How to construct entanglement witnesses

Dariusz Chruściński and Andrzej Kossakowski
Institute of Physics, Nicolaus Copernicus University,
Grudziądzka 5/7, 87–100 Toruń, Poland

Abstract

We present very simple method for constructing indecomposable entanglement witnesses out of a given pair — an entanglement witness W and the corresponding state detected by W. This method may be used to produce new classes of atomic witnesses which are able to detect the 'weakest' quantum entanglement. Actually, it works perfectly in the multipartite case, too. Moreover, this method provides a powerful tool for constructing new examples of bound entangled states.

1 Introduction

One of the most important problems of quantum information theory [1, 2] is the characterization of mixed states of composed quantum systems. In particular it is of primary importance to test whether a given quantum state is separable or entangled. For low dimensional systems there exists simple necessary and sufficient condition for separability. The celebrated Peres-Horodecki criterium [3, 4] states that a state of a bipartite system living in $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$ or $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^3$ is separable iff its partial transpose is positive, i.e. a state is PPT. Unfortunately, for higher-dimensional systems there is no single universal separability condition.

The most general approach to characterize quantum entanglement uses a notion of an entanglement witness (EW) [5, 6, 7]. A Hermitian operator W defined on a tensor product $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ is called an EW iff 1) $\mathrm{Tr}(W\sigma_{\mathrm{sep}}) \geq 0$ for all separable states σ_{sep}, and 2) there exists an entangled state ρ such that $\mathrm{Tr}(W\rho) < 0$ (one says that ρ is detected by W). It turns out that a state is entangled if and only if it is detected by some EW [5]. There was a considerable effort in constructing and analyzing the structure of EWs [6–15]. There were also attempts for their experimental realizations [16, 17] and several procedures for optimizing EWs for arbitrary states were proposed [8, 18, 19, 20].

The simplest way to construct EW is to define $W = P + (\mathbb{1} \otimes \tau)Q$, where P and Q are positive operators, and $(\mathbb{1} \otimes \tau)Q$ denotes partial transposition. It is easy to see that $\mathrm{Tr}(W\sigma_{\mathrm{sep}}) \geq 0$ for all separable states σ_{sep}, and hence if W is non-positive, then it is EW. Such EWs are said to be decomposable [**?**]. Note, however, that decomposable EW cannot detect PPT entangled state (PPTES) and, therefore, such EWs are useless in the search for bound entangled state. Unfortunately, there is no general method to construct indecomposable EW and only very few examples of indecomposable EWs are available in the literature.

In the present paper we propose very simple method for constructing indecomposable EWs. If we are given one indecomposable EW W_0 and the corresponding state ρ_0 detected by W_0, then we are able to construct an open convex set of indecomposable EWs detecting ρ_0, and an open convex set of PPTES detected by W_0. Hence, out of a given pair (W_0, ρ_0) we construct huge classes of new EWs and PPTES, respectively. In particular, we may apply this method to construct so called atomic EWs which are able to detect the 'weakest' quantum entanglement (i.e. PPTES ρ such that both Schmidt number [21] of ρ and its partial transposition $(\mathbb{1}\otimes\tau)\rho$ does not exceed 2). We stress that proposed method is very general and it works perfectly for multipartite case.

The paper is organized as follows: in the next section we introduce a natural hierarchy of convex cones in the space of EWs. This hierarchy explains the importance of indecomposable and atomic EWs. Section 3 presents our method for constructing indecomposable EWs. Section 4 provides construction of atomic EWs and it is illustrated by a new class of such witnesses. Finally, in section 5 we generalize our construction for multipartite case. A brief discussion is included in the last section.

