

Some Applications for an Euler Angle Parameterization of $SU(N)$ and $U(N)$

Todd Tilma

*The Ilya Prigogine Center for Studies in Statistical Mechanics and Complex Systems
Physics Department
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas 78712-1081**

E.C.G. Sudarshan

*Center for Particle Physics
Physics Department
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas 78712-1081[†]
(Dated: October 31, 2018)*

Here we apply our $SU(N)$ and $U(N)$ parameterizations [1, 2, 3] to the question of entanglement in the two qubit and qubit/qutrit system. In particular, the group operations which entangle a two qubit pure state will be given, as well as the corresponding manifold that the operations parameterize. We also give the volume of this manifold, as well as the *hypothesized* volume for the set of all entangled two qubit pure and mixed states. Extension of this work to the qubit/qutrit system will also be given.

*Email:tilma@physics.utexas.edu

[†]Email:sudarshan@physics.utexas.edu

I. INTRODUCTION

We know that, in general, N -dimensional density matrices can be written in the form

$$\rho = \frac{1}{N} \left(\mathbb{1}_N + \sqrt{\frac{N(N-1)}{2}} (\mathbf{n} \cdot \boldsymbol{\lambda}) \right).^1 \quad (1)$$

This representation is a convenient one since for *pure* states it yields,

$$\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 1, \text{ and } \mathbf{n} \star \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{n}, \quad (2)$$

where the “star” product is defined according to

$$(\mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{b})_k = \sqrt{\frac{N(N-1)}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{N-2} \right) d_{ijk} a_i b_j. \quad (3)$$

The way to see this is to just use the following relationship from [4, 5]

$$\lambda_i \lambda_j = \frac{2}{N} \delta_{ij} \mathbb{1}_N + (d_{ijk} + ic_{ijk}) \lambda_k, \quad (4)$$

where the c_{ijk} and the d_{ijk} are the structure coefficients for the $SU(N)$ Lie algebra in question. For N -dimensional density matrices there exists a simple procedure to calculate the components of \mathbf{n} : beginning with equation (1) we use the trace condition on the elements of the algebra

$$\text{Tr}[\lambda_i \cdot \lambda_j] = 2\delta_{ij} \quad (5)$$

to generate

$$\begin{aligned} n_i &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{2N(N-1)}} * \text{Tr}[(N\rho - \mathbb{1}_N) \cdot \lambda_i] \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{N}{2(N-1)}} * \text{Tr}[\rho \cdot \lambda_i] \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

We can use this to represent \mathbf{n} in terms of other parameterizations such as when $\rho = U\rho_d U^\dagger$ or to evaluate (1) when ρ is explicitly given as in the following example.

A. Example Calculation: Bell’s States

We begin by defining the four Bell states [6]:

$$\psi_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi_3 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi_4 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ -1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

¹ Note that orthogonal states in this representation are those that have an angle $\theta = \cos^{-1}(\frac{-1}{N-1})$ between them in the corresponding Hilbert space.

² Substitution of $\rho = U\rho_d U^\dagger$ into equation (6) yields

$$n_i = \sqrt{\frac{N}{2(N-1)}} * \text{Tr}[(U\rho_d U^\dagger) \cdot \lambda_i]$$

which upon calculation gives \mathbf{n} as a function of the $N(N-1)$ group parameters (denoted by α_i) and the $N-1$ “rotations” (denoted by θ_i) parameterizing ρ_d .

which can also be represented as the following density matrices

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_1\psi_1^\dagger \equiv \rho_{BS1} &= \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, & \psi_2\psi_2^\dagger \equiv \rho_{BS2} &= \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \psi_3\psi_3^\dagger \equiv \rho_{BS3} &= \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \psi_4\psi_4^\dagger \equiv \rho_{BS4} &= \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

These four density matrices represent the four possible EPR pairs for two qubit systems in $SU(4)$ and represent an orthonormal basis for the entire two qubit, pure state, state space (i. e. for the vector space but not for ρ). By their definition, they are *maximally* entangled states, i.e. nonfactorizable superpositions of product states, and thus impart non-local correlations between the behavior of the two qubits that make up these four states. For, if these states were factorizable

$$\rho = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B, \quad (9)$$

then the probability of joint detection would also factorize

$$|\rho|^2 = |\rho_A|^2 |\rho_B|^2, \quad (10)$$

and thus the measurements would be independent of each other.

Now although the Bell states cannot be decomposed into a set of product states, we can decompose their density matrix representation given in equation (8) into the one given by equation (1) by using equation (6) with $N = 4$,

$$\rho = \frac{1}{4}(\mathbb{1}_4 + \sqrt{6} \mathbf{n} \cdot \boldsymbol{\lambda}), \quad (11)$$

thus yielding

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{BS1} &= \frac{1}{4}(\mathbb{1}_4 + \sqrt{6}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\lambda_3 + \frac{1}{3\sqrt{2}}\lambda_8 + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\lambda_9 - \frac{1}{3}\lambda_{15})), \\ \rho_{BS2} &= \frac{1}{4}(\mathbb{1}_4 + \sqrt{6}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\lambda_3 + \frac{1}{3\sqrt{2}}\lambda_8 - \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\lambda_9 - \frac{1}{3}\lambda_{15})), \\ \rho_{BS3} &= \frac{1}{4}(\mathbb{1}_4 + \sqrt{6}(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\lambda_3 + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\lambda_6 - \frac{1}{3\sqrt{2}}\lambda_8 + \frac{1}{3}\lambda_{15})), \\ \rho_{BS4} &= \frac{1}{4}(\mathbb{1}_4 + \sqrt{6}(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\lambda_3 - \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\lambda_6 - \frac{1}{3\sqrt{2}}\lambda_8 + \frac{1}{3}\lambda_{15})). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

We can see that for the first two Bell states the only non-zero components of \mathbf{n} are n_3 , n_8 , n_9 and n_{15} whereas for the last two Bell states one switches n_9 for n_6 (with its corresponding Lie algebra component). The rest of the components of \mathbf{n} are zero.

II. GENERAL ENTANGLING OPERATIONS ON TWO QUBITS

From ([7, 8, 9] and references within) we know that entangled (and entangleable) two qubit density matrices must satisfy³

$$Tr[\rho^2] > \frac{1}{3}. \quad (13)$$

³ Note that this is just a necessary condition for a state to either be already entangled, or to possibly be entangled under some group operation. Obviously, pure states satisfy this criterion automatically, but it is the mixed state situation to which this criterion is more often applied. Separable two qubit density matrices have $Tr[\rho^2] \leq \frac{1}{3}$.

