

Entanglement Cost of a Nonlocal Measurement

Somshubhro Bandyopadhyay¹, Gilles Brassard¹, Shelby Kimmel², and William K. Wootters²

¹*Département IRO, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Québec, H3C 3J7, Canada*

²*Department of Physics, Williams College, Williamstown, MA 01267, USA*

(Dated: July 19, 2022)

For certain specific joint measurements on a pair of spatially separated qubits, we ask how much entanglement is needed to carry out the measurement exactly. We focus primarily on a particular orthogonal measurement with partially entangled eigenstates, for which we present upper and lower bounds on the entanglement cost. The upper bound is based on a recent result by D. Berry [Phys. Rev. A **75**, 032349 (2007)]. The lower bound, which is new, implies that the entanglement required to perform the measurement is strictly greater than the average entanglement of its eigenstates. We also present a closely related eight-outcome measurement whose cost we can compute exactly. We find that the costs of these two similar measurements differ significantly from each other, raising a question as to what constitutes the crucial distinction between the two cases.

I. INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of entanglement has received much attention in the past couple of decades as researchers have come to appreciate its importance for quantum information processing and quantum communication. In particular, much work has been done on the problem of quantifying entanglement, which amounts to quantifying the degree of nonseparability of a quantum state.

It has also been recognized that quantum *measurements* can be nonseparable in a way that is not entirely captured by the notion of entanglement. For example, a 1999 paper entitled “Quantum nonlocality without entanglement” presented a specific bipartite measurement that could not be performed using only local operations and classical communication (LOCC), even though all of the states that the measurement distinguishes are unentangled [3]. In several other papers, this example has been further analyzed and other measurements demonstrating the same effect have been found [8, 14, 26]. Evidently, then, the amount of entanglement required, as a resource, to do a measurement is not determined only by the entanglement of the states associated with the outcomes of the measurement; there is something else involved. In this paper we ask what nonlocal resources are needed to perform certain bipartite measurements on a pair of qubits.

Compared to the analysis of entanglement, relatively little work has been done so far on quantifying the nonseparability of quantum measurements, but over the past several years a few lines of research have been pursued that bear on this problem. The 1999 paper that we mentioned above derived upper bounds on the amount of quantum communication needed to do the nonlocal measurement presented in that paper, bounds that have recently been improved by Cohen [9]. An entanglement cost associated with Naimark extensions of generalized measurements has been investigated in Ref. [20]. Work has also been done towards quantifying the amount of entanglement (and the amount of classical communica-

tion) required to perform certain global *unitary transformations* on two or more spatially separated objects [4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12]. These latter results immediately provide upper bounds on the cost of certain nonlocal orthogonal measurements, since one method of performing such a measurement is to do a unitary transformation that renders the measurement local. Another line of research has focused on whether a given set of orthogonal states (not necessarily a complete basis) of a spatially distributed system can be distinguished locally [6, 25, 27]. There are several specific results of this sort, and, most relevant for our current work, methods have been developed that lead to *lower bounds* on the needed entanglement [13, 17, 23]. The task of discriminating among orthogonal states is evidently closely related to the task of performing a specific measurement, and indeed some of the cases we consider here are examples of discrimination among orthogonal states. But a measurement, as specified by a positive-operator-valued measure (POVM), need not be orthogonal. We consider a class of nonorthogonal measurements in Subsection V.1.

In some of the papers cited above, the quantity of interest is the amount of quantum communication as measured by the number of qubits transmitted between the two locations. In other papers, there is no direct transmission of qubits, and the quantity of interest is the amount of shared entanglement that must be consumed to carry out the task in question. As long as classical communication is regarded as free (as we assume here), these two formulations are equivalent. A single transmitted qubit can be used to share one ebit of entanglement—the transmitted qubit can be half of an entangled pair—and conversely, a single ebit can be used to transmit one qubit by means of teleportation [2]. Here we adopt an entanglement-based scenario: there is no direct transmission of qubits, but we keep track of the amount of entanglement consumed.

We begin by analyzing a specific one-parameter family of orthogonal measurements, which we label M_a , on a pair of qubits. The measurement M_a distinguishes four

states of the following form.

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_a^+\rangle &= a|00\rangle + b|11\rangle, & |\phi_a^-\rangle &= b|00\rangle - a|11\rangle \\ |\psi_a^+\rangle &= a|01\rangle + b|10\rangle, & |\psi_a^-\rangle &= b|01\rangle - a|10\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Here a and b are nonnegative real numbers and $a^2 + b^2 = 1$. Measurements of this form provide an interesting test case because the eigenstates are all equally entangled. We also consider two closely related families of measurements (to be specified later), in order to begin to identify those features that affect the amount of entanglement needed.

To define the entanglement cost, we imagine two participants, Alice and Bob, each holding one of the two objects to be measured. We allow them to do any sequence of local operations and classical communication, but we do not allow them to transmit quantum particles from one location to the other. Rather, we give them, as a resource for quantum communication, arbitrary shared entangled states, and, as noted above, we keep track of the amount of entanglement they consume in performing the measurement.

At this point, though, we have a few options in defining the problem. Do we try to find the cost of performing the measurement only once, or do we imagine that the same measurement will be performed many times (on many different pairs of qubits) and look for the asymptotic cost per trial? And how do we quantify the amount of entanglement that is used up? In this paper we imagine that Alice and Bob will perform the given measurement only once. (In making this choice we are following Cohen [9].) However, we suppose that this measurement is one of many measurements they will eventually perform (not necessarily repeating any one of the measurements and not necessarily knowing in advance what the future measurements will be), and we assume that they have a large supply of entanglement from which they will continue to draw as they carry out these measurements. In this setting it makes sense to use the standard measure of entanglement for pure states, namely, the entropy of either of the two parts [1]. Thus, for a pure state $|\psi\rangle$ of a bipartite system AB, the entanglement is

$$\mathcal{E}(|\psi\rangle) = -\text{tr} \rho_A \log \rho_A, \quad (2)$$

where ρ_A is the reduced density matrix of particle A: $\rho_A = \text{tr}_B |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$. In this paper the logarithm will always be base two; so the entanglement is measured in ebits. By means of local operations and classical communication, Alice and Bob can create from their large supply of entanglement any specific state that they need. For example, if they create and use up a copy of the state $|\phi_c^+\rangle = c|00\rangle + d|11\rangle$, this counts as a cost of $\mathcal{E}(|\phi_c^+\rangle) = -(c^2 \log c^2 + d^2 \log d^2)$. We define the total cost to be the sum of the entanglements of all such pairs that are used.

