

Reverse Coherent Information

Raúl García-Patrón,¹ Stefano Pirandola,¹ Seth Lloyd,¹ and Jeffrey H. Shapiro¹

¹Research Laboratory of Electronics, MIT, Cambridge, MA 02139

We extend the relation between entanglement distribution and quantum key distribution to a new family of protocols assisted by classical-communication feedback. The rates of such protocols are governed by a symmetric counterpart of the coherent information that we call reverse coherent information. This lead to the definition of a new assisted entanglement distribution capacity which outperforms the unassisted capacity for some interesting channels.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 03.67.Dd, 03.67.Hk

Quantum information theory is a generalization of Shannon's information theory that offers new potential applications, such as quantum key distribution (QKD) and entanglement distribution (ED), which distribute resources between two partners (Alice and Bob). Both techniques have long been known to be intimately related. For example, the first entanglement distillation protocols used in ED were inspired by error correction and privacy amplification techniques developed for QKD [1]. Another example is the seminal paper by Shor and Preskill [2], in which the unconditional security of BB84 [3] was proven by combining an entanglement-based description of BB84 and quantum error correction codes. This technique has now become universal in QKD security proofs. The relation between ED and QKD was extended by Devetak and Winter in [4], where they presented a class of QKD protocols that can be mapped into one-way ED protocols achieving the same rate. The corresponding rate is the coherent information, which plays a crucial role in quantum communication [5].

It is well known in the continuous-variable QKD community [6] that backward error correction, also called *reverse reconciliation*, can yield a considerable advantage when distributing a secret key over lossy channels. For example, the initial limitation of continuous-variable QKD to 3 dB loss was overcome using reverse reconciliation techniques [7]. In this Letter we combine the idea of using reverse reconciliation with the analogy between QKD and ED of [4] to present a new family of ED protocols that are assisted by backward classical communication. These new protocols achieve rates symmetric to the coherent information up to a permutation of Alice and Bob's roles. This new quantity, which we call *reverse coherent information*, can be used to define a new entanglement distribution capacity assisted by reverse reconciliation (E_R) that is additive for all channels and outperforms the unassisted one (E) for some interesting channels, such as the amplitude damping channel.

Entanglement-based description.— Generalizing [2], one can show that any QKD protocol in which Alice sends a pure state $|a\rangle$ to Bob according to a probability distribution $p(a)$ has an equivalent entanglement-based QKD protocol. In this protocol, Alice generates an entangled

pure quantum state $\psi_{AA'}$ and sends system A' to Bob through the quantum channel \mathcal{N} , which transforms $\psi_{AA'}$ into the mixed bipartite state $\rho_{AB} = (\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathcal{N})\psi_{AA'}$. The action of \mathcal{N} can be equivalently represented by a unitary interaction $U_{A'E}^{\mathcal{N}}$ between the subsystem sent by Alice and the eavesdropper's (Eve's) ancillary pure system ψ_0 (Stinespring's dilation) [8], see Fig. 1. Therefore, we can replace ρ_{AB} by its purification $\psi_{ABE} = (\mathbb{I}_A \otimes U_{A'E}^{\mathcal{N}})\psi_{AA'} \otimes \psi_0$, which simplifies the analysis. The difference between ED and entanglement-based QKD resides in the operation that Alice and Bob apply after the distribution of ρ_{AB} : a measurement followed by some classical post-processing (which could be noisy) in entanglement-based QKD generates the secret key; quantum local operations assisted by classical communication in ED yields a maximally entangled state.




FIG. 1: (color online) Entanglement-based QKD and ED protocols start by Alice generating an entangled state $\psi_{AA'}$ and subsequently sending subsystem A' to Bob through a quantum channel \mathcal{N} . The quantum channel \mathcal{N} is equivalent to a unitary interaction $U_{A'E}^{\mathcal{N}}$ between the subsystem sent by Alice and the environment's (Eve's) ancillary pure state ψ_0 .

