

A Protocol of Quantum Energy Distribution

Masahiro Hotta

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

Abstract

Recently a remarkable quantum protocol, quantum energy teleportation(QET) has been proposed, in which localized energy can be transported on average from one position to another only by LOCC. The protocol attains a crucial property that dissipation of the energy transportation is drastically suppressed. This is because we transmit only classical information through a classical channel. The teleportation is performed by use of ground-state entanglement of spin chain systems.

In this paper, an extended protocol, quantum energy distribution(QED) is proposed by combining QET and quantum key distribution(QKD). In the protocol, multi-parties can simultaneously extract positive energy on average from spin chains by use of common secret key shared by the energy supplier. QED is robust against impersonation. An adversary, who does not have common secret key and tries to get energy, cannot obtain but give energy to the spin chains. Total amount of energy transfer gives a lower bound of residual energy of a local cooling process by the supplier. We also analyze an example of quantum energy distribution in the one-dimensional Ising model. Amount of distributed energy is evaluated depending on distance from 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 the spin-chain ground state plays an essential role to realize QET. It is a remarkable property of QET that dissipation rate of energy in the transport is severely suppressed because we transmit not energy itself but classical information through a classical channel.

The protocol of QET [3] can be considered 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 the ground state.

In the QET protocol, the receiver of classical information from the 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 consumers are able to simultaneously extract energy from the ground state by use of common secret key shared by the energy supplier. Let us later call the protocol quantum energy distribution (QED). QED has a remarkable property against impersonation. Let us imagine that an illegal consumer appears, who does not have common secret key and tries to get energy from the 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, the local cooling cannot extract all energy of the excited system and residual energy remains in the system. The total amount of energy distributed via QED gives a lower bound of residual energy of a supplier's local cooling for an excited state. We also analyze QET and QED protocols in the critical 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 critical 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]. 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 are Hermitian and take the form of

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

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 the values make 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 the 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.

The state $\rho^{(1)}$ after the measurement is given by

$$\rho^{(1)} = \sum_{\mu=0,1} P_A(\mu) |g\rangle\langle g| P_A(\mu).$$

Hence, the average input energy E_A is evaluated as

$$E_A = \text{Tr} [\rho^{(1)} H_A] = \sum_{\mu=0,1} \langle g| P_A(\mu) H P_A(\mu) |g\rangle > 0. \quad (7)$$

After step (3), the quantum state is transformed into

$$\rho^{(3)} = \sum_{\mu=0,1} V_B(\mu) P_A(\mu) |g\rangle\langle g| P_A(\mu) V_B^\dagger(\mu).$$

It is noted that the localized energy of qubits around Alice does not change in step (3):

$$\text{Tr} [\rho^{(3)} H_A] = \text{Tr} [\rho^{(1)} H_A] = E_A.$$

After Bob's transformation, the localized energy of qubits around him becomes negative on average as follows.

$$\text{Tr} [\rho^{(3)} H_B] = -\frac{1}{2} \left[\sqrt{\xi^2 + \eta^2} - \xi \right] < 0.$$

Because the energy did not exist before step (3), positive energy must be released to Bob's devices for the operation $V_B(\mu)$ in step (3). The amount of energy extracted from the system 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 protocol,

there exists energy E_A , that Alice first deposited to the spin chain system by herself. Let us imagine that Alice tries to completely withdraw E_A by local operation after step (3). If it is possible, the energy gain E_B of Bob from the spin chain system needs no cost. However, if Alice is really able to make the localized energy around site n_A zero, the total energy of the spin chain becomes equal to $-E_B$, that is, negative. We know that the total energy of the spin chain system must be nonnegative. Hence, it is impossible that Alice cannot withdraw the energy larger than $E_A - E_B$ by local operation at site n_A . The main reason of her failure is because the local measurement by Alice breaks entanglement between her qubit and other qubits. If Alice wants to recover the original state of her qubit with zero energy density, she must create the entanglement again. However, entanglement generation needs nonlocal operations in general. Therefore, she cannot recover the state of her qubit perfectly only by her local operations. Therefore, a part of E_A becomes residual energy, which cannot be withdrawn by Alice. On security of the residual energy, Bob with classical information μ has borrowed E_B in advance from the spin chains. When global cooling of the spin chains, which is induced by 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.

