

State estimation from pair of conjugate qudits

Xiang-Fa Zhou, Yong-Sheng Zhang,^y and Guang-Can Guo^z

Key Laboratory of Quantum Information, University of Science and Technology of China,
Hefei, Anhui 230026, People's Republic of China

We show that, for N parallel input states, an antilinear map with respect to a specific basis is essentially a classical operation. We also consider the information contained in phase-conjugate pair $|j\rangle|j^*\rangle$, and prove that there is more information about a quantum state encoded in phase-conjugate pair than in parallel pair.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 42.65.Hw, 03.65.Ta

Wigner's theorem says that symmetry transformations in quantum mechanics must be unitary or antiunitary [1]. The identity is unitary and symmetry, hence any symmetry that can become the identity by continuously changing a parameter has a unitary representation. On the contrary antiunitary maps are not connected to the identity, so it is not suitable to describe quantum physics. Therefore nature chooses unitary dynamics as its reasonable description. Nevertheless antiunitary transformations still have many interesting properties. The well-known Kramer's degeneracy comes from the time-reverse symmetry of quantum systems which contain an odd number of fermions [2]. Such time-reversal transformation is antiunitary. Usually an antiunitary operator can be decomposed into an antilinear transformation multiplied by a unitary operator. Many strange properties come from the antilinear part of such an operator. Recent progress in quantum information reveals that antilinear operator may play an important role during the study of quantum entanglement. In fact the famous Positive Partial Transpose (PPT) criterion [3], where antilinear map acts on the second particle of a bipartite density operator, provides a useful condition for testing quantum separability. Also antilinear map can be used as a useful technique to construct superoperators [4]. In the case of 2-dimensional Hilbert space, antilinear map is directly related to the universal ρ of a quantum state [5]. For high dimensional case, universal ρ operator doesn't exist. However, the map $\rho|j\rangle = \rho|j^*\rangle|j\rangle$ with respect to a specific basis $|j\rangle$ still has many interesting properties. Here the state vector $|j\rangle$ is often called as the phase-conjugate state of $|j^*\rangle$.

In the case of continuous quantum variables, Cerf et al. [6] have pointed out that phase conjugate of an unknown Gaussian state can be realized by measurement procedure. We think that a similar result exists for any finite dimension case. In this paper, we simply prove that an antilinear map is essentially a classical operation. That is, if the input states are composed of N

copies of $|j\rangle$, a quantum operation can be implemented by classical ways. We next consider the information of a quantum state $|j\rangle$ contained in phase-conjugate pair $|j\rangle|j^*\rangle$. We find that there is more information about a quantum state encoded in phase-conjugate pair than in parallel pair. In the two-level case, when the number of the output copies is sufficiently large, quantum cloning with two antiparallel spins $\frac{1}{2}$ can get higher fidelity than with parallel spins [7]. Our proof reveals that such result still holds in the high-dimension case.

Consider a d -level system with N copies. The whole state of such system can be expressed as $|j\rangle^{\otimes N}$ and $|j\rangle^{\otimes 2H}$ (Here and the following, without loss of generality, we assume that the Hilbert space H is C^d). The space spanned by all these states, which is often called as the "Bose subspace" of $H^{\otimes N}$ and denoted by $H_+^{\otimes N}$ [8], is invariant under permutation S_N . Our aim is just to find a trace-preserving completely positive (CP) map $\mathcal{F}: H_+^{\otimes N} \rightarrow H$, which can maximize the mean fidelity

$$F = \frac{1}{d} \sum_j \text{Tr}(\rho_j \mathcal{F}(\rho_j^{\otimes N})) \quad (1)$$

For a quantum operation it is always possible to find a set of operators which satisfy $\mathcal{F}(\rho) = \sum_i A_i \rho A_i^\dagger$ with the normalization condition $\sum_i A_i^\dagger A_i = I$. This is also known as Kraus representation [9] of quantum operation. By substituting this into Eq. (1) we can obtain

$$F = \frac{1}{d} \sum_j \text{Tr}[\rho_j \mathcal{F}(\rho_j^{\otimes N})] = \frac{1}{d} \sum_j \text{Tr}[\rho_j \sum_i A_i \rho_j^{\otimes N} A_i^\dagger] \quad (2)$$

