

# Maximally correlated multipartite quantum states

J. Batle<sup>1</sup>, M. Casas<sup>2</sup>, A. Plastino<sup>2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Departament de Física, Universitat de les Illes Balears, 07122 Palma de Mallorca, Spain*

<sup>2</sup>*Departament de Física and IFISC, Universitat de les Illes Balears, 07122 Palma de Mallorca, Spain*

<sup>3</sup>*Instituto de Física La Plata–CCT-CONICET, Universidad Nacional de La Plata, C.C. 67, 1900, La Plata, Argentina*

(Dated: April 12, 2021)

We investigate quantum states that possess both maximum entanglement and maximum discord between the pertinent parties. Since entanglement (discord) is defined only for bipartite (two qubit) systems, we shall introduce an appropriate sum over of all bi-partitions as the associated measure. The ensuing definition –not new for entanglement– is thus extended here to quantum discord. Also, additional dimensions within the parties are considered (*qudits*). We also discuss nonlocality (in the form of maximum violation of a Bell inequality) for all multiqubit systems. The emergence of more nonlocal states than local ones, all of them possessing maximum entanglement, will be linked, surprisingly enough, to whether quantum mechanics is defined over the fields of real or complex numbers.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a; 03.67.Mn; 03.65.-w

## I. INTRODUCTION

Entanglement, non-locality, and quantum discord are foundational quantum mechanical issues [1] and have received renewed and intense attention in the last years (for a very small sample, see for instance [1–4] and references therein). Some important distinctions between the three concepts deserve a few words. Entanglement, non-locality, and quantum discord are foundational quantum mechanical issues [1] and have received renewed and intense attention in the last years (for a very small sample, see for instance [1–4] and references therein). Some important distinctions between the three concepts deserve a few words.

- While two-party entanglement is quite well understood, entanglement in a multi-partite system is an area of great current interest (see [5] and references therein). Since entanglement is a resource to be taken advantage of, the quest for maximally entangled states has proceeded at a rapid pace. Thus far, only few qubit maximally entangled states such as two qubit Bell states, three qubit Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) states, and four qubit states [6] have been clearly identified. Of course, it would be of considerable interest to generate such maximally entangled states as representatives of the ground state of a physically realizable (spin) model. Why? Because the strength of correlations in a many-body system is a reflection of the degree of entanglement (for pure states) [3]. We are here speaking of quantities such as density, magnetization, etc. Thus, characterization of multi-particle entanglement and production of maximal/high multi-qubit entanglement is vital for the mutual enrichment of i) quantum information physics and ii) many-body condensed matter.
- There exist certain tasks, such as device-independent quantum key distribution [7] and

quantum communication complexity problems [38], which can only be carried out provided the corresponding entangled states exhibit *nonlocal correlations*. Non-locality, as measured by the violation of Bell's inequalities, describes the part of quantum correlations that cannot be reproduced by any classical local model. Non-locality plays a key role in some applications of quantum information theory [7] and for infinite quantum system [5], in which violation of Bell's inequalities can constitute a complementary resource and pinpoint the critical points associated with quantum phase transitions.

- In turn, quantum discord [8] is defined as the difference between two expressions of mutual information extended from the classical to the quantum realm. It aims to capture all the nonclassical correlations of a quantum system, something that entanglement fails to do.
- In recent years, a large number of studies focus attention on strictly quantal correlations [9–17], and many different correlation measures have been proposed to detect them [18–23]. It is of the essence to point out that these correlations, and their measures, exhibit intriguing peculiarities. Thus, violation of Bell's inequalities implies entanglement, but the presence of entanglement does not necessarily imply Bell-violation [24, 25]. In turn, quantum discord exhibits a distinctly different behavior from that of entanglement [26]. Remarkably enough, quantum discord has proved itself a useful quantity in a number of applications, such as speed-up in quantum computation [27].

For our present purposes we specially note that quantum teleportation –one of the most intriguing features of entanglement– has been proposed theoretically using protocols based on genuine *multipartite* entanglement, and experimentally realized in four and five qubits systems [28, 29]. States with genuine multipartite entanglement

are defined as having strict maximal entanglement in all bipartitions of the system. The question of maximal entangled states and their definition was first addressed by Gisin [30], where the existence of only a few of them was first pointed out. Along lines recently pursued by Helwig et al. [31], we shall focus attention here on states that may become maximally entangled for any number of parties *by changing the qudit dimension*. One clear motivation for studying these states is that their maximal entanglement content makes them natural candidates for implementing original multipartite communication protocols.

The concept of quantum correlation for multipartite systems is intimately related to the mathematical structure of quantum mechanics, as a direct consequence of the linear character of tensor product Hilbert spaces. A question that will be seen important below revolves around the fact that the Hilbert space of a system may use the field of real or of complex numbers. We will show instances in which a description provided by real coefficients is both useful and necessary.

It is the aim of the present work to regard multipartite quantum correlations from three standpoints: those of quantum entanglement, quantum discord, and non-locality.

In the Appendix we review all measures employed for describing quantum correlations. Some readers may want to peruse it before proceeding with the paper. Equations in the Appendix are numbered with a capital A preceding the corresponding number and are referenced throughout the text. In Section II we study maximally entangled states for  $N=3$  till 8 qubits, emphasizing the role played, in each case, by non-locality. Section III is devoted to obtaining maximally entangled states for systems of qudits. States are compared with their corresponding qubit counterparts. Section IV makes use of quantum discord in order to find multipartite qubit system maximizing it. Section V compares all correlation measures by individually studying how they evolve as the number of parties increases, or globally correlating their absolute values for different maximal states with fixed number of parties. Finally, some conclusions are drawn in Section VI.

## II. MAXIMALLY ENTANGLED STATES OF MULTIQUBIT SYSTEMS. THE ROLE OF NONLOCALITY

When dealing with states maximizing entanglement in multiple qubits, it will prove convenient to employ the maximally correlated basis that is defined for every  $2^N$ -Hilbert space. Usually, the preferred basis for two qubit states is the so called computational one  $\{|00\rangle, |01\rangle, |10\rangle, |11\rangle\}$ . The Bell basis of maximally correlated states for  $N=2$  is given by

$$|\Phi^\pm\rangle = \frac{(|00\rangle \pm e^{i\theta}|11\rangle)}{\sqrt{2}}, |\Psi^\pm\rangle = \frac{(|01\rangle \pm e^{i\theta}|10\rangle)}{\sqrt{2}}. \quad (1)$$

For simplicity, and without loss of generality, we shall take real coefficients ( $\theta = 0$  in (1)). These states maximally violate the CHSH Bell inequality. Needless to say, only in the bipartite case entanglement implies non-locality and vice versa (*Gisin's theorem* [32]). Let us recall that the family of pure states of three qubits  $|\Psi_{j,N=3}^\pm\rangle = (|j\rangle \pm |2^N-3-j\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$  forms a basis, the so called GHZ basis or Mermin basis, and that these states maximally violate the Mermin inequality. In the general case, the most convenient basis for dealing with maximally correlated multipartite states of  $N$  qubits will be given by

$$|\Psi_{j,N}^\pm\rangle = (|j\rangle \pm |2^N-1-j\rangle)/\sqrt{2}. \quad (2)$$

Notice that these states maximally violate the generalized MABK Bell inequality.

