Antidistinguishability Conjecture

Vincent Russo

$$|\psi_?\rangle$$

Antidistinguishability game

- Fix a set of quantum states.
- Someone hands you a state from the set at random.
- Determine which state you were ***not*** given.

$$\{|\psi_1\rangle, \dots, |\psi_n\rangle\}$$



Antidistinguishability game: Correct guess



Antidistinguishability game: Incorrect guess



Antidistinguishable

$$\{|\psi_1\rangle, \ldots, |\psi_n\rangle\}$$

The set of states are **antidistinguishable** if the player can play this game perfectly.



Antidistinguishable

More formally, a set of pure quantum states

$$\{|\psi_1\rangle, \ldots, |\psi_n\rangle\} \subset \mathbb{C}^d$$

are **antidistinguishable** if there exists a POVM $\{M_1, \ldots, M_n\}$

$$\langle \psi_i | M_i | \psi_i \rangle = 0$$

for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$

Antidistinguishability applications

- Used as key part in proof of PBR theorem[1]; a result that has significance to the foundations of quantum mechanics, and more specifically, significance to how one may interpret the reality of the quantum state.

- Has been studied under the guise of *unambiguous quantum state exclusion*[3].

- Possible to determine whether a collection of quantum states are antidistinguishable or not based on the optimal value of a semidefinite program (SDP).

[1]Matthew F Pusey, Jonathan Barrett, and Terry Rudolph. On the reality of the quantum state. Nature Physics, 8(6):475–478, 2012.
[2]Bandyopadhyay, Somshubhro, et al., Conclusive exclusion of quantum states, Physical Review A 89.2 (2014): 022336.

Antidistinguishability conjecture[1]

A collection of pure quantum states

$$\{|\psi_1\rangle, \ldots, |\psi_d\rangle\} \subset \mathbb{C}^d$$

are **antidistinguishable** if

$$|\langle\psi_i|\psi_j\rangle| \leq (d-2)/(d-1)$$

for all $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$

[1]Vojtěch Havlíček, Jonathan Barrett, Simple communication complexity separation from quantum state antidistinguishability, Physical Review Research 2.1 (2020): 013326.

What does a validation of the conjecture imply?

If true, there exists a communication task that[1]:

- Can be solved with $\log d$ qubits

- Requires $\Omega(d \log d)$ classical bits

Would imply an **exponential separation** between classical and quantum communication complexity.

[1]Vojtěch Havlíček, Jonathan Barrett, Simple communication complexity separation from quantum state antidistinguishability, Physical Review Research 2.1 (2020): 013326.

Can we invalidate this conjecture?

- Find a collection of states that are **not** antidistinguishable but **do** satisfy the conjectured inequality.

- Need some way of determining whether an arbitrary collection of states are antidistinguishable.
    - Turns out this can be framed as a specific optimization problem.

- For $d=2$ and $d=3$, the conjecture is known to hold[1].

[1]Caves, Carlton M., Christopher A. Fuchs, and Rüdiger Schack, Conditions for compatibility of quantum-state assignments, Physical Review A 66.6 (2002): 062111.

Semidefinite programming

Primal problem		Dual problem	
maximize:	$\langle A, X \rangle$	minimize:	$\langle B, Y \rangle$
subject to:	$\Phi(X) = B,$	subject to:	$\Phi^*(Y) \geq A,$
	$X \in \mathrm{Pos}(\mathcal{X}).$		$Y \in \mathrm{Herm}(\mathcal{Y}).$

- Generalization of linear programming.
- Powerful tool with many applications in quantum information.
- SDPs are efficiently solvable (polynomial time).
- Software packages for solving SDPs exist (cvxpy, mosek, etc.).

Semidefinite program for antidistinguishability

Whether a collection of quantum states are **antidistinguishable** can be framed as the optimal value of a **semidefinite program**[1].

$$\min \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{Tr}(N_i \rho_i) : \sum_{i=1}^{n} N_k = \mathbb{I}, N_1, \ldots, N_n \succeq 0 \right\}$$

$$\max \left\{ \mathrm{Tr}(Y) : Y \preceq \rho_i, \ \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \right\}$$

Value of SDP is **zero** iff states are **antidistinguishable**.

[1]Bandyopadhyay, Somshubhro, et al., Conclusive exclusion of quantum states, Physical Review A 89.2 (2014): 022336.

