

Broadcasting of nonlocality in two qubit systems

Dhruvil Patel,¹ Arup Roy,² Indranil Chakrabarty,³ and Nirman Ganguly^{4,*}

¹Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 70803, USA

²S. N. Bose National Centre for Basic Sciences, Block JD, Sector III, Salt Lake, Kolkata-700098, India.

³Center for Security, Theory and Algorithmic Research,

International Institute of Information Technology-Hyderabad, Gachibowli, Telangana-500032, India

⁴Department of Mathematics, Birla Institute of Technology and Science Pilani, Hyderabad Campus, Telangana-500078, India.

Bell non-locality and steering are essential features of quantum mechanics which mark significant departures from classical notion. They basically refer to the presence of quantum correlations between separated systems which violate a non-local inequality, the violation being not possible if we restrict ourselves only to classical correlations. In view of the importance of such unique correlations one may be interested to generate more non-local states starting from a few, a protocol which is termed as broadcasting. However in the present submission we show that if one restricts to broadcasting through quantum cloning, then such non-local states cannot be broadcasted. Our study is done in the purview of the Bell-CHSH inequality and a steering inequality pertaining to three measurement settings. We also find suitable restrictions on the Werner and Bell diagonal states which will make them unsteerable under any number of measurement settings, after broadcasting.

I. INTRODUCTION

Bell's inequality [1] provides a significant yardstick for the presence of non-locality in a system. The fact that some quantum states violate Bell's inequality and are thus non-local, contributed significantly to our understanding of the foundational issues in quantum mechanics [1]. A plethora of work also exploited non-locality from an information processing perspective leading to works on quantum cryptography [2, 3], Steering, a notion first envisaged by Schrodinger [4] and later given an operational interpretation in [5], is another form of non-local correlations is considered as a hybrid between entanglement and Bell non-locality [6, 7]. Alike Bell non-locality various steering inequalities have been proposed to witness steerability in quantum systems [8–18].

Given the importance of a quantum resource, a tactical scheme could be to generate more such resources through copying. However, the no-cloning theorem in quantum mechanics [19] puts a restriction on perfect cloning. The No cloning theorem states that there exists no quantum mechanical process that can take two different non-orthogonal quantum states $|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle$ into states $|\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle \otimes |\psi_2\rangle$ respectively. Even though we cannot copy an unknown quantum state perfectly but quantum mechanics never rules out the possibility of cloning it approximately [20–23]. It also allows probabilistic cloning as one can always clone an arbitrary quantum state perfectly with some non-zero probability of success [21, 24].

Buzek et al. introduced the concept of approximate cloning with certain fidelity. In this process, the state independent quantum copying machine was introduced by keeping the fidelity of cloning independent of the input state parameters. This machine is popularly known as universal quantum cloning machine (UQCM) [23] which was later

proven to be optimal [25, 26]. Apart from this, there are also state dependent QCMs for which the quality of copies depend on the input state [24].

On a different but close perspective, the term broadcasting can be used in different contexts. Classical theory permits broadcasting of information, however that is not the case for all states in quantum theory. In this context, Barnum *et. al* were the first to show that non-commuting mixed states do not meet the criteria of broadcasting [27]. It is impossible to have a process which will perfectly broadcast an arbitrary quantum state [28]. Interestingly when we talk about broadcasting of correlations (resources in general) we refer to a situation that the correlations in a two qubit state ρ^{ab} are locally broadcastable if there exist two operations, $\Sigma^a: S(\mathbb{H}^a) \rightarrow S(\mathbb{H}^{a_1} \otimes \mathbb{H}^{a_2})$ and $\Sigma^b: S(\mathbb{H}^b) \rightarrow S(\mathbb{H}^{b_1} \otimes \mathbb{H}^{b_2})$ such that $I(\rho^{a_1 b_1}) = I(\rho^{a_2 b_2}) = I(\rho^{ab})$. Here, $I(\rho^{ab})$ is the correlation measure, $\rho^{a_1 a_2 b_1 b_2} := \Sigma^a \otimes \Sigma^b(\rho^{ab})$ and $\rho^{a_i b_i} := \text{Tr}_{a_j b_j}(\rho^{a_1 a_2 b_1 b_2})$. One of the possible examples of the operations Σ^a, Σ^b are quantum cloning operations. Using local and non-local cloning operations we are able to broadcast entanglement from one pair of states to larger number of pairs for a smaller range of input state parameters. As an input state we did not only restrict ourselves to $2 \otimes 2$ states [22, 29–33] but also consider resource states from higher dimension [34]. In addition to this progress were also made in broadcasting of general resources like coherence and correlation that goes beyond the notion of entanglement [32–35].

In the present submission, we probe the possibility of generating more number of non-local resources starting from a few. The study is done in the ambit of the Bell-CHSH inequality and a steering inequality with three measurement settings. We exhibit that it is impossible to broadcast non-locality under the constraint of broadcasting through cloning. We also find that Werner and Bell diagonal states become unsteerable under any number of measurements, for some values of their parameters after broadcasting.

* nirmanganguly@gmail.com

II. SOME USEFUL DEFINITION AND CONCEPTS

In this section we briefly revisit some basic concepts like non locality of quantum states and quantum cloning. All these concepts will be useful and relevant for the main findings of our manuscript.

