

All inseparable two-mode Gaussian continuous variable states are distillable

Géza Giedke, Lu-Ming Duan, J. Ignacio Cirac, and Peter Zoller

Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Innsbruck, Technikerstr. 25, 6020 Innsbruck, Austria

We show that all entangled Gaussian states of two infinite dimensional systems can be distilled to maximally entangled states in finite dimensions. The distillation protocol involves local squeezing operations, local homodyne measurements with ancilla systems prepared in coherent states, and local joint measurements of the total number operator of two copies of the state.

The existence of *pure* entangled states of two or more systems entails the possibility of finding new applications of Quantum Mechanics, in particular in the fields of computation and communication. In the latter case, several protocols were devised that use entangled pairs of qubits (quantum systems described in terms of a Hilbert space of dimension two) to achieve secure secret communication [1]. These protocols have been successfully implemented experimentally by using pairs of photons generated via parametric down conversion [2]. More recently, these protocols have been generalized to the case of infinite dimensional Hilbert spaces, i.e., the so called continuous variable (CV) systems [3]. The successful experimental realization of teleportation [4, 5] using light beams in squeezed states indicates that those (or more efficient) protocols may be very soon implemented in the laboratory. It is clear that with light beams in squeezed states (containing many photons) one could increase the transmission rate in quantum communication compared to the systems realized today.

In practice, however, systems are exposed to interactions with the environment. These interactions transform pure into *mixed* states, which may not be useful for quantum communication. Fortunately, there exist methods to recover pure entangled states from mixed ones in certain situations. These processes are called *entanglement distillation* (or purification) [6, 7], and consist of local operations and classical communication transforming several copies of a mixed entangled state into one (approximately) pure entangled state which is then useful for quantum communication. In fact, using this method in the appropriate way one can construct quantum repeaters [8] that should allow quantum communication over arbitrarily long distances. Unfortunately, it is not known, in general, which mixed states ρ are distillable. At the moment we only have necessary or sufficient criteria for distillability, but not both. First, obviously the state ρ must be inseparable (entangled) for it to be distillable. Moreover, as shown by Horodecki *et al.* [9], there exists a stronger necessary condition, namely that ρ must have non-positive partial transpose. In fact, surprisingly enough there are entangled states which are not distillable since their density matrices remain positive under partial transposition [10]. Furthermore, there is evidence that this condition is not sufficient since there seem to exist states that have non-positive partial transpose but

that nevertheless are not distillable [11]. On the other hand, a useful sufficient criterion, the so-called reduction criterion, has been reported [12]. It states that if there exists some vector $|\psi\rangle$ such that

$$\langle\psi|\mathrm{tr}_B\rho\otimes\mathbb{1}-\rho|\psi\rangle<0. \quad (1)$$

then the state ρ is distillable. Here, tr_B stands for the partial trace with respect to the second subsystem. An important aspect of this criterion is that if one can find a state $|\psi\rangle$ satisfying (1), then one can explicitly construct a protocol to distill ρ .

Although all these results can be easily generalized to CV systems, in that case it is very complicated (if not impossible, in general) even to determine whether a mixed state is entangled or not. However, for a class of states comprising nearly all the states that can currently be generated in the laboratory, a necessary *and* sufficient condition for inseparability has been derived [13, 14] (in fact, in [14] it is shown that the partial transposition condition is also sufficient). Those states are called Gaussian states, since their density matrices can be written as Gaussian functions of position- and momentum-like operators acting on the two infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces of the two subsystems. As mentioned above, this necessary and sufficient condition for entanglement is, in general, not sufficient for a mixed state to be distillable. In this Letter, however, we show that for Gaussian states of two modes inseparability implies distillability: all entangled Gaussian states of two modes are shown to be distillable and thus useful for quantum communication. Moreover, our proof, which is based in part on the reduction criterion, provides an explicit protocol that accomplishes distillation for all those states.