If we start with equation (1), assigning $N = 4$

$$\rho = \frac{1}{4} \left(\mathbb{1}_4 + \sqrt{6}(\mathbf{n} \cdot \boldsymbol{\lambda}) \right), \quad (14)$$

then equation (13) yields

$$\text{Tr}[\rho^2] = \text{Tr} \left[\frac{1}{16} \left(\mathbb{1}_4 + \sqrt{6}(\mathbf{n} \cdot \boldsymbol{\lambda}) \right)^2 \right] = \frac{1}{4} (1 + 3 \|\mathbf{n}\|^2) > \frac{1}{3} \quad (15)$$

implying that $\|\mathbf{n}\| > 1/3$ for entangled states. On the other hand if we begin with $\rho = U \rho_d U^\dagger$ where $U \in SU(4)$, we can see that

$$\text{Tr}[\rho^2] = \text{Tr}[(U \rho_d U^\dagger)(U \rho_d U^\dagger)] = \text{Tr}[U \rho_d^2 U^\dagger] = \text{Tr}[\rho_d^2] > \frac{1}{3} \quad (16)$$

where ρ_d is

$$\rho_d = \begin{pmatrix} \sin^2(\theta_1) \sin^2(\theta_2) \sin^2(\theta_3) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos^2(\theta_1) \sin^2(\theta_2) \sin^2(\theta_3) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cos^2(\theta_2) \sin^2(\theta_3) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cos^2(\theta_3) \end{pmatrix} \quad (17)$$

from [1] and we have exploited the knowledge that $UU^\dagger = \mathbb{1}_4$. Evaluation of this trace yields the following demands on the ranges of θ_1 , θ_2 , and θ_3 (here expressed as functions of $\sin(\theta_i)$ and $\cos(\theta_i)$):

$$\text{Tr}[\rho_d^2] = \cos(\theta_3)^4 + \left(\cos(\theta_2)^4 + \frac{1}{4} (3 + \cos(4\theta_1)) \sin(\theta_2)^4 \right) \sin(\theta_3)^4 > \frac{1}{3}. \quad (18)$$

Depending on the ranges of θ_i one could either have a pure or mixed state that would satisfy equation (13).

A. Pure State Entanglement

One can see that for $\theta_i = \pi/2$, ($i = 1, 2, 3$), equation (18) would be satisfied and thus we would have a ρ_d which could be entangled. Therefore using equation (17) with $\theta_i = \pi/2$, ($i = 1, 2, 3$), we can define a pure state as⁴

$$\rho_d = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (19)$$

Using equation (6) we can then calculate the components of \mathbf{n} in terms of the twelve α and three θ parameters when ρ is given by $\rho = U \rho_d U^\dagger$ and $U \in SU(4)$. From this it would be possible to determine the actual parameter values that would generate the Bell states given in equation (8) by solving the fifteen simultaneous equations implied by the representation of \mathbf{n} in terms of the Euler parameters. Another, more instructive way is to apply successive unitary operations, $U \in SU(4)$, to the two qubit pure state given in equation (19) until one achieves the requisite Bell state.⁵

⁴ Remember that any 4 by 4 matrix with one element along the diagonal equal to unity and the rest equal to zero will be invariant under a $U(3)$ subgroup of $SU(4)$ and would therefore represent a pure state. The representation given in equation (19) however is ideally suited for the following calculations based on the group parameters remaining after evaluating the coset $SU(4)/U(3)$ (see [3] for more details) since it is those remaining 6 parameters (equally split between three λ_3 phases and three $\lambda_{(i-1)^2+1}$ ($i = 2, 3, 4$) rotations) that are explicitly contained in the pure state volume measure given in [3] which parameterizes the space $\mathbb{C}P^3$ via the corresponding Fubini-Study metric (see [10, 11] for the $SU(3)$ case) which directly acts upon the $\rho_{\{1,1\}}$ element. This pure state representation is also consistent with the generalized ρ_d , used in [1, 2] given previously.

⁵ Because of the $U(3)$ invariance of the two qubit pure state given in equation (19), we only have to look at those operations in the coset $SU(4)/U(3)$ which we know from [3] to be represented by

$$e^{i\lambda_3 \alpha_1} e^{i\lambda_2 \alpha_2} e^{i\lambda_3 \alpha_3} e^{i\lambda_5 \alpha_4} e^{i\lambda_3 \alpha_5} e^{i\lambda_{10} \alpha_6}$$

but it is instructive to see, through the use of the full group $SU(4)$, that only those operations generated from the set $\{\lambda_2, \lambda_5, \lambda_{10}\}$ yield pure state entanglement.

1. Bell States One and Two

To begin, we first act upon our pure state with the group operations,

$$U = e^{i\lambda_{10}\alpha} \text{ and } U^\dagger = e^{-i\lambda_{10}\alpha}, \quad (20)$$

yielding

$$\rho = U\rho_d U^\dagger = e^{i\lambda_{10}\alpha}\rho_d e^{-i\lambda_{10}\alpha}, \quad (21)$$

which in matrix notation is

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\alpha) & 0 & 0 & \sin(\alpha) \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -\sin(\alpha) & 0 & 0 & \cos(\alpha) \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\alpha) & 0 & 0 & -\sin(\alpha) \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \sin(\alpha) & 0 & 0 & \cos(\alpha) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\alpha)^2 & 0 & 0 & -\cos(\alpha)\sin(\alpha) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\cos(\alpha)\sin(\alpha) & 0 & 0 & \sin(\alpha)^2 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Taking the partial transpose of the above density matrix yields

$$\rho^{pt} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\alpha)^2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\cos(\alpha)\sin(\alpha) & 0 \\ 0 & -\cos(\alpha)\sin(\alpha) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \sin(\alpha)^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (23)$$

which has an eigenvalue decomposition equal to

$$\{\chi_1, \chi_2, \chi_3, \chi_4\} = \{\cos(\alpha)^2, -\cos(\alpha)\sin(\alpha), \cos(\alpha)\sin(\alpha), \sin(\alpha)^2\}, \quad (24)$$

and where the constant term in the characteristic polynomial is⁶

$$\text{Det}(\rho^{pt} - \mathbb{1}_4 * \chi) \rightarrow -\cos(\alpha)^4 \sin(\alpha)^4. \quad (25)$$

Recalling that α varies from 0 to $\pi/2$ we can see that for $0 < \alpha < \frac{\pi}{2}$ we have an entangled density matrix ρ . In particular we can see that if $\alpha = \pi/4$ we generate the second Bell state

$$\begin{aligned} \rho\left(\alpha = \frac{\pi}{4}\right) &= \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\frac{\pi}{4})^2 & 0 & 0 & -\cos(\frac{\pi}{4})\sin(\frac{\pi}{4}) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\cos(\frac{\pi}{4})\sin(\frac{\pi}{4}) & 0 & 0 & \sin(\frac{\pi}{4})^2 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Now, in general, if we use the Euler angle parameterization of $SU(4)$ given in [1] and take the most general $U \in SU(4)$ to be given as

$$\begin{aligned} U &= U(\alpha_1, 0, \alpha_3, 0, \alpha_5, \alpha_6, \alpha_7, 0, \alpha_9, 0, \alpha_{11}, 0, \alpha_{13}, \alpha_{14}, \alpha_{15}) \\ &= e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_1} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_3} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_5} e^{i\lambda_{10}\alpha_6} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_7} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_9} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_{11}} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_{13}} e^{i\lambda_8\alpha_{14}} e^{i\lambda_{15}\alpha_{15}}, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