For  $N=3$  qubits, the maximally entangled state is given by the usual GHZ state  $|GHZ\rangle = (|000\rangle + |111\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ . This instance will be the only one for which maximum entanglement and maximum non-locality are provided by the same state. For  $N=4$  qubits, the state discovered by Higuchi and Sudbery [6], given by

$$|\Phi_4\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \left[ |\Psi_{3,4}^+\rangle + \omega |\Psi_{6,4}^+\rangle + \omega^2 |\Psi_{5,4}^+\rangle \right], \quad (3)$$

with  $\omega = -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}i$ , is the one which possesses maximum entanglement ( $9.3773 \ln 2$ ) as defined by the measure of Eq. (A1). For this entanglement measure to be optimal, the corresponding state must possess complex expansion-coefficients. In addition,  $QD \neq 0$  for state (3). When pursuing maximum entanglement for real states *only*, we encounter the following state

$$|\Phi_4^R\rangle = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \left[ |\Psi_{0,4}^-\rangle - |\Psi_{3,4}^+\rangle - |\Psi_{4,4}^+\rangle + \sqrt{2}|\Psi_{5,4}^+\rangle + \sqrt{2}|\Psi_{6,4}^-\rangle + |\Psi_{7,4}^-\rangle \right]. \quad (4)$$

This state—which has null discord—is highly entangled, but does not reach the maximal value. Instead, it stays very close to it ( $9.2017 \ln 2$ ). Specifically, for the state (4) all one qubit reduced matrices are maximally mixed, as in the case of the state (3), and two of the six associated density matrices for two qubits are maximally mixed. In the light of these results, we should require some figure of merit to somehow validate one of these two states or both of them. Let us suppose that we study the concomitant MABK Bell inequality maximal violation given in the Appendix by Eq. (A15). In the complex case of four qubits,  $MABK_4^{\max} = 2.17732$ , a 38% of the maximum possible violation. On the other hand, our real

state of four qubits has  $MABK_4^{\max} = \sqrt{6}$ , only a 43% of the maximum value. This is not a big surprise, for the more linear combinations of maximally correlated states we have, the less non-locality is attained [5]. In our case, however,  $|\Phi_4^R\rangle$  is more nonlocal than  $|\Phi_4\rangle$ , although less entangled.

In this case, the state possessing maximum correlations, either in the form of entanglement or of non-locality, is not the one with complex coefficients. Therefore, it makes a great difference which field of numbers we use for building up quantum states.

For  $N=5$  qubits, Brown et al. [33] proposed a state which is shown to possess the maximum entanglement given in the Appendix by (A1). This state of five qubits is of the form

$$|\Phi_5\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \left[ |100\rangle|\Phi_-\rangle + |010\rangle|\Psi_-\rangle + |100\rangle|\Phi_+\rangle + |111\rangle|\Psi_+\rangle \right], \quad (5)$$

with a maximum entanglement of  $25 \ln 2$ . It is apparent that the previous state does not contain correlations going beyond those for the bipartite case. Certainly, the concomitant non-locality measure is 2.1361, only 27% of the corresponding maximum possible value.

For  $N=6$  qubits, we discovered in Ref. [34] a state with a maximum entanglement given by Eq. (A1). This is a state for which all bipartitions are maximally mixed. The aforementioned state has the form

$$|\Phi_6\rangle = \frac{1}{4} \left[ |\Psi_{0,6}^+\rangle + |\Psi_{3,6}^+\rangle + |\Psi_{5,6}^+\rangle + |\Psi_{6,6}^+\rangle \right. \\ \left. + |\Psi_{9,6}^+\rangle + |\Psi_{15,6}^+\rangle + |\Psi_{17,6}^+\rangle + |\Psi_{18,6}^+\rangle \right. \\ \left. + |\Psi_{24,6}^+\rangle + |\Psi_{29,6}^+\rangle - (|\Psi_{10,6}^+\rangle + |\Psi_{12,6}^+\rangle) \right. \\ \left. + |\Psi_{20,6}^+\rangle + |\Psi_{23,6}^+\rangle + |\Psi_{27,6}^+\rangle + |\Psi_{30,6}^+\rangle \right]. \quad (6)$$

Remarkably enough, Tapiador et al. [35] were able to algebraically simplify this state into a form that greatly clarifies how correlations are distributed among subsystems. This state  $|\Psi_6\rangle$  reads

$$\frac{1}{2} (|\Psi_{0,4}^+\rangle|\Psi^-\rangle + |\Psi_{3,4}^+\rangle|\Psi^+\rangle + |\Psi_{6,4}^+\rangle|\Phi^-\rangle + |\Psi_{5,4}^+\rangle|\Phi^+\rangle). \quad (7)$$

It is plain from (7) that all correlations existing in this maximally entangled state are encoded via maximally correlated 4-party and 2-party subsystems, which entails interesting implications regarding non-locality. Indeed, the maximal violation of the corresponding MABK Bell inequality for 6 qubits is only 2 (18% of the maximum value). In other words, state (7) may have maximum entanglement, but does not violate the corresponding MABK inequality. For this state all concomitant reduced density matrices of one, two and three qubits are completely mixed, yet the state is not nonlocal.  $|\Psi_6\rangle$  constitutes an example of a state which has found applications in quantum information processing [36, 37], but since it has negligible non-locality, it may not be suitable for other tasks [7, 38].

## A. Special cases: $N=7$ and $N=8$ qubits

These two particular instances deserve special consideration for –as far as we know– they have not yet been investigated in detailed fashion.

In the case of  $N=7$  qubits, since the state obtained in [34] is one with no easily discernible algebraic structure, one wonders whether a better form for that state might exist, either for real or complex state-functions. A more detailed study is carried out here. A conjecture made in [34] establishes that there is no pure state of seven qubits with marginal density matrices for subsystems of one, two, or three qubits that are (all of them) *completely* mixed. Contrarily to the case of the seven-qubit state reported in [34], we encounter other states that –although lacking a simple structure– all possess totally mixed 1- and 2-qubit marginal density matrices. Several highly entangled states of 7 qubits have been obtained [35] without reaching an upper bound.

The aforementioned state of  $N=7$  qubits possesses a maximum entanglement of 105.7882. Certainly, its reduced states of two qubits are not (all) mixed, but in practice, they can be considered as such. This is so because, for reduced states of two qubits, 6 of them possess entanglement  $0.99205 \ln 2$  and the remaining 15,  $0.99760 \ln 2$ . This “imperfect” mixture surely is immaterial for practical purposes. As far as 3-qubit marginal density matrices are concerned, 15 contain an entanglement of  $0.97913 \ln 8$  and the remaining 20,  $0.99541 \ln 8$ . Although some more compact algebraic form for the seven-qubit maximally entangled state could in principle be found, that is not actually the case. Such putative state should necessarily be complex –not real– to attain maximum entanglement, which is paramount importance for our present discussion.

In the light of these results, we may wonder if it makes *physical* sense to have states that are not completely mixed. Should one expect a maximally entangled state to be endowed with some sort of hierarchy in which increasing entanglement would be accompanied by maximal mixedness at every one-, two-, three-stages involving marginal states? Also, is it mandatory to resort to states with complex coefficients in order to have maximum multipartite entanglement? These are precisely the questions we wish to answer in the present work.

To this end we have explored the whole space of real and complex states via a simulated annealing method, and have found similar results for both real and complex states. We have been able to detect states with totally mixed 1- and 2-qubit marginal density matrices, while increasing mixedness for 3 qubits. In the case of  $N=7$  real states, we encountered a maximum entanglement of 105.1151, greater than that recorded all previous findings. On the other hand, the complex expansion-coefficients instance displays a slightly greater value of entanglement than the real one, namely, 105.1441. While the former situation accrues nearly 31/35 completely mixed three qubit reduced density matrices, in the later

one that figure is increased up to 33/35. In Fig. 1, the coefficients of the real state are depicted. Had we let the optimization procedure evolve freely *in the complex case*, we would have reached the same result as in [34]. In other words, it is possible to obtain highly entangled states, either real or complex, with totally mixed 1- and 2-qubit reduced states. To the best of our knowledge, no other states had been previously provided with this maximal entanglement values.




FIG. 1. (Color online) Coefficients of the real state of  $N = 7$  qubits that maximizes total entanglement, with fully 1- and 2-qubit reduced states that are maximally mixed. See text for details.

On the whole, although we have not been able to provide a conclusive answer regarding entanglement for the  $N=7$  qubit case, we have shed light on the characteristics of these states by introducing a new one that possesses maximally mixed reduced two qubit states. As we have seen, real or complex states behave differently, a situation that might become immaterial, provided real states suffice to fulfill eventual applications. As far as non-locality is concerned, all  $N = 7$  qubit instances do not violate the corresponding MABK inequality. Again, as in the  $N = 6$  case, we find completely opposite behaviors for entanglement vis-a-vis non-locality.

