

Deterministic entanglement concentration assisted by generalized XZ basis

Harikrishnan K J and Amit Kumar Pal

Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology Palakkad, Palakkad 678 623, India

(Dated: October 22, 2024)

We propose a protocol for concentrating bipartite entanglement over a qubit-qudit system from arbitrary number of qubit-qudit states via a truncation of the Hilbert space corresponding to the subsystem containing the qubits to a space that hosts a single qubit. We achieve this truncation via a multi-qubit measurement in the generalized XZ basis, and show that the protocol is effectively deterministic. We also design a repetitive two-qubit measurement protocol, where the measurements on the qubit-parts is performed taking two qubit-qudit system at a time, and establish its equivalence with the protocol involving the multi-qubit measurement. We show that a concentration of entanglement is possible in each round of two-qubit measurements in the latter scheme, and derive lower and upper bounds of the entanglement concentrated after a given number of rounds of measurements, where the entanglement of the initial qubit-qudit systems are not-necessarily equal. We apply the repetitive two-qubit measurement protocol to concentrate entanglement using arbitrary two-qubit states with unequal entanglement, and discuss the entanglement properties of the multi-qubit state created in this process. We also show that the protocol can be used to create generalized GHZ states on arbitrary number of qubits, which highlights the possibility of creating maximally entangled qubit pairs via qubit-local projection measurements.

I. INTRODUCTION

In contemporary research in quantum networks [1], a major thrust is given in creating highly entangled – preferably maximally entangled – states among multiple and possibly distant parties due to emergence of entanglement [2] as necessary ingredient in quantum communication protocols. On one hand, development of quantum communication schemes such as quantum teleportation [3], quantum dense coding [4], and quantum cryptography [5] between a single sender and a single receiver sharing a bipartite entangled state as resource, and experimental demonstrations of the said protocols [6] highlights the importance of creating bipartite entangled states across quantum networks (c.f. [7] and references therein). On the other hand, advent of multipartite quantum communication schemes involving multiple senders and receivers underlines the necessity of creating multiparty-entangled states to be utilized in this venture. Apart from achieving secure quantum communications [8] and advantages in increasing communication complexity [9], ideas and developments regarding quantum networks have also been shown to contribute to synchronization of clocks [10], and distributed quantum computing [11].

In practice, states shared between two parties, say, A and B , can be mixed entangled states, $\rho_{A_i B_i}$, or non-maximally entangled pure states, $|\psi_{A_i B_i}\rangle$, and a number of protocols [2] exist for creating a bipartite state $|\Psi_{AB}\rangle$ with higher entanglement out of them, where only local operations by A and B , and classical communication (LOCC) between A and B are allowed, barring all global operations and quantum communications. These include a number of *entanglement purification* schemes [12] where the existing less-entangled states are mixed, and *entanglement concentration* schemes [13–17] involving non-maximally entangled pure states, which have also been experimentally implemented using photonic platforms [18]. Within the framework of entanglement concentration, the effort is mainly divided into two directions. In one, referred to as the *probabilistic concentration*, maximally entangled states are created from a collection of less-entangled pure bipartite states via local operations [13, 14], swapping-

type protocols [15, 19], and catalysis-assisted schemes [20] with a certain probability. However, in the other, the higher-entangled state is created *deterministically* using, for example, local positive operator valued measure (POVM) and one-way classical communication [17], and generalized measurements [21], avoiding the chance of failure of this enterprise. Fundamental restrictions on the state transformations via these protocols have also been proposed [14, 16, 22]. In this paper, we are specifically interested in the *deterministic* approach, and explore the possibility of achieving it via a multi-qubit measurement in the XZ basis [23, 24].

Post deterministic entanglement concentration, depending on the details of the chosen protocol, $|\Psi_{AB}\rangle$ can typically be a *multiparty* state involving a subset of the parties $\{B_i\}$ and $\{A_i\}$ with the desired bipartite entanglement over the partition $A : B$. It is desirable to tune the entanglement concentration protocol to output a state $|\Psi_{AB}\rangle$ such that one has the freedom to perform further operations local to subsystems A and B to accumulate maximum entanglement over any two chosen parties, say, $A_i : B_j$, or $A_i : A_j$. This is in the same vein as the *localization* of entanglement [25, 26] via measurements local to the individual parties, and a particularly important example is the N -qubit GHZ state [27] $|\Psi\rangle = (|0\rangle^{\otimes N} + |1\rangle^{\otimes N})/\sqrt{2}$. Here, the individual qubits are identified as the parties A_i s and B_i s, with $|\Psi\rangle$ having a maximal entanglement over the bipartition $A : B$, and it is possible to create maximum entanglement over any two chosen qubits via qubit-local measurements on the rest of the qubits. There exists a number of protocols to create multi-qubit GHZ and generalized GHZ (gGHZ) states (for example, see [28–30] for probabilistic, and [31] for deterministic preparation). In this paper, using the XZ basis, we design a GHZ state-preparation scheme which uses the our prescription for deterministic bipartite entanglement concentration.

We consider the case of N qubit-qudit pairs – an overall $2N$ -party system – where the qudits A_i s (qubits B_i s) constitute the part A (B) of the system, and propose an entanglement concentration protocol that reduces the dimension of the part B from 2^N to 2 via an N -qubit measurement in a specific graph state basis, referred to as the generalized XZ basis (see Sec. II for the definition), and creates $(N + 1)$ -party quantum states




FIG. 1. An N -qubit measurement (left) \mathcal{M} given by Eq. (4) maps N bipartite unit systems in $\mathbb{C}_{B_i}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}_{A_i}^{d_i}$ (solid circles represent qubits while empty circles represent qudits) into a system in $\mathbb{C}_B^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}_A^{D_A}$. The state $|\Psi\rangle = \bigotimes_{i=1}^N |\psi_i\rangle$ is the *initial* state prior to measurement, while $|\Phi_{(0)}\rangle$ is the post-measured state corresponding to the measurement outcome $k = 0$. Alternatively, one may also apply repetitive two-qubit measurement scheme (right, see Sec. II A for details) with $N - 1$ rounds of measurements applied to the N qubit-qudit systems in the order $1, 2, \dots, N$, where post each measurement round, the state corresponding to the measurement outcome $k = 0$ is selected for using in the next round of measurement. This leads to the same overall post-measured state $|\Phi_{(0)}\rangle$ after the completion of $N - 1$ rounds of two-qubit measurements (see proposition 3). The reduction of the two-qubit Hilbert space into a single-qubit Hilbert space after the XZ measurement is indicated by the dotted lines connecting the measured qubits to the existing qubit after measurement.

with entanglement over the bipartition $B : A$ higher than the maximum entanglement available among the initial N qubit-qudit pairs. We prove that all of the post-measured $(N + 1)$ -party states are equally probable, and are connected by unitary operators of the form $U_A \otimes U_B$, having the same entanglement over the $A : B$ partition, thereby establishing the deterministic nature of the proposed scheme.

As an alternative to the joint N -qubit measurement, we propose a repetitive 2-qubit measurement scheme where each two-qubit measurement projects the Hilbert space to that of a single qubit using projection operations constituted using the two-qubit XZ basis, thereby gradually truncating the 2^N -dimensional Hilbert space to a 2-dimensional one. This protocol, when applied $(N - 1)$ times to the qubits in B , leads to equally probable $(N + 1)$ -party states having the same entanglement properties as the states obtained post the N -qubit measurement. We prove that the concentrated entanglement monotonically increases with increasing the number of rounds of the two-qubit measurements. Further, we derive lower and upper bounds of the entanglement concentrated via $(N - 1)$ rounds of two-qubit measurements on N unequally entangled qubit-qudit states. We apply the proposed repetitive two-qubit measurement scheme on N equally entangled two-qubit states, and show that the entanglement between any two qubits BA_i in the post-measured states decreases monotonically with increasing rounds of measurements, while the post-measured state becomes monotonically *more monogamous* [32, 33] with respect to the nodal observer B , when the concurrence squared is used as the entanglement measure [33]. However, given a specific set of N two-qubit states, the multipartite entanglement in the post-measured states, as quantified by the generalized geometric measure [34, 35], remains constant with increasing rounds of measurement.

