

Signatures of non-classicality in mixed-state quantum computation

Animesh Datta^{1,2} and Sevag Gharibian³

¹*Institute for Mathematical Sciences, 53 Prince's Gate, Imperial College, London, SW7 2PG, UK*

²*QOLS, The Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College London, Prince Consort Road, SW7 2BW, UK*

³*Institute for Quantum Computing, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Canada*

(Dated: August 30, 2019)

We investigate signatures of nonclassicality in quantum states, in particular, that involved in the DQC1 model of mixed-state quantum computation, introduced by Knill and Laflamme [Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5672 (1998)]. We first study the disturbance of a quantum state under locally noneffective unitary operations (LNU), which are local unitaries acting invariantly on a subsystem. We next consider a quantity inspired by measurement-induced disturbance (MID). It is similar in spirit to the quantum discord, the difference being in the use of measurements given by the eigenbasis of the reduced density matrices, on both the subsystems. We prove that a non-zero quantum discord implies a non-zero shift under LNUs, and discuss resulting notions of “non-classicality” arising from disturbance under measurement versus disturbance under unitary operations. Finally, we study the role of these figures of non-classicality in the exponential speedup of the DQC1 model and compare them *vis-a-vis* the interpretation provided in terms of quantum discord.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud,03.67.Mn,03.67.Lx

Keywords:

I. INTRODUCTION

A thorough understanding of classical and quantum correlations underlies their successful exploitation in quantum information science. The relative roles and abilities of these two forms of correlations in performing specific computational and information processing tasks would be a valuable advance in the field. Substantial progress in this direction have already been achieved. The role of entangled states in quantum information processing and computing is quite well studied. Jozsa and Linden [1] showed that multipartite entanglement must grow unboundedly with the problem size if a pure-state quantum computation is to attain an exponential speedup over its classical counterpart. In the context of information processing, Masanes has shown [2] that all bipartite entangled states can enhance the teleporting power of some other state. In spite of these successes, there are instances of quantum computations where the quantum advantage cannot be attributed to entanglement. Meyer has presented a quantum search algorithm that uses no entanglement [3]. Instances are also known of oracle based problems that can be solved without entanglement, yet with certain advantages over the best known classical algorithms [4],[5].

Given this scenario, it becomes a logical necessity to study the essentialness of entanglement in quantum information science. The oldest signature of quantum behavior has been non-locality. Interestingly, it is well known that quantum nonlocality and entanglement are not equivalent notions [6],[7]. Entanglement stems from the superposition principle, or the amplitude description of quantum mechanics. This description is, however, not one that uniquely defines quantum mechanics. Consequently, it should not be a surprise that entanglement

cannot capture the whole power of quantum mechanics. This provides a significant motivation for studying alternative certificates of quantum behavior.

A much more realistic motivation is that provided by mixed-state quantum computation. Pure states in a quantum computation inevitably get mixed due to decoherence. Countering this requires the techniques of quantum error-correction. A different way to address this issue would be to study the prospects of quantum computational speedup with mixed states themselves [8]. NMR quantum computation provides a perfect scenario for this. As a simplified model for this, Knill and Laflamme proposed the DQC1 or the ‘power of one qubit’ model [9]. Though not believed to be as powerful as a pure-state quantum computer, it is known to provide an exponential speedup over the best known classical algorithm for estimating the normalized trace of a unitary matrix. The DQC1 model was found to have a limited amount of (bipartite) entanglement that does not increase with the system size. Additionally, for certain parameter settings, there is no distillable entanglement present whatsoever, and yet the model retains its exponential advantage. In this latter case the state has a positive partial transpose, and thus possesses, at most, just bound entanglement [10]. Looking for a more satisfactory explanation for the exponential speedup, the quantum discord [11],[12] was calculated, of which the amount found was a constant fraction of the maximum possible [13], regardless of the parameter settings for the model. In this paper, we study two alternative methods of studying the quantum behavior of the DQC1 model.

Locally noneffective unitary operations (LNU) have previously been studied with the aim of developing an entanglement detection criterion [14],[15]. Here, we study the LNU as

a possible notion of non-classicality, motivated by the disturbance of a quantum state under unitary operations. We provide a brief introduction to the LNU in Sec II. In Sec III, we employ LNU in analyzing the DQC1 model. The DQC1 model has previously been studied using the quantum discord. Thus, in Sec IV, we compare these two certificates of non-classicality, with the aim of contrasting *disturbance under measurement* with *disturbance under unitary operations*. We then move on to study the DQC1 model using the measurement-induced disturbance (MID) measure [16] in Sec V. In Ref. [16], a preliminary analysis of the DQC1 model was begun. Here, we extend this analysis to the entire parameter range for the DQC1 model, including those which limit the DQC1 state to being at most bound entangled. This latter case is of particular interest due to the lack of distillable entanglement, as previously discussed. We conclude with a brief discussion in Sec VI. Throughout, we denote a vector by \mathbf{v} , and take all logarithms to base 2. We define $D(\mathcal{H}^M \otimes \mathcal{H}^N)$ as the set of density operators acting on the MN -dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^M \otimes \mathcal{H}^N$. All designations of a density matrix without any subscripts will be implied to mean a bipartite state. For example, τ shall stand for τ_{AB} .

