

Witness for edge states and its characteristics

Nirman Ganguly^{1*}; Satyabrata Adhikari²

¹ Heritage Institute of Technology, Kolkata-107, West Bengal, India

² S.N.Bose National Centre for Basic Sciences, Salt lake, Kolkata 700098,
West Bengal, India

Abstract

Edge states lying at the edge of PPT entangled states have a very intriguing existence and their detection is equally interesting. We present here a new witness for detection of edge states. We then compare between our proposed witness operator and the witness operator proposed in [Physical Review A, 62, 052310 (2000)] in terms of the efficiency in the detection of PPT entangled states. In this regard we show that this operator is finer than the Lewenstein et.al. operator in some restriction. We also discuss about its experimental realization via Gell-Mann matrices.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a

1 Introduction

Quantum entanglement [1,2] is one of the most amazing features of quantum formalism. Its spooky features makes it an enigma drawing attention from scientists worldwide over the years. The development of its knowledge theoretically and experimentally made possible a number of practical applications including quantum computation [3] and quantum

*nirmanganguly@rediffmail.com

teleportation [4].

The significance of entanglement in quantum information theory makes its distinction from separable states all the more important. For low dimensional ($2 \otimes 2$ and $2 \otimes 3$) states there exist simple necessary and sufficient conditions for separability [5,6] which is based on the fact that separable states have a positive partial transpose (PPT). For higher dimensional systems all states with negative partial transpose (NPT) are entangled but there are entangled states which have a positive partial transposition [7,8]. Thus the separability problem can be framed as finding whether states with positive partial transposition are entangled. Of specific importance in this context are the so called edge states [9] which lies at the boundary of PPT and NPT states. An interesting character that an edge state shows is extreme violation of the range criterion [7] which states that there exists no product vector $|e, f\rangle$ belonging to the range of the edge state ρ such that $|e, f^*\rangle$ (conjugation is done with respect to the second system) belongs to the range of ρ^{TB} . Since the edge states are PPT entangled states so partial transposition method fails to detect them and also it is very difficult to identify the edge states by range criterion. So it becomes necessary to find an alternate method to detect the edge states.

A very general method to distinguish between entangled and separable states is through witness operators [6,10]. Witness operator is the outcome of the celebrated Hahn-Banach theorem in functional analysis. It is a hermitian operator, thus observable with at least one negative eigenvalue. The witness operators act as a hyperplane separating separable states from entangled ones. They can be divided into two classes: Decomposable witness (DW) operators and Non-decomposable witness (NDW) operators. DW can detect only NPT states while NDW detects not only NPT states but also PPT entangled states. Terhal first introduced a family of indecomposable positive linear maps based on entangled quantum states [10] using the notion of unextendible product basis. Thereafter Lewenstein et. al. extensively worked on indecomposable witnesses and provided an algorithm to optimize them [12]. These operators are also of prime importance because they can be used in an experimental set up to detect inseparability. An experimental realization of a geometric entanglement witness in terms of Gell-Mann matrices and spin-1 operators was studied in [13]. This makes witness operators all the more significant from a very

pragmatic sense.

In this paper together with the proposition of a new witness for edge states, we show that our proposed witness operator is finer than the witness introduced in [12] in some cases. We also provide an insight as to how an experimental realization can be done of our proposed witness.

Our paper is organized as follows: In section 2 we review certain related definitions and terms. In section 3 we revisit the non-decomposable witness operator and find the condition for which it is finer. In section 4 we give the construction of the witness, its extension to multipartite edge states and discuss its experimental realization. In section 5 we compare our proposed witness with that in [9,12]. In section 6 we provide explicit examples. Lastly we end with conclusions.

2 Prerequisites: A few definitions and results

Definition-1: The kernel of a given density matrix $\rho \in B(H_A \otimes H_B)$ is defined as the set of all eigenvectors corresponding to the zero eigenvalue in the Hilbert space H_A . Mathematically, $\ker(\rho) = \{|x\rangle \in H_A : \rho|x\rangle = 0\}$.

