

Measuring Polynomial Invariants of Multi-Party Quantum States

M. S. Leifer and N. Linden

Dept. of Mathematics, University of Bristol, University Walk, Bristol, BS8 1TW, UK

A. Winter

Dept. of Computer Science, University of Bristol,
Merchant Venturers Building, Woodland Road, Bristol, BS8 1UB, UK
(Dated: January 14, 2002)

We present networks for directly estimating the polynomial invariants of multi-party quantum states under local transformations. The structure of these networks is closely related to the structure of the invariants themselves and this lends a physical interpretation to these otherwise abstract mathematical quantities. Specifically, our networks estimate the invariants under local unitary (LU) transformations and under stochastic local operations and classical communication (SLOCC). Our networks can estimate the LU invariants for multi-party states, where each party can have a Hilbert space of arbitrary dimension and the SLOCC invariants for multi-qubit states. We analyze the statistical efficiency of our networks compared to methods based on estimating the state coefficients and calculating the invariants.

I. INTRODUCTION

Entanglement is a key resource in quantum information and computation since it can be used to perform tasks such as teleportation, super-dense coding and key distribution. Therefore, it is important to find ways of classifying and quantifying the entanglement properties of quantum states. Central to this is the idea that locally invariant quantities can be used to characterize entanglement. Invariants under Local Unitary (LU) and more general transformations, such as Stochastic Local Operations and Classical Communication (SLOCC), have been extensively studied in this context [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12].

However, invariants are rather abstract mathematical objects and it is natural to ask whether any physical meaning can be given to them. One way of doing this is to investigate how these quantities might be measured given a number of copies of an unknown state. This could be done by simply measuring the coefficients of the state and then calculating the invariants. However, finding procedures to measure the invariants directly may be more efficient and also lends the invariants a physical interpretation as "collective observables" of the state.

For bipartite pure states, the Schmidt coefficients are a complete set of LU invariants and optimal protocols for measuring them were given in [13]. Also, in [14] a method was given for estimating the polynomial SLOCC invariants of a general two-qubit state.

In this paper we present networks for estimating two classes of polynomial invariants for multi-party states: the LU invariants for multi-party states with arbitrary local Hilbert space dimension and the SLOCC invariants for multi-qubit states. In both cases, the protocol works for both pure and mixed states. In particular, the struc-

ture of the networks reflects the structure of the invariants in a very simple way.

In xII, we review the construction of local invariants under LU transformations and in xIII, the networks for measuring these invariants are presented. We then turn to invariants under SLOCC transformations, reviewing their construction in xIV and presenting networks to measure them in xV. In order to construct the networks for SLOCC invariants we make use of the Structural Physical Approximation (SPA) to non-physical maps introduced in [15]. The relevant details of this are presented in xVI. Finally, in xVII we evaluate estimation protocols based on our networks by comparing them to simple techniques based on estimating the state coefficients.

II. POLYNOMIAL INVARIANTS UNDER LU TRANSFORMATIONS

A. Pure states

Two n -party pure states $|j\rangle_i$; $|j\rangle_i \in \bigotimes_{j=1}^n \mathbb{C}^{d_j}$ are equivalent under LU transformations if

$$|j\rangle_i = U_1 \otimes U_2 \otimes \dots \otimes U_n |j\rangle_i \quad (1)$$

where $U_j \in U(d_j)$ is a unitary operation acting on the Hilbert space of the j th party. States on the same orbit under this action have the same entanglement properties. Given a particular state, we might be interested in determining which orbit it belongs to. This can be done by establishing a canonical point on each orbit, such as the Schmidt form for bipartite states. However, canonical forms rapidly become more complicated as the number of parties is increased. Alternatively, we can construct polynomial functions of the state coefficients that are invariant on each orbit. Theorems from invariant theory guarantee that a finite set of such polynomials is enough to distinguish the generic orbits under this action. We now review the construction of such a set.




FIG. 1: Diagrammatic representation of the quartic two-qubit LU invariant J , given in eq.(4). The first index of each term is represented by a circle and the second by a square. A line joins indices that are contracted with a δ .

1. One party

Consider the state $|j\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^d |i\rangle |j_i\rangle$ in a single party Hilbert space \mathbb{C}^d , where $|i\rangle$ is an orthonormal basis. The only independent invariant under unitary transformations of this state is the norm $\langle j | j \rangle$. This may be written as

$$\langle j | j \rangle = \sum_i \langle i | i \rangle = \sum_{i,j} \delta_{ij} \langle j | j \rangle \quad (2)$$

where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta. $\langle j | j \rangle$ is the $U(d)$ invariant tensor and invariants for larger numbers of parties are formed by similar contractions of the state coefficients with their complex conjugates.