From QKD to unassisted entanglement distribution.— After distributing n copies of ρ_{AB} through the quantum channel, Alice continues the QKD protocol presented in [4] by measuring each system A_i using the same POVM M_A , see Fig. 2. Alice and Bob then apply error correction, viz., Alice publicly communicates to Bob which of the $2^{nS(a|B)}$ Holevo-Schumacher-Westmoreland (HSW) codes \mathcal{C}_i^A [9] covering Alice's typical set T_a contains her measurement output a^n (see Fig 3). Knowing the code \mathcal{C}_i^A , Bob applies the corresponding collective measurement $M_{\mathcal{C}_i^A}$ and obtains a^n . Error correction is followed by privacy amplification, from which Alice and Bob extract nK secret bits by decorrelating their data from Eve's




FIG. 2: Alice generates n copies of the pure entangled state $\psi_{AA'}$ and sends the A_i systems to Bob through the quantum channel \mathcal{N} . Alice applies the same POVM M_A to each system A_i obtaining a^n . During error correction, Alice communicates to Bob the HSW code \mathcal{C}_i^A containing a^n by using $nS(a|B)$ bits of public classical communication. Bob then applies the measurement $M_{\mathcal{C}_i^A}$ and obtains a^n .

quantum system. As shown in Fig 3, each HSW code can be divided into 2^{nK} privacy amplification (PA) sets $\mathcal{C}_{l,s}^A$ of size $2^{nS(a:E)}$, such that averaging Eve's system over all the sequences of a given PA set $\mathcal{C}_{l,s}^A$ gives a constant operator, independent from s . Therefore Alice and Bob can extract a secret key from s with rate,

$$K = \frac{1}{n} \log \left[\frac{|\mathcal{C}_{l,s}^A|}{|\mathcal{C}_{l,s}^A|} \right] = S(a:B) - S(a:E). \quad (1)$$

If Alice's POVM M_A projects into pure states, the rate




FIG. 3: For large n , Alice's measurement output lies (with probability ≈ 1) in the typical set T_a composed of $\approx 2^{nS(a)}$ equiprobable sequences a^n , each one associated with a quantum state $|a^n\rangle_{\bar{A}'}$ ($a^n = u_{l,m,x}$). Alice's typical set can be covered by $\approx 2^{nS(a|B)}$ HSW codes \mathcal{C}_i^A of size $\approx 2^{nS(a:B)}$. Each HSW code can be divided again into 2^{nK} privacy amplifications sets $\mathcal{C}_{l,s}^A$ of size $\approx 2^{nS(a:E)}$. The construction of the codes is done using random coding techniques common to Shannon's theory and quantum information theory [4, 8].

becomes $K = S(B) - S(A, B) = I(\mathcal{N}, \rho_{A'})$ (where $\rho_{A'} = \text{Tr}_A \psi_{AA'}$), i.e., coherent information.

In [4] the authors showed that the preceding QKD protocol can be transformed into an ED protocol achieving the same rate. To do so, Alice and Bob have to make their operations coherent. Interestingly, the forward communication used during the distillation can be avoided if, instead of using $\psi_{AA'}^{\otimes n}$, Alice prepares the state

$$|\Psi\rangle_{\bar{A}\bar{A}'} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|s|}} \sum_s |s\rangle_{\bar{A}} \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{|x|}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}_{l,s}^A} |u_{l,s,x}\rangle_{\bar{A}'}, \quad (2)$$

where $|u_{l,s,x}\rangle$ are the sequences of the PA set $\mathcal{C}_{l,s}^A$. Because now all the states received by Bob belong to the same HSW code \mathcal{C}_i^A , the forward communication is no longer needed, obtaining an unassisted ED protocol. It was shown in [5] that the coherent information plays a crucial role in the definition of the unassisted ED capacity (E). By analogy with Shannon's theory, one would expect E to be calculated by maximizing over a single channel use,

$$E^{(1)} = \max_{\rho_{A'}} I(\mathcal{N}, \rho_{A'}). \quad (3)$$

Unfortunately, the quantum case is more complicated, as $E^{(1)}$ is known to be not always optimal [10]. The correct ED capacity reads,

$$E = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \max_{\rho_{A'}} I(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}, \rho_{A'}). \quad (4)$$

