

Orthogonality And Distinguishability: Criterion For Local Distinguishability of Arbitrary Orthogonal States

Ping-Xing Chen^{1,2*} and Cheng-Zu Li¹

1. *Department of Applied Physics, National University of Defense Technology, Changsha, 410073, P. R. China.*

2. *Laboratory of Quantum Communication and Quantum Computation, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, 230026, P. R. China*

(November 1, 2018)

Abstract

We consider deeply the relation between the orthogonality and the distinguishability of a set of arbitrary states (including multi-partite states). It is shown that if a set of arbitrary states can be distinguished by local operations and classical communication (LOCC), each of the states can be written as a linear combination of product vectors such that all product vectors of one of the states are orthogonal to the other states. With this result we then prove a simple necessary condition for LOCC distinguishability of a class of orthogonal states. These conclusions may be useful in discussing the distinguishability of orthogonal quantum states further, understanding the essence of nonlocality and discussing the distillation of entanglement.

PACS number(s): 89.70.+c, 03.65.ud

Typeset using REVTeX

*E-mail: pxchen@nudt.edu.cn

One of the interesting features of non-locality in quantum mechanics is that a set of orthogonal quantum states cannot be distinguished if only a single copy of these states is provided and only local operations and classical communication (LOCC) are allowed, in general. Taking the bipartite states as an example, the procedure of distinguishing quantum states locally is: Alice and Bob hold a part of a quantum system, which occupies one of m possible orthogonal states $|\Psi_1\rangle, |\Psi_2\rangle, \dots, |\Psi_i\rangle, \dots, |\Psi_m\rangle$. Alice and Bob know the precise form of these states, but don't know which of these possible states they actually hold. To distinguish these possible states they will perform some operations locally: Alice (or Bob) first measures her part. Then she tells the Bob her measurement result, according to which Bob measures his part. With the measurement results they can exclude some possibilities of the system [1].

Many authors have considered some schemes for distinguishing locally between a set of quantum states [1–8], both inseparable and separable. Bennett et al showed that there are nine orthogonal product states in a $3 \otimes 3$ system which cannot be distinguished by LOCC [2]. Walgate et al showed that any two multipartite orthogonal states can be distinguished by LOCC [1]. For two-qubit systems (or $2 \otimes 2$ systems), any three of the four Bell states cannot be distinguished by LOCC [4]. The distinguishability of quantum states has some close connections with distillable entanglement [9] and the information transformation [10]. On one hand, using the upper bound of distillable entanglement, relative entropy entanglement [11] and logarithmic negativity [12], the authors in Ref [4] proved that some states are indistinguishable. On the other hand, using the rules on distinguishability one may discuss the distillable entanglement [13]. The LOCC distinguishability has link to the features of non-locality, obviously. So the further analysis for distinguishability is meaningful.

The orthogonality acts as an important role in the distinguishability of a set of possible states. A simple necessary condition for distinguishability is each of the possible states is orthogonal to the other states. If the states are locally orthogonal states [7], they can be distinguished without classical communication (CC); if the states can be distinguished by only projective measurements and CC, each possible state is a superpositions of some orthogonal product vectors [1,3]. A question is: for a set of general LOCC distinguishable states, what is its orthogonality? In this Letter, we will first show that if a set of arbitrary orthogonal states are distinguishable by LOCC, each of the possible states has at least a product-vectors-decomposition such that the product vectors of each of the possible states are orthogonal to the other possible states. With this result we then prove a simple necessary condition for LOCC distinguishability of a class of orthogonal states. These conclusions may be useful in discussing the distinguishability of orthogonal quantum states further, understanding the essence of nonlocality [14] and discussing the distillation of entanglement.

