

Entanglement classification and *non-k*-separability certification via Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger-class fidelity

Marcin Płodzień,¹ Jan Chwedeńczuk,² Maciej Lewenstein,^{1,3} and Grzegorz Rajchel-Mieldzioc⁴

¹*ICFO-Institut de Ciències Fòniques, The Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology, 08860 Castelldefels (Barcelona), Spain*

²*Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw, ul. Pasteura 5, 02-093 Warszawa, Poland*

³*ICREA, Passeig Lluís Companys 23, 08010 Barcelona, Spain*

⁴*NASK National Research Institute, ul. Kolska 12, 01-045 Warszawa, Poland*

Many-body quantum systems can be characterised using the notions of *k*-separability and entanglement depth. A quantum state is *k*-separable if it can be expressed as a mixture of *k* entangled subsystems, and its entanglement depth is given by the size of the largest entangled subsystem. In this paper we propose a multipartite entanglement measure that satisfies the following criteria: (i) it can be used with both pure and mixed states; (ii) it is encoded in a single element of the density matrix, so it does not require knowledge of the full spectrum of the density matrix; (iii) it can be applied to large systems; and (iv) it can be experimentally verified. The proposed method allows the certification of *non-k*-separability of a given quantum state. We show that the proposed method successfully classifies three-qubit systems into known stochastic local operations and classical communication (SLOCC) classes, namely bipartite, W-, and GHZ-type entanglement. Furthermore, we characterise the *non-k*-separability in known nine SLOCC classes of four-qubit states, absolutely maximally entangled states for five and six qubits and for arbitrary size qubit Dicke states.

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the important consequences of the quantum description of physical systems is the notion of entanglement [1] which is the necessary resource for the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering [2] and the Bell correlations [3–5]. None of these correlations has a classical counterpart. The highlighted role of entanglement requires a systematic characterisation and classification of quantum states in terms of some entanglement measure [6–8]. Nevertheless, the tools for entanglement classification are usually difficult to implement in realistic experimental settings and are not universal due to the large number of entanglement classes [9]. The problem of assigning a multipartite state to some entanglement class is hard even for three qubits [10–16], and is even more complicated for four qubits, where the number of entanglement classes is already infinite [17–19]. Hence the variety of multipartite entanglement measures, such as based on local [20] or on the collective measurements [21]. Research has focused on limiting the experimental effort [22] and recently a method called *entanglement detection length* has been proposed to witness many-body entanglement with a minimal number of observables [23]. A technique has been developed for detecting multipartite entanglement based on a constant number of measurements, independent of the number of qubits, suitable for the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) states, cluster- or Dicke states [24, 25]. The urgency for a versatile entanglement certification method is underlined by the fact that the Dicke states have been created in experiments with few qubits in different configurations such as photonic systems [25–30], ultracold atoms [24, 31–33] and quantum circuits [34, 35]. A Hilbert-Schmidt distance between a given state and the closest separable state is another important entanglement witness [36]. The other

methods to distinguish entanglement of quantum states use local unitary optimisations [37, 38]. The next measures are entanglement of formation [39–47], quantum discord [48–56], and concurrence [57–62].

A separable class of witnesses to multipartite entanglement is related to quantum metrology [63]. The prominent example is the quantum Fisher information (QFI), which sets the upper limit for the precision of parameter estimation [64]. Broadly speaking, an increasing value of the QFI implies increasing depth of multipartite entanglement, decreasing *k*-separability, and a better precision of a quantum sensor taking this state as input [65–67]. The QFI can be difficult to calculate and even harder to measure as it requires full information about the spectrum of a many-body state. However other related quantities are easier to access, such as the classical Fisher information, the spin-squeezing, or other witnesses based on two-body correlators that carry some information about the multipartite entanglement [68–101].

Another method is based on the measurement of macroscopic observables such as magnetic susceptibility [102], heat capacity [103], energy [104–106], mean spin and spin correlations [107–109], with magnetic resonance spectroscopy [110, 111], entropic correlations [112], out-of-time-order correlations [113–115] or the energy of a thermal state in equilibrium [116]. Next, there is a family of methods based on SLOCC (stochastic local operations and classical communications) and tensor properties [117–125]. These methods can generally be divided into subgroups [9]: eigenvalue criteria [126–130], entanglement witnesses [131–140], geometric and robustness criteria [141–149], and operational measures [8, 150, 151]. Entanglement has been also classified with the help of mathematical tools from group theory [152], topology [153], and algebraic geometry [154]. Finally, in recent years the problem of entanglement classification in many-

body systems has been approached from a machine learning point of view [155–172].

Here we propose a method for detecting and classifying many-body entanglement using a correlator originally proposed for detecting Bell correlations and the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering [173–177]. Among the advantages of this method is the possibility to quantify the entanglement with a single element of the density matrix, which is directly accessible in an experiment without the need for full tomography [178–180]. It has already been shown to detect the entanglement depth in the multipartite setting [176, 181–183]. This correlator belongs to a broader family considered in Ref. [184], where a general framework for certifying many-body Bell correlations was formulated. Its other variants include the Mermin form of Bell inequalities [185–187], the N -body inequalities [173, 175, 184, 188] or the Ardehali inequalities [189]. Some of these inequalities have been used to distinguish W and GHZ states [190]. Recently, several other techniques have been developed that tackle the problem of certifying entanglement without using all possible N -body correlations [191, 192].

Our method allows SLOCC classification of three- and four-qubit entanglement classes for both pure and mixed states. We use the proposed setup to characterise the k -separability of all remaining qubit absolutely maximally entangled (AME) states, and to classify the k -separability of Dicke states of any number of qubits. All characterisations are performed by inspecting the single element of the density matrix, corresponding to the GHZ coherence in the optimally chosen basis.

The paper is structured as follows: In Sec. II we introduce the framework used for characterisation and classification of *non- k* -separability. Next, in Sec. III we use the proposed method to characterise *non- k* -separability in many-body qubit systems. In Sec. III A we focus on three-qubit quantum states and show its relation with SLOCC classification. In Sec. III B we characterize *non- k* -separability of four-qubit states from nine SLOCC classes; in Sec. III C we characterise Absolutely Maximally Entangled (AME) states and in Sec. III D we characterise k -separability of Dicke states for any number of qubits and any magnetisation sector. In Sec. IV we comment on the protocol for measuring *non- k* -separability. Finally, we conclude in Sec. V. Some additional details are presented in Appendices.

II. METHODS

A. Many-body correlator

Consider a many-body system containing N parties. Each of N parties can measure a pair of observables $\sigma_x^{(k)}$ and $\sigma_y^{(k)}$, each yielding binary outcomes, i.e., $\sigma_{x/y} = \pm 1$, with $k \in \{1 \dots N\}$. At this point, it is not assumed that these observables are quantum. The correlation function (also referred to as the correlator) of these results is here

defined as

$$\mathcal{E}_N = \left| \langle \sigma_+^{(1)} \dots \sigma_+^{(N)} \rangle \right|^2, \quad (1)$$

with $\sigma_+^{(k)} = 1/2(\sigma_x^{(k)} + i\sigma_y^{(k)})$. This correlation is consistent with the local and realistic theory if the average can be expressed in terms of an integral over the random (*hidden*) variable λ distributed with a probability density $p(\lambda)$ as follows

$$\langle \sigma_+^{(1)} \dots \sigma_+^{(N)} \rangle = \int d\lambda p(\lambda) \prod_{k=1}^N \sigma_+^{(k)}(\lambda). \quad (2)$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for complex integrals together with the fact that $|\sigma_+^{(k)}(\lambda)|^2 = 1/2$ for all k , we see that the \mathcal{E}_N is bounded from above:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_N &= \left| \int d\lambda p(\lambda) \prod_{k=1}^N \sigma_+^{(k)}(\lambda) \right|^2 \\ &\leq \int d\lambda p(\lambda) \left| \sigma_+^{(k)}(\lambda) \right|^2 = 2^{-N}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

We thus conclude that

$$\mathcal{E}_N \leq 2^{-N} \quad (4)$$

is the N -body Bell inequality, because its violation defies the postulates of local realism expressed in Eq. (2).

The provided inequality is valid for systems that yield binary outcomes of local, single-particle observables - such conditions are realized in the case of the N -qubit quantum system described by density matrix $\hat{\rho}$. The quantum-mechanical equivalent of Eq. (1) is defined as

$$\mathcal{E} = \left| \text{Tr} \left[\hat{\rho} \bigotimes_{k=1}^N \hat{\sigma}_+^{(k)} \right] \right|^2. \quad (5)$$

Assuming quantum-mechanical behavior of each parties of the system, i.e., $|\langle \hat{\sigma}_+^{(k)} \rangle|^2 \leq 4^{-1}$, we obtain that for a separable state of N qubits the following holds: $\mathcal{E} \leq 4^{-N}$

Based on the above considerations, to witness and classify the multi-qubit entanglement of an N -qubit density matrix $\hat{\rho}$, we use the generalized N -body correlator

$$\mathcal{Q} = \log_4 [4^N |\text{Tr} [\hat{\rho} \bigotimes_{k=1}^N \hat{\sigma}_{+,n_k}^{(k)}]|^2], \quad (6)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_{+,n_k}^{(k)}$ is the single-qubit operator that is rising the projection of the spin along the axis n_k , i.e.,

$$\hat{\sigma}_{+,n_k}^{(k)} = \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\sigma}_{m_k}^{(k)} + i\hat{\sigma}_{l_k}^{(k)}). \quad (7)$$

where $\vec{r}_k = (n_k, m_k, l_k)$ are three mutually orthogonal components of a Bloch vector. Axis n_k defines the rotated version of the operator $\hat{\sigma}_+^{(k)} = 1/2(\hat{\sigma}_x^{(k)} + i\hat{\sigma}_y^{(k)})$ after the action of local unitary matrices, i.e., $\hat{\sigma}_{+,n_k}^{(k)} = \hat{R}_k^\dagger(\vec{\theta}_k)\hat{\sigma}_+^{(k)}\hat{R}_k(\vec{\theta}_k)$, where $\hat{R}_k(\vec{\theta}_k) = e^{-i\vec{\theta}_k \cdot \vec{\sigma}_k}$, $\vec{\theta}_k = \{\theta_x^{(k)}, \theta_y^{(k)}, \theta_z^{(k)}\}$, $\vec{\sigma}_k = \{\hat{\sigma}_x^{(k)}, \hat{\sigma}_y^{(k)}, \hat{\sigma}_z^{(k)}\}$.




FIG. 1. Pictorial representation of $N = 12$ qubit quantum states. (a) 6-separable state with entanglement depth $d_e = 4$, (b) 4-separable state with entanglement depth $d_e = 4$, (c) 2-separable quantum state with entanglement depth $d_e = 6$, and (d) genuinely entangled quantum state with entanglement depth $d_e = 12$, not-2-separable.

B. Quantum state structure characterization

In the following we show how the correlator \mathcal{Q} carries extensive information on the entanglement of a given state $\hat{\rho}$ [176, 182, 183, 193].

Let us consider the density operator of N qubits as a product of k entangled states, each with n_l qubits, $\sum_{l=1}^k n_l = N$, i.e.,

$$\hat{\rho} = \int d\lambda p(\lambda) \bigotimes_{l=1}^k \hat{\rho}_{n_l}(\lambda) \equiv \hat{\rho}_{n_1 \dots n_k}. \quad (8)$$

Such states are called k -separable [194–200], and its entanglement depth is defined as $d_e = \max\{n_1 \dots n_k\}$, see Fig. 1.

