

super fidelity and related metric

Zhihao Ma

Department of Mathematics, Shanghai Jiaotong University, Shanghai, 200240, P.R.China

Fu-Lin Zhang and Jing-Ling Chen*

*Theoretical Physics Division, Chern Institute of Mathematics,
Nankai University, Tianjin, 300071, P.R.China*

Zhi-Hua Chen

*Department of Science, Zhijiang college,
Zhejiang University of technology, Hangzhou, 310024, P.R.China*

(Dated: October 23, 2019)

Abstract

Recently, a new fidelity measure called super-fidelity, was introduced in [J. A. Miszczak, et al., “Sub- and super-fidelity as bounds for quantum fidelity”, *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **9**(2009)0103]. Then it was found that this fidelity has deep connection with quantum entanglement [Zhihao ma, et al., bounds of concurrence and their relation with fidelity and frontier states, *Phys. Let. A* **78**(2009) 064305]. So it is worthwhile to continue studying the property of super-fidelity. In this paper, we introduce metric of quantum states induced by super-fidelity, and connect it with other metrics. The metric character is presented. The CPT contractive property and convex property of the metrics are studied.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 03.65.Ta

Keywords: Super-Fidelity; Metric; Quantum state

*Email:chenjl@nankai.edu.cn

I. INTRODUCTION

Suppose one has two quantum states ρ and σ , then the Uhlmann-Jozsa fidelity [1] between ρ and σ is given by

$$F(\rho, \sigma) = [\text{Tr}\sqrt{\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}}]^2.$$

Uhlmann-Jozsa fidelity plays an important role in quantum information theory and quantum computation [3, 4, 5].

We know that for the case of qubit, Uhlmann-Jozsa fidelity has a simple form. From the Bloch sphere representation of quantum states, a qubit is described by a density matrix as([6]):

$$\rho(\mathbf{u}) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{I} + \sigma \cdot \mathbf{u})$$

where \mathbf{I} is the 2×2 unit matrix and $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)$ are the Pauli matrices. Assume $\rho(\mathbf{u})$ and $\rho(\mathbf{v})$ are two states of one qubit, then they can be represented by two vectors \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in the Bloch sphere. The Uhlmann-Jozsa fidelity for qubits has an elegant form([6]):

$$F(\rho(\mathbf{u}), \rho(\mathbf{v})) = \frac{1}{2}[1 + \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v} + \sqrt{1 - |\mathbf{u}|^2}\sqrt{1 - |\mathbf{v}|^2}]$$

where $\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v}$ is the inner product of two vectors \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} , and $|\mathbf{u}|$ is the magnitude of \mathbf{u} .

We know that for $N \times N$ quantum states, the Uhlmann-Jozsa fidelity has no simple form like the case of qubits. To use the simple form of fidelity, we note that in [7], the authors introduce a new fidelity, called super-fidelity, defined as

$$G(\rho_1, \rho_2) := \text{Tr}\rho_1\rho_2 + \sqrt{(1 - \text{Tr}\rho_1^2)(1 - \text{Tr}\rho_2^2)} \quad (1)$$

and it was proved that Uhlmann-Jozsa fidelity can be bounded above by the super-fidelity:

$$F(\rho_1, \rho_2) \leq G(\rho_1, \rho_2) \leq 1$$

When ρ_1 and ρ_2 are two qubits, super-fidelity $G(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ coincides with Uhlmann-Jozsa

fidelity $F(\rho_1, \rho_2)$.

The super-fidelity $G(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ has some good properties. Let $\rho_u = \frac{1}{N}(I + \sqrt{\frac{N(N-1)}{2}} \vec{\lambda} \cdot \mathbf{u})$ be the density matrix of a qunit ($N \times N$ quantum state), where I is the $N \times N$ unit matrix, $\vec{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{N^2-1})$ are the generators of $SU(N)$, and \mathbf{u} is the $(N^2 - 1)$ -dimensional Bloch vector. Then super-fidelity is rewritten as $G(\rho_u, \rho_v) = \frac{1}{N}[1 + (N - 1) \times \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v} + (N - 1) \times \sqrt{(1 - |\mathbf{u}|^2)(1 - |\mathbf{v}|^2)}]$. This shows that super-fidelity only depends on the magnitudes of \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} and the angle between them (that is, $\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v}$).

