

Submitted to Physical Review Letters

Noncommuting mixed states cannot be broadcast

Howard Barnum, Carlton M. Caves, Christopher A. Fuchs,

Richard Jozsa, and Benjamin Schumacher^y

Center for Advanced Studies, Department of Physics and Astronomy,

University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131-1156

(March 24, 2002)

Abstract

We show that, given a general mixed state for a quantum system, there are no physical means for broadcasting that state onto two separate quantum systems, even when the state need only be reproduced marginally on the separate systems. This result generalizes and extends the standard no-cloning theorem for pure states.

1995 PACS numbers: 03.65.Bz, 89.70.+c, 02.50.-r

Typeset using REVTeX

The fledgling field of quantum information theory [1] draws attention to fundamental questions about what is physically possible and what is not. An example is the theorem [2,3] that there are no physical means by which an unknown pure quantum state can be reproduced or copied—a result summarized by the phrase “quantum states cannot be cloned.” In this paper we formulate and prove an impossibility theorem that extends and generalizes the pure-state no-cloning theorem to mixed quantum states. The theorem answers the question: are there any physical means for broadcasting an unknown quantum state, pure or mixed, onto two separate quantum systems? By broadcasting we mean that the marginal density operator of each of the separate systems is the same as the state to be broadcast.

The pure-state “no-cloning” theorem [2,3] prohibits broadcasting pure states, for the only way to broadcast a pure state $|\psi\rangle$ is to put the two systems in the product state $|\psi\rangle \otimes |\psi\rangle$, i.e., to clone $|\psi\rangle$. Things are more complicated when the states are mixed. A mixed-state no-cloning theorem is not sufficient to demonstrate no-broadcasting, for there are many conceivable ways to broadcast a mixed state without the joint state being in the product form, the mixed-state analog of cloning; the systems might be correlated or entangled in such a way as to give the right marginal density operators. For instance, if the density operator has the spectral decomposition $\rho = \sum_b p_b |\psi_b\rangle\langle\psi_b|$, a potential broadcasting state is the highly correlated joint state $\tilde{\rho} = \sum_b p_b |\psi_b\rangle\langle\psi_b| \otimes |\psi_b\rangle\langle\psi_b|$, which, though not of the product form, reproduces the correct marginal probability distributions.

The general problem, posed formally, is this. A quantum system AB is composed of two parts, A and B , each having an N -dimensional Hilbert space. System A is secretly prepared in one state from a set $A = \{|\psi_0\rangle, |\psi_1\rangle\}$ of two quantum states. System B , slated to receive the unknown state, is in a standard quantum state $|\phi\rangle$. The initial state of the composite system AB is the product state $|\psi_s\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle$, where $s = 0$ or 1 specifies which state is to be broadcast. We ask whether there is any physical process E , consistent with the laws of quantum theory, that leads to an evolution of the form $|\psi_s\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle \rightarrow E(|\psi_s\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle) = |\tilde{\psi}_s\rangle$, where $|\tilde{\psi}_s\rangle$ is any state on the N^2 -dimensional Hilbert space AB such that

$$\text{tr}_A(\tilde{\rho}_s) = \rho_s \quad \text{and} \quad \text{tr}_B(\tilde{\rho}_s) = \rho_s : \quad (1)$$

Here tr_A and tr_B denote partial traces over A and B . If there is an E that satisfies Eq. (1) for both ρ_0 and ρ_1 , then the set A can be broadcast. A special case of broadcasting is the evolution specified by $E(\rho_s) = \rho_s \otimes \rho_s$; we reserve the word cloning for this strong form of broadcasting.

The most general action E on AB consistent with quantum theory is to allow AB to interact unitarily with an auxiliary quantum system C in some standard state and thereafter to ignore the auxiliary system [4]; that is,

$$E(\rho_s) = \text{tr}_C(U(\rho_s \otimes \sigma_C)U^\dagger); \quad (2)$$

for some auxiliary system C , some standard state σ_C on C , and some unitary operator U on ABC . We show that such an evolution can lead to broadcasting if and only if ρ_0 and ρ_1 commute. This result strikes close to the heart of the difference between the classical and quantum theories, because it provides another physical distinction between commuting and noncommuting states. We further show that A is clonable if and only if ρ_0 and ρ_1 are identical or orthogonal ($\rho_0 \rho_1 = 0$).

