

# On the ‘Polarized distances between quantum states and observables’

D.A. Trifonov  
Institute for Nuclear Research, Sofia, Bulgaria

August 21, 2018

## Abstract

The scheme for construction of distances, presented in our previous paper quant-ph/0005087, v.1 (Ref. 1) is amended. The formulation of Proposition 1 of Ref. 1 does not ensure the triangle inequality, therefore some of the functionals  $D(a, b)$  in Ref. 1 are in fact quasi-distances. In this note we formulate sufficient conditions for a functional  $D(a, b)$  of the (squared) form  $D(a, b)^2 = f(a)^2 + f(b)^2 - 2f(a)f(b)g(a, b)$  to be a distance and provide some examples of such distances. A one parameter generalization of a bounded distance of the (squared) form  $D(a, b)^2 = D_0^2(1 - g(a, b))$ , which includes the known Bures-Uhlmann and Hilbert-Schmidt distances between quantum states, is established.

In the scheme of paper quant-ph/0005087 [1] (to be cited also as Ref. 1) two functionals,  $f(a)$  and  $g(a, b)$  on a set  $\mathcal{A}$  ( $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ ) are involved.  $f(a)$  was required to be positive,  $g(a, b)$  – symmetric,  $g(a, b) = g(b, a)$ , with values in the interval  $[-1, 1]$ . In addition it was supposed that  $a = b$  is equivalent to  $g(a, b) = 1$  and  $f(a) = f(b)$  (i.e.  $g(a, b) = 1, f(a) = f(b) \iff a = b$ ). Then the expression  $D[a, b]$ ,

$$D[a, b] = \left( f(a)^2 + f(b)^2 - 2f(a)f(b)g(a, b) \right)^{1/2} \quad (1)$$

was proposed [1] as distance between elements of  $\mathcal{A}$ . The functional  $g(a, b)$  is a *cosine-type* functional, and  $f(a)$  plays the role of *polarization*. If  $f(a) = \text{const.}$  then the distance (1) is *not polarized*. In somewhat different form the notion of polarized distance was introduced in [2].

Before proceed further let us recall the defining properties (d1) - (d4) of the *distance*  $D(a, b)$  between elements  $a, b, c$  of a given set  $\mathcal{A}$ :

$$D(a, b) \geq 0 \quad (\text{nonnegativity}), \quad (d1)$$

$$D(a, b) = 0 \quad \text{iff } a = b \quad (\text{Euclidean property}), \quad (d2)$$

$$D(a, b) = D(b, a) \quad (\text{symmetricity}), \quad (d3)$$

$$D(a, b) + D(b, c) \geq D(a, c) \quad (\text{triangle inequality}). \quad (d4)$$

Trivial distance  $D(a, a) = 0, D(a, b \neq a) = 1$  always exists. If all but (d2) are valid then  $D(a, b)$  is called *pseudo-distance*. If all but the triangle inequality (d4) are valid then  $D(a, b)$  would be called *quasi-distance*.

However the above requirements on  $g(a, b)$  in Eq. (1) do not ensure the triangle inequality (d4). Some of the "new distances"  $D[a, b]$  of the type (1), constructed in Ref. 1 (the expressions  $D_{\text{III}}$  in subsection 5.1.1 of [1] for example) violate (d4), and are in fact *quasi-distances* only. The expressions  $D'[A, B]$  of [1] should be regarded as quasi-distances between quantum observables  $A$  and  $B$ .

In this note we accomplish the Proposition 1 of [1] adding an extra requirement on the functional  $g(a, b)$  in (1) in order to ensure the triangle inequality. The Bures-Uhlmann (BU) distance between pure quantum states is an example that obeys these additional requirements. Then we provide a one parameter generalization of an angle distance  $\arccos(g(a, b))$  (Proposition 2) that entails a one parameter generalization of bounded distances of BU type between pure quantum states. The generalization includes the Hilbert-Schmidt (HS) distance between pure states and also obeys the conditions of Proposition 1. Finally we note that some of the "new polarized distances" in [1] (those based on the HS and BU distances) do satisfy (d4) and are correct distances on the corresponding set of quantum states.