Now, the last case of interest, which has been quite elusive, is the one corresponding to  $N=8$  qubits. It is undeniable that as we increase more and more the dimension of the concomitant Hilbert space, the problem of obtaining an optimum state with maximum generalized entanglement becomes less and less tractable, either analytically or numerically.

In any case, we have carried out extensive computations in order to get a suitable result. By performing a simulated annealing optimization procedure, we have reached a maximum for the entanglement and, in turn, obtained a multipartite state of eight qubits that appears to be an optimal one. We mention that in order to tackle the problem, we have only pursued real states, that is, configurations of states with real coefficients. This fact may

limit the validity of our conclusions, but we are confident that, in any case, we have gotten a valid result. In addition, we have limited the expansion-coefficients to be all equal in modulus, thus acquiring a *simple* algebraic structure. Needless to say, these simplifications have led to greater values of entanglement than arbitrary explorations with no constraints.

Our special state of eight qubits  $|\Phi_8\rangle$  reads

$$\frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}} \left[ -|\Psi_{0,8}^- \rangle - |\Psi_{3,8}^- \rangle + |\Psi_{5,8}^- \rangle - |\Psi_{6,8}^- \rangle - |\Psi_{25,8}^+ \rangle \right. \\ + |\Psi_{26,8}^+ \rangle + |\Psi_{28,8}^+ \rangle + |\Psi_{31,8}^+ \rangle + |\Psi_{33,8}^- \rangle - |\Psi_{34,8}^- \rangle \\ + |\Psi_{36,8}^- \rangle + |\Psi_{39,8}^- \rangle + |\Psi_{56,8}^+ \rangle + |\Psi_{59,8}^+ \rangle + |\Psi_{61,8}^+ \rangle \\ - |\Psi_{62,8}^+ \rangle + |\Psi_{73,8}^- \rangle + |\Psi_{74,8}^- \rangle + |\Psi_{76,8}^- \rangle - |\Psi_{79,8}^- \rangle \\ + |\Psi_{80,8}^+ \rangle - |\Psi_{83,8}^+ \rangle + |\Psi_{85,8}^+ \rangle + |\Psi_{86,8}^+ \rangle - |\Psi_{104,8}^- \rangle \\ + |\Psi_{107,8}^- \rangle + |\Psi_{109,8}^- \rangle + |\Psi_{110,8}^- \rangle - |\Psi_{113,8}^+ \rangle \\ \left. - |\Psi_{114,8}^+ \rangle + |\Psi_{116,8}^+ \rangle - |\Psi_{119,8}^+ \rangle \right]. \quad (8)$$

It exhibits interesting features. The amount of total entanglement is  $362 \ln 2$ . All reduced states of one, two, and three qubits are maximally mixed. This fact implies that this state is perfectly suitable for i) performing teleportation protocols involving up to three qubits within eight parties, as well as ii) for many other applications. However, as expected, all four qubit reduced states are not completely mixed. The work by Gisin and Bechmann-Pasquinucci [30] already pointed out that states of eight qubits cannot have all subsystems completely mixed. However, in our case, we get close enough to such desideratum.

Out of the  $\binom{8}{4} = 70$  possible reduced states of four qubits,

- 56 matrices are completely mixed ( $\ln 16$ )
- 6 of them are nearly diagonal matrices with four equal eigenvalues ( $\frac{1}{2} \ln 16$ ). The corresponding partitions are  $\{1, 2, 3, 6\}$ ,  $\{1, 2, 4, 5\}$ ,  $\{1, 2, 7, 8\}$ ,  $\{3, 4, 5, 6\}$ ,  $\{3, 6, 7, 8\}$ ,  $\{4, 5, 7, 8\}$ .
- The 8 remaining matrices are almost diagonal, possessing eight equal eigenvalues ( $\frac{3}{4} \ln 16$ ). The concomitant partitions are  $\{1, 3, 4, 7\}$ ,  $\{1, 3, 5, 8\}$ ,  $\{1, 4, 6, 8\}$ ,  $\{1, 5, 6, 7\}$ ,  $\{2, 3, 4, 8\}$ ,  $\{2, 3, 5, 7\}$ ,  $\{2, 4, 6, 7\}$ ,  $\{2, 5, 6, 8\}$ .

As far as non-locality is concerned, state (8) does not violate the corresponding MABK Bell inequality. In the light of the previous results, we may formulate the following conjecture.

**Conjecture 1.** *No maximally entangled state greater than 5 qubits violates the MABK Bell inequalities.*

We shall see in forthcoming sections that non-locality for maximally entangled states decreases exponentially with the number of qubits.

Summing up, 1) we confirm that no states of  $N=8$  qubit exist with all their marginal density matrices being maximally mixed and 2) We provided an example of real state that might be tailored for quantum communication protocols or teleportation.

### III. MAXIMALLY ENTANGLED STATES OF HIGHER DIMENSIONS

Maximum *qudit* entanglement constitutes an extension of a previous study for qubits to states living in a  $D^N$ -Hilbert space, where  $D$  stands for the dimension of each party. Helwig et al. [31] addressed the interesting and nontrivial problem of finding the conditions for the existence of states that maximize the entanglement between all bipartitions. These states are of the type  $|\Psi_{N,D}\rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{D^N-1} c_i |i\rangle$ . The equivalence between several pure state quantum secret sharing schemes and states with maximum multipartite  $(N, D)$ -entanglement with an even number of parties is proven in [31], an equivalence which indirectly implies the existence of these maximally entangled states for an arbitrary number of parties, based on known results about the existence of quantum secret sharing schemes.

We will try to ascertain just what sort of states can host a maximum amount of entanglement between their parties. Since no general procedure has yet been provided for studying what conditions these maximally entangled qudit states should fulfill, we shall resort to numerical explorations that will hopefully shed some insight into qudits-systems that might not apply for qubits-ones. As dimensional-examples we have considered the cases  $\mathcal{H}_3^{\otimes 3}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_4^{\otimes 3}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_3^{\otimes 4}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_3^{\otimes 5}$ .

The case of three qutrits ( $\mathcal{H}_3^{\otimes 3}$ ) is really exceptional, as we shall see. The Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_3$  is spanned by the basis  $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |2\rangle\}$ . The state  $|\Psi_{N=3,D=3}\rangle$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \left[ |000\rangle - |011\rangle - |112\rangle + |120\rangle - |202\rangle + |221\rangle \right] \quad (9)$$

possesses maximum entanglement  $3 \ln 3$  and from inspection, it is biseparable. The situation becomes more involved when one notices that the state

$$|\Psi'_{N=3,D=3}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \left[ |000\rangle + |111\rangle + |222\rangle \right], \quad (10)$$

which is clearly nonlocal, also reaches the maximum value  $3 \ln 3$ . How is it possible that two different states (one being separable, and the other non-separable) may attain the same entanglement-based correlations? Should we use (10) and regard state (9) as an anomaly, or should we revisit instead the definition of maximum entanglement? Increasing individual party dimensions by one unit, we get a state living in the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_4^{\otimes 3}$  (spanned by  $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |2\rangle, |3\rangle\}$ ). The maximally entangled state for  $N = 3, D = 4$   $|\Psi_{3,4}\rangle$  reads

$$\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \left[ \sqrt{2}|002\rangle + \sqrt{2}|310\rangle - |121\rangle + |123\rangle + |231\rangle + |233\rangle \right]. \quad (11)$$

This dimension does not pose the puzzle we found previously for three qutrits, in the sense that it is maximally entangled ( $3 \ln 4$ ) as opposed to

$$|\Psi'_{3,4}\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \left[ |000\rangle + |111\rangle + |222\rangle + |333\rangle \right], \quad (12)$$

which has entanglement  $\frac{5}{4} \ln 4$ . For (11), the first two elements are inseparable, while the remaining ones are biseparable. Thus, the role of quantum correlations is not as dominant as above. To be more rigorous, we should develop some tight Bell inequality and resort to the concomitant maximum violation. Unfortunately, no such Bell inequalities have been encountered so far.

