

Commutative version of the local Hamiltonian problem and comm on eigenspace problem .

Sergey Bravyi^a

Institute for Quantum Information, California Institute of Technology,
 Pasadena, CA 91125, USA .

Mikhail Vyalı^b

Independent University of Moscow,
 Bol'shoi Vlas'evskii per. 11, Moscow 119002, Russia

Received (March 1, 2022)

Revised (revised date)

We study the complexity of a problem "Com on Eigenspace" | verifying consistency of eigenvalue equations for composite quantum systems. The input of the problem is a family of pairwise commuting Hermitian operators $H_1; \dots; H_r$ on a Hilbert space $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$ and a string of real numbers $\lambda_1; \dots; \lambda_r$. The problem is to determine whether the comm on eigenspace speci ed by equalities $H_a | \psi \rangle = \lambda_a | \psi \rangle$, $a = 1; \dots; r$ has a positive dimension. We consider two cases: (i) all operators H_a are k -local; (ii) all operators H_a are factorized. It can be easily shown that both problems belong to the class QMA | quantum analogue of NP, and that some NP-complete problems can be reduced to either (i) or (ii). A non-trivial question is whether the problems (i) or (ii) belong to NP? We show that the answer is positive for some special values of k and d . Also we prove that the problem (ii) can be reduced to its special case, such that all operators H_a are factorized projectors and all $\lambda_a = 0$.

Keywords: quantum complexity, quantum codes, multipartite entanglement

Communicated by: to be filled by the Editorial

1 Formulation of the problem

Quantum complexity were studied intensely during the last decade. Many quantum complexity classes were invented (to find any of them see a comprehensive list [1]). Many interesting results are known for these classes. Nevertheless, the exact relationship between quantum and classical complexity classes remain open for almost all of them . In this paper we will focus on the classical complexity class NP and its quantum analogue QMA which was defined in [2], [3].

Let us recall the definitions of these classes. A Boolean function $F : B \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is in NP if there is a function $R : B \times B \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ computable in polynomial time on a classical computer and a polynomial p such that

$$\begin{aligned} F(x) = 1 & \iff \exists y \in B, |y| \leq p(|x|) : R(x, y) = 1 \\ F(x) = 0 & \iff \forall y \in B, |y| \leq p(|x|) : R(x, y) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

^ae-mail: serg@cs.caltech.edu

^be-mail: vyalyi@mcom.e.ru

(Here and below $B = \{0,1\}^*$ and B^n is the set of finite binary strings. A length of string $x \in B^n$ is denoted by $|x|$.) It will be convenient to introduce two players: Arthur and Merlin. Arthur wants to compute $F(x)$, but he is not powerful enough to do that without assistance of Merlin. Merlin sends him the string y as a proof that $F(x) = 1$. The properties of $R(x; y)$ guarantee that Merlin can convince Arthur that $F(x) = 1$ iff $F(x) = 1$.

The class QMA is defined analogously, but Arthur is able to process quantum information. For our purposes it suffices to mention three distinctions between QMA and NP. Firstly, there is a quantum communication channel between Arthur and Merlin. Thus Merlin's message may be a quantum superposition of many strings y . Secondly, Arthur has a quantum computer which he uses to verify the proof (i.e. the function $R(x; y)$ is computed by a quantum circuit, rather than a classical one). Thirdly, the verification may fail with a non-zero probability. However, the gap between Arthur's acceptance probabilities corresponding to $F(x) = 1$ and $F(x) = 0$ must be sufficiently large (bounded by a polynomial in $1/|x|$).

By definition, $NP \subseteq MA \subseteq QMA$, where MA is the class of Merlin-Arthur games | probabilistic analogue of the class NP. It is not known whether these inclusions are strict. But good candidates for separating QMA and MA exist. The first example is the group non-membership problem (GNM). Watrous [4] showed that GNM in the oracle model has succinct quantum proofs. He also constructed an oracle B such that $GNM(B) \not\subseteq MA^B$. So, in a relativized world the inclusion $MA^B \subseteq QMA^B$ is strict. The second example was found by Aharonov and Regev [5]. It is a complement to a gap version of the shortest lattice vector problem.

Similarly to the class NP, the class QMA has complete problems. The first QMA-complete problem was found by Kitaev [2]. It is the k -local Hamiltonian problem with $k \leq 5$. Later Kempe and Regev [6] proved that the 3-local Hamiltonian problem is also QMA-complete. Then Kempe, Kitaev, and Regev [7] combined this result with a perturbative analysis to show that the 2-local Hamiltonian is QMA-complete. Recently, Janzing, Wocjan and Beth have found another example of QMA-complete problem, see [8]. It is a non-identity check for an unitary operator given by a quantum circuit.

Recall, that the input of the 2-local Hamiltonian problem is $x = (H; \{u_1, \dots, u_n\})$, where H is a Hermitian operator (a Hamiltonian) acting on a Hilbert space $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$ and $u_1 < \dots < u_n$ are real numbers, such that $u_n - u_1 = \text{poly}(n)$. The operator H is represented as a sum of pairwise interactions:

$$H = \sum_{1 \leq a < b \leq n} H_{ab}; \quad (1)$$

The function $F(x)$ to be computed^c is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} F(x) &= 1, & H \text{ has an eigenvalue not exceeding } u_1; \\ F(x) &= 0, & \text{all eigenvalues of } H \text{ are greater than } u_n; \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Merlin convinces Arthur that $F(x) = 1$ by sending him the ground state $|\psi_0\rangle$ of the Hamiltonian H . For any Merlin's message $|\psi\rangle$ Arthur can efficiently evaluate an expectation value $\langle \psi | H | \psi \rangle$, see [2], that allows him to verify Merlin's proof.

^cSome binary encoding must be used for an input of all problems. Accordingly, all functions to be computed are Boolean functions (may be partially defined).

For some special classes of Hamiltonians the ground state may admit a good classical description (a good description must have a polynomial length and must allow classical polynomial verification algorithm for Arthur). A trivial case is a Hamiltonian H such that all interactions H_{ab} are diagonal in the standard product basis of $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$. Then the ground state is a basis vector. It can be described by $n \log(d)$ classical bits. The corresponding 2-local Hamiltonian problem thus belongs to NP. As an example, consider a graph $G = (V; E)$ with qubits living at vertices and an 'anti-ferromagnetic' Hamiltonian $H = \sum_{(u,v) \in E} \sigma_u^z \sigma_v^z$, where σ_u^z is the Pauli operator acting on the qubit u . As was shown in [9], it yields NP-complete problem. Note that generally Arthur can not solve the problem without Merlin's assistance, because the Hamiltonian is highly frustrated.

A less restricted case of the 2-local Hamiltonian problem is obtained by putting pairwise commutativity constraint on the individual interactions:

$$H_{ab}H_{cd} = H_{cd}H_{ab} \quad \text{for all pairs } (a;b) \text{ and } (c;d): \quad (3)$$

In this case all interactions are still diagonalized over the same basis. In particular, the ground state $|j_0\rangle$ of H satisfies eigenvalue equations

$$H_{ab}|j_0\rangle = \epsilon_{ab}|j_0\rangle \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq a < b \leq n;$$

while the lowest eigenvalue of H is

$$E_0 = \sum_{1 \leq a < b \leq n} \epsilon_{ab}.$$

(If some pair of particles $a;b$ do not interact with each other, i.e., $H_{ab} = 0$, one can take $\epsilon_{ab} = 0$.) However, a priori, there is no good classical description for the state $|j_0\rangle$. Note that a list of the eigenvalues ϵ_{ab} is not a good classical description, since some configurations of the eigenvalues may be inconsistent due to frustrations or (and) the entanglement monogamy. So the complexity of the problem may be higher than NP.

As a simple example consider Hamiltonians associated with the one-dimensional cluster states, see [10]. The cluster state $|\mathcal{C}_n\rangle$ is an entangled state of a linear chain of n qubits. It is specified by eigenvalue equations

$$S_a |\mathcal{C}_n\rangle = |\mathcal{C}_n\rangle; \quad S_a = (\sigma^z \otimes \sigma^x \otimes \sigma^z) [a-1; a; a+1]; \quad (4)$$

where a runs from 1 to n and the square brackets indicates the qubits acted on by an operator (we use the periodic boundary conditions $[0] = [n]$ and $[n+1] = [1]$). All operators S_a pairwise commute. Define a Hamiltonian H as

$$H = \sum_{a=1}^n S_a.$$

This Hamiltonian is 2-local with respect to a coarse-grained partition, such that the qubits 1;2 comprise the first particle, the qubits 3;4 — the second, and so on (the partition is defined only for even n). Its unique ground state is the cluster state $|\mathcal{C}_n\rangle$. This example demonstrates that the commutativity constraint (3) does not prevent the ground state of H from being highly entangled.

We shall prove that the ground state of any 2-local Hamiltonian (1) satisfying the commutativity constraint (3) always admits a good classical description^d, so the corresponding 2-local Hamiltonian problem belongs to NP (is NP-complete for $d \geq 3$). It should be contrasted with the general 2-local Hamiltonian problem, which is QMA-complete.

We consider here this problem and some other problems involving sets of pairwise commuting Hermitian operators acting on a product space

$$H = H_1 \otimes H_2 \otimes \dots \otimes H_n : H \quad (5)$$

The factors H_j will be referred to as 'particles'. The maximal local dimension

$$d = \max_{j=1, \dots, n} \dim H_j$$

will be regarded as a constant. Let us introduce two classes of operators. An operator $H \in L(H)$ is called factorized if it can be expressed as $H = h_1 \otimes h_2 \otimes \dots \otimes h_n$ for some $h_j \in L(H_j)$. For any group of particles $S = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and for any operator $h \in L(\bigotimes_{j \in S} H_j)$ there exists a naturally defined operator $h[S] \in L(H)$. It is equal to a tensor product of h with identity operators for all $j \notin S$. An operator $H \in L(H)$ is called strictly k -local if it can be expressed as $H = \sum_S h[S]$ for some $S = \{1, \dots, n\}$, $|S| \leq k$, and $h \in L(\bigotimes_{j \in S} H_j)$. Note that if d and k are regarded as constants, both factorized and k -local operators admit a concise classical description (its length grows at most linearly with n).

Consider now a family of Hermitian operators $H_1, \dots, H_r \in L(H)$ such that

$$H_a H_b = H_b H_a \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq a, b \leq r, \quad (6)$$

and a set of real numbers $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$. We shall use a notation $x = (H_1, \dots, H_r; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r)$ for all these data as it will be a typical input of our problems. The operators H_a will be referred to as check operators. Define a common eigenspace (CES) corresponding to x as

$$L_x = \{ \psi \in H : H_a \psi = \alpha_a \psi \text{ for all } a = 1, \dots, r \} \quad (7)$$

If there are no vectors $\psi \in H$ satisfying all the eigenvalue equations, the common eigenspace is empty, $L_x = \emptyset$.

Problem 1 (THE k -LOCAL CES) The input is $x = (H_1, \dots, H_r; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r)$, where all check operators H_a are k -local. Determine whether the common eigenspace L_x has a positive dimension.

Problem 2 (THE FACTORIZED CES) The input is $x = (H_1, \dots, H_r; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r)$, where all check operators H_a are factorized. Determine whether the common eigenspace L_x has a positive dimension.

To analyze the complexity of these problems, the input x must be represented by a binary string using a suitable encoding. Assuming that an eigenvalue and a matrix element of a linear operator can be represented by a constant number of bits (see a remark at the end of this section), the length of the input is $|x| = O(d^{2k} r)$ for the k -local CES and $|x| = O(d^2 n r)$ for the factorized CES. As was mentioned above, d and k are regarded as constants, so the length

^dThe lowest eigenvalue of H may be degenerate. In this case one can choose a ground state with a good classical description.

of the input is bounded by a polynomial, $|x| = \text{poly}(n + r)$. Note also that the consistency of the input, i.e., the commutativity constraint (6), can be verified by an algorithm running in a time $\text{poly}(n + r)$. If x is regarded as a binary string, both problems require computation of a Boolean function

$$\begin{aligned} F(x) &= 1, & L_x &\neq 0; \\ F(x) &= 0, & L_x &= 0: \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Remarks: The input of the CES problems consists of operators and their eigenvalues. Operators acting on a space of fixed dimension will be represented by their matrix elements in some fixed basis. Note that the CES problems are formulated in terms of exact equalities. So, we need an appropriate 'exact' representation of (complex) numbers. A good choice is algebraic numbers of bounded degree of the extension over rationals. These numbers are represented by arrays of rationals and we have a trivial algorithm to check an exact equality for them.

