

Additivity and Distinguishability of Random Unitary Channels

Bill Rosgen
 Institute for Quantum Computing
 and School of Computer Science
 University of Waterloo
 wrosgen@iqc.ca

April 11, 2008

Abstract

A random unitary channel is one that is given by a convex combination of unitary channels. It is shown that the conjectures on the additivity of the minimum output entropy and the multiplicativity of the maximum output p -norm can be equivalently restated in terms of random unitary channels. This is done by constructing a random unitary approximation to a general quantum channel. This approximation can be constructed efficiently, and so it is also applied to the computational problem of distinguishing quantum circuits. It is shown that the problem of distinguishing random unitary circuits is as hard as the QIP-complete problem of distinguishing general mixed state circuits.

1 Introduction

A quantum channel is *random unitary* if it can be decomposed into the probabilistic application of one of a finite set of unitary operations. More formally, Φ is random unitary if there exist unitary operators U_1, \dots, U_n and a probability distribution p_1, \dots, p_n such that

$$\Phi(X) = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i U_i X U_i^*. \quad (1)$$

It has been shown by Gregoratti and Werner [11] that the random unitary channels describe exactly the noise processes that can be corrected using classical information obtained by measuring the environment. For channels on qubits, a theorem of Landau and Streater [16] shows that the random unitary channels are exactly the unital channels. For channels on spaces of larger dimension this correspondence does not hold. Audenaert and Scheel have recently provided necessary and sufficient conditions for a channel to be random unitary [4]. Buscemi has also provided an upper bound on the number of unitaries needed for a random unitary decomposition [6].

A natural question arises from this class of channels: is the additivity conjecture simplified when restricted to the random unitary channels? In the present paper this question is answered in the negative. This is done using a method to approximate an arbitrary quantum channel by a random unitary one. This approximation can also be used to show that the question of the multiplicativity of the maximum output p -norm can be restricted to random unitary channels with no loss of generality. These results extend the results of Fukuda [9] on unital channels. In addition to these results, this approximation scheme can be used to show the computational hardness of distinguishing mixed-state quantum circuits that implement random unitary channels.

All Hilbert spaces considered here are finite dimensional, and denoted by calligraphic letters $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}, \dots$. The set of all (bounded) linear operators on a space \mathcal{H} is denoted by $\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{H})$. The set of density matrices, which are the positive semidefinite operators with unit trace, on the space \mathcal{H} is denoted $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{H})$. The notation

$\mathbf{T}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is used for the set of admissible maps from \mathcal{H} to \mathcal{K} . An admissible map, which will hereafter be called a channel, is one that is completely positive and trace preserving. The notation $\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{H}}$ will be used to denote the maximally mixed state on \mathcal{H} , i.e. $\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{H}} = I_{\mathcal{H}} / \dim \mathcal{H}$.

The minimum output entropy of a channel Φ is given by

$$S_{\min}(\Phi) = \min_{\rho \in \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{H})} S(\Phi(\rho)),$$

where S is the von Neumann entropy. A central conjecture in quantum information is whether this quantity is additive [14, 19], i.e. whether

$$S_{\min}(\Phi \otimes \Psi) = S_{\min}(\Phi) + S_{\min}(\Psi),$$

for all channels Φ and Ψ . In Section 5 it is shown that this conjecture can be restricted to the random unitary channels with no loss of generality.

A related quantity is the maximum output p -norm of a quantum channel $\Phi \in \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$. This quantity, for $p \in [1, \infty)$ is given by

$$\nu_p(\Phi) = \sup_{\rho \in \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{H})} \|\Phi(\rho)\|_p = \sup_{\rho \in \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{H})} (\text{tr} |\Phi(\rho)|^p)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

which is simply the p -norm of the singular values of $\Phi(\rho)$, maximized over all inputs ρ . This is extended to the case of $p = \infty$ in the usual way, by replacing the sum in the p -norm with a maximization over the singular values of $\Phi(\rho)$. The corresponding conjecture regarding this quantity is that it is multiplicative with respect to the tensor product of two channels [3], i.e. that

$$\nu_p(\Phi \otimes \Psi) = \nu_p(\Phi) \nu_p(\Psi),$$

for any two channels Φ, Ψ . Counterexamples to this conjecture are known for all fixed $p > 1$, with the exception of $p = 2$ [12, 21, 22]. This does not eliminate interest in this quantity, however, as the conjecture can be weakened to ask if, for given Φ, Ψ , does there exist p close enough to one so that this quantity is multiplicative? This weakened conjecture still implies the additivity of the minimum output entropy [3], and so remains of interest. In Section 4 it is shown that this conjecture can also be restricted to an equivalent one on random unitary channels.

2 Random Unitary Approximation

Stinespring's Dilation Theorem [20] states that any quantum channel Φ can be written as

$$\Phi(X) = \text{tr}_{\mathcal{B}} U(X \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|)U^*, \quad (2)$$

for U a unitary operation. There are two operations in this representation that are not random unitary, as defined by Equation (1). These operations are the partial trace over the system \mathcal{B} , and the introduction of the ancillary system in the state $|0\rangle$. To find an approximation to Φ that is random unitary, we will need to deal with both of these operations.

Fixing notation, let Φ be a completely positive and trace preserving map from $\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{H})$ to $\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{K})$. Representing Φ as in Equation 2, let \mathcal{A} be the space containing the ancillary space starting in the $|0\rangle$ state, and let \mathcal{B} be the space that is traced out. This implies that U is a unitary map from $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ to $\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{B}$.

To avoid tracing out the system in the space \mathcal{B} the partial trace may be replaced by the operation $N_{\mathcal{B}}$ that takes the state in \mathcal{B} to the completely mixed state. This operation can be implemented as a random unitary operation as the uniform mixture of the generalized Pauli operators [2, 5, 13]. It is not difficult to see that for ρ a density matrix on $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$,

$$N_{\mathcal{B}}(\rho) = (\text{tr}_{\mathcal{B}} \rho) \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}. \quad (3)$$

This implies that if the system to be traced out instead has $N_{\mathcal{B}}$ applied to it, the resulting state is the same, up to a maximally mixed state in the space \mathcal{B} . This factor will change both the minimum output entropy and the maximum output p -norm by a fixed value that will not affect the additivity or multiplicativity of these quantities.

