

# Recurrent construction of optimal entanglement witnesses for $2N$ qubit systems

Justyna P. Zwolak\*

*Department of Physics, Oregon State University,  
Corvallis, OR 97331, USA*

Dariusz Chruściński

*Institute of Physics, Nicolaus Copernicus University,  
Grudziądzka 5/7, 87-100 Toruń, Poland*

(Dated: November 6, 2018)

We provide a recurrent construction of entanglement witnesses for a bipartite systems living in a Hilbert space corresponding to  $2N$  qubits ( $N$  qubits in each subsystem). Our construction provides a new method of generalization of the Robertson map that naturally meshes with  $2N$  qubit systems, i.e., its structure respects the  $2^{2N}$  growth of the state space. We prove that for  $N > 1$  these witnesses are indecomposable and optimal. As a byproduct we provide a new family of PPT (Positive Partial Transpose) entangled states.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Entanglement witnesses (EW) provide universal tools for analyzing and detecting quantum entanglement [1, 2]. Let us recall that a Hermitian operator  $\mathcal{W}$  defined on a tensor product  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$  is called an EW iff  $\langle \psi_A \otimes \phi_B | \mathcal{W} | \psi_A \otimes \phi_B \rangle \geq 0$  and  $\mathcal{W}$  possesses at least one negative eigenvalue. It turns out that a state  $\rho$  in  $\mathcal{H}$  is entangled if and only if it is detected by some EW [3], that is, iff there exists an EW  $\mathcal{W}$  such that  $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{W}\rho) < 0$ . In recent years there was a considerable effort in constructing and analyzing the structure of EWs (see e.g. [4–20]). However, the general construction of an EW is not known. Let us recall that an entanglement witness  $\mathcal{W}$  is decomposable if

$$\mathcal{W} = A + B^\Gamma, \quad (1)$$

where  $A, B \geq 0$  and  $B^\Gamma$  denotes a partial transposition of  $B$ . EWs that can not be represented as (1) are called indecomposable. Indecomposable EWs are necessary to detect PPT entangled states (a state  $\rho$  is PPT if  $\rho^\Gamma \geq 0$ ). If  $\rho$  is PPT,  $\mathcal{W}$  is an EW and  $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{W}\rho) < 0$ , then  $\rho$  is entangled and  $\mathcal{W}$  is necessarily indecomposable. The optimal EW is defined as follows: if  $\mathcal{W}_1$  and  $\mathcal{W}_2$  are two entanglement witnesses then following Ref. [5] we call  $\mathcal{W}_1$  finer than  $\mathcal{W}_2$  if  $D_{\mathcal{W}_1} \supseteq D_{\mathcal{W}_2}$ , where

$$D_{\mathcal{W}} = \{ \rho | \text{Tr}(\rho\mathcal{W}) < 0 \}$$

denotes the set of all entangled states detected by  $\mathcal{W}$ . Now, an EW  $\mathcal{W}$  is optimal if there is no other witness that is finer than  $\mathcal{W}$ . One proves [5] that  $\mathcal{W}$  is optimal iff for any  $\alpha > 0$  and a positive operator  $P$  an operator  $\mathcal{W} - \alpha P$  is no longer an EW. Authors of [5] provided the following sufficient condition of optimality: for a given

EW  $\mathcal{W}$  one defines

$$P_{\mathcal{W}} = \{ |\psi \otimes \phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B | \langle \psi \otimes \phi | \mathcal{W} | \psi \otimes \phi \rangle = 0 \}. \quad (2)$$

If  $P_{\mathcal{W}}$  spans  $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ , then  $\mathcal{W}$  is optimal.

Using well known duality between bi-partite operators in  $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$  and linear maps  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)$  one associates with a given EW  $\mathcal{W}$  a linear positive map by  $\Lambda_{\mathcal{W}}$  such that  $\mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{I} \otimes \Lambda_{\mathcal{W}})P_A^+$ , where  $P_A^+$  denotes maximally entangled state in  $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_A$ , and  $\mathcal{I}$  denotes an identity map. Due to the fact that  $\mathcal{W} \not\geq 0$  the corresponding map  $\Lambda_{\mathcal{W}}$  is not completely positive (CP).