Next, we explore the possibility of creating a GHZ state using the repetitive two-qubit measurement scheme. We start with N generalized GHZ states of different sizes which are

not necessarily equally entangled, where for each such state, we identify an arbitrary qubit as the subsystem B_i , while the rest of the qubits constitute the d -dimensional system A_i . We perform the repetitive two-qubit measurement scheme on the B_i qubits and show that the post-measured states after each rounds of measurement can be connected to a generalized GHZ state via a unitary operator that is local to A constituted of the d -dimensional subsystems A_i s. We provide specific prescription for constructing these unitary operators, and show that the number of two-qubit operations required to create a desired generalized GHZ state varies as the square of the number of rounds of two-qubit measurements.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we establish the deterministic nature of the proposed N -qubit measurement scheme and show that a concentration of entanglement is possible. Sec. II A presents the repetitive two-qubit measurement scheme, prove its equivalence with the N -qubit measurement protocol for deterministic entanglement concentration, and provide bounds for the concentrated entanglement. We apply the protocol for two-qubit entangled states in Sec. II B, and discuss the entanglement properties of the created multi-qubit states. The protocol for creating GHZ states over arbitrary number of qubits using the proposed repetitive two-qubit measurement scheme is discussed in Sec. III. Sec. IV contains concluding remarks and outlook.

II. DETERMINISTIC CONCENTRATION OF BIPARTITE ENTANGLEMENT

Consider N bipartite systems $A_i B_i$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, N$), each constituted of a 2-dimensional (qubit) subsystem B_i , and a d_i -dimensional (qudit) subsystem A_i (see Fig. 1), sharing an entangled states in $\mathbb{C}_{B_i}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}_{A_i}^{d_i}$ having the Schmidt-decomposed form

$$|\psi_i\rangle = \cos \theta_i |0_{B_i}\rangle |\xi_{A_i}^{(0)}\rangle + \sin \theta_i |1_{B_i}\rangle |\xi_{A_i}^{(1)}\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ is the computational basis in \mathbb{C}^2 , and $|\xi_{A_i}^{(0)}\rangle$ and $|\xi_{A_i}^{(1)}\rangle$ are mutually orthogonal states in \mathbb{C}^{d_i} . We refer to these bipartite systems as *unit systems*, and the corresponding states to be the *unit states*. Also, note that the $2N$ -party system has a bipartition $A : B$ with $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^N A_i$ being an N -qudit subsystem having a dimension $D_A = \prod_{i=1}^N d_i$, and $B = \bigcup_{i=1}^N B_i$ being the N -qubit subsystem with a Hilbert space dimension $D_B = 2^N$. The fact that the part B_i is a qubit in each $A_i B_i$ ensures $|\xi_{A_i}^{(0)}\rangle$ and $|\xi_{A_i}^{(1)}\rangle$ to be the eigenvectors of $\rho_{A_i} = \text{Tr}_{B_i} |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$ corresponding to the only two non-zero eigenvalues, allowing one to consider $A_i B_i$ to be an effective two-qubit system [33], such that one can quantify entanglement E_i between A_i and B_i using *concurrence* [36] as $E_i = \sin 2\theta_i$. Without any loss in generality, $\theta_i \in [0, \pi/4]$ with $\theta_i = 0$ representing an un-entangled state, while $\theta = \pi/4$ corresponds to a maximally entangled state. The full system is in the state

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{b=0}^{2^N-1} c_b |b\rangle |\chi_A^{(b)}\rangle, \quad (2)$$

with $\sum_{b=0}^{2^N-1} c_b^2 = 1$, where $|b\rangle \equiv \otimes_{i=1}^N |b_{B_i}\rangle$, $|\chi_A^{(b)}\rangle = \otimes_{i=1}^N |\xi_{A_i}^{(b_{B_i})}\rangle$, and

$$c_b = \prod_{i=1}^N (\cos \theta_i)^{1 \oplus b_{B_i}} (\sin \theta_i)^{b_{B_i}}. \quad (3)$$

Here, $b_{B_i} = 0, 1$, and \oplus denotes the modular two addition. We use the decimal and binary representation of the indices such as b interchangeably in the rest of the paper.

We perform a joint measurement \mathcal{M} on the B -qubits projecting $\otimes_{i=1}^N \mathbb{C}_{B_i}^2$ to \mathbb{C}_B^2 (see Fig. 1, given by the 2^{N-1} measurement operators

$$M_{(k)} = |0\rangle\langle +_{(k)}| + |1\rangle\langle -_{(k)}|, \quad (4)$$

corresponding to the measurement outcomes k , where

$$|\pm_{(k)}\rangle = \left[|e_{b_k}\rangle \pm |e_{b'_k}\rangle \right] / \sqrt{2}, \quad (5)$$

with $b_k \neq b'_k \forall k$, and

$$|e_b\rangle = U_B^G |b\rangle = \left[\prod_{(i,j) \in G} U_{(i,j)}^{cz} H_B \right] |b\rangle. \quad (6)$$

Here, G is an arbitrary, un-directed, simply connected graph on N nodes without any loops connecting a node to itself [37], specified completely by the $N \times N$ adjacency matrix Γ , given by

$$\Gamma_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } (i,j) \in G \text{ and } i \neq j, \\ 0, & \text{if } (i,j) \notin G \text{ and } i \neq j, \\ 0, & \text{if } i = j, \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

with (i,j) denoting a link between the nodes i and j , and

$$U_{(i,j)}^{cz} = \frac{1}{2} \left[(I + \sigma^z)_i I_j + (I - \sigma^z)_i \sigma_j^z \right], i \neq j \quad (8)$$

is the controlled Z operator acting on the qubit-pair (i,j) , and $H_B = \otimes_{i=1}^N H_{B_i}$, H_{B_i} being the Hadamard operators. We refer to the basis defined by Eq. (6) as the *generalized XZ basis* (which one can also identify as the *graph basis*), and note that for $N = 2$, it reduces to the well-known XZ basis for two qubits. For brevity, we work with the special case $|e_b\rangle = H_B |b\rangle$ (i.e., $U_B^G = H_B$) corresponding to the special case of an N -qubit graph constituted of N disconnected qubits (i.e., $\Gamma_{i,j} = 0 \forall i, j$), and argue later that the results remain unchanged for an arbitrary choice of G .

Note that for two different outcomes k and k' ,

$$k' = k \oplus \ell, \quad (9)$$

and the pair $(b_{k'}, b'_{k'})$ can be chosen as

$$b_{k'} = b_k \oplus \ell; b'_{k'} = b'_k \oplus \ell \quad (10)$$

without any repetition of the pairs, where ℓ is a bit-string of length $N - 1$. This ensures $\sum_k M_{(k)}^\dagger M_{(k)} = I$, I being the identity operator on the N -qubit Hilbert space, where all M_k can be generated by varying $\ell \in [1, 2^{N-1} - 1]$. Note further that the set of measurement operators $\{M_{(k)}\}$ can be generated starting from $k = 0$ and choosing any two possible values of b corresponding to this, which we denote by (b_0, b'_0) , such that the rest of $M_{(k)}$ s can be constructed using Eqs. (9)-(10) (see Appendix A for the example of $N = 2$). In what follows, we assume the choice of a specific pair (b_0, b'_0) , which we refer to as the *zero'th pair*, and denote the corresponding measurement by $\mathcal{M}_{(b_0, b'_0)}$. The following proposition is true for this measurement.

Proposition 1. *The N -qubit measurement $\mathcal{M}_{(b_0, b'_0)}$, for all choices of the zero'th pair, leads to equi-probable measurement outcomes and local unitary-equivalent post-measured states, where the unitary operators are local to the subsystems A and B .*

Proof. Let us define the matrix element

$$\langle e_b | b' \rangle = \langle b | H_B | b' \rangle = 2^{-N/2} (-1)^{f_{(b, b')}}, \quad (11)$$

where

$$f_{(b, b')} = \bigoplus_i b_{B_i} \wedge b'_{B_i} \in \{0, 1\}, \quad (12)$$

with \wedge denoting the logical AND operation between two bits b_{B_i} and b'_{B_i} . Note that the action of $M_{(k)}$ on $|\Psi\rangle$ (Eq. (2)) results in

$$M_{(k)} |\Psi\rangle = 2^{-\frac{N-1}{2}} \sum_b c_b [g^+ |0_B\rangle + g^- |1_B\rangle] |\chi_A^{(b)}\rangle, \quad (13)$$

with

$$g^\pm = \frac{(-1)^{f_{(b_k, b)}} \pm (-1)^{f_{(b'_k, b)}}}{2}. \quad (14)$$

such that $g^\pm = \pm 1$ implies $g^\mp = 0$, yielding

$$p_k = \langle \Psi | M_{(k)}^\dagger M_{(k)} | \Psi \rangle = 2^{-(N-1)}. \quad (15)$$

