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#### Abstract

We present an inequality for detecting entanglement and distillability of arbitrary dimensional bipartite systems. This inequality provides a sufficient condition of entanglement for bipartite mixed states, and a necessary and sufficient condition of entanglement for bipartite pure states. Moreover, the inequality also gives a necessary and sufficient condition for distillability.
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## I. INTRODUCTION

Entanglement is one of the most fascinating features of quantum theory and has numerous applications in quantum information processing [1]. As a result, various approaches have been proposed and many significant conclusions have been derived in detecting entanglement [2-13]. However there are yet no operational necessary and sufficient separability criteria for general higher dimensional quantum states. In particular, experimental detection of quantum entanglement by measuring some suitable quantum mechanical observables has practical importance. The Bell inequalities can be used to detect perfectly the entanglement of pure bipartite states [14-18]. Besides Bell inequalities, the entanglement witness could also be used for experimental detection of quantum entanglement for some special states [4, 19, 20], which could give rise to entanglement estimation [21]. The two-copy measurement of concurrence for two-qubit pure states has been already realized experimentally [22-24]. For arbitrary dimensional bipartite pure states, one method of measuring concurrence has been presented in terms of one-copy measurement [25]. Except that, uncertainty relations are also favorable in entanglement detection, for instance, one separability condition has been derived for all negative partial transpose state in experimentally accessible forms [26].

For bipartite mixed states, a necessary and sufficient inequality has been derived for detecting entanglement of two-qubit states [27]. In Ref. [28] based on a different approach,
an inequality is presented, which is both necessary and sufficient in detecting entanglement of qubit-qutrit states, and necessary for qubit-qudit states.

In this article we propose an inequality detecting entanglement for arbitrary dimensional bipartite states, which consists of local observables with measurement outcomes $\pm 1$. This inequality gives a necessary condition of separability for mixed states, namely, any violation of the inequality implies entanglement. It is shown that our inequality can detect entanglement of a wide class of states such as Horodecki's state, isotropic state and Werner state. For pure states, the inequality becomes both necessary and sufficient. All pure entangled states violate it. Moreover, our inequality provides also a necessary and sufficient condition for entanglement distillability, an approach to get the ideal resource from general quantum mixed states for quantum information processing $[29,30]$.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we first propose an inequality in terms of the mean values of local observables. Then we prove that all separable states obey this inequality and all pure entangled states violate it. As applications some detailed examples are presented. We show then that the inequality is a necessary and sufficient condition for distillability. Comments and conclusions are given in the last section.

## II. INEQUALITY FOR ARBITRARY BIPARTITE SYSTEMS

Let $H_{m}, H_{n}$ be $m$, $n$-dimensional vector spaces with $\{|i\rangle\}_{i=0}^{m-1}$ and $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=0}^{n-1}$ the computational basis respectively. Set $\lambda_{0}^{A}=I_{m}$ the $m \times m$ identity matrix, $\lambda_{i}^{A}=|0\rangle\langle 0|-|i\rangle\langle i|$, $\mu_{1}^{A}=|0\rangle\langle 1|+|1\rangle\langle 0|$, and $\mu_{2}^{A}=\mathrm{i}|0\rangle\langle 1|-\mathrm{i}|1\rangle\langle 0|$, where $|i\rangle \in H_{m}, i=1, \cdots, m-1$. Set $\lambda_{0}^{B}=I_{n}$ the $n \times n$ identity matrix, $\lambda_{i}^{B}=|0\rangle\langle 0|-|i\rangle\langle i|, \mu_{1}^{B}=|0\rangle\langle 1|+|1\rangle\langle 0|$, and $\mu_{2}^{B}=\mathrm{i}|0\rangle\langle 1|-\mathrm{i}|1\rangle\langle 0|$, where $|i\rangle \in H_{n}, i=1, \cdots, n-1$. Let $A_{i}=U \lambda_{i}^{A} U^{\dagger}, i=0,1, \cdots, m-1, A_{j}^{\prime}=U \mu_{j}^{A} U^{\dagger}$, $j=1,2$, be a set of quantum mechanical observables acting on the first subsystem, with $U$ any $m \times m$ unitary matrix. Let $B_{i}=V \lambda_{i}^{B} V^{\dagger}, i=0,1, \cdots, n-1, B_{j}^{\prime}=V \mu_{j}^{B} V^{\dagger}, j=1,2$, be a set of quantum mechanical observables acting on the second subsystem, with $V$ any $n \times n$ unitary matrix. Here Roman letter i represents the imaginary unit.