Replacing the introduction of the ancillary space \mathcal{A} with a random unitary operation is more complicated. The strategy employed is to expand the input of the transformation to include the space \mathcal{A} . The input state of this system will not, in general, be $|0\rangle$, and so a checking process will be used in an effort to force this to be the case. The idea behind this process is to leave the state $|0\rangle$ fixed, but on any other state send both the space \mathcal{H} and the space \mathcal{A} to the maximally mixed state. As the maximally mixed state has maximum entropy, an input state that minimizes the minimum output entropy will be close to a product state with $|0\rangle\langle 0|$ in the space \mathcal{A} . A similar argument will apply to the maximum p -norm due to the fact that the p -norm of the maximally mixed state is the minimum over all density operators.

Unfortunately, the ideal transformation that fixes $|0\rangle\langle 0|$ but sends any other state the maximally mixed state is not random unitary. This strategy is still viable, however, as this channel can be approximated by a random unitary operation to within an additive error of $O(1/\dim \mathcal{A})$, and so by taking the dimension of this space large enough the result is essentially the same as the ideal transformation.

As a first step in this approximation the operation known as decoherence or phase damping is applied to the space \mathcal{A} . This operation eliminates the off-diagonal elements of a density matrix, so that when applied to the input density matrix ρ , the result is of the form

$$D_{\mathcal{A}}(\rho) = \sum_{i=0}^{\dim \mathcal{A}-1} p_i |i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \rho_i,$$

for some probability distribution p_i . This operation is random unitary, as it may be implemented with a uniform mixture of the generalized Pauli Z operators [10]. This is considered in more detail in Section 6, where a circuit construction for this channel is considered.

The second and final step of this approximation is to apply the operation that takes $|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \rho$ to a state close to the maximally mixed state, for any $i \neq 0$. The channel that implements this perfectly is not random unitary, but there is a random unitary channel M that implements

$$M(|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \rho) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\dim \mathcal{A}} (I_{\mathcal{A}} - |0\rangle\langle 0| + |\psi_i\rangle\langle \psi_i|) \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{H}} & \text{if } i \neq 0, \\ |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \rho, & \text{if } i = 0, \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where $|\psi_i\rangle$ is a pure state that depends on i . A circuit description of the channel M is given in Section 6, from which it follows that this channel is random unitary when the dimension is a power of two. The extension to the case of general dimension is straightforward. The key observation to make about the transformation M is that when $i \neq 0$ the result is, up to an additive error of $O(1/\dim \mathcal{A})$, a completely mixed state. When Equation (4) is combined with the decoherence channel $D_{\mathcal{A}}$, the result is

$$(D_{\mathcal{A}} \circ M)(\rho) = \sum_{i=0}^{\dim \mathcal{A}-1} p_i M(|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \rho_i) \quad (5)$$

The operation $D_{\mathcal{A}} \circ M$ will be referred to as the conditional mixing procedure, as it is used to send the input near to the maximally mixed state if the state in \mathcal{A} is not $|0\rangle$.

Putting all of these pieces together, given a channel $\Phi(\rho) = \text{tr}_{\mathcal{B}} U(\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|)U^*$, the random unitary approximation Φ' is given by

$$\Phi'(\rho) = N_{\mathcal{B}}(U[(D_{\mathcal{A}} \circ M)(\rho)]U^*), \quad (6)$$

which, more plainly, is simply the application of the conditional mixing procedure, the unitary operation from a Stinespring dilation of Φ , and finally the completely mixing channel to the space that would have been traced out by Φ . As the composition of random unitary transformations remains random unitary, the channel Φ' will be a random unitary channel.

It will be useful to observe that the channel Φ' specified in Equation (6) can be used to simulate the channel Φ . This occurs when the input $|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \rho$ is provided to Φ' , as argued in the following proposition.

Proposition 1. *Let Φ be a quantum channel from $\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{H})$ to $\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{K})$. If Φ' is the random unitary channel mapping $\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{H})$ to $\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{B})$ that is constructed from Φ in Equation (6), then*

$$\Phi'(|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \rho) = \Phi(\rho) \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

Proof. Notice that both $D_{\mathcal{A}}$ and M do not affect this input: the decoherence operation does not affect the pure state on \mathcal{A} , and M does not affect the state by Equation (4). Thus, the output of Φ' channel is

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi'(\rho) &= N_{\mathcal{B}}(U[(D_{\mathcal{A}} \circ M)(|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \rho)]U^*) \\ &= N_{\mathcal{B}}(U(|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \rho)U^*) \\ &= \text{tr}_{\mathcal{B}}(U(|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \rho)U^*) \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}} \\ &= \Phi(\rho) \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the penultimate equality is an application of Equation (3). \square

Combining this proposition with Equation (5) that demonstrates the effect of the decoherence operation $D_{\mathcal{A}}$, and the observation that applying $D_{\mathcal{A}}$ twice has no further effect than applying it once, the output of Φ' on an arbitrary input state ρ is given by

$$\Phi'(\rho) = \sum_{i=0}^{\dim \mathcal{A}-1} p_i \Phi'(|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \rho_i) = p_0 \Phi(\rho_0) \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}} + \sum_{i=1}^{\dim \mathcal{A}-1} p_i \Phi'(|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \rho_i). \quad (7)$$

The major technical portion of the results that follow will be bounding the distance from the maximally mixed state of the terms in the sum, from which most of the results will follow.

3 Properties of the Constructed Channel

In this section some basic results on the random unitary approximation of a channel are shown. Throughout the section, and the remainder of the paper, Φ will represent the original transformation and Φ' will represent the random unitary transformation constructed from it as in Equation (6).

