

# Quantum restrictions on transfer of matrix elements

Armen E. Allahverdyan<sup>1</sup> and Karen Hovhannisyan<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Yerevan Physics Institute, Alikhanian Brothers Street 2, Yerevan 375036, Armenia,

<sup>2</sup>Yerevan State University, A. Manoogian Street 1, Yerevan, Armenia

We discuss restrictions imposed by quantum mechanics on the process of matrix elements transfer from the one system to another. This is relevant for various processes of partial state transfer (quantum communication, indirect measurement, polarization transfer, *etc*). Given two systems A and B with initial density operators  $\lambda$  and  $r$ , respectively, we consider most general interactions, which lead to transferring certain matrix elements of unknown  $\lambda$  into those of the final state  $\tilde{r}$  of B. We find that this process leads to eliminating the memory on the transferred (or certain other) matrix elements from the final state of A. If one diagonal matrix element is transferred:  $\tilde{r}_{aa} = \lambda_{aa}$ , the memory on each non-diagonal element  $\lambda_{a \neq b}$  is completely eliminated from the final density operator of A. The transfer of a non-diagonal element:  $\tilde{r}_{ab} = \lambda_{ab}$  eliminates the memory on the diagonal elements  $\lambda_{aa}$  and  $\lambda_{bb}$ , while the memory about their sum  $\lambda_{aa} + \lambda_{bb}$  is kept. Moreover, the memory about  $\lambda_{ab}$  itself is completely eliminated from the final state of A. Generalization of these set-ups to non-ideal transfer brings in a trade-off between the quality of the transfer and the amount of preserved memory. This trade-off is expressed via system-independent uncertainty relations.

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

Partial or complete transfer of a quantum state from one system to another is an essential part of many processes of energy and/or information/entropy transport: *i*) Quantum communication via (partial) state transfer plays an important role both for practical implementation of scalable quantum processors and for understanding the efficiency of quantum computation; see [1, 2] for reviews. *ii*) Quantum measurements, where the initial probabilities of an observable  $\hat{A}$  of the tested system are mapped to the final probabilities of an apparatus observable  $\hat{B}$  [4]. For instance, the quantum state of the readout object (e.g., qubit) is partially transferred to a macroscopic system, ensuring its reliable registration [5]. *iii*) Polarization transfer from one system to another is well known in NMR/ESR, quantum/atomic optics, semiconductor physics *etc* [6–8]. This is the main method of polarization increasing or cooling [8]. *iv*) Related processes of energy (excitation) transfer are important in biological systems (e.g., photosynthesis) [9].

Here we study fundamental restrictions imposed by quantum mechanics on information transmission via partial state transfer. To formulate this problem, we assume that the information is encoded into matrix elements of the system density operator (state); this situation is realized in many of the above examples. To be a carrier of information this state has to be unknown for the transmitter, and (as the first step) we assume that the state is *completely* unknown. Now as far as the full state transfer is concerned, one limitation comes from the no-cloning theorem, which states that once the full (unknown) state is transferred from system A to system B, the final state of A must differ from its initial state [10]. Together with its various generalizations [11, 12] the no-cloning theorem is one of the most known constraints on the quantum information processing. However, it cannot be applied

directly to the present problem, since here only certain (in general, not all) matrix elements are transferred.

Consider a quantum system A in an unknown state described by a density operator  $\lambda$  and a composite system B + C in some known state with density operator  $\omega$ . The Hilbert spaces of A and B have the same dimension:  $\dim \mathcal{H}_A = \dim \mathcal{H}_B = N$ . The initial state of the overall system A + B + C is  $\lambda \otimes \omega$ . Let  $p, r = 1, \dots, N$  and

$$\{|p\rangle\}_{p=1}^n, \langle p|r\rangle = \delta_{pr}, \quad \{|\bar{p}\rangle\}_{p=1}^n, \langle \bar{p}|\bar{r}\rangle = \delta_{p\bar{r}}, \quad (1)$$

be two orthonormal bases in  $\mathcal{H}_A$  and  $\mathcal{H}_B$ , respectively. The interaction between A and B + C is described by unitary operator  $U$ . It will be chosen such that for *any* initial density operator  $\lambda$  of A, certain initial matrix elements  $\lambda_{ab} = \langle a|\lambda|b\rangle$  of  $\rho$  are equal to the corresponding matrix elements of the final state  $\tilde{r}$  of B:

$$\lambda_{ab} = \tilde{r}_{ab} = \langle \bar{a}|\tilde{r}|\bar{b}\rangle, \quad \tilde{r} = \text{tr}_{A+C}(U \lambda \otimes \omega U^\dagger).$$

