

Abelian Group Codes for Classical and Classical-Quantum Channels: One-shot and Asymptotic Rate Bounds

James (Chin-Jen) Pang^{*}, S. Sandeep Pradhan[†] and Hessam Mahdavi[‡]

^{*} Marvell Technology, Inc., Santa Clara, CA, USA,

[†] Department of EECS, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

[‡] Department of ECE, Northeastern University, Boston, USA,

*cjpang@umich.edu †pradhanv@umich.edu ‡h.mahdavi@northeastern.edu

Abstract

We study the problem of transmission of information over classical and classical-quantum channels in the one-shot regime where the underlying codes are constrained to be *group codes*. In the achievability part, we introduce a new input probability distribution that incorporates the encoding homomorphism and the underlying channel law. Using a random coding argument, we characterize the performance of group codes in terms of hypothesis testing relative-entropic quantities. In the converse part, we establish bounds by leveraging a hypothesis testing-based approach. Furthermore, we apply the one-shot result to the asymptotic stationary memoryless setting, and establish a single-letter lower bound on *group capacities* for both classes of channels. Moreover, we derive a matching upper bound on the asymptotic group capacity.

I. INTRODUCTION

We study in this paper the problem of channel coding both in the classical and *classical-quantum* settings. In both problems, the data to be transmitted reliably are classical, but the channel output of the former must have a classical alphabet. The classical channel coding has been studied extensively in the literature [1]. Classical-quantum channel coding has also been studied extensively in a scenario where the channel can be used arbitrarily many times. The channel coding theorem for stationary memoryless classical-quantum channels, established by Holevo [2] and Schumacher and Westmoreland [3], provides an explicit formula for the maximum rate at which data can be transmitted reliably. More general channel coding theorems that do not rely on this independence assumption have been developed in later works by Hayashi and Nagaoka [4] and by Kretschmann and Werner [5]. These results are asymptotic, i.e., they refer to a limit where the number of channel uses tends to infinity while the probability of error is required to approach zero. Moreover, the asymptotic performance limits are evaluated for ensembles of random codes with no apparent structure. We refer to them as random unstructured codes.

Due to its algebraic properties, the finite field structure has been adopted in the coding schemes, over the past several decades, to approach information-theoretic performance limits of point-to-point communication [6]–[10].

These are structured codes where the structure is exploited to yield computationally efficient encoding and decoding algorithms. Later these coding approaches were extended to weaker algebraic structures such as rings and groups to yield group codes [11]–[17]. There are several reasons for studying group codes. We mention the following two reasons: a) finite fields exist only for alphabets with a prime power size, and b) for communication under certain constraints, codes with weaker algebraic structures have better properties. For example, when communicating over an additive white Gaussian noise channel with 8-PSK constellation, codes over \mathbb{Z}_8 , the cyclic group of size 8, are more desirable over binary linear codes because the structure of the code is matched to the structure of the signal set [13]. As another example, construction of polar codes over alphabets of size p^r , for $r > 1$ and p prime, is simpler with a module structure rather than a vector space structure [18]–[20] leading to multilevel polarization. In fact, polarization does not take place in finite fields in the polar codes with additive kernel when the field is of size p^r with $r > 1$, since components of the finite field remain disconnected in the encoding process. Group codes were first studied by Slepian [17] for the Gaussian channel. In [21], the capacity of group codes for certain classes of channels has been computed. Further results on the capacity of group codes were established in [6], [7]. The capacity of group codes over a class of channels exhibiting symmetries with respect to the action of a finite Abelian group has been investigated in [12]. The capacity of these codes for the discrete memoryless channels was characterized in [16].

Even when computational complexity is a non-issue, structured codes provide performance gains over unstructured codes. For example, the typical performance of the ensemble of random structured (linear) codes is better than that of the ensemble of random unstructured codes for point-to-point channels in terms of error exponents and minimum distance [22], [23]. These gains get accentuated in network communication setting where structured codes provide gains in the first order performance limits such as capacity or rate-distortion functions. For example, in problems such as distributed source coding, multiple-access channels, interference channels and broadcast channels [24]–[34], the use of structured codes have been studied extensively to yield the state-of-the-art bounds on the performance limits. Similar first order gains have also been reported in the classical-quantum settings [35]–[38] recently. In these settings, the algebraic structure of the codes are exploited to affect distributed coordination among the terminals of the network to yield maximum throughput.

All the aforementioned performance limits are evaluated under the asymptotic assumption, and many assume additionally that the channels are memoryless and stationary. However, in many real-world scenarios, we encounter channels which are neither stationary nor memoryless. Therefore, it is of fundamental importance to think of coding schemes for the channels which fail to satisfy these assumptions. The independent channel uses are relaxed in [4], [39] and general channels with memory are studied in [40], [41], albeit these results are derived in the form of a limit such that the error probability vanishes as the number of channel uses goes to infinity. Hence, the study of performance of codes in the non-asymptotic regimes is of great interest.

In this setting, the problems with single-serving scenarios, called the one-shot approach, where a given channel is

used only once has been studied extensively in the recent past. This approach gives rise to a high level of generality that no assumptions are made on the structure of the channel and the associated capacity is usually referred to as *one-shot* capacity. The one-shot capacity of a classical channel was characterized in terms of min- and max-entropies in [42]. The one-shot classical capacity of a quantum channel is addressed by a hypothesis testing approach in [43] and [44], yielding expressions in terms of the generalized (Rényi) relative entropies and a smooth relative entropy quantity, respectively. See [45] for a comprehensive treatment of this approach. These works considered random unstructured codes—those which do not have any group structure—in their achievability approaches [46]–[49]. In the one-shot approach, the objective is to characterize the performance of a random unstructured code of length unity by using a given channel once. The characterization is given in terms of ϵ one-shot capacity. The performance of the code on n independent uses of the channel can be obtained by evaluating the ϵ -capacity of the n -product channel normalized by n . Moreover, the characterization should be fine enough that normalized ϵ capacity for asymptotically large n should give the Shannon capacity of the channel. This approach is also closely related to the second order analysis of capacity of channels as studied in [50], [51].

In this work, we consider the performance of structured codes for transmission of classical information over point-to-point classical and classical-quantum channels in the one-shot regime. The motivation for this problem is that most codes of practical importance have some form of algebraic structure, hence it is of significance to obtain a characterization their one-shot coding performance. This problem has not been studied before. The first question that arises here is how to formulate the problem. Suppose we want to restrict our attention to just finite fields and formulate the one-shot problem. A code can be defined as a sub-field of a finite field. Such a formulation may be overly restrictive. For example, let us take the case of linear codes defined over the binary field \mathbb{F}_2 . For block length 1, the alphabet is a finite field, and there is no non-trivial code. For any larger block-length n , the alphabet is \mathbb{F}_2^n . Although one can construct a multiplication operation leading to a Galois field $GF(2^n)$, the standard (n, k) linear code works only with the algebraic structure of \mathbb{F}_2 . In fact, it is a subgroup of \mathbb{F}_2^n by considering the latter as just a group, i.e., closed under the addition operation of the base finite field \mathbb{F}_2 and, in general, is not a sub-field of $GF(2^n)$. This means that we need to go beyond finite fields in our formulation. A similar argument can be given to a formulation just based on rings, where a code is a sub-ring of a given ring. Based on these considerations, we formulate a one-shot channel coding problem that can encompass a broad class of well-known structured codes.

We assume in this work that the channel input alphabet G is endowed with an Abelian group structure, and we consider a \mathbb{C} code characterized via a homomorphism from a group J to G , where J is the input message group. Our derivation is based on the idea of relating the problem of channel coding to hypothesis testing. Here, we use a relative-entropy-type quantity defined in [44] known as hypothesis testing relative entropy, denoted by $D_{\mathbb{H}}^{\epsilon}(\cdot||\cdot)$. We introduce a new hypothesis testing group-based relative entropy that incorporates the underlying subgroup structure of the channel input group alphabet, and derive a tight characterization of the performance of group codes. We use the framework of one-shot quantum typicality developed in [52] for the achievability of multi-terminal CQ

channels. The reason for using this multiterminal technique for characterizing the group code performance for point-to-point channel is the following. For any non-field group J , the lattice [53] of subgroups induces certain dependence structure on a given group code, \mathbb{C} , bringing with this problem certain issues commonly seen in multi-terminal channel coding problems. Each subgroup of J yields a subcode and one can associate a fictitious terminal with such a subcode. These terminals, with access to certain parts of the original message, form a network induced by the lattice of subgroups. The overall communication can be interpreted as each such terminal in the network wishing to send a part of the given message with some rate to the receiver.

