

## COEXISTENCE OF QUBIT EFFECTS

PAUL BUSCH AND HEINZ-JÜRGEN SCHMIDT

ABSTRACT. Two quantum events, represented by positive operators (effects), are *coexistent* if they can occur as possible outcomes in a single measurement scheme. Equivalently, the corresponding effects are *coexistent* if and only if they are contained in the ranges of a single (joint) observable. Here we give a necessary and sufficient condition for the coexistence of a pair of qubit effects.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

It is a fundamental result of the quantum theory of measurement that pairs of observables represented by noncommuting selfadjoint operators cannot be measured together. The joint measurability of two observables  $A, B$  entails that for every state (density operator)  $\rho$  there is a joint probability distribution of the observables such that the probability of obtaining a value of  $A$  in a (Borel) subset  $X$  of  $\mathbb{R}$  and a value of  $B$  in a subset  $Y$  of  $\mathbb{R}$  is given by  $\text{tr}[\rho G(X \times Y)]$ , where  $G(X \times Y)$  is a positive operator. The probabilities for  $A$  and  $B$  alone are included as the *marginal* distributions  $X \mapsto \text{tr}[\rho G(X \times \mathbb{R})]$ ,  $Y \mapsto \text{tr}[\rho G(\mathbb{R} \times Y)]$ , respectively. The operators  $G(X \times \mathbb{R})$  and  $G(\mathbb{R} \times Y)$  coincide with the spectral projections  $E^A(X)$  and  $E^B(Y)$  of  $A$  and  $B$ , respectively. From this it follows that  $A$  and  $B$  commute and that the operators  $G(X \times Y)$  are the projection operators  $E^A(X)E^B(Y)$ .

For observables  $E, F$  represented as positive operator valued measures (POVMs) (say with values in  $\mathbb{R}$ ), the existence of a joint observable does not in general require the commutativity of  $E$  and  $F$ .  $E, F$  are said to be jointly measurable if there exists a joint observable  $G$  (with values in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ ) of which they are marginals. The positive operators (effects)  $E(X), F(Y)$  in the ranges of  $E$  and  $F$  are then contained in the range of a single observable ( $G$ ). A collection of effects will be called *coexistent* if they are contained in the range of a single POVM.

It is an open problem to give general, operationally significant conditions for the joint measurability of two observables. Here we address the special case of two *simple* observables (having just two possible values). The joint measurability of two simple observables is equivalent to the coexistence of a pair of effects.

We will consider pairs of effects in a qubit system (i.e. a quantum system represented by a 2-dimensional Hilbert space), and deduce a system of conditions and inequalities which together form necessary and sufficient conditions for the coexistence of two qubit effects.

The notions of effects and their coexistence were introduced by Günther Ludwig in the 1960s in his fundamental work on the axiomatic foundation of quantum mechanics [1]. We dedicate this work to the memory of Günther Ludwig (1918–2007).

## 2. COEXISTENT PAIRS OF EFFECTS

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a complex Hilbert space with inner product  $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$ , and let  $\mathcal{L} \equiv [\mathbb{O}, \mathbb{1}]$  denote the set of effects, that is, all operators  $a$  such that  $\mathbb{O} \prec a \prec \mathbb{1}$ . Here  $\mathbb{O}$  and  $\mathbb{1}$  represent the null and identity operators, respectively, and  $\prec$  denotes the usual ordering of selfadjoint operators:  $a \prec b$  (equivalently,  $b \succ a$ ) if  $\langle \varphi | a\varphi \rangle \leq \langle \varphi | b\varphi \rangle$  for all  $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$ .

Any effect  $e$  together with its complement effect  $e' = \mathbb{1} - e$  forms a simple observable. In general, an observable with finitely many values is determined essentially by a set of effects  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$ , where the indices label the values,  $a_k$  is the effect that determines the probabilities for the outcome labeled with  $k$ , and  $\sum_k a_k = \mathbb{1}$ .

**Lemma 1.** *Two effects  $e, f$  are coexistent if and only if there are effects  $a, b \in \mathcal{L}$ , such that*

$$(1) \quad a \prec e \prec b, \quad a \prec f \prec b, \quad a + b = e + f.$$

*Proof.* In fact, these inequalities are necessary and sufficient for each element of the set of operators

$$(2) \quad \{a, e - a, f - a, \mathbb{1} - e - f + a\}.$$

to be effects. This set thus defines an observable whose range contains the effects  $e$  and  $f$  as well as  $e'$  and  $f'$ ; hence it constitutes a joint observable for the simple observables given by  $\{e, e'\}$  and  $\{f, f'\}$ .  $\square$

For later reference we note a few well-known results.