A. General two qubit mixed state

In this paper, we use a general two qubit mixed state (shared by parties numbered 1 and 2) as a resource state for some operations, and it is represented in the canonical form as,

$$\rho_{12} = \frac{1}{4}[\mathbb{I}_4 + \sum_{i=1}^3 (x_i \sigma_i \otimes \mathbb{I}_2 + y_i \mathbb{I}_2 \otimes \sigma_i) + \sum_{i,j=1}^3 t_{ij} \sigma_i \otimes \sigma_j] = \{\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \mathbb{T}\} \quad (\text{say}), \quad (1)$$

where $x_i = \text{Tr}[\rho_{12}(\sigma_i \otimes \mathbb{I}_2)]$, $y_i = \text{Tr}[\rho_{12}(\mathbb{I}_2 \otimes \sigma_i)]$ are local Bloch vectors. The correlation matrix is given by $\mathbb{T} = [t_{ij}]$ where $t_{ij} = \text{Tr}[\rho_{12}(\sigma_i \otimes \sigma_j)]$ with $[\sigma_i; i = \{1, 2, 3\}]$ are $2 \otimes 2$ Pauli matrices and \mathbb{I}_n is the identity matrix of order n .

B. Non Locality of a Quantum State

Bell non-locality is a phenomenon arising out of some measurements made on a composite system, contradicting the assumptions of locality and realism. Bell's inequality provides a convenient tool to detect non-locality. Any state that violates this inequality is said to exhibit Bell non-locality. Bell nonlocality, *a-priori* has nothing to do with quantum mechanics, however certain correlations arising from quantum states violate a suitably chosen Bell's inequality and thus underscore the presence of non-local correlations.

Quantum steering is the manifestation of the non-classical correlations obtained between the outcomes of measurements applied on one part of an entangled state and the post-measurement states remaining with the other part. Although noted by Schrodinger in his seminal paper [4], the notion of steering gained prominence with an operational reformulation in [5]. A steering test can be seen as an entanglement test where one of the parties performs measurements. Thus, steering can be considered as a form of non-locality occupying a place between entanglement and Bell non-locality [6, 7].

A much weaker form of non-locality is quantum entanglement. A quantum state is called entangled if it cannot be expressed as a convex combination of product states. The inability to write the state in the above form gives rise to the identification of entanglement as a key quantum resource. We now put down the formal mathematical definition of the above features.

Bell non-locality: Consider that there are two parties Alice and Bob. Let \mathbf{D}_α and \mathbf{D}_β represent the set of observ-

ables on Alice's and Bob's side respectively. Let the corresponding sets of measurements (which are subsets of the respective set of observables) be represented by \mathbf{M}_α and \mathbf{M}_β . If we restrict ourselves to projective measurements, then

$$P(a, b|A, B; \rho) = \text{Tr}[(\Pi_a^A \otimes \Pi_b^B)\rho] \quad (2)$$

here, $P(a, b|A, B; \rho)$ represents the probability obtained and a, b are respective eigenvalues of $A \in \mathbf{D}_\alpha, B \in \mathbf{D}_\beta$ and Π_a^A, Π_b^B are the respective projectors.

Bell nonlocality is said to be exhibited by a state ρ if there is at least one probability which cannot be written in the form given below:

$$P(a, b|A, B; \rho) = \sum_{\xi} p(a|A, \xi) p(b|B, \xi) \quad (3)$$

here, $p(a|A, \xi), p(b|B, \xi)$ are some probability distributions.

In [36, 37], Horodecki et. al found closed form pertaining to the violation of the Bell-CHSH inequality optimized over all possible measurements. The maximum Bell-CHSH violation $S(\rho_{12})$ for a two-qubit state ρ_{12} is given by,

$$S(\rho_{12}) = 2\sqrt{M(\rho_{12})}, \quad (4)$$

where $M(\rho_{12}) = m_1 + m_2$, where m_1 and m_2 are the largest eigenvalues of the matrix $U = T_{\rho_{12}}^t T_{\rho_{12}}$ (t being the transpose of the matrix). Here $T_{\rho_{12}}$ is the correlation matrix of the state ρ_{12} with entries $(T_{\rho_{12}})_{ij} = \text{Tr}(\sigma_i \otimes \sigma_j \rho_{12})$. For a two-qubit state ρ_{12} , violation of the Bell-CHSH inequality implies that the Bell-CHSH value S is greater than 2. Therefore, a two qubit state violates the Bell-CHSH inequality iff

$$M(\rho_{12}) > 1, \quad (5)$$

Quantum Steering: Steering, as noted earlier lies between entanglement and Bell nonlocality, and a state can be defined to be steerable from Alice to Bob if there is at least one probability which cannot be written as,

$$P(a, b|A, B; \rho) = \sum_{\xi} p(a|A, \xi) p(b|B, \sigma_{\xi}^B) \quad (6)$$

As we can see from the equation above, steering is an asymmetric property unlike Bell nonlocality and entanglement. Like Bell nonlocality and entanglement there are several linear equalities to detect steerability. In [38] authors have developed a series of steering inequalities to check whether a bipartite state is steerable when both the parties are allowed to perform n measurements on his or her part.

$$F_n(\rho, \mu) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \langle A_i \otimes B_i \rangle \right| \leq 1, \quad (7)$$