Moreover, very recently, it was found that super-fidelity play an important role in quantifying entanglement, see [4]. So it is natural to study the property of super-fidelity in further step.

Recall that super-fidelity by itself is not a metric. it is a measure of the ‘‘closeness’’ of two states. If we say a function $d(x, y)$ defined on quantum states is a metric, it should satisfies the following four axioms:

- (M1). $d(x, y) \geq 0$ for all states x and y ;
- (M2). $d(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y$;
- (M3). $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$ for all states x and y ;
- (M4). The triangle inequality: $d(x, y) \leq d(x, z) + d(y, z)$ for all states x, y and z .

For super-fidelity, one can define the metric as (Proposition III.3 of [8]):

$$C_N(\rho, \sigma) := \sqrt{1 - G(\rho, \sigma)}$$

It was proved in [8] that the above three are all genuine distances, that is, they all satisfying the axioms M1-M4.

The purpose of this paper is to introduce a new way to define metric of quantum states based on super-fidelity. This method is quite different from the usual way. surprising, we find the metric induced by the new method coincides with the metric introduced in [8] for the qubits case, and the new metrics have deep connection with spectral metric. Also we find the new metrics possess some appealing properties which make the metrics very useful in quantum information theory. The paper is organized as follows: In Sec. II, two new metrics were defined, and the metric character of the metrics were established. In Sec. III, intrinsic properties of the two metrics were discussed. Conclusion and discussion were made in the last section.

II. METRIC INDUCED BY SUPER-FIDELITY

In quantum information science community, trace metric was widely studied, it was defined by $D_{tr}(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{2}\text{Tr}|\rho - \sigma|$. However, one can define other types of metrics for quantum states, and these metrics also have their own advantages, see [3, 8, 9, 10].

Let us define a metric of quantum states as follows:

$$D_G(\rho, \sigma) = \max_{\tau} |G(\rho, \tau) - G(\sigma, \tau)| \quad (2)$$

where the maximization is taken over all quantum states τ (mix or pure). We call this metric $D_G(\rho, \sigma)$ as the G-metric, and the state τ that attained the maximal is called the optimal state for the metric $D_G(\rho, \sigma)$.

The above definition of metric may be not easy to calculate. So we can change its definition slightly. If τ is a pure state, then Super-fidelity can be simplified as $G(\rho, \tau) = \text{Tr}(\rho\tau)$, hence one can define another version of metric as follows:

$$D_{PG}(\rho, \sigma) = \max_{\tau} |G(\rho, \tau) - G(\sigma, \tau)| \quad (3)$$

where the maximization is taken over all pure states τ . We call this metric $D_{PG}(\rho, \sigma)$ as the PG-metric, and call the pure state τ that attained the maximal as the optimal pure state.

we first consider the case of qubits (two-dimensional quantum system). From the Bloch sphere representation, a qubit is described by a density matrix as

$$\rho(\mathbf{u}) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{I} + \sigma \cdot \mathbf{u})$$

where \mathbf{I} is the 2×2 unit matrix and $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)$ are the Pauli matrices. Assume $\rho(\mathbf{u})$ and $\rho(\mathbf{v})$ are two two states of a qubit, then they can be represented by two vectors \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in the Bloch sphere. The Euclidean metric between vectors \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} is defined by $|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}| = \sqrt{(u_1 - v_1)^2 + (u_2 - v_2)^2 + (u_3 - v_3)^2}$. The trace metric between $\rho(\mathbf{u})$ and $\rho(\mathbf{v})$ satisfies $D_{tr}(\rho(\mathbf{u}), \rho(\mathbf{v})) = \frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}|$, which is proportional to the Euclidean metric.

For the qubit case, it is well-known that the Bures fidelity has an elegant form:

$$F(\rho(\mathbf{u}), \rho(\mathbf{v})) = \frac{1}{2}[1 + \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v} + \sqrt{1 - |\mathbf{u}|^2} \sqrt{1 - |\mathbf{v}|^2}]$$

where $\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v}$ is the inner product of two vectors \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} , and $|\mathbf{u}|$ is the magnitude of \mathbf{u} .