To see that the set A can be broadcast when the states commute, we do not need to attach an auxiliary system. Since orthogonal pure states can be cloned, broadcasting can be obtained by cloning the simultaneous eigenstates of ρ_0 and ρ_1 . Let $|j\rangle$, $j = 1, \dots, N$, be an orthonormal basis for A in which both ρ_0 and ρ_1 are diagonal, and let their spectral decompositions be $\rho_s = \sum_b p_{sb} |j_b\rangle\langle j_b|$. Consider any unitary operator U on AB consistent with $U|j\rangle\langle j| = |j\rangle\langle j|$. If we choose $\sigma_C = |j\rangle\langle j|$ and let

$$\tilde{\rho}_s = U(\rho_s \otimes \sigma_C)U^\dagger = \sum_b p_{sb} |j_b\rangle\langle j_b| \otimes |j_b\rangle\langle j_b|; \quad (3)$$

we immediately have that $\tilde{\rho}_0$ and $\tilde{\rho}_1$ satisfy Eq. (1).

The converse of this statement—that if A can be broadcast, ρ_0 and ρ_1 commute—is more difficult to prove. Our proof is couched in terms of the concept of fidelity between two density operators. The fidelity $F(\rho_0; \rho_1)$ is defined by

$$F(\rho_0; \rho_1) = \text{tr} \sqrt{\rho_0^{1/2} \rho_1 \rho_0^{1/2}}; \quad (4)$$

where for any positive operator O , i.e., any Hermitian operator with nonnegative eigenvalues, $O^{1/2}$ denotes its unique positive square root. (Note that Ref. [6] defines fidelity to be the square of the present quantity.) Fidelity is an analogue of the modulus of the inner product for pure states [5,6] and can be interpreted as a measure of distinguishability for quantum states: it ranges between 0 and 1, reaching 0 if and only if the states are orthogonal and reaching 1 if and only if $\rho_0 = \rho_1$. It is invariant under the interchange $\rho_0 \leftrightarrow \rho_1$ and under the transformation $\rho_0 \rightarrow U \rho_0 U^\dagger$, $\rho_1 \rightarrow U \rho_1 U^\dagger$ for any unitary operator U [6,7]. Also, from the properties of the direct product, one has that $F(\rho_0 \otimes \rho_0'; \rho_1 \otimes \rho_1') = F(\rho_0; \rho_1) F(\rho_0'; \rho_1')$.

Another reason $F(\rho_0; \rho_1)$ defines a good notion of distinguishability [8] is that it equals the minimum overlap between the probability distributions $p_0(b) = \text{tr}(\rho_0 E_b)$ and $p_1(b) = \text{tr}(\rho_1 E_b)$ generated by a generalized measurement or positive operator-valued measure (POVM) $\{E_b\}$ [4]. That is [7],

$$F(\rho_0; \rho_1) = \min_{\{E_b\}} \sum_b \sqrt{\text{tr}(\rho_0 E_b) \text{tr}(\rho_1 E_b)}; \quad (5)$$

where the minimum is taken over all sets of positive operators $\{E_b\}$ such that $\sum_b E_b = \mathbb{1}$. This representation of fidelity has the advantage of being defined operationally in terms of measurements. We call a POVM that achieves the minimum in Eq. (5) an optimal POVM.

One way to see the equivalence of Eqs. (5) and (4) is through the Schwarz inequality for the operator inner product $\text{tr}(AB^\dagger) : \text{tr}(AA^\dagger) \text{tr}(BB^\dagger) \geq |\text{tr}(AB^\dagger)|^2$, with equality if and only if $A = \lambda B$ for some constant λ . Going through this exercise is useful because it leads directly to the proof of the no-broadcasting theorem. Let $\{E_b\}$ be any POVM and let U be any unitary operator. Using the cyclic property of the trace and the Schwarz inequality, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_b \sqrt{\text{tr}(\rho_0 E_b) \text{tr}(\rho_1 E_b)} \\ &= \sum_b \sqrt{\text{tr}(U \rho_0^{1/2} E_b \rho_0^{1/2} U^\dagger) \text{tr}(\rho_1^{1/2} E_b \rho_1^{1/2})} \end{aligned}$$

$$\sum_b \text{tr} U_0^{1=2} E_b^{1=2} E_b^{1=2} U_1^{1=2} \quad (I) \quad (6)$$

$$\sum_b \text{tr} U_0^{1=2} E_b^{1=2} U_1^{1=2} = \text{tr} U_0^{1=2} U_1^{1=2} : \quad (6)$$

