Quantum Information Processing: An Essential Primer

Emina Soljanin, *Fellow, IEEE*

arXiv:2006.15979v2 [quant-ph] 13 Aug 2020

Abstract

Quantum information science is an exciting, wide, rapidly progressing, cross-disciplinary field, and that very nature makes it both attractive and hard to enter. In this primer, we first provide answers to the three essential questions that any newcomer needs to know: How is quantum information represented? How is quantum information processed? How is classical information extracted from quantum states? We then introduce the most basic quantum information theoretic notions concerning entropy, sources, and channels, as well as secure communications and error correction. We conclude with examples that illustrate the power of quantum correlations. No prior knowledge of quantum mechanics is assumed.

I. Introduction

Quantum phenomena provide computing and information handling paradigms that are distinctly different and arguably much more powerful than their classical counterparts. In the past quarter of the century, much progress has been made on the theoretical side, and experiments have been carried out in which quantum computational operations were executed on a small number of quantum bits (qubits). The US National Science Foundation has declared this general area to be one of the 10 big ideas for future investments. In June 2018, the science committee of the US House of Representatives unanimously approved the National Quantum Initiative Act (H.R. 6227, Public Law No: 115-368) [1] to create a 10-year federal effort aimed at boosting quantum science. Similar funding commitments have been made throughout the world.

We have entered what is known as the Noisy Intermediate-Scale Quantum (NISQ) technology era [2]. This term refers to devices with 50-100 qubits (intermediate-scale), which is too few to have have full error-correction (noisy). Nevertheless, NISQ systems may be able to perform tasks that exceed the capabilities of today's classical digital computers, and may be useful tools for exploring many-body quantum physics. On the theoretical side, significant progress has been made in understanding the fundamental limits of

E. Soljanin is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Rutgers University, Piscataway, New Jersey 08854, USA, e-mail: (see https://www.ece.rutgers.edu/emina-soljanin)

quantum telecommunications systems, giving rise to the subfield of quantum information theory. Moreover, classical information theory has been used to understand problems in the foundations of physics.

This is an exciting moment to enter the field, and many excellent textbooks and class notes are available to assist you at that (see e.g. [3]–[7]). The goal of the primer is to quickly provide some essential information. It is aimed at a wide audience with diverse background and interests, and assumes no familiarity with quantum mechanics (see e.g. [8] for a minimal introduction to the field). It does, however, require undergraduate-level knowledge of probability (see e.g. [9]) and linear algebra (see e.g. [10], Volume 1, or [6], Part 3).

This primer is organized and can be read as follows. Sections II, III, and IV answer the following three fundamental questions: How is quantum information represented? How is quantum information processed? How is classical information extracted from quantum states? This material is necessary for everyone entering the field regardless of their further interests. Perhaps surprisingly, this material is also sufficient to understand many quantum algorithms, including the celebrated Shor celebrated factoring algorithm (provided you are familiar with their non-quantum background.) This material is also sufficient to understand the fundamental ideas and principles of quantum key distribution covered in Section V and quantum error correction covered in Section VI. Section VII describes a more general framework to represent quantum states, which is needed for quantum information theory as well as for working on quantum computing platforms such as IBM-Q. Section VIII introduces the most basic quantum information theoretic notions concerning entropy, sources, and channels. Rudimentary knowledge of classical information theory is necessary for reading this section. Section IX illustrates the power of quantum correlations through three canonical examples of "quantum magic".

II. How is Quantum Information Represented?

Representation of quantum information is connected to a postulate of quantum mechanics which says that associated to any isolated physical system is a complex vector space with inner product. In this primer, and quantum computing in general, we mostly deal with finite dimensional spaces $\mathbb{C}^{\mathsf{N}}$ and often conventionally refer to them as Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_{\mathsf{N}}$.

A. Single Qubit

Classical computers store and operate on bits. What about quantum computers? The quantum information and computing counterpart to the bit is the *qubit*. Qubits (as bits) are represented by physical systems.

Mathematically, independently of a particular physical realization, a qubit is represented by a unit-norm[1] vector in the two-dimensional unitary space $\mathbb{C}^2$. If we denote the basis vectors of this space by

$$|0\rangle = \left[\begin{smallmatrix}1\\0\end{smallmatrix}\right] \quad \text{and} \quad |1\rangle = \left[\begin{smallmatrix}0\\1\end{smallmatrix}\right]$$

then a single qubit $|\psi\rangle$ is mathematically a linear combination of $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, that is

$$|\psi\rangle = \alpha\,|0\rangle + \beta\,|1\rangle \tag{1}$$

where α and β are complex numbers such that $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$. Given this constraint, we can write $|\psi\rangle$ uniquely as follows:

$$|\psi\rangle = \cos(\theta/2)\,|0\rangle \;+\; e^{i\phi}\sin(\theta/2)\,|1\rangle \tag{2}$$

where $0 \leqslant \theta \leqslant \pi$ and $0 \leqslant \phi < 2\pi$. Expression (2) can be visualised through the Bloch sphere representation of quantum states, which we introduce in Sec. VII-F.

In classical computing, we refer to a *bit value* or a binary value. In quantum computing, we refer to a *qubit state* or a quantum state. Rather than a *linear combination*, we say that the quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ above is a superposition of the two basis states. The basis $|0\rangle$, $|1\rangle$ in which the qubit is represented is called the *computational basis*. The superposition is instrumental in enabling quantum computing parallelism and speedup.

The notation we used for unit-norm column vectors above is common in the quantum computing literature. In this notation, known as the Dirac or bra-ket notation, *ket* state $|\psi\rangle$ denotes a unit-norm column vector and *bra* state $\langle\psi|$, its Hermitian transpose (a row vector). The *bracket* $\langle\psi|\varphi\rangle$ denotes the inner product, hence the name bra-ket. The outer product $|\psi\rangle\langle\varphi|$ is a matrix, and $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is a rank–1 projection matrix. The Dirac notation is preferred by physicists in general, and almost exclusively used. It let us easily tell apart not only scalars and vectors, but also column and row vectors.

B. Multiple Qubits

Consider two qubits: $|\psi_1\rangle = \alpha_1|0\rangle + \beta_1|1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle = \alpha_2|0\rangle + \beta_2|1\rangle$. The joint state of the pair is the Kronecker product of the individual states:

$$\begin{aligned}|\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\psi_2\rangle &= \big(\alpha_1|0\rangle + \beta_1|1\rangle\big) \otimes \big(\alpha_2|0\rangle + \beta_2|1\rangle\big) \\ &= \alpha_1\alpha_2\,|0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle + \alpha_1\beta_2\,|0\rangle \otimes |1\rangle + \beta_1\alpha_2\,|1\rangle \otimes |0\rangle + \beta_1\beta_2\,|1\rangle \otimes |1\rangle\end{aligned}$$

[1]The norm is induced by the inner product.

where

$$|0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \qquad |0\rangle \otimes |1\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \qquad |1\rangle \otimes |0\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \qquad |1\rangle \otimes |1\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

is a basis for $\mathbb{C}^4 = \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$. In general, a 2-qubit state is any linear combination of the four basis states, and thus cannot always be expressed as a Kronecker product of single qubit states. To see this, consider the two-qubit state $|\psi\rangle = \big(|0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle + |1\rangle \otimes |1\rangle\big)/\sqrt{2}$. States that can be written as a Kronecker product of single-qubit states are called *separable* and those that cannot are called *entangled* states.

An n–qubit state $|\phi\rangle$ is a unit-norm vector in $\mathbb{C}^{2^n}$, which we commonly refer to as the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{2^n} = \mathcal{H}_2^{\otimes n} = \underbrace{\mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_2}_{n}$. We will also often use the common notation $N = 2^n$. For an n–qubit state $|\phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{2^n}$, we have

$$|\phi\rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} \alpha_i |i_0 i_1 \dots i_{n-1}\rangle, \qquad \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} |\alpha_i|^2 = 1.$$

where $i_0 i_1 \dots i_{n-1}$ is the binary representation of i, and $|i_0 i_1 \dots i_{n-1}\rangle$ represents shorthand notation for $|i_0\rangle \otimes |i_1\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |i_{n-1}\rangle$ (the i-th basis vector of $\mathcal{H}_{2^n}$). Other commonly used shorthand notation is

$$|i_0\rangle \otimes |i_1\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |i_{n-1}\rangle \equiv |i_0\rangle|i_1\rangle \dots |i_{n-1}\rangle \equiv |i_0, i_1, \dots, i_{n-1}\rangle \equiv |i_0 i_1 \dots i_{n-1}\rangle$$

III. How is Quantum Information Processed?

Processing of quantum information is connected to a postulate of quantum mechanics which says that the evolution of a closed quantum system is described by a unitary transformation. Therefore, in a closed quantum system, a single-qubit state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2$ can be transformed to some other state in $\mathcal{H}_2$, say $|\varphi\rangle$, in a reversible way only by some unitary operator U, i.e.,

$$|\varphi\rangle = U|\psi\rangle$$

where U is a 2×2 unitary matrix over $\mathbb{C}$. Note that quantum evolution is reversible.

A. Unitary Evolution and Quantum Gates

Unitary evolution in a closed quantum system is a consequence of the Schrödinger equation. In a closed system, the state (wave function) $|\psi(t)\rangle$ evolves according to the Schrödinger equation:

$$i\hbar \frac{d}{dt} |\psi(t)\rangle = H \cdot |\psi(t)\rangle$$

where H is a fixed Hermitian matrix known as the system's Hamiltonian. If H does not depend on time, the solution of this equation is

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = U(t)\,|\psi(0)\rangle$$

and it is easy to show that $U(t) = \exp\left(-\frac{i}{\hbar}Ht\right)$ is a unitary matrix. The Hamiltonian describes the physical model. The Schrödinger equation tells us how a state-vector evolves in time given the physical model described by the Hamiltonian.

If we know how U acts on the basis vectors $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, then we also know how it acts on any vector $|\psi\rangle = \alpha\,|0\rangle + \beta\,|1\rangle$ since the evolution (matrix multiplication) is a linear operation, and thus

$$U\,|\psi\rangle = \alpha U\,|0\rangle + \beta U\,|1\rangle\,.$$

Unitary action U maps the computational basis $|0\rangle$, $|1\rangle$ into the basis $U\,|0\rangle$, $U\,|1\rangle$.

Actions on an n–qubit state are described by $2^n \times 2^n$ unitary matrices, which may or may not be Kronecker products of matrices of smaller dimensions. When $U = U_0 \otimes U_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes U_{n-1}$, where U_i is a 2×2 unitary matrix, then its action on the basis vector $|i_0\rangle \otimes |i_1\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |i_{n-1}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{2^n}$ is given by

$$U\,|i_0 i_1 \ldots i_{n-1}\rangle = \boxed{U_0|i_0\rangle} \otimes \boxed{U_1|i_1\rangle} \otimes \cdots \otimes \boxed{U_{n-1}|i_{n-1}\rangle}$$

B. Some Standard Quantum Gates

Unitary operators that act on one or more qubits are often referred to as *quantum gates*. The requirement that the gates be unitary, i.e., reversible, rules out quantum versions of some classical gates, e.g., the `AND` gate but not the `NOT` gate. We next present some often used quantum gates.

1) Single Qubit Gates: In classical computing, `NOT` is the only single bit gate, that is, in addition to the `I` "gate" (identity). In quantum computing, any 2×2 unitary matrix specifies a single-qubit gate. The most commonly used single-qubit gates are the Pauli and Hadamard matrices.

