

# Negativity and Concurrence as complete entanglement measures for two arbitrary qudits

Suranjana Rai<sup>†</sup> and Jagdish R. Luthra<sup>\*</sup>

(<sup>†</sup>) Raitech, Tuscaloosa, AL 35405

(<sup>\*</sup>) Departamento de Física, Universidad de los Andes, A.A. 4976 Bogotá, Colombia

August 5, 2005

## Abstract

Two measures of entanglement, negativity and concurrence are studied for two arbitrary qudits. We obtain negativity as an expectation value of an operator. The differences of the squares of negativity and concurrence are invariants of multilevel entanglement. Explicit results for qutrits and quadrits are obtained.

For two qubits the defining measure of entanglement is concurrence. It is a good measure of entanglement in every sense. It is computable, it does not change under local operations and classical communications (LOCC) and it gives rise to the entanglement of formation for pure and mixed states [1, 2, 3]. So far the defining measure or set of measures has not been found for arbitrary qudits. In this letter we show that the negativity,  $N$ , and the concurrence,  $C$ , along with the difference of their squares are good candidates for complete description of entanglement for bipartite qudits.

For qubits, Wootters [1] defines concurrence using the Pauli spin matrix  $\sigma_y$  as a spin flip operator. For qubits,  $\sigma_y$  transforms maximally entangled states (Bell states) to themselves, so that the concurrence for these states is one. This is possible because of the special symmetry of  $2 \otimes 2$  systems. In general, for bipartite states of arbitrary dimension, instead of the Bell states, we use states in the Schmidt form. All of the Bell states are not in the Schmidt form as the Schmidt coefficients have to be real and non-negative. A general two qubit pure state in the Schmidt form is

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^2 k_i |ii\rangle \quad (1)$$

where  $k_1, k_2$  are the two Schmidt coefficients with the normalization condition

$$k_1^2 + k_2^2 = 1 \quad (2)$$

The concurrence as defined by Wootters [1] is

$$C(|\psi\rangle) = \langle \psi | \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y | \psi^* \rangle \quad (3)$$

where  $\psi^*$  denotes the complex conjugation and  $\sigma_y$  is one of Pauli spin operators. For the state in Eq.(1), the concurrence is

$$C = 2k_1k_2 \quad (4)$$

---

<sup>\*</sup>e-mail: jluthra@uniandes.edu.co

The above concurrence can also be written as [2]

$$C = \sqrt{2(1 - \text{Tr} \rho_A^2)} = 2k_1k_2 \quad (5)$$

where  $\rho_A$  is the reduced density matrix.

Another important measure of entanglement is the negativity [4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. Negativity is an entanglement monotone so it does not change under LOCC. The negativity [6] of a bipartite system described by the density matrix  $\rho$ , is given by  $N(\rho)$  as

$$N(\rho) = \frac{\|\rho^{TA}\|_1 - 1}{2} \quad (6)$$

where  $\rho^{TA}$  is the partial transpose with respect to system A, and  $\|\dots\|_1$  denotes the trace norm. The negativity is a quantitative measure of the partial positive transpose (PPT), the Peres criteria [9]. It measures how negative the eigenvalues of the density matrix are after the partial transpose is taken. It is the absolute value of the sum of the negative eigenvalues of the partially transposed density matrix. According to the Peres criterion of separability, density matrices with NPT are entangled [9]. The Peres criterion is necessary and sufficient for qubit-qubit and qubit-qutrit systems. For systems of higher dimensions, it is necessary but not sufficient, since, there are states with PPT which are entangled. These states are said to have bound entanglement since entanglement cannot be distilled from these states. The negativity can be generalized to higher dimensions [11] as

$$N(\rho) = \frac{\|\rho^{TA}\|_1 - 1}{d - 1} \quad (7)$$

where  $d$  is the smaller of the dimensions of the bipartite system. For two qubits, the negativity is

$$N = 2k_1k_2 \quad (8)$$

Now we show that the negativity can be obtained from the action of an operator  $X$  defined as

$$X = X_1 \otimes X_2 = \sigma_x^1 \otimes \sigma_x^2 \quad (9)$$

where  $X_1 = \sigma_x^1$  is the Pauli operator that acts on the first qubit and  $X_2 = \sigma_x^2$  acts on the second qubit.

$$X|11\rangle = |22\rangle, X|22\rangle = |11\rangle \quad (10)$$

We define the negativity as the expectation value of the operator  $X$  in the state  $|\psi\rangle$ .

