

# Sufficient conditions of entanglement for tripartite and higher dimensional multipartite qubit density matrixes

Zai-Zhe Zhong

Department of Physics, Liaoning Normal University,  
Dalian 116029, Liaoning, China. E-mail: zhongzaih@hotmai.com

November 30, 2018

## Abstract

In this paper we give the new sufficient conditions of entanglement for multipartite qubit density matrixes. We discuss in detail the case for tripartite qubit density matrixes. As a criterion in concrete application, its steps are quite simple and easy to operate. Some examples and discussions are given.

PACC numbers: 03.67.Mn, 03.65.Ud, 03.67.Hk.

It is known that in modern quantum mechanics, especially in the quantum information theory, to find the criteria of separability of density matrixes is an important task. The first important result is the well-known positive partial transposition(PPT, Peres-Horodecki) criteria[1,2] for  $2 \times 2$  and  $2 \times 3$  systems. Some related works, see [3-7]. About the criteria of separability for multipartite systems see [8-15], especially a well known result is the work of Rudolph[16]. As the simplest case of multipartite systems, the criteria of separability of tripartite qubit density matrixes are yet studied, e.g. see [10, 12], and the classification problem of tripartite qubit pure-states has been completed[17]. However, for multipartite qubit systems, the problems are very complex, we always hope to find some ways, which should be more simple and easy to operate, to ascertain the existence of entanglement for

multipartite qubit density matrixes, even if they only are sufficient conditions. Since there always are many known results about the separability for bipartite qubit density matrixes, then we should consider such a problem: Can the problems of multipartite qubit density matrixes be reduced, in some cases, to the problems for several bipartite qubit density matrixes? If we can accomplish this point, then we can ascertain the existence of entanglement for multipartite qubit density matrixes with the aid of various known results about bipartite qubit density matrixes. In this paper we give such a way, though we only give some sufficient conditions, by which we can ascertain the existence of entanglement in most cases.

The tripartite qubit states are most simple and important multipartite states for application, hence in the first place, we study in detail the case for tripartite qubit density matrixes. It is shown that the sufficient condition of entanglement of a tripartite qubit density matrix is that any one of several special reduced bipartite qubit density matrixes is entangled. In concrete application, its steps are quite simple and easy to operate. Some examples, discussions about conditions in theorem and corollaries, and about the problem of generalization to more high dimensional multipartite qubit density matrixes are given.

In this paper, we shall repeatedly use the definition of the separability of a (bipartite or multipartite) state  $\rho$ , i.e.  $\rho$  is separable if and only if  $\rho$  can be expressed by a convex sum that  $\rho = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \rho_{\alpha}$ ,  $0 \leq p_{\alpha} \leq 1$ ,  $\sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} = 1$ , where every  $\rho_{\alpha}$  is a product of the states of subsystems for any  $\alpha$ .

Let  $|i_A\rangle$ ,  $|j_B\rangle$  and  $|k_C\rangle$  ( $i, j, k = 0, 1$ ) be the standard natural bases, they span the Hilbert spaces  $H_A$ ,  $H_B$  and  $H_C$ , respectively. A tripartite qubit density matrix  $\rho$  as an operator acting upon  $H_A \otimes H_B \otimes H_C$  can be written as

$$\rho = \sum_{i,j,k,r,s,t=0}^1 [\rho]_{ijk,rst} |i_A\rangle |j_B\rangle |k_C\rangle \langle r_A| \langle s_B| \langle t_C| \quad (1)$$

where  $[\rho]_{ijk,rst}$  are the entries of matrix  $\rho$ . Now we define six  $4 \times 4$  matrixes  $\rho_{(A,B)}$ ,  $\rho_{(A,C)}$ ,  $\rho_{(B,C)}$ ,  $\rho_{(A,BC)}$ ,  $\rho_{(B,CA)}$  and  $\rho_{(C,AB)}$  as follows. First,

$$\rho_{(A,B)} = tr_C(\rho), \quad \rho_{(A,C)} = tr_B(\rho), \quad \rho_{(B,C)} = tr_A(\rho) \quad (2)$$