Definition-2: A PPT entangled state δ is called an edge state if for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and any product vector $|e, f\rangle$, $\delta' = \delta - \varepsilon|e, f\rangle\langle e, f|$ is not a PPT state.

Definition-3: A hermitian operator W is said to be an entanglement witness if the expectation value of W is negative for entangled state whereas it is non-negative for any separable state. Mathematically, it can be formulated as

$$\begin{aligned} (i) \quad & Tr(W\sigma) \geq 0 \quad \forall \text{ separable state } \sigma \text{ and} \\ (ii) \quad & Tr(W\rho) < 0, \text{ for at least one entangled state } \rho. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Definition-4: A witness operator is said to be decomposable if it can be expressed in the form

$$D = P + Q^{T_B} \tag{2}$$

where P and Q are positive semi-definite operators.

Non-decomposable operators are those which cannot be written as in (2).

Definition-5: Given two entanglement witnesses W_1 and W_2 , a witness W_1 is said to be finer than another witness W_2 if $D_{W_2} \subseteq D_{W_1}$, where the set D_W is defined as $D_W = \{\rho \geq 0, \text{ such that } Tr(W\rho) < 0\}$.

Result-1: Given two non-decomposable witnesses W_1 and W_2 , W_1 is finer than W_2 , if W_2 can be written as [12]

$$W_2 = (1 - \lambda)W_1 + \lambda D \quad (3)$$

where D is a decomposable witness operator and $0 \leq \lambda < 1$.

Result-2: A witness operator D is decomposable iff [12]

$$Tr(D\rho) \geq 0, \text{ for PPT entangled state } \rho \quad (4)$$

3 Revisiting the non-decomposable witness by Lewenstein *et. al.*

Lewenstein *et. al.* [9, 12] studied the edge states extensively and introduced a non-decomposable witness exclusively for edge states δ which was of the form

$$W^\delta = P + Q^{T_B} - \varepsilon I, \quad P \geq 0, \quad Q \geq 0, \quad 0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0 \quad (5)$$

Since edge states are not of full rank neither are their partial transpose so P and Q can always be chosen as projectors from the respective kernels of δ and δ^{T_B} . ε_0 was defined as

$$\varepsilon_0 = \inf_{|e, f\rangle} \langle e, f | P + Q^{T_B} | e, f \rangle \quad (6)$$

The above mentioned choices entailed that

$$\begin{aligned} Tr(W^\delta \sigma) &\geq 0 \quad \forall \text{ separable } \sigma \text{ and} \\ Tr(W^\delta \delta) &< 0 \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

When we are willing to detect PPT entangled states which are not edge states through the witness operator W^δ then in this situation the task becomes very difficult in choosing the positive semi-definite operators P and Q . This is because of the fact that the given PPT

entangled state ρ (not edge state) or the state described by its partial transposition can be of full rank. Therefore the detection of PPT entangled state (excluding edge states) using W^δ turned out to be a difficult task. So our focus should be on searching the witness operator which can be easily constructed and also detects PPT entangled state together with edge states. We start our search by considering a PPT entangled state ρ . Next we impose two assumptions on ρ :

A1: The PPT entangled state ρ is not an edge state.

A2: ρ is not of full rank but ρ^{T_B} is.

With these assumptions, P can be chosen as mentioned earlier i.e. P can be chosen as a projector on the kernel of ρ . Since there are no vectors in the kernel of ρ^{T_B} (ρ^{T_B} is of full rank), we take Q as a null operator. These choices of P and Q reduces W^δ to W^ρ , which is given by

$$W^\rho = P - \varepsilon' I, \quad P > 0, \quad 0 < \varepsilon' \leq \varepsilon_1 \quad (8)$$

where

$$\varepsilon_1 = \inf_{|e,f\rangle} \langle e, f | P | e, f \rangle \quad (9)$$

Thus, the PPT entangled state ρ which satisfies the above mentioned assumptions can be detected by the non-decomposable witness operator W^ρ .