For all N -separable states, $k = N$, $\hat{\rho}_{n_1 \dots n_k}$, $n_l = 1$, $l \in \{1 \dots N\}$, the correlator \mathcal{Q} takes non-positive values

$$\mathcal{Q} \leq 0, \quad (9)$$

and violation of this inequality indicates entanglement in the system. On the other hand, the maximal value is obtained for a *non-2*-separable state $\hat{\rho}_N = |\psi_{\text{ghz}}\rangle\langle\psi_{\text{ghz}}|$, being a pure Greenberg-Horne-Zeilinger state $|\psi_{\text{ghz}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|1\rangle^{\otimes N} + |0\rangle^{\otimes N})$,

$$\mathcal{Q} = N - 1. \quad (10)$$

For states being a product of a single qubit and entangled state of the remaining $N-1$ qubits, $\hat{\rho}_{1, N-1}$, the correlator is bounded by

$$\mathcal{Q} \leq N - 2, \quad (11)$$

	$N = 3$	$N = 4$	$N = 5$	$N = 6$
$0 < \mathcal{Q} \leq 1$	$k < 3$	$k < 4$	$k < 5$	$k < 6$
$1 < \mathcal{Q} \leq 2$	gen. ent.	$k < 3$	$k < 4$	$k < 5$
$2 < \mathcal{Q} \leq 3$	—	gen. ent.	$k < 3$	$k < 4$
$3 < \mathcal{Q} \leq 4$	—	—	gen. ent.	$k < 3$
$4 < \mathcal{Q} \leq 5$	—	—	—	gen. ent.

TABLE I. The values of \mathcal{Q} for $N = 3, 4, 5$, and 6 that signal the *non- k* -separability, i.e., N qubit entangled state can only be represented as product of at most $(k-1)$ entangled states. Minimal *non- k* -separability ($k = 2$) signifies genuine entanglement (gen. ent.)

and its violation indicates genuine entanglement, i.e. state is *non-2*-separable; the same bound is valid for every 2-separable state, i.e. $\hat{\rho}_{n, N-n}$.

Bounds for \mathcal{Q} can be generalized to states being a product of n single qubits and $(N-n)$ -entangled state, $\hat{\rho}_{n_1 \dots n_n, N-n}$, $n_l = 1$, $l \in \{1 \dots n\}$:

$$N - 1 - (n + 1) < \mathcal{Q} \leq N - 1 - n, \quad (12)$$

and the correlator \mathcal{Q} indicates existence of entanglement depth $d_e = N - n$.

Next, for even number of qubits $N = 2M$, when $\hat{\rho}$ is a product of $N/2$ pairs of entangled qubits, $\hat{\rho}_{n_1 \dots n_k}$, $n_l = 2$, $l \in \{1 \dots N/2\}$, the correlator is bounded from above as

$$\mathcal{Q} \leq \frac{N}{2} = M, \quad (13)$$

and its violation certifies existence of entanglement depth $d_e = 3$.

Finally, considering $N = 3M$ qubits, $\hat{\rho}_{n_1 \dots n_M}$, $n_l = 3$, $l \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, the bound is

$$\mathcal{Q} \leq \frac{2}{3}N = 2M, \quad (14)$$

and its violation indicates entanglement depth $d_e = 4$.

In general, for k -separable states the correlator \mathcal{Q} is bounded from above

$$\mathcal{Q} \leq N - k, \quad (15)$$

and violation of this inequality witnesses a *non- k* -separability, i.e. $\hat{\rho}$ is a product of at most $(k-1)$ -entangled states.

As an examples, let us consider $N = 5$ and $N = 6$. For $N = 5$ qubits, the density operator $\hat{\rho}$ can take the form $\hat{\rho}_{1,4}$, $\hat{\rho}_{2,3}$ or $\hat{\rho}_{1,2,2}$. The respective value of the correlator are bounded by: $\mathcal{Q}_{1,4} \leq 3$ and its violation certifies genuine entanglement $d = 5$, $\mathcal{Q}_{2,3} \leq 3$ and its violation certifies entanglement depth $d_e = 4$; $\mathcal{Q}_{1,2,2} \leq 2$ and its violation certifies entanglement depth $d_e = 3$. For $N = 6$, the entangled state $\hat{\rho}$ can have the following structure: $\hat{\rho}_{1,5}$, $\hat{\rho}_{2,4}$, $\hat{\rho}_{3,3}$, $\hat{\rho}_{2,2,2}$. The corresponding bounds are: $\mathcal{Q}_{1,5} \leq 4$, $\mathcal{Q}_{2,4} \leq 4$, $\mathcal{Q}_{3,3} \leq 4$, and $\mathcal{Q}_{2,2,2} \leq 3$. These observations, adapted to the $N = 3, 4, 5, 6$ are summarized in Tab. I.

C. Extraction of \mathcal{Q}

The correlator \mathcal{Q} can be expressed in terms of a single element of the density matrix, i.e., $\mathcal{C} \equiv \langle \hat{0} |^{\otimes N} \hat{\rho} | \hat{1} \rangle^{\otimes N}$, such that determines the GHZ-type coherence between all the spins $|\hat{0}\rangle^{\otimes N}$ up and all down $|\hat{1}\rangle^{\otimes N}$ in the optimal local bases, namely

$$\mathcal{Q} = N + \log_4(|\mathcal{C}|^2). \quad (16)$$

This observation will be relevant in the forthcoming sections of this work. Importantly for its entanglement measure interpretation, \mathcal{Q} is convex in the input states, see App. A.

The freedom of choice of the orientations \vec{r}_k is of fundamental importance, as it allows to adapt the correlator to the geometry of the state that is scrutinized [193]. To see this, take two examples of three-qubit GHZ states,

$$|\psi_{\text{ghz}}^{zzz}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0_z, 0_z, 0_z\rangle + |1_z, 1_z, 1_z\rangle) \quad (17a)$$

$$|\psi_{\text{ghz}}^{xyz}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0_x, 0_y, 0_z\rangle + |1_x, 1_y, 1_z\rangle), \quad (17b)$$

where, for instance, $|0_x\rangle$ denotes the eigenstate of $\hat{\sigma}_x$ with the spin pointing up. Only the correct choice of the three axes: all operators rising the spin in the z -direction in the former, and in the x , y and z directions in the latter case, allow to maximize the value of \mathcal{Q} . In what follows, we always display results for the correlator, optimized over the choice of the separable basis. What is crucial from our perspective of classification of entanglement, the value of correlations is invariant under local unitary operations. Hence the proposed method for entanglement classification respects SLOCC entanglement classes, see App. B.

As we stated above, our scheme uses local unitary operations, i.e., local rotations, to transform the state into the optimal basis from the perspective of the GHZ-fidelity. A similar setup was already considered from a more general perspective: instead of local unitary operations, the authors of Refs. [201, 202] consider all local operations, because they do not introduce entanglement. For such a setup there exist lower bounds [201] on this type of GHZ-fidelity; however, these cannot be used in our case where GHZ-fidelity is necessarily smaller or equal due to a restricted set of operations.

III. RESULTS

The number of entanglement classes grows rapidly with the number of parties and the local dimension. For pure states of two qubits, there are only two entanglement classes, with a Bell state as an extremal representative of one and separable states forming the other. Increasing the number of qubits to three yields two disjoint genuinely multipartite entanglement classes, together forming six different classes. Interestingly, the growth of the number of classes is not even exponential; already for four

qubits, there are infinitely many entanglement classes, which can be divided into nine [17, 123, 162] or forty-nine groups [163, 203].

For mixed states $\hat{\rho}$, the situation is even more complicated. The usual method of assigning $\hat{\rho}$ to some class requires the knowledge if it can be written as a convex sum of pure states from a given SLOCC class. Notwithstanding, for a complete characterization of all mixed states, one requires also to extend it to pure states of lower entanglement, that is, non-genuine one [134].

In the following sections we illustrate the power of our method of entanglement classification for $N = 3$ qubits states in three SLOCC classes, $N = 4$ qubits states in nine SLOCC classes. Next, we characterize k -separability for $N = 5, 6$ qubits AME states, and Dicke states of an arbitrary size.

A. Three-qubit entanglement classification

We start by the first non-trivial example which requires classification of entanglement. First, we review well-known results concerning classification and then we show the effectiveness of our setup.

1. Pure states

In three-qubit system, there are two types of entanglement: genuine tripartite entanglement and the one in which one qubit is separated from the rest. In the genuine entanglement case, there are two inequivalent (under SLOCC) types of states: GHZ and W, defined in App. C [204]. One of the key differences between both genuinely entangled states GHZ and W is their tensor rank, see App. C. Therefore, in total there are six classes: two genuine, three two-partite entangled (AB-C, AC-B, BC-A) and one separable class.

In the following we analyze the correlator \mathcal{Q} for three-qubit SLOCC entanglement classes both for pure and mixed states. To do so, we generate the set of three-qubit quantum states as follows

- separable class: 3 Haar-random unitary matrices of size 2×2 acting on $|000\rangle$, yielding $\hat{U}_A \otimes \hat{U}_B \otimes \hat{U}_C |000\rangle$,
- two-party entangled classes: 2 random unitary matrices: one of size 4×4 and another of size 2×2 to entangle only two subsystems, e.g., $\hat{U}_{AB} \otimes \hat{U}_C |000\rangle$,
- W class: we apply the parametrization $|\psi\rangle = \lambda_0|000\rangle + \lambda_1|100\rangle + \lambda_2|101\rangle + \lambda_3|110\rangle$ from Ref. [134, 205] with $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ sampled uniformly,
- GHZ class: a random state belongs to this class with probability 1 [205]; therefore, we act with a random unitary matrix of size 8×8 on any pure state: $\hat{U}_{ABC} |000\rangle$.




FIG. 2. Probability distribution of \mathcal{Q} for three-qubit pure states from SLOCC classes: bi-separable-, W-, and GHZ-type (from top to bottom). The green dashed lines correspond to the maximal values of \mathcal{Q} for each class. Red dashed lines presents numerically obtained probability distribution function.

We generate 100 states of a maximal representatives of each class, and 20000 states for non-maximal representatives of each class. Next, we calculate the optimized Bell correlator \mathcal{Q} for each state.

In Fig. 2 we show the distribution of outcomes, separately for each class. First, we focus on the maximal representatives of each class. In this case, correlator \mathcal{Q} takes always same value, i.e. $\mathcal{Q} = 1$ for bi-separable states, $\mathcal{Q} = 1.6$ for W states, and $\mathcal{Q} = 2$ for GHZ states – denoted as vertical green lines in Fig. 2. This clearly indicates that correlator \mathcal{Q} does not depend on local rotations, and distinguish between SLOCC classes properly. The bound $\mathcal{Q} \leq 1.6$ serves as a GHZ-class witness. When $\mathcal{Q} > 1.6$ for either pure or mixed states, state $\hat{\rho}$ does not belong to the W-class. Values of the correlator \mathcal{Q} indicates the genuine entanglement of states W and GHZ, in accordance with Tab. I.

Next, let us consider the value of \mathcal{Q} for non-maximal representatives of each class. Frequencies of \mathcal{Q} for each class are presented as histogram in Fig. 2. Interestingly, for class W the most probable is $\mathcal{Q} = 1$. For the GHZ class the most probable is $\mathcal{Q} = 1.65$. From the purely numerical results, we observe that most probable value of \mathcal{Q} for W class is the the maximal value of \mathcal{Q} for bi-separable class, while most probable value of \mathcal{Q} for GHZ class is close to the maximal value of \mathcal{Q} for the W class.