The inequalities for $n = 2, 3$ are of the form:

$$F_2(\rho, \mu) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^2 \langle A_i \otimes B_i \rangle \right| \leq 1, \quad (8)$$

$$F_3(\rho, \mu) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^3 \langle A_i \otimes B_i \rangle \right| \leq 1, \quad (9)$$

where $A_i = \hat{u}_i \cdot \vec{s}$, $B_i = \hat{v}_i \cdot \vec{s}$, $\vec{s} = (s_1, s_2, s_3)$ is a vector composed of the Pauli matrices, $\hat{u}_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$ are unit vectors, $\hat{v}_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$ are orthonormal vectors, $\mu = \{\hat{u}_1, \dots, \hat{u}_n, \hat{v}_1, \dots, \hat{v}_n\}$ is the set of measurement directions, $\langle A_i \otimes B_i \rangle = \text{Tr}(\rho A_i \otimes B_i)$ and $\rho \in \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{H}_A \otimes \mathbf{H}_B)$ is some bipartite quantum state.

Entanglement: On an analogous note, a state is said to be entangled if there is atleast one probability which cannot be expressed in the form ,

$$P(a, b|A, B; \rho) = \sum_{\xi} p(a|A, \sigma_{\xi}^A) p(b|B, \sigma_{\xi}^B) \quad (10)$$

C. Cloning

The no-cloning theorem tells us that if we are provided with an unknown quantum state $|\psi\rangle$, it is impossible to construct a complete positive trace preserving map (CPTP) C which in principle will make a copy of the state $|\psi\rangle$ i.e. $C : |\psi\rangle \rightarrow |\psi\rangle \otimes |\psi\rangle$. However, as we have mentioned before this never rules out the existence of approximate quantum cloning machines. In this article for our purpose we consider the optimal and universal quantum cloning machine named as Buzek- Hillery (B-H) cloning machine. Mathematically, the B-H cloning machine (U_{bh}) is a M -dimensional unitary transformation acting on a state $|\psi_i\rangle_{a_0}$ $i = 1, \dots, M$. This state is to be copied on a $|0\rangle_{a_1}$, which we regard as the blank state of the machine. The initial state of the machine or copier is given by $|X\rangle_x$. The transformed state of the machine as a result of the cloning process is given by the set of state vectors $|X_{ii}\rangle_x$ and $|Y_{ij}\rangle_x$. Here a_0, a_1 and x the indices used to represent the input, blank and machine qubits respectively. Here, these transformed state vectors forms an orthonormal basis set in the M -dimensional space. The cloning transformation scheme U_{bh} is given by,

$$U_{bh} |\psi_i\rangle_{a_0} |0\rangle_{a_1} |X\rangle_x \rightarrow c |\psi_i\rangle_{a_0} |\psi_i\rangle_{a_1} |X_{ii}\rangle_x + d \sum_{j \neq i}^M (|\psi_i\rangle_{a_0} |\psi_j\rangle_{a_1} + |\psi_j\rangle_{a_0} |\psi_i\rangle_{a_1}) |Y_{ij}\rangle_x \quad (11)$$

We can make the cloning transformation optimal state independent (U_{bhsi}) by imposing the unitarity and normalization conditions on B-H cloner (U_{bh}) giving rise to the constraint,

$$\langle X_{ii} | X_{ii} \rangle = \langle Y_{ij} | Y_{ij} \rangle = \langle X_{ii} | Y_{ji} \rangle = 1 \quad (12)$$

where we have $\langle X_{ii} | Y_{ij} \rangle = \langle Y_{ji} | Y_{ij} \rangle = \langle X_{ii} | X_{jj} \rangle = 0$ with $i \neq j$ and $c^2 = \frac{2}{M+1}$. Here, we consider $M = 2^m$, m being the number of qubits. The above optimal cloner U_{bhsi} with $M = 2$ becomes a local copier (U_{lbhsi}). From Eq. (1) it is clear that the corresponding values of coefficients c and d will be $\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}$ and $\sqrt{\frac{1}{6}}$ respectively. By putting these values in Eq. (1), we get the optimal state independent cloner which can be used for local copying purposes. For $M = 4$ the above optimal cloner U_{bhsi} turns into a non local copier (U_{nlbhsi}) and the values of the coefficients c and d in Eq. (2) become $\sqrt{\frac{2}{5}}$ and $\sqrt{\frac{1}{10}}$ respectively. On substituting these values in Eq. (1), we obtain the nonlocal optimal state independent cloner .

The B-H state dependent cloner U_{bhsi} can be obtained from this B-H state independent cloning transformation (U_{bhsi}), by relaxing the universality condition: $\frac{\partial D}{\partial \langle X \rangle} = 0$; where $\langle X \rangle$ is the notation used for representing all the parameters of the input state. The distortion D is the measure of distance between the input and output states of the cloner. When $c = d = 1$, the unitarity of the B-H cloning transformation give rise to certain relation on the output states, which are no longer necessarily orthonormal. This is expressed by the condition,

$$\langle X_{ii} | X_{ii} \rangle + \sum_{i \neq j}^M 2 \langle Y_{ij} | Y_{ij} \rangle = 1, \langle Y_{ij} | Y_{kl} \rangle = 0 \quad (13)$$