We can use the freedom in U to make the inequality as tight as possible. To do this, we recall [6,9] that $\max_j \text{tr}(VO_j) = \text{tr} \sqrt{O^\dagger O}$, where O is any operator and the maximum is taken over all unitary operators V . The maximum is achieved only by those V such that $VO = \sqrt{O^\dagger O}$; that there exists at least one such V is insured by the operator polar decomposition theorem [9]. Therefore, by choosing

$$U_0^{1=2} U_1^{1=2} = \sqrt{U_1^{1=2} U_0^{1=2}}; \quad (7)$$

we get that $\sum_b \text{tr}(U_0^{1=2} E_b^{1=2}) = \text{tr} \sqrt{U_1^{1=2} U_0^{1=2}} = F(\rho_0; \rho_1)$.

To find optimal POVMs, we consult the conditions for equality in Eq. (6). These arise from step I and the one following it: a POVM is optimal if and only if

$$U_0^{1=2} E_b^{1=2} = U_1^{1=2} E_b^{1=2} \quad (8)$$

and

$$\text{tr} U_0^{1=2} E_b^{1=2} U_1^{1=2} = \text{tr}(U_1^{1=2} E_b^{1=2}) \geq 0, \quad \text{tr}(U_1^{1=2} E_b^{1=2}) = 0 : \quad (9)$$

When ρ_1 is invertible, Eq. (8) becomes

$$M E_b^{1=2} = U_1^{1=2} E_b^{1=2}; \quad (10)$$

where

$$M = U_1^{1=2} U_0^{1=2} U_1^{1=2} = \sqrt{U_1^{1=2} U_0^{1=2} U_1^{1=2}} \quad (11)$$

is a positive operator. Therefore one way to satisfy Eq. (8) with $\text{tr}(U_1^{1=2} E_b^{1=2}) = 0$ is to take $E_b = |\pi_b\rangle\langle\pi_b|$, where the vectors $|\pi_b\rangle$ are an orthonormal eigenbasis for M , with π_b chosen to be the eigenvalue of $|\pi_b\rangle$. When ρ_1 is noninvertible, there are still optimal POVMs. One can choose the first E_b to be the projector onto the null subspace of ρ_1 ; in the support of ρ_1 , i.e., the

orthocomplement of the null subspace, ρ_1 is invertible, so one can construct the analogue of M and proceed as for an invertible ρ_1 . Note that if both ρ_0 and ρ_1 are invertible, M is invertible.

We begin the proof of the no-broadcasting theorem by using Eq. (5) to show that fidelity cannot decrease under the operation of partial trace; this gives rise to an elementary constraint on all potential broadcasting processes E . Suppose Eq. (1) is satisfied for the process E of Eq. (2), and let $\{E_b\}$ denote an optimal POVM for distinguishing ρ_0 and ρ_1 . Then, for each s , $\text{tr}(\rho_s(E_b - \mathbb{1})) = \text{tr}_A(\text{tr}_B(\rho_s)E_b) = \text{tr}_A(\rho_s E_b)$; it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} F_A(\rho_0; \rho_1) &= \min_b \sum_c q_c \frac{\text{tr}(\rho_0(E_b - \mathbb{1}))}{\text{tr}(\rho_0 E_c)} \frac{\text{tr}(\rho_1(E_b - \mathbb{1}))}{\text{tr}(\rho_1 E_c)} \\ &= F(\rho_0; \rho_1) : \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Here $F_A(\rho_0; \rho_1)$ denotes the fidelity $F(\rho_0; \rho_1)$; the subscript A emphasizes that $F_A(\rho_0; \rho_1)$ stands for the particular representation on the first line. The inequality in Eq. (12) comes from the fact that $\{E_b - \mathbb{1}\}$ might not be an optimal POVM for distinguishing ρ_0 and ρ_1 ; this demonstrates the said partial trace property. Similarly it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} F_B(\rho_0; \rho_1) &= \min_b \sum_c q_c \frac{\text{tr}(\rho_0(\mathbb{1} - E_b))}{\text{tr}(\rho_0 E_c)} \frac{\text{tr}(\rho_1(\mathbb{1} - E_b))}{\text{tr}(\rho_1 E_c)} \\ &= F(\rho_0; \rho_1) ; \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where the subscript B emphasizes that $F_B(\rho_0; \rho_1)$ stands for the representation on the first line.

