

Deterministic hierarchical remote state preparation of a two-qubit entangled state using Brown *et al.* state in a noisy environment

Subhashish Barik^{a,1,*} Aakash Warke^{a,2,†} Bikash K. Behera^{3,1,‡} and Prasanta K. Panigrahi^{1,§}

¹*Department of Physical Sciences,
Indian Institute of Science Education and Research Kolkata, Mohanpur 741246, West Bengal, India*

²*Department of Physics,
Bennett University, Greater Noida 201310, India*

³*Bikash's Quantum (OPC) Pvt. Ltd., Balindi, Mohanpur 741246, West Bengal, India*

Quantum communication is one of the cutting-edge research areas today, where the scheme of Remote State Preparation (RSP) has caught significant attention of researchers. A number of different schemes of RSP have already been proposed so far. We propose here a hierarchical RSP protocol for sending a two-qubit entangled state using a seven-qubit highly entangled state derived from Brown *et al.* state. We have also studied here the effects of two well known noise models namely amplitude damping (AD) and phase damping (PD) that affect the quantum communication channel used for the protocol. An investigation on the variation of fidelity of the state with respect to the noise operator and the receiver is made. PD noise is found to affect the fidelity more than the AD noise and the higher power receiver, obtains the state with higher fidelity than the lower power receiver under the effect of noise. To the best of our knowledge, we believe that we have achieved the highest fidelity for the higher power receiver, 0.89 in the presence of maximum AD noise and 0.72 in the presence of maximum PD noise, compared to all the previously proposed RSP protocols in noisy environments. The study of noise is described in a very pedagogical manner for better understanding of the application of noise models to a communication protocol.

I. INTRODUCTION

Remote State Preparation (RSP) is considered to be a more efficient scheme of teleportation of a known state than the usual teleportation scheme as it involves comparatively lesser number of classical bits¹. Ever since the introduction of Remote State Preparation, many different modified schemes of RSP^{2–16} have been reported such as hierarchical RSP¹³, joint RSP¹⁴ etc. Researchers have also reported schemes such as controlled bidirectional RSP¹⁵, hierarchical joint remote state preparation¹⁶. Since no quantum channel is practically error-free, in general every scheme works in a noisy environment. Detailed analysis of the effect of noise on a quantum channel has also been reported in the last few years^{16,17}. Motivated from these schemes, we have designed a protocol for hierarchical RSP of a two-qubit entangled state using a maximally entangled seven-qubit state obtained from Brown *et al.* state. The proposed scheme is also analyzed in presence of a noisy environment.

Briefly, we can describe the protocol as follows. Alice prepares a five-qubit maximally entangled state called Brown *et al.* state. Then with the addition of two ancilla qubits and by operating *CNOT* operation on them she prepares a seven-qubit entangled state. Out of these seven entangled qubits she keeps the first one with her and sends the rest to the others; two qubits to each of Bob, Charlie and David. This entangled state can be represented now in such a fashion that to obtain the desired state, Bob would need to know the measurement outcomes of Alice and Charlie/David whereas Charlie (David) would need to know the measurement outcomes of Alice, Bob and David (Charlie). Once the receiver obtains the information about others' measurement out-

comes his task is to apply certain Pauli and *CNOT* operations to retrieve the desired state. Hence, it is easier for Bob to retrieve the information than Charlie/David. This forms the hierarchy among the two. The details of the protocol up until here is discussed in Section II. Practically, it is inevitable to do a quantum communication in a noiseless environment. Thus, we should also see how noise affects our HRSP protocol. In Section III, we make a detailed discussion on how noise affects our quantum channel through which entanglement is shared. Finally we give the explanations for the observed effects of noise and conclude in Section IV.

II. SCHEME OF HIERARCHICAL REMOTE STATE PREPARATION USING A SEVEN-QUBIT ENTANGLED STATE

Following the convention in quantum communication, we assume that the participants involved in this scheme are Alice, Bob, Charlie and David. Further, Alice wants to prepare a known state remotely at Bob's, Charlie's or David's end. We can divide our scheme to the following steps.

Step 1. Preparation of the entangled state

Alice starts with a five-qubit entangled state called Brown *et al.* state which is considered to be a maximally entangled state showing high degree of entanglement:

$$|\psi\rangle_{Br} = \frac{1}{2}(|001\rangle|\phi^-\rangle + |010\rangle|\psi^-\rangle + |100\rangle|\phi^+\rangle + |111\rangle|\psi^+\rangle) \quad (1)$$

where, $|\psi^\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle \pm |11\rangle)$ and $|\phi^\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle \pm |10\rangle)$.