$$\langle X \rangle = 2k_1k_2 = N(|\psi\rangle) \quad (11)$$

For two qubits in the Schmidt form, we see from Eqs.(4), (8) and (11), that the negativity and the concurrence turn out to be identical, i.e.,

$$N = C \quad (12)$$

For mixed states, concurrence can be extended by the convex roof [1, 10],

$$C(\rho) \equiv \min \sum_i p_i C(|\psi_i\rangle) \quad (13)$$

where the minimum is taken over the ensemble of all possible decompositions of the density matrix  $\rho$ . The negativity can also be extended by a similar procedure [11].

$$N_m(\rho) \equiv \min \sum_i p_i N(|\psi_i\rangle) \quad (14)$$

Lee et. al.,[11] have also shown that for a mixed two qubit case, the negativity is equal to the concurrence. They state that the convex roof extended negativity is better at detecting separability than the original negativity.

Now, we would like to generalize to arbitrary bipartite qudit states. We consider the general case of  $m \otimes n$  and  $d = \min(m, n)$ . The general bipartite pure state in the Schmidt form can be written as

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^d k_i |ii\rangle \quad (15)$$

with the usual normalization condition

$$\sum_i k_i^2 = 1 \quad (16)$$

The generalized Pauli spin operator  $X$  [12] acts as

$$X|i, i\rangle = |i+1, i+1\rangle, \text{mod}(d) \quad (17)$$

The *cyclic* operator  $X$  transforms the state  $|\psi\rangle$  into a shifted state by the ladder action.  $X$ , is unitary but not hermitian. Now for pure states in the Schmidt form, using  $X$  is sufficient as the Schmidt coefficients are real. In general, if we do not use the Schmidt form, the hermitian operators of the form  $(X \pm X^\dagger)$  have to be used [13]. We propose the use of the generalized operator  $X$  to connect the different levels of the states. It is easy to see that negativity can still be obtained as the expectation value of the  $X$  operator in the state  $|\psi\rangle$ .

$$N(|\psi\rangle) = \langle X \rangle = \sum_{i < j} k_i k_j \quad (18)$$

On the other hand, the concurrence for the general state Eq.(15) is

$$C(|\psi\rangle) = \sqrt{2(1 - \text{Tr} \rho_A^2)} = \sqrt{4 \sum_{i < j} k_i^2 k_j^2} \quad (19)$$

Chen et. al., [10] have shown that

$$4 \sum_{i < j} k_i^2 k_j^2 \geq \frac{2}{d(d-1)} \left( \sum_{i < j} k_i k_j \right)^2 \quad (20)$$

We recognize the terms on the left and the right in terms of the concurrence and negativity respectively. It is important to take care of scaling in Eq.(20). For two qubits the maximum value of  $N$  and  $C$  are equal to 1. However, for systems of higher dimensions, the maximum value of concurrence and negativity on this scale depend on the dimensions of the system. For  $d = 3$ , the maximum value of  $C$  is  $\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}$ . For  $d = 4$ , the maximum value is  $\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}$ . For general  $d$ , the maximum value is  $\sqrt{2(1 - \frac{1}{d})}$ . As  $d$  becomes very large, this converges to a value of  $\sqrt{2}$ . However, on this scale for arbitrary  $d$ , when we consider the subspace of states with only two nonzero Schmidt coefficients, these states have a maximum value of concurrence as one. Of course, the completely separable states have concurrence zero. We also rescale the negativity to have a maximum value of one in any dimension. Therefore the rescaled negativity is

$$N(|\psi\rangle) = \frac{2}{(d-1)} \sum_{i < j} k_i k_j \quad (21)$$

This negativity still has the value one for two qubits. Eq.(20) is now restated in terms of the concurrence and the negativity as

$$C^2 \geq \frac{d-1}{2d} N^2 \quad (22)$$

It is interesting to see specific relations between  $N$  and  $C$  in higher dimensions. We have explored this connection for two qutrits and given an analytic expression relating the two quantities [8]. We also showed that for two qutrits concurrence is lower bounded by negativity. For two qutrits the relation between the concurrence and the rescaled negativity is