We need to say, though, exactly what we mean by a “measurement.” A general measurement is specified by a

POVM, that is, a collection of positive semi-definite operators Π_i that sum to the identity, each operator being associated with one of the outcomes of the measurement. In this paper we restrict our attention to *complete* measurements, that is, measurements in which each operator is of rank one; so each Π_i is of the form $\alpha_i |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|$ for some α_i in the range $0 < \alpha_i \leq 1$. In a complete *orthogonal* measurement, each operator is a projection operator ($\alpha_i = 1$) that projects onto a single vector (an eigenvector $|\phi_i\rangle$ of the measurement). Now, actually performing a measurement will always entail performing some operation on the measured system; so we need to say what we require of this operation. In fact all that we require is that Alice and Bob both end up with an accurate classical record of the outcome of the measurement. In particular, we do not insist that the measured system be collapsed into some particular state or even that it survive the measurement. Our measurement is a measurement for gaining information, not for manipulating the measured system.

We allow the possibility of probabilistic measurement procedures, in which the probabilities might depend on the initial state of the system being measured. However, we do not want our quantification of the cost of a measurement to depend on this initial state; we are trying to characterize the measurement itself, not the system on which it is being performed. So we assume that Alice and Bob are initially completely ignorant of the state of the particles they are measuring. That is, the state they initially assign to these particles is the completely mixed state. This is the state we will use in computing any probabilities associated with the procedure.

Bringing together the above considerations, we now give the definition of the quantity we are investigating in this paper. Given a POVM M , let $\mathcal{P}(M)$ be the set of all LOCC procedures P such that (i) P uses pure entangled pairs and classical communication, and (ii) P realizes M exactly, in the sense that for any initial state of the system to be measured, P yields classical outcomes with probabilities that agree with the probabilities given by M . Then $C(M)$, the entanglement cost of a measurement M , is defined to be

$$C(M) = \inf_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \left\langle \sum_j \mathcal{E}(|\psi_j\rangle) \right\rangle, \quad (3)$$

where $\{|\psi_j\rangle\}$ are the entangled states used by the procedure P , and $\langle \dots \rangle$ indicates an average over all the possible results of P , when the system on which the measurement is being performed is initially in the completely mixed state. [28]

There are two general bounds on $C(M)$, an upper bound and a lower bound, that apply to all complete bipartite measurements. We first give the upper bound (which applies also to incomplete measurements). Con-

sider any measurement on a pair of qudits, that is, particles each having a d -dimensional state space. To perform this measurement, Alice can begin by teleporting the state of her particle to Bob [2], who can then finish the measurement locally. The teleportation uses up one completely entangled state of two qudits; so the cost of this procedure is the entanglement of this state, which is $\log d$ ebits. Therefore $\log d$ is an upper bound on the cost of any such measurement.

We now give the general lower bound, using an argument similar to an argument in Ref. [7] and ultimately based on the Jamiolkowski isomorphism [18]. Again, in a complete measurement each outcome is represented by an operator of the form $\Pi_i = \alpha_i |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|$. For a complete measurement on a pair of qudits, the cost of the measurement is at least as large as the average entanglement $\langle\mathcal{E}\rangle$ of the states $|\phi_i\rangle$, defined by

$$\langle\mathcal{E}\rangle = \frac{1}{d} \sum_i \alpha_i \mathcal{E}(|\phi_i\rangle). \quad (4)$$

To prove this bound, we suppose that initially, Alice's qudit A is completely entangled with another qudit, C, also in Alice's possession, and that B is similarly entangled with D, in Bob's possession. Neither C nor D will be touched by the measuring apparatus. Nevertheless, we show below that if at least one of the states $|\phi_i\rangle$ is entangled, then performing the desired measurement on qudits A and B will cause C and D to end up entangled with each other, with an average entanglement given by Eq. (4). But entanglement cannot be increased, on average, by local operations and classical communication; it follows that on average, some entanglement between Alice's and Bob's locations must have been used up in performing the measurement.

To spell out more of the details of this argument, let us assume that the initial state of the four particles is

$$|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{kl} |kk\rangle_{AC} |ll\rangle_{BD}, \quad (5)$$

a tensor product of two maximally entangled states. Note that the reduced density matrix of qudits A and B is the completely mixed state, in accordance with our definition of the problem. When the measurement yields the outcome i , its effect on $|\Psi\rangle$ can be expressed in the form [21]

$$|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| \rightarrow (A_i \otimes I_{CD}) |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| (A_i^\dagger \otimes I_{CD}), \quad (6)$$

where I_{CD} is the identity on CD, and the operators A_i act on the state space of qudits A and B, telling us what happens to the system when the i th outcome occurs. (But A_i may send states of AB to a different state space, including, for example, the state space of the system in which the classical record of the outcome is to be stored.) The operators A_i satisfy the condition

$$A_i^\dagger A_i = \Pi_i = \alpha_i |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|. \quad (7)$$

Applying the operation of Eq. (6) to the state of Eq. (5), and then tracing out everything except qudits C and D, one finds that these particles are left in the state

$$(|\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|)^*, \quad (8)$$

where the asterisk indicates complex conjugation in the standard basis. This conjugation does not affect the entanglement; so, when outcome i occurs, qudits C and D are left in a state with entanglement $\mathcal{E}(|\phi_i\rangle)$. The probability of this outcome is α_i/d . So the average entanglement of CD after the measurement has been performed is the quantity $\langle\mathcal{E}\rangle$ of Eq. (4). But again, the average entanglement between Alice's and Bob's locations cannot have increased as long as Alice and Bob were restricted to local operations and classical communication. So in the process of performing the measurement, Alice and Bob must have used up an amount of entanglement equal to or exceeding $\langle\mathcal{E}\rangle$.