The contributions of this paper are as follows. We first formulate the one-shot transmission problem with a group structure on the code. We then provide characterizations of the one-shot capacities of Abelian group codes for classical and classical-quantum channels. For the former, we assume that the channels have finite alphabets, and for the latter we assume that the channel output Hilbert space is of finite dimension. The achievability is studied using an ensemble of group codes, and we provide two lower bounds on the one-shot capacity, where the latter is tighter while the former is easier to interpret. These are stated as Theorem 1, 2, 4, and 5, respectively. We also provide upper bounds on the one-shot capacities (see Theorem 3, 6). These bounds are established by exploiting the hypothesis testing-type argument on subcodes of \mathbb{C} associated with subgroups of J . We then extend these results to the asymptotic regime. Using the asymptotic equipartition property (AEP) of the hypothesis testing relative entropy, we rederive a single-letter characterization of the group capacity of discrete stationary and memoryless classical channels which was derived earlier in [16] (see Theorem 7). For the classical-quantum channels, we derive a single-letter characterization of the group capacity in the asymptotic regime using the AEP of hypothesis testing quantum relative entropy under the stationary and memoryless assumption. Furthermore, we provide a converse coding theorem for this capacity (see Theorem 8). We note that group codes have been studied extensively in the literature [54]. The asymptotic performance limits of Abelian group codes have been characterized for classical discrete memoryless channels in [12], [16] using variants of mutual information under maximum likelihood or joint typical decoding procedures.

The new technical elements introduced in this work are as follows. It should be noted that in random ensemble of group codes, introduced in the subsequent sections, the codewords are statistically related, and are not even pairwise independent. This requires a new analysis that takes into account the group structure under consideration. One of the key difficulties of working with groups is the presence of zero divisors. The second issue that comes up is the decision regions. Because of the lattice of subgroups of a given group, we need to consider intersections of several decision regions. This becomes quite involved in the classical-quantum settings, where the decision regions are the projection operators. The third conceptual innovation is the performance characterization. In this regard, we introduce a novel one-shot group hypothesis testing relative entropy toward this. The paper is organized as follows. In Section II we provide the basic definitions and the problem formulation. A description of the ensemble of group codes is provided in Section III. We characterize the performance of one-shot group channel codes for classical and

classical-quantum channels in Section IV and V, respectively. Then we derive a single-letter characterization of the asymptotic group capacity of classical and classical-quantum channels in VI. We compute the performance limits for some examples in Section VII.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Classical and CQ Channel Model

We consider discrete memoryless classical channels used without feedback specified by a tuple $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, W_{Y|X})$, where \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are the channel input and output alphabets, respectively, and $W_{Y|X}$ is a conditional distribution. We also study the *classical-quantum channels*, where the data to be transmitted reliably are *classical*. Let a finite set \mathcal{X} denote the input alphabet. For any input $x \in \mathcal{X}$, the channel produces an output, specified by a density operator ρ_x on a Hilbert space \mathcal{B} . We denote a CQ channel by a mapping $\mathcal{N} : x \mapsto \rho_x$ from \mathcal{X} to the set of all density operators defined on \mathcal{B} .

B. Groups and Group Codes

All groups referred to in this paper are *Abelian groups*. Given a group $(G, +)$ and a subset H of G , we use $H \leq G$ to denote that H is subgroup of G . A *coset* H' of a subgroup H is a shift of H by an arbitrary element $a \in G$, i.e. $H' = a + H$ for some $a \in G$. For a prime p dividing the cardinality of G , the *Sylow- p* subgroup of G is the largest subgroup of G whose cardinality is a power of p . Group isomorphism is denoted by \cong . For summations over groups, we also use \sum . Direct sum of groups is denoted by \oplus and direct product of sets is denoted by \otimes . Given a group G , a group code \mathbb{C} over G with block length n is any subgroup of G^n . A shifted group code over G , given by $\mathbb{C} + b$ is a translation of a group code \mathbb{C} by a fixed vector $b \in G^n$. Group codes generalize the notion of linear codes over primary finite fields to channels with input alphabets having composite sizes.

C. Definition of Achievability for Classical Channel Coding

For a finite Abelian group G , a group transmission system with parameters (n, Ω, τ) for reliable communication over a given channel $(\mathcal{X} = G, \mathcal{Y}, W_{Y|X})$ consists of a codebook, an encoding mapping and a decoding mapping. The codebook \mathbb{C} is a shifted subgroup of G^n whose size is equal to Ω and the mappings are defined as

$$\text{Enc} : \{1, 2, \dots, \Omega\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad \text{Dec} : \mathcal{Y}^n \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, \Omega\},$$

such that

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\Omega} \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\{x = \text{Enc}(m)\}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\{m \neq \text{Dec}(y)\}} W^n(y|x) \leq \tau.$$

A rate R is said to be achievable using group codes if for all $\epsilon > 0$ and for all sufficiently large n , there exists a group transmission system with parameters (n, Ω, τ) such that

$$\frac{1}{n} \log_2 \Omega \geq R - \epsilon, \quad \tau \leq \epsilon.$$

The group capacity C of the channel is defined as the supremum of the set of all achievable rates using group codes.

D. Definition of Achievability for CQ Channel

Given a classical-quantum channel $\mathcal{N} = \{\rho_x\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ from the classical alphabet \mathcal{X} to the quantum system \mathcal{B} , where $\mathcal{X} = G$ is an Abelian group, a group transmission system with parameters (n, Ω, τ) over \mathcal{N} consists of a codebook, an encoding mapping and a decoding positive operator-valued measure (POVM). The codebook \mathbb{C} is a shifted subgroup of G^n whose size is Ω . The encoding mapping is defined as $\text{Enc} : \{1, 2, \dots, \Omega\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. The decoding POVM is a set $\{\Lambda_m\}_{m=1}^{\Omega}$ of operators such that $\Lambda_m \geq 0, \forall m$ and $\sum_m \Lambda_m = I$. The probability of obtaining outcome j is $\text{tr}(\Lambda_j \rho)$ if the state is described by some density operator ρ , where $\text{tr}(\cdot)$ denotes the trace operation. The probability of decoding error of the group transmission system satisfies

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\Omega} \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\{x = \text{Enc}(m)\}} [1 - \text{tr}(\Lambda_m \rho_x)] \leq \tau.$$

Given a channel \mathcal{N} , a rate R is said to be achievable using group codes if for all $\epsilon > 0$ and for all sufficiently large n , there exists a group transmission system for reliable communication with parameters (n, Ω, τ) such that

$$\frac{1}{n} \log_2 \Omega \geq R - \epsilon, \quad \tau \leq \epsilon.$$

The group capacity of the channel $C = C(\mathcal{N})$ is defined as the supremum of all achievable rates using group codes.

E. Hypothesis testing relative entropy

We recall the definition and a few properties of the *hypothesis testing relative entropy* $D_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon}(\rho||\sigma)$ from [44]. Let ρ and σ be two possible states of a system. A strategy for the task of discrimination between the two states is specified by a Positive Operator Valued Measure (POVM) with two elements, Λ and $I - \Lambda$, corresponding to the two possible values for the guess, respectively, where Λ a positive operator with $0 \leq \Lambda \leq I$. The probability that the strategy produces a *correct* guess on input ρ is given by $\text{tr}[\Lambda \rho]$, and the probability that it produces a *wrong* guess on input σ is $\text{tr}[\Lambda \sigma]$. For any $0 < \epsilon < 1$, the hypothesis testing relative entropy $D_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon}(\rho||\sigma)$ is defined by

$$D_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon}(\rho||\sigma) \triangleq -\log_2 \inf_{\substack{\Lambda: 0 \leq \Lambda \leq I, \\ \text{tr}[\Lambda \rho] \geq 1 - \epsilon}} \text{tr}[\Lambda \sigma]. \quad (1)$$

The the following asymptotic equipartition property (AEP) was derived in [55], [56]:

$$D_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon}(\rho^{\otimes n}||\sigma^{\otimes n}) = nD(\rho||\sigma) + \sqrt{nV(\rho||\sigma)}\Phi^{-1}(\epsilon) + O(\log n),$$

where $D(\rho||\sigma)$ is the quantum relative entropy, $V(\rho||\sigma)$ is the quantum information variance and Φ is the CDF of the normal distribution. For two distributions P, Q on a classical alphabet \mathcal{X} , the hypothesis testing relative entropy $D_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon}(P||Q)$ can be similarly defined by

$$D_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon}(P||Q) \triangleq -\log_2 \inf_{A: P(A) \geq 1 - \epsilon} Q(A), \quad (2)$$

where $A \subset \mathcal{X}$ is sometimes called the *decision region*. Of course, a similar second order AEP holds here as well.

III. ABELIAN GROUP CODE ENSEMBLE

In this section, we use the standard characterization of Abelian groups and introduce the ensemble of Abelian group codes used in [12], [16]. The subsequent analysis will be based on this ensemble.

