

Optimal State Discrimination in Generic Probability Models

Gen Kimura ^{[a],*} Takayuki Miyadera ^{[a],†} and Hideki Imai ^{[a],[b]}

^[a] *Research Center for Information Security (RCIS),
National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (AIST), Daibiru building 1102,
Sotokanda, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, 101-0021, Japan.* and

^[b] *Graduate School of Science and Engineering,
Chuo University, 1-13-27 Kasuga, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 112-8551, Japan*

We investigate a state discrimination problem in generic probability models which include both classical and quantum theory. Closely related family of ensembles (which we call a *Helstrom family of ensembles*) with the problem is introduced and we provide a geometrical method to find an optimal measurement for state discrimination by means of Bayesian strategy. We illustrate our method in 2-level quantum systems, and reproduce the optimal success probabilities for binary state discrimination and N numbers of symmetric quantum states. The existences of families of ensembles in binary cases are shown both in classical and quantum theories in any generic cases.

I. INTRODUCTION

Among many attempts to understand quantum theory axiomatically, an operationally natural approach has attracted increasing attention in the recent development of quantum information theory [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. By constructing a general framework of theories to include not only classical and quantum theories but also more general theories, one can reconsider the nature of quantum theory from the outside, especially with the operational and informational point of view. This also enables us to prepare for a (possible) post-quantum theory in the future. For instance, it is important to find conditions to achieve a secure key distribution in a general framework [6]. The convexity or operational approach [7], or recently referred as generic probability models [8], provides a general theory in which the probability plays a basic role. Although this approach has relatively long history [9], there are still many fundamental problems to be left open. This may not be surprising if one recalls that quantum information theory has given new insights and provided attractive problems on the foundation and application of quantum mechanics. One of them is a state discrimination problem. The problem asks how well a given ensemble of states is distinguishable. It has been one of the most important questions in quantum information theory, and there are various formulations of the problem depending on measures to characterize the quality of discrimination [10, 11, 12, 13, 14]. The property that there is no measurement perfectly distinguishes non-orthogonal pure states plays an essential role in the various protocols such as quantum key distribution [15], and is often considered as the most remarkable feature of quantum theory. On the other hand, in the context of generic probability models, the problem distinguishes classical theory from other theories including quantum theory. Indeed, it is known that classical systems can be

characterized by the fact that all the pure states can be perfectly discriminated in a single measurement [8].

In this paper, we consider an optimal state discrimination problem in generic probability models. In spite of the importance of the problem, as far as we know there are no works on it in generic probability models. It, however, should be noted that some works on the problem in quantum theory are related with our purpose. The non-signaling condition was used in deriving the optimal success probability [16] between two states in 2-level quantum systems, a bound of the optimal success probability [17] and a maximal confidence [18] among several non-orthogonal states in general quantum systems.

Our figure of merit is the optimal success probability, in discriminating N numbers of states under a given prior distribution. We introduce a useful family of ensembles, which we call a *Helstrom family of ensembles*, in any generic probability models, which generalizes a family of ensembles used in [16] in 2 level quantum systems with $N = 2$, and show that the family enable us to obtain optimal measurements by means of Bayesian strategy. The existences of the families for $N = 2$ which have a simple geometrical interpretation are shown in both classical and quantum systems in generic cases.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, after a brief review of generic probability models, we introduce a *Helstrom family of ensembles* and show the relation with an optimal measurement in state discrimination problem (Propositions 1, 2, Theorem 1). We also prove the existences of the families of ensembles for $N = 2$ in classical and quantum systems in generic cases (Theorems 2, 3). Finally, we illustrate our method in 2-level quantum systems, and reproduce the optimal success probabilities for binary state discrimination and N numbers of symmetric quantum states. In Sec. III, we summarize our results.

II. HELSTROM FAMILY OF ENSEMBLES IN GENERIC PROBABILITY MODELS

In generic probability models, the state space \mathcal{S} is assumed to be a convex set in a real vector space V , and

*Electronic address: gen-kimura[at]aist.go.jp

†Electronic address: miyadera-takayuki[at]aist.go.jp

an effect e on \mathcal{S} is defined by an affine functional from \mathcal{S} to $[0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}$ so that $e(s)$ is interpreted as the probability to obtain an output corresponding to the effect under a state s . We denote the set of all the effect by \mathcal{E} . There are two trivial effects, unit effect u and zero effect 0 , defined by $u(s) = 1, 0(s) = 0$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$. The observable $\mathbf{E} = \{e_i\}_{i=1}^N$ with finitely many outputs $\{\omega_i\}_{i=1}^N$ is defined by a set of effects $e_i \in E$ ($i = 1, \dots, N$) such that $\sum_i e_i = u$, meaning that $e_i(s)$ is the probability to obtain the output ω_i when measuring the observable \mathbf{E} in the state s . We denote by \mathcal{O}_N the set of all the N -valued observables [23]. While the output value ω_i can be not only from real numbers but also any symbols, like “head” or “tail”, hereafter we often identify them with $\{1, \dots, N\}$.