On expanding the state $|\psi\rangle_{Br}$ fully, we obtain a five-qubit cluster state of eight terms:

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi\rangle_{Br} = & \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(|00101\rangle + |00110\rangle + |01000\rangle \\ & + |01011\rangle + |10001\rangle + |10010\rangle \\ & + |11100\rangle + |11111\rangle) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

She then uses two ancilla qubits each prepared in state $|0\rangle$ and make them entangled with $|\psi\rangle_{Br}$ by applying two *CNOT* operations taking the fourth and fifth qubits of $|\psi\rangle_{Br}$ as control qubits and the ancilla qubits as the target qubits:

$$|\Psi\rangle = \text{CNOT}(|\psi\rangle_{Br} \otimes |00\rangle) \quad (3)$$

This is a very straightforward operation and after its execution Alice finally prepares the state:

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi\rangle = & \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(|0010101\rangle + |0011010\rangle + |0100000\rangle \\ & + |0101111\rangle + |1000101\rangle + |1001010\rangle \\ & + |1110000\rangle + |1111111\rangle) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

We believe, this prepared state is highly entangled, if not maximally entangled, because firstly it is prepared from a maximally entangled Brown *et al.* state which itself incorporates two-qubit maximally entangled Bell states and secondly it is prepared by the implementation of *CNOT* operation which is believed to add entanglement to a state. After obtaining this state, Alice keeps the first qubit with herself and sends the second and third qubits to Bob, fourth and fifth qubits to Charlie, and sixth and seventh qubits to David through ‘different quantum channels’. The word ‘different’ holds some significance here as discussed in Section III. This state is further used by Alice for the execution of HRSP of a particular two-qubit state to Bob or Charlie or David as described below.

Step 2. Factorizing the state $|\Psi\rangle$ into different bases

Let us assume that Alice wants to communicate the state $|\xi\rangle = \alpha|00\rangle + \beta|11\rangle$ where the relation $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$ takes care of the normalization of the state $|\xi\rangle$. The HRSP of known state $|\xi\rangle$ mainly requires the factorization of $|\Psi\rangle$ in a particular fashion which ensures that only the sender (in this case Alice) uses a basis constructed out of the known parameters i.e., by using the information of the known state. It can be shown that $|\Psi\rangle$ can be written in the following fashion:

$$|\Psi\rangle_{ABCD} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(|\zeta_1\rangle_A |\Xi_1\rangle_{BCD} + |\zeta_2\rangle_A |\Xi_2\rangle_{BCD} \right) \quad (5)$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Xi_1\rangle = & \frac{1}{2} \left[(\alpha|01\rangle + \beta|00\rangle)_B |01\rangle_C |01\rangle_D \right. \\ & + (\beta|00\rangle - \alpha|01\rangle)_B |10\rangle_C |10\rangle_D \\ & + (\alpha|10\rangle + \beta|11\rangle)_B |00\rangle_C |00\rangle_D \\ & \left. + (\beta|11\rangle - \alpha|10\rangle)_B |11\rangle_C |11\rangle_D \right] \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\Xi_2\rangle = & \frac{1}{2} \left[(\beta|01\rangle - \alpha|00\rangle)_B |01\rangle_C |01\rangle_D \right. \\ & - (\alpha|00\rangle + \beta|01\rangle)_B |10\rangle_C |10\rangle_D \\ & + (\beta|10\rangle - \alpha|11\rangle)_B |00\rangle_C |00\rangle_D \\ & \left. - (\alpha|11\rangle + \beta|10\rangle)_B |11\rangle_C |11\rangle_D \right] \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

and,

$$\begin{aligned} |\zeta_1\rangle &= \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle \\ |\zeta_2\rangle &= \beta|0\rangle - \alpha|1\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The subscripts A, B, C and D denote the qubits which belong to Alice, Bob, Charlie and David respectively. In a different fashion, $|\Psi\rangle$ can also be written as:

$$|\Psi\rangle_{ABCD} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(|\zeta_1\rangle_A |\phi_1\rangle_{BCD} + |\zeta_2\rangle_A |\phi_2\rangle_{BCD} \right) \quad (9)$$

where, $|\zeta_1\rangle$ and $|\zeta_2\rangle$ are the same as given in Eq. (8) and,

