

Undetermined states: how to find them and their applications

Min-Hsiu Hsieh,¹ Wen-Tai Yen,² and Li-Yi Hsu²

¹*ERATO-SORST Quantum Computation and Information Project,*

Japan Science and Technology Agency 5-28-3, Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, Japan and

²*Department of physics, Chung Yuan Christian University, Chungli, Taiwan*

(Date textdate; Received textdate; Revised textdate; Accepted textdate; Published textdate)

We investigate the undetermined sets consisting of two-level, multi-partite pure quantum states, whose reduced density matrices give absolutely no information of their original states. Two approaches of finding these quantum states are proposed. One is to establish the relation between codewords of the stabilizer quantum error correction codes (SQECCs) and the undetermined states. The other is to study the local complementation rules of the graph states. As an application, the undetermined states can be exploited in the quantum secret sharing scheme. The security is guaranteed by their undeterminedness.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud , 03.67.Pp, 03.67.Dd,

Keywords: Entanglement, stabilizer states, quantum cryptography

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum entanglement has been regarded as an useful physical resource in quantum information and quantum computation. Different non-local correlations embedded in entanglement are employed for different tasks. Characterization of quantum entanglement plays a fundamental role in quantum information science. Entanglement measures in various aspects of research purposes have been proposed [1]. Therein, an interesting and natural approach, as originally proposed by Linden *et. al.*, is to quantify information contained in the reduced density matrix of a given state [2]. In other words, it is concerned whether the partial or low-ordered correlations of the reduced matrices can fully reveal the high-ordered correlations. If the answer is positive, these entangled states, either pure or mixed, can be completely determined by their parts. Surprisingly, *almost* every pure three-qubit entangled state can be entirely determined by its two-qubit reduced density matrices [2]. Later the solution of constructing the three-qubit pure state using any two two-qubit reduced density matrices was explicitly illustrated [4]. Furthermore, Linden and Wootters showed that a fraction of quantum particles of *almost* n -party multi-level pure entangled states can reveal as much information as that of all qubits [3].

In other words, only a few pure entangled states whose parts cannot determine the whole. As a trivial example, the four orthogonal two-qubit Bell states are undetermined since their one-qubit reduced density matrices are all maximally mixed. Recently, Walck and Lyons rigorously proved that the generalized n -qubit Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) states and their local unitary equivalents are the only states that are not uniquely determined among pure states by their $(n-1)$ -qubit reduced density matrices [5, 6]. In this paper, we focus on finding undetermined sets of pure quantum states. Specifically, we would like to construct an undetermined set of n -qubit quantum stabilizer states such that after tracing out arbitrary D qubits, the resulting reduced density matrices

are all the same. In quantum information science, characterizing these undetermined sets is more important since it strongly relates to applications in quantum cryptography.

In this paper, we propose two approaches of finding the undetermined stabilized states. One is to exploit the logic states of stabilizer quantum error-correcting codes (SQECCs) to comprise the undetermined sets. The other approach is based on the local equivalence of graph states. Our paper is organized as follows. First, some definitions are given in Sec. II. The properties of SQECCs are briefly reviewed. Specifically, we focus on $[[n, 1, d]]$ SQECCs. The undeterminedness of codeword states of the SQECCs are studied. Inspired by $[[n, 1, d]]$ SQECCs, some other stabilizer states as undetermined states can be also found. Next, in Sec. III, graph states are introduced. Therein, the graph transformation, called local complementation helps find the conditionally undetermined sets of graph states. Finally, in Sec. IV, we demonstrate several applications of these undetermined states in quantum cryptography. In the following, X_i , Y_i , and Z_i denote the Pauli operators σ_x , σ_y and σ_z on the i -th qubit, respectively.

II. UNCONDITIONALLY UNDETERMINED SETS OF QUANTUM STATES

Throughout this paper, an undetermined set (D_u -set hereafter) of two or more n -qubit pure states is called unconditionally D -undetermined, if the reduced density matrices of *arbitrary* $(n - D)$ qubits are always the same for all state in the D_u -set. According to the definition, the following claim comes up immediately.

