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Abstract

Recently authors of a paper (arXiv: 2105.04407) claim that quantum energy teleportation is unobservable due to time-energy uncertainty relation. In this short note, I will point out that their argument is wrong. They misuse the uncertainty relation.
Recently Razmi and MohammadKazemi wrote a paper about quantum energy teleportation (QET) [1] and claim that QET is unobservable due to time-energy uncertainty relation. In this short note, I will point out that their argument is wrong. They use a wrong uncertainty relation.

Before going to clarify the flaw of their argument, let me remind readers of the minimal QET model [2] the authors used. The system consists of two distant qubits: qubit \( A \) which Alice possesses and qubit \( B \) which Bob possesses. The Hamiltonian is the same as that of the Ising spin chain in the presence of transverse magnetic field as follows:

\[
H = H_A + H_B + V, \tag{1}
\]

where each contribution is given by

\[
H_A = \hbar \sigma^z_A + \frac{2h^2}{\sqrt{4h^2 + k^2}}, \tag{2}
\]

\[
H_B = \hbar \sigma^z_B + \frac{2h^2}{\sqrt{4h^2 + k^2}}, \tag{3}
\]

\[
V = k \sigma^x_A \sigma^x_B + \frac{k^2}{\sqrt{4h^2 + k^2}}, \tag{4}
\]

and \( h \) and \( k \) are positive constants with energy dimension, \( \sigma^x_A \) (\( \sigma^x_B \)) is the x-component of the Pauli operators for the qubit of A (B) and \( \sigma^z_A \) (\( \sigma^z_B \)) is the z-component for the qubit of A (B). The constant terms in Eq. (2)-Eq. (4) are added in order to make the expectational value of each operator zero for the ground state \( |g\rangle \):

\[
\langle g|H_A|g\rangle = \langle g|H_B|g\rangle = \langle g|V|g\rangle = 0.
\]

Because the lowest eigenvalue is \( E_0 = 0 \), the Hamiltonian \( H \) is non-negative operator. The ground state is given by

\[
|g\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \sqrt{1 - \frac{2h}{\sqrt{4h^2 + k^2}}} |+\rangle_A |+\rangle_B - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{1 + \frac{2h}{\sqrt{4h^2 + k^2}}} |-\rangle_A |-\rangle_B \right),
\]

where \( |\pm\rangle_A \) (\( |\pm\rangle_B \)) are eigenstates of \( \sigma^z_A \) (\( \sigma^z_B \)) with eigenvalues \( \pm 1 \).

In the QET protocol, Alice first performs \( \sigma^x_A \) measurement of A. The measurement result is represented as \((-1)\mu\) with \( \mu = 0, 1 \). The projection operators \( P_A(\mu) \) for the post-measurement state \( P_A(\mu)|g\rangle \) are given by

\[
P_A(\mu) = \frac{1}{2} (I + (-1)\mu \sigma^x_A).
\]
After the measurement, $A$ is in an excited state and has an expectation value of energy given by

$$E_A = \frac{\hbar^2}{\sqrt{\hbar^2 + k^2}}.$$  

The energy distribution is localized at $A$ soon after the measurement, but the dynamics induced by $H$ transfers the energy to $B$ as

$$\langle H_B(t) \rangle = \frac{\hbar^2}{2\sqrt{\hbar^2 + k^2}} \left[ 1 - \cos(4kt) \right].$$

The time-scale order of energy transfer is provided by $1/k$. Alice informs the measurement result to Bob in a time duration $t_{\text{teleportation}}$ much shorter than $1/k$:

$$t_{\text{teleportation}} \ll \frac{1}{k}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

Then by using a quantum operation device $C$ interacting with $B$, Bob performs unitary operation

$$U_B(\mu) = I_B \cos \theta - i(-1)^\mu \sigma_B^y \sin \theta$$

to $B$, where the real parameter $\theta$ is fixed so as to move the maximum energy from $B$ to $C$. The value of the maximum energy is positive and is given by

$$E_B = 2\hbar^2 + k^2 \left[ \sqrt{1 + \frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{(2\hbar^2 + k^2)^2}} - 1 \right].$$

This is the minimal QET.

Razmi and MohammadKazemi [1] estimate the value of $E_B$ as

$$E_B \leq 0.13k$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

and argue that the QET cannot be observable due to an obstacle. They propose a time-energy uncertainty relation as

$$\Delta E_B \Delta t_{\text{teleportation}} \geq 1$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

and, by using eq. (7), conclude that

$$E_B t_{\text{teleportation}} \geq 1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)
Using eq. (5) and eq. (8), they derive

$$E_B \gg k.$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

Apparently eq. (6) and eq. (9) contradict with each other. Thus they conclude that the minimal QET is unobservable.

Unfortunately, their argument is wrong because their time-energy uncertainty relation in eq. (7) does not hold. The teleportation time $t_{\text{teleportation}}$ does not have any quantum fluctuation and can be fixed as $t_{\text{teleportation}} = \epsilon/k$, where $\epsilon$ is a small number just like $10^{-3}$. The coupling constant $k$ is not a degree of freedom of the system, and does not change in time. Before the QET experiment, we are able to measure the value of $k$ in an arbitrary precision. Also we are able to adopt a classical channel between Alice and Bob, which achieves $t_{\text{teleportation}}$, even though the energy cost $E_{cc}$ of the classical communication via the channel is high. The teleported energy $E_B$ is additional energy gain independent of $E_{cc}$ for Bob. Since $t_{\text{teleportation}}$ is fixed as $\epsilon/k$ by the coupling constant $k$, $t_{\text{teleportation}}$ does not have any quantum fluctuation and measurement error like $\Delta t_{\text{teleportation}}$ proposed by them:

$$\Delta t_{\text{teleportation}} = 0.$$  

Also no measurement error $\Delta E_B$ of $E_B$ appears. The teleported energy $E_B$ is moved to the quantum operation device $C$ of Bob. By taking arbitrary long measurement time for $C$, Bob is able to measure $E_B$ stored in $C$ in an arbitrary precision. This implies

$$\Delta E_B = 0.$$  

Thus the uncertainty relation proposed by them in eq. (7) cannot be satisfied. In conclusion, their argument never indicate the impossibility of observation of the minimal QET.
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