



Bounding the set of finite dimensional correlations

Miguel Navascués¹ and Tamás Vértesi²

¹Institute for Quantum Optics and Quantum Information (IQOQI), Vienna. ²Institute for Nuclear Research, Hungarian Academy of Sciences.



MN and T. Vértesi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 115, 020501 (2015).

MN, A. Feix, M. Araújo and T. Vértesi, Phys. Rev. A 92, 042117 (2015).









 $\max f(x) \ge \mu$



 $\max f(x) \ge \mu$



-usually, pretty straightforward -usually, universal -sometimes arise as intuitions gathered via numerical experiments. E.g.: MPS.









E.g.: the NPA hierarchy

MN, S. Pironio and A. Acín, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 010401 (2007). MN, S. Pironio and A. Acín, New J. Phys. 10, 073013 (2008).





Are the ouputs of this experiment compatible with quantum mechanics?



Variational methods

Mathematical coincidences



P(a, b | x, y) is not quantum



There do not exist a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , a quantum state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ and projector operators $\{E_a^x, F_b^y\} \subset B(\mathcal{H})$, with $\sum_a E_a^x = \sum_b F_b^y = \mathbb{I}$, $[E_a^x, F_b^y] = 0$, such that $P(a, b|x, y) = \langle \psi | E_a^x F_b^y | \psi \rangle$.

The problem resists brute force approach!!

P(a, b | x, y) is not quantum

There do not exist a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} a quantum state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ and projector operators $\{E_a^x, F_b^y\} \subset B(\mathcal{H})$, with $\sum_a E_a^x = \sum_b F_b^y = \mathbb{I}$, $[E_a^x, F_b^y] = 0$, such that $P(a, b|x, y) = \langle \psi | E_a^x F_b^y | \psi \rangle$.

The problem resists brute force approach!!

What is a Hilbert space?

$$\psi = (\psi_1, \psi_2, \psi_3 \dots)$$
$$\sum_i |\psi_i|^2 < \infty$$

 $P(a, b | x, y) = \langle \phi, E_a^x F_b^y \phi \rangle = \langle E_a^x F_b^y \rangle$ visible averages $\langle E_c^z E_a^x \rangle$ $\checkmark \langle F_c^z F_b^y \rangle$ invisible averages $\checkmark \langle E_c^z E_a^x F_b^y \rangle$



Moment matrix

$$\Gamma_{u,v} = \langle u^{\dagger}v \rangle$$









Bounding the set of finite dimensional quantum correlations

MN and T. Vértesi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 115, 020501 (2015).





Variational methods

Mathematical coincidences





Bob









 $f(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \{0, 1\}$?









$$\max\left(\phi, \sum_{a,b,x,y} C_{a,b}^{x,y} E_a^x \otimes F_b^y \phi\right)$$

s.t.
$$\phi \in \mathcal{H}^{\otimes 2}, \langle \phi, \phi \rangle = 1$$

 $E_a^x, F_b^y \in B(\mathcal{H}), \text{ projectors,}$ $\sum_a E_a^x = \sum_b F_b^y = 1,$ $\dim(\mathcal{H}) \le D$

Brute force theoretically posible, but impractical
What is a D-dimensional Hilbert space?

MN and T. Vértesi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 115, 020501 (2015).







How to incorporate dimension constraints?

$F(X) = 0, \forall X_1, \dots, X_n \in B(\mathbb{C}^d), d \leq D$

$$F(X) = 0, \forall X_1, \dots, X_n \in B(\mathbb{C}^d), d \le D$$

E.g.:
$$\begin{cases} D = 1 \longrightarrow [X_1, X_2] \end{cases}$$

$$F(X) = 0, \forall X_1, \dots, X_n \in B(\mathbb{C}^d), d \le D$$

E.g.:
$$\begin{cases} D = 1 \longrightarrow [X_1, X_2] \\ D = 2 \longrightarrow [[X_1, X_2]^2, X_3] \end{cases}$$

$$F(X) = 0, \forall X_1, \dots, X_n \in B(\mathbb{C}^d), d \le D$$

E.g.:
$$\begin{cases} D = 1 \longrightarrow [X_1, X_2] \\ D = 2 \longrightarrow [[X_1, X_2]^2, X_3] \end{cases}$$