2. Two qubits

As an example, consider a two-qubit state $|j\rangle = \sum_{i,j=0}^1 |i\rangle |j\rangle$. There is only one independent quadratic invariant, which is simply the norm of the state. However, at quartic order we find the following invariant, which is functionally independent of the norm

$$J = \sum_{i_1, i_2, j_1, j_2} \langle i_1 i_2 | j_1 j_2 \rangle \langle j_1 j_2 | i_1 i_2 \rangle \quad (3)$$

For two qubits, we know that this is the only other independent invariant because every state has a canonical Schmidt form $|j\rangle = \sum_i \sqrt{p_i} |i\rangle + \sqrt{1-p_i} |j\rangle$, with $1=2-p$ and $J=2(p^2-p)+1$ determines p uniquely.

Another useful way of representing the invariant is to define two permutations π on the set $\{1,2\}$ where π is the identity permutation and $\pi(1)=2; \pi(2)=1$. Then

$$J(\pi) = \sum_{i_1, i_2, j_1, j_2} \langle i_1 i_2 | j_1 j_2 \rangle \langle \pi(i_1) \pi(j_1) | \pi(i_2) \pi(j_2) \rangle \quad (4)$$

This also suggests a diagrammatic way of representing the invariant (see fig. 1).

3. General case

A multipartite pure state can be written in terms of an orthonormal basis as follows

$$|j\rangle = \sum_{i_1, j_1, \dots, i_r, j_r} |i_1 j_1 \dots i_r j_r\rangle \quad (5)$$

A general polynomial function of the state coefficients and their complex conjugates can be written as

$$P \sum_{i_1, j_1, k_1, \dots, i_r, j_r, k_r} c_{i_1 j_1 k_1} \dots c_{i_r j_r k_r} \quad (6)$$

If the polynomial (6) has equal numbers of c 's and c^* 's and all the indices of the c 's are contracted using the invariant tensor with those of the c^* 's, each index being contracted with an index corresponding to the same party then the polynomial is manifestly invariant under LU transformations.

Such polynomials can be written in terms of permutations on the indices. Let r be the degree of the polynomial in c (and hence also the degree in c^*). Let π_1, \dots, π_r be permutations acting on the set $\{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ and let $\pi = (\pi_1; \dots; \pi_r)$. Then the invariants can be written as:

$$J_\pi = \sum_{i_1, j_1, k_1, \dots, i_r, j_r, k_r} c_{i_1 j_1 k_1} \dots c_{i_r j_r k_r} \quad (7)$$

In fact, π can always be chosen to be the identity permutation by permuting the terms in this expression. Additionally, each J_π can be associated with a diagram constructed in the same way as fig. 1.

The invariants J_π are enough to completely distinguish the generic orbits under LU transformations. In fact, invariant theory guarantees that only a finite collection of them are needed to do this. However, except in a few simple cases, it is unknown which J_π invariants form minimal complete sets.

B. Mixed states

Two mixed states ρ, σ are equivalent under LU transformations if

$$\rho = U_1 \dots U_n \sigma U_1^\dagger \dots U_n^\dagger \quad (8)$$

The LU invariants for mixed states can be derived by rewriting the pure state invariants (7) in terms of the density matrix $\rho = \sum_{i,j} \rho_{ij} |i\rangle \langle j|$ and noting that the resulting expressions are still invariant under LU transformations for general density matrices. This can be done by noting that terms such as $c_{i_1 j_1} \dots c_{i_r j_r}$ are elements of the density matrix. A general density matrix may be written in terms of an orthonormal basis as

$$\rho = \sum_{m,n,p} \rho_{mnp} |m\rangle \langle n| \quad (9)$$




FIG. 2: General construction of network to measure polynomial LU invariants.

and the corresponding expression for an LU invariant is

$$J_{\sim} = \sum_{\substack{P \\ i_1 j_1 k_1 \dots i_r j_r k_r \dots}} \dots \quad (10)$$

III. MEASURING INVARIANTS UNDER LU TRANSFORMATIONS

A. Network construction

The general construction of the network used to measure the LU invariants is shown in Fig. 2. It generalizes networks for estimating functionals of bipartite states given in [14, 16, 17]. To measure an LU invariant of degree r in (and also degree r in) we take r copies of the unknown state . In addition, we take a single qubit in the state $|j\rangle$ and apply a Hadamard rotation H to transform the state to $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|j\rangle + |j\rangle)$. In the next step, we apply a unitary operation U on the r copies of controlled by the Hadamard rotated qubit. Finally we perform a measurement on the single qubit in the $|j\rangle, |j\rangle$ basis. The expectation value of this measurement will be

$$\langle H \rangle = \text{Re} \text{Tr} U^r \quad (11)$$

When $\rho = |j\rangle\langle j|$ is a pure state then this is equivalent to

$$\langle H \rangle = \text{Re} \langle j^r | U^r | j^r \rangle \quad (12)$$

In order to determine networks for measuring the LU invariants, it only remains to show that there is a U such that the invariants can be expressed in the form (11).