Claim 1 *If a D_u -set consists of two pure states, $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$, then for arbitrary D -qubit set (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_D) , there is a unitary $U_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_D}$ such that $|\psi_1\rangle = U_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_D} |\psi_0\rangle$.*

The proof is straightforward and readers can refer to Ref. [5, 7]. In general, for two arbitrary D -qubit sets

(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_D) and $(i'_1, i'_2, \dots, i'_D)$, there must exist some non-trivial D -qubit unitary matrices $U_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_D}$ and $U_{i'_1 i'_2 \dots i'_D}$, such that

$$|\psi_1\rangle = U_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_D} |\psi_0\rangle \text{ and } |\psi_1\rangle = U_{i'_1 i'_2 \dots i'_D} |\psi_0\rangle. \quad (1)$$

Obviously,

$$U_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_D}^{-1} U_{i'_1 i'_2 \dots i'_D} |\psi_0\rangle = |\psi_0\rangle. \quad (2)$$

Notably, here non-trivial $U_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_D}$ and $U_{i'_1 i'_2 \dots i'_D}$ cannot be decomposed as tensor product concluding any 1-qubit identity. Seemingly, $|\psi_0\rangle$ is stabilized by $U_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_D}^{-1} U_{i'_1 i'_2 \dots i'_D}$ and hence the claim implicitly sheds an insight of finding undetermined states via stabilizer states

A. Review of SQECCs

Before further proceeding, we introduce SQECCs as follows. A quantum code that encodes k logical qubits into n physical qubits and has distance d is denoted as $[[n, k, d]]$. For an $[[n, 1, d]]$ stabilizer quantum error-correcting code ($k = 1$), the logic states or, equivalently, codewords are denoted by $|\bar{0}\rangle$ and $|\bar{1}\rangle$, respectively. The code space \mathcal{C} , spanned by $\{|\bar{0}\rangle, |\bar{1}\rangle\}$, was fixed by its stabilizer group $\mathcal{S} = \{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_{n-1}\}$, where g_1, g_2, \dots, g_{n-1} are generators of the group [7]. Moreover, $g_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, are non-trivial n -fold Pauli operators in $\mathcal{P}_n = \langle i, Z_1, X_1, \dots, Z_n, X_n \rangle$ and they all commute with each other. Then $\forall M \in \mathcal{S}$, and $\forall |\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{C}$, we have

$$M|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle.$$

Therefore, the codeword state $|\psi\rangle$ is also called the ‘‘stabilizer state’’.

The normalizer of \mathcal{S} , denoted as $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S})$, is the subgroup of \mathcal{P}_n that commutes with every element of \mathcal{S} . In the case of an $[[n, 1, d]]$ SQECC, we denote its normalizer as $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S}) = \langle i, \bar{Z}, \bar{X} \rangle$, where \bar{Z} and \bar{X} are called the logic phase-flip operator and the logic bit-flip operator, respectively [14]:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Z}|\bar{0}\rangle &= |\bar{0}\rangle \\ \bar{Z}|\bar{1}\rangle &= -|\bar{1}\rangle \\ \bar{X}|\bar{0}\rangle &= |\bar{1}\rangle \\ \bar{X}|\bar{1}\rangle &= |\bar{0}\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that there is some degree of freedom for choosing the logic bit-flip operator, denoted by \bar{X} . Let the operator X satisfy the condition

$$X \in \mathcal{N}/\mathcal{S} \text{ and } \{X, \bar{Z}\} = 0, \quad (3)$$

where $\{, \}$ is anti-commutator. We can also choose any of $X\mathcal{S}$ or X as \bar{X} . Here we define the set of all legitimate \bar{X} operators as \mathcal{X} , where

$$\mathcal{X} = \{X | X \in \mathcal{N}/\mathcal{S} \text{ and } \{X, \bar{Z}\} = 0\}. \quad (4)$$

By definition, given an $[[n, 1, d]]$ SQECC, there must exist *at least* one d -qubit undetected error

$$\mathcal{E}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_d} = (\mathcal{E}_{i_1} \otimes \mathcal{E}_{i_2} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{E}_{i_d}), \quad (5)$$

where \mathcal{E}_i is a non-identity Pauli operator on qubit i , such that

$$\mathcal{E}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_d} |\bar{0}\rangle = |\bar{1}\rangle. \quad (6)$$

Obviously, $\mathcal{E}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_d} \in \mathcal{X}$.

