One-Way Deficit of Two Qubit X States

Yao-Kun Wang,[1, 2] Naihuan Jing,[3, 4] Shao-Ming Fei,[5, 6] Zhi-Xi Wang,[5] Jun-Peng Cao,[1, 7] and Heng Fan[1, 7]

[1]*Institute of Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China*
[2]*College of Mathematics, Tonghua Normal University, Tonghua, Jilin 134001, China*
[3]*School of Mathematical Sciences, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou, Guangdong 510640, China*
[4]*Department of Mathematics, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC27695, USA*
[5]*School of Mathematical Sciences, Capital Normal University, Beijing 100048, China*
[6]*Max-Planck-Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences, 04103 Leipzig, Germany*
[7]*Collaborative Innovation Center of Quantum Matter, Beijing 100190, China*

Quantum deficit originates in questions regarding work extraction from quantum systems coupled to a heat bath [Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 180402 (2002)]. It links quantum correlations with quantum thermodynamics and provides a new standpoint for understanding quantum non-locality. In this paper, we propose a new method to evaluate the one-way deficit for a class of two-qubit states. The dynamic behavior of the one-way deficit under decoherence channel is investigated and it is shown that the one-way deficit of the X states with five parameters is more robust against the decoherence than the entanglement.

I. INTRODUCTION

The quantum entanglement is a resource in quantum information processing such as teleportation[1], super-dense coding[2], quantum cryptography[3], remote-state preparation[4] and so on. However, there are quantum correlations other than entanglement which are also useful and has attracted much attention recently [5–9]. One remarkable and widely accepted quantity of quantum correlation is quantum discord. Quantum discord is a measure of the difference between the mutual information and maximum classical mutual information, which is generally difficult to calculate even for two qubit quantum system [10–14].

Other nonclassical correlations besides entanglement and quantum discord have arisen recently. For example, the quantum deficit [15, 16], measurement-induced disturbance [17], geometric discord [18, 19], and continuous-variable discord [20, 21], see a review [9]. Quantum deficit originates in question how to use nonlocal operation to extract work from a correlated system coupled to a heat bath [15]. It is also closely related with other forms of quantum correlations. Oppenheim *et al.* define the work deficit [15]

$$\Delta \equiv W_t - W_l, \tag{1}$$

where W_t is the information of the whole system and W_l is the localizable information[22]. As with quantum discord, quantum deficit is also equal to the difference of the mutual information and classical deficit [23]. Recently, Streltsov *et al.* [24, 25] give the definition of the one-way information deficit (one-way deficit) by the relative entropy, which reveals an important role of quantum deficit as a resource for the distribution of entanglement. One-way deficit by von Neumann measurement on one side is given by[26]

$$\Delta^{\rightarrow}(\rho^{ab}) = \min_{\{\Pi_k\}} S(\sum_k \Pi_k \rho^{ab} \Pi_k) - S(\rho^{ab}). \tag{2}$$

From the definition we can find that the one-way deficit and quantum discord are exactly different kinds of quantum correlation. One may wonder whether the analytical formula or the calculation method for a class of two-qubit states like quantum discord can be obtained. In this paper, we will endeavor to calculate the one-way deficit for X quantum states with five parameters.

II.   ONE-WAY DEFICIT FOR X STATES WITH FIVE PARAMETERS

We first introduce the form of two qubit X states. By using proper local unitary transformations, we can write ρ^{ab} as

$$\rho^{ab} = \frac{1}{4}(I \otimes I + \mathbf{r} \cdot \sigma \otimes I + I \otimes \mathbf{s} \cdot \sigma + \sum_{i=1}^{3} c_i \sigma_i \otimes \sigma_i), \tag{3}$$

where $\mathbf{r}$ and $\mathbf{s}$ are Bloch vectors and $\{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^{3}$ are the standard Pauli matrices. When $\mathbf{r}=\mathbf{s}=\mathbf{0}$, ρ reduces to the two-qubit Bell-diagonal states. Then, we assume that the Bloch vectors are in z direction, that is, $\mathbf{r} = (0,0,r)$, $\mathbf{s} = (0,0,s)$. The state in Eq. (3) turns into the following form

$$\rho^{ab} = \frac{1}{4}(I \otimes I + r\sigma_3 \otimes I + I \otimes s\sigma_3 + \sum_{i=1}^{3} c_i \sigma_i \otimes \sigma_i), \tag{4}$$

