Monogamy of highly symmetric states

Ion Nechita (LPT Toulouse) R. Allerstorfer, M. Christandl, D. Grinko, M. Ozols, D. Rochette, P. Verduyn Lunel https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.16655

QuDATA Workshop, January 25th, 2024







Outline

We introduce the notion of graph-extendability

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]: $\rho \in \mathcal{M}_d^{\mathrm{sa}}(\mathbb{C})$ such that $\rho \geq 0$, Tr $\rho = 1$.
- A bipartite quantum state ρ ∈ M^{sa}_d(ℂ) ⊗ M^{sa}_d(ℂ) is separable if it can be decomposed as a convex combination of product quantum states:

$$\rho = \sum_{i} \alpha_i \otimes \beta_i \quad \text{with } \alpha_i, \beta_i \ge 0$$

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

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

• The maximally entangled state

$$\omega := \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} |ii\rangle\langle jj| = \frac{1}{d} \int_{i}^{i} \int_{j}^{\bullet} \int_{j}^{$$

• Deciding whether a given state ρ is separable is an NP-hard problem [Gur03].

Detecting entanglement

• There exist various criteria to detect entanglement or separability

$$\rho \in \mathsf{SEP} \implies \rho^{\Gamma} := [\mathsf{id} \otimes \mathsf{transp}](\rho) = \sum_{i} \alpha_{i} \otimes \beta_{i}^{\top} \ge 0$$
$$\left\| \rho - \frac{l}{d} \otimes \frac{l}{d} \right\|_{2} \le \frac{1}{d\sqrt{d^{2} - 1}} \implies \rho \in \mathsf{SEP}$$

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

$$\mathsf{EXT}_k := \left\{ \rho_{AB} : \exists \, \sigma_{AB_1B_2\cdots B_k} \ge 0 \text{ s.t. } \sigma_{AB_i} = \rho_{AB} \quad \forall i \in [k] \right\}$$

all states =
$$\mathsf{EXT}_1 \supseteq \mathsf{EXT}_2 \supseteq \cdots \supseteq \mathsf{EXT}_k \supseteq \cdots \supseteq \mathsf{EXT}_{\infty} = \mathsf{SEP}$$

- Easy direction: if ρ is separable, $\rho = \sum_i \alpha_i \otimes \beta_i \rightsquigarrow \text{take } \sigma = \sum_i \alpha_i \otimes \beta_i^{\otimes k}$
- Quantitative version [CKMR07]:

$$\rho \in \mathsf{EXT}_k \implies \min_{\sigma \in \mathsf{SEP}} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \le \frac{4d^2}{k}$$

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

$$\nexists \rho_{ABC}$$
 s.t. $\rho_{AB} = \omega$ and $\rho_{AC} = \omega$

• Actually, we have more: given a quantum state ρ_{ABC} ,

$$\rho_{AB} = \omega \implies \rho_{ABC} = \omega_{AB} \otimes \rho_C$$

- A bipartite symmetric state ρ is called *n*-exchangeable if there exists a *n*-partite symmetric state σ such that $\rho = \text{Tr}_{n-2} \sigma$
- The quantum de Finetti theorem [ΗΜ76, CFS02, KR05, CKMR07]: a bipartite state ρ is *n*-exchangable for every *n* iff

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

Main definition



This notion generalizes the two previous ones:

n-extendibility : $\exists \sigma_{AB_1B_2\cdots B_n}$ s.t. $\sigma_{AB_i} = \rho_{AB} \iff K_{1,n}$ -extendibility *n*-exchangeability : $\exists \sigma_{A_1A_2\cdots A_n}$ s.t. $\sigma_{A_iA_j} = \rho_{AB} \iff K_n$ -extendibility

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

Main result

• Consider isotropic states

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

The largest p for which the isotropic state $\rho_l(d)$ is K_n -extendible is:

