

The equivalence of two approaches to the design of entanglement distillation protocols.

Erik Hostens,* Jeroen Dehaene, and Bart De Moor
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, ESAT-SCD, Belgium
(Dated: October 2, 2018)

We show the equivalence of two approaches to the design of entanglement distillation protocols. The first approach is based on local unitary operations that yield permutations of tensor products of Bell states. The second approach is based on stabilizer codes.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Mn, 03.67.Pp, 03.67.Hk

I. INTRODUCTION

We describe a link between two approaches to the design of entanglement distillation protocols. The first approach, which we call *permutation based*, has its origins in Refs. [1, 2], where protocols are presented based on local operations that permute the 16 possible tensor products of 2 Bell states. This approach was generalized in Ref. [3] through a description in binary arithmetic of all locally realizable permutations of all tensor products of n Bell states. Several other protocols based on similar ideas as in Refs. [1, 2] have been proposed. We only mention Refs. [4, 5, 6, 7]. The second approach, which we call *code based*, derives distillation protocols from stabilizer codes as in Refs. [8, 9].

In the permutation based approach the protocol consists of unitary operations applied by Alice and Bob to their side of a number of qubit pairs (in some of the references above also higher dimensional systems are considered, but in this paper we will restrict ourselves to qubits), followed by a number of measurements on some of the pairs (single qubit measurements). The measurement outcomes are compared to decide if the protocol has succeeded. If two-way communication is possible, the protocol can be followed by new stages, possibly affecting more qubit pairs.

In the description of code based protocols a number of commuting joint measurements is performed by Alice and Bob (corresponding to measuring the syndrome of a stabilizer code). The measurement outcomes are compared in the same way as for the permutation based protocols. To end up with Bell states a final operation is needed at both sides that corresponds to the decoding operation of the stabilizer code.

We show that both approaches are in correspondence in the following way. If the measurement of the code based protocol is performed by first decoding, then doing qubit measurements and then encoding again, the protocol becomes equivalent to a permutation based protocol, as the encoding operation is canceled by the final decoding operation of the code based protocol. The decoding operator of a stabilizer code applied at both sides

yields a permutation of tensor products of Bell states. Conversely, every permutation based protocol can be interpreted as a code based protocol.

In this paper we will focus on two schemes presented in Refs. [3, 8] that represent the two approaches. In section II, we give an overview of some preliminary definitions and theorems. In section III, we describe the main results of the permutation based and the code based protocols, omitting the more detailed elaborations, as stated in Refs. [3, 8]. Both of them are slightly moderated in order to clearly show the equivalence, which is done in section IV.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Binary vector representation of products of Bell states

Bell states can be represented by assigning two-bit vectors to the Bell states as follows

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi^+\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle) = |B_{00}\rangle \\ |\Psi^+\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle + |10\rangle) = |B_{01}\rangle \\ |\Phi^-\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle - |11\rangle) = |B_{10}\rangle \\ |\Psi^-\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle) = |B_{11}\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

A tensor product of n Bell states can then be described by a $2n$ -bit vector, e.g. $|B_{010011}\rangle = |B_{00}\rangle|B_{11}\rangle|B_{01}\rangle = |\Phi^+\rangle|\Psi^-\rangle|\Psi^+\rangle$. Note that the first half of the subscript refers to the phase of the Bell states ("+" or "-"), and the second to $|\Phi\rangle$ or $|\Psi\rangle$.

An interesting feature is the correspondence between Bell states and Pauli matrices

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi^+\rangle &\rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sigma_{00} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sigma_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ |\Psi^+\rangle &\rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sigma_{01} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sigma_x = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ |\Phi^-\rangle &\rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sigma_{10} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sigma_z = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \\ |\Psi^-\rangle &\rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sigma_{11} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sigma_y = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

A tensor product of n Bell states is then described by a kronecker product of Pauli matrices, e.g. $|\Phi^+\rangle|\Psi^-\rangle|\Psi^+\rangle \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}}\sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x = \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}}\sigma_{00} \otimes \sigma_{11} \otimes \sigma_{01}$.

*Electronic address: erik.hostens@esat.kuleuven.ac.be

In the same way we can use longer vector subscripts to denote such kronecker products, e.g. $\sigma_{010011} = \sigma_{00} \otimes \sigma_{11} \otimes \sigma_{01}$. All the 4.4^n tensor products of Pauli matrices multiplied with a global phase $\in \{\pm 1, \pm i\}$ form the *Pauli group* \mathcal{P}_n .