In the computational basis $|00\rangle, |01\rangle, |10\rangle, |11\rangle$, its density matrix is

$$\rho = \frac{1}{4}\begin{pmatrix} 1+r+s+c_3 & 0 & 0 & c_1 - c_2 \\ 0 & 1+r-s-c_3 & c_1 + c_2 & 0 \\ 0 & c_1 + c_2 & 1-r+s-c_3 & 0 \\ c_1 - c_2 & 0 & 0 & 1-r-s+c_3 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5}$$

From Eq. (4) in [12], after some algebraic calculations, we can obtain that parameters x, y, s, u, t in [12] can be substituted for r, s, c_1, c_2, c_3 of the X states in Eq. (5) successively and

$$r, s, c_1, c_2, c_3 \in [-1, 1]. \tag{6}$$

One can also change them to be x or y direction via an appropriate local unitary transformation without losing its diagonal property of the correlation terms [27].

The eigenvalues of the X states in Eq. (5) are given by

$$u_{\pm} = \frac{1}{4}[1 - c_3 \pm \sqrt{(r-s)^2 + (c_1 + c_2)^2}],$$
$$v_{\pm} = \frac{1}{4}[1 + c_3 \pm \sqrt{(r+s)^2 + (c_1 - c_2)^2}].$$

The entropy is given by

$$\begin{aligned} S(\rho) = {} & 2 - [\frac{1}{4}(1 - c_3 + \sqrt{(r-s)^2 + (c_1 + c_2)^2}) \log(1 - c_3 + \sqrt{(r-s)^2 + (c_1 + c_2)^2}) \\ & + \frac{1}{4}(1 - c_3 - \sqrt{(r-s)^2 + (c_1 + c_2)^2}) \log(1 - c_3 - \sqrt{(r-s)^2 + (c_1 + c_2)^2}) \\ & + \frac{1}{4}(1 + c_3 + \sqrt{(r+s)^2 + (c_1 - c_2)^2}) \log(1 + c_3 + \sqrt{(r+s)^2 + (c_1 + c_2)^2}) \\ & + \frac{1}{4}(1 + c_3 - \sqrt{(r+s)^2 + (c_1 - c_2)^2}) \log(1 + c_3 - \sqrt{(r+s)^2 + (c_1 - c_2)^2})] \end{aligned}$$

$$. \tag{7}$$

Next, we evaluate the one-way deficit of the X states in Eq. (5). Let

$$\{\Pi_k = |k\rangle\langle k|, k = 0, 1\}$$

be the local measurement for the particle b along the computational base $|k\rangle$; then any von Neumann measurement for the particle b can be written as

$$\{B_k = V\Pi_k V^\dagger : k = 0, 1\}$$

for some unitary $V \in U(2)$. For any unitary V, we have

$$V = tI + i\vec{y}\vec{\sigma}$$

with $t \in R$, $\vec{y} = (y_1, y_2, y_3) \in R^3$, and $t^2 + y_1^2 + y_2^2 + y_3^2 = 1$. After the measurement B_k, the state ρ^{ab} will be changed to the ensemble $\{\rho_k, p_k\}$ with

$$\rho_k := \frac{1}{p_k}(I \otimes B_k)\rho(I \otimes B_k)$$
$$p_k = tr(I \otimes B_k)\rho(I \otimes B_k).$$

To evaluate ρ_k and p_k, we write

$$p_k\rho_k = (I \otimes B_k)\rho(I \otimes B_k) = \frac{1}{4}(I \otimes V)(I \otimes \Pi_k)[I + r\sigma_3 \otimes I + sI \otimes V^\dagger\sigma_3 V^\dagger + \sum_{j=1}^{3} c_j\sigma_j \otimes (V^\dagger\sigma_j V)](I \otimes \Pi_k)(I \otimes V^\dagger).$$

