

# Robustness of entanglement for two qubit density matrix

S. J. Akhtarshenas <sup>a,b,c</sup> \*, M. A. Jafarizadeh<sup>a,b,c</sup> †

<sup>a</sup>Department of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, Tabriz University, Tabriz 51664, Iran.

<sup>b</sup>Institute for Studies in Theoretical Physics and Mathematics, Tehran 19395-1795, Iran.

<sup>c</sup>Research Institute for Fundamental Sciences, Tabriz 51664, Iran.

November 12, 2018

---

\*E-mail:akhtarshenas@tabrizu.ac.ir

†E-mail:jafarizadeh@tabrizu.ac.ir

**Abstract**

By considering the decomposition of a generic two qubit density matrix presented by Wootters [W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80** 2245 (1998)], the robustness of entanglement for any mixed state of two qubit systems is obtained algebraically. It is shown that the robustness of entanglement is proportional to concurrence and in Bell decomposable density matrices it is equal to the concurrence. We also give an analytic expression for two separable states which wipe out all entanglement of these states. Since thus obtained robustness is function of the norm of the vectors in the decomposition we give an explicit parameterization for the decomposition.

**Keywords:** Quantum entanglement, Robustness of entanglement, Concurrence

**PACs Index:** 03.65.Ud

## 1 Introduction

Quantum entanglement has recently been attracted much attention as a potential resource for communication and information processing [1, 2]. Entanglement usually arise from quantum correlations between separated subsystems which can not be created by local actions on each subsystem. By definition, a mixed state  $\rho$  of a bipartite system is said to be separable (non entangled) if it can be written as a convex combination of product states

$$\rho = \sum_i w_i \rho_i^{(1)} \otimes \rho_i^{(2)}, \quad w_i \geq 0, \quad \sum_i w_i = 1,$$

where  $\rho_i^{(1)}$  and  $\rho_i^{(2)}$  are states of subsystems 1 and 2, respectively. Although, in the case of pure states of bipartite systems it is easy to check whether a given state is, or is not entangled, the question is yet an open problem in the case of mixed states. Therefore having a measure to quantify entanglement of mixed states is likely to be valuable and several measures of entanglement have been proposed [3, 4, 5, 6].

One useful quantity introduced in [7] as a measure of entanglement is robustness of entanglement. It corresponds to the minimal amount of mixing with locally prepared states which washes out all entanglement. Authors in [7] have given analytical expression for pure states of binary systems. A geometrical interpretation of robustness is given in [8] and have pointed that two corresponding separable states needed to wipe out all entanglement are necessarily on the boundary of separable set. Unfortunately, the above mentioned quantity as the most proposed measures of entanglement involves extremization which are difficult to handel analytically.

In this paper we evaluate robustness for a generic two qubit density matrix. Our approach to finding robustness is based on the decomposition given by Wootters in [6]. Wootters in [6] has shown that for any two qubit density matrix there always exist the decomposition  $\rho = \sum_i |x_i\rangle \langle x_i|$

in such a way that  $\langle x_i | \tilde{x}_j \rangle = \lambda_i \delta_{ij}$  where  $\lambda_i$  are square roots of eigenvalues, in decreasing order, of the non-Hermitian matrix  $\rho \tilde{\rho}$ . We consider Wootters decomposition and show that for a generic two qubit density matrix we can associate a tetrahedral with coordinates  $P_i = \langle x_i | x_i \rangle$ . It is shown that in terms of these coordinates the corresponding separable states form an irregular octahedral. Based on this we evaluate algebraically robustness of entanglement of a generic two qubit density matrix by using a new norm defined by Wootters's basis. We also give an analytic expression for separable states that wipe out all entanglement and show that they are on the boundary of separable states as pointed out in [8]. Since in our approach of evaluation of robustness, one needs to know the norm of the vectors in the decomposition, we give an explicit parameterization for the Wootters decomposition to evaluate the norm explicitly.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 using the Wootters's basis [6] we define a new norm to evaluate robustness. Robustness of entanglement of a generic two qubit density matrix is evaluated in section 3. By giving an explicit parameterization for density matrix  $\rho$ , the norm of the vectors in Wootters decomposition of  $\rho$  is evaluated in section 4. The paper is ended with a brief conclusion in section 5.

## 2 Physical norm based on Wootters's basis

Here in this section we define a new norm to evaluate robustness of a generic two qubit density matrix. To this aim we first review concurrence and Wootters's basis as presented by Wootters in [6]. Wootters in [6] has shown that for any two qubit density matrix  $\rho$  there always exist a decomposition

$$\rho = \sum_i |x_i\rangle \langle x_i|, \quad (2-1)$$

called Wootters's basis, such that

$$\langle x_i | \tilde{x}_j \rangle = \lambda_i \delta_{ij}, \quad (2-2)$$

where  $\lambda_i$  are square roots of eigenvalues, in decreasing order, of the non-Hermitian matrix  $\rho \tilde{\rho}$  and

$$\tilde{\rho} = (\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y) \rho^* (\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y), \quad (2-3)$$

where  $\rho^*$  is the complex conjugate of  $\rho$  when it is expressed in a standard basis such as  $\{|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle, |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle\}, \{|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow\downarrow\rangle\}$  and  $\sigma_y$  represent Pauli matrix in local basis  $\{|\uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow\rangle\}$ . Based on this, the concurrence of the mixed state  $\rho$  is defined by  $\max(0, \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4)$  [6].