In the present paper we provide a recurrent construction a family of positive maps  $\Psi_N : \mathbb{M}_2^{\otimes N} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_2^{\otimes N}$  for  $N \geq 1$ . Equivalently, we define a family of EWs  $\mathcal{W}_N$  in  $\mathbb{C}^{2^{\otimes N}} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{2^{\otimes N}}$ . Interestingly,  $\Psi_1$  reproduces well known reduction map and for  $N = 2$  our construction reproduces the Robertson map [21]. However, for  $N \geq 3$  it provides brand new positive maps (equivalently EWs). Moreover, we show that for  $N > 1$  these EWs are indecomposable and optimal and hence may be used to detect PPT entangled states. Finally, we show that so called structural physical approximation to  $\mathcal{W}_N$  is a separable state [22]. As a byproduct we provide PPT entangled states detected by our witnesses.

## II. RECURRENT CONSTRUCTION

In what follows we provide a recurrent construction of linear positive maps

$$\Psi_N : \mathbb{M}_2^{\otimes N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{M}_2^{\otimes N},$$

where  $\mathbb{M}_2^{\otimes N}$  denotes a tensor product of  $N$  copies of  $\mathbb{M}_2$  (a space of  $2 \times 2$  complex matrices). Let us start with a “vacuum” map  $\Psi_0 : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  defined by  $\Psi_0(z) = 0$  which is evidently positive but not very interesting. Out of  $\Psi_0$  we construct a family of nontrivial positive maps *via* the

\* j.p.zwolak@gmail.com

following formula

$$\Psi_{N+1} \left( \begin{array}{c|c} X_{11} & X_{12} \\ \hline X_{21} & X_{22} \end{array} \right) = \frac{1}{2^N} \left( \begin{array}{c|c} D_{11} & -A_N \\ \hline -B_N & D_{22} \end{array} \right) \quad (3)$$

with the diagonal blocks defined as

$$D_{ii} = \mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes N} (\text{Tr } X - \text{Tr } X_{ii})$$

and the off-diagonal blocks given recursively by

$$\begin{aligned} A_N &= X_{12} + \Psi_N(X_{21}), \\ B_N &= X_{21} + \Psi_N(X_{12}). \end{aligned}$$

In Eq. (3) one uses  $\mathbb{M}_2^{\otimes(N+1)} = \mathbb{M}_2 \otimes \mathbb{M}_2^{\otimes N}$  and hence we can rewrite  $X = \sum_{i,j=1}^2 e_{ij} \otimes X_{ij}$ , with  $X_{ij} \in \mathbb{M}_2^{\otimes N}$  and  $e_{ij} = |i\rangle\langle j|$ . It is clear from the construction that each  $\Psi_N$  is trace-preserving and unital, i.e.  $\Psi_N(\mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes N}) = \mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes N}$ .

Interestingly, one finds  $\Psi_1 : \mathbb{M}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_2$  to be

$$\Psi_1 \left( \begin{array}{cc} x_{11} & x_{12} \\ x_{21} & x_{22} \end{array} \right) = \begin{pmatrix} x_{22} & -x_{12} \\ -x_{21} & x_{11} \end{pmatrix},$$

which reconstructs the reduction map in  $\mathbb{M}_2$ , i.e.,

$$\Psi_1(X) \equiv \mathcal{R}(X) = \mathbb{1}_2 \text{Tr } X - X.$$

This map is known to be positive, decomposable and optimal (even extremal) [15]. Similarly one can reproduce the Robertson map:

$$\Psi_2 \left( \begin{array}{c|c} X_{11} & X_{12} \\ \hline X_{21} & X_{22} \end{array} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \begin{array}{c|c} \mathbb{1}_2 \text{Tr } X_{22} & -A_1 \\ \hline -B_1 & \mathbb{1}_2 \text{Tr } X_{11} \end{array} \right)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= X_{12} + \mathcal{R}(X_{21}), \\ B_1 &= X_{21} + \mathcal{R}(X_{12}), \end{aligned}$$

which is known to be positive, indecomposable and extremal [13]. Recently, this map has been generalized to higher dimensional bipartite systems in several ways [13–16]. In all cases these generalizations lead to families of indecomposable and optimal maps.

