

Infinite number of conditions for local mixed state manipulations

Gilad Gour^{1,*}

¹*Department of Mathematics, University of California/San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093-0112*
(Dated: November 6, 2018)

It is shown that a finite number of conditions are *not* sufficient to determine the locality of transformations between two probability distributions of pure states as well as the locality of transformations between two $d \times d$ mixed states with $d \geq 4$. As an example, an infinite, but minimal, set of necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of a local procedure that converts one probability distribution of two pure pair of qubits into another one is found.

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

Entanglement is one of the main ingredients of non-intuitive quantum phenomena. Besides of being of interest from a fundamental point of view, entanglement has been identified as a non-local resource for quantum information processing. In particular, shared bipartite entanglement is a crucial resource for many quantum information tasks [1] and therefore its quantification is very important. Pure bipartite entanglement is quantified *asymptotically* by the entropy of entanglement [2] and *deterministically* by a set of entanglement monotones [3, 4]. Nevertheless, *mixed* state entanglement is far more rich and lacks a complete quantification despite the enormous efforts that has been made in the last years [5]. Since in practice one usually works with mixed states, quantification of mixed state entanglement is extremely important for quantum information processing.

In this paper we show a surprising result on the number of measures of entanglement that are required to quantify the non-local resources of bipartite mixed states. An entangled pair of qudits (each of dimension d) is described by a finite dimensional density matrix ρ with d^4 elements. Therefore, a finite number of independent measures of entanglement (i.e. entanglement monotones) are required to quantify completely the non-local resources of ρ ; that is, there must be a finite set of entanglement monotones such that *any* measure of entanglement can be expressed as a function of these monotones [10] Yet, it is shown below that for $d \geq 4$ a finite number of measures of entanglement is *insufficient* to determine whether a transformation $T : \rho \rightarrow \sigma$ can be realized by means of local operations and classical communication (LOCC). That is, for *any* finite number of measures of entanglement, say $\{E_k\}$, there exist ρ and σ such that $E_k(\rho) \geq E_k(\sigma)$ (for all k) and yet ρ can not be transformed to σ by LOCC. As will be shown in the following, similar results hold also for converting one probability distribution of *pure* states to another.

For a given transformation, T , between two finite dimensional bipartite pure entangled states, there is a set of entanglement monotones that provide necessary and suf-

ficient conditions to determine if T is local (i.e. can be realized by LOCC). The family of entanglement monotones E_k ($k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, d-1$) which introduced in [4] were first defined over the set of pure states as

$$E_k(|\psi\rangle) = \sum_{i=k}^{d-1} \lambda_i, \quad (1)$$

where $\lambda_0 \geq \lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{d-1}$ are the Schmidt numbers of the $d \times d$ -dimensional bipartite state $|\psi\rangle$, and then extended to mixed states by means of the convex roof extension. For a pure state $|\psi\rangle$ these measures of entanglement quantify *completely* the non-local resources since all the Schmidt coefficients of $|\psi\rangle$ are determined by them. According to Nielsen theorem [6] the transformation between two bipartite states $T : |\psi\rangle \rightarrow |\phi\rangle$ can be performed by LOCC iff

$$E_k(|\psi\rangle) \geq E_k(|\phi\rangle) \quad \forall k. \quad (2)$$

This result has been extended by Jonathan and Plenio [7] to the case where the transformation T lead to several possible final states. That is,

$$T : |\psi\rangle \rightarrow D, \quad (3)$$

where $D = \{p_i, |\phi_i\rangle\}$ is a probability distribution of final states with p_i being the probability that T outputs the state $|\phi_i\rangle$. It has been shown in [7] that T is local iff

$$E_k(|\psi\rangle) \geq E_k(D) \equiv \sum_i p_i E_k(|\phi_i\rangle) \quad \forall k. \quad (4)$$

There are other sets of entanglement monotones, such as the concurrence monotones [8], that quantify completely the non-local resources of a pure state. However, the advantage of the entanglement monotones defined in Eq.(1) is that they provide *sufficient* conditions for the transformation T in Eq.(3) to be local. In the following we show that a finite set of entanglement monotones with this property does not exist (1) if T represents a transformation between two probability distributions of pure bipartite states, $T : D_1 \rightarrow D_2$, and (2) if T represents a transformation between two mixed bipartite states $T : \rho \rightarrow \sigma$.