If matrix elements are algebraic numbers and a size of the matrix is fixed then eigenvalues of the matrix are also algebraic numbers (roots of a characteristic polynomial) of a bounded degree of the extension over rationals.

To keep the bounded degree condition we put some additional restrictions to an input of factorized CES. Namely, we require that eigenvalues of all factors must belong to the same extension of bounded degree over rational numbers. So the eigenvalues which appear in the input belong to the same field.

It is important that such data can be efficiently manipulated. In other words there are algorithms running in polynomial time which solve all common linear algebra tasks in a space of bounded dimension (solving systems of linear equations, finding eigenvalues and eigenvectors of an operator and so on), see books [14, 15] for the subject.

2 Summary of main results

Our first theorem states the upper bound on the complexity of the CES problems.

Theorem 1 The k -local and the factorized CES problems belong to QMA.

Intuitively, it follows from the fact that any state $|j\rangle \in L_x$ is a sound proof that L_x is not empty. Merlin's proving strategy in both problems is to send Arthur an arbitrary state $|j\rangle \in L_x$. The key part of Arthur's verification algorithm is to measure eigenvalues of the check operators, see Section 3 for details.

The next theorem establishes the lower bound on the complexity of the CES problems.

Theorem 2 The k -local CES is NP-hard for $k = 2, d \geq 3$ or $k \geq 3, d = 2$. The factorized CES is NP-hard for $d \geq 2$.

We construct NP-hard instances without resorting to quantum mechanics at all | the corresponding check operators are classical, that is diagonal in the standard product basis. Namely, we will show that NP-complete problems 3-coloring and 3-CNF can be reduced to 'classical' CES problems, see Section 3 for details.

Our main result is that the CES problems belong to NP for special values of k and d .

Theorem 3 The 2-local CES belongs to NP.

We prove this theorem using the concept of interaction algebra introduced by Knill, Laamame, and Viola in [17] and the elementary representation theory for finite-dimensional C^* -algebras. Roughly speaking, we find a fine-grained partition of each particle into smaller subsystems which we call subparticles. These subparticles are naturally grouped into interacting pairs,

such that there is no interaction between different pairs. To verify that the common eigenspace is non zero, one succeeds to do it for each pair of subparticles independently. It can be done efficiently. The fine-grained partition reveals itself only on certain subspace of H . It can be specified locally and Merlin's proof is just a description of this subspace. Amazingly, the structure of the common eigenspace resembles very much the structure of states with "quantum Markov chain" property, see [11].

It follows from Theorems 2,3 that the 2-local CES is NP-complete problem for $d = 3$. Besides, Theorem 3 has the following corollary:

Corollary 1 The problem 2-local Hamiltonian with the pairwise commutativity constraint (3) belongs to NP.

As far as the factorized CES is concerned, we present the following results.

Theorem 4 The factorized CES with $d = 2$ belongs to NP.

The proof of this theorem relies on the explicit formula for the dimension of the common eigenspace. Although Arthur can not use this formula to compute the dimension efficiently, sometimes it allows him to verify that two different instances of the problem yield the common eigenspace of the same dimension. It happens if the two instances satisfy simple consistency relations. We show that for any instance x of the factorized CES there exist another instance y consistent with x , such that all check operators of y are diagonal in the standard product basis. Merlin's proof that $L_x \neq 0$ is just a description of the instance y and a basis vector belonging to L_y .

To state the next theorem let us define the factorized projectors CES. It is the factorized CES problem whose input satisfies additional constraints.

Problem 3 (THE FACTORIZED PROJECTORS CES) The same as the factorized CES, but all check operators H_a are tensor products of orthogonal projectors and all $\alpha_a = 0$.

We shall prove that for any factorized CES problem can be divided into two independent subproblems. The first subproblem is the factorized CES with all check operators being tensor products of the Pauli operators σ^x , σ^y , and σ^z . It can be solved efficiently using the stabilizer formalism, see [18]. The second subproblem is the factorized projectors CES. Both subproblems are defined on a subspace $H^0 \subseteq H$. This subspace is defined locally and admits a good classical description. Arthur can efficiently identify the two subproblems provided that Merlin sends him a description of H^0 . In other words, we prove that Problem 2 can be non-deterministically reduced to Problem 3.

Theorem 5 If the factorized projectors CES with a given $d \geq 2$ belongs to NP then the factorized CES with the same d also belongs to NP.

We shall derive two interesting corollaries of Theorem 5.

Corollary 2 The factorized CES with a constraint ($\alpha_a \neq 0$ for $1 \leq a \leq r$) belongs to NP.

Corollary 3 The factorized CES with a constraint ($H_a H_b \neq 0$ for $1 \leq a, b \leq r$) belongs to NP.

The complexity of the k -local and the factorized CES problem for arbitrary values of k and d is still unknown. The results of Terhal and Di Vincenzo on constant depth quantum circuits [12] suggest that there are instances of the k -local CES for which L_x does not contain a state with a good classical description. Indeed, consider a state $|j\rangle = U |j_{\text{sep}}\rangle$, where $|j_{\text{sep}}\rangle$ is a product state and U is a quantum circuit with two-qubit gates having a depth D . If $D \geq 3$, such circuits are hard to simulate classically, see [12], so generally $|j\rangle$ does

not admit a good classical description. Since j_{sep} can be specified by eigenvalue equations with 1-local check operators, the state j is a one-dimensional common eigenspace for some 2^D -local CES. This argument, however, does not tell anything about the complexity of the k -local CES, since Merlin's proof need not to be a description of a state. Some remarks on the complexity of the factorized CES are made at the end of Section 6.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 3 contains the proof of Theorems 1, 2. Section 4 elucidates the connection between the k -local CES and the k -local Hamiltonian problems. Theorem 3 is proved in Section 5. Section 6 is devoted to a proof of Theorem 5 and its corollaries. In Section 7 we prove that the factorized projectors CES for qubits ($d = 2$) belongs to NP. Being combined with Theorem 5, this result immediately implies that the factorized CES for qubits belongs to NP, i.e., Theorem 4. Unfortunately we do not know how to generalize the algorithm described in Section 7 to the case $d \geq 3$. The reason this algorithm fails for $d \geq 3$ is rather non-trivial and can be understood with the help of Kochen-Specker theorem [20]. We briefly discuss a connection with Kochen-Specker theorem in the concluding part of Section 7.

3 Inclusion in QMA and NP-hardness

The proof of Theorem 1 is contained in the following two lemmas.

Lemma 1 The k -local CES belongs to QMA.

Proof: Let $x = (H_1; \dots; H_r; \epsilon_1; \dots; \epsilon_r)$ be an instance of the k -local CES, L be the common eigenspace, and $F(x)$ be the Boolean function (8) to be computed. Merlin's proof that $F(x) = 1$ will be a quantum state $j \in H$, see (6). We shall construct a polynomial (in $|x|$) size quantum circuit that tells Arthur whether to accept or reject the proof (i.e. decide that $F(x) = 1$ or $F(x) = 0$).

The Hilbert space H can be encoded using $n \log_2 d$ qubits. Under this encoding any check operator H_a acts non-trivially on at most $k \log_2 d$ qubits (this number does not depend on the complexity parameters n, r and must be regarded as a constant).

One can assume without loss of generality, that all operators H_a are orthogonal projectors and all $\epsilon_a = 1$ (otherwise, consider the spectral decomposition of H_a and substitute H_a by the projector corresponding to the eigenvalue ϵ_a). Define a POVM measurement M_a corresponding to the decomposition $I = H_a + (I - H_a)$. Since the operator H_a acts only on a constant number of qubits, Arthur can implement the measurement M_a by a quantum circuit of the size $\text{poly}(\log(1/\delta))$, where δ is the approximation precision, or an error probability, see [2]. The parameter δ will be chosen later. Suppose Arthur implements the measurements $M_1; \dots; M_r$ and gets outcomes $j_1; \dots; j_r \in \{0, 1\}^k$ (the order is not essential, since the measurements commute). If no errors have occurred, the post-measurement state j satisfies eigenvalue equations

$$H_a j^{(0)} = \epsilon_a j^{(0)}; \quad a = 1; \dots; r;$$

Arthur accepts the proof j if all $\epsilon_a = 1$ (in which case $j \in L$ and thus $L \neq \emptyset$). Note that a probability of having at least one error in the whole verification protocol is bounded from above by $r\delta$. The probability of the error-less verification is thus $p \geq 1 - r\delta$. We will choose $\delta = 1/r$, so that $p \geq 1/2$.

If $F(x) = 1$, Merlin can send Arthur a state $j \in L$. Then Arthur accepts the proof with a probability at least p . If $F(x) = 0$, Arthur may accept the proof only due to errors. The

acceptance probability in this case is at most $1 - \frac{1}{r}$. The size of the quantum circuit used in the protocol is bounded by $\text{poly}(r)$. It is enough to place the problem to QMA. \square

In the following we shall skip the details concerning the approximation precision. In all cases considered in this paper the approximation precision can be easily made arbitrarily small with only poly-logarithmic overhead.

Lemma 2 The factorized CES belongs to QMA.

Proof: Let $x = (H_1; \dots; H_{r-1}; \dots; H_r)$ be an instance of the factorized CES, L be the common eigenspace, $F(x)$ be the Boolean function (8) to be computed, and $j \in [H]$ be the Merlin's proof that $F(x) = 1$.

Arthur may pick up $a = 1; \dots; r$ in random and check the equality $H_a j_i = \lambda_a j_i$ for the chosen value of a only. To do that Arthur performs a destructive measurement of the eigenvalue of H_a on the state j_i . If the measured eigenvalue equals λ_a , he accepts the proof, otherwise rejects it. Denote p_0 and p_1 probabilities for Arthur to accept the proof provided that $F(x) = 0$ and $F(x) = 1$ respectively. Let $H_a = \sum_{j=1}^n H_{a,j}$. Without loss of generality we can assume that all factors $H_{a,j}$ are Hermitian operators. Arthur must perform n separate projective eigenvalue measurements for all factors $H_{a,j}$. Because each factor $H_{a,j}$ acts on $\log_2 d$ qubits, the whole measurement can be realized by a quantum circuit of a size $O(n)$ (recall that d is regarded as a constant). After that Arthur computes the product of n measured eigenvalues to evaluate λ_a .

If $j \in [L]$, Arthur always accepts the proof and thus $p_1 = 1$. Suppose $L = 0$. We shall prove that $p_0 \leq 1 - \frac{1}{r}$. Let $j \in [H]$ be the state which maximizes the acceptance probability p_0 . For any real vector $\alpha = (\alpha_1; \dots; \alpha_r)$ denote $P(\alpha) \in [H]$ the projector on the subspace specified by equalities $H_a j_i = \alpha_a j_i$, $a = 1; \dots; r$ (a vector α is analogous to an error syndrome in quantum codes theory). The family of the projectors $P(\alpha)$ defines a unity decomposition, i.e. $\sum_{\alpha} P(\alpha) = I$. Denote also

$$\alpha(\alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i P(\alpha) j_i:$$

For the chosen Arthur's verification algorithm we have

$$p_0 = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{a=1}^r \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_a(\alpha) j_i^2:$$

Changing the order of the summations we come to

$$p_0 = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{a=1}^r \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_a(\alpha) j_i^2 = \sum_{a=1}^r \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_a(\alpha) j_i^2:$$

But since $L = 0$ we have $\alpha_a \neq \lambda_a$ for at least one $a = 1; \dots; r$ whenever $P(\alpha) \neq 0$. Thus

$$p_0 \leq \frac{1}{r} \sum_{a=1}^r \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_a(\alpha) j_i^2 (r-1) = 1 - \frac{1}{r}:$$

So we have a gap $p_1 - p_0 = 1 - \frac{1}{r} = \frac{r-1}{r}$ between acceptance probabilities of positive and negative instances. As was said in the beginning of Section 2, it is enough to place the problem in QMA.

□

The following two lemmas constitute a proof of Theorem 2.

Lemma 3 The 2-local CES is NP-hard for $d = 3$.