### III. PROPERTIES OF $\Psi_N$

In this section we analyze the basic properties of the family of maps  $\Psi_N$ . We already noted that  $\Psi_N$  is positive for  $N = 0, 1$  and 2 (actually, the “vacuum” map  $\Psi_0$  is even CP). The crucial result of this paper consists in the following

**Theorem 1.** *The map  $\Psi_N$  is positive for any  $N$ .*

*Proof.* See the Appendix.  $\square$




FIG. 1. Smallest eigenvalues of the matrix  $\rho_t$  defined by Eq. (4) and  $\rho_t^\Gamma$  as a function of the parameter  $t \in [-1.5; 1.5]$  for three different  $N$ . In the case of  $N = 2, 4, 5$  eigenvalues are scaled so that everything can be shown on one plot. It does not affect the positivity of eigenvalues.

Note that for  $N \geq 1$  the map  $\Psi_N$  is not CP. Indeed, the corresponding EW  $\mathcal{W}_N = (\mathbb{1}_N \otimes \Psi_N)P^+$  possesses exactly one negative eigenvalue

$$\mathcal{W}_N \phi^+ = -\frac{1}{2^N} \phi^+,$$

where  $\phi^+ = \sum_{i=1}^{2^N} e_i \otimes e_i$  denotes the (unnormalized) maximally entangled state. The existence of a negative eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{W}_N$  proves that  $\Psi_N$  is not CP and hence  $\mathcal{W}_N$  is a legitimate entanglement witness.

We already noticed that  $\Psi_1$ , corresponding to the reduction map, is decomposable while  $\Psi_2$ , corresponding to the Robertson map, is indecomposable. One has the following theorem,

**Theorem 2.** *The map  $\Psi_N$  is indecomposable for  $N > 1$ .*

*Proof.* To prove indecomposability of  $\Psi_N$  it is enough to find a PPT state  $\rho$  such that  $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{W}_N \rho) < 0$ . Let us consider the following construction of a family of (unnormalized) matrices parametrized by  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ :

$$\rho_t = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2^N} e_{ij} \otimes \rho_{ij}, \quad (4)$$

with the  $2^N \times 2^N$  blocks  $\rho_{ij}$  defined as follows:

- $\rho_{ii} = \frac{1}{2^N} \mathbb{1}_{2^N} - (2^{N-1} - 1)W_{ii}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 2^N$ ,
- $\rho_{ij} = 2^N$ , if  $i \neq j$  and  $i, j < 2^{N-1}$  or  $i, j > 2^{N-1}$ ,
- $\rho_{i, i+2^{N-1}} = -t \cdot W_{i, i+2^{N-1}}$ ,
- $\rho_{ij} = \frac{1}{2^N \cdot 2^{N-1}} e_{ij}$  in the remaining cases

and  $W_{ij} = \frac{1}{2^N} \Psi_N(e_{ij})$ . Figure 1 shows how the minimal eigenvalue of a state  $\rho_t$  and the minimal eigenvalue of the partially transposed state  $\rho_t^\Gamma$  depends on the parameter  $t$ .



Positive, but not completely positive maps, unlike entanglement witnesses, cannot be directly implemented in the laboratory. One way to tackle this problem is to approximate the positive map by a completely positive one which may serve as a quantum operation. Given a positive map  $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  one defines a family of maps

$$\tilde{\Lambda}(p) = p\mathcal{I} + (1-p)\Lambda .$$

Let  $p_*$  be the smallest  $p$  such that  $\tilde{\Lambda}(p_*)$  is completely positive. One calls  $\tilde{\Lambda}(p_*)$  the structural physical approximation (SPA) of  $\Lambda$ . It was conjectured [22, 23] that structural physical approximation to an optimal positive map defines an entanglement breaking map (a completely positive map  $\mathcal{E}$  is entanglement breaking if  $(\mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{E})\rho$  is separable for an arbitrary state  $\rho$ , see Ref. [24]). In the language of EWs SPA conjecture states that if  $\mathcal{W}$  is an optimal EW, then the corresponding SPA

$$\mathcal{W}(p_*) = \frac{p_*}{d_A d_B} \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \mathbb{1}_B + (1-p_*)\mathcal{W} ,$$

defines a separable state. Recently SPA conjecture has been disproved for indecomposable EWs in [25] and for decomposable ones in [26] (see also recent papers [27, 28]). Interestingly, the SPA for  $\Psi_N$  provides EB map. To show this let us recall the following result from Ref. [15]

