

Condition for unambiguous state discrimination using local operations and classical communication

Anthony Chefles

School of Physics, Astronomy and Mathematics, University of Hertfordshire, Hatfield AL10 9AB, Hertfordshire, UK

We obtain a necessary and sufficient condition for a finite set of states of a finite dimensional multiparticle quantum system to be amenable to unambiguous discrimination using local operations and classical communication. This condition is valid for states which may be mixed, entangled or both. When the support of the set of states is the entire multiparticle Hilbert space, this condition is found to have an intriguing connection with the theory of entanglement witnesses.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Bz, 03.67.-a, 03.67.Hk

It was discovered by Walgate et al [1] that one can perfectly distinguish between any pair of orthogonal, bipartite, pure entangled states without collective measurements. It suffices to use only local operations and classical communication (LOCC) between the parties who possess the component systems.

This discovery runs counter to some of our intuitions about entangled states. Part or all of the information in an entangled state will be stored in Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR)-type correlations [2] between the subsystems rather than in properties of the subsystems themselves. It would therefore be reasonable to expect that perfect discrimination among locally similar orthogonal states, which differ mainly in terms of their collective, EPR correlations, would require a collective measurement.

The discovery that this is not always the case has given rise to a considerable amount of activity devoted to exploring this phenomenon. Particular questions which have been raised include the following[?]: under what circumstances is perfect LOCC discrimination among orthogonal states possible? This relates to the ‘nonlocality without entanglement’ discovered by Bennett et al [3] and numerous interesting results relating to this problem have been obtained by several authors [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]. An intriguing, persistent theme here has been the relationship between perfect LOCC state discrimination and entanglement distillation.

Another issue that has been the focus of much attention has been LOCC discrimination among a set of non-orthogonal states. If the states are non-orthogonal, then perfect discrimination among them is impossible and we must settle for an imperfect strategy. One such strategy is minimum error discrimination. Virmani et al [10] showed that any two multiparticle pure states can be discriminated with minimum error probability using LOCC operations. An alternative discrimination strategy is unambiguous state discrimination, where the result is never incorrect though it may be inconclusive. These authors also considered the possibility that this set of states can be unambiguously discriminated with the minimum probability of inconclusive results by an LOCC measure-

ment. This was subsequently proven to be true for a pair of equally-probable pure states by Chen and Yang [11]. More recently, Hillery and Mimih [12] have investigated LOCC unambiguous state discrimination with certain restrictions placed on the permitted types of classical communication. Also, Horodecki et al [13] have obtained a necessary and sufficient condition for LOCC unambiguous discrimination among a complete set of orthogonal pure states.

All of these results beg the question: which sets of states can be unambiguously discriminated using an LOCC procedure? Even without the LOCC constraint, the linearity of quantum mechanics imposes restrictions on the kind of state sets for which unambiguous discrimination is possible. In particular, if the possible states are pure, and all states have non-zero detection probability, then they must be linearly independent [14]. We anticipate that, in general, the conditions which determine when a set of multiparticle states can be unambiguously discriminated with LOCC will be stronger than this and will relate in some way to the local nature of the measurement. Our search for such conditions could be impeded by the fact that LOCC measurements are notoriously difficult to characterise. At the time of writing, the structure of the set of LOCC measurements is effectively unknown. However, such measurements form a subset of the much simpler and completely characterised set of separable measurements. The main result of this paper is a theorem which exploits the simple form of separable measurements to derive a necessary condition for separable and therefore LOCC unambiguous state discrimination for any finite number of quantum states of an arbitrary, finite dimensional, multiparticle quantum system. This condition is then proven, in a constructive way, to be sufficient for LOCC, and therefore also separable unambiguous state discrimination under the specified conditions. Thus, the necessary and sufficient conditions for LOCC unambiguous state discrimination are identical to those for the broader and simpler class of separable measurements. Probabilistic LOCC implementation of separable quantum operations has also been considered in [15].

