

Linear-Optical Implementation of Perfect Discrimination between Single-bit Unitary Operations

Pei Zhang, Liang Peng, Zhi-Wei Wang, Xi-Feng Ren, Bi-Heng Liu, Yun-Feng Huang *, and Guang-Can Guo
 Key Laboratory of Quantum Information, University of Science and
 Technology of China, CAS, Hefei 230026, People's Republic of China

Discrimination of unitary operations is a fundamental quantum information processing task. Assisted with linear optical elements, we experimentally demonstrate perfect discrimination between single-bit unitary operations using the sequential scheme which is proved by Runyao Duan *et al.* [Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 100503 (2007)]. We also make a comparison with another perfect discrimination scheme named parallel scheme. The complexity and resource consumed are analyzed.

PACS numbers: 03.67-a, 03.65.Ta, 42.50.Xa

For quantum computing and quantum information processing, one important task is the discrimination of quantum states and unitary operations. This is strongly related to quantum nonorthogonality, which is one of the basic features of quantum mechanics. Since the pioneering work of Helstrom [1] on quantum hypothesis testing, the problem of discriminating nonorthogonal quantum states has attracted much attention, both in theory [2, 3] and experiments [4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. Naturally, the concepts of nonorthogonality and distinguishability can also be applied to quantum operations. However, things become very different when we refer to perfect discrimination of quantum operations which already has some theoretical works [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14]. Some pioneering works have been devoted to a good understanding of the exact role of quantum entanglement in the discrimination between unitary operations. It has been proved [9, 10] that perfect discrimination of nonorthogonal unitary operations can always be achieved with a finite number of running the unknown unitary operation, by using a suitable entangled state as input. This is contrary to the case of nonorthogonal quantum states, for which perfect discrimination can not be achieved with finite number of copies. Recently, Runyao Duan et al indicated that entanglement is not necessary for discrimination between unitary operations [11]. They show that by taking a suitable state and proper auxiliary unitary operation, nonorthogonal unitary operations can also be perfectly discriminated even without entanglement. This result impacts on the role of quantum entanglement in the context of quantum computing [15], and also makes experiment much easier because no N -partite entangled state is needed.

First, we briefly explain the basic idea of perfect discrimination between unitary operations [9, 10, 11]. Suppose we have an unknown quantum circuit which is secretly chosen from two alternatives, U and V . Here both U and V are unitary operations acting on a d -dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_d . We apply the unknown circuit to a proper initial state $|\psi_i\rangle$. If the output states $|\psi_o\rangle_U$ and $|\psi_o\rangle_V$ are orthogonal, then perfect discrimination between U and V is achieved. By denoting the length of the smallest arc containing all the eigenvalues of U on the unit circle by $\Theta(U)$, U and V can be perfectly distinguished if and only if $\Theta(U^\dagger V) \geq \pi$. The minimal N such that $\Theta((U^\dagger V)^{\otimes N}) \geq \pi$ is given by $\lceil \frac{\pi}{\Theta(U^\dagger V)} \rceil$. Here $\lceil x \rceil$ denotes the smallest integer that is not less than x . To determine what the circuit really is, we can use the parallel scheme which is brought forward in Ref. [9, 10] or sequential scheme which is brought forward in Ref. [11].

For the parallel scheme, shown in Fig. 1A, we can perfectly discriminate U and V by three steps: First, prepare a proper N -qudit entangled state $|\psi_i\rangle$; second, apply the secretly chosen circuit N times on $|\psi_i\rangle$, where each qudit one time; last, perform a projective measurement on the output states $|\psi_o\rangle_U = U^{\otimes N} |\psi_i\rangle$ and $|\psi_o\rangle_V = V^{\otimes N} |\psi_i\rangle$. If $|\psi_o\rangle_U \perp |\psi_o\rangle_V$ (“ \perp ” represents the orthogonality of two states), then two unitary operations are perfect discriminated. Indeed, we can always find a proper input state to make sure $|\psi_o\rangle_U \perp |\psi_o\rangle_V$ by using this method [9, 10].