The Pauli group and the group of binary vectors \mathbb{Z}_2^{2n} , are related to each other in the following way

$$\sigma_a \sigma_b \sim \sigma_{a+b}, \quad (3)$$

where " \sim " denotes equality up to a global phase [10]. Such a phase is irrelevant when these matrices represent pure state vectors. All addition of binary objects is done modulo 2.

Note that any two elements of the Pauli group either commute or anticommute. It can be easily verified that two Pauli matrices σ_a and σ_b commute if the *symplectic inner product* $a^T P b$ is equal to zero, or

$$\sigma_a \sigma_b = (-1)^{a^T P b} \sigma_b \sigma_a, \quad \text{where } P = \begin{bmatrix} 0_n & I_n \\ I_n & 0_n \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

B. Local permutations of products of Bell states

In general a pure bipartite state $|\psi\rangle$ of $2n$ qubits can be represented by a $2^n \times 2^n$ -matrix $\tilde{\Psi}$ (e.g. as in (2) for Bell states). Local unitary operations $|\psi\rangle \rightarrow (U_A \otimes U_B)|\psi\rangle$, in which Alice acts on her n qubits (jointly) with an operation U_A and Bob on his n qubits with an operation U_B , are then represented by

$$\tilde{\Psi} \rightarrow U_A \tilde{\Psi} U_B^T. \quad (5)$$

Interesting local unitary operations for the protocols under consideration are those that result in a permutation of the 4^n tensor products of n Bell states (up to a global phase). In Ref. [3] it is proven that if local unitary operations result in a permutation of the products of Bell states, this permutation can be represented in the binary vector representation as an affine symplectic operation

$$\begin{aligned} \phi : \mathbb{Z}_2^{2n} &\rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2^{2n} : Ax + b \\ \text{with } A &\in \mathbb{Z}_2^{2n \times 2n}, b \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{2n} \\ \text{and } A^T P A &= P \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

and that any such permutation ϕ can be realized by local unitary operations

$$\sigma_x \rightarrow U_A \sigma_x U_B^T = \sigma_{Ax+b}. \quad (7)$$

For an efficient way of doing this (by means of $O(n^2)$ one and two-qubit operations), we refer to Refs. [3, 10]. A matrix satisfying (6) is called *P-orthogonal* or *symplectic*.

The examined protocols result in a new mixture of tensor products of Bell states

$$\rho = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{2m}} p_x |B_x\rangle \langle B_x|. \quad (8)$$

The maximum value p_a of the p_x in (8) can be used as an entanglement measure. Note that one can always transform p_0 into this maximum value by applying at either Alice's or Bob's side the corresponding Pauli operator σ_a that rotates $|B_a\rangle \langle B_a|$ into $|B_0\rangle \langle B_0|$. We will call $p_0 = \langle B_0 | \rho | B_0 \rangle$ the *fidelity* F .

C. Stabilizer codes

A stabilizer S is a commutative subgroup of the Pauli group \mathcal{P}_n which does not contain -1 or $\pm i$. The stabilizer code $\mathcal{H}_S \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{2^n}$ associated with S is the *joint eigenspace* of all elements of S , or

$$|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_S \Leftrightarrow M|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle, \quad \forall M \in S. \quad (9)$$

The group S is called the stabilizer of the code, since it preserves all of the states in the code. If the stabilizer has $n - m$ independent generators M_i , the code space has dimension 2^m [11]. From the definition of S it follows that the eigenvalues of each M_i are $+1$ and -1 , with the same multiplicity.

Suppose an error $E \in \mathcal{P}_n$ has afflicted a state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_S$. If E and M_i commute, then

$$M_i E |\psi\rangle = E M_i |\psi\rangle = E |\psi\rangle, \quad (10)$$

so the error preserves the value $+1$ of M_i . If E and M_i anticommute, then

$$M_i E |\psi\rangle = -E M_i |\psi\rangle = -E |\psi\rangle, \quad (11)$$

so that the error flips the value of M_i , and the error can be detected by measuring M_i . Repeating this procedure for every generator M_i of S , we may write

$$M_i E = (-1)^{s_i} E M_i. \quad (12)$$

The s_i , $i = 1, \dots, n - m$ constitute a *syndrome* for the error E as $(-1)^{s_i}$ will be the result of measuring M_i if the error E has occurred. For recovery, a Pauli operator R is applied that has the same commutation relations with the M_i as E . Recovery is successful if $RE \in S$, in which case error + recovery has a trivial effect on states $\in \mathcal{H}_S$.

