

Supersinglets

Adán Cabello*

Departamento de Física Aplicada II, Universidad de Sevilla, 41012 Sevilla, Spain

(Dated: October 30, 2018)

Supersinglets $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(d)}\rangle$ are states of total spin zero of N particles of d levels. Some applications of the $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(N)}\rangle$ and $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(2)}\rangle$ states are described. The $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(N)}\rangle$ states can be used to solve three problems which have no classical solution: The “ N strangers,” “secret sharing,” and “liar detection” problems. The $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(2)}\rangle$ (with N even) states can be used to encode qubits in decoherence-free subspaces.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud, 03.65.Ta

I. SUPERSINGLETS

Quantum information has changed not only the way we understand quantum mechanics; it has also changed the way we use quantum mechanics in our dealings with the real world. For years, the research on quantum mechanics has focused on pointing out how different quantum mechanics was from classical physics. The next step has been to realize that quantum mechanics can be used to solve problems unsolvable by any other means. However, although quantum states are powerful tools, they are very fragile for most real-life applications. Therefore, the challenge is twofold: on one hand, to find out new applications—problems without classical solutions that can be solved with the aid of quantum states; on the other, to find out how to protect quantum states—methods that allow us to use quantum states for practical purposes. In this paper I review some results regarding a particular family of quantum states. The properties of these states, particularly their symmetry, grant them a prominent role in this challenge.

Supersinglets $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(d)}\rangle$ are states of total spin zero of N particles, all of them of spin $(d-1)/2$. Supersinglets are N -lateral rotationally invariant. This means that, if we act on any of them with the tensor product of N equal rotation operators, the result will be to reproduce the same state (within a possible phase factor):

$$R^{\otimes N} |\mathcal{S}_N^{(d)}\rangle = |\mathcal{S}_N^{(d)}\rangle, \quad (1)$$

$R^{\otimes N}$ being $R \otimes \dots \otimes R$, where R is a rotation operator.

In this paper, $|01\dots 2\rangle$ denotes the tensor product state $|0\rangle \otimes |1\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |2\rangle$, where $|i\rangle$ corresponds to the state with eigenvalue $(d-1)/2 - i$ of the spin along the z -direction. The basis we shall use, $B_d = \{|i\rangle\}_{i=0}^{d-1}$, and the basis of eigenvectors of the spin along the z -direction, $B_s = \{|m\rangle\}_{m=-s}^s$, have the same kets, except that they are in reverse order: the ket $|i\rangle$ of B_d is equal to the ket $|s-i\rangle$ of B_s .

The interest in some types of supersinglets is not new. For instance, the two-particle d -level supersinglets $|\mathcal{S}_2^{(d)}\rangle$

attracted some attention in connection with violations of Bell’s inequalities for systems of two spin- s particles [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10]. These states can be expressed as

$$|\mathcal{S}_2^{(d)}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} (-1)^i |i\rangle \otimes |d-i-1\rangle. \quad (2)$$

Examples of $|\mathcal{S}_2^{(d)}\rangle$ states are the following:

$$|\mathcal{S}_2^{(2)}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|01\rangle - |10\rangle), \quad (3)$$

$$|\mathcal{S}_2^{(3)}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} (|02\rangle - |11\rangle + |20\rangle), \quad (4)$$

$$|\mathcal{S}_2^{(4)}\rangle = \frac{1}{2} (|03\rangle - |12\rangle + |21\rangle - |30\rangle). \quad (5)$$

The $|\mathcal{S}_2^{(3)}\rangle$ state has also been used in two-particle proofs of Bell’s theorem without inequalities [11, 12, 13]. A method for preparing optical analogs of $|\mathcal{S}_2^{(d)}\rangle$ for every d has been recently described [14]. Also, an experimental violation of a Bell’s inequality using an optical analog of $|\mathcal{S}_2^{(3)}\rangle$ has been recently reported [15].