2 A hierarchy of entanglement witnesses

Consider a space $\mathcal{P}$ of positive operators in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1\otimes\mathcal{H}_2)$. There is a natural family of convex cones in $\mathcal{P}$:

$$\mathbf{V}_r = \{\, \rho\in\mathcal{P} \mid \mathrm{SN}(\rho)\le r \,\} \ , \tag{1}$$

where $\mathrm{SN}(\rho)$ denotes the Schmidt number of (unnormalized) positive operator ρ [21]. One has the following chain of inclusions

$$\mathbf{V}_1 \subset \ldots \subset \mathbf{V}_d = \mathcal{P} \ , \tag{2}$$

where $d=\min\{d_1,d_2\}$, and $d_k=\dim\mathcal{H}_k$. Clearly, $\mathbf{V}_1$ is a cone of separable (unnormalized) states and $\mathbf{V}_d \smallsetminus \mathbf{V}_1$ stands for a set of entangled states. Note, that a partial transposition $(\mathbb{1}\otimes\tau)$ gives rise to another family of cones:

$$\mathbf{V}^l = (\mathbb{1}\otimes\tau)\mathbf{V}_l \ , \tag{3}$$

such that $\mathbf{V}^1\subset\ldots\subset\mathbf{V}^d$. One has $\mathbf{V}_1=\mathbf{V}^1$, together with the following hierarchy of inclusions:

$$\mathbf{V}_1 = \mathbf{V}_1\cap\mathbf{V}^1 \subset \mathbf{V}_2\cap\mathbf{V}^2 \subset\ldots\subset \mathbf{V}_d\cap\mathbf{V}^d \ . \tag{4}$$

Note, that $\mathbf{V}_d\cap\mathbf{V}^d$ is a convex set of PPT (unnormalized) states. Finally, $\mathbf{V}_r\cap\mathbf{V}^s$ is a convex subset of PPT states ρ such that $\mathrm{SN}(\rho)\le r$ and $\mathrm{SN}[(\mathbb{1}\otimes\tau)\rho]\le s$.

Now, in the set of entanglement witnesses $\mathbf{W}$ one may introduce the family of dual cones:

$$\mathbf{W}_r = \{\, W\in\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1\otimes\mathcal{H}_2) |\ \mathrm{Tr}(W\rho)\ge 0 \ ,\ \rho\in\mathbf{V}_r \,\} \ . \tag{5}$$

One has

$$\mathcal{P} = \mathbf{W}_d \subset\ldots\subset \mathbf{W}_1 \ . \tag{6}$$

Clearly, $\mathbf{W}=\mathbf{W}_1\smallsetminus\mathbf{W}_d$. Moreover, for any $k>l$, entanglement witnesses from $\mathbf{W}_l\smallsetminus\mathbf{W}_k$ can detect entangled states from $\mathbf{V}_k\smallsetminus\mathbf{V}_l$, i.e. states ρ with Schmidt number $l<\mathrm{SN}(\rho)\le k$. In particular $W\in\mathbf{W}_k\smallsetminus\mathbf{W}_{k+1}$ can detect state ρ with $\mathrm{SN}(\rho)=k$.

Finally, let us consider the following class

$$\mathbf{W}_r^s = \mathbf{W}_r + (\mathbb{1}\otimes\tau)\mathbf{W}_s \ , \tag{7}$$

that is, $W \in \mathbf{W}_r^s$ iff

$$W = P + (\mathbb{1} \otimes \tau)Q \ , \tag{8}$$

with $P \in \mathbf{W}_r$ and $Q \in \mathbf{W}_s$. Note, that $\mathrm{Tr}(W\rho) \geq 0$ for all $\rho \in \mathbf{V}_r \cap \mathbf{V}^s$. Hence such W can detect PPT states ρ such that $\mathrm{SN}(\rho) \geq r$ and $\mathrm{SN}[(\mathbb{1} \otimes \tau)\rho] \geq s$. Entanglement witnesses from $\mathbf{W}_d^d$ are called decomposable [**?**]. They cannot detect PPT states. One has the following chain of inclusions:

$$\mathbf{W}_d^d \subset \ldots \subset \mathbf{W}_2^2 \subset \mathbf{W}_1^1 \equiv \mathbf{W} \ . \tag{9}$$

To deal with PPT states one needs indecomposable witnesses from $\mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{ind}} := \mathbf{W} \setminus \mathbf{W}_d^d$. The 'weakest' entanglement can be detected by elements from $\mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{atom}} := \mathbf{W} \setminus \mathbf{W}_2^2$. We shall call them *atomic entanglement witnesses*. It is clear that W is an atomic entanglement witness if there is an entangled state $\rho \in \mathbf{V}_2 \cap \mathbf{V}^2$ such that $\mathrm{Tr}(W\rho) < 0$. The knowledge of atomic witnesses, or equivalently atomic maps, is crucial: knowing this set we would be able to distinguish all entangled states from separable ones.

