

# Unambiguous modification of non-orthogonal quantum states

F.A. Torres-Ruiz,<sup>1</sup> J. Aguirre,<sup>1</sup> A. Delgado,<sup>1</sup> G. Lima,<sup>1</sup> L. Neves,<sup>1</sup> S. Pádua,<sup>1,2</sup> L. Roa,<sup>1</sup> and C. Saavedra<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Center for Quantum Optics and Quantum Information, Departamento de Física, Universidad de Concepción, Casilla 160-C, Concepción, Chile.*

<sup>2</sup>*Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Caixa Postal 702, 30123-970 Belo Horizonte MG, Brazil.*

(Dated: December 2, 2018)

A probabilistic method for the unambiguous modification of non-orthogonal quantum states is proposed. This is based on conclusive modifications of the inner product between two pure quantum states in a discrimination-like process. We experimentally implemented this protocol by using two-photon polarization states generated in the process of spontaneous parametric down conversion. In the experiment, for codifying initial quantum states, we consider single photon states and heralded detection. As application, we show that when our protocol is applied to partially entangled states it allows a fine control of the amount of entanglement of the modified states.

PACS numbers: 03.65.-w, 03.65.Ta, 42.50.Dv

The problem of unambiguous quantum state discrimination (UQSD) among non-orthogonal quantum states has been studied extensively. Main motivations driving studies in this problem are the facts that quantum states are not observables and the possibility of encoding information on quantum systems. Seminal work on this problem started with the studies of Helstrom and Holevo on quantum state identification and probability theory [1]. The case of two equally probable non-orthogonal states was first studied by I.D. Ivanovic and D. Dieks [2]. A. Peres [3] solved the problem of the discrimination between two states by considering positive operator valued measurements (POVM), and later his solution was extended for arbitrary a priori probabilities [4] and arbitrary numbers of equally probable states [5]. Today, UQSD plays an important role in quantum communication and quantum computing, being at the core of many quantum cryptographic schemes and probabilistic quantum algorithms [6]. It can be used, for instance, as a model for efficient attack in quantum cryptography [7, 8].

The first experiment for unambiguous state discrimination of two non-orthogonal polarization states of light, near the Ivanovic-Dieks-Peres (IDP) limit, was experimentally implemented via weak optical pulses propagated through an optical fiber with polarization-dependent loss [9]. UQSD at the IDP limit was experimentally achieved via a free-space interferometer which recorded conclusive and inconclusive events [10]. It has also been experimentally investigated in the context of three non-orthogonal linearly independent states [11].

In this letter, we describe a probabilistic protocol to unambiguously modify two non-orthogonal polarization states. The initial states are assumed to be known, as well as the final states. The initial states are generated randomly from a single source so that it is not possible to perform the unambiguous modification in a deterministic way. Here, we report the experimental implementation of this protocol for the case of using photonic qubits. In the

experiment, we have used two-photon states generated by spontaneous parametric down conversion (SPDC), which are selected in factorized polarization states. One photon of the pair is used as a trigger, the other one is used for codifying two polarized initial states whose inner product is conclusively modified. As application, we show that when our protocol is applied to partially entangled two-photon polarization states it allows a fine control of the amount of entanglement of the modified two-photon states. In particular, this allows one for filtering maximally entangled states.

Let us consider a photon prepared in one of two possible polarization states,  $|\psi_+\rangle$  or  $|\psi_-\rangle$ , defined by

$$|\psi_{\pm}\rangle = \cos(\alpha/2)|H\rangle \pm \sin(\alpha/2)|V\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where  $|H\rangle$  and  $|V\rangle$  denote horizontal and vertical polarization, respectively. As an ancillary degree of freedom for the photon we consider two effective distinguishable propagation paths 1 and 2, which are denoted by states  $|1\rangle$  and  $|2\rangle$  [12]. Initially the photon propagates along path  $|1\rangle_a$ . After the application of the protocol, the initial states  $|\psi_+\rangle$  and  $|\psi_-\rangle$  will probabilistically have the angle between them modified. The angle  $\alpha$  of the initial states will be changed to  $\beta$ , i.e., the final states  $|\phi_{\pm}\rangle$  are given by

$$|\phi_{\pm}\rangle = \cos(\beta/2)|H\rangle \pm \sin(\beta/2)|V\rangle. \quad (2)$$

