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#### Abstract

Recovering quantum information from a noisy quantum system is one of the central challenges in quantum information science and fundamental physics. The key to this goal is explicitly constructing a decoder. In this paper, we provide two explicit decoding quantum circuits that are both capable of recovering quantum information when a decoupling condition is satisfied, i.e., when quantum information is in principle recoverable. The decoders are constructed by using the fixedpoint amplitude amplification algorithm based on the quantum singular value transformation, which significantly extends an approach by Yoshida and Kitaev in a specific noise model to general situations. We also show that the proposed decoding circuits reduce the computational cost compared to a previously known explicit decoder. Our constructions not only show an intriguing intersection between decoders and quantum algorithms but also reveal the power of an algorithmic approach to recovering quantum information.


## I. INTRODUCTION

Recovering quantum information from a noisy system is crucial for transmitting quantum information over noisy quantum channels. A standard technique is to use quantum error correction, in which quantum information is encoded before the system experiences noise and is decoded afterward. Recovery of quantum information is also of significant importance in fundamental physics to understanding complicated quantum many-body phenomena. By analyzing the recovery of quantum information, various novel insights into the black hole information paradox [1-3], the AdS/CFT correspondence [4, 5], topological orders [6-8], and quantum chaos [9-11], have been obtained.

The recovery of quantum information is commonly investigated by the decoupling approach [12-14]. Decoupling refers to the situation, where the environmental system of the noisy channel is decoupled from the reference system that keeps track of the quantum information, and is necessary and sufficient for the quantum information to be recoverable. While decoupling provides a useful theoretical approach to the problem of information recovery without referring to the recovery process, from a practical viewpoint, it is important to explicitly construct a recovery protocol, or a decoder. An explicit decoder also advances the understanding of the recovery process of quantum information.

Only a handful of results about explicit constructions of a decoder are known so far [15-17]. A standard explicit decoder is the Petz recovery map [18, 19]. While the map was originally introduced in a different context,

[^0]it is known that the map is applicable to recovering quantum information, resulting in a close-to-optimal recovery error [15]. However, a quantum circuit for implementing the Petz recovery map requires high computational complexity [20]. Hence, simplifications of the Petz recovery map, focusing on its use as a decoder, have been studied [21, 22].

Another explicit decoder is the Yoshida-Kitaev (YK) decoder [16], which is capable of decoding the so-called Hayden-Preskill (HP) protocol [1]. The HP protocol is a toy model of the qubit-erasure noise with a specific unitary encoding, and has a good interpretation in the black hole information paradox. The YK decoder can decode the HP protocol, and its quantum circuit is explicitly given. The decoder is also of interest from an algorithmic perspective: first a recovery protocol with post-selection by measurement is considered, and then a decoder is constructed by replacing the measurement with a non-trivial use of the amplitude amplification (AA) algorithm [2325], which is for amplifying the success probability. The YK decoder, however, strongly relies on the specific setting of the HP protocol. It is highly non-trivial if such a two-step construction of a decoder using a AA-type algorithm can be extended to more general situations.

In this paper, we explore the use of the AA-type algorithms for recovering quantum information and provide two explicit decoding quantum circuits. One is a generalization of the YK decoder, in which we crucially modify the decoder by replacing the AA algorithm with the fixed-point amplitude amplification (FPAA) algorithm based on the quantum singular value transformation (QSVT) [26-28]. Due to the flexibility of the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm, the issues that arise with the AA algorithm can be circumvented, and the generalized YK decoder is applicable to general encoding and noisy channels. The other is a simplification of the Petz
recovery map, which we call a Petz-like decoder. Similarly to the generalized YK decoder, the simplification is achieved by using the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm, and the Petz-like decoder is also applicable to any situation.

We show that both decoders have high recovery performance in the sense that they succeed in recovering quantum information if the decoupling condition is satisfied. As the decoupling is a necessary and sufficient condition for the information recovery, this immediately implies that quantum information can be recovered by the proposed decoders whenever it is in principle recoverable. Important applications of the decoders are to the independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) asymptotic setting. In the i.i.d. setting, both decoders with suitably chosen encoders achieve the quantum capacity [2931]. This is also true when the sender and the receiver share entanglement in advance. This situation is called an entanglement-assisted setting. The proposed decoders with suitable encoders achieve the entanglement-assisted quantum capacity [32-34] as well.

Taking advantage of our explicit constructions, we also investigate the circuit complexity of the generalized YK and the Petz-like decoders. While the complexity depends on various factors, the dominant factor is in general the complexity for implementing the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm. We provide a simple criterion for the generalized YK decoder to have smaller complexity than the Petz-like decoder. The criterion is in terms of the number of qubits of the encoded quantum information, the amount of pre-shared entanglement, the number of output qubits of the noisy channel, and also the number of Kraus operators of the channel. It turns out that the generalized YK decoder typically has less complexity when more entanglement is shared in advance. We additionally compare the complexity with the algorithmic implementation of the original Petz recovery map and show that the proposed decoders have smaller complexity in a large parameter region.

This paper is organized as follows. We start with preliminaries in II. Our main results are summarized in III. The proofs of our results are provided in IV. We conclude with a summary and outlooks in V, and provide a derivation of a technical statement in Appendix A.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

We here introduce our notation and our setting. We then briefly overview an implicit decoder commonly used in the decoupling approach. We also provide quick overviews of the Petz recovery map and the YK decoder.

## A. Notation

Throughout this paper, we denote by $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ a set of all quantum states on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. While we usually
denote a pure state by $|\varphi\rangle$, the corresponding density operator is sometimes described as $\varphi$, namely, $\varphi=|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|$. We use a superscript to represent a system on which operators and maps are defined. For instance, an operator on a system $A B$ and a superoperator from $A$ to $B$ are denoted by $\varphi^{A B}$ and $\mathcal{T}^{A \rightarrow B}$, respectively. The superscript is omitted when it is clear from the context. A reduced density operator on $A$ of $\varphi^{A B}$ is described as $\varphi^{A}$, i.e., $\varphi^{A}=\operatorname{Tr}_{B} \varphi^{A B}$, where $\operatorname{Tr}_{B}$ is the partial trace over $B$.

For an operator $M$, we denote the complex conjugate and the transpose in a given basis by $M^{*}$ and $M^{\top}$, respectively, and denote the Hermitian conjugate by $M^{\dagger}$. The identity operation is denoted by $\mathbb{I}$ and id for operators and superoperators, respectively. We often omit the identity operators and superoperators for simplicity.

A Hilbert space, such as $\mathcal{H}^{A^{\prime}}$ or $\mathcal{H}^{\hat{A}}$, is isomorphic to $\mathcal{H}^{A}$ : it has the same dimension, and we fix the same basis as $\mathcal{H}^{A}$. This applies not only to the system $A$, but also to any systems, such as $\mathcal{H}^{B^{\prime}}$ and $\mathcal{H}^{\hat{C}}$. We write the dimension of a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ as $d$, and for instance, denote by $d_{A}$ the dimension of $\mathcal{H}^{A}$.

We omit the symbol of the tensor product between vectors and denote it as $|\varphi\rangle \otimes|\psi\rangle=|\varphi\rangle|\psi\rangle$, for simplicity, when it is clear from the context. We denote by $|\Phi\rangle$ a maximally entangled state (MES) defined in the orthonormal computational basis. For instance, the MES between $A$ and $\hat{A}$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\Phi\rangle^{A \hat{A}}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{d_{A}}} \sum_{i=1}^{d_{A}}|i\rangle^{A}|i\rangle^{\hat{A}} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\{|i\rangle\}_{i}$ is the computational basis in $A$ and $\hat{A}$, respectively. Note that a MES in an arbitrary basis can be transformed into the MES in the computational basis by applying an appropriate unitary to one of the local systems. We also denote the completely mixed state (CMS) by $\pi$, such as $\pi^{A}=\mathbb{I}^{A} / d_{A}$.

The circuit complexity of $\mathcal{T}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{T})$. It is the minimum total number of one- and two-qubit unitary gates required to perform $\mathcal{T}$ with ancillae polynomial in qubits.

For a matrix $M$, the trace norm is defined by $\|M\|_{1}:=$ $\operatorname{Tr}\left[\sqrt{M^{\dagger} M}\right]$. The trace norm has the contraction property such that for $\varphi^{A B} \in \mathcal{S}\left(\mathcal{H}^{A B}\right)$ and $\psi^{A B} \in \mathcal{S}\left(\mathcal{H}^{A B}\right)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\varphi^{A}-\psi^{A}\right\|_{1} \leq\left\|\varphi^{A B}-\psi^{A B}\right\|_{1} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The fidelity between $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ is defined as $\mathrm{F}(\varphi, \psi):=\|\sqrt{\varphi} \sqrt{\psi}\|_{1}^{2}$. The fidelity is rephrased using the purified states of $\varphi$ and $\psi$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{F}\left(\varphi^{A}, \psi^{A}\right)=\max _{V}\left|\left\langle\left.\varphi\right|^{A C} V^{B \rightarrow C} \mid \psi\right\rangle^{A B}\right|^{2} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the maximization is taken over all isometries $V^{B \rightarrow C}$. Here, we supposed $d_{C} \geq d_{B}$ without loss of generality. This is called the Uhlmann's theorem [35]. The trace norm and the fidelity are related by the Fuchs-van


FIG. 1. A diagram of our setting. Time flows from left to right. The boxes represent quantum channels. The purpose of the sender and the receiver is to transmit quantum information via noisy channel $\mathcal{N}^{C \rightarrow D}$, which is equivalent to preserving the maximally entangled state between $A$ and $R$. They may share $\left(\log d_{B}\right)$-ebit entanglement in advance, which is used during the encoding and decoding operations.
de Graaf inequalities [36, 37]

$$
\begin{equation*}
1-\sqrt{\mathrm{F}(\varphi, \psi)} \leq \frac{1}{2}\|\varphi-\psi\|_{1} \leq \sqrt{1-\mathrm{F}(\varphi, \psi)} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

We use the quantum collision entropy. For $\varphi^{A} \in \mathcal{S}\left(\mathcal{H}^{A}\right)$ it is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{2}(A)_{\varphi}=-\log \operatorname{Tr}\left[\left(\varphi^{A}\right)^{2}\right] . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

This satisfies $0 \leq H_{2}(A)_{\varphi} \leq d_{A}$.

## B. Our setting

We consider the following setting. Suppose that a sender aims to transmit $\left(\log d_{A}\right)$-qubit quantum information using a given noisy channel $\mathcal{N}^{C \rightarrow D}$ and possibly a pre-shared entanglement $|\Phi\rangle^{B B^{\prime}}$, where $B$ and $B^{\prime}$ are with the sender and receiver, respectively. When they share no entanglement, we set $d_{B}=1$. The sender encodes the system $A$ with $B$ using an encoding channel $\mathcal{E}^{A B \rightarrow C}$. The qubits in $C$ are then transmitted to the receiver through the noisy channel $\mathcal{N}^{C \rightarrow D}$. The receiver obtains the output system $D$ of the noisy channel and applies a recovery channel, i.e., a decoder $\mathcal{D}^{D B^{\prime} \rightarrow R^{\prime}}$ onto the system $D B^{\prime}$. For simplicity, we denote by $\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}$ the composite channel $\mathcal{N}^{C \rightarrow D} \circ \mathcal{E}^{A B \rightarrow C}$. The main concern in this paper is to explicitly construct a decoder $\mathcal{D}^{D B^{\prime} \rightarrow R^{\prime}}$ for a given channel $\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}$. We assume that the descriptions of the encoding map $\mathcal{E}$ and the noisy channel $\mathcal{N}$ are known, so that the decoder can depend on their details.

Following the convention, we introduce a reference system $R$ isomorphic to $A$ with $d_{R}=d_{A}$, and prepare the systems $A$ and $R$ to be in a MES $|\Phi\rangle^{A R}$. We denote by $\omega^{R D B^{\prime}}$ the state just before the decoder is applied:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\omega^{R D B^{\prime}}:=\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}\left(\Phi^{A R} \otimes \Phi^{B B^{\prime}}\right) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

See also Fig. 1. The recovery error of quantum information by a decoder $\mathcal{D}^{D B^{\prime} \rightarrow R^{\prime}}$ in this protocol is defined as [38]

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta(\mathcal{D} \mid \mathcal{F}):=\frac{1}{2}\left\|\Phi^{R R^{\prime}}-\mathcal{D}^{D B^{\prime} \rightarrow R^{\prime}}\left(\omega^{R D B^{\prime}}\right)\right\|_{1} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

## C. Decoupling and the Uhlmann decoder

A standard approach to evaluating the recovery error is to estimate how much quantum information is leaked to an "environment" of the noisy channel. This is specifically quantified by the degree of decoupling.

We denote by $V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A B \rightarrow E D}$ a Stinespring isometry of the channel $\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}=\mathcal{N}^{C \rightarrow D} \circ \mathcal{E}^{A B \rightarrow C}$ by an environment $E$. That is, the channel $\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}$ is represented as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}(\cdot)=\operatorname{Tr}_{E}\left[V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A B \rightarrow E D}(\cdot)\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A B \rightarrow E D}\right)^{\dagger}\right] \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

For convenience, we also introduce a purified state of $\omega^{R D B^{\prime}}$ in Eq. (6) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\omega\rangle^{R E D B^{\prime}}:=V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A B \rightarrow E D}|\Phi\rangle^{A R}|\Phi\rangle^{B B^{\prime}} . \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

The following is called the decoupling approach.
Proposition 1 (Decoupling approach [12-14]). Suppose $|\omega\rangle^{R E D B^{\prime}}$ is a pure state. If there exists a state $\tau^{E}$ such that $\left\|\omega^{R E}-\pi^{R} \otimes \tau^{E}\right\|_{1} \leq \epsilon$, then there exists a $C P T P$ map $\mathcal{D}_{\text {Uhlmann }}^{D B^{\prime} \rightarrow R^{\prime}}$ that satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{2}\left\|\Phi^{R R^{\prime}}-\mathcal{D}_{\text {Uhlmann }}^{D B^{\prime} \rightarrow R^{\prime}}\left(\omega^{R D B^{\prime}}\right)\right\|_{1} \leq \sqrt{\epsilon} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

The proof of this proposition follows from Eqs. (2), (3), and (4). See, e.g., [12-14]. We refer to the decoder
$\mathcal{D}_{\text {Uhlmann }}$ as the Uhlmann decoder. The condition that there exists $\tau^{E}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\omega^{R E}-\pi^{R} \otimes \tau^{E}\right\|_{1} \leq \epsilon \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

is known as a decoupling condition. While the decoupling approach implicitly indicates the existence of a decoder when the decoupling condition is satisfied, it does not provide an explicit procedure to construct a decoder. For this reason, all the details about decoders, such as the computational cost for the construction, are open.

The decoupling approach is particularly strong in the study of the maximum possible rate for transmitting quantum information. Let $N$ be the number of uses of a noisy channel $\mathcal{N}^{C \rightarrow D}$ to transmit quantum information. The transmission rate for a fixed $N$ is defined by $\mathrm{R}_{N}:=\frac{1}{N} \log d_{A}$. An asymptotically-achievable rate is then defined by $\mathrm{R}:=\lim _{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathrm{R}_{N}$ under the assumption that there exists a sequence of pairs of an encoder and a decoder such that the recovery error tends to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$. The supremum of asymptotically-achievable rates for the channel is called the quantum capacity $Q(\mathcal{N})$. It is known by the technique of the random encoding that if $\mathrm{R}<Q(\mathcal{N})$, there exists an isometric encoder that asymptotically achieves decoupling, i.e., $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ [39]. Hence, the recovery error of the Uhlmann decoder also asymptotically tends to zero. That is, the Uhlmann decoder with suitably chosen encoders achieves the quantum capacity.

## D. Petz recovery map

One of the explicit decoders we use is the Petz recovery map [18, 19], which has been a useful tool in quantum information theory and has been intensely studied [33, 40]. The Petz recovery map is developed from a quantum analog of Bayes theorem based on the idea that there can be a reverse channel that recovers an effect of noise. The general form of the Petz recovery map is determined by a $\operatorname{map} \mathcal{T}$ and a reference state $\sigma$, and given by

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathcal{P}_{\sigma, \mathcal{T}}^{B \rightarrow A}(\cdot) \\
& =\left(\sigma^{A}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\mathcal{T}^{A \rightarrow B}\right)^{\dagger}\left(\left[\mathcal{T}\left(\sigma^{A}\right)\right]^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\cdot)\left[\mathcal{T}\left(\sigma^{A}\right)\right]^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right)\left(\sigma^{A}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{12}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\left(\mathcal{T}^{A \rightarrow B}\right)^{\dagger}$ is the adjoint map of $\mathcal{T}^{A \rightarrow B}$ with respect to the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product. The Petz recovery map is composed of three CP maps:

$$
\begin{align*}
(\cdot) & \rightarrow\left[\mathcal{T}\left(\sigma^{A}\right)\right]^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\cdot)\left[\mathcal{T}\left(\sigma^{A}\right)\right]^{-\frac{1}{2}}  \tag{13}\\
(\cdot) & \rightarrow\left(\mathcal{T}^{A \rightarrow B}\right)^{\dagger}(\cdot)  \tag{14}\\
(\cdot) & \rightarrow\left(\sigma^{A}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}(\cdot)\left(\sigma^{A}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{15}
\end{align*}
$$

It achieves the perfect recovery for the reference state $\sigma^{A}$, i.e., $\mathcal{P}_{\sigma, \mathcal{T}}^{B \rightarrow A}\left(\mathcal{T}^{A \rightarrow B}\left(\sigma^{A}\right)\right)=\sigma^{A}$.


