

# Bound on trace distance based on super-fidelity

Zbigniew Puchała\*

*Institute of Theoretical and Applied Informatics,  
Polish Academy of Sciences, Bałtycka 5, 44-100 Gliwice, Poland*

Jarosław Adam Miszczał

*Institute of Theoretical and Applied Informatics,  
Polish Academy of Sciences, Bałtycka 5, 44-100 Gliwice, Poland and  
Faculty of Informatics, Masaryk University, Botanická 68a, 602 00 Brno, Czech Republic  
(Dated: 14 November 2008)*

We provide new bound for the trace distance between two quantum states. The lower bound is based on the super-fidelity, which provides the upper bound on quantum fidelity. One of the advantages of the presented bound is that it can be estimated using simple measurement procedure. We also compare this bound with the one provided in terms of fidelity.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 03.65.-w, 02.10.Yn

## INTRODUCTION

Trace distance is one of the most natural distance measures used in quantum information theory [1, 2]. It is one of the main tools used in the distinguishability theory and it is connected to the average success probability when distinguishing two states by a measurement [3, 4, 5]. It is also related with quantum fidelity, which provides the measure of similarity of two quantum states [1, 6, 7].

Both quantities are particularly important in quantum cryptography, since the security of quantum protocols relies on an ability to measure the distance between two quantum states [4]. Trace distance is also related to other properties of quantum states like von Neumann entropy and relative entropy [1].

The main aim of this work is to provide lower bound for the trace distance using measurable quantities. We use nonlinear functions of the form  $\text{tr}\rho_i\rho_j$ ,  $i, j = 1, 2$ , where  $\rho_i, \rho_j$  are density matrices. For such forms there exists feasible schemes to measure them in an experiment without resorting to state tomography [8]. We give lower bound based on super-fidelity introduced recently in [9]. Proof of this bound gives an answer to the conjecture stated by Mendonca *et al.* in [10].

## BOUNDS ON TRACE DISTANCE

Let us denote by  $\Omega_N$  the space of density matrices acting on  $N$ -dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathbb{C}^N$ . For two density matrices  $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \Omega_N$  the trace distance is defined as

$$D_{\text{tr}}(\rho_1, \rho_2) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}|\rho_1 - \rho_2|. \quad (1)$$

In the particular case of pure states we can use Bloch vectors  $\rho_1 = \vec{r} \cdot \vec{\sigma}$  and  $\rho_2 = \vec{s} \cdot \vec{\sigma}$ . One can see that trace distance between such states is equal to half of the

Euclidean distance between respective Bloch vectors

$$D_{\text{tr}}(\rho_1, \rho_2) = \frac{|\vec{r} - \vec{s}|}{2}. \quad (2)$$

Trace distance can be bounded with the use of fidelity [1, 4]

$$1 - \sqrt{F(\rho_1, \rho_2)} \leq D_{\text{tr}}(\rho_1, \rho_2) \leq \sqrt{1 - F(\rho_1, \rho_2)}, \quad (3)$$

where fidelity is defined as

$$F(\rho_1, \rho_2) = [\text{tr}|\sqrt{\rho_1}\sqrt{\rho_2}|]^2. \quad (4)$$

The inequalities (3) shows that  $F$  and  $D_{\text{tr}}$  are closely related indicators of distinguishability.

The main result of this work is new lower bound for the trace distance, which we prove in the next section

$$1 - G(\rho_1, \rho_2) \leq D_{\text{tr}}(\rho_1, \rho_2), \quad (5)$$

where  $G$  is called *super-fidelity*, and was introduced in [9]. For  $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \Omega_N$  it is defined as

$$G(\rho_1, \rho_2) = \text{tr}\rho_1\rho_2 + \sqrt{1 - \text{tr}\rho_1^2}\sqrt{1 - \text{tr}\rho_2^2}. \quad (6)$$

From the matrix analytic perspective the inequality (5) relates the trace norm on the space  $\Omega_N$  with Hilbert-Schmidt scalar product on  $\Omega_N$ .

For the sake of consistency we provide basic information about super-fidelity [9].

