

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: 28th December, 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 output of the experiment 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). While the classical AEP applies to a random experiment with classical outcomes, we consider general experiments that may be described by the laws of quantum mechanics. Our version of the AEP then refers to the typical properties of the outcomes of the experiment relative to some side information, i.e., additional information obtained in the process of the experiment. We call it *fully quantum* because the outcomes as well as the side information may be quantum systems. We note here that in classical versions of the AEP the side information is not usually described explicitly, but is already included in the specification of the distribution of the experimental outcomes (i.e., one considers the probability distribution conditioned on the side information). This is not possible in a fully quantum context, where the side information may be entangled with the outcome and a quantum analogue of conditional probability distributions cannot be defined.

We will first discuss the classical AEP and sketch a possible proof. Our proof of the fully quantum AEP will follow similar lines.

A. Classical AEP

The AEP (cf. Theorem 3.1.1 in [1]) is central to classical information theory because it establishes the Shannon entropy¹,

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

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 distributed according to 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 $2^{-nH(X)}$.

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. The AEP tells us that if we ignore non-typical events we are almost certain not to have an error. We 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 entropies

$$H_\infty(X) := - \log \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P(x) \quad \text{and} \\ H_0(X) := \log |\{x \in \mathcal{X} : P(x) > 0\}|.$$

We also informally introduce smooth min- and max-entropies denoted $H_{\min}^\varepsilon(X)$ and $H_{\max}^\varepsilon(X)$, which will be defined properly in Section II. The smooth min-entropy is constructed by ignoring the most probable events in \mathcal{X} up to total probability ε and taking H_∞ of the remaining distribution. Similarly, the smooth max-entropy ignores the least probable events. In terms of these entropies, the AEP is equivalent to the relations

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

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

These relations have been generalized to the case of conditional entropies (for a non-asymptotic version, see [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 $H_0(X)$ bits. Furthermore, if one tolerates a small probability of failure, only roughly $H_{\max}^\varepsilon(X)$ 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

*marcoto@phys.ethz.ch

†colbeck@phys.ethz.ch

‡renner@phys.ethz.ch

¹ We use \log to denote the binary logarithm.

sequence, and hence relation (2) follows. A similar argument can be made to illustrate relation (1) using randomness extraction [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 H_∞ , H_0 and Shannon entropy ($\alpha \rightarrow 1$) are special cases. Furthermore, the entropies H_α are monotonically decreasing in α and, as shown in [3], the Rényi entropies with $\alpha > 1$ are close to the smooth min-entropy in the sense that

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

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

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

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 first generalized to situations where the outcomes A of the random experiment are quantum systems, whereas the side information is still classical. In this case the side information does not need to be modeled explicitly but can be included in the description of the output states (see e.g. [5, 6, 7]). In this paper we consider a fully quantum AEP, involving possibly quantum mechanical side information B. A preliminary version of the result has appeared in [8] (see the discussion below for a comparison).

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*

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

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

This relation is expressed in terms of quantum versions of the min- and max-entropies [8] and the conditional von Neumann entropy which will be defined precisely below. The reader unfamiliar with quantum entropies is also referred to [9, 10] 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 (cf. Theorem 7). The bound for finite n has the property that the deviation from the asymptotic bound (the term delta in Theorem 7) only depends on max entropies evaluated for ρ_{AB} but is otherwise independent of the dimension of the Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H}_A and \mathcal{H}_B . This is particularly important for applications in the context of cryptography, where quantum systems may be controlled by an adversary. In this case, it is often difficult or impossible to bound their dimension, whereas the entropies can still be estimated.

It is possible to obtain a statement similar to Theorem 1 using typical subspaces. This argument, however, would involve the dimensions of both Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H}_A and \mathcal{H}_B and hence lead to quantitatively weaker result than the one established in Theorem 7 (in particular, no reasonable bound could be obtained for high-dimensional Hilbert spaces). We note that the proof technique used here is different from the one used in [8], where the result also depends on the dimension of the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_A .

Our proof is based on quantities that can be seen as a quantum generalization of Rényi entropies (Section II). A central ingredient is a family of inequalities that generalize (4) to the quantum domain (Section III). The main claim (Theorem 7) then follows from the quantum analogue of (4) and a quantitative bound on the difference between the generalized Rényi entropies and the von Neumann entropy (Section IV). The technical tools used for the derivation of our results (in particular Lemma 9) may be of independent use—for example, they allow for a simple proof of the strong sub-additivity of the von Neumann entropy (cf. Lemma 5 and [11]).