Physically natural topology is given by the (weakest) topology so that all the effects $e : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ are continuous. \mathcal{S} is usually assumed to be compact with respect to this topology. Typical examples of the generic probability models will be classical and quantum systems. For simplicity, the classical and quantum systems we consider in this paper will be finite systems:

[Example 1: Classical Systems] Finite classical system is described by a finite probability theory. Let $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_d\}$ be a finite sample space. A state is a probability distribution $p = (p_1, \dots, p_d)$, meaning that the probability to obtain ω_i is p_i . Therefore, the state space is $\mathcal{S}_{\text{cl}} = \{p = (p_1, \dots, p_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid p_i \geq 0, \sum_i p_i = 1\}$, and forms a standard simplex. The set of extreme points is $\{p^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^d$ where $p_j^{(i)} = \delta_{ij}$. An effect e is given by a random variable $f : \Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $e(p) = \sum_i f(i)p_i$ ($0 \leq f(i) \leq 1$).

[Example 2: Quantum Systems] d -level quantum system is described by an d dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . A state is described by a density operator ρ , a positive operator on \mathcal{H} with unit trace, and $\mathcal{S}_{\text{qu}} = \{\rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) \mid \rho \geq 0, \text{tr} \rho = 1\}$; here $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is a set of all linear operator on \mathcal{H} . Then, an effect e is described [19] by a positive operator B such that $0 \leq B \leq \mathbb{I}$ through $e(\rho) = \text{tr} B\rho$, which is called an element of positive operator valued measure (POVM).

We refer [8], where generalized No-broadcasting and No-cloning theorems have been shown in generic probability models, as an excellent review of more or less a canonical generic probability models.

As a state discrimination is one of the central problems in quantum information theory, we consider a problem to discriminate states in generic probability models by means of Bayesian strategy. Suppose Alice is given a state chosen from $\{s_i \in \mathcal{S}\}_{i=1}^N$ with a prior probability distribution $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^N$ ($p_i \geq 0, \sum_i p_i = 1$). Her goal is to find an optimal measurement to maximize the success probability to discriminate the states. Without loss of generality, it is sufficient to consider an N -valued observable $\mathbf{E} = \{e_i\}_{i=1}^N$ from which she decides the state was in s_i when obtaining the output i . The success probability

is

$$P_S(\mathbf{E}) = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i e_i(s_i). \quad (1)$$

Then, the optimal success probability P_S is given by optimizing $P_S(\mathbf{E})$ among all the N -valued observables:

$$P_S = \sup_{\mathbf{E} \in \mathcal{O}_N} P_S(\mathbf{E}). \quad (2)$$

For a binary discrimination ($N = 2$), it can be written as

$$P_S = p_2 + \sup_{e \in \mathcal{E}} [p_1 e(s_1) - p_2 e(s_2)], \quad (3)$$

where in the final expression we have used $e_1 + e_2 = u$. This problem is well investigated in quantum mechanics, and the optimal success probability to discriminate two distinct density operators ρ_1, ρ_2 with a prior distribution p_1, p_2 is given by

$$\begin{aligned} P_S^{(Q)} &= p_2 + \sup_{0 \leq E \leq \mathbb{I}} \text{tr}[E(p_1 \rho_1 - p_2 \rho_2)] \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(1 + \|p_1 \rho_1 - p_2 \rho_2\|_1). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Here, the norm is a trace norm defined by $\|A\|_1 := \text{tr}|A| = \text{tr} \sqrt{A^\dagger A}$. Since this bound is sometimes referred as the Helstrom bound, let us call P_S in any generic probability models also the Helstrom bound.

In order to obtain the Helstrom bound in generic probability models, we shall introduce a family of ensembles which is later shown to be closely related to the optimizing problem in Eq (2). In the following, we assume that a priori probability distribution satisfy $p_i \neq 0, 1$ in order to remove trivial cases:

Definition 1 Given N distinct states $\{s_i \in \mathcal{S}\}_{i=1}^N$ and a priori probability distribution $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^N$, we call a family of N -numbers of ensembles $\{\tilde{p}_i, s_i; 1 - \tilde{p}_i, t_i\}$ ($i = 1, \dots, N$) a “weak Helstrom family of ensembles” (or simply a “weak Helstrom family”) for states $\{s_i\}$ and a probability $\{p_i\}$ if there exist N -numbers of binary probability distributions $\{\tilde{p}_i, 1 - \tilde{p}_i\}$ ($0 < \tilde{p}_i, i = 1, \dots, N$) and states $\{t_i \in \mathcal{S}\}_{i=1}^N$ satisfying $\frac{p_i}{\tilde{p}_i} = \frac{p_i}{\tilde{p}_j} =: p \leq 1$ and

$$\tilde{p}_i s_i + (1 - \tilde{p}_i) t_i = \tilde{p}_j s_j + (1 - \tilde{p}_j) t_j := s \quad (5)$$

for any $i, j = 1, \dots, N$.

Note that condition (5) means that N ensembles $\{\tilde{p}_i, s_i; 1 - \tilde{p}_i, t_i\}$ are statistically equivalent among any (affine) observables. Therefore, a weak Helstrom family is a family of statistically equivalent ensembles which are mixtures of states $\{s_i\}$ and $\{t_i\}$ with weights reflecting (a priori) probability distribution: $p = \frac{p_i}{\tilde{p}_i}$. We call p , t_i , and s a Helstrom ratio, a conjugate state to s_i , and a reference state, respectively. As is later shown, a Helstrom ratio p plays an important role in an optimal state

discrimination. We call a weak *Helstrom family* a trivial (nontrivial) family when $p = 1$ ($p < 1$).