As a first step to showing that Φ' approximates Φ it is shown that random unitary transformations cannot increase the distance of a state from the completely mixed state. This lemma shows that the output of a random unitary transformation cannot be more pure than the input. The extra space \mathcal{B} appearing in this lemma will correspond to a reference system needed for the results in Section 7.

Lemma 2. *Let $\|\cdot\|$ be a unitarily invariant norm on $\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{A})$. If $\Psi \in \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})$ is random unitary and $\rho \in \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B})$ then*

$$\left\| (\Psi \otimes I_{\mathcal{B}})(\rho) - \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes \text{tr}_{\mathcal{A}} \rho \right\| \leq \left\| \rho - \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes \text{tr}_{\mathcal{A}} \rho \right\|$$

Proof. As Ψ is random unitary, let $\Psi(X) = \sum_i p_i U_i X U_i^*$ with the U_i unitary, $0 \leq p_i \leq 1$, and $\sum_i p_i = 1$. Using this decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| (\Psi \otimes I_{\mathcal{B}})(\rho) - \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes \text{tr}_{\mathcal{A}} \rho \right\| &= \left\| \sum_i p_i (U_i \otimes I) \rho (U_i^* \otimes I) - \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes \text{tr}_{\mathcal{A}} \rho \right\| \\ &\leq \sum_i p_i \left\| (U_i \otimes I) \rho (U_i^* \otimes I) - \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes \text{tr}_{\mathcal{A}} \rho \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that $U_i \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{A}} U_i^* = \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{A}}$, and the unitary invariance of the norm, this becomes

$$\sum_i p_i \left\| (U_i \otimes I) (\rho - \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes \text{tr}_{\mathcal{A}} \rho) (U_i^* \otimes I) \right\| = \sum_i p_i \left\| \rho - \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes \text{tr}_{\mathcal{A}} \rho \right\| = \left\| \rho - \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes \text{tr}_{\mathcal{A}} \rho \right\|.$$

Combining these equations yields the statement of the lemma. \square

This Lemma can be used to show not only that the conditional mixing procedure sends states where the ancillary spaces is not in the $|0\rangle$ state to states that are almost completely mixed, but that the channel Φ' also has this behaviour. Before doing this, however, this Lemma is extended to the case of the von Neumann entropy, where the proof is essentially identical, with the exception that the triangle inequality is replaced by concavity. A description of the properties of the von Neumann entropy can be found in [17].

Corollary 3. *If $\Psi \in \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})$ is random unitary, and $\rho \in \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{A})$, then $S(\rho) \leq S(\Psi(\rho))$.*

Proof. Let $\Psi(\rho) = \sum_i p_i U_i \rho U_i^*$ as in Lemma 2. Using this notation, and the concavity of the von Neumann entropy

$$S(\Psi(\rho)) = S\left(\sum_i p_i U_i \rho U_i^*\right) \geq \sum_i p_i S(U_i \rho U_i^*) = \sum_i p_i S(\rho) = S(\rho),$$

where the unitary invariance of the von Neumann entropy has been used in the penultimate equality. \square

The next lemma shows that when the input in the space \mathcal{A} is orthogonal to the state $|0\rangle\langle 0|$, then the output of Φ' is very close to completely mixed. The distance measure used in the lemma is the trace norm, but this can be applied to the case of the maximum output p -norm due to the fact that $\|\rho\|_{\text{tr}} = \|\rho\|_1 \geq \|\rho\|_p$ for all $p \in [1, \infty]$. This lemma forms a significant portion of the proof of the main results on the additivity and multiplicativity conjectures.

Lemma 4. *On input states ρ of the form $|k\rangle\langle k| \otimes \rho \in \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{H})$ for $0 < k \leq \dim \mathcal{A} - 1$, the output of Φ' satisfies*

$$\left\| \Phi'(\rho) - \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}} \right\|_{\text{tr}} \leq \frac{2}{\dim \mathcal{A}}.$$

Proof. On input of the form $|k\rangle\langle k| \otimes \rho$ the decoherence operation $D_{\mathcal{A}}$ that is applied to the qubits in \mathcal{A} can be ignored, as it has no effect on qubits in a state of the computational basis. As $k \neq 0$ the operation M given by Equation (4) will have a nontrivial effect, sending the input state to

$$\frac{1}{\dim \mathcal{A}} (I_{\mathcal{A}} - |0\rangle\langle 0| + |\psi_k\rangle\langle \psi_k|) \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad (8)$$

where $|\psi_k\rangle$ is a pure state that depends on k (an exact specification of this state is given by the circuit constructions in Section 6). Letting this state be σ_k , we can then compute the distance to the desired one as

$$\left\| \sigma_k - (I_{\mathcal{A}} / \dim \mathcal{A}) \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{H}} \right\|_{\text{tr}} = \frac{1}{\dim \mathcal{A}} \left\| |\psi_k\rangle\langle \psi_k| - |0\rangle\langle 0| \right\|_{\text{tr}} \leq \frac{2}{\dim \mathcal{A}}. \quad (9)$$

Finally, by noting that the remainder of the transformation Φ' is random unitary, an application of Lemma 2 yields the desired bound. \square

Once again we can extend this result to the case of the von Neumann entropy. In this case we do not simply repeat the same method of proof, but instead extend the result to the entropy using a relationship between the trace distance and the entropy. This extension requires that $\dim \mathcal{A} \geq \dim \mathcal{H}$, but this can be assured by considering only those dilations of Φ with this property.

