

A Protocol for Quantum Energy Distribution

Masahiro Hotta

*Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, Tohoku University,
Sendai, 980-8578, Japan
hotta@tuhep.phys.tohoku.ac.jp*

Abstract

In this paper, a protocol called quantum energy distribution(QED) is proposed in which multi-parties can simultaneously extract positive energy on average from spin chains by use of common secret keys shared by an energy supplier. QED is robust against impersonation. An adversary, who does not have common secret keys and attempts to get energy, cannot obtain but give energy to spin chains. Total amount of energy transfer gives a lower bound of residual energy of a local cooling process by the energy supplier.

1 Introduction

Quantum teleportation [1] transfers any unknown quantum state to distant places only by local operations and classical communication (LOCC). It has attracted much attention and been widely investigated. Today, it is considered [2] as a crucial building block of quantum communication. Recently, a new protocol named quantum energy teleportation (QET) in spin-chain systems has been proposed[3], which transports energy from one location to another only by LOCC. Entanglement of spin-chain ground states plays an essential role to realize QET.

The protocol for QET [3] has been proposed for general spin chains with entangled ground states. Even before the advent of QET, spin chain systems have been hot topics of quantum information theory, because it is possible to apply it to short transmission of quantum information[4]. It is also known [5]that spin-chain entanglement is important to shed new light on complicated physical properties of ground states.

In the QET protocol, a receiver of classical information from an energy supplier extracts positive energy from the ground state, accompanied by generation negative energy density in spin chain systems. Here, the zero of energy in the system is naturally defined by a value of the ground state. Though the concept of negative energy density is not so familiar to quantum information theory and quantum communication, it has been investigated in relativistic field theory for long time [6]. Detailed analysis for the spin chains can be seen in [3].

In this paper, an extended protocol is proposed, in which many authenticated consumers are able to simultaneously extract energy from the ground state by use of common secret keys shared by an energy supplier. Let us later call the protocol quantum energy distribution (QED). QED shows robustness against impersonation. Let us imagine that an illegal consumer appears, who does not have common secret keys and attempts to get energy from spin chains. Then we can conclude that the adversary does not obtain but give energy to the spin chains. We also notice that total amount of energy transfer of QED is related with local cooling. Local cooling is a short-time process in which energy is extracted from an excited system only by local operations at a certain site, without use of global time evolution generated by the system dynamics. In general, local cooling is unable to extract all energy of the ex-

cited system and residual energy remains in the system. The total amount of energy distributed via QED gives a lower bound of that residual energy of a supplier's local cooling for an excited state. We also analyze QET and QED protocols in the Ising spin chain system. Amount of energy transmission is evaluated depending on distance from the supplier.

We confine our attention to short-time-scale processes in which dynamical evolution induced by the Hamiltonian is negligible. Meanwhile let us assume that classical communication between qubits can be repeated many times even in the short time interval.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we briefly review QET. In section 3, extending QET, a QED protocol is proposed. In section 4, we discuss a relation between QED and local cooling. In section 5, we analyze the Ising spin chain system and demonstrate the QED protocol. In the final section, conclusion is given.

2 Brief Review of QET

In this section, we shortly review QET. Detailed explanation is seen in [3], including negative-energy physics of spin chains. Let us consider a very long spin chain system with Hamiltonian given by

$$H = \sum_n T_n,$$

where T_n is the n th site energy density operator. In order to capture the essence of QET, let us focus on the nearest neighborhood interaction case. The operator T_n is Hermitian and take the form of

$$T_n = \sum_{\gamma} \prod_{m=n-1}^{n+1} O_m^{(n,\gamma)},$$

where $O_m^{(n,\gamma)}$ is a local Hermitian operator at site m . The ground state $|g\rangle$ is an eigenstate with the lowest eigenvalue of H . When we do not take account of gravitational interaction, absolute values of energy is irrelevant and just

difference of values makes sense. Hence, subtracting constants from energy density and the Hamiltonian, we obtain the following relations without loss of generality.