Only for the restricted class of *degradable channels* [12] (for which a map \mathcal{M} exists such that $\mathcal{M}(\rho_B) = \rho_E$) the unassisted ED capacity is known to be additive $E = E^{(1)}$. Similarly if there is a map \mathcal{G} such that $\mathcal{G}(\rho_E) = \rho_B$ the channel is called *antidegradable* and $E = 0$.

Reverse entanglement distribution.- By interchanging the roles of Alice and Bob after the distribution of ρ_{AB} we obtain the reverse reconciliation (RR) version of the QKD protocol presented in [4], see Fig. 4. Now it is Alice who keeps her subsystems ($\bar{A} = A_1, \dots, A_n$) in a quantum memory until Bob has measured individually each of his subsystems using the POVM M_B , and obtained the sequence b^n . Bob then communicates to Alice which error correcting code \mathcal{C}_i^B contains his sequence b^n using $nS(b|A)$ bits of backward classical communication. This allows Alice to apply the correct collective measurement $M_{\mathcal{C}_i^B}$, giving her b^n . Finally Alice and Bob extract a secret key of size nK_{RR} from the lack of information that Eve has on the exact PA set $\mathcal{C}_{l,s}^B$ in which b^n lies. The secret key rate is then $K_{RR} = S(A:b) - S(b:E)$. When M_B projects into pure states we get $K_{RR} = S(A) - S(A, B) = I_R(\mathcal{N}, \rho_{A'})$, i.e., reverse coherent information. This QKD protocol can be transformed into an ED protocol assisted by backward classical communication (reverse ED) achieving the rate $I_R(\mathcal{N}, \rho_{A'})$, if Alice and Bob's operations are kept coherent. Optimizing over the input states we obtain the single-letter reverse ED capacity $E_R^{(1)}$.




FIG. 4: Alice generates n copies of the pure entangled state $\psi_{AA'}$ and send the A'_i systems to Bob through the quantum channel \mathcal{N} . Bob applies the same POVM M_B to each system B_i obtaining b^n . During the error correction Bob communicates to Alice the HSW code C_i^B containing b^n by using $nS(b|A)$ bits of public classical communication. Alice then applies the measurement $M_{C_i^B}$ and obtains b^n .

Surprisingly, the reverse ED capacity can be shown to be additive ($E_R = E_R^{(1)}$) for all channels. The proof results straightforwardly from the alternative definition of the reverse coherent information $I_R(\mathcal{N}, \rho_{A'}) = S(B|E)$ and the subadditivity of the conditional entropy.

Amplitude damping channel.- The amplitude damping (AD) channel describes the process of energy dissipation through spontaneous emission in a two-level system. The effect of the channel on the input state ρ is $\mathcal{E}_\eta(\rho) = E_0\rho E_0^\dagger + E_1\rho E_1^\dagger$, where

$$E_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\eta} \end{bmatrix}, E_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{1-\eta} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

and $1-\eta$ is the probability of spontaneous emission. Generalizing the results of [13], one can show that we can restrict the input state to the class $\rho_{A'} = \text{diag}(1-p, p)$ without loss of generality (see appendix). For a given input population p , the output state is $\rho_B = \text{diag}(1-\eta p, \eta p)$ and the (reverse) coherent information becomes,

$$\begin{aligned} I(\mathcal{E}, p) &= H(\eta p) - H((1-\eta)p), \\ I_R(\mathcal{E}, p) &= H(p) - H((1-\eta)p), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $H(x)$ is the binary entropy. Optimizing over the input population we obtain $E^{(1)}$ and E_R as functions of the damping parameter η ; see Fig. 5. Using the concatenation property of the AD channel $\mathcal{E}_\eta \circ \mathcal{E}_{\eta'} = \mathcal{E}_{\eta\eta'}$ it is easy to prove that the AD channel is degradable ($E = E^{(1)}$) for $\eta \geq 1/2$ and antidegradable ($E = 0$) for $\eta \leq 1/2$. We conclude that E_R outperforms E over all η , but even more interestingly, E_R remains positive in the range $\eta \leq 1/2$ where $E = 0$ (see Fig. 5).