For the two-qubit measurement M_a , the bounds we have just derived can be expressed as

$$-(a^2 \log a^2 + b^2 \log b^2) = \mathcal{E}(\phi_a^+) \leq C(M_a) \leq 1. \quad (9)$$

We will not in this paper succeed in finding the exact entanglement cost of the measurement M_a . Rather, we present upper and lower bounds on this cost that improve on the bounds in Eq. (9). We give these improved bounds in Sections II and IV, respectively. In the intervening section, we consider in more detail a particular class of measurement procedures—"single-round procedures"—and derive upper and lower bounds for that case. In Section V we consider two closely related measurements; for one of them we will be able to find the exact entanglement cost. Finally, we draw conclusions in Section VI.

II. UPPER BOUND FOR M_a

One way to perform the measurement M_a is to perform the following unitary transformation on the two qubits.

$$U = e^{i\alpha\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x} = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 & b \\ 0 & a & b & 0 \\ 0 & -b & a & 0 \\ -b & 0 & 0 & a \end{pmatrix}, \quad (10)$$

where $\cos \alpha = a$ and $\sin \alpha = b$, the matrix is written in the standard basis and the σ 's are the usual Pauli matrices,

$$\sigma_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (11)$$

Under this transformation, the four orthogonal states that define the measurement M_a are transformed into

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_a^+\rangle &= a|00\rangle + b|11\rangle \rightarrow |00\rangle \\ |\phi_a^-\rangle &= b|00\rangle - a|11\rangle \rightarrow -|11\rangle \\ |\psi_a^+\rangle &= a|01\rangle + b|10\rangle \rightarrow |01\rangle \\ |\psi_a^-\rangle &= b|01\rangle - a|10\rangle \rightarrow -|10\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

So once the transformation has been done, the measurement M_a can be completed locally; Alice and Bob both make the measurement $|0\rangle$ versus $|1\rangle$ and tell each other their results.

The transformation U is equivalent to one that has been analyzed in Refs. [7] and [4], both of which give procedures that are consistent with the rules we have set up for our problem; that is, the procedures can be used to perform the measurement once, rather than asymptotically, using arbitrary entangled states as resources. (The authors of those papers consider the asymptotic problem, but their procedures also work in the setting we have adopted here.) It appears that the procedure presented by Berry in Ref. [4] is the most efficient one known so far. It is a multi-stage procedure, involving at each stage a measurement that determines whether another stage, and another entangled pair, are needed.

We have considered various direct methods for doing the measurement M_a , that is, methods based on measurements rather than transformations, but our best method so far turns out to be equivalent to Berry's method. Even though it is equivalent, the description of the process is different when expressed in terms of measurements rather than transformations. So it is worth summarizing briefly, which we do now. The measurement proceeds in a series of rounds, beginning with what we will call "round one".

1. Alice and Bob are given as a resource the entangled state $|\phi_x^+\rangle = x|00\rangle + y|11\rangle$, where the real numbers x and y (with $x^2 + y^2 = 1$ and $x \geq y$) are to be determined by minimizing the eventual cost. Thus each participant holds two qubits: the qubit to be measured and a qubit that is part of the shared resource.
2. Alice makes a binary measurement on her two qubits, defined by two orthogonal projection operators:

$$\begin{aligned} P &= |\Phi^+\rangle\langle\Phi^+| + |\Psi^-\rangle\langle\Psi^-| \\ Q &= |\Phi^-\rangle\langle\Phi^-| + |\Psi^+\rangle\langle\Psi^+| \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Here the Bell states $|\Phi^\pm\rangle$ and $|\Psi^\pm\rangle$ are defined by $|\Phi^\pm\rangle = (|00\rangle \pm |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and $|\Psi^\pm\rangle = (|01\rangle \pm |10\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. Alice transmits (classically) the result of her measurement to Bob.

3. If Alice gets the outcome P , Bob performs the fol-

lowing binary measurement on his two qubits:

$$\begin{aligned} P_1 &= |\phi_1^+\rangle\langle\phi_1^+| + |\psi_1^+\rangle\langle\psi_1^+|, \\ Q_1 &= |\phi_1^-\rangle\langle\phi_1^-| + |\psi_1^-\rangle\langle\psi_1^-|. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Here $|\phi_1^+\rangle = A|00\rangle + B|11\rangle$, $|\phi_1^-\rangle = B|00\rangle - A|11\rangle$, $|\psi_1^+\rangle = B|01\rangle + A|10\rangle$, and $|\psi_1^-\rangle = A|01\rangle - B|10\rangle$, and the real coefficients A and B are obtained from (a, b) and (x, y) via the equation $Ax/a = By/b$, together with the normalization condition $A^2 + B^2 = 1$. On the other hand, if Alice gets the outcome Q , Bob performs a different binary measurement:

$$\begin{aligned} P_2 &= |\phi_2^+\rangle\langle\phi_2^+| + |\psi_2^+\rangle\langle\psi_2^+|, \\ Q_2 &= |\phi_2^-\rangle\langle\phi_2^-| + |\psi_2^-\rangle\langle\psi_2^-|. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Here $|\phi_2^+\rangle = B|00\rangle + A|11\rangle$, $|\phi_2^-\rangle = A|00\rangle - B|11\rangle$, $|\psi_2^+\rangle = A|01\rangle + B|10\rangle$, and $|\psi_2^-\rangle = B|01\rangle - A|10\rangle$.