$$\langle g|T_n|g\rangle = 0, \quad (1)$$

$$H|g\rangle = 0. \quad (2)$$

Due to Eq.(2), the Hamiltonian becomes nonnegative:

$$H \geq 0.$$

In many models, $|g\rangle$ is a complicated entangled state. Using the entanglement, Alice who stays at site n_A can transport energy to Bob at site n_B only by LOCC. Taking account of the nearest neighborhood interactions, let us define localized energy operators of Alice and Bob as follows.

$$H_A = \sum_{n=n_A-1}^{n_A+1} T_n,$$

$$H_B = \sum_{n=n_B-1}^{n_B+1} T_n.$$

For later convenience, let us introduce several operators as follows. U_A and U_B are unitary Hermitian operators given by

$$U_A = \vec{n}_A \cdot \vec{\sigma}_{n_A}, \quad (3)$$

$$U_B = \vec{n}_B \cdot \vec{\sigma}_{n_B},$$

where $\vec{\sigma}$ are Pauli vector matrices, \vec{n}_A and \vec{n}_B are three-dimensional real unit vectors. The operator U_A can be spectral decomposed into

$$U_A = \sum_{\mu=0,1} (-1)^\mu P_A(\mu),$$

where $P_A(\mu)$ is a projective operator onto the eigenspace with an eigenvalue $(-1)^\mu$ of U_A . \dot{U}_B is time-derivative operator of U_B defined by

$$\dot{U}_B = i[H_B, U_B] = i[H, U_B].$$

Next let us introduce two real coefficients as follows.

$$\xi = \langle g|U_B^\dagger H U_B|g\rangle > 0, \quad (4)$$

$$\eta = \langle g|U_A \dot{U}_B|g\rangle. \quad (5)$$

Also define an angle parameter θ which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \cos(2\theta) &= \frac{\xi}{\sqrt{\xi^2 + \eta^2}}, \\ \sin(2\theta) &= -\frac{\eta}{\sqrt{\xi^2 + \eta^2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally we define a unitary matrix $V_B(\mu)$ for $\mu = 0, 1$ as follows.

$$V_B(\mu) = I \cos \theta + i(-1)^\mu U_B \sin \theta. \quad (6)$$

The parameter η is important for QET. If $|g\rangle$ is separable, we can generally prove that η vanishes. As seen below, QET transports no energy when $\eta = 0$. Thus, in later discussion, we assume that $|g\rangle$ is an entangled state such that $\eta \neq 0$.

In order to perform QET, let us assume that Alice is a good distance from Bob such that

$$|n_A - n_B| \geq 5,$$

and that Alice and Bob share many copies of spin chain systems in the ground state $|g\rangle$. Now let me explain the protocol explicitly. The protocol is composed of three steps as follows.

(1) Alice performs a local projective measurement of the observable U_A for the ground state $|g\rangle$. Assume that she obtains the measurement result μ . She must input energy E_A on average to the spin chain system in order to achieve that local measurement.

(2) Alice announces to Bob the result μ by a classical channel.

(3) Bob performs a local unitary operation $V_B(\mu)$ to his qubit at site n_B , depending on the value of μ . Bob obtains energy output E_B on average from the spin chain system in this process.

It is noticed [3] that the average input energy E_A is evaluated as

$$E_A = \sum_{\mu=0,1} \langle g | P_A(\mu) H P_A(\mu) | g \rangle > 0. \quad (7)$$

A positive amount of energy E_B is released to Bob's devices for the operation $V_B(\mu)$ in step (3). E_B is given by

$$E_B = \frac{1}{2} \left[\sqrt{\xi^2 + \eta^2} - \xi \right]. \quad (8)$$

It is stressed that dissipation effect of transferred energy in channels can be completely neglected for QET because we transmit only classical information through a classical channel.

In the above analysis, it has been argued that Bob actually obtains energy from the spin chain system. However, even after the last step of the protocol, there exists energy E_A , that Alice first deposited to the spin chain by herself. Then a natural question arises. Does Bob extract positive energy without any cost? This apparent paradox can be resolved from the viewpoint of entanglement breaking by Alice. Detailed explanation is seen in [3]. It is concluded that, based on a pledge of E_A , Bob knowing classical information μ has borrowed E_B in advance from the spin chains. When global cooling induced by both long-time evolution of the system and extraction of energy makes the state approaching the ground state, the residual energy and negative energy $-E_B$ around site n_B are compensated.

