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#### Abstract

Quantum gates are represented by unitary operators on a Hilbert space. We consider the unitary operators on $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathbf{C}^{2}$ and describe the component operators on each Hilbert space in the product space. From these criteria we derive a decomposition for a specific class of unitary operators such that each operator in the product has Schmidt rank bounded by 2 . This decomposition directly yields the XOR (controlled NOT) implementation of the SWAP operation.


PACS numbers: 03.65.Db, 03.67.-a

## 1. Introduction

Quantum gates are represented by unitary operators on a Hilbert space [1-3]. For completeness, we present the definitions of the Schmidt rank for states and operators below.

Let $\mathcal{H}_{A}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{B}$ be two finite dimensional Hilbert spaces with the underlying field $\mathbf{C}$. Let $|\psi\rangle$ denote a pure state in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B}$.

The Schmidt number (also called the Schmidt rank) of $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B}$ over $\mathcal{H}_{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B}$ is the smallest non-negative integer $\operatorname{Sch}\left(|\psi\rangle, \mathcal{H}_{A}, \mathcal{H}_{B}\right)$ such that $|\psi\rangle$ can be written as

$$
|\psi\rangle=\sum_{j=1}^{\operatorname{Sch}\left(|\psi\rangle, \mathcal{H}_{A}, \mathcal{H}_{B}\right)}\left|\psi_{j}\right\rangle_{A} \otimes\left|\psi_{j}\right\rangle_{B}
$$

where $\left|\psi_{j}\right\rangle_{A} \in \mathcal{H}_{A}$ and $\left|\psi_{j}\right\rangle_{B} \in \mathcal{H}_{B}$. Consequently for

$$
|\psi\rangle=\sum_{j=1}^{\operatorname{dim} \mathcal{H}_{A}} \sum_{k=1}^{\operatorname{dim} \mathcal{H}_{B}} \psi_{j k}|j\rangle_{A} \otimes|k\rangle_{B}
$$

where the $\left|j_{A}\right\rangle$ and $\left|k_{A}\right\rangle$ form an orthonormal basis in their respective Hilbert spaces, we find that

$$
\operatorname{Sch}\left(|\psi\rangle, \mathcal{H}_{A}, \mathcal{H}_{B}\right)=\operatorname{rank}\left(\psi_{j k}\right)
$$

where $\left(\psi_{j k}\right)$ denotes the $\operatorname{dim} \mathcal{H}_{A} \times \operatorname{dim} \mathcal{H}_{B}$ matrix with entries $\psi_{j k}$.

The Hilbert-Schmidt inner product of two linear operators $A$ and $B$ acting on the same Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is given by $(A, B):=\operatorname{Tr}\left(B^{*} A\right)$, where $\operatorname{Tr}$ denotes the trace. Thus the linear operators form a Hilbert space with the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product. Consequently the definition of the Schmidt rank for pure states can also be applied to matrices (linear operators).

The Schmidt rank of a linear operator $L: \mathcal{H}_{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B}$ over $\mathcal{H}_{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B}$ is the smallest non-negative integer $\operatorname{Sch}\left(L, \mathcal{H}_{A}, \mathcal{H}_{B}\right)$ such that $L$ can be written as

$$
L=\sum_{j=1}^{\operatorname{Sch}\left(L, \mathcal{H}_{A}, \mathcal{H}_{B}\right)} L_{j, A} \otimes L_{j, B}
$$

where $L_{j, A}: \mathcal{H}_{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{A}$ and $L_{j, B}: \mathcal{H}_{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{B}$ are linear operators.
Nielsen et al found that operators could be written in the operator-Schmidt decomposition [5]:
$L=\sum_{j=1}^{\operatorname{Sch}\left(L, \mathcal{H}_{A}, \mathcal{H}_{B}\right)} s_{j} L_{j, A} \otimes L_{j, B}, \quad s_{j} \neq 0 \quad j=1,2, \ldots, \operatorname{Sch}\left(L, \mathcal{H}_{A}, \mathcal{H}_{B}\right)$
$\left(L_{j, A}, L_{k, A}\right)=\left(L_{j, B}, L_{k, B}\right)=\delta_{j k}, \quad j, k=1,2, \ldots, \operatorname{Sch}\left(L, \mathcal{H}_{A}, \mathcal{H}_{B}\right)$.
This decomposition yields more information about the operator $L$ due to the orthogonality of the operators $L_{j, A}$ and $L_{j, B}$.

