1 The Language of Quantum Information Theory

1.1 Density Operators

1.1.1 Postulates of Quantum Mechanics

We begin by stating the a common axiomatization of Quantum Mechanics (QM) based on Hilbert Spaces following [1], we choose it for mathematical simplicity; for alternatives see e.g. [5].

1. To each physical system $\mathcal{S}$ there corresponds a separable Hilbert Space $\mathcal{H}$ such that states of the system are described by positive and unit trace operators on it. The Hilbert Space of a composite system made up of $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}'$ is given by the tensor product of the Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}'$.

2. To each dynamical variable there corresponds a self-adjoint operator on $\mathcal{H}$, called an observable, whose possible values are given by its eigenvalues.

3. Given a system in state ρ and some observable A of it, the probability of measuring A and obtaining the result λ is given by $\text{Tr}[\rho P_\lambda]$ where P_λ is the eigen-projector into the subspace associated with λ. Furthermore the expectation value is $\text{Tr}[\rho A]$.

4. After a measurement with result λ the state of the system becomes $\frac{P_\lambda \rho P_\lambda}{\text{Tr}[P_\lambda \rho P_\lambda]}$.

5. The time evolution of the system in a time interval $(0, t)$ in which no measurement is done is given by some unitary operator U_t according to $\rho_t = U_t \rho U_t^\dagger$ where ρ is the state of the system at time $t = 0$.

Operators satisfying the properties required for a state are called ***Density Operators*** and in contrast to frameworks whose treatment of quantum states is merely as rays in $\mathcal{H}$, they describe statistical mixtures so imperfect state preparation can be handled. To see this consider the spectral resolution of some density operator:

$$\rho = \sum_n p_n \, |\psi_n\rangle\langle\psi_n| \qquad (1.1)$$

by definition we have $p_n \geq 0, \sum_n p_n = 1$ any density operator can be seen as a convex sum of rays in $\mathcal{H}$ (provided we identify each one with its associated projector $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$) and from it an interpretation of ρ as an statistical mixture of rays is suggested: given a preparation process, there is a probability p_n for the system to be in the state $|\psi_n\rangle\langle\psi_n|$ after it, for this reason states of the form $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ are called **Pure** while those who are not we refer to as **Mixed**. This **Ensemble Interpretation** has serious conceptual challenges when one tries to use it outside a fixed preparation procedure due to the non-uniqueness of the decomposition into pure states [4], but is good enough for the porposes of the present work, for a comprehensive discussion of this topic the reader is refered to [6].

1.1.2 Time Evolution

Assuming the evolution to be differentiable in time, we have that there exists a self-adjoint operator H such that $U_t = \exp(-itH)$ [1], called the **Hamiltonian** of the systems and which acts as the generator of the dynamics. It is straightforward now to construct a differential equation for ρ_t by taking the derivative of it:

$$\rho_t = e^{-itH} \rho_t e^{itH} \tag{1.2}$$

$$\partial_t \rho_t = -iH\rho_t + \rho_t iH \tag{1.3}$$

$$\partial_t \rho_t = -i[H, \rho_t]. \tag{1.4}$$

Equation (1.4) is called the Liouville-Von Neumann equation, it generalizes the time-dependent Schrödinger equation to mixed states and can be interpreted as the quantum analog of the Liouville equation in classical mechanics (with the Poisson braket) through the quantization rule $\{\bullet, \bullet\} \to -i[\bullet, \bullet]$. As will be seen in later chapters, this type of evolution is characteristic of closed quantum systems.

1.1.3 Purity

Say we got a particular state production processes whose product ρ we characterize via say tomography [4], it becomes immedeatley important to quantify to which extent we can regard the product as being composed of only one pure states (hopefully the one we wanted to prepare) i.e. we want to define the purity of the state, with this motivation one look for a map $\mathcal{E}$ from the space of density operators to the reals such that:

- $\mathcal{E}(\rho)$ is maximal if and only if ρ is pure.