In the QET protocol, classical channels for Alice to inform measurement results are not assumed private and secure. Therefore, anybody can extract energy from spin chains by listening to the measurement results announced by Alice. In the next section, an extended protocol is proposed in which legitimate multi-users can extract energy but illegal users are unable to steal energy from spin chains at all.

3 Quantum Energy Distribution

In this section, a QED protocol is proposed, in which M consumers C_m ($m = 1 \sim M$) can simultaneously extract energy from spin chains by use of secret

classical information sent by an energy supplier S . The protocol is an extension of QET assisted by quantum key distribution(QKD). Let us consider that S stays at $n = 0$. Assume that the spin chain is so long that we are able to treat the number of sites as infinite and that the entangled ground state has a very large (or divergent) correlation length. Let us assume the sites of S and C_m are separated from each other such that

$$\begin{aligned} |n_{C_m}| &\geq 5, \\ |n_{C_m} - n_{C_{m'}}| &\geq 5. \end{aligned}$$

Here let us introduce U_S and V_{C_m} as follows.

$$U_S = \vec{n}_S \cdot \vec{\sigma}_0 = \sum_{\mu=0,1} (-1)^\mu P_S(\mu),$$

$$V_m(\mu) = I \cos \theta + i (-1)^\mu U_m \sin \theta,$$

where $P_S(\mu)$ is a projective operator onto the eigensubspace with an eigenvalue $(-1)^\mu$ of U_S ,

$$U_m = \vec{n}_m \cdot \vec{\sigma}_{n_{C_m}},$$

and \vec{n}_S and \vec{n}_m are real normal vectors. The localized energy operators for those consumers are given by

$$H_{C_m} = \sum_{n=n_{C_m}-1}^{n_{C_m}+1} T_n.$$

Let us also define a time-derivative operator of U_m as

$$\dot{U}_m = i [H, U_m] = i [H_{C_m}, U_m].$$

Consider that supplier S and any consumer C_m share common secret short keys k for their identification, by which they are able to perform secure QKD in order for S to send secret classical information to those consumers. Because any protocol for QKD including BB84[7] is effective, we do not specify QKD protocols. Also assume that all C_m and S share a set of many spin chains in the ground state $|g\rangle$. Now let me explain the protocol explicitly. The protocol is composed of the following six steps.

(1) S performs a local projective measurement of observable U_S for the ground state $|g\rangle$. Assume that S obtains the measurement result μ . S must

input energy E_S on average to the spin chain in order to achieve that local measurement. E_S is evaluated as

$$E_S = \sum_{\mu=0,1} \langle g | P_S(\mu) H P_S(\mu) | g \rangle.$$

(2) S authenticates C_m by use of common secret short keys k .

(3) S and authenticated C_m 's generate and share sufficiently-long pseudo-random secret keys K via a protocol for QKD.

(4) S encodes the measurement results μ by use of K and sends to authenticated C_m 's.

(5) C_m decodes the measurement results μ by use of K .

(6) C_m 's perform a local unitary operation $V_m(\mu)$ in Eq.(6) to their qubits, depending on the value of μ . Each C_m obtains energy output E_m on average from the spin chains in this process. E_m is given by

$$E_m = \frac{1}{2} \left[\sqrt{\xi_m^2 + \eta_m^2} - \xi_m \right], \quad (9)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_m &= \langle g | U_m^\dagger H U_m | g \rangle, \\ \eta_m &= \langle g | U_S \dot{U}_m | g \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

After step (6), the quantum state is given by

$$\rho_{QED}^{(6)} = \sum_{\mu=0,1} \left(\prod_m V_m(\mu) \right) P_S(\mu) | g \rangle \langle g | P_S(\mu) \left(\prod_m V_m^\dagger(\mu) \right). \quad (10)$$