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_1\rangle = & \frac{1}{4} \left[|++\rangle_B |++\rangle_C (\alpha|+-\rangle + \beta|++\rangle)_D \right. \\ & + |+-\rangle_B |++\rangle_C (\alpha|+-\rangle - \beta|--\rangle)_D \\ & - |-+\rangle_B |++\rangle_C (\alpha|+-\rangle - \beta|--\rangle)_D \\ & + |--\rangle_B |++\rangle_C (\beta|++\rangle - \alpha|+-\rangle)_D \\ & + |++\rangle_B |+-\rangle_C (\alpha|--\rangle + \beta|+-\rangle)_D \\ & + |++\rangle_B |--\rangle_C (\alpha|+-\rangle + \beta|--\rangle)_D \\ & + |+-\rangle_B |+-\rangle_C (\alpha|+-\rangle - \beta|+-\rangle)_D \\ & + |+-\rangle_B |+-\rangle_C (\alpha|--\rangle - \beta|+-\rangle)_D \\ & + |+-\rangle_B |--\rangle_C (\alpha|+-\rangle - \beta|++\rangle)_D \\ & - |-+\rangle_B |+-\rangle_C (\alpha|++\rangle + \beta|+-\rangle)_D \\ & - |-+\rangle_B |+-\rangle_C (\alpha|--\rangle + \beta|+-\rangle)_D \\ & - |-+\rangle_B |--\rangle_C (\alpha|+-\rangle + \beta|++\rangle)_D \\ & + |--\rangle_B |+-\rangle_C (\beta|+-\rangle - \alpha|--\rangle)_D \\ & + |--\rangle_B |+-\rangle_C (\beta|+-\rangle - \alpha|++\rangle)_D \\ & \left. + |--\rangle_B |--\rangle_C (\beta|--\rangle - \alpha|+-\rangle)_D \right] \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
|\phi_2\rangle = \frac{1}{4} & \left[|++\rangle_B |++\rangle_C (\beta |+-\rangle - \alpha |++\rangle)_D \right. \\
& + |+-\rangle_B |++\rangle_C (\alpha |--\rangle + \beta |+-\rangle)_D \\
& + |--\rangle_B |++\rangle_C (\alpha |++\rangle - \beta |+-\rangle)_D \\
& + |++\rangle_B |+-\rangle_C (\beta |--\rangle - \alpha |+-\rangle)_D \\
& + |++\rangle_B |+-\rangle_C (\beta |+-\rangle - \alpha |--\rangle)_D \\
& + |+-\rangle_B |+-\rangle_C (\beta |++\rangle + \alpha |+-\rangle)_D \\
& + |+-\rangle_B |+-\rangle_C (\beta |--\rangle + \alpha |+-\rangle)_D \\
& + |+-\rangle_B |--\rangle_C (\alpha |++\rangle + \beta |+-\rangle)_D \\
& + |--\rangle_B |+-\rangle_C (\alpha |+-\rangle - \beta |++\rangle)_D \\
& + |--\rangle_B |+-\rangle_C (\alpha |+-\rangle - \beta |--\rangle)_D \\
& + |--\rangle_B |--\rangle_C (\alpha |++\rangle - \beta |+-\rangle)_D \\
& - |--\rangle_B |+-\rangle_C (\alpha |+-\rangle + \beta |--\rangle)_D \\
& - |--\rangle_B |+-\rangle_C (\alpha |+-\rangle + \beta |++\rangle)_D \\
& \left. - |--\rangle_B |--\rangle_C (\alpha |--\rangle + \beta |+-\rangle)_D \right] \quad (11)
\end{aligned}$$

where, A, B, C, D , $|\zeta_1\rangle$ and $|\zeta_2\rangle$ mean the same thing as mentioned previously.

Step 3. Measuring in specific basis and executing HRSP

In previous subsection, we can see two different factorization of $|\Psi\rangle$ given by Eq. (5) and Eq. (9). Referring to the factorization given in Eq. (5), if Alice measures in $\{|\zeta_1\rangle, |\zeta_2\rangle\}$ basis and Charlie and David measure in $\{|00\rangle, |01\rangle, |10\rangle, |11\rangle\}$ basis then Bob can easily retrieve the state $|\xi\rangle$ by knowing the outcomes of Alice, Charlie and David. For example, suppose Alice measures her qubit to be in state $|\zeta_1\rangle$ and convey her results to Bob using some classical communication. After knowing Alice's outcome, Bob figures out that his qubits along with Charlie's and David's have collapsed to the three-qubit state $|\Xi_1\rangle$. Now, we can see that in both state $|\Xi_1\rangle$ and state $|\Xi_2\rangle$ there is a direct correlation between Charlie's and David's measurement outcomes for all possibilities i.e., every time Charlie and Bob would have the same measurement outcomes. Suppose now, Charlie measures his qubits to be in state $|01\rangle$ and conveys the result to Bob over some classical communication channel. Knowing Charlie's outcome, Bob immediately gets to know that David would also get the same outcome as per the factorization of state $|\Xi_1\rangle$. This ensures Bob that he has got the state $\alpha|01\rangle + \beta|00\rangle$ and using some simple one-qubit and two-qubit operations on it he can retrieve the required state $|\xi\rangle = \alpha|00\rangle + \beta|11\rangle$. Thus, Bob needs to know the measurement outcomes of only two parties; Alice's outcome plus either Charlie's or David's outcome. The specific sets of operations that Bob has to apply on his obtained state to retrieve $|\xi\rangle$ after knowing the out-

comes from Alice and Charlie/David is given in Table I.

Let us now refer to the factorization given in Eq. (9). We can see that here, the state is finally retrieved by David. Suppose, Alice measures in the $\{|\zeta_1\rangle, |\zeta_2\rangle\}$ basis and finds her qubit to be in state $|\zeta_1\rangle$. Once David obtains Alice's measurement outcome over a classical channel he gets to know that his qubits along with Charlie's and David's have collapsed to the six-qubit state $|\phi_1\rangle$. However, we don't see any kind of correlation between the measurement outcomes of Bob and Charlie for states $|\phi_1\rangle$ and $|\phi_2\rangle$ (as we saw between Charlie and David for the state $|\Xi_1\rangle$ and $|\Xi_2\rangle$). That means to figure out which state he has obtained, David needs the measurement outcomes of both Bob and Charlie. Suppose, Bob and Charlie individually measures in the two-qubit Hadamard basis and find their states to be $|+-\rangle$ and $|++\rangle$ respectively. Once David receives this information over a classical channel from Bob and Charlie he gets to know that his state has collapsed to state $\alpha|+-\rangle - \beta|--\rangle$ as it can be seen from Eq. (10) and accordingly he will apply some simple one-qubit and two-qubit operations on his qubits to obtain the desired state $|\xi\rangle = \alpha|00\rangle + \beta|11\rangle$. The exact set of operations David has to apply based on the outcomes of Alice, Bob and Charlie is given in Table II and Table III. In a similar fashion, we can also factorize $|\phi_1\rangle$ and $|\phi_2\rangle$ in such a way that Charlie receives the desired state for which he will have to know the outcomes of Alice, Bob and David.

