

On the communication complexity of establishing a shared reference frame

Terry Rudolph and Lov Grover

Bell Labs, 600 Mountain Ave., Murray Hill, NJ 07974, U.S.A.

(Dated: April 1, 2022)

We discuss the communication complexity of establishing a shared reference frame, in particular examining the case of aligning spatial axes via the exchange of spin-1/2 particles. Unlike previous work we allow for multiple rounds of communication, and we give several simple examples demonstrating that nontrivial tradeoffs between the number of rounds and the type of communication required exist. We then give an explicit protocol for aligning spatial axes via the exchange of spin-1/2 particles which makes no use of either exchanged entangled states or of joint measurements. Rather it works by performing a simple type of distributed quantum computation. To facilitate comparison with previous work, we show that this protocol achieves a worst case fidelity for the much studied problem of “direction finding” that is asymptotically equivalent (up to polylog factors) to the optimal average case fidelity achievable via a single forward communication of entangled states.

PACS numbers: 03.67-a

Quantum physics allows for powerful new communication tasks that are not possible classically, such as secure secret key distribution [1] and entanglement-enhanced classical communication [2]. Such quantum communication tasks generically require one party to prepare systems in well defined quantum states, and to send these systems to another party. Since the states used are generally defined only with respect to some sort of reference frame, a perfect shared reference frame (SRF) between both parties is normally presumed. In general, however, establishing a perfect SRF requires infinite communication (i.e. transmitting a system with an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space, or an infinite number of systems with finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces). In practice, perfect SRFs are an idealization, and any finite (i.e., approximate) SRF should be viewed as a quantitative physical resource, since, along with requiring communication to establish, quantum mechanics dictates that finite SRFs necessarily drift [3] and thus are intrinsically depleted over time. Moreover, any finite SRF that is treated quantum mechanically will inevitably suffer disturbances during measurements, again depleting the SRF. We also note that shared prior entanglement, a valuable resource in quantum information theory, can be consumed to establish SRFs [4].

In quantum communication theory, the specific physical systems being exchanged determine the type of reference frame that the communicating parties must share; conversely, the ability to exchange physical systems generally allows for certain reference frames to be established. For example, in order for two parties to agree on the superposition $\alpha|\uparrow\rangle + \beta|\downarrow\rangle$ of a single spin-1/2 system, they must share aligned spatial axes; conversely, by exchanging spin-1/2 systems they can establish aligned spatial axes.

The problem of using spin-1/2 systems to establish either a single direction in space or an orthogonal trihedron (xyz-axes), has received considerable attention [5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11]. In particular, the following *standard scenario* has been studied in depth: Alice sends Bob N

spin-1/2 particles in a state which encodes some spatial direction \vec{n}_A . Bob performs a measurement on the N spins, which results, with probability $P(\vec{n}_e|\vec{n}_A)$, in an estimation \vec{n}_e as to the direction \vec{n}_A . The fidelity of the estimation is defined as $\frac{1}{2}(1 + \vec{n}_e \cdot \vec{n}_A)$, and the goal is to optimize the *average* fidelity. That is, for uniformly chosen \vec{n}_A one tries to maximize the expected fidelity, \bar{F} , with respect to initial states prepared by Alice and measurements performed by Bob. (Note that a random guess of direction has an expected fidelity of 1/2; a fidelity of 0 corresponds to an estimate antiparallel to \vec{n}_A). In general it is found that if Alice sends Bob the systems in a tensor product of pure states, then $\bar{F}^{\max} = 1 - O(\frac{1}{N})$, while if Alice prepares entangled states then $\bar{F}^{\max} = 1 - O(\frac{1}{N^2})$. In both cases the measurements Bob must perform to achieve this are *joint* (i.e. entangled) measurements over the N particles, and in general they are positive operator valued measurements (POVM's) as opposed to standard von-Neumann projection valued measurements (PVM's). It is sometimes claimed [11] that more general encoding of a spatial direction in entangled states can achieve $\bar{F}^{\max} = 1 - O(\frac{1}{N})$, however such encodings can only be performed if Alice and Bob *already* share aligned spatial axes (as was noted in [11]), and in this case Alice can do no better than to use the N particles to send Bob *classical* bits of information specifying an approximation to \vec{n}_A . [18] We will always assume here that Alice and Bob do not, a-priori, share any sort of spatial reference frame.