Finally, the following question arises: how precisely does \mathcal{Q} distinguish between the classes. To address this

Ent. class	B-S	W	GHZ
B-S	0	0.27	0.93
W	0.27	0	0.57
GHZ	0.93	0.57	0

TABLE II. The table of pairwise Wootters' distance between the probability distributions of the optimized correlators \mathcal{Q} for three-qubit entanglement classes: biseparable (B-S), W, and GHZ.

point we use the Wootters' distance, which for probability distributions p and q of a random variable n is defined as

$$d(p, q) = 1 - \sum_n \sqrt{p_n q_n}, \quad (18)$$

where the measure $\sum_n \sqrt{p_n q_n}$ is known as the Bhattacharyya coefficient. Two probabilities are distant if $d(p, q) \simeq 1$ and naturally $d(p, p) = 0$. We calculate the Wootters' distance, pairwise, for the probabilities shown in Fig 2 (red lines). The outcome, shown in Table II, informs about the success chance of discrimination between the classes. The GHZ and the bi-separable states are the most distant, confirming the result of Fig. 2. As expected, the W-class that lies in between the two has a significant overlap with the both.

To assign a state to one of two given classes one can process it through the random SLOCC many times, calculating the correlator for each case. This procedure will give one of the two shapes from Fig. 2. The degree of distinguishability can be controlled with the number of samples. This protocol can be thought of as a black-box device, with random SLOCC class states on the input that, as an output, produces the correct classification provided sufficiently many samples.

2. Mixed states

In the following, we study how \mathcal{Q} is vulnerable to noise, i.e., a given state $|\psi\rangle$ with a given value of \mathcal{Q} belonging to some entanglement class, is passed through a decoherence channel. We take into account only states which give the maximal value of \mathcal{Q} for each class (see the vertical dashed green lines in Fig. 2). We consider two types of decoherence, where the first represents a global depolarizing channel

$$\Lambda_p[\hat{\rho}] = (1-p)\hat{\rho} + \frac{p}{8}\hat{1}. \quad (19)$$

As it does not depend on the orientation of the optimal correlator, the value of \mathcal{Q} is analytical and reads

$$\mathcal{Q}(p) = \mathcal{Q} + 2 \log_4(1-p). \quad (20)$$

This result is drawn in Fig. 3 with solid lines.




FIG. 3. The value of the correlator \mathcal{Q} for extremal representatives from each of three-qubit entanglement class, upon which we act with dephasing (dashed lines) and depolarizing (solid lines) noise. The red lines correspond to the noisy GHZ states, the blue one to W states, and the green line depicts the decay of correlations for two-qubit Bell states.

The other source of noise is the dephasing acting on randomly chosen qubit $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$

$$\Delta_p[\hat{\rho}] = (1 - \frac{p}{2})\hat{\rho} + \frac{p}{2}\hat{\sigma}_z^{(i)}\hat{\rho}\hat{\sigma}_z^{(i)}. \quad (21)$$

For every p we generate 100 random states of maximal representatives of each class, and we obtain three values of the optimized \mathcal{Q} , depending on which qubit the dephasing acts. These samples give a range of \mathcal{Q} 's, which together with the average value is shown as a shaded area for each class separately, see Fig. 3. We observe that for reasonably small noise levels ($p < 0.3$ for the dephasing and $p < 0.25$ for the depolarizing noise), the maximal representatives of the SLOCC entanglement classes for three qubits are still mutually distinguishable using the Bell correlators metric.

3. Application: dynamical generation of entanglement

Next, we apply this correlator to classify the three-qubit entangled states generated in the following dynamical protocol. Qubits are initialized in the product state of eigenstate of the $\hat{\sigma}_x^{(k)}$ operators, namely

$$|\psi(0)\rangle = \left(\frac{|0\rangle + |1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \right)^{\otimes 3} \quad (22)$$

and undergo the evolution

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = e^{-it\hat{H}}|\psi(0)\rangle \quad (23)$$

generated by either of the two Hamiltonians

$$\hat{H}_{\text{OAT}} = \sum_{i>j=1}^3 \hat{\sigma}_z^{(i)}\hat{\sigma}_z^{(j)} \quad (24a)$$

$$\hat{H}_{\text{TACT}} = \sum_{i>j=1}^3 \left(\hat{\sigma}_z^{(i)}\hat{\sigma}_z^{(j)} - \hat{\sigma}_x^{(i)}\hat{\sigma}_x^{(j)} \right). \quad (24b)$$




FIG. 4. Dynamical generation of the many-body entanglement in spin squeezing protocols in three-qubit system, i.e., \mathcal{Q} versus the time t . The red solid line corresponds to the one-axis twisting protocol (OAT), while the blue dashed line corresponds to the two-axis counter twisting protocol (TACT). Both protocols generate genuine entanglement at the same critical time t_c , when $\mathcal{Q}(t_c)$ exceeds unity. The OAT protocol generates the most entangled state, namely the GHZ state, for which the correlator takes the maximal value $\mathcal{Q} = 2$.

Here, the two subscripts stand for one-axis- or two-axis-counter-twisting, respectively. Note that according to Eq. (12) and the Tab. I both these Hamiltonians generate entanglement at all times, and genuinely 3-partite entanglement at most instants, see Fig. 4. Moreover, the correlator \mathcal{Q} provides information that only the OAT protocol generates the GHZ-class state with $\mathcal{Q} = 2$ at maximum.

B. Four-qubit entanglement classification

The efforts to classify the multipartite entanglement, relevant in the context of experimental advances [206], have been recently expanded to the four-qubit case [162, 207–209], where nine groups can be distinguished [17]. The main group is formed by those states that are characterized by the generalized GHZ-type entanglement. The other groups are formed by three- and two-qubit entangled states.

For each of the nine classes, we maximize the correlator \mathcal{Q} by picking the maximally entangled representatives of each group (Appendix D and Ref. [162]). As shown in Table III, the highest value of the correlator is reached by the GHZ state ($|G\rangle$ group), and $|E_1\rangle$ and $|E_2\rangle$ groups, while the smallest \mathcal{Q} is for group $|E_6\rangle$.

An important question is about k -separability of a resulting mixed quantum state after tracing out one of the qubits. The correlator \mathcal{Q} provides an information about k -separability of the final three-qubit state. When $\mathcal{Q} > 0$ the remaining quantum state is entangled. Naturally, the entanglement in states $|G\rangle$ is washed out by tracing out any of the qubits. This however is not the case with classes $|E_3\rangle$, $|E_4\rangle$, $|E_6\rangle$, $|E_7\rangle$, and $|E_8\rangle$, see Table III. Moreover, when $\mathcal{Q} > 1$, the mixed state remains genuinely entangled. In particular state $|E_7\rangle$

State \ Discarded	None	$i = 1$	$i = 2$	$i = 3$	$i = 4$
	$ G\rangle$	3	–	–	–
$ E_1\rangle$	2.98	–	–	–	–
$ E_2\rangle$	2.98	–	–	–	–
$ E_3\rangle$	2.41	–	–	0.43	0.43
$ E_4\rangle$	2.5	0.55	–	0.68	–
$ E_5\rangle$	2.98	–	–	–	–
$ E_6\rangle$	1.54	1	–	–	1
$ E_7\rangle$	1.76	1.32	1	1	1
$ E_8\rangle$	2	2	–	–	–

TABLE III. Value of the correlator \mathcal{Q} for maximally entangled four-qubit states in nine entanglement classes (see App. D). The first column corresponds to the value of the correlator of the full state, while the latter four show \mathcal{Q} after discarding (tracing out) one qubit. Null values corresponds to negative lack of entanglement. Observe that the state exhibiting the highest entanglement with respect to four-qubit correlator ($|G\rangle$) does not possess any three-qubit entanglement. Conversely, the states with lower four-qubit entanglement preserve high values of the three-qubit correlator. This is in agreement with similar observations concerning distribution of entanglement among different divisions [17].

remains genuinely entangled after tracing out the first qubit, $\mathcal{Q} = 1.32$.

C. non- k -separability of AME states for $N = 5$ and 6 qubits

A pure state on N qudits is called an *absolutely maximally entangled* AME(N, d) state if all its reduced density matrices after discarding at least half of the subsystems are maximally mixed [210]. Interestingly, the question of the existence of an AME state of a given number of parties and local dimensions is still open. There are a few methods for (dis)proving their existence but none is universal [211, 212]. Recently there were several developments in the search for AME states, including the question of their local orbit, connected with local unitary equivalence [213–215]. The usefulness of AME states extends also to dense coding, quantum secret sharing, and quantum error correction codes [212, 216].

Here, we consider only the qubit case, $d = 2$. In the case of $N = 2, 3$ qubits, the AME is the corresponding GHZ state. Surprisingly, there are no four-qubit AME states [217], and there are no AME states for $N > 6$ [212, 213]; but they do exist for $N = 5, 6$ [216, 218], taking the form of

$$|\text{AME}(N, 2)\rangle = \frac{1}{2^{N/2}} \sum_{i=0}^{2^N-1} \alpha_i^{(N)} |i\rangle, \quad (25)$$

where the values of binary (± 1) coefficients $\alpha_i^{(5)}$ and $\alpha_i^{(6)}$ are given in Appendix E. For AME(5, 2) the correlator takes $\mathcal{Q} = 1.7$ and for AME(6, 2) it takes value $\mathcal{Q} = 2.4$.

These values are about half of maximal values for $N = 5$ and $N = 6$ qubits ($\mathcal{Q} = 4$ and $\mathcal{Q} = 5$ respectively, see Table I).

The type of entanglement of AME states cannot be explained via the provided measure; the correlator for those two AME states can be explained with only three-partite and four-partite correlations, respectively. In this sense, AME's are the strongest entangled states that exist. The correlator \mathcal{Q} can be thus thought of as an alternative to the usual description of AME-type entanglement, understood as the sum of entanglement entropies across every balanced bipartition.

D. non- k -separability of Dicke states, any N

As the last illustration of k -separability characterization with the correlator \mathcal{Q} we use the Dicke states. A set of N -qubit Dicke states $|J, m\rangle$ is defined as a eigenbasis of collective multi-qubit spin operators $\hat{J}^2 = \hat{J}_x^2 + \hat{J}_y^2 + \hat{J}_z^2$ and \hat{J}_z , where $\hat{J}_\tau = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\sigma}_\tau^{(i)}$, $\tau = x, y, z$; $[\hat{J}^2, \hat{J}_z] = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{J}^2 |J, m\rangle &= J(J+1) |J, m\rangle \\ \hat{J}_z |J, m\rangle &= m |J, m\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

with $J = N/2$, $m \in \{-J \dots J\}$. The special case are balanced Dicke states, $m = 0$,

$$|D_n\rangle = \left(\frac{N}{2}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_k \mathcal{P}_k(|0\rangle^{\otimes \frac{N}{2}} \otimes |1\rangle^{\otimes \frac{N}{2}}), \quad (27)$$

summed over all distinct permutations \mathcal{P}_k . Such symmetric Dicke states possess strong multipartite entanglement [24, 219–227], and are useful for quantum metrology [65, 66, 228].