3 Detecting PPT entangled states

Suppose that a PPT entangled state ρ_0 in $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ is detected by an entanglement witness W_0, that is

$$\mathrm{Tr}(W_0\rho_0) < 0 \ . \tag{10}$$

It is clear that in the vicinity of ρ_0 there are other PPT entangled states detected by the same witness W_0. Let σ_{sep} be an arbitrary separable state and consider the following convex combination

$$\rho_\alpha = (1-\alpha)\rho_0 + \alpha\sigma_{\mathrm{sep}} \ . \tag{11}$$

It is evident that ρ_α is PPT for any $\alpha \in [0,1]$. Moreover, for any $0 \leq \alpha < \alpha_{[\rho_0,\sigma_{\mathrm{sep}}]}$, with

$$\alpha_{[\rho_0,\sigma_{\mathrm{sep}}]} := \sup\{\alpha \in [0,1] \ | \ \mathrm{Tr}(W_0\rho_\alpha) < 0\} \ , \tag{12}$$

ρ_α is entangled. This construction gives rise to an open convex set

$$\mathcal{S}^{\mathrm{PPT}}[W_0|\rho_0] := \left\{ \rho_\alpha \ \middle| \ 0 \leq \alpha < \alpha_{[\rho_0,\sigma_{\mathrm{sep}}]} \ \ \& \ \text{aribitrary} \ \ \sigma_{\mathrm{sep}} \right\} . \tag{13}$$

All elements from $\mathcal{S}^{\mathrm{PPT}}[W_0|\rho_0]$ are PPT entangled states detected by W_0. On the other hand in the vicinity of W_0 there are other entanglement witnesses detecting our original PPT state ρ_0. Indeed, let P be an arbitrary positive semidefinite operator in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2)$ and consider one-parameter family of operators

$$W_\lambda = W_0 + \lambda P \ , \qquad \lambda \geq 0 \ . \tag{14}$$

Let us observe that for any $0 \leq \lambda < \lambda_{[W_0,P]}$ with

$$\lambda_{[W_0,P]} := \sup\{\lambda \geq 0 \ | \ \mathrm{Tr}(W_\lambda\rho_0) < 0\} \ , \tag{15}$$

W_λ is an indecomposable EW detecting a PPT state ρ_0. This construction gives rise to a dual open convex set

$$\mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{ind}}[W_0|\rho_0] := \left\{ \ W_\lambda \ \middle| \ 0 \leq \lambda < \lambda_{[W_0,P]} \ \ \& \ \ \text{aribitrary} \ P \geq 0 \ \right\} . \tag{16}$$

Summarizing, having a pair of a PPTES ρ_0 and an indecomposable EW W_0 we may construct two open convex sets: $\mathcal{S}^{\rm PPT}[W_0|\rho_0]$ containing PPTES detected by W_0 and $\mathcal{W}^{\rm ind}[W_0|\rho_0]$ containing indecomposable EW detecting ρ_0. It shows that for any $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathcal{S}^{\rm PPT}[W_0|\rho_0]$ any convex combination

$$p_1\rho_1 + p_2\rho_2 \in \mathcal{S}^{\rm PPT}[W_0|\rho_0] \ , \tag{17}$$

and hence defines a PPTES. Similarly, for any $W_1, W_2 \in \mathcal{W}^{\rm ind}[W_0|\rho_0]$ any convex combination

$$w_1W_1 + w_2W_2 \in \mathcal{W}^{\rm ind}[W_0|\rho_0] \ , \tag{18}$$

and hence defines a indecomposable EW. Therefore, the above constructions provide a methods to produce new PPTES and new indecomposable EW out of a single pair (ρ_0, W_0).

