

## LETTER TO THE EDITOR

# Cloning of observables

Alessandro Ferraro<sup>†</sup>, Matteo Galbiati<sup>‡</sup>, Matteo G. A. Paris<sup>†</sup>

<sup>†</sup> Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università di Milano, Italia.

<sup>‡</sup> STMicroelectronics, I-20041 Agrate Brianza (MI), Italia.

**Abstract.** We introduce the concept of cloning for *classes of observables* and classify cloning machines for qubit systems according to the number of parameters needed to describe the class under investigation. A no-cloning theorem for observables is derived and the connections between cloning of observables and joint measurements of noncommuting observables are elucidated. Relationships with cloning of states and non-demolition measurements are also analyzed.

Information may be effectively manipulated and transmitted by encoding symbols into quantum states. However, besides several advantages, the quantum nature of the transmitted signals entails some drawback, the most relevant being expressed by the so-called *no-cloning* theorem: Quantum information encoded in a set of nonorthogonal states cannot be copied [1, 2, 3]. In order to overcome this limitation an orthogonal coding may be devised, which however requires the additional control of the quantum channel, which generally degrades orthogonality of any set of input quantum signals.

A different scenario arises when one consider encoding information in the value of a set of observables, independently on the quantum state at the input. In a network of this kind there is no need of a precise control of the coding stage whereas, on the other hand, each gate should be *transparent*, *i.e.* should preserve the value of the involved observables. In this letter we address the problem of copying information that has been encoded in the values of a set of observables. For this purpose we introduce the concept of cloning machine for classes of observables and analyze in details the constraint imposed by quantum mechanics to this kind of devices. Two forms of a no-cloning theorem for observables will be derived, and the connections with cloning of states and joint measurements will be discussed.

We assume that information is encoded in the value of a set of qubit observables and consider a device in which a signal qubit (say, qubit "1") prepared in the (unknown) state  $\varrho$  interacts with a probe qubit ("2"), prepared in the known state  $\varrho_p$ , via a given unitary  $U$ . For a given class of qubit observables  $\mathbf{X} \equiv \{X(j)\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$  where  $\mathcal{J}$  is a subset of the real axis and  $X(j) \in \mathcal{L}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ , we introduce the following

**Definition 1 (Cloning machine for a class of observables)** *A cloning machine for the class of observables  $\mathbf{X}$  is a triple  $(U, \varrho_p, \mathbf{X})$  such that  $\bar{X}_1 = \bar{X}$ ,  $\bar{X}_2 = \bar{X} \forall \varrho$  and  $\forall X \in \mathbf{X}$ , where  $\bar{X} \equiv \text{Tr}_1[\varrho X]$ ,  $\bar{X}_1 \equiv \text{Tr}_{12}[R X \otimes I]$ ,  $\bar{X}_2 \equiv \text{Tr}_{12}[R I \otimes X]$  and  $R = U \varrho \otimes \varrho_p U^\dagger$  is the (entangled) state of the two qubits after the interaction.*

The definition above identifies the cloning of an observable with the cloning of its mean value. This is justified by the following

**Proposition 1** *For any single-qubit observable  $X$  the cloning of its mean value is equivalent to the cloning of the whole statistics.*

*Proof:* Any  $X \in \mathcal{L}[\mathbb{C}^2]$  has at most two distinct eigenvalues  $\{\lambda_0, \lambda_1\}$ , occurring with probability  $p_0, p_1$ . For a degenerate eigenvalue the statement is trivial. For two eigenvalues we have  $\bar{X} = \lambda_1 p_1 + \lambda_0 p_0$  which, together with the normalization condition  $1 = p_0 + p_1$ , proves the statement.  $\square$

In other words, we say that the class of observables  $\mathbf{X}$  has been cloned if a measurement of any  $X \in \mathbf{X}$  on either the two qubits at the output gives the same statistics as it was measured on the input signal qubit, independently on the initial qubit preparation.

Our goal is to classify cloning machines according to the number of parameters needed to fully specify the class of observables under investigation. Before beginning our analysis let us introduce the following proposition, which will be extensively used throughout the letter.