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 the 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 the consumers are given by

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

Let us also define the 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 the consumers. Because any protocol of QKD's including BB84[7] is effective, we do not specify the protocol. Also assume that all C_m and S share a set of many spin chain systems 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 system in order to achieve the local measurement. E_S is given by

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

(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 random secret keys K by a protocol of QKD.

(4) S encodes the measurement results μ by use of K and send 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

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

The QED protocol is robust against impersonation attack. Let us imagine that an illegal consumer D appears at site n_D , who does not have k and tries to get energy from the spin chains. Then we can conclude that D does not obtain but give energy to the spin chains. The reason is following. Because D cannot get no information about μ , D 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 D is straightforward and gives a positive value such that

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

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, D must input energy on average to the spin chains without gain.

In this protocol, what the consumers need for energy gain is just classical information about the measurement result without receiving energy directly from S . Hence, dissipation process in energy transportation via channels can be neglected.

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. In step (1) of the 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 tries to completely withdraw E_A by local operations. By a similar argument in section 2, it is shown that the 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 the assist of dynamical evolution induced by the nonlocal Hamiltonian. The time evolution is able to recover the entanglement which Alice breaks by the measurement.) 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 the 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 by

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

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 obtained from the quantum state of QED. If S performs the 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 can be 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 the 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 the QET and QED protocols in the critical Ising model. Detailed properties of the model can be seen in [9]-[11]. Let us write the Hamiltonian as

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

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

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

σ_n^z and σ_n^x are Pauli matrices at site n given by

$$\sigma^z = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\sigma^x = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The system has global symmetries. One of them is given by a unitary transformation as

$$S = \prod_n \sigma_n^z.$$

This transformation flips the x - and y -components of spins as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} S^\dagger \sigma_n^x S &= -\sigma_n^x, \\ S^\dagger \sigma_n^y S &= -\sigma_n^y. \end{aligned}$$

The other symmetry transformation is given by

$$U_s(\phi) = e^{i\phi S},$$

where ϕ is a real parameter. This transforms σ_n^x and σ_n^y as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} U_s^\dagger(\phi) \sigma_n^x U_s(\phi) &= \sigma_n^x \cos(2\phi) + \sigma_n^y \sin(2\phi), \\ U_s^\dagger(\phi) \sigma_n^y U_s(\phi) &= \sigma_n^y \cos(2\phi) - \sigma_n^x \sin(2\phi). \end{aligned}$$

Especially, by taking $\phi = \pi/4$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} U_s^\dagger\left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right) \sigma_n^x U_s\left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right) &= \sigma_n^y, \\ U_s^\dagger\left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right) \sigma_n^y U_s\left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right) &= -\sigma_n^x. \end{aligned}$$

The translational symmetry transformation is given by

$$G^\dagger \sigma_n^a G = \sigma_n^a.$$

The ground state $|g\rangle$ is invariant under these symmetry transformations. The energy density operator at site n is defined by

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

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]-[11]. For example, it is shown that one-point functions are evaluated as

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

$$\langle g|\sigma_n^z|g\rangle = \frac{2}{\pi}.$$

The two-point function for the y -component is calculated as

$$\langle g|\sigma_m^y \sigma_{m+n}^y|g\rangle = \Delta(n),$$

where

$$\Delta(n) = -\left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^n \frac{2^{2n(n-1)} h(n)^4}{(4n^2 - 1) h(2n)},$$

and

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

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

$$\Delta(n \sim \infty) \sim -\frac{1}{4} e^{1/4} 2^{1/12} c^{-3} n^{-9/4}, \quad (18)$$

where the constant c is evaluated as $c \sim 1.28$. The x -component two-point function is also computed. For example, the following relation is obtained.

$$\langle g | \sigma_0^x (\sigma_1^x + \sigma_{-1}^x) | g \rangle = \frac{4}{\pi}. \quad (19)$$