On the other hand, we can just as easily derive an inequality that is opposite to Eqs. (12) and (13). By the direct product formula and the invariance of fidelity under unitary transformations,

$$\begin{aligned} F(\rho_0; \rho_1) &= F(\rho_0 \otimes \rho_0; \rho_1 \otimes \rho_1) \\ &= F(U(\rho_0 \otimes \rho_0)U^\dagger; U(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_1)U^\dagger) : \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Therefore, by the partial-trace property,

$$F(\rho_0; \rho_1) \quad (15)$$

$$F(\text{tr}_C U(\rho_0)U^\dagger; \text{tr}_C U(\rho_1)U^\dagger);$$

or, more succinctly,

$$F(\rho_0; \rho_1) = F(E(\rho_0); E(\rho_1)) = F(\rho_0; \rho_1) : \quad (16)$$

The elementary constraint now follows, for the only way to maintain Eqs. (12), (13), and (16) is with strict equality. In other words, we have that if the set \mathcal{A} can be broadcast, then there are density operators ρ_0 and ρ_1 on AB satisfying Eq. (1) and

$$F_A(\rho_0; \rho_1) = F(\rho_0; \rho_1) = F_B(\rho_0; \rho_1) : \quad (17)$$

Let us pause at this point to consider the restricted question of cloning. If \mathcal{A} is to be clonable, there must exist a process E such that $\rho_s = \rho_s \otimes \rho_s$ for $s = 0, 1$. But then, by Eq. (17), we must have

$$F(\rho_0; \rho_1) = F(\rho_0 \otimes \rho_0; \rho_1 \otimes \rho_1) = F(\rho_0; \rho_1)^2; \quad (18)$$

which means that $F(\rho_0; \rho_1) = 1$ or 0 , i.e., ρ_0 and ρ_1 are identical or orthogonal. There can be no cloning for density operators with nontrivial fidelity. The converse, that orthogonal and identical density operators can be cloned, follows, in the first case, from the fact that they can be distinguished by measurement and, in the second case, because they need not be distinguished at all.

Like the pure-state no-cloning theorem [2,3], this no-cloning result for mixed states is a consistency requirement for the axiom that quantum measurements cannot distinguish nonorthogonal states with perfect reliability. If nonorthogonal quantum states could be cloned, there would exist a measurement procedure for distinguishing those states with arbitrarily high reliability: one could make measurements on enough copies of the quantum state to make the probability of a correct inference of its identity arbitrarily high. That this consistency requirement, as expressed in Eq. (17), should also exclude more general kinds of broadcasting problems is not immediately obvious. Nevertheless, this is the content of our

claim that Eq. (17) generally cannot be satisfied; any broadcasting process can be viewed as creating distinguishability *ex nihilo* with respect to measurements on the larger Hilbert space AB . Only for the case of commuting density operators does broadcasting not create any extra distinguishability.

We now show that Eq. (17) implies that ρ_0 and ρ_1 commute. To simplify the exposition, we assume that ρ_0 and ρ_1 are invertible. We proceed by studying the conditions necessary for the representations $F_A(\rho_0; \rho_1)$ and $F_B(\rho_0; \rho_1)$ in Eqs. (12) and (13) to equal $F(\gamma_0; \gamma_1)$. Recall that the optimal POVM $\{E_b\}$ for distinguishing ρ_0 and ρ_1 can be chosen so that the POVM elements $E_b = \pi_b$ are a complete set of orthogonal one-dimensional projectors onto orthonormal eigenstates of M . Then, repeating the steps leading from Eqs. (6) to (9), one finds that the necessary conditions for equality in Eq. (17) are that each $E_b \mathbb{1} = (E_b \mathbb{1})^{1=2}$ and each $\mathbb{1} E_b = (\mathbb{1} E_b)^{1=2}$ satisfy

$$U \gamma_0^{1=2} (\mathbb{1} E_b) = \gamma_b \gamma_1^{1=2} (\mathbb{1} E_b); \quad (19)$$

$$V \gamma_0^{1=2} (E_b \mathbb{1}) = \gamma_b \gamma_1^{1=2} (E_b \mathbb{1}); \quad (20)$$

where γ_b and γ_b are nonnegative numbers and U and V are unitary operators satisfying

$$U \gamma_0^{1=2} \gamma_1^{1=2} = V \gamma_0^{1=2} \gamma_1^{1=2} = \gamma_1^{1=2} \gamma_0^{1=2} : \quad (21)$$