Note, that this construction may be easily continued. Let us take an arbitrary EW W' from $\mathcal{W}^{\rm ind}[W_0|\rho_0]$ (different from W_0). It is easy to find PPTES from $\mathcal{S}^{\rm PPT}[W_0|\rho_0]$ detected by W': indeed, any state in $\mathcal{S}^{\rm PPT}[W_0|\rho_0]$ has a form (47) and hence

$$\mathrm{Tr}(W'\rho_\alpha) = (1-\alpha)\mathrm{Tr}(W'\rho_0) + \alpha\mathrm{Tr}(W'\sigma_{\rm sep}) \ . \tag{19}$$

Therefore, one has $\mathrm{Tr}(W'\rho_\alpha) < 0$ for

$$\alpha < \frac{-\mathrm{Tr}(W'\rho_0)}{-\mathrm{Tr}(W'\rho_0) + \mathrm{Tr}(W'\sigma_{\rm sep})} \leq 1 \ . \tag{20}$$

Now, W' and $\rho' = \rho_\alpha$ with α satisfying (20) defines a new pair which may be used as a starting point for the construction of $\mathcal{S}^{\rm PPT}[W'|\rho']$ and $\mathcal{W}^{\rm ind}[W'|\rho']$.

4 Constructing atomic entanglement witnesses

Suppose now, that we are given a 'weakly entangled' PPTES, i.e. a state $\rho_0 \in \mathbf{V}_2 \cap \mathbf{V}^2$ and let W_0 be the corresponding atomic EW. Following our construction we define

$$\mathcal{S}_2^2[W_0|\rho_0] \subset \mathbf{V}_2 \cap \mathbf{V}^2 \ , \tag{21}$$

such that each element from $\mathcal{S}_2^2[W_0|\rho_0]$ is detected by the same witness W_0. Similarly, we define a set of atomic witnesses

$$\mathcal{W}^{\rm atom}[W_0|\rho_0] \subset \mathbf{W}^{\rm atom} \ , \tag{22}$$

such that each element from $\mathcal{W}^{\rm atom}[W_0|\rho_0]$ detects our original state ρ_0. Both sets $\mathcal{S}_2^2[W_0|\rho_0]$ and $\mathcal{W}^{\rm atom}[W_0|\rho_0]$ are open and convex.

Note, that knowing atomic EWs one may detect all entangled states. Moreover, it was conjectured by Osaka [24] that all EWs in $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^3 \otimes \mathbb{C}^3)$ may be represented as a sum of decomposable and atomic witnesses. To the best of our knowledge this conjecture is still open. It shows that the knowledge of atomic EWs is crucial both from physical and purely mathematical point of view. Let us illustrate the construction of atomic EWs by the following

Example: new class of atomic EWs in $3 \otimes 3$.

It is well known that there is a direct relation between entanglement witnesses in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2)$ and positive maps $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2)$. Due to the Choi-Jamiołkowski isomorphism [22, 23] one has

$$\varphi \longrightarrow W_\varphi := \sum_{i,j=1}^{d_1} e_{ij} \otimes \varphi(e_{ij}) \ , \tag{23}$$

with $d_1 = \dim \mathcal{H}_1$. In what follows we are using the following notation: $(e_1, \ldots, e_d)$ denotes an orthonormal basis in $\mathbb{C}^d$, and $e_{ij} = |e_i\rangle\langle e_j|$. Consider now the following operator in $M_3 \otimes M_3$ which is related via Choi-Jamiołkowski isomorphism to the celebrated Choi map [23][1]

$$W_0 = \left(\begin{array}{ccc|ccc|ccc} 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & -1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & -1 \\ \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \hline \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ -1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & -1 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \hline \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ -1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & -1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 \end{array} \right) , \tag{24}$$

where to maintain more transparent form we replace all zeros by dots. It was shown by Ha [25] that W_0 is atomic. The proof is based on the construction of a state in $\mathbf{V}_2 \cap \mathbf{V}^2$ detected by W_0. Actually, Ha constructed a whole one-parameter family of such states. For any $0 < \gamma < 1$ let us define

$$\rho_\gamma = \frac{1}{N_\gamma} \left(\begin{array}{ccc|ccc|ccc} 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 \\ \cdot & a_\gamma & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & b_\gamma & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \hline \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & b_\gamma & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & a_\gamma & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \hline \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & a_\gamma & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & b_\gamma & \cdot \\ 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 \end{array} \right) , \tag{25}$$

with

$$a_\gamma = \frac{1}{3}(\gamma^2 + 2) \ , \quad b_\gamma = \frac{1}{3}(\gamma^{-2} + 2) \ , \tag{26}$$

and the normalization factor

$$N_\gamma = 7 + \gamma^2 + \gamma^{-2} \ . \tag{27}$$

It was shown [25] that $\rho_\gamma \in \mathbf{V}_2 \cap \mathbf{V}^2$ and $\mathrm{Tr}(W_0 \rho_\gamma) = (\gamma^2 - 1)/N_\gamma$. Hence, for $\gamma < 1$ the state ρ_γ