where $i \neq j$ and $ij \neq kl$ for $i, j, k, l = \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$. We also assume that, $\langle X_{ii} | X_{jk} \rangle = \frac{\mu}{2}$, $\langle Y_{ij} | Y_{ij} \rangle = \lambda$, $\langle X_{ii} | X_{jj} \rangle = \langle X_{ii} | Y_{ij} \rangle = 0$ where $i \neq j$ and $i, j, k = \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$; μ and λ are the machine parameters. We remove the dependence of the distortion D on λ by equating the partial derivative of it with respect to λ equal to zero. Hence in each of the cases, we will be able to calculate the value of λ for which the B-H state dependent cloners become optimal. For local state dependent cloner (U_{lbhsd}), the distortion D is $D_{ab} = \text{Tr}[\rho_{ab}^{out} - \rho_a^{id} \otimes \rho_b^{id}]^2$. Here $|\psi_{a(b)}^{id}\rangle = \alpha |0_{a(b)}^{id}\rangle + \beta |1_{a(b)}^{id}\rangle$ be an arbitrary pure state of a single quantum system in mode a or b , where α and β represents the input state parameters with $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 = 1$ being the normalization condition. Now, $\rho_{a(b)}^{id} = |\psi_{a(b)}^{id}\rangle \langle \psi_{a(b)}^{id}|$ is the state we will be getting if there is an ideal copy. When the cloning fidelity is non-ideal then the output state of the cloner is given by ρ_{ab}^{out} . Solving the equation $\frac{\partial D_a}{\partial \alpha^2} = 0$ where $D_a = \text{Tr}[\rho_a^{out} - \rho_a^{id}]^2$; with $\rho_a^{out} = \text{Tr}_b[\rho_{ab}^{out}]$, we obtain the relation $\mu = 1 - 2\lambda$. and the range of λ to be $[0, 1/2]$. It is interesting to note that here the value $\lambda = \frac{1}{6}$ is restricted, since for such values the B-H optimal state dependent local cloner U_{lbhsd} loses the input state dependence property.

For nonlocal state dependent cloner U_{nlbhsd} the distortion D is now given by $D_{abcd} = \text{Tr}[\rho_{abcd}^{out} - \rho_{ab}^{id} \otimes \rho_{cd}^{id}]^2$. Here, we have taken $|\psi_{ab(cd)}^{id}\rangle = \alpha |0_{ab(cd)}^{id}\rangle + \beta |1_{ab(cd)}^{id}\rangle$ be an arbitrary non maximally entangled state either in mode ab or cd , where α and β represents the input state parameters with $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 = 1$. The output mode state we are supposed to get for an ideal copy is given by, $\rho_{ab(cd)}^{id} = |\psi_{ab(cd)}^{id}\rangle \langle \psi_{ab(cd)}^{id}|$

. However, in a non-ideal case then the output state of the cloner is given by ρ_{abcd}^{out} . Solving the equation $\frac{\partial D_{ab}}{\partial \alpha^2} = 0$ where $D_{ab} = \text{Tr}[\rho_{ab}^{out} - \rho_{ab}^{id}]^2$; with $\rho_{ab}^{out} = \text{Tr}_{cd}[\rho_{abcd}^{out}]$, we obtain $\mu = 1 - 4\lambda$. The allowed range of λ is henceforth is given by the closed interval $[0, 1/4]$. Similar to the previous situation here the value $\lambda = \frac{1}{10}$ is restricted, as we know that for such values it changes to the B-H optimal state independent local cloner U_{nlbhsi} .

III. IMPOSSIBILITY OF BROADCASTING OF QUANTUM NON LOCALITY

The present section details the aspects of broadcasting of non-locality and further probe whether we are able to create more non-local resources from a few. In particular, we apply local cloning operations on individual labs of each party sharing the resource to create more number of resources across the labs.

Let us consider two parties Alice (A) and Bob (B) sharing a general qubit-qubit mixed quantum state ρ_{12} with an additional constraint of being non-local (in terms of violation of Bell-CHSH inequality or the three measurement steering inequality). Also, qubit 3 and qubit 4 serve as the initial blank state in Alice's and Bob's lab respectively. We apply local cloning unitaries $U_A \otimes U_B$ on qubits (1,3) and qubits (2,4). Tracing out ancilla qubit on Alice's and Bob's side respectively, we get the output state as $\tilde{\rho}_{1234}$. We trace out the (2,4) and (1,3) to obtain the output states $\tilde{\rho}_{13}$ on Alice's side and $\tilde{\rho}_{24}$ on Bob's side respectively. Similarly, after tracing out appropriate qubits from the output state, we obtain the two plausible groups of output states $\tilde{\rho}_{14}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{23}$ across Alice's and Bob's laboratory.

