Information-Theoretic Costs of Simulating Quantum Measurements

Mark M. Wilde

McGill University



Joint with Patrick Hayden, Francesco Buscemi, and Min-Hsiu Hsieh

Quantum Information Seminar, Perimeter Institute, Waterloo, Canada April 18, 2012

Overview

•Review Winter's measurement compression protocol

Introduce a new variation of the protocol

•Review classical data compression with QSI

Introduce measurement compression with QSI

•Outline some applications of MC-QSI



POVMs

Recall:

Quantum state is a positive, unit trace operator ρ

$$\rho \ge 0$$
, $\operatorname{Tr}\{\rho\} = 1$

Positive operator-valued measure is a collection $\Lambda = \{\Lambda_x\}$ such that

$$\sum_{x} \Lambda_x = I, \quad \forall x : \Lambda_x \ge 0$$

Probability of getting outcome x when performing Λ on ρ is

$$p_X(x) = \operatorname{Tr}\{\Lambda_x \rho\}$$



Decomposing POVMs

Just as density operators can represent **noisy quantum states**, so can POVMs represent **noisy measurements**...

Consider decomposing Λ as a **random selection** of a measurement according to M combined with a noisy post-processing $p_{x|w}(x|w)$:

$$\Lambda_x = \sum_{m,w} p_M(m) \,\Gamma_w^{(m)} \, p_{X|W}(x|w)$$



What are the communication costs of simulating quantum measurements?

Example. Consider the following POVM:

$$\left\{\frac{1}{2}|0\rangle\langle 0|, \frac{1}{2}|1\rangle\langle 1|, \frac{1}{2}|+\rangle\langle +|, \frac{1}{2}|-\rangle\langle -|\right\}$$

This measurement decomposes as a random choice of Pauli X or Z

$$\left\{\frac{1}{2}\left\{|0\rangle\langle 0|,\,|1\rangle\langle 1|\right\},\,\frac{1}{2}\left\{|+\rangle\langle+|,\,|-\rangle\langle-|\right\}\right\}$$



Another Example: Pentagon States

Example. Take a slice of the Bloch sphere that includes its center. Consider 5 states that form a pentagon on the slice.

With appropriate weightings, these sum to the identity and form a POVM



Measurement decomposes as a random choice of 3-outcome measurements:



Simulate it with common randomness and classical communication

Measurement Compression

Ideal Information Processing Task for Measurement Compression

Go to the IID setting:



Actual Information Processing Task for Measurement Compression

Use common randomness, a collective measurement, and classical communication to simulate original measurement



Faithful Simulation

A measurement simulation is **faithful** if its action on an IID state is indistinguishable from the true measurement:

Definition 1 (Faithful simulation for purification) A sequence of protocols provides a faithful simulation of the POVM Λ on the source ρ , if for a purification $|\phi_{\rho}\rangle$ of the source, the states on the reference and source systems after applying the measurement maps are ϵ -close in trace distance for all $\epsilon > 0$ and sufficiently large n:

$$\left\| \left(\mathrm{id} \otimes \mathcal{M}_{\Lambda^{\otimes n}} \right) \left(\phi_{\rho}^{\otimes n} \right) - \left(\mathrm{id} \otimes \mathcal{M}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}^{n}} \right) \left(\phi_{\rho}^{\otimes n} \right) \right\|_{1} \leq \epsilon.$$

$$(1)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{\Lambda^{\otimes n}}(\sigma) \equiv \sum_{x^{n}} \operatorname{Tr} \left\{ \Lambda_{x^{n}} \sigma \right\} \left| x^{n} \right\rangle \left\langle x^{n} \right|,$$
$$\mathcal{M}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}^{n}}(\sigma) \equiv \sum_{x^{n}} \operatorname{Tr} \left\{ \widetilde{\Lambda}_{x^{n}} \sigma \right\} \left| x^{n} \right\rangle \left\langle x^{n} \right|.$$

Measurement Compression Theorem

Theorem 1 (Measuremen Groenewold's information gain (1971) and Λ a POVM to simulate on this state. A protocol for faithful simulation of the POVM is achievable with classical communication rate R and common randomness rate S if and only if the following set of inequalities hold

 $R \ge I(X; R),$ $R + S \ge H(X),$

where the entropies are with respect to a state of the following form:

$$\sum_{x} |x\rangle \langle x|^{X} \otimes \operatorname{Tr} \int (I^{R} \otimes \Lambda^{A}) \phi^{RA}$$

Shannon entropy

(1)

and ϕ^{RA} is some purification of the state ρ .

This holds for a "feedback" simulation in which Alice also gets the output of the simulated measurement.

Measurement Compression Region



Notable rate pairs correspond to measurement compression and Shannon compression (also Shannon compression combined with c. comm. to comm. rand.)

