# Short Course in Quantum Information Lecture 3



# Entanglement





# **Course Info**

All materials downloadable @ website

http://info.phys.unm.edu/~deutschgroup/DeutschClasses.html

- <u>Syllabus</u>
  - Lecture 1: Intro Lecture 2: Formal Structure of Quantum Mechanics Lecture 3: Entanglement Lecture 4: Qubits and Quantum Circuits Lecture 5: Algorithms Lecture 6: Error Correction Lecture 7: Physical Implementations Lecture 8: Quantum Cryptography





### Postulates of QM

• A (pure) state of the system describing our knowledge of the system is given by a vector in Hilbert space,  $|\psi\rangle$ .

• A physical observable is a Hermitian linear operator  $\hat{A}$  whose (real) eigenvalues  $\{a\}$  determine the possible measurement outcomes.

• Given state  $|\psi\rangle$  and measurement of  $\hat{A}$ , the probability of finding eigenvalue *a* is given by,

$$p_{a|\psi} = \left| \left\langle a | \psi \right\rangle \right|^2$$

where  $|a\rangle$  is the eigenvector of  $\hat{A}$ .

- Upon finding value *a* the state "collapses",  $|\psi\rangle \Rightarrow |a\rangle$
- In a closed system the state dynamics is determined by the Schrödinger equation ---> Unitary map that preserves in product.





#### **Example: Photon Polarization (I)**



I. H. Deutsch, *University of New Mexico* Short Course in Quantum Information

-



#### **Example: Photon Polarization (II)**

- State: Normalized complex polarization vector  $\vec{\epsilon}$ ,  $\vec{\epsilon}^* \cdot \vec{\epsilon} = 1$
- Orthonormal bases:  $\{\mathbf{e}_{H}, \mathbf{e}_{V}\}$   $\{\mathbf{e}_{D_{+}}, \mathbf{e}_{D_{-}}\}$   $\{\mathbf{e}_{R}, \mathbf{e}_{L}\}$

Let us call {H,V} the "standard basis"

$$\mathbf{e}_{H} = \begin{bmatrix} 1\\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{e}_{V} = \begin{bmatrix} 0\\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \qquad \mathbf{e}_{D+} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1\\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{e}_{D-} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1\\ -1 \end{bmatrix} \qquad \mathbf{e}_{R} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1\\ i \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{e}_{L} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1\\ -i \end{bmatrix}$$

• Three (incompatible) observables:



Pauli matrices with eigenvalues ±1





### **Eigenstates of General Linear Polarization Analyzer**

$$\hat{\sigma}_{\phi} \equiv \cos 2\phi \ \hat{Z} + \sin 2\phi \ \hat{X} = \cos 2\phi \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} + \sin 2\phi \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos 2\phi & \sin 2\phi \\ \sin 2\phi & -\cos 2\phi \end{bmatrix}$$

#### **Eigenvectors/values**

Define<sup>.</sup>

$$\hat{\sigma}_{\phi} |\pm 1_{\phi} \rangle = \pm 1 |\pm 1_{\phi} \rangle \qquad |+1_{\phi} \rangle = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \phi \\ \sin \phi \end{bmatrix} \qquad |-1_{\phi} \rangle = \begin{bmatrix} -\sin \phi \\ \cos \phi \end{bmatrix}$$

Every linear polarization is +1 eigenvector of some  $\hat{\sigma}_{\phi}$ 

$$|e_{\phi}\rangle = \cos\phi|H\rangle + \sin\phi|V\rangle = |+1_{\phi}\rangle \qquad 0 \le \phi < \pi$$





#### **Basic Measurement Statistics (I)**



$$\left\langle \hat{\sigma}_{\phi} \right\rangle_{\theta} = \left\langle +1_{\theta} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{\phi} \right| +1_{\theta} \right\rangle = \cos^{2}(\phi - \theta) - \sin^{2}(\phi - \theta) = \cos[2(\phi - \theta)]$$





# **Course Info**

All materials downloadable @ website

http://info.phys.unm.edu/~deutschgroup/DeutschClasses.html

- <u>Syllabus</u>
  - Lecture 1: Intro Lecture 2: Formal Structure of Quantum Mechanics Lecture 3: Entanglement Lecture 4: Qubits and Quantum Circuits Lecture 5: Algorithms Lecture 6: Error Correction Lecture 7: Physical Implementations Lecture 8: Quantum Cryptography





#### **Joint Probabilities for Multiple Events**

Example: Spontaneous Parametric Downconversion







## **Multipartite Systems and Tensor Product**

#### **Multiple Degrees of Freedom**

-

Consider a physical system with many degrees of freedom (e. g. many particles.)