Here C is an auxiliary system (ancilla), which ensures most general operations. We aim to understand implications of the matrix elements transfer from A to B on the memory of the transferred elements  $\lambda_{ab}$  (or some other elements of  $\lambda$ ) in the final state  $\tilde{\lambda} = \text{tr}_{B+C}(U \lambda \otimes \omega U^\dagger)$  of A. Take as an example two spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  density matrices for A and B, respectively:  $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}[1 + \vec{l}\vec{\sigma}]$ ,  $\rho = \frac{1}{2}[1 + \vec{r}\vec{\sigma}]$ , where  $\vec{\sigma}$  are Pauli matrices, and  $\vec{l}, \vec{r}$  are Bloch vectors. Transferring diagonal (non-diagonal) elements  $\lambda_{11} = \tilde{r}_{11}$  ( $\lambda_{12} = \tilde{r}_{12}$ ) amounts to transferring the  $z$  ( $x$  and  $y$ ) component(s) of the Bloch vectors. Both these processes are well-studied experimentally [3, 6–8].

The initial state of B + C is chosen as

$$\omega = |\bar{1}\rangle \otimes |C\rangle \langle \bar{1}| \otimes \langle C|, \quad (2)$$

where  $|C\rangle$  lives in the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_C$  of C. This choice does not restrict generality provided that we are free to

choose the system C and design unitary evolutions for B + C. Indeed, an initial mixed state of B + C can be purified by extending C to a larger Hilbert space, while the resulting pure state can be rotated to  $|\bar{1}\rangle \otimes |C\rangle$  by a suitable unitary operator.

We represent the unitary operator  $U$  as ( $p = 1, \dots, N$ )

$$U|p\rangle \otimes |\bar{1}\rangle \otimes |C\rangle = \sum_{k,l} |k\rangle \otimes |\bar{l}\rangle \otimes |C_{kl}^p\rangle \equiv |\psi_p\rangle, \quad (3)$$

where all summation indices run from 1 to  $N$ , and where the vectors  $|C_{kl}^p\rangle$  with  $p, k, l = 1, \dots, N$  live in  $\mathcal{H}_C$ .

The unitarity of  $U$  amounts to ( $p, r = 1, \dots, N$ )

$$\langle \psi_p | \psi_r \rangle = \delta_{rp} \quad \text{or} \quad \sum_{kl} \langle C_{kl}^p | C_{kl}^r \rangle = \delta_{rp}. \quad (4)$$

Clearly, (3, 4) define for our purposes the most general unitary operation. The final states  $\tilde{\lambda}$  and  $\tilde{r} = \sum_{a,b} r_{ab} |\bar{a}\rangle \langle \bar{b}|$  of A and B, respectively, read from (3)

$$\tilde{\lambda} = \sum_{pr} \lambda_{pr} \Theta_{rp}, \quad \Theta_{rp} \equiv \sum_{kn} |k\rangle \langle n| \sum_l \langle C_{nl}^r | C_{kl}^p \rangle, \quad (5)$$

$$\tilde{r}_{ab} = \sum_{pr} \lambda_{pr} \sum_k \langle C_{kb}^r | C_{ka}^p \rangle. \quad (6)$$

The process of matrix elements transfer depends crucially on which (diagonal or non-diagonal) elements are transferred. In a sense, diagonal (non-diagonal) elements represent classical (quantum) aspects of the information contained in the unknown state  $\lambda$ . In particular, the transfer of non-diagonal elements relates to transferring entanglement. We therefore study these cases separately.

