

Some Bipartite States Do Not Arise from Channels

Mary Beth Ruskai

Department of Mathematics, Tufts University

Medford, Massachusetts 02155 USA

marybeth.ruskai@tufts.edu

February 9, 2020

Dedicated to Charles H. Bennett on his 60th Birthday

Abstract

It is well-known that the action of a quantum channel on a state can be represented, using an auxiliary space, as the partial trace of an associated bipartite state. Recently, it was observed that for the bipartite state associated with the optimal average input of the channel, the entanglement of formation is simply the entropy of the reduced density matrix minus the Holevo capacity. It is natural to ask if every bipartite state can be associated with some channel in this way. We show that the answer is negative.

PACS number 03.67; MSC classification 82P68.

1 Background

Recently, Matusmoto, Shimono and Winter [4] pointed out an important connection between the channel capacity and of entanglement of formation, which allows one to draw some conclusion about the additivity of the latter from that of the former. There has also been speculation that the additivity of channel capacity and of entanglement of formation, are equivalent. A connection between additivity of entanglement of formation and multiplicativity of the p-norm measure of purity has also been given by Audenaert and S.L. Braunstein [1].

Work partially supported by the U.S. National Science Foundation under Grant number DMS-03-14228.

In view of this it is natural to ask if every bipartite state can be represented so that its reduced density matrix is the optimal average output state for some channel. We give a more precise formulation of this statement and show that the answer is negative.

Recall that a state is represented by a density matrix ρ , i.e., a positive semidefinite operator with $\text{Tr} \rho = 1$. The von Neumann entropy of ρ is $S(\rho) = -\text{Tr} \rho \log \rho$. By an ensemble $E = \{p_i; \rho_i\}$ we mean a set of density matrices, ρ_i and associated probabilities p_i . By a channel \mathcal{N} we mean a completely positive, trace-preserving (CPT) map. The Holevo capacity of the map \mathcal{N} is

$$C_{\text{Holv}}(\mathcal{N}) = \sup_E \left[S\left(\sum_i p_i \mathcal{N}(\rho_i)\right) - \sum_i p_i S(\rho_i) \right] \quad (1)$$

where the supremum is taken over all ensembles $E = \{p_i; \rho_i\}$ and $\rho = \sum_i p_i \rho_i$. The optimal average input is the state $\rho_{\text{opt}} = \sum_i p_i \rho_i$ associated with the ensemble which attains the supremum in (1). The optimal average output is then $\mathcal{N}(\rho_{\text{opt}})$.

Theorem 1 (Stinespring) Given a CPT map \mathcal{N} on $B(H_A)$, one can find an auxiliary space H_B , a density matrix ρ_B and a unitary map U_{AB} on $H_A \otimes H_B$ such that

$$\mathcal{N}(\rho) = \text{Tr}_B [U_{AB}^\dagger \rho \otimes \rho_B U_{AB}] \quad (2)$$

where Tr_B denotes the partial trace and we have identified H with H_A .

Although we are interested in the case in which ρ is a density matrix, the representation (2) is valid [3, 7] for all operators in $B(H)$. When $\rho = \sum_k A_k^\dagger A_k$, it is easy to construct a representation of the form (2), as discussed in section III D of [6]. In fact, $U_{AB}^\dagger \rho \otimes \rho_B U_{AB}$ is the block matrix which has the form $\sum_{j,k} A_j^\dagger A_k \otimes |j\rangle\langle k|$.

Given a bipartite state ρ_{AB} on $H_A \otimes H_B$, its entanglement of formation satisfies

$$EoF(\rho_{AB}) = \inf_{\{p_k; \rho_k\}} \left[\sum_k p_k S(\text{Tr}_B \rho_k) \right] : \rho_{AB} = \sum_k p_k \rho_k \otimes \rho_k \quad (3)$$

Although it is customary to define the EoF using ensembles for which all ρ_k are pure states, there is no loss of generality in allowing arbitrary states.

Theorem 2 (Matsumoto, Shimono and Winter) Let \mathcal{N} be a CPT map with a representation $H_B; \rho_B; U_{AB}$ as in Theorem 1. The Holevo capacity of \mathcal{N} satisfies

$$C_{\text{Holv}}(\mathcal{N}) = \sup_{\rho} \left[S(\text{Tr}_B \rho_{AB}) - EoF(\rho_{AB}) \right] : \rho_{AB} = U_{AB}^\dagger \rho \otimes \rho_B U_{AB} \quad (4)$$

where ρ is a density matrix on $H = H_A$. Moreover, the state ρ_{AB} which attains this supremum satisfies $\text{Tr}_B \rho_{AB} = \rho_{\text{opt}}$ where ρ_{opt} is the optimal input of \mathcal{N} .