A. Abelian Groups

For an Abelian group G , let $\mathcal{P}(G)$ denote the set of all distinct primes which divide $|G|$ and for a prime $p \in \mathcal{P}(G)$ let $S_p(G)$ be the corresponding Sylow subgroup of G . It is known that any Abelian group G can be decomposed as a direct sum of its Sylow subgroups [53] in the following manner

$$G = \bigoplus_{p \in \mathcal{P}(G)} S_p(G). \quad (3)$$

Furthermore, each Sylow subgroup $S_p(G)$ can be decomposed into \mathbb{Z}_{p^r} groups as follows: $S_p(G) \cong \bigoplus_{r \in \mathcal{R}_p(G)} \mathbb{Z}_{p^r}^{M_{p,r}}$,

$$S_p(G) \cong \bigoplus_{r \in \mathcal{R}_p(G)} \mathbb{Z}_{p^r}^{M_{p,r}}, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{R}_p(G) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^+$ and for $r \in \mathcal{R}_p(G)$, $M_{p,r}$ is a positive integer. Note that $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}^{M_{p,r}}$ is defined as the direct sum of the ring \mathbb{Z}_{p^r} with itself for $M_{p,r}$ times. Rewriting (3), we have:

$$G \cong \bigoplus_{p \in \mathcal{P}(G)} \bigoplus_{r \in \mathcal{R}_p(G)} \mathbb{Z}_{p^r}^{M_{p,r}} = \bigoplus_{p \in \mathcal{P}(G)} \bigoplus_{r \in \mathcal{R}_p(G)} \bigoplus_{m=1}^{M_{p,r}} \mathbb{Z}_{p^r}^{(m)}, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}^{(m)}$ is called the m^{th} \mathbb{Z}_{p^r} ring of G or the (p, r, m) -th ring of G . We also define two sets, $\mathcal{Q}(G) \subseteq \mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{Z}^+$ by

$$\mathcal{Q}(G) \triangleq \{(p, r) \mid p \in \mathcal{P}(G), r \in \mathcal{R}_p(G)\},$$

and $\mathcal{G}(G) \subseteq \mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{Z}^+ \times \mathbb{Z}^+$ by

$$\mathcal{G}(G) \triangleq \{(p, r, m) \mid (p, r) \in \mathcal{Q}(G), m \in \{1, 2, \dots, M_{p,r}\}\}.$$

Then, equivalently, G can be written as follows

$$G \cong \bigoplus_{(p,r) \in \mathcal{Q}(G)} \mathbb{Z}_{p^r}^{M_{p,r}} = \bigoplus_{(p,r,m) \in \mathcal{G}(G)} \mathbb{Z}_{p^r}^{(m)}. \quad (6)$$

Define $\zeta(G) := \sum_{(p,r,m) \in \mathcal{G}(G)} r$, the sum of prime powers in the prime factorization of $|G|$. Also define the set $\mathcal{G}^*(G) \triangleq \{(p, r, m, k) : (p, r, m) \in \mathcal{G}(G), 1 \leq k \leq r\}$. Hence any element a of the Abelian group G can be regarded as a vector whose components are indexed by $(p, r, m) \in \mathcal{G}(G)$ and whose (p, r, m) -th component $a_{p,r,m}$ takes values from the ring \mathbb{Z}_{p^r} .

Example 1. Let $G = \mathbb{Z}_4 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_3 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_9^2$. Then we have $\mathcal{P}(G) = \{2, 3\}$, $S_2(G) = \mathbb{Z}_4$ and $S_3(G) = \mathbb{Z}_3 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_9^2$, $\mathcal{R}_2(G) = \{2\}$, $\mathcal{R}_3(G) = \{1, 2\}$, $M_{2,2} = 1$, $M_{3,1} = 1$, $M_{3,2} = 2$ and

$$\mathcal{G}(G) = \{(2, 2, 1), (3, 1, 1), (3, 2, 1), (3, 2, 2)\},$$

$$\mathcal{G}^*(G) = \{(2, 2, 1, 1), (2, 2, 1, 2), (3, 1, 1, 1), (3, 2, 1, 1), (3, 2, 1, 2), (3, 2, 2, 1), (3, 2, 2, 2)\}.$$

Each element a of G can be represented by a quadruple, $(a_{2,2,1}, a_{3,1,1}, a_{3,2,1}, a_{3,2,2})$ where $a_{2,2,1} \in \mathbb{Z}_4$, $a_{3,1,1} \in \mathbb{Z}_3$ and $a_{3,2,1}, a_{3,2,2} \in \mathbb{Z}_9$.

In the following section, we introduce the ensemble of Abelian group codes which we use in the paper.

B. The Image Ensemble

Recall that for a positive integer n , an Abelian group code of length n over the group G is a coset of a subgroup of G^n . Our ensemble of codes consists of *all* Abelian group codes over G ; i.e., we consider all cosets of subgroups of G^n . The following lemma (see [57, Theorem 12-1]) effectively characterizes all subgroups of G^n :

Lemma 1. *For a group \tilde{G} , let $\phi : J \rightarrow \tilde{G}$ be a homomorphism from some group J to \tilde{G} . Then $\phi(J) \leq \tilde{G}$. Moreover, for any subgroup \tilde{H} of \tilde{G} there exists a corresponding group J and a homomorphism $\phi : J \rightarrow \tilde{G}$ such that $\tilde{H} = \phi(J)$.*

Definition 1. *For an element $x \in G$ and a subgroup $H \leq G$, there is a one-to-one mapping $x \leftrightarrow ([x], \bar{x})$, where $[x]$ is a representative of the coset of H which x belongs to, and $\bar{x} \in H$, such that $x = [x] + \bar{x}$.*

Remark 1. *We make a general remark here about an arbitrary subgroup H of G . Let $\phi : J \rightarrow G$ be a homomorphism from some group J to G , and $x = \phi(u) + \beta$ for any fixed $\beta \in G$. Let $H_J = \phi^{-1}(H)$, and let $u = [u] + \bar{u}$ be the decomposition as in Definition 1 with respect to H_J . We note that $[x] = x \bmod H$, and $\phi(\bar{u}) = \bar{x}$. Using the distributive property of mod operation, i.e., $[x + y] = [[x] + y]$, we note that,*

$$[x] = [\phi(u) + \beta] = [[\phi([u]) + \phi(\bar{u})] + \beta] = [[\phi([u])] + \beta],$$

$$\bar{x} = x - [x] = \phi(\bar{u}) + \overline{\phi([u]) + \beta}.$$

Hence $[x]$ depends only on $[u]$, where as \bar{x} depends on the entirety of u in general. This is the characteristic feature of the group codes.

Definition 2. *Let G be an Abelian group. For $p \in \mathcal{P}(G)$, define $r_p = \max \mathcal{R}_p(G)$, and $\mathcal{S}(G) = \{(p, s) \mid p \in \mathcal{P}(G), 1 \leq s \leq r_p\}$.*

It is shown in [16] that we only need to consider homomorphisms from an Abelian group J to \tilde{G} such that $\mathcal{P}(J) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\tilde{G})$, and $s \leq r_q = \max \mathcal{R}_q(\tilde{G})$ for all $(q, s, l) \in \mathcal{G}(J)$. To construct Abelian group codes of length n over G , we start with the following decomposition:

$$G^n \cong \bigoplus_{p \in \mathcal{P}(G)} \bigoplus_{r \in \mathcal{R}_p} \mathbb{Z}_{p^r}^{nM_{p,r}} = \bigoplus_{p \in \mathcal{P}(G)} \bigoplus_{r \in \mathcal{R}_p} \bigoplus_{m=1}^{nM_{p,r}} \mathbb{Z}_{p^r}^{(m)}. \quad (7)$$

Define J as

$$J = \bigoplus_{q \in \mathcal{P}(G)} \bigoplus_{s=1}^{r_q} \mathbb{Z}_{q^s}^{k_{q,s}} = \bigoplus_{q \in \mathcal{P}(G)} \bigoplus_{s=1}^{r_q} \bigoplus_{l=1}^{k_{q,s}} \mathbb{Z}_{q^s}^{(l)}, \quad (8)$$

for some non-negative integers $k_{q,s}$. Define $k = \sum_{q \in \mathcal{P}(G)} \sum_{s=1}^{r_q} k_{q,s}$ and $w_{q,s} = \frac{k_{q,s}}{k}$ for $(q,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)$. Any homomorphism $\phi : J \rightarrow G^n$ can be represented by

$$\phi(a) = \bigoplus_{(p,r,m) \in \mathcal{G}(G^n)} \sum_{(q,s,l) \in \mathcal{G}(J)} a_{q,s,l} g_{(q,s,l) \rightarrow (p,r,m)}, \quad (9)$$

for $a \in J$, where $a_{q,s,l} g_{(q,s,l) \rightarrow (p,r,m)}$ is the short-handed notation for the mod- p^r addition of $g_{(q,s,l) \rightarrow (p,r,m)}$ to itself for $a_{q,s,l}$ times and the sum is over \mathbb{Z}_{p^r} . Further, it is shown in [16, Lemma 2] that we must have

$$g_{(q,s,l) \rightarrow (p,r,m)} = 0 \text{ if } p \neq q \quad \text{and} \quad g_{(q,s,l) \rightarrow (p,r,m)} \in p^{r-s} \mathbb{Z}_{p^r} \text{ if } p = q, r \geq s. \quad (10)$$

