

Testing the Hilbert space dimension

Nicolas Brunner,¹ Stefano Pironio,² Antonio Acín,^{2,3} Nicolas Gisin,¹ André Allan Méthot,¹ and Valerio Scarani⁴

¹Group of Applied Physics, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

²ICFO-Institut de Ciències Fòniques, Castelldefels (Barcelona), Spain

³ICREA-Institució Catalana de Recerca i Estudis Avançats, Barcelona, Spain

⁴Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, Singapore

(Dated: February 6, 2020)

Given a set of correlations originating from measurements on a quantum state of unknown Hilbert space dimension, what is the minimal dimension d necessary to describe such correlations? We introduce the concept of dimension witness to put lower bounds on d . This work represents a first step in a broader research program aiming to characterize Hilbert space dimension in various contexts related to fundamental questions and Quantum Information applications.

A theorist is invited to visit a lab. The experimentalists, not entirely happy with the nuisance, decide to submit the visitor to the ordeal “Guess what we are measuring”. Hardly distinguishing lasers from vacuum chambers, the theorist cannot hope to identify the system under study, and asks for a black-box description of the experiment in order to disentangle at least the physics from the cables. It turns out that the experiment aims at measuring correlations between the outputs of two measuring apparatuses. On each side, the outcome of the measurement is discrete and can take v values — the theorist writes $a, b \in \{0, 1, \dots, v-1\}$. A knob with m positions allows to change the parameters of each measuring apparatus — the theorist writes $x, y \in \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$. Finally, the experimentalists show the data: the frequencies $P(ab|xy)$ of occurrence of a given pair of outcomes for each pair of measurements. The theorist makes some calculations and delivers a verdict...

Some verdicts have been known for some time. In particular, if $P(ab|xy)$ violates a Bell-type inequality [1], we know for sure that an entangled quantum state has been produced in the lab. If on the contrary $P(ab|xy)$ can be distributed by shared randomness, the experiment may in fact be purely classical.

The goal of this paper is to introduce another family of verdicts, different from the “quantum-vs-classical” one. We shall prove that, even in a black-box scenario, the theorist may have something to say about the *dimension of the Hilbert space* of the quantum objects that are measured. Both the enthusiastic verdict “You are using systems of dimension at least d ” and the disappointing one “You may be coding in less than d dimensions” are possible.

From an information-theoretical point of view, the dimensionality of quantum systems can be seen as a resource. Thus testing the Hilbert space dimension is important for quantifying the power of quantum correlations, a central issue in Quantum Information science. Furthermore, this line of research turns out to be relevant for Quantum Key Distribution (QKD) as well. In standard security proofs of QKD [2], the correlations shared by the authorized partners, Alice and Bob, are supposed

to come from measurements on a quantum state of a given dimension. This assumption turns out to be crucial for the security of most of the existing protocols [3]. But is the dimension of a quantum system an experimentally measurable quantity? There also exist protocols whose security does not require any hypothesis on the Hilbert space dimension [4]. However, to prove security in such protocol, it is useful to understand how it is possible to bound effectively the dimension of the systems distributed by the eavesdropper.

Formally, we say that a set of conditional probabilities $P(ab|xy)$ has a d -dimensional representation if it can be written as

$$P(ab|xy) = \text{tr}(\rho M_a^X \otimes M_b^Y), \quad (1)$$

for some state ρ in $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$ and local measurements operators M_a^X and M_b^Y acting on \mathbb{C}^d , or if it can be written as a convex combination of probabilities of the form (1). We are interested in the following question: what is the minimal dimension d necessary to reproduce a given set of probabilities $P(ab|xy)$ [5]?

The fact that we allow convex combinations of (1) means that shared randomness is unrestricted in our scenario. This is consistent with a quantum information perspective where classical resources are taken to be free and we want to bound the quantum resources, in this case the dimensionality of the quantum states, necessary to achieve a task. Within this approach, the answer to the above question is immediate if the initial correlations admit a locally causal model [1], as in this case they can be reproduced using shared randomness only and no quantum systems are strictly needed for their preparation. Thus, our problem is interesting only when the initial correlations are non-local, i.e., when they violate a Bell inequality.