For Dicke states the correlator \mathcal{Q} can be obtained analytically [193] both for balanced $m = 0$ case, and for $m \neq 0$:

$$\mathcal{Q} = 2 \log_4 \binom{N}{m + \frac{N}{2}}. \quad (28)$$

For the large number of qubits, $N \rightarrow \infty$, the above formula can be approximated as

$$\mathcal{Q} = N - \log_4 N - 4 \frac{m^2}{N} \log_4 e + \log_4 \frac{2}{\pi}. \quad (29)$$

The maximal value of the correlator \mathcal{Q} is for balanced Dicke states with $m = 0$. Moreover, the expression in Eq. (29) and inequality Eq. (12) allow classification of Dicke states $|J, m\rangle$ with respect to their *non- k -separability*, one of the results of this work.

IV. MEASUREMENTS

As discussed in the previous section, many-qubit entanglement can be inferred from the single element of the

density matrix $\hat{\rho}$ related to GHZ fidelity. The remaining question concerns the identification of an experimental protocol capable of accessing this quantity.

The measurement of the off-diagonal GHZ element of the density matrix in $N = 4$ qubit system has been performed experimentally with trapped ions [206]. Another approach is to use the quantum state tomography, e.g., with classical shadows, and rotate the state to find the optimal basis in which the GHZ coherence element is maximal [183]. An alternative experimental protocol, not relying on the full tomography, is based on the multiple quantum coherences measurements. This technique provides extensive information about the structure of a many-body state, and allows intertwining of the quantum correlators with other physical quantities like the out-of-time-order correlations [178, 179].

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this work we have provided a many-body quantum correlator that captures the *non-k*-separability of a given pure or mixed quantum state. By construction, the proposed correlator respects the SLOCC entanglement classification; we used it to classify three entanglement classes in a three-qubit system, and to characterise nine entanglement classes in a four-qubit system. We then characterised *non-k*-separability for qubit AME states, and Dicke states of an arbitrary number of qubits. The proposed method is not limited by the system size, and is experimentally accessible.

Like any other method, the one presented in this paper is not able to perfectly classify all entangled states. The strength of the method lies rather in its simplicity. This comes at a price as for each state one has to choose a suitable basis by local unitary rotations, such that maximises the generalised GHZ fidelity.

Our setup is not specifically designed for pure states, and can be adapted to mixed states as well. Therefore, the technique is able to statistically distinguish between states even in the more realistic, mixed case scenarios with experimental imperfections, including particle losses. In many experimental setups it is not necessary to study the most general form of entanglement possible but rather to confirm that the losses do not hinder the state preparation. For such setups, our framework fits perfectly.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We thank Guillem Müller-Rigat, Anna Sanpera, Geza Toth, and Karol Życzkowski for reading the manuscript and their useful comments.

ICFO group acknowledges support from: Europea Research Council AdG NOQIA; MCIN/AEI (PGC2018-0910.13039/501100011033, CEX2019-000910-S/10.13039/501100011033, Plan National

FIDEUA PID2019-106901GB-I00, Plan National STAMEENA PID2022-139099NB, I00, project funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by the “European Union NextGenerationEU/PRTR” (PRTR-C17.I1), FPI); QUANTERA MAQS PCI2019-111828-2); QUANTERA DYNAMITE PCI2022-132919, QuantERA II Programme co-funded by European Union’s Horizon 2020 program under Grant Agreement No 101017733); Ministry for Digital Transformation and of Civil Service of the Spanish Government through the QUANTUM ENIA project call - Quantum Spain project, and by the European Union through the Recovery, Transformation and Resilience Plan - NextGenerationEU within the framework of the Digital Spain 2026 Agenda; Fundació Cellex; Fundació Mir-Puig; Generalitat de Catalunya (European Social Fund FEDER and CERCA program, AGAUR Grant No. 2021 SGR 01452, QuantumCAT U16-011424, co-funded by ERDF Operational Program of Catalonia 2014-2020); Barcelona Supercomputing Center MareNostrum (FI-2023-3-0024); Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union, European Commission, European Climate, Infrastructure and Environment Executive Agency (CINEA), or any other granting authority. Neither the European Union nor any granting authority can be held responsible for them (HORIZON-CL4-2022-QUANTUM-02-SGA PASQuanS2.1, 101113690, EU Horizon 2020 FET-OPEN OPTologic, Grant No 899794), EU Horizon Europe Program (This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon Europe research and innovation program under grant agreement No 101080086 NeQST-Grant Agreement 101080086 — NeQST); ICFO Internal “QuantumGaudi” project; European Union’s Horizon 2020 program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 847648; “La Caixa” Junior Leaders fellowships, La Caixa” Foundation (ID 100010434): CF/BQ/PR23/11980043.

Appendix A: Convexity of correlator \mathcal{Q}

Entanglement cannot be increased while mixing the quantum states [6–8], therefore, any entanglement measure should be convex. As such we require that for any two states $\hat{\rho}_1, \hat{\rho}_2$, the correlator \mathcal{Q} fulfills

$$\mathcal{Q}(\lambda\hat{\rho}_1 + (1-\lambda)\hat{\rho}_2) \leq \lambda\mathcal{Q}(\hat{\rho}_1) + (1-\lambda)\mathcal{Q}(\hat{\rho}_2). \quad (\text{A1})$$

The correlator \mathcal{Q} , Eq.(16), for a linear combination of two states reads:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(\lambda\hat{\rho}_1 + (1-\lambda)\hat{\rho}_2) &= \\ &= N + \log_4 |\langle \tilde{0} |^{\otimes N} (\lambda\hat{\rho}_1 + (1-\lambda)\hat{\rho}_2) | \tilde{1} \rangle^{\otimes N} |^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2})$$

Let us now focus on the logarithm. It inherently involves maximization over a choice of basis, which can be

upper bounded by two independent optimizations

$$\begin{aligned}
2 \log_4 \left(\max_{\{|\tilde{0}\rangle, |\tilde{1}\rangle\}} |\langle \tilde{0} |^{\otimes N} (\lambda \hat{\rho}_1 + (1-\lambda) \hat{\rho}_2) | \tilde{1} \rangle^{\otimes N} | \right) &\leq \\
&\leq 2 \log_4 \left(\lambda \max_{\{|\tilde{0}\rangle, |\tilde{1}\rangle\}} |\langle \tilde{0} |^{\otimes N} \hat{\rho}_1 | \tilde{1} \rangle^{\otimes N} | + \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (1-\lambda) \max_{\{|\tilde{0}\rangle, |\tilde{1}\rangle\}} |\langle \tilde{0} |^{\otimes N} \hat{\rho}_2 | \tilde{1} \rangle^{\otimes N} | \right). \tag{A3}
\end{aligned}$$

Using the concavity of the logarithm, we can bound the latter expression by

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda \log_4 \left(\max_{\{|\tilde{0}\rangle, |\tilde{1}\rangle\}} |\langle \tilde{0} |^{\otimes N} \hat{\rho}_1 | \tilde{1} \rangle^{\otimes N} |^2 \right) + \\
+(1-\lambda) \log_4 \left(\max_{\{|\tilde{0}\rangle, |\tilde{1}\rangle\}} |\langle \tilde{0} |^{\otimes N} \hat{\rho}_2 | \tilde{1} \rangle^{\otimes N} |^2 \right), \tag{A4}
\end{aligned}$$

from which we directly obtain the expressions for $\mathcal{Q}(\hat{\rho}_1)$ and $\mathcal{Q}(\hat{\rho}_2)$, yielding Eq. (A1), what proves the convexity of the correlator \mathcal{Q} .

Appendix B: SLOCC entanglement classes

The two pure multipartite quantum states $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\phi\rangle$ belong to the same SLOCC (stochastic local operations and classical communication) entanglement class if and only if it is possible to convert $|\psi\rangle \mapsto |\phi\rangle$ and $|\phi\rangle \mapsto |\psi\rangle$ with non-zero probabilities using local operations and classical communication, i.e., if there exist a set of invertible operators \hat{O}_k (so that the following condition is symmetric) such that $|\phi\rangle = \bigotimes_{k=1}^N \hat{O}_k |\psi\rangle$, where N is the number of constituents.

The number of entanglement classes grows rapidly with the number of parties and the local dimension. For pure states of two qubits, there are only two entanglement classes, with a Bell state as an extremal representative of one and separable states forming the other. Increasing the number of qubits to three yields two disjoint genuinely multipartite entanglement classes, together forming six different classes. Interestingly, the growth of the number of classes is not even exponential; already for four qubits, there are infinitely many entanglement classes, which can be divided into nine groups [17].

Appendix C: Tensor rank and multipartite entanglement classification

For two-particle pure states $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i_1 i_2} \alpha_{i_1 i_2} |i_1 i_2\rangle$, classification and quantification of bipartite pure entan-

glement stems from the singular value decomposition (SVD). This procedure allows to transform the matrix of the coefficients $[\hat{\alpha}]_{i_1 i_2} = \alpha_{i_1 i_2}$ to give the Schmidt decomposition of the state $|\psi\rangle = \sum_i \sqrt{\lambda_i} |\chi_i, \xi_i\rangle$. From the vector of the singular values $\Lambda = [\lambda_i]_i$ it is possible to infer all the information about entanglement, such as the entanglement entropy $-\sum_i \lambda_i \ln \lambda_i$, or the Schmidt rank (number of non-zero λ_i s) [10]. For example, one can convert one two-partite state $|\psi\rangle$ into another $|\phi\rangle$ via SLOCC if and only if the Schmidt rank of the latter is not larger.

When $N \geq 3$, the situation is more complicated because the coefficients of the state $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i_1 \dots i_N} \alpha_{i_1 \dots i_N} |i_1 \dots i_N\rangle$, form a tensor, for which, in contrast to matrices, SVD is not always possible and various generalizations of higher-order SVDs were proposed (for a list of their applications in quantum information see Ref. [229]). One way is to use the *tensor rank*, which is the minimal number of separable states into which one can decompose a given state. We use this notion to exemplify the difference between two *most entangled* states of three qubits, namely between $|\text{GHZ}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|000\rangle + |111\rangle)$, which has a rank 2 and $|\text{W}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|001\rangle + |010\rangle + |100\rangle)$, which has a rank 3.

Surprisingly, there are states of tensor rank 2 that approximate the W state to an arbitrary precision [205, 230], but the converse is not true – the GHZ state does not have states of tensor rank 3 in its neighborhood inside the Hilbert space. It is again in direct contrast with the bipartite case, as matrices of lower rank always have matrices of higher rank in the neighborhood, while the converse does not hold. Therefore, we say that the *border rank* of the W state is 2. What is more, the generic rank of a matrix is the maximal one, but for tensors of three indices 2-level each (so three-qubit pure states) this is not the case; the maximal tensor rank is 3 and the generic is 2. As such, the generic pure state of three qubits belongs to the GHZ SLOCC-class, not to the W class.