- it is conserved under unitary evolution.

---

[1]Unless otherwise stated, from here on we assume $\hbar = 1$

The first one makes this map a figure of merit one can try to maximize and the second one is imposed to assure that it doesn't changes in a closed system unless a measurement is made, as allowing the free evolution of the system should not improve the knowledge of the experimenter about the system. The standard choiche (altough not the only one) is the **Purity**, defined as [4, 1]:

Definition 1 *The purity γ of a state ρ is:*

$$\gamma = \text{Tr}[\rho^2]. \tag{1.5}$$

The requirements are quickly checked:

$$\text{Tr}[\rho_t^2] = \text{Tr}[(U_t\rho_0 U_t^\dagger)(U_t\rho_0 U_t^\dagger)] = \text{Tr}[\rho_0^2] \tag{1.6}$$

$$\text{Tr}[\rho^2] = \sum_n p_n^2 \leq 1 \tag{1.7}$$

in the second line the inequality is saturated if and only if $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$.

1.1.4 Entanglement

One of the key differences between the structure of the space state of classical and quantum systems is the existance of non-separable states when considering multipartite systems [5, 3, 4] which allows the latter to have **Non-classical Correlations**. Here we define entanglement for mixed states following [3]:

Definition 2 *Given a state ρ in a system composed of two subsystems A and B with total Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B\}$, we say it is an **entangled state** if there doesn't exists a set states $\{\rho_j \otimes \sigma_k\}_{jk}$ and of coefficients $\{p_{jk}\}_{jk}, \sum_{jk} p_{jk} = 1,\ p_{jk} \geq 0$ such that:*

$$\rho = \sum_{jk} p_{jk}\rho_j \otimes \sigma_k \tag{1.8}$$

*if it does exists, the state is called **separable**.*

For the case of pure state this definition coincides with the usually given one [4]: say $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is pure and separable, then:

$$\text{Tr}[\rho^2] = \sum_{jklm} p_{jk}p_{lm}\text{Tr}[\rho_j\rho_l]\text{Tr}[\sigma_k\sigma_m] \tag{1.9}$$

and by the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality with the Frobenious inner product

$$\text{Tr}[\rho^2] \leq \sum_{jklm} p_{jk}p_{lm}\text{Tr}[\rho_j^2]\text{Tr}[\rho_l^2]\text{Tr}[\sigma_k^2]\text{Tr}[\sigma_m^2] \leq 1 \tag{1.10}$$

the first inequality from right to left saturates if and only if all the ρ_j and σ_k are pure, and the first one if and only if all the ρ_j and σ_k are equal between themselves i.e. $p_{jl} = \delta_{0l}\delta_{0j}$. Hence there are pure states in $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$ such that:

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| = |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha| \otimes |\beta\rangle\langle\beta| . \tag{1.11}$$

For a classical system all states are separable [3, 2] thanks to the representation via δ functions of the probability densities.

Bibliography

[1] Leslie E. Ballentine. *Quantum Mechanics: A Modern Development (2nd Edition)*. World Scientific Publishing Company, Aug. 28, 2014. 739 pp.

[2] Heinz-Peter Breuer and Francesco Petruccione. *The theory of open quantum systems*. Oxford University Press, USA, 2002.

[3] Lajos Diosi. *A Short Course in Quantum Information Theory: An Approach From Theoretical Physics*. Springer, June 2, 2011. 167 pp.

[4] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information: 10th Anniversary Edition*. 2010. 702 pp.

[5] Andrés F. Reyes-Lega. "Some aspects of operator algebras in quantum physics". In: *Geometric, Algebraic and Topological Methods for Quantum Field Theory*. WORLD SCIENTIFIC, Sept. 20, 2015, pp. 1–74.

[6] Maximilian A. Schlosshauer. *Decoherence: and the Quantum-To-Classical Transition*. Springer Science & Business Media, July 28, 2007. 428 pp.