On the existence of physical transformations between sets of quantum states

Anthony Chefles[§], Richard Jozsa[†] and Andreas Winter[†]

[§] *Department of Physical Sciences, University of Hertfordshire,*
Hatfield AL10 9AB, Herts, U.K.

[†] *Department of Computer Science, University of Bristol,*
Merchant Venturers Building, Bristol BS8 1UB U.K.

Abstract

Let $A = \{\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_n\}$ be a given set of quantum states. We consider the problem of finding necessary and sufficient conditions on another set $B = \{\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n\}$ that guarantee the existence of a physical transformation taking ρ_i to σ_i for all i. Uhlmann has given an elegant such condition when both sets comprise pure states. We give a simple proof of this condition and develop some consequences. Then we consider multi-probabilistic transformations between sets of pure states which leads to conditions for the problem of transformability between A and B when one set is pure and the other is arbitrary.

1 Introduction

Quantum information theory is often concerned with the manipulation of *families* of quantum states rather than individual states in isolation. For example a discrete quantum source is defined by a (finite) family of signal states together with prior probabilities. In this paper we will address the following fundamental question of transformability in the context of families of states. Let $\{\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_n\}$ be a given (finite) set of quantum states. What are necessary and sufficient conditions on another set $\{\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n\}$ that guarantee the existence of a physical transformation $\mathcal{T}$ satisfying $\mathcal{T}(\rho_i) = \sigma_i$ for all i? We will write $\{\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_n\} \Rightarrow \{\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n\}$ to denote the statement that such a physical transformation exists. We will call ρ_i the source states and σ_i the target states.

By a physical transformation $\mathcal{T}$ we mean a linear completely positive trace preserving map on density operators. In standard quantum formalism this is the most general change that a state can undergo by any physical process. Let ρ^X be any (finite-dimensional) density operator of a system X. We have two well known mathematical expressions for physical transformations.
(a) Kraus operator sum form:

$$\mathcal{T}(\rho^X) = \sum_\mu A_\mu \rho^X A_\mu^\dagger$$

where $\{A_\mu\}$ is any set of operators satisfying $\sum_\mu A_\mu^\dagger A_\mu = I$ (and † denotes the adjoint).
(b) Stinespring unitary dilation form: introduce an auxiliary (ancilla) system E in standard state $|0\rangle\langle 0|$. Then

$$\mathcal{T}(\rho^X) = \mathrm{tr}_E\, U^{XE}(\rho^X \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|^E) U^{XE\dagger}$$

where U_{XE} is a unitary operation on the joint system XE.

$F(\rho, \omega)$ will denote the fidelity between states ρ and σ, defined by

$$F(\rho, \omega) = \mathrm{tr}\sqrt{\sqrt{\omega}\rho\sqrt{\omega}}.$$

We also have [1, 2]

$$F(\rho, \omega) = \max |\langle \xi_\rho | \xi_\omega \rangle| \tag{1}$$

where the maximum is taken over all choices of purifications $|\xi_\rho\rangle$ of ρ and $|\xi_\omega\rangle$ of ω.

We begin by reviewing some known results about the transformability problem. This question (and its restriction to some special cases such as commutative states) has been considered in the work of Alberti and Uhlmann [4, 5] since the early 1980s. For $n=1$ the problem is trivial ($\rho \Rightarrow \sigma$ for any ρ and σ) but already for $n=2$ (pairs of states) the general problem is difficult and mostly unsolved. The significance of fidelity for the transformability problem is summarised in lemma 1. For pairs of states this question was studied in [6].

Lemma 1 *(a) Suppose that* $\{\rho_1,\ldots,\rho_n\} \Rightarrow \{\sigma_1,\ldots,\sigma_n\}$. *Then* $F(\sigma_i,\sigma_j) \geq F(\rho_i,\rho_j)$ *for all* $1 \leq i,j \leq n$.
(b) Suppose that ρ_1 *and* ρ_2 *are* pure *states. Then* $\{\rho_1,\rho_2\} \Rightarrow \{\sigma_1,\sigma_2\}$ *iff* $F(\sigma_1,\sigma_2) \geq F(\rho_1,\rho_2)$.