The Identity and the Pauli Matrices:

The matrices are given below together with their action on the basis vectors in the quantum circuit notation:

$$I = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \begin{array}{l} |0\rangle \text{—}\boxed{I}\text{—} |0\rangle \\ |1\rangle \text{—}\boxed{I}\text{—} |1\rangle \end{array} \qquad \sigma_Y = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \begin{array}{l} |0\rangle \text{—}\boxed{Y}\text{—} i\,|1\rangle \\ |1\rangle \text{—}\boxed{Y}\text{—} -i\,|0\rangle \end{array}$$

$$\sigma_X = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \begin{array}{l} |0\rangle \text{—}\boxed{X}\text{—} |1\rangle \\ |1\rangle \text{—}\boxed{X}\text{—} |0\rangle \end{array} \qquad \sigma_Z = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \begin{array}{l} |0\rangle \text{—}\boxed{Z}\text{—} |0\rangle \\ |1\rangle \text{—}\boxed{Z}\text{—} -|1\rangle \end{array}$$

Note that σ_X maps $|0\rangle$ into $|1\rangle$ and vice versa, and thus it is often referred to as the quantum NOT or the bit-flip gate. These four matrices have many interesting properties, and appear often in physics and mathematics. In particular, any 2×2 complex matrix A (and thus any unitary matrix) can be expressed as a linear combination of the identity I and the Pauli matrices σ_X, σ_Y, and σ_Z:

$$A = \alpha_I I + \alpha_X \sigma_X + \alpha_Y \sigma_Y + \alpha_Z \sigma_Z$$

for some complex numbers α_I, α_X, α_Y, and α_Z.

The Hadamard gate: The Hadamard single qubit gate is defined by the normalized Haramard 2×2 matrix.

$$H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \qquad \begin{array}{l} |0\rangle \text{ —H— } (|0\rangle + |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \\ |1\rangle \text{ —H— } (|0\rangle - |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \end{array}$$

The basis of $\mathbb{C}^2$ defined by vectors

$$|+\rangle = (|0\rangle + |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \quad \text{and} \quad |-\rangle = (|0\rangle - |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \tag{3}$$

that results from the Hadamard action of the computational basis is known as the Hadamard basis.

2) Two Qubit Gates: The two-qubit quantum gate known as quantum XOR or controlled-not gate CNOT is specified as a map, a circuit, and a unitary matrix U_{CNOT} as follows:

$$\text{CNOT} : |x, y\rangle \to |x, x \oplus y\rangle \qquad x, y \in \{0, 1\}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} |x\rangle \text{ —●— } |x\rangle \\ |y\rangle \text{ —⊕— } |x \oplus y\rangle \end{array} \qquad U_{\text{CNOT}} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

We can use the Hadamard and the CNOT gates to create entanglement as follows:

$$\begin{array}{l} |0\rangle \text{ —H—●—} \\ |0\rangle \text{ ———⊕—} \end{array} \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\big(|00\rangle + |11\rangle\big)$$

C. The No-Cloning Theorem

The requirement that any evolution be unitary gives rise to the famous no-cloning theorem [11]–[13], which asserts that there is no unitary operator U_c on $\mathcal{H}_2 \times \mathcal{H}_2$ that takes state $|\psi\rangle \otimes |\omega\rangle$ to $|\psi\rangle \otimes |\psi\rangle$ for all states $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ and some fixed state $\omega \in \mathcal{H}$.

To prove the no-cloning theorem, we suppose that there is a unitary matrix U_c such that for two arbitrary sates $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\varphi\rangle$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} U_c(|\psi\rangle \otimes |\omega\rangle) &= |\psi\rangle \otimes |\psi\rangle \\ U_c(|\varphi\rangle \otimes |\omega\rangle) &= |\varphi\rangle \otimes |\varphi\rangle \end{aligned}$$

where ω is some fixed quantum state. Note the following identities:

1) By the properties of the Kronecker product, we have

$$\big(\langle\psi| \otimes \langle\omega|\big) \cdot \big(|\varphi\rangle \otimes |\omega\rangle\big) = \langle\psi|\varphi\rangle$$

2) Since U_c is unitary, that is $U_c^\dagger \cdot U_c = I$, then by the properties of the Kronecker product, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\psi|\varphi\rangle &= \big(\langle\psi| \otimes \langle\omega|\big) \cdot \big(|\varphi\rangle \otimes |\omega\rangle\big) \\ &= \big(\langle\psi| \otimes \langle\omega|\big) U_c^\dagger \cdot U_c \big(|\varphi\rangle \otimes |\omega\rangle\big) \\ &= \big(\langle\psi| \otimes \langle\psi|\big) \cdot \big(|\varphi\rangle \otimes |\varphi\rangle\big) \\ &= \langle\psi|\varphi\rangle \otimes \langle\psi|\varphi\rangle = \langle\psi|\varphi\rangle^2 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\langle\psi|\varphi\rangle$ is either equal to 0 or to 1. Thus if U_c can clone some state $|\psi\rangle$, then the only other state U_c can clone has to be orthogonal to $|\psi\rangle$.

The no-cloning theorem is often misunderstood to be more restrictive than it is. Note that it does not prohibit the following map:

$$\underbrace{\alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle}_{\in \mathcal{H}_2} \;\rightarrow\; \underbrace{\alpha|000\rangle + \beta|111\rangle}_{\in \mathcal{H}_{23}}$$

which can be accomplished by the circuit consisting of gates we defined above as follows:





Fig. 1. Quantum circuit consisting of two CNOT gates that maps $(\alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle) \otimes |0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle$ to $\alpha|000\rangle + \beta|111\rangle$.

D. Creating Quantum Parallelism

We can evaluate an m-bit valued function f of an n-bit string by what is known as the *function evaluation gate*. The evaluation gate for a function $f : \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \{0,1\}^m$ is described as follows:

$$U_f : |x, y\rangle \to |x, y \oplus f(x)\rangle \qquad x \in \{0,1\}^n,\ y \in \{0,1\}^m$$



Note that U_f is a unitary operator acting on vectors in $\mathcal{H}_2^{\otimes n} \otimes \mathcal{H}_2^{\otimes m}$.

We have seen above that the Hadamard gate action on $|0\rangle$ creates a uniform superposition of the computational basis states. It is easy to show that applying the n–qubit Hadamard product gate $H^{\otimes n}$ to $|0\rangle^{\otimes n}$ creates the uniform superposition of the computational basis of $\mathcal{H}_{2^n}$

$$|0\rangle^{\otimes n} \text{ —} \boxed{H^{\otimes n}} \text{—} \ \tfrac{1}{2^{n/2}} \textstyle\sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^n} |x\rangle$$

Quantum function evaluation parallelism is achieved by first creating the uniform superposition of the computational basis of $\mathcal{H}_{2^n}$ and then applying the U_f unitary transform to simultaneously evaluate f on its entire domain, as follows:

$$U_f\big(H^{\otimes n} \otimes I_m\big)\big(|0\rangle^{\otimes n} \otimes |0\rangle^{\otimes m}\big) = \frac{1}{2^{n/2}} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^n} |x, f(x)\rangle\,. \tag{4}$$

If we could also simultaneously read all the evaluations (which we cannot), we would achieve a quantum speedup. We will see what is possible in the next section which describes how we can extract classical information from quantum states.

IV. How is Classical Information Extracted?

Extraction of classical information from quantum states is connected to a postulate of quantum mechanics which says that to every physical observable, there corresponds an operator defined by a Hermitian matrix. The only possible results of measuring an observable are the eigenvalues of its corresponding Hermitian matrix. The only possible states after measuring an observable are the normalized (unit-norm) eigenvectors of its Hermitian matrix.

A. Observables and Expected Values

The measurement of an observable H always indicates an eigenvalue of H and turns any measured quantum state into the eigenstate of H corresponding to the indicated eigenvalue. The measured state only gives rise to a probability distribution on the set of outcomes, as we explain next. Let $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_N$ be the eigenvalues of an $N \times N$ Hermitian matrix H and $|u_1\rangle, \ldots, |u_N\rangle$ the corresponding eigenvectors. (We assume, for the moment, that all λ_i are different.) Let $|\psi\rangle$ be a state being measured by the observable

described by H. Then the measurement result is λ_i and $|\psi\rangle$ collapses to $|u_i\rangle$ with probability (wp) $|\langle\psi|u_i\rangle|^2$, $1 \leqslant i \leqslant N$, as sketched in Fig. 2.




Fig. 2. Quantum measurement: The only possible results of "measuring H" are its eigenvalues λ_i, and the only possible states after "measuring H" are its normalized eigenvectors $|u_i\rangle$. When we "see" λ_i (which happens wp $|\langle\psi|u_i\rangle|^2$ when state $|\psi\rangle$ is measured), we know that state being measured $|\psi\rangle$ has collapsed to $|u_i\rangle$.

Since H is hermitian, and thus unitarily diagonizable, it holds that

1) $\langle u_i|u_j\rangle = \delta_{ij}$
2) $|u_1\rangle\langle u_1| + |u_2\rangle\langle u_2| + \cdots + |u_N\rangle\langle u_N| = I_N$

A set of vectors $|u_1\rangle, \ldots, |u_N\rangle$ that satisfies the above two conditions is said to form a *resolution of the identity*. We refer to $|u_1\rangle, \ldots, |u_N\rangle$ as the measurement basis, and say that we *perform a measurement in the basis* or measure in the basis $|u_1\rangle, \ldots, |u_N\rangle$.

Example: When we measure state $|\psi\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$ in the computational basis, the result will be $|0\rangle$ wp $|\alpha|^2$ and $|1\rangle$ wp $|\beta|^2$. What can we get if we measure qubit $\big(|0\rangle + |1\rangle\big)/\sqrt{2}$ in the computational basis $|0\rangle$, $|1\rangle$? What is the probability of the outcomes? How about the Hadamard basis defined in (3)?

Regardless of which state $|\psi\rangle$ is being measured by the observable described by H, the only possible outcomes are the eigenvalues of H. The expected value of the measurement depends on $|\psi\rangle$ as follows:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i |\langle\psi|u_i\rangle|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i \langle\psi|u_i\rangle\langle u_i|\psi\rangle$$
$$= \langle\psi| \left(\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i |u_i\rangle\langle u_i|\right) |\psi\rangle = \langle\psi|\, H\, |\psi\rangle$$

where we have used the equality $H = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i |u_i\rangle\langle u_i|$. (The reader may care to observe the convenience of the Dirac notation in this simple derivation.)

It is natural to wonder whether these probabilistic measurements can be useful. Recall that quantum parallelism allows us to evaluate $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}^m$ on its entire domain (see map (4)). But we have just seen that we cannot simultaneously extract all the values by a single measurement. How is then quantum speedup achieved? Many quantum algorithms prescribe further processing of the state $\frac{1}{2^{n/2}} \sum_{x\in\{0,1\}^n} |x, f(x)\rangle$ so that, when a measurement is eventually performed, the probability of getting the answer to the posed question is (close to) 1. Moreover, the questions usually ask about some global

property such as whether a function is balanced or constant or what is its period rather than the explicit function evaluation on its entire domain.