The fact that E_R outperforms E also shows that the backward classical communication during the reverse ED protocol is mandatory, as otherwise we would violate the additivity result of degradable channels [12].




FIG. 5: (a) Comparison of E (dashed line) and E_R (solid line) as functions of the damping parameter η for the AD channel, together with the capacity $E^{(1)} = E_R$ of the GAD channel with a maximally mixed environment ($\alpha = 1/2$) (dotted line). (b) Optimal input population p achieving the previous capacities.

Generalized amplitude damping channel.- Spontaneous emission to an environment at thermal equilibrium leads to the generalized amplitude damping (GAD) channel, which can be modeled by the Stinespring's dilation circuit of Fig. 6. The relaxation operation applies the uni-




FIG. 6: Quantum circuit corresponding to the Stinespring's dilation of the GAD channel. Alice's input state ρ_{in} and half of an entangled state $|\Psi_\alpha\rangle$ interact through the relaxation operation U_{RO} composed of two C-NOT gates and a controlled rotation about the y -axis of the Bloch sphere ($\cos^2(\gamma/2) = \eta$).

tary transformation,

$$U_{RO} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\eta} & \sqrt{1-\eta} & 0 \\ 0 & -\sqrt{1-\eta} & \sqrt{\eta} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

jointly to the input state and the environment. The thermal environment is modelled by inserting half of an entangled state $|\Psi_\alpha\rangle = \sqrt{1-\alpha}|00\rangle + \sqrt{\alpha}|11\rangle$ into the second input of U_{RO} . The channel can be seen as a random mixing of two limiting cases; (1) the AD channel when $\alpha = 0$; and (2) the inverse of the AD channel (populating instead of damping) for $\alpha = 1$. We restrict the analysis to $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1/2$ as for any channel ($\eta, \alpha = 1/2 + x$) with optimal input population p^* there is a symmetric

channel ($\eta, \alpha = 1/2 - x$) with optimal population $1 - p^*$ reaching the same capacity. As before, Alice's input can be restricted to $\rho_{A'} = \text{diag}(1 - p, p)$ giving,

$$S(B) = H(\eta p + (1 - \eta)\alpha), \quad (8)$$

$$S(AB) = H_4(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4), \quad (9)$$

where H_4 is the Shannon entropy of a 4-dimensional distribution and λ_j are the four eigenvalues of ρ_{AB} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 &= \alpha(1 - \eta)(1 - p), \lambda_2 = (1 - \alpha)(1 - \eta)p, \\ \lambda_{3,4} &= \left[1 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 \pm \sqrt{1 - 2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)^2} \right] / 2 \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Optimizing over the input population p we obtain the capacities $E^{(1)}$ and E_R for each channel (η, α). It is easy to show that $E_R > E^{(1)}$ for any noise α except for $\alpha = 1/2$, for which both are equal, as shown in Fig. 5. Unfortunately, we cannot conclude that $E_R \geq E$ for $\alpha > 0$, as the channel is no longer degradable. Therefore we cannot preclude the possibility that an input state entangled among multiple uses of the channel outperforms E_R . Nevertheless, it is easy to prove that GAD channels (η, α) with $\eta \leq 1/2$ are antidegradable ($\rho_B = \mathcal{E}_{\eta/(1-\eta), \alpha}(\rho_E)$), which shows that for such channels $E_R \geq E = 0$ (see Fig. 7).




FIG. 7: (a) Tolerable thermal noise (minimum α such that the capacity is zero) as a function of the damping parameter η for: $E^{(1)}$ (dashed line), and E_R (solid line). (b) Input population p achieving the curves of (a).