The case of four qutrits ( $\mathcal{H}_3^{\otimes 4}$ ) is the natural extension of the four qubit state. The state we obtain is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_{N=4,D=3}\rangle = \frac{1}{6} & \left( |0000\rangle + |1000\rangle + |0021\rangle + |1021\rangle + \right. \\ & |0100\rangle - |0110\rangle - |0121\rangle - |0122\rangle + \\ & |0201\rangle - |0202\rangle + |0211\rangle + |0220\rangle \\ & \left. - |1100\rangle - |1110\rangle + |1121\rangle - |1122\rangle \right. \\ & \left. - |1201\rangle - |1202\rangle + |1211\rangle - |1220\rangle \right) \\ & + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{6} \left( -|0012\rangle + |1012\rangle - |2001\rangle + |2020\rangle \right. \\ & \left. - |2102\rangle - |2111\rangle - |2210\rangle + |2222\rangle \right). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

A careful analysis shows that the above state can be written as a combination of tensor products, where only bipartite correlations appear. These loose correlations in the four-party case should be contrasted with the corresponding ones for four qubit states, where maximum entanglement is reached for i) a state with complex expansion-coefficients (linear combination of three maximally correlated states) and ii) real ones (state with high, but not maximum entanglement embedded into a linear combination of six maximally correlated states). The differences between the cases of maximum entanglement between  $(N, D = 2)$  and arbitrary  $(N, D)$  have to be taken into account in order to shed light on the problem of quantifying and characterizing entanglement for multipartite systems.

The case of five qutrits ( $\mathcal{H}_3^{\otimes 5}$ ) has turned out to be elusive. We cannot provide a simple expression for the concomitant state, only an approximate one. However, numerical evidence shows, in a 'real' quantum treatment, it is most likely that a maximum entanglement ( $25 \ln 3$ ) might be reached, that is, all reduced states of one and two qubits are likely to be maximally mixed. However, this is just an approximate result. If it were confirmed, this would entail that in greater dimensions, real expansion-coefficients suffice to describe all sorts of states with maximum correlations. This fact has been confirmed for the case  $(N = 3, D = 5)$  ( $S = 3 \ln 5$ ) as well, but the concomitant state can not be casted in simple fashion. In view of the previous results, we formulate a second conjecture.

**Conjecture 2.** *Maximally entangled states of multiqutrit systems  $(N, D)$  only require real expansion-coefficients. Also, all their reduced density matrices are completely mixed.*

For multiqubit states, in only a few cases all reduced density matrices are proportional to the normalized identity

(that is, maximum entanglement), whereas in the case of qudits the instances encountered do not display this behavior. Furthermore, it is important to use complex expansion-coefficients for qubits to get maximum entanglement, but this constraint disappears in higher dimensions. These are issues of great interest that find at least partial elucidation in the present work.

#### IV. MULTIQUBIT STATES WITH MAXIMAL DISCORD

In the case of entanglement, the most straightforward way of tackling quantum correlations in multipartite states is to introduce partitions into the system. This is somehow inevitable, as no definitive entanglement measure or criterion is yet available for characterizing true multipartite quantum correlations of this kind. Since  $QD$  is defined only between pairs of qubits, it is quite natural to extend the same tools used for multipartite entanglement to the case of quantum discord. If not otherwise stated, all states are given in the computational basis  $\{|000..00\rangle, |000..01\rangle, |000..10\rangle, \dots, |111..10\rangle, |111..11\rangle\}$ .

##### A. Geometric discord

The GQD, which is a measure introduced so as to grasp all properties of the usual discord measure. This is a computable quantity that detects (and quantifies) true discord. For simplicity, here we shall compute the maximum GQD just for three qubits.

The case of  $N=3$  qubits is special, because the result we obtain is a rather simple one, but the corresponding state is instead of an involved nature. When approaching the problem of finding a state  $\rho = |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$  of three qubits where  $GQD(\rho_{12}) + GQD(\rho_{13}) + GQD(\rho_{23})$  is maximum, by definition (Cf. (A10)), one assumes that the outcome for the unknown expansion-coefficients is not going to a simple one. Indeed, by the nature of this measure, we obtain via simulated annealing what appear to be random coefficients for the state  $\rho = |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$ . This fact should not surprise anyone since the mathematical restrictions that are imposed when optimizing the sum of the GQD content for all pairs are highly nonlinear. Table I lists the real and complex coefficients –in the computational basis– that yield the same maximum GQD.

The concomitant maximum GQD is equal to  $5/8$ , but *individual* discords are different! That is,  $GQD(\rho_{12}) = 1/8$ ,  $GQD(\rho_{13}) = 1/4$ , and  $GQD(\rho_{23}) = 1/4$ . Apparently, there is no a priori reason for this to be the case. This asymmetry between pairs constitutes the first discord feature that is different from those pertaining to the generalized entanglement measure in multipartite systems. Strictly speaking, states with maximal entanglement do have reduced states with different entanglement values, but this occurs only for large number of reduced-state, qubit bipartitions. This sort of 'GQD-asymmetry' occurs

<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>Real state</i>	<i>Complex state</i>
$c_0$	0.435569236	(0.0546370323,-0.100659299)
$c_1$	-0.186434446	(0.0134949587,-0.188315179)
$c_2$	0.151369915	(0.465863387,0.0484337848)
$c_3$	-0.0680793253	(0.242430776,-0.0818648344)
$c_4$	-0.177771681	(0.136790716,-0.217618993)
$c_5$	-0.676301307	(-0.500174131,0.0275624382)
$c_6$	-0.505730715	(-0.442832499,0.0730590501)
$c_7$	0.0567821074	(0.0598215336,-0.379958264)

TABLE I. Expansion-coefficients for the states of three qubits that maximize the total GQD between pairs. Columns refers to real and complex coefficients. See text for details.

already in the simplest possible case of  $N = 3$  qubits and poses a conundrum.

##### B. Discord measure

Although there is an alternative measure for computing the discord content of a given state, we prefer the usual quantum discord definition QD (A6). We stress here that the computation of the maximum QD is a two-fold optimization procedure: first, one must find, given an arbitrary state, the minimum QDs for all pairs  $\rho_{ij}$ , and then, survey all states until the maximum QD is attained.

It would appear that since  $N=3$  qubits is a low dimensional system, the state maximizing the concomitant QD should be given by an algebraically simple expression. As in the case of the previous GQD measure, this is not the case. The  $N=3$  qubits case leads the result  $QD = 1.662026$ , given by the state

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\Psi_3^{QD}\rangle = & 0.52895|000\rangle + 0.19492|001\rangle + 0.25144|010\rangle \\
 & -0.48224|011\rangle + 0.38250|100\rangle - 0.39801|101\rangle \\
 & -0.20213|110\rangle + 0.20209|111\rangle.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{14}$$

The same asymmetry already found in the QGD case occurs also here. Also, real and complex states provide the same result. The non-locality of state 14 is given by  $MABK_3^{\max} = 3.0430$ , a 76% of the maximum possible violation, with an entanglement =  $2.7394 \ln 2$  (91%, very close to the maximal one). Thus, a state with maximum  $QD$  has a relatively high amount for the several quantum correlations surveyed in this work.

The  $N=4$  case leads the result  $QD = 2.436681$ , with partitions  $\{1, 2\}, \{3, 4\}$  having  $QD=1/3$ , and  $QD=0.442503$  for the remaining pairs. This symmetry also occurs in the case of the computation of the GQD, equal to 1.045667. We find the state  $|\Psi_4^{QD}\rangle$  to be of the type

$$\begin{aligned}
 x(|\Psi_{2,4}^-\rangle + \frac{1}{2}|\Psi_{4,4}^-\rangle - \frac{1}{2}|\Psi_{7,4}^-\rangle) + z|\Psi_{3,4}^+\rangle + y|\Psi_{5,4}^+\rangle + y|\Psi_{6,4}^+\rangle.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{15}$$




FIG. 2. (Color online)  $QD$  for the family of states (15) of  $N = 4$  qubits. Seven clear  $x$ -values reach the maximum value. The  $x = 0$  case is given by (16). See text for details.