Proposition 1.[16] For the qubit case, $D_{PG}(\rho(\mathbf{u}), \rho(\mathbf{v}))$ equals to the trace metric, namely $D_{PT}(\rho(\mathbf{u}), \rho(\mathbf{v})) = \frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}| = D_{tr}(\rho(\mathbf{u}), \rho(\mathbf{v}))$.

We can connect our metric with the metric introduced in [8] as following:

Proposition 2.[16] For the qubit case, $D_G(\rho, \sigma) = \sqrt{1 - G(\rho, \sigma)} = C_N(\rho, \sigma)$.

Now we come to discuss the case of qunit(i.e., $N \times N$ quantum states). In this case, if τ is a pure state, then the super-fidelity may have a simple form: $G(\rho, \tau) = \text{Tr}(\rho\tau)$, so we first show the metric character of $D_{PG}(\rho, \sigma)$, where the optimal state τ is restricted to pure state, and then turn to show the metric character of $D_G(\rho, \sigma)$.

We need the following concepts: For two quantum state ρ and σ , let λ_i , ($i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, d$), be all eigenvalues of $\rho - \sigma$, and λ_i 's are arranged as $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_d$. Similarly, let λ'_i be all eigenvalues of $\sigma - \rho$. Define $E(\rho, \sigma) := \max \lambda_i$ and define $E(\sigma, \rho) := \max \lambda'_i$, so we know that $\lambda_1 = \max \lambda_i$.

Now we give an interpretation of $E(\rho, \sigma)$. Let ρ and σ be two quantum states, then the following is well known(for example, see [15]):

$$E(\rho, \sigma) = \max_{\tau} \text{Tr}[\tau(\rho - \sigma)], \quad (4)$$

where the maximization is taken over all pure states τ .

Note that generally $E(\rho, \sigma)$ is not a metric, since $E(\rho, \sigma)$ may not equal to $E(\sigma, \rho)$, but we can symmetrize it as:

$$D_S(\rho, \sigma) := \max[E(\rho, \sigma), E(\sigma, \rho)] = \max |\lambda_i|$$

where $|\lambda_i|$ is the absolute value of λ_i . From the knowledge of matrix analysis, $D_S(\rho, \sigma)$ equals to the spectral metric between ρ and σ , which was defined as the largest singular value of $\rho - \sigma$, hence we know that $D_S(\rho, \sigma)$ is nothing but the spectral metric. Now we show the metric character of $D_{PT}(\rho, \sigma)$.

Proposition 3.[16] For states ρ, σ , we have $D_{PG}(\rho, \sigma) = D_S(\rho, \sigma)$, i.e, the PG-metric is in fact the same as the spectral metric.

Now we know that the PG-metric equals to the spectral metric, so it is a true metric. In the following we shall prove that the G-metric is also a true metric.

Theorem 1. The T-metric $D_G(\rho, \sigma)$ as shown in Eq. (2) is truly a metric, i.e, it satisfies conditions M1-M4.

Proof. From the definition, it is easy to prove conditions M1 and M3 hold. What we need to do is to prove conditions M2 and M4. If $\rho = \sigma$, then of course $D_G(\rho, \sigma) = 0$. If $D_G(\rho, \sigma) = 0$, we will prove $\rho = \sigma$. From the definition, we know that $D_G(\rho, \sigma) \geq D_{PG}(\rho, \sigma)$, so we get $D_{PG}(\rho, \sigma) = 0$, since $D_{PG}(\rho, \sigma)$ is a true metric, we get $\rho = \sigma$. Now we come to prove M4, the triangle inequality $D_G(\rho, \sigma) \leq D_G(\rho, \tau) + D_G(\sigma, \tau)$. $D_G(\rho, \sigma) = \max_{\tau} |G(\rho, \tau) - G(\sigma, \tau)|$, and suppose τ is the state that attains the maximal, so $D_G(\rho, \sigma) = |G(\rho, \tau) - G(\sigma, \tau)|$. We assume that $|G(\rho, \tau) - G(\sigma, \tau)| = G(\rho, \tau) - G(\sigma, \tau)$, then we get $G(\rho, \tau) - G(\sigma, \tau) = G(\rho, \tau) - G(w, \tau) + G(w, \tau) - G(\sigma, \tau) \leq |G(\rho, \tau) - G(w, \tau)| + |G(w, \tau) - G(\sigma, \tau)| \leq D_G(\rho, w) + D_G(w, \sigma)$. Thus one finally has $D_G(\rho, \sigma) \leq D_G(\rho, w) + D_G(w, \sigma)$.