By use of the symmetries, a relation

$$\langle g | \sigma_0^y (\sigma_1^x + \sigma_{-1}^x) | g \rangle = 0 \quad (20)$$

can be also proven. In the derivation of Eq.(20), we have used

$$\langle g | \sigma_0^y \sigma_1^x | g \rangle = -\langle g | \sigma_1^y \sigma_0^x | g \rangle = -\langle g | \sigma_0^y \sigma_{-1}^x | g \rangle,$$

which is obtained from

$$\sigma_0^y \sigma_1^x = -U_s \left(\frac{\pi}{4} \right) \sigma_0^x \sigma_1^y U_s^\dagger \left(\frac{\pi}{4} \right),$$

$$\sigma_1^y \sigma_0^x = G^\dagger \sigma_0^y \sigma_{-1}^x G.$$

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

$$E_A = \frac{1}{2} \langle g | \sigma_{n_A}^y H \sigma_{n_A}^y | g \rangle = J \langle g | \sigma_{n_A}^z | g \rangle + J \langle g | \sigma_{n_A}^x (\sigma_{n_A+1}^x + \sigma_{n_A-1}^x) | g \rangle = \frac{6}{\pi} J,$$

where we have used a relation as

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

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

$$\xi = \langle g | \sigma_{n_B}^x H \sigma_{n_B}^x | g \rangle = 2J \langle g | \sigma_{n_B}^z | g \rangle = \frac{4J}{\pi}.$$

The time-derivative operator of U_B is given by

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

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

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

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

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

From Eq.(18), the asymptotic value of E_B is obtained for $|n_B - n_A| \sim \infty$ as follows.

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

Next let us consider QED with an infinite number of consumers in the most dense distribution. The total amount of energy transfer E_C in Eq.(11) is evaluated as

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

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.

The localized energy H_S is explicitly written as

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

In evaluation of $Tr[\rho_c H_S]$ for Eq.(12), we are able to make calculations as follow.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\alpha\mu} Tr \left[M_S(\alpha, \mu) P_S(\mu) M_S^\dagger(\alpha, \mu) \sigma_0^z \right] \langle g | P_S(\mu) | g \rangle \\
&= \sum_{\alpha\mu} Tr \left[M_S(\alpha, \mu) P_S(\mu) M_S^\dagger(\alpha, \mu) \sigma_0^z \right] \langle g | \frac{I + (-1)^\mu \sigma_0^y}{2} | g \rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha\mu} Tr \left[M_S(\alpha, \mu) P_S(\mu) M_S^\dagger(\alpha, \mu) \sigma_0^z \right] \\
&= Tr [\rho_S \sigma_0^z],
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\alpha\mu} Tr \left[M_S(\alpha, \mu) P_S(\mu) M_S^\dagger(\alpha, \mu) \sigma_0^x \right] \langle g | P_S(\mu) (\sigma_1^x + \sigma_{-1}^x) | g \rangle \\
&= \sum_{\alpha\mu} \langle Tr \left[M_S(\alpha, \mu) P_S(\mu) M_S^\dagger(\alpha, \mu) \sigma_0^x \right] \langle g | \frac{I + (-1)^\mu \sigma_0^y}{2} (\sigma_1^x + \sigma_{-1}^x) | g \rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha\mu} (-1)^\mu Tr \left[M_S(\alpha, \mu) P_S(\mu) M_S^\dagger(\alpha, \mu) \sigma_0^x \right] \langle g | \sigma_0^y (\sigma_1^x + \sigma_{-1}^x) | g \rangle \\
&= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\rho_S = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu\alpha} Tr_{n \neq 0} \left[M_S(\alpha, \mu) P_S(\mu) M_S^\dagger(\alpha, \mu) \right]$$

and Eq.(20) is used in the last step. After these calculations, we obtain

$$Tr [\rho_c H_S] = \frac{6J}{\pi} - J Tr [\rho_S \sigma_0^z].$$

In general, the following inequality holds.

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

The equality is attained by measurement operators as

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

without the α degree of freedom. This leads to the final result as followed.

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

Therefore, Eq.(17) is checked 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

In this paper, a protocol of QED is proposed, in which many consumers can simultaneously extract energy from the spin chains by use of common secret key shared by the 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. QED is robust against impersonation. An adversary, who does not have common secret key and tries 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 has been studied in the critical 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.

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 use of 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,"A Fundamental Lower Bound of Actuating Energy for Broadband Photon Switching",arXiv:0711.1858, to be published in Phys.Lett.A..
- [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.