**Proposition 2** *Given a cloning machine  $(U, \varrho_p, \mathbf{X})$ , then  $(V, \varrho_p, \mathbf{Y})$  is a cloning machine too, where  $V = (W^\dagger \otimes W^\dagger)U(W \otimes I)$  and the class  $\mathbf{Y} = W^\dagger \mathbf{X} W$  is formed by the observables  $Y(j) = W^\dagger X(j) W$ ,  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . The transformation  $W$  may be a generic unitary.*

*Proof:* By definition  $\bar{Y}(j) = \text{Tr}_1[\varrho W^\dagger X(j) W] = \text{Tr}_1[W \varrho W^\dagger X(j)]$ . Then, since  $(U, \varrho_p, \mathbf{X})$  is a cloning machine, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Y}(j) &= \text{Tr}_{1,2}[U(W \varrho W^\dagger \otimes \varrho_p) U^\dagger (X(j) \otimes \mathbb{I})] \\ &= \text{Tr}_{1,2}[U(W \otimes \mathbb{I})(\varrho \otimes \varrho_p)(W^\dagger \otimes \mathbb{I}) U^\dagger (W \otimes W)(Y(j) \otimes \mathbb{I})(W^\dagger \otimes W^\dagger)] \\ &= \text{Tr}_{1,2}[V(\varrho \otimes \varrho_p) V^\dagger (Y(j) \otimes \mathbb{I})] = \bar{Y}_1(j). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

The same argument holds for  $\bar{Y}_2(j)$ .  $\square$

Another result which will be used in the following is the parameterization of a generic  $\text{SU}(4)$  transformation obtained by separating its local and entangling parts. A generic  $\text{SU}(4)$  matrix may be factorized as follows [4]:

$$U = L_2 U_E L_1 = L_2 \exp \left[ \frac{i}{2} \sum_{j=1}^3 \theta_j \sigma_j \otimes \sigma_j \right] L_1 \quad (2)$$

where  $\theta_j \in \mathbb{R}$  and the  $\sigma_j$ 's are the Pauli's matrices. The local transformations  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  belongs to the  $\text{SU}(2) \otimes \text{SU}(2)$  group, whereas  $U_E$  accounts for the entangling part of the transformation  $U$ . In our context, decomposition (2), together with proposition 2, allows to ignore the local transformations  $L_1$ , which corresponds to a different state preparation of signal and probe qubits at the input. On the other hand, as we will see in the following, the degree of freedom offered by the local transformations  $L_2$  will be exploited to design suitable cloning machines for noncommuting observables.

*One-parameter classes.* — Let us begin our analysis with a class constituted by only one observable  $A$ . Then, by Proposition 1 it follows that any cloning machine  $(U, \varrho_p, A)$  corresponds to a quantum non-demolition measurement of  $A$  itself, *i.e.* a measurement which introduces no back-action on the measured observable, thus allowing for repeated measurements. As an example, if  $A = \sigma_3$  then  $(U_C, |0\rangle\langle 0|, \sigma_3)$  is a cloning machine [5],  $U_C$  being the unitary performing the  $C_{not}$  gate. The proof is straightforward since  $\text{Tr}_2[(\mathbb{I} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|) U_C^\dagger (\sigma_3 \otimes \mathbb{I}) U_C] = \text{Tr}_2[(\mathbb{I} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|) U_C^\dagger (\mathbb{I} \otimes \sigma_3) U_C] = \sigma_3$ . The next step is to consider a generic one-parameter class of observables. At first we notice that  $(U_C, |0\rangle\langle 0|, \mathbf{X}_3)$  is a cloning machine for the class  $\mathbf{X}_3 = \{x_3 \sigma_3\}_{x_3 \in \mathbb{R}}$ . Using this result we can state the following ( $\sigma_0$  denotes the identity matrix)

**Theorem 1 (Cloning machine for a one-parameter class of observables):**

Given the class  $\mathbf{X}_A \equiv \{xA\}_{x \in \mathbb{R}}$ , with  $A = \sum_{k=0}^3 a_k \sigma_k$ , the triple  $(U_A, |0\rangle\langle 0|, \mathbf{X}_A)$  is a cloning machine, with  $U_A = (W_A^\dagger \otimes W_A^\dagger) U_C (W_A \otimes \mathbb{I})$ . The single-qubit unitary transformation  $W_A$  is given by  $W_A = \exp(i\phi \sum_{j=1}^2 n_j \sigma_j)$ , with  $n_2^2 = 1 - n_1^2$ ,  $n_1 = a_2 / \sqrt{a_1^2 + a_2^2}$  and  $\phi = \arccos \frac{a_3}{\sqrt{a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2}}$ .