Since classical correlations are taken to be free, the set of d -dimensional quantum correlations is convex. Therefore, standard techniques from convex theory can be applied, as has been done for other quantum information problems such as separability [6]. Following this analogy, we introduce the concept of dimension witnesses. A

d -dimensional witness is a linear function of the probabilities $P(ab|xy)$ described by a vector \vec{w} of real coefficients w_{abxy} , such that

$$\vec{w} \cdot \vec{p} \equiv \sum_{a,b,x,y} w_{abxy} P(ab|xy) \leq w_d \quad (2)$$

for all probabilities of the form (1) with ρ in $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$, and such that there are quantum correlations for which $\vec{w} \cdot \vec{p} > w_d$. When some correlations violate (2), they can thus only be established by measuring systems of dimension larger than d . Dimension witnesses allow us to turn the Hilbert space dimension, a very abstract concept, into an experimentally measurable property.

In the following, we construct several examples of 2-dimensional witnesses. Although testing the Hilbert space dimension is possible for any number of parties, for simplicity we focus here on bipartite correlations.

Witnesses based on CGLMP. A natural starting point for our investigations is the situation corresponding to $m = 2$ measurement settings per side with $v = 3$ possible outcomes. Indeed, in this case Collins-Gisin-Linden-Massar-Popescu (CGLMP) introduced a Bell inequality whose maximal quantum violation is achieved by a two-qutrit state. The CGLMP expression is

$$C(\vec{p}) = P(b_0 \geq a_0) + P(a_0 \geq b_1) + P(a_1 \geq b_0) + P(b_1 > a_1) - 3 \quad (3)$$

where $P(a_x \geq b_y) = \sum_{a \geq b} P(ab|xy)$ [7, 8]. Local correlations satisfy $C(\vec{p}) \leq 0$, while measurements on a partly entangled two-qutrit state yields a maximal value of $C(\vec{p}) = 0.3050$ [9].

The set of quantum probabilities corresponding to $m = 2$ and $v = 3$ lives in a 24-dimensional space. Since it is in general difficult to gain intuition in such a high-dimensional space, we will focus here on a two-dimensional subspace of this quantum set, which has been characterized in [10]. This subspace is parameterized by two numbers: the CGLMP value $C(\vec{p})$ and

$$D(\vec{p}) = - \sum_{x,y=0}^1 \sum_{k=0}^2 P(a = k, b = k-1 - (x-1)(y-1)|xy)$$

The precise form of the probabilities living in this subspace as a function of $C(\vec{p})$ and $D(\vec{p})$ can be found in [10]. Note that if two parties share a point \vec{p} in the original quantum set, they can run a depolarization protocol that will map it onto the two-dimensional subspace while keeping the values of $C(\vec{p})$ and $D(\vec{p})$ constant [10].

Since the quantum region is convex, its boundary in the two-dimensional subspace can be obtained by computing the maximal value of

$$I_\phi(\vec{p}) = \cos \phi C(\vec{p}) + \sin \phi D(\vec{p}) \quad (4)$$




FIG. 1: Quantum region in the two-dimensional subspace described in [10]. The upper curve represents the boundary of the general quantum region and can be achieved by measurements on two-qutrit states. The lower curve represents the boundary of the region accessible through measurements on two-qubit states. The dashed line delimits the no-signaling correlations. The inequality $I_{\phi=\pi/4} \leq 0$ is a dimension witness: it cannot be violated by performing measurements on qubits, but qutrits are required.

for all ϕ , that is by computing how far it extends in every direction of the two-dimensional subspace. We have computed these values using the technique introduced in [11]. The optimal values $I_\phi^{(q)}$ are obtained for a family of entangled states of the form $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2+\gamma^2}}(|00\rangle + \gamma|11\rangle + |22\rangle)$ with measurements that are independent of γ and which can be found in [7]. The resulting quantum curve is represented on Fig. 1 using the parametrization of [10] (we have represented only the region that lies above $C(\vec{p}) = 0$, i.e., that violates the CGLMP inequality, as this is the region of interest here).

We have also determined the region accessible with qubits by maximizing I_ϕ over all measurements, also known as Positive-Operator-Valued-Measures (POVMs), and two-qubit states. The optimal values $I_\phi^{(2)}$ are obtained by performing two-outcome von Neumann measurements on pure entangled two-qubit states $|\psi\rangle = \cos \theta |00\rangle + \sin \theta |11\rangle$. The resulting curve is also shown in Fig. 1. Note that contrarily to the previous case the qubit curve is not the result of an exact computation, but of a numerical search using a heuristic algorithm. Indeed, the method of [11] cannot be directly applied to this problem, as it does not constrain the dimension of the quantum systems, while others techniques based on semidefinite programming [12] are computationally too costly due to the large number of parameters involved here. While we can therefore not guarantee that the values $I_\phi^{(2)}$ that we have found are the actual maximum qubit values, we are quite confident that our numerical optimization did yield the optimal ones.