II. LOCALLY NONEFFECTIVE UNITARY OPERATIONS (LNU)

We begin by introducing locally noneffective unitary operations (LNU), first proposed under the name local *cyclic* operations in [14]. For this, consider a bipartite quantum state $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H}^M \otimes \mathcal{H}^N)$, shared between A and B such that $\rho_A = \text{Tr}_B(\rho)$ and $\rho_B = \text{Tr}_A(\rho)$. Suppose now that Alice performs a local unitary U_A that does not change her subsystem, that is, $\rho_A = U_A \rho_A U_A^\dagger$, or equivalently

$$[\rho_A, U_A] = 0. \quad (1)$$

This action can, however, affect the state of the total system, such that if we define $\rho_f := (U_A \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)\rho(U_A \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)^\dagger$, it is possible that $\rho \neq \rho_f$. Unitaries satisfying Eqn. (1) are called LNU [14]. To quantify the difference between ρ and ρ_f , we use the distance

$$d(\rho, U_A) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \|\rho - \rho_f\|_F, \quad (2)$$

where $\|A\|_F = \sqrt{\text{Tr}(A^\dagger A)}$ denotes the Frobenius norm. Following [14], we shall be interested in *maximizing* this distance as

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\max}(\rho) &:= \max_{U_A : [\rho_A, U_A]=0} d(\rho, U_A) \\ &= \max_{U_A : [\rho_A, U_A]=0} \sqrt{\text{Tr}(\rho^2) - \text{Tr}(\rho\rho_f)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

From the latter expression, it is clear that $0 \leq d_{\max}(\rho) \leq 1$. For any product state $\rho_{\text{prod}} := \rho_A \otimes \rho_B$, $d_{\max}(\rho_{\text{prod}}) = 0$. It is known that $d_{\max}(\rho_{\text{ent}}) > 0$ for entangled (pseudo)pure states and Werner states [15], but it is not known whether $d_{\max}(\rho_{\text{ent}}) > 0$ for all entangled ρ_{ent} . As with the quantum discord, it is possible to have $d_{\max}(\rho_{\text{sep}}) > 0$ for certain separable states, implying $d_{\max}(\rho)$ is not a non-locality measure. A separable state $\rho_{\text{sep}} \in D(\mathcal{H}^M \otimes \mathcal{H}^N)$ is defined as one of the form

$$\rho_{\text{sep}} := \sum_k p_k |a^k\rangle\langle a^k| \otimes |b^k\rangle\langle b^k|, \quad (4)$$

where $\sum_k p_k = 1$, and the $|a^k\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^M$ and $|b^k\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^N$ are vectors of Euclidean norm 1. For two-qubit separable states, the maximum LNU distance attainable is [14]

$$d_{\max}(\rho_{\text{sep}}) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}. \quad (5)$$

Similar bounds exist for dimensions up to $MN = 9$ [15], but are only known to be tight in the two-qubit case.

Let us now calculate, as a simple illustration, the maximum LNU distance for the two-qubit isotropic state,

$$\rho_{\text{iso}} = \frac{1-z}{4} I_4 + z |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|, \quad z \in [0, 1] \quad (6)$$

where $|\Psi\rangle = (|00\rangle + |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and $\text{Tr}_B(\rho_{\text{iso}}) = I_2/2$. The condition of Eq (1) leaves us with the entire group $\text{SU}(2)$ to choose U_A from. Thus,

$$U_A = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\phi} \cos \theta & e^{i\chi} \sin \theta \\ -e^{-i\chi} \sin \theta & e^{-i\phi} \cos \theta \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

Simple algebra leads to

$$d(\rho_{\text{iso}}, U_A) = z \sqrt{1 - \cos^2 \theta \cos^2 \phi} \quad (8)$$

which upon maximizing over θ, ϕ provides

$$d_{\max}(\rho_{\text{iso}}) = z. \quad (9)$$

Note that $0 \leq d_{\max}(\rho_{\text{iso}}) \leq 1$, as is to be expected. By Eqn. (5), we can conclude that the two-qubit isotropic state is entangled for $z > 1/\sqrt{2}$. The partial transpose test, which in this case is necessary and sufficient, shows that this state is actually entangled for all $z > 1/3$, thereby showing that the LNU distance is weaker at detecting entangled states than the former.

We remark that we have restricted our attention here to the case where the LNU is applied to subsystem A of ρ . One can alternatively consider subsystem B as the target subsystem. We now derive a simple upper bound on $d_{\max}(\rho)$ which holds regardless of which target subsystem we choose, and which proves useful in Section III.