II. QUANTUM RÉNYI ENTROPIES

In this section, we define the various entropies used and explore some of their properties. Selected proofs can be found in Appendix B. We use $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ to denote the set of normalized quantum states on the bipartite finite dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{AB} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$. We denote the conditional von Neumann entropy of a state $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ by

$$H(A|B)_\rho := \text{tr}(\rho_{AB}(\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \log \rho_B - \log \rho_{AB})),$$

where $\rho_B = \text{tr}_A(\rho_{AB})$ is obtained by taking the partial trace on A of ρ_{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 is its dual with regards to a purification ρ_{ABC} of ρ_{AB} on an auxiliary Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_C :²

Definition 2. Let $\rho_{ABC} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{ABC})$ be pure, then the max-entropy of A conditioned on B of the state ρ_{AB} is defined as

$$H_{\max}(A|B)_\rho := -H_{\min}(A|C)_\rho. \quad (10)$$

The quantum entropies can be ordered as follows:

Lemma 2. Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$, then

$$H_{\min}(A|B)_\rho \leq H(A|B)_\rho \leq H_{\max}(A|B)_\rho. \quad (11)$$

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

$$\mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho) := \{\tilde{\rho} \geq 0 : \text{tr}(\tilde{\rho}) \leq 1 \text{ and } C(\rho, \tilde{\rho}) \leq \varepsilon\}, \quad (12)$$

where $C(\rho, \tilde{\rho}) := \sqrt{1 - F^2(\rho, \tilde{\rho})}$ as proposed in [12] is a distance measure (on normalized states) based on the fidelity $F(\rho, \tilde{\rho}) := \text{tr}|\sqrt{\rho}\sqrt{\tilde{\rho}}|$. We use this choice of measure because it is invariant under purifications and is directly related to the trace distance for pure states.³ Smoothed versions of the min-entropy are then defined:

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

Similarly, we define

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

The smoothed entropies maintain the duality relation:

Lemma 3. Let $\rho_{ABC} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{ABC})$ be pure and $\varepsilon > 0$, then

$$H_{\max}^\varepsilon(A|B)_\rho = -H_{\min}^\varepsilon(A|C)_\rho. \quad (13)$$

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

Definition 3. Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$, $\sigma_B \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ s.t. $\text{supp}\{\sigma_B\} \supseteq \text{supp}\{\rho_B\}$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$, then the α -entropy of A conditioned on B of the state ρ_{AB} relative to σ_B is given by

$$H_\alpha(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma} := \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \text{tr}(\rho_{AB}^\alpha (\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B)^{1-\alpha}). \quad (14)$$

² Note that this definition is different from definitions used in earlier work (e.g. [8]). However, the definition used here (and introduced in [10]) is chosen because it satisfies the duality relation (10). The classical H_0 can be recovered by taking $H_0(X) = -H_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho|\rho}$, where $\rho_A = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P(x) |x\rangle\langle x|$ and ρ_{AB} purifies ρ_A .

³ To see this, note that $C(\rho, \tilde{\rho})$ corresponds to the minimal trace distance between purifications of ρ and $\tilde{\rho}$ if $\text{tr}(\rho) = \text{tr}(\tilde{\rho}) = 1$.

A similar quantity appears in quantum hypothesis testing [13, 14] and as a quantum relative Rényi entropy in [11, 15, 16]. If $\mathcal{H}_B \cong \mathbb{C}$, we recover the classical Rényi entropies (3). Note that — unlike their classical counterparts — the quantum conditional min- and max-entropies cannot be recovered as special cases of α -entropies. It can be shown that [10], for any $\sigma_B \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)$,

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\max}(A|B)_\rho &= \max_{\tau_B \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)} \log F^2(\rho_{AB}, \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \tau_B) \\ &\geq H_{1/2}(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Furthermore, using the eigenvalue decompositions $\rho_{AB} = \sum_i \lambda_i |i\rangle\langle i|$ and $\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B = \sum_j \mu_j |\tilde{j}\rangle\langle \tilde{j}|$, we have

$$H_\infty(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma} = -\log \max_{\substack{i,j \\ (i|\tilde{j}) \neq 0}} \frac{\lambda_i}{\mu_j} \leq H_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma}.$$

However, the α -entropies share some of the properties of their classical counterparts:

Lemma 4. Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ and $\sigma_B \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)$, then the entropies $H_\alpha(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma}$ are monotonically decreasing in α .

