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We summarize our recent results about monogamy and polygamy of entanglement in multipartite quantum systems. We also consider convex-roof extended negativity as a strong candidate for bipartite entanglement measure for general monogamy and polygamy relations for multipartite quantum systems.
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## 1 Introduction

One distinct property of quantum entanglement from other classical correlations is that multipartite entanglements cannot be freely shared among the parties: If two parties in a multi-party system share a maximally entangled state, then they cannot share any entanglement with the rest. This is known as monogamy of entanglement (MoE) [1], which is a key ingredient for secure quantum cryptography [2,3], and it also plays an important role in condensed-matter physics such as the $N$-representability problem for fermions [4].

Whereas MoE is the restricted sharability of multipartite entanglement, quantifying entanglement itself is about bipartite entanglement among the parties in multipartite systems. Thus, it is important and necessary to have a proper way of quantifying bipartite entanglement for a good description of the multipartite entanglement monogamy. For this reason, certain criteria of bipartite entanglement measure were recently proposed for a good description of the monogamy nature of entanglement in multipartite quantum systems [5]:

1. Monotonicity: the property that ensures entanglement cannot be increased under local operations and classical communications.
2. Separability: capability of distinguishing entanglement from separability.
3. Monogamy: upper bound on a sum of bipartite entanglement measures thereby showing that bipartite sharing of entanglement is bounded.

Using concurrence [6] as a bipartite entanglement measure, MoE was first shown to have a mathematical characterization in three-qubit systems as an inequality [1], and it was generalized for arbitrary multi-qubit systems [7]. As a dual concept of MoE, a polygamy inequality of multi-qubit entanglement was also established later in terms of Concurrence of Assistance (CoA).

However, multi-qubit monogamy inequality using concurrence is known to fail in its generalization for higher-dimensional quantum systems [8, 9], and this exposes the importance of having proper entanglement measure for general MoE in higher-dimensional quantum systems.

## 2 Concurrence-Based Monogamy and Polygamy Inequalities

For any bipartite pure state $|\phi\rangle_{A B}$, its concurrence is defined as [6]

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{C}\left(|\phi\rangle_{A B}\right)=\sqrt{2\left(1-\operatorname{tr} \rho_{A}^{2}\right)}, \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\rho_{A}=\operatorname{tr}_{B}\left(|\phi\rangle_{A B}\langle\phi|\right)$, and for any mixed state $\rho_{A B}$, it is defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{C}\left(\rho_{A B}\right)=\min \sum_{k} p_{k} \mathcal{C}\left(\left|\phi_{k}\right\rangle_{A B}\right), \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the minimum is taken over all possible pure state decompositions, $\rho_{A B}=$ $\sum_{k} p_{k}\left|\phi_{k}\right\rangle_{A B}\left\langle\phi_{k}\right|$.

As a dual quantity to concurrence, CoA is defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{C}^{a}\left(\rho_{A B}\right)=\max \sum_{k} p_{k} \mathcal{C}\left(\left|\phi_{k}\right\rangle_{A B}\right), \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the maximum is taken over all possible pure state decompositions of $\rho_{A B}$ [10],
Concurrence and CoA are known to have an analytic formula for two-qubit systems [6, 10]: For any two-qubit mixed state $\rho_{A B}$ in $\mathcal{B}\left(\mathbb{C}^{2} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{2}\right)$, its concurrence and CoA are

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathcal{C}\left(\rho_{A B}\right)=\max \left\{0, \lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}-\lambda_{3}-\lambda_{4}\right\}, \\
& \mathcal{C}^{a}\left(\rho_{A B}\right)=\lambda_{1}+\lambda_{2}+\lambda_{3}+\lambda_{4}, \tag{2.4}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\lambda_{i}$ 's are the eigenvalues, in decreasing order, of $\sqrt{\sqrt{\rho_{A B}} \tilde{\rho}_{A B} \sqrt{\rho_{A B}}}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{A B}=$ $\sigma_{y} \otimes \sigma_{y} \rho_{A B}^{*} \sigma_{y} \otimes \sigma_{y}$ with the Pauli operator $\sigma_{y}$.