Next,  $\rho_{(A,BC)}$ ,  $\rho_{(B,CA)}$  and  $\rho_{(C,AB)}$ , respectively, are defined by

$$[\rho_{(A,BC)}]_{ij,rs} = [\rho]_{ijj,rss} + [\rho]_{ij(1-j),rs(1-s)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
[\rho_{(B,CA)}]_{ij,rs} &= [\rho]_{jij,srs} + [\rho]_{(1-j)ij,(1-s)rs} \\
[\rho_{(C,AB)}]_{ij,rs} &= [\rho]_{jjj,ssr} + [\rho]_{j(1-j)i,s(1-s)r}
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

**Lemma.**  $\rho_{(A,B)}, \rho_{(A,C)}, \rho_{(B,C)}, \rho_{(A,BC)}, \rho_{(B,CA)}$  and  $\rho_{(C,AB)}$  all are bipartite density matrixes.

**Proof.** Since  $\rho_{(A,B)}, \rho_{(A,C)}, \rho_{(B,C)}$  all are ordinary reductions of  $\rho$ , then lemma holds, we only need to make the proofs for  $\rho_{(A,BC)}, \rho_{(B,CA)}$  and  $\rho_{(C,AB)}$ .

In the first place, we assume that  $\rho$  is a pure-state,  $\rho = |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$ , where  $\Psi = \sum_{i,j,k=0}^1 c_{ijk} |i_A\rangle |j_B\rangle |k_C\rangle \in H_A \otimes H_B \otimes H_C$  is normalized, i.e.

$$\sum_{i,j,k=0,1} |c_{ijk}|^2 = 1 \tag{4}$$

We take two form bases  $|m_X\rangle$  and  $|n_Y\rangle$  ( $m, n = 0, 1$ ) and define

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_{(A/BC)} &= \left(\eta_{(A/BC)}\right)^{-1} \sum_{m,n=0,1} c_{mnn} |m_X\rangle |n_Y\rangle \\
\Phi_{(A/B\check{C})} &= \left(\eta_{(A/B\check{C})}\right)^{-1} \sum_{m,n=0,1} c_{mn(1-n)} |m_X\rangle |n_Y\rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where  $\eta_{(A/BC)} = \sqrt{\sum_{m,n=0,1} |c_{mnn}|^2}$ ,  $\eta_{(A/B\check{C})} = \sqrt{\sum_{m,n=0,1} |c_{mn(1-n)}|^2}$ , then  $\Phi_{(A/BC)}$  and  $\Phi_{(A/B\check{C})}$  both are normalized bipartite qubit pure states. From Eqs.(4) and (5) we have

$$\rho_{(A,BC)} = \eta_{(A/BC)}^2 \rho_{(A/BC)} + \eta_{(A/B\check{C})}^2 \rho_{(A/B\check{C})}, \quad \eta_{(A/BC)}^2 + \eta_{(A/B\check{C})}^2 = 1 \tag{6}$$

where  $\rho_{(A/BC)} = |\Phi_{(A/BC)}\rangle\langle\Phi_{(A/BC)}|$ ,  $\rho_{(A/B\check{C})} = |\Phi_{(A/B\check{C})}\rangle\langle\Phi_{(A/B\check{C})}|$ . Since  $\rho_{(A/BC)}$  and  $\rho_{(A/B\check{C})}$  both are bipartite pure-states,  $\rho_{(A,BC)}$  is a bipartite density matrix (a mixed-state).

Secondly, if  $\rho$  is a mixed-state and the expression  $\rho = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \rho_{\alpha}$  has been given, where every  $\rho_{\alpha}$  is a pure-state with probability  $p_{\alpha}$ , then we can obtain  $\eta_{\alpha(A,BC)}, \rho_{\alpha(A/BC)}, \eta_{\alpha(A/B\check{C})}$  and  $\rho_{\alpha(A/B\check{C})}$  for every  $\rho_{\alpha}$ . From Eq.(5), we have

$$\rho_{(A,BC)} = \sum_{\alpha} \left( \zeta_{\alpha(A/BC)} \rho_{\alpha(A/BC)} + \zeta_{\alpha(A/B\check{C})} \rho_{\alpha(A/B\check{C})} \right) \tag{7}$$

