

Bounding entanglement dimensionality from the covariance matrix

Shuheng Liu,^{1,2,3} Matteo Fadel,⁴ Qiongyi He,^{1,5,6,*} Marcus Huber,^{2,3,†} and Giuseppe Vitagliano^{2,3,‡}

¹State Key Laboratory for Mesoscopic Physics, School of Physics,

Frontiers Science Center for Nano-optoelectronics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China

²Vienna Center for Quantum Science and Technology, Atominsttitut, TU Wien, 1020 Vienna, Austria

³Institute for Quantum Optics and Quantum Information (IQOQI), Austrian Academy of Sciences, 1090 Vienna, Austria

⁴Department of Physics, ETH Zürich, 8093 Zürich, Switzerland

⁵Collaborative Innovation Center of Extreme Optics, Shanxi University, Taiyuan, Shanxi 030006, China

⁶Peking University Yangtze Delta Institute of Optoelectronics, Nantong 226010, Jiangsu, China

(Dated: August 31, 2022)

High-dimensional entanglement has been identified as an important resource in quantum information processing, and also as a main obstacle for simulating quantum systems. Its certification is often difficult, and most widely used methods for experiment are based on fidelity measurements with respect to highly entangled states. Here, instead, we consider covariances of collective observables, as in the well-known Covariance Matrix Criterion (CMC) [1] and present a generalization of the CMC criterion for determining the Schmidt number of a bipartite system. This is potentially particularly advantageous in many-body systems, such as cold atoms, where the set of practical measurements is very limited and only variances of collective operators can typically be estimated. To show the practical relevance of our results, we derive simpler Schmidt-number criteria that require similar information as the fidelity-based witnesses, yet can detect a wider set of states. We also consider case-study criteria based on three orthogonal local spin covariances, which would unlock experimentally feasible detection of high-dimensional entanglement in cold atom systems. In that case, we are able to derive criteria that are valid for mixtures of states with the same Schmidt bases.

Introduction.—Entanglement has been always seen as a crucial property of quantum physics [2]. More recently, it is regarded also as an important resource for quantum information tasks and, at the same time, as a main obstacle for classical simulations of quantum systems [3–5]. In fact, a lot of research has been devoted recently to the problem of distinguishing separable from entangled states, and even quantifying entanglement as a resource [6]. A proper resource-theoretic quantification of entanglement is known to arise from an operational perspective, considering functionals of quantum states that are monotonic under operations that cannot create entanglement, for example, Local Operations and Classical Communications [7]. According to this paradigm, it turns out that for mixed states no unique quantification of entanglement can be given, but rather one can define independent figures of merit for specific tasks.

Relevant entanglement measures can be also given from a purely information-theoretic approach considering entropies of marginals, optimal decompositions of a state in terms of separable states, robustness to noise, distance to the set of separable states, and so on [6]. All of these measures are in practice very hard to estimate from experimental data, and one typically relies on bounding them from so-called entanglement witnesses, i.e., observables that have positive expectation values on separable states but can have negative expectation value for some entangled states. Bounds on entanglement measures have been discussed also in terms of nonlinear witnesses, typically involving variances of collective operators [8, 9]. However, such bounds work well either for very low-dimensional systems in the case of entropic measures [8] or for measures related to the tolerance of the entangled state to noise [9–12].

One particularly important measure that is relevant espe-

cially in the context of classical simulation of quantum systems is the *Schmidt number*, or *entanglement dimensionality* which, loosely speaking, quantifies the memory needed to reproduce the correlations in the quantum state: Proving that a quantum state has a certain entanglement dimensionality r means that such a state cannot be simulated with a system of dimension lower than r . At the same time, genuine high-dimensional entanglement has been proven useful for several practical tasks, ranging from improved security for quantum cryptography [13, 14], to noise resistant quantum communication [15, 16] and universal quantum computation [17, 18].

Such a measure, similar to other entropic measures like the concurrence or the entanglement of formation, is typically especially hard to bound from experimental data, as usual methods rely on fidelity measurements which must be fine-tuned and, especially in many-body systems, typically inaccessible [5]. In fact, entanglement dimensionality quantifications have been successfully done experimentally only in certain two-photon systems, where virtually arbitrary local measurements can be performed [19–21]. On the other hand, it would be highly desirable to have more powerful tools that would allow to detect the entanglement dimensionality in other quantum platforms, e.g., cold atoms, which are suitable for the simulation of other quantum systems. This raises the question on how to find bounds to the entanglement dimensionality based on measurements routinely performed in such systems, such as simple two-body correlators, or variances of simple collective observables.

This is the problem that we address in this Letter, finding a generalization of the well-known Covariance Matrix Criterion (CMC) to witness the Schmidt number of a bipartite quantum state. After deriving the general criterion, we specialize to simpler statements that are more readily appli-

cable to quantum experiments and compare them to the existing criteria based on fidelities with respect to pure (high-dimensionally entangled) states. Afterwards, we also look for criteria based on the covariances of three orthogonal local spin observables, which would connect our results with the spin-squeezing methods successfully applied in many experiments, especially with atomic gases [22–28]. In fact, bipartite entanglement has been recently demonstrated between spatially separated atomic ensembles [29–33], and even a quantification of entanglement via monotones can be provided [9, 34, 35], but not yet those associated with practical quantum information applications, such as especially the entanglement dimensionality.