By the relations [17]

$$V^\dagger\sigma_1 V = (t^2 + y_1^2 - y_2^2 - y_3^2)\sigma_1 + 2(ty_3 + y_1y_2)\sigma_2 + 2(-ty_2 + y_1y_3)\sigma_3,$$
$$V^\dagger\sigma_2 V = 2(-ty_3 + y_1y_2)\sigma_1 + (t^2 + y_2^2 - y_1^2 - y_3^2)\sigma_2 + 2(ty_1 + y_2y_3)\sigma_3,$$
$$V^\dagger\sigma_3 V = 2(ty_2 + y_1y_3)\sigma_1 + 2(-ty_1 + y_2y_3)\sigma_2 + (t^2 + y_3^2 - y_1^2 - y_2^2)\sigma_3,$$

and

$$\Pi_0\sigma_3\Pi_0 = \Pi_0, \Pi_1\sigma_3\Pi_1 = -\Pi_1, \Pi_j\sigma_k\Pi_j = 0, for j = 0, 1, k = 1, 2,$$

After some algebra, we obtain

$$p_0\rho_0 = \frac{1}{4}[I + sz_3I + c_1z_1\sigma_1 + c_2z_2\sigma_2 + (r + c_3z_3)\sigma_3] \otimes (V\Pi_0 V^\dagger),$$
$$p_1\rho_1 = \frac{1}{4}[I - sz_3I - c_1z_1\sigma_1 - c_2z_2\sigma_2 + (r - c_3z_3)\sigma_3] \otimes (V\Pi_1 V^\dagger),$$

where

$$z_1 = 2(-ty_2 + y_1y_3), \quad z_2 = 2(ty_1 + y_2y_3), \quad z_3 = t^2 + y_3^2 - y_1^2 - y_2^2.$$

Next, we will evaluate the eigenvalues of $\sum_k \Pi_k \rho^{ab} \Pi_k$ by

$$\sum_k \Pi_k \rho^{ab} \Pi_k = p_0\rho_0 + p_1\rho_1, \tag{8}$$

and

$$p_0\rho_0 + p_1\rho_1$$

$$= \frac{1}{4}[(I + r\sigma_3) + (sz_3 I + c_1 z_1 \sigma_1 + c_2 z_2 \sigma_2 + c_3 z_3 \sigma_3)] \otimes (V\Pi_0 V^\dagger)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{4}[(I + r\sigma_3) - (sz_3 I + c_1 z_1 \sigma_1 + c_2 z_2 \sigma_2 + c_3 z_3 \sigma_3)] \otimes (V\Pi_1 V^\dagger)$$

$$= \frac{1}{4}(I + r\sigma_3) \otimes (V\Pi_0 V^\dagger + V\Pi_1 V^\dagger)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{4}(sz_3 I + c_1 z_1 \sigma_1 + c_2 z_2 \sigma_2 + c_3 z_3 \sigma_3) \otimes (V\Pi_0 V^\dagger - V\Pi_1 V^\dagger)$$

$$= \frac{1}{4}(I + r\sigma_3) \otimes I + \frac{1}{4}(sz_3 I + c_1 z_1 \sigma_1 + c_2 z_2 \sigma_2 + c_3 z_3 \sigma_3) \otimes V\sigma_3 V^\dagger.$$

The eigenvalues of $p_0\rho_0 + p_1\rho_1$ are the same with the states $(I \otimes V^\dagger)(p_0\rho_0 + p_1\rho_1)(I \otimes V)$, and

$$(I \otimes V^\dagger)(p_0\rho_0 + p_1\rho_1)(I \otimes V) = \frac{1}{4}(I + r\sigma_3) \otimes I + \frac{1}{4}(sz_3 I + c_1 z_1 \sigma_1 + c_2 z_2 \sigma_2 + c_3 z_3 \sigma_3) \otimes \sigma_3. \tag{9}$$

The eigenvalues of the equation (9) are

$$\lambda_{1,2} = \frac{1}{4}\left(1 - sz_3 \pm \sqrt{r^2 - 2rc_3 z_3 + c_1^2 z_1^2 + c_2^2 z_2^2 + c_3^2 z_3^2}\right)$$

$$\lambda_{3,4} = \frac{1}{4}\left(1 + sz_3 \pm \sqrt{r^2 + 2rc_3 z_3 + c_1^2 z_1^2 + c_2^2 z_2^2 + c_3^2 z_3^2}\right) \tag{10}$$

It can be directly verified that

$$z_1^2 + z_2^2 + z_3^2 = 1.$$

Set $\phi = z_3$, and

$$\phi \in [-1, 1]. \tag{11}$$

Let us put $\theta = c_1^2 z_1^2 + c_2^2 z_2^2 + c_3^2 z_3^2$, $c = \min\{|c_1|, |c_2|, |c_3|\}$, $C = \max\{|c_1|, |c_2|, |c_3|\}$, then $c^2 = \min\{c_1^2, c_2^2, c_3^2\}$, $C^2 = \max\{c_1^2, c_2^2, c_3^2\}$, then $c^2 \leq \theta \leq C^2$, and the equality can be readily attained by appropriate choice of t, y_j [17]. Therefore, we see that the range of values allowed for θ is $[c^2, C^2]$.