*Electronic address: ggour@math.ucsd.edu

In order to prove the main result of this paper (theorem 1) we first consider a transformation between two probability distributions. Suppose Alice and Bob share a pure state $|\psi\rangle$ and then perform quantum operations (not necessarily local) represented by a transformation, t , that outputs the state $|\psi_i\rangle$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n_1$) with probability p_i . We then say that Alice and Bob share a probability distribution denoted by $D_1 = \{p_i, |\psi_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{n_1}$. Suppose now that for each i , if the transformation t outputs the state $|\psi_i\rangle$, Alice and Bob perform again quantum operations which are represented by the transformation T_i . We denote by $\{|\phi_j\rangle\}$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots, n_2$) all the possible outcome states such that each transformation T_i outputs the state $|\phi_j\rangle$ with conditional probability $q_{j|i}$. Thus, the transformation $T \equiv (T_1, T_2, \dots, T_{n_1})$ between the probability distributions D_1 and $D_2 \equiv \{q_j, |\phi_j\rangle\}_{j=1}^{n_2}$, outputs the state $|\phi_j\rangle$ with probability $q_j = \sum_i p_i q_{j|i}$. We start with the most simple, but non-trivial, case in which $n_1 = 2$ and both $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$ are 2×2 -dimensional pure states. We also take $n_2 = 1$; that is, the distribution $D_2 = |\phi\rangle$, where $|\phi\rangle$ is also a 2×2 -dimensional pure state.

For any entangled pair of qubits with Schmidt numbers λ_0 and λ_1 (i.e. $|\psi\rangle = \sqrt{\lambda_0}|00\rangle + \sqrt{\lambda_1}|11\rangle$) we define the parameter $x = 2\min\{\lambda_0, \lambda_1\}$. Note that $0 \leq x \leq 1$, and from Eq.(1) $x = 2E_1(|\psi\rangle)$; i.e. x measure the entanglement of $|\psi\rangle$. Moreover, any measure of entanglement, E , for a pure pair of qubits can be written as a function of x ; that is, $E(|\psi\rangle) = f(x)$. The function f is not necessarily continuous (for example, take $E(|\psi\rangle)$ to measure the Schmidt number of $|\psi\rangle$), but it must satisfy the following conditions:

- (i) Monotonicity: for $x_1 \geq x_2$, $f(x_1) \geq f(x_2)$
- (ii) Concavity: $f(\sum p_i x_i) \geq \sum p_i f(x_i)$
- (iii) Normalization: $f(0) = 0$ and $f(1) = 1$

Conditions (i) and (ii) are necessary for entanglement monotones [3, 6, 7] whereas condition (iii) is useful in comparison between different measures of entanglement so that for all measures of entanglement the Bell state has one unit of entanglement. Moreover, these three conditions are sufficient to prove the following simple two lemmas, which will be useful for later:

Lemma 1: $f(x) \geq x$

Proof: $f(x) = f(x \cdot 1 + (1-x) \cdot 0)$ and from conditions (ii) and (iii) we have $f(x) \geq xf(1) + (1-x)f(0) = x$.

Lemma 2: If $f(x_1) = f(x_2)$ for $x_1 \neq x_2$ then $f(x_1) = f(x_2) = 1$.

Proof: We assume that $x_1 < x_2 < 1$; thus, there is $0 < t < 1$ such that $x_2 = tx_1 + 1 - t$. From condition (ii) we have $f(x_2) \geq tf(x_1) + 1 - t$, and since $f(x_1) = f(x_2)$ we get $f(x_1) \geq 1$. From (i) and (iii) we have $f(x_1) \leq 1$ and therefore $f(x_1) = f(x_2) = 1$.