To do this for pure states, we have to express polynomials of the form (7) in the form of (12). Firstly, we note that $i_{jk} \dots = h_{ijk} \dots; j_i, i_{jk} \dots = h_{jijk} \dots; i$ and to each permutation in (7) we associate a permutation matrix

$$P = \sum_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_r} x^d \dots \quad (13)$$




FIG. 3: Network for measuring the 2-qubit quartic invariant.

where P acts on the Hilbert space of the same party for each of the r copies of the state $|j\rangle$. Then to each \sim we associate the permutation matrix

$$P_{\sim} = P \otimes P \otimes P \otimes \dots \quad (14)$$

where $P; P; P; \dots$ act on the Hilbert space of the same party as $; ; ; \dots$ in (7) on each of the r copies of the state. Then (7) can be written as

$$J_{\sim} = \langle j^r | P_{\sim} | j^r \rangle \quad (15)$$

Since P_{\sim} is unitary these invariants can be estimated with the network in Fig. 2 by setting $U = P_{\sim}$ to obtain the real part and $U = iP_{\sim}$ to obtain the imaginary part. For the specific example of the 2-qubit invariant (3) we have

$$J_{(3)} = \langle j_{A_1 B_1} | \langle j_{A_2 B_2} | I_{A_1 A_2} \text{SWAP}_{B_1 B_2} | j_{A_1 B_1} \rangle | j_{A_2 B_2} \rangle \quad (16)$$

Note also that the physical construction of P_{\sim} is closely related to the diagram associated with J_{\sim} (compare Figs. 1 and 3 for example).

Finally, note that if ρ is a mixed state then applying the same procedure without modification will give the invariants of eq. (10).

It has previously been noted [6] that all homogeneous polynomial LU invariants are determined by the expectation values of two observables on r copies of a state. Here, we have given an explicit network for measuring these observables. Also, similar constructions can be made to estimate other polynomial functionals of quantum states [17] and these can be modified to enable the estimation to proceed by LOCC [18], i.e. with no collective operations over the n -parties. A similar modification would enable the LU invariants to be estimated by LOCC, but this would affect the efficiency of the estimation discussed in XV IIB.

IV. POLYNOMIAL INVARIANTS UNDER SLOCC

When attempting to classify entanglement, it is often useful to consider invariants under local transformations that are more general than unitary transformations. For this purpose, invariants under SLOCC have

been introduced [19]. In xV we construct a network to measure the modulus squared of these invariants for the case where each party has a single qubit (i.e. the Hilbert space is $(\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes n}$).

A . Pure states

Two n -party pure states j_i and j^0_i are equivalent under SLOCC if it is possible to obtain j^0_i with non-zero probability via a sequence of Local Operations and Classical Communication (LOCC) starting from a single copy of j_i and vice-versa. In [20], this criterion was shown to be equivalent to

$$j^0_i = M_1 M_2 \dots M_n j_i \quad (17)$$

where $M_j \in GL(d_j)$ is an invertible linear transformation acting on the d_j -dimensional Hilbert space of the j th party.

In what follows, we find polynomial invariants for the special case where $M_j \in SL(2)$, i.e. the transformation has unit determinant and each party has a single qubit. Networks to determine the modulus squared of these invariants will be given in xV. Note that it is not possible to measure the $SL(2)^n$ invariants directly because they are not invariant under global phase transformations $j_i \rightarrow e^{i\phi} j_i$, which have no physical significance. It is for this reason that we instead measure the modulus squared, which is invariant under these phase transformations.

Under general $GL(2)^n$ transformations, the polynomial $SL(2)^n$ invariants are still invariant up to a multiplicative factor, which is just some power of the determinant of $M_1 M_2 \dots M_n$. Thus, ratios of appropriate powers of these polynomials will be invariants under $GL(2)^n$.

