \otimes \sigma_\beta), \end{aligned}$$

$\{\sigma_\alpha\}$  being the Pauli operators. Then its geometric measure of quantum discord is given by [50]

$$D(\rho) = \frac{1}{4} (\|x\|^2 + \|T\|^2 - \lambda_{max}). \quad (3)$$

Here  $\vec{x} := (x_1, x_2, x_3)^t$  and  $\vec{y} := (y_1, y_2, y_3)^t$  are coherent (column) vectors for single qubit reduced density operators,  $T = (t_{\alpha\beta})$  is the correlation matrix, and  $\lambda_{max}$  is the largest eigenvalue of the matrix  $\vec{x}\vec{x}^t + TT^t$ . The norms of vectors and matrices are the Euclidean norms, for example,  $\|x\|^2 := \sum_\alpha x_\alpha^2$ . Here and throughout this article, the superscript  $t$  denotes transpose of vectors and matrices and by the norm of any tensor we mean its Euclidean norm, that is, the square of the norm of a tensor is the sum of squares of its elements.

In this paper

- We obtain a generic form for the quantum discord  $D_k$  (corresponding to the Von Neumann measurement on the  $k$ th part) in a  $N$ -partite quantum state (Section II, Theorem 1).
- We give a formula for quantum discord  $D_k$  in a  $N$ -qubit quantum state, which is exactly computable as well as experimentally implementable (Section III, Theorem 2).
- We apply the exact formula for  $D_k$  (obtained in section III) to some multiqubit states (Section IV).
- We give a generic form for the total quantum correlations in a bipartite state which can be exactly computed and experimentally implemented for a two-qubit state (Section V).
- We give a generic form for the total quantum correlations in a  $N$ -partite state which can be exactly computed and experimentally implemented for a  $N$ -qubit state (Section VI).

Finally, we summarize in section VII.

## II. QUANTUM DISCORD IN A $N$ -PARTITE STATE

Consider a multipartite system  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^1 \otimes \mathcal{H}^2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}^N$  with  $\dim(\mathcal{H}^m) = d_m$ ,  $m = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . Let  $L(\mathcal{H}^m)$  be the Hilbert-Schmidt space of linear operators on  $\mathcal{H}^m$  with the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product

$$\langle X^{(m)} | Y^{(m)} \rangle := \text{tr} X^{(m)\dagger} Y^{(m)}.$$

We can define The Hilbert-Schmidt space  $L(\mathcal{H}^1 \otimes \mathcal{H}^2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}^N)$  similarly. Let  $\{X_i^{(m)} : i = 1, 2, \dots, d_m^2, m = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$  be a set of Hermitian operators which constitute orthonormal bases for  $L(\mathcal{H}^m)$ , then

$$\text{tr} X_i^{(m)} X_j^{(m)} = \delta_{ij},$$

and  $\{X_{i_1}^{(1)} \otimes X_{i_2}^{(2)} \otimes \cdots \otimes X_{i_N}^{(N)}\}$  constitutes an orthonormal basis for  $L(\mathcal{H}^1 \otimes \mathcal{H}^2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}^N)$ . In particular, any  $N$ -partite state  $\rho_{12\dots N} \in L(\mathcal{H}^1 \otimes \mathcal{H}^2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}^N)$  can be expanded as

$$\rho_{12\dots N} = \sum_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N} c_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N} X_{i_1}^{(1)} \otimes X_{i_2}^{(2)} \otimes \cdots \otimes X_{i_N}^{(N)} ; i_m = 1, \dots, d_m^2 ; m = 1, \dots, N, \quad (4)$$

with  $\mathcal{C} = [c_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N}] = [\text{tr}(\rho_{12\dots N} X_{i_1}^{(1)} \otimes X_{i_2}^{(2)} \otimes \cdots \otimes X_{i_N}^{(N)})]$  is a  $N$ -way array (tensor of order  $N$ ) with size  $d_1^2 d_2^2 \cdots d_N^2$ .

We can define the geometric measure of quantum discord for a  $N$ -partite quantum state corresponding to the von Neumann measurement on the  $k$ th part as

$$D_k(\rho_{12\dots N}) = \min_{\chi_k} \|\rho_{12\dots N} - \chi_k\|^2, \quad (5)$$

where the minimum is over the set of zero discord states  $\chi_k$  [i.e.  $D_k(\chi_k) = 0$ ] [51]. A state  $\chi_k \in L(\mathcal{H}^1 \otimes \mathcal{H}^2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}^N)$  is of zero discord if and only if it is a classical-quantum state [52]

$$\chi_k = \sum_{l=1}^{d_k} p_l |l\rangle \langle l| \otimes \rho_{[k]|l}, \quad (6)$$

where  $[k]$  stands for  $12 \cdots k - 1k + 1 \cdots N$ ,  $\{p_l\}$  is a probability distribution over the terms in the sum,  $\{|l\rangle\}$  is an arbitrary orthonormal basis in  $\mathcal{H}^k$ , and  $\{\rho_{[k]|l}\}$  is a set of arbitrary states (density operators acting on  $\mathcal{H}^1 \otimes \mathcal{H}^2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}^{k-1} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{k+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}^N$ ). It follows that the quantum discord corresponding to measurement on different subsystems is different, that is,  $D_k(\rho) \neq D_l(\rho) ; k \neq l$ .

We need to define a product of a tensor with a matrix, the  $n$ -mode product [53, 54]. The  $n$ -mode (*matrix*) *product* of a tensor  $\mathcal{Y}$  (of order  $N$  and with dimension  $J_1 \times J_2 \times \cdots \times J_N$ ) with a matrix  $A$  with dimension  $I \times J_n$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{Y} \times_n A$ . The result is a tensor of size  $J_1 \times J_2 \times \cdots \times J_{n-1} \times I \times J_{n+1} \times \cdots \times J_N$  and is defined elementwise by

$$(\mathcal{Y} \times_n A)_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_{n-1} i j_{n+1} \dots j_N} = \sum_{j_n=1}^{J_n} y_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_n} a_{i j_n}. \quad (7)$$

Recently, for a bipartite system  $ab$  ( $N = 2$ ) with states in  $\mathcal{H}^a \otimes \mathcal{H}^b$ ,  $\dim(\mathcal{H}^a) = d_a$ ,  $\dim(\mathcal{H}^b) = d_b$ , S. Luo and S. Fu introduced the following form of geometric measure of quantum discord [48]

$$D_a(\rho) = \text{tr}(CC^t) - \max_A \text{tr}(ACC^t A^t), \quad (8)$$

where  $C = [c_{ij}]$  is an  $d_a^2 \times d_b^2$  matrix and the maximum is taken over all  $d_a \times d_a^2$ -dimensional isometric matrices  $A = [a_{li}]$  such that  $a_{li} = \text{tr}(|l\rangle\langle l|X_i) = \langle l|X_i|l\rangle$ ,  $l = 1, 2, \dots, d_a$ ;  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d_a^2$  and  $\{|l\rangle\}$  is any orthonormal basis in  $\mathcal{H}^a$ . we generalize this result to  $N$ -partite quantum states.

*Theorem 1.* Let  $\rho_{12\dots N}$  be a  $N$ -partite state defined by Eq.(4), then

$$D_k(\rho_{12\dots N}) = \|C\|^2 - \max_{A^{(k)}} \|C \times_k A^{(k)}\|^2, \quad (9)$$

where  $C = [c_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N}]$  is defined via Eq.(4), the maximum is taken over all  $d_k \times d_k^2$ -dimensional isometric matrices  $A^{(k)} = [a_{li_k}]$ ,  $A^{(k)}(A^{(k)})^t = I_k$ , such that  $a_{li_k} = \text{tr}(|l\rangle\langle l|X_{i_k}^{(k)})$ ,  $l = 1, 2, \dots, d_k$ ;  $i_k = 1, 2, \dots, d_k^2$  and  $\{|l\rangle\}$  is any orthonormal basis for  $\mathcal{H}^k$ .