We are now ready to prove the following observation (proposition 1). For simplicity we will restrict our attention to probability distributions D_1, D_2 of initial and final 2×2 dimensional states with $n_1 = 2$ and $n_2 = 1$. The proposition is trivially applicable for higher dimensions and/or for higher n_1 and n_2 .

Proposition 1 For any finite number of measures of entanglement $\{E_k\}_{k=1}^s$ ($s < \infty$), there are probability distributions D_1 (with $n_1 = 2$) and D_2 (with $n_2 = 1$) such that

$$E_k(D_1) \geq E_k(D_2) \quad \forall k = 1, 2, \dots, s \quad (5)$$

although the transformation $T : D_1 \rightarrow D_2$ can not be realized by LOCC with certainty.

Proof: Let us denote by x_1, x_2 and y twice of the minimal Schmidt numbers of $|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle$ and $|\phi\rangle$, respectively. With these notations, Eq. (5) can be rewritten as

$$p_1 f_k(x_1) + p_2 f_k(x_2) \geq f_k(y) \quad \forall k = 1, 2, \dots, s, \quad (6)$$

where $\{f_k\}_{k=1}^s$ is a finite set of functions that satisfy conditions (i)-(iii) above. Thus, we would like first to find x_1, x_2, y and p_1 ($p_2 = 1 - p_1$) such that Eq.(6) is satisfied for all k . Now, the set $\{f_k\}$ may include the Schmidt function (i.e. $f(x = 0) = 0$ and $f(x > 0) = 1$). Besides the Schmidt function, for all the other functions there exist $x > 0$ such that $f_k(x) < 1$. Therefore, since the set $\{f_k\}$ is finite, there exist $y > 0$ such that besides the Schmidt function, $f_k(y) < 1$ for all k . We can also find $0 < p_1 < 1$ such that $f_k(y) \leq p_1$ for all k (besides the Schmidt function). Thus, by taking $x_1 = 1$, the inequality in Eq.(6) is satisfied for *any* value of $0 < x_2 \leq 1$. Note that even for the Schmidt function the inequality is satisfied. However, the transformation $T : D_1 \rightarrow D_2$ can not be realized by LOCC if $x_2 < y$. That is, the state $|\psi_2\rangle$ occurs with probability $p_2 = 1 - p_1 > 0$ and according to Nielsen theorem the transformation $|\psi_2\rangle \rightarrow |\phi\rangle$ can be realized by LOCC if and only if $y \geq x_2$. Thus, by taking $0 < x_2 < y$ we prove proposition 1 \square

In the above observation we see that finite number of conditions are insufficient to determine if a transformation between two probability distributions, $T : D_1 \rightarrow D_2$, can be realized locally. A natural question that presents itself is then: what are the sufficient conditions for T to be local? In the general case, the answer to this question appears to be complicated especially since it involves infinite number of conditions. Nevertheless, in the following proposition we provide sufficient conditions for the case in which both D_1 and D_2 denotes probability distributions of two 2×2 dimensional pure states.

Proposition 2 Let two distant parties share a probability distribution, D_1 , of 2 (initial) 2×2 -dimensional pure states $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$ with corresponding probabilities p_1 and p_2 , respectively. Let also D_2 be a probability distribution of 2 (final) 2×2 -dimensional pure states $|\phi_1\rangle$ and $|\phi_2\rangle$ with corresponding probabilities q_1 and q_2 , respectively. Then the transformation $T : D_1 \rightarrow D_2$ can be realized by LOCC if, and only if,

$$E_\mu(D_1) \geq E_\mu(D_2) \quad \forall 0 \leq \mu \leq 1, \quad (7)$$

where

$$E_\mu(|\psi\rangle) \equiv f_\mu(x) \equiv \begin{cases} x/\mu & \text{for } x \leq \mu \\ 1 & \text{for } x > \mu \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Note that $f_{\mu=0}$ is the Schmidt function and $f_{\mu=1}(x) = x$.

