

Finding optimal strategies for minimum-error quantum-state discrimination

M. Ježek, J. Řeháček*, and J. Fiurášek

Department of Optics, Palacky University, 17. listopadu 50, 77200 Olomouc, Czech Republic

(October 24, 2018)

We propose a numerical algorithm for finding optimal measurements for quantum-state discrimination. The theory of the semidefinite programming provides a simple check of the optimality of the numerically obtained results. With the help of our algorithm we calculate the minimum attainable error rate of a device discriminating among three particularly chosen non-symmetric qubit states.

Nonorthogonality of quantum states is one of the basic features of quantum mechanics. Its deep consequences are reflected in all quantum protocols. For instance, it is well known that perfect decisions between two nonorthogonal states cannot be made. This has important implications for the information processing at the microscopic level since it sets a limit on the amount of information that can be encoded into a quantum system. Although perfect decisions between nonorthogonal quantum states are impossible, it is of importance to study measurement schemes performing this task in the optimum, though imperfect, way.

Two conceptually different models of decision tasks have been studied. The first one is based on the minimization of the Bayesian cost function, which is nothing but a generalized error rate [1]. In the special case of linearly independent pure states, the second model — unambiguous discrimination of quantum states — makes an interesting alternative. The latter scheme combines the error-less discrimination with a certain fraction of inconclusive results [2–4].

Ambiguous as well as unambiguous discrimination schemes have been intensively studied over the past few years. In consequence, the optimal measurements distinguishing between pair, trine, tetrad states, and linearly independent symmetric states are now well understood [5,7,6,8–17]. Many of the theoretically discovered optimal devices have already been realized experimentally, mainly with polarized light [18–21]. As an example of the practical importance of the optimal decision schemes let us mention their use for the eavesdropping on quantum cryptosystems [22,23].

The purpose of this paper is to develop universal method for optimizing ambiguous discrimination between generic quantum states.

Assume that Alice sets up M different sources of quantum systems living in p -dimensional Hilbert space. The complete quantum-mechanical description of each source

is provided by its density matrix. Alice chooses one of the sources at random using a chance device and sends the generated quantum system to Bob. Bob is also given M numbers $\{\xi_i\}$ specifying probabilities that i -th source is selected by the chance device. Bob is then required to tell which of the M sources $\{\rho_i\}$ generated the quantum system he had obtained from Alice. In doing this he should make as few mistakes as possible.

It is well known [1] that each Bob's strategy can be described in terms of an M -component probability operator measure (POM) $\{\Pi_j\}$, $0 < \Pi_i < 1$, $\sum_j \Pi_j = 1$. Each POM element corresponds to one output channel of Bob's discriminating apparatus. The probability that Bob points his finger at the k -th source while the true source is j is given by the trace rule: $P(k|j) = \text{Tr}\rho_j\Pi_k$. Taking the prior information into account, the average probability of Bob's success in repeated experiments is

$$P_s = \sum_{j=1}^M \xi_j \text{Tr}\rho_j\Pi_j. \quad (1)$$

Since the objective is to keep Bob's error rate as low as possible we should maximize this number over the set of all M -component POMs. In compact form the problem reads:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{maximize } P_s \text{ subject to constraints} \\ &\Pi_j \geq 0, \quad j = 1 \dots M, \\ &\sum_j \Pi_j = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Unfortunately, attacking this problem by analytical means has chance to succeed only in the simplest cases ($M = 2$) [1], or cases with symmetric or linearly independent states [5,10,15,17,24]. In most situations one must resort to numerical methods. In the following we will use the calculus of variations to derive a simple iterative algorithm that provides a convenient way of dealing with the problem (2). This approach has already found its use in the optimization of teleportation protocols [25] and maximum-likelihood estimation of quantum measurements [26]. We are going to seek the global maximum of the success functional P_s subject to the constraints given in Eq. (2). To take care of the first constraint we will decompose the POM elements as follows $\Pi_j = A_j^\dagger A_j$, $j = 1 \dots M$. The other constraint (completeness) can be incorporated into our model using the method of uncertain Lagrange multipliers. Putting all things together, the functional to be maximized becomes