It can be shown that

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

Furthermore, the entropies are additive, i.e. evaluation for an i.i.d. state $\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}$ relative to another i.i.d. state $\sigma_B^{\otimes n}$ results in

$$H_\alpha(A^n|B^n)_{\rho^{\otimes n}|\sigma^{\otimes n}} = nH_\alpha(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma}. \quad (16)$$

The α -entropies are strongly sub-additive for $\alpha \in [0, 2]$:

Lemma 5. Let $\rho_{ABC} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{ABC})$, $\sigma_{BC} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{BC})$ and $\alpha \in [0, 2]$, then

$$H_\alpha(A|BC)_{\rho|\sigma} \leq H_\alpha(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma}. \quad (17)$$

For pure ρ_{AB} and $\alpha \in [0, 2]$, we find the following duality relation:

$$H_\alpha(A|B)_{\rho|\rho} = -H_{2-\alpha}(A). \quad (18)$$

III. MIN-ENTROPY BOUND

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

Theorem 6. Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$, $\sigma_B \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ s.t. $\text{supp}\{\sigma_B\} \supseteq \text{supp}\{\rho_B\}$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\alpha \in (1, 2]$, then the following inequality holds:

$$H_{\min}^\varepsilon(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma} \geq H_\alpha(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma} - \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \frac{2}{\varepsilon^2}. \quad (19)$$

Proof. For fixed $\lambda > 0$ and $\sigma_B \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ s.t. $\sigma_B > 0^4$, we define an operator $X := \rho_{AB} - \lambda \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B$ and 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 10. Furthermore, let $r_i := \langle\psi_i|\rho_{AB}|\psi_i\rangle \geq 0$ and $s_i := \langle\psi_i|\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B|\psi_i\rangle > 0$. 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 Lemma 10 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} &= \text{tr}(\Delta) = \sum_{i \in S^+} r_i - \lambda s_i \leq \sum_{i \in S^+} r_i \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in S^+} r_i \left(\frac{r_i}{\lambda s_i} \right)^{\alpha-1} \\ &\leq \lambda^{1-\alpha} \sum_{i \in S} r_i^\alpha s_i^{1-\alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Next, we apply Lemma 9 to the functional S_{g_α} , where $g_\alpha : t \mapsto t^\alpha$ is operator convex for $\alpha \in (1, 2]$ (cf. Section V.2 of [17]). We use the TP-CPM $A \mapsto \sum_{i \in S} |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|A|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$ 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 (20), we find

$$\lambda^{\alpha-1} \leq \frac{2}{\varepsilon^2} \text{tr}(\rho_{AB}^\alpha (\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B)^{1-\alpha}).$$

Finally, taking the logarithm on both sides, dividing by $1 - \alpha < 0$ and applying Lemma 10 results in (19). \square

IV. QUANTUM AEP

One could use Theorem 6, together with the arguments given for the classical case in Section IA, to prove (6) directly. 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*

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

⁴ This is equivalent to saying that σ_B has full support. The argument for σ_B s.t. $\text{supp}\{\sigma_B\} \supseteq \text{supp}\{\rho_B\}$ is similar: we simply substitute $\hat{\sigma}_B^\xi := (1-\xi)\sigma_B + \xi\mathbb{1}_B$ for σ_B and take the limit $\xi \rightarrow 0$ at the end.

where, for $n \geq \frac{8}{5} \log \frac{2}{\varepsilon^2}$, the error is given by

$$\delta(\varepsilon, \gamma) := 4 \log \gamma \sqrt{\log \frac{2}{\varepsilon^2}} \quad (21)$$

and the single-system entropy contribution by

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &:= \sqrt{2^{-H_{3/2}(A|B)_{\rho|_\rho}}} + \sqrt{2^{H_{1/2}(A|B)_{\rho|_\rho}}} + 1 \\ &\leq \sqrt{2^{H_{\max}(A)_\rho}} + \sqrt{2^{H_{\max}(A|B)_\rho}} + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $\{|i\rangle\}_i$ be an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H}_{AB} and $\mathcal{H}'_{AB} \cong \mathcal{H}_{AB}$ a copy of \mathcal{H}_{AB} . The state $|\gamma\rangle := \sum_i |i\rangle \otimes |i\rangle$ is the (unnormalized) fully entangled state on $\mathcal{H}_{AB} \otimes \mathcal{H}'_{AB}$. We define a purification $|\phi\rangle := (\sqrt{\rho_{AB}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{AB})|\gamma\rangle$ of ρ_{AB} . To simplify notation, we use $\beta := \alpha - 1$ as well as $X := \rho_{AB} \otimes (\mathbb{1} \otimes \rho_B^{-1})^T$.