[1] The (unnormalized) Choi map $\varphi : M_3 \longrightarrow M_3$ is defined as follows:

$$\varphi(e_{11}) = e_{11} + e_{22} \ , \quad \varphi(e_{22}) = e_{22} + e_{33} \ , \quad \varphi(e_{33}) = e_{33} + e_{11} \ ,$$

and $\varphi(e_{ij}) = -e_{ij}$, for $i \neq j$.

is entangled (and W_0 is indecomposable EW).[2] It is therefore clear that if $\gamma_1,\ldots,\gamma_K \in (0,1)$, then any convex combination

$$p_1\rho_{\gamma_1} + \ldots + p_K\rho_{\gamma_K} \tag{29}$$

defines an entangled state in $\mathbf{V}_2 \cap \mathbf{V}^2$ detected by W_0.

Consider now the following maximally entangled state in $\mathbb{C}^3 \otimes \mathbb{C}^3$:

$$\psi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(e_1 \otimes e_3 + e_2 \otimes e_1 + e_3 \otimes e_2)\ , \tag{30}$$

and let $P = 3|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$. Define $W_\lambda = W_0 + \lambda P$. It is given by the following matrix

$$W_\lambda \ = \ \left(\begin{array}{ccc|ccc|ccc} 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & -1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & -1 \\ \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \lambda & \lambda & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \lambda & \cdot \\ \hline \cdot & \cdot & \lambda & \lambda & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \lambda & \cdot \\ -1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & -1 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \hline \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \lambda & \lambda & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \lambda & \cdot \\ -1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & -1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 \end{array}\right)\ , \tag{31}$$

and hence $\mathrm{Tr}(W_\lambda\rho_\gamma) < 0$, if

$$\lambda < \frac{1-\gamma^2}{2+\gamma^{-2}}\ . \tag{32}$$

Actually, the maximal value of λ is attainable for $\gamma^* = \sqrt{(\sqrt{3}-1)/2} \approx 0.605$. Therefore, taking as ρ_0 the state ρ_{γ^*}, one finds $\lambda_{[W_0,P]} = (1-\gamma^{*2})/(2+\gamma^{*-2}) \approx 0.133$. This way it is shown that W_λ, with $0 \leq \lambda < \lambda_{[W_0,P]}$, defines an atomic EW. We may still modify W_λ by adding for example a positive operator $Q = 3|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|$, where

$$\varphi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(e_1 \otimes e_2 + e_2 \otimes e_3 + e_3 \otimes e_1)\ , \tag{33}$$

that is

$$W_{\lambda,\mu} = W_0 + \lambda P + \mu Q\ . \tag{34}$$

[2] Actually, for $\gamma = 1$ one has

$$\rho_{\gamma=1} \ = \ \frac{1}{9}\left(\begin{array}{ccc|ccc|ccc} 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 \\ \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \hline \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \hline \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot \\ 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 \end{array}\right)\ , \tag{28}$$

and it is known [4] that this state is separable.

One finds the following matrix representation

$$
W_{\lambda,\mu} \;=\; \left(\begin{array}{ccc|ccc|ccc}
1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & -1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & -1 \\
\cdot & 1+\mu & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \mu & \mu & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \lambda & \lambda & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \lambda & \cdot \\ \hline
\cdot & \cdot & \lambda & \lambda & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \lambda & \cdot \\
-1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & -1 \\
\cdot & \mu & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1+\mu & \mu & \cdot & \cdot \\ \hline
\cdot & \mu & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \mu & \mu & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \lambda & \lambda & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \lambda & \cdot \\
-1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & -1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1
\end{array} \right) . \tag{35}
$$

