

# Indirect quantum control for finite-dimensional coupled systems

J. Nie<sup>1</sup>, H. C. Fu<sup>2</sup>, X. X. Yi<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*School of Physics and Optoelectronic Technology,  
Dalian University of Technology, Dalian 116024, China*

<sup>2</sup>*School of Physics Science and Technology, Shenzhen University, Shenzhen 518060, China*

(Dated: February 6, 2020)

We present a new analysis on the quantum control for a quantum system coupled to a quantum probe. This analysis is based on the coherent control for the quantum system and a hypothesis that the probe can be prepared in specified initial states. The results show that a quantum system can be manipulated by probe state-dependent coherent control. In this sense, the present analysis also provides a new control scheme which combines the coherent control and state preparation technology.

PACS numbers: 03.65.-w, 03.67.Mn, 02.30.Yy

## I. INTRODUCTION

Controlling the time evolution [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8] of a quantum system is a major task required for quantum information processing. Several approaches to the control of a quantum system have been proposed in the past decade, which can be divided into coherent (unitary) and incoherent (non-unitary) control, according to how the controls enter the dynamics. In the coherent control scheme, the controls enter the dynamics through the system Hamiltonian. It affects the time evolution of the system state, but not its spectrum, i.e., the eigenvalues of the target density matrix  $\rho_f$  remain unchanged in the dynamics, due to the unitarity of the evolution. In the incoherent control scheme [9, 10, 11, 12], an auxiliary system, called probe, is introduced to manipulate the target system through their mutual interaction. This incoherent control scheme is of relevance whenever the system dynamics can not be directly accessed, and it provides a non-unitary evolution which is capable of transferring all initial states (pure or mixed) into an arbitrary pure or mixed state. This breaks the limitation for the coherent control mentioned above.

To be specific, Romano and colleagues [9, 10] have investigated accessibility and controllability of a quantum bit (or a two-level system) coupled to a quantum probe, under the condition that the external control affects only the probe. This analysis is based on the Cartan decomposition [13, 14, 15] of the dynamics, and hence it involved for high-dimensional systems.

In this paper, we first reexamine the controllability for two-dimensional systems, then extend the approach to finite-dimensional quantum systems. This analysis is based on the quantum coherent control scheme and the hypothesis that the probe can be prepared in a specified initial state. The advantages of this scheme are threefold. Firstly, it overcomes the difficulty of the Cartan decomposition based analysis. Secondly, it brings a connection between the coherent control and incoherent control for quantum systems, hence it is easy to be generalized to finite-dimensional systems. Finally, this analysis provides a new control scheme, namely quantum states can

be manipulated by probe state-dependent coherent control on the quantum system.

We denote the state of a quantum system  $s$  by a density matrix  $\rho_s$ , a positive, unit trace operator in the Hilbert space of the system  $\mathcal{H}_s$ . The convex set of all possible states is represented by  $\mathcal{P}_s$  [9]. Its boundary  $\partial\mathcal{P}_s$  is a set of pure states satisfying  $\rho_s^2 = \rho_s$ . By the definition [9], the system  $s$  is controllable if and only if for all pairs  $(\rho_i, \rho_f) \in \mathcal{P}_s \times \mathcal{P}_s$ , there exists a set of controls  $\vec{g}$  such that  $\rho_s(t=0) = \rho_i$  and  $\rho_s(t, \vec{g} = \vec{g}_{\text{fixed}}) = \rho_f$  for some  $t \geq 0$ . Suppose that the quantum system  $s$  interacts with an initially unentangled probe  $p$ , whose density matrix is denoted by  $\rho_p$  on its Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_p$ . The time evolution of the composite system of the controlled system and the probe is governed by  $H = H_s + H_p + H_I$ , where  $H_s$  and  $H_p$  are the free Hamiltonian for the controlled system and the probe, respectively, while  $H_I$  denotes the coupling of the system and the probe. Since local transformations do not affect the controllability of the system [9],  $H_s$  and  $H_p$  can be ignored safely in the later analysis.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec.II, we study the controllability of a two-dimensional system in the indirect control scheme, then we extend the approach to arbitrary finite-dimensional systems in Sec.III. Conclusions and discussions are presented in Sec.IV.