*Proof:*

We expand the operator  $|l\rangle\langle l|$  occurring in the expression for the zero discord state  $\chi_k$  (Eq.(6)) in the orthonormal basis  $\{X_{i_k}^{(k)}\}$  in  $L(\mathcal{H}^k)$  as

$$|l\rangle\langle l| = \sum_{i_k=1}^{d_k^2} a_{li_k} X_{i_k}^{(k)}, \quad l = 1, 2, \dots, d_k; \quad (10)$$

with

$$a_{li_k} = \text{tr}(|l\rangle\langle l|X_{i_k}^{(k)}) = \langle l|X_{i_k}^{(k)}|l\rangle, \quad (11)$$

$\{|l\rangle\}$  being any orthonormal basis in  $\mathcal{H}^k$ . Clearly,  $\sum_{l=1}^{d_k} a_{li_k} = \text{tr}X_{i_k}^{(k)}$ . Arranging the coefficients in a row vector as

$$\vec{a}_l = (a_{l1}, a_{l2}, \dots, a_{ld_k^2}),$$

we get, by the Parseval theorem of abstract Fourier transform,

$$\|\vec{a}_l\|^2 = \||l\rangle\langle l|\|^2 = 1. \quad (12)$$

Where  $\|\vec{a}_l\|^2 = \sum_{i_k} a_{li_k}^2$ . Moreover, the orthonormality of  $\{|l\rangle\}$  implies that  $\{\vec{a}_l\}$  is an orthonormal set of vectors, and therefore  $A^{(k)} = [a_{li_k}]$  is an isometry in the sense that  $A^{(k)}(A^{(k)})^t = I_k$ .

Similarly, because  $\{X_{i_1}^{(1)} \otimes X_{i_2}^{(2)} \otimes \dots \otimes X_{i_{k-1}}^{(k-1)} \otimes X_{i_{k+1}}^{(k+1)} \otimes \dots \otimes X_{i_N}^{(N)}\}$  constitutes an orthonormal basis for  $\mathcal{H}^1 \otimes \mathcal{H}^2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{H}^{k-1} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{k+1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{H}^N$ , which we call the ‘ $X$  basis’, we can expand the operator  $p_l \rho_{[k]|l}$  occurring in the expression for the zero discord state  $\chi_k$  as

$$p_l \rho_{[k]|l} = \sum_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_{k-1} i_{k+1} \dots i_N} b_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_{k-1} i_{k+1} \dots i_N} X_{i_1}^{(1)} \otimes X_{i_2}^{(2)} \otimes \dots \otimes X_{i_{k-1}}^{(k-1)} \otimes X_{i_{k+1}}^{(k+1)} \otimes \dots \otimes X_{i_N}^{(N)},$$

$$l = 1, 2, \dots, d_k; \quad i_m = 1, 2, \dots, d_m^2; \quad m = 1, \dots, k-1, k+1, \dots, N$$

with  $b_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_{k-1} i_{k+1} \dots i_N} = \text{tr}(p_l \rho_{[k]|l} X_{i_1}^{(1)} \otimes X_{i_2}^{(2)} \otimes \dots \otimes X_{i_{k-1}}^{(k-1)} \otimes X_{i_{k+1}}^{(k+1)} \otimes \dots \otimes X_{i_N}^{(N)})$ . Then we have, using orthonormality of the  $X$  basis,

$$\sum_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_{k-1} i_{k+1} \dots i_N} b_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_{k-1} i_{k+1} \dots i_N}^2 = p_l^2 \text{tr} \rho_{[k]|l}^2. \quad (13)$$

In view of Eqs.(5) and (6), the square norm distance between  $\rho_{12\dots N}$  and  $\chi_k$  can be evaluated (using the orthonormality of the bases involved and Eq.(13)) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\rho_{12\dots N} - \chi_k\|^2 &= \text{tr}\rho_{12\dots N}^2 - 2\text{tr}(\rho_{12\dots N}\chi_k) + \text{tr}\chi_k^2 \\
&= \sum_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N} c_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N}^2 - 2 \sum_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N} c_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N} \\
&\quad \sum_l^{d_k} p_l \langle l | X_{i_k}^{(k)} | l \rangle \text{tr}(\rho_{[k]|l} X_{i_1}^{(1)} \otimes X_{i_2}^{(2)} \otimes \dots \otimes X_{i_{k-1}}^{(k-1)} \otimes X_{i_{k+1}}^{(k+1)} \otimes \dots \otimes X_{i_N}^{(N)}) + \sum_l^{d_k} p_l^2 \text{tr}\rho_{[k]|l}^2 \\
&= \|\mathcal{C}\|^2 - 2 \sum_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N} c_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N} \sum_l^{d_k} a_{li_k} b_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_{k-1} l i_{k+1} \dots i_N} + \sum_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_{k-1} l i_{k+1} \dots i_N} b_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_{k-1} l i_{k+1} \dots i_N}^2 \\
&= \|\mathcal{C}\|^2 - \sum_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_{k-1} l i_{k+1} \dots i_N} \left( \sum_{i_k} c_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N} a_{li_k} \right)^2 \\
&\quad + \sum_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_{k-1} l i_{k+1} \dots i_N} \left( b_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_{k-1} l i_{k+1} \dots i_N} - \sum_{i_k} c_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N} a_{li_k} \right)^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

By choosing  $b_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_{k-1} l i_{k+1} \dots i_N} = \sum_{i_k} c_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N} a_{li_k}$  [55], the above equation reduces to

$$\|\rho_{12\dots N} - \chi_k\|^2 = \|\mathcal{C}\|^2 - \|\mathcal{C} \times_k A^{(k)}\|^2.$$

Since the tensor  $\mathcal{C}$  is determined by the state  $\rho_{12\dots N}$  via Eq.(4), we have, using Eq.(2),

$$D_k(\rho_{12\dots N}) = \min_{\chi_k} \|\rho_{12\dots N} - \chi_k\|^2 = \|\mathcal{C}\|^2 - \max_{A^{(k)}} \|\mathcal{C} \times_k A^{(k)}\|^2,$$

where the maximum is taken over  $A^{(k)}$  specified in the theorem, thus completing the proof.

For a bipartite system,  $\mathcal{C}$  is a  $d_1^2 \times d_2^2$  matrix while  $A^{(1)}$  and  $A^{(2)}$  are  $d_1 \times d_1^2$  and  $d_2 \times d_2^2$  matrices respectively. Using the definition of the n-mode product (eq.(7)) and the norm of a tensor it follows that

$$D_1(\rho) = \text{tr}(CC^t) - \max_{A^{(1)}} \text{tr}(A^{(1)}CC^tA^{(1)t}), \tag{15}$$

and

$$D_2(\rho) = \text{tr}(CC^t) - \max_{A^{(2)}} \text{tr}(A^{(2)}C^tCA^{(2)t}). \tag{16}$$

Following its definition in Eq.(1), it seems more natural and simple to define the geometric measure of quantum discord as

$$\overline{D}_k(\rho_{12\dots N}) = \min_{\Pi^k} \|\rho_{12\dots N} - \Pi^k(\rho_{12\dots N})\|^2, \tag{17}$$

where the minimum is over von Neumann measurements  $\Pi^k = \{\Pi_l^k\}$  on system  $\mathcal{H}^k$ , and  $\Pi^k(\rho_{12\dots N}) = \sum_l (I_1 \otimes I_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \Pi_l^k \otimes \dots \otimes I_N) \rho_{12\dots N} (I_1 \otimes I_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \Pi_l^k \otimes \dots \otimes I_N)$ .

It is easy to prove that  $D_k(\rho_{12\dots N}) = \overline{D}_k(\rho_{12\dots N})$ , similar to theorem 2 in ref. [48].

### III. EXACT FORMULA FOR A $N$ -QUBIT STATE

In this section we specialize to the  $N$ -qubit systems with states in  $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2 \dots \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$  ( $N$  factors). We need the structure of the Bloch representation of density operators, which can be briefly described as

follows. Bloch representation of a density operator acting on the Hilbert space of a  $d$ -level quantum system  $\mathbb{C}^d$  is given by

$$\rho = \frac{1}{d}(I_d + \sum_{\alpha} s_{\alpha} \tilde{\lambda}_{\alpha}), \quad (18)$$

where the components of the coherent vector  $\vec{s}$ , defined via Eq.(18), are given by  $s_{\alpha} = \frac{d}{2} \text{tr}(\rho \tilde{\lambda}_{\alpha})$ . Eq.(18) is the expansion of  $\rho$  in the Hilbert-Schmidt basis  $\{I_d, \tilde{\lambda}_{\alpha}; \alpha = 1, 2, \dots, d^2 - 1\}$  where  $\tilde{\lambda}_{\alpha}$  are the traceless hermitian generators of  $SU(d)$  satisfying  $\text{tr}(\tilde{\lambda}_{\alpha} \tilde{\lambda}_{\beta}) = 2\delta_{\alpha\beta}$  [56].