We will use Theorem 6 to get a bound on the min-entropy, so it remains to find a lower bound to

$$H_\alpha(A|B)_{\rho|_\rho} = -\frac{1}{\beta} \log \langle\phi|X^\beta|\phi\rangle \geq \frac{1}{\beta \ln 2} (1 - \langle\phi|X^\beta|\phi\rangle)$$

for small $\beta > 0$ (we used that $\ln x \leq x - 1$ for all $x > 0$). We now expand the exponential t^β for each eigenvalue t of X as follows: $t^\beta = 1 + \beta \ln t + r_\beta(t)$, where $r_\beta(t) := t^\beta - \beta \ln t - 1$. This leads us to

$$\begin{aligned} H_\alpha(A|B)_{\rho|_\rho} &\geq \frac{1}{\beta \ln 2} \left(-\beta \langle\phi|\ln X|\phi\rangle - \langle\phi|r_\beta(X)|\phi\rangle \right) \\ &= H(A|B)_\rho - \frac{1}{\beta \ln 2} \langle\phi|r_\beta(X)|\phi\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

To simplify this further, we note that

$$r_\beta(t) \leq 2(\cosh(\beta \ln t) - 1) =: s_\beta(t).$$

It is easy to verify that s_β is monotonically increasing for $t \geq 1$ and concave in t for $\beta \leq 1/2$ and $t \in [3, \infty)$. Taylor's theorem and an expansion around $\beta = 0$ gives us an upper bound on s_β : $s_\beta(t) \leq \beta^2 (\ln t)^2 \cosh(\beta \ln t)$. Furthermore, we have $s_\beta(t) = s_\beta(\frac{1}{t})$ and $s_\beta(t^2) = s_{2\beta}(t)$. We use this to write⁵

$$\begin{aligned} s_\beta(t) &\leq s_\beta\left(t + \frac{1}{t} + 2\right) = s_{2\beta}(\sqrt{t} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}) \\ &\leq s_{2\beta}(\sqrt{t} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} + 1). \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Next, we apply (23) to the scalar product in (22) and use the fact that the operator $\sqrt{X} + 1/\sqrt{X} + \mathbb{1}$ has its eigenvalues in $[3, \infty)$ together with Lemma 8:

$$\langle\phi|r_\beta(X)|\phi\rangle \leq \langle\phi|s_{2\beta}(\sqrt{X} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{X}} + \mathbb{1})|\phi\rangle \leq s_{2\beta}(\gamma), \quad (24)$$

⁵ Adaptions of this step lead to different bounds. Here, we are interested in a bound that can be expressed in terms of H_{\max} .

where we introduced the single-system entropy contribution $\gamma = \langle \phi | \sqrt{X} + 1/\sqrt{X} + \mathbb{1} | \phi \rangle$. We now introduce a factor $\mu \geq 0$ and will determine the μ that gives the tightest bound later. We choose β inversely proportional to \sqrt{n} and the optimization factor μ and require an upper bound on β as follows:

$$\beta = \frac{1}{2\mu\sqrt{n}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{5}{8}} \cdot \frac{1}{2\log\gamma} \leq \min\left\{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2\log\gamma}\right\}, \quad (25)$$

where the second inequality follows from $\gamma \geq 3$. We bound $s_{2\beta}(\gamma)$ in (24) and use (25) to simplify the expression further:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\beta \ln 2} \langle \phi | r_\beta(X) | \phi \rangle &\leq \frac{1}{\beta \ln 2} (2\beta)^2 \ln^2 \gamma \cosh(2\beta \ln \gamma) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\mu\sqrt{n}} \log^2 \gamma \cosh(\ln 2) \ln 2 \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\mu\sqrt{n}} \log^2 \gamma. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

With these results in mind, we bound the min-entropy

$$\frac{1}{n} H_{\min}^\varepsilon(A^n | B^n)_{\rho^{\otimes n}} \geq \frac{1}{n} H_{\min}^\varepsilon(A^n | B^n)_{\rho^{\otimes n} | \rho^{\otimes n}}. \quad (27)$$