## II. TWO-DIMENSIONAL SYSTEMS

Consider a two-dimensional system  $s$  coupling to a probe  $p$  modeled as another two-dimensional system. The interaction Hamiltonian which describes such a composite system takes the form

$$H_I(\vec{g}) = (g_1\sigma_s^z + g_2\sigma_s^+ + g_2^*\sigma_s^-) \otimes (g_3\sigma_p^x + g_4\sigma_p^z), \quad (1)$$

where  $\vec{g} = (g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4)$  are coupling constants,  $\sigma_s^{+, -, z}$  and  $\sigma_p^{x, z}$  denote the Pauli matrices acting on Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_s$  and  $\mathcal{H}_p$ , respectively. We now show that the two-dimensional system is controllable governed by  $H_I$ .

The controllability requires all initial states in  $\mathcal{H}_s$  can evolve to an arbitrary pure or mixed target state. This

requirement for the initial state can be partly lifted by requiring that the interacting Hamiltonian  $H_I$  is unchanged up to  $\vec{g}$  under the local unitary transformation

$$F(\theta, \phi) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} & -\sin \frac{\theta}{2} e^{i\phi} \\ \sin \frac{\theta}{2} e^{-i\phi} & \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \end{pmatrix}_s \otimes I_p \equiv f_s \otimes I_p, \quad (2)$$

where  $0 \leq \phi \leq 2\pi$ ,  $0 \leq \theta \leq \pi$  and  $I_p$  is the identity operator on  $\mathcal{H}_p$ . By unchanged we mean  $H_I(\vec{g}') = FH_I(\vec{g})F^\dagger$ , namely the transformation  $F(\theta, \phi)$  changes the coupling constants (or the controls) in the Hamiltonian only. The proof is straightforward. Suppose the composite system is initially prepared in a state  $\rho(0) = \rho_s(0) \otimes \rho_p(0)$ . The final state of the quantum system  $s$  reads ( $F = F(\theta, \phi)$ ),

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_s(t, \vec{g}) &= \text{Tr}_p(u\rho(0)u^\dagger) \\ &= \text{Tr}_p(uF^\dagger F\rho(0)F^\dagger Fu^\dagger) \\ &= f_s^\dagger \text{Tr}_p(u'\rho'(0)u'^\dagger) f_s, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $u = e^{-iH_I(\vec{g})t}$ ,  $u' = e^{-iH_I(\vec{g}')t}$ , and  $\rho'(0) = F\rho(0)F^\dagger$  represents a set of states which have the same spectrums as  $\rho(0)$ . Since the two sets  $\{f_s\rho_s(t, \vec{g})f_s^\dagger\}$  and  $\{\rho_s(t, \vec{g})\}$  are in one-to-one correspondence, thus the quantum system  $s$  is controllable initially in  $\{\text{Tr}_b\rho'(0)\}$  if and only if it is controllable initially in  $\{\text{Tr}_b\rho(0)\}$  [16]. With this knowledge, the controllability of the quantum systems can be reformulated as the following. A two-dimensional quantum system is controllable if and only if for all initial state in the form  $\rho_s(0) = \rho_i = p_s(0)|0\rangle_s\langle 0| + (1 - p_s(0))|1\rangle_s\langle 1|$ , where  $|0\rangle_s$  and  $|1\rangle_s$  denote the ground and excited states of the quantum system, respectively, and  $0 \leq p_s(0) \leq 1$ , there exists a set of controls  $\vec{g} = (g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4)$  such that  $\rho_s(t, \vec{g} = \vec{g}_{\text{fixed}}) = \rho_f$  for some  $t \geq 0$ .