FIG. 1: The DQC1 circuit

Theorem 1. For any $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H}^M \otimes \mathcal{H}^N)$,

$$d_{\max}(\rho) \leq \sqrt{2 \left(\text{Tr}(\rho^2) - \frac{1}{MN} \right)}. \quad (10)$$

Proof. Observe that $\left\| \rho - \frac{I}{MN} \right\|_{\text{F}}$ is invariant under unitary operations (since the Frobenius norm is unitarily invariant). Then, via the triangle inequality, we have:

$$\left\| \rho - \rho_f \right\|_{\text{F}} \leq \left\| \rho - \frac{I}{MN} \right\|_{\text{F}} + \left\| \frac{I}{MN} - \rho_f \right\|_{\text{F}} \quad (11)$$

$$= 2 \left\| \rho - \frac{I}{MN} \right\|_{\text{F}} \quad (12)$$

$$= 2 \sqrt{\text{Tr}(\rho^2) - \frac{1}{MN}} \quad (13)$$

Substituting this expression in Eqn. (2) gives the desired result. \square

Thus, if the purity of a state ρ strictly decreases as a function of the dimension, then $d_{\max}(\rho) \rightarrow 0$ as $MN \rightarrow \infty$.

III. LNU IN THE DQC1 MODEL

We now study the non-classical features of the DQC1 model of quantum computation, as quantified by $d_{\max}(\rho)$. The $n+1$ qubit DQC1 state, as demonstrated in Fig (1), is given by [10]

$$\rho_{DQC1} = \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \begin{pmatrix} I_n & \alpha U_n^\dagger \\ \alpha U_n & I_n \end{pmatrix}. \quad (14)$$

We will consider the top qubit to be system A on which our local unitary acts and the remaining n qubits as system B . The reduced state is then

$$\rho_A = \text{Tr}_B(\rho_{DQC1}) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \alpha \tau^* \\ \alpha \tau & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (15)$$

with $\tau = \text{Tr}(U_n)/2^n$. A single qubit $\text{SU}(2)$ operation on A can be denoted as U_A . For a $\text{SU}(2)$ unitary from Eqn. (7), the LNU condition of Eqn. (1) requires that $\chi = \frac{\pi}{2} - \arg(\tau)$ and either $\phi = 0$ or $\theta = \pi/2$. Both cases lead to the same final expression, so let us set $\phi = 0$. Simple algebra then leads to

$$\text{Tr}(\rho_f \rho_{DQC1}) = \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \left(1 + \alpha^2 \cos^2 \theta - \alpha^2 \sin^2 \theta \frac{\text{Re}(\text{Tr}V)}{2^n} \right),$$

where $V = e^{2i\chi} U_n^2$, which on further simplification gives via Eqn. (3) a LNU distance of

$$d(\rho_{DQC1}, \theta) = \frac{\alpha \sin \theta}{2^{(n+1)/2}} \sqrt{1 - \frac{\text{ReTr}(e^{-2i \arg \tau} U_n^2)}{2^n}}.$$

The now trivial maximization over all allowed unitaries leaves us with

$$d_{\max}(\rho_{DQC1}) = \frac{\alpha}{2^{(n+1)/2}} \sqrt{1 - \frac{\text{ReTr}(e^{-2i \arg \tau} U_n^2)}{2^n}} \quad (16)$$

$$\leq \frac{\alpha}{2^{n/2}}. \quad (17)$$

Here, we have used the rough estimate $\text{ReTr}(e^{2i \arg \tau} U_n^2) \geq -2^n$. For a two-qubit pure state ($n = 1, \alpha = 1$), we thus have $d_{\max}(\rho_{DQC1}) \leq 1/\sqrt{2}$, which conforms with Eqn. (5). We know that the quantity in the square root is, in general, not zero and so this state will typically have $d_{\max}(\rho_{DQC1}) > 0$. A typical instance of the DQC1 circuit is provided by that of a random unitary U_n in the DQC1 circuit in Fig (1). For such instances of large enough Haar distributed unitaries, $\text{Tr}(U_n^2)$ is bounded above by a constant with high probability [17]. Thus, the second term inside the square root in Eqn. (16) is approximately zero, and

$$d_{\max}(\rho_{DQC1}) \approx \frac{\alpha}{2^{(n+1)/2}}. \quad (18)$$

This shows that the DQC1 state experiences very little disturbance under LNU, and in fact this disturbance vanishes asymptotically as n grows. As discussed in the introduction, it would appear that the quantum discord is better suited [13] to quantifying non-classicality in the DQC1 model. This, however, raises the question of how the discord and LNU distance are related, and whether the paradigms of ‘disturbance under projective measurement’ and ‘disturbance under LNU’ lead to differing notions of non-classicality. We explore these questions in the following section.

Before closing, we remark that in calculating $d_{\max}(\rho_{DQC1})$, one can alternatively choose to apply a LNU to subsystem B , or define different bi-partitions of ρ_{DQC1} as the subsystems A and B . Evaluating $d_{\max}(\rho_{DQC1})$ directly in such cases unfortunately proves difficult. It turns out, however, that since

$$\text{Tr}(\rho_{DQC1}^2) = \frac{1 + \alpha^2}{2^{n+1}}, \quad (19)$$

Theorem (1) immediately gives the same upper bound of Eqn. (17). Thus, alternate bipartite splits cannot provide any significant increase in $d_{\max}(\rho_{DQC1})$.

IV. QUANTUM DISCORD vs LNU DISTANCE

Motivated by the fact that both the quantum discord and the LNU distance are aimed at capturing the nonclassical features

in a quantum state via an induced disturbance, we seek an answer to the question of whether one implies the other in any sense or not. Specifically, we show that non-zero quantum discord implies a non-zero LNU distance, but that the converse is not necessarily true. We will begin with a formal definition of quantum discord.