We omit the proof (which may be readily seen from the Stinespring form of a physical transformation and eq. (1)).

Thus the fidelity conditions $F(\sigma_i,\sigma_j) \geq F(\rho_i,\rho_j)$ are always necessary. They are also sufficient in the case of pairs so long as the source states are also pure (but fail to be sufficient for general source pairs even if the targets are pure). For triples of states these conditions also fail to be sufficient, even if all source as well as all target states are pure. (Counterexamples may be found in [3]).

In 1980 Alberti and Uhlmann [5] found necessary and sufficient conditions for the transformability of general *pairs* of *qubit* states. Let $||A||_1 = \mathrm{tr}\sqrt{AA^\dagger}$ denote the trace norm of an operator A. If A is hermitian then $||A||_1 = \sum |\lambda_i|$ where λ_i are the eigenvalues of A.

Theorem 1 *[5] Suppose that* $\rho_1,\rho_2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2$ *are all qubit states. Then* $\{\rho_1,\rho_2\} \Rightarrow \{\sigma_1,\sigma_2\}$ *iff*

$$||\sigma_1 - t\sigma_2||_1 \leq ||\rho_1 - t\rho_2||_1 \quad \textit{for all } t \in \mathbb{R}^+. \tag{2}$$

It may be shown [7] that eq. (2) is necessary in any dimension but fails to be sufficient already in dimension 3. However if $\{\rho_1,\rho_2\}$ and $\{\sigma_1,\sigma_2\}$ are both commuting pairs of density operators then eq. (2) is necessary and sufficient in any dimension. Some applications of theorem 1 have been given in [8].

By a simple rescaling, eq. (2) may be written equivalently as

$$||p_1\sigma_1 - p_2\sigma_2||_1 \leq ||p_1\rho_1 - p_2\rho_2||_1 \quad \text{for all probability distributions } \{p_1,p_2\}.$$

Then it is interesting to recall Helstrom's minimum error probability $P_E^{\min}$ [9] for distinguishing a pair of quantum states τ_1,τ_2:

$$P_E^{\min}(\tau_1,\tau_2) = \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - ||p_1\tau_1 - p_2\tau_2||_1\right)$$

Hence theorem 1 may be interpreted as saying that a physical transformation exists for pairs of qubit states iff the target states are no more distinguishable than the source states by minimum error probability discrimination, for any prior probabilities.

In [10] the transformability problem for pairs was further studied leading to an interesting set of necessary and sufficient conditions, but involving a quantification over sets of comparable complexity to the set of physical transformations itself.

In [11] Uhlmann considered the transformability problem for sets of pure states, giving an elegant necessary and sufficient condition, which was later independently rediscovered by Chefles [12].

In the present paper we begin by considering pure state transformations, giving a simple proof of Uhlmann's condition (theorem 2) that improves on the argument in [12], and we develop some consequences (corollaries 1,2,3). Then we go on to consider so-called *multi-probabilistic* transformations between sets of pure states, generalising a notion introduced in [13]. We will see that our characterisation of such transformations (theorem 3) provides a set of necessary and sufficient conditions for the more general problem of transformability between sets of states $\{\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_n\}$ and $\{\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n\}$, where just one set is pure and the other is arbitrary (theorem 4).

2 Sets of pure states

For any two matrices C and D of the same size, we introduce the Hadamard product $C \circ D$ defined by entry-wise product $[C \circ D]_{ij} = [C]_{ij}[D]_{ij}$ with no summing. We will also write $M \geq 0$ to denote the statement that a matrix M is positive semidefinite.