We first take the bipartite states as an example for simplicity. Consider m possible orthogonal states shared between Alice and Bob. Any protocol to distinguish the m possible orthogonal states can be conceived as successive rounds of measurements and communication by Alice and Bob. Let us suppose Alice is the first person to perform a measurement (Alice goes first [3]), and the first round measurement by Alice can be represented by operators $\{A_{1_j}\}$, where $A_{1_j}^+ A_{1_j}$ is known as a POVM element realized by Alice [15,16], and $\sum_j A_{1_j}^+ A_{1_j} = I$. If the outcome 1_j occurs, then the given $|\Psi\rangle$ becomes $A_{1_j} |\Psi\rangle$, up to normalization. After communicating the result of Alice's measurement to Bob, he carries out a measurement and obtain outcome 1_k . The given possible state $|\Psi\rangle$ becomes $A_{1_j} \otimes B_{1_k}(1_j) |\Psi\rangle$, where $B_{1_k}(1_j)$ is an arbitrary measurement operator of Bob which depend on the outcome 1_j of Alice's measurement. After N rounds of measurements and communication, there are many possible outcomes which correspond to many measurement operators acting on the Alice and Bob's Hilbert space. Each of these operators is a product of the N sequential and relative operators, $A_{N_j}(1_j, 1_k, \dots, (N-1)_k) \otimes B_{N_k}(1_j, 1_k, \dots, (N-1)_k, N_j) \dots A_{2_j}(1_j, 1_k) \otimes B_{2_k}(1_j, 1_k, 2_j) A_{1_j} \otimes B_{1_k}(1_j)$, carried out by Alice and Bob. We denote these operators as $\{A_i \otimes B_i\}$, where, $A_i \otimes B_i$ denotes one of these operators, which represent the effects of the N measurements and communication. If the outcome i occurs, the given $|\Psi\rangle$ becomes:

$$A_i \otimes B_i |\Psi\rangle \quad (1)$$

The probability p_i Alice and Bob gain outcome i is

$$p_i = \langle \Psi | A_i^+ \otimes B_i^+ A_i \otimes B_i | \Psi \rangle, \quad (2)$$

and

$$\sum_i A_i^+ \otimes B_i^+ A_i \otimes B_i = I. \quad (3)$$

Suppose we define:

$$E_i = A_i^+ \otimes B_i^+ A_i \otimes B_i, \quad (4)$$

then E_i is a positive operator and that $\sum_i E_i = I$. E_i is same as the known POVM element. In fact, A_i can be written in the form [15]

$$A_i = U_{A2} f_{A_i} U_{A1}, \quad (5)$$

or

$$A_i = c_1^i |\varphi_1^i\rangle \langle \varphi_1^i| + \dots + c_{m_a^i}^i |\varphi_{m_a^i}^i\rangle \langle \varphi_{m_a^i}^i|; \quad (6)$$

$$0 \leq c_j^i \leq 1, j = 1, \dots, m_a^i.$$

Where f_{A_i} is a diagonal positive operator and a filtration [15] which changes the relative weights of components $|\varphi_1^i\rangle, \dots, |\varphi_{n_i}^i\rangle$; U_{A2}, U_{A1} are two unitary operators; $\{|\varphi_1^i\rangle, \dots, |\varphi_{m_a}^i\rangle\}$ and $\{|\eta_1^i\rangle, \dots, |\eta_{m_b}^i\rangle\}$ are two set of orthogonal Alice's vectors, and similarly for B_i .

$$B_i = d_1^i |\eta_1^i\rangle \langle \eta_1^i| + \dots + d_{m_b}^i |\eta_{m_b}^i\rangle \langle \eta_{m_b}^i| \quad (7)$$

$$0 \leq d_j^i \leq 1, j = 1, \dots, m_b^i.$$

where $\{|\eta_1^i\rangle, \dots, |\eta_{m_b}^i\rangle\}$ and $\{|\eta_1^i\rangle, \dots, |\eta_{m_b}^i\rangle\}$ are two set of orthogonal Bob's vectors.

From Eq.(4), Eq.(6) and Eq.(7), we can represent E_i in the form

$$E_i = (a_1^i |\varphi_1^i\rangle_A \langle \varphi_1^i| + \dots + a_{m_a}^i |\varphi_{m_a}^i\rangle_A \langle \varphi_{m_a}^i|) \otimes \quad (8)$$

$$(b_1^i |\eta_1^i\rangle_B \langle \eta_1^i| + \dots + b_{m_b}^i |\eta_{m_b}^i\rangle_B \langle \eta_{m_b}^i|)$$

$$0 \leq a_{m_a}^i \leq 1, 0 \leq b_{m_b}^i \leq 1; 1 \leq m_a^i \leq N_a, 1 \leq m_b^i \leq N_b \quad (9)$$

where N_a, N_b is the dimensions of Alice's and Bob's Hilbert space, respectively.

The discussion above means that: whatever Alice and Bob choose to do by LOCC, their final actions will be described by a set of positive operators $\{E_i\}$. This result is useful to the following discussions.

