

A general approach to physical realization of unambiguous quantum-state discrimination

Bing He, János A. Bergou *

October 20, 2020

Abstract

We present a general scheme to realize the POVMs for the unambiguous discrimination of quantum states. For any set of pure states it enables us to set up a feasible linear optical circuit to perform their optimal discrimination, if they are prepared as single-photon states. An example of unknown states discrimination is discussed as the illustration of the general scheme.

PACS number(s): 03.65.Bz, 03.67.-a, 03.65.Ta

Discrimination of the members of a set of n quantum states $\{\rho_i\}$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n$) is a standard task in quantum communication protocols. Typically these states are nonorthogonal pure states or even mixed states, so it is impossible to achieve one hundred percent correctness in the discrimination process. We can eliminate the chance of error but the price we will pay is that we must allow a chance of inconclusiveness. This scenario is called unambiguous state discrimination (USD) [1], and it has found applications in quantum cryptographic protocol [2] and quantum algorithm [3], etc. The physical methods proposed to do USD include linear quantum optics [4], ion trap architecture [5] and nuclear magnetic resonance [6]. Some experiments on the USD of nonorthogonal photon states [7] have been realized thus far. To perform the USD of nonorthogonal states, we need to use general positive operator-valued measures (POVMs) instead of orthogonal projectors, and their realization in the original signal Hilbert space of the measured system is usually impossible. Through Neumark's theorem [8], however, a POVM can be realized in the extended Hilbert spaces by performing unitary transformations and von Neumann projections together, and then the physical implementation of this POVM is feasible due to the fact that any discrete finite dimensional unitary operator can be constructed in laboratory using optical devices [9]. In finding the necessary unitary operators, we used to require the success probabilities, $p_i = \text{Tr}(\rho_i \Pi_k) \delta_{i,k}$, of the POVM elements Π_k and the corresponding inconclusive probabilities, $q_i = 1 - p_i$ [10]. However, for

*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Hunter College of the City University of New York, 695 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10021, contact email: bhe98@earthlink.net

the USD of a set of unknown states, we don't have the information available to obtain these probabilities and, therefore, are unable to find the required unitary transformations by the existing methods.

In this letter, we present a general scheme to realize *any* POVM for USD only with its elements Π_k we have set up to unambiguously measure a particular set of pure or mixed inputs. The required unitary (orthogonal) transformations are found in an extended $2N$ dimensional Hilbert space if the dimension of the original signal Hilbert space is N . If the input states for discrimination are prepared as one-photon states, we can build a linear-optics circuit with at most N^2 lossless beam splitters to implement the POVM that unambiguously discriminates them. To reach the optimal performance of our set-up, we just need to choose the proper parameters (transmission and reflection coefficients) of the beam splitters such that the unitary (orthogonal) transformations in the extended space will achieve the same effect as the optimal POVM does in the original space. It would also be equally possible to construct this device for the quantum states in the forms of any other type of systems, such as electron, neutron, atoms, etc. Moreover, this scheme is generalizable to the optical implementation of the Kraus operators of a POVM, and of any possible finite linear map given as a quantum operation, the general aspects of the physical realization for which has been discussed in [11].

The construction of the unitary transformations in the extended space by this general scheme is independent of the knowledge about the input states, so it can be applied to realize the USD of the unknown states, for which the inputs with certain symmetry are prepared with the copies of the unknown states as in [12, 13]. Take the inputs and the POVM in [12] for example, two unknown qubits $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$, which are randomly distributed unit vectors on the Bloch sphere,

$$|\psi_i\rangle = \cos(\theta_i/2)|0\rangle + \sin(\theta_i/2)e^{i\varphi_i}|1\rangle, \quad (1)$$

are prepared with their copies to produce the following quantum registers,

$$|\Psi_i\rangle = |\psi_1\rangle_A |\psi_2\rangle_B |\psi_i\rangle_C, \quad (2)$$

where $i = 1, 2$, with the probabilities of η_1 and η_2 respectively, and the POVM elements to unambiguously discriminate them are constructed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_1 &= A_1^\dagger A_1 = k_1(P_{BC}^{as} \otimes I_A) \\ \Pi_2 &= A_2^\dagger A_2 = k_2(P_{AC}^{as} \otimes I_B), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where P_{BC}^{as} and P_{AC}^{as} are the projectors into the anti-symmetric spaces of the respective digit locations. The coefficients k_1 and k_2 can be properly tuned that this POVM will reach the optimum performance in the USD of these inputs. Meanwhile, the probabilities of inconclusiveness are determined by the operator,

$$\Pi_0 = A_0^\dagger A_0 = I - \Pi_1 - \Pi_2. \quad (4)$$

Since the inputs are unknown to us, the only quantity to indicate how well this POVM performs is the average success probability. For the above example of

1 copy of $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$ used as the reference in the registers, the maximum average success probability is $1/6$ if the preparation probabilities η_1 and η_2 are equal [12].

