## Quantifying the intrinsic randomness of quantum measurements

Gabriel Senno, Thomas Strohm and Antonio Acín.

Phys. Rev. Lett. 131, 130202 (2023).









 $p_{\text{guess}}$ : "probability that Eve guesses the outcome of a measurement described by the POVM  $\{M_S^x\}_x$  on a system S in the state  $\rho_S$ , about which she holds side information *E*"



 $p_{\text{guess}}$ : "probability that Eve guesses the outcome of a measurement described by the POVM  $\{M_S^x\}_x$  on a system S in the state  $\rho_S$ , about which she holds side information *E*"



 $p_{\text{guess}}$ : "probability that Eve guesses the outcome of a measurement described by the POVM  $\{M_S^x\}_x$  on a system S in the state  $\rho_S$ , about which she holds side information *E*"























Let  $M_S=\{M_S^0,M_S^1\}$  with  $M_S^1=\eta\vert1\rangle\langle1\vert$  and  $\vert\phi\rangle_S=\cos\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)$  $\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)|0\rangle + \sin\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)|1\rangle$ 

Let  $M_S=\{M_S^0,M_S^1\}$  with  $M_S^1=\eta\vert1\rangle\langle1\vert$  and  $\vert\phi\rangle_S=\cos\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)$  $\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)|0\rangle + \sin\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)|1\rangle$ 

Notice that 
$$
M_S^0 = I - \eta |1\rangle\langle 1|
$$
  
=  $[|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|] - \eta |1\rangle\langle 1| + \eta |0\rangle\langle 0| - \eta |0\rangle\langle 0|$   
=  $(1 - \eta)I + \eta |0\rangle\langle 0|$ 

Let  $M_S=\{M_S^0,M_S^1\}$  with  $M_S^1=\eta\vert1\rangle\langle1\vert$  and  $\vert\phi\rangle_S=\cos\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)$  $\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)|0\rangle + \sin\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)|1\rangle$ 

and  $M_S^1 = (1 - \eta) * \mathbf{0} + \eta |1\rangle\langle 1|$ Notice that  $M_S^0 = I - \eta |1\rangle\langle 1|$  $= (1 - \eta)I + \eta|0\rangle\langle0|$  $=$   $[|0\rangle\langle0| + |1\rangle\langle1|] - \eta|1\rangle\langle1| + \eta|0\rangle\langle0| - \eta|0\rangle\langle0|$ 

Let  $M_S=\{M_S^0,M_S^1\}$  with  $M_S^1=\eta\vert1\rangle\langle1\vert$  and  $\vert\phi\rangle_S=\cos\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)$  $\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)|0\rangle + \sin\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)|1\rangle$ 

Notice that 
$$
M_S^0 = I - \eta |1\rangle\langle 1|
$$
  
\n
$$
= [|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|] - \eta |1\rangle\langle 1| + \eta |0\rangle\langle 0| - \eta |0\rangle\langle 0|
$$
\n
$$
= (1 - \eta)I + \eta |0\rangle\langle 0|
$$
\nand  $M_S^1 = (1 - \eta) * \mathbf{0} + \eta |1\rangle\langle 1|$ 

Measuring  $M_S$  is sampling  $\Lambda \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\eta)$  and then measuring  $M_S^{\lambda}$  with  $M_S^0 = \{I, \mathbf{O}\}\$  and  $M_S^1 = \{ |0\rangle, |1\rangle \}$ .

Let  $M_S=\{M_S^0,M_S^1\}$  with  $M_S^1=\eta\vert1\rangle\langle1\vert$  and  $\vert\phi\rangle_S=\cos\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)$  $\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)|0\rangle + \sin\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)|1\rangle$ 

```
and M_S^1 = (1 - \eta) * \mathbf{0} + \eta |1\rangle\langle 1|Notice that M_S^0 = I - \eta |1\rangle\langle 1|= (1 - \eta)I + \eta |0\rangle\langle 0|= \frac{10}{0!} + \frac{1}{(1)} \frac{1}{1} \frac{-\eta}{1}\frac{1}{(1+\eta)} \frac{0}{0!} \frac{-\eta}{0!}
```
Measuring  $M_S$  is sampling  $\Lambda \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\eta)$  and then measuring  $M_S^{\lambda}$  with  $M_S^0 = \{I, \mathbf{O}\}\$  and  $M_S^1 = \{ |0\rangle, |1\rangle \}$ .

