

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

**Dynamical Aspects of Information Storage
in Quantum-Mechanical Systems**

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Field of Electrical and Computer Engineering

By

Maxim Raginsky

EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

June 2002

© Copyright by Raginsky, Maxim 2002
All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Dynamical Aspects of Information Storage in Quantum-Mechanical Systems

Maxim Raginsky

We study information storage in noisy quantum registers and computers using the methods of statistical dynamics. We develop the concept of a strictly contractive quantum channel in order to construct mathematical models of physically realizable, i.e., nonideal, quantum registers and computers. Strictly contractive channels are simple enough, yet exhibit very interesting features, which are meaningful from the physical point of view. In particular, they allow us to incorporate the crucial assumption of finite precision of all experimentally realizable operations. Strict contractivity also helps us gain insight into the thermodynamics of noisy quantum evolutions (approach to equilibrium). Our investigation into thermodynamics focuses on the entropy-energy balance in quantum registers and computers under the influence of strictly contractive noise. Using entropy-energy methods, we are able to appraise the thermodynamical resources needed to maintain reliable operation of the computer. We also obtain estimates of the largest tolerable error rate. Finally, we explore the possibility of going beyond the standard circuit model of error correction, namely constructing quantum memory devices on the basis of interacting particle systems at low temperatures.

Acknowledgments

Following the hallowed tradition, first I would like to thank my thesis advisor and mentor, Prof. Horace P. Yuen, who not only profoundly influenced my thinking and the course of my career as a graduate student, but also impressed upon me this very important lesson: in scientific research, one should never blindly defer to “authority,” but rather work everything out for oneself. Next I would like to thank Profs. Prem Kumar and Selim M. Shahriar for serving on my final examination committee, Dr. Giacomo M. D’Ariano (University of Pavia, Italy) for serving on my qualifying examination committee and for a careful reading of this dissertation, which resulted in several improvements, Dr. Viacheslav Belavkin (University of Nottingham, United Kingdom) for interesting discussions, and Dr. Masanao Ozawa (Tohoku University, Japan) for valuable comments on my papers. I also gratefully acknowledge the support of the U.S. Army Research Office for funding my research through the MURI grant DAAD19-00-1-0177.

Most of my research was conceived and done in the many coffeehouses of Evanston and Urbana-Champaign. Therefore some credit is due the following fine establishments: in Evanston, the Potion Liquid Lounge (now unfortunately defunct), Unicorn Café, and Kafein; in Urbana-Champaign, the Green Street Coffeehouse and Café Kopi (which also serves alcohol).

During the three years I have spent at Northwestern as a grad student, I have had a chance to meet some interesting characters, with whom it was a real pleasure to discuss the Meaning of Life and other, less substantial, matters, often over a pint or two of Guinness. These people are: Jeff Browning, Eric Corndorf, Yiftie Eisenberg, Vadim Moroz, Ranjith Nair, Boris Rubinstein, Jay Sharping, Brian Taylor, and Laura Tiefenbruck. Did I forget anyone? It is also a pleasure to thank my friends outside Northwestern, for believing in me and for being there. This one goes out to the high-school crew: Mark Friedgan, Alex Rozenblat, Mike Sandler, Ilya Sutin, and Arthur Tretyak.

I owe a great deal of gratitude to my parents, Margarita and Anatoly Raginsky, who always encouraged my interest in science and mathematics, and to my brother Alex, with whom I made a bet that I would earn my doctorate by the time he graduated from high school. Fork over the fifty bucks, dude! And, last but not least, I would like to thank my parents-in-law, Rosa and Vladimir Lazebnik, and my sister-in-law, Masha, for their support.

Finally, I must admit that above all I cherish and value the love of my wonderful wife Lana. I dedicate this dissertation to her.

To Lana

Contents

ABSTRACT	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
1 Introduction	1
2 Basic notions of quantum information theory	6
2.1 Classical systems vs. quantum systems	6
2.1.1 Algebras of observables	7
2.1.2 Pure and mixed states	9
2.2 Channels	14
2.2.1 Definitions	14
2.2.2 Examples	16
2.2.3 The theorems of Stinespring and Kraus	19
2.2.4 Duality between channels and bipartite states	22
2.3 Distinguishability measures for states	25
2.3.1 Trace-norm distance	25
2.3.2 Jozsa-Uhlmann fidelity	27
2.3.3 Quantum detection theory	28
2.4 Distinguishability measures for channels	31
2.4.1 Norm of complete boundedness	31
2.4.2 Channel fidelity	33
3 Strictly contractive channels	38
3.1 Relaxation processes and channels	39
3.2 Strictly contractive channels	41
3.2.1 Definition	41
3.2.2 Examples	43
3.2.3 Strictly contractive channels on $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2)$	44
3.2.4 The density theorem for strictly contractive channels	47
3.3 Strictly contractive dynamics of quantum registers and computers	49
3.4 Error correction and strictly contractive channels	51
3.4.1 The basics of quantum error correction	51

3.4.2	Impossibility of perfect error correction	54
3.4.3	Approximate error correction	56
3.5	Implications for quantum information processing	58
3.5.1	General considerations	58
3.5.2	Case study: ensemble quantum computation using nuclear magnetic resonance	59
3.5.3	Where do we go from here?	62
4	Entropy-energy arguments	64
4.1	Definition and properties of entropy	64
4.2	The Gibbs variational principle and thermodynamic stability	67
4.3	Entropy-energy arguments and quantum information theory	69
4.4	Entropy-energy balance and the maximum number of operations	72
4.5	Thermodynamic stability of large-scale quantum computers	77
4.6	Putting it all in perspective	80
5	Information storage in quantum spin systems	82
5.1	Toric codes and error correction on the physical level	82
5.2	Laying out the ingredients	84
5.3	Putting it together	85
5.4	Summary	87
6	Conclusion	89
	Appendix A: Mathematical background	92
A.1	C*-algebras	92
A.2	States, representations, and the GNS construction	93
A.3	Trace ideals of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$	95
A.4	Fixed-point theorems	96
	Appendix B: List of symbols	98
	Bibliography	99
	Vita	109

List of Figures

1.1	Orbits defined by input density operators ρ and σ in the state space $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ of the quantum system with the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} in the case of (a) noiseless (reversible, unitary) channel; and (b) noisy (irreversible, non-unitary) channel.	3
2.1	Using entanglement to distinguish between quantum channels.	33
3.1	The effect of a strictly contractive channel T on the state space $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ of the quantum system.	42
5.1	Square lattice on a torus.	83

Introduction

Quantum memory will be a key ingredient in any viable implementation of a quantum information-processing system (computer). However, because any quantum computer realized in a laboratory will necessarily be subject to the combined influence of environmental noise and unavoidable imprecisions in the preparation, manipulation, and measurement of quantum-mechanical states, reliable storage of quantum information will prove to be a daunting challenge. Indeed, some authors [95, 139] found that circuit-based quantum computation (i.e., a temporal sequence of local unitary transformations, or quantum gates [8]) is extremely vulnerable to noisy perturbations. The same noisy perturbations will also adversely affect information stored in quantum registers (e.g., between successive stages of a computation).

Therefore, since it was first realized that maintaining reliable operation of a large-scale quantum computer would pose a formidable obstacle to any experimental realization thereof, many researchers have expended a considerable amount of effort devising various schemes for “stabilization of quantum information.” These schemes include, e.g., quantum error-correcting codes [68], noiseless quantum codes [150], decoherence-free subspaces [78], and noiseless subsystems [69]. (The last three of these schemes boil down to essentially the same thing, but are arrived at by different means.) Each of these schemes relies for its efficacy upon explicit assumptions about the nature of the error mechanism. Quantum error-correcting codes [68], for instance, perform best when different qubits in the computer are affected by independent errors. On the other hand, stabilization strategies that are designed to handle collective errors [69, 78, 150] make extensive use of symmetry arguments in order to demonstrate existence of “noiseless subsystems” that are effectively decoupled from the environment, even though the computer as a whole certainly remains affected by errors.

In a recent publication [148], Zanardi gave a unified description of all of the above-mentioned schemes via a common algebraic framework, thereby reducing the conditions for efficient stabilization of quantum information to those based on symmetry considerations. The validity of this framework will ultimately be decided by experiment, but it is also

quite important to test its applicability in a theoretical setting that would require minimal assumptions about the exact nature of the error mechanism, and yet would serve as an abstract embodiment of the concept of a physically realizable (i.e., nonideal) quantum computer.

In this respect, the assumption of finite precision of all physically realizable state preparation, manipulation, and registration procedures is particularly important, and can even be treated as an empirical given. This premise is general enough to subsume (a) fundamental limitations imposed by the laws of quantum physics (e.g., impossibility of reliable discrimination between any two density operators with nonorthogonal supports), (b) practical constraints imposed by the specific experimental setting (e.g., impossibility of synthesizing any quantum state or any quantum operation with arbitrary precision), and (c) environment-induced noise.

As a rule, imprecisions in preparation and measurement procedures will give rise to imprecisions in the building blocks of the computer (quantum gates) because the precision of any experimental characterization of these gates will always be affected by the precision of preparation and measurement steps involved in any such characterization. Conversely, the precision of quantum gates will affect the precision of measurements because the closeness of conditional probability measures, conditioned on the gate used, is bounded above by the closeness of the two quantum gates [11].

Incorporation of the finite-precision assumption into the mathematical model of noisy quantum memories and computers has to proceed in two directions. On the one hand, we must characterize the sensitivity of quantum information-processing devices to small perturbations of both states and operations. This is important for the following reasons. First, any unitary operation required for a particular computational task must be *approximated* by several unitary operations taken from the set of universal quantum gates [8]. Since any quantum computation is a long sequence of unitary operations, approximation errors will propagate in time, and the resultant state at the end of the computation will differ from the one that would be generated by the “ideal” computer. This issue was addressed by Bernstein and Vazirani [11] who found that if a sequence of gates G_1, G_2, \dots, G_n is approximated by the sequence G'_1, G'_2, \dots, G'_n , where the i th approximating gate G'_i differs from the “true” gate G_i by ϵ_i , then the corresponding resultant states will differ by at most $\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2 + \dots + \epsilon_n$. Secondly, in the case of noisy computation, each gate will be perturbed by noise, thus resulting in additional error. This situation was handled by Kitaev [66], with the same conclusion: errors accumulate at most linearly. Therefore, if we approximate the gates sufficiently closely, and if the noise is sufficiently weak, then we can hope that the resulting error in the output state will be small. The same reasoning can be applied to perturbations of initial states: if two states differ by ϵ , then the corresponding output states will also differ by at most ϵ . However, these conclusions are hardly surprising; they are, in fact, simple consequences of the continuity of quantum channels and expectation values.

There is, on the other hand, another aspect of the noiseless/noisy dichotomy, which has been so far largely overlooked. Assuming for simplicity that all operations in the quantum system (register or computer) take place at integer times, each initial state (density operator) ρ_0 defines an *orbit* in the state space of the system, i.e., a sequence $\{\rho_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ where ρ_n is the state of the system at time n . According to the circuit model of a




Figure 1.1: Orbits defined by input density operators ρ and σ in the state space $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ of the quantum system with the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} in the case of (a) noiseless (reversible, unitary) channel; and (b) noisy (irreversible, non-unitary) channel.

quantum computer, each time step of the computation is a unitary channel. Now consider a pair of initial states ρ_0, σ_0 . Then, by unitary invariance of the trace norm (cf. Section 2.3.1), we will have

$$\|\rho_n - \sigma_n\|_1 = \|\rho_0 - \sigma_0\|_1, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In other words, *the output states of a noiseless quantum system are distinguishable from one another exactly to the same extent as the corresponding input states*. However, this is not the case for general (non-unitary) channels. Such channels are described by trace-preserving completely positive maps (cf. Ch. 2) and, for any such map T on density operators, we have $\|T(\rho) - T(\sigma)\|_1 \leq \|\rho - \sigma\|_1$ [113]. A noisy quantum system can be modeled by replacing a unitary channel at each time step with a general completely positive trace-preserving map. In this case, we will have

$$\|\rho_{n+1} - \sigma_{n+1}\|_1 \leq \|\rho_n - \sigma_n\|_1, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N},$$

whence we see that, *for the case of a noisy quantum system, the output states are generally less distinguishable from one another than the corresponding input states. Furthermore, distinguishability can only decrease with each time step*. In other words, the distance between two disjoint orbits in the state space of the system will remain constant in the absence of noise, and shrink when noise is present. Both situations are depicted in Fig. 1.1.

The discussion above suggests that, apart from insensitivity to small perturbations of states and operations, we should also pay attention to *insensitivity to initial conditions*, i.e., the situation where two markedly different input density operators will, over time, evolve into effectively indistinguishable output density operators due to the rapid shrinking of the distance between the corresponding orbits in the state space. One of the central goals of this dissertation is to investigate noisy channels with the property that *any two orbits* get uniformly exponentially close to each other with time. In a sense, this is the “worst” kind of noise because it renders the result of any sufficiently lengthy computation essentially useless, as it cannot be distinguished reliably from the result due to any other input state. Noisy channels with this property will be referred to as *strictly contractive*.

Why do we choose to focus on this seemingly extreme noise model? First of all, as we will show later on, any noisy channel can be approximated arbitrarily closely by a strictly

contractive channel, such that the two cannot be distinguished by any experimental means. Essentially this implies that if a given noiseless channel is perturbed to a noisy one, we may as well assume that the latter is strictly contractive. Secondly, we wish to incorporate the finite-precision assumption into our mathematical framework. In particular, we want our model to be such that, in the presence of noise, there is always a *nonzero* probability of making an error when attempting to distinguish between any two quantum states, even when these states are, in principle, maximally distinguishable. As we will demonstrate, this desideratum is fulfilled by strictly contractive channels. Finally, the strictly contractive model provides a tool for investigations into the *statistical dynamics* of noisy quantum channels. In particular, the model already accommodates two important ingredients for a theory of approach to equilibrium, namely ergodicity and mixing (cf. [72] or [108, pp. 54-60, 237-243]).

Let us quickly recall these notions and outline the way they relate to noisy quantum systems. The content of the so-called *ergodic hypothesis* of statistical mechanics can be succinctly stated as the equivalence of statistical averages and time averages. Physicists usually take the pragmatic approach, assuming that the ergodic hypothesis holds in any physically meaningful situation (cf., e.g., [74, p. 4]). Rigorous proofs of ergodicity have been obtained only for very few cases (see, e.g., Sinai and Chernov [126]), none of which are particularly interesting. The sad fate of the ergodic programme in classical Hamiltonian mechanics had been sealed further by the famous Kolmogorov-Arnold-Moser (KAM) theorem [120, p. 155], which states that the majority of Hamiltonian evolutions do not satisfy the ergodic hypothesis.¹ Quantum systems (spin systems in particular), however, still serve as fruitful soil for various investigations into ergodic theory [4, Ch. 7]. Discrete-time quantum channels are especially amenable to such studies; a general quantum channel T on density operators is termed ergodic² if there exists a unique density operator ρ_T such that $T(\rho_T) = \rho_T$. If $\{\rho_n\}$ is an orbit generated by an ergodic channel T , then it can be shown that, for any observable A , the time average $\frac{1}{N+1} \sum_{n=0}^N \langle A \rangle_n$, where $\langle A \rangle_n := \text{tr}(A\rho_n)$, converges to the fixed-point average $\langle A \rangle_T := \text{tr}(A\rho_T)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

There exists also a stronger property, called *mixing*. In simple terms, a channel T is mixing if, for any observable A , we have $\langle A \rangle_n \rightarrow \langle A \rangle_T$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Mixing obviously implies ergodicity, but the converse is not necessarily true. It turns out that strictly contractive channels are mixing, and hence ergodic. One of the most original thinkers on the subject of statistical physics, Nikolai Krylov, believed [72] that mixing, rather than ergodicity, should play central role in the theory of approach to equilibrium. In particular, he emphasized the importance of the so-called *relaxation time*, i.e., the time after which the system will be found, with very high probability, in a state very close to equilibrium. He showed that mixing, and not ergodicity, is necessary for obtaining correct estimates of the relaxation time. Qualitatively we can say that approach to equilibrium should be

¹Incidentally, it has recently been noted by Novikov [92] that the results of Kolmogorov, Arnold, and Moser *have not been fully proved*. One can only wonder whether this will revive the research into the ergodic hypothesis for classical Hamiltonian systems.

²An alternative (and, in many respects, more natural) definition of ergodicity can be formulated for transformations of observables, i.e., for the Heisenberg picture of quantum dynamics.

exponentially fast, as confirmed by experimental evidence, and this is precisely the feature that strictly contractive channels will be shown to possess.

One of our central results is the following: errors modeled by strictly contractive channels cannot be corrected perfectly. This result, while of a negative nature, does not come as a complete surprise: in a nonideal setting, impossibility of perfect error correction can only be expected. We will, however, present an argument that some form of “approximate” error correction will still be useful in many circumstances. In particular, we will discuss the possibility of either (a) going beyond the circuit model of quantum computation, or (b) finding ways to introduce enough parallelism into our quantum information processing so as to finish any job we need to do before the effect of errors becomes appreciable.

In this respect we will mention an intriguing possibility of realizing quantum information processing in massively parallel arrays of interacting particles (quantum cellular automata [109]). One advantage furnished by such systems is the possibility of a phase transition, i.e., a marked change in macroscopic behavior that occurs when the values of suitable parameters cross some critical threshold. In the classical case, the stereotypical example is provided by the two-dimensional Ising ferromagnet which, at sufficiently low temperatures, can “remember” the direction of an applied magnetic field even after the field is turned off. This phenomenon is, of course, at the basis of magnetic storage devices. The concept of a quantum phase transition [115] is tied to the ground-state behavior of perturbed quantum spin systems on a lattice and refers to an abrupt change in the macroscopic nature of the ground state as the perturbation strength is varied. We will discuss this concept in greater detail later on; here we only mention that existence of a quantum phase transition can be exploited fruitfully for reliable storage of quantum information in the subcritical region at low temperatures (assuming that the ground state carries sufficient degeneracy, so as to accommodate the necessary amount of information).

The dissertation is organized as follows. In Chapter 2 we give a quick introduction to the mathematical formalism of quantum information theory. Then, in Chapter 3, we discuss strictly contractive quantum channels. Chapter 4 is devoted to the study of noisy quantum registers and computers in terms of the entropy-energy balance. In particular, we give an entropic interpretation of strict contractivity for bistochastic strictly contractive channels. In Chapter 5 we briefly comment on the possibility of reliable storage of quantum information in spin systems on a lattice. Concluding remarks are given in Chapter 6. The necessary mathematical background is collected in Appendix A; Appendix B contains the list of symbols used throughout the dissertation.

Basic notions of quantum information theory

In this chapter we introduce the abstract formalism of quantum information theory. But, before we proceed, it is pertinent to ask: what exactly *is* quantum information? Here is a definition taken from an excellent survey article of Werner [144].

Quantum information is that kind of information which is carried by quantum systems from the preparation device to the measuring apparatus in a quantum-mechanical experiment.

Of course, this definition is somewhat vague about the general notion of “information,” but we can take the pragmatic approach and say that the information about a given physical system includes the specification of the initial state of the system, as well as any other knowledge that can be used to *predict* the state of the system at some later time. Note that we are not talking about any quantitative measures of “information content.” For this reason, such notions as channel capacity will be conspicuously absent from our presentation. For a lucid account of quantum channel capacity, the reader is referred to the surveys of Bennett and Shor [10] and Werner [144].

2.1 Classical systems vs. quantum systems

Classical systems are distinguished from their quantum counterparts through such characteristics as size (macroscopic vs. microscopic) or the nature of their energy spectrum (continuous vs. discrete). For example, an electromagnetic pulse sent through an optical fiber can be thought of as classical, whereas a single photon sent through the fiber is regarded as quantum. The most conspicuous differences, however, are revealed through the statistics of experiments performed upon these systems. For instance, the joint probability distribution of a number of classical random variables always has the form of a limit of

convex combinations of product probability distributions, but this is generally not so in the quantum case.

In this section we introduce the mathematical formalism necessary for capturing the essential features of classical and quantum systems. Our exposition closely follows Werner's survey [144]. The requisite background on operator algebras is collected in Appendix A.

2.1.1 Algebras of observables

For each physical system we need an abstract description that would account not only for the classical/quantum distinction, but also for such features as the structure of the set of all possible configurations of the system. Such a description is possible through defining the *algebra of observables* of the system. In order to cover both classical and quantum systems, we will require from the outset that their algebras of observables be C*-algebras with identity. For the moment, we do not elaborate on the reasons for this choice, hoping that they will become clear as we go along.

Anyone who has taken an introductory course in quantum mechanics knows that the presence of noncommuting observables is the most salient feature of the quantum formalism. Therefore we take for granted that the algebra of observables of a quantum system must be noncommutative, whereas the algebra of observables of a classical system must be commutative (abelian). Thus, without loss of generality, the algebra of observables of a quantum system is the algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ of bounded operators on some Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , whereas the corresponding algebra for a classical system is the algebra $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$ of continuous complex-valued functions on a compact set \mathcal{X} .¹

Let us illustrate this high-level statement with some concrete examples. First we treat the simplest classical case, namely the classical bit. Here the set \mathcal{X} is the two-element set $\{0, 1\}$, and the corresponding algebra of observables is the set of all complex-valued functions on $\{0, 1\}$. We can think of an element of this algebra of observables as a random variable defined on the two-element sample space \mathcal{X} . The simplest example of a quantum system, the quantum bit (or *qubit*) is furnished by considering a two-dimensional complex Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} \simeq \mathbb{C}^2$, and the algebra of observables is nothing but the set \mathcal{M}_2 of 2×2 complex matrices.

In general, the structure of the configuration space of the system is reflected in the set \mathcal{X} (in the classical case) or the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} (in the quantum case). Thus a set \mathcal{X} with $|\mathcal{X}| = n$ would be associated to a classical system with an n -element configuration space; similarly, the underlying Hilbert space of a spin- S quantum object would be $(2S + 1)$ -dimensional. We can also describe systems with countably infinite or uncountable configuration spaces, e.g., the classical Heisenberg spin with the set \mathcal{X} being \mathbb{S}^2 (the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^3), or a single mode of an electromagnetic field with the Hilbert space isomorphic to the space ℓ^2 of square-summable infinite sequences of complex numbers. For simplicity let us suppose that, from now on, the algebras of observables with which we

¹We have allowed ourselves a simplification which consists in requiring that the set \mathcal{X} be compact; this is not the case for a general abelian C*-algebra, where the set \mathcal{X} can be merely a locally compact space, but, because we have assumed that any algebra of observables must have an identity, the set \mathcal{X} will, in fact, be compact.

deal are finite-dimensional. This implies that, if we are dealing with the algebra $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$, then the set \mathcal{X} is finite; similarly, given the algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} must be finite-dimensional.

For the purposes of calculations it is often convenient to expand elements of an algebra in a basis. A canonical basis for $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$ is the set of functions $e_x, x \in \mathcal{X}$, defined by

$$e_x(y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = y \\ 0 & \text{if } x \neq y \end{cases}, \quad (2.1)$$

so that any function $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$ can be expanded as $f = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x)e_x$. A basis for $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is constructed by picking any orthonormal basis $\{e_i\}$ for \mathcal{H} and defining the “standard matrix units” $e_{ij} := |e_i\rangle\langle e_j|$. Thus for any $X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ we have $X = \sum_{i,j} X_{ij}e_{ij}$ with $X_{ij} \in \mathbb{C}$.

In order to describe composite systems, i.e., systems built up from several subsystems, we need a way of combining algebras to form new algebras. Let us consider bipartite systems first, starting with the classical case. Suppose we are given two classical systems, Σ_1 and Σ_2 , with configuration spaces \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} respectively. Then the configuration of the joint system, $\Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2$, is characterized by giving an ordered pair $(x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y})$. Thus the configuration space of the joint system is simply the Cartesian product $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, i.e., the set of all ordered pairs of the kind described above. The corresponding algebra of observables is $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$, i.e., the algebra of functions $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Any element f of this algebra can be written in the form

$$f = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}} f(x, y)e_{xy}, \quad (2.2)$$

where the basis functions e_{xy} are defined in the manner similar to Eq. (2.1). Furthermore, for any $x' \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y' \in \mathcal{Y}$ we have $e_{xy}(x', y') = e_x(x')e_y(y')$. On the other hand, a general element of the tensor product $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X}) \otimes \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{Y})$ has the form

$$f = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}} f(x, y)e_x \otimes e_y. \quad (2.3)$$

Directly comparing Eqs. (2.2) and (2.3), we see that $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X}) \otimes \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{Y}) \simeq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$.

In the quantum case we start by taking the tensor product of the Hilbert spaces of the subsystems. Consider two quantum systems with the Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} . Let $\{e_i\}$ and $\{e_\mu\}$ be orthonormal bases of \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} respectively. Then the set $\{e_i \otimes e_\mu\}$ is the corresponding orthonormal basis of the tensor product space $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K}$. A typical element of the algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K})$ has the form

$$X = \sum_{i,j,\mu,\nu} X_{ij,\mu\nu} e_{ij} \otimes e_{\mu\nu},$$

and a typical element of the product algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ has a similar form. Thus we conclude that $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K}) \simeq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$.

In both the classical case and the quantum case we see that the algebra of observables of the bipartite system, whose subsystems are assigned algebras \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , has the form $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$. Algebras of observables for multipartite systems can now be constructed inductively. Using

the tensor product, it is possible to define algebras of observables for hybrid systems, i.e., systems with both classical and quantum subsystems. This is not necessary for our purposes, and therefore we will not dwell on this. An interested reader is referred to Werner's survey [144] for details.

2.1.2 Pure and mixed states

Our next step is to describe the statistics of both classical and quantum systems in a unified fashion. This is accomplished by introducing states over the algebra of observables of the system. Recall that a state over a C*-algebra \mathcal{A} is a positive normalized linear functional on \mathcal{A} , i.e., a mapping $\omega : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ that maps all positive elements of \mathcal{A} to nonnegative real numbers, and for which we have $\omega(\mathbb{1}) = 1$, where $\mathbb{1}$ is the identity element of \mathcal{A} . The number $\omega(A)$ then gives the expected value of the observable A measured on the system in the state ω .

The positive elements of a C*-algebra \mathcal{A} are precisely those elements that can be written in the form B^*B for some $B \in \mathcal{A}$. In the case of the algebra $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$, a function f is a positive element if and only if $f(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ or, equivalently, if and only if $f(x) = |g(x)|^2$ for some $g \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$. In the case of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, an operator X is positive if and only if $\langle \psi | X \psi \rangle \geq 0$ for all $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$ or, equivalently, if and only if $X = Y^*Y$ for some $Y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

Of especial importance to the statistical framework of quantum information theory is the subset of \mathcal{A} consisting of those elements F for which $F \geq 0$ and $\mathbb{1} - F \geq 0$ (this is written as a double inequality $0 \leq F \leq \mathbb{1}$). These observables are referred to as *effects*, the term introduced by Ludwig in his axiomatic treatment of quantum theory [85]. It is obvious that, for any effect F and any state ω , $0 \leq \omega(F) \leq 1$. Furthermore, given a collection $\{F_\alpha\}$ of effects with $\sum_\alpha F_\alpha = \mathbb{1}$, we will have $\sum_\alpha \omega(F_\alpha) = 1$. Thus, in the most general formulation, to each outcome o of an experiment performed on the system, classical or quantum, we associate an effect F_o , such that $\omega(F_o)$ is the probability of getting the outcome o when the system is in the state ω . Obviously, $\sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} \omega(F_o) = 1$, where \mathcal{O} is the set of all possible outcomes of the experiment.

Having said this, let us first treat states in the classical setting. If ω is a state over the algebra $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$, then it is clear that $0 \leq \omega(e_x) \leq 1$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. This follows from the fact that $\omega(\mathbb{1}) \equiv \sum_x \omega(e_x) = 1$ and from the positivity of ω . Thus we see that any state ω over the algebra $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$ gives rise to a probability distribution $\{p_x\}$ on \mathcal{X} , where $p_x := \omega(e_x)$. Conversely, given a probability distribution $\{p_x\}$ on \mathcal{X} , we can define a positive normalized linear functional on $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$ in an obvious way. Therefore there is a one-to-one correspondence between the states over $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$ and the probability distributions on \mathcal{X} . We have argued this for the case of a finite \mathcal{X} ; in general, it is the content of the Riesz-Markov theorem [108, p. 107] that, given a compact Hausdorff space \mathcal{X} , there exists a one-to-one correspondence between positive normalized linear functionals on $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$ and probability measures on \mathcal{X} .

Similarly, given a state ω over the algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ of a quantum system, we can associate with it a matrix ρ whose elements in the basis $\{e_i\}$ will have the form $\rho_{ij} := \omega(e_{ji})$. Thus, given any $X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, we will have $\omega(X) = \sum_{i,j} X_{ij} \rho_{ji} \equiv \text{tr}(\rho X)$. The matrix ρ is easily seen to have unit trace because $\omega(\mathbb{1}) = \sum_i \omega(e_{ii}) = \sum_i \rho_{ii} \equiv \text{tr} \rho$, and is also

positive semidefinite because, for any $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$, $\langle \psi | \rho \psi \rangle = \omega(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \geq 0$. Conversely, given a positive semidefinite matrix ρ of unit trace, we can define a state over $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ via $\omega(e_{ij}) := \text{tr}(\rho e_{ij}) \equiv \rho_{ji}$. Thus we see that, when the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} of the system has finite dimension n , there is a one-to-one correspondence between states over $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and positive semidefinite $n \times n$ matrices of unit trace (called *density matrices* or *density operators*). This is not true in the case when \mathcal{H} is infinite-dimensional: not every state ω over $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ corresponds to a density operator. Those states that do have density operators associated with them are called *normal states*.

In light of the correspondence between states and probability measures (in the classical case) or density operators (in the quantum case), we will use the term “state” interchangeably, referring either to the functional on the corresponding algebra of observables, or to the corresponding probability measure or the density operator.

The set $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$ of states over a C*-algebra \mathcal{A} is a convex set whose extreme points are referred to as *pure states*. The adjective “pure” reflects the fact that these are the states with the least amount of “randomness:” being extreme points of the set $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$, they cannot be written as nontrivial convex combinations of other states. For this reason the pure states over an algebra of observables play a crucial role. In order to characterize the pure states over the algebra $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$, we invoke the fact that a state ω over an abelian C*-algebra \mathcal{A} is pure if and only if $\omega(AB) = \omega(A)\omega(B)$ for all $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$, as well as the fact that a state over $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$ is determined by its action on the basis functions e_x . Because $e_x = (e_x)^2$, which means that $e_x(x') = e_x(x')^2$ for any $x' \in \mathcal{X}$, we have $\omega(e_x) = \omega(e_x)^2$ for ω pure, which implies that $\omega(e_x) \in \{0, 1\}$ for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Since $\sum_x \omega(e_x) = 1$, we conclude that, for each pure state ω over $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$, there exists a unique $y \in \mathcal{X}$ such that

$$\omega(e_x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = y \\ 0 & \text{if } x \neq y \end{cases} .$$

This pure state corresponds to the probability measure δ_y concentrated on the single point $y \in \mathcal{X}$. Such measures are referred to as *point measures*. Conversely, defining the state ω_y corresponding to the point measure δ_y , we can easily convince ourselves that $\omega_y(fg) = \omega_y(f)\omega_y(g)$ for all pairs $f, g \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$. Thus the pure states over the algebra $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$ are in a one-to-one correspondence with the point measures over \mathcal{X} .

As for quantum systems, we know that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the set of states over $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and the convex set $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ of the density operators on \mathcal{H} (again, we assume that the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is finite-dimensional). Furthermore this correspondence is *affine*, i.e., convex combinations of states over $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ correspond to convex combinations of density operators on \mathcal{H} . Hence there is a one-to-one correspondence between the extreme points of the respective sets. The extreme points of $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ are the one-dimensional projectors, i.e., those density matrices ρ for which $\rho^2 = \rho$. Thus the pure states over $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ correspond precisely to the one-dimensional projectors in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ (or, equivalently, to the unit vectors in \mathcal{H}).

States that are not pure are referred to as *mixed*; they correspond to non-extreme points of the corresponding state spaces. According to the Krein-Milman theorem [118, p. 67], any point of a compact convex set S in a locally convex topological space is a limit of convex combinations of the extreme points of S . In fact, a stronger result due

to Carathéodory [100, p. 7] states that any point in a compact convex subset S of an n -dimensional space is a convex combination of at most $n+1$ extreme points of S . Therefore any mixed state over $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$ can be represented as a convex mixture of point measures on \mathcal{X} , while any mixed state over $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is a convex mixture of one-dimensional projections on \mathcal{H} . In either case the operation of forming a convex combination of pure states can be thought of as introducing “classical” randomness. In this respect an important role is played by the so-called *maximally mixed* states, i.e., those states that are “most random.” The maximally mixed state over the classical algebra of observables $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$ corresponds to the normalized counting measure on \mathcal{X} , i.e., to the measure that assigns the value $1/|\mathcal{X}|$ to each $x \in \mathcal{X}$. The maximally mixed state over $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ corresponds to the normalized identity matrix, $\mathbb{1}/\dim \mathcal{H}$. The reason for the name “maximally mixed” will become apparent when we discuss entropy in Sec. 4.1.

States of composite systems are defined by means of the tensor product construction. In other words, a state of the system with the algebra of observables $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$ is a positive normalized linear functional over $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$. Again, any state over $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$ will be a convex combination of pure states. In the classical case, $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{Y})$, pure states correspond to the point measures $\delta_{(x,y)} \equiv \delta_x \otimes \delta_y$. Thus any state over $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X}) \otimes \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{Y})$ has the form

$$\omega = \sum_{x,y} p_{xy} \delta_x \otimes \delta_y, \quad 0 \leq p_{xy} \leq 1, \quad \sum_{x,y} p_{xy} = 1$$

i.e., it can be written as a convex combination of product measures. This is not so for the states over $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$, where \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} are Hilbert spaces. Now the pure states correspond to unit vectors in $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K}$, and it is a basic fact of the theory of tensor products that not every vector in $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K}$ can be written in the product form $\psi \otimes \phi$ with $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{K}$. Consequently, not all states of a composite quantum system are *separable* in the following sense.

Definition 2.1.1 *A state ω of a composite system with the algebra of observables $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$ is called separable (or classically correlated in the terminology of Werner [143]) if it can be written as*

$$\omega = \sum_i p_i \omega_i^{\mathcal{A}} \otimes \omega_i^{\mathcal{B}}, \quad (2.4)$$

where $\omega_i^{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\omega_i^{\mathcal{B}} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{B})$, with nontrivial weights p_i . Otherwise ω is called entangled.

On the contrary, *every* state of a composite classical system is separable, as we have seen above. This conclusion also follows for very general cases from the observation that every such state is a convex combination of point measures, but, because the point measures on a Cartesian product of sets are precisely the product measures [121, p. 32], the state is a convex combination of product measures and hence separable.

There are many interesting examples of entangled states. In the case of $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$, where $\mathcal{H} \simeq \mathbb{C}^2$, we can give an example of a family of entangled states whose state vectors also form an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$.

Example 2.1.2 (the Bell basis) Let $|e_1\rangle$ and $|e_2\rangle$ be an orthonormal basis of \mathbb{C}^2 . Then the pure states, whose vectors form the so-called *Bell basis*,

$$|\Psi_1^+\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|e_1 \otimes e_1\rangle + |e_2 \otimes e_2\rangle) \quad (2.5)$$

$$|\Psi_2^+\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|e_1 \otimes e_2\rangle + |e_2 \otimes e_1\rangle) \quad (2.6)$$

$$|\Psi_1^-\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|e_1 \otimes e_1\rangle - |e_2 \otimes e_2\rangle) \quad (2.7)$$

$$|\Psi_2^-\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|e_1 \otimes e_2\rangle - |e_2 \otimes e_1\rangle), \quad (2.8)$$

are entangled states. □

The theory of entanglement is a rich subfield of quantum information theory, but, since we are not directly concerned with entanglement in this work, we will limit ourselves to the very basic facts. The reader is encouraged to consult the survey article by M., P., and R. Horodecki [61] for further details.

Given an arbitrary state ρ , it is in general not an easy task to decide whether it is entangled unless it is pure, in which case our job reduces to the analysis of the so-called *Schmidt decomposition* of the corresponding state vector. In order to define the Schmidt decomposition, we first need to look at the restriction of states to subsystems.

Definition 2.1.3 Let ω be a state over the algebra of observables $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$. Then the restriction of ω to \mathcal{A} is the unique state $\omega_{\mathcal{A}}$ determined by $\omega_{\mathcal{A}}(A) := \omega(A \otimes \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}})$ for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$.

The number $\omega(A \otimes \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}})$ should be thought of as the expected value of the observable A which we measure on the subsystem with the algebra \mathcal{A} , completely ignoring the subsystem with the algebra \mathcal{B} .

In the classical case, where $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X}) \otimes \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{Y})$, observables of the form $A \otimes \mathbf{1}$ can be written as

$$A \otimes \mathbf{1} = \sum_{x,y} A(x) e_x \otimes e_y,$$

so that the restriction to \mathcal{A} of the state corresponding to the probability measure p_{xy} on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ is the state corresponding to the probability measure $p_x = \sum_y p_{xy}$, i.e., $\omega_{\mathcal{A}}(f) = \sum_{x,y} p_{xy} f(x)$. This is precisely the marginal probability distribution obtained by integrating over the set \mathcal{Y} . It is easy to see that any pure state of a bipartite classical system restricts to a pure state on either subsystem.

In the case of a quantum system, the restriction of a state ρ over $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K})$ to \mathcal{A} is determined by $\text{tr}(\rho_{\mathcal{A}} A) = \text{tr}[\rho(A \otimes \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{K}})]$, i.e., the corresponding density operator $\rho_{\mathcal{A}}$ is obtained by taking the partial trace of ρ over \mathcal{K} , $\rho_{\mathcal{A}} = \text{tr}_{\mathcal{K}} \rho$. Contrary to the classical case, pure states over $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K})$ that are not elementary tensors (i.e., are not of the form $\psi \otimes \phi$) do not restrict to pure states over \mathcal{H} or over \mathcal{K} . Indeed, the restriction to $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ of any the pure states defined in Eqs. (2.5)-(2.8) is the maximally mixed state $(1/2)\mathbf{1}$.

Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be algebras of observables. Given the restrictions $\rho_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\rho_{\mathcal{B}}$, it is generally impossible to reconstruct the state ρ over $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$ with these restrictions unless it is known *a priori* that ρ is pure. In this case we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1.4 (Schmidt decomposition) *Let $\psi \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K}$ be a unit vector, and let $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}$ be the restriction of the state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ to the first system. Let $\rho_{\mathcal{H}} = \sum_i q_i |e_i\rangle\langle e_i|$ be the spectral decomposition of $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $q_i > 0$. Then there exists an orthonormal system $\{f_i\}$ in \mathcal{K} such that*

$$\psi = \sum_i \sqrt{q_i} e_i \otimes f_i. \quad (2.9)$$

Furthermore, the state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is entangled if its Schmidt decomposition (2.9) has two or more terms. The number of terms is referred to as the Schmidt number of ψ .

Proof: By definition of the restricted state, we have

$$\text{tr } \rho_{\mathcal{H}} A = \langle\psi|(A \otimes \mathbf{I}_{\mathcal{K}})\psi\rangle,$$

where $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is an arbitrary operator. Writing $\psi = \sum_i e_i \otimes v_i$, where $v_i \in \mathcal{K}$ are not normalized, we obtain

$$\text{tr } \rho_{\mathcal{H}} A = \sum_{i,j} \langle e_i | A e_j \rangle \langle v_i | v_j \rangle.$$

We let $A = |e_m\rangle\langle e_n|$ to get $q_m \delta_{mn} = \langle v_m | v_n \rangle$. Defining $f_i := (1/\sqrt{q_i})v_i$, we obtain $\psi = \sum_i \sqrt{q_i} e_i \otimes f_i$, which proves Eq. (2.9).

Now suppose that ψ is a product state. Then the restriction of $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ to the first system is a one-dimensional projection, and hence has only one nonzero eigenvalue, which means that the Schmidt decomposition of $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ has only one term. ■

The Schmidt decomposition can also work “in reverse,” as follows from the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1.5 (purification) *Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space. For any state $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ there exist a Hilbert space \mathcal{K} and a pure state $\psi \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K}$, called the purification of ρ , such that $\rho = \text{tr}_{\mathcal{K}} |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$. Furthermore, the restriction $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ can be chosen to have no zero eigenvalues, in which case the space \mathcal{K} and the vector ψ are unique up to a unitary transformation.*

Proof: Let $\rho = \sum_{i=1}^k q_i |e_i\rangle\langle e_i|$ be the spectral decomposition of ρ with $q_i > 0$. Choose \mathcal{K} isomorphic to \mathbb{C}^k , and let $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^k$ be an orthonormal basis for \mathcal{K} . Then the vector $\psi := \sum_{i=1}^k \sqrt{q_i} e_i \otimes f_i$ is the desired purification. Since the number k and the vectors e_i are uniquely determined by ρ , the only freedom in this construction is the orthonormal basis $\{f_i\}$, but any two such bases are connected by a unitary transformation. ■

With the aid of the Schmidt decomposition, we see that a pure state over $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$ is separable if and only if it restricts to pure states over both subsystems. (Actually, Theorem 2.1.4 implies the “only if” part; the “if” part is trivial.) The diametrical opposite of this situation is described in the following definition.

Definition 2.1.6 *A pure state of a bipartite system is called maximally entangled if it restricts to maximally mixed states on either subsystem.*

For instance, the states forming the Bell basis are all maximally entangled. We will come back to the subject of maximally entangled states in the next section. Here we only mention that maximally entangled states are a crucial resource in virtually every quantum communication scheme and cryptographic protocol; see the survey by Weinfurter and Zeilinger [142] for details.

2.2 Channels

After having introduced algebras of observables and states of classical and quantum systems, we must provide the mathematical description of any processing performed on these systems. This is done by means of the so-called *channels*. From now on, we will assume that all systems under consideration are quantum systems, unless specified otherwise.

2.2.1 Definitions

Let us consider the following situation. Suppose that, after some processing on the system with the algebra of observables \mathcal{A} , the result is a system with the corresponding algebra \mathcal{B} . On this “new” system, we measure an effect $F \in \mathcal{B}$. However, we can also view this sequence of actions as the measurement of some effect $\hat{F} \in \mathcal{A}$ on the “old” system. Thus the processing step can be thought of as a transformation T that takes effects in \mathcal{B} to effects in \mathcal{A} , $\hat{F} = T(F)$ or, in general, as a mapping $T : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ that takes observables in \mathcal{B} to observables in \mathcal{A} . Alternatively, we can view the processing step as a transformation T_* that takes states over \mathcal{A} to states over \mathcal{B} . Obviously, these two interpretations of the processing step must be equivalent in the statistical sense, so we require that, for any state ω over \mathcal{A} and for any observable X in \mathcal{B} ,

$$(T_*(\omega))(X) = \omega(T(X)), \quad (2.10)$$

which expresses the statement that the expectation values for the outcome of any measurement must be the same for T and for T_* . Sometimes we will use the composition notation $\omega \circ T$ to denote the state defined by $(\omega \circ T)(X) := (T_*(\omega))(X)$.

Already from this simple description we can glean the properties required of the map T . First of all, T must map effects to effects, which implies that T must be a *positive map*, i.e., $X \geq 0$ must imply $T(X) \geq 0$. Secondly, the trivial measurement corresponding to the effect $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}}$ must be mapped to the trivial measurement $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}$, $T(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}}) = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}$. These two requirements can be summarized by saying that T must be *positive* and *unital* (or *unit-preserving*). Furthermore, if ω is a state, then by hypothesis $T_*(\omega)$ is a state also. Hence the left-hand side of Eq. (2.10) is linear in X , which means that the right-hand side must also be linear in X . Thus T must be a *linear* positive unital map $\mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$.

The dual map T_* on states can also be viewed as a map that takes density operators in \mathcal{A} to density operators in \mathcal{B} , which allows us to rewrite Eq. (2.10) as

$$\text{tr} [T_*(\rho)X] = \text{tr} [\rho T(X)]. \quad (2.11)$$

Since T is unit-preserving, the linear map T_* must be trace-preserving, $\text{tr } T_*(\rho) = \text{tr } \rho$ [just substitute $\mathbb{1}$ for X in Eq. (2.11)], and positive, so that density operators are mapped to density operators.

Mere positivity of the maps T and T_* , however, is not sufficient. In many situations we need to consider parallel processing performed on quantum systems, i.e., transformations of the form $S \otimes T : \mathcal{B}_1 \otimes \mathcal{B}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2$, where $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2$ are algebras of observables. In order to represent a physically meaningful processing step, the map $S \otimes T$ must be a linear positive unital map. However the tensor product of positive maps may fail to be positive, as follows from the following standard example [24, p. 192].

Example 2.2.1 (the transposition map) Let the algebra \mathcal{A} be the space \mathcal{M}_d of $d \times d$ complex matrices. Matrices in \mathcal{M}_d act as operators on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} \simeq \mathbb{C}^d$. Let $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^d$ be an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H} . Consider the *transposition map* $\Theta : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, that is, the map that sends $|e_j\rangle\langle e_k|$ to $|e_k\rangle\langle e_j|$. Since Θ leaves each $|e_j\rangle\langle e_j|$ invariant, it is trace-preserving and positive [given a positive operator X , write its spectral decomposition to see that $\Theta(X)$ is also positive]. Let us form the map $\Theta \otimes \text{id}$ on $\mathcal{M}_d \otimes \mathcal{M}_d$, where id is the identity map, in which case we have

$$\Theta \otimes \text{id} : |e_j \otimes e_k\rangle\langle e_l \otimes e_m| \mapsto |e_l \otimes e_k\rangle\langle e_j \otimes e_m|.$$

Now consider the operator

$$A := \sum_{j,k=1}^d |e_j \otimes e_j\rangle\langle e_k \otimes e_k|$$

which is clearly positive. Then

$$F := \Theta \otimes \text{id}(A) = \sum_{j,k=1}^d |e_k \otimes e_j\rangle\langle e_j \otimes e_k|$$

is the so-called *flip operator* on $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$, that is, for any pair $\psi, \phi \in \mathbb{C}^d$, $F(\psi \otimes \phi) = \phi \otimes \psi$. The flip operator is manifestly not positive because, for the antisymmetric vector $\Psi \equiv \psi \otimes \phi - \phi \otimes \psi$, we see that $F\Psi = -\Psi$. Hence the operator F has a negative eigenvalue, and therefore cannot be positive. \square

The above example shows that, even if a map T is positive, the map $T \otimes \text{id}$ may already fail to be positive, which in turn shows that tensor products of positive maps do not have to be positive maps. This is clearly unacceptable for the mathematical model of a channel. A good way out of this difficulty is to restrict the class of admissible maps to include only the so-called *completely positive* maps [97, p. 25].

Definition 2.2.2 Let $T : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be a map between operator algebras. Define the map $T_n : \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{M}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{M}_n$ via $T_n := T \otimes \text{id}$. Then T is called *n-positive* if T_n is a positive map. A map that is *n-positive* for all values of n is termed *completely positive*.

Now suppose that $S : \mathcal{B}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_1$ and $T : \mathcal{B}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_2$ are completely positive maps. Let m and n be the dimensions of the Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} , where \mathcal{B}_2 and \mathcal{A}_1 are subalgebras

of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ respectively. Then the maps $S \otimes \text{id}_m : \mathcal{B}_1 \otimes \mathcal{B}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{B}_2$ and $\text{id}_n \otimes T : \mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{B}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2$ are positive. Hence their composition, $S \otimes T$, is well-defined and positive.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{B}_1 \otimes \mathcal{B}_2 & \xrightarrow{S \otimes T} & \mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2 \\
 \searrow^{S \otimes \text{id}_m} & & \nearrow^{\text{id}_n \otimes T} \\
 & \mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{B}_2 &
 \end{array}$$

This observation, pictured on the diagram above, motivates the following definition.

Definition 2.2.3 A channel converting systems with the algebra of observables \mathcal{A} into systems with the algebra of observables \mathcal{B} is a completely positive unital linear map $T : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$. The dual map T_* , related to T via Eq. (2.10) is then a completely positive trace-preserving linear map, and is referred to as the dual channel.

Remark: We have been somewhat cavalier in our definition of the dual channel T_* acting on states through the channel T acting on observables, having ignored certain technicalities that arise when the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is infinite-dimensional. These complications disappear in the finite-dimensional case, so we will not dwell on this point any further. \square

We say that the channel T corresponds to the *Heisenberg picture* of quantum dynamics, whereas the dual channel T_* describes the *Schrödinger picture*. This generalizes the notions of the Heisenberg and the Schrödinger pictures, studied in introductory courses on quantum mechanics.

2.2.2 Examples

It turns out that all physically meaningful examples of channels can be constructed by putting together certain basic building blocks. We will get to this issue in a moment, but first we will provide several examples of completely positive maps in general, and channels in particular. These examples can be found in Werner's survey [144], but here we fill in the missing details.

Example 2.2.4 (*-homomorphisms) Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be C^* -algebras, and consider a $*$ -homomorphism $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$. We know that $*$ -homomorphisms map positive elements to positive elements, hence π is a positive map. Let us consider the map $\pi \otimes \text{id}_n$ that maps $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{M}_n$ to $\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{M}_n$. The tensor product $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{M}_n$ is isomorphic to the algebra $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathcal{A})$ of $n \times n$ matrices with \mathcal{A} -valued entries; this follows from noting that any element of $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{M}_n$ can be written in the form $\sum_{i,j=1}^n A_{ij} \otimes e_{ij}$, where $A_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}$ and e_{ij} is the matrix unit with entries δ_{ij} . Thus it is natural to identify the element $A_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}$ with the (i, j) th

entry of an $n \times n$ \mathcal{A} -valued matrix. The product of elements in $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{M}_n$ is given by

$$\left(\sum_{i,j} A_{ij} \otimes e_{ij} \right) \left(\sum_{k,l} B_{kl} \otimes e_{kl} \right) = \sum_{i,j} \sum_k A_{ik} B_{kj} \otimes e_{ij},$$

where the (i, j) th entry is given by the usual laws of matrix multiplication, but with elements of \mathcal{A} instead of complex numbers. The other operations are defined similarly. Furthermore, the action of the map $\pi \otimes \text{id}_n$ on an element of $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathcal{A})$ amounts to the entrywise application of the $*$ -homomorphism π . It is an easy task to show that the resulting map is also a $*$ -homomorphism, and hence positive. This shows that $*$ -homomorphisms between C^* -algebras are completely positive. \square

Example 2.2.5 (conjugations) Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be Hilbert spaces, and let $V : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ be a bounded operator. Then the map $T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ defined by $T(X) = VXV^*$ is completely positive. First of all, T is obviously positive. Indeed, given $X \geq 0$, there exists Y such that $X = Y^*Y$, which implies that $T(X) = VY^*YV^* = (YV^*)^*(YV^*) \geq 0$. Now, if $X = Y^*Y$ is a positive element of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \otimes \mathcal{M}_n$, then similarly $T \otimes \text{id}_n(X) = (V \otimes \mathbb{1})X(V^* \otimes \mathbb{1}) = (Y(V^* \otimes \mathbb{1}))^*(Y(V^* \otimes \mathbb{1})) \geq 0$. This holds for all n , hence T is completely positive. This example covers the special case of unitary conjugations, i.e., the case when V is a unitary operator. Because $VV^* = V^*V = \mathbb{1}$ for a unitary V , the corresponding conjugation is also a channel. \square

Example 2.2.6 (restriction) Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be algebras, and consider the map $M_{\mathcal{B}} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$ defined by $M_{\mathcal{B}}(A) = A \otimes \mathbb{1}$. This map is clearly completely positive and unital. Let us pass to the Schrödinger picture, where we expect that the dual channel $M_{\mathcal{B}*}$ is the operation of taking the partial trace over the second system. Indeed, consider a density operator

$$\rho = \sum_{i,j,\mu,\nu} \rho_{ij,\mu\nu} |e_i \otimes e_\mu\rangle \langle e_j \otimes e_\nu|.$$

In the duality relation (2.11), let X be the matrix unit $|e_q\rangle \langle e_p|$. Then we obtain

$$\langle e_p | M_{\mathcal{B}*}(\rho) e_q \rangle = \sum_{\mu} \rho_{pq,\mu\mu},$$

which is precisely the (p, q) th matrix element of the partial trace of ρ over the second system. Thus $M_{\mathcal{B}*} \equiv \text{tr}_{\mathcal{B}}$. \square

Example 2.2.7 (expansion) A common operation in quantum information theory is, given a system in some state ρ , to adjoin an auxiliary system in some fixed state ρ_0 . In the Schrödinger picture, this operation is a channel, and has the form $T_*(\rho) = \rho \otimes \rho_0$. Let us determine the corresponding channel in the Heisenberg picture. Let the two systems have \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} respectively as their algebras of observables. The sought channel is a map from $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$ to \mathcal{A} . Because any $X \in \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$ can be written in the form $X = \sum_i A_i \otimes B_i$, where $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B_i \in \mathcal{B}$, the action of the channel T is determined by its effect on the elementary tensors $A \otimes B$. From the duality relation (2.11), we have $\text{tr}[(\rho \otimes \rho_0)(A \otimes B)] = \text{tr}[\rho T(A \otimes B)]$, which can be rewritten as $\text{tr}(\rho A) \text{tr}(\rho_0 B) =$

$\text{tr}[\rho T(A \otimes B)]$. This must hold for an arbitrary density operator ρ , which implies that $T(A \otimes B) = [\text{tr}(\rho_0 B)]A$. The action of T can be extended to the whole of $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$ by linearity. Complete positivity follows from the fact that T_* is completely positive, and therefore so is its dual map T . \square

Example 2.2.8 (measurement) A measurement can be thought of as a channel that converts quantum systems into classical systems. Let \mathcal{X} be the set of the measurement outcomes. Then the act of measurement can be represented by a mapping $T : \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, where \mathcal{A} is the algebra of observables of the quantum system. The channel T is obviously determined by the operators $F_x := T(e_x), x \in \mathcal{X}$. It is a basic result in the theory of completely positive maps that any positive map $T : \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, where \mathcal{X} is a compact set and \mathcal{A} is an operator algebra, is automatically completely positive [24, p. 192]. Thus we must have $F_x \geq 0$. Furthermore, because T must be unital, the operators F_x must form a *resolution of identity* on \mathcal{A} , i.e., $\sum_x F_x = \mathbb{1}$. The application of T_* to a density operator ρ yields a function $f(x) = \text{tr}(\rho F_x)$, i.e., the probability of obtaining the outcome x when the system is in the state ρ . The collection $\{F_x\}$ with $F_x \geq 0$ and $\sum_x F_x = \mathbb{1}$ is an example of a *positive operator-valued measure* (POVM). We will discuss POVM's in greater detail in Sec. 2.3.3, when we talk about quantum detection theory. The “old-school” projective (von Neumann-Lüders) measurement obtains when the effects F_x have the property $F_x F_y = \delta_{xy} F_x$. \square

Example 2.2.9 (irreversible quantum dynamics) In Example 2.2.5, we have considered the case of unitarily implemented channels. Such channels arise whenever we talk about reversible quantum dynamics. A general theory of irreversible quantum dynamics proceeds as follows [31]. The system, initially in some state $\rho \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, is brought into contact with another system, the *reservoir*, initially in some fixed state $\rho_R \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$, where \mathcal{K} is the Hilbert space of the reservoir. The combined “system + reservoir” entity is assumed to be closed. Then the two are caused to interact by means of a unitarily implemented channel, and the final state of the system is obtained by tracing out the reservoir degrees of freedom. In the Schrödinger picture, this irreversible evolution of the system is given by the channel $T_*(\rho) = \text{tr}_{\mathcal{K}} U(\rho \otimes \rho_R) U^*$. \square

Finally we give one more example, which has nothing to do with quantum information theory *per se*, but rather serves to demonstrate the all-encompassing nature of the definition of the channel.

Example 2.2.10 (classical channel) A classical channel is, roughly speaking, a transformation that converts classical systems into classical systems. Hence a positive map $T : \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{Y})$ is a classical channel, which is uniquely determined by the functions $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{Y}) \ni f_x := T(e_x)$. The dual map T_* converts states over $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{Y})$ into states over $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$ or, equivalently, probability measures on \mathcal{Y} into probability measures on \mathcal{X} . Specifically, we can expand $f_x = \sum_y f_{xy} e_y$, so that, for any function $g \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$, we have $T(g) = \sum_{x,y} g(x) f_{xy} e_y$. If $p = \{p_y\}$ a probability measure on \mathcal{Y} , the duality relation (2.10) says that

$$\sum_y p_y (T(g))(y) = \sum_x (T_*(p))_x g(x),$$

from which we get, upon expanding,

$$\sum_x \sum_y p_y g(x) f_{xy} = \sum_x (T_*(p))_x g(x).$$

Comparing coefficients, we obtain $(T_*(p))_x = \sum_y f_{xy} p_y$. The positive numbers f_{xy} form the *transition matrix* of the channel, where f_{xy} is the conditional probability $p(x|y)$ that the symbol x is received given that the symbol y was transmitted. Because T is a channel, it is unital, i.e., $T(\mathbf{1}) = \sum_x T(e_x) = \mathbf{1} \equiv \sum_y e_y$. But $\sum_x f_x = \sum_{x,y} f_{xy} e_y$, so we see, comparing coefficients, that $\sum_x f_{xy} = 1$, i.e., the columns of the transition matrix add up to one. \square

2.2.3 The theorems of Stinespring and Kraus

Up to this point, our treatment of channels has been largely axiomatic. However, we can adopt the pragmatic point of view and demand that only those transformations that can be built up from certain basic blocks can serve as channels. We take our cue from quantum theory of open systems [31] and say that any “physically acceptable” channel can be realized as a sequence of the following steps: (a) adjunction of an auxiliary system (called the *ancilla*² in the terminology of Helstrom [58]) in some fixed initial state, (b) unitarily implemented evolution of the enlarged system, and (c) restriction to the original subsystem. In other words, any channel must be of the form described in Example 2.2.9. Luckily it turns out that the two descriptions coincide; this is ultimately a consequence of the Stinespring theorem [129] which we first state, without proof, in the form given by Paulsen [97, p. 43].

Theorem 2.2.11 (Stinespring) *Let \mathcal{A} be a C^* -algebra with identity, and let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space. Then a linear map $T : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is completely positive if and only if there exist a Hilbert space \mathcal{K} , a unital $*$ -homomorphism $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$, and a bounded operator $V : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ with $\|V\|^2 = \|T(\mathbf{1})\|$ such that*

$$T(A) = V^* \pi(A) V. \quad (2.12)$$

for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$. We will refer either to Eq. (2.12) or to the triple (\mathcal{K}, V, π) as the Stinespring decomposition of T .

It immediately follows from the Stinespring theorem that if T is also a unital map, then V is an isometry, i.e., $V^*V = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$. The Stinespring theorem has a useful specialization [37, p. 15], [134, p. 222] to the case when the algebra \mathcal{A} is an algebra of operators in a Hilbert space.

Theorem 2.2.12 (Stinespring; the Hilbert-space version) *Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}_1 be Hilbert spaces, and let $T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be a completely positive map with the Stinespring decomposition (\mathcal{K}, V, π) . Then there exist a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_2 and a unitary operator $U : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ such that, for any $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1)$,*

$$T(A) = V^* U^* (A \otimes \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_2}) U V. \quad (2.13)$$

²Latin for “housemaid;” we choose not to dwell on the philosophical implications of this!

We can absorb the unitary U and the mapping V into a single mapping to obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 2.2.13 *Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be Hilbert spaces, and let $T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ be a completely positive map. Then there exist a Hilbert space \mathcal{E} and a bounded map $V : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{E}$ such that*

$$T(A) = V^*(A \otimes \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}})V \quad (2.14)$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Furthermore, if T is unital, then V is an isometry.

The following result [71], which carries a great deal of significance in quantum information theory, is a consequence of the Stinespring theorem. We provide the proof because it is instructive, and because we will come to rely on some of the techniques used in it.

Theorem 2.2.14 (the Kraus representation) *Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be Hilbert spaces, and let $T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ be a completely positive map. Then there exist bounded operators $V_\alpha : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ such that*

$$T(A) = \sum_{\alpha} V_{\alpha}^* A V_{\alpha} \quad (2.15)$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, where the sum in Eq. (2.15) converges in the strong operator topology. Furthermore, if the map T is unital, then $\sum_{\alpha} V_{\alpha}^* V_{\alpha} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$. The collection of operators $\{V_{\alpha}\}$ will be referred to as the Kraus decomposition of T .

Proof: Let \mathcal{E} and V be given by Eq. (2.14). Now let $\{\xi_{\alpha}\}$ be an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{E} . Then, given any $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$, we can expand

$$V\psi = \sum_{\alpha} V_{\alpha}\psi \otimes \xi_{\alpha}, \quad (2.16)$$

where $V_{\alpha} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ are some operators. Let χ be an arbitrary vector in \mathcal{K} . Then the action of the adjoint V^* on elementary tensors $\psi \otimes \phi \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{E}$ can be read off from

$$\langle \chi | V^*(\psi \otimes \phi) \rangle = \langle V\chi | \psi \otimes \phi \rangle = \sum_{\alpha} \langle V_{\alpha}\chi \otimes \xi_{\alpha} | \psi \otimes \phi \rangle = \sum_{\alpha} \langle \chi | V_{\alpha}^* \psi \rangle \langle \xi_{\alpha} | \phi \rangle,$$

which yields

$$V^*(\psi \otimes \phi) = \sum_{\alpha} \langle \xi_{\alpha} | \phi \rangle V_{\alpha}^* \psi. \quad (2.17)$$

Now let ψ be an arbitrary vector in \mathcal{H} . For an arbitrary operator $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} T(A)\psi &= V^*(A \otimes \mathbf{1})V\psi = V^*(A \otimes \mathbf{1}) \sum_{\alpha} V_{\alpha}\psi \otimes \xi_{\alpha} = V^* \left(\sum_{\alpha} AV_{\alpha}\psi \otimes \xi_{\alpha} \right) \\ &= \sum_{\alpha, \beta} \langle \xi_{\beta} | \xi_{\alpha} \rangle V_{\beta}^* AV_{\alpha}\psi = \sum_{\alpha} V_{\alpha}^* AV_{\alpha}\psi, \end{aligned}$$

which is Eq. (2.15). Now if T is unital, then V is an isometry, which implies the normalization condition $\sum_{\alpha} V_{\alpha}^* V_{\alpha} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$. ■

Given a completely positive map T , its Kraus decomposition is obviously not unique. As shown in the proof of Theorem 2.2.14, the operators V_α are determined by the map V and by the orthonormal basis $\{\xi_\alpha\}$ of \mathcal{E} . Thus we have the freedom of choosing the basis of \mathcal{E} ; let $\{\eta_\alpha\}$ be some other basis, and let U be a unitary transformation such that $U\xi_\alpha = \eta_\alpha$. Then, for any $\psi \in \mathcal{K}$, we can expand $V\psi$ as

$$\begin{aligned} V\psi &= \sum_{\alpha} W_{\alpha}\psi \otimes \eta_{\alpha} = \sum_{\alpha} W_{\alpha}\psi \otimes U\xi_{\alpha} = \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma} u_{\beta\gamma} \langle \xi_{\gamma} | \xi_{\alpha} \rangle W_{\alpha}\psi \otimes \xi_{\beta} \\ &= \sum_{\alpha,\beta} u_{\beta\alpha} W_{\alpha}\psi \otimes \xi_{\beta} = \sum_{\alpha} V_{\alpha}\psi \otimes \xi_{\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

where $V_{\alpha} := \sum_{\beta} u_{\alpha\beta} W_{\beta}$, and it is clear that both sets $\{V_{\alpha}\}$ and $\{W_{\alpha}\}$ form Kraus decompositions of T .

Now, if $T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ is a channel, then the dual map T_* transforms density operators on \mathcal{K} to density operators on \mathcal{K} . Let $\{V_{\alpha}\}$ be the Kraus decomposition of T . Then the duality relation (2.11) implies that, for any density operator ρ on \mathcal{K} , we have

$$T_*(\rho) = \sum_{\alpha} V_{\alpha}\rho V_{\alpha}^*. \quad (2.18)$$

It follows from Eq. (2.18) that the dual channel T_* can be extended to all trace-class operators on \mathcal{K} , because any trace-class operator can be written as a complex linear combination of four density operators.

Finally, after all these tedious preparations, we are ready to state and prove the result, due to Kraus [71], that any channel can be represented in the ancilla form.

Theorem 2.2.15 (ancilla form) *Let $T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ be a channel. Then there exist Hilbert spaces \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} , a unit vector $\Omega \in \mathcal{G}$, and a unitary transformation $U : \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ such that, for any density operator ρ on \mathcal{K} ,*

$$T_*(\rho) = \text{tr}_{\mathcal{F}} U(\rho \otimes |\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega|)U^*. \quad (2.19)$$

Proof: Let V and \mathcal{E} be given by Eq. (2.14), and let \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} be Hilbert spaces such that $\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{G} \simeq \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ and $\dim \mathcal{E} \leq \dim \mathcal{F}$. Now pick a unit vector $\Omega \in \mathcal{G}$ and consider the map

$$\hat{U}(\psi \otimes \Omega) := V\psi \quad (2.20)$$

for all $\psi \in \mathcal{K}$. The vector on the right-hand side of Eq. (2.20) is an element of $\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{E}$, hence an element of $\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ because \mathcal{E} is, by construction, isomorphic to a subspace of \mathcal{F} . Now if $\{e_i\}$ is an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{K} , then the vectors $\hat{U}(e_i \otimes \Omega)$ form an orthonormal system in $\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ because

$$\langle \hat{U}(e_i \otimes \Omega) | \hat{U}(e_j \otimes \Omega) \rangle = \langle V e_i | V e_j \rangle = \langle e_i | V^* V e_j \rangle = \langle e_i | e_j \rangle = \delta_{ij},$$

where we have used the fact that T is a channel, and therefore V is an isometry. Hence \hat{U} can be extended to a unitary map $U : \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{F}$. Furthermore, because \mathcal{E} is isomorphic to a subspace of \mathcal{F} , we can express the action of U on the vectors of the form $\psi \otimes \Omega$ using a Kraus decomposition $\{V_{\alpha}\}$ of T as

$$U(\psi \otimes \Omega) = \sum_{\alpha} V_{\alpha}\psi \otimes \xi_{\alpha},$$

where $\{\xi_\alpha\}$ is an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{E} , determined by $\{V_\alpha\}$ (cf. the proof of Theorem 2.2.14). Then, for any $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{F}} U(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \otimes |\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega|)U^* &= \text{tr}_{\mathcal{F}} \sum_{\alpha,\beta} V_\alpha |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| V_\beta^* \otimes |\xi_\alpha\rangle\langle\xi_\beta| \\ &= \sum_{\alpha} V_\alpha |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| V_\alpha^* \equiv T_*(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|), \end{aligned}$$

and the theorem is proved. \blacksquare

Remark: When the Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} are isomorphic, the statement of the theorem simplifies to the following. There exist a Hilbert space \mathcal{E} , a unit vector $\Omega \in \mathcal{E}$, and a unitary $U : \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{E}$ such that $T_*(\rho) = \text{tr}_{\mathcal{E}} U(\rho \otimes |\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega|)U^*$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, where \mathcal{E} is determined by Eq. (2.14). \square

2.2.4 Duality between channels and bipartite states

There exists a correspondence between channels $T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ and states over $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K})$ which, in many situations, is more convenient than the Kraus representation or the ancilla form.

First we make the following observation. Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be Hilbert spaces, and let $A : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be an operator which we write as

$$A = \sum_{i,\mu} A_{i\mu} |e_i\rangle\langle f_\mu|, \quad (2.21)$$

where $\{e_i\}$ and $\{f_\mu\}$ are orthonormal bases of \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} respectively. Using the Dirac notation, Eq. (2.21) can be rewritten as $A = \sum_{i,\mu} A_{i\mu} |e_i\rangle\langle f_\mu|$. We can view the matrix elements $A_{i\mu}$ of A as the coefficients, in the basis $\{|e_i \otimes f_\mu\rangle\}$, of a vector in $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K}$ which we denote by $|A\rangle\rangle$,

$$|A\rangle\rangle := \sum_{i,\mu} A_{i\mu} |e_i \otimes f_\mu\rangle. \quad (2.22)$$

The double-ket notation in Eq. (2.22) is due to Royer [111]. We must caution the reader that, although the only object appearing inside the double ket is the operator A , attention must be paid to the choice of basis for the tensor product of the corresponding Hilbert spaces.

The correspondence $A \mapsto |A\rangle\rangle$ yields a number of useful formulas, which we summarize in the following lemma [28, 111]. We omit the proof which consists in routine, but tedious, manipulations with indices.

Lemma 2.2.16 *Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be Hilbert spaces. Then we have the following relations for vectors in $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K}$:*

$$\langle\langle A|B\rangle\rangle = \text{tr} A^* B \quad (2.23)$$

$$(A \otimes B)|C\rangle\rangle = |ACB^\top\rangle\rangle \quad (2.24)$$

$$\text{tr}_{\mathcal{K}} |A\rangle\rangle\langle\langle B| = AB^* \quad (2.25)$$

$$\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} |A\rangle\rangle\langle\langle B| = A^\top \bar{B}, \quad (2.26)$$

where B^\top denotes the matrix transpose of B , and \bar{B} denotes the operator whose matrix elements are obtained by taking the complex conjugates of the matrix elements of B .

Remark: Once again, we point out that the relations stated in Lemma 2.2.16 are valid as long as the matrix elements of the operators A , B , and C refer to the same choice of bases for \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} . \square

Before proceeding to our main topic, we give a couple of examples, due to D’Ariano, Lo Presti, and Sacchi [28], that illustrate the power of this approach.

Example 2.2.17 (maximally entangled states) Let Ψ be a pure state in $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, where \mathcal{H}_A and \mathcal{H}_B are Hilbert spaces of the same (finite) dimension N . We claim that Ψ is maximally entangled if and only if it can be written in the form $(1/\sqrt{N})|U\rangle\rangle$ for some unitary $U : \mathcal{H}_B \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_A$. Assume first that $\Psi = (1/\sqrt{N})|U\rangle\rangle$ for a unitary $U : \mathcal{H}_B \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_A$. Then, using Eqs. (2.25) and (2.26), we see that the restrictions of $|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$ to A and to B are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{tr}_B|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| &= (1/N)\mathrm{tr}_B|U\rangle\rangle\langle\langle U| = (1/N)UU^* = (1/N)\mathbf{1}_A \\ \mathrm{tr}_A|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| &= (1/N)\mathrm{tr}_A|U\rangle\rangle\langle\langle U| = (1/N)U^\top\bar{U} = (1/N)(U^*U)^\top = (1/N)\mathbf{1}_B,\end{aligned}$$

which shows that Ψ is maximally entangled. On the other hand, suppose Ψ is maximally entangled. Let $\Psi = |M\rangle\rangle$, where $M : \mathcal{H}_B \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_A$ is some operator. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{tr}_B|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| &= \mathrm{tr}_B|M\rangle\rangle\langle\langle M| = MM^* = (1/N)\mathbf{1}_A \\ \mathrm{tr}_A|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| &= \mathrm{tr}_A|M\rangle\rangle\langle\langle M| = M^\top\bar{M} = (M^*M)^\top = (1/N)\mathbf{1}_B,\end{aligned}$$

which would hold if and only if $M = (1/\sqrt{N})U$ for some unitary U . \square

Example 2.2.18 (the Schmidt decomposition) Let $|A\rangle\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ be a pure state. Write down the polar decomposition of A , $A = V\sqrt{A^*A}$, where V is unitary, and choose a unitary operator U such that UA^*AU^* is diagonal. Then

$$|A\rangle\rangle = |V\sqrt{A^*A}\rangle\rangle = (VU^* \otimes U^\top)|U\sqrt{A^*A}U^*\rangle\rangle = \sum_i \sqrt{\lambda_i} e_i \otimes f_i,$$

where $\{\lambda_i, \psi_i\}$ are the eigenvalues and the eigenvectors of $\sqrt{A^*A}$, and we have defined the vectors $e_i := VU^*\psi_i$, $f_i := U^\top\psi_i$. \square

The matrix approach described above reveals its true strength in the following characterization of channels due to D’Ariano and Lo Presti [26]. Let $T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ be a completely positive map, with the corresponding dual map $T_* : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$. Let $\{e_i\}$ be an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{K} , so that $|\mathbf{1}\rangle\rangle \in \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}$ is the unnormalized maximally entangled state $\sum_i e_i \otimes e_i$. Define on $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K}$ the positive operator

$$R_T := (T_* \otimes \mathrm{id})(|\mathbf{1}\rangle\rangle\langle\langle\mathbf{1}|) \quad (2.27)$$

(the positivity of R_T follows from the complete positivity of T_*). Then the action of T_* on an arbitrary $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K})$ can be given in terms of R_T as

$$T_*(\rho) = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{K}} \left[(\mathbf{1} \otimes \rho^\top) R_T \right], \quad (2.28)$$

where the transpose operation is performed with respect to the basis $\{e_i\}$. Here is one way to prove Eq. (2.28). Pick a Kraus decomposition $\{V_\alpha\}$ of T . Then, using Eq. (2.24), we get

$$R_T = \sum_{\alpha} (V_\alpha \otimes \mathbf{1}) |\mathbf{1}\rangle \langle \mathbf{1}| (V_\alpha^* \otimes \mathbf{1}) = \sum_{\alpha} |V_\alpha\rangle \langle V_\alpha|.$$

Substituting this into the right-hand side of Eq. (2.28) and using Lemma 2.2.16 yields

$$\sum_{\alpha} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[(\mathbf{1} \otimes \rho^\top) |V_\alpha\rangle \langle V_\alpha| \right] = \sum_{\alpha} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} |V_\alpha \rho\rangle \langle V_\alpha| = \sum_{\alpha} V_\alpha \rho V_\alpha^* = T_*(\rho).$$

In fact, the map T_* defined in Eq. (2.28) can be extended to a completely positive map on all operators $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

The operator R_T is the unique operator for which Eq. (2.28) holds. To see this, assume that, to the contrary, Eq. (2.28) holds with some other operator R in place of R_T . Then, for any $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$,

$$\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[(\mathbf{1} \otimes \rho^\top) (R_T - R) \right] = 0 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}).$$

The fact that $R_T = R$ is now a consequence of the following lemma [26].

Lemma 2.2.19 *Let X be an operator on $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$. Suppose that, for any $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$, the operator ${}_{\mathcal{H}}\langle \psi | X \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is the zero operator. Then X is the zero operator on $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$.*

Thus we have shown that, for any completely positive $T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, there exists a unique positive operator $R_T \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ such that Eq. (2.28) holds. However, this correspondence works in the reverse direction as well. That is, given a positive operator $R \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H})$, the map

$$T_*^R(A) := \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[(\mathbf{1} \otimes A^\top) R \right] \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \quad (2.29)$$

is completely positive. In order to show this, we need the following trivial lemma.

Lemma 2.2.20 *Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space. An operator $X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is positive if and only if it can be written in the form $X = \sum_{\alpha} |\psi_{\alpha}\rangle \langle \psi_{\alpha}|$ for some collection $\{\psi_{\alpha}\}$ of vectors in \mathcal{H} .*

Now let a positive operator $R \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H})$ be given. Then Lemma 2.2.20 states that we can write $R = \sum_{\alpha} |V_{\alpha}\rangle \langle V_{\alpha}|$, where V_{α} are some operators from \mathcal{H} to \mathcal{H} . Substituting this form of R into Eq. (2.29), we get $T_*^R(A) := \sum_{\alpha} V_{\alpha} A V_{\alpha}^*$, which is completely positive. The map T_*^R is then the dual of the map $T^R : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, which is also completely positive.