Achievability

Resource inequality for measurement compression:

$$I\left(X;R\right)\left[c \to c\right] + H\left(X|R\right)\left[cc\right] \ge \left\langle \Lambda\left(\rho\right)\right\rangle$$

Consider POVM Λ and state ρ leads to the following ensemble:

$$p_X(x) = \operatorname{Tr}\{\Lambda_x \rho\}$$
$$\hat{\rho}_x = \frac{1}{p_X(x)} \sqrt{\rho} \Lambda_x \sqrt{\rho}$$

Can think that the goal is to "steer" the reference to be as above

Do this with $\sqrt{\text{measurement}} \{ \rho^{-1/2} p_X(x) \hat{\rho}_x \rho^{-1/2} \}$

How to do this approximately?

Achievability (Ctd.)

Select $|\mathcal{L}||\mathcal{M}|$ codewords $x^{n}(I,m)$ according to $p_{x^{n}}(x^{n})$ where $|\mathcal{L}| \approx 2^{nI(X;R)}$ $|\mathcal{L}||\mathcal{M}| \approx 2^{nH(X)}$ $|\mathcal{M}| \approx 2^{nH(X)R)}$

Exploit the Ahlswede-Winter Operator Chernoff bound to guarantee that

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{l} \hat{\rho}_{x^{n}(l,m)} \approx \rho^{\otimes n}$$

This first condition is helpful in constructing a POVM for each m

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}||\mathcal{M}|} \left| \{l, m : x^n \left(l, m\right) = x^n \} \right| \approx p_{X^n}(x^n)$$

This second condition is helpful in proving that the simulation is faithful Andreas Winter. "Extrinsic" and "Intrinsic" Data in Quantum Measurements. arXiv:quant-ph/0109050

Single-Letter Converse

Single-letter converse \rightarrow the rates in the theorem are optimal

$R \ge I(X;R)$ $R + S \ge H(X)$

Happens more often in QIT when resources are **hybrid** (quantum and classical)

Main steps are just to think about the most general protocol for this task and exploit **quantum data processing inequality**

Suppose that POVM $\{\Lambda\}$ has a decomposition as

$$\Lambda_x = \sum_w p_{X|W}(x|w)M_w$$

It would then be possible to simulate $\{M_w\}$ first, followed by Bob locally simulating X from W

Is there a benefit in doing so?

Simulation is such that Alice does not require measurement output



Achievability follows by employing a variation of Winter's measurement compression protocol:

$$I\left(W;R\right)\left[c \to c\right] + I\left(W;X|R\right)\left[cc\right] \ge \left\langle \Lambda\left(\rho\right)\right\rangle$$

No need for as much common randomness consumption because Bob simulates $p_{x|w}(x|w)$ locally

Total rate of **common randomness consumption** is then I(W; X | R)for a total classical cost of I(W; XR)

Single-letter converse follows from a technique similar to that of Paul Cuff (arXiv:0805.0065) adapted to the quantum case

Theorem 1 (Non-feedback measurement compression theorem) Let ρ be a source state and \mathcal{N} a quantum instrument to simulate on this state:

$$\mathcal{N}\left(
ho
ight) = \sum_{x} \mathcal{N}_{x}\left(
ho
ight) \otimes \left|x
ight
angle \left\langle x
ight|^{X}$$
 .

A protocol for faithful simulation of the quantum instrument is achievable with classical communication rate R and common randomness rate S if and only if R and S are in the rate region given by the union of the following regions:

$$R \ge I(W; R),$$
$$R + S \ge I(W; XR),$$

where the entropies are with respect to a state of the following form:

$$\sum_{x,w} p_{X|W}(x|w) |w\rangle \langle w|^{W} \otimes |x\rangle \langle x|^{X} \otimes \operatorname{Tr}_{A} \left\{ \left(I^{R} \otimes \mathcal{M}_{w}^{A} \right) \left(\phi_{\rho}^{RA} \right) \right\}, \qquad (1)$$

 ϕ_{ρ}^{RA} is some purification of the state ρ , and the union is with respect to all decompositions of the original instrument \mathcal{N} of the form:

$$\mathcal{N}(\rho) = \sum_{x,w} p_{X|W}(x|w) \mathcal{M}_w(\rho) \otimes |x\rangle \langle x|^X, \qquad (2)$$

such that R - W - X is a quantum Markov chain.

Example plot of trade-off improvement:



Charles H. Bennett, Igor Devetak, Aram W. Harrow, Peter W. Shor and Andreas Winter. 0912.5537

Classical Data Compression with Quantum Side Information

Devetak and Winter. arXiv:quant-ph/0209029

Classical Data Compression with Quantum Side Information

Consider an ensemble of the following form: $\{p_X(x), \rho_x\}$

Suppose that an **information source** generates a classical sequence x^n and quantum state ρ_{x^n}

It gives the classical sequence to Alice and the quantum state to Bob

Question: How much classical communication is needed for Bob to recover xⁿ?

