

On the Optimality of Square Root Measurements in Quantum State Discrimination

Nicola Dalla Pozza*

*School of Engineering and Information Technology,
University of New South Wales Canberra, Australia*

Gianfranco Pierobon

University of Padova, Padova, Italy

(Dated: March 2, 2024)

Distinguishing assigned quantum states with assigned probabilities via quantum measurements is a crucial problem for the transmission of classical information through quantum channels. Measurement operators maximizing the probability of correct discrimination have been characterized by Helstrom, Holevo and Yuen since 1970's. On the other hand, closed-form solutions are available only for particular situations enjoying high degrees of symmetry. As a suboptimal solution to the problem, measurement operators, directly determined from states and probabilities and known as square root measurements (SRM), were introduced by Hausladen and Wootters. These operators were also recognized to be optimal for pure states equipped with geometrical uniform symmetry (GUS). In this paper we discuss the optimality of the SRM and find necessary and sufficient conditions in order that SRM maximize the correct decision probabilities for set of states formed by several constellations of GUS states. The results are applied to some specific examples concerning double constellations of quantum phase shift keying (PSK) and pulse position modulation (PPM) states, with possible applications to practical systems of quantum communications.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Hk

I. INTRODUCTION

The long standing problem of transmitting classical information through a noiseless quantum channel refers to the following scenario. A classical information source emits a symbol S in a finite alphabet, say $\{s_0, \dots, s_{m-1}\}$, whose nature is irrelevant to the problem. The symbols s_i are emitted with probabilities q_i satisfying the properties $q_i > 0$ and $\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} q_i = 1$. On the basis of the symbol s_i emitted by the classical source, the transmitter (conventionally known as Alice) prepares the quantum channel in a state belonging to a set of agreed quantum states, generally mixed states with density operators ρ_i which are semidefinite positive ($\rho_i \geq 0$) and have unitary trace ($\text{Tr } \rho_i = 1$). The quantum ensemble $\{q_i, \rho_i\}$ can be conveniently represented by the weighted density operators $W_i = q_i \rho_i$.

The problem of the receiver (conventionally known as Bob) is to extract as well as he can classical information from the quantum channel he and Alice share. In this task Bob is assumed to know both the quantum states ρ_i and their probabilities q_i . We assume that the measurement and decision strategy of Bob is the *quantum hypothesis testing* introduced by Helstrom [1]. The strategy consists in performing on the quantum channel a positive operator-valued measurement (POVM) with measurement operators P_i semidefinite positive ($P_i \geq 0$) and resolving the identity operator, namely, $\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} P_i = I$. The conditional probability $p(j|i)$ that the measurement

gives the result $R = j$ provided that the state is ρ_i turns out to be $\text{Tr}(\rho_i P_j)$. The usual task of Bob is the choice of the POVM P_i *maximizing the probability of correct decision*

$$P_c = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} q_i p(i|i) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} q_i \text{Tr}(\rho_i P_i) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \text{Tr}(W_i P_i). \quad (1)$$

The problem solution is given by well known general results due to Holevo [2], Yuen *et al.* [3], and Helstrom [1] (see also [4], and [5] for a connection with min-entropy of a classical source) and is summarized by the following theorem.

THEOREM 1. The measurement operators P_i give the maximum correct detection probability if and only if the operator

$$Y = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} W_i P_i \quad (2)$$

satisfies the conditions

$$Y - W_i \geq 0 \quad (3)$$

for each $i = 0, \dots, m-1$. The above condition implies also that Y is semidefinite positive and that the equalities

$$P_i(W_i - W_j)P_j = 0 \quad (4)$$

hold true for all $i, j = 0, \dots, m-1$. \square

Unfortunately, closed form solutions are available only in few very particular cases, generally implying pure states enjoying high degrees of symmetry. Indeed, as

*Electronic address: n.dallapozza@adfa.edu.au

pointed out in [6], serious mathematical difficulties arise because of the non linearity of the problem, which turns out to be a convex semidefinite programming problem.

If the states prepared by Alice are pure, namely, $\rho_i = |\gamma_i\rangle\langle\gamma_i|$, it can be shown [7] that also the measurement operators have rank 1, namely, $P_i = |\mu_i\rangle\langle\mu_i|$. Then the correct detection probability (1) depends on the inner products of the states $|\gamma_i\rangle$ and of the *measurement vectors* $|\mu_i\rangle$, namely,

$$P_c = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} |\langle\mu_i|\tilde{\gamma}_i\rangle|^2, \quad (5)$$

where $|\tilde{\gamma}_i\rangle = \sqrt{q_i}|\gamma_i\rangle$ are the weighted states. The optimization problem reduces to find the measurement vectors $|\mu_i\rangle$ maximizing the correct detection probability (5). In accordance with the general case, the vectors $|\mu_i\rangle$ must resolve the identity operator I of the Hilbert space spanned by the states

$$\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} |\mu_i\rangle\langle\mu_i| = I. \quad (6)$$

In the following we assume that the weighted states $|\tilde{\gamma}_i\rangle$ are linearly independent. This is not at all too restrictive for all situations of practical interest. In this case it can be shown [8] that the optimal measurement vectors $|\mu_i\rangle$ (to be determined) form an orthonormal basis. Since the weighted states are linear combinations of the measurement vectors, provided that the states $|\tilde{\gamma}_i\rangle$ are collected into a matrix Γ and the measurement vectors $|\mu_i\rangle$ into a matrix M , i.e.,

$$\Gamma = [|\tilde{\gamma}_0\rangle, \dots, |\tilde{\gamma}_{m-1}\rangle], \quad M = [|\mu_0\rangle, \dots, |\mu_{m-1}\rangle] \quad (7)$$

a matrix relation $\Gamma = MX$ holds. The entries of the $m \times m$ matrix X are given by $X_{ki} = \langle\mu_k|\tilde{\gamma}_i\rangle$. The joint input–output probabilities become $p(i, j) = P[S = i, R = j] = |X_{ij}|^2$ and the corresponding correct decision probability turns out to be

$$P_c = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} |X_{ii}|^2. \quad (8)$$

The optimization problem can be conveniently formulated introducing the *Gram matrix* G of the weighted states $|\tilde{\gamma}_i\rangle$, namely $G_{ij} = \langle\tilde{\gamma}_i|\tilde{\gamma}_j\rangle$. Then, using (6) gives

$$G_{ij} = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \langle\tilde{\gamma}_i|\mu_k\rangle\langle\mu_k|\tilde{\gamma}_j\rangle = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} X_{ki}^* X_{kj} \quad (9)$$

and $G = X^\dagger X$ in matrix form. In conclusion, the optimal detection problem reduces to find the factorization $G = X^\dagger X$ of the Gram matrix that maximizes probability (8). Provided that X_0 is the result of the optimization, the measurement vectors are obtained by $M = \Gamma X_0^{-1}$. Note that the independence of the states

implies that the Gram matrix is positive definite, so that X is invertible. Unfortunately the factorization (9) of the Gram matrix leads to a set of quadratic equations, which can be solved only by numerical programs, at least in general.

