

Gate fidelity of self-adjoint gates constrained by conservation laws

Tokishiro Karasawa¹, Julio Gea-Banacloche²,
and Masanao Ozawa³

¹National Institute of Informatics, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, 101-8430, Japan

²Department of Physics, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas, 72701, USA

³Graduate School of Information Science, Nagoya University, Chikusa-ku, Nagoya, 464-8601, Japan

E-mail: jidai@nii.ac.jp, jgeabana@uark.edu, and ozawa@is.nagoya-u.ac.jp

Abstract.

Recent investigations show that conservation laws limit the accuracy of gate operations in quantum computing. The inevitable error under the angular momentum conservation law has been evaluated so far for the CNOT, Hadamard, and NOT gates for spin 1/2 qubits, while the SWAP gate has no constraint. Here, we consider arbitrary self-adjoint gates under arbitrary conservation laws from a geometrical point of view. A lower bound of the gate infidelity, one minus the squared gate fidelity, is obtained to be inversely proportional to the squared size of the controller and proportional to the squared sine of 2 times the relative angle between the axes of rotations on the Bloch sphere generated by the conserved quantity and the gate operation. Taking all the directions into account, we conclude that no self-adjoint gate on a spin 1/2 qubit can be implemented with a gate infidelity less than $(4 + 4N^2)^{-1}$ by any rotationally invariant interaction with a spin $N/2$ ancilla. In the case where the above axes are orthogonal like the NOT gate, the above bound vanishes, but by further elaborations the gate infidelity is shown to have another non vanishing lower bound.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Lx, 03.67.-a, 03.65.Yz, 03.65.Ta

1. Introduction

One of the most demanding factors in realizing scalable quantum computers is the accuracy requirement for implementing the elementary quantum gates set by the threshold theorem for successful concatenated error-correction [1]. Two types of errors under current consideration are the environment-induced decoherence, caused by the interaction with the environment, and the controller-induced decoherence, caused by the interaction with the controller of the gate operation (the latter considered separately from, and in addition to, any errors arising from classical control imperfections). The environment-induced decoherence may be overcome, in principle, by developing qubits with long decoherence time. In the early treatments [1], the controller-induced decoherence was not distinguished from the environment-induced one. However, they have different constraints, since insensitivity and controllability are two contradictory demands.

In the conventional description, the controller is described as a classical system and then causes no decoherence. However, the quantum nature of electromagnetic control fields has been studied by one of the present authors and others [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9], and shown to yield a substantial decoherence in realizing scalable quantum computers; see also Refs. [10, 11, 12] for a debate on the validity of the model under consideration.

In contrast to the above model-dependent approach, one of the present authors [13, 14, 15, 16] independently found physical constraints on gate operations generally imposed by conservation laws, by quantitatively generalizing the so-called Wigner-Araki-Yanase theorem [17, 18, 19]. The inevitable error probability under the angular momentum conservation law has been shown to be inversely proportional to the variance of the controller's conserved quantity for the CNOT gate [13] and the Hadamard gate [15], while the SWAP gate obeys no constraint [13]. For the NOT gate a similar lower bound has been obtained more recently by a different method [20]. Subsequently, the above two approaches have been compared and merged [21, 22]. It was shown there that the limit derived from the angular momentum conservation law is equivalent to the one yielded by the phase fluctuations of the control field when a qubit-field interaction Hamiltonian of the Jaynes-Cummings type is assumed.

Here, we extend the above results to arbitrary self-adjoint gates with arbitrary conservation laws from a geometrical point of view. We show that a lower bound of the gate infidelity, one minus the squared gate fidelity, is given by $(\sin^2 2\Psi)(4 + 4\sigma(L/c)^2)^{-1}$, where Ψ is the relative angle between the axes of rotations on the Bloch sphere generated by the conserved quantity and the gate operation; L is the conserved quantity in the controller; and c is the maximum standard deviation of the conserved quantity in the qubit, while the standard deviation $\sigma(L/c)$ of L/c is generally understood as the size of the controller. Taking all the directions into account, we eventually conclude that the gate infidelity of any implementation of an arbitrary self-adjoint gate on a spin 1/2 qubit controlled by a spin $N/2$ ancilla system is bounded by $(4 + 4N^2)^{-1}$ under the angular momentum conservation law. If the control interaction does not have the full rotational

symmetry, the relative angle determines a coefficient of the lower bound, which runs from zero to one. By further elaborations of the above bound, we also show that even in the case $\Psi = \pi/2$, in which the above bound vanishes (as in the case of the NOT, or bit-flip, gate), the gate infidelity still has a lower bound $(1 + \sqrt{1 + \sigma(L/c)^2})^{-2}$.

Although in many practical cases what we have called the controller will, by its very nature, be too large for our limits to represent a significant constraint, we note that, as pointed out above, laser pulses interacting with atomic qubits may be an exception to this [5], especially in view of the recent result that minimum energy pulses cannot be, in general, safely shared or reused [22]. Other systems for which our results may be quite relevant are the so-called “programmable quantum processors,” [23, 24] which consist of a set of data qubits undergoing joint, closed evolution with a set of “program” qubits. If the total system evolution obeys a conservation law, our results clearly imply that the set of program qubits needs to be sufficiently large, in order to carry out the desired operations to a sufficiently large degree of accuracy.

Our paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives the formulation of the problem and examples to which our formulation applies. Section 3 introduces the deviation operator and gives a lower bound of the infidelity in terms of the variance of the deviation operator. In Section 4, we consider the commutator of the deviation operator and the conserved quantity to obtain a lower bound on the variance of the deviation operator using Robertson’s inequality. In Section 5, the lower bound is represented in terms of the relative angle mentioned above and the size of the controller. Section 6 considers the case of the full rotational symmetry, while Section 7 gives an alternative lower bound which is useful for the case where the above bound vanishes.