Corollary 5. *Let $m = \log \dim \mathcal{A}$. If $\dim \mathcal{A} \geq \dim \mathcal{H}$, $m \geq 3$, and $0 < i \leq \dim \mathcal{A} - 1$, then*

$$S(\Phi'(|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \rho)) \geq S(\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}}) - \frac{m}{2^{m-3}}.$$

Proof. Let $\hat{\rho}$ be the state in Equation (8) of the proof of Lemma 4. This is the state after the conditional mixing procedure of Φ' has been applied to the input. By Equation (9), the trace distance between $\hat{\rho}$ and $\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}}$ is at most $2^{-(m-1)}$. Applying Fannes' inequality [8] yields

$$\left| S(\hat{\rho}) - S(\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}}) \right| \leq \frac{\log \dim \mathcal{H} + m}{2^{m-1}} + \frac{m}{2^{m-1}} \leq \frac{m}{2^{m-3}},$$

where we have implicitly used the fact that $-x \log x$ is monotone for $x \in [0, 1/e]$, and $2^{-(m-1)} < 1/e$ for $m \geq 3$. By Corollary 3 applying the remainder of Φ' to the state $\hat{\rho}$ cannot decrease the entropy, as this portion of Φ' is random unitary, and so the previous equation implies that

$$S(\Phi'(|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \rho)) \geq S(\hat{\rho}) \geq S(\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}}) - \frac{m}{2^{m-3}},$$

as in the statement of the lemma. \square

4 Multiplicativity of Random Unitary Transformations

In this section the construction of Section 2 is used to show some results about the multiplicativity of the maximum output p -norm and random unitary channels. The main result is that the p -norm of the tensor product of two channels is multiplicative if and only if the p -norm is multiplicative on the random unitary approximations to these channels.

Before proving this theorem, it is shown that the random unitary channel Φ' constructed from Φ in Equation (6) is a good approximation with respect to the p -norm.

Theorem 6. *If $\Phi \in \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$, then the random unitary transformation $\Phi' \in \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{B})$ satisfies*

$$\nu_p(\Phi) \leq \frac{\nu_p(\Phi')}{\|\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}\|_p} < \nu_p(\Phi) + \frac{3}{\dim \mathcal{A}}.$$

Proof. For convenience, let $d = \dim \mathcal{A}$. The first inequality is simple: $\Phi'(|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \rho) = \Phi(\rho) \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}$ by Proposition 1, and so it is clear that $\nu_p(\Phi) \|\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}\|_p \leq \nu_p(\Phi')$, by the multiplicativity of $\|\cdot\|_p$ with respect to the tensor product of states.

To prove the second inequality let $\rho \in \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{H})$ be a state such that

$$\nu_p(\Phi') - \frac{1}{d} < \|\Phi'(\rho)\|_p.$$

The output of Φ' on ρ is given by Equation (7), applying the triangle inequality to this yields

$$\|\Phi'(\rho)\|_p = \left\| q_0 \Phi(\rho_0) \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}} + \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} q_i \Phi'(|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \rho_i) \right\|_p \leq q_0 \|\Phi(\rho_0) \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}\|_p + \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} q_i \|\Phi'(|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \rho_i)\|_p.$$

Applying Lemma 4 to this gives

$$\|\Phi'(\rho)\|_p \leq q_0 \|\Phi(\rho_0) \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}\|_p + \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} q_i \left(\|\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{B}}\|_p + \frac{2}{d} \right) = q_0 \|\Phi(\rho_0) \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}\|_p + (1 - q_0) \left(\|\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{B}}\|_p + \frac{2}{d} \right).$$

Then, as the norm $\|\cdot\|_p$ is multiplicative with respect to the tensor product of states, and $\|\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{K}}\|_p \leq \|\sigma\|_p$ for any state $\sigma \in \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{K})$,

$$\|\Phi'(\rho)\|_p \leq q_0 \|\Phi(\rho_0)\|_p \|\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}\|_p + (1 - q_0) \left(\|\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{K}}\|_p \|\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}\|_p + \frac{2}{d} \right) \leq \|\Phi(\rho_0)\|_p \|\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}\|_p + \frac{2}{d}.$$

Finally, by the choice of the input ρ

$$\nu_p(\Phi') < \|\Phi'(\rho)\|_p + \frac{1}{d} \leq \nu_p(\Phi) \|\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}\|_p + \frac{2}{d} + \frac{1}{d},$$

which completes the proof of the theorem. \square

With this approximation result, the main theorem on the maximum output p -norm can be shown. This extends part of the work done by Fukuda [9] on unital channels to the random unitary case.

Theorem 7. *If $\Phi, \Psi \in \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ and $p \in [1, \infty]$, then*

$$\nu_p(\Phi \otimes \Psi) = \nu_p(\Phi) \nu_p(\Psi)$$

only if

$$\nu_p(\Phi'_d \otimes \Psi) = \nu_p(\Phi'_d) \nu_p(\Psi),$$

for all sufficiently large d , where Φ'_d is the random unitary extension of the channel obtained by applying the construction of Section 2 to a Stinespring dilation of Φ using a d -dimensional ancillary space.

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$, and choose d so that $3\nu_p(\Psi)/d < \epsilon$. Then, as $\Phi'_d(|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \rho) = \Phi(\rho) \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}$ by Proposition 1,

$$\nu_p(\Phi \otimes \Psi) \leq \frac{\nu_p(\Phi'_d \otimes \Psi)}{\|\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}\|}.$$

By assumption, this second quantity is multiplicative, so that

$$\nu_p(\Phi \otimes \Psi) \leq \frac{\nu_p(\Phi'_d \otimes \Psi)}{\|\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}\|} = \frac{\nu_p(\Phi'_d) \nu_p(\Psi)}{\|\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}\|} < \left[\nu_p(\Phi) + \frac{3}{d} \right] \nu_p(\Psi) < \nu_p(\Phi) \nu_p(\Psi) + \epsilon,$$

where the penultimate inequality is an application of Theorem 6. As epsilon was chosen arbitrarily, the multiplicativity of $\nu_p(\Phi'_d)$ for all large enough d implies the multiplicativity of $\nu_p(\Phi)$. \square

5 Minimum Output Entropy and Random Unitary Channels

These results on the multiplicativity of the p -norm can be extended to the additivity of the minimum output entropy. This is done using a similar method of proof as the results of the previous section. The following theorem demonstrates that the random unitary channel Φ' constructed in Equation (6) forms a good approximation of the original channel Φ , from which the result on the additivity will follow directly.