Although ρ_0 and ρ_1 are assumed invertible, one cannot demand that γ_0 and γ_1 be invertible; a glance at Eq. (3) shows that to be too restrictive. This means that U and V need not be the same. Also we cannot assume that there is any relation between γ_b and γ_b .

The remainder of the proof consists in showing that Eqs. (19) through (21), which are necessary (though perhaps not sufficient) for broadcasting, are nevertheless restrictive enough to imply that ρ_0 and ρ_1 commute. The first step is to sum over b in Eqs. (19) and (20). Defining the positive operators

$$G = \sum_b \gamma_b \pi_b \quad \text{and} \quad H = \sum_b \gamma_b \pi_b; \quad (22)$$

we obtain

$$\mathcal{U} \tilde{\gamma}_0^{1=2} = \tilde{\gamma}_1^{1=2} (\mathbb{1} - G) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{V} \tilde{\gamma}_0^{1=2} = \tilde{\gamma}_1^{1=2} (H - \mathbb{1}) : \quad (23)$$

The next step is to demonstrate that G and H are invertible and, in fact, equal to each other. Multiplying the two equations in Eq. (23) from the left by $\tilde{\gamma}_0^{1=2} \mathcal{U}^\dagger$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_0^{1=2} \mathcal{V}^\dagger$, respectively, and partial tracing the first over A and the second over B , we get

$$\text{tr}_A \tilde{\gamma}_0^{1=2} \mathcal{U}^\dagger \tilde{\gamma}_1^{1=2} G = \text{tr}_B \tilde{\gamma}_0^{1=2} \mathcal{V}^\dagger \tilde{\gamma}_1^{1=2} H : \quad (24)$$

Since, by assumption, $\tilde{\gamma}_0$ is invertible, it follows that G and H are invertible. Returning to Eq. (23), multiplying both parts from the left by $\tilde{\gamma}_1^{1=2}$ and tracing over A and B , respectively, we obtain

$$\text{tr}_A \tilde{\gamma}_1^{1=2} \mathcal{U} \tilde{\gamma}_0^{1=2} = \text{tr}_B \tilde{\gamma}_1^{1=2} \mathcal{V} \tilde{\gamma}_0^{1=2} = \text{tr}_A H : \quad (25)$$

Conjugating the two parts of Eq. (25) and inserting the results into the two parts of Eq. (24) yields

$$\text{tr}_A G = \text{tr}_B H \quad \text{and} \quad \text{tr}_A H = \text{tr}_B G : \quad (26)$$

This shows that $G = H$, because these equations have a unique positive solution, namely the operator M of Eq. (11). This can be seen by multiplying Eq. (26) from the left and right by $\tilde{\gamma}_1^{1=2}$ to get $\tilde{\gamma}_1^{1=2} \text{tr}_A G \tilde{\gamma}_1^{1=2} = (\tilde{\gamma}_1^{1=2} G \tilde{\gamma}_1^{1=2})^2$. The positive operator $\tilde{\gamma}_1^{1=2} G \tilde{\gamma}_1^{1=2}$ is thus the unique positive square root of $\tilde{\gamma}_1^{1=2} \text{tr}_A G \tilde{\gamma}_1^{1=2}$.