For an orthonormal basis $\{|0\rangle,|1\rangle\}$ in $\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{2}}$ we define the unitary operators:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& U_{\mathrm{NOT}}:=|0\rangle\langle 1|+|1\rangle\langle 0| \\
& U_{\mathrm{NOT}}(1):=U_{\mathrm{NOT}} \otimes I_{2} \\
& U_{\mathrm{NOT}}(2):=I_{2} \otimes U_{\mathrm{NOT}} \\
& U_{\mathrm{CNOT}}(1,2):=|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes I_{2}+|1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes U_{\mathrm{NOT}} \\
& U_{\mathrm{CNOT}}(2,1):=I_{2} \otimes|0\rangle\langle 0|+U_{\mathrm{NOT}} \otimes|1\rangle\langle 1| \\
& U_{\mathrm{SWAP}}:=|00\rangle\langle 00|+|10\rangle\langle 01|+|01\rangle\langle 10|+|11\rangle\langle 11| .
\end{aligned}
$$

Of course, $U_{\text {SWAP }}$ is composed of three $U_{\mathrm{CNOT}}$ operations:

$$
U_{\mathrm{SWAP}}=U_{\mathrm{CNOT}}(2,1) U_{\mathrm{CNOT}}(1,2) U_{\mathrm{CNOT}}(2,1)
$$

This is the XOR implementation of the SWAP operation. This type of decomposition is useful in applications such as communication complexity where it is clear that information must be communicated in both directions to achieve the SWAP operation, whereas the CNOT operation only requires communication in one direction. Thus it would be useful to find a decomposition that illustrates this structure.

## 2. Operators on $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathbf{C}^{2}$

Here we consider operators on $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathbf{C}^{2}$ where $\mathcal{H}$ is an arbitrary finite dimensional Hilbert space with dimension $n$. Let $U_{q}$ be a unitary operator on $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathbf{C}^{2}$. We can write $U_{q}$ in the form

$$
U_{q}=Q_{0} \otimes|0\rangle\langle 0|+Q_{1} \otimes|0\rangle\langle 1|+Q_{2} \otimes|1\rangle\langle 0|+Q_{3} \otimes|1\rangle\langle 1|
$$

where $Q_{0}, Q_{1}, Q_{2}$ and $Q_{3}$ are linear operators in $\mathcal{H}$ (some of which may be the zero operator), and $\{|0\rangle,|1\rangle\}$ is an orthonormal basis in $\mathbf{C}^{2}$. Next we determine the constraints on $Q_{0}, Q_{1}, Q_{2}$ and $Q_{3}$ from the condition $U_{q} U_{q}^{*}=U_{q}^{*} U_{q}=I_{n} \otimes I_{2}$. Since $U_{q}$ is a unitary operator, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
U_{q} U_{q}^{*}= & \left(Q_{0} Q_{0}^{*}+Q_{1} Q_{1}^{*}\right) \otimes|0\rangle\langle 0|+\left(Q_{0} Q_{2}^{*}+Q_{1} Q_{3}^{*}\right) \otimes|0\rangle\langle 1| \\
& +\left(Q_{2} Q_{2}^{*}+Q_{3} Q_{3}^{*}\right) \otimes|1\rangle\langle 1|+\left(Q_{2} Q_{0}^{*}+Q_{3} Q_{1}^{*}\right) \otimes|1\rangle\langle 0| \\
= & I_{n} \otimes I_{2}=U_{q}^{*} U_{q} .
\end{aligned}
$$

$I_{n}$ denotes the $n \times n$ identity operator and $0_{n}$ denotes the $n \times n$ zero operator. Thus we find the conditions on the operators $Q_{j}$ :

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
Q_{0} Q_{0}^{*}+Q_{1} Q_{1}^{*}=I_{n} & Q_{0}^{*} Q_{0}+Q_{2}^{*} Q_{2}=I_{n} \\
Q_{2} Q_{2}^{*}+Q_{3} Q_{3}^{*}=I_{n} & Q_{1}^{*} Q_{1}+Q_{3}^{*} Q_{3}=I_{n}  \tag{1}\\
Q_{2} Q_{0}^{*}+Q_{3} Q_{1}^{*}=0_{n} & Q_{1}^{*} Q_{0}+Q_{3}^{*} Q_{2}=0_{n}
\end{array}
$$