For this family of states, its  $QD$  is plotted in Fig. 2 as a function of  $x$ . Except for  $x = 0$ , there exists seven additional states that reach the maximum possible  $QD$ -value. The one we consider here is given in (15) with  $x = 0$ , that is,

$$|\Psi_4^{QD}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|\Psi_{3,4}^+\rangle + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}|\Psi_{5,4}^+\rangle + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}|\Psi_{6,4}^+\rangle. \quad (16)$$

Notice that this state has all their two qubit reduced states of the 'X-form'. Accordingly, their  $QD$  is given in analytical fashion [55]. Remark that the state that we have found to attain maximal  $QD$  does have the same maximally correlated sub-states as the maximally entangled state of four qubits (3)! Needless to say, real and complex states reach the same maximum  $QD$ -value. Regarding non-locality,  $MABK(|\Psi_4^{QD}\rangle) = \frac{8}{3}\sqrt{2}$  (67%).

In the case of  $N=5$  qubits, we have not reached a "nice" algebraic form for the 'maximal' state. All contributions in the computational basis possess a nonzero weight, and the overall state does not seem to exhibit any symmetry. However, within the limits of numerical accuracy, all  $5(5-1)/2 = 10$  pairs of qubits seem to have the same amount of  $QD$ , the total one being 3.642445. This fact implies that there ought to be a simpler form for the aforementioned state. The expansion-coefficients are shown in Fig. 3. The non-locality of the state  $|\Psi_5^{QD}\rangle$  is  $\approx 5.0233$  (63%).

The case of  $N=6$  qubits, on the other hand, does exhibit a definite symmetry. All reduced pairs have the same  $QD$ -value (0.350977) and the total  $QD$  is 5.264662. As in the case of  $N=4$  qubits, all pairs are of the X-form and, thus, analytically computable. The final (real) state is of the form

$$|\Psi_6^{QD}\rangle = \frac{1}{4\sqrt{5}} \left[ |\Psi_{0,6}^+\rangle + |\Psi_{3,6}^+\rangle + |\Psi_{5,6}^+\rangle + |\Psi_{6,6}^+\rangle \right. \\ + |\Psi_{9,6}^+\rangle + |\Psi_{10,6}^+\rangle + |\Psi_{12,6}^+\rangle + |\Psi_{15,6}^+\rangle \\ + |\Psi_{17,6}^+\rangle + |\Psi_{18,6}^+\rangle + |\Psi_{20,6}^+\rangle + |\Psi_{23,6}^+\rangle \\ \left. + |\Psi_{24,6}^+\rangle + |\Psi_{27,6}^+\rangle + |\Psi_{30,6}^+\rangle + 5|\Psi_{29,6}^+\rangle \right]. \quad (17)$$

Notice again the tendency towards a large number of linear combinations of maximally correlated states. Specifically, the state  $|\Psi_{29,6}^+\rangle$  is particularly relevant. Again, complex and real coefficients lead to the same  $QD$ -value.




FIG. 3. (Color online) Coefficients of the state of  $N = 5$  qubits maximizing  $QD$ . No clear algebraic structure can be drawn from these results. See text for details.




FIG. 4. (Color online) Similar plot as that of Fig. 3 for  $N = 7$  qubits. A single state ( $|\Psi_{48,7}^+\rangle$ ) significantly contributes to the total  $QD$ . Notice the symmetry between  $i$  and  $2^N - i$  coefficients, which constitutes a clear sign of an underlying superposition of maximally correlated states. See text for details.

The case of  $N=7$  qubits case is tantalizing. As in the case of  $N=5$  qubits, we have not been able to find a simple algebraic form. Per contra, our hypothesis of—as far as QD is concerned—a total symmetry in the state basis is duly confirmed here. That is, the state of seven qubits is formed by a plethora ( $2^7/2 = 64$ ) of maximally correlated states. The state we obtain possesses a maximum QD of 8.4290, which is only an approximate value. Fig. 4 shows the value of the expansion-coefficient for each position in the computational basis. The two peaks correspond to the state  $|\Psi_{48,7}^+\rangle$ , which due to unknown reasons, becomes differentiated from the rest. Once again, complex and real coefficients are equivalent when providing states with maximum QD.




FIG. 5. (Color online) (a) Value of  $S_N^{\max}$  vs  $N$  in terms of  $[N(2^{N-1}-1)\frac{1}{3}\ln 2]$  (upper curve).  $N = 3$ , and  $N = 5$  coincide ( $1/3$ , horizontal line). The remaining values display a step-like evolution.  $S_N$  for  $|GHZ_N\rangle$  states (maximally nonlocal) in units of the same quantity  $[N(2^{N-1}-1)\frac{1}{3}\ln 2]$  is also depicted (lower curve). (b) Value of  $QD_N^{\max}$  vs  $N$ . The evolution is clearly exponential. (c) Normalized non-locality (to  $2^{\frac{N+1}{2}}$ ) for maximally entangled (solid line) and discordant (dot-dashed line) qubit states. The QD case saturates to  $k2^{\frac{N+1}{2}}$ ,  $k$  being some positive constant, for an increasing number of parties. (d)  $QD_N^{\max}$  vs.  $S_N^{\max}$ . Notice that each point corresponds to different states. On the whole, a monotonic increasing behavior is apparent. See text for details.

## V. COMPARISON BETWEEN DIFFERENT MEASURES

At first sight, there is no precise way to correlate measures  $S$ ,  $MABK_N^{\max}$ , and  $QD$ . However, although different in nature, they globally behave in analogous fashion. We observe that, in all three cases, the states's maximal measures for each quantum correlation's type either increase or diminish exponentially with the number of parties. This behavior becomes apparent in Fig. 5. Now, when relating two definite measures, special instances appear. Let us consider the case of  $N=4$  qubits.

It was shown that two states reached maximum “real” and “complex” entanglement separately. Surprisingly, the more entangled the state was, the lesser non-locality it possessed. Additionally, the state maximizing entanglement is the only one in all multiqubit states here considered that has non zero  $QD$ . In general, entanglement and quantum discord are more similar to each other than to non-locality.

Regarding non-locality vs. entanglement, it is plain from Table II that maximum entanglement by no means implies maximum non-locality. Nevertheless,  $MABK_N^{\max}$  is not that different from maximum entanglement. This fact is easily seen when analyzing generalized GHZ states, which are the ones that maximize MABK Bell inequalities. Measure  $MABK_N^{\max}$  is equal to  $2^{\frac{N+1}{2}}$ , and its entanglement is  $S_N(|GHZ_N\rangle) = (2^{N-1} - 1) \ln 2$  ( $QD_N(|GHZ_N\rangle) = 0$ ). Entanglement and  $MABK_N^{\max}$  for generalized GHZ states are monotonic increasing functions one of the other  $\rightarrow S_N = (\frac{1}{4}[MABK_N^{\max}]^2 - 1) \ln 2$ . The average entanglement per partition is equal to  $\ln 2$  in all cases.

When computing the maximum entanglement for qubits systems, we obtain that  $S_N^{\max} \geq N(2^{N-1}-1)\frac{1}{3}\ln 2$ , equality holding for  $N = 3, 5$ . In Fig. 5 a) we depict  $S_N^{\max}$  and  $S_N(|GHZ_N\rangle)$  in terms of  $[N(2^{N-1}-1)\frac{1}{3}\ln 2]$  vs.  $N$ . What we obtain is that entanglement for maximally entangled states behaves in the same way, differences appearing between clusters of states (states of 3,4, and 5 qubits are to be compared with results for 6,7, and 8 qubits). A kind of step-like behavior is apparent, as well as the decreasing tendency of  $S_N(|GHZ_N\rangle)$ . This fact constitute a strong argument concluding that non-locality vs. entanglement display a quite special behavior as opposed to the relation entanglement vs. discord, where general tendencies are more pronounced.

