

Entropic Bounds for the Quantum Marginal Problem

Tobias J. Osborne*

Department of Mathematics, Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, Surrey, TW20 0EX, UK

The quantum marginal problem asks, given a set of reduced quantum states of a multipartite system, whether there exists a joint quantum state consistent with these reduced states. The quantum marginal problem is known to be hard to solve in general as it is a variant of the *N-representability problem*. We provide entropic bounds on the number of orthogonal solutions to the quantum marginal problem.

PACS numbers: 03.67.a, 03.65.Ud

arXiv:0806.2962v1 [quant-ph] 18 Jun 2008

The quantum marginal problem (QMP) asks when and what joint quantum states of a composite system are compatible with a given set of reduced states. This question has its genesis in the *marginal problem* of classical probability theory which is concerned with the existence of a probability density function with given projections onto a set of coordinate subspaces (see [1] and references therein). Since the foundational work of [2, 3], which revealed that almost all tripartite quantum states are uniquely determined by their two-party reduced states, there has been a great deal of progress on variations and generalisations of the QMP [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14]. At the current time only the most fundamental version of the QMP, which asks what constraints prevent the existence of a joint state $\rho_{A_1 A_2 \dots A_n}$ given only the single-particle reduced states ρ_{A_j} , is well understood. This problem was completely solved by Klyachko in the finite-dimensional setting [8], and by Eisert et al. [14] in the gaussian setting.

A general solution to the QMP would have profound and revolutionary consequences for physics as it would provide a solution to the *N-representability problem* of quantum chemistry [13, 15], and hence allow us to easily calculate, eg., the binding energies of complex molecules. It turns out that this is too much to hope for as a general solution cannot exist: the *N-representability problem* is now understood to be too hard to solve, even on a quantum computer [13]. Thus, in order to gain quantitative progress on the QMP we must take recourse either to approximate or heuristic methods. We take the first approach here: we derive bounds on the *number* of orthogonal solutions to the general QMP. We illustrate these bounds in the tripartite case where we are looking for joint quantum states of a tripartite system ABC given two reduced states ρ_{AB} and ρ_{BC} (even the classical marginal problem is unsolved in this case [1]).

In this Letter we study a generalisation of the QMP, namely, how many *orthogonal* solutions are there to the QMP? This problem is of direct relevance not only to quantum chemistry, but also to condensed matter physics and quantum complexity theory because solutions to the QMP arise as *ground states* of locally interacting hamiltonians, and the number of orthogonal pure-state solutions is equal to the ground-state degeneracy of the hamiltonian.

We first focus on the case where we are given two re-

duced states ρ_{AB} and ρ_{BC} of a tripartite quantum system ABC , with local dimensions d_A , d_B , and d_C , and we wish to determine how many orthogonal *pure states* $|\psi_j\rangle$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$ of ABC are consistent with ρ_{AB} and ρ_{BC} , meaning that $\text{tr}_C(|\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|) = \rho_{AB}$ and $\text{tr}_A(|\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|) = \rho_{BC}$, for all j . To approach this problem we suppose that m such orthogonal states exist and construct the following mixed quantum state of ABC :

$$\rho_{ABC} = \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{m} |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|. \quad (1)$$

Notice that $\rho_{AB} = \text{tr}_C(\rho_{ABC})$ and $\rho_{BC} = \text{tr}_A(\rho_{ABC})$.

Our next step is to take our putative state ρ_{ABC} and compute its von Neumann entropy, $S_{ABC} \equiv -\text{tr}(\rho_{ABC} \log_2(\rho_{ABC})) = \log_2(m)$, which follows because the eigenvalues of ρ_{ABC} are $1/m$.

To complete our derivation we then apply the *strong subadditivity inequality* for the von Neumann entropy [16] to ABC , which reads $\log_2(m) = S_{ABC} \leq S_{AB} + S_{BC} - S_B$. Thus we obtain the bound

$$m \leq 2^{S_{AB} + S_{BC} - S_B}. \quad (2)$$

Note that S_{AB} , S_{BC} , and S_B are easy to calculate in terms of the initial data as ρ_B is obtained from ρ_{AB} via partial trace.