Before proceeding let us introduce the natural isomorphism between operators $A: H_1 \rightarrow H_2$ and vectors \tilde{A} in $H_2 \otimes H_1$ which is defined by $\tilde{A} = \sum_{ij} A_{ij} |j\rangle\langle i|$ (Here H_1 and H_2 are not required to have the same dimension). This method has been used in many related works [10, 11] and can greatly simplify the question we consider here. It is not difficult to testify that the following identities are satisfied

$$M \tilde{A} = \tilde{A} M^T \quad (3)$$

$$\text{Tr}_1[\tilde{A} \tilde{A}^\dagger] = A^\dagger A \quad (4)$$

$$\text{Tr}_2[\tilde{A} \tilde{A}^\dagger] = A A^\dagger \quad (5)$$

$$\text{Tr}[A M_1 A^\dagger M_2] = \text{Tr}[\tilde{A} \tilde{A}^\dagger M_2 \otimes M_1] \quad (6)$$

^Electronic address: xfzhou@mailustc.edu.cn

^yElectronic address: yshzhang@ustc.edu.cn

^zElectronic address: goguo@ustc.edu.cn

Here \cdot^T and \cdot^* represent the transposition and complex conjugation with respect to the fixed basis, while Tr_i denotes the partial trace over the Hilbert space H_i . Hence by introducing this new notation Eq. (2) now can be rewritten as

$$F = \sum_{j=1}^d \text{Tr}[\mathbf{A}^{\dagger} \text{iih} \mathbf{A}^{\dagger} j^{\dagger} j^{\dagger} \text{ih} j^{N+1}]$$

$$= \frac{1}{d^{N+1}} \sum_{j=1}^d \text{Tr}[\mathbf{A}^{\dagger} \text{iih} \mathbf{A}^{\dagger} j^{\dagger}_{H_{N+1}}]; \quad (7)$$

where $d^{N+1} = \frac{(N+d)!}{(d-1)!(N+1)!}$ represents the dimension of the "Bose subspace" H_{N+1} . Since \mathbf{A}^{\dagger} composes a complete quantum operation, under the natural isomorphism the normalization condition becomes

$$\sum_{j=1}^d \text{Tr}_{H_{N+1}} (\mathbf{A}^{\dagger} \text{iih} \mathbf{A}^{\dagger} j^{\dagger}) = I_{H_{N+1}} \quad (8)$$

Substituting Eq. (8) into Eq. (7) one can easily find that

$$F = \frac{1}{d^{N+1}} \text{Tr}[\mathbf{A}^{\dagger} \text{iih} \mathbf{A}^{\dagger}] = \frac{d^{N+1}}{d^{N+1}} = \frac{N+1}{N+d}; \quad (9)$$

Interestingly the right-hand-side of Eq. (9) is just the optimal fidelity for state estimation from N parallel input copies [12]. Usually quantum physics is governed by unitary operations. Any physical accessible operations can be understood from the unitary evolution plus projective measurements process. In the most cases, quantum operations have been demonstrated superior to their classical correspondence. However Eq. (9) reveals that the fidelity of antilinear operation is bounded by the amount of classical information distillable from the input states. This means one can construct the phase-conjugate states of the inputs through a classical measurement-based scenario. It should be addressed that the irreducibility of the input state space plays an important role in the derivation (see Eq. (7)). Recently it has been pointed out by Buscemi et al [13] that for equatorial states the optimal phase covariant time-reversal states cannot be achieved via a measurement-preparation procedure.

In the case of 2-level system, Positive Operator Value Measure (POVM) acting on $|j\rangle$ can get more information than two parallel states $|j\rangle$ [14, 15]. This result is often considered as an evidence of "nonlocality without entanglement". In fact, as we will mention below, in high dimensional system $d \geq 3$, such result will still hold. The method we use here can be regarded as a generalized version of Ref. [14, 15] in high-dimension case.

For phase-conjugate pair $|j\rangle$, the density matrix is connected with $(|j\rangle\langle j|) = |j\rangle\langle j|^T$ by

$$(|j\rangle\langle j|) = |j\rangle\langle j|^T = (|j\rangle\langle j|)^T; \quad (10)$$

where T denotes the partial transpose of the second particles. Suppose there exists a set of Hermitian operators

\hat{a}_i which satisfies the following identity $\sum_i \hat{a}_i = I$. Since \hat{a}_i is Hermitian, one can always express it as

$$\hat{a}_i = w^{(i)} I + \sum_{m,n} t_{mn}^{(i)} \hat{a}_m \hat{a}_n + \sum_m (r_m^{(i)} \hat{a}_m + s_m^{(i)} I + \hat{a}_m); \quad (11)$$

where \hat{a}_m represent the generators of the unitary group $SU(d)$. The explicit form of \hat{a}_m can be found elsewhere [16]. When $\hat{a}_i = 0$, which indicates that \hat{a}_i are physical accessible operations, the set $\{\hat{a}_i\}$ constitutes a complete POVM and $\text{Tr}(\rho \hat{a}_i)$ corresponds to the probability of getting the measurement outcome i . Now consider the passive transformation of T on $\{\hat{a}_i\}$, which is defined by