There are several ways in which this standard scenario (and the extension of it in which Alice and Bob align an orthogonal trihedron as opposed to a single direction) is somewhat unsatisfactory. For a start, the particular choice of cost function (e.g. the fidelity) has a strong bearing on what the optimal states and measurements turn out to be [9]. Secondly, the optimizations are performed for the *average case* scenario, and not the *worst case* scenario, which is arguably more interesting (and which is the norm for communication complexity type problems). This yields the difficulty that if we wish

to ask questions pertinent to future quantum communication using spatial axes aligned under such a procedure, it is somewhat problematic to translate these results into standard properties of the quantum channel. This in turn makes it difficult to determine the extent to which such communication overhead can be amortized. The standard scenario also ignores the question as to whether allowing backwards communication (from Bob to Alice) can improve their ability to align their reference frames. Finally, in quantum communication scenarios it is natural to presume that Alice and Bob have access to *both* classical and quantum channels, and to examine the extent to which classical and quantum communication can in some sense be traded off against each other.[19] Peres has raised some interesting questions about classical communication costs within the standard scenario [12], although within this scenario, from a communication theory perspective, one may generally assume that such costs are amortized into the definition of the protocol. Below we will give some simple examples of protocols for which such amortization is not possible.

In this paper our aim is to expand the analysis of procedures for establishing SRFs, by demonstrating the wealth of nontrivial possibilities which remain to be explored. We also approach the problem with a view to rectifying some of the shortcomings of the standard scenario mentioned above. As such, we consider strategies for aligning a spatial reference frame that allow Bob, within a worst case scenario, to directly determine the Euler angles which relate his and Alice's reference frames. More precisely, if θ is an Euler angle relating Alice and Bob's axes, and θ' is the estimation of θ inferred by Bob, then we will be interested in the amount (and type) of communication required for protocols that achieve $\Pr[|\theta - \theta'| \geq \delta] \leq \epsilon$, for some fixed $\epsilon, \delta > 0$. By setting $\delta = 1/2^{k+1}$ we say that with probability $(1 - \epsilon)$ Bob has a k bit approximation to θ . In order to connect with known results for the standard scenario, we will show that the particular procedure we propose for determining the Euler angles can be used to give a *worst case* fidelity of $F = 1 - O(\frac{\log^2 N}{N^2})$, which is within a logarithmic factor of the best average case fidelity obtainable in the standard scenario. However, in contrast to the standard scenario procedure which achieves this best average case fidelity, the protocol that we propose makes no use of entanglement - either in the states that must be prepared or in the measurements that must be performed. We feel this is of great pragmatic importance, since if Alice and Bob had the ability to create and exchange the arbitrarily large entangled states, and perform the arbitrarily large joint measurements, required within the standard scenario, then in most situations they would be far better off to use the ideas presented in [13] - wherein it is shown how they can perform quantum communication *perfectly* (i.e without having noise due to the finiteness of the SRF) and with asymptotically no loss of resources.

Before presenting our specific protocol, we discuss a few simple examples, designed to indicate the diversity

of options that open up once we consider bi-directional communication of both classical and quantum bits, and to show that we should expect, in general, some highly non-trivial tradeoffs - as well as classical communication that cannot be amortized. For simplicity let us assume that Bob is trying to estimate the direction of Alice's z axis. With a single qubit of forward communication (the standard scenario), Alice sends Bob a single spin-1/2 in the state $|z_A^+\rangle$ (for almost all of this paper we assume the qubits are spin-1/2 particles). Although we always assume it is Bob who must estimate the direction, the same fidelity can be achieved by one qubit of *backward* communication from Bob to Alice, followed by one forward bit of *classical* information from Alice to Bob. This is done by Bob preparing two spins in a singlet state, and sending one of the spins to Alice. Alice performs a measurement on the spin, which steers [7] its partner being held by Bob to either $|z_A^+\rangle$ or $|z_A^-\rangle$ - she then sends a classical bit to inform Bob of the outcome.

If we consider two qubits worth of communication, it is known that Alice would prefer Bob to be end up with an *antiparallel* pair of spins [8]. This can be achieved with one qubit of backward communication, followed by one qubit and one classical bit of forward communication. To do this we simply modify the procedure mentioned above, so that after Alice has made her measurement, in addition to the classical bit she also sends an extra qubit aligned anti-parallel to her measurement outcome. Note that with two qubits of backward communication, implementing a similar procedure would result in Bob's 2 qubits being in one of the 4 pairs of states $|z_A^+ z_A^+\rangle, |z_A^- z_A^-\rangle, |z_A^+ z_A^-\rangle, |z_A^- z_A^+\rangle$, with equal likelihood. Alice would need to send two classical bits to Bob, and moreover cannot ensure that the qubits are antiparallel.