*Proof:* At first notice that any observable of the form  $A' = \sum_{j=1}^3 a_j \sigma_j$  can be obtained from  $x_3 \sigma_3$  by a unitary transformation  $A' = W^\dagger x_3 \sigma_3 W$  as follows: take  $x_3 = \sqrt{a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2}$  and then consider the unitary  $W = W_A$ , the proof is by substitution. The theorem follows from Proposition 2 by reminding that  $(U_C, |0\rangle\langle 0|, \mathbf{X}_3)$  is a cloning machine and that the identity matrix is trivially cloned.  $\square$

*The set of all qubit observables.* — Consider now the  $n$ -parameter class  $\mathbf{X}_g = \{x_1 X(1) + \dots + x_n X(n)\}_{x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}}$ . Recall that the aim of a cloning machine for observables is to copy the expectation value of a generic linear combination  $X$  of the  $n$  observables  $X(j)$  i.e.  $X = x_1 X(1) + \dots + x_n X(n)$ . By decomposing each observable  $X(j)$  on the Pauli matrices basis  $X(j) = a_{j,0} \sigma_0 + a_{j,1} \sigma_1 + a_{j,2} \sigma_2 + a_{j,3} \sigma_3$  and reordering one obtains:  $X = y_0 \sigma_0 + y_1 \sigma_1 + y_2 \sigma_2 + y_3 \sigma_3$ , where  $y_k = \sum_{j=1}^n x_j a_{j,k}$ . From the expression above we see that at most a four-parameter class may be of interest, being any other class of observables embodied in that. Now the following operator counterpart of the usual no-cloning theorem for states can be formulated:

**Theorem 2 (No-cloning of observables I)** *A cloning machine  $(U, \varrho_p, \mathbf{X}_g)$  where  $\mathbf{X}_g$  is a generic  $n$ -parameter class of qubit observables does not exist.*

*Proof.* Let us reduce to a four-parameter class as above. Then the request  $\bar{X} = \bar{X}_1 = \bar{X}_2$  implies  $\text{Tr}_1 [\varrho \sigma_k] = \text{Tr}_{12} [R \sigma_k \otimes I] = \text{Tr}_{12} [R I \otimes \sigma_k] \quad \forall k$ , which in turn violates the no-cloning theorem for quantum states, since expresses the equality of the input Bloch vector with that of the two partial traces at the output.  $\square$

The results of theorems 1 and 2 permit to start a comparison among cloning machines for observables and for states. Let us write the generic input signal as  $\varrho = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_0 + \mathbf{s} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)$  and  $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, s_2, s_3)$  is the Bloch vector, and consider the cloning of the single-parameter class  $\mathbf{X}_3$  via  $(U_C, |0\rangle\langle 0|, \mathbf{X}_3)$ . The action of this cloning machine is the perfect copying of the component  $s_3$  of the Bloch vector  $\mathbf{s}$ , whereas the values of  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  are completely disregarded. The same situation occurs with any single-parameter class: a single component of the generalized Bloch vector is copied, upon describing the qubit in a suitable basis. When the whole class of qubit observables is considered, this requirement should be imposed to all the components and cannot be satisfied. Only approximate cloning is allowed for the entire state of a generic qubit, with the whole Bloch vector being shrunk by the same factor with respect to the initial Bloch vector  $\mathbf{s}$  [6, 7, 8, 9]. In the following we analyze intermediate situations between these two extrema.