Now let us define states  $|x'_i\rangle$  as

$$|x'_i\rangle = \frac{|x_i\rangle}{\sqrt{\lambda_i}}, \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, 3, 4. \quad (2-4)$$

Then  $\rho$  can be expanded as

$$\rho = \sum_i \lambda_i |x'_i\rangle \langle x'_i|, \quad (2-5)$$

and Eq. (2-2) takes the following form

$$\langle x'_i | \tilde{x}'_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}. \quad (2-6)$$

Using the independency of Wootters's basis, one can expand an arbitrary  $4 \times 4$  Hermitian matrix  $M$  in terms of them, that is, we can write

$$M = \sum_{ij} a_{ij} |x'_i\rangle \langle x'_j|, \quad (2-7)$$

where the Hermiticity of  $M$  implies that  $a_{ij} = a_{ji}^*$ . We now define norm of the matrix  $M$  by

$$\|M\| = \sqrt{|Tr(M\tilde{M})|} = \sqrt{\left| \sum_{ij} a_{ij}^2 \right|}, \quad (2-8)$$

where  $\tilde{M}$  is defined as Eq. (2-3). Obviously, the absolute value appearing in Eq. (2-8) guarantees the positivity of the above defined norm. In fact in cases that  $M$  is nonnegative matrix then  $\tilde{M}$  and  $M\tilde{M}$  is also nonnegative and absolute value sign in Eq. (2-8) can be neglected.

Any Physical norm in quantum information should be at least invariant under local unitary transformation and below we prove that the norm defined in Eq. (2-8) is actually invariant under local unitary transformation. Suppose the matrix  $M$  is subjected to local unitary transformation defined as

$$M \longrightarrow M' = (U_1 \otimes U_2)M(U_1 \otimes U_2)^\dagger = \sum_{ij} a_{ij} |x''_i\rangle \langle x''_j|, \quad (2-9)$$

where  $|x''_i\rangle = (U_1 \otimes U_2) |x'_i\rangle$  are the new Wootters's basis with the corresponding  $|\tilde{x}''_i\rangle$  defined as

$$|\tilde{x}''_i\rangle = (\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y)(U_1^* \otimes U_2^*)(\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y) |\tilde{x}'_i\rangle \quad (2-10)$$

which satisfy

$$\langle x''_i | \tilde{x}''_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}, \quad (2-11)$$

where in Eq. (2-11) we have used the fact that  $(U^T \sigma_y U)_{ij} = -i \epsilon_{kl} U_{ki} U_{lj} = -i \det(U) \epsilon_{ij} = (\sigma_y)_{ij}$ .

Therefore using the definition of norm given in Eq. (2-8) and using Eq. (2-11) we have

$$\|M'\| = \sqrt{|\sum_{ij} a_{ij}^2|} \quad (2-12)$$

Now, comparing Eq. (2-12) with (2-8) we see that norm of  $M$  is invariant under local unitary transformations.

With these considerations it is natural to define distance between two density matrices  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$  as

$$\|\rho_1 - \rho_2\| = \sqrt{|Tr((\rho_1 - \rho_2)(\tilde{\rho}_1 - \tilde{\rho}_2))|} \quad (2-13)$$

which is invariant under local unitary transformations .

### 3 Robustness for two qubit density matrices

According to [7] for a given entangled state  $\rho$  and separable state  $\rho_s$ , a new density matrix  $\rho(s)$  can be constructed as,

$$\rho(s) = \frac{1}{s+1}(\rho + s\rho_s), \quad s \geq 0, \quad (3-14)$$

where it can be either entangled or separable. It was pointed that there always exists the minimal  $\mathbf{s}$  corresponding to  $\rho_s$  such that  $\rho(s)$  is separable. This minimal  $\mathbf{s}$  is called the robustness of  $\rho$  relative to  $\rho_s$ , denoted by  $R(\rho \parallel \rho_s)$ . The absolute robustness of  $\rho$  is defined as the quantity,

$$R(\rho \parallel S) \equiv \min_{\rho_s \in S} R(\rho \parallel \rho_s). \quad (3-15)$$

Du et al. in [8] have given a geometrical interpretation of robustness and pointed that if  $\mathbf{s}$  in Eq. (3-14) is minimal among all separable states  $\rho_s$ , i.e.  $\mathbf{s}$  is the absolute robustness of  $\rho$ , then  $\rho_s$  and  $\rho(s)$  in Eq. (3-14) are necessarily on the boundary of the separable states.

Here in this section we obtain robustness for a generic two qubit density matrix. Our method of evaluation of robustness is based on the decomposition of density matrix given by Wootters in [6]. By defining  $P_i = \lambda_i K_i$ , where  $K_i = \langle x'_i | x'_i \rangle$ , then normalization condition of  $\rho$  leads to

$$\text{Tr}(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^4 P_i = 1, \quad P_i > 0. \quad (3-16)$$

This means that with respect to coordinates  $P_i$ , the space of density matrices forms a tetrahedral. With respect to this representation separability condition  $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4 \leq 0$  takes the following form

$$\frac{P_1}{K_1} - \frac{P_2}{K_2} - \frac{P_3}{K_3} - \frac{P_4}{K_4} \leq 0. \quad (3-17)$$

States that saturate inequality (3-17) form a plane called  $\mathcal{S}_1$  (see Fig. 1). All states violating inequality (3-17) are entangled states for which  $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4$ . These states form an entangled

region with  $\mathcal{S}_1$  as its separable boundary. There exist, however, three other entangled regions corresponding with the cases that  $\lambda_j$  is dominated ( $j = 2, 3, 4$ ). These regions also define separable planes  $\mathcal{S}_j$ . Four planes  $\mathcal{S}_i$  together with four planes  $\mathcal{S}'_i$ , corresponding to  $\lambda_i = 0$ , form an irregular octahedral corresponding to the separable states. This geometry is similar to that of Bell decomposable states but here we have an irregular octahedral associated to separable states [9]. Figure 1 shows a perspective of this geometry, where two separable planes  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}'_1$  are shown explicitly.