B. Mathematical Description of the Quantum Measurement

We have seen above that a measurement on an n–qubit state is defined by a set of $N = 2^n$ basis vectors $|u_i\rangle$, $1 \leqslant i \leqslant N$. When state $|\psi\rangle$ enters the measuring apparatus, it collapses to the state $|u_i\rangle$ wp $|\langle\psi|u_i\rangle|^2$. If we denote by Π_i the rank–1 projection on $|u_i\rangle$, we can equivalently say the the measurement is defined by the set of N orthogonal rank–1 projections $\Pi_i = |u_i\rangle\langle u_i|$ and the measured state $|\psi\rangle$ collapses to $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\langle\psi|\Pi_i|\psi\rangle}}\Pi_i|\psi\rangle$ wp $\langle\psi|\Pi_i|\psi\rangle$. We can now easily generalize our basis defined measurement by removing the requirement that the projections Π_i be rank–1.

1) Von Neumann Measurement: An observable described by a Hermitian $N \times N$ matrix H may have $m \leqslant N$ different eignvalues. Let Π_i be the projection operator on the eigenspace i of H, $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m$. The von Neumann projective measurement is defined as follows:

- A set of pairwise orthogonal projection operators $\{\Pi_i\}$ such that $\sum_i \Pi_i = I$.
- For input $|\psi\rangle$, output i happens with probability $\langle\psi|\Pi_i|\psi\rangle$, and $|\psi\rangle$ collapses to $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\langle\psi|\Pi_i|\psi\rangle}}\Pi_i|\psi\rangle$.

2) Positive Operator-Valued Measure (POVM): We can further generalize the von Neumann measurement of an n–qubit state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{2^n}$ by observing that we can add an ancillary m–qubit state in $\mathcal{H}_{2^m}$ to $|\psi\rangle$ and perform a von Neumann measurement to the joint state in $\mathcal{H}_{2^n} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{2^m}$. If we restrict our attention[2] to $\mathcal{H}_{2^n}$, the measurement is defined as follows:

- Any set of positive-semidefinite operators $\{E_i\}$ such that $\sum_i E_i = I$.
- For input $|\psi\rangle$, output i happens with probability $\langle\psi|E_i|\psi\rangle$, and $|\psi\rangle$ collapses to $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\langle\psi|E_i|\psi\rangle}}\Pi_i|\psi\rangle$.

C. Examples of Quantum Measurements

We consider measuring two single-qubit states $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$. The angle between these vectors is $2\pi/6$.

1) Von Neumann Measurement: The measurement is defined by the computational basis vectors $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$. The angle between $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|0\rangle$ is $\pi/12$, and so is the angle between $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, as in Fig. 3. No matter which state is measured, the resulting state after the measurement is either $|0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$. If state $|\psi_0\rangle$ is measured, it will collapse either to state $|0\rangle$ with probability $|\langle\psi_0|0\rangle|^2 = \cos^2(\pi/12) = 1/2+\sqrt{3}/4$ or to state $|1\rangle$ with probability $|\langle\psi_0|1\rangle|^2 = 1-|\langle\psi_0|0\rangle|^2 = \sin^2(\pi/12) = 1/2-\sqrt{3}/4$. We can make similar observations when state $|\psi_1\rangle$ is measured.

[2]*Restricting our attention* to a part of the system is a formal mathematical notion; see Sec. VII-D which discusses bipartite states.




Fig. 3. (a) States $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$ with the bases $|0\rangle$, $|1\rangle$ used for a von Neumann measurement. (b) the states before and after the measurement with the possible transitions. (Some labels are omitted for clarity of the figure.)

2) Positive Operator Value Measure (POVM): The measurement is defined by the projections on vectors $|\varphi_0\rangle$, $|\varphi_1\rangle$, $|\varphi_2\rangle$. The angle between $|\varphi_0\rangle$ and $|\varphi_i\rangle$, $i = 1, 2$, is $2\pi/3$, and it is easy to see that properly normalized projections on these vectors form a resolution of the identity I_2. Vectors $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\varphi_1\rangle$ are orthogonal, and so are $|\varphi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$, as in Fig. 4. No matter which state is measured, the resulting state




Fig. 4. (a) States $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$ with the vectors $|\varphi_0\rangle$, $|\varphi_1\rangle$, and $|\varphi_1\rangle$ used for a POVM. (b) the states before and after the measurement with the possible transitions.

after the measurement is one of the states $|\varphi_0\rangle$, $|\varphi_1\rangle$, $|\varphi_2\rangle$. If state $|\psi_0\rangle$ is measured, it will collapse either to state $|\varphi_0\rangle$ with probability $|\langle\psi_0|\varphi_0\rangle|^2 = \cos^2(2\pi/6) = 1/4$ or to state $|\varphi_2\rangle$ with probability $|\langle\psi_0|\varphi_2\rangle|^2 = \cos^2(\pi/6) = 3/4$. Note that the probability of state $|\psi_0\rangle$ collapsing to $|\varphi_1\rangle$ is zero. We can make similar observations when state $|\psi_1\rangle$ is measured.

3) Measurements Defined by Pauli Matrices: Pauli Matrices are both unitary and Hermitian, and thus can serve to define both quantum gates and quantum measurements. Their eigenvalues with the corresponding eigenvectors are shown in Table I.

TABLE I
PAULI MATRICES AND THEIR EIGENVALUES WITH THE CORRESPONDING NORMALIZED EIGENVECTORS.

matrix	eigenvalue/eigenvector	
σ_X	$+1/(\|0\rangle + \|1\rangle)$	$-1/(\|0\rangle - \|1\rangle)$
σ_Y	$+1/\|0\rangle + \mathrm{i}\|1\rangle)$	$-1/(\|0\rangle - \mathrm{i}\|1\rangle)$
σ_Z	$+1/\|0\rangle$	$-1/\|1\rangle$

V. QUANTUM KEY DISTRIBUTION

Traditional data encryption methods, based on using public keys, are threatened by the advances in quantum computing algorithms promising to efficiently solve so far intractable problems that make public key encryption currently secure. However, it is precisely quantum information processing advances that are also expected to enable secure communications by allowing efficient and secure private key distribution. The main advantage of private key encryption is that as long as the key strings are truly secret, it is provably secure, that is, insensitive to advances in computing.

A Quantum Key Distribution (QKD) protocol describes how two parties, commonly referred to as Alice and Bob, can establish a secret key by communicating over a quantum and a public classical channel when both channels can be accessed by an eavesdropper Eve. The basic observation behind QKD protocols is that, since Eve cannot clone qubits (cf. Sec. III-C), she can only gain information by measuring the original qubit. Therefore, when non-orthogonal qubits are transmitted from Alice to Bob, then Eve cannot gain any information from the qubits without disturbing their states, thus alerting Alice and Bob of her presence. We next describe two important QKD protocols. Substantial progress has been made towards building practical schemes based on these protocols.

A. BB84 Protocol

The BB84 was developed by Bennett and Brassard in 1984, hence the name [14]. We outline steps that Alice and Bob make under this protocol in order to generate a secret key of $O(n)$ bits for an arbitrary integer n.

1) Alice creates a sequence of $(4+\delta)n$ random data bits which she will map into qubits for transmission over the quantum channel between her and Bob.
2) For each data bit, Alice tosses a fair coin. If she gets a head (H), she maps her data bit into either $|0\rangle$ (if her data bit is 0) or $|1\rangle$ (if her data bit is 1). If she gets a tail (T), she maps her data bit into

either $|+\rangle$ (if her data bit is 0) or $|-\rangle$ (if her data bit is 1). Recall that $|-\rangle$ and $|+\rangle$ states are defined in (3). We will refer to the sequence of heads and tails that Alice generated as C_A. We will call $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ the H basis and $\{|-\rangle, |+\rangle\}$ the T basis, according to the corresponding coin faces.

3) Alice sends the resulting $(4+\delta)n$ qubits to Bob over their public quantum communication channel. Each qubit may be altered by the noise in the channel and/or measured by Eve. Note that, at this point, Eve has no knowledge of C_A and thus what measurement basis she should use for an intercepted qubit in order to learn the corresponding bit. She can only guess the preparation basis for a qubit, and if her guess is wrong, she will alter its state, thus leaving a proof of eavesdropping.
4) Upon receiving a qubit, Bob then tosses a fair coin and then, depending on the toss outcome, he measures the qubit in either the H or the T basis. If he uses the H bases and gets $|0\rangle$, or the T bases and gets $|+\rangle$, he records bit 0; otherwise he records bit 1.

   We refer to the sequence of heads and tails generated by Bob as C_B.
5) Once Bob receives $(4+\delta)n$ qubits, Alice publicly announces C_A and Bob publicly announces C_B.
6) Alice and Bob discard the bits where sequences C_A and C_B differ (that is, when Bob measured a qubit a in the different basis than Alice used for its preparation). With high probability, there are at least 2n bits left (if not, repeat the protocol). They keep $2n$ bits.
7) Alice selects a subset of n bits from the remaining $2n$ that will serve to check Eve's interference, and tells Bob which bits she selected.
8) Alice and Bob announce and compare the values of the n check bits. If more than an acceptable number disagree, they abort the protocol. (The acceptable number is determined by e.g., the noise in the channels.)
9) Alice and Bob perform classical information reconciliation and privacy amplification on the remaining n bits to obtain $O(n)$ shared key bits.

B. E91-like Protocols

The E91 protocol was proposed by Ekert in 1991, hence the name [15]. The scheme distributes entangled pairs of photons so that Alice and Bob each end up with one photon from each entangled pair. The creation and distribution of photons can be done by Alice, by Bob, or by some third party.

Suppose Alice and Bob share a set of n entangled pairs of qubits in the state $(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and Eve is not present. If they measure their respective states in the computational basis, they will get

identical sequences of completely random bits. Thus the scheme benefits from two properties of shared entanglement: randomness and correlation. To check if Eve was present, Alice and Bob can, for example, select a random subset of the shared entangled pairs, and test to see if they are entangled (instead of using them to generate the key bits). They can do that e.g., by playing the CHSH game discussed in Sec. IX-D.

VI. Error Correcting Codes

Error correcting codes add redundancy to data in order to make it less sensitive to errors. The most basic form of redundancy is simple replication (cloning), known as *repetition coding*. For example, if each bit is replicated 3 times, any single bit flip among the 3 replicas can be corrected by turning it to the value of the other two replicas, after first finding out (measuring) what the value of the majority is. But could there be a counterpart to this process in the quantum world where the no-cloning theorem holds and the measurements disturb the states?[3] We will first formally describe the process of introducing redundancy (encoding) and correcting errors (decoding) for a 1-to-3 bits repetition code, which will allow us to introduce and understand its quantum 1-to-3 qubit counterpart.

A. A Classical Error Correcting Code

- Encoding is a map that introduces redundancy. In our 1-to-3 bits repetition code example, each bit x is mapped to a 3 bit string $x\,x\,x$, that is, the encoding is the following map:

$$0 \to 000 \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \to 111$$

- Error Model: In this example, at most one of the bits $x\,x\,x$ gets flipped. Such flipping is equivalent to adding (component-wise) a string in the set $\{000, 100, 010, 001\}$ to $x\,x\,x$ and getting $y_0\,y_1\,y_2$:

additive error	y_0	y_1	y_2
0 0 0	x	x	x
1 0 0	$x \oplus 1$	x	x
0 1 0	x	$x \oplus 1$	x
0 0 1	x	x	$x \oplus 1$

[3] *As significant as Shor's factoring algorithm may prove to be, there is another recently discovered feature of quantum information that may be just as important: the discovery of quantum error correction. Indeed, were it not for this development, the prospects for quantum computing technology would not seem bright.*

John Preskill, *Quantum Computation Lecture Notes.* Chapter 1, 1997/98.