We define

$$
\begin{align*}
H_{U, V}^{(m, n)} & =\frac{1}{m n} \sum_{i, j}\left(1-\frac{m}{2} \delta_{i 1}-\frac{n}{2} \delta_{j 1}\right) A_{i} \otimes B_{j} \\
P_{U, V}^{(m, n)} & =\frac{1}{2 m^{2} n^{2}} \sum_{i, j}\left(m \delta_{i 1}-n \delta_{j 1}\right) A_{i} \otimes B_{j}  \tag{1}\\
Q_{U, V}^{(m, n)} & =\frac{1}{16}\left(A_{1}^{\prime} \otimes B_{1}^{\prime}-A_{2}^{\prime} \otimes B_{2}^{\prime}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

where $\delta_{k l}=1$ if $k=l$ and is zero otherwise. According to the mean values of the operators in Eq. (11), we can construct an inequality detecting entanglement for $m \otimes n$ systems.

Theorem 1 Any separable state $\rho$ in $H_{m} \otimes H_{n}$ obeys the following inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle H_{U, V}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{\rho}^{2} \geq\left\langle P_{U, V}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{\rho}^{2}+\left\langle Q_{U, V}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{\rho}^{2} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $m \times m$ unitary matrix $U$ and $n \times n$ unitary matrix $V$.

Proof. First we show that inequality (2) holds for all pure separable states, which is equivalent to prove that for arbitrary pure separable state $\rho$, the following inequality holds:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle H_{I_{m}, I_{n}}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{\rho}^{2} \geq\left\langle P_{I_{m}, I_{n}}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{\rho}^{2}+\left\langle Q_{I_{m}, I_{n}}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{\rho}^{2} . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that any pure separable state can be written as $|\xi\rangle=\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} a_{i} b_{j}|i j\rangle$ with $\sum_{i=0}^{m-1}\left|a_{i}\right|^{2}=\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\left|b_{j}\right|^{2}=1$. Inserting this separable pure state $\rho=|\xi\rangle\langle\xi|$ into Eq. (3), one gets that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle H_{I_{m}, I_{n}}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{|\xi\rangle\langle\xi|}=\frac{1}{2}\left(\left|a_{0} b_{1}\right|^{2}+\left|a_{1} b_{0}\right|^{2}\right) \geq 0 . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

While the right hand side of inequality (3) becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle P_{I_{m}, I_{n}}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{|\xi\rangle\langle\xi|}^{2}+\left\langle Q_{I_{m}, I_{n}}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{|\xi\rangle\langle\xi|}^{2}=\frac{1}{4}\left(\left|a_{0} b_{1}\right|^{2}-\left|a_{1} b_{0}\right|^{2}\right)^{2}+\operatorname{Re}\left(a_{0} a_{1}^{*} b_{0} b_{1}^{*}\right)^{2} . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

From Eqs. (4) and (5), it is easy to obtain that inequality (3) holds for any pure separable states.