2. Basic formulation

Let \mathbf{S} be a qubit with computational basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$. A self-adjoint gate on \mathbf{S} is an arbitrary unitary operator $U_{\mathbf{S}}$ on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{S}}$ of \mathbf{S} that is self-adjoint, i.e., $U_{\mathbf{S}}^{\dagger} = U_{\mathbf{S}}$. We naturally assume that $U_{\mathbf{S}}$ is not a scalar operator, or equivalently has two eigenvalues ± 1 . The class of self-adjoint gates includes the Pauli operators defined by $X_{\mathbf{S}} = |0\rangle\langle 1| + |1\rangle\langle 0|$, $Y_{\mathbf{S}} = -i|0\rangle\langle 1| + i|1\rangle\langle 0|$, and $Z_{\mathbf{S}} = |0\rangle\langle 0| - |1\rangle\langle 1|$, as well as the Hadamard gate defined by $H_{\mathbf{S}} = (\sqrt{2})^{-1}(|0\rangle\langle 0| + |0\rangle\langle 1| + |1\rangle\langle 0| - |1\rangle\langle 1|)$.

We assume that a self-adjoint gate $U_{\mathbf{S}}$ is implemented by an interaction for a finite time interval with an ancilla \mathbf{A} , which is described as a quantum system with a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{A}}$. Then, every possible implementation is characterized by a pair $\alpha = (|A\rangle, U)$ consisting of a state vector $|A\rangle$ in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{A}}$ describing the initial state of \mathbf{A} and a unitary operator U on $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{A}}$ describing the time evolution of $\mathbf{S} + \mathbf{A}$ during the interaction [13]. An implementation (characterized by) $\alpha = (|A\rangle, U)$ defines a trace-preserving quantum operation \mathcal{E}_{α} by

$$\mathcal{E}_{\alpha}(\rho) = \text{Tr}_{\mathbf{A}}[U(\rho \otimes |A\rangle\langle A|)U^{\dagger}] \quad (1)$$

for any density operator ρ of the system \mathbf{S} , where $\text{Tr}_{\mathbf{A}}$ stands for the partial trace over $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{A}}$. How successful the implementation $\alpha = (|A\rangle, U)$ has been is measured by the gate

fidelity of \mathcal{E}_α relative to $U_{\mathbf{S}}$ (Ref. [1], p. 418) defined by

$$F(\mathcal{E}_\alpha, U_{\mathbf{S}}) = \inf_{|\psi\rangle} F(|\psi\rangle), \quad (2)$$

where $|\psi\rangle$ varies over all state vectors of \mathbf{S} , and $F(|\psi\rangle)$ is the fidelity of the two states $U_{\mathbf{S}}|\psi\rangle$ and $\mathcal{E}_\alpha(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$, given by

$$F(|\psi\rangle) = \langle\psi|U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger\mathcal{E}_\alpha(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)U_{\mathbf{S}}|\psi\rangle^{1/2}. \quad (3)$$

Then, the implementation is perfect, i.e., $\mathcal{E}_\alpha(\rho) = U_{\mathbf{S}}\rho U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger$ for any density operator ρ , if and only if $F(\mathcal{E}_\alpha, U_{\mathbf{S}}) = 1$.

In the present paper, we consider a constraint naturally imposed by conservation laws. For this purpose, we assume that there are additively conserved quantities $L_{\mathbf{S}}$ and $L_{\mathbf{A}}$ of systems \mathbf{S} and \mathbf{A} , respectively, so that the unitary operator U should satisfy the conservation law

$$[U, L] = 0, \quad (4)$$

where $L = L_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}} + I_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes L_{\mathbf{A}}$.

Since different pairs of observables can represent the same additive conservation law, it is convenient to introduce a standard representation of the conserved quantity. Since a scalar operator poses no constraint, we always assume that $L_{\mathbf{S}}$ has two distinct real eigenvalues $a < b$. Let $c = (b - a)/2$. Then, it is easy to see that c is the maximum standard deviation of $L_{\mathbf{S}}$ attained, for instance, by $|\psi\rangle = 2^{-1/2}(|L_{\mathbf{S}} = a\rangle + |L_{\mathbf{S}} = b\rangle)$. It is also easy to see that the operator $c^{-1}(L_{\mathbf{S}} - bI_{\mathbf{S}}) + I_{\mathbf{S}}$ is a non-scalar, unitary and self-adjoint operator.

Every non-scalar, unitary and self-adjoint operator A on $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{S}}$ can be represented as

$$A = \vec{a} \cdot \vec{\sigma} = a_x X_{\mathbf{S}} + a_y Y_{\mathbf{S}} + a_z Z_{\mathbf{S}}, \quad (5)$$

where $\vec{\sigma} = (X_{\mathbf{S}}, Y_{\mathbf{S}}, Z_{\mathbf{S}})$ and $\vec{a} = (a_x, a_y, a_z)$ is a real vector satisfying

$$\|\vec{a}\|^2 = a_x^2 + a_y^2 + a_z^2 = 1. \quad (6)$$

Thus, we have two vectors \vec{l} and \vec{u} with $\|\vec{l}\| = \|\vec{u}\| = 1$ satisfying

$$L_{\mathbf{S}} = (b - c)I_{\mathbf{S}} + c\vec{l} \cdot \vec{\sigma}, \quad (7)$$

$$U_{\mathbf{S}} = \vec{u} \cdot \vec{\sigma}, \quad (8)$$

where b and c are the maximum eigenvalue and the maximum standard deviation of $L_{\mathbf{S}}$, respectively. The addition of a scalar operator to $L_{\mathbf{S}}$ does not affect the condition Eq. (4), and it also does not change the standard deviation of $L_{\mathbf{S}}$; thus, the pair $(L_{\mathbf{S}}, L_{\mathbf{A}})$ and the pair $(c\vec{l} \cdot \vec{\sigma}, L_{\mathbf{A}})$ represent the same additive conservation law. From the above, it is also true that the pair $(\vec{l} \cdot \vec{\sigma}, L_{\mathbf{A}}/c)$ represents the same conservation law as the pair $(L_{\mathbf{S}}, L_{\mathbf{A}})$. We shall use such simplifications where it is useful.

The above formulation typically includes the following examples.