Proof: It is easy to see that the functions f_μ satisfy conditions (i)-(iii); that is, they are entanglement monotones. As such, the inequalities in Eq.(7) are *necessary* conditions that any local transformation T must satisfy. We will now show that they are also *sufficient*.

Denoting by x_1 and x_2 twice the minimal Schmidt number of $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$, respectively, we first note that according to Eq. (4) if $x_1 = x_2$ the condition $E_{\mu=1}(D_1) \geq E_{\mu=1}(D_2)$ is a sufficient condition for T to be local [7]. Thus, without loss of generality we take $x_1 > x_2$. We also denote by y_1 and y_2 twice the minimal Schmidt number of $|\phi_1\rangle$ and $|\phi_2\rangle$, respectively, and assume that $y_1 \geq y_2$. Now, if $y_2 > x_2$ we get $E_{\mu=y_2}(D_1) < E_{\mu=y_2}(D_2) = 1$; that is, the condition in Eq.(7) is not satisfied for $\mu = y_2$. Thus we have $x_2 \geq y_2$.

The most general transformation $T : D_1 \rightarrow D_2$ consist of two transformations which we denote by T_1 and T_2 . The transformation T_1 (T_2) on $|\psi_1\rangle$ ($|\psi_2\rangle$) outputs the states $|\phi_1\rangle$, $|\phi_2\rangle$ with conditional probabilities $q_{1|1}$, $q_{2|1} = 1 - q_{1|1}$ ($q_{1|2}$, $q_{2|2} = 1 - q_{1|2}$), respectively. Thus, the probabilities $q_{1|1}$ and $q_{1|2}$ must satisfy $q_1 = p_1 q_{1|1} + p_2 q_{1|2}$ (or equivalently $q_2 = p_1 q_{2|1} + p_2 q_{2|2}$). According to Eq. (4), T_1 and T_2 can be realized by LOCC (i.e. T can be realized by LOCC) if, and only if,

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &\geq q_{1|1}y_1 + (1 - q_{1|1})y_2 \\ x_2 &\geq q_{1|2}y_1 + (1 - q_{1|2})y_2 . \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

We now consider the three possible options:

(a) $x_1 > x_2 \geq y_1 \geq y_2$: in this case we take $q_{1|1} = q_{1|2} = q_1$. According to Eq. (9) the transformations T_1 and T_2 can be realized by LOCC. Hence, the transformation $T = (T_1, T_2) : D_1 \rightarrow D_2$ can also be realized by LOCC.
 (b) $x_1 \geq y_1 > x_2 \geq y_2$: in this case, according to Eq. (9) the transformation T_1 can be realized by LOCC for any value of $q_{1|1}$. On the other hand, the transformation T_2 can be realized by LOCC only if $q_{1|2} \leq q_{1|2}^{max} \equiv (x_2 - y_2)/(y_1 - y_2)$. Thus, the transformation $T = (T_1, T_2) : D_1 \rightarrow D_2$ can be realized by LOCC only if $p_1 + q_{1|2}^{max} p_2 \geq q_1$. By substituting the value of $q_{1|2}^{max}$, this condition can be expressed as:

$$p_1 y_1 + p_2 x_2 \geq q_1 y_1 + q_2 y_2 . \quad (10)$$

Now, it can be shown that this condition is satisfied by taking $\mu = y_1$ in Eq. (7).

(c) $y_1 \geq x_1 > x_2 \geq y_2$: in this case, according to Eq. (9), the transformations T_1 and T_2 can be realized by LOCC only if $q_{1|1} \leq q_{1|1}^{max} \equiv (x_2 - y_2)/(y_1 - y_2)$ and $q_{1|2} \leq q_{1|2}^{max}$. Thus, the transformation T can be realized by LOCC only if $q_{1|1}^{max} p_1 + q_{1|2}^{max} p_2 \geq q_1$. By substituting the values of $q_{1|1}^{max}$ and $q_{1|2}^{max}$, this condition can be expressed as:

$$p_1 x_1 + p_2 x_2 \geq q_1 y_1 + q_2 y_2 . \quad (11)$$

This condition is obtained by taking $\mu = 1$ in Eq. (7) \square

In the observation above the set of conditions given in Eq. (7) is *not* minimal. In fact, it is enough to require that