Optimality discussion.— Since the reverse ED capacity is additive, it would be very interesting if it was also optimal among all the ED protocols assisted by backward classical communication ($E_R = E_B$). Unfortunately that is not the case. The difference between both coherent informations ($I_R - I = S(A) - S(B)$) shows that for channels satisfying $S(B) > S(A)$ for all inputs, such as optical amplifiers or the erasure channel, we get $E > E_R$. By definition E_B must satisfy $E \leq E_B$, which shows that reverse reconciliation defines a subset of protocols that are not necessarily optimal among the ED protocols assisted by backward classical communication. Using similar reasoning it is easy to see that for those channels satisfying $S(A) > S(B)$ over all inputs, such as the AD and GAD

channels or the bosonic lossy channel, reverse reconciliation performs better than the single-letter unassisted ED capacity $E^{(1)}$.

Conclusion.— We have extended the previously existing analogy between QKD and entanglement distribution by defining the entanglement distribution equivalent of reverse reconciliation QKD. This leads us to define an entanglement distribution capacity, which is additive and outperforms the unassisted capacity for some important channels, such as the damping channel and its generalization. Finally, we remark that by appending the teleportation protocol to the previous entanglement distribution protocol assisted by backward classical communication, we generate a quantum communication protocol assisted by two-way classical communication.

We acknowledge financial support from the W. M. Keck Foundation Center for Extreme Quantum Information Theory. S.P. acknowledges financial support from the EU (Marie Curie fellowship).

Appendix: Optimality of the input state

Amplitude Damping Channel

The most general input state to the amplitude damping (AD) channel reads

$$\rho_{A'} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - p & \sqrt{(1 - p)p}e^{-i\phi} \cos \theta \\ \sqrt{(1 - p)p}e^{i\phi} \cos \theta & p \end{bmatrix}. \quad (11)$$

One valid purification of $\rho_{A'}$ (all are equivalent up to a unitary on A) reads

$$|\psi\rangle_{AA'} = \sqrt{1 - p}|0\rangle_A|0\rangle_{A'} + \sqrt{p}e^{i\phi}|1\rangle_A[\cos \theta|0\rangle + \sin \theta|1\rangle]_{A'}. \quad (12)$$

In Fig. 8 we observe that the state $|\psi^\phi\rangle_{AA'}$ is generated from $|\psi^{(\phi=0)}\rangle_{AA'}$ by the local unitary $U_\phi = \mathbb{I}_A \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\phi} \end{bmatrix}_{A'}$ applied just before sending the state A' through the channel. After passage through the chan-




FIG. 8: Quantum circuit generating the bipartite state $|\psi\rangle_{AA'}$. The first rotation $R_y(\phi)$ generates the quantum state $\sqrt{1 - p}|0\rangle_{A'} + \sqrt{p}|1\rangle_{A'}$ ($\sin(\phi/2) = p$). The bipartite state is then entangled by the controlled rotation, generating $|\psi^{(\phi=0)}\rangle_{AA'}$. The phase ϕ is finally fixed by a last local unitary operation U_ϕ on A' .

nel Alice and Bob entangled state reads

$$\rho_{AB}(\phi) = \begin{bmatrix} 1-p+p(1-\eta)\cos^2\theta & p(1-\eta)\cos\theta\sin\theta & \sqrt{\eta(1-p)pe^{-i\phi}}\cos\theta & \sqrt{\eta(1-p)pe^{-i\phi}}\sin\theta \\ p(1-\eta)\cos\theta\sin\theta & p(1-\eta)\sin^2\theta & 0 & 0 \\ \sqrt{\eta(1-p)pe^{i\phi}}\cos\theta & 0 & p\eta\cos^2\theta & p\eta\cos\theta\sin\theta \\ \sqrt{\eta(1-p)pe^{i\phi}}\sin\theta & 0 & p\eta\cos\theta\sin\theta & p\eta\sin^2\theta \end{bmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

where η is the damping parameter. It is easy to check that by applying U_ϕ^\dagger to ρ_{AB}^ϕ we obtain $\rho_{AB}^{(\phi=0)}$. Because the von Neumann entropy is invariant under a unitary transformation U_ϕ^\dagger , we can restrict our study to the case $\phi = 0$ without loss of generality.