We now prove that inequality (21) also holds for general separable mixed states,

$$
\rho=\sum_{i} p_{i}\left|\psi_{i}\right\rangle\left\langle\psi_{i}\right|, \quad 0 \leq p_{i} \leq 1, \quad \sum_{i} p_{i}=1,
$$

where $\left|\psi_{i}\right\rangle$ are all pure separable states. Denote

$$
\begin{aligned}
c_{i} & =\left\langle H_{U, V}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{\left|\psi_{i}\right\rangle\left\langle\psi_{i}\right|} ; \\
d_{i} & =\left\langle P_{U, V}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{\left|\psi_{i}\right\rangle\left\langle\psi_{i}\right|} ; \\
e_{i} & =\left\langle Q_{U, V}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{\left|\psi_{i}\right\rangle\left\langle\psi_{i}\right|} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since inequality (2) holds for all pure separable states, one has $c_{i}^{2} \geq d_{i}^{2}+e_{i}^{2}$. Taking into account that if the inequality $c_{i}^{2} \geq d_{i}^{2}+e_{i}^{2}$ holds for arbitrary real numbers $d_{i}, e_{i}$ and nonnegative $c_{i}, i=1, \cdots, N$, then $\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} p_{i} c_{i}\right)^{2} \geq\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} p_{i} d_{i}\right)^{2}+\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} p_{i} e_{i}\right)^{2}$ for $0 \leq p_{i} \leq 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{N} p_{i}=1$, we know that any mixed separable state $\rho$ obeys inequality (2).

This theorem shows that any violation of this inequality implies entanglement. Hence it gives a sufficient condition of entanglement for arbitrary dimensional bipartite systems. Next we prove that for the pure state case, one has that all pure entangled states violate this inequality for some unitary $U$ and $V$, so that the inequality provides a necessary and sufficient condition for entanglement of pure states.

Theorem $2 A$ pure state in $H_{m} \otimes H_{n}$ is entangled if and only if it violates inequality ((2)) for some unitary matrices $U$ and $V$.

Proof. Here we only need to prove that any pure entangled state in $H_{m} \otimes H_{n}$ violates inequality (2) for some unitary matrices $U$ and $V$. Without loss of generality, we assume $m \geq n$. By Schmidt decomposition any entangled pure state $|\phi\rangle$ can be transformed into $\left|\phi^{\prime}\right\rangle:$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\phi^{\prime}\right\rangle=U^{\dagger} \otimes V^{\dagger}|\phi\rangle=\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_{i}|i i\rangle, \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $a_{0}>0, a_{1}>0$, and $a_{i} \geq 0$ for $i=2, \cdots, n-1, \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\left|a_{i}\right|^{2}=1$. Here $U$ is an $m \times m$ unitary matrix and $V$ is an $n \times n$ unitary matrix. Then from the PPT criterion [3, 4] there exist nonzero real numbers $a$ and $b$ satisfying $a^{2}+b^{2}=1$ and $|\psi\rangle=a|01\rangle+b|10\rangle$ such that

$$
\left\langle(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)^{T_{1}}\right\rangle_{\left|\phi^{\prime}\right\rangle\left\langle\phi^{\prime}\right|}=\langle\psi|\left(\left|\phi^{\prime}\right\rangle\left\langle\phi^{\prime}\right|\right)^{T_{1}}|\psi\rangle<0 .
$$

By expanding the partial transposed matrix $|\psi\rangle\left\langle\left.\psi\right|^{T_{1}}\right.$ according to the matrices $\left\{\lambda_{i}^{A}\right\},\left\{\mu_{i}^{A}\right\}$, $\left\{\lambda_{i}^{B}\right\}$ and $\left\{\mu_{i}^{B}\right\}$ on the first and second subsystems respectively, we get