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_j \xi_j \text{Tr}\{\rho_j A_j^\dagger A_j\} - \text{Tr}\{\lambda \sum_j A_j^\dagger A_j\}, \quad (3)$$

*e-mail: rehacek@phoenix.inf.upol.cz

where λ is a Hermitian Lagrange operator. This expression is now to be varied with respect to M independent variables A_j to yield a necessary condition for the extremal point in the form of a set of M extremal equations for the unknown POM elements: $\xi_j \rho_j \Pi_j = \lambda \Pi_j$, $j = 1 \dots M$. For our purposes it is advantageous to bring these equations to an explicitly positive semidefinite form,

$$\Pi_j = \xi_j^2 \lambda^{-1} \rho_j \Pi_j \rho_j \lambda^{-1}, \quad j = 1 \dots M. \quad (4)$$

Lagrange operator λ is obtained by summing Eq. (4) over j ,

$$\lambda = \left(\sum_j \xi_j \rho_j \Pi_j \rho_j \right)^{1/2}. \quad (5)$$

The iterative algorithm comprised of the $M+1$ equations (4) and (5) is the main formal result of this paper. One usually starts from some ‘‘unbiased’’ trial POM $\{\Pi_j^0\}$. After plugging it in Eq. (5) the first guess of the Lagrange operator λ is obtained. This operator is, in turn, used in Eq. (4) to get the first correction to the initial-guess strategy $\{\Pi_j^0\}$ [27]. The procedure gets repeated, until, eventually, a stationary point is attained. Notice that both the positivity and completeness of the initial POM are preserved in the course of iterating.

Since equations (4) and (5) represent only a necessary condition for the extreme, one should always check the optimality of the stationary point. In the following we will make use of the theory of the semidefinite programming (SDP) [28] to derive a criterion of the optimality of the iteratively obtained POM, which turns out to be the well-known Helstrom condition [1]. SDP theory also provides alternative means of solving the problem (2) numerically.

Recently, it has been pointed out [29] that many problems of the quantum-information processing can be formulated as SDP problems. For instance, let us compare our original problem (2) to the SDP dual problem that is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} \quad -\text{Tr} F_0 Z, \\ & Z \geq 0, \\ & \text{Tr} F_i Z = c_i, \quad i = 1 \dots m, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where data are $m+1$ Hermitian matrices F_i and a complex vector $c \in \mathbb{C}^m$, and Z is a Hermitian variable. As can be easily checked, our problem (2) reduces to a dual SDP problem upon the following substitutions:

$$\begin{aligned} F_0 &= -\bigoplus_{j=1}^m \xi_j \rho_j, & Z &= \bigoplus_{j=1}^m \Pi_j, \\ F_i &= \bigoplus_{j=1}^m \Gamma_i, & c_i &= \text{Tr} \Gamma_i, \quad i = 1 \dots p^2. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Here operators $\{\Gamma_i, i = 1 \dots p^2\}$ comprise an orthonormal operator basis in the p^2 -dimensional space of Hermitian operators acting in the Hilbert space of our problem: $\text{Tr} \Gamma_j \Gamma_k = \delta_{jk}$, $j, k = 1 \dots p^2$. For simplicity, let us take Γ_1 proportional to the unity operator, then all c_i apart from c_1 vanish.

An important point is that there exists a primal problem associated with the dual one,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} \quad c^T x, \\ & F(x) = F_0 + \sum_i x_i F_i \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Here data F_i and c_i are the same as in Eq. (6), and vector x is now the variable.

The advantage of the SDP formulation of the quantum-state discrimination problem is that there are strong numerical tools designed for solving SDP problems. In particular, these methods are guaranteed to converge to the real solution. This might become important when the iterative algorithm derived above encounters convergence problems.