In this paper we are interested in two types of supersinglets: N -particle N -level supersinglets, $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(N)}\rangle$, and N -qubit (with N even) supersinglets, $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(2)}\rangle$. The former can be expressed as

$$|\mathcal{S}_N^{(N)}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N!}} \sum_{\substack{\text{permutations} \\ \text{of } 01\dots(N-1)}} (-1)^t |ij\dots n\rangle, \quad (6)$$

where t is the number of transpositions of pairs of elements that must be composed to place the elements in canonical order (i.e., $0, 1, 2, \dots, N-1$). The $|\mathcal{S}_2^{(2)}\rangle$ state is given in equation (3). Other examples of $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(N)}\rangle$ states are the following:

$$|\mathcal{S}_3^{(3)}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (|012\rangle - |021\rangle - |102\rangle + |120\rangle + |201\rangle - |210\rangle), \quad (7)$$

$$|\mathcal{S}_4^{(4)}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{24}} (|0123\rangle - |0132\rangle - |0213\rangle + |0231\rangle + |0312\rangle - |0321\rangle - |1023\rangle + |1032\rangle)$$

*Electronic address: adan@us.es

$$\begin{aligned}
& + |1203\rangle - |1230\rangle - |1302\rangle + |1320\rangle \\
& + |2013\rangle - |2031\rangle - |2103\rangle + |2130\rangle \\
& + |2301\rangle - |2310\rangle - |3012\rangle + |3021\rangle \\
& + |3102\rangle - |3120\rangle - |3201\rangle + |3210\rangle). \quad (8)
\end{aligned}$$

The $|\mathcal{S}_3^{(3)}\rangle$ state has been used in the solution of the so-called *Byzantine agreement problem* [16] (see more on this problem in section III). The $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(N)}\rangle$ states have been used in a scheme designed to probe a quantum gate that realizes an unknown unitary transformation [17]. Some interesting properties of $|\mathcal{S}_3^{(3)}\rangle$ have been reported in [18]. An experimental realization of $|\mathcal{S}_3^{(3)}\rangle$ has been recently proposed [19].

For N even, the N -qubit supersinglet can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{S}_N^{(2)}\rangle = \frac{1}{\frac{N}{2}! \sqrt{\frac{N}{2} + 1}} \sum_{\substack{\text{permutations} \\ \text{of } 0\dots 01\dots 1}} z! \left(\frac{N}{2} - z\right)! (-1)^{\frac{N}{2} - z} \\ |ij\dots n\rangle, \quad (9)
\end{aligned}$$

where the sum is extended to all the states obtained by permuting the state $|0\dots 01\dots 1\rangle$, which contains the same number of zeros and ones; z is the number of zeros in the first $N/2$ positions (for example: in $|01\rangle$, $z = 1$; in $|1100\rangle$, $z = 0$; in $|010110\rangle$, $z = 2$). The $|\mathcal{S}_2^{(2)}\rangle$ state is given in equation (3). Other examples of $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(2)}\rangle$ (with N even) states are the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{S}_4^{(2)}\rangle &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}(2|0011\rangle - |0101\rangle - |0110\rangle \\
&\quad - |1001\rangle - |1010\rangle + 2|1100\rangle), \quad (10) \\
|\mathcal{S}_6^{(2)}\rangle &= \frac{1}{6}(3|000111\rangle - |001011\rangle - |001101\rangle \\
&\quad - |001110\rangle - |010011\rangle - |010101\rangle \\
&\quad - |010110\rangle + |011001\rangle + |011010\rangle \\
&\quad + |011100\rangle - |100011\rangle - |100101\rangle \\
&\quad - |100110\rangle + |101001\rangle + |101010\rangle \\
&\quad + |101100\rangle + |110001\rangle + |110010\rangle \\
&\quad + |110100\rangle - 3|111000\rangle). \quad (11)
\end{aligned}$$

Very recently, the $|\mathcal{S}_4^{(2)}\rangle$ state has been experimentally prepared using four parametric down-converted photons entangled in polarization [20]. Some applications of the $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(2)}\rangle$ states are described in section V.

The structure of this paper is the following: In section II, three apparently unrelated problems are introduced. In section III, these three problems are proved to not have classical solution. In section IV a solution based on the use of the $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(N)}\rangle$ states is presented. Finally, in section V, the use of the $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(2)}\rangle$ states to create decoherence-free subspaces with qubits is described.

II. THREE PROBLEMS

A. The N strangers problem

The scenario for the *N strangers problem* (NSP) is an extension to a high number N of players of the situation described in Patricia Highsmith's novel [21] and Alfred Hitchcock's movie [22] *Strangers on a Train*: N complete strangers A_i ($i = 1, \dots, N$) meet on a train. A_i wants B_i dead. In the course of small talk, one suggests that an "exchange" murder between N complete strangers would be unsolvable. After all, how could the police find the murderer when he/she is a total and complete stranger with absolutely no connection whatsoever to the victim? A_i could kill B_k , etc. However, such a plan suffers from an important problem: if all the players know who the murderer of each victim is, then the whole plan is vulnerable to individual denunciations. Alternatively, if the distribution of victims is the result of a secret lottery, how could the murderers be assured that the lottery was not rigged and that nobody had contrived the result or could ascertain it?

