

Time evolution / operations on density matrices

Unitary evolution: $|\psi\rangle \mapsto U|\psi\rangle$, then

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \mapsto U|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|U^\dagger.$$

Unitary evolution of density matrices:

$$\rho \mapsto U\rho U^\dagger.$$

Is this the most general thing we can do on a system? No: take a system, embed it in a larger one, time evolve there, trace out.

Example: $\rho \in S(\mathcal{H})$, add \mathcal{K}

$$(1) \rho \mapsto \rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|$$

$$(2) \rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| \mapsto U(\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|)U^\dagger$$

$$(3) \text{tr}_{\mathcal{K}}(U(\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|)U^\dagger) =: T(\rho)$$

Let us write $U = \sum_k A_k \otimes B_k$, then

$$T(\rho) = \text{tr}_{\mathcal{K}}(U(\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|)U^\dagger) =$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k\ell} \text{tr}_k \left(A_k \rho A_k^\dagger \otimes B_k |0\rangle\langle 0| B_k^\dagger \right) = \\
& = \sum_{k\ell} A_k \rho A_k^\dagger \cdot \text{tr}_k \left\{ B_k |0\rangle\langle 0| B_k^\dagger \right\} = \\
& = \sum_{k\ell} A_k \rho A_k^\dagger \cdot \sum_i \langle i| B_k |0\rangle \langle 0| B_k^\dagger |i\rangle \\
& = \sum_i \left(\sum_k A_k \cdot \langle i| B_k |0\rangle \right) \rho \left(\sum_\ell A_\ell^\dagger \langle 0| B_\ell^\dagger |i\rangle \right) \\
& = \sum_i C_i \rho C_i^\dagger .
\end{aligned}$$

So this kind of time evolution does:

$$\rho \longmapsto T(\rho) = \sum_i C_i \rho C_i^\dagger .$$

Just as for density matrices, let us abstract away from the concrete time evolution and characterize this map by its properties:



We have considered the following time evolution: consider the state ρ , add another system to it (e.g. in the $|0\rangle\langle 0|$ state), time evolve w/ global unitary (i.e., unitary acting on both systems), then trace out the added system.

$$T(\rho) = \text{tr}_B \left(U (\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|) U^\dagger \right).$$

We have seen:

$$T(\rho) = \sum_i C_i \rho C_i^\dagger,$$

with $C_i = (\mathbb{1} \otimes \langle i|) U (\mathbb{1} \otimes |0\rangle)$.

Def (Kraus map): Let \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K} be Hilbert spaces.

A linear map $T: \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ is called a

Kraus map if $\exists \{C_i\}_{i \in I} \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ s.t.

$$T(\rho) = \sum_i C_i \rho C_i^\dagger.$$

Example: the above. Or even simpler,

$\rho \mapsto U\rho U^\dagger$ is a Kraus map.

The above example contained 2 more operations, each are Kraus:

(1) $\rho \mapsto \rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|$, as

$$\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| = C\rho C^\dagger \text{ with } C \in \text{Lin}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}_k)$$

$$C|+\rangle = |+\rangle \otimes |0\rangle.$$

(2) The partial trace. Here,

$$\text{tr}_B(\rho_{AB}) = \sum_i C_i \rho_{AB} C_i^\dagger \text{ w/}$$

$$C_i \in \text{Lin}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}_k, \mathcal{H}), C_i |k\rangle = |k\rangle \delta_{ik}.$$

Remark: composition of Kraus maps is Kraus.

(3) Post-measurement state (unnormalized!):

$$\rho \mapsto \Pi_i \rho \Pi_i^\dagger = p_i \rho_i$$

(4) Expected post-meas. state: $\rho = \sum_i p_i \rho_i = \sum_i \Pi_i \rho \Pi_i^\dagger$

Remark: Kraus maps form convex structure, probabilistic interpretation!

Then: Let $T: B(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{K})$ be Kraus.