The expression for non local outputs states $\tilde{\rho}_{14}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{23}$ across Alice's and Bob's labs are given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_{14} &= \text{Tr}_{23}[\tilde{\rho}_{1234}] \\ &= \text{Tr}_{23}[U_A \otimes U_B(\rho_{12} \otimes Y_{34} \otimes X_{56})U_B^\dagger \otimes U_A^\dagger], \\ \tilde{\rho}_{23} &= \text{Tr}_{14}[\tilde{\rho}_{1234}] \\ &= \text{Tr}_{14}[U_A \otimes U_B(\rho_{12} \otimes Y_{34} \otimes X_{56})U_2^\dagger \otimes U_1^\dagger], \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

while the expression for local output states within Alice's and Bob's labs are given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_{13} &= \text{Tr}_{24}[\tilde{\rho}_{1234}] \\ &= \text{Tr}_{24}[U_A \otimes U_B(\rho_{12} \otimes Y_{34} \otimes X_{56})U_B^\dagger \otimes U_A^\dagger], \\ \tilde{\rho}_{24} &= \text{Tr}_{13}[\tilde{\rho}_{1234}] \\ &= \text{Tr}_{13}[U_A \otimes U_B(\rho_{12} \otimes Y_{34} \otimes X_{56})U_B^\dagger \otimes U_A^\dagger]. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Here Y_{34} and X_{56} represent the initial blank state and machine state respectively. If the states $\tilde{\rho}_{14}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{23}$ are non local for some value of the input parameters, then we say that the non-locality is broadcasted. However, for optimal broadcasting we need the output states $\tilde{\rho}_{13}$ on Alice's side and $\tilde{\rho}_{24}$ on Bob's side to be local with respect to the concerned inequalities.

The nonlocality of an entangled state is said to be broadcast

after the application of nonlocal cloning operation (U_{12}), if for some values of the input state parameters, the desired output states $\tilde{\rho}_{14} = \text{Tr}_{23}[\tilde{\rho}_{1234}] = \text{Tr}_{23}[U_{AB}(\rho_{12} \otimes Y_{34} \otimes X_{56})U_{AB}^\dagger]$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{23} = \text{Tr}_{14}[\tilde{\rho}_{1234}] = \text{Tr}_{14}[U_{AB}(\rho_{12} \otimes Y_{34} \otimes X_{56})U_{AB}^\dagger]$ are non local. It is important to note that for symmetric cloners like Buzek -Hillery cloners outputs $\tilde{\rho}_{14}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{23}$ are identical and for the process instead of checking the pairs $\tilde{\rho}_{14}, \tilde{\rho}_{23}$, we can also check the identical non local pairs $\tilde{\rho}_{12}, \tilde{\rho}_{34}$. Interestingly, in this work we find that it is impossible to broadcast non-locality if we restrict ourselves to B-H cloning machines.

A. Broadcasting of Bell Non Local States

We start with a general two qubit state ρ_{12} , shared by Alice and Bob, which violates the Bell-CHSH inequality i.e., $1 \leq M(\rho_{12}) \leq 2$. In what follow below, we show the impossibility of broadcasting Bell non-locality, considered in the purview of Bell-CHSH inequality.

Theorem 1. *Non-locality of a particular quantum state cannot be broadcasted using Buzek-Hillery state dependent local cloner (U_{lbhsd}).*

Proof. Consider a general two qubit mixed state ρ_{12} as shown in Eq. 1, initially taken as input state and represented in short form as,

$$\rho_{12} = \left\{ \vec{x}, \vec{y}, \mathbb{T} \right\} \quad (16)$$

where \vec{x} and \vec{y} are Bloch vectors and $\mathbb{T} = [t_{ij}]$ is a correlation matrix. Suppose the above quantum state ρ_{12} violates the CHSH inequality then:

$$1 \leq M(\rho_{12}) \leq 2. \quad (17)$$

Here $M(\rho_{12})$ is the sum of two largest eigenvalues (η_1, η_2) of the matrix $\mathbb{T}^T \mathbb{T}$. Therefore we have,

$$1 \leq \eta_1 + \eta_2 \leq 2. \quad (18)$$

After the application of B-H state dependent local cloner U_{lbhsd} to ρ_{12} , the final state will be of the form:

$$\tilde{\rho}_{12} = \left\{ \mu \vec{x}, \mu \vec{y}, \mu^2 \mathbb{T} \right\}. \quad (19)$$

Here λ and μ are the cloning machine parameters. Suppose the two largest eigenvalues of matrix $\mu^4 \mathbb{T}^T \mathbb{T}$ are $(\eta_1', \eta_2') \equiv (\mu^4 \eta_1, \mu^4 \eta_2)$. Considering the Eq. 18,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\leq \eta_1 + \eta_2 \leq 2 \\ \mu^4 &\leq \mu^4 \eta_1 + \mu^4 \eta_2 \leq 2\mu^4 \\ \mu^4 &\leq \eta_1' + \eta_2' \leq 2\mu^4 \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

But the maximum value of μ is restricted by Schwarz inequality which is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$. So, the above equation becomes,

$$\frac{1}{4} \leq \eta'_1 + \eta'_2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad (21)$$

This proves that Buzek-Hillary state dependent local cloner cannot broadcast non-locality. ■

Theorem 2. *Non-locality of a particular quantum state cannot be broadcasted using Buzek-Hillary state dependent non local cloner (U_{nlbhsd}).*

Proof. Consider a general two qubit mixed state ρ_{12} as shown in Eq. 1, initially taken as input state and represented in short form as,

$$\rho_{12} = \left\{ \vec{x}, \vec{y}, \mathbb{T} \right\} \quad (22)$$

where \vec{x} and \vec{y} are Bloch vectors and $\mathbb{T} = [t_{ij}]$ is a correlation matrix. Suppose the above quantum state ρ_{ab}^{id} violates the CHSH inequality then:

$$1 \leq M(\rho_{12}) \leq 2. \quad (23)$$

Here $M(\rho_{12})$ is the sum of two largest eigenvalues (η_1, η_2) of the matrix $\mathbb{T}^T \mathbb{T}$. Therefore the above Eq. 23 becomes,

$$1 \leq \eta_1 + \eta_2 \leq 2. \quad (24)$$

After the application of B-H state dependent non local cloner U_{nlbhsd} to ρ_{12} , the final state will be of the form:

$$\tilde{\rho}_{12} = \left\{ \mu \vec{x}, \mu \vec{y}, \mu \mathbb{T} \right\}. \quad (25)$$