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\langle(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)^{T_{1}}\right\rangle_{\left|\phi^{\prime}\right\rangle\left\langle\phi^{\prime}\right|}  \tag{7}\\
& =\frac{1}{m n}\left\langle\sum_{i, j \neq 1} \lambda_{i} \otimes \lambda_{j}+\sum_{i, j}\left[\left(\frac{-m+2}{2}+\frac{m}{2} \sqrt{1-C^{2}}\right) \delta_{i 1}\right.\right. \\
& \left.\left.+\left(\frac{-n+2}{2}-\frac{n}{2} \sqrt{1-C^{2}}\right) \delta_{j 1}\right] \lambda_{i} \otimes \lambda_{j}\right\rangle_{\left|\phi^{\prime}\right\rangle\left\langle\phi^{\prime}\right|}+\frac{1}{4} C\left\langle\mu_{1}^{A} \otimes \mu_{1}^{B}-\mu_{2}^{A} \otimes \mu_{2}^{B}\right\rangle_{\left|\phi^{\prime}\right\rangle\left\langle\phi^{\prime}\right|} \\
& \geq\left\langle H_{I_{m}, I_{n}}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{\left|\phi^{\prime}\right\rangle\left\langle\phi^{\prime}\right|}-\left|\sqrt{1-C^{2}}\left\langle P_{I_{m}, I_{n}}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{\left|\phi^{\prime}\right\rangle\left\langle\phi^{\prime}\right|}+C\left\langle Q_{I_{m}, I_{n}}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{\left|\phi^{\prime}\right\rangle\left\langle\phi^{\prime}\right|}\right| \\
& \geq\left\langle H_{I_{m}, I_{n}}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{\left|\phi^{\prime}\right\rangle\left\langle\phi^{\prime}\right|}-\left(\left\langle P_{I_{m}, I_{n}}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{\left|\phi^{\prime}\right\rangle\left\langle\phi^{\prime}\right|}^{2}+\left\langle Q_{I_{m}, I_{n}}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{\left|\phi^{\prime}\right\rangle\left\langle\phi^{\prime}\right|}^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& =\left\langle H_{U, V}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|}-\left(\left\langle P_{U, V}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|}^{2}+\left\langle Q_{U, V}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|}^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{align*}
$$

where $C=2 a b$ is just the concurrence of the pure state $|\psi\rangle$, defined by $C(|\psi\rangle)=$ $\sqrt{2\left(1-\operatorname{Tr} \rho_{1}^{2}\right)} . \rho_{1}$ is the reduced density matrix $\rho_{1}=\operatorname{Tr}_{2}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$, where $\operatorname{Tr}_{2}$ stands for the partial trace with respect to the second subsystem. Here $A_{i}=U \lambda_{i}^{A} U^{\dagger}, i=0,1, \cdots, m-1$, $A_{j}^{\prime}=U \mu_{j}^{A} U^{\dagger}, j=1,2, B_{i}=V \lambda_{i}^{B} V^{\dagger}, i=0,1, \cdots, n-1, B_{j}^{\prime}=V \mu_{j}^{B} V^{\dagger}, j=1,2 . U$ and $V$ are just the unitary matrices from the Schmidt decomposition in Eq. (6). The first inequality is due to $-|x| \leq x$ and the second one is from the Cauchy inequality. Since the left hand side of (7) is negative, we have that the pure entangled state $|\phi\rangle$ violates inequality (2) with respect to the corresponding observables.

Therefore any pure state $|\psi\rangle$ in $H_{m} \otimes H_{n}$ is separable if and only if inequality (2) is satisfied. Inequality (2) gives a necessary and sufficient criterion for the separability of pure states, which may be determined by experimental measurements on the local observables. For example, for pure entangled state $\left|\phi^{\prime}\right\rangle$ defined above, it violates inequality (3) corresponding to $U=I_{m}$ and $V=I_{n}$ in inequality (2).

In fact for pure bipartite states there are already many Bell inequalities like Refs. [15, 18] in terms of the expectation of the local observables and Refs. [16, 17] in terms of probabilities for $d \otimes d$ systems. Inequality (2) is for arbitrary dimensional pure bipartite systems, no matter whether the dimensions of the two subsystems are the same or not. Moreover, it also provides sufficient condition for entanglement of mixed states.