Pure states of the *i*<sup>th</sup> subsystem is described by a vector in a Hilbert space  $\hat{h}_i$ ,  $|\psi\rangle_i \in \hat{h}_i$ .

Joint state of whole system is a vector in the *tensor product* space:

$$|\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H} = h_1 \otimes h_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes h_n$$

**Example: Bipartite System of Two Photons**  $\mathcal{H} = \mathbf{C}_{2} \otimes \mathbf{C}_{2} = (\mathbf{C}_{2})^{\otimes 2} \qquad \text{Four dimensional}$   $|\psi\rangle_{1} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{bmatrix}, |\phi\rangle_{2} = \begin{bmatrix} \gamma \\ \delta \end{bmatrix} \qquad \longrightarrow \qquad |\psi\rangle_{1} \otimes |\phi\rangle_{2} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \gamma \\ \delta \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \gamma \\ \alpha \delta \\ \beta \gamma \\ \beta \delta \end{bmatrix}$ 





#### **Tensor Product: Formal Structure**

**Joint Bipartite Hilbert space:**  $\mathcal{H}_{AB} = h_A \otimes h_B$ 

Orthonormal "product basis" for joint space

$$\left\{ \left| E_{i,j} \right\rangle_{AB} = \left| e_i \right\rangle_A \otimes \left| f_j \right\rangle_B = \left| e_i \right\rangle \left| f_j \right\rangle = \left| e_i, f_j \right\rangle = \left| ij \right\rangle \right\}$$

<u>General state vector:</u>  $|\Psi\rangle_{AB} = \sum_{ij} c_{ij} |e_i\rangle_A \otimes |f_j\rangle_B$ 

-

$$c_{ij} = \left( \left\langle e_i \right|_A \otimes \left\langle f_j \right|_B \right) |\Psi\rangle_{AB} = \left\langle ij |\Psi\rangle_{AB} \qquad p(i \text{ and } j) = \left| \left\langle ij |\Psi\rangle_{AB} \right|^2 = \left| c_{ij} \right|^2$$





#### **Uncorrelated Probabilities**

Consider a "product state" in the joint Hilbert Space  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathsf{AB}}$ 

$$\left|\Psi\right\rangle_{AB}=\left|\psi\right\rangle_{A}\otimes\left|\phi\right\rangle_{B}$$

Joint Probability of Measurement

$$P(A = i \text{ and } B = j) = \left\| \left( \left\langle e_i \right|_A \otimes \left\langle f_j \right|_B \right) |\Psi\rangle_{AB} \right\|^2 = \left| \left\langle e_i \left| \psi \right\rangle_A \right|^2 \left| \left\langle f_j \left| \phi \right\rangle_B \right|^2 \right|^2$$
$$= P(A = i)P(B = j)$$

Product state  $\Leftrightarrow$  Statistically Uncorrelated Events

#### "Separable State"





### **Entangled States**

"Quantum Correlated" events = Superposition of joint processes.

Feynman: Add probability amplitudes for indistinguishable processes.



"Type II" Downconversion: Signal and Idler have *opposite polarization*. But which? Process does not distinguish them --> superposition.

$$|\Psi\rangle_{si} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|H\rangle_{s} \otimes |V\rangle_{i} - |V\rangle_{s} \otimes |H\rangle_{i}) \neq |\psi\rangle_{s} \otimes |\phi\rangle_{i}$$



- -



#### **Entanglement and correlated collapse**

Suppose a measurement of the signal photon's polarization is made in the H-V basis and the result "H" is found.

What is the post-measurement state?

$$|\Psi\rangle_{si} \Rightarrow |H\rangle_{s} \langle H_{s} |\Psi\rangle_{si} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( |H\rangle_{s} \langle H_{s} |H\rangle_{s} \otimes |V\rangle_{i} - |H\rangle_{s} \langle H_{s} |V\rangle_{s} \otimes |H\rangle_{i} \right) \Rightarrow |H\rangle_{s} \otimes |V\rangle_{i}$$

The state of the idler photon "collapses" due to measurement of the signal.

What Alice knows about the Bob's photon is effected by her measurement because she knows the photons are *correlated*.



















Note: Alice and Bob's results are *random*, but perfectly correlated.