Thus we see here that, to retrieve the required state $|\xi\rangle$ Bob needs the information of only two people; (Alice and Charlie/David) where as Charlie (David) needs the information of three people; (Alice, Bob, David (Charlie)). Thus it is easier for Alice to prepare a known state remotely at Bob's end than that in Charlie/David's end. In other words, Bob here is the higher power receiver where as Charlie and David are the lower power receivers having the same power. This forms a hierarchy between Bob, Charlie and David, where Bob lies at the top level followed by Charlie and David lying in the same level. Hence, this scheme becomes an example of HRSP.

III. EFFECT OF NOISE ON THE QUANTUM CHANNEL

Practically, it is impossible to do quantum communication through a noiseless channel. At best what we can do is to study the sources and effects of noise and try to minimize them. We can conveniently study the effects of different kinds of noises for the HRSP of state $|\xi\rangle$ by studying the evolution of $\rho = |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$ under the effects of different noise operators (more commonly called Kraus operators). For the sake of simplicity, we study here the effects of only two prominent kinds of noises namely amplitude damping (AD) and phase damping (PD). Fortunately, there exist the defined forms of noise operators for AD and PD noise for which we would not have to

Alice's outcome	Charlie/David's outcome	Bob's Operations
ζ_1	$ 01\rangle 01\rangle$	X_2CX_{2-1}
ζ_1	$ 10\rangle 10\rangle$	iY_2CX_{2-1}
ζ_1	$ 00\rangle 00\rangle$	X_1CX_{2-1}
ζ_1	$ 11\rangle 11\rangle$	$-iY_2X_{1,2}CX_{2-1}$
ζ_2	$ 01\rangle 01\rangle$	$iY_2X_2CX_{2-1}$
ζ_2	$ 10\rangle 10\rangle$	$-iY_1RCX_{2-1}$
ζ_2	$ 00\rangle 00\rangle$	$Z_2X_{1,2}CX_{2-1}$
ζ_2	$ 11\rangle 11\rangle$	$iY_1X_2CX_{2-1}$

TABLE I. The operations that Bob has to operate on his qubits to retrieve state $|\xi\rangle$ depending on the outcomes of Alice and Charlie/David is listed here. It can be conspicuously seen that Charlie and David get the same outcome for their measurement each time. This is the reason it suffices for David to know the outcome of only one of the two parties i.e., either Bob or Charlie in addition to the outcome of Alice. In other words, Bob would need the collaboration of only two parties (Alice plus Charlie/David). The notation O_1 (where $O \in \{H, X, iY, Z, CX, RCX\}$) indicates that Bob has to apply the operation O on his first qubit and the notation O_2 indicates that Bob has to apply the operation O on his second qubit. Similarly, $O_{1,2}$ indicates that Bob has to apply the operation O on both his qubits. The operator O_{1-2} indicates that Bob has to apply the operator O taking the first one as the controlled qubit and the second one as the target qubit. CX and RCX refers to $CNOT$ and *ReverseCNOT* operations respectively.

Alice's outcome	Bob/Charlie's outcome	David's Operations
ζ_1	$ ++\rangle_B ++\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}X_1CX_{1-2}$
ζ_1	$ +-\rangle_B ++\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}Z_1RCX_{1-2}$
ζ_1	$ -+\rangle_B ++\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}Z_2RCX_{1-2}$
ζ_1	$ --\rangle_B ++\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}iY_1CX_{1-2}$
ζ_1	$ ++\rangle_B +-\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}X_{1,2}CX_{1-2}$
ζ_1	$ ++\rangle_B -+\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}CX_{1-2}$
ζ_1	$ ++\rangle_B --\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}RCX_{1-2}$
ζ_1	$ +-\rangle_B +-\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}Z_1CX_{1-2}$
ζ_1	$ +-\rangle_B -+\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}X_{1,2}Z_1CX_{1-2}$
ζ_1	$ +-\rangle_B --\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}X_1Z_1CX_{1-2}$
ζ_1	$ -+\rangle_B +-\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}X_2Z_2RCX_{1-2}$
ζ_1	$ -+\rangle_B -+\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}iY_2X_1CX_{1-2}$
ζ_1	$ -+\rangle_B --\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}X_2Z_2X_1X_2CX_{1-2}$
ζ_1	$ --\rangle_B +-\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}iY_1X_2CX_{1-2}$
ζ_1	$ --\rangle_B -+\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}X_2Z_2RCX_{1-2}$
ζ_1	$ --\rangle_B --\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}Z_2Z_1RCX_{1-2}$