With two qubits of communication there is yet another option available to Alice and Bob. Instead of measuring her half of the singlet, Alice can simply apply some unitary operation to it and return it to Bob. Because of the differences in their reference frames, the entangled state held by Bob will now encode some information about their relative axes alignment. A detailed analysis of such a procedure can be found in [14]. It is interesting to note that if Alice does a σ_A^z rotation, and returns the entangled qubit along with another spin which is aligned with her z -axis, then this procedure (which has involved one backward and two forward qubits of communication) gives an average fidelity the same as if Alice had sent three parallel spins to Bob. As such it is not, a-priori, particularly interesting. However a significant difference arises in the measurement Bob must perform on the three spins he now holds. It is easy to show that he can achieve this fidelity by performing a Bell measurement on the two entangled spins (one of the Bell outcomes has probability 0 of occurring) and a standard PVM on the remaining spin - the specific nature of which is based on the outcome of the Bell measurement. Thus, the same average fidelity is achieved by a PVM with classical feedforward -

a decidedly different and simpler measurement than the minimal and optimal POVM known for the standard scenario [6].

We now turn to the simplest protocol we have been able to find for determining the Euler angles $\{\phi, \theta, \psi\}$ in a worst-case scenario. Unless otherwise indicated by a subscript/superscript, all states and operators are written in Bob's frame of reference. We define the Euler angles such that the rotation matrix describing the change from Alice to Bobs' frame of reference is given by $R \equiv e^{-i\psi\sigma_z/2}e^{-i\theta\sigma_y/2}e^{-i\phi\sigma_z/2}$. Explicitly,

$$R = e^{-i(\psi+\phi)/2} \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta/2 & -e^{i\phi} \sin \theta/2 \\ -e^{i\psi} \sin \theta/2 & e^{i(\phi+\psi)} \cos \theta/2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $\theta = \pi T$, where $0 \leq T \leq 1$ has a binary expansion $T = 0 \cdot t_1 t_2 \dots$. The protocol we propose involves Alice and Bob following an iterative procedure which determines the bits t_1, t_2 up to t_k independently. We choose the probability of error for each bit of T to be ϵ/k , so that after finding the first k bits of T the total probability of error is $1 - (1 - \epsilon/k)^k \leq \epsilon$.

To find t_1 , Alice sends a single spin polarized in her z direction, and Bob measures it in his $\pm z$ basis. The measurement by Bob yields the outcome 1 (spin down say) with probability:

$$P_1 = \cos^2 \frac{\theta}{2} = \frac{1}{2}[1 + \cos 2\pi T] = \frac{1}{2}[1 + \cos(2\pi 0 \cdot t_1 t_2 \dots)].$$

Repeating this n times, Bob obtains an estimate P'_1 as to the true value of P_1 , and thus an estimate T' of the true value of T . If we choose n (details below) such that $|P_1 - P'_1| \leq 1/4$ with probability $(1 - \epsilon/k)$, then $|T - T'| \leq 1/4$ with the same probability, and this implies that T' agrees with T to at least the first bit t_1 .

We now show how the above process for estimating the first bit of T can be generalized so as to estimate the $(j+1)$ 'th bit of T . Consider the situation where Bob sends a qubit in the state $|z^+\rangle$ to Alice, Alice performs a σ_z rotation on it and returns it to Bob, who also performs a σ_z on it. The total transformation U on the qubit is

$$U = \sigma_z \sigma_z^A = \sigma_z R^\dagger \sigma_z R = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -e^{i\phi} \sin \theta \\ e^{-i\phi} \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

Note that $U^m = \begin{pmatrix} \cos m\theta & -e^{i\phi} \sin m\theta \\ e^{-i\phi} \sin m\theta & \cos m\theta \end{pmatrix}$. We imagine a procedure wherein a single spin is exchanged back and forth 2^{j-1} times, with Alice and Bob each applying σ_z rotations, such that U^{2^j} is performed on it. A measurement now yields the outcome 1 with probability:

$$\begin{aligned} P_1 &= \frac{1}{2}[1 + \cos(2^j 2\pi T)] = \frac{1}{2}[1 + \cos(2^j 2\pi 0 \cdot t_1 t_2 t_3 t_4 \dots)] \\ &= \frac{1}{2}[1 + \cos((2\pi t_1 t_2 \dots t_j) + (2\pi 0 \cdot t_{j+1} t_{j+2} \dots))] \\ &= \frac{1}{2}[1 + \cos(2\pi 0 \cdot t_{j+1} t_{j+2} \dots)] \end{aligned}$$