In order to give the Bloch representation of a density operator acting on the Hilbert space  $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$  of a  $N$ -qubit quantum system, we introduce the following notation. We use  $k_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots$ ) to denote a qubit chosen from  $N$  qubits, so that  $k_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots$ ) take values in the set  $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ . Thus each  $k_i$  is a variable taking values in  $\mathcal{N}$ . The variables  $\alpha_{k_i} = 1, 2, 3$  for a given  $k_i$  span the set of generators of  $SU(2)$  group (except identity) for the  $k_i$ th qubit, namely the set of Pauli operators  $\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3\}$  for the  $k_i$ th qubit. For two qubits  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  we define

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\alpha_{k_1}}^{(k_1)} &= (I_2 \otimes I_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{\alpha_{k_1}} \otimes I_2 \otimes \dots \otimes I_2) \\ \sigma_{\alpha_{k_2}}^{(k_2)} &= (I_2 \otimes I_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{\alpha_{k_2}} \otimes I_2 \otimes \dots \otimes I_2) \\ \sigma_{\alpha_{k_1}}^{(k_1)} \sigma_{\alpha_{k_2}}^{(k_2)} &= (I_2 \otimes I_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{\alpha_{k_1}} \otimes I_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{\alpha_{k_2}} \otimes I_2 \otimes I_2), \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where  $\sigma_{\alpha_{k_1}}$  and  $\sigma_{\alpha_{k_2}}$  occur at the  $k_1$ th and  $k_2$ th places (corresponding to  $k_1$ th and  $k_2$ th qubits respectively) in the tensor product and are the  $\alpha_{k_1}$ th and  $\alpha_{k_2}$ th generators of  $SU(2)$ ,  $\alpha_{k_1} = 1, 2, 3$  and  $\alpha_{k_2} = 1, 2, 3$  respectively. Then we can write, for a  $N$ -qubit state  $\rho_{12\dots N}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{12\dots N} &= \frac{1}{2^N} \left\{ \otimes_m^N I_{d_m} + \sum_{k_1 \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{\alpha_{k_1}} s_{\alpha_{k_1}} \sigma_{\alpha_{k_1}}^{(k_1)} + \sum_{\{k_1, k_2\}} \sum_{\alpha_{k_1} \alpha_{k_2}} t_{\alpha_{k_1} \alpha_{k_2}} \sigma_{\alpha_{k_1}}^{(k_1)} \sigma_{\alpha_{k_2}}^{(k_2)} + \dots + \right. \\ &\quad \sum_{\{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_M\}} \sum_{\alpha_{k_1} \alpha_{k_2} \dots \alpha_{k_M}} t_{\alpha_{k_1} \alpha_{k_2} \dots \alpha_{k_M}} \sigma_{\alpha_{k_1}}^{(k_1)} \sigma_{\alpha_{k_2}}^{(k_2)} \dots \sigma_{\alpha_{k_M}}^{(k_M)} + \dots + \\ &\quad \left. \sum_{\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_N} t_{\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_N} \sigma_{\alpha_1}^{(1)} \sigma_{\alpha_2}^{(2)} \dots \sigma_{\alpha_N}^{(N)} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where  $\mathbf{s}^{(k_1)}$  is a Bloch (coherent) vector corresponding to  $k_1$ th qubit,  $\mathbf{s}^{(k_1)} = [s_{\alpha_{k_1}}]_{\alpha_{k_1}=1}^3$ , which is a tensor of order one defined by

$$s_{\alpha_{k_1}} = \text{tr}[\rho \sigma_{\alpha_{k_1}}^{(k_1)}] = \text{tr}[\rho_{k_1} \sigma_{\alpha_{k_1}}], \quad (21)$$

where  $\rho_{k_1}$  is the reduced density matrix for the  $k_1$ th qubit. Here  $\{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_M\}$ ,  $2 \leq M \leq N$ , is a subset of  $\mathcal{N}$  and can be chosen in  $\binom{N}{M}$  ways, contributing  $\binom{N}{M}$  terms in the sum  $\sum_{\{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_M\}}$  in Eq.(20), each containing a tensor of order  $M$ . The total number of terms in the Bloch representation of  $\rho$  is  $2^N$ . We denote the tensors occurring in the sum  $\sum_{\{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_M\}}$ , ( $2 \leq M \leq N$ ) by  $\mathcal{T}^{\{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_M\}} = [t_{\alpha_{k_1} \alpha_{k_2} \dots \alpha_{k_M}}]$  which are defined by

$$t_{\alpha_{k_1} \alpha_{k_2} \dots \alpha_{k_M}} = \text{tr}[\rho \sigma_{\alpha_{k_1}}^{(k_1)} \sigma_{\alpha_{k_2}}^{(k_2)} \dots \sigma_{\alpha_{k_M}}^{(k_M)}] = \text{tr}[\rho_{k_1 k_2 \dots k_M} (\sigma_{\alpha_{k_1}} \otimes \sigma_{\alpha_{k_2}} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{\alpha_{k_M}})] \quad (22)$$

where  $\rho_{k_1 k_2 \dots k_M}$  is the reduced density matrix for the subsystem  $\{k_1 k_2 \dots k_M\}$ . We call the tensor in last term in Eq.(20)  $\mathcal{T}^{(N)}$ .

In this article, we find the maximum in Eq.(9) for a  $N$ -qubit state  $\rho_{12\dots N}$  to obtain an exact analytic formula, as in the two-qubit case (Eq.(3)) [50].

*Theorem 2.* Let  $\rho_{12\dots N}$  be a  $N$ -qubit state defined by Eq.(20), then

$$D_k(\rho_{12\dots N}) = \frac{1}{2^N} \left[ \|\vec{s}^{(k)}\|^2 + \sum_{1 \leq M \leq N-1} \sum_{\{k_1, \dots, k_M\} \in \mathcal{N}-k} \|\mathcal{T}^{\{k_1, \dots, k_M, k\}}\|^2 - \eta_{max} \right]. \quad (23)$$

Here  $\eta_{max}$  is the largest eigenvalue of the matrix  $G^{(k)}$  which is a  $3 \times 3$  real symmetric matrix, defined as

$$G^{(k)} = \vec{s}^{(k)}(\vec{s}^{(k)})^t + \sum_{k_1 \in \mathcal{N}-k} (T^{\{k_1, k\}})^t T^{\{k_1, k\}} + \sum_{2 \leq M \leq N-1} \mathbb{T}^{(M+1)}, \quad (24)$$

where  $\mathbb{T}^{(M+1)} = [\tau_{\alpha_k \beta_k}^{(M+1)}]$  are  $3 \times 3$  matrices, defined elementwise as

$$\tau_{\alpha_k \beta_k}^{(M+1)} = \sum_{\{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_M\} \in \mathcal{N}-k} \sum_{\alpha_{k_1} \alpha_{k_2} \dots \alpha_{k_M}} t_{\alpha_{k_1} \alpha_{k_2} \dots \alpha_{k_M} \alpha_k} t_{\alpha_{k_1} \alpha_{k_2} \dots \alpha_{k_M} \beta_k}$$

$$\alpha_{k_i}, \alpha_k, \beta_k = 1, 2, 3; \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, M.$$

*Proof:*

Our goal is to get a closed form expression for the term  $\max_{A^{(k)}} \|\mathcal{C} \times_k A^{(k)}\|^2$  in Eq.(9) applied to an arbitrary state  $\rho_{12\dots N}$  of a  $N$ -qubit system. The tensor  $\mathcal{C} = [c_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N}]$  determined by the  $N$ -qubit state  $\rho_{12\dots N}$  via Eq.(4) has  $i_m = 1, 2$ ;  $m = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , having  $2^N$  elements in it. The  $2 \times 4$  isometric matrices  $A = [a_{l i_k}]$  have to satisfy  $a_{l i_k} = \text{tr}(|l\rangle\langle l| X_{i_k}^{(k)})$ . In other words, the row vectors of  $A^{(k)}$  must satisfy Eq.(18) for some single qubit pure state. However, it is well known that every unit vector  $\hat{s}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  satisfies Eq.(18) for some single qubit pure state (which is not true for a higher dimensional system [57, 58]). Therefore, we can obtain the required maximum over *all* isometric  $2 \times 4$  matrices in the form obtained below (See Eq.s(31,32)).