$E_\mu(D_1) \geq E_\mu(D_2)$ for all the *rational* numbers μ in the interval $[0, 1]$. The proof for proposition 2 will not change much because for any irrational number $\mu \in [0, 1]$, there is a series of rational numbers $\{\mu_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ ($\mu_n \in [0, 1]$) such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n = \mu$. According to proposition 1 there must be an infinite number of conditions and therefore the set of conditions in Eq.(5) with rational μ is countable and in this sense is minimal (but not unique). We are now ready to prove the main result of this paper:

Theorem 1 *Let $\{E_k\}_{k=1}^s$ be a finite set of entanglement monotones defined on $d \times d$ -dimensional bipartite mixed states. Then, for $d \geq 4$ there exist density matrices ρ and σ such that:*

- (i) $E_k(\rho) \geq E_k(\sigma) \quad \forall k = 1, 2, \dots, s$
- (ii) *There is no local procedure that converts ρ into σ (i.e. the transformation $T : \rho \rightarrow \sigma$ can not be realized by LOCC with certainty).*

Proof: The density matrix ρ is taken to be of the following form:

$$\rho = p_1 |\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1| + p_2 |\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2| , \quad (12)$$

where p_1 and p_2 will be determined later, and

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_1\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|00\rangle + |11\rangle) \\ |\psi_2\rangle &= \sqrt{\lambda}|22\rangle + \sqrt{1-\lambda}|33\rangle , \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where the Schmidt number λ is smaller than $1/2$ and will be determined later. The density matrix σ is taken to be the pure state:

$$\sigma = |\phi\rangle = \sqrt{\eta}|00\rangle + \sqrt{1-\eta}|11\rangle , \quad (14)$$

with Schmidt number $\eta < 1/2$.

Suppose now that Alice performs a projective measurement with projectors $P_0 \equiv |0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|$ and $P_1 \equiv |2\rangle\langle 2| + |3\rangle\langle 3|$. The result of her measurement yields the state $|\psi_1\rangle$ with probability p_1 and the state $|\psi_2\rangle$ with probability p_2 . Thus, any measure of entanglement must satisfy $E(\rho) \geq p_1 E(|\psi_1\rangle) + p_2 E(|\psi_2\rangle)$. On the other hand, $E(\rho) \leq p_1 E(|\psi_1\rangle) + p_2 E(|\psi_2\rangle)$ because if Alice and Bob forget the result of the measurement they end up back with the same state ρ . Thus, any measure of entanglement, E , must satisfies

$$E(\rho) = p_1 E(|\psi_1\rangle) + p_2 E(|\psi_2\rangle) . \quad (15)$$

Now, following the same lines of proposition 1, there exist values of p_1 , λ and η such that (1) $E_k(\rho) \geq E_k(|\phi\rangle)$ for all k and (2) $\eta > \lambda > 0$. We would like to show now that Alice and Bob can not convert ρ to ϕ by LOCC. For this purpose, we define a set of entanglement monotones similar to the one defined in Eq. (7).

For any given normalized measure of entanglement [11], E , we define a set of entanglement monotones as follows

$$E_\mu(|\psi\rangle) \equiv \begin{cases} \mu^{-1} E(|\psi\rangle) & \text{if } E(|\psi\rangle) \leq \mu \\ 1 & \text{if } E(|\psi\rangle) > \mu \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

where $\mu \in [0, 1]$ and the definition of E and E_μ for mixed state are given in terms of the convex roof extension. Since we assume that E is an entanglement monotone, it follows from Theorem 2 in [3] that the $\{E_\mu\}$ are indeed entanglement monotones for all $0 \leq \mu \leq 1$. Let us now take the measure of entanglement, E , given in Eq. (16) to be

$$E(|\psi\rangle) = \frac{4}{3}(1 - \lambda_{max}), \quad (17)$$

where λ_{max} is the largest Schmidt number of $|\psi\rangle$. Thus, for $\mu = \eta$, E_μ as defined in Eqs. (16,17) satisfies

$$E_{\mu=\eta}(\rho) = \frac{2}{3}p_1 + \frac{4}{3}(1 - \lambda)p_2 < \frac{2}{3} = E_{\mu=\eta}(|\phi\rangle). \quad (18)$$