Central polynomial (commutes with everything)

Standard Identity



C. Procesi. Rings with polynomial identities. Marcel Dekker, New York, 1973







$\begin{array}{ll} \mbox{D-dimensional} & \Gamma \geq 0 \\ \mbox{Hilbert space} & & \Gamma \in \mathcal{S}^D \end{array}$

D-dimensional Hilbert space





Toy problem

$$\max \sum_{j=1,2} \sum_{c_1,c_2=0,1} (-1)^{c_j} \langle X_{c_1 c_2} Y_j X_{c_1 c_2} \rangle$$

s.t.
$$X_{c_1c_2}^2 = Y_j^2 = 1$$

Temporal quantum correlations



C. Budroni, T. Moroder, M. Kleinmann, O. Gühne, Phys. Rev. Lett. 111, 020403 (2013)

Temporal quantum correlations



C. Budroni, T. Moroder, M. Kleinmann, O. Gühne, Phys. Rev. Lett. 111, 020403 (2013)

Toy problem

$$p^* = \max \langle \phi | \sum_{j=1,2} \sum_{c_1, c_2=0,1} (-1)^{c_j} X_{c_1 c_2} Y_j X_{c_1 c_2} | \phi \rangle$$

s.t. $X_{c_1 c_2}^2 = Y_j^2 = 1,$
 $\langle \phi | \phi \rangle = 1$

Toy problem

$$p^* = \max \langle \phi | \sum_{j=1,2} \sum_{c_1,c_2=0,1} (-1)^{c_j} X_{c_1 c_2} Y_j X_{c_1 c_2} | \phi \rangle$$

s.t. $X_{c_1 c_2}^2 = Y_j^2 = 1,$
 $\langle \phi | \phi \rangle = 1$

In the dimension-free case, this kind of problems can be solved with a single SDP

S. Pironio, M. Navascués and A. Acín, SIAM J. Optim. 20, 5, 2157-2180 (2010). C. Budroni, T. Moroder, M. Kleinmann, O. Gühne, Phys. Rev. Lett. 111, 020403 (2013)



titus curr state indeni tige 9.Edges/g.Terttess/core_state_indes).edge(1)1.at ------- is sev gs < g. vertice (index).status = 1007 ent_index).statue - 100 is new_go < p.VetticosOdepos est_index).gath = g.Tertlices(exet_state_index).path > g.Tert est_index).gs = me_gs/ // Common idenoundent_index(.atatus (to tur) where index:.path = g.Vertices!Garr_state_index:.path + g.Ver effect_index:.status = (c); ndex_index[.edex].gs = meg.gs; // formed g.Vertices(desceneert_index).fn + Calculate(g.Vertices(descendent_

With Form1

End With

End Function

$$p^* = 8$$

Temporal quantum correlations



C. Budroni, T. Moroder, M. Kleinmann, O. Gühne, Phys. Rev. Lett. 111, 020403 (2013)

Toy problem

$$p^* = \max \langle \phi | \sum_{j=1,2} \sum_{c_1, c_2=0,1} (-1)^{c_j} X_{c_1 c_2} Y_j X_{c_1 c_2} | \phi \rangle$$

s.t. $X_{c_1 c_2}^2 = Y_j^2 = 1$,

$$\langle \phi | \phi \rangle = 1,$$

 $| \phi \rangle \in \mathbb{C}^2, X_{c_1 c_2}, Y_j \in B(\mathbb{C}^2)$

Solving the toy problem (I): divide the problem into classes

$$X = 1 \quad \text{rank}(X+1) = 2$$

$$X^{2} = 1 \quad X = -1 \quad \text{rank}(X+1) = 0$$

$$X = 2 \frac{|u\rangle\langle u|}{\langle u|u\rangle} - 1 \quad \text{rank}(X+1) = 1 \quad \text{non-trivial}$$