Definition 3. *The ensemble of Abelian group encoders consists of all mappings $\phi : J \rightarrow G^n$ in the form of (9) and*

$$g_{(q,s,l) \rightarrow (p,r,m)} \begin{cases} = 0 & \text{if } p \neq q \\ \sim \text{Unif}(\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}) & \text{if } p = q, r \leq s \\ \sim \text{Unif}(p^{r-s} \mathbb{Z}_{p^r}) & \text{if } p = q, r \geq s \end{cases}$$

The corresponding group code is defined by

$$\mathbb{C} = \{\phi(a) + V | a \in J\}, \quad (11)$$

where V is a uniform random variable over G^n .

The rate of this code is given by

$$R = \frac{1}{n} \log |J| = \frac{k}{n} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{P}(G)} \sum_{s=1}^{r_q} s w_{q,s} \log q. \quad (12)$$

We can express the code compactly as follows:

$$\mathbb{C} = \left\{ \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \left[\bigoplus_{(p,r,m) \in \mathcal{G}(G)} \sum_{s=1}^{r_p} a_{p,s} g_{(p,s) \rightarrow (r,m)}^{(i)} + V^{(i)} \right] : a_{p,s} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^s}^{k w_{p,s}}, \forall (p,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G) \right\},$$

where $g_{(p,s) \rightarrow (r,m)}^{(i)} \in p^{|r-s|^+} \mathbb{Z}_{p^r}^{k w_{p,s}}$, and the product is given by the component-wise product followed by the addition operation.

C. The $H_{\hat{\theta}}$ coset

For an Abelian group G defined in (5), denote a vector $\hat{\theta}$ whose components are non-negative integer-valued and indexed by $(p,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)$ by $(\hat{\theta}_{p,s})_{(p,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)}$, where $0 \leq \hat{\theta}_{p,s} \leq s$. Let \mathbf{s} denote the vector whose components satisfy $\mathbf{s}_{(p,s)} = s$ for all $(p,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)$. Let $\Theta = \Theta(G)$ be the set of vectors $\hat{\theta}$ indexed by $(p,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)$ such that $0 \leq \hat{\theta}_{p,s} \leq s$ and $\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}$, and denote its size by $M \triangleq |\Theta|$. For $a \in J$ and $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\theta}_{p,s})_{(p,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)}$, let $T_{\hat{\theta}}(a)$ denote the set of vectors $\tilde{a} \in J$ such that

$$\tilde{a}_{p,s} - a_{p,s} \in p^{\hat{\theta}_{p,s}} \mathbb{Z}_{p^s}^{k_{p,s}} \setminus p^{\hat{\theta}_{p,s}+1} \mathbb{Z}_{p^s}^{k_{p,s}}, \forall (p,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G),$$

where we follow the convention and set $p^s \mathbb{Z}_{p^s}^{k_{p,s}} \setminus p^{s+1} \mathbb{Z}_{p^s}^{k_{p,s}} = \{0\}$. Then we have $|T_{\hat{\theta}}(a)| = \prod_{(p,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)} p^{(s - \hat{\theta}_{p,s}) k_{p,s}}$ for all $a \in J$. Therefore, we may write $|T_{\hat{\theta}}(a)| = |T_{\hat{\theta}}|$ without any ambiguity. Let $\omega_{\hat{\theta}}$ be defined by

$$\omega_{\hat{\theta}} \triangleq \frac{\sum_{(p,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)} \hat{\theta}_{p,s} w_{p,s} \log p}{\sum_{(p,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)} s w_{p,s} \log p}, \quad (13)$$

we show in Appendix A the following result:

$$\log |T_{\hat{\theta}}| = (1 - \omega_{\hat{\theta}}) n R. \quad (14)$$

For any $a \in J$, $\{T_{\hat{\theta}}(a)\}_{\hat{\theta}}$ is a union of disjoint sets whose union is $\cup_{\hat{\theta}} T_{\hat{\theta}}(a) = J$. Hence $\sum_{\hat{\theta}} |T_{\hat{\theta}}| = \sum_{\hat{\theta}} |T_{\hat{\theta}}(a)| = |J|$. Exploiting (14), we have that $\sum_{\hat{\theta}} 2^{(1 - \omega_{\hat{\theta}}) n R} = |J|$, or equivalently, $\sum_{\hat{\theta}} 2^{(1 - \omega_{\hat{\theta}})} = 1$.

For $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\theta}_{p,s})_{(p,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)}$, define a vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\hat{\theta})$ indexed by $(p, r) \in \mathcal{Q}(G)$ and

$$\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}(\hat{\theta})\right)_{p,r} \triangleq \min_{\substack{(p,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G) \\ w_{p,s} \neq 0}} |r - s|^+ + \hat{\theta}_{p,s}.$$

Let $H_{\hat{\theta}}$ be a subgroup of G defined as

$$H_{\hat{\theta}} \triangleq \bigoplus_{(p,r,m) \in \mathcal{G}(G)} p^{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\hat{\theta})_{p,r}} \mathbb{Z}_{p^r}^{(m)}. \quad (15)$$

As shown in Lemma 2 in Appendix A, if $\tilde{a} \in T_{\hat{\theta}}(a)$ for some $a \in J$, the difference $\phi(\tilde{a}) - \phi(a) = \phi(\tilde{a} - a)$ is uniformly distributed over $H_{\hat{\theta}}^n$, for the code ensemble described in Definition 3.

Example 2. Let $G = \mathbb{Z}_4 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_8$, and $J = \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_4 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_8$ and let $n = 1$. Here r takes 2 values and s takes 3 values. The set $\mathcal{P}(G)$ is the singleton set of 2, $r_2 = 3$, and the set $\mathcal{S}(G) = \{(2, 1), (2, 2), (2, 3)\}$. Also, we have $k_{2,1} = k_{2,2} = k_{2,3} = 1$, $k = 3$, and $w_{2,1} = w_{2,2} = w_{2,3} = 1/3$. A vector $\hat{\theta}$ has three entries $0 \leq \hat{\theta}_{2,1} \leq 1, 0 \leq \hat{\theta}_{2,2} \leq 2, 0 \leq \hat{\theta}_{2,3} \leq 3$. The vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\hat{\theta})$ is indexed by $(p, r) \in \mathcal{Q}(G) = \{(2, 2), (2, 3)\}$, and

$$\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}(\hat{\theta})\right)_{2,2} = \min_{1 \leq s \leq 3} (|2 - s|^+ + \hat{\theta}_{2,s}), \quad \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}(\hat{\theta})\right)_{2,3} = \min_{1 \leq s \leq 3} (|3 - s|^+ + \hat{\theta}_{3,s}).$$

We consider two cases of $\hat{\theta}$ and show the corresponding $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\hat{\theta})$ and $H_{\hat{\theta}}$. First, consider $\hat{\theta} = (0, 0, 0)$. Then $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\hat{\theta}) = (0, 0)$, and $H_{\hat{\theta}} = \mathbb{Z}_4 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_8$. For $a \in J$, a vector $\tilde{a} \in T_{\hat{\theta}}(a)$ has

$$\tilde{a}_{2,1} - a_{2,1} \in \mathbb{Z}_2 \setminus 2\mathbb{Z}_2, \quad \tilde{a}_{2,2} - a_{2,2} \in \mathbb{Z}_4 \setminus 2\mathbb{Z}_4, \quad \tilde{a}_{2,3} - a_{2,3} \in \mathbb{Z}_8 \setminus 2\mathbb{Z}_8.$$

Considering all homomorphisms ϕ as in (9) satisfying (10), one can show that the set $\{\phi(\tilde{a} - a)\}_{\tilde{a} \in T_{\hat{\theta}}(a)}$ is equal to $H_{\hat{\theta}}$. For another case, consider $\hat{\theta} = (1, 1, 2)$. Then $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\hat{\theta}) = (1, 2)$, and $H_{\hat{\theta}} = 2\mathbb{Z}_4 \oplus 4\mathbb{Z}_8$. For $a \in J$, a vector $\tilde{a} \in T_{\hat{\theta}}(a)$ has

$$\tilde{a}_{2,1} - a_{2,1} \in 2\mathbb{Z}_2 \setminus 4\mathbb{Z}_2, \quad \tilde{a}_{2,2} - a_{2,2} \in 2\mathbb{Z}_4 \setminus 4\mathbb{Z}_4, \quad \tilde{a}_{2,3} - a_{2,3} \in 4\mathbb{Z}_8 \setminus 8\mathbb{Z}_8,$$

that is $\tilde{a} = (\tilde{a}_{2,1}, \tilde{a}_{2,2}, \tilde{a}_{2,3}) = (a_{2,1}, a_{2,2} + 2, a_{2,3} + 4)$. Similarly, $\{\phi(\tilde{a} - a)\}_{\tilde{a} \in T_{\hat{\theta}}(a)}$ is equal to $H_{\hat{\theta}}$.