We are therefore back to the situation discussed above for estimating t_1 (although obviously with more exchanges of the qubit necessitated). As before, we imagine the

process is repeated n times, such that Bob obtains an estimate P'_1 of P_1 . The Chernoff bound tells us that the probability the difference between P'_1 and the true value P_1 is greater than some precision δ , decreases exponentially with n . That is,

$$\Pr[|P'_1 - P_1| \geq \delta] \leq 2e^{-n\delta^2/2}.$$

By setting $\delta = 1/4$, we obtain a bound that corresponds to P'_1 agreeing with P_1 to the first bit - which in this generalized scenario means that Bob obtains the bit t_{j+1} . We can therefore bound n as follows:

$$2e^{-n/32} \leq \epsilon/k \rightarrow n \geq 32 \ln(2k/\epsilon).$$

The total amount of qubit communication required to obtain bits t_1 through t_k by this procedure is

$$N = n \times \sum_{j=1}^k 2^{j-1} = n(2^k - 1) = O(2^k \ln(2k/\epsilon)).$$

Note that, since we determine the bits of T independently with this protocol, the number of *rounds* of communication can be reduced by running the procedure in parallel. In order to obtain the other Euler angles accurate to k bits, or, for that matter, to fix a direction in space with θ, ϕ angles fixed to k bits, we can extend this protocol by changing the transformations that Alice and Bob perform (and/or the initial state Bob prepares). However this clearly only increases the communication overhead by a constant factor.

To facilitate comparison with previous work which focussed on maximizing the average fidelity, we imagine that Alice and Bob use a variant of the above protocol to obtain, with probability $(1 - \epsilon)^2$, angles $\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{\phi}$ which are " k -bit" estimators of the angles θ, ϕ specifying \vec{n}_A (i.e. $|\theta - \theta'| \leq 2\pi/2^{k+1}, |\phi - \phi'| \leq 2\pi/2^{k+1}$). We have then that $\vec{n}_A \cdot \vec{n}_e \equiv \cos \Delta\alpha \geq 1 - (\frac{2\pi}{2^k})^2$. (This follows because $\Delta\alpha \leq |\theta - \theta'| + |\phi - \phi'|$ and $\cos x \geq 1 - x^2$.) Thus, the choice of $\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{\phi}$ leads to a worst case fidelity of

$$F = (1 - \epsilon)^2 \frac{1}{2}(1 + \cos \Delta\alpha) \geq (1 - \epsilon)^2(1 - 2\pi^2 \frac{1}{2^{2k}})$$

(we underestimate the fidelity by assuming that when an error occurs, then the fidelity of the choice of $\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{\phi}$ is 0 - i.e. worse than random guessing.) If we take $\epsilon = 1/2^{2k}$, then the total qubit communication is $N = O(k2^k)$ (ignoring terms logarithmic in k) while the worst case fidelity is $F = 1 - O(\frac{1}{2^{2k}}) = 1 - O(\frac{\log^2 N}{N^2})$.

It is useful to understand the above protocol in quantum computational terms. In effect, Alice and Bob are performing a combination of a distributed quantum search algorithm [15] and a phase estimation algorithm. In a quantum search algorithm, a generic transformation of the form $(I_t R^\dagger I_0 R)$, where R is an arbitrary unitary transformation and I_t, I_0 are phase inversions about source and target states, is repeated some large number of times in order to coherently drive the state of the

computer. Here we are performing a similar procedure, where the computer is now only a single bit, the phase inversions are Alice and Bob's local σ_z rotations, and the unitary transformation R is passively provided by their lack of a SRF. We may also interpret this procedure as one in which the eigenvalues of U are being 'quantum computed' - in fact there is much in common here with Kitaev's version of the quantum phase estimation procedure [16].

We note that a more general distributed quantum computation would require Alice and Bob to create entangled states. Without a SRF however, this is at first glance problematic - since pure entangled states in Alice's frame are generally mixed in Bob's frame. A possible resolution is for Alice and Bob to use the encodings of spin states presented in [13]. Such encodings allow for three entangled spin-1/2 particles to form logical qubit states, $\{|0_L\rangle, |1_L\rangle\}$ which are *not* reference frame dependent. As such, Alice and Bob could, for instance, run the more standard phase estimation algorithm [17], which involves using the discrete fourier transform to obtain the best k bit estimator of the eigenvalue(s) of a unitary transformation. Explicitly, the eigenvalues $e^{\pm i\theta}$ of U (Eq. (1)), could be computed as follows: Bob prepares a set of qubits in the state