Now in order to obtain robustness of  $\rho$  suppose that a ray from  $\rho$  is drawn such that intersects the boundary planes of separable region at points  $\rho'_s$  and  $\rho''_s$ . Although  $\rho'_s$  is necessarily on the plane  $\mathcal{S}_1$ , but  $\rho''_s$  is allowed to lie on any plane  $\mathcal{S}'_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{S}_3$  or  $\mathcal{S}_4$ , where we evaluate robustness for each case separately. First consider the case that  $\rho''_s$  is lying on the plane  $\mathcal{S}'_1$ . In this case  $\rho''_s$  can be written as a convex sum of three vertices of the plane

$$\rho''_s = \sum_i \lambda''_i |x'_i\rangle \langle x'_i| = a_2\sigma_2 + a_3\sigma_3 + a_4\sigma_4, \quad a_2 + a_3 + a_4 = 1, \quad (3-18)$$

where  $\sigma_i$  are separable states that can be written as convex sum of two corresponding vertices of tetrahedral as

$$\sigma_2 = \frac{1}{K_3 + K_4} |x'_3\rangle \langle x'_3| + \frac{1}{K_3 + K_4} |x'_4\rangle \langle x'_4|, \quad (3-19)$$

$$\sigma_3 = \frac{1}{K_2 + K_4} |x'_2\rangle \langle x'_2| + \frac{1}{K_2 + K_4} |x'_4\rangle \langle x'_4|, \quad (3-20)$$

$$\sigma_4 = \frac{1}{K_2 + K_3} |x'_2\rangle \langle x'_2| + \frac{1}{K_2 + K_3} |x'_3\rangle \langle x'_3|, \quad (3-21)$$

and  $\lambda''_i$  are

$$\lambda''_1 = 0, \quad (3-22)$$

$$\lambda''_2 = \frac{a_3}{K_2 + K_4} + \frac{a_4}{K_2 + K_3}, \quad (3-23)$$

$$\lambda''_3 = \frac{a_2}{K_3 + K_4} + \frac{a_4}{K_2 + K_3}, \quad (3-24)$$



$$\lambda_4'' = \frac{a_2}{K_3 + K_4} + \frac{a_3}{K_2 + K_4}. \quad (3-25)$$

By expanding  $\rho'_s$  as convex sum of  $\rho$  and  $\rho_s''$

$$\rho'_s = \frac{1}{1+s}(\rho + s\rho_s''), \quad (3-26)$$

and also using the fact that the coordinates of  $\rho'_s$  satisfy the equation

$$\frac{P'_1}{K_1} - \frac{P'_2}{K_2} - \frac{P'_3}{K_3} - \frac{P'_4}{K_4} = 0, \quad (3-27)$$

after some algebra coordinates  $\lambda'_i$  of  $\rho'_s = \sum_i \lambda'_i |x'_i\rangle \langle x'_i|$  can be written as

$$\lambda'_1 = \frac{\left(\frac{a_2}{K_3+K_4} + \frac{a_3}{K_2+K_4} + \frac{a_4}{K_2+K_3}\right) \lambda_1}{\frac{a_2}{K_3+K_4} + \frac{a_3}{K_2+K_4} + \frac{a_4}{K_2+K_3} + \frac{C}{2}}, \quad (3-28)$$

$$\lambda'_2 = \frac{\left(\frac{a_2}{K_3+K_4} + \frac{a_3}{K_2+K_4} + \frac{a_4}{K_2+K_3}\right) \lambda_2 + \frac{C}{2} \left(\frac{a_3}{K_2+K_4} + \frac{a_4}{K_2+K_3}\right)}{\frac{a_2}{K_3+K_4} + \frac{a_3}{K_2+K_4} + \frac{a_4}{K_2+K_3} + \frac{C}{2}}, \quad (3-29)$$

$$\lambda'_3 = \frac{\left(\frac{a_2}{K_3+K_4} + \frac{a_3}{K_2+K_4} + \frac{a_4}{K_2+K_3}\right) \lambda_3 + \frac{C}{2} \left(\frac{a_2}{K_3+K_4} + \frac{a_4}{K_2+K_3}\right)}{\frac{a_2}{K_3+K_4} + \frac{a_3}{K_2+K_4} + \frac{a_4}{K_2+K_3} + \frac{C}{2}}, \quad (3-30)$$

$$\lambda'_4 = \frac{\left(\frac{a_2}{K_3+K_4} + \frac{a_3}{K_2+K_4} + \frac{a_4}{K_2+K_3}\right) \lambda_4 + \frac{C}{2} \left(\frac{a_2}{K_3+K_4} + \frac{a_3}{K_2+K_4}\right)}{\frac{a_2}{K_3+K_4} + \frac{a_3}{K_2+K_4} + \frac{a_4}{K_2+K_3} + \frac{C}{2}}, \quad (3-31)$$

where  $C = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4$  is the concurrence of  $\rho$ . By using the above result and the definition of distance given in Eq. (2-13) one can evaluate robustness of  $\rho$  relative to  $\rho_s''$  as

$$s_1 = \frac{\|\rho - \rho'_s\|}{\|\rho'_s - \rho_s''\|} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_i (\lambda_i - \lambda'_i)^2}{\sum_i (\lambda'_i - \lambda''_i)^2}} = \frac{C}{\frac{2a_2}{K_3+K_4} + \frac{2a_3}{K_2+K_4} + \frac{2a_4}{K_2+K_3}}. \quad (3-32)$$