FIG. 2. A diagram of the Petz recovery map applied to our setting. The dash-dotted box corresponds to the Petz recovery map $\mathcal{P}_{\pi, \mathcal{G}}$ given in Eq. (19). The boxes of $\left(\omega^{B^{\prime} D}\right)^{-1 / 2}$ and $\left(\pi^{R^{\prime}}\right)^{1 / 2}$ represent that $(\cdot) \rightarrow\left(\omega^{B^{\prime} D}\right)^{-1 / 2}(\cdot)\left(\omega^{B^{\prime} D}\right)^{-1 / 2}$ and $(\cdot) \rightarrow\left(\pi^{R^{\prime}}\right)^{1 / 2}(\cdot)\left(\pi^{R^{\prime}}\right)^{1 / 2}$, respectively. The double vertical lines represent that the qubits of that system are traced out.

For the recovery error of the Petz recovery map, the following is known, stating that, if there exists a decoder that recovers information with a small error, the Petz recovery map also recovers it with a small error.

Proposition 2 (Barnum-Knill's theorem [15]). For any state $\rho^{A}$ and any channel $\mathcal{T}^{A \rightarrow B}$, it holds that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{F}\left(\rho^{A R}, \mathcal{P}_{\rho, \mathcal{T}}^{B \rightarrow A} \circ \mathcal{T}^{A \rightarrow B}\left(\rho^{A R}\right)\right) \\
& \quad \geq\left[\max _{\mathcal{R}} \mathrm{F}\left(\rho^{A R}, \mathcal{R}^{B \rightarrow A} \circ \mathcal{T}^{A \rightarrow B}\left(\rho^{A R}\right)\right)\right]^{2} \tag{16}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\rho^{A R}=|\rho\rangle\left\langle\left.\rho\right|^{A R}\right.$ is a purified state of $\rho^{A}$. The maximum is taken over all quantum channels $\mathcal{R}^{B \rightarrow A}$.

To apply the Petz recovery map to our setting, let $F$ be the system such that $A B F=E D$, and a unitary $U_{\mathcal{F}}^{L}$ be defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A B \rightarrow E D}=U_{\mathcal{F}}^{L}|0\rangle^{F} \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $L=A B F=E D$. Using this unitary, Eq. (8) is rephrased as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}(\cdot)=\operatorname{Tr}_{E}\left[U_{\mathcal{F}}^{L}\left(\cdot \otimes|0\rangle\left\langle\left. 0\right|^{F}\right)\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}^{L}\right)^{\dagger}\right]\right. \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

We use $\mathcal{G}^{A \rightarrow D B^{\prime}}(\cdot):=\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}\left(\cdot \otimes \Phi^{B B^{\prime}}\right)$ and fix the reference state to be the CMS $\pi^{A}$. The explicit form of the Petz recovery map in our setting is then given by

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathcal{P}_{\pi, \mathcal{G}}^{D B^{\prime} \rightarrow R^{\prime}}\left(\omega^{R D B^{\prime}}\right) \\
& =d_{E}\left(\pi^{R^{\prime}}\right)^{1 / 2}\left\langle\Phi | ^ { \hat { B } B ^ { \prime } } \left\langle0 | ^ { \hat { F } } ( U _ { \mathcal { F } } ^ { \hat { L } } ) ^ { \dagger } \left[\left(\omega^{D B^{\prime}}\right)^{-1 / 2} \omega^{R D B^{\prime}}\right.\right.\right. \\
& \left.\quad\left(\omega^{D B^{\prime}}\right)^{-1 / 2} \otimes \Phi^{\hat{E} E^{\prime}}\right] U_{\mathcal{F}}^{L}|\Phi\rangle^{\hat{B} B^{\prime}}|0\rangle^{\hat{F}}\left(\pi^{R^{\prime}}\right)^{1 / 2}, \tag{19}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\hat{L}$ is equal to $R^{\prime} \hat{B} \hat{F}=\hat{E} D$. See also the diagram in Fig. 2.

By combining Proposition 2 with Proposition 1 and the Fuchs-van de Graaf inequalities, we derive the following statement, which relates the recovery error of the Petz recovery map $\mathcal{P}_{\pi, \mathcal{G}}^{D B^{\prime}} \rightarrow R^{\prime}$ against $\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}$ to the decoupling condition: if there exists a state $\tau^{E}$ such that $\left\|\omega^{R E}-\pi^{R} \otimes \tau^{E}\right\|_{1} \leq \epsilon$, then the recovery error of the Petz recovery map in the above setting is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta\left(\mathcal{P}_{\pi, \mathcal{G}} \mid \mathcal{F}\right) \leq 2 \epsilon^{1 / 4} \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

As discussed in IIC, the decoupling is asymptotically achieved by an appropriately chosen encoder. Since the upper bound on the recovery error of $\mathcal{P}_{\pi, \mathcal{G}}$ tends to zero with such an encoder, hence, the Petz recovery map also archives the quantum capacity.

An algorithmic implementation of the Petz recovery map using the QSVT is provided in [20]. Using the algorithm, one can obtain an explicit decoder. However, its circuit complexity is generally inefficient.

## E. Yoshida-Kitaev decoder in the Hayden-Preskill protocol

The YK decoder [16] was proposed for recovering quantum information in the toy model of the black hole information paradox, i.e., the HP protocol [1]. The HP protocol formulates the information paradox based on the qubit-erasure noise with a restriction that the encoding operation is given by a unitary dynamics of a black hole, typically assumed to be sufficiently random. More specifically, the encoder $\mathcal{E}$ and the noisy channel $\mathcal{N}$ in Fig. 1 are given by a random unitary and the partial trace over a subsystem $E$ of $C$, respectively, where $A B=C$. It is further assumed that the receiver, i.e., the person who applies a decoder, knows what unitary was applied and which qubits were traced over.

The YK decoder provides an explicit algorithm for decoding the HP protocol, and is based on the idea of "emulating" the inverse dynamics of the encoding unitary and the erasure noise in the receiver's local system. The receiver then measures the output of the erasure noise and the corresponding "emulated" output in the maximallyentangled basis. If a desired outcome were obtained, the emulated output becomes as if it were in the quantum state same as the state of the actual input of noise. In this case, the effect of the erasure noise is canceled by the emulated inverse in the local system, and the receiver succeeds in recovering quantum information. While this protocol does not succeed with certainty as it requires post-selection, the probability of obtaining the desired outcome can be amplified by a non-trivial use of the AA algorithm, completing the construction of the YK decoder.

Although the YK decoder provides an insight that the two-step approach, i.e., the approach of considering the protocol with post-selection and combining it with the AA algorithm, may be useful for constructing a decoder, the reason for the decoder to work strongly relies on the
specific properties of the HP protocol. In particular, it is crucial that, when the decoupling condition is met, the unitary encoding and the erasure noise make the eigenvalues of the quantum state on the reference $R$ and the environment $E$ of the noise completely uniform, namely, $\omega^{R E} \approx \pi^{R} \otimes \pi^{E}$. Without this uniform property, the AA algorithm in the YK decoder does not work. Since the uniform condition is not satisfied for general encoding operations and noises, extending the YK decoder to a general situation is highly non-trivial. We comment on this point in more detail in the proof of our main result in IV A 2.

## III. MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we summarize our results. We provide explicit quantum circuit constructions of two decoders and evaluate their performance. One is the generalized Yoshida-Kitaev decoder presented in III A, and the other is the Petz-like decoder given in III B. We investigate the complexity of the decoders in III C and III D.

Both decoders are constructed by the two-step approach similar to the YK decoder: we first consider a protocol with post-selection and then transform the protocol into the one without post-selection. Unlike the YK decoder, however, we use the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm $[26-28]$ instead of the standard AA algorithm. The QSVT-based FPAA algorithm is a slight extension of the standard FPAA algorithm [41-43] and is crucial for circumventing the issues arisen when the standard AA algorithm is used.

## A. Generalized Yoshida-Kitaev decoder

We below propose a generalization of the YK decoder. In III A 1, we investigate a decoding protocol with postselection that works for general encoding maps and noisy channels. We then show in III A 2 that the protocol can be transformed into a decoder using the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm.

## 1. Decoding protocol with post-selection

The decoding protocol with post-selection consists of the following three steps. See Fig. 3 as well.

1. The receiver prepares ancilla qubits in the system $A^{\prime} R^{\prime}$, and then generates a MES $\Phi^{A^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$, which is a copy of the MES $\Phi^{A R}$.
2. The receiver applies an isometry $\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{*}$ onto $A^{\prime} B^{\prime}$, where $V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A B \rightarrow E D}$ is a Stinespring isometry of $\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}$. The complex conjugate is taken in the computational basis.


FIG. 3. A diagram of the protocol with post-selection for the generalized YK decoder. The double vertical lines represent that the qubits of that system are traced out. The dashdotted box corresponds to the isometry map $\mathcal{V}^{B^{\prime} \rightarrow D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ defined in Eq. (21).
3. The receiver performs a binary measurement $\mathcal{M}:=\left\{|\Phi\rangle\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{D D^{\prime}}, \mathbb{I}^{D D^{\prime}}-\mid \Phi\right\rangle\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{D D^{\prime}}\right\} \quad\right.$ on $\quad D D^{\prime}$. When the former result of the measurement $\mathcal{M}$ is obtained, this protocol succeeds.
In this protocol, all the systems with a prime, i.e., $A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}$ $R^{\prime}, D^{\prime}$, and $E^{\prime}$, in addition to the output system $D$ of the channel $\mathcal{F}$ are in the hands of the receiver. Hence, the above protocol can be executed by the receiver.

The Stinespring dilation $V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A B \rightarrow C D}$ in the step 2 is not uniquely determined from a given channel $\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}$ : the dilation has a freedom of applying additional isometries on the environment $E$. However, the protocol works for any choice of $V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A B \rightarrow C D}$. Hence, the receiver can choose arbitrary Stinespring dilation of the channel $\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}$.

For future use, we denote the operation up to the step 2 of the above protocol by an isometry map $\mathcal{V}^{B^{\prime} \rightarrow D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$. That is,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathcal{V}^{B^{\prime} \rightarrow D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}(\cdot) \\
& \quad:=\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{*}\left(\cdot \otimes \Phi^{A^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\right)\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{\top} . \tag{21}
\end{align*}
$$

We denote by $p_{\text {succ }}$ and $\zeta_{\text {succ }}$ the success probability and the output state with the success in the step 3, respectively. The reduced state on $R R^{\prime}$ of $\zeta_{\text {succ }}$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\zeta_{\text {succ }}^{R R^{\prime}}=\operatorname{Tr}_{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime}}\left[\frac{1}{p_{\text {succ }}}|\Phi\rangle\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{D D^{\prime}} \mathcal{V}^{B^{\prime} \rightarrow D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\left(\omega^{R D B^{\prime}}\right)\right]\right. \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

In IV A 1 , we compute $p_{\text {succ }}$ and the fidelity between $\zeta_{\text {succ }}^{R R^{\prime}}$ and $\Phi^{R R^{\prime}}$, and then obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& p_{\text {succ }}=\frac{d_{B}}{d_{D}} 2^{-H_{2}(R E)_{\omega}}  \tag{23}\\
& \mathrm{F}\left(\zeta_{\text {succ }}^{R R^{\prime}}, \Phi^{R R^{\prime}}\right)=\frac{1}{d_{A}} 2^{H_{2}(R E)_{\omega}-H_{2}(E)_{\omega}} \tag{24}
\end{align*}
$$

This implies that if $\omega^{R E}$ decouples as $\omega^{R E} \approx \pi^{R} \otimes \omega^{E}$, the fidelity after post-selection becomes $\mathrm{F}\left(\zeta_{\text {succ }}^{R R^{\prime}}, \Phi^{R R^{\prime}}\right) \approx 1$. Namely, the recovery of the MES is succeeded if the measurement is successful under the decoupling is satisfied.

## 2. Construction of the generalized YK decoder

We now explain how the above decoding protocol with post-selection can be transformed into a decoder without post-selection by the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm. The QSVT is a quantum algorithm described by a unitary $G_{t, \phi}$ with parameters $\phi=\left(\phi_{1}, \phi_{2}, \ldots, \phi_{t}\right) \in(-\pi, \pi]^{t}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}$. It is to apply a polynomial transformation to the singular values of a linear operator embedded in a submatrix of the unitary [26-28]. The polynomial is determined by the phase sequence $\phi$, and the integer $t$ which corresponds to the degree of the polynomial. The key point of the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm is that, by choosing an appropriate $t$ and $\phi$ for approximating the sign function, we amplify the success probability of the measurement $\mathcal{M}$ in the step 3 to nearly unity.

To elucidate the structure of the unitary $G_{t, \phi}$ in our setting, we introduce two projectors:

$$
\begin{align*}
\Pi_{1}^{D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}:= & \left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{*} \\
& \left(\mathbb{I}^{B^{\prime}} \otimes|\Phi\rangle\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{A^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\right)\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{\mathrm{T}},\right.  \tag{25}\\
\Pi_{2}^{D D^{\prime}}:= & |\Phi\rangle\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{D D^{\prime}},\right. \tag{26}
\end{align*}
$$

and unitaries:

$$
\begin{equation*}
W_{m}(\theta):=e^{i \theta\left(2 \Pi_{m}-\mathbb{I}\right)} \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $m=1,2$ and $\theta \in(-\pi, \pi]$. Let $W_{t, \phi}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ be a unitary given by

$$
\begin{align*}
& W_{t, \phi}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} \\
& \qquad=W_{2}\left(\phi_{t}\right)^{D D^{\prime}} \prod_{j=1}^{(t-1) / 2} W_{1}\left(\phi_{2 j}\right)^{D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} W_{2}\left(\phi_{2 j-1}\right)^{D D^{\prime}} . \tag{28}
\end{align*}
$$

The unitary $G_{t, \phi}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H}$ is then defined by

$$
\begin{align*}
& G_{t, \phi}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H}:=W_{t, \phi}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} \otimes|+\rangle\left\langle+\left.\right|^{H}\right. \\
& \quad+W_{t,-\phi}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} \otimes|-\rangle\left\langle-\left.\right|^{H}\right. \tag{29}
\end{align*}
$$

where $H$ is a single-qubit auxiliary system.
When we construct the generalized YK decoder, the measurement step 3 in the previous protocol is replaced with the application of $G_{t, \phi}$ as follows.

3'. The receiver prepares an auxiliary single-qubit state $|0\rangle^{H}$ in a system $H$, and then applies a unitary $G_{t, \phi}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H}$, with appropriate $t$ and $\phi$ to approximate the sign function.
All together, the decoder is given by $\mathcal{D}_{t, \phi}^{D B^{\prime}} \rightarrow R^{\prime}$ as

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathcal{D}_{t, \phi}^{D B^{\prime} \rightarrow R^{\prime}}(\cdot) \\
& \qquad=\operatorname{Tr}_{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} H}\left[G _ { t , \phi } ^ { D D ^ { \prime } E ^ { \prime } R ^ { \prime } H } \left(\mathcal{V}^{B^{\prime} \rightarrow D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}(\cdot)\right.\right.  \tag{30}\\
& \left.\otimes|0\rangle\left\langle\left. 0\right|^{H}\right)\left(G_{t, \phi}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H}\right)^{\dagger}\right]
\end{align*}
$$



FIG. 4. A diagram of the generalized YK decoder. Open circles imply that the gates are controlled by $|0\rangle$, while closed circles indicate the ones controlled by $|1\rangle$. The gate H is the single-qubit Hadamard gate. The red dashed and green dotted boxes correspond to the generalized YK decoder $\mathcal{D}_{t, \phi}$ defined in Eq. (30), and the unitary $G_{t, \phi}$ by the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm given in Eq. (29), respectively.
where $\mathcal{V}^{B^{\prime} \rightarrow D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ is defined in Eq. (21). See Fig. 4 as well.