Methods.—Let us consider a bipartite system with Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$ and a (bipartite) density matrix ϱ in the set of trace-class operators $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ [36]. The (symmetric) covariance matrix associated to a set of observables $\mathfrak{M} = (M_1, \dots, M_K)$ has components given by:

$$[\text{Cov}_\varrho(\mathfrak{M})]_{jk} = \frac{1}{2}\langle M_j M_k + M_k M_j \rangle_\varrho - \langle M_j \rangle_\varrho \langle M_k \rangle_\varrho. \quad (1)$$

Let us now consider a pair of $\mathbf{g} = (\mathbf{g}_a, \mathbf{g}_b)$, where $\mathbf{g}_a = (g_1^{(a)} \otimes \mathbb{1}, \dots, g_{d_a}^{(a)} \otimes \mathbb{1})$ and $\mathbf{g}_b = (\mathbb{1} \otimes g_1^{(b)}, \dots, \mathbb{1} \otimes g_{d_b}^{(b)})$ are orthonormal basis of observables for party a and b respectively[37]. Central to our work is the covariance matrix associated to (a canonical) pair \mathbf{g} calculated on a generic ϱ , namely

$$\text{Cov}_\varrho(\mathbf{g}) := \Gamma_\varrho = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_a & X_\varrho \\ X_\varrho^T & \gamma_b \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

where we emphasized that it has a block structure, in which the diagonals $\gamma_a := \text{Cov}_{\varrho_a}(\mathbf{g}_a)$ and $\gamma_b := \text{Cov}_{\varrho_b}(\mathbf{g}_b)$ are the symmetric covariance matrices of each party, and the off-diagonal blocks[38]

$$(X_\varrho)_{kl} = \langle g_k^{(a)} \otimes g_l^{(b)} \rangle_\varrho - \langle g_k^{(a)} \rangle_\varrho \langle g_l^{(b)} \rangle_\varrho \quad (3)$$

are the cross-covariances between the two local observables vectors. Concretely, as a canonical basis for each party we will consider $\mathbf{g} = (\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{i})$, which is composed by diagonal operators $\mathbf{d} = \{|j\rangle\langle j| \otimes \mathbb{1}\}_{j=1}^d$, real operators $\mathbf{r} = \{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|j\rangle\langle k| + |k\rangle\langle j|) \otimes \mathbb{1}\}_{j < k=1}^d$ and imaginary operators $\mathbf{i} = \{\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(|j\rangle\langle k| - |k\rangle\langle j|) \otimes \mathbb{1}\}_{j < k=1}^d$, associated to a canonical Hilbert space basis $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=1}^d$. For the components of such a basis we will often use a multi-index notation g_μ with $\mu = (jk)$ and $1 \leq j, k \leq d$, with the convention that indices with $j = k$ correspond to the vector \mathbf{d} , indices with $j < k$ correspond to \mathbf{r} and indices with $j > k$ correspond to \mathbf{i} .

It is well-known that every separable density matrix $\sigma = \sum_k p_k \varrho_a \otimes \varrho_b$ with $p_k \geq 0$ and $\sum_k p_k = 1$ has to satisfy

$$\Gamma_\sigma \geq \kappa_a \oplus \kappa_b, \quad (4)$$

where $\kappa_a = \sum_k p_k \text{Cov}_{\varrho_a}(\mathbf{g}_a)$ and $\kappa_b = \sum_k p_k \text{Cov}_{\varrho_b}(\mathbf{g}_b)$ are positive matrices. In other words, if a state is separable, there must exist positive matrices κ_a and κ_b , which are covariance matrices of single particle states, such that Eq. (4) holds.

Thus, given two positive matrices κ_a and κ_b that lower bound Γ_ϱ for a certain density matrix ϱ one has to be able to find pure local states $|\phi_a\rangle$ and $|\phi_b\rangle$ and probabilities p_k such that $\kappa_a = \sum_k p_k \text{Cov}_{\phi_a}(\mathfrak{M})$ and similarly for party b . If such states $|\phi_a\rangle$ and $|\phi_b\rangle$ (and the corresponding κ_a and κ_b) are not found, then ϱ must be entangled. This is called *covariance matrix criterion* (CMC) in the literature [1, 8, 39] and is known to be equivalent to all possible entanglement criteria of the form $\sum_k (\Delta T_k)_\varrho^2 \geq K_a + K_b$, where $T_k = A_k \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes B_k$ are collective observables, $(\Delta T)_\varrho^2 = \langle T^2 \rangle_\varrho - \langle T \rangle_\varrho^2$ is their variance and the bounds are given by $K_a = \min_\phi \sum_k (\Delta A_k)_\phi^2$ and similarly for K_b [40]. The CMC follows from essentially two properties: (i) the *concavity* of the covariance matrix under mixing quantum states, i.e., the inequality $\text{Cov}_\varrho(\mathfrak{M}) \geq \sum_k p_k \text{Cov}_{\varrho_k}(\mathfrak{M})$ that holds for a mixed state $\varrho = \sum_k p_k \varrho_k$ and for every observables' set \mathfrak{M} ; (ii) the fact that $\langle A \otimes B \rangle_\sigma = \langle A \rangle_\sigma \langle B \rangle_\sigma$ holds for all separable states σ and for all local observables pairs (A, B) , implying that $X_\sigma = 0$. Note that we have $\text{tr}(\gamma_n) = d - \text{tr}(\varrho_n^2)$ and $\text{tr}(\kappa_n) = d - 1$ for $n = a, b$, where the second equality is valid since κ_n come from a pure state.

Another tool that is very important for what follows is the so-called *Schmidt decomposition*: Any arbitrary bipartite pure state can be brought to the normal form under local unitary operations $|\psi\rangle \mapsto U_a \otimes U_b |\psi\rangle = \sum_j \sqrt{\lambda_j} |j_a j_b\rangle$, where $\{|j_n\rangle\}$ with $n = a, b$ are orthonormal basis for the two local Hilbert spaces and λ_j are called *Schmidt coefficients*. Such a Schmidt decomposition can be achieved essentially from the singular value decomposition of the coefficient matrix of the state $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{kl} c_{kl} |k, l\rangle$. In other words, the transformation that brings the coefficient matrix c_{kl} in its singular value decomposition amounts to a local unitary transformation of $|\psi\rangle$, which in turn provides the Schmidt decomposition. The Schmidt decomposition also gives the reduced density matrix of each party as $\varrho_a = \text{tr}_b(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = \sum_j \lambda_j |j_a\rangle\langle j_a|$, and similarly for ϱ_b . Clearly, such a transformation does not map a product state into an entangled state nor vice-versa. Moreover, it cannot change the amount of entanglement of the state, since all entanglement monotones are by definition invariant under local unitary transformations. In fact, the number $s(|\psi\rangle)$ of nonzero Schmidt coefficients of a pure state defines the entanglement monotone called Schmidt rank. This monotone can be extended to all bipartite density matrices via *convex-roof construction*, this way defining the *Schmidt number*:

$$s(\varrho) := \inf_{\mathcal{D}(\varrho)} \max_{|\psi_i\rangle \in \mathcal{D}(\varrho)} r(|\psi_i\rangle), \quad (5)$$

where the infimum is taken over all pure state decompositions $\mathcal{D}(\varrho) = \{p_i, |\psi_i\rangle\}$ of the density matrix $\varrho = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$. Roughly speaking, this entanglement monotone is connected with the minimal dimension of the Hilbert space needed to reproduce the states' correlations. The Schmidt number can be also lower bounded via entanglement witnesses, the most typical of which are fidelities with respect to target states [19–21, 41]. Specifically, given a certain pure target state $|\psi_T\rangle = \sum_{j=1} \sqrt{\xi_j} |j_a j_b\rangle$ one can prove that every other (mixed) state ϱ

of Schmidt number smaller than r must satisfy:

$$F(\varrho, \psi_T) := \text{tr}(\varrho|\psi_T\rangle\langle\psi_T|) \leq \sum_{j=1}^r \xi_j, \quad (6)$$

where clearly we are assuming that the target state has Schmidt rank larger or equal than r . Here, the left-hand side is the fidelity between ϱ and the target state $|\psi_T\rangle$. As the most common example, considering a target maximally entangled state $|\psi_+\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} |j_a j_b\rangle$, one obtains $F(\varrho, \psi_+) \leq \frac{r}{d}$.

A CMC criterion for entanglement dimensionality.—Here we present our main results. First a CMC criterion with a tight bound that is valid for states with a given Schmidt number r . Afterwards, we present a corollary that is more practical for applications. Our main theorem follows:

Theorem 1. *Let us consider a bipartite density matrix $\varrho \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that its Schmidt number is $s(\varrho) \leq r$ and its canonical covariance matrix $\Gamma_\varrho = \text{Cov}_\varrho(\mathbf{g})$. The matrix inequality*

$$\Gamma_\varrho \geq \sum_k p_k \Gamma_r^{(k)} \quad (7)$$

must hold for some probability distributions $\{p_k\}$ and some positive $\Gamma_r = \text{Cov}_{\psi_r}(\mathbf{g})$, where $\psi_r = \sum_j \sqrt{\lambda_j} |j_a j_b\rangle$ are pure Schmidt-rank- r states.

Here Γ_r has generally the following block form

$$\Gamma_r = \begin{pmatrix} \kappa_a & X_r \\ X_r^T & \kappa_b \end{pmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

and the singular values of the blocks satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon(\kappa_a) &= \epsilon(\kappa_b) = (\epsilon(D), \{\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_j + \lambda_k)\}_{j < k=1}, \{\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_j + \lambda_k)\}_{j > k=1}), \\ \epsilon(|X_r|) &= (\epsilon(D), \{\sqrt{\lambda_j \lambda_k}\}_{j < k=1}, \{\sqrt{\lambda_j \lambda_k}\}_{j > k=1}) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where D is the $d \times d$ matrix with elements $D_{jk} = \lambda_j \delta_{jk} - \lambda_j \lambda_k$.

Proof.—The statement follows from two properties: (i) concavity of covariances, i.e., the fact that $\Gamma_\varrho \geq \sum_k p_k \Gamma_{\varrho_k}$ holds for density matrices decomposed as $\varrho = \sum_k p_k \varrho_k$; and (ii) the fact that a generic covariance matrix of a pure Schmidt-rank- r state has the above block form and in the canonical basis constructed from its Schmidt bases, the blocks are given by $\kappa_a = \kappa_b = \text{diag}(D, R, I)$ and $X_r = \text{diag}(D, R_C, I_C)$ with $D_{jk} = \lambda_j \delta_{jk} - \lambda_j \lambda_k$ being a $d \times d$ -dimensional matrix and $R = I = \text{diag}\{\omega_{jk}\}_{j < k=1}^r$ being diagonal matrices of dimension $d(d-1)/2 \times d(d-1)/2$ with eigenvalues given by $\omega_{jk} = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_j + \lambda_k)$ and similarly $R_C = -I_C = \text{diag}\{\omega_{jk}^C\}_{j < k=1}^r$ with $\omega_{jk}^C = \sqrt{\lambda_j \lambda_k}$. This last fact can be directly verified with simple algebra (see also [8]). With these two ingredients, the proof goes as follows. Consider a generic Schmidt-number- r density matrix $\varrho = \sum_k p_k |\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|$ decomposed in terms of pure Schmidt-rank- r states $|\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|$. Using concavity we have $\Gamma_\varrho \geq \sum_k p_k \Gamma_{\psi_k}$ with each of the Γ_{ψ_k} having the form (8) in a particular basis. Finally, we use the fact that arbitrary changes of local bases (which include local unitary transformations on

the quantum state) correspond to local orthogonal transformations $O_a \oplus O_b \Gamma_\varrho (O_a \oplus O_b)^T$. In particular, such transformations cannot change the eigenvalues of κ_a and κ_b and the singular values of X_r . \square

The matrix formulation of the criterion is per se very hard to evaluate due to the fact that one should in principle scan essentially all possible pure Schmidt-rank- r -state covariance matrices Γ_{ψ_r} . However, it is also possible to find corollaries to our main theorem which can be actually readily applied, as soon as even just partial information about Γ_ϱ is available. One particular condition which is already quite powerful is obtained taking the traces of the covariance matrix blocks.