Here λ and μ are the cloning machine parameters. Suppose the two largest eigenvalues of matrix $\mu^2 \mathbb{T}^T \mathbb{T}$ are $(\eta'_1, \eta'_2) \equiv (\mu^2 \eta_1, \mu^2 \eta_2)$. Considering the Eq. 24,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\leq \eta_1 + \eta_2 \leq 2 \\ \mu^2 &\leq \mu^2 \eta_1 + \mu^2 \eta_2 \leq 2\mu^2 \\ \mu^2 &\leq \eta'_1 + \eta'_2 \leq 2\mu^2 \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

But the maximum value of μ is restricted by Schwarz inequality which is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$. So, the above equation becomes,

$$\frac{1}{2} \leq \eta'_1 + \eta'_2 \leq 1 \quad (27)$$

Clearly, we can see that the sum of two largest eigenvalues is not greater than one. So the final output state $\tilde{\rho}_{12}$ is local in nature even though the initial state is non-local. This proves that Buzek-Hillary state dependent non local cloner cannot broadcast non-locality. ■

B. Broadcasting of 3 Steerable States

In the present section we study the broadcasting of 3 steerability which is inequivalent to Bell nonlocality under two measurement settings.

Theorem 3. *The application of Buzek-Hillary state dependent local cloner on a general two qubit mixed state which is 3-steerable will result in the output state to be 3-unsteerable.*

Proof. Suppose a general two qubit mixed state ρ_{12}^{id} as shown in Eq. 1 is 3-steerable then:

$$1 \leq F_3^{CJWR}(\rho_{12}) \leq \sqrt{3}. \quad (28)$$

Here $F_3^{CJWR}(\rho_{12})$ is the sum of eigenvalues (η_1, η_2, η_3) of the matrix $\mathbb{T}^T \mathbb{T}$. Therefore the above Eq. 28 becomes,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\leq \sqrt{\eta_1 + \eta_2 + \eta_3} \leq \sqrt{3} \\ 1 &\leq \eta_1 + \eta_2 + \eta_3 \leq 3. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

After the application of B-H state dependent local cloner to ρ_{12} , the final state will be of the form:

$$\tilde{\rho}_{12} = \left\{ \mu \vec{x}, \mu \vec{y}, \mu^2 \mathbb{T} \right\}. \quad (30)$$

Here λ and μ are the cloning machine parameters. Suppose the eigenvalues of matrix $\mu^4 \mathbb{T}^T \mathbb{T}$ are $(\eta'_1, \eta'_2, \eta'_3) \equiv (\mu^4 \eta_1, \mu^4 \eta_2, \mu^4 \eta_3)$. Considering the Eq. 29,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\leq \eta_1 + \eta_2 + \eta_3 \leq 3 \\ \mu^4 &\leq \mu^4 \eta_1 + \mu^4 \eta_2 + \mu^4 \eta_3 \leq 3\mu^4 \\ \mu^4 &\leq \eta'_1 + \eta'_2 + \eta'_3 \leq 3\mu^4 \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

But the maximum value of μ is restricted by Schwarz inequality which is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$. So, the above equation becomes,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4} &\leq \eta'_1 + \eta'_2 + \eta'_3 \leq \frac{3}{4} \\ \frac{1}{2} &\leq \sqrt{\eta'_1 + \eta'_2 + \eta'_3} \leq \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Clearly, we can see that the sum of eigenvalues of $\mathbb{T}^T \mathbb{T}$ is not greater than one. So the final output state $\tilde{\rho}_{12}$ is 3-unsteerable in nature even though the initial state is 3-steerable. This proves that Buzek-Hillary state dependent local cloner cannot broadcast 3-steerability. ■

Theorem 4. *The application of Buzek-Hillary state dependent nonlocal cloner on a general two qubit mixed state which is 3-steerable will result in the output state to be 3-unsteerable.*

Proof. Suppose a general two qubit mixed state ρ_{12} as shown in Eq. 1 is 3-steerable then:

$$1 \leq F_3^{CJWR}(\rho_{12}) \leq \sqrt{3}. \quad (33)$$

Here $F_3^{CJWR}(\rho_{12})$ is the sum of eigenvalues (η_1, η_2, η_3) of the matrix $\mathbb{T}^T \mathbb{T}$. Therefore the above Eq. 33 becomes,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\leq \sqrt{\eta_1 + \eta_2 + \eta_3} \leq \sqrt{3} \\ 1 &\leq \eta_1 + \eta_2 + \eta_3 \leq 3. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

After the application of B-H state dependent nonlocal cloner to ρ_{12} , the final state will be of the form:

$$\tilde{\rho}_{12} = \left\{ \mu \vec{x}, \mu \vec{y}, \mu \mathbb{T} \right\}. \quad (35)$$