The entropy of $\sum_k \Pi_k \rho^{ab} \Pi_k$ is

$$S(\sum_k \Pi_k \rho^{ab} \Pi_k) = f(\phi, \theta) = -\sum_{i=1}^{4} \lambda_i \log \lambda_i$$

$$= 2 - \frac{1}{4}[(1 - s\phi + \sqrt{r^2 - 2rc_3\phi + \theta}) \log(1 - s\phi + \sqrt{r^2 - 2rc_3\phi + \theta})$$

$$+ (1 - s\phi - \sqrt{r^2 - 2rc_3\phi + \theta}) \log(1 - s\phi - \sqrt{r^2 - 2rc_3\phi + \theta})$$

$$+ (1 + s\phi + \sqrt{r^2 + 2rc_3\phi + \theta}) \log(1 + s\phi + \sqrt{r^2 + 2rc_3\phi + \theta})$$

$$+ (1 + s\phi - \sqrt{r^2 + 2rc_3\phi + \theta}) \log(1 + s\phi - \sqrt{r^2 + 2rc_3\phi + \theta})].$$

$$\tag{12}$$

From Eq.(6), (11), we can obtain $1 \mp s\phi \geq 0$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial f}{\partial \theta} &= \frac{1}{\ln[256]} \left[\frac{\ln(1 - s\phi - \sqrt{r^2 - 2rc_3\phi + \theta}) - \ln(1 - s\phi + \sqrt{r^2 - 2rc_3\phi + \theta})}{\sqrt{r^2 - 2rc_3\phi + \theta}} \right. \\
&\left. + \frac{\ln(1 + s\phi - \sqrt{r^2 + 2rc_3\phi + \theta}) - \ln(1 + s\phi + \sqrt{r^2 + 2rc_3\phi + \theta})}{\sqrt{r^2 + 2rc_3\phi + \theta}} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\ln[256]} \left[\frac{\ln \frac{1 - s\phi - \sqrt{r^2 - 2rc_3\phi + \theta}}{1 - s\phi + \sqrt{r^2 - 2rc_3\phi + \theta}}}{\sqrt{r^2 - 2rc_3\phi + \theta}} + \frac{\ln \frac{1 + s\phi - \sqrt{r^2 + 2rc_3\phi + \theta}}{1 + s\phi + \sqrt{r^2 + 2rc_3\phi + \theta}}}{\sqrt{r^2 + 2rc_3\phi + \theta}} \right] < 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{13}
$$

It converts the problem about $\min S(\sum_k \Pi_k \rho^{ab} \Pi_k)$ to the problem about the function of one variable ϕ for minimum. That is

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min S(\sum_k \Pi_k \rho^{ab} \Pi_k) &= \min_\phi f(\phi, C) \\
&= \min_\phi \{ 2 - \frac{1}{4}[(1 - s\phi + \sqrt{r^2 - 2rc_3\phi + C^2}) \log(1 - s\phi + \sqrt{r^2 - 2rc_3\phi + C^2}) \\
&\quad + (1 - s\phi - \sqrt{r^2 - 2rc_3\phi + C^2}) \log(1 - s\phi - \sqrt{r^2 - 2rc_3\phi + C^2}) \\
&\quad + (1 + s\phi + \sqrt{r^2 + 2rc_3\phi + C^2}) \log(1 + s\phi + \sqrt{r^2 + 2rc_3\phi + C^2}) \\
&\quad + (1 - s\phi - \sqrt{r^2 + 2rc_3\phi + C^2}) \log(1 + s\phi - \sqrt{r^2 + 2rc_3\phi + C^2})] \}.
\end{aligned} \tag{14}
$$