III. PROPERTIES OF D_G AND D_{PG}

We know that for qubits, D_G has a clear form as: $D_G(\rho, \sigma) = \sqrt{1 - G(\rho, \sigma)}$, how about higher dimension?

For the qunit case, one does not have the relation $D_G(\rho, \sigma) = \sqrt{1 - G(\rho, \sigma)}$ as in Proposition 2.

However, the following upper bound holds: For qunits $\rho(\mathbf{u})$ and $\rho(\mathbf{v})$,

$$D_G(\rho(\mathbf{u}), \rho(\mathbf{v})) \leq \sqrt{\frac{2 \times (N - 1)}{N}} \sqrt{1 - G(\rho(\mathbf{u}), \rho(\mathbf{v}))} \quad (5)$$

Proof: Let $\rho = \rho(\mathbf{u})$, $\sigma = \rho(\mathbf{v})$ and $\tau = \rho(\mathbf{w})$, then one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} & |G(\rho, \tau) - G(\sigma, \tau)| \\ &= \frac{N-1}{N} \left| (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{w} + \sqrt{1 - |\mathbf{w}|^2} (\sqrt{1 - |\mathbf{u}|^2} - \sqrt{1 - |\mathbf{v}|^2}) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{N-1}{N} \left[|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}| |\mathbf{w}| + \sqrt{1 - |\mathbf{w}|^2} |\sqrt{1 - |\mathbf{u}|^2} - \sqrt{1 - |\mathbf{v}|^2}| \right] \\ &\leq \frac{N-1}{N} \sqrt{|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}|^2 + |\sqrt{1 - |\mathbf{u}|^2} - \sqrt{1 - |\mathbf{v}|^2}|^2} \\ &= \frac{N-1}{N} \sqrt{[2 - 2\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v} - 2\sqrt{1 - |\mathbf{u}|^2} \sqrt{1 - |\mathbf{v}|^2}]} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{2 \times (N - 1)}{N}} \sqrt{1 - G(\rho(\mathbf{u}), \rho(\mathbf{v}))}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Now we will discuss the inequality (5) in more detail. When $N = 2$, i.e., in the case of qubits, we get that inequality (5) becomes equality, that is, $D_G(\rho, \sigma) = \sqrt{1 - G(\rho, \sigma)}$. But for higher dimension, the equality sign does not hold in general. Why?

The reason is subtle. When the equality sign holds, i.e., $D_G(\rho, \sigma) = \sqrt{\frac{2 \times (N-1)}{N}} \sqrt{1 - G(\rho(\mathbf{u}), \rho(\mathbf{v}))}$, the inequality (6) need to be equality, that means the optimal state $\tau = \rho(\mathbf{w})$ is always attained, where \mathbf{w} is a vector that parallels to $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}$, and $|\mathbf{w}| = \frac{\sqrt{N-1}|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{v}|}{\sqrt{2 \times N} \sqrt{1 - G(\rho(\mathbf{u}), \rho(\mathbf{v}))}}$, but in fact we can not always get such optimal state. Because such an operator may not be a density operator! We will explain it in the following.