Let us consider a Gaussian state ρ of two systems A and B acting on a Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbb{R})\otimes L^2(\mathbb{R})$, e.g. two modes of the electromagnetic field. (We will in the following often use quantum optical terms, like “modes” or “beam splitters”, because quantum optics currently offers the most promising setting for the realization of CV systems. The results of this paper, however, are valid for all CV systems.) For such systems, it is convenient to describe the state ρ by its characteristic function [15]

$$\chi(\xi)=\mathrm{tr}[\rho D(\xi)]. \quad (2)$$

Here $\xi = (q_a, p_a, q_b, p_b) \in \mathbb{R}^4$ is a real vector and

$$D(\xi) = e^{-i \sum_{k=a,b} (q_k X_k + p_k P_k)}, \quad (3)$$

where $X_{a,b}$ and $P_{a,b}$ are operators of system A and B, respectively, satisfying canonical commutation relations ($\hbar = 1$). The characteristic function contains all the information about the state of the system (e.g., [15]), that is, one can find ρ starting from χ . Gaussian states are exactly those for which χ is a Gaussian function of ξ [17]

$$\chi(\xi) = e^{-\frac{1}{4} \langle \xi, M \xi \rangle - \langle d, \xi \rangle}, \quad (4)$$

where the *correlation matrix* M is a real symmetric matrix, the *displacement* $d \in \mathbb{R}^4$ a real vector, and where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the standard scalar product in \mathbb{R}^4 . Thus, a Gaussian state is fully characterized by the correlation matrix M and the displacement vector d .

Any Gaussian state of two modes can be transformed into what we called the *standard form*, using local unitary operations only [13, 14]. The corresponding characteristic function has displacement $d = 0$ and the correlation matrix M has the simple form

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} M_A & M_{AB} \\ M_{AB}^T & M_B \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

where

$$M_A = \begin{pmatrix} n_a & 0 \\ 0 & n_a \end{pmatrix}, M_B = \begin{pmatrix} n_b & 0 \\ 0 & n_b \end{pmatrix}, M_{AB} = \begin{pmatrix} k_x & 0 \\ 0 & k_p \end{pmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

As mentioned in [13] the local unitaries needed to achieve standard form are linear Bogoliubov transformations, i.e., generated by Hamiltonians that are at most quadratic in the operators $X_{a,b}, P_{a,b}$. For optical fields this means that they can be performed with beam splitters, phase shifters and squeezers, i.e., currently available technology.

The four real parameters (n_a, n_b, k_x, k_p) fully characterize a Gaussian state up to local linear Bogoliubov transformations (LLBT). They can be easily calculated from the four LLBT-invariants $|M_A|, |M_B|, |M_{AB}|$, and $|M|$ as follows:

$$n_a^2 = |M_A|, n_b^2 = |M_B|, k_x k_p = |M_{AB}|, \quad (7a)$$

$$(n_a n_b - k_x^2)(n_a n_b - k_p^2) = |M|, \quad (7b)$$

where $|M|$ denotes the determinant of M ; without loss of generality we choose $k_x \geq |k_p|$.

Note that not all values of these parameters are allowed, since the correlation matrix must correspond to the density operator of a physical state. It has been shown [17] that a given correlation matrix M corresponds

to a physical state if and only if (iff) $M > 0$ and $-JMJ \geq M^{-1}$, where J is a 4×4 matrix called complex structure, defined by $J(q_a, p_a, q_b, p_b)^T = (-p_a, q_a, -p_b, q_b)^T$. In terms of the parameters (7) we can reexpress these conditions as

$$(n_a n_b - k_x^2)(n_a n_b - k_p^2) + 1 \geq n_a^2 + n_b^2 + 2k_x k_p, \quad (8a)$$

$$n_a n_b - k_x^2 \geq 1. \quad (8b)$$

On the other hand, starting from results of [14] it is easy to show that a Gaussian state is entangled iff the corresponding parameters satisfy

$$(n_a n_b - k_x^2)(n_a n_b - k_p^2) + 1 < n_a^2 + n_b^2 - 2k_x k_p. \quad (9)$$

In the following we will prove that a Gaussian state is distillable iff its parameters fulfill (9); that is, iff it is entangled. We will proceed as follows: first, we recall the proof of the reduction criterion in [12] and extend the result to infinite dimensions. The extended criterion provides a sufficient condition for distillability of CV states. Secondly, we show for *symmetric* Gaussian states, i.e. states for which $n_a = n_b = n$, that the inseparability criterion (9) is equivalent to the reduction criterion. So, all the symmetric inseparable states are distillable. Finally, we show that all the states which are not symmetric ($n_a \neq n_b$) can be brought into a symmetric form by using local operations and without disentangling them.