The operators $Q_{0}, Q_{1}, Q_{2}$ and $Q_{3}$ can be written in polar form $Q_{j}=U_{j} H_{j}$, where $U_{j}$ is unitary and $H_{j}$ is positive semi-definite for $j=0,1,2,3$. Inserting the polar form into equations (1) yields the set of equations

$$
\begin{aligned}
& H_{0}^{2}+H_{2}^{2}=I_{n} \\
& H_{0} H_{2}=-H_{2} H_{0}\left(U_{3}^{*} U_{2}\right)^{*}\left(U_{1}^{*} U_{0}\right) \\
& H_{1}=\left(U_{3}^{*} U_{2}\right) H_{2}\left(U_{3}^{*} U_{2}\right)^{*}=\left(U_{1}^{*} U_{0}\right) H_{2}\left(U_{1}^{*} U_{0}\right)^{*} \\
& H_{3}=\left(U_{3}^{*} U_{2}\right) H_{0}\left(U_{3}^{*} U_{2}\right)^{*}=\left(U_{1}^{*} U_{0}\right) H_{0}\left(U_{1}^{*} U_{0}\right)^{*}
\end{aligned}
$$

We note that if $Q_{1}=0_{n}\left(H_{1}=0_{n}\right)$ then $Q_{2}=0_{n}$. Similarly $Q_{2}=0_{n}$ implies $Q_{1}=0_{n}$ and $Q_{0}=0_{n} \Longleftrightarrow Q_{3}=0_{n}$. In other words, when one of $Q_{0}, Q_{1}, Q_{2}$ and $Q_{3}$ is the zero operator, the non-zero operators of $Q_{0}, Q_{1}, Q_{2}$ and $Q_{3}$ are unitary. This result is independent of the chosen basis $\{|0\rangle,|1\rangle\}$. Thus we find that the Schmidt rank of $U_{q}$ over $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathbf{C}^{2}$ is either 1,2 or 4. (This result was previously demonstrated by Dür et al [4] and Nielsen et al [5].)

## 3. Structure

To illustrate the structure further we suppose none of the operators $Q_{j}$ are unitary (Schmidt rank 4 over $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathbf{C}^{2}$ ); in other words, the operators $Q_{0}, Q_{1}, Q_{2}$ and $Q_{3}$ are linearly independent. The operators $Q_{0}, Q_{1}, Q_{2}$ and $Q_{3}$ span a four-dimensional vector space which is isomorphic to the space spanned by $\{|0\rangle\langle 0|,|0\rangle\langle 1|,|1\rangle\langle 0|,|1\rangle\langle 1|\}$. The operators $\{|0\rangle\langle 0|,|0\rangle\langle 1|,|1\rangle\langle 0|,|1\rangle\langle 1|\}$ are linearly independent, with the matrix representations in the standard basis $\{|0\rangle,|1\rangle\}$ of $\mathbf{C}^{2}$

$$
\left\{\left(\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 0 \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right),\left(\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 1 \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right),\left(\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 0 \\
1 & 0
\end{array}\right),\left(\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right)\right\}
$$

The vector space isomorphisms which do not violate the conditions (1) are as follows:

> (1) $Q_{0} \rightarrow|0\rangle\langle 0|, \quad Q_{1} \rightarrow|1\rangle\langle 0|, \quad Q_{2} \rightarrow|0\rangle\langle 1|, \quad Q_{3} \rightarrow|1\rangle\langle 1|$ $\rightarrow U_{\text {SWAP }}$
> (2) $Q_{0} \rightarrow|1\rangle\langle 0|, \quad Q_{1} \rightarrow|0\rangle\langle 0|$,
> $Q_{2} \rightarrow|1\rangle\langle 1|, \quad Q_{3} \rightarrow|0\rangle\langle 1|$
> $\rightarrow U_{\text {NOT }}(1) U_{\text {SWAP }}$
> (3) $Q_{0} \rightarrow|0\rangle\langle 1|, \quad Q_{1} \rightarrow|1\rangle\langle 1|, \quad Q_{2} \rightarrow|0\rangle\langle 0|, \quad Q_{3} \rightarrow|1\rangle\langle 0|$ $\rightarrow U_{\mathrm{NOT}}(2) U_{\mathrm{SWAP}}$
> (4) $Q_{0} \rightarrow|1\rangle\langle 1|, \quad Q_{1} \rightarrow|0\rangle\langle 1|, \quad Q_{2} \rightarrow|1\rangle\langle 0|, \quad Q_{3} \rightarrow|0\rangle\langle 0|$ $\rightarrow U_{\text {NOT }}(1) U_{\text {NOT }}(2) U_{\text {SWAP }}$
> (5) $Q_{0} \rightarrow|0\rangle\langle 0|, \quad Q_{1} \rightarrow|1\rangle\langle 1|, \quad Q_{2} \rightarrow|0\rangle\langle 1|, \quad Q_{3} \rightarrow|1\rangle\langle 0|$ $\rightarrow U_{\text {CNOT }}(1,2) U_{\text {SWAP }}$
> (6) $Q_{0} \rightarrow|1\rangle\langle 0|, \quad Q_{1} \rightarrow|0\rangle\langle 1|$,
> $Q_{2} \rightarrow|1\rangle\langle 1|, \quad Q_{3} \rightarrow|0\rangle\langle 0|$
> $\rightarrow U_{\mathrm{NOT}}(1) U_{\mathrm{CNOT}}(1,2) U_{\mathrm{SWAP}}$
> (7) $Q_{0} \rightarrow|0\rangle\langle 1|, \quad Q_{1} \rightarrow|1\rangle\langle 0|, \quad Q_{2} \rightarrow|0\rangle\langle 0|, \quad Q_{3} \rightarrow|1\rangle\langle 1|$ $\rightarrow U_{\text {NOT }}(2) U_{\mathrm{CNOT}}(1,2) U_{\mathrm{SWAP}}$
(8) $Q_{0} \rightarrow|1\rangle\langle 1|, \quad Q_{1} \rightarrow|0\rangle\langle 0|, \quad Q_{2} \rightarrow|1\rangle\langle 0|, \quad Q_{3} \rightarrow|0\rangle\langle 1|$ $\rightarrow U_{\mathrm{NOT}}(1) U_{\mathrm{NOT}}(2) U_{\mathrm{CNOT}}(1,2) U_{\mathrm{SWAP}}$
(9) $Q_{0} \rightarrow|0\rangle\langle 0|, \quad Q_{1} \rightarrow|1\rangle\langle 0|, \quad Q_{2} \rightarrow|1\rangle\langle 1|, \quad Q_{3} \rightarrow|0\rangle\langle 1|$ $\rightarrow U_{\mathrm{CNOT}}(2,1) U_{\text {SWAP }}$
(10) $Q_{0} \rightarrow|1\rangle\langle 0|, \quad Q_{1} \rightarrow|0\rangle\langle 0|, \quad Q_{2} \rightarrow|0\rangle\langle 1|, \quad Q_{3} \rightarrow|1\rangle\langle 1|$ $\rightarrow U_{\text {NOT }}(1) U_{\mathrm{CNOT}}(2,1) U_{\mathrm{SWAP}}$
(11) $Q_{0} \rightarrow|1\rangle\langle 1|, \quad Q_{1} \rightarrow|0\rangle\langle 1|, \quad Q_{2} \rightarrow|0\rangle\langle 0|, \quad Q_{3} \rightarrow|1\rangle\langle 0|$ $\rightarrow U_{\mathrm{NOT}}(2) U_{\mathrm{CNOT}}(2,1) U_{\mathrm{SWAP}}$
(12) $Q_{0} \rightarrow|0\rangle\langle 1|, \quad Q_{1} \rightarrow|1\rangle\langle 1|, \quad Q_{2} \rightarrow|1\rangle\langle 0|, \quad Q_{3} \rightarrow|0\rangle\langle 0|$. $\rightarrow U_{\text {NOT }}(1) U_{\text {NOT }}(2) U_{\mathrm{CNOT}}(2,1) U_{\mathrm{SWAP}}$.

The only non-local unitary operators are described in terms of $U_{\text {SWAP }}$ or $U_{\text {CNOT }}$. Dür et al similarly found that 2 qubit operations could be classified in terms of equivalence classes characterized by local unitary, $U_{\text {SWAP }}$ and $U_{\mathrm{CNOT}}$ operations [4]. This structure is apparent in a restricted class of unitary operators described below.

