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## Outline

## We introduce the notion of graph-extendability

A bipartite symmetric quantum state $\rho=\bullet —$ is $G=$ 年。- -extendible if there exists a global state $\sigma=$ for all edges $e={ }_{\bullet \bullet} ; \in G$, the reduced state $\sigma_{e}={ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}$ is equal to $\rho$.

For given $d$ and $n$, which highly symmetric states (such as Werner, Brauer, and isotropic states) on $\mathbb{C}^{d} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d}$ are $G$-extendible?

## Separability of quantum states

## Quantum entanglement

- Quantum states are unit trace positive semidefinite matrices [NC10, Wat18]: $\rho \in \mathcal{M}_{d}^{\text {sa }}(\mathbb{C})$ such that $\rho \geq 0, \operatorname{Tr} \rho=1$.
- A bipartite quantum state $\rho \in \mathcal{M}_{d}^{\text {sa }}(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{M}_{d}^{\text {sa }}(\mathbb{C})$ is separable if it can be decomposed as a convex combination of product quantum states:

$$
\rho=\sum_{i} \alpha_{i} \otimes \beta_{i} \quad \text { with } \alpha_{i}, \beta_{i} \geq 0
$$

- A pure (i.e. unit rank) state $\rho=|x\rangle\langle x|$ is separable iff it is product:

$$
|x\rangle=|a\rangle \otimes|b\rangle
$$

- The maximally entangled state

$$
\left.\omega:=\frac{1}{d} \sum_{i, j=1}^{d}|i i\rangle\langle j j|=\frac{1}{d}\right)^{i}{ }^{\bullet}
$$

- Deciding whether a given state $\rho$ is separable is an NP-hard problem [Guro3].


## Detecting entanglement

- There exist various criteria to detect entanglement or separability

$$
\begin{gathered}
\rho \in \operatorname{SEP} \Longrightarrow \rho^{\Gamma}:=[\operatorname{id} \otimes \operatorname{transp}](\rho)=\sum_{i} \alpha_{i} \otimes \beta_{i}^{\top} \geq 0 \\
\left\|\rho-\frac{l}{d} \otimes \frac{l}{d}\right\|_{2} \leq \frac{1}{d \sqrt{d^{2}-1}} \Longrightarrow \rho \in \mathrm{SEP}
\end{gathered}
$$

- The DPS hierarchy [DPS02, DPS04] can certify entanglement using a sequence of semidefinite programs

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{EXT}_{k} & :=\left\{\rho_{A B}: \exists \sigma_{A B_{1} B_{2} \cdots B_{k}} \geq 0 \text { s.t. } \sigma_{A B_{i}}=\rho_{A B} \quad \forall i \in[k]\right\} \\
\text { all states } & =\mathrm{EXT}_{1} \supseteq \mathrm{EXT}_{2} \supseteq \cdots \supseteq \mathrm{EXT}_{k} \supseteq \cdots \supseteq \mathrm{EXT}_{\infty}=\mathrm{SEP}
\end{aligned}
$$

- Easy direction: if $\rho$ is separable, $\rho=\sum_{i} \alpha_{i} \otimes \beta_{i} \rightsquigarrow$ take $\sigma=\sum_{i} \alpha_{i} \otimes \beta_{i}^{\otimes k}$
- Quantitative version [CKMRO7]:

$$
\rho \in \mathrm{EXT}_{k} \Longrightarrow \min _{\sigma \in \mathrm{SEP}}\|\rho-\sigma\|_{1} \leq \frac{4 d^{2}}{k}
$$

## Graph extendability

## Monogamy of entanglement \& exchangeability

- Monogamy is a fundamental property of quantum entanglement [KW04]. Informally, given 3 quantum parties Alice, Bob, and Charlie:

Alice cannot be maximally entangled with Bob and Charlie

$$
\nexists \rho_{A B C} \quad \text { s.t. } \quad \rho_{A B}=\omega \text { and } \rho_{A C}=\omega
$$