4. If Alice and Bob have obtained either of the outcomes $P \otimes P_1$ or $Q \otimes Q_2$, which we call the "good" outcomes, they can now finish the desired measurement M_a by making local measurements, with no further expenditure of entangled resources. The total probability of getting one of these good outcomes is

$$\text{probability} = \frac{1}{(a/x)^2 + (b/y)^2}. \quad (16)$$

On the other hand, if they have obtained one of the other two outcomes, $P \otimes Q_1$ or $Q \otimes P_2$ —the "bad" outcomes—they find that in order to finish the measurement M_a on their *original* pair of qubits, they now have to perform a different measurement M_{a_1} on the system that they now hold. The measurement M_{a_1} has the same form as M_a , but with new values a_1 and b_1 instead of a and b . The new values are determined by the equation

$$a_1 = \frac{(x^2 - y^2)ab}{\sqrt{x^4b^2 + y^4a^2}}. \quad (17)$$

In any case, Alice and Bob have now finished round one. If they have obtained one of the bad outcomes, they now have two choices: (i) begin again at step 1 but with the new values a_1 and b_1 , or (ii) use up a whole ebit to teleport Alice's system to Bob, who finishes the measurement locally. They choose the method that will ultimately be less costly in entanglement. If they choose option (i), we say that they have begun round two.

5. This procedure is iterated until the measurement is finished or until L rounds have been completed, where L is an integer chosen in advance. In round j , the measurement parameter a_j is determined from

the parameters a_{j-1} and x_{j-1} used in the preceding round according to Eq. (17) (with the appropriate substitutions).

6. If L rounds are completed, Alice teleports her system to Bob, who finishes the measurement locally.

The entanglement cost of each stage of this procedure is $\mathcal{E}(\phi_x^+)$, that is, the entanglement of the entangled pair used in that stage. Again, Eqs. (16) and (17), which give the probability of success at each stage and the rule for obtaining the parameter a_j that defines the next measurement, are the same as in Berry's procedure for performing the unitary transformation of Eq. (10). Therefore the optimization problem is exactly the problem analyzed by Berry. We present in Fig. 1 the result of this optimization, that is, the minimal cost achieved by this procedure, plotted as a function of the entanglement of the eigenstates of the measurement. (In constructing the curve, we have limited Alice and Bob to two rounds. Additional rounds do not make a noticeable difference in the shape of the curve, given our choice of the axis variables.) This curve thus gives an upper bound on the cost $C(M_a)$. (We also show on the figure the lower bound to be derived in Section IV.) We note that so far, for cases in which the entanglement of the eigenstates exceeds around 0.55 ebits, there is no known measurement strategy that does better than simple teleportation, with a cost of one ebit.

Bounds on the cost




FIG. 1: The solid curves are upper and lower bounds on the entanglement cost of the measurement M_a . (The derivation of the lower bound is in Section IV.) The diagonal dashed line is the general lower bound defined by the entanglement of the states themselves, and the horizontal dashed line is the general upper bound based on teleportation.

III. LIMITATION TO A SINGLE ROUND

As it happens, the upper bound shown in Fig. 1 is only slightly lower than what one obtains by limiting Alice and Bob to a single round before they resort to teleportation. We now consider the single-round case in more detail. It turns out that, at least for small values of the entanglement of the eigenstates, we can determine quite precisely the minimal cost of the measurement M_a when Alice and Bob are restricted to a single round.

We begin by defining the class of measurement strategies we consider in this section. A “single-round procedure” is a measurement procedure of the following form. (i) Alice and Bob are given the state $x|00\rangle + y|11\rangle$ at first, with which they try to complete the measurement. (ii) If they use this resource but fail to carry out the measurement, Alice teleports a qubit to Bob, who finishes the measurement locally. (In other words, we are now setting $L = 1$ in the procedure outlined in Section II.) We refer to the minimum entanglement cost entailed by any such procedure as the “single-round cost”. In this section we find upper and lower bounds on the single-round cost of M_a .

The minimal cost of the specific procedure outlined in Section II, when it is restricted to a single round, is given by

$$\text{cost} = h(x^2) + \left[1 - \frac{1}{(a/x)^2 + (b/y)^2} \right], \quad (18)$$

where h is the binary entropy function, $h(z) = -[z \log z + (1-z) \log(1-z)]$, and the value of x is chosen so as to minimize the cost. (Here $x^2 + y^2 = 1$ and $x \geq y \geq 0$ as before.) The two terms of Eq. (18) are easy to interpret: the first term is the entanglement of the shared resource that is used up in any case, and the second term, obtained from Eq. (16), is the probability of failure (multiplied by the 1 ebit associated with the resulting teleportation). Numerically minimizing the cost over values of x , we obtain the upper curve in Fig. 2, which is thus an upper bound on the single-round cost of M_a .

We can also find a good lower bound for such procedures, by adapting a scenario used to analyze other problems in Refs. [23], [13], and [17], and by using a known upper bound on the probability of increasing the amount of entanglement in a single copy through local operations and classical communication [19, 24]. To set up the argument, we assume, once again, that qubits A and B, on which Alice and Bob wish to perform their measurement, are initially entangled with auxiliary qubits C and D, which will not be involved in the measurement. (Alice holds qubits A and C, and Bob holds B and D.) This time, however, there will not be maximal entanglement between A and C and between B and D. Instead,

the initial state of these four qubits is

$$|\xi\rangle = \frac{1}{2} [|\phi_a^+\rangle_{AB}|\phi_c^+\rangle_{CD} + |\phi_a^-\rangle_{AB}|\phi_c^-\rangle_{CD} + |\psi_a^+\rangle_{AB}|\psi_c^+\rangle_{CD} + |\psi_a^-\rangle_{AB}|\psi_c^-\rangle_{CD}]. \quad (19)$$

Here the states with the index c are defined as in Eq. (1), but with c and d in place of a and b . (Again we assume for definiteness that $c \geq d \geq 0$, c and d to be determined later.) Note that again the reduced state of qubits A and B, after tracing out the auxiliary qubits, is the completely mixed state, as it must be to be consistent with our definition of the entanglement cost. Of particular interest to us is the entanglement between Alice's part of the system and Bob's part. One can show directly from Eq. (19) that the eigenvalues of the density matrix of Alice's (or Bob's) part of the system, that is, the squared Schmidt coefficients, are

$$(ac + bd)^2 \text{ and } (ad - bc)^2. \quad (20)$$

In addition to these qubits, Alice and Bob hold their entangled resource, which we can take without loss of generality to be

$$|\phi_x^+\rangle = x|00\rangle + y|11\rangle. \quad (21)$$

They now try to execute the measurement by using up this resource.

