

A Fully Quantum Asymptotic Equipartition Property

Marco Tomamichel,^{1,*} Roger Colbeck,^{1,2,†} and Renato Renner^{1,‡}

¹*Institute for Theoretical Physics, ETH Zurich, 8093 Zurich, Switzerland.*

²*Institute of Theoretical Computer Science, ETH Zurich, 8092 Zurich, Switzerland.*

(Dated: 7th November, 2008)

The classical asymptotic equipartition property is the statement that, in the limit of a large number of identical repetitions of a random experiment, the output sequence is virtually certain to come from the typical set, each member of which is equally likely. In this paper, we prove a fully quantum generalization of this property, where both the system and side information are quantum. This naturally leads to a family of Rényi-like quantum conditional entropies, for which the von Neumann entropy emerges as a special case.

I. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we prove a fully quantum version of the asymptotic equipartition property (AEP). Since there is no quantum analogue of conditional probability distributions, we express the classical AEP in terms of entropies before generalizing it to the quantum case. The fully quantum version is similar to the classical one for which we first sketch the proof.

A. Classical AEP

The AEP (cf. Theorem 3.1.1 in [1]) is central to classical information theory because it establishes the Shannon entropy as the relevant quantity for various problems involving independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables. It is a direct consequence of the weak law of large numbers and states that, for large enough n , the outcome of a random experiment given by an i.i.d. sequence $X^n = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) \in \mathcal{X}^{\times n}$ of random variables and a probability distribution P on a set \mathcal{X} will almost certainly be in a set of approximately $2^{nH(X)}$ typical events that each occur with a probability close to $2^{-nH(X)}$, where $H(X)$ is the Shannon entropy:¹

$$H(X) = - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P(x) \log P(x).$$

Consider, for example, the problem of source compression. There, one asks for the number of bits needed to store the outcome of the above random experiment. In typical information theoretic applications, we tolerate small errors. Then, the AEP tells us that we can ignore non-typical events and thus only need $nH(X)$ bits to store the whole sequence, i.e. $H(X)$ bits per element.

This can alternatively be formulated in terms of the

min- and max-entropy, which are defined as follows:

$$H_{\min}(X) := - \log \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P(x),$$

$$H_{\max}(X) := \log |\{x \in \mathcal{X} : P(x) > 0\}|.$$

We also informally introduce smooth versions of the min- and max-entropy, denoted $H_{\min}^\varepsilon(X)$ and $H_{\max}^\varepsilon(X)$. The smooth min-entropy is constructed by ignoring the most probable events in \mathcal{X} up to total probability ε and taking the min-entropy of the remaining distribution. Similarly, to construct the smooth max-entropy one ignores the least probable events. In terms of these entropies, the AEP for i.i.d. variables can be stated

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{\min}^\varepsilon(X^n) = H(X) \quad \text{and} \quad (1)$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{\max}^\varepsilon(X^n) = H(X). \quad (2)$$

These relations have also been generalized to the case of conditional entropies [2].

Returning to the example of source compression makes clear the second of these relations. In order to store (with certainty) the outcome of a single random experiment given by X and P , one needs $H_{\max}(X)$ bits. Furthermore, if one tolerates a small probability of failure, only $H_{\max}^\varepsilon(X)$ bits are required. However, in the case of a large sequence of i.i.d. random variables, the AEP tells us that $H(X)$ bits are needed for each element of the sequence, and hence relation (2) follows. A similar argument can be made using randomness extraction to illustrate the relation (1) [3].

We now sketch a proof of the AEP (1). We use the Rényi entropies [4]

$$H_\alpha(X) := \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P(x)^\alpha, \quad \alpha \in [0, \infty), \quad (3)$$

for which the min-entropy ($\alpha \rightarrow \infty$), max-entropy ($\alpha \rightarrow 0$) and Shannon entropy ($\alpha \rightarrow 1$) are special cases. Furthermore, the entropies $H_\alpha(X)$ are monotonically decreasing in α and, as shown in [3], the Rényi entropies with $\alpha > 1$ are close to the smooth min-entropy

$$H_{\min}^\varepsilon(X) \geq H_\alpha(X) - \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \varepsilon, \quad \alpha > 1 \quad (4)$$

*marcoto@phys.ethz.ch

†colbeck@phys.ethz.ch

‡renner@phys.ethz.ch

¹ We use \log to denote the binary logarithm.

while those with $\alpha < 1$ are close to the smooth max-entropy. Note that the error term $\frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \varepsilon$ in (4) diverges when we try to recover the Shannon entropy. However, in the case of an i.i.d. sequence we find

$$\frac{1}{n} H_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(X^n) \stackrel{(4)}{\geq} H_{\alpha}(X) - \frac{1}{n(1-\alpha)} \log \varepsilon, \quad (5)$$

where we have used $H_{\alpha}(X^n) = nH_{\alpha}(X)$. We proceed by bounding $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(X^n)$ from above and below. To get the lower bound, we choose $\alpha = 1 + 1/\sqrt{n}$ and take the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (5). The upper bound essentially follows from $H_{\min}(X) \leq H(X)$.

B. Fully Quantum AEP

The AEP was generalized to unconditional quantum entropies in [5, 6], and a statement for conditional entropies follows from Theorem 3.3.6 in [7]. We propose a fully quantum AEP, where fully refers to the fact that we condition on quantum side information.