Analogue to the above method one can evaluate robustness of  $\rho$  for the case that  $\rho_s''$  lies on the plane  $\mathcal{S}_2$ . In this case  $\rho_s''$  can be expanded as convex sum of three vertices of the plane

$$\rho_s'' = b_1\sigma_1 + b_3\sigma_3 + b_4\sigma_4, \quad b_1 + b_3 + b_4 = 1, \quad (3-33)$$

where

$$\sigma_1 = \frac{1}{K_1 + K_2} |x'_1\rangle \langle x'_1| + \frac{1}{K_1 + K_2} |x'_2\rangle \langle x'_2|, \quad (3-34)$$

and  $\sigma_3$  and  $\sigma_4$  are defined in Eqs. (3-20) and (3-21). Then after some algebra we obtain the corresponding robustness as

$$s_2 = \frac{C}{\frac{2b_3}{K_2+K_4} + \frac{2b_4}{K_2+K_3}}. \quad (3-35)$$

Similarly in cases that separable state  $\rho''_s$  are on the planes  $\mathcal{S}_3$  and  $\mathcal{S}_4$  we obtain relative robustness of  $\rho$  as

$$s_3 = \frac{C}{\frac{2c_2}{K_3+K_4} + \frac{2c_3}{K_2+K_4}}, \quad (3-36)$$

and

$$s_4 = \frac{C}{\frac{2d_3}{K_2+K_4} + \frac{2d_4}{K_2+K_3}}, \quad (3-37)$$

respectively. Equations. (3-32), (3-35), (3-36) and (3-37) show that in order to achieve the minimum robustness it is enough to consider the case that separable state  $\rho''_s$  lies on the plane  $\mathcal{S}'_1$ . With this consideration we are now allowed to choose coefficients  $a_i$  in such a way that Eq. (3-32) becomes minimum. It is easy to see that this happens as long as the coefficient  $a_k$  corresponding to the term  $\min(K_i + K_j)$  becomes one. Therefore robustness of  $\rho$  relative to  $\rho''_s$  is

$$s = \frac{\min(K_i + K_j)}{2} C \quad (3-38)$$

which is the main result this work. Here the minimum is taken over all combination of  $K_i + K_j$  for  $i, j = 2, 3, 4$ . Equation (3-38) implies that for two qubit systems robustness is proportional to the concurrence. We see that the minimum robustness given in Eq. (2-3) corresponds to  $a_i = \delta_{ik}$ , therefore, by using Eq. (3-18) we get the following result for  $\rho''_s$

$$\rho''_s = \sigma_k. \quad (3-39)$$

Also by using  $a_i = \delta_{ik}$  in Eqs. (3-28) to (3-31) one can easily obtain the coordinates  $\lambda'_i$  of separable state  $\rho'_s$ .

As we will show in the next section the Bell decomposable states correspond to the  $K_i = 1$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ , therefore in Bell decomposable states Eq. (3-38) implies that the robustness is equal to the concurrence.

Now we have to show that thus obtained robustness is minimum over all separable states. Vidal et al. in [7] have shown that  $R(\rho \parallel \rho_s)$  is a convex function of  $\rho_s$ . This means that any local minimum is also the absolute one, thus in order to find the absolute minimum of  $R(\rho \parallel \rho_s)$  as a function of  $\rho_s$  it is enough to find local minimum [7]. As the above mentioned argument shows robustness given in Eq. (3-38) is minimal relative to all separable states of the tetrahedral. In the rest of this section we want to show that it is indeed minimum over all separable states. To this aim let us consider following pseudomixture for the density matrix  $\rho$  given in Eq. (2-5)

$$\rho = (1 + s)\rho'_s - s\rho''_s, \quad (3-40)$$

where  $\rho'_s$  and  $\rho''_s$  are two separable states with following decomposition

$$\rho'_s = \sum_i \lambda'_i |x'_i\rangle\langle x'_i| + \sum_{i,j} a_{ij} |x'_i\rangle\langle x'_j|, \quad (3-41)$$

$$\rho''_s = \sum_i \lambda''_i |x''_i\rangle\langle x''_i| + \sum_{i,j} b_{ij} |x''_i\rangle\langle x''_j|, \quad (3-42)$$

where  $A$  and  $B$  are, respectively, off-diagonal Hermitian matrices  $A = (a_{ij})$  and  $B = (b_{ij})$ . It follows from Eqs. (3-40) to (3-42) that the following equations should hold

$$\lambda_i = (1 + s)\lambda'_i - s\lambda''_i, \quad (3-43)$$

$$(1 + s)a_{ij} - sb_{ij} = 0. \quad (3-44)$$

Now using Eqs. (2-13), (3-41) and (3-42) robustness of  $\rho$  relative to  $\rho''_s$  is defined by

$$s = \frac{\|\rho - \rho'_s\|}{\|\rho'_s - \rho''_s\|} = \sqrt{\left| \frac{\text{Tr}(\rho - \rho'_s)(\tilde{\rho} - \tilde{\rho}'_s)}{\text{Tr}(\rho'_s - \rho''_s)(\tilde{\rho}'_s - \tilde{\rho}''_s)} \right|}.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
s &= \sqrt{\left| \frac{\sum_i (\lambda_i - \lambda'_i)^2 + Tr(AA^*)}{\sum_i (\lambda'_i - \lambda''_i)^2 + Tr(A-B)(A-B)^*} \right|} \\
&= \sqrt{\left| \frac{\sum_i (\lambda_i - \lambda'_i)^2 + Tr(AA^*)}{\sum_i (\lambda'_i - \lambda''_i)^2 + \frac{1}{s^2} Tr(AA^*)} \right|}, \tag{3-45}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last line Eq. (3-44) have been used. in order to show that thus obtained robustness is minimum over all separable states we need to show that it is local minimum [7]. To do so, it is straightforward to see that the robustness  $s$  given in Eq. (3-45) reduces to