In the remainder of this section, we show that the Hamiltonian  $H_I$  can drive the quantum system from the initial state  $\rho_s(0)$  to an arbitrary final state. The time evolution operator for the composite system governed by  $H_I$  can be written as,

$$U(t) = \sum_{a,b=0,1} U_{ab}^s(t) |a\rangle_p \langle b|, \quad (4)$$

where  $U_{ab}^s(t)$  satisfy

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} U_{ab}^s(t) = H_{ab}^s U_{ab}^s(t), \quad (5)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} H_{00}^s &= -H_{11}^s = -g_4(g_1\sigma_s^z + g_2\sigma_s^+ + g_2^*\sigma_s^-), \\ H_{01}^s &= H_{10}^s = g_3(g_1\sigma_s^z + g_2\sigma_s^+ + g_2^*\sigma_s^-). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

After some algebras, we find the density matrix for the quantum system at time  $t$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_s(t) &= p_p [p_s|\psi_{00}\rangle\langle\psi_{00}| + (1 - p_s)|\psi_{00}^\perp\rangle\langle\psi_{00}^\perp|] \\ &\quad + (1 - p_p) [p_s|\psi_{11}\rangle\langle\psi_{11}| + (1 - p_s)|\psi_{11}^\perp\rangle\langle\psi_{11}^\perp|] \\ &\quad + p_s|\psi_{10}\rangle\langle\psi_{10}| + (1 - p_s)|\psi_{10}^\perp\rangle\langle\psi_{10}^\perp|, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where  $\rho_p(0) = p_p(0)|0\rangle_p\langle 0| + (1 - p_p(0))|1\rangle_p\langle 1|$  ( $0 \leq p_p(0) \leq 1$ ) was assumed in the derivation. Here  $|\psi_{ij}\rangle = U_{ij}^s|0\rangle$ ,  $|\psi_{10}\rangle = |\psi_{01}\rangle$  and  $|\psi_{ij}^\perp\rangle = U_{ij}^s|1\rangle$ ,  $i, j = 0, 1$ . Unitarity of the time evolution operator  $U(t)$  requires that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0,1} U_{0i}^{s\dagger} U_{0i}^s &= 1 = \sum_{i=0,1} U_{1i}^{s\dagger} U_{1i}^s, \\ U_{00}^s U_{10}^{s\dagger} &= -U_{01}^s U_{11}^{s\dagger}, U_{10}^s U_{00}^{s\dagger} = -U_{11}^s U_{01}^{s\dagger}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

hence  $|\psi_{ij}\rangle$  and  $|\psi_{ij}^\perp\rangle$  ( $i, j = 0, 1$ ) are not normalized. This problem can be solved by restricting the density matrix to be unit trace as Eq.(9) shows below. Note that  $|\psi_{ij}\rangle$  and  $|\psi_{ij}^\perp\rangle$  are orthogonal, we can rewrite the density matrix for the quantum system in the basis spanned by  $\{|\psi_{00}\rangle, |\psi_{00}^\perp\rangle\}$ ,

$$\rho_s(t) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \rho_s^{00}(t) & \rho_s^{01}(t) \\ \rho_s^{10}(t) & \rho_s^{11}(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

where (setting  $p_p(0) = p_p$ , and  $p_s(0) = p_s$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_s^{10}(t) &= (\rho_s^{01})^* = \frac{2p_s - 1}{2} (\sin 2\alpha_0 e^{i\beta_0} + (1 - p_p) \sin 2\alpha_1 e^{i\beta_1}), \\ \rho_s^{00}(t) &= p_p p_s + p_s \cos^2 \alpha_0 + (1 - p_s) \sin^2 \alpha_0 + (1 - p_p) (p_s \cos^2 \alpha_1 + (1 - p_s) \sin^2 \alpha_1), \\ \rho_s^{11}(t) &= p_p (1 - p_s) + p_s \sin^2 \alpha_0 + (1 - p_s) \cos^2 \alpha_0 + (1 - p_p) (p_s \sin^2 \alpha_1 + (1 - p_s) \cos^2 \alpha_1). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Here  $\alpha_j$  is defined by ( $j = 0, 1$ ),

$$|\psi_{1j}\rangle = \cos \alpha_j |\psi_{00}\rangle + \sin \alpha_j e^{i\beta_j} |\psi_{00}^\perp\rangle.$$