**Lemma 2.** *Effects  $e, f \in \mathcal{L}$  are coexistent if  $e \prec f$  or  $e \prec f'$ . In particular,  $e, e'$  are coexistent.*

*Proof.* Let  $e \prec f$ . Take  $a = e, b = f$ , then  $\mathbb{O} \prec e = a \prec e, f \prec e + f - e = f = b \prec \mathbb{1}$ . If  $e \prec f'$ , take  $a = \mathbb{O}, b = e + f$ , then  $\mathbb{O} \prec e, f \prec e + f - \mathbb{O} = b \prec \mathbb{1}$ . Finally, choose  $f = e'$ , then  $e \prec f' = e$ , so  $e, e'$  are coexistent.  $\square$

We also note without proof that if at least one of two effects  $e, f$  is a projection, then the effects are coexistent if and only if they commute. In this case the joint observable (2) is uniquely determined by  $e, f$  via  $a = ef$ .

## 3. COEXISTENT PAIRS OF QUBIT EFFECTS

**3.1. Preliminaries.** In the case  $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^2$ , selfadjoint operators are represented as hermitian  $2 \times 2$  matrices. These form a 4-dimensional real vector space  $M_4$ , spanned by the basis

$$\sigma_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

For  $x \in M_4$  we have  $x \succ \mathbb{O}$  exactly when the eigenvalues of  $x$  are non-negative. We define  $x \succ_o \mathbb{O}$  (equivalently  $\mathbb{O} \prec_o x$ ) to mean that  $x \succ \mathbb{O}$  and at least one eigenvalue of  $x$  is equal to zero. Then for  $x, y \in M_4$ ,  $x \succ_o y$  (or  $y \prec_o x$ ) is defined to mean  $x - y \succ_o \mathbb{O}$ .

Next we define the bilinear form

$$\langle e | f \rangle := x_0 y_0 - \sum_{i=1}^3 x_i y_i = x_0 y_0 - \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y},$$

where  $x = \sum_{i=0}^3 x_i \sigma_i$ ,  $y = \sum_{i=0}^3 y_i \sigma_i$ .

We note without proof the following fact.

**Theorem 1.**  $(M_4, \langle | \rangle, \prec, \prec_o)$  is isomorphic to the 4-dimensional Minkowski space.

Accordingly, we will apply freely the terminology of Minkowski geometry. We use the same notation for vectors and for points in  $M_4$  as an affine space.

The *forward* and *backward light cones* of an element  $x \in M_4$  are defined as the sets

$$(3) \quad \mathcal{F}(x) := \{y \in M_4 : x \prec_o y\}, \quad \mathcal{B}(x) := \{y \in M_4 : x \succ_o y\}.$$

A vector  $x \in M_4$  is called *lightlike* if  $\langle x|x \rangle = 0$ . If  $\langle x|x \rangle > 0$  or  $< 0$ , the vector  $x$  is called *timelike* or *spacelike*, respectively. Then  $e \prec_o f$  is equivalent to  $f - e$  being lightlike and  $f_0 - e_0 \geq 0$ . Elements  $e, f \in M_4$  are called *spacelike*,  $e \sigma f$ , if  $\langle e - f | e - f \rangle < 0$ .

The set of effects  $\mathcal{L} = [\mathbb{0}, \mathbb{1}]$  is convex and compact, that is, it includes its boundary (surface), which is the intersection of the upward light cone of  $\mathbb{0}$  and the downward light cone of  $\mathbb{1}$ .

**Lemma 3.** Let  $e, f \in \mathcal{L}$  be spacelike ( $e \sigma f$ ), and let  $a, b \in \mathcal{L}$  be such that  $a \prec e \prec b$ ,  $a \prec f \prec b$  and  $a + b = e + f$ . Then there exist  $\tilde{a}, \tilde{b} \in \mathcal{L}$  such that  $\tilde{a} \prec_o e \prec_o \tilde{b}$ ,  $\tilde{a} \prec_o f \prec_o \tilde{b}$  and  $\tilde{a} + \tilde{b} = e + f$ .

*Proof.* Let  $P$  be the 2-dimensional plane containing  $e, f, a$  and hence  $b$ . In  $P$  the forward and backward light cones degenerate to lines. Since  $e \sigma f$ , the forward and backward cones of  $e$  and  $f$  intersect in exactly one point, respectively. Hence we define  $\tilde{a}$  and  $\tilde{b}$  by  $\mathcal{B}(e) \cap \mathcal{B}(f) = \{\tilde{a}\}$ ,  $\mathcal{F}(e) \cap \mathcal{F}(f) = \{\tilde{b}\}$ . The lines  $\ell(e, \tilde{a})$  and  $\ell(f, \tilde{b})$  are parallel, likewise  $\ell(e, \tilde{b})$  and  $\ell(f, \tilde{a})$ . Hence  $e, \tilde{b}, f, \tilde{a}$  form the vertices of a parallelogram and  $\tilde{a} + \tilde{b} = e + f$ . Due to the convexity of  $\mathcal{L}$ , the element  $\tilde{a} \in \mathcal{L}$  since the intersection of  $\ell(\tilde{a}, f)$  and the line segment  $s(e, a) \subseteq \mathcal{L}$  contains one element  $a' \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $\tilde{a}$  is in the line segment  $s(a', f) \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ . Analogously it is shown that  $\tilde{b} \in \mathcal{L}$ .  $\square$

The construction used in this proof gives rise to a geometric proof of the following.