- Measurements: We perform the following matrix vector multiplication (cf. two measurements):

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} y_0 \\ y_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} y_0 \oplus y_1 \\ y_0 \oplus y_2 \end{bmatrix} \tag{5}$$

We refer to the vector $\begin{bmatrix} y_0 \oplus y_1 \\ y_0 \oplus y_2 \end{bmatrix}$ as the *error syndrome*. Observe that the first bit of the syndrome tells us if whether bits y_0 and y_1 have identical values and the second bit of the syndrome tells us if whether bits y_0 and y_2 have identical values.

- Error Correction: The 2-bit measurement result (syndrome) tells us which bit is flipped, and thus instructs us how to correct errors:

y_0	y_1	y_2	$y_0 \oplus y_1$	$y_0 \oplus y_2$	add to $y_0\, y_1\, y_2$
x	x	x	0	0	0 0 0
x$\oplus$ 1	x	x	1	1	1 0 0
x	x$\oplus$ 1	x	1	0	0 1 0
x	x	x $\oplus$ 1	0	1	0 0 1

B. A Quantum Error Correcting Code

Quantum error correction has to follow the laws of quantum mechanics. Therefore all actions on qubits (encoding, errors, decoding) have to be either unitary or measurements. We describe the simplest code only to show that quantum error correction under these constraints is feasible, and possibly make the reader interested in this fascinating subject. [4]

- Encoding: As in the classical case, encoding is a map that introduces redundancy. In our example, a single qubit state is mapped into a 3-Qubit state as follows:

$$\alpha\,|0\rangle + \beta\,|1\rangle \rightarrow \alpha\,|000\rangle + \beta\,|111\rangle$$

The unitary circuit shown in Fig. 1 can serve as a quantum mechanically valid encoder for our code. It uses two `CNOT` gates and two ancillary qubits, each initially in the state $|0\rangle$. The result is an entangled 3-Qubit state.

[4] *Correcting errors might sound like a dreary practical problem, of little aesthetic or conceptual interest. But aside from being of crucial importance for the feasibility of quantum computation, it is also one of the most beautiful and surprising parts of the subject.*
David Mermin, *Quantum Computer Science: An Introduction.* Cambridge Univ. Press.

- Error Model: We assume that at most one qubit experiences the basis flip (i.e., is acted on by σ_X, see Sec. III-B). The possible 3-qubit error operators and the resulting states they give when acting on $\alpha|000\rangle + \beta|111\rangle$ are as follows:

error operators	resulting state
$I \otimes I \otimes I$	$\alpha\|000\rangle + \beta\|111\rangle$
$\sigma_X \otimes I \otimes I$	$\alpha\|100\rangle + \beta\|011\rangle$
$I \otimes \sigma_X \otimes I$	$\alpha\|010\rangle + \beta\|101\rangle$
$I \otimes I \otimes \sigma_X$	$\alpha\|001\rangle + \beta\|110\rangle$

- Measurements: As in the classical case, the idea is to have two measurements such that one compares qubits 1 and 2, and the other compares qubits 1 and 3. The additional constraint here is that the measuring process leave the measured states unchanged. We perform the following two measurements:

  $\boxed{M_1}$: This measurement is defined by the Hermitian operator $\sigma_Z \otimes \sigma_Z \otimes I$, i.e., the following two orthogonal projection operators:

$$\Pi_1 = |000\rangle\langle 000| + |111\rangle\langle 111| + |001\rangle\langle 001| + |110\rangle\langle 110|$$
$$\Pi_2 = |010\rangle\langle 010| + |101\rangle\langle 101| + |011\rangle\langle 011| + |100\rangle\langle 100|$$

  Π_1 projects on the eigenspace of $\sigma_Z \otimes \sigma_Z \otimes I$ with eigenvalue 1, and Π_2 projects on the eigenspace of $\sigma_Z \otimes \sigma_Z \otimes I$ with eigenvalue -1. (See Table I.)

  $\boxed{M_2}$: This measurement is defined by the Hermitian operator $\sigma_Z \otimes I \otimes \sigma_Z$, i.e., the following two orthogonal projection operators:

$$\Pi_1 = |000\rangle\langle 000| + |111\rangle\langle 111| + |010\rangle\langle 010| + |101\rangle\langle 101|$$
$$\Pi_2 = |001\rangle\langle 001| + |110\rangle\langle 110| + |011\rangle\langle 011| + |100\rangle\langle 100|$$

  Π_1 projects on the eigenspace of $\sigma_Z \otimes I \otimes \sigma_Z$ with eigenvalue 1, and Π_2 projects on the eigenspace of $\sigma_Z \otimes I \otimes \sigma_Z$ with eigenvalue -1. (See Table I.)

- Error Correction: The results of the two measurements are two eigenvalues (2 bits). As in the classical case, we refer to this result as the error syndrome, which instructs us how to correct errors, as follows:

corrupted state	M_1	M_2	apply
$\alpha\|000\rangle + \beta\|111\rangle$	$+1$	$+1$	$I \otimes I \otimes I$
$\alpha\|100\rangle + \beta\|011\rangle$	-1	-1	$\sigma_X \otimes I \otimes I$
$\alpha\|010\rangle + \beta\|101\rangle$	-1	$+1$	$I \otimes \sigma_X \otimes I$
$\alpha\|001\rangle + \beta\|110\rangle$	$+1$	-1	$I \otimes I \otimes \sigma_X$

Remark: The error detecting procedure we used 1) follows directly from classical error correction and 2) it is is useful in generalizing to other quantum codes with more qubits. However, M_1 and M_2 are not the only measurements we can use to obtain the error syndrome that can uniquely identify the error. To see that consider the following set of projections:

$$\Pi_1 = |000\rangle\langle 000| + |111\rangle\langle 111| \quad \text{no error}$$

$$\Pi_2 = |100\rangle\langle 100| + |011\rangle\langle 011| \quad \text{bit flip on Qubit one}$$

$$\Pi_3 = |010\rangle\langle 010| + |101\rangle\langle 101| \quad \text{bit flip on Qubit two}$$

$$\Pi_4 = |001\rangle\langle 001| + |110\rangle\langle 110| \quad \text{bit flip on Qubit three}$$

Note that the (no)-error states belong to orthogonal subspaces, and therefore a von Neumann measurement defined by projectors to those subspaces can 1) unambiguously identify the error state and 2) will not disturb the measured state.

As their classical counterparts, decoders of quantum error correcting codes can miss-correct or not-detect certain error patterns. For example, the decoder above will miss-correct the two-qubit error introduced by the operator $\sigma_X \otimes \sigma_X \otimes I$, and it will not detect three-qubit error $\sigma_X \otimes \sigma_X \otimes \sigma_X$ and even a single-qubit error $\sigma_Z \otimes I \otimes I$.

VII. Mixed States

There are many scenarios when we do not know the state of a quantum system, but do know that it is in the state $|\psi_j\rangle$ with probability p_j, $j = 1, \ldots, k$. We say then that the quantum system is in a *mixed state*, and refer to the collection of pairs $\{\psi_j, p_j\}_{j=1}^k$ as an *ensemble of states*. The states we worked with so far, which can be described by a vector, are known as *pure states*. A mixed state arises e.g., when we know that a measurement of a pure state has been performed but do not know the outcome, or when one of some k noise operators acted on a pure state, as in Sec. VI. We will use the mixed state

notion extensively in the next section when we present some elements of quantum information theory. This section is concerned with representing, processing, and measuring mixed states.

A. The Density Matrix Formalism

So far, we used unit-norm vectors in Hilbert spaces to mathematically specify quantum states. We can instead describe a quantum state, say $|\psi\rangle$, by the projection matrix $\rho_\psi = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$. We refer to ρ_ψ as the *density matrix* of $|\psi\rangle$. To see that this is a valid model, we next describe 1) how a state evolves when a unitary transformation is applied to it and 2) what happens to a state and with what probability when a measurement is performed on it.

1) Suppose that unitary operator U acts on state $|\psi\rangle$ giving the state $|\varphi\rangle = U|\psi\rangle$. We have $|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi| = U|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|U^\dagger$. Therefore, $|\psi\rangle \xrightarrow{U} U|\psi\rangle$ is replaced by $\rho_\psi \xrightarrow{U} U\rho_\psi U^\dagger$.
2) Suppose a measurement defined by the basis $|u_1\rangle, \ldots, |u_N\rangle$ is performed on the state $|\psi\rangle$. We know that the resulting state will be $|u_i\rangle$ with probability (wp) $|\langle\psi|u_i\rangle|^2$, $1 \leqslant i \leqslant N$. In terms of density matrices, we have $\rho_\psi \to |u_i\rangle\langle u_i| \quad \text{wp} \quad \mathrm{Tr}\big(|u_i\rangle\langle u_i|\rho_\psi\big)$, where the probability expression was obtained by observing that $|\langle\psi|u_i\rangle|^2 = \langle\psi|u_i\rangle\langle u_i|\psi\rangle = \mathrm{Tr}\big(|u_i\rangle\langle u_i| \cdot |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\big) = \mathrm{Tr}\big(|u_i\rangle\langle u_i| \cdot \rho_\psi\big)$.

Note that to describe the state, evolution, and measurement, we used density matrices rather than state vectors. The advantage of the density matrix formalism is that it allows us to compactly describe mixed states. A mixed state, that is, a quantum system about which we only know that it is in the state $|\psi_j\rangle$ with probability p_j has a density matrix defined as follows:

$$\rho = \sum_j p_j |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|. \tag{6}$$

The states that have rank–1 density matrices $\rho_\psi = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ are known as *pure states*. In general, a density matrix ρ is a Hermitian, positive semi-definite, trace–1 matrix. These properties easily follow from (6).

Observe that two different ensembles of states can have identical density matrices, and therefore quantum mechanically represent identical states. Fig. 5 shows two different ensembles with the density matrix equal to $\frac{1}{2}I$. When a $d \times d$ density matrix is equal to $\frac{1}{2}I$, we say that the system is in the maximally mixed state. These density matrices are quantum counterparts to classical uniform distributions.

B. Unitary Evolution of Mixed States

What happens to a mixed state when a unitary transform U is applied to it? If the system described by the mixed state is actually in pure state $|\psi_j\rangle$ with the density matrix $\rho_j = |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|$, then it will evolve to




Fig. 5. Two "different" mixtures of pure states with identical density matrices.

the state $U\rho_j U^\dagger$, as we showed above. But we only know that the system is in the state ρ_j with probability p_j. Therefore, the mixed state will evolve to the state $U\rho_j U^\dagger$ with probability p_j. Therefore, the system with density matrix (6) will evolve into another mixed state, whose density matrix is given by

$$\sum_j p_j U|\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|U^\dagger = U\Big(\sum_j p_j|\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|\Big)U^\dagger = U\rho U^\dagger$$

Therefore, $\rho \xrightarrow{U} U\rho U^\dagger$.

C. Measuring Mixed States

We next look into what happens when we perform a quantum measurement defined by operators Π_i on a mixed state whose density matrix is $\rho = \sum_j p_j|\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|$. Again, let $\rho_j = |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|$. If the state being measured is $|\psi_j\rangle$ (which happens with probability p_j), then the probability of getting measurement result i is $\mathrm{Tr}\big(\Pi_i\rho_j\big)$. Therefore, by the total probability formula, when measuring ρ, we get outcome i with probability

$$\sum_j p_j \underbrace{\mathrm{Tr}\big(\Pi_i|\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|\big)}_{\Pr(i|j)} = \mathrm{Tr}\big(\Pi_i \sum_j p_j|\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|\big) = \mathrm{Tr}\big(\Pi_i\rho\big)$$

Note that different ensembles $\{\psi_j, p_j\}$ with the same ρ will give outcome i with the same probability $\mathrm{Tr}\big(\Pi_i\rho\big)$, which depends only on ρ.