It should be noted that a weak *Helstrom family* always exists for any distinct states $\{s_i\}$ and a priori probability distribution $\{p_i\}$. For instance, it is easy to see that $\tilde{p}_i = p_i$ ($p = 1$) and $t_i = \frac{1}{1-p_i}((\sum_j p_j s_j) - p_i s_i)$ gives a weak *Helstrom family of ensembles* with a reference state $s = \sum_i p_i s_i$, although it is a trivial family (See later examples for nontrivial families). Moreover, if $\{\tilde{p}_i, s_i; 1 - \tilde{p}_i, t_i\}$ ($i = 1, \dots, N$) is a weak *Helstrom family* with a Helstrom ratio $p < 1$ and a reference state s , then for any $p < p' \leq 1$, one can construct another weak *Helstrom family* with a Helstrom ratio p' . Indeed, since $0 \leq \frac{1-\tilde{p}_i}{1-\tilde{p}_i'} < 1$ for $\tilde{p}_i' = \frac{p_i'}{p'}$ (< 1), one can take conjugate states as $t_i' := \frac{1-\tilde{p}_i}{1-\tilde{p}_i'} t_i + (1 - \frac{1-\tilde{p}_i}{1-\tilde{p}_i'}) s_i$. Then it is easy to see that the family of $\{s_i, \tilde{p}_i'; t_i', 1 - \tilde{p}_i'\}$ is a weak *Helstrom family* with a Helstrom ratio p' and the same reference state s .

One of the easiest way to find a weak *Helstrom family of ensembles* is by means of geometry. Let us explain this for the most interesting cases, i.e., those with the uniform probability distribution $p_i = 1/N$. In these cases, \tilde{p}_i 's gives the same weights $q := \tilde{p}_i = \frac{1}{Np}$, and one could find conjugate states t_i , first by taking aim at an appropriate reference state s , and making lines from each s_i passing through s to the point with which s is the interior point with the ratio q and $1 - q$ so that the end-points of the lines are contained in \mathcal{S} (See Fig. 1 [A] for $N = 3$). Then, with conjugate states as end-points of lines, one obtains a weak family of *Helstrom family* $\{q, s_i; 1 - q; t_i\}$ with a Helstrom ratio $p = \frac{1}{qN}$. More precisely, with general a priori probability distribution $\{p_i\}$, an algorithm to find a (possibly nontrivial) weak *Helstrom family* as small p as possible is given as follows: take a reference state $s = \sum_i p_i s_i$ (of a trivial weak *Helstrom family*). Extend a line from each s_i ($i = 1, \dots, N$) passing through s until the line reaches the boundary of \mathcal{S} . Let u_i be such states on the boundary and let $0 \leq q_i \leq 1$ be the ratio so that $s = q_i s_i + (1 - q_i) u_i$. Then, conjugate states t_i on each line satisfying $s = \tilde{p}_i s_i + (1 - \tilde{p}_i) t_i$ with $\tilde{p}_i := \frac{p_i q_{i_0}}{p_{i_0}}$ where $i_0 := \operatorname{argmax}_{i=1, \dots, N} [\frac{p_i}{q_i}]$, give a (nontrivial) weak *Helstrom family of ensembles* with a Helstrom ratio $p = \frac{p_{i_0}}{q_{i_0}}$ (See Fig. 1 [B] for $N = 3$).

In the following, we show that a (weak) *Helstrom family of ensembles* is closely related to an optimal state discrimination strategy, and provide a geometrical method to obtain the Helstrom bound P_S and an optimal measurement in any generic probability model.

Let $\mathbf{E} = \{e_i\}_{i=1}^N$ be any N -valued observable with which Alice decide the states from $\{s_i \in \mathcal{S}\}_{i=1}^N$ with a prior distribution $\{p_i\}$. Let $\{\tilde{p}_i, s_i; 1 - \tilde{p}_i, t_i\}$ ($i = 1, \dots, N$) be a weak *Helstrom family of ensembles* with the reference state $s = \tilde{p}_i s_i + (1 - \tilde{p}_i) t_i$ ($i = 1, \dots, N$) and a Helstrom ratio $p = \frac{p_i}{\tilde{p}_i}$. Using $u = \sum_i e_i$, the affinity of




FIG. 1: Let \mathcal{S} be a convex set in \mathbb{R}^2 as in the figure. For three distinct states $\{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$ in \mathcal{S} , non-trivial weak *Helstrom families* are illustrated [A] for the uniform distribution and [B] for $p_1 = 1/6, p_2 = 1/3, p_3 = 1/2$, where Helstrom ratios are [A] $p = 1/3q = 1/2$ ($q = \tilde{p}_i = 2/3$) and [B] $p = 2/3$.

e_i and Eq. (1), it follows

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \sum_i e_i(s) = \sum_i e_i(\tilde{p}_i s_i + (1 - \tilde{p}_i) t_i) \\ &= \frac{1}{p} \sum_i p_i e_i(s_i) + \sum_i (1 - \tilde{p}_i) e_i(t_i) \\ &= \frac{1}{p} P_S(\mathbf{E}) + \sum_i (1 - \tilde{p}_i) e_i(t_i). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Since $\sum_i (1 - \tilde{p}_i) e_i(t_i) \geq 0$, we obtain

$$P_S(\mathbf{E}) \leq p \quad (7)$$

which holds for any observables \mathbf{E} . Thus we have proved the following proposition.

