

October 3, 2001

Recap and linear algebra review

Projection operators

Let's choose an arbitrary pair of kets in a 2-dimensional state space:

$$|\Psi_c\rangle = c_x|x\rangle + c_y|y\rangle \leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} c_x \\ c_y \end{pmatrix},$$

$$|\Psi_d\rangle = d_x|x\rangle + d_y|y\rangle \leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} d_x \\ d_y \end{pmatrix}.$$

1

Recall that normalization requires $|c_x|^2 + |c_y|^2 = |d_x|^2 + |d_y|^2 = 1$.

The inner product between these two states is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi_c | \Psi_d \rangle &= \begin{pmatrix} c_x^* & c_y^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d_x \\ d_y \end{pmatrix} \\ &= c_x^* d_x + c_y^* d_y. \end{aligned}$$

2

This inner product is the complex generalization of the familiar “dot product” between vectors in a real Hilbert space:

$$\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b} = a_x b_x + a_y b_y = |a||b| \cos \theta,$$

3

where θ is the included angle.

Since the norms of physical states are required to be 1, we can think of the inner product as defining a kind of generalized “angle” between state vectors:

$$\langle \Psi_c | \Psi_d \rangle \sim \cos \xi.$$

4

In particular, $\langle \Psi_c | \Psi_d \rangle = 0$ implies that the two states are orthogonal, and $\langle \Psi_c | \Psi_d \rangle = 1$ implies that Ψ_c and Ψ_d are the same state. Of course, the inner product between two states is generally a complex number, but we can still think of $|\langle \Psi_c | \Psi_d \rangle|^2$ as being a quantitative measure of the “relative orthogonality” of Ψ_c and Ψ_d .

$\langle \Psi_c | \Psi_d \rangle$ is often called the “overlap” between Ψ_c and Ψ_d .

The projection operator corresponding to a state Ψ_c is given by

$$\mathbf{P}_c = |\Psi_c\rangle\langle\Psi_c|.$$

5

Let's look at the expectation value of \mathbf{P}_c with respect to a state Ψ_d :

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi_d | \mathbf{P}_c | \Psi_d \rangle &= \langle \Psi_d | |\Psi_c\rangle\langle\Psi_c| | \Psi_d \rangle \\ &= (\langle \Psi_c | \Psi_d \rangle)^* (\langle \Psi_c | \Psi_d \rangle) \\ &= |\langle \Psi_c | \Psi_d \rangle|^2. \end{aligned}$$

6

Hence, \mathbf{P}_c is basically an operator that measures the overlap of other states with Ψ_c .

If we just let \mathbf{P}_c act on a state Ψ_d as an operator,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_c|\Psi_d\rangle &= |\Psi_c\rangle\langle\Psi_c|\Psi_d\rangle \\ &\sim \cos\xi|\Psi_c\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

In vector-speak, this is something like the “component of Ψ_d along Ψ_c ” or the **projection** of Ψ_d on Ψ_c . Hence the name.

At this point it should be clear why $\mathbf{P}_c^2 = \mathbf{P}_c$, right?

Spectral decomposition of a normal operator

“Normal” operators are defined as those operators which satisfy

$$[\mathbf{N}, \mathbf{N}^\dagger] \equiv \mathbf{N}\mathbf{N}^\dagger - \mathbf{N}^\dagger\mathbf{N} = 0. \tag{8}$$

Clearly, Hermitian ($\mathbf{N} = \mathbf{N}^\dagger$) and unitary ($\mathbf{N}^\dagger\mathbf{N} = \mathbf{N}\mathbf{N}^\dagger = \mathbf{1}$) operators are normal.

In a finite-dimensional vector space, every normal operator has a complete set of orthonormal eigenvectors (see Merzbacher §10.1).

If λ_i^q is an eigenvalue of the operator \mathbf{O}_q and $|i^q\rangle$ is an associated eigenstate,

$$\mathbf{O}_q|i^q\rangle = \lambda_i^q|i^q\rangle. \tag{9}$$

If \mathbf{O}_q is a normal operator, its eigenstates $\{|i^q\rangle\}$ can serve as a complete set of orthonormal basis kets for the Hilbert space. [n.b., If \mathbf{O}_q has repeated eigenvalues, we have to diagonalize inside the degenerate subspaces in order to get a good set.] That is, **every** state in the state space can be decomposed in the form:

$$|\Psi_c\rangle = \sum_i c_i|i^q\rangle,$$

$$\sum_i |c_i|^2 = 1. \tag{10}$$

Let’s think about the action of \mathbf{O}_q in this basis:

$$\mathbf{O}_q|\Psi_c\rangle = \mathbf{O}_q \sum_i c_i|i^q\rangle$$

$$= \sum_i c_i\mathbf{O}_q|i^q\rangle$$

$$= \sum_i c_i\lambda_i^q|i^q\rangle. \tag{11}$$

Likewise, let’s think of the action of the projection operators

$$\mathbf{P}_i^q \equiv |i^q\rangle\langle i^q| \tag{12}$$

in this basis:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P}_i^q |\Psi_c\rangle &= |i^q\rangle \langle i^q| \sum_{i'} c_{i'} |i'^q\rangle \\
&= \sum_{i'} c_{i'} |i^q\rangle \langle i^q || i'^q\rangle \\
&= \sum_{i'} c_{i'} |i^q\rangle \langle i^q | i'^q\rangle \\
&= \sum_{i'} c_{i'} |i^q\rangle \delta(i, i') \\
&= c_i |i^q\rangle.
\end{aligned}
\tag{13}$$

Hence, we see that

$$\mathbf{O}_q |\Psi_c\rangle = \sum_i \lambda_i^q \mathbf{P}_i^q |\Psi_c\rangle.
\tag{14}$$

Since this is true for any state $|\Psi_c\rangle$, and since the algebra we have just done is basis-independent, we have that

$$\mathbf{O}_q = \sum_i \lambda_i^q \mathbf{P}_i^q.
\tag{15}$$

This decomposition is called the **spectral decomposition** of the operator \mathbf{O}_q .

Back to matrix notation

Let's go through an example in two-dimensional Hilbert space, mainly in order to illustrate how the above algebra works in matrix notation. This example may also convince you that bras and kets do a really good job of hiding messy details regarding changes of basis...

Suppose we choose a pair of basis kets for the Hilbert space, $|x\rangle$ and $|y\rangle$. Hence, an arbitrary state $|\Psi_c\rangle$ can be decomposed into

$$|\Psi_c\rangle = c_x |x\rangle + c_y |y\rangle,
\tag{16}$$

with $|c_x|^2 + |c_y|^2 = 1$. Once we agree that the basis kets are **fixed**, we can introduce the vector notation

$$|\Psi_c\rangle \leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} c_x \\ c_y \end{pmatrix}.
\tag{17}$$

Now suppose we have a normal operator \mathbf{O} , with eigenvalues λ_a and λ_b , and corresponding (orthonormal) eigenstates

$$\begin{aligned}
|a\rangle &= a_x |x\rangle + a_y |y\rangle \leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} a_x \\ a_y \end{pmatrix}, \\
|b\rangle &= b_x |x\rangle + b_y |y\rangle \leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} b_x \\ b_y \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{18}$$

We can derive the matrix representation (in the x, y basis) for the projection operators corresponding to these eigenvectors:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}_a &= |a\rangle\langle a| = \begin{pmatrix} a_x \\ a_y \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_x^* & a_y^* \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} |a_x|^2 & a_x a_y^* \\ a_y a_x^* & |a_y|^2 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{P}_b &= |b\rangle\langle b| = \begin{pmatrix} b_x \\ b_y \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} b_x^* & b_y^* \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} |b_x|^2 & b_x b_y^* \\ b_y b_x^* & |b_y|^2 \end{pmatrix}.\end{aligned}\tag{19}$$

We can thus compute the matrix representation of \mathbf{O} via spectral decomposition:

$$\mathbf{O} \leftrightarrow \lambda_a \begin{pmatrix} |a_x|^2 & a_x a_y^* \\ a_y a_x^* & |a_y|^2 \end{pmatrix} + \lambda_b \begin{pmatrix} |b_x|^2 & b_x b_y^* \\ b_y b_x^* & |b_y|^2 \end{pmatrix}.\tag{20}$$

Diagonal form of a normal operator

Another interesting way to compute the matrix representation is by constructing the “diagonal form” of \mathbf{O} . Using O to denote the matrix representation of the operator \mathbf{O} , we can write

$$\begin{aligned}O \begin{pmatrix} a_x \\ a_y \end{pmatrix} &= \lambda_a \begin{pmatrix} a_x \\ a_y \end{pmatrix}, \\ O \begin{pmatrix} b_x \\ b_y \end{pmatrix} &= \lambda_b \begin{pmatrix} b_x \\ b_y \end{pmatrix}.\end{aligned}\tag{21}$$

Hence,

$$O \begin{pmatrix} a_x & b_x \\ a_y & b_y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_a a_x & \lambda_b b_x \\ \lambda_a a_y & \lambda_b b_y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a_x & b_x \\ a_y & b_y \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_a & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_b \end{pmatrix}.\tag{22}$$

Note that the matrix whose columns are the orthonormal eigenvectors (let’s call it S) of a normal operator is itself *unitary*:

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_x^* & a_y^* \\ b_x^* & b_y^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_x & b_x \\ a_y & b_y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} |a_x|^2 + |a_y|^2 & a_x^* b_x + a_y^* b_y \\ a_x b_x^* + a_y b_y^* & |b_x|^2 + |b_y|^2 \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{1},\tag{23}$$

$$S^\dagger = S^{-1}.$$

Hence, we can multiply equation (22) by S^{-1} from the right, to yield

$$O = S \Lambda S^{-1},\tag{24}$$

where

$$\Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_a & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_b \end{pmatrix}\tag{25}$$

is the diagonal matrix of eigenvalues. The existence of the factorization (24) for every normal matrix O , with S a unitary matrix whose columns are the eigenvectors of O , is called the Spectral Theorem. Since S can be viewed as a “transformation matrix” that changes the original x, y basis into the a, b basis, this theorem expresses the fact that a matrix is diagonal in its own eigenbasis (provided that basis exists and is complete and orthonormal).

Note that this decomposition is quite useful. For example, it gives us a closed form for

arbitrary powers of normal matrices:

$$\begin{aligned}
 O^n &= (S \Lambda S^{-1})^n \\
 &= (S \Lambda S^{-1})(S \Lambda S^{-1})(S \Lambda S^{-1}) \dots \\
 &= S \Lambda^n S^{-1} \\
 &= S \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_a^n & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_b^n & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots \end{pmatrix} S^{-1}.
 \end{aligned}$$

#

26

Of course, we can do a similar trick with our operator version of the spectral decomposition:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{O}^n &= \left(\sum_i \lambda_i |i\rangle\langle i| \right)^n \\
 &= \sum_i \lambda_i^n |i\rangle\langle i|.
 \end{aligned}$$

27

If you don't see this right away, write it out as an exercise...

Nonorthogonality and imperfect distinguishability

The following simple example is intended to highlight our first genuine example of a mysterious property of quantum mechanics that follows directly from the rules for representation and prediction.

Let's continue to think about our nice simple two-dimensional Hilbert space with basis kets $|x\rangle$ and $|y\rangle$.

Given an arbitrary pair of states

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\Psi_c\rangle &= c_x|x\rangle + c_y|y\rangle, \\
 |\Psi_d\rangle &= d_x|x\rangle + d_y|y\rangle,
 \end{aligned}$$

28

under what conditions is it possible to find a (standard) measurement that can distinguish them with zero probability of error?

Recall that a standard measurement is specified by a complete set of orthogonal projectors. Since for now we are working in just two dimensions, we actually only need to specify a single ket $|\phi\rangle$. Then unambiguously,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{P}_1 &= |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|, \\
 \mathbf{P}_2 &= \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{P}_1.
 \end{aligned}$$

29

In the current scenario, we are trying to pick $|\phi\rangle$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Pr(1|c) &= \langle\Psi_c|\mathbf{P}_1|\Psi_c\rangle = 1, \\
 \Pr(1|d) &= \langle\Psi_d|\mathbf{P}_1|\Psi_d\rangle = 0, \\
 \Pr(2|c) &= \langle\Psi_c|\mathbf{P}_2|\Psi_c\rangle = 0, \\
 \Pr(2|d) &= \langle\Psi_d|\mathbf{P}_2|\Psi_d\rangle = 1.
 \end{aligned}$$

30

In order to satisfy the first condition, we clearly need to choose

$$|\phi\rangle = |\Psi_c\rangle.$$

31

As a consequence

$$\Pr(1|d) = \langle \Psi_d | \mathbf{P}_1 | \Psi_d \rangle = |c_x^* d_x + c_y^* d_y|^2, \quad 32$$

and we find that our two states Ψ_c and Ψ_d are not perfectly distinguishable **unless** they have zero overlap:

$$\Pr(1|d) = 0 \quad \text{iff} \quad \langle \Psi_c | \Psi_d \rangle = 0. \quad 33$$

Hopefully it should be clear that among all possible pairs of vectors in a Hilbert space, only a **vanishing** fraction are orthogonal!

And yet, according to our quantum representation rule, every vector in the Hilbert space corresponds to a distinct physical state of the system – that is, to a distinct *preparation* procedure.

Even though quantum measurement theory allows for non-projective measurements (see third term of this course), it is nonetheless a theorem that

- No measurement can distinguish nonorthogonal states, with zero probability of error, in a single trial.

It is a profound mystery that quantum mechanics presents us with such a huge space of possible physical states without allowing us perfectly to distinguish between them. Why is it that we can “put more information into” the preparation of a quantum system than we can “get back out” in a single measurement of that very same system?

In a sense it’s embarrassing that we don’t yet have a good answer, but some of the most insightful scientists I know believe that this is the single most important question for contemporary research in quantum theory.