A different approach is based on a very popular suboptimal measurement, known as *square root measurement* (SRM), which was introduced by Hausladen and Wootters [9] and thoroughly discussed by Eldar and Forney [10]. In the framework discussed above, the square root measurement corresponds to the factorization $G = X^\dagger X$ of the Gram matrix with $X = G^{1/2}$ square root of the Gram matrix itself. Under our assumptions both the matrix $G^{1/2}$ and its inverse $G^{-1/2}$ are definite positive. The matrix M of the measurement vectors is given by $M = \Gamma G^{-1/2}$ and the correct detection probability is the sum of the squares of the diagonal entries of $G^{1/2}$, i.e.,

$$P_c = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} [(G^{1/2})_{ii}]^2. \quad (10)$$

Even though this measurement is not optimal in general, it exhibits interesting properties. It can be straightforwardly obtained by the Gram matrix and gives performances near to the optimum provided that the weighted states $|\tilde{\gamma}_i\rangle$ are almost orthogonal. Indeed Hausladen *et al.* [11] have shown that SRM (also known as “pretty good” measurement) is asymptotically optimal, in the sense that it is good enough to be used as non local measurement in the proof of their fundamental theorem on the classical capacity of a quantum channel. More recently SRM has found application [12–14] in the search of optimal measurement for distinguishing hidden subgroup states, providing an interesting approach to the large class of quantum computational problems linked to the *hidden subgroup problem*. In any case SRM furnishes a lower bound to the optimal performance and it may be assumed as a starting point to find the optimal measurement X_0 through unitary transformations.

The SRM turns out to be the optimal measurement when the states exhibit a high degree of symmetry. Then, particular attention has been given to applications of the SRM to states enjoying *geometrically uniform symmetry* (GUS), i.e., sets of states that are invariant with respect to a unitary transformation [10, 15]. This is particularly interesting for practical quantum communication systems using quantum phase shift–keying (QPSK) [16] and pulse position modulation (PPM) [17]. Also extensions to mixed state have been considered [18, 19].

The aim of the present paper is to show that the optimal feature of SRM is by no means confined to states enjoying GUS and having equal probabilities. In particular we consider a set of states composed by distinct *constellations* of states enjoying the same GUS (we use the term “constellation” borrowed from the telecommunications jargon for the more general “subset”). This is a particular case of the *compound geometrical uniform symmetry* discussed in [18]. The novelty of our approach

stays in the fact that we find necessary and sufficient conditions in order that SRM is the optimal measurement for this case. Moreover we present possible applications to practical quantum communication systems as PSK and suggest a version of PPM improving its efficiency.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II we revisit two important results concerning our topic. The first, due to Helstrom [20], characterizes the factorization $G = X^\dagger X$ that maximizes the correct decision probability. The second, due to Sasaki *et al.* [21], gives simple sufficient conditions guaranteeing that the SRM is the optimal measurement. In particular the last result enables one to show in a very simple way that SRM is optimal for states $|\gamma_i\rangle$ enjoying *geometrical uniform symmetry*. The main result of the paper is presented in Section III, where a necessary and sufficient condition is furnished in order that the SRM is optimal for a set formed by constellations of GUS states generated by the same unitary transformation S but applied to different states. In Section IV the result is applied to a double constellation of quantum PSK states, showing that SRM may be optimal also for states with non uniform probabilities. In Section V we consider a double constellation of PPM states and show that the SRM is optimal for this case and leads to a communications scheme more efficient than the original PPM. Some conclusions close the paper.

II. THE SRM AS OPTIMAL MEASUREMENT

While Theorem 1 refers to the general case of mixed states, a simple characterization of the optimal measurement for independent pure states is given by the following theorem.

THEOREM 2. The factorization $G = X^\dagger X$ maximizes the correct decision probability if and only if the following conditions hold:

i) for each i and j

$$X_{ii}X_{ji}^* = X_{ij}X_{jj}^* ; \quad (11)$$

ii) the matrix

$$Y = XX_d^\dagger \quad (12)$$

with

$$X_d = \text{diag}\{X_{00}, \dots, X_{m-1, m-1}\} \quad (13)$$

is positive definite. (Note that (11) implies that Y is Hermitian). \square

The theorem, not frequently cited in the literature, has been proved by Helstrom in a paper [20] concerning an iterative search of the optimal measurement. The proof of the theorem, given in appendix of the paper, is somewhat intricate. A simplified version of the proof is given here in Appendix A.

As we pointed out, the SRM corresponding to the factorization $G = X^\dagger X$ with $X = G^{1/2}$ is not optimal in

general. On the basis of the Theorem 2, Sasaki *et al.* [21] in a paper about the superadditivity of the capacity of a quantum channel have found a nice sufficient condition for the optimality of SRM. The following theorem gives a generalization of the result.

THEOREM 3. Assume that the Gram matrix G (and its square root $G^{1/2}$) is block diagonal, namely, $G = G_1 \oplus \dots \oplus G_r$. Then, the square root measurement is optimal if and only if the square root $G_i^{1/2}$ of each block has equal diagonal entries.

PROOF. If the matrix G is formed by a single block, it is irreducible and its associated directed graph is strongly connected [22]. Then, the indexes $0, \dots, m-1$ may be ordered into a cycle $i_0, i_1, \dots, i_{m-1}, i_0$ such that $(G^{1/2})_{i_k i_{k+1}} \neq 0$ for each $k = 0, \dots, m-1$. Since $G^{1/2}$ is Hermitian, $(G^{1/2})_{i_{k+1} i_k}^* = (G^{1/2})_{i_k i_{k+1}}$ and condition (11) is satisfied if and only if $(G^{1/2})_{i_k i_k} = (G^{1/2})_{i_{k+1} i_{k+1}}$ for each k or, equivalently, if the diagonal entries of $G^{1/2}$ have a common value g . Therefore, condition (12) of Theorem 2 holds in that $XX_d^* = gG^{1/2}$ is positive definite. If G has many diagonal block, the proof can be applied to each block. \square

Confining our attention to the case of a single block, since $Y_{ii} = |X_{ii}|^2 = p(i, i)$, the theorem is equivalent to say that the SRM is optimal if and only if the probabilities of correct decision is g^2 , independent of the state transmitted. In particular, the optimal correct decision probability turns out to be

$$P_c = mg^2. \quad (14)$$

It is worthwhile to note that the optimality of the SRM depends only on the Gram matrix. Since this is invariant with respect to unitary transformations, if a constellation of weighted states satisfy the conditions of Theorem 3, any other constellation obtained via a unitary transformation admits optimal SRM with the same error probability. Of course the optimal SRM operators vary according to the unitary transformation.