The measuring apparatus does not touch qubits C and D. Therefore, if Alice and Bob succeed in distinguishing the four states $\{|\phi_a^+\rangle, |\phi_a^-\rangle, |\psi_a^+\rangle, |\psi_a^-\rangle\}$, then even if they destroy qubits A and B they will have collapsed qubits C and D into one of the four corresponding states represented in $|\xi\rangle$. Each of these states has Schmidt coefficients c^2 and d^2 . Using a result of Jonathan and Plenio [19], we can place an upper bound on the probability of achieving the transformation from the state $|\xi\rangle \otimes |\phi_x^+\rangle$ to one of the four desired final states of qubits C and D. This probability cannot be larger than

$$\frac{\sum_{j=\ell}^n \alpha_j}{\sum_{j=\ell}^n \beta_j}, \quad (22)$$

where α_j and β_j ($j = 1, \dots, n$) are, respectively, the squared Schmidt coefficients of the initial state and any of the desired final states, in decreasing order, and ℓ can take any value from 1 to n . For our problem, there are only two values of ℓ to consider, since the final state—the entangled state of qubits C and D—has only two nonzero Schmidt coefficients. The case $\ell = 1$ tells us only that the probability does not exceed unity; so the only actual constraint comes from the case $\ell = 2$, which tells us that

$$\text{the success probability} \leq \frac{1 - (ac + bd)^2 x^2}{1 - c^2}. \quad (23)$$

The cost of any single-round procedure is therefore at least

$$\text{cost} \geq h(x^2) + \max \left\{ 0, \left[1 - \frac{1 - (ac + bd)^2 x^2}{1 - c^2} \right] \right\}, \quad (24)$$

since a failure will lead to a cost of one ebit for the teleportation.

Bounds on the single-round cost




FIG. 2: Upper and lower bounds on the entanglement cost of the measurement M_a , when Alice and Bob are restricted to a single round before resorting to teleportations.

Alice and Bob will choose their resource pair, that is, they will choose the value of x , so as to minimize the cost. So we want to find a value of x that minimizes the right-hand side of Eq. (24). Because the probability of failure cannot be less than zero, we can restrict our attention to values of x in the range

$$c/(ac + bd) \leq x \leq 1. \quad (25)$$

In this range, the cost is a concave function of x^2 ; so the function achieves its minimum value at one of the two endpoints. We thus have the following lower bound on the cost of any single-round procedure:

$$\text{cost} \geq \min \left\{ h \left[\frac{c^2}{(ac + bd)^2} \right], \frac{(ac + bd)^2 - c^2}{1 - c^2} \right\}. \quad (26)$$

This bound holds for any value of c for which it is defined. To make the bound as strong as possible, we want to maximize it over all values of c . In the range $1/\sqrt{2} \leq c \leq a$, the first entry in Eq. (26) is a decreasing function of c , whereas the second entry is increasing. (For larger values of c , both functions are decreasing until they become undefined at $c = (ac + bd)$. Beyond this point we would violate Eq. (25).) Therefore, we achieve the strongest bound when the two entries are equal. That is, our lower bound is given by

$$\text{cost} \geq \frac{(ac + bd)^2 - c^2}{1 - c^2}, \quad (27)$$

where c is determined by the equation

$$h \left[\frac{c^2}{(ac + bd)^2} \right] = \frac{(ac + bd)^2 - c^2}{1 - c^2}. \quad (28)$$

We have solved this equation numerically for a range of values of a and have obtained the lower of the two curves in Fig. 2. For very weakly entangled eigenstates—that is, at the left-hand end of the graph—the single-round upper bound and the single-round lower bound shown in the figure are very close to each other, with a ratio that approaches unity (numerically) as the entanglement of the states approaches zero. Thus in this limit, we have a very good estimate of the cost of the measurement, but only if we restrict Alice and Bob to a single round. We would prefer to have a lower bound that applies to any conceivable procedure, and that is still better than the general lower bound we derived in Section I. We obtain such a bound in the following section.

IV. AN ABSOLUTE LOWER BOUND FOR M_a

Again, we imagine a situation in which Alice and Bob hold two auxiliary qubits that will not be involved in the measurement. We assume the same initial state as in Section III:

$$|\xi\rangle = \frac{1}{2} [|\phi_a^+\rangle_{AB}|\phi_c^+\rangle_{CD} + |\phi_a^-\rangle_{AB}|\phi_c^-\rangle_{CD} + |\psi_a^+\rangle_{AB}|\psi_c^+\rangle_{CD} + |\psi_a^-\rangle_{AB}|\psi_c^-\rangle_{CD}]. \quad (29)$$

Qubits A and B are the qubits on which the measurement will be made, while C and D are the auxiliary qubits. As before, we are interested in the entanglement between Alice's part of the system and Bob's part, that is, between AC and BD. This entanglement is

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{initial}} = h[(ac + bd)^2]. \quad (30)$$

Now suppose that Alice and Bob perform the measurement M_a , which distinguishes among the four states with the subscript AB. Again, the measurement collapses qubits C and D into one of the four states with the subscript CD. Each of these states has the same entanglement, which is therefore the final entanglement between Alice's and Bob's locations after the measurement, namely,

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{final}} = h(c^2). \quad (31)$$

If $\mathcal{E}_{\text{final}}$ is greater than $\mathcal{E}_{\text{initial}}$, then Alice and Bob must have used up some entanglement in performing the measurement, or else the net entanglement between them would have increased, which would be a contradiction. (Note that this argument is independent of the number of rounds in the procedure.) In fact, the amount of entanglement they used must be at least

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{final}} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{initial}}. \quad (32)$$

By maximizing this quantity numerically over the parameter c , we get our best absolute lower bound on the entanglement cost $C(M_a)$. This bound is plotted in Fig. 1.