Now, $\mathrm{Tr}(W_{\lambda,\mu}\rho_\gamma) < 0$, if λ satisfies (32) and

$$
\mu < \frac{1-\gamma^2 - \lambda(2+\gamma^{-2})}{2+\gamma^2} \ . \tag{36}
$$

Interestingly, applying our method to a pair (W_0, ρ_γ) we constructed an atomic EW $W_{\lambda,\mu}$ which has a circulant structure analyzed in [26]. Therefore, it may be used to test quantum entanglement within a class of circulant PPT states [26] (see also [27]). To the best of our knowledge this is the first example of a 'circulant atomic' EW.

Actually, this example may be generalized for $d \otimes d$ case. Consider the following set of Hermitian operators:

$$
W_{d,k} := \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} e_{ij} \otimes X^{d,k}_{ij} \ , \tag{37}
$$

where the $d \times d$ matrices $X^{d,k}_{ij}$ are defined as follows:

$$
X^{d,k}_{ij} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} (d-k-1)e_{ii} + \sum_{l=1}^{k} e_{i+l,i+l} & , \ i = j \\ -e_{ij} & , \ i \neq j \end{array} \right. \ . \tag{38}
$$

For $d = 3$ and $k = 1$ the above formula reconstructs W_0 defined in (24). Again, $W_{d,k}$ are related via Choi-Jamiołkowski isomorphism to the family of positive maps [28]

$$
\tau_{d,k}(x) = (d-k)\varepsilon(x) + \sum_{l=1}^{k} \varepsilon(S^l x S^{*l}) - x \ , \qquad x \in M_d \ , \tag{39}
$$

where $\varepsilon(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} x_{ii}e_{ii}$, and S is the shift operator defined by $Se_i = e_{i+1}$ (mod d). The positivity of $\tau_{d,k}$ for $k = 1, \ldots, d-1$ was shown by [28] (for $k = d-1$ this map is completely copositive) and Osaka shown that $\tau_{d,1}$ is atomic. Finally, it was shown by Ha [25] that it is atomic for $k = 1, \ldots, k-2$. Therefore, it proves the atomicity of $W_{d,k}$. Ha's proof is based on the construction of the family of states $\rho_\gamma \in \mathbf{V}_2 \cap \mathbf{V}^2$:

$$
\rho_\gamma = \frac{1}{N_\gamma} \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} e_{ij} \otimes A^\gamma_{ij} \ , \tag{40}
$$

where the $d \times d$ matrices A^γ_{ij} are defined as follows:

$$A^\gamma_{ij} = \begin{cases} e_{ij} & , \ i \neq j \\ e_{11} + a_\gamma e_{22} + \sum_{l=3}^{d-1} e_{ll} + b_\gamma e_{dd} & , \ i = j = 1 \\ S^{j-1} A_{11} S^{*j-1} & , \ i = j \neq 1 \end{cases} , \tag{41}$$

with

$$a_\gamma = \frac{1}{d}(\gamma^2 + d - 1) \ , \qquad b_\gamma = \frac{1}{d}(\gamma^{-2} + d - 1) \ , \tag{42}$$

and the normalization factor

$$N_\gamma = d^2 - 2 + \gamma^2 + \gamma^{-2} \ , \tag{43}$$

which reproduces (27) for $d = 3$. One shows [25] that $\rho_\gamma \in \mathbf{V}_2 \cap \mathbf{V}^2$ and $\mathrm{Tr}(W_{d,k}\rho_\gamma) = (\gamma^2 - 1)/N_\gamma$. Hence, for $\gamma < 1$, the family of states ρ_γ is detected by each $W_{d,k}$ for $k = 1, \ldots, d-2$. It is therefore clear that any convex combination

$$W_d[\mathbf{p}] := \sum_{k=1}^{d-2} p_k \, W_{d,k} \ , \qquad \mathbf{p} = (p_1, \ldots, p_{d-2}) \ , \tag{44}$$

the new EW $W_d[\mathbf{p}]$ is still atomic. Following 3-dimensional example one may easily construct out of a pair $(W_{d,k}, \rho_\gamma)$ a family of new EWs.