⁶ The constant term is just the zeroth order coefficient of χ in the characteristic equation.

we would then have a density matrix equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= U \rho_d U^\dagger \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\alpha_6)^2 & 0 & 0 & -e^{i(\alpha_1+\alpha_3+\alpha_5)} \cos(\alpha_6) \sin(\alpha_6) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -e^{-i(\alpha_1+\alpha_3+\alpha_5)} \cos(\alpha_6) \sin(\alpha_6) & 0 & 0 \\ -e^{-i(\alpha_1+\alpha_3+\alpha_5)} \cos(\alpha_6) \sin(\alpha_6) & 0 & 0 & \sin(\alpha_6)^2 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

whose partial transpose is

$$\rho^{pt} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\alpha_6)^2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -e^{-i(\alpha_1+\alpha_3+\alpha_5)} \cos(\alpha_6) \sin(\alpha_6) & 0 \\ 0 & -e^{i(\alpha_1+\alpha_3+\alpha_5)} \cos(\alpha_6) \sin(\alpha_6) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \sin(\alpha_6)^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (29)$$

which yields an eigenvalue decomposition and a constant term in the characteristic polynomial equivalent to equations (24) and (25) but that does not generate the second Bell state when $\alpha_6 = \pi/4$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho\left(\alpha_6 = \frac{\pi}{4}\right) &= \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\frac{\pi}{4})^2 & 0 & 0 & -e^{i(\alpha_1+\alpha_3+\alpha_5)} \cos(\frac{\pi}{4}) \sin(\frac{\pi}{4}) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -e^{-i(\alpha_1+\alpha_3+\alpha_5)} \cos(\frac{\pi}{4}) \sin(\frac{\pi}{4}) & 0 & 0 \\ -e^{-i(\alpha_1+\alpha_3+\alpha_5)} \cos(\frac{\pi}{4}) \sin(\frac{\pi}{4}) & 0 & 0 & \sin(\frac{\pi}{4})^2 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2}e^{i(\alpha_1+\alpha_3+\alpha_5)} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}e^{-i(\alpha_1+\alpha_3+\alpha_5)} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

What we would have, on the other hand, is the following. Define $\alpha_1 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_5 = \beta$, where $0 \leq \beta \leq 5\pi$ since α_1 runs from 0 to π and α_3 and α_5 each run from 0 to 2π .⁷ Then

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\pm i(\alpha_1+\alpha_3+\alpha_5)} &= e^{\pm i\beta} \\ &= \cos(\beta) \pm i \sin(\beta) \\ &= -1 \text{ when } \beta = \pi, 3\pi, 5\pi \\ &= 1 \text{ when } \beta = 0, 2\pi, 4\pi. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Thus when $\alpha_1 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_5 = \pi, 3\pi$, or 5π we get the first Bell state and when $\alpha_1 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_5 = 0, 2\pi$, or 4π we get the second Bell state. Intermediate values of $\alpha_1 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_5$ can be equated to ‘‘intermediate’’ Bell states; states which have an equivalent density matrix representation as the first and second Bell state, but which are *not* equal to any type of *convex sum* of said Bell states.

Now if, instead of equation (20) we were to choose

$$U = e^{i\lambda_2\alpha} \text{ or } U = e^{i\lambda_5\alpha} \quad (32)$$

and apply it to ρ_d (as in equation (21)) we would not generate the other two Bell states, or for that matter any entangled density matrix ρ , even with the most general U (as in equation (27)). The question now is, what combination of the exponentiation of λ_2 with λ_5 , and/or λ_{10} will entangle the pure state density matrix ρ_d yielding the other two Bell states. It is to this question we now proceed.

2. Bell States Three and Four

To begin, we first act upon our pure state with the group operations,

$$U = e^{i\lambda_5\mu} e^{i\lambda_2\nu} \text{ and } U^\dagger = e^{-i\lambda_2\nu} e^{-i\lambda_5\mu}, \quad (33)$$

⁷ We are now using the *covering* ranges for $SU(4)$, defined in [1].

yielding

$$\rho = U\rho_d U^\dagger = e^{i\lambda_5\mu} e^{i\lambda_2\nu} \rho_d e^{-i\lambda_2\nu} e^{-i\lambda_5\mu}, \quad (34)$$

which in matrix notation is⁸

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\mu)\cos(\nu) & \cos(\mu)\sin(\nu) & \sin(\mu) & 0 \\ -\sin(\nu) & \cos(\nu) & 0 & 0 \\ -\cos(\nu)\sin(\mu) & -\sin(\mu)\sin(\nu) & \cos(\mu) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\mu)\cos(\nu) & \sin(\nu) & \cos(\nu)\sin(\mu) & 0 \\ -\cos(\mu)\sin(\nu) & \cos(\nu) & -\sin(\mu)\sin(\nu) & 0 \\ -\sin(\mu) & 0 & \cos(\mu) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\mu)^2\cos(\nu)^2 & -\cos(\mu)\cos(\nu)\sin(\nu) & -\cos(\mu)\cos(\nu)^2\sin(\mu) & 0 \\ -\cos(\mu)\cos(\nu)\sin(\nu) & \sin(\nu)^2 & \cos(\nu)\sin(\mu)\sin(\nu) & 0 \\ -\cos(\mu)\cos(\nu)^2\sin(\mu) & \cos(\nu)\sin(\mu)\sin(\nu) & \cos(\nu)^2\sin(\mu)^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Now the above density matrix does not look like either of the remaining two Bell states; unless we demand that $\mu = \pi/2$. Then we get

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sin(\nu)^2 & \cos(\nu)\sin(\nu) & 0 \\ 0 & \cos(\nu)\sin(\nu) & \cos(\nu)^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (36)$$

which has the same form as the remaining two Bell states. As before, taking the partial transpose of the above density matrix yields

$$\rho^{pt} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \cos(\nu)\sin(\nu) \\ 0 & \sin(\nu)^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cos(\nu)^2 & 0 \\ \cos(\nu)\sin(\nu) & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (37)$$

which has an eigenvalue decomposition equal to

$$\{\chi_1, \chi_2, \chi_3, \chi_4\} = \{\cos(\nu)^2, -\cos(\nu)\sin(\nu), \cos(\nu)\sin(\nu), \sin(\nu)^2\}, \quad (38)$$

and where the constant term in the characteristic polynomial is

$$\text{Det}(\rho^{pt} - \mathbb{1}_4 * \chi) \rightarrow -\cos(\nu)^4 \sin(\nu)^4. \quad (39)$$