B. Logic states as elements of the D_u -set

Before presenting new sets of undetermined states, it should be noted that the unitary $U_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_D}$ in Eq. (1) is not necessarily as tensor product of D non-identity Pauli operators. In the following, in order to apply the theory of stabilizer quantum error correction, we restrict $U_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_D}$ as the format of D -fold Pauli operators. Now, the connection between $[[n, 1, d]]$ SQECC and D_u -set can be described as follows. Two pure states $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$ in the above claim can be presumed as $|\bar{0}\rangle$ and $|\bar{1}\rangle$ of the $[[n, 1, d]]$ SQECC. In addition, the unitary operators $U_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_d}$ and $U_{i'_1 i'_2 \dots i'_d}$ in Eq. (1) each is equal to $\mathcal{E}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_d}$ in Eq. (5) as the logic bit-flip operator. In order for logic states comprising the D_u -set, however, the following criterion must be fulfilled according to the claim.

Criterion 2 *For arbitrary D qubits, there must exist an undetected error operator $\mathcal{E}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_D} \in \mathcal{X}$ as $U_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_D}$.*

We emphasize that *not* two logic states of any $[[n, 1, d]]$ SQECCs can always comprise a two-element D_u -set. As a result, we propose how to find a two-element D_u -set as follows. (i) choose an $[[n, 1, d]]$ SQECC. (ii) verify whether this SQECC satisfies the criterion. If the criterion is satisfied, the logic states can comprise a D_u -set.

As a trivial example, here we show how to recover the result of [5] using the idea of SQECCs. Wherein, the n -qubit GHZ states $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle^{\otimes n} + |1\rangle^{\otimes n})$ and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle^{\otimes n} - |1\rangle^{\otimes n})$ can be regarded as the logic states of the $[[n, 1, 1]]$ SQECC, $|\bar{0}\rangle$ and $|\bar{1}\rangle$, respectively. The corresponding stabilizer generators g_i is $Z_i Z_{i+1}$, $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$, and the logic phase-flip operator \bar{Z} can be chosen as $X^{\otimes n}$. It is noteworthy that such an $[[n, 1, 1]]$ stabilizer code can correct all the single-qubit bit-flip errors, but not single-qubit phase-flip errors. Obviously, $Z_i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\{Z_i, \bar{Z}\} = 0$. In other words, there exist Pauli operators $Z_i \in \mathcal{X}$, $\forall i$, on each qubit such that

$$|\bar{1}\rangle = Z_i |\bar{0}\rangle \text{ and } |\bar{0}\rangle = Z_i |\bar{1}\rangle. \quad (7)$$

Therefore, these GHZ states $|\bar{0}\rangle$ and $|\bar{1}\rangle$ are 1-undetermined states according to the claim.

In addition, let E_D be the number of operators in \mathcal{X} whose weight is D . The inequality,

$$E_D \geq \frac{n!}{D!(n-D)!},$$

is a necessary condition for an $[[n, 1, d]]$ SQECC such that its codewords can comprise D -set. It is also easy to see that

$$D \geq d.$$

In the case of n -qubit GHZ states, $D = d = 1$. In the following, some logic states as elements of a D_u -set are given.