1. Two qubits

In order to illustrate the polynomial invariants under $SL(2)^n$, first consider the case where $n = 2$. Two states $j_i = \sum_{j,k=1}^2 j^{jk} j_{jk} i$ and $j^0_i = \sum_{j,k=1}^2 j^{0jk} j_{jk} i$ satisfy (17) if

$$j^0_i = M_1 M_2^T j_i \quad (18)$$

This means that $\det(j) = \det(j^0)$ is an $SL(2) \times SL(2)$ invariant, since $\det(M_1) = \det(M_2) = 1$. This may be written as

$$\det(j) = \sum_{i_1 i_2 j_1 j_2} \epsilon_{i_1 i_2} \epsilon_{j_1 j_2} j_{i_1 j_1} j_{i_2 j_2} \quad (19)$$

where the totally antisymmetric tensor ϵ_{ij} is the $SL(2)$ invariant tensor. For two qubit pure states, this is the only independent $SL(2) \times SL(2)$ invariant.

2. General case

The $SL(2)^n$ invariants can be constructed in a similar way to the LU invariants except the invariant tensor is now ϵ_{ij} , and we contract j 's with i 's instead of j 's. Thus, polynomials of the form

$$K_{\sim} = \sum_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_n j_1 j_2 \dots j_n k_1 k_2 \dots k_n} \epsilon_{i_1 j_1} \epsilon_{i_2 j_2} \dots \epsilon_{i_n j_n} \epsilon_{i_1 k_1} \epsilon_{i_2 k_2} \dots \epsilon_{i_n k_n} \dots \quad (20)$$

are manifestly invariant. Note that it is straightforward to generalize this construction to the case where each party has a d -dimensional Hilbert space by contracting with the $SL(d)^n$ invariant tensor $\epsilon_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_d}$ instead of ϵ_{ij} . However, it is not yet clear how to measure these invariants because the effect of the higher rank tensors cannot be physically implemented by linear transformations on states.

B . Mixed states

In general, two mixed states j_i and j^0_i are equivalent under SLOCC if there exists two completely positive maps E_1, E_2 which are implementable via LOCC with non-zero probability of success such that $j^0_i = E_1(j_i)$ and $j_i = E_2(j^0_i)$. In order to derive invariants using the expressions from the previous section, we will restrict to the case where j_i and j^0_i are related by

$$j^0_i = M_1 M_2 \dots M_n M_1^Y M_2^Y \dots M_n^Y j_i \quad (21)$$

with $M_j \in SL(2)$. The resulting expressions may not be invariant under more general SLOCC transformations, but are related to important quantities in entanglement theory as described in xIV C.

Unlike the LU invariants, it is not clear that (20) can be written simply in terms of the coefficients of the density matrix $\rho = j_i j_i$. However, $K_{\sim} j^2$ can be written as follows

$$K_{\sim} j^2 = \sum_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_n j_1 j_2 \dots j_n k_1 k_2 \dots k_n} \epsilon_{i_1 j_1} \epsilon_{i_2 j_2} \dots \epsilon_{i_n j_n} \epsilon_{i_1 k_1} \epsilon_{i_2 k_2} \dots \epsilon_{i_n k_n} \dots \quad (22)$$

and these will also be $SL(2)^n$ invariants for mixed states.

C . Examples of $SL(2)^n$ invariants

The K_{\sim} invariants are especially interesting in entanglement theory because many important entanglement measures can be easily calculated from them. For example, in the case of two-qubits, the concurrence [21] is defined as a simple function of the eigenvalues of $\tilde{\rho}$, where

$$\tilde{\rho} = \rho^Y \rho^T \rho \quad (23)$$




FIG. 4: Diagrammatic representation of the 3-tangle. The first index of each term is represented by a circle, the second by a square and the third by a triangle. A line joins indices that are contracted with an ϵ .

and T stands for transpose in the computational basis. These eigenvalues can be calculated from $\text{Tr}((\tilde{\rho})^m)$ for $m = 1; 2; 3; 4$, which are simply the modulus squared of K_{\sim} invariants. In [14], networks were constructed to estimate these invariants for two qubits and we will generalize this construction to K_{\sim} invariants for larger numbers of parties.

Another interesting example is the 3-tangle [22, 23], which is defined for pure states as the modulus of the following 3-qubit K_{\sim} invariant.

$$3 = \frac{P}{1} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & i_1 j_1 k_1 & i_2 j_2 k_2 \\ i_3 j_3 k_3 & i_4 j_4 k_4 \end{pmatrix} \quad (24)$$

The 3-tangle gives information about the genuine 3-party entanglement between the qubits.

Finally, note that the K_{\sim} invariants can be given similar diagrammatic representations to the J_{\sim} invariants. This is illustrated for the 3-tangle in Fig. 4.