The distance proposition (a sufficient condition for a distance of the type (1)) should have the following form:

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $f(a)$  be a positive functional on a set  $\mathcal{A}$ , and  $g(a, b)$  be a symmetric functional on  $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}$  ( $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ ) with the property*

$$|g(a, b)| \leq 1. \quad (2)$$

Then the expression

$$D(a, b; f, g) = \left( f(a)^2 + f(b)^2 - 2f(a)f(b)g(a, b) \right)^{1/2} \quad (3)$$


is a distance between elements of  $\mathcal{A}$  if  $g(a, b) = g(b, a)$  and

$$f(a) = f(b), g(a, b) = 1 \iff a = b, \quad (4)$$

$$|\varphi_{ab} - \varphi_{bc}| \leq \varphi_{ac} \leq \min\{\varphi_{ab} + \varphi_{bc}, 2\pi - (\varphi_{ab} + \varphi_{bc})\}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\varphi_{ij} = \arccos(g(i, j))$ ,  $i, j = a, b, c$ .

*Proof.* The first three required properties for  $D(a, b; f, g)$  as a distance are easily seen to follow straightforwardly from eqs. (2) and (4), and the inequality  $(f(a) - f(b))^2 \geq 0$ . To prove the triangle inequality we consider a reper in  $\mathbf{R}_3$ , consisting of three unit vectors  $\vec{e}_a, \vec{e}_b$  and  $\vec{e}_c$  (see figure 1), the angles subtended by the three pairs of unit vectors



**Figure 1.** A distance triangle  $ABC$  (thick sides) of the form (3):  $AB = D(a, b; f, g)$ ,  $BC = D(b, c; f, g)$ ,  $CA = D(c, a; f, g)$ . The Points  $O, A, B, C'$  are in the plane  $YOZ$ . The distance triangle is a base of a pyramid with apex in the origin  $O$  and edges  $OA = f(a)$ ,  $OB = f(b)$ ,  $OC = f(c)$ .

$(\vec{e}_i, \vec{e}_j)$ ,  $i, j = a, b, c$ , being equal to  $\arccos(g(i, j)) \equiv \varphi_{ij}$  respectively.

We first put the vectors  $f(a)\vec{e}_a = \vec{OA}$  and  $f(b)\vec{e}_b = \vec{OB}$ , with the angle between them equal to  $\arccos(g(a, b)) \equiv \varphi_{ab}$ . Next we put (in the plane  $YOZ$  of  $\vec{OA}$  and  $\vec{OB}$ ) the vector  $f(c)\vec{e}_{c'} = \vec{OC}'$  with the angle between  $OB$  and  $OC'$  equal to  $\varphi_{bc}$  and, if  $\varphi_{ac}$  is less than  $\varphi_{ab} + \varphi_{bc}$  (as it is the case shown on figure 1, where  $\varphi_{ab} + \varphi_{bc} > \pi$ ), rotate  $\vec{OC}'$  around  $\vec{OB}$  until the angle between  $OC'$  and the already fixed  $OA$  becomes equal to  $\varphi_{ac}$ . The required property (5) ensures this possibility. The final position of  $\vec{OC}'$  is  $\vec{OC}$ . In this way we obtain the triangle  $ABC$  (thick lines), the side of which are exactly the three distances  $D(a, b; f, g)$ ,  $D(b, c; f, g)$  and  $D(a, c; f, g)$  of the form (3). And the sides of a triangle do satisfy the triangle inequality. End of Proof.

*Remark.* If the cosine functional obey the inequalities  $0 \leq g(a, b) \leq 1$ , then all the three distance angles  $\varphi_{ij}$  are in the interval  $[0, \pi/2]$ , and the condition (5) simplifies to

$$|\varphi_{ab} - \varphi_{bc}| \leq \varphi_{ac} \leq \varphi_{ab} + \varphi_{bc}. \quad (6)$$

The distance triangle pyramids in these cases are in the first cartesian octant.