Next, note that Eq. (9) is equivalent to local sign flips of $|e_b\rangle$, i.e. $|e_{b\oplus\ell}\rangle = Z_B^{(\ell)} |e_b\rangle$, where $Z_B^{(\ell)} = \prod_{i=1}^N (\sigma_{B_i}^z)^{\ell_{B_i}}$, $\ell_{B_i} \in \{0, 1\}$ being the bit corresponding to B_i in ℓ . Note also that

$$\langle e_{b\oplus\ell} | b' \rangle = 2^{-N/2} (-1)^{f_{(b,b')}} (-1)^{f_{(\ell,b')}}, \quad (16)$$

which leads us to the normalized post measured state corresponding to an outcome $k' = k \oplus \ell$ (Eq. (9)), given by

$$|\Phi_{(k')}\rangle = \sum_b (-1)^{f_{(\ell,b)}} c_b [g^+ |0_B\rangle + g^- |1_B\rangle] |\chi_A^{(b)}\rangle, \quad (17)$$

implying introduction of a local phase with the b th term when $f_{(\ell,b)} = 1$. A unitary operator of the form $U_{AB}^{(\ell)} = I_B \otimes U_A^{(\ell)}$, which is local to the partitions A and B with I_B being the identity matrix on B , and

$$U_A^{(\ell)} = \sum_b (-1)^{f_{(\ell,b)}} |\chi_A^{(b)}\rangle \langle \chi_A^{(b)}|, \quad (18)$$

negates these local phases, leading to

$$|\Phi_{(k')}\rangle = U_{AB}^{(\ell)} |\Phi_{(k)}\rangle. \quad (19)$$

This, along with Eq. (15), proves proposition 1. \square

Proposition 1 suggests the N -qubit measurement given in Eq. (4) to be *effectively* deterministic. Note that the post-measured states $|\Phi_{(k)}\rangle$ are $(N+1)$ -party entangled states in which the part B is the two-dimensional system on which the 2^N -dimensional Hilbert space is projected via Eq. (4), while A consists of all d_i -dimensional subsystems A_i . While any one of these parties can, in general, have non-zero entanglement with any other party (see Fig. 1) with the full system described by the state $|\Phi_{(k)}\rangle$, here we focus only on the bipartite entanglement over the partition $B : A$. By virtue of Proposition 1, we choose to work with the post measured state $|\Phi_{(0)}\rangle$, which can be written in Schmidt decomposed form as

$$|\Phi_{(0)}\rangle = \cos \theta_f^{(b_0, b'_0)} |0_B\rangle |\xi_A^{(0)}\rangle + \sin \theta_f^{(b_0, b'_0)} |1_B\rangle |\xi_A^{(1)}\rangle, \quad (20)$$

with

$$\cos \theta_f^{(b_0, b'_0)} = \sqrt{\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} c_b^2}, \quad (21)$$

where \mathcal{B} is the set of all b such that $(g^+)^2 = 1$, with the partition B now hosting one qubit as opposed the N prior to the measurement. This leads to the entanglement over the bipartition $A : B$ in $|\Phi_{(0)}\rangle$ as

$$E_f^{(b_0, b'_0)} = 2 \sqrt{\left(\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} c_b^2 \right) \left(\sum_{b \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}} c_b^2 \right)}, \quad (22)$$

which is identical for all $|\Phi_{(k)}\rangle$ given a fixed zero'th pair, where $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$ is the complementary set of \mathcal{B} hosting the values of b satisfying $(g^-)^2 = 1$, such that $E_f^{(b_0, b'_0)}$ also provides the average entanglement over the bipartition $A : B$.

Since E_i can be different for different qubit-qudit pairs, we desire

$$E_f^{(b_0, b'_0)} \geq E_0 = \max\{E_i; i = 1, 2, \dots, N\} \quad (23)$$

for at least one choice of the zero'th pair – a situation corresponding to a *profitable concentration of entanglement* (PCE), when entanglement is considered as resource. The following proposition demonstrates that at least one such pair exists.

Proposition 2. *For N identical qubit-qudit systems $\mathbb{C}_{B_i}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}_{A_i}^d$ each having bipartite entanglement E_0 , there exists at least one zero'th pair (b_0, b'_0) such that $\mathcal{M}_{(b_0, b'_0)}$ concentrates entanglement $E_f \geq E_0$ over a qubit-qudit system $\mathbb{C}_B^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}_A^d$ with $D_A = d^N$.*

Proof. Consider the choice of (b_0, b'_0) , among $\binom{2^N}{2}$ possibilities, to be

$$b_0 = 0, b'_0 = 2^N - 1, \quad (24)$$

corresponding respectively to the states $|0\rangle^{\otimes N}, |1\rangle^{\otimes N}$ on B , leading to the following definition of \mathcal{B} and $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$:

$$\mathcal{B} = \{b; \oplus_i b_i = 0\}, \overline{\mathcal{B}} = \{b; \oplus_i b_i = 1\}. \quad (25)$$

Note that $\mathcal{B} (\overline{\mathcal{B}})$ is the *even-parity set* (*odd-parity set*), where the parity defines the number qubits in the state $|1\rangle$ in the corresponding $|b\rangle$ for each element. Separating the terms according to \mathcal{B} and $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$, $|\Phi_{(0)}\rangle$ becomes

$$|\Phi_{(0)}\rangle = |0_B\rangle \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} c_b |\chi_A^{(b)}\rangle + |1_B\rangle \sum_{b \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}} c_b |\chi_A^{(b)}\rangle. \quad (26)$$

Assuming identical bipartite systems $A_i B_i$ with $\theta_i = \theta_0 \forall i$, and using Eq. (21) with (b_0, b'_0) given in Eq. (24), $\cos \theta_f = \sqrt{[1 + (\cos 2\theta_0)^N]}/2$, leading to

$$E_f = \sqrt{1 - (1 - E_0^2)^N}, \quad (27)$$

where $E_0 = \sin 2\theta_0$. Note that $E_f \geq E_0$ for all $0 \leq E_0 \leq 1$, proving proposition 2. \square

Note that $E_f \geq 0$ (Eq. (27)) for all $N \geq 2$, as long as $E_0 > 0$, while for a fixed E_0 , E_f increases monotonically with N – the number of qubits participating in the joint measurement: $E_f \rightarrow 1$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ for all non-zero values of E_0 , or as $E_0 \rightarrow 1$ for all N . In Fig. 2(a), we plot the variation of E_f with N for a number of choices of E_0 , demonstrating the need for larger number of qubit-qudit pairs if E_0 is small. Inverting Eq. (27), one can obtain the number m_N of qubit-qudit systems with entanglement E_0 required to obtain E_f given in Eq. (27) as

$$m_N = \left\lceil \frac{\ln(1 - E_f^2)}{\ln(1 - E_0^2)} \right\rceil, \quad (28)$$

where $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ is the ceiling of a real number.

We point out here that using Eq. (6) corresponding to an arbitrary G directly results in the following matrix elements (see Eq. (11) to compare with the matrix element of the Hadamard operator alone):

$$\langle b | U_B^G | b' \rangle = 2^{-N/2} (-1)^{f_{(b,b')}} (-1)^{g_b}, \quad (29)$$




FIG. 2. (a) Variations of E_f (Eq. (27)) as a function of N for different E_0 (i.e., different θ_0), where $E_i = E_0 \forall i$. (b) Scatter plot of $E_{(N-1)}$ and E_0 with $N = 5$, where $E_0 = \max\{E_i\}$, and E_i s are generally different. A sample of size 10^5 instances with different states $|\psi_i\rangle$ having different E_i is used, where E_0 for each instance is sampled from a uniform distribution over $[0, 1]$. All quantities plotted are dimensionless.

where

$$g_b = \bigoplus_{i,j=1}^N \Gamma_{i,j} b_{B_i} b_{B_j} \in \{0, 1\}. \quad (30)$$

Note that Eq. (29) ensures the validity of propositions 1 and 2 in the cases of all sets of the generalized XZ basis generated by Eq. (6) corresponding to all arbitrary graphs of N qubits. In the case of the disconnected graph used explicitly so far, $g_b = 0 \forall b$.