Recalling that ν varies from 0 to $\pi/2$ we can see that for $0 < \nu < \frac{\pi}{2}$ we have an entangled density matrix ρ . In particular we can see that if $\nu = \pi/4$ we generate the third Bell state

$$\begin{aligned} \rho\left(\nu = \frac{\pi}{4}\right) &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sin(\frac{\pi}{4})^2 & \cos(\frac{\pi}{4})\sin(\frac{\pi}{4}) & 0 \\ 0 & \cos(\frac{\pi}{4})\sin(\frac{\pi}{4}) & \cos(\frac{\pi}{4})^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Notice, if we had instead used

$$U\rho U^\dagger = e^{i\lambda_2\psi} e^{i\lambda_5\phi} \rho_d e^{-i\lambda_5\phi} e^{-i\lambda_2\psi} \quad (41)$$

⁸ Recall that since λ_2 and λ_5 do *not* commute, the other possible group operation $e^{i\lambda_2\nu} e^{i\lambda_5\mu} \rho_d e^{-i\lambda_5\mu} e^{-i\lambda_2\nu}$ will not generate this matrix. But, because $[\lambda_2, \lambda_5] = -[\lambda_5, \lambda_2]$, the subsequent work *after* this step will be similar for either $e^{i\lambda_2\nu} e^{i\lambda_5\mu} \rho_d e^{-i\lambda_5\mu} e^{-i\lambda_2\nu}$ or $e^{i\lambda_5\mu} e^{i\lambda_2\nu} \rho_d e^{-i\lambda_2\nu} e^{-i\lambda_5\mu}$.

as our initial starting point, we would have instead produced the following density matrix

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\phi)^2 \cos(\psi)^2 & -\cos(\phi)^2 \cos(\psi) \sin(\psi) & -\cos(\phi) \cos(\psi) \sin(\phi) & 0 \\ -\cos(\phi)^2 \cos(\psi) \sin(\psi) & \cos(\phi)^2 \sin(\psi)^2 & \cos(\phi) \sin(\phi) \sin(\psi) & 0 \\ -\cos(\phi) \cos(\psi) \sin(\phi) & \cos(\phi) \sin(\phi) \sin(\psi) & \sin(\phi)^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (42)$$

One can see that in order for this matrix to be equivalent to (36), one must demand that $\psi = \pi/2$, thus yielding

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos(\phi)^2 & \cos(\phi) \sin(\phi) & 0 \\ 0 & \cos(\phi) \sin(\phi) & \sin(\phi)^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (43)$$

For simplicity, we shall generalize this group operation and not the original $e^{i\lambda_5\mu} e^{i\lambda_2\nu}$ calculation.

Therefore, in general, if we use the Euler angle parameterization of $SU(4)$ given in [1] and take $U \in SU(4)$ to be given as

$$\begin{aligned} U &= U(\alpha_1, \frac{\pi}{2}, \alpha_3, \alpha_4, \alpha_5, 0, \alpha_7, 0, \alpha_9, 0, \alpha_{11}, 0, \alpha_{13}, \alpha_{14}, \alpha_{15}) \\ &= e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_1} e^{i\lambda_2\frac{\pi}{2}} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_3} e^{i\lambda_5\alpha_4} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_5} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_7} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_9} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_{11}} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_{13}} e^{i\lambda_8\alpha_{14}} e^{i\lambda_{15}\alpha_{15}}, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

we would generate the following density matrix

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= U \rho_d U^\dagger \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos(\alpha_4)^2 & e^{-i(\alpha_1-\alpha_3)} \cos(\alpha_4) \sin(\alpha_4) & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i(\alpha_1-\alpha_3)} \cos(\alpha_4) \sin(\alpha_4) & \sin(\alpha_4)^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

whose partial transpose is

$$\rho^{pt} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & e^{i(\alpha_1-\alpha_3)} \cos(\alpha_4) \sin(\alpha_4) \\ 0 & \cos(\alpha_4)^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sin(\alpha_4)^2 & 0 \\ e^{-i(\alpha_1-\alpha_3)} \cos(\alpha_4) \sin(\alpha_4) & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (46)$$

which yields an eigenvalue decomposition and a constant term in the characteristic polynomial equivalent to equations (38) and (39) but that does not generate the third Bell state when $\alpha_4 = \pi/4$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho\left(\alpha_4 = \frac{\pi}{4}\right) &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos(\frac{\pi}{4})^2 & e^{-i(\alpha_1-\alpha_3)} \cos(\frac{\pi}{4}) \sin(\frac{\pi}{4}) & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i(\alpha_1-\alpha_3)} \cos(\frac{\pi}{4}) \sin(\frac{\pi}{4}) & \sin(\frac{\pi}{4})^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} e^{-i(\alpha_1-\alpha_3)} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} e^{i(\alpha_1-\alpha_3)} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

What we would have, as before with the second Bell state, is the following. Define $\alpha_1 - \alpha_3 = \gamma$, where $-2\pi \leq \gamma \leq 0$ since α_1 and α_3 again run from 0 to π and 0 to 2π respectively. Then

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\pm i(\alpha_1-\alpha_3)} &= e^{\pm i\gamma} \\ &= \cos(-|\gamma|) \pm i \sin(-|\gamma|) \\ &= \cos(|\gamma|) \mp i \sin(|\gamma|) \\ &= -1 \text{ when } |\gamma| = \pi \\ &= 1 \text{ when } |\gamma| = 0, 2\pi. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Thus when $|\alpha_1 - \alpha_3| = \pi$ we get the fourth Bell state and when $|\alpha_1 - \alpha_3| = 0$ or 2π we get the third Bell state. Intermediate values of $|\alpha_1 - \alpha_3|$ can be thought of as ‘‘intermediate’’ Bell states; states which have an equivalent density matrix representation as the third and fourth Bell state, but which are *not* equal to any type of *convex sum* of said Bell states.

3. General Two Qubit Pure State Entanglement

The natural extension of the previous work is to look at the case when we use the Euler angle parameterization of $SU(4)$ given in [1] and take $U \in SU(4)$ to be given as⁹

$$\begin{aligned} U &= U(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4, \alpha_5, \alpha_6, \alpha_7, 0, \alpha_9, 0, \alpha_{11}, 0, \alpha_{13}, \alpha_{14}, \alpha_{15}) \\ &= e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_1} e^{i\lambda_2\alpha_2} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_3} e^{i\lambda_5\alpha_4} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_5} e^{i\lambda_{10}\alpha_6} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_7} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_9} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_{11}} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_{13}} e^{i\lambda_8\alpha_{14}} e^{i\lambda_{15}\alpha_{15}}. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

We would then generate the following density matrix (see ρ on next page). One can see immediately that in order to obtain the general form for Bell states three and four, α_2 and α_6 must be set to $\pi/2$ and zero respectively. Similarly, in order to obtain the general form for Bell states one and two, α_2 and α_4 must be set to zero.