Next our task is to show that W^ρ is finer than W^δ . To show this we use the result-1.

Therefore the result given in (3) clearly demands that the witness operator (8) is finer than its counterpart (5) because (5) can be written as

$$W^\delta = (1 - \lambda)W^\rho + \lambda D, \quad 0 \leq \lambda < 1 \quad (10)$$

taking $D = Q^{T_B}$.

Thus, W^ρ gives us a more general entanglement witness which can detect some PPT entangled states along with edge states, or in other words, W^ρ is finer than W^δ .

Illustration: As an illustration we consider the PPT entangled state [15]

$$\rho_\alpha = \frac{2}{7} |\psi^+\rangle \langle \psi^+| + \frac{\alpha}{7} \rho_+ + \frac{5-\alpha}{7} \rho_- \quad (11)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_+ &= \frac{1}{3}(|01\rangle\langle 01| + |12\rangle\langle 12| + |20\rangle\langle 20|) \\
\rho_- &= \frac{1}{3}(|10\rangle\langle 10| + |21\rangle\langle 21| + |02\rangle\langle 02|) \\
|\psi^+\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \sum_{i=0}^2 |ii\rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

The state is PPT entangled for $3 < \alpha \leq 4$ and edge state for $\alpha = 4$. The rank of ρ_α is 7 whereas the rank of ρ_α^{TB} is 9. Now using the prescription described above for the construction of the witness operator (8), we can easily construct the witness operator for the PPT entangled state ρ_α as

$$W^{\rho_\alpha} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \varepsilon' & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\varepsilon' & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\varepsilon' & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\varepsilon' & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 - \varepsilon' & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\varepsilon' & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\varepsilon' & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\varepsilon' & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 - \varepsilon' \end{pmatrix} \tag{13}$$

We observe that $Tr(W^{\rho_\alpha} \rho_\alpha) = -\varepsilon' < 0$.

4 Construction of the witness and its experimental realization

In this section we propose a new non-decomposable witness operator and thereafter show that it is indeed a non-decomposable witness operator which detects the edge states. Also we study its extension in the multipartite system and further discuss its experimental realization.

Theorem: An operator W is a non-decomposable witness operator for an edge state δ if

it can be expressed in the form

$$W = Q^{T_B} - k(I - P) \quad (14)$$

where P is a positive semi-definite operator and Q is a positive definite operator and T_B denotes the partial transposition over the second subsystem.

Proof: To prove that W is a non-decomposable witness operator for an edge state δ , it is sufficient to verify the two witness inequalities given in (1) for W .

(i) We have to show that $Tr(W\sigma) \geq 0 \quad \forall$ separable state σ .

$$\begin{aligned} Tr(W\sigma) &= Tr((Q^{T_B} - k(I - P))\sigma) \\ &= Tr(Q\sigma^{T_B}) - k(1 - Tr(P\sigma)) \quad (\text{since } Tr(Q^{T_B}\sigma) = Tr(Q\sigma^{T_B})) \\ &= ((1 - Tr(P\sigma)))[\frac{Tr(Q\sigma^{T_B})}{(1 - Tr(P\sigma))} - k] \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

We can always select a value of k from the interval $0 < k \leq k_0$ so that $Tr(W\sigma) \geq 0$, where k_0 is given by

$$k_0 = \min \frac{Tr(Q\sigma^{T_B})}{1 - Tr(P\sigma)} \quad (16)$$

Here the minimum is taken over all separable states σ .

(ii) Now it remains to be shown that $Tr(W\delta) < 0$ for an edge state δ .