Important known examples of distances of the form (1) are the norm distance between vectors in Hilbert spaces and the Hilbert-Schmidt (HS) and the Bures-Uhlmann (BU) distances  $D_{\text{HS}}$ ,  $D_{\text{BU}}$  between quantum states. The HS and BU distances read

$$D_{\text{HS}}(\rho_1, \rho_2) = \sqrt{f_{\text{HS}}^2(\rho_1) + f_{\text{HS}}^2(\rho_2) - 2f_{\text{HS}}(\rho_1)f_{\text{HS}}(\rho_2)g_{\text{HS}}(\rho_1, \rho_2)}, \quad (7)$$

$$f_{\text{HS}}(\rho) = \sqrt{\text{Tr}(\rho^2)}, \quad g_{\text{HS}} = \text{Tr}(\rho_1\rho_2)/\sqrt{\text{Tr}(\rho_1^2)\text{Tr}(\rho_2^2)},$$

$$D_{\text{BU}}(\rho_1, \rho_2) = \sqrt{2(1 - g_{\text{BU}}(\rho_1, \rho_2))}, \quad g_{\text{BU}} = \text{Tr}\sqrt{\sqrt{\rho_1}\rho_2\sqrt{\rho_1}}, \quad (8)$$

where  $\rho$  is the density operator, representing quantum states. One sees that

$$0 \leq g_{\text{BU}} \leq 1, \quad 0 \leq g_{\text{HS}} \leq 1.$$

For pure states  $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$  these formulas simplify to

$$D_{\text{HS}}(\psi_1, \psi_2) = \sqrt{2(1 - g_{\text{HS}}(\psi_1, \psi_2))}, \quad g_{\text{HS}}(\psi_1, \psi_2) = |\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle|^2, \quad (9)$$

$$D_{\text{BU}}(\psi_1, \psi_2) = \sqrt{2(1 - g_{\text{BU}}(\psi_1, \psi_2))}, \quad g_{\text{BU}}(\psi_1, \psi_2) = |\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle|, \quad (10)$$

where  $\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle$  is the scalar product.

We shall show below that for pure states  $g_{\text{BU}}$  and  $g_{\text{HS}}$  obey (6), i.e. the HS and BU distances between pure states are examples of known distances which obey the requirements of Proposition 1. (It is not clear whether  $g_{\text{BU}}$  and  $g_{\text{HS}}$  obey the angle condition (6) in the case of mixed states).

The proof for  $g_{\text{BU}}(\psi_1, \psi_2)$  is very simple. It resorts to the known fact that the angle  $\varphi_{12} = \arccos(|\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle|)$  (the Hilbert space angle) is a distance between pure quantum states [3]. Therefore  $\varphi_{12} + \varphi_{23} \geq \varphi_{31}$ , what exactly is the requirement (6) for  $g_{\text{BU}}(\psi_1, \psi_2)$ . The property (6) for  $g_{\text{HS}}(\psi_1, \psi_2)$  follows from the Proposition 2 below.

Let us note that not every distance of the form (1) obeys the property (5), in particular not every finite distance of the form

$$D(a, b) = D_0 \sqrt{1 - g(a, b)}, \quad 0 \leq g(a, b) \leq 1 \quad (11)$$

obeys (6) (One can easily find counter-examples numerically). In fact any finite distance  $D(a, b) \leq D_0$  can be put in the form (11) with  $g(a, b) = 1 - D^2(a, b)/D_0^2$ .

**Proposition 2.** *If the angle  $\varphi(a, b) = \arccos(g(a, b))$  is a distance,  $0 \leq \varphi(a, b) \leq \pi/2$ , on a set  $\mathcal{A}$ , then*

$$\arccos(g^\tau(a, b)) \equiv \varphi(a, b; \tau) \quad (12)$$

is also a distance for  $\tau > 1$ .

*Proof.* It is clear that we have to prove the triangle inequality for  $\varphi(a, b; \tau)$  only, since the properties (d1)-(d3) of  $\varphi(a, b; \tau)$  straightforwardly follow from those of  $\varphi(a, b) = \varphi(a, b; 1)$ .

In the notations  $x = g(a, b)$ ,  $y = g(b, c)$ ,  $z = g(a, c)$  (note that  $0 \leq x, y, z \leq 1$ ) the triangle inequality for  $\varphi(a, b)$  reads


$$\varphi(x) + \varphi(y) \geq \varphi(z). \quad (13)$$

We have to prove that

$$\varphi(x, \tau) + \varphi(y, \tau) \geq \varphi(z, \tau) \quad (14)$$

for  $\tau > 1$ .

