ISSN 1674-1056
http://cpb.iphy.ac.cn
http://iopscience.iop.org/cpb
中国物理 B
Chinese Physics
中国物理 Chinese Physics B

## Separability criteria based on Heisenberg-Weyl representation of density matrices

Jingmei Chang(常景美), Meiyu Cui(崔美钰), Tinggui Zhang(张廷桂), Shao-Ming Fei(费少明)
**Citation:**Chin. Phys. B . 2018, 27(3): 030302. **doi:** 10.1088/1674-1056/27/3/030302

Journal homepage: http://cpb.iphy.ac.cn; http://iopscience.iop.org/cpb

**What follows is a list of articles you may be interested in**

---

## Detecting high-dimensional multipartite entanglement via some classes of measurements

Lu Liu(刘璐), Ting Gao(高亭), Fengli Yan(闫凤利)
Chin. Phys. B . 2018, 27(2): 020306. **doi:** 10.1088/1674-1056/27/2/020306

## Arbitrated quantum signature scheme with continuous-variable squeezed vacuum states

Yan-Yan Feng(冯艳艳), Rong-Hua Shi(施荣华), Ying Guo(郭迎)
Chin. Phys. B . 2018, 27(2): 020302. **doi:** 10.1088/1674-1056/27/2/020302

## Improved quantum randomness amplification with finite number of untrusted devices based on a novel extractor

Ming-Feng Xu(徐明峰), Wei Pan(潘炜), Lian-Shan Yan(闫连山), Bin Luo(罗斌), Xi-Hua Zou(邹喜华), Peng-Hua Mu(穆鹏华), Li-Yue Zhang(张力月)
Chin. Phys. B . 2018, 27(1): 010305. **doi:** 10.1088/1674-1056/27/1/010305

## Quantum coherence preservation of atom with a classical driving field under non-Markovian environment

De-Ying Gao(高德营), Qiang Gao(高强), Yun-Jie Xia(夏云杰)
Chin. Phys. B . 2017, 26(11): 110303. **doi:** 10.1088/1674-1056/26/11/110303

## Simple and practical method of characterizing the parametric down-conversion source

Dong Wang(王东), Juan Wu(伍娟), Liang-Yuan Zhao(赵良圆), Xue-Bi An(安雪碧), Zhen-Qiang Yin(银振强), Wei Chen(陈巍), Zheng-Fu Han(韩正甫), Qin Wang(王琴)
Chin. Phys. B . 2017, 26(11): 110302. **doi:** 10.1088/1674-1056/26/11/110302

---

# Separability criteria based on Heisenberg–Weyl representation of density matrices*

Jingmei Chang(常景美)[1], Meiyu Cui(崔美钰)[1], Tinggui Zhang(张廷桂)[1,2,‡], and Shao-Ming Fei(费少明)[3,4,†]

[1] School of Mathematics and Statistics, Hainan Normal University, Haikou 571158, China
[2] Hainan Center for Mathematical Research, Hainan Normal University, Haikou 571158, China
[3] School of Mathematical Sciences, Capital Normal University, Beijing 100048, China
[4] Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences, Leipzig 04103, Germany

(Received 11 October 2017; revised manuscript received 16 December 2017; published online 13 February 2018)

Separability is an important problem in theory of quantum entanglement. By using the Bloch representation of quantum states in terms of the Heisenberg–Weyl observable basis, we present a new separability criterion for bipartite quantum systems. It is shown that this criterion can be better than the previous ones in detecting entanglement. The results are generalized to multipartite quantum states.

**Keywords:** Heisenberg–Weyl observable basis, Bloch representation, separability criterion, multipartite quantum states

**PACS:** 03.67.–a, 02.20.Hj, 03.65.–w **DOI:** 10.1088/1674-1056/27/3/030302

## 1. Introduction

Quantum entanglement is a fascinating phenomenon in quantum physics. In recent decades, much works have been devoted to understand entanglement as it plays important roles in many quantum information processing. Nevertheless, there are still many problems remain unsolved in the theory of quantum entanglement. One basic problem is to determine whether a given bipartite state is entangled or separable. Although the problem is believed to be a nondeterministic polynomial-time hard problem, there are a number of operational criteria to deal with the problem, for example, the positive partial transpose (PPT) criterion,[1,2] realignment criteria,[3–7] covariance matrix criteria,[8–10] correlation matrix criteria,[11–13] and so on. More recently, some more separability criteria have been proposed.[14–19] Among them, Li *et al.*[14] presented separability criteria based on correlation matrices and the Bloch vectors of reduced density matrices. By adding some extra parameters, reference [19] present a more general separability criterion for bipartite states in terms of the Bloch representation of density matrices.