A random instance can be generated easily

Solving the toy problem (I): divide the problem into classes

729 classes Each class labeled by a vector $\vec{r} \in \{0,1,2\}^6$ $rank(X_{c_1c_2} + 1) = r_{c_1c_2}$ $rank(Y_j + 1) = r_j$

Classed toy problem

$$p_{\vec{r}}^* = \max \langle \phi | \sum_{j=1,2} \sum_{c_1, c_2=0,1} (-1)^{c_j} X_{c_1 c_2} Y_j X_{c_1 c_2} | \phi \rangle$$

s.t. $X_{c_1 c_2}^2 = Y_j^2 = 1,$
 $\langle \phi | \phi \rangle = 1.$

$$\langle \psi | \psi \rangle = 1,$$

 $| \phi \rangle \in \mathbb{C}^{2}, X_{c_{1}c_{2}}, Y_{j} \in B(\mathbb{C}^{2}),$
 $rank(X_{c_{1}c_{2}} + 1) = r_{c_{1}c_{2}},$
 $rank(Y_{j} + 1) = r_{j}$

$$\max \sum_{j=1,2} \sum_{c_1,c_2=0,1} (-1)^{c_j} \Gamma_{X_{c_1c_2}Y_jX_{c_1c_2}}$$

s.t. $\Gamma_{1,1} = 1$
 $\Gamma \ge 0,$
 $\Gamma \in S_{D,\vec{r}}$

Solving the toy problem (II): Identify $S_{D,\vec{r}}$

$$\max \sum_{j=1,2} \sum_{c_1,c_2=0,1} (-1)^{c_j} \Gamma_{X_{c_1c_2}Y_jX_{c_1c_2}}$$

s.t. $\Gamma_{1,1} = 1$
 $\Gamma \ge 0,$
 $\Gamma \in S_{D,\vec{r}}$

$$i = 1$$

i = 1

Generate random dichotomic operators $X_{c_1c_2}^i, Y_j^i \in B(\mathbb{C}^2)$ (with app. ranks) and vector $\phi^i \in \mathbb{C}^2$

i = 1

Generate random dichotomic operators $X_{c_1c_2}^i, Y_j^i \in B(\mathbb{C}^2)$ (with app. ranks) and vector $\phi^i \in \mathbb{C}^2$



i = 1

Generate random dichotomic operators $X_{c_1c_2}^i, Y_j^i \in B(\mathbb{C}^2)$ (with app. ranks) and vector $\phi^i \in \mathbb{C}^2$

Build moment matrix Γ^j

 $\Gamma^{i}_{\mathbb{I},\mathbb{I}} = \left\langle \phi^{i} \middle| \mathbb{I}_{d} \middle| \phi^{i} \right\rangle = 1,$

 $\Gamma^{i}_{X_{c_1c_2},Y_j} = \langle \phi^i \big| X^i_{c_1c_2}, Y^i_j \big| \phi^i \rangle,$

i = i + 1

Repeat until the moment matrix $\Gamma^{(N+1)}$ is a linear combination of $\Gamma^{(1)}, \dots, \Gamma^{(N)}$

i = 1

Generate random dichotomic operators $X_{c_1c_2}^i, Y_j^i \in B(\mathbb{C}^2)$ (with app. ranks) and vector $\phi^i \in \mathbb{C}^2$

Build moment matrix Γ^{j} $\Gamma_{\mathbb{I},\mathbb{I}}^{i} = \langle \phi^{i} | \mathbb{I}_{d} | \phi^{i} \rangle = 1,$ $\Gamma_{X_{c_{1}c_{2}},Y_{j}}^{i} = \langle \phi^{i} | X_{c_{1}c_{2}}^{i}, Y_{j}^{i} | \phi^{i} \rangle,$ \vdots i = i + 1At that point, *any* feasible moment matrix Γ must be a linear combination of $\Gamma^{(1)}, \dots, \Gamma^{(N)}$ $\mathcal{S}_{r}^{D} = span(\Gamma^{(1)}, \dots, \Gamma^{(N)})$