In more general, noncriminal, terms the *N strangers problem* can be reformulated as follows: Each of N parties must perform one among N different tasks which they do not want to perform themselves. However, each party volunteers to perform some other party's task.

The problem is then how to distribute the victims/tasks $\{B_i\}_1^N$ among the murderers/volunteers $\{A_i\}_1^N$, which share no previous secret information nor any secure classical channel, in a way that guarantees that each murderer/volunteer A_i knows only the identity of his/her victim/task and that nobody else (besides the murderers/volunteers) knows anything about the victim/task assignments.

B. The secret sharing problem

The *secret sharing problem* (SSP) was already described, for $N = 3$, in [23]. It could arise in the following context: A_1 wants to have a secret action taken on her behalf at a distant location. There she has $N - 1$ agents, A_2, A_3, \dots, A_N who carry it out for her. A_1 knows that some of them are dishonest, but she does not know which ones. She cannot simply send a secure message to all of them, because the dishonest ones will try to sabotage the action, but it is assumed (as in [23]) that if all of them carry it out together, the honest ones will keep the dishonest ones from doing any damage. The problem is then that A_1 wishes to convey a cryptographic key to A_2, A_3, \dots, A_N in such a way that none of them can read it on their own, only if all the A_i ($i = 2, 3, \dots, N$) collaborate. In addition, they wish to prevent any eavesdropper from acquiring information without being detected. It is assumed that A_1 shares no previous secret information nor any secure classical channel with her agents. Different quantum solutions to this problem for $N = 3$ has been

proposed using either GHZ [23, 24] or Bell states [25] (see also [26]). Below we shall propose a different solution for any N .

C. The liar detection problem

The *liar detection problem* (LDP) occurs in the following scenario: three parties A , B , and C are connected by secure pairwise classical channels. Let us suppose that A sends a message m to B and C , and B sends the same message to C . If both A and B are honest, then C should receive the same m from A and B . However, A could be dishonest and send different messages to B and C , $m_{AB} \neq m_{AC}$, or, alternatively, B could be dishonest and send a message which is different from the one he receives, $m_{BC} \neq m_{AB}$. For C the problem is to ascertain without any doubt who is being dishonest. This problem is interesting for classical information distribution in pairwise connected networks. The message could be a database and the dishonest behavior a consequence of an error during the copying or distribution process.

III. PROOFS OF IMPOSSIBILITY OF CLASSICAL SOLUTIONS

In this section I shall explain in which sense each of the three problems introduced in section II have no classical solution. I will furthermore offer proofs of the impossibility of the existence of that kind of solutions.

In Peres' book [27] (p. 293), the *key distribution problem* (KDP) is defined as follows: "The problem (...) is how to distribute a cryptographic key (a secret sequence of bits) to several observers who initially share no secret information, by using an insecure communication channel subject to inspection by a hostile eavesdropper. If only classical means are used, this is an impossible task. Quantum phenomena, on the other hand, provide various solutions. The reason for this difference is that information stored in classical form (...) can be examined objectively without altering it in any detectable way, let alone destroying it, while it is impossible to do that with quantized information encoded in unknown non-orthogonal states."

In this definition, trusted couriers, clandestine meetings or private secure communication links between the parties are not allowed. It is in this scenario—namely, one in which previous secret information and secure communication channels between all parties (in the NSP) or between A_1 and her agents (in the SSP) are not allowed, but public classical channels which cannot be altered are assumed—in which the first two problems (NSP and SSP) have no classical solution. A proof follows.

Lemma 1 *The KDP between two parties has no classical solution.*

Proof: Information stored in classical form can be examined objectively without altering it in any detectable way, *q.e.d.* ■

Lemma 2 *The NSP has no classical solution.*

Proof: Suppose the NSP had a classical solution for some $N > 1$. Then, $N - 2$ parties could publicly announce the names of their victims and then the remaining two parties would have a way to solve the KDP (for instance, by publicly assigning 0 and 1 to the remaining two victims and agreeing to define the corresponding entry of the key as the bit value assigned to the victim of one of the two parties), *q.e.d.* ■

Lemma 3 *The SSP has no classical solution.*

Proof: Suppose the SSP had a classical solution for some $N > 2$ (if $N = 1$, then the SSP is the KDP). Such a solution must work even when all of A_1 's agents are honest. In this case, $N - 2$ agents could publicly collaborate and share the result of such a collaboration with the remaining agent. Then A_1 and the remaining agent would have a way to solve the KDP, *q.e.d.* ■

The scenario of the third problem, the LDP, is different. A , B , and C are now connected by pairwise classical channels. These channels must be secure. In this scenario—namely, one in which previous secret information is not allowed, but secure pairwise classical channels are assumed—the LDP has no classical solution. In order to prove this, we need some previous results.