The state of two quantum systems A and B, acting on the finite-dimensional Hilbert space $H = H_{\rm A} \otimes H_{\rm B}$, is described by the density operator $\rho$. A state $\rho$ is said to be separable if $\rho$ can be written as a convex combination of product vectors,[20] i.e.,

$$\rho = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i, \varphi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i, \varphi_i|, \tag{1}$$

where $0 \leqslant p_i \leqslant 1$, $\sum_i p_i = 1$, and $|\psi_i, \varphi_i\rangle = |\psi_i\rangle_{\rm A} \otimes |\varphi_i\rangle_{\rm B}$ ($|\psi\rangle_{\rm A} \in H_{\rm A}$ and $|\varphi\rangle_{\rm B} \in H_{\rm B}$). The state $\rho$ is said to be entangled, when $\rho$ cannot be written as in form of Eq. (1).

In this article, we put forward a new Bloch representation in terms of the Heisenberg–Weyl (HW) observable basis.[21] It is one of the standard Hermitian generalization of Pauli operators, constructed from HW operators.[22–25] They have distinct properties from those of Gell–Mann matrices,[21] Based on the Heisenberg–Weyl representation of density matrices, we give a new separability criterion for bipartite quantum states and multipartite states. By example, we show that this criterion has advantages in determining whether a quantum state is separable or entangled.

**HW observable basis** First, we briefly introduce the HW-operator basis.[21] The generalized Pauli "phase" and "shift" operators are given by $Z = \exp\left(\frac{{\rm i}2\pi Q}{d}\right)$ and $X = \exp\left(\frac{-{\rm i}2\pi P}{d}\right)$, respectively, $X|j\rangle = |j+1 \mod d\rangle$ and $Z|j\rangle = \exp\left(\frac{{\rm i}2\pi j}{d}\right)|j\rangle$. $Q$ and $P$ are the discrete position and momentum operators describing a $d \times d$ grid.

The phase-space displacement operators for d-level systems are defined by

$$\mathcal{D}(l,m) = Z^l X^m \exp\left(\frac{-{\rm i}\pi lm}{d}\right), \tag{2}$$

i.e.,[26]

$$\mathcal{D}(l,m) = \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} \exp\left(\frac{2{\rm i}\pi kl}{d}\right)|k\rangle\langle(k+m) \mod d|, \tag{3}$$

$l, m = 0, 1, \ldots, d-1$. These non-Hermitian orthogonal basis operators satisfy the following orthogonality condition,

*Project supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 11501153, 11661031, and 11675113) and the National Natural Science Foundation of Hainan Province, China (Grant No. 20161006).

†Corresponding author. E-mail: feishm@mail.cnu.edu.cn
‡Corresponding author. E-mail: tinggui333@163.com

© 2018 Chinese Physical Society and IOP Publishing Ltd 

$\mathrm{Tr}\{\mathcal{D}(l,m)\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}(l',m')\} = d\delta_{l,l'}\delta_{m,m'}$. The complete set of Hermitian operators can be constructed from the HW operators $\mathcal{D}(l,m)$ by defining

$$\mathcal{Q}(l,m) = \mathcal{X}\mathcal{D}(l,m) + \mathcal{X}^{*}\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}(l,m), \tag{4}$$

where $\mathcal{X} = (1\pm i)/2$. $\mathcal{Q}(l,m)$ are the so-called HW observable basis and satisfy the orthogonality condition,

$$\mathrm{Tr}\{\mathcal{Q}(l,m)\mathcal{Q}(l',m')\} = d\delta_{l,l'}\delta_{m,m'}. \tag{5}$$