The remainder of this paper is devoted to exploring

some implications of this result. We find it to be equivalent to the condition for unambiguous state discrimination without the LOCC constraint supplemented by a subsidiary condition which exhibits the local nature of the measurement. It is also shown that there are curious links between LOCC unambiguous state discrimination and entanglement witnesses.

Prior to discussing the problem of LOCC unambiguous state discrimination, we shall find it to be helpful to give a reformulation of the conditions for unambiguous state discrimination not subject to the LOCC constraint. In the context of this paper, it is appropriate to refer to this as unconstrained unambiguous state discrimination.

The situation we consider here is as follows: we have a quantum system q with associated Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , which we take to have finite dimensionality D . The system is prepared in one of $M < \infty$ quantum states ρ_μ , where $\mu \in \{1, \dots, M\}$. We would like to determine unambiguously which state has been prepared.

It may be the case that we are only interested in obtaining a conclusive identification, with non-zero probability, for a subset of the M possible states. So, let Δ be the subset of $\{1, \dots, M\}$ for which the discrimination probability is required to be greater than zero for ρ_μ and $\mu \in \Delta$. Also, let M_Δ be the number of elements of the set Δ .

We require a measurement with $M_\Delta + 1$ outcomes: M_Δ of these correspond to the states which are to be positively discriminated and a further outcome signals an inconclusive result, ‘?’’. These requirements can be expressed in terms of positive, operator-valued measures (POVMs). We need M_Δ positive operators Π_μ and a further positive operator $\Pi_?$ such that

$$\Pi_? + \sum_{\mu \in \Delta} \Pi_\mu = 1_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad (1)$$

where $1_{\mathcal{H}}$ is the identity operator on \mathcal{H} . The POVM elements satisfy

$$\text{Tr}(\rho_\mu \Pi_{\mu'}) = p(\mu|\rho_\mu) \delta_{\mu\mu'}. \quad (2)$$

Here, $p(\mu|\rho_\mu) > 0 \ \forall \ \mu \in \Delta$ is the probability of detecting the state ρ_μ .

In order to obtain the conditions under which such a measurement is possible, we make the following definitions. Let \mathcal{R}_μ be the support [17] of ρ_μ and let $\mathcal{R}_{\bar{\mu}}$ be the support of $(\sum_{\mu' \neq \mu=1}^M \rho_{\mu'})$, that is, the sum of the $M - 1$ other density operators. Let us denote the orthogonal complements of \mathcal{R}_μ and $\mathcal{R}_{\bar{\mu}}$ by \mathcal{R}_μ^\perp and $\mathcal{R}_{\bar{\mu}}^\perp$ respectively. We have $\mathcal{R}_\mu \oplus \mathcal{R}_\mu^\perp = \mathcal{R}_{\bar{\mu}} \oplus \mathcal{R}_{\bar{\mu}}^\perp = \mathcal{H}$. Furthermore, let us denote the set complement of \mathcal{R}_μ^\perp by $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_\mu^\perp$. That is, $\mathcal{R}_\mu^\perp \cup \bar{\mathcal{R}}_\mu^\perp = \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{R}_\mu^\perp \cap \bar{\mathcal{R}}_\mu^\perp = \emptyset$. Here, \emptyset is the empty set. Finally, let $\mathcal{S}_\mu = \mathcal{R}_{\bar{\mu}}^\perp \cap \bar{\mathcal{R}}_\mu^\perp$.