We are interested in the specific case when $T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is a channel. Then $T_* : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is a trace-preserving map. That is, for any $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, we must have

$$\text{tr} T_*(A) = \text{tr} (A^\top \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} R_T) = \text{tr} A = \text{tr} A^\top,$$

which implies that $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} R_T = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$. We can summarize everything we have said up to now in the following theorem [26].

Theorem 2.2.21 (duality between channels and bipartite states) *Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces. There exists a one-to-one correspondence between channels $T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ and density operators $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K})$ with $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \rho = (1/\dim \mathcal{K})\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$, given by*

$$T_*(A) = \dim \mathcal{K} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{K}}[(\mathbb{1} \otimes A^\top)\rho] \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}), \quad (2.30)$$

where $T_* : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is the dual channel corresponding to T .

This correspondence can be extended to tensor products of channels in the following way [23, 149]. Let $S : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}_A)$ and $T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}_B)$ be channels, and let $\{e_i\}$ and $\{f_\mu\}$ be orthonormal bases of \mathcal{H}_A and \mathcal{H}_B respectively. Define the vectors

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{1}\rangle_A &:= \sum_i |e_i \otimes e_i\rangle \\ |\mathbb{1}\rangle_B &:= \sum_\mu |f_\mu \otimes f_\mu\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

and the operator

$$R_{S \otimes T} := (S \otimes \text{id} \otimes T \otimes \text{id})(|\mathbb{1}\rangle_{A A} \langle\langle \mathbb{1} | \otimes |\mathbb{1}\rangle_{B B} \langle\langle \mathbb{1} |). \quad (2.31)$$

Then the action of $S_* \otimes T_*$ on density operators $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ is given by

$$S_* \otimes T_*(\rho_A \otimes \rho_B) = \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_A} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B} \left[(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B} \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B}^\top) R_{S \otimes T} \right].$$

In the case of a product density operator $\rho_A \otimes \rho_B \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ we recover the correct relation $S_* \otimes T_*(\rho_A \otimes \rho_B) = S_*(\rho_A) \otimes T_*(\rho_B)$.

2.3 Distinguishability measures for states

In quantum information theory, we frequently encounter the following problem: given two states ω_1 and ω_2 , to what extent does one of them approximate the other? This problem is relevant, e.g., for the circuit model of quantum computation [8], whenever we need to determine how much the output states of an “ideal” quantum computer differ from the corresponding output states of the quantum circuit that approximates it. In this section we concentrate on two such measures of closeness for states, the trace-norm distance and the Jozsa-Uhlmann fidelity. We will freely use the concepts from the theory of trace ideals; the necessary background information is given in Sec. A.3.

2.3.1 Trace-norm distance

Any state ω over an algebra of observables \mathcal{A} is given essentially as a “catalogue” of the expectation values $\omega(A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Therefore it makes intuitive sense to say that two states ω_1 and ω_2 are close if the corresponding expectations $\omega_1(A)$ and $\omega_2(A)$ are close for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Without loss of generality, we can compare the expectations $\omega_1(A)$ and $\omega_2(A)$

on the unit ball of \mathcal{A} , i.e., the set of all $A \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\|A\| \leq 1$. The corresponding measure of closeness between ω_1 and ω_2 will thus be given by the variational expression

$$D(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}; \|A\| \leq 1} |\omega_1(A) - \omega_2(A)|.$$

In fact, we can vary only over the group $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{A})$ of the unitary elements of \mathcal{A} (i.e., those $U \in \mathcal{A}$ for which $UU^* = U^*U = \mathbb{1}$). This follows from the Russo-Dye theorem [30, p. 25] which states that the unit ball in a C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} with identity is the closed convex hull of the unitary elements of \mathcal{A} . So we take

$$D(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \sup_{U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{A})} |\omega_1(U) - \omega_2(U)| \quad (2.32)$$

as the putative measure of distance between ω_1 and ω_2 .

Consider a concrete quantum system with the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , and let ρ_1 and ρ_2 be a pair of density operators on \mathcal{H} . Then Eq. (2.32) will take the form

$$D(\rho_1, \rho_2) = \sup_{U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})} |\operatorname{tr}(\rho_1 U) - \operatorname{tr}(\rho_2 U)|. \quad (2.33)$$

Now we can use the fact that, for any $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, the maximum of $|\operatorname{tr}(AU)|$ over all unitaries U is attained when $AU \geq 0$ and equals the trace norm $\|A\|_1 := \operatorname{tr}(A^*A)^{1/2} \equiv \operatorname{tr}|A|$ [119, p. 43]. In other words, $D(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ is precisely the trace-norm distance $\|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1$.

Remark: Please note that the trace-norm distance $D(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ defined here is twice the *trace distance* $D(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ defined by Nielsen and Chuang [91]. Therefore, in order to avoid confusion, we will no longer use the notation $D(\cdot, \cdot)$. \square

The trace-norm distance is obviously a metric on the set $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ of all density operators on \mathcal{H} , and therefore possesses all the properties that make “geometrical sense” (e.g., the triangle inequality). In particular, because $\|\rho\|_1 = 1$ for any $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, we have $0 \leq \|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1 \leq 2$. It follows from the standard properties of norms that the minimum value 0 is attained if and only if $\rho_1 = \rho_2$, and it can be shown [145] that the maximum value 2 results if and only if $\rho_1 \rho_2 = 0$ (i.e., if and only if ρ_1 and ρ_2 have orthogonal ranges). When ρ_1 and ρ_2 are pure states, one can readily derive the formula $\|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1 = 2\sqrt{1 - |\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle|^2}$, where ψ_1 and ψ_2 are the corresponding state vectors. Furthermore, we have the following key result.

Theorem 2.3.1 *Let $T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ be a channel. Then, for any $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, we have the following.*

1. $\|T_*(\rho_1) - T_*(\rho_2)\|_1 \leq \|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1$.
2. *If T is unitarily implemented, i.e., $T(A) = UAU^*$ for a unitary $U : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$, then $\|T_*(\rho_1) - T_*(\rho_2)\|_1 = \|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1$.*

Proof: The proof of the first statement, due to Ruskai [113], runs as follows. Write $\rho_1 - \rho_2$ as a difference of two positive operators N_+, N_- with orthogonal ranges, so that $|\rho_1 - \rho_2| = N_+ + N_-$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_*(\rho_1) - T_*(\rho_2)\|_1 &= \|T_*(N_+) - T_*(N_-)\|_1 \\ &\leq \|T_*(N_+)\|_1 + \|T_*(N_-)\|_1 \\ &= \text{tr } T_*(N_+) + \text{tr } T_*(N_-) \\ &= \text{tr } (N_+ + N_-) \\ &\equiv \|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof.

To prove the second statement, note that $V \mapsto UVU^*$ is a group isomorphism between $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{K})$. Therefore substituting $U^*\rho_1U$ and $U^*\rho_2U$ into Eq. (2.33) instead of ρ_1 and ρ_2 does not change the value of the supremum. ■

The trace-norm distance also has an operational characterization in terms of generalized quantum measurements, and we will come back to it in Sec. 2.3.3.

2.3.2 Jozsa-Uhlmann fidelity

Another useful distinguishability measure for quantum states, the *fidelity*, is given by the formidable-looking expression

$$F(\rho_1, \rho_2) := \left(\text{tr } \sqrt{\sqrt{\rho_1}\rho_2\sqrt{\rho_1}} \right)^2, \quad (2.34)$$

where ρ_1 and ρ_2 are a pair of density operators. The fidelity (2.34) was introduced by Jozsa [63], but the original idea came from the work of Uhlmann [138] who generalized the notion of the “transition probability” $\langle\psi|\phi\rangle$ for pure states to general states over C^* -algebras. For this reason we will refer to the fidelity F as the *Jozsa-Uhlmann fidelity*.

The main appeal of the Jozsa-Uhlmann fidelity lies in the result known as the Uhlmann theorem [138]. We state this theorem in the form given by Jozsa [63].

Theorem 2.3.2 (Uhlmann) *Let ρ_1 and ρ_2 be density operators on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Then*

$$F(\rho_1, \rho_2) = \max_{\psi_1, \psi_2} |\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle|^2, \quad (2.35)$$

where the maximum is taken over all purifications ψ_1 and ψ_2 of ρ_1 and ρ_2 respectively in an extended Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K}$.

Proof: Without loss of generality, we may take $\mathcal{K} \simeq \mathcal{H}$ because only the nonzero eigenvalues of a density operator are relevant for constructing its purification. Let $\{e_i\}$ be the eigenvectors of ρ_1 , and $\{f_i\}$ the eigenvectors of ρ_2 . We can write all purifications of ρ_1 and ρ_2 in the form $|\sqrt{\rho_1}V\rangle\rangle$ and $|\sqrt{\rho_2}UW\rangle\rangle$ with respect to the basis $\{e_i\}$, where $f_i = Ue_i$, and V and W are the unitaries corresponding to the choice of basis in the auxiliary Hilbert space \mathcal{K} for each of the purifications. Writing

$$\langle\langle\sqrt{\rho_2}UW|\sqrt{\rho_1}V\rangle\rangle = \text{tr}(W^*U^*\sqrt{\rho_2}\sqrt{\rho_1}V) = \text{tr}(VW^*U^*\sqrt{\rho_2}\sqrt{\rho_1})$$

and observing that U is determined by ρ_1 and ρ_2 , we see that the maximum in Eq. (2.35) can be written as $\max_{V \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})} \left| \text{tr}(\sqrt{\rho_2} \sqrt{\rho_1} V) \right|^2$ and hence equals $\left(\text{tr} \left| \sqrt{\rho_2} \sqrt{\rho_1} \right| \right)^2 \equiv \left(\text{tr} \sqrt{\sqrt{\rho_1} \rho_2 \sqrt{\rho_1}} \right)^2$. This proves the theorem. ■

Apart from its immediate physical significance, the Uhlmann theorem allows us to derive the properties of the fidelity (2.34). We summarize these properties in the theorem below, for the proof of which the reader is referred to the paper of Jozsa [63].

Theorem 2.3.3 (properties of the Jozsa-Uhlmann fidelity)

1. $0 \leq F(\rho_1, \rho_2) \leq 1$ and $F(\rho_1, \rho_2) = 1$ if and only if $\rho_1 = \rho_2$.
2. F is a symmetric function: $F(\rho_1, \rho_2) = F(\rho_2, \rho_1)$.
3. If ρ_1 is pure, then $F(\rho_1, \rho_2) = \text{tr}(\rho_1 \rho_2)$ for any ρ_2 . Otherwise, $F(\rho_1, \rho_2) \geq \text{tr}(\rho_1 \rho_2)$.
4. For a fixed ρ , $F(\rho, \cdot)$ is a concave function: $F(\rho, \lambda_1 \rho_1 + \lambda_2 \rho_2) \geq \lambda_1 F(\rho, \rho_1) + \lambda_2 F(\rho, \rho_2)$ for any positive real numbers λ_1, λ_2 with $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 1$.
5. F is multiplicative with respect to tensor products: $F(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2, \rho_3 \otimes \rho_4) = F(\rho_1, \rho_3) F(\rho_2, \rho_4)$.
6. If T is a channel, then $F(T_*(\rho_1), T_*(\rho_2)) \geq F(\rho_1, \rho_2)$, where equality holds for all ρ_1, ρ_2 when T is unitarily implemented.

It can be shown that the trace-norm distance and the Jozsa-Uhlmann fidelity are equivalent distinguishability measures for quantum states. This follows from the following key theorem [42], given here without proof.

Theorem 2.3.4 (Fuchs-van de Graaf) For any two density operators ρ_1, ρ_2 ,

$$2 - 2\sqrt{F(\rho_1, \rho_2)} \leq \|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{1 - F(\rho_1, \rho_2)}. \quad (2.36)$$

Since the Jozsa-Uhlmann fidelity is easier to compute than the trace-norm distance, the Fuchs-van de Graaf theorem provides a quick and painless way to get tight estimates of the trace-norm distance.

2.3.3 Quantum detection theory

As we have shown in Example 2.2.8, any measurement performed on a quantum system with the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} can be described by a collection of effects F_x that form a resolution of identity on \mathcal{H} , i.e., $\sum_x F_x = \mathbf{1}$. This is an example of a *positive operator-valued measure*, which is defined as follows [59].

Definition 2.3.5 Let (\mathcal{X}, Σ) be a measurable space, i.e., \mathcal{X} is a set and Σ is a σ -algebra of subsets of \mathcal{X} , and let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space. Then a positive operator-valued measure (POVM) on \mathcal{X} with values in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is a map F from \mathcal{X} to the positive operators on \mathcal{H} which is

- (a) *normalized*: $F(\emptyset) = 0, F(\mathcal{X}) = \mathbf{1}$.
- (b) *σ -additive*: for any countable collection of pairwise disjoint sets $\mathcal{S}_i \in \Sigma$, $F(\cup_i \mathcal{S}_i) = \sum_i F(\mathcal{S}_i)$, where the sum converges in the strong operator topology.

The definition just given is the most general. In this section we will content ourselves with the case when the set \mathcal{X} is finite, so we will not have to deal with σ -algebras and the like. Then any POVM is simply a collection of positive operators $\{F_x | x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ with $\sum_x F_x = \mathbf{1}$. These operators will be referred to as the *elements* of the POVM.

Consider the following problem. We are presented with a quantum system whose state is unknown, but we are told that it is drawn from some known set $\{\rho_m\}_{m=1}^M$ according to the probability distribution $\{p_m\}_{m=1}^M$. Our task is to devise a measurement that would maximize the probability of correctly identifying the state. This is known as the *M -ary quantum detection problem* [58].

Any measurement we would perform will be described by a POVM F_m on the M -element set $\{1, \dots, M\}$. Given the state ρ , the probability of identifying ρ as ρ_m is equal to $\text{tr}(\rho F_m)$. Thus the average probability of correct decision using the POVM $F := \{F_m\}$ is given by

$$\bar{P}_c[F] := \sum_{m=1}^M p_m \text{tr}(\rho_m F_m). \quad (2.37)$$

The problem of designing the optimum M -ary quantum detector thus amounts to finding the M -element POVM F that would maximize $\bar{P}_c[F]$.

It is not possible to give a general closed-form expression for the POVM that would maximize Eq. (2.37). However, a theorem of Yuen, Kennedy, and Lax [147] gives necessary and sufficient conditions for a given POVM F to be a maximizer of $\bar{P}_c[F]$. Usually the candidate POVM's are found by inspection or by taking advantage of the problem's intrinsic symmetries, should they exist, in which case the Yuen-Kennedy-Lax theorem gives a quick way to verify the optimality. For many interesting examples, the reader is invited to consult their article [147], as well as the book by Helstrom [58].

We give a complete solution of the binary quantum detection problem ($M = 2$). In this case we are considering two-element POVM's $\{F, \mathbf{1} - F\}$, so there is only one independent operator F that must satisfy the condition $0 \leq F \leq \mathbf{1}$. The corresponding variational expression is

$$\bar{P}_c = \max_{0 \leq F \leq \mathbf{1}} \{p_1 \text{tr}(\rho_1 F) + p_2 \text{tr}[\rho(\mathbf{1} - F)]\},$$

which simplifies to

$$\bar{P}_c = p_2 + \max_{0 \leq F \leq \mathbf{1}} \text{tr}[(p_1 \rho_1 - p_2 \rho_2) F]. \quad (2.38)$$

We have the following theorem [58].

Theorem 2.3.6 (optimum binary quantum detection) *Consider the binary quantum detection problem for the density operators ρ_1 and ρ_2 and the probabilities p_1 and p_2 . Then the optimum average probability of correct decision is given by*

$$\bar{P}_c = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \|p_1 \rho_1 - p_2 \rho_2\|_1, \quad (2.39)$$

and the elements of the optimum POVM can be chosen to be projection operators.

Proof: Write down the orthogonal decomposition $p_1\rho_1 - p_2\rho_2 = R_+ - R_-$, where $R_{\pm} \geq 0$ and $R_+R_- = 0$. Because $R_- \geq 0$, we have $\text{tr } R_-F \geq 0$ for any $F \geq 0$, so

$$\max_{0 \leq F \leq \mathbb{I}} \text{tr} [(R_+ - R_-)F] \leq \max_{0 \leq F \leq \mathbb{I}} \text{tr} (R_+F) \leq \text{tr } R_+,$$

where the maximum is achieved by the projection operator P with $PR_+ = R_+$ and $PR_- = 0$. Thus

$$\max_{0 \leq F \leq \mathbb{I}} \text{tr} [(R_+ - R_-)F] = \text{tr } R_+.$$

Because $\text{tr} (p_1\rho_1 - p_2\rho_2) = p_1 - p_2$, we have $\text{tr } R_- = \text{tr } R_+ + p_2 - p_1$. Also

$$\|p_1\rho_1 - p_2\rho_2\|_1 = \text{tr} |p_1\rho_1 - p_2\rho_2| = \text{tr } R_+ + \text{tr } R_- = 2\text{tr } R_+ + p_2 - p_1,$$

whence it follows that

$$\max_{0 \leq F \leq \mathbb{I}} \bar{P}_c[F] = p_2 + \max_{0 \leq F \leq \mathbb{I}} \text{tr} [(p_1\rho_1 - p_2\rho_2)F] = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \|p_1\rho_1 - p_2\rho_2\|_1.$$

The optimizing POVM is then given by $\{P, \mathbb{I} - P\}$. ■

Theorem 2.3.6 clearly exhibits the prominent role played by the trace-norm distance in the quantitative characterization of the performance of generalized quantum measurements. In particular, the probability of correct discrimination between two equiprobable states ρ_1 and ρ_2 equals $1/2 + (1/4) \|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1$. Furthermore, the maximum average probability (2.39) of correct decision equals unity if and only if ρ_1 and ρ_2 are such that the trace norm $\|p_1\rho_1 - p_2\rho_2\|_1$ attains its maximum value of $p_1 + p_2 \equiv 1$, which happens if and only if $\rho_1\rho_2 = 0$. In the case when ρ_1 and ρ_2 are pure states, this reduces to the requirement that the corresponding state vectors be orthogonal.

The trace-norm distance between states ρ_1 and ρ_2 can also be expressed as [91, p. 405]

$$\|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|_1 = 2 \sup_{\{F_m\}} \sum_m |\text{tr} (\rho_1 F_m) - \text{tr} (\rho_2 F_m)|, \quad (2.40)$$

where the supremum is taken with respect to all POVM's whose elements belong to $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, where \mathcal{H} is the Hilbert space on which the density operators ρ_1 and ρ_2 act. A similar expression can be derived for $\|p_1\rho_1 - p_2\rho_2\|_1$, which shows that it is sufficient to consider only two-element POVM's for the solution of the binary quantum detection problem. The sum on the right-hand side of Eq. (2.40) is the so-called Kolmogorov distance between the probability distributions $\{\text{tr} (\rho_1 F_m)\}_{m=1}^M$ and $\{\text{tr} (\rho_2 F_m)\}_{m=1}^M$.

Incidentally, the Jozsa-Uhlmann fidelity (2.34) can likewise be given an intuitive operational meaning in terms of generalized quantum measurements by means of the formula [91, p. 412]

$$\sqrt{F(\rho_1, \rho_2)} = \inf_{\{F_m\}} \sum_m \sqrt{\text{tr} (\rho_1 F_m) \text{tr} (\rho_2 F_m)}. \quad (2.41)$$

The sum in the right-hand side of (2.41) is the so-called Fisher metric [6, p. 29], a Riemannian metric on the manifold of probability distributions on an m -element sample space. The physical meaning of Eqs. (2.40) and (2.41) is apparent: whenever we engage in the business of distinguishing quantum states, we are essentially distinguishing probability distributions describing the outcomes of generalized quantum measurements.

2.4 Distinguishability measures for channels

In the preceding section we have discussed ways in which we can compare quantum states. It is also important to have at our disposal some tools for the comparison of channels. In this section we describe two distinguishability measures for channels, the cb-norm distance and the channel fidelity. The latter distinguishability measure was defined and studied by the present author [103].

2.4.1 Norm of complete boundedness

Just as we have defined a distinguishability measure for states as a metric induced by the trace norm, it should likewise be possible to construct a distinguishability measure for channels from $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ to $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ in a natural way from a suitable metric on the set of all completely positive maps from $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ to $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$. One possible candidate is the metric induced by the operator norm,

$$\|T\| := \sup_{X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}); \|X\|=1} \|T(X)\|. \quad (2.42)$$

Unfortunately, the operator norm is rather ill-behaved: it is not stable with respect to tensor products. In particular, there are some positive maps T , for which the norm $\|T \otimes \text{id}_n\|$ will increase with n , as the following example [97] shows.

Example 2.4.1 (transposition map revisited) Consider the transposition map Θ (cf. Example 2.2.1) on the algebra \mathcal{M}_2 , and define the map $\Theta_2 := \Theta \otimes \text{id}_2$ on $\mathcal{M}_2 \otimes \mathcal{M}_2$. Let F be the flip operator

$$F = \sum_{i,j=1}^2 |e_j \otimes e_i\rangle\langle e_i \otimes e_j| \equiv \begin{pmatrix} e_{11} & e_{21} \\ e_{12} & e_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

for which we have $\|F\| = 1$. Now

$$\Theta_2(F) = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta(e_{11}) & \Theta(e_{21}) \\ \Theta(e_{12}) & \Theta(e_{22}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} e_{11} & e_{12} \\ e_{21} & e_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

which has norm 2. Thus $\|\Theta_2\| \geq 2$. □

A good choice then is the metric induced by the stabilized version of the operator norm (2.42), namely the *norm of complete boundedness* (or cb-norm for short), defined by [97]

$$\|T\|_{\text{cb}} := \sup_n \|T \otimes \text{id}_n\|. \quad (2.43)$$

For any operator $X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and any two maps S, T on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ with finite cb-norm (in the case of finite-dimensional \mathcal{H} , this is always true [97]), we have the relations

$$\|T(X)\| \leq \|T\|_{\text{cb}} \|X\|, \quad (2.44)$$

$$\|ST\|_{\text{cb}} \leq \|S\|_{\text{cb}} \|T\|_{\text{cb}}, \quad (2.45)$$

$$\|S \otimes T\|_{\text{cb}} = \|S\|_{\text{cb}} \|T\|_{\text{cb}}. \quad (2.46)$$

Furthermore, for any completely positive map T , we have [97] $\|T\|_{\text{cb}} = \|T(\mathbf{1})\|$. This implies, in particular, that $\|T\|_{\text{cb}} = 1$ for any channel.

We have defined the cb-norm (2.43) for channels that act on observables, but we also need a similar norm for the corresponding dual channels that act on states (and, by linear extension, on trace-class operators). Thus let $T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ be a channel, and let $T_* : \mathcal{T}_1(\mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_1(\mathcal{H})$ be its dual. Then we define the norm of T_* as

$$\|T_*\| := \sup_{X \in \mathcal{T}_1(\mathcal{K}); \|X\|_1=1} \|T_*(X)\|_1,$$

and the corresponding cb-norm as

$$\|T_*\|_{\text{cb}} := \sup_n \|T_* \otimes \text{id}_n\|. \quad (2.47)$$

Luckily, the cb-norms of T and T_* agree, as follows from the following argument. We have

$$\sup_{\substack{X \in \mathcal{T}_1(\mathcal{K}); \\ \|X\|_1=1}} \sup_{\substack{Y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}); \\ \|Y\|=1}} |\text{tr}[T_*(X)Y]| = \sup_{\substack{X \in \mathcal{T}_1(\mathcal{K}); \\ \|X\|_1=1}} \|T_*(X)\|_1 \equiv \|T_*\|$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\substack{X \in \mathcal{T}_1(\mathcal{H}); \\ \|X\|_1=1}} \sup_{\substack{Y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}); \\ \|Y\|=1}} |\text{tr}[T_*(X)Y]| &= \sup_{\substack{Y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}); \\ \|Y\|=1}} \sup_{\substack{X \in \mathcal{T}_1(\mathcal{H}); \\ \|X\|_1=1}} |\text{tr}[XT(Y)]| \\ &= \sup_{\substack{Y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}); \\ \|Y\|=1}} \|T(Y)\| \equiv \|T\|, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that $\|T\| = \|T_*\|$ for any two maps $T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ and $T_* : \mathcal{T}_1(\mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_1(\mathcal{H})$ that are connected via the duality relation

$$\text{tr}[XT(Y)] = \text{tr}[T_*(X)Y], \quad \forall X \in \mathcal{T}_1(\mathcal{H}), \forall Y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$$

and such that at least one of them has finite norm. Therefore we have, for any n , $\|T \otimes \text{id}_n\| = \|T_* \otimes \text{id}_n\|$; taking the supremum of both sides with respect to n , we get $\|T\|_{\text{cb}} = \|T_*\|_{\text{cb}}$. This equality holds for completely positive maps in particular, and for completely bounded maps in general (e.g., for sums and differences of completely positive maps). Thus the properties similar to (2.44)-(2.46) also hold for the cb-norm (2.47), but with obvious modifications (e.g., with the operator norm replaced by the trace norm). In particular, we have $\|T_*\|_{\text{cb}} = 1$ for any channel T . The “dual” cb-norm (2.47) has appeared, under different guises, in the work of Aharonov, Kitaev, and Nisan [2], Giedke *et al.* [49], and Kitaev [66].

If two channels T, S are close in cb-norm, then, for any density operator ρ , the corresponding states $T_*(\rho), S_*(\rho)$ are close in trace norm since, from Eq. (2.44), it follows that

$$\|T_*(\rho) - S_*(\rho)\|_1 = \|(T_* - S_*)(\rho)\|_1 \leq \|T_* - S_*\|_{\text{cb}} = \|T - S\|_{\text{cb}}.$$

In fact, the above estimate cannot be loosened by adjoining a second system with the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} in some state $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}$, entangling the two systems through some channel K




Figure 2.1: Using entanglement to distinguish between quantum channels.

on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K})$, and then comparing the channels $T \otimes R$ and $S \otimes R$, where $R : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ is some suitably chosen channel. This is evident from the estimate

$$\|(T_* \otimes R_*)K_*(\rho \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{K}}) - (S_* \otimes R_*)K_*(\rho \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{K}})\|_1 \leq \|T_* - S_*\|_{\text{cb}},$$

which can be easily obtained by repeated application of Eqs. (2.44)-(2.46). In other words, as far as the cb-norm distinguishability criterion is concerned, entangling the system with an auxiliary system will not improve distinguishability of the channels T and S . The cb-norm, however, is an extremely strong distinguishability measure: its definition already accounts for optimization with respect to entanglement and input states over Hilbert spaces of very large (but finite) dimension. There exist weaker measures of channel distinguishability (such as the channel fidelity presented below) that describe how channels may be distinguished with bounded resources. Using these weaker criteria, one may show that the use of entanglement does entail an improvement in the practical distinguishability of both states and channels [27].

2.4.2 Channel fidelity

Recall that the Jozsa-Uhlmann fidelity (2.34) can be given an intuitive operational meaning in terms of the Fisher metric on the manifold of probability distributions. This suggests that any experiment designed to distinguish between two given quantum states amounts to distinguishing a pair of suitable probability distributions.

It is tempting to apply the same idea to distinguishability of channels. Consider the situation portrayed in Fig. 2.1. Namely, suppose that we are given a “black box” that effects one of two channels S, T . In order to tell what the “black box” does, we can exploit the correspondence (2.27) between channels and bipartite states. That is, we prepare two systems, A and B , in the maximally entangled state $|\mathbb{1}\rangle\rangle\langle\langle\mathbb{1}|$, and then let the “black box” act on A , while leaving B untouched. The resulting state is, up to normalization, the R -operator (2.27) of the unknown channel. In order to distinguish between S and T , we simply perform a measurement that would distinguish between the states $(S_* \otimes \text{id})(|\mathbb{1}\rangle\rangle\langle\langle\mathbb{1}|)$ and $(T_* \otimes \text{id})(|\mathbb{1}\rangle\rangle\langle\langle\mathbb{1}|)$. In fact, D’Ariano, Lo Presti, and Paris have recently shown [27] that strategies of this kind generally result in improved distinguishability.

The correspondence (2.27) between channels $T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ and positive operators $R_T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K})$ is, as we already stated, bijective: namely, $R_S = R_T$ if and only if $S = T$. Furthermore, it is easy to see that $\rho_T := (1/d)R_T$, where $d = \dim \mathcal{K}$, is a density operator. Hence it seems natural to define the *fidelity* $\mathcal{F}(S, T)$ between two channels S and T as the Jozsa-Uhlmann fidelity between the density operators ρ_S and ρ_T :

$$\mathcal{F}(S, T) := F(\rho_S, \rho_T). \quad (2.48)$$

Being expressed in terms of the Jozsa-Uhlmann fidelity F , the channel fidelity \mathcal{F} inherits many of its natural properties. We now summarize these properties with brief proofs [103].

Theorem 2.4.2 (properties of the channel fidelity) *Let S, T be channels $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$, and let $d = \dim \mathcal{K}$. Then the channel fidelity \mathcal{F} has the following properties.*

1. $0 \leq \mathcal{F}(S, T) \leq 1$, and $\mathcal{F}(S, T) = 1$ if and only if $S = T$.
2. $\mathcal{F}(S, T) = \mathcal{F}(T, S)$ (symmetry).
3. For any two unitarily implemented channels \hat{U} and \hat{V} [i.e., $\hat{U}_*(\rho) = U\rho U^*$ and $\hat{V}_*(\rho) = V\rho V^*$ with unitary U and V], $\mathcal{F}(\hat{U}, \hat{V}) = (1/d^2) |\text{tr}(U^*V)|^2$.
4. For any real λ with $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$, $\mathcal{F}(S, \lambda T_1 + (1 - \lambda)T_2) \geq \lambda \mathcal{F}(S, T_1) + (1 - \lambda)\mathcal{F}(S, T_2)$ (concavity).
5. $\mathcal{F}(S_1 \otimes S_2, T_1 \otimes T_2) = \mathcal{F}(S_1, T_1)\mathcal{F}(S_2, T_2)$ (multiplicativity with respect to tensoring).
6. \mathcal{F} is invariant under composition with unitarily implemented channels, i.e., for any unitarily implemented channel \hat{U} , $\mathcal{F}(S\hat{U}, T\hat{U}) = \mathcal{F}(S, T)$ and $\mathcal{F}(\hat{U}S, \hat{U}T) = \mathcal{F}(S, T)$.
7. \mathcal{F} does not decrease under composition with arbitrary channels, i.e., for any channel R , $\mathcal{F}(SR, TR) \geq \mathcal{F}(S, T)$.

Proof:

- 1, 2. These hold because ρ_S and ρ_T are density operators, and because $T \mapsto \rho_T$ is a bijection.
3. $R_{\hat{U}} = |U\rangle\rangle\langle\langle U|$, and similarly for $R_{\hat{V}}$. Thus both $\rho_{\hat{U}}$ and $\rho_{\hat{V}}$ are pure states. Since for pure states ψ, ϕ we have $F = |\langle\psi|\phi\rangle|^2$, it follows that $\mathcal{F}(\hat{U}, \hat{V}) = (1/d^2) |\langle\langle U|V\rangle\rangle|^2 = (1/d^2) |\text{tr}(U^*V)|^2$.
4. Note that the map $T \mapsto \rho_T$ is linear. Thus, for $T = \lambda T_1 + (1 - \lambda)T_2$, we have $\rho_T = \lambda \rho_{T_1} + (1 - \lambda)\rho_{T_2}$, and the concavity of \mathcal{F} follows from the concavity of the mixed-state fidelity (2.34).
5. It follows from Eq. (2.31) that $\rho_{S \otimes T} = \rho_S \otimes \rho_T$, and the multiplicativity property of \mathcal{F} follows from the corresponding property of F .

6. Write $T\hat{U} \otimes \text{id} = (T \otimes \text{id})(\hat{U} \otimes \text{id})$ to obtain $\rho_{T\hat{U}} = (U \otimes \mathbb{1})\rho_T(U^* \otimes \mathbb{1})$, and do the same for $S\hat{U}$. Since the mixed-state fidelity F is invariant under unitary transformations, the same property holds for the channel fidelity \mathcal{F} . For $\hat{U}T$, we have $\rho_{\hat{U}T} = (T_* \otimes \text{id})|U\rangle\rangle\langle\langle U| = (\mathbb{1} \otimes U^\top)\rho_T(\mathbb{1} \otimes (U^\top)^*)$, and the same holds for $\hat{U}S$. Because U is unitary, U^\top is unitary also. Thus ρ_T and $\rho_{\hat{U}T}$ are unitarily equivalent, as are ρ_S and $\rho_{\hat{U}S}$, and the desired conclusion again follows from the unitary invariance of the Jozsa-Uhlmann fidelity.
7. The same reasoning as before, except now we have to use the property that $F((R_* \otimes \text{id})\rho_S, (R_* \otimes \text{id})\rho_T) \geq F(\rho_S, \rho_T)$.

■

Remark: Property 6 (invariance of \mathcal{F} under unitary transformations) implies that our definition of the channel fidelity is good in the sense that we could have used *any* maximally entangled pure state to define the density operators ρ_S and ρ_T for the channels S and T to obtain the same numerical value for the fidelity $\mathcal{F}(S, T) := F(\rho_S, \rho_T)$. \square

Our next step is to obtain a meaningful analogue of Uhlmann's theorem for the channel fidelity \mathcal{F} . In order to do that, we must draw the connection between the channel T and purifications of the density operator ρ_T . As a warm-up, let us first prove the following lemma [103].

Lemma 2.4.3 *Given a channel $T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$, where \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} are isomorphic Hilbert spaces with $d = \dim \mathcal{H} = \dim \mathcal{K}$, the density operator ρ_T is pure if and only if the channel T is unitarily implemented.*

Proof: Proving the forward implication is easy: $\rho_{\hat{U}} = (1/d)|U\rangle\rangle\langle\langle U|$, which is a pure state. Let us now prove the reverse implication. Suppose that, given the channel T , the state ρ_T is pure. It follows from Theorem 2.2.21 that the reduced density operator $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{K}}\rho_T$ is a multiple of the identity, i.e., a maximally mixed state. Since ρ_T is pure, the reduced density operators $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}}\rho_T$ and $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{K}}\rho_T$ have the same nonzero eigenvalues [83]. All eigenvalues of $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{K}}\rho_T \equiv (1/d)\mathbb{1}$ are equal and positive. Since $\mathcal{H} \simeq \mathcal{K}$ by assumption, $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}}\rho_T$ and $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{K}}\rho_T$ are isospectral. Hence ρ_T is a maximally entangled state and therefore has the form $(1/d)|U\rangle\rangle\langle\langle U|$ for some unitary U (cf. Example 2.2.17). Using Eq. (2.24), we can write

$$|U\rangle\rangle\langle\langle U| = (U \otimes \mathbb{1})|\mathbb{1}\rangle\rangle\langle\langle \mathbb{1}|(U^* \otimes \mathbb{1}),$$

which implies that T is a unitarily implemented channel. \blacksquare

Therefore, for any two unitarily implemented channels \hat{U} and \hat{V} , the states $\rho_{\hat{U}}, \rho_{\hat{V}}$ are already pure and, as stated in Theorem 2.4.2,

$$\mathcal{F}(\hat{U}, \hat{V}) = \frac{1}{d^2} |\langle\langle U|V\rangle\rangle|^2 \equiv \frac{1}{d^2} |\text{tr}(U^*V)|^2, \quad (2.49)$$

which is nothing but the squared normalized Hilbert-Schmidt inner product of the operators U and V . As we shall now show, the fidelity $\mathcal{F}(S, T)$ for *arbitrary channels*

$S, T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ can be expressed as a maximum of expressions similar to the right-hand side of Eq. (2.49), but with the difference that, in place of the unitaries U and V , there will appear certain *isometries* from \mathcal{H} to $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{E}$, where \mathcal{E} is a suitably defined auxiliary Hilbert space. The following theorem [103] states this in precise terms.

Theorem 2.4.4 *Let $S, T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ be channels, where \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} are finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces. Then we can choose a Hilbert space \mathcal{E} and two isometries $V, W : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{E}$ such that, for any $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$,*

$$S(A) = V^*(A \otimes \mathbf{I}_{\mathcal{E}})V \quad (2.50)$$

$$T(A) = W^*(A \otimes \mathbf{I}_{\mathcal{E}})W, \quad (2.51)$$

and the isometries V, W are unique up to a unitary transformation of \mathcal{E} . Furthermore,

$$\mathcal{F}(S, T) = \left(\frac{1}{\dim \mathcal{K}} \right)^2 \max_{V, W} |\text{tr}(V^*W)|^2, \quad (2.52)$$

where the maximum is taken over all such isometries V and W .

Proof: Consider the channel S . Given any Kraus decomposition $\{V_{\alpha}\}$ of S , we can define the isometry V through Eq. (2.16). It can be shown that we can always choose a Kraus decomposition of S in such a way that the operators forming it are linearly independent in the sense of Hilbert-Schmidt; such a decomposition, referred to as the *minimal Kraus decomposition* [90], will consist of at most $\dim \mathcal{H} \cdot \dim \mathcal{K}$ operators. The same holds for the channel T . Then we can choose the Hilbert space $\mathcal{E} \simeq \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K}$ and add as many zero operators to the given minimal Kraus decompositions $\{V_{\alpha}\}$ and $\{W_{\alpha}\}$ of S and T as necessary.