TABLE II. The operations that David has to operate on his qubits to retrieve state $|\xi\rangle$ when Alice gets the outcome $|\zeta_1\rangle$ are listed here. It can be clearly seen that Bob and Charlie get random outcomes for their measurements with respect to each other. This is the reason David would require the collaboration of all other parties unlike that in Table I to retrieve state $|\xi\rangle$. The notations O_1 , O_2 , $O_{1,2}$, O_{1-2} , CX and RCX have the same meaning as described in Table I with the only difference that here David would apply those operations instead of Bob.

separately construct them here^{18,19}. The noise operators usually evolve ρ in the following way:

$$\rho \rightarrow \sum_i K_i \rho K_i^\dagger \quad (12)$$

where K_i is any particular noise operator. The noise operators are constructed following the operator-sum representation and the set of noise operators, $\{K_0, K_1\}$ for AD can be given as^{16,17}:

$$K_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{1-\eta_A} \end{pmatrix} \quad K_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{\eta_A} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (13)$$

where, η_A describes the probability of error due to AD noise. Similarly, the set of noise operators, $\{E_0, E_1, E_2\}$ for PD can be given as^{16,17}:

$$\begin{aligned} E_0 &= \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{1-\eta_P} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{1-\eta_P} \end{pmatrix} \\ E_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\eta_P} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ E_2 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\eta_P} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where, η_P describes the probability of error due to PD noise. Further, η_A and η_P can take values between 0 to 1. Next, we see the effects of AD noise and PD noise one by one.

Alice's outcome	Bob/Charlie's outcome	David's Operations
ζ_2	$ ++\rangle_B ++\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}X_1Z_1X_1CX_{1-2}$
ζ_2	$ +-\rangle_B ++\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}X_{1,2}CX_{1-2}$
ζ_2	$ --\rangle_B ++\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}X_{1,2}Z_1CX_{1-2}$
ζ_2	$ +-\rangle_B ++\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}X_2Z_2RCX_{1-2}$
ζ_2	$ ++\rangle_B +-\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}iY_1X_{1,2}CX_{1-2}$
ζ_2	$ ++\rangle_B --\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}Z_1X_2CX_{1-2}$
ζ_2	$ +-\rangle_B +-\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}Z_1X_{1,2}CX_{1-2}$
ζ_2	$ +-\rangle_B +-\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}X_1CX_{1-2}$
ζ_2	$ +-\rangle_B +-\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}X_2CX_{1-2}$
ζ_2	$ +-\rangle_B --\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}CX_{1-2}$
ζ_2	$ --\rangle_B +-\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}iY_1CX_{1-2}$
ζ_2	$ --\rangle_B +-\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}X_2Z_1CX_{1-2}$
ζ_2	$ --\rangle_B --\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}Z_1CX_{1-2}$
ζ_2	$ --\rangle_B +-\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}Z_1X_1CX_{2-1}$
ζ_2	$ --\rangle_B +-\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}X_1CX_{1-2}$
ζ_2	$ --\rangle_B --\rangle_C$	$H_{1,2}Z_2CX_{1-2}$

TABLE III. The operations that David has to operate on his qubits to retrieve state $|\xi\rangle$ when Alice gets the outcome $|\zeta_2\rangle$ are listed here. Similar to our observation in Table II, Bob and Charlie get random outcomes for their measurements with respect to each other and consequently David would require the collaboration of all other parties to retrieve state $|\xi\rangle$. The notations O_1 , O_2 , $O_{1,2}$, O_{1-2} , CX and RCX have the same meaning as described in Table II.

A. Effect of AD noise

Referring to Eq. (12) we can describe the evolution of ρ under the effect of AD noise as follows:

$$\rho' = \sum_{i,j,l} (I_2^A \otimes K_i^{B_0} \otimes K_i^{B_1} \otimes K_j^{C_0} \otimes K_j^{C_1} \otimes K_l^{D_0} \otimes K_l^{D_1}) \rho (I_2^A \otimes K_i^{B_0} \otimes K_i^{B_1} \otimes K_j^{C_0} \otimes K_j^{C_1} \otimes K_l^{D_0} \otimes K_l^{D_1})^\dagger \quad (15)$$

Clearly, ρ is a 128×128 (or $2^7 \times 2^7$) matrix as $|\Psi\rangle$ defines a seven-qubit system. Accordingly, we have seven one-qubit operators on the left and seven on the right of ρ . The superscripts on the noise operators denote the particular qubit on which the operator would operate. Furthermore, we should be clear that B_0 and B_1 denote the two qubits of Bob, C_0 and C_1 denote the two qubits of Charlie and D_0 and D_1 denote the two qubits of David. The subscript however, denotes the two different AD operators i.e., $i, j, l \in \{0, 1\}$. It is assumed that Alice prepares the entangled state and then distributes the qubits to Bob, Charlie and David through some quantum channels. Thus, we can practically assume that the noise would affect all qubits except for Alice's qubit. Further, assuming that the two qubits belonging to the same receiver are communicated through the same quantum channel we believe that they are affected by the same noise operators and hence we put the same index on the subscript of noise operators that acts on the qubits of the same receiver. For example, the two noise operators K^{B_0} and K^{B_1} acting on the two qubits of Bob have the same subscript " i ". Following similar argument, the noise operators acting on the qubits of two different receivers bear different index on their subscripts.