Angular momentum conservation law. In this case, we assume that the system \mathbf{S} has the spin $(\hbar/2)\vec{\sigma}$. Then, $L_{\mathbf{S}} = (\hbar/2)\vec{l} \cdot \vec{\sigma}$ represents the spin component along the (θ, ϕ) direction with $\vec{l} = (\sin \theta \cos \phi, \sin \theta \sin \phi, \cos \theta)$, where $0 \leq \theta \leq \pi$ and $0 \leq \phi < 2\pi$.

The angular momentum conservation law in the (θ, ϕ) direction is represented as the case where $L_{\mathbf{A}}$ is the angular momentum of \mathbf{A} in the (θ, ϕ) direction. In this case, we have $b = c = \hbar/2$ and \vec{l} is arbitrary.

Atom-field interaction. An additive conservation law holds for the well-known Jaynes-Cummings model [25], which describes the coupling of a two-level atom \mathbf{S} with a single-mode \mathbf{A} of the electromagnetic field with annihilation operator a . Allowing for a detuning Δ between the atom and the field, the Hamiltonian for the model may be written in a suitable interaction picture as

$$H = \hbar\Delta I \otimes a^\dagger a + i\hbar g (|0\rangle\langle 1| \otimes a - |1\rangle\langle 0| \otimes a^\dagger), \quad (9)$$

where g is an appropriate coupling constant. Then, $L_{\mathbf{S}} = Z_{\mathbf{S}}$ and $L_{\mathbf{A}} = 2a^\dagger a$ constitute a pair of additively conserved quantities for $U = e^{-itH/\hbar}$ for any real t [21]. Thus, the constraint applies when one wants to realize a self-adjoint gate $U_{\mathbf{S}}$ by the Jaynes-Cummings interaction with controlling the parameters Δ , g , and t . In this case, we have $b = c = 1$ and $\vec{l} = (0, 0, 1)$. For multimode fields, we refer the reader to Refs. [21, 22].

3. Mean square deviation

In order to obtain an upper bound of the gate fidelity $F(\mathcal{E}_\alpha, U_{\mathbf{S}})$, we shall study the gate infidelity defined as $1 - F(\mathcal{E}_\alpha, U_{\mathbf{S}})^2$, and show that an additive conservation law generally poses a lower bound on the gate infidelity. It is natural to expect that such a limitation can be derived by the uncertainty relation generally formulated by Robertson [26] on quantum fluctuations, measured by standard deviations or variances, of arbitrary pairs of non-commuting observables. In fact, in Refs. [13, 15] commutation relations satisfied by noise and disturbance operators with the conserved quantity have been considered in order to apply Robertson's inequality, and lower bounds have been obtained for the gate infidelities of the CNOT gate and the Hadamard gate. Here, we extend the above method to arbitrary self-adjoint gates.

For this purpose, we introduce the deviation operator D of the system $\mathbf{S} + \mathbf{A}$ defined by

$$D = U^\dagger (L_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}}) U - U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger L_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}}, \quad (10)$$

and we shall show that the variance of the deviation operator is, up to a constant factor, a lower bound on the gate infidelity. By the obvious cancellation when Eq. (7) is substituted in Eq. (10), we can assume $L_{\mathbf{S}} = c\vec{l} \cdot \vec{\sigma}$ without any loss of generality. Then, $L_{\mathbf{S}}$ has eigenvalues $\pm c$. Let $|\chi_0\rangle$ and $|\chi_1\rangle$ be unit eigenvectors with eigenvalues c and $-c$, respectively. We define an orthonormal basis $\{|\xi_0\rangle, |\xi_1\rangle\}$ as $|\xi_0\rangle = U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger |\chi_0\rangle$ and $|\xi_1\rangle = U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger |\chi_1\rangle$. For the input states $|\xi_i\rangle$ with $i = 0, 1$, the fidelity is given by

$$F(|\xi_i\rangle) = \langle \chi_i | \mathcal{E}_\alpha (|\xi_i\rangle \langle \xi_i|) | \chi_i \rangle^{1/2}. \quad (11)$$

Since $\text{Tr}[\mathcal{E}_\alpha(|\xi_i\rangle \langle \xi_i|)] = 1$, we have

$$\sum_{j=0}^1 \langle \chi_j | \mathcal{E}_\alpha (|\xi_i\rangle \langle \xi_i|) | \chi_j \rangle = 1. \quad (12)$$

Therefore, Eqs. (11) and (12) give

$$\langle \chi_i | \mathcal{E}_\alpha(|\xi_j\rangle \langle \xi_j|) | \chi_i \rangle = 1 - F(|\xi_j\rangle)^2, \quad (13)$$

where $i \neq j$ for $i, j = 0, 1$. On the other hand, the output state $U(|\xi_i\rangle \otimes |A\rangle)$ can be generally described by

$$U(|\xi_i\rangle \otimes |A\rangle) = |\chi_0\rangle \otimes |A_0^i\rangle + |\chi_1\rangle \otimes |A_1^i\rangle, \quad (14)$$

where $|A_j^i\rangle$ are unnormalized states of \mathbf{A} . We, therefore, have

$$\langle \chi_i | \mathcal{E}_\alpha(|\xi_j\rangle \langle \xi_j|) | \chi_i \rangle = \||A_i^j\rangle\|^2. \quad (15)$$

Thus

$$\||A_i^j\rangle\|^2 = 1 - F(|\xi_j\rangle)^2, \quad (16)$$

for $i \neq j$.

Considering now the mean square $\langle D^2 \rangle$ of the deviation operator D in the state $|\psi\rangle \otimes |A\rangle$, we have

$$\langle D^2 \rangle = \||[(L_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I)U - U(U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger L_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I)](|\psi\rangle \otimes |A\rangle)\|^2. \quad (17)$$

The above quantity can be evaluated as follows. Any input state $|\psi\rangle$ of \mathbf{S} can be described as $|\psi\rangle = \cos \gamma |\xi_0\rangle + e^{i\delta} \sin \gamma |\xi_1\rangle$, where $0 \leq \gamma \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $0 \leq \delta < 2\pi$. Note also that $L_{\mathbf{S}} = c|\chi_0\rangle \langle \chi_0| - c|\chi_1\rangle \langle \chi_1|$, and from Eq. (14) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D^2 \rangle &= 4c^2 (\||A_1^0\rangle\|^2 \cos^2 \gamma + \||A_0^1\rangle\|^2 \sin^2 \gamma) \\ &= 4c^2 [1 - F(|\xi_0\rangle)^2 \cos^2 \gamma - F(|\xi_1\rangle)^2 \sin^2 \gamma] \\ &\leq 4c^2 [1 - F(\mathcal{E}_\alpha, U_{\mathbf{S}})]. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Since $\sigma(D)^2 \leq \langle D^2 \rangle$, where $\sigma(D)^2$ stand for the variance of D in the state $|\psi\rangle \otimes |A\rangle$, we obtain

$$1 - F(\mathcal{E}_\alpha, U_{\mathbf{S}})^2 \geq \frac{1}{4c^2} \sup_{|\psi\rangle} \sigma(D)^2, \quad (19)$$

where $|\psi\rangle$ varies over all the state vectors of \mathbf{S} .