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

• Compare with optimal p for $K_{1,n}$ -extensibility (\iff quantum cloning [KW99])

$$p_I(K_{1,n},d)=\frac{d+n}{n(d+1)}$$

• Similar results for Werner states and for Brauer states

$$\begin{split} \rho_{W}(d) &:= p \frac{\Pi_{\mathbb{B}}}{\mathsf{Tr}\,\Pi_{\mathbb{B}}} + (1-p) \frac{\Pi_{\mathbb{m}}}{\mathsf{Tr}\,\Pi_{\mathbb{m}}}, \quad \rho_{B}(d) := p \omega + q \frac{\Pi_{\mathbb{B}}}{\mathsf{Tr}\,\Pi_{\mathbb{B}}} + (1-p-q) \Big[\frac{\Pi_{\mathbb{m}}}{\mathsf{Tr}\,\Pi_{\mathbb{m}}} - \omega \Big] \\ \Pi_{\mathbb{B}} &:= \frac{I-F}{2}, \qquad \Pi_{\mathbb{m}} := \frac{I+F}{2}, \qquad F := \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} |ij\rangle \langle ji| = \int_{j}^{i} \int_{j}^{j} \int_{j}^{j}$$

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 (2n − 1)!! perfect matchings on K_{2n}, and if e is an edge on K_{2n}, then there are (2n − 3)!! perfect matchings on K_{2n} containing e.



Let E₁,..., E_{(2n-1)!!} be all the perfect matchings on K_{2n}, and for each perfect matching E_k, define the quantum state ρ^(k) on K_{2n} by

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

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

$$\rho_e = rac{1}{2n-1}\omega + \Big(1-rac{1}{2n-1}\Big)rac{l}{d^2} \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad p_l(2n,d) \geq rac{1}{2n-1}.$$

- Consider the simpler Werner states p · Π_B/ Tr Π_B + (1 − p) · Π_m/ Tr Π_m.
- We want to solve, for a graph G with n vertices

$$p_W(G,d):=\max_{
ho,
ho} p \;\; ext{s.t.} \;\; ext{Tr}[\Pi_e
ho]=p \;\;\; orall e \in E, \;\;\; ext{Tr} \;
ho=1, \;\;\;
ho \geq 0$$

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

• Given an optimal ρ , we can assume wlog that it has symmetry:

$$\forall U \in \mathcal{U}(d) \qquad U^{\otimes n} \rho (U^{\otimes n})^* = \rho$$
$$\forall \pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n \qquad \pi . \rho = \rho$$

with $\pi.A_1 \otimes A_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes A_n := A_{\pi^{-1}(1)} \otimes Ax_{\pi^{-1}(2)} \otimes \cdots \otimes A_{\pi^{-1}(n)}$.

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

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

where β_{λ} is a probability distribution $\{\beta_{\lambda} : \lambda \vdash n\}$ and ρ_{λ} are the normalized isotypical projectors.

Representation theory

• The groups $\mathcal{U}(d)$ and \mathfrak{S}_n act on $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$:

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

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

$$(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n} \simeq \bigoplus_{\substack{\lambda \vdash n \\ l(\lambda) \leq d}} V_{\lambda}^{(\mathcal{U})} \otimes V_{\lambda}^{(\mathfrak{S})}.$$

- Since an optimal ρ 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 [CKMR07] $\operatorname{Tr}_{[n]\setminus e} \rho_{\lambda} = \alpha_{\mathrm{H}}^{\lambda} \varepsilon_{\mathrm{H}} + \alpha_{\mathrm{m}}^{\lambda} \varepsilon_{\mathrm{m}}$, where

$$\alpha_{\mathrm{H}}^{\lambda} = \frac{s_{\mathrm{H}}^{*}(\lambda)}{m_{d}(\underline{\square})n(n-1)}$$

where $s^*_{\mu}(\lambda)$ is the shifted Schur function [0097] and $m_d(\lambda) = \dim V^{(\mathcal{U})}_{\lambda}$.