A. A repetitive two-qubit measurement scheme

We now ask the question as to whether one can achieve a PCE via the minimal instance of joint measurement, i.e., a two-qubit measurement, performed repeatedly over pairs of qubits among $\{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_N\}$, and answer this question affirmatively. The structure of the repetitive two-qubit measurement scheme is as follows: In the first step, a two-qubit measurement $\mathcal{M}^{(1)}$ of the form¹ (see Eq. (4))

$$\begin{aligned} M_{(0)} &= |0\rangle \left(\frac{\langle e_0 | + \langle e_3 |}{\sqrt{2}} \right) + |1\rangle \left(\frac{\langle e_0 | - \langle e_3 |}{\sqrt{2}} \right), \\ M_{(1)} &= |0\rangle \left(\frac{\langle e_1 | + \langle e_2 |}{\sqrt{2}} \right) + |1\rangle \left(\frac{\langle e_1 | - \langle e_2 |}{\sqrt{2}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

is applied on the qubit parts of the *first* two entangled qubit-qudit pairs $\mathbb{C}_{B_1}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}_{A_1}^{d_1}$ and $\mathbb{C}_{B_2}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}_{A_2}^{d_2}$ in states $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$, respectively, to create entangled post-measured states

$\{|\Phi_{(0)}^{(1)}\rangle, |\Phi_{(1)}^{(1)}\rangle\}$ in $\mathbb{C}_B^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}_{A_{(1)}}^{D_{(1)}}$, with $A_{(1)} = A_1 \cup A_2$ and $D_{(1)} = d_1 d_2$, where the post-measured states are connected via local unitary operations (see discussions preceding Eq. (18)), and one may write (see Eq. (26))

$$|\Phi_{(0)}^{(1)}\rangle = |0_B\rangle \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}_{(1)}} c_b |\chi_{A_{(1)}}^{(b)}\rangle + |1_B\rangle \sum_{b \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}_{(1)}} c_b |\chi_{A_{(1)}}^{(b)}\rangle. \quad (32)$$

Here, we recognize $\mathcal{B}_{(1)} = \{0, 3\}$, and $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_{(1)} = \{1, 2\}$ (see Appendix A). Next, we perform the second round of two-qubit measurement, $\mathcal{M}^{(2)}$ on the state $|\Phi_{(0)}^{(1)}\rangle$, and the state $|\psi_3\rangle$ of the $\mathbb{C}_{B_3} \otimes \mathbb{C}_{A_3}^{d_3}$ system, such that the post-measured ensemble $\{|\Phi_{(0)}^{(2)}\rangle, |\Phi_{(1)}^{(2)}\rangle\}$ in $\mathbb{C}_B^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}_{A_{(2)}}^{D_{(2)}}$ is created, with $A_{(2)} = A_{(1)} \cup A_3$, and $D_{(2)} = D_{(1)} d_3$. Moreover, $|\Phi_{(0)}^{(2)}\rangle$ can be written in the form (32), where one needs to define $\mathcal{B}_{(2)} = (\mathcal{B}_{(1)} \circ \mathcal{B}_{(0)}) \cup (\overline{\mathcal{B}}_{(1)} \circ \overline{\mathcal{B}}_{(0)})$ and $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_{(2)} = (\mathcal{B}_{(1)} \circ \overline{\mathcal{B}}_{(0)}) \cup (\overline{\mathcal{B}}_{(1)} \circ \mathcal{B}_{(0)})$, with $\mathcal{B}_{(0)} = \{0\}$, and $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_{(0)} = \{1\}$ (see Eq. (24), corresponding to $N = 1$), which can be interpreted as the sets \mathcal{B} and $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$ corresponding to the individual qubit-qudit pairs, such that $\mathcal{B}_{(2)} = \{0, 3, 5, 6\}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_{(2)} = \{1, 2, 4, 7\}$. Here, the operation $\mathcal{L} \circ \mathcal{R}$ between the sets $\mathcal{L} = \{L_1, L_2, \dots\}$ and $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1, R_2, \dots\}$ of decimal numbers yields a new set of decimal numbers by concatenating a bit-string corresponding to an element in \mathcal{L} with the same corresponding to all elements in \mathcal{R} . This process can be continued (see Fig. 1 for an illustration) r times, taking $(r + 1)$ qubit-qudit states labelled as $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, r + 1$ and maintaining this order, to achieve a post-measured ensemble $\{|\Phi_{(0)}^{(r)}\rangle, |\Phi_{(1)}^{(r)}\rangle\}$ with $|\Phi_{(0)}^{(r)}\rangle$ connected to $|\Phi_{(1)}^{(r)}\rangle$ via local unitary operator, and having desired entanglement properties. One can now connect the above repeated two-qubit measurement scheme with the N -qubit measurement in Eq. (4) via the following proposition.

¹ This remains the same for all rounds of two-qubit measurements.




FIG. 3. Variations of $E_{B:A_i}^{(r)}$ (dashed lines) Eq. (43), as quantified by concurrence, and $\delta_B^{(r)}$ (continuous lines) Eq. (44), using the squared concurrence, as functions of r . All quantities plotted are dimensionless.

Proposition 3. Given N qubit-qudit systems $\mathbb{C}_{B_i}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}_{A_i}^{d_i}$ in the states $|\psi_i\rangle$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, $N - 1$ consecutive rounds of 2-qubit measurements, as given in Eq. (31), on the qubit-qudit pairs in the order $1, 2, \dots, N$ leads to the post-measured state $|\Phi_{(0)}^{(N-1)}\rangle = |\Phi_{(0)}\rangle$, where $|\Phi_{(0)}\rangle$ is a post-measured state as given in Eq. (26), corresponding to a joint N -qubit measurement on the qubit parts of the N qubit-qudit system.

Proof. We closely look at the r -th round, $\mathcal{M}^{(r)}$, of the repetitive two-qubit measurement corresponding to the zero'th pair proposed in Eq. (24). While performed on the qubit-parts of (a) the state $|\Phi_{(0)}^{(r-1)}\rangle$ in $\mathbb{C}_B^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}_{A_{(r-1)}}^{D_{(r-1)}}$ post the $(r-1)$ th round of two-qubit measurement corresponding to $M_{(0)}$, with $A_{(r-1)} = \bigcup_{i=1}^r A_i$ and $D_{(r-1)} = \prod_{i=1}^r d_r$, and (b) the state $|\psi_{r+1}\rangle$ in $\mathbb{C}_{B_{r+1}}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}_{A_{r+1}}^{d_{r+1}}$, such that the ensemble $\{|\Phi_{(0)}^{(r)}\rangle, |\Phi_{(1)}^{(r)}\rangle\}$ in $\mathbb{C}_B^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}_{A_{(r)}}^{D_{(r)}}$, with $A_{(r)} = A_{(r-1)} \cup A_{r+1}$ and $D_{(r)} = D_{(r-1)}d_{r+1}$, is obtained. Following Eq. (32), $|\Phi_{(0)}^{(r)}\rangle$ can be written as

$$|\Phi_{(0)}^{(r)}\rangle = |0_B\rangle \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}_{(r)}} c_b |\chi_{A_{(r)}}^{(b)}\rangle + |1_B\rangle \sum_{b \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}_{(r)}} c_b |\chi_{A_{(r)}}^{(b)}\rangle, \quad (33)$$

where the sets $\mathcal{B}_{(r)}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_{(r)}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_{(r)} &= (\mathcal{B}_{(r-1)} \circ \mathcal{B}_{(0)}) \cup (\bar{\mathcal{B}}_{(r-1)} \circ \bar{\mathcal{B}}_{(0)}), \\ \bar{\mathcal{B}}_{(r)} &= (\mathcal{B}_{(r-1)} \circ \bar{\mathcal{B}}_{(0)}) \cup (\bar{\mathcal{B}}_{(r-1)} \circ \mathcal{B}_{(0)}). \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

with the cardinality of $\mathcal{B}_{(r)}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_{(r)}$ being $|\mathcal{B}_{(r)}| = |\bar{\mathcal{B}}_{(r)}| = 2^{r+1}$. Note that the recursion relation in Eq. (34) preserves the parity of $\mathcal{B}_{(r)}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_{(r)}$ to be even and odd, respectively. One identifies $\mathcal{B}_{(r)} = \mathcal{B}$ when $r = N - 1$, which corresponds

to the joint N -qubit measurement given by Eq. (4), and subsequently $|\Phi_{(0)}^{(r)}\rangle$, as given in Eq. (33), is equal to $|\Phi_{(0)}\rangle$ in Eq. (26). Hence the proof. \square

Note also that one may, in fact, choose to work with either of the states $|\Phi_{(1)}^{(k)}\rangle$, $k = 0, 1$, after the first round of two-qubit measurement, which would lead to a tree of 2^r paths leading to 2^r possible post-measured states after the completion of r rounds of measurement, and one can identify them as the 2^{N-1} post-measured states corresponding to the N -qubit joint measurement when $r = N - 1$. Further, each of these states are connected by local unitary operations of the form $U_A \otimes U_B$.

The following proposition is to show that each round of 2-qubit measurements on the available N qubit-qudit pairs leads to a PCE.

Proposition 4. For two consecutive rounds $r + 1$ and r of two-qubit measurements, $E_{(r+1)} \geq E_{(r)} \forall r$.