In three-qubit systems, monogamy inequality in terms of concurrence was first proposed as [1],

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{C}_{A(B C)}^{2} \geq \mathcal{C}_{A B}^{2}+\mathcal{C}_{A C}^{2} \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

for a pure state $|\psi\rangle_{A B C}$, where $\mathcal{C}_{A(B C)}=\mathcal{C}\left(|\psi\rangle_{A(B C)}\right)$ is the concurrence of a 3-qubit state $|\psi\rangle_{A(B C)}$ with respect to the bipartite cut between $A$ and $B C$, and $\mathcal{C}_{A B}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{A C}$ are the concurrences of the reduced density matrices onto subsystems $A B$ and $A C$ respectively. Later, Eq. (2.5) was generalized into arbitrary multi-qubit systems as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{C}_{A_{1}\left(A_{2} \cdots A_{n}\right)}^{2} \geq \mathcal{C}_{A_{1} A_{2}}^{2}+\cdots+\mathcal{C}_{A_{1} A_{n}}^{2} \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

for an $n$-qubit state $\rho_{A_{1} \cdots A_{n}}$ [7].
As a dual inequality to Eq. (2.6), a polygamy inequality for multi-qubit systems in terms of CoA was also introduced as,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{C}_{A_{1}\left(A_{2} \cdots A_{n}\right)}^{2} \leq\left(\mathcal{C}_{A_{1} A_{2}}^{a}\right)^{2}+\cdots+\left(\mathcal{C}_{A_{1} A_{n}}^{a}\right)^{2}, \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

for an $n$-qubit pure state $|\psi\rangle_{A_{1} \cdots A_{n}}$ [11].
Although concurrence is a good entanglement measure for multi-qubit systems satisfying the criteria in [5], it is also known that there are some counter examples in higher-dimensional quantum systems violating concurrence-based monogamy inequality in Eq. $(2.6)[8,9]$.

Let us first consider a pure state $|\psi\rangle$ in $3 \otimes 3 \otimes 3$ quantum systems [8] such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\psi\rangle_{A B C}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(|123\rangle-|132\rangle+|231\rangle-|213\rangle+|312\rangle-|321\rangle) . \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then, we can easily check $C_{A(B C)}^{2}=\frac{4}{3}$, while $C_{A B}^{2}=C_{A C}^{2}=1$, and therefore we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{A B}^{2}+C_{A C}^{2}=2 \geq \frac{4}{3}=C_{A(B C)}^{2} \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is a violation of the inequality in Eq. (2.6) for higher-dimensional quantum systems.
Now, let us consider a pure state $|\psi\rangle$ in $3 \otimes 2 \otimes 2$ quantum systems such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\psi\rangle_{A B C}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(\sqrt{2}|010\rangle+\sqrt{2}|101\rangle+|200\rangle+|211\rangle) . \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Again, it can be easily seen that $\mathcal{C}_{A(B C)}^{2}=\frac{12}{9}$ whereas $\mathcal{C}_{A B}^{2}=\mathcal{C}_{A C}^{2}=\frac{8}{9}$, which implies the violation of the inequality in Eq. (2.6).

In other words, the concurrence-based monogamy inequality in Eq. (2.6) only holds for multi-qubit systems, and even a tiny extension in any of the subsystems leads to a violation.

## 3 Convex-Roof Extended Negativity

Besides concurremce, another well-known quantification of bipartite entanglement is the negativity $[12,13]$, which is based on the positive partial transposition (PPT) criterion [14, 15]. For a bipartite pure state $|\phi\rangle_{A B}$, its negativity is defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{N}\left(|\phi\rangle_{A B}\right)=\||\phi\rangle_{A B}\left\langle\left.\phi\right|^{T_{B}} \|_{1}-1\right. \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $|\phi\rangle_{A B}\left\langle\left.\phi\right|^{T_{B}} \text { is the partial transpose of } \mid \phi\right\rangle_{A B}\langle\phi|$, and $\|\cdot\|_{1}$ is the trace norm.
However, for a mixed state $\rho_{A B}$, its negativity,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{N}\left(\rho_{A B}\right)=\left\|\rho_{A B}{ }^{T_{B}}\right\|_{1}-1 \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

does not even give us a separability criterion because there exist some entangled states with PPT [ 15,16 ].

To overcome this lack of separability criterion, a modified version of negativity was introduced, and it is called Convex-Roof Extended Negativity (CREN) [12].

For a bipartite mixed state mixed state $\rho_{A B}$, CREN is defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{N}_{c}(\rho) \equiv \min \sum_{k} p_{k} \mathcal{N}\left(|\phi\rangle_{k}\right), \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the minimum is taken over all possible pure state decompositions of $\rho=$ $\sum_{k} p_{k}\left|\phi_{k}\right\rangle\left\langle\phi_{k}\right|$. Unlike usual negativity of bipartite mixed states in Eq. (3.2), CREN provides a perfect discrimination of PPT bound entangled states and separable states in any bipartite quantum system.