This basis simply reduces to the pauli matrices for $d = 2$. When $d = 3$, we have

$$\mathcal{Q}(0,1) = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1+i & 1-i \\ 1-i & 0 & 1+i \\ 1+i & 1-i & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathcal{Q}(0,2) = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1-i & 1+i \\ 1+i & 0 & 1-i \\ 1-i & 1+i & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathcal{Q}(1,0) = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1-\sqrt{3} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{3}-1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathcal{Q}(1,1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathrm{e}^{\frac{\pi}{4}i} & \mathrm{e}^{\frac{5}{12}\pi i} \\ \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\pi}{4}i} & 0 & \mathrm{e}^{\frac{11}{12}\pi i} \\ \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{5}{12}\pi i} & \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{11}{12}\pi i} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathcal{Q}(1,2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{11}{12}\pi i} & \mathrm{e}^{\frac{\pi}{4}i} \\ \mathrm{e}^{\frac{11}{12}\pi i} & 0 & \mathrm{e}^{\frac{5}{12}\pi i} \\ \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\pi}{4}i} & \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{5}{12}\pi i} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathcal{Q}(2,0) = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{3}-1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1-\sqrt{3} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathcal{Q}(2,1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathrm{e}^{\frac{\pi}{4}i} & \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{11}{12}\pi i} \\ \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\pi}{4}i} & 0 & \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{5}{12}\pi i} \\ \mathrm{e}^{\frac{11}{12}\pi i} & \mathrm{e}^{\frac{5}{12}\pi i} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathcal{Q}(2,2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathrm{e}^{\frac{5}{12}\pi i} & \mathrm{e}^{\frac{\pi}{4}i} \\ \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{5}{12}\pi i} & 0 & \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{11}{12}\pi i} \\ \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\pi}{4}i} & \mathrm{e}^{\frac{11}{12}\pi i} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

**Note** A brief guidance on how to prepare a manuscript is also given at the end of this template (after the Reference section).

## 2. Bloch representation under Heisenberg–Wely observables

A state $\rho \in \mathbb{C}^d$ of single quantum system can be expressed in terms of the $d\times d$ identity operator $I_d$ and the $d^2-1$ traceless Hermitian HW observable operators $\mathcal{Q}(l,m)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho &= \frac{1}{d}\sum_{l,m=0}^{d-1} r_{lm}\mathcal{Q}(l,m) \\ &= \frac{1}{d}(I_d + \sum_{\substack{l,m=0 \\ (l,m)\neq(0,0)}}^{d-1} r_{lm}\mathcal{Q}(l,m)),\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $\mathcal{Q}(0,0) = I_d$. The coefficients $r_{lm}$ in Eq. (6) are given by

$$r_{lm} = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho\mathcal{Q}(l,m)),$$

where $l = 0,1,\cdots,d-1$, $m = 0,1,\cdots,d-1$, and $(l,m)\neq(0,0)$. We denote

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{r} = (&r_{0,1}, r_{0,2}, \ldots, r_{0,d-1}, r_{1,0}, \ldots, r_{1,d-1}, \\ &\ldots, r_{d-1,0}, \ldots, r_{d-1,d-1}).\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

**Lemma 1** For pure states,

$$\| \boldsymbol{r} \|_2 = \sqrt{d-1}, \tag{8}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_2$ is the Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^{d^2-1}$.

**Proof** According to Eq. (6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Tr}\rho^2 &= \frac{1}{d^2}\sum_{l,m,l',m'=0}^{d-1} r_{lm}r_{l'm'}\mathrm{Tr}\{\mathcal{Q}(l,m)\mathcal{Q}(l',m')\} \\ &= \frac{1}{d^2}d\sum_{l,m=0}^{d-1} r_{lm}^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{d}(1+\sum_{\substack{l,m=0 \\ (l,m)\neq(0,0)}}^{d-1} r_{lm}^2) = \frac{1}{d}(1+\| \boldsymbol{r} \|_2^2).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\rho$ is a pure state, one has $\mathrm{Tr}\rho^2 = \mathrm{Tr}\rho = 1$. Therefore $\| \boldsymbol{r} \|_2^2 = d-1$. □