Proof. Let the bipartite entanglements of the participating qubit-qudit pairs at the r th round of measurement $\mathcal{M}^{(r)}$ are $E_{(r)}$ (computed with $|\Phi_{(0)}^{(r-1)}\rangle$) and E_{r+1} (obtained from the state of the $\mathbb{C}_B^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}_{A_{r+1}}^{d_{r+1}}$ system). We work with the two-qubit measurement corresponding to the zero'th pair $(b_0, b'_0) = (0, 3)$ (see Eq. (24)), which leads to (see Appendix A)

$$\begin{aligned} E_{(r+1)} &= \sqrt{E_{(r)}^2 + E_{r+1}^2 - E_{(r)}^2 E_{r+1}^2} \\ &\geq \max\{E_{(r)}, E_{r+1}\} \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Without any loss in generality, we assume $E_{r+1} = \max\{E_{(r)}, E_{r+1}\}$, and write $E_{(r)} = qE_{r+1}$ with $0 \leq q \leq 1$, which takes Eq. (35) to

$$E_{(r+1)} = E_{r+1} \sqrt{1 + (1 - E_{r+1}^2)q^2}. \quad (36)$$

Since $\sqrt{1 + (1 - E_{r+1}^2)q^2} \geq 1$, $E_{(r+1)} \geq E_{r+1} \geq E_{(r)}$. Similarly, $E_{(r+1)} \geq E_{(r)}$ when $E_{(r)} = \max\{E_{(r)}, E_{r+1}\}$ as well. Hence the proof. \square

Note that $E_{(r+1)}$ (Eq. (36)) is a monotonically increasing function of q , for a fixed value of $\max\{E_{(r)}, E_{r+1}\}$, $E_{(r+1)}$ is maximum for $q = 1$.

Let us now consider the situation of N qubit-qudit pairs in states $|\psi_i\rangle$ with bipartite entanglement over the qubit-qudit partition as E_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, where one performs $N - 1$ rounds of repetitive two-qubit measurements merging the qubit-qudit pairs one by one in the order $1, 2, \dots, N$, and obtains the bipartite entanglement in the final qubit-qudit system as $E_{(N-1)}$. The next proposition provides bounds on $E_{(N-1)}$.

Proposition 5. The concentrated bipartite entanglement $E_{(N-1)}$ post $(N - 1)$ rounds of repetitive two-qubit measurements on N qubit-qudit pairs in states $|\psi_i\rangle$ having entanglement E_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, satisfies

$$E_0 \leq E_{(N-1)} \leq \sqrt{1 - (1 - E_0^2)^N}, \quad (37)$$

where $E_0 = \max\{E_1, E_2, \dots, E_N\}$.




FIG. 4. Protocol for deterministically creating large gGHZ states, starting from multiple copies of two-qubit states $|\xi_1\rangle$, using the two-qubit repeated measurement scheme (see Sec. II A). The controlled unitary operations U_{A_1, A_2} and R_{A_2, A_1} to be done on the qubits in A are demonstrated by arrows, which are from the *control* to the *target* qubits. The single-qubit rotation on A_1 is shown by the rectangular block. The unitary operator V_A^m is demonstrated by thick lines.

Proof. To prove this, without any loss in generality, we assume $E_i = q_i E_0$ with $0 \leq q_i \leq 1$, and write $E_{(r+1)}$ as

$$E_{(r+1)} = \sqrt{E_{(r)}^2 + q_{r+1}^2 E_0^2 (1 - E_{(r)}^2)}, \quad (38)$$

which is a monotonically increasing function of q_{r+1} for a fixed E_0 and $E_{(r)}$, attaining maximum at $q_{r+1} = 1$. This also applies to all rounds of measurements, such that $q_i = 1 \forall i$ for $E_{(N-1)}$ to attain its maximum, leading to $E_i = E_0 \forall i$. Further, using proposition 3, the concentrated entanglement in this situation is given by Eq. (27), thereby proving the upper bound. Also, $(N - 1)$ rounds of two-qubit measurements includes all available qubit-qubit pairs, which, along with proposition 4 leads to the lower bound. Hence the proof. \square

The lower and the upper bound of $E_{(N-1)}$ (Eq. (37)) is demon-

strated in Fig. 2(b) with 10^5 instances of 5 bipartite entangled pairs $A_i B_i$ ($N = 5$) having different entanglement E_i , with a uniform distribution of E_0 in the range $0 \leq E_0 \leq 1$.

B. Two-qubit states as unit states

We now apply the repetitive two-qubit measurement protocol discussed in Sec. II A, and generate large bipartite-entangled states of multiple qubits with specific entanglement over a specific bipartition $A : B$, starting from *identical* two-qubit unit systems in *identical* states.

Let us consider identical two-qubit systems ($d_i = 2 \forall i$) in identical states $|\psi_0\rangle$ with entanglement E_0 (corresponding to $\theta_i = \theta_0 \forall i$) as unit states. Post r rounds of measurements on $(r + 1)$ two-qubit states $|\psi_0\rangle$, $|\Phi_{(0)}^{(r)}\rangle$ takes the form

$$|\Phi_{(0)}^{(r)}\rangle = |0\rangle_B \sum_{k=0,2,\dots}^{r+1} (\cos \theta_0)^{r+1-k} (\sin \theta_0)^k \mathcal{P}(|0\rangle^{\otimes r+1-k} |1\rangle^{\otimes k}) + |1\rangle_B \sum_{k=1,3,\dots}^{r+1} (\cos \theta_0)^{r+1-k} (\sin \theta_0)^k \mathcal{P}(|0\rangle^{\otimes r+1-k} |1\rangle^{\otimes k}), \quad (39)$$

where $\mathcal{P}(\cdot)$ represents all possible permutations of $r + 1 - k$ qubits in state $|0\rangle$ and k qubits in $|1\rangle$, suggesting an invariance of $|\Phi_{(0)}^{(r)}\rangle$ with respect to all possible permutations of A_i s, leading to identical reduced density matrices

$$\rho_{BA_i}^{(r)} = \text{Tr}_{\{A_j; j \neq i\}} |\Phi_{(0)}^{(r)}\rangle \langle \Phi_{(0)}^{(r)}|. \quad (40)$$

Explicitly, one may calculate

$$\rho_{BA_i}^{(r)} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} a_{00} & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{a_{00}a_{11}} \\ 0 & a_{01} & \sqrt{a_{01}a_{10}} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{a_{01}a_{10}} & a_{10} & 0 \\ \sqrt{a_{00}a_{11}} & 0 & 0 & a_{11} \end{bmatrix} \quad (41)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} a_{00} &= \cos^2 \theta_0 [1 + (\cos 2\theta_0)^r] \\ a_{01} &= \sin^2 \theta_0 [1 - (\cos 2\theta_0)^r] \\ a_{10} &= \cos^2 \theta_0 [1 - (\cos 2\theta_0)^r] \\ a_{11} &= \cos^2 \theta_0 [1 + (\cos 2\theta_0)^r], \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

using which the concurrence between B and A_i after the r th round of measurement can be evaluated as

$$E_{BA_i}^{(r)} = E_0 (1 - E_0^2)^{r/2}. \quad (43)$$

From Eq. (43), it is evident that with increasing r , E_{BA_i} decreases monotonically, and eventually vanishes. Further, $E_{A_i A_j} = 0$ for any (A_i, A_j) pair with $j \neq i$, and $A_i, A_j \in A$ as the two-qubit measurements are local to the subsystem B .




FIG. 5. Quantum circuit for performing the two qubit measurements (Eq. (31)) on the qubits B_i and B_j via a basis transformation (see Appendix A) and a parity measurement with the help of an ancilla qubit a , which is initialized in $|0\rangle$, and is finally measured in the computational basis. After the measurement, the two qubits are *disentangled* via a controlled NOT operation, and one can proceed with the control qubit as the B -qubit, discarding the other.

Aware of the fact that the generated states are *multi-qubit states*, we further investigate the multipartite quantum correlations present in the generated states, as quantified by the generalized geometric measure (GGM), and the monogamy score (MS) of concurrence squared (see Appendix B for definitions). Due to proposition 4, the maximum Schmidt coefficient in the $B : A_{(r)}$ partition decreases monotonically with r , implying that the GGM is not decided by this partition. Our numerical analysis suggests that the maximum of the Schmidt coefficients among all possible bipartitions of the system $BA_1A_2 \cdots A_{r+1}$ is always provided by the bipartition $A_i : BA$ with $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{j \neq i} A_j$, and A_i is determined by the two-qubit system with the minimum entanglement, i.e., $\min\{E_1, E_2, \dots, E_{r+1}\}$. On the other hand, MS with concurrence squared corresponding to the qubit B as the nodal observer after r rounds of two-qubit measurements merging

$(r + 1)$ two-qubit states with equal entanglement E_0 is given by

$$\delta_B^{(r)} = 1 - (1 - E_0^2)^r (1 + rE_0^2), \quad (44)$$

which is a monotonically increasing function of r for fixed E_0 . See Fig. 3 for an illustration.