Given a quantum state $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H}^M \otimes \mathcal{H}^N)$, its quantum mutual information is defined as $\mathcal{I}(\rho) := S(\rho_A) + S(\rho_B) - S(\rho)$. The quantum mutual information can, however, also be defined in an inequivalent way as

$$\mathcal{J}_{\{\Pi_j^A\}}(\rho) = S(\rho_B) - S(\rho_{B|\{\Pi_j^A\}}) \quad (20)$$

with

$$S(\rho_{B|\{\Pi_j^A\}}) = \sum_j p_j S\left(\frac{(\Pi_j^A \otimes I^B)\rho(\Pi_j^A \otimes I^B)}{p_j}\right),$$

where $p_j = \text{Tr}(\Pi_j^A \otimes I^B \rho)$. Projective measurements on subsystem A removes all nonclassical correlations between A and B . The quantity \mathcal{J} thus signifies a measure of classical correlations in the state ρ [12]. To ensure that it captures all classical correlations, we need to maximize \mathcal{J} over the set of one dimensional projective measurements. This leads to the definition of quantum discord [11] as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(\rho) &:= \mathcal{I}(\rho) - \max_{\{\Pi_j^A\}} \mathcal{J}_{\{\Pi_j^A\}}(\rho) \\ &= S(\rho_A) - S(\rho) + \min_{\{\Pi_j^A\}} S(\rho_{B|\{\Pi_j^A\}}). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Intuitively, quantum discord captures purely quantum correlations in a quantum state. This is distinct from entanglement in the case of mixed states. For pure states, quantum discord reduces to the von-Neumann entropy of the reduced density matrix, which is a measure of entanglement. On the other hand, it is possible for mixed separable states to have non-zero quantum discord. The main theorem concerning the discord that we require here is the following.

Theorem 2 (Ollivier and Zurek [11]). *For $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H}^M \otimes \mathcal{H}^N)$, $\mathcal{D}(\rho) = 0$ if and only if $\rho = \sum_j (\Pi_j^A \otimes I^B)\rho(\Pi_j^A \otimes I^B)$, for some complete set of rank one projectors $\{\Pi_j^A\}$.*

We now show the following.

Theorem 3. *For $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H}^M \otimes \mathcal{H}^N)$, if $\mathcal{D}(\rho) > 0$, then $d_{\max}(\rho) > 0$.*

Proof. We begin by writing ρ in Fano form [18], i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \rho = \frac{1}{MN} & (I^A \otimes I^B + \mathbf{r}^A \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}^A \otimes I^B + \\ & I^A \otimes \mathbf{r}^B \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}^B + \sum_{s=1}^{M^2} \sum_{t=1}^{N^2} T_{st} \sigma_s^A \otimes \sigma_t^B). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Here, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^A$ denotes the $(M^2 - 1)$ -component vector of traceless orthogonal Hermitian generators of $SU(M)$ (which generalize the Pauli spin operators), \mathbf{r}^A is the $(M^2 - 1)$ -dimensional

Bloch vector for subsystem A with $r_s^A = \frac{M}{2} \text{Tr}(\rho_A \sigma_s^A)$, and T is a real matrix known as the correlation matrix with entries $T_{st} = \frac{MN}{4} \text{Tr}(\sigma_s^A \otimes \sigma_t^B \rho)$. The definitions for subsystem B are analogous.

An explicit construction for the generators σ_i of $SU(d)$ for $d \geq 2$ is given as follows [19]. Define $\{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^{d^2-1} = \{U_{pq}, V_{pq}, W_r\}$, such that for $1 \leq p < q \leq d$ and $1 \leq r \leq d-1$, and $\{|k\rangle\}_{k=1}^d$ some complete orthonormal basis for \mathcal{H}^d :

$$U_{pq} = |p\rangle\langle q| + |q\rangle\langle p| \quad (23a)$$

$$V_{pq} = -i|p\rangle\langle q| + i|q\rangle\langle p| \quad (23b)$$

$$W_r = \sqrt{\frac{2}{r(r+1)}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^r |k\rangle\langle k| - r|r+1\rangle\langle r+1| \right) \quad (23c)$$

In our ensuing discussion, without loss of generality, for $SU(M)$ we fix the choice of basis $\{|k\rangle\}_{k=1}^M$ above as the eigenbasis [24] of ρ_A .

Assume now that $\mathcal{D}(\rho) > 0$. Then, any choice of complete measurement $\{\Pi_j^A\}$ must disturb ρ , i.e. by Theorem 2, if we define

$$\rho_f := \sum_{j=1}^M (\Pi_j^A \otimes I) \rho (\Pi_j^A \otimes I), \quad (24)$$

then $\rho_f \neq \rho$ [11],[12],[20]. Henceforth, when we discuss the action of $\{\Pi_j^A\}$ on ρ_A , we are referring to the state $\sum_{j=1}^M \Pi_j^A \rho_A \Pi_j^A$. Now, let $\{\Pi_j^A\}$ be a complete projective measurement onto the eigenbasis of ρ_A . Then, $\{\Pi_j^A\}$ acts invariantly on ρ_A , and thus must alter T to ensure $\rho_f \neq \rho$. To see this, recall that one can write $\rho_A = \frac{1}{M}(I^A + \mathbf{r}^A \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}^A)$, from which it follows that if $\{\Pi_j^A\}$ acts invariantly on ρ_A , then it also acts invariantly on $\mathbf{r}^A \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}^A$ from Eqn. (22). Since all generators $\sigma_s^A \in \{W_r\}_r$ are diagonal, it follows that there must exist some $T_{st} \neq 0$ such that $\sigma_i^A \in \{U_{pq}, V_{pq}\}_{pq}$. We now use this fact to construct a LNU U^A achieving $d(\rho, U_A) > 0$.