Generally, by a direct sum, we append an M dimensional ancilla space A to the N dimensional original Hilbert space H to realize a POVM through Neumark's theorem. With quantum optics techniques (see M. Mohseni *et al.* in [7]), n arbitrary initial input states $|\psi_i^{in}\rangle = \sum_{j \in J} d_{i,j} a_j^\dagger |0\rangle$, where $J = \{1, 2, \dots, N + M\}$ and $d_{i,j} = 0$ for $N + 1 \leq j \leq N + M$, are prepared as linear combinations of single-photon states through multi-rail representation [14], and are mapped by a unitary transformation in the extended space to the final states, the parts of which in the original Hilbert space H are orthogonal and can be distinguished among themselves by counting the photons in different output ports. The output photons recorded in the ancilla ports then correspond to the inconclusive results.

We start our direct sum realization of all such POVMs with the observation that the inconclusive operator Π_0 is positive and Hermitian in any of an orthonormal basis $\{|e_i\rangle\}$, where $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, in our N dimensional Hilbert space H . Then we will find a unitary transformation U that transforms the general orthonormal basis $\{|e_i\rangle\}$ to a unique orthonormal basis $\{|\alpha_i\rangle\}$ (up to some permutation), where Π_0 is diagonalized:

$$U\Pi_0U^\dagger = \sum_{i=1}^N c_i |\alpha_i\rangle\langle\alpha_i|. \quad (5)$$

Because Π_0 is a positive operator and $\langle\phi|\Pi_0|\phi\rangle \leq 1$ for any $|\phi\rangle$ in H , all its eigenvalues satisfy $0 \leq c_i \leq 1$. From this fact we obtain the following well-defined operators:

$$A_0 = A_0^\dagger = U^\dagger \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{c_i} |\alpha_i\rangle\langle\alpha_i| \right) U, \quad (6)$$

and

$$(I - A_0^\dagger A_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} = U^\dagger \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{1 - c_i} |\alpha_i\rangle\langle\alpha_i| \right) U, \quad (7)$$

if we represent them with the general orthonormal basis $\{|e_i\rangle\}$. With these operators we construct Σ and other three unitary, or more exactly orthogonal transformation, operators in the extended $2N$ dimensional space as follows:

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} (I - A_0^\dagger A_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} & -A_0 \\ A_0 & (I - A_0^\dagger A_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

The other three such operators are obtained by putting the minus sign in the upper right sub-matrix of Σ to the other three sub-matrix blocks, respectively. It is straightforward to prove $\Sigma^\dagger \Sigma = \Sigma \Sigma^\dagger = I$ with the operators defined in Eq.

(6) and Eq. (7). In the most general situation when we have n inputs to be unambiguously discriminated among themselves, $I - A_0^\dagger A_0$ in the square root equals $\sum_{i \in I} \Pi_i$, where $I = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

We take Σ to act on a set of states $\{\rho_i\}$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n$), which are to be distinguished between each other in a USD process, in the extended $2N$ dimensional Hilbert space:

$$\Sigma \begin{pmatrix} \rho_i & \\ & o \end{pmatrix} \Sigma^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} (I - A_0^\dagger A_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_i (I - A_0^\dagger A_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} & (I - A_0^\dagger A_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_i A_0^\dagger \\ A_0 \rho_i (I - A_0^\dagger A_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} & A_0 \rho_i A_0^\dagger \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

where the blank blocks and the o sub-matrix represent the parts with all the entries 0. The trace of the upper left diagonal block gives the success probability p_i of unambiguously determining ρ_i because $Tr(\rho_i \Pi_j) = p_i \delta_{i,j}$ for the Π_i 's, and the trace of the lower right diagonal block gives the failure probability q_i in the ancilla space A , and in the whole extended space $K = H \oplus A$ we have $p_i + q_i = Tr \rho_i = 1$.