Let us now give the mathematical description of the protocol. In the first case, we aim at increasing the angle between the initial states, i.e.,  $0 \leq \alpha \leq \beta \leq \pi$ . In particular, the case of orthogonal states occurs when  $\beta = \pi/2$ . We perform a conditional unitary operation,  $\hat{U}_1$ , which acts in a subspace of the composite system (polarization and path states) spanned by  $\{|H\rangle|1\rangle, |V\rangle|1\rangle, |V\rangle|2\rangle\}$ . The action of this conditional operation is such that  $\hat{U}_1|H\rangle|1\rangle = \cos(2\gamma_1)|H\rangle|1\rangle + \sin(2\gamma_1)|V\rangle|2\rangle$  and  $\hat{U}_1|V\rangle|1\rangle = e^{i\varphi_1}|V\rangle|1\rangle$ , where  $\varphi_1$  accounts for the optical path difference when propagating



sured as a function of the angle  $\gamma_1$  of HWP<sub>1</sub>, with  $\gamma_1$  varied from 0 up to  $\pi/2$  and  $\gamma_2$  kept fixed at zero angle. The success probability of generating states  $|\phi_{\pm}\rangle$  is plotted in Fig. 2.a. The measured success probability is the ratio between the coincidence counts measured for arbitrary  $\gamma_1$  ( $0 \leq \gamma_1 \leq \pi/2$ ) and coincidence counts for  $\gamma_1 = 0$ .  $\beta$  is calculated from  $\gamma$  through  $2\gamma_1 = \arccos \frac{\tan(\beta/2)}{\tan(\alpha/2)}$ . Secondly, we chose a fixed value for the angle  $\alpha = \pi/4$




FIG. 2: Success probability (black points) as a function of the output angle  $\beta$  in units of  $\pi$ , where the initially superposition was  $|\psi_{\pm}\rangle$ , with (a)  $\alpha = \pi/2$  and (b)  $\alpha = \pi/4$ . The solid line corresponds to the success probability  $P_s^{(1)}$  (Eq. (4)) for  $\beta$  satisfying  $\alpha \leq \beta \leq \pi$  and  $P_s^{(2)}$  (Eq. (6)) for  $\beta$  satisfying  $0 \leq \beta \leq \alpha$ .

of the input states and measure the success probability of generating output states with their inner product equal to  $\cos\beta$ . Thus, at the experimental setup, both HWP are rotated, with one of them fixed at zero angle for a given case (HWP<sub>1</sub> for  $0 \leq \beta \leq \alpha$  and HWP<sub>2</sub> for  $\alpha \leq \beta \leq \pi$ ). This allows us to get the plot from  $0 \leq \beta \leq \pi$ , which is depicted in Fig. 2.b. The quality of the experimental setup was tested by measuring the visibility at the Mach-Zehnder interferometer and by performing the tomographic reconstruction of the polarization states in case of success measurements for input as well as for output states, which are depicted in Fig. 3.

In the experiment above described the two-photon state was generated in a separable state, where one of them serves as witness of the other. If this state is replaced by a partially entangled two-photon polarization state, then it is possible to probabilistically increase or decrease its amount of entanglement [13] by feeding the experimental setup of Fig. (1) with one of the photons of the entangled pair, which is related to the optimal conclusive discrimination of two states by local operations and classical communications even in case of multipartite system [16]. The possibility of coherently mapping the non-orthogonal symmetric one-photon states onto a different set of non-orthogonal one-photon states allows one to control the degree of entanglement of the total two-photon state. In this case we prepare the initial state

$$|\Psi_{\text{in}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\psi_{+}\rangle|+\rangle + |\psi_{-}\rangle|-\rangle), \quad (7)$$