where  $\zeta_{\alpha(A/BC)} = p_\alpha \eta_{\alpha(A/BC)}^2$ ,  $\zeta_{\alpha(A/B\check{C})} = p_\alpha \eta_{\alpha(A/B\check{C})}^2$ ,  $\sum_\alpha \left( \zeta_{\alpha(A/BC)} + \zeta_{\alpha(A/B\check{C})} \right) = 1$ . Since all  $\rho_{\alpha(A/BC)}, \rho_{\alpha(A/B\check{C})}$  are bipartite qubit density matrixes,  $\rho_{(A,BC)}$  is a bipartite qubit density matrix (a mixed state). Similarly, we can prove the cases for  $\rho_{(B,CA)}$  and  $\rho_{(C,AB)}$ . **QED**

From the above lemma we know that  $\rho_{(A,BC)}, \rho_{(B,CA)}$  and  $\rho_{(C,AB)}$ , in fact, are yet some special reductions of  $\rho$ .

**Theorem (criterion of entanglement).** If any one of six bipartite qubit density matrixes  $\rho_{(A,B)}, \rho_{(A,C)}, \rho_{(B,C)}, \rho_{(A,BC)}, \rho_{(B,CA)}$  and  $\rho_{(C,AB)}$  is entangled, then the tripartite qubit density matrix  $\rho$  is entangled.

**Proof.** In order to prove this theorem, we only need to prove that if  $\rho$  is separable, then six bipartite qubit density matrixes  $\rho_{(A,B)}, \rho_{(A,C)}, \rho_{(B,C)}, \rho_{(A,BC)}, \rho_{(B,CA)}$  and  $\rho_{(C,AB)}$  all must be separable.

In the first place, we prove that it is true when  $\rho$  is a pure-state. Suppose that  $\rho = |\Psi_A\rangle\langle\Psi_A| \otimes |\Psi_B\rangle\langle\Psi_B| \otimes |\Psi_C\rangle\langle\Psi_C|$ , where  $\Psi_A \equiv a_0 |0_A\rangle + a_1 |1_A\rangle$ ,  $\Psi_B \equiv b_0 |0_B\rangle + b_1 |1_B\rangle$ ,  $\Psi_C \equiv c_0 |0_C\rangle + c_1 |1_C\rangle$ , and  $|a_0|^2 + |a_1|^2 = |b_0|^2 + |b_1|^2 = |c_0|^2 + |c_1|^2 = 1$ , then  $\rho_{(A,B)} = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B$ ,  $\rho_{(B,C)} = \rho_B \otimes \rho_C$ ,  $\rho_{(A,C)} = \rho_A \otimes \rho_C$ , i.e.  $\rho_{(A,B)}, \rho_{(B,C)}$  and  $\rho_{(A,C)}$  are separable. In addition, by a directly calculation we find the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{(A,BC)} &= \rho_A \otimes \omega_{BC}, \quad \omega_{BC} = \begin{bmatrix} |b_0|^2 & \gamma_C b_0 b_1^* \\ \gamma_C b_0^* b_1 & |b_1|^2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \gamma_C = 2 \operatorname{Re}(c_0 c_1^*) \\ \rho_{(B,CA)} &= \rho_B \otimes \omega_{CA}, \quad \omega_{CA} = \begin{bmatrix} |c_0|^2 & \gamma_A c_0 c_1^* \\ \gamma_A c_0^* c_1 & |c_1|^2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \gamma_A = 2 \operatorname{Re}(a_0 a_1^*) \\ \rho_{(C,AB)} &= \rho_C \otimes \omega_{AB}, \quad \omega_{AB} = \begin{bmatrix} |a_0|^2 & \gamma_B a_0 a_1^* \\ \gamma_B a_0^* a_1 & |a_1|^2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \gamma_B = 2 \operatorname{Re}(b_0 b_1^*) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where  $\operatorname{Re}(z)$  is the real part of a complex number  $z$ ,  $\operatorname{Re}(z) = \frac{1}{2}(z + z^*)$ . Obviously,  $\omega_{BC}, \omega_{CA}$  and  $\omega_{AB}$  all are bipartite qubit density matrixes. Therefore  $\rho_{(A,BC)}, \rho_{(B,CA)}$  and  $\rho_{(C,AB)}$  all must be separable.