The following theorem holds.
Theorem 3 (Performance of the generalized YK decoder). For a given channel $\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}$, let $\overline{\mathcal{F}}^{A B \rightarrow E}$ be a complementary channel of $\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}, \omega^{R E}$ be given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\omega^{R E}=\overline{\mathcal{F}}^{A B \rightarrow E}\left(\Phi^{A R} \otimes \pi^{B}\right) \tag{31}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $\lambda_{\min }\left(\omega^{R E}\right)$ be the non-zero minimum eigenvalue of $\omega^{R E}$. Suppose that there exists a state $\tau^{E}$ such that $\left\|\omega^{R E}-\pi^{R} \otimes \tau^{E}\right\|_{1} \leq \epsilon$. For any $\delta \in(0,1]$, there exist $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\phi=\left(\phi_{1}, \phi_{2}, \ldots, \phi_{t}\right) \in(-\pi, \pi]^{t}$ such that the recovery error $\Delta\left(\mathcal{D}_{t, \phi} \mid \mathcal{F}\right)$ of the generalized YK decoder $\mathcal{D}_{t, \phi}^{D B^{\prime} \rightarrow R^{\prime}}$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta\left(\mathcal{D}_{t, \phi} \mid \mathcal{F}\right) \leq \sqrt{\epsilon}+\sqrt{2 \delta} \tag{32}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $t$ is an odd integer satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
t=\Theta\left(\sqrt{\frac{d_{D}}{d_{B} \lambda_{\min }\left(\omega^{R E}\right)}} \log (1 / \delta)\right) \tag{33}
\end{equation*}
$$

The circuit complexity of the decoder $\mathcal{D}_{t, \phi}^{D B^{\prime} \rightarrow R^{\prime}}$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{C}\left(\mathcal{D}_{t, \phi}\right)=\mathcal{O}\left(t\left(\mathcal{C}\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}\right)+\log \left(d_{D}^{2} d_{E} / d_{B}\right)\right)\right) \tag{34}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the number of ancilla qubits is $\mathcal{O}\left(\log \left(d_{D}^{2} d_{E} / d_{B}\right)\right)$. Here, $\mathcal{C}\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}\right)$ is a circuit complexity of a unitary $U_{\mathcal{F}}^{L}$ such that $U_{\mathcal{F}}^{L}|0\rangle^{F}$ is a Stinespring isometry of $\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}$, and $L=A B F=E D$.

Theorem 3 shows in Eq. (32) that the recovery error is dependent on $\epsilon$ and $\delta$. While $\epsilon$ is an upper bound on the
degree of decoupling and depends only on the channel $\mathcal{F}$, $\delta$ can be chosen arbitrarily small. One may hence think that the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$ should be taken. This is true if the recovery error is the only concern. However, there is a trade-off relation between the recovery error and the circuit complexity. The parameter $\delta$ is to characterize the trade-off. In fact, Eqs. (33) and (34) show that the circuit complexity of the generalized YK decoder depends on $\delta$, such as $\log (1 / \delta)$. Hence, the complexity increases if one wishes to achieve small errors. This trade-off is naturally expected due to the nature of the AA-type algorithm. Note that the dependence of the complexity on $1 / \delta$ is only logarithmic, and so, exponentially small $\delta$ is feasible.

One needs to know the value of each $\phi_{j}$ for $j=$ $1,2, \ldots, t$ to implement the generalized YK decoder, which requires additional computational cost, apart from the circuit complexity. However, the computational cost for this is not high since the values are independent of $\mathcal{F}$ and there exist classical algorithms to compute such $\phi_{j}$ in running time $\mathcal{O}(\operatorname{poly}(t))$ [44-48].

As $\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}=\mathcal{N}^{C \rightarrow D} \circ \mathcal{E}^{A B \rightarrow C}$, Theorem 3 states that when the encoding $\operatorname{map} \mathcal{E}$ is appropriately chosen against a given noise $\mathcal{N}$, or equivalently when the encoder $\mathcal{E}$ is chosen to satisfy the decoupling condition with small error, then the generalized YK decoder achieves a small error in recovering quantum information. As explained in II C, if the rate is below the quantum capacity, there exists such a good encoder that achieves the decoupling condition with a vanishing $\epsilon$ in the i.i.d. asymptotic limit. Hence, by setting $\delta$ in Theorem 3 to the values vanishing in the i.i.d. asymptotic limit, the generalized YK decoder can be used as a decoder that achieves the quantum capacity, which can be entanglement-non-assisted or -assisted. In this sense, the generalized YK decoder is a
capacity-achieving decoder.
We make a couple of comments on the complexity $\mathcal{C}\left(\mathcal{D}_{t, \phi}\right)$. First, as the number $t$ depends on $\lambda_{\min }\left(\omega^{R E}\right)$, the receiver needs to know that value. When the decoupling condition is satisfied with small $\epsilon$, the minimum eigenvalue $\lambda_{\min }\left(\omega^{R E}\right) \approx \lambda_{\min }\left(\tau^{E}\right) / d_{A}$, where $\lambda_{\min }\left(\tau^{E}\right)$ is minimum eigenvalue of the state $\tau^{E}$ in the environment. Since the number $t$ is proportional to $\left[\lambda_{\min }\left(\tau^{E}\right)\right]^{-1 / 2}$, the larger $\lambda_{\min }\left(\tau^{E}\right)$ is, the smaller the complexity becomes. In the case that $\tau^{E}$ is a pure state, for instance, $\lambda_{\min }\left(\tau^{E}\right)=1$. We then have a minimal complexity with $t=\Theta\left(\sqrt{d_{A} d_{D} / d_{B}} \log (1 / \delta)\right)$. On the other hand, when $\tau^{E}$ is the CMS, $\lambda_{\min }\left(\tau^{E}\right)=1 / d_{E}$ and then $t=\Theta\left(\sqrt{d_{A} d_{D} d_{E} / d_{B}} \log (1 / \delta)\right)=\Theta\left(d_{A} \sqrt{d_{F}} \log (1 / \delta)\right)$.

From these observations and Eqs. (33) and (34), the number $t$ is dominant in the complexity unless $\mathcal{C}\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}\right)$ is exponentially large. The number $t$ arises from the QSVTbased FPAA algorithm and is known to be an optimal order [27, 42, 49]. Hence, the quantum circuit implementation for the generalized YK decoder given in Fig. 4 cannot be significantly improved. Note that, while $t$ is independent of the choice of the dilation of $\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}$, the whole complexity is dependent on the choice due to the factor $\mathcal{C}\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}\right)+\log \left(d_{D}^{2} d_{E} / d_{B}\right)$ in Eq. (34). Hence, using the unitary $U_{\mathcal{F}}^{L}$ which minimizes $\mathcal{C}\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}\right)+\log \left(d_{D}^{2} d_{E} / d_{B}\right)$ results in the smallest complexity.

Another important factor to be noted in the complexity is $\sqrt{d_{D} / d_{B}}$, where $d_{D}$ is the dimension of the output of the noisy channel $\mathcal{N}^{C \rightarrow D}$ and $d_{B}$ is that of the preshared entanglement. In the simplest case, where the encoding map is given by a unitary on $A B$ that is set to the same size as the input system $C$ of the noisy channel $\mathcal{N}^{C \rightarrow D}$, we have $\sqrt{d_{D} / d_{B}}=\sqrt{d_{A} d_{D} / d_{C}}$. In this case, the complexity depends on $d_{A}$ and the ratio $d_{D} / d_{C}$ between the dimensions of the input $C$ and the output $D$ of the noisy channel. If the encoding is non-unitary, this is not the case, and one may expect that the complexity could be decreased by increasing $d_{B}$. This might be done by, e.g., factitiously adding more entanglement at the outset, and by discarding it in the encoding process. This trick, however, does not change the total complexity due to the other factor $\left[\lambda_{\min }\left(\omega^{R E}\right)\right]^{-1 / 2}$. As $|\omega\rangle^{R E D B^{\prime}}$ is pure, $\lambda_{\min }\left(\omega^{R E}\right)=\lambda_{\min }\left(\omega^{D B^{\prime}}\right)$, where $\lambda_{\min }\left(\omega^{D B^{\prime}}\right)$ is non-zero minimum eigenvalue of $\omega^{D B^{\prime}}$. This implies that, even if we factitiously add extra entanglement of dimension $d_{\text {extra }}$ for increasing $d_{B}$, the value of $\lambda_{\min }\left(\omega^{D B^{\prime}}\right)$ changes by factor $1 / d_{\text {extra }}$, which cancels the increase of $d_{B}$ in the complexity.

## B. Petz-like decoder

Using a similar technique, we can construct another decoder, which is thought of as a simplification of the Petz recovery map. We call this decoder the Petz-like decoder [50]. We first introduce a decoding protocol with post-selection in III B 1. Combining it with the QSVT-


FIG. 5. A diagram of the protocol with post-selection for the Petz-like decoder. The dash-dotted box represents the isometry map $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}$ in Eq. (35).
based FPAA algorithm, we explicitly construct the Petzlike decoder in III B 2.

## 1. Decoding protocol with post-selection

The decoding protocol with post-selection is as follows. See Fig. 5 as well. Similarly to the generalized YK decoder, we denote a Stinespring isometry of $\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}$ by $U_{\mathcal{F}}^{L}|0\rangle^{F}$ as given in Eqs. (17) and (18). Note that the protocol works for any choice of $U_{\mathcal{F}}$.

1. The receiver prepares ancilla qubits in the system $\hat{E} E^{\prime}$, and then generates a MES $\Phi^{\hat{E} E^{\prime}}$.
2. The receiver applies the unitary $\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}^{\hat{L}}\right)^{\dagger}$, where $\hat{L}=$ $R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B}=\hat{E} D$.
3. the receiver performs a binary measurement $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}:=$ $\left\{|0\rangle\left\langle\left. 0\right|^{\hat{F}} \otimes \mid \Phi\right\rangle\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{\hat{B} B^{\prime}}, \mathbb{I}^{\hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}-\mid 0\right\rangle\left\langle\left. 0\right|^{\hat{F}} \otimes \mid \Phi\right\rangle\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{\hat{B} B^{\prime}}\right\}\right.$ on $\hat{F} \hat{B}{\underset{\sim}{B}}^{\prime}$. When the former result of the measurement $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is obtained, this protocol succeeds.
In this protocol, all the systems with a prime or a hat, and the channel output $D$, are in the hands of the receiver. Below, we denote by $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}^{D \rightarrow E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B}}$ an isometry map of the operation up to the step 2. That is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{\mathcal{V}}^{D \rightarrow E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B}}(\cdot):=\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}^{\hat{L}}\right)^{\dagger}\left(\cdot \otimes \Phi^{\hat{E} E^{\prime}}\right) U_{\mathcal{F}}^{\hat{L}} \tag{35}
\end{equation*}
$$

Conditioned by the success of the measurement $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$, the reduced state on the system $R R^{\prime}$ is given by

$$
\begin{align*}
\tilde{\zeta}_{\text {succ }}^{R R^{\prime}}=\operatorname{Tr}_{E^{\prime} \hat{E} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}\left[\frac { 1 } { \tilde { p } _ { \text { succ } } } \left(|0\rangle\left\langle\left. 0\right|^{\hat{F}} \otimes \mid \Phi\right\rangle\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{\hat{B} B^{\prime}}\right)\right.\right.  \tag{36}\\
\left.\tilde{\mathcal{V}}^{D \rightarrow E^{\prime} \hat{F} R^{\prime} \hat{B}}\left(\omega^{R D B^{\prime}}\right)\right]
\end{align*}
$$

where $\tilde{p}_{\text {succ }}$ is the success probability of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$, and $\omega^{R D B^{\prime}}=$ $\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}\left(\Phi^{A R} \otimes \Phi^{B B^{\prime}}\right)$. It is straightforward to show that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \tilde{p}_{\text {succ }}=\frac{d_{A}}{d_{E}} 2^{-H_{2}(R E)_{\omega}}  \tag{37}\\
& \mathrm{F}\left(\tilde{\zeta}_{\text {succ }}^{R R^{\prime}}, \Phi^{R R^{\prime}}\right)=\frac{1}{d_{A}} 2^{H_{2}(R E)_{\omega}-H_{2}(E)_{\omega}} . \tag{38}
\end{align*}
$$

See Sec. III B 1 for the details.
As mentioned before, $U_{\mathcal{F}}^{L}$ is not uniquely determined from $\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}$. Although this decoding protocol works for any choice of $U_{\mathcal{F}}$, the decoding performance depends on the choice, which is unlike the generalized YK decoder. In fact, the success probability $\tilde{p}_{\text {succ }}$ is inverseproportional to $d_{E}$, which implies that it succeeds with higher probability if a smaller environment of the channel $\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}$ is chosen. On the other hand, the fidelity is the same as the generalized YK decoder. It is independent of the choice of $U_{\mathcal{F}}$, and we have $\mathrm{F}\left(\tilde{\zeta}_{\text {succ }}^{R R^{\prime}}, \Phi^{R R^{\prime}}\right) \approx 1$ when the decoupling is satisfied as $\omega^{R E} \approx \pi^{R} \otimes \omega^{E}$.

## 2. Construction of the Petz-like decoder

We now use the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm to amplify the success probability of the measurement $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$. To describe the corresponding unitary $\tilde{G}_{t, \phi}$, let us define two projectors as

$$
\begin{align*}
& \tilde{\Pi}_{1}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B}}:=\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}^{\hat{L}}\right)^{\dagger}\left(|\Phi\rangle\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{\hat{E} E^{\prime}} \otimes \mathbb{I}^{D}\right) U_{\mathcal{F}}^{\hat{L}},\right.  \tag{39}\\
& \tilde{\Pi}_{2}^{\hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}:=|0\rangle\left\langle\left. 0\right|^{\hat{F}} \otimes \mid \Phi\right\rangle\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{\hat{B} B^{\prime}} .\right. \tag{40}
\end{align*}
$$

By replacing $\Pi_{m}$, in the definition of $W_{m}(\theta)(m=1,2)$ in Eq. (27) and the following the constructions by (28) and (29), with $\tilde{\Pi}_{1}$ and $\tilde{\Pi}_{2}$, we define the unitary $\tilde{G}_{t, \phi}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime} H}$.

The Petz-like decoder $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{t, \phi}^{D B^{\prime} \rightarrow R^{\prime}}$ is given by changing the step 3 in the protocol with post-selection to the following. See Fig. 6 as well.

3'. The receiver prepares an auxiliary state $|0\rangle^{H}$ in the system $H$ and applies the unitary $\tilde{G}_{t, \phi}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime} H}$.
With this modification, the Petz-like decoder is explicitly given as

$$
\begin{align*}
& \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{t, \phi}^{D B^{\prime} \rightarrow R^{\prime}}(\cdot) \\
& :=\operatorname{Tr}_{E^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime} H}\left[\tilde { G } _ { t , \phi } ^ { E ^ { \prime } R ^ { \prime } \hat { F } \hat { B } B ^ { \prime } H } \left(\tilde{\mathcal{V}}^{D \rightarrow E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B}}(\cdot)\right.\right.  \tag{41}\\
& \\
& \left.\otimes|0\rangle\left\langle\left. 0\right|^{H}\right)\left(\tilde{G}_{t, \phi}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime} H}\right)^{\dagger}\right] .
\end{align*}
$$

The number $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and the phases $\phi \in(-\pi, \pi]^{t}$ are chosen such that the QSVT realizes an approximation of the sign function.

The following theorem provides the performance of the Petz-like decoder.

Theorem 4 (Performance of the Petz-like decoder). For a given channel $\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}$, let $\overline{\mathcal{F}}^{A B \rightarrow E}$ be a complementary channel of $\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}, \omega^{R E}$ be

$$
\begin{equation*}
\omega^{R E}=\overline{\mathcal{F}}^{A B \rightarrow E}\left(\Phi^{A R} \otimes \pi^{B}\right) \tag{42}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $\lambda_{\min }\left(\omega^{R E}\right)$ be the non-zero minimum eigenvalue of $\omega^{R E}$. Suppose that there exists a state $\tau^{E}$ such that $\left\|\omega^{R E}-\pi^{R} \otimes \tau^{E}\right\|_{1} \leq \epsilon$. For any $\delta \in(0,1]$, there exist $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\phi=\left(\phi_{1}, \phi_{2}, \ldots, \phi_{t}\right) \in(-\pi, \pi]^{t}$ such that


FIG. 6. A diagram of the Petz-like decoder $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{t, \phi}$, which is given in Eq. (41), corresponds to the dash-dotted box. Note that $\tilde{G}_{t, \phi}$ consists of repeated applications of unitaries, which is similar to Fig. 4.
the recovery error $\Delta\left(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{t, \phi} \mid \mathcal{F}\right)$ of the Petz-like decoder $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{t, \phi}^{D B^{\prime} \rightarrow R^{\prime}}$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta\left(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{t, \phi} \mid \mathcal{F}\right) \leq \sqrt{\epsilon}+\sqrt{2 \delta} \tag{43}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $t$ is an odd integer $t$ satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
t=\Theta\left(\sqrt{\frac{d_{E}}{d_{A} \lambda_{\min }\left(\omega^{R E}\right)}} \log (1 / \delta)\right) \tag{44}
\end{equation*}
$$

The circuit complexity of the decoder $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{t, \phi}^{D B^{\prime} \rightarrow R^{\prime}}$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{C}\left(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{t, \phi}\right)=\mathcal{O}\left(t\left(\mathcal{C}\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}\right)+\log \left(d_{D} d_{E}^{2} / d_{A}\right)\right)\right) \tag{45}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the number of ancilla qubits is $\mathcal{O}\left(\log \left(d_{D} d_{E}^{2} / d_{A}\right)\right)$. Here, $\mathcal{C}\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}\right)$ is a circuit complexity of a unitary $U_{\mathcal{F}}^{L}$ such that $U_{\mathcal{F}}^{L}|0\rangle^{F}$ is the Stinespring isometry of $\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}$, and $L=A B F=E D$.