It follows immediately that for the state e_{AB}

$$EoF(e_{AB}) = S(\rho_{opt}) - C_{Holv}(\rho): \quad (5)$$

It is thus natural to ask the following

Question 3 Given a bipartite state ρ_{AB} on $H_A \otimes H_B$, is there a CPT map $\rho \rightarrow \rho_B$ on $B(H_A)$ such that $\text{Tr}_B \rho_{AB}$ is the optimal average output state of ρ and

$$EoF(\rho_{AB}) = C_{Holv}(\rho) - S(\text{Tr}_B \rho_{AB})? \quad (6)$$

We will show that the answer to this question is negative.

Our counter-example is based on a result in [5] and [9] which comes from the fact that when $\rho = \sum_k p_k \rho_k$

$$S(\rho) = \sum_k p_k S(\rho_k) = \sum_k p_k H(\rho_k; \rho) \quad (7)$$

where the relative entropy is defined as

$$H(\rho; \sigma) = \text{Tr}[\rho \log \rho - \rho \log \sigma] \quad (8)$$

Theorem 4 Let $\rho \rightarrow \rho_B$ be a CPT map with optimal average input ρ_{opt} . Then

$$C_{Holv}(\rho) = \sup_{\rho} H[\rho_B; \rho_{opt}]: \quad (9)$$

It follows as an immediate corollary, that if $E = \sum_k p_k \rho_k$ is any optimal ensemble for the channel $\rho \rightarrow \rho_B$, then $H[\rho_B; \rho_{opt}] = C_{Holv}(\rho)$ is independent of k , i.e., the optimal average output is "equi-distant" in the sense of relative entropy from all outputs ρ_k in the ensemble.

2 Counter-example

An affirmative answer to Question 3 above would imply that if the ensemble $\sum_k p_k \rho_k$ is optimal for $EoF(\rho_{AB})$, then $\sum_k p_k \text{Tr}_B \rho_k$ would be an optimal output ensemble for the corresponding map $\rho \rightarrow \rho_B$. It would then follow from the equi-distance corollary to Theorem 8 that

$$H(\rho_k; \rho_A) = S(\rho_k) - \text{Tr}_A \rho_k \log \rho_A = C: \quad (10)$$

where $\rho_k = \text{Tr}_B \rho_k$ and C is a constant which is independent of k . (In fact, C is the Holevo capacity of $\rho \rightarrow \rho_B$ if such a channel exists.) We will present an example of a bipartite qubit state which does not satisfy (10).

It may be that counter-examples to (10) can already be found in the literature on entanglement. However, we will take advantage of a result of Wootters [10] to construct a rather simple qubit counter-example which does not require extensive numerical computation. In [10], Wootters obtained an explicit formula for the EoF of a bipartite qubit state using a quantity called the concurrence. Moreover, he showed that the EoF could be achieved using an ensemble of at most four pure states $|j_k\rangle|i_k\rangle$, for which $S(\text{Tr}_B |j_k\rangle|i_k\rangle) = \text{EoF}(\rho_{AB})$. Thus, for such an ensemble, (10) holds if and only if

$$\text{Tr}_A [(\text{Tr}_B |j_k\rangle|i_k\rangle) \log \rho_A] \quad (11)$$

is independent of k . We can assume without loss of generality that ρ_A is diagonal with eigenvalues $\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm x)$. Then $\text{Tr}[\rho_A \log \rho_A]$ depends only on the diagonal elements of ρ_A which can be written as $\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm d)$. In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}[\rho_A \log \rho_A] &= \frac{1+d}{2} \log \frac{1+x}{2} + \frac{1-d}{2} \log \frac{1-x}{2} \\ &= \log 2 - \frac{1}{2} \log(1-x^2) + d \log \frac{1+x}{1-x} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

which depends linearly on d for fixed $x \neq 0$. Thus, when $\rho_A \notin \frac{1}{2}I$, (11) is independent of k if and only if all $\rho_k = \text{Tr}_B |j_k\rangle|i_k\rangle$ have the same diagonal elements. However, we also know that $S(\rho_k) = \text{EoF}(\rho_{AB})$ is independent of k , which implies that all ρ_k have the same eigenvalues. Thus, all the reduced density matrices $\text{Tr}_B |j_k\rangle|i_k\rangle$ must have the form $\frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1+d & e^{i\theta} \\ e^{-i\theta} & 1-d \end{pmatrix}$ for some fixed θ . It is not hard to find an example for which this does not hold.