We choose the orthonormal bases  $\{X_{i_m}^{(m)}\}$ ,  $i_m = 1, 2, 3, 4$ ;  $m = 1, 2, \dots, N$  in Eq.(4) as the generators of  $SU(2_m)$ ,  $m = 1, 2, \dots, N$  [48].

$$X_1^{(m)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} I_2, \quad (25)$$

and

$$X_{i_m}^{(m)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sigma_{i_m-1}, \quad i_m = 2, 3, 4; \quad m = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (26)$$

where  $\sigma_{1,2,3}$  stand for the Pauli operators acting on the  $m$ th qubit.

Since  $\text{tr} \sigma_{\alpha_k} = 0$ ;  $\alpha_k = 1, 2, 3$ , we have,

$$\sum_{l=1}^2 a_{l i_k} = \text{tr} X_{i_k}^{(k)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \text{tr} \sigma_{i_k-1} = 0, \quad i_k = 2, 3, 4.$$

Therefore,

$$a_{2 i_k} = -a_{1 i_k}, \quad i_k = 2, 3, 4. \quad (27)$$

We now proceed to construct the  $2 \times 4$  matrix  $A^{(k)}$  defined via Eq.(11). We will use Eq.(27). The row vectors of  $A^{(k)}$  are

$$\vec{a}_l = (a_{l1}, a_{l2}, a_{l3}, a_{l4}); l = 1, 2.$$

Next we define

$$\hat{e}_l = \sqrt{2}(a_{l2}, a_{l3}, a_{l4}), l = 1, 2, \quad (28)$$

and using Eq.(27), we get

$$\hat{e}_2 = -\hat{e}_1. \quad (29)$$

We can prove

$$\|\hat{e}_l\|^2 = 1, l = 1, 2, \quad (30)$$

using the condition  $\|\vec{a}_l\|^2 = \sum_{i_k=1}^4 a_{li_k}^2 = 1$  (Eq.(12)) and using  $a_{l1} = \text{tr}(|l\rangle\langle l|X_1^{(k)}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ .

We can now construct the row vectors of  $2 \times 4$  matrix  $A^{(k)}$ , using Eq.(28) and Eq.(29).

$$\vec{a}_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1, \hat{e}_1), \quad (31)$$

$$\vec{a}_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1, -\hat{e}_1). \quad (32)$$

The matrix  $A^{(k)}$  is, in terms of its row vectors defined above,

$$A^{(k)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \hat{e}_1 \\ 1 & -\hat{e}_1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The norm of the tensor  $\mathcal{C}$  can be expressed in terms of the norms of the tensors defining  $\rho_{1\dots N}$  by using the equivalence of the definitions of  $\rho_{1\dots N}$  given in Eq.(4) and Eq.(20) as

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{C}\|^2 = \frac{1}{2^N} & \left[ 1 + \sum_{k_1 \in \mathcal{N}} \|\vec{s}^{(k_1)}\|^2 + \sum_{\{k_1, k_2\}} \|T^{\{k_1, k_2\}}\|^2 + \dots \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{\{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_M\}} \|T^{\{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_M\}}\|^2 + \dots + \|T^{(N)}\|^2 \right]. \quad (33) \end{aligned}$$

In order to get the norm of  $\mathcal{C} \times_k A^{(k)}$  we use its elementwise definition,

$$(\mathcal{C} \times_k A^{(k)})_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_{k-1} l i_{k+1} \dots i_N} = \sum_{\substack{i_k \\ l = 1, 2}} c_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_{k-1} i_k i_{k+1} \dots i_N} a_{li_k}, \quad (34)$$

the equivalence of the definitions of  $\rho_{1\dots N}$  given in Eq.(4) and Eq.(20) and the elements of  $A^{(k)}$  given by Eq.s(31,32). The result is

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{C} \times_k A^{(k)}\|^2 &= \frac{1}{2^N} \left\{ 1 + \sum_{k_1 \in \mathcal{N}-k} \|\vec{s}^{(k_1)}\|^2 + \sum_{2 \leq M \leq N-1} \sum_{\{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_M\} \in \mathcal{N}-k} \|T^{\{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_M\}}\|^2 \right. \\
&\quad + \hat{e}_1 \vec{s}^{(k)} (\vec{s}^{(k)})^t \hat{e}_1^t + \sum_{k_1 \in \mathcal{N}-k} \hat{e}_1 (T^{\{k_1, k\}})^t T^{\{k_1, k\}} \hat{e}_1^t \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{2 \leq M \leq N-1} \sum_{\{k_1, \dots, k_M\} \in \mathcal{N}-k} \sum_{\alpha_k=1}^3 \sum_{\beta_k=1}^3 \hat{e}_{1\alpha_k} \left( \sum_{\alpha_{k_1} \dots \alpha_{k_M}} t_{\alpha_{k_1} \dots \alpha_{k_M} \alpha_k} t_{\alpha_{k_1} \dots \alpha_{k_M} \beta_k} \right) \hat{e}_{1\beta_k} \right\}, \quad (35)
\end{aligned}$$

or,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{C} \times_k A^{(k)}\|^2 &= \frac{1}{2^N} \left\{ 1 + \sum_{k_1 \in \mathcal{N}-k} \|\vec{s}^{(k_1)}\|^2 + \sum_{2 \leq M \leq N-1} \sum_{\{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_M\} \in \mathcal{N}-k} \|T^{\{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_M\}}\|^2 \right. \\
&\quad + \hat{e}_1 \left[ \vec{s}^{(k)} (\vec{s}^{(k)})^t + \sum_{k_1 \in \mathcal{N}-k} (T^{\{k_1, k\}})^t T^{\{k_1, k\}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \sum_{2 \leq M \leq N-1} \mathbb{T}^{(M+1)} \right] \hat{e}_1^t \right\}, \quad (36)
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbb{T}^{(M+1)} = [\tau_{\alpha_k \beta_k}^{(M+1)}]$  with

$$\tau_{\alpha_k \beta_k}^{(M+1)} = \sum_{\{k_1, \dots, k_M\} \in \mathcal{N}-k} \sum_{\alpha_{k_1} \alpha_{k_2} \dots \alpha_{k_M}} t_{\alpha_{k_1} \alpha_{k_2} \dots \alpha_{k_M} \alpha_k} t_{\alpha_{k_1} \alpha_{k_2} \dots \alpha_{k_M} \beta_k},$$

as in the statement of the theorem.

Let us put the expression in square bracket, the  $(3 \times 3)$  real symmetric matrix in Eq.(36) as

$$G^{(k)} = \vec{s}^{(k)} (\vec{s}^{(k)})^t + \sum_{k_1 \in \mathcal{N}-k} (T^{\{k_1, k\}})^t T^{\{k_1, k\}} + \sum_{2 \leq M \leq N-1} \mathbb{T}^{(M+1)}.$$

Thus, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{C} \times_k A^{(k)}\|^2 &= \frac{1}{2^N} \left\{ 1 + \sum_{k_1 \in \mathcal{N}-k} \|\vec{s}^{(k_1)}\|^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{2 \leq M \leq N-1} \sum_{\{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_M\} \in \mathcal{N}-k} \|T^{\{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_M\}}\|^2 + \hat{e}_1 G^{(k)} \hat{e}_1^t \right\}. \quad (37)
\end{aligned}$$

In Eq.(37) only the last term depends on matrix  $A^{(k)}$  while all others are determined by the state  $\rho_{1 \dots N}$ . Therefore, to maximize  $\|\mathcal{C} \times_k A^{(k)}\|^2$  we take  $\hat{e}_1$  to be the eigenvector of  $G^{(k)}$  corresponding to its largest eigenvalue  $\eta_{max}$ , so that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{A^{(k)}} \|\mathcal{C} \times_k A^{(k)}\|^2 &= \frac{1}{2^N} \left\{ 1 + \sum_{k_1 \in \mathcal{N}-k} \|\vec{s}^{(k_1)}\|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{2 \leq M \leq N-1} \sum_{\{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_M\} \in \mathcal{N}-k} \|T^{\{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_M\}}\|^2 + \eta_{max} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Finally, Eq.(33), Eq.(38) and Eq.(9) together imply

$$D_k(\rho_{12\dots N}) = \frac{1}{2^N} \left\{ \|\vec{s}^{(k)}\|^2 + \sum_{1 \leq M \leq N-1} \sum_{\{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_M\} \in \mathcal{N}-k} \|\mathcal{T}^{\{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_M, k\}}\|^2 - \eta_{max} \right\},$$

where  $\eta_{max}$  is the largest eigenvalue of matrix  $G^{(k)}$ , thus completing the proof.