#### "Singlet": Anticorrelated in any basis







#### "Singlet": Anticorrelated in any basis







## "Singlet": Anticorrelated in any basis

#### **Proof**:

Entangled state of joint system

$$\Psi\rangle_{si} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( |H\rangle_{s} \otimes |V\rangle_{i} - |V\rangle_{s} \otimes |H\rangle_{i} \right)$$

Measure signal photon

$$\hat{\sigma}_{\phi} \qquad \text{eigenvectors} \quad |+1_{\phi}\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} \cos\phi \\ \sin\phi \end{bmatrix} \quad |-1_{\phi}\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} -\sin\phi \\ \cos\phi \end{bmatrix}$$
$$|\Psi\rangle_{si} \Rightarrow |1_{\phi}\rangle_{s} \langle 1_{\phi} |\Psi\rangle_{si} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( |1_{\phi}\rangle_{s} \langle 1_{\phi} |H\rangle_{s} \otimes |V\rangle_{i} - |1_{\phi}\rangle_{s} \langle 1_{\phi} |V\rangle_{s} \otimes |H\rangle_{i} \right)$$
$$\Rightarrow |1_{\phi}\rangle_{s} \otimes (\cos\phi |V\rangle_{i} - \sin\phi |H\rangle_{i}) = |1_{\phi}\rangle_{s} \otimes |-1_{\phi}\rangle_{i}$$

If signal photon is found linear along  $\varphi,$  idler is found in the orthogonal polarization.

-

















I. H. Deutsch, *University of New Mexico* Short Course in Quantum Information

-

















#### Results are uncorrelated.





#### **EPR Paradox**

Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality Be Considered Complete? A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. 47, 777 (1935)

> If, without in any way disturbing a system, we can predict with certainty (i.e., with probability equal to unity) the value of a physical quantity, then there exists an **element of physical reality corresponding** to this physics quantity



EPR argue that, by their definition of "realistic properties", quantum mechanics "incomplete" as it cannot give definite predictions of measurement results that have some definite value (hidden variables).





## **The EPR Argument**

(Version due to Bohm, 1951)

• Consider entangled state, 
$$|\Psi\rangle_{AB} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|H\rangle_{A} \otimes |V\rangle_{B} - |V\rangle_{A} \otimes |H\rangle_{B})$$

•If Alice were to measure  $\hat{Z}$  on her photon, she can, without in any way effecting Bob, determine whether he will find H or V should he perform a  $\hat{Z}$  measurement.  $\implies$  Bob's value of  $\hat{Z}$  is an "element of reality".

•If Alice were to measure  $\hat{X}$  on her photon, she can, *without in any way* effecting Bob, determine whether he will find D<sub>+</sub> or D<sub>-</sub> should he perform a  $\hat{X}$  measurement.  $\longrightarrow$  Bob's values of  $\hat{X}$  is an "element of reality".

• Quantum mechanical states *cannot* give a *simultaneous definite* value of both  $\hat{Z}$  and  $\hat{X}$  since these operators don't commute.



Quantum mechanical sates are not a "complete" description of the physical world and can be completed by some "hidden variables".





## John Bell: Putting Hidden Variables to the Test



Bell took EPR seriously, 30 years after they published their original paper and asked when the EPR assumption had any *measurable* significance. Amazingly...YES!

> Bell's Inequality. J.S. Bell, Physics 1 195 (1964).





### **Formal Statement of EPR**

Consider measurement of,  $\hat{\sigma}_{\phi}$  linear polarization at angle  $\phi$ .

According to EPR, the value that Alice measures is a function of her polarizer setting  $\phi_a$  and the "realistic hidden variables"  $\lambda$ . Similarly for Bob, and his polarizer setting  $\phi_b$ .

Measured values:  $A(\phi_a, \lambda) = \pm 1$   $B(\phi_b, \lambda) = \pm 1$ 

The *crucial* assumption is that A is not a function of  $\phi_b$ , and B is not a function of  $\phi_a$ . "Local hidden variable theory".

These functions show produce the same statistics as quantum mechanics for some suitable distribution of  $\lambda$ . They should reproduce the quantum mechanical results.  $\langle \hat{\sigma}_{\phi_a} \rangle = \int P(\lambda) A(\phi_a, \lambda)$ 





### Hidden Variable Model for Single Photon Linear Polarization Measurement



 $\lambda$  is a *unknown* unit vector with probability uniformly distributed in the blue 1/4-wedge.