Assuming that this has been done, we can write

$$\rho_S = \frac{1}{\dim \mathcal{K}} \sum_{\alpha} |V_{\alpha}\rangle\langle V_{\alpha}|,$$

and construct the purification of ρ_S in $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{E}$,

$$\psi_S := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\dim \mathcal{K}}} \sum_{\alpha} |V_{\alpha}\rangle \otimes |e_{\alpha}\rangle.$$

Let us define the isometry $V' : \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{E}$ through

$$V'(\psi \otimes \phi) := \sum_{\alpha} (V_{\alpha}\psi) \otimes \phi \otimes e_{\alpha},$$

in which case we have $\psi_S = (1/\sqrt{\dim \mathcal{K}})V'|\mathbf{1}\rangle$. Do the same thing for the channel T to arrive at the purification $\psi_T = (1/\sqrt{\dim \mathcal{K}})W'|\mathbf{1}\rangle$ of ρ_T . From Uhlmann's theorem (Theorem 2.3.2) we have

$$F(\rho_S, \rho_T) = \max_{\psi_S, \psi_T} |\langle \psi_S | \psi_T \rangle|^2.$$

It is easily shown that $\langle \psi_S | \psi_T \rangle = (1/\dim \mathcal{K})\langle\langle \mathbf{1} | (V'^*W') \mathbf{1} \rangle\rangle \equiv (1/\dim \mathcal{K})\text{tr} V^*W$. Hence the maximization over the purifications ψ_S and ψ_T of ρ_S and ρ_T is equivalent to the

maximization over the isometries V and W , and the theorem is proved. \blacksquare

Finally we consider the relation of the channel fidelity \mathcal{F} to the cb-norm. Using the properties of the latter, as well as the Fuchs-van de Graaf theorem (Theorem 2.3.4), we easily obtain the inequality

$$2 - 2\sqrt{\mathcal{F}(S, T)} \leq \|S - T\|_{\text{cb}}. \quad (2.53)$$

It is certainly an interesting and important problem to derive an upper bound on $\|S - T\|_{\text{cb}}$ in terms of $\mathcal{F}(S, T)$. We can expect that this upper bound will not be nearly as tight as the lower bound because, as we have indicated above, the cb-norm distance is a much stronger distinguishability criterion than the channel fidelity.

However, in the case when one of the channels is the identity channel, and the other one is an arbitrary channel $T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, we actually *can* bound the channel fidelity in terms of the cb-norm both above and below. For this purpose we need the *off-diagonal fidelity* of the channel $T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, defined by [144]

$$\mathcal{F}_{\%}(T) := \sup_{\psi, \phi \in \mathcal{H}} \text{Re} \langle \phi | T_*(|\phi\rangle\langle\psi|)\psi \rangle,$$

for which we have the inequality

$$\|T - \text{id}\|_{\text{cb}} \leq 4\sqrt{1 - \mathcal{F}_{\%}(T)}.$$

Then $\mathcal{F}(T, \text{id}) \leq \mathcal{F}_{\%}(T \otimes \text{id})$, so that, using the fact that the cb-norm is multiplicative with respect to tensor products, we get

$$\|T - \text{id}\|_{\text{cb}} \leq 4\sqrt{1 - \mathcal{F}(T, \text{id})}. \quad (2.54)$$

Combining inequalities (2.53) and (2.54) yields

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \|T - \text{id}\|_{\text{cb}}\right)^2 \leq \mathcal{F}(T, \text{id}) \leq 1 - \frac{1}{16} \|T - \text{id}\|_{\text{cb}}^2. \quad (2.55)$$

The upper bound in this inequality is not nearly as tight as the lower bound. Indeed, when $\|T - \text{id}\|_{\text{cb}}$ equals its maximum value of 2, the fidelity $\mathcal{F}(T, \text{id})$ can take any value between 0 and 3/4. This serves as yet another indication that the cb-norm is a much more stringent distinguishability criterion than the channel fidelity \mathcal{F} .

Strictly contractive channels

Among the basic postulates laid down by the founding fathers of statistical physics, there is the so-called *zeroth law of thermodynamics* [36, p. 3], [124, p. 18] which expresses formally the empirical fact that any large system will normally be observed in an *equilibrium state* characterized by a few macroscopic parameters, and that any system not in equilibrium will rapidly approach it. This process of return to equilibrium is normally referred to as *relaxation* [72]. One of the main parameters of a relaxation process is the *relaxation time* τ_{relax} — if we disturb a large system at $t = 0$ and then observe it again at $t \gg \tau_{\text{relax}}$, we will find, with high probability, that the system is in a state arbitrarily close to equilibrium.

The classic example of a relaxation process is the phenomenon of *thermalization*, i.e., when a physical system reaches thermal equilibrium with its surroundings, the latter being maintained at an absolute temperature T . It is a basic result in statistical mechanics [132, p. 153] that the corresponding equilibrium state is precisely the *canonical* (or *Gibbs*) state

$$\rho_\beta := \frac{e^{-\beta H}}{Z_\beta}, \tag{3.1}$$

where H is the Hamiltonian of the system, $\beta := 1/k_B T$ is the *inverse temperature*, and the normalizing factor $Z_\beta := \text{tr } e^{-\beta H}$ is known as the *canonical partition function*. We will discuss the Gibbs state in greater detail in Ch. 4, when we talk about the Gibbs variational principle.

The ultimate goal of the experimental research into quantum information processing is the construction of a reliable large-scale quantum computer. Such a computer will necessarily be a macroscopic system subject to the laws of thermodynamics; therefore it makes sense to deal with such things as approach to equilibrium, and relaxation processes in general, in the context of quantum information theory.

3.1 Relaxation processes and channels

How can we model a relaxation process using the tools of quantum information theory? A good way to do this is by means of a discrete-time version of a quantum dynamical semigroup [31]. Consider a quantum system with the algebra of observables \mathcal{A} , and let $T : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be a channel¹. Then the dynamics is given by the semigroup $\{T^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, so that T represents a single step of the dynamics. Given any initial state $\omega_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$, we can track the evolution of the system under the semigroup dynamics by following the orbit $\{\omega_n\}$, where $\omega_n := \omega_0 \circ T^n$. The dynamics defined in this way is *stationary* (i.e., the evolution law is independent of time) and *Markovian* (i.e., the state ω_n depends only on the initial state ω_0).

A good model of relaxation should satisfy the following natural requirements. (1) There should exist a unique state $\omega_T \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\omega_T \circ T = \omega_T$. (2) For any choice of the initial state ω_0 , the sequence $\{\omega_n\}$ should converge weakly* to ω_T , in the sense of the following definition.

Definition 3.1.1 *Let \mathcal{X} be a Banach space with the dual Banach space \mathcal{X}^* . Then the sequence $\{\omega_n\}$ in \mathcal{X}^* is said to converge to some $\omega \in \mathcal{X}^*$ in the weak* sense, written as $w^*\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega_n = \omega$, if for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$ we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega_n(X) = \omega(X)$.*

It can be shown [16, p. 68] that weak* convergence of a sequence $\{\omega_n\}$ of normal states implies trace-norm convergence of the sequence $\{\rho_n\}$ of the corresponding density operators, and *vice versa*. (3) The convergence of the orbit $\{\omega_n\}$ to the equilibrium state ω_T should be exponential, i.e., there should exist a constant k with $0 < k < 1$ such that, for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$, $|\omega_n(A) - \omega_T(A)| \leq C_A k^n$, where C_A is a constant depending on A . Our reason for insisting on this is dictated essentially by the zeroth law.

The first requirement states that the channel T must be *ergodic*, according to the following definition.

Definition 3.1.2 *Let \mathcal{A} be an algebra of observables. A channel $T : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is called ergodic if there exists a unique state $\omega_T \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\omega_T \circ T = \omega_T$.*

Ergodicity of the channel T implies that, for any state $\omega \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$, the *ergodic mean*

$$\bar{\omega}_N := \frac{1}{N+1} \sum_{n=0}^N \omega \circ T^n \quad (3.2)$$

converges weakly* to the unique T -invariant state ω_T . In terms of the corresponding density operators, we would then have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N+1} \sum_{n=0}^N T_*^n(\rho) - \rho_T \right\|_1 = 0,$$

¹We have made the unfortunate choice of denoting a typical channel by the letter T , the same letter also being used for temperature. We hope that it will always be clear from the context what the letter T stands for.

where T_* is the dual channel corresponding to T , and ρ_T is the density operator corresponding to the unique T -invariant state, i.e., $T_*(\rho_T) = \rho_T$.

To prove the weak* convergence of the ergodic mean (3.2) to ω_T , we first note that, because the state space of a C*-algebra with identity is weakly* compact [16, p. 53], the sequence $\{\bar{\omega}_N\}$ has a weakly* convergent subsequence. Furthermore, for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$|(\bar{\omega}_N \circ T)(A) - \bar{\omega}_N(A)| = \frac{1}{N+1} |(\omega \circ T^{N+1})(A) - \omega(A)| \leq \frac{2\|A\|}{N+1},$$

i.e., any weakly* convergent subsequence of $\{\bar{\omega}_N\}$ has a T -invariant limit. Because the T -invariant state ω_T is unique, we see that *every* weakly* convergent subsequence of $\{\bar{\omega}_N\}$ converges to ω_T . Thus it follows that

$$\text{w}^*\text{-}\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N+1} \sum_{n=0}^N \omega \circ T^n = \omega_T \quad \forall \omega \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$$

by weak* compactness of $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$.

However, mere ergodicity of T is not sufficient; we also demand weak* convergence of the orbit $\{\omega \circ T^n\}$ for any $\omega \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$. Thus, for any observable $A \in \mathcal{A}$, the sequence of the expectation values $\{(\omega \circ T^n)(A)\}$ should converge to the expectation value $\omega_T(A)$, i.e., the dynamics should be *mixing*. In terms of the corresponding density operators, we must have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|T_*^n(\rho) - \rho_T\|_1 = 0$$

for all ρ . While mixing implies ergodicity, the converse is not necessarily true. It turns out, however, that, at least in the case when the underlying Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is finite-dimensional, there is a condition under which ergodicity and mixing are equivalent. This is the content of the following result of Werner, stated in the article by Terhal and DiVincenzo [135].

Theorem 3.1.3 (Werner) *Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space of finite dimension d . Let $T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be a channel with the dual channel T_* . Suppose that the map T_* , extended linearly to all of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, has a unique fixed point $\rho_T \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$. Then there exist a polynomial P and a constant $k \in (0, 1)$ such that, for any $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$,*

$$\|T_*^n(\rho) - \rho_T\|_1 \leq C_d P(n) k^n, \tag{3.3}$$

where the constant C_d depends on the dimension d . Furthermore, if we view T_* as a linear operator on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ with the eigenvalues μ_m , then $k = \max_{m; \mu_m \neq 1} |\mu_m|$. If T_* is diagonalizable, then the estimate (3.3) holds with $P \equiv 1$.

The main requirement of Theorem 3.1.3 is the uniqueness of the fixed point of T_* in the entire algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, not just in the state space $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$. However, if the only information we have is that there is a unique T -invariant state, the above criterion may not apply. Fortunately, there exist other methods of proving the mixing property, such as the following theorem [132, p. 52].

Theorem 3.1.4 (Liapunov’s direct method) *Let \mathcal{X} be a separable compact space, and let $\tau : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be a continuous map. Suppose that there exists a strict Liapunov function for τ , i.e., a continuous functional f on \mathcal{X} such that, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $(f \circ \tau)(x) > f(x)$ unless $\tau(x) = x$. Suppose also that τ has a unique fixed point $x_\tau \in \mathcal{X}$. Then, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, the sequence $\{\tau^n(x)\}$ converges to x_τ .*

Remark: In order for Theorem 3.1.4 to be applicable, the topology of \mathcal{X} must be such that (a) \mathcal{X} is separable and compact, (b) τ is continuous, and (c) f is continuous. Then the sequence $\{\tau^n(x)\}$ converges in this topology. \square

Finally we come to the last desideratum on our list, namely the exponential convergence of the sequence $\{T_*^n(\rho)\}$. When the algebra of observables is finite-dimensional, Theorem 3.1.3 says that this holds whenever T_* has a unique fixed point (which would necessarily be a density operator [135]), and is a diagonalizable linear operator on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. However, if the only piece of information we have to go on is the uniqueness of the T -invariant state, then Theorem 3.1.3 will not apply. We can only say that, in general, the exact convergence rate of the orbit $\{T_*^n(\rho)\}$ will depend on the spectrum of T_* .

Explicit models of relaxation processes were constructed using the tools of quantum information theory in the articles of Scarani *et al.* [116] and Ziman *et al.* [152]. Also, an interesting paper by Terhal and DiVincenzo [135] investigates the possibility of using quantum computers to *simulate* relaxation processes. In this chapter we describe another approach to this problem, via the so-called *strictly contractive channels*. Our exposition closely follows Ref. [104].

Before we go on, we make one important comment concerning notation. For the most part of our discussion in this chapter, as well as in the next chapter, we will deal with transformations of states (i.e., the Schrödinger picture). Therefore, if we are given a system with the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , we will use the term “channel” to refer to any completely positive trace-preserving linear map $T : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, and we will also omit the asterisk subscript in order to avoid cluttered equations. On those rare occasions when we do talk about the Heisenberg picture, the corresponding map will be denoted by \hat{T} .

3.2 Strictly contractive channels

3.2.1 Definition

Recall Theorem 2.3.1, which states that, for any channel T and any two density operators ρ, σ in its domain,

$$\|T(\rho) - T(\sigma)\|_1 \leq \|\rho - \sigma\|_1.$$

In other words, any channel is a *contraction* in the trace norm on the set of density operators. Now consider the following definition.

Definition 3.2.1 *A channel $T : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ is called strictly contractive if there exists a constant $k \in [0, 1)$, called the contractivity modulus, such that*

$$\|T(\rho) - T(\sigma)\|_1 \leq k \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \tag{3.4}$$




Figure 3.1: The effect of a strictly contractive channel T on the state space $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ of the quantum system.

for any pair of density operators $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$.

As shown in Fig. 3.1, the action of a strictly contractive channel on the set $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ can be visualized as a uniform shrinking of the trace-norm distance between any two density operators ρ, σ .

It is easily seen that any strictly contractive channel satisfies our requirements for a relaxation dynamics. First of all, the set $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ is a closed subset of the Banach space $\mathcal{T}_1(\mathcal{H})$ of the trace-class operators on \mathcal{H} . Then the contraction mapping principle (cf. Section A.4) tells us that there exists a *unique* density operator $\rho_T \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $T(\rho_T) = \rho_T$. Furthermore, given any pair $\rho_0, \sigma_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, consider the orbits $\{T^n(\rho_0)\}$ and $\{T^n(\sigma_0)\}$. Strict contractivity shows that these orbits get exponentially close to each other with n because

$$\|T^n(\rho_0) - T^n(\sigma_0)\|_1 \leq k^n \|\rho_0 - \sigma_0\|_1.$$

Furthermore, each orbit converges to ρ_T as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus the image of $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ under the iterates T^n shrinks to a point (namely, ρ_T) exponentially fast. These features naturally lead us toward mixing, and hence ergodicity, because the trace-norm convergence of the orbit $\{T^n(\rho)\}$ implies the convergence of the expectation values $\text{tr}[AT^n(\rho)]$ to $\text{tr}(A\rho_T)$ for any $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

Another feature of strictly contractive channels is that they render the states of the system less distinguishable in the sense of quantum detection theory (see Section 2.3.3). To see this, we observe that no two density operators in the image of $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ under a strictly contractive channel can be farther than $2k$ from one another in terms of the trace-norm distance. This puts an upper bound on the optimum probability of correct discrimination between any two equiprobable density operators in the image of a strictly contractive channel in a binary quantum detection scheme, namely

$$\bar{P}_c \leq \frac{1+k}{2}.$$

Thus there is always a nonzero probability of making an error, which satisfies the bound

$$\bar{P}_e \geq \frac{1-k}{2}.$$

In any realistic setting, hardly any event occurs with probability exactly equal to unity. For instance, we can never prepare a pure state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, but rather a mixture $(1-\epsilon)|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + \epsilon\rho$,

where both ϵ and ρ depend on the particulars of the preparation procedure. Similarly, the measuring device that would ideally identify $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ perfectly will instead be realized by $(1 - \delta)|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + \delta F$, where δ and the operator F , $0 \leq F \leq \mathbb{1}$, are again determined by practice. If we assume that, in any physically realizable quantum computer, all state preparation, manipulation, and registration procedures can be carried out with finite precision, then it is reasonable to expect that there exist strict bounds on all probabilities that figure in the description of the computer's operation.

As we argued in Chapter 1, any imprecision in a nonideal quantum computer can be traced back to our inability to distinguish between quantum states beyond a certain resolution threshold. In other words, in any experimental situation there will always be some small ϵ_0 such that any two states with $\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 < \epsilon_0$ must be considered *practically* indistinguishable. It follows from the discussion above that strictly contractive channels capture this intuition mathematically. Furthermore, as we will see later, *any* channel can be approximated arbitrarily closely in cb-norm by a strictly contractive channel. This means that, for any channel T and any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists some strictly contractive channel T' such that $\|T - T'\|_{\text{cb}} < \epsilon$. Then, using Eq. (2.53), we see that $\mathcal{F}(T, T') > (1 - \epsilon/2)^2 \simeq 1 - \epsilon$ for ϵ sufficiently small. This, of course, means that the channels T and T' cannot be distinguished by any experimental procedure whenever ϵ is less than the threshold resolution ϵ_0 .

We note that strictly contractive channels have been mentioned in the text of Nielsen and Chuang [91], but none of their properties, apart from the uniqueness of the fixed point, were described.

3.2.2 Examples

In this section we give a few examples of strictly contractive channels. All of these channels have been extensively studied by the researchers in the field of quantum information theory.

Example 3.2.2 (degenerate channel) Let ρ be a density operator on \mathcal{H} , and consider the map $K_\rho : X \mapsto (\text{tr } X)\rho$. This is a completely positive trace-preserving map of $\mathcal{T}_1(\mathcal{H})$ into itself, and its restriction to $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ is the channel that maps any density operator $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ to ρ . It is easy to see that ρ is the only fixed point of K_ρ , and that K_ρ is strictly contractive with $k = 0$. Channels of this form are called *degenerate* (in the terminology of Davies [31]). \square

Example 3.2.3 (depolarizing channel) Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space of finite dimension d . For any $p \in (0, 1]$, define the map

$$D_p := (1 - p)\text{id} + pK_{\mathbb{1}/d}.$$

The restriction of D_p to $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ is the so-called *depolarizing channel*

$$D_p(\rho) = (1 - p)\rho + p\frac{\mathbb{1}}{d}.$$

For any pair $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, we have

$$\|D_p(\rho) - D_p(\sigma)\|_1 = (1 - p)\|\rho - \sigma\|_1,$$

which shows that D_p is strictly contractive with $k = 1 - p$. The unique T -invariant density operator is the maximally mixed state $\mathbf{1}/d$. Channels that preserve the maximally mixed state are called *bistochastic*. \square

Example 3.2.4 (two-Pauli channel) Consider the channel on $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ with the Kraus operators

$$V_1 = \sqrt{p}\mathbf{1}, \quad V_2 = \sqrt{(1-p)/2}\sigma_1, \quad V_3 = -i\sqrt{(1-p)/2}\sigma_2.$$

This channel is bistochastic and strictly contractive with $k = \max\{p, 2p - 1\}$. \square

Example 3.2.5 (amplitude damping) The channel on $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ with the Kraus operators

$$V_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{1-\gamma} \end{pmatrix}, \quad V_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{\gamma} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

is strictly contractive with $k = \sqrt{1-\gamma}$. Its unique fixed point is the pure state $|\psi_+\rangle\langle\psi_+|$ with $\sigma_3\psi_+ = \psi_+$. \square

Example 3.2.6 (thermalization of a qubit) Consider the Hamiltonian $H = E\sigma_3$ with $E > 0$, and the corresponding Gibbs state

$$\rho_\beta = \frac{1}{2 \cosh \beta E} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\beta E} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{\beta E} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $p := \exp(-\beta E)/(2 \cosh \beta E)$. Consider the map $T : \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ given in the Kraus form $T(\rho) = \sum_{n=1}^4 V_n \rho V_n^*$ with

$$\begin{aligned} V_1 &= \sqrt{p} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{1-\gamma} \end{pmatrix}, & V_2 &= \sqrt{p} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{\gamma} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ V_3 &= \sqrt{1-p} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{1-\gamma} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, & V_4 &= \sqrt{1-p} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \sqrt{\gamma} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where γ is a constant between 0 and 1. Then we have $T(\rho_\beta) = \rho_\beta$, and a straightforward calculation shows that T is strictly contractive with $k = \sqrt{1-\gamma}$. The constant γ can be given a direct physical interpretation. Let us write $\gamma = 1 - e^{-2/\Delta}$. Then for $n \geq \Delta$ we will have $\|T^n(\rho) - \rho_\beta\|_1 \leq e^{-1} \|\rho - \rho_\beta\|_1$. \square

3.2.3 Strictly contractive channels on $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2)$

Consider a channel $T : \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^n)$. Because the trace class $\mathcal{T}_1(\mathbb{C}^n)$ is the linear span of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^n)$, and because we also have $\mathcal{T}_1(\mathbb{C}^n) = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^n) \equiv \mathcal{M}_n$, the map T can be uniquely extended to all of \mathcal{M}_n . We can naturally identify the space \mathcal{M}_n of $n \times n$ complex matrices with \mathbb{C}^{n^2} . Thus any linear map of \mathcal{M}_n to itself can be naturally regarded as an $n^2 \times n^2$ complex matrix.

Under this identification, it is possible to parametrize all completely positive maps on \mathcal{M}_n (see, e.g., the article of Fujiwara and Algoet [43]), but the analysis turns out to be quite involved already in the case of \mathcal{M}_2 (cf. King and Ruskai [65] or Ruskai, Szarek,

and Werner [114]). In this section we show how the contraction properties of a channel $T : \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ can be read off directly from its matrix representation.

First of all, recall that any 2×2 complex matrix M can be written as a linear combination of the identity matrix and the Pauli matrices

$$\sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In particular, if M is Hermitian, then the coefficients in this expansion will be real. The set $\{\mathbb{1}/\sqrt{2}, \sigma_1/\sqrt{2}, \sigma_2/\sqrt{2}, \sigma_3/\sqrt{2}\}$ forms an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{M}_2 , when the latter is viewed as a Hilbert space with the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product $\langle A, B \rangle := \text{tr}(A^*B)$. We will refer to this basis as the *Pauli basis*. The upshot is that we can represent any matrix

$$M = m_0\mathbb{1} + m_1\sigma_1 + m_2\sigma_2 + m_3\sigma_3$$

as a vector in \mathbb{C}^4 with the components $m_i, i = 0, 1, 2, 3$. Furthermore, we have $m_0 = \text{tr } M/2$ and $m_i = \text{tr}(M\sigma_i/2)$.

Now it is easy to show that any density matrix $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ can be written as

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{1} + r_1\sigma_1 + r_2\sigma_2 + r_3\sigma_3) \equiv \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{1} + \mathbf{r} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}),$$

where $r_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and $r_1^2 + r_2^2 + r_3^2 \leq 1$ with equality if and only if ρ is a pure state. Thus there is a one-to-one correspondence between the density matrices in \mathcal{M}_2 and the points in the closed unit ball in \mathbb{R}^3 . Under this identification, this ball is known as the *Bloch-Poincaré ball*. Given $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2)$, we will refer to the corresponding vector $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ as the *Bloch-Poincaré vector* of ρ .

Our characterization of strictly contractive channels on $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ hinges on the following important theorem [65].

Theorem 3.2.7 (King-Ruskai) *Let T be a channel on $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2)$. Then there exist unitaries U, V and vectors $\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that*

$$T(\rho) = UT_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{v}}(V\rho V^*)U^*, \quad (3.5)$$

where the channel $T_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{v}}$ is defined by

$$T_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{v}} \left(w_0\mathbb{1} + \sum_{i=1}^3 w_i\sigma_i \right) = w_0\mathbb{1} + \sum_{i=1}^3 (w_0t_i + v_iw_i)\sigma_i. \quad (3.6)$$

Proof: First observe that, with respect to the Pauli basis, any trace-preserving map $T : \mathcal{M}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_2$ can be written in block form as

$$T = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{u} & \tilde{T} \end{array} \right), \quad (3.7)$$

where $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{C}^3$, and \tilde{T} is a 3×3 complex matrix. Furthermore, if T is a positive map, then $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and \tilde{T} is a real matrix; this follows from the fact that any positive map on a C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} leaves invariant the set of self-adjoint elements of \mathcal{A} [130].

Any $n \times n$ matrix A can be written in the form $A = VDW^*$, where V and W are unitary, and D is a positive semidefinite diagonal matrix. This is referred to as the *singular value decomposition* of A [12]. If A is real, the matrices V and W can be chosen real orthogonal. Write down the singular value decomposition $\tilde{T} = VDW^\top$, where $V, W \in O(2)$. Any matrix in $O(2)$ is a rotation (modulo sign), so we can write

$$\tilde{T} = R_1 \tilde{D} R_2^\top,$$

where R_1 and R_2 are rotations, and the sign has been absorbed into the matrix \tilde{D} . We can then decompose T as follows:

$$T = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0} & R_1 \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline R_1^\top \mathbf{u} & \tilde{D} \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0} & R_2 \end{array} \right). \quad (3.8)$$

Now put $\mathbf{t} := R_1^\top \mathbf{u}$, and let \mathbf{v} be the vector whose components are the diagonal entries of \tilde{D} . The middle matrix on the right-hand side of Eq. (3.8) is precisely the matrix representation, with respect to the Pauli basis, of the map $T_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{t}}$ defined in Eq. (3.6), while the first and last matrices correspond to unitary conjugations in \mathcal{M}_2 . This proves the theorem. ■

Using Theorem 3.2.7, we can read off the contraction properties of T from the channel $T_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{t}}$ (the unitary conjugations $U \cdot U^*$ and $V \cdot V^*$ are irrelevant for this purpose because of unitary invariance of the trace norm). Thus consider two density operators ρ, ρ' with the Bloch-Poincaré vectors \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}' . Letting $\Delta := \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|T(\rho) - T(\rho')\|_1 &= \|T_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{t}}(\rho - \rho')\|_1 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^3 v_i \Delta_i \sigma_i \right\|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\max_i |v_i| \right) \left\| \sum_{i=1}^3 \Delta_i \sigma_i \right\|_1 \\ &\equiv \left(\max_i |v_i| \right) \|\rho - \rho'\|_1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

Clearly, the upper bound in Eq. (3.9) is achieved whenever the only nonzero component of Δ corresponds to the direction in which $|v_i|$ is largest. Hence, if T is strictly contractive, we have $k = \max_i |v_i|$. Writing T in the form (3.7), we see that k is also the largest singular value of the matrix \tilde{T} , i.e., $k = \|\tilde{T}\|$.

Given two density operators $\rho, \rho' \in \mathcal{M}_2$, let \mathbf{r} and \mathbf{r}' be their Bloch-Poincaré vectors. Then we have the following useful observation. The trace-norm distance $\|\rho - \rho'\|_1$ can be expressed geometrically in terms of the Euclidean distance between \mathbf{r} and \mathbf{r}' as

$$\|\rho - \rho'\|_1 = \sqrt{\Delta_1^2 + \Delta_2^2 + \Delta_3^2},$$

where Δ is defined as before. The proof is easy once we note that the matrix $\rho - \rho'$ has eigenvalues $\pm(1/2)\sqrt{\Delta_1^2 + \Delta_2^2 + \Delta_3^2}$. Thus the action of any channel T on $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ can be

visualized, modulo a rotation and a translation, as the shrinking of the Bloch-Poincaré ball into an ellipsoid, and the contractivity modulus of T is precisely the half-length of the longest symmetry axis of this ellipsoid. In this sense, the term “strictly contractive” becomes especially apt. For instance, the action of the depolarizing channel D_p on $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ is tantamount to the rescaling of the Bloch-Poincaré ball by the factor of $1 - p$.

Tensor products of strictly contractive channels do not lend themselves as easily to an intuitive geometric interpretation, apart from some special cases. In particular, when T and T' are bistochastic strictly contractive channels on $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^2)$, with the respective contractivity moduli k and k' , it can be shown that the product channel $T \otimes T'$ is also strictly contractive with the contractivity modulus $\max\{k, k'\}$. To see this, we first note that any density matrix in \mathcal{M}_4 can be written as [87, Ch. 2]

$$\rho = \frac{1}{4} \left(\mathbf{1} + \sum_{i=1}^3 r_i \sigma_i \otimes \mathbf{1} + \sum_{i=1}^3 s_i \mathbf{1} \otimes \sigma_i + \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \theta_{ij} \sigma_i \otimes \sigma_j \right),$$

where the vectors $\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ are referred to as the *coherence vectors* of the first and second qubit respectively, and the 3×3 real matrix Θ is called the *correlation tensor* of ρ . Hence each density operator $\rho \in \mathcal{M}_4$ can be uniquely described by the ordered triple $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}, \Theta)$, so we will write $\rho \sim (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}, \Theta)$. The contraction properties of the channel $T \otimes T'$ can be read off from the corresponding channel $T_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{v}} \otimes T_{\mathbf{t}', \mathbf{v}'}$. Consider two density operators $\rho \sim (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}, \Theta)$ and $\rho' \sim (\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{s}', \Theta')$ and define $\mathbf{\Gamma} := \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'$, $\mathbf{\Delta} := \mathbf{s} - \mathbf{s}'$, and $\mathbf{\Xi} := \Theta - \Theta'$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} & \| (T \otimes T')(\rho - \rho') \|_1 \\ &= \| (T_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{v}} \otimes T_{\mathbf{t}', \mathbf{v}'}) (\rho - \rho') \|_1 \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^3 v_i \Gamma_i \sigma_i \otimes \mathbf{1} + \sum_{i=1}^3 v'_i \Delta_i \mathbf{1} \otimes \sigma_i + \sum_{i,j=1}^3 v_i v'_j \Xi_{ij} \sigma_i \otimes \sigma_j \right\|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \max \left\{ |v_1|, \dots, |v_3|, |v'_1|, \dots, |v'_3| \right\} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^3 \Gamma_i \sigma_i \otimes \mathbf{1} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \Delta_i \mathbf{1} \otimes \sigma_i + \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \Xi_{ij} \sigma_i \otimes \sigma_j \right\|_1 \\ &\equiv \max\{k, k'\} \|\rho - \rho'\|_1, \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

where we have used the fact that $|v_i|, |v'_i| < 1$ for all i because T and T' are strictly contractive. Again, the bound (3.10) can be achieved by choosing ρ and ρ' suitably, so we conclude that $T \otimes T'$ is strictly contractive, and that its contractivity modulus equals the greater of k and k' .

3.2.4 The density theorem for strictly contractive channels

Suppose we are presented with some quantum system in an unknown state ρ , and we are trying to determine this state. Any physically realizable apparatus will have finite resolution ϵ , so that all states ρ' with $\|\rho - \rho'\|_1 < \epsilon$ are considered indistinguishable from ρ . Now, if \mathcal{H} is the Hilbert space associated with the system, and if Σ is a dense subset of $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, then, by definition of a dense subset, for any $\epsilon > 0$ and any $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, there will always be some $\sigma \in \Sigma$ such that $\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 < \epsilon$.

The same reasoning also applies to distinguishability of quantum channels, except now the appropriate measure of closeness is furnished by the cb-norm. Thus, if an experiment utilizes some apparatus with resolution ϵ , then any two channels T, S with $\|T - S\|_{\text{cb}} < \epsilon$ are considered indistinguishable from each other. There is, however, no fundamental difference between distinguishability of states and distinguishability of channels because any experiment purporting to distinguish between two given channels T and S consists in preparing the apparatus in some state ρ and then making some measurements that would tell the states $T(\rho)$ and $S(\rho)$ apart from each other. Then, since for any state ρ , $\|T(\rho) - S(\rho)\|_1 \leq \|T - S\|_{\text{cb}}$, the resolving power of the apparatus that will distinguish between T and S is limited by the resolving power of the apparatus that will distinguish between $T(\rho)$ and $S(\rho)$.

The main result of this section is summarized in the following theorem [104].

Theorem 3.2.8 *Let $C(\mathcal{H})$ be the set of all channels on $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$. Then the set $C_{\text{sc}}(\mathcal{H})$ of all strictly contractive channels on $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ is a $\|\cdot\|_{\text{cb}}$ -dense convex subset of $C(\mathcal{H})$.*

Proof: We show convexity first. Suppose $T_1, T_2 \in C_{\text{sc}}(\mathcal{H})$. Define the channel $S := \lambda T_1 + (1 - \lambda)T_2$, $0 < \lambda < 1$. Then, for any $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|S(\rho) - S(\sigma)\|_1 &\leq \lambda \|T_1(\rho) - T_1(\sigma)\|_1 + (1 - \lambda) \|T_2(\rho) - T_2(\sigma)\|_1 \\ &\leq [\lambda k(T_1) + (1 - \lambda)k(T_2)] \|\rho - \sigma\|_1, \end{aligned}$$

where $k(T_i)$ is the contractivity modulus of T_i , $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Defining $k := \max\{k(T_1), k(T_2)\}$, we get

$$\|S(\rho) - S(\sigma)\|_1 \leq k \|\rho - \sigma\|_1.$$

Since T_1, T_2 are strictly contractive, $k < 1$, and therefore $S \in C_{\text{sc}}(\mathcal{H})$. To prove density, let us fix some $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$. Given $\epsilon > 0$, pick some positive n such that $1/n < \epsilon$. For any $T \in C(\mathcal{H})$, define

$$T_n := \frac{1}{2n}K_\sigma + \left(1 - \frac{1}{2n}\right)T.$$

Clearly, $T_n \in C_{\text{sc}}(\mathcal{H})$, and the estimate

$$\|T - T_n\|_{\text{cb}} = \frac{1}{2n} \|T - K_\sigma\|_{\text{cb}} \leq \frac{1}{n} < \epsilon$$

finishes the proof. ■

This theorem indicates that, as far as physically realizable (finite-precision) measurements go, there is no way to distinguish a given channel T from some strictly contractive T' with $\|T - T'\|_{\text{cb}} < \epsilon$, where ϵ is the resolution of the measuring apparatus. We can also consider the channel fidelity as the measure of distinguishability, in which case we have the following corollary.

Corollary 3.2.9 *For any channel $T : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ and any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a strictly contractive channel $T' : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\mathcal{F}(T, T') > 1 - \epsilon$.*

Proof: Given ϵ , Theorem 3.2.8 says that there exists a strictly contractive channel T' with $\|T - T'\|_{\text{cb}} < 2(1 - \sqrt{1 - \epsilon})$. Then Eq. (2.53) implies that $\mathcal{F}(T, T') > 1 - \epsilon$. ■

We also mention that any channel T with $\|T - \text{id}\|_{\text{cb}} < \epsilon$ (for some sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$) cannot be distinguished from a depolarizing channel. Indeed, it suffices to pick some

$$n > \frac{\|K_{\mathbb{1}/d} - \text{id}\|_{\text{cb}}}{\epsilon - \|T - \text{id}\|_{\text{cb}}},$$

where $d = \dim \mathcal{H}$, so that

$$\|T - D_{1/n}\|_{\text{cb}} \leq \|T - \text{id}\|_{\text{cb}} + (1/n) \|K_{\mathbb{1}/d} - \text{id}\|_{\text{cb}} < \epsilon.$$

We note that the channel formed by taking a convex combination of any channel with a strictly contractive channel is a strictly contractive channel. Let $T \in C$ be an arbitrary channel, and suppose that $T' \in C_{\text{sc}}$ [from now on, we will not mention the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} when talking about channels on $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, unless this omission might cause ambiguity]. Define, for some $0 < \lambda < 1$, the channel $S := \lambda T + (1 - \lambda)T'$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|S(\rho) - S(\sigma)\|_1 &\leq \lambda \|T(\rho) - T(\sigma)\|_1 + (1 - \lambda) \|T'(\rho) - T'(\sigma)\|_1 \\ &\leq [\lambda + (1 - \lambda)k(T')] \|\rho - \sigma\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lambda + (1 - \lambda)k(T') < 1$, we conclude that $S \in C_{\text{sc}}$.

Finally, we mention that a method similar to that in the proof of Theorem 3.2.8 can be used to show that the set $C_{\text{sc}}^{\mathbb{1}}$ of all bistochastic strictly contractive channels is a dense convex subset of the set $C^{\mathbb{1}}$ of all bistochastic channels.

3.3 Strictly contractive dynamics of quantum registers and computers

So far we have established two important properties of strictly contractive channels. Firstly, any channel T can be approximated arbitrarily closely by a strictly contractive channel T' , i.e., for any $\epsilon > 0$, we can find a strictly contractive channel T' such that $\mathcal{F}(T, T') > 1 - \epsilon$. Secondly, any quantum decision strategy that would, in principle, distinguish some pair ρ, ρ' of density operators with certainty, will fail with probability at least $[1 - k(T)]/2$ in the presence of a strictly contractive error channel T . The latter statement can also be phrased as follows: no two density operators in the image $T\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ of $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ under some $T \in C_{\text{sc}}$ have orthogonal supports; furthermore, the trace-norm distance between any two density operators in $T\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ is bounded from above by $2k$.

In this section we obtain dimension-independent estimates on decoherence rates of quantum memories and computers under the influence of strictly contractive noise and without any error correction (the possibility of error correction will be addressed in the next two sections).

We treat quantum memories (registers) first. Suppose that we want to store a state $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ for time t in the presence of errors modeled by some strictly contractive

channel T . Let τ be the decoherence timescale, with $\tau \ll t$, and let $n = \lceil t/\tau \rceil$. The final state of the register is then $\rho_n = T^n(\rho_0)$. If ρ_T is the unique fixed point of T , then

$$\|\rho_n - \rho_T\|_1 = \|T^n(\rho_0) - T^n(\rho_T)\|_1 \leq k(T)^n \|\rho_0 - \rho_T\|_1.$$

In other words, the state ρ_0 , stored in a quantum register in the presence of strictly contractive noise T , evolves to the unique T -invariant state ρ_T , and the convergence is incredibly rapid. For the sake of concreteness let us consider a numerical example. Suppose that $k(T) = 0.9$, and that initially the states ρ_0 and ρ_T have orthogonal supports, so $\|\rho_0 - \rho_T\|_1 = 2$. Then, after $n = 10$ iterations (i.e., $t = 10\tau$), we have $\|\rho_n - \rho_T\|_1 \leq 0.697$, and the probability of correct discrimination between ρ_n and ρ_T is only 0.674. Note that the decoherence rate estimate

$$r(n; \rho_0, T) := \frac{\|\rho_n - \rho_T\|_1}{\|\rho_0 - \rho_T\|_1} \leq k(T)^n$$

does not depend on the dimension of \mathcal{H} , but only on the contractivity modulus $k(T)$ and on the relative storage duration n . In other words, quantum registers of *any* size are equally sensitive to strictly contractive errors with the same contractivity modulus.