Optimization

• Plugging the partial trace expression into the formula for p_W , in the case $G = K_n$, we obtain

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

- Since β_λ are probability weights, we need to maximize the expression above over partitions λ ⊢ n with l(λ) ≤ d.
- Using a formula for the shifted Schur function [0097] we obtain

$$p_W(n,d) = \max_{\substack{\lambda \vdash n \ l(\lambda) \leq d}} rac{\sum_{d \geq i > j \geq 1} \lambda_i(\lambda_j+1)}{n(n-1)}$$

• The optimal λ is the tallest approximate rectangle possible, and gives

$$p_W(n,d) = rac{d-1}{2d} \cdot rac{(n+k+d)(n-k)}{n(n-1)} + rac{k(k-1)}{n(n-1)} \quad ext{where } k = n ext{ mod } d$$

Clearly, if d ≥ n, p_W = 1 is achieved by λ = 1ⁿ, and ρ is the normalized projection on the anti-symmetric subspace Λⁿ(ℂ^d) ⊆ (ℂ^d)^{⊗n}.

Take home slide

Monogamy of highly symmetric states



- 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

$$ho_I =
ho \cdot rac{1}{d} \sum_{ij} |ii
angle \langle jj| + (1-
ho) \cdot rac{l}{d} \otimes rac{l}{d}$$

• G-extendibility of isotropic states for all n: separability vs. K_n -extendibility

Graph family	Form of ∞ -extendible states	Range of <i>p</i>
$K_{1,n}$ or $K_{m,n}$	$ \rho = \sum_{i} \alpha_i \otimes \beta_i $	$\left[rac{-1}{d^2-1},rac{1}{d+1} ight]$
K _n	$ \rho = \sum_{i} \alpha_i \otimes \alpha_i $	{0}



[Aub18]	Guillaume Aubrun. Schur-weyl duality, 2018.
[Bra37]	Richard Brauer. On algebras which are connected with the semisimple continuous groups. Annals of Mathematics, pages 857–872, 1937.
[CFS02]	Carlton M Caves, Christopher A Fuchs, and Rüdiger Schack.
	Unknown quantum states: the quantum de finetti representation. Journal of Mathematical Physics, 43(9):4537–4559, 2002.
[CKMR07]	Matthias Christandl, Robert König, Graeme Mitchison, and Renato Renner. One-and-a-half quantum de finetti theorems. Communications in Mathematical Physics, 273(2):473–498, 2007.
[DP\$02]	Andrew C Doherty, Pablo A Parrilo, and Federico M Spedalieri. Distinguishing separable and entangled states. <i>Physical Review Letters</i> , 88(18):187904, 2002.
[DPS04]	Andrew C Doherty, Pablo A Parrilo, and Federico M Spedalieri. Complete family of separability criteria. <i>Physical Review A</i> , 69(2):022308, 2004.
[GO22]	Dmitry Grinko and Maris Ozols. Linear programming with unitary-equivariant constraints. 2022.
[Gur03]	Leonid Gurvits.

	Classical deterministic complexity of edmonds' problem and quantum entanglement. In Proceedings of the thirty-fifth annual ACM symposium o Theory of computing, pages 10–19, 2003.
[HM76]	Robin L Hudson and Graham R Moody. Locally normal symmetric states and an analogue of de finetti's theorem. Zeitschrift row Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete, 33(4):343–351, 1976.
[KR05]	Robert König and Renato Renner. A de finetti representation for finite symmetric quantum states. Journal of Mathematical physics, 46(12), 2005.
[KW99]	Michael Keyl and Reinhard F Werner. Optimal cloning of pure states, testing single clones. Journal of Mathematical Physics, 40(7):3283–3299, 1999.
[KW04]	Masato Koashi and Andreas Winter. Monogamy of quantum entanglement and other correlations. <i>Physical Review A</i> , 69(2):022309, 2004.
[NC10]	Michael A Nielsen and Isaac L Chuang. <i>Quantum computation and quantum information.</i> Cambridge University Press, 2010.
[0097]	Andrei Okounkov and Grigori Olshanski. Shifted schur functions. Algebra i Analiz, 9(2):73–146, 1997.
[Wat18]	John Watrous. <i>The Theory of Quantum Information.</i> Cambridge University Press, 2018.