Theorem 1. If a set of m orthogonal states $\{|\Psi_i\rangle\}$ is perfectly distinguishable by LOCC, there is surely a set of *product vectors* (PV) such that each state $|\Psi_i\rangle$ is a superposition of some of these *product vectors* as follows:

$$|\Psi_i\rangle = |\Phi_i^1\rangle_A |\xi_i^1\rangle_B + \dots + |\Phi_i^{m^i}\rangle_A |\xi_i^{m^i}\rangle_B; \quad (10)$$

and each product vector $|\Phi_i^{k^i}\rangle_A |\xi_i^{k^i}\rangle_B$ ($1 \leq k^i \leq m^i$) belongs to only a state $|\Psi_i\rangle$, *i.e.*,

$$\langle \Phi_i^{k^i} | \langle \xi_i^{k^i} | \Psi_j \rangle = 0, \text{ for all } i \neq j; \quad (11)$$

$$\langle \Phi_i^{k^i} | \langle \xi_i^{k^i} | \Psi_i \rangle \neq 0, \quad (12)$$

where m^i is a positive integral number.

Proof: If a set of states is reliably distinguishable by LOCC, there must be a complete set of POVM element $\{E_i\}$ representing the effect of all measurements and communication, such that if every outcome i occurs Alice and Bob know with certainty that they were given the state $|\Psi_i\rangle$. This means that:

$$\langle \Psi_i | E_{i(s)} | \Psi_i \rangle \neq 0; \quad (13)$$

$$\langle \Psi_j | E_{i(s)} | \Psi_j \rangle = 0, j \neq i. \quad (14)$$

In a simple way, we can say that a element E_i can “indicate” $|\Psi_i\rangle$ and only $|\Psi_i\rangle$. Of course a possible state may be “indicated” by more than one POVM element E_i . $E_{i(s)}$ denotes all E_i “indicating” $|\Psi_i\rangle$. Note that because the non-projective measures and the classical communication between Alice and Bob are allowed, some POVM elements in $\{E_i\}$ can be not orthogonal to others.

From the general expression of a operator A_i in Eq.(6), it follows that a operator A_i in a POVM element E_i in Eq.(4) can be carried out by the following operators: 1). do projective operation P_A^i ,

$$P_A^i = |\varphi_1^i\rangle \langle \varphi_1^i| + \cdots + |\varphi_{n_i}^i\rangle \langle \varphi_{n_i}^i|, \quad (15)$$

which projects out the Alice’s component $|\varphi_1^i\rangle, \dots, |\varphi_{n_i}^i\rangle$ in a possible state $|\Psi_i\rangle$ (if $|\Psi\rangle = |0\rangle_A |0\rangle_B + |1\rangle_A |1\rangle_B$, we say $|\Psi\rangle$ have components $|0\rangle_A |0\rangle_B$ and $|1\rangle_A |1\rangle_B$; $|\Psi\rangle$ have Alice’s components $|0\rangle_A$ and $|1\rangle_A$); 2). do local filter operation [17] which changes the relative weights of the component $|\varphi_1^i\rangle, \dots, |\varphi_{n_i}^i\rangle$ in a possible state $|\Psi_i\rangle$; 3). do a local unitary operation which transfers the Alice’s bases from $\{|\varphi_1^i\rangle, \dots, |\varphi_{n_i}^i\rangle\}$ to $\{|\varphi_1^i\rangle, \dots, |\varphi_{n_i}^i\rangle\}$, and similarly for B_i . So if E_i “indicates” a state $|\Psi_i\rangle$, i.e., Eq. (13) holds, the state $|\Psi_i\rangle$ should have all or part of the following components:

$$|\varphi_1^i\rangle_A |\eta_1^i\rangle_B, \dots, |\varphi_1^i\rangle_A |\eta_{m_b^i}^i\rangle_B, \dots, |\varphi_{m_a^i}^i\rangle_A |\eta_1^i\rangle_B, \dots, |\varphi_{m_a^i}^i\rangle_A |\eta_{m_b^i}^i\rangle_B. \quad (16)$$

If E_i “indicates” only the state $|\Psi_i\rangle$, i.e., Eq. (14) holds, each product vector in (16) should be orthogonal to the other states $|\Psi_j\rangle$, for all $j \neq i$. We may say that E_i also “indicates” each product vector in (16) which belongs to only the state $|\Psi_i\rangle$.