Since δ and δ^{T_B} have some vectors in their kernel so we get some freedom to choose the operators P and Q as the projectors on $ker(\delta)$ and $ker(\delta^{T_B})$ respectively. Therefore, we have $Tr(P\delta) = 0$ and $Tr(Q\delta^{T_B}) = 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} Tr(W\delta) &= Tr(Q^{T_B}\delta) - kTr((I - P)\delta) \\ &= Tr(Q\delta^{T_B}) - k(1 - Tr(P\delta)) \\ &= -k \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Now using the inequality $0 < k \leq k_0$ and exploiting equations (16) and (17), we find that $Tr(W\delta) < 0$. Hence we are able to prove that the non-decomposable witness operator proposed in the theorem detects an edge state.

Corollary: The non-decomposable witness can also be constructed as

$$W' = P - k(I - Q^{T_B}), \quad 0 < k \leq k_0, \quad P > 0, \quad Q \geq 0 \quad (18)$$

where

$$k_0 = \min_{\sigma} \frac{\text{Tr}(P\sigma)}{1 - \text{Tr}(Q\sigma^{T_B})} \quad (19)$$

With similar arguments it can be shown that W' also detects edge states. Particularly if $Q^{T_B} = 0$, i.e. if the state described by the partially transposed density operator has no vectors in its kernel then witness operator (18) reduces to (8). Hence in this case the witness operator (18) detects not only edge states but also other PPT entangled states.

Extension of the witness for edge states in 3 qubits: Since edge states are also found in tripartite systems so we extend the prescription of our proposed entanglement witness operator in 3-qubit systems.

For a given tripartite edge state $\delta_{tri} \in B(H_1 \otimes H_2 \otimes H_3)$, we define the non-decomposable witness operator as:

$$W_{tri} = Q^{T_X} - k_0(I - P), \quad X = 1, 2, 3 \quad (20)$$

P =Projector on $\text{Ker}(\delta_{tri})$ and Q = Projector on $\text{Ker}(\delta_{tri}^{T_X})$, where T_X denotes the transpose taken with respect to any one of the subsystems. As before we define

$$k_0 = \min_{\sigma} \frac{\text{Tr}(Q^{T_X}\sigma)}{\text{Tr}((I - P)\sigma)} \quad (21)$$

where the minimum is taken over all separable states σ .

If now we take $0 < k \leq k_0$ and use $W_{tri} = Q^{T_X} - k(I - P)$, then we obtain

$$\text{Tr}(W_{tri}\delta_{tri}) = -k < 0 \quad (22)$$

For the above choice of k_0 given in (21), we can always find some k for which $\text{Tr}(W_{tri}\sigma) \geq 0$.

Experimental Realization: Our task is now to show that our proposed witness operator can be used in an experimental setup to detect the edge state in a qutrit system. Since entanglement witnesses are hermitian operators and every hermitian operators are observables so they are experimentally realizable quantities. Thus they provide experimental evidence of entanglement present in the given system. The quantity to be measured is the expectation value

$$\langle W \rangle = \text{Tr}(W\rho) \quad (23)$$

Here we rewrite the witness operator defined in (14) for a certain edge state in a qutrit system in terms of Gell-Mann matrices [13] and thereby finding the expectation value of these physical operators in order to experimentally detect entanglement.

The generalized Gell-Mann matrices are higher dimensional extensions of the Pauli matrices (for qubits) and are hermitian and traceless. They form an orthogonal set and basis. In particular, they can be categorized for qutrits as three different types of traceless matrices :

(i) three symmetric Gell-Mann matrices

$$\Lambda_s^{01} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Lambda_s^{02} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Lambda_s^{12} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (24)$$

(ii) three antisymmetric Gell-Mann matrices

$$\Lambda_a^{01} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Lambda_a^{02} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Lambda_a^{12} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (25)$$

(iii) two diagonal Gell-Mann matrices

$$\Lambda^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Lambda^1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1/\sqrt{3} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/\sqrt{3} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2/\sqrt{3} \end{pmatrix} \quad (26)$$

Let us consider a qutrit described by the density operator (11). Our prescribed witness (14) for the state with $\alpha = 4$ is given in matrix form as