*Two-parameter classes.* — In order to introduce the case of two-parameter class cloning machines, let us consider two specific classes:  $\mathbf{X}_{c_1} = \{x_0 \sigma_0 + x_3 \sigma_3\}_{x_0, x_3 \in \mathbb{R}}$  and  $\mathbf{X}_{nc} = \{x_1 \sigma_1 + x_2 \sigma_2\}_{x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}}$ . The first class is constituted by commuting observables, hence one expects no quantum constraints on cloning them. This is indeed the case, and an explicit representative of a cloning machine is given by  $(U_C, |0\rangle\langle 0|, \mathbf{X}_{c_1})$ . The statement follows by reminding that  $(U_C, |0\rangle\langle 0|, \mathbf{X}_3)$  is a cloning machine and by noticing that the identity matrix  $\sigma_0$  is trivially cloned by any cloning machine. As already noticed such a cloning machine copies the component  $s_3$  of the input

signal Bloch vector  $\mathbf{s}$ . On the other hand, consider the class  $\mathbf{X}_{\text{nc}}$ , constituted by noncommuting observables. If a cloning machine  $(U, \varrho_p, \mathbf{X}_{\text{nc}})$  existed, then the mean values as well as the statistics of any observable belonging to  $\mathbf{X}_{\text{nc}}$  would be cloned at its output (see proposition 1). As a consequence, one would jointly measure any two non-commuting observables belonging to  $\mathbf{X}_{\text{nc}}$  (e.g.,  $\sigma_1$  on the output signal and  $\sigma_2$  on the output probe) without any added noise, thus violating the bounds imposed by quantum mechanics [10, 11, 12]. Generalizing this argument to any two-parameter class of noncommuting observables (i.e., to any class  $\mathbf{X}_{\text{gnc}} = \{cC + dD\}_{c,d \in \mathbb{R}}$ , with  $C, D$  generic non-commuting observables), we then conclude with the following stronger version of Theorem 2:

**Theorem 3 (No-cloning of observables II)** *A cloning machine for a generic two-parameter class of noncommuting observables does not exist.*

The state-cloning counterpart of the Theorem above can be obtained by considering the class of observables  $\mathbf{X}_{\text{nc}}$ : If a cloning machine  $(U, \varrho_p, \mathbf{X}_{\text{nc}})$  existed, then the components  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  of Bloch vector  $\mathbf{s}$  would be cloned for any input signal. The same situation occurs in the case of a two-parameter class generated by any pair of Pauli operators. In other words, it is not possible to simultaneously copy a pair of components of the Bloch vector of a generic state, even completely disregarding the third one [13, 14].

By theorem 3, it is also clear that a three-parameter class of observables does not warrant further attention. In fact, a cloning machine for a three-parameter class of noncommuting observables does not exist, whereas a three-parameter class of commuting observables reduces to a two-parameter class (of commuting observables).

*Commuting observables.* — Concerning commuting observables, it turns out that the cloning machine introduced in theorem 1 for a generic single-parameter class of observables provides a cloning machine for a generic two-parameter class of commuting observables. In order to prove this statement let us first recall the relationship between two generic commuting observables:

**Proposition 3** *Given an observable  $A = \sum_{k=0}^3 a_k \sigma_k$ , then a generic observable  $B$  commuting with  $A$  is given by  $B = \sum_{k=0}^3 b_k \sigma_k$ , with  $b_1 = a_1 b_3 / a_3$  and  $b_2 = a_2 b_3 / a_3$  ( $b_0$  and  $b_3$  are free parameters) [15].*

*Proof.* It follows simply by imposing  $[A, B] = 0$ .  $\square$

Considering now two generic commuting observables  $A$  and  $B$ , one has the following Theorem.

**Theorem 4 (Cloning machine for a class of commuting observables)** *A cloning machine for the class  $\mathbf{X}_c = \{aA + bB\}_{a,b \in \mathbb{R}}$  with  $[A, B] = 0$  is given by  $(U_A, |0\rangle\langle 0|, \mathbf{X}_c)$ , where  $U_A$  is given in Theorem 1.*