The *Byzantine generals problem* (BGP) is defined [28, 29] as follows: A commanding general must send an order to his $N - 1$ lieutenant generals such that: (IC1) All loyal lieutenant generals obey the same order. (IC2) If the commanding general is loyal, then every loyal lieutenant general obeys the order he sends. (IC1) and (IC2) are known as the interactive consistency conditions. Note that if the commanding general is loyal, (IC1) follows from (IC2). However, the commanding general may be a traitor.

Lemma 4 *The BGP for $N = 3$ generals and 1 traitor has no classical solution.*

Proof [29] (p. 384): For simplicity, we consider the case in which the only possible orders are "attack" or "retreat". Let us first examine the scenario in which the commanding general is loyal and sends an "attack" order, but lieutenant general 2 is a traitor and reports to lieutenant general 1 that he received a "retreat" order. For (IC2) to be satisfied, lieutenant general 1 must obey the order to attack. Now consider another scenario in which the commanding general is a traitor and sends an "attack" order to lieutenant general 1 and a "retreat" order to lieutenant general 2. Lieutenant general 1 does not know who the traitor is, and he cannot tell what message the commanding general actually sent to

lieutenant general 2. Hence, the scenarios in these two cases appear exactly the same to lieutenant general 1. If the traitor lies consistently, then there is no way for lieutenant general 1 to distinguish between these two situations, so he must obey the “attack” order in both of them. Hence, whenever lieutenant general 1 receives an “attack” order from the commanding general, he must obey it, *q.e.d.* ■

For a more rigorous proof, see [28].

Lemma 5 *No solution for the BGP for $N < 3M + 1$ generals can cope with M traitors.*

Proof: The BGP for $N < 3M + 1$ generals and M traitors can be reduced to the BGP for $N = 3$ generals and $M = 1$ traitor, with each of the generals simulating at most M lieutenants and taking the same decision as the loyal lieutenants they simulate, *q.e.d.* ■

A solution for the BGP for $N > 3M$ and up to M traitors is given in [29].

The protocol proposed in [16] solves the BGP for $N = 3$ in the following sense: (1) If all generals are loyal, then the protocol achieves broadcast. (2) If one general is a traitor, then either the protocol achieves broadcast or both loyal generals abort the protocol.

The LDP described in section II is simplification of the BGP for $N = 3$ and $M = 1$.

Lemma 6 *The LDP has no classical solution.*

Proof: Supposing that the LDP had a classical solution, then the BGP for $N = 3$ and $M = 1$ had classical solution, *q.e.d.* ■

IV. SOLUTIONS

In this section I will show that all three problems introduced in section II can be solved if each of the N participants are in possession of a sequence of numbers with the following properties:

- (i) It is *random* (i.e., generated by an intrinsically unrepeatable method which gives each possible number with the same probability of occurring).
- (ii) The possible numbers are integers from 0 to $N - 1$.
- (iii) If a number i is at position j of the sequence of party k , i is not at position j in the sequence of a different party.
- (iv) Each party knows only his/her own sequence.
- (v) Nobody else (besides the parties) knows the sequences.

Properties (iv) and (v) are difficult to accomplish using classical tools due to the fact that information transmitted in classical form can be examined and copied without altering it in any detectable way. However, as quantum key distribution protocols show [30, 31], quantum information does not suffer from such a drawback. Assuming we have a reliable method of generating sequences of numbers with properties (i) to (v) among N distant parties, a method that will be presented below, then the solutions to the above problems are described in the following subsections.

A. Solution to the N strangers problem

Each victim B_i is assigned a label, taken from 0 to $N - 1$. If murderer A_i 's sequence starts with j , then A_i must kill B_j , etc. The remaining entries of the sequence can be used for subsequent rounds. The result tells every murderer who his/her victim is in such a way that prevents any murderer (or even a small group of them) from denouncing or blackmailing another. The only way to ascertain with certainty who murdered B_j is that all the other murderers confess. A_i has a probability of $1/N$ to have to kill his/her own desired victim B_i . In case A_i must kill B_i , since the fact that A_i wants B_i dead is presumably known by others, the best thing A_i could do is to participate in another round with a different set of strangers.