Then $T(\rho) \geq 0$ if $B(\mathcal{H}) \ni \rho \geq 0$

Proof: We need to check expectation values of $T(\rho)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi | T(\rho) | \psi \rangle &= \sum_i \langle \psi | C_i \rho C_i^\dagger | \psi \rangle \\ &= \sum_i \langle C_i^\dagger \psi | \rho | C_i^\dagger \psi \rangle \geq 0. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We might have problem w/ trace preserving:

Then Let $T: B(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{K})$ be Kraus,

$$T(\rho) = \sum_i C_i \rho C_i^\dagger.$$

Then $\text{tr}\{T(\rho)\} = \text{tr}\{\rho\} \quad \forall \rho \in B(\mathcal{H})$ iff

$$\sum_i C_i^\dagger C_i = \mathbb{1}.$$

Proof

$$\text{tr}(T(\rho)) = \text{tr}\left(\sum_i C_i \rho C_i^\dagger\right) = \text{tr}\left\{\sum_i C_i^\dagger C_i \rho\right\},$$

and thus $\text{tr}(T(\rho)) = \text{tr}\{\rho\} \quad \forall \rho \in B(\mathcal{H})$

iff $\sum_i C_i^\dagger C_i = \mathbb{1}.$

\square

Examples:

(1) $\rho \mapsto U\rho U^\dagger$ is trace-preserving

$$\text{tr}\{U\rho U^\dagger\} = \text{tr}\{U^\dagger U \rho\} = \text{tr}\{\rho\}.$$

(2) $\rho \mapsto \rho \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle\langle\text{vac}|$ is trace-preserving

(3) $\rho_{AB} \mapsto \rho_A = \text{tr}_B \rho_{AB}$ — " —

(4) Given a measurement $\{\Pi_i\}_{i=1}^k$, $\sum_i \Pi_i^\dagger \Pi_i = \mathbb{1}$,
the post-meas. constr.

$$\rho \mapsto \Pi_i \rho \Pi_i^\dagger$$

is not trace preserving. Can't
make it trace preserving w/ normalization:

$$\Pi_i^\dagger \Pi_i \notin \mathbb{C} \cdot \mathbb{1}.$$

(i.e., the probability $(\text{tr}\{\Pi_i \rho \Pi_i^\dagger\})$ depends
on the state, there is no state-
independent normalization).

Remark: Composition of TP Kraus maps is TP.

(HW) Check $\sum_i C_i^\dagger C_i = \mathbb{1}$ for $C_i = (\text{id} \otimes \langle i|) U (\text{id} \otimes |0\rangle)$

We have seen that Kraus maps arise, for example, as $\rho \mapsto \rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| \mapsto U(\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|)U^\dagger \mapsto \rho_B$.

Actually, all trace-preserving Kraus maps are like this.

Theorem: Let $T: \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be a Kraus map, $T(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^n A_i \rho A_i^\dagger$. Then \exists k fd. Hilbert space and $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \otimes k)$ unitary s.t.

$$T(\rho) = \text{tr}_k U(\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|)U^\dagger.$$

Proof: Let $k = \mathbb{C}^n$. Consider

$$X = \sum_i A_i \otimes |i\rangle\langle 0| = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & 0 \\ A_2 & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots \\ A_n & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Then

$$X^\dagger X = \begin{pmatrix} \sum_i A_i^\dagger A_i & \\ & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} & \\ & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

X as orthogonal columns. We can extend it to an orthonormal basis U :

$$U = \sum_{ij} U_{ij} \otimes |i\rangle\langle j|, \quad U_{i0} = A_i.$$

$$\text{Then } U(\rho \otimes |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|)U^\dagger =$$

$$= \sum_i A_i \rho A_i^\dagger \otimes |\bar{i}\rangle\langle j|$$

$$\text{And thus } \text{tr}_B(U(\rho \otimes |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|)U^\dagger) = \sum_i A_i \rho A_i^\dagger.$$

□

HW: what happens w/ Kraus maps of the form $B(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{K})$?

Just as density matrices are pure states on a larger system, Kraus maps are unitaries on a larger system as well.

Can we have more general time evolution?

Requirements

- $\rho \mapsto T(\rho)$ density matrix

- T s/b linear

Is this enough? No!

Take $T: A \mapsto A^T$. This is h -preserving and positivity preserving (positive):

$$\langle \psi | A | \psi \rangle \geq 0 \quad \forall \psi \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \langle \psi | A^T | \psi \rangle \geq 0 \quad \forall \psi$$

just by transposing.