The most interesting features of super-fidelity is that it provides upper bound for quantum fidelity [9]

$$F(\rho_1, \rho_2) \leq G(\rho_1, \rho_2) \quad (7)$$

Super-fidelity has also properties which make it useful for quantifying distance between quantum states. In particular we have:

1. Bounds:  $0 \leq G(\rho_1, \rho_2) \leq 1$ .

2. Symmetry:  $G(\rho_1, \rho_2) = G(\rho_2, \rho_1)$ .
3. Unitary invariance: for any unitary operator  $U$ , we have  $G(\rho_1, \rho_2) = G(U\rho_1U^\dagger, U\rho_2U^\dagger)$ .
4. Concavity:  $G(\rho_1, \alpha\rho_2 + (1-\alpha)\rho_3) \geq \alpha G(\rho_1, \rho_2) + (1-\alpha)G(\rho_1, \rho_3)$  for any  $\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3 \in \Omega_N$  and  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ .
5. Supermultiplicativity: for  $\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3, \rho_4 \in \Omega_N$  we have

$$G(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2, \rho_3 \otimes \rho_4) \geq G(\rho_1, \rho_3)G(\rho_2, \rho_4). \quad (8)$$

Note that super-fidelity shares properties 1.-4. with fidelity. However in contrast to fidelity, super-fidelity is not multiplicative, but supermultiplicative.

In [10] the authors showed that  $G$  is *jointly* concave in its two arguments

$$G(\alpha\rho_1 + (1-\alpha)\rho_2, \alpha\rho'_1 + (1-\alpha)\rho'_2) \geq \alpha G(\rho_1, \rho'_1) + (1-\alpha)G(\rho_2, \rho'_2), \quad (9)$$

for  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ . Note that the property of joint concavity is obeyed by square root of fidelity  $\sqrt{F}(\rho_1, \rho_2) = \text{tr}[\sqrt{\sqrt{\rho_2}\sqrt{\rho_1}\sqrt{\rho_2}}]$ , but not by the fidelity (4).

Fidelity can be used to define the metric  $D_B(\rho_1, \rho_2)$  on the space  $\Omega_N$  as

$$D_B(\rho_1, \rho_2) = \sqrt{2 - 2\sqrt{F(\rho_1, \rho_2)}}. \quad (10)$$

Unfortunately the analogue of Bures distance defined using super-fidelity

$$D'_B(\rho_1, \rho_2) = \sqrt{2 - 2\sqrt{G(\rho_1, \rho_2)}} \quad (11)$$

is not a metric [10], but the quantity

$$D_G(\rho_1, \rho_2) = \sqrt{2 - 2G(\rho_1, \rho_2)} \quad (12)$$

provides the metric on the space  $\Omega_N$ .

Finally one should note that super-fidelity is particularly convenient to use as the practical measure of similarity between quantum states. One of the main advantages of super-fidelity is that it is possible to design feasible schemes to measure it in an experiment [9]. Also from the computational point of view calculation of super-fidelity is significantly less resource-consuming [10].

## MAIN RESULT

Properties of super-fidelity listed above suggest that it would be convenient to use it instead of fidelity to conclude about the distinguishability of quantum states. This section show how this can be done by relating super-fidelity and trace distance.

First we can observe that from the inequality

$$F(\rho_1, \rho_2) \leq G(\rho_1, \rho_2), \quad (13)$$

and since we have (3) we get that

$$1 - \sqrt{G(\rho_1, \rho_2)} \leq D_{\text{tr}}(\rho_1, \rho_2). \quad (14)$$

Our main aim is to prove the following inequality, which provides tighter bound.

**Theorem 1** *For any  $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \Omega_N$  we have*

$$1 - G(\rho_1, \rho_2) \leq D_{\text{tr}}(\rho_1, \rho_2), \quad (15)$$

or equivalently

$$\frac{1}{2}\text{tr}|\rho_1 - \rho_2| + \text{tr}\rho_1\rho_2 + \sqrt{1 - \text{tr}\rho_1^2}\sqrt{1 - \text{tr}\rho_2^2} \geq 1. \quad (16)$$

This inequality was first stated as a conjecture in [10], where it was verified numerically for small dimensions. Clearly it is motivated by the lower bound for trace distance provided by the inequality (3).

To prove the Theorem 1 we need the following lemma.

**Lemma 1** *For any  $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \Omega_N$  let  $P_+$  and  $P_-$  be the projectors onto  $(\rho_1 - \rho_2)^+$  and  $(\rho_1 - \rho_2)^-$  respectively. We have the following inequalities*

$$\text{tr}P_+(\mathbb{1} - \rho_1)\rho_1 \geq \text{tr}P_+(\mathbb{1} - \rho_1)\rho_2, \quad (17)$$

$$\text{tr}P_-\rho_1(\mathbb{1} - \rho_1) \geq \text{tr}P_-\rho_1(\mathbb{1} - \rho_2), \quad (18)$$

$$\text{tr}P_+(\mathbb{1} - \rho_2)\rho_2 \geq \text{tr}P_+(\mathbb{1} - \rho_1)\rho_2, \quad (19)$$

$$\text{tr}P_-\rho_2(\mathbb{1} - \rho_2) \geq \text{tr}P_-\rho_1(\mathbb{1} - \rho_2). \quad (20)$$

*Proof.* Because of the similarity we will only show inequality (17). It is easy to prove inequalities (18), (19) and (20) in a similar manner.