Obtaining estimates on decoherence rates of computers is not so simple because, in general, the sequence $\{\rho_n\}$, where ρ_n is the overall state of the computer after n computational steps, does not have to be convergent. Let us first fix the model of a quantum computer. We define an *ideal quantum circuit of size n* to be an ordered n -tuple of unitaries U_i , where each U_i is a tensor product of elements of some set \mathcal{G} of universal gates [8], which must be a dense subgroup of the group $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$ of all unitary operators on \mathcal{H} . For some error channel T , a *T -noisy quantum circuit of size n with r error locations* is an ordered $(n+r)$ -tuple containing n channels $\hat{U}_i := U_i \cdot U_i^*$, where the unitaries U_i are of the form described above, as well as r instances of T . We will assume, for simplicity, that each T is preceded and followed by some \hat{U}_i and \hat{U}_{i+1} . Based on this definition, the “noisiest” computer for fixed T and n is represented by a T -noisy quantum circuit of size n with n error locations, i.e., by a $2n$ -tuple of the form $(\hat{U}_1, T, \hat{U}_2, T, \dots, \hat{U}_n, T)$. If the initial state of the computer is ρ_0 , then we will use the notation

$$\rho_n = \left(\prod_{i=1}^n T \hat{U}_i \right) (\rho_0) \tag{3.11}$$

to signify the state of the computer after n computational steps. In the above expression, the product sign should be understood in the sense of composition $T \circ \hat{U}_n \circ \dots \circ T \circ \hat{U}_1$.

Given an arbitrary sequence of computational steps, the sequence $\{\rho_n\}$, defined by Eq. (3.11) (assuming that n is sufficiently large, i.e., the computation is sufficiently long) need not be convergent. However, if the channel T is strictly contractive, then for any $\epsilon > 0$ there will exist some N_0 such that, for any pair of initial states $\rho_0, \rho'_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, the states ρ_n, ρ'_n , $n \geq N_0$, will be indistinguishable from each other. In other words, any two sufficiently lengthy computations will yield nearly the same final state.

Using Eq. (3.11), as well as unitary invariance of the trace norm, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho_n - \rho'_n\|_1 &= \left\| \left(\prod_{i=1}^n T \hat{U}_i \right) (\rho_0 - \rho'_0) \right\|_1 \\ &\leq k(T)^n \|\rho_0 - \rho'_0\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose that at the end of the computation we perform a measurement with precision ϵ , i.e., any two states ρ, ρ' with $\|\rho - \rho'\|_1 < \epsilon$ are considered indistinguishable. Then, if the computation takes at least $N_0 = \lceil \log(\epsilon/2) / \log k(T) \rceil$ steps, we will have $\|\rho_n - \rho'_n\|_1 < \epsilon$ for all $n \geq N_0$. For a numerical illustration, we take $k(T) = 0.9$ and $\epsilon = 0.01$, which yields $N_0 = 50$. In other words, the result of any computation that takes more than 50 steps in the presence of a strictly contractive channel T with $k(T) = 0.9$ is untrustworthy since we will not be able to distinguish between any two states ρ and ρ' with $\|\rho - \rho'\|_1 < 0.01$. Again, N_0 depends only on the contractivity modulus of T and on the measurement precision ϵ , not on the dimension of \mathcal{H} , at least not explicitly. We note that, if the state of the computer is a density operator over a 2^s -dimensional Hilbert space, then any efficient quantum computation will take $O(\text{Poly}(s))$ steps, and therefore the sensitivity of the computer's algorithm to errors grows exponentially with s .

There are, however, some cases when the sequence $\{\rho_n\}$ does converge. Suppose first that the channel $T \in C_{\text{sc}}$ is bistochastic. Then, since each channel \hat{U}_i is bistochastic as well, the sequence $\{\rho_n\}$ converges exponentially fast to the maximally mixed state $\mathbf{1}/d$, where $d = \dim \mathcal{H}$. Also, if the computation employs a static algorithm, i.e., $\hat{U}_i = \hat{U}$ for all i (this is true, e.g., in the case of Grover's search algorithm [55]), then the channel $S := T\hat{U}$ is also strictly contractive, and $k(S) = k(T)$ by unitary invariance of the trace norm. Denoting the fixed point of S by ρ_S , we then have

$$\|\rho_n - \rho_S\|_1 = \|S^n(\rho_0) - S^n(\rho_S)\|_1 \leq k(T)^n \|\rho_0 - \rho_S\|_1,$$

i.e., the output state of any sufficiently lengthy computation with a static algorithm will be indistinguishable from the fixed point ρ_S of $S = T\hat{U}$.

3.4 Error correction and strictly contractive channels

After we have seen that quantum memories and computers are ultrasensitive to errors modeled by strictly contractive channels, we must address the issue of error correction (stabilization of quantum information). Since we have not made any specific assumptions (beyond strict contractivity) about the errors affecting the computer, it is especially important to investigate the possibility of error correction, if only to determine the limitations on the robustness of physically realizable quantum computers from the foundational standpoint.

3.4.1 The basics of quantum error correction

The simplest scheme for protecting quantum information is a straightforward adaptation of a classical error-correcting code [86]. The basic object in the construction of a quantum error-correcting code is defined as follows.

Definition 3.4.1 *An (n, k) quantum code is an isometry $V : \mathcal{H}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ from the 2^k -dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_0 to the 2^k -dimensional subspace \mathcal{K} (the code) of a 2^n -dimensional coding space \mathcal{H} .*

In other words, an input state $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ gives rise to the encoded state $V\rho V^* \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K})$. The encoded state is acted upon by some known channel T , which models the errors. Then we say that V is a T -correcting code if and only if there exists the *recovery channel* \tilde{R} such that, for any $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_0)$, we have

$$(\tilde{R} \circ T)(V\rho V^*) = \rho. \quad (3.12)$$

The channel $\tilde{R} \circ T \circ (V \cdot V^*)$ can be viewed as the composition of the encoding step, the noisy channel, and the decoding step. The isometry V can be eliminated from Eq. (3.12) by writing it as

$$(R \circ T)(\rho) = \rho \quad \forall \rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}). \quad (3.13)$$

We then say that \mathcal{K} is a T -correcting code if and only if Eq. (3.13) holds for some channel R .

The following theorem, due to Knill and Laflamme [68], is a tool for determining whether a given subspace \mathcal{K} of the coding space can serve as a T -correcting code.

Theorem 3.4.2 (Knill-Laflamme) *Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space, and consider a channel $T : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$. Let $\{V_\alpha\}$ be a Kraus decomposition of T . Then a subspace \mathcal{K} of \mathcal{H} is a T -correcting code if and only if, for all $\psi, \phi \in \mathcal{K}$,*

$$\langle \psi | (V_\alpha^* V_\beta) \phi \rangle = c_{\alpha\beta} \langle \psi | \phi \rangle,$$

where $c_{\alpha\beta}$ is some constant that depends only on V_α and V_β .

We do not give the proof of Theorem 3.4.2 because it is not important for our purposes; the interested reader can consult either the original proof of Knill and Laflamme [68], or an alternative argument due to Nielsen *et al.* [90]. Knill and Laflamme have also given another criterion [68] in terms of maximally entangled pure states on $\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}$. Please note that our proof differs from the original argument in that it relies on the concept of the channel fidelity (cf. Section 2.4.2).

Theorem 3.4.3 (Knill-Laflamme) *Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space, and consider a channel $T : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$. Then a subspace \mathcal{K} of \mathcal{H} is a T -correcting code if and only if there exists a channel $R : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ such that, for any orthonormal basis $\{e_i\}$ of \mathcal{K} ,*

$$((R \circ T) \otimes \text{id}) \left(\sum_{i,j} |e_i \otimes e_i\rangle \langle e_j \otimes e_j| \right) = \sum_{i,j} |e_i \otimes e_i\rangle \langle e_j \otimes e_j|. \quad (3.14)$$

Proof: We note that Eq. (3.14) is equivalent to the statement that $\mathcal{F}(R \circ T|_{\mathcal{K}}, \text{id}_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})}) = 1$, where $R \circ T|_{\mathcal{K}}$ denotes the restriction of the channel $R \circ T$ to $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K})$. However, this will hold if and only if $R \circ T|_{\mathcal{K}} \equiv \text{id}_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})}$, which proves the theorem. ■

The Knill-Laflamme theory provides also for approximately correctable channels. That is, let $\{V_\alpha\}$ be a Kraus decomposition of some channel T on $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$. For any subset Λ of $\{V_\alpha\}$, we can define the completely positive map T_Λ via

$$T_\Lambda(X) := \sum_{V_\alpha \in \Lambda} V_\alpha X V_\alpha^*, \quad \forall X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}).$$

Then a subspace \mathcal{H} of \mathcal{H} can serve as a T_Λ -correcting code if there exists some channel R on $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_c)$ such that, for all $\rho \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$(R \circ T)(\rho) \propto \rho.$$

If $\|T - T_\Lambda\|_{\text{cb}}$ is sufficiently small, then it makes sense to say that the noisy channel T is *approximately correctable*.

The method of quantum error-correcting codes is ill-suited for dealing with correlated errors. A more general approach to the stabilization of quantum information is described in the work of Knill, Laflamme, and Viola [69] and Zanardi [148], the essence of which we now summarize. Given some quantum system with the associated finite-dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , we consider the error channel T with the Kraus operators V_α . We define the *interaction algebra* \mathcal{V} of T as the $*$ -algebra generated by the V_α 's (i.e., as the norm closure of the set of all polynomials in V_α and their adjoints). It is obvious that \mathcal{V} is an algebra with identity because of the condition $\sum_\alpha V_\alpha^* V_\alpha = \mathbb{1}$. However, since the Kraus representation of a channel T is not unique, we must make sure that, for any two choices $\{V_\alpha\}$ and $\{W_\alpha\}$ of Kraus decompositions of T , the corresponding interaction algebras are equal. Using the fact that any two Kraus decompositions of a channel are connected via

$$V_\alpha = \sum_\beta v_{\alpha\beta} W_\beta,$$

where $v_{\alpha\beta}$ are the entries of a matrix V with $V^*V = \mathbb{1}$, we see that it is indeed the case that the interaction algebra of a channel T does not depend on the particular choice of the Kraus operators.

The existence of noiseless subsystems with respect to T hinges on the reducibility of the interaction algebra \mathcal{V} . Since \mathcal{V} is, by definition, a uniformly closed $*$ -subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, it is a finite-dimensional C^* -algebra. A basic result from representation theory [4] tells us that \mathcal{V} is isomorphic to a direct sum of r full matrix algebras, each of which appears with multiplicity m_i and has dimension n_i^2 (i.e., it is an algebra of $n_i \times n_i$ complex matrices). Thus $\dim \mathcal{V} = \sum_{i=1}^r m_i n_i^2$. The *commutant* \mathcal{V}' of \mathcal{V} is defined as the set of all operators $X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ that commute with all $V \in \mathcal{V}$. From the Wedderburn theorem [151, p. 61] it follows that each $V \in \mathcal{V}$ has the form

$$V = \bigoplus_{i=1}^r \mathbb{1}_{m_i} \otimes V_i, \quad V_i \in \mathcal{M}_{n_i}, \quad (3.15)$$

and that each $V' \in \mathcal{V}'$ has the form

$$V' = \bigoplus_{i=1}^r V'_i \otimes \mathbb{1}_{n_i}, \quad V'_i \in \mathcal{M}_{m_i}. \quad (3.16)$$

Thus $\dim \mathcal{V}' = \sum_{i=1}^r m_i^2$. We have the corresponding isomorphism

$$\mathcal{H} \simeq \bigoplus_{i=1}^r \mathbb{C}^{m_i} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n_i}, \quad (3.17)$$

and each factor \mathbb{C}^{m_i} is referred to as a *noiseless subsystem* because it is effectively decoupled from the error channel T . It is rather obvious that, in order to be of any use, a noiseless subsystem must be nontrivial, i.e., at least two-dimensional. Now, if the interaction algebra \mathcal{V} is irreducible, then $\dim \mathcal{V}' = 1$, and no noiseless subsystems exist. There is a simple necessary and sufficient condition for irreducibility of an algebra, Schur's lemma [16, p. 47], which states that a $*$ -algebra \mathcal{A} is irreducible if and only if its commutant \mathcal{A}' consists of complex multiples of the identity.

3.4.2 Impossibility of perfect error correction

We now draw our attention to the correctability of errors modeled by strictly contractive channels. Consider a strictly contractive channel $T : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$. It is easy to see that there does not exist a subspace of \mathcal{H} that could serve as a T -correcting code. Indeed, suppose to the contrary that \mathcal{K} is such a subspace. Then there exists a channel $R : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ such that Eq. (3.13) holds. However, because T is strictly contractive, the channel $R \circ T$ is also strictly contractive with $k(R \circ T) \leq k(T)$. Therefore, for any $\rho, \rho' \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ we have

$$\|(R \circ T)(\rho - \rho')\|_1 \leq k(T) \|\rho - \rho'\|_1.$$

On the other hand, Eq. (3.13) implies that

$$\|(R \circ T)(\rho - \rho')\|_1 = \|\rho - \rho'\|_1,$$

which would be true only for $k(T) \geq 1$. This is a contradiction, so we see that no strictly contractive channel T admits a *perfect* quantum error-correcting code. On the other hand, keeping in mind the fact that the Knill-Laflamme theory allows for approximate correctability of errors, we can conclude that the nonexistence of perfect error-correcting codes is not likely to be a serious problem.

It turns out, however, that the property of strict contractivity is so strong that no strictly contractive channel admits noiseless subsystems. As a warm-up, let us prove the special case when the channel in question is also bistochastic [104].

Theorem 3.4.4 *Consider a bistochastic strictly contractive channel $T : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, where \mathcal{H} is a finite-dimensional Hilbert space. Then the interaction algebra \mathcal{V} of T is irreducible, i.e., T admits no noiseless subsystems.*

Proof: We first observe that any operator X that belongs to the commutant of \mathcal{V} must necessarily be a fixed point of T in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Indeed, if $X \in \mathcal{V}'$, then

$$T(X) = \sum_{\alpha} V_{\alpha} X V_{\alpha}^* = X \sum_{\alpha} V_{\alpha} V_{\alpha}^* = X,$$

where we used the fact that $\sum_{\alpha} V_{\alpha} V_{\alpha}^* = \mathbb{1}$ for a bistochastic channel. Now if $X \in \mathcal{V}'$, then we also have $X^* \in \mathcal{V}'$. This implies that, for any $X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, $X_1 := (X + X^*)/2$

and $X_2 := (X - X^*)/2i$ are in \mathcal{V}' whenever X is. We can therefore restrict ourselves to self-adjoint operators in the commutant of \mathcal{V} .

For any self-adjoint operator X , the operator $|X| \equiv (X^*X)^{1/2}$ belongs to the algebra generated by X^2 [16, p. 34], whence

$$X = X^* \in \mathcal{V}' \implies X_{\pm} := \frac{|X| \pm X}{2} \in \mathcal{V}'.$$

Since $X = X_+ - X_-$ and $X_{\pm} \geq 0$, we reduce our task to showing that any positive X in the commutant of \mathcal{V} is a multiple of the identity. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\|X\|_1 = 1$, which, together with the positivity of X , implies that X is a density operator. But the only density operator left invariant by T is the maximally mixed state $\mathbb{1}/\dim \mathcal{H}$, so we conclude that $\mathcal{V}' = \mathbb{C}\mathbb{1}$, i.e., \mathcal{V} is irreducible by Schur's lemma. \blacksquare

Remark: Incidentally, one can use Theorem 3.4.4 to show that the multiples of identity are the only operators in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ that are left invariant by the Heisenberg-picture channel \hat{T} . This is a consequence of a theorem of Fannes, Nachtergaele, and Werner [15, 40], which in the finite-dimensional case states that if there exists an invertible density operator left invariant by T , then the fixed-point set of \hat{T} is precisely the commutant of the interaction algebra of T . \square

We now prove the general case [104]. Whereas the proof of Theorem 3.4.4 relied only on the existence and uniqueness of the T -invariant state, the proof below directly exploits the property of strict contractivity.

Theorem 3.4.5 *Consider a strictly contractive channel $T : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, where \mathcal{H} is a finite-dimensional Hilbert space. Then the interaction algebra \mathcal{V} of T is irreducible, i.e., T admits no noiseless subsystems.*

Proof: Let \mathcal{V} be the interaction algebra of the channel T . Let us suppose, contrary to the statement of the theorem, that T admits at least one noiseless subsystem (i.e., \mathcal{V} is reducible). That is, there exists at least one $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that $m_j, n_j \geq 2$ in Eqs. (3.15)-(3.17). Let \mathcal{K} be some closed subspace of \mathcal{H} . Restricting the channel T to the set

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K}) := \{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \mid \text{supp } \rho \subseteq \mathcal{K}\}$$

(where $\text{supp } \rho$ is the orthogonal complement of $\ker \rho$), we note that, by definition, the contractivity modulus of the restricted channel cannot exceed the contractivity modulus of T . Let \mathcal{H}_j be the j th direct summand $\mathbb{C}^{m_j} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n_j}$ in Eq. (3.17). Define the channel T_j as the restriction of T to $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_j)$. Then any Kraus operator of T_j has the form $\mathbb{1}_{m_j} \otimes V_{\mu}$ where $V_{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}_{n_i}$ and

$$\sum_{\mu} V_{\mu}^* V_{\mu} = \mathbb{1}_{n_i}.$$

Furthermore $k(T_j) \leq k(T) < 1$. Now T_j is the channel of the form $\text{id} \otimes S_j$, where S_j is the channel on $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^{n_j})$ with Kraus operators V_{μ} . As can be easily seen, channels of this form are not strictly contractive (they have infinitely many fixed points). Thus $k(T_j) = 1$,

and the theorem is proved, *reductio ad absurdum*. ■

The statement of Theorem 3.4.5 is quite shocking as it unequivocally rules out the existence of noiseless subsystems for any strictly contractive channel. From the standpoint of foundations of quantum theory, the importance of Theorem 3.4.5 lies in the fact that it establishes nonexistence of noiseless subsystems for a wide class of physically realizable quantum computers on the basis of a minimal set of assumptions. Furthermore, from the mathematical point of view, it is rather remarkable that strict contractivity of a channel already implies irreducibility of its interaction algebra. We must, however, hasten to emphasize that, despite its sweeping generality, Theorem 3.4.5 should not be considered as a proof of impossibility of building a reliable quantum computer. It merely rules out the possibility of building quantum computers with *perfect* protection against errors modeled by strictly contractive channels.

3.4.3 Approximate error correction

At this point we must realize that the results of the previous section are not as unexpected as they may seem. After all, nothing is perfect in the real world! Therefore, our error correction schemes must, at best, come as close as possible to the perfect scenario. Of course, the precise criteria for determining how close a given error correction scheme is to the “perfect case” will vary depending on the particular situation, but we can state perhaps the most obvious criterion in terms of distinguishability of channels.

Let us first phrase everything in abstract terms. Let the error mechanism affecting the computer be modeled by some channel T . We assume that there exists some positive $\delta < 1$ which, in some way, characterizes the channel T (it could be given, e.g., by the minimum of the operator norms of the Kraus operators of T , and thus quantify the “smallest” probability of an error occurring). Let \mathcal{H} be the Hilbert space associated with the computer. Then, for each $\epsilon > 0$, we define an (ϵ, δ) -approximate error-correcting scheme for T to consist of the following objects:

- (1) an integer $n > 1$,
- (2) a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{ext} with $\dim \mathcal{H}_{\text{ext}} \geq \dim \mathcal{H}$,
- (3) a channel $E : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{ext}})$,
- (4) a channel $\tilde{T} : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{ext}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{ext}})$, and
- (5) a completely positive (CP) map $T_{\text{corr}} : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{ext}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{ext}})$,

such that the channel \tilde{T} depends uniquely on n , \mathcal{H}_{ext} , T , and E ; the CP map T_{corr} is correctable (say, in the Knill-Laflamme sense, or through other means, depending on the particular situation); and we have the estimate

$$\left\| \tilde{T} - T_{\text{corr}} \right\|_{\text{cb}} < \delta^n < \epsilon. \quad (3.18)$$

Let us give a concrete example in order to illustrate the above definition. Suppose that the channel T is of the form $\text{id} + S$ with $\|S\|_{\text{cb}} < \delta$. Then, for any n , we can write

$$T^{\otimes n} = \text{id} + \sum_{\substack{A \subset \{1, \dots, n\} \\ 0 < |A| < n}} \bigotimes_{k=1}^n S^{\iota_A(k)} + S^{\otimes n}, \quad (3.19)$$

where $|A|$ denotes the cardinality of the set A , and $\iota_A : \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is the indicator function of A . We use the convention that, for any map M , $M^0 = \text{id}$. In other words, the summation on the right-hand side of Eq. (3.19) consists of tensor product terms with one or more identity factors. For the last term, we have $\|S^{\otimes n}\|_{\text{cb}} < \delta^n$.

In this case, given some $\epsilon > 0$, we pick such n that $\delta^n < \epsilon$ and let $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ext}} := \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$. If the CP map given by the sum of the first two terms on the right-hand side of Eq. (3.19) is correctable on some subspace \mathcal{H} of \mathcal{H}_{ext} , then the channel E is defined in a natural way through the composition of the following two operations: (a) adjoining additional $n - 1$ copies of \mathcal{H} in some suitable state ρ_0 , and (b) restricting to the subspace \mathcal{H} . This way, we obviously have $\tilde{T} := T^{\otimes n}$ and

$$T_{\text{corr}} := \text{id} + \sum_{\substack{A \subset \{1, \dots, n\} \\ 0 < |A| < n}} \bigotimes_{k=1}^n S^{\iota_A(k)}.$$

The estimate (3.18) holds because $\tilde{T} - T_{\text{corr}} = S^{\otimes n}$. We note that this construction results in a quantum error-correcting code that corrects any $n - 1$ errors. We can use similar reasoning to describe quantum codes that correct $k < n$ errors.

Constructing \mathcal{H}_{ext} as a tensor product of a number of copies of \mathcal{H} , the Hilbert space of the computer, evidently leads to the usual schemes for fault-tolerant quantum computation [102]. Other solutions, such as embedding the finite-dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} in a suitable infinite-dimensional Hilbert space (e.g., encoding a qubit in a harmonic oscillator [52]), can also be formulated in a manner consistent with our definition above.

Let us now address approximate correctability of strictly contractive errors. We have previously demonstrated that, in the absence of error correction, the sensitivity of quantum memories and computers to such errors grows exponentially with storage and computation time respectively. Let T be a strictly contractive error channel. It is obvious that the appropriate approximate error correction scheme must be such that the contraction rate of the “encoded” computer, where the errors are now modeled by the channel \tilde{T} , is effectively slowed down. In some cases, straightforward tensor-product realization may prove useful (e.g., when the product channel $T \otimes T$ is not strictly contractive). We must recall that, for any channel S , a necessary condition for correctability is $k(S) = 1$. Thus, if we can find a suitable approximate error-correcting scheme where \tilde{T} would be well approximated by some channel T_{corr} with $k(T_{\text{corr}}) = 1$, we may effectively slow down the contraction rate by protecting the encoded computer against errors modeled by T_{corr} . A more ingenious approach may call for replacing circuit-based quantum computation with that in massively parallel arrays of interacting particles; several such implementations have already been proposed (see, e.g., [18]). It is quite likely that the possible “encodings” of quantum computation in these massively parallel systems may offer a more efficient implementation of approximate error correction.

Finally, we should mention that the idea of “approximate” noiseless subsystems has already been explored by Bacon, Lidar, and Whaley [7]. In their work, it is argued that the symmetry, which is required of a channel in order for noiseless subsystems to exist, is generally broken by perturbing the channel. They show that, if the perturbations of the channel are “reasonable,” then the noiseless subsystem is stable to second order in time. We must reiterate that the negative results we have stated in the previous section refer only to nonexistence of “perfectly” noiseless subsystems; in the real world, we have no choice but to settle for “almost perfect” anyway.

3.5 Implications for quantum information processing

3.5.1 General considerations

As we have seen in Section 3.3, the maximum number n_{\max} of operations that can be carried out on a physically realizable quantum computer in the presence of strictly contractive noise is limited by the contraction rate k and the measurement precision ϵ , and is equal to $\log(\epsilon/2)/\log k$. The measurement precision ϵ depends on the measuring apparatus, while the contraction rate k is determined by the decoherence mechanism. In the next section we will present an elementary analysis of noisy bulk spin-resonance quantum computation [25, 48] in terms of the strictly contractive decoherence model; here we focus on the quantitative conclusions that can be drawn regardless of the type of “hardware” used for building the quantum computer.

First of all, let us make an obvious observation that the number of operations that can be carried out within the “coherence time” of the computer is related not to the *size* of the corresponding quantum circuit (i.e., the total number of gates used to construct it), but rather to the *depth* of the circuit (i.e., the maximum number of gates acting on any qubit throughout the computation). It is quite clear that the *complexity-theoretic* circuit depth is irrelevant here; what matters is the *physical* circuit depth, which is, of course, determined by the particular realization of the computer. With that in mind, let $D_A(n)$ denote the physical circuit depth for some quantum algorithm A with the input state of n qubits. Then, if the contraction rate k is fixed, the required measurement precision is easily seen to be given by

$$\epsilon = 2k^{D_A(n)}. \quad (3.20)$$

Because the contraction rate can be written as $1/2^\alpha$, where α is some large positive number, we can rewrite Eq. (3.20) as

$$\epsilon = \frac{1}{2^{cD_A(n)}},$$

where c is a constant that depends on the decoherence mechanism and increases as the noise gets stronger. Thus we see that the required measurement precision grows exponentially with the physical circuit depth.

Alternatively we can consider the case when we are given ϵ and $D_A(n)$, and need to determine the maximum tolerable error rate. Then, whenever $k \geq (\epsilon/2)^{1/D_A(n)}$, we will have $n_{\max} \geq D_A(n)$. When the noise is sufficiently weak, we can approximate it with a depolarizing channel (cf. Section 3.2.4), in which case $k = 1 - \eta$, and the depolarization

constant η can be thought of as the error rate. If the computation is to be concluded within the coherence time, then the maximum allowable error rate is given by $1 - (\epsilon/2)^{1/D_A(n)}$, whence we see that, in order to build fault-tolerant circuit-based quantum computers, we need high-precision measurements and shallow circuits. To make an (admittedly academic) illustration of this, we provide in the table below the values of the threshold error rate for algorithms with various physical circuit depths for the case when the measurement precision is on the order of $\sqrt{\hbar}$, comparable to the so-called *standard quantum limit* (SQL) [14].

$D(n)$	n (number of qubits)				
	20	40	60	80	100
$\log n$	~ 1	0.999	0.999	0.998	0.998
n	0.863	0.630	0.485	0.392	0.328
n^3	4.96×10^{-3}	6.22×10^{-4}	1.84×10^{-4}	7.78×10^{-5}	3.98×10^{-5}
$\sqrt{2^n}$	0.038	3.80×10^{-5}	3.71×10^{-8}	3.62×10^{-11}	3.53×10^{-14}

Despite the fact that the measurement precision we have assumed is ridiculously high ($\epsilon \sim 10^{-17}$), the maximum tolerable error rate is still prohibitively low for circuits of polynomial and superpolynomial depth, even when the number of qubits is quite modest. It is worth noticing, however, that the threshold error rate starts off very close to unity and rolls off fairly slowly when the quantum circuit has logarithmic or linear depth. We will come back to this point in Section 3.5.3, when we talk about parallelization as a means of protecting the computer against noise.

3.5.2 Case study: ensemble quantum computation using nuclear magnetic resonance

Looking back to the formula $n_{\max} = \log(\epsilon/2)/\log k$, we can pose the following question. Given a particular experimental scheme for realizing a quantum computer, what can we say about the measurement precision and about the noise strength (contraction rate)? In this section we carry out a simple analysis in order to answer this question for ensemble quantum computation using nuclear magnetic resonance, proposed in 1997 independently by Cory, Fahmy, and Havel [25], and by Gershenfeld and Chuang [48]. From now on we will use the term “NMR quantum computation” to refer to this scheme; a more descriptive, and also more cumbersome, term would be “high-temperature liquid-state NMR quantum computation.”

The basic idea behind NMR quantum computation is the following. An N -spin NMR quantum computer operates on a sample solution containing a huge number of molecules (on the order of 10^{23}), each of which accommodates N two-level nuclear spins. The sample, which is placed in a strong unidirectional magnetic field, is subjected to a temporal sequence of radio-frequency pulses, and each molecule functions as an autonomous computational unit. The result of the computation, which is read off by means of the usual techniques of NMR spectroscopy [39], is the ensemble average of the computer outputs taken with respect to the state of all the molecules in the sample. Because NMR experiments are conducted at room temperature (~ 300 K), the initial state of the sample

is the thermal equilibrium state $\exp(-\beta H)/Z_\beta$, where H is the Hamiltonian of a single molecule.

On a more formal level, the inner workings of an NMR quantum computer can be described using the concept of an *effective pure state*, which is defined as follows [22].

Definition 3.5.1 *Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space. Consider a unit vector $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$, a channel $T : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, and a set $\{X_i\}$ of observables in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Then the state $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ is called an effective pure state for ψ with respect to T and $\{X_i\}$ if there exists another channel T' and a constant α such that, for each i ,*

$$\text{tr}[T'(\rho)X_i] = \alpha\langle\psi|\hat{T}(X_i)\psi\rangle. \quad (3.21)$$

Here is a concrete example [22] to illustrate this abstract definition. Let T be a bistochastic channel, i.e., $T(\mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{1}$. Then, for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, the state

$$\rho_\alpha := (1 - \alpha)\mathbf{1}/\dim \mathcal{H} + \alpha|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \quad (3.22)$$

is an effective pure state, with $T' = T$, for the pure state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ with respect to T and any set of traceless observables. Indeed, for any X with $\text{tr} X = 0$, we have

$$\text{tr}[T(\rho_\alpha)X] = \frac{1 - \alpha}{\dim \mathcal{H}} \text{tr}[T(\mathbf{1})X] + \alpha\langle\psi|\hat{T}(X)\psi\rangle = \alpha\langle\psi|\hat{T}(X)\psi\rangle,$$

so that the condition (3.21) is satisfied.

The significance of the above formalism for NMR quantum computation comes from the fact that the Gibbs state of the liquid sample is well approximated by the state of the form (3.22) with $\dim \mathcal{H} = 2^N$ and $\alpha = N\hbar\Omega\beta/2^{N+1}$, where $\hbar\Omega$ is the average difference between the excited-state and the ground-state energies of the nuclear spins in a strong magnetic field [48, 117]. The quantity $\hbar\Omega\beta/2$ is referred to as the *Boltzmann factor* [22]. To give a feel for the orders of magnitude involved, the average resonant frequency of a nuclear spin in a typical NMR experiment is on the order of 200 MHz [48], which at room temperature corresponds to $\alpha \sim 1.6 \times 10^{-5} N/2^N$. One crucial feature of an effective pure state of the form (3.22) is that, for any bistochastic channel T , we have

$$T(\rho_\alpha) = (1 - \alpha)2^{-N}\mathbf{1} + \alpha T(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|),$$

i.e., the polarized spins that participate in the actual computation evolve independently of the unpolarized spins forming the “thermal background” in the sample. Then, provided that a suitable set of traceless observables is measured at the end of the computation, the only detectable signal comes from the pure portion of ρ_α , the obvious disadvantage being that the corresponding signal strength is $O(N/2^N)$, which decreases rapidly as the number of spins per molecule increases.

An NMR quantum computer is usually run many times, and each time a single-spin observable is measured; the measurement results are then processed on a classical computer [22]. Let $\sigma_1^n, \sigma_2^n, \sigma_3^n$ denote the Pauli spin matrices acting on the Hilbert space of the n th spin. A typical observable measured on the n th spin after a single run of the computer is equal, up to a multiplicative constant, to $M_n := \sigma_1^n + i\sigma_2^n$, so that the experimentally

detected output is proportional to the transverse magnetization of the sample, $N_S \text{tr}(\rho M_n)$, where N_S is the number of molecules in the sample and ρ is the state of the sample after the computation [48]. Using this information, we can give a concrete interpretation of the measurement precision ϵ . Consider the measurement of an arbitrary observable A . For any two density operators ρ and ρ' , we have the bound

$$|\text{tr}(\rho A) - \text{tr}(\rho' A)| \leq \|A\| \|\rho - \rho'\|_1. \quad (3.23)$$

Now let Δ_A a typical (e.g., r.m.s.) fluctuation of A . If we stipulate that the resolution of the measurement of A is limited by Δ_A , then Eq. (3.23) suggests that any two density operators ρ, ρ' with $\|\rho - \rho'\|_1 < \Delta_A / \|A\|$ can be considered indistinguishable. When we are talking about the number N_S of molecules in a macroscopic sample, the corresponding fluctuation is given by $\sqrt{N_S}$ [74, Ch. 1]. Therefore, because $\|M_n\| = 2$, we have $\epsilon = 1/2\sqrt{N_S}$, which yields, for $N_S \sim 10^{23}$, the value $\epsilon \sim 10^{-12}$. This gives us a rough (order-of-magnitude) estimate of the measurement precision in NMR quantum computers.

As far as the decoherence mechanism is concerned, we need only consider single-spin dynamics because, after each run of the computer, only the single-spin observables are measured. There are two main sources of decoherence [48, 140], namely the thermal relaxation and the phase damping; they are described explicitly as follows [140]. The channel that models thermal relaxation is precisely the channel shown in Example 3.2.6; this channel is strictly contractive with $k = e^{-\tau/2T_{\text{th}}}$, where τ is the duration of the single step of the noisy dynamics, and T_{th} is the thermal relaxation time. The phase damping is modeled by the channel with the Kraus operators $\sqrt{\lambda}\mathbb{1}$ and $\sqrt{1-\lambda}\sigma_3$, where $\lambda = (1 + e^{-\tau/T_{\text{ph}}})/2$, T_{ph} being the phase damping time. The phase-damping channel is not strictly contractive because it has two fixed points, $|\psi_+\rangle\langle\psi_+|$ and $|\psi_-\rangle\langle\psi_-|$, where $\sigma_3\psi_{\pm} = \pm\psi_{\pm}$.

Typically the phase damping time is much shorter than the thermal relaxation time [48], the value of the ratio $T_{\text{ph}}/T_{\text{th}}$ depending on the kinetics of the particular molecule. Therefore the phase damping time sets a more stringent limitation on the number of operations that can be carried out on an NMR quantum computer, but, because the channel formed by composing the thermalizing channel and the phase-damping channel is still strictly contractive with $k = e^{-\tau/2T_{\text{th}}}$, only the thermal relaxation time is relevant to our analysis. With this in mind, we can write down the following expression for the maximum number of operations that can be carried out within the thermal relaxation time:

$$n_{\text{max}} = \frac{\log(\epsilon/2)}{\log k} \sim \frac{\log(10^{-12}/2)}{\log e^{-\tau/2T_{\text{th}}}}.$$

The duration τ of the single step of the noisy dynamics is comparable to the time it takes to execute a single unitary operation [48, 140]. A single-spin unitary operation can be performed in about 10 ms, whereas it may take roughly 100 ms to apply a two-spin gate. A conservative estimate for τ would therefore be around 45 ms, whence we obtain $n_{\text{max}} = 1258.85T_{\text{th}}$, where the thermal relaxation time T_{th} is measured in seconds.

Recently Vandersypen *et al.* [140] implemented the simplest nontrivial instance of Shor's quantum factoring algorithm (namely, finding the prime factorization of 15) using a 7-spin NMR computer, which required ~ 300 computational steps. In the molecule they used, the thermal relaxation times of the spins were as small as 2.8 seconds and as large as

45.4 seconds, which implies that the maximum number of operations that could be carried out using a molecule with spin relaxation times in this range is anywhere from 3,525 to 57,152. Because Shor’s algorithm has cubic complexity, we may infer that the NMR quantum computer utilizing such molecules would not be scalable beyond 39 spins. In general, the scalability would increase with T_{th} , so one of the ways to meet the scalability challenge would be to engineer molecules with high thermal relaxation times. We mention in passing that, as pointed out by Schack and Caves [117], there exists a purely classical model for NMR quantum computation when the number N of the spins per molecule is sufficiently low (e.g., when the Boltzmann factor equals 2×10^{-6} , the NMR computer with $N < 16$ admits a classical model).

3.5.3 Where do we go from here?

The main lesson to be learned from the strictly contractive model of decoherence is the following: the longer the computation, the less reliable its output. The same problem arises in classical circuit-based computation with noisy gates, and there are two ways to handle it: (a) error-correcting codes, and (b) parallelization. The first of these techniques amounts to introducing a considerable amount of redundancy into the network. In particular, it was shown by Dobrushin and Ortyukov [34] (cf. also the more refined argument by Pippenger, Stamoulis, and Tsitsiklis [101]) that, if a noiseless network requires N gates to compute a particular function, then the noisy network would require at least $N \log N$ gates to compute the same function reliably, provided that the error probability per gate does not exceed $1/2$. The parallelization technique, on the other hand, allows to reduce the computation time by shrinking the circuit depth.

The problems that are efficiently parallelizable (i.e., can be computed in polylogarithmic time using a polynomial number of processors working in parallel) form the complexity class **NC** [96, Ch. 15]. The abbreviation **NC** stands for “Nick’s class,” after Nicholas Pippenger who extensively studied this complexity class. Typical problems in **NC** are, e.g., summing m numbers [which can be done in time $O(\log m)$], or copying the contents of a particular memory cell into $n^{O(1)}$ memory cells [which can be done in time $O(\log n)$] [5, p. 253 ff.].