Deterministic binary choice, given  $\lambda$ :

+1 if  $\lambda$  is in pink 1/4-wedge. -1 if  $\lambda$  is not.

$$p_{+1} = \frac{\alpha(\theta, \phi)}{\pi/2} \qquad p_{-1} = \frac{\pi/2 - \alpha(\theta, \phi)}{\pi/2}$$

**Choose:** 
$$\alpha(\theta,\phi) = \frac{\pi}{2}\cos^2(\phi-\theta)$$





#### **Correlation functions**

Averages of joint observables

$$\left\langle \hat{\sigma}_{\phi_a} \otimes \hat{\sigma}_{\phi_b} \right\rangle = E(\phi_a, \phi_b) \quad \text{(Expectation value)}$$
$$= \left\langle \Psi_{AB} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{\phi_a} \otimes \hat{\sigma}_{\phi_b} \right| \Psi_{AB} \right\rangle$$
$$= \int d\lambda \ P_{AB}(\lambda) \ A(\phi_a, \lambda) B(\phi_b, \lambda)$$

For quantum mechanical singlet state

$$\Psi_{AB} \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( |H\rangle_A |V\rangle_B - |V\rangle_A |H\rangle_B \right)$$

$$\left\langle \hat{\sigma}_{\phi_a} \otimes \hat{\sigma}_{\phi_b} \right\rangle = -\cos[2(\phi_a - \phi_b)]$$

#### Can the local hidden variable theory mimic the QM prediction?





#### **Measuring Correlation Functions**

#### **Coincidence counting**

-

$$\langle \hat{\sigma}_{\phi_a} \otimes \hat{\sigma}_{\phi_b} \rangle = C(1_{\phi_a}, 1_{\phi_b}) + C(-1_{\phi_a}, -1_{\phi_b}) - C(1_{\phi_a}, -1_{\phi_b}) - C(-1_{\phi_a}, 1_{\phi_b})$$







## **Bell/CHSH Inequality**

(Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt version, Phys. Rev. Lett. 23 880 (1969))

Alice and Bob can choose to measure in one of two local basis



Consider the following correlation joint observable

$$\hat{S} = \hat{\sigma}_{a} \otimes (\hat{\sigma}_{b'} - \hat{\sigma}_{b}) + \hat{\sigma}_{a'} \otimes (\hat{\sigma}_{b'} + \hat{\sigma}_{b})$$
$$\left\langle \hat{S} \right\rangle = E(\phi_{a}, \phi_{b'}) - E(\phi_{a}, \phi_{b}) + E(\phi_{a'}, \phi_{b'}) + E(\phi_{a'}, \phi_{b})$$

The value of  $S_{\lambda}$  in a local hidden variable model

$$\begin{split} S_{\lambda} &= A(\phi_{a},\lambda) \Big[ B(\phi_{b'},\lambda) - B(\phi_{b},\lambda) \Big] + A(\phi_{a'},\lambda) \Big[ B(\phi_{b'},\lambda) + B(\phi_{b},\lambda) \Big] \\ S_{\lambda} &= \pm 2 \end{split}$$

$$-2 \le \langle S \rangle_{LHV} \le 2$$

-



#### **QM Violates LHV**

#### In singlet state:

$$\left\langle \hat{S} \right\rangle_{QM} = -\cos[2(\phi_a - \phi_{b'})] + \cos[2(\phi_a - \phi_b)] - \cos[2(\phi_{a'} - \phi_{b'})] - \cos[2(\phi_{a'} - \phi_b)]]$$

Consider case where the polarizer directions are equally spaced as follows:





-

$$\left\langle \hat{S} \right\rangle_{QM} = 3\cos 2\theta - \cos(6\theta)$$

Quantum correlations *stronger* than classical correlations.





#### **Experimental Verification**

#### • First definitive test:

Aspect et al. 1982, Phys. Rev. Lett. 49 1804.



Atomic cascade

6 standard deviations averaged for hours.

• Modern tests:

P.G. Kwiat et al. 1995, 75 4337



Bright source of entangled photons

100 standard deviations in <5 min.





## Implications

- Quantum mechanics cannot be described by a *local realistic theory*.
  - Nonlocal hidden variables?
  - No "realistic properties" of observed quantities.
- Entanglement **CANNOT** be used to communicate faster than the speed of light.
  - Alice and Bobs results are random but correlated.
- Entanglement as a resource.
  - Quantum correlations are special and destroyed by "eavesdropper".
  - Communication tasks aided by shared entanglement:
    - Quantum dense coding.
    - Teleportation.
    - Distributed computation (e.g. appointment problem).