From Eq.(37) and Eq.(38) we note that the isometric  $2 \times 4$  matrix  $\tilde{A}^{(k)}$  which maximizes  $\|\mathcal{C} \times_k A^{(k)}\|^2$  can now be explicitly constructed as

$$\tilde{A}^{(k)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \hat{e}_{max} \\ 1 & -\hat{e}_{max} \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\hat{e}_{max}$  is the eigenvector of  $G^{(k)}$  for its highest eigenvalue  $\eta_{max}$ . We can then use Eq.(9) directly to compute

$$D_k(\rho_{12\dots N}) = \|\mathcal{C}\|^2 - \|\mathcal{C} \times_k \tilde{A}^{(k)}\|^2. \quad (39)$$

For a two qubit system Eq.(23) reduces to

$$D_1(\rho_{12}) = \frac{1}{4} (\|\vec{x}\|^2 + \|\mathcal{T}\|^2 - \eta_{max}), \quad (40)$$

and

$$D_2(\rho_{12}) = \frac{1}{4} (\|\vec{y}\|^2 + \|\mathcal{T}\|^2 - \zeta_{max}), \quad (41)$$

where  $\vec{x}, \vec{y}$  are the coherent vectors of the reduced density operators of the first and the second qubit respectively,  $\mathcal{T}$  is the two qubit correlation matrix and  $\eta_{max}, \zeta_{max}$  are the largest eigenvalues of  $G^{(1)} = \vec{x}\vec{x}^t + \mathcal{T}\mathcal{T}^t$  and  $G^{(2)} = \vec{y}\vec{y}^t + \mathcal{T}^t\mathcal{T}$  respectively.

Interestingly, the quantum discord  $D_k(\rho_{12\dots N})$  can be obtained experimentally, without a detailed knowledge of the state  $\rho_{12\dots N}$ , because all the elements of the matrix  $G^{(k)}$  as well as the tensor  $\mathcal{C}$  (Eq.(4)) (both of which are the average values of the tensor products of Pauli operators in the  $N$ -qubit state) can be experimentally determined by measuring Pauli operators on individual qubits.

#### IV. EXAMPLES

Next, we apply our measure to some multiqubit quantum states. Unfortunately, a quantitative comparison with the entanglement-separability scenario still eludes us because a viable measure of entanglement for multipartite mixed states is not available.

The first example comprises the 3-qubit mixed states

$$\rho = p|GHZ\rangle\langle GHZ| + \frac{(1-p)}{8} I_8, \quad 0 \leq p \leq 1; \quad (42)$$

where  $|GHZ\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|000\rangle + |111\rangle)$  and  $I_8$  is the identity matrix. Figure 1(a) shows the variation of  $D_1(\rho)$  with  $p$ . We see that  $D_1(\rho)$  increases continuously from  $p = 0$  state (random mixture) to  $p = 1$  state (pure GHZ state), as expected.




Figure 1 : Variation of the quantum discord with parameter  $p$  for the states given in (a) Eq.(42) (b) Eq.(43) and (c)Eq.(44).

Second example is the set of 3-qubit states

$$\rho = p|W\rangle\langle W| + (1-p)|GHZ\rangle\langle GHZ|, \quad 0 \leq p \leq 1; \quad (43)$$

where  $|W\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|100\rangle + |010\rangle + |001\rangle)$ . Figure 1(b) shows the variation of  $D_1(\rho)$  with  $p$ . It is straightforward to check that this state cannot be written as a classical quantum state for any value of  $p$ , including  $p = \frac{1}{2}$ . This explains the nonzero discord at  $p = \frac{1}{2}$ . Further, we observe that discord for the pure GHZ state exceeds that for the pure W state, in conformity with similar behavior of entanglement in these states [59]. The rate of increase of the discord diminishes discontinuously at  $p = \frac{3}{4}$  as the  $|W\rangle$  state increasingly dominates the classical mixture with increasing  $p$ . This interesting observation needs further analysis.

As the last example we consider the set of 3-qubit states

$$\rho = p|GHZ_-\rangle\langle GHZ_-| + (1-p)|GHZ\rangle\langle GHZ|, \quad 0 \leq p \leq 1; \quad (44)$$

where  $|GHZ_-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|000\rangle - |111\rangle)$ . Figure 1(c) shows the variation of  $D_1(\rho)$  with  $p$ . The discord is symmetric about  $p = \frac{1}{2}$  at which it vanishes. For  $p = \frac{1}{2}$  the state can be written as

$$\frac{1}{2}|000\rangle\langle 000| + \frac{1}{2}|111\rangle\langle 111|$$

which is a classical quantum state, so that discord vanishes at  $p = \frac{1}{2}$ . Again, discord is maximum and equal for pure  $|GHZ\rangle$  state and pure  $|GHZ_-\rangle$  state, similar to the behavior of entanglement in these two states [59].

We note that, in all these examples,  $D_1(\rho) = D_2(\rho) = D_3(\rho)$  as all the states are symmetric with respect to the swapping of qubits.

## V. TOTAL QUANTUM CORRELATIONS IN A BIPARTITE STATE

Consider a bipartite state  $\rho$  and denote by  $\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}$  the von Neumann measurement minimizing  $\|\rho - \Pi^{(1)}(\rho)\|^2$ . It is straightforward to check that the state after the measurement  $\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho)$  is a zero discord state, that is  $D_1(\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho)) = 0$ . However, the state  $\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho)$  may have  $D_2(\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho)) \neq 0$ . Thus the state  $\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho)$  can have some non-zero quantum correlations. Thus neither  $D_1(\rho)$  nor  $D_2(\rho)$  gives us a measure of the total quantum correlations in the state  $\rho$ . But this analysis suggests that the quantity

$$Q(\rho) = D_1(\rho) + D_2(\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho)) \quad (45)$$

gives the required measure of the total quantum correlations in the state  $\rho$  [51].

In order to find the optimal von Neumann measurement  $\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}$  on  $\rho$  which minimizes  $\|\rho - \tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho)\|^2$  we have to find the corresponding orthonormal basis  $\{|\tilde{q}\rangle\}$  in  $\mathcal{H}^1$  such that  $\{\tilde{\Pi}_q^{(1)}\} = \{|\tilde{q}\rangle\langle\tilde{q}|\}$ . The expansion of these 1-D projectors  $|\tilde{q}\rangle\langle\tilde{q}|$  in the basis  $X_i = \{I_1, \lambda_i\}$  ( $\lambda_i$  : generators of  $SU(d_1)$ ) via Eq.(10), that is,

$$|\tilde{q}\rangle\langle\tilde{q}| = \sum_i^{d_1^2} \tilde{a}_{qi} X_i \quad ; q = 1, \dots, d_1 \quad (46)$$

with

$$\tilde{a}_{qi} = \langle\tilde{q}|X_i|\tilde{q}\rangle, \quad q = 1, 2, \dots, d_1; \quad i = 1, \dots, d_1^2, \quad (47)$$

must then give the matrix  $\tilde{A}^{(1)}$  which maximizes  $tr(ACCT^t A^t)$  which in turn gives  $D_1(\rho)$ .