If $\{\rho_i\}$ is a set of linearly independent pure states $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$, we will prove that the parts of their outputs after the action of Σ are mutually orthogonal in the original signal Hilbert space H . Before the transformation, they are extended to the inputs $|\psi_i^{in}\rangle = (|\psi_i\rangle, \mathbf{0})^T$, where $(\mathbf{0})$ represents a N -tuple of zero's, $(0, 0, \dots, 0)$, in A . The output states are obtained as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_i^{out}\rangle &= \begin{pmatrix} (I - A_0^\dagger A_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} & -A_0 \\ A_0 & (I - A_0^\dagger A_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} |\psi_i\rangle \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} (I - A_0^\dagger A_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} |\psi_i\rangle \\ A_0 |\psi_i\rangle \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Then the inner product of the outputs for any pair of different $|\psi_i\rangle$ and $|\psi_j\rangle$ in H is

$$\langle \psi_j | (I - A_0^\dagger A_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} (I - A_0^\dagger A_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} | \psi_i \rangle = \langle \psi_j | \sum_{k=1}^n A_k^\dagger A_k | \psi_i \rangle = 0, \quad (11)$$

and in A is

$$\langle \psi_j | A_0^\dagger A_0 | \psi_i \rangle = \langle \psi_j | \psi_i \rangle. \quad (12)$$

For the mixed states we act Σ on the products $\rho_i \rho_j$ ($i \neq j$) in the same way as in Eq. (9), and find that the trace of the outputs in H vanishes while in A is the same as those of the inputs $\rho_i \rho_j$. Therefore, the unitary (orthogonal) transformation Σ in the extended $2N$ dimensional Hilbert space realizes a scheme to unambiguously discriminate any set of quantum states $\{\rho_i\}$.

Next we need to find the way of how to optically realize the unitary transformation Σ , given that the inputs are linear combinations of single-photon states. Because the representation of Σ may be complicated with the general orthonormal basis, we apply the following unitary transformation in K to reduce it to

be diagonalized in 4 blocks:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \begin{pmatrix} U & \\ & U \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} (I - A_0^\dagger A_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} & -A_0 \\ A_0 & (I - A_0^\dagger A_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} U^\dagger & \\ & U^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{1-c_i} |\alpha_i\rangle\langle\alpha_i| & -\sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{c_i} |\alpha_i\rangle\langle\alpha_i| \\ \sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{c_i} |\alpha_i\rangle\langle\alpha_i| & \sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{1-c_i} |\alpha_i\rangle\langle\alpha_i| \end{pmatrix}. \tag{13}
\end{aligned}$$

We use $T_{p,q}$ to define an identity matrix with the entries I_{pp} , I_{pq} , I_{qp} and I_{qq} replaced by the corresponding $O(2)$ matrix elements. If we multiply the matrix obtained in Eq. (13) by $T_{p,q}$, only the entries at (p,p) , (p,q) , (q,p) and (q,q) positions will be changed with all other entries intact. Taking out the entries on the i th and $(i+N)$ th rows and columns for example, and multiplying them on the right by the corresponding $O(2)$ sub-matrix in $T_{i+N,i}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{1-c_i} & -\sqrt{c_i} \\ \sqrt{c_i} & \sqrt{1-c_i} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta_i & -\sin \theta_i \\ \sin \theta_i & \cos \theta_i \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta_i \sqrt{1-c_i} - \sin \theta_i \sqrt{c_i} & -\sin \theta_i \sqrt{1-c_i} - \cos \theta_i \sqrt{c_i} \\ \sin \theta_i \sqrt{1-c_i} + \cos \theta_i \sqrt{c_i} & \cos \theta_i \sqrt{1-c_i} - \sin \theta_i \sqrt{c_i} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{14}
\end{aligned}$$

If we choose $\tan \theta_i = -\sqrt{\frac{c_i}{1-c_i}}$ to let the off-diagonal elements vanish, the diagonal elements will be 1 and an identity matrix will be obtained. This two dimensional rotational transformation matrix, with its diagonal and off-diagonal elements given as the transmission and reflection coefficient respectively, can be implemented by a lossless beam splitter, if the inputs are single-photon states. Similarly, if we right-multiply the whole matrix successively by $T_{2N,N}, T_{2N-1,N-1}, \dots, T_{N+1,1}$, we will obtain

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{1-c_i} |\alpha_i\rangle\langle\alpha_i| & -\sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{c_i} |\alpha_i\rangle\langle\alpha_i| \\ \sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{c_i} |\alpha_i\rangle\langle\alpha_i| & \sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{1-c_i} |\alpha_i\rangle\langle\alpha_i| \end{pmatrix} T_{2N,N} T_{2N-1,N-1} \cdots T_{N+1,1} = I, \tag{15}$$

an identity matrix in the extended $2N$ dimensional space K . Therefore Σ represented by the basis $\{|\alpha_i\rangle\}$ is given as

$$\Sigma = T_{N+1,1}^{-1} T_{N+2,2}^{-1} \cdots T_{2N,N}^{-1}, \tag{16}$$

and can be exactly implemented by N lossless beam splitters [9]. Following the notation of P. Kok *et al.* in [9], we choose the relative phase shift $\varphi = \frac{\pi}{2}$ for these beam splitters.