While for the sequential scheme, shown in Fig. 1B, we need to prepare a proper one qudit state $|\psi_i\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_d$ and perform the unknown circuit sequentially on $|\psi_i\rangle$ for N times. Between each two runs of the unknown circuits, a proper auxiliary unitary operation $X_i \in \mathcal{U}$ ($i = 1, \dots, N-1$) is inserted. Here \mathcal{U} represents a set of unitary operations acting on \mathcal{H}_d . Perfect discrimination between U and V requires that two output states are orthogonal, such that

$$UX_{N-1} \cdots UX_1 U |\psi_i\rangle \perp VX_{N-1} \cdots VX_1 V |\psi_i\rangle. \quad (1)$$

As proved in Ref. [11], this discrimination task can always be translated to distinguish $U^\dagger V$ and identity (I). Then, relation (1) can be reduced as follows:

$$(U^\dagger V)X(U^\dagger V)^{N-1} |\psi_i\rangle \perp X |\psi_i\rangle. \quad (2)$$

* Corresponding author: hyf@ustc.edu.cn




FIG. 1: Two schemes of perfect discrimination two unitary operations. O represents one of the unknown circuit, U or V . $|\psi_i\rangle$ is the input state and $|\psi_o\rangle$ is the output state. Figure A: A parallel scheme for discriminating two unitary operations U and V . Figure B: A sequential scheme for discriminating two unitary operations U and V . X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{N-1} are auxiliary unitary operations. $|\psi_i\rangle$ is the input state and $|\psi_o\rangle$ is the output state. The output states $|\psi_o\rangle_U$ and $|\psi_o\rangle_V$ need to be orthogonal for perfect discrimination.

Where X_i , X and $|\psi_i\rangle$ depend on $\Theta(U^\dagger V)$.

By comparison of these two schemes, sequential scheme is experimentally much easier than parallel scheme especially in testing the orthogonality of output states. For sequential scheme, only single qubit projective measurement is needed while for parallel scheme non-local measurements should be performed, which is rather difficult within current technology. Further more, because of the environment noise and experimental error, the output states of parallel scheme are always mixed entangled states which are hardly precisely distinguished by local operation and classical communication (LOCC) [16].

In this paper, we report an experiment which demonstrates perfect discrimination between single-qubit unitary operations using the sequential scheme [11]. Linear optical elements are used to perform unitary operations on photonic qubits in the experiment. At the end we perform a projective measurement to show the perfect discrimination. The quality of our unitary operation is characterized by the average process fidelity $F(U)$ [17, 18] between the matrix which is got from standard quantum process tomography [19, 20, 21, 22, 23] and the theoretical one.

Although the sequential scheme is not limited to single-qubit unitary operations, we choose to discriminate two single-bit unitary operations in our experiment. Because single-qubit unitary operation is a class of fundamental unitary transformations which is widely used in quantum computing and quantum information processing tasks. And with linear optical elements, any single-qubit unitary operation on photonic polarization qubit can be easily implemented using a set of wave-plates [24]. For simplicity, we set the run times N of the unknown circuit to be $N = \lceil \frac{\pi}{\Theta(U^\dagger V)} \rceil = 2$. And two sets of unitary operations are chose:

$$\text{Case1} : U_1 = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\frac{2}{3}\pi} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, V_1 = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\frac{1}{6}\pi} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \Theta(U_1^\dagger V_1) = \frac{\pi}{2} \quad (3)$$

$$\text{Case2} : U_2 = U_1 = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\frac{2}{3}\pi} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, V_2 = I = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \Theta(U_2^\dagger V_2) = \frac{2\pi}{3}. \quad (4)$$

Case 1: $N = \lceil \frac{\pi}{\Theta(U_1^\dagger V_1)} \rceil = 2$, auxiliary operation $X = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \alpha & -\sin \alpha \\ \sin \alpha & \cos \alpha \end{pmatrix} = I$, where $\alpha = \arctan \sqrt{-\frac{\cos(N\Theta/2)}{\cos((N-2)\Theta/2)}}$, and $|\psi_i\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|H\rangle + |V\rangle)$, where φ_1 and φ_2 are the eigenvectors of $X^\dagger(U^\dagger V)X(U^\dagger V)^{N-1}$ [11]. The experimental setup is shown in Fig. 2. We do a projective measurement to show the results of perfect discrimination. The projective basis we chose is $|\psi_b\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(-e^{i\frac{\pi}{3}}|H\rangle + |V\rangle)$. Photons will be only detected by D_1 if their state is $|\psi_b\rangle$ or will be only detect by D_2 if their state is the orthogonal state of $|\psi_b\rangle$. All the operations are achieved by linear optical components. And all the degrees of wave plates are shown in Table I. We do a process tomography of our unitary operations to ensure their validity. The average process fidelities we got are $F(U_1) = 0.985$ and $F(V_1) = 0.975$. After a theoretical calculation, we know that the output state $|\psi_o\rangle$ is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(-e^{i\frac{\pi}{3}}|H\rangle + |V\rangle)$ when applying U_1 while $|\psi'_o\rangle$ is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(-e^{i\frac{\pi}{3}}|H\rangle - |V\rangle)$ when applying V_1 , and $\langle \psi_o | \psi'_o \rangle = 0$. The polarized beam splitter (PBS) transmits vertical polarizing photons and reflects horizontal polarizing photons. So, with our projective measurement, we get the results that the unknown unitary operation is U_1 when photons are only detected by D_1 and the unknown unitary operation is V_1 when photons are only detected by D_2 . The results are shown in Fig. 3.