Here λ and μ are the cloning machine parameters. Suppose the eigenvalues of matrix $\mu^2 \mathbb{T}^T \mathbb{T}$ are $(\eta'_1, \eta'_2, \eta'_3) \equiv (\mu^2 \eta_1, \mu^2 \eta_2, \mu^2 \eta_3)$. Considering the Eq. 34,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\leq \eta'_1 + \eta'_2 + \eta'_3 \leq 3 \\ \mu^2 &\leq \mu^2 \eta_1 + \mu^2 \eta_2 + \mu^2 \eta_3 \leq 3\mu^2 \\ \mu^2 &\leq \eta'_1 + \eta'_2 + \eta'_3 \leq 3\mu^2 \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

But the maximum value of μ is restricted by Schwarz inequality which is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}$. So, the above equation becomes,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{6} &\leq \eta'_1 + \eta'_2 + \eta'_3 \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} &\leq \sqrt{\eta'_1 + \eta'_2 + \eta'_3} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

This entails that 3-steerability cannot be broadcasted through BH state dependent nonlocal cloner. ■

The two theorems mentioned above depict the instances in which the output states are rendered 3-unsteerable. However, we also observe that under certain situations, the output states can become unsteerable under any number of measurement settings i.e., they admit a local hidden state model(LHS). In the work [39], the authors had derived a sufficient criteria for the unsteerability of a two qubit state based on its bloch parameters. States which satisfy the criteria admits a local hidden state model(LHS) thereby rendering them unsteerable under any number of measurement settings. In the theorems which follow below, we show that in some instances when a steerable Werner state is used for broadcasting of steerability, states which admits LHS are obtained as outputs.

Theorem 5. *The application of Buzek-Hillary state dependent local cloner on a steerable Werner state makes it unsteerable.*

Proof. Werner states are given as,

$$\rho_{ab} = \left\{ \vec{0}, \vec{0}, \mathbb{T} \right\}. \quad (38)$$

where $\mathbb{T} = \text{diag}(p, -p, p)$. After the application of B-H local cloning machine, the output states are given as,

$$\rho_{ab}^{\text{out}} = \left\{ \vec{0}, \vec{0}, \mu^2 \mathbb{T} \right\}. \quad (39)$$

Now the criterion in [] can also be written as,

$$|\vec{x}|^2 + 2\sqrt{\eta_{\max}} \leq 1 \quad (40)$$

Substituting the bloch vectors of Werner states into the above equation, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 2\sqrt{\eta_{\max}} &\leq 1 \\ 2\mu^2 p &\leq 1 \\ p &\leq \frac{1}{2\mu^2} \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

For maximum value of μ i.e. $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, we get $p \leq 1$. For other lower values of μ , we get the same range of p for which it is satisfying the criterion as the parameter p in Werner state are already constrained as $0 \leq p \leq 1$. In addition to these, we also know that for Werner states, we are able to broadcast entanglement for some range of p . ■

Theorem 6. *Application of BH state dependent cloner on a steerable Bell-diagonal state makes it unsteerable.*

Proof. Bell Diagonal states are given as,

$$\rho_{ab} = \left\{ \vec{0}, \vec{0}, \mathbb{T} \right\}. \quad (42)$$

where $\mathbb{T} = \text{diag}(c_1, c_2, c_3)$. After the application of B-H local cloning machine, the output states are given as,

$$\rho_{ab}^{\text{out}} = \left\{ \vec{0}, \vec{0}, \mu^2 \mathbb{T} \right\}. \quad (43)$$

Now the criterion can also be written as,

$$|\vec{x}|^2 + 2\sqrt{\eta_{\max}} \leq 1 \quad (44)$$

Substituting the Bloch vectors of Bell Diagonal states (assuming the first case as $c_1 \geq c_2 \geq c_3$) into the above equation, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 2\sqrt{\eta_{\max}} &\leq 1 \\ 2\mu^2 c_1 &\leq 1 \\ c_1 &\leq \frac{1}{2\mu^2} \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

For maximum value of μ i.e. $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, we get $c_1 \leq 1$. For other lower values of μ , we get the same range of c_1 for which it is satisfying the criterion as c_1 parameter in Bell Diagonal states are already constrained as $-1 \leq c_1 \leq 1$. Similar proof can be used for other two cases i.e. $c_2 \geq c_3 \geq c_1$ and $c_3 \geq c_1 \geq c_2$. Therefore, the whole range will satisfy the Brunner's criterion after local B-H cloning. In addition to these, we also know that for Bell diagonal states, we are able to broadcast entanglement for some range of c_1, c_2, c_3 . ■

IV. CONCLUSION

Nonlocality is an extremely important ingredient in quantum information processing tasks. As a consequence, generating more number of non-local resources from a few assumes considerable significance. However, an improper choice of cloning machines as tools for broadcasting may result in loss of resources. In the present submission, we show that this is indeed the case, for the choice of cloning machine as the Buzek-Hillery transformation scheme. We study in the purview of the Bell-CHSH inequality and a three settings steering inequality to exhibit that non-local resources can get lost. The loss can also be to the extent of

the state being rendered as unsteerable under any number of measurement settings. Our work also opens some pertinent questions for future research work. Protocols devised to preserve non-locality under such circumstances warrants attention. Further probe is also needed to study the effect of cloning machines on quantum states under irrespective of any specific non-local inequality.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

NG would like to acknowledge support from the Research Initiation Grant of BITS-Pilani, Hyderabad vide letter no. BITS/GAU/RIG/2019/H0680 dated 22nd April, 2019.