This QED protocol is robust against impersonation attack. Let us imagine that an illegal consumer Derick appears at site n_D , who does not have k and attempts to get energy from spin chains. Then we can conclude that Derick does not obtain but give energy to the spin chains. The reason is following. Because Derick cannot get no information about μ , Derick makes randomly two local operations $V_D(0)$ and $V_D(1)$ given by

$$V_D(\mu) = I \cos \theta + i (-1)^\mu \vec{n}_D \cdot \vec{\sigma}_{n_D} \sin \theta.$$

Then, instead of Eq.(10), the final state becomes

$$\rho_D = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu, \mu'} V_D(\mu') \left(\prod_m V_m^\dagger(\mu) \right) P_S(\mu) |g\rangle \langle g| P_S(\mu) \left(\prod_m V_m^\dagger(\mu) \right) V_D^\dagger(\mu').$$

Evaluation of the average localized energy around Derick is straightforward and gives a positive value such that

$$\text{Tr}[\rho_D H_D] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu'=0,1} \langle g|V_D^\dagger(\mu') H V_D(\mu') |g\rangle > 0.$$

Here we have used

$$\left[\prod_m V_m(\mu), V_D^\dagger(\mu') H_D V_D(\mu') \right] = 0,$$

$$\left[P_S(\mu), V_D^\dagger(\mu') H_D V_D(\mu') \right] = 0,$$

and

$$\langle g|V_D^\dagger(\mu') H_D V_D(\mu') |g\rangle = \langle g|V_D^\dagger(\mu') H V_D(\mu') |g\rangle.$$

Because the value of $\text{Tr}[\rho_D H_D]$ is positive, Derick must input energy on average to the spin chains without gain.

Finally we add a comment that it is possible to array an infinite number of consumers in the most dense distribution by putting consumers at $n = 5m$ for nonzero integer m . The total amount of energy gain by the consumers is defined by

$$E_C = - \sum_{m \neq 0} \text{Tr} \left[\rho_{QED}^{(6)} H_{C_m} \right] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m \neq 0} \left[\sqrt{\xi_m^2 + \eta_m^2} - \xi_m \right]. \quad (11)$$

4 Local Cooling by Energy Supplier

In this section, we discuss a relation between QED and a local cooling process by the energy supplier S of QED. In step (1) of the previous QED protocol,

S must deposit energy E_A to the spin chain. Let us imagine that S stops the protocol soon after step (1) and attempts to completely withdraw E_A by local operations. By a similar argument in [3], it is shown that this attempt never succeeds. In step (1), S breaks entanglement between S 's qubit and other qubits and the entanglement cannot be recovered only by local operations. (Of course, for a long time interval beyond the short time scale that we have considered, local cooling is naturally expected to make residual energy approaching zero by an assist of dynamical evolution induced by nonlocal Hamiltonians. The time evolution is able to recover the entanglement broken by S .) Hence, there exists nonvanishing residual energy E_r of the local cooling. Though explicit values of E_r can be obtained for a special class of spin chain systems, including the Ising spin chain analyzed in the next section, the evaluation of E_r is not so easy for general spin chains. However, E_C in Eq.(11) generally gives a lower bound of E_r .

The reason is following. Let us consider a general local operation of S , which is expressed by use of μ -dependent measurement operators $M_S(\alpha, \mu)$ satisfying

$$\sum_{\alpha} M_S^{\dagger}(\alpha, \mu) M_S(\alpha, \mu) = I.$$

Then the quantum state after that local cooling by S is given by

$$\rho_c = \sum_{\mu, \alpha} M_S(\alpha, \mu) P_S(\mu) |g\rangle\langle g| P_S(\mu) M_S^{\dagger}(\alpha, \mu). \quad (12)$$

The residual energy E_r is evaluated as

$$E_r = \min_{\{M_S(\alpha, \mu)\}} \text{Tr}[\rho_c H_S], \quad (13)$$

where H_S is the energy density of S given by

$$H_S = \sum_{n=-1}^1 T_n.$$

The key point is that the value of E_r can be calculated from the quantum state of QED. If S performs the above local cooling after the end of the QED protocol, the quantum state is transformed from that in Eq.(10) to

$$\rho_{QED}^{(C)} = \sum_{\mu\alpha} M_S(\alpha, \mu) \left(\prod_{m \neq 0} V_m(\mu) \right) P_S(\mu) |g\rangle\langle g| P_S(\mu) \left(\prod_{m \neq 0} V_m^{\dagger}(\mu) \right) M_S^{\dagger}(\alpha, \mu).$$