**Lemma 4.** Effects  $e, f$  are mutually commuting if and only if  $\mathbb{1}$  lies in the plane spanned by  $e, f, \mathbb{0}$ . In that case,  $e$  and  $f$  are coexistent.

*Proof.* It is sufficient to consider the case  $e \sigma f$ . If  $e = e_0 \mathbb{1} + \mathbf{e} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}$  and  $f = f_0 \mathbb{1} + \mathbf{f} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}$  commute, then  $\mathbf{e}$  and  $\mathbf{f}$  are collinear, which entails that  $\mathbb{1}$  is in the span of  $e$  and  $f$ . The converse implication is equally immediate. Thus  $e, \mathbb{0}, f, \mathbb{1}$  form a quadrilateral in a plane  $P$ , and this quadrilateral is a subset of the intersection  $[\mathbb{0}, \mathbb{1}]_P$  of  $[\mathbb{0}, \mathbb{1}]$  with  $P$ . The parallelogram  $e, \tilde{a}, f, \tilde{b}$ , where  $\{\tilde{a}\} = \mathcal{B}(e) \cap \mathcal{B}(f)$  and  $\{\tilde{b}\} = \mathcal{F}(e) \cap \mathcal{F}(f)$ , is enclosed by a similar parallelogram in  $[\mathbb{0}, \mathbb{1}]_P$  with the set of vertices  $[(\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{1}) \cap \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{0})) \cap P] \cup \{\mathbb{0}, \mathbb{1}\}$ . Hence  $\tilde{a}, \tilde{b} \in \mathcal{L}$ .  $\square$

An algebraic proof of the coexistence of commuting effects  $e, f$  consists of verifying that  $\{ef, ef', e'f, e'f'\}$  constitutes a joint observable for  $e, f$ .

We will make use of a 3-dimensional Minkowski subspace  $M_3(\cong \mathbb{R}^3)$  of  $M_4$ , defined as the linear span of  $\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \sigma_2$ , with the orderings  $\prec, \prec_o$  carried over from  $M_4$ . For  $x, y \in M_3$ , define

$$(4) \quad x \times_o y := \begin{pmatrix} x_0 \\ x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} \times_o \begin{pmatrix} y_0 \\ y_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1 \\ x_0 y_2 - x_2 y_0 \\ x_1 y_0 - x_0 y_1 \end{pmatrix}.$$




FIGURE 1. Illustration of the proof of Lemma 3.

Hence  $x \times_o y$  is the usual vector product, but with spacelike components inverted. We will freely use the following properties.

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $x, y \in M_3$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x | x \times_o y \rangle &= \langle y | x \times_o y \rangle = 0; \\ \langle x \times_o y | \tilde{x} \times_o \tilde{y} \rangle &= \langle x | \tilde{x} \rangle \langle y | \tilde{y} \rangle - \langle x | \tilde{y} \rangle \langle \tilde{x} | y \rangle; \\ x \times_o (y \times_o z) &= y \langle x | z \rangle - z \langle x | y \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

**3.2. Reduction to  $M_3$ .** Next we consider the question of the coexistence of effects  $e, f$  which are spacelike and not mutually commuting.

We define  $M(e, f, \mathbb{1})$  as the 3-dimensional Minkowski space spanned by  $e, f$  and  $\mathbb{1}$  and equipped with the orderings  $\prec, \succ_o$  inherited from  $M_4$ . We also note that

this subspace can be identified with  $M_3$  since  $e, f$  can be unitarily transformed into elements of  $M_3$  and the relation of coexistence is invariant under unitary transformations.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $e, f \in \mathcal{L}$ ,  $e \sigma f$ ,  $e \sigma f'$ . If  $e, f$  are coexistent, then they are also coexistent in  $M(e, f, \mathbb{1})$ , that is, there is an effect  $a \in \mathcal{L} \cap M(e, f, \mathbb{1})$  such that*

$$\mathbb{0} \prec a \prec e, f \prec e + f - a \prec \mathbb{1}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\pi : M_4 \rightarrow M(e, f, \mathbb{1})$  be the linear projection satisfying  $\pi(e) = e$ ,  $\pi(f) = f$ ,  $\pi(\mathbb{1}) = \mathbb{1}$ . This map is monotone, i.e., if  $a, b \in M_4$  and  $a \prec b$ , then  $\pi(a) \prec \pi(b)$ .