Proof: We will show that the NP-complete 3-coloring problem can be reduced to 2-local CES with $d = 3$. (An idea used in this reduction was suggested by P. Woźniak in [9]). Let $G = (V; E)$ be an arbitrary graph. The 3-coloring problem is to determine whether the graph G admits a coloring of the vertices with 3 colors such that each edge has endpoints of different colors. Let $n = |V|$ and $r = 3|E|$. Choose a Hilbert space $H = (C^3)^n$ such that each vertex of the graph carries a space C^3 . The operators H_a will be assigned to the edges with three operators assigned to each edge. These operators are responsible for three forbidden coloring of the edge. It is convenient to introduce a composite index $a = (uv; c)$, where $(uv) \in E$ is an edge and $c \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ is a color. Then the 2-local CES $(H_1; \dots; H_r; \dots; H_r)$ is defined as

$$H_{uv;c} = (|j\rangle\langle j| + |i\rangle\langle i| + |k\rangle\langle k|) |u\rangle\langle v|; \quad H_{uv;c} = 0; \quad (uv) \notin E; \quad c = 1, 2, 3. \quad (9)$$

Obviously, existence of non-trivial common eigenspace L is equivalent to existence of 3-coloring for the graph G . (Note that the projectors (9) also provide an instance of the factorized projectors CES.) We have shown that 2-local CES with $d = 3$ is NP-hard.

□

Lemma 4 The k -local CES is NP-hard for $d = 2, k = 3$.

Proof: We will prove that NP-complete 3-CNF problem can be reduced to 3-local CES with $d = 2$. Recall that 3-CNF (conjunctive normal form) is a Boolean function of the form $L(x) = C_1(x) \wedge C_2(x) \wedge \dots \wedge C_r(x)$, $x = (x_1; \dots; x_n) \in B^n$, where each clause $C_a(x)$ is a disjunction of three literals (a literal is a variable or negation of a variable). An example of three-literal clause is $x_1 \vee x_3 \vee (\neg x_5)$. The 3-CNF problem is to determine whether an equation $L(x) = 1$ admits at least one solution. Choose a Hilbert space $H = (C^2)^n$. The operators H_a and the eigenvalues λ_a must be assigned to the clauses $C_a(x)$ according to the following table:

$C_a(x)$	H_a	λ_a
$x_i \vee x_j \vee x_k$	$(j\rangle\langle j + i\rangle\langle i + k\rangle\langle k) i\rangle\langle j $	0
$x_i \vee x_j \vee (\neg x_k)$	$(j\rangle\langle j + i\rangle\langle i + k\rangle\langle k) i\rangle\langle j $	0
$(\neg x_i) \vee (\neg x_j) \vee (\neg x_k)$	$(j\rangle\langle j + i\rangle\langle i + k\rangle\langle k) i\rangle\langle j $	0

It is easy to check that the common eigensubspace for the 3-local CES introduced above is non-trivial iff the equation $L(x) = 1$ has at least one solution. Thus we have reduced 3-CNF problem to the 3-local CES.

□

Obviously, the 3-local CES assigned to 3-CNF problem in the previous lemma is a special case of the factorized projectors CES (and thus a special case of the factorized CES). So we have proved all statements of Theorem 2.

4 The k -local commuting Hamiltonian

We shall now discuss the k -local Hamiltonian problem. Recall that the problem is to evaluate the Boolean function (2) with the Hamiltonian

$$H = \sum_{a=1}^R H_a; \quad H_a \text{ is strictly } k\text{-local for all } a; \quad (10)$$

If, additionally, all terms in H pairwise commute,

$$H_a H_b = H_b H_a \quad \text{for all } a, b;$$

we shall call the problem " k -local commuting Hamiltonian". The goal of this section is to reduce the k -local commuting Hamiltonian to the k^0 -local CES. In the first Lemma a non-deterministic reduction with $k^0 = k$ is put forward. It also shows that Corollary 1 indeed follows from Theorem 3. The second Lemma [19] establishes a deterministic reduction with $k^0 = k + 1$.

Lemma 5 If the k -local CES belongs to NP then the k -local commuting Hamiltonian also belongs to NP.

Proof: Obviously, we can choose a complete set of eigenvectors of H which are eigenvectors of all operators H_a also. To prove that H indeed has an eigenvalue not exceeding $\frac{1}{2} M$ Merlin can send Arthur a set of eigenvalues $(\lambda_1; \dots; \lambda_R)$ such that

- (i) $\sum_{a=1}^R \lambda_a = \frac{1}{2} M$,
- (ii) $(\lambda_1; \dots; \lambda_R; \lambda_1; \dots; \lambda_R)$ is a positive instance of k -local CES (i.e. $L \notin 0$).

Although Arthur can not verify (ii) by himself, according to assumption of the lemma this verification belongs to NP. So Arthur can ask Merlin to include a proof of (ii) in his message. It follows that k -local commuting Hamiltonian problem belongs to NP. \square

Lemma 6 The problem k -local commuting Hamiltonian can be polynomially reduced to the $(k + 1)$ -local CES.

Proof: Let $x = (H; \frac{1}{2} M; \frac{1}{2} M)$ be an instance of the k -local commuting Hamiltonian. Here the Hamiltonian H has the form (10). Taking the spectral decomposition of each operator H_a we can rewrite the Hamiltonian as follows:

$$H = \sum_{a=1}^R \sum_{i=1}^{d_a} \lambda_{a,i} P_{a,i}; \quad \lambda_{a,i} = \lambda_{b,i} \quad \text{for all } a, b;$$

where all $P_{a,i}$ are orthogonal projectors. Note that the number of terms R is at most $R = rd^k$, that is only linear in the length of the input $|x|$ (recall that d and k are regarded as constants). For any binary string $y = (y_1; \dots; y_R)$ define the corresponding energy

$$E(y) = \sum_{a=1}^R \lambda_{a,i} y_a;$$

and the eigenspace

$$L_y = \{ \psi : \lambda_{a,i} \psi = y_a \psi \quad \text{for all } a = 1; \dots; R \};$$

Then x is a positive instance of the problem if there exist a binary string y such that $E(y) = 1$ and $L_y \leq 0$. Let us define a partially defined Boolean function

$$\begin{aligned} R(y) &= 1, & E(y) &= 1; \\ R(y) &= 0, & E(y) &> 1/2. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Obviously, $R(y)$ can be computed by an algorithm running in a polynomial time, or equivalently, there exists a polynomial classical circuit that computes $R(y)$. It allows to cast the function $R(y)$ into a 3-CNF with only a polynomial number of clauses:

$$R(y) = C_1(y) \wedge C_2(y) \wedge \dots \wedge C_M(y); \quad M = \text{poly}(k): \quad (12)$$

Here each clause C_j involves at most three bits y_a . (For a connection between classical circuits and 3-CNFs see [2].) We are now ready to present an instance of the $(k+1)$ -local CES associated with x . The CES problem is defined on the space

$$H^0 = H \otimes (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes R}:$$

The auxiliary R qubits will 'keep' the binary string y . Denote $|j_a\rangle_{0a}$ and $|j_a\rangle_{1a}$ the projectors $|j\rangle_{ih0}$ and $|j\rangle_{ih1}$ applied to the a -th qubit. The CES problem has two families of check operators. The first one is

$$H_a^0 = \sum_a |j_a\rangle_{1a} \langle j_a| + (I - \sum_a |j_a\rangle_{0a} \langle j_a|); \quad a = 1; \dots; R:$$

Roughly speaking, H_a^0 ties the value of y_a to the eigenvalue of the projector $|j_a\rangle_{0a}$. Note that the operators H_a^0 are strictly $(k+1)$ -local. The check operators of the second family act only on the qubits. They are associated with the clauses C_j in (12). Let us introduce an operator \hat{C}_j acting on R qubits such that its action on the basis vectors $|j\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes R}$ is

$$\hat{C}_j |j\rangle = C_j(y) |j\rangle:$$

The corresponding check operator acting on H^0 is $I \otimes \hat{C}_j$. It is strictly 3-local. Consider a common eigenspace

$$M = \{ |j\rangle \in H^0 : H_a^0 |j\rangle = \lambda_a |j\rangle; \quad I \otimes \hat{C}_j |j\rangle = \lambda_j |j\rangle \text{ for all } a = 1; \dots; R; j = 1; \dots; M \}:$$

It follows from the definitions that $M \neq \emptyset$ if there exist a product state $|j\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$ such that $|j\rangle \in L_y$ and $R(y) = 1$. It means that x is a positive instance of the k -local commuting Hamiltonian problem.

□

5 The 2-local commuting eigenspace problem

Let us start from revisiting the example of cluster states, see Section 1. Recall that the chain of n qubits is partitioned into two-qubit particles as shown on Fig. 1. There are n check operators $S_1; \dots; S_n$, see (4). The commuting eigenspace L is defined by equations $S_a |j\rangle = \lambda_a |j\rangle$, where a runs from 1 to n . In this example L is one-dimensional with the basis vector $|j\rangle_n$. Although $|j\rangle_n$ is a highly entangled state, its entanglement has very simple structure with respect to the coarse-grained partition. Indeed, denote the qubits comprising the j -th particle

as j_l and j_r , see Fig. 1. A pair of qubits j_r and $(j+1)_l$ will be referred to as a bond. Let V_j be the controlled- z operator applied to the qubits j_l and j_r , and $V = V_1 \cdots V_n$. It is an easy exercise to verify that the state $V|C_n\rangle$ is a tensor product over the bonds:

$$V|C_n\rangle = |j_l; r; 2; l\rangle |j_r; 3; l\rangle \cdots |n; l; 1; r\rangle; \quad (13)$$

where the square brackets indicate owners of a state and $j \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2$ is specified by eigenvalue equations $(\sigma^x \otimes \sigma^z)j = (\sigma^z \otimes \sigma^x)j = j$. In other words, $|C_n\rangle$ can be prepared from a collection of bipartite pure states distributed between the particles by local unitary operators. This fact is not just a coincidence. We will show later that for any instance of the 2-local CES the common eigenspace is either empty or contains a state which can be created from a collection of bipartite pure states by applying local isometries (local unitary embeddings into a larger Hilbert space).

We continue by making three simplifications that allow one to reduce the number of check operators. Let $x = (H_1; \dots; H_r; \dots; H_r)$ be an instance of the 2-local CES and L_x be the common eigenspace.

Simplification 1: Clearly, $L_x = \{0\}$ unless λ_a is an eigenvalue of H_a . Since Arthur can verify efficiently, we shall assume that the input of the 2-local CES satisfies an additional constraint:

$$\lambda_a \in \text{Spec}(H_a) \quad \text{for all } a = 1; \dots; r.$$

Simplification 2: It eliminates all check operators acting only on one particle. Suppose that the check operator H_a acts only on the particle j i.e., $H_a = h[a]$ for some $h \in L(H_j)$. The eigenvalue equation $H_a j = \lambda_a j$ implies that the space H_j can be reduced to the eigenspace $\text{Ker}(h - \lambda_a I) \subset H_j$. Indeed, denote

$$H_1^0 = \begin{cases} H_1 & \text{for } l \neq j; \\ \text{Ker}(h - \lambda_a I) & \text{for } l = j; \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad H^0 = \bigotimes_{j=1}^n H_j^0 \quad H :$$

It is clear that $L_x \subset H^0$. Moreover, since all check operators commute, the subspace H^0 is preserved by all of them, so one can define the restrictions

$$H_b^0 = H_b|_{H^0} \in L(H^0); \quad b = 1; \dots; r.$$

Since the reduction $H \rightarrow H^0$ is done locally, all operators H_b^0 are strictly 2-local. Also, they all pairwise commute. It may happen however that $\lambda_b \notin \text{Spec}(H_b^0)$ for some b . If this is the case, one has $L_x = \{0\}$. Otherwise, we arrive to a new instance of the 2-local CES $y = (H_1^0; \dots; H_r^0; \dots; H_r^0)$ which is equivalent to x . Since $H_a^0 = \lambda_a I$, the corresponding eigenvalue equation is trivial and the pair $(H_a^0; \lambda_a)$ can be excluded from y . We have reduced




Fig. 1. A chain of 8 qubits is partitioned into $n = 4$ particles with local dimensions $d = 4$.

the number of check operators by one and the dimension of some particle at least by one. Obviously, Arthur can implement this reduction efficiently. After at most r iterations Arthur either decides that $L_x = 0$ or arrives to a simplified instance in which all check operators act non-trivially on two particles.