**Corollary 1.** *If  $\Lambda : \mathbb{M}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_n$  is a unital map, and the smallest eigenvalue of the corresponding entanglement witness  $\mathcal{W}$  satisfies  $\xi_{min} \leq -\frac{1}{n}$ , then the SPA to  $\mathcal{W}$  defines a separable state.*

Since for any  $N \geq 1$  an entanglement witness  $\mathcal{W}_N$  corresponding to  $\Psi_N$  possesses only one negative eigenvalue  $\xi = -\frac{1}{2^N}$ , thus the SPA to  $\Psi_N$  indeed defines an entanglement breaking channel.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

We provided a new class of linear positive, but not completely positive, maps in  $\mathbb{M}_2^{\otimes N}$ . These maps are indecomposable and optimal, and their structural physical approximation gives rise to an entanglement breaking channel. Equivalently, our construction provides new entanglement witnesses for bi-partite systems where each subsystem lives in the  $N$  qubit Hilbert space.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

DC was partially supported by the National Science Centre project DEC-2011/03/B/ST2/00136.

- 
- [1] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 865 (2009)
  - [2] O. Gühne and G. Tóth, *Phys. Rep.* **474**, 1 (2009)
  - [3] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, *Phys. Lett. A* **223**, 1 (1996)
  - [4] B. M. Terhal, *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **287**, 313 (2002)
  - [5] M. Lewenstein, B. Kraus, J. I. Cirac, and P. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 052310 (2000)
  - [6] B. Kraus, M. Lewenstein, and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 042327 (2002)
  - [7] D. Bruß, *J. Math. Phys.* **43**, 4237 (2002)
  - [8] G. Tóth and O. Gühne, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 060501 (2005)
  - [9] R. A. Bertlmann, H. Narnhofer, and W. Thirring, *Phys. Rev. A* **66**, 032319 (2002)
  - [10] H.-P. Breuer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 080501 (2006)
  - [11] W. Hall, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **39**, 14119 (2006)
  - [12] D. Chruściński and a. Kossakowski, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **41**, 145301 (2008)
  - [13] D. Chruściński, J. Pytel, and G. Sarbicki, *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 062314 (2009)
  - [14] D. Chruściński and J. Pytel, *Phys. Rev. A* **82**, 052310 (2010)
  - [15] D. Chruściński and J. Pytel, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **44**, 165304 (2011)
  - [16] J. P. Zwolak and D. Chruściński, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **71**, 163 (2013)
  - [17] K.-C. Ha and S.-H. Kye, *Phys. Lett. A* **325**, 315 (2004)
  - [18] K.-C. Ha and S.-H. Kye, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **38**, 9039 (2005)
  - [19] K.-C. Ha and S.-H. Kye, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 024302 (2011)
  - [20] C. Spengler, M. Huber, S. Brierley, T. Adaktylos, and B. C. Hiesmayr, *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 022311 (2012)
  - [21] A. G. Robertson, *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* **32**, 133 (1985)
  - [22] J. I. K. Korbicz, M. L. Almeida, J. Bae, M. Lewenstein, and A. Acín, *Phys. Rev. A* **78**, 062105 (2008)
  - [23] R. Augusiak, J. Bae, L. Czekaj, and M. Lewenstein, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **44**, 185308 (2011)
  - [24] M. Horodecki, P. W. Shor, and M. B. Ruskai, *Rev. Math. Phys.* **15**, 629 (2003)
  - [25] K.-C. Ha and S.-H. Kye, *J. Math. Phys.* **53**, 102204 (2012)
  - [26] D. Chruściński and G. Sarbicki, arXiv:1309.2883
  - [27] R. Augusiak, J. Bae, J. Tura, and M. Lewenstein, arXiv:1304.2040
  - [28] B.-H. Wang and D.-Y. Long, *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 062324 (2013)
  - [29] R. Bhatia, *Positive Definite Matrices* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2007)