$$s = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_i (\lambda_i - \lambda'_i)^2}{\sum_i (\lambda'_i - \lambda''_i)^2}}, \tag{3-46}$$

which takes minimum values given in Eq. (3-38) as the earlier argument of this section indicates. Since as long as both the numerator and denominator under the radicals have the same sign,  $s$  would be independent of the perturbation of corresponding separable states. While in cases that numerator and denominator posses different sign then  $s$  would be perturbation dependent. It is trivial to see that the numerator and denominator should change sign simultaneously, hence  $s$  would be independent of perturbation. Since both the numerator and denominator of robustness  $s$  given in Eq. (3-45) are continuous function of the matrix elements of matrices  $A$  and  $B$ , so we expect that  $s$  is also continuous function of them. Now suppose that separable states  $\rho'_s$  and  $\rho''_s$  given in Eqs. (3-41) and (3-42) are obtained by small perturbation of corresponding separable states on planes  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}'_1$ . This means that matrix elements of  $A$  and  $B$  are infinitesimal, i.e.,  $Tr(AA^*)$  is infinitesimal. Though  $Tr(AA^*)$  can be negative but both numerator and denominator of Eq. (3-45) remain positive. Therefore for small enough perturbations the robustness  $s$  is equal to (3-46) and it is independent of perturbation. Hence if the numerator changes the sign under the appropriate continuous perturbation while the denominator remains positive, obviously robustness  $s$  would vanishes at perturbation corresponding to the change of sign of the numerator. Similarly if

the denominator changes sign while the numerator remain positive, the robustness becomes infinite at the corresponding perturbation. In either case the robustness  $s$  as a continuous function of parameters of perturbation will jump discontinuously to zero or infinite which is not possible.

In summary as we see the continuous perturbation of separable states which minimum robustness can not affect the robustness. This means that the obtained robustness given in Eq. (3-38) is local minimum thus according to Ref. [7] it is global minimum.

## 4 Evaluation of $K_i$ via the explicit parameterization of the density matrix

In the previous section we evaluated robustness for a generic two qubit density matrix. As we see our approach of evaluation of robustness is based on the decomposition (2-1). As we see thus evaluated robustness is function of concurrence and also  $K_i$ , i.e., norm of vectors of the decomposition. Here in this section we introduce an explicit parameterization for  $|x_i\rangle$ , in order to evaluate  $K_i$ . To this aim we define matrix  $X$  and  $\tilde{X}$  as

$$X = (|x'_1\rangle, |x'_2\rangle, |x'_3\rangle, |x'_4\rangle), \quad (4-47)$$

and

$$\tilde{X} = (|\tilde{x}'_1\rangle, |\tilde{x}'_2\rangle, |\tilde{x}'_3\rangle, |\tilde{x}'_4\rangle), \quad (4-48)$$

respectively. Therefore Eq. (2-2) takes the following form

$$\tilde{X}^\dagger X = X^T \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y X = I. \quad (4-49)$$

Symmetric matrix  $\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y$  can be diagonalized as

$$\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y = O^T \eta^2 O, \quad (4-50)$$

where  $O$  is an orthogonal matrix defined by

$$O = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4-51)$$

and  $\eta$  is the diagonal matrix

$$\eta = \begin{pmatrix} i & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4-52)$$

Using Eq. (4-50) we can rewrite Eq. (4-49) as

$$Y^T Y = I, \quad (4-53)$$

where

$$Y = \eta O X. \quad (4-54)$$

Equation (4-53) shows that  $Y$  is a complex 4-dimensional orthogonal matrix. This means that a given density matrix  $\rho$  with corresponding set of positive numbers  $\lambda_i$  and Wootters's basis can transform under  $SO(4, c)$  into a generic  $2 \times 2$  density matrix with the same set of positive numbers but with new Wootters's basis. This implies that the space of two qubit density matrices can be characterized with 12-dimensional (as real manifold) space of complex orthogonal group  $SO(4, c)$  together with four positive numbers  $\lambda_i$ . Of course the normalization condition reduces number of parameters to 15.

As far as entanglement is concerned the states  $\rho$  and  $\rho'$  are equivalent if they are on the same orbit of the group of local transformation, that is, if there exist local unitary transformation  $U_1 \otimes U_2$  such that  $\rho' = (U_1 \otimes U_2)\rho(U_1 \otimes U_2)^\dagger$ , where  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  are unitary transformations acting on Hilbert spaces of particles  $A$  and  $B$ , respectively.

It can be easily seen that under the above mentioned local unitary transformations of density matrix  $\rho$ , the matrix  $X$  transforms as

$$X \rightarrow X' = (U_1 \otimes U_2)X. \quad (4-55)$$

It is worth to mention that  $X'$  also satisfy Eq. (4-49). To show that this is indeed the case, we need to note that  $X'^T \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y X' = X^T (U_1^T \sigma_y U_1) \otimes (U_2^T \sigma_y U_2) X$ . By using  $(\sigma_y)_{ij} = -i\epsilon_{ij}$  we get  $(U^T \sigma_y U)_{ij} = -i\epsilon_{kl} U_{ki} U_{lj} = -i \det(U) \epsilon_{ij} = (\sigma_y)_{ij}$ , where last equality comes from the fact that the unitary matrix belongs to  $SU(2)$ . This implies that

$$X'^T \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y X' = I. \quad (4-56)$$