D. Regular versus irregular codes

We have seen that for a given pair (J, G^n) , any homomorphism between them must be of the form given in (9). Every such homomorphism can be characterized using the collection $\{g_{(p,s) \rightarrow (r,m)}^{(i)}\}$ and a corresponding code is given by $\mathbb{C} = \{\phi(a) + v | a \in J\}$, where $v \in G$ is a shift element. It is then possible to construct group codes where the image of the homomorphism belongs to $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n H_i$, where $H_i \leq G$, and some or all of H_i may be proper subgroups of G . To bookkeep such cases, consider an arbitrary coordinate i . One can associate two vectors η and b of G for i as follows. The components of the vector η are indexed by (p, r, m, s) , for every $(p, r, m) \in \mathcal{G}(G)$ and $0 \leq s \leq r_p$, and satisfies $0 \leq \eta_{p,r,m,s} \leq r - |r - s|^+$. The components of b are indexed by $(p, r, m) \in \mathcal{G}(G)$ and $b_{p,r,m} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$. The components are characterized as follows

$$g_{(p,s) \rightarrow (r,m)}^{(i)} \in p^{\eta_{p,r,m,s} + |r-s|^+} \mathbb{Z}_{p^r}^{kw_{p,s}}, \quad g_{(p,s) \rightarrow (r,m)}^{(i)} \notin p^{\eta_{p,r,m,s} + 1 + |r-s|^+} \mathbb{Z}_{p^r}^{kw_{p,s}}, \quad b_{p,r,m} = v_{p,r,m}.$$

A code is said to be regular if η is the all-zero vector for all i . If not, the code is said to be irregular. For irregular codes, the image of the homomorphism may be restricted to a coset of a proper subgroup of G .

Example 3. Let $G = \mathbb{Z}_4 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_8$, and $J = \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_4 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_8$. Here r takes two values and s takes 3 values. The three input components are mapped to the two output components. Consider the case when η is the all-zero vector. Then $g_{(p,s) \rightarrow (r,m)} \in 2^{r-s} \mathbb{Z}_{2^r} \setminus 2^{r-s+1} \mathbb{Z}_{2^r}$, for $r \geq s$, and $g_{(p,s) \rightarrow (r,m)} \in \mathbb{Z}_{2^r} \setminus 2^1 \mathbb{Z}_{2^r}$ for $r < s$. The image of the homomorphism is equal to G . Next consider the case when η is the all-ones vector. Then $g_{(p,s) \rightarrow (r,m)} \in 2^{r-s+1} \mathbb{Z}_{2^r} \setminus 2^{r-s+2} \mathbb{Z}_{2^r}$, for $r \geq s$, and $g_{(p,s) \rightarrow (r,m)} \in 2^1 \mathbb{Z}_{2^r} \setminus 2^2 \mathbb{Z}_{2^r}$ for $r < s$. The image of the homomorphism takes values in $2\mathbb{Z}_4 \oplus 2\mathbb{Z}_8$.

For $\hat{\theta}$, and η , define

$$\theta(\eta) \triangleq \left(\min_{\substack{1 \leq s \leq r_p \\ w_{p,s} \neq 0}} |r - s|^+ + \eta_{p,r,m,s} \right)_{(p,r,m) \in \mathcal{P}(G)}.$$

Define $H_\eta \leq G$ and $H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}} \leq H_\eta$ as

$$H_\eta \triangleq \bigoplus_{(p,r,m) \in \mathcal{G}(G)} p^{\theta(\eta)_{p,r,m}} \mathbb{Z}_{p^r}^{(m)}, \quad H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}} \triangleq \bigoplus_{(p,r,m) \in \mathcal{G}(G)} p^{\theta(\eta+\hat{\theta})_{p,r,m}} \mathbb{Z}_{p^r}^{(m)}, \quad (16)$$

where $\eta + \hat{\theta}$ denote a vector obtained by adding the components with index (p, s) in $\mathcal{S}(G)$. The image of the corresponding homomorphism is equal to H_η .

We use the following notations for the conditional distributions of the codeword and channel output given the coset information.

Definition 4. For any pair (η, b) and any vector $\hat{\theta}$, let X be distributed according to $P_X \equiv \text{Unif}(H_\eta + b)$, the

uniform distribution over $H_\eta + b$. Then, for a representative $[x_r]$ of a coset of $H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}}$ in $H_\eta + b$, define

$$P_{[X]}([x]) \triangleq \Pr([X] = [x]) = \frac{|H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}}|}{|H_\eta|},$$

$$P_{X|[X]}(x | [x_r]) \triangleq \Pr(X = x | [X] = [x_r]) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}}|} & \text{if } x \in [x_r], \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where we use $x \in [x_r]$ as a shorthand for $x \in [x_r] + H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}}$, when it is clear from the context. When a classical channel $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, W_{Y|X})$ is given, we define

$$P_{Y|[X]}(y | [x_r]) \triangleq \Pr(Y = y | [X] = [x_r]) = \sum_{x \in [x_r]} P_{X|[X]}(x | [x_r]) W_{Y|X}(y|x) = \sum_{x \in [x_r]} \frac{1}{|H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}}|} W_{Y|X}(y|x).$$

An analogous quantum object will be defined in the case of classical-quantum channel in Section V.

IV. ONE-SHOT CLASSICAL GROUP CODING

Given a channel $(\mathcal{X} = G, \mathcal{Y}, W_{Y|X})$, and a pair (η, b) , let the joint distribution $P_{X_{\eta,b}Y}$ be $P_{X_{\eta,b}Y} = P_{X_{\eta,b}} \cdot W_{Y|X}$ with $P_{X_{\eta,b}}$ being the uniform distribution over $H_\eta + b$, and let P_Y denote the marginal distribution of $P_{X_{\eta,b}Y}$ over \mathcal{Y} . Consider a vector $\hat{\theta} \in \Theta(G)$. Let $H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}}$ be a subgroup of G defined in (16) and let $[X_{\eta,b}]_{\hat{\theta}}$ be the representative of the coset of $H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}}$ to which $X_{\eta,b}$ belongs. Moreover¹, $\overline{X}_{\eta,b} = X_{\eta,b} - [X_{\eta,b}]_{\hat{\theta}}$. Define

$$I_{\text{H}}^\epsilon(\overline{X}_{\eta,b}; [X_{\eta,b}], Y) \triangleq D_{\text{H}}^\epsilon(P_{X_{\eta,b}Y} \| P_{[X_{\eta,b}]} P_{X_{\eta,b}|[X_{\eta,b}]} P_{Y|[X_{\eta,b}]}). \quad (17)$$

We can also denote this quantity as $I_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon, \hat{\theta}}(\overline{X}_{\eta,b}; [X]_{\eta,b} Y)$ if we would like to make its dependence on $\hat{\theta}$ explicit. When η and b are clear from the context, this quantity is also denoted as $I_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon, \hat{\theta}}(\overline{X}; [X]Y)$ or $I_{\text{H}}^\epsilon(\overline{X}; [X]Y)$.

A. Achievability

We have the first main result of this section. This characterizes an achievable one-shot performance of group codes on a classical channel.

Theorem 1. *Let ϵ and $\{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}\}$ be given with $\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}} > 0$ for all $\hat{\theta}$, and $\sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} \epsilon_{\hat{\theta}} \leq \epsilon$. For a given classical channel $(G, \mathcal{Y}, W_{Y|X})$, any (η, b) , and any J as given in (8), there exists a $(1, |J|, \epsilon')$ - group transmission system such that*

$$\epsilon' \leq \epsilon + \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} \exp_2 \left\{ (1 - \omega_{\hat{\theta}}) R - I_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}(\overline{X}_{\eta,b}; [X_{\eta,b}], Y) \right\},$$

where the rate R is given in (12).