Is the state corresponding to outcome i pure or mixed? If the state being measured is $|\psi_j\rangle$ and the measurement result is i, then the system is in the state $\frac{\Pi_i\rho_j\Pi_i}{\mathrm{Tr}\left(\Pi_i\rho_j\right)}$. Therefore, if we observe outcome i, the system is in the mixed state

$$\sum_j p_j \frac{\Pi_i\rho_j\Pi_i}{\mathrm{Tr}\left(\Pi_i\rho_j\right)} = \frac{\Pi_i\rho\Pi_i}{\mathrm{Tr}\left(\Pi_i\rho\right)}.$$

Note that we ended up having a mixed state after the measurement resulted in outcome i, because we started with a mixed state.

Which state would we have if we lost the measurement record? Note that, mathematically, the state of the system is for us described based on our *ignorance/knowledge*. We saw that we get state $\frac{\Pi_i\rho\Pi_i}{\mathrm{Tr}\left(\Pi_i\rho\right)}$ wp $\mathrm{Tr}\left(\Pi_i\rho\right)$. If we lost the measurement record, we would have a state described by the density matrix

$$\sum_{i=1} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\Pi_i\rho\right) \cdot \frac{\Pi_i\rho\Pi_i}{\mathrm{Tr}\left(\Pi_i\rho\right)} = \sum_{i=1} \Pi_i\rho\Pi_i. \tag{7}$$

Elementary probability (e.g., the total probability expression) is used for derivations.

D. Bipartite States

Let $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$ be finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces with basis states $\{|a_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{|b_j\rangle\}_{j=1}^m$, respectively. Then the state space of the composite system is the tensor product $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ with the basis $\{|a_i\rangle \otimes |b_j\rangle\}$, or in more compact notation $\{|a_i b_j\rangle\}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, $j = 1, \ldots, m$.

Let $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$. We say that $|\psi\rangle$ is a bipartite pure state of a composite system with subsystems A and B. (The state space of a composite physical system is the tensor product of the state spaces of the component physical systems.) Any pure state of the composite system can be written as

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m c_{i,j}(|a_i\rangle \otimes |b_j\rangle) = \sum_{i,j} c_{i,j}|a_i b_j\rangle, \quad \sum_{i,j} |c_{i,j}|^2 = 1.$$

When $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ can be written in the form $|\psi\rangle = |\psi_A\rangle \otimes |\psi_B\rangle$, we say that subsystems A and B are separable. Otherwise they are entangled. When a system is in an entangled pure state, it is not possible to assign states to its subsystems.

Let ρ_{AB} be a density matrix in the product Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$. A mixed state of the bipartite system described by ρ_{AB} can be

1) a product state if $\rho_{AB} = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B$,
2) a separable state if there exist a probability distribution $\{p_k\}$ and mixed states $\{\rho_A^k\}$ and $\{\rho_B^k\}$ (states of the respective subsystems) such that $\rho = \sum_k p_k \rho_A^k \otimes \rho_B^k$,

3) an entangled state if neither 1) nor 2) holds.

Thus for mixed states, *separable* and *product* are different notions.

Recall the trace expression in the Dirac notation: Let $|e_i\rangle$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$ be an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then $|e_i\rangle\langle e_i|A$ is a matrix whose i-th diagonal element is a_{ii} and all other diagonal elements are 0. Therefore,

$$\operatorname{Tr} A = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \operatorname{Tr}\big(|e_i\rangle\langle e_i|A\big) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \langle e_i| A |e_i\rangle .$$

E. Reduced Density Matrices

Let ρ_{AB} be a density matrix in the product Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, and $|b_i\rangle$ the basis of $\mathcal{H}_B$. The *reduced density matrix* ρ_A is obtained by taking the *partial trace* of ρ_{AB} over the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_B$ as follows:

$$\rho_A = \operatorname{Tr}_B \rho_{AB} = \sum_i \big(I \otimes \langle b_i|\big)\rho_{AB}\big(I \otimes |b_i\rangle\big).$$

(You will often see a shorthand expression $\operatorname{Tr}_B \rho_{AB} = \sum_b \langle b| \rho_{AB} |b\rangle$.) We say that ρ_A is a reduced density operator obtained from ρ_{AB} by *tracing out* the subsystem B. Note that the reduced density operators are quantum counterparts to marginal distributions of the classical world.

Example #1 – Product State:

Suppose a quantum system is in the product state $\rho_{AB} = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B$ where ρ_A is a density operator for system A, and ρ_B is a density operator for system B. Then

$$\rho_A = \operatorname{Tr}_B(\rho_A \otimes \rho_B) = \rho_A \operatorname{Tr} \rho_B = \rho_A.$$

Example #2 – Entangled State:

Consider the bipartite state $|\phi_{AB}\rangle = (|00\rangle + |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. This is a pure state with the density operator

$$\rho_{AB} = |\phi_{AB}\rangle\langle\phi_{AB}| = \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle\langle 00| + |00\rangle\langle 11| + |11\rangle\langle 00| + |11\rangle\langle 11|).$$

Tracing out the second qubit, we find the reduced density operator of the first qubit,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_A = \operatorname{Tr}_B \rho_{AB} &= (I \otimes \langle 0|)\rho_{AB}(I \otimes |0\rangle) + (I \otimes \langle 1|)\rho_{AB}(I \otimes |1\rangle) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|) = \frac{1}{2} I.\end{aligned}$$

Suppose we have n–qubit state ρ and an ancillary m–qubit state (which can be used to describe interactions with the environment). If we apply a unitary evolution to the joint bipartite state and then

trace out the ancillary subsystem, we get that ρ has been transformed to another state $\mathcal{E}(\rho)$ by what is known as a *completely positive, trace-preserving* map:

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \sum_k E_k \rho E_k^\dagger \quad \text{where} \quad \sum_k E_k^\dagger E_k = I. \tag{8}$$

Similarly, if we perform a von Neumann measurement on the joint state, and then trace out the ancillary subsystem, we observe that this process is mathematically equivalent to performing a POVM on the original state (cf. Sec. IV).

F. Bloch Sphere

The Bloch sphere provides a useful way to represent and visualize both pure and mixed states, and is traditionally used in quantum mechanics. It is also used in quantum computing platforms, such as IBM-Q, since actions of single-qubit gates on pure states are easy to see within the Bloch sphere framework.

Any 2×2 complex matrix, and thus any density matrix ρ, can be expressed as a linear combination of the identity I and the Pauli matrices σ_X, σ_Y, and σ_Z:

$$\rho = \alpha_I I + \alpha_X \sigma_X + \alpha_Y \sigma_Y + \alpha_Z \sigma_Z$$

for some complex numbers α_I, α_X, α_Y, and α_Z. Since a density matrix is Hermitian and has trace one, these numbers will satisfy certain constraints.

Note that σ_X, σ_Y, and σ_Z have trace equal to 0. Therefore

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2}\left(I + \beta_X \sigma_X + \beta_Y \sigma_Y + \beta_Z \sigma_Z\right)$$

where β_X, β_Y, and β_Z are real numbers. To see that we write the above expression for ρ as follows:

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} 1+\beta_Z & \beta_X - i\beta_y \\ \beta_X + i\beta_y & 1-\beta_Z \end{bmatrix}. \tag{9}$$

We call $\vec{\beta} = (\beta_X, \beta_Y, \beta_Z)$ the Bloch vector of ρ. Since ρ is positive semi-definite, we have $\det(\rho) \geqslant 0$:

$$0 \leqslant \det(\rho) = 1 - (\beta_X^2 + \beta_Y^2 + \beta_Z^2) = 1 - |\vec{\beta}|^2,$$

which implies $|\vec{\beta}|^2 \leqslant 1$. The set of all vectors that satisfy this condition is a ball in $\mathbb{R}^3$, known as the *Bloch sphere.*

For pure states, we have $\mathrm{tr}(\rho^2) = 1$, and thus

$$1 = \mathrm{tr}(\rho^2) = \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + |\vec{\beta}|^2\right) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad |\vec{\beta}| = 1$$




Fig. 6. Bloch Sphere: Pure states $|\psi\rangle = \cos(\theta/2)|0\rangle + e^{i\phi}\sin(\theta/2)|1\rangle$ correspond to the points on the surface, and mixed states correspond to the points in the interior.

Therefore, the surface of the Bloch sphere represents all the pure states of a two-dimensional quantum system, whereas the interior corresponds to all the mixed states.

We can also see that pure states are points on the Bloch sphere by considering the representation of $|\psi\rangle$ as in (2). Comparing $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ with the matrix (9), we find that the Bloch vector of $|\psi\rangle$ makes an angle of θ with the z axis, and its projection in the $x-y$ plane makes an angle of ϕ with the x axis, as shown in Fig. 6. With the representation (2), it is easy to see that any two diametrically opposite (antipodal) points correspond to a pair of mutually orthogonal pure state vectors. In particular, $\beta_X = \beta_Y = 0$ and $\beta_Z = 1$ gives $\rho = |0\rangle\langle 0|$, while $\beta_X = \beta_Y = 0$ and $\beta_Z = -1$ gives $\rho = |1\rangle\langle 1|$.

VIII. Elements of Quantum Information Theory

This section covers the most basic notions of quantum information theory. It defines quantum (von Neumann) entropy, two measures of similarity between quantum states, and the fundamentals concerning quantum sources and channels.

A. Von Neumann Entropy

Shannon entropy measures the expected uncertainty associated with a classical probability distribution. In classical information theory, Shannon entropy has multiple *operational* meanings, e.g., the compression rate of classical DMS information sources. The quantum counterpart of a probability distribution is a density matrix ρ. Recall that a density matrix ρ is a Hermitian, positive semi-definite, trace one matrix. It

follows that ρ can be diagonalized by a unitary matrix, and has eigenvalues that are all real, nonnegative, and sum to one.

The von Neumann entropy is an older concept that generalizes the Shannon entropy. It is defined as

$$S(\rho) = -\operatorname{Tr} \rho \log \rho.$$

If λ_i are the eigenvalues of ρ, we have

$$S(\rho) = -\sum_i \lambda_i \log \lambda_i.$$

The von Neumann entropy of a density matrix is, therefore, the Shannon entropy of the set of its eigenvalues.

We next list several important properties of the von Neumann entropy, which we will use in the following sections. Except for 4 and 5, they easily follow from the definition of von Neumann entropy and the corresponding properties of Shannon entropy.

1) $S(\rho) \geqslant 0$ with equality iff ρ is a pure state.
2) $S(\rho) \leqslant \log d$ with equality iff the $\rho = I/d$.
3) $S(\rho)$ is invariant under a change of the basis.
4) $S(\rho_{AB}) \leqslant S(\rho_A) + S(\rho_B)$ with equality iff $\rho_{AB} = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B$ *(additivity)*
5) $S(\rho_{ABC}) + S(\rho_B) \leqslant S(\rho_{AB}) + S(\rho_{BC})$ *(strong subadditivity)*

Proving the strong subadditivity property is considered a significant achievement in quantum information theory [16]. Unlike Shannon entropy, von Neumann entropy of a bipartite system may be smaller than that of its subsystems, that is, we cannot claim that $S(\rho_{AB}) \geqslant S(\rho_A)$ always holds. Consider, for example, the 2-qubit state $|\phi_{AB}\rangle = (|00\rangle + |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. This is a pure state and thus its von Neumann entropy is 0. However, each of its single-qubit subsystems has density matrix $\frac{1}{2}I$ (see Sec. VII-E), and thus each has von Neumann entropy equal to 1.