Let  $a \in M_4$ ,  $a \prec e, f$  and  $e + f - a \prec \mathbb{1}$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(a) &\prec \pi(e) = e, \\ \pi(a) &\prec \pi(f) = f, \\ \pi(e) + \pi(f) - \pi(a) &= \pi(e + f - a) \prec \pi(\mathbb{1}) = \mathbb{1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $e, f$  are coexistent in  $M(e, f, \mathbb{1})$ .  $\square$

**3.3. Characterization of coexistence in  $M_3$ .** Let  $e, f \in M_3$ ,  $e \sigma f$ ,  $e \sigma f'$ . Then

$$(5) \quad d := e - f$$

is a spacelike vector,  $\langle d | d \rangle < 0$ .

Let  $H$  be the plane passing through  $\frac{1}{2}(e + f)$  which is  $\langle | \rangle$ -perpendicular to  $d$ . It is well known that the intersections  $\mathcal{B}(e) \cap \mathcal{B}(f)$  and  $\mathcal{F}(e) \cap \mathcal{F}(f)$  are the two branches of a hyperbola lying in  $H$ . (In fact, if  $a \in \mathcal{B}(e) \cap \mathcal{B}(f)$  or  $a \in \mathcal{F}(e) \cap \mathcal{F}(f)$ , then  $\langle e - a | e - a \rangle = 0 = \langle f - a | f - a \rangle$ , and it follows immediately that  $\langle \frac{1}{2}(e + f) - a | e - f \rangle = 0$ .)

Utilizing Lemma 3, the coexistence of  $e, f$  is equivalent to the statement that there exists an  $a \in M_3$  such that  $a \in \mathcal{B}(e) \cap \mathcal{B}(f) \cap \mathcal{L}$  and  $e + f - a \in \mathcal{F}(e) \cap \mathcal{F}(f) \cap \mathcal{L}$ . Writing  $a = \frac{1}{2}(e + f) - v$ , these conditions are spelled out as follows:

(i)  $a \in H$  is equivalent to

$$(6) \quad \langle v | d \rangle = 0.$$

(ii)  $a \in \mathcal{B}(e) \cap \mathcal{B}(f)$  and  $e + f - a \in \mathcal{F}(e) \cap \mathcal{F}(f)$  are both equivalent to

$$(7) \quad \langle v \pm \frac{1}{2}d | v \pm \frac{1}{2}d \rangle = \langle v | v \rangle + \frac{1}{4} \langle d | d \rangle = 0$$

$$(8) \quad v_0 \geq \frac{1}{2}|d_0|.$$

(iii) The conditions  $a \succ \mathbb{0}$  and  $b = e + f - a \prec \mathbb{1}$  specify two bounded segments  $\mathcal{S}_a$  and  $\mathcal{S}_b$  of admissible elements  $a$  on the hyperbola  $\mathcal{B}(e) \cap \mathcal{B}(f)$ . The end points of these segments are determined by  $a \succ_o \mathbb{0}$ , that is,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \langle a | a \rangle = \frac{1}{4} \langle e + f | e + f \rangle + \langle v | v \rangle - \langle e + f | v \rangle \\ (9) \quad &= \langle e | f \rangle - \langle e + f | v \rangle, \quad \text{for } \mathcal{S}_a, \quad [\text{using (7)}] \end{aligned}$$

$$(10) \quad 0 \leq a_0 = \frac{1}{2}(e_0 + f_0) - v_0,$$

and  $e + f - a \prec_o \mathbb{1}$ , that is,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \langle \mathbb{1} + a - e - f \mid \mathbb{1} + a - e - f \rangle \\
&= 1 + \frac{1}{4} \langle e + f \mid e + f \rangle + \langle v \mid v \rangle - \langle \mathbb{1} \mid e + v \rangle \\
&\quad - 2 \langle \mathbb{1} \mid v \rangle + \langle e + f \mid v \rangle \\
(11) \quad &= \langle e' \mid f' \rangle - \langle e' + f' \mid v \rangle \quad \text{for } \mathcal{S}_b, \quad [\text{using (7)}]
\end{aligned}$$

$$(12) \quad 0 \leq 1 - e_0 - f_0 + a_0 = \frac{1}{2}(e'_0 + f'_0) - v_0.$$

Note that in (9) and (11) we have used (7).

It can be shown that (10) and (12) already follow from the remaining conditions and hence can be neglected as far as equivalence to the coexistence of  $e$  and  $f$  is concerned. Geometrically, (10) holds since the hyperbola  $\mathcal{B}(e) \cap \mathcal{B}(f)$  intersects  $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{O})$  in exactly two points, or touches  $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{O})$  at a single point in special cases. On the other hand,  $\mathcal{B}(e) \cap \mathcal{B}(f) \cap \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{O}) = \emptyset$  or, in special cases,  $\mathcal{B}(e) \cap \mathcal{B}(f) \cap \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{O}) = \{0\}$ . Analogous arguments apply to (12).