Theorem 8. *If $\Phi \in \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$, then the random unitary transformation $\Phi' \in \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{B})$ satisfies*

$$S_{\min}(\Phi) \geq S_{\min}(\Phi') - \log \dim \mathcal{B} \geq S_{\min}(\Psi) - \frac{8 \log \dim \mathcal{A}}{\dim \mathcal{A}}.$$

Proof. Exactly as in the proof of Theorem 6, Proposition 1 implies the first inequality, as $\Phi'(|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \rho) = \Phi(\rho) \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}$.

Let ρ be a state minimizing $S(\Phi(\rho))$ and for convenience let $\delta = 8 \log \dim \mathcal{A} / \dim \mathcal{A}$, which is the quantity that appears in the statement of the theorem. Equation (7) gives the output of Φ' on ρ . Applying the concavity of the entropy to this, we obtain

$$S_{\min}(\Phi') = S(\Phi'(\rho)) \geq p_0 S(\Phi(\rho_0) \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}) + \sum_{i=1}^{\dim \mathcal{A} - 1} p_i S(\Phi'(|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \rho_i)).$$

By applying Corollary 5 to each term in the sum, this becomes

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\min}(\Phi') &\geq p_0 S(\Phi(\rho_0) \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}) + \sum_{i=1}^{\dim \mathcal{A} - 1} p_i (S(\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}}) - \delta) \\ &= p_0 S(\Phi(\rho_0) \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}) + (1 - p_0) (S(\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}}) - \delta). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that since Φ' is random unitary, it is the case that $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{B}$. This implies that $S(\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}}) = S(\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{B}})$. Two additional properties of the entropy will be useful: $S(\sigma \otimes \xi) = S(\sigma) + S(\xi)$ for any σ, ξ and $S(\sigma) \leq \log \dim K = S(\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{K}})$ for all $\sigma \in \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{K})$. Using these three observations, in order, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\min}(\Phi') &\geq p_0 S(\Phi(\rho_0) \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}) + (1 - p_0)(S(\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{B}}) - \delta) \\ &= p_0(S(\Phi(\rho_0)) + S(\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}})) + (1 - p_0)(S(\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{K}}) + S(\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}) - \delta) \\ &\geq p_0(S(\Phi(\rho_0)) + S(\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}})) + (1 - p_0)(S(\Phi(\rho_0)) + S(\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}) - \delta) \\ &\geq S(\Phi(\rho_0)) + S(\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}) - \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, since $S(\tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}) = \log \dim \mathcal{B}$ and $S_{\min}(\Phi) \leq S(\Phi(\sigma))$ for any σ , we have

$$S_{\min}(\Phi') \geq S_{\min}(\Phi) + \log \dim \mathcal{B} - \delta,$$

which completes the proof of the theorem. \square

The proof that the additivity conjecture can be equivalently restricted to random unitary channels follows from the previous theorem in a way that is identical to the proof of Theorem 7, with the exception that the p -norm has been replaced by the minimum output entropy.

Theorem 9. *If $\Phi, \Psi \in \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$, then*

$$S_{\min}(\Phi \otimes \Psi) = S_{\min}(\Phi) + S_{\min}(\Psi)$$

only if

$$S_{\min}(\Phi'_d \otimes \Psi) = S_{\min}(\Phi'_d) + S_{\min}(\Psi),$$

for all sufficiently large d , where Φ'_d is the random unitary extension of the channel obtained by applying the construction of Section 2 to Stinespring dilation for Φ using an ancillary space of dimension d .

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$, and choose d so that $8(\log d)/d < \epsilon$. Then, as $\Phi'_d(|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \rho) = \Phi(\rho) \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{B}}$,

$$S_{\min}(\Phi \otimes \Psi) \leq S_{\min}(\Phi'_d \otimes \Psi) + \log \dim \mathcal{B}.$$

By assumption, this second quantity is additive, so that

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\min}(\Phi \otimes \Psi) &\leq S_{\min}(\Phi'_d \otimes \Psi) + \log \dim \mathcal{B} \\ &= S_{\min}(\Phi'_d) + S_{\min}(\Psi) + \log \dim \mathcal{B} \\ &\leq S_{\min}(\Phi) + \frac{8 \log d}{d} + S_{\min}(\Psi) \\ &< S_{\min}(\Phi) + S_{\min}(\Psi) + \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

where the penultimate inequality is an application of Theorem 8. As epsilon was chosen arbitrarily, the additivity of Φ'_d for all large enough d implies the additivity of Φ . \square

This theorem immediately implies the following corollary, which generalizes a result of Fukuda [9] on the additivity of the minimum output entropy of unital channels. This theorem implies that in the search for either a proof of this conjecture or a counterexample to it, only random unitary channels need to be considered.

Corollary 10. *The additivity of the minimum output entropy, given by*

$$S_{\min}(\Phi \otimes \Psi) = S_{\min}(\Phi) + S_{\min}(\Psi)$$

is true for all channels Φ and Ψ if and only if it is true for all random unitary channels Φ and Ψ .

6 Circuit Constructions

In this section an efficient circuit construction is provided for the random unitary approximation described in Section 2. This construction will allow the hardness of computationally distinguishing quantum circuits to be extended to the case of random unitary circuits.

Before constructing these circuits, it will be important to specify the circuit models that are being used. The circuit model used to define the quantum circuit distinguishability problem is the *mixed state quantum circuit* model of Aharonov, Kitaev, and Nisan [1]. Circuits in this model can include unitary gates as well as measurements and other non-unitary operations, but as shown in [1], we may assume that all such circuits first introduce any necessary ancillary qubits, then perform a unitary operation, and finally trace out those qubits that are not part of the output. This approach is equivalent to building a circuit for the Stinespring dilation of a channel. As all unitary transformations can be (approximately) implemented using one and two qubit gates there is no loss in generality in assuming that the unitary transformations implemented in such a circuit are composed of gates from some finite basis of one and two qubit gates. Circuits in this model can represent any physically realizable quantum operation.