Two observations can be made from Eq.(8). (1)  $|\psi_{00}\rangle$  can

be prepared for the quantum system to be an arbitrary pure state (unnormalized), this can be done by control  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  in  $H_{00}^s$ . The reason is that  $|\psi_{00}\rangle$  is a solution of the Schrödinger equation  $i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} |\psi_{00}\rangle = H_{00}^s |\psi_{00}\rangle$  with

the initial state  $|0\rangle_s$ , since  $i\sigma_s^z \in su(2)$  and  $i\sigma_s^\pm \in su(2)$  are generators of the Lie algebra  $SU(2)$ ,  $|\psi_{00}\rangle$  can be manipulated to be any pure state in  $\partial\mathcal{P}_s$ .  $(2)\alpha_i, i = 0, 1$  (or  $\beta_i$ ) are controllable by  $g_3$  and  $g_4$  resulting from the change of the overlap among  $|\psi_{ij}\rangle$   $i, j = 0, 1$ . As a result of these observations, we conclude that  $\rho_s^{10}(t)$  can be manipulated to be zero for any  $p_s$  and  $p_p$ , leading to

$$\rho_s(t) = \rho_s^{00}(t)|\psi_{00}\rangle\langle\psi_{00}| + \rho_s^{11}(t)|\psi_{00}^\perp\rangle\langle\psi_{00}^\perp|. \quad (11)$$

Obviously,  $\frac{1}{2}(\rho_s^{00} + \rho_s^{11}) = 1$ , and  $\rho_s^{00}$  can be arbitrarily controlled in the interval  $[0, 1]$  by changing  $p_p$ . Therefore, the quantum system is controllable with  $H_I$ . To be specific,  $\rho_s^{10}(t) = 0$  yields,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_0 &= \frac{1}{2} \arcsin[(1 - p_p) \cos \beta_1], \\ \alpha_1 &= \frac{1}{2} \arcsin(-\cos \beta_0), \\ \beta_0 &= \beta_1 + n\pi, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Suppose that the target state is  $\rho_s^{00}(t) = 2q$ , ( $0 \leq q \leq 1$ ), we find

$$p_p = \frac{2q - \sin^2 \alpha_0 - p_s(\cos 2\alpha_0 + \cos 2\alpha_1) - \sin \alpha_1^2}{\sin^2 \alpha_1 (2p_s - 1)}. \quad (13)$$

Eqs.(12) and (13) together determine the parameters  $g_3$ ,  $g_4$  and  $p_p$ . These discussions suggest that a two-level system can be controlled by the Hamiltonian Eq.(1) together with the initial state preparation of the probe. The probe is not required to be prepared in an arbitrary initial state but with a specified spectrum, according to the target state of the controlled system. In fact, this requirement on the probe can be removed by adding a control in the Hamiltonian (see Eq.(13)). This holds true for finite-dimensional system discussed in the next section.

### III. FINITE-DIMENSIONAL SYSTEM

In order to extend the approach to finite-dimensional systems, we recall that the controllability in this case can be expressed in the following way. For any state  $\rho_s$  in  $\mathcal{P}_s$ , the quantum system is controllable if and only if there exists a Kraus map  $\Phi_{\rho_s}$  such that  $\Phi_{\rho_s}(\rho_s) = \rho_f$  for all state  $\rho_s$  in  $\mathcal{P}_s$ . In this section, we shall show that the following Hamiltonian

$$H_I = \left( \sum_{j \neq i=1}^N g_{ij} |i\rangle_s \langle j| \right) \otimes \left( \sum_{m \neq n}^N f_{mn} |m\rangle_p \langle n| \right), \quad (14)$$

which describes interaction between the system  $s$  and the probe  $p$ , would give rise to the Kraus map  $\Phi_{\rho_s}$  required for the controllability. Assume that the composite system is initially in an uncorrelated state  $\rho(0) = \rho_s(0) \otimes \rho_p(0)$ , and the final state of the quantum system reads

$$\rho_s(t) = \text{Tr}_p[\mathcal{U}(t)\rho_s(0) \otimes \rho_p(0)\mathcal{U}^\dagger(t)]. \quad (15)$$

Preparing initially the probe in state ( $\sum_n P_n = 1$ )

$$\rho_p(t=0) = \sum_n P_n |n\rangle_p \langle n|, \quad (16)$$

we obtain

$$\rho_s(t) = \sum_{m,n} \sqrt{P_n} \langle m|\mathcal{U}(t)|n\rangle_p \rho_s(0)_p \langle n|\mathcal{U}^\dagger(t)|m\rangle_p. \quad (17)$$