Remark 2. *This theorem motivates the definition of one-shot ϵ -group capacity as*

$$\max_{\eta, b} \min_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} \frac{1}{(1 - \omega_{\hat{\theta}})} I_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}(\overline{X}_{\eta,b}; [X_{\eta,b}], Y).$$

¹ $\hat{\theta}$ is not explicit in the notation \overline{X} to reduce clutter. It should be clear from the context.

We compute this quantity for several examples in Section VII. First consider the case when $\eta = 0$, and b is arbitrary. Note that there is a constraint on the rate for every subgroup of the input group J , indexed by $\hat{\theta}$. The constraint can be interpreted as follows. Suppose a message $a \in J$ is sent by the encoder. Then $\exp_2[-I_{\mathbf{H}}^{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}(\bar{X}_{\eta,b}; [X_{\eta,b}], Y)]$ corresponds to the probability of the event that some other message \tilde{a} looks statistically related to the output Y , and $\tilde{a} \in T_{\hat{\theta}}(a)$, i.e., they belong to the same coset of the subgroup. The number of such \tilde{a} is given by $\exp_2[(1 - w_{\hat{\theta}})R]$. This set of constraints is the price to be paid for endowing the code with the group structure. This is also the penalty for the loss of pairwise independence of the codewords in the group ensemble. This will be evident when we discuss the proof of the theorem.

Remark 3. When G is a simple group, then there is no non-trivial subgroup and the rate is given by $I_{\mathbf{H}}^{\epsilon}(X; Y)$. This corresponds to the case when G is a finite field. This is also the one-shot ϵ -capacity achieved by the random unstructured code ensemble with uniform input distribution. Then the group structure comes for free. However, for the unstructured code ensemble, one has the freedom to use any non-uniform distribution on the input alphabet, which is forbidden for group codes defined in terms of group homomorphisms. The reason for this is that when the distribution on the input group J is uniform, i.e., message distribution is uniform, then the single-letter output distribution will be uniform on a coset of a subgroup of G due to the homomorphic nature of the encoding. In a group code ensemble, there is less freedom in choice of a codeword assigned to a particular message due to the global algebraic structure of the code. For any non-trivial η, b , the image of the code takes values in a coset of a proper subgroup of G .

Proof: We give a detailed proof for the case when $\eta = 0$, and b is arbitrary. An extension to any general η vector is straightforward by redefining the group G accordingly as H_{η} , and by redefining the channel as first adding b to the input and then acting with random transformation given by $W_{Y|X}$.

Let the ensemble of homomorphisms ϕ from J to G and the group code $\mathbb{C} = \{\phi(a) + V | a \in J\}$ be given as in Definition 3 with $n = 1$. Let a set of parameters $\{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}\}_{\hat{\theta} \neq s}$ be given such that $\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}} > 0$ for each $\hat{\theta}$ and that $\sum_{\hat{\theta}} \epsilon_{\hat{\theta}} = \epsilon$. Consider a decision region $A_{\epsilon} \subset \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, which will be constructed explicitly in the sequel, such that

$$P_{XY}(A_{\epsilon}) = \sum_{(x,y) \in A_{\epsilon}} P_X(x)W_{Y|X}(y|x) \geq 1 - \epsilon, \quad (18)$$

where P_X is uniform over G .

To find an achievable rate, we use a random coding argument in which the random encoder is characterized by the random homomorphism ϕ and a random vector V uniformly distributed over G . Given a message $u \in J$, the encoder maps it to $x = \phi(u) + V$ and x is then fed to the channel. At the receiver, after receiving the channel output $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, the decoder looks for a unique $\tilde{u} \in J$ such that $(\phi(\tilde{u}) + V, y) \in A_{\epsilon}$. If the decoder does not find such \tilde{u} or if such \tilde{u} is not unique, it declares error. Thus, the error event can be characterized by the union of two events: $E(u) = E_1(u) \cup E_2(u)$ where $E_1(u)$ is the event that $(\phi(u) + V, y) \notin A_{\epsilon}$ and $E_2(u)$ is the event that there exists a

$\tilde{u} \neq u$ such that $(\phi(\tilde{u}) + V, y) \in A_\epsilon$. We can provide an upper bound on the probability of the error event as

$$\Pr(E(u)) \leq \Pr(E_1(u)) + \Pr(E_2(u) \cap (E_1(u))^c).$$

Now we specify the region A_ϵ . Let the set $A_{\epsilon_\theta}^*$ be a minimizer in the definition of the right-hand side of (2) for $I_H^{\epsilon_\theta}(\bar{X}; [X]Y)$, i.e., $P_{XY}(A_{\epsilon_\theta}^*) \geq 1 - \epsilon_\theta$ and

$$I_H^{\epsilon_\theta}(\bar{X}; [X]Y) = -\log_2 \left[\sum_{[x_r]} P([x_r]) \sum_{x \in [x_r]} P(x | [x_r]) \sum_{y: (x,y) \in A_{\epsilon_\theta}^*} P(y | [x_r]) \right].$$

Define the region A_ϵ as $A_\epsilon = \cap_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} A_{\epsilon_\theta}^*$. In Appendix B, we show that

$$\Pr(E(u)) \leq \epsilon + \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} |T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)| \exp_2 \{ -I_H^{\epsilon_\theta}(\bar{X}; [X]Y) \}. \quad (19)$$

The average probability of error of the group transmission scheme can be bounded from above by

$$\Pr(\text{error}) = \sum_{u \in J} \frac{1}{|J|} \Pr(E(u)) \leq \epsilon + \sum_{u \in J} \frac{1}{|J|} \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} |T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)| \exp_2 \{ -I_H^{\epsilon_\theta}(\bar{X}; [X]Y) \}.$$

Exploiting (14), we get the desired result in terms of the rate R of the code. ■

Example 4. Let $J = \mathbb{Z}_4, G = \mathbb{Z}_8$. In this example, we have $\mathcal{G}(G) = \{(2, 3, 1)\}$ and $\mathcal{G}(J) = \{(2, 2, 1)\}$, $k_{2,1} = 0, k_{2,2} = 1, k_{2,3} = 0$, and the term $g_{(2,2,1) \rightarrow (2,3,1)}$ is a uniform random variable over $2\mathbb{Z}_8$. For simplicity, we write $u = u_{2,2,1} \in J$ and $g = g_{(2,2,1) \rightarrow (2,3,1)} \in \mathbb{Z}_8$. Then $r_2 = \max \mathcal{R}_2(G) = 3$ and the set $\mathcal{Q}(J) = \mathcal{S}(G) = \{(2, 1), (2, 2), (2, 3)\}$, and $\mathbf{s}_{(2,1)} = 1, \mathbf{s}_{(2,2)} = 2, \mathbf{s}_{(2,3)} = 3$. For distinct $u, \tilde{u} \in J$, the vector $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\theta}_{2,1}, \hat{\theta}_{2,2}, \hat{\theta}_{2,3})$ for which $\tilde{u} \in T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)$ must have $\hat{\theta}_{2,1} = 1, 0 \leq \hat{\theta}_{2,2} < 2, \hat{\theta}_{2,3} = 3$. Thus $P_{err}(u) \leq P_{err}(u, (1, 0, 3)) + P_{err}(u, (1, 1, 3))$.

The set $\mathcal{Q}(G) = \{(2, 3)\}$, so $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\hat{\theta}) = \boldsymbol{\theta}(\hat{\theta})_{(2,3)}$ and

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}(\hat{\theta})_{(2,3)} = \min_{\substack{(2,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G) \\ w_{2,s} \neq 0}} \{ |3 - s|^+ + \hat{\theta}_{2,s} \} = |3 - 2|^+ + \hat{\theta}_{2,2} = 1 + \hat{\theta}_{2,2}.$$

Case 1: $\hat{\theta}_{2,2} = 0, \boldsymbol{\theta}(\hat{\theta})_{(2,3)} = 1$. For $\tilde{u} \in T_{\hat{\theta}}(u), \tilde{u} - u \in \mathbb{Z}_4 \setminus 2\mathbb{Z}_4, H_{\hat{\theta}} = 2\mathbb{Z}_8$, and $|T_{(1,0,3)}(u)| = 2$. Let $A_{\epsilon/2, \hat{\theta}}^*$ be a maximizer for $D_H^{\epsilon/2}(P_{XY} \| P_{[X]_{\hat{\theta}}} P_{X|[X]_{\hat{\theta}}} P_{Y|[X]_{\hat{\theta}}})$. Thus we have

$$P_{err}(u, (1, 0, 3)) \leq |T_{(1,0,3)}(u)| \exp_2 \{ -I_H^{\epsilon/2}(\bar{X}; [X]Y) \}.$$

Case 2: $\hat{\theta}_{2,2} = 1, \boldsymbol{\theta}(\hat{\theta})_{(2,3)} = 2$ For $\tilde{u} \in T_{\hat{\theta}}(u), \tilde{u} - u \in 2\mathbb{Z}_4 \setminus 4\mathbb{Z}_4, H_{\hat{\theta}} = 4\mathbb{Z}_8, |T_{(1,1,3)}(u)| = 1$, and we have

$$P_{err}(u, (1, 1, 3)) \leq |T_{(1,1,3)}(u)| \exp_2 \{ -I_H^{\epsilon_\theta, \hat{\theta}}(\bar{X}; [X]Y) \}.$$

Therefore the error probability for a message u is

$$\Pr(E(u)) \leq \Pr(E_1(u)) + \Pr(E_2(u) \cap (E_1(u))^c)$$

$$\leq \epsilon + |T_{(1,0,3)}(u)| \exp_2 \{ -I_H^{\epsilon_\theta, \hat{\theta}}(\bar{X}; [X]Y) \}_{\hat{\theta}=(1,0,3)} + |T_{(1,1,3)}(u)| \exp_2 \{ -I_H^{\epsilon_\theta, \hat{\theta}}(\bar{X}; [X]Y) \}_{\hat{\theta}=(1,1,3)},$$

where we use $A_\epsilon = \cap_{\hat{\theta}} A_{\epsilon/2, \hat{\theta}}^*$.