We apply Theorem 6 and use the additivity property (16) of the α -entropy to bound the rhs. of (27):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rhs.} &\geq \frac{1}{n} H_\alpha(A^n | B^n)_{\rho^{\otimes n} | \rho^{\otimes n}} - \frac{1}{n\beta} \log \frac{2}{\varepsilon^2} \\ &= H_\alpha(A|B)_{\rho | \rho} - \frac{2\mu}{\sqrt{n}} \log \frac{2}{\varepsilon^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, using (22) and (26), we find

$$\text{rhs.} \geq H(A|B)_\rho - \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\mu \log \frac{2}{\varepsilon^2} + \frac{1}{\mu} \log^2 \gamma \right). \quad (28)$$

We want to choose μ such that it minimizes the expression $\mu \log \frac{2}{\varepsilon^2} + \mu^{-1} \log^2 \gamma$. However, condition (25) restricts the choice of μ for fixed n , hence, the error term δ is in general a function of n . For large enough n the optimum μ_* can be reached and we get:

$$\mu_* = \sqrt{\frac{\log^2 \gamma}{\log \frac{2}{\varepsilon^2}}} \quad \text{for } n \geq \frac{8 \log^2 \gamma}{5 \mu_*^2} = \frac{8}{5} \log \frac{2}{\varepsilon^2}.$$

We substitute this result into (28) to get (21).

It remains to evaluate γ , which we do as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &= \text{tr}(\rho_{AB}^{3/2} (\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \rho_B)^{-1/2}) + \text{tr}(\rho_{AB}^{1/2} (\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \rho_B)^{1/2}) + 1 \\ &= \sqrt{2^{-H_{3/2}(A|B)_{\rho | \rho}}} + \sqrt{2^{H_{1/2}(A|B)_{\rho | \rho}}} + 1. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Let ρ_{ABC} be a purification of ρ_{AB} , then, using the sub-additivity (17) and duality property (18) of the α -entropy, we get

$$\begin{aligned} -H_{3/2}(A|B)_{\rho | \rho} &\leq -H_{3/2}(A|BC)_{\rho | \rho} \\ &= H_{1/2}(A)_\rho. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Finally, we bound γ using (15) and (30), which concludes the proof. \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 Theorem 7 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 result⁶. The max-entropy relation (7) follows after we substitute the duals of the smooth min-entropy (cf. Lemma 3) and the von Neumann entropy⁷ into (6). \square

Acknowledgments

We thank Johan Åberg, Nilanjana Datta, Milán Mosonyi and Jürg Wullschleger for comments.

APPENDIX A: TECHNICAL RESULTS

Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space and $|\phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$. The following lemma is a simple application of Jensen's inequality:

Lemma 8. *Let f be a convex function on $[a, b]$ and X an operator on \mathcal{H} s.t. $a\mathbb{1} \leq X \leq b\mathbb{1}$. Then,*

$$\langle \phi | f(X) | \phi \rangle \geq f(\langle \phi | X | \phi \rangle).$$

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 $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}'$. Then, for any continuous function $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and operators $A \geq 0, B > 0$ on \mathcal{H} , we define

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

where $(\cdot)^T$ denotes the transpose with respect to $\{|i\rangle\}_i$. The following lemma, originally proven by Petz [18], establishes the monotonicity of certain functionals S_f under trace-preserving completely positive maps (TP-CPMs) and is of independent use in quantum information theory (see e.g. [11, 13]).

Lemma 9. *Let f be operator convex⁸ on $[0, \infty)$ with $f(0) = 0$ and let \mathcal{E} be a TP-CPM, then for all operators $A \geq 0, B > 0$ on \mathcal{H} :*

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

⁶ We also use the continuity of the von Neumann entropy under small perturbations of the state (cf. Fannes' inequality in [7]). 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 .

⁷ For $\rho_{ABC} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{ABC})$ pure, we have $H(A|B) = -H(A|C)$.

⁸ 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 .