A primal (dual) SDP problem is called ‘‘strictly feasible’’ if there exists x (Z) satisfying the constraints in Eq. (8) [Eq. (6)] with sharp inequalities. One can easily check that both the primal and dual problems associated with the quantum-state discrimination problem are strictly feasible. Hence we can use a powerful result of SDP theory saying that in this case, x is optimal if and only if x is primal feasible and there is a dual feasible Z such that

$$ZF(x) = 0. \quad (9)$$

This condition is called the complementary slackness condition. Now, taking x_i to be the coordinates of the Lagrange operator λ in Γ_i basis, $x_i = \text{Tr} \lambda \Gamma_i$, $i = 1 \dots p^2$, the complementary slackness condition is seen to be equivalent to the extremal equation. Since the dual feasibility of the iteratively obtained POM elements is guaranteed by construction, our extremal equation becomes a necessary and sufficient condition on the maximum of P_s once the positive semidefiniteness of $F(x)$ is verified. In terms of states and POM elements this latter condition reads:

$$\lambda - \xi_j \rho_j \geq 0, \quad j = 1 \dots M \quad (10)$$

One perceives that complementary slackness condition (9) together with the criterion of optimality (10) are nothing else than the well-known Helstrom equations [1] for POM maximizing the success probability (1).

Let us illustrate the utility of our algorithm on a simple, albeit nontrivial example of discriminating between three non-symmetric coplanar qubit states. The geometry of this problem is shown in Fig. 1.




FIG. 1. A cut through the Bloch sphere showing the states to be discriminated.

Ψ_1 and Ψ_2 taken to be equal-prior states, $\xi_1 = \xi_2 = \xi/2$, symmetrically placed around the z axis; the third state lies in the direction of x or y . A similar configuration (with Ψ_3 lying along z) has recently been investigated by Andersson *et al.* [17]. Exploiting the mirror symmetry of their problem the authors derived analytic expressions for POMs minimizing the average error rate. For a given angle φ the optimum POM turned out to have two or three nonzero elements depending on the amount of the prior information ξ .

Our problem is a bit more complicated one due to the lack of the mirror symmetry. Let us see whether the transition from the mirror-symmetric configuration to a non-symmetric one has some influence on the qualitative behavior of the optimal POMs. Minimal error rates calculated using the proposed iterative procedure [Eqs. (4) and (5)] for the fixed angle of $\varphi = \pi/16$ are summarized in Fig. 2.




FIG. 2. Average error rate ($1 - P_s$) in dependence on Bob's prior information ξ ; $\varphi = \pi/16$. Regions I, II, and III are regions where the optimum discriminating device has two, three, and two output channels, respectively.

The conclusions that can be drawn from the numerical results partly coincide with that of Ref. [17]. For large ξ (region III) the optimum strategy consist in the optimal discrimination between states Ψ_1 and Ψ_2 . When ξ becomes smaller than a certain φ -dependent thresh-

old (region II), state Ψ_3 can no longer be ignored and the optimum POM has three nonzero elements. Simple calculation yields

$$\xi_{\text{II,III}} = \frac{1}{1 + \sin \varphi \cos \varphi} \quad (11)$$

for the threshold value of the prior. However, when ξ becomes still smaller (region I), the optimum POM will eventually become a two-element POM again – the optimal strategy now being the optimal discrimination between states Ψ_1 and Ψ_3 . This last regime is absent in the mirror-symmetric case. The transition between regions I and II is governed by a much more complicated expression than Eq. (11), and will not be given here. We will close the example noting that already a few iterations are enough to determine the optimum discriminating device to the precision the elements of the realistic experimental setup can be controlled with in the laboratory.

In this paper we derived a simple iterative algorithm for finding optimal devices for quantum-state discrimination. Utility of our procedure was illustrated on a non-trivial example of discriminating between three non-symmetric states. From the mathematical point of view, the problem of quantum-state discrimination is a problem of the semidefinite programming. Such correspondence is a good news since there exist robust numerical tools designed to deal with SDP problems. These can substitute our iterative algorithm in the very few exceptional cases (if there are any) where our procedure might suffer from the convergence problems.