Here it is easily proven that

$$\text{Tr} \left[\rho_{QED}^{(C)} H_S \right] = \text{Tr} [\rho_c H_S]$$

because $M_S(\alpha, \mu)$ and $V_m(\mu)$ commute with each other. Thus E_r is rewritten as

$$E_r = \min_{\{M_S(\alpha, \mu)\}} \text{Tr} \left[\rho_{QED}^{(C)} H_S \right]. \quad (14)$$

It is stressed that the following relation should hold because of nonnegativity of H .

$$\text{Tr} \left[\rho_{QED}^{(C)} H \right] = \text{Tr} \left[\rho_{QED}^{(C)} H_S \right] + \sum_{m \neq 0} \text{Tr} \left[\rho_{QED}^{(C)} H_{C_m} \right] \geq 0. \quad (15)$$

Moreover, it is shown that

$$\sum_{m \neq 0} \text{Tr} \left[\rho_{QED}^{(C)} H_{C_m} \right] = \sum_{m \neq 0} \text{Tr} \left[\rho_{QED}^{(6)} H_{C_m} \right] = -E_C, \quad (16)$$

where $\rho_{QED}^{(6)}$ is the quantum state in Eq.(10). From Eq.(15) and Eq.(16), we obtain

$$\text{Tr} \left[\rho_{QED}^{(C)} H_S \right] - E_C \geq 0.$$

This gives a relation what we want by taking account of Eq.(14):

$$E_r \geq E_C. \quad (17)$$

Thus it has been proven that E_C in Eq.(11) gives a lower bound of E_r .

There may be a question whether the bound in Eq.(17) is achievable or not. However, this is very nontrivial. One of the necessary conditions is to achieve the equality of Eq.(15) even if negative energy density appears in some region. Though the answer is not known for spin chain systems, equality of a similar relation does not hold for a free field in two dimensional spacetime [8]. Hence, it might be impossible to attain the bound in Eq.(17).

5 Ising Chain Analysis

In this section, we demonstrate QET and QED protocols in Ising models without spontaneous symmetry breaking. Detailed properties of the model can be seen in [9]-[11]. Let us write the Hamiltonian as

$$H = -h \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \sigma_n^z - J \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \sigma_n^x \sigma_{n+1}^x - E_g,$$

where $h \geq J > 0$ and E_g is a constant which shifts the eigenvalue of the ground state $|g\rangle$ to zero:

$$H|g\rangle = 0,$$

and σ_n^z and σ_n^x are Pauli matrices at site n .

Let us introduce a parameter $\lambda = J/h (\leq 1)$. When $\lambda = 1$, the system becomes the critical Ising model. The energy density operator at site n is defined by

$$T_n = -h\sigma_n^z - \frac{J}{2}\sigma_n^x (\sigma_{n+1}^x + \sigma_{n-1}^x) - \epsilon,$$

where ϵ is a real constant to satisfy $\langle g|T_n|g\rangle = 0$. The Hamiltonian can be expressed as a sum of T_n :

$$H = \sum_n T_n.$$

The system can be mapped into a Fermionic system and solved analytically[9]. It is shown that correlation functions are evaluated, for example, as

$$\langle g|\sigma_n^x|g\rangle = \langle g|\sigma_n^y|g\rangle = 0,$$

$$\langle g|\sigma_n^z|g\rangle = G(0),$$

$$\langle g|\sigma_0^x (\sigma_1^x + \sigma_{-1}^x) |g\rangle = 2G(-1),$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle g|\sigma_m^y \sigma_{m+n}^y |g\rangle &= \Delta(n) \\ &= \begin{vmatrix} G(1) & G(0) & \cdots & G(2-n) \\ G(2) & G(1) & \cdots & G(3-n) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ G(n) & G(n-1) & \cdots & G(1) \end{vmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where the function $G(n)$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} G(n) &= L(n) + \lambda L(n+1), \\ L(n) &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi \frac{\cos(kn)}{\sqrt{1 + \lambda^2 + 2\lambda \cos k}} dk. \end{aligned}$$