Corollary 1. *For every Schmidt-number- r density matrix ϱ the following inequalities hold*

$$(\text{tr}|X_\varrho| - (r-1))^2 \leq [1 - \text{tr}(\varrho_a^2)][1 - \text{tr}(\varrho_b^2)], \quad (10a)$$

$$\text{tr}(\varrho_a^2) + \text{tr}(\varrho_b^2) + 2\text{tr}|X_\varrho| \leq 2r, \quad (10b)$$

where for Eq. (10a) the condition $\text{tr}|X_\varrho| \geq r-1$ must be ensured. The inequality (10b) is strictly weaker than (10a)

Proof.—Let us multiply Eq. (7) with vectors $\mathbf{t}_\mu = (\alpha \mathbf{u}_\mu, -\beta \mathbf{v}_\mu)$, where \mathbf{u}_μ and \mathbf{v}_μ are the singular vectors of X_ϱ and $\alpha, \beta > 0$. We obtain $\sum_\mu \mathbf{t}_\mu \Gamma_\varrho \mathbf{t}_\mu^T \geq \sum_k p_k \sum_\mu (\alpha^2 \mathbf{u}_\mu \kappa_a^{(k)} \mathbf{u}_\mu^T + \beta^2 \mathbf{v}_\mu \kappa_b^{(k)} \mathbf{v}_\mu^T - 2\alpha\beta \mathbf{u}_\mu X_r^{(k)} \mathbf{v}_\mu^T)$, and after summing over all μ (which span a whole basis for each party a and b) we get $\alpha^2 \text{tr} \gamma_a + \beta^2 \text{tr} \gamma_b - 2\alpha\beta \text{tr}|X_\varrho| = \alpha^2(d - \text{tr}(\varrho_a^2)) + \beta^2(d - \text{tr}(\varrho_b^2)) - 2\alpha\beta \text{tr}|X_\varrho| \geq \alpha^2 \text{tr} \kappa_a + \beta^2 \text{tr} \kappa_b - 2\alpha\beta \sum_\mu |(X_r)_{\mu\mu}| \geq \alpha^2 \text{tr} \kappa_a + \beta^2 \text{tr} \kappa_b - 2\alpha\beta \text{tr}|X_r| \geq \alpha^2(d - \text{tr}(\varrho_r^2)) + \beta^2(d - \text{tr}(\varrho_r^2)) - 2\alpha\beta(r - \text{tr}(\varrho_r))$, where $\text{tr}(\varrho_r)$ is the trace of the single particle reduced density matrix of a generic (optimal) pure Schmidt rank- r state and we used the fact that $\text{tr}|X_r| \leq r - \text{tr}(\varrho_r^2)$ as it can be directly verified using the generic expression of its singular values from Eq. (9). This way, we have $(\alpha - \beta)^2 \geq (\alpha - \beta)^2 \text{tr}(\varrho_r) \geq \alpha^2 \text{tr}(\varrho_a^2) + \beta^2 \text{tr}(\varrho_b^2) + 2\alpha\beta(\text{tr}|X_\varrho| - r)$. Now, minimizing over all α and β we have that the minimum is achieved for $\alpha/\beta = (\text{tr}|X_\varrho| - r + 1)/(1 - \text{tr}(\varrho_a^2))$, whenever this is positive and results in Eq. (10a). Note that for the optimal value of α/β to be positive we have to ensure that $\text{tr}|X_\varrho| \geq r-1$, which is an additional constraint for Eq. (10a) to be a valid criterion. Instead, in the special case $\alpha = \beta = 1$ we get Eq. (10b), which is thus a weaker criterion than Eq. (10a). \square

Applications.—To show the usefulness of our results we are going to observe what states can be potentially detected. First, as a practical comparison with the fidelity criterion, we can observe that Eq. (10b) is stronger than the criterion coming from the fidelity to the maximally entangled state.

Observation 1. *Every state ϱ that violates the criterion in Eq. (6) with a target maximally entangled state $|\psi_T\rangle = |\psi_+\rangle$ for some r , also violates Corollary 1 for the same r .*

Proof.—The Hilbert-Schmidt scalar product between a generic density matrix ϱ and $|\psi_+\rangle\langle\psi_+|$ can be expressed as $F(\varrho, \psi_+) = \text{tr}(\varrho|\psi_+\rangle\langle\psi_+|) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_\mu \langle g_\mu^{(a)} \otimes g_\mu^{(b)} \rangle_\varrho$. Then, let us consider the expression in Eq. (10b). We have that the left-hand side is $\text{tr}(\varrho_a^2) + \text{tr}(\varrho_b^2) + 2\text{tr}|X_\varrho| \geq \sum_{jk} \langle g_{jk}^{(a)} \rangle^2 + \langle g_{jk}^{(b)} \rangle^2 -$

$2\langle g_{jk}^{(a)} \rangle \langle g_{jk}^{(b)} \rangle + 2\langle g_{jk}^{(a)} \otimes g_{jk}^{(b)} \rangle \geq \sum_{jk} 2\langle g_{jk}^{(a)} \otimes g_{jk}^{(b)} \rangle = 2dF(\varrho, \psi_+)$ since $\langle g_{jk}^{(a)} \rangle^2 + \langle g_{jk}^{(b)} \rangle^2 - 2\langle g_{jk}^{(a)} \rangle \langle g_{jk}^{(b)} \rangle = (\langle g_{jk}^{(a)} \rangle - \langle g_{jk}^{(b)} \rangle)^2$ are positive terms. Thus, we have that $F(\varrho, \psi_+) > r/d$ implies that Eq. (10b) is violated. \square

In fact, Corollary 1 detects states that are not detected by Eq. (6). For example consider the mixed state $\varrho = \frac{1}{2}|\Psi_3\rangle\langle\Psi_3| + \frac{1}{4}(|23\rangle + |32\rangle)(\langle 23| + \langle 32|)$ with Schmidt number $s(\varrho) = 3$, where $|\Psi_3\rangle := (1/\sqrt{3})(|00\rangle + |11\rangle + |22\rangle)$. Its Schmidt number certified by fidelity witness is at most 2 [42], while Corollary 1 detects the actual Schmidt number 3. The advantage of Corollary 1 is that it is a criterion which is invariant under a change of the local bases in the definition of Γ_ϱ . In general, in fact, it is not obvious which basis is more convenient to consider for the evaluation of theorem 1. A special case in which this is actually clear is when the density matrix can be written as a mixture of states with the same Schmidt bases, so called Schmidt-correlated states [39]. For this particular class of states we can even observe that our theorem provides a necessary and sufficient condition.

Observation 2. A Schmidt-correlated state $\varrho = \sum_{ij} \varrho_{ij} |ii\rangle\langle jj|$ satisfies $s(\varrho) > r$ if and only if it violates Eq. (7).