Next, it can be shown that  $\mathcal{S}_a \neq \emptyset$  since  $\mathbb{O} \prec e, f$  and, by arguing analogously as in the proof of lemma 3, we may conclude that there exists an  $a \in \mathcal{L}$  such that  $a \prec_o e, f$ . Similarly, one can show that  $\mathcal{S}_b \neq \emptyset$ . But it may happen that  $\mathcal{S}_a$  as well as  $\mathcal{S}_b$  degenerate into a single point.

Now we introduce a suitable parametrization. Let  $g_+, g_-$  be a basis of the 2-dimensional subspace parallel to the plane  $H$ ; a specific choice of  $g_{\pm}$  will be made shortly. We write

$$(13) \quad a = \frac{1}{2}(e + f) - v = \frac{1}{2}(e + f) - \lambda g_+ - \mu g_-.$$

Then the above conditions read as follows. Eq. (6) is automatically fulfilled since  $g_{\pm}$  are perpendicular to  $d$ ,

$$(14) \quad \langle g_{\pm} \mid d \rangle = 0.$$

The hyperbola equation (7) becomes

$$(15) \quad \lambda^2 \langle g_+ \mid g_+ \rangle + \mu^2 \langle g_- \mid g_- \rangle + 2\lambda\mu \langle g_+ \mid g_- \rangle + \frac{1}{4} \langle d \mid d \rangle = 0.$$

The conditions (9) and (11) translate into

$$(16) \quad \lambda \langle e + f \mid g_+ \rangle + \mu \langle e + f \mid g_- \rangle = \langle e \mid f \rangle \quad \text{for } \mathcal{S}_a$$

and

$$(17) \quad \lambda \langle e' + f' \mid g_+ \rangle + \mu \langle e' + f' \mid g_- \rangle = \langle e' \mid f' \rangle \quad \text{for } \mathcal{S}_b.$$

We require that  $\langle e + f \mid g_+ \rangle = 0 = \langle e' + f' \mid g_- \rangle$ , which is realized by

$$(18) \quad g_+ = d \times_o (e + f) = 2e \times_o f,$$

$$(19) \quad g_- = -d \times_o (e' + f') = 2e' \times_o f'.$$

With these choices one obtains

$$(20) \quad \langle e' + f' \mid g_+ \rangle = \langle e + f \mid g_- \rangle = 2 \langle \mathbb{1} \mid g_+ \rangle = 4(e \times_o f)_0 = 4(e_1 f_2 - e_2 f_1).$$




FIGURE 2. One branch  $\mathcal{H}$  of the hyperbola described by Eq.(15) together with the segments  $\mathcal{S}_a$  and  $\mathcal{S}_b$  defined by  $\mu \leq \mu_0$  and  $\lambda \leq \lambda_0$ , respectively. To every point in  $\mathcal{S}_a \cap \mathcal{S}_b$  there exist effects  $a$  and  $b$  satisfying Eq.(1) and hence  $e$  and  $f$  are coexistent.

The above linear equations (16) and (17) for the end points of  $\mathcal{S}_a, \mathcal{S}_b$  now assume the form

$$(21) \quad \mu = \frac{\langle e|f \rangle}{4(e_1 f_2 - e_2 f_1)} = \pm \frac{\langle e|f \rangle}{4|e_1 f_2 - e_2 f_1|} =: \pm \mu_0 \quad \text{for } \mathcal{S}_a,$$

$$(22) \quad \lambda = \frac{\langle e'|f' \rangle}{4(e_1 f_2 - e_2 f_1)} = \pm \frac{\langle e'|f' \rangle}{4|e_1 f_2 - e_2 f_1|} =: \pm \lambda_0 \quad \text{for } \mathcal{S}_b.$$

These two equations describe lines intersecting the hyperbola (15), thus cutting out the two bounded segments  $\mathcal{S}_a$  and  $\mathcal{S}_b$ , see Fig. 2. We summarize:

**Lemma 6.** *Let  $e, f \in \mathcal{L}$ , and let  $a$  be as given in (13) with  $\lambda, \mu$  satisfying (15). Then*

$$e, f \text{ coexistent} \iff \mathcal{S}_a \cap \mathcal{S}_b \neq \emptyset \iff |\lambda| \leq \lambda_0 \ \& \ |\mu| \leq \mu_0.$$

As a consistency check one can verify that the spacelike vectors  $g_+, g_-$  satisfy the inverted Schwartz inequality

$$(23) \quad \langle g_+ | g_+ \rangle \langle g_- | g_- \rangle - \langle g_+ | g_- \rangle^2 < 0,$$

which is the determinant condition ensuring that (15) describes a hyperbola. The proof of inequality (23) goes as follows:

$$\langle g_+ | g_+ \rangle \langle g_- | g_- \rangle - \langle g_+ | g_- \rangle^2 = \langle g_+ \times_o g_- | g_+ \times_o g_- \rangle < 0$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} g_+ \times_o g_- &= [d \times_o (e + f)] \times [-d \times (e' + f')] \\ &= -d \langle e' + f' | d \times_o (e + f) \rangle + (e' + f') \langle d | d \times_o (e + f) \rangle \\ &= -d \langle e' + f' | d \times_o (e + f) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

is spacelike.