In most realistic applications, we also need a post-process unitary transformation V after the action of Σ so that the output states, which have already been orthogonal, will be mapped to different final output ports for measurement. Together with the former procedure, the whole unitary transformation

U_T (in the extended space K) required to realize the USD of a set of inputs is constructed as follows:

$$U_T = \begin{pmatrix} V & \\ & V \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{1-c_i} |\alpha_i\rangle \langle \alpha_i| & -\sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{c_i} |\alpha_i\rangle \langle \alpha_i| \\ \sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{c_i} |\alpha_i\rangle \langle \alpha_i| & \sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{1-c_i} |\alpha_i\rangle \langle \alpha_i| \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} U & \\ & U \end{pmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

which consists of the pre-process transformation U , Σ in the form of 4 diagonalized sub-matrices and the post-process transformation V . We don't actually need U and V in the ancilla space A , so the total number of the beam splitters required to perform the USD of the inputs has an upper bound $2 \times (N(N-1)/2) + N = N^2$, a value determined by the dimension of the Hilbert space of the measured system.

As an application of this general scheme, we show how to realize the USD of a pair of unknown qubits discussed in [12]. We assume that the preparation probabilities η_1 and η_2 of the inputs are equal for simplicity (the unequal η_i 's situation is realized in the same way but the matrix elements involved would look more complicated) and give the optical realization procedure to achieve their optimal USD.

The quantum registers in Eq. (2) are expanded as $|\Psi_i\rangle = \sum_x d_{i,x} |x\rangle$, where $\{|x\rangle\}$ is $\{|000\rangle, |001\rangle, \dots, |111\rangle\}$ and can be realized by 8 modes of single-photon state $|k\rangle = a_k^\dagger |0\rangle$ ($k = 1, 2, \dots, 8$) respectively. With these basis vectors we perform the following transformations:

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta_{i1}\rangle &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} |i10\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} |i01\rangle \\ |\chi_{i1}\rangle &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} |i10\rangle - \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} |i01\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where $i = 0, 1$, to map them to a set of another orthonormal basis

$$\{|g_i\rangle\} = \{|000\rangle, |100\rangle, |\eta_{01}\rangle, |\chi_{01}\rangle, |011\rangle, |\eta_{11}\rangle, |\chi_{11}\rangle, |111\rangle\}. \quad (19)$$

These orthogonal transformations can be implemented by beam splitters in the input states preparation period, and the advantage of doing this is that the multiplicity of the eigenvalues of Π_0 will be conveniently demonstrated if we represent it with this basis. Then the quantum registers for the USD process are represented with this basis as follows:

$$|\Psi_i\rangle = |\Psi_i^{(0)}\rangle + |\Psi_i^{(1)}\rangle + |\Psi_i^{(2)}\rangle + |\Psi_i^{(3)}\rangle, \quad (20)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_1^{(1)}\rangle &= \begin{pmatrix} \cos \frac{\theta_1}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_1}{2} e^{i\varphi_1} \cos \frac{\theta_2}{2} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cos \frac{\theta_1}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_1}{2} e^{i\varphi_1} \cos \frac{\theta_2}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cos^2 \frac{\theta_1}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_2}{2} e^{i\varphi_2} \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cos \frac{\theta_1}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_1}{2} e^{i\varphi_1} \cos \frac{\theta_2}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cos^2 \frac{\theta_1}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_2}{2} e^{i\varphi_2} \end{pmatrix}, \\ |\Psi_2^{(1)}\rangle &= \begin{pmatrix} \sin \frac{\theta_1}{2} e^{i\varphi_1} \cos^2 \frac{\theta_2}{2} \\ \sqrt{2} \cos \frac{\theta_1}{2} \cos \frac{\theta_2}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_2}{2} e^{i\varphi_2} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