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -k-2 \\ 0 & 1-k & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 4-k & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 4-k & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -k-2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1-k & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1-k & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 4-k & 0 \\ -k-2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -k-2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & k \end{pmatrix} \quad (27)$$

Writing the witness A in terms of the Gell-Mann matrices and taking the expectation value we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A \rangle = & -\langle \Lambda_s^{01} \otimes \Lambda_s^{01} \rangle + \langle \Lambda_a^{01} \otimes \Lambda_a^{01} \rangle - \frac{k+2}{2} (\langle \Lambda_s^{02} \otimes \Lambda_s^{02} \rangle - \langle \Lambda_a^{02} \otimes \Lambda_a^{02} \rangle) \\ & - \frac{k+2}{2} (\langle \Lambda_s^{12} \otimes \Lambda_s^{12} \rangle - \langle \Lambda_a^{12} \otimes \Lambda_a^{12} \rangle) + \frac{2k-5}{4} \langle \Lambda^0 \otimes \Lambda^0 \rangle - \frac{9}{4\sqrt{3}} (\langle \Lambda^0 \otimes \Lambda^1 \rangle - \langle \Lambda^1 \otimes \Lambda^0 \rangle) \\ & + \frac{22k-45}{36} \langle \Lambda^1 \otimes \Lambda^1 \rangle - \frac{k}{9} (\langle \Lambda^1 \otimes I \rangle + \langle I \otimes \Lambda^1 \rangle) + \frac{15-5k}{9} \langle I \otimes I \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Thus for an experimental outcome $\langle A \rangle < 0$, the state is entangled.

For qutrits the Gell-Mann matrices can be expressed in terms of eight physical operators, the observables $S_x, S_y, S_z, S_x^2, S_y^2, S_z^2, \{S_x, S_y\}, \{S_y, S_z\}, \{S_z, S_x\}$ of a spin-1 system, where $\vec{S} = \{S_x, S_y, S_z\}$ is the spin operator and $\{S_i, S_j\} = S_i S_j + S_j S_i$ (with $i, j = x, y, z$) denotes the corresponding anticommutator. The representation of the Gell-Mann matrices in terms of the the spin-1 operators is as follows [13]:

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_s^{01} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\hbar^2} (\hbar S_x + \{S_z, S_x\}), & \Lambda_s^{02} &= \frac{1}{\hbar^2} (S_x^2 - S_y^2), \\ \Lambda_s^{12} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\hbar^2} (\hbar S_x - \{S_z, S_x\}), & \Lambda_a^{01} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\hbar^2} (\hbar S_y + \{S_y, S_z\}), \\ \Lambda_a^{02} &= \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \{S_x, S_y\}, & \Lambda_a^{12} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\hbar^2} (\hbar S_y - \{S_y, S_z\}), \\ \Lambda^0 &= 2I + \frac{1}{2\hbar^2} (\hbar S_z - 3S_x^2 - 3S_y^2), & \Lambda^1 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} (-2I + \frac{3}{2\hbar^2} (\hbar S_z + S_x^2 + S_y^2)) \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

All eight physical operators can be represented by the following matrices :

$$\begin{aligned}
S_x &= \frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & S_y &= \frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 \\ i & 0 & -i \\ 0 & i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & S_z &= \hbar \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \\
S_x^2 &= \frac{\hbar^2}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, & S_y^2 &= \frac{\hbar^2}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\
\{S_x, S_y\} &= \hbar^2 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \{S_y, S_z\} &= \frac{\hbar^2}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 \\ i & 0 & i \\ 0 & -i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\{S_z, S_x\} &= \frac{\hbar^2}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Therefore experimental detection of entanglement can also be done by writing the Gell-Mann matrices in terms of spin-1 operators and then taking the expectation value.

5 Detection of a larger set of PPT entangled states by our proposed witness operator

In this section we study the efficiency of our proposed witness operator (14). We will show some specific situations in which our proposed witness operator is finer than its counterpart in (5). Thus our operator witness a larger set of PPT entangled states.