V. MEASURING SLOCC INVARIANTS

The modulus squared of the SLOCC invariants can be measured using a network similar to Fig. 2 except that the unknown states must be preprocessed prior to the controlled-U operation. If K_{\sim} is of degree r in ρ then we will need r copies of ρ . The preprocessing stage will consist of collective unitary operations and completely positive maps that act on the entire Hilbert space of the r copies of ρ . The resulting state ρ^0 , will yield the expectation value

$$\langle \tilde{K}_{\sim} \rangle = \text{Re}(\text{Tr}(\tilde{U} \rho^0)) \quad (25)$$

for the measurement at the end of the network. In this section, we describe the preprocessing operations and unitary operations \tilde{U} that enable the modulus squared of the SLOCC invariants to be written in this form.

First, we apply the inverse of the permutation matrix associated with $\tilde{\rho}$ to the r copies of ρ to obtain $P_{\sim}^Y \rho_{\sim}$.

The second, and final, part of the preprocessing stage is to apply a completely positive map to the state. To describe we first define the multiparty analogue of eq. (23).

$$\tilde{\rho} = \begin{pmatrix} \rho & \rho & \dots & \rho^T & \rho & \rho & \dots & \rho \end{pmatrix} \quad (26)$$

Next, we define a map that acts on a product of r states by applying the tilde operation to the even numbered states as follows

$$(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \rho_r) = \tilde{\rho}_1 \otimes \tilde{\rho}_2 \otimes \rho_3 \otimes \dots \otimes \rho_r \quad (27)$$

where each ρ_j is an n -party state.

Unfortunately, $\tilde{\rho}$ cannot be physically implemented, since it is not a completely positive map. This can be dealt with by using the Structural Physical Approximation (SPA) to $\tilde{\rho}$, which we will call $\tilde{\rho}_{\sim}$. This is the "closest" physical map to $\tilde{\rho}$. This is discussed in xVII, but for now we construct the network as if $\tilde{\rho}$ could be implemented perfectly.

The final pre-processed state ρ^0 will be

$$\rho^0 = (P_{\sim}^Y \rho_{\sim} P_{\sim}) \quad (28)$$

Next, the controlled-U operation in our network must be chosen such that $\langle \tilde{K}_{\sim} \rangle = \langle \tilde{K}_{\sim} \rangle$ when ρ^0 is used as the input. One can easily verify that the pairwise SWAP gate, defined by

$$U \begin{pmatrix} j_1 i & j_2 i & \dots & j_r i \\ j_2 i & j_1 i & \dots & j_r i \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} j_r i & j_r i \\ j_1 i & j_1 i \end{pmatrix} \quad (29)$$

where $j_j i$ is an n -party state fulfills this condition.

VI. THE STRUCTURAL PHYSICAL APPROXIMATION

The operation encountered in the previous section is an example of a positive, but not completely positive map. These cannot be implemented exactly, but instead we can apply an approximation.

$$(\tilde{\rho}) = I + \epsilon (\tilde{\rho}) \quad (30)$$

where I is the identity operator and ϵ ; are real positive constants chosen such that $\tilde{\rho}_{\sim}$ is completely positive. If we choose ϵ and $\tilde{\rho}$ such that $\tilde{\rho}_{\sim}$ is trace-preserving and is maximized, then the results of [15] imply that

$$\langle \tilde{K}_{\sim} \rangle = \frac{2^{\frac{3}{2}nr}}{2^{\frac{3}{2}nr} + 1} \frac{I}{2^{nr}} + \frac{1}{2^{\frac{3}{2}nr} + 1} \langle \tilde{K}_{\sim} \rangle \quad (31)$$

where n is the number of qubits in each copy of the state and r is the degree of the K_{\sim} for which we are estimating the modulus squared.

On replacing $\tilde{\rho}$ with $\tilde{\rho}_{\sim}$ in our network the expectation value of the \tilde{K}_{\sim} measurement still allows the modulus squared of the K_{\sim} invariant to be determined via

$$\langle \tilde{K}_{\sim} \rangle^2 = \frac{2^{\frac{3}{2}nr}}{2^{\frac{3}{2}nr} + 1} \langle \tilde{K}_{\sim} \rangle + 2^{nr} \quad (32)$$

However, the SPA does affect the accuracy to which the invariant is determined. This is discussed further in the next section. Additionally, in [18], it is shown that this sort of SPA can be implemented by LOCC. Thus, the SLOCC invariants could also be estimated by LOCC, but the efficiency discussed in xVII B would be affected.

V II. EVALUATION

The main aim of the protocols presented in XIII and XV is to provide a physical interpretation for the polynomial invariants. However, we have not yet addressed the question of how efficient these measurement protocols are. In this section, we compare the efficiency of our protocols to protocols based on simply measuring the state coefficients and calculating the invariants. We use unbiased estimators based on counting [24, 25, 26]. Also, we perform the analysis in the limit where a large number of copies of the state have been measured, so that the variances of the estimates are small and can be treated to first order in all subsequent calculations. We note that more sophisticated estimation procedures are also possible [27], but our purpose here is to compare the networks to methods that are easily accessible experimentally.