represented by $\{|100\rangle, |\eta_{01}\rangle, |\chi_{01}\rangle\}$, and $|\Psi_1^{(2)}\rangle$ and $|\Psi_2^{(2)}\rangle$, which are spanned by the set of basis vectors $\{|011\rangle, |\eta_{11}\rangle, |\chi_{11}\rangle\}$, just carry the above $|\Psi_1^{(1)}\rangle, |\Psi_2^{(1)}\rangle$ components but with one $\cos \frac{\theta_i}{2}$ in the terms replaced by $\sin \frac{\theta_i}{2} e^{i\varphi_i}$ because there is one more digit 1 in the basis vectors. The $|\Psi_1^{(0)}\rangle$ and $|\Psi_1^{(3)}\rangle$ (resp. $|\Psi_2^{(0)}\rangle$ and $|\Psi_2^{(3)}\rangle$) in the joint space of $|\Psi_1\rangle$ and $|\Psi_2\rangle$ are given as

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_1^{(0)}\rangle &= \cos^2 \frac{\theta_1}{2} \cos \frac{\theta_2}{2} |000\rangle \\ |\Psi_1^{(3)}\rangle &= \sin^2 \frac{\theta_1}{2} e^{i2\varphi_1} \sin \frac{\theta_2}{2} e^{i\varphi_2} |111\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

and $|\Psi_2^{(0)}\rangle, |\Psi_2^{(3)}\rangle$ are obtained by interchanging θ_1, ϕ_1 with θ_2, ϕ_2 for all the factors in Eq. (22). We should bear in mind that we know nothing about θ_i 's and φ_i 's because $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$ are randomly distributed on the Bloch sphere.

With the basis $\{|g_i\rangle\}$ the inconclusive operator Π_0 for the optimal USD measurement is given as the following direct sum:

$$\Pi_0 = \Gamma_0 \oplus \Gamma_1 \oplus \Delta_1 \oplus \Delta_0, \quad (23)$$

where Γ_0 and Δ_0 are 1×1 matrices 1 acting on the spaces spanned by $|000\rangle$ and $|111\rangle$, respectively, and

$$\Gamma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{3} & \frac{\sqrt{2}}{6} & -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{6} \\ \frac{\sqrt{2}}{6} & \frac{5}{6} & \frac{1}{6} \\ -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{6} & \frac{1}{6} & \frac{1}{6} \end{pmatrix} \quad (24)$$

acting on the space spanned by $\{|100\rangle, |\eta_{01}\rangle, |\chi_{01}\rangle\}$, and Δ_1 acting on the space spanned by $\{|011\rangle, |\eta_{11}\rangle, |\chi_{11}\rangle\}$ looks similar to J_1 with the signs of some off-diagonal elements changed. There is a rotation,

$$U^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\sqrt{6}}{6} & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{6} & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \\ -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3} & \frac{\sqrt{6}}{3} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (25)$$

which can be decomposed into three 2 dimensional rotations and is thus realized by three beam splitters together, to get Γ_1 diagonalized:

$$\Gamma'_1 = U^{(1)} \Gamma_1 U^{(1)T} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{2}{3} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (26)$$

and Δ_1 is diagonalized to the same matrix or has the same eigenvalues as Γ_1 . Now we have the diagonalized operators,

$$(I - \Gamma'_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} = (I - \Delta'_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (27)$$

acting on the respective sub-spaces of H , and the unitary (orthogonal) operator

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & -1 & & & & & \\ & (I - \Gamma'_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} & & & -(\Gamma'_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} & & & & \\ & & (I - \Delta'_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} & & & -(\Delta'_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} & & & \\ & & & 0 & & & & & -1 \\ 1 & & & & 0 & & & & \\ & (\Gamma'_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} & & & & (I - \Gamma'_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & & (\Delta'_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} & & & & (I - \Delta'_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} & & \\ & & & 1 & & & & & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (28)$$

acting on the extended space K .

We therefore just need to look at the USD of $|\Psi_1^{(1)}\rangle$ and $|\Psi_2^{(1)}\rangle$ for the whole problem. The output parts of these states in the original Hilbert space after U and Σ are