C. $[[4, 1, 2]]$ SQECC

As a simple example, firstly, we consider the $[[4, 1, 2]]$ SQECC with the following generators

$$g_1 = Y_1 Y_3, \quad g_2 = Y_2 Y_4, \quad \text{and} \quad g_3 = Z_1 Z_2 Z_3 Z_4.$$

Here we pick $\bar{Z} = Y_1 X_2 Z_4$. Then it is easy to verify that

$$\{Y_1 Y_2, Y_2 Y_3, Y_3 Y_4, Y_4 Y_1, Z_1 Z_3, X_2 X_4\} \in \mathcal{X}.$$

As a result, the two-qubit reduced density of the corresponding logic states $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$ are always the same. In other words, $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$ are 2-undetermined.

In general, there exist several $[[4, 1, 2]]$ SQECCs that are not equivalent. The set of generators is constructed based on a computer search with the constrain that \mathcal{X} must contains all possible two-qubit Pauli operators.

D. $[[5, 1, 3]]$ cyclic SQECC and its generalization

Another set comprises the logic states of the $[[5, 1, 3]]$ SQECC [11], where the stabilizer generator

$$g_i = \mathfrak{R}^{i-1}(X_1 Z_2 Z_3 X_4 I_5)$$

(\mathfrak{R} is the right-shift operator), and

$$\bar{Z} = Z_1 Z_2 Z_3 Z_4 Z_5,$$

respectively. Interestingly, we have the error set

$$\{Y_2 Y_3 X_5 + \text{cyclic terms}, X_1 Z_2 Z_5 + \text{cyclic terms}\} \in \mathcal{X}.$$

Therefore, the logic states are 3-undetermined states.

Inspired by the $[[5, 1, 3]]$ code, we consider the following n -qubit states $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$. Wherein, the stabilizer group is generated by g_i , where $g_i = \mathfrak{R}^{i-1}(X^{\otimes p} Z^{\otimes 2p} X^{\otimes p} I^{\otimes q})$ and the logic phase-flip operator \bar{Z} is $Z^{\otimes(4p+q)}$, respectively. Note that $n = 4p + q$, where $q \equiv n \pmod{4}$. For $5 \leq n \leq 15$, it is found that when arbitrary $n - 2$ qubits are traced out, the reduced density matrices are the same and undetermined.

III. CONDITIONALLY UNDETERMINED SETS OF QUANTUM STATES

We can weaken the unconditionally undetermined condition as follows. The D'_c -set consisting of pure quantum states is called conditionally undetermined, if, when some particular D' qubits are traced out, the reduced density matrices are the same. This particular set corresponds to the *unauthorized set* first mentioned in [13]. Obviously, the logic states of any $[[n, 1, d]]$ SQECC comprise a D'_c -set with the minimal D' equal to d . In addition, if the D'_c -set is identical to some D_u -set, we have $d \leq D' \leq D$. As a concrete example, we consider the $[[7, 1, 3]]$ Steane code [12], where the six generators are

$$X_3 X_4 X_5 X_6, X_2 X_3 X_6 X_7, X_1 X_3 X_5 X_7, \\ Z_3 Z_4 Z_5 Z_6, Z_2 Z_3 Z_6 Z_7, Z_1 Z_3 Z_5 Z_7, \quad (8)$$

and $\bar{Z} = Z_1 Z_2 Z_3 Z_4 Z_5 Z_6 Z_7$. It is easy to see that $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$ are conditionally 3-undetermined states since $\text{Tr}_{(234)}(|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0|) \neq \text{Tr}_{(234)}(|\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1|)$. By further check, these two logic states become unconditionally 5-undetermined if arbitrary five qubits are traced out.

A. Review of graph states

In addition, another approach of finding D'_c -sets is based on the equivalent graph states under local transformation. Before further proceeding we review graph states as follows. In general, an n -vertex graph is denoted by $G_n = (V, E)$, which can be composed of a set V of n vertices and a set E of edges. The neighboring set of the vertex a , $N(a)$, is defined as $N(a) = \{i \mid (a, i) \in E\}$. The quantum state corresponding to G_n is denoted by $|G_n\rangle$. Therein, the vertex i corresponds to the qubit i , $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. In addition, $|G_n\rangle$ is stabilized by the stabilizer generators, g_i

$$g_i = X_i \prod_{j \in N(i)} Z_j, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (9)$$