Inequality (2) can be associated with nonlinear entanglement witness operators, where the violation is replaced by a negative expectation value. In fact, for given $U$ and $V$, inequality (2) gives rise to a kind of nonlinear entanglement witness $W_{U, V}^{(m, n)}$ :

$$
\left\langle W_{U, V}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{\rho} \equiv\left\langle H_{U, V}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{\rho}^{2}-\left(\left\langle P_{U, V}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{\rho}^{2}+\left\langle Q_{U, V}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{\rho}^{2}\right)
$$

For all separable states $\sigma,\left\langle W_{U, V}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{\sigma} \geq 0$. If $\left\langle W_{U, V}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{\rho}<0$ then $\rho$ is entangled. As an entanglement witness gives rise to a superface in the state space, dividing the space into a set of entangled states and the rest, the detection of different entangled states depends on the choice of different witnesses. Here different choices of $U$ and $V$ detect different sets of entangled states.

Generally linear entanglement witness operators can be associated with positive maps in terms of Jamiolkowski isomorphism. And positive maps could give rise to entanglement linear witness operators, see e.g. [31]. Our inequality (2) is not linear, as many Bell-type inequalities for mixed states [27, 28]. The entanglement witness operators deduced from the inequality is also nonlinear. The direct relations between the entanglement witness operators and the positive maps are not obvious.

Subsequently, we consider the maximal violation of inequality (2). Let $F^{(m, n)}(\rho)=$ $\max _{U, V}\left\{-\left\langle W_{U, V}^{(m, n)}\right\rangle_{\rho}, 0\right\}$ denote the maximal violation value with respect to a given state $\rho$, under all $U$ and $V$. Then $F^{(m, n)}(\rho)=0$ if $\rho$ is separable. Additionally, $F^{(m, n)}(\rho)$ is invariant under the local unitary transformations.

From another point of view, inequality (2) can be viewed as the generalization of the main result in Ref. [27] and Ref. [28]. For $m=n=2$, inequality (22) becomes the one in Ref. [27] which is necessary and sufficient in detecting entanglement for pure or mixed states. For $m=2$ and $n=3$, inequality (2) is also the necessary and sufficient condition of separability [28]. But for $m>3$ or $n>3$, this inequality is only necessary for separability of mixed states, but necessary and sufficient for pure states. As is shown in Ref. [28], for $m=2$ the inequality can detect some PPT entanglement. In the following we give some examples concerning entanglement detection in terms of inequality (22).

Example 1. Horodecki's $3 \otimes 3$ state:

$$
\sigma_{\alpha}=\frac{2}{7}\left|\psi^{+}\right\rangle\left\langle\psi^{+}\right|+\frac{\alpha}{7} \sigma_{+}+\frac{5-\alpha}{7} \sigma_{-},
$$

where $\sigma_{+}=\frac{1}{3}(|01\rangle\langle 01|+|12\rangle\langle 12|+|20\rangle\langle 20|), \sigma_{-}=\frac{1}{3}(|10\rangle\langle 10|+|21\rangle\langle 21|+|02\rangle\langle 02|),\left|\psi^{+}\right\rangle=$ $\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|00\rangle+|11\rangle+|22\rangle) . \sigma_{\alpha}$ is separable for $2 \leq \alpha \leq 3$, bound (PPT) entangled for $3<\alpha \leq 4$,
and free entangled for $4<\alpha \leq 5$ [32]. Employing inequality (3) for $3 \otimes 3$ systems,

$$
\begin{align*}
& 4\left\langle 2 I_{3} \otimes I_{3}-I_{3} \otimes \lambda_{1}^{B}+2 I_{3} \otimes \lambda_{2}^{B}-\lambda_{1} \otimes I_{3}-4 \lambda_{1} \otimes \lambda_{1}^{B}\right. \\
& \left.-\lambda_{1}^{A} \otimes \lambda_{2}^{B}+2 \lambda_{2}^{A} \otimes I_{n}-\lambda_{2}^{A} \otimes \lambda_{1}^{B}+2 \lambda_{2}^{A} \otimes \lambda_{2}^{B}\right\rangle_{\rho}^{2}  \tag{8}\\
& \geq 36\left\langle I_{3} \otimes \lambda_{1}^{B}-\lambda_{1}^{A} \otimes I_{3}-\lambda_{1}^{A} \otimes \lambda_{2}^{B}+\lambda_{2}^{A} \otimes \lambda_{1}^{B}\right\rangle_{\rho}^{2} \\
& +81\left\langle\mu_{1}^{A} \otimes \mu_{1}^{B}+\mu_{2}^{A} \otimes \mu_{2}^{B}\right\rangle_{\rho}^{2},
\end{align*}
$$

we have that the left hand side of inequality (8) is $\frac{900}{49}$ and the right hand side of inequality (8) is $\frac{36(2 \alpha-5)^{2}}{49}+\frac{576}{49}$. Hence $\sigma_{\alpha}$ violates inequality (8) if and only if $\alpha>4$.