-
- [1] J. S. Bell; [Physics 1, 195–200 \(1964\)](#)
 - [2] A. Ekert; [Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 661 \(1991\)](#).
 - [3] C. H. Bennett; G. Brassard; [Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems and Signal Processing, 1992](#), pp. 175–179 (1992).
 - [4] E. Schrödinger; [Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 31, 555–563 \(1935\)](#).
 - [5] Z. Ou; S. Pereira; H. Kimble; [App. Phys. B 55, Issue 3, 265–278 \(1992\)](#).
 - [6] H. Wiseman; S. Jones ; A. Doherty; [Phys. Rev. Lett., 98:140402 \(2007\)](#).
 - [7] S. Jones; H. Wiseman; A. Doherty; [Phys. Rev. A 76, 052116 \(2007\)](#).
 - [8] Reid, M.D.; [Phys. Rev. A 1989, 40, 913–923](#).
 - [9] Reid, M.D.; Drummond, P.D.; Bowen, W.P.; Cavalcanti, E.G.; Lam, P.K.; Bachor, H.A.; Andersen, U.L.; Leuchs, G. [Rev. Rev. Mod. Phys. 2009, 81, 1727](#).
 - [10] Cavalcanti, E.G.; Jones, S.J.; Wiseman, H.M.; Reid, M.D; [Phys. Rev. A 2009, 80, 032112](#).
 - [11] Pusey, M.F; [Phys. Rev. A 2013, 88, 032313](#).
 - [12] Ren, C.L.; Su, H.Y.; Shi, H.F.; Chen, J.L; [Phys. Rev. A 2018, 97, 032119](#).
 - [13] Walborn, S.P; Salles, A.; Gomes, R.M.; Toscano, E; Ribeiro, P.H.S; [Phys. Rev. Lett. 2011, 106, 130402](#).
 - [14] Schneeloch, J.; Broadbent, C.J.; Walborn, S.P; Cavalcanti, E.G.; Howell, J.C; [Phys. Rev. A 2013, 87, 062103](#)
 - [15] Pramanik, T.; Kaplan, M.; Majumdar, A.S; [Phys. Rev. A 2014, 90, 050305](#).
 - [16] Chen, Y.N.; Li, C.M.; Lambert, N.; Chen, S.L.; Ota, Y.; Chen, G.Y.; Nori, F; [Phys. Rev. A 2014, 89, 032112](#).
 - [17] Zukowski, M.; Dutta, A.; Yin, Z; [Phys. Rev. A 2015, 91, 032107](#).
 - [18] Zhu, H.; Hayashi, M.; Chen, L; [Phys. Rev. A 2015, 91, 032107](#).
 - [19] W. K. Wootters and W. H. Zurek, [Nature 299, 802 \(1982\)](#).
 - [20] V. Scarani *et al.*, [Rev. Mod. Phys. 77, 1225 \(2005\)](#), and references therein.
 - [21] L. M. Duan and G. C. Guo, [Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 4999 \(1998\)](#); L. Hardy and D. D. Song, [Phys. Lett. A 259, 331 \(1999\)](#).
 - [22] V. Buzek and M. Hillery, [Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 5003\(1998\)](#).
 - [23] V. Buzek and M. Hillery, [Phys. Rev. A 54, 1844 \(1996\)](#).
 - [24] Satyabrata Adhikari, B S Choudhury and Indranil Chakrabarty, [J. Phys. A, 39 26 \(2006\)](#).
 - [25] N. Gisin and S. Massar, [Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 2153 \(1997\)](#).
 - [26] N. Gisin, [Phys. Lett. A 242, 1 \(1998\)](#).
 - [27] H. Barnum et al., [Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 2818 \(1996\)](#).
 - [28] H. Barnum, C. M. Caves, C. A. Fuchs, R. Jozsa, and B. Schumacher, [Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 2818 \(1996\)](#)
 - [29] V. Buzek et al., [Phys. Rev. A 55, 3327 \(1997\)](#).
 - [30] S. Ghosh, P. K. Kar, [Phys. Rev. A 60, 3296 \(1999\)](#).
 - [31] I. Ghiu, [Phys. Rev. A 67, 012323 \(2003\)](#)
 - [32] S. Chatterjee, S. Sazim, and I. Chakrabarty, [Phys. Rev. A 93, 042309 \(2016\)](#).
 - [33] A. Jain, I. Chakrabarty, and S. Chatterjee, [Phys. Rev. A 99, 022315 \(2019\)](#).
 - [34] R. Mundra, D. Patel, I. Chakrabarty, N. Ganguly, S. Chatterjee [arXiv:1807.11002v2](#)
 - [35] U. K. Sharma, I. Chakrabarty, and M. K. Shukla, [Phys. Rev. A 96, 052319 \(2017\)](#).
 - [36] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and M. Horodecki, [Phys. Lett. A 200, 340 \(1995\)](#).
 - [37] R. Horodecki, [Phys. Lett. A 210, 223 \(1996\)](#).
 - [38] A. C. S. Costa and R. M. Angelo, [Phys. Rev. A 93, 020103\(R\) \(2016\)](#)
 - [39] J. Bowles, F. Hirsch, M. T. Quintino, and N. Brunner, [Phys. Rev. A 93, 022121 \(2016\)](#)