*Proof.* Consider the decomposition of  $A$  in the Pauli basis, namely  $A = \sum_{k=0}^3 a_k \sigma_k$ , and define  $A_r = a_0 \sigma_0 + a_3 \sigma_3$ . By Proposition 3 one has that an observable  $B_r$  commuting with  $A_r$  must be of the form  $B_r = b_0 \sigma_0 + b_3 \sigma_3$ . The class of observables defined by  $A_r$  and  $B_r$ —i.e.,  $\mathbf{X}_{c_2} = \{aA_r + bB_r\}_{a,b \in \mathbb{R}}$ —coincides with the class  $\mathbf{X}_{c_1}$ . As a consequence, since  $(U_C, |0\rangle\langle 0|, \mathbf{X}_{c_1})$  is also a cloning machine, one has that  $(U_C, |0\rangle\langle 0|, \mathbf{X}_{c_2})$  is a cloning machine too. Now, following the proof of Theorem 1, one can easily show that  $\forall A$  there exists a unitary  $W_A$  such that  $A = W_A^\dagger A_r W_A$ . The corresponding transformation on  $B_r$  leads to  $W_A^\dagger B_r W_A = b_0 \sigma_0 + b_3 n_2 \sin \theta \sigma_1 - b_3 n_1 \sin \theta \sigma_2 + b_3 \cos \theta \sigma_3$ . Together with Proposition 3, the previous Equation explicitly shows that the observable  $B$ , defined as  $B = W_A^\dagger B_r W_A$ , is the most general observable

commuting with  $A$ . Hence, by Propositions 2 and recalling that  $U_A$  is defined as  $U_A = (W_A^\dagger \otimes W_A^\dagger) U_C (W_A \otimes \mathbb{I})$  the proof is completed.  $\square$

*Noncommuting observables and joint measurements.* — We already pointed out that no cloning machine exists for a two-parameter class of noncommuting observables (Theorem 3). On the other hand, analogously to state-cloning, we may introduce the concept of approximate cloning machines, that is cloning of observables involving added noise, and search for optimal approximate cloning machines.

**Definition 2 (Approximate cloning machine for a class of observables)** *An approximate cloning machine for the class of observables  $\mathbf{X}$  is a triple  $(U, \varrho_p, \mathbf{X})_{\text{apx}}$  such that  $\bar{X}_1 = \bar{X}/g_1$  and  $\bar{X}_2 = \bar{X}/g_2$  for any  $X \in \mathbf{X}$ . We refer to  $g_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2$  as the noise added by the cloning process.*

Let us begin by again considering the class  $\mathbf{X}_{\text{nc}} = \{x_1\sigma_1 + x_2\sigma_2\}_{x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}}$ . By using the decomposition of a generic  $SU(4)$  matrix in Eq. (2) one may attempt to find an approximate cloning machine considering only the action of the entangling kernel  $U_E$ . Unfortunately, it can be shown that no  $U_E$ ,  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  exist which realize approximate cloning for  $\varrho_p = |0\rangle\langle 0|$ . A further single-qubit transformation should be introduced after  $U_E$ . In particular, the unitary  $F = i/\sqrt{2}(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2)$  flips the Pauli matrices  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  (i.e.,  $F^\dagger\sigma_{1,2}F = \sigma_{2,1}$ ) and allows to state the following

**Proposition 4** *The unitary  $T = (\mathbb{I} \otimes F)U_{\text{nc}}$ , with  $U_{\text{nc}} = e^{i\frac{\theta}{2}(\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_1 - \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2)}$ , realizes the approximate cloning machine  $(T, |0\rangle\langle 0|, \mathbf{X}_{\text{nc}})_{\text{apx}}$  with added noises  $g_1 = 1/\cos\theta$  and  $g_2 = 1/\sin\theta$ .*

*Proof.* Let us start from the unitary  $(\mathbb{I} \otimes F)U_E$ , where  $U_E$  is a generic entangling unitary of the form given in Eq. (2). Then, by imposing approximate cloning for any  $X \in \mathbf{X}_{\text{nc}}$ , one obtains the following system of Equations:

$$g_1 \text{Tr}_2[(\mathbb{I} \otimes \varrho_p) U_E^\dagger (\sigma_1 \otimes \mathbb{I}) U_E] = \sigma_1 \quad (3a)$$

$$g_1 \text{Tr}_2[(\mathbb{I} \otimes \varrho_p) U_E^\dagger (\sigma_2 \otimes \mathbb{I}) U_E] = \sigma_2 \quad (3b)$$

$$g_2 \text{Tr}_2[(\mathbb{I} \otimes \varrho_p) U_E^\dagger (\mathbb{I} \otimes \sigma_2) U_E] = \sigma_1 \quad (3c)$$

$$g_2 \text{Tr}_2[(\mathbb{I} \otimes \varrho_p) U_E^\dagger (\mathbb{I} \otimes \sigma_1) U_E] = \sigma_2. \quad (3d)$$