Let $S_A = \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n\}$ be a set of pure states $\alpha_i = |a_i\rangle\langle a_i|$. Given α_i the ket $|a_i\rangle$ is fixed only up to a phase freedom. For any choice $K_A = \{|a_1\rangle, \ldots, |a_n\rangle\}$ of such kets the Gram matrix G_A is given by $[G_A]_{ij} = \langle a_i|a_j\rangle$. Hence G_A is not determined uniquely by S_A but we have the following.

Lemma 2 *Let G_A be any Gram matrix for S_A. Then G'_A is a Gram matrix for S_A iff $G'_A = G_A \circ K$ where $[K]_{ij} = e^{i(\theta_i - \theta_j)}$ for some $\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_n \in \mathbb{R}$ (so $K \geq 0$ too).*

Proof Easy to check. □

Thus we associate a whole family of Gram matrices (related as in lemma 2) to a set S_A of pure physical states, but we could also attempt to specify a canonical unique choice. For example suppose that $\alpha_i\alpha_j \neq 0$ for all i, j i.e. the states are pairwise non-orthogonal. Let $|a_1\rangle$ be any choice of ket for α_1 and then choose $|a_i\rangle$ for $i > 1$ such that $\langle a_1|a_i\rangle$ is real positive, which fixes these kets uniquely. The resulting Gram matrix $G_{ij} = \langle a_i|a_j\rangle$ is then independent of the choice of $|a_1\rangle$. Indeed directly in terms of the states α_i we can write

$$G_{ij} = r_{ij}e^{i\theta_{ij}} \text{ where } r_{ij}^2 = \operatorname{tr}\alpha_i\alpha_j \text{ and } \theta_{ij} = \text{phase of } \operatorname{tr}\alpha_1\alpha_i\alpha_j \tag{3}$$

(noting that the phase of $\operatorname{tr}\alpha_1\alpha_i\alpha_j$ equals the phase of $\langle a_i|a_j\rangle$ if $\langle a_1|a_i\rangle$ and $\langle a_1|a_j\rangle$ are real positive). This construction, as written, fails to specify G uniquely if $\alpha_1\alpha_i = 0$ for some i and then presumably some more complicated prescription is required. However in the following, we will not work with such canonical choices.

We have the following three basic properties of Gram matrices.

Property 1 *If $S_{AX} = \{\alpha_i \otimes \xi_i\}$ is a set of pure product states and G_A, G_X are Gram matrices for $\{\alpha_i\}$ and $\{\xi_i\}$ respectively then $G_{AX} = G_A \circ G_X$ (where the kets for S_{AX} are taken as the products of the chosen kets for G_A and G_X).*

Proof Easy to check. □

Property 2 *A matrix M arises as a Gram matrix for some set of kets $\{|a_i\rangle\}$ iff (i) $M_{ii} = 1$ for all i, and (ii) $M \geq 0$.*

Proof The forward implication is immediate. Conversely if $M \geq 0$ then we can write $M = C^\dagger C$. Then the $|a_i\rangle$'s are given in components by the columns of C. □

Property 3 *Let $S_A = \{\alpha_i\}$ and $S_B = \{\beta_i\}$ be two sets of pure states and let G_A and G_B be any corresponding choices of Gram matrices. Then S_A and S_B are unitarily equivalent iff $G_A = K \circ G_B$ where $[K]_{ij} = e^{i(\theta_i - \theta_j)}$ for some $\theta_i \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof By lemma 2 we can choose equal Gram matrices for S_A and S_B iff $G_A = K \circ G_B$ with $[K]_{ij} = e^{i(\theta_i - \theta_j)}$ for some $\theta_i \in \mathbb{R}$. The result then follows immediately from lemma 1 of [3], stating that two sets of kets are unitarily equivalent iff they have equal Gram matrices. □

Using these properties, we get the following result.