Proof.—The “if” direction is clear from theorem 1. The proof of the “only if” part consists of two steps. First, one observes that for Schmidt-correlated states the states $|\psi_r^{(k)}\rangle$ that provide the lower bound on the right-hand side of Eq. (7) must have the same Schmidt bases as ϱ . Second, one observes that whenever Eq. (7) is satisfied, these $|\psi_r^{(k)}\rangle$ provide a decomposition of ϱ , which thus must satisfy $s(\varrho) \leq r$ by definition (5). More details can be found in the Supplemental Material [43]. \square

The criterion Eq. (7) is a compact way of writing many individual entanglement conditions in the form of variance-based uncertainty relations $\sum_k (\Delta T_k)_\varrho^2 \geq \min_{\psi_r} (\Delta T_k)_{\psi_r}^2$, with $T_k = A_k \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes B_k$ being collective observables. In fact, the criterion (10b) is nothing but an uncertainty relation criterion for a full basis set, i.e., with $T_\mu = g_\mu^A \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes g_\mu^B$, the bound being $2(d-r)$. For other specific T_k , however, the minimization over all pure Schmidt-rank- r states might be quite challenging as r grows. A very important case consists of spin measurements along three orthogonal directions, which is what is typically measured in, e.g., cold-atom experiments [4, 5].

Hence, as a paradigmatic case let us consider three local observables $\mathbf{j} = (j_x, j_y, j_z)$ being spin component along orthogonal axes in their irreducible representation with quantum number $j = \frac{d-1}{2}$ for both parties. Taking a canonical observables’ basis $\mathbf{g} = (\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{i})$ with the diagonal operators sharing eigenbasis with j_z we have that j_x and j_y are combination of only the real and imaginary operators respectively with the particular coefficients $x_{lk} = w_l \delta_{l+1,k}$ and $y_{lk} = w_k \delta_{l,k+1}$ with $w_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{j(j+1) - m_k(m_k+1)}$, while j_z is just combination of the diagonal operators with coefficients given by $z_{lk} = m_k \delta_{lk}$, with $m_k = -j - 1 + k$ being the j_z eigenvalues. Next, we look for a lower bound to expressions of the form $(\Delta J_x^\pm)^2 + (\Delta J_y^\pm)^2 + (\Delta J_z^\pm)^2$, where $J_k^\pm = j_k \otimes \mathbb{1} \pm \mathbb{1} \otimes j_k$ are col-

lective spin observables. Constructing the spin operators this way, we can derive a statement that involves pure or Schmidt-correlated states, with measurements which are aligned with the Schmidt bases of the state. In other words, every Schmidt-correlated state $\varrho = \sum_{ij} \varrho_{ij} |ii\rangle\langle jj|$ such that $s(\varrho) \leq r$ must satisfy an uncertainty relation of the form $\text{tr}(\text{Cov}_{\varrho_a}(\mathbf{i}_a)) + \text{tr}(\text{Cov}_{\varrho_b}(\mathbf{i}_b)) - 2 \sum_i |(X_\varrho^j)_{ii}| \geq B_{j,r}$, where X_ϱ^j is the cross-covariance matrix between the local spin operators and the bound is $B_{j,r} = \min_{\lambda} \sum_{k=1}^{2j} k(2j+1-k) (\sqrt{\lambda_k} - \sqrt{\lambda_{k+1}})^2$. Here, the minimization is taken over all vectors λ with only r nonzero and positive components which sum up to one, and j_z have eigenbases coinciding with the Schmidt bases of ϱ .

To prove such a bound, we again exploit the fact that for Schmidt correlated states we know that the states providing the right-hand side of Eq. (7) must have the same Schmidt bases. Consider the vectors $t_x = (\mathbf{x}, \pm \mathbf{x})$, $t_y = (\mathbf{y}, \pm \mathbf{y})$ and $t_z = (\mathbf{z}, \pm \mathbf{z})$, with component as above in the canonical bases, which are constructed from the Schmidt bases of ϱ . Multiplying Eq. (7) with the three vectors t_k and summing we obtain $\sum_k t_k \Gamma_\varrho t_k^T \geq \text{tr}(\text{Cov}_{\varrho_a}(\mathbf{i}_a)) + \text{tr}(\text{Cov}_{\varrho_b}(\mathbf{i}_b)) - 2 \sum_i |(X_\varrho^j)_{ii}| = \sum_{\mu\nu} x_\mu x_\nu (2R_{\mu\nu} - 2|(R_C)_{\mu\nu}|) + y_\mu y_\nu (2I_{\mu\nu} - 2|(I_C)_{\mu\nu}|) \geq \min_{|\psi_r\rangle} B(|\psi_r\rangle)$, where the bound is taken over a generic Schmidt-rank- r pure state. Here the blocks are given by $R = I = \frac{1}{2} \text{diag} \{ \varrho_{jj} + \varrho_{kk} \}_{j,k=1}^d$ and $R_C = -I_C = \text{diag} \{ \varrho_{jk} \}_{j,k=1}^d$. Since the $|\psi_r\rangle$ providing the bound must have Schmidt bases coinciding with our computational bases (due to Lemma 1 in the Supplemental Material [43]) and since both local j_z are diagonal in such computational bases, we get similarly that $B(|\psi_r\rangle) = \sum_{\mu\nu} x_\mu x_\nu (2R'_{\mu\nu} - 2|(R'_C)_{\mu\nu}|) + y_\mu y_\nu (2I'_{\mu\nu} - 2|(I'_C)_{\mu\nu}|)$, with diagonal blocks with singular values as in theorem 1. Substituting the expressions in Eq. (9) we finally get $B(|\psi_r\rangle) = \sum_k 2w_k^2 (\sqrt{\lambda_k} - \sqrt{\lambda_{k+1}})^2$ with $2w_k^2 = k(2j+1-k)$, which must be then minimized over all pure states, i.e., all Schmidt vectors λ .