Eigenvalues

The eigenvalues of ρ_A read

$$\lambda_{A,1(2)} = \lambda_{\pm}(1). \quad (14)$$

where

$$\lambda_{\pm}(x) = [1 \pm \sqrt{(1-2xp)^2 + 4x(1-p)p\cos^2\theta}]/2. \quad (15)$$

The eigenvalues of ρ_{AB} then read

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{AB,1(2)} &= \lambda_{\pm}(1-\eta), \\ \lambda_{AB,3(4)} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Bob state read

$$\rho_B = \begin{bmatrix} 1-\eta p & \sqrt{\eta(1-p)p}\cos\theta \\ \sqrt{\eta(1-p)p}\cos\theta & \eta p \end{bmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

which gives the eigenvalues

$$\lambda_{B,1(2)} = \lambda_{\pm}(\eta). \quad (18)$$

Now we are ready to calculate the (reverse) coherent information for a general input state.

Coherent Information

The coherent information reads $I = S(B) - S(AB)$. In order to proof that $\cos\theta = 0$ maximizes the coherent information, we calculate the derivative of I ,

$$\frac{\partial I}{\partial \theta} = -p(1-p)\sin(2\theta)[F(\eta) - F(1-\eta)] \quad (19)$$

where

$$F(x) = \frac{x}{\sqrt{a}} \log \left[\frac{1-\sqrt{a}}{1+\sqrt{a}} \right], \quad (20)$$

and $a = (1-2xp)^2 + 4x(1-p)p\cos^2\theta$. In order to find the values of θ maximizing I , we first search for the extrema ($\partial I/\partial \theta = 0$). The term $\sin(2\theta)$ ($\cos^2\theta$) having period of π ($\pi/2$), we can restrict the study to the domain $\theta \in \{0, \pi\}$ without loss of generality. There are two cases of pathological extrema; Firstly, $p = 0$ and $p = 1$ which correspond to separable input states ($|00\rangle$ and $|11\rangle$ respectively) which give $I = 0$; Secondly, $F(\eta) = F(1-\eta)$ giving $\eta = 1/2$, i.e., the range limitation of I (the lowest η such that $I(\eta = 1/2) = 0$). For $0 < p < 1$ and $\eta > 1/2$ we have an extremum when $\sin(2\theta) = 0$, ($\theta = k\pi/2$). For $\theta = \{0, \pi\}$ the input state is separable ($|0\rangle_A \otimes (|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)_{A'}/\sqrt{2}$) and therefore has $I = 0$ (as $S(A, B) = S(A) + S(B)$ and $S(A) = 0$), which is a minimum for $\eta > 1/2$. Because a single extremum between two minimums can only be a maximum, we conclude that $\theta = \pi/2$ optimizes I . We have then proven that the optimal input is $\text{diag}(p, 1-p)$, as shown in [13]. In the range $\eta < 1/2$ the roles of $\pi/2$ and $\theta = \{0, \pi\}$ are exchanged, giving $I = 0$ as maximum.

Reverse Coherent Information

The reverse coherent information reads $I_R = S(A) - S(AB)$. The proof is very similar to the previous result, where the partial derivative among θ now reads,

$$\frac{\partial I}{\partial \theta} = -p(1-p)\sin(2\theta)[F(1) - F(1-\eta)]. \quad (21)$$

For $\theta = \{0, \pi\}$ the initial input being separable, we obtain $I_R = -S(B)$, which is negative. This two extrema being minima, $\theta = \pi/2$ remains the maximum. The pathological extremum $\eta = 1/2$ is now replaced by $\eta = 0$, which coincides with the range limitation of the reverse coherent information.