The inequalities $I_\phi(\vec{p}) \leq I_\phi^{(2)}$ form a family of 2-

dimensional witnesses. Any one of these inequalities for which the maximal quantum value $I_\phi^{(q)} > I_\phi^{(2)}$ is strictly greater than the maximal qubit value, that is any direction in Fig. 1 for which there is a gap between the qubit and the general quantum curve, allows one to distinguish qubits from higher-dimensional systems. Note that the expressions (4) can also be interpreted as Bell inequalities with local bound $I_\phi^{(l)} = 0$ if $\sin\phi$ is positive and $I_\phi^{(l)} = -2\sin(\phi)$ otherwise. The inequalities with $\tan\phi \geq 1$ are noteworthy because the local bound and the qubit bound coincide, $I_\phi^{(2)} = I_\phi^{(l)} = 0$, i.e., qubits no longer violate them; they can only be violated with qutrits or higher dimensional systems.

Although the situation that we just considered is illustrative, we mentioned that we had to resort to heuristic numerical searches to compute the qubit value of the expressions (4). We now present two situations where stronger statements can be made. While techniques have been developed to characterize the boundary of the general quantum set (i.e., with no bound on the dimension) [11], we still lack of efficient tools to characterize the quantum region corresponding to fixed Hilbert-space dimension. The two examples below provide two different approaches to this problem, the first one uses semidefinite programming, the second one establishes a link with the Grothendieck constant.

Using semidefinite programming. We give here an example of a dimension witness where the maximal violation can be determined for any two-qubit state using semidefinite programming [13]. We consider a scenario where Alice chooses between two settings ($m_A = 2$) and Bob among three settings ($m_B = 3$). All settings yield binary outcomes except Alice's second setting $x = 1$, which is ternary. In this case, the following Bell expression

$$E(\vec{p}) = P_A(0|0) - P(00|00) - P(00|01) - P(00|02) + P(00|10) + P(10|11) + P(20|12) + 1 \quad (5)$$

with local bound $E(\vec{p}) \leq 0$, has recently been introduced [14]. The maximal quantum violation $E^q = 0.2532$ can be found using the method of [11] and is achieved for a partially entangled state of two-qutrits.

In order to prove that the largest violation for qubits is strictly smaller, we computed the maximal value of the right-hand side of (5) over all two-qubit states $\rho \in \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$ and over all measurement settings. Since we seek to maximize an expression which is linear in the probabilities $p(ab|xy) = \text{tr}[\rho M_a^x \otimes M_b^y]$, its maximum will be attained by *pure* states $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ and *extremal* POVMs. Up to a local change of basis, any pure two-qubit state can be written as $|\psi(\theta)\rangle = \cos(\theta)|00\rangle + \sin(\theta)|11\rangle$ with $0 \leq \theta \leq \pi/4$. Every extremal POVM M for qubits has elements $\{M_i\}$ which are proportional to rank 1 projectors [15] and can thus be parameterized in term of the Pauli matrices $\vec{\sigma} = (\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z)$ as $M_i = \frac{1}{2}(m_i \mathbb{1} + \vec{m}_i \cdot \vec{\sigma})$ where $m_i \geq 0$, $\sum_i m_i = 2$, $\sum_i \vec{m}_i = 0$, and $(m_i)^2 =$

$(\vec{m}_i)^2$. Let u denote the set of variables necessary to represent all POVMs $x = 0, 1$ and $y = 0, 1, 2$ using this parameterizations for POVMs, and let $c(u) \geq 0$ represent the (quadratic) constraints to which these variables are subject. For given θ , the right-hand side of (5) is a quadratic function $E_\theta(u)$ of u . Our problem is thus to solve the following (non-convex) quadratic program

$$E_\theta^* = \max_u E_\theta(u) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad c(u) \geq 0. \quad (6)$$