$QD_N^{\max}$  for each number of qubits is depicted in Fig. 5 b). This curve is perfectly fitted by an exponential. Thus, maximum QD also evolves exponentially with the number of parties involved. As far as non-locality is concerned, Fig. 5 c) displays the evolution of  $MABK$  for those states with maximal discord (dot-dashed line) and maximum entanglement (solid line) in units of  $2^{\frac{N+1}{2}}$ . It is plain that non-locality for maximally entangled states diminishes exponentially, whereas in the case of quantum discord, a sort of proportionality is reached ( $MABK(QD_N^{\max}) \propto 2^{\frac{N+1}{2}}$  for  $N \geq 7$ ).

When comparing maximum quantities corresponding to different states, we obtain a result such as the one depicted in Fig. 5 d). That is, the QD for those states maximizing QD monotonically increases with their entanglement counterpart.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have explored the tripod entanglement-discord-non-locality for multiqubit systems. We have revisited the known cases of maximally entangled states of  $N = 4$ -



$N$	$MABK(S_{max})$	$MABK(QD_{max})$	$S(QD_{max})$
3	4 - 100%	3.0430 - 76%	$2.7394 \ln 2$ - 91%
4	2.1773 - 38%	$\frac{8}{3}\sqrt{2}$ - 67%	$8 \ln 2$ - 85%
5	2.1381 - 27%	$\approx 5.0233$ - 63%	$17.7864 \ln 2$ - 71%
6	2 - 18%	$5\sqrt{2}$ - 62.5%	$41.2542 \ln 2$ - 63%
7	2 - 13%	$\approx 7.2524$ - 45%	$\approx 97.9457 \ln 2$ - 64%
8	2 - 9%	-	-

TABLE II. Several types of correlation measure for states with increasing number of qubits. The first column displays de maximum violation of the generalized MABK Bell inequality for those states that maximize the generalized measure of entanglement, as well as the concomitant percentage with respect to the maximum possible violation ( $2^{\frac{N+1}{2}}$  for each  $N$ ). The second row displays similar results for those states with maximum QD. Finally, in the last column, the entanglement for states maximizing QD is computed. Notice that some results are analytic. The computation of QD for states with maximum entanglement is not depicted, as it vanishes except for  $N=4$  ( $QD(S_{max}) = 0.7548 - 31\%$ ). See text for details.

, 5-, and 6-qubits, exploring their properties as far as non-locality is concerned. Specifically, the cases of 7 and 8 qubits have been studied in some detail, and allowed for original results in both cases. It has become clear that, some similarities notwithstanding, entanglement and non-locality  $MABK_N^{max}$  behave differently in one or the other direction. That is, the more entangled the states are, the less nonlocal they become. Recall that, however, we only focus on extreme cases, and not on arbitrary states. The aforementioned tendency has been confirmed for an increasing number of qubits. This is the case because entanglement and non-locality constitute, after all, different resources.

Quantum discord, which has been recently proved to be a valuable resource, has been extended here to multiqubit systems by introducing a measure over all two-qubit partitions. Employing the corresponding maximum value, we have discovered states of “maximum discord” for up to 8 qubits. These states possess very interesting features, including unexplained asymmetries among their parties. Furthermore, we strongly believe that these maximal  $QD$ -states may find interesting applications in quantum information processing.

In the light of recent research, we have also explored entanglement in multiqubit systems, and obtained the concomitant maximally entangled states for different  $(N, D)$ -configurations. Also, the way of defining quantum mechanics over real or complex numbers is subject to inspection here. We find that real expansion-coefficients in a given basis suffice to explain maximum entanglement. Recall that this has not been the case for multi-qubit states.

Finally, the comparison of all types of measure leads us to conclude that entanglement and discord are both positively correlated, whereas non-locality decreases with ei-

ther maximum entanglement or discord. We conclude, thus, that maximum entanglement and maximum discord display some similarities, whereas this scenario is blurred when considering non-locality.

## Appendix A: On correlations measures

Research on the properties and applications of multipartite entanglement measures has attracted considerable attention in recent years [6, 33, 39–48]. One of the first useful entanglement measures for  $N$ -qubit pure states  $|\phi\rangle$  to be proposed was the one introduced by Meyer and Wallach [39]. It was later pointed out by Brennen [40] that the measure advanced by Meyer and Wallach is equivalent to the average of all the single-qubit linear entropies, that is, the average entanglement of each qubit of the system with the remaining  $(N-1)$ -qubits.

Another way of characterizing the global amount of entanglement exhibited by an  $N$ -qubit state is provided by the sum of the (bi-partite) entanglement measures associated with the  $2^{N-1} - 1$  possible bi-partitions of the  $N$ -qubits system [33]. This particular number takes into account that the marginal density matrices describing the  $k$ th party, after tracing out the rest, are equivalent to those of  $N - k$  parties because of the relation  $\binom{N}{k} = \binom{N}{N-k}$ . In essence, these entanglement measures are given by the degree of mixedness of the marginal density matrices associated with each bi-partition. In our case, we shall use the von Neumann entropy

$$S_{VN} = \sum_i -Tr[\rho_i \ln \rho_i], \quad (A1)$$

where the sum is performed over all  $2^{N-1} - 1$  different bipartitions.

A considerable amount of research has been devoted to unveil the mathematical structures underlying entanglement, in particular concerning those states which possess maximum entanglement, as given by some appropriate measure. The survey of (pure) states maximizing measure (A1) has been the subject of intense research, initiated by the work of Brown et al. [33]. These *genuinely entangled states* achieving the maximum possible entanglement according to the (A1) have recently investigated with regards to their usefulness for perfect quantum teleportation, superdense coding, and quantum secret sharing. Indeed, highly entangled multipartite states generate intense interest for quantum information processing and one-way universal quantum computing [49]. They are essential for several quantum error codes and communication protocols [50], since they are robust against decoherence. *The aforementioned research for maximally entangled states will be extended here to  $N=7$  and  $N=8$  qubits in Section III.*

Quantum discord is also a valuable resource for the implementation of non-classical information processing protocols [22, 51–54]. In the light of these developments, it be-

comes imperative to characterize multipartite states not only through their maximum amount of entanglement but also through the maximization of their corresponding total quantum discord, establishing the links within the tripod entanglement-discord-nonlocality.

In addition to entanglement, quantum discord [8, 22] constitutes a rather recent information-theoretical measure of the “non-classicality” of bipartite correlations as given by the discrepancy between the quantum counterparts of two classically equivalent expressions for the mutual information. Quantum discord corresponds to a new facet of the “quantumness” that arises even for non-entangled states. More precisely, quantum discord is defined as the difference between two ways of expressing (quantum mechanically) such an important entropic quantifier. Let  $\rho$  represent a state of a bipartite quantum system consisting of two subsystems  $A$  and  $B$ . If  $S(\rho)$  stands for the von Neumann entropy of matrix  $\rho$  and  $\rho_A$  and  $\rho_B$  are the reduced (“marginal”) density matrices describing the two subsystems, the quantum mutual information (QMI)  $M_q$  reads [8]

$$M_q(\rho) = S(\rho_A) + S(\rho_B) - S(\rho). \quad (\text{A2})$$

This quantity is to be compared to another quantity  $\tilde{M}_q(\rho)$ , expressed using conditional entropies, that classically coincides with the mutual information. To define  $\tilde{M}_q(\rho)$  we need first to consider the notion of conditional entropy. If a complete projective measurement  $\Pi_j^B$  is performed on  $B$  and (i)  $p_i$  stands for  $\text{Tr}_{AB} \Pi_i^B \rho$  and (ii)  $\rho_{A|\Pi_i^B}$  for  $[\Pi_i^B \rho \Pi_i^B / p_i]$ , then the conditional entropy becomes

$$S(A|\{\Pi_j^B\}) = \sum_i p_i S(\rho_{A|\Pi_i^B}), \quad (\text{A3})$$

and  $\tilde{M}_q(\rho)$  adopts the appearance

$$\tilde{M}_q(\rho)_{\{\Pi_j^B\}} = S(\rho_A) - S(A|\{\Pi_j^B\}). \quad (\text{A4})$$