A necessary and sufficient condition for unconstrained unambiguous discrimination among the M states ρ_μ , with non-zero detection probability for $\mu \in \Delta$, is that for all $\mu \in \Delta$,

$$\mathcal{S}_\mu \neq \emptyset. \quad (3)$$

To prove necessity, we see from Eq. (2) that for each $\mu' \in \Delta$, $\Pi_{\mu'}$ has an eigenstate, $|\pi_{\mu'}\rangle$, such that

$$\langle \pi_{\mu'} | \rho_\mu | \pi_{\mu'} \rangle > 0 \text{ iff } \mu = \mu', \quad (4)$$

for all $\mu \in \{1, \dots, M\}$. This implies that, for $\mu \in \Delta$, $|\pi_\mu\rangle$ is in both the sets \mathcal{R}_μ^\perp and $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_\mu^\perp$. It is thus in their intersection, and thus \mathcal{S}_μ . This implies that \mathcal{S}_μ cannot be the empty set or the set whose sole element is the zero vector. However, by definition, \mathcal{S}_μ cannot contain the zero vector. The reason for this is that the set \mathcal{R}_μ^\perp , being a vector space, contains the zero vector and so its set complement $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_\mu^\perp$ doesn't, and every element of \mathcal{S}_μ is, by definition, also an element of $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_\mu^\perp$. So, we see that \mathcal{S}_μ cannot be the empty set and this proves necessity.

To prove sufficiency, we note that for each $\mu \in \Delta$, if \mathcal{S}_μ is non-empty then it must contain at least one pure state. Let $|\pi_\mu\rangle$ be one pure state in \mathcal{S}_μ . This state is clearly also an element of both \mathcal{R}_μ^\perp and $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_\mu^\perp$, since \mathcal{S}_μ is the intersection of these sets.

Let λ be the maximum eigenvalue of the operator $\sum_{\mu \in \Delta} |\pi_\mu\rangle \langle \pi_\mu|$. The fact that this operator acts on a finite dimensional Hilbert space implies that it is bounded [16], and so $\lambda < \infty$. Consider now the POVM:

$$\Pi_\mu = \lambda^{-1} |\pi_\mu\rangle \langle \pi_\mu| \text{ for } \mu \in \Delta \quad (5)$$

$$\Pi_? = 1_{\mathcal{H}} - \sum_{\mu \in \Delta} \Pi_\mu. \quad (6)$$

Then we have

$$\text{Tr}(\rho_\mu \Pi_{\mu'}) = p(\mu|\rho_\mu) \delta_{\mu\mu'}, \quad p(\mu|\rho_\mu) > 0 \text{ for } \mu \in \Delta, \quad (7)$$

where $p(\mu|\rho_\mu) = \lambda^{-1} \langle \pi_\mu | \rho_\mu | \pi_\mu \rangle$. We know from Eq. (2) that $\langle \pi_\mu | \rho_\mu | \pi_\mu \rangle$ is non-zero. Also, the fact that $\lambda < \infty$ implies that $\lambda^{-1} > 0$. Taken together, these observations lead to the conclusion that $p(\mu|\rho_\mu) > 0 \ \forall \ \mu \in \Delta$ and this proves sufficiency.

Let us now bring these ideas to bear on the problem of LOCC unambiguous discrimination among $M < \infty$ multiparticle quantum states ρ_μ . Here, we have N quantum systems q_j , where $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. System q_j has associated Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_j , having finite dimensionality D_j . The Hilbert space of the composite system is the tensor product space $\mathcal{H} = \otimes_{j=1}^N \mathcal{H}_j$ and we shall denote the dimensionality of this space by $D = \prod_{j=1}^N D_j$. Each of the N systems is spatially separated from the others.

The states to be discriminated, ρ_μ , are states of this N particle system. The N parties who each possess one of the component subsystems are restricted to the use of local operations in their individual laboratories and classical communication between them in order to collectively unambiguously determine the state. This LOCC constraint will impose restrictions upon the form of the POVM elements Π_μ . While general, simple necessary and sufficient criteria for a POVM to be implementable by LOCC are not known at this time, one useful necessary condition [3] is that the POVM elements must be

separable. This means that they have to be of the form

$$\Pi_{\mu'} = \sum_{k=1}^K \otimes_{j=1}^N \Pi_{\mu'jk} \quad (8)$$

for some K , and where the positive operator $\Pi_{\mu'jk}$ acts upon the space \mathcal{H}_j . As before, $\mu' \in \Delta$. We may, without loss of generality, take $K \leq D^2$, which is finite. We will now use this expression to derive a necessary condition for LOCC unambiguous state discrimination which we will also constructively prove to be sufficient.