Theorem 2 *[11, 12] Let $\{\alpha_i\}$ and $\{\beta_i\}$ be two sets of pure states. Let G_A and G_B be any corresponding choices of Gram matrices. Then $\{\alpha_i\} \Rightarrow \{\beta_i\}$ iff $G_A = M \circ G_B$ for some $M \geq 0$ (and then we must also have M satisfying (i) of property 2).*

Proof There is a physical transformation mapping α_i to β_i
iff there is a unitary map $\alpha_i \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| \to \beta_i \otimes \xi_i$ for some pure states ξ_i (by Stinespring dilation)
iff $\{\alpha_i\}$ and $\{\beta_i \otimes \xi_i\}$ are unitarily equivalent for some choice of pure states ξ_i
iff $G_A = K \circ G_X \circ G_B$ for some $G_X \geq 0$ and $[K]_{ij} = e^{i(\theta_i - \theta_j)}$ for some $\theta_i \in \mathbb{R}$ (by properties 1,3)
iff $G_A = M \circ G_B$ for some $M \geq 0$ (by property 2).
In the last step we have also used the fact that the Hadamard product of positive semi-definite matrices is positive semi-definite. □

Corollary 1 *Let $\{\alpha_i\}$ and $\{\beta_i\}$ be sets of pure states on $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$ respectively.*
(a) If $\{\alpha_i\} \Rightarrow \{\beta_i\}$ and $\{\beta_i\} \Rightarrow \{\alpha_i\}$ then $\{\alpha_i\}$ and $\{\beta_i\}$ are unitarily equivalent (i.e. there is a unitary operation U on $\mathcal{H}_A \oplus \mathcal{H}_B$ with $U\alpha_i U^\dagger = \beta_i$ for each i).
(b) Let π be any permutation of the set of indices i. If $\{\alpha_i\} \Rightarrow \{\beta_i\}$ and $\{\beta_i\} \Rightarrow \{\alpha_{\pi(i)}\}$ then $\{\alpha_i\}$ and $\{\beta_i\}$ are unitarily equivalent.

Proof (a) By theorem 2 we can write

$$G_A = M^{(1)} \circ G_B \text{ and } G_B = M^{(2)} \circ G_A. \tag{4}$$

Let $K_A = \{|a_i\rangle\}$ and $K_B = \{|b_i\rangle\}$ be sets of kets with Gram matrices G_A and G_B respectively. By eq. (4), $[G_A]_{ij} = 0$ iff $[G_B]_{ij} = 0$. Hence if the kets of K_A lie in a family of orthogonal subspaces then the corresponding kets of K_B must similarly fall into subsets that are mutually orthogonal, and the corresponding subsets of K_A and K_B must be mapped to eachother. So without loss of generality we may assume that K_A cannot be orthogonally decomposed and in particular, for each $|a_k\rangle$ there is a sequence from $|a_1\rangle$ to $|a_k\rangle$:

$$|a_1\rangle = |a_{l_0}\rangle, |a_{l_1}\rangle, \ldots, |a_{l_m}\rangle = |a_k\rangle \tag{5}$$

such that each successive pair $|a_{l_i}\rangle$ and $|a_{l_{i+1}}\rangle$ is non-orthogonal. Now $G_A = M^{(1)} \circ M^{(2)} \circ G_A$ so if $[G_A]_{ij} = \langle a_i | a_j \rangle \neq 0$ then