*Diagonal to diagonal transfer.* Assume that for every initial state  $\lambda$  of A a diagonal element  $\lambda_{aa}$  of A is transferred into the diagonal element  $\tilde{r}_{aa}$  of B:  $\lambda_{aa} = \tilde{r}_{aa}$ . For this it is necessary to have [see (6)]

$$\sum_k \langle C_{ka}^r | C_{ka}^p \rangle = \delta_{pr} \delta_{pa} \quad \text{for all pairs } (r, p). \quad (7)$$

Eq. (7) for  $r = p = a$  implies  $\sum_k \langle C_{ka}^a | C_{ka}^a \rangle = 1$ . Combining this with (4) under the same condition  $p = r = a$  gives  $|C_{kl}^a\rangle = 0$  for  $l \neq a$ . Eq. (7) for  $r = p = c \neq a$  gives  $|C_{ka}^c\rangle = 0$  for every  $c \neq a$ . Altogether, we get

$$\sum_l \langle C_{nl}^a | C_{kl}^c \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for every } c \neq a \quad \text{or} \quad \Theta_{ac} = 0,$$

implying from (5) that *due to the transfer*  $\lambda_{aa} = \tilde{r}_{aa}$  *the memory on each initial non-diagonal element*  $\lambda_{a \neq c}$  *in the final density operator*  $\tilde{\lambda}$  *of A is lost.* This generalizes the no-cloning principle, since once the memory of some elements is eliminated from the final state of A, this state cannot be kept intact. Note that *i)* to be able to speak on the memory and its loss, we have to have initially some freedom in choosing  $\lambda_{a \neq c}$ , i.e., the latter should carry some information. *ii)*  $\tilde{\lambda}$  need not be diagonal. *iii)* The memory on  $\lambda_{aa}$  itself is conserved in  $\tilde{\lambda}$ .

While the above results refer to the ideal transfer, it is important to see how much memory can be preserved

under a non-ideal transfer. The simplest definition of the non-ideal transfer for one matrix element  $\lambda_{aa}$  amounts to requiring  $\tilde{r}_{aa} = \varepsilon_a \lambda_{aa}$ , where  $0 < \varepsilon_a < 1$  does not depend on the initial  $\lambda$  and quantifies the non-ideality. Thus, if  $\lambda_{aa}$  is considered as signal,  $\varepsilon < 1$  corresponds to reducing (by a fixed amount) the signal magnitude. If some noise is present during the transfer, this reduction will correspond to decreasing the signal-to-noise ratio.

We now study the *maximal possible memory* on the initial non-diagonal elements  $\lambda_{a \neq c}$  under such transfer. It proves more convenient to assume  $N \geq 3$  and to start immediately with the simultaneous non-ideal transfer of two diagonal elements:

$$\tilde{r}_{aa} = \varepsilon_a \lambda_{aa}, \quad \tilde{r}_{bb} = \varepsilon_b \lambda_{bb}, \quad 0 < \varepsilon_a < 1, \quad 0 < \varepsilon_b < 1, \quad (8)$$

where  $\varepsilon_a$  and  $\varepsilon_b$  do not depend on the initial state  $\lambda$  and quantify the non-ideality. This case is generic, since the non-ideal transfer of one (or several) elements can be recovered from it; see below. (The non-ideal transfer (8) does not exist for  $N = 2$ , since the trace should be conserved; here we can transfer only one element.) Instead of (7) we get from (8)

$$\sum_k \langle C_{ku}^r | C_{ku}^p \rangle = \varepsilon_u \delta_{pr} \delta_{pu} \quad \text{for all } (r, p) \text{ and } u = a, b. \quad (9)$$

Eq. (9) for  $r = p \neq a$  and for  $r = p \neq b$  gives for any  $k$

$$|C_{ka}^p\rangle = 0 \quad \text{for } p \neq a \quad \text{and} \quad |C_{kb}^p\rangle = 0 \quad \text{for } p \neq b. \quad (10)$$