#### APPENDIX: PROOF OF THEOREM 1

*Proof.* We prove the theorem by induction. We already know that it holds for  $N = 1$  and  $N = 2$ . Now, assum-

ing that it is true for  $\Psi_N$  we prove it for  $\Psi_{N+1}$ . We shall use the fact that  $\Psi_N$  is contractive, i.e.

$$\|\Psi_N(X)\| \leq \|X\| , \quad (5)$$

where  $\|X\|$  denotes an operator norm of  $X$ , i.e., the maximal eigenvalue of  $|X| = \sqrt{XX^\dagger}$ . Recall that any unital map is positive iff it is contractive in the operator norm [29]. To show that  $\Psi_{N+1}$  defines a positive map it is enough to show that it maps any rank-1 projector into a positive element. Let us consider  $P = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$  with  $\psi$  being an arbitrary vector in  $\mathbb{C}^{2^{N+1}}$ . Since  $\mathbb{C}^{2^{N+1}} = \mathbb{C}^{2^N} \oplus \mathbb{C}^{2^N}$  one can rewrite  $\psi = \bigoplus_{i=1}^2 \sqrt{\alpha_i} \psi_i$ , with  $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \mathbb{C}^{2^N}$  and  $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 1$ . Without loosing generality one can assume  $\langle\psi_i|\psi_i\rangle = 1$  and hence

$$\Psi_{N+1}(P) = \frac{1}{2^N} \left( \begin{array}{c|c} \mathbb{1}_{2^N} \alpha_2 & -\sqrt{\alpha_1 \alpha_2} A_N \\ \hline -\sqrt{\alpha_1 \alpha_2} A_N^\dagger & \mathbb{1}_{2^N} \alpha_1 \end{array} \right) ,$$

with  $A_N = |\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_2| + \Psi_N(|\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_1|)$ . It is clear that  $\Psi_{N+1}(P) \geq 0$  iff

$$A_N A_N^\dagger \leq \mathbb{1}_{2^N} . \quad (6)$$

**Lemma 4.** *The map  $\Psi_N$  satisfies*

$$\Psi_N(|x\rangle\langle y|)|x\rangle = 0 , \quad \langle y|\Psi_N(|x\rangle\langle y|) = 0 , \quad (7)$$

for any vectors  $|x\rangle, |y\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^{2^N}$ .

*Proof.* We prove this by induction. For  $N = 1$  one immediately verifies (7). Now, assuming that (7) holds for  $\Psi_N$  we prove it for  $\Psi_{N+1}$ . Using

$$|x\rangle = |x_1 \oplus x_2\rangle , \quad |y\rangle = |y_1 \oplus y_2\rangle ,$$

one finds for  $2^N \Psi_{N+1}(|x\rangle\langle y|)$ :

$$\left( \begin{array}{c|c} \langle y_2|x_2\rangle \mathbb{1}_{2^N} & -|x_1\rangle\langle y_2| - \Psi_N(|x_2\rangle\langle y_1|) \\ \hline -|x_2\rangle\langle y_1| - \Psi_N(|x_1\rangle\langle y_2|) & \langle y_1|x_1\rangle \mathbb{1}_{2^N} \end{array} \right) ,$$

and hence

$$\Psi_{N+1}(|x\rangle\langle y|)|x\rangle \equiv \Psi_{N+1}(|x\rangle\langle y|) \begin{pmatrix} |x_1\rangle \\ |x_2\rangle \end{pmatrix} = 0$$

where we have used  $\Psi_N(|x_2\rangle\langle y_1|)|x_2\rangle = 0$ . Similarly  $\langle y|\Psi_N(|x\rangle\langle y|) = 0$ .  $\square$

Now, using the Lemma 4 one arrives at

$$A_N A_N^\dagger = |\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1| + Q_N ,$$

where  $Q_N = \Psi_N(|\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_1|)\Psi_N(|\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_2|)$ . Note that  $Q_N$  is supported on the subspace orthogonal to  $|\psi_1\rangle$  and hence the set of eigenvalues of  $A_N A_N^\dagger$  consists of eigenvalues of  $Q_N$  and 1. Now, using contractivity (5) one obtains

$$\|\Psi_N(|\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_2|)\| \leq \| |\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_2| \| \leq 1 ,$$

which shows that the maximal eigenvalue of  $Q_N$  is not greater than 1. This finally proves (6).  $\square$