Now, if we minimize over all possible  $\Pi_j^B$  the difference  $M_q(\rho) - \tilde{M}_q(\rho)_{\{\Pi_j^B\}}$  we obtain the  $QD$ , that quantifies non-classical correlations in a quantum system *including those not captured by entanglement*. The most general parameterization of the corresponding local measurements that can be implemented on one qubit (let us call it  $B$ ) is of the form  $\{\Pi_B^{0'} = I_A \otimes |0'\rangle\langle 0'|, \Pi_B^{1'} = I_A \otimes |1'\rangle\langle 1'|\}$ . More specifically we have

$$\begin{aligned} |0'\rangle &\leftarrow \cos \alpha' |0\rangle + e^{i\beta'} \sin \alpha' |1\rangle \\ |1'\rangle &\leftarrow e^{-i\beta'} \sin \alpha' |0\rangle - \cos \alpha' |1\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

which is obviously a unitary transformation –rotation in the Bloch sphere defined by angles  $(\alpha', \beta')$ – for the  $B$  basis  $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$  in the range  $\alpha' \in [0, \pi]$  and  $\beta' \in [0, 2\pi)$ . The previous computation of the  $QD$  has to be carried

out numerically, unless the two qubit states belong to the class of the so called  $X$ -states, where  $QD$  is analytic [55]. Accordingly, we shall introduce here a generalized  $QD$  measure for multiqubit states in the form

$$QD = \sum_i QD[\rho_i], \quad (\text{A6})$$

where the sum takes place only over all  $N(N-1)/2$  reduced two qubit states  $\rho_i$ , since  $QD$  is only defined in that case.

Since the evaluation of  $QD$  (A6) involves an optimization procedure and analytical results are known only in a few cases, an interesting alternative was advanced in [22] by introducing a geometric measure of quantum discord (GQD). Let  $\chi$  be a generic zero  $QD$  state. The GQD measure is then given by Hilbert-Schmidt norm

$$GQD(\rho) = \text{Min}_\chi [||\rho - \chi||^2], \quad (\text{A7})$$

where the minimum is taken over the set of zero-discord states  $\chi$ . Given the general form of an arbitrary two-qubits state in the Bloch representation

$$4\rho = \mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{I} + \sum_{u=1}^3 x_u \sigma_u \otimes \mathcal{I} + \sum_{u=1}^3 y_u \mathcal{I} \otimes \sigma_u + \sum_{u,v=1}^3 T_{uv} \sigma_u \otimes \sigma_v, \quad (\text{A8})$$

with  $x_u = \text{Tr}(\rho(\sigma_u \otimes \mathcal{I}))$ ,  $y_u = \text{Tr}(\rho(\mathcal{I} \otimes \sigma_u))$ , and  $T_{uv} = \text{Tr}(\rho(\sigma_u \otimes \sigma_v))$ , it is found in Ref. [22] that a necessary and sufficient criterion for witnessing non-zero quantum discord is given by the rank of the correlation matrix

$$\frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & y_1 & y_2 & y_3 \\ x_1 & T_{11} & T_{12} & T_{13} \\ x_2 & T_{21} & T_{22} & T_{23} \\ x_3 & T_{31} & T_{32} & T_{33} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A9})$$

that is, a state  $\rho$  of the form (A8) exhibits finite quantum discord iff the matrix (A9) has a rank greater than two. It is seen that the geometric measure (A7) is of the form [22]

$$\begin{aligned} GQD(\rho) &= \frac{1}{4} \left( ||\mathbf{x}||^2 + ||T||^2 - \lambda_{\max} \right) = \\ &= \frac{1}{R} - \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{4} \left( ||\mathbf{y}||^2 + \lambda_{\max} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A10})$$

where  $||\mathbf{x}||^2 = \sum_u x_u^2$ ,  $\lambda_{\max}$  is the maximum eigenvalue of the matrix  $(x_1, x_2, x_3)^t (x_1, x_2, x_3) + TT^t$  and  $R = 1/\text{Tr}(\rho^2)$ . The study of the properties of the generalized GQD will be here carried out for  $N=3$  and  $N=4$  qubits, its form being analogous to that of (A6).

Entanglement, however, is not the only quantum correlation that can be considered in multipartite quantum systems (qubits in our case). Since the formalization by

Werner [56] of the modern concept of quantum entanglement it has become clear that there exist entangled states that comply with all Bell inequalities (BI). This entails that non-locality, associated to BI-violation, constitutes a non-classicality manifestation exhibited only by just a subset of the full set of states endowed with quantum correlations.

In some cases, however, entangled states are useful to solve a problem if and only if they violate a Bell inequality [38]. Moreover, there are important instances of non-classical information tasks that are based directly upon non-locality, with no explicit reference to the quantum mechanical formalism or to the associated concept of entanglement [7]. Most of our knowledge on Bell inequalities and their quantum mechanical violation is based on the CHSH inequality [57]. The scenario with two dichotomic observables per party, is the simplest one [58] endowed with a nontrivial Bell inequality for the bipartite case (with binary inputs and outcomes). Quantum mechanically, these observables reduce to  $\mathbf{A}_j(\mathbf{B}_j) = \mathbf{a}_j(\mathbf{b}_j) \cdot \sigma$ , where  $\mathbf{a}_j(\mathbf{b}_j)$  are unit vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  and  $\sigma = (\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z)$  the Pauli matrices. Violation of CHSH inequality requires the expectation value of the operator  $B_{CHSH} = \mathbf{A}_1 \otimes \mathbf{B}_1 + \mathbf{A}_1 \otimes \mathbf{B}_2 + \mathbf{A}_2 \otimes \mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2 \otimes \mathbf{B}_2$  to be greater than two. It is indeed an inequality that poses an upper limit ( $2\sqrt{2}$ , the Tsirelson-bound [59]), to quantum mechanical correlations between distant events. A relation exists here with the discussion and experimental determination of whether local variable model (LVM) variables are required for, or even compatible with, the representation of experimental results. A proper way to measure non-locality (for the two qubit state  $\rho$ ) uses the quantity

$$B_{CHSH}^{\max} \equiv \max_{\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j} Tr(\rho B_{CHSH}). \quad (\text{A11})$$

Similarly, non-locality in the three qubit case is given by the violation of the Mermin's inequality [60]. This inequality was conceived originally in order to detect genuine three-party quantum correlations, impossible to reproduce via LVMs. The Mermin inequality states that  $Tr(\rho B_{Mermin}) \leq 2$ , where  $B_{Mermin}$  is the Mermin operator

$$B_{Mermin} = B_{a_1 a_2 a_3} - B_{a_1 b_2 b_3} - B_{b_1 a_2 b_3} - B_{b_1 b_2 a_3}, \quad (\text{A12})$$

where  $B_{uvw} \equiv \mathbf{u} \cdot \sigma \otimes \mathbf{v} \cdot \sigma \otimes \mathbf{w} \cdot \sigma$  with  $\sigma = (\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z)$  being the usual Pauli matrices, and  $\mathbf{a}_j$  and  $\mathbf{b}_j$  unit vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Notice that the Mermin inequality is maximally violated by Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) states. As in the bipartite case, we shall define the following quantity

$$Mermin^{\max} \equiv \max_{\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j} Tr(\rho B_{Mermin}) \quad (\text{A13})$$

as a measure of the non-locality of the state  $\rho$ . While in the bipartite case the CHSH inequality is the strongest

possible one, no bond equivalent to Tsirelson's is available for arbitrary dimensions.