By defining  $Y'$  as

$$Y' = \eta O X', \quad (4-57)$$

one can easily show that  $Y'$  is also satisfies orthogonality condition

$$Y'^T Y' = I. \quad (4-58)$$

Now by using Eq. (4-57) and inverting Eq. (4-55), we can express  $Y'$  in terms of  $Y$

$$Y' = (\eta O)(U_1 \otimes U_2)(\eta O)^{-1} Y. \quad (4-59)$$

Now by using the fact that  $(\eta O) \exp(\mathcal{U}_1 \otimes \mathcal{U}_2) (\eta O)^{-1} = \exp((\eta O)(\mathcal{U}_1 \otimes \mathcal{U}_2)(\eta O)^{-1})$  and using the explicit form for generators  $(\mathcal{U}_1 \otimes \mathcal{U}_2)$  of local group, one can after some algebraic calculations

see that  $(\eta O)(\mathcal{U}_1 \otimes \mathcal{U}_2)(\eta O)^{-1}$  is real antisymmetric matrix. This means that under local unitary transformations matrix  $Y$  transforms with  $SO(4, r)$  group. So we can parameterize the space of two qubit density matrices as 6-dimensional coset space  $SO(4, c)/SO(4, r)$  together with 4 positive numbers  $\lambda_i$ , which again normalization condition reduces the number of parameters to 9.

Below in the rest of this section we will obtain an explicit parameterization for a generic two qubit density matrix. First note that we can decompose coset  $SO(4, c)/SO(4, r)$  as [10]

$$\frac{SO(4, c)}{SO(4, r)} = \frac{SO(4, c)/SO(4, r)}{SO(2, c)/SO(2, r) \otimes SO(2, c)/SO(2, r)} \otimes \left( \frac{SO(2, c)}{SO(2, r)} \otimes \frac{SO(2, c)}{SO(2, r)} \right), \quad (4-60)$$

that is, coset representative  $Y$  can be decomposed as  $Y = Y_1 Y_2$ . One can easily show that coset representative of  $SO(2, c)/SO(2, r)$  has the following form

$$\exp \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i\phi \\ -i\phi & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cosh \phi & i \sinh \phi \\ -i \sinh \phi & \cosh \phi \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4-61)$$

Thus  $Y_2$  can be written as

$$Y_2 = \left( \begin{array}{cc|cc} \cosh \phi_1 & i \sinh \phi_1 & & 0 \\ -i \sinh \phi_1 & \cosh \phi_1 & & \\ \hline & & \cosh \phi_2 & i \sinh \phi_2 \\ 0 & & -i \sinh \phi_2 & \cosh \phi_2 \end{array} \right). \quad (4-62)$$

On the other hand  $Y_1$  can be evaluated as

$$Y_1 = \exp \left( \begin{array}{c|c} 0 & iB \\ \hline -iB^T & 0 \end{array} \right) = \left( \begin{array}{c|c} \cosh \sqrt{BB^T} & iB \frac{\sinh \sqrt{B^T B}}{\sqrt{B^T B}} \\ \hline -i \frac{\sinh \sqrt{B^T B}}{\sqrt{B^T B}} B^T & \cosh \sqrt{B^T B} \end{array} \right) = \left( \begin{array}{c|c} \sqrt{I + CC^T} & iC \\ \hline -iC^T & \sqrt{I + C^T C} \end{array} \right), \quad (4-63)$$

where  $B$  is a  $2 \times 2$  matrix and in the last step we used  $C = B \frac{\sinh \sqrt{B^T B}}{\sqrt{B^T B}}$ . Now using the singular



value decomposition  $C = O_1 D O_2^T$ , Eq. (4-63) becomes

$$Y_1 = \left( \begin{array}{c|c} O_1 \sqrt{I + D^2} O_1^T & i O_1 D O_2^T \\ \hline -i O_2 D O_1^T & O_2 \sqrt{I + D^2} O_2^T \end{array} \right), \quad (4-64)$$

where  $D$  is a non-negative diagonal matrix. It can be easily seen that Eq. (4-64) can be decomposed

as

$$Y_1 = \left( \begin{array}{c|c} O_1 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & O_2 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c|c} \sqrt{I + D^2} & iD \\ \hline -iD & \sqrt{I + D^2} \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c|c} O_1^T & 0 \\ \hline 0 & O_2^T \end{array} \right). \quad (4-65)$$

By combining Eqs. (4-62) and (4-65) we get

$$Y = \left( \begin{array}{c|c} O_1 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & O_2 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c|c} \sqrt{I + D^2} & iD \\ \hline -iD & \sqrt{I + D^2} \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c|c} O_1' & 0 \\ \hline 0 & O_2' \end{array} \right). \quad (4-66)$$

Finally using parameterization given in Eq. (4-62) we get

$$Y = \left( \begin{array}{cc|cc|c} \cosh \theta_1 & i \sinh \theta_1 & & & 0 \\ -i \sinh \theta_1 & \cosh \theta_1 & & & \\ \hline & & \cosh \theta_2 & i \sinh \theta_2 & \\ 0 & & -i \sinh \theta_2 & \cosh \theta_2 & \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{cc|cc|c} \cosh \xi_1 & 0 & i \sinh \xi_1 & 0 & \\ 0 & \cosh \xi_2 & 0 & i \sinh \xi_2 & \\ \hline -i \sinh \xi_1 & 0 & \cosh \xi_1 & 0 & \\ 0 & -i \sinh \xi_2 & 0 & \cosh \xi_2 & \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{cc|cc|c} \cosh \phi_1 & i \sinh \phi_1 & & & 0 \\ -i \sinh \phi_1 & \cosh \phi_1 & & & \\ \hline & & \cosh \phi_2 & i \sinh \phi_2 & \\ 0 & & -i \sinh \phi_2 & \cosh \phi_2 & \end{array} \right), \quad (4-67)$$

where  $\sinh \xi_i$  (for  $i = 1, 2$ ) are diagonal elements of  $D$  with the conditions  $\xi_i \geq 0$ .