The bound $B_{j,r}$ is quite difficult to calculate analytically for a given pair (j, r) . Still, in the case $r = 2$ such a bound can be actually calculated for all j , and moreover further (non-optimal) bounds can be derived for all r . In fact, we have $B_{j,r} \geq (r \sum_{k=1}^r k^{-1} (2j+1-k)^{-1})^{-1} \geq \frac{2j}{r^2}$. Furthermore, for $r = 2$ we have $B_{j,2} = 4j - 1 - \sqrt{1 - 4j + 8j^2}$, which is the tight bound. A detailed proof of this bound can be found in the Supplemental Material [43]. Note that these bounds formally work only for Schmidt-correlated states which have Schmidt bases aligned with the eigenvectors of one spin direction. However, numerical search shows that actually for general spin observables the bound is still satisfied, thus hinting at the fact that the construction above is optimal also for the general case. Furthermore, one can observe that typical spin states prepared in experiments, such as singlet states, Dicke states and spin squeezed states are detected, at least for a small amount of noise. A detailed study of such a general inequality with spin operators is left for a subsequent publication.

Conclusions.—In conclusion, generalizing the work of Ref. [1] we have derived a covariance matrix criterion for the

entanglement dimensionality. We have also discussed weaker corollaries of such a general criterion and their application to detect general states, as well as collective spin states. The latter are routinely prepared in atomic ensembles, and collective spin variances are almost the only observables that can be measured in those experiments, which gave also a further motivation for the present work and for subsequent investigations. As an outlook, many theoretical questions are uncovered by the present work and left for future investigation, including a further improvement of our theorem with non-unitary filtering operations [1, 39] and the relation with other criteria based on collective variances, e.g., Ref. [22]. These questions would have implications also on the application side, to find further concrete inequalities that have the sufficient noise tolerance to be employed in actual experiments.

Acknowledgments.—This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grants No. 12125402). SL acknowledges financial support from the China Scholarship Council (Grant No. 202006010302). MF was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation, and by The Branco Weiss Fellowship – Society in Science, administered by the ETH Zürich. QH acknowledges the Beijing Natural Science Foundation (Z190005) and the Key R&D Program of Guangdong Province (Grant No. 2018B030329001). GV acknowledges financial support from the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) through the grants P 35810-N (Stand-Alone) and ZK 3 (Zukunftskolleg). MH acknowledges funding from the European Research Council (Consolidator grant ‘Cocoquest’ 101043705).

* qiongyihe@pku.edu.cn

† marcus.huber@univie.ac.at

‡ poissonfdb@gmail.com

- [1] O. Gühne, P. Hyllus, O. Gittsovich, and J. Eisert, Covariance Matrices and the Separability Problem, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 130504 (2007).
- [2] E. Schrödinger, Die gegenwärtige Situation in der Quantenmechanik, *Naturwissenschaften* **23**, 807 (1935).
- [3] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Quantum entanglement, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 865 (2009).
- [4] O. Gühne and G. Tóth, Entanglement detection, *Phys. Rep.* **474**, 1 (2009).
- [5] N. Friis, G. Vitagliano, M. Malik, and M. Huber, Entanglement certification from theory to experiment, *Nat. Rev. Phys.* **1**, 72 (2019).
- [6] M. B. Plenio and S. Virmani, An introduction to entanglement measures, *Quant. Inf. Comput.* **7**, 1 (2007).
- [7] G. Vidal, Entanglement monotones, *J. Mod. Opt.* **47**, 355 (2000).
- [8] O. Gittsovich and O. Gühne, Quantifying entanglement with covariance matrices, *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 032333 (2010).
- [9] M. Fadel, A. Usui, M. Huber, N. Friis, and G. Vitagliano, Entanglement Quantification in Atomic Ensembles, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 010401 (2021).
- [10] F. G. S. L. Brandão, Quantifying entanglement with witness operators, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 022310 (2005).
- [11] M. Cramer, M. B. Plenio, and H. Wunderlich, Measuring Entanglement in Condensed Matter Systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 020401 (2011).
- [12] O. Marty, M. Epping, H. Kampermann, D. Bruß, M. B. Plenio, and M. Cramer, Quantifying entanglement with scattering experiments, *Phys. Rev. B* **89**, 125117 (2014).
- [13] Z. Zhang, M. Tengner, T. Zhong, F. N. C. Wong, and J. H. Shapiro, Entanglement’s Benefit Survives an Entanglement-Breaking Channel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 010501 (2013).
- [14] M. Huber and M. Pawłowski, Weak randomness in device-independent quantum key distribution and the advantage of using high-dimensional entanglement, *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 032309 (2013).
- [15] S. Ecker, F. Bouchard, L. Bulla, F. Brandt, O. Kohout, F. Steinlechner, R. Fickler, M. Malik, Y. Guryanova, R. Ursin, and M. Huber, Overcoming noise in entanglement distribution, *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 041042 (2019).
- [16] X.-M. Hu, C. Zhang, Y. Guo, F.-X. Wang, W.-B. Xing, C.-X. Huang, B.-H. Liu, Y.-F. Huang, C.-F. Li, G.-C. Guo, X. Gao, M. Pivoluska, and M. Huber, Pathways for Entanglement-Based Quantum Communication in the Face of High Noise, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 110505 (2021).
- [17] B. P. Lanyon, M. Barbieri, M. P. Almeida, T. Jennewein, T. C. Ralph, K. J. Resch, G. J. Pryde, J. L. O’Brien, A. Gilchrist, and A. G. White, Simplifying quantum logic using higher-dimensional hilbert spaces, *Nat. Phys.* **5**, 134 (2009).
- [18] M. Van den Nest, Universal Quantum Computation with Little Entanglement, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 060504 (2013).
- [19] M. Krenn, M. Huber, R. Fickler, R. Lapkiewicz, S. Ramelow, and A. Zeilinger, Generation and confirmation of a (100×100) -dimensional entangled quantum system, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **111**, 6243 (2014).
- [20] P. Erker, M. Krenn, and M. Huber, Quantifying high dimensional entanglement with two mutually unbiased bases, *Quantum* **1**, 22 (2017).
- [21] J. Bavaresco, N. Herrera Valencia, C. Klöckl, M. Pivoluska, P. Erker, N. Friis, M. Malik, and M. Huber, Measurements in two bases are sufficient for certifying high-dimensional entanglement, *Nat. Phys.* **14**, 1032 (2018).
- [22] V. Giovannetti, S. Mancini, D. Vitali, and P. Tombesi, Characterizing the entanglement of bipartite quantum systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 022320 (2003).
- [23] B. Lücke, J. Peise, G. Vitagliano, J. Arlt, L. Santos, G. Tóth, and C. Klempt, Detecting Multiparticle Entanglement of Dicke States, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 155304 (2014).
- [24] G. Vitagliano, G. Colangelo, F. Martin Ciurana, M. W. Mitchell, R. J. Sewell, and G. Tóth, Entanglement and extreme planar spin squeezing, *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 020301(R) (2018).
- [25] L. Pezzè, A. Smerzi, M. K. Oberthaler, R. Schmied, and P. Treutlein, Quantum metrology with nonclassical states of atomic ensembles, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **90**, 035005 (2018).
- [26] G. Vitagliano, I. Apellaniz, M. Kleinmann, B. Lücke, C. Klempt, and G. Tóth, Entanglement and extreme spin squeezing of unpolarized states, *New J. Phys.* **19**, 013027 (2017).
- [27] F. Baccari, J. Tura, M. Fadel, A. Aloy, J.-D. Bancal, N. Sangouard, M. Lewenstein, A. Acín, and R. Augusiak, Bell correlations depth in many-body systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 022121 (2019).
- [28] M. Fadel and M. Gessner, Relating spin squeezing to multipartite entanglement criteria for particles and modes, *Phys. Rev. A* **102**, 012412 (2020).
- [29] B. Julsgaard, A. Kozhekin, and E. S. Polzik, Experimental long-lived entanglement of two macroscopic objects,