If Eve sees  $\lambda = 0$ , she guesses  $x =0$ else she guesses  $x = \argmax$  $\mathcal{Y}$  $y|\phi\rangle|^2$ .

Let  $M_S=\{M_S^0,M_S^1\}$  with  $M_S^1=\eta\vert1\rangle\langle1\vert$  and  $\vert\phi\rangle_S=\cos\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)$  $\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)|0\rangle + \sin\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)|1\rangle$ 

Notice that 
$$
M_S^0 = I - \eta |1\rangle\langle 1|
$$
  
\n
$$
= [|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|] - \eta |1\rangle\langle 1| + \eta |0\rangle\langle 0| - \eta |0\rangle\langle 0|
$$
\n
$$
= (1 - \eta)I + \eta |0\rangle\langle 0|
$$
\nand  $M_S^1 = (1 - \eta) * \mathbf{0} + \eta |1\rangle\langle 1|$ 

Measuring  $M_S$  is sampling  $\Lambda \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\eta)$  and then measuring  $M_S^{\lambda}$  with  $M_S^0 = \{I, \mathbf{O}\}\$  and  $M_S^1 = \{ |0\rangle, |1\rangle \}$ .

If Eve sees  $\lambda = 0$ , she guesses  $x =0$ else she guesses  $x = \argmax$  $\mathcal{Y}$  $y|\phi\rangle|^2$ .

She's correct with prob  $p_{\text{guess}} = (1 - \eta) + \eta \max_y$  $y|\phi\rangle|^2$ 

Let  $M_S=\{M_S^0,M_S^1\}$  with  $M_S^1=\eta\vert1\rangle\langle1\vert$  and  $\vert\phi\rangle_S=\cos\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)$  $\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)|0\rangle + \sin\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)|1\rangle$ 



Measuring  $M_S$  is sampling  $\Lambda \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\eta)$  and then measuring  $M_S^{\lambda}$  with  $M_S^0 = \{I, \mathbf{O}\}\$  and  $M_S^1 = \{ |0\rangle, |1\rangle \}$ .

If Eve sees  $\lambda = 0$ , she guesses  $x =0$ else she guesses  $x = \argmax$  $\mathcal{Y}$  $y|\phi\rangle|^2$ .

She's correct with prob  $p_{\text{guess}} = (1 - \eta) + \eta \max_y$  $y|\phi\rangle|^2$ 













$$
\rho_{XE} := \sum_{x} |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes \tilde{\rho}_{E}^{x}
$$
  
with  $\tilde{\rho}_{E}^{x} := \text{Tr}_{SA}[(\Pi_{SA}^{x} \otimes I)|\phi, \psi\rangle\langle\phi, \psi|]$ 

 $\sigma_A$ 

 $\{\Pi_{SA}^x\}_x$ 

 $\rightarrow x$ 

 $\boldsymbol{P}$ 

 $|\phi\rangle_S$ 

 $1$  D. Frauchiger, M. Troyer and R. Renner, "True randomness from realistic quantum devices", arXiv:1311.4547.



 $1$  D. Frauchiger, M. Troyer and R. Renner, "True randomness from realistic quantum devices", arXiv:1311.4547.



 $1$  D. Frauchiger, M. Troyer and R. Renner, "True randomness from realistic quantum devices", arXiv:1311.4547.  $2$  GS, T. Strohm and A. Acín, Phys. Rev. Lett. 131, 130202 (2023).

#### General scenario





## Results (1/2)

**Thm:** For every state  $\rho_S$  and every POVM  $\{M_S^{\chi}\}_\chi$  it holds that

- 1.  $p_{guess}(X|\Lambda, \rho_S, \{M_S^x\}_x) \leq p_{guess}(X|E, \rho_S, \{M_S^x\}_x)$  and
- 2. If  $p_{guess}(X|E, \rho_S, \{M_S^x\}_x)$  has an optimal solution  $\langle \{M_E^x\}_x, \{\Pi_{SA}^x\}_x, \rho_{SA}\rangle$ such that the postmeasurement states on SA