Using above results and Eq. (4-47) and (4-54) we can evaluate the states  $|x_i\rangle$  as

$$|x_1\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_1}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} -(\sinh \xi_1 \sinh \theta_2 \cosh \phi_1 + \sinh \xi_2 \cosh \theta_2 \sinh \phi_1) - i(\cosh \xi_1 \cosh \theta_1 \cosh \phi_1 + \cosh \xi_2 \sinh \theta_1 \sinh \phi_1) \\ -(\sinh \xi_1 \cosh \theta_2 \cosh \phi_1 + \sinh \xi_2 \sinh \theta_2 \sinh \phi_1) - i(\cosh \xi_1 \sinh \theta_1 \cosh \phi_1 + \cosh \xi_2 \cosh \theta_1 \sinh \phi_1) \\ (\sinh \xi_1 \cosh \theta_2 \cosh \phi_1 + \sinh \xi_2 \sinh \theta_2 \sinh \phi_1) - i(\cosh \xi_1 \sinh \theta_1 \cosh \phi_1 + \cosh \xi_2 \cosh \theta_1 \sinh \phi_1) \\ (\sinh \xi_1 \sinh \theta_2 \cosh \phi_1 + \sinh \xi_2 \cosh \theta_2 \sinh \phi_1) - i(\cosh \xi_1 \cosh \theta_1 \cosh \phi_1 + \cosh \xi_2 \sinh \theta_1 \sinh \phi_1) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4-68)$$

$$|x_2\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_2}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} (\cosh \xi_1 \cosh \theta_1 \sinh \phi_1 + \cosh \xi_2 \sinh \theta_1 \cosh \phi_1) - i(\sinh \xi_1 \sinh \theta_2 \sinh \phi_1 + \sinh \xi_2 \cosh \theta_2 \cosh \phi_1) \\ (\cosh \xi_1 \sinh \theta_1 \sinh \phi_1 + \cosh \xi_2 \cosh \theta_1 \cosh \phi_1) - i(\sinh \xi_1 \cosh \theta_2 \sinh \phi_1 + \sinh \xi_2 \sinh \theta_2 \cosh \phi_1) \\ (\cosh \xi_1 \sinh \theta_1 \sinh \phi_1 + \cosh \xi_2 \cosh \theta_1 \cosh \phi_1) + i(\sinh \xi_1 \cosh \theta_2 \sinh \phi_1 + \sinh \xi_2 \sinh \theta_2 \cosh \phi_1) \\ (\cosh \xi_1 \cosh \theta_1 \sinh \phi_1 + \cosh \xi_2 \sinh \theta_1 \cosh \phi_1) + i(\sinh \xi_1 \sinh \theta_2 \sinh \phi_1 + \sinh \xi_2 \cosh \theta_2 \cosh \phi_1) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4-69)$$

$$|x_3\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_3}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} (\sinh \xi_1 \cosh \theta_1 \cosh \phi_2 + \sinh \xi_2 \sinh \theta_1 \sinh \phi_2) - i(\cosh \xi_1 \sinh \theta_2 \cosh \phi_2 + \cosh \xi_2 \cosh \theta_2 \sinh \phi_2) \\ (\sinh \xi_1 \sinh \theta_1 \cosh \phi_2 + \sinh \xi_2 \cosh \theta_1 \sinh \phi_2) - i(\cosh \xi_1 \cosh \theta_2 \cosh \phi_2 + \cosh \xi_2 \sinh \theta_2 \sinh \phi_2) \\ (\sinh \xi_1 \sinh \theta_1 \cosh \phi_2 + \sinh \xi_2 \cosh \theta_1 \sinh \phi_2) + i(\cosh \xi_1 \cosh \theta_2 \cosh \phi_2 + \cosh \xi_2 \sinh \theta_2 \sinh \phi_2) \\ (\sinh \xi_1 \cosh \theta_1 \cosh \phi_2 + \sinh \xi_2 \sinh \theta_1 \sinh \phi_2) + i(\cosh \xi_1 \sinh \theta_2 \cosh \phi_2 + \cosh \xi_2 \cosh \theta_2 \sinh \phi_2) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4-70)$$

$$|x_4\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_4}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} (\cosh \xi_1 \sinh \theta_2 \sinh \phi_2 + \cosh \xi_2 \cosh \theta_2 \cosh \phi_2) + i(\sinh \xi_1 \cosh \theta_1 \sinh \phi_2 + \sinh \xi_2 \sinh \theta_1 \cosh \phi_2) \\ (\cosh \xi_1 \cosh \theta_2 \sinh \phi_2 + \cosh \xi_2 \sinh \theta_2 \cosh \phi_2) + i(\sinh \xi_1 \sinh \theta_1 \sinh \phi_2 + \sinh \xi_2 \cosh \theta_1 \cosh \phi_2) \\ -(\cosh \xi_1 \cosh \theta_2 \sinh \phi_2 + \cosh \xi_2 \sinh \theta_2 \cosh \phi_2) + i(\sinh \xi_1 \sinh \theta_1 \sinh \phi_2 + \sinh \xi_2 \cosh \theta_1 \cosh \phi_2) \\ -(\cosh \xi_1 \sinh \theta_2 \sinh \phi_2 + \cosh \xi_2 \cosh \theta_2 \cosh \phi_2) + i(\sinh \xi_1 \cosh \theta_1 \sinh \phi_2 + \sinh \xi_2 \sinh \theta_1 \cosh \phi_2) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4-71)$$