As an example, consider the four-qubit graph state $|G_4\rangle$ with associated graph $G_4 = (V, E)$. Wherein, there are four vertices 1, 2, 3 and 4, and $E = \{(1, 2), (2, 3), (3, 4), (4, 1), (2, 4)\}$. Another genuine four-qubit entangled state $|\chi\rangle$ has the form

$$|\chi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\phi^0\rangle + |\phi^1\rangle)$$

with

$$|\phi^0\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|0000\rangle - |0011\rangle - |0101\rangle + |0110\rangle) \quad (10)$$

$$|\phi^1\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|1001\rangle + |1010\rangle + |1100\rangle + |1111\rangle) \quad (11)$$

It can be easily checked that $\text{Tr}_{24}(|\chi\rangle\langle\chi|) = \text{Tr}_{24}(|G_4\rangle\langle G_4|)$ [15].

Local complementation $\mathcal{L}(a)$ on $G_n = (V, E)$ is to complement the connection relation in the vertex set $N(a)$. In details, for any two vertices $i, j \in N(a)$, $\mathcal{L}(a)$ removes (creates) the edge (i, j) if $(i, j) \in E$ ($\notin E$) [16]. Correspondingly, two graph states are local equivalent, if these two associated graphs are equivalent under the sequential local complementations. If two graphs $G_n = (V, E)$ and $G'_n = (V', E')$ are local equivalent under the operation $\mathcal{L}(a)$, we have

$$|G_n\rangle = U_{N(a) \cup a} |G'_n\rangle, \quad (12)$$

and as a result,

$$\text{Tr}_{N(a) \cup a}(|G_n\rangle\langle G_n|) = \text{Tr}_{N(a) \cup a}(|G'_n\rangle\langle G'_n|). \quad (13)$$

A minimal D'_c -set has the form

$$D'_c = \{|G_n\rangle, |G'_n\rangle\} \text{ with } D' = |N(a)| + 1.$$

IV. APPLICATIONS OF UNDETERMINED STATES IN QUANTUM CRYPTOGRAPHY

In the following, we will show that the undetermined states have several important applications in quantum cryptography.

A. Quantum bit commitment

A well-known result is that the unconditionally secure quantum bit commitment (QBC) is impossible [8]. In brief, to defy QBC, the dishonest sender initially prepares the singlet state, $|B\rangle$. In the sealing phase, the sender keeps one qubit and seals the other qubit into the black box, which is then delivered to the honest receiver.

In the detailed analysis by Lo and Chau [8], the states $|B\rangle$ and $U \otimes I |B\rangle$ are undetermined by their single-qubit density matrices, where U and I are the single qubit operation and 2×2 identity matrix, respectively. That is, the dishonest sender can perform the single qubit operation U on the qubit at hand without the receiver's awareness. On the other hand, the sender can access the full information via the anti-perfect correlation of the singlet state. As a result, the undetermineness of two-qubit Bell states rejects the security of QBC.

B. Quantum secret sharing (QSS)

In brief, classical secret sharing scheme (SSS) refers to a method of splitting secret message into n shares, each containing only partial information. The QSS protocol for sharing classical secrets is first proposed by Hillery,

Bužek, and Berthiaume (HBB) [9], which can be briefed as follows. (i) The distribution phase: the sender Alice *always* initially prepares the same three-qubit GHZ states, $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle^{\otimes 3} + |1\rangle^{\otimes 3})$ in each round. Then she sends two of these three qubits to each the receivers, Bob and Charlie. Afterwards, all three parties perform either Y or X measurement at random. The receivers each send the measurement basis to Alice. On the other hand, Alice performs her measurement. Here the secret bit is Alice's measurement outcome. (ii) The revealing phase: Alice announces her measurement basis. If either one or three X measurements are performed among these three parties, they keep their respective outcomes, otherwise these outcomes are discarded. As for the reserved outcomes, Bob and Charlie have to collaborate to deduce Alice's outcome. To achieve this, they just reveal their respective outcomes to each other in private. At last, in order to detect the eavesdropping in the checking phase, some portion of the outcomes should be chosen randomly and then announced public. If the bit error is beyond some threshold, there must exist eavesdropping and hence the secret bits should be abandoned.