Proposition 1 Let $\{\tilde{p}_i, s_i; 1 - \tilde{p}_i, t_i\}$ ($i = 1, \dots, N$) be a weak *Helstrom family of ensembles* with a Helstrom ratio $p = \frac{p_i}{\tilde{p}_i}$. Then, we have a bound for the Helstrom bound $P_S \leq p$.

This means that, once we find a weak *Helstrom family of ensembles*, a bound of the Helstrom bound is automatically obtained. A trivial weak *Helstrom family* gives a trivial condition $P_S \leq p = 1$, which is the reason we called it trivial. Examples of nontrivial weak *Helstrom families* are given in Fig. 1, where [A] $P_S \leq p = 1/2$ and [B] $P_S \leq p = 2/3$. Namely, the optimal success probability in the generic probability models described by this \mathcal{S} is at most $1/2$ and $2/3$ for [A] $p_1 = p_2 = p_3 = 1/3$ and [B] $p_1 = 1/6, p_2 = 1/3, p_3 = 1/2$, respectively.

Moreover, Proposition 1 leads us to a useful notion of *Helstrom family of ensembles* defined as follows:

Definition 2 Let $\{\tilde{p}_i, s_i; 1 - \tilde{p}_i, t_i\}$ ($i = 1, \dots, N$) be a weak *Helstrom family of ensembles* for N distinct states $\{s_i\}$ and a priori probability distributions $\{p_i\}$. We call it a *Helstrom family of ensembles* if the Helstrom ratio $p = \frac{p_i}{\tilde{p}_i}$ attains the Helstrom bound: $P_S = p$.




FIG. 2: Geometrical appearance of two distinguishable states t_1, t_2 .

From equations (6), an observable \mathbf{E} satisfies $P_S(\mathbf{E}) = p$ if $e_i(t_i) = 0$ for any $i = 1, \dots, N$. Then, it follows $p = P_S(\mathbf{E}) \leq P_S \leq p$. Consequently, we have

Proposition 2 *A sufficient condition for a weak Helstrom family of ensembles $\{\tilde{p}_i, s_i; 1 - \tilde{p}_i, t_i\}$ ($i = 1, \dots, N$) to be Helstrom family is that there exists an observable $\mathbf{E} = \{e_i\}_{i=1}^N$ satisfying $e_i(t_i) = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$. In this case, the observable \mathbf{E} gives an optimal measurement to discriminates $\{s_i\}$ with a prior distribution $\{p_i\}$.*

Two states $t_1, t_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ are said to be distinguishable if there exists an observable $\mathbf{E} = \{e_1, e_2\}$ which discriminates t_1 and t_2 with certainty (for any prior distributions), or equivalently satisfies $e_1(\sigma_1) = 1, e_1(\sigma_2) = 0$ ($\Leftrightarrow e_2(\sigma_1) = 0, e_2(\sigma_2) = 1$). Therefore, as a corollary of Proposition 2 for $N = 2$, we obtained the following theorem for a binary state discrimination $N = 2$.

Theorem 1 *Let $\{\tilde{p}_i, s_i; 1 - \tilde{p}_i, t_i\}$ ($i = 1, 2$) be a weak Helstrom family of ensembles for states $s_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ and a binary probability distribution p_1, p_2 such that t_1 and t_2 are distinguishable states. Then, $\{\tilde{p}_i, s_i; 1 - \tilde{p}_i, t_i\}$ ($i = 1, 2$) is a Helstrom family with the Helstrom ratio $p = P_S$. An optimal measurement to distinguish s_0 and s_1 is given by an observable to distinguish t_0 and t_1 .*

Proof The distinguishability of t_1 and t_2 satisfies the sufficient condition in Proposition 2. ■

Let us consider the case where \mathcal{S} is a subset of finite dimensional vector space V . Geometrically, two distinguishable states t_1, t_2 are states on the boundary of \mathcal{S} which possess parallel supporting hyperplanes (See Fig. 2). Here, a supporting hyperplane at a point $s \in \mathcal{S}$ is a hyperplane $H \subset V$ such that $s \in H$ and \mathcal{S} is contained in one of the two closed half-spaces of the hyperplane [20]. Indeed, if there exist two parallel supporting hyperplanes H_1 and H_2 at $t_1 \in \mathcal{S}$ and $t_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ respectively, one can construct an affine functional f on V such that $f(x) = 1$ on $x \in H_1$ and $f(y) = 0$ for $y \in H_2$. Then, the restriction of f to \mathcal{S} is an effect which distinguishes t_1 and t_2 with certainty since \mathcal{S} is contained between H_1 and H_2 and $f(t_1) = 1, f(t_2) = 0$. Then, to find a Helstrom family of ensembles given in Theorem 1 is nothing but a simple geometrical task. Here, we explain this in the uniform distribution cases: From the definition of a (weak) Helstrom family of ensembles and Theorem 1, two ensembles




FIG. 3: [A] A typical Helstrom family of ensembles in \mathbb{R}^2 ; [B] a Helstrom family of ensembles is not unique; [C] A Helstrom family of ensembles exists for models \mathcal{S} with infinite numbers of extreme points.