We also compute the inner products separately:

$$(24) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle g_+ | g_+ \rangle &= 4 \left[ \langle e | e \rangle \langle f | f \rangle - \langle e | f \rangle^2 \right] \equiv 4C(e, f) \\ &= 4(|\mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{f}|^2 - \mathbf{d}_1^2) \end{aligned}$$

$$(25) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle g_- | g_- \rangle &= 4 \left[ \langle e' | e' \rangle \langle f' | f' \rangle - \langle e' | f' \rangle^2 \right] \equiv 4C(e', f') \\ &= (|\mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{f}|^2 - \mathbf{d}_2^2) \end{aligned}$$

$$(26) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle g_+ | g_- \rangle &= 4 \left[ \langle e | e' \rangle \langle f | f' \rangle - \langle e | f' \rangle \langle e' | f \rangle \right] \equiv 4D(e, f) \\ &= (|\mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{f}|^2 + \mathbf{d}_1 \cdot \mathbf{d}_2). \end{aligned}$$

Here we use the abbreviations

$$(27) \quad \mathbf{d}_1 \equiv f_0 \mathbf{e} - e_0 \mathbf{f}, \quad \mathbf{d}_2 \equiv (1 - f_0) \mathbf{e} - (1 - e_0) \mathbf{f}.$$

The first two quantities are negative since  $e, f$  are timelike and not collinear, and similarly for  $e', f'$ .

We will show that the last term  $\langle g_+ | g_- \rangle > 0$ . This is required for consistency, since we already found above that the two linear equations defining the end points of the two segments  $\mathcal{S}_a, \mathcal{S}_b$  of a hyperbola branch require that  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  have the same sign, that is, the branch must lie in either the first or third quadrant of the  $\lambda - \mu$  plane.

**Lemma 7.** *For all  $e, f \in \mathcal{L} \cap M_3$  such that  $e \sigma f$  we have  $D(e, f) \equiv \langle e' | e \rangle \langle f' | f \rangle - \langle e' | f \rangle \langle f' | e \rangle \geq 0$  and the equality sign applies if and only if  $e$  and  $f$  are linearly dependent.*

*Proof.*  $D(e, f)$  can be written as a determinant,

$$(28) \quad D(e, f) = \begin{vmatrix} \langle e' | e \rangle & \langle e' | f \rangle \\ \langle f' | e \rangle & \langle f' | f \rangle \end{vmatrix}.$$

If  $D(e, f) = 0$ , the corresponding matrix will have a non-zero eigenvector  $\begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{pmatrix}$  with eigenvalue 0. Hence  $\langle e' | \alpha e + \beta f \rangle = \langle f' | \alpha e + \beta f \rangle = 0$  and  $u \equiv \alpha e + \beta f \in$






FIGURE 3. The only case where  $\mathcal{S}_a \cap \mathcal{S}_b = \emptyset$  occurs if  $\lambda_0 < \lambda_Q$ ,  $\mu_0 < \mu_P$  and  $S = (\lambda_0, \mu_0)$  lies outside the convex hull of the hyperbola  $\mathcal{H}$ .

$\text{span}(e, f) \cap \text{span}(g_-)$ . This is only possible if  $u = 0$ , that is, if  $e$  and  $f$  are linearly dependent; otherwise  $\text{span}(e, f)$  would contain two  $\langle | \rangle$ -orthogonal subspaces spanned by the spacelike vectors  $d = e - f$  and  $g_-$ .

Conversely,  $D(e, f)$  vanishes if  $e$  and  $f$  are linearly dependent. It follows that  $D : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a non-vanishing continuous function defined on the connected domain  $\mathcal{D} \equiv \{(e, f) \in (\mathcal{L} \cap M_3) \times (\mathcal{L} \cap M_3) : e \sigma f \text{ and } e, f \text{ are linearly independent}\}$ . The sign of  $D(e, f)$  thus cannot change and can be determined by evaluation at

some arbitrary point  $(e, f) \in \mathcal{D}$ , say,  $e = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $f = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ , which yields

$$D(e, f) = \frac{3}{16} > 0. \quad \square$$

Considering Fig. 2, let  $\mathcal{H}$  be the branch of the hyperbola (15) representing  $\mathcal{F}(e)$  and  $\mathcal{F}(f)$ . We may assume that it lies in the first quadrant ( $\lambda \geq 0, \mu \geq 0$ ); otherwise, we would swap  $e$  and  $f$ . We will eventually write the resulting inequalities in a symmetric fashion w. r. t.  $e$  and  $f$ ; hence the case where  $\mathcal{H}$  lies in the third quadrant need not be considered separately.

