

Entanglement transmission and generation under channel uncertainty: Universal quantum channel coding

Igor Bjelaković^{1,2}, Holger Boche^{1,2}, Janis Nötzel¹

¹ Heinrich-Hertz-Lehrstuhl für Mobilkommunikation (HFT 6)

Technische Universität Berlin, Germany

²Institut für Mathematik, Technische Universität Berlin, Germany

May 29, 2019

Abstract

We determine the optimal rates of universal quantum codes for entanglement transmission and generation under channel uncertainty. In the simplest scenario the sender and receiver are provided merely with the information that the channel they use belongs to a given set of channels, so that they are forced to use quantum codes that are reliable for the whole set of channels. This is precisely the quantum analog of the compound channel coding problem. We determine the entanglement transmission and entanglement-generating capacities of compound quantum channels and show that they are equal. Moreover, we investigate two variants of that basic scenario, namely the cases of informed decoder or informed encoder, and derive corresponding capacity results.

1 Introduction

The determination of capacities of quantum channels in various settings has been a field of intense work over the last decade. In contrast to classical information theory, to any quantum channel we can associate in a natural way different notions of capacity depending on what is to be transmitted over the channel and which figure of merit is chosen as the criterion for the success of the particular quantum communication task. For example we may try to determine the maximum number of classical messages that can be reliably distinguished at the output of the channel leading to the notion of classical capacity of a quantum channel. We might as well wish to establish secure classical communication over a quantum channel, giving rise to the definition of a channel's private capacity.

On the other hand, in the realm of quantum communication, one may ask e.g. the question what the maximal amount of entanglement is that we can generate or transmit over a given quantum channel, leading to the notions of entanglement-generating and entanglement transmission capacities. Other examples of quantum capacities are the subspace transmission and average subspace transmission capacities. Such quantum communication tasks are needed, for example, to support computation in quantum circuits or to provide the best possible supply of pure entanglement in a noisy environment. Fortunately, these genuinely quantum mechanical capacities are shown to be equal for perfectly known single user channels [1], [19].

First results indicating that coherent information was to play a role in the determination of the quantum

capacity of memoryless channels were established by Schumacher and Nielsen [24] and, independently, by Lloyd [21] who was the first to conjecture that indeed the regularized coherent information would give the correct formula for the quantum capacity and gave strong heuristic evidence to his claim. In 1998 Barnum, Knill, and Nielsen and Barnum, Nielsen, and Schumacher [1] gave the first upper bound on the capacity of a memoryless channel in terms of the regularized coherent information. Later on, Shor [27] and Devetak [10] offered two independent approaches to the achievability part of the coding theorem. Despite the fact that the regularized coherent information was identified as the capacity of memoryless quantum channels many other approaches to the coding theorem have been offered subsequently. Of particular interest for our paper are the developments by Klesse [18] and Hayden, Horodecki, Winter, and Yard [12] based on the decoupling idea which can be traced back to Schumacher and Westmoreland [26]. In fact, the main purpose of our work is to show that the decoupling idea can be utilized to prove the existence of reliable universal quantum codes for entanglement transmission and generation.

On the other hand, the classical capacity of memoryless quantum channels has been determined in the pioneering work by Holevo [13] and Schumacher and Westmoreland [25]. Their results have been substantially sharpened by Winter [29] and Ogawa and Nagaoka [23] who gave independent proofs of the strong converse to the coding theorem.

However, most of the work done so far on quantum channel capacities relies on the assumption that the channel is *perfectly known* to the sender and receiver. Such a requirement is hardly fulfilled in many situations. In this paper we consider compound quantum channels which are among the simplest non-trivial models with channel uncertainty. A rough description of this communication scenario is that the sender and receiver do not know the memoryless channel they have to use. The prior knowledge they have access to is merely that the actual channel belongs to a set \mathfrak{J} of channels which in turn is known to the sender and receiver. It is important to notice that we impose no restrictions on the set \mathfrak{J} , i.e. it can be finite, countably-infinite or uncountable. Our intention is to identify the best rates of quantum codes for entanglement transmission and generation that are reliable for the whole set of channels \mathfrak{J} simultaneously. This is, in some sense, a quantum channel counterpart of the universal quantum data compression result discovered by Jozsa and the Horodecki family [16].

While the classical capacity of compound quantum channels has been determined only recently in [3], in this paper we will focus on entanglement-generating and entanglement transmission capacities of compound quantum channels. Specifically we will determine both of them and show that they are equal. The investigation of their relation to other possible definitions of quantum capacity of compound quantum channels in spirit of [1], [19] will be given elsewhere.

1.1 Related Work

The capacity of compound channels in the classical setting was determined by Wolfowitz [30, 31] and Blackwell, Breiman, and Thomasian [5]. The full coding theorem for transmission of classical information via compound quantum channels was proven in [3]. Subsequently, Hayashi [11] obtained a closely related result with a completely different proof technique based on the Schur-Weyl duality from representation theory and the packing lemma from [7].

In our previous paper [4] we determined the entanglement transmission capacity of *finite* quantum compound channels (i.e. $|\mathfrak{J}| < \infty$). Moreover, we were able to prove the coding theorem for arbitrary \mathfrak{J} with *informed decoder*. It is important to remark here that we used a different notion of codes in [4], following [18], which is motivated by the theory of quantum error correction. In the cases of an informed decoder and uninformed users this change does not appear to be of importance. In the case of an informed encoder it is of crucial importance in the proof of the direct part of the coding result.

In our former paper, the strategy of proof was as follows. First, we derived a modification of Klesse’s one-shot coding result [18] that was adapted to arithmetic averages of channels. Application of this theorem combined with a discretization technique based on τ -nets yielded the coding result for quantum compound channels with informed decoder and arbitrary \mathfrak{J} .

With the help of the channel-estimation technique developed by Datta and Dorlas [9] we were able to show that in the case of a *finite* compound channel it is asymptotically of no relevance if one spends the first $\lfloor \sqrt{l} \rfloor$ transmissions for channel estimation, thus turning an uninformed decoder into an informed decoder. Since for an informed decoder we had already proven the existence of good codes, we were able to obtain the full coding result in the case $|\mathfrak{J}| < \infty$.

Unfortunately, the speed at which one can gain channel knowledge using the channel estimation technique we employed is highly dependent on the number of channels. Due to this fact, the combination of channel estimation and approximation of general compound channels through finite ones did not seem to work in the other two cases.

In this paper, we use a more direct strategy. First, we derive one-shot coding results for *finite* compound channels with uninformed users and informed encoder. In order to evaluate the dependance of the derived bounds on the block length we have to project onto typical subspaces of individual channels. Therefore, it turns out that we effectively end up in the scenario with *informed decoder*. Now, instead of employing a channel estimation strategy we study the impact of these projections onto the typical subspaces on the entanglement fidelity of the entire encoding-decoding procedure. It turns out that these projections can simply be removed without decreasing the entanglement fidelity too much and we have got a universal (i.e. uninformed) decoder for our coding problem. Then, again, using the discretization technique based on τ -nets we can convert these results for finite \mathfrak{J} to arbitrary compound quantum channels.

Another difference to our previous paper [4] is that we determine the optimal rates in all the scenarios described above for entanglement generation over compound quantum channels and show that they coincide with the entanglement transmission capacities.

1.2 Outline

Section 2 contains the fundamental definitions of codes and capacities for entanglement transmission in all three different settings.

It is followed by a section on one-shot results containing the one-shot result of Klesse [18], as well as our modifications thereof. The modified coding results guarantee the existence of unitary encodings as well as recovery operations for finite arithmetic averaged channels in all three different cases and establish a relation between the rate of the code and its entanglement fidelity. We also give an estimate relating the entanglement fidelity of a coding-decoding procedure to that of a disturbed version, where disturbance means that the application of the channel is followed by a projection.

With these one-shot results at hand, in Section 4 we are able to prove the existence of codes for entanglement transmission of sufficiently high rates and entanglement fidelity asymptotically approaching one exponentially fast in the case of finite compound channels.

Section 5 states the basic properties of finite size nets in the set of quantum channels. They are used to approximate general sets of quantum channels and provide the link between finite and general compound channels. The construction is such that their size depends polynomially on the approximation parameter. We use the coding results for finite compound channels and the properties of finite nets in section 6 to derive sharp lower bounds on the entanglement transmission capacity of general compound channels. This section also contains variants of the BSST Lemma [2] where BSST stands for Bennett, Shor, Smolin, and Thapliyal. The proofs rely heavily on the difference in the polynomial growth of nets versus exponentially

fast convergence to entanglement fidelity one for the codes in the finite setting.

The next section 7 contains the converse parts of the coding theorems for general compound channels. Since the converse must hold for arbitrary encoding schemes and since we explicitly allow the code space to be larger than the input space of the channels, we deviate from the usual structure and instead employ the converse part for the case of entanglement generation that was developed by Devetak [10]. We also use a recent continuity result due to Leung and Smith [20] that connects the difference in coherent information between nearby channels.

In section 8 we show, once again using the work of Leung and Smith [20], that the entanglement transmission capacities of compound quantum channels are continuous with respect to the Hausdorff metric.

In the final section 9 we apply the results obtained so far to determine the entanglement-generating capacities of compound quantum channels. It is not very surprizing that it turns out that they coincide with their counterparts for entanglement transmission.

1.3 Notation and Conventions

All Hilbert spaces are assumed to have finite dimension and are over the field \mathbb{C} . $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ is the set of states, i.e. positive semi-definite operators with trace 1 acting on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Pure states are given by projections onto one-dimensional subspaces. A vector of unit length spanning such a subspace will therefore be referred to as a state vector.

The set of completely positive trace preserving (CPTP) maps between the operator spaces $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ is denoted by $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$. $\mathcal{C}^\downarrow(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ stands for the set of completely positive trace decreasing maps between $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$. $\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{H})$ will denote in what follows the group of unitary operators acting on \mathcal{H} . For a Hilbert space $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{H}$ we will always identify $\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G})$ with a subgroup of $\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{H})$ in the canonical way. For any projection $q \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ we set $q^\perp := \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} - q$. Each projection $q \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ defines a completely positive trace decreasing map \mathcal{Q} given by $\mathcal{Q}(a) := qaq$ for all $a \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. In a similar fashion any $u \in \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{H})$ defines a $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H})$ by $\mathcal{U}(a) := uau^*$ for $a \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

We use the base two logarithm which is denoted by \log . The von Neumann entropy of a state $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ is given by

$$S(\rho) := -\text{tr}(\rho \log \rho).$$

The coherent information for $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ and $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ is defined by

$$I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}) := S(\mathcal{N}(\rho)) - S((\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \mathcal{N})(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)),$$

where $\psi \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ is an arbitrary purification of the state ρ . Following the usual conventions we let $S_e(\rho, \mathcal{N}) := S((\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \mathcal{N})(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|))$ denote the entropy exchange.

As a measure of closeness between two states $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ we use the fidelity $F(\rho, \sigma) := \|\sqrt{\rho}\sqrt{\sigma}\|_1^2$. The fidelity is symmetric in the input and for a pure state $\rho = |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$ we have $F(|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|, \sigma) = \langle\phi, \sigma\phi\rangle$.

A closely related quantity is the entanglement fidelity. For $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{C}^\downarrow(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ it is given by

$$F_e(\rho, \mathcal{N}) := \langle\psi, (\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \mathcal{N})(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)\psi\rangle,$$

with $\psi \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ being an arbitrary purification of the state ρ .

For the approximation of arbitrary compound channels by finite ones we use the diamond norm $\|\cdot\|_\diamond$, which is given by

$$\|\mathcal{N}\|_\diamond := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \max_{a \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathcal{H}), \|a\|_1=1} \|(\text{id}_n \otimes \mathcal{N})(a)\|_1,$$

where $\text{id}_n : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^n) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^n)$ is the identity channel, and $\mathcal{N} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ is any linear map, not necessarily completely positive. The merits of $\|\cdot\|_\diamond$ are due to the following facts (cf. [17]). First, $\|\mathcal{N}\|_\diamond = 1$ for all $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$. Thus, $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}) \subset S_\diamond$, where S_\diamond denotes the unit sphere of the normed space $(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}), \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})), \|\cdot\|_\diamond)$. Moreover, $\|\mathcal{N}_1 \otimes \mathcal{N}_2\|_\diamond = \|\mathcal{N}_1\|_\diamond \|\mathcal{N}_2\|_\diamond$ for arbitrary linear maps $\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2 : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$.

We further use the diamond norm to define the function $D_\diamond(\cdot, \cdot)$ on $\{(\mathfrak{J}, \mathfrak{J}') : \mathfrak{J}, \mathfrak{J}' \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})\}$, which is for $\mathfrak{J}, \mathfrak{J}' \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ given by

$$D_\diamond(\mathfrak{J}, \mathfrak{J}') := \max\left\{\sup_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} \inf_{\mathcal{N}' \in \mathfrak{J}'} \|\mathcal{N} - \mathcal{N}'\|_\diamond, \sup_{\mathcal{N}' \in \mathfrak{J}'} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} \|\mathcal{N} - \mathcal{N}'\|_\diamond\right\}.$$

For $\mathfrak{J} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ let $\bar{\mathfrak{J}}$ denote the closure of \mathfrak{J} in $\|\cdot\|_\diamond$. Then D_\diamond defines a metric on $\{(\mathfrak{J}, \mathfrak{J}') : \mathfrak{J}, \mathfrak{J}' \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}), \mathfrak{J} = \bar{\mathfrak{J}}, \mathfrak{J}' = \bar{\mathfrak{J}}'\}$ which is basically the Hausdorff distance induced by the diamond norm.

Obviously, for arbitrary $\mathfrak{J}, \mathfrak{J}' \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$, $D_\diamond(\mathfrak{J}, \mathfrak{J}') \leq \epsilon$ implies that for every $\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}$ ($\mathcal{N}' \in \mathfrak{J}'$) there exists $\mathcal{N}' \in \mathfrak{J}'$ ($\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}$) such that $\|\mathcal{N} - \mathcal{N}'\|_\diamond \leq 2\epsilon$. If $\mathfrak{J} = \bar{\mathfrak{J}}$, $\mathfrak{J}' = \bar{\mathfrak{J}}'$ holds we even have $\|\mathcal{N} - \mathcal{N}'\|_\diamond \leq \epsilon$. In this way D_\diamond gives a measure of distance between two compound channels.

Finally, for any set $\mathfrak{J} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}$ we set

$$\mathfrak{J}^{\otimes l} := \{\mathcal{N}^{\otimes l} : \mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}\}.$$

2 Codes and Capacity for Entanglement Transmission

Let $\mathfrak{J} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$. The memoryless compound channel associated with \mathfrak{J} is given by the family $\{\mathcal{N}^{\otimes l} : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K}^{\otimes l})\}_{l \in \mathbb{N}, \mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}}$. In the rest of the paper we will simply write \mathfrak{J} for that family.

Each compound channel can be used in three different scenarios:

1. the *informed decoder*
2. the *informed encoder*
3. the case of *uninformed users*.

In the following three subsections we will give definitions of codes and capacity for these cases.

2.1 The Informed Decoder

An (l, k_l) -code for \mathfrak{J} with *informed decoder* is a pair $(\mathcal{P}^l, \{\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}}^l : \mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}\})$ where:

1. $\mathcal{P}^l : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}_l) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^{\otimes l}$ is a CPTP map for some Hilbert space \mathcal{F}_l with $k_l = \dim \mathcal{F}_l$.
2. $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}}^l : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})^{\otimes l} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}_l)$ is a CPTP map for each $\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}$ where the Hilbert space \mathcal{F}_l satisfies $\mathcal{F}_l \subset \mathcal{F}_l'$. In what follows the operations $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}}^l$ are referred to as recovery (or decoding) operations. Since the decoder knows which channel is actually used during transmission, they are allowed to depend on the channel.

Note at this point that we deviate from the standard assumption that $\mathcal{F}_l = \mathcal{F}_l'$. We allow $\mathcal{F}_l \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_l'$ for convenience only since it allows more flexibility in code construction. It is readily seen from the definition of achievable rates and capacity below that the assumption $\mathcal{F}_l \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_l'$ cannot lead to a higher capacity of \mathfrak{J} in any of the three cases that we are dealing with.

A nonnegative number R is called an achievable rate for \mathfrak{J} with informed decoder if there is a sequence of (l, k_l) -codes such that

1. $\liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \log k_l \geq R$, and
2. $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_l}, \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}}^l \circ \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l} \circ \mathcal{P}^l) = 1$

holds.

The *capacity* $Q_{ID}(\mathfrak{J})$ of the compound channel \mathfrak{J} with informed decoder is given by

$$Q_{ID}(\mathfrak{J}) := \sup\{R \in \mathbb{R}_+ \quad : \quad R \text{ is achievable for } \mathfrak{J} \text{ with informed decoder}\}.$$

2.2 The Informed Encoder

An (l, k_l) -code for \mathfrak{J} with *informed encoder* is a pair $(\{\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{N}}^l : \mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}\}, \mathcal{R}^l)$ where:

1. $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{N}}^l : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}_l) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^{\otimes l}$ is a CPTP map for each $\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}$ for some Hilbert space \mathcal{F}_l with $k_l = \dim \mathcal{F}_l$. The maps $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{N}}^l$ are the encoding operations which we allow to depend on \mathcal{N} since the encoder knows which channel is in use.
2. $\mathcal{R}^l : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})^{\otimes l} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}'_l)$ is a CPTP map where the Hilbert space \mathcal{F}'_l satisfies $\mathcal{F}_l \subset \mathcal{F}'_l$.