4. Uncertainty relation

In what follows, we shall consider the uncertainty relation between the deviation operator D and the conserved quantity L to obtain an lower bound of the variance of D .

By the conservation law (4), we have

$$[D, L] = -[U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger L_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}}, L_{\mathbf{S}}] \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}}. \quad (20)$$

Since addition of a scalar operator does not affect the commutator, we assume $b = c$ or $L_{\mathbf{S}} = c\vec{l} \cdot \vec{\sigma}$ without any loss of generality. By Robertson's inequality [26], we have

$$\sigma(D)\sigma(L) \geq \frac{1}{2} |\langle [D, L] \rangle|, \quad (21)$$

where $\langle \cdot \cdot \rangle$ and σ stands for the mean value and standard deviation in the state $|\psi\rangle \otimes |A\rangle$, respectively. In the product state $|\psi\rangle \otimes |A\rangle$, we also have

$$\sigma(L)^2 = \sigma(L_{\mathbf{S}})^2 + \sigma(L_{\mathbf{A}})^2. \quad (22)$$

Thus, we have

$$\sigma(D)^2 \geq \left(\frac{1}{4}\right) \frac{|\langle [U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger L_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}}, L_{\mathbf{S}}] \rangle|^2}{\sigma(L_{\mathbf{S}})^2 + \sigma(L_{\mathbf{A}})^2}. \quad (23)$$

Note that we have $\sigma(L_{\mathbf{S}}) \leq c$, and hence we have

$$\sigma(D)^2 \geq \left(\frac{1}{4c^2}\right) \frac{|\langle [U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger L_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}}, L_{\mathbf{S}}] \rangle|^2}{1 + \sigma(L_{\mathbf{A}}/c)^2} \quad (24)$$

for any $|\psi\rangle$ and $|A\rangle$. We are interested in the worst case error $\sup_{|\psi\rangle} \sigma(D)^2$. Taking the supremum over $|\psi\rangle$ of the both sides, and noting the relation $\sup_{|\psi\rangle} |\langle X \rangle| = \|X\|$ for any operator on $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{S}}$, we obtain

$$\sup_{|\psi\rangle} \sigma(D)^2 \geq \left(\frac{1}{4c^2}\right) \frac{\| [U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger L_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}}, L_{\mathbf{S}}] \|^2}{1 + \sigma(L_{\mathbf{A}}/c)^2} \quad (25)$$

for any $|A\rangle$.

5. Constraint with relative angle in the general case

In what follows, we determine the operator norm $\| [U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger L_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}}, L_{\mathbf{S}}] \|$ in geometrical terms from the vector analysis in three-dimensional space.

Recall the relations $L_{\mathbf{S}}/c = \vec{l} \cdot \vec{\sigma}$ and $U_{\mathbf{S}} = \vec{u} \cdot \vec{\sigma}$. We have the relation

$$(\vec{l} \cdot \vec{\sigma})(\vec{u} \cdot \vec{\sigma}) = (\vec{l} \cdot \vec{u})I + i(\vec{l} \times \vec{u}) \cdot \vec{\sigma}, \quad (26)$$

where $\vec{l} \cdot \vec{u} = l_x u_x + l_y u_y + l_z u_z$ and $\vec{l} \times \vec{u} = (l_y u_z - l_z u_y, l_z u_x - l_x u_z, l_x u_y - l_y u_x)$. Then, straightforward calculations lead to

$$[U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger L_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}}, L_{\mathbf{S}}] = 2c^2 i \{ (\vec{l} \cdot \vec{u})(\vec{u} \times \vec{l}) - [\vec{u} \times (\vec{l} \times \vec{u})] \times \vec{l} \} \cdot \vec{\sigma}. \quad (27)$$

By $\vec{u} \times (\vec{l} \times \vec{u}) = \vec{l} - (\vec{l} \cdot \vec{u})\vec{u}$, we have $(\vec{u} \times (\vec{l} \times \vec{u})) \times \vec{l} = -(\vec{l} \cdot \vec{u})(\vec{u} \times \vec{l})$. Thus we obtain

$$[U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger L_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}}, L_{\mathbf{S}}] = 4c^2 i (\vec{l} \cdot \vec{u})(\vec{u} \times \vec{l}) \cdot \vec{\sigma}, \quad (28)$$

and consequently,

$$\| [U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger L_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}}, L_{\mathbf{S}}] \| = 4c^2 |\vec{l} \cdot \vec{u}| \|\vec{u} \times \vec{l}\|. \quad (29)$$

Here, the vectors \vec{u} and \vec{l} have the following geometric meaning with respect to the Bloch sphere determined by $\vec{\sigma}$. The vector \vec{u} represents the axis of the rotation of the Bloch sphere given by $R_U(t) = \exp(-itU_{\mathbf{S}}/2)$. On the other hand, the vector \vec{l} represents the axis of the rotation of the Bloch sphere given by $R_L(t) = \exp(-itL_{\mathbf{S}}/2c)$, which is interpreted as the direction of the conserved quantity; for instance, the direction of a conserved angular momentum component. Let Ψ be the relative angle between those two axes corresponding to R_U and R_L . Then, Ψ is characterized by

$$\vec{l} \cdot \vec{u} = \cos \Psi \quad \text{and} \quad \|\vec{u} \times \vec{l}\| = \sin \Psi. \quad (30)$$