Appendix D: Entanglement classes for four qubits

Here we list nine representatives of entanglement classes for four qubits [17, 123, 162]:

$$\begin{aligned}
|G\rangle &= \frac{a+b}{2}(|0000\rangle + |1111\rangle) + \frac{a-d}{2}(|0011\rangle + |1100\rangle) + \frac{b+c}{2}(|0101\rangle + |1010\rangle) + \frac{b-c}{2}(|0110\rangle + |1001\rangle), \\
|E_1\rangle &= \frac{a+b}{2}(|0000\rangle + |1111\rangle) + \frac{a-b}{2}(|0011\rangle + |1100\rangle) + c(|0101\rangle + |1010\rangle) + |0110\rangle, \\
|E_2\rangle &= a(|0000\rangle + |1111\rangle) + b(|0101\rangle + |1010\rangle) + |0110\rangle + |0011\rangle, \\
|E_3\rangle &= a(|0000\rangle + |1111\rangle) + \frac{a+b}{2}(|0101\rangle + |1010\rangle) + \frac{a-b}{2}(|0110\rangle + |1001\rangle) + \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(|0001\rangle + |0010\rangle + |0111\rangle + |1011\rangle), \\
|E_4\rangle &= a(|0000\rangle + |0101\rangle + |1010\rangle + |1111\rangle) + i|0001\rangle + |0110\rangle - i|1011\rangle, \\
|E_5\rangle &= a(|0000\rangle + |1111\rangle) + |0011\rangle + |0101\rangle + |0110\rangle, \\
|E_6\rangle &= |0000\rangle + |0101\rangle + |1000\rangle + |1110\rangle, \\
|E_7\rangle &= |0000\rangle + |1011\rangle + |1101\rangle + |1110\rangle, \\
|E_8\rangle &= |0000\rangle + |0111\rangle.
\end{aligned}
\tag{D1}$$

Appendix E: Absolutely Maximally Entangled states AME(5,2) and AME(6,2)

The AME coefficients [216, 218] for $N = 5$ are

$$\alpha^{(5)} = \{1, 1, 1, 1, 1, -1, -1, 1, 1, -1, -1, 1, \\
1, 1, 1, 1, -1, -1, 1, -1, -1, -1, \\
1, -1, 1, -1, -1, 1, 1\}
\tag{E1}$$

while for $N = 6$

$$\alpha^{(6)} = \{-1, -1, -1, 1, -1, 1, 1, 1, -1, -1, -1, 1, \\
1, -1, -1, -1, -1, -1, 1, -1, -1, 1, -1, -1, \\
1, 1, -1, 1, -1, 1, -1, -1, -1, 1, -1, -1, -1, \\
-1, 1, -1, 1, -1, 1, 1, -1, -1, 1, -1, 1, -1, -1, \\
-1, 1, 1, 1, -1, 1, -1, -1, -1, -1, -1, -1, 1\}.
\tag{E2}$$

- [1] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Quantum entanglement, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 865 (2009).
- [2] R. Uola, A. C. S. Costa, H. C. Nguyen, and O. Gühne, Quantum steering, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **92**, 015001 (2020).
- [3] J. S. Bell, On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox, *Physics* **1**, 195 (1964).
- [4] N. Brunner, D. Cavalcanti, S. Pironio, V. Scarani, and S. Wehner, Bell nonlocality, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **86**, 419 (2014).
- [5] J. S. Bell, On the problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **38**, 447 (1966).
- [6] V. Vedral, M. B. Plenio, M. A. Rippin, and P. L. Knight, Quantifying entanglement, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 2275 (1997).
- [7] M. Horodecki, Entanglement measures, *Quantum Information and Computation* **1**, 3–26 (2001).
- [8] M. Plenio and S. Virmani, An introduction to entanglement measures, *Quantum Information and Computation* **7**, 1 (2007).
- [9] O. Gühne and G. Tóth, Entanglement detection, *Physics Reports* **474**, 1 (2009).
- [10] I. Bengtsson and K. Życzkowski, *Geometry of Quantum States: An Introduction to Quantum Entanglement* (Cambridge University Press, 2006).
- [11] C. Sabín and G. García-Alcaine, A classification of entanglement in three-qubit systems, *The European Physical Journal D* **48**, 435 (2008).
- [12] M. Enríquez, F. Delgado, and K. Życzkowski, Entanglement of three-qubit random pure states, *Entropy* **20**, 10.3390/e20100745 (2018).
- [13] G. D. Chiara and A. Sanpera, Genuine quantum correlations in quantum many-body systems: a review of recent progress, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **81**, 074002 (2018).
- [14] S. Szalay, Multipartite entanglement measures, *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 042329 (2015).
- [15] A. Srivastava, G. Müller-Rigat, M. Lewenstein, and G. Rajchel-Mieldzioć, *Introduction to quantum entanglement in many-body systems* (2024), arXiv:2402.09523 [quant-ph].
- [16] S. Xie, D. Younis, Y. Mei, and J. H. Eberly, Multipartite entanglement: A journey through geometry, *Entropy* **26**, 217 (2024).
- [17] F. Verstraete, J. Dehaene, B. De Moor, and H. Verschelde, Four qubits can be entangled in nine different ways, *Physical Review A* **65**, 10.1103/physreva.65.052112 (2002).
- [18] G. Gour and N. R. Wallach, All maximally entangled four-qubit states, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **51**, 112201 (2010), https://pubs.aip.org/aip/jmp/article-pdf/doi/10.1063/1.3511477/14694696/112201_1_online.pdf.
- [19] C. Spee, J. I. de Vicente, and B. Kraus, The maximally entangled set of 4-qubit states, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **57**, 052201 (2016), https://pubs.aip.org/aip/jmp/article-pdf/doi/10.1063/1.4946895/15923401/052201_1_online.pdf.
- [20] D. Sadhukhan, S. S. Roy, A. K. Pal, D. Rakshit, A. Sen(De), and U. Sen, Multipartite entanglement accumulation in quantum states: Localizable generalized geometric measure, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 022301 (2017).
- [21] G. Tóth, Entanglement detection in optical lattices of bosonic atoms with collective measurements, *Phys. Rev. A* **69**, 052327 (2004).

- [22] L. Knips, C. Schwemmer, N. Klein, M. Wieśniak, and H. Weinfurter, Multipartite entanglement detection with minimal effort, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 210504 (2016).
- [23] F. Shi, L. Chen, G. Chiribella, and Q. Zhao, Entanglement detection length of multipartite quantum states (2024), [arXiv:2401.03367 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.03367).
- [24] 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).
- [25] W. Wieczorek, R. Krischek, N. Kiesel, P. Michelberger, G. Tóth, and H. Weinfurter, Experimental entanglement of a six-photon symmetric Dicke state, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 020504 (2009).
- [26] T. Vanderbruggen, S. Bernon, A. Bertoldi, A. Landragin, and P. Bouyer, Spin-squeezing and Dicke-state preparation by heterodyne measurement, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 013821 (2011).
- [27] R. Prevedel, G. Cronenberg, M. S. Tame, M. Paternostro, P. Walther, M. S. Kim, and A. Zeilinger, Experimental realization of dicke states of up to six qubits for multiparty quantum networking, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 020503 (2009).
- [28] Y.-Y. Zhao, Y.-C. Wu, G.-Y. Xiang, C.-F. Li, and G.-C. Guo, Experimental violation of the local realism for four-qubit dicke state, *Opt. Express* **23**, 30491 (2015).
- [29] M.-Y. Wang, F.-L. Yan, and T. Gao, Deterministic distribution of four-photon Dicke state over an arbitrary collective-noise channel with cross-Kerr nonlinearity, *Scientific Reports* **6**, 29853 (2016).
- [30] F. Mu, Y. Gao, H. Yin, and G. Wang, Dicke state generation via selective interactions in a Dicke-Stark model, *Opt. Express* **28**, 39574 (2020).
- [31] B. Lücke, M. Scherer, J. Kruse, L. Pezzé, F. Deuretzbacher, P. Hyllus, O. Topic, J. Peise, W. Ertmer, J. Arlt, L. Santos, A. Smerzi, and C. Klempt, Twin matter waves for interferometry beyond the classical limit, *Science* **334**, 773 (2011), <https://www.science.org/doi/pdf/10.1126/science.1208798>.
- [32] C. D. Hamley, C. S. Gerving, T. M. Hoang, E. M. Bookjans, and M. S. Chapman, Spin-nematic squeezed vacuum in a quantum gas, *Nature Physics* **8**, 305 (2012).
- [33] Y.-Q. Zou, L.-N. Wu, Q. Liu, X.-Y. Luo, S.-F. Guo, J.-H. Cao, M. K. Tey, and L. You, Beating the classical precision limit with spin-1 dicke states of more than 10,000 atoms, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **115**, 6381 (2018), <https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.1715105115>.
- [34] A. Bäertschi and S. Eidenbenz, Short-depth circuits for dicke state preparation, in *2022 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE)* (2022) pp. 87–96.
- [35] S. Narisada, S. Beppu, F. S., and S. Kiyomoto, Concrete quantum circuits to prepare generalized dicke states on a quantum mac, in *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Information Systems Security and Privacy (ICISSP 2)* (2023) pp. 329–338.
- [36] P. Pandya, O. Sakarya, and M. Wieśniak, Hilbertschmidt distance and entanglement witnessing, *Phys. Rev. A* **102**, 012409 (2020).
- [37] Ł. Rudnicki, P. Horodecki, and K. Życzkowski, Collective uncertainty entanglement test, *Physical Review Letters* **107**, 10.1103/physrevlett.107.150502 (2011).
- [38] Ł. Rudnicki, Z. Puchała, P. Horodecki, and K. Życzkowski, Collectibility for mixed quantum states, *Physical Review A* **86**, 10.1103/physreva.86.062329 (2012).
- [39] W. K. Wootters, Entanglement of formation and concurrence, *Quantum Info. Comput.* **1**, 27–44 (2001).
- [40] W. K. Wootters, Entanglement of formation of an arbitrary state of two qubits, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 2245 (1998).
- [41] S. Luo, Entanglement measures based on observable correlations, *Theoretical and Mathematical Physics* **155**, 896 (2008).
- [42] P. M. Hayden, M. Horodecki, and B. M. Terhal, The asymptotic entanglement cost of preparing a quantum state, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **34**, 6891 (2001).
- [43] A. W. Majewski, On entanglement of formation, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **35**, 123 (2001).
- [44] S.-M. Fei, J. Jost, X. Li-Jost, and G.-F. Wang, Entanglement of formation for a class of quantum states, *Physics Letters A* **310**, 333 (2003).
- [45] Z. Hui and W. Zhi-Xi, Entanglement of formation for quantum states, *Communications in Theoretical Physics* **47**, 45 (2007).
- [46] X. Gao, A. Sergio, K. Chen, S. Fei, and X. Li-Jost, Entanglement of formation and concurrence for mixed states, *Frontiers of Computer Science in China* **2**, 114–128 (2008).
- [47] S. Onoe, S. Tserkis, A. P. Lund, and T. C. Ralph, Multipartite Gaussian entanglement of formation, *Phys. Rev. A* **102**, 042408 (2020).
- [48] W. Zurek, Einselection and decoherence from an information theory perspective, *Annalen der Physik* **512**, 855 (2000), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/andp.200051211-1204>.
- [49] L. Henderson and V. Vedral, Classical, quantum and total correlations, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **34**, 6899 (2001).
- [50] H. Ollivier and W. H. Zurek, Quantum discord: A measure of the quantumness of correlations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 017901 (2001).
- [51] S. Luo, Quantum discord for two-qubit systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 042303 (2008).
- [52] A. Datta and S. Gharibian, Signatures of nonclassicality in mixed-state quantum computation, *Phys. Rev. A* **79**, 042325 (2009).
- [53] G. Adesso and A. Datta, Quantum versus classical correlations in Gaussian states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 030501 (2010).
- [54] Y. Huang, Quantum discord for two-qubit x states: Analytical formula with very small worst-case error, *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 014302 (2013).
- [55] D. Girolami, A. M. Souza, V. Giovannetti, T. Tufarelli, J. G. Filgueiras, R. S. Sarthour, D. O. Soares-Pinto, I. S. Oliveira, and G. Adesso, Quantum discord determines the interferometric power of quantum states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 210401 (2014).
- [56] A. Bera, T. Das, D. Sadhukhan, S. S. Roy, A. Sen(De), and U. Sen, Quantum discord and its allies: a review of recent progress, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **81**, 024001 (2017).
- [57] S. A. Hill and W. K. Wootters, Entanglement of a pair of quantum bits, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 5022 (1997).
- [58] R. Hildebrand, Concurrence revisited, *Jour-*