B. Solution to the secret sharing problem

The key is defined as A_1 's sequence. The only way to reveal it is to make the remaining $N - 1$ parties share their respective sequences; the key is then composed by the missing results. If a dishonest party D declares a result which is different to his/her actual result, then there is a probability $1/(r - 1)$, where r is the number of honest parties which have not yet declared their results, that other honest party H has obtained that result. Then H would stop the process, so Alice's key (and thus Alice's action) would remain safe (dishonest parties cannot sabotage Alice's action if they do not know what it is). The order in which the agents declare their respective results must change from round to round to avoid any dishonest party being always the last to declare.

C. Solution to the liar detection problem

Before entering into the details of the solution, it will be useful to sketch how it works. A (lice) must send B (ob) [and C (arol)] some information $l_{AB}(m_{AB})$ [$l_{AC}(m_{AC})$] such that: (a) It is only known to Alice. (b) Its authenticity can be checked by B (and C) using information only known to him (her). (c) The information $l_{AB}(m_{AB})$ [$l_{AC}(m_{AC})$] is correlated with the message m_{AB} (m_{AC});




FIG. 1: Protocol for solving the liar detection problem. To explain how it works, we will assume that nobody is lying. A must send B a message m_{AB} and the list $l_{AB}(m_{AB})$ in which the message m_{AB} appears. Analogously, A must send C a message m_{AC} and the corresponding list $l_{AC}(m_{AC})$. Finally, B must send C a message m_{BC} and two lists: $l_{BC}(m_{BC})$ and $l_{AB}(m_{AB})$.

if the message were different, then this information would also be different. Bob needs $l_{AB}(m_{AB})$ to convince Carol that the message A sent him was actually m_{AB} (and not other).

Let us suppose that the message m is a trit value 0, 1, or 2. All three parties agree to use the following protocol:

- (I) If the transmitted message is m_{ij} , then the sender i must also send j the list $l_{ij}(m_{ij})$ of positions in his/her sequence in which the number m_{ij} appears (see figure 1). Note that if the sequences are random and long enough then any $l_{ij}(m_{ij})$ must contain about one third of the total length L of the sequences.
- (II) The receiver j would not accept any message if the intersection between the received list $l_{ij}(m_{ij})$ and his/her list $l_j(m_{ij})$ is not null nor if $l_{ij}(m_{ij}) \ll L/3$ elements.

We will assume that requirements (I) and (II) force the dishonest party to send correct but perhaps incomplete lists. Otherwise, if i sends a list containing n erroneous data, then the probability that j does not accept the message m_{ij} would be $(2^n - 1)/2^n$. In addition,

- (III) B must send C the list $l_{BC}(m_{AB})$ containing the sequence he has (supposedly) received from A (see figure 1).

Therefore, when C finds that $m_{AC} \neq m_{BC}$, she has received three lists to help her to find out whether it is A or B who is being dishonest (see figure 1). According to rules (I) to (III), if B wants to be dishonest $l_{BC}(m_{BC}) \cup l_{BC}(m_{AB})$ must necessarily be a subset of $l_B(m_{BC})$, because B does not know $l_A(m_{BC})$. However, the length of $l_B(m_{BC})$ is about $L/3$, while C is expecting

B to send her two lists with a total length of $2L/3$; then C would conclude that B was being dishonest. Alternatively, if it is A who is being dishonest, the length of the two lists that C received from B would total about $2L/3$; C would then conclude that A was being dishonest.

D. N -particle N -level supersinglets

A possible quantum method to generate sequences of numbers with properties (i) to (iv) among N distant parties is by distributing among all N parties an N -particle N -level supersinglet $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(N)}\rangle$ described in (6). Once the particles have been distributed among the parties, a direction of measurement is randomly chosen and publicly announced. Due to the N -lateral rotational invariance of the $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(N)}\rangle$ states, whenever the N parties measure the spin of the N separated particles along this direction, each of them finds a different result in the set $\{0, \dots, N-1\}$; thus such results satisfy requirements (ii) and (iii).

In order to accomplish requirements (i), (iv), and (v), an essential property is *nonseparability*, that is, the quantum predictions for the $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(N)}\rangle$ states cannot be reproduced by any local hidden variables model in which the results of the spin measurements are somehow determined before the measurement. To show the nonseparability of $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(N)}\rangle$ we have to study whether they violate Bell's inequalities derived from the assumptions of local realism. Most Bell's inequalities require two alternative local dichotomic (taking values -1 or 1) observables A_j and B_j on each particle j . To test nonseparability, we will use the dichotomic local observables proposed by Peres in [9]. A Peres' observable A_k can be operationally defined as follows: to measure A_k , first measure the spin component of particle k along direction A , $S_A^{(k)}$. If particle k is a spin- s particle, then measuring $S_A^{(k)}$ could give $2s+1$ different results. Then assign value 1 to results $s, s-2, \dots$, and value -1 to results $s-1, s-3, \dots$. The operator representing observable A_k can be written as

$$\hat{A}_k = \sum_{m=-s}^s (-1)^{s-m} |S_A^{(k)} = m\rangle \langle S_A^{(k)} = m|, \quad (12)$$

where $|S_A^{(k)} = m\rangle$ is the eigenstate of the spin component along direction A of particle k .