What is most interesting about this bound is that, except at the extreme points where the eigenstates of the measurement are either all unentangled or all maximally entangled, the bound is strictly larger than the entanglement of the eigenstates themselves. This is another example, then, showing that the nonseparability of the measurement can exceed the nonseparability of the states that the measurement distinguishes.

Not only is our new lower bound absolute in the sense that it does not depend on the number of rounds used by Alice and Bob; it applies even asymptotically. Suppose, for example, that Alice and Bob are given n pairs of qubits and are asked to perform the same measurement M_a on each pair. It is conceivable that by using operations that involve all n pairs, Alice and Bob might achieve an efficiency not possible when they are performing the measurement only once. Even in this setting, the lower bound given by Eq. (32) applies. That is, the cost of performing the measurement n times must be at least n times our single-copy lower bound. To see this, imagine that *each* of the given pairs of qubits is initially entangled with a pair of auxiliary qubits. Both the initial entanglement of the whole system (that is, the entanglement between Alice's side and Bob's side), and the final entanglement after the measurement, are simply proportional to n , so that the original argument carries over to this case.

It is interesting to look at the behavior of the upper and lower bounds as a approaches zero, that is, as the eigenstates of the measurement approach product states. Berry has done this analysis for the upper bound and has found that for small a , the cost is proportional to a , with proportionality constant 5.6418. For our lower bound, it is a question of finding the value of c (with $c^2 + d^2 = 1$) that maximizes the difference

$$h(c^2) - h[(ac + bd)^2] \quad (33)$$

for small a . One finds that for small a , the optimal value of c approaches a constant c_0 , which we obtain as follows. In this limit the difference in Eq. (33) is approximately equal to

$$2ac_0d_0 \log(d_0^2/c_0^2), \quad (34)$$

where $d_0 = \sqrt{1 - c_0^2}$. Thus the lower bound is also proportional to a for small a . The quantity in Eq. (34) is maximized when

$$(d_0^2 - c_0^2) \ln(d_0/c_0) = 1, \quad (35)$$

which one finds numerically to be satisfied when $c_0 = 0.28848$, for which the bound, as given by Eq. (34), is equal to $1.9123a$. Comparing this with the upper bound in the limit of vanishingly small entanglement, $5.6418a$, we see that there is still a sizable gap between the two bounds, though the combination of these results suggests a linear dependence of $C(M_a)$ on a for small a .

V. RELATED MEASUREMENTS

1. An eight-outcome measurement

A measurement closely related to M_a is a measurement $M_a^{(8)}$ with eight outcomes, represented by a positive-operator-valued measure whose elements $\Pi_i = \alpha_i |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|$ all have $\alpha_i = 1/2$, with the eight states $|\phi_i\rangle$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_a^+\rangle &= a|00\rangle + b|11\rangle, & |\phi_a^-\rangle &= b|00\rangle - a|11\rangle \\ |\psi_a^+\rangle &= a|01\rangle + b|10\rangle, & |\psi_a^-\rangle &= b|01\rangle - a|10\rangle \\ |\phi_b^+\rangle &= b|00\rangle + a|11\rangle, & |\phi_b^-\rangle &= a|00\rangle - b|11\rangle \\ |\psi_b^+\rangle &= b|01\rangle + a|10\rangle, & |\psi_b^-\rangle &= a|01\rangle - b|10\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

That is, they are the same states as in M_a , plus the four states obtained by interchanging a and b . This is a non-orthogonal measurement, but any non-orthogonal measurement can be performed by preparing an auxiliary system in a known state and then performing a global orthogonal measurement on the combined system.

In fact, we can show explicitly how to perform this particular measurement, in a way that will allow us to determine the value of $C(M_a^{(8)})$. To do the measurement, Alice and Bob draw, from their store of entanglement, the entangled state $|\phi_a^+\rangle = a|00\rangle + b|11\rangle$ of qubits C and D. (Alice holds C and Bob holds D.) Then each of them locally performs the Bell measurement $\{|\Phi^+\rangle, |\Phi^-\rangle, |\Psi^+\rangle, |\Psi^-\rangle\}$ on his or her pair of qubits. (The Bell states were defined just after Eq. (13).)

The resulting 16-outcome orthogonal measurement on ABCD defines a 16-outcome POVM on just the two qubits A and B. For each outcome k of the global orthogonal measurement, we can find the corresponding POVM element Π_k of the AB measurement as follows:

$$\Pi_k = \text{tr}_{CD}\{\pi_k[I_{AB} \otimes (|\phi_a^+\rangle\langle\phi_a^+|)_{CD}]\}, \quad (37)$$

where π_k is the k th POVM element of the global measurement. Less formally, we can achieve the same result by taking the ‘‘partial inner product’’ between the initial state $|\phi_a^+\rangle$ of the system CD and the k th eigenstate of the global measurement. For example, the eigenstate $|\Phi^+\rangle|\Phi^+\rangle$ yields the following partial inner product:

$$(\langle\phi_a^+|_{CD})(|\Phi^+\rangle_{AC}|\Phi^+\rangle_{BD}), \quad (38)$$

which works out to be $(1/2)|\phi_a^+\rangle_{AB}$. The corresponding POVM element on the AB system is $(1/4)|\phi_a^+\rangle\langle\phi_a^+|$. Continuing in this way, one finds the following correspondence between the 16 outcomes of the global measure-

ment and the POVM elements of the AB measurement.