It is well known that every $N \times N$ density matrix can be represented by the $(N^2 - 1)$ -dimensional Bloch vector as: $\rho(\mathbf{u}) = \frac{1}{N}(I + \sqrt{\frac{N(N-1)}{2}} \vec{\lambda} \cdot \mathbf{u})$, but the converse is not true, i.e., not all operator of the form $\frac{1}{N}(I + \sqrt{\frac{N(N-1)}{2}} \vec{\lambda} \cdot \mathbf{u})$ is a density matrix, where \mathbf{u} is an arbitrary $(N^2 - 1)$ -dimensional Bloch vector. Note that a density matrix must satisfy three conditions: (a). Trace unity, $\text{Tr}(\rho(\mathbf{u})) = 1$. (b) Hermitian, $\rho(\mathbf{u})^* = \rho(\mathbf{u})$; and (c). positivity, i.e., all eigenvalues of $\rho(\mathbf{u})$ are non-negative.

Indeed, the operator $\frac{1}{N}(I + \sqrt{\frac{N(N-1)}{2}} \vec{\lambda} \cdot \mathbf{u})$ automatically satisfies the conditions (a) and (b). However, not every vector \mathbf{u} , $|\mathbf{u}| \leq 1$, allows $\rho(\mathbf{u})$ satisfies the positive condition (c), see([6]).

To get that inequality (6) becomes equality, we need that the optimal state $\tau = \rho(\mathbf{w})$ is a density matrix, where \mathbf{w} is a vector that parallels to $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}$, and $|\mathbf{w}| = \frac{\sqrt{N-1}|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{v}|}{\sqrt{2 \times N} \sqrt{1 - G(\rho(\mathbf{u}), \rho(\mathbf{v}))}}$, but this is not always true in general. So we can only get the following inequality:

$$D_G(\rho, \sigma) \leq \sqrt{\frac{2 \times (N - 1)}{N}} \sqrt{1 - G(\rho, \sigma)}$$

The following counterexample will show that strictly inequality will occur.

Example 1. Let $|\psi\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}|00\rangle + \frac{1}{2}|11\rangle$, $|\phi\rangle = \frac{1}{2}|00\rangle + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}|11\rangle$. Define $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, $\sigma = |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$, then we get that $D_G(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{2}$, while $\sqrt{\frac{2 \times (3)}{4}} \sqrt{1 - G(\rho, \sigma)} = \sqrt{\frac{3}{8}} > \frac{1}{2}$.

Now we will study the intrinsic properties of the D_G and D_{PG} . We are interested in the following properties:

Property 1: contractive under quantum operation. suppose T is a quantum operation, i.e., a completely positive trace preserving (CPT) map, and ρ, σ are density operators, we say a metric $D(\rho, \sigma)$ is contractive under quantum operation, if the following

holds:

$$D(T(\rho), T(\sigma)) \leq D(\rho, \sigma)$$

Why we study the property of contractive under quantum operation? It has a physical interpretation [10]: a quantum process acting on two quantum states cannot increase their distinguishability.

Property 2: joint convex property. we say that the metric $D(\rho, \sigma)$ has the convex property, if p_j are probabilities, then $D(\sum_j p_j \rho_j, \sum_j p_j \sigma_j) \leq \sum_j p_j D(\rho_j, \sigma_j)$.

The joint convex property also has a physical interpretation [10]: the distinguishability between the states $\sum_j p_j \rho_j$ and $\sum_j p_j \sigma_j$, where p_j is not known, can never be greater than the average distinguishability when p_j is known.

We know that the Uhlmann-Jozsa fidelity $F(\rho, \sigma)$ has the **CPT expansive property**: If ρ and σ are density matrices, Φ is a CPT map, then $F(\Phi(\rho), \Phi(\sigma)) \geq F(\rho, \sigma)$.

We may guess that if super-fidelity has the CP expansive property, the following counterexample shows that this property does not hold.

Example 2 ([8]). Let

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

Define $\Phi(\gamma) = A\gamma A^+ + B\gamma B^+$, where γ is an arbitrary density operator, then we defined a completely positive trace preserving map.

Let ρ and σ be the density operators defined by

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix},$$

Then

$$\Phi(\rho) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Phi(\sigma) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

One then easily obtains $G(\rho, \sigma) > G(\Phi(\rho), \Phi(\sigma))$, which shows that the CP expansive property does not hold for super-fidelity.

So we get that the metric $C_N(\rho, \sigma) := \sqrt{1 - G(\rho, \sigma)}$ introduced in [8] is **not** contractive under quantum operation.