$$\text{Tr}(\hat{a}_i^T) = \text{Tr}(\hat{a}_i); \quad (12)$$

If $\hat{a}_i^T = 0$ for all i , $\{\hat{a}_i^T\}$ constitute a complete POVM for the input state $(|j\rangle\langle j|)$. The probability of getting the outcome i for input state $|j\rangle$ is now becomes $\text{Tr}(\hat{a}_i^T (|j\rangle\langle j|)) = \text{Tr}(\hat{a}_i (|j\rangle\langle j|))$. Therefore by introducing the T operator all quantities we are concerned about can be uniformly expressed in the same form except for different positive conditions.

Consider the input state $\rho_0 = |j\rangle\langle j|^2$. We assume the POVM is covariant and symmetric. Mathematically this is equivalent to say that

$$\text{Tr}(\hat{a}_i |j\rangle\langle j|^2) = \text{Tr}(\hat{a}_i |j\rangle\langle j|^2) \quad (u(j) = j) \quad (13)$$

and \hat{a}_i is invariant under the permutation group S_2 . The covariance of the POVM can greatly simplify the explicit form of \hat{a}_0 .

Since the state ρ_0 is invariant under $u_g = u_g$ with [17]

$$u_g = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & e^{i\phi} & 0 & \dots & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & u_{g-1}^d & & A \\ \vdots & & & & \end{pmatrix}; \quad (14)$$

where u_{g-1}^d is a $(d-1)$ -dimensional unitary matrix with $\det(u_{g-1}^d) = e^{i\phi}$, the operator \hat{a}_0 must be commutable with $u_g = u_g$. A detailed analysis can give the explicit form of \hat{a}_0 . Here we choose \hat{a}_0 with the following form which is enough for our consideration

$$\hat{a}_0 = I + \sum_{m,n=1}^d (T_{mn}^{(3)} I + I T_{mn}^{(3)}) + \sum_{m,n=1}^d (T_{mn}^{(1)} T_{0m}^{(1)} + T_{0m}^{(2)} T_{0m}^{(2)}) + \sum_{m,n=1}^d (T_{mn}^{(1)} T_{mn}^{(1)} + T_{mn}^{(2)} T_{mn}^{(2)}) + \frac{2}{d-2} T_{mn}^{(3)} T_{mn}^{(3)}; \quad (15)$$

where $T^{(3)} = \text{diag}(1, \underbrace{d-1, 1, \dots, 1}_{d-1})$, $T_{mn}^{(1)} = |j\rangle\langle j| + |j\rangle\langle j| T_{mn}^{(2)} = |j\rangle\langle j| + |j\rangle\langle j|$ and $T_{mn}^{(3)} = |j\rangle\langle j|$

where \hat{a}_0 is the last term of Eq. (15) corresponds to the quadratic Casimir operator of unitary group $SU(d+1)$.

Since we have assumed that the POVM is covariant and symmetric, the completeness relation can be reformulated as

$$\int du u^2 \hat{a}_0 (u^y)^2 = I; \quad (16)$$

where du denotes the integration with respect to the normalized Haar measurement [16] of the unitary group. Taking into account of the explicit form of \hat{a}_0 , we can obtain

$$d(d-1) + 4(d-1) + 2d(d-2) = 0; \quad (17)$$

When we get a measurement result r corresponding to the operation \hat{a}_r , we can guess the input state to be $|j_r\rangle$. The whole information distilled from the measurement results can be described by the following fidelity

$$F = \frac{1}{d} \sum_r \text{Tr}[\hat{a}_r(\rho; \rho)] |j_r\rangle\langle j_r| \\ = \text{Tr}[\hat{a}_0 \int du u^2 \rho(u^y)^2 |j_0\rangle\langle j_0|]; \quad (18)$$

Substituting Eq. (15) into Eq. (18) we can simplify the expression as

$$F = \frac{1}{d} \frac{(d+2)(d-1) - 2(d-1)(d-2) + d(d-2)}{2d(d+1)(d+2)}; \quad (19)$$

Now our aim is just to maximize the fidelity F under the constraints of Eq. (15;17) with \hat{a}_0 satisfying different positive conditions.