Now consider bipartite states $\rho \in \mathbb{C}^{d_1}\otimes\mathbb{C}^{d_2}$. Any state $\rho$ can be similarly represented as[27]

$$\begin{aligned}\rho = \frac{1}{d_1 d_2}\Big(&I_{d_1}\otimes I_{d_2} + \sum_{(l,m)\neq(0,0)} r_{lm}\mathcal{Q}(l,m)\otimes I_{d_2} \\ &+ \sum_{(k,n)\neq(0,0)} s_{kn} I_{d_1}\otimes\widetilde{\mathcal{Q}}(k,n) \\ &+ \sum_{(l,m),(k,n)\neq(0,0)} t_{lmkn}\mathcal{Q}(l,m)\otimes\widetilde{\mathcal{Q}}(k,n)\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} r_{lm} &= \mathrm{Tr}\{\rho\mathcal{Q}(l,m)\otimes I_{d_2}\}, \\ s_{kn} &= \mathrm{Tr}\{\rho I_{d_1}\otimes\widetilde{\mathcal{Q}}(k,n)\}, \\ t_{lmkn} &= \mathrm{Tr}\{\rho\mathcal{Q}(l,m)\otimes\widetilde{\mathcal{Q}}(k,n)\},\end{aligned}$$

where $l,m = 0,\ldots,d_1-1$, $k,n = 0,\ldots,d_2-1$, and $(l,m),(k,n)\neq(0,0)$.

## 3. Separability criteria for bipartite states

Similar to (7), we denote $\boldsymbol{r} = (r_{0,1},\ldots, r_{0,d_1-1},\ldots, r_{d_1-1,0},\ldots, r_{d_1-1,d_1-1})^{\mathrm{t}}$ and $\boldsymbol{s} = (s_{0,1},\ldots, s_{0,d_2-1},\ldots, s_{d_2-1,0},\ldots, s_{d_2-1,d_2-1})^{\mathrm{t}}$, where $t$ stands for transpose. Set $T = (t_{ij})$, where the entries $t_{ij}$ are given by the coefficients $t_{lmkn}$, $l,m = 0,\ldots,d_1-1$, $k,n = 0,\ldots,d_2-1$, $(l,m),(k,n)\neq(0,0)$, with the first two indices $lm$ associated with the array

index $i$, and the last two indices $kn$ with the column index $j$ of $T$.

Let us consider the following matrix:

$$\mathcal{S}^m_{\alpha,\beta}(\rho) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha\beta E_{m\times m} & \beta\omega_m(\boldsymbol{s})^{\rm t} \\ \alpha\omega_m(\boldsymbol{r}) & T \end{pmatrix}, \tag{10}$$

where

$$\omega_m(\boldsymbol{x}) = \underbrace{(\boldsymbol{x}\ \ldots\ \boldsymbol{x})}_{m\ \text{columns}},$$

$\alpha$ and $\beta$ are nonnegative real numbers, $m$ is a given natural number, $E_{m\times m}$ is an $m\times m$ matrix with all entries being 1. We have the following theorem.

**Theorem 1** If the state $\rho$ in $\mathbb{C}^{d_1}\otimes\mathbb{C}^{d_2}$ is separable, then

$$\| \mathcal{S}^m_{\alpha,\beta}(\rho) \|_{\rm tr} \leq \sqrt{(m\beta^2+d_1-1)(m\alpha^2+d_2-1)}, \tag{11}$$

where $||\cdot||_{\rm tr}$ stands for the trace norm (the sum of singular values).

**Proof** Since $\rho$ is separable, from Ref. [13] there exist vectors $\boldsymbol{u}_i\in\mathbb{R}^{d_1^2-1}$, $\boldsymbol{v}_i\in\mathbb{R}^{d_2^2-1}$ satisfying Eq. (8), and weights $p_i$ satisfying $0\leq p_i\leq 1$, $\sum_i p_i = 1$ such that

$$T = \sum_i p_i \boldsymbol{u}_i \boldsymbol{v}_i^{\rm t}, \quad \boldsymbol{r} = \sum_i p_i \boldsymbol{u}_i, \quad \boldsymbol{s} = \sum_i p_i \boldsymbol{v}_i.$$

From Lemma 1, we have

$$\| \boldsymbol{u}_i \|_2 = \sqrt{d_1-1}, \quad \| \boldsymbol{v}_i \|_2 = \sqrt{d_2-1}.$$