Theorem 4 has many similarities to Theorem 3 for the generalized YK decoder, such as that the recovery error depends on the degree $\epsilon$ of the decoupling as well as the parameter $\delta$ that characterizes the trade-off relation between the recovery error and the circuit complexity of the decoder. Also, from the upper bound on the recovery error in Eq. (43), we observe that the Petz-like decoder achieves quantum capacity in the asymptotic i.i.d. limit if the encoder and $\delta$ are suitably chosen.

On the other hand, the complexity of the Petz-like decoder differs from that of the generalized YK decoder. The number $t$, as well as the remaining part in $\mathcal{C}\left(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{t, \phi}\right)$, explicitly depends on $d_{E}$. This implies that the complexity depends on the choice of the dilation of $\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}$, which reflects the aforementioned fact that the success probability of the protocol with post-selection is dependent on $d_{E}$. Hence, it is desirable to use a dilated unitary $U_{\mathcal{F}}^{L}$ with a small environment $E$.

In the next section, we compare the complexities of decoders and clarify the cases in which one decoder has

TABLE I. A table of notation that we use in III C. Instead of the dimensions, we use the numbers of qubits in the systems.

| $k$ | The number of logical qubits in $A: k=\log d_{A}$. |
| :---: | :--- |
| $n_{\text {in }}$ | The number of input qubits of the channel $\mathcal{N}: n_{\text {in }}=\log d_{C}$. |
| $n_{\text {out }}$ | The number of output qubits of the channel $\mathcal{N}: n_{\text {out }}=\log d_{D}$ |
| $e$ | The number of ebits shared by the sender and the receiver in advance: $e=\log d_{B}$ |
| $\kappa$ | The number of qubits in the environment $E$, <br> which is equal to the logarithm of \#Kraus ops.: $\kappa=\log d_{E}=\log (\#$ Kraus ops.). |

smaller complexity than the other. As explained, our decoder has a better circuit complexity than the algorithmic implementation of the original Petz recovery map [20], if $\delta$ is appropriately chosen. This is because we are interested in applying the Petz recovery map to decoding quantum information. When this is the case, it is not necessary to exactly implement the Petz recovery map.

## C. Comparision of the circuit complexities

We compare the circuit complexities of the generalized YK decoder, the Petz-like decoder, and the algorithmic implementation of the original Petz recovery map [20]. In the comparison, we use the number of qubits in each system instead of the dimensions. Specifically, we denote the number of qubits in $A, B, C, D$, and $E$ by $k, e, n_{\text {in }}, n_{\text {out }}$, and $\kappa$, respectively. See Table I as well. Note that $\kappa$ is the logarithm of the number of the Kraus operators of the channel $\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}$, i.e., $\kappa=\log d_{E}=\log$ (\#Kraus ops.). This number depends on how the channel is dilated. As we are interested in minimizing the complexity, we take the minimum possible number of Kraus operators in the comparison below.

We here compare the complexity of the generalized YK decoder and that of the Petz-like decoder. As explained in Sec. III A 2, the number $t$ is the significant factor in the complexity. We denote the numbers $t$ for the generalized YK decoder and for the Petz-like decoder by $t_{\text {gYK }}$ and $t_{\mathrm{Pl}}$, respectively. That is,

$$
\begin{align*}
& t_{\mathrm{gYK}}=\Theta\left(\left[2^{e-n_{\mathrm{out}}} \lambda_{\min }\left(\omega^{R E}\right)\right]^{-1 / 2} \log (1 / \delta)\right)  \tag{46}\\
& t_{\mathrm{Pl}}=\Theta\left(\left[2^{k-\kappa} \lambda_{\min }\left(\omega^{R E}\right)\right]^{-1 / 2} \log (1 / \delta)\right) \tag{47}
\end{align*}
$$

See Eq. (33) and Eq. (44). Comparing $t_{\text {gYK }}$ and $t_{\text {Pl }}$, we find that

$$
\begin{align*}
t_{\mathrm{gYK}} & \leq t_{\mathrm{Pl}}  \tag{48}\\
& \Longleftrightarrow k-e \leq \kappa-n_{\mathrm{out}} . \tag{49}
\end{align*}
$$

The left-hand side of Eq. (49) is given by the number $k$ of qubits that the sender intends to transmit and the number $e$ of pre-shared ebits. On the other hand, the right-hand side depends on the quantities $\kappa$ and $n_{\text {out }}$ that
are the properties of the channel $\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}$. To better understand the condition (49), we below consider a couple of explicit instances, in which we assume an isometric encoder for convenience. In these cases, $\kappa$ corresponds to the number of Kraus operators of the noisy channel $\mathcal{N}^{C \rightarrow D}$.

For a given noisy channel $\mathcal{N}^{C \rightarrow D}$, the right-hand side of Eq. (49) is fixed as a property of the noise. Hence, the number of logical qubits, $k$, and that of pre-shared entanglement, $e$, determines which decoder has smaller complexity. In general, the generalized YK decoder has an advantage when $e$ is large, and as $e$ becomes smaller, the advantage shifts to the Petz-like decoder. To observe this more concretely, we note that $0 \leq e \leq n_{\text {in }}-k$. When the sender and the receiver pre-share the maximal number of entanglement, i.e., $e=n_{\text {in }}-k$, Eq. (49) is rephrased as $k \leq \frac{1}{2}\left(n_{\text {in }}-n_{\text {out }}-\kappa\right)$. In particular, if the input and the output systems of the channel $\mathcal{N}^{C \rightarrow D}$ are identical, i.e., $n_{\text {in }}=n_{\text {out }}$, it reduces to $k \leq \frac{1}{2} \kappa$. In this case, unless the number of logical qubits exceeds half of the number of the Kraus operators of the noisy channel, the generalized YK decoder has smaller complexity than the Petz-like decoder. In contrast, when no entanglement is shared in advance and $e=0$, Eq. (49) reduces to $k \leq \kappa-n_{\text {out }}$. Although whether this holds or not depends on details, there exist cases where the inequality is violated, such as the amplitude damping noise on each qubit independently. For such noises or the choice of large $k$, the Petz-like decoder has smaller complexity than the generalized YK decoder.

We may also use the fact that $k$ should necessarily satisfy $k \leq n_{\text {in }}$ for the recovery to be possible. This leads to a trivial inequality $k+n_{\text {out }}-\kappa \leq n_{\text {in }}+n_{\text {out }}-\kappa$. Furthermore, $\kappa$ always satisfies $\kappa \leq n_{\text {in }}+n_{\text {out }}$, since $\kappa$ is the logarithm of the number of Kraus operators. If a given noisy channel $\mathcal{N}$ has the property that $\kappa=n_{\text {in }}+$ $n_{\text {out }}$, it follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
k+n_{\text {out }}-\kappa \leq 0 \leq e, \tag{50}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any $e$. Hence, for the noise with the maximum possible number of Kraus operators, the generalized YK decoder has smaller complexity than the Petz-like decoder no matter how much entanglement is pre-shared.

We next compare the complexity of the Petz-like decoder with an algorithmic implementation of the original

Petz recovery map provided in [20]. The following Corollary can be derived by applying this algorithmic implementation to our setting.

Corollary 5 (Algorithmic implementation of the Petz recovery map [20]). Let $\mathcal{P}_{\pi, \mathcal{G}}^{D B^{\prime} \rightarrow R^{\prime}}$ be the decoder based on the Petz recovery map defined in Eq. (19). There exists a quantum algorithm realizing the map $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\pi, \mathcal{G}}^{D B^{\prime} \rightarrow R^{\prime}}$, which satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\pi, \mathcal{G}}^{D B^{\prime} \rightarrow R^{\prime}}-\mathcal{P}_{\pi, \mathcal{G}}^{D B^{\prime} \rightarrow R^{\prime}}\right\|_{\diamond} \leq \varepsilon \tag{51}
\end{equation*}
$$

with a circuit complexity

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{C}\left(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\pi, \mathcal{G}}\right)=\mathcal{O} & \left(t _ { \mathrm { Petz } } \left(\mathcal{C}\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}\right)+\log d_{B} d_{E}+\frac{\mathcal{C}\left(U_{\omega}\right)}{\lambda_{\min }\left(\omega^{R E}\right)}\right.\right. \\
& \left.\left.\times \log \frac{d_{E}}{\varepsilon}+d_{A} \log d_{A} \log \frac{d_{E}}{\varepsilon \lambda_{\min }\left(\omega^{R E}\right)}\right)\right) \tag{52}
\end{align*}
$$

where $t_{\text {Petz }}$ is an integer satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
t_{\text {Petz }}=\Theta\left(\sqrt{\frac{d_{E}}{\lambda_{\min }\left(\omega^{R E}\right)}}\right) \tag{53}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $\mathcal{C}\left(U_{\omega}\right)$ is a circuit complexity of a unitary $U_{\omega}^{D B^{\prime} P}$ such that, for any system $P$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\omega^{D B^{\prime}}=\operatorname{Tr}_{P}\left[U_{\omega}^{D B^{\prime} P}|0\rangle\left\langle\left. 0\right|^{D B^{\prime} P}\left(U_{\omega}^{D B^{\prime} P}\right)^{\dagger}\right]\right. \tag{54}
\end{equation*}
$$

From Eqs. (20) and (51), the recovery error of $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\pi, \mathcal{G}}$ is bounded as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta\left(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\pi, \mathcal{G}} \mid \mathcal{F}\right) \leq 2 \epsilon^{1 / 4}+\varepsilon \tag{55}
\end{equation*}
$$

when there exists $\tau^{E}$ such that $\left\|\omega^{R C}-\pi^{R} \otimes \tau^{E}\right\|_{1} \leq \epsilon$.
We clarify the condition that the Petz-like decoder has smaller complexity than the algorithmic implementation of the Petz recovery map. First, when $\mathcal{C}\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}\right)$ is larger than other terms, Eqs. (45) and (52) approximately reduce to

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathcal{C}\left(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{t, \phi}\right) \approx \mathcal{O}\left(t_{\mathrm{Pl}} \mathcal{C}\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}\right)\right),  \tag{56}\\
& \mathcal{C}\left(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\pi, \mathcal{G}}\right) \approx \mathcal{O}\left(t_{\mathrm{Petz}} \mathcal{C}\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}\right)\right), \tag{57}
\end{align*}
$$

respectively. When this is the case, we only need to compare $t_{\mathrm{Pl}}$ with $t_{\text {Petz }}$, which satisfies $t_{\mathrm{Pl}}=$ $\Theta\left(\frac{\log (1 / \delta)}{\sqrt{d_{A}}} t_{\text {Petz }}\right)$. Hence, as far as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta=\Omega\left(2^{-\sqrt{d_{A}}}\right) \tag{58}
\end{equation*}
$$

the Petz-like decoder has smaller complexity than the algorithmic implementation of the original Petz recovery map. Note that $\delta$ is also related to the recovery error of the Petz-like decoder, as in Eq. (43). However, the choice of $\delta$ such as Eq. (58) is sufficiently small and can be negligible in the recovery error.

The advantage of the Petz-like decoder remains even when $\mathcal{C}\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}\right)$ is not dominant. To see this, suppose that
$\varepsilon$ in Eq. (52) is $\varepsilon=\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\delta})$ with sufficiently small $\delta$. The complexity of the algorithmic implementation of the Petz recovery map reduces to

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{C}\left(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\pi, \mathcal{G}}\right) \approx \mathcal{O}( & t_{\text {Petz }} \log (1 / \delta) \operatorname{poly}\left(n_{\mathrm{in}}, n_{\mathrm{out}}, k\right) \\
& \left.\times\left(\frac{\operatorname{poly}\left(n_{\mathrm{in}}, n_{\mathrm{out}}, k\right)}{\lambda_{\min }\left(\omega^{R E}\right)}+k 2^{k}\right)\right)  \tag{59}\\
=\mathcal{O}( & t_{\mathrm{Pl}} \operatorname{poly}\left(n_{\mathrm{in}}, n_{\mathrm{out}}, k\right) \\
& \left.\times 2^{k / 2}\left(\frac{\operatorname{poly}\left(n_{\mathrm{in}}, n_{\mathrm{out}}, k\right)}{\lambda_{\min }\left(\omega^{R E}\right)}+k 2^{k}\right)\right) \tag{60}
\end{align*}
$$

Here, we used in the second equation that $t_{\mathrm{Pl}}=$ $\Theta\left(\frac{\log (1 / \delta)}{\sqrt{d_{A}}} t_{\text {Petz }}\right)$ and assumed that $\mathcal{C}\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}^{L}\right)$ is polynomial in qubits, which further implies that $\mathcal{C}\left(U_{\omega}^{D B^{\prime} P}\right)$ is polynomial. On the other hand, the complexity of the Petz-like decoder in this case is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{C}\left(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{t, \phi}\right)=\mathcal{O}\left(t_{\mathrm{Pl}} \operatorname{poly}\left(n_{\mathrm{in}}, n_{\mathrm{out}}, k\right)\right) \tag{61}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since this corresponds to the first line of Eq. (60), the Petz-like decoder has smaller circuit complexity than the algorithmic implementation of the Petz recovery map.

## D. Application to concrete noisy models

We consider several noises for demonstration. We investigate the noises that independently act on each qubit, such as the independent Pauli noise, the independent amplitude damping noise, and the qubit-erasure noise. If the input system $C$ of the noisy channel $\mathcal{N}^{C \rightarrow D}$ is equal to the output system $D$ of it, we denote by $S$ the system as $S=C=D$, and by $n$ the number of these qubits as $n=n_{\text {in }}=n_{\text {out }}$.

## - Independent Pauli noise

The first example is the independent Pauli noise. A Stinespring isometry of the single-qubit Pauli noise is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{\mathcal{N}}^{S \rightarrow E S}=\sum_{i=0}^{3} \sqrt{p_{i}}\left|e_{i}\right\rangle^{E} \otimes \sigma_{i}^{S} \tag{62}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\sum_{i=0}^{3} p_{i}=1$ and $\left(\sigma_{i}^{S}\right)=\left(\mathbb{I}^{S}, X^{S}, Y^{S}, Z^{S}\right)$. Since the number of qubits of the system $S$ is $n$, and the logarithm of the number of the Kraus operators $\kappa=2 n$, we can rephrase Eqs. (48) and (49) as

$$
\begin{align*}
n-k-e & \geq 0  \tag{63}\\
& \Longleftrightarrow t_{\mathrm{gYK}} \leq t_{\mathrm{Pl}} \tag{64}
\end{align*}
$$

Since $k+e \leq n$ is always satisfied, the generalized YK decoder has smaller complexity than the Petz-like decoder for the independent Pauli noise.