It is easy to find that  $\mathcal{U}(t)$  has the form

$$\mathcal{U}(t) = \sum_{m,n} U_{mn}^s(t) |m\rangle_p \langle n|, \quad (18)$$

with  $U_{mn}^s(t)$  satisfying,

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial U_{mn}^s(t)}{\partial t} = H_{mn}^s U_{mn}^s(t), H_{mn}^s = f_{mn} \sum_{i \neq j=1}^N g_{ij} |i\rangle_s \langle j|.$$

Substituting Eq.(18) into Eq.(17), we find

$$\rho_s(t) = \sum_{m,n} P_n U_{mn}^s(t) \rho_s(0) U_{mn}^{s\dagger}(t), \quad (19)$$

and the Kraus map  $\Phi_{\rho_s}$  in this case is

$$\Phi_{\rho_s}(\rho_s(0)) = \sum_{m,n} K_{mn}(t) \rho_s(0) K_{mn}^\dagger(t), \quad (20)$$

where  $K_{mn}(t) = \sqrt{P_n} U_{mn}^s(t)$ . It has been proved that  $U_{mn}(t)$  can drive all initial pure states of the quantum system  $s$  into an arbitrary pure state at some time  $t \geq 0$  [7, 8]. So,  $U_{mn}^s(t)$  can be written as,

$$U_{mn} = |\phi_m(t)\rangle \langle \varphi_n(0)|, \quad (21)$$

where both  $|\phi_m(t)\rangle$  and  $|\varphi_n(0)\rangle$  are arbitrary and in  $\partial\mathcal{P}_s$ . This together with the hypothesis that the probe can be initially prepared in an arbitrary state, show controllability of the quantum system  $s$ .

Before closing this section, we present a general formalism to show that the indirect control can be represented as a combination of coherent control for the quantum system  $s$  and preparation of the initial state for the probe  $p$ . Consider an initial state of the composite system  $\rho(0) = \rho_s(0) \otimes \rho_p(0)$ , and a Hamiltonian  $H = H_s \otimes H_p$  that governs the evolution of the composite system. Suppose that both the quantum system and the probe are  $N$ -dimensional, and the quantum system is coherently controllable driven by  $H_s$ . The latter assumption means  $H_s$  can drive the quantum from an arbitrary pure state to the other arbitrary pure state, i.e.,  $\{|\phi_i\rangle_s = e^{-iH_s t} |i\rangle_s\}$   $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  span a basis for the quantum system, and  $|\phi_i\rangle_s$  is an arbitrary pure state in  $\partial\mathcal{P}_s$  for any  $i$ . The density matrix for the quantum system at time  $t$  reads

$$\rho_s(t) = \sum_{m_p} \langle m| e^{-i(H_s \otimes H_p)t} \rho_s(0) \otimes \rho_p(0) e^{i(H_s \otimes H_p)t} |m\rangle_p.$$

Choosing  $H_p|m\rangle_p = E_m|m\rangle_p$ , we obtain

$$\rho_s(t) = \sum_j p_j \sum_m \langle m|\rho_p(0)|m\rangle_p |\phi_j(E_m t)\rangle \langle \phi_j(E_m t)|, \quad (22)$$

where the initial state  $\rho_s(0) = \sum_j p_j |j\rangle_s \langle j|$  was set, and  $|\phi_j(E_m t)\rangle = e^{-iH_s E_m t} |j\rangle_s$ . Suppose the target state is  $(\sum_j q_j = 1)$

$$\rho_s(T) = \sum_m^N q_m |\phi_m(T)\rangle \langle \phi_m(T)|, \quad (23)$$

we find the condition to determine the controls in  $H_s$  and  $H_p$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} q_\alpha &= \sum_j p_j \sum_m \langle m|\rho_p(0)|m\rangle_p |c_\alpha^{jm}|^2, \\ \sum_j p_j \sum_m \langle m|\rho_p(0)|m\rangle_p c_\beta^{jm} (c_\gamma^{jm})^* &= 0, \\ \alpha, \beta, \gamma &= 1, 2, \dots, N, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where  $c_\alpha^{jm}$  was defined by  $|\phi_j(E_m t)\rangle = \sum_\alpha c_\alpha^{jm} |\phi_\alpha(T)\rangle$ . These results suggest that the manipulation of a quan-