By Eqs. (2), (7), (14), the one-way deficit of the X states in Eq. (5) is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta^\rightarrow(\rho^{ab}) &= \min_{\{\Pi_k\}} S(\sum_k \Pi_k \rho^{ab} \Pi_k) - S(\rho^{ab}) \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \left[(1 - c_3 + \sqrt{(r-s)^2 + (c_1 + c_2)^2}) \log(1 - c_3 + \sqrt{(r-s)^2 + (c_1 + c_2)^2}) \right. \\
&\quad + (1 - c_3 - \sqrt{(r-s)^2 + (c_1 + c_2)^2}) \log(1 - c_3 - \sqrt{(r-s)^2 + (c_1 + c_2)^2}) \\
&\quad + (1 + c_3 + \sqrt{(r+s)^2 + (c_1 - c_2)^2}) \log(1 + c_3 + \sqrt{(r+s)^2 + (c_1 - c_2)^2}) \\
&\quad \left. + (1 + c_3 - \sqrt{(r+s)^2 + (c_1 - c_2)^2}) \log(1 + c_3 - \sqrt{(r+s)^2 + (c_1 - c_2)^2}) \right] \\
&\quad - \max_\phi \frac{1}{4} \left[(1 - s\phi + \sqrt{r^2 - 2rc_3\phi + C^2}) \log(1 - s\phi + \sqrt{r^2 - 2rc_3\phi + C^2}) \right. \\
&\quad + (1 - s\phi - \sqrt{r^2 - 2rc_3\phi + C^2}) \log(1 - s\phi - \sqrt{r^2 - 2rc_3\phi + C^2}) \\
&\quad + (1 + s\phi + \sqrt{r^2 + 2rc_3\phi + C^2}) \log(1 + s\phi + \sqrt{r^2 + 2rc_3\phi + C^2}) \\
&\quad \left. + (1 + s\phi - \sqrt{r^2 + 2rc_3\phi + C^2}) \log(1 + s\phi - \sqrt{r^2 + 2rc_3\phi + C^2}) \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{15}
$$

where $C = \max\{|c_1|, |c_2|, |c_3|\}, \phi \in [-1, 1]$.

For an example, we set $r = 0.2, s = 0.3, c_1 = 0.3, c_2 = -0.4, c_3 = 0.56$, and use the minimun command

$$
\text{MinValue}[\{\Delta^\rightarrow(\rho^{ab}), -1 \leq \phi \leq 1\}, \phi] \tag{16}
$$

in "Wolfram Mathematics8.0" software, and obtain the value of the one-way deficit 0.130614.

When $r = s = 0$, ρ reduces to the two-qubit Bell-diagonal states. One-way deficit of Bell-diagonal states is

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta^{\rightarrow}(\rho^{ab}) &= \min_{\{\Pi_k\}} S(\sum_k \Pi_k \rho^{ab} \Pi_k) - S(\rho^{ab}) \\
&= \frac{1}{4}[(1 - c_1 - c_2 - c_3)\log(1 - c_1 - c_2 - c_3) \\
&\quad + (1 - c_1 + c_2 + c_3)\log(1 - c_1 + c_2 + c_3) \\
&\quad + (1 + c_1 - c_2 + c_3)\log(1 + c_1 - c_2 + c_3) \\
&\quad + (1 + c_1 + c_2 - c_3)\log(1 + c_1 + c_2 - c_3)] \\
&\quad - \frac{1 - C}{2}\log(1 - C) - \frac{1 + C}{2}\log(1 + C)
\end{aligned}
\tag{17}
$$

which is in consistent with the result using the simultaneous diagonalization theorem obtained in [28].

It is worth mentioning that we have obtained a formula for solving one-way deficit. It is more simpler than the method using the joint entropy theorem[29].

III.   DYNAMICS OF ONE-WAY DEFICIT UNDER LOCAL NONDISSIPATIVE CHANNELS

The concurrence of the X states in Eq. (5) can be calculated in terms of the eigenvalues of $\rho\widetilde{\rho}$, where $\widetilde{\rho} = \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y \rho^* \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y$. The eigenvalues of $\rho\widetilde{\rho}$ are