TABLE II. The circuit complexity of our decoders to particular noise models. We denote $\min _{i}\left\{p_{i}\right\}$ by $p_{\text {min }}$. The constant $\gamma$ is assumed to be $1 / 2$ or less. We have assumed a unitary encoding, so $k+e=n_{\mathrm{in}}$. The part poly( $\left.\cdots\right)$ comes from the term of unitary dilation of the noise, and from the term logarithmic in dimensions in Eqs. (34) and (45).

|  | Generalized YK decoder $\mathcal{C}\left(\mathcal{D}_{t, \phi}\right)$ | Petz-like decoder $\mathcal{C}\left(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{t, \phi}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pauli noise | $\left[\left(2^{k} / p_{\text {min }}^{n / 2}\right) \log (1 / \delta)\right] \operatorname{poly}(n, k)$ | $\left[\left(2 / p_{\text {min }}^{1 / 2}\right)^{n} \log (1 / \delta)\right] \operatorname{poly}(n, k)$ |
| Amplitude damping noise | $\left[2^{k}(2 / \gamma)^{n / 2} \log (1 / \delta)\right] \operatorname{poly}(n, k)$ | $\left[(4 / \gamma)^{n / 2} \log (1 / \delta)\right] \operatorname{poly}(n, k)$ |
| Erasure noise | $\left[2^{k} \log (1 / \delta)\right] \operatorname{poly}\left(n_{\text {in }}, n_{\text {out }}, k\right)$ | $\left[2^{n_{\text {in }}-n_{\text {out }}} \log (1 / \delta)\right] \operatorname{poly}\left(n_{\text {in }}, n_{\text {out }}, k\right)$ |

## - Independent amplitude damping noise

The second example is the amplitude damping noise for $\left\{|0\rangle^{S},|1\rangle^{S}\right\}$, which independently acts on each qubit. The single-qubit noise is represented by an isometry

$$
\begin{align*}
V_{\mathcal{N}}^{S \rightarrow E S}= & \sqrt{\gamma}\left|e_{0}\right\rangle^{E} \otimes|0\rangle\left\langle\left. 1\right|^{S}\right. \\
& +\left|e_{1}\right\rangle^{E} \otimes\left(|0\rangle\left\langle\left. 0\right|^{S}+\sqrt{1-\gamma} \mid 1\right\rangle\left\langle\left. 1\right|^{S}\right)\right. \tag{65}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\gamma \in[0,1]$. As $n=\kappa$, Eqs. (48) and (49) become

$$
\begin{align*}
& e-k \geq 0  \tag{66}\\
& \Longleftrightarrow t_{\mathrm{gYK}} \leq t_{\mathrm{Pl}} \tag{67}
\end{align*}
$$

Hence, when the number of pre-shared entanglement $e$ is more than the number of the logical qubits $k$, the generalized YK decoder has smaller complexity than the Petzlike decoder.

- Qubit-erasure noise

The third example is the qubit-erasure noise, which erases $\kappa$ qubits out of $n_{\text {in }}$ input qubits. The erased qubits are randomly chosen, but it is assumed that the receiver knows which qubits were erased. In this case, it holds that $n_{\text {in }}=n_{\text {out }}+\kappa$. Thus, Eqs. (48) and (49) become

$$
\begin{align*}
n_{\text {in }}-2 n_{\text {out }}-k+e & \geq 0  \tag{68}\\
& \Longleftrightarrow t_{\mathrm{gYK}} \leq t_{\mathrm{Pl}} . \tag{69}
\end{align*}
$$

Especially, when there is no pre-shared entanglement, $e=0$ and the encoding rate $k / n_{\text {in }}$ is given by $k / n_{\text {in }}=n_{\text {out }} / n_{\text {in }}-1 / 2$, which is the value near the quantum capacity, Eq. (68) does not hold, and the Petz-like decoder has smaller complexity than the generalized YK decoder. On the other hand, when the maximal amount of entanglement is pre-shared, i.e., $e=n_{\text {in }}-k$, Eq. (68) is rephrased as $k \leq n_{\text {in }}-n_{\text {out }}=\kappa$. Hence, if more than $k$ qubits are erased by the noise, the generalized YK decoder has smaller complexity than the Petz-like decoder.

In Table II, we explicitly provide the circuit complexities of our decoders against these noise models. For simplicity, the values in Table II are restricted to those for a unitary encoder by a polynomial-sized quantum circuit.

Moreover, we assume the decoupling $\omega^{R E} \approx \pi^{R} \otimes \omega^{E}$, which leads to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{\min }\left(\omega^{R E}\right) \approx \lambda_{\min }\left(\omega^{E}\right) / d_{A} \tag{70}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\lambda_{\min }\left(\omega^{E}\right)$ is the non-zero minimum eigenvalue of $\omega^{E}=\overline{\mathcal{N}}^{C \rightarrow E}\left(\pi^{C}\right)$.

From these results, we find that, when $p_{\text {min }}=$ $\min _{i=0,1,2,3}\left\{p_{i}\right\}$ or $\gamma$ is larger, the complexities becomes smaller. Hence, from the viewpoint of the computational cost, both the generalized YK decoder and the Petz-like decoder are more advantageous in moderately noisy situations.

## IV. PROOFS

In this section, we provide proofs of the main results. In IV A and IV B, we show the statements about the generalized YK decoder and the Petz-like decoder, respectively.

## A. Proofs: the generalized YK decoder

We first consider the decoding protocol with postselection, and provide the success probability and the fidelity after the post-selection. We then prove Theorem 3.

## 1. Success probability and fidelity in the decoding protocol with post-selection

The input state of the decoding protocol is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\omega^{R D B^{\prime}}=\mathcal{F}^{A B \rightarrow D}\left(\Phi^{A R} \otimes \Phi^{B B^{\prime}}\right) \tag{71}
\end{equation*}
$$

When necessary, we consider the state including the environment $E$, namely, a purified state

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\omega\rangle^{R E D B^{\prime}}=V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A B \rightarrow E D}|\Phi\rangle^{A R}|\Phi\rangle^{B B^{\prime}} . \tag{72}
\end{equation*}
$$

We use the following lemma. The proof of this lemma is straightforward. See Fig. 7 for the diagram of the statement.

Lemma 6 (Transpose of a matrix sandwiched by two MESs). For any linear operator $L^{A B \rightarrow E D}$, i.e., $d_{E} d_{D} \times$ $d_{A} d_{B}$ matrix, it holds that

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{E E^{\prime}}\right. & \left(\mathbb{I}^{B^{\prime} E^{\prime}} \otimes L^{A B \rightarrow E D}\right)|\Phi\rangle^{B B^{\prime}} \\
& =\sqrt{\frac{d_{A} d_{D}}{d_{B} d_{E}}}\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{A A^{\prime}}\left(\left(L^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{\top} \otimes \mathbb{I}^{A D}\right) \mid \Phi\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime}} \tag{73}
\end{align*}
$$

Note that this is a liner operator from $A E^{\prime}$ to $B^{\prime} D$. The transpose is taken with respect to the basis that defines each MES.

Using Lemma 6 for $L=V_{\mathcal{F}}^{*}$, the state $\zeta_{\text {succ }}^{R R^{\prime}}$ on the system $R R^{\prime}$ after the post-selection is rewritten as

$$
\begin{align*}
& \zeta_{\text {succ }}^{R R^{\prime}}= \frac{1}{p_{\text {succ }}} \operatorname{Tr}_{E^{\prime}}\left[\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{D D^{\prime}}\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{*}\right.\right. \\
&\left(\omega^{R D B^{\prime}} \otimes \Phi^{A^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\right)\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}|\Phi\rangle^{\left.D D^{\prime}\right]}  \tag{74}\\
&= \frac{1}{p_{\text {succ }}} \operatorname{Tr}_{E^{\prime}}\left[\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{D D^{\prime}}\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{*} \mid \Phi\right\rangle^{A^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\right. \\
&=\left.\frac{1}{p_{\text {succ }}} \frac{d_{B} d_{E}}{d_{A} d_{D}} \operatorname{Tr}_{E^{\prime}}\left[\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{A^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\right| V_{\mathcal{F}}^{R^{\prime} \hat{B} \rightarrow \hat{E} D}\right)^{\dagger D^{\prime}}\right]  \tag{75}\\
&= \frac{1}{p_{\text {succ }}} \frac{d_{B} \hat{E} E^{\prime}}{d_{A} d_{D}}\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{\hat{B} B^{\prime}}\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{R^{\prime} \hat{B} \rightarrow \hat{E} D}\right)^{\dagger}\right. \\
&\left.\quad\left(\omega^{R D B^{\prime}} \otimes \mathbb{I}^{\hat{E}}\right) V_{\mathcal{F}}^{R^{\prime} \hat{B} \rightarrow \hat{B} \rightarrow \hat{E} D}|\Phi\rangle^{\hat{B} B^{\prime}}\right]  \tag{76}\\
& 7
\end{align*}
$$

Here, we used Lemma 6 in the third equation. The success probability of the measurement $\mathcal{M}$ is then given as

$$
\begin{align*}
& p_{\text {succ }}= \frac{d_{B}}{d_{A} d_{D}} \operatorname{Tr}\left[\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{\hat{B} B^{\prime}}\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{R^{\prime} \hat{B} \rightarrow \hat{E} D}\right)^{\dagger}\right.\right. \\
&\left.\quad\left(\omega^{R D B^{\prime}} \otimes \mathbb{I}^{\hat{E}}\right) V_{\mathcal{F}}^{R^{\prime} \hat{B} \rightarrow \hat{E} D}|\Phi\rangle^{\hat{B} B^{\prime}}\right]  \tag{78}\\
&= \frac{d_{B}}{d_{D}} \operatorname{Tr}\left[\left(\mathbb{I}^{R} \otimes V_{\mathcal{F}}^{R^{\prime} \hat{B} \rightarrow \hat{E} D}\left(\pi^{R^{\prime}} \otimes \Phi^{\hat{B} B^{\prime}}\right)\right.\right. \\
&\left.\left.\quad\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{R^{\prime} \hat{B} \rightarrow \hat{E} D}\right)^{\dagger}\right)\left(\omega^{R D B^{\prime}} \otimes \mathbb{I}^{\hat{E}}\right)\right]  \tag{79}\\
&= \frac{d_{B}}{d_{D}} \operatorname{Tr}\left[\left(\mathbb{I}^{R} \otimes \omega^{D B^{\prime} \hat{E}}\right)\left(\omega^{R D B^{\prime}} \otimes \mathbb{I}^{\hat{E}}\right)\right]  \tag{80}\\
&= \frac{d_{B}}{d_{D}} \operatorname{Tr}\left[\left(\omega^{D B^{\prime}}\right)^{2}\right]  \tag{81}\\
&= \frac{d_{B}}{d_{D}} 2^{-H_{2}(R E)_{\omega}} . \tag{82}
\end{align*}
$$

Since the state $|\omega\rangle^{R E D B^{\prime}}$ is pure, we here used that $\operatorname{Tr}\left[\left(\omega^{D B^{\prime}}\right)^{2}\right]=\operatorname{Tr}\left[\left(\omega^{R E}\right)^{2}\right]=2^{-H_{2}(R E)_{\omega}}$.

The fidelity after the post-selection is calculated from
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$\zeta_{\text {succ }}^{R R^{\prime}}$ as follows:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{F}\left(\zeta_{\text {succ }}^{R R^{\prime}}, \Phi^{R R^{\prime}}\right) \\
& =\frac{1}{p_{\text {succ }}} \frac{d_{B}}{d_{A} d_{D}} \operatorname{Tr}\left[\Phi ^ { R R ^ { \prime } } \left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{\hat{B} B^{\prime}}\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{R^{\prime} \hat{B} \rightarrow \hat{E} D}\right)^{\dagger}\right.\right. \\
& \left.\quad\left(\omega^{R D B^{\prime}} \otimes \mathbb{I}^{\hat{E}}\right) V_{\mathcal{F}}^{R^{\prime} \hat{B} \rightarrow \hat{E} D}|\Phi\rangle^{\hat{B} B^{\prime}}\right]  \tag{83}\\
& =\frac{1}{p_{\text {succ }}} \frac{d_{B}}{d_{A} d_{D}} \operatorname{Tr}\left[V_{\mathcal{F}}^{R^{\prime} \hat{B} \rightarrow \hat{E} D}\left(\Phi^{R R^{\prime}} \otimes \Phi^{\hat{B} B^{\prime}}\right)\right. \\
& \left.\quad\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{R^{\prime} \hat{B} \rightarrow \hat{E} D}\right)^{\dagger}\left(\omega^{R D B^{\prime}} \otimes \mathbb{I}^{\hat{E}}\right)\right]  \tag{84}\\
& =\frac{1}{p_{\text {succ }}} \frac{d_{B}}{d_{A} d_{D}} \operatorname{Tr}\left[\omega^{R \hat{E} D B^{\prime}}\left(\omega^{R D B^{\prime}} \otimes \mathbb{I}^{\hat{E}}\right)\right]  \tag{85}\\
& =\frac{1}{p_{\text {succ }}} \frac{d_{B}}{d_{A} d_{D}} \operatorname{Tr}\left[\left(\omega^{R D B^{\prime}}\right)^{2}\right]  \tag{86}\\
& =\frac{1}{p_{\text {succ }}} \frac{d_{B}}{d_{A} d_{D}} 2^{-H_{2}\left(R D B^{\prime}\right)_{\omega}} . \tag{87}
\end{align*}
$$

Substituting Eq. (82), we obtain that

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{F}\left(\zeta_{\text {succ }}^{R R^{\prime}}, \phi^{R R^{\prime}}\right) & =\frac{1}{d_{A}} 2^{H_{2}(R E)-H_{2}\left(R D B^{\prime}\right)}  \tag{88}\\
& =\frac{1}{d_{A}} 2^{H_{2}(R E)-H_{2}(E)}, \tag{89}
\end{align*}
$$

where we used $H_{2}\left(R D B^{\prime}\right)_{\omega}=H_{2}(E)_{\omega}$ since $|\omega\rangle^{R E D B^{\prime}}$ is pure. Thus, we obtain Eqs. (23) and (24).

## 2. Proof of Theorem 3

To show Theorem 3, we use the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm instead of the measurement $\mathcal{M}$. We here mention that our situation differs from the common situation for the AA algorithm since the receiver has access only to a part of the whole system: the reference $R$ and environment $E$ are not with the receiver. This issue will be circumvented by Jordan's lemma, which we explain below.

We denote the input state of the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\omega_{0}^{R D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}:=\mathcal{V}^{B^{\prime} \rightarrow D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\left(\omega^{R D B^{\prime}}\right) \tag{90}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathcal{V}^{B^{\prime} \rightarrow D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ is the isometry map such that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathcal{V}^{B^{\prime}} \rightarrow D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}(\cdot) \\
& \quad=\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{*}\left(\cdot \otimes \Phi^{A^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\right)\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{\top} . \tag{91}
\end{align*}
$$

Note that $\omega_{0}^{R E}=\omega^{R E}$. Let $\left|\omega_{0}\right\rangle^{R E D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ be the purified state of $\omega_{0}^{R D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\omega_{0}\right\rangle^{R E D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}=\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{*}|\omega\rangle^{R E D B^{\prime}}|\Phi\rangle^{A^{\prime} R^{\prime}} \tag{92}
\end{equation*}
$$

We first check relations between this state $\omega_{0}$, the state after the post-selection $\zeta_{\text {succ }}$, and the two projectors $\Pi_{1}$ and $\Pi_{2}$. Here, the state $\zeta_{\text {succ }}$ on $R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime}$ after postselection is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\zeta_{\text {succ }}\right\rangle^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{p_{\text {succ }}}}\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{D D^{\prime}} \mid \omega_{0}\right\rangle^{R E D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} \tag{93}
\end{equation*}
$$

To this end, we use the following lemma.
Lemma 7 (Jordan's lemma [51-53]). For any two projectors $\Pi$ and $\Pi^{\prime}$ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, there exists an orthogonal decomposition of $\mathcal{H}$ into one- and twodimensional subspaces $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}$. Each subspace $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}$ is invariant under $\Pi$ and $\Pi^{\prime}$. Moreover, in each subspace, $\Pi$ and $\Pi^{\prime}$ act as rank-one projectors, such as $\left.\Pi\right|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu}}=\left|\psi_{\mu}\right\rangle\left\langle\psi_{\mu}\right|$ and $\left.\Pi^{\prime}\right|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu}}=\left|\xi_{\mu}\right\rangle\left\langle\xi_{\mu}\right|$, respectively. Each subspace is hence given by $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}=\operatorname{span}\left\{\left|\psi_{\mu}\right\rangle,\left|\xi_{\mu}\right\rangle\right\}$.

This lemma states that, as $\left|\psi_{\mu}\right\rangle \perp\left|\xi_{\nu}\right\rangle$ for $\mu \neq \nu$, namely, they are in different subspaces, the products of $\Pi$ and $\Pi^{\prime}$ are given by

$$
\begin{align*}
\Pi \Pi^{\prime} \Pi & =\sum_{\mu=1}^{r} q_{\mu}\left|\psi_{\mu}\right\rangle\left\langle\psi_{\mu}\right|  \tag{94}\\
\Pi^{\prime} \Pi^{\prime} & =\sum_{\mu=1}^{r} q_{\mu}\left|\xi_{\mu}\right\rangle\left\langle\xi_{\mu}\right| \tag{95}
\end{align*}
$$

where $q_{\mu}=\left|\left\langle\xi_{\mu} \mid \psi_{\mu}\right\rangle\right|^{2}$, and we arranged them such as $q_{1} \geq q_{2} \geq \ldots \geq q_{r}>0$. The whole Hilbert space can be decomposed as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{H}=\stackrel{r}{\mu=1} \mathcal{H}_{\mu} \oplus \mathcal{H}_{\perp} . \tag{96}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here, the Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}=\operatorname{span}\left\{\left|\psi_{\mu}\right\rangle,\left|\xi_{\mu}\right\rangle\right\}$ are either common one-dimensional subspaces spanned by $\left|\psi_{\mu}\right\rangle=$ $\left|\xi_{\mu}\right\rangle$ or two-dimensional subspaces. The Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\perp}$ is the remaining orthogonal complement to the others.