Thus, we have

$$\| [U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger L_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}}, L_{\mathbf{S}}] \|^2 = 4c^4 \sin^2 2\Psi, \quad (31)$$

and we conclude

$$\sup_{|\psi\rangle} \sigma(D)^2 \geq \frac{c^2 \sin^2 2\Psi}{1 + \sigma(L_{\mathbf{A}}/c)^2}. \quad (32)$$

The above relation may be combined with Eq. (19) to obtain

$$1 - F(\mathcal{E}_\alpha, U_{\mathbf{S}})^2 \geq \frac{\sin^2 2\Psi}{4 + 4\sigma(L_{\mathbf{A}}/c)^2}. \quad (33)$$

This relation was previously proved for the Hadamard gate [15], which corresponds to the worst case $\Psi = \pi/4$, i.e., $\sin 2\Psi = 1$, for $L_{\mathbf{S}} = Z_{\mathbf{S}}$ or $L_{\mathbf{S}} = X_{\mathbf{S}}$; here we have successfully generalized it to all the self-adjoint gates.

6. Constraint under the angular momentum conservation law

Now, we consider the angular momentum conservation law, or the requirement of the rotational invariance of U . In this case, for the given $U_{\mathbf{S}}$ the conservation law (4) holds for any direction (θ, ϕ) , so that Eq. (33) holds for any Ψ with $c = \hbar/2$, and hence we obtain

$$1 - F(\mathcal{E}_\alpha, U_{\mathbf{S}})^2 \geq \frac{1}{4 + 4\sigma(2L_{\mathbf{A}}/\hbar)^2}, \quad (34)$$

where $L_{\mathbf{A}}$ is the (θ, ϕ) component of the angular momentum of \mathbf{A} . Thus, every self-adjoint gate has a lower bound of the gate infidelity that is inversely proportional to $4 + 4\sigma(2L_{\mathbf{A}}/\hbar)^2$. The lower bound decreases as the fluctuation of the conserved quantity increases. For any given ancilla system \mathbf{A} , the variance $\sigma(2L_{\mathbf{A}}/\hbar)^2$ is upper bounded by the operator norm $\|2L_{\mathbf{A}}/\hbar\|$, if it is finite, attained by the optimal ancilla states. Thus, if \mathbf{A} is a spin $N/2$ system we have $\|2L_{\mathbf{A}}/\hbar\| = N$ and hence

$$1 - F(\mathcal{E}_\alpha, U_{\mathbf{S}})^2 \geq \frac{1}{4 + 4N^2}. \quad (35)$$

In particular, if the ancilla consists of N qubits, the total spin number is $N/2$. We conclude that any self-adjoint gate on a spin $1/2$ qubit system cannot be implemented within the gate infidelity less than $(4 + 4N^2)^{-1}$ by a rotationally invariant interaction with an N qubit ancilla system, or with any ancilla with spin $N/2$.

7. An alternative lower bound

The derivation in Section 5 (in particular, Eq. (33)) suggests that there is no constraint on the realization of gates for which $\Psi = 0$ (that is, $\vec{u} = \vec{l}$) or $\Psi = \pi/2$ (that is, $\vec{u} \cdot \vec{l} = 0$). While the first conclusion is correct, the second one is not true in general, since, for instance, a lower bound for the gate trace distance $D(\mathcal{E}_\alpha, U_{\mathbf{S}})$ has been obtained recently [20] for the bit flip or quantum NOT gate, $U_{\mathbf{S}} = X_{\mathbf{S}}$, under $b = c = 1$ and $\vec{l} = (0, 0, 1)$. However, since the gate infidelity is always dominated by the gate trace

distance, i.e., $D(\mathcal{E}_\alpha, U_{\mathbf{S}}) \geq 1 - F(\mathcal{E}_\alpha, U_{\mathbf{S}})^2$, we cannot immediately derive constraints for the gate fidelity from the result in [20]. Here, we shall instead show directly that such constraints do exist.

To motivate the calculations that follow, consider again the case just mentioned, with $U_{\mathbf{S}} = X_{\mathbf{S}}$ (i.e., $\vec{u} = (1, 0, 0)$), and a conservation law given by Eq. (7) with $b = c = 1$ and $\vec{l} = (0, 0, 1)$ (i.e., $L_{\mathbf{S}} = Z_{\mathbf{S}}$). The difficulty is that in this case the ideal gate operator $U_{\mathbf{S}}$ transforms $L_{\mathbf{S}}$ into something that commutes with itself:

$$U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger L_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}} = X_{\mathbf{S}} Z_{\mathbf{S}} X_{\mathbf{S}} = -Z_{\mathbf{S}} = -L_{\mathbf{S}} \quad (36)$$

As a result, no constraint on D follows from Eq. (20), since the commutator on the right-hand side vanishes. However, the situation is different when we look at the action of $U_{\mathbf{S}}$ on other system operators, in particular $X_{\mathbf{S}}$ and $Y_{\mathbf{S}}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger X_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}} &= X_{\mathbf{S}} \\ U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger Y_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}} &= -Y_{\mathbf{S}} \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

so if we define, as in Eq. (10), the corresponding deviation operators

$$\begin{aligned} D_x &= U^\dagger (X_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}}) U - X_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}} \\ D_y &= U^\dagger (Y_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}}) U + Y_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}} \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

we find (using the conservation law, $[U, L] = [U^\dagger, L] = 0$)

$$\begin{aligned} [D_y, L] &= U^\dagger [Y_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}}, L] U + [Y_{\mathbf{S}}, L_{\mathbf{S}}] \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}} \\ &= 2iU^\dagger (X_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}}) U + 2iX_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}} \\ &= 2iD_x + 4iX_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}} \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

which shows that D_y and D_x cannot simultaneously be zero. Now, it is important to realize that the derivation of Eq. (19) does not depend on D being the deviation operator for the system's conserved quantity: an identical lower bound on the fidelity could be obtained from the deviation operator of any system Hermitian operator with eigenvalues $\pm c$. Accordingly, in what follows we show how a generalization of the result (39), to arbitrary $U_{\mathbf{S}}$ and $L_{\mathbf{S}}$, can be used in this way to derive a general lower bound for the gate infidelity that does not vanish when $\Psi = \pi/2$, and thus in a sense complements the one obtained in Section 5, Eq. (33).