However, we can prove the following:

Theorem 2. The PG-metric $D_{PG}(\rho, \sigma)$ is contractive under quantum operation.

Proof. Suppose γ is the optimal pure state for quantum states $\phi(\rho), \phi(\sigma)$, so we get $D_{PG}(\phi(\rho), \phi(\sigma)) = |G(\phi(\rho), \gamma) - G(\phi(\sigma), \gamma)| = |(\text{Tr}\phi(\rho)\gamma) - (\text{Tr}\phi(\sigma)\gamma)|$

Let ϕ be a quantum operation, and denote $\gamma' := \phi^*(\gamma)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & D_{PG}(\phi(\rho), \phi(\sigma)) \\ &= |(\text{Tr}\phi(\rho)\gamma) - (\text{Tr}\phi(\sigma)\gamma)| \\ &= |(\text{Tr}\rho\phi^*(\gamma)) - (\text{Tr}\sigma\phi^*(\gamma))| \\ &= |(\text{Tr}\rho\gamma') - (\text{Tr}\sigma\gamma')| \\ &\leq D_{PG}(\rho, \sigma) \end{aligned}$$

Theorem is proved.

How about the G-metric? Using example 2, we get $D_G(\Phi(\rho), \Phi(\sigma)) = \max_{\tau} |\text{Tr}(\Phi(\rho) - \Phi(\sigma))\tau| = 1$, while $D_G(\rho, \sigma) = \max_{\tau} |G(\rho, \tau) - G(\sigma, \tau)| = \max_{\tau} |\text{Tr}(\rho - \sigma)\tau + \sqrt{1 - \text{Tr}\tau^2}(\sqrt{1 - \text{Tr}\rho^2} - \sqrt{1 - \text{Tr}\sigma^2})| = \max_{\tau} |\text{Tr}(\rho - \sigma)\tau|$, numerical experiment shows that $\max_{\tau} |\text{Tr}(\rho - \sigma)\tau| = \frac{1}{2}$, this example shows that $D_G(\rho, \sigma) < D_G(\Phi(\rho), \Phi(\sigma))$. So we get that the G-metric $D_G(\rho, \sigma)$ is **not** contractive under quantum operation.

Now we discuss the joint convex property.

Proposition 4. (joint convexity of the PG-metric): Let $\{p_i\}$ be probability distributions over an index set, let ρ_i and σ_i be density operators with the indices from the same index

set. Then

$$D_{PG}(\sum_i p_i \rho_i, \sum_i p_i \sigma_i) \leq \sum_i p_i D_{PG}(\rho_i, \sigma_i)$$

We know that $D_{PG}(\rho, \sigma) = D_S(\rho, \sigma) = \max(E(\rho, \sigma), E(\sigma, \rho))$, so we only need to prove the following holds:

$$E(\sum_i p_i \rho_i, \sum_i p_i \sigma_i) \leq \sum_i p_i E(\rho_i, \sigma_i)$$

since $E(\rho, \sigma) = \max_{\gamma} \text{Tr}(\gamma(\rho - \sigma))$, where the maximization in the right hand is taken over all pure states γ , then there exists a pure state γ such that

$$E(\sum_i p_i \rho_i, \sum_i p_i \sigma_i) = \sum_i p_i \text{Tr}(\gamma(\rho_i - \sigma_i)) \leq \sum_i p_i E(\rho_i, \sigma_i).$$

The proof is complete.

We also find that, the metric D_G is **not** joint convex, however, numerical experiment shows that its square is joint convex, that is, the following holds:

$$D_G^2((\lambda \rho_1 + (1 - \lambda) \rho_2), \sigma) \leq \lambda D_G^2(\rho_1, \sigma) + (1 - \lambda) D_G^2(\rho_2, \sigma)$$