The proof of (14) resorts to the monotone character (with respect to the parameter  $\tau$ ) of function  $\varphi(x, \tau)$  and its first and second derivatives  $\varphi'(x, \tau) = d\varphi(x, \tau)/d\tau$  and  $\varphi''(x, \tau) = d^2\varphi(x, \tau)/d\tau^2$ :  $\varphi(x, \tau)$  increases from 0 at  $\tau = 0$  to  $\pi/2$  at  $\tau \rightarrow \infty$  (see three dashed lines in figure 2, where  $x = 0.9, 0.6, 0.2$ );  $\varphi'(x, \tau)$  is strictly decreasing function of  $\tau$ ,  $\infty > \varphi'(x, \tau) > 0$ , and  $\varphi''(x, \tau)$  is strictly increasing negative function of  $\tau$ ,  $-\infty < \varphi''(x, \tau) < -0$ . The sum  $\varphi(x, \tau) + \varphi(y, \tau) \equiv \varphi_+(x, y; \tau)$  is also strictly increasing function of  $\tau$  (with strictly decreasing positive first derivative) and tending to  $\pi$  at  $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ : At  $\tau \gg 1$  one has  $\varphi_+(x, y; \tau) > \varphi(z; \tau)$ .



**Figure 2.**  $\arccos(x^t)$  as a function of  $t$  for  $x = 0.9$  (the lower dashed line),  $x = 0.6$  (the intermediate dashed line) and  $x = 0.2$  (the top dashed line). The solid line represents the sum  $\arccos(0.9^t) + \arccos(0.6^t)$ .

Due to these monotone properties the two curves,  $\varphi_+(x, y; \tau)$  and  $\varphi(z; \tau)$ , either do not intersect (i.e.  $\varphi_+(x, y; \tau) > \varphi(z; \tau)$  for all  $\tau > 0$ ) or intersect at one point only, after

which  $\varphi_+(x, y; \tau) > \varphi(z; \tau)$ . In view of (13) the intersection can occur at  $t \leq 1$  only (see figure 2, where the solid line represents  $\varphi(0.9, 0.6; \tau)$ ). Two or more intersections mean that  $\varphi_+(x, y; \tau)$  is oscillating around  $\varphi(z; \tau)$  which is impossible due to strictly monotone behavior of these functions and their derivatives. End of the Proof.

Next we note that if  $\varphi(a, b; \tau)$  is a distance it does satisfy the inequalities (6). As a result we have the

**Corollary 1.** *If  $D(a, b)$  is a bounded distance of the form (11) satisfying (6) then  $D(a, b; \tau) = D_0 \sqrt{1 - g^\tau(a, b)}$  is also a distance satisfying (6).*

The BU distance (10) between pure quantum states is of the form (11) with angle (the Hilbert space angle [3])  $\varphi(\psi_1, \psi_2) = \arccos(|\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle|)$  satisfying (6) ( $\varphi(\psi_1, \psi_2) = \arccos(g_{\text{BU}}(\psi_1, \psi_2))$ ). Therefore the functionals  $D(\psi_1, \psi_2; \tau)$ ,

$$D(\psi_1, \psi_2; \tau) = \sqrt{2(1 - |\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle|^\tau)}, \quad \tau \geq 1, \quad (15)$$

are also distances between pure quantum states, satisfying all the requirements of the Proposition 1 (with  $f(a) = 1$  and the stronger inequalities (6)). Any distance triangle with sides  $D(\psi_1, \psi_2; \tau)$ ,  $D(\psi_2, \psi_3; \tau)$  and  $D(\psi_3, \psi_1; \tau)$  is a base of (slant) pyramid with unit edges. It can be realized as a triangle between three points on the first octant of the unit sphere, the apex of the pyramid being placed in the center of the sphere. At  $\tau = 2$  the functional  $D(\psi_1, \psi_2; \tau)$  coincides with the HS distance between pure states.

It is worth noting another simple generalization: if  $D(a, b)$  is a bounded distance on a set  $\mathcal{A}$  of the form (11) (the condition (6) is not required) then

$$D(a, b; \tau) = D_0 \sqrt{1 - g^\tau(a, b)} \quad (16)$$

is also a distance for  $\tau \geq 1$ . The proof of the statement resorts on the strictly monotone character of  $\sqrt{1 - x^\tau}$  and its first and second derivatives as functions of  $\tau$  and is carried out similarly to the case of Proposition 2. It may be useful also to note that at  $\tau \rightarrow \infty$  the expression  $D(a, b; \tau)$  tends to the trivial distance in  $\mathcal{A}$ :  $D(a, b; \tau \rightarrow \infty) = 1$ , if  $a \neq b$  and  $D(a, b; \tau \rightarrow \infty) = 0$  if  $a = b$ .