- Actually, we have more: given a quantum state $\rho_{A B C}$,

$$
\rho_{A B}=\omega \Longrightarrow \rho_{A B C}=\omega_{A B} \otimes \rho_{C}
$$

- A bipartite symmetric state $\rho$ is called $n$-exchangeable if there exists a $n$-partite symmetric state $\sigma$ such that $\rho=\operatorname{Tr}_{n-2} \sigma$
- The quantum de Finetti theorem [HM76, CFS02, KRO5, CKMRO7]: a bipartite state $\rho$ is $n$-exchangable for every $n$ iff

$$
\rho=\sum_{i} \alpha_{i} \otimes \alpha_{i}
$$

## Main definition

A bipartite symmetric quantum state $\rho=\bullet —$ is $G=$ 货 ${ }^{\circ}$-extendible if there exists a global state $\sigma=$ on $G$ such that for all edges $e={ }_{\bullet} ; \in G$, the reduced state $\sigma_{e}={ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}$ is equal to $\rho$.

- This notion generalizes the two previous ones:

$$
\begin{array}{r}
n \text {-extendibility: } \exists \sigma_{A B_{1} B_{2} \cdots B_{n}} \text { s.t. } \sigma_{A B_{i}}=\rho_{A B} \Longleftrightarrow K_{1, n} \text {-extendibility } \\
\text { n-exchangeability: } \exists \sigma_{A_{1} A_{2} \cdots A_{n}} \text { s.t. } \sigma_{A_{i} A_{j}}=\rho_{A B} \Longleftrightarrow K_{n} \text {-extendibility }
\end{array}
$$

- The property above can be formulated as a semidefinite program.


## Main result

- Consider isotropic states

$$
\rho_{l}(d):=p \omega+(1-p) \frac{l}{d} \otimes \frac{l}{d}
$$

The largest $p$ for which the isotropic state $\rho_{l}(d)$ is $K_{n}$-extendible is:

$$
p_{l}(n, d)= \begin{cases}\frac{1}{n-1+n \bmod 2} & \text { if } d>n \text { or either } d \text { or } n \text { is even } \\ \min \left\{\frac{2 d+1}{2 d n+1}, \frac{1}{n-1}\right\} & \text { if } n \geq d \text { and both } d \text { and } n \text { are odd }\end{cases}
$$

- Compare with optimal $p$ for $K_{1, n}$-extensibility ( $\Longleftrightarrow$ quantum cloning [Kw99])

$$
p_{l}\left(K_{1, n}, d\right)=\frac{d+n}{n(d+1)}
$$

- Similar results for Werner states and for Brauer states

$$
\begin{aligned}
\rho_{W}(d) & :=p \frac{\Pi_{\mathrm{B}}}{\operatorname{Tr} \Pi_{\mathrm{B}}}+(1-p) \frac{\Pi_{\mathrm{\Phi}}}{\operatorname{Tr} \Pi_{\mathrm{\oplus}}}, \quad \rho_{B}(d):=p \omega+q \frac{\Pi_{\mathrm{B}}}{\operatorname{Tr} \Pi_{\mathrm{B}}}+(1-p-q)\left[\frac{\Pi_{\mathrm{\infty}}}{\operatorname{Tr} \Pi_{\mathrm{\oplus}}}-\omega\right] \\
\Pi_{\mathrm{B}} & :=\frac{l-F}{2}, \quad \Pi_{\mathrm{\infty}}:=\frac{l+F}{2}, \quad F:=\sum_{i, j=1}^{d}|i j\rangle\langle j i|=
\end{aligned}
$$

## Proof techniques

## LB for isotropic states: perfect matchings

- A perfect matching on a graph $G=(V, E)$ is a subset of edges from $E$, such that every vertex in $V$ is contained in exactly one of those edges.
- There are $(2 n-1)$ !! perfect matchings on $K_{2 n}$, and if $e$ is an edge on $K_{2 n}$, then there are $(2 n-3)$ !! perfect matchings on $K_{2 n}$ containing $e$.