Define unitary U^A as diagonal in the eigenbasis of ρ_A , i.e. $U^A = \sum_{k=1}^M e^{i\theta_k} |k\rangle\langle k|$, with eigenvalues to be chosen as needed. Then, $[U^A, \rho_A] = 0$ by construction, and so $U^A \otimes I^B$ must alter T through its action on ρ to ensure $\rho_f \neq \rho$. Focusing on T from Eqn. (22), we thus have:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s=1}^{M^2} \sum_{t=1}^{N^2} T_{st} U^A \sigma_s^A U^{A\dagger} \otimes \sigma_t^B = \\ \sum_{s=1}^{M^2} \sum_{t=1}^{N^2} T_{st} \left(\sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{n=1}^M e^{i(\theta_m - \theta_n)} \langle m | \sigma_s^A | n \rangle |m\rangle\langle n| \right) \otimes \sigma_t^B \end{aligned}$$

Analyzing each generator σ_s^A case by case, we find, for some

$1 \leq p < q \leq M$ or $1 \leq r \leq M - 1$:

$$\sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{n=1}^M e^{i(\theta_m - \theta_n)} \langle m | \sigma_s | n \rangle \langle m \rangle \langle n | = \begin{cases} \cos(\theta_p - \theta_q) U_{pq} - \sin(\theta_p - \theta_q) V_{pq} & \text{if } \sigma_s = U_{pq} \\ \sin(\theta_p - \theta_q) U_{pq} + \cos(\theta_p - \theta_q) V_{pq} & \text{if } \sigma_s = V_{pq} \\ W_r & \text{if } \sigma_s = W_r \end{cases}$$

Denoting by T^f the T matrix for ρ_f , we have:

$$T_{st}^f = \begin{cases} \cos(\theta_p - \theta_q) T_{st} + \sin(\theta_p - \theta_q) T_{wt} & \text{if } \sigma_s = U_{pq}, \text{ where } \sigma_w = V_{pq} \\ \cos(\theta_p - \theta_q) T_{st} - \sin(\theta_p - \theta_q) T_{wt} & \text{if } \sigma_s = V_{pq}, \text{ where } \sigma_w = U_{pq} \\ T_{st} & \text{if } \sigma_s = W_r. \end{cases}$$

Thus, if there exists an s such that $T_{st} \neq 0$ and $\sigma_s^A \in \{U_{pq}, V_{pq}\}_{pq}$, it follows that one can easily choose appropriate eigenvalues $e^{i\theta_p}$ and $e^{i\theta_q}$ for U^A such that $T^f \neq T$, implying $d_{\max}(\rho) > 0$. By our argument above for $\mathcal{D}(\rho) > 0$, such an s does in fact exist. \square

Observe that by the contrapositive of Theorem 3, it immediately follows that if $d_{\max}(\rho) = 0$, then $\mathcal{D}(\rho) = 0$. By our discussion in Section II, it follows that $\mathcal{D}(\rho) = 0$ for any product state $\rho = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B$, as expected.

To show now that the converse of Theorem 3 does not hold, we present an example of a zero discord state that has non-zero LNU measure. Consider the two qubit separable state

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{I_2 + \mathbf{a} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}}{2} \otimes \frac{I_2 + \mathbf{b} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}}{2} + \frac{I_2 - \mathbf{a} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}}{2} \otimes \frac{I_2 - \mathbf{b} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}}{2} \right),$$

where $\|\mathbf{a}\|_2 = \|\mathbf{b}\|_2 = 1$. This state, by construction, has zero discord for a single qubit measurement on either A or B . To see this, just consider the projective measurements

$$\left\{ \frac{I_2 \pm \mathbf{a} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}}{2} \right\}$$

on A . Let us now study the LNU distance for this state, with the local unitary being applied to say A . Notice that $\rho_A = \rho_B = I_2/2$, and $\text{Tr}(\rho^2) = 1/2$. The former implies that the set of allowed local unitaries is the whole of $SU(2)$, an element of which is given by Eq (7). Let us for convenience parameterize $\mathbf{a} = (0, 0, 1)$ and $\mathbf{b} = (\sin \gamma \cos \delta, \sin \gamma \sin \delta, \cos \gamma)$. Then, some algebra leads to

$$\text{Tr}(\rho \rho_f) = \frac{1}{2} \cos^2 \theta. \quad (25)$$

whose minimum is 0, whereby

$$d_{\max}(\rho) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}. \quad (26)$$

We thus have an example of a class of separable, zero discord states which demonstrates a non-zero shift under LNU. In fact, it attains the maximum shift possible for two-qubit separable states. Hence, if one wishes to define notions of non-classicality in quantum states in terms of ‘disturbance under measurement’ versus ‘disturbance under unitary operations’, and one chooses discord and the LNU distance as canonical quantifiers of such effects, respectively, then the resulting respective notions of non-classicality are not equivalent. As we have shown in Thm. 3, however, the quantum discord is a stronger such notion than the LNU criterion. We remark that if one is to consider such maximization of disturbance under unitary operations, then LNU are indeed a possibly fair choice of canonical quantifiers — otherwise, allowing *arbitrary* unitary operations without the restriction of Eqn. (1) would disturb even product states.