Because of the completeness of $\{E_i\}$, which assures that each product vector in all possible states can be indicated by a POVM element, and the necessity of reliably distinguishing the possible states, which asks a POVM element “indicates” the product vectors of only a possible state, each state of the m possible states must be a superposition of many product vectors each of which is orthogonal to the other possible states. This ends the proof.

The above theorem 1 shows that if a set of possible states are LOCC distinguishable, not only that these possible states should be orthogonal, but also each possible state can be written as a linear combination of product vectors such that each product vector of a possible state $|\Psi_i\rangle$ should be orthogonal to the other possible states. There are two “opposite” cases [3,5]: 1. entanglement may increase the local indistinguishability of orthogonal states. An example is: nm orthogonal states of a $n \otimes m$ system cannot be perfectly LOCC distinguishable if at least one of the states is entangled (see [5]); 2.

entanglement may increase the local distinguishability of orthogonal states. An example is: the set S containing states (without normalization):

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_1\rangle &= |00\rangle + w |11\rangle + w^2 |22\rangle; |\Psi_2\rangle = |00\rangle + w^2 |11\rangle + w |22\rangle; \\ |\Psi_3\rangle &= |01\rangle + |12\rangle + |20\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

is LOCC distinguishable (w is a unreal cube root of unity). But the states, $|\Psi_1\rangle, |\Psi_2\rangle$ and $|\Psi'_3\rangle = |01\rangle$ are not LOCC distinguishable (see [5]). In fact, entanglement as a potential non-local “resource” may increase the distinguishability of the states (to distinguish a set of states, the entanglement of these states may be lost, in general. This means entanglement can be used to distinguish states as to do teleportation et al). But on other hand, a entangled state contains more product vectors. So the entangled state increases the requirement for orthogonality as shown in the above theorem 1 and then may increase the indistinguishability of the states.

Employing theorem 1 we can discuss the LOCC distinguishability of orthogonal states further. First, the above discussions and theorem 1 are fit to the multipartite systems obviously. The generalisation of the theorem 1 can be expressed as:

if a set of multi-partite possible states are LOCC distinguishable, each possible state can be written as a linear combination of product vectors such that each product vector of a possible state is orthogonal to the other possible states.

Then we will follow a especially simple criterion for distinguishability of a class of orthogonal states. To achieve this, we define a concept of *Schmidt number*. If a pure state $|\Psi\rangle$ have following Schmidt decomposition:

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^l \sqrt{p_i} |\phi_i\rangle_A |\eta_i\rangle_B, \quad p_i > 0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^l p_i = 1 \quad (18)$$

where $|\phi_i\rangle_A$ s and $|\eta_i\rangle_B$ s are orthogonal bases of Alice and Bob, respectively, we say $|\Psi\rangle$ has *Schmidt number* l .

Theorem 2: Let $\{|\Psi_i^{AB}\rangle\}$ is $mn - m'$ orthogonal states of an $m \otimes n$ system, if at least one of the states has Schmidt numbers bigger than $m' + 1$, the states $|\Psi_i^{AB}\rangle$ s are not perfectly distinguishable by LOCC.

Proof : Each state of the $\{|\Psi_i^{AB}\rangle\}$ should include linearly independent product vectors(LIPV) not less than its Schmidt numbers. If at least one state (note it as $|\Psi_{i'}^{AB}\rangle$) among the $|\Psi_i^{AB}\rangle$ s has Schmidt numbers bigger than $m' + 1$, an assumption of local distinguishability of $|\Psi_i^{AB}\rangle$ s implies that the state $|\Psi_{i'}^{AB}\rangle$ is a superposition of more than $m' + 1$ LIPVs each of which is orthogonal to the other states $|\Psi_i^{AB}\rangle$ s ($i \neq i'$). Thus the states $|\Psi_i^{AB}\rangle$ s ($i \neq i'$) and the LIPVs of $|\Psi_{i'}^{AB}\rangle$ form a set of linearly independent vectors of an $m \otimes n$ system. The number of these linearly independent vectors is bigger than

$mn - m' - 1 + m' + 1 = mn$. This is impossible for an $m \otimes n$ system. So the states $|\Psi_i^{AB}\rangle_s$ are not perfectly distinguishable by LOCC. This ends the proof.