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lambda_5 &= \frac{1}{16}(c_1 - c_2 - \sqrt{(1 + c_3)^2 - (r + s)^2})^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{16}(c_1 - c_2 - \sqrt{(1 + r + s + c_3)(1 - r - s + c_3)})^2,
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lambda_6 &= \frac{1}{16}(c_1 - c_2 + \sqrt{(1 + c_3)^2 - (r + s)^2})^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{16}(c_1 - c_2 + \sqrt{(1 + r + s + c_3)(1 - r - s + c_3)})^2,
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lambda_7 &= \frac{1}{16}(c_1 + c_2 - \sqrt{(1 - c_3)^2 - (r - s)^2})^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{16}(c_1 + c_2 - \sqrt{(1 + r - s - c_3)(1 - r + s - c_3)})^2,
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lambda_8 &= \frac{1}{16}(c_1 + c_2 + \sqrt{(1 - c_3)^2 - (r - s)^2})^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{16}(c_1 + c_2 + \sqrt{(1 + r - s - c_3)(1 - r + s - c_3)})^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

The concurrence of the X states in Eqs. (5) is given by

$$
C(\rho^{ab}) = \max\{2\max\{\sqrt{\lambda_5}, \sqrt{\lambda_6}, \sqrt{\lambda_7}, \sqrt{\lambda_8}\} - \sqrt{\lambda_5} - \sqrt{\lambda_6} - \sqrt{\lambda_7} - \sqrt{\lambda_8}, 0\}.
\tag{18}
$$

In the following we consider that the X states in Eq. (5) undergoes the phase flip channel [30], with the Kraus operators $\Gamma_0^{(A)} = \mathrm{diag}(\sqrt{1 - p/2}, \sqrt{1 - p/2}) \otimes I$, $\Gamma_1^{(A)} = \mathrm{diag}(\sqrt{p/2}, -\sqrt{p/2}) \otimes I$, $\Gamma_0^{(B)} = I \otimes$

diag($\sqrt{1-p/2}, \sqrt{1-p/2}$), $\Gamma_1^{(B)} = I \otimes$ diag($\sqrt{p/2}, -\sqrt{p/2}$), where $p = 1 - \exp(-\gamma t)$, γ is the phase damping rate [30, 31]. Let $\varepsilon(\cdot)$ represent the operator of decoherence. Then under the phase flip channel we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon(\rho) \;=\; & \frac{1}{4}(I \otimes I + r\sigma_3 \otimes I + I \otimes s\sigma_3 + (1-p)^2 c_1 \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_1 \\
& + (1-p)^2 c_2 \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2 + c_3 \sigma_3 \otimes \sigma_3).
\end{aligned}
\tag{19}
$$

We will only consider the following further simplified family of the X states in Eq. (5), where

$$
|c_1| < |c_2| < |c_3|,
\tag{20}
$$

As $\varepsilon(\rho)$ satisfies conditions in Eqs. (5), (20) and the one-way deficit of the ρ^{ab} under the phase flip channel is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta^{\rightarrow}(\varepsilon(\rho^{ab})) \;=\; & \frac{1}{4}\Big[(1 - c_3 + \sqrt{(r-s)^2 + (1-p)^4(c_1+c_2)^2})\log(1 - c_3 + \sqrt{(r-s)^2 + (1-p)^4(c_1+c_2)^2}) \\
& + (1 - c_3 - \sqrt{(r-s)^2 + (1-p)^4(c_1+c_2)^2})\log(1 - c_3 - \sqrt{(r-s)^2 + (1-p)^4(c_1+c_2)^2}) \\
& + (1 + c_3 + \sqrt{(r+s)^2 + (1-p)^4(c_1-c_2)^2})\log(1 + c_3 + \sqrt{(r+s)^2 + (1-p)^4(c_1-c_2)^2}) \\
& + (1 + c_3 - \sqrt{(r+s)^2 + (1-p)^4(c_1-c_2)^2})\log(1 + c_3 - \sqrt{(r+s)^2 + (1-p)^4(c_1-c_2)^2})\Big] \\
& - \max_{\phi} \frac{1}{4}\Big[(1 - s\phi + \sqrt{r^2 - 2rc_3\phi + c_3^2})\log(1 - s\phi + \sqrt{r^2 - 2rc_3\phi + c_3^2}) \\
& + (1 - s\phi - \sqrt{r^2 - 2rc_3\phi + c_3^2})\log(1 - s\phi - \sqrt{r^2 - 2rc_3\phi + c_3^2}) \\
& + (1 + s\phi + \sqrt{r^2 + 2rc_3\phi + c_3^2})\log(1 + s\phi + \sqrt{r^2 + 2rc_3\phi + c_3^2}) \\
& + (1 + s\phi - \sqrt{r^2 + 2rc_3\phi + c_3^2})\log(1 + s\phi - \sqrt{r^2 + 2rc_3\phi + c_3^2})\Big].
\end{aligned}
\tag{21}
$$