SDP relaxation

$$\max \sum_{j=1,2} \sum_{c_1,c_2=0,1} (-1)^{c_j} \Gamma_{X_{c_1c_2}Y_jX_{c_1c_2}}$$

s.t. $\Gamma_{1,1} = 1$
 $\Gamma \ge 0,$
 $\Gamma = \sum_{s=1}^N c_s \Gamma^s$

SDP relaxation



Implementation tips





Strict positivity

Implementation tips



Use (modified) Gram-Schmidt as you generate the matrices Γ^1 , Γ^2 ...

Sequence of orthogonal matrices $\widetilde{\Gamma^1}, \widetilde{\Gamma^2}$...

at s=N+1, $\widetilde{\Gamma^s} = 0$, up to computer precision

$$\Gamma = \sum_{s=1}^{N} c_s \Gamma^s \quad \qquad \qquad \Gamma = \sum_{s=1}^{N} \widetilde{c_s} \frac{\widetilde{\Gamma_s}}{\sqrt{tr(\widetilde{\Gamma_s}^2)}}$$
SDP relaxation







titus curr state index) tige 9.Edges/g.Terttess/core_state_indes).edge(1)1.at ------- is sev gs < g. vertice (index).status = 1007 ent_index).statue - 100 is new_go < p.VetticosOmerow est_index).gath = g.Tertlices(exet_state_index).path > g.Tert est_index).gs = me_gs/ // Common idenoundent_index(.atabia (te-tur) where index:.path = g.Vertices!Garr_state_index:.path + g.Ver effect_index:.status = (c); ndex_index[.edex].gs = meg.gs; // formed g.Vertices(desceneert_index).fn + Calculate(g.Vertices(descendent_

With Form1

End With

End Function

Free dimensionality

$$p^* = 8$$

Second relaxation, D=2

$$p^2 = 5.656854 \dots$$

Generalization

NPO problem with dimension constraints

$$p^* = \min_{\mathcal{H}, X, \phi} \langle \phi, p(X)\phi \rangle$$

s.t. $X_1, \dots, X_n \in B(\mathcal{H}),$
 $q_i(X) \ge 0, i = 1, \dots, s$
 $\phi \in \mathcal{H}$
 $\langle \phi, \phi \rangle = 1$
 $\dim(\mathcal{H}) \le D$

MN, A. Feix, M. Araújo and T. Vértesi, Phys. Rev. A 92, 042117 (2015).

$$p_k^* = \min \sum_{w} p_w y_w$$

s.t. $y_1 = 1$,
 $M_k(y) \ge 0$,
 $M_{k-\lfloor d_i/2 \rfloor}(q_i y) \ge 0$,
 $y = \sum_{s=1}^{j-1} c_s y^{(s)}, c_s \in \mathbb{C}$.
 $p_k^* \le p^*$

$$p_k^* = \min \sum_{w} p_w y_w$$

s.t. $y_1 = 1$,
 $M_k(y) \ge 0$,
 $M_{k-\lfloor d_i/2 \rfloor}(q_i y) \ge 0$,
 $y = \sum_{s=1}^{j-1} c_s y^{(s)}, c_s \in \mathbb{C}.$

Archimedean
condition
$$C - \sum_{r} X_{r}^{\dagger} X_{r} + X_{r} X_{r}^{\dagger} = \sum_{s} f_{s} f_{s}^{\dagger} + \sum_{s,i} g_{s,i} q_{i} g_{s,i}^{\dagger}$$