A relation

$$\langle g | \sigma_0^y (\sigma_1^x + \sigma_{-1}^x) | g \rangle = 0 \quad (18)$$

is also obtained explicitly. For the case with $\lambda = 1$, $G(n)$ is calculated as

$$G(n) = \frac{2(-1)^n}{\pi 2n+1}.$$

Then the correlation functions are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle g | \sigma_n^z | g \rangle &= \frac{2}{\pi}, \\ \langle g | \sigma_0^x (\sigma_1^x + \sigma_{-1}^x) | g \rangle &= \frac{4}{\pi}, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

$$\langle g | \sigma_m^y \sigma_{m+n}^y | g \rangle = - \left(\frac{2}{\pi} \right)^n \frac{2^{2n(n-1)} h(n)^4}{(4n^2 - 1) h(2n)},$$

where

$$h(n) = \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} k^{n-k}.$$

The asymptotic behavior of $\Delta(n)$ for large n is given by

$$\Delta(n \sim \infty) \sim -\frac{1}{4} e^{1/4} 2^{1/12} c^{-3} n^{-9/4}, \quad (20)$$

where the constant c is evaluated as $c \sim 1.28$ [11].

Now let us first consider QET. To specify the protocol, we set

$$U_A = \sigma_{n_A}^y, \quad (21)$$

and

$$U_B = \sigma_{n_B}^x. \quad (22)$$

The energy input E_A by the energy supplier of Eq.(7) is evaluated as

$$E_A = \frac{1}{2} \langle g | \sigma_{n_A}^y H \sigma_{n_A}^y | g \rangle = h \langle g | \sigma_{n_A}^z | g \rangle + J \langle g | \sigma_{n_A}^x (\sigma_{n_A+1}^x + \sigma_{n_A-1}^x) | g \rangle = hG(0) + 2JG(-1),$$

where we have used a relation as

$$P_S(\mu) = \frac{1}{2} [I + (-1)^\mu \sigma_{n_A}^y].$$

For the case with $\lambda = 1$, E_A is given by

$$E_A = \frac{6}{\pi} h.$$

The coefficient ξ in Eq.(4) is evaluated as

$$\xi = \langle g | \sigma_{n_B}^x H \sigma_{n_B}^x | g \rangle = 2h \langle g | \sigma_{n_B}^z | g \rangle = 2hG(0).$$

The time-derivative operator of U_B is given by

$$\dot{U}_B = i [-h\sigma_{n_B}^z, \sigma_{n_B}^x] = 2h\sigma_{n_B}^y.$$

Hence, the value of η in Eq.(5) is calculated as

$$\eta = \langle g | U_A \dot{U}_B | g \rangle = 2h \langle g | \sigma_{n_A}^y \sigma_{n_B}^y | g \rangle = 2h\Delta(|n_A - n_B|).$$

From these values of ξ and η , the energy output E_B of QET is computed as

$$E_B = \frac{2h}{\pi} \left[\sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{\pi}{2} \Delta(|n_A - n_B|) \right)^2} - 1 \right].$$

It should be stressed that nonvanishing values of E_B are obtained for general values of λ , including noncritical models. It is noted that the evaluation of E_B is simple for the critical Ising case with $\lambda = 1$. The asymptotic value of E_B with $\lambda = 1$ is obtained for $|n_B - n_A| \sim \infty$ from Eq.(20) as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} E_B &\sim \frac{h}{\pi} \left(\frac{\pi}{2} \Delta(|n_B - n_A|) \right)^2 \\ &\sim h \frac{\pi}{64} \sqrt{e} 2^{1/6} c^{-6} |n_B - n_A|^{-9/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Next let us consider QED with an infinite number of consumers in the most dense distribution. When $\lambda = 1$, the total amount of energy transfer E_C in Eq.(11) can be evaluated explicitly as

$$E_C = \frac{2h}{\pi} \sum_{m \neq 0} \left[\sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{\pi}{2} \Delta(5|m|) \right)^2} - 1 \right] \\ \sim 6.2 \times 10^{-5} h. \quad (24)$$

As discussed in section 4, this value gives a lower bound of E_r of local cooling by S . In this solvable model, we can check explicitly the relation in Eq.(17). The minimization of E_r in Eq.(13) among local operations is possible.