Now, let us consider the relation between CREN and concurrence. For any bipartite pure state $|\phi\rangle_{A B}$ with Schmidt rank 2,

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\phi\rangle_{A B}=\sqrt{\lambda_{0}}|00\rangle_{A B}+\sqrt{\lambda_{1}}|11\rangle_{A B}, \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{N}\left(|\phi\rangle_{A B}\right)=\||\phi\rangle\left\langle\left.\phi\right|^{T_{B}} \|_{1}-1=2 \sqrt{\lambda_{0} \lambda_{1}}=\mathcal{C}\left(|\phi\rangle_{A B}\right),\right. \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\rho_{A}=\operatorname{tr}_{B}(|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|)$. In other words, negativity is reduced to concurrence for any pure state with Schmidt rank 2, and consequently, for any 2 -qubit mixed state $\rho_{A B}=$ $\sum_{i} p_{i}\left|\phi_{i}\right\rangle\left\langle\phi_{i}\right|$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{N}_{c}\left(\rho_{A B}\right)=\mathcal{C}\left(\rho_{A B}\right) \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Similar to the duality between concurrence and CoA, we can also define a dual to CREN by taking the maximum value of average negativity over all possible pure state decomposition, namely Negativity of Assistance (NoA). Furthermore, for a two-qubit state $\rho_{A B}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{N}^{a}\left(\rho_{A B}\right)=\max \sum_{i} p_{i} \mathcal{N}\left(\left|\phi_{i}\right\rangle\right)=\max \sum_{i} p_{i} \mathcal{C}\left(\left|\phi_{i}\right\rangle\right)=\mathcal{C}^{a}\left(\rho_{A B}\right), \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathcal{N}^{a}\left(\rho_{A B}\right)$ is the NoA of $\rho_{A B}$, and the maxima are taken over all pure state decompositions of $\rho_{A B}$. Thus, the monogamy and polygamy inequalities in Eqs. (2.6) and
(2.7) based on concurrence can be rephrased in terms of negativity: For any $n$-qubit state $\rho_{A_{1} \cdots A_{n}}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{N}_{c A_{1}\left(A_{2} \cdots A_{n}\right)}{ }^{2} \geq \mathcal{N}_{c A_{1} A_{2}}{ }^{2}+\cdots+\mathcal{N}_{c A_{1} A_{n}}{ }^{2} \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

and for any $n$-qubit pure state $|\psi\rangle_{A_{1} \cdots A_{n}}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\mathcal{N}_{c A_{1}\left(A_{2} \cdots A_{n}\right)}\right)^{2} \leq\left(\mathcal{N}_{c A_{1} A_{2}}^{a}\right)^{2}+\cdots+\left(\mathcal{N}_{c A_{1} A_{n}}^{a}\right)^{2}, \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathcal{N}_{c A_{1}\left(A_{2} \cdots A_{n}\right)}=\mathcal{N}\left(|\psi\rangle_{A_{1}\left(A_{2} \cdots A_{n}\right)}\right), \mathcal{N}_{c A_{1} A_{i}}=\mathcal{N}_{c}\left(\rho_{A_{1} A_{i}}\right)$ and $\mathcal{N}_{c A_{1} A_{i}}^{a}=$ $\mathcal{N}_{c}{ }^{a}\left(\rho_{A_{1} A_{i}}\right)$ for $i=2, \ldots, n$. In other words, multi-qubit monogamy and polygamy relation can be well-characterized in terms of CREN and NoA.

In fact, the states in Eqs. (2.8) and (2.10) are all known counterexamples showing the violation of the concurrence-based monogamy inequality in higher-dimensional quantum systems. However, they still have a monogamy relation in terms of CREN: For the state in Eq. (2.8), it can be directly checked that $\mathcal{N}_{A(B C)}=2$ and $\mathcal{N}_{c A B}=\mathcal{N}_{c A C}=1$, and thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{N}_{c A(B C)}{ }^{2}=4 \geq 1+1=\mathcal{N}_{c A B}^{2}+\mathcal{N}_{c A C}{ }^{2} \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Similarly, we can also show $\mathcal{N}_{c A(B C)}{ }^{2}=4$ and $\mathcal{N}_{c A B}{ }^{2}=\mathcal{N}_{c A B}{ }^{2}=\frac{8}{9}$ for the state in Eq. (2.10) [5].