$\{\tilde{p}_i, s_i; 1 - \tilde{p}_i, t_i\}$ ($i = 1, 2$) for a distinct states $s_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ with the uniform distribution $p_1 = p_2 = 1/2$ are ensembles of a Helstrom family if t_1, t_2 are distinguishable and

$$s := qs_1 + (1 - q)t_1 = qs_2 + (1 - q)t_2, \quad (8)$$

with some $0 \leq q := \tilde{p}_1 = \tilde{p}_2 \leq 1$. From (8), $s_1 - s_2$ and $t_1 - t_2$ should be parallel, and therefore one easy way to find Helstrom family is as follows: search conjugate states t_1 and t_2 on the boundary of \mathcal{S} which are on a line parallel to $s_1 - s_2$ such that there exist parallel supporting hyperplanes at t_1 and t_2 . Then, the crossing point is a reference state s while the ratio between $s_1 - s$ ($s_2 - s$) and $s - t_1$ ($s - t_2$) determines the Helstrom ratio $p = \frac{1}{Nq}$. In Fig. 3, Helstrom families for some models on $V = \mathbb{R}^2$ are illustrated.

Now it is important to ask whether a Helstrom family of ensembles always exists for any generic probability models or not. In this paper, we show a Helstrom family of ensembles for a binary state discrimination ($N = 2$) always exist in generic cases for both classical and quantum systems. (For the existence in more general generic probability models, see our forthcoming paper [21].) Here, we mean by generic cases all the cases except for trivial cases where $P_S = \max[p_1, p_2]$ with a trivial measurement u , i.e., there are no improvement of guessing the state exceed to the prior knowledge.

First, let us consider a quantum system \mathcal{S}_{qu} . For distinct density operators ρ_1, ρ_2 with a priori probability distribution p_1, p_2 , define an Hermitian operator $X := p_1\rho_1 - p_2\rho_2$. Let $X = \sum_i x_i P_i$ be the spectral decomposition of X . The positive and negative parts of X are given by $X_+ := \sum_{i:x_i \geq 0} x_i P_i$ and $X_- := \sum_{i:x_i < 0} |x_i| P_i$ satisfying

$$X = X_+ - X_-. \quad (9)$$

Note that $X_+, X_- \geq 0$, $X_+ X_- = 0$, and $\|X_+\|_1 - \|X_-\|_1 = \text{tr } X_+ - \text{tr } X_- = p_1 - p_2$. X_+ or X_- can

be zero operator [24], but in that case the optimization problem is nothing but a trivial case. Indeed, suppose that $X_- = 0$. Then, for any POVM element E , it follows $\text{tr} EX = \text{tr} EX_+ \leq \text{tr} \mathbb{I} X_+ = \text{tr} X = p_1 - p_2$, and thus $P_S = p_1$ with a trivial measurement \mathbb{I} from (4). The similar argument shows that the case $X_+ = 0$ is again a trivial case with $P_S = p_2$. Therefore, for any generic case, we can assume $X_+, X_- \neq 0$. Then, we can define two density operators by

$$\sigma_1 := \frac{1}{\|X_-\|_1} X_-, \quad \sigma_2 := \frac{1}{\|X_+\|_1} X_+. \quad (10)$$

Notice that they are orthogonal and thus are distinguishable with certainty. It follows that $\sup_{0 \leq E \leq \mathbb{I}} \text{tr} EX = \text{tr} X_+ = \|X_+\|_1$ where the maximum is established by the projection operator $P = \sum_{i: x_i \geq 0} P_i$. From (4), we have

$$P_S^{(Q)} = p_2 + \|X_+\|_1 = p_1 + \|X_-\|_1. \quad (11)$$

Let $\tilde{p}_i = p_i/P_S^{(Q)}$ ($i = 1, 2$). It follows $0 < \tilde{p}_i \leq 1$ from (11) and $\frac{\tilde{p}_1}{\tilde{p}_2} = \frac{p_1}{p_2}$ by definition. Finally, direct calculation using (9), (10) and (11) shows the equation (5).

Therefore, we have obtained [25]

Theorem 2 *For any quantum mechanical systems, a Helstrom family of ensembles for a binary state discrimination exists for any generic cases.*

As any classical systems is embeddable into quantum systems (into diagonal elements with a fixed base), we have also

Theorem 3 *For any classical systems \mathcal{S}_{cl} , a Helstrom family of ensembles for a binary state discrimination exists for any generic cases.*

More concretely, for given distinct classical states $s_1 = (x_i)_{i=1}^d$, $s_2 = (y_i)_{i=1}^d \in \mathcal{S}_{cl}$ ($x_i, y_i \geq 0$, $\sum_i x_i = \sum_i y_i = 1$) with a priori probability distribution p_1, p_2 , one can define $t_1 = \frac{1}{\|X_-\|_1} (-\min[X_i, 0])_{i=1}^d$, $t_2 = \frac{1}{\|X_+\|_1} (\max[X_i, 0])_{i=1}^d$ where $X_i = p_1 x_i - p_2 y_i$, $\|X_-\|_1 = \sum_{i: X_i < 0} X_i$ and $\|X_+\|_1 = \sum_{i: X_i \geq 0} X_i$. Finally \tilde{p}_i is given by $p_i/P_S = 2p_i/(1 + \sum_i |X_i|)$.