System (3) admits the solution  $\theta_1 = -\theta_2 = \theta/2$ ,  $\theta_3 = 0$ —i.e.,  $U_E \equiv U_{\text{nc}}$  with  $\theta$  free parameter—with  $g_1 = 1/\cos\theta$  and  $g_2 = 1/\sin\theta$ . This completes the proof. Notice that other solutions for the  $\theta_{1,2,3}$ 's parameters may be found, which however give the same added noise as the one considered above.  $\square$

Remarkably, similar cloning machines may be obtained for any class of observables generated by a pair of operators unitarily equivalent to  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$ . Given the two-parameter classes of noncommuting observables defined as  $\mathbf{X}_V = \{cC + dD\}_{c, d \in \mathbb{R}}$ , with  $C = V^\dagger\sigma_1V$ ,  $D = V^\dagger\sigma_2V$  and  $V$  generic unitary one has the following Theorem.

**Theorem 5 (Approximate cloning machine for noncommuting observables)** *The triple  $(U_V, |0\rangle\langle 0|, \mathbf{X}_V)_{\text{apx}}$ , with  $U_V = (V^\dagger \otimes V^\dagger)(\mathbb{I} \otimes F) U_{\text{nc}} (V \otimes \mathbb{I})$ , is an approximate cloning machine with added noises  $g_1 = 1/\cos\theta$  and  $g_2 = 1/\sin\theta$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from Propositions 4 and 2.  $\square$

Similar theorems hold for classes unitarily generated by any pair of (noncommuting) Pauli operators.

A question arises about optimality of approximate cloning machines for noncommuting observables. In order to assess the quality and to define optimality of a triple  $(U, \varrho_p, \mathbf{X})_{\text{apx}}$  we consider it as a tool to perform a joint measurements of noncommuting qubit observables [16]. For example, consider the cloning machine  $(T, |0\rangle\langle 0|, \mathbf{X}_{\text{nc}})_{\text{apx}}$  and suppose to measure  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  on the two qubits at the output. We emphasize that the cloning machine  $(T, |0\rangle\langle 0|, \mathbf{X}_{\text{nc}})_{\text{apx}}$  clones every observable belonging to  $\mathbf{X}_{\text{nc}}$ , while we are now considering only the observables  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  which, in a sense, generate the class. We have that the measured expectation values of  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  at the output are given by  $\langle \sigma_h \rangle_{\text{m}} = g_h \langle \sigma_h \rangle$  (with  $h = 1, 2$ ), where the  $\langle \sigma_h \rangle$ 's are the input mean values. It follows that the uncertainties  $(\Delta O = \langle O^2 \rangle - \langle O \rangle^2)$  at the output are given by  $\Delta_{\text{m}}\sigma_h = g_h^2 \Delta_i\sigma_h$  where  $\Delta_i\sigma_h$  denote the intrinsic uncertainties for the two quantities at the input. Since for any Pauli operators we have  $\sigma_h^2 = \mathbb{I}$  one may rewrites  $\Delta_{\text{m}}\sigma_1 = \tan^2 \theta + \Delta_i\sigma_1$ , and  $\Delta_{\text{m}}\sigma_2 = \cot^2 \theta + \Delta_i\sigma_2$ . As a consequence, the measured uncertainty product is given by:  $\Delta_{\text{m}}\sigma_1 \Delta_{\text{m}}\sigma_2 = \Delta_i\sigma_1 \Delta_i\sigma_2 + \cot^2 \theta \Delta_i\sigma_1 + \tan^2 \theta \Delta_i\sigma_2 + 1$ . Since the arithmetic mean is bounded from below by the geometric mean we have  $\cot^2 \theta \Delta_i\sigma_1 + \tan^2 \theta \Delta_i\sigma_2 \geq 2\sqrt{\Delta_i\sigma_1 \Delta_i\sigma_2}$ , with the equal sign iff  $\Delta_i\sigma_1 = \tan^4 \theta \Delta_i\sigma_2$ , then it follows that  $\Delta_{\text{m}}\sigma_1 \Delta_{\text{m}}\sigma_2 \geq (\sqrt{\Delta_i\sigma_1 \Delta_i\sigma_2} + 1)^2$ . If the initial signal is a minimum uncertainty state—*i.e.*,  $\Delta_i\sigma_1 \Delta_i\sigma_2 = 1$ —one finally has that the measured uncertainty product is bounded by  $\Delta_{\text{m}}\sigma_1 \Delta_{\text{m}}\sigma_2 \geq 4$ . An optimal joint measurement corresponds to have  $\Delta_{\text{m}}\sigma_1 \Delta_{\text{m}}\sigma_2 = 4$ . In our case this is realized when  $\theta$  is chosen such that  $\tan^4 \theta = \Delta_i\sigma_1 / \Delta_i\sigma_2$ . Therefore, since  $(T, |0\rangle\langle 0|, \mathbf{X}_{\text{nc}})_{\text{apx}}$  adds the minimum amount of noise in a joint measurement performed on minimum uncertainty states we conclude that it is an optimal approximate cloning machine for the class under investigation. An optimal approximate cloning machine for the more general class  $\mathbf{X}_{\text{gnc}}$  may be also defined, using the concept of joint measurement for noncanonical observables [16].