FIG. 3: (a) Normalized coincidence counts obtained with the signal detector at the output  $|1\rangle_a$  as a function of the arms' length difference  $\Delta = l_1 - l_2$  in units of  $\lambda = 702\text{nm}$ . A linear polarizer rotated at an angle of  $\pi/4$  was inserted in front of the detector  $D_{s1}$ . The phase difference was modified by rotating the PS along the propagation path. The solid curve is given by  $a(1 + V \sin(\Delta + \zeta))$ , with  $a = 0.53 \pm 0.01$  and  $\zeta = 1.97 \pm 0.07$ . (b) Tomographic reconstruction of both (i) the input state  $|\psi_{+}\rangle$  with  $\alpha = \pi/4$  and (ii) the output state  $|\phi_{+}\rangle$  with  $\beta = 0.22\pi$ . The fidelity for these states are  $F = 0.94 \pm 0.03$  and  $F = 0.88 \pm 0.04$ , respectively.

where  $|\pm\rangle = (|H\rangle \pm |V\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$  and  $|\psi_{\pm}\rangle$  are given by Eq. (1). In the experimental setup, we replace the type-II BBO crystal by two 0.5-mm-thick BBO crystals, cut for type-I phase matching, which are separated by an air layer of 0.1 mm, see figure 1 in Ref. [14]. In this case the HWP in front of the interferometer was replaced by a HWP and a QWP (at 351.1 nm) before of BBO crystals. The HWP allows one for varying the  $\alpha$  angle between  $|\psi_{\pm}\rangle$  states and the QWP allows one to modify the relative phase between horizontal and vertical polarizations, which appears due to the birefringence of the crystals [15]. For the initial state (Eq. (7)) the HWP at arm 1 (2) is rotated by an angle  $\gamma_1$  ( $\gamma_2$ ). The modified two-photon polarization state at the output 1 of the interferometer is given by

$$|\Psi_{\text{out}1}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\phi_{+}^{(1)}\rangle|+\rangle + |\phi_{-}^{(1)}\rangle|-\rangle), \quad (8)$$

with  $|\phi_{\pm}^{(1)}\rangle = \cos(\alpha/2) \cos(2\gamma_1)|H\rangle \mp \sin(\alpha/2) \cos(2\gamma_2)|V\rangle$ , disregarding the normalization constant for this state. The expression for the degree of entanglement [19] of the state (8) is

$$E(|\Psi_{\text{out}1}\rangle) = \frac{E(|\Psi_{\text{in}}\rangle) |\cos(2\gamma_1) \cos(2\gamma_2)|}{\cos^2(\alpha/2) \cos^2(2\gamma_1) + \sin^2(\alpha/2) \cos^2(2\gamma_2)}. \quad (9)$$

In figure 4 we plot the entanglement of the output state  $|\Psi_{out1}\rangle$  as a function of the rotation angle of HWP<sub>1</sub>, while HWP<sub>2</sub> is kept fixed. In this experiment the interferometer was dynamically stabilized. One can observe that our protocol allows a simple, controlled modification of the entanglement of two-photon polarization states.




FIG. 4: Entanglement of the output state  $|\Psi_1\rangle$  as a function of the angle  $\gamma_1$  at HWP<sub>1</sub>, while  $\gamma_2 = \pi/9$ . In this curve the solid line is given by Eq. (9) and the experimental data appears as black points.

This setup is well suited for an experimental implementation of the so called “4+2” [17] as well as the SARG [18] quantum key distribution protocols using one-photon states, where two families of non-orthogonal quantum states are used for establishing a common secret key between two legitimate users of a quantum channel, Alice and Bob. The “4+2” protocol could work as follows: The sender Alice prepares the random sequence of states from the two families by initially randomly choosing states  $|\psi_{\pm}\rangle$  with  $\alpha = \pi/2$ , with  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  different from zero, which gives origin to the states  $|\phi_{\pm}^{(j)}\rangle = \cos(\theta_j/2)|H\rangle \pm \sin(\theta_j/2)|V\rangle$ , with  $j = 1, 2$  for outputs |1⟩ and |2⟩ of the interferometer. The rotation angles for HWP are given by  $\sin(2\gamma_1) = \cos\frac{\theta_1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{(1+\cos\theta_2)}{\cos\theta_1+\cos\theta_2}}$  and  $\sin(2\gamma_2) = \sin\frac{\theta_1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{2(1+\cos\theta_2)}{\cos\theta_1+\cos\theta_2}}$ . These families of states are generated with probabilities  $P_{\phi_{\pm}^{(1)}} = \frac{1+\cos\theta_2}{\cos\theta_1+\cos\theta_2}$  and  $P_{\phi_{\pm}^{(2)}} = 1 - P_{\phi_{\pm}^{(1)}}$  which can be both equal to 1/2. Then, she randomly chooses which output is sent to Bob. Hence, the receiver, Bob, needs to unambiguously discriminate states from pairs  $\{|\phi_{+}^{(1)}\rangle, |\phi_{-}^{(1)}\rangle\}$  and  $\{|\phi_{+}^{(2)}\rangle, |\phi_{-}^{(2)}\rangle\}$ . For this purpose Bob randomly chooses to rotate HWP at angles  $\gamma_2^{(j)} = \frac{1}{2}\arccos\left(\tan\frac{\theta_j}{2}\right)$ ; this allows him to get orthogonal states  $|\phi_{\pm}\rangle = (|H\rangle \pm |V\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$  at the output |1⟩ of Bob’s discrimination device, which again is given by Fig. 1. Alice codifies 0 (1) at states  $|\psi_{+}\rangle$  ( $|\psi_{-}\rangle$ ), so that Bob obtains an element of the key when the discrimination angle  $\gamma_2^{(j)}$  coincides with the output sent by Alice. The output |2⟩ of Bob could be used for detecting the presence of an eavesdropper, because any intervention of the channel will modify the discrimination probability.

