

Quantum Information Theory, Lent 2018

Example Sheet 4:

Exercise 1 The other Fuchs and van de Graaf inequality.

1. Let $\{E_m\}_{m \in M}$ be a POVM, where M is a finite set. Given two states ρ_A and σ_A , use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to show that

$$F(\rho_A, \sigma_A) \leq \sum_{m \in M} \sqrt{\text{tr}[E_m \rho] \text{tr}[E_m \sigma]} = F(\tilde{\rho}_M, \tilde{\sigma}_M) \quad (1)$$

where

$$\tilde{\rho}_M = \sum_{m \in M} \text{tr}[E_m \rho] |m\rangle \langle m|, \quad \tilde{\sigma}_M = \sum_{m \in M} \text{tr}[E_m \sigma] |m\rangle \langle m| \quad (2)$$

are diagonal states encoding probabilities of the measurement outcomes m , in a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_M of dimension M with orthonormal basis $\{|m\rangle\}_{m \in M}$.

Hint: use the polar decomposition $\sqrt{\rho}\sqrt{\sigma} = |\sqrt{\rho}\sqrt{\sigma}|U$.

2. Let ρ and σ be mixed states and assume ρ is invertible.

Show that if $\hat{M} := \rho^{-1/2} |\rho^{1/2} \sigma^{1/2} | \rho^{-1/2}$ has spectral decomposition $\hat{M} = \sum_m \lambda_m |m\rangle \langle m|$, then

$$|m\rangle \langle m| \sqrt{\rho} = \frac{1}{\lambda_m} |m\rangle \langle m| \sigma^{1/2} U^\dagger, \quad (3)$$

where U is unitary and defined by the polar decomposition $\sqrt{\rho}\sqrt{\sigma} = |\sqrt{\rho}\sqrt{\sigma}|U$.

Hint: start by showing that $|m\rangle \langle m| M = \lambda_m |m\rangle \langle m|$.

3. Show that projective measurement $\{E_m\}_{m \in M}$ defined by $E_m = |m\rangle \langle m|$, achieves equality in equation (1).

Conclude that when ρ is invertible,

$$F(\rho, \sigma) = \min_{\{E_m\}_{m \in M}} F(\tilde{\rho}_M, \tilde{\sigma}_M) \quad (4)$$

where the minimum is over POVMs $\{E_m\}_{m \in M}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_M$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_M$ are defined in (2).

4. Given two quantum states ρ and σ such that ρ is invertible, use equation (4) to show that

$$D(\rho, \sigma) \geq 1 - F(\rho, \sigma). \quad (5)$$

Exercise 2 Let $|\psi\rangle_{ABE}$ be a pure state of a tripartite system ABE . Define the *coherent information* from A to B of ψ to be

$$I_c^{A>B}(\psi) = -S(A|B)_\psi.$$

Here $S(A|B)_\psi$ denotes the conditional entropy of the subsystem A with respect to subsystem B , given that the composite system ABE is in the pure state $|\psi\rangle_{ABE}$. Henceforth we shall omit ψ .

Prove the following identities:

1. $\frac{1}{2}I(A : B) + \frac{1}{2}I(A : E) = S(A)$
2. $\frac{1}{2}I(A : B) - \frac{1}{2}I(A : E) = I_c^{A>B}$

Exercise 3 A bipartite quantum state ρ_{AB} is said to be *separable* if it can be written as a convex combination of product states, i.e., if there exists an ensemble $\{p_i, \sigma_A^{(i)} \otimes \tau_B^{(i)}\}$, with $\sigma_A^{(i)} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ and $\tau_B^{(i)} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)$, such that

$$\rho_{AB} = \sum_i p_i \sigma_A^{(i)} \otimes \tau_B^{(i)}.$$

This allows us to extend the definition of entanglement to mixed states: *a mixed state is entangled if it is not separable.*

Show that if ρ_{AB} is separable then $I_c^{A>B} \leq 0$.

What implication does this have on the conditional entropy $S(A|B)$?

Exercise 4 Use the HSW theorem to find the product state capacity of the depolarizing channel, Λ , defined by

$$\Lambda(\rho) = p\rho + (1-p)\frac{\mathbf{I}}{2}.$$

Exercise 5 Alice prepares a photon in one of two polarization states, given by the kets $|a\rangle := |1\rangle$, and $|b\rangle := \sin\theta|0\rangle + \cos\theta|1\rangle$, depending on the outcome of a fair coin toss. If the outcome is heads, she prepares the state $|a\rangle$. Otherwise she prepares the state $|b\rangle$. Evaluate the Holevo χ quantity for her ensemble of states. (Use the convention that $|0\rangle = (1\ 0)^T$ and $|1\rangle = (0\ 1)^T$). For what value of θ is the Holevo bound achieved? Explain why.

Exercise 6 Alice encodes classical information into n photons which she sends to Bob through a quantum channel. What is the maximum number of bits of information that Bob can infer from the output of the channel by doing measurements on it?

Hint: Use the Holevo bound.

Exercise 7 Entropy exchange The entropy exchange for a state ρ and a quantum channel Λ is defined as follows:

$$S(\rho, \Lambda) := S(\rho'_{RQ}),$$

where $\rho'_{RQ} = (\text{id}_R \otimes \Lambda)\psi'_{RQ}$, with ψ'_{RQ} being a purification of ρ .