To get the state  $\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho)$  we proceed as follows. As noticed above, any post measurement state  $\Pi^{(1)}(\rho)$  is a zero discord state satisfying  $D_1(\Pi^{(1)}(\rho)) = 0$ . Hence  $\Pi^{(1)}(\rho)$  must have the form of classical quantum state as in Eq.(6) for  $N = 2$  namely,

$$\Pi^{(1)}(\rho) = \sum_{q=1}^{d_1} p_q |q\rangle\langle q| \otimes \rho_q. \quad (48)$$

We expand the state  $p_q \rho_q$  in Eq.(48) in terms of the basis  $\{X_j^{(2)}\}$  to get

$$p_q \rho_q = \sum_j b_{qj} X_j^{(2)}, \quad (49)$$

where  $b_{qj} = tr(p_q \rho_q X_j^{(2)})$ . We know from ref. [48] that, for Eq.(39) for  $N = 2$  to hold, we must have

$$b_{qj} = \sum_i \tilde{a}_{qi} c_{ij}. \quad (50)$$

where the matrix  $C = [c_{ij}]$  is defined via Eq.(4) for  $N = 2$ . Now, we substitute Eq.(46), Eq.(49) and Eq.(50) in the expression for the general post measurement state (Eq.(48)) to get the state  $\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho)$  which easily reduces to

$$\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho) = \sum_{lj} (\tilde{A}^{(1)t} \tilde{A}^{(1)} C)_{lj} X_l^{(1)} \otimes X_j^{(2)}, \quad (51)$$

where  $\tilde{A}^{(1)}$  is the matrix which maximizes  $tr(A^{(1)} C C^t A^{(1)t})$ . Thus  $\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho)$  has the form

$$\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho) = \sum_{lj} c'_{lj} X_l^{(1)} \otimes X_j^{(2)}$$

same as in Eq.(4) for  $N = 2$ .

Specializing to 2-qubit systems, we have, for  $D_2(\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho))$ , using Eq.(41),

$$D_2(\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho)) = \frac{1}{4} (\|\tilde{y}\|^2 + \|\tilde{T}\|^2 - \tilde{\zeta}_{max}), \quad (52)$$

where  $y_j = tr(I \otimes \sigma_j \tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho)) = tr(I \otimes \sigma_j \rho)$ ,  $\tilde{t}_{ij} = tr(\sigma_i \otimes \sigma_j \tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho))$ ,  $\tilde{\zeta}_{max}$  is the largest eigenvalue of the real symmetric matrix

$$\tilde{G}^{(2)} = \tilde{y}\tilde{y}^t + \tilde{T}^t \tilde{T},$$

and  $\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho)$  is given by Eq.(51). The total quantum correlations in the state  $\rho$  are given by

$$Q(\rho) = D_1(\rho) + D_2(\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho)) \quad (53)$$

along with equations Eq.(40), Eq.(52) and Eq.(51) (for  $\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho)$ ).

## VI. TOTAL QUANTUM CORRELATIONS IN A $N$ -PARTITE STATE

In this section, we obtain a closed form expression for the total quantum correlations in a  $N$ -partite quantum state. We use Eq. (9,17).

Consider a  $N$ -partite state  $\rho_{12\dots N}$  and denote by  $\tilde{\Pi}^{(k)}$  the von Neumann measurement minimizing Eq.(17). It is straightforward to check that the state after the measurement  $\tilde{\Pi}^{(k)}(\rho_{12\dots N})$  is a zero  $k$ -discord state, that is  $D_k(\tilde{\Pi}^{(k)}(\rho_{12\dots N})) = 0$ . However, the state  $\tilde{\Pi}^{(k)}(\rho_{12\dots N})$  may have  $D_l(\tilde{\Pi}^{(k)}(\rho_{12\dots N})) \neq 0$ ,  $l \neq k$ . Thus the state  $\tilde{\Pi}^{(k)}(\rho_{12\dots N})$  can have some non-zero quantum correlations. Thus  $D_k(\rho_{12\dots N})$  cannot give us a measure of the total quantum correlations in the state  $\rho_{12\dots N}$ . This analysis suggests a geometric measure of total quantum correlations present in a  $N$ -partite state  $\rho_{12\dots N}$  [51].

We can now use the above considerations to investigate the total quantum correlations present in a state  $\rho_{12\dots N}$ . Let us assume that the non-selective von Neumann projective measurements  $\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}, \tilde{\Pi}^{(2)}, \dots, \tilde{\Pi}^{(N)}$  are performed successively on  $N$  parts  $12\dots N$ ,  $k$ th successive measurement being performed on the  $k$ th part, leading to  $D_k(\mu_{12\dots N}) = 0$ , where  $\mu_{12\dots N}$  is the state produced after  $(k-1)$ th successive measurement, given in Eq.(54). Clearly, the corresponding post-measurement states are given by

$$\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho_{12\dots N}), \tilde{\Pi}^{(2)}(\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho_{12\dots N})), \dots, \tilde{\Pi}^{(N)}(\dots(\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho_{12\dots N})\dots)). \quad (54)$$

Here the measurement  $\tilde{\Pi}^{(k)}$  minimizes the loss of correlations in the state produced after the first  $k-1$  successive measurements on  $k-1$  parts. Thus the geometric measures of quantum discord of these successive measurement states are given by

$$D_1(\rho_{12\dots N}), \quad (55)$$

$$D_2(\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho_{12\dots N})), \quad (56)$$

$$D_3(\tilde{\Pi}^{(2)}(\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho_{12\dots N}))), \quad (57)$$

⋮

$$D_N(\tilde{\Pi}^{(N-1)}(\dots(\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho_{12\dots N})))) \dots). \quad (58)$$

Therefore, the geometric measure of total quantum correlations present in a  $N$ -partite quantum state  $\rho_{12\dots N}$  is given by

$$Q(\rho_{12\dots N}) = D_1(\rho_{12\dots N}) + D_2(\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho_{12\dots N})) + D_3(\tilde{\Pi}^{(2)}(\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho_{12\dots N}))) + \dots \\ \dots + D_N(\tilde{\Pi}^{(N-1)}(\dots(\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho_{12\dots N})))) \dots), \quad (59)$$

which is a multipartite generalization of the measure (53) introduced in the previous section.

We use Eq.(9) to write, for the quantum discord  $D_k$  corresponding to the  $k$ th successive measurement on the  $k$ th part,

$$D_k(\tilde{\Pi}^{(k-1)}(\dots(\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho_{12\dots N})))) \dots) = \|\mathcal{C}^{(k)}\|^2 - \|\mathcal{C}^{(k)} \times_k \tilde{A}^{(k)}\|^2, \quad (60)$$

where  $\tilde{A}^{(k)}$  gives the maximum value of the second term. From Eq.(A4) in the Appendix we can infer that

$$\mathcal{C}^{(k)} = \mathcal{C}^{(k-1)} \times_{k-1} (\tilde{A}^{(k-1)t} \tilde{A}^{(k-1)}) \quad k = 2, 3, \dots, N. \quad (61)$$

Therefore, we get, for the total quantum correlations  $Q(\rho_{12\dots N})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\rho_{12\dots N}) &= \|\mathcal{C}^{(1)}\|^2 - \|\mathcal{C}^{(1)} \times_1 \tilde{A}^{(1)}\|^2 \\ &+ \sum_{k=2}^N (\|\mathcal{C}^{(k-1)} \times_{k-1} (\tilde{A}^{(k-1)t} \tilde{A}^{(k-1)})\|^2 - \|\mathcal{C}^{(k-1)} \times_{k-1} (\tilde{A}^{(k-1)t} \tilde{A}^{(k-1)}) \times_k \tilde{A}^{(k)}\|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

Written explicitly, the  $k$ th term in the expression of  $Q(\rho_{12\dots N})$  for  $2 \leq k \leq N$  is,

$$\|\mathcal{C}^{(1)} \Pi_{j=2}^k \times_{j-1} ((\tilde{A}^{(j-1)t}) \tilde{A}^{(j-1)})\|^2 - \|\mathcal{C}^{(1)} (\Pi_{j=2}^k \times_{j-1} ((\tilde{A}^{(j-1)t}) \tilde{A}^{(j-1)}) \times_k \tilde{A}^{(k)})\|^2,$$

where  $\mathcal{C}^{(1)} = \mathcal{C}$  and  $\tilde{A}^{(1)}$ , maximizing the second term in Eq.(9), correspond to the starting state  $\rho_{12\dots N}$  via Eq.s(4,9).