Measuring the syndrome s comes down to projecting onto the joint eigenspace of the M_i with eigenvalues s_i . Note that this eigenspace is the code space associated with the stabilizer with generators $(-1)^{s_i} M_i$. We will call this code space $\mathcal{H}_{S,s}$.

III. TWO SCHEMES FOR CREATING ENTANGLEMENT DISTILLATION PROTOCOLS

A. Permutation based protocols

A slightly generalized variant of the distillation protocols presented in Ref. [3] can be summarized as follows.

1. Start from a mixture of 4^n tensor products of Bell states. Typically, this is the tensor product of n identical independent Bell diagonal states.
2. Apply a permutation of these 4^n products of Bell states with local unitary transformations as described in the preceding section.
3. Check whether the last $n - m$ qubit pairs are $|\Phi\rangle$ or $|\Psi\rangle$ -states. This can be accomplished locally by measuring both qubits of each pair in the $|0\rangle, |1\rangle$ basis, and checking whether both measurements yield the same or the opposite result.
4. Perform m single-qubit Pauli operations to Bob's remaining qubits as described further. This comes down to rotating the resulting state (8) where p_a is maximal to a state where p_0 is maximal.
5. If the resulting state of the m remaining pairs satisfies a certain criterion (e.g. the fidelity exceeds a certain proposed value), keep them, otherwise, discard them. The result is a new mixture of 4^m products of Bell states.

Using the same techniques as in Ref. [3], one obtains the following. If Alice and Bob apply the above protocol, starting from an initial state

$$\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{2n}} p_x |B_x\rangle \langle B_x|, \quad (13)$$

the resulting state of the m remaining pairs after the measurement is

$$2^{n-m} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{2m}} \left(\frac{\sum_{x \in \mathcal{S} + PA^T P \bar{y}} p_x}{\sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}^\perp + PA^T P \bar{0}} p_x} \right) |B_y\rangle \langle B_y| \quad (14)$$

where \mathcal{S} is the subspace spanned by the rows of AP with indices $n + m + 1, \dots, 2n$ and \mathcal{S}^\perp is the subspace of all the binary vectors that have a symplectic inner product equal to zero with the elements of \mathcal{S} . Note that $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{S}^\perp$. $\bar{y} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{2n}$ is constructed from $y \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{2m}$ as follows

$$\bar{y} = \underbrace{y_1 y_2 \dots y_m}_{m} \underbrace{00 \dots 0}_{n-m} \underbrace{y_{n+1} y_{n+2} \dots y_{n+m}}_m \underbrace{t_1 t_2 \dots t_{n-m}}_{n-m}, \quad (15)$$

where t is the outcome of the measurements of the last $n - m$ qubit pairs, i.e. zeros where the measurements are the same, ones where they are opposite.

In step 4, Bob applies to his remaining m qubits the σ_a for which the coefficient of $|B_a\rangle \langle B_a|$ in (14) is maximal, or

$$a = \operatorname{argmax}_{y \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{2m}} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{S} + PA^T P \bar{y}} p_x \right). \quad (16)$$

Note that a solution is not unique: any element in the coset $a + \mathcal{S}$ will do. The resulting fidelity is then

$$F = 2^{n-m} \left(\frac{\sum_{x \in \mathcal{S} + PA^T P \bar{a}} p_x}{\sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}^\perp + PA^T P \bar{0}} p_x} \right). \quad (17)$$

B. Code based protocols

The protocols described in Ref. [8] are derived from a stabilizer S with generators σ_{g_i} for $i = 1, \dots, n - m$. In Ref. [8], the protocols are more generally defined for higher-dimensional systems (qudits). We only consider qubits here. The protocol goes as follows:

1. Alice measures the observable $\sigma_{g_i}^*$ for each i , where "*" stands for elementwise complex conjugation. Let $(-1)^{a_i}$ be the results of the measurements: they are the eigenvalues of the stabilizer code space $\mathcal{H}_{S^*,a}$ containing the state after measurement.
2. Bob measures the observable σ_{g_i} for each i . Let $(-1)^{b_i}$ be the eigenvalues of the stabilizer code space $\mathcal{H}_{S,b}$ containing the state after measurement.
3. Bob performs the error correcting process treating the string $s = (b_1 + a_1, \dots, b_{n-m} + a_{n-m}) \pmod{2}$ as a syndrome as described below.
4. Alice applies to her share of the qubit pairs the inverse of the encoding operator of $\mathcal{H}_{S^*,a}$. Bob applies the inverse of the encoding operator of $\mathcal{H}_{S,b}$ to his share.
5. They discard the last $n - m$ qubit pairs.
6. If the fidelity of the resulting state (which depends on the difference of the measurement outcomes $(b_1 + a_1, \dots, b_{n-m} + a_{n-m})$) of the m remaining pairs is large enough, they are kept, otherwise, discarded.