IV. CONCLUSION

In summary, we have introduced a new way to define metric of quantum states from super-fidelity. We find that, for qubit case, our metric D_G coincides with the metric $C_N(\rho, \sigma)$ introduced in [8]. We proved that the metric D_{PG} is contractive under quantum operation, while the metric D_G is not contractive under quantum operation. Numerical experiment shows that the square of D_G and D_{PG} are both joint convex.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS This work is supported by the New teacher Foundation of Ministry of Education of P.R.China (Grant No. 20070248087), partially supported by a grant of science and technology commission of Shanghai Municipality (STCSM, No. 09XD1402500). J.L.C is supported in part by NSF of China (Grant No. 10605013), and Program for New Century Excellent Talents in University, and the Project-sponsored by

- [1] A. Uhlmann, “The transition probability in the state space of a $*$ -algebra ”, Rep. Math. Phys. **9**(1976)273; R. Jozsa, “Fidelity for Mixed Quantum States ”, J. Mod. Opt. **41**(1994)2315;
- [2] M. Hübner, Phys. Lett. A **163**(1992)239-242.
- [3] M. A. Nielsen, I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [4] Z. H. Ma, F. L. Zhang, D.L.Deng, J. L. Chen, bounds of concurrence and their relation with fidelity and frontier states, Phys. Let. A **78**(2009) 064305.
- [5] Paolo Zanardi, H. T. Quan, Xiaoguang Wang, and C. P. Sun, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 032109 (2007); Shi-Jian Gu, Ho-Man Kwok, Wen-Qiang Ning, Hai-Qing Lin Phys. Rev. B **77**, 245109 (2008); Shi-Jian Gu, arXiv:0811.3127; Xiaoguang Wang, Zhe Sun, Z. D. Wang, arxiv: 0803.2940; Jian Ma, Lei Xu, Hengna Xiong, Xiaoguang Wang, Phys. Rev. E **78**, 051126 (2008); Xiao-Ming Lu, Zhe Sun, Xiaoguang Wang, Paolo Zanardi, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 032309 (2008); Jian Ma, Lei Xu, Xiaoguang Wang, arxiv: 0808.1816; Paolo Giorda and Paolo Zanardi, arxiv: 0903.1262.
- [6] J. L. Chen, L. Fu, A. A. Ungar, X. G. Zhao, Phys. Rev. A **65**(2002)054304; J. L. Chen, L. Fu, A. A. Ungar, X. G. Zhao, Phys. Rev. A **65**(2002)024303.
- [7] J. A. Miszczak, Z. Puchała, P. Horodecki, A. Uhlmann, and K. Życzkowski, “Sub- and super-fidelity as bounds for quantum fidelity”, Quantum Inf. Comput. **9**(2009)0103.
- [8] Paulo E. M. F. Mendonca, R. d. J. Napolitano, M. A. Marchioli, C.J.Foster, Y.C.Liang, “An alternative fidelity measure for quantum states”, Phys. Rev. A, **78**, 052330 (2008).
- [9] C. A. Fuchs, Ph.D. thesis, University of New Mexico, 1995.
- [10] A. Gilchrist, N. K. Langford, and M. A. Nielsen, “Distance measures to compare real and ideal quantum processes”, Phys. Rev. A **71**(2005)062310.
- [11] A.E. Rastegin, “Sine distance for quantum states ”, arxiv: quant-ph/0602112.
- [12] A.E. Rastegin, “Relative error of state-dependent cloning”, Phys. Rev. A **66**(2002)042304.
- [13] Johan G. F. Belinfante, “Transition probability spaces”, J. Math. Phys. **17**(1976)285.
- [14] Z. H. Ma, F. L. Zhang, J. L. Chen, Geometric interpretation for the A fidelity and its relation with the Bures fidelity, Phys. Rev. A **78**(2008)064305.

- [15] R. A. Horn, C. R. Johnson, *Topics in matrix analysis*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1991.
- [16] Z. H. Ma, F. L. Zhang, J. L. Chen, arXiv:0808.0984.
- [17] W. Bruzda, V. Cappellini, H. Sommers, K. Życzkowski, “Random Quantum Operations”, *Phys. Lett. A* **373**(2009)320.
- [18] D. Garca , M. Wolf, D. Petz, M. Ruskai, “Contractivity of positive and trace-preserving maps under L_p norms” *J. Math. Phys*, 47, (2006)083506.