III. CREATING GHZ STATES OF MULTIPLE QUBITS

We now discuss how the deterministic entanglement concentration protocol developed in Sec. II can be used for creating generalized GHZ (gGHZ) states of N qubits, given by

$$|\xi_m\rangle = \cos \theta_m |0_B\rangle \bigotimes_{j=1}^m |0_{A_j}\rangle + \sin \theta_m |1_B\rangle \bigotimes_{j=1}^m |1_{A_j}\rangle, \quad (45)$$

with $\theta_m \in [0, \pi/4]$ and $N = m + 1$, starting from two-qubit ($m = 1$) states of the same form. The following proposition is crucial for this.

Proposition 6. *Using two-qubit XZ measurement on the B -qubits, an $(m + 1)$ -qubit gGHZ state of the form $|\xi_m\rangle$ can be merged with a two-qubit state $|\xi_1\rangle$ to form a $(m + 2)$ -qubit gGHZ state via unitary operations local to A .*

Proof. Consider the following four stages of operations on the states $|\xi_m\rangle$ and $|\xi_1\rangle$.

(a) First, see that the two-qubit XZ measurements on the B -qubits of $|\xi_m\rangle$ and $|\xi_1\rangle$ leads to the post measured states $|\Phi_{(0)}\rangle$ and $|\Phi_{(1)}\rangle$ with

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi_{(0)}\rangle &= |0_B\rangle [\cos \theta_m \cos \theta_1 \bigotimes_{j=1}^{m+1} |0_{A_j}\rangle + \sin \theta_m \sin \theta_1 \bigotimes_{j=1}^{m+1} |1_{A_j}\rangle] \\ &\quad + |1_B\rangle [\sin \theta_m \cos \theta_1 \bigotimes_{j=1}^m |1_{A_j}\rangle |0_{A_{m+1}}\rangle + \cos \theta_m \sin \theta_1 \bigotimes_{j=1}^m |0_{A_j}\rangle |1_{A_{m+1}}\rangle], \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where we have re-labelled $\{|0_{A_1}\rangle, |1_{A_1}\rangle\}$ corresponding to the state $|\xi_1\rangle$ as $\{|0_{A_{m+1}}\rangle, |1_{A_{m+1}}\rangle\}$ for efficiently keeping tab on the A -qubits, and

$$|\Phi_{(1)}\rangle = \sigma_{A_{m+1}}^z |\Phi_{(0)}\rangle. \quad (47)$$

(b) Next, perform a series of controlled X operators, defined by

$$U_{(a_1, a_2)}^{\text{cx}} = \frac{1}{2} [(I + \sigma^z)_{a_1} I_{a_2} + (I - \sigma^z)_{a_1} \sigma_{a_2}^x] \quad (48)$$

for qubit-pairs (a_1, a_2) , on the *nearest-neighbor* pairs of A -qubits in $|\Phi_{(0)}\rangle$. The *overall* A -unitary is defined by

$$U_A^{\text{cx}} = \begin{cases} U_{(A_1, A_2)}^{\text{cx}} & \text{for } m = 1, \\ U_{(A_1, A_2)}^{\text{cx}} V_A^m & \text{for } m > 1, \end{cases} \quad (49)$$

with

$$V_A^m = \prod_{i=0}^{m-2} U_{(A_{m-i+1}, A_{m-i})}^{\text{cx}} U_{(A_{m-i}, A_{m-i+1})}^{\text{cx}}, \quad (50)$$

leading to

$$U_A^{\text{cx}} |\Phi_{(0)}\rangle = |0_B\rangle |\alpha_{A_1}\rangle \bigotimes_{j=2}^{m+1} |0_{A_j}\rangle + |1_B\rangle |\beta_{A_1}\rangle \bigotimes_{j=2}^{m+1} |1_{A_j}\rangle, \quad (51)$$

where we have defined

$$\begin{aligned} |\alpha_{A_1}\rangle &= \cos \theta_m \cos \theta_1 |0_{A_1}\rangle + \sin \theta_m \sin \theta_1 |1_{A_1}\rangle, \\ |\beta_{A_1}\rangle &= \cos \theta_m \sin \theta_1 |0_{A_1}\rangle + \sin \theta_m \cos \theta_1 |1_{A_1}\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Note that the ordering of control and target qubits arranged in Eqs. (49) and (50) is important to arrive at the desired state.

Note also that the unitary operator V_A^m starts operating only when $m > 1$, i.e., one is merging a $(m + 1)$ -qubit gGHZ state with a two-qubit state $|\xi_1\rangle$.

(c) We now define

$$\cos \theta_{m+1} = \sqrt{\cos^2 \theta_m \cos^2 \theta_1 + \sin^2 \theta_m \sin^2 \theta_1}, \quad (53)$$

and perform a controlled rotation

$$R_{A_2, A_1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & u & 0 & -v \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -v & 0 & -u \end{bmatrix}, \quad (54)$$

with

$$u = \frac{\sin 2\theta_m \cos 2\theta_1}{4 \sin 2\theta_{m+1}}, \quad v = \frac{\sin 2\theta_1}{4 \sin 2\theta_{m+1}}, \quad (55)$$

over the qubit-pair (A_1, A_2) with A_2 (A_1) as the control (target) qubit.

(d) The last step is a local rotation on the qubit A_1 , given by

$$L_{A_1} = \begin{bmatrix} x & y \\ -y & x \end{bmatrix}, \quad (56)$$

with

$$x = \frac{\cos \theta_m \cos \theta_1}{\cos \theta_{m+1}}, \quad y = \frac{\sin \theta_m \sin \theta_1}{\cos \theta_{m+1}}. \quad (57)$$

Applying $L_{A_1} R_{(A_1, A_2)}$ on $U_A^{\text{cx}} |\Phi_{(0)}\rangle$ results in

$$L_{A_1} R_{(A_1, A_2)} U_A^{\text{cx}} |\Phi_{(0)}\rangle = \cos \theta_{m+1} |0_B\rangle \bigotimes_{j=1}^{m+1} |0_{A_j}\rangle + \sin \theta_{m+1} |1_B\rangle \bigotimes_{j=1}^{m+1} |0_{A_j}\rangle = |\xi_{m+1}\rangle. \quad (58)$$

Note that the overall unitary

$$\mathcal{U}_A = L_{A_1} R_{(A_2, A_1)} U_A^{\text{cx}} \quad (59)$$

is local to the A -qubits. Hence the proof. \square

The unitary operation \mathcal{U}_A required to produce an N -qubit gGHZ state ($N = m + 1$) combining the states $|\xi_{m-1}\rangle$ and $|\xi_1\rangle$ contains $2(m - 1)$ controlled operations. Using this, one can estimate the number, \mathcal{N} , of controlled operations required to produce a state of the form $|\xi_m\rangle$ via combining m copies of the state $|\xi_1\rangle$ as

$$\mathcal{N} = \sum_{i=1}^m 2(i - 1) = m^2 - m. \quad (60)$$

Note further that the two-qubit measurement (Eq. (31)) can be performed via an appropriate basis transformation for the two qubits, followed by a parity measurement assisted by an ancilla qubit initialized in $|0\rangle$ and subsequently measured in computational basis (see Fig. 5 for a circuit diagram, and Appendix A for details). Therefore, the number of two-qubit operations corresponding to the two-qubit measurements varies as $\sim m$, which is the sub-leading order in m in Eq. (60).

One can now use proposition 6, and apply the XZ measurement and the unitary operation prescribed in Eq. (59) repeatedly to create gGHZ states of arbitrary sizes, starting from a collection of two-qubit states (which can be non-maximally entangled) of the form $|\xi_1\rangle$. The process is outlined in Figure 4, where one starts with a pair of states of the form $|\xi_1\rangle$ on the two-qubit systems $A_1 B_1$ and $A_2 B_2$, and performs an XZ measurement on the qubits B_1 and B_2 , followed by the unitary operation $L_{A_1} R_{(A_2, A_1)} U_{(A_1, A_2)}^{\text{cx}}$ (see Eq. (49) for $m = 1$) on the parties A_1 and A_2 in the post-measured state corresponding to the outcome $k = 0$. This creates a three-qubit gGHZ

state $|\xi_2\rangle$ on the three-qubit system $B_{(1)} A_1 A_2$. This is further merged with a state $|\xi_1\rangle$ on the two-qubit system $A_3 B_3$ via an XZ measurement on the qubits $B_{(1)}$ and B_3 , followed by the unitary operation $L_{A_1} R_{(A_2, A_1)} U_{(A_1, A_2)}^{\text{cx}} U_{(A_3, A_2)}^{\text{cx}} U_{(A_2, A_3)}^{\text{cx}}$ (see Eq. (49) with $m = 2$) on the post-measured state corresponding to the outcome $k = 0$, creating a state $|\xi_3\rangle$ on the 4-qubit system $B_{(2)} A_1 A_2 A_3$. This process can be continued to obtain a gGHZ state of arbitrary number of qubits. Note also that creating gGHZ states of arbitrary number of qubits require availability of a pool of adequate number of two-qubit non-maximally entangled states of the form $|\xi_1\rangle$.