Theorem *A condition for unambiguous discrimination among M N -particle states ρ_μ , with non-zero detection probability for $\mu \in \Delta$, which is necessary for separable (and therefore LOCC) measurements and sufficient for LOCC (and therefore separable) measurements is that for each $\mu \in \Delta$, the set \mathcal{S}_μ contains an N -particle product state.*

Proof. We will prove necessity first. Substituting (8) into (2), we see that the requirement of unambiguous state discrimination can be expressed as

$$\text{Tr} \left(\rho_\mu \sum_{k=1}^K \otimes_{j=1}^N \Pi_{\mu'jk} \right) = p(\mu|\rho_\mu) \delta_{\mu\mu'}, \quad (9)$$

where $p(\mu|\rho_\mu) > 0$ for all $\mu \in \Delta$. Coupling this with the fact that $K < \infty$ implies that for each $\mu' \in \Delta$, there exists $k_{\mu'} \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ such that

$$\text{Tr} \left(\rho_\mu \otimes_{j=1}^N \Pi_{\mu'jk_{\mu'}} \right) = p'(\mu|\rho_\mu) \delta_{\mu\mu'} \quad (10)$$

for some $p'(\mu|\rho_\mu) > 0$. The eigenstates of $\otimes_{j=1}^N \Pi_{\mu'jk_{\mu'}}$ may be taken to be of product form. It follows from Eq. (10) that for each $\mu' \in \Delta$, $\otimes_{j=1}^N \Pi_{\mu'jk_{\mu'}}$ has a product state eigenstate, $|\pi_{\mu'}\rangle$, such that

$$\langle \pi_{\mu'} | \rho_\mu | \pi_{\mu'} \rangle = \tilde{p}(\mu|\rho_\mu) \delta_{\mu\mu'} \quad (11)$$

and $\tilde{p}(\mu|\rho_\mu) > 0$ for all $\mu \in \Delta$. This is a necessary condition for separable or LOCC unambiguous state discrimination. It is clear from this expression that, for $\mu \in \Delta$, $|\pi_\mu\rangle$ must be orthogonal to \mathcal{R}_μ^\perp and that it is therefore an element of \mathcal{R}_μ . The fact that $\tilde{p}(\mu|\rho_\mu) > 0$ implies that $|\pi_\mu\rangle$ cannot be an element of \mathcal{R}_μ^\perp . It must be an element of its set complement $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_\mu^\perp$. The product state $|\pi_\mu\rangle$ is an element of both \mathcal{R}_μ^\perp and $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_\mu^\perp$ and so it is also an element of their intersection \mathcal{S}_μ . This proves the necessity of our condition.

We shall now see that this is also a sufficient condition. Suppose that, for each $\mu \in \Delta$, \mathcal{S}_μ contains a product state $|\pi_\mu\rangle$. These states then satisfy Eq. (11) and may be written as $|\pi_\mu\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^N |\pi_{\mu j}\rangle$. Let λ_j be the maximum eigenvalue of the operator $\sum_{\mu \in \Delta} |\pi_{\mu j}\rangle \langle \pi_{\mu j}|$. Consider now performing a local measurement on the j th system

with $M_\Delta + 1$ outcomes, having the corresponding POVM elements:

$$\Pi_{\mu j} = \lambda_j^{-1} |\pi_{\mu j}\rangle \langle \pi_{\mu j}|, \quad \Pi_{?j} = 1_{\mathcal{H}_j} - \sum_{\mu \in \Delta} \Pi_{\mu j}, \quad (12)$$