Theorem 1 (Fully Quantum AEP). *Let ρ_{AB} be a bipartite state on $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ so that $\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}$ is an i.i.d. state on $(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)^{\otimes n}$, then*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(A^n|B^n)_{\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}} = H(A|B)_{\rho} \quad \text{and} \quad (6)$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{\max}^{\varepsilon}(A^n|B^n)_{\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}} = H(A|B)_{\rho}. \quad (7)$$

This relation is expressed in terms of quantum versions of the min- and max-entropies [7] and the conditional von Neumann entropy which will be defined precisely below. The reader unfamiliar with quantum entropies is also referred to [8, 9] for many of their properties and applications.

In this contribution, we prove a non-asymptotic version of Theorem 1 that gives a lower bound on $H_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(A^n|B^n)$ for finite n . This result has a direct application in quantum cryptography when analyzing the security of finite keys. In the process, we encounter new quantities that can be seen as a quantum generalization of Rényi entropies as well as a family of inequalities that generalize (4) for quantum conditional entropies.

II. QUANTUM RÉNYI ENTROPIES

We use $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ to denote the set of normalized quantum states on the bipartite finite dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{AB} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, and denote the von Neumann entropy by $H(A|B)_{\rho} := \text{tr}(\rho_{AB}(\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \log \rho_B - \log \rho_{AB}))$. We define the min-entropy:

Definition 1. Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ and $\sigma_B \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)$, then the min-entropy of A conditioned on B of the state ρ_{AB} relative to σ_B is defined as

$$H_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma} := -\log \min\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : \lambda \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B \geq \rho_{AB}\} \quad (8)$$

if the support of σ_B satisfies $\text{supp}\{\sigma_B\} \supseteq \text{supp}\{\rho_B\}$, otherwise $H_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma} := -\infty$. Furthermore, without the restriction to σ_B , we define

$$H_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho} := \max_{\sigma_B \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)} H_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma}. \quad (9)$$

The max-entropy $H_{\max}(A|B)_{\rho} := -H_{\min}(A|C)_{\rho}$ is its dual with regards to a purification ρ_{ABC} of ρ_{AB} on an auxiliary Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_C .²

The quantum entropies can be ordered as follows³:

Lemma 2 (Ordering of Entropies). *Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$, then*

$$H_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho} \leq H(A|B)_{\rho} \leq H_{\max}(A|B)_{\rho}. \quad (10)$$

Proof. It is sufficient to prove the first inequality, since $H_{\min}(A|B) \leq H(A|B)$ implies $H_{\max}(A|C) \geq H(A|C)$. This follows from the definition of $H_{\max}(A|B)$ and the fact that $H(A|B) = -H(A|C)$ for any purification on C. The first step uses Klein's inequality $D(\rho_B \|\sigma_B) := \text{tr}(\rho_B(\log \rho_B - \log \sigma_B)) \geq 0$ (with equality if and only if $\sigma_B = \rho_B$).

$$\begin{aligned} H(A|B)_{\rho} &= \max_{\sigma_B \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)} H(AB)_{\rho} - H(B)_{\rho} - D(\rho_B \|\sigma_B) \\ &= \max_{\sigma_B \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)} \text{tr}(\rho_{AB}(\log(\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B) - \log \rho_{AB})) \\ &\geq \text{tr}(\rho_{AB}(\log(\lambda \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma'_B) - \log \rho_{AB})) - \log \lambda \\ &\geq H_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho}, \end{aligned}$$

where we chose $\lambda > 0$ and $\sigma'_B \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ such that they optimize (8) and (9). Hence, $-\log \lambda = H_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho}$. Furthermore, it follows from (8) that $\lambda \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma'_B \geq \rho_{AB}$. Then, using the operator monotonicity⁴ of $t \mapsto \log t$ (cf. Chapter V in [11]), we find that the remaining term is positive. \square

In order to define smooth versions, we consider the set of states close to ρ in the following sense. For $\varepsilon > 0$, we define an ε -ball of states around ρ as

$$\mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\rho) := \{\tilde{\rho} \geq 0 : F(\rho, \tilde{\rho}) \geq 1 - \varepsilon\}, \quad (11)$$

where $F(A, B) := \text{tr}|\sqrt{A}\sqrt{B}|$ denotes the quantum fidelity generalized to non-normalized states. Smoothed versions of the min-entropy are then defined:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma} &:= \max_{\tilde{\rho}_{AB} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{AB})} H_{\min}(A|B)_{\tilde{\rho}|\sigma}, \\ H_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(A|B)_{\rho} &:= \max_{\tilde{\rho}_{AB} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{AB})} H_{\min}(A|B)_{\tilde{\rho}} \\ &= \max_{\sigma_B \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)} H_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

² Note that the classical definition of the max-entropy can be recovered by the dual $H_{\max}(X) = -H_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho|\rho}$, where $\rho_A = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P(x) |x\rangle\langle x|$ and ρ_{AB} a purification of ρ_A .

³ See also Lemma 10 in [10] for an alternative proof. There they define $D_{\max}(\rho_B \|\sigma_B)$ which, for $\mathcal{H}_A \cong \mathbb{C}$ is $-H_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma}$. Further note that D_{\min} as defined in [10] is not related to H_{\max} .

⁴ A function f is operator monotone if $A \geq B$ implies $f(A) \geq f(B)$ for any positive semi-definite matrices A and B .