To show the nonseparability of the $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(N)}\rangle$ states, let us consider the following scenario: N distant observers share N N -level particles in the $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(N)}\rangle$ state; the $N-m$ observers can choose between measuring $A_j = A$ and $B_j = a$; the remaining m observers can choose between measuring $A_k = B$ and $B_k = b$. Then nonseparability can be tested by means of the following Bell's inequality, which generalizes to N particles the Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt inequality [32]

$$|E_N(A, \dots, A, B, \dots, B) + E_N(A, \dots, A, b, \dots, b)$$

$$+E_N(a, \dots, a, B, \dots, B) - E_N(a, \dots, a, b, \dots, b)| \leq 2(13)$$

Note that this inequality uses only a subset of all possible correlation functions (for instance, it does not use $E_N(A, a, \dots, a, B, \dots, B)$). For the $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(N)}\rangle$ states, restricting our attention to Peres' observables, the correlation function $E_N^{(m)}(A, \dots, A, B, \dots, B)$, which represents the expected value of this product of the results of measuring, for instance, $N - m$ observables A , and m observables B is given by

$$E_N^{(N-1)} = (-1)^{f(N/2)} \frac{1}{N} \frac{\sin(N\theta_{AB})}{\sin\theta_{AB}}, \quad (14)$$

$$E_N^{(N-2)} = (-1)^{f(N/2)} \frac{1}{N+2} \left\{ 1 + \frac{\sin[(N+1)\theta_{AB}]}{\sin\theta_{AB}} \right\} \quad (15)$$

where θ_{AB} is the angle between directions A and B and $f(x)$ gives the greatest integer less than or equal to x . In case of $m = 1$, that is, using correlation functions of the $E_N^{(N-1)}$ type, we have found that $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(N)}\rangle$ states violate inequality (13) for any N . The maximum violation for $N = 2$ is $2\sqrt{2}$, for $N = 3$ is 2.552, and for $N \rightarrow \infty$ tends to 2.481. In case of $m = 2$, that is, using correlation functions of the $E_N^{(N-2)}$ type, we have found that the $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(N)}\rangle$ states violate inequality (13) for any N . The maximum violation for $N = 4$ is 2.418, for $N = 5$ is 2.424 and for $N \rightarrow \infty$ tends to 2.481.

So far we have assumed that the N parties share a large collection of N -level systems in the $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(N)}\rangle$ state. To make sure that this is the case (and that nobody has changed the state) requires a protocol to distribute and test these states between the N parties such that at the end of the protocol either all parties agree that they share a $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(N)}\rangle$ state (and then they can reliably apply the described solutions), or all of them conclude that something went wrong (and then abort any subsequent action). For $N = 3$ such a distribute-and-test protocol is explicitly described in [16] and can be easily generalized to any $N > 3$. The test requires that the parties compare a sufficiently large subset of their particles which are subsequently discarded.

V. N -QUBIT SUPERSINGLET AND DECOHERENCE-FREE SUBSPACES

N -qubit (with N even) supersinglets $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(2)}\rangle$ have found many applications: they can be used to solve the KDP, and the SSP, defined in section II; they can be used to do *telecloning* (a process combining quantum teleportation and optimal quantum cloning from one input to M outputs [33]). In fact, $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(2)}\rangle$ are the N -lateral rotationally invariant version of the telecloning states introduced in [33]. Recently, it has been found that $|\mathcal{S}_4^{(2)}\rangle$ can also be used to solve the LDP described in section II [34]. Here, however, we shall be examining a different use for these states: encoding quantum information in a way

that makes sure that it is not affected by some kind of otherwise unavoidable errors.