Note that the proposition 6 provides a prescription for creating large gGHZ states. Given proposition 5 (see Sec. II A), it can also be used for creating N -qubit GHZ state if at least one of the available two-qubit entangled states is a Bell state (i.e., $\theta = \pi/4$). This observation is crucial for the scenario where the number of Bell states are limited, and one intends to create maximally-entangled qubit pair between any two qubits shared between two parties, as one may create a GHZ state including all qubits using the proposed protocol, and subsequently perform single-qubit measurements in σ^x basis to create a maximally-entangled state among the desired qubits.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK

In this paper, we propose a protocol for concentrating bipartite entanglement over a qubit-qudit system starting from N arbitrary qubit-qudit states via a joint N -qubit measurement on the qubits using the generalized XZ basis that reduces the dimension of the qubit Hilbert space from 2^N to 2. We prove the protocol to be a deterministic one by establishing the equi-probability of occurrence of all post-measured states,

and by showing that all post-measured states are connected by local unitary operators ensuring their identical bipartite entanglement properties. As a solution to the practical challenges in performing an N -qubit measurement, we further propose a repetitive two-qubit measurement scheme using two-qubit XZ basis which deterministically provides the same entanglement concentration as in the case of the joint N -qubit measurement. We also show that the concentrated entanglement increases monotonically with the number of measurement rounds in the case of the repetitive two-qubit measurement protocol, and derive upper and lower bounds of the concentrated entanglement in terms of the maximum bipartite entanglement available in the initial qubit-qudit states. We apply this protocol in the case of arbitrary two-qubit systems, and discuss the entanglement properties of the states created in the process. Further, we demonstrate the applicability of the proposed protocol in creating GHZ states over arbitrary number of qubits, designing specific operations that define the protocol.

Our work gives rise to a number of interesting and important questions. Within the framework of the applications of the devised protocol reported in this paper, it is interesting to explore the properties of the states obtained by merging paradigmatic multi-qubit states, such as the generalized W states [38] and permutation-symmetric Dicke states [39]. Further, the fact of the increase of loss with increasing the number of mixed states with the application of swapping-type protocols being known [40], concentrating entanglement in the case of bipartite mixed states and the applicability, or possible modification of the proposed protocol poses an important and yet challenging question. Also, the question of extending the devised scheme towards entanglement percolation [41] is underlined by the application, although not towards a deterministic scheme, of the use of two-qubit measurement-based schemes in related problems [24, 28].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Authors acknowledge the use of **QIClib** – a modern C++ library for general purpose quantum information processing and quantum computing. H.K.J. thanks the Prime Minister’s Research Fellowship (PMRF) program, Government of India, for the financial support. A.K.P acknowledges the support from the Anusandhan National Research Foundation (ANRF) of the Department of Science and Technology (DST), India, through the Core Research Grant (CRG) (File No. CRG/2023/001217, Sanction Date 16 May 2024).

Appendix A: Two-qubit measurement

In the special case of $N = 2$, the columns of the matrix form of the two qubit Hadamard operator $H_{B_1} \otimes H_{B_2}$, being self-inverse, can be identified as $|e_b\rangle$ ($|b\rangle$), $b = 0, 1, 2, 3$, when written in the $\{|e_b\rangle\}$ ($\{|b\rangle\}$) basis. Also, we assume that the two-qubit measurements are performed on two arbitrary qubit-qudit pairs with bipartite entanglement E_1 and E_2 over the qubit-qudit bipartition, giving rise to a qubit-qudit system with bipartite entanglement E_f over the qubit-qudit bipartition.

a. Choice of the zero’th pair. Considering three distinct choices of (b_0, b'_0) , namely, $(0, 1)$, $(0, 2)$ and $(0, 3)$, the measurement operators corresponding to each case can be constructed using Eqs. (4) - (10). Corresponding to each of these three choices, the Schmidt coefficients of the post-measured states can be obtained as (see Eq. (21))

$$\cos \theta_f^{(0,1)} = \cos \theta_2, \quad (A1)$$

$$\cos \theta_f^{(0,2)} = \cos \theta_1, \quad (A2)$$

$$\cos \theta_f^{(0,3)} = \sqrt{\cos^2 \theta_1 \cos^2 \theta_2 + \sin^2 \theta_1 \sin^2 \theta_2}, \quad (A3)$$

and the entanglement $E_f^{(b_0, b'_0)}$ for these states are (see Eq. (22))

$$E_f^{(0,1)} = E_2, \quad (A4)$$

$$E_f^{(0,2)} = E_1, \quad (A5)$$

$$E_f^{(0,3)} = \sqrt{E_1^2 + E_2^2 - E_1^2 E_2^2}. \quad (A6)$$

Note that while the choice of $(0, 1)$ and $(0, 2)$ for (b_0, b'_0) provides E_f to be equal to the entanglement in an already existing qubit-qudit pair (E_2 and E_1 respectively), to achieve $E_f > \max\{E_1, E_2\}$, one needs to choose $(b_0, b'_0) \equiv (0, 3)$ (as per Eq. (24)). This can be shown in the same fashion as in proposition 4, by assuming that $E_1 = \max(E_1, E_2)$, and $E_2 = qE_1$ with $0 \leq q \leq 1$, and then rewriting Eq. (A6) as

$$E_f^{(0,3)} = E_1 \sqrt{1 + (1 - E_1^2)q^2} \geq E_1. \quad (A7)$$

b. Performing the two-qubit measurement. The two qubit deterministic measurement given by Eq. (31) on two qubits B_i and B_j , which are parts of the qubit-qudit systems $A_i B_i$ and $A_j B_j$, can be performed via two-qubit parity measurement assisted with an ancillary qubit, preceded by an appropriate basis transformation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|e_0\rangle + |e_3\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} &\rightarrow |00\rangle, & \frac{|e_0\rangle - |e_3\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} &\rightarrow |11\rangle, \\ \frac{|e_1\rangle + |e_2\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} &\rightarrow |01\rangle, & \frac{|e_1\rangle - |e_2\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} &\rightarrow |10\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (A8)$$

brought about by two-qubit controlled NOT operations and single-qubit Hadamard gates (see Fig. 5). The ancilla qubit is initialized in $|0\rangle$, and is measured in the computational basis, resulting in either $+1$, corresponding to M_0 , or -1 , corresponding to M_1 . Post parity measurement, qubits B_i and B_j are disentangled via a controlled NOT operation, after which the control qubit remains entangled with the parties A_i s, while the target qubit is fully disentangled. Therefore, the target qubit can be discarded, and the control qubit can be carried forward as the B -qubit of the bipartite system AB .

Appendix B: Measures of quantum correlations

Here, we provide brief descriptions of the measures of quantum correlations used in this paper.

a. Concurrence. Concurrence quantifies the entanglement between two qubits A and B in a state ρ_{AB} , and is calculated as [36]

$$E_{AB} = \max\{0, \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4\}, \quad (\text{B1})$$

where $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \lambda_3 \geq \lambda_4$, and λ_i are the eigenvalues of $\rho_{AB}\tilde{\rho}_{AB}$, with $\tilde{\rho}_{AB}$ being the positive, non-Hermitian operator

$$\tilde{\rho}_{AB} = (\sigma_A^y \otimes \sigma_B^y) \rho_{AB}^* (\sigma_A^y \otimes \sigma_B^y). \quad (\text{B2})$$

Here, σ^y is the y -component of the Pauli matrices, and the complex conjugation of ρ_{AB} is taken in computational basis. In situations where ρ_{AB} is a pure state [33],

$$E_{AB} = 2\sqrt{\det \rho_A}, \quad (\text{B3})$$

where $\rho_A = \text{Tr}_B(\rho_{AB})$.

b. Monogamy and monogamy score. For a given bipartite entanglement measure E and an $(N + 1)$ -qubit system $A_0A_1 \cdots A_N$, a quantum state ρ is said to be *monogamous* for E with A_0 as the *nodal observer* if [32]

$$E_{A_0:A_1 \cdots A_N} \geq \sum_{i=1}^N E_{A_0:A_i}. \quad (\text{B4})$$

Otherwise, the state is *non-monogamous* for E with this particular choice of the nodal observer. In this setup, the entanglement measure E is said to be *monogamous* if Eq. (B4) is true for all states ρ on the $(N + 1)$ -qubit system. In the same spirit

as the motivation behind the definition of *tangle* [33], one defines the *monogamy score* corresponding to the entanglement measure E for an N -qubit system as

$$\delta_{A_0} = E_{A_0:A_1 \cdots A_N} - \sum_{i=1}^N E_{A_0:A_i}, \quad (\text{B5})$$

where we have assumed a fixed nodal observer A_0 . Monogamy score can also be considered as a quantifier for multipartite quantum correlations present in the $(N + 1)$ -qubit system [35]. In this paper, we use the squared concurrence for E .

c. Generalized geometric measure. For an N -qubit pure state $|\psi\rangle$, the generalized geometric measure (GGM) quantifies the multipartite entanglement, and is defined as (see the original definition of geometric measure of entanglement [42])

$$G = 1 - \max_{\mathcal{S}} |\langle \psi' | \psi \rangle|^2, \quad (\text{B6})$$

where \mathcal{S} is the set of all possible biseparable states $|\psi'\rangle$. The optimization in the definition of G can be performed by using the maximization of the Schmidt coefficients across all possible bipartitions of $|\psi\rangle$, leading to the simplified version of GGM given by [34, 35]

$$G = 1 - \max_{\mathcal{S}_{A:B}} \{\lambda_{A:B}^2\}. \quad (\text{B7})$$

Here, $\lambda_{A:B}$ is the maximum Schmidt coefficient of $|\psi\rangle$ in the partition $A : B$, and the maximum in Eq. (B7) being taken over the set, $\mathcal{S}_{A:B}$, of all arbitrary $A : B$ bipartitions of the N -qubit system.