This work was supported by grant No. LN00A015 and project CEZ:J14/98 “Wave and particle optics” of the Czech Ministry of Education.

-
- [1] C.W. Helstrom, Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory (Academic Press, New York, 1976).
 - [2] I.D. Ivanovic, Phys. Lett. A **123**, 257 (1987).
 - [3] D. Dieks, Phys. Lett. A **126**, 303 (1988).
 - [4] A. Peres, Phys. Lett. A, **128**, 19 (1988).
 - [5] H.P. Yuen, R.S. Kennedy, and M. Lax, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **IT-21**, 125 (1975).
 - [6] A. Chefles, Phys. Lett. A **239**, 339 (1998).
 - [7] A. Chefles and S.M. Barnett, J. Mod. Opt. **45**, 1295 (1998).
 - [8] A. Chefles and S.M. Barnett, Phys. Lett. A **250**, 223 (1998).
 - [9] L.S. Phillips, S.M. Barnett, and D.T. Pegg, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 3259 (1998).
 - [10] M. Sasaki, K. Kato, M. Izutsu, and O. Hirota, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 1246 (1998).
 - [11] A. Chefles, Contemp. Phys. **41**, 401 (2000); preprint at arXiv:quant-ph/0010114.
 - [12] J. Walgate, A.J. Short, L. Hardy, and V. Vedral, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 4972 (2000).

- [13] S. Virmani, M.F. Sacchi, M.B. Plenio, and D. Markham, Phys. Lett. A **288**, 62 (2001).
- [14] S. Zhang, Y. Feng, X. Sun, and M. Ying, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 062103 (2001).
- [15] S.M. Barnett, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 030303(R) (2001).
- [16] A. Chefles, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 062305 (2001).
- [17] E. Andersson, S.M. Barnett, C.R. Gilson, and K. Hunter (2002), preprint at arXiv:quant-ph/0201074.
- [18] B. Huttner, A. Muller, J.D. Gautier, H. Zbinden, and N. Gisin, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3783 (1996).
- [19] S.M. Barnett and E. Riis, J. Mod. Opt. **44**, 1061 (1997).
- [20] R.B.M. Clarke, A. Chefles, S.M. Barnett, and E. Riis, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 040305(R) (2001).
- [21] R.B.M. Clarke, V.M. Kendon, A. Chefles, S.M. Barnett, E. Riis, and M. Sasaki, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 012303 (2001).
- [22] A. Ekert, B. Huttner, G.M. Palma, and A. Peres, Phys. Rev. A **50**, 1047 (1994).
- [23] M. Dušek, M. Jahma, and N. Lütkenhaus, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 022306 (2000).
- [24] M. Ban, K. Kurokawa, R. Momose, and O. Hirota, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **36**, 1269 (1997).
- [25] J. Řeháček, Z. Hradil, and J. Fiurášek, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 060301 (2001).
- [26] J. Fiurášek, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 024102 (2001).
- [27] It is interesting to note that when the initial POM is chosen to be the maximally ignorant one, $\Pi_j^0 = 1/M$, $j = 1 \dots M$, the first correction is, in fact, the “pretty good” measurement introduced by P. Hausladen and W.K. Wootters, J. Mod. Opt. **41**, 2385 (1994). Interestingly enough, this measurement is known to be optimal in certain cases [24].
- [28] L. Vandenberghe and S. Boyd, Semidefinite programming, SIAM Review **38**, 49 (1996).
- [29] E.M. Rains, IEEE Trans. Inform. Th. **47**, 2921 (2001); K. Audenaert and B. De Moor (2001), preprint at arXiv:quant-ph/0109155; A.C. Doherty, P.A. Parrilo, and F.M. Spedalieri (2001), preprint at arXiv:quant-ph/0112007.