For general values of λ , the localized energy H_S is explicitly written as

$$H_S = -h\sigma_0^z - J\sigma_0^x (\sigma_1^x + \sigma_{-1}^x) \\ - \frac{J}{2} \sigma_1^x \sigma_2^x - \frac{J}{2} \sigma_{-1}^x \sigma_{-2}^x - J (\sigma_{-1}^z + \sigma_1^z) - 3\epsilon.$$

It is noted that the following relation holds for ρ_c in Eq. (12).

$$\text{Tr} \left[\rho_c \left(-\frac{J}{2} \sigma_1^x \sigma_2^x - \frac{J}{2} \sigma_{-1}^x \sigma_{-2}^x - J (\sigma_{-1}^z + \sigma_1^z) - 3\epsilon \right) \right] \\ = \langle g | \left(-\frac{J}{2} \sigma_1^x \sigma_2^x - \frac{J}{2} \sigma_{-1}^x \sigma_{-2}^x - J (\sigma_{-1}^z + \sigma_1^z) - 3\epsilon \right) | g \rangle.$$

By use of the above relation, we are able to manipulate as follows.

$$\text{Tr} [\rho_c H_S] = \text{Tr} [\rho_c (-h\sigma_0^z - J\sigma_0^x (\sigma_1^x + \sigma_{-1}^x))] \\ + \langle g | \left(-\frac{J}{2} \sigma_1^x \sigma_2^x - \frac{J}{2} \sigma_{-1}^x \sigma_{-2}^x - J (\sigma_{-1}^z + \sigma_1^z) - 3\epsilon \right) | g \rangle \\ = \langle g | (h\sigma_0^z + J\sigma_0^x (\sigma_1^x + \sigma_{-1}^x)) | g \rangle - \text{Tr} [\rho_c (h\sigma_0^z + J\sigma_0^x (\sigma_1^x + \sigma_{-1}^x))] + \langle g | H_S | g \rangle.$$

By substituting $\langle g | H_S | g \rangle = 0$ and

$$\langle g | (h\sigma_0^z + J\sigma_0^x (\sigma_1^x + \sigma_{-1}^x)) | g \rangle = hG(0) + 2JG(-1),$$

it is obtained that

$$\text{Tr} [\rho_c H_S] = hG(0) + 2JG(-1) - \text{Tr} [\rho_c (h\sigma_0^z + J\sigma_0^x (\sigma_1^x + \sigma_{-1}^x))].$$

Here it is useful to write $P_S(\mu)$ as follows.

$$P_S(\mu) = |\mu, n = 0\rangle\langle\mu, n = 0| \prod_{n \neq 0} I_n = \frac{1}{2} [I + (-1)^\mu \sigma_0^y]. \quad (25)$$

After messy calculations using Eq. (25), we obtain

$$\text{Tr}[\rho_c H_S] = hG(0) + 2JG(-1) - h \text{Tr}[\rho_S \sigma_0^z]. \quad (26)$$

In general, the following inequality holds.

$$1 \geq \text{Tr}[\rho_S \sigma_0^z].$$

The equality is attained by measurement operators as

$$M_A(\mu = 0) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -i \\ 1 & i \end{bmatrix},$$

$$M_A(\mu = 1) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & i \\ 1 & -i \end{bmatrix},$$

without the α degree of freedom. These lead to the final result as followed.

$$E_r = h(G(0) - 1) + 2JG(-1).$$

When $\lambda = 1$, the value of E_r is given by

$$E_r = \left(\frac{6}{\pi} - 1\right) J \sim 0.91J.$$

Because evaluation of the total amount of energy transfer E_C in Eq.(11) is difficult, comparison between E_C and E_r is not performed easily. However, by taking $\lambda = 1$, the comparison is possible as follows. From Eq. (24), Eq.(17) is verified because $0.91 > 6.2 \times 10^{-5}$. In this case, the bound of Eq.(17) is not so tight. This result depends on the choice of U_A and U_B in Eq.(21) and Eq.(22). If we change the choice, the bound may become tighter.