The second model of quantum circuits we consider is the model of *random unitary quantum circuits*. These circuits consist of one and two qubits gates as well as random unitary gates, which implement a unitary gate with probability one half. More formally, the application of such a gate takes the state ρ to the state $(1/2)U\rho U^* + (1/2)\rho$, where U is a one or two qubit unitary gate. This is an extremely simple model, which does not appear to be universal for the class of transformations that implement random unitary operations, as defined in Equation (1). It is not clear what the correct definition of the random unitary circuits is, and since the aim of the present paper is to prove a hardness result, an extremely weak definition has been chosen, so that the result will apply to as large a class of circuit models as possible.

In order to implement the construction of Section 2 as a random unitary circuit there are three main challenges. The first two of these, N the completely noisy channel and D the decoherence channel, will be easy to implement. More difficult to implement will be the channel M , described by Equation (4).

The channel D can be implemented as a random unitary circuit by performing the Pauli Z operation to each qubit independently with probability $1/2$, as described in [7]. This will have the effect of negating the off-diagonal elements of a density matrix with probability $1/2$, so that the resulting state is diagonal in the computational basis. This is exactly the decoherence operation used in Section 2.

The completely noisy channel N is also simple to implement as a random unitary circuit. This channel can be realized by performing a uniform mixture of the Pauli operators on each qubit. This mixture can be implemented by, independently on each qubit, applying the Pauli Z operation with probability $1/2$, followed by applying the Pauli X operation with probability $1/2$, as shown in [5]. Intuitively, the Z operations will zero the off-diagonal elements of a density matrix (viewed in the computational basis), and the X operations will scramble the diagonal, resulting in the completely mixed state $I/2$ on each qubit.

The operation M is not so simple to implement as a random unitary circuit. Recall that the operation M does not affect states of the form $|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \rho$, but sends states of the form $|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \rho$ for $i \neq 0$ to a state that is very close to the completely mixed state. As might be expected, this transformation can be implemented using only controlled-mixing operations. Before describing this implementation, notice that the controlled application of the channel N can be described by a random unitary circuit. This is because each of the unitaries applied in the above implementation of the channel N are single qubit gates that are applied independently. Adding a control qubit to each of these gates results in two qubit gates, which fit into the model of random unitary circuits used here. It is not clear that general controlled random unitary operations can be implemented as random unitary circuits in the circuit model used here, but the only controlled operation that will be needed for this construction is the completely mixing channel.

Let m be the number of qubits in the space \mathcal{A} that is given as part of the input to M , i.e. the number of ancillary qubits used to represent the ancillary space used by the original channel. The implementation of M consists of m stages, with the j th stage testing that the j th qubit of the space \mathcal{A} is in the $|0\rangle$ state, and mixing the qubits if this is not the case. A diagram of one stage of the circuit is given in Figure 1. The j th stage consists first of an application of the controlled N operation from the j th qubit to each other qubit of $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}$. After these operations, stage j is completed by $m - 1$ further controlled N operations: all with




Figure 1: One stage of the mixing procedure on the ancillary qubits. The mixing operations applied to the qubits in the space \mathcal{H} are not shown.




Figure 2: Circuit performing the conditional mixing procedure $D \circ M$. The top three qubits are simulating the ancillary qubits of the original circuit in the space \mathcal{A} , and the bottom two are simulating the input to the original circuit in the space \mathcal{H} . The dashed lines separate the stages of the mixing procedure.

the j th qubit as the target qubit and one of the other qubits of \mathcal{A} as the control qubit. An example of this construction with $m = 3$ is presented in Figure 2.

With circuit implementations of the three channels D, N, M it is simple to apply the construction given in Equation (6) to obtain a random unitary circuit C from a quantum channel given as a mixed-state quantum circuit Q . If the output of Q is given by $Q(\rho) = \text{tr}_{\mathcal{B}} U(|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \rho) U^*$, then the circuit C is given by simply composing the circuits for D, N, M , and U in the order specified by Equation (6).

Before applying this construction to showing the hardness of distinguishing random unitary circuits it is shown that this construction correctly implements the channel M . Much of the proof of this lemma is similar to the proof of Lemma 4, but we will need to consider the explicit construction of the circuit for M in order to extend this lemma to the case where there is a reference system in the space \mathcal{F} . This reference system will correspond to the one given in the definition of the diamond norm, which is used in the definition of the mixed state circuit distinguishability problem. For this reason, this extra space will be essential when considering the hardness variants of this problem, as discussed in the next section.

Lemma 11. *On input states of the form $|k\rangle\langle k| \otimes \rho \in \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{F})$ for $|k\rangle\langle k| \in \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{A})$ with $0 < k \leq 2^m - 1$,*

the output of C satisfies

$$\left\| (C \otimes I_{\mathcal{F}})(|k\rangle\langle k| \otimes \rho) - \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}} \otimes \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \rho \right\|_{\text{tr}} \leq \frac{1}{2^{m-1}},$$

where m is the number of ancillary qubits used by the circuit Q .