We have experimentally demonstrated the controlled conclusive modification of non-orthogonal quantum states. This effective non-unitary evolution of quantum states is generated by coupling the quantum system to an ancillary system followed by a projective measurement on the ancilla. We have experimentally proved that the success probability is given by Eqs. (4) and (6). We want to remark that we have demonstrated that our protocol is optimal for the class of states considered. This experimental setup is also well suited for the controlled generation of polarization mixed states of one and two photon by changing in a controlled way the length of one of the arms of the interferometer. This would also allow to experimentally study the discrimination of two density matrices. The application of the protocol for partially entangled states can be complemented with the possibility of generating mixed states by unbalancing the interferometer. The generalization of the results here reported and the case of higher dimensional systems seems feasible considering recent advances by Politi *et. al* [20] in integrated waveguide quantum circuits.

**Acknowledgment** This work was supported by Grants Milenio ICM P06-067F and FONDECYT 1061046 and 1080383. F.A. Torres-Ruiz thanks to MECESUP for scholarship support.

- 
- [1] C.W. Helstrom, *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory* (New York: Academic Press, 1976); A.S. Holevo, *Theory Probab. Appl.* **23**, 411 (1979).
  - [2] I.D. Ivanovic, *Phys. Letts. A* **123**, 257 (1987); D. Dieks, *ibid* **126**, 303 (1988).
  - [3] A. Peres, *Phys. Letts. A* **128**, 19 (1988).
  - [4] G. Jaeger and A. Shimony, *Phys. Lett. A* **197**, 83 (1995).
  - [5] A. Chefles, *Phys. Lett. A* **239**, 339 (1998); A. Chefles and S.M. Barnett, *ibid* **250**, 223 (1998).
  - [6] J. Bergou, U. Herzog, and M. Hillery, *Lect. Notes in Phys.* **649**, 297 (2004).
  - [7] C.A. Fuchs and A. Peres, *Phys. Rev. A* **53**, 2038 (1996).
  - [8] M. Dušek, M. Jahma, and N. Lütkenhaus, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 022306 (2000).
  - [9] B. Huttner *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 3783 (1996).
  - [10] R. Clarke *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 040305(R) (2001).
  - [11] M. Mohseni, A.M. Steinberg, and J.A. Bergou, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 200403 (2004).
  - [12] N.J. Cerf, C. Adami, and P.G. Kwiat, *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, R1477 (1998).
  - [13] P. Rungta and C.M. Caves, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 012307 (2003).
  - [14] P.G. Kwiat *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. A* **60**, R773 (1999).
  - [15] A.G. White *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 3103 (1999); Z.W. Wang *et al.*, *ibid* **96**, 220505 (2006).
  - [16] Z. Ji, H. Cao and M. Ying, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 032323 (2005).
  - [17] B. Huttner *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. A* **51**, 1863 (1996).
  - [18] V. Scarani *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 057901 (2004).
  - [19] W.K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 2245 (1998).
  - [20] A. Politi *et al.*, *Science* **320**, 646 (2008).