Numerical SDP solvers

- We can numerically encode and solve the antidistinguishability SDP.

- Python code that makes use of the Picos package[1] to invoke the CVXOPT solver[2].

[1]Sagnol and Stahlberg. Picos, a Python interface to conic optimization solvers. In Proceedings of the in 21st International Symposium on Mathematical Programming, 2012.
[2]Lieven Vandenberghe. The CVXOPT linear and quadratic cone program solvers. Online: http://cvxopt. org/documentation/coneprog. pdf, 2010.

Counterexample strategy

1. Generate collection of “d” random pure states of dimension “d”.

Counterexample strategy

1. Generate collection of “d” random pure states of dimension “d”.

2. Check whether the states are antidistinguishable (use SDP).

Counterexample strategy

1. Generate collection of “d” random pure states of dimension “d”.

2. Check whether the states are antidistinguishable (use SDP).

3. If the states are **not** antidistinguishable, check the conjecture:
    a. If the inequality is satisfied it implies a violation

Counterexample strategy

1. Generate collection of “d” random pure states of dimension “d”.

2. Check whether the states are antidistinguishable (use SDP).

3. If the states are **<u>not</u>** antidistinguishable, check the conjecture:
   a. If the inequality is satisfied it implies a violation.

4. Repeat! Many times for d > 3.

Live Demo

https://github.com/vprusso/antidist

Track-and-run randomly generated tests



Check if any states violate the conjecture



Counterexample for d = 4

Found example of 4 states that violate conjecture via random search.

$$|\psi_1\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} 0.50127198 - 0.037607j \\ -0.00698152 - 0.590973j \\ 0.08186514 - 0.4497548j \\ -0.01299883 + 0.43458491j \end{bmatrix}^{\mathsf{T}}, \quad |\psi_3\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} 0.31360906 + 0.46339313j \\ -0.0465825 - 0.47825017j \\ -0.10470394 - 0.11776404j \\ 0.60231515 + 0.26154959j \end{bmatrix}^{\mathsf{T}},$$

$$|\psi_2\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} -0.07115345 - 0.27080326j \\ 0.82047712 + 0.26320823j \\ 0.22105089 - 0.2091996j \\ -0.23575591 - 0.1758769j \end{bmatrix}^{\mathsf{T}}, \quad |\psi_4\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} -0.53532122 - 0.03654632j \\ 0.40955941 - 0.15150576j \\ 0.05741386 + 0.23873985j \\ -0.4737113 - 0.48652564j \end{bmatrix}^{\mathsf{T}}.$$

Other collection of 4-dimensional states were also found.

Antidistinguishability conjecture is false (d=4)

The ensemble **satisfies** the conjectured bound:

$$\max(|\langle\psi_i|\psi_j\rangle|) \approx 0.64514234... < \frac{2}{3}$$

However, the SDP tells us that these states are **not** antidistinguishable.

$$\mathrm{Tr}(Y) \approx 0.00039382039 > 0.$$

[1]Recall conjecture inequality: $|\langle\psi_i|\psi_j\rangle| \leq (d-2)/(d-1)$

Conclusion

- Antidistinguishability conjecture is false for d = 4.
- Generalize this result for all d >= 4?
- More sophisticated methods to randomly generate non-antidistinguishable sets of states?
- Further study on properties of antidistinguishable states?
- Can anything be salvaged from a communication complexity standpoint?

Thanks!

References:
[1]Matthew F Pusey, Jonathan Barrett, and Terry Rudolph. On the reality of the quantum state. Nature Physics, 8(6):475–478, 2012.
[2]Sagnol and Stahlberg. Picos, a Python interface to conic optimization solvers. In Proceedings of the in 21st International Symposium on Mathematical Programming, 2012.
[3]Lieven Vandenberghe. The CVXOPT linear and quadratic cone program solvers. Online: http://cvxopt. org/documentation/coneprog. pdf, 2010.
[4]Vojtěch Havlíček, Jonathan Barrett, Simple communication complexity separation from quantum state antidistinguishability, Physical Review Research 2.1 (2020): 013326.
[5]Caves, Carlton M., Christopher A. Fuchs, and Rüdiger Schack, Conditions for compatibility of quantum-state assignments, Physical Review A 66.6 (2002): 062111.
[6]Bandyopadhyay, Somshubhro, et al., Conclusive exclusion of quantum states, Physical Review A 89.2 (2014): 022336.