Could just Shannon compress *x*^{*n*}, but we can do better with QSI...

Devetak and Winter. arXiv:quant-ph/0209029

Ideal Protocol for CDC-QSI



In the ideal protocol, Alice just sends the classical sequence to Bob. Devetak and Winter. arXiv:quant-ph/0209029

Actual Protocol for CDC-QSI X_1 Alice X_n B_1 B_1 Bob

1) Alice hashes the classical sequence and sends Bob the hash

 B_n

2) Bob performs a "gentle" quantum measurement conditional on the hash value to recover *x*^{*n*}

 B_n

CDC-QSI Theorem

Theorem 1 (Classical data compression with quantum side information) Suppose that

$$\sum_{x} p_X(x) \left| x \right\rangle \left\langle x \right|^X \otimes \rho_x^B$$

is a classical-quantum state that characterizes a classical-quantum source. Then the conditional von Neumann entropy H(X|B) is the smallest possible achievable rate for classical data compression with quantum side information for this source:

$$\inf \left\{ R \mid R \text{ is achievable} \right\} = H\left(X|B \right).$$

Intuition:

There are nH(X) bits needed to describe the classical sequence x^n

Bob can recover nI(X;B) bits about x^n by measuring his state ρ_{x^n}

Alice needs to send the difference n[H(X) - I(X;B)] = nH(X|B)

Devetak and Winter. arXiv:quant-ph/0209029

Achievability

Resource inequality for CDC-QSI: $\left\langle \rho^{XB} \right\rangle + H\left(X|B\right) \left[c \rightarrow c\right] \geq \left\langle \rho^{XX_BB} \right\rangle$

New proof strategy exactly like classical Slepian-Wolf protocol

Before communicating, Alice throws the typical sequences into **random bins**. After doing so, this establishes a code and our assumption is that Bob knows the assignments.

What's different: Bob receives hash from Alice, and scans over all of the quantum states consistent with the hash value. He performs sequential binary projective measurements asking, "Does my quantum state correspond to the mth sequence consistent with the hash?"

Single-Letter Converse

Main steps are just to think about the most general protocol for this task and exploit quantum data processing inequality

$$nR \ge H(L)$$

$$\ge H(L|B^{n})$$

$$\ge I(X^{n}; L|B^{n})$$

$$= H(X^{n}|B^{n}) - H(X^{n}|LB^{n})$$

$$\ge H(X^{n}|B^{n})_{\omega} - H(X^{n}|\hat{X}^{n})_{\omega}$$

$$\ge H(X^{n}|B^{n})_{\sigma} - n\epsilon'$$

$$= nH(X|B) - n\epsilon'.$$

<u>Measurement Compression</u> with Quantum Side Information

Ideal MC-QSI Protocol



Alice and Bob share many copies of state ρ^{AB} Goal is for Alice and Bob to simulate ideal measurement and for Bob's state not to be disturbed

Actual MC-QSI Protocol

Use common randomness, an Alice collective measurement, classical communication, and a Bob collective measurement to simulate original measurement



Achievability

Resource inequality for CDC-QSI:

 $\left\langle \rho^{AB} \right\rangle + I\left(X; R | B\right) \left[c \to c \right] + H\left(X | RB\right) \left[cc \right] \geq \left\langle \Lambda^A \left(\rho^{AB} \right) \right\rangle$

Proof strategy combines ideas from MC and CDC-QSI (though not possible to concatenate protocols with resource calculus)

Choose an MC protocol randomly as before. Choose a hash function randomly as well. Can show there exists a choice of these that works well.

Operation: Alice performs simulation measurement, hashes the outcome, and sends it to Bob. Bob receives hash from Alice, and scans over all of the post-measurement states consistent with the hash value. He performs sequential binary projective measurements asking, "Does my quantum state correspond to the mth measurement outcome consistent with the hash?"

MC-QSI Theorem

Theorem 1 (Measurement compression with QSI) Let ρ^{AB} be a source state shared between a sender A and a receiver B, and let Λ be a POVM to simulate on the A system of this state. A protocol for faithful simulation of the POVM is achievable with classical communication rate R and common randomness rate S if and only if the following set of inequalities hold

 $R \ge I\left(X; R|B\right),$ $R + S \ge H\left(X|B\right),$

where the entropies are with respect to a state of the following form:

$$\sum_{x} \left| x \right\rangle \left\langle x \right|^{X} \otimes \operatorname{Tr}_{A} \left\{ \left(I^{R} \otimes \Lambda_{x}^{A} \right) \phi^{RAB} \right\},$$

and ϕ^{RAB} is some purification of the state ρ^{AB} .