B. Fidelity and Trace Distance

Claude Shannon has written that the *fundamental problem of communication is that of reproducing at one point either exactly or approximately a message selected at another point*. To say what *approximately* means in quantum communications, we need to have a notion of distance and/or similarity between quantum states.

To measure how faithfully mixed state σ approximates mixed state ω and vice versa, we use the so called *mixed state fidelity* F defined as

$$\mathsf{F}(\sigma,\omega) = \left\{\mathrm{Tr}\left[(\sqrt{\sigma}\omega\sqrt{\sigma})^{1/2}\right]\right\}^2,$$

Besides computing the mixed state fidelity, we can measure how close state σ is to state ω by computing the *trace distance*

$$\mathsf{D}(\sigma,\omega) = \frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{Tr}\,|\sigma-\omega|.$$

where $|A|$ is the positive square root of $A^\dagger A$, *i.e.,* $|A| = \sqrt{A^\dagger A}$. The trace distance is a metric on the space of density operators, and is closely related to the fidelity as follows:

$$1-\mathsf{F}(\sigma,\omega) \leqslant \mathsf{D}(\sigma,\omega) \leqslant \sqrt{1-\mathsf{F}(\sigma,\omega)^2}. \tag{10}$$

The trace distance and the fidelity generalize the classical measures of distance/similarity between probability distributions. When matrices σ and ω are simultaneously diagonalizable, the trace distance is equal to the total variation between their eigenvalues, and the fidelity is equal to the squared Bhattacharyya coefficient of the their eigenvalues.

C. Compressing Quantum Discrete Memoryless Sources

A discrete memoryless source (DMS) of information produces a sequence of independent, identically distributed random variables taking values in a finite set called the *source alphabet* $\mathcal{X}$. The source produces letter $a \in \mathcal{X}$ with probability p_a. In quantum systems, source letters are mapped into *quantum states* for quantum transmission or storage. In this section, we outline a way to compress pure state sources where source letter $a \in \mathcal{X}$ is mapped into qubit $|\psi_a\rangle$. Generalization to higher dimensional spaces is straightforward. While compression of pure state sources has been known for a quarter of the century [17], compression of mixed state sources has not been fully understood yet. A DMS of qubits is completely specified by the ensemble $\mathcal{E} = \{|\psi_a\rangle, p_a\}_{a\in\mathcal{X}}$. We refer to the density matrix of this ensemble $\rho = \sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}} p(a)|\psi_a\rangle\langle\psi_a|$ as the source density matrix. Note that we can express ρ in terms of its eigenvectors and eigenvalues as follows:

$$\rho = \lambda_0|\phi_0\rangle\langle\phi_0| + \lambda_1|\phi_1\rangle\langle\phi_1|,$$

where $\{\lambda_0, \lambda_1\}$ is a probability mass function (PMF) on $\{0,1\}$ and $\langle\phi_0|\phi_1\rangle = 0$. Therefore, ρ is also the density matrix of the ensemble $\{|\phi_i\rangle, \lambda_i\}_{i\in\{0,1\}}$, and we can express $\rho^{\otimes n}$ in two ways as follows:

$$\rho^{\otimes n} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n} p_{\boldsymbol{x}} |\Psi_{\boldsymbol{x}}\rangle\langle\Psi_{\boldsymbol{x}}| = \sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\{0,1\}^n} \lambda_{\boldsymbol{z}} |\Phi_{\boldsymbol{z}}\rangle\langle\Phi_{\boldsymbol{z}}|.$$

where $|\Psi_{\boldsymbol{x}}\rangle = |\psi_{x_1}\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |\psi_{x_n}\rangle$, $p_{\boldsymbol{x}} = p_{x_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot p_{x_n}$, $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$,

and $|\Phi_{\boldsymbol{z}}\rangle = |\psi_{z_1}\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |\psi_{z_n}\rangle$, $\lambda_{\boldsymbol{z}} = \lambda_{z_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \lambda_{z_n}$, $z_i \in \{0,1\}$.

We can define typical sequences according to the distribution $\Lambda = \{\lambda_0, \lambda_1\}$ as follows. We say that sequence $\boldsymbol{z} = z_1, \ldots, z_n \in \{0,1\}^n$ is weakly ϵ_n-typical if

$$2^{-n(S(\rho)+\epsilon)} \leqslant \lambda_{\boldsymbol{z}} \leqslant 2^{-n(S(\rho)-\epsilon)}. \tag{11}$$

The set of all such sequences A_ϵ is the typical set according to distribution Λ. It's size $\left|A_\varepsilon\right|$ is bounded as follows:

$$(1-\varepsilon)2^{n(S(\rho)-\varepsilon)} \leqslant \left|A_\epsilon\right| \leqslant 2^{n(S(\rho)+\epsilon)}. \tag{12}$$

From (11) and (12), it follows that the probability of the typical set A_ϵ is greater than $1-\epsilon$, and thus the probability of its complement A_ϵ^C is

$$\Pr\left(A_\epsilon^C\right) = \sum_{\lambda_{\boldsymbol{z}}\in A_\epsilon^C} \lambda_{\boldsymbol{z}} \leqslant \epsilon. \tag{13}$$

We define the *typical subspace* $\boldsymbol{\Lambda_n}$ to be the subspace spanned by the typical states $|\Phi_{\boldsymbol{z}}\rangle$, $\boldsymbol{z} \in A_\epsilon$. We




Fig. 7. Each source vector state $|\Psi_{\boldsymbol{x}}\rangle$ is a sum of its projections to the typical subspace $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ and its complement $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^\perp$. A source vector is on average well approximated by its projection on the typical space.

define the projector on $\boldsymbol{\Lambda_n}$ and its complement as follows:

$\Pi = \sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in A_\epsilon} |\Phi_{\boldsymbol{z}}\rangle\langle\Phi_{\boldsymbol{z}}|$ is the projector on $\boldsymbol{\Lambda_n}$, and $\Pi^\perp = \sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\{0,1\}^n\setminus A_\epsilon} |\Phi_{\boldsymbol{z}}\rangle\langle\Phi_{\boldsymbol{z}}|$ is the projector on $\boldsymbol{\Lambda_n}^\perp$.

Note that $\Pi + \Pi^\perp = I_{2^n}$. The dimension of $\boldsymbol{\Lambda_n}$ is at most $2^{n(S(\rho)+\epsilon)}$, cf. (12).

We show that the fidelity between state $|\Psi_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle$ and its projection $\Pi|\Psi_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle$ on the typical subspace is on average high, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{F} &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n} P(\mathbf{x}) F(|\Psi_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle, \Pi|\Psi_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle) \\
&= \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n} P(\mathbf{x}) |\langle\Psi_{\mathbf{x}}|\Pi|\Psi_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle|^2 \geqslant \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n} P(\mathbf{x})(1-2\langle\Psi_{\mathbf{x}}|\Pi|\Psi_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle) \\
&= -1 + 2\,\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi\rho^{\otimes n}) \\
&= -1 + 2\,\mathrm{Tr}\Big\{\Big[\sum_{\mathbf{z}\in A^{\wedge}_{\epsilon_n}} |\Phi_z\rangle\langle\Phi_z|\Big]\cdot\Big[\sum_{\mathbf{z}\in\{0,1\}^n} \lambda(\mathbf{z})|\Phi_z\rangle\langle\Phi_z|\Big]\Big\} \\
&= 1 - 2\epsilon_n
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if an n–qubit source state $|\Psi_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle$ is measured by the projectors Π, $\Pi^{\perp}$, the outcome will likely collapse to a vector in the typical subspace $\Pi|\Psi_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle$ that on average closely approximates $|\Psi_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle$, as sketched in Fig. 7.

D. Accessible Information

The accessible information is defined for an ensemble of quantum states as the maximal number of bits that can be communicated by the ensemble source Alice to the receiver Bob under all quantum measurements that Bob can make. The accessible information cannot exceed a quantity known as the Holevo information of the ensemble for Alexander Holevo who proved this result. In this section, we define the accessible information, state the Holevo bound and outline its proof.

1) Holevo Bound Statement and Implications: Suppose a source Alice has a classical random variable X over alphabet $\mathcal{X}$ with $|\mathcal{X}|$ letters and letter probabilities $\{p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_{|\mathcal{X}|}\}$. When X assumes letter $a \in \mathcal{X}$, Alice prepares a quantum state with density matrix ρ_a and gives this state to the receiver Bob, whose goal is to find the value a of X that Alice has. In order to achieve this goal, Bob performs a measurement on the received state obtaining a classical outcome, namely, a random variable which we call Y.

The process of measurement is mathematically equivalent to single-letter classical information transmission through a classical channel. The channel (that is, its output alphabet and the input-output transition probabilities) is determined by the selected measurements. To see that, consider the ensemble of two pure single-qubit states $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$ as in Sec. IV-C. Fig. 3 shows a von Neumann measurement and the associated binary symmetric channel with the crossover probability $p = \sin^2(\pi/12) = 1/2 - \sqrt{3}/4$. Fig. 4

shows a POVM and the associated binary erasure channel with the erasure probability $\epsilon = 3/4$. Thus, for the same input, each measurement selection defines a different channel.

The Alice's RV X is specified by the associated quantum ensemble $\mathcal{E} = \{\rho_a, p_a\}_{a\in\mathcal{X}}$, and Bob's RV Y is specified by $\mathcal{E}$ and the measurement. The maximum value of the mutual information $I(X;Y)$ between the random variables X and Y over all the possible measurements that Bob can make on $\mathcal{E}$ is in quantum information theory known as the *accessible information* of the ensemble $\mathcal{E}$, and denoted by $\mathrm{Acc}(\mathcal{E})$. We have

$$\mathrm{Acc}(\mathcal{E}) = \max_{\text{measurements}} I(X;Y)$$

The general formula to compute the accessible information for an ensemble $\mathcal{E} = \{\rho_a, p_a\}_{a\in\mathcal{X}}$ is not known. The best known upper bound on accessible information is the famous Holevo bound [18]:

$$\mathrm{Acc}(\mathcal{E}) \leqslant S(\rho) - \sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}} p_a S(\rho_a) \tag{14}$$

where $\rho = \sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}} p_a \rho_a$ is the ensemble density matrix. The quantity

$$\chi = S(\rho) - \sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}} p_a S(\rho_a)$$

is called the Holevo information or the Holevo χ quantity. Note that for an ensemble of pure states, we have $\chi = S(\rho)$.

Consider again the example with two single-qubit states $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$ as in Sec. IV-C, and assume that their probabilities are $P_X(0) = P_X(1) = 0.5$. It is an easy but useful exercise to show that $S(\rho) = 0.8112781$. Fig. 3 shows a von Neumann measurement and the induced binary symmetric channel with the crossover probability $p = 1/2 - \sqrt{3}/4$. The mutual information is computed as $I(X,Y) = 1 - h(p) = 0.6454211$, where $h(p)$ is the binary entropy. Fig. 4 shows a POVM and the induced binary erasure channel with the erasure probability $\epsilon = 1/4$. The mutual information is computed as $I(X,Y) = 1 - \epsilon = 1/4$.

