



2/14/02

# Contents

(a) algebraic states

(b) local uniform mixing

(c) pretty good state transfer

Algebraic states

## Gelfond-Schneider Theorem

If  $\alpha, \beta$  are algebraic numbers,  $\alpha \neq 0, 1$  and  $\beta$  is irrational,  
then  $\alpha^\beta$  is transcendental.  $\square$



A matrix is algebraic if its entries are algebraic numbers.

**Theorem** Let  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  be algebraic density matrices.

If the Hamiltonian of the quantum walk on  $X$  is algebraic and there is perfect state transfer from  $D_1$  to  $D_2$ , then the ratio condition holds.

**Proof** Suppose

$$D_2 = U(b)D_1U(1-b) = \sum_{r,s} e^{it(\theta_r - \theta_s)} E_r D_1 E_s$$

If the Hamiltonian is algebraic, its eigenvalues are algebraic and accordingly the spectral idempotents are algebraic.

We have

$$E_k D_2 E_l = e^{it(\theta_k - \theta_l)} E_k D_1 E_l$$

and therefore  $e^{it(\theta_k - \theta_l)}$  is algebraic whenever  $E_k D_1 E_l \neq 0$

If  $k \neq \mathbb{Q}$ ,

$$e^{ib(c\theta_1 - d_3)} = \left( e^{it(\theta_1 - \theta_2)} \right)^{\frac{\theta_1 - \theta_2}{\theta_1 - \theta_2}} \quad (1)$$

By the Gel'fond-Schneider theorem, with  $\alpha = e^{it(\theta_1 - \theta_2)}$

and  $\beta = \frac{\theta_1 - \theta_2}{\theta_1 - \theta_2}$ , we have that if  $\beta$  is algebraic & not rational,

the right side of (1) is transcendental. Therefore

$\beta$  must be rational, giving us the ratio condition.  $\square$

Local uniform mixing

We have **local uniform mixing** at time  $t$ , starting from a state  $D$ , if  $D(t) = U(t) D U(-t)$  has constant diagonal. (The uniform mixing is local relative to  $D$ .)

In most cases, the initial state will be a vertex-state  $D_a$ .

We have **uniform mixing** on  $X$  at time  $t$  if there is local uniform mixing from each vertex state at time  $t$ .

The easiest way to get uniform mixing is to get local uniform mixing (relative to a vertex) on a vertex-transitive graph.

We see that  $U(t)e_a e_a^T U(-t)$  has constant diagonal if & only if  $U(t)e_a$  is flat. So, local uniform mixing from  $a$  if the  $a$ -column of  $U(t)$  is flat; uniform mixing if & only if  $U(t)$  itself is flat.

$$M(t) = U(A)U(t)$$

**Lemma** We have uniform mixing at time  $t$  on  $X$  if and only if

$U(t)$  is flat or, equivalently,  $M(t) = \frac{1}{|V(X)|} J$ .  $\square$

**Lemma** Assume  $X$  is bipartite. If there is local uniform mixing

at time  $t$  from vertex  $a$ , then  $D_a(t)$  is algebraic.

**Proof** Recall that if  $X$  is bipartite,  $U(t)$  has the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} C_+(t) & iK(t) \\ iK^T(t) & C_-(t) \end{bmatrix}$$

where  $C_+(t)$ ,  $C_-(t)$  are real & symmetric &  $K(t)$  is real.

If  $n = |V(X)|$  and a column of  $U(A)$  is flat, then all entries of this column lie in  $\{\pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}, \pm \frac{i}{\sqrt{n}}\}$  — thus they are algebraic numbers (and  $D_n(A)$  is algebraic).

**Corollary** If  $X$  is bipartite and admits local uniform mixing from the vertex  $a$ , then the eigenvalue support of  $a$  satisfies the ratio condition &  $a$  is periodic.  $\square$



Pretty good state transfer

There is <sup>pgst</sup> pretty good state transfer from  $D_1$  to  $D_2$  if  $D_2$  lies in the closure of the  $Q$ -orbit. Equivalently, for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is a time  $t$  such that

$$\|U(t)D_1 - U(t)D_2\| < \varepsilon.$$

### Claims

- If there is pgst from  $D_1$  to  $D_2$ , there is pgst from  $D_2$  to  $D_1$ .
- If there is pgst from  $D_1$  to  $D_2$ , then  $D_1$  &  $D_2$  are strongly cospectral.

For one example, see the treatment of  $P_4$  in Chapter 1 of the notes.

We view  $pst$  as a special case of  $pgst$ . We justify our claims. Let  $P$  &  $Q$  be density matrices.