In step 3, Bob has to apply a recovery operator R treating the string s as a syndrome. R is defined as follows. Let C be the linear subspace of \mathbb{Z}_2^{2n} generated by g_1, \dots, g_{n-m} , and C^\perp the orthogonal space of C with respect to the symplectic inner product. Choose $v \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{2n}$ such that σ_v has commutation relations with the σ_{g_i} corresponding to s , or $v^T P g_i = s_i$. Now define u as the vector having maximum

$$\sum_{x \in C+u} p_x \quad (18)$$

in the coset $C^\perp + v$. Maximum fidelity (after step 5) is achieved if Bob applies $R = \sigma_u$ in step 3 and is equal to

$$F = 2^{n-m} \left(\frac{\sum_{x \in C+u} p_x}{\sum_{x \in C^\perp+v} p_x} \right). \quad (19)$$

IV. EQUIVALENCE OF THE TWO APPROACHES

We will first show that measuring the observables in the code based protocols can be carried out by local unitary operations that yield a permutation of the tensor products of the Bell states, followed by single qubit

measurements and the inverse of the local operations. Second, we show more specifically that the protocols of Refs. [3] and [8] have the same results, i.e. the formulas for the resulting fidelity in Refs. [3] and [8] are equivalent.

A. Observable measurements in the code based protocols

Let us first consider Bob's actions. A way of measuring the observables σ_{g_i} is by first applying U^\dagger , which is the inverse of the unitary coding operator U , then measuring the last $n - m$ qubits in the $|0\rangle, |1\rangle$ basis, and then applying U . For every $b \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{n-m}$, U transforms states

$$|\underbrace{00\dots 0}_m b_1 b_2 \dots b_{n-m}\rangle, \dots, |\underbrace{11\dots 1}_m b_1 b_2 \dots b_{n-m}\rangle \quad (20)$$

to a basis of the stabilizer code space $\mathcal{H}_{S,b}$. U satisfies

$$\sigma_{g_i} = U \sigma_{e_{m+i}} U^\dagger, \quad i = 1 \dots n - m, \quad (21)$$

where $e_{m+i} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{2n}$ has 1 in position $m + i$ and zeros elsewhere, or $\sigma_{e_{m+i}} = I^{\otimes(m+i-1)} \otimes \sigma_z \otimes I^{\otimes(n-m-i)}$. A way of efficiently implementing such coding operator U is explained in Ref. [12]. The U in (21) and the inverse of the coding operator U^\dagger in step 4 of the protocol cancel each other, so Bob only applies U^\dagger and then measures his last $n - m$ qubits.

In the same way, we can see that, in order to measure the observables $\sigma_{g_i}^*$, Alice applies U^T and then measures her last $n - m$ qubits. From $U_A = U^T$, $U_B = U^\dagger$ and (21) it follows that

$$\sigma_{e_{m+i}} = U_A \sigma_{g_i}^* U_B^T. \quad (22)$$

If we interpret the σ in this equation as representing tensor products of Bell states, we see with (6) and (7) that the local unitary transformations U_A and U_B yield in the binary picture a permutation ϕ , with

$$\phi(g_i) = e_{m+i}, \forall i. \quad (23)$$

Note that $\sigma_{g_i}^* \sim \sigma_{g_i}$ and these matrices represent the same pure states as a global phase is irrelevant.

B. Equivalence of the two schemes

To point out that formulas (17) and (19) are equivalent, we have to show that the subspaces \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{C} are the same and that the summations are done over the same cosets of $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{S}^\perp = \mathcal{C}^\perp$.

We define a symplectic matrix B with $B e_{m+i} = g_i$, which means that columns $m + 1$ through n are g_1, \dots, g_{n-m} . A matrix with these columns can always be completed to a symplectic matrix since S is a commutative group, and therefore we already have

that $g_i^T P g_j = 0, \forall i, j$. The inverse of this matrix is $B^{-1} = P B^T P$, which is also symplectic. B^{-1} defines the permutation realized by U_A and U_B . Note that fixing B by adding columns to B comes down to fixing bases of the stabilizer codes $\mathcal{H}_{S^*,a}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{S,b}$. The last $n - m$ rows of $B^{-1} P = P B^T$ are g_1, \dots, g_{n-m} , which means that \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{C} in (17) and (19) are the same.