Measuring the state coefficients would clearly be a more straightforward procedure to perform experimentally than using our network. Although more parameters have to be determined, this does not necessarily mean that it is a less efficient method for estimating the invariants than using our networks. There are several quite general reasons why this might be the case.

Firstly, suppose that we are interested in measuring a complete set of polynomial LU invariants for some unknown state of n parties, where each party has a d -dimensional Hilbert space. In general, we do not know how many we would need to measure, but parameter counting arguments [1, 2, 3] show that the number of local degrees of freedom is linear in n whereas the total number of degrees of freedom is exponential in n . Thus, for large n almost all the degrees of freedom are non-local. Even for moderately sized n , there are nearly as many invariants as there are state coefficients. In addition, the invariants are typically highly non-linear functions of the state coefficients. For these reasons, we expect that measuring a complete set of invariants directly will generally not be more efficient than measuring the state coefficients for large n . Similar considerations also apply to the SLOCC invariants.

Despite these considerations, it may be the case that our networks are more efficient if we are only interested in measuring a small incomplete subset of the invariants. Also, they may be more efficient for estimating complete sets when n is small. For this reason, and for simplicity, we concentrate on estimating two qubit invariants in this section.

There are also other reasons why our protocols may not be efficient. For example, our protocols only employ a two-outcome measurement for each r copies of the state whereas estimating the state coefficients uses a two-outcome measurement on each copy. Also, for the K_{\sim} invariants, we will see that using the SPA introduces a lot of noise into the measurement. Nonetheless, there are still some cases where using our networks is more efficient than estimating the state coefficients.

A. Statistical analysis of the network

For a particular setup in our network we make repeated measurements of an observable Z , with expectation value $F = \text{Tr}(U^0)$. Z is a random variable [31] with distribution

$$\begin{aligned} p(Z = +1) &= \frac{1}{2}(1 + F) \\ p(Z = -1) &= \frac{1}{2}(1 - F) \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

If we define the event $Z = +1$ as a success and set $p = P(Z = +1)$ then repeating the network N times is equivalent to performing N Bernoulli trials. The number of successes N_s is a random variable with a binomial distribution and its expectation value is $\langle N_s \rangle = Np = \frac{N}{2}(1 + F)$. In an actual experiment, the observed number of successes \hat{N}_s can be used to compute an unbiased estimator for F , given by

$$\hat{F} = 2 \frac{\hat{N}_s}{N} - 1 \quad (34)$$

with variance

$$\text{var}(\hat{F}) = \frac{1}{N}(1 - F^2) \quad (35)$$

We are interested in determining how many trials are needed in order for the estimate \hat{F} to be reasonably accurate. Specifically, we would like to quantify how many trials are needed to make the variance of $\text{var}(\hat{F})$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. In an experimental situation, we would not be able to calculate $\text{var}(\hat{F})$ from our data, so we would have to estimate it using the sample variance, $\hat{\text{var}}(\hat{F})$. However, in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ we can use the fact that $\text{var}(\hat{F}) = O(N^{-1})$ and $\text{var}(\hat{\text{var}}(\hat{F})) = O(N^{-4})$, i.e. $\hat{\text{var}}(\hat{F})$ converges to the true variance much faster than \hat{F} converges to F so $\hat{\text{var}}(\hat{F}) \approx \text{var}(\hat{F})$. Thus, in this limit we have that

$$N \approx \frac{1}{\epsilon^2(1 - F^2)} \quad (36)$$

Recall that for the LU invariants, the real and imaginary parts of the invariant are estimated independently and that each use of the network requires r copies of the state, where r is the degree of the invariant in \sim . If we use the same number of samples for estimating both the real and imaginary parts then the total number of copies required is

$$M \approx \frac{r}{\epsilon^2} 2 \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon} \quad (37)$$

In some cases, we know a priori that the invariant is always real or always imaginary. If this is the case, then we can achieve the same accuracy with

$$M \approx \frac{r}{\epsilon^2} \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon} \quad (38)$$

For the SLOCC invariants, each use of the network requires r copies of the state, where r is the degree of the

invariant in (3). Also the estimate of the invariant must take into account the use of the SPA via (32). In this case, the total number of copies required is

$$M \sim \frac{r}{2} 2^{\frac{3}{2}nr} + 1 \sim \frac{r}{2} 2^{nr} + 2^{nr} \quad (39)$$

Notice that the $2^{\frac{3}{2}nr}$ term will dominate the term in the square bracket for large n and r . This is due to the noise introduced into the measurement by the SPA.