The matrix (10) has the form,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}^m_{\alpha,\beta}(\rho) &= \sum_i p_i \begin{pmatrix} \alpha\beta E_{m\times m} & \beta\omega_m(\boldsymbol{v}_i)^{\rm t} \\ \alpha\omega_m(\boldsymbol{u}_i) & \boldsymbol{u}_i\boldsymbol{v}_i^{\rm t} \end{pmatrix}, \\ &= \sum_i p_i \begin{pmatrix} \beta E_{m\times 1} \\ \boldsymbol{u}_i \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha E_{1\times m} & \boldsymbol{v}_i^{\rm t} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \| \mathcal{S}^m_{\alpha,\beta}(\rho) \|_{\rm tr} &= \| \sum_i p_i \begin{pmatrix} \beta E_{m\times 1} \\ \boldsymbol{u}_i \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha E_{1\times m} & \boldsymbol{v}_i^{\rm t} \end{pmatrix} \|_{\rm tr} \\ &\leq \sum_i p_i \| \begin{pmatrix} \beta E_{m\times 1} \\ \boldsymbol{u}_i \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha E_{1\times m} & \boldsymbol{v}_i^{\rm t} \end{pmatrix} \|_{\rm tr}. \end{aligned}$$

Accounting to that for any vectors $|i\rangle = (i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_m)^{\rm t}$ and $|j\rangle = (j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_n)^{\rm t}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \| |i\rangle\langle j| \|_{\rm tr} &= {\rm Tr}\sqrt{(|i\rangle\langle j|)^\dagger |i\rangle\langle j|} \\ &= {\rm Tr}\sqrt{|j\rangle(\langle i||i\rangle)\langle j|} \\ &= \sqrt{(i_1^2+i_2^2+\cdots+i_m^2)(j_1^2+j_2^2+\cdots+j_n^2)} \\ &= \| |i\rangle \|_2 \| |j\rangle \|_2, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_i p_i \| \begin{pmatrix} \beta E_{m\times 1} \\ \boldsymbol{u}_i \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha E_{1\times m} & \boldsymbol{v}_i^{\rm t} \end{pmatrix} \|_{\rm tr} \\ &= \| \begin{pmatrix} \beta E_{m\times 1} \\ \boldsymbol{u}_i \end{pmatrix} \|_2 \| \begin{pmatrix} \alpha E_{m\times 1} \\ \boldsymbol{v}_i \end{pmatrix} \|_2 \\ &= \sqrt{(m\beta^2+d_1-1)(m\alpha^2+d_2-1)}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives rise to (11). □

**Remark** Theorem 1 implies that a pure bipartite quantum state in Bloch representation (Eq. (9)) is separable if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}^m_{\alpha,\beta}(\rho) &= \begin{pmatrix} \beta E_{m\times 1} \\ \boldsymbol{r} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha E_{1\times m} & \boldsymbol{s}^{\rm t} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \alpha\beta E_{m\times m} & \beta\omega_m(\boldsymbol{s})^{\rm t} \\ \alpha\omega_m(\boldsymbol{r}) & T \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that equation (9) can be rewritten as

$$\rho = \rho_{\rm A}\otimes\rho_{\rm B} + \frac{1}{d_1 d_2}[(t_{lmkn} - r_{lm}s_{kn})\mathcal{Q}(l,m)\otimes\widetilde{\mathcal{Q}}(k,n)],$$

where $\rho_{\rm A}$ and $\rho_{\rm B}$ are the reduced density matrices. Since $\mathcal{Q}(l,m)\otimes\widetilde{\mathcal{Q}}(k,n)$ are linearly independent, $(t_{lmkn} - r_{lm}s_{kn})\mathcal{Q}(l,m)\otimes\widetilde{\mathcal{Q}}(k,n) = 0$ if and only if $t_{lmkn} - r_{lm}s_{kn} = 0$, i.e., $T = \boldsymbol{r}\boldsymbol{s}^{\rm t}$, for any $l$, $m$, $k$, $n$. Moreover, for $d_1 = d_2 = 2$, the HW observable basis is equivalent to Pauli matrices. In this case, Theorem 1 is equivalent to the Theorem 1 in Ref. [19].