 $\tilde{\rho}_{SA}^{x} = \mathrm{Tr}_{E}[(I_{SA} \otimes M_{E}^{x})|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|]$ 

are all separable, then  $p_{guess}(X|E, \rho_S, \{M_S^X\}_x) \leq p_{guess}(X|\Lambda, \rho_S, \{M_S^X\}_x)$  $\mathcal{X}$ 

## Results (1/2)

**Thm:** For every state  $\rho_S$  and every POVM  $\{M_S^{\chi}\}_\chi$  it holds that

- 1.  $p_{guess}(X|\Lambda, \rho_S, \{M_S^x\}_x) \leq p_{guess}(X|E, \rho_S, \{M_S^x\}_x)$  and
- 2. If  $p_{guess}(X|E, \rho_S, \{M_S^x\}_x)$  has an optimal solution  $\langle \{M_E^x\}_x, \{\Pi_{SA}^x\}_x, \rho_{SA}\rangle$ such that the postmeasurement states on SA

 $\tilde{\rho}_{SA}^{x} = \mathrm{Tr}_{E}[(I_{SA} \otimes M_{E}^{x})|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|]$ 

are all separable, then  $p_{guess}(X|E, \rho_S, \{M_S^X\}_x) \leq p_{guess}(X|\Lambda, \rho_S, \{M_S^X\}_x)$  $\mathcal{X}$ 

Observe that equality for the case of  $\rho_S$  pure follows as a corollary.

#### Restricted adversarial setting

In [1], intrinsic randomness quantification was studied under the assumptions:

> 1. System A and ancilla S are uncorrelated and,



$$
|\psi\rangle_{SAE}=|\phi\rangle_{SE_{1}}|\varphi\rangle_{AE_{2}}
$$

[1] H. Dai, B. Chen, X. Zhang and X. Ma (2023), "Intrinsic randomness under general quantum measurements", Phys. Rev. Research 5, 033081.

#### Restricted adversarial setting

In [1], intrinsic randomness quantification was studied under the assumptions:

- 1. System A and ancilla S are uncorrelated and,
- 2. Eve is restricted to act on their purifications *individually*.



$$
|\psi\rangle_{SAE}=|\phi\rangle_{SE_{1}}|\varphi\rangle_{AE_{2}}
$$

 $M_E^{\chi} = M_{E_1}^{\chi} \otimes M_{E_2}^{\chi}$ 

[1] H. Dai, B. Chen, X. Zhang and X. Ma (2023), "Intrinsic randomness under general quantum measurements", Phys. Rev. Research 5, 033081.

#### Restricted adversarial setting

In [1], intrinsic randomness quantification was studied under the assumptions:

- 1. System A and ancilla S are uncorrelated and,
- 2. Eve is restricted to act on their purifications *individually*.



$$
|\psi\rangle_{SAE}=|\phi\rangle_{SE_1}|\varphi\rangle_{AE_2}
$$

 $M_E^{\chi} = M_{E_1}^{\chi} \otimes M_{E_2}^{\chi}$ 

Thm. 1 implies that no separation between the guessing probabilities in the classical and quantum pictures can be seen under this restrictions.

[1] H. Dai, B. Chen, X. Zhang and X. Ma (2023), "Intrinsic randomness under general quantum measurements", Phys. Rev. Research 5, 033081.

Results (2/2)

**Thm:** There exists a 4-outcome qubit POVM  $\{F_S^x\}_x$  such that

 $p_{guess}(X|\Lambda, I/2, \{F_S^x\}_x) < p_{guess}(X|E, I/2, \{F_S^x\}_x) = 1.$ 

Results (2/2)

**Thm:** There exists a 4-outcome qubit POVM  $\{F_S^x\}_x$  such that

 $p_{guess}(X|\Lambda, I/2, \{F_S^x\}_x) < p_{guess}(X|E, I/2, \{F_S^x\}_x) = 1.$ 

Proof (sketch):

Results (2/2)

**Thm:** There exists a 4-outcome qubit POVM  $\{F_S^x\}_x$  such that

 $p_{guess}(X|\Lambda, I/2, \{F_S^x\}_x) < p_{guess}(X|E, I/2, \{F_S^x\}_x) = 1.$ 

Proof (sketch):

1. Let  $\rho_{SA} = \frac{1}{4}$  $\frac{1}{4}\sum |\psi^x\rangle\langle\psi^x|$  with  $\{|\psi^x\rangle\}_x$  be the entangled basis for two qubits from [1] and let  $F_S^x=0$  $\mathrm{Tr}[\Pi_{SA}^x(I\otimes\rho_A)]$  with  $\Pi_{SA}^x=|\psi^x\rangle\langle\psi^x|$ . Quantum guessing probability is then unity by construction.