In quantum computation and quantum communication [35], information is stored in the quantum state of quantum systems, usually qubits. Preserving the desired states of the qubits and controlling their evolution is essential for most of the tasks. However, when the qubits interact with the environment, although the overall evolution of the state of the qubits-environment system is unitary (according to quantum mechanics, the evolution of the state of any closed system is unitary), the evolution of the state of the qubits alone (which do not form a closed system) is not unitary. The state of the qubits rapidly evolves into a state which is entangled with the environment. This implies that, even if the initial state of the qubits was pure ($\rho^2 = \rho$), after such an interaction the state of the qubits rapidly becomes mixed ($\rho^2 \neq \rho$). This process is known as *decoherence* [36, 37]. Decoherence is thus a major obstacle in quantum computation and quantum communication.

There are two ways to overcome decoherence. One is based on adding redundancy when encoding information in order to detect and correct errors by using *quantum error correction codes* [38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43]. A quantum error-correcting code is defined as a unitary mapping (encoding) of k qubits into a subspace of the quantum state space of n qubits such that, if any t of the qubits undergoes arbitrary decoherence, not necessarily independently, the resulting n qubits can be used to faithfully reconstruct the original quantum state of the k encoded qubits.

The other approach is by encoding qubits within subspaces which do not suffer decoherence due to reasons of symmetry. These subspaces are called *decoherence-free (DF) subspaces* [44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56]. Indeed, DF subspaces can be considered as a special class of quantum error correction codes [53].

Let us illustrate the use of the $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(2)}\rangle$ states for constructing DF subspaces by considering a simple example: N qubits coupled by a single thermal bath described by a collection of noninteracting linear oscillators. Let us assume that all qubits suffer the *same* interaction with the bath. Such an assumption is justified as long as the qubits have very close positions with respect to the bath coherence length. Then, it has been shown that, for N even, the $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(2)}\rangle$ states are eigenstates of the whole Hamiltonian of the qubits-bath system and also eigenstates of the interaction Hamiltonian with eigenvalue zero (see [46] for details). This is due to the fact that the $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(2)}\rangle$ states are N -lateral unitary invariant. This means that, if we act on any of them with the tensor product of N equal unitary operators, the result will be to reproduce the same state:

$$U^{\otimes N} |\mathcal{S}_N^{(2)}\rangle = |\mathcal{S}_N^{(2)}\rangle, \quad (16)$$

$U^{\otimes N}$ being $U \otimes \dots \otimes U$, where U is a unitary operator [57].

In addition, any (coherent or incoherent) superposition of N -lateral unitary invariant states is also N -lateral unitary invariant. Therefore, for arbitrary N (even), the $|\mathcal{S}_j^{(2)}\rangle$ states with j ranging from 2 to N (and tensor products thereof) span a $d(N)$ -dimensional DF subspace. Let us call this subspace $\mathcal{C}_{d(N)}$. The dimension of $\mathcal{C}_{d(N)}$ is given [46] by

$$d(N) = \frac{N!}{(N/2)!(N/2 + 1)!}. \quad (17)$$

The number of qubits encoded in $\mathcal{C}_{d(N)}$ is $\log_2 d(N)$. For large N ,

$$\log_2 d(N) \simeq N - \frac{3}{2} \log_2 N. \quad (18)$$

Therefore, the encoding efficiency, defined as

$$\mathcal{E}(N) \equiv \frac{\log_2 d(N)}{N}, \quad (19)$$

is asymptotically *unity*.

Acknowledgments

I thank N. D. Mermin and C. Serra for useful comments, M. Bourennane, M. Eibl, S. Gaertner, N. Kiesel, and H. Weinfurter for illuminating discussions, M. Ferrero and the rest of organizers for inviting me to the Oviedo Conference on Quantum Information, H. Weinfurter for his hospitality at Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München, and Max-Planck-Institut für Quantenoptik, Garching, and the Spanish Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología grants BFM2001-3943 and BFM2002-02815, the Junta de Andalucía grant FQM-239, and the Max-Planck-Institut für Quantenoptik for support.