Solving such a problem is in general a difficult task, as it may have many local optima. Following the approach of Lasserre [12] we derived upper-bounds on E_θ^* using semidefinite programming [13]. For any given value of θ , we obtained an upper-bound on the maximal value of the right-hand side of (5). This value coincides up to 10^{-6} (the precision of our computations) with the maximum value obtained when we discard one of the outcomes of the POVM $x = 1$. In this case the inequality (5) reduces to the CHSH inequality [16], whose maximal violation as a function of θ is $(\sqrt{1 + \sin^2(2\theta)} - 1)/2$. The maximal qubit violation of (5) is thus achieved for $\theta = \pi/4$ and equal to $E^{(2)} = 1/\sqrt{2} - 1/2 \approx 0.2071$, to be compared with the maximal quantum violation $E^{(q)} = 0.2532$ achieved using two-qutrit states. Let us stress that our qubit bound, which can be reached, is an upper-bound on the global optimal solution of the problem. This is because there exist algorithms able to find the *global* optimum of semidefinite programs [13] (as opposed to local optima when using heuristic optimization algorithms).

Link to the Grothendieck constant. The previous examples of qubit witnesses all contain at least one three-outcome measurement. In this case, it is perhaps not surprising, though difficult to prove, that systems of dimension larger than two are needed to get the maximal quantum value. In what follows, we show that qubit witnesses exist even for two-outcome correlations. This result implies that not all d -outcome quantum correlations are achievable with d -dimensional quantum states, answering a question raised by Gill [17] (see also [18]). A proof of the same result for two parties has been independently obtained in [19], while the results of [20] answer Gill's question in the tripartite case.

Our proof goes as follows. Define the correlator c_{xy} between measurement x by Alice and y by Bob as $c_{xy} = P(a = b|xy) - P(a \neq b|xy)$, and consider now a linear function of such correlators,

$$I = \sum_{i,j=1}^m M_{ij} c_{x_i y_j} \quad (7)$$

defined by an $m \times m$ matrix M verifying the normalization condition $\max_{\{x_i, y_j\}} |\sum_{i,j=1}^m M_{ij} x_i y_j| = 1$ for all real numbers $x_i, y_j = \pm 1$. Because of this normalization, I can be seen as a standard Bell inequality whose local bound is 1.

On the other hand, the correlators are quantum, in the sense that they can be written as $c_{xy} = \langle X \otimes Y \rangle_\psi$ for some observables X and Y with ± 1 eigenvalues, if and only if there exist two normalized vectors $\vec{x}, \vec{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $c_{xy} = \vec{x} \cdot \vec{y}$ (see [21, 22] for details). The maximum value that any operator I can take, when c_{xy} is of this form, is known in the mathematical literature as $K_G(N)$ and called the *Grothendieck constant of order N* ; the maximum over all N is written K_G . Note now that in the case of two-outcome correlators the analysis can be restricted to projective measurements [23]. In this situation, any Bell operator associated to I is diagonal in the Bell basis, implying that the largest value is obtained for a maximally entangled state, say the singlet. Since any two-outcome correlator for projective measurements on the singlet state is equal to the scalar product of three-dimensional real vectors, the maximal value of I achievable with qubits is $K_G(3)$. Although the exact values of the Grothendieck constants are still unknown, it is proven that $K_G(3) < K_G$ [24]: this means that there exist an inequality I which is not saturated by correlations coming from two qubits. This proves the existence of dimension witnesses for qubits with two-outcome measurements. Although our proof is not constructive, examples of qubit witnesses built from two-outcome measurements have been recently found in [19].

We conjecture that two-outcome measurements may be sufficient to test the dimension of any bipartite quantum system, in the sense that there exist dimension witnesses built from binary measurements for any finite dimension. Indeed, all quantum correlators in $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$ can be written as scalar product of vectors of size $2d^2$ [21, 22]. Therefore, if $K_G(N)$ is strictly smaller than K_G for any finite N , which is plausible but unproven to our knowledge, one can construct witnesses with binary measurements for arbitrary dimension.

Conclusion and other directions. With the goal of testing the Hilbert space dimension of an unknown quantum system, we introduced the concept of dimension witness. We presented two examples of qubit witnesses, which can detect correlations that require measurements on quantum systems of dimension greater than two for their generation. Both of these examples involved three-outcome measurements; so the number of measurement outcomes exceeded the dimension of the Hilbert space to be witnessed. This shows, as one may expect, that not all d -outcome correlations can be obtained by measuring quantum systems of dimension smaller than d . Then, somehow surprisingly, we proved that qubit witnesses also exist in the case of two-outcome measurements. In other words, not all two-outcome correlations can be obtained by measuring qubits.