B. Comparison to methods based on state estimation

In order to evaluate our protocols, we compare them to methods based on estimating the density matrix of the state and then calculating the invariants. We do this by estimating each state coefficient using observations on single copies of the state. This is known as homodyne tomography (see [27] for an overview and also [24, 25, 26]). This is not the optimal way of reconstructing the state in general [28], but it will greatly simplify the analysis.

1. Example: Two-qubit LU invariants

A general two-qubit density matrix can be written as

$$\rho = \frac{1}{4} \left(I_2 \otimes I_2 + \sum_j a_j \sigma_j \otimes I_2 + \sum_j b_j I_2 \otimes \sigma_j + \sum_{j,k} R_{jk} \sigma_j \otimes \sigma_k \right) \quad (40)$$

The two-qubit LU invariant (3) can be written in terms of these coefficients as

$$J = \text{Tr}(\rho^2) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \sum_j b_j^2 \right) \quad (41)$$

Each b_j can be determined by simply performing a σ_j measurement on N_j copies of Bob's half of the state. The probability distributions of the associated random variables are given by

$$\begin{aligned} p(j = +1) &= \frac{1}{2} (1 + b_j) \\ p(j = -1) &= \frac{1}{2} (1 - b_j) \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Thus, each b_j can be estimated in the same way as F in (34) and we have that

$$\text{var}(\hat{b}_j) = \frac{1 - b_j^2}{N_j} \quad (43)$$

We can then construct an estimator for J given by

$$\hat{J} = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \sum_j \hat{b}_j^2 \right) \quad (44)$$

which will be biased, but in the large N_j limit

$$\text{var}(\hat{J}) \sim \sum_j \frac{1 - b_j^2}{N_j} \quad (45)$$

to first order in $\text{var}(\hat{b}_j)$.

If we make the additional restriction that each observable σ_j is sampled the same number of times (i.e. $N_j = \frac{N}{3}$) then we must take

$$N \sim \frac{3}{1 - b_j^2} \quad (46)$$

for our estimate to have variance $\sim \frac{1}{N}$.

One way to compare this to the result for our network is to take an average over all pure states. If we assume that all pure states are equally likely, i.e. integrate (V IIB) and (46) using Haar measure (for details see [29]), then we find that on average we will need $3=2$ times as many copies of the state if we use the coefficient estimation method. This is half of what one might expect from parameter counting alone, since three times as many parameters are estimated in the state coefficient method. The factor of two is explained by the fact that each use of our network uses two copies of the state.

However, it is possible to find parameter ranges in which the state coefficient method performs better than our networks. One such range is given by setting $b_1 = b_2 = 0$; $\frac{3}{5} < b_3 < \frac{4}{5}$. This illustrates the fact that parameter counting does not always reflect the statistical efficiency of a given protocol. Any partial information we have available about the type of states being measured might change our judgement of which protocol is more efficient.

2. Example: Two-qubit SLOCC invariants

For the two-qubit SLOCC invariants we take the quadratic invariant (19) as an example. In terms of the decomposition (40) this can be written as

$$K = \frac{1}{4} \left(1 + \sum_j a_j^2 + \sum_{j,k} R_{jk}^2 \right) \quad (47)$$

If we estimate this by measuring all 15 of the state coefficients an equal number of times then by a similar analysis to the LU case we find that we need at least

$$N \sim \frac{15}{4} \left(\frac{1}{1 - a_j^2} + \frac{1}{1 - b_j^2} + \frac{1}{1 - R_{jk}^2} \right) \quad (48)$$

copies of the state to get a variance $\sim \frac{1}{N}$.

Taking averages, one finds that fewer copies are needed in the state coefficient protocol by a factor $\sim 5 \times 10^3$ despite the fact that many more parameters have to be

estimated in this protocol than when using our network. This is largely due to the factor 2^{12} that appears in (39), which arises from the noise introduced by the SPA. This suggests that other estimation and detection protocols based on the SPA [14, 16] may be less efficient than parameter counting arguments would imply. In fact, there are no states for which our network performs better than the coefficient estimation method. Even in the best possible case for our network, the state coefficient method requires fewer states by about 3 orders of magnitude.

V III. C O N C L U S I O N S

We have presented networks for measuring the polynomial invariants of quantum states under LU and SLOCC

transformations. The structure of these networks is closely related to the structure of the invariants themselves and thus gives the invariants a physical interpretation. Comparison of these networks with methods based on estimating the state coefficients indicate that the networks are of limited practical use for estimating complete sets of invariants. Indeed, our results suggest that any estimation procedure that employs the SPA is statistically inefficient even when the number of parties is small.