The memory of the final state (5) on the non-diagonal element  $\lambda_{a \neq c}$  should be quantified via derivative of  $\tilde{\lambda}$  over  $\lambda_{a \neq c}$ . Though due to the presence of  $\lambda_{a \neq c}^*$ ,  $\tilde{\lambda}$  is not an analytic function of  $\lambda_{a \neq c}$ , we can employ the generalized complex-variable derivative [13]:

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{\lambda}}{\partial \lambda_{ac}} \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left( \left. \frac{\partial \tilde{\lambda}}{\partial \Re \lambda_{ac}} \right|_{\Im \lambda_{ac}} - i \left. \frac{\partial \tilde{\lambda}}{\partial \Im \lambda_{ac}} \right|_{\Re \lambda_{ac}} \right) = \Theta_{ac}, \quad (11)$$

where  $\Theta_{ac}$  is defined in (5). The definition (11) has all features expected from a derivative [13]. In particular, for an analytic (over  $\lambda_{a \neq c}$ ) function it coincides with the ordinary complex derivative [13].

The magnitude of the matrix  $\Theta_{a \neq c}$ , or the strength of the dependence of  $\tilde{\lambda}$  on  $\lambda_{a \neq c}$ , can be characterized by some norm. Since all norms are equivalent in a finite-dimensional Hilbert space [13]—i.e., given two norms  $\|\cdot\|_1$  and  $\|\cdot\|_2$ , there exist positive constants  $a$  and  $b$  such that  $a\|A\|_2 \leq \|A\|_1 \leq b\|A\|_2$  for any matrix  $A$ —we work with the Euclidean norm  $\|\Theta_{ac}\| \equiv \sqrt{\text{tr}(\Theta_{ac} \Theta_{ac}^\dagger)}$ , where  $\Theta^\dagger$  is the hermitean conjugate of  $\Theta$ . Recall that for any norm  $\|A\| = 0$  implies  $A = 0$ . Due to (11) we get

$$\|\Theta_{a \neq c}\| = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\|\partial \tilde{\lambda} / \partial \Re \lambda_{ac}\|^2 + \|\partial \tilde{\lambda} / \partial \Im \lambda_{ac}\|^2}, \quad (12)$$

showing that  $\|\Theta_{a\neq c}\|$  includes the memory on the real and imaginal part of  $\tilde{\lambda}$ . The same value  $\|\Theta_{a\neq c}\|$  is obtained under norming of the complex conjugate derivative  $\partial\tilde{\lambda}/\partial\lambda_{ac}^* = (\partial\tilde{\lambda}^\dagger/\partial\lambda_{ac})^\dagger = \Theta_{ac}^\dagger$ .

That the memory of  $\tilde{\lambda}$  on  $\lambda_{ac}$  can be characterized by  $\|\Theta_{ac}\|$  is verified also by studying the matrix gradient of  $\tilde{\lambda}$ , whose modulus is limited by  $\|\Theta_{a\neq c}\|$  and  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\|\Theta_{a\neq c}\|$  from above and below, respectively [15]. Note that in the initial state  $\|\frac{\partial\tilde{\lambda}}{\partial\lambda_{ac}}\| = 1$ , while in general  $\|\Theta_{ac}\| \leq 1$ ; see (13–15) below. Thus, expectedly, the memory on matrix element can only decrease after a unitary transformation.

Given (8, 9, 10) we now establish an upper bound on  $\|\Theta_{a\neq c}\|$ . Let  $z_{nlkl}^r \equiv \langle C_{nl}^r | C_{kl}^r \rangle$  and let  $\sum'_l$  be the summation over  $l = 1, \dots, N$  excluding  $l = a$  and  $l = b$ . We get from (5)

$$\|\Theta_{a\neq c}\|^2 \equiv \sum_{k,n} \left| \sum'_l z_{nlkl}^c \right|^2 \leq \sum_{k,n} \left[ \sum'_l |z_{nlkl}^c| \right]^2 \quad (13)$$

$$\leq \sum_{k,n} \left[ \sum'_l \sqrt{z_{nl}^c} \sqrt{z_{kl}^c} \right]^2 \quad (14)$$

$$\leq \sum_n \sum'_l z_{nl}^c \sum_k \sum'_l z_{kl}^c, \quad (15)$$

where the inequalities in (14) and (15) are due to the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, while in (14) we additionally used (10). We now get from (15) and (4, 9, 10)

$$\|\Theta_{a\neq b}\| \leq \sqrt{(1 - \varepsilon_a)(1 - \varepsilon_b)}, \quad (16)$$

$$\|\Theta_{a\neq c}\| \leq \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon_a} \text{ for every } c \neq a, c \neq b. \quad (17)$$