We start by reviewing the proof of the reduction criterion for distillability and generalizing it to infinite dimensions. Let a density matrix ρ and the pure state $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{n,m} a_{nm} |n\rangle \otimes |m\rangle$ fulfill the criterion (1), where the vectors $|n\rangle$ form an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H} . The coefficients a_{nm} define a matrix $A = (a_{nm})$ satisfying $AA^\dagger = \text{tr}_B(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$. Distillation of ρ is divided into three steps. The first is a filtering operation: The operator $AA^\dagger \otimes \mathbb{1}$ can be viewed as an element of a positive-operator-valued measure (POVM), which defines a generalized measurement [18]. Conditional on the measurement outcome corresponding to $AA^\dagger \otimes \mathbb{1}$ we obtain the state

$$\tilde{\rho} = A^\dagger \otimes \mathbb{1} \rho A \otimes \mathbb{1} / \text{tr}(\rho AA^\dagger \otimes \mathbb{1}), \quad (10)$$

which still satisfies (1) but now with $|\psi\rangle = |\Phi_+^N\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=1}^N |k, k\rangle$, the symmetric maximally entangled state of two N -level systems. In this case, (1) implies $\text{tr}(\tilde{\rho} |\Phi_+^N\rangle\langle\Phi_+^N|) > 1/N$. A state satisfying this inequality can be distilled by a generalization of the protocol of Ref. [6], which consists of two steps: depolarization and joint measurements. Applying an operation of the form $U \otimes U^*$ (U unitary, randomly chosen) depolarizes $\tilde{\rho}$, i.e. transforms it into a mixture of the maximally entangled state $|\Phi_+^N\rangle$ (which is invariant under transformations of the form $U \otimes U^*$) and the completely mixed state $\frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{1}$; the overlap of ρ with $|\Phi_+^N\rangle$ remains

unchanged. Taking two entangled pairs in this depolarized form, both A and B perform the generalized XOR gate $\text{XOR}_N : |k\rangle |l\rangle \mapsto |k\rangle |(l+k) \bmod N\rangle$ on their respective systems. Then they both measure the state of their second system in the basis $|k\rangle$. The first pair is kept, iff they get the same result. The resulting state has a density matrix ρ' , which has a larger overlap with the maximally entangled state $|\Phi_+^N\rangle$ than the original ρ . Iterating the last two steps sufficiently often, the overlap between the resulting state and $|\Phi_+^N\rangle$ approaches 1, that is, we obtain a nearly maximally entangled state.

The reduction criterion was proved in [12] for finite dimensional systems. Since we want to apply it to CV states we have to show that it extends to infinite dimensions, i.e., that Ineq. (1) implies distillability even for $\dim \mathcal{H} = \infty$. Let $\{|k\rangle : k = 0, 1, \dots\}$ be an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H} , let $\mathcal{H}_n = \text{span}\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, \dots, |n\rangle\}$, and let ρ be a density matrix on $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$. Let $\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \text{tr}_B \rho \otimes \mathbb{1} - \rho$ be the map occurring on the lefthand side of (1). Assume that $\exists |\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}, \epsilon > 0$ such that $\langle \psi | \mathcal{E}(\rho) | \psi \rangle < -\epsilon < 0$. Since $\rho_n = P_{\mathcal{H}_n} \rho P_{\mathcal{H}_n}$ converges weakly to ρ , there is $N \geq 0$ such that $\langle \psi | \mathcal{E}(\rho_n) | \psi \rangle < -\epsilon/2$ for all $n \geq N$. Thus ρ can be projected by local operations to a distillable state ρ_N and is therefore itself distillable. ■

Now we specialize to Gaussian states. If both the states ρ and ψ occurring in (1) are Gaussian with displacements $d_\rho = d_\psi = 0$ and correlation matrices M_ρ, M_ψ respectively, then (1) takes the form [19]

$$2[|M_{\text{tr}B\rho} + M_{\text{tr}B\psi}|]^{-1/2} - 4[|M_\rho + M_\psi|]^{-1/2} < 0. \quad (11)$$

Let ρ be a symmetric Gaussian state in standard form and ψ the pure two-mode squeezed state $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\cosh r} \sum_n \tanh^n r |nn\rangle$. This is also a Gaussian state and the four parameters (7) are $n_a = n_b = \cosh r, k_x = -k_p = \sinh r$. In the limit of large r (keeping only the leading terms in e^r) this becomes after some simple algebra

$$(n + k_x)(n - k_p) > 1. \quad (12)$$

For symmetric states, however, Ineq. (12) is implied by the inseparability criterion: for symmetric states, (9) simplifies to $|n^2 - k_x k_p - 1| < n(k_x - k_p)$, which implies Ineq. (12) both if $n^2 - k_x k_p > 1$ or < 1 , proving that all symmetric inseparable Gaussian states are distillable.