A nonnegative number R is called an achievable rate for \mathfrak{J} with informed encoder if there is a sequence of (l, k_l) -codes such that

1. $\liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \log k_l \geq R$, and
2. $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_l}, \mathcal{R}^l \circ \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l} \circ \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{N}}^l) = 1$

holds.

The *capacity* $Q_{IE}(\mathfrak{J})$ of the compound channel \mathfrak{J} with informed encoder is given by

$$Q_{IE}(\mathfrak{J}) := \sup\{R \in \mathbb{R}_+ \quad : \quad R \text{ is achievable for } \mathfrak{J} \text{ with informed encoder}\}.$$

2.3 The Case of Uninformed Users

Codes and capacity for the compound channel \mathfrak{J} with *uninformed users* are defined in a similar fashion. The only change is that we do not allow the encoding operations to depend on \mathcal{N} . I.e. An (l, k_l) -code for \mathfrak{J} is a pair $(\mathcal{P}^l, \mathcal{R}^l)$ of CPTP maps $\mathcal{P}^l \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{F}_l, \mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})$ where \mathcal{F}_l is a Hilbert space with $k_l = \dim \mathcal{F}_l$ and $\mathcal{R}^l \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}^{\otimes l}, \mathcal{F}'_l)$ with $\mathcal{F}_l \subset \mathcal{F}'_l$.

A nonnegative number R is called an achievable rate for \mathfrak{J} if there is a sequence of (l, k_l) -codes such that

1. $\liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \log k_l \geq R$, and
2. $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_l}, \mathcal{R}^l \circ \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l} \circ \mathcal{P}^l) = 1$.

The *capacity* $Q(\mathfrak{J})$ of the compound channel \mathfrak{J} is given by

$$Q(\mathfrak{J}) := \sup\{R \in \mathbb{R}_+ \quad : \quad R \text{ is achievable for } \mathfrak{J}\}.$$

A first simple consequence of these definitions is the following relation among the capacities of \mathfrak{J} .

$$Q(\mathfrak{J}) \leq \min\{Q_{ID}(\mathfrak{J}), Q_{IE}(\mathfrak{J})\}.$$

3 One-Shot Results

In this section we will establish the basic building blocks for the achievability parts of the coding theorems for compound channels with and without channel knowledge. The results are formulated as one-shot statements in order to simplify the notation.

3.1 One-Shot Coding Result for a Single Channel

Before we turn our attention to quantum compound channels we will shortly describe a part of recent developments in coding theory for single (i.e. perfectly known) channels as given in [18] and [12]. Both approaches are based on a decoupling idea which is closely related to approximate error correction. In order to state this decoupling lemma we need some notational preparation.

Let $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ be given and consider any purification $\psi \in \mathcal{H}_a \otimes \mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{H}_a = \mathcal{H}$, of ρ . According to Stinespring's representation theorem any $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{C}^\downarrow(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is given by

$$\mathcal{N}(\cdot) = \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_e}((\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes p_e)v(\cdot)v^*), \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{H}_e is a suitable finite-dimensional Hilbert space, p_e is a projection onto a subspace of \mathcal{H}_e , and $v : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{H}_e$ is an isometry.

Let us define a pure state on $\mathcal{H}_a \otimes \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{H}_e$ by the formula

$$\psi' := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\text{tr}(\mathcal{N}(\pi_{\mathcal{F}}))}}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_a \otimes \mathcal{H}} \otimes p_e)(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_a} \otimes v)\psi.$$

We set

$$\rho' := \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_a \otimes \mathcal{H}_e}(|\psi'\rangle\langle\psi'|), \quad \rho'_{ae} := \text{tr}_{\mathcal{K}}(|\psi'\rangle\langle\psi'|),$$

and

$$\rho_a := \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}_e}(|\psi'\rangle\langle\psi'|), \quad \rho'_e := \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_a \otimes \mathcal{K}}(|\psi'\rangle\langle\psi'|).$$

The announced decoupling lemma can now be stated as follows.

Lemma 1 (Cf. [18],[12]) *For $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{C}^\downarrow(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ there exists a recovery operation $\mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{H})$ with*

$$F_e(\rho, \mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{N}) \geq w - \|w\rho'_{ae} - w\rho_a \otimes \rho'_e\|_1,$$

where $w = \text{tr}(\mathcal{N}(\rho))$.

The striking implication of Lemma 1 is that if the so called quantum error $\|\rho'_{ae} - \rho_a \otimes \rho'_e\|_1$ for $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is small then almost perfect error correction is possible via \mathcal{R} .

Lemma 1 was Klesse's [18] starting point for his highly interesting proof of the following theorem which is a one-shot version of the achievability part of the coding theorem. In the statement of the result we will use the following notation.

$$F_{c,e}(\rho, \mathcal{N}) := \max_{\mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{H})} F_e(\rho, \mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{N}),$$

where $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{C}^\downarrow(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$.

Theorem 2 (Klesse [18]) *Let the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} be given and consider subspaces $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{H}$ with $\dim \mathcal{E} = k$. Then for any $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{C}^\downarrow(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ allowing a representation with n Kraus operators we have*

$$\int_{\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G})} F_{c,e}(u\pi_{\mathcal{E}}u^*, \mathcal{N})du \geq \text{tr}(\mathcal{N}(\pi_{\mathcal{G}})) - \sqrt{k \cdot n} \|\mathcal{N}(\pi_{\mathcal{G}})\|_2,$$

where $\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G})$ denotes the group of unitaries acting on \mathcal{G} and du indicates that the integration is with respect to the Haar measure on $\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G})$.

We will indicate briefly how Klesse [18] derived the direct part of the coding theorem for memoryless quantum channels from Theorem 2. Let us choose for each $l \in \mathbb{N}$ subspaces $\mathcal{E}_l \subset \mathcal{G}^{\otimes l} \subset \mathcal{H}^{\otimes l}$ with

$$\dim \mathcal{E}_l =: k_l = 2^{l(I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}) - 3\epsilon)}.$$

To given $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ and $\pi_{\mathcal{G}}$ Klesse constructed a reduced version \mathcal{N}'_l of $\mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}$ in such a way that \mathcal{N}'_l has a Kraus representation with $n_l \leq 2^{l(S_e(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}) + \epsilon)}$ Kraus operators. Let $q_l \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}^{\otimes l})$ be the entropy-typical projection of the state $(\mathcal{N}(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}))^{\otimes l}$ and set $\mathcal{N}'_l(\cdot) := q_l \mathcal{N}_l(\cdot) q_l$. Then we have the following properties (some of which are stated once more for completeness)

1. $k_l = 2^{l(I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}) - 3\epsilon)}$,
2. $\text{tr}(\mathcal{N}'_l(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}^{\otimes l})) \geq 1 - o(l^0)$,
3. $n_l \leq 2^{l(S_e(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}) + \epsilon)}$, and
4. $\|\mathcal{N}'_l(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}^{\otimes l})\|_2^2 \leq 2^{-l(S(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}) - \epsilon)}$

An application of Theorem 2 to \mathcal{N}'_l shows heuristically the existence of a unitary $u \in \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G}^{\otimes l})$ and a recovery operation $\mathcal{R}_l \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}^{\otimes l}, \mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})$ with

$$F_e(u\pi_{\mathcal{E}_l}u^*, \mathcal{R}_l \circ \mathcal{N}'_l) \geq 1 - o(l^0) - 2^{-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon}.$$

This in turn can be converted into

$$F_e(u\pi_{\mathcal{E}_l}u^*, \mathcal{R}_l \circ \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}) \geq 1 - o(l^0),$$

which is the achievability of $I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N})$. The passage from $\pi_{\mathcal{G}}$ to arbitrary states ρ is then accomplished via the Bennett, Shor, Smolin, and Thapliyal Lemma from [2] and the rest is by regularization.

3.2 One-Shot Coding Result for Uninformed Users

Our goal in this section is to establish a variant of Theorem 2 that works for finite sets of channels. Since the entanglement fidelity depends affinely on the channel it is easily seen that for each set $\mathcal{J} = \{\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_N\}$ any good coding scheme with uninformed users is also good for the channel

$$\mathcal{N} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{N}_i$$

and vice versa. Since it is easier to deal with a single channel and we do not lose anything if passing to averages we will formulate our next theorem for arithmetic averages of completely positive trace decreasing maps instead of the set $\{\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_N\}$.

Theorem 3 (One-Shot Result: Uninformed Users and Averaged Channel) *Let the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} be given and consider subspaces $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{H}$ with $\dim \mathcal{E} = k$. For any choice of $\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_N \in \mathcal{C}^\downarrow(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ each allowing a representation with n_j Kraus operators, $j = 1, \dots, N$, we set*

$$\mathcal{N} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{N}_j,$$

and for any $u \in \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G})$

$$\mathcal{N}_u := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{N}_j \circ \mathcal{U}.$$

Then

$$\int_{\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G})} F_{c,e}(\pi_{\mathcal{E}}, \mathcal{N}_u) du \geq \text{tr}(\mathcal{N}(\pi_{\mathcal{G}})) - 2 \sum_{j=1}^N \sqrt{kn_j} \|\mathcal{N}_j(\pi_{\mathcal{G}})\|_2,$$

where the integration is with respect to the normalized Haar measure on $\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G})$.

Remark 4 *It is worth noting that the average in this theorem is no more over maximally mixed states like in Theorem 2, but rather over encoding operations.*

Proof. The proof is easily reduced to that of the corresponding theorem in our previous paper [4]. Most of the details can also be seen in the proof of Theorem 6 in the next subsection. □

3.3 One-Shot Coding Result for Informed Encoder

Before stating the main result of this section we recall a useful lemma from [4] which will be needed in the proof of Theorem 6.

Lemma 5 *Let L and D be $N \times N$ matrices with non-negative entries which satisfy*

$$L_{jl} \leq L_{jj}, \quad L_{jl} \leq L_{ll}, \tag{2}$$

and

$$D_{jl} \leq \max\{D_{jj}, D_{ll}\} \tag{3}$$

for all $j, l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Then

$$\sum_{j,l=1}^N \frac{1}{N} \sqrt{L_{jl} D_{jl}} \leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^N \sqrt{L_{jj} D_{jj}}.$$

Proof. The proof of this lemma is elementary. The details can be picked up in our previous paper [4]. □

We will focus now on the scenario where the sender or encoder knows which channel is in use. Consequently, the encoding operation can depend on the individual channel. The idea behind the next theorem is that we perform an independent, randomized selection of unitary encoders for each channel in the finite set $\mathfrak{J} = \{\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_N\}$. This explains why the averaging in (4) is with respect to products of Haar measures instead of averaging over one single Haar measure as in Theorem 3.

Theorem 6 (One-Shot Result: Informed Encoder and Averaged Channel) *Let the finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be given. Consider subspaces $\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_N \subset \mathcal{H}$ with $\dim \mathcal{E} = k$ such that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ the dimension relation $k \leq \dim \mathcal{G}_i$ holds. Let $\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_N \in \mathcal{C}^\downarrow(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ each allowing a representation with n_j Kraus operators, $j = 1, \dots, N$. Let $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{H})$ be any fixed set of unitary operators such that $v_i \mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{G}_i$ holds for every $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. For an arbitrary set $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{H})$, define*

$$\mathcal{N}_{u_1, \dots, u_N} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{N}_i \circ \mathcal{U}_i \circ \mathcal{V}_i.$$

Then

$$\int_{\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G}_1) \times \dots \times \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G}_N)} F_{c,e}(\pi_{\mathcal{E}}, \mathcal{N}_{u_1, \dots, u_N}) du_1 \dots du_N \geq \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\frac{1}{N} \text{tr}(\mathcal{N}_j(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j})) - 2\sqrt{kn_j} \|\mathcal{N}_j(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j})\|_2 \right], \quad (4)$$

where the integration is with respect to the product of the normalized Haar measures on $\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G}_1), \dots, \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G}_N)$.

Proof. Our first step in the proof is to show briefly that $F_{c,e}(\pi_{\mathcal{E}}, \mathcal{N}_{u_1, \dots, u_N})$ depends measurably on $(u_1, \dots, u_N) \in \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G}_1) \times \dots \times \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G}_N)$. For each recovery operation $\mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{H})$ we define a function $f_{\mathcal{R}} : \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G}_1) \times \dots \times \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G}_N) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by

$$f_{\mathcal{R}}(u_1, \dots, u_N) := F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{E}}, \mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{N}_{u_1, \dots, u_N}).$$

Clearly, $f_{\mathcal{R}}$ is continuous for each fixed $\mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{H})$. Thus, the function

$$F_{c,e}(\pi_{\mathcal{E}}, \mathcal{N}_{u_1, \dots, u_N}) = \max_{\mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{H})} f_{\mathcal{R}}(u_1, \dots, u_N)$$

is lower semicontinuous, and consequently measurable.

We turn now to the proof of inequality (4). From Lemma 1 we know that there is a recovery operation \mathcal{R} such that

$$F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{E}}, \mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{N}_{u_1, \dots, u_N}) \geq w - \|w\rho'_{ae} - w\rho_a \otimes \rho'_e\|_1, \quad (5)$$

where we have used the notation introduced in the paragraph preceding Lemma 1, and

$$w = w(u_1, \dots, u_N) = \text{tr}(\mathcal{N}_{u_1, \dots, u_N}(\pi_{\mathcal{E}})).$$

For each $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ let $\{b_{j,i}\}_{i=1}^{n_j}$ be the set of Kraus operators of \mathcal{N}_j . Clearly, for every set u_1, \dots, u_N of unitary matrices, $\mathcal{N}_j \circ \mathcal{U}_j \circ \mathcal{V}_j$ has Kraus operators $\{a_{j,i}\}_{i=1}^{n_j}$ given by $a_{j,i} = b_{j,i} u_j v_j$. Utilizing the very same calculation that was used in the proof of Theorem 3 in [4], which in turn is almost identical to the corresponding calculation in [18], we can reformulate inequality (5) as

$$F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{E}}, \mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{N}_{u_1, \dots, u_N}) \geq w - \|D(u_1, \dots, u_N)\|_1, \quad (6)$$

with $w = \text{tr}(\mathcal{N}_{u_1, \dots, u_N}(\pi_{\mathcal{E}}))$ and

$$D(u_1, \dots, u_N) := \sum_{j,l=1}^N \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,r=1}^{n_j, n_l} D_{(ij)(rl)}(u_j, u_l) \otimes |e_i\rangle\langle e_r| \otimes |f_j\rangle\langle f_l|$$

where

$$D_{(ij)(rl)}(u_j, u_l) := \frac{1}{k} \left(p a_{j,i} a_{l,r}^* p - \frac{1}{k} \text{tr}(p a_{j,i}^* a_{l,r} p) p \right),$$

and $p := k\pi_{\mathcal{E}}$ is the projection onto \mathcal{E} . Let us define

$$D_{j,l}(u_j, u_l) := \sum_{i=1, k=1}^{n_j, n_l} D_{(ij)(kl)}(u_j, u_l) \otimes |e_i\rangle\langle e_k| \otimes |f_j\rangle\langle f_l|. \quad (7)$$

The triangle inequality for the trace norm yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|D(u_1, \dots, u_N)\|_1 &\leq \sum_{j,l=1}^N \frac{1}{N} \|D_{j,l}(u_j, u_l)\|_1 \\ &\leq \sum_{j,l=1}^N \frac{1}{N} \sqrt{k \min\{n_j, n_l\}} \|D_{j,l}(u_j, u_l)\|_2, \\ &= \sum_{j,l=1}^N \frac{1}{N} \sqrt{k \min\{n_j, n_l\}} \|D_{j,l}(u_j, u_l)\|_2^2, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where the second line follows from $\|a\|_1 \leq \sqrt{d}\|a\|_2$, d being the number of non-zero singular values of a . In the next step we will compute $\|D_{j,l}(u_j, u_l)\|_2^2$. We set $p_l := v_l p v_l^*$ which defines new projections $\{p_l\}_{l=1}^N$ with $\text{supp}(p_l) \subset \mathcal{G}_l$ for every $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. A glance at (7) shows that

$$(D_{j,l}(u_j, u_l))^* = \sum_{i=1, k=1}^{n_j, n_l} (D_{(ij)(kl)}(u_j, u_l))^* \otimes |e_k\rangle\langle e_i| \otimes |f_l\rangle\langle f_j|, \quad (9)$$

and consequently we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_{j,l}(u_j, u_l)\|_2^2 &= \text{tr}((D_{j,l}(u_j, u_l))^* D_{j,l}(u_j, u_l)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1, r=1}^{n_j, n_l} \text{tr}((D_{(ij)(kl)}(u_j, u_l))^* D_{(ij)(kl)}(u_j, u_l)) \\ &= \frac{1}{k^2} \sum_{i=1, r=1}^{n_j, n_l} \{ \text{tr}(p(a_{j,i}^* a_{l,r})^* p a_{j,i}^* a_{l,r}) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{k} |\text{tr}(p a_{j,i}^* a_{l,r})|^2 \} \\ &= \frac{1}{k^2} \sum_{i=1, r=1}^{n_j, n_l} \{ \text{tr}(p_l u_l^* b_{l,r}^* b_{j,i} u_j p_j u_j^* b_{j,i}^* b_{l,r} u_l) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{k} |\text{tr}(p v_j^* u_j^* b_{j,i}^* b_{l,r} u_l v_l)|^2 \}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

It is apparent from the last two lines in (10) that $\|D_{j,l}(u_j, u_l)\|_2^2$ depends measurably on $(u_1, \dots, u_N) \in \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G}_1) \times \dots \times \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G}_N)$. Let U_1, \dots, U_N be independent random variables taking values in $\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G}_i)$ according to the normalized Haar measure on $\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G}_i)$ ($i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$). Then using Jensen's inequality and abbreviating $L_{jl} := k \min\{n_j, n_l\}$ we can infer from (8) that

$$\mathbb{E}(\|D(U_1, \dots, U_N)\|_1) \leq \sum_{j,l=1}^N \frac{1}{N} \sqrt{L_{jl} \mathbb{E}(\|D_{j,l}(U_j, U_l)\|_2^2)}. \quad (11)$$

Note that the expectations on the RHS of (11) are only with respect to pairs of random variables U_1, \dots, U_N .