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} p_{k}^{*} = p^{*}$$

Related hierarchies

SDP hierarchy for quantum non-locality under dimension constraints



$$\max\left(\phi, \sum_{a,b,x,y} C^{x,y}_{a,b} E^x_a \otimes F^y_b \phi\right)$$

s.t.
$$\phi \in \mathcal{H}^{\otimes 2}, \langle \phi, \phi \rangle = 1$$

 $E_a^x, F_b^y \in B(\mathcal{H}), \text{ projectors},$
 $\sum_a E_a^x = \sum_b F_b^y = 1,$
 $\dim(\mathcal{H}) \leq D$

$$\max\left(\phi, \sum_{a,b,x,y} C^{x,y}_{a,b} E^x_a \otimes F^y_b \phi\right)$$

s.t.
$$\phi \in \mathcal{H}^{\otimes 2}, \langle \phi, \phi \rangle = 1$$

 $E_a^x, F_b^y \in B(\mathcal{H}), \text{ projectors},$
 $\sum_a E_a^x = \sum_b F_b^y = 1,$
 $\dim(\mathcal{H}) \leq D,$
 $rank(E_a^x) = r_a^x, rank(F_b^y) = t_b^y$

High level description

i = 1



SDP hierarchy



s.t.
$$\Gamma_{1,1} = 1$$

 $\Gamma \ge 0, \Gamma = \sum_{s=1}^{j} c_s \Gamma^s$

Convergence is guaranteed

MN, A. Feix, M. Araújo and T. Vértesi, Phys. Rev. A 92, 042117 (2015).



titus curr state index) tige 9.Edges/g.Terttess/core_state_indes).edge(1)1.at ------- is sev gs < g. vertice (index).status = 1007 ent_index).statue - 100 is new_go < p.VetticosOmerow est_index).gath = g.Tertlices(exet_state_index).path > g.Tert est_index).gs = me_gs/ // Common idenoundent_index(.atabia (te-tur) where index:.path = g.Vertices!Garr_state_index:.path + g.Ver effect_index:.status = (c); ndex_index[.edex].gs = meg.gs; // formed g.Vertices(desceneert_index).fn + Calculate(g.Vertices(descendent_

With Form1

End With

End Function



$$\begin{split} I_{4,4} = & E_1^A + E_{1,1} + E_{1,2} + E_{2,1} - E_{2,2} \\ & + E_{3,3} + E_{3,4} + E_{4,3} - E_{4,4} \leq 5.9907 \\ & & & & & \\ I_{4,4} = & E_1^A + E_{1,1} + E_{1,2} + E_{2,1} - E_{2,2} \\ & & + E_{3,3} + E_{3,4} + E_{4,3} - E_{4,4} \leq 5.8310 \end{split}$$

$$4,3 - E_{4,4} \le 5.8310$$

D=2, 3



MN, A. Feix, M. Araújo and T. Vértesi, Phys. Rev. A 92, 042117 (2015).



High level description

i = 1

Generate random projectors $E_a^{i,x}$, $F_b^{i,y} \in B(\mathbb{C}^D)$ (with app. ranks) Repeat until the Build moment matrix Γ^i moment matrix $\Gamma^{(N+1)}$ is a linear combination of $\Gamma_{\mathbb{I},\mathbb{I}}^{i} = \langle \psi^{+} | \mathbb{I}_{d} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{d} | \psi^{+} \rangle = 1,$ $\Gamma^{(1)},\ldots,\Gamma^{(N)}$ $\Gamma^{i}_{E^{\mathcal{X}}_{a},F^{\mathcal{Y}}_{b}} = \left\langle \psi^{+} \middle| E^{i,\mathcal{X}}_{a} \otimes F^{i,\mathcal{Y}}_{b} \right\rangle$ i = i + 1



titus curr state index) tige 9.Edges/g.Terttess/core_state_indes).edge(1)1.at ------- is sev gs < g. vertice (index).status = 1007 ent_index).statue - 100 is new_go < p.VetticosOmerow est_index).gath = g.Tertlices(exet_state_index).path > g.Tert est_index).gs = me_gs/ // Common idenoundent_index(.atabia (te-tur) where index:.path = g.Vertices!Garr_state_index:.path + g.Ver effect_index:.status = (c); ndex_index[.edex].gs = meg.gs; // formed g.Vertices(desceneert_index).fn + Calculate(g.Vertices(descendent_