Now, in the case of multiqubit systems, one must instead use a generalization of the CHSH inequality to N qubits. This is done in natural fashion by considering an extension of the CHSH or Mermin inequality to the multipartite case. The first Bell inequality (BI) for four qubits was derived by Mermin, Ardehali, Belinskii, and Klyshko [60]. One deals with four parties with two dichotomic outcomes each, the BI being maximum for the generalized GHZ state  $(|0000\rangle + |1111\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ . The Mermin-Ardehali-Belinskii-Klyshko (MABK) inequalities are of such nature that they constitute extensions of older inequalities, with the requirement that generalized GHZ states must maximally violate them. To concoct an extension to the multipartite case, we shall introduce a recursive relation that will allow for more parties. This is easily done by considering the operator

$$B_{N+1} \propto [(B_1 + B'_1) \otimes B_N + (B_1 - B'_1) \otimes B'_N], \quad (\text{A14})$$

with  $B_N$  being the Bell operator for N parties and  $B_1 = \mathbf{v} \cdot \sigma$ , with  $\sigma = (\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z)$  and  $\mathbf{v}$  a real unit vector. The prime on the operator denotes the same expression but with all vectors exchanged. The concomitant maximum value

$$MABK_N^{\max} \equiv \max_{\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j} Tr(\rho B_N) \quad (\text{A15})$$

will serve as a measure for the non-locality content of a given state  $\rho$  of N qubits if  $\mathbf{a}_j$  and  $\mathbf{b}_j$  are unit vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . The non-locality measure (A15) will be maximized by generalized GHZ states,  $2^{\frac{N+1}{2}}$  being the corresponding maximum value.

The MABK inequalities are not the only existing Bell inequalities for N qubits [61], but they constitute a simple generalization of the CHSH one to the multipartite case. Accordingly, it will suffice to use these particular inequalities to illustrate the basic results of the present work, as far as non-locality is concerned.

Regardless of the quantity one shall compute or of the state one aims at finding, some sort of optimization procedure must be carried out. In the case of maximum entanglement (A1), the  $2^N$  coefficients of the multipartite pure state constitute the variables to deal with (twice if the state is of complex instead of real nature). For the quantum discord QD, a minimization takes place for the two parameters in every  $N(N-1)/2$  reduced two qubit state, whereas non-locality  $MABK_N^{\max}$  requires an exploration among their corresponding unit vectors defining the observers' settings. In any case, we have performed a two-fold search employing i) an amoeba optimization procedure, where the optimal value is obtained at the risk of falling into a local minimum and ii) the well known simulated annealing approach [62]. The advantage of this computational 'duplicity' is that we can

be confident regarding the final results reached. Indeed, the second recipe contains a mechanism that allows for local searches that eventually can escape local optima.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

J. Batle acknowledges fruitful discussions with J. Rosselló and M. del M. Batle, while A. Plastino and M. Casas ac-

knowledge partial support under project FIS2011-23526

- 
- [1] M. A. Nielsen and I.L. Chuang *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- [2] G. Vidal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 147902 (2003).
- [3] J. I. Latorre and A. Riera, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **42**, 504002 (2009).
- [4] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2009).
- [5] J. Batle and M. Casas, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 062101 (2010); J. Batle and M. Casas, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **44**, 445304 (2011).
- [6] A. Higuchi and A. Sudbery Phys. Lett. A **273**, 213 (2000).
- [7] J. Barrett, L. Hardy, A. Kent Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 010503 (2005); A. Acín A, N. Gisin, Ll. Masanes, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97** 120405 (2006); A. Acín et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 230501 (2007).
- [8] H. Ollivier, W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 017901 (2001).
- [9] R. Dillenschneider, E. Lutz Europhys. Lett. **88**, 50003, (2009).
- [10] T. Werlang, C. Trippe, G. Ribeiro, G. Rigolin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 095702 (2010).
- [11] A. Shabani, D. Lidar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102** 100402
- [12] Roa L, Retamal J C and Alid-Vaccarezza M 2011 Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 080401 (2009).
- [13] S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 042303 (2008).
- [14] M. Ali M, A. Rau, G. Alber, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 042105 (2010).
- [15] J. Zhang, B. Shao, B. Liu, J. Zou, Q. Li, L. Wu, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 012327 (2011).
- [16] P. Perinotti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 120502 (2012).
- [17] Q. Chen, C. Zhan, S. Yu, X. Yi, C. Oh, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 042313 (2011).
- [18] G. Adesso, A. Datta, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 030501 (2010).
- [19] P. Giorda, M. Paris, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 020503 (2010).
- [20] M. Lang, C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 150501 (2010).
- [21] K. Modi, T. Paterek, W. Son, V. Vedral, M. Williamson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 080501 (2010).
- [22] B. Dakic, V. Vedral, C. Brukner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 190502 (2010).
- [23] C. Rulli, M. Sarandy, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 042109 (2011).
- [24] J. Li, J. Liang, Phys. Lett. A **374**, 1975 (2010).
- [25] B. Bellomo, R. Franco, G. Compagno, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 062309 (2008).
- [26] Q. He, J. Xu, D. Yao, Y. Zhang, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 022312 (2011).
- [27] A. Datta, A. Shaji, C.M. Caves, 2008 Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 050502 (2008).
- [28] Y. Yeo and W. K. Chua, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 060502 (2006).
- [29] Z. Zhao, Y.-A. Chen, A.-N. Zhang, T. Yang, H. J. Briegel, and J.-W. Pan, Nature **430**, 54 (2004).
- [30] N. Gisin, H. Bechmann-Pasquinucci, Phys. Lett. A **246**, 1 (1998).
- [31] W. Helwig, W. Cui, A. Riera, J. I. Latorre, H-K Lo, arXiv:1204.2289 (2012).
- [32] N. Gisin, Phys. Lett. A **154**, 201 (1991).
- [33] I. Brown, S. Stepney, A. Sudbery, S. L: Braunstein, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **38**, 1119 (2005).
- [34] A. Borrás, A.R. Plastino, J. Batle, C. Zander, M. Casas, A. Plastino, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **40**, 13407 (2007).
- [35] J.E. Tapiador et al J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **42**, 415301 (2009).
- [36] J. Sakshi et al. EPL **87**, 60008 (2009).
- [37] S. Choudhury et al. J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **42**, 115303 (2009).
- [38] C. Brukner, M. Zukowski, A. Zeilinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 197901 (2002).
- [39] D. A. Meyer, N. R. Wallach, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 4273 (2002).
- [40] G. K. Brennen, Quantum Inf. Comput. **3**, 619 (2003).
- [41] Y. S. Weinstein, C. S. Hellberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 030501 (2005).
- [42] Y. S. Weinstein, C. S. Hellberg, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 022331 (2005).
- [43] M. Cao, S. Zhu, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 034311 (2005).
- [44] A. Lakshminarayan, W. Subrahmanyam, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 062334 (2005).
- [45] A. J. Scott, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 052330 (2004).
- [46] A. Carvalho, F. Mintert, A. Buchleitner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 230501 (2004).
- [47] M. Aolita, F. Mintert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 050501 (2006).
- [48] J. Calsamiglia, L. Hartmann, W. Durr, H. Briegel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 180502 (2005).
- [49] H. J. Briegel and R. Raussendorf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 910 (2001).
- [50] R. Cleve, D. Gottesman, and H.-K. Lo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 648 (1999).
- [51] A. Ferraro, L. Aolita, D. Cavalcanti, F. Cucchietti, A. Acín, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 052318 (2010).
- [52] S. Datta, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 050502 (2008).
- [53] S. Lu, S. Fu, 2010 *Phys. Rev. A* **82**, 034302 (2010).
- [54] S. Datta, arXiv [quant-ph] 1003.5256.
- [55] M. Ali, A. R. P. Rau, G. Alber, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 042105 (2010).

- [56] R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 4277 (1989).
- [57] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **23**, 880 (1969).
- [58] D. Collins and N. Gisin, J. Phys. A **37**, 1775 (2004).
- [59] B. S. Tsirelson, Lett. Math. Phys. **4**, 93 (1980); B. S. Tsirelson, J. Soviet Math. **36**, 557 (1987); B. S. Tsirelson, Hadronic Journal Supplement **8**, 329 (1993).
- [60] N. D. Mermin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 1838 (1990); M. Ardehali, Phys. Rev. A **46**, 5375 (1992); A. V. Belinskii and D. N. Klyshko, Phys. Usp. **36**, 653 (1993).
- [61] V. Scarani, A. Acín, E. Schenck, and M. Aspelmeyer, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 042325 (2005).
- [62] S. Kirkpatrick, C. D. Gelatt Jr., M. P. Vecchi, Science **220**, 671 (1983).