Next we prove that

$$\|\mathcal{C}^{(k-1)} \times_{k-1} \tilde{A}^{(k-1)}\|^2 = \|\mathcal{C}^{(k)}\|^2 = \|\mathcal{C}^{(k-1)} \times_{k-1} \tilde{A}^{(k-1)t} \tilde{A}^{(k-1)}\|^2, \quad k = 2, \dots, N.$$

Using the definition of norm of a tensor as the inner product of a tensor with itself given in [53] we get,

$$\|\mathcal{C}^{(k-1)} \times_{k-1} ((\tilde{A}^{(k-1)t}) \tilde{A}^{(k-1)})\|^2 = \langle \mathcal{C}^{(k-1)} \times_{k-1} ((\tilde{A}^{(k-1)t}) \tilde{A}^{(k-1)}), \mathcal{C}^{(k-1)} \times_{k-1} ((\tilde{A}^{(k-1)t}) \tilde{A}^{(k-1)}) \rangle,$$

We use Proposition 3.11 and Proposition 3.4(b) in [53] to get

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \mathcal{C}^{(k-1)} \times_{k-1} ((\tilde{A}^{(k-1)t}) \tilde{A}^{(k-1)}), \mathcal{C}^{(k-1)} \times_{k-1} ((\tilde{A}^{(k-1)t}) \tilde{A}^{(k-1)}) \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathcal{C}^{(k-1)} \times_{k-1} ((\tilde{A}^{(k-1)t}) \tilde{A}^{(k-1)}) \times_{k-1} ((\tilde{A}^{(k-1)t}) \tilde{A}^{(k-1)}), \mathcal{C}^{(k-1)} \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathcal{C}^{(k-1)} \times_{k-1} ((\tilde{A}^{(k-1)t}) (\tilde{A}^{(k-1)} \tilde{A}^{(k-1)t}) \tilde{A}^{(k-1)}), \mathcal{C} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

We know that  $\tilde{A}^{(k)} (\tilde{A}^{(k)})^t = I$ ;  $k = 1, \dots, N$ , so that,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{C}^{(k-1)} \times_{k-1} ((\tilde{A}^{(k-1)t}) \tilde{A}^{(k-1)})\|^2 &= \langle \mathcal{C}^{(k-1)} \times_{k-1} ((\tilde{A}^{(k-1)t}) \tilde{A}^{(k-1)}), \mathcal{C}^{(k-1)} \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathcal{C}^{(k-1)} \times_{k-1} \tilde{A}^{(k-1)}, \mathcal{C}^{(k-1)} \times \tilde{A}^{(k-1)} \rangle = \|\mathcal{C}^{(k-1)} \times_{k-1} \tilde{A}^{(k-1)}\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

By using this, all the terms except the first and the last term in Eq.(62) pairwise cancel. Thus, we finally get

$$Q(\rho_{12\dots N}) = \|\mathcal{C}\|^2 - \|\mathcal{C} \times_1 \tilde{A}^{(1)} \times_2 \tilde{A}^{(2)} \times_3 \dots \times_{N-1} \tilde{A}^{(N-1)} \times_N \tilde{A}^{(N)}\|^2. \quad (64)$$

This formula applies to an arbitrary  $N$ -partite quantum state. However,  $Q(\rho_{12\dots N})$  can be actually computed only for a  $N$ -qubit state, because the matrices  $\tilde{A}^{(k)}$  as well as the states  $\tilde{\Pi}^{(k)}(\rho_{12\dots N})$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, N$  can be explicitly constructed in this case, as shown in section III and the appendix (Eq.(A4)). Further, for  $N$ -qubit states, this formula can be experimentally implemented, as all the elements of all the matrices can be determined by measuring Pauli operators on individual qubits.

From Proposition 3.4(a) of ref.[53], namely,

$$\mathcal{Y} \times_m A \times_n B = (\mathcal{Y} \times_m A) \times_n B = (\mathcal{Y} \times_n B) \times_m A \quad m \neq n,$$

where  $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{J_1 \times J_2 \times \dots \times J_N}$  is a  $N$ -way tensor and  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{L_m \times J_m}$ ,  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{L_n \times J_n}$  are matrices, it follows that the total quantum correlation is invariant under arbitrary permutation of factors in Eq.(64) or is invariant under any permutation of order in which the measurements on individual parts are made.

## VII. SUMMARY AND COMMENTS

To summarize, we obtain generic forms of quantum discord and total quantum correlations in a  $N$ -partite state and the corresponding exact formulas in the  $N$ -qubit case. The formulas for the quantum discord and the total quantum correlations in the  $N$ -qubit case are not only exactly computable using the  $N$ -qubit quantum state, but can also be experimentally implemented when the  $N$ -qubit state is not precisely known. States of quantum systems may not be known at some intermediate stage of quantum information processing and deciphering an unknown quantum state is a formidable task. Hence it is of great advantage if the crucial resources like entanglement or quantum discord can be estimated experimentally, without taking recourse to what the quantum state is. The number of quantities required to be measured goes linearly with the system size  $N$ , as only three Pauli operators are to be measured on a qubit. The computational complexity of the discord in a  $N$ -qubit state is dominated by that of the middle term in Eq.(23) which deals with  $3 \times 4^{N-1}$  elements (average values of the tensor products of Pauli operators in the  $N$ -qubit state). Thus computation increases exponentially with system size. This is not a real restriction when  $N$  is small ( $N = 2, 3, 4$  qubits). Regarding the operational procedure defining the total quantum correlation in a  $N$ -partite state, we note that it accounts for the total quantum correlations between  $N$  parts as no quantum correlations remain, including all possible cuts. However, if one or more parts contain correlated sub-parts and the optimal measurement is a joint measurement (in an entangled basis) on these sub-parts, then the correlations between these sub-parts remain. These correlations may be eliminated by considering the sub-parts as separate parts of the system. We do not lose any generality in this situation because we are concerned with the quantum correlations between the specified  $N$  parts and our formulas account for these correlations. The actual division of the system into subsystems (parts) is dictated by the correlations required for a particular application. Finally, it will be interesting to seek a generalization of this work to include POVMs.

*Acknowledgments :*

This work was supported by the BCUD research grant RG-13. ASMH thanks Pune University for the hospitality during his visit when this work was initiated. PSJ thanks Anil Shaji and Sai Vinjanampathy for a useful discussion.

*Appendix : Finding the state  $\tilde{\Pi}^{(k)}(\rho_{12\dots N})$*

In order to find the optimal von Neumann measurement  $\tilde{\Pi}^{(k)}$  on  $\rho_{12\dots N}$  which minimizes  $\|\rho_{12\dots N} - \Pi^{(k)}(\rho_{12\dots N})\|^2$  we have to find the corresponding orthonormal basis  $\{|\tilde{z}\rangle\}$  in  $H^k$  such that  $\{\tilde{\Pi}_z^{(k)}\} = \{|\tilde{z}\rangle\langle\tilde{z}|\}$ . The expansion of these 1-D projectors  $|\tilde{z}\rangle\langle\tilde{z}|$  in the basis  $X_i^{(k)}$   $i = 1, \dots, d_k^2$  ( $X_i^{(k)}$  : generators of  $SU(d_k)$ ) that is,

$$|\tilde{z}\rangle\langle\tilde{z}| = \sum_i \tilde{a}_{zi} X_i^{(k)} \quad ; i = 1, \dots, d_k^2 \quad (A1)$$

with

$$\tilde{a}_{zi} = \langle\tilde{z}|X_i^{(k)}|\tilde{z}\rangle, \quad z = 1, 2, \dots, d_k; \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, d_k^2.$$

must then give the matrix  $\tilde{A}^{(k)}$  which maximizes  $\|\mathcal{C} \times_k A^{(k)}\|^2$  which in turn gives the  $k$ -discord  $D_k(\rho_{12\dots N})$ .