V. MEASURING CORRELATIONS VIA MEASUREMENT-INDUCED DISTURBANCE

The measure we intend to use in this section was presented by Luo in [16]. It relies on the disturbance of a quantum system under a generic measurement. In that sense, it is similar in spirit to quantum discord, but not quite. In the case of quantum discord, as per Eqn. (21), one maximizes over one-dimensional projective measurements on one of the subsystems. For the new measure, which we will call the measurement-induced disturbance (MID) measure, one performs measurements on *both* the subsystems, with the measurements being given by projectors onto the eigenvectors of the reduced subsystems. Then the MID measure of quantum correlations for a quantum state $\rho \in D(\mathcal{H}^M \otimes \mathcal{H}^N)$ is given by [16]

$$\mathcal{M}(\rho) := \mathcal{I}(\rho) - \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{P}(\rho)) \quad (27)$$

where

$$\mathcal{P}(\rho) := \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^N (\Pi_i^A \otimes \Pi_j^B) \rho (\Pi_i^A \otimes \Pi_j^B). \quad (28)$$

Here $\{\Pi_i^A\}, \{\Pi_j^B\}$ denote rank one projections onto the eigenbases of ρ_A and ρ_B , respectively. $\mathcal{I}(\sigma)$ is the quantum mutual information, which is considered to be the measure of total, classical and quantum, correlations in the quantum state σ . Since no optimizations are involved in this measure, it is much easier to calculate in practice than the quantum discord or the LNU distance, which involve optimizations over projective measurements and local unitaries respectively. The measurement induced by the spectral resolution leaves the entropy of the reduced states invariant and is, in a certain sense, the least disturbing. Actually, this choice of measurement even leaves the reduced states invariant [16]. Interestingly, for pure states,




FIG. 2: (Color online) The solid cyan line is the MID measure \mathcal{M} for the 2×4 Horodecki state from [21]. The dashed red line is the quantum discord \mathcal{D} for the same state [20]. The kink in the latter curve occurs at $p = 1/7$. We see here, as in the case of the DQC1 state, that the MID measure is greater than or equal to the quantum discord.

both the quantum discord and the MID measure reduce to the von-Neumann entropy of the reduced density matrix, which is a measure of bipartite entanglement.

As a nontrivial example, we will consider the well-known Horodecki bound entangled state in $2 \otimes 4$ dimensions [21]. It is bound entangled for all values of $0 \leq p \leq 1$, and the state is given as

$$\rho_H = \frac{1}{1+7p} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & p & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & p & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & p & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & p & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & p \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & p & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1+p}{2} & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{1-p^2}}{2} \\ p & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & p & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & p & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & p & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & p & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{1-p^2}}{2} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1+p}{2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

From this, the projectors onto eigenvectors of the reduced density matrices can be calculated to be

$$\begin{aligned} \{\Pi_1^A, \Pi_2^A\} &= \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}, \quad \text{and} \\ \{\Pi_1^B, \dots, \Pi_4^B\} &= \{ |\Psi^+\rangle\langle\Psi^+|, |\Psi^-\rangle\langle\Psi^-|, \\ &\quad |\Phi^+\rangle\langle\Phi^+|, |\Phi^-\rangle\langle\Phi^-| \}. \end{aligned}$$

where $|\Psi^\pm\rangle = (|11\rangle \pm |22\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and $|\Phi^\pm\rangle = (|00\rangle \pm |33\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ are two dimensional Bell states in the four dimen-

sional space. Using these in Eqn. (28), we can easily obtain

$$\mathcal{P}(\rho_H) = \frac{1}{1+7p} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & p & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & p & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & p & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1+p}{2} & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{1-p^2}}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & p & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & p & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{1-p^2}}{2} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1+p}{2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

This density matrix is different from the original one in that there are no coherences between the two subsystems, as is to be expected. The MID measure for this state can then easily be obtained analytically as $\mathcal{M}(\rho_H) = S(\mathcal{P}(\rho_H)) - S(\rho_H)$ and is plotted in Fig (2). In the same figure is shown the quantum discord for this state, when a measurement is made on the two-dimensional subsystem. For the details of its calculation, see Ref. [20]. As we see, there are nonclassical correlations in this state that are not distillable into maximally entangled Bell pairs. Another instance, dealt with next, is the DQC1 state, which for $\alpha < 1/2$ is, at best, bound entangled, having failed to show any entanglement by partial transposition criterion across any bipartite split. It even failed to show any entanglement at the second level of the scheme of [22]. It therefore might be possible to quantify the intrinsic information processing abilities of these bound entangled states using the measures dealt with in this paper.