-
- [1] N.D. Mermin, Phys. Rev. D **22**, 356 (1980).
 - [2] N.D. Mermin and G.M. Schwarz, Found. Phys. **12**, 101 (1982).
 - [3] A. Garg and N.D. Mermin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 901 (1982); Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 1294 (1982).
 - [4] A. Garg and N.D. Mermin, Phys. Rev. D **27**, 339 (1983).
 - [5] M. Ögren, Phys. Rev. D **27**, 1766 (1983).
 - [6] S.L. Braunstein and C.M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 662 (1988).
 - [7] A.L. Sanz and J.L. Sánchez Gómez, An. Fis., Ser. A **86**, 77 (1990).
 - [8] M. Ardehali, Phys. Rev. D **44**, 3336 (1991).
 - [9] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. A **46**, 4413 (1992).
 - [10] N. Gisin and A. Peres, Phys. Lett. A **162**, 15 (1992).
 - [11] P. Heywood and M.L.G. Redhead, Found. Phys. **13**, 481 (1983).
 - [12] H.R. Brown and G. Svetlichny, Found. Phys. **20**, 1379 (1990).
 - [13] A. Cabello, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 1687 (1998).
 - [14] A. Lamas-Linares, J.C. Howell, and D. Bouwmeester, Nature (London) **412**, 887 (2001).
 - [15] J.C. Howell, A. Lamas-Linares, and D. Bouwmeester, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 030401 (2002).
 - [16] M. Fitzi, N. Gisin, and U. Maurer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 217901 (2001).
 - [17] M. Hillery and V. Bužek, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 042303 (2001).
 - [18] K.A. Dennison and W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 010301 (2002).
 - [19] N. Gisin, in the Conference *Quantum Information: Quantum Entanglement* (Sant Feliu de Guíxols, Spain, 2002).
 - [20] H. Weinfurter (private communication, 2002).
 - [21] P. Highsmith, *Strangers on a Train* (Harper and Brothers, New York, 1950).
 - [22] A. Hitchcock, *Strangers on a Train* (Warner Brothers, Hollywood, CA, 1951).
 - [23] M. Hillery, V. Bužek, and A. Berthiaume, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 1829 (1999).
 - [24] M. Żukowski, A. Zeilinger, M.A. Horne, and H. Weinfurter, Acta Phys. Pol. **93**, 187 (1998).
 - [25] A. Karlsson, M. Koashi, and N. Imoto, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 162 (1999).
 - [26] J. Gruska, *Quantum Computing* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1999).
 - [27] A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods* (Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1993).
 - [28] M. Pease, R. Shostak, and L. Lamport, J. ACM **27**, 2, 228 (1980).
 - [29] L. Lamport, R. Shostak, and M. Pease, ACM Trans. Programming Languages and Syst. **4**, 382 (1982).
 - [30] C.H. Bennett and G. Brassard, in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computers, Systems, and Signal Processing, Bangalore, India, 1984* (IEEE, New York, 1984), p. 175.
 - [31] A.K. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 661 (1991).
 - [32] J.F. Clauser, M.A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R.A. Holt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **23**, 880 (1969).
 - [33] M. Murao, D. Jonathan, M.B. Plenio, and V. Vedral, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 156 (1999).
 - [34] A. Cabello, quant-ph/0210079.
 - [35] M.A. Nielsen and I.L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
 - [36] W.H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. D **24**, 1516 (1981).
 - [37] W.H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. D **26**, 1862 (1982).
 - [38] P.W. Shor, Phys. Rev. A **52**, 2493 (1995).
 - [39] A.M. Steane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 793 (1996).
 - [40] A.K. Ekert and C. Macchiavello, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 2585 (1996).
 - [41] A.R. Calderbank and P.W. Shor, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 1098 (1996).
 - [42] D. Gottesman, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 1862 (1998).
 - [43] A.R. Calderbank, E.M. Rains, P.W. Shor, and N.J.A. Sloane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 405 (1997).
 - [44] G.M. Palma, K. Suominen, and A.K. Ekert, Proc. R. Soc.

- Lond. A **452**, 567 (1996).
- [45] L.-M. Duan and G.-C. Guo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 1953 (1997).
- [46] P. Zanardi and M. Rasetti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 3306 (1997).
- [47] P. Zanardi and M. Rasetti, Mod. Phys. Lett. B **25**, 1085 (1997).
- [48] P. Zanardi, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 4445 (1997).
- [49] L.-M. Duan and G.-C. Guo, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 737 (1998).
- [50] P. Zanardi, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 3276 (1998).
- [51] L.-M. Duan and G.-C. Guo, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 3491 (1998).
- [52] D.A. Lidar, I.L. Chuang, and K.B. Whaley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 2594 (1998).
- [53] D.A. Lidar, D. Bacon, and K.B. Whaley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 4556 (1999).
- [54] D.A. Lidar, D. Bacon, J. Kempe, and K.B. Whaley, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 052307 (2000).
- [55] D.A. Lidar, D. Bacon, J. Kempe, and K.B. Whaley, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 022306 (2001).
- [56] D.A. Lidar, D. Bacon, J. Kempe, and K.B. Whaley, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 022307 (2001).
- [57] The $|\mathcal{S}_N^{(N)}\rangle$ states given in (6) are also N -lateral unitary invariant, but not the $|\mathcal{S}_2^{(d)}\rangle$ states given in (2), which are simply N -lateral rotationally invariant.