The most known case of optimality of the SRM concerns states equipped with *geometrical uniform symmetry* (GUS) [10, 15]. The weighted states $|\tilde{\gamma}_i\rangle$ enjoy GUS if $|\tilde{\gamma}_i\rangle = S^i |\tilde{\gamma}_0\rangle$, $i = 0, \dots, m-1$, where S is a unitary operator satisfying the condition $S^m = I$. This generalizes the usual definition of GUS states $|\gamma_i\rangle$ as satisfying the condition $|\gamma_i\rangle = S^i |\gamma_0\rangle$, and having equal probabilities $q_i = 1/m$. The proof of the optimality of the SRM is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3. Indeed, the entries of the weighted Gram matrix become

$$G_{ij} = \langle \tilde{\gamma}_i | \tilde{\gamma}_j \rangle = \langle \tilde{\gamma}_0 | S^{j-i} | \tilde{\gamma}_0 \rangle \quad (15)$$

and depend only by $(j-i)_{\text{mod } m}$. One concludes that the matrix G is circulant [23]. (Details on the basic properties of circulant matrices are collected for convenience in Appendix B). Then G has spectral decomposition

$$G = F \Lambda F^\dagger \quad (16)$$

(see (B3)) where F is the unitary Fourier matrix (B4) and the diagonal matrix $\Lambda = \text{diag}\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m\}$ collects the (positive) eigenvalues of G . Then

$$G^{1/2} = F\Lambda^{1/2}F^\dagger \quad (17)$$

is circulant, its diagonal entries are equal, and the SRM is optimal. In particular

$$g = \frac{1}{m} \text{Tr}(G^{1/2}) = \frac{1}{m} \text{Tr}(\Lambda^{1/2}) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^{1/2} \quad (18)$$

and

$$P_c = mg^2 = \frac{1}{m} \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^{1/2} \right)^2. \quad (19)$$

The GUS is by no means the only case where Theorem 3 finds application. As an elementary example consider the Gram matrix

$$G = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \chi \\ \chi^* & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (20)$$

of two states $|\gamma_0\rangle$ and $|\gamma_1\rangle$ with equal probability and $\chi = \langle \gamma_0 | \gamma_1 \rangle$. Note that this matrix is not circulant in general. Its square root matrix is

$$G^{1/2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ b^* & a \end{bmatrix} \quad (21)$$

with $a^2 + |b|^2 = 1$ and $2ab = \chi$. By virtue of Theorem 3 the SRM is optimal. A simple algebra shows that

$$a = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{1 + \sqrt{1 - |\chi|^2}}, \quad (22)$$

so that the *Helstrom bound*

$$P_c = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \sqrt{1 - |\chi|^2} \right) \quad (23)$$

holds. This is perhaps the simplest proof of the Helstrom bound, at least for equilikely states. In the literature the SRM is usually presented in connection with GUS states having equal probabilities. However, the extension to other situations is possible (see [24] for a detailed, but scarcely constructive, theoretical analysis). Recently Kato [25] has found a closed form expression of the input probabilities for which the measurement operators obtained from the not weighted Gram matrix are optimal in the case of three coherent states $|\alpha\rangle$, $|0\rangle$ and $|\alpha\rangle$.

III. MULTIPLE CONSTELLATIONS OF GUS STATES

Here we consider a collection of sm states $\{|\gamma_{ki}\rangle\}$, $k = 1, \dots, s$, $i = 0, \dots, m-1$, defined as

$$|\gamma_{ki}\rangle = S^i |\gamma_{k0}\rangle, \quad (24)$$

where S is a unitary operator such that $S^m = I$. In other words the set of states is formed by s constellations of GUS states obtained by the same unitary operator S , starting from s different states $|\gamma_{k0}\rangle$. Moreover we relax the hypothesis of equal probabilities, only assuming that the states of each constellation have the same probability, namely, $q_{ki} = q_k$ with $\sum_k q_k = 1/m$. Under these assumptions we find a sufficient and necessary condition for the optimality of the SRM. This is a particularization of the concept of *compound geometrical uniform* (CGU) states, introduced by Eldar *et al.* [18], where $|\gamma_{ki}\rangle = S^i |\gamma_{k0}\rangle$ and the m unitary operators S^i form a (not necessarily Abelian) multiplicative group.

We begin by ordering the states as

$$|\gamma_{10}\rangle, \dots, |\gamma_{1,m-1}\rangle, \dots, |\gamma_{s0}\rangle, \dots, |\gamma_{s,m-1}\rangle. \quad (25)$$

The weighted Gram matrix of the states may be partitioned in the form

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} G_{11} & \dots & G_{1s} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ G_{s1} & \dots & G_{ss} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (26)$$

where the s^2 submatrices G_{hk} have order m and entries

$$\begin{aligned} G_{hk}(i, j) &= \langle \tilde{\gamma}_{hi} | \tilde{\gamma}_{kj} \rangle = \sqrt{q_h q_k} \langle \gamma_{hi} | \gamma_{kj} \rangle \\ &= \sqrt{q_h q_k} \langle \gamma_{h0} | S^{j-i} | \gamma_{k0} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that the matrices G_{hk} are circulant and are simultaneously diagonalizable as $G_{hk} = F \Lambda_{hk} F^\dagger$, where F is the Fourier matrix defined in Appendix B. Then $G = F_s \Lambda F_s^\dagger$, with $F_s = F \oplus \dots \oplus F$ and the blocks of

$$\Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_{11} & \dots & \Lambda_{1s} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \Lambda_{s1} & \dots & \Lambda_{ss} \end{bmatrix} \quad (27)$$

are diagonal matrices of order m .