The functionals  $D_{\text{Ia}}$  and  $D_{\text{Ib}}$  of subsection 5.1.1 of [1] are of the form (1) with  $g = g_{\text{HS}}$ . Therefore, in view of the Proposition 2 they obey the conditions (2), (4) and (6) and are polarized distances between pure quantum states (note however that in Eqs. (57), (58) of [1] the numerator  $1 - \exp(-|\alpha - \beta|^2)$  should be replaced by  $\exp(-|\alpha - \beta|^2)$ ). The expressions  $D'[A, B]$  of [1] may satisfy the triangle inequality on some restricted subsets only, and thus should be regarded as quasi-distances between quantum observables  $A$  and  $B$ . The expressions  $D_{\text{III}}(\rho_1, \rho_2; B, \mu, \nu)$  [1] would be a (polarized) quasi-distance between (mixed) states if  $\text{Tr}(\rho_1 \rho_2)$  is replaced by  $\text{Tr}(\sqrt{\rho_1} \rho_2 \sqrt{\rho_1})^{1/2}$ .

Let us note at this point, that quasi-distances are also involved in some physical applications. Thus in the measure of entanglement  $E(\sigma) := \min_{\rho \in \mathcal{D}} D(\sigma || \rho)$  [4] the functional  $D$  is supposed to be "any measure of distance between the two density matrices  $\rho$  and  $\sigma$  such that  $E(\sigma)$  satisfies the above three conditions" [4]. In particular it could be of the form  $D_B(\sigma || \rho) = 2 - 2\sqrt{F(\sigma, \rho)}$ , where  $F(\sigma, \rho) := [\text{Tr}\{\sqrt{\rho} \sigma \sqrt{\rho}\}^{1/2}]^2$  [4]. The functional  $D_B(\sigma || \rho)$  coincides with the squared BU distance (8), and squared distances are quasi-distances – they obey (d1)-(d3) but violate the triangle inequality. (The other choice  $S(\sigma || \rho)$  used in [4] for  $D(\sigma || \rho)$  is not even a quasi-distance, since it is not symmetric).

**Conclusion.** We have established sufficient conditions for distances of the form (3) on a given set  $\mathcal{A}$  (Proposition 1) and showed that the known Bures-Uhlmann (BU) and Hilbert-Schmidt (HS) distances between pure quantum states, and some of the new distances in Ref. 1, obey the required conditions (5), or (6). This is an amended version of the incomplete Proposition 1 of [1]. We have also constructed a one parameter generalization  $D(\psi_1, \psi_2; \tau)$ , Eq. (15), of BU and HS distances between pure quantum states that also obeys the requirements of Proposition 1. Intermediately we showed that  $\arccos(|\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle|^\tau)$  is a distance between pure quantum states for  $\tau \geq 1$ . The latter is a particular case of Proposition 2. The same one parameter generalization (eq. (16)) is extended to bounded distances of the form (11) without requirement of property (6) for the symmetric functional  $g(a, b)$ .

The established generalizations can be combined (according to (3)) with any positive functional  $f(a)$  on  $\mathcal{A}$  to obtain new (polarized, therefore more sensitive) distances between elements of  $\mathcal{A}$ , in particular between states of quantum systems. Let us remind that distances can be used as measures of distinguishability between elements of  $\mathcal{A}$ . In particular the notion of distinguishability between quantum states has shown to play an important role in the modern quantum information theory.

## References

- [1] D.A. Trifonov and S.G. Donev, *Polarized distances between quantum states and observables*, quant-ph/0005087, v.1.
- [2] V.V. Dodonov, O.V. Man'ko, V.I. Man'ko, and A. Wünsche, Phys. Scripta **59**, 81-89 (1999) [quant-ph/9810085].
- [3] W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 357 (1981); R. Schack, G.M. D'Ariano, and C.M. Caves, Phys. Rev. E **50**, 972-87 (1994) [chao-dyn/9403005].
- [4] V. Vedral, M.B. Plenio, M.A. Rippin and P.L. Knight, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** 2275-2279 (1997) [quant-ph/9701027].