We then compute ρ' using MATLAB and obtain a 128×128 matrix which turns out to be a function of η_A . Certainly, now ρ' is the state which evolves as per the measurements made by Alice, Bob and Charlie as depicted by the protocol in Section II to some state ρ'' (say). We construct this unitary evolution operator by carefully choosing the measurement operators that would act on each qubit. Hence,

$$\rho'' = U \rho' U^\dagger \quad (16)$$

where, U is the following operator:

$$U = M_A \otimes M_{B_0} \otimes M_{B_1} \otimes M_{C_0} \otimes M_{C_1} \otimes M_{D_0} \otimes M_{D_1} \quad (17)$$

where, M_X represents the measurement operator that would act on the qubit X . After obtaining ρ'' , we have to normalize it, just the way states are normalized after measurement. Thus we obtain our normalized ρ''' (say, ρ''') by dividing it by the trace of ρ'' :

$$\rho''' = \frac{\rho''}{\text{Tr}(\rho'')} = \frac{U \rho' U^\dagger}{\text{Tr}(U \rho' U^\dagger)} \quad (18)$$

ρ''' itself is a 128×128 matrix and in order to know what state the receiver gets we must reduce it to a 4×4 matrix (since the receiver obtains a two-qubit state here). If Bob is the receiver then we have to trace out the qubits of Alice, Charlie and David (corresponding to A, C_0, C_1, D_0, D_1):

$$\rho^{Bob} = \text{Tr}_{A, C_0, C_1, D_0, D_1}(\rho''') \quad (19)$$

Once the receiver receives this state he uses the appropriate unitary operator, say O , to obtain the desired state $|\xi\rangle$:

$$\rho_n = O\rho^{Bob}O^\dagger \quad (20)$$

Hence, ρ_n is the state received through the noisy channel. As noise here is parameterized by η_A we can see ρ_n to be a function of η_A . Now, to see the effect of noise on our desired state $\rho_0 = |\xi\rangle\langle\xi|$ we calculate the fidelity between ρ_0 and ρ_n since fidelity would show how close is ρ_n to ρ_0 :

$$F = \text{Tr}\left(\sqrt{\sqrt{\rho_0}\rho_n\sqrt{\rho_0}}\right) \quad (21)$$

Let us explicitly calculate the fidelity for a particular set of measurements. Let us consider the the first set of measurements (the first line in the table) from Table I where, Bob is the receiver of the desired state. It should be noted that for AD, ρ' remains the same for all the sets of measurements given in Table I-III. However, the operators U and O differ from set to set. The measurement operators of Alice, Charlie, David and Bob to be used in Eq. (10) can be given as:

$$\begin{aligned} M_A &= \left(\frac{|0\rangle + |1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}\right)\left(\frac{\langle 0| + \langle 1|}{\sqrt{2}}\right) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ M_C &= M_{C_0} \otimes M_{C_1} = |01\rangle\langle 01| = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ M_D &= M_{D_0} \otimes M_{D_1} = |01\rangle\langle 01| = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ M_B &= M_{B_0} \otimes M_{B_1} = I_2 \times I_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

To simplify the calculations, we have taken $\alpha=\beta=1/\sqrt{2}$ in $M_A=(\alpha|0\rangle+\beta|1\rangle)(\alpha^*\langle 0|+\beta^*\langle 1|)$ in Eq. (15). Further, we can see that Bob's measurement operator is an Identity matrix. This is because, while the state is evolving under the noise Bob performs no measurement. More precisely, Bob performs a local

measurement only after he gets to know the outcomes of others i.e., only after tracing out the qubits of Alice, Charlie and David. Consequently, we take Bob's measurement into consideration only while calculating ρ_n . For the particular set of measurements that we have considered, Bob's measurement operator (O) as used in Eq. (23) becomes:

$$O = M_{B_0} \otimes M_{B_1} = CX_{2 \rightarrow 1}(I \otimes X) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (23)$$