In other words, the states in Eqs. (2.8) and (2.10) still show the monogamy of entanglement in terms of CREN, although they are counterexamples of the concurrence-based monogamy inequality. Thus, CREN monogamy and polygamy inequalities in Eqs. (3.8) and (3.9) are strong candidates for general monogamy and polygamy inequalities in multipartite higher-dimensional quantum systems without any known counterexample.

## 4 Monogamy and Polygamy of Entanglement in Higher-Dimensional Quantum Systems

Multipartite entanglement is known to have many inequivalent classes, which are not convertible to each other under stochastic local operations and classical communications (SLOCC) [18]. For example, there are two inequivalent classes in three-qubit systems: the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) class [17] and the W-class [18]. In terms of monogamy and polygamy relations, W-class states saturate concurrence-based monogamy and polygamy inequalities in Eqs. (2.6) and (2.7), while the differences between terms in the inequalities can assume their largest values for GHZ-class states. In other words, monogamy and polygamy of multipartite entanglement can also be used for an analytical characterization of entanglement in multipartite quantum systems.

As the first step toward general CREN MoE studies in higher-dimensional quantum systems, we consider here a class of quantum states in higher-dimensional quantum systems,
which are in partially coherent superposition of a generalized W-class state [9] and the vacuum. We further show that this class of states saturates CREN monogamy and polygamy inequalities in Eqs. (3.8) and (3.9), regardless of the decoherency in the superposition.

A partially coherent superposition of a generalized W-class state and $|0\rangle^{\otimes n}$ is given as

$$
\begin{align*}
\rho_{A_{1} \cdots A_{n}}= & p\left|W_{n}^{d}\right\rangle\left\langle W_{n}^{d}\right|+(1-p)|0\rangle^{\otimes n}\left\langle\left. 0\right|^{\otimes n}\right. \\
& \left.+\lambda \sqrt{p(1-p)}\left(| | W_{n}^{d}\right\rangle\left\langle\left. 0\right|^{\otimes n}+\mid 0\right\rangle^{\otimes n}\left\langle W_{n}^{d}\right|\right) \tag{4.1}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\left|W_{n}^{d}\right\rangle$ is the $n$-qudit W -class state [9],

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|W_{n}^{d}\right\rangle_{A_{1} \cdots A_{n}}=\sum_{i=1}^{d-1}\left(a_{1 i}|i 0 \cdots 0\rangle+a_{2 i}|0 i \cdots 0\rangle+\cdots+a_{n i}|00 \cdots 0 i\rangle\right) \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $\sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{d-1}\left|a_{j i}\right|^{2}=1$, and $\lambda$ is the degree of coherence for $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$.
By using the method introduced in [5,9], we can directly evaluate the average negativity of the reduced density matrices $\rho_{A_{1} A_{i}}$ for $i=2, \ldots, n$, and we can also show that the average negativity is invariant for any possible choice of pure state decomposition of $\rho_{A_{1} A_{i}}$. Furthermore, after a tedious calculation, we obtain the following equalities;

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i=2}^{n} \mathcal{N}_{c A_{1} A_{i}}{ }^{2}=\mathcal{N}_{c A_{1}\left(A_{2} \cdots A_{n}\right)}^{2}=\sum_{i=2}^{n}\left(\mathcal{N}_{c A_{1} A_{i}}^{a}\right)^{2} \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is the saturation of CREN monogamy and polygamy inequalities in Eqs. (3.8) and (3.9).

Besides the case of multi-qubit systems and the counterexamples in in Eqs. (2.8) and (2.10), CREN also shows a strong possibility of general monogamy and polygamy relation of entanglement by providing saturated inequalities for a large class of higher-dimensional quantum states.

## 5 Conclusion

We have shown that CREN is a powerful candidate to characterize general monogamy and polygamy relation of multipartite entanglement in higher-dimensional quantum systems. We have shown that multi-qubit monogamy and polygamy inequalities can be rephrased in terms of CREN, and CREN monogamy inequality is also true even for the counterexamples of concurrence-based inequalities in higher-dimensional quantum systems. We further tested the possibility of CREN monogamy and polygamy inequalities in higher-dimensional quantum systems by showing its saturation for a large class of quantum states in $n$-qudit systems that are in a partially coherent superpositions of a generalized W class state and the vacuum. Thus, CREN is a strong candidate for the general monogamy relation of multipartite entanglement in higher-dimensional quantum systems with no obvious counterexamples.
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