Recently, cryptanalysis of the HBB protocol using the intercept-and-resend attack is proposed by Qin *et al.* [10]. Without loss of generality, the dishonest Charlie is presumed equipped with unlimited power without violating the physics principle. To access the secret bit without Bob's assistance, Charlie intercepts both the delivered qubits and performs joint operations on the these qubits with unlimited ancilla qubits. He then resends one qubit to Bob. In the revealing phase, the dishonest Charlie can forge his measurement basis before the actual measurement. In addition, Charlie can wiretap Bob's measurement basis. Finally, after Alice's announcement, Charlie himself can deduce Alice's outcome without any assistance and awareness [10].

Here we demonstrate that the undetermined states can save the security of the HBB protocol with any other further modification. The essential weakness of the original protocol lies in the changeless state prepared in the distribution phase. To rescue its security, the QSS protocol can be modified as follows. In the preparation phase of each round, one of the logic states of $[[3, 1, 1]]$ stabilizer code, which are $|\psi_0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle^{\otimes 3} + |1\rangle^{\otimes 3})$ and $|\psi_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle^{\otimes 3} - |1\rangle^{\otimes 3})$, are initially prepared with equal probability. Then two qubits of the prepared three-qubit state are sent to the receivers. In the revealing phase, Alice announces which state is prepared after she ensures that Bob and Charlie have exchanged their measurement outcomes. The proof of security is analogue to the impossibility of the secure quantum bit commitment as addressed above [8]. Essentially, the states $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$, which are randomly distributed, are 1-undetermined. It is impossible for Bob and Charlie to discriminate $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle$ from their two-qubit density matrices. That is, the undeterminedness as the physics principle prevents a successful eavesdropping. In this condition, any forge

can be regarded as random guess, which can be detected at the checking phase with half probability. Therefore, the modified quantum secret sharing scheme is unconditionally secure.

Furthermore, the HBB protocol be generalized as follows. (i) In the distribution phase, the dealer can prepare one of the n -qubit states in the D_u -set and then distributes $n-D$ qubits each into $n-D$ receivers. (ii) In the revealing phase, $n-D$ of n receivers discuss their outcomes of the local measurements before sender's announcement on state preparation and the local measurement.

The security of the above QSS protocols is guaranteed by the undetermineness of the elements in the D_u -set. As a result, even intercepting all delivered qubits, any dishonest receiver cannot determine which states are distributed. Using the protocol similar to the above modified protocol, the correlation embedded in quantum entanglement can be exploited for secret sharing. For example, as pointed out, for any graph-state-based QSS scheme for classical bits [17] cannot be secure, if only one element of the D_u -set or D'_c -set is deterministically prepared [18].

Finally, the D -undetermined states provide unconditional security for a quantum $((n-D+1, n))$ threshold scheme if such scheme exists [13]. A quantum $((k, n))$ threshold scheme has n shares, of which *any* k shares are sufficient to reconstruct the secret, while any set of $k-1$ or fewer shares has no information about the secret. This can be easily verified because that the reduced density matrix of any set of parties less than or equal to D is the same. Furthermore, the conditionally D' -undetermined states from some SQECCs provide us a trivial way of determining the unauthorized sets (therefore its quantum access structure [13]) when we use the codewords of this SQECC in the quantum secret sharing protocol.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we focus on the construction of families of undetermined *pure* state. However, the undetermined mixed states can be also constructed from SQECCs similarly. Consider the $[[n, 2, d]]$ SQECCs with the logic states $|\bar{i}\bar{j}\rangle$, $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$. Let \bar{Z}_1 and \bar{Z}_2 be the logic σ_z operators on logic states $|\bar{i}\rangle$ and $|\bar{j}\rangle$, respectively. In addition, denote the set