Using the operators given in Eq. (22) we first calculate U as per Eq. (17) and then ρ''' as per Eq. (18). Then we trace out the qubits corresponding to A, C_0, C_1, D_0, D_1 using a MATLAB program to find out ρ^{Bob} which is a 4×4 matrix. After that using the operator O (a 4×4 matrix as we would expect it to be multiplied with ρ^{Bob}) we calculate ρ_n as per the formula in Eq. (20). We have taken, $\alpha = \beta = 1/\sqrt{2}$, thus, the intended state that Bob should obtain in the absence of noise is:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_0 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|00\rangle + |11\rangle\right)\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\langle 00| + \langle 11|\right) \\ \rho_0 &= \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Then, finally we calculate the fidelity by plugging in ρ and ρ_n in Eq. (21). We obtain fidelity as a function of η_A . Further, as η_A can take values between 0 and 1 only we calculate and plot fidelity as a function of η_A by varying η_A in steps of 0.1. This plot is shown in Fig. 1. To see the effect of noise based on the power of the receiver we calculate the fidelity once taking Bob (higher power receiver) as the receiver using the first set of measurements given in the top line of the Table I, and once taking David (lower power receiver) as the receiver using the first set of measurements given in the top line of the Table II. The behaviour of Bob's and David's fidelities with η_{AD} is depicted by the blue line and red line in Fig. 1 respectively. It can be understood that the behaviour of fidelities with η_{AD} would be the same for other sets of measurements of the particular table as long as we calculate it for the same receiver.

B. Effect of PD noise

In studying the effects of PD noise, we take the same approach as we took for AD noise. At first, we write down the evolution of ρ in terms of the PD noise operators:




FIG. 1. This figure depicts the variation of fidelity with the AD noise parameter. The blue line refers to the fidelity when the higher power receiver (Bob here) receives the state $|\xi\rangle$ and the red line refers to the fidelity when the lower power receiver (David here) receives the state $|\xi\rangle$. The fidelity curve for Bob lies above that of David. Further, the lowest fidelity for Bob is 0.89 where as that for David is 0.73. This ensures that the fidelity of the higher power receiver is more affected by the AD noise than the fidelity of the lower power receiver.

$$\rho' = \sum_{i,j,l} (I_2^A \otimes E_i^{B_0} \otimes E_i^{B_1} \otimes E_j^{C_0} \otimes E_j^{C_1} \otimes E_l^{D_0} \otimes E_l^{D_1}) \rho (I_2^A \otimes E_i^{B_0} \otimes E_i^{B_1} \otimes E_j^{C_0} \otimes E_j^{C_1} \otimes E_l^{D_0} \otimes E_l^{D_1})^\dagger \quad (25)$$

We calculate this 128×128 matrix in MATLAB plugging in the values of the PD noise operators from equation (14). From here onward, the rest of the formalism is exactly the same with what we did for AD noise. We calculate U using the sets of measurements used by Alice, Bob, Charlie and David followed by the calculation of ρ^{Bob} and then ρ_n . Finally, we calculate the fidelity using the formula given in Eq. (21). For the first set of measurements in Table I, which was also used for the AD noise, we calculate the fidelity. The fidelity comes out to be a function η_{PD} just as we would have expected. We then plot this fidelity for different values of η_{PD} varying between 0 and 1 as shown in Fig. 2. We calculate the fidelity once taking Bob (higher power receiver) as the receiver using the first set of measurements given in the top line of the Table I, and once taking David (lower power receiver) as the receiver using the first set of measurements given in the top line of the Table II. The behaviour of Bob's and David's fidelities with η_{PD} is depicted by the blue line and red line in Fig. 2 respectively. The behaviour of fidelities with η_{PD} would be the same for the other sets of measurements of the particular table as long as we calculate it for the same receiver.

IV. DISCUSSION

We have proposed here a scheme for the HRSP of a two-qubit entangled state using a seven-qubit entangled state generated from Brown *et al.* state. Emphasis has been put on describing a generic HRSP protocol in the most pedagogic way for better understanding of the protocol. We believe the way we have presented the




FIG. 2. This figure depicts the variation of fidelity with the PD noise parameter. The blue line refers to the fidelity when the higher power receiver (Bob here) receives the state $|\xi\rangle$ and the red line refers to the fidelity when the lower power receiver (David here) receives the state $|\xi\rangle$. Just like in Fig. 1 the fidelity curve for Bob lies above that of David. Further, the lowest fidelity for Bob is 0.72 where as for David is 0.50. This implies that the fidelity of the higher power receiver is more affected by the PD noise than the fidelity of the lower power receiver. Moreover, it can be noted that the fidelity is more affected by PD noise than AD noise.

protocol here would help readers to come up with the HRSP of even more complicated states (involving maximum number of qubits, say n) using the factorization of a multipartite-entangled state involving maximum number of qubits, say m . The efficiency of the protocol would depend upon the ratio $\frac{n}{m}$; higher being more efficient.

We have also shown the effects of AD and PD noises on our protocol considering the noise to only affect the

travelling qubits (the ones Alice sends to others). From the two figures it can be seen that the least value of fidelity for AD noise is 0.73 and for PD noise is 0.5 which is quite better compared to many of the recently proposed protocols^{16,17,20-23}. This proves our scheme to be quite trustable for practical implementation. We believe, the reason behind the higher fidelity is the highly entangled seven-qubit state that we have taken. It would be interesting to know the exact amount of entanglement present in this seven-qubit state which is generated from the maximally entangled Brown *et al.* state. We would like to leave it to the future researchers to measure the amount of entanglement (in any plausible measure of entanglement) in this seven-qubit entangled state. We have seen that the PD noise has more effect on the fidelity than the AD noise.