Viewing the dimensionality of a quantum system as a resource and trying to understand how to estimate or bound it, is an approach that deserve further investiga-

tion. The concept of dimension witnesses represents only a first step in this direction.

In general, the problem of Hilbert space characterization is not restricted to a multipartite non-local scenario. When dealing with fundamental issues for instance, it can be relevant to estimate the dimension of a quantum system without any distinction between classical and quantum resources. The motivation being that if nature is indeed described by quantum theory, classical degrees of freedom have also to be coded ultimately in quantum systems. In this context the (possibly one-partite) global quantum state is then taken to be pure and the goal is, given some initial statistical data, to determine the physical realization of minimal dimension. One may also wonder to what extent high dimensional quantum systems are more powerful than lower dimensional ones when noise is added. In particular, it would be interesting to look for dimension witnesses very robust to noise. Finally, a related, though different question concerns the multi-partite case. How can one be sure that data obtained by measurements on a n -party quantum state do require n -partite entanglement without any assumption of the local Hilbert space dimensions?

The authors thank C. Branciard, D. Pérez-García, S. Popescu, and T. Vértesi for useful discussions and acknowledge financial support from the EU project QAP (IST-FET FP6-015848), Swiss NCCR Quantum Photonics and Spanish MEC through Consolider QOIT and FIS2007-60182 projects, and a “Juan de la Cierva” grant.

-
- [1] J. S. Bell, *Physics* **1**, 195 (1964).
 - [2] P.W. Shor and J. Preskill, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 441 (2000); B. Kraus, N. Gisin, and R. Renner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 080501 (2005).
 - [3] A. Acín, N. Gisin, and L. Masanes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 120405 (2006).
 - [4] A. Acín, N. Brunner, N. Gisin, S. Massar, S. Pironio, and V. Scarani, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 230501 (2007).
 - [5] It is clear that one can always increase the dimension of the Hilbert space which describes a quantum system by adding useless extra dimensions. Thus, the relevant question here is to obtain the minimal dimension d that is required for the given correlations.
 - [6] M. Lewenstein and *et. al.*, *J. Mod. Opt.* **47**, 2841 (2000).
 - [7] D. Collins, N. Gisin, N. Linden, S. Massar, and S. Popescu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 040404 (2002).
 - [8] S. Zohren and R. D. Gill, *quant-ph/0612020*.
 - [9] A. Acín, T. Durt, N. Gisin, and J. I. Latorre, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 052325 (2002).
 - [10] V. Scarani, N. Gisin, N. Brunner, L. Masanes, S. Pino, and A. Acín, *PRA* **74**, 042339 (2006).
 - [11] M. Navascués, S. Pironio, and A. Acín, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 010401 (2007).
 - [12] J. Lasserre, *SIAM J. Optim.* **11**, 796 (2001).
 - [13] L. Vandenberghe and S. Boyd, *SIAM Review* **38**, 49 (1996).

- [14] S. Pironio, All CHSH polytopes, in preparation.
- [15] G. D'Ariano, P. Presti, and P. Perinotti, *J. Phys. A: Mth. Gen.* **38**, 5979 (2005).
- [16] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 880 (1969).
- [17] R. Gill, QI open problems project: www.imaph.tubs.de/qi/problems (2005).
- [18] N. Gisin, arXiv:quant-ph/0702021.
- [19] T. Vertesi and K. Pal, arXiv:0712.4225, arXiv:0712.4320.
- [20] D. Perez-Garcia, M. M. Wolf, C. Palazuelos, I. Villanueva and M. Junge, quant-ph/0702189v2.
- [21] B. Tsirelson, *J. Sov. Math.* **35**, 557 (1987).
- [22] A. Acin, N. Gisin, and B. Toner, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 062105 (2006).
- [23] R. F. Werner and M. M. Wolf, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 032112 (2001).
- [24] A. M. Davies (unpublished note, 1984) and J. A. Reeds (unpublished note, 1991) showed that $K_G \geq 1.6770$, while Krivine [25] showed that $K_G(3) \leq 1.5163$.
- [25] J. Krivine, *Adv. Math.* **31**, 16 (1979).