To simplify the calculations that follow, we shall take the z axis, which is, in principle, arbitrary, to be in the direction of \vec{l} , that is, the direction privileged by the conservation quantity. We can do this without loss of generality as long as we keep the vector \vec{u} arbitrary; then everything that follows will be true up to a change of basis (spatial rotation). As we shall see below, the constraint we obtain can be put in a form that depends only on the angle Ψ between \vec{l} and \vec{u} , so it is clearly independent of the choice of axes (to make sure, see Appendix A, in which we give a brief derivation of the constraint under the conservation law with arbitrary \vec{l}).

Let then $L_{\mathbf{S}} = (b - c)I_{\mathbf{S}} + cZ_{\mathbf{S}}$ and define accordingly, by analogy with (38), the deviation operators

$$D_x = U^\dagger (X_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}}) U - U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger X_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}}$$

$$D_y = U^\dagger(Y_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}})U - U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger Y_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}}. \quad (40)$$

Making use of the conservation law as in Eqs. (39) above, we obtain the relations

$$\frac{1}{c}[D_x, L] = -2i(D_y + U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger Y_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}}) - [U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger X_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}}, Z_{\mathbf{S}}] \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}}, \quad (41)$$

$$\frac{1}{c}[D_y, L] = 2i(D_x + U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger X_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}}) - [U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger Y_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}}, Z_{\mathbf{S}}] \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}}. \quad (42)$$

Let now $U_{\mathbf{S}} = \vec{u} \cdot \vec{\sigma}$, with $\vec{u} = (u_x, u_y, u_z)$. For the second terms of Eqs. (41) and (42), useful results, easily established by direct calculation, are that,

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger X_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}} &= (u_x^2 - u_y^2 - u_z^2)X_{\mathbf{S}} + 2u_x u_y Y_{\mathbf{S}} + 2u_x u_z Z_{\mathbf{S}}, \\ U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger Y_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}} &= (u_y^2 - u_x^2 - u_z^2)Y_{\mathbf{S}} + 2u_x u_y X_{\mathbf{S}} + 2u_y u_z Z_{\mathbf{S}}. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Accordingly, we find

$$\frac{1}{c}[D_x, L] = -2i\{D_y + 2U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger Y_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}} + 2(u_z^2 Y_{\mathbf{S}} - u_y u_z Z_{\mathbf{S}}) \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}}\}, \quad (44)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{c}[D_y, L] = 2i\{D_x + 2U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger X_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}} + 2(u_z^2 X_{\mathbf{S}} - u_x u_z Z_{\mathbf{S}}) \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}}\}. \quad (45)$$

Then, as in Section 4, Robertson's uncertainty relation implies that:

$$\sigma(D_x)^2 \geq \frac{|\langle D_y + 2U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger Y_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}} + 2(u_z^2 Y_{\mathbf{S}} - u_y u_z Z_{\mathbf{S}}) \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}} \rangle|^2}{1 + \sigma(L_{\mathbf{A}}/c)^2}, \quad (46)$$

$$\sigma(D_y)^2 \geq \frac{|\langle D_x + 2U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger X_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}} + 2(u_z^2 X_{\mathbf{S}} - u_x u_z Z_{\mathbf{S}}) \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}} \rangle|^2}{1 + \sigma(L_{\mathbf{A}}/c)^2}. \quad (47)$$

Now suppose we evaluate the numerator of the right-hand side in (46) in the eigenstate of $U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger Y_{\mathbf{S}} U_{\mathbf{S}}$ corresponding to the eigenvalue +1. Let $\langle \cdot \rangle'$ denote the expectation values in this particular state. We then have

$$\langle (D_x)^2 \rangle' \geq \frac{|2 + \langle D_y \rangle' + 2(u_z^2 \langle Y_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}} \rangle' - u_y u_z \langle Z_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}} \rangle')|^2}{1 + \sigma(L_{\mathbf{A}}/c)^2}. \quad (48)$$

Taking the square root of Eq. (48), we have

$$\sqrt{\langle (D_x)^2 \rangle'} \geq \frac{2 - |\langle D_y \rangle'| - 2u_z^2 |\langle Y_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}} \rangle'| - 2|u_y u_z| |\langle Z_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}} \rangle'|}{\sqrt{1 + \sigma(L_{\mathbf{A}}/c)^2}}. \quad (49)$$

Note that the maximum expectation value of $Y_{\mathbf{S}}$ and $Z_{\mathbf{S}}$ is 1, and also $\sqrt{\sup\langle X^2 \rangle} \geq \sqrt{\langle X^2 \rangle} \geq |\langle X \rangle|$ holds for any observable X . Therefore,

$$\sqrt{\sup\langle (D_x)^2 \rangle} \geq \frac{2 - \sqrt{\sup\langle (D_y)^2 \rangle} - 2u_z^2 - 2|u_y u_z|}{\sqrt{1 + \sigma(L_{\mathbf{A}}/c)^2}}, \quad (50)$$

In a similar way, we have a lower bound of $\sqrt{\sup\langle (D_y)^2 \rangle}$ as

$$\sqrt{\sup\langle (D_y)^2 \rangle} \geq \frac{2 - \sqrt{\sup\langle (D_x)^2 \rangle} - 2u_z^2 - 2|u_x u_z|}{\sqrt{1 + \sigma(L_{\mathbf{A}}/c)^2}}. \quad (51)$$

Adding Eqs. (50) and (51) gives

$$\sqrt{\sup\langle(D_x)^2\rangle} + \sqrt{\sup\langle(D_y)^2\rangle} \geq \frac{1}{1 + \sqrt{1 + \sigma(L_{\mathbf{A}}/c)^2}} \{4 - 4u_z^2 - 2|u_z|(|u_x| + |u_y|)\}. \quad (52)$$