A. MID measure in the DQC1 model

We now move on to calculate the MID measure in the DQC1 model. Our analysis extends that of [16], where only the case of $\alpha = 1$ was considered. Considering $\alpha < 1/2$ here will be of particular interest, due to the lack of distillable entanglement in the DQC1 state. Consequently, we start with the $n+1$ qubit DQC1 state, given by Eqn. (14), wherefrom

$$\rho_A = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \alpha\tau^* \\ \alpha\tau & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_B = I_n/2^n. \quad (29)$$

The projectors onto their respective eigenvectors are

$$\{\Pi_1^A, \Pi_2^A\} = \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & e^{-i\phi} \\ e^{i\phi} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -e^{-i\phi} \\ -e^{i\phi} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

where $\tau = r e^{i\phi}$ for $r = |\tau|$ is the normalized trace of U_n , i.e. $\tau = \text{Tr}(U_n)/2^n$, and

$$\{\Pi_j^B\} = \{E_j\} \quad \text{where} \quad [E_j]_{kl} = \delta_{kj}\delta_{lj}, \quad j, k, l = 1, \dots, 2^n.$$

Using this, we can calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}(\rho_{DQC1}) &= \sum_{j=1}^{2^n} \sum_{i=1}^2 (\Pi_i^A \otimes \Pi_j^B) \rho_{DQC1} (\Pi_i^A \otimes \Pi_j^B) \\
&= \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \sum_j \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \alpha d_j \\ \alpha d_j^* & 1 \end{pmatrix} \otimes E_j \\
&= \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \begin{pmatrix} I_n & \alpha D \\ \alpha D^\dagger & I_n \end{pmatrix} \quad (30)
\end{aligned}$$

where $d_j = (u_{jj}^* + e^{-2i\phi} u_{jj})/2$, with u_{jj} being the (j, j) th entry of U_n , and

$$D = \text{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_j, \dots).$$

Since D is diagonal, it is fairly easy to obtain the spectrum of $\mathcal{P}(\rho_{DQC1})$, which is given by

$$\lambda[\mathcal{P}(\rho_{DQC1})] = \left\{ \frac{1 \pm \alpha |d_i|}{2^{n+1}} \right\} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, 2^n. \quad (31)$$

Letting λ_k denote the k th entry of $\lambda[\mathcal{P}(\rho_{DQC1})]$, the von-Neumann entropy of this state is

$$\begin{aligned}
S(\mathcal{P}(\rho_{DQC1})) &= - \sum_{k=1}^{2^{n+1}} \lambda_k \log(\lambda_k) \\
&= n + 1 - \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \sum_{j=1}^{2^n} \left(\log(1 - \alpha^2 |d_j|^2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \alpha |d_j| \log \left(\frac{1 + \alpha |d_j|}{1 - \alpha |d_j|} \right) \right). \quad (32)
\end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$S(\rho_{DQC1}) = n + H_2 \left(\frac{1 - \alpha}{2} \right), \quad (33)$$

and the entropies of the partial density matrices being identical,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_{DQC1} &= \mathcal{I}(\rho_{DQC1}) - \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{P}(\rho_{DQC1})) \\
&= S(\mathcal{P}(\rho_{DQC1})) - S(\rho_{DQC1}) \\
&= 1 - H_2 \left(\frac{1 - \alpha}{2} \right) - \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \sum_i \left(\log(1 - \alpha^2 |d_i|^2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \alpha |d_i| \log \left(\frac{1 + \alpha |d_i|}{1 - \alpha |d_i|} \right) \right). \quad (34)
\end{aligned}$$

Here, $|d_i| = |u_{ii} \cos(\phi + \beta_i)|$ where $u_{ii} = r e^{i\beta_i}$ for $r = |u_{ii}|$. Given a unitary, which is known in any implementation of the DQC1 circuit, the above quantity can be computed easily. Not surprisingly, if the random unitary is diagonal, the measure \mathcal{M} for the DQC1 circuit actually reduces to its quantum discord (seen via Eqns. (12) and (13) of [13]). For a




FIG. 3: (Color online) The solid cyan line is the MID measure \mathcal{M} (Eqn. (34)) for the DQC1 circuit for a $n = 5$ qubit Haar distributed random unitary matrix. The blue dashed line is the analytic expression for the MID measure for DQC1 states with a Haar distributed random unitary matrix (Eqn. (35)). The dashed red line shows the discord \mathcal{D} in the DQC1 circuit with the same unitary. The solid green line shows the analytical expression in of quantum discord from [13]. All quantities are shown as functions of the purity of the control qubit.

Haar distributed random unitary matrix, $|u_{ii}| \sim 1/2^{n/2}$. In the asymptotic limit of large n , $|d_i| \rightarrow 0$, in which case the whole quantity within the summation in Eqn. (34) goes to zero. Then,

$$\mathcal{M}_{DQC1} = 1 - H_2 \left(\frac{1 - \alpha}{2} \right). \quad (35)$$

One fact immediately notable is that the above expression for the MID measure is independent of n , for large n . The result for a $n = 5$ qubit Haar distributed random unitary matrix is shown in Fig (3). As is evident, despite the approximations used in the derivation of Eqn. (35) the asymptotic analytic expression matches the numerical result at $n = 5$ quite well.