We have $C^\perp + P B^{-T} P \bar{0} = C^\perp + v$ if $P B^{-T} P \bar{0} = B \bar{0}$ has symplectic inner products with g_1, \dots, g_{n-m} equal to s_1, \dots, s_{n-m} . We know from the definition of s and t that $s = t$. We then have

$$B \bar{0} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-m} s_i B_{n+m+i}, \quad (24)$$

with B_k the k -th column of B . We know from the symplecticity of B that B_{n+m+i} has symplectic inner product equal to zero with all the other columns of B except $B_{m+i} = g_i$, from which follows that $(B \bar{0})^T P g_i = s_i$.

In the same way it can be verified that $\forall y \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{2m} : B \bar{y} \in C^\perp + B \bar{0}$, or $C + B \bar{a} \subset C^\perp + B \bar{0}$ so the cosets $C + B \bar{a}$ and $C + u$ are the same since they are both cosets of C in C^\perp having maximum total probability of their elements.

V. CONCLUSION

We have compared two approaches to the design of entanglement distillation protocols. Although both approaches are based on different concepts, they turn out to be to a large extent equivalent.

Acknowledgments

Dr. Bart De Moor is a full professor at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium. Research supported by: Research Council KUL: GOA-Mefisto 666, GOA AM-BioRICS, several PhD/postdoc & fellow grants; Flemish Government: FWO: PhD/postdoc grants, projects, G.0240.99 (multilinear algebra), G.0407.02 (support vector machines), G.0197.02 (power islands), G.0141.03 (Identification and cryptography), G.0491.03 (control for intensive care glycemia), G.0120.03 (QIT), G.0452.04 (new quantum algorithms), G.0499.04 (Robust SVM), research communities (ICCoS, ANMMM, MLDM); AWI: Bil. Int. Collaboration Hungary/ Poland; IWT: PhD Grants, GBOU (McKnow); Belgian Federal Science Policy Office: IUAP P5/22 ('Dynamical Systems and Control: Computation, Identification and Modelling', 2002-2006) ; PODO-II (CP/40: TMS and Sustainability); EU: FP5-Quprodis; ERNSI; Eureka 2063-IMPACT; Eureka 2419-FlITE; Contract Research/agreements: ISMC/IPCOS, Data4s, TML, Elia, LMS, Mastercard.

-
- [1] C.H. Bennett, G. Brassard, S. Popescu, B. Schumacher, J.A. Smolin, and W.K. Wootters, *Purification of Noisy Entanglement and Faithful Teleportation via Noisy Channels*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 722-725 (1996).
- [2] C.H. Bennett, D.P. DiVincenzo, J.A. Smolin, and W.K. Wootters, *Mixed State Entanglement and Quantum Error Correction*, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824-3851 (1996).
- [3] J. Dehaene, M. Van den Nest, B. De Moor, and F. Verstraete, *Local permutations of products of Bell states and entanglement distillation*, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 022310 (2003).
- [4] E. Maneva and J.A. Smolin, *Improved two-party and multi-party purification protocols*, quant-ph/0003099.
- [5] D. Deutsch, A. Ekert, R. Josza, C. Macchiavello, S. Popescu, and A. Sanpera, *Quantum Privacy Amplification and the Security of Quantum Cryptography over Noisy Channels*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 2818-2821 (1996).
- [6] N. Metwally, *A more efficient variant of the Oxford protocol*, quant-ph/0109051.
- [7] K.G.H. Vollbrecht and F. Verstraete, *Interpolation of recurrence and hashing entanglement distillation protocols*, quant-ph/0404111.
- [8] R. Matsumoto, *Conversion of a general quantum stabilizer code to an entanglement distillation protocol*, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **36**, 8113-8127 (2003).
- [9] A. Ambainis and D. Gottesman, *Two-Way Entanglement Purification for Finite Block Size*, quant-ph/0310097.
- [10] J. Dehaene and B. De Moor, *The Clifford group, stabilizer states, and linear and quadratic operations over $GF(2)$* , Phys. Rev. A **68**, 042318 (2003).
- [11] D. Gottesman, *An Introduction to Quantum Error Correction*, quant-ph/0004072.
- [12] R. Cleve and D. Gottesman, *Efficient Computations of Encodings for Quantum Error Correction*, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 76-82 (1997).