In the same way as in Section 3 (cf. Eq. (18)), it can be shown that the gate infidelity is bounded from below by the mean square of D_x or D_y , i.e.,

$$1 - F(\mathcal{E}_\alpha, U_{\mathbf{S}})^2 \geq \frac{1}{4} \sup_{|\psi\rangle} \langle(D_i)^2\rangle. \quad (53)$$

with $i = x$ or y . Then we have

$$4\sqrt{1 - F(\mathcal{E}_\alpha, U_{\mathbf{S}})^2} \geq \frac{1}{1 + \sqrt{1 + \sigma(L_{\mathbf{A}}/c)^2}} \{4 - 4u_z^2 - 2|u_z|(|u_x| + |u_y|)\}, \quad (54)$$

or finally

$$1 - F(\mathcal{E}_\alpha, U_{\mathbf{S}})^2 \geq \frac{1}{\left(1 + \sqrt{1 + \sigma(L_{\mathbf{A}}/c)^2}\right)^2} \left[1 - u_z^2 - \frac{1}{2}|u_z|(|u_x| + |u_y|)\right]^2. \quad (55)$$

This lower bound can be expressed in terms of the relative angle Ψ as follows. Because of our choice of axes, we have $\cos \Psi = \vec{u} \cdot \vec{l} = u_z$, from which one may introduce another angle γ so that

$$\vec{u} = (\sin \Psi \cos \gamma, \sin \Psi \sin \gamma, \cos \Psi), \quad (56)$$

since $\|\vec{u}\| = 1$. The quantity $1 - u_z^2 - |u_z|(|u_x| + |u_y|)/2$ can be rewritten as

$$\sin^2 \Psi - \frac{1}{2} |\sin \Psi \cos \Psi| (|\cos \gamma| + |\sin \gamma|) \geq \sin^2 \Psi - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |\sin \Psi \cos \Psi| \quad (57)$$

in terms of the angle Ψ . The inequality is easy to establish, by minimizing over γ . This leads immediately to the result

$$1 - F(\mathcal{E}_\alpha, U_{\mathbf{S}})^2 \geq \frac{1}{\left(1 + \sqrt{1 + \sigma(L_{\mathbf{A}}/c)^2}\right)^2} \sin^2 \Psi \left(|\sin \Psi| - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |\cos \Psi| \right)^2 \quad (58)$$

which could also be written as

$$1 - F(\mathcal{E}_\alpha, U_{\mathbf{S}})^2 \geq \frac{\sin^2 2\Psi}{4 \left(1 + \sqrt{1 + \sigma(L_{\mathbf{A}}/c)^2}\right)^2} \left(|\tan \Psi| - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \right)^2 \quad (59)$$

if $\Psi \neq \pi/2$. This is a general lower limit which should be compared to Eq. (33). Generally speaking, neither bound is tighter than the other (See Fig.1). The factor $(1 + \sigma(L_{\mathbf{A}}/c)^2)^{-1}$ which appears in (33) is always greater than the factor $(1 + \sqrt{1 + \sigma(L_{\mathbf{A}}/c)^2})^{-2}$ which appears in (59) above. The trigonometric function in (59), on the other hand, will be greater than the trigonometric function in (33) whenever




Figure 1. Comparison between the lower bound in Eq. (58) (Solid line) and that in Eq. (33) (dashed line). The right figure is for $\sigma(L_A/c) = 1$, and the left for $\sigma(L_A/c) = 10$.

$|\tan \Psi| > 1 + 1/\sqrt{2}$, which is to say whenever $|\Psi - \pi/2| < 0.5299$ radians. This includes, of course, the case $\Psi = \pi/2$, which was the main motivation for this subsection.

If $u_z = 0$, in other words, $\Psi = \pi/2$, we obtain a constraint for any self-adjoint gate $U_{\mathbf{S}}$ that satisfies $\vec{u} \cdot \vec{l} = 0$, namely,

$$1 - F(\mathcal{E}_\alpha, U_{\mathbf{S}})^2 \geq \frac{1}{\left(1 + \sqrt{1 + \sigma(L_A/c)^2}\right)^2}. \quad (60)$$

For the atom-field interaction discussed in Section 2, we have $c = 1$, $L_A = 2a^\dagger a$ and Eq. (60) leads to a constraint on the gate infidelity, for any gate of the form $U_{\mathbf{S}} = u_x X_{\mathbf{S}} + u_y Y_{\mathbf{S}}$, that goes as $1/4\sigma(\hat{n})^2$ for large $\sigma(\hat{n})$, where \hat{n} is the photon number operator.

On the other hand, if $\Psi = 0$, the lower bound vanishes in Eq. (58). In fact, in this case $U_{\mathbf{S}} = \vec{u} \cdot \vec{\sigma}$ must be equal to $\vec{l} \cdot \vec{\sigma} = (1/c)(L_{\mathbf{S}} - (b - c)I_{\mathbf{S}})$, and this is perfectly implemented by $U = (1/c)(L_{\mathbf{S}} - (b - c)I_{\mathbf{S}}) \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}}$, which satisfies the conservation law.

Acknowledgments

This research was partially supported by the SCOPE project of the MIC, the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B)17340021 of the JSPS, and the CREST project of the JST. J. G.-B.'s research was supported by the National Science Foundation.

Appendix A.

We give a brief derivation of Eq. (58) by assuming the conservation law (4) with the representation (7) for any unit vector \vec{l} . Since $\vec{l} \cdot \vec{\sigma}$ has the eigenvalues ± 1 , it can be written as $\vec{l} \cdot \vec{\sigma} = |+\rangle\langle+| - |-\rangle\langle-|$, where $|\pm\rangle$ denote the corresponding eigenvectors to eigenvalues ± 1 . For convenience we introduce operators l_i as

$$\begin{aligned} l_{\mathbf{S},1} &:= |+\rangle\langle-| + |-\rangle\langle+|, \\ l_{\mathbf{S},2} &:= -i|+\rangle\langle-| + i|-\rangle\langle+|, \\ l_{\mathbf{S},3} &:= \vec{l} \cdot \vec{\sigma}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

which have the same commutation relation as those of the Pauli operators:

$$[l_{\mathbf{S},i}, l_{\mathbf{S},j}] = 2i \sum_k \epsilon_{ijk} l_{\mathbf{S},k}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where ϵ_{ijk} is the Levi-Civita symbol. Define deviation operators D_i as

$$D_i = U^\dagger (l_{\mathbf{S},i} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}}) U - U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger l_{\mathbf{S},i} U_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

for $i = 1, 2$. Since the conservation law (4) is equivalent to

$$[U, l] = 0, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

with

$$l = cl_{\mathbf{S},3} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}} + I_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes L_{\mathbf{A}}, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

it now leads to

$$\frac{1}{c} [D_1, l] = -2i(D_2 + U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger l_{\mathbf{S},2} U_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}}) - [U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger l_{\mathbf{S},1} U_{\mathbf{S}}, l_{\mathbf{S},3}] \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}}, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$\frac{1}{c} [D_2, l] = 2i(D_1 + U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger l_{\mathbf{S},1} U_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}}) - [U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger l_{\mathbf{S},2} U_{\mathbf{S}}, l_{\mathbf{S},3}] \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Note that any $U_{\mathbf{S}}$ can be expanded by the operators $(l_{\mathbf{S},1}, l_{\mathbf{S},2}, l_{\mathbf{S},3})$, as in Eq. (8),

$$U_{\mathbf{S}} = \tilde{u}_1 l_{\mathbf{S},1} + \tilde{u}_2 l_{\mathbf{S},2} + \tilde{u}_3 l_{\mathbf{S},3} = \vec{u} \cdot \vec{\sigma}, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where $\vec{u} = (\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \tilde{u}_3)$ with $\|\vec{u}\| = 1$, and $\vec{\sigma} = (l_{\mathbf{S},1}, l_{\mathbf{S},2}, l_{\mathbf{S},3})$. Considering the commutation relation (A.2) gives

$$\frac{1}{c} [D_1, l] = -2i\{D_2 + 2U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger l_{\mathbf{S},2} U_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}} + 2(\tilde{u}_3^2 l_{\mathbf{S},2} - \tilde{u}_2 \tilde{u}_3 l_{\mathbf{S},3}) \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}}\}, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

and

$$\frac{1}{c} [D_2, l] = 2i\{D_1 + 2U_{\mathbf{S}}^\dagger l_{\mathbf{S},1} U_{\mathbf{S}} \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}} + 2(\tilde{u}_3^2 l_{\mathbf{S},1} - \tilde{u}_1 \tilde{u}_3 l_{\mathbf{S},3}) \otimes I_{\mathbf{A}}\}. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Eqs. (A.9) and (A.10) have exactly the same form as Eqs. (44) and (45); the derivation in Section 7 is directly applicable to this problem. Accordingly, we obtain

$$1 - F(\mathcal{E}_\alpha, U_{\mathbf{S}})^2 \geq \frac{1}{\left(1 + \sqrt{1 + \sigma(L_{\mathbf{A}}/c)^2}\right)^2} \sin^2 \Psi \left(\left| \sin \Psi - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cos \Psi \right| \right)^2,$$

where the relative angle is defined by $\cos \Psi = \tilde{u}_3$.

In the preceding sections, we used the basis $\vec{\sigma}$ when representing $U_{\mathbf{S}}$ and $L_{\mathbf{S}}$. Instead, in this appendix we introduce the new basis $\vec{\sigma}$ yielding $U_{\mathbf{S}} = \vec{u} \cdot \vec{\sigma}$. It also gives $\vec{l} \cdot \vec{\sigma} = l_{\mathbf{S},3} = \vec{l} \cdot \vec{\sigma}$, where $\vec{l} = (0, 0, 1)$; the axis of the rotation $R_L(t)$ can also be characterized by the vector \vec{l} . Accordingly, the relative angle is defined by the inner product between the two axes in the new basis, namely $\cos \Psi = \vec{l} \cdot \vec{u} (= \tilde{u}_3)$.

References

- [1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
- [2] J. P. Barnes and W. S. Warren, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 4363 (1999).

- [3] S. J. van Enk and H. J. Kimble, *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **2**, 1 (2002).
- [4] J. Gea-Banacloche, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 022308 (2002).
- [5] J. Gea-Banacloche, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 022308 (2002).
- [6] J. Gea-Banacloche and L. B. Kish, *Fluctuation and Noise Letters* **3**, C3 (2003).
- [7] J. Gea-Banacloche and L. B. Kish, *Proc. IEEE* **93**, 1858 (2005).
- [8] A. Silberfarb and I. H. Deutsch, *Phys. Rev. A* **69**, 042308 (2004).
- [9] F. Xue, S. X. Yu, and C. P. Sun, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 013403 (2006).
- [10] W. M. Itano, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 046301 (2003).
- [11] S. J. van Enk and H. J. Kimble, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 046302 (2003).
- [12] J. Gea-Banacloche, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 046303 (2003).
- [13] M. Ozawa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 057902 (2002).
- [14] M. Ozawa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 050402 (2002).
- [15] M. Ozawa, *Int. J. Quant. Inf.* **1**, 569 (2003).
- [16] M. Ozawa, in *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Quantum Communication, Measurement and Computing*, edited by J. H. Shapiro and O. Hirota (Rinton Press, Princeton, 2003), pp. 175–180.
- [17] E. P. Wigner, *Z. Phys.* **133**, 101 (1952).
- [18] H. Araki and M. M. Yanase, *Phys. Rev.* **120**, 622 (1960).
- [19] M. M. Yanase, *Phys. Rev.* **123**, 666 (1961).
- [20] T. Karasawa and M. Ozawa, *Phys. Rev. A* **75**, 032324 (2007).
- [21] J. Gea-Banacloche and M. Ozawa, *J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass. Opt.* **7**, S326 (2005).
- [22] J. Gea-Banacloche and M. Ozawa, *Phys. Rev. A* **74**, 060301(R) (2006).
- [23] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 321 (1997).
- [24] M. Hillery, M. Ziman and V. Buč ek, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 022345 (2006).
- [25] E. Jaynes and F. W. Cummings, *Proc. IEEE* **51**, 89 (1963).
- [26] H. P. Robertson, *Phys. Rev.* **34**, 163 (1929).