The square root of Λ , say $\Sigma = \Lambda^{1/2}$, has the same structure as Λ . Indeed, by a joint permutation of rows and columns generated by a permutation matrix Π the matrix Λ can be transformed into a block diagonal matrix

$$D = \Pi \Lambda \Pi^T = \begin{bmatrix} D_1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & D_s \end{bmatrix}. \quad (28)$$

Incidentally, the permutation converting the ordering (25) of the states into the ordering

$$|\gamma_{10}\rangle, \dots, |\gamma_{s0}\rangle, \dots, |\gamma_{1,m-1}\rangle, \dots, |\gamma_{s,m-1}\rangle \quad (29)$$

is the natural choice. Since the matrix $\Lambda = F_s^\dagger G F_s$ is positive definite as G , also $D = \Pi \Lambda \Pi^T$ and its diagonal blocks D_k are positive definite. Then

$$D^{1/2} = \Pi \Lambda^{1/2} \Pi^T = \begin{bmatrix} D_1^{1/2} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & D_s^{1/2} \end{bmatrix} \quad (30)$$

is well defined. Applying to $D^{1/2}$ the inverse permutation Π^T one gets $G^{1/2} = F_s \Lambda^{1/2} F_s^{-1}$, where

$$\Lambda^{1/2} = \Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_{11} & \dots & \Sigma_{1s} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \Sigma_{s1} & \dots & \Sigma_{ss} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (31)$$

where the blocks Σ_{hk} are diagonal matrices of order m .

The diagonal blocks of the square root of the weighted Gram matrix are $(G^{1/2})_{hh} = F \Sigma_{hh} F^\dagger$. This results in a circulant matrix with diagonal elements, say g_h , depending on h . The condition of optimality of the SRM (see Theorem 3) is satisfied if and only if $g_h = g$ is independent of h . This is summarized by the following theorem.

THEOREM 4. The SRM is optimal for the multiple constellation of GUS states if and only if the diagonal blocks of the square root $G^{1/2}$ of the weighted Gram matrix have equal diagonal entries. \square

An alternative criterion derives from the fact that

$$g_h = \frac{1}{m} \text{Tr}((G^{1/2})_{hh}) = \frac{1}{m} \text{Tr}(F \Sigma_{hh} F^\dagger) = \frac{1}{m} \text{Tr}(\Sigma_{hh}). \quad (32)$$

Then the condition of optimality of the SRM is satisfied if and only if the blocks Σ_{hh} have equal traces.

Finally, provided that the SRM is optimal, the correct decision probability becomes

$$P_c = m s g^2. \quad (33)$$

IV. DOUBLE QUANTUM PSK CONSTELLATION

As a first application of the above theory we consider a double quantum *binary phase shift keying* (BPSK) with four coherent states $|\pm\alpha\rangle$ and $|\pm\beta\rangle$ in a Fock space. The system is a particular case of the scheme discussed in the previous section by setting

$$|\gamma_{10}\rangle = |\alpha\rangle, \quad |\gamma_{11}\rangle = |-\alpha\rangle, \quad |\gamma_{20}\rangle = |\beta\rangle, \quad |\gamma_{21}\rangle = |-\beta\rangle. \quad (34)$$

In this case the symmetry operator is the rotation operator $S = e^{i\pi a^\dagger a}$ with a and a^\dagger annihilation and creation operators in the Fock space giving $S|\alpha\rangle = |-\alpha\rangle$. According to our previous assumption the probabilities of $|\pm\alpha\rangle$ and $|\pm\beta\rangle$ are p and q respectively, with $p + q = 1/2$.

The Gram matrix depends on the inner products

$$\chi = \langle\alpha|\beta\rangle, \quad \eta_\alpha = \langle\alpha|-\alpha\rangle, \quad \eta_\beta = \langle\beta|-\beta\rangle, \quad \xi = \langle\alpha|-\beta\rangle. \quad (35)$$

The blocks of the weighted Gram matrix turn out to be

$$G_{11} = p \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \eta_\alpha \\ \eta_\alpha & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad G_{22} = q \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \eta_\beta \\ \eta_\beta & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (36)$$

$$G_{12} = \sqrt{pq} \begin{bmatrix} \chi & \xi \\ \xi & \chi \end{bmatrix} = G_{21}^*. \quad (37)$$

Applying the discrete Fourier transform (B5) gives the eigenvalues of the block G_{11}

$$\lambda_0 = p(1 + \eta_\alpha), \quad \lambda_1 = p(1 - \eta_\alpha). \quad (38)$$

Similarly, the eigenvalues of G_{12} are

$$\mu_0 = \sqrt{pq}(\chi + \xi), \quad \mu_1 = \sqrt{pq}(\chi - \xi), \quad (39)$$

and the eigenvalues of G_{22}

$$\omega_0 = p(1 + \eta_\beta), \quad \omega_1 = p(1 - \eta_\beta). \quad (40)$$

The weighted Gram matrix is decomposed as $G = F_2 \Lambda F_2^\dagger$, where Λ is the matrix (27) with diagonal blocks $\Lambda_{11} = \text{diag}\{\lambda_0, \lambda_1\}$, $\Lambda_{12} = \text{diag}\{\mu_0, \mu_1\}$ and $\Lambda_{22} = \text{diag}\{\omega_0, \omega_1\}$.

The square root $\Sigma = \Lambda^{1/2}$ can be evaluated taking advantage of the sparsity of the matrix Λ , or, as an alternative, considering the permutation Π that converts the ordering of the states into (29). The result is the block-diagonal matrix (28), which is related to Λ through $D = \Pi \Lambda \Pi^T$, and has diagonal blocks

$$D_1 = \begin{bmatrix} p(1 + \eta_\alpha) & \sqrt{pq}(\chi + \xi) \\ \sqrt{pq}(\chi + \xi)^* & q(1 + \eta_\beta) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (41)$$

$$D_2 = \begin{bmatrix} p(1 - \eta_\alpha) & \sqrt{pq}(\chi - \xi) \\ \sqrt{pq}(\chi - \xi)^* & q(1 - \eta_\beta) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (42)$$