Moore and Nilsson [89] recently introduced the quantum complexity class **QNC**. They showed that most circuits, including those for performing error correction, can be parallelized to logarithmic depth. A notable exception is the circuit for the quantum Fourier transform (QFT), a crucial ingredient in Shor’s factoring algorithm, which can be parallelized only to linear depth. Moore and Nilsson conjectured that it is impossible to parallelize the QFT circuit to less than linear depth. In Section 3.5.1 we provided some numerical estimates for the threshold error rate in circuit-based quantum computers as a function of the circuit depth. We saw that circuits of logarithmic and linear depth turned out to be more robust than circuits of polynomial and superpolynomial depth. Hence, if one does insist on implementing quantum computers using the circuit paradigm, then it may be worthwhile to explore the class **QNC** further.

A more radical solution is to abandon the quantum circuits in favor of massively parallel systems of locally interacting particles (cellular automata). In a cellular automaton, the state of each particle at some integer time $t + 1$ is determined by its state, as well as by the

states of finitely many neighboring particles, at time t . Classical cellular automata, both deterministic [21, 47] and probabilistic [76, 80], model a rich variety of complex phenomena; in particular, they can serve as a computational medium. As was shown by Toom [137], it is possible to store reliably a single bit of information in a noisy two-dimensional cellular automaton. The approach of Toom was adopted by Gács [45] and by Gács and Reif [46], who have demonstrated that it is possible to perform reliable computation in noisy three-dimensional cellular automata. The physical underpinning of reliable computation and information storage in noisy cellular automata can be understood in terms of phase transitions [76]. The idea is to construct a *nonergodic* cellular automaton, i.e., one that does not have a unique invariant state which it would eventually reach irrespective of initial conditions.

It would be interesting to see how much of this carries over to the quantum domain. There are many proposals for computation, both classical and quantum, using quantum cellular automata (see, e.g., Briegel and Raussendorf [18], Fussy *et al.* [44], Lent *et al.* [77], Lloyd [84] or Meyer [88]). The two main attractions of quantum cellular automata are (a) massively parallel structure, and (b) the possibility of a phase transition. We have already discussed massively parallel structure of quantum cellular automata in Section 3.4.3; here we focus our attention on phase transitions. A necessary condition for the existence of a phase transition in a cellular automaton is nonergodicity. Richter and Werner [110] gave an ergodicity criterion for quantum cellular automata, formulated in terms of the completely positive map that describes, in the Heisenberg picture, the transition rule of the automaton. Assuming that each cell (site) of the automaton is under the influence of some strictly contractive error channel T , an interesting problem would be to devise such a transition rule that the automaton would be nonergodic. In this respect we should mention that, even if T is a strictly contractive channel, it is not at all obvious whether $T \otimes T$ is strictly contractive as well: it has a unique fixed point among the product density operators, but there may also be another fixed point of $T \otimes T$ that is not a product density operator.

Entropy-energy arguments

The physics of relaxation processes is often understood, at least on a heuristic level, through the consideration of the balance of energy and entropy, as determined by the temperature. There is a thermodynamic function that relates energy, entropy, and temperature, namely the *Helmholtz free energy* [20, p. 98],

$$F := E - (1/\beta)S,$$

where E is the energy, S is the entropy, and β is the inverse temperature. The second law of thermodynamics [36, p. 17] states that no energy-conserving process can decrease the entropy. Another way to state this is to say that, among all the configurations of the system that have the same energy, the ones with the largest entropy are “thermodynamically favorable” [41, pp. 22-24], by which we mean that the corresponding configurations have very large probabilities. We can also deal with processes that do not conserve energy, in which case we are interested in the incremental free energy, $\Delta F = \Delta E - (1/\beta)\Delta S$. We can consider a particular configuration stable if any local modification of this configuration results in $\Delta F > 0$, i.e., the energy cost of the modification more than compensates for the entropy gain. On the other hand, if $\Delta F < 0$, then the energy cost cannot offset the entropy gain, and the corresponding configuration is unstable.

In this chapter we offer an interpretation of the relaxation dynamics of noisy quantum computers in terms of the entropy-energy balance.

4.1 Definition and properties of entropy

We give a very brief overview of the concept of entropy. Most of the results are just stated without proofs. The reader is encouraged to consult the book by Gray [53] for the rigorous treatment of entropy in the context of classical information theory; an excellent survey of Wehrl [141] is devoted to the concept of entropy in statistical physics. For an abstract treatment of entropy in the context of operator algebras, we recommend the book by Ohya and Petz [93].

In statistical physics, the entropy of a system that can exist in N possible configurations is given, up to a multiplicative constant, by Boltzmann's formula

$$S := \ln N.$$

This assumes, however, that all N configurations of the system are equiprobable. When this is not the case, i.e., when the i th configuration occurs with probability w_i , the entropy is defined as

$$S := - \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \ln w_i. \quad (4.1)$$

Given the probability distribution $w = \{w_i\}$, we will denote the corresponding entropy (4.1) by $S(w)$ or, when we want to exhibit the probabilities explicitly, by $S(\{w_i\})$. The entropy $S(w)$ is referred to as the *Shannon entropy* of w . It can be shown that, for any probability distribution w on an N -element set, $0 \leq S(w) \leq \ln N$, where the lower bound is achieved if and only if $w_i = \delta_{ik}$ for some $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, and the upper bound is achieved if and only if w is the uniform distribution, $w_i = 1/N$ for all i . In view of this, it is natural to regard the entropy as a measure of “randomness” of a probability distribution. A crucial property of the entropy is *concavity*: given any number $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, we have $S(\lambda w + (1 - \lambda)w') \geq \lambda S(w) + (1 - \lambda)S(w')$, where the convex combination $\lambda w + (1 - \lambda)w'$ of the probability distributions $w = \{w_i\}$ and $w' = \{w'_i\}$ is the probability distribution $\{\lambda w_i + (1 - \lambda)w'_i\}$.

Now consider a classical system with the N -element configuration space \mathcal{X} and the corresponding algebra of observables $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$. Then the one-to-one correspondence between the states over $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$ and the probability measures on \mathcal{X} allows us to define the entropy of the state ω as the entropy of the corresponding probability distribution. We see that the only states with zero entropy are the pure states; the mixed states all have strictly positive entropy. The concavity of the entropy then means that mixing leads to an increase in entropy. Because the normalized counting measure on \mathcal{X} corresponds to the unique state that maximizes the entropy, we will refer to this state as *maximally mixed*.

Next we turn to the case of a quantum system, the corresponding algebra of observables being the algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ of bounded operators on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} associated with the system. We assume for simplicity that \mathcal{H} has finite dimension N . Then there is a one-to-one correspondence between the states over $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and the density operators in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Given the density matrix ρ , we define its *von Neumann entropy* as

$$S(\rho) := -\text{tr } \rho \ln \rho. \quad (4.2)$$

The eigenvalues λ_i of ρ form a probability distribution on an N -element set, and it is clear from the definition (4.2) that the von Neumann entropy of ρ is precisely the Shannon entropy of this probability distribution. This also implies that $S(\rho) = 0$ if and only if ρ is a pure state, and that the unique state that maximizes S is the maximally mixed state $\mathbb{1}/N$. The von Neumann entropy enjoys a concavity property similar to that of the Shannon entropy.

The von Neumann entropy is a continuous functional on the state space $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ when the latter is given the topology induced by the trace norm. More precisely, we have the following lemma [93, p. 22].

Lemma 4.1.1 (Fannes) *Let ρ, σ be two density operators on an N -dimensional Hilbert space, and suppose that $\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 < 1/3$. Then*

$$|S(\rho) - S(\sigma)| \leq \ln N \cdot \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 - \eta(\|\rho - \sigma\|_1), \quad (4.3)$$

where $\eta(t) := t \ln t$.

Now suppose that we are given a channel T with the following properties: (1) the T -invariant state ρ_T is unique, and (2) $S(T(\rho)) > S(\rho)$ unless $\rho = \rho_T$. Then the Fannes inequality (4.3) implies that the von Neumann entropy is a strict Liapunov function for T . Theorem 3.1.4 can then be used to establish the trace-norm convergence of the orbit $\{T^n(\rho)\}$ to ρ_T for any initial state ρ .

The entropy is an extensive property (it scales with system size). That is, if we consider two systems with the Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} , then for any $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ and any $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K})$ we have

$$S(\rho \otimes \sigma) = S(\rho) + S(\sigma).$$

In fact, among all the density operators $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K})$ with the same restrictions $\rho_{\mathcal{H}} := \text{tr}_{\mathcal{K}} \rho$ and $\rho_{\mathcal{K}} := \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \rho$, the product state $\rho_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{K}}$ has the largest entropy. This property is referred to as the *subadditivity* of the entropy. There is also a property referred to as the *strong subadditivity*, which consists in the following. Let $\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3$ be Hilbert spaces; we will use $\text{tr}_{ij}(\cdot)$ to denote the partial trace over $\mathcal{H}_i \otimes \mathcal{H}_j$. Given a density operator $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_3)$, define the partial traces $\rho_1 := \text{tr}_{23} \rho$, $\rho_{12} := \text{tr}_3 \rho$, and so on. Then

$$S(\rho) + S(\rho_2) \leq S(\rho_{12}) + S(\rho_{23}).$$

The proof of the strong subadditivity, which was first obtained by Lieb and Ruskai [79], is far from transparent, in stark contrast to the fairly straightforward proof of the corresponding property of the Shannon entropy.

A useful quantity derived from entropy is the so-called *relative entropy*. The classical definition, for a pair w, w' of probability distributions, is given by

$$S(w|w') := \sum_i w_i \ln \frac{w_i}{w'_i}.$$

It is easy to show that $S(w|w') \geq 0$ with equality if and only if $w = w'$. Sometimes the relative entropy is referred to as the *Kullback-Leibler distance*, but this is a misnomer because the relative entropy is not symmetric and does not satisfy the triangle inequality. A more appropriate term is the *Kullback-Leibler divergence*. The quantum relative entropy is defined, for two density operators ρ and σ , as

$$S(\rho|\sigma) := \text{tr}(\rho \ln \rho - \rho \ln \sigma).$$

The quantum relative entropy has the same positivity property as the corresponding classical quantity, namely $S(\rho|\sigma) \geq 0$ with equality if and only if $\rho = \sigma$. This can be proved using the following lemma [131], which also gives a handy lower bound on $S(\cdot|\cdot)$.

Lemma 4.1.2 (Streater) *Let ρ and σ be two density operators. Then*

$$S(\rho|\sigma) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|\rho - \sigma\|_2^2, \quad (4.4)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_2$ is the Hilbert-Schmidt norm.

Proof: Consider the function $\eta(x)$, defined as above, on the interval $I = [0, 1]$. For any pair $x, y \in I$ we have, by Taylor's theorem with the Lagrange remainder,

$$\eta(x) = \eta(y) + (x - y)\eta'(y) + \frac{1}{2}(x - y)^2\eta''(t)$$

for some $t \in I$. Now $\eta''(t) = 1/t \geq 1$ for $t \in I$, which leads to the estimate

$$\eta(x) - \eta(y) - (x - y)\eta'(y) - \frac{1}{2}(x - y)^2 \geq 0. \quad (4.5)$$

Let a_i and ϕ_i be the eigenvalues and the eigenvectors of ρ , and let b_i and ψ_i denote the same objects for σ . Define $g_{ij} := \langle \phi_i | \psi_j \rangle$, so that $\sum_j |g_{ij}|^2 = 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \phi_i | [\eta(\rho) - \eta(\sigma) - (\rho - \sigma)\eta'(\sigma) - (\rho - \sigma)^2/2] \phi_i \rangle \\ &= \sum_j |g_{ij}|^2 [\eta(a_i) - \eta(b_i) - (a_i - b_i)\eta'(b_i) - (a_i - b_i)^2/2]. \end{aligned}$$

Summing over i and using the estimate (4.5), we get

$$\text{tr}(\rho \ln \rho - \rho \ln \sigma) \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\rho - \sigma)^2 \equiv \frac{1}{2} \|\rho - \sigma\|_2^2,$$

and the lemma is proved. ■

In a limited sense, the relative entropy $S(\rho|\sigma)$ can be thought of as a measure of closeness between ρ and σ [we say “limited” because $S(\cdot|\cdot)$, just like its classical counterpart, fails to satisfy the triangle inequality]. In this regard we mention the result of Lindblad [81] that, for any channel $T : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ and for any pair $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, we have $S(T(\rho)|T(\sigma)) \leq S(\rho|\sigma)$.

4.2 The Gibbs variational principle and thermodynamic stability

In Section 3.1 we have discussed the zeroth law of thermodynamics, which essentially says that any macroscopic system will generally be found in the state of equilibrium, characterized by a few macroscopic parameters. According to the well-known Gibbs variational principle in statistical mechanics [124, p. 348], the equilibrium states of a finite quantum system with Hamiltonian H at absolute temperature T are precisely those states that minimize the free-energy functional

$$F_\beta(\rho) := \text{tr}(\rho H) - \frac{1}{\beta} S(\rho) \quad (4.6)$$

(in case of an infinite system, one would instead minimize the specific free-energy functional, i.e., free energy per “particle”).

It is very easy to see that, when the system in question is finite, the Gibbs state ρ_β [cf. Eq. (3.1)] is the unique solution of the variational problem (4.6). Let $\Phi(\beta) := -(1/\beta) \ln Z_\beta$, where $Z_\beta = \text{tr} e^{-\beta H}$ is the canonical partition function. Then, for any density operator ρ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_\beta(\rho) - \Phi(\beta) &= \text{tr}(\rho H) + \frac{1}{\beta} [\text{tr}(\rho \ln \rho) + \ln Z_\beta] \\ &= -\frac{1}{\beta} [\text{tr}(\rho \ln \rho_\beta) + \ln Z_\beta] + \frac{1}{\beta} [\text{tr}(\rho \ln \rho) + \ln Z_\beta] \\ &= \text{tr}(\rho \ln \rho - \rho \ln \rho_\beta) \\ &\equiv S(\rho|\rho_\beta), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $F_\beta(\rho_\beta) \equiv \Phi(\beta)$. Now all we need to show is that, for any $\rho \neq \rho_\beta$, $F_\beta(\rho) > \Phi(\beta)$, but this follows immediately from Lemma 4.1.2. The uniqueness of the solution to (4.6) for finite systems makes them unsuitable for the study of macroscopic degeneracy (i.e., when a given macroscopic system has multiple equilibrium states at a given temperature) and phase transitions; it is then necessary to pass to the so-called *thermodynamic limit*.

An alternative characterization of equilibrium states is developed through the notions of global and local thermodynamic stability [122]. Global thermodynamic stability is equivalent to the Gibbs variational principle: states that are globally thermodynamically stable (GTS) are precisely those that minimize the specific free-energy functional. On the other hand, a state ρ is locally thermodynamically stable (LTS) if the specific free energy of any state σ , obtained by local perturbation of ρ , is greater than that of ρ . It is known that any GTS state is also LTS, but the converse is not generally true for an infinite system [122, pp. 31-33]. We thus obtain a useful device for showing that a given state is not GTS: namely, showing that it is not LTS. An argument of this kind is referred to as an “entropy-energy argument” [125] since showing that the state ρ is not LTS amounts to showing that it is possible to perturb ρ locally in such a way that the resulting change in specific free energy is negative, owing to the fact that the entropy gain due to the perturbation overwhelms the corresponding energy shift. Although the goal of an entropy-energy argument is to show that a given infinite-volume state is not GTS, it is often possible to consider only the finite-volume scenario to show that the state is not LTS.

We illustrate a typical entropy-energy argument by giving a heuristic description of the argument due to Thouless [136] concerning the absence of ordering in a one-dimensional Ising system (spin chain) with short-range interactions. The original argument appeared in the text by Landau and Lifshitz [74, p. 537]; the version of Thouless is a refinement of their reasoning. Let us assume, to the contrary, that ordering exists; that is, all of the spins in the chain point in the same direction. Then, if the ordered phase is stable, the corresponding state must minimize the free-energy functional. Now suppose that we reverse all the spins in a segment of large (but finite) size N . Due to the short range of the interactions, the energy cost of inserting this “macroscopic droplet” is bounded above by a constant. Now, if we randomly insert this droplet in any one of n contiguous segments,

the entropy gain will be on the order of $\ln n$, so the free-energy gain will be bounded from above by $\text{const} - (1/\beta) \ln n$, which will be negative for large n . Hence, by means of a local perturbation of the putative ordered phase, we obtain a state of lower free energy, which implies that the ordered phase is unstable.

Arguments of this kind depend crucially on both the dimension of the model and on the range of the interactions. For instance, they are inapplicable whenever there exists a possibility that energy may overwhelm entropy. Consider, for instance, a d -dimensional Ising model with short-range interactions, where $d \geq 2$. Then, upon being presented with the ordered phase, we flip all the spins in a hypercube of volume N , chosen at random out of n contiguous hypercubes. Again, this results in the entropy gain of $\ln n$. However, the energy cost of flipping the spins in a hypercube of volume N will be on the order of its surface area, so that the free-energy gain will be on the order of $\text{const} \cdot N^{(d-1)/d} - (1/\beta) \ln n$. In this case it very well may happen that the energy shift will offset the entropy change.

4.3 Entropy-energy arguments and quantum information theory

Our goal in this chapter is to incorporate entropy-energy arguments into the framework of quantum information science. Our starting point will be Streater's adaptation of an entropy-energy argument, described in his monograph [132] on nonequilibrium thermodynamics. We briefly illustrate his approach in order to set the stage for our own investigation.

Consider a quantum system Σ whose initial state is given by a density operator ρ and let T be an irreversible discrete-time dynamics constructed by mixing of reversible evolutions. Then the von Neumann entropy S will increase monotonically along the orbit $\{T^n(\rho)\}$. Let H be the bounded energy observable (Hamiltonian) of Σ with the property that its spectral projections are left invariant by T . Then the mean energy is conserved along the orbit but, since the entropy keeps on growing, the sequence of iterates $T^n(\rho)$ will eventually converge to the mixture of microcanonical states on the eigenspaces (energy levels) of H for any choice of the initial state ρ (assuming that each eigenvalue of H has finite geometric multiplicity). In case of an irreversible quantum dynamics T that does not conserve energy, the same argument works as well because, as one can easily show, the absolute value of the energy shift due to T can be crudely bounded from above by twice the operator norm of H (i.e., by twice the largest energy available to Σ).

Now we present our twist on Streater's reasoning, as well as the essence of our method. While it is clear from the above discussion that, for sufficiently high temperatures, entropy will eventually overwhelm energy, we would like to obtain an estimate as to when that will happen. In order to do so, we appeal to the Gibbs variational principle. Let us, for simplicity, assume that the system Σ is finite, and is maintained at inverse temperature β . As we have already pointed out, the energy shift due to the iterated dynamics T^n is bounded from above by $2\|H\|$. Suppose, further, that we have the lower bound on the entropy gain due to T^n in the form $\Delta S \geq f(n)$, where f is an invertible function. Then the free energy will change by at most $2\|H\| - f(n)/\beta$. This number will, in turn, be negative when $f(n) > 2\beta\|H\|$. If f is an increasing function, then so is the inverse function f^{-1} .

As a consequence of this, entropy will exceed energy for all $n \geq f^{-1}(2\beta \|H\|)$. Thus we see that, in order to keep the system stable for a long time, we must either increase the energy or lower the temperature (or do both). The exact form of the function f will then allow us to appraise the energy-temperature trade-off involved in keeping the system stable.

The dynamics of a noisy quantum computer can be pictured as the competition between the entangling unitary transformations and the localized errors which tend to destroy entanglement, thereby increasing entropy [1]. Because a large-scale quantum computer is neither homogeneous in space nor homogeneous in time, there is no straightforward way to tackle this problem using the formalism of statistical mechanics of spin systems. In particular, the usual notion of the thermodynamic limit no longer applies. Recall, however, our remark in the preceding section that it is possible to carry out entropy-energy arguments without passing to the thermodynamic limit. In our case we can reason as follows. A large-scale quantum computer is, for all practical purposes, a macroscopic system. However, the only part of this system of any interest to us is comprised by the degrees of freedom directly involved in the actual computation; the number of such degrees of freedom is ostensibly finite. If we can show that this finite system is not LTS, then the entire macroscopic computer cannot be GTS.

There are two separate aspects of the thermodynamics of noisy quantum computers — the temporal and the spatial. The temporal aspect refers to the maximum number of computational operations that can be carried out before being in any state, other than the microcanonical (maximally mixed) state, becomes “thermodynamically unfavorable” for the computational degrees of freedom. This is, of course, tied closely to the relaxation time. The spatial aspect concerns the size of the computational subsystem as measured in qubits — on a heuristic level, we can expect that, as the subsystem gets larger, there is more room for “randomness” in the locations of the errors, so that it may be possible to show, using a typical entropy-energy argument à la Thouless, that the computer is not LTS. We present analyses of these two aspects in Sections 4.4 and 4.5, devoting the rest of this section to energy shift estimates.

We agree at the outset to deal only with the circuit model of quantum computation, in which case we adopt the model of noisy quantum computation from Section 3.3. Namely, each step of the computation is the application of a unitarily implemented channel (quantum gate), followed by an invocation of a fixed noisy channel T . We take T to be strictly contractive and bistochastic. In fact, as we have shown in Section 3.2.4, if the noise modeled by T is sufficiently weak (i.e., $\|T - \text{id}\|_{\text{cb}} < \epsilon$ with ϵ sufficiently small), then there exists a depolarizing channel D_η such that $\|T - D_\eta\|_{\text{cb}} < \epsilon$ and $\eta < \epsilon/\text{const}$.

Let us first consider the temporal aspect, in which case we are interested in the estimate of the energy shift due to n successive invocations of the noisy channel T . In the case when the Hamiltonian H does not depend on time, the estimate is easy — we have, for any density operator ρ ,

$$|\Delta E| = |\text{tr}[T^n(\rho)H] - \text{tr}(\rho H)| \leq \|\hat{T}^n(H) - H\| \leq 2\|H\|.$$

If we picture noiseless quantum computation as an evolution governed by the Schrödinger equation, then the corresponding Hamiltonian is manifestly time-dependent. Noisy computation could then be described by a Lindblad master equation [83], but the Hamiltonian

part of the corresponding Liouvillian would still be time-dependent. We can, however, circumvent this issue for the following reason. The goal of “temporal” entropy-energy arguments is to obtain an estimate of the maximum number n_{\max} of computational steps that can be carried out before the entropy gain due to the repeated invocations of T overwhelms the energy cost of the computation, which may include any energy resources required to perform error correction. Specifically, we are interested in the expression for n_{\max} in terms of energy and temperature. Therefore we *assume* that we operate the computer under the maximum energy constraint, i.e., the energy shift can be estimated as $\Delta E \leq E_{\max}$ for some given E_{\max} . Recalling the discussion above, we will then have $n_{\max} \geq f^{-1}(\beta E_{\max})$, where f is the function that figures in the lower bound on the entropy gain due to T^n .

Now we turn to the analysis of the spatial aspect. Suppose that we have a quantum computer comprised by a large number of qubits. Let T be the channel that models the decoherence of a single qubit in the computer. Imagine picking, at random, one out of n disjoint k -qubit sets and applying the channel $T^{\otimes k}$ to the qubits in this set. Suppose that the energy shift due to this local perturbation is independent of k and n . Then we want to show that if we take k large enough, there will be some finite value of n such that the corresponding entropy gain overwhelms the energy shift. How can we show that the energy shift can, in fact, be bounded independently of k and n ? We reason as follows. Given an initial state of N qubits, consider a quantum circuit whose size is polynomial in N . Each gate in the circuit acts on at most c qubits, where the number c is independent of N . Let ρ_{s-1} be the state of the computer given by

$$\rho_{s-1} = \left(\prod_{i=1}^{s-1} T \hat{U}_i \right) (\rho_0),$$

where ρ_0 is the input state, and T is a fixed noisy channel. Suppose that the s th gate has been applied, so we have the transformation $\rho_{s-1} \mapsto U_s \rho_{s-1} U_s^*$. Now, when we invoke the channel T , the corresponding energy shift will be determined by the Hamiltonian H_s , where $U_s = \exp(-iH_s\tau/\hbar)$ and τ is the time it takes to apply the s th gate. Because, by hypothesis, each gate acts on at most c qubits, the energy shift can be bounded from above by a function of c alone. This assumption can also be justified on the grounds of “local reversibility” [99] (cf. also the “gearbox quantum computer” of DiVincenzo [33]).

We can, in fact, put this energy shift estimate in a broader context of simulation of quantum systems using quantum computers [91, pp. 204-212]. Again, consider a system of N qubits and the Hamiltonian

$$H = \sum_{k=1}^{P(N)} H_k,$$

where P is some polynomial, and each local interaction H_k involves at most c qubits, the number c being, as before, independent of N . Then, assuming that we can implement the unitary evolution generated by each term H_k using a circuit whose size is polynomial in c , we can simulate the unitary evolution generated by H using high-order approximations [35] of the Lie-Trotter product formula

$$e^{A+B} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(e^{A/n} e^{B/n} \right)^n,$$

for any two matrices A, B of the same shape. The main point is that, at each step of the simulation, the number of interacting qubits is bounded from above by a function of c alone.

4.4 Entropy-energy balance and the maximum number of operations

In the preceding section we have argued that, as far as the temporal entropy-energy arguments are concerned, we may assume that the energy shift due to n invocations of the noisy channel T can be bounded from above by some constant E_{\max} , which can be thought of as the energy resources available for the computation. In order to proceed with the entropy-energy argument, we need the estimate of the entropy gain due to T^n . We state some preliminaries first.

Let $T : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ be a channel. Extending the map T to all of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and treating the latter as a Hilbert space with the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product $\langle A, B \rangle := \text{tr}(A^*B)$, we see that the Heisenberg-picture channel \hat{T} coincides with the adjoint operator T^* . Indeed, let $\{V_\alpha\}$ be a Kraus decomposition of T . Then we have, for any $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$,

$$\langle A, T(B) \rangle = \sum_{\alpha} \langle A, V_{\alpha} B V_{\alpha}^* \rangle = \sum_{\alpha} \text{tr}(A^* V_{\alpha} B V_{\alpha}^*) = \sum_{\alpha} \text{tr}(V_{\alpha}^* A^* V_{\alpha} B) = \langle \hat{T}(A), B \rangle,$$

which shows that $T^* = \hat{T}$. Furthermore, if T is bistochastic, then the map $\hat{T}T$ is also a bistochastic channel: it is a composition of two completely positive maps, and its Kraus decomposition $\{V_{\alpha}^* V_{\beta}\}$ has the proper normalization,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\alpha, \beta} (V_{\alpha}^* V_{\beta})^* V_{\alpha}^* V_{\beta} &= \sum_{\beta} V_{\beta}^* \left(\sum_{\alpha} V_{\alpha} V_{\alpha}^* \right) V_{\beta} = \mathbb{I} \\ \sum_{\alpha, \beta} V_{\alpha}^* V_{\beta} (V_{\alpha}^* V_{\beta})^* &= \sum_{\alpha} V_{\alpha}^* \left(\sum_{\beta} V_{\beta} V_{\beta}^* \right) V_{\alpha} = \mathbb{I}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that T is bistochastic. In addition, the map $\hat{T}T$ is self-adjoint in the sense that $\langle A, \hat{T}T(B) \rangle = \langle \hat{T}T(A), B \rangle$, and hence diagonalizable. Furthermore, $\hat{T}T$ is a positive operator¹ because, for any $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$,

$$\langle A, \hat{T}T(A) \rangle = \langle T(A), T(A) \rangle = \text{tr}[T(A)^* T(A)] \geq 0.$$

Because the absolute values of the eigenvalues of any completely positive map do not exceed unity [135], we conclude that the spectrum of $\hat{T}T$ is contained in the interval $[0, 1]$ of the real line. We will need some additional ergodic and spectral properties for the channel T , which we summarize in the following definition.

¹Here we mean operator positivity in the usual Hilbert-space sense, not in the sense that $\hat{T}T$ maps positive operators to positive operators, which it obviously does.

Definition 4.4.1 Let $T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be a bistochastic channel. We say that T is ergodic with spectral gap γ if $\mathbb{1}$ is the only fixed point of T in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, and the spectrum of the channel $\hat{T}T$ is contained in the set $[0, 1 - \gamma] \cup \{1\}$.

Our starting point will be the following entropy gain estimate due to Streater [131].

Lemma 4.4.2 (Streater) Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space of finite dimension d . If $T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is a bistochastic channel which is ergodic and has spectral gap γ , then for any $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$

$$S(T(\rho)) - S(\rho) \geq \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\rho - \mathbb{1}/d\|_2^2. \quad (4.7)$$

Proof: Given a bistochastic channel T , a theorem of Alberti and Uhlmann [3] says that, for any ρ , there exist unitaries U_α and nonnegative numbers p_α with $\sum_\alpha p_\alpha = 1$ such that $T(\rho) = \sum_\alpha p_\alpha U_\alpha \rho U_\alpha^*$. Define $\rho_\alpha := U_\alpha \rho U_\alpha^*$. By Lemma 4.1.2 we have, for each α ,

$$\mathrm{tr} [\rho_\alpha \ln \rho_\alpha - \rho_\alpha \ln T(\rho)] \geq \frac{1}{2} \|\rho_\alpha - T(\rho)\|_2^2.$$

Because ρ_α and ρ are unitarily equivalent, we have $S(\rho_\alpha) = S(\rho)$ for all α , and thus

$$\sum_\alpha p_\alpha \mathrm{tr} [\rho_\alpha \ln \rho_\alpha - \rho_\alpha \ln T(\rho)] = S(T(\rho)) - S(\rho),$$

which yields

$$S(T(\rho)) - S(\rho) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_\alpha p_\alpha \|\rho_\alpha - T(\rho)\|_2^2. \quad (4.8)$$

We can rewrite Eq. (4.8) as

$$\begin{aligned} S(T(\rho)) - S(\rho) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_\alpha p_\alpha [\langle \rho_\alpha, \rho_\alpha \rangle - \langle \rho_\alpha, T(\rho) \rangle - \langle T(\rho), \rho_\alpha \rangle + \langle T(\rho), T(\rho) \rangle] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} [\langle \rho, \rho \rangle - \langle T(\rho), T(\rho) \rangle] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \langle \rho, (\mathrm{id} - \hat{T}T)(\rho) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Because 1 is a simple eigenvalue of $\hat{T}T$, we can write ρ as a direct sum $\mathbb{1}/d \oplus (\rho - \mathbb{1}/d)$. Then Eq. (4.9) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} S(T(\rho)) - S(\rho) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \langle \rho - \mathbb{1}/d, (\mathrm{id} - \hat{T}T)(\rho - \mathbb{1}/d) \rangle \\ &\geq \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\rho - \mathbb{1}/d\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that γ is the smallest nonzero eigenvalue of $\hat{T}T$. We thus obtain Eq. (4.7), and the lemma is proved. \blacksquare

Remark: Notice that the theorem of Alberti and Uhlmann cited in the proof above does *not* imply that a channel is bistochastic if and only if it is a convex combination

of unitarily implemented channels. While it is obvious that any convex combination of unitary conjugations is a bistochastic channel, Landau and Streater [75] showed that the converse is not true in general when the dimension of the underlying Hilbert space is greater than 2. The Alberti-Uhlmann theorem only says that if T is a bistochastic channel, then for each $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ there exist ρ -dependent unitaries U_α and nonnegative weights p_α such that $T(\rho) = \sum_\alpha p_\alpha U_\alpha \rho U_\alpha^*$. \square

Lemma 4.4.2 says that the von Neumann entropy is a strict Liapunov function for any bistochastic channel which is ergodic with a spectral gap. Hence Theorem 3.1.4 can be applied to show the trace-norm convergence of the orbit $\{T^n(\rho)\}$ to the maximally mixed state $\mathbb{1}/d$ for any $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$; the rate of convergence is controlled by the spectral gap. The next result shows the connection between ergodic bistochastic channels on \mathcal{M}_2 and strictly contractive channels.

Theorem 4.4.3 *Let $T : \mathcal{M}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_2$ be a bistochastic channel. If T is strictly contractive, then it is ergodic with spectral gap $\gamma = 1 - k^2$, where k is the contractivity modulus. Conversely, if T is ergodic with spectral gap γ , then it is strictly contractive with $k = \sqrt{1 - \gamma}$.*

Proof: First we need a lemma.

Lemma 4.4.4 *If $T : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is a bistochastic channel, then so is the dual map $\hat{T} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ in the sense that \hat{T} is a completely positive trace-preserving unital map.*

Proof: Let $\{V_\alpha\}$ be a Kraus decomposition of T , so that, for any $X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, we have $T(X) = \sum_\alpha V_\alpha X V_\alpha^*$. Then we have $\sum_\alpha V_\alpha^* V_\alpha = \mathbb{1}$ because T is trace-preserving, and also $\sum_\alpha V_\alpha V_\alpha^* = \mathbb{1}$ because T is bistochastic. Now, for any $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, we have

$$\mathrm{tr} \hat{T}(A) = \mathrm{tr} \left(\sum_\alpha V_\alpha^* A V_\alpha \right) = \mathrm{tr} \left(A \sum_\alpha V_\alpha V_\alpha^* \right) = \mathrm{tr} A.$$

Hence \hat{T} is a completely positive trace-preserving unital map, i.e., a bistochastic channel. \blacksquare

Now let $T : \mathcal{M}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_2$ be a strictly contractive bistochastic channel, and let \mathcal{V} be its interaction algebra (cf. Section 3.4.2). Theorem 3.4.4 then says that $\mathcal{V}' = \mathbb{C}\mathbb{1}$, where \mathcal{V}' is the commutant of \mathcal{V} . By Lemma 4.4.4, the Heisenberg-picture channel \hat{T} is trace-preserving, and leaves invariant the maximally mixed state $\mathbb{1}/2$, which is an invertible matrix. Then, according to the Fannes-Nachtergaele-Werner theorem (cf. Refs. [15] and [40] and the remark after Theorem 3.4.4), the set of operators in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ left invariant by T is precisely the commutant \mathcal{V}' . Thus the only operators in \mathcal{M}_2 that are left invariant by T are the complex multiples of the identity matrix, i.e., T is ergodic. (In fact, the same argument can be used to show that any bistochastic strictly contractive channel is ergodic.)

Now recall from Section 3.2.3 that if T is a bistochastic channel on \mathcal{M}_2 , then there exists a real 3×3 matrix \tilde{T} such that, for any density operator

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{w} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}), \quad (4.10)$$

we will have

$$T(\rho) = \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{1} + (\tilde{T}\mathbf{w}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}].$$

Furthermore, if T is strictly contractive, then the contractivity modulus k is precisely the operator norm (the largest singular value) $\|\tilde{T}\|$ of \tilde{T} . Now consider the channel $\hat{T}T$, whose action on the density operator (4.10) is given by

$$(\hat{T}T)(\rho) = \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{1} + (\tilde{T}^\top \tilde{T}\mathbf{w}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}].$$

Since T is strictly contractive, so is $\hat{T}T$; this follows from the fact that, for any two density operators ρ, ρ' , we have

$$\|(\hat{T}T)(\rho - \rho')\|_1 \leq \|T(\rho - \rho')\|_1 \leq k \|\rho - \rho'\|_1.$$

Then the discussion above applies, and $\hat{T}T$ is ergodic. Furthermore, since $\hat{T}T$ is self-adjoint, its second largest eigenvalue equals $\|\tilde{T}^\top \tilde{T}\|$. But $\|\tilde{T}^\top \tilde{T}\| = \|\tilde{T}\|^2 = k^2$, which implies that $1 - \gamma = k^2$. Thus we have shown that if T is a bistochastic strictly contractive channel, then it is ergodic with the spectral gap $\gamma = 1 - k^2$. We skip the proof of the converse statement, because it is quite similar to this argument. ■

As far as the entropy gain estimate goes, Theorem 4.4.3 has the following useful corollary.

Corollary 4.4.5 *Let $\mathcal{H} \simeq (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes N}$, and consider the channel $T := R^{\otimes N}$, where $R : \mathcal{M}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_2$ is a strictly contractive bistochastic channel. Then, for any $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ and for any positive n , we have*

$$S(T^n(\rho)) - S(\rho) \geq \frac{1 - k^{2n}}{2} \|\rho - \mathbf{1}/2^N\|_2^2, \quad (4.11)$$

where k is the contractivity modulus of R .

Proof: Because R is bistochastic and strictly contractive, so is T (cf. Section 3.2.3). Hence, T is ergodic. Furthermore, the contractivity modulus of T equals that of R . Therefore, in order to prove Eq. (4.11), all we need to do is to estimate the spectral gap of T^n and then apply Lemma 4.4.2.