With Form1

End With

End Function



SDP hierarchy for quantum communication complexity



$$p^* = \frac{1}{2^{2n}} \max \sum_{x,y} tr(F_{f(x,y)}^y \rho_x)$$

such that
$$F_b^{\mathcal{Y}}, \rho_x \in B(\mathbb{C}^D),$$

 $(F_b^{\mathcal{Y}})^2 = F_b^{\mathcal{Y}},$
 $\rho_x \ge 0, tr(\rho_x) = 1$

High level description

i = 1



SDP hierarchy

$$\max \frac{1}{2^{2n}} \sum_{b,x,y} \Gamma_{\rho_x,F_{f(x,y)}^y}$$

s.t.
$$\Gamma_{1,1} = 1$$

 $\Gamma \ge 0, \Gamma = \sum_{s=1}^{j} c_s \Gamma^s$

No proof of convergence!!!

MN, A. Feix, M. Araújo and T. Vértesi, Phys. Rev. A 92, 042117 (2015).

Random Access Codes (RAC)





titus curr state index) tige 9.Edges/g.Terttess/core_state_indes).edge(1)1.at ------- is sev gs < g. vertice (index).status = 1007 ent_index).statue - 100 is new_go < p.VetticosOmerow est_index).gath = g.Tertlices(exet_state_index).path > g.Tert est_index).gs = me_gs/ // Common idenoundent_index(.atabia (te-tur) where index:.path = g.Vertices!Garr_state_index:.path + g.Ver effect_index:.status = (c); ndex_index[.edex].gs = meg.gs; // formed g.Vertices(desceneert_index).fn + Calculate(g.Vertices(descendent_

With Form1

End With

End Function

Random Access Codes (RAC)

D	2	3	4	5	6	7
LB	0.788675	0.832273	0.908248	0.924431	0.951184	0.969841
UB	0.788675	0.832273	0.908248	0.924445	0.954123	0.969841

TABLE I: Lower and upper bounds on $P_{\max}(3 \rightarrow \log_2(D))$.



R. Gallego, N. Brunner, C. Hadley and A. Acín, Phys. Rev. Lett. 105, 230501 (2010).

Prepare-and-measure dimension witnesses



	C_2 (bit)	Q_2 (qubit)	C_3 (trit)	Q_3 (qutrit)	C_4 (quat)
I_3	3	$1 + 2\sqrt{2}$	5	5	5
I_4	5	6	7	7.9689	9

TABLE I: Classical and quantum bounds for the dimension witnesses I_3 and I_4 . Notably, these witnesses can distinguish classical and quantum systems of given dimensions.







titus curr state index) tige 9.Edges/g.Terttess/core_state_indes).edge(1)1.at ------- is sev gs < g. vertice (index).status = 1007 ent_index).statue - 100 is new_go < p.VetticosOmerow est_index).gath = g.Tertlices(exet_state_index).path > g.Tert est_index).gs = me_gs/ // Common idenoundent_index(.atabia (te-tur) where index:.path = g.Vertices!Garr_state_index:.path + g.Ver effect_index:.status = (c); ndex_index[.edex].gs = meg.gs; // formed g.Vertices(desceneert_index).fn + Calculate(g.Vertices(descendent_

With Form1

End With

End Function

	C_2 (bit)	Q_2 (qubit)	C_3 (trit)	Q_3 (qutrit)	C_4 (quat)
I_3	3	$1 + 2\sqrt{2}$	5	5	5
I_4	5	6	7	7.9689	9

TABLE I: Classical and quantum bounds for the dimension witnesses I_3 and I_4 . Notably, these witnesses can distinguish classical and quantum systems of given dimensions.