Proof. Every TP-CPM can be expressed as a unitary map on an enlarged space followed by a partial trace (cf. [7], Section 8.2). Hence, the statement of the lemma follows when the following three conditions are met:

1. For any auxiliary Hilbert space $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$ and $|\psi\rangle \in \bar{\mathcal{H}}$, we have $S_f(A, B) = S_f(A \otimes |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|, B \otimes |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$.
2. For any unitary U on \mathcal{H} , we have $S_f(A, B) = S_f(UAU^\dagger, UBU^\dagger)$.
3. For any bipartite Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$, we have $S_f(A, B) \geq S_f(A_1, B_1)$, where $A_1 = \text{tr}_2(A)$ and $B_1 = \text{tr}_2(B)$.

We will repeatedly use the fact that $\langle\gamma|A \otimes \mathbb{1}|\gamma\rangle = \text{tr}(A)$ and $(A \otimes \mathbb{1})|\gamma\rangle = (\mathbb{1} \otimes A^T)|\gamma\rangle$. Furthermore, $f(0) = 0$ implies $f(A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|) = f(A) \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|$. Conditions 1 and 2 are easy to verify. To verify condition 3, we introduce $\mathcal{H}'_1 \cong \mathcal{H}_1$ and the (unnormalized) fully entangled state $|\gamma\rangle_1$ on $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}'_1$. It remains to show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle\gamma|(\sqrt{B} \otimes \mathbb{1})f(B^{-1} \otimes A^T)(\sqrt{B} \otimes \mathbb{1})|\gamma\rangle \\ & \geq \langle\gamma|(\sqrt{B_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_1)f(B_1^{-1} \otimes A_1^T)(\sqrt{B_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_1)|\gamma\rangle_1. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

Let us define a map $\nu : \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}'_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}'$ by

$$\nu : (\sqrt{B_1} \otimes D_1)|\gamma\rangle_1 \mapsto (\sqrt{B} \otimes D_1 \otimes \mathbb{1}_2)|\gamma\rangle, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where D_1 is an endomorphism on \mathcal{H}'_1 . First, note that ν is well defined since, for every $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}'_1$, there exists a D_1^Ψ s.t. $|\Psi\rangle = \sqrt{B_1} \otimes D_1^\Psi|\gamma\rangle_1$. Next, we show that ν is an isometry. The map is linear, hence, it suffices to show that, for all endomorphisms D_1 ,

$$\|(\sqrt{B_1} \otimes D_1)|\gamma\rangle_1\|_1^2 = \|(\sqrt{B} \otimes D_1 \otimes \mathbb{1}_2)|\gamma\rangle\|_1^2.$$

To verify this, note that the rhs. evaluates to

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\gamma|B \otimes D_1^\dagger D_1 \otimes \mathbb{1}_2|\gamma\rangle &= \text{tr}(B(D_1^\dagger D_1 \otimes \mathbb{1}_2)^T) \\ &= \text{tr}(B_1(D_1^\dagger D_1)^T) \\ &= \langle\gamma|B_1 \otimes D_1^\dagger D_1|\gamma\rangle_1. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we show that $\nu^\dagger(B^{-1} \otimes A^T)\nu = B_1^{-1} \otimes A_1^T$ by determining its action on arbitrary states. The scalar product with $|\Psi\rangle$ and $|\Phi\rangle$ of the rhs. evaluates to

$$\langle\Psi|B_1^{-1} \otimes A_1^T|\Phi\rangle = \langle\gamma|\mathbb{1}_1 \otimes D_1^{\Psi\dagger} A_1^T D_1^\Phi|\gamma\rangle_1 = \text{tr}(A_1^T D_1^\Phi D_1^{\Psi\dagger}),$$

whereas the lhs. evaluates to

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle\Psi|\nu^\dagger(B^{-1} \otimes A^T)\nu|\Phi\rangle \\ &= \langle\gamma|\mathbb{1} \otimes ((D_1^{\Psi\dagger} \otimes \mathbb{1}_2)A^T(D_1^\Phi \otimes \mathbb{1}_2))|\gamma\rangle \\ &= \text{tr}(A^T((D_1^\Phi D_1^{\Psi\dagger}) \otimes \mathbb{1}_2)) \\ &= \text{tr}(A_1^T D_1^\Phi D_1^{\Psi\dagger}). \end{aligned}$$

If f is operator convex on $[0, \infty)$ and ν an isomorphism into $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}'$, then, for all $C \geq 0$ on $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}'$: $\nu^\dagger f(C)\nu \geq$

$f(\nu^\dagger C \nu)$ (cf. Theorem V.2.3 in [17] and [19]). Applied to the situation at hand:

$$\nu^\dagger f(B^{-1} \otimes A^T)\nu \geq f(\nu^\dagger(B^{-1} \otimes A^T)\nu) = f(B_1^{-1} \otimes A_1^T).$$

Finally, using (A2), we recover (A1) by taking the matrix element for $(\sqrt{B_1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_1)|\gamma\rangle_1$ on both sides of the inequality. \square

APPENDIX B: SELECTED PROOFS

For completeness, we prove various properties of the min-, max- and α -entropies presented in Section II.