Example 2. Isotropic states are a class of $U \otimes U^{*}$ invariant mixed states in $H_{n} \otimes H_{n}$ [6]:

$$
\rho_{i s o}(f)=\frac{1-f}{n^{2}-1} I_{n}+\frac{n^{2} f-1}{n^{2}-1}\left|\psi^{+}\right\rangle\left\langle\psi^{+}\right|,
$$

with $f=\left\langle\psi^{+}\right| \rho_{\text {iso }}(f)\left|\psi^{+}\right\rangle$satisfying $0 \leq f \leq 1,\left|\psi^{+}\right\rangle=\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}|i i\rangle$. These states are shown to be separable if and only if they are PPT, i.e. $f \leq \frac{1}{n}$. Now we utilize inequality (3) with $m=n$. It can be verified that the left hand side of inequality (3) is $\left(\frac{1-f}{n^{2}-1}\right)^{2}$ and the right hand side of inequality (3) is $\left(\frac{n^{2} f-1}{n^{2}\left(n^{2}-1\right)}\right)^{2}$ for $\rho_{i s o}(f)$. If we choose $U=V=I_{n}$ in inequality (2), then the violation of this inequality for this isotropic state is $-\left\langle W_{I_{n}, I_{n}}^{(n, n)}\right\rangle_{\rho_{\text {iso }}(f)}=$ $\left(\frac{n^{2} f-1}{n^{2}\left(n^{2}-1\right)}\right)^{2}-\left(\frac{1-f}{n^{2}-1}\right)^{2}$, which is positive if and only if $f>\frac{1}{n}$. Therefore, inequality (3) can detect all the entanglement of isotropic states.

Example 3. Werner states are a class of $U \otimes U$ invariant mixed states in $H_{n} \otimes H_{n}$ [33]:

$$
\rho_{w e r}(f)=\frac{n-f}{n^{3}-n} I_{n}+\frac{n f-1}{n^{3}-n} \tilde{V},
$$

where $\tilde{V}=\sum_{i, j=0}^{n-1}|i j\rangle\langle j i|$ and $f=\left\langle\psi^{+}\right| \rho_{\text {wer }}(f)\left|\psi^{+}\right\rangle,-1 \leq f \leq 1$. These states are separable if and only if they are PPT, i.e. $f \geq 0$. According to inequality (2), we choose $U=|0\rangle\langle 1|+$ $|0\rangle\langle 1|+\sum_{i=2}^{n-1}|i\rangle\langle i|$ and $V=I_{n}$, then the violation of this inequality is $-\left\langle W_{U, V}^{(n, n)}\right\rangle_{\rho_{w e r}(f)}=$ $\left(\frac{n f-1}{n^{3}-n}\right)^{2}-\left(\frac{f+1}{n(n+1)}\right)^{2}$, which is positive if and only if $f<\frac{2-n}{2 n-1}$ (See FIG. 1). Obviously, when $n=3$, Werner state violates this inequality if $f<-0.2$.

In the following, we study the relations between inequality (2) and entanglement distillability.

Theorem $3 A$ state $\rho \in H_{m} \otimes H_{n}$ is distillable if and only if there exist two projectors $A$ and $B$ mapping high dimensional spaces to two dimensional ones such that the restriction of the state of $N$ copies of $\rho$ to such $2 \otimes 2$ subspace violates inequality (园).