Let $|j_0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|j_0\rangle + |j_1\rangle)$ and $|j_3\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|j_0\rangle - |j_1\rangle)$ be the indicated maximally entangled Bell states, and

$$\rho_{AB} = \frac{5}{8}|j_0\rangle|i_0\rangle + \frac{1}{16}|j_3\rangle|i_3\rangle + \frac{1}{4}|j_1\rangle|i_1\rangle + \frac{1}{16}|j_0\rangle|i_0\rangle \quad (13)$$

The reduced density matrix is $\rho_A = \text{Tr}_B \rho_{AB} = \frac{1}{2}(I + \frac{3}{16}Z) \notin \frac{1}{2}I$. One can show that the optimal EoF decomposition of (13) has the form $\rho_{AB} = \sum_{k=1}^4 p_k |j_k\rangle|i_k\rangle$ with $|j_1\rangle = a_0|j_0\rangle + a_3|j_3\rangle$ so that $\rho_1 = \text{Tr}_B (|j_1\rangle|i_1\rangle)$ is diagonal in the basis $|j_0\rangle, |j_1\rangle$ (ie, $\theta = 0$ in the matrix above). However, the remaining ρ_k are superpositions which contain Bell states $|j_k\rangle$ and the product states $|j_1\rangle, |j_0\rangle$ in a form which necessarily yields a reduced density matrix ρ_k which is not diagonal. By the discussion above, this implies a negative answer to Question 3.

To actually find the entanglement of formation and optimal decomposition of ρ_{AB} , let

$$\sigma = \frac{5}{8}|j_0\rangle|i_0\rangle + \frac{1}{16}|j_3\rangle|i_3\rangle + \frac{1}{4}|j_0\rangle|i_1\rangle + \frac{1}{16}|j_1\rangle|i_0\rangle \quad (14)$$

be the density matrix with all spins flipped. The concurrence can be expressed in terms of the eigenvalues of $(\rho - e^{\rho})^{1/2}$. Following Wootters [10], one finds $\frac{5}{8} \frac{1}{16} \frac{1}{8} \frac{1}{8} = \frac{5}{16}$. Let

$$h(x) = -\frac{1+x}{2} \log \frac{1+x}{2} - \frac{1-x}{2} \log \frac{1-x}{2} : \quad (15)$$

Then, proceeding as described in [10], one finds

$$E_{\text{of}}(\rho_{AB}) = h\left(\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 - \frac{P_{231}}{16}}\right) = h\left(\frac{P_{231}}{16}\right) = 0.1689 < 0.9745 = h\left(\frac{3}{16}\right) = S(\rho_A) :$$

The optimal ensemble has weights

$$p_1 = 0.1527; \quad p_2 = p_3 = p_4 = 0.2824$$

associated with the projections for the following pure states

$$\begin{aligned} |j_1\rangle &= 0.8101|j_0\rangle + 0.5863|j_3\rangle \\ |j_2\rangle &= 0.7870|j_0\rangle + 0.1087|j_3\rangle + 0.5432|j_1\rangle + 0.2716|j_4\rangle \\ |j_3\rangle &= 0.7870|j_0\rangle - 0.1087|j_3\rangle + 0.5432e^{i\pi/3}|j_1\rangle + 0.2716e^{i\pi/3}|j_4\rangle \\ |j_4\rangle &= 0.7870|j_0\rangle + 0.1087|j_3\rangle - 0.5432e^{i\pi/3}|j_1\rangle - 0.2716e^{i\pi/3}|j_4\rangle \end{aligned}$$

One can easily verify that the diagonal elements of $\rho_1 = \text{Tr}_B |j_1\rangle\langle j_1|$ are not equal to those of $\rho_k = \text{Tr}_B |j_k\rangle\langle j_k|$ for $k = 2, 3, 4$. One can also compute the reduced density matrices ρ_k and see that ρ_1 is diagonal in the basis $|j_i\rangle, |j_4\rangle$, but the others are not. Alternatively, one can observe that if a reduced density matrix is diagonal in the basis $|j_i\rangle, |j_4\rangle$, then any purification must have the form

$$|j_i\rangle = a|j_0\rangle + b|j_4\rangle + c|j_1\rangle + d|j_2\rangle : \quad (16)$$

with $|j_1\rangle, |j_2\rangle$ orthogonal. By rewriting

$$\begin{aligned} |j_2\rangle &= 0.4796|j_0\rangle - 0.6333|j_4\rangle + 0.5432|j_1\rangle + 0.2716|j_4\rangle \\ &= |j_0\rangle - 0.4796|j_4\rangle + 0.5432|j_1\rangle + |j_4\rangle - 0.2716|j_0\rangle - 0.6333|j_4\rangle ; \end{aligned}$$

one sees that ρ_2 does not have the form (16) with orthogonal $|j_k\rangle$. The actual reduced density matrices have the form $\rho_1 = \frac{1}{2} I + \frac{P_{231}}{16} \sigma_z = \begin{pmatrix} 0.9750 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.0250 \end{pmatrix}$,

$$\rho_k = \begin{pmatrix} 0.5251 & e^{i\pi/3} 0.4743 \\ e^{-i\pi/3} 0.4743 & 0.4749 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with } \rho_2 = \rho_3 = \rho_4 = \frac{1}{3} I.$$