Simplification 3: We will show now that all operators H_a acting on some particular pair of particles $(j;k)$ can be substituted by a single check operator. Indeed, let us group the operators $H_1; \dots; H_r$ into subsets $S_{jk}, 1 \leq j < k \leq n$, such that S_{jk} contains all labels a for which H_a acts on the particles j and k . To distinguish the pairs for which $S_{jk} \neq \emptyset$; we shall characterize an instance of the 2-local CES by its interaction graph $G = (V; E)$, such that V is the set of particles, and edges are drawn between interacting particles.

Definition 1 A graph $G = (V; E)$ with $V = \{1; 2; \dots; n\}$ and $E = \{(j;k) : S_{jk} \neq \emptyset\}$; g is called an interaction graph of the instance x .

For any $(j;k) \in E$ consider an eigenspace

$$L_{jk} = \{ \psi \in L(H) : H_a \psi = \alpha_a \psi \text{ for all } a \in S_{jk} \}$$

Denote $\pi_{jk} \in L(H)$ the orthogonal projector onto L_{jk} . Clearly, $\{ \pi_{jk} \}_{(j;k) \in E}$ is a family of pairwise commuting 2-local operators and the common eigenspace L_x can be specified by equations

$$L_x = \{ \psi \in L(H) : \pi_{jk} \psi = \psi \text{ for all } (j;k) \in E \} \quad (14)$$

Thus x is equivalent to an instance

$$y = (\{ \pi_{jk} \}_{(j;k) \in E}; 1; \dots; 1) \quad (15)$$

Summarizing the three simplifications above, one succeeds to prove Theorem 3 only for the following version of the 2-local CES.

Input: An interaction graph $G = (V; E)$ and a family of 2-local pairwise commuting projectors $x = \{ \pi_{jk} \}_{(j;k) \in E}$. For every pair $(j;k) \in E$ the projector π_{jk} acts non-trivially on both H_j and H_k (in particular $\pi_{jk} \neq 0$).

Problem: Determine whether the common eigenspace (14) has a positive dimension.

Our first goal is to introduce a notion of irreducible instance and prove Theorem 3 for irreducible instances only. Then we will generalize the proof to arbitrary instances.

Definition 2 Let $x = \{ \pi_{jk} \}_{(j;k) \in E}$ be an instance of the 2-local CES. Consider a subalgebra $N_j \subset L(H_j)$ of operators acting on the particle j and commuting with all check operators:

$$N_j = \{ O \in L(H_j) : O \pi_{jk} = \pi_{jk} O \text{ for all } (j;k) \in E \} \quad (16)$$

The instance x is called irreducible if algebras N_j are trivial, i.e., $N_j = \mathbb{C} \cdot I$ for all $j = 1; \dots; n$.

Remark: Arthur can check whether an instance is irreducible using an efficient algorithm (the constraints (16) are given by linear equations on a space of bounded dimension). We shall now prove that any irreducible instance of the 2-local CES is positive ($L_x \neq \emptyset$). The proof is based on the following lemma.

Lemma 7 Let $x = \{ \pi_{jk} \}_{(j;k) \in E}$ be an irreducible instance of the 2-local CES with an interaction graph $G = (V; E)$. There exist

A pair of Hilbert spaces $H_{j;k}$ and $H_{k;j}$ associated with each edge $(j;k) \in E$,

$$\text{A tensor product structure } H_j = \bigotimes_{k:(j;k) \in E} H_{j;k},$$

such that the projector $\prod_{j=1}^n \prod_{k:(j;k) \in E} N_{j;k}$ acts non-trivially only on the two factors $H_{j;k}$ and $H_{k;j}$ in the decomposition $H = \bigotimes_{l=1}^n \bigotimes_{m:(l;m) \in E} H_{l;m}$.

The lemma says that there exist a fine-grained partition of the system, such that the particle j is decomposed into several subparticles $j;k$, where $(j;k) \in E$. The interaction between the particles j and k affects only the subparticles $j;k$ and $k;j$, that is $J_{jk} = h_{jk}[j;k; k;j]$ for some $h_{jk} \in L(H_{j;k} \otimes H_{k;j})$. A straightforward corollary of the lemma is that the common eigenspace L_x has a tensor product structure:

$$L_x = \bigotimes_{(j;k) \in E} M_{j;k}; \quad (17)$$

where $M_{j;k} \subset H_{j;k} \otimes H_{k;j}$ is specified by an equation $h_{jk} j_i = j_i$. Since $j_k \notin 0$ for $(j;k) \in E$, one has $h_{jk} \notin 0$, and thus $M_{j;k} \neq 0$, which implies $L_x \neq 0$. So the lemma has the following amazing corollary.

Corollary 4 Any irreducible instance of the 2-local CES is positive.

Now we move on to the proof of Lemma 7. The main mathematical tool used in the analysis is the representation theory for finite-dimensional C^* -algebras. In the subsequent discussion the term C^* -algebra refers to any algebra of operators on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space which is γ -closed and contains the identity. The center of a C^* -algebra A will be denoted $Z(A)$. By definition,

$$Z(A) = \{X \in A : XY = YX \text{ for all } Y \in A\}.$$

An algebra has a trivial center if $Z(A) = \mathbb{C} \cdot I$. We shall use the following fact (for the proof see the book [16], or Theorem 5 in [17]):

Fact 1: Let H be a Hilbert space and $A \subset L(H)$ be a C^* -algebra with a trivial center. There exists a tensor product structure $H = H_1 \otimes H_2$ such that A is the subalgebra of all operators acting on the factor H_1 i.e.,

$$A = L(H_1) \otimes I.$$

Proof of Lemma 7: Consider any pair $(j;k) \in E$ and let $J_{jk} = h[j;k]$ for some $h \in L(H_j \otimes H_k)$, $h \neq 0$. Our goal is to construct two C^* -algebras $A_{j;k} \subset L(H_j)$ and $A_{k;j} \subset L(H_k)$ such that $h \in A_{j;k} \otimes A_{k;j}$. The main element of the construction was proposed by Knill, Laamame, and Viola [17], who studied γ -closed algebras generated by an interaction between a system and an environment. Consider a decomposition

$$h = \sum_A A \otimes B; \quad (18)$$

where the families of operators $fA \in L(H_j)$ and $fB \in L(H_k)$ are linearly independent. Denote $M_{j;k}$ and $M_{k;j}$ the linear spaces spanned by fA and fB respectively. One can easily verify that $M_{j;k}$ and $M_{k;j}$ do not depend upon the choice of the decomposition (18). An identity

$$h^y = h = \sum_A A^y \otimes B^y;$$

tells us that $M_{j;k}$ and $M_{k;j}$ are closed under Hermitian conjugation. Define $A_{j;k} \subseteq L(H_j)$ and $A_{k;j} \subseteq L(H_k)$ as the minimal C^* -algebras such that $M_{j;k} \subseteq A_{j;k}$ and $M_{k;j} \subseteq A_{k;j}$. Equivalently, $A_{j;k}$ is generated by the family $\{fA_{jg} \mid g \in I\}$ and $A_{k;j}$ is generated by $\{fB_{kg} \mid g \in I\}$. (The fact that h is a projector is irrelevant for this construction.)

Consider any triple of particles $j \in k \in l$ such that $(j;k) \in E$ and $(j;l) \in E$. What can be said about the C^* -algebras $A_{j;k}, A_{j;l} \subseteq L(H_j)$?

The first claim is that these algebras commute i.e.,

$$XY = YX \quad \text{for all } X \in A_{j;k} \text{ and } Y \in A_{j;l}. \quad (19)$$

Indeed, the projectors p_{jk} and p_{jl} can be represented as

$$p_{jk} = H[j;k;l], \quad p_{jl} = G[j;k;l];$$

where the operators $H, G \in L(H_j \otimes H_k \otimes H_l)$ admit decompositions

$$H = \sum_X A_X \otimes B_X \otimes I; \quad G = \sum_X C_X \otimes I \otimes D_X;$$

Here all the families $\{fA_{jg}\}, \{fB_{kg}\}, \{fC_{lg}\}$, and $\{fD_{lg}\}$ are linearly independent. The commutativity constraint $p_{jk} p_{jl} = p_{jl} p_{jk}$ yields

$$\sum_X (A_X C_X - C_X A_X) \otimes B_X \otimes D_X = 0;$$

All terms in the sum are linearly independent due to the second and the third factors. Thus the equality is possible only if $A_X C_X = C_X A_X$ for all X and X . Since the algebras $A_{j;k}$ and $A_{j;l}$ are generated by $\{fA_{jg}\}$ and $\{fC_{lg}\}$ respectively, we conclude that they commute.

The next step is to prove that the center $Z(A_{j;k})$ is trivial for all $(j;k) \in E$. Indeed, it follows from (19) that any central element $Z \in Z(A_{j;k})$ commutes with all elements of the algebras $A_{j;l}$, where $(j;l) \in E$. Since $p_{jl} = h[j;l]$ for some $h \in A_{j;l} \subseteq A_{l;j}$, we conclude that an operator $Z[j] \in L(H_j)$ commutes with all projectors p_{jl} . Since we consider an irreducible instance of CES, it is possible only if $Z = \lambda I$ for some complex number λ . Thus $Z(A_{j;k}) = \mathbb{C} \cdot I$.

Let us show how H_j acquires the tensor product structure for some particular j . For any pair $(j;k) \in E$ one can make use of Fact 1 with $H = H_j$ and $A = A_{j;k} \subseteq L(H_j)$. It follows that H_j admits a decomposition

$$H_j = H_{j;k} \otimes H_j^0; \quad (20)$$

such that the algebra $A_{j;k}$ is the algebra of all operators acting on the factor $H_{j;k}$ i.e.,

$$A_{j;k} = L(H_{j;k}) \otimes I. \quad (21)$$

Consider now a third particle l such that $(j;l) \in E$. Let us examine the commutativity relation between the algebras $A_{j;k}$ and $A_{j;l}$. It is consistent with the decompositions (20,21) if $A_{j;l}$ acts trivially on the factor $H_{j;k}$. In other words, any element $X \in A_{j;l}$ has a form $X = I \otimes X^0$ for some $X^0 \in L(H_j^0)$. We can now make use of Fact 1 with $H = H_j^0$ and $A = A_{j;l}$ to get a finer decomposition

$$H_j = H_{j;k} \otimes H_{j;l} \otimes H_j^{00};$$

such that

$$A_{j;k} = L(H_{j;k}) \otimes I \quad \text{and} \quad A_{j;l} = I \otimes L(H_{j;l}) \quad I:$$

Repeating these arguments we arrive to a decomposition $H_j = \bigotimes_{k:(j;k) \in E} H_{j;k} \otimes H_{j;j}$, such that the algebra $A_{j;k}$ coincides with the algebra of all linear operators on the factor $H_{j;k}$. As for the last factor $H_{j;j}$, it is acted on by neither of the algebras. This factor however can not appear for an irreducible problem. Indeed, any operator $X \in L(H_j)$ acting only on $H_{j;j}$ would commute with all algebras $A_{j;k}$. Accordingly, an operator $X[j]$ would commute with all projectors π_{jk} . This is possible only if $X = I$. Thus the algebra $L(H_{j;j})$ is just the algebra of complex numbers. It follows that $H_{j;j} = \mathbb{C}$ and it can be removed from the decomposition. Summarizing, we get

$$H_j = \bigotimes_{k:(j;k) \in E} H_{j;k}; \quad A_{j;k} = I \otimes \pi_{jk} \otimes (H \otimes I) \quad I:$$

It follows from the definitions above that π_{jk} acts non-trivially only on the factor $H_{j;k}$ in H_j and only on the factor $H_{k;j}$ in H_k . The lemma is proved. \square

The next step is to generalize Lemma 7 to reducible instances. We first outline the generalization and then put it formally. For each particle j a local classical variable x_j will be defined. Each value of x_j specifies a subspace $H_j^{(x_j)} \subset H_j$, such that a decomposition $H_j = \bigoplus_{x_j} H_j^{(x_j)}$ is a direct sum. This decomposition is preserved by all check operators. If one fixes the classical variables x_1, \dots, x_n for each particle, one gets some subspace $H^{(x_1, \dots, x_n)} \subset H$. The restriction of the problem on this subspace is almost irreducible (in the sense specified below), so Lemma 7 can be applied. In other words, for fixed values of the classical variables the fine-grained partition into subparticles emerges. The subparticles are naturally grouped into pairs, such that there is no any interactions between different pairs. Arthur can solve the restricted problem efficiently. Accordingly, the role of Merlin is just to send Arthur the values of the classical variables x_1, \dots, x_n for which the intersection $L_x \cap H^{(x_1, \dots, x_n)}$ is not empty.