*Proof of Lemma 2.*⁹ It is sufficient to prove the first relation, 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 monotonicity¹⁰ of $t \mapsto \log t$ (cf. Chapter V in [17]), we find that the remaining term is positive. \square

Proof of Lemma 3. 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, we define an ε -ball $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^\varepsilon(\rho_{AB})$ of states around ρ_{AB} that are close on the purified space:

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

where ρ_{ABC} is an arbitrary purification of ρ_{AB} . The monotonicity of the quantum fidelity under partial trace gives $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^\varepsilon(\rho_{AB}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_{AB})$. Then, using Uhlmann's theorem (Theorem 9.4 in [7]), it follows that every state $\tilde{\rho}_{AB} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_{AB})$ has a purification $\tilde{\rho}_{ABC} \in \mathcal{B}_*^\varepsilon(\rho_{ABC})$, and

⁹ See also Lemma 10 in [20] 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 [20] is related to another definition of H_{\max} (cf. Footnote 2 in Section II).

¹⁰ 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 .

so $\mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_{AB}) \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^\varepsilon(\rho_{AB})$. Hence, the two sets are equal and

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

□

Proof of Lemma 4. Using the (unnormalized) fully entangled state $|\gamma\rangle$ as in Appendix A, we define a purification $|\phi\rangle := (\sqrt{\rho_{AB}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{AB})|\gamma\rangle$ of ρ_{AB} . Furthermore, we set $\beta := \alpha - 1$ and $X := \rho_{AB} \otimes (\mathbb{1} \otimes \sigma_B^{-1})^T$. It is easy to verify that

$$\begin{aligned} H_\alpha(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma} &= -\frac{1}{\beta} \log \langle \phi | X^\beta | \phi \rangle \quad \text{and} \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} H_\alpha(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma} &= \frac{1}{\beta^2} \log \langle \phi | X^\beta | \phi \rangle - \frac{1}{\beta} \frac{\langle \phi | X^\beta \log X | \phi \rangle}{\langle \phi | X^\beta | \phi \rangle} \\ &= \frac{f(\langle \phi | X^\beta | \phi \rangle) - \langle \phi | f(X^\beta) | \phi \rangle}{\beta^2 \langle \phi | X^\beta | \phi \rangle}. \end{aligned}$$

The statement of the lemma then follows from the convexity of $f : t \mapsto t \log t$ and Lemma 8. □

Proof of Lemma 5. The proof is a simple application of Lemma 9, where we choose the partial trace over \mathcal{H}_C as a TP-CPM. In the von Neumann limit, we write

$$\begin{aligned} H(A|BC)_{\rho|\sigma} &= S_h(\rho_{ABC}, \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_{BC}) \\ &\leq S_h(\rho_{AB}, \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B) = H(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $h : t \mapsto -t \log t$ is operator concave on $[0, \infty)$ (cf. Chapter V in [17]). Similarly,

$$(1 - \alpha)H_\alpha(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma} = \log S_{g_\alpha}(\rho_{AB}, \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B),$$

where $g_\alpha : t \mapsto t^\alpha$ on $[0, \infty)$ is operator concave for $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and operator convex for $\alpha \in (1, 2]$ (cf. Chapter V in [17]). The statement of the lemma then follows from the same argument as above. □

APPENDIX C: ESTIMATE OF $H_{\min}^\varepsilon(A|B)_\rho$

The following lemma gives an estimate of the smooth min-entropy $H_{\min}^\varepsilon(A|B)_\rho$ (see also [21]):

Lemma 10. *Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$, $\sigma_B \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ s.t. $\text{supp}\{\sigma_B\} \supseteq \text{supp}\{\rho_B\}$ and $\lambda > 0$, then*

$$H_{\min}^\varepsilon(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma} \geq -\log \lambda, \quad \varepsilon = \sqrt{2 \text{tr}(\Delta)}, \quad (\text{C1})$$