Similarly, we define

$$H_{\max}^\varepsilon(\mathsf{A}|\mathsf{B})_\rho := \min_{\tilde{\rho}_{\mathsf{AB}} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_{\mathsf{AB}})} H_{\max}(\mathsf{A}|\mathsf{B})_{\tilde{\rho}}.$$

The smoothed entropies maintain the duality relation as the following lemma shows.

Lemma 3. *Let $\rho_{\mathsf{ABC}} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathsf{A}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathsf{B}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathsf{C}})$ be a pure state and $\varepsilon > 0$, then*

$$H_{\max}^\varepsilon(\mathsf{A}|\mathsf{B})_\rho = -H_{\min}^\varepsilon(\mathsf{A}|\mathsf{C})_\rho. \quad (12)$$

Proof. We use $\mathcal{B}_*^\varepsilon(\rho)$ to denote the set of pure states close to ρ , i.e. $\mathcal{B}_*^\varepsilon(\rho) := \{\tilde{\rho} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho) : \text{rank}(\tilde{\rho}) = 1\}$. Next, for ρ_{ABC} as an arbitrary purification of ρ_{AB} , we define an ε -ball $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^\varepsilon(\rho_{\mathsf{AB}})$ of states around ρ_{AB} that are close on the purified space:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^\varepsilon(\rho_{\mathsf{AB}}) := \{\text{tr}_{\mathsf{C}}(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathsf{ABC}}) : \tilde{\rho}_{\mathsf{ABC}} \in \mathcal{B}_*^\varepsilon(\rho_{\mathsf{ABC}})\}.$$

The monotonicity of the quantum fidelity under partial trace gives $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^\varepsilon(\rho_{\mathsf{AB}}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_{\mathsf{AB}})$. Then, using Uhlmann's theorem (Theorem 9.4 in [12]), it follows that every state $\tilde{\rho}_{\mathsf{AB}} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_{\mathsf{AB}})$ has a purification $\tilde{\rho}_{\mathsf{ABC}} \in \mathcal{B}_*^\varepsilon(\rho_{\mathsf{ABC}})$, and so $\mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_{\mathsf{AB}}) \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^\varepsilon(\rho_{\mathsf{AB}})$. Hence, the two sets are equal and

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\max}^\varepsilon(\mathsf{A}|\mathsf{B})_\rho &= \min_{\tilde{\rho}_{\mathsf{ABC}} \in \mathcal{B}_*^\varepsilon(\rho_{\mathsf{ABC}})} H_{\max}(\mathsf{A}|\mathsf{B})_{\tilde{\rho}} \\ &= - \max_{\tilde{\rho}_{\mathsf{ABC}} \in \mathcal{B}_*^\varepsilon(\rho_{\mathsf{ABC}})} H_{\min}(\mathsf{A}|\mathsf{C})_{\tilde{\rho}} \\ &= -H_{\min}^\varepsilon(\mathsf{A}|\mathsf{C})_\rho. \end{aligned}$$

□

Next, we introduce a family of quantum Rényi-like entropies:

Definition 2. Let $\rho_{\mathsf{AB}} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathsf{AB}})$, $\sigma_{\mathsf{B}} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathsf{B}})$ s.t. $\text{supp}\{\sigma_{\mathsf{B}}\} \supseteq \text{supp}\{\rho_{\mathsf{B}}\}$ and $\alpha \in [0, \infty)$, then the α -entropy of A conditioned on B of the state ρ_{AB} relative to σ_{B} is given by

$$H_\alpha(\mathsf{A}|\mathsf{B})_{\rho|\sigma} := \lim_{\xi \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \text{tr}[\rho_{\mathsf{AB}}^\alpha (\mathbb{1}_{\mathsf{A}} \otimes \hat{\sigma}_{\mathsf{B}}^\xi)^{1-\alpha}], \quad (13)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_{\mathsf{B}}^\xi := (1-\xi)\sigma_{\mathsf{B}} + \xi\mathbb{1}_{\mathsf{B}}$ is invertible. Furthermore, $H_\alpha(\mathsf{A}|\mathsf{B})_\rho := \max_{\sigma_{\mathsf{B}} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathsf{B}})} H_\alpha(\mathsf{A}|\mathsf{B})_{\rho|\sigma}$.

A similar quantity appears in quantum hypothesis testing [13, 14] and as a quantum relative Rényi entropy in [15]. Indeed, some of the techniques we use are inspired by [13]. If $\mathcal{H}_{\mathsf{B}} = \mathbb{C}$ is empty, we recover the classical Rényi entropies (3). It can be shown that $H_{1/2}(\mathsf{A}|\mathsf{B})_\rho = H_{\max}(\mathsf{A}|\mathsf{B})_\rho$ [9]. Moreover, one can verify

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} H_\alpha(\mathsf{A}|\mathsf{B})_\rho = H(\mathsf{A}|\mathsf{B})_\rho. \quad (14)$$

Furthermore, evaluation for an i.i.d. state $\rho_{\mathsf{AB}}^{\otimes n}$ relative to another i.i.d. state $\sigma_{\mathsf{B}}^{\otimes n}$ results in

$$H_\alpha(\mathsf{A}^n|\mathsf{B}^n)_{\rho^{\otimes n}|\sigma^{\otimes n}} = nH_\alpha(\mathsf{A}|\mathsf{B})_{\rho|\sigma}. \quad (15)$$

III. ENTROPY BOUND

Our main tool in proving the fully quantum AEP is a family of inequalities that relate the smooth conditional min-entropy $H_{\min}^\varepsilon(\mathsf{A}|\mathsf{B})$ to $H_\alpha(\mathsf{A}|\mathsf{B})$ for $\alpha \in (1, 2]$. The result is a quantum generalization of (4).