By applying the previous argument inductively step we can provide a general entropic bound on the number m of pure-state solutions to more general instances of the QMP: suppose we are given the reduced states $\rho_{A_j A_{j+1}}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ of an n -partite system (the subsystems A_j need not have the same dimension), then we can bound the number m of pure-state solutions to the QMP as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{A_1 A_2 \dots A_n} &\leq S_{A_1 A_2 \dots A_{n-1}} + S_{A_{n-1} A_n} - S_{A_{n-1}} \\ &\vdots \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} S_{A_j A_{j+1}} - \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} S_{A_j}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where we've repeatedly the strong subadditivity inequality to $S_{A_1 A_2 \dots A_k}$ in each step. Thus, using the same reasoning as above, we have that

$$m \leq \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} 2^{S_{A_j A_{j+1}}} \prod_{j=2}^{n-1} 2^{-S_{A_j}}. \quad (4)$$

It is clear how to extend this argument to more general settings.

The problem of determining the constraints on the existence of a joint state $\rho_{A_1 A_2 \dots A_n}$ given only the single-particle reduced states ρ_{A_j} is completely solved. However, the number of such constraints is enormous when the dimensions of A_j become large [8]. For example, even for the case of two three-level systems there are 387 inequalities to be checked. For the problem considered here, even if these inequalities are satisfied, one still needs to work out how many orthogonal pure-state solutions there are. Thus it is still desirable to develop bounds on the number of solutions to the QMP for this simpler case. We can do this using the *subadditivity* of the von Neumann entropy as follows. Consider the case where we are given ρ_A and ρ_B : then, as before, the number m of orthogonal solutions to the QMP is bounded by

$$\log_2(m) = S_{AB} \leq S_A + S_B \quad (5)$$

so that $m \leq 2^{S_A} 2^{S_B}$, and, following the inductive argument presented above, we have that

$$m \leq \prod_{j=1}^n 2^{S_{A_j}}. \quad (6)$$

Up to this point we have focussed on the special case where we are only looking for pure-state solutions to the QMP. However, it could be that there are no pure-state solutions to the QMP, yet the QMP is still solvable with a mixed state. To deal with this we extend our argument to the mixed-state case by using another idea, namely, *purification* [16]: any mixed state ρ of a quantum system A can be realised as the reduced state of a pure state $|\rho\rangle_{AA'}$ of a ‘‘doubled’’ system AA' where A' is a copy of A . To see this write $\rho = \sum_{j=1}^d p_j |u_j\rangle\langle u_j|$ for the spectral decomposition of ρ . Then

$$|\rho\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^d \sqrt{p_j} |u_j\rangle_A (|u_j\rangle_{A'}^*) \quad (7)$$

is a purification. If we have purifications $|\rho\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^d \sqrt{p_j} |u_j\rangle_A (|u_j\rangle_{A'}^*)$ and $|\sigma\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^d \sqrt{q_j} |v_j\rangle_A (|v_j\rangle_{A'}^*)$ of two mixed states ρ and σ then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \rho | \sigma \rangle &= \sum_{j,k=1}^n \sqrt{p_j q_k} \langle u_j | v_k \rangle (\langle u_j | v_k \rangle)^* \\ &= \text{tr}(\sqrt{\sigma} \sqrt{\rho}) = G(\rho, \sigma), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $G(\rho, \sigma)$ is a quantity related to the *fidelity* $F(\rho, \sigma) = \text{tr}(\sqrt{\sqrt{\rho} \sigma \sqrt{\rho}})$ between ρ and σ .

We apply this observation in the following way. Suppose that ρ_{ABC} is a mixed state solution to the QMP where we are given ρ_{AB} and ρ_{BC} . Then let $|\rho_{ABCA'B'C'}\rangle$ be the purification Eq. (7) of ρ_{ABC} onto the doubled system $ABCA'B'C'$. Suppose that there are m such mixed-state

solutions with corresponding purifications $|\psi_j\rangle$, and suppose that these purifications are orthogonal. (This orthogonality implies that the supports of $\rho_{ABC}^{(j)}$ and $\rho_{ABC}^{(k)}$, $j \neq k$, are orthogonal so that the corresponding solutions $\rho_{ABC}^{(j)}$ to the QMP have zero pairwise fidelity: $F(\rho_{ABC}^{(j)}, \rho_{ABC}^{(k)}) = \delta_{jk}$.) We then apply our main argument to $|\psi_j\rangle$ to find

$$\begin{aligned} \log_2(m) &= S_{ABCA'B'C'} \leq 2S_{ABC} \\ &= 2S_{AB} + 2S_{BC} - 2S_B, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where we’ve applied the subadditivity of the von Neumann entropy to $|\psi_j\rangle$ across the bipartition $ABC : A'B'C'$ and exploited the fact that $S_{ABC} = S_{A'B'C'}$. So we learn that

$$m \leq 2^{2S_{AB}} 2^{2S_{BC}} 2^{-2S_B}. \quad (10)$$

The extension to the general QMP is clear.