In reference [16], a family of ensembles in Theorem 1 (and thus a *Helstrom family of ensembles*) has been used in 2-level quantum systems for a binary state discrimination with a uniform prior distribution $p_0 = p_1 = 1/2$. The purpose there was to reproduce Helstrom bound (4) in 2-level quantum systems (with $p_0 = p_1 = 1/2$) by resorting to (A) remote state preparation and (B) no-signaling condition [26]. In contrast to their results, Theorem 2 shows that a *Helstrom family of ensembles* exists not only in 2-level systems with uniform distributions but also in any quantum systems for generic cases. Moreover, Theorem 1 implies that a logical connection with an optimal state discrimination has already appears through the existence of a *Helstrom family of ensembles*, resort to neither (a) nor (b); and indeed this appears in any generic probability models, not only in quantum systems.




FIG. 4: 2-dimensional section of the Bloch Ball.

Finally, we conclude this section by illustrating our method in 2-level quantum systems (qubit systems). As is well known, any density operator ρ for qubits is represented by the Bloch vector $\mathbf{b} \in D^3 := \{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \|\mathbf{b}\| \leq 1\}$ through the map $\mathbf{b} \mapsto \rho(\mathbf{b}) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{I} + \sum_{i=1}^3 b_i \sigma_i)$, where σ_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) are Pauli Matrices. Notice that the trace distance between density operators coincides with the Euclid distance in \mathbb{R}^3 between the corresponding Bloch vectors: $\|\rho(\mathbf{b}_1) - \rho(\mathbf{b}_2)\|_1 = \|\mathbf{b}_1 - \mathbf{b}_2\|$.

[Examples 3: Binary state discrimination] Let us consider a state discrimination between $\rho(\mathbf{b}_1)$ and $\rho(\mathbf{b}_2)$ with a uniform distribution. Following a geometrical view of a *Helstrom family of ensembles* in Theorem 1, one can find it in the following manner: In order that states $\mathbf{c}_1 \in D^3$ and $\mathbf{c}_2 \in D^3$ have parallel supporting hyperplanes so that they are distinguishable, they should be on the Bloch sphere (pure states) in opposite direction [27]. Moreover, the line $\mathbf{c}_1 - \mathbf{c}_2$ has to be parallel to $\mathbf{b}_1 - \mathbf{b}_2$ from condition (8). Then, \mathbf{c}_1 and \mathbf{c}_2 are uniquely determined by points on the intersection of the Bloch ball and the hyperplane determined by $\mathbf{b}_1 - \mathbf{b}_2$ and the origin (See Fig. 4). Then, it is an elementary geometric problem to obtain the ratio: $q = \frac{2}{2 + \|\mathbf{b}_1 - \mathbf{b}_2\|}$. Since the Helstrom ratio is given by $p = p_i/\tilde{p}_i = 1/2q$, this reproduces a Helstrom bound $P_S = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{b}_1 - \mathbf{b}_2\|)$ by use of Theorem 1. Indeed, from (4), the optimal success probability to discriminate two distinct ρ_1 and ρ_2 with a uniform prior distribution is

$$P_S^{(Q)} = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \frac{1}{2}\|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1). \quad (12)$$

(Recall that $\|\rho(\mathbf{b}_1) - \rho(\mathbf{b}_2)\|_1 = \|\mathbf{b}_1 - \mathbf{b}_2\|$).

[Examples 4: N -numbers of symmetric state discrimination] In quantum systems, discrimination of N numbers of state is much more difficult problem than binary cases. For symmetric quantum (pure) states $\{\rho_j = |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|_{j=1}^N$ with uniform distribution $p_i = 1/N$, where state vectors are given by $|\psi_j\rangle = V^{j-1}|\psi\rangle$ with a normalized vector $|\psi\rangle$ and a unitary operator satisfying

$V^N = \exp(i\chi)\mathbb{I}$ ($\chi \in \mathbb{R}$), Ban et al. [22] obtained the optimal success probability:

$$P_S^{(Q)} = |\langle \psi | \Phi | \psi \rangle|^2,$$

where $\Phi := \sum_{j=1}^N |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|$. As a typical example, let us consider N symmetric states in 2-level systems (as illustrated in Fig. 5 [A] for the case $N = 8$). Let $V := \exp(-i\frac{\pi}{N}\sigma_3)$ be a unitary operator which rotates Bloch vectors by the angle $2\pi/N$ around on the z axis ($V^N = -\mathbb{I}$); and let $|\psi\rangle := \cos(\frac{\theta}{2})|0\rangle + \sin(\frac{\theta}{2})|1\rangle$ where $|0\rangle, |1\rangle$ the eigenvectors of σ_3 with eigenvalues $1, -1$. The corresponding Bloch vector to $|\psi\rangle$ is $\mathbf{b} = (\sin\theta, 0, \cos\theta)$. Then, it follows