Since we cannot define the Schmidt numbers of a multi-partite pure state, in general, the theorem 2 above cannot be generalized to multi-partite states directly. However, any pure state has a product-vectors-decomposition with the least number of product vectors, if we replace "Schmidt numbers" in the theorem 2 by "the least numbers of product vectors", the theorem 2 can be generalized into multi-partite states. For example, an 3-qubits system owns 7 possible orthogonal states. If one of the possible states is a $|W\rangle$ state

$$|W\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|100\rangle + |010\rangle + |011\rangle), \quad (19)$$

these possible are not perfectly distinguishable by LOCC since a $|W\rangle$ state has at least three LIPVs [18].

The theorem 2 is powerful to check LOCC indistinguishability of the orthogonal states the number of which is equal to or near to the dimensions of the quantum system. For example, one can get by theorem 2 easily that if a full orthogonal basis can be LOCC distinguished all vectors must be product, as shown in Ref. [5].

To conclude, we have considered deeply the relation between the orthogonality and the distinguishability, and shown that if a set of possible multi-partite orthogonal states are LOCC distinguishable, each of the possible states has at least a product-vectors-decomposition such that the product vectors of each of the possible states are orthogonal to the other possible states. Based on our result one can discuss the distinguishability of orthogonal states further. We also present a simple necessary condition for distinguishability of a class of orthogonal quantum states. These results come directly from the limits on local operations, not from the upper bound of distillable entanglement [4], So we believe that they may be useful in understanding the essence of nonlocality. On the other hand, the distillation of entanglement and local distinguishability are closely related as shown in Ref. [4,5,13], so our results may be helpful for calculating the distillable entanglement or the bound of distillable entanglement. The further works may be the applications of these results.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank J. Finkelstein, A. Sen(De) and U. Sen for their helpful suggestions by E-mail and Guangcan Guo for his help to this work.

REFERENCES

- [1] J.Walgate, A.J.Short, L.Hardy and V.Vedral, Phys.Rev.Lett.85,4972 (2000).
- [2] C.H. Bennett, D.P. DiVincenzo, C.A. Fuchs, T.Mor, E.Rains, P.W. Shor, J.A. Smolin, and W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A 59,1070 (1999) or quant-ph/9804053.
- [3] J. Walgate and L. Hardy, Phys. Rev. Lett 89, 147901 (2002)
- [4] S.Ghosh, G.Kar, A.Roy, A.Sen and U.Sen, Phys.Rev.Lett.87, 277902 (2001); S. Ghosh, G.Kar, A.Roy, D.Sarkar, A.Sen(De) and U.Sen, quant-ph/0111136 (2001);
- [5] M. Horodecki, A. Sen (De), U. Sen and K. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett 90, 047902 (2003).
- [6] S. Virmani, M.F. Sacchi, M.B. Plenio and D. Markham, Physics Letters A 288, 62-68 (2001);
- [7] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Acta Physica Slovaca, 48, (1998) 141, or quant-ph/9805072
- [8] Y.-X.Chen and D.Yang, Phys.Rev.A 64, 064303 (2001);
- [9] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, S. Popescu, B. Schumacher, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett **76** 722 (1996); C. H. Bennett, D. P. Divincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824 (1996)
- [10] J. Eisert, T. Felbinger, P. Papadopoulos, M.B. Plenio and M. Wilkens, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 1611 (2000); L.Henderson and V.Vedral, Phys.Rev.Lett 84, 2263 (2000).
- [11] V.Vedral, M.B.Plenio, M.A.Rippin and P.L.Knight, Phys.Rev.Lett. 78, 2275 (1997); V.Vedral and M.B.Plenio, Phys.Rev.A 57, 1619 (1998)
- [12] G.Vidal and R.F.Werner, quant-ph/0102117 (2001);
- [13] P.-X Chen and C.-Z Li, Quantum Information and Computation 3, 203 (2003)
- [14] Č. Brukner, M. Żukowski and A. Zeilinger, quant-ph/0106119
- [15] N. Linden, S. Massar and S. Popescu, Phys.Rev.Lett 81, 3279 (1998)
- [16] H. Barnum, M. A. Nielsen and B. Schumacher, Phys.Rev.A 57, 4153 (1998);
- [17] N. Gisin, Phys. Lett. A 210, 151 (1996);
- [18] W. Dür, G. Vidal and J. Cirac, Phys. Rev.A 63, 042111 (2001)