Finally, let us consider the comparison with a joint measurement of  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  performed with the aid of an optimal universal cloning machine for states [6]. It is easy to show that the best result in this case is given by  $\Delta_{\text{m}}\sigma_1 \Delta_{\text{m}}\sigma_2 = \frac{9}{2}$ , indicating that cloning of observables is more effective than cloning of states to perform joint measurements (for the case of three observables see Refs. [17, 18]). In fact, a symmetric cloning machine for states shrinks the whole Bloch vector  $\mathbf{s}$  by a factor  $\frac{2}{3}$ , whereas a cloning machine for observables shrinks the components  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  of  $\mathbf{s}$  only by a factor  $1/\sqrt{2}$  (considering equal noise  $g_1 = g_2 = \sqrt{2}$ ). Notice that such a behavior is different from what happens in the case of continuous variables, for which the optimal covariant cloning of coherent states also provides the optimal joint measurements of two conjugated quadratures [19]. This is due to the fact that coherent states are fully characterized by their complex amplitude, that is by the expectation values of two operators only.

In conclusion, the concepts of exact and approximate cloning for a class of observables have been introduced and developed. Explicit realizations of cloning machines have been found for classes of commuting observables. Two no-cloning theorems for observables have been derived and approximate cloning machines for classes of noncommuting observables have been also found, which realize optimal joint measurements.

## References

- [1] D. Dieks, Phys. Lett. A **92**, 271 (1982).

- [2] W. K. Wootters and W. H. Zurek, *Nature* **299**, 802 (1982).
- [3] G. C. Ghirardi and T. Weber, *Nuovo Cim. B* **78**, 9 (1983).
- [4] see e.g. R. R. Tucci, e-print quant-ph/0507171.
- [5] T.C. Ralph *et al.*, e-print, quant-ph/0412149 .
- [6] V. Buzek and M. Hillery, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 1844 (1996).
- [7] N. Gisin, S. Massar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 2153 (1997).
- [8] F. Werner, *Phys. Rev. A* **58**, 1827 (1998).
- [9] D. Bruss et al, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 2598 (1998).
- [10] E. Arthurs, J. L. Kelly, *Bell. Sys. Tech. J.* **44**, 725 (1965).
- [11] E. Arthurs, M. S. Goodman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, 2447 (1988).
- [12] H. P. Yuen, *Phys. Lett. A* **91**, 101 (1982).
- [13] P. Kienzler, *Int. J. Th. Phys.* **37**, 257 (1998).
- [14] D. M. Appleby, *Int. J. Th. Phys.* **39**, 2231 (2000).
- [15] The roles of  $a_{1,2,3}$  can be interchanged to avoid singularities.
- [16] G. Bjork et al., *Phys. Rev. A* **60**, 1874 (1999); A. Trifonov et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 4423 (2001);
- [17] V. Buzek et al, *Phys. Rev. A* **56**, 3446 (1997).
- [18] G. M. D'Ariano et al, *J. Opt. B* **3**, 44 (2001).
- [19] N. J. Cerf et al, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85** 1754 (2000).