We apply the Jordan's lemma to our projectors

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathbb{I}^{D} \otimes \Pi_{1}^{D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}=\mathbb{I}^{D} \otimes\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{*}\left(\mathbb{I}^{B^{\prime}} \otimes\right. \\
&|\Phi\rangle\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{A^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\right)\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{\top}  \tag{97}\\
& \Pi_{2}^{D D^{\prime}} \otimes \mathbb{I}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}=|\Phi\rangle\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{D D^{\prime}} \otimes \mathbb{I}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\right. \tag{98}
\end{align*}
$$

Then, the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ is decomposed into a direct sum of one- and two-dimensional subspaces, each of which is invariant under $\Pi_{1}^{D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ and $\Pi_{2}^{D D^{\prime}}$. The products of these projectors can be computed as

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left(\Pi_{1} \Pi_{2} \Pi_{1}\right)^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}=\frac{d_{B}}{d_{D}} \omega_{0}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}  \tag{99}\\
& \left(\Pi_{2} \Pi_{1} \Pi_{2}\right)^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}=|\Phi\rangle\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{D D^{\prime}} \otimes\left(\frac{d_{B} p_{\mathrm{succ}}}{d_{D}} \zeta_{\mathrm{succ}}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\right)^{1 / 2}\right. \tag{100}
\end{align*}
$$



FIG. 8. A diagram of the state $\left|\zeta_{\text {succ }}\right\rangle^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$. This is symmetrical with respect to the red dash-dotted line, up to the complex conjugate. Due to this symmetry, the Schmidt basis of $\left|\zeta_{\text {succ }}\right\rangle^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ is given by $\left\{\left|\eta_{\mu}\right\rangle^{R E}\left|\eta_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\right\}_{\mu}$.
which are derived in Appendix A.
Let $q_{\mu}$ and $\left|\psi_{\mu}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ for $\mu=1,2, \ldots, r$ be nonzero eigenvalues and the corresponding eigenstates of $\left(\Pi_{1} \Pi_{2} \Pi_{1}\right)^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$, respectively. From Eq. (99), the Schmidt decomposition of $\left|\omega_{0}\right\rangle^{R E D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$, divided into $R E$ and $D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}$, is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\omega_{0}\right\rangle^{R E D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}=\sum_{\mu=1}^{r} \sqrt{\frac{d_{D}}{d_{B}}} \sqrt{q_{\mu}}\left|\eta_{\mu}\right\rangle^{R E}\left|\psi_{\mu}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} \tag{101}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\left\{\left|\eta_{\mu}\right\rangle^{R E}\right\}_{\mu}$ is an orthonormal basis. From Eq. (93), the state $\left|\zeta_{\text {succ }}\right\rangle^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ is then given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\zeta_{\mathrm{succ}}\right\rangle^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}=\sum_{\mu=1}^{r} \sqrt{\frac{d_{D} q_{\mu}}{d_{B} p_{\mathrm{succ}}}}\left|\eta_{\mu}\right\rangle^{R E}\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{D D^{\prime}} \mid \psi_{\mu}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} \tag{102}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is important to notice the symmetry of $\left|\zeta_{\text {succ }}\right\rangle R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime}$ between $R E$ and $R^{\prime} E^{\prime}$. From Fig. 8, we observe that taking the complex conjugate of this state is equal to swapping $R E$ for $R^{\prime} E^{\prime}$. Hence, the Schmidt basis of $\left|\zeta_{\text {succ }}\right\rangle^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ in $R E$ and that in $E^{\prime} R^{\prime}$ are the same up to the complex conjugate. Together with Eq. (102), we see that $\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{D D^{\prime}} \mid \psi_{\mu}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ is proportional to $\left|\eta_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ with a real coefficient. Moreover, substituting Eq. (102) to Eq. (100) and noting that the eigenvalues of $\Pi_{2} \Pi_{1} \Pi_{2}$ are $q_{\mu}$ by the Jordan's lemma, the coefficient turns out to be $\sqrt{q_{\mu}}$. Thus,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{D D^{\prime}} \mid \psi_{\mu}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}=\sqrt{q_{\mu}}\left|\eta_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} \tag{103}
\end{equation*}
$$

From Eqs. (102) and (103), the Schmidt decomposition of $\left|\zeta_{\text {succ }}\right\rangle^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\zeta_{\text {succ }}\right\rangle^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}=\sum_{\mu=1}^{r} \sqrt{\frac{d_{D}}{d_{B}}} \frac{q_{\mu}}{\sqrt{p_{\text {succ }}}}\left|\eta_{\mu}\right\rangle^{R E}\left|\eta_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} \tag{104}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using the states $\left\{\left|\psi_{\mu}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\right\}_{\mu}$ and $\left\{\left|\eta_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\right\}_{\mu}$, the products of projectors $\Pi_{1}$ and $\Pi_{2}$ are rephrased as

$$
\begin{align*}
\left(\Pi_{1} \Pi_{2} \Pi_{1}\right)^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} & =\sum_{\mu=1}^{r} q_{\mu}\left|\psi_{\mu}\right\rangle\left\langle\left.\psi_{\mu}\right|^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\right.  \tag{105}\\
\left(\Pi_{2} \Pi_{1} \Pi_{2}\right)^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} & =\sum_{\mu=1}^{r} q_{\mu}\left|\xi_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle\left\langle\left.\xi_{\mu}^{*}\right|^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\right. \tag{106}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\left|\xi_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}:=|\Phi\rangle^{D D^{\prime}}\left|\eta_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$, and the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ is decomposed into

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{H}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}=\underset{\mu=1}{\stackrel{r}{\oplus}} \mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} \oplus \mathcal{H}_{\perp}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} \tag{107}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}=\operatorname{span}\left\{\left|\psi_{\mu}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}},\left|\xi_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\right\}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\perp}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ is remaining orthogonal complement to $\oplus_{\mu=1}^{r} \mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$.

In the following, we focus only on the subspaces $\oplus_{\mu=1}^{r} \mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ and ignore $\mathcal{H}_{\perp}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$. This does not cause any issue since Eqs. (99) and (100) guarantee that all eigenstates of $\omega_{0}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ and $\Phi^{D D^{\prime}} \otimes \zeta_{\text {succ }}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ are in $\oplus_{\mu=1}^{r} \mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$. As we will explain later, our goal is to transform the eigenvectors $\left|\psi_{\mu}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ to the corresponding eigenvectors $\left|\xi_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ within each subspace $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ by the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm. Thus, it is sufficient that we focus only on the subspaces that contain all eigenstates.

For the sake of analysis, we define an auxiliary state $\left|\omega_{\mathrm{targ}}\right\rangle^{R R^{\prime} E E^{\prime}}$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\omega_{\mathrm{targ}}\right\rangle^{R R^{\prime} E E^{\prime}}:=\sum_{\mu} \sqrt{\frac{d_{D}}{d_{B}}} \sqrt{q_{\mu}}\left|\eta_{\mu}\right\rangle^{R E}\left|\eta_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} \tag{108}
\end{equation*}
$$

This state is useful due to the following lemma.
Lemma 8. If there exists a state $\tau^{E}$ such that $\| \omega^{R E}-$ $\pi^{R} \otimes \tau^{E} \|_{1} \leq \epsilon$, it holds that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{2}\left\|\omega_{\mathrm{targ}}^{R R^{\prime}}-\Phi^{R R^{\prime}}\right\|_{1} \leq \sqrt{\epsilon} \tag{109}
\end{equation*}
$$

This lemma is shown by a vectorization operation. A vectorization in a given basis $\{|i\rangle\}_{i}$ is a linear map Vec such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Vec}(|\psi\rangle\langle\varphi|)=|\psi\rangle\left|\varphi^{*}\right\rangle \tag{110}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the complex conjugate is taken in the basis $\{|i\rangle\}_{i}$, i.e., $\left|\varphi^{*}\right\rangle=\sum_{i} c_{i}^{*}|i\rangle$ when $|\varphi\rangle=\sum_{i} c_{i}|i\rangle$. A vectorization has the property that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|L-M\|_{2}=\|\operatorname{Vec}(L)-\operatorname{Vec}(M)\| \tag{111}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any matrix $L$ and $M$, where $\|\cdot\|_{2}$ is the HilbertSchmidt norm for matrices and $\|\cdot\|$ is the Euclidian norm for vectors.

Proof. (Proof of Lemma 8) Let $\tau_{\alpha}$ and $\left\{\left|e_{\alpha}\right\rangle^{E}\right\}_{\alpha}$ be eigenvalues and eigenstates of $\tau^{E}$, respectively, and let $|\tau\rangle^{E E^{\prime}}:=\sum_{\alpha} \sqrt{\tau_{\alpha}}\left|e_{\alpha}\right\rangle^{E}\left|e_{\alpha}^{*}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime}}$, where the complex conjugate is taken in the computational basis $|\alpha\rangle^{E}$.

We regard the two pure states $\left|\omega_{\text {targ }}\right\rangle^{R R^{\prime} E E^{\prime}}$ and $|\Phi\rangle^{R R^{\prime}}|\tau\rangle^{E E^{\prime}}$ as the states after the vectorization of operators on $R E$, which is taken in the computational basis $\left\{|i\rangle^{R}|\alpha\rangle^{E}\right\}_{i, \alpha}$. That is,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \|\left|\omega_{\mathrm{targ}}\right\rangle^{R R^{\prime} E E^{\prime}}-|\Phi\rangle^{R R^{\prime}}|\tau\rangle^{E E^{\prime}} \| \\
& \begin{aligned}
&=\| \sum_{\mu} \sqrt{\frac{d_{D}}{d_{B}}} \sqrt{q_{\mu}}\left|\eta_{\mu}\right\rangle^{R E}\left|\eta_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{R^{\prime} E^{\prime}} \\
& \quad-\sum_{i, \alpha} \sqrt{\frac{\tau_{\alpha}}{d_{A}}}|i\rangle^{R}\left|e_{\alpha}\right\rangle^{E}|i\rangle^{R^{\prime}}\left|e_{\alpha}^{*}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime}} \| \\
&=\| \operatorname{Vec}\left(\sum_{\mu} \sqrt{\frac{d_{D}}{d_{B}}} \sqrt{q_{\mu}}\left|\eta_{\mu}\right\rangle\left\langle\left.\eta_{\mu}\right|^{R E}\right)\right. \\
& \quad-\operatorname{Vec}\left(\sum_{i, \alpha} \sqrt{\frac{\tau_{\alpha}}{d_{A}}}|i\rangle\left\langle\left. i\right|^{R} \otimes \mid e_{\alpha}\right\rangle\left\langle\left. e_{\alpha}\right|^{E}\right) \| .\right.
\end{aligned}
\end{align*}
$$

Using the property of the vectorization in Eq. (111). Eq. (113) is equal to

$$
\begin{align*}
& \| \sum_{\mu} \sqrt{\frac{d_{D}}{d_{B}}} \sqrt{q_{\mu}}\left|\eta_{\mu}\right\rangle\left\langle\left.\eta_{\mu}\right|^{R E}\right. \\
& \quad-\sum_{i, \alpha} \sqrt{\frac{\tau_{\alpha}}{d_{A}}}|i\rangle\left\langle\left. i\right|^{R} \otimes \mid e_{\alpha}\right\rangle\left\langle\left. e_{\alpha}\right|^{E} \|_{2}\right.  \tag{114}\\
& =\left\|\left(\omega_{\text {targ }}^{R E}\right)^{1 / 2}-\left(\pi^{R} \otimes \tau^{E}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{2}  \tag{115}\\
& \leq\left\|\omega_{\text {targ }}^{R E}-\pi^{R} \otimes \tau^{E}\right\|_{1}^{1 / 2}  \tag{116}\\
& =\left\|\omega^{R E}-\pi^{R} \otimes \tau^{E}\right\|_{1}^{1 / 2}  \tag{117}\\
& \leq \sqrt{\epsilon} \tag{118}
\end{align*}
$$

In the first inequality we used the Powers-Størmer inequality $[54,55]:\left\|L^{1 / 2}-M^{1 / 2}\right\|_{2}^{2} \leq\|L-M\|_{1}$ for Hermite operators $L$ and $M$. The last equation follows as $\omega_{\text {targ }}^{R E}=\omega^{R E}$, and the last inequality is by assumption.

From $\||v\rangle\langle v|-|w\rangle\langle w|\left\|_{1} \leq 2\right\||v\rangle-|w\rangle \|$ for any pure states $|v\rangle$ and $|w\rangle$, it follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{2}\left\|\omega_{\text {targ }}^{R R^{\prime} E E^{\prime}}-\Phi^{R R^{\prime}} \otimes \tau^{E E^{\prime}}\right\|_{1} \leq \sqrt{\epsilon} \tag{119}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using the contraction property of the trace norm against the partial trace, we complete the proof.

We now turn to investigate the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm. From Lemma 8, it suffices to show that the output state $\mathcal{D}_{t, \phi}^{D B^{\prime} \rightarrow R^{\prime}}\left(\omega^{R D B^{\prime}}\right)$ is closed to $\omega_{\text {targ }}^{R R^{\prime}}$. This is achieved by the operation such that $\left|\psi_{\mu}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} \rightarrow$ $\left|\xi_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}=|\Phi\rangle^{D D^{\prime}}\left|\eta_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ for all $\mu$. In fact, we
observe from Eqs. (101) and (108) that this operation achieves

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\omega_{0}\right\rangle^{R E D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} \rightarrow\left|\omega_{\mathrm{targ}}\right\rangle^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}|\Phi\rangle^{D D^{\prime}} \tag{120}
\end{equation*}
$$

whose reduced state on $R R^{\prime}$ is $\omega_{\text {targ }}^{R R^{\prime}}$. The goal below is to show that this operation is ahieved by the QSVT-based FPAA algoriothm with high accuracy.

Before we start, we comment on the crucial role of the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm rather than the standard AA algorithm. As we will soon show, when the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm or the AA algorithm is applied, $\left|\psi_{\mu}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ rotates toward $\left|\xi_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ in each two-dimensional subspace $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$. Hence, the decoding succeeds by stopping the rotation when all the states $\left|\psi_{\mu}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ simultaneously get close to the corresponding $\left|\xi_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$. If $q_{\mu}$ differs from each other, this simultaneous condition is hard to satisfied by the standard AA algorithm since it can over-rotate the state. This is the reason why we need to use the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm.

We make another small comment on the difference between the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm and the standard FPAA algorithm in [42]. When we use the standard FPAA algorithm instead of the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm, $\left|\psi_{\mu}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ still rotates in each subspace. However, the algorithm may end up with undesirable phases $\theta_{\mu}$, such as $\left|\psi_{\mu}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} \rightarrow e^{i \theta_{\mu}}\left|\xi_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$. In our case, these phases act as relative phases (see Eq. (101)), and results in the failure of the recovery. This issue is also circumvented by the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm [26, 27].

The following is an important lemma about the QSVT in our setting.

Lemma 9 (Quantum singular value transformation to real odd polynomials $[26,27,47])$. Suppose that $Q_{t}(x)$ is any degree-t odd real polynomial satisfying $\left|Q_{t}(x)\right| \leq 1$ for all $x \in[-1,1]$. Then, there exists $\phi \in(-\pi, \pi]^{t}$ such that

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left(\Pi_{2}^{D D^{\prime}} \otimes\left\langle\left. 0\right|^{H}\right) G_{t, \phi}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H}\left(\Pi_{1}^{D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} \otimes|0\rangle^{H}\right)\right. \\
=Q_{t}\left(\Pi_{2}^{D D^{\prime}} \Pi_{1}^{D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\right) \tag{121}
\end{gather*}
$$

The unitary $G_{t, \phi}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H}$ is given by Eq. (29), and $\Pi_{1}^{D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ and $\Pi_{2}^{D D^{\prime}}$ are given by Eqs. (25) and (26), respectively. The system $H$ is a single-qubit system.

By the Jordan's lemma, $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{D D^{\prime} C^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ is invariant under the action of $\Pi_{1}^{D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ and $\Pi_{2}^{D D^{\prime}}$. Hence, it suffices to consider the action of $G_{t, \phi}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H}$ in each subspace $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H}:=\operatorname{span}\left\{\left|\psi_{\mu}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}|0\rangle^{H},\left|\xi_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}|0\rangle^{H}\right\}$. We use a notation such as $|\check{\varphi}\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H}=|\varphi\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}|0\rangle^{H}$ for a state $|\varphi\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$. From Eq. (103), the state $\left|\check{\psi}_{\mu}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H}$ is expanded as

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\check{\psi}_{\mu}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H}=\sqrt{q_{\mu}} \mid & \left.\check{\xi}_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H} \\
& +\sqrt{1-q_{\mu}}\left|\check{\perp}_{\mu}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H} \tag{122}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\left|\check{\perp}_{\mu}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H}$ is a state in $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H}$ orthogonal to $\left|\check{\xi}_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H}$. From Lemma 9, the QSVT achieves the matrix transformation in $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H}$ such as

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\left.\mathbb{I}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H}\right|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu}}=\left|\check{\xi}_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle \\
\left|\check{L}_{\mu}\right\rangle
\end{array}\left(\begin{array}{c}
\left\langle\check{\psi}_{\mu}\right|  \tag{124}\\
\sqrt{q_{\mu}} \\
\sqrt{1-q_{\mu}} \sqrt{\left\langle\check{\psi}_{\mu}^{\perp}\right|} \\
-\sqrt{1-q_{\mu}}
\end{array}\right) .
$$

Here, $\left|\check{\psi}_{\mu}^{\perp}\right\rangle$ is the state in $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H}$ orthogonal to $\left|\check{\psi}_{\mu}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H}$.