Theorem 4. *Let $\rho_{\mathsf{AB}} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathsf{AB}})$, $\sigma_{\mathsf{B}} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathsf{B}})$ s.t. $\text{supp}\{\sigma_{\mathsf{B}}\} \supseteq \text{supp}\{\rho_{\mathsf{B}}\}$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\alpha \in (1, 2]$, then the following inequality holds:*

$$H_{\min}^\varepsilon(\mathsf{A}|\mathsf{B})_{\rho|\sigma} \geq H_\alpha(\mathsf{A}|\mathsf{B})_{\rho|\sigma} - \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \varepsilon. \quad (16)$$

Moreover, (16) holds without the restriction to σ_{B} .

To prove Theorem 4, we will need two lemmas that are established in Appendices A and B. The first gives the following estimate of $H_{\min}^\varepsilon(\mathsf{A}|\mathsf{B})_\rho$ (see also [16]):

Lemma 5. *Let $\rho_{\mathsf{AB}} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathsf{AB}})$, $\sigma_{\mathsf{B}} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathsf{B}})$ s.t. $\text{supp}\{\sigma_{\mathsf{B}}\} \supseteq \text{supp}\{\rho_{\mathsf{B}}\}$ and $\lambda > 0$, then*

$$H_{\min}^\varepsilon(\mathsf{A}|\mathsf{B})_{\rho|\sigma} \geq -\log \lambda, \quad \varepsilon = \text{tr}(\Delta), \quad (17)$$

where $\Delta := \{\rho_{\mathsf{AB}} - \lambda\mathbb{1}_{\mathsf{A}} \otimes \sigma_{\mathsf{B}}\}_+$ is the positive part of the operator $\rho_{\mathsf{AB}} - \lambda\mathbb{1}_{\mathsf{A}} \otimes \sigma_{\mathsf{B}}$.

The second lemma, originally proven by Petz [17], establishes the monotonicity of certain functionals under trace-preserving completely positive maps (TPCPMs) and is of independent use in quantum information theory (see e.g. [13]).

Definition 3. Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space with orthonormal basis $\{|i\rangle\}_i$, $\mathcal{H}' \cong \mathcal{H}$ be a copy of \mathcal{H} , and $|\gamma\rangle = \sum_i |i\rangle \otimes |i\rangle$ be the (unnormalized) fully entangled state on $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}'$. For a continuous function $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and operators $A \geq 0, B > 0$, we define

$$S_f(A, B) := \langle \gamma | (B^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \mathbb{1}) f(B^{-1} \otimes A^T) (B^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \mathbb{1}) | \gamma \rangle,$$

where $(\cdot)^T$ denotes the transpose with respect to the basis $\{|i\rangle\}_i$.

Lemma 6. *Let f be operator convex⁵ on $[0, \infty)$ with $f(0) = 0$ and \mathcal{E} be a TPCPM, then for all Hermitian operators $A \geq 0, B > 0$:*

$$S_f(A, B) \geq S_f(\mathcal{E}(A), \mathcal{E}(B)). \quad (18)$$

Proof of Theorem 4. For fixed $\lambda > 0$ and $\sigma_{\mathsf{B}} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathsf{B}})$ s.t. $\sigma_{\mathsf{B}} > 0$ ⁶, we define operator $X = \rho_{\mathsf{AB}} - \lambda\mathbb{1}_{\mathsf{A}} \otimes \sigma_{\mathsf{B}}$ and

⁵ A continuous function f is operator convex if $f(\frac{1}{2}(A+B)) \leq \frac{1}{2}(f(A)+f(B))$ for all positive semi-definite matrices A and B .

⁶ This is equivalent to saying that σ_{B} has full support. The argument for σ_{B} s.t. $\text{supp}\{\sigma_{\mathsf{B}}\} \supseteq \text{supp}\{\rho_{\mathsf{B}}\}$ is similar: we simply substitute $\hat{\sigma}_{\mathsf{B}}^\xi$ for σ_{B} and take the limit $\xi \rightarrow 0$ at the end.

denote by $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}_{i \in S}$ its eigenbasis. The set $S^+ \subseteq S$ contains the indices i corresponding to positive eigenvalues of X . Hence, $P^+ = \sum_{i \in S^+} |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$ is the projector on the positive eigenspace of X and $P^+ X P^+ = \Delta$ as defined in Lemma 5. Furthermore, let $r_i = \langle\psi_i|\rho_{AB}|\psi_i\rangle \geq 0$ and $s_i = \langle\psi_i|\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B|\psi_i\rangle > 0$. From the definitions, it follows that

$$\forall_{i \in S^+} : r_i - \lambda s_i \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{r_i}{\lambda s_i} \geq 1.$$

For any $\alpha \in (1, 2]$, we bound ε in (17) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &= \text{tr}(\Delta) = \sum_{i \in S^+} r_i - \lambda s_i \leq \sum_{i \in S^+} r_i \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in S^+} r_i \left(\frac{r_i}{\lambda s_i} \right)^{\alpha-1} \\ &\leq \lambda^{1-\alpha} \sum_{i \in S} r_i^\alpha s_i^{1-\alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Next, we apply Lemma 6 to the functional S_{g_α} with $g_\alpha : t \mapsto t^\alpha$ for $\alpha \in (1, 2]$. (Note that g_α is operator convex for such α (see Section V.2 of [11]).) We use the TPCPM $A \mapsto \sum_{i \in S} |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|A|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$ to obtain

$$S_{g_\alpha}(\rho_{AB}, \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B) = \text{tr}(\rho_{AB}^\alpha (\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B)^{1-\alpha}) \geq \sum_{i \in S} r_i^\alpha s_i^{1-\alpha}.$$