$$\mathcal{X}_i = \{X_i | X_i \in \mathcal{N} \text{ and } \{X_i, \bar{Z}_i\} = 0\},$$

where $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and \mathcal{N} is the normalizer of the stabilizer group generated by g_1, g_2, \dots, g_{n-2} . Now, define the density matrices of two mixed states

$$\rho_0 = \frac{1}{2}(|\bar{00}\rangle \langle \bar{00}| + |\bar{11}\rangle \langle \bar{11}|),$$

and

$$\rho_1 = \frac{1}{2}(|\bar{10}\rangle \langle \bar{10}| + |\bar{01}\rangle \langle \bar{01}|).$$

If the mixed states ρ_0 and ρ_1 are D -undetermined, by definition, for arbitrary D qubits i_1, i_2, \dots, i_D , there must be an undetected error $\mathcal{E}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_D}$, such that

$$\mathcal{E}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_D} \in \mathcal{X}_{12} = \mathcal{X}_1 \cup \mathcal{X}_2 - \mathcal{X}_1 \cap \mathcal{X}_2.$$

As a trivial example, we consider the $[[4, 2, 2]]$ code. Wherein, $g_1 = Y_1 Y_2 Y_3 Y_4$, $g_2 = Z_1 Z_2 Z_3 Z_4$, $Z_1 = Z_2 Z_3$ and $Z_2 = Z_1 Z_4$. It is easy to show that

$$\mathcal{X}_{12} = \{Z_1 X_2 Y_3, Z_2 X_3 Y_4, X_1 Z_3 Y_4, X_1 Z_2 Y_4\}.$$

Notably, here $2 = d \neq D = 3$.

In conclusion, we constructed sets of the undetermined, either pure or mixed, states. Specifically, we establish the connection between the logic states of SQECCs and the pure undetermined states through the error correcting power of the SQECCs. With the undeterminedness property, the reason that the SQECCs are capable of quantum cryptography tasks becomes trivial. Several applications of the undetermined states are given in this article. Nevertheless, the generalized multi-level undetermined states are still open questions for further studies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author LYH would like to thank Prof. Feng-Li Lin for stimulating discussion. He also acknowledges support from National Science Council of the Republic of China under Contract No. NSC.96-2112-M-033-007-MY3. The author MHH receives support from NSF Grant No. ECS-0507270. LYH and MHH are also partially supported by the Physics Division, National Center of Theoretical Sciences.

-
- [1] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, K. Horodecki, e-print arXiv: quant-ph/0702225.
 - [2] N. Linden, S. Popescu, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 207901 (2002).
 - [3] N. Linden and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 277906 (2002).
 - [4] L. Diósi, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 010302 (2004).
 - [5] S. N. Walck and D. W. Lyons, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 050501 (2008).
 - [6] S. N. Walck and D. W. Lyons, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 032326 (2009).
 - [7] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).

- [8] H.-K. Lo and H. F. Chau, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 3410 (1997).
- [9] M. Hillery, V. Bužek, and A. Berthiaume, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 1829 (1999).
- [10] S.-J. Qin, F. Gao, Q.-Y. Wen, and F.-C. Zhu, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 062324 (2007).
- [11] R. Laflamme, C. Miquel, J. P. Paz, and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 198 (1996).
- [12] A. M. Steane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 793 (1996).
- [13] D. Gottesman, Phys. Rev. A. **61**, 042311 (2000).
- [14] D. Gottesman, Ph.D thesis, Stabilizer codes and quantum error correction, California Institute of Technology (1997).
- [15] M.-Y. Ye and X.-M. Lin, Phys. Lett. A **372** 4157 (2008).
- [16] M. Hein, W. Dür, J. Eisert, R. Raussendorf, M. Van den Nest, and H.-J. Briegel, quant-ph/0602096.
- [17] D. Markham, B. C. Sanders, Phys. Rev. A **78** 042309 (2008).
- [18] L.-Y. Hsu and W.-T. Yen, Chin. J. Phys, **48** 138 (2010).