Case one: When the input state is $|j_{in}\rangle = |j\rangle|j\rangle$, positivity of \hat{a}_0 gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i,j} 1 - 2(d-1) + (d-1)^2 \geq 0; \\ & \sum_{i,j} 1 + 2 + \dots + 2 \frac{d-2}{d-1} \geq 0; \\ & \sum_{i,j} 1 + 2 + \dots + d \left(\frac{1}{d-1} \right) \geq |j\rangle\langle j|; \\ & \sum_{i,j} 1 + 2 + \dots + 2 \frac{1}{d-1} \geq |j\rangle\langle j|; \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Maximizing F now becomes a usual linear programming problem. A simple algebra reveals the maximum of the fidelity $F_k = \frac{3}{d+2}$ is obtained at $\frac{3}{4}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, 0 , and $\frac{d}{4}$, which is consistent with the result of Ref. [12]. The corresponding \hat{a}_0 now can be written as

$$\hat{a}_0 = \frac{d(d+1)}{2} |j_0\rangle\langle j_0| + \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{d}{2} |j_i\rangle\langle j_i| \quad (21)$$

with $|j_i\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|j_{ii}\rangle - |j_{0i}\rangle)$.

Case two: For input state $|j_{in}\rangle = |j\rangle|j\rangle$, the operator \hat{a}_0^T should be positive. This is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i,j} 1 - 2(d-2) + (d-1) \geq 0; \\ & \sum_{i,j} 1 + 2 + \dots + 2 \frac{1}{d-1} \geq 0; \\ & \sum_{i,j} 1 + 2 + \dots + 2 \frac{d-2}{d-1} \geq |j\rangle\langle j|; \\ & \sum_{i,j} 1 + 2 + \dots + 2 \frac{1}{d-1} \geq |j\rangle\langle j|; \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Since Eq. (22) contains a nonlinear term, maximizing F corresponds to a nonlinear programming problem, which makes the question a little complicated. Before giving an analytical expression, here we concentrate on a very special case. By setting Eq. (22) to be equality constraints, one can find a local extremal point of Eq. (22) is $\frac{1}{(1+\frac{1}{d-1})^2} - 1$, $\frac{4+(d-2)(d^2+2\frac{1}{d-1})}{d^2(d-1)}$, $\frac{(\frac{1}{d-1})^2}{2d}$, and $\frac{2-d^2+(d-2)\frac{1}{d-1}}{2d}$. This indicates that $\hat{a}_0^T = |j_{local}\rangle\langle j_{local}|$ is a rank-1 operator with

$$|j_{local}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\frac{d-1}{1+d+1}} |j_0i\rangle + \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\frac{1}{1+d-1}} |j_{ii}\rangle; \quad (23)$$

The corresponding fidelity becomes

$$F_{local} = \frac{2(1+2d)}{(1+d)(2+d)} \frac{(d-1) \frac{1}{1+d} - 1^2}{d^2(1+d)}; \quad (24)$$

which is larger than $\frac{3}{d+2}$ for arbitrary integer $d \geq 2$. Interestingly, in the case of $d=2$, such rank-1 operator is also global optimal [15]. Hence by considering the local extreme value of F , it is enough to show that phase-conjugate pair can encode more information than parallel pair.

In the general case, the global maximum of the fidelity for this phase-conjugate input pair can be obtained when $\frac{A}{4(d-1)}$, $\frac{(d-1)A+4}{4(d-1)^2}$, $\frac{A}{8(d-1)}$, and $\frac{d}{4}$, with $A = 2d \frac{1}{2d(d+1)}$. The maximum fidelity can be formulated as

$$F_{\text{max}} = \frac{1}{d+2} + \frac{r}{d+1}; \quad (25)$$

And the measurement operator now becomes

$$\hat{a}_0^T = \frac{d}{2A_+} \sum_{i,j=1}^d |j_{ij}\rangle\langle j_{ij}| + |j_{?}\rangle\langle j_{?}|; \quad (26)$$

with $|j_{?}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{i=1}^d |j_{0i}\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{i=1}^d |j_{ii}\rangle$. In table. 1 we give some explicit numerical results on these different fidelities. One can easily get that $F_{\text{max}} - F_{local} > F_k$ and in the most case the local extrema are very close to the corresponding global maxima.

TABLE I: Some numerical results of the information distilled from two different input states (from Eq. (22)). Here d is the dimension of H . Compared with parallel pair (F_k), phase-conjugate input states ($F_?$ and F_{local}) can encode more information for our purpose of merits. One can also find that the local extreme values are very close to the global maximum.

d	2	3	4	5	6	11	17
F_k	0.75	0.6	0.5	.4286	.375	.2308	.1579
F_{local}	.7887	.6444	.5427	.4678	.4195	.2531	.1723
$F_?$.7887	.6449	.5442	.4701	.4137	.2580	.1776

It has been found that the optimal procedure to encode a quantum state depends only on the dimension of the encoding space [18]. Phase-conjugate pair span the whole Hilbert space of two particles while the space spanned by parallel pair is only $\frac{d(d+1)}{2}$ -dimension. So it might not be a surprise that phase-conjugate pair encode more information. However, since the optimal encoding state is often an entangled state, while in our consideration, the two kinds of inputs are both direct-product states, which make the whole question not so obvious.