Generally, though, the two sets of eigenvalues of the partial transpose of equation (50)

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\pm} &= \pm e^{\frac{-i}{2}(2\alpha_1 + \alpha_5)} \cos(\alpha_4) \cos(\alpha_6) \times \Delta, \\ \Phi_{\pm} &= \frac{1}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2} e^{\frac{-i}{2}(2\alpha_1 + \alpha_5)} \sqrt{\left(e^{i(2\alpha_1 + \alpha_5)} - 4\cos(\alpha_4)^2 \cos(\alpha_6) \right)} \times \Delta, \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

where Δ is

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta &= \left(e^{i\alpha_5} \cos(\alpha_6) \sin(\alpha_2) \sin(\alpha_4) + e^{2i\alpha_1} \cos(\alpha_2) \sin(\alpha_6) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad \times \left(e^{2i\alpha_1} \cos(\alpha_6) \sin(\alpha_2) \sin(\alpha_4) + e^{i\alpha_5} \cos(\alpha_2) \sin(\alpha_6) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

indicate that the phase parameter α_3 does not contribute. We claim that one only needs three rotations, and one *overall* phase in order to carry out a general entangling operation on ρ_d . This can be seen if one expands the constant term from the characteristic polynomial for this situation

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Det}(\rho^{pt} - \mathbb{1}_4 * \epsilon) &\rightarrow - e^{-2i(2\alpha_1 + \alpha_5)} \cos(\alpha_4)^4 \cos(\alpha_6)^4 \\ &\quad \times \left(e^{i\alpha_5} \cos(\alpha_6) \sin(\alpha_2) \sin(\alpha_4) + e^{2i\alpha_1} \cos(\alpha_2) \sin(\alpha_6) \right)^2 \\ &\quad \times \left(e^{2i\alpha_1} \cos(\alpha_6) \sin(\alpha_2) \sin(\alpha_4) + e^{i\alpha_5} \cos(\alpha_2) \sin(\alpha_6) \right)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

and defines $\eta = 2\alpha_1 - \alpha_5$ as the cumulative phase

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^0 &\equiv - \cos(\alpha_4)^4 \cos(\alpha_6)^8 \sin(\alpha_2)^4 \sin(\alpha_4)^4 \\ &\quad - 2e^{-i\eta} \cos(\alpha_2) \cos(\alpha_4)^4 \cos(\alpha_6)^7 \sin(\alpha_2)^3 \sin(\alpha_4)^3 \sin(\alpha_6) \\ &\quad - 2e^{i\eta} \cos(\alpha_2) \cos(\alpha_4)^4 \cos(\alpha_6)^7 \sin(\alpha_2)^3 \sin(\alpha_4)^3 \sin(\alpha_6) \\ &\quad - 4\cos(\alpha_2)^2 \cos(\alpha_4)^4 \cos(\alpha_6)^6 \sin(\alpha_2)^2 \sin(\alpha_4)^2 \sin(\alpha_6)^2 \\ &\quad - e^{-2i\eta} \cos(\alpha_2)^2 \cos(\alpha_4)^4 \cos(\alpha_6)^6 \sin(\alpha_2)^2 \sin(\alpha_4)^2 \sin(\alpha_6)^2 \\ &\quad - e^{2i\eta} \cos(\alpha_2)^2 \cos(\alpha_4)^4 \cos(\alpha_6)^6 \sin(\alpha_2)^2 \sin(\alpha_4)^2 \sin(\alpha_6)^2 \\ &\quad - 2e^{-i\eta} \cos(\alpha_2)^3 \cos(\alpha_4)^4 \cos(\alpha_6)^5 \sin(\alpha_2) \sin(\alpha_4) \sin(\alpha_6)^3 \\ &\quad - 2e^{i\eta} \cos(\alpha_2)^3 \cos(\alpha_4)^4 \cos(\alpha_6)^5 \sin(\alpha_2) \sin(\alpha_4) \sin(\alpha_6)^3 \\ &\quad - \cos(\alpha_2)^4 \cos(\alpha_4)^4 \cos(\alpha_6)^4 \sin(\alpha_6)^4. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

From the previous work it is obvious that only the parameters α_{2i} ($i = 1, 2, 3$) and η , the overall phase running from 0 to 2π , are needed to parameterize all entangling operations that can be done on an initial pure state (given in equation (19)). These three rotations and one phase thus can be used to parameterize the following manifold

$$\mathcal{M}_{E_{SU(4)}} = \frac{SU(4)}{U(3) \times U(1)_{SU(2)_\eta}} = \frac{\mathbb{C}P^3}{U(1)_{SU(2)_{2\alpha_1 - \alpha_5}}}, \quad (55)$$

⁹ We only need to look at the first 6 group operations of U because they are the ones that “parameterize” the coset $SU(4)/U(3) = \mathbb{C}P^3$ [3].

$$\rho = U \rho_d U^\dagger =$$

$$\left(\begin{array}{cccc} \cos(\alpha_2)^2 \cos(\alpha_4)^2 \cos(\alpha_6)^2 & -e^{2i\alpha_1} \cos(\alpha_2) \cos(\alpha_4)^2 \cos(\alpha_6)^2 \sin(\alpha_2) & \frac{-1}{2} e^{i(\alpha_1+\alpha_3)} \cos(\alpha_2) \cos(\alpha_6)^2 \sin(2\alpha_4) & \frac{-1}{2} e^{i(\alpha_1+\alpha_3+\alpha_5)} \cos(\alpha_2) \cos(\alpha_4) \sin(2\alpha_6) \\ -e^{-2i\alpha_1} \cos(\alpha_2) \cos(\alpha_4)^2 \cos(\alpha_6)^2 \sin(\alpha_2) & \cos(\alpha_4)^2 \cos(\alpha_6)^2 \sin(\alpha_2)^2 & e^{-i(\alpha_1-\alpha_3)} \cos(\alpha_4) \cos(\alpha_6)^2 \sin(\alpha_2) \sin(\alpha_4) & e^{-i(\alpha_1-\alpha_3-\alpha_5)} \cos(\alpha_4) \cos(\alpha_6) \sin(\alpha_2) \sin(\alpha_6) \\ -e^{-i(\alpha_1+\alpha_3)} \cos(\alpha_2) \cos(\alpha_4) \cos(\alpha_6)^2 \sin(\alpha_4) & e^{i(\alpha_1-\alpha_3)} \cos(\alpha_4) \cos(\alpha_6)^2 \sin(\alpha_2) \sin(\alpha_4) & \cos(\alpha_6)^2 \sin(\alpha_4)^2 & e^{i\alpha_5} \cos(\alpha_6) \sin(\alpha_4) \sin(\alpha_6) \\ -e^{-i(\alpha_1+\alpha_3+\alpha_5)} \cos(\alpha_2) \cos(\alpha_4) \cos(\alpha_6) \sin(\alpha_6) & e^{i(\alpha_1-\alpha_3-\alpha_5)} \cos(\alpha_4) \cos(\alpha_6) \sin(\alpha_2) \sin(\alpha_6) & e^{-i\alpha_5} \cos(\alpha_6) \sin(\alpha_4) \sin(\alpha_6) & \sin(\alpha_6)^2 \end{array} \right). \quad (50)$$

the volume of which can be found using the material from [3]