We proved that all these witnesses were sound, hence validating of the conclusions of the experimental papers

M. Hendrych, R. Gallego, M. Micuda, N. Brunner, A. Acín and J. P. Torres, Nat. Phys. 8, 588 (2012). J. Ahrens, P. Badziag, A. Cabello, M. Bourennane, Nat. Phys. 8, 592 (2012).

Hierarchy for real quantum systems

i = 1



Real vs. Complex quantum mechanics


Random Access Codes (RAC)



The structure of Matrix Product States



Matrix product states



D. Perez-Garcia, F. Verstraete, M.M. Wolf and J.I. Cirac, Quantum Inf. Comput. 7, 401 (2007).

Matrix product states



Features:

a) Efficient computation of expectation values

b) Calculations in the thermodynamical limit $k \rightarrow \infty$

D. Perez-Garcia, F. Verstraete, M.M. Wolf and J.I. Cirac, Quantum Inf. Comput. 7, 401 (2007).

Correspondence between polynomials and states

$$P(X) = P(X_1, ..., X_d),$$

homogeneous polynomial
of degree m
$$P(X) = \sum_{\vec{i}} p_{\vec{i}} X_{i_1} ... X_{i_m} \qquad |P(X)\rangle = \sum_{\vec{i}} p_{\vec{i}}^* |i_1, ..., i_m\rangle$$

Overlap between a polynomial and a MPS



Existence of annihilation operators

$$\langle P(X) | \psi \rangle = \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_s, \\ i_{s+m+1}, \dots, i_k}} tr(\sigma A_{i_1} \dots A_{i_s} P(A) A_{i_{s+m+1}} \dots A_{i_k}) | i_1, \dots, i_s, i_{s+m+1}, \dots i_k \rangle$$



There exist local operators h which annihilate all MPS of bond dimension D or smaller

Actually, for high m, almost all m-local operators are annihilation operators, because

Local dimension of m particles d^m

Local dimension of MPS subspace poly(m)

Existence of cut-and-glue operators

{
$$P_j(X)$$
}, basis of
homogeneous central
polynomials for
dimension D of degree m
$$C = \sum_j |j\rangle \langle P_j(X)|$$



C, cut-and-glue operator



C, cut-and-glue operator





C, cut-and-glue operator for dimension D

 ho_k , k-site MPS of bond dimension D







Theoretical complexity of the SDP hierarchy and connection with MPS

Complexity of implementing the kth relaxation



Free-dimensional problems have the same complexity as dimension-constrained ones!?

Connection with MPSs

$$\Gamma_k = \sum_{i_1,\dots,i_k} \sum_{j_1,\dots,j_k} \operatorname{tr}(\tilde{X}_{j_n}\dots\tilde{X}_{j_1}|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\tilde{X}_{i_1}\dots\tilde{X}_{i_k})|\vec{i}\rangle\langle\vec{j}|$$

Feasible moment matrices are extendible MPSs of bond dimension D!!!

Complexity of implementing the kth relaxation



Complexity of implementing the kth relaxation

$$\tilde{\Gamma}^{k} = \left(\begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \right) \right\} poly(k)$$

$$|\tilde{c^k}| = \operatorname{poly}(k)$$

Finite dimensions are exponentially easier to characterize than infinite dimensions!!! Extra PSD conditions to boost speed of convergence

$$\Gamma^k = \sum p_j \rho^j_{MPS}$$

Extra PSD conditions to boost speed of convergence

$$\Gamma^k = \sum p_j \rho^j_{MPS}$$



Extra PSD conditions to boost speed of convergence



Conclusions

-Simple, easy-to-program technique to enforce dimension constraints in noncommutative polynomial optimization.

-<u>Plentv of numerical evidence</u> suggests that it is effective.

-It can be combined with other hierarchies, such as MLHG or BFS.

T. Moroder, J.-D. Bancal, Y.-C. Liang, M. Hofmann and O. Gühne, Phys. Rev. Lett. 111, 030501 (2013).

M. Berta, O. Fawzi and V. B. Scholz, arXiv:1506.08810.