Now let us recall two witness operators W^δ and W given in (5) and (14) respectively and investigate the situation when W^δ detects larger set of PPT entangled state than W or vice-versa. Also we observe that

$$D_W \cap D_{W^\delta} \neq \phi \tag{31}$$

Equation (31) depicts the fact that there exist PPT entangled states which are detected

by both W and W^δ .

Case-I: If the entanglement witness W be finer than W^δ then using (3), we can always write

$$\begin{aligned} W^\delta &= (1 - \lambda)W + \lambda D \\ \Rightarrow P + Q^{T_B} - \varepsilon I &= (1 - \lambda)(Q^{T_B} - k(I - P)) + \lambda D \\ \Rightarrow D &= \frac{1 - k + \lambda k}{\lambda} P + Q^{T_B} + \frac{k - \varepsilon - \lambda k}{\lambda} I \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

From (32) and using the result-2, we get

$$1 - k + \lambda k \geq 0, \quad k - \varepsilon - \lambda k \geq 0 \quad (33)$$

which gives

$$k \leq \frac{1}{1 - \lambda}, \quad k \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \lambda} \quad (34)$$

Thus W is finer than W^δ when $k \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \lambda}, \frac{1}{1 - \lambda}]$.

Case-II: If the entanglement witness W^δ be finer than W then we can proceed in similar way as above and find that W^δ is finer than W when $k \in [1 - \lambda, \varepsilon - \lambda\varepsilon]$.

6 Examples

In this section we explicitly construct our proposed witness operator for different edge states living in $C^3 \otimes C^3$ and $C^2 \otimes C^2 \otimes C^2$ and express them in the matrix form.

Example 1: We start with the edge state in $C^3 \otimes C^3$ as proposed in [7]. The state and

its partial transpose is :

$$\rho_a = \frac{1}{8a+1} \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 & 0 & a & 0 & 0 & 0 & a \\ 0 & a & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & a & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ a & 0 & 0 & 0 & a & 0 & 0 & 0 & a \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & a & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1+a}{2} & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{1-a^2}}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & a & 0 \\ a & 0 & 0 & 0 & a & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{1-a^2}}{2} & 0 & \frac{1+a}{2} \end{pmatrix} \quad (35)$$

$$\rho_a^{T_B} = \frac{1}{8a+1} \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a & 0 & a & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a & 0 & 0 & 0 & a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a & 0 & a & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & a & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & a & 0 & a & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1+a}{2} & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{1-a^2}}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & a & 0 & a & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{1-a^2}}{2} & 0 & \frac{1+a}{2} \end{pmatrix} \quad (36)$$

where $0 < a < 1$.

The projector on the kernel of ρ_a is:

$$\begin{aligned} P = & |00\rangle\langle 00| + c|00\rangle\langle 20| - |00\rangle\langle 22| + c|20\rangle\langle 00| + \\ & c^2|20\rangle\langle 20| - c|20\rangle\langle 22| - |22\rangle\langle 00| - c|22\rangle\langle 20| + \\ & |22\rangle\langle 22| + |11\rangle\langle 11| + c|11\rangle\langle 20| - |11\rangle\langle 22| + \\ & + c|20\rangle\langle 11| + c^2|20\rangle\langle 20| - c|20\rangle\langle 22| - |22\rangle\langle 11| + \\ & - c|22\rangle\langle 20| + |22\rangle\langle 22| \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

The partial transpose of the projector on the kernel of $\rho_a^{T_B}$ is:

$$Q^{T_B} = d^2|02\rangle\langle 02| - d^2|00\rangle\langle 22| - d|02\rangle\langle 22| - d^2|22\rangle\langle 00| \quad (38)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& +d^2|20\rangle\langle 20| + d|22\rangle\langle 20| - d|22\rangle\langle 02| + d|20\rangle\langle 22| \\
& +|22\rangle\langle 22| + |12\rangle\langle 12| - |11\rangle\langle 22| - |22\rangle\langle 11| \\
& +|21\rangle\langle 21| + |01\rangle\langle 01| - |00\rangle\langle 11| - |11\rangle\langle 00| + |10\rangle\langle 10|
\end{aligned}$$

where $c = \frac{\sqrt{1-a^2}}{1+a}$ and $d = \frac{\sqrt{1-a^2}}{a-1}$. Thus the witness is obtained as :