where $1_{\mathcal{H}_j}$ is the identity operator on \mathcal{H}_j . All of these operators are positive. Following these measurements, the results are discussed among the N parties over classical communication channels. It is easy to see that if all parties obtain the same result ' μ ', then it follows that the initial state must have been ρ_μ . This will occur with probability $p(\mu|\rho_\mu) = \tilde{p}(\mu|\rho_\mu) \prod_{j=1}^N \lambda_j^{-1}$. For all $\mu \in \Delta$, this can be seen to be non-zero. The $\tilde{p}(\mu|\rho_\mu)$ are non-zero as a consequence of Eq. (11). Furthermore, the λ_j^{-1} are also non-zero because the $\Pi_{\mu j}$, being operators on finite dimensional spaces, are bounded. This implies that $\lambda_j < \infty$ and completes the proof. \square

Let us make some observations about this theorem. Firstly, it is interesting to see how the above condition for LOCC unambiguous state discrimination is stronger than that for unconstrained unambiguous state discrimination. If arbitrary quantum measurements are possible, then we know from Eq. (3) that the necessary and sufficient condition for unambiguous state discrimination is that for all $\mu \in \Delta$, $\mathcal{S}_\mu \neq \emptyset$. When the states are pure and $\Delta = \{1, \dots, M\}$, this is equivalent to the condition that the states are linearly independent.

However, the above theorem shows that, to perform unambiguous state discrimination by LOCC means, not only must each of these sets be non-empty, they must also each contain a product state. We have thus separated the condition for LOCC unambiguous state discrimination into the condition for unconstrained unambiguous state discrimination and a subsidiary condition which exhibits the local nature of the measurement procedure.

Notice that classical communication barely enters into the discussion. In fact, the measurement we constructed in our proof of the sufficiency part of the theorem only used classical communication to establish whether or not the discrimination attempt was a success. In particular, no local measurement on one system depended on the results of local measurements on other systems. This shows that if we are only interested in performing LOCC unambiguous state discrimination with some non-zero probability, and are not interested in optimality, then the significance of classical communication is limited to the collective establishment of success or failure. It has however been shown by Hillery and Mimih [12] that if we wish to perform optimal LOCC unambiguous state discrimination, then classical communication channels play a more significant role.

Let us now examine in more detail the \mathcal{S}_μ for $\mu \in \Delta$. The key property of presence or absence of product states in these sets suggests a connection with entanglement witnesses, which discriminate between product and entangled states [18, 19]. Recall that an Hermitian operator W is an entanglement witness iff, for every separable

state ρ_{sep} , $\text{Tr}(\rho_{sep}W) \geq 0$ and for at least one entangled state ρ_{ent} , $\text{Tr}(\rho_{ent}W) < 0$. In relation to entanglement detection, if any sets S_μ could be subspaces rather than more complex subsets of \mathcal{H} , then they would have a special status, as a consequence of the linearity of witness operators. However, as we have shown above, no S_μ contains the zero vector and so none of these sets can be subspaces of \mathcal{H} . So, instead we shall consider the sets