tum system may be realized by coherent controls for the quantum system conditioned on the spectrum of the initial density matrix of the probe.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have presented a model of indirect control for a quantum system coupled to a probe. This control scheme is actually a combination of coherent control conditioned on the initial state of the probe. For a two-level system, we have proved that the restriction on the initial state for the quantum system can be partly removed. This simplifies the formulation for the controllability. The scheme has been generalized to arbitrary finite dimensional systems and equations to determine the controls are given. We would like to note that the probe is not required to be initially prepared in an arbitrary state but with a specified spectrum. This requirement can be lifted by adding more controls in the composite systems.

This work was supported by NCET of M.O.E, NSF of China under grant No. 60578014, 10775023 and 10675085.

- 
- [1] H. Rabitz, R. de Vivie-Riedle, M. Motzkus, K. Kompa, *Science* **288**, 824(2000).  
 [2] S. Lloyd, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**,022108(2000).  
 [3] V. Jurdjevic, *Geometric Control Theory*, Cambridge University Press, 1997.  
 [4] A. G. Butkovskiy and Yu. I. Samoilenko, *Control of Quantum-mechanical Processes and Systems* (Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1990).  
 [5] *Information Complexity and Control in Quantum Physics*, edited by A. Blaquiére, S. Dinerand and G. Lochak (Springer, New York, 1987).  
 [6] V. Ramakrishna, M. V. Salapaka, M. Dahleh, H. Rabitz, A. peirce, *Phys. Rev. A* **51**, 960(1995).  
 [7] S. G. Schirmer, H. Fu, and A. I. Solomon, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 063410(2001).  
 [8] H. Fu, S. G. Schirmer, and A. I. Solomon, *J. Phys. A* **34**, 1679(2001).  
 [9] R. Romano and D. D'Alessandro, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 022323 (2006).  
 [10] R. Romano and D. D'Alessandro, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 080402(2006).  
 [11] F. Xue, S. X. Yu, and C. P. Sun, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**,013403(2006).  
 [12] H. C. Fu, H. Dong, X. F. Liu, and C. P. Sun, *Phys. Rev. A* **75**, 052317(2007).  
 [13] S. Helgason, *Differential geometry, Lie group and symmetric spaces* (Academic Press, New York, 1978).  
 [14] J. Zhang, J. Vala, S. Sastry, and K. B. Whaley, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 042313(2003).  
 [15] R. Cabrera, C. Rangan, and W. E. Baylis, *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 033401(2007).  
 [16] This also can be understood as follows. Consider the Schrödinger equation  $i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} |\varphi(t)\rangle = H_I |\varphi(t)\rangle$ , where  $|\varphi(t)\rangle$  is the wavefunction of the composite system. By the time-independent transformation  $F(\theta, \phi)$ ,  $|\varphi(t)\rangle \rightarrow F^\dagger |\phi'(t)\rangle$  we find  $i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (F^\dagger |\phi'(t)\rangle) = H_I (F^\dagger |\phi'(t)\rangle)$ , and  $i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} |\phi'(t)\rangle = F H_I F^\dagger |\phi'(t)\rangle$ . Since  $H_I(\vec{g}') = F H_I(\vec{g}) F^\dagger$ , we claim that there exists a one-to-one correspondence in sets  $\{Tr_b(|\phi'(t)\rangle \langle \phi'(t)|)\}$  and  $\{Tr_b(|\phi(t)\rangle \langle \phi(t)|)\}$ . Therefore, if  $\{Tr_b(|\phi'(t)\rangle \langle \phi'(t)|)\}$  covers all states in  $\mathcal{P}_s$ ,  $\{Tr_b(|\phi(t)\rangle \langle \phi(t)|)\}$  is a convex set of all possible states for the two dimensional system.