(a) Since the complex conjugate of  $U(t)P U(t) - Q$  is  $U(-t)P U(t) - Q$

$$\|U(-t)P U(t) - Q\| = \|U P - U(t)Q U(-t)\|.$$

So we have  $pgsb$  from  $P$  to  $Q$  if & only, there is  $pgst$  from  $Q$  to  $P$ .

(b) Assume  $A$  is real. We have

$$U(A)P U(A)^* = \sum_{r,s} e^{it(\theta_r - \theta_s)} E_r P E_s,$$

$$Q = \sum_{r,s} E_r Q E_s,$$

and hence if  $U(A)P U(A)^*$  is close to  $Q$ , then

$$e^{it(\theta_k - \theta_l)} E_k P E_l, \quad E_k Q E_l$$

are close. It follows that  $E_k P E_l = \pm E_k Q E_l \quad \forall k, l$  and  $E_k P E_k = E_k Q E_k$ .

So  $P$  &  $Q$  are strongly cospectral.

For the proof of the following, see the notes:

**Theorem** There is  $pgst$  between the end vertices of  $P_n$

if and only if  $n = p-1$  or  $2p-1$  ( $p$  prime) or  $n = 2^k - 1$   $\square$

So  $P_{11}$  is the smallest path which does not have  $pgst$  between its end-vertices.

Averages

Recall that

$$D(t) = U(t) D U(-t).$$

We define the **average state**  $\hat{D}$  by

$$\hat{D} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T U(t) D U(-t) dt$$

Does it exist? We have  $U(t) D U(-t) = \sum_{r,s} e^{it(\theta_r - \theta_s)} E_r D E_s$

and if  $r \neq s$ , then  $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T e^{it(\theta_r - \theta_s)} dt = 0$ . So

Lemma  $\hat{D} = \sum_r E_r D E_r.$

□

So  $\hat{D} \neq 0$  and  $\text{tr}(\hat{D}) = \sum_r \text{tr}(E_r D E_r) = \sum_r \text{tr}(D E_r^2)$   
 $= \sum_r \text{tr}(D E_r)$   
 $= \text{tr}(D \sum_r E_r)$   
 $= \text{tr}(D I)$   
 $= \text{tr}(D)$   
 $= 1.$



Note that the terms in  $\sum_r E_r D_1 E_r$  are pairwise orthogonal.

Also if  $\hat{D}_1 = \hat{D}_2$ , then

$$E_k D_1 E_k = E_k \left( \sum_r E_r D_1 E_r \right) = E_k \left( \sum_r E_r D_2 E_r \right) = E_k D_2 E_k.$$

Thus if the sums are equal, the terms are equal.

Further:

**Theorem** If  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  are strongly cospectral, then  $\hat{D}_1 = \hat{D}_2$ .

*exercise*

If  $D_1$  &  $D_2$  are pure states and  $\hat{D}_1 = \hat{D}_2$ , then  $D_1$  &  $D_2$  are strongly cospectral.  $\square$

We have  $\hat{D} = \hat{D}$ , so the map  $D \rightarrow \hat{D}$  is idempotent and linear. Also

$$\langle D_1, \hat{D}_2 \rangle = \text{tr} \left( D_1 \sum_r E_r D_2 E_r \right) = \sum_r \text{tr} (D_1 E_r D_2 E_r) = \sum_r \text{tr} (E_r D_1 E_r D_2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{D}_1, D_2 &= \dots = \hat{D}_1, \hat{D}_2 &= \text{tr} (\sum_r E_r D_1 E_r D_2) \\ &= \langle \hat{D}_1, \hat{D}_2 \rangle \end{aligned}$$

and therefore the map  $D \rightarrow \hat{D}$  is self-adjoint.

Hence it is a projection. Onto what?

If  $DA = AD$ , then  $E_r D = D E_r$  and

$$\hat{D} = \sum_r E_r D E_r = \sum_r D E_r^2 = \sum_r D E_r = D \sum_r E_r = D$$

As  $\hat{D}$  &  $E_r$  commute for each  $r$ , we have:

**Lemma** The map  $D \rightarrow \hat{D}$  is orthogonal projection

onto the commutant of  $A$ .

□

**Lemma** If  $D(t) := U(t)DU(-t)$ , then

$$\|D(t) - \hat{D}\| = \|D - \hat{D}\| \quad \forall t$$

**Proof**

$$\begin{aligned} \|D(t) - \hat{D}\| &= \|U(t)DU(-t) - \hat{D}\| = \|U(t)(D - \hat{D})U(-t)\| \\ &= \|D - \hat{D}\| \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We also note that

$$\|D - \hat{D}\|^2 = \|D\|^2 - \|\hat{D}\|^2$$

(Pythagoras)