$$[M^{(1)}]_{ij} = \frac{1}{[M^{(2)}]_{ij}}. \tag{6}$$

But $M^{(1)}$ is the Gram matrix G_X for some set $\{|\xi_i\rangle\}$ and similarly for $M^{(2)}$. Hence $|[M^{(k)}]_{ij}| \leq 1$ and then eq. (6) gives $|[M^{(1)}]_{ij}| = 1$ if $\langle a_i | a_j \rangle \neq 0$. In that case $|\xi_j\rangle = e^{i\theta_{ij}} |\xi_i\rangle$. Now according to eq. (5) any $|a_k\rangle$ can be connected back to $|a_1\rangle$ by a sequence of $|a_i\rangle$'s such that any two consecutive states are non-orthogonal. Hence the corresponding $|\xi_i\rangle$'s along the sequence differ only by a phase. Thus we get $|\xi_k\rangle = e^{i\theta_k} |\xi_1\rangle$ for all k so $[M^{(1)}]_{ij} = e^{i(\theta_i - \theta_j)}$ and by property 3, $\{\alpha_i\}$ and $\{\beta_i\}$ are unitarily equivalent.
(b) Suppose $\mathcal{T} : \alpha_i \to \beta_i$ and $\mathcal{S} : \beta_i \to \alpha_{\pi(i)}$ are physical transformations. Then $\mathcal{ST} : \alpha_i \to \alpha_{\pi(i)}$ and there is a power k (actually the order of π in the permutation group) such that $(\mathcal{ST})^k : \alpha_i \to \alpha_i$. Writing $(\mathcal{ST})^k$ as $((\mathcal{ST})^{k-1}\mathcal{S})\mathcal{T}$ we see that $((\mathcal{ST})^{k-1}\mathcal{S}) : \beta_i \to \alpha_i$ so by (a), $\{\alpha_i\}$ and $\{\beta_i\}$ are unitarily equivalent. □

The method of proof of theorem 2 also allows us to characterise the space of all possible physical transformations taking $\{\alpha_i\}$ to $\{\beta_i\}$ when $\{\alpha_i\} \Rightarrow \{\beta_i\}$ is true. For example we have the following.

Corollary 2 *Let $\{\alpha_i\}$ and $\{\beta_i\}$ be sets of pure states. Suppose that $\{\alpha_i\} \Rightarrow \{\beta_i\}$ and $\operatorname{tr} \beta_i\beta_j \neq 0$ for all i, j i.e. the pure target states are pairwise non-orthogonal. Then there is a unique physical transformation (for density operators on the joint support of the source states) mapping $\{\alpha_i\}$ to $\{\beta_i\}$.*

Proof Suppose that we have a physical transformation $\mathcal{T} : \alpha_i \to \beta_i$. By the purity of all states involved, the Stinespring unitary dilation must have the form $\alpha_i \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| \to \beta_i \otimes \xi_i$ for some set $X = \{\xi_i\}$ of pure states. Then (with suitable choices of kets) $G_A = G_X \circ G_B$. Since $\operatorname{tr} \beta_i\beta_j \neq 0$ we have $[G_B]_{ij} \neq 0$ for all i, j so G_X is uniquely determined i.e. $\{\xi_i\}$ is fixed up to unitary equivalence and all such sets produce the same physical transformation on the source space. $\Box$

Our ultimate goal would be to characterise transformability $\{\rho_i\} \Rightarrow \{\sigma_i\}$ between general sets of mixed states. The above proof technique (relating the matrix M directly to the Stinespring form of the physical transformation) reveals limitations of our approach for this general context. For example if both sets of mixed states are on a system X then the Stinespring form of the physical transformation is

$$U : \rho_i^X \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|^E \to \xi_i^{XE} \qquad \text{with } \sigma_i = \operatorname{tr}_E \xi_i^{XE}.$$

For pure target states σ_i we must have the product form $\xi_i^{XE} = \sigma_i^X \otimes \omega_i^E$ and we get the Hadamard product structure for the corresponding Gram matrices. However for mixed target states the XE register will generally be entangled and we lose the simple Hadamard product structure. Another, perhaps more fundamental, problem is the lack of a suitable generalisation of the notion of Gram matrix for a general set of *mixed* states $\{\rho_i\}$. For example the matrix constructed from $\operatorname{tr} \rho_i\rho_j$ and $\operatorname{tr} \rho_1\rho_i\rho_j$ in eq. (3) no longer characterises $\{\rho_i\}$ up to unitary equivalence. Hence we need some new kind of construction that also behaves well under partial traces. However if the target set is pure (but the source set is general) we still retain the product structure of the XE register above and the problem of $\{\rho_i\} \Rightarrow \{|b_i\rangle\langle b_i|\}$ can be reduced to the fully pure state case as follows.