B. Generalized Achievability

In this section, we provide an alternative characterization of an achievable one-shot performance of group codes on classical channels. Recall in Section III-C, for an Abelian group G , we defined vectors $\hat{\theta}$ whose components are non-negative integer-valued and indexed by $(p, s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)$, and $\Theta = \Theta(G)$ to be the set of vectors $\hat{\theta}$ with cardinality $M \triangleq |\Theta|$.

Definition 5. Consider an arbitrary pair (η, b) and any vector $\hat{\theta} \in \Theta$. Let $P_X, P_{[X]}, P_{X|[X]}, P_{Y|[X]}$ be defined as in Definition 4. For a representative $[x_r]$ of a coset of $H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}}$ in $H_\eta + b$, define two conditional joint distributions $P_{XY|[X]}, P_{XY|\hat{\theta}}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} P_{XY|[X]}(\tilde{x}, y | [x_r]) &\triangleq P_{X|[X]}(\tilde{x} | [x_r])P_{Y|[X]}(y | [x_r]), \\ P_{XY|\hat{\theta}}(\tilde{x}, y) &\triangleq \sum_{[x_r]} P_{[X]}([x_r])P_{XY|[X]}(\tilde{x}, y | [x_r]), \end{aligned}$$

and a joint distribution for all $\tilde{x} \in H_\eta + b$ and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$:

$$P_{XY|J}(\tilde{x}, y) \triangleq (|J| - 1)^{-1} \sum_{\hat{\theta} \in \Theta} |T_{\hat{\theta}}| P_{XY|\hat{\theta}}(\tilde{x}, y) \quad (20)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= (|J| - 1)^{-1} \sum_{\hat{\theta}} |T_{\hat{\theta}}| \sum_{[x_r]} P_{[X]}([x_r])P_{X|[X]}(\tilde{x} | [x_r])P_{Y|[X]}(y | [x_r]) \\ &= (|J| - 1)^{-1} \sum_{\hat{\theta}} |T_{\hat{\theta}}| \frac{1}{|H_\eta|} \sum_{x \in [\tilde{x}]} \frac{1}{|H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}}|} W_{Y|X}(y|x). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Note that $P_X(x) = \frac{1}{|H_\eta|}$ for all $x \in H_\eta + b$, thereby

$$P_{XY|J}(\tilde{x}, y) = P_X(\tilde{x})(|J| - 1)^{-1} \sum_{\hat{\theta}} |T_{\hat{\theta}}| \sum_{x \in [\tilde{x}]} \frac{1}{|H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}}|} W_{Y|X}(y|x). \quad (22)$$

We emphasize that the dependence of $P_{XY|J}$ on the pair (η, b) is not made explicit till now for notational simplicity.

Let A_ϵ be a subset of $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ that achieves $D_{\text{H}}^\epsilon(P_{X_{\eta,b}Y} \| P_{X_{\eta,b}Y|J})$. That is, $P_{X_{\eta,b}Y}(A_\epsilon) \geq 1 - \epsilon$ and

$$D_{\text{H}}^\epsilon(P_{X_{\eta,b}Y} \| P_{X_{\eta,b}Y|J}) = -\log_2 P_{X_{\eta,b}Y|J}(A_\epsilon). \quad (23)$$

We now state the main result of this subsection.

Theorem 2. For a given classical channel $(G, \mathcal{Y}, W_{Y|X})$, and any J as given in (8), there exists a $(1, |J|, \epsilon')$ -group transmission system such that

$$R \geq \max_{\eta, b} D_{\text{H}}^\epsilon(P_{X_{\eta,b}Y} \| P_{X_{\eta,b}Y|J}) - \log_2 \frac{1}{\epsilon' - \epsilon},$$

for any $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon')$, where the rate $R = \log_2 |J|$.

We have the following proposition which relates the two lower bounds given above, a proof of which is given in Appendix C.

Proposition 1. *The lower bound on R given in Theorem 2 is no smaller than that in Theorem 1, i.e., for any subgroup J as in (8) and (η, b) we have*

$$D_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon}(P_{X_{\eta,b}Y} \| P_{X_{\eta,b}Y|J}) \geq -\log_2 \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} \exp_2 \{ -(\omega_{\hat{\theta}} R - I_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}(\bar{X}_{\eta,b}; [X_{\eta,b}], Y)) \}.$$

Remark 4. *As noted above, the result of Theorem 2 is tighter than that of Theorem 1. However, the latter is easier to work with as demonstrated in the application to the asymptotic capacity characterization in later sections.*

Proof of Theorem 2: We consider the random coding argument of the proof of Theorem 1 as given in the previous subsection, where the error events $E_1(u)$ and $E_2(u)$ were defined. In the following we provide alternative upper bounds on the probabilities of these events. The probability for the event $E_1(u)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\Pr(E_1(u))] &= \Pr((\phi(u) + V, Y) \notin A_{\epsilon}) = 1 - \Pr((\phi(u) + V, Y) \in A_{\epsilon}) \\ &= 1 - \sum_x \Pr(\phi(u) + V = x) \sum_{y: (x,y) \in A_{\epsilon}} W_{Y|X}(y|x) \\ &= 1 - \sum_{(x,y) \in A_{\epsilon}} P_X(x) W_{Y|X}(y|x) = 1 - P_{XY}(A_{\epsilon}) \leq \epsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where the expectation and probability are evaluated with the distribution of the code ensemble given in Definition 3, specifically, the homomorphism ϕ and the ‘shift’ V .

Combining equations (47) and (49), from Appendix B with regard to the analysis of proof of Theorem 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\Pr(E_2(u) \cap E_1(u)^c)] &\leq \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} \sum_{\tilde{u} \in T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)} \sum_{[x_r]} \sum_{\tilde{x} \in [x_r]} \sum_{y: (\tilde{x}, y) \in A_{\epsilon}} P([x_r]) P(\tilde{x} | [x_r]) P(y | [x_r]) \\ &= \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} \sum_{\tilde{u} \in T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)} \sum_{[x_r]} \sum_{(\tilde{x}, y) \in A_{\epsilon}} P([x_r]) P(\tilde{x}, y | [x_r]) \\ &= \sum_{(\tilde{x}, y) \in A_{\epsilon}} \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} \sum_{\tilde{u} \in T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)} P_{XY|\hat{\theta}}(\tilde{x}, y) \\ &= \sum_{(\tilde{x}, y) \in A_{\epsilon}} \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} |T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)| P_{XY|\hat{\theta}}(\tilde{x}, y), \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where the first equality holds because $P(\tilde{x}, y | [x_r])$ vanishes for $\tilde{x} \notin [x_r]$, and the last equality holds because for any x, y , the term $P_{XY|\hat{\theta}}(x, y)$ depends only on $\hat{\theta}$ and is independent of \tilde{u} . Finally, using the definition of $P_{XY|J}$ as in (20), the probability of error for u can be bounded from above as

$$\mathbb{E}[\Pr(E_2(u) \cap E_1(u)^c)] \leq (|J| - 1) \sum_{(\tilde{x}, y) \in A_{\epsilon}} P_{XY|J}(\tilde{x}, y) \leq |J| P_{XY|J}(A_{\epsilon}). \quad (26)$$

We now provide an upper bound for the probability of error for the coding scheme by combining the bounds on the probabilities of the two error events as follows.

$$\Pr(\text{error}) = \frac{1}{|J|} \sum_{u \in J} \Pr(E(u)) \leq \epsilon + |J| P_{XY|J}(A_{\epsilon}) = \epsilon + 2^{R - D_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon}(P_{X_{\eta,b}Y} \| P_{X_{\eta,b}Y|J})}, \quad (27)$$

where the inequality follows from (24) and (26). The last equality follows from (23) and the rate of the code R being $R = \log_2 |J|$, as in equation (12). The characterization of error probability for the coding scheme proves the claim. \blacksquare

C. Converse

Toward the converse, we have the following theorem whose proof is given in Appendix D. This is the main result of this subsection. Given a classical channel $(G, \mathcal{Y}, W_{Y|X})$, and an input group J as defined in (8), and a $(1, |J|, \epsilon)$ group transmission system, define the input distribution as P_X is uniform on $\{\phi(J) + V\}$, where ϕ is the homomorphism and V is the shift. Define $P_{[X]}$, $P_{X|[X]}$ and $P_{Y|[X]}$ similar to those in Definition 4 for every $\hat{\theta} \neq s$ by noting that $[X]$ is a function of X .