-
- [1] H. J. Kimble, *Nature* **453**, 1023 (2008); S. Wehner, D. Elkouss, and R. Hanson, *Science* **362**, eaam9288 (2018), <https://www.science.org/doi/pdf/10.1126/science.aam9288>.
- [2] M. B. Plenio and V. Vedral, *Contemp.Phys.* **39**, 431 (1998), [arXiv:quant-ph/9804075](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9804075); R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 865 (2009).
- [3] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1895 (1993).
- [4] C. H. Bennett and S. J. Wiesner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 2881 (1992); A. Sen(De) and U. Sen, *Phys. News* **40**, 17 (2011), [arXiv:1105.2412](https://arxiv.org/abs/1105.2412).
- [5] A. K. Ekert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 661 (1991).
- [6] D. Bouwmeester, J.-W. Pan, K. Mattle, M. Eibl, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zeilinger, *Nature* **390**, 575 (1997); K. Mattle, H. Weinfurter, P. G. Kwiat, and A. Zeilinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 4656 (1996).
- [7] G. Vardoyan, E. van Milligen, S. Guha, S. Wehner, and D. Towsley, [arXiv:2307.04477](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.04477) (2023).
- [8] S. Liu, Z. Lu, P. Wang, Y. Tian, X. Wang, and Y. Li, *npj Quantum Information* **9**, 92 (2023).
- [9] H. Buhrman, W. van Dam, P. Høyer, and A. Tapp, *Phys. Rev. A* **60**, 2737 (1999); P. A. Guérin, A. Feix, M. Araújo, and i. c. v. Brukner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 100502 (2016).
- [10] P. Kómár, E. M. Kessler, M. Bishof, L. Jiang, A. S. Sørensen, J. Ye, and M. D. Lukin, *Nature Physics* **10**, 582 (2014).
- [11] J. I. Cirac, A. K. Ekert, S. F. Huelga, and C. Macchiavello, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 4249 (1999).
- [12] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, S. Popescu, B. Schumacher, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 722 (1996); M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 574 (1997); M. Murao, M. B. Plenio, S. Popescu, V. Vedral, and P. L. Knight, *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, R4075 (1998); W. Dür, J. I. Cirac, and R. Tarrach, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 3562 (1999); M. Horodecki and P. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 4206 (1999).
- [13] C. H. Bennett, H. J. Bernstein, S. Popescu, and B. Schumacher, *Phys. Rev. A* **53**, 2046 (1996); L. Hardy, *Phys. Rev. A* **60**, 1912 (1999); Z. Zhao, J.-W. Pan, and M. S. Zhan, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 014301 (2001); T. Yamamoto, M. Koashi, and N. Imoto, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 012304 (2001).
- [14] H.-K. Lo and S. Popescu, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 022301 (2001).
- [15] S. Bose, V. Vedral, and P. L. Knight, *Phys. Rev. A* **60**, 194 (1999).
- [16] F. Morikoshi and M. Koashi, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 022316 (2001); F. Morikoshi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 3189 (2000).
- [17] Y.-J. Gu, W.-D. Li, and G.-C. Guo, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 022321 (2006).
- [18] J.-W. Pan, S. Gasparoni, R. Ursin, G. Weihs, and A. Zeilinger, *Nature* **423**, 417 (2003); Z. Zhao, T. Yang, Y.-A. Chen, A.-N. Zhang, and J.-W. Pan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 207901 (2003); T. Yamamoto, M. Koashi, Ş. K. Özdemir, and N. Imoto, *Nature* **421**, 343 (2003).

- [19] M. Żukowski, A. Zeilinger, M. A. Horne, and A. K. Ekert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 4287 (1993); M. Żukowski, A. Zeilinger, and H. Weinfurter, *Ann. NY Acad. Sci.* **755**, 91 (1995); A. Sen(De), U. Sen, and M. Żukowski, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 062301 (2003).
- [20] S. Santra and V. S. Malinovsky, *Quantum Information Processing* **20**, 206 (2021).
- [21] J. Zhao, W. Li, and Y. Gu, *Europhysics Letters* **104**, 10005 (2013).
- [22] M. A. Nielsen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 436 (1999); G. Vidal, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 1046 (1999); D. Jonathan and M. B. Plenio, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 1455 (1999).
- [23] S. Perseguers, J. I. Cirac, A. Acín, M. Lewenstein, and J. Wehr, *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 022308 (2008).
- [24] X. Meng, J. Gao, and S. Havlin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 170501 (2021).
- [25] D. P. DiVincenzo, C. A. Fuchs, H. Mabuchi, J. A. Smolin, A. Thapliyal, and A. Uhlmann, [arXiv:quant-ph/9803033](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9803033) (1998).
- [26] F. Verstraete, M. Popp, and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 027901 (2004); F. Verstraete, M. A. Martín-Delgado, and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 087201 (2004); M. Popp, F. Verstraete, M. A. Martín-Delgado, and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 042306 (2005); D. Sadhukhan, S. S. Roy, A. K. Pal, D. Rakshit, A. Sen(De), and U. Sen, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 022301 (2017).
- [27] D. M. Greenberger, M. A. Horne, and A. Zeilinger, *Bell's theorem, quantum theory and conceptions of the universe* (Kluwer, Netherlands, 1989).
- [28] S. Perseguers, D. Cavalcanti, G. J. Lapeyre, M. Lewenstein, and A. Acín, *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 032327 (2010).
- [29] S. Khanna, S. Halder, and U. Sen, *Phys. Rev. A* **109**, 012419 (2024).
- [30] D. Hong-Yi, Z. Ming, and K. Le-Man, *Communications in Theoretical Physics* **50**, 73 (2008).
- [31] J. Wei, L. Shi, S. Zhao, K. Zhou, L. Yu, W. Lu, L. Ma, and B. Zhao, *Quantum Information Processing* **18**, 237 (2019).
- [32] H. S. Dhar, A. K. Pal, D. Rakshit, A. Sen(De), and U. Sen, “Monogamy of quantum correlations - a review,” in *Lectures on General Quantum Correlations and their Applications*, edited by F. F. Fanchini, D. d. O. Soares Pinto, and G. Adesso (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2017) pp. 23–64; X.-L. Zong, H.-H. Yin, W. Song, and Z.-L. Cao, *Frontiers in Physics* **10** (2022), 10.3389/fphy.2022.880560.
- [33] V. Coffman, J. Kundu, and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 052306 (2000).
- [34] A. Sen(De) and U. Sen, *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 012308 (2010).
- [35] R. Prabhu, A. K. Pati, A. Sen(De), and U. Sen, *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 052337 (2012).
- [36] S. A. Hill and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 5022 (1997).
- [37] M. Hein, W. Dür, J. Eisert, R. Raussendorf, M. Van den Nest, and H. J. Briegel, [arXiv:quant-ph/0602096](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0602096) (2006).
- [38] W. Dür, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 062314 (2000).
- [39] R. H. Dicke, *Phys. Rev.* **93**, 99 (1954).
- [40] A. Sen(De), U. Sen, i. c. v. Brukner, V. Bužek, and M. Żukowski, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 042310 (2005).
- [41] A. Acín, J. I. Cirac, and M. Lewenstein, *Nature Physics* **3**, 256 (2007).
- [42] A. Shimony, *Ann. NY Acad. Sci.* **755**, 675 (1995); H. Barnum and N. Linden, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **34**, 6787 (2001); T.-C. Wei and P. M. Goldbart, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 042307 (2003).