Substituting this into (19), we find

$$\lambda^{\alpha-1} \leq \varepsilon^{-1} \text{tr}(\rho_{AB}^\alpha (\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B)^{1-\alpha}).$$

Taking the logarithm on both sides, dividing by $1-\alpha < 0$ and applying (17) results in

$$H_{\min}^\varepsilon(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma} \geq \frac{\log \text{tr}(\rho_{AB}^\alpha (\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B)^{1-\alpha}) - \log \varepsilon}{1-\alpha}. \quad (20)$$

We now use $\text{tr}(A) \leq \text{tr}|A|$ (cf. Lemma 9.5 in [12]) to substitute $H_\alpha(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma}$ and recover (16):

$$H_{\min}^\varepsilon(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma} \geq H_\alpha(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma} - \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \varepsilon.$$

Finally, denoting by σ'_B the state that maximizes $H_\alpha(A|B)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\min}^\varepsilon(A|B)_\rho &\geq H_{\min}^\varepsilon(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma'} \\ &\stackrel{(16)}{\geq} H_\alpha(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma'} - \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \varepsilon \\ &= H_\alpha(A|B)_\rho - \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

□

IV. QUANTUM AEP

One could use Theorem 4, together with the arguments given for the classical case in Section IA, to prove (6). In many applications, it is useful to have an explicit lower bound on $H_{\min}^\varepsilon(A|B)$. We derive such a bound, from which the asymptotic version (6) is a corollary.

Theorem 7. Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and n an integer so that $\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}$ is an i.i.d. state on $\mathcal{H}_{AB}^{\otimes n}$, then

$$\frac{1}{n} H_{\min}^\varepsilon(A^n|B^n)_{\rho^{\otimes n}} \geq H(A|B)_\rho - \frac{\delta - \log \varepsilon}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad (21)$$

where $\delta := \lim_{\xi \rightarrow 0} \frac{\ln^2}{2} \text{tr}(\rho_{AB}(\log^2 \rho_{AB} + \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \log^2 \hat{\rho}_B^\xi)(\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \hat{\rho}_B^\xi)^{-1})$ and $\hat{\rho}_B^\xi := (1-\xi)\rho_B + \xi\mathbb{1}_B$.

Proof. We derive a lower bound on $H_{\min}^\varepsilon(A^n|B^n)_{\rho^{\otimes n}}$ by expanding the trace term in (20).⁷ The subsequent inequalities for $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, $\mu \in (0, 1]$ and $\alpha \in (1, 2]$ follow from Taylor's theorem⁸ and an expansion around $\alpha = 1$.

$$\lambda^\alpha \leq \lambda(1 + (\alpha-1)\ln \lambda + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha-1)^2 \ln^2 \lambda), \quad (22)$$

$$\mu^{1-\alpha} \leq 1 - (\alpha-1)\ln \mu + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha-1)^2 \frac{1}{\mu} \ln^2 \mu, \quad (23)$$

$$\mu^{-1} \geq \mu^{1-\alpha} \geq 1. \quad (24)$$

Let A and B be two Hermitian operators with $0 \leq A \leq \mathbb{1}$ and $0 < B \leq \mathbb{1}$. Since (22) holds for all eigenvalues of A , we get

$$A^\alpha \leq A(\mathbb{1} + (\alpha-1)\ln A + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha-1)^2 \ln^2 A) \quad (25)$$

and analogous inequalities for B from (23) and (24). We now apply these results to $\text{tr}(A^\alpha B^{1-\alpha})$ and repeatedly use the fact that $\text{tr}(CD) \geq 0$ if $C \geq 0$ and $D \geq 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(A^\alpha B^{1-\alpha}) &\stackrel{(25)}{\leq} \text{tr}(AB^{1-\alpha}) + (\alpha-1)\text{tr}(A(\ln A)B^{1-\alpha}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha-1)^2 \text{tr}(A(\ln^2 A)B^{1-\alpha}) \\ &\stackrel{(24)}{\leq} \text{tr}(AB^{1-\alpha}) + (\alpha-1)\text{tr}(A \ln A) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha-1)^2 \text{tr}(A(\ln^2 A)B^{-1}) \\ &\stackrel{(23)}{\leq} \text{tr}(A) + (\alpha-1)\text{tr}(A(\ln A - \ln B)) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha-1)^2 \text{tr}(A(\ln^2 A + \ln^2 B)B^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, since for all $x > 0$ the logarithm is upper bounded by $\ln x \leq x - 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \log \text{tr}(A^\alpha B^{1-\alpha}) &\leq \frac{\text{tr}(A)-1}{\ln 2} + (\alpha-1)\text{tr}(A(\log A - \log B)) \\ &\quad + \frac{\ln^2}{2}(\alpha-1)^2 \text{tr}(A(\log^2 A + \log^2 B)B^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

⁷ We could use Theorem 4 directly instead, however, the modulus in the definition of $H_\alpha(A|B)$ causes a more involved calculation and (20) is tighter.