We write LHS – RHS of (17) to get

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{tr}P_+(\mathbb{1} - \rho_1)\rho_1 - \text{tr}P_+(\mathbb{1} - \rho_1)\rho_2 \\ &= \text{tr}P_+(\mathbb{1} - \rho_1)(\rho_1 - \rho_2) \\ &= \text{tr}P_+(\mathbb{1} - \rho_1)(\rho_1 - \rho_2)P_+ \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

because  $\mathbb{1} - \rho_1$  is positive semidefinite.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Adding the inequalities (17) and (18) we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{tr}\rho_1(\mathbb{1} - \rho_1) \\ & \geq \text{tr}P_+(\mathbb{1} - \rho_1)\rho_2 + \text{tr}P_-\rho_1(\mathbb{1} - \rho_2). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Similarly by adding inequalities (19) and (20) we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{tr}\rho_2(\mathbb{1} - \rho_2) \\ & \geq \text{tr}P_+(\mathbb{1} - \rho_1)\rho_2 + \text{tr}P_-\rho_1(\mathbb{1} - \rho_2). \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Now we notice that if two non-negative numbers are greater than the third one, then so is the geometric mean of the first two numbers. Using this fact we combine (22) and (23) to get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{\text{tr}\rho_1(\mathbb{1}-\rho_1)}\sqrt{\text{tr}\rho_2(\mathbb{1}-\rho_2)} \\ & \geq \text{tr}P_+(\mathbb{1}-\rho_1)\rho_2 + \text{tr}P_-\rho_1(\mathbb{1}-\rho_2). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

On the other hand we can rewrite trace distance with the use of projectors  $P_+$  and  $P_-$ .

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{tr}}(\rho_1, \rho_2) &= \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(\text{tr}P_+\rho_1 - \text{tr}P_+\rho_2 + \text{tr}P_-\rho_2 - \text{tr}P_-\rho_1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(\text{tr}P_+\rho_1 + \text{tr}P_+\rho_2 + \text{tr}P_-\rho_2 + \text{tr}P_-\rho_1) \\ &\quad - \text{tr}P_+\rho_2 - \text{tr}P_-\rho_1 \\ &= 1 - \text{tr}P_+\rho_2 - \text{tr}P_-\rho_1. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Now finally we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}|\rho_1 - \rho_2| + \sqrt{1 - \text{tr}\rho_1^2}\sqrt{1 - \text{tr}\rho_2^2} \\ & \geq 1 - \text{tr}P_+\rho_2 - \text{tr}P_-\rho_1 \\ & \quad + \text{tr}P_+(\mathbb{1}-\rho_1)\rho_2 + \text{tr}P_-\rho_1(\mathbb{1}-\rho_2) \\ & = 1 - \text{tr}\rho_1\rho_2, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

which is equivalent to (16).  $\square$

## COMPARISON OF BOUNDS

It is natural to ask what is the relation between lower bounds in (3) and (5). It is clear that bound (5) is better than (3) whenever  $G - \sqrt{F} \leq 0$ .

In the one qubit case or if one of the states is pure the bound (5) is always better than (3). This follows from equality between fidelity and super-fidelity in these situations [9].

On the other hand the inequality (3) provides better lower bound if states  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$  have orthogonal supports. In such case fidelity between states vanishes, but super-fidelity is not necessarily equal to zero [9].

To get some feeling about the difference between bound given by fidelity and new bound we will consider the following families of states:

- Family  $\rho_\alpha$  is defined as:

$$\rho_\alpha = \alpha|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + (1-\alpha)\mathbb{1}/N, \quad (27)$$

where  $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$  is a pure state and in our case we take  $|\psi\rangle = |0\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^N$ .

- Family  $\sigma_\beta \in \Omega_8$  is defined as:

$$\sigma_\beta = \beta|GHZ\rangle\langle GHZ| + (1-\beta)\mathbb{1}/N, \quad (28)$$

where  $|GHZ\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|000\rangle + |111\rangle)$ .

- Family  $\tau_\gamma \in \Omega_8$  is defined as:

$$\tau_\gamma = \gamma|010\rangle\langle 010| + (1-\gamma)\mathbb{1}/N. \quad (29)$$

In Fig. 1 we consider family  $\rho_\alpha$  and calculate the difference  $G(\rho_\alpha, \mathbb{1}/N) - \sqrt{F(\rho_\alpha, \mathbb{1}/N)}$ . One can notice that for small dimensions and states close to the pure state  $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$  super-fidelity gives much better approximation for the trace distance than fidelity. For larger dimensions this is not the case but nevertheless we can observe that still super-fidelity provides better bound. This advantage is lost for the states close to the maximally mixed state.