Case 2: Similar to the discussions in Case 1, we get $N = \lceil \frac{\pi}{\Theta(U_2^\dagger V_2)} \rceil = 2$, auxiliary operation $X = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2} & -1 \\ 1 & \sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}$ and $|\psi_i\rangle = (-0.151 + 0.262i)|H\rangle + 0.953|V\rangle$. The projective basis we chose is $|\psi_b\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e^{-\frac{\pi}{6}i}|H\rangle + |V\rangle)$. The experimental setup is not changed but the settings of wave plates are different from the settings in Case 1. All the settings of wave plates are shown in Table I. The average process fidelity of the auxiliary operation X is $F(X) = 0.996$. We can get two orthogonal output states $|\psi_o\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e^{-\frac{\pi}{6}i}|H\rangle + |V\rangle)$ and $|\psi'_o\rangle = (\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e^{-\frac{\pi}{6}i}|H\rangle - |V\rangle))$ when applying U_2 and V_2 respectively. So we know that the unknown unitary operation is U_2 when photons are only detected by D_1 and the unknown unitary operation is V_2 when photons are only detected by D_2 which are shown in Fig. 3.




FIG. 2: Experimental setup for sequential scheme. Atten represents the attenuator. P is the polarizer. PBS represents the polarized beam splitter which transmits vertical polarizing photons and reflects horizontal polarizing photons. IF is interference filter centred at $702nm$ with $4nm$ bandwidth. D_1 and D_2 are photon detectors. Q_i ($i = 1, 2, \dots, 8$) and H_j ($j = 1, 2, \dots, 5$) represent quarter wave plates (QWP) and half wave plates (HWP) respectively. Our unitary operations (U , V and X) are all realized by a HWP and two QWPs. At the end, we perform the projective measurement.

TABLE I: Wave plates setting (degree)

	input		U(V)			X			U(V)			measurement	
	Q ₁	H ₁	Q ₂	H ₂	Q ₃	Q ₄	H ₃	Q ₅	Q ₆	H ₄	Q ₇	Q ₈	H ₅
U_1	0	22.5	45	15	45	0	0	0	45	15	45	45	37.5
V_1	0	22.5	45	37.5	45	0	0	0	45	37.5	45	45	37.5
U_2	-15	42.4	45	15	45	27.4	45	62.6	45	15	45	45	15
V_2	-15	42.4	0	0	0	27.4	45	62.6	0	0	0	45	15

In our experimental setup, the single photon source is achieved by attenuating the coherent Ti-sapphire laser to single photon level. Then a polarizer (transmitted horizontal polarizing photon), quarter wave plate (QWP) Q_1 and half wave plate (HWP) H_1 make up the initialization of input states. The set of wave plates with one half wave plate sandwiched by two quarter wave plates can realize any unitary operation on the photonic polarization qubit, which can be represented in terms of three Eulerian angles. Projective measurement consists of QWP (Q_8), HWP (H_5), PBS (transmitting vertical polarizing photons) and two photon detectors. It is used to verify the orthogonality of output states.

Our results are shown in Fig. 3. When choosing the input states and projective measurements discussed above, we can discriminate the circuits via the results of photon detectors. The probabilities of successful discrimination are about 98.0% [25] (Fig 3(a)), 98.1% (Fig 3(b)) of Case 1, and 98.3% (Fig 3(c)), 98.4% (Fig 3(d)) of Case 2. In our results, the errors mainly come from the deviations of the angle settings of wave plates. Because there are many wave plates in our experimental setup and the precision of them is only about 0.2° . This leads to the discrimination probability less than 1. But it is quite different from other non-perfect discrimination schemes whose probabilities of successful discrimination never achieve 100%, even in theory.