5 Multipartite entanglement witnesses

Let us note, that the above construction works perfectly for multipartite case. Consider N-partite system living in $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathcal{H}_N$. A state ρ_0 in $\mathcal{H}$ is entangled if there exists an entanglement witness $W_0 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathcal{H}_N)$ such that:

1. $\mathrm{Tr}(W_0 \sigma_{\mathrm{sep}}) \geq 0$ for all N-separable states σ_{sep},
2. $\mathrm{Tr}(W_0 \rho_0) < 0$.

In the multipartite case a set of PPT states may be generalized as follows. For each binary N-vector $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_N)$ one introduces a class of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$-PPT states: ρ is $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$-PPT iff

$$\tau^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \rho := (\tau^{\sigma_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes \tau^{\sigma_N}) \, \rho \geq 0 \ . \tag{45}$$

Finally, an entanglement witness W is $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$-decomposable if it may represented as the following sum

$$W = Q_1 + \tau^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} Q_2 \ , \tag{46}$$

where Q_1 and Q_2 are positive operators in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathcal{H}_N)$. Clearly, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$-decomposable EW cannot detect entangled $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$-PPT state.

Suppose, that an entangled N-partite $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$-PPT state ρ_0 is detected by $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$-indecomposable entanglement witness W_0. Therefore, if σ_{sep} is an arbitrary N-separable state, then the following convex combination

$$\rho_\alpha = (1 - \alpha)\rho_0 + \alpha \sigma_{\mathrm{sep}} \ , \tag{47}$$

defines $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$-PPT entanglement state for any $0 \leq \alpha < \alpha_{[\rho_0,\sigma_{\rm sep}]}$, with

$$\alpha_{[\rho_0,\sigma_{\rm sep}]} := \sup\{\alpha \in [0,1] \mid {\rm Tr}(W_0\rho_\alpha) < 0\} \ . \tag{48}$$

This construction gives rise to an open convex set

$$\mathcal{S}^{\rm PPT}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}[W_0|\rho_0] := \left\{ \rho_\alpha \ \middle| \ 0 \leq \alpha < \alpha_{[\rho_0,\sigma_{\rm sep}]} \ \ \& \text{ aribitrary } \ \sigma_{\rm sep} \right\} . \tag{49}$$

Similarly, let P be an arbitrary positive semidefinite operator in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathcal{H}_N)$ and consider one-parameter family of operators

$$W_\lambda = W_0 + \lambda P \ , \qquad \lambda \geq 0 \ . \tag{50}$$

Let us observe that for any $0 \leq \lambda < \lambda_{[W_0,P]}$ with

$$\lambda_{[W_0,P]} := \sup\{\lambda \geq 0 \mid {\rm Tr}(W_\lambda\rho_0) < 0\} \ , \tag{51}$$

W_λ defines $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$-indecomposable EW detecting the state ρ_0. This construction gives rise to a dual open convex set

$$\mathcal{W}^{\rm ind}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}[W_0|\rho_0] := \left\{ \ W_\lambda \ \middle| \ 0 \leq \lambda < \lambda_{[W_0,P]} \ \ \& \ \text{ aribitrary } P \geq 0 \right\} . \tag{52}$$

6 Conclusions

A simple and general method for constructing indecomposable EWs was presented. Knowing one EW W_0 and the corresponding entangled PPT state ρ_0 detected by W_0, one is able to construct new EWs and new PPTES. In particular one may apply this method to construct new examples of atomic EWs which are crucial to distinguish between separable and entangled states. Moreover, one may apply the same strategy to construct EWs for multipartite systems.

What we can do if only one element from the above pair is available? Note, that a nonpositive Hermitian operator in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2)$ may be always written as a difference of two positive operators P and Q:

$$W = Q - P \ , \tag{53}$$

and, as is well know, most of known EWs have this form with Q being separable (very often $Q \propto \mathbb{I}_1 \otimes \mathbb{I}_2$, but following [31] one may look for more general form of Q) and P being entangled (for example maximally entangled pure state). Let W defined in (53) be an EW detecting an NPT (and hence entangled) state P. Is W indecomposable? One may try to look for the states detectable by W in the following form

$$\rho_\alpha = (1-\alpha)P + \alpha\sigma_{\rm sep} \ , \tag{54}$$

where σ_α is a separable state. Now, mixing an NPT state P with $\sigma_{\rm sep}$ may result in a PPT state. Hence, if ρ_α becomes PPT for some $\alpha > 0$, and it is still detected by W, then W is necessarily indecomposable EW.