Proof. On input of the form $|k\rangle\langle k| \otimes \rho$ the decoherence operations that are applied to the qubits in \mathcal{A} can be ignored, as they have no effect on qubits in a state of the computational basis. As $k \neq 0$ at least one qubit is in the state $|1\rangle$, and so the controlled mixing operations in the implementation of the channel M will have an effect. Let the first nonzero qubit among the qubits of \mathcal{A} be the j th one. The first controlled N operation with nonzero control qubit that effects the j th qubit will be at the j th stage of the mixing process, where the j th qubit is the control qubit. As this qubit is not modified before this stage (as any previous qubits are in the state $|0\rangle$ by choice of j), the first gate in the j th stage will mix the remaining qubits, so that the state after this gate is, using Equation (3),

$$|1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{A}'} \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \rho,$$

where for notational convenience the j th qubit has been written first, and \mathcal{A}' is the space of all but the j th qubit of \mathcal{A} . The remainder of the j th stage of the mixing process consists of $m-1$ controlled N gates with the j th qubit as the target, each controlled by one of the $m-1$ qubits in \mathcal{A}' . Considering the state $I/2^{m-1}$ on \mathcal{A}' in the computational basis, the only term for which qubit j is not mixed by these operations is the all zero term. With this observation, the state after the j th stage is

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2^{m-1}} \left[|1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes m-1} + \frac{|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|}{2} \otimes (I_{\mathcal{A}'} - (|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes m-1}) \right] \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \rho \\ &= \frac{I_{\mathcal{A}} + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes m-1} - (|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes m}}{2^m} \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \rho. \end{aligned}$$

This proves that the circuit implementing the channel M does so correctly, as this quantity is exactly the state given in Equation (7) with the addition of $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \rho$ in the reference system.

As in the proof of Lemma 4, let this state be σ_j . Computing the distance from this state to the desired one, we have

$$\left\| \sigma_j - \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \rho \right\|_{\text{tr}} = \frac{1}{2^m} \left\| |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes m-1} - (|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes m} \right\|_{\text{tr}} = \frac{1}{2^{m-1}}.$$

Finally, by noting that the remainder of the circuit C is random unitary, an application of Lemma 2 yields the desired bound. \square

7 QIP-Completeness of Distinguishing Random Unitary Circuits

The construction outlined in the previous section can be used to show that the problem of distinguishing random unitary quantum circuits is QIP-complete. The basic idea is to reduce an instance of the quantum circuit distinguishability problem to one with random unitary circuits that has the same distinguishability properties. This will be done by taking the instance (Q_1, Q_2) and constructing the instance (C_1, C_2) by applying the construction of Section 6 to each of these circuits. The quantum circuit distinguishability problem is given by

Quantum Circuit Distinguishability. For constants $0 \leq b < a \leq 2$, the input consists of quantum circuits Q_1 and Q_2 that implement transformations from \mathcal{H} to \mathcal{K} . The promise problem is to distinguish the two cases:

Yes $\|Q_1 - Q_2\|_{\diamond} \geq a$,

No $\|Q_1 - Q_2\|_\diamond \leq b$.

This problem was introduced and shown to be complete for the complexity QIP in [18]. The norm used in the definition of the problem is the diamond norm, which can be defined on a channel $\Phi \in \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ by

$$\|\Phi\|_\diamond = \sup_{\|X\|_{\text{tr}}=1} \|(\Phi \otimes I_{\mathcal{F}})(X)\|_{\text{tr}},$$

where the space \mathcal{F} has dimension at least as large as \mathcal{H} . A more thorough definition as well as some properties of this norm can be found in [15]. It is shown in [18] that the maximum of this norm on the difference of two completely positive transformations is achieved by a density matrix, and so we can restrict the supremum in the definition to $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{F})$.

Here we consider this distinguishability problem with the added restriction that the input circuits are random unitary circuits in the model defined in Section 6. The following theorem states that the constructed circuits C_1 and C_2 have almost the same distinguishability characteristics as the original circuits Q_1 and Q_2 . As the circuit distinguishability problem is defined as a promise problem, this theorem shows immediately that the problem of distinguishing random unitary circuits is QIP-complete, as the construction of the circuits C_1 and C_2 can be performed efficiently.

Theorem 12. *For any $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$\|Q_1 - Q_2\|_\diamond \leq \|C_1 - C_2\|_\diamond \leq \|Q_1 - Q_2\|_\diamond + \epsilon,$$

where the circuits C_1 and C_2 use $O(\log 1/\epsilon)$ ancillary qubits.

Proof. The first inequality is not hard to show. Once again, if the state $(|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes m} \otimes \rho$ is given as input to the circuit C_i , then by Proposition 1, the output is a simulation of Q_i , so that the distinguishability of Q_1 and Q_2 cannot be greater than the distinguishability of C_1 and C_2 . More formally, note that

$$\|Q_1 - Q_2\|_\diamond = \sup_{\rho \in \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{F})} \|(Q_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{F}})(\rho) - (Q_2 \otimes I_{\mathcal{F}})(\rho)\|_{\text{tr}},$$

and fix $\delta > 0$ and ρ as a state achieving a value within δ of this supremum. By Proposition 1 if the state $(|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes m} \otimes \rho$ is given as input to the circuit C_i , then the output is given by $(Q_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{F}})(\rho)$. Using this we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|C_1 - C_2\|_\diamond &\geq \|(C_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{F}})((|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes m} \otimes \rho) - (C_2 \otimes I_{\mathcal{F}})((|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes m} \otimes \rho)\|_{\text{tr}} \\ &= \|(Q_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{F}})(\rho) - (Q_2 \otimes I_{\mathcal{F}})(\rho)\|_{\text{tr}} \\ &\geq \|Q_1 - Q_2\|_\diamond - \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Since this is true for any $\delta > 0$, it must be the case that $\|Q_1 - Q_2\|_\diamond \leq \|C_1 - C_2\|_\diamond$.