- Nature **413**, 400 (2001).
- [30] M. Fadel, T. Zibold, B. Décamps, and P. Treutlein, Spatial entanglement patterns and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering in Bose-Einstein condensates, *Science* **360**, 409 (2018).
- [31] P. Kunkel, M. Prüfer, H. Strobel, D. Linnemann, A. Frölian, T. Gasenzer, M. Gärtner, and M. K. Oberthaler, Spatially distributed multipartite entanglement enables EPR steering of atomic clouds, *Science* **360**, 413 (2018).
- [32] K. Lange, J. Peise, B. Lücke, I. Kruse, G. Vitagliano, I. Apellaniz, M. Kleinmann, G. Tóth, and C. Klempt, Entanglement between two spatially separated atomic modes, *Science* **360**, 416 (2018).
- [33] G. Vitagliano, M. Fadel, I. Apellaniz, M. Kleinmann, B. Lücke, C. Klempt, and G. Tóth, Detecting Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering and bipartite entanglement in split Dicke states, arXiv:2104.05663 .
- [34] M. Cramer, A. Bernard, N. Fabbri, L. Fallani, C. Fort, S. Rosi, F. Caruso, M. Inguscio, and M. B. Plenio, Spatial entanglement of bosons in optical lattices, *Nat. Commun.* **4**, 2161 (2013).
- [35] R. Islam, R. Ma, P. M. Preiss, M. E. Tai, A. Lukin, M. Rispoli, and M. Greiner, Measuring entanglement entropy in a quantum many-body system, *Nature* **528**, 77 (2015).
- [36] Here for simplicity we restrict to bipartite spaces with equal dimensions, but our main results can be straightforwardly extend to nonequal dimensions.
- [37] Here we consider basis operators (ortho)normalized as $\text{tr}(g_k g_l) = \delta_{kl}$.
- [38] In the following we will often simplify the notation and whenever clear from the context omit the dependence on the density matrix and the local bases.
- [39] O. Gittsovich, O. Gühne, P. Hyllus, and J. Eisert, Unifying several separability conditions using the covariance matrix criterion, *Phys. Rev. A* **78**, 052319 (2008).
- [40] H. F. Hofmann and S. Takeuchi, Violation of local uncertainty relations as a signature of entanglement, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 032103 (2003).
- [41] S. T. Flammia and Y.-K. Liu, Direct Fidelity Estimation from Few Pauli Measurements, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 230501 (2011).
- [42] M. Weilenmann, B. Dive, D. Trillo, E. A. Aguilar, and M. Navascués, Entanglement Detection beyond Measuring Fidelities, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 200502 (2020).
- [43] See supplemental material for details of proofs.
-

Supplemental Material

In this supplement we provide formal proofs corroborating some of the statements in the main text.

Lemma 1. *Let us consider a Schmidt-correlated density matrix $\varrho = \sum_{ij} \varrho_{ij} |ii\rangle\langle jj|$ and the associated covariance matrix Γ_ϱ in the canonical operator basis constructed from its Schmidt basis. The matrix $\Delta := \Gamma_\varrho - \sum_k p_k \Gamma_{\psi_k}$ as in Eq. (7) in the main text can be positive semidefinite only if all states $|\psi_k\rangle$ have the same Schmidt bases as ϱ .*

Proof.—Let us consider generic states $|\psi_k\rangle = \sum_{i,j} m_{ij}^{(k)} |ij\rangle$, expanded in the Schmidt bases of ϱ and let us consider the principal minor of Δ corresponding to the operators $\{|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \mathbb{1}, \mathbb{1} \otimes |i\rangle\langle i|\}$:

$$\Delta_{(vv)} = \begin{pmatrix} D_{ii} - \sum_k p_k a_k & D_{ii} - \sum_k p_k c_k \\ D_{ii} - \sum_k p_k c_k & D_{ii} - \sum_k p_k b_k \end{pmatrix}, \text{ with } v = (ii), D_{ii} = \varrho_{ii} - \varrho_{ii}^2, \quad (1)$$

where the generic elements a_k, b_k, c_k are given by: $a_k = \sum_j |m_{ij}^{(k)}|^2 - \left(\sum_j |m_{ij}^{(k)}|^2\right)^2$, $b_k = \sum_j |m_{ji}^{(k)}|^2 - \left(\sum_j |m_{ji}^{(k)}|^2\right)^2$ and $c_k = |m_{ii}^{(k)}|^2 - \left(\sum_j |m_{ij}^{(k)}|^2\right) \left(\sum_j |m_{ji}^{(k)}|^2\right)$. From the positivity of Γ_{ψ_k} we have

$$\sqrt{\left(\sum_k p_k a_k\right) \left(\sum_k p_k b_k\right)} \geq \sum_k p_k \sqrt{a_k b_k} \geq \sum_k p_k c_k \quad (2)$$

Then notice that $\Delta_{(vv)}$ is positive only when $\sum_k p_k a_k = \sum_k p_k b_k = \sum_k p_k c_k \leq D_{ii}$. In this case Eq. (2) saturates, which means that $a_k = b_k = c_k$ for all k . Imposing that $a_k = b_k$ and $a_k = c_k$ gives $m_{ij}^{(k)} = 0$ for all $j \neq i$. This means that $|\psi_k\rangle = \sum_i m_{ii}^{(k)} |ii\rangle$ for all k , which proves the claim. \square

With this Lemma, we are now in the position to provide a more formal proof of Observation 2 in the main text.