Next, we discuss the case of mixed states. Suppose that  $\rho$  is separable mixed-state, i.e. there is a decomposition of  $\rho$  as  $\rho = \sum_\alpha p_\alpha \rho_\alpha$ ,  $0 \leq p_\alpha \leq 1$ ,  $\sum_\alpha p_\alpha = 1$ , and every  $\rho_\alpha$  is a separable pure-state. Then from the above discussions, all  $(\rho_\alpha)_{(\bullet, \bullet)}, (\rho_\alpha)_{(\bullet, \bullet\bullet)}$  ( $(\bullet, \bullet\bullet) = (A, BC), (B, CA), (C, AB)$  and  $(\bullet, \bullet) = (A, B), (B, C), (C, A)$ ) all are separable pure-states. From the def-

initions of  $(\rho_\alpha)_{(\bullet,\bullet)}, (\rho_\alpha)_{(\bullet,\bullet\bullet)}$  as in Eqs.(2) and (3), obviously we can obtain the following equations

$$\rho_{(\bullet,\bullet\bullet)} = \sum_\alpha p_\alpha (\rho_\alpha)_{(\bullet,\bullet\bullet)}, \quad \rho_{(\bullet,\bullet)} = \sum_\alpha p_\alpha (\rho_\alpha)_{(\bullet,\bullet)} \quad (9)$$

where  $(\bullet, \bullet\bullet) = (A, BC), (B, CA), (C, AB)$  and  $(\bullet, \bullet) = (A, B), (B, C), (C, A)$ . This means that the bipartite mixes-states  $\rho_{(A,B)}, \rho_{(A,C)}, \rho_{(B,C)}, \rho_{(A,BC)}, \rho_{(B,CA)}$  and  $\rho_{(C,AB)}$  all must be separable. Sum up, whether  $\rho$  is pure or mixed, if  $\rho$  is separable, then bipartite  $\rho_{(A,B)}, \rho_{(A,C)}, \rho_{(B,C)}, \rho_{(A,BC)}, \rho_{(B,CA)}$  and  $\rho_{(C,AB)}$  all must be separable, in other words, if any one of  $\rho_{(A,B)}, \rho_{(A,C)}, \rho_{(B,C)}, \rho_{(A,BC)}, \rho_{(B,CA)}$  and  $\rho_{(C,AB)}$  is entangled, then the tripartite qubit density matrix  $\rho$  must be entangled. **QED**

This theorem gives us a practical criterion (however they only are sufficient conditions, see below) for existence of entanglement of  $\rho$ , its steps are quite simple and easy to operate. As for whether one of six density matrix is or not entangled, which may be ascertained by any known way, say, by the PPT(Peres-Horodecki) criteria[1, 2]. Therefore, for instance, if we find any one partial transposition of  $\rho_{(A,B)}, \rho_{(A,C)}, \rho_{(B,C)}, \rho_{(A,BC)}, \rho_{(B,CA)}$  and  $\rho_{(C,AB)}$  has a negative eigenvalue, then  $\rho$  must be entangled.

**Example 1.** As a simple example of pure-state, we see the GHZ-state  $\rho = |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$ ,  $|\phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0_A\rangle|0_B\rangle|0_C\rangle + |1_A\rangle|1_B\rangle|1_C\rangle)$ . In this case  $\rho_{(A,B)} = \rho_{(A,C)} = \rho_{(B,C)} = \frac{1}{2}(|0_X\rangle\langle 0_X| \otimes |0_Y\rangle\langle 0_Y| + \frac{1}{2}|1_X\rangle\langle 1_X| \otimes |1_Y\rangle\langle 1_Y|)$ , they all are separable. However  $\rho_{(A,BC)} = \rho_{(B,CA)} = \rho_{(C,AB)} = \frac{1}{2}(|0_X\rangle\langle 0_X| \otimes |0_Y\rangle\langle 0_Y| + |1_X\rangle\langle 1_X| \otimes |1_Y\rangle\langle 1_Y|)$ , they all are entangled Bell's state, this shows that the GHZ-state is entangled.