These inequalities—which are akin to the uncertainty relations—relate non-ideality of the transfer to the maximal possible amount of the conserved memory. The extension of (16, 17) to transferring non-ideally several matrix elements should be obvious, since the non-diagonal elements under such a transfer divide naturally into two classes, which correspond to (16) and (17), respectively.

Let us show that the bounds (16, 17) are saturated by the proper choice of  $|C_{kn}^p\rangle$ . To this end assume that  $\dim\mathcal{H}_C = 1$ :  $|C_{kb}^p\rangle = C_{kb}^p |C\rangle$ , where  $C_{kb}^p$  are c-numbers satisfying (4). Choosing for  $N = 3$

$$C_{11}^1 = \sqrt{\varepsilon_1}, \quad C_{13}^1 = \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon_1}, \quad C_{22}^2 = \sqrt{\varepsilon_2}, \quad C_{23}^2 = \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon_2},$$

and  $C_{33}^3 = 1$  (while all other  $C_{kb}^p$  with  $p, k, b = 1, 2, 3$  are zero) we satisfy the unitarity conditions (4) and realize the optimal memory-conserving non-ideal transfer (8) with  $a = 1$  and  $b = 2$ . Now (16, 17) become equalities.

The memory on the transferred diagonal elements  $\lambda_{uu}$  ( $u = a, b$ ) in the final state  $\tilde{\lambda}$  of A is quantified by the norm  $\|\Theta_{uu}\| \leq 1$ . The above example is optimal with respect to the memory-conservation of the non-diagonal elements, and it also provides the maximal memory of the transferred elements:  $\|\Theta_{11}\| = \|\Theta_{22}\| = 1$ .

*Nondiagonal to nondiagonal transfer.* Demanding

$$\sum_k \langle C_{ka}^r | C_{kb}^p \rangle = \delta_{ra} \delta_{pb} \text{ for all } (r, p) \text{ and } a \neq b, \quad (18)$$

amounts to transferring ideally the corresponding non-diagonal element:  $\tilde{r}_{ab} = \lambda_{ab}$  for arbitrary initial state  $\lambda$  of A; see (5). The non-negativity of  $\sum_k [\alpha^* \langle C_{ka}^a | + \beta^* \langle C_{kb}^b |] [\alpha | C_{ka}^a \rangle + \beta | C_{kb}^b \rangle]$  as a function of two complex numbers  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  (Cauchy-Schwartz inequality) leads to

$$1 = \sum_k \langle C_{ka}^a | C_{kb}^b \rangle \leq \sqrt{\sum_k \langle C_{ka}^a | C_{ka}^a \rangle \sum_k \langle C_{kb}^b | C_{kb}^b \rangle}, \quad (19)$$

where the equality in (19) is due to (18) under  $r = a$  and  $k = b$ . The inequality in (19) has to be saturated, since (4) implies  $\sum_k \langle C_{ka}^a | C_{ka}^a \rangle \leq 1$ ,  $\sum_k \langle C_{kb}^b | C_{kb}^b \rangle \leq 1$ . Thus we have  $\sum_k \langle C_{ka}^a | C_{ka}^a \rangle = \sum_k \langle C_{kb}^b | C_{kb}^b \rangle = 1$ , which together with (4) gives for any  $k$

$$|C_{kl}^a\rangle = 0 \text{ for } l \neq a \text{ and } |C_{kl}^b\rangle = 0 \text{ for } l \neq b. \quad (20)$$

Eqs. (5, 20) lead to  $\Theta_{a\neq b} = \Theta_{b\neq a} = 0$ , i.e., *the memory on the transferred non-diagonal element  $\lambda_{ab}$  in the final density operator  $\tilde{\lambda}$  is lost.*