Generalized Amplitude Damping Channel

After passage through the generalized amplitude damping (GAD) channel, Alice and Bob entangled state reads

$$\rho_{AB} = \begin{bmatrix} Z & C \\ C^T & W \end{bmatrix}, \quad (22)$$

where

$$Z = \begin{bmatrix} (1-p)\alpha\eta + (1-\alpha)(1-p+p(1-\eta)\cos^2\theta) & p(1-\alpha)(1-\eta)\cos\theta\sin\theta \\ p(1-\alpha)(1-\eta)\cos\theta\sin\theta & p(1-\alpha)(1-\eta)\sin^2\theta \end{bmatrix}, \quad (23)$$

$$W = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha(1-p)(1-\eta) + p(\alpha + (1-\alpha)\eta)\cos^2\theta & p(\alpha + (1-\alpha)\eta)\cos\theta\sin\theta \\ p(\alpha + (1-\alpha)\eta)\cos\theta\sin\theta & p(\alpha + (1-\alpha)\eta)\sin^2\theta \end{bmatrix}, \quad (24)$$

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\eta(1-p)p}\cos\theta & \sqrt{\eta(1-p)p}\sin\theta \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (25)$$

η is the damping parameter and α is related to the thermal noise of the environment. After a long calculation one can show that the eigenvalues of ρ_{AB} read

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{AB,1(2)} &= \frac{1}{4} \left[1 + \sqrt{a + bp(1-p)\cos^2\theta} \pm \sqrt{c + dp(1-p)\cos^2\theta + \sqrt{a + bp(1-p)\cos^2\theta}} \right], \\ \lambda_{AB,3(4)} &= \frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \sqrt{a + bp(1-p)\cos^2\theta} \pm \sqrt{c + dp(1-p)\cos^2\theta - \sqrt{a + bp(1-p)\cos^2\theta}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where

$$a = (1 - 2(1-\eta)(\alpha + p - 2\alpha p))^2 \quad (27)$$

$$b = 4(1-\eta)(1 - 4(1-\alpha)\alpha(1-\eta)) \quad (28)$$

$$c = 1 - 2(1-\eta)(\alpha + p - 2\alpha p) + 2(p-\alpha)^2(1-\eta)^2 \quad (29)$$

$$d = 2(1-\eta). \quad (30)$$

In the GAD channel Alice state ρ_A and its eigenvalues remain the same as in the AD channel. Bob's state reads

$$\rho_B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \frac{(\eta p + (1-\eta)\alpha)}{\sqrt{\eta(1-p)p}\cos\theta} & \sqrt{\eta(1-p)p}\cos\theta \\ \sqrt{\eta(1-p)p}\cos\theta & \eta p + (1-\eta)\alpha \end{bmatrix}, \quad (31)$$

which gives the eigenvalues

$$\lambda_{B,1(2)} = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 \pm \sqrt{e + fp(1-p)\cos^2\theta} \right], \quad (32)$$

where $e = (1 - 2(p\eta + \alpha(1-\eta)))^2$ and $f = 4\eta$.

Extremum Search

The first derivative of the coherent information reads,

$$\frac{\partial I}{\partial \theta} = \frac{p(1-p)}{8} \sin(2\theta) \left[Z + \sum_{i,j=0}^1 Y(i,j) [1 + J(i,j)] \right], \quad (33)$$

where,

$$Z = -\frac{f}{\sqrt{e + fp(1-p)\cos^2\theta}} \log \left[\frac{1 - \sqrt{e + fp(1-p)\cos^2\theta}}{1 + \sqrt{e + fp(1-p)\cos^2\theta}} \right], \quad (34)$$

$$Y(i,j) = (-)^i \left[\frac{b}{\sqrt{a + b\cos^2\theta}} + (-)^j \frac{\frac{b}{\sqrt{a + b\cos^2\theta}} - (-)^i 2d}{\sqrt{2}\sqrt{c + d\cos^2\theta} - (-)^i \sqrt{a + b\cos^2\theta}} \right]. \quad (35)$$

and

$$J(i,j) = \log \left[\frac{1}{4} \left(1 - (-)^i \sqrt{a + bp(1-p)\cos^2\theta} + (-)^j \sqrt{2}\sqrt{c + dp(1-p)\cos^2\theta} - (-)^i \sqrt{a + bp(1-p)\cos^2\theta} \right) \right]. \quad (36)$$

