## 2.111/8.370/18.435 Problem Set 4 Solutions

Due: October 13, 2015

- 1. Show that if  $(\langle \phi | U^{\dagger})(U | \psi \rangle) = \langle \phi | \psi \rangle$  for all  $|\phi \rangle$  and  $|\psi \rangle$ , then  $U^{\dagger}U = I$ , U is unitary. Given  $(\langle \phi | U^{\dagger})(U | \psi \rangle) = \langle \phi | \psi \rangle$  for all  $|\phi \rangle$  and  $|\psi \rangle$ : Let  $A = U^{\dagger}U I$ , then  $\forall |\phi \rangle, |\psi \rangle$ :  $\langle \phi | A | \psi \rangle = 0$ . Let  $\{|i\rangle\}$  be an orthonormal basis of the Hilbert space of  $|\phi \rangle, |\psi \rangle$ . Then  $\sum_i |i\rangle \langle i|A|\psi \rangle = A|\psi \rangle = 0$ . That is,  $\ker(A)$  is the whole space: A = 0. Thus,  $U^{\dagger}U = I$ .
- 2. Show that no unitary can perform the following:  $U_{ABC}|\psi\rangle_A|0\rangle_B|0\rangle_C = |\psi\rangle_A|\psi\rangle_B|\mathrm{junk}\rangle_C$  (|junk\rangle can be a function of  $|\psi\rangle$ ).

$$\begin{split} \langle \phi | \psi \rangle &= \langle \phi | \langle 0 | \langle 0 | | \psi \rangle | 0 \rangle | 0 \rangle \\ &= \langle \phi | \langle 0 | \langle 0 | U^{\dagger} U | \psi \rangle | 0 \rangle | 0 \rangle \\ &= \langle \phi | \langle \phi | \langle \text{junk}(\phi) | | \psi \rangle | \psi \rangle | \text{junk}(\psi) \rangle \\ &= \langle \phi | \psi \rangle^{2} \langle \text{junk}(\phi) | \text{junk}(\psi) \rangle. \end{split}$$

Take the norm of both sides:  $|\langle \phi | \psi \rangle| = |\langle \phi | \psi \rangle|^2 |\langle \text{junk}(\phi)| \text{junk}(\psi) \rangle| \Rightarrow |\langle \phi | \psi \rangle| |\langle \text{junk}(\phi)| \text{junk}(\psi) \rangle| = 1$ , which only holds iff  $\forall |\phi\rangle, |\psi\rangle : |\langle \phi | \psi\rangle| = |\langle \text{junk}(\phi)| \text{junk}(\psi) \rangle| = 1$ : not true. Thus, such U doesn't exist.

*Remarks*: This result indicates that even if we allow arbitrary quantum operations instead of just unitaries, the no-cloning theorem still holds. Furthermore, if we allow mixed states as the input, the theorem can also be easily proven by purification.

3. What happens for a CNOT with  $|\otimes\rangle, |\odot\rangle$  inputs?

Recall that  $|\otimes\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1,i)^T = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + i|1\rangle), \ |\odot\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1,-i)^T = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - i|1\rangle).$  Applying regular CNOT on bipartite product states of  $|\otimes\rangle, |\odot\rangle$ :

$$\begin{aligned} &\operatorname{CNOT}|\otimes\rangle|\otimes\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{CNOT}(|00\rangle + i|01\rangle + i|10\rangle - |11\rangle) = \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle + i|01\rangle - |10\rangle + i|11\rangle), \\ &\operatorname{CNOT}|\otimes\rangle|\odot\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{CNOT}(|00\rangle - i|01\rangle + i|10\rangle + |11\rangle) = \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle - i|01\rangle + |10\rangle + i|11\rangle), \\ &\operatorname{CNOT}|\odot\rangle|\otimes\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{CNOT}(|00\rangle + i|01\rangle - i|10\rangle + |11\rangle) = \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle + i|01\rangle + |10\rangle - i|11\rangle), \\ &\operatorname{CNOT}|\odot\rangle|\odot\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{CNOT}(|00\rangle - i|01\rangle - i|10\rangle - |11\rangle) = \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle - i|01\rangle - |10\rangle - i|11\rangle). \end{aligned}$$

All of them are not separable (cannot be factorized into  $\cdot \otimes \cdot$ ), i.e., entangled.