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi^+\rangle|\Phi^+\rangle \text{ or } |\Phi^-\rangle|\Phi^-\rangle &\rightarrow \frac{1}{4}|\phi_a^+\rangle\langle\phi_a^+| \\ |\Phi^+\rangle|\Phi^-\rangle \text{ or } |\Phi^-\rangle|\Phi^+\rangle &\rightarrow \frac{1}{4}|\phi_b^-\rangle\langle\phi_b^-| \\ |\Phi^+\rangle|\Psi^+\rangle \text{ or } |\Phi^-\rangle|\Psi^-\rangle &\rightarrow \frac{1}{4}|\psi_a^+\rangle\langle\psi_a^+| \\ |\Phi^+\rangle|\Psi^-\rangle \text{ or } |\Phi^-\rangle|\Psi^+\rangle &\rightarrow \frac{1}{4}|\psi_b^-\rangle\langle\psi_b^-| \\ |\Psi^+\rangle|\Psi^+\rangle \text{ or } |\Psi^-\rangle|\Psi^-\rangle &\rightarrow \frac{1}{4}|\phi_b^+\rangle\langle\phi_b^+| \\ |\Psi^+\rangle|\Psi^-\rangle \text{ or } |\Psi^-\rangle|\Psi^+\rangle &\rightarrow \frac{1}{4}|\phi_a^-\rangle\langle\phi_a^-| \\ |\Psi^+\rangle|\Phi^+\rangle \text{ or } |\Psi^-\rangle|\Phi^-\rangle &\rightarrow \frac{1}{4}|\psi_b^+\rangle\langle\psi_b^+| \\ |\Psi^+\rangle|\Phi^-\rangle \text{ or } |\Psi^-\rangle|\Phi^+\rangle &\rightarrow \frac{1}{4}|\psi_a^-\rangle\langle\psi_a^-| \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Thus, even though there are formally 16 outcomes of the AB measurement, they are equal in pairs, so that there are only eight distinct outcomes, and they are indeed the outcomes of the measurement $M_a^{(8)}$.

The cost of this procedure is $\mathcal{E}(\phi_a^+) = -(a^2 \log a^2 + b^2 \log b^2)$. This is the same as the average entanglement of the eight states representing the outcomes of $M_a^{(8)}$, which we know is a lower bound on the cost. Thus the lower bound is achievable in this case, and we can conclude that $C(M_a^{(8)})$ is exactly equal to $-(a^2 \log a^2 + b^2 \log b^2)$.

2. A more general four-outcome measurement

We now consider the following variation on the measurement M_a . It is an orthogonal measurement, which we call $M_{a,c}$, with eigenstates

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_a^+\rangle &= a|00\rangle + b|11\rangle, & |\phi_a^-\rangle &= b|00\rangle - a|11\rangle, \\ |\psi_c^+\rangle &= c|01\rangle + d|10\rangle, & |\psi_c^-\rangle &= d|01\rangle - c|10\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where all the coefficients are real and nonnegative and all the states are normalized. For this measurement we have found a lower bound using essentially the same method as in Section II. That is, in addition to the qubits A and B to which the measurement is being applied, we consider two other qubits: as before, Alice holds qubit C and Bob holds qubit D. Suppose that the four qubits are initially in the state

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta\rangle &= \frac{1}{2} [|\phi_a^+\rangle_{AB}|\phi_{a'}^+\rangle_{CD} + |\phi_a^-\rangle_{AB}|\phi_{a'}^-\rangle_{CD} \\ &\quad + |\psi_c^+\rangle_{AB}|\psi_{c'}^+\rangle_{CD} + |\psi_c^-\rangle_{AB}|\psi_{c'}^-\rangle_{CD}], \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where the real parameters a' and c' are to be adjusted to achieve the most stringent lower bound. This initial state has an entanglement between Alice’s location and

Bob's location (that is, between AC and BD) equal to the Shannon entropy of the following four probabilities:

$$\begin{aligned} (aa' + bb' + cc' + dd')^2/4, & \quad (aa' + bb' - cc' - dd')^2/4, \\ (ab' - ba' + dc' - cd')^2/4, & \quad (ab' - ba' - dc' + cd')^2/4. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Once the measurement is completed, even if the AB system is destroyed, the final entanglement is the entanglement of the CD system, which on average is

$$[h(a'^2) + h(c'^2)]/2. \quad (43)$$

The difference between the final entanglement and the initial entanglement is a lower bound on $C(M_{a,c})$, which we want to maximize by our choice of a' and c' . We have again done the maximization numerically, for many values of the measurement parameters a and c , covering their domain quite densely. We plot the results in Fig. 3. In almost every case, the resulting lower bound is *higher*

Lower bound on the cost




FIG. 3: Lower bound for the measurement $M_{a,c}$ as computed from the pure state given in Eq. (41), plotted against the average entanglement of the eigenstates. Different values of the pair (a, c) can be associated with the same point on the horizontal axis but may yield different lower bounds, as indicated by the gray area. The point touching the dotted line in the middle of the graph represents a measurement with two Bell states and two product states, as in Eq. (44).

than the average entanglement of the eigenstates of the measurement. The only exceptions we have found, besides the ones already mentioned in Section II (in which all the states are maximally entangled or all are unentangled), are those for which two of the measurement eigenstates are maximally entangled and the other two are unentangled. That is, this method does not produce a better lower bound for the measurement with eigenstates

$$|\Phi^+\rangle, |\Phi^-\rangle, |01\rangle, |10\rangle, \quad (44)$$

or for the analogous measurement with $|\Phi^\pm\rangle$ replaced by $|\Psi^\pm\rangle$ and with the product states suitable replaced to make the states mutually orthogonal. In all other cases the cost of the measurement is strictly greater than the average entanglement of the states.

VI. DISCUSSION

As we discussed in the Introduction, a general lower bound on the entanglement cost of a complete measurement is the average entanglement of the pure states associated with the measurement's outcomes. Perhaps the most interesting result of this paper is that, for almost all the orthogonal measurements we considered, the actual cost is strictly greater than this lower bound. The same is true in the examples of “nonlocality without entanglement”, in which the average entanglement is zero but the cost is strictly positive. However, whereas those earlier examples may have seemed special because of their intricate construction, the examples given here are quite simple. The earlier examples were also for larger state-spaces, whereas our examples involve only two qubits. The fact that the cost in these simple cases exceeds the average entanglement of the states suggests that this feature may be a generic property of bipartite measurements. If this is true, then in this sense the nonseparability of a measurement is generically a distinct property from the nonseparability of the eigenstates.