$$|\psi_j\rangle := V^{j-1}|\psi\rangle = \cos(\frac{\theta}{2})|0\rangle + \sin(\frac{\theta}{2})e^{i\frac{2\pi(j-1)}{N}}|1\rangle, \quad (13)$$

for $j = 1, \dots, N$, with the corresponding Bloch vectors $\mathbf{b}^{(j)} = (\sin\theta \cos \frac{2\pi(j-1)}{N}, \sin\theta \sin \frac{2\pi(j-1)}{N}, \cos\theta)$. It is easy to show $\Phi = \frac{N}{2}(\mathbb{I} + \cos\theta\sigma_3)$ [28], and the optimal success probability is

$$P_S^{(Q)} = \frac{1}{N}(1 + \sin\theta). \quad (14)$$

In the following, we apply our method and show that there exists a *Helstrom family of ensemble* for this problem with any N and thus reproduce the success probability (14). (In the following, we identify the density operator ρ_j , the state vector ψ_j , and its Bloch vector \mathbf{b}_j .)

First, from the symmetricity and geometrical view point of a weak *Helstrom family of ensembles*, it is clear that a weak *Helstrom family* for $\{\rho_j = |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|\}_{j=1}^N$ and $p_i = 1/N$ can be constructed as follows: In the Bloch ball, make lines from each ρ_j to a point on the z -axis, say point C , and extend the lines until they arrives at the Bloch sphere, and let conjugate states σ_j be each end-points of the lines from ρ_j . Fig. 5 [B] shows one of the 2-dimensional sections of the Bloch ball where the points A and B are the corresponding ρ_j and σ_j . Then, we have obtained a weak *Helstrom family of ensembles* $\{q_\xi, \rho_j; 1 - q_\xi, \sigma_j\}$ where q_ξ is a ratio $\frac{CB}{AB}$, where we explicitly write the dependence on the angle $\xi = \angle DAB$, so that the reference state ρ is the point C :

$$\rho = q_\xi \rho_j + (1 - q_\xi) \sigma_j \quad (j = 1, \dots, N).$$

Note that we have a bound $P_S \leq p = \frac{1}{Nq_\xi}$ from Proposition 1. Therefore, in order to obtain a tighter bound of P_S , we would like to find a weak *Helstrom family* with larger q_ξ as much as possible. It is again a simple geometric problem to obtain $q_\xi = 1 - \frac{\sin\theta}{\sin(\theta+2\xi)+\sin\theta}$ (see the caption of Fig. 5 [B]), which takes the maximum $q_{\xi_M} = \frac{1}{1+\sin\theta}$ at $\xi_M = \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{\theta}{2}$ ($= \angle DAE$) (See Fig. 5 [C]). Remarkably, this attains the tight bound (14), and thus we have demonstrated that our method reproduces the optimal success probability. Indeed, we can show




FIG. 5: [A] Symmetric quantum states ρ_1, \dots, ρ_8 in the Bloch ball; [B] 2-dimensional section where points A, B, C are ρ_j, σ_j and ρ , respectively; ($AC = \frac{\sin\theta}{\cos\xi}$, $AB = 2\sin(\theta + \xi)$, and thus $q = 1 - \frac{AC}{AB} = 1 - \frac{\sin\theta}{2\sin(\theta+\xi)\cos\xi}$); [C] *Helstrom family of ensembles* with conjugate states σ_j and the reference state ρ .

that this weak *Helstrom family of ensembles* is a *Helstrom family* from Proposition 2: note that $\sigma_j = |\phi_j\rangle\langle\phi_j|$ at ξ_M is

$$|\phi_j\rangle = \cos(\frac{\pi}{4})|0\rangle + \sin(\frac{\pi}{4})e^{i(\frac{2\pi(j-1)}{N} + \pi)}|1\rangle. \quad (15)$$

Let $|\chi_j\rangle := \cos(\frac{\pi}{4})|0\rangle + \sin(\frac{\pi}{4})e^{i\frac{2\pi(j-1)}{N}}|1\rangle$ which is orthogonal to $|\phi_j\rangle$ for all $j = 1, \dots, N$. Then, it follows $\sum_{j=1}^N |\chi_j\rangle\langle\chi_j| = \frac{N}{2}\mathbb{I}$ and thus $\{E_i := \frac{2}{N}|\chi_i\rangle\langle\chi_i|\}$ is a POVM which satisfies the condition $\text{tr } E_i \sigma_i = 0$ in Proposition 2. Consequently, we have found a *Helstrom family of ensembles* and thus obtained the Helstrom bound.

III. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we introduced a notion of a (weak) *Helstrom family of ensembles* in generic probability models and showed the close relation with state discrimination problems. Basically, *Helstrom family* can be searched by means of geometry, and once we have the family, or at least a weak family, the optimal success probability, or a bound of it, is automatically obtained from the Helstrom ratio. In binary state discriminations, a weak *Helstrom family of ensembles* with distinguishable conjugate states is shown to be a *Helstrom family* which has again a simple geometrical interpretation. We illustrated our method in

2-level quantum systems, and reproduced the Helstrom bound (12) for binary state discrimination and symmetric quantum states (14).