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{E}SU(4)}} &= V\left(\frac{SU(4)}{U(3) \times U(1)_{SU(2)_n}}\right) = V\left(\frac{\mathbb{C}P^3}{U(1)_{2*\lambda_3}}\right) = \frac{V_{\mathbb{C}P^3}}{2 * V_{U(1)_{\lambda_3}}} \\
&= \frac{\pi^3/6}{2\pi \times 2\pi} \\
&= \frac{\pi}{24}.
\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

What we have been able to derive in equation (56) is the volume of the manifold of all operations on two qubit pure states which produce entanglement. Since these operations act upon a pure state (again, see equation (19)), which is just a point in $\mathbb{C}P^3$ and thus of measure zero, one may conclude that, up to the volume of a measure zero set, the volume of the manifold of all operations on two qubit pure states which produce entanglement is equivalent to the volume of the set of all entangled two qubit pure states

$$\begin{aligned}
\{\text{Set of All Entangled Two Qubit Pure States}\} &\equiv \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{E}SU(4)} \\
V_{\text{Set of All Entangled Two Qubit Pure States}} &\equiv V_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{E}SU(4)}} = \frac{\pi}{24}.
\end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

This volume is less than the numerically estimated value calculated by Zyczkowski et. al. in [8](eq. 30) and referenced in [9] for the lower bound of the volume of entangled two qubit states (1-0.863) by approximately 6 one-thousandths.

Unfortunately, whereas our calculation was done with only pure states in mind, the Zyczkowski et. al. calculation was numerically done using a mixed state product measure defined on $U(N)$ and randomly chosen density matrices [8, 9] which satisfied the Peres-Horodecki criterion for separability [12, 13]. Therefore although a tantalizing conclusion, we must concede that until a more general calculation is performed using our mixed state product measure (defined in [3]) we cannot definitively state that we have calculated the exact volume of the set of all entangled two qubit pure states.

B. Mixed State Entanglement

Using common mathematical software, one can see that for $\theta_i \neq \pi/2$, ($i = 1, 2, 3$) equation (18) could still be satisfied *if*

$$\begin{aligned}
\sin(\theta_1) &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{32789757}}{12482}} \text{ and} \\
1 > \sin(\theta_2) &> -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{\frac{1 + \sqrt{\sin(\theta_1)^2 - \sin(\theta_1)^4}}{1 - \sin(\theta_1)^2 + \sin(\theta_1)^4}} \text{ and } 1 > \sin(\theta_3) > \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}
\end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned}
\sin(\theta_1) &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{\frac{785323439}{3}}}{37446}} \text{ and} \\
1 > \sin(\theta_2) &> -\frac{1}{3\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{\frac{9 + \sqrt{3} \sqrt{-1 + 28 \sin(\theta_1)^2 - 28 \sin(\theta_1)^4}}{1 - \sin(\theta_1)^2 + \sin(\theta_1)^4}} \text{ and } 1 > \sin(\theta_3) > \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}
\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} < \sin(\theta_1) &< \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{\frac{785323439}{3}}}{37446}} \text{ and} \\
\frac{79}{100} < \sin(\theta_2) &\leq -\frac{1}{3\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{\frac{9 + \sqrt{3} \sqrt{-1 + 28 \sin(\theta_1)^2 - 28 \sin(\theta_1)^4}}{1 - \sin(\theta_1)^2 + \sin(\theta_1)^4}} \text{ and} \\
1 > \sin(\theta_3) &> -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \sqrt{\frac{3 + \sqrt{3} \sqrt{-1 + 4 \sin(\theta_2)^2 - 4 \sin(\theta_2)^4 + 4 \sin(\theta_1)^2 \sin(\theta_2)^4 - 4 \sin(\theta_1)^4 \sin(\theta_2)^4}}{1 - \sin(\theta_2)^2 + \sin(\theta_2)^4 - \sin(\theta_1)^2 \sin(\theta_2)^4 + \sin(\theta_1)^4 \sin(\theta_2)^4}}
\end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

or

$$1 > \sin(\theta_1) > \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{32789757}}{12482}} \text{ and } 1 > \sin(\theta_2) > \frac{79}{100} \text{ and } 1 > \sin(\theta_3) > \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \quad (61)$$

or

$$\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{32789757}}{12482}} > \sin(\theta_1) > \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{\frac{785323439}{3}}}{37446}} \text{ and } 1 > \sin(\theta_2) > \frac{79}{100} \text{ and } 1 > \sin(\theta_3) > \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \quad (62)$$

or

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} < \sin(\theta_1) < \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{\frac{785323439}{3}}}{37446}} \text{ and } 1 > \sin(\theta_2) > -\frac{1}{3\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{\frac{9 + \sqrt{3} \sqrt{-1 + 28 \sin(\theta_1)^2 - 28 \sin(\theta_1)^4}}{1 - \sin(\theta_1)^2 + \sin(\theta_1)^4}} \text{ and } 1 > \sin(\theta_3) > \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}. \quad (63)$$

Therefore we could generate a ρ_d which could be entangled but would no longer be a pure state. Unfortunately, the fact that ρ_d is no longer a pure state also means that we would have to look at the most general $U \in SU(4)$ acting on ρ_d in order to determine which successive unitary operations $U\rho_d U^\dagger$ would produce entanglement. This is a rather lengthy and complicated calculation and is beyond the scope of this section.