FIG. 1: The violation value of Werner state with respect to inequality (2) under $U=|0\rangle\langle 1|+$ $|0\rangle\langle 1|+\sum_{i=2}^{n-1}|i\rangle\langle i|$ and $V=I_{n}$.

Proof. Any state $\rho$ is distillable if and only if there exist two projectors $A$ and $B$ mapping high dimensional spaces to two dimensional ones such that $A \otimes B \rho^{\otimes N} A \otimes B$ is entangled [30]. However, $A \otimes B \rho^{\otimes N} A \otimes B$ is two-qubit entangled if and only if there exist $m^{N} \times m^{N}$ unitary matrix $U_{0}, n^{N} \times n^{N}$ unitary matrix $V_{0}$, and nonzero real numbers $a$ and $b, a^{2}+b^{2}=1$, such that $U_{0} \otimes V_{0}(a|01\rangle+b|10\rangle)$ is the eigenvector of $A \otimes B\left(\rho^{\otimes N}\right)^{T_{1}} A \otimes B$ with respect to a negative eigenvalue. Taking into account that inequality (2) is the necessary and sufficient condition for two-qubit entanglement [28], we have that $\rho$ is distillable if and only if one finds two projectors $A$ and $B$ mapping high dimensional spaces to two dimensional ones such that the restriction of the state of $N$ copies of $\rho$ to such $2 \otimes 2$ subspace violates inequality (2).

Some necessary conditions for distillability have been proposed in Refs. [6, 18, 34]. The distillability condition we obtained here is both necessary and sufficient and could be verified experimentally in principle.

Example 4. For non-PPT (NPT) entangled state

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varrho_{1}= & \frac{p}{6}(|00\rangle\langle 00|+|01\rangle\langle 01|+|02\rangle\langle 02|+|10\rangle\langle 10|+|11\rangle\langle 11|+|12\rangle\langle 12|)-\frac{p}{6}(|00\rangle\langle 12| \\
& +|01\rangle\langle 12|+|12\rangle\langle 00|+|12\rangle\langle 01|+|10\rangle\langle 11|+|11\rangle\langle 10|)+\frac{1-p}{2}(|22\rangle\langle 22|+|33\rangle\langle 33|),
\end{aligned}
$$

Ref. [35] has proved that the distillability of this state can not be detected by reduction criterion [6] and the criterion in Ref. [34]. The distillability of this state can not be recognized either by the result in Ref. [18]. However, setting $A=|0\rangle\langle 0|+|1\rangle\langle 1|$ and $B=(|0\rangle+|1\rangle)(\langle 0|+$ $\langle 1|)+|2\rangle\langle 2|$, one can verify that $A \otimes B \varrho_{1} A \otimes B$ violates inequality (2) with $m=2, n=3$ and $U=I_{2}, V=|1\rangle\langle 2|+\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|0\rangle(\langle 0|+\langle 1|)+\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|2\rangle(\langle 0|-\langle 1|)$. Therefore our inequality gives a better recognition of distillability for this case.

## III. COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS

We have provided an inequality in terms of the expectation values of local observables, each with two possible measurement outcomes, for detecting entanglement and distillability for arbitrary dimensional bipartite systems. Any violation of this inequality implies that the state being measured is entangled. Moreover, all pure entangled states violate the inequality, namely the inequality is both necessary and sufficient in detecting entanglement for bipartite pure states. As examples we have analyzed the entanglement detection of the Horodecki's state, isotropic state and Werner state. It has been shown that the inequality can detect considerable mixed entangled states. Above all, the inequality is a necessary and sufficient condition of distillability. The results may be used in experimental entanglement detection and distillability verification.

In addition, since the dimensions of the two subsystems in inequality (2) are arbitrary, this inequality could be also used to detect entanglement in multipartite systems: if a multipartite state is bipartite separable under some partition, then it fulfills inequality (2) under the corresponding bipartite partition. A multipartite pure state is bipartite separable if and only if it fulfills inequality (2) for all unitary operators $U$ and $V$ under this bipartite partition, for which the two subsystems may have different dimensions.
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