- nal of Mathematical Physics **48**, 102108 (2007), https://pubs.aip.org/aip/jmp/article-pdf/doi/10.1063/1.2795840/16056058/102108_1_online.pdf.
- [59] S. N. Swain, V. S. Bhaskara, and P. K. Panigrahi, Generalized entanglement measure for continuous-variable systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **105**, 052441 (2022).
- [60] V. S. Bhaskara and P. K. Panigrahi, Generalized concurrence measure for faithful quantification of multiparticle pure state entanglement using Lagrange's identity and wedge product, *Quantum Information Processing* **16**, 118 (2017).
- [61] P. Rungta, V. Bužek, C. M. Caves, M. Hillery, and G. J. Milburn, Universal state inversion and concurrence in arbitrary dimensions, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 042315 (2001).
- [62] S. M. Hashemi Rafsanjani, M. Huber, C. J. Broadbent, and J. H. Eberly, Genuinely multipartite concurrence of n -qubit x matrices, *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 062303 (2012).
- [63] G. Tóth and I. Apellaniz, Quantum metrology from a quantum information science perspective, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **47**, 424006 (2014).
- [64] S. L. Braunstein and C. M. Caves, Statistical distance and the geometry of quantum states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 3439 (1994).
- [65] P. Hyllus, W. Laskowski, R. Krischek, C. Schwemmer, W. Wieczorek, H. Weinfurter, L. Pezzé, and A. Smerzi, Fisher information and multiparticle entanglement, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 022321 (2012).
- [66] G. Tóth, Multipartite entanglement and high-precision metrology, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 022322 (2012).
- [67] Z. Ren, W. Li, A. Smerzi, and M. Gessner, Metrological detection of multipartite entanglement from young diagrams, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 080502 (2021).
- [68] M. Kitagawa and M. Ueda, Squeezed spin states, *Phys. Rev. A* **47**, 5138 (1993).
- [69] D. Wineland, J. Bollinger, W. Itano, and D. Heinzen, Squeezed atomic states and projection noise in spectroscopy, *Phys. Rev. A* **50**, 67 (1994).
- [70] J. K. Korbicz, J. I. Cirac, and M. Lewenstein, Spin squeezing inequalities and entanglement of n qubit states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 120502 (2005).
- [71] J. K. Korbicz, O. Gühne, M. Lewenstein, H. Häffner, C. F. Roos, and R. Blatt, Generalized spin-squeezing inequalities in n -qubit systems: Theory and experiment, *Phys. Rev. A* **74**, 052319 (2006).
- [72] J. Esteve, C. Gross, A. Weller, S. Giovanazzi, and M. Oberthaler, Squeezing and entanglement in a bose-einstein condensate, *Nature* **455**, 1216 (2008).
- [73] Q. Y. He, S.-G. Peng, P. D. Drummond, and M. D. Reid, Planar quantum squeezing and atom interferometry, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 022107 (2011).
- [74] H. Strobel, W. Muessel, D. Linnemann, T. Zibold, D. B. Hume, L. Pezzé, A. Smerzi, and M. K. Oberthaler, Fisher information and entanglement of non-Gaussian spin states, *Science* **345**, 424 (2014).
- [75] G. De Chiara and A. Sanpera, Detection of entanglement in ultracold lattice gases, *Journal of Low Temperature Physics* **165**, 292 (2011).
- [76] J. K. Stockton, J. M. Geremia, A. C. Doherty, and H. Mabuchi, Characterizing the entanglement of symmetric many-particle spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 022112 (2003).
- [77] 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 (2018).
- [78] G. Vitagliano, P. Hyllus, I. n. L. Egusquiza, and G. Tóth, Spin squeezing inequalities for arbitrary spin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 240502 (2011).
- [79] A. S. Sørensen and K. Mølmer, Entanglement and extreme spin squeezing, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 4431 (2001).
- [80] J. Tura, R. Augusiak, A. B. Sainz, T. Vértesi, M. Lewenstein, and A. Acín, Detecting nonlocality in many-body quantum states, *Science* **344**, 1256 (2014), <https://www.science.org/doi/pdf/10.1126/science.1247715>.
- [81] J. Tura, A. B. Sainz, T. Vértesi, A. Acín, M. Lewenstein, and R. Augusiak, Translationally invariant multipartite bell inequalities involving only two-body correlators, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **47**, 424024 (2014).
- [82] J. Tura, R. Augusiak, A. Sainz, B. Lücke, C. Klempt, M. Lewenstein, and A. Acín, Nonlocality in many-body quantum systems detected with two-body correlators, *Annals of Physics* **362**, 370 (2015).
- [83] J. Tura, A. Aloy, F. Baccari, A. Acín, M. Lewenstein, and R. Augusiak, Optimization of device-independent witnesses of entanglement depth from two-body correlators, *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 032307 (2019).
- [84] F. Baccari, J. Tura, M. Fadel, A. Aloy, J.-D. Bancal, N. Sangouard, M. Lewenstein, A. Acín, and R. Augusiak, Bell correlation depth in many-body systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 022121 (2019).
- [85] G. Tóth, C. Knapp, O. Gühne, and H. J. Briegel, Spin squeezing and entanglement, *Phys. Rev. A* **79**, 042334 (2009).
- [86] G. Tóth, C. Knapp, O. Gühne, and H. J. Briegel, Optimal spin squeezing inequalities detect bound entanglement in spin models, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 250405 (2007).
- [87] I. Apellaniz, M. Kleinmann, O. Gühne, and G. Tóth, Optimal witnessing of the quantum fisher information with few measurements, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 032330 (2017).
- [88] G. Vitagliano, I. Apellaniz, I. n. L. Egusquiza, and G. Tóth, Spin squeezing and entanglement for an arbitrary spin, *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 032307 (2014).
- [89] O. Marty, M. Cramer, G. Vitagliano, G. Toth, and M. B. Plenio, Multipartite entanglement criteria for non-symmetric collective variances (2017), [arXiv:1708.06986 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1708.06986).
- [90] G. Vitagliano, I. Apellaniz, M. Kleinmann, B. Lücke, C. Klempt, and G. Tóth, Entanglement and extreme spin squeezing of unpolarized states, *New Journal of Physics* **19**, 013027 (2017).
- [91] M. Fadel, A. Usui, M. Huber, N. Friis, and G. Vitagliano, Entanglement quantification in atomic ensembles, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 010401 (2021).
- [92] G. Müller-Rigat, A. Aloy, M. Lewenstein, and I. Frérot, Inferring nonlinear many-body bell inequalities from average two-body correlations: Systematic approach for arbitrary spin- j ensembles, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 030329 (2021).
- [93] F. Fröwis, P. C. Strassmann, A. Tiranov, C. Gut, J. Lavoie, N. Brunner, F. Bussières, M. Afzelius, and N. Gisin, Experimental certification of millions of genuinely entangled atoms in a solid, *Nature Communications* **8**, 907 (2017).
- [94] A. Aloy, J. Tura, F. Baccari, A. Acín, M. Lewenstein,

- and R. Augusiak, Device-independent witnesses of entanglement depth from two-body correlators, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 100507 (2019).
- [95] J. Roik, K. Bartkiewicz, A. Černoč, and K. Lemr, Entanglement quantification from collective measurements processed by machine learning, *Physics Letters A* **446**, 128270 (2022).
- [96] K. C. Cox, G. P. Greve, J. M. Weiner, and J. K. Thompson, Deterministic squeezed states with collective measurements and feedback, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 093602 (2016).
- [97] G. Müller-Rigat, A. K. Srivastava, S. Kurdzialek, G. Rajchel-Mieldzioc, M. Lewenstein, and I. Frérot, Certifying the quantum Fisher information from a given set of mean values: a semidefinite programming approach, *Quantum* **7**, 1152 (2023).
- [98] M. Fadel, B. Yadin, Y. Mao, T. Byrnes, and M. Gessner, Multiparameter quantum metrology and mode entanglement with spatially split nonclassical spin ensembles, *New Journal of Physics* **25**, 073006 (2023).
- [99] G. Vitagliano, M. Fadel, I. Apellaniz, M. Kleinmann, B. Lücke, C. Klempt, and G. Tóth, Number-phase uncertainty relations and bipartite entanglement detection in spin ensembles, *Quantum* **7**, 914 (2023).
- [100] J. Guo, J. Tura, Q. He, and M. Fadel, Detecting bell correlations in multipartite non-Gaussian spin states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 070201 (2023).
- [101] P. M. Poggi and M. H. Muñoz-Arias, Measurement-induced multipartite-entanglement regimes in collective spin systems, *Quantum* **8**, 1229 (2024).
- [102] M. Wieśniak, V. Vedral, and Časlav Brukner, Magnetic susceptibility as a macroscopic entanglement witness, *New Journal of Physics* **7**, 258 (2005).
- [103] M. Wieśniak, V. Vedral, and i. c. v. Brukner, Heat capacity as an indicator of entanglement, *Phys. Rev. B* **78**, 064108 (2008).
- [104] C. Brukner and V. Vedral, Macroscopic thermodynamical witnesses of quantum entanglement (2004), [arXiv:quant-ph/0406040](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0406040) [quant-ph].
- [105] M. R. Dowling, A. C. Doherty, and S. D. Bartlett, Energy as an entanglement witness for quantum many-body systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 062113 (2004).
- [106] G. Tóth, Entanglement witnesses in spin models, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 010301 (2005).
- [107] L.-A. Wu, S. Bandyopadhyay, M. S. Sarandy, and D. A. Lidar, Entanglement observables and witnesses for interacting quantum spin systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 032309 (2005).
- [108] A. M. Frydryszak, M. I. Samar, and V. M. Tkachuk, Quantifying geometric measure of entanglement by mean value of spin and spin correlations with application to physical systems, *The European Physical Journal D* **71**, 233 (2017).
- [109] A. Kuzmak and V. Tkachuk, Detecting entanglement by the mean value of spin on a quantum computer, *Physics Letters A* **384**, 126579 (2020).
- [110] S. I. Doronin, E. B. Fel'dman, and I. D. Lazarev, Many-particle entanglement in multiple quantum nuclear-magnetic-resonance spectroscopy, *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 022330 (2019).
- [111] I. D. Lazarev and E. B. Fel'dman, Many-spin entanglement in multiple quantum nmr with a dipolar ordered initial state, *Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics* **131**, 723 (2020).
- [112] J. Schneeloch, C. C. Tison, M. L. Fanto, S. Ray, and P. M. Alsing, Quantifying tripartite entanglement with entropic correlations, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **2**, 043152 (2020).
- [113] R. J. Lewis-Swan, A. Safavi-Naini, J. J. Bollinger, and A. M. Rey, Unifying scrambling, thermalization and entanglement through measurement of fidelity out-of-time-order correlators in the Dicke model, *Nature Communications* **10**, 1581 (2019).
- [114] P. D. Blocher, S. Asaad, V. Mourik, M. A. I. Johnson, A. Morello, and K. Mølmer, Measuring out-of-time-ordered correlation functions without reversing time evolution, *Phys. Rev. A* **106**, 042429 (2022).
- [115] A. W. Harrow, L. Kong, Z.-W. Liu, S. Mehraban, and P. W. Shor, Separation of out-of-time-ordered correlation and entanglement, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 020339 (2021).
- [116] F. Iglói and G. Tóth, Entanglement witnesses in the xy chain: Thermal equilibrium and postquench nonequilibrium states, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **5**, 013158 (2023).
- [117] W. Dür, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac, Three qubits can be entangled in two inequivalent ways, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 062314 (2000).
- [118] A. Burchardt, G. m. c. M. Quinta, and R. André, Entanglement classification via a single entanglement measure, *Phys. Rev. A* **109**, 032424 (2024).
- [119] M. Huber and J. I. de Vicente, Structure of multidimensional entanglement in multipartite systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 030501 (2013).
- [120] J. I. De Vicente, Separability criteria based on the bloch representation of density matrices, *Quantum Info. Comput.* **7**, 624–638 (2007).
- [121] J. I. de Vicente, C. Spee, and B. Kraus, Maximally entangled set of multipartite quantum states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 110502 (2013).
- [122] J. I. de Vicente and M. Huber, Multipartite entanglement detection from correlation tensors, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 062306 (2011).
- [123] S. M. Zangi, J.-L. Li, and C.-F. Qiao, Entanglement classification of four-partite states under the SLOCC, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **50**, 325301 (2017).
- [124] G. Gour and N. R. Wallach, Classification of multipartite entanglement of all finite dimensionality, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 060502 (2013).
- [125] C. Palazuelos and J. I. d. Vicente, Genuine multipartite entanglement of quantum states in the multiple-copy scenario, *Quantum* **6**, 735 (2022).
- [126] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Separability of mixed states: necessary and sufficient conditions, *Physics Letters A* **223**, 1 (1996).
- [127] A. Peres, Separability criterion for density matrices, *Physical Review Letters* **77**, 1413 (1996).
- [128] K. Chen and L.-A. Wu, A matrix realignment method for recognizing entanglement, *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **3**, 193 (2003).
- [129] O. Rudolph, Further results on the cross norm criterion for separability, *Quantum Information Processing* **4**, 219 (2005).
- [130] B. Jungnitsch, T. Moroder, and O. Gühne, Taming multiparticle entanglement, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 190502 (2011).
- [131] O. Gühne, M. Mechler, G. Tóth, and P. Adam, Entanglement criteria based on local uncertainty relations are strictly stronger than the computable cross