Interesting if A and B share $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$,

$$\text{or } \rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Try: B applies the map T

$$(\text{id} \otimes T)(\rho) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} (10)^T & (01)^T \\ (00)^T & (00)^T \\ (00)^T & (00)^T \\ (10)^T & (01)^T \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

and this is not a density matrix, as it is not positive.

Takeaway: even though T is positivity preserving, $\text{id} \otimes T$ (or $T \otimes \text{id}$) might not be.

Def: Let $T: B(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{K})$ be linear. We say that

- T is positivity preserving, or simply positive, if $T(p) \geq 0$ if $p \geq 0$.

- T is n -positive if $T \otimes \text{id}: B(\mathcal{H}) \otimes B(\mathbb{C}^n) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{K}) \otimes B(\mathbb{C}^n)$ is positive

- T is completely positive if it is n -positive $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$.

The transposition map is not CP (completely positive).

Physical operations should be CP as

one should be able to manipulate entangled states as well.

Example CP map: unitary time evolution.

$$T(p) = U p U^\dagger$$

Consider now $p \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathbb{C}$, $p \geq 0$, then

$$(T \otimes \text{id})(p) = (U \otimes \mathbb{1}) p (U \otimes \mathbb{1})^\dagger \geq 0$$

Similarly,

Thm: Every Kraus map is CP.

Proof: Same as for unitaries: if $\rho \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$,

$$T(\rho) = \sum_i C_i \rho C_i^\dagger \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}),$$

then for $\rho \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{L})$

$$(T \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{L})})(\rho) = \sum_i (C_i \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{L}}) \rho (C_i \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{L}})^\dagger,$$

$$\text{as } \text{id}_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{L})}(X) = X = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{L}} X \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{L}}.$$

Then given $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{L}$,

$$\langle \psi | (T \otimes \text{id})(\rho) | \psi \rangle = \sum_i \langle \psi | C_i \otimes \mathbb{1} \rho (C_i \otimes \mathbb{1})^\dagger | \psi \rangle \geq 0.$$

^{TP}
 ψ So Kraus maps describe physical operations! □

We will show: every CP map is Kraus.

Lemma (see ex. class): Let $|\Omega\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$

be the max. ent. state,

$$|\Omega\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} |ii\rangle. \quad \text{Then}$$

$$(1 \otimes X) |-\mathcal{R}\rangle = (X^T \otimes 1) |-\mathcal{R}\rangle \quad \forall X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{F}^d).$$

Proof: direct calculation:

$$(1 \otimes X) |-\mathcal{R}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j,k} X_{ij} (1 \otimes |i\rangle\langle j|) |kk\rangle$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i,k} X_{ik} |ki\rangle.$$

$$(X^T \otimes 1) |-\mathcal{R}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j,k} X_{ji} (|i\rangle\langle j| \otimes 1) |kk\rangle =$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i,k} X_{ki} |ik\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i,k} X_{ik} |ki\rangle.$$

— o —

□

Lemma: Let $|Y\rangle \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$. Then $\exists O \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$

$$\text{s.t. } |Y\rangle = (O \otimes \text{id}) |-\mathcal{R}\rangle, \quad |-\mathcal{R}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_i |ii\rangle.$$

Proof: We can write $|Y\rangle = \sum_i |Y_i\rangle \otimes |i\rangle$, so

if we define $O = \sum_k |Y_k\rangle\langle k|$, then

$$(O \otimes \text{id}) |-\mathcal{R}\rangle = |Y\rangle.$$

□

General quantum operations: CP maps.

$$\text{CP: } T: \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}) \text{ s.t. } \forall \mathcal{L} \text{ and } \rho \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{L}), \\ (T \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{L})})(\rho) \geq 0 \text{ if } \rho \geq 0.$$

Goal: to show that CP maps are Kraus:

$$T(\rho) = \sum_i C_i \rho C_i^\dagger$$

Note: we have seen that Kraus maps are CP.

Lemma (Last lecture): Let $|\Omega\rangle \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ be the max. ent. state, $|\Omega\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} |ii\rangle$. Then $\forall O \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$

$$(O \otimes \mathbb{1}) |\Omega\rangle = (\mathbb{1} \otimes O^T) |\Omega\rangle.$$

Lemma: Let $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$. Then $\exists O \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ s.t. $|\Psi\rangle = (O \otimes \text{id}) |\Omega\rangle$, $|\Omega\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_i |ii\rangle$.