Lemma 8 Let $x = \{f_{jk} \mid (j;k) \in E\}$ be an instance of the 2-local CES with an interaction graph $G = (V; E)$. There exist

Direct sum decompositions $H_j = \bigoplus_{x_j} H_j^{(x_j)}$ with induced decomposition $H = \bigoplus_{(x_1, \dots, x_n)} H^{(x_1, \dots, x_n)}$, where $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $H^{(x_1, \dots, x_n)} = H_1^{(x_1)} \otimes \dots \otimes H_n^{(x_n)}$.

A pair of Hilbert spaces $H_{j;k}^{(x_j, x_k)}$ and $H_{k;j}^{(x_k, x_j)}$ associated with each edge $(j;k) \in E$,

Hilbert spaces $H_{j;j}^{(x_j)}$,

A tensor product structure $H_j^{(x_j)} = H_{j;j}^{(x_j)} \otimes \bigotimes_{k:(j;k) \in E} H_{j;k}^{(x_j, x_k)}$,

such that the check operators admit a decomposition

$$\pi_{jk} = \bigotimes_{x_j, x_k} H_{j;k}^{(x_j, x_k)};$$

where $\sum_{j,k} \binom{j+k}{j} 2^{-L} (H^{(j)})$ acts only on the factors $H_{j,k}^{(j+k)}$ in the tensor product

$$H^{(j)} = \bigotimes_{l=1}^n H_{l:l}^{(1)} \bigotimes_{l=1}^n \bigotimes_{m:(l,m) \in E} H_{l,m}^{(1+m)} A : \quad (22)$$

As in Lemma 7, the notation j,k refers to subparticles of the particle j . It should be noted that the spaces $H_{j:j}^{(j)}$ are acted on by neither of the check operators. That is why they do not appear in Lemma 7. However, if the problem is reducible, and there exist an operator $h[j]$ commuting with all check operators, it acts only on the spaces $H_{j:j}^{(j)}$. Also it should be mentioned that any of the Hilbert spaces listed in Lemma 8 may be one-dimensional.

A straightforward corollary of the lemma is that the common eigenspace can be represented as a direct sum :

$$L_x = \bigoplus M^{(j,k)}; \quad M^{(j,k)} = L_x \cap H^{(j,k)} \quad (23)$$

where each subspace $M^{(j,k)}$ has a tensor product structure:

$$M^{(j,k)} = \bigotimes_{j=1}^n H_{j:j}^{(j)} A \bigotimes_{(j,k) \in E} M_{j,k}^{(j+k)} A; \quad M_{j,k}^{(j+k)} = H_{j,k}^{(j+k)} H_{k:j}^{(k)} : \quad (24)$$

(Some of the subspaces $M_{j,k}^{(j+k)}$ may be zero though.) Indeed, the lemma says that $\sum_{j,k} \binom{j+k}{j} h_{j,k}^{(j+k)} [j,k;k,j]$ for some $h_{j,k}^{(j+k)} \in L \cap H_{j,k}^{(j+k)} H_{k:j}^{(k)}$. Thus the eigenvalue equations $\sum_{j,k} j_i = j_i$ specifying L_x lead to (23,24) with

$$M_{j,k}^{(j+k)} = \sum_{j_i=0}^n \sum_{j_i=2} H_{j,k}^{(j+k)} H_{k:j}^{(k)} : h_{j,k}^{(j+k)} j_i = j_i : \quad (25)$$

Theorem 3 is a simple corollary of Lemma 8. Indeed, Merlin's proof that $L_x \neq 0$ may be a description of the subspaces $H_j^{(j)} = H_j$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, such that $L_x \cap H^{(j)} \neq 0$. Arthur uses Merlin's message to find the restricted projectors $\pi_{j,k}^{(j,k)}$. It follows from (23,24,25) that $L_x \neq 0$ implies $\pi_{j,k}^{(j,k)} \neq 0$ for all j and k . Arthur can verify it efficiently.

Besides, Lemma 8 implies that the common eigenspace L_x contains a state with a good classical description. Indeed, choose some value of ϵ for which $L_x \cap H^{(j)} \neq \emptyset$. Denote $V_j : H_j^{(j)} \rightarrow H_j$ an isometry corresponding to the embedding $H_j^{(j)} \rightarrow H_j$. Choose an arbitrary state $\sum_{j,k} \pi_{j,k}^{(j,k)}$ and an arbitrary state $\sum_{j,i} \pi_{j,i}^{(j,i)}$. Denote

$$j_i = \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{j_i=0}^1 \bigotimes_{(j,k) \in E} \pi_{j,k}^{(j,k)} A \in H^{(j)} :$$

This state is just a collection of bipartite pure states and local unentangled states. As such it has a concise classical description. A state $j_i = (V_1 \dots V_n) j$ belongs to L_x and also has a concise classical description. An eigenvalue equation $\sum_{j,k} j_i = j_i$ follows from identities

$$j_k V = V \pi_{j,k}^{(j,k)}; \quad \pi_{j,k}^{(j,k)} j_i = j_i;$$

where we denoted $V = V_1 \otimes \dots \otimes V_n$.

In the rest of this section we prove Lemma 8. It requires a generalization of Fact 1 to C^* -algebras with non-trivial center (the statement given below coincides with Theorem 5 in [17]).

Fact 2: Let H be a Hilbert space and $A \subseteq L(H)$ be a C^* -algebra. There exist a direct sum decomposition $H = \bigoplus_{i=1}^M H^{(i)}$ and a tensor product structure $H^{(i)} = H_1^{(i)} \otimes H_2^{(i)}$ such that

$$A = \bigoplus_{i=1}^M L(H_1^{(i)}) \otimes I.$$

The center $Z(A)$ is generated by orthogonal projectors on the subspaces $H^{(i)}$.

Proof of Lemma 8: Define C^* -algebras $A_{j;k} \subseteq L(H_j)$ for $(j;k) \in E$ in the same way as in the proof of Lemma 7. The key role is played by a C^* -algebra $A_{j;j} \subseteq L(H_j)$, see (16). These algebras obey certain commutativity relations. Namely,

$$XY = YX \quad \text{for all } X \in A_{j;k} \text{ and } Y \in A_{j;l}; \quad (26)$$

whenever $j \notin k \in I$, $(j;k) \in E$, $(j;l) \in E$, or $j = k \in I$, $(j;l) \in E$. They follow either from (19) or from the definitions. It follows that any element of the center $Z(A_{j;k})$ commutes with all algebras under consideration. As such, it must be an element of $A_{j;j}$, that is $Z(A_{j;k}) \subseteq A_{j;j}$. But the algebras $A_{j;k}$ and $A_{j;j}$ pairwise commute, so one has

$$Z(A_{j;k}) \subseteq Z(A_{j;j}) \quad \text{for all } (j;k) \in E. \quad (27)$$

Let us apply Fact 2 with $A = A_{j;j}$ and $H = H_j$. One gets a direct sum decomposition

$$H_j = \bigoplus_{j=1}^M H_j^{(j)}; \quad H_j^{(j)} = H_{j;j}^{(j)} \otimes K_j^{(j)}; \quad (28)$$

such that

$$A_{j;j} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^M L(H_{j;j}^{(j)}) \otimes I = \bigoplus_{j=1}^M A_{j;j}^{(j)}. \quad (29)$$

Consider now an edge $(j;k) \in E$. It follows from (26) that any element of $A_{j;k}$ preserves the subspaces $H_j^{(j)}$. Thus the algebra $A_{j;k}$ has the same direct sum structure:

$$A_{j;k} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^M A_{j;k}^{(j)}; \quad A_{j;k}^{(j)} \subseteq L(H_j^{(j)}).$$

It follows from (27) that each subalgebra $A_{j;k}^{(j)}$ has a trivial center. Moreover, the commutativity relation (26) implies that $A_{j;k}^{(j)}$ acts only on the factor $K_j^{(j)}$ in the decomposition (28).

Let us fix any $i = (i_1; \dots; i_n)$ and consider a subspace $H^{(i)} = \bigotimes_{j=1}^n H_j^{(i_j)} \subseteq H$. Since the check operator γ_{jk} is generated by the algebras $A_{j;k}$ and $A_{k;j}$ (see the proof of Lemma 7), the decomposition $H = \bigoplus_{i=1}^N H^{(i)}$ is preserved by all check operators. Therefore one can define restricted check operators

$$\gamma_{jk}^{(i,j,k)} = \gamma_{jk}|_{H^{(i)}} \in L(H^{(i)}). \quad (30)$$

From (28) one gets

$$H^{(\cdot)} = \bigotimes_{j=1}^n H_{j:j}^{(\cdot)} A_{j:j}^{(\cdot)} K^{(\cdot)}; K^{(\cdot)} = \bigotimes_{j=1}^n K_j^{(\cdot)} \quad (31)$$

It follows that the restricted check operators (30) act only on the factor $K^{(\cdot)}$.

Consider an instance y of the 2-local CES with the Hilbert space $K^{(\cdot)}$ and the check operators (30). This instance is irreducible. Indeed, suppose an operator $Z \in L(K_j^{(\cdot)})$ belongs to the set N_j (see Definition 2) for the instance y . Denote $Z^0 = I - Z \in L(H^{(\cdot)})$, where I acts on the first n factors $H_{j:j}^{(\cdot)}$ in the decomposition (31). By definition, $Z^0 \in A_{j:j}^{(\cdot)}$, see (29). But we know that the algebra $A_{j:j}^{(\cdot)}$ acts only on the factor $H_{j:j}^{(\cdot)}$ in the decomposition (31). Thus Z is proportional to the identity, that is y is irreducible. Applying Lemma 7 to y we get the desired decomposition (22). \square

6 The factorized comm on eigenspace problem

In this section we prove Theorem 5. First of all we shall answer a simple question: under what circumstances do factorized Hermitian operators commute with each other?

Lemma 9 Let $H_1; H_2 \in L(H)$ be tensor products of Hermitian operators:

$$H_a = \bigotimes_{j=1}^n H_{a;j}; \quad H_{a;j}^y = H_{a;j}; \quad a = 1; 2; \quad j = 1; \dots; n:$$

Then the commutator $[H_1; H_2] = 0$ if one of the following conditions hold

1. $H_{1;j}H_{2;j} = H_{2;j}H_{1;j}$ for each j in the range $1; \dots; n$. The number of anticommuting factors is even.
2. $H_{1;j}H_{2;j} = 0$ for some $j \in [1; n]$. Equivalently, $H_1H_2 = 0$.

Proof: Obviously, either of conditions stated in the lemma is sufficient. Suppose that $[H_1; H_2] = 0$ and prove that at least one of the conditions is true. We have

$$\bigotimes_{j=1}^n H_{1;j}H_{2;j} = \bigotimes_{j=1}^n H_{2;j}H_{1;j} \quad (32)$$

If both sides of this equality equal zero then $H_{1;j}H_{2;j} = 0$ for at least one $j \in [1; n]$. Suppose that both sides are non-zero operators, i.e. $H_{1;j}H_{2;j} \neq 0$ for all j . Then by definition of a tensor product, there exists a set of complex numbers $r_1; \dots; r_n$ such that

$$H_{1;j}H_{2;j} = r_j H_{2;j}H_{1;j}; \quad j = 1; \dots; n \quad \text{and} \quad \prod_{j=1}^n r_j = 1 \quad (33)$$

This equality says that the operator $H_{2;j}$ maps any eigenvector of $H_{1;j}$ to an eigenvector of $H_{1;j}$. Under this map an eigenvalue of $H_{1;j}$ is multiplied by r_j . It means that r_j must be a real number. Taking Hermitian conjugation of (33) we get an equality $H_{2;j}H_{1;j} = r_j^* H_{1;j}H_{2;j}$. Combining it with (33) yields $r_j^2 = 1$, i.e. $r_j = \pm 1$, which completes the proof.

□

This lemma motivates the following definition.

Definition 3 Let $H_1, H_2 \in L(H)$ be Hermitian factorized commuting operators. We say that H_1 and H_2 commute in a singular way if $H_1 H_2 = 0$. Otherwise we say that H_1 and H_2 commute in a regular way.

Thus saying that H_1 and H_2 commute in a regular way implies that all factors of H_1 and H_2 either commute or anticommute.