## Results (2/2)

**Thm:** There exists a 4-outcome qubit POVM  $\{F_S^x\}_x$  such that

 $p_{guess}(X|\Lambda, I/2, \{F_S^x\}_x) < p_{guess}(X|E, I/2, \{F_S^x\}_x) = 1.$ 

Proof (sketch):

- 1. Let  $\rho_{SA} = \frac{1}{4}$  $\frac{1}{4}\sum |\psi^x\rangle\langle\psi^x|$  with  $\{|\psi^x\rangle\}_x$  be the entangled basis for two qubits from [1] and let  $F_S^x=0$  $\mathrm{Tr}[\Pi_{SA}^x(I\otimes\rho_A)]$  with  $\Pi_{SA}^x=|\psi^x\rangle\langle\psi^x|$ . Quantum guessing probability is then unity by construction.
- 2. We show that for qubit POVMs,

 $p_{guess}(X|\Lambda,\rho,\{M_S^x\}_x)=1 \ \Rightarrow \ \{M_S^x\}_x$  is a convex combination of projective measurements.

## Results (2/2)

**Thm:** There exists a 4-outcome qubit POVM  $\{F_S^x\}_x$  such that

 $p_{guess}(X|\Lambda, I/2, \{F_S^x\}_x) < p_{guess}(X|E, I/2, \{F_S^x\}_x) = 1.$ 

Proof (sketch):

- 1. Let  $\rho_{SA} = \frac{1}{4}$  $\frac{1}{4}\sum |\psi^x\rangle\langle\psi^x|$  with  $\{|\psi^x\rangle\}_x$  be the entangled basis for two qubits from [1] and let  $F_S^x=0$  $\mathrm{Tr}[\Pi_{SA}^x(I\otimes\rho_A)]$  with  $\Pi_{SA}^x=|\psi^x\rangle\langle\psi^x|$ . Quantum guessing probability is then unity by construction.
- 2. We show that for qubit POVMs,

 $p_{guess}(X|\Lambda,\rho,\{M_S^x\}_x)=1 \ \Rightarrow \ \{M_S^x\}_x$  is a convex combination of projective measurements.

3. Finally, using tools from [2], we show that  $\{F_S^x\}_x$  is not a convex combination of projective measurements.

[1] A. Tavakoli et al., "Bilocal Bell inequalities violated by the quantum elegant joint measurement", Phys. Rev. Lett. 126, 220401 (2021). [2] M. Oszmaniec et al., "Simulating positive-operator-valued measures with projective measurements", Phys. Rev. Lett. 119, 190501 (2017).

• If a given POVM  $\{M_S^x\}_x$  is not a convex combination of projective measurements, then, in order to measure it, one necessarily must implement a Naimark dilation.

- If a given POVM  $\{M_S^x\}_x$  is not a convex combination of projective measurements, then, in order to measure it, one necessarily must implement a Naimark dilation.
- The information about the dilation is not being given to classical Eve. Therefore, it seems to make sense that her guessing probability is below that of quantum Eve.

- If a given POVM  $\{M_S^x\}_x$  is not a convex combination of projective measurements, then, in order to measure it, one necessarily must implement a Naimark dilation.
- The information about the dilation is not being given to classical Eve. Therefore, it seems to make sense that her guessing probability is below that of quantum Eve.
- However, that cannot be the whole explanation, because this already happens in the setting of pure states in which we do have equality.

- If a given POVM  $\{M_S^x\}_x$  is not a convex combination of projective measurements, then, in order to measure it, one necessarily must implement a Naimark dilation.
- The information about the dilation is not being given to classical Eve. Therefore, it seems to make sense that her guessing probability is below that of quantum Eve.
- However, that cannot be the whole explanation, because this already happens in the setting of pure states in which we do have equality.

### Future work

- Characterize the set of states and measurements for which the classical and quantum *pguesses* coincide.
- Find ways to compute (or to, at least, computably approximate from above)  $p_{guess}(X|E, \rho_S, \{M_S^x\}_x).$

# ¡Gracias!

# ¡Gracias!

## Questions?