The Holevo bound, in particular, tells us that the most Alice can communicate to Bob by single qubit is a single bit of classical information, regardless of how large her ensemble of states is (cf. Sec. VIII-D). Note that her ensemble can be arbitrarily large since a qubit, say $|\psi\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$, is specified by two complex numbers α and β. However, Bob cannot read the values of complex numbers, that is *inaccessible to him*. He can only possibly apply some unitary transformations to $|\psi\rangle$ and then perform a measurement, which would give him at most one bit.

2) Holevo Bound Proof Outline: In order prove the Holevo bound (14), we devise a tripartite quantum system we refer to ABM. The subsystem A corresponds to the Alice's RV X, and is described by the ensemble $\{|a\rangle, p_a\}_{a\in\mathcal{X}}$ where $|a\rangle$, $a \in \mathcal{X}$ are orthogonal states. The subsystem B corresponds to the quantum state prepared by Alice and given to Bob and is described by the ensemble $\mathcal{E} = \{\rho_a, p_a\}_{a\in\mathcal{X}}$. The subsystem M (channel output RV Y) is where Bob imprints his measurement result.

The joint system ABM is prior to the measurement in the state

$$\rho_{ABM} = \sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}} p_a |a\rangle\langle a| \otimes \rho_a \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|$$

The state of the subsystem M before the measurement is some known state of the register, here $|0\rangle\langle 0|$. If the B subsystem is in state ρ_a (for some $a \in \mathcal{X}$, and Bob performs the von Neumann measurement $\{\Pi_m\}$, then Bob is left with the state (cf. (7)):

$$\rho_a \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| \longrightarrow \sum_m \Pi_m \rho_a \Pi_m \otimes |m\rangle\langle m|$$

Therefore, the tripartite system state ρ_{ABM} is mapped into ρ'_{ABM} as follows:

$$\rho_{ABM} \longrightarrow \rho'_{ABM} = \sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}} p_a |a\rangle\langle a| \otimes \sum_m \Pi_m \rho_a \Pi_m \otimes |m\rangle\langle m|$$

By the strong subadditibvity of the quantum entropy (see Sec. VIII-A), we have

$$S(\rho'_{ABM}) + S(\rho'_M) \leqslant S(\rho'_{AM}) + S(\rho'_{BM}). \tag{15}$$

The Holevo bound follows from (15) and the following, easy to prove, identities:

1) $S(\rho'_{ABM}) = H(X) + \sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}} p_a S(\rho_a)$
2) $S(\rho'_M) = H(Y)$
3) $S(\rho'_{AM}) = H(X, Y)$
4) $S(\rho'_{BM}) = S(\rho)$

IX. Entanglement and Quantum Correlations

Entangled states (those that cannot be written as a Kronecker product of single-qubit states) are responsible for much of "quantum magic", and the phenomenon of entanglement is considered to be a cornerstone of quantum computing. This section presents three examples that illustrates the power of entanglement.

A. Bell States (aka EPR Pairs)

An entangled pair of states can be created by applying a unitary transform to separable states, e.g., as shown in Fig. 8. These four entangled states are known as Bell states or EPR pairs. EPR stands for




Fig. 8. Creating Bell states by a 2-qubit entanglement gate.

Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen, who were the first to point out the "strange" properties of this state [19].

Notice that the Bell states form a basis (known as Bell's basis), which should not be a surprise since they are created by a unitary transform from the four computational basis states. Therefore, Bell states can be used to define a measurement, which is often referred to as the Bell measurement.

Entangled states have some "surprising" properties. To see that, we consider the state $\big(|00\rangle + |11\rangle\big)/\sqrt{2}$ and observe the following:

1) The individual qubits that make up an entangled state cannot be characterized as having individual states of their own. Consider, for example, the first qubit, and observe that it cannot be represented in the form $\alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$.
2) There seems to be *spooky action at a distance*:[5] What happens if we measure only the first qubit in the computational basis? Two outcomes are possible: $|0\rangle$ with probability 1/2, giving the post-measurement 2-qubit state $|00\rangle$, and $|1\rangle$ with probability 1/2, giving the post-measurement 2-qubit state $|11\rangle$. What happens if we subsequently measure the other qubit? Only one outcome is possible: the one that gives the same result as the measurement of the first qubit. This behavior has been confirmed by experiment.

[5]Einstein's phrase; he was not comfortable with the notion of non-deterministic measurements and entanglement.

B. Dense Coding

The most Alice can communicate to Bob by sending him a single qubit is a single bit of information regardless of how large her ensemble of states is (cf. Sec. VIII-D). That is, unless they share an EPR pair. Then a quantum communication protocol known as *dense coding* enables Alice to transmit two classical bits of information (00, 01, 10 or 11) to Bob, by sending him only one qubit [20]. Here is how.

Suppose Alice and Bob had prepared together an entangled pair of qubits in the state

$$|\varphi_{AB}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\big(|0_A 0_B\rangle + |1_A 1_B\rangle\big) \tag{16}$$

and then Alice took qubit A and Bob took qubit B. How does the state $|\varphi_{AB}\rangle$ evolve if only Alice applies a unitary transformation to her qubit? Consider the following four local unitary actions on the first qubit:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathrm{I}\otimes\mathrm{I})\,|\varphi_{AB}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\big(|0_A 0_B\rangle + |1_A 1_B\rangle\big)\\
(\sigma_X\otimes\mathrm{I})\,|\varphi_{AB}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\big(|1_A 0_B\rangle + |0_A 1_B\rangle\big)\\
(\sigma_Z\otimes\mathrm{I})\,|\varphi_{AB}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\big(|0_A 0_B\rangle - |1_A 1_B\rangle\big)\\
(\sigma_Z\sigma_X\otimes\mathrm{I})\,|\varphi_{AB}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\big(-|1_A 0_B\rangle + |0_A 1_B\rangle\big)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that Alice is able to create four orthogonal states (which would be impossible to do by local actions if the qubits were not entangled). If after performing local action, Alice sends her qubit to Bob, he can unambiguously identify which of the four orthogonal Bell states the EPR pair assumed as a result of Alice's action, by performing a measurement in the Bell basis. He can therefore get two bits of information. Alice and Bob have to have agreed on how to label Alice's actions, e.g.,

$$\begin{aligned}
00: &\quad (\mathrm{I}\otimes\mathrm{I})\\
01: &\quad (\sigma_X\otimes\mathrm{I})\\
10: &\quad (\sigma_Z\otimes\mathrm{I})\\
11: &\quad (\sigma_Z\sigma_X\otimes\mathrm{I})
\end{aligned}$$

For example, if Alice wants to send two classical bits 10 to Bob, she will apply σ_Z to her qubit before sending it to Bob. That would create the global state in Bob's possession $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\big(|0_A 0_B\rangle - |1_A 1_B\rangle\big)$, which he will learn after performing the Bell measurement.

C. Teleportation

Here again Alice and Bob had prepared together an entangled pair of qubits in the state (16), and then Alice took qubit A and Bob took qubit B. Now, Alice has another qubit in the state

$$|\psi\rangle = \alpha\,|0\rangle_{\mathrm{a}} + \beta\,|1\rangle_{\mathrm{a}}$$

which she would like to send to Bob. (We will use a (new) and A (entangled with Bob) subscripts to distinguish the two qubits on Alice's side.) However, there is only a classical communications channel between Alice and Bob. Can Alice send her qubit to Bob by sending only classical bits of information? How many classical bits does she need to send?

To answer that question, consider the joint state of Alice's new qubit and the entangled pair:

$$\begin{aligned}|\psi\rangle\,|\Psi\rangle &= \big(\alpha\,|0\rangle_{\mathrm{a}} + \beta\,|1\rangle_{\mathrm{a}}\big)\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\big(|0_{\mathrm{A}}\rangle\,|0_{\mathrm{B}}\rangle + |1_{\mathrm{A}}\rangle\,|1_{\mathrm{B}}\rangle\big)\\ &= \alpha\,|0\rangle_{\mathrm{a}}\,\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\big(|0_{\mathrm{A}}0_{\mathrm{B}}\rangle + |1_{\mathrm{A}}1_{\mathrm{B}}\rangle\big) + \beta\,|1\rangle_{\mathrm{a}}\,\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\big(|0_{\mathrm{A}}0_{\mathrm{B}}\rangle + |1_{\mathrm{A}}1_{\mathrm{B}}\rangle\big)\end{aligned}$$

The following protocol, known as *teleportation* [21], results in Bob's qubit (member of the entangled pair) assuming the state $|\psi\rangle$:

1) Alice first applies a `CNOT` gate to her two qubits $|x\rangle_{\mathrm{a}}\,|x_{\mathrm{A}}\rangle$ obtaining $|x_{\mathrm{a}}\rangle\,|x_{\mathrm{a}} \oplus x_{\mathrm{A}}\rangle$. The 3-qubit state then becomes

$$|\Phi\rangle = \alpha\,|0\rangle_{\mathrm{a}}\,\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\big(|0_{\mathrm{A}}0_{\mathrm{B}}\rangle + |1_{\mathrm{A}}1_{\mathrm{B}}\rangle\big) + \beta\,|1\rangle_{\mathrm{a}}\,\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\big(|1_{\mathrm{A}}0_{\mathrm{B}}\rangle + |0_{\mathrm{A}}1_{\mathrm{B}}\rangle\big)$$

2) Alice then applies a Hadamard transformation H to her qubit a, and the joint state becomes

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathrm{H}\otimes\mathrm{I}\otimes\mathrm{I})\,|\Phi\rangle &= \alpha\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle_{\mathrm{A}} + |1\rangle_{\mathrm{B}})\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\big(|0_{\mathrm{A}}0_{\mathrm{B}}\rangle + |1_{\mathrm{A}}1_{\mathrm{B}}\rangle\big)\\ &\quad + \beta\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle_{\mathrm{A}} - |1\rangle_{\mathrm{B}})\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\big(|1_{\mathrm{A}}0_{\mathrm{B}}\rangle + |0_{\mathrm{A}}1_{\mathrm{B}}\rangle\big)\\ &= \frac{1}{2}\,|00\rangle_{\mathrm{a}\mathrm{A}}\,\big(\alpha\,|0\rangle_{\mathrm{B}} + \beta\,|1\rangle_{\mathrm{B}}\big) + \frac{1}{2}\,|01\rangle_{\mathrm{a}\mathrm{A}}\,\big(\alpha\,|1\rangle_{\mathrm{B}} + \beta\,|0\rangle_{\mathrm{B}}\big)\\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\,|10\rangle_{\mathrm{a}\mathrm{A}}\,\big(\alpha\,|0\rangle_{\mathrm{B}} - \beta\,|1\rangle_{\mathrm{B}}\big) + \frac{1}{2}\,|11\rangle_{\mathrm{a}\mathrm{A}}\,\big(\alpha\,|1\rangle_{\mathrm{B}} - \beta\,|0\rangle_{\mathrm{B}}\big)\end{aligned}$$

Observe the following:

a) The four states in the above sum are orthogonal.

b) For each of the four basis states on Alice's side, we have a corresponding state on Bob's side

that can be obtained from $|\psi\rangle$ by a unitary action:

$$\alpha |0\rangle_B + \beta |1\rangle_B = I |\psi\rangle$$
$$\alpha |1\rangle_B + \beta |0\rangle_B = \sigma_X |\psi\rangle$$
$$\alpha |0\rangle_B - \beta |1\rangle_B = \sigma_Z |\psi\rangle$$
$$\alpha |1\rangle_B - \beta |0\rangle_B = \sigma_Z \sigma_X |\psi\rangle$$

3) Alice performs a joint measurement of her two qubits in the computational basis. Her pair of qubits will collapse to one of the basis states and Bob's qubit will assume its corresponding state. After the measurement, Alice knows which state she is left with and thus which state Bob's qubit is in. Bob can turn that state to $|\psi\rangle$ by applying the appropriate unitary operator. Whether that operator should be I, or σ_X or σ_Z or $\sigma_Z\sigma_X$ can be communicated to him by Alice with 2 bits of classical information. They have to have agreed on how to label the four operators. Observe that there is only one copy of state $|\psi\rangle$ at the end of the protocol, the one that Bob has. Alice's 2-qubit state collapsed to a basis state after her measurement. Therefore, teleportation is not cloning.