To get the state  $\tilde{\Pi}^{(k)}(\rho_{12\dots N})$  we proceed as follows. As noticed above, the state  $\tilde{\Pi}^{(k)}(\rho_{12\dots N})$  is a zero  $k$ -discord state satisfying  $D_k(\tilde{\Pi}^{(k)}(\rho_{12\dots N})) = 0$ . Hence  $\tilde{\Pi}^{(k)}(\rho_{12\dots N})$  must have the form of classical quantum state as in Eq.(6). We expand the state  $p_z \rho_{[k]|z}$  in Eq. (6) in terms of the basis  $\{X_j^{(1)} \otimes X_j^{(2)} \otimes \dots \otimes X_j^{(k-1)} \otimes X_j^{(k+1)} \otimes \dots \otimes X_j^{(N)}\}$  to get,

$$p_z \rho_{[k]|z} = \sum_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_{k-1} i_{k+1} \dots i_N} b_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_{k-1} i_{k+1} \dots i_N} X_{i_1}^{(1)} \otimes X_{i_2}^{(2)} \otimes \dots \otimes X_{i_{k-1}}^{(k-1)} \otimes X_{i_{k+1}}^{(k+1)} \otimes \dots \otimes X_{i_N}^{(N)},$$

$$z = 1, 2, \dots, d_k; \quad i_m = 1, \dots, d_k^2; \quad m = 1, 2, \dots, N, \quad (A2)$$

with  $b_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_{k-1} i_{k+1} \dots i_N} = \text{tr}(p_l \rho_{[k]|l} X_{i_1}^{(1)} \otimes X_{i_2}^{(2)} \otimes \dots \otimes X_{i_{k-1}}^{(k-1)} \otimes X_{i_{k+1}}^{(k+1)} \otimes \dots \otimes X_{i_N}^{(N)})$ . We know from theorem 1 that, for Eq.(9) to hold, we must have

$$b_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_{k-1} i_{k+1} \dots i_N} = \sum_{i_k} c_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N} \tilde{a}_{z i_k} \quad (A3)$$

Now, we substitute Eq.(A1), Eq.(A2) and Eq.(A3) in the expression for the general post measurement state (Eq.(6))

$$\chi_k = \sum_{z=1}^{d_k} p_z |z\rangle \langle z| \otimes \rho_{[k]|z},$$

and use the definition of n-mode product in Eq.(7) and proposition 3.4(b) in ref.[53] to get the state  $\tilde{\Pi}^{(k)}(\rho_{12\dots N})$  which easily reduces to

$$\tilde{\Pi}^{(k)}(\rho_{12\dots N}) = \sum_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N} [\mathcal{C} \times_k ((\tilde{A}^{(k)})^t \tilde{A}^{(k)})]_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N} X_{i_1}^{(1)} \otimes X_{i_2}^{(2)} \otimes \dots \otimes X_{i_N}^{(N)} \quad (A4)$$

where  $\tilde{A}^{(k)}$  is the matrix which maximizes  $\|\mathcal{C} \times_k A^{(k)}\|^2$ . Thus  $\tilde{\Pi}^{(k)}(\rho_{12\dots N})$  has the form

$$\tilde{\Pi}^{(k)}(\rho_{12\dots N}) = \sum_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N} \mathcal{C}'_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N} X_{i_1}^{(1)} \otimes X_{i_2}^{(2)} \otimes \dots \otimes X_{i_N}^{(N)}$$

same as in Eq.(4).

- 
- [1] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2009).  
[2] O. Guhne and GüToth, Phys. Rep. **474**, 1 (2009).  
[3] R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 4277 (1989).  
[4] E. Knill and R. Laflamme, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5672 (1998).  
[5] S. L. Braunstein, C. M. Caves, R. Jozsa, N. Linden, S. Popescu, and R. Schack, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1054 (1999).  
[6] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, C. A. Fuchs, T. Mor, E. Rains, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 1070 (1999).  
[7] D. A. Meyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2014 (2000).  
[8] E. Biham, G. Brassard, D. Kenigsberg, and T. Mor, Theor. Comput. Sci. **320**, 15 (2004).  
[9] A. Datta, S. T. Flammia, and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 042316 (2005).  
[10] A. Datta and G. Vidal, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 042310 (2007).  
[11] M. Piani, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 090502 (2008).

- [12] S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 022301 (2008).
- [13] S. Luo and Q. Zhang, J. Stat. Phys. **131**, 1169 (2008).
- [14] N. Li and S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 024303 (2008).
- [15] H. Ollivier and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 017901 (2001).
- [16] L. Henderson and V. Vedral, J. Phy. A **34**, 6899 (2001).
- [17] W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 012320 (2003).
- [18] Z. Zhang and S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 032312 (2007).
- [19] A. Datta, A. Shaji, and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 050502 (2008).
- [20] B. P. Lanyon, M. Barbieri, M. P. Almeida, and A. G. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 200501 (2008).
- [21] S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 042303 (2008).
- [22] R. Dillenschneider, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 224413 (2008).
- [23] A. Shabani and D. A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 100402 (2009).
- [24] A. Datta and S. Gharibian, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 042325 (2009).
- [25] M. S. Sarandy, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 022108 (2009).
- [26] T. Werlang, S. Souza, F. F. Fanchini, and C. J. Villas Boas, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 024103 (2009).
- [27] A. Datta, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 052304 (2009).
- [28] B. Wang, Z. Y. Xu, Z. Q. Chen, and M. Feng, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 014101 (2010).
- [29] K. Modi, T. Paterek, W. Son, V. Vedral, and M. Williamson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 080501 (2010).
- [30] Y. X. Chen and S. W. Li, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 032120 (2010).
- [31] T. Werlang and G. Rigolin, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 044101 (2010).
- [32] M. Ali, A. R. P. Rau, and G. Alber, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 042105 (2010).
- [33] F. F. Fanchini, T. Werlang, C. A. Brasil, L. G. E. Arruda, and A. O. Caldeira, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 052107 (2010).
- [34] A. Ferraro, L. Aolita, D. Cavalcanti, F. M. Cucchietti, and A. Acn, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 052318 (2010).
- [35] L. Mazzola, J. Piilo, and S. Maniscalco, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 200401 (2010).
- [36] J. Wang, J. Deng, and J. Jing, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 052120 (2010).
- [37] B. Bylicka and D. Chruscinski, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 062102 (2010).
- [38] A. Brodutch and D. R. Terno, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 062103 (2010).
- [39] M. Zwolak, H. T. Quan, and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 062110 (2010).
- [40] D. O. Soares-Pinto, L. C. Celeri, R. Auccaise, F. F. Fanchini, E. R. deAzevedo, J. Maziero, T. J. Bonagamba, and R. M. Serra, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 062118 (2010).
- [41] R. C. Ge, M. Gong, C. F. Li, J. S. Xu, and G. C. Guo, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 064103 (2010).
- [42] P. Giorda and M. G. A. Paris, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 020503 (2010).
- [43] R. Vasile, P. Giorda, S. Olivares, M. G. A. Paris, and S. Maniscalco, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 012313 (2010).
- [44] G. Adesso and A. Datta, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 030501 (2010).
- [45] J.-S. Xu, X.-Y. Xu, C.-F. Li, C.-J. Zhang, X.-B. Zou, and G.-C. Guo, Nature Commun. **1**, 7 (2010).
- [46] J. Cui and H. Fan, J. Phys. A **43**, 045305 (2010).
- [47] M. D. Lang and C. M. Caves, e-print arXiv:1006.2775v2.
- [48] Shunlong Luo and Shuangshuang Fu, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 034302 (2010).
- [49] I. Chakrabarty, P. Agrawal, A. K. Pati arXiv:1006.5784 (2010), Kavan Modi and Vlatko Vedral arXiv:1104.1520 (2011).
- [50] B. Dakic, V. Vedral, and C. Brukner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 190502 (2010).
- [51] M. Okrasa and Z. Walczak, arXiv: 1101.6057.
- [52] Lin Chen, Eric Chitambar, Kavan Modi, and Giovanni Vacanti, arXiv: 1005.4348.
- [53] T. G. Kolda, "Multilinear operator for higher order decompositions", Tech. Report SAND2006-2081, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico and Livermore, Colifornia Apr. 2006.
- [54] L. De Lathauwer, B. De Moor and J. Vandewalle, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. A.* **21**, 1253 (2000).
- [55] This amounts to choosing for  $\sum_l p_l \rho_{[k]|l}$  the reduced density operator obtained by tracing out the  $k$ th part from the state  $\rho_{12\dots N}$  (Eq.(4)), which can always be done because  $\{\rho_{[k]|l}\}$  is a set of arbitrary density operators acting on  $\mathcal{H}^1 \otimes \mathcal{H}^2 \otimes \dots \mathcal{H}^{k-1} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{k+1} \otimes \dots \mathcal{H}^N$  and  $\{p_l\}$  is an arbitrary probability distribution.
- [56] G. Mahler, Volker A. Weberruss, *Quantum Networks* (Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 1995).
- [57] M. S. Byrd and N. Khaneja, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 062322 (2003); Ali Saif M. Hassan and Pramod S. Joag, Quantum Inf. Comput. **8**, 773 (2008).
- [58] G. Kimura, Phys. Lett. A **314**, 339 (2003).
- [59] Ali Saif M. Hassan and Pramod S. Joag, Physical Review A **77**, 062334 (2008).