The square root $D^{1/2}$ has the same structure of D , and can be evaluated from the square root of $D_1^{1/2}$ and $D_2^{1/2}$, with

$$D_1^{1/2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p(1 + \eta_\alpha) + q(1 + \eta_\beta) + 2\sqrt{\Delta^{(+)}}}} \times \begin{bmatrix} p(1 + \eta_\alpha) + \sqrt{\Delta^{(+)}} & \sqrt{pq}(\chi + \xi) \\ \sqrt{pq}(\chi + \xi)^* & q(1 + \eta_\beta) + \sqrt{\Delta^{(+)}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (43)$$

where $\Delta^{(+)} = pq[(1 + \eta_\alpha)(1 + \eta_\beta) - |\chi + \xi|^2]$. Similarly the square root of D_2 , which can also be obtained from (43) with the substitutions

$$\eta_\alpha \rightarrow -\eta_\alpha, \quad \eta_\beta \rightarrow -\eta_\beta, \quad \xi \rightarrow -\xi. \quad (44)$$

Finally, the square root $\Sigma = \Lambda^{1/2}$ is obtained applying the inverse permutation Π^T to the block-diagonal matrix $D^{1/2}$. The blocks of Σ are still diagonal, and in particular

$$\Sigma_{11} = \text{diag} \left\{ \frac{p(1 + \eta_\alpha) + \sqrt{\Delta^{(+)}}}{\sqrt{p(1 + \eta_\alpha) + q(1 + \eta_\beta) + 2\sqrt{\Delta^{(+)}}}}, \frac{p(1 - \eta_\alpha) + \sqrt{\Delta^{(-)}}}{\sqrt{p(1 - \eta_\alpha) + q(1 - \eta_\beta) + 2\sqrt{\Delta^{(-)}}}} \right\} \quad (45)$$

and

$$\Sigma_{22} = \text{diag} \left\{ \frac{q(1 + \eta_\beta) + \sqrt{\Delta^{(+)}}}{\sqrt{p(1 + \eta_\alpha) + q(1 + \eta_\beta) + 2\sqrt{\Delta^{(+)}}}}, \frac{q(1 - \eta_\beta) + \sqrt{\Delta^{(-)}}}{\sqrt{p(1 - \eta_\alpha) + q(1 - \eta_\beta) + 2\sqrt{\Delta^{(-)}}}} \right\} \quad (46)$$

with $\Delta^{(-)}$ obtained from $\Delta^{(+)}$ with the substitutions (44). The square root of the weighted Gram matrix is then obtained through the Fourier transform, $G^{1/2} = F_2 \Lambda^{1/2} F_2^{-1}$.

The optimality of SRM can be verified with the aid of Theorem 4, or, as an alternative, through the conditions (32). Given a set of parameters α , β and p , the optimality is not assured. However, it is worthwhile to investigate how one of the parameters should be optimized given the others, in order to meet the optimality conditions. This is the topic of this section, where we investigate the optimization of the variable p given the parameters α , β . Although this optimization can be (numerically) performed for arbitrary α , β , we focus our attention on two particular cases.

A. Case $|\alpha| = |\beta|$

As a first case, we consider $|\alpha| = |\beta|$. Practical application of this case arises when the transmitter, supposed to produce a Quaternary-PSK, has a misalignment or a systematic bias error in the angle defining one of the two constellations. Without loss of generality, the alphabet can be defined with two real parameters, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\beta = \alpha e^{i\delta}$, with $\delta \in [0, \pi/2]$ defining the angular shift between the two binary constellations.

The entries in the weighted Gram matrix G simplifies, and the inner products between the states become

$$\chi = e^{-\alpha^2(1-e^{i\delta})}, \quad \eta_\alpha = \eta_\beta = e^{-2\alpha^2}, \quad \xi = e^{-\alpha^2(1+e^{i\delta})}.$$

It is immediate to verify that with these positions, condition (32) for the optimality of the SRM is satisfied by $p = q = 1/4$. That is, the equal prior probability between the symbols gives the optimality of SRM, even in the case $\delta \neq \frac{\pi}{2}$.

The probability of correct detection is obtained employing (32) and (33), resulting in

$$P_c = \frac{1}{16} \left(\sqrt{1 + \eta_\alpha + |\chi + \xi|} + \sqrt{1 + \eta_\alpha - |\chi + \xi|} + \sqrt{1 - \eta_\alpha + |\chi - \xi|} + \sqrt{1 - \eta_\alpha - |\chi - \xi|} \right)^2$$

In Fig. 1 the performances of the Double BPSK are plotted as a function of the mean photon number $|\alpha|^2$ employed in each transmitted state. In the figure, different curves correspond to the values of the phase shift $\delta = 0, \pi/8, \pi/4, 3\pi/8, \pi/2$. As we can see, the lines




FIG. 1: (Color online) Probability of correct detection for a Double BPSK constellation, as a function of the mean photon number $|\alpha|^2$ employed in the transmission of each state. From the top to the bottom, the performance of different values of δ as they appear in the legend.

are monotonically increasing in both the value of $|\alpha|^2$ and δ . In addition, the performances are similar when δ is around $\pi/2$, which is the situation of the Quaternary PSK, while they drop quickly for lower values of the phase shift.

B. Case $\beta = 3\alpha$

As a second case of study, we consider $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $\beta = 3\alpha$. This set of constellations corresponds to the modulation scheme known as 4-Pulse Amplitude Modulation (PAM). While usually an equal prior probability is assumed for the transmitted states, here we study the optimization of this probability such that the SRM are optimal.

The inner products between the states read

$$\begin{aligned} \chi &= \langle \alpha | 3\alpha \rangle = e^{-2\alpha^2} = \eta_\alpha, \\ \eta_\beta &= \langle 3\alpha | -3\alpha \rangle = e^{-18\alpha^2} = \eta_\alpha^9, \\ \xi &= \langle \alpha | -3\alpha \rangle = e^{-8\alpha^2} = \eta_\alpha^4. \end{aligned}$$

Again, we resort to conditions (32) in order to find the value of p that makes the SRM optimal. In this case, there are no evident solutions, and the authors could not find any closed form solution, so we turn to numerical algorithms to find the optimal value.

The results of the numerical optimization are plotted in Fig. 2, as a function of the mean photon number $|\alpha|^2$ of the states $|\pm\alpha\rangle$. Note that while for low values of α the prior p moves away from equal distribution, the optimal solution tends to $p = 0.25$ as the value of α increases. The corresponding performance is plotted in Fig. 3, which show an increase in the performance as the value of $|\alpha|^2$ increases.




FIG. 2: (Color online) Optimal prior probability p of the state $|\pm\alpha\rangle$ of the Double BPSK modulation, in the case $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $\beta = 3\alpha$.




FIG. 3: (Color online) Probability of error of a 4-PAM system with optimized a priori probability and Square Root Measurement at the receiver. On the x axis, the mean photon number employed in the transmitted state $|\pm\alpha\rangle$.