⁸ We use the Lagrange form of the remainder term $R_1(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha-1)^2 f''(\zeta)$ for some $\zeta \in [1, \alpha] \subseteq [1, 2]$ to form the bound.

In particular, dividing by $1 - \alpha < 0$, setting $A = \rho_{AB}$ and setting $B = \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \rho_B$ (we assume $\rho_B > 0$ ⁹) leads to

$$\frac{\log \text{tr}(\rho_{AB}^\alpha (\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \rho_B)^{1-\alpha})}{1-\alpha} \geq H(A|B)_\rho - (\alpha - 1)\delta. \quad (26)$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} H_{\min}^\varepsilon(A^n|B^n)_{\rho^{\otimes n}} &\geq \frac{1}{n} H_{\min}^\varepsilon(A^n|B^n)_{\rho^{\otimes n}|\rho^{\otimes n}} \\ &\stackrel{(20),(15)}{\geq} \frac{\log \text{tr}(\rho_{AB}^\alpha (\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \rho_B)^{1-\alpha})}{1-\alpha} - \frac{\log \varepsilon}{n(1-\alpha)} \\ &\stackrel{(26)}{\geq} H(A|B)_\rho - \frac{\delta - \log \varepsilon}{\sqrt{n}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we chose $\alpha = 1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$ in the last step. \square

The asymptotic version stated in Theorem 1 follows as a corollary.

Proof of Theorem 1. We first show the min-entropy relation (6). Taking the $n \rightarrow \infty$ limit in (21) gives

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{\min}^\varepsilon(A^n|B^n)_{\rho^{\otimes n}} \geq H(A|B)_\rho.$$

However, since, for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the min-entropy is smaller than the Shannon entropy (cf. Lemma 2), we get the desired result¹⁰. The max-entropy relation (7) follows after we substitute the duals of the smooth min-entropy (cf. Lemma 3) and the von Neumann entropy ($H(A|B) = -H(A|C)$) into (6). \square

APPENDIX A: PROOF OF LEMMA 5

We first choose a state $\tilde{\rho}_{AB}$, calculate $H_{\min}(A|B)_{\tilde{\rho}|\sigma}$ and then show that $\tilde{\rho}_{AB}$ is indeed in $\mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_{AB})$. We use the abbreviated notation $\Gamma = \lambda \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B$ and choose

$$\tilde{\rho}_{AB} = C \rho_{AB} C^\dagger, \quad C = \Gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} (\Gamma + \Delta)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

From the definition of Δ , we have $\rho_{AB} \leq \Gamma + \Delta$; hence, $\tilde{\rho}_{AB} \leq \Gamma$. This allows us to write $H_{\min}(A|B)_{\tilde{\rho}|\sigma} \geq -\log \lambda$. Next we upper bound $1 - F(\rho_{AB}, \tilde{\rho}_{AB})$. To this avail, let $|\theta\rangle_{ABE}$ be a purification of ρ_{AB} on an auxiliary Hilbert

space \mathcal{H}_E , then $|\tilde{\theta}\rangle_{ABE} = C \otimes \mathbb{1}_E |\theta\rangle_{ABE}$ is a purification of $\tilde{\rho}_{AB}$. By Uhlmann's theorem

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - F(\rho_{AB}, \tilde{\rho}_{AB}) &\leq 1 - |\langle \theta | \tilde{\theta} \rangle| \\ &\leq |1 - \langle \theta | \tilde{\theta} \rangle| \\ &= |\langle \theta | (\mathbb{1}_{AB} - C) \otimes \mathbb{1}_E |\theta \rangle| \\ &= |\text{tr}(\rho_{AB} (\mathbb{1}_{AB} - C))|. \end{aligned} \quad (A1)$$

Next we show that $\bar{C} = \frac{1}{2}(C + C^\dagger) \leq \mathbb{1}_{AB}$. By multiplying $\Gamma \leq \Gamma + \Delta$ with $(\Gamma + \Delta)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ from left and right, we get

$$C^\dagger C = (\Gamma + \Delta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma (\Gamma + \Delta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \mathbb{1}_{AB}.$$

Using the operator norm $\|C\| = \sqrt{\|C^\dagger C\|} = \max\{\sqrt{\lambda} : \lambda \text{ is an eigenvalue of } C^\dagger C\}$, we find that $C^\dagger C \leq \mathbb{1}_{AB}$ requires $\|C\| = \|C^\dagger\| \leq 1$. Furthermore, we conclude that $\|\bar{C}\| \leq 1$ by the triangle inequality and therefore $\bar{C} \leq \mathbb{1}_{AB}$.

Using the linearity of the trace together with its invariance under the Hermitian conjugate to exchange C with \bar{C} and using $\mathbb{1}_{AB} - \bar{C} \geq 0$, we find that the trace (A1) is positive. Furthermore, $\rho_{AB} \leq \Gamma + \Delta$ and thus

$$1 - F(\rho_{AB}, \tilde{\rho}_{AB}) \leq \text{tr}(\Gamma + \Delta) - \text{tr}((\Gamma + \Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

By using the operator monotonicity of $t \mapsto \sqrt{t}$ (V.1.8 in [11]), we find $\sqrt{\Gamma + \Delta} \geq \sqrt{\Gamma}$ and

$$1 - F(\rho_{AB}, \tilde{\rho}_{AB}) \leq \text{tr}(\Delta) = \varepsilon.$$

Hence, according to (11), we have shown that $\tilde{\rho}_{AB}$ is indeed in $\mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_{AB})$. Finally

$$H_{\min}^\varepsilon(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma} \geq H_{\min}(A|B)_{\tilde{\rho}|\sigma} \geq -\log \lambda. \quad \square$$