What we can do though is make an educated guess as to the volume of entangled two qubit mixed states by noticing that it is a product of the volume of the 3-dimensional simplex of eigenvalues of ρ_d (with appropriate ranges) and the volume of the flag manifold $SU(4)/U(1)_{SU(2)} \times U(1)_{SU(3)} \times U(1)_{SU(4)}$.¹⁰ These volumes can be calculated by using the mixed state product measure given in [3] with the necessary ranges for the eigenvalues (given above) and the covering ranges for $SU(4)$ (given in [1]). Using this material we arrive at

$$dV_{E_{m,s}} = \alpha_s \Lambda_1^{s-1} \Lambda_2^{s-1} \Lambda_3^{s-1} \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^3 \Lambda_i\right)^{s-1} d\Lambda_1 \dots d\Lambda_3 \times d\left(\frac{SU(4)}{U(1)_{SU(2)} \times U(1)_{SU(3)} \times U(1)_{SU(4)}}\right) d\alpha_{12} \dots d\alpha_1. \quad (64)$$

A general (and rather naive) evaluation of this measure for our situation yields

$$V_{E_{m,s}} = \alpha_s \frac{(a_L^s - a_U^s) (b_L^s - b_U^s) (c_L^s - c_U^s) (d_L^s - d_U^s)}{s^4} \times \frac{\pi^6}{12} = \omega \frac{\pi^6}{12}, \quad (65)$$

where $\{a_U, a_L\}, \{b_U, b_L\}, \{c_U, c_L\}$ and $\{d_U, d_L\}$ are the squared values of the above maximal and minimal ranges ($\{d_U, d_L\}$ comes from $\Lambda_4 \equiv 1 - \sum_{i=1}^3 \Lambda_i$). Since the simplex measure is *assumed* to be non-zero, and using the work contained in [3] we can *hypothesize* that ω has the following bounds (dependent on the value of s and recalling that $\alpha_s > 0$ and $s > 0$)

$$0 < (a_L^s - a_U^s) (b_L^s - b_U^s) (c_L^s - c_U^s) (d_L^s - d_U^s) < 4^{-4s} (-1 + 4^s). \quad (66)$$

Notice that the right side of the above inequality approaches 0 when both $s \rightarrow \infty$ and $s \rightarrow 0$, thus we can conclude that the numerator of (65) will be < 1 and therefore, the value of ω (be it either > 1 or < 1) will be completely dependent on the explicit choice of the value of s .

The important point to recognize here is not the simplex calculations but rather the flag manifold volume. Through the Euler parameterization of $SU(N)$ and $U(N)$ given in [2, 3] we have been able to generate the appropriate representation of the ‘‘truncated’’ Haar measure which is crucial to any mixed state volume calculation. It is this factor which is not ‘‘user dependent’’; i. e. dependent on the initial distribution chosen for the $(N - 1)$ -dimensional simplex, and therefore not completely subject to disagreements between researchers studying entanglement.¹¹

¹⁰ Explained in detail in [3].

¹¹ Although disagreements in numerical values are found, they are mostly due to variations in the ranges of the $N(N - 1)$ parameters which define the measure (see for example [14] and references within).

III. QUBIT/QUTRIT ENTANGLEMENT

A. Pure State Entanglement

By following the same procedure as was done in the two qubit case, we can derive the manifold of operations that produce entanglement of an initial qubit/qutrit pure state

$$\rho_d = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (67)$$

via a $U \in SU(6)$ given in [2]

$$\begin{aligned} U &= U(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4, \alpha_5, \alpha_6, \alpha_7, \alpha_8, \alpha_9, \alpha_{10}, \alpha_{11}, 0, \alpha_{13}, 0, \alpha_{15}, 0, \alpha_{17}, \\ &\quad \times 0, \alpha_{19}, 0, \alpha_{21}, 0, \alpha_{23}, 0, \alpha_{25}, 0, \alpha_{27}, 0, \alpha_{29}, 0, \alpha_{31}, \alpha_{32}, \alpha_{33}, \alpha_{34}, \alpha_{35}) \\ U &= e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_1} e^{i\lambda_2\alpha_2} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_3} e^{i\lambda_5\alpha_4} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_5} e^{i\lambda_{10}\alpha_6} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_7} e^{i\lambda_{17}\alpha_8} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_9} e^{i\lambda_{26}\alpha_{10}} \\ &\quad \times e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_{11}} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_{13}} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_{15}} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_{17}} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_{19}} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_{21}} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_{23}} \\ &\quad \times e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_{25}} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_{27}} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_{29}} e^{i\lambda_3\alpha_{31}} e^{i\lambda_{15}\alpha_{33}} e^{i\lambda_{24}\alpha_{34}} e^{i\lambda_{35}\alpha_{35}}, \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

by taking the partial transpose of $U\rho_dU^\dagger$ and evaluating the corresponding eigenvalues through the Peres-Horodecki criterion.¹² Doing this work, which did not yield well to simplification, generates the following *hypothesized* manifold

$$\mathcal{M}_{E_{SU(6)}} = \frac{SU(6)}{U(5) \times U(1)_{SU(2)_\kappa}} = \frac{\mathbb{C}P^5}{U(1)_{SU(2)_\kappa}}, \quad (69)$$

where $\kappa \cong -2(2\alpha_1 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_7 + \alpha_9)$ is the cumulative phase.¹³ The volume of the manifold is

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\mathcal{M}_{E_{SU(6)}}} &= V\left(\frac{SU(6)}{U(5) \times U(1)_{SU(2)_\kappa}}\right) = \frac{V_{\mathbb{C}P^5}}{10 * V_{U(1)_{\lambda_3}}} \\ &= \frac{\pi^5}{5! * 20\pi^4} \\ &= \frac{\pi}{2400}. \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

If we make the same argument for the volume of this manifold to be equivalent to the volume of entangled qubit/qutrit pure states, as we did in the two qubit case, then, in this case, our values are within the ranges specified in [8, 9] but since we do not include the possibility of bound entangled states (states which are entangled, but which have positive partial transposes) we must concede that our value given in equation (70) is probably too small.

B. Mixed State Entanglement

Again, as in the two qubit case, one can see that for a general ρ_d for a qubit/qutrit system [2]

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_d &= \text{diag}\{\sin(\theta_1)^2 \sin(\theta_2)^2 \sin(\theta_3)^2 \sin(\theta_4)^2 \sin(\theta_5)^2, \cos(\theta_1)^2 \sin(\theta_2)^2 \sin(\theta_3)^2 \sin(\theta_4)^2 \sin(\theta_5)^2, \\ &\quad \cos(\theta_2)^2 \sin(\theta_3)^2 \sin(\theta_4)^2 \sin(\theta_5)^2, \cos(\theta_3)^2 \sin(\theta_4)^2 \sin(\theta_5)^2, \cos(\theta_4)^2 \sin(\theta_5)^2, \cos(\theta_5)^2\} \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

¹² We are forced to generate the six eigenvalue equations rather than evaluate the constant term from the characteristic polynomial because in this case we have two eigenvalues equal to zero thus negating the constant term's effectiveness.