FIG. 1: The difference  $G(\rho_\alpha, \mathbb{1}/N) - \sqrt{F(\rho_\alpha, \mathbb{1}/N)}$  calculated for states (27) and maximally mixed state as the function of the dimension  $N$  and the parameter  $\alpha$  (see: Eq. 27).




FIG. 2: The difference  $G(\rho_\alpha, \sigma_\beta) - \sqrt{F(\rho_\alpha, \sigma_\beta)}$  calculated for states (27) and (28) as the function of parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ .

Similar situation can be observed in Fig. 2 where the difference between  $G(\rho_\alpha, \sigma_\beta)$  and  $\sqrt{F(\rho_\alpha, \sigma_\beta)}$  ( $\rho_\alpha, \sigma_\beta \in \Omega_8$ ) is presented. For this particular family the bound (5) is better than (3), but the difference vanishes for the states close to the maximally mixed state.

Unfortunately bound (5) is not always tighter when compared with (3). Fig. 3 shows the difference between  $G(\rho_\alpha, \tau_\gamma)$  and  $\sqrt{F(\rho_\alpha, \tau_\gamma)}$  ( $\rho_\alpha, \tau_\gamma \in \Omega_8$ ). As one can see




FIG. 3: The difference  $G(\rho_\alpha, \tau_\gamma) - \sqrt{F(\rho_\alpha, \tau_\gamma)}$  calculated for states (27) and (29) ( $\rho_\alpha, \tau_\gamma \in \Omega_8$ ) as the function of parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$ . Solid line is a border that separates two regions. For the parameters in lighter one the inequality (3) provides better bound, while in darker region the inequality (5) is better.

for this family of states there are regions for which the bound (5) is better than (3) but in this case for highly mixed states (3) is better than (5).

### FINAL REMARKS

We know that the probability of error for distinguishing two density matrices  $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \Omega_N$  is expressed by the trace distance as [1, 3]

$$P_E(\rho_1, \rho_2) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - D_{\text{tr}}(\rho_1, \rho_2)). \quad (30)$$

Using the inequality (5) we can write

$$\frac{1}{2}G(\rho_1, \rho_2) \geq P_E(\rho_1, \rho_2). \quad (31)$$

We have shown the relation between super-fidelity and trace distance, which is analogous to the relation with trace distance and fidelity. This shows that super-fidelity

can be used to conclude about the distinguishability of states.

Experimental scheme proposed in [9] can be used to estimate super-fidelity. Consequently it is possible to estimate experimentally provided lower bound for trace distance.

Our bound provides the relation between the trace distance and the overlap of two operators supplementary to inequality from [11, Th.1]. As such it provides neat mathematical tool which can be used in quantum information theory.

Authors would like to thank K. Życzkowski, R. Winiarczyk and P. Gawron for many interesting, stimulating and inspiring discussions. We acknowledge the financial support by the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education under the grant number N519 012 31/1957.

\* Electronic address: z.puchala@iitis.gliwice.pl

- [1] I. Bengtsson and K. Życzkowski, *Geometry of Quantum States: An Introduction to Quantum Entanglement*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.
- [2] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [3] T. Heinosaari, M. Ziman, *Guide to mathematical concepts of quantum theory*, Acta Physica Slovaca **58**, No.4, 487-674 (2008). arXiv:0810.3536.
- [4] C. A. Fuchs, J. van de Graaf, *Cryptographic distinguishability measures for quantum-mechanical states*, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theor. **45**, 1216-1227 (1999).
- [5] B.-G. Englert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 2154 (1996).
- [6] D. Markham, J. A. Miszczak, Z. Puchała, K. Życzkowski, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 042111 (2008).
- [7] R. Jozsa, J. Mod. Opt. **41**, 2315-2323 (1994).
- [8] F. A. Bovino, G. Castagnoli, A. Ekert, P. Horodecki, C. M. Alves, A. V. Sergienko, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 240407 (2005)
- [9] J. A. Miszczak, Z. Puchała, P. Horodecki, A. Uhlmann, K. Życzkowski, *Sub- and super-fidelity as bounds for quantum fidelity*, Quantum Information & Computation, **9**, No.1&2 (2009), arXiv:0805.2037.
- [10] P. E. M. F. Mendonca, R. d. J. Napolitano, M. A. Marchioli, C. J. Foster, Y.-C. Liang, *An alternative fidelity measure for quantum states*, to appear in PRA, arXiv:0806.1150.
- [11] K. M. R. Audenaert, J. Calsamiglia, R. Muñoz-Tapia, E. Bagan, Ll. Masanes, A. Acín, F. Verstraete, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 160501 (2007).