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & ck & 0 & -(d^2 + k) \\ 0 & 1-k & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & d^2 - k & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -d \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1-k & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & ck & 0 & -1-k \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1-k & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ ck & 0 & 0 & 0 & ck & 0 & 2c^2k + d^2 - k & 0 & d - 2ck \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1-k & 0 \\ -(d^2 + k) & 0 & -d & 0 & -1-k & 0 & d - 2ck & 0 & 1+k \end{pmatrix} \quad (39)$$

Using W as constructed in (39) we obtain,

$$Tr(W\rho_a) = -k < 0 \quad (40)$$

Example 2: Next we construct the witness for the edge state in 3 qubits proposed in [14]. The edge state was proposed as:

$$\delta_{tri} = \frac{1}{n} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & a & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & b & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & c & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{c} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{b} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{a} & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (41)$$

where $n = 2+a+b+c+1/a+1/b+1/c$ and the basis is taken in the order $|000\rangle, |001\rangle, |010\rangle, |011\rangle, |100\rangle, |101\rangle, |110\rangle, |111\rangle$. The partial transpose with respect to system C is given by:

$$\delta_{tri}^{TC} = \frac{1}{n} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & b & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & c & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{c} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{b} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{a} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (42)$$

The vector in the kernel of δ_{tri} is $|000\rangle - |111\rangle$ and the vector in the kernel of δ_{tri}^{TC} is $|001\rangle - a|110\rangle$. With these vectors the witness (20) is obtained as :

$$W_{tri} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -k-a \\ 0 & 1-k & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -k & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -k & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -k & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -k & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & a^2-k & 0 \\ -k-a & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (43)$$

which gives,

$$Tr(W_{tri}\delta_{tri}) = -k < 0 \quad (44)$$

7 Conclusion

To summarize, we have constructed a non-decomposable witness operator which gives a negative expectation value on edge states, thereby detecting them. Our proposed witness operator is interesting in the sense that it sometime detects larger set of PPT entangled state than the non-decomposable witness operator given by Lewenstein et.al.[12].

In technical terms we have showed that our proposed witness operator is finer than the Lewenstein et.al. operator in some situation and found that in some cases the fact is reverse. Also we have discussed its experimental relevance to substantiate the worth of the witness, which to our knowledge can help us to detect PPT entangled states experimentally.

8 Acknowledgement

NG acknowledges his mother for her eternal love and blessings.

References

- [1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777 (1935).
- [2] E. Schrodinger, Naturewissenschaften **23**, 807 (1935).
- [3] A. Barenco, D. Deutsch, A. Ekert and R. Jozsa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 4083 (1995).
- [4] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895 (1993).
- [5] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1413 (1996).
- [6] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki and R. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **223**, 1 (1996).
- [7] P. Horodecki ,Phys. Lett. A **232**, 333 (1997).
- [8] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, T. Mor, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin and B. M. Terhal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 5385 (1999).
- [9] M. Lewenstein, B. Krauss, P. Horodecki and J. I. Cirac, arxiv:quant-ph/0005112v1 (2000).
- [10] B. M. Terhal, arxiv:quant-ph/9810091.
- [11] S. L. Woronowicz, Rep. Math. Phys. **10**, 165 (1976).

- [12] M. Lewenstein, B. Krauss, J. I. Cirac and P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 052310 (2000).
- [13] R. A. Bertlmann and P. Krammer, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor **41**, 235303 (2008).
- [14] A. Acin, D. Bruss, M. Lewenstein and A. Sanpera, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 040401 (2001).
- [15] P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1056 (1999).