In this paper, we showed the existences of *Helstrom families of ensembles* analytically in both classical and quantum theory in any generic cases in binary state dis-

criminations. For the more general models, it will be investigated in our forthcoming paper [21].

Acknowledgment

We would like to thank Dr. Imafuku, Dr. Nuida and Dr. Hagiwara for their fruitful comments.

-
- [1] L. Hardy, arXiv: quant-ph/0101012.
 [2] C. A. Fuchs, arXiv:quant-ph/0205039.
 [3] J. Barrett, Phys. Rev. A. **75** (2007) 032304.
 [4] R. Clifton, J. Bub, and H. Halvorson, Found. Phys. **33**, 1561 (2003).
 [5] G. M. D'Ariano, arXiv: quant-ph/0603011.
 [6] J. Barrett, L. Hardy, A. Kent, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 010503 (2005).
 [7] S. P. Gudder, *Stochastic Method in Quantum Mechanics* (Dover, Mineola, 1979); S. P. Gudder, *Quantum Probability* (Academic, Boston, 1988).
 [8] H. Barnum, J. Barrett, M. Leifer and A. Wilce, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99** 240501 (2007); arXiv: quant-ph/0611295
 [9] C. M. Edwards, Comm. Math. Phys. **16**, 207 (1970); E. B. Davies and J. T. Lewis, Comm. Math. Phys. **17** 239 (1970); G. Ludwig, *Foundations of Quantum Mechanics* Vol I and II, (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983 and 1985). E. B. Davies, *Quantum Theory of Open Systems* (Academic, London, 1976).
 [10] C. W. Helstrom, *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory*, (Academic, NewYork, 1976).
 [11] C. A. Fuchs, *Distinguishability and Accessible Information in Quantum Theory*, PhD thesis, The University of New Mexico (1996).
 [12] I. D. Ivanovic, Phys. Lett. A **123**, 257 (1987).
 [13] D. Dieks, Phys. Lett. A **126**, 303 (1988).
 [14] A. Peres, Phys. Lett. A **128**, 19 (1988).
 [15] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard, Proc. of IEEE Int. Conf. on Computers, Systems and Signal Processing, 175 (1984).
 [16] W. Y. Hwang, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 062315 (2005); J. Bae, J. W. Lee, J. Kim and W. Y. Hwang, arXiv: quant-ph/0406032.
 [17] S. M. Barnett and E. Andersson, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 044307 (2002); D. Qiu, Phys. Lett. A **303**, 140 (2002); Y. Feng, S. Zhang, R. Duan, and M. Ying, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 062313 (2002).
 [18] S. Croke, E. Andersson, S. M. Barnett, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 012113 (2008).
 [19] M. Ozawa, Rep. on Math. Phys. **18**, 11 (1980). See also Theorem II.2 in M. Ozawa, Ann. Phys. **311**, 350 (2004).
 [20] S. R. Lay, *Convex Sets and Their Applications* (Krieger, Malabar, 1992).
 [21] K. Nuida, et al. (in preparation).
 [22] M. Ban, K. Kurokawa, R. Momose, and O. Hirota, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **36**, 1269 (1997).
 [23] Although, one can consider more general observables with infinite numbers of observables with measure theoretic language, we restrict to the finitely many outputs observables since it is enough for our purpose in discriminating states among finitely many sets.
 [24] Note that this happens even when $0 < p_1, p_2 < 1$.
 [25] Although we explained in finite level quantum systems, it is straightforward to generalize to any quantum mechanical systems with Hilbert space with countably infinite dimension. (Notice that X is a trace class operator on \mathcal{H} and thus has a discrete spectral decomposition.)
 [26] [(A) Remote State Preparation] Let $\{p_i; \rho_i\}$ and $\{q_j; \sigma_j\}$ be two ensembles in a quantum system ($\rho_i, \sigma_j \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{qu}}$, $p_i, q_j \geq 0, \sum_i p_i, \sum_j q_j = 1$) which satisfies $\sum_i p_i \rho_j = \sum_j q_j \sigma_j$. Then, there exist a Hilbert space \mathcal{K} , a state τ on $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K}$, and local measurements M_1 and M_2 on \mathcal{K} such that the ensembles $\{p_i; \rho_i\}$ and $\{q_j; \sigma_j\}$ can be remotely prepared by measuring M_1 and M_2 under the state τ . [(B) No-signaling condition] Any information does not instantaneously transmit by local measurement. In quantum systems, it is well known that both (A) and (B) holds.
 [27] Indeed, this is equivalent to the orthogonality between $\rho(\mathbf{e}_1)$ and $\rho(\mathbf{e}_2)$.
 [28] For instance, one can make use of the Bloch vector representation. $\Phi := \sum_{j=1}^N |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j| = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{I} + \sum_{k=1}^3 b_k^{(j)} \sigma_k) = \frac{N}{2}(\mathbb{I} + \cos \theta \sigma_3)$, since $\sum_j b_1^{(j)} \sigma_1 = \sum_j b_1^{(j)} \sigma_1$ vanish from the rotational symmetricity around z -axis.