(i) Prove that $S(\rho, \Lambda) = S(\rho'_E)$, where $\rho'_E = \text{tr}_{RQ}(\rho'_{RQE})$ with

$$\rho'_{RQE} = \text{tr}_E((I_R \otimes U_{QE})(\psi'_{RQ} \otimes |0_E\rangle\langle 0_E|)(I_R \otimes U_{QE})),$$

with U_{QE} being the Stinespring dilation of the channel Λ .

Thus the entropy exchange can be interpreted as the amount of entropy introduced by Λ into an initially pure environment.

(ii) Prove that the entropy exchange can also be written in the form

$$S(\rho, \Lambda) = S(W) = -\text{tr} W \log W,$$

where W denotes a matrix with elements $W_{ij} = \text{tr}(A_i \rho A_j)$, where $\{A_i\}$ denote a set of Kraus operators of Λ .

Exercise 8 Quantum Fano inequality Prove the quantum Fano inequality:

$$S(\rho, \Lambda) \leq h(F_e(\rho, \Lambda)) + (1 - F_e(\rho, \Lambda)) \log(d^2 - 1) \quad (6)$$

where

• Λ denotes a quantum operation with Kraus representation

$$\Lambda(\rho) = \sum_{i=0}^{d^2} V_i \rho V_i^\dagger,$$

with ρ being the state of a quantum system Q with Hilbert space of dimension d .

• $h(\cdot)$ denotes the binary Shannon entropy, i.e., for any $0 < p < 1$,

$$h(p) = -p \log p - (1 - p) \log(1 - p).$$

•

$$S(\rho, \Lambda) = -\text{tr}(W \log W),$$

with W being a matrix with elements $W_{ij} = \text{tr}(V_i \rho V_j)$. $S(\rho, \Lambda)$ is called *entropy exchange*.

•

$$F_e(\rho, \Lambda) := \langle \Psi'_{RQ} | (\text{id} \otimes \Lambda) \Psi'_{RQ} | \Psi'_{RQ} \rangle,$$

is the entanglement fidelity. Here $|\Psi'_{RQ}\rangle$ is a purification of the state ρ , with R denoting the reference system used for the purification.

What is the implication of the quantum Fano inequality as regards entanglement?

Exercise 9 Continuity of the von Neumann entropy (Fannes' inequality): Suppose $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$ are states such that their trace distance $D(\rho, \sigma)$ satisfies the bound

$$2D(\rho, \sigma) = \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq 1/e. \quad (7)$$

Then

$$|S(\rho) - S(\sigma)| \leq \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \log d + \eta(\|\rho - \sigma\|_1), \quad (8)$$

where $d = \dim \mathcal{H}$, and $\eta(x) := -x \log x$.

Let us prove this theorem in steps:

(i) Let $r_1 \geq r_2 \geq \dots \geq r_d$ be the eigenvalues of ρ arranged in non-increasing order, and let $s_1 \geq s_2 \geq \dots \geq s_d$ be the eigenvalues of σ arranged in non-increasing order. Then prove that:

$$\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \geq \sum_{j=1}^d |r_j - s_j| \quad (9)$$

(ii) Check (using elementary calculus) that if $|r - s| \leq 1/2$, then

$$|\eta(r) - \eta(s)| \leq \eta(|r - s|), \quad (10)$$

where $\eta(x) := -x \log x$.

(iii) Use (ii) and the triangle inequality to prove that

$$|S(\rho) - S(\sigma)| \leq \sum_j \eta(|r_j - s_j|), \quad (11)$$

(iv) Let $\varepsilon_j := |r_j - s_j| \forall j = 1, 2, \dots, d$, and $\varepsilon := \sum_j \varepsilon_j$. Let $\lambda_j := \varepsilon_j/\varepsilon$ and note that $\{\lambda_j\}$ forms a probability distribution. Use this fact and (iii) to prove that

$$|S(\rho) - S(\sigma)| \leq \varepsilon \log d + \eta(\varepsilon). \quad (12)$$

(v) Note that $\eta(\varepsilon)$ is a monotonically increasing function of ε for $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1/e$. Use this to finally arrive at the statement (8).

Exercise 10 An interesting class of quantum channels are the *entanglement-breaking (EB) channels*. An EB channel Λ is one for which $(I \otimes \Lambda)(\omega)$ is separable, even for entangled ω ¹. The Holevo capacity has been proved to be additive for EB channels.

(i) Prove that any channel of the following form is EB:

$$\Lambda(\rho) = \sum_k \sigma_k \text{tr}(E_k \rho), \quad (13)$$

where σ_k are density matrices and $\{E_k\}$ is a POVM. The above form has the following physical interpretation. Alice does a measurement (POVM) on the input state ρ and communicates the outcomes k to Bob via a classical channel; Bob then prepares an agreed upon state σ_k . Hence, EB channels are also called “measure-and-prepare channels”.

(ii) Prove that if the Choi state $(I \otimes \Lambda)|\tilde{\Phi}\rangle\langle\tilde{\Phi}|$ (where $|\tilde{\Phi}\rangle$ denotes the unnormalized maximally entangled state) is separable, then Λ has the form (13).

¹It derives its name from the fact that the channel outputs a separable state whenever half of an entangled state is input to it