Let $x = (H_1; \dots; H_{r-1}; \dots; H_r)$ be an instance of the factorized CES problem. By definition,

$$H_a = \sum_{j=1}^{O^n} H_{a,j}; \quad H_{a,j}^\dagger = H_{a,j} \quad \text{for all } a = 1; \dots; n; \quad j = 1; \dots; n; \quad (34)$$

It will be convenient to define a table $T_x = [H_{a,j}]$ whose entries are Hermitian operators. Let us agree that the columns of the table T_x correspond to particles (the index j), while the rows correspond to the check operators (the index a). Let us give one more definition:

Definition 4 A row a of the table T_x is called regular if $L_a \neq 0$. If $L_a = 0$ the row a is called singular.

Generally, some rows of T_x commute in a regular way and some rows commute in a singular way. Note that two regular rows always commute in a regular way unless $L_x = 0$. Indeed, if $H_a H_b = 0$ for some regular rows a, b , then for any $j \in L_x$ one has $0 = H_a H_b |j\rangle = L_{a,b} |j\rangle$. Since $L_{a,b} \neq 0$, this is possible only if $|j\rangle = 0$. It is the presence of rows which commute in a singular way which makes the problem highly non-trivial. In this case the operators $H_{a,j}$ and $H_{b,j}$ may neither commute nor anticommute and their eigenspaces may be embedded into H_j more or less arbitrarily. In this situation we can not expect that the common eigenspace L_x contains a state which has a 'good' classical description.

As before, Merlin claims that x is a positive instance ($L_x \neq 0$) and Arthur must verify it. First of all we note that Arthur may perform two significant simplifications of the table T by himself.

Simplification 1: Note that $\text{Im } H_a = \sum_{j=1}^n \text{Im } H_{a,j}$ for any $a \in [1; r]$ and that the subspace $\text{Im } H_a$ is preserved by all other check operators. If the a -th row is a regular one then, in addition, $L_x \subseteq \text{Im } H_a$. Thus we can restrict the problem on the subspace $H^0 = H$ defined as

$$H^0 = \bigcap_{a: L_a \neq 0} \text{Im } H_a = \sum_{j=1}^{O^n} H_{a,j}^0; \quad H_j^0 = \bigcap_{a: L_a \neq 0} \text{Im } H_{a,j}; \quad (35)$$

Obviously, restricted check operators $H_{a,j}^0$ are factorized and pairwise commuting. Thus the modified problem is the factorized CES with a constraint that an operator $H_{a,j}$ is non-degenerated whenever a is a regular row. Since Arthur can easily find the subspaces H_j^0 and the restricted operators $H_{a,j}^0$, we can assume that the original instance x already satisfies this constraint.

Simplification 2: For any singular row b denote $H_{b,j}^0 \in L(H_j)$ a projector on the subspace $\text{Im } H_{b,j} \cap H_j$. Denote

$$H_b^0 = \sum_{j=1}^{O^n} H_{b,j}^0;$$

Obviously, $\text{Im } H_b = \text{Im } H_b^0 = \bigcap_{j=1}^n \text{Im } H_{b;j}$, so that

$$\text{Ker } H_b = \text{Ker } H_b^0. \quad (36)$$

The subspace $\text{Im } H_b^0$ is preserved by all check operators H_a , so that

$$[H_a; H_b^0] = 0 \quad \text{for all } a = 1, \dots, r. \quad (37)$$

Thus if we substitute each $H_{b;j}$ by $H_{b;j}^0$ (i.e. substitute H_b by H_b^0), the new family of operators is pairwise commuting. So it corresponds to some factorized CES problem. The equality (36) tells us that both problems have the same answer. Applying, if necessary, the substitutions $H_b \mapsto H_b^0$, we can assume that the original problem satisfies the following constraint: $H_{b;j}$ is a projector whenever b is a singular row. In other words, we can assume that singular rows of the table T_x constitute a factorized projectors CES.

Lemma 10 If a is a regular row and b is a singular row then $[H_{a;j}; H_{b;j}] = 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, n$.

Proof: Since the operators $fH_{a;j}g_j$ are non-degenerated, we have $H_a H_b \neq 0$, i.e. a regular and a singular row can commute only in a regular way. Thus $H_{a;j}$ and $H_{b;j}$ either commute or anticommute for all j . Suppose that $H_{a;j} H_{b;j} = H_{b;j} H_{a;j}$ for some j . Since $H_{a;j} H_{b;j} \neq 0$, the operator $H_{a;j}$ maps an eigenvector of $H_{b;j}$ to an eigenvector of $H_{b;j}$ reversing a sign of the eigenvalue. But after the simplifications $H_{b;j}$ became a projector and thus it can not anticommute with $H_{a;j}$. □

Let us summarize the results of the two simplifications:

$H_{a;j}$ is non-degenerated whenever a is a regular row.

$H_{b;j}$ is a projector whenever a is a singular row.

$[H_{a;j}; H_{b;j}] = 0$ for all j whenever a is regular and b is singular.

In the remaining part of the section we describe a non-deterministic reduction of the simplified factorized CES problem to the factorized projectors CES. The reduction is based on the following possible transformations of the table T and the vector $f_a g$:

- (i). Suppose there exists $j \in [1; n]$ and a Hermitian operator $Z \in L(H_j)$ such that Z commutes with all $H_{1;j}; \dots; H_{r;j}$. Then $Z[j]$ commutes with all $H_1; \dots; H_r$ and thus preserves the subspace L_x . Assuming that $L_x \neq 0$, the operator Z has some eigenvalue λ such that the intersection $L_x \cap \text{Ker}(Z[j] - \lambda I)$ is non-zero. So a transformation

$$H_j \mapsto H_j^0 \in \text{Ker}(Z - \lambda I) \quad \text{and} \quad H_{a;j} \mapsto H_{a;j} H_j^0; \quad a = 1, \dots, r$$

leads to an equivalent instance. To implement this transformation, Merlin should send a description of $(j; Z; \lambda)$ to Arthur.

- (ii). Suppose for some $j \in [1; n]$ we have $H_j = H_j^0 \oplus H_j^{\text{off}}$ and $H_{a;j} = H_{a;j}^0 \oplus H_{a;j}^{\text{off}}$ for all $a = 1, \dots, r$ (here $H_{a;j}^0$ acts on the factor H_j^0 and $H_{a;j}^{\text{off}}$ acts on the factor H_j^{off}). A transformation replacing the j -th column by two new columns with entries $fH_{a;j}^0 g$ and $fH_{a;j}^{\text{off}} g$ leads to an equivalent problem.

(iii). Suppose in some column j all operators $H_{a;j}$ are proportional to the identity: $H_{a;j} = r_a I$ for some real numbers $r_a, a = 1; \dots; r$. We may delete the j -th column from the table and perform a transformation $H_a \rightarrow H_a - r_a, a = 1; \dots; r$.

(iv). For any column j we can perform a transformation

$$H_{a;j} \rightarrow U H_{a;j} U^\dagger; \quad a = 1; \dots; r;$$

where $U \in L(H_j)$ is an arbitrary unitary operator.

(v). For any non-zero real number r we can replace some $H_{a;j}$ by $rH_{a;j}$ and replace r_a by $r \cdot r_a$.

(vi). Swaps of the columns and swaps of the rows.

We claim that the transformations (i) – (vi) allow to transform the simplified instance x into a canonical form x_c . The instance x_c consists of two independent problems. The first problem is the factorized CES with $r_a = 1$ and all check operators being tensor products of the Pauli operators and the identity. The second problem is the factorized projectors CES. More strictly, the table T_{x_c} for the instance x_c has the following structure:

Pauli operators	I	$r_a = 1$
I	factorized projectors	$r_a = 0$

The table is divided into four blocks. Columns in the left half of the table represent the qubits, i.e. $H_j = \mathbb{C}^2$. All operators $H_{a;j}$ sitting at the north-west block are either the Pauli operators $x; y; z$, or the identity. All operators $H_{a;j}$ sitting at the south-east block are projectors. Any operator $H_{a;j}$ sitting in the blocks labeled by I is the identity. The whole Hilbert space H factorizes: $H = H^0 \otimes H^0$, where the factor $H^0 = \mathbb{C}^{2^{n/2}}$ corresponds to the left half and H^0 to the right half of the table. The common eigenspace also factorizes: $L_{x_c} = L^0 \otimes L^0$, where L^0 is a code subspaces of some stabilizer code (see [2, 18] for the subject), and L^0 is the factorized projectors CES. Obviously $L_{x_c} \neq 0$ i. $L^0 \neq 0$ and $L^0 \neq 0$. Arthur can verify that $L^0 \neq 0$ (and even compute the dimension of L^0) using an efficient algorithm, see [2]. Thus the original instance x has been reduced to an instance of the factorized projectors CES. Summarizing, Theorem 5 follows from the claim given above. We restate it here as a lemma.

Lemma 11 The transformations (i) – (vi) allow one to transform any instance of the factorized CES into the canonical form.

Proof: Let T_x be a table representing a simplified instance of the factorized CES. The first step is to apply the transformation (i) as long as it is possible. To describe operators Z suitable for the transformation (i) it is convenient to use a language of C^* -algebras.

Definition 5 A column algebra $A_j \subset L(H_j)$ of a column j is the C^* -algebra generated by the operators $H_{a;j}$ for all regular rows a .

Let $Z(A_j) \subseteq A_j$ be a center of the column algebra A_j . By definition, any operator $Z \in Z(A_j)$ commutes with all $H_{a;j}$ for regular a . On the other hand, Z commutes with all $H_{b;j}$ for singular b , see Lemma 10. Thus Arthur can use any operator $Z \in Z(A_j)$ to implement the transformation (i). We would like to choose Z such that after the transformation (i) the column algebra of the column j would have a trivial center. Making use of Fact 2 from Section 5 one can identify a direct sum decomposition $H_j = \bigoplus_{\ell} H_j^{(\ell)}$ such that $A_j = \bigoplus_{\ell} A_j^{(\ell)}$, where the algebra $A_j^{(\ell)} \subseteq L(H_j^{(\ell)})$ has a trivial center. Let us apply transformation (i), where Z is the projector onto $H_j^{(\ell)}$ (ℓ can be chosen arbitrarily) and $\ell = 1$. The column algebra of the column j for the transformed problem is obviously $A_j^{(1)}$. It has a trivial center. Arthur must implement n transformations (i) for all columns j . Now we can assume that all column algebras A_j have a trivial center^e.

Then according to Fact 1 from Section 5, the spaces H_j have a tensor product structure

$$H_j = H_j^0 \otimes H_j^{\infty}; \quad (38)$$

such that the column algebra A_j acts on the factor H_j^0 only:

$$A_j = L(H_j^0) \otimes I;$$

Take some singular row b . The operator $H_{b;j}$ commutes with all elements of A_j , see Lemma 10. It means that $H_{b;j}$ acts only on the factor H_j^{∞} :

$$H_{b;j} = I \otimes H_{b;j}^{\infty} \text{ whenever } b = 0;$$

for some operator $H_{b;j}^{\infty} \in L(H_j^{\infty})$. Since $H_{b;j}$ is a projector, the same does $H_{b;j}^{\infty}$. Summarizing, the whole space H has a tensor product structure

$$H = H^0 \otimes H^{\infty}; \quad H^0 = \bigotimes_{j=1}^n H_j^0; \quad H^{\infty} = \bigotimes_{j=1}^n H_j^{\infty};$$

such that all regular rows act only on H^0 while all singular rows act only on H^{∞} . Applying poly($n + r$) transformations (ii), (iii), and (vi) we can split the original instance x into two independent instances: x^0 (regular rows) and x^{∞} (singular rows), such that $L_x = L_{x^0} \otimes L_{x^{\infty}}$. One remains to prove that x^0 is equivalent to non-triviality check for some stabilizer quantum code.

Since we have already known that all singular rows can be isolated, let us assume that all rows of the table T_x are regular. Thus all operators $H_{a;j}$ are non-degenerated and all column algebras A_j have a trivial center. Applying, if necessary, the transformation (iii) we can get rid of 'free' factors H_j^{∞} in (38), so we can also assume that

$$A_j = L(H_j):$$

For any column j the operators $H_{a;j}$ either commute or anticommute with each other. It follows that the operator $H_{a;j}^2$ belongs to the center of A_j . Thus $H_{a;j}^2 \in I$. Applying, if

^eSince Arthur can find the direct sum decomposition of H_j and A_j efficiently (recall that the space H_j has a bounded dimension), Merlin can just tell him what of the subspaces $H_j^{(\ell)}$ has to be chosen.

necessary, the transformation (v) we can make $H_{a;j}^2 = I$ for all a and j . Note that $\alpha_a = 1$ for all a after this transformation, otherwise $L_x = 0$ by obvious reasons. A connection with stabilizer codes is established by the following lemma (we shall prove it later):

Lemma 12 Let S be a Hilbert space, $G_1, \dots, G_r \in L(S)$ be Hermitian operators such that

$$G_a^2 = I; \quad G_a G_b = G_b G_a \quad \text{for all } a, b;$$

and such that the algebra generated by G_1, \dots, G_r coincides with $L(S)$. Then there exists an integer n , a tensor product structure $S = (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes n}$ and a unitary operator $U \in L(S)$ such that $U G_a U^\dagger$ is a tensor product of the Pauli operators and the identity (up to a sign) for all a .