¹³ After taking into account the degeneracy in the eigenvalues, full simplification of the resulting 4th order characteristic polynomial was not possible without making certain numerical assumptions. Thus, the actual representation of κ as a function of $\alpha_1, \alpha_3, \alpha_7$ and α_9 was not possible; thus the equivalence.

when $\theta_i \neq \pi/2$, ($i = 1, \dots, 5$) the generalization of equation (13) for the qubit/qutrit case [8, 9]

$$\text{Tr}[\rho^2] > \frac{1}{5} \quad (72)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}[\rho^2] &= \text{Tr}[(U\rho_d U^\dagger)^2] = \text{Tr}[\rho_d^2] \\ &= 1 - 2\sin(\theta_5)^2 (1 + \sin(\theta_5)^2 - \sin(\theta_4)^2 \sin(\theta_5)^2 + \sin(\theta_4)^4 \sin(\theta_5)^2 \\ &\quad - \sin(\theta_3)^2 \sin(\theta_4)^4 \sin(\theta_5)^2 + \sin(\theta_3)^4 \sin(\theta_4)^4 \sin(\theta_5)^2 - \sin(\theta_2)^2 \sin(\theta_3)^4 \sin(\theta_4)^4 \sin(\theta_5)^2 \\ &\quad + \sin(\theta_2)^4 \sin(\theta_3)^4 \sin(\theta_4)^4 \sin(\theta_5)^2 - \sin(\theta_1)^2 \sin(\theta_2)^4 \sin(\theta_3)^4 \sin(\theta_4)^4 \sin(\theta_5)^2 \\ &\quad + \sin(\theta_1)^4 \sin(\theta_2)^4 \sin(\theta_3)^4 \sin(\theta_4)^4 \sin(\theta_5)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

could still be satisfied. In this case then we would have for the entangled mixed state product measure (under appropriate ranges for Λ_i and α_i)

$$\begin{aligned} dV_{E_{ms}} &= \alpha_s \Lambda_1^{s-1} \dots \Lambda_5^{s-1} (1 - \sum_{i=1}^5 \Lambda_i)^{s-1} d\Lambda_1 \dots d\Lambda_5 \\ &\quad \times d\left(\frac{SU(6)}{U(1)_{SU(2)} \times U(1)_{SU(3)} \times U(1)_{SU(4)} \times U(1)_{SU(5)} \times U(1)_{SU(6)}} \right) d\alpha_{30} \dots d\alpha_1. \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

Another general (and again, rather naive) evaluation of this measure for our situation yields

$$\begin{aligned} V_{E_{ms}} &= \alpha_s \frac{(a_L^s - a_U^s) (b_L^s - b_U^s) (c_L^s - c_U^s) (d_L^s - d_U^s) (e_L^s - e_U^s) (f_L^s - f_U^s)}{s^6} \times \frac{\pi^{15}}{34560} \\ &= \omega \frac{\pi^{15}}{34560}, \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

where $\{a_U, a_L\}$ through $\{f_U, f_L\}$ are the squared values of the maximal and minimal ranges of Λ_i that satisfy (72). As before, the simplex measure must be *assumed* to be non-zero, therefore using the work contained in [3] we can *hypothesize* that ω has the following bounds (dependent on the value of s and recalling that $\alpha_s > 0$ and $s > 0$)

$$0 < (a_L^s - a_U^s) (b_L^s - b_U^s) (c_L^s - c_U^s) (d_L^s - d_U^s) (e_L^s - e_U^s) (f_L^s - f_U^s) < 6^{-6s} (-1 + 6^s). \quad (76)$$

Again we notice that the right side of the above inequality approaches 0 when both $s \rightarrow \infty$ and $s \rightarrow 0$, we can again conclude that the numerator of (75) will be < 1 and therefore, the value of ω (be it either > 1 or < 1) will be completely dependent on the explicit choice of the value of s . Also, as before in the two qubit case, the important point to recognize here is not the simplex calculations but rather the flag manifold volume.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have applied our $SU(N)$ and $U(N)$ parameterizations to the two qubit and qubit/qutrit system in order to explicit calculate the manifold of operations which entangle two qubit and qubit/qutrit pure states. We have also been able to give the volume of this manifold, as well as the *hypothesized* volume for the set of all entangled two qubit and qubit/qutrit pure and mixed states. In the pure state case, the values were within the ranges given by [8, 9] but in the qubit/qutrit case, because we did not take into account the possibility of bound entangled states (which do not appear in the two qubit case) our volume is *most likely* smaller than the actual volume for the set of all entangled qubit/qutrit pure states.

Work is continuing on the mixed state situation; explicitly in calculating the volume of the mixed state manifold without having to know the exact probability distribution on the $(N - 1)$ -dimensional simplex. Extensions of the pure state work to two qutrit systems is also ongoing.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Dr. M. Byrd for his editorial help on the various representational conventions for density matrices as well as Anil Shaji for invaluable assistance in calculating the various manifold volumes given here.

APPENDIX A: $SU(4)$ LIE ALGEBRA

From [1] we know that the Gell-Mann type basis for the Lie algebra of $SU(4)$ is given by the following set of matrices [5]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \lambda_2 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \lambda_3 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\lambda_4 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \lambda_5 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \lambda_6 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\lambda_7 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -i & 0 \\ 0 & i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \lambda_8 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \lambda_9 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\lambda_{10} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \lambda_{11} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \lambda_{12} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & i & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\lambda_{13} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \lambda_{14} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & 0 & i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \lambda_{15} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -3 \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A1}$$

Using these matrices one can then generate the various group operations given in section II. Similarly, in [2] one can see how to construct the $N^2 - 1$ elements of the $SU(N)$ Lie algebra necessary for general $SU(N)$ group operations.

-
- [1] T. Tilma, M. Byrd, and E. C. G. Sudarshan, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **35**, 10445 (2002).
 - [2] T. Tilma and E. C. G. Sudarshan, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **35**, 10467 (2002).
 - [3] T. Tilma and E. C. G. Sudarshan, LANL ePrint math-ph/0210057 (2002).
 - [4] M. Gell-Mann, in *The Eightfold Way*, edited by M. Gell-Mann and Y. Ne'eman (W. A. Benjamin, New York, 1964).
 - [5] W. Greiner and B. Müller, *Quantum Mechanics: Symmetries* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989).
 - [6] J. S. Bell, Physics **1**, 196 (1964).
 - [7] W. K. Wothers, Quantum Information and Computation **1**, 27 (2001).
 - [8] K. Życzkowski, P. Horodecki, A. Sanpera, and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 883 (1998).
 - [9] K. Życzkowski, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 3496 (1999).
 - [10] M. Byrd, LANL ePrint quant-ph/9902061 (1999).
 - [11] M. Byrd, J. Math. Phys. **39**, 6125 (1998).
 - [12] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. Lett **77**, 1413 (1996).
 - [13] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, LANL ePrint quant-ph/9605038 (1996).
 - [14] P. Slater, LANL ePrint quant-ph/0207181 (2002).