Corollary 3 *For any set $\{\rho_i\}$ let $\rho_i = \sum_\nu p_{i\nu}\alpha_{i\nu}$ with $\alpha_{i\nu} = |a_{i\nu}\rangle\langle a_{i\nu}|$ be any pure state decompositions of the states and let $\{\beta_i\}$ be any set of pure states. Then $\{\rho_i\} \Rightarrow \{\beta_i\}$ iff there is a physical transformation $\mathcal{T} : \alpha_{i\nu} \to \beta_i$ i.e. iff $\{\alpha_{i\nu}\} \Rightarrow \{\beta_{i\nu}\}$ where $\beta_{i\nu} = \beta_i$ for all ν.*

Proof Since β_i is pure, any transformation sending ρ_i to β_i must also send every pure state in the range of ρ_i to β_i too, giving the forward implication. The reverse implication is immediate by the linearity of $\mathcal{T}$. $\Box$

In the next section we will introduce a broader class of transformations, multi-probabilistic state transformations, which have implications for the more difficult problem of $\{\rho_i\} \Rightarrow \{\sigma_i\}$ when the source set is pure (and the target set may be mixed).

3 Multi-probabilistic transformations

Consider a family of pure source states, $\{\alpha_i\}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, and m families of corresponding pure target states, $\{\beta_i^j\}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, $j = 1, \ldots, m$, all being states on the same Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ of finite dimension d.

We want to consider here the question whether there is a transformation which, for each i, sends α_i with probability P_i^j to β_i^j, for an admissible probability matrix P_i^j, i.e. a matrix of non–negative entries satisfying $\sum_j P_i^j \leq 1$ for all i. The value $P_i^0 = 1 - \sum_j P_i^j$ is the probability of failure of the process, given the source state labelled i. The transformations we seek should in fact not only perform these transformations with the conditional probabilities P_i^j, but also output the value of

$j \in \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$ as a measurement result. Such transformations are known in the literature as *instruments* [14].

We call such a state map a *multi–probabilistic transformation*, denoted

$$\mathcal{T} : \{\alpha_i\} \xmapsto{P_i^j} \{\beta_i^j\}.$$

Note that even though we introduce this transformation only on some pure states, it is generally a physical transformation on all density operators on $\mathcal{H}$.

As a first observation, note that we can in fact demand $\sum_j P_i^j = 1$ for all i: we simply augment the operation $\mathcal{T}$ by a preparation of some arbitrary pure β^0, if the failure event "0" occurs. This we will assume from now on.

As in section 2 we introduce kets $|a_i\rangle$ and $|b_i^j\rangle$ with $\alpha_i = |a_i\rangle\langle a_i|$, $\beta_i^j = |b_i^j\rangle\langle b_i^j|$ and corresponding Gram matrices G_A and G_{B^j} for the sets $\{\alpha_i\}$ and $\{\beta_i^j\}$.

Theorem 3 *A multi–probabilistic transformation*

$$\mathcal{T} : \{\alpha_i\} \xmapsto{P_i^j} \{\beta_i^j\}$$

exists iff there are positive semidefinite matrices $\Pi^1, \dots, \Pi^m$ *with* $\operatorname{diag} \Pi^j = (P_1^j, \dots, P_n^j)$*, such that*

$$G_A = \sum_j \Pi^j \circ G_{B^j}. \tag{7}$$

Proof For the forward implication, assume that such a $\mathcal{T}$ exists. By augmenting the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ by a suitable ancillary space $\mathcal{E}$ and a measurement output space $\mathcal{J} = \operatorname{span}\{|j\rangle : j = 1, \dots, m\}$, this transformation can be thought of as an isometry

$$U : \mathcal{H} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{J} \otimes \mathcal{E},$$

followed by tracing out $\mathcal{E}$ and measuring $\{|j\rangle : j = 1, \dots, m\}$. To conform to the requirements, the image of $|a_i\rangle$ under U must be of the form

$$U|a_i\rangle = \sum_j \sqrt{P_i^j}\,|b_i^j\rangle \otimes |j\rangle \otimes |\varphi_i^j\rangle.$$