APPENDIX B: PROOF OF LEMMA 6

Every TPCPM can be expressed as a unitary map on a enlarged space followed by a partial trace. Hence, it is sufficient to show that the inequality holds under unitary maps (i), when embedding \mathcal{H} into a larger Hilbert space (ii) and when taking a partial trace (iii). We will repeatedly make use of $\langle \gamma | A \otimes \mathbb{1} | \gamma \rangle = \text{tr}(A)$ and $(A \otimes \mathbb{1}) | \gamma \rangle = (\mathbb{1} \otimes A^T) | \gamma \rangle$.

i) We consider the unitary map $A \mapsto UAU^\dagger$. Note that $f(UAU^\dagger) = Uf(A)U^\dagger$ as well as $(UAU^\dagger)^T = U^T A U^T$. It is now easy to verify that

$$S_f(UAU^\dagger, UBU^\dagger) = S_f(A, B).$$

ii) It is sufficient to embed \mathcal{H} into $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$, where \mathbb{C}^2 has basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$. We map positive operators A on \mathcal{H} to positive operators $A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|$ on $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$. Note that

⁹ The more general case follows by substituting $\hat{\rho}_B^\xi$ for ρ_B and taking the limit $\xi \rightarrow 0$ at the end.

¹⁰ We also use of the continuity of the von Neumann entropy under small perturbations of the state (cf. Fannes' inequality in [12]). This ensures that the difference between the Shannon entropy of a state $\tilde{\rho}^{\otimes n} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho^{\otimes n})$ and the Shannon entropy of $\rho^{\otimes n}$ grows at most linearly in n .

$f(A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|) = f(A) \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|$ for all functions f with $f(0) = 0$. Thus,

$$S_f(A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|, B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|) = S_f(A, B).$$

iii) Here we split the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{XY}$ into two parts $\mathcal{H}_{XY} = \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y$. For an operator A_{XY} on \mathcal{H} , we denote by A_X its reduction to \mathcal{H}_X , namely $A_X = \text{tr}_Y(A_{XY})$. Furthermore, we fix bases $\{|i\rangle_X\}_i$ on \mathcal{H}_X and $\{|i\rangle_Y\}_i$ on \mathcal{H}_Y , introduce copies $\mathcal{H}'_X \cong \mathcal{H}_X$ and $\mathcal{H}'_Y \cong \mathcal{H}_Y$, and define the (unnormalized) completely mixed states $|\gamma\rangle_X$ and $|\gamma\rangle_{XY}$ accordingly. It remains to be shown that, when f operator convex,

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \gamma | \sqrt{B_{XY}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{XY} f(B_{XY}^{-1} \otimes A_{XY}^T) \sqrt{B_{XY}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{XY} |\gamma\rangle_{XY} \\ & \geq \langle \gamma | \sqrt{B_X} \otimes \mathbb{1}_X f(B_X^{-1} \otimes A_X^T) \sqrt{B_X} \otimes \mathbb{1}_X |\gamma\rangle_X. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B1})$$

Let us define an isometry $\nu : \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}'_X \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{XY} \otimes \mathcal{H}'_Y$ that maps

$$\nu : \sqrt{B_X} \otimes D_X |\gamma\rangle_X \mapsto \sqrt{B_{XY}} \otimes D_X \otimes \mathbb{1}_Y |\gamma\rangle_{XY},$$

where D_X is a linear operator on \mathcal{H}_X . First, note that we can write every pure state $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}'_X$ as $|\Psi\rangle = \sqrt{B_X} \otimes D_X^\Psi |\gamma\rangle_X$. In fact, if $|\Psi\rangle = \sum_i \sqrt{\lambda_i} |i\rangle_X \otimes |\tilde{i}\rangle_X$, $\lambda_i \geq 0$, is the Schmidt decomposition of $|\Psi\rangle$, $U_X : |i\rangle_X \mapsto |\tilde{i}\rangle_X$ and $V_X : |i\rangle_X \mapsto |\tilde{i}\rangle_X$ are unitaries and $E_X = \sum_i \lambda_i |\tilde{i}\rangle\langle \tilde{i}|_X$, then it is easy to verify that $D_X^\Psi = \sqrt{E_X} V_X U_X^T (\sqrt{B_X})^{-T}$.

Next we show that ν is indeed an isometry. It suffices to show that

$$\| |\Psi\rangle - |\Phi\rangle \| = \| \nu |\Psi\rangle - \nu |\Phi\rangle \|$$

or equivalently, setting $D_X = D_X^\Psi - D_X^\Phi$,

$$\| \sqrt{B_X} \otimes D_X |\gamma\rangle_X \|^2 = \| \sqrt{B_{XY}} \otimes D_X \otimes \mathbb{1}_Y |\gamma\rangle_{XY} \|^2.$$