It is clear from this representation that, if one chooses the polynomial $Q_{t}(\cdot)$ such that $Q_{t}\left(\sqrt{q_{\mu}}\right) \approx 1$ for all $\mu$, the desired operation that transforms $\left|\psi_{\mu}\right\rangle$ into $\left|\xi_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle$ is realized. A possible choice of such a polynomial is a polynomial approximating the sign function:

$$
\operatorname{sign}(x)= \begin{cases}1 & (x>1)  \tag{125}\\ 0 & (x=0) \\ -1 & (x<0)\end{cases}
$$

The following lemma shows that there exists such a polynomial approximating the sign function.

Lemma 10 (Polynomial approximation of the sign function $[26-28,56,57])$. For any $\beta, \delta \in(0,1]$, there exists an odd integer $t=\Theta\left(\frac{1}{\beta} \log (1 / \delta)\right)$ and a real polynomial $Q_{t}^{\text {sign }}(x)$ of degree $t$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { - } x \in[-1,1]:\left|Q_{t}^{\text {sign }}(x)\right| \leq 1, \\
& \text { - } x \in[-1,-\beta) \cup(\beta, 1]:\left|Q_{t}^{\text {sign }}(x)-\operatorname{sign}(x)\right| \leq \delta .
\end{aligned}
$$

Given a polynomial, the corresponding $\phi$ can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(\operatorname{poly}(t))$ time by a classical computer [4448], where $t$ is the degree of the polynomial. We take the phase sequence $\phi=\left(\phi_{1}, \ldots, \phi_{t}\right)$ so that the polynomial $Q_{t}(\cdot)$ in Eqs. (121) and (124) becomes $Q_{t}^{\text {sign }}(\cdot)$. From Lemma 10, for $Q_{t}^{\text {sign }}\left(\sqrt{q_{\mu}}\right)$ to be larger than $1-\delta$ for all $\mu=1, \ldots, r$, it is necessary that $\sqrt{q_{\text {min }}} \geq \beta$, where $q_{\text {min }}:=\min _{\mu \in[1, r]} q_{\mu}$. From $\omega_{0}^{R E}=\omega^{R E}$ and Eq. (101), the non-zero minimum eigenvalue of $\omega^{R E}$ is $\lambda_{\min }\left(\omega^{R E}\right)=\frac{d_{D}}{d_{B}} q_{\text {min }}$. Hence, we take the odd integer $t$ such that

$$
\begin{align*}
t & =\Theta\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{q_{\mathrm{min}}}} \log (1 / \delta)\right)  \tag{126}\\
& =\Theta\left(\sqrt{\frac{d_{D}}{d_{B} \lambda_{\min }\left(\omega^{R E}\right)}} \log (1 / \delta)\right) \tag{127}
\end{align*}
$$

We finally combine all together. We denote the output state of the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\check{\omega}_{t}\right\rangle^{R E D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H}:=G_{t, \phi}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H}\left|\omega_{0}\right\rangle^{R E D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}|0\rangle^{H} . \tag{128}
\end{equation*}
$$

By taking $t$ and $\phi$ as mentioned above to approximate the sign function, we obtain the overlap between this output state and the state $\left|\omega_{\mathrm{targ}}\right\rangle^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}|\Phi\rangle^{D D^{\prime}}|0\rangle^{H}$ as

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\langle\omega _ { \mathrm { targ } } | ^ { R E E ^ { \prime } R ^ { \prime } } \left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{D D^{\prime}}\left\langle\left. 0\right|^{H} \mid \check{\omega}_{t}\right\rangle^{R E D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H}\right.\right.  \tag{129}\\
& \quad=\frac{d_{D}}{d_{B}} \sum_{\mu=1}^{r} q_{\mu}\left\langle\left.\check{\xi}_{\mu}^{*}\right|^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H} G_{t, \phi} \mid \check{\psi}_{\mu}\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime} H}  \tag{130}\\
& \quad=\frac{d_{D}}{d_{B}} \sum_{\mu=1}^{r} q_{\mu} Q_{t}^{\mathrm{sign}}\left(\sqrt{q_{\mu}}\right)  \tag{131}\\
& \quad \geq(1-\delta) \frac{d_{D}}{d_{B}} \sum_{\mu=1}^{r} q_{\mu}  \tag{132}\\
& \quad=1-\delta \tag{133}
\end{align*}
$$

where we use $\frac{d_{D}}{d_{B}} \sum_{\mu=1}^{r} q_{\mu}=1$. Using the Fuchs-van de Graaf inequities and the contraction property of the trace norm, it follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{2}\left\|\check{\omega}_{t}^{R R^{\prime}}-\omega_{\mathrm{targ}}^{R R^{\prime}}\right\|_{1} \leq \sqrt{1-(1-\delta)^{2}} \leq \sqrt{2 \delta} \tag{134}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that the state $\check{\omega}_{t}^{R R^{\prime}}$ is the output state of the generalized YK decoder: $\check{\omega}_{t}^{R R^{\prime}}=\mathcal{D}_{t, \phi}^{D B^{\prime} \rightarrow R^{\prime}}\left(\omega^{R D B^{\prime}}\right)$. By Lemma 8, Eq. (134), and the triangle inequality, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{2}\left\|\check{\omega}_{t}^{R R^{\prime}}-\Phi^{R R^{\prime}}\right\|_{1} \leq \sqrt{\epsilon}+\sqrt{2 \delta} \tag{135}
\end{equation*}
$$

completing the evaluation of the recovery error by the generalized YK decoder.

We next investigate the circuit complexity of the generalized YK decoder. Since the non-trivial part is to implement the unitary $G_{t, \phi}$ by the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm, we focus on $\mathcal{C}\left(G_{t, \phi}\right)$.

We start with a circuit implementation of $W_{m}(\theta)$ for $m=1,2$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
W_{m}(\theta) & =e^{i \theta\left(2 \Pi_{m}-\mathbb{I}\right)}  \tag{136}\\
& =e^{-i \theta} \mathbb{I}-\left(e^{-i \theta}-e^{i \theta}\right) \Pi_{m} \tag{137}
\end{align*}
$$

To implement the unitary $W_{m}(\theta)$, we use the projectorcontrolled NOT gate [26, 27] that is in general defined for a projector $\Pi$ on the system $P$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{C}_{\Pi} \mathrm{NOT}^{P-G}:=\Pi^{P} \otimes X^{G}+\left(\mathbb{I}^{P}-\Pi^{P}\right) \otimes \mathbb{I}^{G} . \tag{138}
\end{equation*}
$$

The order of the superscripts in the left-hand side indicates the controlling and controlled systems. The gate


FIG. 9. A quantum circuit for implementing a unitary $W_{m}(\theta)^{P}$. The box in which a projector is written implies that this projector controls the gate. The circle drawn inside the intersecting lines represents the NOT gate, i.e., the Pauli$X$ gate.


FIG. 10. A quantum circuit for implementing $W_{1}\left(\phi_{2 j}\right)^{D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ $W_{2}\left(\phi_{2 j-1}\right)^{D D^{\prime}} \otimes|+\rangle\left\langle+\left.\right|^{H}+W_{1}\left(-\phi_{2 j}\right)^{D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} W_{2}\left(-\phi_{2 j-1}\right)^{D D^{\prime}} \otimes\right.$
 by $|0\rangle$, while closed circles indicate the ones controlled by $|1\rangle$.
$X$ is the single-qubit Pauli- $X$ gate. We also use a singlequbit rotation- $Z$ gate:

$$
\begin{align*}
Z(\theta) & :=e^{-i \theta Z}  \tag{139}\\
& =e^{-i \theta}|0\rangle\langle 0|+e^{i \theta}|1\rangle\langle 1| \tag{140}
\end{align*}
$$

It is straightforward to check that, for any state $|\Psi\rangle^{P}$,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left(\mathrm{C}_{\Pi} \mathrm{NOT}^{P-G} Z(\theta)^{G} \mathrm{C}_{\Pi} \mathrm{NOT}^{P-G}\right)\left(|\Psi\rangle^{P} \otimes|0\rangle^{G}\right) \\
& \left.\quad=\left[e^{-i \theta} \mathbb{I}^{P}-\left(e^{-i \theta}-e^{i \theta}\right) \Pi^{P}\right)|\Psi\rangle^{P}\right] \otimes|0\rangle^{G} \tag{141}
\end{align*}
$$

Hence, we can implement $W_{m}(\theta)^{P}$ by preparing a singlequbit system $G$ and by operating a quantum circuit in Fig. 9.

To construct a circuit for $G_{t, \phi}$, we prepare another single-qubit system $H$ for the controlled implementation of $W_{m}(\theta)^{P}$. For instance, a quantum circuit implementing

$$
\begin{align*}
& W_{1}\left(\phi_{2 j}\right)^{D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} W_{2}\left(\phi_{2 j-1}\right)^{D D^{\prime}} \otimes|+\rangle\left\langle+\left.\right|^{H}\right. \\
& \quad+W_{1}\left(-\phi_{2 j}\right)^{D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} W_{2}\left(-\phi_{2 j-1}\right)^{D D^{\prime}} \otimes|-\rangle\left\langle-\left.\right|^{H}\right. \tag{142}
\end{align*}
$$

is given in Fig. 10. By applying the circuit $(t-1) / 2$ times with various phases and finally applying $W_{2}\left(\phi_{t}\right)^{D D^{\prime}} \otimes$ $\mathrm{H}^{H}$, the unitary $G_{t, \phi}$ is realized. Here, the gate $\mathrm{H}^{H}$ is the single-qubit Hadamard gate on the system $H$.

In this construction, the unitary $G_{t, \phi}$ is decomposed into two unitaries $\mathrm{C}_{\Pi_{1}} \mathrm{NOT}^{D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}-G}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{\Pi_{2}} \mathrm{NOT}^{D D^{\prime}-G}$. A quantum circuit for $\mathrm{C}_{\Pi_{1}} \mathrm{NOT}^{D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}-G}$ is given in Fig. 11. The unitary $\mathrm{C}_{|0\rangle\langle 0|} \mathrm{NOT}^{P-G}$ can be implemented using $\mathcal{O}\left(\log d_{P}\right)$ single- and two-qubit gates and $\mathcal{O}\left(\log d_{P}\right)$ ancilla qubits [58], and the unitary $U_{\Phi}^{A^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$,


FIG. 11. A quantum circuit for implementing the protectorcontrolled NOT gate $\mathrm{C}_{\Pi_{1}} \mathrm{NOT}^{D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}-G}$. The dashed box represents the gete $\mathrm{C}_{|0\rangle\langle 0|} \mathrm{NOT}^{F^{\prime} A^{\prime} R^{\prime}-G}$.
which is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
U_{\Phi}^{A^{\prime} R^{\prime}}|0\rangle^{A^{\prime}}|0\rangle^{R^{\prime}}=|\Phi\rangle^{A^{\prime} R^{\prime}} \tag{143}
\end{equation*}
$$

can be implemented using $\mathcal{O}\left(\log d_{A}\right)$ gates. Hence, in total, $\mathrm{C}_{\Pi_{1}} \mathrm{NOT}^{D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}-G}$ can be implemented by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{O}\left(\mathcal{C}\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}\right)+\log \left(d_{A} d_{F}\right)\right) \tag{144}
\end{equation*}
$$

gates and $\mathcal{O}\left(\log d_{A} d_{F}\right)$ ancilla qubits. Similarly, $\mathrm{C}_{\Pi_{2}} \mathrm{NOT}^{D D^{\prime}-G}$ can be implemented using $\mathcal{O}\left(\log d_{D}\right)$ gates and $\mathcal{O}\left(\log d_{D}\right)$ ancilla qubits.

In the unitary $G_{t, \phi}$, these projector-controlled NOT gates are used $\mathcal{O}(t)$ times. Thus, the total complexity of the generalized YK decoder is given by

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{C}\left(\mathcal{D}_{t, \phi}\right)= & \mathcal{O}\left(t\left(\mathcal{C}\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}\right)+\log \left(d_{A} d_{F} d_{D}\right)\right)\right) \\
& +\mathcal{C}\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}\right)+\mathcal{O}\left(\log d_{A}\right)  \tag{145}\\
= & \mathcal{O}\left(t\left(\mathcal{C}\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}\right)+\log \left(d_{D}^{2} d_{E} / d_{B}\right)\right)\right) \tag{146}
\end{align*}
$$

with $\mathcal{O}\left(\log \left(d_{D}^{2} d_{E} / d_{B}\right)\right)$ ancilla qubits. Here, we used $d_{A} d_{B} d_{F}=d_{E} d_{D}$. In Eq. (145), the first line in the righthand side comes from $G_{t, \phi}$ and the second line comes from $\mathcal{V}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}$, which is applied before $G_{t, \phi}$.

## B. Proofs: the Petz-like decoder

Similarly to the YK decoder, we first consider the decoding protocol with post-selection and then provide a sketch of a proof of Theorem 4.

From Eqs. (17), (35), and (36), the success probability $\tilde{p}_{\text {succ }}$ is computed as

$$
\begin{align*}
\tilde{p}_{\text {succ }} & =\frac{d_{A}}{d_{E}} \operatorname{Tr}\left[V_{\mathcal{F}}^{R^{\prime} \hat{B} \rightarrow \hat{E} D}\left(\Phi^{\hat{B} B^{\prime}} \otimes \pi^{R^{\prime}}\right)\right. \\
& \left.\quad\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{R^{\prime} \hat{B} \rightarrow \hat{E} D}\right)^{\dagger}\left(\omega^{R D B^{\prime}} \otimes \mathbb{I}^{\hat{E}}\right)\right]  \tag{147}\\
& =\frac{d_{A}}{d_{E}} \operatorname{Tr}\left[\left(\omega^{D B^{\prime}}\right)^{2}\right]  \tag{148}\\
& =\frac{d_{A}}{d_{E}} 2^{-H_{2}\left(D B^{\prime}\right)_{\omega}}  \tag{149}\\
& =\frac{d_{A}}{d_{E}} 2^{-H_{2}(R E)_{\omega}} \tag{150}
\end{align*}
$$

where we used $H_{2}\left(D B^{\prime}\right)_{\omega}=H_{2}(R E)_{\omega}$ as $|\omega\rangle^{R E D B^{\prime}}$ is pure. The fidelity between $\tilde{\zeta}_{\text {succ }}^{R R^{\prime}}$ and $\Phi^{R R^{\prime}}$ is computed as

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{F}\left(\tilde{\zeta}_{\text {succ }}^{R R^{\prime}}, \Phi^{R R^{\prime}}\right) \\
& =\frac{1}{d_{E} \tilde{p}_{\text {succ }}} \operatorname{Tr}\left[V_{\mathcal{F}}^{R^{\prime} \hat{B} \rightarrow \hat{E} D}\left(\Phi^{R R^{\prime}} \otimes \Phi^{\hat{B} B^{\prime}}\right)\right. \\
& \left.\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{R^{\prime} \hat{B} \rightarrow \hat{E} D}\right)^{\dagger}\left(\omega^{R D B^{\prime}} \otimes \mathbb{I}^{\hat{E}}\right)\right]  \tag{151}\\
& =\frac{1}{d_{A}} 2^{H_{2}(R E)_{\omega}} \operatorname{Tr}\left[\omega^{R \hat{E} D B^{\prime}}\left(\omega^{R B^{\prime} D} \otimes \mathbb{I}^{\hat{E}}\right)\right]  \tag{152}\\
& =\frac{1}{d_{A}} 2^{H_{2}(R E)_{\omega}-H_{2}\left(R D B^{\prime}\right)_{\omega}}  \tag{153}\\
& =\frac{1}{d_{A}} 2^{H_{2}(R E)_{\omega}-H_{2}(E)_{\omega}}, \tag{154}
\end{align*}
$$

by using $H_{2}\left(R D B^{\prime}\right)_{\omega}=H_{2}(E)_{\omega}$ for $|\omega\rangle^{R E D B^{\prime}}$. Hence, we obtained Eqs. (37) and (38).

Let us now turn to the proof of Theorem 4. Since it can be shown similar to Theorem 3, we provide only an outline of the proof.