Isometry requires preservation of the inner products, i.e. for all i, k,

$$\langle a_i|a_k\rangle = \sum_j \sqrt{P_i^j P_k^j}\,\langle\varphi_i^j|\varphi_k^j\rangle \cdot \langle b_i^j|b_k^j\rangle, \tag{8}$$

using that the $|j\rangle$ form an orthonormal basis in $\mathcal{J}$. Then $\Pi_{ik}^j = \sqrt{P_i^j P_k^j}\,\langle\varphi_i^j|\varphi_k^j\rangle$ clearly defines semidefinite matrices with the correct diagonal, and satisfying eq. (7).

Conversely, assume eq. (7). Then we can write $\Pi_{ik}^j = \sqrt{P_i^j P_k^j}\,\langle\varphi_i^j|\varphi_k^j\rangle$, with normalised vectors $|\varphi_i^j\rangle$ (because a positive semidefinite matrix is always expressible as a Gram matrix of vectors whose lengths are given by the diagonal - an easy generalisation of property 2 above). Thus clearly eq. (7) is satisfied, which means that that the sets $\{|a_i\rangle\}$ and $\left\{\sum_j \sqrt{P_i^j}\,|b_i^j\rangle \otimes |j\rangle \otimes |\varphi_i^j\rangle\right\}$ are related by an isometry U. This, followed by tracing over $\mathcal{E}$ and measuring $\{|j\rangle : j = 1, \dots, m\}$, is the desired map $\mathcal{T}$. $\Box$

We remark that in case we choose not to demand $\sum_j P_i^j = 1$ but only ≤ 1, the criterion of the above theorem simply becomes

$$G_A \geq \sum_j \Pi^j \circ G_{B^j}, \tag{9}$$

which, for $m = 1$ (i.e., only one set of possible target states) reduces to (a generalisation of) Chefles' probabilistic state transformation theorem in [13].

We demonstrate now how theorem 3 can be applied to the problem of $\{\rho_i\} \Rightarrow \{\sigma_i\}$ when the source states ρ_i are pure.

Theorem 4 *Let $\{\alpha_i\}$ and $\{\sigma_i\}$ be sets of states with α_i pure. Then $\{\alpha_i\} \Rightarrow \{\sigma_i\}$ iff there exist pure state decompositions $\sigma_i = \sum_j P_i^j \beta_i^j$ ($\beta_i^j = |b_i^j\rangle\langle b_i^j|$) and a multi-probabilistic transformation $\mathcal{T} : \{\alpha_i\} \xmapsto{P_i^j} \{|b_i^j\rangle\langle b_i^j|\}$.*

Proof Suppose a physical transformation maps α_i to σ_i, which as usual can be written as the composition of an isometry

$$U : \mathcal{H} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{E},$$

involving an ancillary space $\mathcal{E}$, followed by a partial trace over $\mathcal{E}$. Introducing an arbitrary rank–one measurement POVM $(E_j)_{j=1,\ldots,m}$ in $\mathcal{E}$ (e.g., a complete von Neumann measurement in some basis), we observe the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_i &= \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{E}} U \alpha_i U^\dagger \\ &= \sum_j \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{E}} \left((\mathbb{1} \otimes E_j) U \alpha_i U^\dagger \right), \end{aligned}$$

because the E_j sum to unity. Since the α_i are pure, the summands in the second line are positive rank–one operators, which can be written

$$\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{E}} \left((\mathbb{1} \otimes E_j) U \alpha_i U^\dagger \right) = P_i^j |b_i^j\rangle\langle b_i^j|,$$

with pure states $|b_i^j\rangle$ and probability distributions $(P_i^1, \ldots, P_i^m)$.