$$\tilde{S}_\mu = S_\mu \cup \{\tilde{0}\}, \quad (13)$$

where $\tilde{0}$ denotes the zero vector. There is an important set of circumstances under which the \tilde{S}_μ are indeed subspaces of \mathcal{H} . This is when the support of $\sum_{\mu=1}^M \rho_\mu$ is the entire multipartite Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . When this is the case, for any $\mu \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, no pure state can be orthogonal to both \mathcal{R}_μ and $\mathcal{R}_{\bar{\mu}}$. So, every pure state must be in at least one of the sets $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_\mu^\perp$ and $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{\bar{\mu}}^\perp$. This implies that $\mathcal{H} = \bar{\mathcal{R}}_\mu^\perp \cup \bar{\mathcal{R}}_{\bar{\mu}}^\perp \cup \{\tilde{0}\}$. From this, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{\bar{\mu}}^\perp &= \mathcal{R}_\mu^\perp \cap \mathcal{H} \\ &= \mathcal{R}_\mu^\perp \cap (\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{\bar{\mu}}^\perp \cup \bar{\mathcal{R}}_\mu^\perp \cup \{\tilde{0}\}) \\ &= (\mathcal{R}_\mu^\perp \cap \bar{\mathcal{R}}_{\bar{\mu}}^\perp) \cup (\mathcal{R}_\mu^\perp \cap \bar{\mathcal{R}}_\mu^\perp \cup \{\tilde{0}\}) \\ &= \mathcal{R}_\mu^\perp \cap (\bar{\mathcal{R}}_\mu^\perp \cup \{\tilde{0}\}) = \tilde{S}_\mu. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

That is, \tilde{S}_μ is the subspace of \mathcal{H} which is orthogonal to $\mathcal{R}_{\bar{\mu}}$.

Of particular interest are the projectors onto these subspaces, which we shall denote by P_μ . If LOCC unambiguous state discrimination is impossible, then at least one of the \tilde{S}_μ contains no product state. If these sets nevertheless contain a non-zero vector, which is the condition for unconstrained unambiguous state discrimination, then it follows that all states in these \tilde{S}_μ must be entangled. For any entangled density operator $\rho_{ent}^{\tilde{S}_\mu}$ whose support is a subspace of such an \tilde{S}_μ , we will have $\text{Tr}(\rho_{ent}^{\tilde{S}_\mu} P_\mu) = 1$. However, for any separable density operator ρ_{sep} with support on \mathcal{H} , we must have $\text{Tr}(\rho_{sep} P_\mu) < 1$. For any $\tilde{S}_\mu \neq \{\tilde{0}\}$ which contains no product states, we can easily construct a corresponding entanglement witness which detects the states in \tilde{S}_μ . Let

$$\gamma_\mu = \max_{\rho_{sep}} \text{Tr}(\rho_{sep} P_\mu). \quad (15)$$

Then the operator

$$W_\mu = 1_{\mathcal{H}} - \gamma_\mu^{-1} P_\mu \quad (16)$$

is an entanglement witness which detects all of the states in \tilde{S}_μ .

It is worth noting that, when unconstrained unambiguous state discrimination is possible and the S_μ are subspaces of \mathcal{H} , then the operators W_μ in Eq. (16) are always well-defined. When there is at least one vector in

\tilde{S}_μ besides the zero vector, then there is a product state which is non-orthogonal to it and so both γ_μ and P_μ are non-zero. It follows that W_μ is well-defined. The W_μ can then be used to give an alternative characterisation of the way in which the LOCC constraint tightens further the conditions for unambiguous state discrimination: given that unconstrained unambiguous state discrimination is possible, for it also to be possible using an LOCC procedure, it is necessary and sufficient that, for $\mu \in \Delta$, none of the W_μ can be entanglement witnesses. It is therefore possible that some of the work that has been done on the optimisation of entanglement witnesses [20] could be brought to bear on the issue of LOCC unambiguous state discrimination.

It is interesting to see what happens when the states we aim to discriminate among are pure. If $\rho_\mu = |\psi_\mu\rangle\langle\psi_\mu|$, $\Delta = \{1, \dots, M\}$ and the $|\psi_\mu\rangle$ span \mathcal{H} , then the space \tilde{S}_μ is spanned by the reciprocal state $|\tilde{\psi}_\mu\rangle$ corresponding to $|\psi_\mu\rangle$ [14, 21]. The existence of these states is equivalent to the linear independence of the $|\psi_\mu\rangle$ and therefore their amenability to unconstrained unambiguous state discrimination. It follows from the theorem that if we wish to unambiguously discriminate among them with an LOCC measurement, then the $|\psi_\mu\rangle$ must be product states. Furthermore, if the $|\psi_\mu\rangle$ are orthonormal, then $|\tilde{\psi}_\mu\rangle = |\psi_\mu\rangle$ and we obtain the result of Horodecki et al [13] that a complete set of orthonormal pure states can be unambiguously discriminated by an LOCC measurement iff they are product states.