For high-dimensional quantum states, let us consider the following $2\times 4$ bound entangled state[28] as an example:

$$\rho = \frac{1}{7b+1}\begin{pmatrix} b & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & b & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & b & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & b & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & b \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & b & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2}(1+b) & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{1-b^2} \\ b & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & b & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & b & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & b & 0 & \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{1-b^2} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2}(1+b) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $0<b<1$. We mix the above state with state $|\xi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$,

$$\rho_x = x|\xi\rangle\langle\xi| + (1-x)\rho.$$

By choosing

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \beta = \sqrt{\frac{2}{11}}, \quad m = 1, \quad b = 0.9.$$

Theorem 1 can detect the entanglement in $\rho_x$ for $0.2234\leq x\leq 1$, while Theorem 1 in Ref. [19], the V–B criterion[13] and the L–B criterion[14] can only detect the entanglement in $\rho_x$ for $0.2320\leq x\leq 1$, $0.2293\leq x\leq 1$, and $0.2841\leq x\leq 1$, respectively. In this case, our criterion is better in detecting entanglement.

Here, instead of (4) if we define $\mathcal{Q}(l,m) = k(\mathcal{X}\mathcal{D}(l,m) + \mathcal{X}^*\mathcal{D}^\dagger(l,m))$, $k = \sqrt{2/d}$, then $\| \boldsymbol{r} \|_2 = \sqrt{\frac{d(d-1)}{2}}$, and the conclusion becomes

$$\| \mathcal{S}^m_{\alpha,\beta}(\rho) \|_{\rm tr} \leq \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(2m\beta^2+d_1^2-d_1)(2m\alpha^2+d_2^2-d_2)}.$$

In this case, the least upper bound in Theorem 1 is equal to the Theorem 1.[19]

## 4. Separability criteria for multipartite states

We now generalize our result in Theorem 1 to multipartite case. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be an $f_1 \times \cdots \times f_N$ tensor, $A$ and $\bar{A}$ be two nonempty subsets of $\{1,\ldots,N\}$ satisfying $A \cup \bar{A} = 1,\ldots,N$. Let $\mathcal{S}^{A|\bar{A}}$ denote the $A$, $\bar{A}$ matricization of $\mathcal{S}$, see Refs. [19] and [29] for detail.

For any state $\rho$ in $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_N}$, we import a natural number $m$ and nonnegative real parameters $\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_N$, and define

$$\delta^{(d_i)}_{(k_i,n_i)} = \begin{cases} \alpha_i I_{d_i}, & 1 \le k_i = n_i \le m \\ Q^{(d_i)}(k_i - m, n_i - m), & \begin{array}{l} m \le k_i \le d_i + m - 1, \\ m \le n_i \le d_i + m - 1, \\ (k_i,n_i) \ne (m,m), \end{array} \end{cases}$$

where $i = 1,\ldots,N$. Let $Q^{(d_i)}(k,n)$ be the traceless Hermitian HW observable basis and satisfy the orthogonality relation $\mathrm{Tr}\{\mathcal{Q}^{(d_i)}(k,n)\mathcal{Q}^{(d_i)}(k',n')\} = d_i \delta_{l,l'}\delta_{m,m'}$. Denote $\mathcal{W}^{(m)}_{\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\ldots,\alpha_N}(\rho)$ the tensor given by elements of the following form:

$$w_{(k_1,n_1)\ldots(k_N,n_N)} = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho\, \delta^{(d_1)}_{(k_1,n_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \delta^{(d_N)}_{(k_N,n_N)}),$$

where $1 \le k_i = n_i \le m$ and $m \le k_i, n_i \le d_i + m - 1$. Below we give the full separability criterion based on $\mathcal{W}^{(m)}_{\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\ldots,\alpha_N}(\rho)$.

**Theorem 2** If a state $\rho$ in $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_N}$ is fully separable, then for any subset $A$ of $\{1,\ldots,N\}$, we have

$$\| (\mathcal{W}^{(m)}_{\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\ldots,\alpha_N}(\rho))^{A|\bar{A}} \|_{\mathrm{tr}} \le \prod_{k=1}^{N} \sqrt{(m\alpha_k^2 + d_k - 1)}. \quad (13)$$