We denote the input state of the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{\omega}_{0}^{R E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}:=\tilde{\mathcal{V}}^{D \rightarrow E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B}}\left(\omega^{R D B^{\prime}}\right) \tag{155}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}^{D \rightarrow E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B}}$ is the isometry map such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{\mathcal{V}}^{D \rightarrow E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B}}=\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}^{\hat{L}}\right)^{\dagger}\left(\cdot \otimes \Phi^{\hat{E} E^{\prime}}\right) U_{\mathcal{F}}^{\hat{L}} \tag{156}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $\hat{L}=R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B}=\hat{E} D$. Note that $\tilde{\omega}_{0}^{R E}=\omega^{R E}$. Let $\left|\tilde{\omega}_{0}\right\rangle^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}$ be the purified state which is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\tilde{\omega}_{0}\right\rangle^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}=\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}^{\hat{L}}\right)^{\dagger}|\omega\rangle^{R E D B^{\prime}}|\Phi\rangle^{\hat{E} E^{\prime}} \tag{157}
\end{equation*}
$$

The state on $R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime}$ after the post-selection is then given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathrm{succ}}\right\rangle^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\tilde{p}_{\mathrm{succ}}}}\left\langle\left. 0\right|^{\hat{F}}\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{\hat{B} B^{\prime}} \mid \tilde{\omega}_{0}\right\rangle^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}\right. \tag{158}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is important to observe that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathrm{succ}}^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}=\zeta_{\mathrm{succ}}^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} \tag{159}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the right-hand side is the state after the postselection in the generalized YK protocol. Although it may be hard to observe this relation from its construction in Fig. 5, it can be readily shown using Lemma 6 as in Fig. 12. From this relation, it turns out that the state $\tilde{\zeta}_{\text {succ }}^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ is also symmetrical between $R E$ and $E^{\prime} R^{\prime}$ up to the complex conjugate, and thus, the Schmidt basis in $R E$ and that in $E^{\prime} R^{\prime}$ are complex conjugate of each other.

We next compute the products of projectors $\tilde{\Pi}_{1}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B}}$ and $\tilde{\Pi}_{2}^{\hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}$, which are defined in Eqs.(39) and (40). Sim-


FIG. 12. The equivalence of the states $\tilde{\zeta}_{\text {succ }}^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ and $\zeta_{\text {succ }}^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$, which are obtained after the post-selection in the Petz-like protocol and in the generalized YK protocol, respectively. We can derive this equivalence by applying Lemma 6 onto the portion enclosed by the blue dash-dotted lines.
ilarly to Eqs. (99) and (100), we obtain

$$
\left.\begin{array}{rl}
\left(\tilde{\Pi}_{1} \tilde{\Pi}_{2} \tilde{\Pi}_{1}\right)^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}= & \frac{d_{A}}{d_{E}} \tilde{\omega}_{0}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}, \\
\left(\tilde{\Pi}_{2} \tilde{\Pi}_{1} \tilde{\Pi}_{2}\right)^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}=\left(\frac{d_{A} \tilde{p}_{\text {succ }}}{d_{E}} \tilde{\zeta}_{\text {sucucc }}\right)^{\prime}
\end{array}\right)^{1 / 2} .
$$

Let $\tilde{q}_{\mu}$ and $\left|\tilde{\psi}_{\mu}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}$ for $\mu=1,2, \ldots, r$ be non-zero eigenvalues and corresponding eigenstates of $\left(\tilde{\Pi}_{1} \tilde{\Pi}_{2} \tilde{\Pi}_{1}\right)^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}$, respectively. From Eq. (160), the Schmidt decomposition of $\left|\tilde{\omega}_{0}\right\rangle^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}$, divided into $R E$ and $E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}$, is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\tilde{\omega}_{0}\right\rangle^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}=\sum_{\mu=1}^{r} \sqrt{\frac{d_{E}}{d_{A}}} \sqrt{\tilde{q}_{\mu}}\left|\eta_{\mu}\right\rangle^{R E}\left|\tilde{\psi}_{\mu}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}, \tag{162}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\left\{\left|\eta_{\mu}\right\rangle^{R E}\right\}_{\mu}$ is an orthonormal basis. As $\tilde{\omega}_{0}^{R E}$ is equal to $\omega_{0}^{R E}$, we have that $\tilde{q}_{\mu}=\frac{d_{A} d_{D}}{d_{B} d_{E}} q_{\mu}$.

Since the state $\left|\tilde{\zeta}_{\text {succ }}\right\rangle$ is defined by using $\left|\tilde{\omega}_{0}\right\rangle$ as Eq. (158), it follows that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|\tilde{\zeta}_{\text {succ }}\right\rangle^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} \\
& \quad=\sum_{\mu=1}^{r} \sqrt{\frac{d_{E} \tilde{q}_{\mu}}{d_{A} \tilde{p}_{\text {succ }}}}\left|\eta_{\mu}\right\rangle^{R E}\left\langle\left. 0\right|^{\hat{F}}\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{\hat{B} B^{\prime}} \mid \tilde{\psi}_{\mu}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}} .\right. \tag{163}
\end{align*}
$$

From Eq. (104) for $\left|\zeta_{\text {succ }}\right\rangle$ in the generalized YK protocol with post-selection and Eq. (159), we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\langle\left. 0\right|^{\hat{F}}\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{\hat{B} B^{\prime}} \mid \tilde{\psi}_{\mu}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}\right. \\
& \quad=\sqrt{\frac{d_{A} d_{D} \tilde{p}_{\text {succ }}}{d_{B} d_{E} p_{\text {succ }}}} \frac{q_{\mu}}{\sqrt{\tilde{q}_{\mu}}}\left|\eta_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}=\sqrt{\tilde{q}_{\mu}}\left|\eta_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} . \tag{164}
\end{align*}
$$

Here, we substituted the success probabilities $p_{\text {succ }}$ and $\tilde{p}_{\text {succ }}$ in the generalized YK and Petz-like protocols with
post-selection, which are given by Eqs. (23) and (37). We have also used $\tilde{q}_{\mu}=\frac{d_{A} d_{D}}{d_{B} d_{E}} q_{\mu}$.

Applying the Jordan's lemma (Lemma 7) to the projectors $\tilde{\Pi}_{1}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B}}$ and $\tilde{\Pi}_{2}^{\hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}$, the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}$ is decomposed into a direct sum of one- and twodimensional subspaces $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}$ and the remaining orthogonal complement $\mathcal{H}_{\perp}^{E^{\prime}} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{H}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}=\oplus_{\mu=1}^{r} \mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}} \oplus \mathcal{H}_{\perp}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}} \tag{165}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}=\operatorname{span}\left\{\left|\tilde{\psi}_{\mu}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}},\left|\eta_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}|0\rangle^{\hat{F}}|\Phi\rangle^{\hat{B} B^{\prime}}\right\} . \tag{166}
\end{equation*}
$$

From Eqs. (160) and (161), all eigenstates of $\tilde{\omega}_{0}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}$ and $\tilde{\zeta}_{\text {succ }}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ are in $\oplus_{\mu=1}^{r} \mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}$, on which we focus in the following.

In each subspace $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}$, the state $\left|\tilde{\psi}_{\mu}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}$ is decomposed as

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|\tilde{\psi}_{\mu}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}=\sqrt{\tilde{q}_{\mu}}\left|\eta_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}|0\rangle^{\hat{F}}|\Phi\rangle^{\hat{B} B^{\prime}}  \tag{167}\\
& +\sqrt{1-\tilde{q}_{\mu}}\left|\tilde{\perp}_{\mu}\right\rangle{ }^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}},
\end{align*}
$$

where $\left|\tilde{\perp}_{\mu}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}$ is a state in $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}$ orthogonal to $\left|\eta_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}|0\rangle^{\hat{F}}|\Phi\rangle^{\hat{B} B^{\prime}}$. By the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm with appropriately chosen $\phi \in(-\pi, \pi]^{t}$, $\left|\tilde{\psi}_{\mu}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}$ is transformed to $\left|\eta_{\mu}^{*}\right\rangle^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}|0\rangle^{\hat{F}}|\Phi\rangle^{\hat{B} B^{\prime}}$ in each subspace. Hence, it approximately achieves the transformation that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\tilde{\omega}_{0}\right\rangle^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}} \mapsto\left|\omega_{\operatorname{targ}}\right\rangle^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}|0\rangle^{\hat{F}}|\Phi\rangle^{\hat{B} B^{\prime}} \tag{168}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\left|\omega_{\mathrm{targ}}\right\rangle^{R E E^{\prime} R^{\prime}}$ is defined as Eq. (108). Thus, by a similar technique to the generalized YK decoder, we obtain that the Petz-like decoder $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{t, \phi}$ achieves

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{2}\left\|\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{t, \phi}^{D B^{\prime} \rightarrow R^{\prime}}\left(\omega^{R D B^{\prime}}\right)-\omega_{\mathrm{targ}}^{R R^{\prime}}\right\| \leq \sqrt{2 \delta} \tag{169}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $t$ is an odd number satisfying

$$
\begin{align*}
t & =\Theta\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\tilde{q}_{\min }}} \log (1 / \delta)\right)  \tag{170}\\
& =\Theta\left(\sqrt{\frac{d_{A}}{d_{E} \lambda_{\min }\left(\omega^{R E}\right)}} \log (1 / \delta)\right) \tag{171}
\end{align*}
$$

From Lemma $8, \omega_{\text {targ }}^{R R^{\prime}} \approx \Phi^{R R^{\prime}}$ when the decoupling condition is satisfied. Hence, using the triangle inequality, the recovery error by the Petz-like decoder is evaluated as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{2}\left\|\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{t, \phi}^{D B^{\prime} \rightarrow R^{\prime}}\left(\omega^{R D B^{\prime}}\right)-\Phi^{R R^{\prime}}\right\|_{1} \leq \sqrt{\epsilon}+\sqrt{2 \delta} \tag{172}
\end{equation*}
$$

Finally, since $\tilde{\Pi}_{1}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime} \hat{F} \hat{B}}$ and $\tilde{\Pi}_{2}^{\hat{F} \hat{B} B^{\prime}}$ are explicitly given by Eqs. (39) and (40), respectively, the complexity of the Petz-like decoder can be evaluated similarly to the generalized YK decoder. The circuit complexity of $\mathrm{C}_{\tilde{\Pi}_{1}}$ NOT is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{O}\left(\mathcal{C}\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}\right)+\log d_{E}\right) \tag{173}
\end{equation*}
$$

and that of $\mathrm{C}_{\tilde{\Pi}_{2}}$ NOT is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{O}\left(\log d_{B} d_{F}\right) \tag{174}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since they are applied $\mathcal{O}(t)$ times in the Petz-like decoder, the total complexity is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{O}\left(t\left(\mathcal{C}\left(U_{\mathcal{F}}\right)+\log \left(d_{E} d_{B} d_{F}\right)\right)\right) \tag{175}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $\mathcal{O}\left(\log \left(d_{E} d_{B} d_{F}\right)\right)$ ancilla qubits. Using $d_{A} d_{B} d_{F}=$ $d_{E} d_{D}$, Theorem 4 is obtained.

## V. SUMMARY AND OUTLOOKS

In this paper, we have provided two explicit decoders that are applicable to any encoding and noisy channels: one is the generalized YK decoder, and the other is the Petz-like decoder. Both are constructed by two steps: first we consider a decoding protocol with measurement and post-selection, and then we construct a decoder by replacing the measurement with the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm, which is for amplifying the success probability of the post-selection. These decoders have been shown to have high recovering performance in the sense that they can recover quantum information when the recovery is guaranteed to be in principle possible, which is formulated in terms of the decoupling condition. An important implication is that the decoders with a suitable choice of encoding are capacity-achieving.

We have then investigated the circuit complexity of the generalized YK decoder and the Petz-like decoder. While the complexity depends on various factors, we have shown that the generalized YK decoder has smaller complexity in general if the sender and the receiver share
more entanglement in advance. This conclusion was obtained by comparing the dominant term, i.e., the one that comes from the implementation of the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm.

Our approach extends the powerful use of the QSVT to the problem of recovering quantum information, which bridges quantum algorithms to quantum information theory, and is of conceptual interest. As mentioned, this approach was proposed in the original work by Yoshida and Kitaev [16] with a limited use in a specific model, where the standard AA algorithm was used. Our work shows that, if one uses the QSVT-based FPAA algorithm instead of the standard AA algorithm, the approach can be extended to general situations. The constructed decoder is still inefficient in general, but it would be an interesting open problem to see if an efficient decoder can be constructed by this approach.

It may also be interesting to address the question about whether a similar approach may work for recovering classical $[59,60]$ or hybrid [61-64] information. In the former, the encoded information is classical, and the decoder is simply given by quantum measurement. In the latter, the information is a mixture of classical and quantum, which can be decoded by a simultaneous use of quantum measurement and quantum decoder. Both use quantum measurement, and a couple of quantum measurements are known to work well, such as the pretty-good measurement [60, 65]. Our approach adapted to these settings may provide a better decoder.

From a technical viewpoint, another direction is a relaxation of the assumptions about the knowledge of the noisy channel [66] and the non-zero minimum eigenvalue of the noisy state. While general decoders, as well as the proposed decoders in this paper, are constructed based on such knowledge, it would not be realistic to obtain complete knowledge of the noise. If we can relax these assumptions, the decoders become more practical ones. An intriguing future challenge lies in understanding to what extent we can relax those restrictions.

These decoders may also have potential use in fundamental physics for exploring exotic quantum many-body phenomena that are related to the recovery of quantum information. For instance, the proposed decoders could be potentially applied to reconstructing the internal structure of a black hole from the noisy Hawking radiation [67], and to recovering the bulk structure from a part of boundaries, such as the entanglement wedge reconstruction [68]. This is also an intriguing direction of study with the decoders.
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Appendix A: Derivation of Eqs. (99) and (100)
In this section, we derive Eqs. (99) and (100). The calculations are as follows.

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left(\Pi_{1} \Pi_{2} \Pi_{1}\right)^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} \\
& =\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{\left.A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}\right)^{*}|\Phi\rangle\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{A^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{\top} \mid \Phi\right\rangle^{D D^{\prime}}} \begin{array}{l}
\quad\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{*}|\Phi\rangle\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{A^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{\top} \quad(\mathrm{A} 1)\right. \\
=\frac{d_{B} d_{E}}{d_{A} d_{D}}\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{*}|\Phi\rangle^{A^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{E E^{\prime}} V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A B \rightarrow E D}\right. \\
\\
|\Phi\rangle\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{B B^{\prime}}\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A B \rightarrow E D}\right)^{\dagger} \mid \Phi\right\rangle^{E E^{\prime}}\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{A^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{\top}\right. \\
= \\
\frac{d_{B}}{d_{D}}\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{*}\left(\omega^{D B^{\prime}} \otimes \Phi^{A^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\right)\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{\top} \\
= \\
\frac{d_{B}}{d_{D}} \omega_{0}^{D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}},
\end{array}\right. \text { (A3)}
\end{align*}
$$

where we used Lemma 6 in the second equation. Note that $\omega^{D B^{\prime}}$ is given by $\omega^{D B^{\prime}}=\operatorname{Tr}_{E}\left[V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A B \rightarrow E D}\left(\pi^{A} \otimes\right.\right.$
$\left.\left.\Phi^{B B^{\prime}}\right)\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A B \rightarrow E D}\right)^{\top}\right]$.
The other one is calculated as

$$
\begin{align*}
& {\left[\left(\Pi_{2} \Pi_{1} \Pi_{2}\right)^{\left.D D^{\prime} E^{\prime} R^{\prime}\right]^{2}}\right.} \\
& =|\Phi\rangle\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{D D^{\prime}}\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{*} \mid \Phi\right\rangle\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{A^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\right. \\
& \quad|\Phi\rangle\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{D D^{\prime}}\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{\top}\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{*}\right. \\
& \quad|\Phi\rangle\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{A^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{\top} \mid \Phi\right\rangle\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{D D^{\prime}}\right.  \tag{A5}\\
& =\Phi^{D D^{\prime}} \otimes \frac{d_{B}}{d_{D}}\left\langle\left.\Phi\right|^{D D^{\prime}}\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{*}\right. \\
& \quad\left(\omega^{D B^{\prime}} \otimes \Phi^{A^{\prime} R^{\prime}}\right)\left(V_{\mathcal{F}}^{A^{\prime} B^{\prime} \rightarrow E^{\prime} D^{\prime}}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}|\Phi\rangle^{D D^{\prime}}  \tag{A6}\\
& =\Phi^{D D^{\prime}} \otimes \frac{d_{B} p_{\text {succ }}}{d_{D}} \zeta_{\text {succ }}^{E^{\prime} R^{\prime}} . \tag{A7}
\end{align*}
$$

Taking the square root of both sides concludes the derivation. Here, we also used Lemma 6 in the second equation.
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