Take $S = H_j$ and $G_a = H_{a;j}$ for some column j . Let $U \in L(H_j)$ be a unitary operator whose existence is guaranteed by Lemma 12. Applying the transformations (iv) with the operator U followed by the transformation (ii) to the j -th column we split it into n columns. Each of new columns represents a qubit. The entries of all new columns are either the Pauli operators or the identity. Performing this transformation for all columns independently, we transform the original instance of the factorized CES to the factorized CES with all check operators being tensor products of the identity and the Pauli operators. The total number of transformations (i)–(vi) that we made is $\text{poly}(n + r)$. \square

Proof of Lemma 12: The family G_1, \dots, G_r contains at least one anticommuting pair $G_a G_b = -G_b G_a$, since otherwise the algebra generated by G_a 's has a non-trivial center. Without loss of generality, $G_1 G_2 = -G_2 G_1$. The operator G_1 has only eigenvalues ± 1 and G_2 swaps the subspaces corresponding to the eigenvalue $+1$ and -1 . Thus both subspaces have the same dimension and we can introduce a tensor product structure $S = \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes S^0$ such that

$$U G_1 U^\dagger = \sigma_z \otimes I; \quad U G_2 U^\dagger = \sigma_x \otimes I;$$

for some unitary operator $U \in L(S)$. Using the fact that all other G_a 's either commute or anticommute with G_1 and G_2 one can easily show that each G_a also has a product form:

$$U G_a U^\dagger = G_a^0 \otimes G_a^1; \quad G_a^0 \in L(S^0); \quad G_a^1 \in L(\mathbb{C}^2):$$

Obviously, the family of operators G_1^0, \dots, G_r^0 satisfies

$$(G_a^0)^\dagger = G_a^0; \quad (G_a^0)^2 = I; \quad G_a^0 G_b^0 = G_b^0 G_a^0: \quad (39)$$

Denote $A \subset L(S^0)$ the \mathbb{C} -algebra generated by the operators G_1^0, \dots, G_r^0 . It has a trivial center. Indeed, if $Z \in A$ is a non-trivial central element then $I - Z$ is a non-trivial central element of $L(S)$, which is impossible. Applying Fact 1 from Section 5 to the pair $(S^0; A)$, we conclude that there exists a tensor product structure

$$S^0 = S^{\otimes} \otimes S^{\otimes\otimes}; \quad A = L(S^{\otimes}) \otimes I:$$

But the factor $S^{\otimes\otimes}$ is acted on by neither of G_a 's and thus $S^{\otimes\otimes} = \mathbb{C}$. We have proved that

$$A = L(S^0): \quad (40)$$

Taking into account (39) and (40) we can apply induction with respect to $\dim S$ (the base of induction corresponds to $S = \mathbb{C}$).

□

We conclude this section by proving Corollaries 2 and 3. Obviously, if $H_a \neq 0$ for all a then all rows of the table T_x are regular and thus the factorized CES can be non-deterministically reduced to non-triviality check for an additive quantum code. Suppose now that $H_a H_b \neq 0$ for all a and b . It means that all rows of the table (both regular and singular) commute in a regular way. Thus the factorized projectors CES which appears in our reduction has the following special property: for any column j all projectors $H_{a,j}$ pairwise commute. Therefore the space H_j has a basis in which all projectors $H_{a,j}$ are diagonal. So the problem becomes classical and belongs to NP by obvious reasons.

7 The factorized projectors common eigenspace problem for qubits

In this section we prove that the factorized projectors CES for qubits ($d = 2$) belongs to NP. Let us start from a general note that applies to an arbitrary d . Consider an instance $x = (H_1; \dots; H_r) = fH_{a,j}g$ of the factorized projectors CES and the common eigenspace

$$L_x = \{ \psi \mid H_a \psi = 0 \text{ for all } a = 1; \dots; r \}$$

If we do not care about computational complexity, the dimension of L_x can be calculated using the following simple formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \dim L_x = & \operatorname{Rk}(I) - \sum_a \operatorname{Rk}(H_a) + \sum_{a < b} \operatorname{Rk}(H_a H_b) - \sum_{a < b < c} \operatorname{Rk}(H_a H_b H_c) \\ & + \dots + (-1)^{r+1} \operatorname{Rk}\left(\prod_{a=1}^r H_a\right); \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where $\operatorname{Rk}(A) = \dim \operatorname{Im} A$ is a rank of the operator A . All summation here are carried out in the range $[1; r]$. Formula (41) is analogous to exclusion-inclusion formula for cardinality of a union of sets. We can apply it since all projectors H_a are diagonalizable over the same basis and each projector can be identified with the set of basis vectors which belong to $\operatorname{Im} H_a$.

Let $f_1; \dots; f_r$ be an arbitrary subset of check operators. Denote

$$r(f) = \operatorname{Rk}\left(\prod_{a \in f} H_a\right); \quad (42)$$

Formula (41) has the following important consequence. Let $x = fH_{a,j}g$ and $x^0 = fH_{a,j}^0g$ be two instances of the factorized projectors CES with the same n and r . If for any subset of check operators f the quantities $r(f)$ for the instances x and x^0 coincide then both instances have the same answer. So we can try to simplify the original instance x by modifying the projectors $H_{a,j}$ in such a way that all quantities $r(f)$ are preserved. Although this approach seems to fail in a general case (see a discussion at the end of this section), it works perfectly for qubits.

In a case of qubits we have $H_j = C^2$ for all j and $H = (C^2)^n$. Each operator $H_{a,j} \in L(C^2)$ is either the identity operator or a projector of rank one. Let us fix the number of qubits n and the number of check operators r . Recall, that the input $x = fH_{a,j}g$ is regarded as a table, such that the columns correspond to the qubits and the rows correspond to the check operators. We start from introducing an appropriate terminology.

Definition 6 A table $x = fH_{a;j}g$ is called commutative if $[H_a; H_b] = 0$ for all a and b .

Definition 7 A table $x^0 = fH_{a;j}^0g$ is called consistent with a table $x = fH_{a;j}g$ if for any column j one has

$$\text{Rk}(H_{a;j}) = \text{Rk}(H_{a;j}^0) \text{ for all } a.$$

$$H_{a;j} = H_{b;j} \Rightarrow H_{a;j}^0 = H_{b;j}^0.$$

$$H_{a;j}H_{b;j} = 0 \Rightarrow H_{a;j}^0H_{b;j}^0 = 0.$$

Two following lemmas show that we can substitute the original table x by any table x^0 consistent with x without changing the answer of the problem.

Lemma 13 Let x be a commutative table. If a table x^0 is consistent with x then x^0 is also a commutative table.

Proof: Let $x = fH_{a;j}g$, $x^0 = fH_{a;j}^0g$, $H_a = \sum_{j=1}^n H_{a;j}$, and $H_a^0 = \sum_{j=1}^n H_{a;j}^0$.

Suppose that H_a and H_b commute in a singular way i.e., $H_aH_b = 0$. It means that $H_{a;j}H_{b;j} = 0$ for some j . Since x^0 is consistent with x , we have $H_{a;j}^0H_{b;j}^0 = 0$. Thus H_a^0 and H_b^0 also commute (in a singular way).

Suppose now that H_a and H_b commute in a regular way, that is $H_aH_b \notin 0$, $H_aH_b = H_bH_a$. It follows from Lemma 9 that $H_{a;j}H_{b;j} = H_{b;j}H_{a;j}$ for all j . Since both $H_{a;j}$ and $H_{b;j}$ are projectors, they can not anticommute, so we conclude that $[H_{a;j}, H_{b;j}] = 0$ for all j . Besides, we know that $H_{a;j}H_{b;j} \notin 0$. It is easy to see that both conditions can be met by one-qubit projectors only if for any fixed j at least one of the following statements is true:

- (i) At least one of $H_{a;j}$ and $H_{b;j}$ is the identity operator.
- (ii) $H_{a;j} = H_{b;j}$.

Now we can make use of the fact that x^0 is consistent with x . If the statement (i) is true, one has $\text{Rk}(H_{a;j}) = 2$ or (and) $\text{Rk}(H_{b;j}) = 2$. It follows that $\text{Rk}(H_{a;j}^0) = 2$ or (and) $\text{Rk}(H_{b;j}^0) = 2$, that is at least one of the projectors $H_{a;j}^0$ and $H_{b;j}^0$ is the identity. If the statement (ii) is true, one has $H_{a;j}^0 = H_{b;j}^0$. In both cases $H_{a;j}^0H_{b;j}^0 \notin 0$ and $[H_{a;j}^0, H_{b;j}^0] = 0$. Since it holds for all j , we conclude that H_a^0 and H_b^0 commute (in a regular way). □

Lemma 14 Let x be a commutative table. If a table x^0 is consistent with x then all quantities $r(\cdot)$ for the tables x and x^0 coincide.

Proof: Let $x = fH_{a;j}g$, $x^0 = fH_{a;j}^0g$, $H_a = \sum_{j=1}^n H_{a;j}$, and $H_a^0 = \sum_{j=1}^n H_{a;j}^0$. According to Lemma 13 the table x^0 is commutative, so for any a we can define a quantity

$$r^0(a) = \text{Rk}\left(\sum_{a2} H_a^0\right); \quad (43)$$

We should prove that $r(a) = r^0(a)$ for all $a \in \{1, \dots, rg\}$. There are two possibilities:

(i) $r(a) > 0$. It means that $H_aH_b \notin 0$ for all $a, b \in \{1, \dots, rg\}$. Thus all operators H_a , $a \in \{1, \dots, rg\}$ commute in a regular way and $[H_{a;j}, H_{b;j}] = 0$ for all $a, b \in \{1, \dots, rg\}$ and for all j . In this situation the formula (42) for $r(a)$ factorizes:

$$r(a) = \prod_{j=1}^n r_j(a); \quad r_j(a) = \text{Rk}\left(\sum_{a2} H_{a;j}\right); \quad (44)$$

Let us consider some particular j . The family of projectors $\{H_{a;j}G_{a2}\}$ is diagonalizable over the same basis. Denote corresponding basis vectors as $|j_0\rangle$ and $|j_1\rangle$, $\langle j_i| = \langle j_0|, \langle j_1|$. Each member of the family $\{H_{a;j}G_{a2}\}$ is one of the following projectors: I , $|j_0\rangle\langle j_0|$ and $|j_1\rangle\langle j_1|$. The requirement $r_j(\cdot) > 0$ implies that the projectors $|j_0\rangle\langle j_0|$ and $|j_1\rangle\langle j_1|$ do not enter into this family simultaneously. Thus there exist integers k_1 and k_2 , $k_1 + k_2 = |j|$, such that the family $\{H_{a;j}G_{a2}\}$ consists of k_2 identity operators I and k_1 projectors of rank one $|j_i\rangle\langle j_i|$ (with $j_i = j_0$ or $j_i = j_1$). Now let us look at the family $\{H_{a;j}^0G_{a2}\}$. Since x^0 is consistent with x , this family also consists of k_2 identity operators I and k_1 projectors of rank one $|j_i'\rangle\langle j_i'|$ for some $j_i' \in \mathbb{C}^2$. Therefore $[H_{a;j}^0; H_{b;j}^0] = 0$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{C}^2$ and

$$r_j^0(\cdot) = \text{Rk} \left(\sum_{a \in \mathbb{C}^2} H_{a;j}^0 \right) = r_j(\cdot):$$