The second inequality requires somewhat more work. Let m be the number of ancillary qubits and let n be the number of input qubits used by the circuits Q_i , so that $m = \lceil \log \dim \mathcal{A} \rceil$ and $n = \lceil \log \dim \mathcal{H} \rceil$. Without loss of generality let $2^{-(m-3)} < \epsilon$, by adding at most $3 + \log(1/\epsilon)$ extra (unused) ancillary qubits to Q_1 and Q_2 . Let $\rho \in \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{F})$ be a state such that

$$\|C_1 - C_2\|_\diamond - \epsilon/2 \leq \|(C_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{F}})(\rho) - (C_2 \otimes I_{\mathcal{F}})(\rho)\|_{\text{tr}},$$

and note that the reference system \mathcal{F} need not have the same dimension as the space of the same name considered in the proof of the previous inequality. The first gates applied in the circuit C_i are the decoherence gates applied to \mathcal{A} . These gates produce a state of the form $\sum_{i=0}^{2^m-1} p_i |i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \sigma_i$, and since applying these gates twice has no further effect, the output of the circuits C_1 and C_2 is the same on ρ as it is on this state. Applying the triangle inequality, the quantity of interest is

$$\|(C_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{F}})(\rho) - (C_2 \otimes I_{\mathcal{F}})(\rho)\|_{\text{tr}} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{2^m-1} p_i \|(C_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{F}})(|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \sigma_i) - (C_2 \otimes I_{\mathcal{F}})(|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \sigma_i)\|_{\text{tr}} \quad (10)$$

Then, by applying Lemma 11 to each term with $i \neq 0$ the states in the norm can be replaced with completely mixed states on $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ plus a small correction factor. Doing this, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & p_i \|(C_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{F}})(|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \sigma_i) - (C_2 \otimes I_{\mathcal{F}})(|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \sigma_i)\|_{\text{tr}} \\ & \leq p_i \left[\frac{2}{2^{m-1}} + \left\| \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}} \otimes \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \sigma_i - \tilde{I}_{\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}} \otimes \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \sigma_i \right\|_{\text{tr}} \right] \\ & = p_i / 2^{m-2} < p_i \epsilon / 2. \end{aligned}$$

Applying this to Equation (10) we have

$$\|C_1 - C_2\|_{\diamond} - \epsilon/2 \leq p_0 \|(C_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{F}})(|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \sigma_0) - (C_2 \otimes I_{\mathcal{F}})(|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \sigma_0)\|_{\text{tr}} + \sum_{i=1}^{2^m-1} p_i \epsilon / 2. \quad (11)$$

By Proposition 1 the output of the circuits C_i on this input can be replaced the output of the circuits Q_i and a maximally mixed state. When this is done to Equation (11), the desired bound is given by

$$\|C_1 - C_2\|_{\diamond} \leq p_0 \|(Q_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{F}})(\sigma_0) - (Q_2 \otimes I_{\mathcal{F}})(\sigma_0)\|_{\text{tr}} + (1 - p_0)\epsilon/2 + \epsilon/2 \leq \|Q_1 - Q_2\|_{\diamond} + \epsilon.$$

This completes the proof of the theorem, since $0 \leq p_0 \leq 1$. \square

8 Conclusion

A method for approximating a quantum channel with one that is random unitary has been provided. This approximation yields the equivalence of several important problems when restricted to random unitary channels. These results raise the open problem of how far these equivalences extend. What other problems can be restricted to the random unitary case without loss of generality, and what problems are simplified when restricted to this class of channels?

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank John Watrous for several helpful discussions, as well as constructive comments on earlier versions of this paper. Canadas NSERC and MITACS have supported this research.

References

- [1] D. Aharonov, A. Kitaev, and N. Nisan. Quantum circuits with mixed states. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing*, pages 20–30, 1998.
- [2] A. Ambainis, M. Mosca, A. Tapp, and R. de Wolf. Private quantum channels. In *Proceedings of the 41st IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 547–553, 2000.
- [3] G. G. Amosov, A. S. Holevo, and R. F. Werner. On some additivity problems in quantum information theory. *Problems of Information Transmission*, 36(4):305–313, 2000.
- [4] K. M. R. Audenaert and S. Scheel. On random unitary channels. *New Journal of Physics*, 10:023011, 2008.
- [5] P. O. Boykin and V. Roychowdhury. Optimal encryption of quantum bits. *Physical Review A*, 67:042317, 2003.
- [6] F. Buscemi. On the minimum number of unitaries needed to describe a random-unitary channel. *Physics Letters A*, 360:256–258, 2006.

- [7] I. L. Chuang and Y. Yamamoto. Creation of a persistent quantum bit using error correction. *Physical Review A*, 55:114–127, 1997.
- [8] M. Fannes. A continuity property of the entropy density for spin lattice systems. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 31(4):291–294, 1973.
- [9] M. Fukuda. Simplification of additivity conjecture in quantum information theory. *Quantum Information Processing*, 6(3):179–186, 2007.
- [10] M. Fukuda and A. S. Holevo. On Weyl-covariant channels. arxiv:quant-ph/0510148.
- [11] M. Gregoratti and R. F. Werner. Quantum lost and found. *Journal of Modern Optics*, 50(6–7):915–933, 2003.
- [12] P. Hayden. The maximal p -norm multiplicativity conjecture is false. arXiv:0707.3291v1 [quant-ph], 2007.
- [13] P. Hayden, D. W. Leung, P. Shor, and A. Winter. Randomizing quantum states: Constructions and applications. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 250:371–391, 2004.
- [14] C. King and M. B. Ruskai. Minimal entropy of states emerging from noisy quantum channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 47(1):192–209, 2001.
- [15] A. Y. Kitaev, A. H. Shen, and M. N. Vyalyi. *Classical and Quantum Computation*, volume 47 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, 2002.
- [16] L. J. Landau and R. F. Streater. On birkhoff’s theorem for doubly stochastic completely positive maps of matrix algebras. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 193:107–127, 1993.
- [17] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [18] B. Rosgen and J. Watrous. On the hardness of distinguishing mixed-state quantum computations. In *Proceedings of the 20th Conference on Computational Complexity*, pages 344–354, 2005.
- [19] P. W. Shor. Equivalence of additivity questions in quantum information theory. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 246(3):453–472, 2004.
- [20] W. F. Stinespring. Positive functions on C^* -algebras. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 6(2):211–216, 1955.
- [21] R. F. Werner and A. S. Holevo. Counterexample to an additivity conjecture for output purity of quantum channels. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 43(9):4353–4357, 2002.
- [22] A. Winter. The maximum output p -norm of quantum channels is not multiplicative for any $p > 2$. arXiv:0707.0402v2 [quant-ph], 2007.