Our next goal is to upper-bound $\mathbb{E}(\|D_{j,l}(U_j, U_l)\|_2^2)$.

Case $j \neq l$: Since the last term in (10) is non-negative and the random variables U_j and U_l are independent we obtain the following chain of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\|D_{j,l}(U_j, U_l)\|_2^2) &= \frac{1}{k^2} \sum_{i=1, r=1}^{n_j, n_l} \left[\mathbb{E} \text{tr}(p_l U_l^* b_{l,r}^* b_{j,i} U_j p_j U_j^* b_{j,i}^* b_{l,r} U_l) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{k} \mathbb{E} |\text{tr}(p v_j^* U_j^* b_{j,i}^* b_{l,r} U_l v_l)|^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{k^2} \sum_{i=1, r=1}^{n_j, n_l} \mathbb{E} \text{tr}(p_l U_l^* b_{l,r}^* b_{j,i} U_j p_j U_j^* b_{j,i}^* b_{l,r} U_l) \\ &= \frac{1}{k^2} \sum_{i=1, r=1}^{n_j, n_l} \mathbb{E} \text{tr}(U_l p_l U_l^* b_{l,r}^* b_{j,i} U_j p_j U_j^* b_{j,i}^* b_{l,r}) \\ &= \frac{1}{k^2} \sum_{i=1, r=1}^{n_j, n_l} \text{tr}(\mathbb{E}(U_l p_l U_l^*) b_{l,r}^* b_{j,i} \mathbb{E}(U_j p_j U_j^*) b_{j,i}^* b_{l,r}) \\ &= \frac{1}{k^2} \sum_{i=1, r=1}^{n_j, n_l} \text{tr}(k \cdot \pi_{\mathcal{G}_l} b_{l,r}^* b_{j,i} k \cdot \pi_{\mathcal{G}_j} b_{j,i}^* b_{l,r}) \\ &= \langle \mathcal{N}_j(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j}), \mathcal{N}_l(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_l}) \rangle_{HS}, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{HS}$ denotes the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product, and we used the fact that

$$\mathbb{E}(U_l p_l U_l^*) = k \cdot \pi_{\mathcal{G}_l} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}(U_j p_j U_j^*) = k \cdot \pi_{\mathcal{G}_j}.$$

Case $j = l$: In this case we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\|D_{j,j}(U_j, U_j)\|_2^2) &= \frac{1}{k^2} \sum_{i=1, r=1}^{n_j, n_j} \left[\mathbb{E} \text{tr}(p_j U_j^* b_{j,r}^* b_{j,i} U_j p_j U_j^* b_{j,i}^* b_{j,r} U_j) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{k} \mathbb{E} |\text{tr}(p v_j^* U_j^* b_{j,i}^* b_{j,r} U_j v_j)|^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{k^2} \sum_{i=1, r=1}^{n_j, n_j} \mathbb{E} \text{tr}(U_j p_j U_j^* b_{j,r}^* b_{j,i} U_j p_j U_j^* b_{j,i}^* b_{j,r}) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{k} \mathbb{E} |\text{tr}(U_j p_j U_j^* b_{j,i}^* b_{j,r})|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Thus, the problem reduces to the evaluation of

$$\mathbb{E}\{b_{UpU^*}(x, y)\}, \quad (x, y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}))$$

where p is an orthogonal projection with $\text{tr}(p) = k$ and

$$b_{UpU^*}(x, y) := \text{tr}(UpU^*x^*UpU^*y) - \frac{1}{k}\text{tr}(UpU^*x^*)\text{tr}(UpU^*y),$$

for a Haar distributed random variable U with values in $\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G})$ where $\text{supp}(p) \subset \mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{H}$.

Here we can refer to [18] where the corresponding calculation is carried out via the theory of group invariants and explicit evaluations of appropriate integrals with respect to row-distributions of random unitary matrices. The result is

$$\mathbb{E}\{b_{UpU^*}(x, y)\} = \frac{k^2 - 1}{d^2 - 1}\text{tr}(p_{\mathcal{G}}x^*p_{\mathcal{G}}y) + \frac{1 - k^2}{d(d^2 - 1)}\text{tr}(p_{\mathcal{G}}x^*)\text{tr}(p_{\mathcal{G}}y), \quad (14)$$

for all $x, y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ where $p_{\mathcal{G}}$ denotes the projection onto \mathcal{G} with $\text{tr}(p_{\mathcal{G}}) = d$. In Appendix A we will give an elementary derivation of (14) for the sake of completeness.

Inserting (14) with $x = y = b_{j,i}^*b_{j,r}$ into (13) yields with $d_j := \text{tr}(p_{\mathcal{G}_j})$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\|D_{j,j}(U_j, U_j)\|_2^2) &= \frac{1 - \frac{1}{k^2}}{d_j^2 - 1} \left[\sum_{i=1, r=1}^{n_j, n_j} \text{tr}(p_{\mathcal{G}_j} b_{j,r}^* b_{j,i} p_{\mathcal{G}_j} b_{j,i}^* b_{j,r}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{d_j} |\text{tr}(p_{\mathcal{G}_j} b_{j,i}^* b_{j,r})|^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1 - \frac{1}{k^2}}{d_j^2 - 1} \sum_{i=1, r=1}^{n_j, n_j} \text{tr}(p_{\mathcal{G}_j} b_{j,r}^* b_{j,i} p_{\mathcal{G}_j} b_{j,i}^* b_{j,r}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{d_j^2} \sum_{i=1, r=1}^{n_j, n_j} \text{tr}(p_{\mathcal{G}_j} b_{j,r}^* b_{j,i} p_{\mathcal{G}_j} b_{j,i}^* b_{j,r}) \\ &= \frac{1}{d_j^2} \sum_{i=1, r=1}^{n_j, n_j} \text{tr}(b_{j,r} p_{\mathcal{G}_j} b_{j,r}^* b_{j,i} p_{\mathcal{G}_j} b_{j,i}^*) \\ &= \langle \mathcal{N}_j(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j}), \mathcal{N}_j(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j}) \rangle_{HS}. \end{aligned}$$

Summarizing, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(\|D_{j,j}(U_j, U_j)\|_2^2) \leq \langle \mathcal{N}_j(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j}), \mathcal{N}_j(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j}) \rangle_{HS} = \|\mathcal{N}_j(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j})\|_2^2. \quad (15)$$

Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\text{tr}(\mathcal{N}_{U_1, \dots, U_N}(\pi_{\mathcal{E}}))) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}(\text{tr}(\mathcal{N}_j(U_j \frac{1}{k} p_j U_j^*))) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \text{tr}(\mathcal{N}_j(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j})). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

(6), (8), (12), (15), and (16) show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(F_{c,e}(\pi_{\mathcal{E}}, \mathcal{N}_{U_1, \dots, U_N})) &\geq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \text{tr}(\mathcal{N}_j(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j})) \\ &\quad - \sum_{j,l=1}^N \frac{1}{N} \sqrt{L_{jl} D_{jl}}, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where for $j, l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ we introduced the abbreviation

$$D_{jl} := \langle \mathcal{N}_j(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j}), \mathcal{N}_l(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_l}) \rangle_{HS},$$

and, as before,

$$L_{jl} = k \min\{n_j, n_l\}.$$

It is obvious that

$$L_{jl} \leq L_{jj} \quad \text{and} \quad L_{jl} \leq L_{ll}$$

hold. Moreover, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product shows that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{jl} &= \langle \mathcal{N}_j(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j}), \mathcal{N}_l(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_l}) \rangle_{HS} \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{N}_j(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j})\|_2 \|\mathcal{N}_l(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_l})\|_2 \\ &\leq \max\{\|\mathcal{N}_j(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j})\|_2^2, \|\mathcal{N}_l(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_l})\|_2^2\} \\ &= \max\{D_{jj}, D_{ll}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, an application of Lemma 5 allows us to conclude from (17) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(F_{c,e}(\pi_{\mathcal{E}}, \mathcal{N}_{U_1, \dots, U_N})) &\geq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \text{tr}(\mathcal{N}_j(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j})) \\ &\quad - 2 \sum_{j=1}^N \sqrt{kn_j} \|\mathcal{N}_j(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j})\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

and we are done. □

3.4 Entanglement Fidelity

The purpose of this subsection is to develop a tool which will enable us to convert a special kind of recovery maps depending on the channel into such that are universal, at least for finite compound channels. Anticipating constructions in section 4 below the situation we will be faced with is as follows. For finite set $\mathcal{J} = \{\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_N\}$ of channels, block length $l \in \mathbb{N}$, and small $\epsilon > 0$ we will be able to find one single recovery map \mathcal{R}^l and a unitary encoder \mathcal{W}^l such that for each $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$

$$F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_l}, \mathcal{R}^l \circ \mathcal{Q}_{l,i} \circ \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l} \circ \mathcal{W}^l) \geq 1 - \epsilon,$$

where $\mathcal{Q}_{l,i}(\cdot) := q_{l,i}(\cdot)q_{l,i}$ with suitable projections $q_{l,i}$ acting on $\mathcal{K}^{\otimes l}$. Thus we will effectively end up with the recovery maps $\mathcal{R}_i^l := \mathcal{R}^l \circ \mathcal{Q}_{l,i}$. Consequently, it turns out that the decoder is *informed*. Lemma 7 below shows how to get rid of the maps $\mathcal{Q}_{l,i}$ ensuring the existence of a universal recovery map for the whole set \mathfrak{J} while decreasing the entanglement fidelity only slightly.

Lemma 7 *Let $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ for some Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Let, for some other Hilbert space \mathcal{K} , $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$, $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{H})$, $q \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ be an orthogonal projection.*

1. Denoting by \mathcal{Q}^\perp the completely positive map induced by $q^\perp := \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{K}} - q$ we have

$$F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{A}) \geq F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{Q} \circ \mathcal{A})(1 - 2F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{Q}^\perp \circ \mathcal{A})). \quad (18)$$

2. If for some $\epsilon > 0$ the relation $F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{Q} \circ \mathcal{A}) \geq 1 - \epsilon$ holds, then

$$F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{Q}^\perp \circ \mathcal{A}) \leq \epsilon,$$

and (18) implies

$$F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{A}) \geq (1 - \epsilon)(1 - 2\epsilon) \geq 1 - 3\epsilon. \quad (19)$$

3. If for some $\epsilon > 0$ merely the relation $\text{tr}\{q\mathcal{A}(\rho)\} \geq 1 - \epsilon$ holds then we can conclude that

$$F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{A}) \geq F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{Q} \circ \mathcal{A}) - 2\epsilon. \quad (20)$$

The following Lemma 8 contains two inequalities one of which will be needed in the proof of Lemma 7.

Lemma 8 *Let $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{H})$ and $x_1 \perp x_2$, $z_1 \perp z_2$ be state vectors, $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{K}$, $z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{H}$. Then*

$$|\langle z_1, \mathcal{D}(|x_1\rangle\langle x_2|)z_1 \rangle| \leq \sqrt{|\langle z_1, \mathcal{D}(|x_1\rangle\langle x_1|)z_1 \rangle| \cdot |\langle z_1, \mathcal{D}(|x_2\rangle\langle x_2|)z_1 \rangle|} \leq 1, \quad (21)$$

and

$$|\langle z_1, \mathcal{D}(|x_1\rangle\langle x_2|)z_2 \rangle| \leq \sqrt{|\langle z_1, \mathcal{D}(|x_1\rangle\langle x_1|)z_1 \rangle| \cdot |\langle z_2, \mathcal{D}(|x_2\rangle\langle x_2|)z_2 \rangle|} \leq 1. \quad (22)$$

We will utilize only (21) in the proof of Lemma 7. But the inequality (22) might prove useful in other context so that we state it here for completeness.

Proof of Lemma 8. Let $\dim \mathcal{H} = h$, $\dim \mathcal{K} = \kappa$. Extend $\{x_1, x_2\}$ to an orthonormal basis $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_\kappa\}$ of \mathcal{K} and $\{z_1, z_2\}$ to an orthonormal basis $\{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_h\}$ on \mathcal{H} . Since $x_1 \perp x_2$ and $z_1 \perp z_2$, this can always be done. By the theorem of Choi [6], a linear map from $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ to $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ is completely positive if and only if its Choi matrix is positive. Write $\mathcal{D}(|x_i\rangle\langle x_j|) = \sum_{k,l=1}^h D_{kl}^{ij} |z_k\rangle\langle z_l|$. Then the Choi matrix of \mathcal{D} is, with respect to the bases $\{x_1, \dots, x_\kappa\}$ and $\{z_1, \dots, z_h\}$, written as

$$CHOI(\mathcal{D}) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{\kappa} |x_i\rangle\langle x_j| \otimes \sum_{k,l=1}^h D_{kl}^{ij} |z_k\rangle\langle z_l|.$$

If $CHOI(\mathcal{D})$ is positive, then all principal minors of $CHOI(\mathcal{D})$ are positive (cf. Corollary 7.1.5 in [15]) and thus

$$|D_{kl}^{ij}| \leq \sqrt{|D_{kk}^{ii}| \cdot |D_{ll}^{jj}|}$$

for every suitable choice of i, j, k, l . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle z_1 | \mathcal{D}(|x_1\rangle\langle x_2|) z_2 \rangle| &= |D_{12}^{12}| \\ &\leq \sqrt{|D_{11}^{11}| \cdot |D_{22}^{22}|} \\ &= \sqrt{|\langle z_1, \mathcal{D}(|x_1\rangle\langle x_1|) z_1 \rangle| \cdot |\langle z_2, \mathcal{D}(|x_2\rangle\langle x_2|) z_2 \rangle|}, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$|\langle z_1, \mathcal{D}(|x_1\rangle\langle x_2|) z_1 \rangle| \leq \sqrt{|\langle z_1, \mathcal{D}(|x_1\rangle\langle x_1|) z_1 \rangle| \cdot |\langle z_1, \mathcal{D}(|x_2\rangle\langle x_2|) z_1 \rangle|}.$$

The fact that \mathcal{D} is trace preserving gives us the estimate $\langle z_i, \mathcal{D}(|x_j\rangle\langle x_j|) z_i \rangle \leq 1$ (i, j suitably chosen) and we are done. □

Proof of Lemma 7. Let $\dim \mathcal{H} = h$, $\dim \mathcal{K} = \kappa$, $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{H}_a \otimes \mathcal{H}$ be a purification of ρ (w.l.o.g. $\mathcal{H}_a = \mathcal{H}$). Set $\tilde{\mathcal{D}} := id_{\mathcal{H}_a} \otimes \mathcal{D}$, $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} := id_{\mathcal{H}_a} \otimes \mathcal{A}$, $\tilde{q} := \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_a} \otimes q$ and, as usual, \tilde{q}^\perp the orthocomplement of \tilde{q} within $\mathcal{H}_a \otimes \mathcal{K}$. Obviously,

$$\begin{aligned} F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{A}) &= \langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{D}} \circ \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \psi \rangle \\ &= \langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}([\tilde{q} + \tilde{q}^\perp] \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| [\tilde{q} + \tilde{q}^\perp]) \psi) \rangle \\ &= \langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(\tilde{q} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \tilde{q}) \psi \rangle + \langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(\tilde{q}^\perp \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \tilde{q}^\perp) \psi \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(\tilde{q} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \tilde{q}^\perp) \psi \rangle + \langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(\tilde{q}^\perp \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \tilde{q}) \psi \rangle \\ &\geq \langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(\tilde{q} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \tilde{q}) \psi \rangle + 2\Re\{\langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(\tilde{q} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \tilde{q}^\perp) \psi \rangle\} \\ &\geq \langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(\tilde{q} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \tilde{q}) \psi \rangle - 2|\langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(\tilde{q} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \tilde{q}^\perp) \psi \rangle| \\ &= F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{Q} \circ \mathcal{A}) - 2|\langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(\tilde{q} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \tilde{q}^\perp) \psi \rangle|. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

We establish a lower bound on the second term on the RHS of (23). Let

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa \cdot h} \lambda_i |a_i\rangle\langle a_i|,$$

where $\{a_1, \dots, a_{\kappa \cdot h}\}$ are assumed to form an orthonormal basis. Now every a_i can be written as $a_i = \alpha_i x_i + \beta_i y_i$ where $x_i \in \text{supp}(\tilde{q})$ and $y_i \in \text{supp}(\tilde{q}^\perp)$, $i \in \{1, \dots, \kappa \cdot h\}$, are state vectors and $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in \mathbb{C}$. Define $\sigma := \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$, then

$$\sigma = \sum_{j=1}^{\kappa \cdot h} \lambda_j (|\alpha_j|^2 |x_j\rangle\langle x_j| + \alpha_j \beta_j^* |x_j\rangle\langle y_j| + \beta_j \alpha_j^* |y_j\rangle\langle x_j| + |\beta_j|^2 |y_j\rangle\langle y_j|). \tag{24}$$

Set $X := |\langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(\tilde{q}\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)\tilde{q}^\perp)\psi \rangle|$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
X &= |\langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(\tilde{q}\sigma q^\perp)\psi \rangle| \\
&\stackrel{\mathbf{a}}{=} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa \cdot h} \lambda_i \langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(\tilde{q}|a_i\rangle\langle a_i|\tilde{q}^\perp)\psi \rangle \right| \\
&= \left| \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa \cdot h} \lambda_i \alpha_i \beta_i^* \langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(|x_i\rangle\langle y_i|)\psi \rangle \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa \cdot h} |\lambda_i \alpha_i \beta_i^*| \cdot |\langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(|x_i\rangle\langle y_i|)\psi \rangle| \\
&\stackrel{\mathbf{b}}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa \cdot h} \sqrt{\lambda_i |\langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(|x_i\rangle\langle x_i|)\psi \rangle} \alpha_i \sqrt{\lambda_i |\langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(|y_i\rangle\langle y_i|)\psi \rangle} \beta_i^* \\
&\stackrel{\mathbf{c}}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa \cdot h} \lambda_i |\alpha_i|^2 \langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(|x_i\rangle\langle x_i|)\psi \rangle \sum_{j=1}^{\kappa \cdot h} \lambda_j |\beta_j|^2 \langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(|y_j\rangle\langle y_j|)\psi \rangle. \tag{25}
\end{aligned}$$

Here, **a** follows from using the convex decomposition of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$, **b** from utilizing inequality (21) from Lemma 8 and **c** is an application of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Now, employing the representation (24) it is easily seen that

$$F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{Q} \circ \mathcal{A}) = \langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(\tilde{q}|a_i\rangle\langle a_i|\tilde{q})\psi \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa \cdot h} \lambda_i |\alpha_i|^2 \langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(|x_i\rangle\langle x_i|)\psi \rangle \tag{26}$$

and similarly

$$F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{Q} \circ \mathcal{A}) = \sum_{j=1}^{\kappa \cdot h} \lambda_j |\beta_j|^2 \langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(|y_j\rangle\langle y_j|)\psi \rangle. \tag{27}$$

The inequalities (27), (26), (25), and (23) yield

$$\begin{aligned}
F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{A}) &\geq F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{Q} \circ \mathcal{A}) - 2F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{Q} \circ \mathcal{A})F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{Q}^\perp \circ \mathcal{A}) \\
&= F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{Q} \circ \mathcal{A})(1 - 2F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{Q}^\perp \circ \mathcal{A}))
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

which establishes (18).

Let us turn now to the other assertions stated in the lemma. Let $\text{tr}\{q\mathcal{A}(\rho)\} \geq 1 - \epsilon$. This implies $\text{tr}(q^\perp\mathcal{A}(\rho)) \leq \epsilon$. A direct calculation yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{tr}(\tilde{q}^\perp\sigma) &= \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_a}(\text{tr}_{\mathcal{K}}((\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_a} \otimes q^\perp)id_{\mathcal{H}_a} \otimes \mathcal{A}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|))) \\
&= \text{tr}_{\mathcal{K}}(q^\perp\mathcal{A}(\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_a}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|))) \\
&= \text{tr}_{\mathcal{K}}(q^\perp\mathcal{A}(\rho)) \\
&\leq \epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Using (24), we get the useful inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon &\geq \text{tr}(\tilde{q}^\perp \sigma) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa \cdot h} \lambda_i |\beta_i|^2 \text{tr}(\tilde{q}^\perp |y_i\rangle \langle y_i|) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa \cdot h} \lambda_i |\beta_i|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Using Lemma 8 and (29) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
X &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa \cdot h} \lambda_i |\alpha_i|^2 \sum_{j=1}^{\kappa \cdot h} \lambda_j |\beta_j|^2 \\
&\leq \epsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

thus by equation (23) we have

$$F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{A}) \geq F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{Q} \circ \mathcal{A}) - 2\epsilon.$$

In case that $F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{Q} \circ \mathcal{A}) \geq 1 - \epsilon$, we note that the linear maps \mathcal{Q} and \mathcal{Q}^\perp are elements of $\mathcal{C}^\perp(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K})$ whilst $\mathcal{Q} + \mathcal{Q}^\perp \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K})$ and since F_e is affine in the operation

$$F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{Q} \circ \mathcal{A}) + F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{Q}^\perp \circ \mathcal{A}) = F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ (\mathcal{Q} + \mathcal{Q}^\perp) \circ \mathcal{A}) \leq 1$$

has to hold. This in turn implies

$$F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{Q}^\perp \circ \mathcal{A}) \leq \epsilon.$$

Using this, our assumption that $F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{Q} \circ \mathcal{A}) \geq 1 - \epsilon$, and (28) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{A}) &\geq F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{Q} \circ \mathcal{A})(1 - 2F_e(\rho, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{Q}^\perp \circ \mathcal{A})) \\
&\geq (1 - \epsilon)(1 - 2\epsilon) \\
&\geq 1 - 3\epsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

which is the claim we made in (19). □

4 Direct Part of The Coding Theorem for Finitely many Channels

4.1 Typical Projections and Kraus Operators

In this subsection we recall briefly the well-known properties of frequency typical projections and reduced operations. A more detailed description can be found in [4] and references therein.

Lemma 9 *There is a real number $c > 0$ and functions $h : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, $\varphi : (0, 1/2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ with $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} h(l) = 0$ and $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \varphi(\delta) = 0$, and for any $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, $\delta > 0$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$ an orthogonal projection $q_{\delta, l} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^{\otimes l}$ called frequency-typical projection that satisfies*

1. $\text{tr}(\rho^{\otimes l} q_{\delta,l}) \geq 1 - 2^{-l(c\delta^2 - h(l))}$,
2. $2^{-l(S(\rho) + \varphi(\delta))} q_{\delta,l} \leq q_{\delta,l} \rho^{\otimes l} q_{\delta,l} \leq 2^{-l(S(\rho) - \varphi(\delta))} q_{\delta,l}$, and
3. $\eta_l(\delta) 2^{l(S(\rho) - \varphi(\delta))} \leq \text{tr}(q_{\delta,l}) \leq 2^{l(S(\rho) + \varphi(\delta))}$ where

$$\eta_l(\delta) := 1 - 2^{-l(c\delta^2 - h(l))}.$$

The rightmost inequalities in 2. and 3. imply

$$\|q_{\delta,l} \rho^{\otimes l} q_{\delta,l}\|_2^2 \leq 2^{-l(S(\rho) - 3\varphi(\delta))}.$$

Moreover, φ and h are given by

$$h(l) = \frac{d}{l} \log(l+1) \quad \forall l \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \varphi(\delta) = -\delta \log \frac{\delta}{d} \quad \forall \delta \in (0, 1/2).$$

Lemma 10 *Let $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$. There is a function $\gamma : (0, 1/2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfying $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \gamma(\delta) = 0$ such that for each $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ and maximally mixed state $\pi_{\mathcal{G}}$ on some subspace $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{H}$ there is an operation $\mathcal{N}_{\delta,l} \in \mathcal{C}^\downarrow(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l}, \mathcal{K}^{\otimes l})$ called reduced operation with respect to \mathcal{N} and $\pi_{\mathcal{G}}$ that satisfies*

1. $\text{tr}(\mathcal{N}_{\delta,l}(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}^{\otimes l})) \geq 1 - 2^{-l(c'\delta^2 - h'(l))}$, with a universal positive constant $c' > 0$,
2. $\mathcal{N}_{\delta,l}$ has a Kraus representation with at most $n_{\delta,l} \leq 2^{l(S_e(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}) + \gamma(\delta))}$ Kraus operators.
3. For every state $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})$ and every two channels $\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{C}^\downarrow(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l}, \mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})$ and $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{C}^\downarrow(\mathcal{K}^{\otimes l}, \mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})$ the inequality $F_e(\rho, \mathcal{L} \circ \mathcal{N}_{\delta,l} \circ \mathcal{I}) \leq F_e(\rho, \mathcal{L} \circ \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l} \circ \mathcal{I})$ is fulfilled.

The function $h' : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is given by $h'(l) = \frac{d^2}{l} \log(l+1) \quad \forall l \in \mathbb{N}$ and γ by $\gamma(\delta) = -\delta \log \frac{\delta}{d^2}$, $\forall \delta \in (0, 1/2)$.

4.2 The Case of Uninformed Users

Let us consider a compound channel given by a finite set $\mathfrak{J} := \{\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_N\} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ and a subspace $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{H}$. For every $l \in \mathbb{N}$, we choose a subspace $\mathcal{E}_l \subset \mathcal{G}^{\otimes l}$. As usual, $\pi_{\mathcal{E}_l}$ and $\pi_{\mathcal{G}}$ denote the maximally mixed states on \mathcal{E}_l , respectively \mathcal{G} while $k_l := \dim \mathcal{E}_l$ gives the dimension of \mathcal{E}_l .

For $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and states $\mathcal{N}_j(\pi_{\mathcal{G}})$ let $q_{j,\delta,l} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})^{\otimes l}$ be the frequency-typical projection of $\mathcal{N}_j(\pi_{\mathcal{G}})$ and $\mathcal{N}_{j,\delta,l}$ be the reduced operation associated with \mathcal{N}_j and $\pi_{\mathcal{G}}$ as defined in Subsec. 4.1.

These quantities enable us to define a new set of channels that is more adapted to our problem than the original one. We set for an arbitrary unitary operation $u^l \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})$

$$\hat{\mathcal{N}}_{j,u^l,\delta}^l := \mathcal{Q}_{j,\delta,l} \circ \mathcal{N}_{j,\delta,l} \circ \mathcal{U}^l$$

and, accordingly,

$$\hat{\mathcal{N}}_{u^l,\delta}^l := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \hat{\mathcal{N}}_{j,u^l,\delta}^l.$$

We will show the existence of good codes for the reduced channels $\mathcal{Q}_{j,\delta,l} \circ \mathcal{N}_{j,\delta,l}$ in the limit of large $l \in \mathbb{N}$. An application of Lemma 7 and Lemma 10 will then show that these codes are also good for the original

compound channel.

Let U^l be a random variable taking values in $\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G}^{\otimes l})$ which is distributed according to the Haar measure. Application of Theorem 3 yields

$$\mathbb{E}F_{c,e}(\pi_{\mathcal{E}_l}, \hat{\mathcal{N}}_{U^l, \delta}^l) \geq \text{tr}(\hat{\mathcal{N}}_{\delta}^l(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}^{\otimes l})) - 2 \sum_{j=1}^N \sqrt{k_l n_{j,\delta,l}} \|\hat{\mathcal{N}}_{j,\delta}^l(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}^{\otimes l})\|_2, \quad (30)$$

where $n_{j,\delta,l}$ stands for the number of Kraus operators of the reduced operation $\mathcal{N}_{j,\delta,l}$ ($j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$) and

$$\hat{\mathcal{N}}_{j,\delta}^l := \mathcal{Q}_{j,\delta,l} \circ \mathcal{N}_{j,\delta,l},$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{N}}_{\delta}^l := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \hat{\mathcal{N}}_{j,\delta}^l.$$

Notice that $\mathcal{Q}_{j,\delta,l} \circ \mathcal{N}_{j,\delta,l}$ trivially has a Kraus representation containing exactly $n_{j,\delta,l}$ elements. We will use inequality (30) in the proof of the following theorem.

Theorem 11 (Direct Part: Uninformed Users and $|\mathfrak{J}| < \infty$) *Let $\mathfrak{J} = \{\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_N\} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ be a compound channel and $\pi_{\mathcal{G}}$ the maximally mixed state associated to a subspace $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{H}$. Then*

$$Q(\mathfrak{J}) \geq \min_{\mathcal{N}_i \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}_i).$$

Proof. We show that for every $\epsilon > 0$ the number $\min_{\mathcal{N}_i \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}_i) - \epsilon$ is an achievable rate for \mathfrak{J} .

1) If $\min_{\mathcal{N}_i \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}_i) - \epsilon \leq 0$, there is nothing to prove.

2) Let $\min_{\mathcal{N}_i \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}_i) - \epsilon > 0$.

Choose $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$ satisfying $\gamma(\delta) + 3\varphi(\delta) < \epsilon$ with functions ψ, φ from Lemma 9 and 10.

Now choose for every $l \in \mathbb{N}$ a subspace $\mathcal{E}_l \subset \mathcal{G}^{\otimes l}$ such that

$$\dim \mathcal{E}_l =: k_l = \lfloor 2^{l(\min_{\mathcal{N}_i \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}_i) - \epsilon)} \rfloor.$$

By $S(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}) \geq I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}_j)$ (see [1]), this is always possible.

Obviously,

$$\min_{\mathcal{N}_i \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}_i) - \epsilon - o(l^0) \leq \frac{1}{l} \log k_l \leq \min_{\mathcal{N}_i \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}_i) - \epsilon.$$

We will now give lower bounds on the terms in (30), thereby making use of Lemma 9 and Lemma 10:

$$\text{tr}(\hat{\mathcal{N}}_{\delta}^l(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}^{\otimes l})) \geq 1 - 2^{-l(c\delta^2 - h(l))} - 2^{-l(c'\delta^2 - h'(l))}. \quad (31)$$

A more detailed calculation can be found in [4] or [18]. Further, and additionally using the inequality $\|A + B\|_2^2 \geq \|A\|_2^2 + \|B\|_2^2$ valid for nonnegative operators $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}^{\otimes l})$ (see [18]), we get the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\mathcal{N}}_{j,\delta}^l(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}^{\otimes l})\|_2^2 &\leq \text{tr}(q_{j,\delta,l}) 2^{-2l(S(\mathcal{N}_j(\pi_{\mathcal{G}})) - \varphi(\delta))} \\ &\leq 2^{-l(S(\mathcal{N}_j(\pi_{\mathcal{G}})) - 3\varphi(\delta))}. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

From (30), (31), (32) and our specific choice of k_l it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}F_{c,e}(\pi_{\mathcal{E}_l}, \hat{\mathcal{N}}_{j,\delta}^l) &\geq 1 - 2^{-l(c\delta^2 - h(l))} - 2^{-l(c'\delta^2 - h'(l))} \\ &\quad - 2 \sum_{j=1}^N \sqrt{2^{l(\frac{1}{3} \log k_l + \gamma(\delta) + 3\varphi(\delta) - I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}_j))}} \\ &\geq 1 - 2^{-l(c\delta^2 - h(l))} - 2^{-l(c'\delta^2 - h'(l))} \\ &\quad - 2N \sqrt{2^{-l(\epsilon - \gamma(\delta) - 3\varphi(\delta))}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\epsilon - \gamma(\delta) - 3\varphi(\delta) > 0$, this shows the existence of at least one sequence of (l, k_l) -codes for \mathfrak{J} with uninformed users and

$$\liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \log k_l = \min_{\mathcal{N}_i \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}_i) - \epsilon$$

as well as (using that entanglement fidelity is affine in the channel), for every $l \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\min_{j \in \{1, \dots, N\}} F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_l}, \mathcal{R}^l \circ \hat{\mathcal{N}}_{j,\delta}^l \circ \mathcal{W}^l) \geq 1 - N \frac{1}{3} \epsilon_l \quad (33)$$

where $w^l \in \mathfrak{A}(\mathcal{G}^{\otimes l}) \forall l \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$\epsilon_l = 3 \cdot (2^{-l(c\delta^2 - h(l))} + 2^{-l(c'\delta^2 - h'(l))} + 2N \sqrt{2^{-l(\epsilon - \gamma(\delta) - 3\varphi(\delta))}}). \quad (34)$$

Note that $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_l = 0$ exponentially fast. For every $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}$ we thus have, by property 3. of Lemma 10, construction of $\hat{\mathcal{N}}_{j,w^j,\delta}^l$, and equation (33),

$$\begin{aligned} F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_l}, \mathcal{R}^l \circ \mathcal{Q}_{j,\delta,l} \circ \mathcal{N}_j^{\otimes l} \circ \mathcal{W}^l) &\geq F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_l}, \mathcal{R}^l \circ \mathcal{Q}_{j,\delta,l} \circ \mathcal{N}_{j,\delta,l} \circ \mathcal{W}^l) \\ &= F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_l}, \mathcal{R}^l \circ \hat{\mathcal{N}}_{j,w^j,\delta}^l) \\ &\geq 1 - N \frac{1}{3} \epsilon_l. \end{aligned}$$

By the first two parts of Lemma 7, this immediately implies

$$\min_{\mathcal{N}_j \in \mathfrak{J}} F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_l}, \mathcal{R}^l \circ \mathcal{N}_j^{\otimes l} \circ \mathcal{W}^l) \geq 1 - N \epsilon_l \quad \forall l \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (35)$$

Since $\epsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, we have shown that $\min_{\mathcal{N}_i \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}_i)$ is an achievable rate. \square

4.3 The Informed Encoder

In this subsection we shall prove the following Theorem:

Theorem 12 (Direct Part: Informed Encoder and $|\mathfrak{J}| < \infty$) *For every finite compound channel $\mathfrak{J} = \{\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_N\} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ and any set $\{\pi_{\mathcal{G}_1}, \dots, \pi_{\mathcal{G}_N}\}$ of maximally mixed states on subspaces $\{\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_N\}$ with $\mathcal{G}_i \subset \mathcal{H}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ we have*

$$Q_{IE}(\mathfrak{J}) \geq \min_{\mathcal{N}_i \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_i}, \mathcal{N}_i).$$

Proof. Let a compound channel be given by a finite set $\mathfrak{J} := \{\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_N\} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ and let $\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_N$ be arbitrary subspaces of \mathcal{H} . We will prove that for every $\epsilon > 0$ the value

$$R(\epsilon) := \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_i}, \mathcal{N}_i) - \epsilon$$

is achievable. If $R(\epsilon) \leq 0$, there is nothing to prove. Hence we assume $R(\epsilon) > 0$. For every $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ we choose the following. First, a subspace $\mathcal{E}_l \subset \mathcal{H}^{\otimes l}$ of dimension $k_l := \dim \mathcal{E}_l$ that satisfies $k_l \leq \dim \mathcal{G}_i$. Second, a set $\{v_1^l, \dots, v_N^l\}$ of unitary operators with the property $v_i^l \mathcal{E}_l \subset \mathcal{G}_i^{\otimes l}$. Again, the maximally mixed states associated to the above mentioned subspaces are denoted by $\pi_{\mathcal{E}_l}$ on \mathcal{E}_l and $\pi_{\mathcal{G}_i}$ on \mathcal{G}_i .

For $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and states $\mathcal{N}_j(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j})$ let $q_{j,\delta,l} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})^{\otimes l}$ be the frequency-typical projection of $\mathcal{N}_j(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j})$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{j,\delta,l}$ be the reduced operation associated with \mathcal{N}_j and $\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j}$ as considered in section 4.1.

Let, for the moment, $l \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed. We define a new set of channels that is more adapted to our problem than the original one. We set, for an arbitrary set $\{u_1^l, \dots, u_N^l\}$ of unitary operators on $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l}$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{j,\delta}^l := \mathcal{Q}_{j,\delta,l} \circ \mathcal{N}_{j,\delta,l},$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{N}}_{j,u_j^l,\delta}^l := \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{j,\delta}^l \circ \mathcal{U}_j^l \circ \mathcal{V}_j^l$$

and, accordingly,

$$\hat{\mathcal{N}}_{u_1^l, \dots, u_N^l, \delta}^l := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \hat{\mathcal{N}}_{j,u_j^l,\delta}^l.$$

we will first show the existence of good unitary encodings and recovery operation for $\{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{1,\delta}^l, \dots, \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{N,\delta}^l\}$. Like in the previous subsection, application of Lemma 7 will enable us to show the existence of reliable encodings and recovery operation for the original compound channel \mathfrak{J} .

Let U_1^l, \dots, U_N^l be independent random variables such that each U_i^l takes on values in $\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G}_i^{\otimes l})$ and is distributed according to the Haar measure on $\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G}_i^{\otimes l})$ ($i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$). By Theorem 6 we get the lower bound

$$\mathbb{E} F_{c,\epsilon}(\pi_{\mathcal{E}_l}, \hat{\mathcal{N}}_{U_1^l, \dots, U_N^l, \delta}^l) \geq \sum_{j=1}^N \left[\frac{1}{N} \text{tr}(\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{j,\delta}^l(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j^{\otimes l}})) - 2\sqrt{k_l n_{j,\delta,l}} \|\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{j,\delta}^l(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j^{\otimes l}})\|_2 \right], \quad (36)$$

where $n_{j,\delta,l}$ denotes the number of Kraus operators in the operations $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{j,\delta,l}^l$ ($j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$). By Lemmas 9,10 for every $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ the corresponding term in the above sum can be bounded from below through

$$\frac{1}{N} \text{tr}(\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{j,\delta}^l(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j^{\otimes l}})) \geq \frac{1}{N} (1 - 2^{-l(c\delta^2 - h(l))} - 2^{-l(c'\delta^2 - h'(l))})$$

and

$$-2\sqrt{k_l n_{j,\delta,l}} \|\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{j,\delta}^l(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j^{\otimes l}})\|_2 \geq -2\sqrt{k_l \cdot 2^{l(-\min_{1 \leq j \leq N} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j}, \mathcal{N}_j) + \gamma(\delta) + 3\varphi(\delta))}}.$$

Set $k_l := \lfloor 2^{lR(\epsilon)} \rfloor$. Obviously, for any $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$,

$$k_l \cdot 2^{l(-\min_{1 \leq j \leq N} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j}, \mathcal{N}_j))} \leq 2^{-l\epsilon}.$$

This implies

$$\mathbb{E}F_{c,e}(\pi_{\mathcal{E}_l}, \hat{\mathcal{N}}_{U_1^l, \dots, U_N^l, \delta}^l) \geq 1 - 2^{-l(c\delta^2 - h(l))} - 2^{-l(c'\delta^2 - h'(l))} - 2N\sqrt{2^{l(-\epsilon + \gamma(\delta) + 3\varphi(\delta))}}.$$

Now choosing the approximation parameter δ such that $-\epsilon + \gamma(\delta) + 3\varphi(\delta) < -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon$ (note that this choice of δ is independent of the value of l) and setting

$$\epsilon_l := 2^{-l(c\delta^2 - h(l))} + 2^{-l(c'\delta^2 - h'(l))} + 2N\sqrt{2^{l(-\epsilon + \gamma(\delta) + 3\varphi(\delta))}}$$

we see that

$$\mathbb{E}F_{c,e}(\pi_{\mathcal{E}_l}, \hat{\mathcal{N}}_{U_1^l, \dots, U_N^l, \delta}^l) \geq 1 - \epsilon_l,$$

where $\epsilon_l \searrow 0$. Thus, there exist unitary operators $w_1^l, \dots, w_N^l \subset \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})$ and a recovery operation \mathcal{R}^l such that, passing to the individual channels, we have for every $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$

$$F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{E}_l}, \mathcal{R}^l \circ \mathcal{Q}_{j,\delta,l} \circ \mathcal{N}_{j,\delta,l} \circ \mathcal{W}_j^l) \geq 1 - N\epsilon_l.$$

By property 3. of Lemma 10 and Lemma 7, we immediately see that

$$F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{E}_l}, \mathcal{R}^l \circ \mathcal{N}_j^{\otimes l} \circ \mathcal{W}_j^l) \geq 1 - 3N\epsilon_l \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$$

is valid as well. We finally get the desired result: For every set $\{\pi_{\mathcal{G}_1}, \dots, \pi_{\mathcal{G}_N}\}$ of maximally mixed states on subspaces $\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_N \subset \mathcal{H}$ and every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a sequence of (l, k_l) codes for \mathfrak{J} with informed encoder with the properties

1. $\liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \log k_l = \min_{\mathcal{N}_j \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}_j}, \mathcal{N}_j) - \epsilon,$
2. $\min_{\mathcal{N}_j \in \mathfrak{J}} F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{E}_l}, \mathcal{R}^l \circ \mathcal{N}_j^{\otimes l} \circ \mathcal{W}_j^l) \geq 1 - 3N\epsilon_l.$

Since $\epsilon > 0$ was arbitrary and $\epsilon_l \searrow 0$, we are done. □

5 Finite Approximations in the Set of Quantum Channels

Our goal in this section is to discretize a given set of channels $\mathfrak{J} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ in such a way that the results derived so far for finite sets can be employed to derive general versions of coding theorems for compound channels.

The first concept we will need is that of a τ -net in the set $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ and we will give an upper bound on the cardinality of the best τ -net in that set. Best τ -nets characterize the degree of compactness of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$. A τ -net in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is a finite set $\{\mathcal{N}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ with the property that for each $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ there is at least one $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ with $\|\mathcal{N} - \mathcal{N}_i\|_{\diamond} < \tau$. Existence of τ -nets in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is guaranteed by the compactness of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$. The next lemma contains a crude upper bound on the cardinality of minimal τ -nets.

Lemma 13 *For any $\tau \in (0, 1]$ there is a τ -net $\{\mathcal{N}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ with $N \leq (\frac{3}{\tau})^{2(d-d')^2}$, where $d = \dim \mathcal{H}$ and $d' = \dim \mathcal{K}$.*

Proof. The assertion of the lemma follows from the standard volume argument (cf. Lemma 2.6 in [22]). The details can be found in our previous paper [4].

□

Let $\mathfrak{J} \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ be an arbitrary set. Starting from a $\tau/2$ -net $\mathfrak{N} := \{\mathcal{N}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ with $N \leq (\frac{6}{\tau})^{2(d+d')}$ as in Lemma 13 we can build a $\tau/2$ -net \mathfrak{J}'_τ that is adapted to the set \mathfrak{J} given by

$$\mathfrak{J}'_\tau := \{\mathcal{N}_i \in \mathfrak{N} : \exists \mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J} \text{ with } \|\mathcal{N} - \mathcal{N}_i\|_\diamond < \tau/2\}, \quad (37)$$

i.e. we select only those members of the $\tau/2$ -net that are contained in the $\tau/2$ -neighbourhood of \mathfrak{J} . Let $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ be the useless channel given by $\mathcal{T}(\rho) := \frac{1}{\dim \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{K}}$, $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, and consider

$$\mathfrak{J}_\tau := \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{\tau}{2}\right)\mathcal{N} + \frac{\tau}{2}\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}'_\tau \right\}, \quad (38)$$

where \mathfrak{J}'_τ is defined in (37). For $\mathfrak{J} \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ we set

$$I_c(\rho, \mathfrak{J}) := \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}),$$

for $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$. We list a few more or less obvious results in the following lemma that will be needed in the following.

Lemma 14 *Let $\mathfrak{J} \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$. For each positive $\tau \leq \frac{1}{e}$ let \mathfrak{J}_τ be the finite set of channels defined in (38).*

1. $|\mathfrak{J}_\tau| \leq (\frac{6}{\tau})^{2(d+d')}$ with $d = \dim \mathcal{H}$ and $d' = \dim \mathcal{K}$.

2. For $\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}$ there is $\mathcal{N}_i \in \mathfrak{J}_\tau$ with

$$\|\mathcal{N}^{\otimes l} - \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l}\|_\diamond < l\tau. \quad (39)$$

Consequently, for \mathcal{N} , \mathcal{N}_i , and any CPTP maps $\mathcal{P} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^{\otimes l}$ and $\mathcal{R} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})^{\otimes l} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}')$ the relation

$$|F_e(\rho, \mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l} \circ \mathcal{P}) - F_e(\rho, \mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l} \circ \mathcal{P})| < l\tau \quad (40)$$

holds for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}$.

3. For all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ we have

$$|I_c(\rho, \mathfrak{J}) - I_c(\rho, \mathfrak{J}_\tau)| \leq \tau + 3\tau \log \frac{d}{\tau}. \quad (41)$$

Proof. The proofs of the assertions claimed here are either identical to those given in [4] or can be obtained by trivial modifications thereof.

□

6 Direct Parts of the Coding Theorems for General Quantum Compound Channels

6.1 The Case of Informed Decoder and Uninformed Users

The main step towards the direct part of the coding theorem for quantum compound channels with uninformed users is the following theorem.

Theorem 15 *Let $\mathfrak{J} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ be an arbitrary compound channel and let $\pi_{\mathcal{G}}$ be the maximally mixed state associated with a subspace $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{H}$. Then*

$$Q(\mathfrak{J}) \geq \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}).$$

Proof. We consider two subspaces $\mathcal{E}_l, \mathcal{G}^{\otimes l}$ of $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l}$ with $\mathcal{E}_l \subset \mathcal{G}^{\otimes l} \subset \mathcal{H}^{\otimes l}$. Let $k_l := \dim \mathcal{E}_l$ and we denote as before the associated maximally mixed states on \mathcal{E}_l and \mathcal{G} by $\pi_{\mathcal{E}_l}$ and $\pi_{\mathcal{G}}$.

If $\inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}) \leq 0$ there is nothing to prove. Therefore we will suppose in the following that

$$\inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}) > 0$$

holds. We will show that for each $\varepsilon \in (0, \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}))$ the number

$$\inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}) - \varepsilon$$

is an achievable rate.

For each $l \in \mathbb{N}$ let us choose some $\tau_l > 0$ with $\tau_l \leq \frac{1}{e}$, $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} l\tau_l = 0$, and such that N_{τ_l} grows subexponentially with l . E.g. we may choose $\tau_l := \min\{1/e, 1/l^2\}$. We consider, for each $l \in \mathbb{N}$, the finite set of channels $\mathfrak{J}_{\tau_l} := \{\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_{N_{\tau_l}}\}$ associated to \mathfrak{J} given in (38) with the properties listed in Lemma 14. We can conclude from the proof of Theorem 11 that for each $l \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a subspace $\mathcal{F}_l \subset \mathcal{G}^{\otimes l}$ of dimension

$$k_l = \lfloor 2^{l(\min_{i \in \{1, \dots, N_{\tau_l}\}} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}_i) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2})} \rfloor, \quad (42)$$

a recovery operation \mathcal{R} , and a unitary encoder \mathcal{W}^l such that

$$\min_{i \in \{1, \dots, N_{\tau_l}\}} F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_l}, \mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l} \circ \mathcal{W}^l) \geq 1 - N_{\tau_l} \varepsilon_l \quad (43)$$

where ε_l is defined in (34), and we have chosen l large enough and $\delta > 0$ small enough to ensure that

$$\min_{i \in \{1, \dots, N_{\tau_l}\}} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}_i) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} > 0,$$

and

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{2} - \gamma(\delta) - 3\varphi(\delta) > 0.$$

By our construction of \mathfrak{J}_{τ_l} we can find to each $\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}$ at least one $\mathcal{N}_i \in \mathfrak{J}_{\tau_l}$ with

$$|F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_l}, \mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l} \circ \mathcal{W}^l) - F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_l}, \mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l} \circ \mathcal{W}^l)| \leq l \cdot \tau_l \quad (44)$$

according to Lemma 14. Moreover, by the last claim of Lemma 14 we obtain the following estimate on the dimension k_l of the subspace \mathcal{F}_l :

$$k_l \geq \lfloor 2^{l(\inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}) - \frac{\epsilon}{2} - \tau_l - 2\tau_l \log \frac{d}{\tau_l})} \rfloor. \quad (45)$$

The inequalities (43) and (44) show that

$$\min_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_l}, \mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l} \circ \mathcal{W}^l) \geq 1 - N_{\tau_l} \epsilon_l - l\tau_l,$$

which in turn with (45) shows that $\inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N})$ is an achievable rate. \square

In order to pass from the maximally mixed state $\pi_{\mathcal{G}}$ to an arbitrary one we have to employ the compound generalization of Bennett, Shor, Smolin, and Thapliyal Lemma (BSST Lemma for short) from [2] and [14]. For the proof of this generalized BSST Lemma we refer to [4].

Lemma 16 (Compound BSST Lemma) *Let $\mathfrak{J} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ be an arbitrary set of channels. For any $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ let $q_{\delta, l} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})$ be the frequency-typical projection of ρ and set*

$$\pi_{\delta, l} := \frac{q_{\delta, l}}{\text{tr}(q_{\delta, l})} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l}).$$

Then there is a positive sequence $(\delta_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \delta_l = 0$ with

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\pi_{\delta_l, l}, \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}) = \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}).$$

With these preparations it is easy now to finish the proof of the direct part of the coding theorem for the quantum compound channel with uninformed users.

First notice that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$Q(\mathfrak{J}^{\otimes k}) = kQ(\mathfrak{J}) \quad (46)$$

holds. For any fixed $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes m})$ let $q_{\delta, l} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes ml})$ be the frequency-typical projection of ρ and set $\pi_{\delta, l} = \frac{q_{\delta, l}}{\text{tr}(q_{\delta, l})}$. Theorem 15 implies that for any $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$ we have

$$Q(\mathfrak{J}^{\otimes ml}) \geq I_c(\pi_{\delta, l}, \mathfrak{J}^{\otimes ml}), \quad (47)$$

for all $m, l \in \mathbb{N}$. Utilizing (46), (47) and Lemma 16 we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\mathfrak{J}) &= \frac{1}{m} \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} Q(\mathfrak{J}^{\otimes ml}) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{m} \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\pi_{\delta_l, l}, (\mathcal{N}^{\otimes m})^{\otimes l}) \\ &= \frac{1}{m} I_c(\rho, \mathfrak{J}^{\otimes m}). \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

From (48) and since $Q_{ID}(\mathfrak{J}) \geq Q(\mathfrak{J})$ trivially holds we get without further ado the direct part of the coding theorem.

Theorem 17 (Direct Part: Informed Decoder and Uninformed Users) *Let $\mathfrak{J} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ be an arbitrary set. Then*

$$Q_{ID}(\mathfrak{J}) \geq Q(\mathfrak{J}) \geq \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}). \quad (49)$$

Remark 18 *It is quite easy to see that the limit in (49) exists. Indeed it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l+k})} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l+k}) &\geq \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}) \\ &\quad + \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes k})} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}^{\otimes k}) \end{aligned}$$

which implies the existence of the limit via standard arguments.

6.2 The Informed Encoder

Before entering the proof of the direct part of the coding theorem we have to establish some preliminary results. Specifically, we need a version of the BSST Lemma that is appropriate for application to compound channels with informed encoder. We start with the following result that shows that our discretization argument applies as far as we are looking at the coherent information.

Lemma 19 *Let $\mathfrak{J} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ and for $\tau \in (0, 1/e)$ let \mathfrak{J}_τ denote the discrete approximation of \mathfrak{J} as given in (38). Then*

$$\left| \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}) - \min_{i \in \{1, \dots, N_\tau\}} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}_i) \right| \leq g(\tau), \quad (50)$$

where

$$g(\tau) = 6(\tau \log d - \tau \log \tau). \quad (51)$$

Proof. Let $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ be given and let $\psi \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ be any purification of ρ . Then, by construction of \mathfrak{J}_τ , to each $\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}$ we can find $\mathcal{N}_i \in \mathfrak{J}_\tau$, and vice versa, with

$$\|\mathcal{N} - \mathcal{N}_i\|_\diamond \leq \tau.$$

This, in turn, implies by definition of $\|\cdot\|_\diamond$ that

$$\|\mathcal{N}(\rho) - \mathcal{N}_i(\rho)\|_1 \leq \tau \quad \text{and} \quad \|id_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \mathcal{N}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) - id_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \mathcal{N}_i(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)\|_1 \leq \tau. \quad (52)$$

The inequalities (52) and an application of Fannes' inequality show that

$$\begin{aligned} |I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}) - I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}_i)| &\leq \tau \log d - \tau \log \tau \\ &\quad + \tau \log d^2 - \tau \log \tau \\ &\leq 3(\tau \log d - \tau \log \tau) \\ &=: g'(\tau). \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

It is then readily seen from (53) that

$$\left| \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}) - \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}_i) \right| \leq g'(\tau). \quad (54)$$

Thus, we have shown that to each $\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}$ there is at least one $\mathcal{N}_i \in \mathfrak{J}_\tau$ and vice versa with

$$\left| \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}) - \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}_i) \right| \leq g'(\tau),$$

which has

$$\left| \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}) - \min_{i \in \{1, \dots, N_\tau\}} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}_i) \right| \leq 2g'(\tau)$$

as an immediate consequence. □

Our next lemma is the promised variant of the BSST Lemma that will be used in the proof of the direct part of the coding theorem for compound channels with informed encoder.

Lemma 20 *Given any $\mathfrak{J} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ let $(\tau_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ be any sequence with $\tau_l \in (0, 1/e)$ and $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} l\tau_l = 0$. For each $l \in \mathbb{N}$ let $\mathfrak{J}_{\tau_l} = \{\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_{N_{\tau_l}}\}$ denote the discretized version of \mathfrak{J} according to (38). Then there are positive sequences $(\delta_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(\Delta_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \delta_l = 0$, $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_l = 0$ and such that the following statement holds:*

For any set $\Omega_l = \{\rho_{1,l}, \dots, \rho_{N_{\tau_l}, l}\} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ with corresponding frequency typical projections $q_{\delta,l}^{(i)}$, $i = 1, \dots, N_{\tau_l}$, and

$$\pi_{\delta,l}^{(i)} := \frac{q_{\delta,l}^{(i)}}{\text{tr}(q_{\delta,l}^{(i)})}$$

we have

$$\left| \min_{i \in \{1, \dots, N_{\tau_l}\}} \frac{1}{l} I_c(\pi_{\delta,l}^{(i)}, \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l}) - \min_{i \in \{1, \dots, N_{\tau_l}\}} I_c(\rho_{i,l}, \mathcal{N}_i) \right| \leq \Delta_l, \quad (55)$$

where $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_l = 0$.

Proof. We will rely heavily on Holevo's proof [14] of the the BSST Lemma for a single channel. We choose a sequence $(\tau_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$, with $\tau_l > 0$, $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} l\tau_l = 0$, and consider the finite set of channels $\mathfrak{J}_{\tau_l} = \{\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_{N_{\tau_l}}\}$ associated to \mathfrak{J} defined in (38).

By our construction of the set \mathfrak{J}_{τ_l} we know that for any $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$

$$\mathcal{N}_i(\rho) \geq \frac{\tau_l}{2 \dim \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{K}} \quad (56)$$

holds for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N_{\tau_l}\}$, which implies

$$\log \mathcal{N}_i(\rho) \geq \log \left(\frac{\tau_l}{2 \dim \mathcal{K}} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{K}} \quad \forall \rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \quad (57)$$

uniformly in $i \in \{1, \dots, N_{\tau_l}\}$. On the other hand let $\mathfrak{J}_{\tau_l, e} = \{\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_{N_{\tau_l}}\} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_e)$ denote the complementary set of channels associated to \mathfrak{J}_{τ_l} . We alter $\mathfrak{J}_{\tau_l, e}$ by mixing a bit of useless channel $\mathcal{T}_e \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_e)$ to each $\mathcal{E}_i \in \mathfrak{J}_{\tau_l, e}$, i.e. we set

$$\mathfrak{J}'_{\tau_l, e} := \left(1 - \frac{\tau_l}{2}\right) \mathfrak{J}_{\tau_l, e} + \frac{\tau_l}{2} \mathcal{T}_e.$$

Note that then for each $\mathcal{E}'_i \in \mathfrak{J}'_{\tau_l, e}$ the inequality

$$\mathcal{E}'_i(\rho) \geq \frac{\tau_l}{2 \dim(\mathcal{H}_e)} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_e} \quad \forall \rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$$

is valid, and w.l.o.g. $\mathcal{H}_e = \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K}$ holds. Obviously,

$$\log \mathcal{E}'_i(\rho) \geq \log \left(\frac{\tau_l}{2 \dim(\mathcal{H}_e)} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_e} \quad \forall \rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}). \quad (58)$$

Applying Holevo's argument from [14] to each channel from \mathcal{J}_{τ_l} and $\mathcal{J}'_{\tau_l, e}$ with our notation from Lemma 9 and uniform bounds (57), (58) we obtain uniformly in $i \in \{1, \dots, N_{\tau_l}\}$ the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{l} S(\mathcal{T}_i^{\otimes l}(\pi_{\delta, l}^{(i)})) - S(\mathcal{T}_i(\rho_{i, l})) \right| &\leq -\frac{1}{l} \log \eta_l(\delta) + 2\varphi(\delta) \\ &\quad - d\delta \log \left(\frac{\tau_l}{2D} \right) \\ &=: \Theta_l(\delta, D), \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

where $(\mathcal{T}_i, D) \in \{(\mathcal{N}_i, \dim \mathcal{K}), (\mathcal{E}'_i, \dim \mathcal{H}_e)\}$.

By construction, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, N_{\tau_l}\}$ we have

$$\|\mathcal{E}_i - \mathcal{E}'_i\|_{\diamond} \leq \tau_l,$$

and thus

$$\|\mathcal{E}_i^{\otimes l} - \mathcal{E}'_i^{\otimes l}\|_{\diamond} \leq l\tau_l.$$

Hence choosing l sufficiently large we can ensure that $l\tau_l \leq \frac{1}{e}$ and an application of Fannes inequality yields for each $i \in \{1, \dots, N_{\tau_l}\}$

$$|S(\mathcal{E}'_i(\rho_{i, l})) - S(\mathcal{E}_i(\rho_{i, l}))| \leq \tau_l \log \frac{\dim \mathcal{H}_e}{\tau_l}, \quad (60)$$

and

$$\left| \frac{1}{l} S(\mathcal{E}'_i^{\otimes l}(\pi_{\delta, l}^{(i)})) - \frac{1}{l} S(\mathcal{E}_i^{\otimes l}(\pi_{\delta, l}^{(i)})) \right| \leq l\tau_l \log \frac{\dim \mathcal{H}_e}{l\tau_l}. \quad (61)$$

Inequalities (59), (60), and (61) show that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{l} I_c(\pi_{\delta, l}^{(i)}, \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l}) - I_c(\rho_{i, l}, \mathcal{N}_i) \right| &\leq \Theta_l(\delta, \dim \mathcal{K}) + \Theta_l(\delta, \dim \mathcal{H}_e) \\ &\quad + \tau_l \log \frac{\dim \mathcal{H}_e}{\tau_l} \\ &\quad + l\tau_l \log \frac{\dim \mathcal{H}_e}{l\tau_l} \\ &=: \Delta_l(\delta, \dim \mathcal{K}, \dim \mathcal{H}_e) \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

for each $i \in \{1, \dots, N_{\tau_l}\}$. The estimate (62) implies immediately

$$\left| \min_{i \in \{1, \dots, N_{\tau_l}\}} \frac{1}{l} I_c(\pi_{\delta, l}^{(i)}, \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l}) - \min_{i \in \{1, \dots, N_{\tau_l}\}} I_c(\rho_{i, l}, \mathcal{N}_i) \right| \leq \Delta_l(\delta, \dim \mathcal{K}, \dim \mathcal{H}_e). \quad (63)$$

We conclude the proof by replacing δ by any positive sequence $(\delta_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ with the properties 1) $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \delta_l = 0$, 2) $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \eta_l(\delta_l) = 1$, 3) $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \delta_l \log \tau_l = 0$, and defining

$$\Delta_l := \Delta_l(\delta_l, \dim \mathcal{K}, \dim \mathcal{H}_e).$$

□

Lemmas 20, 19 and Theorem 12 easily imply the following result.

Theorem 21 *Let $\mathfrak{J} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ be an arbitrary set. Then*

$$Q_{IE}(\mathfrak{J}) \geq \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}).$$

Proof. It suffices to show that to each $\epsilon, \sigma > 0$ we can find a sequence of (t, k_t) -codes for \mathfrak{J} with unitary informed encoder and

$$F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_t}, \mathcal{R}^t \circ \mathcal{N}^{\otimes t} \circ \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{N}}^t) \geq 1 - \sigma, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N} \quad (64)$$

as well as with

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \dim \mathcal{F}_t \geq \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}) - \epsilon. \quad (65)$$

Notice that the requirement (64) can be satisfied if we only show that it holds for all $t \geq t_0(\sigma)$. This is because we can always send at rate 0 with entanglement fidelity equal to 1 during the first $t_0(\sigma) - 1$ transmissions without violating the asymptotic requirement (65). Take any sequence $(\tau_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\tau_l \searrow 0$, $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} l\tau_l = 0$ and let

$$\mathfrak{J}_{\tau_l} = \{\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_{N_{\tau_l}}\}$$

be the corresponding discretization of \mathfrak{J} . Let $\epsilon, \sigma > 0$ be given. Choose $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough to ensure that

$$l_0 \tau_{l_0} \leq \frac{\sigma}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad g(\tau_{l_0}) + \Delta_{l_0} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \quad (66)$$

where $g(\tau_{l_0})$ and Δ_{l_0} are from Lemma 19 and Lemma 20 respectively.

Let $\{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{N_{\tau_{l_0}}}\} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l_0})$ be maximally mixed states on suitable subspaces $\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_{N_{\tau_{l_0}}} \subset \mathcal{H}^{\otimes l_0}$. A specific choice of $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{N_{\tau_{l_0}}}$ will be made below. Without loss of generality we assume that

$$\frac{1}{l_0} \min_{1 \leq i \leq N_{\tau_{l_0}}} I_c(\pi_i, \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l_0}) - \frac{\epsilon}{2} > 0.$$

Set

$$\mathfrak{J}'_{l_0} := \{\mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l_0} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l_0}, \mathcal{K}^{\otimes l_0}) : \mathcal{N}_i \in \mathfrak{J}_{\tau_{l_0}}\}.$$

Considering \mathfrak{J}'_{l_0} as a (finite) compound channel we may infer from the proof of Theorem 12 that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there is an $(m, k_{l_0, m})$ -code for \mathfrak{J}'_{l_0} with informed encoder consisting of a subspace $\mathcal{F}_{l_0, m} \subset (\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l_0})^{\otimes m}$ such that

$$k_{l_0, m} := \dim \mathcal{F}_{l_0, m} = \left\lfloor 2^{m(\min_{i \in \{1, \dots, N_{\tau_{l_0}}\}} I_c(\pi_i, \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l_0}) - \frac{\epsilon}{2})} \right\rfloor \quad (67)$$

and a recovery operation $\mathcal{R}^{l_0, m} \in \mathcal{C}((\mathcal{K}^{\otimes l_0})^{\otimes m}, (\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l_0})^{\otimes m})$ such that for each $i \in \{1, \dots, N_{\tau_{l_0}}\}$ there is a unitary encoding operation $\mathcal{U}_i^{l_0, m}$ with

$$F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_{l_0, m}}, \mathcal{R}^{l_0, m} \circ \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l_0 m} \circ \mathcal{U}_i^{l_0, m}) \geq 1 - 3N_{\tau_{l_0}} \epsilon_m(N_{\tau_{l_0}}), \quad (68)$$

where

$$\epsilon_m(N_{\tau_{l_0}}) = 2^{-m(c\delta^2 - h_{l_0}(m))} + 2^{-m(c'\delta^2 - h'_{l_0}(m))} + 2N_{\tau_{l_0}} \sqrt{2^{m(-\frac{\epsilon}{2} + \gamma_{l_0}(\delta) + 3\varphi_{l_0}(\delta))}}. \quad (69)$$

Here $\delta > 0$ is chosen small enough to ensure that $\gamma_{l_0}(\delta) + 3\varphi_{l_0}(\delta) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and $h_{l_0}(m) := \frac{d^{l_0}}{m} \log(m+1)$, $h'_{l_0}(m) := \frac{d^{2l_0}}{m} \log(m+1)$, $\gamma_{l_0}(\delta) := -\delta \log \frac{\delta}{d^{2l_0}}$, $\varphi_{l_0}(\delta) := -\delta \log \frac{\delta}{d^{l_0}}$ are easily recognized from Lemma 9 and Lemma 10.

Having at hand these codes for \mathcal{J}'_{l_0} we wish to convert them to codes for \mathcal{J} . This is done in the following: For any $t \in \mathbb{N}$ there are unique integers $m = m(t) \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r = r(t) \in \{0, 1, \dots, l_0 - 1\}$ with $t = ml_0 + r$. For each $r \in \{0, 1, \dots, l_0 - 1\}$ we choose a state vector $x_r \in \mathcal{H}^{\otimes r}$ and define a subspace $\mathcal{F}_t \subset \mathcal{H}^{\otimes t}$ by

$$\mathcal{F}_t := \mathcal{F}_{l_0, m} \otimes \mathbb{C}x_r$$

so that

$$\pi_{\mathcal{F}_t} = \pi_{\mathcal{F}_{l_0, m}} \otimes |x_r\rangle\langle x_r|.$$

We modify the encoding operations $\mathcal{U}_i^{l_0, m}$ by defining

$$\mathcal{U}_i^t := \mathcal{U}_i^{l_0, m} \otimes id_r,$$

where id_r is the identity operation on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^{\otimes r}$. Moreover, denoting by $\mathcal{T}_r \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}^{\otimes r}, \mathcal{H}^{\otimes r})$ the operation $\mathcal{T}_r(a) = \text{tr}(a)|x_r\rangle\langle x_r|$, ($a \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}^{\otimes r})$), we define a new recovery operation by

$$\mathcal{R}^t := \mathcal{R}^{l_0, m} \otimes \mathcal{T}_r.$$

Then it is clear that

$$\dim \mathcal{F}_t = \dim \mathcal{F}_{l_0, m}, \tag{70}$$

and for each $i \in \{1, \dots, N_{\tau_{l_0}}\}$

$$\begin{aligned} F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_t}, \mathcal{R}^t \circ \mathcal{N}_i^t \circ \mathcal{U}_i^t) &= F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_{l_0, m}}, \mathcal{R}^{l_0, m} \circ \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l_0 m} \circ \mathcal{U}_i^{l_0, m}) \\ &\geq 1 - 3N_{\tau_{l_0}} \epsilon_m(N_{\tau_{l_0}}). \end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

Now passing to the original compound channel \mathcal{J} we may conclude via Lemma 14 that for each $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{J}$ there is a unitary encoder $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{N}}^t$ (namely \mathcal{U}_i^t for suitably chosen $i \in \{1, \dots, N_{\tau_{l_0}}\}$) such that

$$F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_t}, \mathcal{R}^t \circ \mathcal{N}^{\otimes t} \circ \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{N}}^t) \geq 1 - 3N_{\tau_{l_0}} \epsilon_m(N_{\tau_{l_0}}) - l_0 \tau_{l_0}. \tag{72}$$

Making m , and thus t , sufficiently large we can ensure that $3N_{\tau_{l_0}} \epsilon_m(N_{\tau_{l_0}}) \leq \frac{\sigma}{2}$ which with (72) shows that (72) can be lower bounded by

$$F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_t}, \mathcal{R}^t \circ \mathcal{N}^{\otimes t} \circ \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{N}}^t) \geq 1 - \sigma \tag{73}$$

for all $t \geq t_0(\sigma)$. On the other hand, it is clear from our construction that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \dim \mathcal{F}_t &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \dim \mathcal{F}_{l_0, m(t)} \\ &= \frac{1}{l_0} \min_{i \in \{1, \dots, N_{\tau_{l_0}}\}} I_c(\pi_i, \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l_0}) - \frac{\epsilon}{2}. \end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

Now, we will employ Lemma 20, Lemma 19, (73), and (74) to finish the proof.

Let $\rho_{i, l_0} := \arg \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}_i)$ where $i \in \{1, \dots, N_{\tau_{l_0}}\}$ and $\pi_{\delta_{l_0}, l_0}^{(i)}$, $i \in \{1, \dots, N_{\tau_{l_0}}\}$ be the corresponding maximally mixed states associated to the frequency typical projections of $\rho_{1, l_0}, \dots, \rho_{N_{\tau_{l_0}}, l_0}$

as given in Lemma 20.

The construction that led us to (73) and (74) applies to the family $\pi_{\delta_{l_0}, l_0}^{(i)}$, $i \in \{1, \dots, N_{\tau_{l_0}}\}$ so that we end up with the codes for \mathfrak{J} with informed decoder satisfying (73) and

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \dim \mathcal{F}_t &\geq \frac{1}{l_0} \min_{i \in \{1, \dots, N_{\tau_{l_0}}\}} I_c(\pi_{\delta_{l_0}, l_0}^{(i)}, \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l_0}) - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \\
&\geq \min_{1 \leq i \leq N_{\tau_{l_0}}} I_c(\rho_{i, l_0}, \mathcal{N}_i) - \Delta_{l_0} - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \\
&\geq \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}) - g(\tau_{l_0}) - \Delta_{l_0} - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \\
&\geq \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}) - \epsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is by Lemma 20, the third by Lemma 19, and the last inequality is by (66). This establishes our claims (64), (65) and we are done. \square

Noting that for each $\mathfrak{J} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ and any $l \in \mathbb{N}$ the relation

$$Q_{IE}(\mathfrak{J}^{\otimes l}) = lQ_{IE}(\mathfrak{J}) \quad (75)$$

holds we obtain from Theorem 21 applied to $\mathfrak{J}^{\otimes l}$

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{IE}(\mathfrak{J}) &= \frac{1}{l} Q_{IE}(\mathfrak{J}^{\otimes l}) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{l} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}).
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently we obtain

Theorem 22 (Direct Part: Informed Encoder) *For any $\mathfrak{J} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ we have*

$$Q_{IE}(\mathfrak{J}) \geq \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}). \quad (76)$$

Remark 23 *Note that the limit in (76) exists. Indeed, set*

$$C_l(\mathcal{N}) := \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}).$$

Then it is clear that

$$C_{l+k}(\mathcal{N}) \geq C_l(\mathcal{N}) + C_k(\mathcal{N})$$

and consequently

$$\begin{aligned}
\inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} C_{l+k}(\mathcal{N}) &\geq \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} (C_l(\mathcal{N}) + C_k(\mathcal{N})) \\
&\geq \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} C_l(\mathcal{N}) + \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} C_k(\mathcal{N}),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies the existence of the limit in (76).

7 Converse Parts of the Coding Theorems for General Quantum Compound Channels

In this section we prove the converse parts of the coding theorems for general quantum compound channels in the three different settings concerned with entanglement transmission that are treated in this paper. The proofs deviate from the usual approach due to our more general definitions of codes.

7.1 Converse for Informed Decoder and Uninformed Users

We first prove the converse part in the case of a finite compound channel, then use a recent result [20] that gives a more convenient estimate for the difference in coherent information of two nearby channels in order to pass on to the general case.

For the converse part in the case of a finite compound channel we need the following lemma that is due to Devetak [10]:

Lemma 24 (Cf. [10]) *For two states $\sigma, \rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2)$ where $\dim \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 = b$ with fidelity $f = F(\sigma, \rho)$,*

$$|\Delta S(\rho) - \Delta S(\sigma)| \leq \frac{2}{e} + 4 \log(b) \sqrt{1-f},$$

where

$$\Delta S(\cdot) := S(\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_1}[\cdot]) - S(\cdot).$$

We shall now embark on the proof of the following theorem.

Theorem 25 (Converse Part: Informed Decoder, Uninformed Users, $|\mathcal{J}| < \infty$) *Let $\mathcal{J} = \{\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_N\} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ be a finite compound channel. The capacities $Q_{ID}(\mathcal{J})$ and $Q(\mathcal{J})$ of \mathcal{J} with informed decoder and uninformed users are bounded from above by*

$$Q(\mathcal{J}) \leq Q_{ID}(\mathcal{J}) \leq \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} \min_{\mathcal{N}_i \in \mathcal{J}} \frac{1}{l} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l}).$$

Proof. The inequality $Q(\mathcal{J}) \leq Q_{ID}(\mathcal{J})$ is obvious from the definition of codes. We give a proof for the second inequality. Let for arbitrary $l \in \mathbb{N}$ an (l, k_l) code for a compound channel $\mathcal{J} = \{\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_N\}$ with informed decoder and the property $\min_{1 \leq i \leq N} F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_l}, \mathcal{R}_i^l \circ \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l} \circ \mathcal{P}^l) \geq 1 - \epsilon_l$ be given, where $\epsilon_l \in [0, 1]$. Let $|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l| \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{E}_l \otimes \mathcal{F}_l)$ be a purification of $\pi_{\mathcal{F}_l}$ where \mathcal{E}_l is just a copy of \mathcal{F}_l . We use the abbreviation $\mathcal{D}^l := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{R}_i^l \circ \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l}$. Obviously, the above code then satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi_l, id_{\mathcal{E}_l} \otimes \mathcal{D}^l(id_{\mathcal{E}_l} \otimes \mathcal{P}^l(|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|)) \psi_l \rangle &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_l}, \mathcal{R}_i^l \circ \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l} \circ \mathcal{P}^l) \\ &\geq 1 - \epsilon_l. \end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

Let $\sigma_{\mathcal{P}^l} := id_{\mathcal{E}_l} \otimes \mathcal{P}^l(|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|)$ and consider any convex decomposition $\sigma_{\mathcal{P}^l} = \sum_{i=1}^{(\dim \mathcal{F}_l)^2} \lambda_i |e_i\rangle\langle e_i|$ of $\sigma_{\mathcal{P}^l}$ into pure states $|e_i\rangle\langle e_i| \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}_l \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})$. By (77) there is at least one $i \in \{1, \dots, (\dim \mathcal{F}_l)^2\}$ such that

$$\langle \psi_l, id_{\mathcal{E}_l} \otimes \mathcal{D}^l(|e_i\rangle\langle e_i|) \psi_l \rangle \geq 1 - \epsilon_l \tag{78}$$

holds. Without loss of generality, $i = 1$. Turning back to the individual channels, we get

$$\langle \psi_l, id_{\mathcal{E}_l} \otimes \mathcal{R}_i^l \circ \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l}(|e_1\rangle\langle e_1|)\psi_l \rangle \geq 1 - N\epsilon_l \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\}. \quad (79)$$

We define the state $\rho^l := \text{tr}_{\mathcal{E}_l}(|e_1\rangle\langle e_1|) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})$ and note that $|e_1\rangle\langle e_1|$ is a purification of ρ^l . Application of recovery operation and individual channels to ρ^l now defines the states $\sigma_k^l := id_{\mathcal{E}_l} \otimes \mathcal{R}_k^l \circ \mathcal{N}_k^{\otimes l}(|e_1\rangle\langle e_1|)$ ($k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$) which have independently of k the property

$$F(\psi^l, \sigma_k^l) = \langle \psi_l, id_{\mathcal{E}_l} \otimes \mathcal{R}_k^l \circ \mathcal{N}_k^{\otimes l}(|e_i\rangle\langle e_i|)\psi_l \rangle \geq 1 - N\epsilon_l$$

and thus put us into position for an application of Lemma 24, which together with the data processing inequality for coherent information [24] establishes the following chain of inequalities for every $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \log \dim \mathcal{F}_l &= S(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_l}) \\ &= \Delta S(|\psi^l\rangle\langle\psi^l|) \\ &\leq \Delta S(\sigma_k^l) + \frac{2}{e} + 4 \log((\dim \mathcal{F}_l)^2) \sqrt{N\epsilon_l} \\ &= S(\text{tr}_{\mathcal{E}_l}(id_{\mathcal{E}_l} \otimes \mathcal{R}_k^l \circ \mathcal{N}_k^{\otimes l}(|e_1\rangle\langle e_1|))) - S(id_{\mathcal{E}_l} \otimes \mathcal{R}_k^l \circ \mathcal{N}_k^{\otimes l}(|e_1\rangle\langle e_1|)) \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{e} + 4 \log((\dim \mathcal{F}_l)^2) \sqrt{N\epsilon_l} \\ &= I_c(\rho^l, \mathcal{R}_k^l \circ \mathcal{N}_k^{\otimes l}) + \frac{2}{e} + 4 \log((\dim \mathcal{F}_l)^2) \sqrt{N\epsilon_l} \\ &\leq I_c(\rho^l, \mathcal{N}_k^{\otimes l}) + \frac{2}{e} + 4 \log((\dim \mathcal{F}_l)^2) \sqrt{N\epsilon_l}. \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \log \dim \mathcal{F}_l &\leq \min_{k \in \{1, \dots, N\}} I_c(\rho^l, \mathcal{N}_k^{\otimes l}) + \frac{2}{e} + 4 \log((\dim \mathcal{F}_l)^2) \sqrt{N\epsilon_l} \\ &\leq \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} \min_{k \in \{1, \dots, N\}} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}_k^{\otimes l}) + \frac{2}{e} + 8 \log(\dim \mathcal{F}_l) \sqrt{N\epsilon_l}. \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

Let a sequence of (l, k_l) codes for \mathfrak{J} with informed decoder be given such that $\liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \log \dim \mathcal{F}_l = R \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_l = 0$. Then by (81) we get

$$\begin{aligned} R &= \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \log \dim \mathcal{F}_l \\ &\leq \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} \min_{k \in \{1, \dots, N\}} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}_k^{\otimes l}) \\ &\quad + \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \frac{2}{e} + \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} 8 \log(\dim \mathcal{F}_l) \sqrt{N\epsilon_l} \\ &= \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} \min_{k \in \{1, \dots, N\}} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}_k^{\otimes l}), \end{aligned}$$

□

Let us now focus on the general case. We shall prove the following theorem:

Theorem 26 (Converse Part: Informed Decoder, Uninformed Users) *Let $\mathfrak{J} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ be a compound channel. The capacities $Q_{ID}(\mathfrak{J})$ and $Q(\mathfrak{J})$ for \mathfrak{J} with informed decoder and with uninformed users are bounded from above by*

$$Q(\mathfrak{J}) \leq Q_{ID}(\mathfrak{J}) \leq \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} \frac{1}{l} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}).$$

For the proof of this theorem, we will make use of the following Lemma:

Lemma 27 (Cf. [20]) *Let $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{N}_i \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ and $d_{\mathcal{K}} = \dim \mathcal{K}$. Let \mathcal{H}_r be an additional Hilbert space, $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_r \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})$. If $\|\mathcal{N} - \mathcal{N}_i\|_{\diamond} \leq \epsilon$, then*

$$|S(id_{\mathcal{H}_r} \otimes \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}(\phi)) - S(id_{\mathcal{H}_r} \otimes \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l}(\phi))| \leq l(4\epsilon \log(d_{\mathcal{K}}) + 2h(\epsilon)).$$

Here, $h(\cdot)$ denotes the binary entropy.

This result immediately implies the following Lemma:

Lemma 28 *Let \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K} be finite dimensional Hilbert spaces. There is a function $\nu : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ with $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \nu(x) = 0$ such that for every $\mathfrak{J}, \mathfrak{J}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ with $D_{\diamond}(\mathfrak{J}, \mathfrak{J}') \leq \tau \leq 1/2$ and every $l \in \mathbb{N}$ we have the estimates*

1.

$$\left| \frac{1}{l} I_c(\rho, \mathfrak{J}^{\otimes l}) - \frac{1}{l} I_c(\rho, \mathfrak{J}'^{\otimes l}) \right| \leq \nu(2\tau) \quad \forall \rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})$$

2.

$$\left| \frac{1}{l} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}) - \frac{1}{l} \inf_{\mathcal{N}' \in \mathfrak{J}'} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}'^{\otimes l}) \right| \leq \nu(2\tau)$$

The function ν is given by $\nu(x) = x + 8x \log(d_{\mathcal{K}}) + 4h(x)$. Again, $h(\cdot)$ denotes the binary entropy.

Proof of Theorem 26. Again, the first inequality is easily seen to be true from the very definition of codes in the two cases, so we concentrate on the second. Let $\mathfrak{J} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ be a compound channel and let for every $l \in \mathbb{N}$ an (l, k_l) code for \mathfrak{J} with informed decoder be given such that $\liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \log k_l = R$, and $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_l}, \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}}^l \circ \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l} \circ \mathcal{P}^l) = 1$ hold.

Take any $0 < \tau \leq 1/2$. Then it is easily seen that starting with a $\frac{\tau}{2}$ -net in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ we can find a set $\mathfrak{J}'_{\tau} = \{\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_{N_{\tau}}\} \subset \mathfrak{J}$ with $|N_{\tau}| \leq \left(\frac{6}{\tau}\right)^{2(\dim \mathcal{H} \cdot \dim \mathcal{K})^2}$ such that for each $\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}$ there is $\mathcal{N}_i \in \mathfrak{J}'_{\tau}$ with

$$\|\mathcal{N} - \mathcal{N}_i\|_{\diamond} \leq \tau.$$

Clearly, the above sequence of codes satisfies for each $i \in \{1, \dots, N_{\tau}\}$

$$1. \quad \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \log k_l = R, \text{ and}$$

$$2. \quad \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \min_{\mathcal{N}_i \in \mathfrak{J}'_{\tau}} F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_l}, \mathcal{R}^l \circ \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l} \circ \mathcal{P}^l) = 1.$$

From Theorem 25 it is immediately clear then, that

$$R \leq \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} \min_{\mathcal{N}_i \in \mathfrak{J}'_{\tau}} \frac{1}{l} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l})$$

and from the first estimate in Lemma 28 we get by noting that $D_{\diamond}(\mathfrak{J}, \mathfrak{J}'_{\tau}) \leq \tau$ holds

$$R \leq \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} \frac{1}{l} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}) + \nu(2\tau).$$

Taking the limit $\tau \rightarrow 0$ proves the theorem.

7.2 The Informed Encoder

The case of an informed encoder can be treated in the same manner as the other two cases. We will just state the theorem and very briefly indicate the central ideas of the proof.

Theorem 29 (Converse Part: Informed Encoder) *Let $\mathfrak{J} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ be a compound channel. The capacity $Q_{IE}(\mathfrak{J})$ for \mathfrak{J} with informed encoder is bounded from above by*

$$Q_{IE}(\mathfrak{J}) \leq \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}).$$

Proof. The proof of this theorem is a trivial modification of the one for Theorem 26. Again, the first part of the proof is the converse in the finite case, while the second part uses the second estimate in Lemma 28.

For the proof in the finite case note the following: due to the data processing inequality, the structure of the proof is entirely independent from the decoder. A change from an informed decoder to an uninformed decoder does not change our estimate. The only important change is that there will be a whole set $\{e_{i_1}^1, \dots, e_{i_N}^N\}$ of vector states satisfying equation (78), one for each channel in \mathfrak{J} . This causes the state ρ^l in equation (80) to depend on the channel. □

8 Continuity of Compound Capacity

This section is devoted to a question that has been answered only recently in [20] for single-channel capacities, namely that of continuity of capacities of quantum channels.

The question is relevant not only from a mathematical point of view, but might also have a strong impact on applications. It seems a hard task in general to compute the regularized capacity formulae obtained so far for quantum channels. There are, however, cases where the regularized capacity formula can be reduced to a one-shot quantity (see for example [8] and references therein) that can be calculated using standard optimization techniques.

Knowing that capacity is a continuous quantity one could raise the question how close an arbitrary (compound) channel is to a (compound) channel with one-shot capacity and thereby get an estimate on arbitrary capacities.

We will now state the main result of this section.

Theorem 30 (Continuity of Compound Capacity) *The compound capacities $Q(\cdot)$, $Q_{ID}(\cdot)$ and $Q_{IE}(\cdot)$ are continuous. To be more precise, let $\mathfrak{J}, \mathfrak{J}' \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ be two compound channels with $D_{\diamond}(\mathfrak{J}, \mathfrak{J}') \leq \epsilon \leq 1/2$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} |Q(\mathfrak{J}) - Q(\mathfrak{J}')| &= |Q_{ID}(\mathfrak{J}) - Q_{ID}(\mathfrak{J}')| \leq \nu(2\epsilon), \\ |Q_{IE}(\mathfrak{J}) - Q_{IE}(\mathfrak{J}')| &\leq \nu(2\epsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where the function ν is taken from Lemma 28.

Remark 31 *Let $\mathfrak{J} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$. Then $D(\mathfrak{J}, \bar{\mathfrak{J}}) = 0$, implying that the three different capacities of \mathfrak{J} coincide with those for $\bar{\mathfrak{J}}$. We may thus define the equivalence relation $\mathfrak{J} \sim \mathfrak{J}' \Leftrightarrow \bar{\mathfrak{J}} = \bar{\mathfrak{J}'}$ and even use D_{\diamond} as a metric on the set of equivalence classes without losing any information about our channels.*

Proof. Let $D_{\diamond}(\mathfrak{J}, \mathfrak{J}') \leq \epsilon$. By the first estimate in Lemma 28 and the capacity formula $Q_{ID}(\mathfrak{J}) = Q(\mathfrak{J}) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} I_c(\rho, \mathfrak{J}^{\otimes l})$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|Q(\mathfrak{J}) - Q(\mathfrak{J}')| &= |Q_{ID}(\mathfrak{J}) - Q_{ID}(\mathfrak{J}')| \\
&= \left| \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \left[\max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} I_c(\rho, \mathfrak{J}^{\otimes l}) - \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} I_c(\rho, \mathfrak{J}'^{\otimes l}) \right] \right| \\
&= \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{l} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} I_c(\rho, \mathfrak{J}^{\otimes l}) - \frac{1}{l} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} I_c(\rho, \mathfrak{J}'^{\otimes l}) \right| \\
&\leq \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \nu(2\epsilon) \\
&= \nu(2\epsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

For the proof in the case of an informed encoder let us first note that $Q_{IE}(\mathfrak{J}) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l})$ holds. The second estimate in Lemma 28 justifies the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
|Q_{IE}(\mathfrak{J}) - Q_{IE}(\mathfrak{J}')| &= \left| \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \left[\inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}) - \inf_{\mathcal{N}' \in \mathfrak{J}'} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}'^{\otimes l}) \right] \right| \\
&= \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{l} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}) - \frac{1}{l} \inf_{\mathcal{N}' \in \mathfrak{J}'} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}'^{\otimes l}) \right| \\
&\leq \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \nu(2\epsilon) \\
&= \nu(2\epsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

□

9 Entanglement-Generating Capacity of Compound Channels

In this last section we will use the results obtained so far to achieve our main goal. Namely, we will determine the entanglement-generating capacity of quantum compound channels. We give the definitions of codes and capacity only for the most interesting case of uninformed users because there is no doubt that the reader will easily guess the definitions in the remaining cases. Nevertheless, we will state the coding result in all three cases.

An entanglement-generating (l, k_l) -code for the compound channel $\mathfrak{J} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ with uninformed users consists of a pair $(\mathcal{R}^l, \varphi_l)$ where $\mathcal{R}^l \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}^{\otimes l}, \mathcal{F}_l)$ with $k_l = \dim \mathcal{F}_l$ and φ_l is a pure state on $\mathcal{F}_l \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes l}$. $R \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is called an achievable rate for \mathfrak{J} with uninformed users if there is a sequence of (l, k_l) entanglement-generating codes with

1. $\liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \log k_l \geq R$, and
2. $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} F(|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|, (id_{\mathcal{F}_l} \otimes \mathcal{R}^l \circ \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l})(|\varphi_l\rangle\langle\varphi_l|)) = 1$ where ψ_l denotes the standard maximally entangled state on $\mathcal{F}_l \otimes \mathcal{F}_l$ and $F(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the fidelity.

The entanglement-generating capacity of \mathfrak{J} with uninformed users is then defined as the least upper bound of all achievable rates and is denoted by $E(\mathfrak{J})$. The entanglement-generating capacities $E_{ID}(\mathfrak{J})$ and $E_{IE}(\mathfrak{J})$ of \mathfrak{J} with informed decoder or informed encoder are obtained if we allow the decoder or preparator to choose \mathcal{R}^l or φ_l in dependance of $\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}$.

Recall from the proof of Theorem 15 that to each subspace $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{H}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ we always can find a subspace $\mathcal{F}_l \subset \mathcal{G}^{\otimes l} \subset \mathcal{H}^{\otimes l}$, a recovery operation $\mathcal{R}^l \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}^{\otimes l}, \mathcal{F}_l)$, and a unitary operation $\mathcal{U}^l \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l}, \mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})$ with

$$k_l = \dim \mathcal{F}_l \geq \lfloor 2^{l(\inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}) - \frac{\epsilon}{2} - o(l^0))} \rfloor, \quad (82)$$

and

$$\inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} F_e(\pi_{\mathcal{F}_l}, \mathcal{R}^l \circ \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l} \circ \mathcal{U}^l) = 1 - o(l^0). \quad (83)$$

Notice that the maximally entangled state ψ_l in $\mathcal{F}_l \otimes \mathcal{F}_l$ purifies the maximally mixed state $\pi_{\mathcal{F}_l}$ on \mathcal{F}_l and defining $|\varphi_l\rangle\langle\varphi_l| := \mathcal{U}^l(|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|)$, the relation (83) can be rewritten as

$$\inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} F(|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|, id_{\mathcal{F}_l} \otimes \mathcal{R}^l \circ \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}(|\varphi_l\rangle\langle\varphi_l|)) = 1 - o(l^0). \quad (84)$$

This together with (82) shows that

$$E(\mathfrak{J}) \geq \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\pi_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}). \quad (85)$$

Thus, using the compound BSST Lemma 16 and arguing as in the proof of Theorem 17, we can conclude that

$$E(\mathfrak{J}) \geq Q(\mathfrak{J}) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}). \quad (86)$$

Since $E(\mathfrak{J}) \leq E_{ID}(\mathfrak{J})$ holds it suffices to show

$$E_{ID}(\mathfrak{J}) \leq Q(\mathfrak{J}) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}) \quad (87)$$

in order to establish the coding theorem for $E_{ID}(\mathfrak{J})$ and $E(\mathfrak{J})$ simultaneously.

The proof of (87) relies on Lemma 24 and the data processing inequality. Indeed, let $R \in \mathbb{R}_+$ be an achievable entanglement generation rate for \mathfrak{J} with informed decoder and let $((\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}}^l)_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}}, \varphi_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a corresponding sequence of (l, k_l) -codes, i.e we have

1. $\liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \log k_l \geq R$, and
2. $\inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} F(|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|, (id_{\mathcal{F}_l} \otimes \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}}^l \circ \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l})(|\varphi_l\rangle\langle\varphi_l|)) = 1 - \epsilon_l$ where $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_l = 0$ and ψ_l denotes the standard maximally entangled state on $\mathcal{F}_l \otimes \mathcal{F}_l$ with Schmidt rank k_l .

Set $\rho^l := \text{tr}_{\mathcal{F}_l}(|\varphi_l\rangle\langle\varphi_l|)$ and

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{N}}^l := id_{\mathcal{F}_l} \otimes \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}}^l \circ \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}(|\varphi_l\rangle\langle\varphi_l|).$$

Then the data processing inequality and Lemma 24 imply for each $\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}$

$$\begin{aligned} I_c(\rho^l, \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}) &\geq I_c(\rho^l, \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}}^l \circ \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}) \\ &= \Delta(\sigma_{\mathcal{N}}^l) \\ &\geq \Delta(|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l|) - \frac{2}{e} - 8 \log(k_l) \sqrt{\epsilon_l} \\ &= \log k_l - \frac{2}{e} - 8 \log(k_l) \sqrt{\epsilon_l}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$(1 - 8\sqrt{\epsilon_l}) \frac{1}{l} \log k_l \leq \frac{1}{l} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{J}} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}) + \frac{2}{le} \quad (88)$$

and we end up with

$$R \leq \limsup_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \log k_l \leq \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{J}} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}),$$

which implies (87). The expression for $E_{IE}(\mathcal{J})$ is obtained in a similar fashion. We summarize the results in the following theorem.

Theorem 32 (Entanglement-Generating Capacities of \mathcal{J}) *For arbitrary compound channels $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ we have*

$$E(\mathcal{J}) = E_{ID}(\mathcal{J}) = Q(\mathcal{J}) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{J}} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}),$$

and

$$E_{IE}(\mathcal{J}) = Q_{IE}(\mathcal{J}) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l} \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{J}} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l}).$$

A Appendix

Let \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{G} be subspaces of \mathcal{H} with $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{H}$ where $k := \dim \mathcal{E}$, $d_{\mathcal{G}} := \dim \mathcal{G}$. p and $p_{\mathcal{G}}$ will denote the orthogonal projections onto \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{G} . For a Haar distributed random variable U with values in $\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G})$ and $x, y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ we define a random sesquilinear form

$$b_{UpU^*}(x, y) := \text{tr}(UpU^*x^*UpU^*y) - \frac{1}{k} \text{tr}(UpU^*x^*) \text{tr}(UpU^*y).$$

In this appendix we will give an elementary derivation of the formula

$$\mathbb{E}\{b_{UpU^*}(x, y)\} = \frac{k^2 - 1}{d_{\mathcal{G}}^2 - 1} \text{tr}(p_{\mathcal{G}}x^*p_{\mathcal{G}}y) + \frac{1 - k^2}{d_{\mathcal{G}}(d_{\mathcal{G}}^2 - 1)} \text{tr}(p_{\mathcal{G}}x^*) \text{tr}(p_{\mathcal{G}}y) \quad (89)$$

for all $x, y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and where the expectation is taken with respect to the random variable U .

Let us set

$$p_U := UpU^*.$$

Since $\text{tr}(p_Ux^*p_Uy)$ and $\text{tr}(p_Ux^*)\text{tr}(p_Uy)$ depend sesquilinearly on $(x, y) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ it suffices to consider operators of the form

$$x = |f_1\rangle\langle g_1| \quad \text{and} \quad y = |f_2\rangle\langle g_2| \quad (90)$$

with suitable $f_1, f_2, g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{H}$. With x, y as in (90) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(p_Ux^*p_Uy) &= \langle f_1, p_U f_2 \rangle \langle g_2, p_U g_1 \rangle \\ &= \langle f_1 \otimes g_2, (U \otimes U)(p \otimes p)(U^* \otimes U^*) f_2 \otimes g_1 \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(p_Ux^*)\text{tr}(p_Uy) &= \text{tr}((p_U \otimes p_U)(|g_1\rangle\langle f_1| \otimes |f_2\rangle\langle g_2|)) \\ &= \langle f_1 \otimes g_2, (U \otimes U)(p \otimes p)(U^* \otimes U^*) g_1 \otimes f_2 \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

Since the range of the random projection $(U \otimes U)(p \otimes p)(U^* \otimes U^*)$ is contained in $\mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{G}$ we see from (91) and (92) that we may (and will) w.l.o.g. assume that $f_1, f_2, g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{G}$. Moreover, (91) and (92) show,

due to the linearity of expectation, that the whole task of computing the average in (89) is boiled down to the determination of

$$\begin{aligned} A(p) &:= \mathbb{E}((U \otimes U)(p \otimes p)(U^* \otimes U^*)) \\ &= \int_{\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G})} (u \otimes u)(p \otimes p)(u^* \otimes u^*) du. \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

Obviously, $A(p)$ is $u \otimes u$ -invariant, i.e. $A(p)(u \otimes u) = (u \otimes u)A(p)$ for all $u \in \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{G})$. It is fairly standard (and proven by elementary means in [28]) that then

$$A(p) = \alpha \Pi_s + \beta \Pi_a, \quad (94)$$

where Π_s and Π_a denote the projections onto the symmetric and antisymmetric subspaces of $\mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{G}$. More specifically

$$\Pi_s := \frac{1}{2}(\text{id} + \mathbb{F}) \quad \Pi_a = \frac{1}{2}(\text{id} - \mathbb{F}),$$

with $\text{id}(f \otimes g) = f \otimes g$ and $\mathbb{F}(f \otimes g) = g \otimes f$, for all $f, g \in \mathcal{G}$.

Since Π_s and Π_a are obviously $u \otimes u$ -invariant, and $\Pi_s \Pi_a = \Pi_a \Pi_s = 0$ holds, the coefficients α and β in (94) are given by

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{\text{tr}(\Pi_s)} \text{tr}((p \otimes p)\Pi_s) = \frac{2}{d_{\mathcal{G}}(d_{\mathcal{G}} + 1)} \text{tr}((p \otimes p)\Pi_s), \quad (95)$$

and

$$\beta = \frac{1}{\text{tr}(\Pi_a)} \text{tr}((p \otimes p)\Pi_a) = \frac{2}{d_{\mathcal{G}}(d_{\mathcal{G}} - 1)} \text{tr}((p \otimes p)\Pi_a), \quad (96)$$

where $d_{\mathcal{G}} = \dim \mathcal{G}$ and we have used the facts that

$$\text{tr}(\Pi_s) = \dim \text{ran}(\Pi_s) = \frac{d_{\mathcal{G}}(d_{\mathcal{G}} + 1)}{2}$$

and

$$\text{tr}(\Pi_a) = \dim \text{ran}(\Pi_a) = \frac{d_{\mathcal{G}}(d_{\mathcal{G}} - 1)}{2}.$$

It is easily seen by an explicit computation with a suitable basis that

$$\text{tr}((p \otimes p)\Pi_s) = \frac{1}{2}(k^2 + k) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{tr}((p \otimes p)\Pi_a) = \frac{1}{2}(k^2 - k). \quad (97)$$

For example choosing any orthonormal basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_{d_{\mathcal{G}}}\}$ of \mathcal{G} with $e_1, \dots, e_k \in \text{ran}(p)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}((p \otimes p)\Pi_s) &= \sum_{i,j=1}^{d_{\mathcal{G}}} \langle e_i \otimes e_j, (p \otimes p)\Pi_s e_i \otimes e_j \rangle \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^k \langle e_i \otimes e_j, (p \otimes p)\Pi_s e_i \otimes e_j \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^k \langle e_i, e_i \rangle \langle e_j, e_j \rangle + \langle e_i, e_j \rangle \langle e_j, e_i \rangle \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(k^2 + k), \end{aligned}$$

with a similar calculation for $\text{tr}((p \otimes p)\Pi_a)$. Utilizing (95), (96), (97), and (94) we end up with

$$A(p) = \frac{k^2 + k}{d_G(d_G + 1)}\Pi_s + \frac{k^2 - k}{d_G(d_G - 1)}\Pi_a. \quad (98)$$

Now, (98), (93), (92), (91), and some simple algebra show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\{\text{tr}(UpU^*x^*UpU^*y) - \frac{1}{k}\text{tr}(UpU^*x^*)\text{tr}(UpU^*y)\} &= \frac{k^2 - 1}{d_G^2 - 1}\text{tr}(x^*y) \\ &+ \frac{1 - k^2}{d_G(d_G^2 - 1)}\text{tr}(x^*)\text{tr}(y). \end{aligned}$$

Acknowledgement. I.B. is supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) via project “Entropie und Kodierung großer Quanten-Informationssysteme” at the TU Berlin. H.B. and J.N. are grateful for the support by TU Berlin through the fund for basic research.

References

- [1] H. Barnum, E. Knill, and M.A. Nielsen, “On Quantum Fidelities and Channel Capacities”, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Th.* 46, 1317-1329 (2000), H. Barnum, M.A. Nielsen, B. Schumacher, “Information transmission through a noisy quantum channel”, *Phys. Rev. A* Vol. 57, No. 6, 4153 (1998)
- [2] C.H. Bennett, P.W. Shor, J.A. Smolin, and A.V. Thapliyal, “Entanglement-assisted capacity of a quantum channel and the reverse Shannon theorem”, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Th.* 48, 2637-2655 (2002)
- [3] I. Bjelaković, H. Boche, arXiv:0710.3027, “Classical Capacities of Averaged and Compound Quantum Channels”, submitted to *IEEE Trans. Inf. Th.*
Available at: <http://arxiv.org/abs/0710.3027>
- [4] I. Bjelaković, H. Boche, J. Nötzel, “Quantum capacity of a class of compound channels”, *Phys. Rev. A* 78, 042331, (2008)
- [5] D. Blackwell, L. Breiman, A.J. Thomasian, “The capacity of a class of channels”, *Ann. Math. Stat.* Vol. 30, No. 4, 1229-1241 (1959)
- [6] M.-D. Choi, “Completely Positive Linear Maps on Complex Matrices”, *Linear Algebra and Its Applications* 10, 285-290 (1975)
- [7] I. Csizsar, J. Körner, *Information Theory; Coding Theorems for Discrete Memoryless Systems*, Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest/Academic Press Inc., New York 1981
- [8] T. Cubitt, M. Ruskai and G. Smith, “The structure of degradable quantum channels”, *Jour. Math. Physics* Vol. 49, No. 10. (2008)
- [9] N. Datta, T.C. Dorlas, “The coding theorem for a class of quantum channels with long-term memory”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* Vol. 40, 8147-8164 (2007)
- [10] I. Devetak, “The private classical capacity and quantum capacity of a quantum channel”, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Th.* 51, No.1, 44-55 (2005)

- [11] M. Hayashi, “Universal coding for classical-quantum channel”, arXiv:0805.4092
Available at: <http://arxiv.org/abs/0805.4092>
- [12] P. Hayden, M. Horodecki, A. Winter, J. Yard, “A decoupling approach to the quantum capacity”,
Open. Syst. Inf. Dyn. 15, 7-19 (2008)
- [13] A.S. Holevo, “The Capacity of the Quantum Channel with General Signal States”, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Th.* Vol. 44, No. 1, 269-273, (1998)
- [14] A.S. Holevo, “On entanglement-assisted classical capacity” *Jour. Math. Physics* Vol. 43, No. 9, 4326-4333 (2002)
- [15] R.A. Horn, C.R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press (1999)
- [16] R. Jozsa, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, “Universal Quantum Information Compression”,
Phys. Rev. Letters Vol. 81, No. 8, 1714-1717 (1998)
- [17] A.Yu. Kitaev, A.H. Shen, M.N. Vyalyi, *Classical and Quantum Computation*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics 47, American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island (2002)
- [18] R. Klesse, “Approximate Quantum Error Correction, Random Codes, and Quantum Channel Capacity”, *Phys. Rev. A* 75, 062315 (2007)
- [19] D. Kretschmann, R.F. Werner, “Tema con variazioni: quantum channel capacity”, *New Journal of Physics* Vol. 6, 26-59 (2004)
- [20] D. Leung, G. Smith, “Continuity of quantum channel capacities”, arXiv:0810.4931v1
- [21] S. Lloyd, “Capacity of the noisy quantum channel”, *Phys. Rev. A* Vol. 55, No. 3 1613-1622 (1997)
- [22] V.D. Milman, G. Schechtman, *Asymptotic Theory of Finite Dimensional Normed Spaces*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1200, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, corrected second printing (2001)
- [23] T. Ogawa, H. Nagaoka, “Strong converse to the quantum channel coding theorem”, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Th.* Vol. 45, No. 7, 2486-2489 (1999)
- [24] B. Schumacher, M.A. Nielsen “Quantum data processing and error correction”, *Phys. Rev. A* Vol. 54, No.4, 2629 - 2635 (1996)
- [25] B. Schumacher, M.D. Westmoreland, “Sending classical information via noisy quantum channels”,
Phys. Rev. A Vol. 56, No. 1, 131-138, (1997)
- [26] B. Schumacher, M.D. Westmoreland, “Approximate quantum error correction”, *Quant. Inf. Proc.* Vol. 1, 5-12 (2002)
- [27] P. Shor, unpublished talk manuscript. Available at:
<http://www.msri.org/publications/ln/msri/2002/quantumcrypto/shor/1/>
- [28] R.F. Werner, “Quantum states with Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen correlations admitting a hidden-variable model”, *Phys. Rev. A* Vol. 40, No. 8, 4277-4281 (1989)

- [29] A. Winter, “Coding theorem and strong converse for quantum channels”, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Th.* Vol. 45, No. 7, 2481-2485 (1999)
- [30] J. Wolfowitz, “Simultaneous channels”, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* Vol. 4, No. 4, 371-386 (1960)
- [31] J. Wolfowitz, *Coding Theorems of Information Theory*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete 31, 3. Edition, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany, 1978