This holds for a "feedback" simulation in which Alice also gets the output of the simulated measurement.

Single-Letter Converse

Single-letter converse \rightarrow the rates in the theorem are optimal

Main steps are just to think about the most general protocol for this task and exploit quantum data processing inequality

Also, we require that the protocol causes only a negligible disturbance to Bob's state

$R \ge I(X;R|B)$ $R + S \ge H(X|B)$

This is for feedback case in which Alice gets a copy of measurement outcome

Applications of MC-QSI

- 1) Classically assisted state redistribution
- 2) Quantum reverse Shannon theorem for a quantum instrument
- 3) Local purity distillation

Classically assisted state redistribution



Most general protocol for entanglement distillation with the help of classical and quantum communication

Classically-assisted state redistribution

Begin with state
$$~
ho^{AB}~~$$
 that has purification $~\psi^{ABE}~$

Perform MC-QSI

Requires $I(X_B; E|B)$ rate of classical communication

Then perform **Quantum State Redistribution** conditional on classical information

$$\left\langle \rho^{AB} \right\rangle + I\left(X_B; E|B\right)_{\sigma} [c \to c] + \frac{1}{2} I\left(A'; E|E'X_B\right)_{\sigma} [q \to q] \ge \frac{1}{2} \left(I\left(A'; B|X_B\right)_{\sigma} - I\left(A'; E'|X_B\right)_{\sigma}\right) [qq]$$

Classically-assisted state redistribution

Quantum Reverse Shannon Theorem for a Quantum Instrument

We have a reverse Shannon theorem for a quantum channel

We have a reverse Shannon theorem for a POVM

What about for a quantum instrument with classical and quantum outputs?

Protocol is to perform measurement compression followed by FQRS: $I(X;R)[c \to c] + H(X|R)[cc] + \frac{1}{2}I(B';R|X)[q \to q] + \frac{1}{2}I(B';E|X)[qq]$ $\geq \langle U_{\mathcal{N}}^{A \to XX_EB'E} : \rho^A \rangle.$

$$\begin{split} \text{Reverse Shannon theorem when QSI is available:} \\ \left< \rho^{AB} \right> + I\left(X; R | B\right) \left[c \to c \right] + H\left(X | RB\right) \left[cc \right] + \frac{1}{2} I\left(B'; R | BX\right) \left[q \to q \right] \\ + \frac{1}{2} \left(I\left(B'; E | X\right) - I\left(B'; B | X\right) \right) \left[qq \right] \geq \left< U_{\mathcal{N}}^{A \to XX_EB'E} : \rho^{AB} \right> \end{split}$$

Local Purity Distillation

Paradigm: Alice and Bob share a state Their goal is to distill local pure states using classical communication and local unitaries

By using MC-QSI, we have the following improvement to Krovi-Devetak 0705.4089

Theorem 1 The 1-way distillable local purity of the state ρ^{AB} is given by $\kappa_{\rightarrow} = \kappa_{\rightarrow}^*$, where

$$\kappa_{\rightarrow}^{*}\left(\rho^{AB},R\right) = \kappa\left(\rho^{A}\right) + \kappa\left(\rho^{B}\right) + P_{\rightarrow}\left(\rho^{AB},R\right).$$

In the above, we have the definitions

$$\kappa (\omega^{C}) \equiv \log d_{C} \quad \text{Lower classical comm. cost}$$
$$P_{\rightarrow} (\rho^{AB}, R) \equiv \lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{k} P^{(1)} \left(\left(\rho^{AB} \right)^{\otimes k}, kR \right)$$

and

$$P^{(1)}\left(\rho^{AB}, R\right) \equiv \max_{\Lambda} \left\{ I\left(Y; B\right)_{\sigma} : I\left(Y; E | B\right) \leq R \right\},\$$
$$\sigma^{YBE} \equiv \left(\mathcal{M}_{\Lambda} \otimes I^{BE}\right)\left(\psi^{ABE}\right),$$

where ψ^{ABE} is a purification of ρ^{AB} , \mathcal{M}_{Λ} is a measurement map corresponding to the POVM Λ , and the maximization is over all POVMs mapping Alice's system A to a classical system Y.

Conclusion and Current Work

Measurement compression gives a powerful **operational way** for understanding quantum measurement

We have extended Winter's original protocol in two ways:

1) Nonfeedback measurement compression 2) Measurement compression with QSI

In progress:

Figuring out nonfeedback measurement compression w/ QSI

Good open question:

Prove measurement compression theorem so that protocol does not depend on structure of input state