Note that the arguments presented here don’t depend on the dimension of the composite system and hence generalise, in the appropriate limits, to infinite-dimensional systems.

Physically, the bound Eq. (2) says that, in order for there to be m solutions to the tripartite QMP the entropy, and hence, our ignorance, of the reduced states of AB and BC needs to be large enough to suppress the entropy of the interface system B ; there needs to be enough room to move at the interface subsystem to marry up the two reductions into a larger consistent state. This is intuitively reasonable and provides a physical interpretation for the following simple *entanglement monogamy* result [17]. Suppose we are given $\rho_{AB} = |\Psi^-\rangle_{AB} \langle \Psi^-|$ and $\rho_{BC} = |\Psi^-\rangle_{BC} \langle \Psi^-|$, where $|\Psi^-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)$ is the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ singlet, then there are no pure joint states ρ_{ABC} consistent with these reduced density operators [17]: the bound Eq. (2) reads $m \leq \frac{1}{2}$, so that $m = 0$. Our bound Eq. (10) actually shows much more as we learn that this situation is robust against perturbations; there must be an ball of states around $|\Psi^-\rangle_{AB}$ and $|\Psi^-\rangle_{BC}$ where there are no joint states consistent with both ρ_{AB} and ρ_{BC} .

The bounds Eq. (2) and Eq. (10) are likely to be tight in the low-entropy regime, where the entropy of the interface system B is larger than that of AB or BC . In this case the bounds provide an easy way to prohibit the existence of a solution to the QMP. The bound Eq. (2) is also likely to perform well in the high entropy regime as it reproduces the exact result in the completely mixed case $\rho_{AB} = \mathbb{I}/d_A d_B$ and $\rho_{BC} = \mathbb{I}/d_B d_C$, namely, $m = 2^{d_A + d_B + d_B}$.

In this Letter we have developed an entropic upper bound on the *number* of orthogonal solutions to the quantum marginal problem. This bound also provides nontrivial constraints on the existence of solutions to the general QMP. Using our bound it is possible that new bounds for the ground-state energy and degeneracy (and hence, the thermodynamic pressure) of local hamiltonians may be developed. Additionally, it is likely that our bound will be useful in quantum complexity theory where it should be able to provide nontrivial bounds on quantum counting problems.

I would like to thank Henry Haselgrove and Michael Nielsen for helpful conversations which directly inspired this work. This work was supported, in part, by the University of London central research fund.

* Tobias.Osborne@rhul.ac.uk

- [1] A. Klyachko (2002), quant-ph/0206012.
- [2] N. Linden, S. Popescu, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 207901 (2002), quant-ph/0207109.
- [3] N. Linden and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 277906 (2002), quant-ph/0208093.
- [4] A. Higuchi, A. Sudbery, and J. Szulc, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 107902 (2003), quant-ph/0209085.
- [5] A. Higuchi (2003), quant-ph/0309186.
- [6] S. Bravyi, Quantum Inf. and Comp. **4**, 012 (2004), quant-ph/0301014.
- [7] Y.-J. Han, Y.-S. Zhang, and G.-C. Guo, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 052306 (2005), quant-ph/0403151.
- [8] A. Klyachko (2004), quant-ph/0409113.
- [9] M. Franz, J. Lie Theory **12**, 539 (2002).
- [10] M. Christandl and G. Mitchison, Commun. Math. Phys. **261**, 789 (2006), quant-ph/0409016.
- [11] S. Daftuar and P. Hayden, Ann. Phys. **315**, 80 (2005), quant-ph/0410052.
- [12] W. Hall, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 032102 (2007), quant-ph/0610031.
- [13] Y.-K. Liu, M. Christandl, and F. Verstraete, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 110503 (2007), quant-ph/0609125.
- [14] J. Eisert, T. Tyc, T. Rudolph, and B. C. Sanders, Commun. Math. Phys. **280**, 263 (2007), quant-ph/0703225.
- [15] A. J. Coleman and V. I. Yukalov, *Reduced density matrices*, vol. 72 of *Lecture Notes in Chemistry* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000).
- [16] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum computation and quantum information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
- [17] V. Coffman, J. Kundu, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 052306 (2000), quant-ph/9907047.