6 Conclusion and Discussions

In this paper, a protocol for QED is proposed, in which many consumers can simultaneously extract energy from spin chains by use of common secret keys shared by an energy supplier. In this protocol, what consumers need for energy gain is just classical information about measurement results. Hence, dissipation process in energy transportation via channels can be neglected. This protocol for QED is robust against impersonation. An adversary, who does not have common secret keys and attempts to get energy, cannot obtain but give energy to the spin chains. We have also pointed out that the total amount of energy distributed via QED gives a lower bound of residual energy in a supplier's local cooling for a state excited by the supplier's measurement. Finally, QET and QED protocols have been studied in the Ising spin chain model. Amount of energy transmission is explicitly evaluated depending on distance from the supplier. Finally, the lower bound of Eq.(17) has been explicitly checked.

For practical situations for QED, there remain some open problems of QED. They are listed below.

One of them is related with energy dissipation. It is expected that dissipation effects in the energy transport of QED are severely suppressed even if a zero-temperature uncontrolled environment is coupled with the spin chain. What those consumers need for energy gain is just classical information about the measurement result without receiving energy directly from the supplier. This aspects is quite a contrast to ordinary energy transmission in the spin chains. In the transportation, excitations as energy carriers in the spin chain get gradually annihilated dependent on environment interaction properties. Detailed analysis of comparison between QED and ordinary energy transports in spin chains is an interesting problem. However, the analysis is out of scope of this paper and will be discuss elsewhere. The finite temperature effect is also considered to be of importance for QED.

In the QED protocol, we fix a unitary operation of B which takes a form in Eq. (6). However, the optimal local operation of B to extract maximum energy from the spin chain is not obtained yet. The optimal operation is crucial for analyses of local cooling because the extracted energy gives a lower bound of residual energy of local cooling by the supplier.

Realistic implemetation proposals of QED are not reported yet. However, there are possible candidates. One of them might be the carbon nanotube.

Carbon nanotubes are able to contain fullerenes with atoms inside. The fullerenes acquire spins by doping some atoms. By laying the fullerenes side-by-side in a nanotube, a spin chain might be constructed and useful to check QED. Quantum dots and SQUID qubit systems might allow to create spin chains for QED.

Acknowledgments

This research was partially supported by the SCOPE project of the MIC.

References

- [1] C.H.Bennett, G.Brassard, C.Crépeau, R.Jozsa, A.Peres, and W.K.Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett.70(1993)1895.
- [2] H.Briegel, W.Dür, J.Cirac and P.Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81 (1998)5932; D.Gottesman and I.Chuang, Nature 402(1999)390; E.Knill, R.Laflamme and G.Milburn, Nature 409 (2001)46.
- [3] M.Hotta, "Quantum Energy Teleportation by Ground State Entanglement of Spin Chain Systems", arXiv:0803.0348.
- [4] S. Bose, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91(2003)207901; F. Verstraete, M.A. Martı́n-Delgado, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev.Lett. 92 (2004)087201.
- [5] A recent review is available. L.Amico, R.Fazio, A.Osterloh and V.Vedral, "Entanglement in Many-Body Systems " arXiv:quant-ph/0703044 to be published in Rev. Mod. Phys..
- [6] See a standard textbook, N. D. Birrell and P. C. W. Davies, *Quantum Fields in Curved Space* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1982).
- [7] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard. Quantum cryptography,"Public key distribution and coin tossing", In Proc. IEEE Intl. Conf. on Computers, Systems, and Signal Processing, pages 175–179, 1984.
- [8] See section 6 in the reference: M. Hotta, Phys.Lett. A372 (2008) 3752.

- [9] E.Lieb, T.Schultz and D.Mattis, *Ann.Phys.*16(1961)406.
- [10] B.M.McCoy, *Phys.Rev.*173(1968)531.
- [11] P.Pfeuty, *Ann.Phys.*57(1970)79.