$$N^2 = \frac{C^2}{4} \pm 2(k_1 k_2 k_3) \sqrt{1 + 2N} \quad (23)$$

In the previous paper [8], we had given a relation between  $N$  and  $C$  for qutrits where  $C$  was also scaled to one. Both concurrence and negativity give entanglement as a sum of entanglement between pairs of levels. Concurrence is the root mean square of pair-wise products of the Schmidt coefficients while negativity is the sum of pair-wise products of the coefficients. The difference contains a part which occurs with the product of the three Schmidt coefficients,  $k_1 k_2 k_3$ . This product vanishes when three way entanglement is absent, i.e., when one of the Schmidt coefficient is zero, in which case  $N = C/2$ . For maximum entanglement,  $C = 1$  and  $N = 1/2$ . It is significant to see that the difference between  $C$  and  $N$  is in terms of the three-level entanglement of the two qutrits. The product  $k_1 k_2 k_3$  is related to the determinant of the coefficient matrix, which is an invariant under local unitaries.

On similar lines, we would like to extend this procedure to quadrits. The difference of the squares of negativity and concurrence generates interesting quantities that could be useful in the description of various types of entanglements possible. Now we relate the square of the negativity of two quadrits to the concurrence. The negativity and concurrence for two quadrits are

$$N = \frac{2}{3}(k_1 k_2 + k_1 k_3 + k_1 k_4 + k_2 k_3 + k_2 k_4 + k_3 k_4) \quad (24)$$

$$C = 4(k_1^2 k_2^2 + k_1^2 k_3^2 + k_1^2 k_4^2 + k_2^2 k_3^2 + k_2^2 k_4^2 + k_3^2 k_4^2) \quad (25)$$

We invoke some results from the theory of entanglement and invariants [14] to understand the various terms that arise while relating  $N$  and  $C$ . For quadrits there are four symmetric polynomials that are invariant under unitary transformations:

$$s_1 = k_1 + k_2 + k_3 + k_4 \quad (26)$$

$$s_2 = k_1 k_2 + k_1 k_3 + k_1 k_4 + k_2 k_3 + k_2 k_4 + k_3 k_4 \quad (27)$$

$$s_3 = k_1 k_2 k_3 + k_2 k_3 k_4 + k_3 k_4 k_1 + k_4 k_1 k_2 \quad (28)$$

$$s_4 = k_1 k_2 k_3 k_4 \quad (29)$$

The invariants in the above equations are given in terms of Schmidt coefficients. Negativity has a very simple structure in terms of pairs of Schmidt coefficients and is the invariant  $s_2$ .

$$N = \frac{2}{3} s_2 \quad (30)$$

We see that negativity contains entirely pair-wise entanglement. The concurrence on the hand, involves other invariants which are related to three-level and four-level entanglements through invariants  $s_1, s_3$  and  $s_4$ . The square of concurrence can be written as

$$C^2 = 4s_2^2 + 2(s_4 - s_1 s_3) \quad (31)$$

The difference measures the contribution to entanglement from a larger number of level entanglements. In fact we can obtain a general relation connecting the concurrence to negativity as

$$C^2 - 4N^2 = 2(s_4 - s_1 s_3) \quad (32)$$

We could continue to explore the squares of negativity and concurrence in arbitrary dimensions. We conclude by making some general observations about higher dimensional qudits. Since the negativity and concurrence are both invariants, the difference between them in the general case is also an invariant. We can study invariant multilevel entanglement from these quantities. Higher powers would provide complete information about entanglement. These results can also be extended to mixed states.

## References

- [1] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998); S. Hill and W. K. Wootters, *ibid.* **78**, 5022(1997).
- [2] P. Rungta et. al., Phys. Rev. A, **64**,042315, (2001).
- [3] Armin Uhlmann, Phys. Rev. A, **62**,032307, (2000).
- [4] K. Zyczkowski, et. al., Phys. Rev. A, **58**, 883, (1998).
- [5] Jens Eisert, Ph.D. thesis, University of Potsdam (2001).
- [6] G. Vidal, R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A, **65**,032314, (2002).
- [7] J. Lee, M. S. Kim, Y. J. Park, S. Lee, J. Mod. Opt. 47, 2151 (2000).
- [8] S. Rai and J. R. Luthra, quant-ph/0507263.
- [9] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1413, (1996).
- [10] Kai Chen, Sergio Albeverio and Shao-Ming Fei, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 040504 (2005).
- [11] S. Lee, et. al., Phys. Rev. A, **68**, 062304 2003.
- [12] Jay Lawrence, Phys. Rev. A, **70**, 012302, (2004).
- [13] Cesar Herreno-Fierro and J. R. Luthra, quant-ph/0507223.
- [14] Markus Grassl, MSRI Lectures, (2002).