**Proof** Without loss of generality, we assume

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \{q_1,\ldots,q_M\}, \qquad q_1 < \cdots < q_M, \\ \bar{A} &= \{q_{M+1},\ldots,q_N\}, \quad q_M + 1 < \cdots < q_N. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\rho$ is fully separable, from Ref. [30] there exist vectors $\boldsymbol{u}_i^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_k^2-1}$ such that

$$\mathcal{W}^{(m)}_{\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\ldots,\alpha_N}(\rho) = \sum_i p_i \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 E_{m\times 1} \\ \boldsymbol{u}_i^{(1)} \end{pmatrix} \otimes \cdots \otimes \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_N E_{m\times 1} \\ \boldsymbol{u}_i^{(N)} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\| \boldsymbol{u}_i^{(k)} \|_2 = \sqrt{d_k - 1}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \| (\mathcal{W}^{(m)}_{\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\ldots,\alpha_N}(\rho))^{A|\bar{A}} \|_{\mathrm{tr}} \\ &= \| \sum_i p_i \bigotimes_{l=1}^{M} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{q_l} E_{m\times 1} \\ \boldsymbol{u}_i^{(q_l)} \end{pmatrix} \bigotimes_{p=M+1}^{N} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{q_p} E_{m\times 1} \\ \boldsymbol{u}_i^{(q_p)} \end{pmatrix}^{\mathrm{t}} \|_{\mathrm{tr}} \\ &\le \sum_i p_i \| \bigotimes_{l=1}^{M} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{q_l} E_{m\times 1} \\ \boldsymbol{u}_i^{(q_l)} \end{pmatrix} \bigotimes_{p=M+1}^{N} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{q_p} E_{m\times 1} \\ \boldsymbol{u}_i^{(q_p)} \end{pmatrix}^{\mathrm{t}} \|_{\mathrm{tr}} \\ &= \sum_i p_i \| \bigotimes_{l=1}^{M} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{q_l} E_{m\times 1} \\ \boldsymbol{u}_i^{(q_l)} \end{pmatrix} \|_2 \| \bigotimes_{p=M+1}^{N} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{q_p} E_{m\times 1} \\ \boldsymbol{u}_i^{(q_p)} \end{pmatrix} \|_2 \\ &= \sum_i p_i \sqrt{\mathrm{tr}(\bigotimes_{l=1}^{M} (\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{q_l} E_{m\times 1} \\ \boldsymbol{u}_i^{(q_l)} \end{pmatrix}^{\dagger} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{q_l} E_{m\times 1} \\ \boldsymbol{u}_i^{(q_l)} \end{pmatrix}))} \\ &\quad \cdot \sqrt{\mathrm{tr}(\bigotimes_{p=M+1}^{N} (\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{q_p} E_{m\times 1} \\ \boldsymbol{u}_i^{(q_p)} \end{pmatrix}^{\dagger} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{q_p} E_{m\times 1} \\ \boldsymbol{u}_i^{(q_p)} \end{pmatrix}))} \\ &= \sum_i p_i \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{N} \mathrm{tr}(\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_k E_{m\times 1} \\ \boldsymbol{u}_i^{(k)} \end{pmatrix}^{\dagger} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_k E_{m\times 1} \\ \boldsymbol{u}_i^{(k)} \end{pmatrix})} \\ &= \prod_{k=1}^{N} \sqrt{(m\alpha_k^2 + d_k - 1)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the equality (12) and $\mathrm{tr}(A \otimes B) = \mathrm{tr}A \cdot \mathrm{tr}B$. □

As for tripartite case, by taking $m = 1$, and $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = 0.1$, we consider the one-parameter three-qutrit state[31] $\rho = \frac{1-a}{27} I_{27} + a|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$, with $|\phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|012\rangle + |021\rangle + |111\rangle)$. Theorem 2 can detect the entanglement in $\rho$ for $a > 0.0114$, while Theorem 2 in Ref. [19] can only detect the entanglement in $\rho$ for $a > 0.3817$.

## 5. Conclusion

We have studied the separability problem based on the Bloch representation of density matrices in terms of the Heisenberg–Weyl observable basis. New separability criteria have been derived for both bipartite and multipartite quantum systems, which provide more efficient ways in detecting quantum entanglement for certain kinds of quantum states. These criteria can experimentally implemented.