- norm criterion, *Physical Review A* **74**, [10.1103/physreva.74.010301](https://doi.org/10.1103/physreva.74.010301) (2006).
- [132] B. M. Terhal, Detecting quantum entanglement, *Theoretical Computer Science* **287**, 313 (2002), natural Computing.
- [133] M. Lewenstein, B. Kraus, P. Horodecki, and J. I. Cirac, Characterization of separable states and entanglement witnesses, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 044304 (2001).
- [134] A. Acín, D. Bruß, M. Lewenstein, and A. Sanpera, Classification of mixed three-qubit states, *Physical Review Letters* **87**, [10.1103/physrevlett.87.040401](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.87.040401) (2001).
- [135] M. Bourennane, M. Eibl, C. Kurtsiefer, S. Gaertner, H. Weinfurter, O. Gühne, P. Hyllus, D. Bruß, M. Lewenstein, and A. Sanpera, Experimental detection of multipartite entanglement using witness operators, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 087902 (2004).
- [136] P. Horodecki, From limits of quantum operations to multicopy entanglement witnesses and state-spectrum estimation, *Physical Review A* **68**, [10.1103/physreva.68.052101](https://doi.org/10.1103/physreva.68.052101) (2003).
- [137] M. Blasone, F. Dell’Anno, S. De Siena, and F. Illuminati, Hierarchies of geometric entanglement, *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 062304 (2008).
- [138] H. Lu, Q. Zhao, Z.-D. Li, X.-F. Yin, X. Yuan, J.-C. Hung, L.-K. Chen, L. Li, N.-L. Liu, C.-Z. Peng, Y.-C. Liang, X. Ma, Y.-A. Chen, and J.-W. Pan, Entanglement structure: Entanglement partitioning in multipartite systems and its experimental detection using optimizable witnesses, *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 021072 (2018).
- [139] I. Frérôt and T. Roscilde, Optimal entanglement witnesses: A scalable data-driven approach, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 040401 (2021).
- [140] A. Rico and F. Huber, Entanglement detection with trace polynomials, *Physical Review Letters* **132**, [10.1103/physrevlett.132.070202](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.132.070202) (2024).
- [141] G. Vidal and R. Tarrach, Robustness of entanglement, *Physical Review A* **59**, 141 (1999).
- [142] T.-C. Wei and P. M. Goldbart, Geometric measure of entanglement and applications to bipartite and multipartite quantum states, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 042307 (2003).
- [143] D. A. Meyer and N. R. Wallach, Global entanglement in multiparticle systems, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **43**, 4273 (2002), https://pubs.aip.org/aip/jmp/article-pdf/43/9/4273/19183190/4273_1_online.pdf.
- [144] M. Lewenstein, G. Müller-Rigat, J. Tura, and A. Sanpera, Linear maps as sufficient criteria for entanglement depth and compatibility in many-body systems, *Open Systems & Information Dynamics* **29**, 2250011 (2022), <https://doi.org/10.1142/S1230161222500111>.
- [145] N. A. Susulovska and K. P. Gnatenko, Quantifying geometric measure of entanglement of multi-qubit graph states on the ibm’s quantum computer, in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE)* (2021) pp. 465–466.
- [146] Y. Guo, Y. Jia, X. Li, and L. Huang, Genuine multipartite entanglement measure, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **55**, 145303 (2022).
- [147] M. Wieśniak, P. Pandya, O. Sakarya, and B. Wolowicz, Distance between bound entangled states from unextendible product bases and separable states, *Quantum Reports* **2**, 49 (2020).
- [148] S. Xie and J. H. Eberly, Triangle measure of tripartite entanglement, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 040403 (2021).
- [149] Y. Li and J. Shang, Geometric mean of bipartite concurrences as a genuine multipartite entanglement measure, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **4**, 023059 (2022).
- [150] A. A. Klyachko, B. Öztop, and A. S. Shumovsky, Operational measure of entanglement for pure states of bipartite systems, *Acta Physica Hungarica Series B, Quantum Electronics* **26**, 311 (2006).
- [151] K. Schwaiger, D. Sauerwein, M. Cuquet, J. I. de Vicente, and B. Kraus, Operational multipartite entanglement measures, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 150502 (2015).
- [152] J. K. Korbicz and M. Lewenstein, Group-theoretical approach to entanglement, *Phys. Rev. A* **74**, 022318 (2006).
- [153] D. Melnikov, Entanglement classification from a topological perspective, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 126005 (2023).
- [154] M. Gharahi, S. Mancini, and G. Ottaviani, Fine-structure classification of multipartite entanglement by algebraic geometry, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **2**, 043003 (2020).
- [155] S. Lu, S. Huang, K. Li, J. Li, J. Chen, D. Lu, Z. Ji, Y. Shen, D. Zhou, and B. Zeng, Separability-entanglement classifier via machine learning, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 012315 (2018).
- [156] C. Harney, S. Pirandola, A. Ferraro, and M. Paternostro, Entanglement classification via neural network quantum states, *New Journal of Physics* **22**, 045001 (2020).
- [157] C. Harney, M. Paternostro, and S. Pirandola, Mixed state entanglement classification using artificial neural networks, *New Journal of Physics* **23**, 063033 (2021).
- [158] C. Chen, C. Ren, H. Lin, and H. Lu, Entanglement structure detection via machine learning, *Quantum Science and Technology* **6**, 035017 (2021).
- [159] S. M. A. Rizvi, N. Asif, M. S. Ulum, T. Q. Duong, and H. Shin, Multiclass classification of metrologically resourceful tripartite quantum states with deep neural networks, *Sensors* **22**, [10.3390/s22186767](https://doi.org/10.3390/s22186767) (2022).
- [160] F. E. Ayachi and M. E. Baz, General classification of entanglement using machine learning (2022), [arXiv:2210.07711 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.07711).
- [161] Y. Tian, L. Che, X. Long, C. Ren, and D. Lu, Machine learning experimental multipartite entanglement structure, *Advanced Quantum Technologies* **5**, 2200025 (2022), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/qute.202200025>.
- [162] S. Vintskevich, N. Bao, A. Nomerotski, P. Stankus, and D. Grigoriev, Classification of four-qubit entangled states via machine learning, *Physical Review A* **107**, [10.1103/physreva.107.032421](https://doi.org/10.1103/physreva.107.032421) (2023).
- [163] S. Giordano and M. Martin-Delgado, Reinforcement-learning generation of four-qubit entangled states, *Physical Review Research* **4**, [10.1103/physrevresearch.4.043056](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevresearch.4.043056) (2022).
- [164] N. Asif, U. Khalid, A. Khan, T. Q. Duong, and H. Shin, Entanglement detection with artificial neural networks, *Scientific Reports* **13**, 1562 (2023).
- [165] C. Sanavio, E. Tignone, and E. Ercolessi, Entanglement classification via witness operators generated by support vector machine, *The European Physical Journal Plus* **138**, 936 (2023).
- [166] J. Pawłowski and M. Krawczyk, Identification of quantum entanglement with siamese convolutional neural networks and semi-supervised learning (2023), [arXiv:2210.07410 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.07410).
- [167] D. Koutný, L. Ginés, M. Moczala-Dusanowska, S. Höfling, C. Schneider, A. Predojević,