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{2^x-1} |j_L\rangle \otimes |z^+\rangle.$$

The subscript L indicates the integers j are encoded in spin-1/2 systems using the aforementioned binary "logical" states about which Alice and Bob both agree despite no SRF; the number x is a function of k - the number of bits to which we wish to approximate θ . In the phase estimation algorithm a series of controlled- U^{2^j} operations are performed on the second register (the single qubit) controlled on the first register (the logical qubits). In this communication scenario, performing these transformations clearly requires the exchange of the subset of logical qubits being used for the control, as well as the single spin upon which Alice and Bob perform controlled- σ_z operations. (The state $|z^+\rangle$ is not an eigenstate of U , as is generally used in the quantum phase estimation al-

gorithm, however it is an equi-weighted superposition of the two eigenstates, and this is sufficient - see e.g. [17] for details). In the standard manner the phases $e^{\pm i2^j\theta}$ accumulated on the single spin-1/2 are "kicked back" in front of the logical qubit states, and consequently a discrete fourier transform by Bob on the logical qubit states will, with probability $(1-\epsilon)$, reveal the best k bit approximation to θ providing we choose $x = k + \lceil \log(2 + 1/2\epsilon) \rceil$ [17]. In terms of the previous discussion regarding direction finding and the fidelity, this procedure can be shown to give a worst case fidelity that goes as $F = 1 - O(\frac{1}{N^2})$, with N the total qubit communication. Note, however, that this procedure *does* require the ability to create and exchange large entangled states.

We conclude with some more general observations regarding the communication complexity of establishing a SRF. We know of no examples where the ability to exchange classical information provably helps in reducing the amount of qubit communication required. It does, as remarked upon in the introduction, facilitate certain types of protocols in which entanglement might be "traded in" for a reference frame. We leave the reader with the following related and important question: To what extent does sharing of one type of reference frame (e.g. synchronised clocks) facilitate in establishing a different type of reference frame (e.g. aligned spatial axes). Surprisingly, it seems that in some cases such facilitation is possible. Consider, for example, the case when Alice and Bob have synchronised clocks and thus can quantum communicate perfectly using two (possibly degenerate) energy eigenstates $\{|e_1\rangle, |e_2\rangle\}$ of some system. They can use a register of these qubits to take the place of the "logical qubits" discussed above in the phase estimation procedure. This results in a constant factor improvement in the total amount of qubit communication required.

Acknowledgments

TR would like to thank the Technion for their hospitality during a visit in which his interest in this problem was re-ignited. This work is supported by the NSA & ARO under contract No. DAAG55-98-C-0040.

-
- [1] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard, in *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems, and Signal Processing*, IEEE Press, Los Alamitos (1984), p. 175.
 - [2] C. Macchiavello and G. M. Palma, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 050301(R) (2002).
 - [3] E. Wigner, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **29**, 255 (1957); Y. Aharonov and T. Kaufherr, *Phys. Rev. D* **30**, 368 (1984).
 - [4] T. Rudolph, quant-ph/9902010;
 - [5] S. Massar and S. Popescu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 1259 (1995).
 - [6] R. Derka *et al*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 1571 (1998); J. I. Latorre *et al*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 1351 (1998).
 - [7] E. Schrödinger. *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.*, 31:555, 1935; *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.*, 32:446, 1936.
 - [8] N. Gisin and S. Popescu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 432 (1999).
 - [9] S. Massar, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, R040101 (2000).
 - [10] E. Bagan *et al*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 5230 (2000); A. Peres and P. F. Scudo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 4160 (2001); E. Bagan *et al*, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 052309 (2001); A. Peres and P. F. Scudo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 167901(2001); E. Bagan *et al*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 257903 (2001).
 - [11] E. Bagan, quant-ph/0106155.
 - [12] Asher Peres, private communication.
 - [13] S. Bartlett, T. Rudolph and R. Spekkens,

- quant-ph/0302111.
- [14] A. Acin, E. Jane and G. Vidal, quant-ph/0012015.
 - [15] L. Grover, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 325 (1997).
 - [16] A. Kitaev, quant-ph/9511026.
 - [17] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
 - [18] It appears that in quant-ph/0303019 this mistake has been made again. For the procedures outlined in that paper, it seems to us that Alice and Bob need to share aligned spatial axes - in which case they can do no better than to simply use standard dense coding of classical information.
 - [19] We presume that classical bits are communicated in such a manner that they convey no information suitable for aligning spatial reference frames!