Proof of Observation 2. The coefficients ϱ_{ij} can be written in computational basis as $\varrho_{ij} = \sum_u q_u \sqrt{\Lambda_i^{(u)} \Lambda_j^{(u)}}$ where $\Lambda_i^{(u)}$ are Schmidt coefficients of every pure state component of ϱ . The blocks in the covariance matrix of ϱ are given by $\gamma_a = \gamma_b = \text{diag}(D, R, I)$ and $X_\varrho = \text{diag}(D, R_C, I_C)$ with $D_{jk} = \varrho_{jj} \delta_{jk} - \varrho_{jj} \varrho_{kk}$, $R = I = \frac{1}{2} \text{diag} \left\{ \varrho_{jj} + \varrho_{kk} \right\}_{j < k=1}^d$ and $R_C = -I_C = \text{diag} \left\{ \varrho_{jk} \right\}_{j < k=1}^d$. Using Lemma 1 above, we know that Eq. (7) can be satisfied only if all the $|\psi_r^{(k)}\rangle$ share the same Schmidt bases as ϱ . Let us consider the principal minor of $\Delta = \Gamma_\varrho - \sum_k p_k \Gamma_{\psi_r^{(k)}}$ corresponding to the operators $\left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|j\rangle\langle k| + |k\rangle\langle j|) \otimes \mathbb{1}, \mathbb{1} \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|j\rangle\langle k| + |k\rangle\langle j|) \right\}$:

$$\Delta_{(vv)} = \begin{pmatrix} R_{vv} - \sum_u p_u R_{vv}^{(u)} & (R_C)_{vv} - \sum_u p_u (R_C^{(u)})_{vv} \\ (R_C)_{vv} - \sum_u p_u (R_C^{(u)})_{vv} & R_{vv} - \sum_u p_u R_{vv}^{(u)} \end{pmatrix}, \text{ with } v = (jk), j < k. \quad (3)$$

From the positivity of $\Delta_{(vv)}$ we have $R_{vv} - \sum_u p_u R_{vv}^{(u)} \geq 0$ for all v . Since $\sum_{j < k} R_{jk, jk} = \frac{1}{2}(d-1) \sum_j \varrho_{jj} = \frac{1}{2}(d-1)$ and $\sum_{j < k} R_{jk, jk}^{(u)} = \frac{1}{2}(d-1) \sum_j \lambda_j = \frac{1}{2}(d-1)$, then we have that $\Delta_{(vv)}$ is the null matrix and therefore $\varrho_{jj} = \sum_u p_u \lambda_j^{(u)}$ and $\varrho_{jk} = \sum_u p_u \sqrt{\lambda_j^{(u)} \lambda_k^{(u)}}$. By setting $\lambda = \lambda$ and $q = p$, we can then find a set of pure states $|\psi_r^{(k)}\rangle$ which satisfy Eq. (7), which also provides a decomposition of ϱ . In summary, if Eq. (7) is violated, it means one cannot find a decomposition using $|\psi_r^{(k)}\rangle$ whose Schmidt rank $\leq r$, i.e., the Schmidt number of ϱ is greater than r . Conversely, if the Schmidt number of ϱ is greater than r , then one cannot have $\varrho_{jj} = \sum_u p_u \lambda_j^{(u)}$ and $\varrho_{jk} = \sum_u p_u \sqrt{\lambda_j^{(u)} \lambda_k^{(u)}}$, which means that Eq. (7) cannot be satisfied. In fact, whenever these last equations are satisfied, then one can find a decomposition of ϱ in terms of Schmidt-rank- r pure states. In conclusion, the violation of Eq. (7) is necessary and sufficient for $s(\varrho) > r$ to hold. \square

Finally, we prove the lower bound to $B_{j,r}$ valid for the inequality with the spin operators.

Lemma 2. *The lower bound $B_{j,r}$ satisfies*

$$B_{j,r} \geq \left(r \sum_{k=1}^r k^{-1} (2j+1-k)^{-1} \right)^{-1} \geq \frac{2j}{r^2}. \quad (4)$$

when $r < d$. Furthermore, for $r = 2$ we have

$$B_{j,2} = 4j - 1 - \sqrt{1 - 4j + 8j^2}. \quad (5)$$

Proof.—By using Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we have $B_{j,r} = \min_{\lambda} \sum_{k=1}^r 2w_k^2 (\sqrt{\lambda_k} - \sqrt{\lambda_{k+1}})^2 \geq (\sum_{k=1}^r (2w_k^2)^{-1})^{-1} \min_{\lambda} (\sum_{k=1}^r |\sqrt{\lambda_k} - \sqrt{\lambda_{k+1}}|)^2 \geq \frac{1}{r} (\sum_{k=1}^r (2w_k^2)^{-1})^{-1}$, with $2w_k^2 = k(2j+1-k)$. The last bound is because $\sum_{k=1}^r |\sqrt{\lambda_k} - \sqrt{\lambda_{k+1}}|$ reaches the minimum when $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_r$ and $\lambda_1 \geq \frac{1}{r}$. Then we have $B_{j,r} \geq \frac{1}{r} (\sum_{k=1}^r (k(2j+1-k))^{-1})^{-1} \geq (r \sum_{k=1}^r (2j)^{-1})^{-1} = \frac{2j}{r^2}$. When $r = 2 < d$, the lowest variance is $\min_{\lambda_1} 2j (\sqrt{\lambda_1} - \sqrt{1-\lambda_1})^2 + (4j-2)(1-\lambda_1)$ by taking $\lambda_2 = 1 - \lambda_1$. The solution is $4j-1 - \sqrt{1-4j+8j^2}$. \square