Another consequence of saturating the inequality in (19) is that  $|C_{kb}^b\rangle = |C_{ka}^a\rangle$  for any  $k$ , which leads to

$$\sum_l \langle C_{nl}^a | C_{kl}^a \rangle = \langle C_{na}^a | C_{ka}^a \rangle = \sum_l \langle C_{nl}^b | C_{kl}^b \rangle = \langle C_{nb}^b | C_{kb}^b \rangle,$$

i.e.,  $\Theta_{aa} = \Theta_{bb}$ , meaning that *the memory about the diagonal elements  $\lambda_{aa}$  and  $\lambda_{bb}$  in the final density operator  $\tilde{\lambda}$  is lost. Only the memory about  $\lambda_{aa} + \lambda_{bb}$  is kept.* Thus one ideal nondiagonal-to-nondiagonal transfer eliminates the memory on three real quantities, while one diagonal-to-diagonal ideal transfer eliminates memory on  $2(N - 1)$  real quantities. The difference between these two cases is that for the ideal nondiagonal-to-nondiagonal transfer the memory on the transferred element itself is eliminated from the final state of A. Let us announce that when only the real part of the non-diagonal element is transferred,  $\Re\tilde{r}_{ab} = \Re\lambda_{ab}$  for any  $\lambda$ , then the above result on eliminating the memory on  $\lambda_{aa}$  and  $\lambda_{bb}$  still holds, while only the memory on the imaginary part  $\Im\lambda_{ab}$  is eliminated from the final density operator  $\tilde{\lambda}$  of A [14].

Turning to the non-ideal transfer  $\tilde{r}_{ab} = \varepsilon\lambda_{ab}$  (where  $a \neq b$  are two indices and  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ ), we restrict ourselves to finding the maximal possible value of  $\|\Theta_{12}\|$  for the c-number case  $|C_{kb}^p\rangle = C_{kb}^p |C\rangle$ , since so far we were not able to get more general results. For  $\tilde{r}_{a\neq b} = \varepsilon\lambda_{a\neq b}$  to hold for arbitrary initial state  $\lambda$  of A we need

$$\sum_k C_{kb}^r C_{ka}^{p*} = \varepsilon \delta_{rb} \delta_{pa} \text{ for all } (r, p) \text{ and } a \neq b. \quad (21)$$

This implies  $\sum_k C_{kb}^a C_{ka}^{a*} = \sum_k C_{kb}^b C_{ka}^{b*} = 0$ , and then

$$\|\Theta_{a\neq b}\|^2 = \phi_a^a \phi_a^b + \phi_b^a \phi_b^b + \Lambda_{12}, \quad \phi_v^u \equiv \sum_k |C_{kv}^u|^2, \quad (22)$$

$$\Lambda_{a\neq b} \equiv \sum'_{[sl]} \left[ \sum_k C_{kl}^a C_{ks}^{a*} \right] \left[ \sum_n C_{ns}^b C_{nl}^{b*} \right], \quad (23)$$

where  $\sum'_{[sl]}$  means that the values  $(s, l) = (a, a), (a, b), (b, a), (b, b)$  are excluded from the summation over  $s = 1, \dots, N$  and  $l = 1, \dots, N$ . In estimating  $|\Lambda_{a \neq b}|$  from above we proceed by applying the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and using (22):

$$|\Lambda_{a \neq b}| \leq \sum'_{[sl]} \left[ \sum_k |C_{kl}^a| |C_{ks}^{a*}| \right] \left[ \sum_n |C_{ns}^b| |C_{nl}^{b*}| \right] \quad (24)$$

$$\leq \sum'_{[sl]} \sqrt{\phi_l^a \phi_s^a \phi_l^b \phi_s^b} \leq \sqrt{\sum'_{[sl]} \phi_l^a \phi_s^a \sum'_{[sl]} \phi_l^b \phi_s^b}. \quad (25)$$

Working out (25) and combining it with (22) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Theta_{a \neq b}\|^2 &\leq \phi_a^a \phi_b^b + \phi_b^a \phi_a^b \quad (26) \\ &+ \sqrt{[1 - (\phi_a^a + \phi_b^a)^2][1 - (\phi_b^b + \phi_a^b)^2]} \equiv F. \quad (27) \end{aligned}$$