We know that no procedure for estimating invariants directly can outperform protocols based on estimating the state coefficients as the number of parties is increased. For small numbers of parties it seems that there can be some increase in efficiency, but the optimal protocol is not known in general.

-
- [1] N. Linden and S. Popescu, *Fortsch. Phys.* **46**, 567 (1998), quant-ph/9711016.
 - [2] H. Carteret, N. Linden, S. Popescu, and A. Sudbery, *Foundations of Physics* **29** (4), 527 (1999).
 - [3] N. Linden, S. Popescu, and A. Sudbery, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 243 (1999), quant-ph/9801076.
 - [4] A. Sudbery, *J. Phys. A* **34**, 643 (2001), quant-ph/0001116.
 - [5] H. Carteret and A. Sudbery, *J. Phys. A* **33**, 4981 (2000), quant-ph/0001091.
 - [6] M. Grassl, M. Rotteler, and T. Beth, *Phys. Rev. A* **58**, 1833 (1998), quant-ph/9712040.
 - [7] F. Verstraete, J. Dehaene, and B. De Moor, *Normal forms, entanglement monotones and optimal contraction of multiparticle quantum systems* (2001), quant-ph/0105090.
 - [8] F. Verstraete, J. Dehaene, and B. De Moor, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 032308 (2002), quant-ph/0108043.
 - [9] F. Verstraete, J. Dehaene, B. De Moor, and H. Verschelde, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 052112 (2002), quant-ph/0109033.
 - [10] G. Jaeger, A. Teodorescu-Frumosu, M. Sergienko, B. A. E. Saleh, and M. C. Teich, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 032307 (2003), quant-ph/0301128.
 - [11] M. Teodorescu-Frumosu and G. Jaeger, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 052305 (2003).
 - [12] G. Jaeger, A. V. Sergienko, B. E. A. Saleh, and M. C. Teich, *Entanglement, mixedness, and spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ symmetry in multiple-qubit systems* (2003), to appear in *Phys. Rev. A*, quant-ph/0307124.
 - [13] A. Acín, R. Tarrach, and G. Vidal, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 62307 (2000), quant-ph/9911008.
 - [14] P. Horodecki, *Measuring quantum entanglement without prior state reconstruction* (2001), quant-ph/0111064.
 - [15] P. Horodecki, *From limits of quantum nonlinear operations to multiparty entanglement witnesses and state spectrum estimation* (2001), quant-ph/0111036.
 - [16] P. Horodecki and A. Ekert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89** (2002), quant-ph/0111064.
 - [17] A. K. Ekert et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 217901 (2002), quant-ph/0203016.
 - [18] C. M. Alves, P. Horodecki, D. K. L. Oi, L. C. Kwek, and A. K. Ekert, *Direct estimation of functionals of density operators by local operations and classical communication* (2003), quant-ph/0304123.
 - [19] C. H. Bennett, S. Popescu, D. Rohrlich, J. A. Smolin, and A. V. Thapliyal, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 012307 (2001), quant-ph/9908073.
 - [20] W. Dur, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 062314 (2000), quant-ph/0005115.
 - [21] W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 2245 (1998).
 - [22] W. K. Wootters, *Phil. Trans. of the Royal Society* **356** (1743), 1717 (1998).
 - [23] V. Co man, J. Kundu, and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 052306 (2000), quant-ph/990747.
 - [24] D. T. Smith, M. Beck, M. G. Raymer, and A. Faridani, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1244 (1993).
 - [25] U. Leonhardt, *Measuring the Quantum State of Light* (Cambridge University Press, 1997).
 - [26] G. M. d'Ariano, C. Macchiavello, and M. G. A. Paris, *Phys. Rev. A* **50**, 4298 (1994).
 - [27] R. Gill and M. I. Guta, *An invitation to quantum tomography* (2003), submitted to *J. Royal Stat. Soc. B*, quant-ph/0303020.
 - [28] O. E. Barndorff-Nielsen, R. Gill, and P. E. Jupp, *On quantum statistical inference* (2003), to appear in *J. Royal Stat. Soc. B*, URL <http://www.math.uu.nl/people/gill/Preprints/qiread9statsoc>.
 - [29] V. Buzek et al., *Chaos, Solitons and Fractals* **10**, 981 (1999), quant-ph/9805020.
 - [30] D. R. Cox and D. V. Hinkley, *Theoretical Statistics* (Chapman and Hall, 1974).
 - [31] The statistical inference theory used in this section can be found in many statistics textbooks, such as [30].