As an example, for $r = 0.2$, $s = 0.3, c_1 = 0.3, c_2 = -0.4, c_3 = 0.56$, the dynamic behavior of correlation of the state under the phase flip channel is depicted in Fig.1. Here one sees that the concurrence become zero after the transition. We find that sudden death of entanglement appears at $p = 0.217617$. Therefore for these states the entanglement is weaker against the decoherence than the one-way deficit.


FIG. 1: (Color online) Concurrence(blue dashed line) and one-way deficit(red solid line) under phase flip channel for $r = 0.2$, $s = 0.3$, $c_1 = 0.3$, $c_2 = -0.4$ and $c_3 = 0.56$.

IV. SUMMARY

We have given a new method to evaluate the one-way deficit for X states with five parameters. By this way, we can evaluate one-way deficit of the wide range states than the method using the simultaneous diagonalization theorem. Meanwhile, this way is more simpler than the method using the joint entropy theorem. The dynamic behavior of the one-way deficit under decoherence channel is investigated. It is shown that one-way deficit of the X states is more robust against the decoherence than quantum entanglement.

[1] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895 (1993).

[2] C. H. Bennett and S. Wiesner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2881(1992).

[3] A. K. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 661 (1991).

[4] A. K. Pati, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 014302 (2000); C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, B. M. Terhal, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 077902 (2001).

[5] L. Henderson and V. Vedral, J. Phys. A **34**, 6899 (2001); H. Ollivier and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 017901(2002).

[6] K. Modi, T. Paterek, W. Son, V. Vedral, and M. Williamson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 080501 (2010).

[7] G. L. Giorgi, B. Bellomo, F. Galve, and R. Zambrini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 190501 (2011).

[8] A. Streltsov, G. Adesso, M. Piani, and D. Bruß, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 050503 (2012).

[9] K. Modi, A. Brodutch, H. Cable, T. Paterek and V. Vedral, Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**. 1655 (2012).

[10] M. Ali, A. R. P. Rau, G. Alber, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 042105 (2010).

[11] B. Li, Z. X. Wang and S. M. Fei, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 022321 (2011).

[12] Q. Chen, C. Zhang, S. Yu, X. X. Yi and C. H. Oh, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 042313 (2011).

[13] M. Shi, C. Sun, F. Jiang, X. Yan and J. Du, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 064104 (2012).

[14] S. Vinjanampathy, A. R. P. Rau, J. Phys. A **45**, 095303 (2012).

[15] J. Oppenheim, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 180402 (2002).

[16] M. Horodecki, K. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, A. Sen(De) and U. Sen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 100402 (2003).

[17] S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 042303 (2008).

[18] S. Luo and S. Fu, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 034302 (2010).

[19] B. Dakic, V. Vedral, and C. Brukner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**,190502 (2010).

[20] G. Adesso and A. Datta, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 030501 (2010).

[21] P. Giorda and M. G. A. Paris, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 020503 (2010).

[22] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, A. Sen(De), U. Sen and B. Synak, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 062307 (2005); M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki and J. Oppenheim, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 062104 (2003).

[23] J. Oppenheim, K. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 022307 (2003).

[24] A. Streltsov, H. Kampermann and D. Bruß, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 250501 (2012).

[25] T. K. Chuan, J. Maillard, K. Modi, T. Paterek, M. Paternostro and M. Piani, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 070501 (2012).

[26] A. Streltsov, H. Kampermann and D. Bruß, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 160401 (2011).

[27] H. Kim, M. R. Hwang, E. Jung and D. Park, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 052325 (2010).

[28] Y. K. Wang, T. Ma, B. Li, Z. X. Wang, Commun. Theor. Phys **59**, 540 (2013).

[29] L. H. Shao, Z. J. Xi, Y. M. Li, Commun. Theor. Phys **59**, 285 (2013).

[30] J. Maziero, L. C. Céleri, R. M. Serra and V. Vedral, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 044102 (2009).

[31] T. Yu and J. H. Eberly, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 140403 (2006).