We have compared the performance of the SRM with optimal a priori probabilities with the performances of both the SRM and the optimal measurement (evaluated via semidefinite programming [6]) with equal a priori probabilities. The results are practically indistinguishable if plotted as in Fig. 3. This further confirms that SRM is really a very good measurement in cases of practical interest. In particular, in the present case, optimizing the a priori probabilities does not reduce in significant way the error probability.

V. DOUBLE QUANTUM PPM CONSTELLATION

A. Simple quantum PPM constellation

A popular scheme proposed for deep space quantum communications is the *pulse position modulation* (PPM) [26]. This scheme can be modeled in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes m}$ formed by m replicas of the Fock space \mathcal{H} . The states used by Alice are m tensor products

$$|\gamma_i\rangle = |\gamma_{i0}\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\gamma_{i,m-1}\rangle \quad (47)$$

where only $|\gamma_{ii}\rangle$ coincides with a coherent state $|\alpha\rangle$, while the other coincide with the null state $|0\rangle$. For instance, for $m = 3$, the states are

$$\begin{aligned} |\gamma_0\rangle &= |\alpha\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle, \\ |\gamma_1\rangle &= |0\rangle \otimes |\alpha\rangle \otimes |0\rangle, \\ |\gamma_2\rangle &= |0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \otimes |\alpha\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

In practical realizations, in correspondence with the symbol i the laser radiates only in the i -th slot of a time frame of m slots.

Although the symmetry of the states is apparent (every state is a cyclic permutation of the preceding), the evaluation of the unitary symmetry operator S in the tensor space $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes m}$ is by no means trivial [17]. In any case, provided that the states have equal probabilities $1/m$, the weighted Gram matrix is given by

$$G = \frac{1}{m} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \chi & \dots & \chi \\ \chi & 1 & \dots & \chi \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \chi & \chi & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (49)$$

with $\chi = \langle \alpha|0\rangle\langle 0|\alpha\rangle = e^{-\alpha^2}$ (without loss of generality α is assumed real). Since $G^{1/2}$ is circulant as G , the SRM is optimal. Applying the discrete Fourier transform (B5) gives the eigenvalues of G

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_0 &= \frac{1}{m} [1 + (m-1)\chi], \\ \lambda_k &= \frac{1}{m} (1 - \chi), \quad k = 1, \dots, m-1. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Applying to the eigenvalues $\lambda_k^{1/2}$ of $G^{1/2}$ the inverse discrete Fourier transform (B6), one gets the first row of $G^{1/2}$, namely,

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 &= \frac{1}{m\sqrt{m}} \left[\sqrt{1 + (m-1)\chi} + (m-1)\sqrt{1-\chi} \right], \\ c_1 &= \dots = c_{m-1} = \frac{1}{m\sqrt{m}} \left[\sqrt{1 + (m-1)\chi} - \sqrt{1-\chi} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $G^{1/2}$ has the same structure of G with equal entries out of the diagonal.

The correct detection probability is obtained by (19) and is

$$P_c = mc_0^2 = \frac{1}{m^2} \left[\sqrt{1 + (m-1)\chi} + (m-1)\sqrt{1-\chi} \right]^2$$

B. Double quantum PPM constellation

Here we propose a new PPM scheme with the goal of doubling the number of the states and, possibly, of improving the capacity of the quantum communication system. We consider a double constellation in $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$

$$|\gamma_{10}\rangle, \dots, |\gamma_{1,m-1}\rangle \quad |\gamma_{20}\rangle, \dots, |\gamma_{2,m-1}\rangle.$$

where, as in the ordinary quantum PPM, $|\gamma_{1i}\rangle$ includes only one non null state $|\alpha\rangle$ in the i -th slot, while $|\gamma_{2i}\rangle$ includes only one non null state $|\alpha\rangle$ in the i -th slot. To maintain the symmetry of the problem, we assume that the states have equal probability $1/(2m)$. The weighted Gram matrix turns out to be

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} H & K \\ K & H \end{bmatrix}$$

where $H_{ij} = \langle \gamma_{0i} | \gamma_{0j} \rangle = \langle \gamma_{1i} | \gamma_{1j} \rangle$ and $K_{ij} = \langle \gamma_{0i} | \gamma_{1j} \rangle = \langle \gamma_{1i} | \gamma_{0j} \rangle$. Simple considerations lead to the following circulant matrices

$$H = \frac{1}{2m} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \chi & \dots & \chi \\ \chi & 1 & \dots & \chi \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \chi & \chi & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad K = \frac{1}{2m} \begin{bmatrix} \chi^2 & \chi & \dots & \chi \\ \chi & \chi^2 & \dots & \chi \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \chi & \chi & \dots & \chi^2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The discrete Fourier transform (B5) gives the eigenvalues of H

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_0 &= \frac{1}{2m} [1 + (m-1)\chi], \\ \lambda_k &= \frac{1}{2m} (1 - \chi), \quad k = 1, \dots, m-1. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

and the eigenvalues of K

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_0 &= \frac{1}{2m} [\chi^2 + (m-1)\chi], \\ \mu_k &= \frac{1}{2m} (\chi^2 - \chi), \quad k = 1, \dots, m-1. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Then $G = F_2 \Lambda F_2^\dagger$ with

$$\Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_0 & \Lambda_1 \\ \Lambda_1 & \Lambda_0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (53)$$

where $\Lambda_0 = \text{diag}\{\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{m-1}\}$ and $\Lambda_1 = \text{diag}\{\mu_0, \dots, \mu_{m-1}\}$. It follows that

$$G^{1/2} = F_2 \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_0 & \Sigma_1 \\ \Sigma_1 & \Sigma_0 \end{bmatrix} F_2^\dagger = \begin{bmatrix} R & T \\ T & R \end{bmatrix}, \quad (54)$$

where the diagonal matrices Σ_0 and Σ_1 satisfy the conditions $\Sigma_0^2 + \Sigma_1^2 = \Lambda_0$ and $2\Sigma_0\Sigma_1 = \Lambda_1$. Since the diagonal blocks of Σ coincide, the SRM is optimal. Simple computations lead to $\Sigma_0 = \text{diag}\{\nu_0, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_1\}$ and