We have experimentally distinguished two sets of single-bit unitary operations where $N = 2$ using sequential scheme. If $N > 2$, we need to apply unknown unitary operation N times and auxiliary unitary operations $N - 1$ times on the input state. This is easy to be implemented compared with the parallel scheme mentioned above. However, it needs to perform sequentially at least $2N - 1$ steps of unitary operations. This may lead to a long discriminating time, meanwhile, the deviations of the results would be influenced by the additional $N - 1$ auxiliary unitary operations. Instead, in the parallel scheme one needs to prepare an N -partite entangled state as the input state. When we have at least N copies of the unknown circuit and a suitable entangled resource, we can complete the discrimination within




FIG. 3: Experimental results of perfect discrimination. The above two figures are the results of Case 1, and the bottom two figures are the results of Case 2. We can directly discriminate the circuits by counts of two detectors.

a single step by applying N copies of the unknown circuit to the input state. This scheme is fast (only one step) but costs entanglement resource, and there are also some practical difficulties in non-local measurements.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Runyao Duan and Xiang-Fa Zhou for interesting and helpful discussions. This work was funded by the National Fundamental Research Program, National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 60121503 and Grant No. 10674128), Innovation Funds from Chinese Academy of Sciences, Program for New Century Excellent Talents in University, A Foundation for the Author of National Excellent Doctoral Dissertation of PR China (Grant No. 200729), and Doctor Foundation of Education Ministry of China.

References

-
- [1] C. W. Helstrom, *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory* (Academic Press, New York, 1976).
 - [2] A. Chefles, *Contemporary Physics* **41** (6) (2000) 401-424.
 - [3] J. Bergou, U. Herzog, and M. Hillery, *Quantum State Estimation*, Lecture Notes in Physics Vol. **649** (Springer, Berlin, 2004), p. 417; A. Chefles, *ibid.*, p. 467.
 - [4] B. Huttner, A. Muller, J. D. Gautier, H. Zbinden, and N. Gisin, *Phys. Rev. A* **54** (1996) 3783.
 - [5] S. M. Barnett and E. Riis, *J. Mod. Opt.* **44** (1997) 1061.
 - [6] R. B. M. Clarke, A. Chefles, S. M. Barnett and E. Riis, *Phys. Rev. A* **63** (2001) 040305(R).
 - [7] R. B. M. Clarke, V. M. Kendon, A. Chefles, S. M. Barnett, E. Riis, and M. Sasaki, *Phys. Rev. A* **64** (2001) 012303.
 - [8] M. Mohseni, A. M. Steinberg, and J. A. Bergou, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93** (2004) 200403.
 - [9] A. Acin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87** (2001) 177901.
 - [10] G. M. D'Ariano, P. Lo Presti, and M. G. A. Paris, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87** (2001) 270404.
 - [11] R. Duan, Y. Feng, and M. Ying, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98** (2007) 100503.
 - [12] X.-F. Zhou, Y.-S. Zhang, and G.-C. Guo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99** (2007) 170401.

- [13] T. Vertesi and R. Englman, Phys. Rev. A **76** (2007) 042322.
- [14] R. Duan, Y. Feng, and M. Ying, Phys. Rev. Lett. **1** (2008) 020503.
- [15] D. A. Meyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85** (2000) 2014.
- [16] A. Peres and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66** (1991) 1119.
- [17] J. B. Altepeter et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **90** (2003) 193601.
- [18] Z.-W. Wang, Y.-S. Zhang, Y.-F. Huang, X.-F. Ren, and G.-C. Guo, Phys. Rev. A **75** (2007) 044304.
- [19] J. F. Poyatos, J. I. Cirac and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** (1997) 390.
- [20] I. L. Chuang and M. A Nielsen, J. Mod. Opt. **44** (1997) 2455.
- [21] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2000).
- [22] A. M. Childs, I. L. Chuang and D. W. Leung, Phys. Rev. A **64** (2001) 012314.
- [23] M. W. Mitchell C. W. Ellenor, S. Schneider, and A. M. Steinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91** (2003) 120402.
- [24] B. G. Englert, C. Kurtsiefer, and H. Weinfurter, Phys. Rev. A **63** (2001) 032303.
- [25] Suppose the counts of detector D1 and D2 are c_1 and c_2 , respectively. Then the successful discrimination probability can be written as $p = c_1/(c_1 + c_2)$ or $p = c_2/(c_1 + c_2)$ based on projective basis.