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

Proof. We first choose $\tilde{\rho}_{AB}$, bound $H_{\min}(A|B)_{\tilde{\rho}|\sigma}$ and then show that $\tilde{\rho}_{AB} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_{AB})$. We use the abbreviated notation $\Lambda := \lambda \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B$ and set

$$\tilde{\rho}_{AB} := G \rho_{AB} G^\dagger, \quad G := \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} (\Lambda + \Delta)^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

From the definition of Δ , we have $\rho_{AB} \leq \Lambda + \Delta$; hence, $\tilde{\rho}_{AB} \leq \Lambda$ and $H_{\min}(A|B)_{\tilde{\rho}|\sigma} \geq -\log \lambda$.

Let $|\psi\rangle$ be a purification of ρ_{AB} , then $(G \otimes \mathbb{1})|\psi\rangle$ is a purification of $\tilde{\rho}_{AB}$ and, using Uhlmann's theorem, we find a bound on the fidelity:

$$F(\rho_{AB}, \tilde{\rho}_{AB}) \geq |\langle \psi | G | \psi \rangle| \geq \Re\{\text{tr}(G \rho_{AB})\} = \text{tr}(\bar{G} \rho_{AB}),$$

where we introduced $\bar{G} := \frac{1}{2}(G + G^\dagger)$. Hence,

$$C(\rho_{AB}, \tilde{\rho}_{AB}) \leq \sqrt{(1 + \text{tr}(\bar{G} \rho_{AB}))(1 - \text{tr}(\bar{G} \rho_{AB}))}.$$

This can be simplified further after we note that G is a contraction.¹¹ To see this, we multiply $\Lambda \leq \Lambda + \Delta$ with $(\Lambda + \Delta)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ from left and right and get

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

Furthermore, $\bar{G} \leq \mathbb{1}_{AB}$, since $\|\bar{G}\| \leq 1$ by the triangle inequality and $\|G\| = \|G^\dagger\| \leq 1$. Clearly, $\text{tr}(\bar{G} \rho_{AB}) \leq 1$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \text{tr}(\bar{G} \rho_{AB}) &= \text{tr}((\mathbb{1}_{AB} - \bar{G}) \rho_{AB}) \\ &\leq \text{tr}(\Lambda + \Delta) - \text{tr}(\bar{G}(\Lambda + \Delta)) \\ &\leq \text{tr}(\Lambda + \Delta) - \text{tr}((\Lambda + \Delta)^{1/2} \Lambda^{1/2}) \\ &\leq \text{tr}(\Delta), \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\rho_{AB} \leq \Lambda + \Delta$ and $\sqrt{\Lambda + \Delta} \geq \sqrt{\Lambda}$. The latter inequality follows from the operator monotonicity of the square root function (Proposition V.1.8 in [17]). Finally, $C(\rho_{AB}, \tilde{\rho}_{AB}) \leq \sqrt{2 \text{tr}(\Delta)} = \varepsilon$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{AB} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_{AB})$. □

¹¹ A contraction G is an operator with operator norm $\|G\| \leq 1$.

-
- [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] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- [8] R. Renner, Ph.D. thesis, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich (2005), URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0512258>.
- [9] R. Renner and R. König, in *Second Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2005* (Springer, 2005), vol. 3378 of *LNCS*, pp. 407–425.
- [10] R. König, R. Renner, and C. Schaffner, *The operational meaning of min- and max-entropy* (2008), URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/0807.1338>.
- [11] M. Hayashi, *Quantum Information — An Introduction* (Springer, 2006).
- [12] A. Gilchrist, N. K. Langford, and M. A. Nielsen, *Distance measures to compare real and ideal quantum processes* (2004), URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0408063>.
- [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] M. Mosony and N. Datta, *Generalized relative entropies and the capacity of classical-quantum channels* (2008), URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/0810.3478>.
- [17] R. Bhatia, *Matrix Analysis*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics (Springer, 1997).
- [18] D. Petz, *Reports on Mathematical Physics* **23**, 57 (1984).
- [19] F. Hansen and G. K. Pedersen, *Bulletin of the London Math. Soc.* **35**, 553 (2003).
- [20] N. Datta, *Min- and max- relative entropies and a new entanglement monotone* (2008), URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/0803.2770v1>.
- [21] N. Datta and R. Renner, *Smooth Rényi entropies and the quantum information spectrum* (2008), URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/0801.0282>.