To summarise, we have taken advantage of the fact that any LOCC measurement is also separable and separable measurements have a particularly simple form. We used this to obtain a necessary condition for LOCC unambiguous state discrimination by an LOCC, which we also proved, constructively, to be sufficient. For a large class of state sets we demonstrated an interesting connection with entanglement witnesses, in terms of which the LOCC constraint can be explicitly expressed.

It is interesting to view this in the context of previous work relating to perfect LOCC state discrimination [4, 5, 7, 8, 9]. Here, intriguing connections with entanglement have been revealed by many authors. The relevant issue has been entanglement distillation. However, it seems that unambiguous state discrimination subject to the LOCC constraint has a particularly direct connection with entanglement detection.

Acknowledgements

The author is grateful to the University of Hertfordshire for the award of a Postdoctoral Research Fellowship.

-
- [1] J. Walgate, A. J. Short, L. Hardy and V. Vedral, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85** 4972 (2000).
- [2] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky and N. Rosen, *Phys. Rev.* **47** (1935) 777.
- [3] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, C. A. Fuchs, T. Mor, E. Rains, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. A* **59** 1070 (1999).
- [4] J. A. Smolin, *Phys. Rev. A* **63** 032306 (2001).
- [5] S. Ghosh, G. Kar, A. Roy, A. Sen(De) and U. Sen., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87** 277902 (2001).
- [6] J. Walgate and L. Hardy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89** 147901 (2002).
- [7] S. Ghosh, G. Kar, A. Roy, D. Sarkar, A. Sen(De) and U. Sen, *Phys. Rev. A* **65** 062307 (2002).
- [8] Y.-X. Chen and D. Yang, *Phys. Rev. A* **66** 014303 (2002).
- [9] P.-X. Chen and C.-Z. Li, ‘Local distinguishability of quantum states and the distillation of entanglement’, LANL eprint quant-ph/0210139.
- [10] S. Virmani, M. F. Sacchi, M. B. Plenio and D. Markham, *Phys. Lett. A* **288** 62 (2001).
- [11] Y.-X. Chen and D. Yang, *Phys. Rev. A* **65** 022320 (2002).
- [12] M. Hillery and J. Mimih, ‘Distinguishing two-qubit states using local measurements and restricted classical communication’, LANL eprint quant-ph/0210179.
- [13] M. Horodecki, A. Sen(De), U. Sen and K. Horodecki, ‘Local indistinguishability: more nonlocality with less entanglement’, LANL eprint quant-ph/0301106.
- [14] A. Chefles, *Phys. Lett. A* **239** 339 (1998).
- [15] J. I. Cirac, W. Dür, B. Kraus and M. Lewenstein, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86** 544 (2001).
- [16] See any introductory functional analysis text, e.g. E. Kreyzig, *Introductory Functional Analysis with Applications*, (Wiley, 1978).
- [17] We take the support of a positive (semi-definite) operator to be the subspace spanned by its eigenstates corresponding to non-zero eigenvalues.
- [18] B. Terhal, *J. Theor. Comp. Sci.* **287**(1) 313 (2002).
- [19] D. Bruß, J. I. Cirac, P. Horodecki, F. Hulpke, B. Kraus, M. Lewenstein and A. Sanpera, *J. Mod. Opt.* **49** 1399 (2002).
- [20] R. A. Bertlmann, H. Narnhofer and W. Thirring, *Phys. Rev. A* **66** 032319 (2002).
- [21] A. Chefles and S. M. Barnett, *Phys. Lett. A* **250** 223 (1998).