Also it means that the quantity $r^0(\cdot)$ factorizes, $r^0(\cdot) = \prod_{j=1}^n r_j^0(\cdot)$, and thus $r^0(\cdot) = r(\cdot)$. (ii) $r(\cdot) = 0$. It means that $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{C}^2} H_a = 0$. Suppose first that $H_a H_b = 0$ for some $a, b \in \mathbb{C}^2$. Since x^0 is consistent with x it implies that $H_a^0 H_b^0 = 0$ (see the last part of the proof of Lemma 13) and so that $r^0(\cdot) = 0$. Now suppose that $H_a H_b \neq 0$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{C}^2$. By definition, it means that all check operators H_a , $a \in \mathbb{C}^2$ commute in a regular way, i.e. $[H_{a;j}, H_{b;j}] = 0$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{C}^2$ and for all j . In particular, the family $\{H_{a;j}G_{a2}\}$ is diagonalizable over the same basis. In this situation we can use a decomposition (44). We know that $r_j(\cdot) = 0$ for some j . But it happens if the family $\{H_{a;j}G_{a2}\}$ contains a pair of rank one projectors corresponding to mutually orthogonal states, i.e. $H_{a;j}H_{b;j} = 0$ for some $a, b \in \mathbb{C}^2$. But it implies $H_a H_b = 0$ which contradicts our assumption. \square

What is the most simple form of a table x^0 consistent with the original table x ? We will show that for any table x (which may be not a commutative one) there exists a table $x^0 = \{H_{a;j}^0\}$ consistent with x such that $H_{a;j}^0 \in \{I, |j_0\rangle\langle j_0|, |j_1\rangle\langle j_1|\}$ for all a and j . Here $|j_i\rangle, |j_i| \in \mathbb{C}^2$ is some fixed orthonormal basis of \mathbb{C}^2 (computational basis). All check operators H_a^0 for the table x^0 are diagonal in the computational basis of $(\mathbb{C}^2)^n$, therefore Merlin's proof might be a description of the table x^0 and a binary string $(x_1; x_2; \dots; x_n)$ such that $H_a^0 |x_i\rangle = |x_i\rangle$ for all a . Verification that x^0 is indeed consistent with x requires only $O(nr^2)$ computational steps. Thus existence of a table x^0 with the specified properties implies that the factorized projectors CES for qubits belongs to NP. It remains to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 15 For any table x there exists a table $x^0 = \{H_{a;j}^0\}$ consistent with x such that $H_{a;j}^0 \in \{I, |j_0\rangle\langle j_0|, |j_1\rangle\langle j_1|\}$ for all a and j .

Proof: Let $x = \{H_{a;j}\}$. A transformation from x to the desired table x^0 is defined independently for each column n , so let us focus on some particular column n , say $j = 1$. At first, we define an orthogonality graph $G = (V; E)$. A vertex $v \in V$ is a set of rows which contain the same projector. In other words, we introduce an equivalence relation on the set of rows: $a \sim b$, $H_{a;1} = H_{b;1}$ and define a vertex $v \in V$ as an equivalence class of rows. Thus, by definition, each vertex $v \in V$ carries a projector $H(v) \in L(\mathbb{C}^2)$. A pair of vertices $u, v \in V$ is connected by an edge if the projectors corresponding to u and v are orthogonal: $(u; v) \in E$, $H(u)H(v) = 0$.

Consider as an example the following table ($r = 100$): $H_{1;1} = I, H_{2;1} = H_{3;1} = 1/2(I + \sigma_z), H_{4;1} = 1/2(I - \sigma_z), H_{5;1} = 1/2(I + \sigma_x), H_{6;1} = 1/2(I - \sigma_x), H_{7;1} = 1/2(I + \sigma_y), H_{8;1} = 1/2(I - \sigma_y)$. Then an orthogonality graph consists of six vertices, $V = \{1;2;3;4;5;6\}g$, with $H(1) = I, H(2) = 1/2(I + \sigma_z), H(3) = 1/2(I - \sigma_z), H(4) = 1/2(I + \sigma_x), H(5) = 1/2(I - \sigma_x),$ and $H(6) = 1/2(I + \sigma_y)$. The set of edges is $E = \{2;3\}; \{4;5\}g$.

It is a special property of qubits that any orthogonality graph always splits to several disconnected edges representing pairs of orthogonal projectors and several disconnected vertices representing unpaired projectors of rank one and the identity operator.

Suppose we perform a transformation

$$H(v) \mapsto H^0(v); \quad v \in V; \quad (45)$$

for some projectors $H^0(v) \in L(\mathbb{C}^2)$ which satisfy

$$\text{Rk}(H(v)) = \text{Rk}(H^0(v)) \quad \text{for all } v \in V; \quad H^0(u)H^0(v) = 0 \quad \text{for all } (u,v) \in E; \quad (46)$$

As each vertex of the graph represents a group of cells of the table, the transformation (45) can be also regarded as a transformation of the tables $x \mapsto x^0$. Note that the table x^0 is consistent with the table x , since the restrictions (46) are just rephrasing of Definition 7.

Now existence of the table x^0 with the desired properties is obvious. For each disconnected edge $(u,v) \in E$ we define the transformation (45) as $H^0(u) = |0\rangle\langle 0|, H^0(v) = |1\rangle\langle 1|$ (it does not matter, how exactly 0 and 1 are assigned to endpoints of the edge). For any disconnected vertex $v \in V$, we define $H^0(v) = I$ if $H(v) = I$ and $H^0(v) = |0\rangle\langle 0|$ if $\text{Rk}(H(v)) = 1$. \square

We conclude this section by several remarks concerning the factorized projectors CES problem with $d > 2$. For simplicity, let us put an additional constraint, namely that each projector $H_{a;j}$ is either the identity operators or a projector of rank one (a projector on a pure state). Definitions 6 and 7 are still reasonable in this setting. Moreover, it is easy to check that Lemmas 13 and 14 are still valid (the proofs given above can be repeated almost literally). A natural generalization of Lemma 15 might be the following:

For any table x there exists a table $x^0 = \{H_{a;j}^0\}g$ consistent with x such that for all a and j $H_{a;j}^0 \in \{I, |j_1\rangle\langle j_1|, \dots, |j_d\rangle\langle j_d|\}$.

Here some fixed orthonormal basis $|j_1\rangle, \dots, |j_d\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d$ is chosen. Unfortunately, this statement is wrong even for $d = 3$. Counterexamples may be obtained by constructions used in the proof of the Kochen-Specker theorem [20]. According to this theorem there exist families of projectors $P_1, \dots, P_r \in L(\mathbb{C}^d)$ ($d = 3$) which do not admit an assignment

$$P_a \mapsto \pi_a \in \{0,1\}g; \quad a = 1, \dots, r; \quad (47)$$

such that

$$\sum_{a \in X} \pi_a = 1 \quad \text{whenever} \quad \sum_{a \in X} P_a = I; \quad (48)$$

Here $X \subseteq \{1, \dots, r\}$ may be an arbitrary subset. Peres [21] suggested an explicit construction of such family for $d = 3$ and $r = 33$. This family consists of the projectors of rank one, i.e. $P_a = |j_a\rangle\langle j_a|, j_a \in \{1,2,3\}, a = 1, \dots, 33$.

Suppose a table $x = \{H_{a;j}\}g$ consists of 33 rows and the first column accommodates the family of projectors suggested by Peres: $H_{a;1} = |j_a\rangle\langle j_a|, a = 1, \dots, 33$. Let $x^0 = \{H_{a;j}^0\}g$ be

a table whose existence is promised by the generalized Lemma 15. Since x^0 is consistent with x , one has $\text{Rk}(H_{a,1}^0) = \text{Rk}(H_{a,1}) = 1$, so neither of the projectors $H_{a,1}^0$, $a = 1; \dots; 33$, is the identity. Then the only possibility (if the lemma is true) is that $H_{a,1}^0 \in \{j_1 i_1 j_2; j_1 i_2 j_3; j_2 i_3 j_3\}$. A consistency property implies also that

$$\sum_{a=2}^X H_{a,1} = I \quad \sum_{a=2}^X H_{a,1}^0 = I: \quad (49)$$

Indeed, the equality on the lefthand side is possible if $j_1 j_2 = 3$ and all projectors $H_{a,1} g_{a2}$ are pairwise orthogonal. Then the projectors $H_{a,1}^0 g_{a2}$ are also pairwise orthogonal and we get the equality on the righthand side. The family of projectors $H_{a,1}^0 g$ obviously admits an assignment (47,48). Indeed, we can put

$$a = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } H_{a,1}^0 = j_2 i_3 j_3 \\ 0 & \text{if } H_{a,1}^0 = j_1 i_1 j_2 \text{ or } j_1 i_2 j_3 \end{cases}$$

But the property (49) implies that the assignment $H_{a,1} \neq a$, $a = 1; \dots; 33$ also satisfies the requirements (48). It is impossible. Therefore the generalization of Lemma 15 given above is wrong.

In fact, the proof of Lemma 15 needs a regular d -coloring of a graph which admits d -dimensional orthogonal representation. As we have seen, this is not always possible. It might happen however that all ‘pathological’ (which violate Lemma 15) commutative tables lead to simple instances of factorized projectors CES. Indeed, a difficult instance must contain pairs of rows commuting in a singular way and pairs commuting in a regular way. The number of pairs of each type must be sufficiently large. For example, if all rows commute in a regular way, the problem belongs to NP according to Corollary 3. If all rows commute in a singular way, we can easily compute $\dim L_0$ using the exclusion-inclusion formula (41). The number of ‘pathological’ columns in the table also must be sufficiently large. To construct difficult instances we must meet all these requirements which seems to be hard.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank P. Woźniak for interesting discussions which motivated this line of research. We thank A. Kitaev and J. Preskill for helpful comments and suggestions. We are grateful to the referee of the paper for numerous remarks and corrections. The main part of this work was done when M. V. was visiting Institute for Quantum Information, Caltech. The work was supported by RFBR grant 02-01-00547, and by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. EEC-0086038.

References

1. S. Aaronson, The complexity zoo, <http://www.complexityzoo.com/>
2. A. Kitaev, A. Shen, and M. V. Vayli (2002), Classical and quantum computation, AMS.
3. D. Aharonov and T. Naveh (2002), Quantum NP — a survey, quant-ph/0210077.
4. J. Watrous (2000), Succinct quantum proofs for properties of finite groups, Proceedings of IEEE FOCS, p. 537.
5. D. Aharonov and O. Regev (2003), A lattice problem in quantum NP, quant-ph/0307220.
6. J. Kempe and O. Regev (2003), 3-Local Hamiltonian is QMA-complete, Quantum Information and Computation, Vol. 3(3), p. 258–64.

7. J. Kempe, A. Kitaev, and O. Regev (2004), The Complexity of the Local Hamiltonian Problem, quant-ph/0406180.
8. D. Janzing, P. Wocjan, and Th. Beth (2003), Identity check is QMA-complete, quant-ph/0305050.
9. P. Wocjan and Th. Beth (2003), The 2-local Hamiltonian problem encompasses NP, International Journal of Quantum Information, Vol. 1 (3), p. 349–357.
10. H. Briegel and R. Raussendorf, Persistent entanglement in arrays of interacting particles, quant-ph/0004051.
11. P. Hayden, R. Jozsa, D. Petz, A. Winter (2004), Structure of states which satisfy strong subadditivity of quantum entropy with equality, Commun. Math. Phys., 246 (2), p. 359.
12. B. Terhal and D. DiVincenzo (2004), Adaptive quantum computation, constant depth quantum circuits and Arthur-Merlin games, Quantum Information and Computation, Vol. 4 (2), p. 122–133.
13. A. Calderbank, E. Rains, P. Shor, and N. Sloane (1996), Quantum error correction and orthogonal geometry, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, p. 405; quant-ph/9605005.
14. A. Aho, J. Hopcroft, and J. Ullman (1974), The Design and Analysis of Computer Algorithms, Addison-Wesley Reading, Massachusetts.
15. D. Bini and V. Y. Pan (1994), Polynomial and matrix computation, Vol. 1. Birkhäuser, Boston, Cambridge, MA.
16. M. Takesaki (1979), Theory of operator algebras I, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg-Berlin.
17. E. Knill, R. Laamme, and L. Viola (2000), Theory of Quantum Error Correction for General Noise, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, p. 2525.
18. M. Nielsen and I. Chuang (2000), Quantum Computation and Quantum Information, Cambridge University Press.
19. This Lemma and its proof were suggested by the referee of the paper.
20. S. Kochen and E. P. Specker (1967), The problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics, J. Math. Mech. 17, p. 59.
21. A. Peres (1991), Two simple proofs of the Kochen-Specker theorem, Journal of Physics A 24, p. L175.