$\Sigma_1 = \text{diag}\{\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{m-1}\}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_0 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{8m}} \left[\sqrt{1 + \chi^2 + 2(m-1)\chi} + \sqrt{1 - \chi^2} \right], \\ \nu_1 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{8m}} \left[1 - \chi + \sqrt{1 - \chi^2} \right], \\ \xi_0 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{8m}} \left[\sqrt{1 + \chi^2 + 2(m-1)\chi} - \sqrt{1 - \chi^2} \right], \\ \xi_1 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{8m}} \left[1 - \chi - \sqrt{1 - \chi^2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, using the inverse discrete transform (B6), we get the first rows of the circulant matrices R and T

$$\begin{aligned} r_0 &= \frac{1}{2m\sqrt{2m}} \left[\sqrt{1 + 2(m-1)\chi + \chi^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (m-1)(1 - \chi) + m\sqrt{1 - \chi^2} \right] \\ t_0 &= \frac{1}{2m\sqrt{2m}} \left[\sqrt{1 + 2(m-1)\chi + \chi^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (m-1)(1 - \chi) - m\sqrt{1 - \chi^2} \right] \\ r_i &= t_i = \frac{1}{2m\sqrt{2m}} \left[\sqrt{1 + 2(m-1)\chi + \chi^2} - (1 - \chi) \right], \\ &\quad i = 1, \dots, m-1. \end{aligned}$$

Note that R and T have equal entries out of the diagonal as a consequence of the particular symmetry.

Finally (33) gives the correct decision probability of the double PPM

$$P_c = 2mr_0^2 = \frac{1}{4m^2} \left[\sqrt{1 + \chi^2 + 2(m-1)\chi} \right. \\ \left. + (m-1)(1 - \chi) + m\sqrt{1 - \chi^2} \right]^2$$

C. Mutual information comparison

In Fig. 4 the error probabilities of the simple and double PPM are compared for $m = 2$ and $m = 16$ in terms of the mean number of photons per symbol α^2 related to the parameter χ by $\chi = e^{-\alpha^2}$. The error probability of double PPM is larger, but its states are twice as many. Then a significant comparison requires the evaluation of the informations transferred by the systems.

The channel defined by the simple PPM is a symmetric channel with joint input-output probabilities $p(i, i) = c_0^2$ and $p(i, j) = c_1^2$ for $j \neq i$. The marginal probabilities are uniform $p(i) = p(j) = 1/m$. Then the mutual information turns out to be

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \sum_{i,j=0}^{m-1} p(i, j) \log \frac{p(i, j)}{p(i)p(j)} \\ &= 2 \log m + mc_0^2 \log c_0^2 + m(m-1)c_1^2 \log c_1^2 \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

The channel defined by the double PPM has joint input-output probabilities $p(i, i) = c_0^2$, $p(i, m+i) =$




FIG. 4: (Color online) Probability of error of m -PPM (dashed) and m -Double PPM (solid), for $m = 2$ (lower lines) and $m = 16$ (upper lines). On the x axis, the mean photon number employed in the transmitted state, $|\alpha|^2$.

$p(m+i, i) = t_0^2$, $i = 0, \dots, m-1$, while the other $4m^2 - 4m$ crossover probabilities have common value r_i . The marginal probabilities are uniform $p(i) = p(j) = 1/(2m)$ as a consequence of the symmetry. In conclusion the mutual information turns out to be

$$I_2 = \sum_{i,j=0}^{2m-1} p(i, j) \log \frac{p(i, j)}{p(i)p(j)} = 2 \log(2m) + 2mr_0^2 \log r_0^2 + 2mt_0^2 \log t_0^2 + 4(m-1)mr_i^2 \log r_i^2 \quad (56)$$

Asymptotically, as α increases (and χ tends to zero), I_1 tends to $\log m$ and I_2 tends to $\log(2m)$ with a gain of one bit per symbol. The mutual informations I_1 and I_2 , coinciding with the capacities of the channels, are compared in Fig. 5 for $m = 2$ and $m = 16$.

Two remarks are adequate. First, the double PPM scheme is a combination of the simple PPM scheme and of a binary PSK scheme. Further gain could be obtained combining PPM with k -PSK, using k PPM constellation with non empty states $|\alpha e^{i2\pi r/k}\rangle$, $r = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$. Second, from a practical point of view, double PPM implies some complications, both on the transmitter and on receiver side. At the transmitter the on-off modulation must be replaced by a phase modulation, while at the receiver a simple photon counter must be replaced by a phase sensitive device. We do not insist on these topics that are beyond the scope of the paper.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The square root measurement furnishes an alternative approach to the reliable discrimination of quantum states. This measurement is only suboptimal, in general,




FIG. 5: (Color online) Mutual information between the transmitted and estimated symbols, for a m -PPM (dashed) and m -Double PPM (solid) constellation, in the case of $m = 2$ (lower lines) and $m = 16$ (upper lines). On the x axis, the mean photon number employed in the transmitted state, $|\alpha|^2$.

but it is well known that it turns to be optimal for quantum states enjoying geometrically uniform symmetry. In this paper, we showed that the square root measurement is optimal also in other situations of practical interest. In particular we found necessary and sufficient conditions for the optimality in the presence of multiple constellations of symmetrical states also with non uniform probabilities. As an application example we considered the case of two pairs of quantum binary symmetrical states (PSK states). Finally, the theory is applied to a possible improvement of the pulse position modulation (PPM) scheme that increases the capacity of the resulting channel.

Acknowledgments

Nicola Dalla Pozza acknowledges partial support by the ‘Borsa Gini’ scholarship, awarded by ‘Fondazione Aldo Gini’, Padova, Italy.

Appendix A: Proof of Theorem 2

We apply the Theorem 1 to the operators $W_i = |\tilde{\gamma}_i\rangle\langle\tilde{\gamma}_i|$ and $P_i = |\mu_i\rangle\langle\mu_i|$ and preliminarily note the following matrix representations of Y , W_r and $Y^{(r)} = Y - W_r$ in terms of the orthonormal basis $\{|\mu_i\rangle\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\mu_i|Y|\mu_j\rangle &= X_{ij}X_{jj}^*, & \langle\mu_i|W_r|\mu_j\rangle &= X_{ir}X_{jr}^*, \\ Y_{ij}^{(r)} &= X_{ij}X_{jj}^* - X_{ir}X_{jr}^*. \end{aligned} \quad (A1)$$

If the measurement is optimal statement i) follows directly from (4) and $Y = XX_d^*$ is semidefinite positive.