- Let $E_{1}, \ldots, E_{(2 n-1)!!}$ be all the perfect matchings on $K_{2 n}$, and for each perfect matching $E_{k}$, define the quantum state $\rho^{(k)}$ on $K_{2 n}$ by

$$
\rho^{(k)}:=\bigotimes_{e \in E_{k}} \omega_{e} \quad \text { and } \quad \rho:=\frac{1}{(2 n-1)!!} \sum_{k=1}^{(2 n-1)!!} \rho^{(k)}
$$

- For any edge $e \in K_{2 n}$, we have

$$
\rho_{e}=\frac{1}{2 n-1} \omega+\left(1-\frac{1}{2 n-1}\right) \frac{l}{d^{2}} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad p_{l}(2 n, d) \geq \frac{1}{2 n-1} .
$$

## UB for Werner states: symmetry

- Consider the simpler Werner states $p \cdot \Pi_{\mathrm{B}} / \operatorname{Tr} \Pi_{\mathrm{B}}+(1-p) \cdot \Pi_{\varpi} / \operatorname{Tr} \Pi_{\varpi}$.
- We want to solve, for a graph $G$ with $n$ vertices

$$
p_{W}(G, d):=\max _{\rho, p} p \text { s.t. } \quad \operatorname{Tr}\left[\Pi_{e} \rho\right]=p \quad \forall e \in E, \quad \operatorname{Tr} \rho=1, \quad \rho \geq 0
$$

where $\Pi_{e}$ acts like $\Pi_{\boxminus}$ on the tensor factors associated to the vertices of $e$ and as the identity elsewhere; $\rho$ is a state on $\left(\mathbb{C}^{d}\right)^{\otimes n}$.

- Given an optimal $\rho$, we can assume wlog that it has symmetry:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\forall U \in \mathcal{U}(d) & U^{\otimes n} \rho\left(U^{\otimes n}\right)^{*}=\rho \\
\forall \pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{n} & \pi . \rho=\rho
\end{aligned}
$$

with $\pi . A_{1} \otimes A_{2} \otimes \cdots \otimes A_{n}:=A_{\pi^{-1}(1)} \otimes A x_{\pi^{-1}(2)} \otimes \cdots \otimes A_{\pi^{-1}(n)}$.

- By Schur-Weyl duality [Aub18, GO22, Bra37], we have

$$
\rho=\sum_{\substack{\lambda \vdash n \\ l(\lambda) \leq d}} \beta_{\lambda} \rho_{\lambda}
$$

where $\beta_{\lambda}$ is a probability distribution $\left\{\beta_{\lambda}: \lambda \vdash n\right\}$ and $\rho_{\lambda}$ are the normalized isotypical projectors.

## Representation theory

- The groups $\mathcal{U}(d)$ and $\mathfrak{S}_{n}$ act on $\left(\mathbb{C}^{d}\right)^{\otimes n}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& U .\left|x_{1}\right\rangle \otimes\left|x_{2}\right\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes\left|x_{n}\right\rangle:=U\left|x_{1}\right\rangle \otimes U\left|x_{2}\right\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes U\left|x_{n}\right\rangle \\
& \pi \cdot\left|x_{1}\right\rangle \otimes\left|x_{2}\right\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes\left|x_{n}\right\rangle:=\left|x_{\pi^{-1}(1)}\right\rangle \otimes\left|x_{\pi^{-1}(2)}\right\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes\left|x_{\pi^{-1}(n)}\right\rangle
\end{aligned}
$$

- Schur-Weyl duality: the algebras spanned by the matrices associated to these actions are mutual commutants of each other. Equivalently, the space $\left(\mathbb{C}^{d}\right)^{\otimes n}$ decomposes into isotypic sectors consisting of tensor products of irreps:

$$
\left(\mathbb{C}^{d}\right)^{\otimes n} \simeq \bigoplus_{\substack{\lambda-n \\ l(\lambda) \leq d}} V_{\lambda}^{(\mathcal{U})} \otimes V_{\lambda}^{(\mathfrak{G})}
$$