Let  $P$  and  $Q$  be the points of  $\mathcal{H}$  which have a tangent parallel to the  $\mu$ -axis and  $\lambda$ -axis, respectively, see Fig. 3, with coordinates  $(\lambda_P, \mu_P)$  and  $(\lambda_Q, \mu_Q)$ . After a

short calculation we obtain

$$(29) \quad \mu_P^2 = -\frac{1}{4} \frac{\langle d|d \rangle \langle g_+|g_- \rangle^2}{\langle g_-|g_- \rangle (\langle g_+|g_+ \rangle \langle g_-|g_- \rangle - \langle g_+|g_- \rangle^2)},$$

$$(30) \quad \lambda_Q^2 = -\frac{1}{4} \frac{\langle d|d \rangle \langle g_+|g_- \rangle^2}{\langle g_+|g_+ \rangle (\langle g_+|g_+ \rangle \langle g_-|g_- \rangle - \langle g_+|g_- \rangle^2)}.$$

We have always:

$$(31) \quad P \in \mathcal{S}_a \quad \text{and} \quad Q \in \mathcal{S}_b.$$

Hence,

$$(32) \quad \mu_0 \geq \mu_P \implies \mathcal{S}_a \cap \mathcal{S}_b \neq \emptyset;$$

$$(33) \quad \lambda_0 \geq \lambda_Q \implies \mathcal{S}_a \cap \mathcal{S}_b \neq \emptyset.$$

In the remaining case of

$$(34) \quad \mu_0 < \mu_P \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_0 < \lambda_Q$$

we have:

$$(35) \quad \mathcal{S}_a \cap \mathcal{S}_b \neq \emptyset$$

$$(36) \quad \iff S := (\lambda_0, \mu_0) \in \text{conv}(\mathcal{H}) \quad (\text{convex hull; see Fig. 3})$$

$$(37) \quad \iff \lambda_0^2 \langle g_+|g_+ \rangle + \mu_0^2 \langle g_-|g_- \rangle + 2\lambda_0\mu_0 \langle g_+|g_- \rangle + \frac{1}{4} \langle d|d \rangle \geq 0.$$

**3.4. Final result.** We will summarize our final result by writing all terms in the inequalities in a form that is invariant under spatial rotations. For example,  $|e_1 f_2 - e_2 f_1|^2 = |\mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{f}|^2 = -\frac{1}{12} \text{tr}([e, f]^2) = \frac{1}{4} \|[e, f]\|^2$ . In this way the result will be generally valid in  $M_4$ ; the previous reduction to  $M_3$  was only made for the sake of simplifying the proofs. We will utilize the following abbreviations, which have partly been introduced before, and assume that  $e, f \in \mathcal{L} \subset M_4$ :

$$(38) \quad d = e - f,$$

$$(39) \quad D(e, f) = \langle e|e' \rangle \langle f|f' \rangle - \langle e|f' \rangle \langle f|e' \rangle,$$

$$(40) \quad C(e, f) = \langle e|e \rangle \langle f|f \rangle - \langle e|f \rangle^2,$$

$$(41) \quad \Delta(e, f) = C(e, f)C(e', f') - D(e, f)^2.$$

With these notations, the (sufficient) coexistence conditions  $\mu_0^2 \geq \mu_P^2$ ,  $\lambda_0^2 \geq \lambda_Q^2$  and (37) assume the form

$$(42) \quad 0 \leq \frac{\langle e|f \rangle^2}{|\mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{f}|^2} + \frac{\langle d|d \rangle D(e, f)^2}{C(e', f') \Delta(e, f)},$$

$$(43) \quad 0 \leq \frac{\langle e'|f' \rangle^2}{|\mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{f}|^2} + \frac{\langle d|d \rangle D(e, f)^2}{C(e, f) \Delta(e, f)},$$

$$(44) \quad 0 \leq \frac{\langle e|f \rangle \langle e'|f' \rangle}{|\mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{f}|^2} D(e, f) + \frac{1}{2|\mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{f}|^2} \left( \langle e'|f' \rangle^2 C(e, f) + \langle e|f \rangle^2 C(e', f') \right) + \frac{1}{2} \langle d|d \rangle,$$

respectively. On rearranging terms we obtain:

$$(45) \quad -\langle d|d\rangle|\mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{f}|^2 D(e, f)^2 \leq \langle e|f\rangle^2 C(e', f') \Delta(e, f),$$

$$(46) \quad -\langle d|d\rangle|\mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{f}|^2 D(e, f)^2 \leq \langle e'|f'\rangle^2 C(e, f) \Delta(e, f),$$

$$(47) \quad -\langle d|d\rangle|\mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{f}|^2 \leq 2\langle e|f\rangle\langle e'|f'\rangle D(e, f) \\ + \langle e'|f'\rangle^2 C(e, f) + \langle e|f\rangle^2 C(e', f').$$