Conversely, given a PPTES state ρ one may try to construct the corresponding (indecomposable) EW detecting ρ. This problem is in general very hard since it is extremely difficult to check weather

W satisfies $\mathrm{Tr}(W\sigma_{\rm sep}) \geq 0$ for *all* separable $\sigma_{\rm sep}$. One example of such construction is provided via unextendible product bases by Terhal [7].

It is clear, that presented method provides new classes of indecomposable (and atomic) linear positive maps (for recent analysis of atomic maps see [30]). In particular a positive map corresponding to $W_{\lambda,\mu}$ defined in (35) provides a considerable generalization of the Choi map. On may try to look for other well know positive indecomposable maps and to perform 'deformation' within the class of indecomposable maps. Any new examples of such maps provide important tool for the studies of quantum entanglement.

Acknowledgement

This work was partially supported by the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education Grant No 3004/B/H03/2007/33.

References

[1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum computation and quantum information*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.

[2] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki and K. Horodecki, *Quantum entanglement*, arXiv: quant-ph/0702225.

[3] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1413 (1996).

[4] P. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **232**, 333 (1997).

[5] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **223**, 1 (1996).

[6] B.M. Terhal, Phys. Lett. A **271**, 319 (2000); Linear Algebr. Appl. **323**, 61 (2000).

[7] B. M. Terhal, Theor. Comput. Sci. **287**, 313 (2002).

[8] M. Lewenstein, B. Kraus, J. I. Cirac, and P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 052310 (2000).

[9] M. Lewenstein, B. Kraus, P. Horodecki, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 044304 (2001).

[10] B. Kraus, M. Lewenstein, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 042327 (2002).

[11] P. Hyllus, O. Gühne, D. Bruß, and M. Lewenstein Phys. Rev. A **72**, 012321 (2005).

[12] D. Bruß, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 4237 (2002).

[13] G. Tóth and O. Gühne, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 060501 (2005)

[14] R. A. Bertlmann, H. Narnhofer and W. Thirring, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 032319 (2002).

[15] F.G.S.L. Brandão, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 022310 (2005).

[16] M. Bourennane, M. Eibl, C. Kurtsiefer, S. Gaertner, H. Weinfurter, O. Gühne, P. Hyllus, D. Bruss, M. Lewenstein and Anna Sanpera, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 087902 (2004).

[17] L.-A. Wu, S. Bandyopadhyay, M. S. Sarandy, and D. A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 032309 (2005).

[18] A.C. Doherty, P.A. Parrilo and F.M. Spedalieri, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 187904 (2002).

[19] F.G.S.L. Brandão and R.O. Vianna, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 220503 (2004).

[20] J. Eisert, P. Hyllus, O. Gühne, and M. Curty, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 062317 (2004).

[21] B. Terhal and P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 040301 (2000); A. Sanpera, D. Bruss and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 050301(R) (2001).

[22] A. Jamiołkowski, Rep. Math. Phys. **3**, 275 (1972).

[23] M.-D. Choi, Lin. Alg. Appl. **10**, 285 (1975); *ibid* **12**, 95 (1975).

[24] H. Osaka, Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ., **28**, 747 (1992).

[25] K.-C. Ha, Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ., **34**, 591 (1998).

[26] D. Chruściński and A Kossakowski, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 032308 (2007).

[27] D. Chruściński and A Kossakowski, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 022308 (2006)

[28] T. Ando, *Positivity of certain maps*, Seminar Notes, 1985 (cited in [25]).

[29] H. Osaka, Lin. Alg. Appl. **186**, 45 (1993).

[30] D. Chruściński and A. Kossakowski, Open Systems and Inf. Dynamics, **14**, 275 (2007); D. Chruściński and A Kossakowski, *A class of positive atomic maps*, ArXiv: 0711.4483.

[31] K. Tanahashi and J. Tomiyama, Canad. Math. Bull. **31**, 308 (1988).