We now maximize  $F$  in the RHS of (27) so as to obtain a bound on  $\|\Theta_{a \neq b}\|^2$  that holds for any  $\{C_{kl}^b\}$ . The maximization is carried out under two constraints: *i*)  $\phi_a^a \phi_b^b \geq \varepsilon^2$ , which follows from applying the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality to (21) with  $r = b$  and  $p = a$ ; *ii*)  $\phi_a^a + \phi_b^a \leq 1$  and  $\phi_b^b + \phi_a^b \leq 1$ , which follow from the unitarity condition (4). Note from (26, 27) that the maximum of  $F$  over  $\phi_b^a$  can be reached only at the boundaries of its range, i.e., at  $\phi_b^a = 0$  or at  $\phi_b^a = 1 - \phi_b^b$ . The same holds for  $\phi_a^b$ . Direct inspection shows that the maximum of  $F$  is reached for  $\phi_b^a = \phi_b^b = 0$  and  $\phi_a^a = \phi_b^b = \varepsilon$ :

$$\|\Theta_{a \neq b}\| \leq \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}. \quad (28)$$

Comparing (28) with (17) we see that the maximal amount of the preserved memory for the non-ideal nondiagonal-to-nondiagonal transfer is larger than for the non-ideal diagonal-to-diagonal transfer.

For the transfer  $\tilde{\tau}_{12} = \varepsilon \lambda_{12}$  and for  $N = 2$  the bound (28) is saturated by the following choice of  $\{C_{kl}^b\}$

$$C_{11}^1 = 1, \quad C_{21}^1 = C_{12}^1 = C_{22}^1 = 0, \quad (29)$$

$$C_{21}^2 = \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}, \quad C_{12}^2 = \varepsilon, \quad C_{22}^2 = C_{11}^2 = 0. \quad (30)$$

Generalizing this example to  $N \geq 3$  is straightforward.

*Two non-commuting initial states.* Above we assumed that the initial state  $\lambda$  of the (source) system A is completely unknown. Let us now assume that due to some *a priori* information  $\lambda$  can be one of two non-commuting density operators  $\rho$  and  $\chi$ . This is the minimal setup, which still contains quantum information [12]. The complete understanding of the matrix elements transfer for this minimal setup is yet to be developed [14]. Here we present one example showing that the above constraints on the transfer may or may not carry over literally. Assume that  $\rho$  and  $\chi$  are two  $2 \times 2$  matrices with the following relation between their matrix elements:

$$\rho_{11} \chi_{12} = \chi_{11} \rho_{12}, \quad \rho_{11} \neq \chi_{11}, \quad \rho_{12} \neq \chi_{12}, \quad (31)$$

where  $\rho$  and  $\chi$  do not commute due to the latter two conditions. The relations for the exact transfer

of the diagonal elements  $\rho_{11}$  and  $\chi_{11}$  [see (6) with  $N = 2$ ] read:  $\rho_{11} = \sum_{p,r=1}^2 \rho_{pr} \sum_{k=1}^2 \langle C_{k1}^r | C_{k1}^p \rangle$ ,  $\chi_{11} = \sum_{p,r=1}^2 \chi_{pr} \sum_{k=1}^2 \langle C_{k1}^r | C_{k1}^p \rangle$ . (Then  $\rho_{22}$  and  $\chi_{22}$  are transferred automatically.) Multiplying the first and second equation by  $\chi_{12}$  and  $\rho_{12}$ , respectively, subtracting the resulting equations from each other and employing (31) and (4) we conclude that for  $k = 1, 2$ :  $|C_{k1}^2\rangle = |C_{k2}^1\rangle = 0$ . Together with (5) this leads to eliminating the memory on the non-diagonal elements:  $\Theta_{12} = 0$ . However, under conditions (31) the exact transfer of the non-diagonal element does not lead to any complete elimination of memory.