Many interesting problems arise from these results. One may consider, for example, the cloning machine with phase-conjugate pair. It has been demonstrated that for a 2-level system, quantum cloning with anti-parallel spins can get better results than parallel input spins when the number of the output copies is sufficiently large [7]. Generally state estimation can be considered as the limit case of quantum cloning [19], so it would be expected

that in high dimension case, quantum cloning with phase-conjugate pair can also get higher fidelity. One can also consider generalizing this to the case of having N parallel input states and M phase-conjugate states [20]. Another point is that we have only considered the case that the input states are n -fold, actually to find the condition under which quantum operation is bounded by classical information is still an interesting question.

In conclusion, we have shown that an antilinear map is essentially a classical operation for N parallel input states. The fidelity of such operation is bounded by the classical information distillable from the input state. We have also considered the classical information contained in two different input states (j_{ij} and j_{ij}^*). Compared with the parallel pair, more information can be encoded in phase-conjugate pair for our purpose of merit. We expect our work will be helpful to explore the role played by antilinear map within quantum information.

This work was funded by the National Fundamental Research Program (2001CB309300), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (10304017, 60121503), the Innovation Funds from the Chinese Academy of Sciences, and Program for New Century Excellent Talents in University.

Note added: Very recently J. Fiurasek [21] has got similar results about the state estimation from phase-conjugate pair j_{ij}^* , and he has also given a physical explanation about the results that we have got in this work. Interestingly the global optimal fidelity we got corresponds to the result of the optimal probabilistic estimation strategy, while the local extreme value agrees with the result of the optimal deterministic estimation strategy.

-
- [1] V. Bargmann, J. Math. Phys. 5, 862 (1964).
[2] D. J. Griffiths, Introduction to Quantum Mechanics (Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1995).
[3] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 1413 (1996); M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A 223, 1 (1996).
[4] J. Preskill, Lecture notes on Physics 229: Quantum information and computation, available on Internet at <http://www.theory.caltech.edu/people/preskill/ph229/>.
[5] V. Buzek, M. Hillery, and R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A 60, R2626 (1999).
[6] N. J. Cerf and S. Iblisdir, Phys. Rev. A 64, 032307 (2001); N. J. Cerf and S. Iblisdir, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 247903 (2001).
[7] J. Fiurasek, S. Iblisdir, S. Massar, and N. J. Cerf, Phys. Rev. A 65, 040302(R) (2002).
[8] R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A 58, 1827 (1998).
[9] K. Kraus, States, effects, and operations: Fundamental Notions in Quantum Theory (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983).
[10] G. M. D'Ariano and P. Lo Presti, Phys. Rev. A 64, 042308 (2001).
[11] F. Buscemi, G. M. D'Ariano, P. Perinotti, and M. F. Sacchi, Phys. Lett. A 314, 374 (2003).
[12] D. Bru and C. Macchiavello, Phys. Lett. A 253, 249 (1999).
[13] F. Buscemi, G. M. D'Ariano, and C. Macchiavello, Phys. Rev. A 72, 062311 (2005).
[14] N. Gisin and S. Popescu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 432 (1999).
[15] S. Massar, Phys. Rev. A 62, 040101(R) (2000).
[16] S. Sternberg, Group Theory and Physics (Cambridge University Press, 1994).
[17] G. Chiribella and G. M. D'Ariano, J. Math. Phys. 45, 4435 (2004).
[18] E. Bagan, M. Baig, A. Brey, R. Muñoz-Tapia, and R. Tarrach, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 5230 (2000).
[19] J. Bae and A. Acín, Phys. Rev. Lett. 97, 030402 (2006).
[20] S. L. Braunstein, S. Ghosh, and S. Severini, preprint arxiv quant-ph/0412101; S. D. Bartlett, T. Rudolph, and R. W. Spekkens, Phys. Rev. A 70, 032321 (2004); N. H. Lindner, P. F. Scudo, and D. Bruss, preprint arxiv quant-ph/0506223; N. Gisin and S. Iblisdir, preprint arxiv quant-ph/0507118.
[21] J. Fiurasek, preprint arxiv quant-ph/0606156.