The MID measure for the DQC1 state across the bipartite split separating the top qubit from the rest is non-zero for all non-zero values of the polarization. Across this split, the DQC1 state is strictly separable [10] and possesses no entanglement. Hence, it is natural to propose the MID measure as a quantifier of the resource behind the quantum advantage in the DQC1 model [16]. As can be seen from Fig. (3), the behavior of the MID measure is qualitatively quite similar to that of the quantum discord. To argue that one is behind the quantum advantage in the DQC1 model as opposed to the other would be quite premature. Though both these measures attempt to capture the quantum feature of disturbance under measurement, they are quantitatively quite different. We will come back to this point in the following final section.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have analyzed two possible quantifiers of nonclassical correlations beyond quantum entanglement, specifically locally noneffective unitary operations [14], and the measurement-induced disturbance measure [16], and compared them to the quantum discord [11] within the context of the DQC1 circuit [9].

The LNU distance showed (Eqn. (17)) that there is little nonclassicality in the $n + 1$ qubit DQC1 state. This behavior is very similar to that of negativity in the DQC1 model which was used to characterize its entanglement [10]. The crucial difference is that the bipartite split chosen in Sec III is separable, and therefore exhibits no entanglement at all. As the LNU distance vanishes exponentially quickly with growing n , one is hard-pressed to relegate the role of the resource exponentially speeding up the DQC1 model to it. This does not, however, prove that this kind of quantum characteristic cannot be the resource behind other forms of quantum advantage.

The MID measure, on the other hand, is considerably more satisfactory. The zero-entanglement split in the DQC1 model is shown to have a non-zero amount of nonclassicality as per the MID measure. The magnitude of this measure, as shown in

Fig. (3), is a constant fraction of its maximum possible value. The maximum possible value, which is independent of the size of the system under consideration, is $\mathcal{M}_{max} = 1$, and is attained for the maximally entangled state. Indeed, for a perfectly pure top qubit $\alpha = 1$, the DQC1 state attains this value. The MID measure can thus be ascribed to be a quantifier of the correlations behind the speedup of the DQC1 model. Indeed, this has already been proposed in [16]. The MID measure, however, lacks a clear physical interpretation of the form of quantum discord, which motivates its operational significance as a measure of pure quantum correlations [23]. Further studies in this direction are required before a comprehensive conclusion can be reached.

Acknowledgements

AD thanks Carl Caves and Anil Shaji for numerous stimulating discussions. AD was supported in part by the US Office of Naval Research (Grant No. N00014-07-1-0304) and also by EPSRC (Grant No. EP/C546237/1), EPSRC QIP-IRC and the EU Integrated Project (QAP). SG was partially supported by Canada's NSERC, CIAR and MITACS.

-
- [1] R. Jozsa and N. Linden, Proc. Roy. Soc. A **459**, 2011 (2003).
 - [2] L. Masanes, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 150501 (2006).
 - [3] D. A. Meyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2014 (2000).
 - [4] E. Biham, G. Brassard, D. Kenigsberg, and T. Mor, Theor. Comput. Sci. **320**, 15 (2004).
 - [5] D. Kenigsberg, T. Mor, and G. Ratsaby, Quantum Inform. Comput. **6**, 606 (2006).
 - [6] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, C. A. Fuchs, T. Mor, E. Rains, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 1070 (1999).
 - [7] A. A. Methot and V. Scarani, Quantum Inform. Comput. **7**, 157 (2007).
 - [8] A. Ambainis, L. J. Schulman, and U. V. Vazirani, in *STOC* (2000), p. 697.
 - [9] E. Knill and R. Laflamme, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5672 (1998).
 - [10] A. Datta, S. T. Flammia, and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 042316 (2005).
 - [11] H. Ollivier and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 017901 (2002).
 - [12] L. Henderson and V. Vedral, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **34**, 6899 (2001).
 - [13] A. Datta, A. Shaji, and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 050502 (2008).
 - [14] L. Fu, Europhys. Lett. **75**, 1 (2006).
 - [15] S. Gharibian, H. Kampermann, and D. Bruß, arXiv:0809.4469 (2008).
 - [16] S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 022301 (2008).
 - [17] P. Diaconis, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **40**, 155 (2003).
 - [18] U. Fano, Rev. Mod. Phys. **55**, 855 (1983).
 - [19] F. T. Hioe and J. H. Eberly, Phys. Rev. Lett. **47**, 838 (1981).
 - [20] A. Datta, PhD Thesis, University of New Mexico, arxiv:0807.4490 (2008).
 - [21] P. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **232**, 333 (1997).
 - [22] A. C. Doherty, P. A. Parrilo, and F. M. Spedalieri, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 022308 (2004).
 - [23] W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 012320 (2003).
 - [24] The set of orthonormal eigenvectors of ρ_A will not be unique if the eigenvalues of ρ_A are degenerate. Hence, we fix some choice of eigenbasis for ρ_A as the "canonical" choice to be referred to throughout the rest of our discussion.