The first two inequalities can be simplified as follows. Using the explicit expressions of Eqs. (24)-(26), a straightforward but gory calculation shows that

$$(48) \quad \Delta(e, f) = \langle d|d\rangle|\mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{f}|^2.$$

Next, note that

$$(49) \quad \langle e|f\rangle^2 = -C(e, f) + \langle e|e\rangle\langle f|f\rangle, \\ \langle e'|f'\rangle^2 = -C(e', f') + \langle e'|e'\rangle\langle f'|f'\rangle.$$

Substituting these expressions into Eqs. (45), (46), these inequalities assume the form:

$$(50) \quad -\langle d|d\rangle|\mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{f}|^2 \leq -\langle e|e\rangle\langle f|f\rangle C(e', f'),$$

$$(51) \quad -\langle d|d\rangle|\mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{f}|^2 \leq -\langle e'|e'\rangle\langle f'|f'\rangle C(e, f).$$

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $e, f \in \mathcal{L} \subset M_4$ . Then  $e$  and  $f$  are coexistent if and only if at least one of the following conditions is satisfied:*

$$(52) \quad e \prec f \text{ or } f \prec e \quad \text{or} \quad e \prec f' \text{ or } f' \prec e;$$

$$(53) \quad 0 = [e, f];$$

$$(54) \quad -\langle d|d\rangle|\mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{f}|^2 \leq -\langle e|e\rangle\langle f|f\rangle C(e', f'),$$

$$(55) \quad -\langle d|d\rangle|\mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{f}|^2 \leq -\langle e'|e'\rangle\langle f'|f'\rangle C(e, f),$$

$$(56) \quad -\langle d|d\rangle|\mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{f}|^2 \leq 2\langle e|f\rangle\langle e'|f'\rangle D(e, f) \\ + \langle e'|f'\rangle^2 C(e, f) + \langle e|f\rangle^2 C(e', f').$$

#### 4. DISCUSSION

A special case of Theorem 3 was proven in [2]:

$$e = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{1} + \mathbf{e} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \quad f = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{1} + \mathbf{f} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} \quad \text{are coexistent}$$

$$(57) \quad \iff |\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{f}| + |\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{f}| \leq 1$$

$$(58) \quad \iff 16|\mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{f}|^2 \leq (1 - 4\mathbf{e}^2)(1 - 4\mathbf{f}^2).$$

A quick calculation shows that for the given form of effects, (57), (58) are indeed equivalent to (56), and furthermore, that conditions (54) and (55) become identical and imply (54). This latter condition follows also if  $e, f$  commute. Either of the conditions  $e \prec f, f \prec e, e \prec f', f' \prec e$  imply that the two effects being compared are actually equal, so that they commute. It thus follows that the condition (56) is indeed necessary and sufficient for the coexistence of  $e, f$  if  $e_0 = f_0 = 1/2$ .

In this particular case, the coexistence condition in the form (58) has a simple operational meaning as explained in [3]: the quantities  $1 - 4\mathbf{e}^2$  and  $1 - 4\mathbf{f}^2$  are measures of the *unsharpness* of  $e, f$ , so that according to this inequality the degrees of unsharpness of a coexistent pair of effects  $e, f$  cannot simultaneously be made small if  $e, f$  do not commute.

*Note added.* A paper with identical title is being published on the arXiv simultaneously by Teiko Heinosaari, Daniel Reitzner and Peter Stano. These authors solve the same problem independently with a different method. The final results have yet to be compared.

## REFERENCES

- [1] G. Ludwig, *Deutung des Begriffs "physikalische Theorie" und axiomatische Grundlegung der Hilbertraumstruktur durch Hauptsätze des Messens*, Lecture Notes in Physics Vol. 4, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1970).
- [2] P. Busch, Unsharp reality and joint measurements for spin observables, *Phys. Rev. D* **33**, 2253–2261 (1986).
- [3] P. Busch, T. Heinonen, Approximate joint measurements of qubit observables, arXiv:quant-ph/0706.1415 (2007).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF YORK, YORK, UK  
*E-mail address:* `pb516@york.ac.uk`

UNIVERSITÄT OSNABRÜCK, FACHBEREICH PHYSIK, OSNABRÜCK, GERMANY  
*E-mail address:* `hschmidt@uni-osnabrueck.de`