Thus the sequence of operations: the isometry U, measuring the POVM (E_j) and tracing out $\mathcal{E}$, implements a multi–probabilistic transformation

$$\mathcal{T} : \{\alpha_i\} \xmapsto{P_i^j} \{|b_i^j\rangle\} \qquad \text{with } \textstyle\sum_j P_i^j |b_i^j\rangle\langle b_i^j| = \sigma_i \text{ for all } i. \tag{10}$$

Conversely, the existence of such a multi–probabilistic transformation obviously implies that the transformation has the property $\mathcal{T} : \{\alpha_i\} \longmapsto \{\sigma_i\}$. $\square$

Hence we have found necessary and sufficient conditions for the problem of mapping pure source states to general target states. However the result is more complicated than the cases of theorem 2 and corollary 3 since it involves an existential quantifier over all pure state decompositions of the target states. As such, it is more difficult to implement in practice but we note that our conditions may be recast in the formalism of semi-definite programming to facilitate their implementation. More details will be given in an expanded version of this paper. The general problem of finding useful tractable conditions guaranteeing $\{\rho_i\} \Rightarrow \{\sigma_i\}$, where both sets may contain mixed states, appears to be a rather difficult question. Some further recent developments have been announced in [15].

Acknowledgements

The authors were supported by the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council. AC was also supported by a University of Hertfordshire Postdoctoral Fellowship for part of this work. We are grateful to Peter Alberti for comments and references to earlier relevant works.

References

[1] Uhlmann, A. (1976) The 'transition probability' in the state space of a *-algebra, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **9**, 273-279.

[2] Jozsa, R. (1994) Fidelity for mixed quantum states, *J. Mod. Opt.* **41**, 2314-2323.

[3] Jozsa, R. and Schlienz, J. (1999) Distinguishability of states and von Neumann entropy, *Phys. Rev.* **A62**, 012301-1 to 01203-11.

[4] Alberti, P. and Uhlmann, A. (1980) Existence and Density Theorems for Stochastic Maps on Commutative C^*-Algebras, *Math. Nachr.* **97**, 279-295; Alberti, P. and Uhlmann, A. (1981) Dissipative Motion in State Spaces, volume 33 of *Teubner-Texte zur Mathematik* Teubner Verlag Leipzig, Leipzig; Alberti, P. and Uhlmann, A. (1982) Stochasticity and Partial Order—Doubly Stochastic Maps and Unitary Mixing, volume 9 of *Mathematics and its Applications.* D.Reidel Publ. Company, Dordrecht-Boston-London.

[5] Alberti, P. and Uhlmann, A. (1980) A problem relating to positive linear maps on matrix algebras, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **18**, 163-176.

[6] Uhlmann, A. (1985) The transition probability for states of *-algebras, *Annalen der Physik* **42**, 524-531.

[7] P. Alberti, private communication.

[8] Carlini, A. and Sasaki, M. (2003) Geometrical conditions for CPTP maps and their application to a quantum repeater and a state-dependent quantum cloning machine, preprint available at quant-ph/0304011.

[9] Helstrom, C. W. (1976) Quantum detection and estimation theory, Academic Press, New York.

[10] Alberti, P. (2003) Playing with fidelities, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **51**, 87-125.

[11] Uhlmann, A. (1985) Eine Bemerkung über vollständig positive Abbildungen von Dichteoperatoren, *Wiss. Z. KMU Leipzig,Math.-Naturwiss. R.* **34**(6), 580-582.

[12] Chefles, A. (2000) Deterministic quantum state transformations, *Phys. Lett A* **270**, 14.

[13] Chefles, A. (2002) Quantum operations, state transformations and probabilities, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 052314.

[14] Davies, E. B. and Lewis, J. T. (1970) An operational approach to quantum probability, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **17**, 239-260.

[15] Alberti, P. (2003) Transforming vector states: a toolkit, *unpublished manuscript*, 23pp.