What is it that causes a measurement to be “more nonseparable” than the states it distinguishes? Evidently the answer must have to do with the *relationships* among the states. In the original “nonlocality without entanglement” measurement, the crucial role of these relationships is clear: in order to separate any eigenstate $|v\rangle$ from any other eigenstate $|w\rangle$ by a local measurement, the observer must disturb some of the other states in such a way as to render them indistinguishable.

The one nontrivial example we have given for which we have been able to compute its cost exactly is the eight-outcome measurement $M_a^{(8)}$, for which the lower bound obtained in the Introduction can be achieved. It is interesting that if one merely removes four of the eight outcomes, to leave an orthogonal measurement, the cost of the measurement increases. Presumably the outcomes that were removed had been playing an important role in the network of relationships among the states. Some recent papers have quantified relational properties of ensembles of bipartite states [15, 16]. Perhaps one of these approaches, or a different approach yet to be developed, will capture the aspect of these relationships that determines the cost of the measurement.

We thank Alexei Kitaev, Debbie Leung, David Poulin, John Preskill, Andrew Scott and Jon Walgate for valuable discussions and comments on the subject. G.B. is supported by Canada's Natural Sciences and Engineering

Research Council (NSERC), the Canada Research Chair program, the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research (CIFAR) and the Quantum *Works* Network. S. B. is supported by Canada's Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC).

-
- [1] C. H. Bennett, H. J. Bernstein, S. Popescu, B. Schumacher, "Concentrating partial entanglement by local operations", *Phys. Rev. A* **53**, 2046 (1996).
- [2] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, "Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen channels", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1895 (1993).
- [3] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, C. A. Fuchs, T. Mor, E. Rains, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, W. K. Wootters, "Quantum nonlocality without entanglement", *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 1070 (1999).
- [4] D. W. Berry, "Implementation of multipartite unitary operations with limited resources", *Phys. Rev. A* **75**, 032349 (2007).
- [5] A. Chefles, C. R. Gilson, S. M. Barnett, "Entanglement, information, and multiparticle quantum operations", *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 032314 (2001).
- [6] Y.-X. Chen and D. Yang, "Distillable entanglement of multiple copies of Bell states", *Phys. Rev. A* **66**, 014303 (2002); "Optimally conclusive discrimination of nonorthogonal entangled states by local operations and classical communication", **65**, 022320 (2002).
- [7] J. I. Cirac, W. Dür, B. Kraus, and M. Lewenstein, "Entangling Operations and Their Implementation Using a Small Amount of Entanglement", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 544 (2001).
- [8] S. M. Cohen, "Local distinguishability with preservation of entanglement", *Phys. Rev. A* **75**, 052313 (2007).
- [9] S. M. Cohen, "Understanding entanglement as resource: Locally distinguishing unextendible product bases", *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 012304 (2008).
- [10] D. Collins, N. Linden, S. Popescu, "Nonlocal content of quantum operations", *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 032302 (2001).
- [11] W. Dür, G. Vidal, J. I. Cirac, N. Linden, S. Popescu, "Entanglement Capabilities of Nonlocal Hamiltonians", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 137901 (2001).
- [12] J. Eisert, K. Jacobs, P. Papadopoulos, M. B. Plenio, "Optimal local implementation of nonlocal quantum gates", *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 052317 (2000).
- [13] S. Ghosh, G. Kar, A. Roy, A. Sen(De), and U. Sen, "Distinguishability of Bell States", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 277902 (2001).
- [14] B. Groisman and L. Vaidman, "Nonlocal variables with product-state eigenstates", *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **34**, 6881–6889 (2001).
- [15] M. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, A. Sen(De), and U. Sen, "Distillation Protocols: Output Entanglement and Local Mutual Information", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 170503 (2004).
- [16] M. Horodecki, A. Sen(De), U. Sen, "Quantification of quantum correlation of ensembles of states", *Phys. Rev. A* **75**, 062329 (2007).
- [17] M. Horodecki, A. Sen(De), U. Sen, and K. Horodecki, "Local Indistinguishability: More Nonlocality with Less Entanglement", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 047902 (2003).
- [18] A. Jamiołkowski, "Linear transformations which preserve trace and positive semidefiniteness of operators", *Rep. Math. Phys.* **3**, 275–278 (1972).
- [19] D. Jonathan and M. B. Plenio, "Minimal Conditions for Local Pure-State Entanglement Manipulation", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 1455–1458 (1999).
- [20] R. Jozsa, M. Koashi, N. Linden, S. Popescu, S. Presnell, D. Shepherd, and A. Winter, "Entanglement cost of generalised measurements," arXiv:quant-ph/0303167 (2003).
- [21] K. Kraus, *States, Effects, and Operations*, Lecture Notes in Physics **190** (Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1983).
- [22] M. B. Plenio and V. Vedral, "Entanglement measures and purification procedures", *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, 1619 (1998).
- [23] J. A. Smolin, "Four-party unlockable bound entangled state", *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 032306 (2001).
- [24] G. Vidal, "Entanglement of pure states for a single copy", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 1046–1049 (1999).
- [25] S. Virmani, M. F. Sacchi, M. B. Plenio, and D. Markham, "Optimal local discrimination of two multipartite pure states", *Phys. Lett. A* **288**, 62 (2001).
- [26] J. Walgate and L. Hardy, "Nonlocality, Asymmetry, and Distinguishing Bipartite States", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 147901 (2002).
- [27] J. Walgate, A. J. Short, L. Hardy, and V. Vedral, "Local Distinguishability of Multipartite Orthogonal Quantum States", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 4972 (2000).
- [28] One might wonder why we are using the *average* cost if we are imagining each measurement being performed only once. The reason is this: even in a series of distinct measurements, if the series is long enough the actual cost will, with very high probability, be very close to the sum of the average costs of the individual measurements.