3 Remarks on representations

In the canonical method of constructing a representation of the form (2), the reference state ρ_B is pure and d_B the dimension of H_B is equal to the number of Kraus operators. Then the lifted state $\rho_{AB} = U_{AB} \rho_B U_{AB}^\dagger$ for which $\rho_{AB} = \text{Tr}_B \rho_{AB}$ has rank at most $d = d_A$, the dimension of the original Hilbert space. This is clearly a very restricted class of bipartite states. Moreover, generically, $d_B > d$ since many maps require the maximum number d^2 of Kraus operators. This the canonical representation yields only bipartite states which are far more singular than most states.

Some maps $\rho \mapsto \rho'$ can be represented in the form (2) using a mixed reference state ρ_B . Indeed, given a mixed bipartite state ρ_B and unitary operator U_{AB} , (2) can be used to define a channel $\rho \mapsto \rho'$. Unfortunately, relatively little is known about such mixed state representations. It has been suggested that one might be able to represent a channel $\rho \mapsto \rho'$ in the form (2) using a space of dimension $d_B = d$ if mixed states are used. However, this is known not to be true in general [8, 11].

Now suppose that a qubit channel $\rho \mapsto \rho'$ can be represented (possibly using a mixed reference state ρ_B) in the form (2) using an auxiliary qubit space H_B so that $d_B = 2$. Then the argument given before (11) can be used to show that for the optimal input distribution f_k ρ_k

$$\text{Tr}(\rho_k) \log(\rho_{\text{opt}}) \quad (17)$$

must be independent of k . One can easily check that the 3-state examples given in [2] do not have this property. Most non-unital qubit maps for which the translation of the image of the Bloch sphere lacks symmetry will also violate (17). This implies that such channels require an auxiliary space with $d_B > 2$. One expects $d_B = 4$, consistent with the fact that such maps also require 4 Kraus operators. This gives another, somewhat indirect, proof that some CPT maps require an auxiliary space with $d_B > d$.

It would be of some interest to characterize the maps which admit mixed state representations with $d_B = d$, as well as the bipartite states corresponding to the optimal average output.

Acknowledgment: It is a pleasure to thank Professor Christopher King for stimulating and helpful discussions.

References

- [1] K. M. R. Audenaert and S. L. Braunstein "On Strong Superadditivity of the Entanglement of Formation" quant-ph/0303045
- [2] C. King, M. Nathanson and M. B. Ruskai "Qubit Channels Can Require More than Two Inputs to Achieve Capacity" Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 057901 (2002). quant-ph/0109079
- [3] G. Lindblad, "Completely Positive Maps and Entropy Inequalities" Commun. Math. Phys. 40, 147-151 (1975).
- [4] K. Matsumoto, T. Shiono and A. Winter, "Remarks on additivity of the Holevo channel capacity and of the entanglement of formation" quant-ph/0206148
- [5] M. Ohya, D. Petz and N. Watanabe, "On capacities of quantum channels" Prob. Math. Stats. 17, 170{196 (1997).
- [6] M. B. Ruskai, "Inequalities for Quantum Entropy: A Review with Conditions for Equality" J. Math. Phys. 43, 4358{4375 (2002). quant-ph/0205064
- [7] W. F. Stinespring, "Positive Functions on C*-Algebras" Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 6, 211{216 (1955)
- [8] B. M. Terhal, I. L. Chuang, D. P. DiVincenzo, M. Grassl, J. A. Smolin "Simulating quantum operations with mixed environments" Phys. Rev. A 60 881{884 (1999). quant-ph/9806095
- [9] B. Schumacher and M. D. Westmoreland, "Optimal Signal Ensembles" preprint lanl:quant-ph/9912122.
- [10] W. Wootters, "Entanglement of Formation of an Arbitrary State of Two Qubits" Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 2245{2248 (1998).
- [11] C. Zalka and E. Rieffel "Quantum operations that cannot be implemented using a small mixed environment" J. Math. Phys. 43, 4376{4381 (2002).