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_1^{(1)'}\rangle &= (I - \Gamma'_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} U^{(1)} |\Psi_1^{(1)}\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \cos \frac{\theta_1}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_2}{2} e^{i\varphi_1} \cos \frac{\theta_2}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \cos^2 \frac{\theta_1}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_2}{2} e^{i\varphi_2} \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \cos \frac{\theta_1}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_2}{2} e^{i\varphi_1} \cos \frac{\theta_2}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \cos^2 \frac{\theta_1}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_2}{2} e^{i\varphi_2} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ |\Psi_2^{(1)'}\rangle &= (I - \Gamma'_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} U^{(1)} |\Psi_2^{(1)}\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \sin \frac{\theta_1}{2} e^{i\varphi_1} \cos^2 \frac{\theta_2}{2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \cos \frac{\theta_1}{2} \cos \frac{\theta_2}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_2}{2} e^{i\varphi_2} \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \sin \frac{\theta_1}{2} e^{i\varphi_1} \cos^2 \frac{\theta_2}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \cos \frac{\theta_1}{2} \cos \frac{\theta_2}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_2}{2} e^{i\varphi_2} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (29) \end{aligned}$$

respectively. At this step they have been orthogonal to each other, and then we add a Hadamard gate,

$$V^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (30)$$

as the post-process to rotate these two states such that they will have non-zero components in different output ports. Thus the final states will be unambiguously distinguished between each other once the photons are recorded in different output ports.

The process on $|\Psi_1^{(2)}\rangle$ and $|\Psi_2^{(2)}\rangle$ is similar too. $|\Psi_1^{(0)}\rangle$, $|\Psi_2^{(0)}\rangle$ and $|\Psi_1^{(3)}\rangle$, $|\Psi_2^{(3)}\rangle$ will be zero vectors after we map them with the corresponding transformations to the final states. Together with 2 zero components produced in other sub-spaces like those in Eq. (29), there is a 4 dimensional joint space of $|\Psi_1\rangle$ and $|\Psi_2\rangle$, the vector components in which only contribute to the inconclusive result. The average of the inner products of the output vectors in Eq. (29) is $1/12$. Putting it together with the corresponding contribution from $|\Psi_1^{(2)}\rangle$ or $|\Psi_2^{(2)}\rangle$, we have the total average success probability $1/6$ for the optimal USD of $|\Psi_1\rangle$ and $|\Psi_2\rangle$ [12].

All the transformations in the process only need 14 beam splitters (including some totally reflecting mirrors) to implement. Moreover, in the whole process, we don't need to acquire any information about θ_i 's and φ_i 's of the randomly distributed qubits. By the general scheme we propose in this paper, we realize the USD of the unknown states prepared as in Eq. (2).

B. He would like to thank Dr. Z. Wang for helpful discussions.

References

- [1] I. D. Ivanovic, Phys. Lett. A **123**, 257 (1987); D. Dieks, Phys. Lett. A **126**, 303 (1988); A. Peres, Phys. Lett. A **128**, 19 (1988); A. Chefles, Phys. Lett. A **239**, 339 (1998).
- [2] C. H. Bennett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 3121 (1992).
- [3] J. Bergou, U. Herzog, and M. Hillery, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 257901 (2003).
- [4] J. Bergou, M. Hillery, and Y. Sun, J. Mod. Opt. **47**, 487 (2000). Y. Sun, M. Hillery, J. A. Bergou, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 022311 (2001), quant-ph/0112051.
- [5] L. Roa, J. C. Retamal, C. Saavedra, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 012103 (2003).
- [6] T. Gopinath, R. Das and A. Kumar, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 042307 (2005); quant-ph/0510196.
- [7] B. Hutter, A. Muller, J. D. Gautier, H. Zbinden, and N. Gisin, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3783 (1996); R. B. M. Clarke, A. Chefles, S. M. Barnett, and E. Riis, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 040305(R) (2001); M. Mohseni, A. M. Steinberg, J. A. Bergou, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 200403 (2004), quant-ph/0401002.
- [8] M. A. Neumark, Izv. Akad. Nauk. SSSR, Ser. Mat. **4**, 277 (1940).
- [9] M. Reck, A. Zeilinger, H. J. Bernstein and, P. Bertani, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 58 (1994); P. Kok, W. J. Munro, K. Nemoto, T. C. Ralph, J. P. Dowling, and G. J. Milburn, quant-ph/0512071.
- [10] J. Bergou, U. Herzog, and M. Hillery, *Discrimination of quantum states*, Lecture Notes in Physics Vol. **649** (Springer, Berlin, 2004), p. 417.
- [11] F. Buscemi, G. M. D'Ariano, and M. F. Sacchi, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 042113 (2003), quant-ph/0305180.
- [12] J. Bergou, M. Hillery, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 160501 (2005), quant-ph/0504201.
- [13] A. Hayashi, M. Horibe, T. Hashimoto, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 012328 (2006), quant-ph/0510015.
- [14] G. Milburn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 2124 (1988).