If the state is not symmetric, it means that the reduced state at one of the two sides has larger entropy than the other. This suggests to let a pure state interact with the “hotter” side to cool it down. To do this without destroying the entanglement of ρ , we proceed as follows: ρ is transformed such that the correlation matrix of its Wigner function takes on its standard form with parameters (N_a, N_b, K_x, K_p) . The Wigner function is the symplectic Fourier transform of the characteristic function (4) and therefore also Gaussian for Gaussian states. The Wigner correlation matrix M_W is related to the (characteristic) correlation matrix by $M_W = -JM^{-1}J$ [16].

One can formulate the conditions (8,9) similarly in terms of the parameters (N_a, N_b, K_x, K_p) . Just as the form (6), the Wigner standard form can be obtained by local squeezing operations.

Now assume that $N_b < N_a$, i.e., B is the hotter side. Take an ancilla mode in the vacuum state and couple it to B's mode by a beam splitter with transmittivity $\cos^2 \theta$. After a homodyne measurement of the ancilla results a state $\tilde{\rho}$ with Wigner correlation matrix \tilde{M} with

$$\tilde{M}_A = \frac{1}{\nu} \begin{pmatrix} c^2 N_a + s^2 D_x & 0 \\ 0 & c^2 N_a + s^2 N_a N_b \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\tilde{M}_B = \frac{1}{\nu} \begin{pmatrix} N_b & 0 \\ 0 & (c^2 N_b + s^2) \nu \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\tilde{M}_{AB} = \frac{1}{\nu} \begin{pmatrix} c K_x & 0 \\ 0 & c K_p \nu \end{pmatrix},$$

where the abbreviations $c = \cos \theta, s = \sin \theta, \nu = s^2 N_b + c^2$, and $D_{x,p} = N_a N_b - K_{x,p}^2$ were used. The condition for symmetry, $|\tilde{M}_A| = |\tilde{M}_B|$, requires

$$\tan^2 \theta = \frac{N_a^2 - N_b^2}{N_b - D_x N_a}. \quad (13)$$

Checking (9) for \tilde{M} one easily sees that the sign of the lefthand side does not change; therefore the transformed state is inseparable iff the original one was inseparable. It remains to be shown that there always exists a θ to satisfy (13), i.e., that the right hand side of Eq. (13) is positive. The numerator is positive since we have chosen $N_b < N_a$, the denominator is positive for all states since the second part of condition (8) implies that $(N_a - D_x N_b) > 0$ and the first part assures that $(N_a - D_x N_b)(N_b - D_p N_a) \geq (N_a K_x + N_b K_p)^2 \geq 0$, hence all Gaussian states can be symmetrized this way. But since every Gaussian state can be brought into Wigner standard form by local unitaries, this completes the proof. ■

Moreover, this implies that the protocol of Ref. [12] can in principle be used to obtain maximally entangled states in a finite dimensional Hilbert space from any given inseparable Gaussian two-mode state. However, a *practical* distillation protocol for all Gaussian states remains to be found. The realistic proposals for Gaussian states have only been shown to work for pure states [20] or in the limit of small or one-sided noise [21]. It is worth noting, though, that major parts of the universal protocol of [12] are in fact implemented by the procedure of Duan *et al.* [21]. Let us briefly discuss the steps for distillation of an inseparable Gaussian state ρ :

(i) remove displacements $d \neq 0$; symmetrize ρ if necessary; bring the symmetric state into standard form. These steps require the local use of beam splitters, one-mode squeezers, ancilla systems in coherent states, and

a homodyne measurement.

(ii) for a state in symmetric standard form the filtering operation (10) is unnecessary, since then ρ already satisfies Ineq. (1) with state $|\psi\rangle \propto \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 1} \sum_k \lambda^k |k\rangle |k\rangle$ (in the photon number basis). This gives $a_{nm} = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 1} \lambda^{n+m} \delta_{nm}$, hence $A = 1$.

(iii) depolarize the state; in [13] this step is not necessary; we do not know how to completely depolarize an arbitrary state quantum optically. However, since all this operation does is to increase our ignorance of the system it is not necessary for distillation but could for any given ρ be replaced by some specific unitary that would work just as well or even better.

(iv) This is the most important step of the distillation protocol. A bilocal XOR is used to mutually entangle two entangled pairs. A subsequent measurement selects a distilled subensemble. This operation is implemented in [21] by the total photon number measurement at both sides: The state conditional on both A and B obtaining the same result N differs only by a local unitary transformation (namely $|n, N-n\rangle \mapsto |n, N\rangle$) from the one obtained by first projecting bilocally to the $N+1$ dimensional subspace \mathcal{H}_{N+1} ($\rho \rightarrow \rho_{N+1}$), performing the bilocal XOR $_{N+1}$ and finally measuring the target system. As shown before, for a sufficiently large value of N , the truncated state ρ_{N+1} is distillable and then step (iv) leads to a state with larger overlap with $|\Phi_+^{N+1}\rangle$.