- Since an optimal $\rho$ commutes is invariant w.r.t. both actions, it must act like the identity on each tensor factor, for every term of the direct sum.
- We have [CKMRO7] $\operatorname{Tr}_{[n] \backslash e} \rho_{\lambda}=\alpha_{\text {日 }}^{\lambda} \varepsilon_{\text {日 }}+\alpha_{\square}^{\lambda} \varepsilon_{\varpi}$, where

$$
\alpha_{\boxminus}^{\lambda}=\frac{s_{\boxminus}^{*}(\lambda)}{m_{d}(\Xi) n(n-1)},
$$

where $s_{\mu}^{*}(\lambda)$ is the shifted Schur function [0097] and $m_{d}(\lambda)=\operatorname{dim} V_{\lambda}^{(\mathcal{U})}$.

## Optimization

- Plugging the partial trace expression into the formula for $p_{W}$, in the case $G=K_{n}$, we obtain

$$
p_{W}(\rho)=\sum_{\substack{\lambda \vdash n \\ l(\lambda) \leq d}} \beta_{\lambda} \frac{d(\boxminus) s_{\boxminus}^{*}(\lambda)}{n(n-1)}
$$

- Since $\beta_{\lambda}$ are probability weights, we need to maximize the expression above over partitions $\lambda \vdash n$ with $l(\lambda) \leq d$.
- Using a formula for the shifted Schur function [0097] we obtain

$$
p_{W}(n, d)=\max _{\substack{\lambda+n \\ l(\lambda) \leq d}} \frac{\sum_{d \geq i>j \geq 1} \lambda_{i}\left(\lambda_{j}+1\right)}{n(n-1)}
$$

- The optimal $\lambda$ is the tallest approximate rectangle possible, and gives

$$
p_{W}(n, d)=\frac{d-1}{2 d} \cdot \frac{(n+k+d)(n-k)}{n(n-1)}+\frac{k(k-1)}{n(n-1)} \quad \text { where } k=n \bmod d
$$

- Clearly, if $d \geq n, p_{W}=1$ is achieved by $\lambda=1^{n}$, and $\rho$ is the normalized projection on the anti-symmetric subspace $\Lambda^{n}\left(\mathbb{C}^{d}\right) \subseteq\left(\mathbb{C}^{d}\right)^{\otimes n}$.


## Take home slide

## Monogamy of highly symmetric states

A bipartite symmetric quantum state $\rho=\bullet \square$ is $G=\stackrel{0}{0} 0_{0}^{0}$-extendible if there exists a global state $\sigma=$ on $G$ such that for all edges $e={ }_{\bullet} ; \in G$, the reduced state $\sigma_{e}={ }_{\bullet}^{\circ}$ is equal to $\rho$.

- For $G=K_{1, n}$ or $G=K_{m, n}$, we obtain the standard DPS hierarchy.
- For given $d$ and $n$, we compute the value noise parameter $p$ for which highly symmetric states (Werner, Brauer, isotropic) on $\mathbb{C}^{d} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d}$ are $K_{n}$-extendible

$$
\rho_{I}=p \cdot \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i j}|i i\rangle\langle j j|+(1-p) \cdot \frac{l}{d} \otimes \frac{l}{d}
$$

- $G$-extendibility of isotropic states for all $n$ : separability vs. $K_{n}$-extendibility

| Graph family | Form of $\infty$-extendible states | Range of $p$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $K_{1, n}$ or $K_{m, n}$ | $\rho=\sum_{i} \alpha_{i} \otimes \beta_{i}$ | $\left[\frac{-1}{d^{2}-1}, \frac{1}{d+1}\right]$ |
| $K_{n}$ | $\rho=\sum_{i} \alpha_{i} \otimes \alpha_{i}$ | $\{0\}$ |
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