If k is the contractivity modulus of R , then the contractivity modulus of R^n (and hence of T^n) is at most k^n . Now if $1 - \gamma$ is the second largest eigenvalue of $\hat{R}^n R^n$, then Theorem 4.4.3 implies that $\gamma \geq 1 - k^{2n}$. But

$$\hat{T}^n T^n = (\hat{R}^{\otimes N})^n (R^{\otimes N})^n = (\hat{R}^n)^{\otimes N} (R^n)^{\otimes N} = (\hat{R}^n R^n)^{\otimes N},$$

so the second largest eigenvalue of $\hat{T}^n T^n$ equals that of $\hat{R}^n R^n$. Thus the spectral gap of T^n is at least $1 - k^{2n}$, and the corollary is proved. ■

Now we are ready to proceed with our entropy-energy argument. Suppose that we have a quantum computer operating on N qubits at the inverse temperature β . We assume that the input to the computer is given by an effective pure state

$$\rho = (1 - \epsilon)\mathbb{1}/2^N + \epsilon|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|. \quad (4.12)$$

Let us adopt the typical model of *local stochastic noise* [1], meaning that the noisy channel T has the form $R^{\otimes N}$, where R is a bistochastic channel on \mathcal{M}_2 . We will further assume that R is strictly contractive. Given the “energy resources,” or maximum allowed energy cost, E_{\max} , we are interested in the maximum number n_{\max} of computational steps that can be carried out before the balance of energy vs. entropy tips in favor of the latter. We claim that if β , E_{\max} , ϵ , and N are such that

$$\beta E_{\max} < \frac{\epsilon^2(1 - 2^{-N})}{2}, \quad (4.13)$$

then

$$n_{\max} = \frac{\log \left\{ 1 - 2\beta E_{\max}/[\epsilon^2(1 - 2^{-N})] \right\}}{2 \log k}, \quad (4.14)$$

where k is the contractivity modulus of R . Indeed, we have

$$\|\rho - 2^{-N}\mathbb{1}\|_2^2 = \epsilon^2 \text{tr} \left(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| - 2^{-N}\mathbb{1} \right)^2 = \epsilon^2(1 - 2^{-N}).$$

Using this result and Corollary 4.4.5, we can bound the entropy gain due to T^n from below as follows:

$$S(T^n(\rho)) - S(\rho) \geq \frac{\epsilon^2(1 - k^{2n})(1 - 2^{-N})}{2}.$$

The corresponding change in the free energy is then

$$2\beta\Delta F \leq 2\beta E_{\max} - \epsilon^2(1 - k^{2n})(1 - 2^{-N}).$$

The right-hand side of this expression will be negative when $n > n_{\max}$ with n_{\max} given by Eq. (4.14). When the number N of qubits in the computer is very large, and when ϵ does not depend on N , the term 2^{-N} can be neglected, so Eqs. (4.13) and (4.14) become respectively

$$\beta E_{\max} < \frac{\epsilon^2}{2}$$

and

$$n_{\max} = \frac{\log(1 - 2\beta E_{\max}/\epsilon^2)}{2 \log k}.$$

The condition (4.13) restricts the range of applicability of our entropy-energy argument to low-energy quantum computers that are operated at high temperatures. We can, however, dispense with Eq. (4.13) altogether when the noisy channel T has the form

$$T = (1 - \delta)\text{id} + \delta R^{\otimes N}$$

for some small positive δ , where R is a strictly contractive bistochastic channel on \mathcal{M}_2 with the contractivity modulus k . Then we have

$$T^n = \sum_{l=0}^n \binom{n}{l} (1-\delta)^{n-l} \delta^l (R^l)^{\otimes N}.$$

Let the input state be given by Eq. (4.12) and suppose, as before, that N is sufficiently large and that ϵ does not depend on N . Then, using the concavity of the von Neumann entropy as well as Corollary 4.4.5, we obtain the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta S \equiv S(T^n(\rho)) - S(\rho) &\geq \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \sum_{l=0}^n \binom{n}{l} (1-\delta)^{n-l} \delta^l (1-k^{2l}) \\ &= \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} [1 - (1-\delta + \delta k^2)^n] \\ &= \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} n\delta(1-k^2) + o(\delta), \end{aligned}$$

where $o(\delta)$ stands, as usual, for terms that go to zero faster than δ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. By the assumed smallness of δ , we may neglect these terms. Then the free-energy increment can be calculated from

$$2\beta\Delta F \leq 2\beta E_{\max} - \epsilon^2 n\delta(1-k^2),$$

so that we obtain

$$n_{\max} = \frac{2\beta E_{\max}}{\delta\epsilon^2(1-k^2)}.$$

This formula shows clearly that, in order to keep the computer stable, we must either lower the temperature or raise the energy (or, perhaps, do both). The good news is that, when the noise is weak, the required thermodynamic resources are polynomial in the number of operations.

4.5 Thermodynamic stability of large-scale quantum computers

In Section 4.4 we used an entropy-energy argument to estimate the maximum number of operations that can be carried out on a noisy quantum computer before the cumulative entropy gain due to decoherence overwhelms the energy cost of the computation, including error correction. Here we consider the spatial aspect of decoherence in quantum computers and show, using an entropy-energy argument, that there exists an upper bound on the number of qubits that can be accommodated by circuit-based quantum computers.

What we present here is an adaptation of the classical entropy-energy argument (cf. Simon and Sokal [125]) that shows the absence of ordering in a one-dimensional Ising ferromagnet with short-range interactions. The main ingredient of the Simon-Sokal argument is the following entropy gain estimate. Consider a finite portion of a chain of classical Ising spins divided into n disjoint segments, each containing k spins. Now suppose that we choose, at random, a k -spin segment and flip all of the spins in it. The resulting entropy gain is easily seen to be on the order of $\ln n$. Simon and Sokal then give a lower

bound on the entropy gain when the segments are “almost disjoint,” in the sense that the corresponding configurations can be associated with probability measures with “minimally overlapping” supports. The following lemma and its proof are a straightforward adaptation of a similar result due to Simon and Sokal [125].

Lemma 4.5.1 (entropy of statistical mixtures). *Let $\rho_i, i = 1, \dots, n$, be n mutually commuting density operators. Suppose that there exists a constant $\kappa \geq 0$ such that, for each i , we have*

$$\mathrm{tr} \sum_{j \neq i} \rho_j \rho_i \leq \kappa. \quad (4.15)$$

Let $\rho = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i$. Then

$$S(\rho) \geq n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n S(\rho_i) + \ln n - 2\kappa^{1/2}. \quad (4.16)$$

Proof: Let $\{q_\alpha^{(i)}\}$ be the eigenvalues of ρ_i . We have then

$$\begin{aligned} S(\rho) &= n^{-1} \sum_i S(\rho_i) - \ln n = -n^{-1} \sum_i \mathrm{tr} \rho_i \left(\ln \sum_j \rho_j - \ln \rho_i \right) \\ &= -n^{-1} \sum_i \sum_\alpha q_\alpha^{(i)} \ln \frac{\sum_j q_\alpha^{(j)}}{q_\alpha^{(i)}} = -2n^{-1} \sum_i \sum_\alpha q_\alpha^{(i)} \ln \left(\frac{\sum_j q_\alpha^{(j)}}{q_\alpha^{(i)}} \right)^{1/2} \\ &\geq -2n^{-1} \sum_i \ln \sum_\alpha \left((q_\alpha^{(i)})^2 + \sum_{j \neq i} q_\alpha^{(j)} q_\alpha^{(i)} \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

$$\geq -2n^{-1} \sum_i \ln \left(1 + \sum_\alpha \left(\sum_{j \neq i} q_\alpha^{(j)} q_\alpha^{(i)} \right)^{1/2} \right) \quad (4.18)$$

$$\geq -2n^{-1} \sum_i \sum_\alpha \left(\sum_{j \neq i} q_\alpha^{(j)} q_\alpha^{(i)} \right)^{1/2} \quad (4.19)$$

$$= -2n^{-1} \sum_i \mathrm{tr} \left(\sum_{j \neq i} \rho_j \rho_i \right)^{1/2}, \quad (4.20)$$

where (4.17) is a consequence of Jensen’s inequality [57] and the convexity of the function $x \mapsto -\ln x$, (4.18) uses $(a+b)^{1/2} \leq a^{1/2} + b^{1/2}$, and (4.19) uses $\ln(x+1) \leq x$. For i fixed, we have, for the trace in (4.20),

$$\mathrm{tr} \left(\sum_{j \neq i} \rho_j \rho_i \right)^{1/2} \leq \left(\mathrm{tr} \sum_{j \neq i} \rho_j \rho_i \right)^{1/2}, \quad (4.21)$$

which follows from the concavity of the function $x \mapsto \sqrt{x}$ and the self-adjointness of the operator $\sum_{j \neq i} \rho_j \rho_i$ (the latter is a consequence of the fact that ρ_i are mutually commuting). The right-hand side of (4.21) can now be bounded from above by $\kappa^{1/2}$, and

the lemma is proved. ■

Remark: The requirement that the density operators ρ_i be “almost disjoint” is rigorously borne out by Eq. (4.15). □

Consider now a quantum computer operating on N qubits. In Section 4.3 we have already noted that, during each computational step, the number of interacting qubits is no greater than some fixed constant c that depends on the particular algorithm, but not on N . Hence it follows from the considerations of local reversibility [99] that the energy shift due to any noisy channel applied right after the computational step can be bounded above by a function of c alone. Another important consequence of local reversibility is the observation that we can partition the set $Q := \{1, \dots, N\}$ into disjoint sets C_l , $l \in \{1, \dots, L\}$, such that, at some stage of the computation, the overall state of the computer will be a separable state of the form

$$\rho = \bigotimes_{l=1}^L \rho_l, \quad (4.22)$$

where ρ_l is a state of the qubits indexed by elements of C_l . This observation can be justified as follows. An input state for a typical quantum network is the pure state

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^N}} \sum_{m=0}^{2^N-1} |m\rangle = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|0\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|1\rangle \right)^{\otimes N},$$

which is manifestly separable. The quantum network responsible for the computation consists of one- and two-qubit gates, which explains the formation of disjoint clusters of qubits. Furthermore, we can picture the noisy computation as a competition between the entangling gates, which tend to form clusters of qubits, and the errors, which tend to detach qubits from clusters [1]. We assume, for simplicity, that the clusters all have the same size d , so that $N = Ld$.

Now suppose that we are given two positive integers, k and n , so that $L \geq nk$. Thus our computer is operating on at least knd qubits. Partition the set $\{1, \dots, nk\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, L\}$ into n disjoint k -element subsets S_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$. For some $\eta \in (0, 1)$, let $D_\eta^{(l)}$ denote the depolarizing channel

$$D_\eta(A) := (1 - \eta)A + \eta 2^{-d}(\text{tr } A)\mathbb{1}$$

acting on the qubits in the cluster C_l . For each i , let T_i be the channel that acts as $(D_\eta^{(l)})^{\otimes k}$ on the qubits in $\cup_{l \in S_i} C_l$, and is the identity channel on the rest of the qubits. For the state ρ given by Eq. (4.22), define the density operators $\rho_i := T_i(\rho)$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then we have $[\rho_i, \rho_j] = 0$ for all i, j . We also note the following elementary estimate:

$$\sum_{j \neq i} \text{tr}(\rho_i \rho_j) = \sum_{j \neq i} \text{tr}[T_i(\rho)T_j(\rho)] \leq (n-1) \left(1 - \eta + \frac{\eta}{2^d}\right)^{2k}.$$

Given n , d , and η , we can always find such a value of k that

$$\left(1 - \eta + \frac{\eta}{2^d}\right)^{2k} \leq \frac{1}{n-1},$$

so that the condition (4.15) of Lemma 4.5.1 is satisfied by the ρ_i 's with $\kappa = 1$. Hence the entropy gain due to the channel $T := n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n T_i$ can be bounded from below as follows:

$$S(T(\rho)) - S(\rho) \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n S(\rho_i) - S(\rho) + \ln n - 2 \geq \ln n - 2,$$

where the last inequality follows from extensivity of the von Neumann entropy and from the fact that we can write

$$\rho = \bigotimes_{l=1}^L \rho_l = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \left(\bigotimes_{l \in S_i} \rho_l \right).$$

The corresponding free-energy increment can then be bounded by

$$\beta \Delta F \leq \beta E(c) - \ln n + 2, \quad (4.23)$$

where $E(c)$ is the c -dependent upper bound on the energy shift. We can certainly pick n so large that the right-hand side of Eq. (4.23) is negative. With the appropriate choice of k , we see that, if the computer operates on at least nkd qubits, then it is possible to “depolarize” a randomly chosen set of qubit clusters in such a way that the resulting entropy gain will overwhelm the corresponding energy shift.

Remark: In order for our entropy-energy argument to work, it is crucial that the energy shift be bounded independently of n and k (the latter actually depends on n). As we have argued above, this bound can be justified for circuit-based quantum computation. We also draw the reader's attention to the following caveat. The validity of the entropy-energy argument just presented rests chiefly on the assumption that, at some stage in the computation, the state of the computer can be written in the form (4.22). This is certainly true for circuit-based computers, either because the initial state is completely separable, or because an initially entangled state is rendered separable by noise. \square

Notice that up to now we have left unspecified the value of the depolarization rate η without sacrificing much of our argument. We can, however, pick η in such a way that the state of the computer will be separable with high probability. This follows from the work of Aharonov [1], who showed that when the computer is realized as a circuit in $d + 1$ dimensions, there exists a critical value $\eta_c \in [1/3, 1/2^{1/d}]$ such that, for all $\eta > \eta_c$, the state of the computer will eventually end up in the form (4.22) with a large value of L . Our entropy-energy argument can therefore be used to elucidate the thermodynamical underpinnings of the process by which noisy quantum computers tend towards essentially classical behavior.

4.6 Putting it all in perspective

The results reported in this chapter help shed some light on the thermodynamics of noisy quantum computation. We have seen, in particular, that, when the noise affecting the system is modeled by a bistochastic strictly contractive channel, there is an intimate connection between the contraction rate and the rate of entropy production. This lends further

support to our claim that strictly contractive channels serve as a physically reasonable model of relaxation processes in noisy quantum memories and computers.

We also showed that there is an upper bound on the number of qubits that can be accommodated in a circuit-based quantum computer. The existence of this bound was shown under two crucial assumptions: (a) that the energy shift due to a single step of the noisy dynamics does not depend on the number of qubits, and (b) that, at some point, the state of the computer is separable. As we have emphasized, both of these assumptions are justified for the case of quantum circuits. However, this limitation on the size of the computer is significant only at high temperatures, as can be easily seen from Eq. (4.23). On the other hand, Ozawa showed recently [94] that conservation laws impose a lower bound on the size of quantum computers. Unlike the competing upper bound implied by our entropy-energy argument, Ozawa's bound is independent of temperature, which suggests that operating quantum computers at low temperature may go a long way towards curtailing the effects of decoherence.

Another approach to stabilization of quantum memories and computers would call for replacing circuit-based computation with the following procedure [18, 146]: upon preparing a multiparticle entangled state, a suitable set of observables is measured on it, and the measurement results are processed on a classical computer. While any computation performed using this technique is manifestly irreversible, it has the advantage of being less susceptible to the effects of noise by virtue of cutting down the computation time.

Information storage in quantum spin systems

In Chapter 4 we have considered the situation when the effect of noise is such that the entropy produced exceeds the resulting energy shift, at which point it becomes thermodynamically unfavorable for the computer to be in any state other than the maximally mixed (microcanonical) state, or a mixture of such states on the energy eigenspaces. In this chapter we briefly comment on the possibility of reliable storage of information in quantum spin systems in which there exists a possibility of a phase transition. In this case it can be shown, using the so-called Peierls argument [41, 54, 98], that the energy shift does, in fact, overwhelm the entropy gain.

Our goal here is to reinterpret the results of rigorous perturbation theory for quantum spin systems in the context of quantum information processing. We hope that these preliminary findings might spur further research into this topic both in the quantum information community and in the statistical mechanics community. The contents of this chapter follow Ref. [105] essentially verbatim.

5.1 Toric codes and error correction on the physical level

Error correction is a key ingredient in any good recipe for quantum information processing. Many ingenious schemes have been invented to that effect. A particularly interesting approach has been suggested by Kitaev and colleagues in a series of beautiful papers [17, 32, 66], namely the possibility of implementing quantum error correction *on the physical level*.

Consider a $k \times k$ square lattice Λ on the torus \mathbb{Z}^2/\mathbb{Z} . Associate a qubit with each edge of Λ , for a total of $n = 2k^2$ qubits. We can identify two kinds of geometric objects on Λ , *vertices* and *faces*; Fig. 5.1 shows a portion of the lattice together with a vertex v , a face




Figure 5.1: Square lattice on a torus.

F , and the edges incident with v and F . It is easy to see that there are k^2 vertices and k^2 faces.

Given a vertex v , we denote by $\Sigma(v)$ the set of all edges of Λ incident with v . Similarly, given a face F , we let ∂F denote the boundary of F . For any v , $\Sigma(v)$ contains exactly four edges; the same can be said of ∂F for any F . Now define the *verification operators*

$$A_v := \bigotimes_{e \in \Sigma(v)} \sigma_1^e, \quad B_F := \bigotimes_{e \in \partial F} \sigma_3^e,$$

where σ_i^e denotes the Pauli matrix σ_i acting on the Hilbert space of the qubit associated to the edge e . It is easy to see that all of these n operators commute with each other, and are self-adjoint with eigenvalues ± 1 .

Let \mathcal{H} be the Hilbert space of the n qubits on the lattice and consider the *protected subspace*

$$\mathcal{K} := \{\psi \in \mathcal{H} \mid A_v \psi = \psi, B_F \psi = \psi \quad \forall v, F\}.$$

There are two relations connecting the operators A_v and B_F , namely $\prod_v A_v = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $\prod_F B_F = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Hence there are $m = n - 2$ independent verification operators. Using the theory of the so-called *stabilizer codes* [51], it can be shown that the dimension of the protected subspace is equal to $2^{n-m} = 4$.

In Ref. [67], Kitaev proposed the following approach to quantum error correction. He considered the Hamiltonian

$$H_\Lambda := - \sum_v A_v - \sum_F B_F, \quad (5.1)$$

where the summations run over all the vertices and faces of Λ . Note that this Hamiltonian is formed by 4-spin interactions, namely the verification operators. The ground state of the Hamiltonian (5.1) is fourfold degenerate, and the corresponding eigenspace is precisely the protected subspace \mathcal{K} . We can therefore store a state of 2 qubits as a vector in \mathcal{K} .

Addition of a small local perturbation given by the sum of certain single-spin terms and 2-spin interactions (cf. Ref. [67] for details) modifies the Hamiltonian H_Λ to $H_\Lambda(\epsilon)$, where ϵ is the perturbation strength. The effect of the perturbation is to introduce an

energy splitting between the degenerate ground-state levels of the unperturbed Hamiltonian. Kitaev then argues that there exists a constant ϵ_0 such that, at low temperatures and for all $|\epsilon| \leq \epsilon_0$, the energy splitting for sufficiently large Λ is given by $\exp(-ck)$ for some positive c . In other words, in the thermodynamic limit $\Lambda \uparrow \mathbb{Z}^2$, the ground state is still fourfold degenerate, and any sufficiently weak perturbation is “washed out” by the system itself.

The four-body interactions comprising the Hamiltonian (5.1) were originally considered by Kitaev in Ref. [66] as a basis for the construction of a family $(2k^2, 2)$ stabilizer codes, which he termed “toric codes.” The remarkable feature of toric codes is the fact that, despite their apparent nonoptimality (in the sense of Calderbank and Shor [19]), they require only local operations for their implementation and can correct any number of errors (provided that the lattice is large enough). The bulk of Kitaev’s analysis of toric codes was concerned with their properties as “conventional” quantum error-correcting codes [68] that require active intervention through frequent measurements and other external processing. The issue of constructing “self-correcting” quantum spin systems on the basis of toric codes has been taken up again only very recently by Dennis *et al.* [32]. Their approach, however, is centered around the topological features of toric codes and delves deep into such subjects as nonabelian gauge theory [9, 32].

On the other hand, the very idea of physical error correction is so tantalizing, both practically and conceptually, that one cannot help but wonder: how generic are phenomena of this kind? In this chapter we show that a few results in statistical mechanics of quantum spin systems point towards the conclusion that physical error correction is fairly common in such systems, under quite reasonable conditions.

5.2 Laying out the ingredients

First of all, let us agree on the ingredients necessary for the analysis of a self-correcting quantum spin system. Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, where $\nu \geq 2$, be a finite lattice. Let \mathcal{H}_0 be the $(2S + 1)$ -dimensional Hilbert space of a single particle of spin S . Spins are situated on the lattice sites $l \in \Lambda$ (in Kitaev’s construction, spins were located on the lattice bonds). In order to retain a superficial analogy with stabilizer codes, we will assume that the unperturbed Hamiltonian H_Λ is *classical*, i.e., the interactions comprising it generate an abelian subalgebra of the algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\Lambda)$ of all linear operators on $\mathcal{H}_\Lambda := \otimes_{l \in \Lambda} \mathcal{H}_l$, where \mathcal{H}_l is an isomorphic copy of \mathcal{H}_0 . That is,

$$H_\Lambda = \sum_{M \subset \Lambda} \Phi_M,$$

where each Φ_M is a self-adjoint operator on $\mathcal{H}_M := \otimes_{l \in M} \mathcal{H}_l$, and $[\Phi_M, \Phi_N] = 0$. We assume periodic boundary conditions [that is, the lattice Λ is drawn on the torus $(\mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z})^\nu$, where k is the lattice size]. We let $\{|\underline{\sigma}\rangle\}$ be the orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H}_Λ in which H_Λ is diagonal; the basis vectors are labelled by classical spin configurations, $\underline{\sigma} = \{\sigma_l\}_{l \in \Lambda}$ with $\sigma_l \in \{-S, -S + 1, \dots, S - 1, S\}$. We also assume that the smallest eigenvalue of H_Λ is equal to zero, and that its geometric multiplicity is $m \geq 2$. We denote the corresponding eigenspace by \mathcal{H}_Λ^g .

The effect of errors is modeled by introducing an off-diagonal perturbation term to the Hamiltonian:

$$H_\Lambda(\epsilon) := H_\Lambda + \epsilon P,$$

where ϵ is a positive constant and P is a self-adjoint operator whose exact form is, for the moment, left unspecified. Addition of the ϵP term will perturb the eigenvalues of H_Λ , resulting in energy splitting between orthogonal ground states of the original (unperturbed) Hamiltonian. Consequently, we define

$$\Delta E_\Lambda(\epsilon) := \max_{|\underline{\sigma}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_\Lambda^g} \langle \underline{\sigma} | H_\Lambda(\epsilon) | \underline{\sigma} \rangle.$$

Thus the basic idea behind a self-correcting quantum spin system boils down to the following. Information is stored in the ground-state eigenspace of the unperturbed Hamiltonian H_Λ . The multiplicity m is, obviously, dictated by the desired storage capacity: when $m = 2^k$, our “ground-state memory cell” will hold k qubits. Errors will cause some of the information to leak out into excited states. In order for error correction to take place, the system should be able to recover its ground state from sufficiently weak perturbations at sufficiently low temperatures (the fact that we have to work with low temperatures is clear since we are dealing with the ground state). That is, we hope that there exists a threshold value ϵ_0 such that

$$\lim_{\Lambda \uparrow \mathbb{Z}^d} \Delta E_\Lambda(\epsilon) = 0, \quad \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0. \quad (5.2)$$

However, this condition is necessary but not sufficient for error correction. It may happen that the m -fold degeneracy of the ground state does not survive in the thermodynamic limit [this possibility is borne out by the off-diagonal matrix elements $\langle \underline{\sigma} | H_\Lambda(\epsilon) | \underline{\sigma}' \rangle$, where $|\underline{\sigma}\rangle, |\underline{\sigma}'\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_\Lambda^g$]. Therefore we require that the ground state of the perturbed Hamiltonian remain m -fold degenerate for all $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$ in the thermodynamic limit. In the next section we elaborate further on these requirements for self-correction and show that they are quite easy to fulfill in a wide variety of quantum spin systems.

5.3 Putting it together

The main question is: which restrictions ensue on the unperturbed Hamiltonian H_Λ and on the perturbation P ? It turns out that this question can be answered using the same methods that are employed for constructing low-temperature phase diagrams for classical spin systems with quantum perturbations [13, 29, 64]. Thus the Hamiltonian H_Λ can be comprised by n -spin interactions (for fixed n) that satisfy the Peierls condition [127]: the energy cost of a local perturbation ω' of a translationally invariant ground state ω is on the order of the surface area of the region that encloses the part of the lattice on which ω and ω' differ. Additionally, the unperturbed Hamiltonian is assumed to have a spectral gap $g > 0$ (i.e., its first nonzero eigenvalue $\geq g$). Admissible perturbations are formed by sums of translates of an arbitrary self-adjoint operator P_0 , whose support (the set of sites on which the action of P_0 is nontrivial) is finite and encloses the origin of the lattice. Thus

$$P = \sum_{l \in \Lambda} P_l,$$

where $P_l = \gamma_l P_0$ with γ_l being the automorphism induced by the translation of the lattice Λ that maps the origin 0 to the site l and respects the periodic boundary conditions. Also, both the unperturbed and the perturbed Hamiltonians are assumed to be invariant under unitary transformations induced by a symmetry group acting transitively on the set $\{|\underline{\sigma}\rangle\} \cap \mathcal{H}_\Lambda^g$.

Assuming these conditions are satisfied, we invoke a theorem of Kennedy and Tasaki [64], which says that there exists a constant ϵ_0 such that, for all $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, the perturbed spin system has m translationally invariant ground states in the thermodynamic limit. Furthermore, if the m translationally invariant ground states of the unperturbed Hamiltonian are invariant under some additional symmetries, these invariance properties carry over to the ground states of the perturbed system. The threshold value ϵ_0 of the parameter ϵ is determined by developing a low-temperature expansion [50, 64] of the perturbed partition function using a modified Lie-Trotter product formula,

$$\mathrm{tr} e^{-\beta H_\Lambda(\epsilon)} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathrm{tr} \left\{ \left[\left(\mathbb{1} - \frac{\epsilon P}{N} \right) e^{-(1/N)H_\Lambda} \right]^{N\beta} \right\}.$$

The trace is expanded in the basis $\{|\underline{\sigma}\rangle\}$, thus allowing for combinatorial analysis on a “space-time” grid, where the space axis is labelled by the lattice sites l and the time axis is labelled by the values $0, (1/N)\beta, (2/N)\beta, \dots, \beta$. The perturbation theory is controlled by a suitable coarse-graining of the time axis, which then allows to determine the threshold value ϵ_0 that will render the contributions of the perturbation terms P_l sufficiently small. In fact, the translation-invariance requirements can be lifted, with the perturbation theory still going through [64]. A similar space-time analysis of the error rate has been described heuristically by Dennis *et al.* [32].

Another important issue is the following: while the infinite-volume ground state of the perturbed system may retain the degeneracy of the original (unperturbed) ground state, the degeneracy may be lost when the lattice has finite size. This phenomenon, referred to as *obscured symmetry breaking* [70], is characterized by the fact that the low-lying eigenstates of the finite-system Hamiltonian converge to additional ground states in the thermodynamic limit. In this case we will have, for any finite Λ ,

$$\Delta E_\Lambda(\epsilon) > 0.$$

It is therefore important to obtain an estimate of the convergence rate in (5.2); namely, given some $\delta > 0$, find N_0 such that

$$\Delta E_\Lambda(\epsilon) < \delta, \quad |\Lambda| \geq N_0.$$

Knowing the convergence rate allows us to appraise the resources needed to implement error correction with the desired accuracy δ . In this respect, an estimate of the form

$$\Delta E_\Lambda(\epsilon) = e^{-c|\Lambda|}, \quad \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0, \quad (5.3)$$

where the constant c depends on ϵ , would be ideal — an exponential gain in error-correction accuracy could then be achieved with polynomial resources. This exponential convergence rate is, in fact, one of the most attractive features of Kitaev’s construction in Ref. [67].

On the other hand, the rate at which $\Delta E_\Lambda(\epsilon)$ converges to zero is determined by the unperturbed Hamiltonian H_Λ , the perturbation P , and the perturbation strength ϵ . It is therefore important to know what we can expect in a generic setting. Obviously, the exponential convergence, as in Eq. (5.3), is optimal, but it may as well turn out that the particular implementation (e.g., with a different Hamiltonian) does not allow for it. We can, however, hope for a slower (but still quite decent) convergence rate. According to a theorem of Horsch and von der Linden [62], certain quantum spin systems possess low-lying eigenstates of the finite-lattice Hamiltonian with

$$\Delta E_\Lambda(\epsilon) = c/|\Lambda|.$$

The conditions for this to hold are the following. There has to exist an *order observable* O_Λ of the form

$$O_\Lambda = \sum_{l \in \Lambda} O_l,$$

where each O_l is a self-adjoint operator such that $[O_l, O_{l'}] = 0$. Furthermore, for any interaction term $\Phi_{M \subset \Lambda}$ in the perturbed Hamiltonian $H_\Lambda(\epsilon)$ (these also include the perturbation terms), we will have $[\Phi_M, O_l] = 0$ unless $l \in M$. The operators Φ_M and O_l are required to be uniformly bounded (in M and l respectively), and the cardinality of the support set M must not exceed some fixed constant C (the latter condition has also to be fulfilled for the perturbation theory described above to converge). Finally, if $|\psi\rangle$ is an eigenstate of $H_\Lambda(\epsilon)$, then we must have $\langle \psi | O_\Lambda | \psi \rangle = 0$, but $\langle \psi | O_\Lambda^2 | \psi \rangle \geq \zeta |\Lambda|^2$ (here the constant ζ depends on O_l). The latter conditions are taken as manifestations of obscured symmetry breaking. Examples of systems for which the Horsch-von der Linden theorem holds include [70] the Ising model in the transverse magnetic field or the Heisenberg antiferromagnet with a Néel order.

5.4 Summary

Where does it all take us? It appears, from the discussion in the preceding section, that any quantum spin system, whose Hamiltonian is formed by mutually commuting n -body interactions that satisfy the Peierls condition, can recover from sufficiently weak quantum (i.e., off-diagonal) perturbations at low temperatures. The admissible perturbations can be either finite-range [64], or exponentially decaying [13]. Under these (quite general) conditions, it follows from rigorous perturbation theory for quantum spin systems that there exists a critical perturbation strength ϵ_0 , such that, for all $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$, the degeneracy and the symmetry properties of the ground state of the original (unperturbed) system survive in the thermodynamic limit. Furthermore, even if ground-state degeneracy is removed by perturbation of the finite-size system, the effect of the error (perturbation) is effectively “washed out” in the thermodynamic limit, as the low-lying excited states of the perturbed system converge to additional ground states.

However, the systems we have considered were assumed to have classical Hamiltonians and discrete symmetries. What about truly quantum Hamiltonians and continuous symmetry (e.g., the quantum Heisenberg model)? The situation here is not so easy. For instance, it is apparent from our discussion that, in order to be self-correcting, the perturbed

system must exhibit an order-disorder transition as the parameter ϵ is tuned: in the “ordered phase,” error correction is possible; in the “disordered phase,” occurrence of errors results in irrevocable loss of information. (This has already been noted by Dennis *et al.* [32].) Since we require the ground state of the perturbed Hamiltonian to exhibit the same degeneracy as the corresponding state of the unperturbed Hamiltonian, it makes sense to talk about spontaneously broken symmetry in the ordered phase (i.e., when $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$). However, according to the so-called Goldstone theorem [73], symmetry cannot be broken in a system with continuous symmetry and a gap. It would certainly be worthwhile to explore physical error correction in systems with continuous symmetries as well, but the models in which it can work will not be as easy to find.

Conclusion

The now-fashionable field of “physics of information and computation” is at least 73 years old if we count from 1929, the year when Leo Szilard published his seminal paper [133] on the Maxwell’s demon. Today, the amount of published work in this area is astounding; to be sure, we have gained quite a bit (pun intended) of new knowledge and new insights, owing to the continuous cross-fertilization between the disciplines of mathematics, physics, and computer science. However, we hardly made a dent in the Big Problem of harnessing the enormous information-processing potential of quantum-mechanical systems. Reliable storage of quantum information still remains the paramount challenge.

In this dissertation, we presented a systematic study of the dynamical aspects of information storage in quantum-mechanical systems. We have already outlined in Chapter 1 the way in which dynamics (statistical dynamics, in particular) relates to our investigation of information storage in noisy quantum registers and computers. Let us therefore elaborate on the “big picture.”

First of all, what do we mean by “information?” We take a very simple approach: we refer to any assignment of an initial state (density operator) as the information stored in the register (or supplied to the computer). Statistical dynamics then comes in useful as we attempt to follow the orbit traced over time by this initial information in the state space of the register (computer). Now, given any pair of different initial states, the states along the corresponding orbits in the noiseless case will be distinguishable from one another exactly to the same extent as the input states. This, in general, will not be the case when noise is present. It is precisely this feature that is central in our analysis of the noisy dynamics.

In a sense, quantum information science is a nonequilibrium theory: it deals with systems whose quantum-mechanical states are not necessarily the thermodynamically favorable ones. We believe, therefore, that an important aspect of the noisy dynamics of quantum registers and computers is the tendency towards equilibrium. Since the rate of convergence to equilibrium is expected to be quite rapid (and this is precisely the behavior we have shown strictly contractive dynamics to exhibit), any active intervention (such as error correction) would have to take place extremely often. In fact, if the computational

network is very elaborate, we may expect most of it to be taken up by the degrees of freedom that are responsible for keeping the computation stable. However, because these degrees of freedom are also susceptible to the noisy dynamics, the overall trend toward equilibrium will still be present.

In this dissertation, the noise afflicting the quantum register (computer) was modeled by a strictly contractive channel [104, 106]. This model is justified for several reasons, the main one being the rapid convergence of disjoint orbits toward each other. This behavior naturally leads towards ergodicity and mixing, two important ingredients in the theory of approach to equilibrium. Furthermore, strictly contractive channels give us a way to incorporate the crucial assumption of *finite precision* of any experimentally available apparatus into the mathematical model of a physically realizable (i.e., nonideal) quantum computer. We have shown, in particular, that no two states of such a computer can be distinguished from one another with absolute certainty, even if they are maximally distinguishable in the noiseless case. Finally we have shown that, given any channel T , there will always be a strictly contractive channel T' in any neighborhood of T in the cb-norm topology. Using the fidelity measure we have developed for quantum channels [103], we showed that, for any channel T , there always exists a strictly contractive channel T' that cannot be distinguished from T by any *experimental* means. We then went on to demonstrate that, in the absence of error correction, the sensitivity of quantum memories and computers to strictly contractive errors would grow exponentially with storage time and computation time respectively, and would depend only on the contraction rate and on the measurement precision. We proved that strict contractivity rules out the possibility of perfect error correction, and gave an argument that approximate error correction, which covers previous work on fault-tolerant quantum computation as a special case, is possible.

We have then applied our model to the problem of determining the threshold error rate for noisy quantum computation. If the noise is sufficiently weak, we may model the decoherence mechanism by a depolarizing channel, the error rate being precisely the rate of depolarization. We would like to emphasize that we did not make any assumptions about the specific procedure employed for error correction, nor did we appeal to combinatorial considerations. The threshold error rate was shown to depend on the measurement precision and on the physical circuit depth. We presented some numerical estimates for the threshold error rate for the case when the measurement precision is on the order of the standard quantum limit, and found that, even with such ridiculously precise measurements, the maximum tolerable error rate would drop to zero extremely rapidly for circuits of polynomial and superpolynomial physical depth.

After having described the general properties of strictly contractive channels, along with implications for quantum information processing, we took up the following question [107]. How does strict contractivity relate to the balance of energy and entropy in a noisy quantum register (computer)? We found that there is a close connection between the contraction rate of a channel and the rate of entropy production in a noisy quantum computer. We adapted the so-called “entropy-energy arguments” in order to determine the maximum number of operations that can be carried out reliably on a noisy quantum computer in terms of energy and temperature, thus enabling us to judge the *thermodynamic cost* of keeping the computer stable. Ideally we would like to do error correction as infrequently as possible; the longer the relaxation time, the closer we will be to this

goal. We also proved that, under certain conditions, there exists an upper bound on the number of qubits in a circuit-based quantum computer.

Finally we looked into the possibility of using quantum spin systems with phase transitions for reliable storage of quantum information [105]. Our inspiration came from Kitaev's idea [67] to store quantum information in the degenerate ground state of a system of interacting anyons on a periodic lattice. Proper treatment of the ground states calls for the analysis of *low-temperature* behavior of quantum spin systems, where the main issue is not entropy, but rather the energy fluctuations above the ground-state level, caused by quantum perturbations. We have, in particular, addressed the following question: what kinds of interactions are admissible for constructing such quantum memory devices, and what are the perturbations against which these memories will be stable? We indicated that a few results in rigorous statistical mechanics of quantum spin systems [112] point toward the conclusion that such "self-correction" is fairly common in quantum spin systems with Hamiltonians that are comprised by interactions satisfying the so-called Peierls condition (the standard example being an Ising-type Hamiltonian), the admissible perturbations being either finite-range or exponentially decaying.

Most of the results we have presented in this dissertation are of a somewhat negative nature. The implications, however, are more of a blessing than a curse for the future of quantum information processing. We believe that the successful solution of problems faced by researchers in this field will require models of computers far more ingenious than networks of one- and two-qubit gates. As we have mentioned in Chapter 3, massively parallel systems of interacting particles (quantum cellular automata) may well prove to be a viable medium for the experimental realization of large-scale quantum computers.

Appendix A

Mathematical background

A.1 C*-algebras

We summarize here the absolute minimum of the C*-algebra theory. For the mathematical treatment, the reader is referred to the books by Bratteli and Robinson [16], Conway [24], and Davidson [30], and for the C*-algebras in the context of quantum theory and statistical mechanics to the books by Emch [38], Haag [56], and Streater [132].

First we give a few definitions.

Definition A.1.1 *An algebra is a complex linear space \mathcal{A} , equipped with the product operation $(A, B) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \mapsto AB \in \mathcal{A}$ such that, for all $A, B, C \in \mathcal{A}$ and all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, (1) $A(BC) = (AB)C$, (2) $A(B + C) = AB + AC$, (3) $(\alpha\beta)(AB) = (\alpha A)(\beta B)$. The product operation does not have to be commutative; an algebra with the commutative product is called abelian or simply commutative.*

Definition A.1.2 *An algebra with identity or a unital algebra is an algebra \mathcal{A} with the unique element $\mathbb{1} \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $A\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}A = A$ for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$.*

Definition A.1.3 *An involution on an algebra \mathcal{A} is a mapping $A \in \mathcal{A} \mapsto A^* \in \mathcal{A}$ such that, for all $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ and all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, (1) $(A^*)^* = A$, (2) $(AB)^* = B^*A^*$, (3) $(\alpha A + \beta B)^* = \bar{\alpha}A^* + \bar{\beta}B^*$. An element $A \in \mathcal{A}$ with $A = A^*$ is called self-adjoint. An algebra with an involution is referred to as a *-algebra.*

Definition A.1.4 *An algebra \mathcal{A} is a normed algebra if it is equipped with a norm $\|\cdot\|$ which is, in addition to the usual properties of the norm, submultiplicative, i.e., for any $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$, $\|AB\| \leq \|A\| \|B\|$. If a normed algebra \mathcal{A} is a complete normed space, and if the norm has the property $\|A^*\| = \|A\|$ for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$, then \mathcal{A} is called a Banach *-algebra.*

Definition A.1.5 *A Banach *-algebra \mathcal{A} is called a C*-algebra if its norm has the C*-norm property $\|A^*A\| = \|A\|^2$.*

In this case, the requirement that the involution on \mathcal{A} be isometric with respect to the norm is redundant, since this property follows from the C^* -norm property and the submultiplicativity of the norm.