Another important conclusion from our study of noise is that the higher power agent (Bob here) would receive a high fidelity state than the low power agent (David here) as it can be very conspicuously seen in Figs. 1 and 2. However, in order to generalize this observation to all different kinds of noises and all different kinds of

hierarchical protocols, we need a much detailed study of different kinds of hierarchical protocols in different noisy environments. Thus, we feel that further research in this area may lead to more concrete results which would help to design more efficient protocols for practical implementations in future.

V. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

S.B. and A.W. would like to thank Bikash's Quantum (OPC) Pvt. Ltd. and IISER Kolkata for providing hospitality during the course of the project work. A.W. would like to thank Bennett University for providing the license required for operating MATLAB. A.W. would also like to thank Yash Palan from IISER Bhopal for his suggestions during the calculations with MATLAB. B.K.B. acknowledges the support of Institute fellowship provided by IISER Kolkata. The authors would also like to acknowledge QuEST initiative to DST/ICPS/QUST/THEME-1/2019 for the grant support.

* subhashishbarik1995@gmail.com; The authors have equally contributed to this work

† aw8169@bennett.edu.in; The authors have equally contributed to this work

‡ bikash@bikashsquantum.com

§ pprasanta@iiserkol.ac.in

¹ A. K. Pati, Minimum classical bit for remote preparation and measurement of a qubit, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 014302, (2000).

² C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, B. M. Terhal, and W. K. Wootters, Remote State Preparation, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 077902 (2001).

³ Y. Xia, J. Song and H. S. Song, Multiparty remote state preparation, J. Phys. B, **40**, 18 (2007).

⁴ Z. Kurucz, P. Adam, Z. Kis, and J. Janszky, Continuous variable remote state preparation, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 052315 (2005).

⁵ P. C. Ma, G. B. Chen, X. W. Li, Y. B. Zhan, Hierarchical Controlled Remote State Preparation by Using a Four-Qubit Cluster State, Int J. Theor. Phys. **57**, 1748–1755 (2018)

⁶ N. Paul, J. V. Menon, S. Karumanchi, S. Muralidharan, P. Panigrahi, Quantum tasks using six qubit cluster states. Quantum Inf Process **10**, 619–632 (2011)

⁷ P. Panigrahi, S. Karumanchi, S. Muralidharan, Minimal classical communication and measurement complexity for quantum information splitting of a two-qubit state, Pramana-J Phys, 73:499 (2009)

⁸ S. Muralidharan and P. K. Panigrahi, Perfect teleportation, quantum-state sharing, and superdense coding through a genuinely entangled five-qubit state, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 032321 (2008)

⁹ S. Muralidharan and P. K. Panigrahi, Quantum-information splitting using multipartite cluster states, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 062333 (2008)

¹⁰ J. M. Liu, and Y. J. Wang, Remote preparation of a two-particle entangled state, Phys. Lett. A. **316**, 159-167 (2003).

¹¹ A. Abeyesinghe and P. Hayden, Generalized remote state preparation: Trading cbits, qubits, and ebits in quantum communication, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 062319 (2003).

¹² D. W. Leung and P. W. Shor, Oblivious Remote State Preparation, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 127905 (2003).

¹³ C. Shukla, and A. Pathak, Hierarchical quantum communication, Phys. Lett. A **377**, 1337-1344 (2013).

¹⁴ B. A. Nguyen, and J. Kim, Joint remote state preparation, J. Phys. B **41**, 095501 (2008).

¹⁵ T. B. Cao and B. A. Nguyen, Deterministic controlled bidirectional remote state preparation, Adv. Nat. Sci. **5**, 015003 (2014).

¹⁶ C. Shukla, K. Thapliyal, and A. Pathak, Hierarchical joint remote state preparation in noisy environment, Quantum Inf. Process. **16**, 205 (2017).

¹⁷ V. Sharma, C. Shukla, S. Banerjee, and A. Pathak, Controlled bidirectional remote state preparation in noisy environment: a generalized view, Quantum Inf. Process. **14**, 3441-3464 (2015).

¹⁸ D. McMahon, Quantum Computing Explained, Wiley, 254-271 (2007).

¹⁹ M. Nielson, I. Chuang, Quantum Computing and Quantum Information, Cambridge University Press, 356-385 (2000).

²⁰ Q. Chen, M. Lu, and S. Hao, Effect of noise on joint remote preparation of an arbitrary two-qubit state via a Brown state, Ind. J. Phys., 1-10 (2019).

²¹ P. Zhang, S. Ma, L. Gong, Deterministic Remote Preparation via the χ State in Noisy Environment, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **58**, 2795 (2019).

²² Y. Qian, S. Xue, and M. Jiang, Deterministic remote preparation of arbitrary single-qubit state via one inter-

mediate node in noisy environment, Phys. Lett. A, 126204 (2019).

- ²³ B. J. Falaye, G. H. Sun, O. C. Nieto and S. H. Dong, Joint remote state preparation (JRSP) of two-qubit equatorial

state in quantum noisy channels, Int. J. Quantum Inf. **14**, 1650034 (2016).