That is, there exist entanglement monotone that quantify $|\phi\rangle$ with more entanglement than ρ . Thus, Alice and Bob can not convert ρ into σ by LOCC \square

Any finite dimensional density matrix, ρ , consists of a finite number of parameters, ρ_{ij} . This means that any measure of entanglement is a function of these parameters. Thus, there must be a finite number of entanglement monotones, say $\{E_k\}_{k=1}^s$, that quantify *completely* the non-local resources of ρ . That is, all measures of entanglement can be written as a function of these s entanglement monotones. Nevertheless, according to theorem 3, these measures of entanglement are not sufficient to determine whether ρ can be converted into σ by LOCC. A natural question is then arise: is there an *infinite* number of entanglement monotones that do provide the sufficient conditions for a transformation $T : \rho \rightarrow \sigma$ to be local? We generalize this question to include probability distributions of mixed states in the following conjecture:

Conjecture: A transformation $T : D_1 \rightarrow D_2$ between two probability distributions of bipartite mixed states

can be realized by LOCC iff $E(D_1) \geq E(D_2)$ for *all* entanglement monotones E .

The necessity of these conditions is trivial to prove though the sufficiency appears to be complicated to prove due to the complexity of mixed state entanglement. The conjecture above has been proved for the case where D_1 is a single pure bipartite state [6, 7] and in proposition 2 we have proved this conjecture for the case where D_1 and D_2 each is a probability distribution of two *pure* pair of qubits. If the conjecture above is incorrect for the general case, then entanglement would be insufficient to quantify non-locality in quantum mechanics. Since we have some examples with the flavor of “quantum non-locality without entanglement” [9], it would not be too surprising (though very interesting) if the conjecture above turns out to be incorrect.

To summarize: we have shown that infinite number of conditions (based on entanglement monotones) are required for determining the locality of transformations on a given $d \times d$ -dimensional mixed bipartite state (with $d \geq 4$) and on a given probability distribution of pure bipartite states. We have also presented a minimal set of infinite number of conditions that are required for determining the locality of transformations between two probability distributions of two pure pair of qubits. We believe that our results will also prove fruitful in further developments on mixed state entanglement.

Acknowledgments: I am indebted to David Meyer for very valuable discussions and to Joe Henson for his help. This work has been partially supported by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) QuIST program under contract F49620-02-C-0010, and by the National Science Foundation (NSF) under grant ECS-0202087.

-
- [1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, “*Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*” (Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- [2] C. H. Bennett, H. J. Bernstein, S. Popescu and B. Schumacher, Phys. Rev. A **53**, 2046 (1996).
- [3] G. Vidal, J. Mod. Opt. **47**, 355 (2000).
- [4] G. Vidal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1046 (1999).
- [5] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki and R. Horodecki, in *Quantum Information: An Introduction to Basic Theoretical Concepts and Experiments* by G. Alber *et al.* (Springer Tracts in Modern Physics, July 2001).
- [6] M. A. Nielsen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 436 (1999).
- [7] D. Jonathan and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1455 (1999).
- [8] G. Gour, Phys. Rev. A, **71**, 012318 (2005).
- [9] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, C. Fuchs, T. Mor, P. Shor, E. Rains and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 1070 (1999).
- [10] For example, the set of entanglement monotones given in Eq.(1) (see [4]), or the set of concurrence monotones given in [8], are both quantifying completely the non-local resources of a pure bipartite state, in the sense that any measure of entanglement can be expressed in terms of these entanglement monotones.
- [11] The measure of entanglement, E , is normalized such that $E = 1$ for a maximally entangled state.