*In conclusion*, we studied how quantum mechanics constrains the process of matrix elements transfer from one system A to another system B. Assuming that the initial state of A is completely unknown, we show that transferring certain matrix elements leads to eliminating the memory on the transferred (or certain other) matrix elements from the final state of A. We also studied the maximal memory that can be preserved under non-ideal transfer. For each type of transfer this maximal memory relates to the amount of non-ideality by universal relations akin to the uncertainty relations.

It is pleasure to thank R. Balian for discussions. The work was supported by Volkswagenstiftung.

- 
- [1] D. Burgarth, Eur. Phys. J. Spec. Top. **151**, 147 (2007).
  - [2] Z. Song and C.P. Sun, Low Temp. Phys. **31**, 686 (2005).
  - [3] A.D. Boozer *et al.* Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 193601 (2007). H. Kosaka *et al.* Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 096602 (2008).
  - [4] V.B. Braginsky and F.Ya. Khalili, *Quantum Measurement* (Cambridge University, Cambridge, UK, 1992).
  - [5] A.E. Allahverdyan *et al.* Europhys. Lett. **61** 452 (2003).
  - [6] O.W. Sorensen, Prog. NMR Spectrosc. **21**, 503 (1989).
  - [7] K. Ishikawa *et al.* Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 183004 (2007).
  - [8] A. Abragam and M. Goldman, Rep. Prog. Phys. **41**, 395 (1978).
  - [9] G.D. Scholes, Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem. **54**, 57 (2003).
  - [10] D. Dieks, Phys. Lett. A **92**, 271 (1982). W.K. Wootters and W.H. Zurek, Nature, **299**, 802 (1982).
  - [11] H.P. Yuen, Phys. Lett. A **113**, 405 (1986).
  - [12] H. Barnum *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 2818 (1996).
  - [13] L. Schwartz, *Cours d'Analyse II* (Hermann, Paris, 1967). S. Haykin, *Adaptive Filter Theory* (Prentice Hall, NJ, 2002).
  - [14] K. Hovhannisyanyan and A.E. Allahverdyan, in preparation.
  - [15] Consider the differential  $d\tilde{\lambda}$  of the matrix  $\tilde{\lambda}$  over an infinitesimal increments of two independent real variables  $x \equiv \Re \lambda_{a \neq c}$  and  $y \equiv \Im \lambda_{a \neq c}$ :  $d\tilde{\lambda} = \Theta_{ac}(dx + idy) + \Theta_{ac}^\dagger(dx - idy)$ . To develop the notion of the matrix gradient (similar to the usual gradient) we first calculate the Euclidean norm  $\|d\tilde{\lambda}\|$  of  $d\tilde{\lambda}$ :  $\|d\tilde{\lambda}\|^2 = (dx^2 + dy^2)[\text{tr}(A^2)n_x^2 + \text{tr}(B^2)n_y^2 + 2\text{tr}(AB)n_x n_y]$ , where  $A = \Theta_{ac} + \Theta_{ac}^\dagger$ ,  $B = i(\Theta_{ac} - \Theta_{ac}^\dagger)$ , and where  $(n_x, n_y) = (dx, dy)/\sqrt{dx^2 + dy^2}$  is the normal vector over the direction of the small increment. The (modulus of) ma-

trix gradient is defined by maximizing over  $\vec{n} \equiv (n_x, n_y)$ :  
 $\frac{1}{4} \max_{\vec{n}} \|\widehat{d\lambda}\|^2 = \frac{1}{2} (dx^2 + dy^2) [\text{tr}(\Theta_{ac}\Theta_{ac}^\dagger) + |\text{tr}(\Theta_{ac}^2)|]$ .  
 As follows from  $\text{tr}(AB) \leq \sqrt{\text{tr}(A^2)\text{tr}(B^2)}$ ,  $\frac{\max_{\vec{n}} \|\widehat{d\lambda}\|^2}{4(dx^2+dy^2)}$  is

limited from above by  $\text{tr}(\Theta_{ac}\Theta_{ac}^\dagger) = \|\Theta_{ac}\|^2$ , and from below by  $\frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(\Theta_{ac}\Theta_{ac}^\dagger)$ .