- and M. Ježek, Deep learning of quantum entanglement from incomplete measurements, *Science Advances* **9**, eadd7131 (2023), <https://www.science.org/doi/pdf/10.1126/sciadv.add7131>.
- [168] A. M. Palmieri, G. Müller-Rigat, A. K. Srivastava, M. Lewenstein, G. Rajchel-Mieldzioć, and M. Płodzień, Enhancing quantum state tomography via resource-efficient attention-based neural networks (2023), [arXiv:2309.10616](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.10616) [quant-ph].
- [169] M. Krawczyk, J. Pawłowski, M. M. Maška, and K. Roszak, Data-driven criteria for quantum correlations, *Phys. Rev. A* **109**, 022405 (2024).
- [170] A. Dawid, J. Arnold, B. Requena, A. Gresch, M. Płodzień, K. Donatella, K. A. Nicoli, P. Stornati, R. Koch, M. Büttner, R. Okuła, G. Muñoz-Gil, R. A. Vargas-Hernández, A. Cervera-Lierta, J. Carrasquilla, V. Dunjko, M. Gabrié, P. Huembeli, E. van Nieuwenburg, F. Vicentini, L. Wang, S. J. Wetzel, G. Carleo, E. Greplová, R. Krems, F. Marquardt, M. Tomza, M. Lewenstein, and A. Dauphin, Modern applications of machine learning in quantum sciences (2023), [arXiv:2204.04198](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.04198) [quant-ph].
- [171] M. Wieśniak, Performance comparison of Gilbert’s algorithm and machine learning in classifying Bell-diagonal two-qutrit entanglement, *Scientific Reports* **13**, 19500 (2023).
- [172] J. Ureña, A. Sojo, J. Bermejo, and D. Manzano, Entanglement detection with classical deep neural networks (2024), [arXiv:2304.05946](https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.05946) [quant-ph].
- [173] E. G. Cavalcanti, C. J. Foster, M. D. Reid, and P. D. Drummond, Bell inequalities for continuous-variable correlations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 210405 (2007).
- [174] Q. He, E. Cavalcanti, M. Reid, and P. Drummond, Bell inequalities for continuous-variable measurements, *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 062106 (2010).
- [175] E. Cavalcanti, Q. He, M. Reid, and H. Wiseman, Unified criteria for multipartite quantum nonlocality, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 032115 (2011).
- [176] A. Niezgoda, M. Panfil, and J. Chwedeńczuk, Quantum correlations in spin chains, *Phys. Rev. A* **102**, 042206 (2020).
- [177] A. Niezgoda and J. Chwedeńczuk, Many-body nonlocality as a resource for quantum-enhanced metrology, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 210506 (2021).
- [178] M. Gärttner, J. G. Bohnet, A. Safavi-Naini, M. L. Wall, J. J. Bollinger, and A. M. Rey, Measuring out-of-time-order correlations and multiple quantum spectra in a trapped-ion quantum magnet, *Nature Physics* **13**, 781 (2017).
- [179] M. Gärttner, P. Hauke, and A. M. Rey, Relating out-of-time-order correlations to entanglement via multiple-quantum coherences, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 040402 (2018).
- [180] G. Struchalin, Y. A. Zagorovskii, E. Kovlakov, S. Straupe, and S. Kulik, Experimental estimation of quantum state properties from classical shadows, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 010307 (2021).
- [181] M. Płodzień, M. Kościelski, E. Witkowska, and A. Sinatra, Producing and storing spin-squeezed states and Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger states in a one-dimensional optical lattice, *Phys. Rev. A* **102**, 013328 (2020).
- [182] M. Płodzień, M. Lewenstein, E. Witkowska, and J. Chwedeńczuk, One-axis twisting as a method of generating many-body bell correlations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 250402 (2022).
- [183] M. Płodzień, T. Wasak, E. Witkowska, M. Lewenstein, and J. Chwedeńczuk, Generation of scalable many-body bell correlations in spin chains with short-range two-body interactions, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **6**, 023050 (2024).
- [184] M. Żukowski and Č. Brukner, Bell’s theorem for general n-qubit states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 210401 (2002).
- [185] N. Mermin, Extreme quantum entanglement in a superposition of macroscopically distinct states, *Physical Review Letters* **65**, 1838 (1990).
- [186] C. Schmid, N. Kiesel, W. Laskowski, W. Wieczorek, M. Żukowski, and H. Weinfurter, Discriminating multipartite entangled states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 200407 (2008).
- [187] N. D. Mermin, Bringing home the atomic world: Quantum mysteries for anybody, *American Journal of Physics* **49**, 940 (1981), https://pubs.aip.org/aapt/ajp/article-pdf/49/10/940/11864850/940_1_online.pdf.
- [188] M. D. Reid, Q.-Y. He, and P. D. Drummond, Entanglement and nonlocality in multi-particle systems, *Frontiers of Physics* **7**, 72 (2012).
- [189] M. Ardehali, Bell inequalities with a magnitude of violation that grows exponentially with the number of particles, *Physical Review A* **46**, 5375 (1992).
- [190] N. Brunner, J. Sharam, and T. Vértesi, Testing the structure of multipartite entanglement with Bell inequalities, *Physical Review Letters* **108**, 10.1103/physrevlett.108.110501 (2012).
- [191] N. Friis, O. Marty, C. Maier, C. Hempel, M. Holzäpfel, P. Jurcevic, M. Plenio, M. Huber, C. Roos, R. Blatt, and B. Lanyon, Observation of entangled states of a fully controlled 20-qubit system, *Physical Review X* **8**, 10.1103/physrevx.8.021012 (2018).
- [192] I. Frérot, F. Baccari, and A. Acín, Unveiling quantum entanglement in many-body systems from partial information, *PRX Quantum* **3**, 10.1103/prxquantum.3.010342 (2022).
- [193] M. Płodzień, J. Chwedeńczuk, and M. Lewenstein, Inherent quantum resources in the stationary spin chains (2024), [arXiv:2405.16974](https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.16974) [quant-ph].
- [194] A. Gabriel, B. C. Hiesmayr, and M. Huber, Criterion for k-separability in mixed multipartite states, *Quantum Info. Comput.* **10**, 829–836 (2010).
- [195] O. Gühne and M. Seevinck, Separability criteria for genuine multipartite entanglement, *New Journal of Physics* **12**, 053002 (2010).
- [196] M. Seevinck and J. Uffink, Partial separability and entanglement criteria for multiqubit quantum states, *Phys. Rev. A* **78**, 032101 (2008).
- [197] T. Gao and Y. Hong, Separability criteria for several classes of n-partite quantum states, *The European Physical Journal D* **61**, 765–771 (2011).
- [198] T. Gao, Y. Hong, Y. Lu, and F. Yan, Efficient k-separability criteria for mixed multipartite quantum states, *Europhysics Letters* **104**, 20007 (2013).
- [199] S. Szalay, k-stretchability of entanglement, and the duality of k-separability and k-producibility, *Quantum* **3**, 204 (2019).
- [200] Y. Hong, T. Gao, and F. Yan, Detection of k-partite entanglement and k-nonseparability of multipartite quantum states, *Physics Letters A* **401**, 127347 (2021).
- [201] J. Kaniewski, Analytic and nearly optimal self-testing bounds for the Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt

- and Mermin inequalities, *Physical Review Letters* **117**, [10.1103/physrevlett.117.070402](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.117.070402) (2016).
- [202] J. Li, T. Liu, S. Wang, C. Jebarathinam, and Q. Wang, Experimental violation of Mermin steering inequality by three-photon entangled states with nontrivial GHZ-fidelity, *Optics Express* **27**, 13559 (2019).
- [203] D. Li, X. Li, H. Huang, and X. Li, SLOCC classification for nine families of four-qubits, *Quantum Information and Computation* **9**, 778 (2009).
- [204] The former class encompasses the majority of states in the Haar-measure sense; a state, drawn at random, will belong to the GHZ class with probability 1.
- [205] A. Acín, A. Andrianov, E. Jané, and R. Tarrach, Three-qubit pure-state canonical forms, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **34**, 6725 (2001).
- [206] C. A. Sackett, D. Kielpinski, B. E. King, C. Langer, V. Meyer, C. J. Myatt, M. Rowe, Q. A. Turchette, W. M. Itano, D. J. Wineland, and C. Monroe, Experimental entanglement of four particles, *Nature* **404**, 256 (2000).
- [207] M. Ghahi and S. Akhtarshenas, Entangled graphs: a classification of four-qubit entanglement, *The European Physical Journal D* **70**, [10.1140/epjd/e2016-60729-1](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjd/e2016-60729-1) (2016).
- [208] W. Wiczczyk, N. Kiesel, C. Schmid, and H. Weinfurter, Multiqubit entanglement engineering via projective measurements, *Physical Review A* **79**, [10.1103/physreva.79.022311](https://doi.org/10.1103/physreva.79.022311) (2009).
- [209] N. Kiesel, C. Schmid, G. Tóth, E. Solano, and H. Weinfurter, Experimental observation of four-photon entangled Dicke state with high fidelity, *Physical Review Letters* **98**, [10.1103/physrevlett.98.063604](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.98.063604) (2007).
- [210] W. Helwig, W. Cui, J. I. Latorre, A. Riera, and H.-K. Lo, Absolute maximal entanglement and quantum secret sharing, *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 052335 (2012).
- [211] F. Huber and N. Wyderka, [Table of Absolutely Maximally Entangled states](https://arxiv.org/abs/1708.02512).
- [212] A. J. Scott, Multipartite entanglement, quantum-error-correcting codes, and entangling power of quantum evolutions, *Phys. Rev. A* **69**, 052330 (2004).
- [213] F. Huber, O. Gühne, and J. Siewert, Absolutely maximally entangled states of seven qubits do not exist, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 200502 (2017).
- [214] S. A. Rather, A. Burchardt, W. Bruzda, G. Rajchel-Mieldzióć, A. Lakshminarayan, and K. Życzkowski, Thirty-six entangled officers of Euler: Quantum solution to a classically impossible problem, *Physical Review Letters* **128**, [10.1103/physrevlett.128.080507](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.128.080507) (2022).
- [215] S. A. Rather, N. Ramadas, V. Kodyalam, and A. Lakshminarayan, Absolutely maximally entangled state equivalence and the construction of infinite quantum solutions to the problem of 36 officers of Euler, *Physical Review A* **108**, [10.1103/physreva.108.032412](https://doi.org/10.1103/physreva.108.032412) (2023).
- [216] D. Goyeneche, D. Alsina, J. I. Latorre, A. Riera, and K. Życzkowski, Absolutely maximally entangled states, combinatorial designs, and multiunitary matrices, *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 032316 (2015).
- [217] A. Higuchi and A. Sudbery, How entangled can two couples get?, *Physics Letters A* **273**, 213 (2000).
- [218] P. Facchi, G. Florio, G. Parisi, and S. Pascazio, Maximally multipartite entangled states, *Physical Review A* **77**, [10.1103/physreva.77.060304](https://doi.org/10.1103/physreva.77.060304) (2008).
- [219] S. Campbell, M. S. Tame, and M. Paternostro, Characterizing multipartite symmetric Dicke states under the effects of noise, *New Journal of Physics* **11**, 073039 (2009).
- [220] L.-M. Duan, Entanglement detection in the vicinity of arbitrary dicke states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 180502 (2011).
- [221] J.-Y. Chen, Z. Ji, N. Yu, and B. Zeng, Entanglement depth for symmetric states, *Phys. Rev. A* **94**, 042333 (2016).
- [222] M. Demianowicz, G. Rajchel-Mieldzióć, and R. Augusiak, Simple sufficient condition for subspace to be completely or genuinely entangled, *New Journal of Physics* **23**, 103016 (2021).
- [223] A. Aloy, M. Fadel, and J. Tura, The quantum marginal problem for symmetric states: applications to variational optimization, nonlocality and self-testing, *New Journal of Physics* **23**, 033026 (2021).
- [224] C. Marconi, A. Aloy, J. Tura, and A. Sanpera, Entangled symmetric states and copositive matrices, *Quantum* **5**, 561 (2021).
- [225] J. Tura, A. Aloy, R. Quesada, M. Lewenstein, and A. Sanpera, Separability of diagonal symmetric states: a quadratic conic optimization problem, *Quantum* **2**, 45 (2018).
- [226] R. Quesada, S. Rana, and A. Sanpera, Entanglement and nonlocality in diagonal symmetric states of n qubits, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 042128 (2017).
- [227] A. Burchardt, J. Czartowski, and K. Życzkowski, Entanglement in highly symmetric multipartite quantum states, *Phys. Rev. A* **104**, 022426 (2021).
- [228] G. Tóth, Detection of multipartite entanglement in the vicinity of symmetric Dicke states, *J. Opt. Soc. Am. B* **24**, 275 (2007).
- [229] W. Bruzda, S. Friedland, and K. Życzkowski, Rank of a tensor and quantum entanglement, *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 1 (2023).
- [230] P. Vrana and M. Christandl, Asymptotic entanglement transformation between W and GHZ states, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **56**, [10.1063/1.4908106](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4908106) (2015).