Equations (4-68) to (4-71) together with normalization condition  $\sum_{i=1}^4 \langle x_i | x_i \rangle = 1$  give a parameterization for a generic orbit of two qubit density matrix up to local unitary group. We are now in position to evaluate  $K_i$ . By using Eqs. (4-68) to (4-71) after some algebra we arrive at the following results

$$K_1 = \cosh 2\theta_2 (\sinh^2 \xi_1 \cosh^2 \phi_1 + \sinh^2 \xi_2 \sinh^2 \phi_1) \\ + \cosh 2\theta_1 (\cosh^2 \xi_1 \cosh^2 \phi_1 + \cosh^2 \xi_2 \sinh^2 \phi_1)$$

$$+ \sinh 2\phi_1 (\sinh \xi_1 \sinh \xi_2 \sinh 2\theta_2 + \cosh \xi_1 \cosh \xi_2 \sinh 2\theta_1), \quad (4-72)$$

$$\begin{aligned} K_2 &= \cosh 2\theta_2 (\sinh^2 \xi_1 \sinh^2 \phi_1 + \sinh^2 \xi_2 \cosh^2 \phi_1) \\ &+ \cosh 2\theta_1 (\cosh^2 \xi_1 \sinh^2 \phi_1 + \cosh^2 \xi_2 \cosh^2 \phi_1) \\ &+ \sinh 2\phi_1 (\sinh \xi_1 \sinh \xi_2 \sinh 2\theta_2 + \cosh \xi_1 \cosh \xi_2 \sinh 2\theta_1), \end{aligned} \quad (4-73)$$

$$\begin{aligned} K_3 &= \cosh 2\theta_1 (\sinh^2 \xi_1 \cosh^2 \phi_2 + \sinh^2 \xi_2 \sinh^2 \phi_2) \\ &+ \cosh 2\theta_2 (\cosh^2 \xi_1 \cosh^2 \phi_2 + \cosh^2 \xi_2 \sinh^2 \phi_2) \\ &+ \sinh 2\phi_2 (\sinh \xi_1 \sinh \xi_2 \sinh 2\theta_1 + \cosh \xi_1 \cosh \xi_2 \sinh 2\theta_2), \end{aligned} \quad (4-74)$$

$$\begin{aligned} K_4 &= \cosh 2\theta_1 (\sinh^2 \xi_1 \sinh^2 \phi_2 + \sinh^2 \xi_2 \cosh^2 \phi_2) \\ &+ \cosh 2\theta_2 (\cosh^2 \xi_1 \sinh^2 \phi_2 + \cosh^2 \xi_2 \cosh^2 \phi_2) \\ &+ \sinh 2\phi_2 (\sinh \xi_1 \sinh \xi_2 \sinh 2\theta_1 + \cosh \xi_1 \cosh \xi_2 \sinh 2\theta_2). \end{aligned} \quad (4-75)$$

As an example let us consider Bell decomposable states  $\rho = \sum_{i=1}^4 p_i |\psi_i\rangle \langle \psi_i|$ , where  $p_i \geq 0$ ,  $\sum_i p_i = 1$ . For these states by choosing  $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = \xi_1 = \xi_2 = \phi_1 = \phi_2 = 0$  we get  $\lambda_i = p_i$  and states  $|x_i\rangle$  are given by

$$|x_1\rangle = -i\sqrt{p_1} |\psi_1\rangle, \quad |\psi_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\downarrow\rangle), \quad (4-76)$$

$$|x_2\rangle = \sqrt{p_2} |\psi_2\rangle, \quad |\psi_2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle + |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle), \quad (4-77)$$

$$|x_3\rangle = -i\sqrt{p_3} |\psi_3\rangle, \quad |\psi_3\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle), \quad (4-78)$$

$$|x_4\rangle = \sqrt{p_4} |\psi_4\rangle, \quad |\psi_4\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle - |\downarrow\downarrow\rangle). \quad (4-79)$$

So it can be easily seen that for these states we get  $K_i = 1$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ .

## 5 Conclusion

In this work we have obtained robustness of entanglement of a generic two qubit density matrix.

Our approach to obtain robustness is based on the decomposition of a generic two qubit density

matrix presented by Wootters. We have shown that the robustness of entanglement is proportional to concurrence and in Bell decomposable density matrices it is equal to the concurrence. We also present an analytical expression for two separable states that wipe out all entanglement of these states. We show that robustness is function of the norm of the vectors of the decomposition so we present an explicit parameterization for the decomposition.

## References

- [1] C. H. BENNETT, G. BRASSARD, C. CRÉPEAU, R. JOZSA, A PERES AND W. K. WOOTTERS, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1895 (1993).
- [2] C. H. BENNETT, AND S. J. WIESNER, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 2881 (1992).
- [3] C. H. BENNETT, D. P. DIVINCENZO, J. A. SMOLIN AND W.K. WOOTTERS, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 3824 (1996).
- [4] V. VEDRAL, M. B. PIENIO, M. A. RIPPIN AND P. L. KNIGHT *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 2275 (1995).
- [5] V. VEDRAL AND M. B. PLENIO, *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, 1619 (1998).
- [6] W. K. WOOTTERS, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80** 2245 (1998).
- [7] G. VIDAL AND R. TARRACH, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 141 (1999).
- [8] J.F. DU, M.J. SHI, X.Y. ZHOU AND R.D. HAN, *Phys. Lett. A* **267**, 244 (2000).
- [9] R. HORODECKI AND M. HORODECKI *Phys. Rev. A* **54** 1838 (1996).

- [10] R. GILMORE, *Lie Groups, Lie Algebras, and Some of Their Applications* (John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1974)

## Figure Captions

Figure 1: The space of a generic two qubit density matrix is represented by a tetrahedron. Vertices  $P_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$  correspond to pure states defined by  $\rho = \lambda_i |x'_i\rangle \langle x'_i|$ . Irregular octahedron corresponds to separable states. Separable planes  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}'_1$  are shown explicitly.




Figure 1: