

The Classically-Enhanced Father Protocol

Min-Hsiu Hsieh

*ERATO-SORST Quantum Computation and Information Project,
Japan Science and Technology Agency 5-28-3, Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, Japan*

Mark M. Wilde*

Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, 3 Science Drive 2, Singapore 117543

(Dated: November 19, 2021)

The *classically-enhanced father protocol* is an optimal protocol for a sender to transmit both classical and quantum information to a receiver by exploiting preshared entanglement and a large number of independent uses of a noisy quantum channel. We detail the proof of a quantum Shannon theorem that gives the three-dimensional capacity region containing all achievable rates that the classically-enhanced father protocol obtains. Points in the capacity region are *rate triples* consisting of the classical communication rate, the quantum communication rate, and the entanglement consumption rate of a particular coding scheme. The classically-enhanced father protocol is more general than any other protocol in the family tree of quantum Shannon theoretic protocols. Several previously known quantum protocols are now child protocols of the classically-enhanced father protocol. Interestingly, the classically-enhanced father protocol gives insight for constructing optimal classically-enhanced entanglement-assisted quantum error-correcting codes.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Hk, 03.67.Pp

Keywords: entanglement-assisted classical-quantum coding, classically-enhanced father protocol

I. INTRODUCTION

One can argue that the most important breakthroughs in quantum Shannon theory were the quantum source coding theorem [1] and the quantum channel coding theorem [2, 3, 4]. The result of the quantum source coding theorem is a formula that determines the ultimate compressibility of quantum information. The result of the quantum channel coding theorem is a formula, though generally incomputable, for the capacity of a quantum channel for transmitting quantum information with high fidelity.

Quantum communication is not the only resource available in quantum information theory. Classical communication and entanglement play fundamental roles as well. An important question is then how one might combine all three different resources in an optimal way. Previous work has addressed the optimal trade-offs for source coding both quantum and classical information with the aid of entanglement [5], but no one has yet considered the triple trade-offs for channel coding.

Quantum information theorists have organized protocols that exploit the different resources of quantum communication, classical communication, and entanglement into a family tree [6, 7, 8, 9]. One member of the tree is the *father protocol* [6, 7]. It gives the optimal rates for quantum communication and entanglement consumption when a sender and receiver have access to shared entanglement and a large number of independent uses of a noisy quantum channel. The father protocol is so named

because it generates several “child” protocols using the theory of resource inequalities [6, 7].

In this article, we begin the investigation of the optimal trade-offs for channel coding both quantum and classical information with the assistance of entanglement. We extend the family tree of quantum Shannon theory by developing the *classically-enhanced father protocol* [32]. This protocol is more general than any of the existing protocols in the tree. The protocol achieves optimal limiting rates in a three-dimensional capacity region. We dub this protocol the “classically-enhanced father protocol” because it is an extension of the father protocol and it generates two child protocols in the sense of Refs. [6, 7]. Its two child protocols are classically-enhanced quantum communication [10] and entanglement-assisted classical communication [11, 12, 13].

A benefit of the classically-enhanced father protocol is that it provides a hint for the design of optimal classically-enhanced entanglement-assisted quantum error-correcting codes [14, 15]. We give evidence in Section VIII C that it is possible to achieve optimal performance without encoding classical information into the entanglement shared between the sender and receiver.

We structure this article as follows. In the next section, we give some definitions and establish notation used in the remainder of the article. Section III provides a description of the classically-enhanced father protocol. We then state the main capacity theorem, Theorem 1, in Section IV and show how the classically-enhanced quantum capacity region [10] and the father capacity region [7] are special cases of the classically-enhanced father capacity region. We prove the converse of Theorem 1 in Section V and prove the direct-coding part of Theorem 1 in Section VI. Our article ends with a discussion of the

*Electronic address: mark.wilde@alumni.usc.edu

child protocols that the classically-enhanced father protocol generates and we pose several open problems related to time-sharing, “single-letterization” of our results, and ways to recover the “full triple trade-off” for coding classical and quantum information with entanglement assistance.

II. DEFINITIONS AND NOTATION

The ensemble $\{p(x), \psi_x^{ABE}\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$, where each state ψ_x^{ABE} is a pure tripartite state, proves to be essential in the ensuing analysis of this article. The *coherent information* $I(A)B)_{\psi_x}$ of each state ψ_x^{ABE} in the ensemble is as follows:

$$I(A)B)_{\psi_x} \equiv H(B)_{\psi_x} - H(AB)_{\psi_x},$$

where $H(B)_{\psi_x}$ is the von Neumann entropy of the reduction of the state ψ_x^{ABE} to the system B with a similar definition for $H(AB)_{\psi_x}$. The *quantum mutual information* $I(A; B)_{\psi_x}$ of each state ψ_x^{ABE} is as follows:

$$I(A; B)_{\psi_x} \equiv H(A)_{\psi_x} + I(A)B)_{\psi_x}.$$

We can classically correlate states in some system X with each state ψ_x^{ABE} to produce an augmented ensemble

$$\left\{ p(x), |x\rangle \langle x|^X \otimes \psi_x^{ABE} \right\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}},$$

where the set $\{|x\rangle\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ is some preferred orthonormal basis for the auxiliary system X . The expected density operator of this augmented ensemble is the following classical-quantum state:

$$\sigma^{XABE} \equiv \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p(x) |x\rangle \langle x|^X \otimes \psi_x^{ABE}.$$

The *Holevo information* of the classical variable X with the quantum system B is $I(X; B)_\sigma$. For the special case of a classical system X , taking the expectation of some of the above entropic quantities with respect to the density $p(x)$ gives the respective conditional entropy $H(A|X)_\sigma$, conditional coherent information $I(A)B|X)_\sigma$, and conditional mutual information $I(A; B|X)_\sigma$:

$$\begin{aligned} H(A|X)_\sigma &\equiv \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p(x) H(A)_{\psi_x}, \\ I(A)B|X)_\sigma &\equiv \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p(x) I(A)B)_{\psi_x}, \\ I(A; B|X)_\sigma &\equiv \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p(x) I(A; B)_{\psi_x}. \end{aligned}$$

One can easily prove that $I(A)B|X)_\sigma = I(A)BX)_\sigma$. We use the notation $I(A)BX)_\sigma$ for conditional coherent information in what follows. The above definitions lead to

the following useful identities:

$$H(A|X) = \frac{I(A; B|X)}{2} + \frac{I(A; E|X)}{2}, \quad (1)$$

$$I(A)BX) = \frac{I(A; B|X)}{2} - \frac{I(A; E|X)}{2}. \quad (2)$$

Proving the above identities is a simple matter of noting that the von Neumann entropy is equal for the reduced systems of a pure bipartite state. Adding the above identities gives the following one:

$$H(A|X) + I(A)BX) = I(A; B|X). \quad (3)$$

The chain rule for quantum mutual information proves to be useful as well:

$$I(AX; B) = I(A; B|X) + I(X; B). \quad (4)$$

All of the above information quantities possess operational interpretations in the theorems in this article.

A noisy quantum channel $\mathcal{N}^{A' \rightarrow B}$ acts as a completely-positive trace-preserving (CPTP) map. It takes a quantum system A' as an input and produces a noisy output quantum system B .

A *conditional quantum encoder* $\mathcal{E}^{MA \rightarrow B}$, or *conditional quantum channel* [16], is a collection $\{\mathcal{E}_m^{A \rightarrow B}\}_m$ of CPTP maps. Its inputs are a classical system M and a quantum system A and its output is a quantum system B . A classical-quantum state ρ^{MA} , where

$$\rho^{MA} \equiv \sum_m p(m) |m\rangle \langle m|^M \otimes \rho_m^A,$$

can act as an input to the conditional quantum encoder $\mathcal{E}^{MA \rightarrow B}$. The action of the conditional quantum encoder $\mathcal{E}^{MA \rightarrow B}$ on the classical-quantum state ρ^{MA} is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{E}^{MA \rightarrow B}(\rho^{MA}) \\ &= \text{Tr}_M \left\{ \sum_m p(m) |m\rangle \langle m|^M \otimes \mathcal{E}_m^{A \rightarrow B}(\rho_m^A) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is actually possible to write *any* quantum channel as a conditional quantum encoder when its input is a classical-quantum state [16]. In this article, a conditional quantum encoder functions as the sender Alice’s encoder of classical and quantum information.

A *quantum instrument* $\mathcal{D}^{A \rightarrow BM}$ is a CPTP map whose input is a quantum system A and whose outputs are a quantum system B and a classical system M [7, 16]. A collection $\{\mathcal{D}_m^{A \rightarrow B}\}_m$ of completely-positive trace-reducing maps specifies the instrument $\mathcal{D}^{A \rightarrow BM}$. The action of the instrument $\mathcal{D}^{A \rightarrow BM}$ on an arbitrary input state ρ is as follows:

$$\mathcal{D}^{A \rightarrow BM}(\rho^A) = \sum_m \mathcal{D}_m^{A \rightarrow B}(\rho^A) \otimes |m\rangle \langle m|^M. \quad (5)$$

Tracing out the classical register M gives the induced quantum operation $\mathcal{D}^{A \rightarrow B}$ where

$$\mathcal{D}^{A \rightarrow B}(\rho^A) \equiv \sum_m \mathcal{D}_m^{A \rightarrow B}(\rho^A).$$

This sum map is trace preserving:

$$\text{Tr} \left\{ \sum_m \mathcal{D}_m^{A \rightarrow B} (\rho^A) \right\} = 1.$$

We can think of the following quantity

$$p(m) \equiv \text{Tr} \{ \mathcal{D}_m^{A \rightarrow B} (\rho^A) \},$$

as a probability $p(m)$ of receiving the classical message m . In this article, a quantum instrument functions as Bob's decoder of classical and quantum information.

We note some other points before beginning. The trace norm $\|A\|_1$ of an operator A is as follows:

$$\|A\|_1 \equiv \text{Tr} \left\{ \sqrt{A^\dagger A} \right\}.$$

The maximally entangled state on system T_A and T_B is $\Phi^{T_A T_B}$. The omission of a superscript implies a reduced state, e.g., the state Φ^{T_A} is the reduced state of $\Phi^{T_A T_B}$ on T_A . Yard's thesis [16] provides a good introduction to quantum Shannon theory, and we point the reader there for properties such as strong subadditivity and the quantum data processing inequality.

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE CLASSICALLY-ENHANCED FATHER PROTOCOL

We begin by defining the classically-enhanced father protocol for a quantum channel from a sender Alice to a receiver Bob. Alice would like to communicate two items to Bob:

1. An arbitrary quantum state ρ^{A_1} in a system A_1 with dimension 2^{nQ} .
2. One of 2^{nR} classical messages.

Alice and Bob also share entanglement in the form of a maximally entangled state $\Phi^{T_A T_B}$ prior to communication. Alice possesses the system T_A , Bob possesses the system T_B , and the dimension of each system is 2^{nE} . We can think of this state as possessing nE "gold standard" ebits in the state $|\Phi^+\rangle$. Alice performs a conditional quantum encoder $\mathcal{E}^{M A_1 T_A \rightarrow A'^n}$ that encodes both her quantum systems A_1 and T_A and the classical message in system M . The encoding operation $\mathcal{E}^{M A_1 T_A \rightarrow A'^n}$ prepares a system A'^n for input to a noisy quantum channel $\mathcal{N}^{A'^n \rightarrow B^n}$. The channel $\mathcal{N}^{A'^n \rightarrow B^n}$ represents n independent uses of the noisy quantum channel $\mathcal{N}^{A' \rightarrow B}$:

$$\mathcal{N}^{A'^n \rightarrow B^n} \equiv \left(\mathcal{N}^{A' \rightarrow B} \right)^{\otimes n}.$$

She then sends her state through the quantum channel $\mathcal{N}^{A'^n \rightarrow B^n}$. Bob receives the system B^n and performs




FIG. 1: (Color online) The above figure depicts a general classically-enhanced father protocol. A sender Alice would like to communicate the quantum information in system A_1 and the classical information in system X . Her system T_A represents shared maximal entanglement with the receiver's system T_B . Alice encodes her information and uses the noisy channel a large number of times. The environment Eve obtains part of the output and the receiver Bob obtains the other part. Bob combines his received systems with his half of the entanglement and performs a decoding operation to recover both the classical and quantum information.

a decoding instrument $\mathcal{D}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E \hat{M}}$ on the channel output B^n and his half of the entanglement T_B . The instrument $\mathcal{D}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E \hat{M}}$ produces a system B_1 with the quantum information that Alice sent, a classical register \hat{M} containing Alice's classical message, and another system B_E that does not contain any useful information. Bob should be able to identify the classical message with high probability and recover the state ρ^{A_1} with high fidelity. Figure 1 provides a detailed illustration of this protocol.

It is useful to consider the isometric extension $U_{\mathcal{N}}^{A' \rightarrow BE}$ of the channel $\mathcal{N}^{A' \rightarrow B}$ where Alice controls the channel input system A' , Bob has access to the channel output system B , and the environment Eve has access to the system E . For an independent and identically distributed (IID) channel $\mathcal{N}^{A' \rightarrow B^n}$ as defined above, we write its isometric extension as $U_{\mathcal{N}}^{A'^n \rightarrow B^n E^n}$. Also, it is useful to think of Alice's quantum system ρ^{A_1} as a restriction of some pure state $\varphi^{R A_1}$ where Alice does not have access to the purification system R .

We formalize the classically-enhanced father quantum information processing task as follows. Define an (n, R, Q, E, ϵ) classically-enhanced father code by

- Alice's conditional quantum encoder $\mathcal{E}^{M A_1 T_A \rightarrow A'^n}$ with encoding maps $\{\mathcal{E}_m^{A_1 T_A \rightarrow A'^n}\}_{m \in [2^{nR}]}$. This encoder encodes both her quantum information and classical information. Define the following states

for each classical message m :

$$\omega_m^{RA^n T_B} \equiv \mathcal{E}_m^{A_1 T_A \rightarrow A'^n} (\varphi^{RA_1} \otimes \Phi^{T_A T_B}), \quad (6)$$

where the dimension of system A_1 is 2^{nQ} and the dimension of system T_A is 2^{nE} . The density operator that includes the classical register M and averages over all classical messages is as follows:

$$\omega^{MRA^n T_B} \equiv \frac{1}{M} \sum_m |m\rangle \langle m|^M \otimes \omega_m^{RA^n T_B}. \quad (7)$$

The output of the channel given that Alice sent classical message m is then as follows:

$$\omega_m^{RB^n E^n T_B} \equiv U_{\mathcal{N}}^{A'^n \rightarrow B^n E^n} \left(\omega_m^{RA^n T_B} \right).$$

The average output of the channel is as follows:

$$\omega^{MRB^n E^n T_B} \equiv U_{\mathcal{N}}^{A'^n \rightarrow B^n E^n} \left(\omega^{MRA^n T_B} \right). \quad (8)$$

- Bob's decoding instrument $\mathcal{D}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E \hat{M}}$, whose action is defined in (5), is a collection of completely positive trace reducing maps $\{\mathcal{D}_m^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E}\}_{m \in [2^{nR}]}$. The decoding instrument decodes both the quantum information and classical information that Alice sends. The density operator corresponding to Bob's output state is as follows:

$$\omega^{MRB_1 B_E \hat{M} E^n} \equiv \mathcal{D}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E \hat{M}} \left(\omega^{MRB^n E^n T_B} \right).$$

The classical probability of successful transmission of message m is as follows:

$$\Pr\{\hat{M} = m \mid M = m\} = \text{Tr}\{(\mathcal{D}_m^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E})(\omega_m^{RB^n E^n T_B})\},$$

where \hat{M} denotes the random variable corresponding to Bob's received classical message. The final state on the reference system R and Bob's quantum system B_1 is Υ^{RB_1} where

$$\Upsilon^{RB_1} \equiv \text{Tr}_{\hat{M} B_E E^n} \{ \mathcal{D}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E \hat{M}} (\omega_m^{RB^n E^n T_B}) \}.$$

For the (n, R, Q, E, ϵ) classically-enhanced father code to be " ϵ -good," the following two conditions should hold for all classical messages $m \in [2^{nR}]$:

1. Bob decodes any of the classical messages m with high probability

$$\Pr\{\hat{M} = m \mid M = m\} \geq 1 - \epsilon, \quad (9)$$

2. The state Υ^{RB_1} should be ϵ -close to the ideal state φ^{RB_1} :

$$\|\Upsilon^{RB_1} - \varphi^{RB_1}\|_1 \leq \epsilon, \quad (10)$$

so that Bob recovers the quantum information in system A_1 with high fidelity.

A rate triple (R, Q, E) is *achievable* if there exists an $(n, R - \delta, Q - \delta, E + \delta, \epsilon)$ classically-enhanced father code for any $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ and sufficiently large n . The capacity region $C(\mathcal{N})$ is a three-dimensional region containing all achievable rate triples (R, Q, E) .

IV. CLASSICALLY-ENHANCED FATHER CAPACITY THEOREM

We now state our main theorem.

Theorem 1 *The capacity region $C(\mathcal{N})$ of an entanglement-assisted quantum channel \mathcal{N} for simultaneously transmitting both quantum information and classical information is equal to the following expression:*

$$C(\mathcal{N}) = \overline{\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} C^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n})}, \quad (11)$$

where \overline{Z} is the closure of a set Z . The "one-shot" region $C^{(1)}(\mathcal{N})$ is the set of all $R, Q, E \geq 0$, such that

$$R \leq I(X; B)_\sigma, \quad (12)$$

$$Q \leq E + I(A)BX)_\sigma, \quad (13)$$

$$Q \leq \frac{1}{2} I(A; B|X)_\sigma. \quad (14)$$

The above entropic quantities are with respect to a "one-shot" quantum state $\sigma^{XABEE'}$ where

$$\sigma^{XABEE'} \equiv \sum_x p(x) |x\rangle \langle x|^X \otimes U_{\mathcal{N}}^{A' \rightarrow BE} (\phi_x^{AA'E'}), \quad (15)$$

and the states $\phi_x^{AA'E'}$ are pure [33] and it is sufficient to consider $|\mathcal{X}| \leq \min\{|A'|, |B|\}^2 + 1$ by the method in Ref. [17].

Proving that the above theorem holds consists of proving it in two steps, traditionally called the *direct coding theorem* and the *converse*. For our case, the *direct coding theorem* proves that the region corresponding to the right hand side of (11) is an achievable rate region. It constructs a classically-enhanced father protocol whose rates are in the region of the right hand side of (11) and shows that its fidelity of quantum communication is high and its probability of error of classical communication is small. The *converse* assumes that a good code with high fidelity and low probability of error exists and shows that the region on the right hand side of (11) bounds the achievable rate region. We prove the converse first in Section V and prove the direct coding theorem in Section VI.

A. Special Cases of the Classically-Enhanced Father Capacity Theorem

We consider two special cases of the above capacity theorem that arise when one of R or E is equal to zero. Each of these special cases traces out a two-dimensional achievable rate region in the three-dimensional capacity region. The coding scenario is entanglement-assisted quantum communication (EAQ) [6, 7] when there is no

classical communication. The achievable rate region for EAQ lies in the $(0, Q, E)$ plane of the three-dimensional region in (11). The coding scenario is classically-enhanced quantum communication (CEQ) [10] when there is no entanglement assistance. The achievable rate region for CEQ lies in the $(R, Q, 0)$ plane of the three-dimensional region in (11).

1. Entanglement-Assisted Quantum Capacity

The following theorem gives the two-dimensional capacity region $C_{EAQ}(\mathcal{N})$ of a quantum channel \mathcal{N} for entanglement-assisted quantum communication [6, 7].

Theorem 2 *The capacity region $C_{EAQ}(\mathcal{N})$ is given by*

$$C_{EAQ}(\mathcal{N}) = \overline{\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} C^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n})}, \quad (16)$$

The “one-shot” region $C^{(1)}(\mathcal{N})$ is the set of all $Q, E \geq 0$, such that

$$Q \leq E + I(A)BX)_{\sigma} \quad (17)$$

$$Q \leq \frac{1}{2} I(A; B|X)_{\sigma}, \quad (18)$$

where the entropic quantities are with respect to the state $\sigma^{XABEE'}$ in (15) with the restriction that the density $p(x)$ is degenerate.

A special case of the above theorem is the quantum capacity theorem [2, 3, 4]. This case occurs when $E = 0$, or equivalently, when there is no entanglement available. The E' register is trivial (not necessary) when determining the quantum capacity because noiseless, isometric encodings are optimal [18].

2. Classically-Enhanced Quantum Capacity

The following theorem gives the two-dimensional capacity region $C_{CEQ}(\mathcal{N})$ for classically-enhanced quantum communication through a quantum channel \mathcal{N} [10].

Theorem 3 *The capacity region $C_{CEQ}(\mathcal{N})$ is given by*

$$C_{CEQ}(\mathcal{N}) = \overline{\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} C^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n})}, \quad (19)$$

The “one-shot” region $C^{(1)}(\mathcal{N})$ is the set of all $R, Q \geq 0$, such that

$$R \leq I(X; B)_{\sigma} \quad (20)$$

$$Q \leq I(A)BX)_{\sigma}, \quad (21)$$

where the entropic quantities are with respect to the state $\sigma^{XABEE'}$ in (15) with the restriction that the E' system is trivial.

A special case of the above capacity region is again the quantum capacity, occurring when there is no classical communication. For this case, we maximize over states of the form stated above with the additional restriction that the density $p(x)$ is degenerate.

V. THE CONVERSE PROOF

Our method for proving the converse of Theorem 1 is first to bound the quantum communicate rate. We get this bound by employing steps that are similar to those in Ref. [7] that prove the optimality of the father protocol. Our method for bounding the classical communication rate is different from the standard technique of using Fano’s inequality [19] and the Holevo bound [20]. We use a method of reasoning similar to that in Ref. [5] that appeals to the optimality of another protocol. Our method is to use some extra entanglement and superdense coding [21] to convert all of the quantum communication to classical communication. We then bound the original classical communication rate with a proof by contradiction that appeals to the optimality of Shor’s capacity theorem for entanglement-assisted classical communication [11].

We now recall both Shor’s capacity theorem and the Alicki-Fannes’ inequality for continuity of coherent information and then proceed to prove the converse.

Theorem 4 *The entanglement-assisted classical capacity region $C_{EAC}(\mathcal{N})$ of a quantum channel \mathcal{N} is equal to the following expression:*

$$C_{EAC}(\mathcal{N}) = \overline{\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} C^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n})}. \quad (22)$$

The “one-shot” region $C^{(1)}(\mathcal{N})$ is the set of all $R, E \geq 0$, such that

$$R \leq I(AX; B)_{\sigma}, \quad (23)$$

$$E \geq H(A|X)_{\sigma}, \quad (24)$$

where the entropic quantities are with respect to the state $\sigma^{XABEE'}$ in (15) with the restriction that the E' system is not necessary.

The E' register is not necessary for this case because isometric encodings are optimal [7, 12].

Theorem 5 (Alicki-Fannes Inequality [22])

Suppose two states ρ^{AB} and σ^{AB} are close:

$$\|\rho^{AB} - \sigma^{AB}\|_1 \leq \epsilon.$$

Then their respective coherent informations are close:

$$|I(A)B)_{\rho} - I(A)B)_{\sigma}| \leq 4\epsilon \log |A| + 2H(\epsilon). \quad (25)$$

$|A|$ is the dimension of the system A and $H(\epsilon)$ is the binary entropy function that has the property $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} H(\epsilon) = 0$.

Proof [Converse] Section III describes the most general classically-enhanced father protocol and this most general case is the one we consider in proving the converse.

Suppose Alice shares the maximally entangled state Φ^{RA_1} with the reference system R (the protocol should be able to transmit the entanglement in state Φ^{RA_1} with ϵ -accuracy if it can approximately transmit the entanglement with system R for any pure state on R and A_1). Alice also shares the maximally entangled state $\Phi^{TA T_B}$ with Bob. Alice combines her quantum state Φ^{RA_1} with the state $\Phi^{TA T_B}$ and the classical register M that contains her classical information. The most general encoding operation that she can perform on her three registers M , A_1 , and T_A is a conditional quantum encoder $\mathcal{E}^{MA_1 T_A \rightarrow A'^n}$ consisting of a collection $\{\mathcal{E}_m^{A_1 T_A \rightarrow A'^n}\}_m$ of CPTP maps. Each element $\mathcal{E}_m^{A_1 T_A \rightarrow A'^n}$ of the conditional quantum encoder produces the following state:

$$\omega_m^{RA'^n E' T_B} \equiv \mathcal{E}_m^{A_1 T_A \rightarrow A'^n E'}(\Phi^{RA_1} \otimes \Phi^{TA T_B}),$$

where we consider the isometric extension $\mathcal{E}_m^{A_1 T_A \rightarrow A'^n E'}$ of each element $\mathcal{E}_m^{A_1 T_A \rightarrow A'^n}$. The average density operator over all classical messages is then as follows:

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_m |m\rangle \langle m|^M \otimes \omega_m^{RA'^n E' T_B}.$$

Alice sends the A'^n system through the noisy channel $U_{\mathcal{N}}^{A'^n \rightarrow B^n E^n}$, producing the following state:

$$\begin{aligned} & \omega^{MRB^n E^n E' T_B} \\ & \equiv \frac{1}{M} \sum_m |m\rangle \langle m|^M \otimes U_{\mathcal{N}}^{A'^n \rightarrow B^n E^n}(\omega_m^{RA'^n E' T_B}). \end{aligned}$$

Define $A \equiv RT_B$ so that the above state is a particular n^{th} extension of the state in (15). The above state is the state at time t in Figure 1. Bob receives the above state and performs a decoding instrument $\mathcal{D}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E \hat{M}}$. The protocol ends at time t_f . Let (ω') be the state at time t_f after Bob processes $\omega^{MRB^n E^n E' T_B}$ with the decoding instrument $\mathcal{D}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E \hat{M}}$.

Suppose that an $(n, R - \delta, Q - \delta, E + \delta, \epsilon)$ classically-enhanced father protocol as given above exists. We prove that the following bounds apply to the elements of its rate triple $(R - \delta, Q - \delta, E + \delta)$:

$$R - \delta \leq \frac{I(M; B^n)_\omega}{n}, \quad (26)$$

$$Q - \delta \leq E + \frac{I(A)B^n M)_\omega}{n}, \quad (27)$$

$$Q - \delta \leq \frac{I(A; B^n | M)_\omega}{2n}, \quad (28)$$

$$E + \delta \geq \frac{I(A; E^n E' | M)_\omega}{2n}, \quad (29)$$

for any $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ and all sufficiently large n .

In the ideal case, the identity channel acts on system A_1 to produce the maximally entangled state Φ^{RB_1} . So for our case, the following inequality

$$\left\| (\omega')^{RB_1} - \Phi^{RB_1} \right\|_1 \leq \epsilon, \quad (30)$$

holds because the protocol is ϵ -good for quantum communication according to the criterion in (10).

We first prove the upper bound in (27) on the quantum communication rate:

$$\begin{aligned} & n(Q - \delta) \\ & = I(R)B_1)_{\Phi^{RB_1}} \\ & \leq I(R)B_1)_{\omega'} + 4nQ\epsilon + H(\epsilon) \\ & \leq I(R)B_1 M)_{\omega'} + 4nQ\epsilon + H(\epsilon) \\ & \leq I(R)B^n T_B M)_\omega + 4nQ\epsilon + H(\epsilon) \\ & \leq I(RT_B)B^n M)_\omega + H(T_B | M)_\omega + 4nQ\epsilon + H(\epsilon) \\ & = I(A)B^n M)_\omega + nE + 4nQ\epsilon + H(\epsilon). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

The first equality follows by evaluating the coherent information for the state Φ^{RB_1} , the first inequality follows from (30) and the Alicki-Fannes' inequality in Theorem 5, the second inequality is from strong subadditivity, the third inequality is quantum data processing, the fourth inequality follows because $H(T_B | B^n M) \leq H(T_B | M)$ (conditioning reduces entropy), and the last equality follows from the definition $A \equiv RT_B$ and the fact that $H(T_B | M)_\omega = nE$ for the state ω . The inequality in (27) follows by redefining δ as $\delta' \equiv \delta + 4Q\epsilon + \frac{H(\epsilon)}{n}$.

We next prove the other upper bound in (28) on the quantum communication rate. The following identity holds for the state ω :

$$H(A|M)_\omega = H(R|M)_\omega + H(T_B|M)_\omega = nQ + nE.$$

Combine (31) with the above identity to give the following chain of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} & nQ - n\delta' \leq I(A)B^n M)_\omega + nE \\ \therefore n(2Q - Q) - n\delta' & \leq I(A)B^n M)_\omega + nE \\ \therefore n2Q - n\delta' & \leq I(A)B^n M)_\omega + H(A|M)_\omega \\ \therefore Q - \frac{\delta'}{2} & \leq \frac{I(A; B^n | M)_\omega}{2n}. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

The last inequality follows by the identity in (3).

We prove the lower bound in (29) on the entanglement consumption rate by using the following identity:

$$\begin{aligned} I(A)B^n M)_\omega & = H(B^n | M)_\omega - H(AB^n | M)_\omega \\ & = H(AE^n E' | M)_\omega - H(E^n E' | M)_\omega. \end{aligned}$$

Combine this identity with the inequality in (31) and the above expression for $H(A|M)_\omega$ to obtain the lower bound in (29):

$$\begin{aligned} & nQ - I(A)B^n M)_\omega \leq n(2E - E) + n\delta' \\ \therefore H(A|M)_\omega - I(A)B^n M)_\omega & \leq n2E + n\delta' \\ \therefore \frac{I(A; E^n E' | M)_\omega}{2n} & \leq E + \frac{\delta'}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

We now prove the upper bound in (26) on the classical communication rate R . First let us suppose that Alice and Bob have some extra entanglement available in the form of $I(A; B^n | M)_\omega / 2$ ebits. Then they can use superdense coding to convert this extra entanglement and the quantum communication with rate Q into classical communication with some rate R_Q . The following upper bound then applies to the classical communication rate R_Q :

$$R_Q - \delta' \leq \frac{I(A; B^n | M)_\omega}{n},$$

because superdense coding yields a classical communication rate that is double the quantum communication rate. This classical communication is ϵ -good because the original quantum communication is ϵ -good. The new protocol uses at least $H(A|M)_\omega$ ebits because the following inequality holds

$$I(A; B^n | M)_\omega / 2 + I(A; E^n E' | M)_\omega / 2 \geq H(A|M)_\omega.$$

The bound in Theorem 4 then applies to the total classical communication rate $R + R_Q$ of this new protocol because it is a protocol for 2ϵ -good entanglement-assisted classical communication:

$$R + R_Q - \delta' - \delta \leq \frac{I(AM; B^n)_\omega}{n}.$$

Suppose for now that the classical rate R exceeds $I(M; B^n)_\omega / n$:

$$R - \delta > \frac{I(M; B^n)_\omega}{n}.$$

This assumption then leads to the possibility that the sum rate $R + R_Q$ exceeds the bound from entanglement-assisted classical coding by using the chain rule in (4), contradicting the optimality of that protocol. Thus, the bound in (26) holds for the classical rate R . \square

It would be ideal to prove that isometries are optimal and eliminate the need for the extra E' register. It is not clear that we can use the technique from Ref. [18] to prove that isometries are optimal. That proof relies on using the decoder to show optimality of an isometric encoder. In the case of entanglement-assisted coding, the decoder uses Bob's half of the entanglement in addition to the channel outputs. So it is not clear that the method in Ref. [18] applies because an entanglement-assisted encoder performs encoding operations on Alice's qubits only.

It seems that the E' register serves as a place for Alice to put any extra entanglement that the protocol does not consume. In the above protocol, Alice just throws away the E' register because it contains extra, unnecessary entanglement. In practice, Alice would not throw away this precious extra entanglement but instead would coordinate with Bob to save it for the next round of the protocol.

VI. THE DIRECT CODING THEOREM

We can phrase the direct coding theorem as the *classically-enhanced father resource inequality* (see Ref. [7] for the theory of resource inequalities):

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{N}^{A' \rightarrow B} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} I(A; E|X)_\sigma [qq] \\ \geq \frac{1}{2} I(A; B|X)_\sigma [q \rightarrow q] + I(X; B)_\sigma [c \rightarrow c] \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

The precise statement of the classically-enhanced father resource inequality is a statement of achievability. For any $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ and sufficiently large n , there exists a protocol that consumes n uses of the noisy channel $\mathcal{N}^{A' \rightarrow B}$ and consumes $\approx nI(A; E|X)_\sigma / 2$ ebits. In doing so, the protocol sends $\approx nI(A; B|X)_\sigma / 2$ qubits with $1 - \epsilon$ fidelity and $\approx nI(X; B)_\sigma$ classical bits with ϵ probability of error. The entropic quantities are with respect to the state $\sigma^{XABEE'}$ in (15) with a trivial system E' (the system E' is not necessary because we use isometric encoders in the proof of the direct coding theorem).

The proof of the direct coding theorem for the classically-enhanced father protocol proceeds in several steps. We first establish some definitions relevant to an entanglement-assisted quantum code, or *father* code for short, and recall the direct coding theorem for entanglement-assisted quantum (EAQ) communication [6, 7, 8]. We then define a *random* father code, give a few relevant definitions and properties, and prove a version of the EAQ coding theorem that applies to random father codes. In particular, we show random father codes exist whose expected channel input is close to a product state (similar to result of the random quantum coding theorem in Appendix D of Ref. [4]). We follow this development by showing how to “paste” random father codes together so that the expected channel input of the pasted random code is close to a product state containing a classical message. A *random classically-enhanced father code* is then a collection of “pasted” father codes. The closeness of each expected channel input to a product state allows us to apply the HSW coding theorem [23, 24] so that Bob can decode the classical message while causing almost no disturbance to the encoded quantum information. Based on the classical message, Bob determines which random father code he should be decoding for. This method of efficiently coding classical and quantum information is the “piggybacking” technique introduced in Ref. [10] and applied again in Refs. [17, 25]. The final arguments consist of a series of Shannon-theoretic arguments of derandomization and expurgation. The result is a *deterministic* classically-enhanced father code that performs well and achieves the rates in the capacity region in Theorem 1.

A. Father Codes

The unencoded state of a father code is as follows

$$|\varphi\rangle^{RA_1} \otimes |\Phi\rangle^{T_A T_B}, \quad (34)$$

where

$$|\varphi\rangle^{RA_1} \equiv \sum_{k=1}^{2^{nQ}} \alpha_k |k\rangle^R |k\rangle^{A_1},$$

$$|\Phi\rangle^{T_A T_B} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{nE}}} \sum_{m=1}^{2^{nE}} |m\rangle^{T_A} |m\rangle^{T_B}.$$

The isometric encoder $\mathcal{E}^{A_1 T_A \rightarrow A'^n}$ of the father code maps kets on the systems A_1 and T_A as follows

$$|\phi_{k,m}\rangle^{A'^n} \equiv \mathcal{E}^{A_1 T_A \rightarrow A'^n} (|k\rangle^{A_1} |m\rangle^{T_A}),$$

where the states $|\phi_{k,m}\rangle^{A'^n}$ are mutually orthogonal. Therefore, the encoder $\mathcal{E}^{A_1 T_A \rightarrow A'^n}$ maps the unencoded state in (34) to the following encoded state:

$$\mathcal{E}^{A_1 T_A \rightarrow A'^n} (|\varphi\rangle^{RA_1} \otimes |\Phi\rangle^{T_A T_B}) = \sum_{k=1}^{2^{nQ}} \alpha_k |k\rangle^R |\phi_k\rangle^{A'^n T_B},$$

where we define the states $|\phi_k\rangle^{A'^n T_B}$ in the following definition.

Definition 1 The set $\mathcal{C} \equiv \{|\phi_k\rangle^{A'^n T_B}\}_k$ is a representation of the father code. The EAQ codewords are as follows:

$$|\phi_k\rangle^{A'^n T_B} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{nE}}} \sum_{m=1}^{2^{nE}} |\phi_{k,m}\rangle^{A'^n} |m\rangle^{T_B}. \quad (35)$$

The EAQ code density operator $\rho^{A'^n T_B}(\mathcal{C})$ is a uniform mixture of the EAQ codewords:

$$\rho^{A'^n T_B}(\mathcal{C}) \equiv \frac{1}{2^{nQ}} \sum_{k=1}^{2^{nQ}} |\phi_k\rangle \langle \phi_k|^{A'^n T_B}.$$

The channel input density operator $\rho^{A'^n}(\mathcal{C})$ is that part of the code density operator $\rho^{A'^n T_B}(\mathcal{C})$ that is input to the channel:

$$\rho^{A'^n}(\mathcal{C}) \equiv \text{Tr}_{T_B} \left\{ \rho^{A'^n T_B}(\mathcal{C}) \right\}.$$

The above definitions imply the following two results:

$$\rho^{A'^n T_B}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{E}^{A_1 T_A \rightarrow A'^n} (\pi^{A_1} \otimes \Phi^{T_A T_B}),$$

$$\rho^{A'^n}(\mathcal{C}) = \frac{1}{2^{n(Q+E)}} \sum_{k=1}^{2^{nQ}} \sum_{m=1}^{2^{nE}} |\phi_{k,m}\rangle \langle \phi_{k,m}|^{A'^n}.$$

The direct coding theorem for entanglement-assisted quantum communication gives a method for achieving the optimal quantum communication rate and entanglement consumption rate.

Proposition 1 (EAQ Coding Theorem) Consider a quantum channel $\mathcal{N}^{A' \rightarrow B}$ and its isometric extension $U_{\mathcal{N}}^{A' \rightarrow BE}$. For any $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ and all sufficiently large n , there exists an (n, ϵ) entanglement-assisted quantum code defined by isometries $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D})$, such that the trace distance between the actual output

$$(\mathcal{D}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E} \circ U_{\mathcal{N}}^{A'^n \rightarrow B^n E^n} \circ \mathcal{E}^{A_1 T_A \rightarrow A'^n})(\varphi^{RA_1} \otimes \Phi^{T_A T_B}),$$

and the ideal decoupled output

$$\varphi^{RB_1} \otimes \rho^{EB_E}, \quad (36)$$

is no larger than ϵ , for any state φ^{RA_1} with dimension 2^{nQ} in the system A_1 and any maximally entangled $\Phi^{T_A T_B}$ equivalent to nE ebits. The rate of quantum communication is $Q - \delta = \frac{1}{2} I(A; B)_\phi$ provided that the rate of entanglement consumption is at least $E + \delta = \frac{1}{2} I(A; E)_\phi$. The entropic quantities are with respect to the following state:

$$|\phi\rangle^{ABE} \equiv U_{\mathcal{N}}^{A' \rightarrow BE} |\psi\rangle^{AA'}, \quad (37)$$

where $|\psi\rangle^{AA'}$ is the purification of some state $\rho^{A'}$.

Proof See Ref. [8]. \square

B. Random Father Codes

We cannot say much about the channel input density operator $\rho^{A'^n}(\mathcal{C})$ for a particular EAQ code \mathcal{C} . But we can say something about the expected channel input density operator of a random EAQ code \mathcal{C} (where \mathcal{C} itself becomes a random variable).

Definition 2 A random EAQ code is an ensemble $\{p_{\mathcal{C}}, \mathcal{C}\}$ of codes where each code \mathcal{C} occurs with probability $p_{\mathcal{C}}$. The expected code density operator $\bar{\rho}^{A'^n T_B}$ is as follows:

$$\bar{\rho}^{A'^n T_B} \equiv \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left\{ \rho^{A'^n T_B}(\mathcal{C}) \right\}.$$

The expected channel input density operator $\bar{\rho}^{A'^n}$ is as follows:

$$\bar{\rho}^{A'^n} \equiv \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left\{ \rho^{A'^n}(\mathcal{C}) \right\}.$$

A random EAQ code is “ ρ -like” if the expected channel input density operator is close to a tensor power of some state ρ :

$$\left\| \bar{\rho}^{A'^n} - \rho^{\otimes n} \right\|_1 \leq \epsilon. \quad (38)$$

It follows from the above definition that

$$\bar{\rho}^{A'^n T_B} = \sum_{\mathcal{C}} p_{\mathcal{C}} \rho^{A'^n T_B}(\mathcal{C}),$$

$$\bar{\rho}^{A'^n} = \text{Tr}_{T_B} \left\{ \bar{\rho}^{A'^n T_B} \right\}.$$

We now state a version of the direct coding theorem that applies to random father codes. The proof shows that we can produce a random father code with an expected channel input density operator close to a tensor power state.

Proposition 2 *For any $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ and all sufficiently large n , there exists a random $\rho^{A'}$ -like EAQ code for a channel $\mathcal{N}^{A' \rightarrow B}$. In particular, the random EAQ code has quantum rate $\frac{1}{2}I(A; B)_\phi - \delta$ and entanglement consumption rate $\frac{1}{2}I(A; E)_\phi + \delta$. The entropic quantities are with respect to the state in (37) and the state $\rho^{A'}$ is that state's restriction to the system A' .*

Proof The proof is in Appendix A. \square

C. Associating a Random Father Code with a Classical String

Suppose that we have an ensemble $\{p(x), \rho_x\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ of quantum states. Let $x^n \equiv x_1 \cdots x_n$ denote a classical string generated by the density $p(x)$ where each symbol $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$. Then there is a density operator ρ_{x^n} corresponding to the string x^n where

$$\rho_{x^n} \equiv \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \rho_{x_i}.$$

Suppose that we label a random father code by the string x^n and let $\bar{\rho}_{x^n}^{A'n}$ denote its expected channel input density operator.

Definition 3 *A random father code is (ρ_{x^n}) -like if the expected channel input density operator $\bar{\rho}_{x^n}^{A'n}$ is close to the state ρ_{x^n} :*

$$\left\| \bar{\rho}_{x^n}^{A'n} - \rho_{x^n} \right\|_1 \leq \epsilon.$$

Proposition 3 *Suppose we have an ensemble as above. Consider a quantum channel $\mathcal{N}^{A' \rightarrow B}$ with its isometric extension $U_{\mathcal{N}}^{A' \rightarrow BE}$. Then there exists a random (ρ_{x^n}) -like entanglement-assisted quantum code for the channel $\mathcal{N}^{A' \rightarrow B}$ for any $\epsilon, \delta > 0$, for all sufficiently large n , and for any classical string x^n in the typical set $T_\delta^{X^n}$ [19]. Its quantum communication rate is $I(A; B|X)/2 - c'\delta$ and its entanglement consumption rate is $I(A; E|X)/2 + c''\delta$ for some constants c', c'' where the entropic quantities are with respect to the state in (15) with a trivial system E' . The state ρ_{x^n} is generated from the restriction of the ensemble $\{p(x), \phi_x^{AA'}\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ to the A' system. The states $\phi_x^{AA'}$ in the ensemble correspond to the states $\phi_x^{AA'}$ in (15).*

Proof The method of proof involves “pasting” random father codes together. The proof is in Appendix B. \square

D. Construction of a Classically-Enhanced Father Code

The HSW coding theorem gives an optimal method for sending classical information over a noisy quantum channel. The crucial property that we exploit is that it uses a product-state input for sending classical information. This tensor-product structure is what allows us to “piggyback” classical information onto father codes.

Proposition 4 (HSW Coding Theorem [23, 24])

Consider an input ensemble $\{p(x), \rho_x^{A'}\}$ that gives rise to a classical-quantum state σ^{XB} where

$$\sigma^{XB} \equiv \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p(x) |x\rangle \langle x|^X \otimes \mathcal{N}^{A' \rightarrow B}(\rho_x^{A'}).$$

Let $R = I(X; B)_\sigma - c'\delta$ for any $\delta > 0$ and for some constant c' . Then for all $\epsilon > 0$ and for all sufficiently large n , there exists a classical encoding map

$$f : [2^{nR}] \rightarrow T_\delta^{X^n},$$

and a decoding POVM

$$\Lambda^{B^n} \equiv (\Lambda_m^{B^n})_{m \in [2^{nR}]},$$

that allows Bob to decode any classical message $m \in [2^{nR}]$ with high probability:

$$\text{Tr}\{\tau_m^{B^n} \Lambda_m^{B^n}\} \geq 1 - \epsilon.$$

The density operators $\tau_m^{B^n}$ are the channel outputs

$$\tau_m^{B^n} \equiv \mathcal{N}^{A'^n \rightarrow B^n}(\rho_{f(m)}^{A'^n}), \quad (39)$$

and the channel input states $\rho_{x^n}^{A'^n}$ are a tensor product of states in the ensemble:

$$\rho_{x^n}^{A'^n} \equiv \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \rho_{x_i}^{A'}.$$

We are now in a position to prove the direct coding part of the classically-enhanced father capacity theorem. The proof is similar to that in Ref. [10].

Proof [Direct Coding Theorem] Define the classical message set $[2^{nR}]$, the classical encoding map f , the channel output states $\tau_m^{B^n}$, and the decoding POVM Λ^{B^n} as in Proposition 4. Invoking Proposition 3, we know that for each $m \in [2^{nR}]$, there exists a random $(\rho_{f(m)}^{A'^n})$ -like father code \mathcal{C}_m whose probability density is $p_{\mathcal{C}_m}$. The random father code \mathcal{C}_m has encoding-decoding isometry pairs $(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{A_1 T_A \rightarrow A'^n}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B_n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E})$ for each of its realizations. It transmits $n[I(A; B|X)/2 - c'\delta]$ qubits provided Alice and Bob share at least $n[I(A; E|X)/2 + c''\delta]$ ebits. Let \mathcal{C} denote the random classically-enhanced father code that is the collection of random father codes $\{\mathcal{C}_m\}_{m \in [2^{nR}]}$.

We first prove that the expectation of the classical error probability for message m is small. The expectation is

with respect to the random father code \mathcal{C}_m . Let $\tau_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n}$ denote the *channel output density operator* corresponding to the father code \mathcal{C}_m :

$$\tau_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n} \equiv \text{Tr}_{T_B} \left\{ \mathcal{N}^{A'^n \rightarrow B^n} \left(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{A_1 T_A \rightarrow A'^n} (\pi^{A_1} \otimes \Phi^{T_A T_B}) \right) \right\}.$$

Let $\bar{\tau}_m^{B^n}$ denote the *expected channel output density operator* of the random father code \mathcal{C}_m :

$$\bar{\tau}_m^{B^n} \equiv \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}_m} \left\{ \tau_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n} \right\} = \sum_{\mathcal{C}_m} p_{\mathcal{C}_m} \tau_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n}.$$

The following inequality holds

$$\left\| \bar{\rho}_{f(m)}^{A'^n} - \rho_{f(m)}^{A'^n} \right\|_1 \leq |\mathcal{X}| \epsilon$$

because the random father code \mathcal{C}_m is $(\rho_{f(m)}^{A'^n})$ -like. Then the expected channel output density operator $\bar{\tau}_m^{B^n}$ is close to the tensor product state $\tau_m^{B^n}$ in (39):

$$\left\| \bar{\tau}_m^{B^n} - \tau_m^{B^n} \right\|_1 \leq |\mathcal{X}| \epsilon, \quad (40)$$

because the trace distance is monotone under the quantum operation $\mathcal{N}^{A'^n \rightarrow B^n}$. It then follows that the POVM element $\Lambda_m^{B^n}$ has a high probability of detecting the expected channel output density operator $\bar{\tau}_m^{B^n}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} \{ \Lambda_m^{B^n} \bar{\tau}_m^{B^n} \} &\geq \text{Tr} \{ \Lambda_m^{B^n} \tau_m^{B^n} \} - \left\| \bar{\tau}_m^{B^n} - \tau_m^{B^n} \right\|_1 \\ &\geq 1 - \epsilon - |\mathcal{X}| \epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

The first inequality follows from the following lemma [16] that holds for any two quantum states ρ and σ and a positive operator Π where $0 \leq \Pi \leq I$:

$$\text{Tr} \{ \Pi \rho \} \geq \text{Tr} \{ \Pi \sigma \} - \|\rho - \sigma\|_1.$$

The second inequality follows from Proposition 4 and (40). We define Bob's decoding instrument $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E \hat{M}}$ for the random classically-enhanced father code \mathcal{C} as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E \hat{M}} \left(\rho^{B^n T_B} \right) \\ &\equiv \sum_m \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E} \left(\sqrt{\Lambda_m^{B^n}} \rho^{B^n T_B} \sqrt{\Lambda_m^{B^n}} \right) \otimes |m\rangle \langle m|^{\hat{M}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E}$ is the decoding isometry for the father code \mathcal{C}_m and each map $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E} (\sqrt{\Lambda_m^{B^n}} \rho \sqrt{\Lambda_m^{B^n}})$ is trace reducing. The induced quantum operation corresponding to this instrument is as follows:

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E} (\rho) = \text{Tr}_{\hat{M}} \left\{ \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E \hat{M}} (\rho) \right\}.$$

Let $p_e(\mathcal{C}_m)$ denote the classical error probability for each classical message m of the classically-enhanced father code \mathcal{C} :

$$\begin{aligned} p_e(\mathcal{C}_m) &\equiv 1 - \Pr \{ M' = m \mid M = m \} \\ &= 1 - \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E} \left(\sqrt{\Lambda_m^{B^n}} \tau_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n} \sqrt{\Lambda_m^{B^n}} \right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then by the above definition, (41), and the fact that the trace does not change under the isometry $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E}$, it holds that the expectation of the classical error probability $p_e(\mathcal{C}_m)$ with respect to the random father code \mathcal{C}_m is low:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}_m} \{ p_e(\mathcal{C}_m) \} \leq (1 + |\mathcal{X}|) \epsilon. \quad (42)$$

We now prove that the expectation of the quantum error is small (the expectation is with respect to the random father code \mathcal{C}_m). Input the state $\Phi^{R A_1} \otimes \Phi^{T_A T_B}$ to the encoder $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{A_1 T_A \rightarrow A'^n}$ followed by the channel $\mathcal{N}^{A'^n \rightarrow B^n}$. The resulting state is an extension $\Omega_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{R T_B B^n}$ of $\tau_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n}$:

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{R T_B B^n} \equiv \mathcal{N}^{A'^n \rightarrow B^n} \left(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{A_1 T_A \rightarrow A'^n} (\Phi^{R A_1} \otimes \Phi^{T_A T_B}) \right).$$

Let $\bar{\Omega}_m^{R T_B B^n}$ denote the expectation of $\Omega_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{R T_B B^n}$ with respect to the random code \mathcal{C}_m :

$$\bar{\Omega}_m^{R T_B B^n} \equiv \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}_m} \left\{ \Omega_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{R T_B B^n} \right\}.$$

It follows that $\bar{\Omega}_m^{R T_B B^n}$ is an extension of $\bar{\tau}_m^{B^n}$. The following inequality follows from (41):

$$\text{Tr} \{ \bar{\Omega}_m^{R T_B B^n} \Lambda_m^{B^n} \} \geq 1 - (1 + |\mathcal{X}|) \epsilon. \quad (43)$$

The above inequality is then sufficient for us to apply a modified version of the gentle measurement lemma (Lemma 2 in Appendix C) so that the following inequality holds

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}_m} \left\{ \left\| \sqrt{\Lambda_m^{B^n}} \Omega_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{R T_B B^n} \sqrt{\Lambda_m^{B^n}} - \Omega_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{R T_B B^n} \right\|_1 \right\} \\ &\leq \sqrt{8(1 + |\mathcal{X}|) \epsilon}. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Monotonicity of the trace distance gives an inequality for the trace-reducing maps of the quantum decoding instrument:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}_m} \left\{ \left\| \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E} \left(\sqrt{\Lambda_m^{B^n}} \Omega_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{R T_B B^n} \sqrt{\Lambda_m^{B^n}} \right) - \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E} \left(\Omega_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{R T_B B^n} \right) \right\|_1 \right\} \\ &\leq \sqrt{8(1 + |\mathcal{X}|) \epsilon}. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

The following inequality also holds

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}_m} \left\{ \left\| \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E} \left(\Omega_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{RT_B B^n} \right) - \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E} \left(\sqrt{\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n}} \Omega_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{RT_B B^n} \sqrt{\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n}} \right) \right\|_1 \right\} \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}_m} \left\{ \sum_{m' \neq m} \left\| \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}_{m'}}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E} \left(\sqrt{\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}_{m'}}^{B^n}} \Omega_{\mathcal{C}_{m'}}^{RT_B B^n} \sqrt{\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}_{m'}}^{B^n}} \right) \right\|_1 \right\} \\
& = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}_m} \left\{ \sum_{m' \neq m} \left\| \sqrt{\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n}} \Omega_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{RT_B B^n} \sqrt{\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n}} \right\|_1 \right\} \\
& = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}_m} \left\{ \sum_{m' \neq m} \text{Tr} \left\{ \Lambda_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n} \Omega_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{RT_B B^n} \right\} \right\} \\
& = 1 - \text{Tr} \left\{ \Lambda_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n} \Omega_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{RT_B B^n} \right\} \\
& \leq (1 + |\mathcal{X}'|)\epsilon. \tag{46}
\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows by definitions and the triangle inequality, the first equality follows because the trace distance is invariant under isometry, the second equality follows because the operator $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n} \Omega_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{RT_B B^n}$ is positive, the third equality follows because from some algebra, and the second inequality follows from (41). The fidelity of quantum communication for all classical messages m and codes \mathcal{C}_m is high

$$F \left(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E} \left(\Omega_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{RT_B B^n} \right), \Phi^{RB_1} \right) \geq 1 - \epsilon$$

because each code \mathcal{C}_m in the random father code is good for quantum communication. It then follows that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}_m} \left\{ \left\| \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E} \left(\Omega_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{RT_B B^n} \right) - \Phi^{RB_1} \right\|_1 \right\} \leq 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \tag{47}$$

because of the relation between the trace distance and fidelity [16]. Application of the triangle inequality to (47), (46), and (45) gives the following bound on the expected quantum error

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}_m} \{q_e(\mathcal{C}_m)\} \leq \epsilon' \tag{48}$$

where

$$\epsilon' \equiv (1 + |\mathcal{X}'|)\epsilon + \sqrt{8(1 + |\mathcal{X}'|)\epsilon} + 2\sqrt{\epsilon},$$

and where we define the quantum error $q_e(\mathcal{C}_m)$ of the code \mathcal{C}_m as follows:

$$q_e(\mathcal{C}_m) \equiv \left\| \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{B^n T_B \rightarrow B_1 B_E} \left(\Omega_{\mathcal{C}_m}^{RT_B B^n} \right) - \Phi^{RB_1} \right\|_1.$$

The above random classically-enhanced father code relies on Alice and Bob having access to a source of common randomness. We now show that they can eliminate the need for common randomness and select a good classically-enhanced father code \mathcal{C} that has a low quantum error $q_e(\mathcal{C}_m)$ and low classical error $p_e(\mathcal{C}_m)$ for all classical messages m in a large subset of $[2^{nR}]$. By the

bounds in (42) and (48), the following bound holds for the expectation of the averaged summed error probabilities:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}_m} \left\{ \frac{1}{2^{nR}} \sum_m p_e(\mathcal{C}_m) + q_e(\mathcal{C}_m) \right\} \leq \epsilon' + (1 + |\mathcal{X}'|)\epsilon.$$

If the above bound holds for the expectation over all random codes, it follows that there exists a particular classically-enhanced father code $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{C}_m\}_{m \in [2^{nR}]}$ with the following bound on its averaged summed error probabilities:

$$\frac{1}{2^{nR}} \sum_m p_e(\mathcal{C}_m) + q_e(\mathcal{C}_m) \leq \epsilon' + (1 + |\mathcal{X}'|)\epsilon.$$

We fix the code \mathcal{C} and expurgate the worst half of the father codes—those father codes with classical messages m that have the highest value of $p_e(\mathcal{C}_m) + q_e(\mathcal{C}_m)$. This derandomization and expurgation yields a classically-enhanced father code that has each classical error $p_e(\mathcal{C}_m)$ and each quantum error $q_e(\mathcal{C}_m)$ upper bounded by $2(\epsilon' + (1 + |\mathcal{X}'|)\epsilon)$ for the remaining classical messages m . This expurgation decreases the classical rate by a negligible factor of $\frac{1}{n}$. \square

Note that the above proof is a scheme for entanglement transmission. This task is equivalent to the task of subspace transmission (quantum communication) by the methods in Ref. [18].

VII. CHILD PROTOCOLS OF THE CLASSICALLY-ENHANCED FATHER PROTOCOL

We detail two protocols that are each a child of the classically-enhanced father protocol in the sense of Ref. [7]. Recall the classically-enhanced father resource inequality in (33). Recall the three respective unit resource inequalities for teleportation, superdense coding, and entanglement distribution:

$$2[c \rightarrow c] + [qq] \geq [q \rightarrow q], \tag{49}$$

$$[qq] + [q \rightarrow q] \geq 2[c \rightarrow c], \tag{50}$$

$$[q \rightarrow q] \geq [qq]. \tag{51}$$

We can first append entanglement distribution to the classically-enhanced father resource inequality. This appending gives rise to the classically-enhanced quantum protocol in Ref. [10]. The development proceeds as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \mathcal{N}^{A' \rightarrow B} \rangle + \frac{I(A; E|X)}{2} [qq] \\
& \geq \frac{I(A; B|X)}{2} [q \rightarrow q] + I(X; B) [c \rightarrow c] \\
& = \left(\frac{I(A; E|X)}{2} + I(A)BX \right) [q \rightarrow q] + I(X; B) [c \rightarrow c] \\
& \geq \frac{I(A; E|X)}{2} [qq] + I(A)BX [q \rightarrow q] + I(X; B) [c \rightarrow c]
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is the classically-enhanced father resource inequality, the first equality exploits the identity in (2), and the last inequality follows from entanglement distribution. By the cancellation lemma (Lemma 4.6 of Ref. [7]), the following resource inequality holds

$$\langle \mathcal{N}^{A' \rightarrow B} \rangle + o[qq] \geq I(A|BX)[q \rightarrow q] + I(X; B)[c \rightarrow c],$$

where $o[qq]$ represents a sublinear amount of entanglement. The above resource inequality is equivalent to the classically-enhanced quantum protocol in Ref. [10] (modulo the sublinear entanglement).

We can then combine the classically-enhanced father protocol with superdense coding to get Shor's entanglement-assisted classical capacity result [11]:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \mathcal{N}^{A' \rightarrow B} \rangle + H(A|X)[qq] \\ &= \langle \mathcal{N}^{A' \rightarrow B} \rangle + \frac{I(A; E|X)}{2}[qq] + \frac{I(A; B|X)}{2}[qq] \\ &\geq \frac{I(A; B|X)}{2}[q \rightarrow q] + I(X; B)[c \rightarrow c] + \frac{I(A; B|X)}{2}[qq] \\ &\geq I(X; B)[c \rightarrow c] + I(A; B|X)[c \rightarrow c] \\ &= I(AX; B)[c \rightarrow c], \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

where the first equality uses the identity in (1), the first inequality uses the classically-enhanced father resource inequality, the second inequality uses superdense coding, and the last equality uses the chain-rule identity in (4). The above rates are the same as those in Refs. [7, 11].

The father protocol is not a child protocol of the classically-enhanced father protocol because we cannot use the three unit inequalities in (49-51) to obtain the father resource inequality from the classically-enhanced father [34].

VIII. CONCLUSION

We have constructed an optimal entanglement-assisted classical-quantum coding strategy, the *classically-enhanced father protocol*. This coding strategy is useful in determining a three-dimensional capacity region that contains two previously known regions as a special case. We discuss several open problems in what follows.

A. The Issue of Time-Sharing

Time-sharing is a simple method of combining coding strategies [19]. As an example, consider the case of time-sharing a channel between an (n, Q_1, ϵ) quantum code and another (n, Q_2, ϵ) quantum code. For any λ where $0 < \lambda < 1$, the sender uses the first code for a fraction λ of the channel uses and uses the other code for a fraction $(1 - \lambda)$ of the channel uses. This time-sharing strategy produces a quantum code with rate $\lambda Q_1 + (1 - \lambda) Q_2$ and error at most 2ϵ .

An important question for entanglement-assisted classical-quantum coding is whether a time-sharing strategy is optimal for some scenario. If this result were true for some scenario, it would imply that our classically-enhanced father protocol is not useful for this scenario because one could just time-share the channel with other strategies. We do not answer this question in the present article, but instead give evidence that time-sharing is not optimal in certain cases.

There are three time-sharing strategies that one could employ in entanglement-assisted classical-quantum (EACQ) coding. In all three strategies, we suppose that the sender and receiver share some finite amount of entanglement E . The three strategies are as follows:

1. Use an entanglement-assisted quantum code with rate triple $(0, Q_1, E_1)$ and an HSW code with rate triple $(R_2, 0, 0)$. If $E = \lambda E_1$, then time-sharing produces an EACQ code with rate triple $((1 - \lambda) R_2, \lambda Q_1, E)$.
2. Use an entanglement-assisted classical code with rate triple $(R_1, 0, E_1)$ and a quantum channel code with rate triple $(0, Q_2, 0)$. If $E = \lambda E_1$, then time-sharing produces an EACQ code with rate triple $(\lambda R_1, (1 - \lambda) Q_2, E)$.
3. Use an entanglement-assisted quantum code with rate triple $(0, Q_1, E_1)$ and an entanglement-assisted classical code with rate triple $(R_2, 0, E_2)$. If $E = \lambda E_1 + (1 - \lambda) E_2$, then time-sharing produces an EACQ code with rate triple $((1 - \lambda) R_2, \lambda Q_1, E)$.

Time-sharing is not optimal in some cases when the sender and receiver do not share entanglement [10]. Specifically, Devetak and Shor showed that time-sharing is not optimal when the noisy channel is the dephasing channel. They simplified the problem significantly by first showing that the classically-enhanced quantum capacity region for a degradable channel is "single-letterizable." The dephasing channel is an example of a degradable channel and thus its capacity region simplifies. Then the computation becomes much simpler for showing the sub-optimality of time-sharing.

The obvious step for our case is to determine if the three-dimensional capacity region "single-letterizes" for the case of a degradable channel. It is straightforward to apply the argument in Ref. [10] and subadditivity of von Neumann entropy to show that the quantum communication expression in (14) "single-letterizes." But it is not clear that the expression for the entanglement consumption rate does.

We show in what follows that a time-sharing strategy is optimal in the case where the sender and receiver share unlimited entanglement. We state the result formally as the following lemma.

Lemma 1 *Suppose that a sender and receiver share unlimited entanglement. Then a time-sharing strategy for*

entanglement-assisted classical-quantum coding is optimal:

$$\langle \mathcal{N} \rangle \geq \lambda I(AX; B)[c \rightarrow c] + (1 - \lambda) \frac{I(AX; B)}{2} [q \rightarrow q]. \quad (53)$$

The entropic quantity is maximized with respect to the state in Theorem 4.

Proof We prove this lemma using a proof by contradiction. Given an unlimited amount of entanglement, the following resource equality holds

$$2[c \rightarrow c] = [q \rightarrow q], \quad (54)$$

by superdense coding and teleportation. Shor’s version [11] of the unlimited entanglement-assisted classical capacity [12, 13] states that the rate $I(AX; B)$ is achievable and optimal. This result and the resource equality in (54) imply that the unlimited entanglement-assisted quantum capacity is $I(AX; B)/2$. If it were not so, then one could convert all of the quantum communication to classical communication by superdense coding and beat the rate $I(AX; B)$. But this result contradicts the optimality of the unlimited entanglement-assisted classical capacity. Likewise, suppose that the resource inequality in (53) is not optimal. That is, there exists a protocol that beats the rates in (53) for some λ where $0 < \lambda < 1$. With unlimited entanglement, we can convert all of the quantum communication to classical communication by superdense coding. But this result again contradicts the optimality of the unlimited entanglement-assisted classical capacity. \square

Thus we have two different results. Time-sharing is not necessarily optimal when there is no entanglement available, but it is optimal when there is an infinite amount of entanglement available. In reality, a sender and receiver have only a finite amount of entanglement available, and the above argument in Lemma 1 does not apply. Thus, we conjecture that there are some parts of the capacity region where time-sharing is not necessarily optimal (but there may be others where it is). The classically-enhanced father protocol should be optimal in a “low-entanglement” region where time-sharing is not, but time-sharing might be optimal in a “high-entanglement” region.

B. The Full Triple Trade-off

In this article, we discuss the classically-enhanced father protocol and its optimality only. Special cases of the rate region are the two-dimensional regions achieved by entanglement-assisted quantum coding and classically-enhanced quantum coding. Shor’s region for entanglement-assisted classical communication is not part of the achievable rate region of Theorem 1. So it remains an open question to characterize the full triple trade-off region. Our conjecture is that the classically-enhanced father capacity region combined with the rate

region obtainable by the unit resource inequalities in (49-51) should produce the full triple trade-off region.

C. The Structure of Optimal Classically-Enhanced Father Codes

In Ref. [14], one of the authors constructed a classically-enhanced father code that uses only ancilla qubits for encoding classical information. In Ref. [15], the other author constructed a classically-enhanced father code that uses both ancilla qubits and ebits for encoding classical information. One might think that using ebits in addition to ancilla qubits for encoding classical information could improve performance and it was unclear which coding structure might perform better.

The structure of our classically-enhanced father protocol actually gives a hint for constructing optimal classically-enhanced father codes that achieve the rates in Theorem 1. Consider the protocol in the proof of the direct coding part of Theorem 1. Bob decodes the classical information by measuring the channel outputs only. He does not need to measure his half of the entanglement to decode the classical information. This decoding implies that he is not using the entanglement for sending classical information—if he were, he would need to measure his half of the entanglement as well. This observation lends credence to the conjecture that it is sufficient to encode classical information into ancilla qubits when attempting to construct codes that achieve the optimal trade-off rate triple in Theorem 1.

But this argument does not take into account the possibility of discovering another protocol that encodes classical information into ebits and achieves an optimal trade-off rate triple. In fact, the authors in Ref. [17] discuss an alternative to the piggybacking technique that first decodes quantum information and then decodes classical information. So it may be interesting to see if this alternate technique can apply for achieving a set of triple trade-off rates different from those in Theorem 1.

D. Other Issues

It would be useful to investigate channels for which the capacity region in Theorem 1 becomes “single-letterizable.” One might begin with degradable channels, but so far, we have only been able to determine that the classical communication rate and the quantum communication rate “single-letterizes.” One might need an additional restriction on the channel to show that the entanglement consumption rate “single-letterizes.” Another issue remains with the “pasting” proof technique. It relies on the assumption that the channel is IID and thus does not apply in a straightforward way to channels with memory. Many proof techniques in quantum Shannon theory rely on a “one-shot” lemma applied to the IID case. The usefulness of this method of proof is that the

one-shot result can apply to more general scenarios such as channels that have memory. So it may be useful to develop a one-shot result for the code pasting technique.

IX. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank Igor Devetak for initial discussions during the development of this project and thank Andreas Winter for useful discussions during the final development of the project. The authors thank Chung-Hsien Chou and the National Center for Theoretical Science (South) for hosting M.-H.H. as a visitor and thank Martin Rötteler and NEC Laboratories America for hosting M.M.W. as a visitor. M.M.W. acknowledges support from the National Research Foundation & Ministry of Education, Singapore.

APPENDIX A

The proof of Proposition 2 is an extension of the development in Appendix D of Ref. [4].

Proof [Proposition 2] Consider an arbitrary density operator $\rho^{A'}$ whose spectral decomposition is as follows:

$$\rho^{A'} = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p(x) |x\rangle \langle x|^{A'}.$$

The n^{th} extension of the above state as a tensor power state is as follows:

$$\rho^{A'^n} \equiv (\rho^{A'})^{\otimes n} = \sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n} p^n(x^n) |x^n\rangle \langle x^n|^{A'^n}.$$

We define the pruned distribution p'^n as follows:

$$p'^n(x^n) \equiv \begin{cases} p^n(x^n) / \sum_{x^n \in T_\delta^{X^n}} p^n(x^n) & : x^n \in T_\delta^{X^n} \\ 0 & : \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

where $T_\delta^{X^n}$ denotes the δ -typical set of sequences with length n . Let $\tilde{\rho}^{A'^n}$ denote the following ‘‘pruned state’’:

$$\tilde{\rho}^{A'^n} \equiv \sum_{x^n \in T_\delta^{X^n}} p'^n(x^n) |x^n\rangle \langle x^n|^{A'^n}. \quad (\text{A1})$$

For any $\epsilon > 0$ and sufficiently large n , the state $\rho^{A'^n}$ is close to $\tilde{\rho}^{A'^n}$ by the gentle measurement lemma [26] and the typical subspace theorem [20]:

$$\left\| \rho^{A'^n} - \tilde{\rho}^{A'^n} \right\|_1 \leq 2\epsilon.$$

For any density operator $\rho^{A'}$, it is possible to construct an entanglement-assisted quantum code that achieves the quantum communication rate and entanglement consumption rate in Proposition 2. Ref. [8] provides group-theoretical and other clever arguments to show how to achieve the rates in Proposition 2.

Another method for achieving the rates in Proposition 2 is to exploit the connection between quantum privacy and quantum coherence in constructing quantum codes [4, 27]. Indeed, in Ref. [28], one of the current authors showed how to construct secret-key-assisted private classical codes for a quantum channel. Using the methods of [4, 27], it is possible to make ‘‘coherent’’ versions, i.e., entanglement-assisted quantum codes, of these secret-key-assisted private classical codes. Let $[k]$ denote a set of size $\sim 2^{nQ}$ and let $[m]$ denote a set of size $\sim 2^{nE}$. Let $U_{k,m}$ denote $\sim 2^{n(Q+E)}$ random variables that we choose according to the pruned distribution $p'^n(x^n)$. The realizations $u_{k,m}$ of the random variables $U_{k,m}$ are sequences in \mathcal{X}^n and are the basis for constructing an entanglement-assisted quantum code \mathcal{C} whose codewords are as follows

$$\mathcal{C} = \{ |\phi_k\rangle^{A^n T_B} \}_k.$$

The entanglement-assisted quantum codewords $|\phi_k\rangle^{A^n T_B}$ in \mathcal{C} are as follows

$$|\phi_k\rangle^{A^n T_B} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{nE}}} \sum_{m=1}^{2^{nE}} |\phi_{u_{k,m}}\rangle^{A'^n} |m\rangle^{T_B},$$

where

$$|\phi_{u_{k,m}}\rangle^{A'^n} \equiv |u_{k,m}\rangle^{A'^n}.$$

We then expurgate this code to improve its performance and this expurgation has a minimal impact on the rate of the code. After expurgation, the code forms a good entanglement-assisted quantum code, resulting in failure with probability $\epsilon + 10\sqrt[4]{\epsilon}$ by the arguments in Refs. [4, 27].

Suppose that we choose a particular entanglement-assisted quantum code \mathcal{C} according to the above prescription. Its code density operator is

$$\rho^{A'^n T_B}(\mathcal{C}) = \frac{1}{2^{nQ}} \sum_{k=1}^{2^{nQ}} |\phi_k\rangle \langle \phi_k|^{A'^n T_B},$$

and its input code density operator is

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{A'^n}(\mathcal{C}) &= \text{Tr}_{T_B} \left\{ \rho^{A'^n T_B}(\mathcal{C}) \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{n(Q+E)}} \sum_{m=1}^{2^{nE}} \sum_{k=1}^{2^{nQ}} |\phi_{u_{k,m}}\rangle \langle \phi_{u_{k,m}}|^{A'^n}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose we now consider the entanglement-assisted code chosen according to the above prescription as a *random* code \mathcal{C} (where \mathcal{C} is now a random variable). Let $\rho^{A'^n}(\mathcal{C})$ be the channel input density operator for the random code before expurgation and $\rho^{A'^n}(\mathcal{C})$ its channel

input density operator after expurgation:

$$\begin{aligned}\rho'^{A'n}(\mathcal{C}) &\equiv \frac{1}{2^{n(Q'+E')}} \sum_{k=1}^{2^{nQ'}} \sum_{m=1}^{2^{nE'}} |\phi_{U_{k,m}}\rangle \langle \phi_{U_{k,m}}|^{A'n}, \\ \rho^{A'n}(\mathcal{C}) &\equiv \frac{1}{2^{n(Q+E)}} \sum_{k=1}^{2^{nQ}} \sum_{m=1}^{2^{nE}} |\phi_{U_{k,m}}\rangle \langle \phi_{U_{k,m}}|^{A'n},\end{aligned}$$

where the primed rates are the rates before expurgation and the unprimed rates are those after expurgation (they are slightly different but identical for large n). Let $\bar{\rho}'^{A'n}$ and $\bar{\rho}^{A'n}$ denote the expectation of the above channel input density operators:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\rho}'^{A'n} &\equiv \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left\{ \rho'^{A'n}(\mathcal{C}) \right\}, \\ \bar{\rho}^{A'n} &\equiv \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left\{ \rho^{A'n}(\mathcal{C}) \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Choosing our code in the particular way that we did leads to an interesting consequence. The expectation of the density operator corresponding to Alice's restricted codeword $|\phi_{U_{k,m}}\rangle^{A'n}$ is equal to the pruned state in (A1):

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left\{ |\phi_{U_{k,m}}\rangle \langle \phi_{U_{k,m}}|^{A'n} \right\} = \sum_{x^n} p'^n(x^n) |\phi_{x^n}\rangle \langle \phi_{x^n}|^{A'n},$$

because we choose the codewords $|\phi_{U_{k,m}}\rangle$ randomly according to the pruned distribution $p'^n(x^n)$. Then the expected channel input density operator $\bar{\rho}'^{A'n}$ is as follows:

$$\bar{\rho}'^{A'n} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left\{ \rho'^{A'n}(\mathcal{C}) \right\} \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2^{n(Q'+E')}} \sum_{k=1}^{2^{nQ'}} \sum_{m=1}^{2^{nE'}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left\{ |\phi_{U_{k,m}}\rangle \langle \phi_{U_{k,m}}|^{A'n} \right\} \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$= \sum_{x^n} p'^n(x^n) |\phi_{x^n}\rangle \langle \phi_{x^n}|^{A'n}. \quad (\text{A4})$$

Then we know that the following inequality holds for $\bar{\rho}'^{A'n}$ and the tensor power state $\rho^{A'n}$

$$\left\| \bar{\rho}'^{A'n} - \rho^{A'n} \right\|_1 \leq 2\epsilon \quad (\text{A5})$$

by the typical subspace theorem and the gentle measurement lemma. The expurgation of any entanglement-assisted code \mathcal{C} has a minimal effect on the resulting channel input density operator [4]:

$$\left\| \rho'^{A'n}(\mathcal{C}) - \rho^{A'n}(\mathcal{C}) \right\|_1 \leq 4\sqrt[4]{\epsilon}.$$

The above inequality implies that the following one holds for the expected channel input density operators $\bar{\rho}'^{A'n}$ and $\bar{\rho}^{A'n}$

$$\left\| \bar{\rho}'^{A'n} - \bar{\rho}^{A'n} \right\|_1 \leq 4\sqrt[4]{\epsilon}, \quad (\text{A6})$$

because the trace distance is convex. The following inequality holds

$$\left\| \bar{\rho}^{A'n} - \rho^{A'n} \right\|_1 \leq 2\epsilon + 4\sqrt[4]{\epsilon}, \quad (\text{A7})$$

by applying the triangle inequality to (A5) and (A6). Therefore, the random entanglement-assisted quantum code is ρ -like. \square

APPENDIX B

We now prove Proposition 3 that applies to a random father code that has an associated classical string.

Proof [Proposition 3] The proof is similar to the proof of Proposition 5 in Ref. [10]. Suppose that we have an ensemble $\{p_x, \rho_x^{A'}\}$ where each density operator $\rho_x^{A'}$ has a purification $\psi_x^{AA'}$ and state $\phi_x^{ABE} = U_{\mathcal{N}}^{A' \rightarrow BE}(\psi_x^{AA'})$ arising from the channel $\mathcal{N}^{A' \rightarrow B}$. By Proposition 2, for sufficiently large n and for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, there exists a random $\rho_x^{A'}$ -like entanglement-assisted $(n[p_x - \delta], \epsilon)$ code of quantum rate $Q_x = I(A; B)_{\phi_x}/2 - \delta$ and entanglement consumption rate $E_x = I(A; E)_{\phi_x}/2 + \delta$. Its expected channel input density operator $\bar{\rho}_x^{A'n[p_x - \delta]}$ is close to a tensor power of the state $\rho_x^{A'}$:

$$\left\| \bar{\rho}_x^{A'n[p_x - \delta]} - \rho_x^{\otimes n[p_x - \delta]} \right\|_1 \leq \epsilon.$$

The code's quantum rate is $Q_x = \frac{1}{2}I(A; B)_{\phi_x} - \delta$ because it transmits $n[p_x - \delta]Q_x$ qubits for $n[p_x - \delta]$ uses of the channel. The code's entanglement consumption rate is $E_x = \frac{1}{2}I(A; E)_{\phi_x} + \delta$ because it consumes at least $n[p_x - \delta]E_x$ ebits for $n[p_x - \delta]$ uses of the channel. We produce an $(n - |\mathcal{X}|\delta, |\mathcal{X}|\epsilon)$ entanglement-assisted code with expected channel input density operator

$$\bar{\rho}^{A'n(1-|\mathcal{X}|\delta)} = \bigotimes_x \bar{\rho}_x^{A'n[p_x - \delta]}$$

by "pasting" $|\mathcal{X}|$ of these codes together (one for each x). Applying the triangle inequality $|\mathcal{X}|$ times, the expected channel input density operator $\bar{\rho}^{A'n(1-|\mathcal{X}|\delta)}$ of the pasted code is close to a pasting of the tensor power states $\{\rho_x^{\otimes n[p_x - \delta]}\}_x$:

$$\left\| \bar{\rho}^{A'n(1-|\mathcal{X}|\delta)} - \bigotimes_x \rho_x^{\otimes n[p_x - \delta]} \right\|_1 \leq |\mathcal{X}|\epsilon. \quad (\text{B1})$$

Consider the classical sequence x^n . Let random variable X have the probability distribution p and define the typical set

$$T_\delta^{X^n} = \{x^n : \forall x \ |n_x - np_x| \leq \delta n\},$$

where $n_x \equiv N(x|x^n)$ is the number of occurrences of the symbol x in x^n . If x^n lies in the typical set $T_\delta^{X^n}$, then we can construct a conditional permutation operation that

permutes the elements of the input sequence as follows [29]:

$$x^n \rightarrow \underbrace{x_1 \cdots x_1}_{n[p_{x_1} - \delta]} \underbrace{x_2 \cdots x_2}_{n[p_{x_2} - \delta]} \cdots \underbrace{x_{|\mathcal{X}|} \cdots x_{|\mathcal{X}|}}_{n[p_{x_{|\mathcal{X}|}} - \delta]} x_g$$

where x_g (for “ x garbage”) denotes the remaining $n|\mathcal{X}|\delta$ symbols in x^n . The density operator ρ_{x^n} corresponds to the input sequence x^n . We can construct a conditional permutation unitary that acts on the density operator ρ_{x^n} and changes the ordering of the state ρ_{x^n} as follows:

$$\rho_{x^n} \rightarrow \bigotimes_x \rho_x^{n[p_x - \delta]} \otimes \rho_{x_g}$$

where $\dim(\rho_{x_g}) \leq n|\mathcal{X}|\delta \log d_{A'}$. We modify the random entanglement-assisted code slightly by inserting $|\mathcal{X}|\delta$ “garbage states” with density operator ρ_{x_g} and define the expected channel input density operator $\bar{\rho}^{A'^n}$ for the full code as follows:

$$\bar{\rho}^{A'^n} \equiv \bar{\rho}^{A'^{n(1-|\mathcal{X}|\delta)}} \otimes \rho_{x_g}.$$

Then the expected channel input density operator $\bar{\rho}^{A'^n}$ is close to the permuted version of ρ_{x^n}

$$\left\| \bar{\rho}^{A'^n} - \bigotimes_x \rho_x^{n[p_x - \delta]} \otimes \rho_{x_g} \right\|_1 \leq |\mathcal{X}|\epsilon.$$

The quantum rate Q for the random “pasted” father code is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \frac{\sum_x nQ_x[p_x - \delta]}{n} \\ &= \sum_x Q_x[p_x - \delta] \\ &= \sum_x p_x \left(\frac{I(A; B)_{\phi_x}}{2} - \delta \right) - \delta Q_x \\ &= \frac{I(A; B|X)}{2} - c'\delta, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$c' \equiv 1 + \sum_x Q_x.$$

The entanglement consumption rate E is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \frac{\sum_x nE_x[p_x - \delta]}{n} \\ &= \sum_x E_x[p_x - \delta] \\ &= \sum_x p_x \left(\frac{I(A; E)_{\phi_x}}{2} - \delta \right) - \delta E_x \\ &= \frac{I(A; E|X)}{2} - c''\delta, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$c'' \equiv 1 + \sum_x E_x.$$

A permutation relates the states ρ_{x^n} and $\bigotimes_x \rho_x^{n[p_x - \delta]} \otimes \rho_{x_g}$. Therefore, there exists an $(n, |\mathcal{X}|\epsilon)$ random entanglement-assisted code of the same quantum communication rate and entanglement consumption rate with an expected channel input density operator $\bar{\rho}^{A'^n}$ that is close to the tensor power state ρ_{x^n} :

$$\left\| \bar{\rho}^{A'^n} - \rho_{x^n} \right\|_1 \leq |\mathcal{X}|\epsilon,$$

because the action of the IID channel $\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}$ is invariant under permutations of the input Hilbert spaces. \square

APPENDIX C

Lemma 2 (Gentle Measurement for Ensembles)

Let $\{p_x, \rho_x\}$ be an ensemble with average $\bar{\rho} \equiv \sum_x p_x \rho_x$. Given a positive operator X with $X \leq I$ and $\text{Tr}\{\bar{\rho}X\} \geq 1 - \epsilon$ where $\epsilon \leq 1$, then

$$\sum_x p_x \left\| \rho_x - \sqrt{X} \rho_x \sqrt{X} \right\|_1 \leq \sqrt{8\epsilon}.$$

Proof We can apply the same steps in the proof of the gentle measurement lemma [30] to get the following inequality:

$$\left\| \rho_x - \sqrt{X} \rho_x \sqrt{X} \right\|_1^2 \leq 8(1 - \text{Tr}\{\rho_x X\}).$$

Summing over both sides produces the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_x p_x \left\| \rho_x - \sqrt{X} \rho_x \sqrt{X} \right\|_1^2 &\leq 8(1 - \text{Tr}\{\rho X\}) \\ &\leq 8\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the square root of the above inequality gives the following one:

$$\sqrt{\sum_x p_x \left\| \rho_x - \sqrt{X} \rho_x \sqrt{X} \right\|_1^2} \leq \sqrt{8\epsilon}.$$

Concavity of the square root implies then implies the result:

$$\sum_x p_x \sqrt{\left\| \rho_x - \sqrt{X} \rho_x \sqrt{X} \right\|_1^2} \leq \sqrt{8\epsilon}.$$

\square

-
- [1] Benjamin Schumacher. Quantum coding. *Physical Review A*, 51(4):2738–2747, April 1995.
- [2] Seth Lloyd. Capacity of the noisy quantum channel. *Physical Review A*, 55(3):1613–1622, March 1997.
- [3] Peter W. Shor. The quantum channel capacity and coherent information. In *Lecture Notes, MSRI Workshop on Quantum Computation*, 2002.
- [4] Igor Devetak. The private classical capacity and quantum capacity of a quantum channel. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 51:44–55, January 2005.
- [5] Anura Abeyesinghe and Patrick Hayden. Generalized remote state preparation: Trading cbits, qubits, and ebits in quantum communication. *Physical Review A*, 68(6):062319, Dec 2003.
- [6] Igor Devetak, Aram W. Harrow, and Andreas Winter. A family of quantum protocols. *Physical Review Letters*, 93(23):230504, December 2004.
- [7] Igor Devetak, Aram W. Harrow, and Andreas Winter. A resource framework for quantum shannon theory. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 54(10):4587–4618, October 2008.
- [8] Anura Abeyesinghe, Igor Devetak, Patrick Hayden, and Andreas Winter. The mother of all protocols: Restructuring quantum information’s family tree. *arXiv:quant-ph/0606225*, 2006.
- [9] Jonathan Oppenheim. State redistribution as merging: introducing the coherent relay. *arXiv:0805.1065*, 2008.
- [10] Igor Devetak and Peter W. Shor. The capacity of a quantum channel for simultaneous transmission of classical and quantum information. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 256:287–303, 2005.
- [11] Peter W. Shor. *Quantum Information, Statistics, Probability (Dedicated to A. S. Holevo on the occasion of his 60th birthday)*, chapter “The classical capacity achievable by a quantum channel assisted by limited entanglement”, pages 144–152. Rinton Press, Inc., (quant-ph/0402129), 2004.
- [12] Charles H. Bennett, Peter W. Shor, John A. Smolin, and Ashish V. Thapliyal. Entanglement-assisted capacity of a quantum channel and the reverse shannon theorem. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 48:2637–2655, 2002.
- [13] Charles H. Bennett, Peter W. Shor, John A. Smolin, and Ashish V. Thapliyal. Entanglement-assisted classical capacity of noisy quantum channels. *Physical Review Letters*, 83(15):3081–3084, Oct 1999.
- [14] Mark M. Wilde and Todd A. Brun. Unified quantum convolutional coding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (arXiv:0801.0821)*, pages 359–363, July 2008.
- [15] Isaac Kremsky, Min-Hsiu Hsieh, and Todd A. Brun. Classical enhancement of quantum-error-correcting codes. *Physical Review A*, 78(1):012341, 2008.
- [16] Jon Yard. *Simultaneous classical-quantum capacities of quantum multiple access channels*. PhD thesis, Stanford University (arXiv:quant-ph/0506050), June 2005.
- [17] Jon Yard, Patrick Hayden, and Igor Devetak. Capacity theorems for quantum multiple-access channels: Classical-quantum and quantum-quantum capacity regions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 54(7):3091–3113, July 2008.
- [18] Howard Barnum, Emmanuel Knill, and Michael A. Nielsen. On quantum fidelities and channel capacities. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 46(4):1317–1329, July 2000.
- [19] Thomas M. Cover and Joy A. Thomas. *Elements of Information Theory*. Wiley-Interscience, 1991.
- [20] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [21] Charles H. Bennett and Stephen J. Wiesner. Communication via one- and two-particle operators on einstein-podolsky-rosen states. *Physical Review Letters*, 69(20):2881–2884, November 1992.
- [22] Robert Alicki and Mark Fannes. Continuity of quantum conditional information. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 37(5):L55–L57, 2004.
- [23] Alexander S. Holevo. The capacity of the quantum channel with general signal states. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 44(1):269–273, 1998.
- [24] Benjamin Schumacher and Michael D. Westmoreland. Sending classical information via noisy quantum channels. *Physical Review A*, 56(1):131–138, July 1997.
- [25] Jon Yard and Igor Devetak. Optimal quantum source coding with quantum information at the encoder and decoder. *arXiv:0706.2907*, 2007.
- [26] Andreas Winter. Coding theorem and strong converse for quantum channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 45(7):2481–2485, 1999.
- [27] Igor Devetak and Andreas Winter. Relating quantum privacy and quantum coherence: An operational approach. *Physical Review Letters*, 93(8):080501, Aug 2004.
- [28] Min-Hsiu Hsieh, Zhicheng Luo, and Todd Brun. Secret-key-assisted private classical communication capacity over quantum channels. *Physical Review A*, 78(4):042306, 2008.
- [29] Hari Krovi and Igor Devetak. Local purity distillation with bounded classical communication. *Physical Review A*, 76(1):012321, 2007.
- [30] Andreas Winter. *Coding Theorems of Quantum Information Theory*. PhD thesis, Universität Bielefeld (arXiv:quant-ph/9907077), 1999.
- [31] Min-Hsiu Hsieh, Igor Devetak, and Andreas Winter. Entanglement-assisted capacity of quantum multiple-access channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 54(7):3078–3090, 2008.
- [32] As a side note, we mention that former articles discuss the possibility of this protocol but never fully developed it [7, 31]. In addition, the current authors have both constructed “classically-enhanced father” error-correcting coding schemes for block codes [15] and for convolutional codes [14].
- [33] We need the E' system due to a slight issue in the converse proof of this theorem. In short, we cannot rule out the possibility that a noisy encoder could outperform a noiseless, isometric one!
- [34] It is for this reason that we do not name our protocol “the grandfather protocol” but instead choose the name “classically-enhanced father protocol.”