## 4. Decomposing the SWAP gate

Now consider the restricted class of unitary operators with $Q_{j}=U_{j} \Pi_{j}$ where $U_{j}$ is unitary and $\Pi_{j}$ is a projection operator for $j=0,1,2,3$. This is a special case of the polar decomposition of $Q_{j}$. Inserting these assumptions into equations (1) yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Pi_{0}+\Pi_{2}=I_{n} \\
& \Pi_{1}=\left(U_{3}^{*} U_{2}\right) \Pi_{2}\left(U_{3}^{*} U_{2}\right)^{*}=\left(U_{1}^{*} U_{0}\right) \Pi_{2}\left(U_{1}^{*} U_{0}\right)^{*} \\
& \Pi_{3}=\left(U_{3}^{*} U_{2}\right) \Pi_{0}\left(U_{3}^{*} U_{2}\right)^{*}=\left(U_{1}^{*} U_{0}\right) \Pi_{0}\left(U_{1}^{*} U_{0}\right)^{*}
\end{aligned}
$$

Consequently we also find

$$
\Pi_{0} \Pi_{2}=\Pi_{0}\left(I_{n}-\Pi_{0}\right)=0_{n}
$$

Thus $\Pi_{0}$ and $\Pi_{2}$ decompose the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ into two orthogonal subspaces. Additionally, $\Pi_{1}$ and $\Pi_{3}$ also decompose $\mathcal{H}$ into two orthogonal subspaces and is equivalent to the decomposition given by $\left\{\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{2}\right\}$ under the unitary transformation $U_{1}^{*} U_{0}$ (or $U_{3}^{*} U_{2}$ ). This allows us to decompose $U_{q}$ as a product of three operators each of Schmidt rank not greater than 2:

$$
\begin{aligned}
U_{q}= & U_{0} \Pi_{0} \otimes|0\rangle\langle 0|+U_{1} \Pi_{1} \otimes|0\rangle\langle 1|+U_{2} \Pi_{2} \otimes|1\rangle\langle 0|+U_{3} \Pi_{3} \otimes|1\rangle\langle 1| \\
= & U_{0} \Pi_{0} \otimes|0\rangle\langle 0|+U_{0} \Pi_{2} U_{0}^{*} U_{1} \otimes|0\rangle\langle 1|+U_{2} \Pi_{2} \otimes|1\rangle\langle 0|+U_{2} \Pi_{0} U_{2}^{*} U_{3} \otimes|1\rangle\langle 1| \\
= & \left(U_{0} \otimes|0\rangle\langle 0|+U_{2} \otimes|1\rangle\langle 1|\right)\left(\Pi_{0} \otimes I_{2}+\Pi_{2} \otimes U_{\mathrm{NOT}}\right) \\
& \times\left(I_{n} \otimes|0\rangle\langle 0|+\left[\Pi_{0} U_{2}^{*} U_{3}+\Pi_{2} U_{0}^{*} U_{1}\right] \otimes|1\rangle\langle 1|\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

The operator $\Pi_{0} U_{2}^{*} U_{3}+\Pi_{2} U_{0}^{*} U_{1}$ is obviously unitary. The decomposition has the interpretation of an exchange of information (1 qubit) from the Hilbert space $\mathbf{C}^{2}$ described by the projection operators $\{|0\rangle\langle 0|,|1\rangle\langle 1|\}$ and the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ described by the projection operators $\left\{\Pi_{0}, \Pi_{2}\right\}$.

The operator $U_{\text {SWAP }}$ has $U_{0}=U_{3}=I_{2}, U_{1}=U_{2}=U_{\mathrm{NOT}}, \Pi_{0}=\Pi_{1}=|0\rangle\langle 0|$ and $\Pi_{2}=\Pi_{3}=|1\rangle\langle 1|$. Consequently

$$
\begin{aligned}
U_{\mathrm{SWAP}}= & \left(I_{2} \otimes|0\rangle\langle 0|+U_{\mathrm{NOT}} \otimes|1\rangle\langle 1|\right)\left(|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes I_{2}+|1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes U_{\mathrm{NOT}}\right) \\
& \times\left(I \otimes|0\rangle\langle 0|+\left[|0\rangle\langle 0| U_{\mathrm{NOT}}+|1\rangle\langle 1| U_{\mathrm{NOT}}\right] \otimes|1\rangle\langle 1|\right) \\
= & U_{\mathrm{CNOT}}(2,1) U_{\mathrm{CNOT}}(1,2) U_{\mathrm{CNOT}}(2,1)
\end{aligned}
$$

that is, we derived the XOR implementation of SWAP.
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