The left-hand side evaluates to

$$\begin{aligned} \| \sqrt{B_X} \otimes D_X |\gamma\rangle_X \|^2 &= \langle \gamma | B_X \otimes D_X^\dagger D_X |\gamma\rangle_X \\ &= \text{tr}(D_X^{\dagger T} B_X D_X^T), \end{aligned}$$

while the right-hand side evaluates to

$$\begin{aligned} & \| \sqrt{B_{XY}} \otimes D_X \otimes \mathbb{1}_Y |\gamma\rangle_{XY} \|^2 \\ &= \langle \gamma | B_{XY} \otimes D_X^\dagger D_X \otimes \mathbb{1}_Y |\gamma\rangle_{XY} \\ &= \text{tr}((D_X^{\dagger T} \otimes \mathbb{1}_Y) B_{XY} (D_X^T \otimes \mathbb{1}_Y)) \\ &= \text{tr}(D_X^{\dagger T} B_X D_X^T). \end{aligned}$$

We have now established that ν is an isometry. Next we show that

$$\nu^\dagger (B_{XY}^{-1} \otimes A_{XY}^T) \nu = B_X^{-1} \otimes A_X^T$$

by looking at its action on arbitrary states. The right-hand side evaluates to

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \Psi | B_X^{-1} \otimes A_X^T |\Phi\rangle_X \\ &= \langle \gamma | (\sqrt{B_X} \otimes D_X^{\Psi\dagger}) B_X^{-1} \otimes A_X^T (\sqrt{B_X} \otimes D_X^\Phi) |\gamma\rangle_X \\ &= \langle \gamma | \mathbb{1}_X \otimes D_X^{\Psi\dagger} A_X^T D_X^\Phi |\gamma\rangle_X \\ &= \text{tr}(D_X^{\Psi\dagger} A_X^T D_X^\Phi), \end{aligned}$$

whereas the left-hand side evaluates to

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \Psi | \nu^\dagger (B_{XY}^{-1} \otimes A_{XY}^T) \nu |\Phi\rangle_X \\ &= \langle \gamma | (\sqrt{B_{XY}} \otimes D_X^{\Psi\dagger} \otimes \mathbb{1}_Y) B_{XY}^{-1} \otimes A_{XY}^T \\ & \quad \cdot (\sqrt{B_{XY}} \otimes D_X^\Phi \otimes \mathbb{1}_Y) |\gamma\rangle_{XY} \\ &= \langle \gamma | \mathbb{1}_{XY} \otimes (D_X^{\Psi\dagger} \otimes \mathbb{1}_Y) A_{XY}^T \\ & \quad \cdot (D_X^\Phi \otimes \mathbb{1}_Y) |\gamma\rangle_{XY} \\ &= \text{tr}((D_X^{\Psi\dagger} \otimes \mathbb{1}_Y) A_{XY}^T (D_X^\Phi \otimes \mathbb{1}_Y)) \\ &= \text{tr}(D_X^{\Psi\dagger} A_X^T D_X^\Phi). \end{aligned}$$

If f is operator monotone on $[0, \infty)$ and ν an isomorphism into \mathcal{H} , then, for all $A \geq 0$ on \mathcal{H} : $\nu^\dagger f(A) \nu \geq f(\nu^\dagger A \nu)$ (cf. V.2.2 in [11]). Applied to the situation at hand:

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^\dagger f(B_{XY}^{-1} \otimes A_{XY}^T) \nu &\geq f(\nu^\dagger (B_{XY}^{-1} \otimes A_{XY}^T) \nu) \\ &= f(B_X^{-1} \otimes A_X^T). \end{aligned}$$

This holds in particular if we take the scalar product with $(\sqrt{B_X} \otimes \mathbb{1}_X) |\gamma\rangle_X$, which immediately leads us to the desired result as stated in (B1). \square

-
- [1] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory* (Wiley Series in Telecommunications, 1991).
- [2] T. Holenstein and R. Renner, *On the randomness of independent experiments* (2006), URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/cs/0608007>.
- [3] R. Renner and S. Wolf, in *Proc. ISIT* (2004), p. 233.
- [4] A. Rényi, in *Proc. 4th Berkeley Symp. on Math., Stat. and Probability* (1961), pp. 547–561.
- [5] H. Barnum, E. Knill, and M. Nielsen, *IEEE Trans. on Inf. Theory* **46**, 1317 (2000).
- [6] B. Schoenmakers, J. Tjoelker, P. Tuyls, and E. Verbitskiy, *ISIT 2007* pp. 256–260 (2007).
- [7] R. Renner, Ph.D. thesis, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich (2005), URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0512258>.
- [8] R. Renner and R. König, in *Second Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2005* (Springer, ???).
- [9] R. König, R. Renner, and C. Schaffner, *The operational meaning of min- and max-entropy* (2008), URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/0807.1338>.
- [10] N. Datta, *Min- and max- relative entropies and a new entanglement monotone* (2008), URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/0803.2770v1>.
- [11] R. Bhatia, *Matrix Analysis*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics (Springer, 1997).
- [12] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- [13] T. Ogawa and H. Nagaoka, *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on* **46**, 2428 (2000).
- [14] K. M. R. Audenaert, J. Calsamiglia, R. Muñoz-Tapia, E. Bagan, L. Masanes, A. Acín, and F. Verstraete, *Physical Review Letters* **98**, 160501 (2007), URL <http://link.aps.org/abstract/PRL/v98/e160501>.
- [15] M. Ohya and D. Petz, *Quantum Entropy and Its Use* (Springer, 1993).
- [16] N. Datta and R. Renner, *Smooth rényi entropies and the quantum information spectrum* (2008), URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/0801.0282v1>.
- [17] D. Petz, *Reports on Mathematical Physics* **23**, 57 (1984).