**Example 2.** If  $\rho$  is a  $8 \times 8$  matrix whose entries are defined by

$$[\rho]_{ijk,rst} = xR_{ijk,rst} + \frac{1}{8}(1-x)\delta_{ir}\delta_{js}\delta_{kt} \quad (10)$$

where the real variable  $0 \leq x \leq 1$ , the nonvanishing entries of density matrix  $R$  are  $[R]_{010,010} = [R]_{011,011} = [R]_{100,100} = [R]_{101,101} = \frac{1}{4}$ ,  $[R]_{010,101} = [R]_{101,100} = [R]_{100,011} = [R]_{100,101} = -\frac{1}{4}$ . It is easily verified that  $\rho$  is a tripartite qubit density matrix. Therefore

$$[\rho_{(A,BC)}]_{ij,rs} = xS_{ij,rs} + \frac{1}{4}(1-x)\delta_{ir}\delta_{js} \quad (11)$$

where the nonvanishing entries of density matrix  $S$  are  $[S]_{01,01} = [S]_{10,10} = -[S]_{01,10} = -[S]_{10,01} = \frac{1}{2}$ , i.e.  $\rho_{(A,BC)}$  just is the Werner state[1, 18]. From [1]

we know that the partial transposition of  $\rho_{(A,BC)}$  has three equal eigenvalues  $\frac{1}{4}(1+x)$ , the fourth eigenvalue is  $\frac{1}{4}(1-3x)$ . Therefore when  $x > \frac{1}{3}$ ,  $\rho_{(A,BC)}$  must be entangled, this leads that  $\rho$  must be entangled. If we don't use the above way, this is not easily seen.

Generally, if a bipartite qubit entangled density matrix  $R$  is given, we can define the nonvanishing entries of  $\rho$  by any one of the following six ways:

$$\begin{aligned}
(1) \quad [\rho]_{ijj,rs} &= [\rho]_{ij(1-j),rs(1-s)} = \frac{1}{2} [R]_{ij,rs} \\
(2) \quad [\rho]_{jjj,rs} &= [\rho]_{(1-j)ij,(1-s)rs} = \frac{1}{2} [R]_{ij,rs} \\
(3) \quad [\rho]_{jjj,ssr} &= [\rho]_{j(1-j)i,s(1-s)r} = \frac{1}{2} [R]_{ij,rs} \\
(4) \quad [\rho]_{ij0,rs0} &= [\rho]_{ij1,rs1} = \frac{1}{2} [R]_{ij,rs} \\
(5) \quad [\rho]_{i0j,r0s} &= [\rho]_{i1j,r1s} = \frac{1}{2} [R]_{ij,rs} \\
(6) \quad [\rho]_{0ij,0rs} &= [\rho]_{1ij,1rs} = \frac{1}{2} [R]_{ij,rs}
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

then the tripartite qubit density matrix  $\rho$  must be entangled.

**Example 3.** In [19], a state considered (we only discuss the case of tripartite qubit state) is as

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho &= \sum_{rs=AB,BC,AC} p_{rs} |\Psi_{rs}\rangle\langle\Psi_{rs}| \\
|\Psi_{rs}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0_r\rangle|1_s\rangle + |1_r\rangle|0_s\rangle) \otimes |0_{rest}\rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where  $0 \leq p_{rs} \leq 1$ ,  $\sum_{rs=AB,AC,BC} p_{rs} = 1$ . In order to clarify that whether  $\rho$  is or not entangled, we consider  $\rho_{(r,s)}((r,s) = (A,B), (A,C), (B,C))$ . It is proved[18] that the form of  $\rho_{(r,s)}$  is as

$$\rho_{(r,s)} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{rs} & & & & \\ & \beta_{rs} & \frac{1}{2}p_{rs} & & \\ & \frac{1}{2}p_{rs} & \gamma_{rs} & & \\ & & & & 0 \end{bmatrix} \tag{14}$$

where  $\alpha_{rs}, \beta_{rs}, \gamma_{rs}$  are some real numbers and  $\alpha_{rs} + \beta_{rs} + \gamma_{rs} = 1$ . Here, there is no need to calculate the so-called 'concurrences'[20] of  $\rho_{(r,s)}$  as did

as in [19], but we can use the above criteria. In fact, the partial transposition of matrix  $\rho_{(r,s)}$  has four eigenvalues  $\lambda_{(1)rs} = \beta_{rs}, \lambda_{(2)rs} = \gamma_{rs}, \lambda_{(\pm)rs} = \frac{1}{2} \left( -\alpha_{rs} \pm \sqrt{\alpha_{rs}^2 + p_{rs}^2} \right)$ . It is impossible that  $p_{AB}, p_{AC}, p_{BC}$  all vanish simultaneously, this means that there must be at least one of three  $\lambda_{(-)rs} (rs = AB, AC, BC)$  which is negative, therefore  $\rho$  must be entangled. In view of physical point, it is true of course, since the state has contained some ‘entanglement molecules’[19].