D. The CHSH Game

The CHSH game demonstrates how two players Alice and Bob, who cannot communicate with each other once the game starts, can benefit from shared entanglement much more than from shared classical randomness in winning the game [22]. It is rooted in a paper by Clauser, Horne, Shimony, and Holt, hence the name [23].

In the CHSH game, Alice is given a binary input $x \in \{0, 1\}$ and Bob is given a binary input $y \in \{0, 1\}$ by a referee who guarantees that each combination of the inputs is equally likely. Upon receiving the input, Alice generates her output a and Bob his output b. They send the outputs to the referee who declares them the winners if $x \cdot y = a \texttt{ xor } b$. In other words, if $x = y = 1$, Alice and Bob win if their outputs are different, and in all other cases, they win if their outputs are identical. Alice and Bob are allowed to agree on a strategy in advance, and to share random bits or entangled qubits, but once the game starts, they cannot communicate. Is there any advantage to be had from sharing entangled qubits?

A classical strategy to maximize the winning probability is that Alice and Bob send to the referee $a = b = 0$ regardless of which input values they receive. With this strategy, they loose only when x and y are both 1, and thus win the game with probability 0.75. It is straightforward to check that this is the best

strategy among the 16 deterministic strategies (ways to map four possible inputs to four possible outputs). Any shared classical randomness would essentially randomize among the 16 deterministic strategies, and thus cannot beat the best. The question then becomes if Alice and Bob can benefit from a shared EPR pair. The answer to this question is yes, and we next describe a strategy with the winning probability of about 0.85.

Consider a strategy where Alice and Bob share an entangled pair of qubits in the state $|\varphi_{AB}\rangle$ given in (16). Upon receiving the input, each player measures his/her qubit in one of the two possible bases depending on whether the input is 0 or 1. They then generate their outputs according to the result of the measurement. Alice's basis choices are the computational basis for input $x = 0$, and the Hadamard basis for input $x = 1$. Bob's two bases are as Alice's for the identical inputs just rotated by $\pi/8$ and $-3\pi/8$, and he makes his choices based on his input y. Thus, there are four possible combinations of Alice/Bob measurement bases corresponding to the four different input pairs x and y, as shown in Fig. 9. In order




Fig. 9. Choice of measurement bases that Alice and Bob make based of the inputs x and y. If Alice measures A_i, she outpus $a = i$, and if Bob measures B_i, he outputs $b = i$. The angle θ is chosen to be $\pi/8$.

to find the winning probability of this strategy, we next prove a general result about local measurements of entangled qubits.

Recall that Alice and Bob share an EPR pair in the state $|\varphi_{AB}\rangle$ given by (16). Suppose that Alice measures her qubit in the basis $\{|A_0\rangle, |A_1\rangle\}$ and Bob measurews his qubit in the basis $\{|B_0\rangle, |B_1\rangle\}$,

where $|A_0\rangle$ and $|B_0\rangle$ can be expressed in the computational basis as follows:

$$|A_0\rangle = \cos\alpha|0\rangle + \sin\alpha|1\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad |B_0\rangle = \cos\beta|0\rangle + \sin\beta|1\rangle$$

Note that Bob's basis can be obtained from Alice's by rotation, where the rotation angle is $\alpha-\beta$. When Alice's measurement result is $i \in \{0,1\}$, she outputs $a = i$, and when Bob's measurement result is $j \in \{0,1\}$, he outputs is $b = j$. We next show that Alice and Bob will have identical outputs wp $\cos^2\theta$.

Since Alice and Bob perform their measurements locally, the measurement on the shared EPR pair $|\varphi_{AB}\rangle$ is effectively performed in the Kronceker product basis $|A_i\rangle\langle A_i| \otimes |B_j\rangle\langle B_j|$, $i,j \in \{0,1\}$. It follows from the definition of quantum measurement and simple geometry (see Fig. 9) that

$$P(a = b = 0) = P(a = b = 1) = \langle\varphi_{AB}| \left(|A_0\rangle\langle A_0| \otimes |B_0\rangle\langle B_0|\right) |\varphi_{AB}\rangle .$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(a = b) &= 2 \cdot \langle\varphi_{AB}| \left(|A_0\rangle\langle A_0| \otimes |B_0\rangle\langle B_0|\right) |\varphi_{AB}\rangle \\ &= \frac{2}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\langle 0|A_0\rangle \langle A_0| \otimes \langle 0|B_0\rangle \langle B_0| + \langle 0|A_0\rangle \langle A_0| \otimes \langle 0|B_0\rangle \langle B_0|\right) |\varphi_{AB}\rangle \\ &= \cos^2\alpha\cos^2\beta + 2\cos\alpha\cos\beta\sin\alpha\sin\beta + \sin^2\alpha\sin^2\beta \\ &= (\cos\alpha\cos\beta + \sin\alpha\sin\beta)^2 = \cos^2(\alpha-\beta) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, when Bob's basis can be obtained from Alice's by the angle $\alpha-\beta$ rotation, we have

$$P(a = b) = \cos^2(\alpha-\beta) \quad \text{and} \quad P(a \neq b) = \sin^2(\alpha-\beta). \tag{17}$$

We are now ready to derive the probability that Alice and Bob win the CHSH game. Observe that 1) the angle between Alice's and Bob's measurement bases is $3\pi/8$ when $x = y = 1$, and $\pi/8$ for all other input combinations (see in Fig. 9), and 2) Alice and Bob win if they generate different outputs $a \neq b$ for inputs $x = y = 1$, and identical outputs for all other input combinations. Therefore, by (17), we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(\text{Alice \& Bob win}) &= P(xy = 0)P(a + b = 0|xy = 0)| + P(xy = 1)P(a + b = 1|xy = 1) \\ &= \frac{3}{4}P(a = b|xy = 0)| + \frac{1}{4}P(a \neq b|xy = 1)] \\ &= \frac{3}{4} \cdot \cos^2(\pi/8) + \frac{1}{4} \cdot \sin^2(3\pi/8) \\ &= \cos^2(\pi/8) = (2+\sqrt{2})/4 \gtrsim 0.853. \end{aligned}$$

The significance of the CHSH game and similar tools is that they show that there is a limit to what can be done with classical (possibly hidden) randomness. If experiments involving shared entanglement show that this limit can be beaten (as they have), then there must be some "spooky action at a distance" like the one reflected in (17). And that is where the weirdness and the power of quantum computing reside.

X. Conclusions

This primer started with addressing the following three essential questions: How is quantum information represented? How is quantum information processed? How is classical information extracted from quantum states? The paper next focused on the fundamentals of quantum information theory. This material is provided to address the most common interests of this journal's readers. At the end, the paper presented the basics of the power of entanglement, which is, almost universally, considered to be the most fascinating feature of quantum information science.

This paper presented the very basics of quantum information science in the most concise way the author could master. Its purpose was neither to survey this vast field nor speculate about its promising future, but rather to supply a bare minimum of materiel required to enter the field without necessarily taking an introductory class or reading a textbook. Entering the field of quantum information science means different things to different people, and ranges from starting to read research papers to joining multi-disciplinary teams in building quantum devices, as an expert in a related field. This paper strives to provide such diverse groups of scientists and engineers with what they need to know in order to start their endeavors and proceed to the next level.

Acknowledgment

The author would like to thank Andrea da Conturbia, Esmaeil Karimi, and an anonymous reviewer for their comments on an earlier version of this paper.

REFERENCES

[1] "H.R.6227 – National Quantum Initiative Act." [Online]. Available: https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/6227

[2] J. Preskill, "Quantum Computing in the NISQ era and beyond," *Quantum: the open journal for quantum science*, vol. 2, pp. 79–98, Aug. 2018.

[3] N. D. Mermin, *Quantum Computer Science: An Introduction*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2007.

[4] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2011.

[5] M. M. Wilde, *Quantum Information Theory*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2017.

[6] J. D. Hidary, *Quantum Computing: An Applied Approach*. Springer, 2019.

[7] B. Zeng, X. Chen, D.-L. Zhou, and X.-G. Wen, *Quantum Information Meets Quantum Matter: From Quantum Entanglement to Topological Phases of Many-Body Systems*. Springer, 2019.

[8] L. Susskind and A. Friedman, *Quantum Mechanics: The Theoretical Minimum*. Basic Books, 2015.

[9] H. Pishro-Nik, *Introduction to probability, statistics and random processes*. Kappa Research, LLC, 2014.

[10] F. W. Byron and R. W. Fuller, *Mathematics of Classical and Quantum Physics*. Dover Publications, 1992.

[11] J. L. Park, "The concept of transition in quantum mechanics," *Foundations of Physics*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 23–33, 1970.

[12] D. Dieks, "Communication by epr devices," *Physics Letters A*, vol. 92, no. 6, pp. 271–272, 1982.

[13] W. K. Wootters and W. H. Zurek, "A single quantum cannot be cloned," *Nature*, vol. 299, no. 5886, pp. 802–803, 1982.

[14] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard, "An update on quantum cryptography," in *Advances in Cryptology, Proceedings of CRYPTO '84, Santa Barbara, California, USA, August 19-22, 1984, Proceedings*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, G. R. Blakley and D. Chaum, Eds., vol. 196. Springer, 1984, pp. 475–480.

[15] A. K. Ekert, "Quantum cryptography based on bells theorem," *Physical review letters*, vol. 67, no. 6, pp. 661–663, 1991.

[16] E. H. Lieb and R. B. Ruskai, "Proof of the strong subadditivity of quantum-mechanical entropy," *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, vol. 14, pp. 1938–1941, 1973.

[17] B. Schumacher, "Quantum coding," *Physical Review A*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 2738–2747, 1995.

[18] A. S. Holevo, "Bounds for the quantity of information transmitted by a quantum communication channel," *Problems Inform. Transmission*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 177–183, 1973.

[19] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, "Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?" *Physical review*, vol. 47, no. 10, pp. 777–780, 1935.

[20] C. H. Bennett and S. J. Wiesner, "Communication via one-and two-particle operators on einstein-podolsky-rosen states," *Physical review letters*, vol. 69, no. 20, pp. 2881–2884, 1992.

[21] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, "Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and einstein-podolsky-rosen channels," *Physical review letters*, vol. 70, no. 13, pp. 1895–1899, 1993.

[22] R. Cleve, P. Høyer, B. Toner, and J. Watrous, "Consequences and limits of nonlocal strategies," in *19th Annual IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity (CCC'04), Amherst, MA, USA*, Jun. 2004, pp. 236–249.

[23] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, "Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories," *Physical review letters*, vol. 23, no. 15, pp. 880–884, 1969.