Knowing that $G = H = M$, we return to Eq. (23). The two parts, taken together, imply that

$$\mathcal{V}^\dagger \mathcal{U} \tilde{\gamma}_0^{1=2} = \tilde{\gamma}_0^{1=2} (M^{-1} - M) : \quad (27)$$

If $|\mathbf{b}\rangle$ and $|\mathbf{c}\rangle$ are eigenvectors of M , with eigenvalues λ_b and λ_c , Eq. (27) implies that

$$\mathcal{V}^\dagger \mathcal{U} \tilde{\gamma}_0^{1=2} |\mathbf{b}\rangle |\mathbf{c}\rangle = \frac{\lambda_c}{\lambda_b} \tilde{\gamma}_0^{1=2} |\mathbf{b}\rangle |\mathbf{c}\rangle : \quad (28)$$

This means that $\tilde{\gamma}_0^{1=2} |\mathbf{b}\rangle |\mathbf{c}\rangle$ is zero or it is an eigenvector of the unitary operator $\mathcal{V}^\dagger \mathcal{U}$. In the latter case, since the eigenvalues of a unitary operator have modulus 1, it must be true that $\lambda_b = \lambda_c$. Hence we can conclude that

$$\tilde{\rho}_0^{1=2} \text{Tr}(\rho_0 \rho_1) = 0 \quad \text{when} \quad \rho_0 \notin \rho_1 : \quad (29)$$

This is enough to show that ρ_0 and ρ_1 commute and hence $[\rho_0, \rho_1] = 0$. Consider the matrix element

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\rho_0 \rho_1 \rho_0 \rho_1) &= (\rho_0 \rho_1) \text{Tr}(\rho_0 \rho_1) \\ &= (\rho_0 \rho_1) \sum_c \text{Tr}(\rho_0 \rho_1 \rho_c \rho_c) : \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

If $\rho_0 = \rho_1$, this is automatically zero. If, on the other hand, $\rho_0 \notin \rho_1$, then the sum over c must vanish by Eq. (29). It follows that ρ_0 and ρ_1 commute. Hence, using Eq. (26),

$$\rho_0 \rho_1 = \rho_1 \rho_0 = \rho_0 \rho_1 = \rho_1 \rho_0 : \quad (31)$$

This completes the proof that noncommuting quantum states cannot be broadcast.

Note that, by the same method as above, $\tilde{\rho}_1^{1=2} \text{Tr}(\rho_0 \rho_1) = 0$ when $\rho_1 \notin \rho_0$. This condition, along with Eq. (29), determines the conceivable broadcasting states, in which the correlations between the systems A and B range from purely classical to purely quantum. For example, since ρ_0 and ρ_1 commute, the states of Eq. (3) satisfy these conditions, but so do the perfectly entangled pure states $\sum_b \sum_{sb} \rho_b \rho_{sb} \text{Tr}(\rho_0 \rho_1)$. Not all such broadcasting states can be realized by a physical process E, but sufficient conditions for realizability are not known.

In closing, we mention an application of this result. In some versions of quantum cryptography [10], the legitimate users of a communication channel encode the bits 0 and 1 into nonorthogonal pure states. This is done to ensure that any eavesdropping is detectable, since eavesdropping necessarily disturbs the states sent to the legitimate receiver [11]. If the channel is noisy, however, causing the bits to evolve to noncommuting mixed states, the detectability of eavesdropping is no longer a given. The result presented here shows that there are no means available for an eavesdropper to obtain the signal, noise and all, intended for the legitimate receiver without in some way changing the states sent to the receiver.

We thank Richard Hughes for useful discussions. This work was supported in part by the Office of Naval Research (Grant No. N00014-93-1-0116).

REFERENCES

Permanent Address: School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Plymouth,
Drake Circus, Plymouth, Devon PL4 8AA, England.

^y Permanent Address: Department of Physics, Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio 43022.

- [1] C. H. Bennett, *Physics Today* 48 (10), 24 (1995).
- [2] W. K. Wootters and W. H. Zurek, *Nature* 299, 802 (1982).
- [3] D. Dieks, *Phys. Lett. A*, 92, 271 (1982).
- [4] K. Kraus, *States, Effects, and Operations: Fundamental Notions of Quantum Theory* (Springer, Berlin, 1983).
- [5] A. Uhlmann, *Rep. Math. Phys.* 9, 273 (1976).
- [6] R. Jozsa, *J. Mod. Opt.* 41, 2315 (1994).
- [7] C. A. Fuchs and C. M. Caves, *Open Sys. Inf. Dyn.* 3, 1 (1995).
- [8] W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. D* 23, 357 (1981).
- [9] R. Schatten, *Norm Ideals of Completely Continuous Operators* (Springer, Berlin, 1960).
- [10] C. H. Bennett, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 68, 3121 (1992).
- [11] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, and N. D. Mermin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 68, 557 (1992).