In Ref. [19] the traceless Hermitian generators of $SU(d)$ satisfying the orthogonality relations have been used in the Bloch representation of density matrices. While in this paper we have adopted the same approach as the one used in Ref. [19] but used the Heisenberg–Weyl observable basis[21] in the Bloch representation of density matrices. An interesting fact here is that the ability of detecting quantum entanglement can be improved by using different observable basis in the Bloch representation. Hence our results are complementary to the ones obtained in Ref. [19] in detecting entanglement for some quantum states. Just like the case that one needs different witnesses to detect the entanglement of different quantum states, we need to measure the quantum systems with suitable local observable sets in entanglement detection. The choices of suitable observable basis depend on the detailed entangled states to be detected. It would be more interesting if such state-dependent choices of observable basis can be analytically derived optimally. It is also possible to improve such separability criteria by taking into account measurement outcomes of more observable bases simultaneously, similar to the cases that involve all the mutually unbiased bases,[32,33] or mutually unbiased measurements,[34] or general symmetric informationally complete positive operator-valued measurements.[35]

## Acknowledgment

We thank Shu-Qian Shen for useful discussion.

## References


[1] Peres A 1996 *Phys. Rev. Lett* **77** 1413
[2] Horodecki M, Horodecki P and Horodecki R 1996 *Phys. Lett. A* **223** 1
[3] Rudolph O 2003 *Phys. Rev. A* **67** 032312
[4] Chen K and Wu L A 2003 *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **3** 193
[5] Rudolph O 2005 *Quantum Inf. Process.* **4** 219
[6] Zhang C J, Zhang Y S, Zhang S and Guo G C 2008 *Phys. Rev. A* **77** 060301
[7] Aniello P and Lupo C 2008 *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **41** 355303
[8] Gühne O, Hyllus P, Gittsovich O and Eisert J 2007 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99** 130504
[9] Gittsovich O, Gühne O, Hyllus P and Eisert J 2008 *Phys. Rev. A* **78** 052319
[10] Gittsovich O, Hyllus P and Gühne O 2010 *Phys. Rev. A* **82** 032306
[11] Badziag P, Brukner Č, Laskowski W, Paterek T and Żukowski M 2008 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100** 140403
[12] Laskowski W, Markiewicz M, Paterek T and Żukowski M 2011 *Phys. Rev A* **84** 062305
[13] de Vicente J I 2007 *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **7** 624
[14] Li M, Wang J, Fei S M and Li-Jost X 2014 *Phys. Rev. A* **89** 022325
[15] Shen S Q, Wang M Y, Li M and Fei S M 2015 *Phys. Rev. A* **92** 042332
[16] Lewenstein M, Augusiak R, Chruściński D, Rana S and Samsonowicz J 2016 *Phys. Rev. A* **93** 042335
[17] Fujikawa K, Oh C H, Umetsu K and Yu S 2016 *Annals of Physics* **368** 248
[18] Bohnet-Waldraff F, Braun D and Giraud O 2016 *Phys. Rev. A* **94** 042343
[19] Shen S Q, Yu J, Li M and Fei S M 2016 *Sci. Rep.* **6** 28850
[20] Werner R F 1989 *Phys. Rev. A* **40** 4277
[21] Asadian A, Erker P, Huber M and Klöckl C 2016 *Phys. Rev. A* **94** 010301
[22] Bertlmann R A and Krammer P 2008 *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **41** 235303
[23] Massar S and Spindel P 2008 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100** 190401
[24] Asadian A, Budroni C, Steinhoff F E S, Rabl P and Gühne O 2015 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114** 250403
[25] Huang X F, Jing N H and Zhang T G 2016 *Commun. Theor. Phys.* **65** 701
[26] Reinhold A and Krammer P 2008 *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **41** 235303
[27] Fano U 1983 *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **55** 855
[28] Horodecki P 1997 *Phys. Lett. A* **232** 333
[29] de Vicente J I and Huber M 2011 *Phys. Rev. A* **84** 062306
[30] Hassan A S M and Joag P S 2008 *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **8** 0773
[31] Chen Z H, Ma Z H, Chen J L and Severini S 2012 *Phys. Rev. A* **85** 062320
[32] Wootters W K and Fields B D 1989 *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **191** 363
[33] Bertlmann R A, Durstberger K, Hiesmayr B C and Krammer P 2005 *Phys. Rev. A* **72** 052331
[34] Chen B, Ma T and Fei S M 2014 *Phys. Rev. A* **89** 064302
[35] Chen B, Li T and Fei S M 2015 *Quant. Inform. Processing* **14** 2281