**Discussion.** (1) It is a pity that the conditions in theorem only are sufficient, but not necessary condition for entanglement of  $\rho$ . In fact, for some  $\rho$  the six reduced matrixes all are separable, however  $\rho$  still are entangled. For instance, a state given in [8] is as

$$\rho = \frac{1}{4} \left( I - \sum_{i=1}^4 |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \right) \quad (15)$$

where  $|\psi_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0_A\rangle|1_B\rangle + |0_C\rangle|1_C\rangle)$ ,  $|\psi_2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|1_A\rangle|0_B\rangle + |1_B\rangle|0_C\rangle)$ ,  $|\psi_3\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0_A\rangle|1_A\rangle + |1_B\rangle|0_C\rangle)$ ,  $|\psi_4\rangle = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} (|0_A\rangle - |1_A\rangle)(|0_B\rangle - |1_B\rangle)(|0_C\rangle - |1_C\rangle)$ , in this case  $\rho_{(A,B)}, \rho_{(A,C)}, \rho_{(B,C)}, \rho_{(A,BC)}, \rho_{(B,CA)}$  and  $\rho_{(C,AB)}$  all are separable (it can be verified that they all satisfy the PPT conditions), however  $\rho$  is entangled[8,12].

Similarly,  $\rho_{(AC,BD)}, \rho_{(AD,BC)}$  (notice that there are several repeated, e.g.  $\rho_{(BD,AC)} = \rho_{(AC,BD)}$ , etc., hence we delete them). By a similar way we can define  $\rho_{(A,BCD)}, \rho_{(B,CDA)}, \rho_{(C,DAB)}, \rho_{(D,ABC)}$ , etc.. We can similarly prove that the above bipartite matrixes all are density matrixes, and we have completely similar theorem, etc.. By the similar way, in fact, we can obtain the more generalized results of separability and partial separability (hence the entanglement and the partial entanglement) of multipartite qubit density matrixes, they are discussed by us elsewhere[21].

## References

- [1] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. Lett., **77**(1996)1413.
- [2] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A, **223**(1996)1.

- [3] P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A, **54**(1996)1838.
- [4] P. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A, **323**(1997)333.
- [5] P. Horodecki, M. Lewenstein, G. Vidal, and I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A, **62**(2000)022310.
- [6] K. Chen, L. A. Wu, and L. Yang, Quan. Inform. Compu., **3**(2003)193.
- [7] A. C. Doherty, P. A. Parrilo, and F. A. M. Spedalieri, quan-ph/0308032.
- [8] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, T. Mor, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and B. M. Terhal, Phys. Rev. Lett., **82**(1999)5385.
- [9] S. Wu, X. Chen, and Y. Zhang, Phys. Lett. A, **275**(2000)244.
- [10] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, quan-ph/0006071.
- [11] B. M. Terhal, J. Theo. Compu. Sci., **287**(1)(2002)313.
- [12] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, quan-ph/0206008.
- [13] K. Chen, and L. A. Wu, Phys. Lett. A, **306**(2002)14
- [14] J. Bate, A. R. Plastino, M. Casas, and A. Plastino, quan-ph/0307167.
- [15] H. Heydar, and G. Björk, quan-ph/0308091.
- [16] O. Rudolph, quant-ph/0202121.
- [17] W. Dür, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A, **62**(2000)062314.
- [18] J. Blank, and P. Exner, Acta Univ. Carolinae, Math. Phys., **18**(1997)3.
- [19] W. Dür, Phys. Rev. A, **63**(2001)020303.
- [20] S. Hill, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett., **78**(1997)5022; W. K. Wootters, Phys Rev. Lett., **80**(1998)2245.
- [21] Z. Z. Zhong, quant-ph/0403173.