There are two classic examples of C^* -algebras. (1) Let \mathcal{X} be a compact Hausdorff space, and let $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$ be the set of all continuous complex-valued functions on \mathcal{X} . Then $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$ is a C^* -algebra with the operations defined pointwise, $(f + g)(x) := f(x) + g(x)$, $(fg)(x) := f(x)g(x)$, and $f^*(x) := \overline{f(x)}$, and the norm $\|f\| := \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |f(x)|$. The C^* -algebra $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$ is an abelian algebra. (2) Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space, and let $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be the set of all bounded operators acting on \mathcal{H} . Then $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is a C^* -algebra with the usual sum and product operations, and the involution given by the Hilbert-space (Hermitian) adjoint. The norm is the operator norm $\|A\| := \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{H}; \|\psi\|=1} \|A\psi\|$. The C^* -algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is a noncommutative algebra. Both of these algebras are algebras with identity; in the first case, the identity is the constant function 1, and, in the second case, the identity is the identity operator, $\mathbb{1}\psi = \psi$ for all $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$.

It turns out that these two examples are already exhaustive in the following sense. A theorem of Gelfand and Naimark asserts that, for any C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} , there exists a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} such that \mathcal{A} is isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Furthermore, according to a theorem of Gelfand, any commutative C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} is isomorphic to the algebra $\mathcal{C}_0(\mathcal{X})$ of complex-valued continuous functions that vanish at infinity on some locally compact Hausdorff space \mathcal{X} . [This algebra is a more general object than $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$ defined above, but, whenever \mathcal{A} has an identity, the space \mathcal{X} will automatically be compact.] From now on we assume that all the C^* -algebras, with which we are dealing, have an identity.

A.2 States, representations, and the GNS construction

Definition A.2.1 *An element A of a C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} is called invertible if there exists an element A^{-1} , called the inverse of A , such that $AA^{-1} = A^{-1}A = \mathbb{1}$. The resolvent set of A , denoted by $r(A)$, is the subset of \mathbb{C} consisting of all complex numbers λ such that $A - \lambda\mathbb{1}$ has an inverse. The spectrum of A , denoted by $\sigma(A)$, is the complement of $r(A)$ in \mathbb{C} , $\sigma(A) := \mathbb{C} \setminus r(A)$.*

It is a celebrated result in spectral analysis that the spectrum of any $A \in \mathcal{A}$ is a nonempty compact set. In particular, the *spectral radius* r_A of A , defined as $r_A := \sup_{\lambda \in \sigma(A)} |\lambda|$, does not exceed the norm of A .

In case of a self-adjoint $A \in \mathcal{A}$, the spectrum $\sigma(A)$ is contained within the interval $[-\|A\|, \|A\|]$ of the real line, and $r_A \equiv \|A\|$. A self-adjoint element A of a C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} is called *positive* (this is denoted by $A \geq 0$) if $\sigma(A) \subseteq [0, \|A\|]$. An element $A \in \mathcal{A}$ is positive if and only if there exists some $B \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $A = B^*B$.

After these preliminaries, we can define a state over a C^* -algebra.

Definition A.2.2 *A state over a C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} is a normalized positive linear functional ω over \mathcal{A} , i.e., $\omega(\mathbb{1}) = 1$ and $\omega(A^*A) \geq 0$ for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$. The set $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$ of all states over a C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} is a convex set, and its extreme points are referred to as pure states.*

A canonical example of a state over a C^* -algebra is furnished by considering the algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ of bounded operators on some Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Let $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$ be a unit vector, and define the linear functional $\omega_\psi(A) := \langle \psi | A \psi \rangle$. It is quite easy to see that ω_ψ is a state. A state defined in this way is called a *vector state*. It is the gist of the famous Gelfand-Naimark-Segal (GNS) construction that any state over a C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} has the form of a vector state over a C^* -subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ for some Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . For this reason, the GNS construction is central to the C^* -algebraic quantum theory. However, in order to state it properly, we first have to introduce some additional machinery.

Definition A.2.3 A $*$ -homomorphism between C^* -algebras \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} is a mapping $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ such that, for all $A, B, C \in \mathcal{A}$ and all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, (1) $\pi(\alpha A + \beta B) = \alpha\pi(A) + \beta\pi(B)$, (2) $\pi(AB) = \pi(A)\pi(B)$, (3) $\pi(A^*) = \pi(A)^*$. In other words, a $*$ -homomorphism between two C^* -algebras is a mapping that preserves the C^* -algebraic structure. A bijective $*$ -homomorphism is referred to as a $*$ -isomorphism.

Any $*$ -homomorphism maps positive elements to positive elements because $\pi(A^*A) = \pi(A^*)\pi(A) = \pi(A)^*\pi(A) \geq 0$, and is also continuous: $\|\pi(A)\| \leq \|A\|$.

Definition A.2.4 A representation of a C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} is a pair (\mathcal{H}, π) , where \mathcal{H} is a Hilbert space and π is a $*$ -homomorphism of \mathcal{A} into $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. The representation (\mathcal{H}, π) of \mathcal{A} is called *faithful* if $\ker \pi := \{A \in \mathcal{A} | \pi(A) = 0\}$ is trivial.

From now on, when we talk about representations, we will omit the mention of the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} whenever it is clear from the context which Hilbert space we are talking about.

Definition A.2.5 A vector $\Omega \in \mathcal{H}$ is called the *cyclic vector* for the representation (\mathcal{H}, π) of a C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} if the set $\{\pi(A)\Omega | A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ is dense in \mathcal{H} , i.e., if for any $\phi \in \mathcal{H}$ and any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists some $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\|\phi - \pi(A)\Omega\| < \epsilon$. The triple $(\mathcal{H}, \pi, \Omega)$ is called the *cyclic representation* of \mathcal{A} . The representation (\mathcal{H}, π) is called *irreducible* if every vector $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$ is cyclic for π or, equivalently, if the only invariant subspaces of the set $\pi(\mathcal{A}) := \{\pi(A) | A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ are $\{0\}$ and \mathcal{H} . Otherwise, the representation is called *reducible*.

It can be shown that any representation of a C^* -algebra as an algebra of operators over a Hilbert space can be decomposed into a direct sum of irreducible representations. In general, a set \mathcal{M} of bounded operators on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is called *irreducible* if it has no nontrivial invariant subspaces. Thus we can say that the representation (\mathcal{H}, π) of a C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} is irreducible if and only if the set $\pi(\mathcal{A})$ is irreducible.

A useful irreducibility criterion is provided by Schur's lemma, which states that a set $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ which is self-adjoint (i.e., closed under the operation of taking the adjoint), is irreducible if and only if the *commutant* of \mathcal{M} , i.e., the set $\mathcal{M}' := \{X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) | [X, M] = 0, \forall M \in \mathcal{M}\}$, consists only of complex multiples of the identity operator (this is written as $\mathcal{M}' = \mathbb{C}\mathbf{I}$). Thus the representation (\mathcal{H}, π) of a C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} is irreducible if and only if $\pi(\mathcal{A})' = \mathbb{C}\mathbf{I}$.

Now we are ready to state the theorem which is the essence of the GNS construction.

Theorem A.2.6 (Gelfand-Naimark-Segal) *Let ω be a state over the C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} . Then there exists a cyclic representation $(\mathcal{H}, \pi, \Omega)$ of \mathcal{A} such that*

$$\omega(A) = \langle \Omega | \pi(A) \Omega \rangle$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$, and Ω is a unit vector. This representation, to which we will refer as the GNS representation of \mathcal{A} associated with ω , is unique up to unitary equivalence.

Given a C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} and a state ω , the corresponding GNS representation is irreducible if and only if ω is a pure state. This result has an interesting consequence for pure states over abelian C^* -algebras. Namely, ω is a pure state over an abelian C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} if and only if $\omega(AB) = \omega(A)\omega(B)$ for all $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$. Indeed, let (\mathcal{H}, π) be the corresponding GNS representation. Since ω is a pure state, the representation is irreducible, and therefore $\pi(\mathcal{A})' = \mathbb{C}\mathbf{I}$. But, because \mathcal{A} is abelian, we have $\pi(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \pi(\mathcal{A})'$, which means that π is irreducible if and only if \mathcal{H} is one-dimensional, i.e., isomorphic to \mathbb{C} . The factorization property of ω is now apparent.

A.3 Trace ideals of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$

Definition A.3.1 *Let \mathcal{A} be an algebra. A subset \mathcal{I} of \mathcal{A} is called a two-sided ideal (or simply an ideal) of \mathcal{A} if, for any $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and any $A \in \mathcal{A}$, the elements AI and IA are also in \mathcal{I} .*

In this section we will give a brief description of a class of ideals of the algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, the so-called *trace ideals*. For a well-written exposition of the theory of trace ideals, as well as its applications to mathematical physics, consult the text by Simon [123]; another good source is the classic monograph by Schatten [119].

The starting point in the theory of trace ideals is the concept of a *compact operator*.

Definition A.3.2 *A bounded operator $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is called a finite-rank operator if it has finite-dimensional range. A bounded operator is called compact if it is a norm limit of finite-rank operators.*

Let $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ denote the set of all compact operators on \mathcal{H} . It is easy to see that $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ is a two-sided ideal of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Indeed, if A is a finite-rank operator and B is a bounded operator, then AB and BA are both finite-rank operators. Because $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ is a norm closure of the set of all finite-rank operators, we see that AB and BA are compact whenever A is compact and B is bounded. In fact, any two-sided ideal of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is a subset of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$. Furthermore, we have the following key theorem.

Theorem A.3.3 *Let A be a compact operator. Then A has a norm-convergent canonical expansion*

$$A = \sum_{n=1}^N \mu_n(A) |\psi_n\rangle \langle \phi_n|,$$

where N is a nonnegative integer or infinity, each $\mu_n(A) > 0$ with $\mu_1(A) \geq \mu_2(A) \geq \dots$, and $\{\psi_n\}$ and $\{\phi_n\}$ are (not necessarily complete) orthonormal sets. Moreover, the

numbers $\mu_n(A)$, called the singular values of A , are the nonzero eigenvalues of $|A| := (A^*A)^{1/2}$, arranged in descending order.

Now suppose that we are given a compact operator A . For $p = 1, 2, \dots$, define the *Schatten p -norm* of A as

$$\|A\|_p := \left(\sum_n \mu_n(A)^p \right)^{1/p} \equiv (\operatorname{tr} |A|^p)^{1/p}$$

Then A is said to belong to *Schatten p -class* if $\|A\|_p^p$ is finite; in this case we will write $A \in \mathcal{T}_p(\mathcal{H})$. It can be shown that, for any p , the Schatten p -class $\mathcal{T}_p(\mathcal{H})$ is a two-sided ideal of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$; alternatively, $\mathcal{T}_p(\mathcal{H})$ is the closure of the finite-rank operators in the Schatten p -norm.

We are mainly interested in the cases $p = 1$ and $p = 2$. Let us look at the first case, where we have the norm

$$\|A\|_1 := \operatorname{tr} |A|,$$

referred to as the *trace norm*. The Schatten 1-class $\mathcal{T}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is also referred to as the *trace class*, and any operator $A \in \mathcal{T}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is called a *trace-class operator*. For a self-adjoint trace-class operator A we also have $|\operatorname{tr} A| \leq \|A\|_1$. Furthermore, for any trace-class operator A and any bounded operator B , we have the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \|AB\|_1 &\leq \|B\| \|A\|_1 \\ \|BA\|_1 &\leq \|B\| \|A\|_1, \end{aligned}$$

which can, of course, be taken as an indication that the trace-class is a two-sided ideal of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

When $p = 2$, the corresponding p -norm,

$$\|A\|_2 := (\operatorname{tr} |A|^2)^{1/2} \equiv [\operatorname{tr} (A^*A)]^{1/2},$$

is called the *Hilbert-Schmidt norm*, and the space $\mathcal{T}_2(\mathcal{H})$ is called the space of the Hilbert-Schmidt operators. The Hilbert-Schmidt norm is the norm induced by the inner product $\operatorname{tr} (A^*B)$, and it can be shown that the space of the Hilbert-Schmidt operators is a Hilbert space. The product of a Hilbert-Schmidt operator A and a bounded operator B , in any order, is again a Hilbert-Schmidt operator with

$$\|AB\|_2, \|BA\|_2 \leq \|B\| \|A\|_2.$$

This shows that the Hilbert-Schmidt space $\mathcal{T}_2(\mathcal{H})$ is a two-sided ideal of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

A.4 Fixed-point theorems

Let \mathcal{X} be a metric space with the metric $d(\cdot, \cdot)$. An operator $A : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is called a *contraction* if, for any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$, $d(Ax, Ay) \leq d(x, y)$, and a *strict contraction* if there exists some $k \in [0, 1)$ such that $d(Ax, Ay) \leq kd(x, y)$. If \mathcal{X} is a complete metric space, then the contraction mapping principle [108] states that any strict contraction A on \mathcal{X} has a unique fixed point. In other words, the problem $Ax = x$ has a unique solution on

\mathcal{X} . If \mathcal{Y} is a closed subset of \mathcal{X} , then it follows that any strict contraction $A : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ has a unique fixed point on \mathcal{Y} .

Strict contractivity is a remarkably strong property. Indeed, if we pick any $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, then the sequence of iterates $A^n y$ converges to the fixed point y_0 of A exponentially fast, because

$$d(A^n y, y_0) = d(A^n y, A^n y_0) \leq k^n d(y, y_0). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

This fact is of tremendous use in numerical analysis when one wants to solve the fixed-point problem $Ay = y$ by the iteration method with some initial guess \hat{y} . If the operator A is a strict contraction on a closed subset of a complete metric space, then, for any choice of \hat{y} , the iteration method is guaranteed to zero in on the solution in $O(\log \epsilon^{-1})$ steps, where ϵ is the desired precision.

It should be noted that existence and uniqueness of a fixed point of some operator A are, by themselves, not sufficient to guarantee convergence of the sequence of iterates $A^n y$ for any point y in the domain of A . Indeed, according to the Leray-Schauder-Tychonoff theorem [108], any continuous map on a compact convex subset of a locally convex space \mathcal{X} has at least one fixed point. Furthermore, any *weak contraction* on a compact subset C of a Banach space, i.e., a map $W : C \rightarrow C$ with the property $\|Wx - Wy\| < \|x - y\|$ for any $x, y \in C$, has a unique fixed point [128]. The key to the rapid convergence in Eq. (A.1) is the fact that a strict contraction $A : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ shrinks distances between points of \mathcal{Y} *uniformly*.

Appendix B

List of Symbols

$\mathcal{A} \simeq \mathcal{B}$	\mathcal{A} is isomorphic to \mathcal{B}
\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}	operator algebras
$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$	the algebra of bounded operators on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}
$\mathbb{C}\mathbb{I}$	the set of the complex multiples of the identity operator
$\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}$	Hilbert spaces
\mathbb{I}	identity operator
id	identity mapping
id_n	identity mapping on \mathcal{M}_n
\mathcal{M}_n	the algebra of $n \times n$ complex matrices
M^\top	matrix transpose of M
ρ, σ	density operators
$\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$	the state space of the C*-algebra \mathcal{A}
$\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$	the set of density operators on \mathcal{H}
$\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3$	Pauli matrices
$\mathcal{T}_p(\mathcal{H})$	Schatten p -class on \mathcal{H}
$ X $	cardinality of the set X
X^*	operator adjoint to the operator X
\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}	general (e.g., topological or measurable) spaces
\bar{z}	complex conjugate of $z \in \mathbb{C}$

Bibliography

* **Note:** some of the references point to arXiv preprints. For example, a reference to “arXiv preprint no. quant-ph/0101001” means that the cited paper can be downloaded from <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0101001>.

- [1] D. Aharonov, “Quantum to classical phase transition in noisy quantum computers,” *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 062311 (2000).
- [2] D. Aharonov, A.Yu. Kitaev, and N. Nisan, “Quantum circuits with mixed states,” in *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing* (ACM Press, New York, 1998), pp. 20-30.
- [3] P.M. Alberti and A. Uhlmann, *Stochasticity and Partial Order* (Reidel, Dordrecht, 1982).
- [4] R. Alicki and M. Fannes, *Quantum Dynamical Systems* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2001).
- [5] N. Alon and J.H. Spencer, *The Probabilistic Method*, 2nd ed. (Wiley, New York, 2000).
- [6] S. Amari and H. Nagaoka, *Methods of Information Geometry* (American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2000).
- [7] D. Bacon, D.A. Lidar, and K.B. Whaley, “Robustness of decoherence-free subspaces for quantum computation,” *Phys. Rev. A* **60**, 1944 (1999).
- [8] A. Barenco, C.H. Bennett, R. Cleve, D.P. DiVincenzo, N. Margolus, P. Shor, T. Sleator, J. Smolin, and H. Weinfurter, “Elementary gates for quantum computation,” *Phys. Rev. A* **52**, 3457 (1995).
- [9] D. Beckman, D. Gottesman, A. Kitaev, and J. Preskill, “Measurability of Wilson loop operators,” *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 065022 (2002).
- [10] C.H. Bennett and P.W. Shor, “Quantum information theory,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **44**, 2724 (1998).

-
- [11] E. Bernstein and U. Vazirani, “Quantum complexity theory,” *SIAM J. Comput.* **26**, 1411 (1997).
- [12] R. Bhatia, *Matrix Analysis* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997).
- [13] C. Borgs, R. Kotecký, and D. Ueltschi, “Low-temperature phase diagrams for quantum perturbations of classical spin systems,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **181**, 409 (1996).
- [14] V. Braginsky and F.Ya. Khalili, *Quantum Measurement* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge MA, 1992).
- [15] O. Bratteli, P.E.T. Jorgensen, A. Kishimoto, and R.F. Werner, “Pure states on \mathcal{O}_d ,” *J. Operator Theory* **43**, 97 (2000).
- [16] O. Bratteli and D.W. Robinson, *Operator Algebras and Quantum Statistical Mechanics I*, 2nd ed. (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1987).
- [17] S. Bravyi and A. Kitaev, “Quantum codes on a lattice with boundary,” arXiv preprint no. quant-ph/9811052.
- [18] H.J. Briegel and R. Raussendorf, “A one-way quantum computer,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 5188 (2001).
- [19] A.L. Calderbank and P.W. Shor, “Good quantum error-correcting codes exist,” *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 1098 (1996).
- [20] H.B. Callen, *Thermodynamics* (Wiley, New York, 1960).
- [21] B. Chopard and M. Droz, *Cellular Automata Modeling of Physical Systems* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999).
- [22] I.L. Chuang, N. Gershenfeld, M.G. Kubinec, and D.W. Leung, “Bulk quantum computation with nuclear magnetic resonance: theory and experiment,” *Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A* **454**, 447 (1998).
- [23] J.I. Cirac, W. Dür, B. Kraus, and M. Lewenstein, “Entangling operations and their implementation using small amount of entanglement,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 544 (2001).
- [24] J.B. Conway, *A Course in Operator Theory* (American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2000).
- [25] D.G. Cory, A.F. Fahmy, and T.F. Havel, “Ensemble quantum computing by NMR spectroscopy,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **94**, 1634 (1997).
- [26] G.M. D’Ariano and P. Lo Presti, “Optimal nonuniversally covariant cloning,” *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 042308 (2001).
- [27] G.M. D’Ariano, P. Lo Presti, and M.G.A. Paris, “Using entanglement improves precision of quantum measurements,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 270404 (2001).

- [28] G.M. D’Ariano, P. Lo Presti and M.F. Sacchi, “Bell measurements and observables,” *Phys. Lett. A* **272**, 32 (2000).
- [29] N. Datta, R. Fernández, and J. Fröhlich, “Low-temperature phase diagrams of quantum lattice systems I. Stability for quantum perturbations of classical systems with finitely many ground states,” *J. Stat. Phys.* **84**, 455 (1996).
- [30] K.R. Davidson, *C*-Algebras by Example* (American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1996).
- [31] E.B. Davies, *Quantum Theory of Open Systems* (Academic Press, London, 1976).
- [32] E. Dennis, A. Kitaev, A. Landahl, and J. Preskill, “Topological quantum memory,” arXiv preprint no. quant-ph/0110143.
- [33] D.P. DiVincenzo, “Two-bit gates are universal for quantum computation,” *Phys. Rev. A* **51**, 1015 (1995).
- [34] R.L. Dobrushin and S.I. Ortyukov, “Lower bound for the redundancy of self-correcting arrangements of unreliable functional elements,” *Probl. Inf. Transm.* **13**, 59 (1977).
- [35] J.L. Dodd, M.A. Nielsen, M.J. Bremner, and R.T. Thew, “Universal quantum computation and simulation using any entangling Hamiltonian and local unitaries,” *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 040301(R) (2002).
- [36] T.C. Dorlas, *Statistical Mechanics* (Institute of Physics Publishing, Bristol, 1999).
- [37] T. Eggeling, *Information und Störung bei quantenmechanischen Messungen*, diploma thesis, Technische Universität Braunschweig, Germany (1999).
- [38] G.G. Emch, *Algebraic Methods in Statistical Mechanics and Quantum Field Theory* (Wiley, New York, 1972).
- [39] R.R. Ernst, G. Bodenhausen, and A. Wokaun, *Principles of Nuclear Magnetic Resonance in One and Two Dimensions* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1994).
- [40] M. Fannes, B. Nachtergaele, and R.F. Werner, “Finitely correlated pure states,” *J. Funct. Anal.* **120**, 511 (1994).
- [41] R. Fernández, *Contour Ensembles and the Description of Gibbsian Probability Distributions at Low Temperature*, notes for a minicourse given at the 21 Colóquio Brasileiro de Matemática, IMPA, Rio de Janeiro, July 1997.
- [42] C.A. Fuchs and J. van de Graaf, “Cryptographic distinguishability measures for quantum-mechanical states,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **45**, 1216 (1999).
- [43] A. Fujiwara and P. Algoet, “One-to-one parametrization of quantum channels,” *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 3290 (1999).

-
- [44] S. Fussy, G. Grössing, H. Schwabl, and A. Scrinzi, “Nonlinear computation in quantum cellular automata,” *Phys. Rev. A* **48**, 3470 (1993).
- [45] P. Gács, “Reliable computation with cellular automata,” *J. Comp. Sys. Sci.* **32**, 15 (1986).
- [46] P. Gács and J. Reif, “A simple three-dimensional real-time reliable cellular array,” *J. Comp. Sys. Sci.* **36**, 125 (1988).
- [47] M. Garzon, *Models of Massive Parallelism* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995).
- [48] N. Gershenfeld and I.L. Chuang, “Bulk spin-resonance quantum computation,” *Science* **275**, 350 (1997).
- [49] G. Giedke, H.J. Briegel, J.I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, “Lower bounds for attainable fidelity in entanglement purification,” *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 2641 (1999).
- [50] J. Ginibre, “Existence of phase transitions for quantum lattice systems,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **14**, 205 (1969).
- [51] D.A. Gottesman, “Class of quantum error-correcting codes saturating the quantum Hamming bound,” *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 1862 (1996).
- [52] D.A. Gottesman, A.Yu. Kitaev, and J. Preskill, “Encoding a qubit in an oscillator,” *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 012310 (2001).
- [53] R.M. Gray, *Entropy and Information Theory* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1990).
- [54] R.B. Griffiths, “Peierls’ proof of spontaneous magnetization in a two-dimensional Ising ferromagnet,” *Phys. Rev.* **136**, 437 (1964).
- [55] L.K. Grover, “Quantum mechanics helps in searching for a needle in a haystack,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 325 (1997).
- [56] R. Haag, *Local Quantum Physics*, 2nd ed. (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996).
- [57] G.H. Hardy, J.E. Littlewood, and G. Polya, *Inequalities* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1967).
- [58] C.W. Helstrom, *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory* (Academic Press, New York, 1976).
- [59] A.S. Holevo, *Statistical Structure of Quantum Theory* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001).
- [60] A.S. Holevo and R.F. Werner, “Evaluating capacities of bosonic Gaussian channels,” *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 032312 (2001).

- [61] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, “Mixed-state entanglement and quantum communication,” in *Quantum Information — an Introduction to Basic Theoretical Concepts and Experiments*, Springer Tracts in Modern Physics, vol. 173 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001), pp. 151-195.
- [62] P. Horsch and W. von der Linden, “Spin correlations and low-lying excited states of the spin-1/2 Heisenberg antiferromagnet on a square lattice,” *Z. Phys. B* **72**, 181 (1988).
- [63] R. Jozsa, “Fidelity for mixed quantum states,” *J. Mod. Opt.* **41**, 2315 (1994).
- [64] T. Kennedy and H. Tasaki, “Hidden symmetry breaking and the Haldane phase in $S = 1$ quantum spin chains,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **147**, 431 (1992).
- [65] C. King and M.B. Ruskai, “Minimal entropy of states emerging from noisy quantum channels,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **47**, 192 (2001).
- [66] A. Yu. Kitaev, “Quantum computation: algorithms and error correction,” *Russian Math. Surveys* **52**, 1191 (1997).
- [67] A. Kitaev, “Fault-tolerant quantum computation by anyons,” arXiv preprint no. quant-ph/9707021.
- [68] E. Knill and R. Laflamme, “Theory of quantum error-correcting codes,” *Phys. Rev. A* **55**, 900 (1997).
- [69] E. Knill, R. Laflamme, and L. Viola, “Theory of quantum error correction for general noise,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 2525 (2000).
- [70] T. Koma and H. Tasaki, “Symmetry breaking and finite-size effects in quantum many-body systems,” *J. Stat. Phys.* **76**, 745 (1994).
- [71] K. Kraus, *States, Effects, and Operations* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983).
- [72] N.S. Krylov, *Works on the Foundations of Statistical Physics* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1979).
- [73] L. Landau, J. Fernando-Perez, and W. F. Wreszinski, “Energy gap, clustering, and the Goldstone theorem in statistical mechanics,” *J. Stat. Phys.* **26**, 755 (1981).
- [74] L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, *Statistical Physics I*, 3rd ed. (Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 1980).
- [75] L.J. Landau and R.F. Streater, “On Birkhoff’s theorem for doubly stochastic completely positive maps of matrix algebras,” *Lin. Alg. Appl.* **193**, 107 (1993).
- [76] J.L. Lebowitz, C. Maes, and E.R. Speer, “Statistical mechanics of probabilistic cellular automata,” *J. Stat. Phys.* **59**, 117 (1990).
- [77] C. Lent, P.D. Tougaw, W. Porod, and G.H. Bernstein, “Quantum cellular automata,” *Nanotechnology* **4**, 49 (1993).

-
- [78] D.A. Lidar, I.L. Chuang, and K.B. Whaley, “Decoherence-free subspaces for quantum computation,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 2594 (1998).
- [79] E.H. Lieb and M.B. Ruskai, “Proof of the strong subadditivity of quantum-mechanical entropy,” *J. Math. Phys.* **14**, 1938 (1973).
- [80] T.M. Liggett, *Interacting Particle Systems* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1985).
- [81] G. Lindblad, “Completely positive maps and entropy inequalities,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **40**, 147 (1975).
- [82] G. Lindblad, “On the generators of quantum dynamical semigroups,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **48**, 199 (1976).
- [83] G. Lindblad, “Quantum entropy and quantum measurements,” in *Quantum Aspects of Optical Communications*, Lecture Notes in Physics, vol. 378 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991), pp. 71-80.
- [84] S. Lloyd, “A potentially realizable quantum computer,” *Science* **261**, 1569 (1993).
- [85] G. Ludwig, *An Axiomatic Basis for Quantum Mechanics*, 2 volumes (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987).
- [86] F.J. MacWilliams and N.J.A. Sloane, *The Theory of Error-Correcting Codes* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1977).
- [87] G. Mahler and V. Wehrruss, *Quantum Networks*, 2nd ed. (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998).
- [88] D.A. Meyer, “From quantum cellular automata to quantum lattice gases,” *J. Stat. Phys.* **85**, 551 (1996).
- [89] C. Moore and M. Nilsson, “Parallel quantum computation and quantum codes,” *SIAM J. Comput.* **31**, 799 (2001).
- [90] M.A. Nielsen, C.M. Caves, B. Schumacher, and H. Barnum, “Information-theoretic approach to quantum error correction and reversible measurement,” *Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A* **454**, 277 (1998).
- [91] M.A. Nielsen and I.L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge MA, 2000).
- [92] S.P. Novikov, “1. Classical and modern topology; 2. Topological phenomena in real world physics,” arXiv preprint no. math-ph/0004012.
- [93] M. Ohya and D. Petz, *Quantum Entropy and Its Use* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993).
- [94] M. Ozawa, “Conservation laws, uncertainty relations, and quantum limits of measurements,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 050402 (2002).

- [95] G.M. Palma, K.-A. Suominen, and A.K. Ekert, “Quantum computers and dissipation,” Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A **452**, 567 (1996).
- [96] C.H. Papadimitriou, *Computational Complexity* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1994).
- [97] V.I. Paulsen, *Completely Bounded Maps and Dilations* (Longman Scientific & Technical, Harlow UK, 1986).
- [98] R. Peierls, “On the Ising model of ferromagnetism,” Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. **32**, 477 (1936).
- [99] A. Peres, “Reversible logic and quantum computers,” Phys. Rev. A **32**, 3266 (1985).
- [100] R.R. Phelps, *Lectures on Choquet’s Theorem* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001).
- [101] N. Pippenger, G.D. Stamoulis, and J.N. Tsitsiklis, “On a lower bound for the redundancy of reliable networks with noisy gates,” IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **37**, 639 (1991).
- [102] J. Preskill, “Reliable quantum computers,” Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A **454**, 385 (1998).
- [103] M. Raginsky, “A fidelity measure for quantum channels,” Phys. Lett. A **290**, 11 (2001).
- [104] M. Raginsky, “Strictly contractive quantum channels and physically realizable quantum computers,” Phys. Rev. A **65**, 032306 (2002).
- [105] M. Raginsky, “Almost any quantum spin system with short-range interactions can support toric codes,” Phys. Lett. A **294**, 153 (2002).
- [106] M. Raginsky, “Completely positive strict w^* -contractions on the predual of a von Neumann algebra,” in preparation.
- [107] M. Raginsky, “Entropy-energy arguments for quantum channels,” in preparation.
- [108] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics I: Functional Analysis* (Academic Press, San Diego, 1980).
- [109] S. Richter, *Construction of States on Two-Dimensional Lattices and Quantum Cellular Automata*, doctoral dissertation, Universität Osnabrück, Germany (1994).
- [110] S. Richter and R.F. Werner, “Ergodicity of quantum cellular automata,” J. Stat. Phys. **82**, 963 (1996).
- [111] A. Royer, “Wigner function in Liouville space: a canonical formalism,” Phys. Rev. A **43**, 44 (1991).
- [112] D. Ruelle, *Statistical Mechanics: Rigorous Results*, (Imperial College Press, London, 1999).

-
- [113] M.B. Ruskai, “Beyond strong subadditivity: improved bounds on the contraction of generalized relative entropy,” *Rev. Math. Phys.* **6**, 1147 (1994).
- [114] M.B. Ruskai, S. Szarek, and E. Werner, “An analysis of completely positive trace-preserving maps on \mathcal{M}_2 ,” *Lin. Alg. Appl.* **347**, 159 (2002).
- [115] S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999).
- [116] V. Scarani, M. Ziman, P. Štelmachovič, N. Gisin, and V. Bužek, “Thermalizing quantum machines: dissipation and entanglement,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 097905 (2002).
- [117] R. Schack and C.M. Caves, “Classical model for bulk-ensemble NMR quantum computation,” *Phys. Rev. A* **60**, 4354 (1999).
- [118] H.H. Schaefer, *Topological Vector Spaces*, 2nd ed. (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999).
- [119] R. Schatten, *Norm Ideals of Completely Continuous Operators* (Springer, Berlin, 1960).
- [120] F. Scheck, *Mechanics*, 3rd ed. (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999).
- [121] I.E. Segal and R.A. Kunze, *Integrals and Operators* (McGraw Hill, New York, 1968).
- [122] G.L. Sewell, *Quantum Theory of Collective Phenomena* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1986).
- [123] B. Simon, *Trace Ideals and Their Applications* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1979).
- [124] B. Simon, *The Statistical Mechanics of Lattice Gases* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1993).
- [125] B. Simon and A.D. Sokal, “Rigorous entropy-energy arguments,” *J. Stat. Phys.* **25**, 679 (1981).
- [126] Ya.G. Sinai and N.I. Chernov, “Ergodic properties of certain systems of two-dimensional discs and three-dimensional balls,” *Russian Math. Surveys* **42**, 181 (1987).
- [127] J. Slawny, “Low-temperature properties of classical lattice systems: phase transitions and phase diagrams,” in *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena*, vol. 11, ed. by C. Domb and J.L. Lebowitz (Academic Press, 1987).
- [128] I. Stakgold, *Green’s Functions and Boundary Value Problems*, 2nd ed. (Wiley, New York, 1998).
- [129] W.F. Stinespring, “Positive functions on C*-algebras,” *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **6**, 211 (1955).

- [130] E. Størmer, “Positive linear maps of operator algebras,” *Acta Math.* **110**, 233 (1963).
- [131] R.F. Streater, “Convergence of the quantum Boltzmann map,” *Comm. Math. Phys.* **98**, 177 (1985).
- [132] R.F. Streater, *Statistical Dynamics* (Imperial College Press, London, 1995).
- [133] L. Szilard, “Über die Entropieverminderung in einem thermodynamischen System bei Eingriffen intelligenter Wesen,” *Z. Phys.* **53**, 840-856 (1929). Published in English as “On the decrease of entropy in a thermodynamic system by the intervention of intelligent beings,” *Behavioral Science* **9**, 301-310 (1964).
- [134] M. Takesaki, *Theory of Operator Algebras I* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001).
- [135] B.M. Terhal and D.P. DiVincenzo, “Problem of equilibration and the computation of correlation functions on a quantum computer,” *Phys. Rev. A.* **61**, 022301 (2000).
- [136] D.J. Thouless, “Long-range order in one-dimensional Ising systems,” *Phys. Rev.* **187**, 732 (1969).
- [137] A.L. Toom, “Non-ergodic multidimensional systems of automata,” *Probl. Inf. Transm.* **10**, 239 (1974).
- [138] A. Uhlmann, “The ‘transition probability’ on the state space of a $*$ -algebra,” *Rep. Math. Phys.* **9**, 273 (1976).
- [139] W.G. Unruh, “Maintaining coherence in quantum computers,” *Phys. Rev. A* **51**, 992 (1995).
- [140] L.M.K. Vandersypen, M. Steffen, G. Breyta, C.S. Yannoni, M.H. Sherwood, and I.L. Chuang, “Experimental realization of Shor’s quantum factoring algorithm using nuclear magnetic resonance,” *Nature* **414**, 883 (2001).
- [141] A. Wehrl, “General properties of entropy,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **50**, 221 (1978).
- [142] H. Weinfurter and A. Zeilinger, “Quantum communication,” in *Quantum Information — an Introduction to Basic Theoretical Concepts and Experiments*, Springer Tracts in Modern Physics, vol. 173 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001), pp. 58-95.
- [143] R.F. Werner, “Quantum states with Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen correlations admitting a hidden-variable model,” *Phys. Rev. A* **40**, 4277 (1989).
- [144] R.F. Werner, “Quantum information theory — an invitation,” in *Quantum Information — an Introduction to Basic Theoretical Concepts and Experiments*, Springer Tracts in Modern Physics, vol. 173 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001), pp. 14-57.
- [145] H.P. Yuen, private communication.
- [146] H.P. Yuen, “A new approach to quantum computation,” in *Quantum Communication, Computation, and Measurement 2*, ed. by P. Kumar, O. Hirota, and G.M. D’Ariano (Plenum Publishers, New York, 2000), pp. 249-256.

-
- [147] H.P. Yuen, R.S. Kennedy, and M. Lax, "Optimum testing of multiple hypotheses in quantum detection theory," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **21**, 125 (1975).
- [148] P. Zanardi, "Stabilizing quantum information," *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 012301 (2001).
- [149] P. Zanardi, "Entanglement of quantum evolutions," *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, R040304 (2001).
- [150] P. Zanardi and M. Rasetti, "Noiseless quantum codes," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 3306 (1997).
- [151] D.P. Zhelobenko, *Compact Lie Groups and Their Representations* (American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1973).
- [152] M. Ziman, P. Štelmachovič, V. Bužek, M. Hillery, V. Scarani, and N. Gisin "Diluting quantum information: an analysis of information transfer in system-reservoir interactions," *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 042105 (2002).

Vita

Maxim Raginsky was born in 1977 in Vladimir, Russia. His family immigrated to the United States of America in 1992. In 2000 he obtained his B.S. and M.S. degrees, both in electrical engineering, from Northwestern University. Maxim's doctoral research, carried out in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at Northwestern under the supervision of Prof. Horace P. Yuen, was concerned with the problem of information storage in quantum-mechanical systems.

Publications

- (with P. Kumar) "Generation and manipulation of squeezed states of light in optical networks for quantum communication and computation," *J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass. Opt.* **3**, L1 (2000).
- "A fidelity measure for quantum channels," *Phys. Lett. A* **290**, 11 (2001).
- "Strictly contractive quantum channels and physically realizable quantum computers," *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 032306 (2002).
- "Almost any quantum spin system with short-range interactions can support toric codes," *Phys. Lett. A* **294**, 153 (2002).