Iteration of the steps (i)-(iv) leads with finite probability arbitrarily close to a maximally entangled state in some finite dimensional space.

In conclusion we have shown that all inseparable Gaussian states of two modes are distillable into maximally entangled states in some finite dimensional Hilbert space. We have described a protocol that accomplishes this and discussed its relation to the quantum optical distillation procedure of Ref. [21], showing that major parts of the protocol can be implemented by simple quantum optical means. A number of open questions remain: firstly, it is not clear how to implement the depolarizing operation quantum optically. It will be further investigated whether this step is necessary at all for Gaussian states and how it might be performed quantum optically. To iterate the protocol, the same question has to be answered for the states obtained by (repeatedly) performing steps (i)-(iv) on a Gaussian state. Note also that the protocol [21] works better, when the total photon number measurement is performed on more than two entangled pairs simultaneously (indeed being optimal for pure states asymptotically). If using many modes simultaneously improves the protocol for mixed states, too, remains to be seen. Furthermore, it would be interesting to see whether the equivalence of inseparability and distillability also holds for Gaussian states of $m_A + m_B > 2$ modes or whether one may find bound entangled Gaussian states of bipartite systems of three or more modes.

G.G. acknowledges financial support by the Friedrich-Naumann-Stiftung. This work was supported by the Austrian Science Foundation under the SFB "Control and Measurement of Coherent Quantum Systems" (Project 11), the European Union under the TMR network ERB-FMRX-CT96-0087 and the project EQUIP (contract IST-1999-11053), the European Science Foundation, and the Institute for Quantum Information GmbH, Innsbruck.

-
- [1] A. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 661 (1997); C.H. Bennett, G. Brassard, N. Mermin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 557 (1992).
 - [2] T. Jennewein, C. Simon, G. Weihs, H. Weinfurter, A. Zeilinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 4729 (2000); D. Naik, C. Peterson, A. White, A. Berglund, P. Kwiat, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 4733 (2000); W. Tittel, J. Brendel, H. Zbinden, N. Gisin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 4737 (2000).
 - [3] T.C. Ralph, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 010303R (2000); M. Hillery, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 022309 (2000); M. Reid, quant-ph/9909030; T.C. Ralph, quant-ph/0007024.
 - [4] L. Vaidman, Phys. Rev. A **49**, 1473 (1994); S.L. Braunstein, H.J. Kimble, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 869 (1998).
 - [5] A. Furusawa, J. Sørensen, S.L. Braunstein, C.A. Fuchs, H.J. Kimble, E.S. Polzik, Science **282**, 706 (1998).
 - [6] C.H. Bennett, G. Brassard, S. Popescu, B. Schumacher, J.A. Smolin, W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 722 (1996).
 - [7] C.H. Bennett, D.P. DiVincenzo, J.A. Smolin, W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **54** 3824 (1996).
 - [8] H.-J. Briegel, W. Dür, J.I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5932 (1998).
 - [9] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 5239 (1998).
 - [10] P. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **232**, 233 (1997).
 - [11] W. Dür, J.I. Cirac, M. Lewenstein and D. Bruß, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 062313 (2000); D. DiVincenzo, P. Shor, J. Smolin, B. Terhal, A. Thapliyal, (quant-ph/9910026).
 - [12] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 4206 (1999).
 - [13] L. Duan, G. Giedke, J.I. Cirac, P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2722 (2000).
 - [14] R. Simon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2726 (2000).
 - [15] D. Petz, *An Invitation to the Algebra of Canonical Commutation Relations*, Leuven University Press, Leuven (1990); C. Gardiner, P. Zoller, *Quantum Noise* 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1999).
 - [16] H. Scutaru, Phys. Lett. A **141**, 223 (1989).
 - [17] J. Manuceau, A. Verbeure, Comm. Math. Phys. **9**, 293 (1968).
 - [18] C. Helstrom, *Quantum detection and estimation theory*, Associate Press, London (1976).
 - [19] H. Scutaru, J. Math. Phys. **39**, 6403 (1998).
 - [20] T. Opatrný, G. Kurizki, D.-G. Welsch, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 032302 (1999).
 - [21] L. Duan, G. Giedke, J.I. Cirac, P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 4002 (2000).