Proof: We can write $|\Psi\rangle = \sum_i |\Psi_i\rangle \otimes |i\rangle$, so if we define $O = \sum_k |\Psi_k\rangle \langle k|$, then

$$(O \otimes \text{id}) |\Omega\rangle = |\Psi\rangle. \quad \square$$

Thm: Let $T: \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ be linear. Then the following are equivalent:

(1) T is CP

(2) T is $\dim(\mathcal{H})$ -positive

(3) $(\text{id} \otimes T)(|\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega|) \geq 0$, where $|\Omega\rangle \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ is the max. ent. state, $|\Omega\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} |ii\rangle$

(4) T is Kraus.

Proof: We have seen $(4) \Rightarrow (1)$. $(1) \Rightarrow (2)$ and $(2) \Rightarrow (3)$ is by def. We show $(3) \Rightarrow (4)$.

Consider $|\Omega\rangle \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ max. ent. state

$|\Omega\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} |ii\rangle$. We have seen $\text{tr}_B(|\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega|) = \mathbb{1}$.

So

$$T(\rho) = T(\rho \cdot \mathbb{1}) = T(\rho \text{tr}_A(|\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega|)) =$$

$$\stackrel{\text{by Lemma}}{=} (\text{tr} \otimes T)(\mathbb{1} \otimes \rho |\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega|) =$$

$$= (\text{tr} \otimes T)(\rho^T \otimes \mathbb{1} |\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega|)$$

$$= \text{tr}_A(\rho^T \otimes \mathbb{1} \cdot X), \text{ where}$$

$$X = (\text{id} \otimes T)(|\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega|) \stackrel{*}{\geq} 0, \text{ and thus}$$

by assumption

$X = \sum_k |\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|$, e.g., $|\psi_k\rangle \in \mathbb{H} \otimes \mathbb{H}$ are unnormalized eigenvectors. But then we can write

$$X = \sum_k (C_k \otimes \mathbb{1}) |\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega| (C_k^\dagger \otimes \mathbb{1}),$$

so

$$\begin{aligned}
 T(\rho) &= \text{tr}_B \left[\sum_k (C_k \otimes \rho^\top) |\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega| (C_k^\dagger \otimes \mathbb{1}) \right] \\
 &= \text{tr}_B \left[\sum_k (C_k \cdot \rho \otimes \mathbb{1}) |\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega| (C_k^\dagger \otimes \mathbb{1}) \right] \\
 &= \sum_k C_k \rho C_k^\dagger. \quad \square
 \end{aligned}$$

Remark: We have seen that $(\text{id} \otimes T)(|\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega|)$ is one-to-one. In fact,

$(\text{id} \otimes T)(|\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega|) = \sum_{i,j} |i\rangle\langle j| \otimes T(|i\rangle\langle j|)$, it is easy to read off T from this matrix. Can be used to check CP-ness! We have done so for transpose.

Significance of CP maps:

Can describe probabilistic time evolutions.

Typically, such scenario arises at communication tasks:



- A prepares a state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$
- Wants to send it to B.
- But the channel is noisy, $|\psi\rangle$ gets distorted.

Example noise model: $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^2$,

proba. P_0 - $|\psi\rangle$ gets transmitted properly

proba. P_X - $X|\psi\rangle$ gets transmitted instead of $|\psi\rangle$ - an X error occurs.

proba. P_Y - $Y|\psi\rangle$ gets transmitted instead

of $|Y\rangle$

proba. $p_2 - 2|Y\rangle$ gets transmitted.

We can then think of the message after transmission as the ensemble

$$\left\{ (p_i, \sigma_i |Y\rangle) \right\}_{i=0}^3$$

The actual info transmitted is the corresponding density operator:

$$\rho = \sum_{i=0}^3 p_i \cdot \sigma_i |Y\rangle \langle Y| \sigma_i^\dagger,$$

instead of the density operator $|Y\rangle \langle Y|$.

That is, we model the channel by the CPTP map (quantum channel)

$$\rho \mapsto \sum_{i=0}^3 p_i \sigma_i \rho \sigma_i^\dagger.$$

These maps are important not only in communication, but also at quantum computation: quantum computers are noisy, and this is how we model noise.