In order to find the maxima of I as a function of θ , we search first for the extrema of I on the domain $\theta \in \{0, \pi\}$.

As for the AD channel, $p = 0$ and $p = 1$ are extrema. The

term $\sin(2\theta)$ gives us again two sets of extrema; Firstly, $\theta = \{0, \pi\}$ corresponding to unentangled inputs giving $I = 0$; Secondly, the solution $\theta = \pi/2$, corresponding to the conjectured optimal input, which is the candidate for being the maximum. Unfortunately the complicated form of the solution of eq. (33) does not preclude the existence of new extrema. After carrying a detailed nu-




FIG. 9: Coherent information I as a function of θ for the GAD channel with parameters $\eta = 0.62$, $\alpha = 0.5$, and input population $p = 0.25$ (solid line) and $p = 0.5$ (dashed line).

merical check over a large spectra of values of the parameter p , α and η we have seen that there exist always two extra solutions to the equation $\partial I / \partial \theta = 0$, as shown in Fig. 9, except for $\alpha = 0$, i.e., the AD channel. The numerical check shows that both solutions $\{\theta^*, \pi - \theta^*\}$ are always minima. Therefore we conclude that $\theta = \pi/2$ is the maximum, as expected.

Reverse Reconciliation

In the case of reverse coherent information the proof is very similar, we just need to change e and f by $e' = (1 - 2p)^2$ and $f' = 4$. The maxima and minima remains the same than those of the coherent information, except for the two minima $\{\theta^*, \pi - \theta^*\}$ which no longer exist, as shown in Fig. 10. We also observe that for $\theta = \{0, \pi\}$ the reverse coherent information is negative ($I_R = -S(B)$), as for the AD channel.

- [3] C. Bennett and G. Brassard, *Proceeding of the IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems and Signal Processing, Bangalore, India* IEEE, New York, p. 175.
 [4] I. Devetak and A. Winter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 080501 (2004).




FIG. 10: Reverse coherent information I_R as a function of θ for the GAD channel with parameters $\eta = 0.75$, $\alpha = 0.4$, and input population $p = 0.25$ (solid line) and $p = 0.5$ (dashed line).

- [1] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 3824 (1996).
 [2] P. W. Shor and J. Preskill, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 441 (2000).

- [5] B. Schumacher and M. A. Nielsen, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 2629 (1996).
 [6] *Quantum Information Theory with Continuous Variables* edited by S. L. Braunstein and A. K. Pati, (Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 2003); *Quantum Information with Continuous Variables of Atoms and Light*, edited by N.J. Cerf, G. Leuchs, and E.S. Polzik, (Imperial College Press, London, 2007).
 [7] F. Grosshans, G. van Assche, J. Wenger, R. Tualle-Brouri, and P. Grangier, *Nature (London)* **421**, 238 (2003).
 [8] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002).
 [9] A. S. Holevo, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **44**, 269 (1998); B. Schumacher, and M. D. Westmoreland, *Phys. Rev. A* **56**, 131 (1997).
 [10] D. DiVincenzo, P. Shor, and J. A. Smolin, *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, 830 (1998); G. Smith and J. A. Smolin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 030501 (2007).
 [11] S. Lloyd, *Phys. Rev. A* **55**, 1613 (1997); I. Devetak, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **51**, 44 (2005).
 [12] I. Devetak and P. W. Shor, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **256**, 287 (2005).
 [13] V. Giovannetti and R. Fazio, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 032314 (2005).