Since X is not singular, it remains to prove that the diagonal entries of X_d (of X) are different from 0. Assume that $X_{00} = \langle \mu_0 | \tilde{\gamma}_0 \rangle = 0$. Then, it must exist $j \neq 0$ such that $X_j = \langle \mu_0 | \tilde{\gamma}_j \rangle \neq 0$, for otherwise all the states $|\tilde{\gamma}_j\rangle$ would be orthogonal to $|\mu_0\rangle$ against the assumption of their linear independence. Without loss of generality, assume that $X_{01} \neq 0$. As a consequence of i) we have also $X_{11} = 0$. Now, if we change the roles of the measurement vectors $|\mu_0\rangle$ and $|\mu_1\rangle$, the matrix X is modified in \hat{X} , with $\hat{X}_{jj} = X_{jj}$ for $j > 1$, $\hat{X}_{00} = X_{10}$, and $\hat{X}_{11} = X_{01}$. Denoted by \hat{P}_c the new correct decision probability, we get $\hat{P}_c - P_c = |X_{01}|^2 + |X_{10}|^2 > 0$ contradicting the optimality of X . One concludes that X_d has non zero diagonal entries and XX_d^* is definite positive. In order to prove the sufficiency note that the matrices $Y^{(r)}$ are Hermitian and $Y = Y^{(r)} + |\tilde{\gamma}_r\rangle\langle\tilde{\gamma}_r|$. Then they satisfy the conditions of a theorem on the eigenvalues of Hermitian matrices [22, Theorem 4.3.4] which states that, denoted by ν_i the eigenvalues of $Y^{(r)}$ and by λ_i the eigenvalues of Y arranged in increasing order, we have

$$\nu_1 \leq \lambda_1 \leq \nu_2 \leq \dots \leq \nu_m \leq \lambda_m. \quad (\text{A2})$$

If Y is positive definite, it follows that $\lambda_1 > 0$. Since in $Y^{(r)}$ the r -th column vanishes, at least one of its eigenvalues vanishes and $\nu_1 = 0$. One concludes that all eigenvalue of $Y^{(r)}$ are non negative and $Y^{(r)}$ is semidefinite positive. Since this holds true for each r , the condition (4) of Theorem 1 is satisfied and the operators $P_i = |\mu_i\rangle\langle\mu_i|$ provide the optimal measurement.

Appendix B: Circulant matrices

We collect in this appendix for convenience some properties of the circulant matrices which are used in the paper. For more details the reader is deferred to the literature on the topic, for instance [23].

A matrix G of order m is said *circulant* if

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} c_0 & c_1 & \dots & c_{m-1} \\ c_{m-1} & c_0 & \dots & c_{m-2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_1 & c_2 & \dots & c_0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{B1})$$

i.e., if

$$G_{ij} = c_{(j-i) \bmod m}. \quad (\text{B2})$$

In other words G is circulant if its rows are cyclic permutation of the first row. A matrix G is circulant if and only if has spectral decomposition

$$G = F \Lambda F^\dagger \quad (\text{B3})$$

where F is the (unitary) *Fourier matrix* with entries

$$F_{hk} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} e^{i2\pi kh/m}, \quad h, k = 0, \dots, m-1 \quad (\text{B4})$$

and the diagonal matrix $\Lambda = \text{diag}\{\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{m-1}\}$ collects the eigenvalues of G . The circulant matrices of order m form a multiplicative commutative group of matrices simultaneously diagonalizable. The eigenvalues of the circulant matrix G can be obtained from the first row of the matrix via the *discrete Fourier transform*

$$\lambda_k = \sum_{r=0}^{m-1} c_r e^{i2\pi kr/m}. \quad (\text{B5})$$

Finally, the inverse discrete Fourier transform gives the first row of G

$$c_r = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \lambda_k e^{-i2\pi kr/m}. \quad (\text{B6})$$

-
- [1] C. W. Helstrom, *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory* (Academic Press, New York, 1976).
 - [2] A. Holevo, *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **3**, 337 (1973).
 - [3] H. P. Yuen, R. S. Kennedy, and M. Lax, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **21**, 125 (1975).
 - [4] S. M. Barnett and S. Croke, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **42**, 062001 (2009).
 - [5] R. Konig, R. Renner, and C. Schaffner, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **55**, 4337 (2009).
 - [6] Y. Eldar, A. Megretski, and G. Verghese, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **49**, 1007 (2003).
 - [7] V. P. Belavkin, *Stochastics* **1**, 315 (1975).
 - [8] R. S. Kennedy, *Research Laboratory of Electronics, MIT Quarterly Progress Report No. 110* pp. 142–146 (1973).
 - [9] P. Hausladen and W. K. Wootters, *Journal of Modern Optics* **41**, 2385 (1994).
 - [10] Y. C. Eldar and G. D. J. Forney, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **47**, 858 (2001).
 - [11] P. Hausladen, R. Jozsa, B. Schumacher, M. Westmoreland, and W. K. Wootters, *Physical Review A* **54**, 1869 (1996).
 - [12] D. Bacon, A. Childs, and W. van Dam, in *46th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'05)* (IEEE, 2005), pp. 469–478.
 - [13] C. Moore and A. Russell, *Quantum Information & Computation* **7**, 752 (2007).
 - [14] M. Hayashi, A. Kawachi, and H. Kobayashi, *Quantum Information & Computation* **8**, 345 (2008).
 - [15] M. Ban, K. Kurokawa, R. Momose, and O. Hirota, *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **36**, 1269 (1997).
 - [16] K. Kato, M. Osaki, M. Sasaki, and O. Hirota, *IEEE Transactions on Communications* **47**, 248 (1999).
 - [17] G. Cariolaro and G. Pierobon, *IEEE Transactions on*

- Communications **58**, 1213 (2010).
- [18] Y. C. Eldar, A. Megretski, and G. Verghese, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **50**, 1198 (2004).
 - [19] G. Cariolaro and G. Pierobon, IEEE Transactions on Communications **58**, 623 (2010).
 - [20] C. Helstrom, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **28**, 359 (1982).
 - [21] M. Sasaki, K. Kato, M. Izutsu, and O. Hirota, Physical Review A **58**, 146 (1998).
 - [22] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis* (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1990).
 - [23] P. J. Davis, *Circulant Matrices: Second Edition*, AMS Chelsea Publishing (Wiley, New York, 1979).
 - [24] C. Mochon, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 032328 (2006).
 - [25] K. Kato, Tamagawa University Quantum ICT Research Institute Bulletin **3**, 29 (2013).
 - [26] S. Dolinar, J. Hamkins, B. Moision, and V. Vilnrotter, in *Deep Space Optical Communications*, edited by H. Hemmati (Wiley, Hoboken, New Jersey, 2006), chap. 4.