Theorem 3. *Given a classical channel $(G, \mathcal{Y}, W_{Y|X})$, and J as given in (8), any $(1, |J|, \epsilon)$ group transmission system satisfies*

$$R \leq \min_{\hat{\theta} \neq s} \frac{1}{1 - \omega_{\hat{\theta}}} I_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon}(\bar{X}; [X]Y),$$

where the rate $R = \log_2 |J|$.

We have provided a converse for the performance characterization as given in Theorem 1.

V. ONE-SHOT CLASSICAL-QUANTUM GROUP CODING

A. Achievability

Consider an arbitrary pair of output and input Abelian groups G and J , a CQ channel $\{\rho_x\}_{x \in G}$, a pair (η, b) and a subgroup $H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}}$ of G indexed by $\hat{\theta}$. We assume the uniform distribution on $H_{\eta} + b$ for the input of the CQ channel yielding the input-output joint state as

$$\rho^{AB} \triangleq \sum_{x \in H_{\eta} + b} \frac{1}{|H_{\eta}|} |x\rangle\langle x|^A \otimes \rho_x^B, \quad (28)$$

where \mathcal{X} denotes² the input space and \mathcal{B} denotes the output space. We refer to the input quantum state as A and the output quantum state as B . Recall that for an element $x \in H_{\eta} + b$ there is a one-to-one mapping $x \leftrightarrow ([x]_{\hat{\theta}}, \bar{x}_{\hat{\theta}})$, where $[x]_{\hat{\theta}}$ is the representative of the coset of $H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}}$ which x belongs to, and $\bar{x}_{\hat{\theta}} \in H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}}$, such that $x = [x]_{\hat{\theta}} + \bar{x}_{\hat{\theta}}$. Define the transversal, the set of coset representatives of $H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}}$ in G , as $T_{\hat{\theta}}^G$. We drop $\hat{\theta}$ from the subscript, when it is clear from the context.

Definition 6. *For any $H_{\hat{\theta}}$, using the one-to-one mapping $x \leftrightarrow ([x]_{\hat{\theta}}, \bar{x}_{\hat{\theta}})$, the joint state can be viewed as follows*

$$\rho^{AB} = \rho^{[A]\bar{A}B} \triangleq \sum_{[x], \bar{x}} \frac{1}{|G|} |[x], \bar{x}\rangle\langle [x], \bar{x}|^{[A]\bar{A}} \otimes \rho_{[x], \bar{x}}^B, \quad = \sum_{[x], \bar{x}} P_{[X]}([x]) P_{\bar{X}}(\bar{x}) |[x]\rangle\langle [x]|^{[A]} \otimes |\bar{x}\rangle\langle \bar{x}|^{\bar{A}} \otimes \rho_{[x], \bar{x}}^B,$$

²Recall that the classical variable (channel input) X with alphabet \mathcal{X} is stored in a quantum register with Hilbert space also denoted as \mathcal{X} .

and we let $P_{[X]}([x]) = \frac{|H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}}|}{|H_\eta|}$ for all $[x]$ and $P_{\bar{X}}(\bar{x}) = \frac{1}{|H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}}|}$ for all \bar{x} . Here $[A]$ denotes the state associated with T_θ^G and \bar{A} as that associated with $H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}}$. Define

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{[x]}^B &\triangleq \sum_{\bar{x}} P_{\bar{X}}(\bar{x}) \rho_{[x],\bar{x}}^B, \quad \rho^{\bar{A}} \triangleq \sum_{\bar{x}} P_{\bar{X}}(\bar{x}) |\bar{x}\rangle\langle\bar{x}|^{\bar{A}}, \\ \rho^{[A]B} &\triangleq \sum_{[x]} P_{[X]}([x]) |[x]\rangle\langle[x]|^{[A]} \otimes \rho_{[x]}^B.\end{aligned}$$

Also define the hypothesis testing mutual information:

$$I_{\text{H}}^\epsilon(\bar{X}_{\eta,b}; [X]_{\eta,b}, Y) \triangleq D_{\text{H}}^\epsilon(\rho^{[A]\bar{A}B} || \rho^{\bar{A}} \rho^{[A]B}).$$

For simplicity, we use the same notation I_{H}^ϵ to denote both classical as well as quantum one-shot hypothesis testing mutual information. The particular form used should be clear from the context. With these definitions, and recalling the quantities $\zeta(G)$ and $\Theta(G)$ (see Section III) associated with G , we are ready to state the first main result of this section.

Theorem 4. *Let ϵ and $\{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}\}$ be given with $\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}} > 0$ for all $\hat{\theta}$ and $\sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} \epsilon_{\hat{\theta}} \leq \epsilon$. For a given CQ channel $\mathcal{N} = \{\rho_x\}_{x \in G}$, any (η, b) , and J as given in (8), there exists a $(1, J, \epsilon')$ -group transmission system such that*

$$\epsilon' \leq \sqrt{\epsilon} [33 + 16|\Theta|\zeta(G)] + 8 \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} \exp_2 \left\{ (1 - \omega_{\hat{\theta}})R - I_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}(\bar{X}_{\eta,b}; [X]_{\eta,b}, Y) \right\},$$

where the rate R is given in (12).

Remark 5. *The characterization for the classical-quantum channel mirrors that for the classical channel. The similarity ends there. The proof is significantly more involved in the quantum case because of the following reasons. The intersection of decision regions used in the proof of the classical case cannot be implemented simply as intersection of operators. We have to use a synergy of complex machinery of intersection of projectors as given in [52] and the intricate group coding approach developed in the classical setting toward developing a proof. Although this is a point-to-point channel coding problem, the lattice of subgroups of J impose a host of constraints on the communication. Any solution to the problem has similar issues to address as those in classical-quantum multiple-access channels with an arbitrary number of transmitters. In fact, it is compounded by the complex structure of dependency among $[u], \bar{u}, [x]$ and \bar{x} for every subgroup $H_{\hat{\theta}}$ of input group J as delineated in Remark 1.*

Remark 6. *The theorem motivates the definition of one-shot ϵ -group capacity as*

$$\max_{\eta, b} \min_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} \frac{1}{(1 - w_{\hat{\theta}})} I_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}(\bar{X}_{\eta,b}; [X]_{\eta,b}, Y).$$

We compute this quantity for several examples in Section VII.

Proof: We give a detailed proof for the case when $\eta = \mathbf{0}$, and b is arbitrary. An extension to any general η vector is straightforward by redefining the group G accordingly as H_η , and by redefining the channel as first adding b to the input and then acting with random transformation given by \mathcal{N} .

Let a set of parameters $\{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}\}_{\hat{\theta} \neq s}$ be given such that $\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}} > 0$ for each $\hat{\theta}$ and that $\sum_{\hat{\theta}} \epsilon_{\hat{\theta}} = \epsilon$. Consider the optimizing POVM $(\Pi'')_{[X]}$ in $[A]\bar{A}B$ arising in the definition of $I_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}(\bar{X}; [X]Y)$. The POVM satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} (\Pi'')_{[X]} &= \sum_{[x], \bar{x}} |[x], \bar{x}\rangle \langle [x], \bar{x}|^{[A]\bar{A}} (\Pi'')_{[X]; [x], \bar{x}}^B, \\ \text{tr} [(\Pi'')\rho^{AB}] &\geq 1 - \epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}, \quad \text{tr} [(\Pi'')\rho^{\bar{A}} \otimes \rho^{[A]B}] \leq 2^{-I_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}(\bar{X}; [X]Y)}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

We consider an extended version of the CQ channel \mathcal{N} as follows. Define $\hat{\mathcal{B}} \triangleq \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$. By Fact 2 in [52], there are orthogonal projections $\Pi_{[X]; x}^{\hat{\mathcal{B}}}$ in $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ that give the same measurement probability on states $\sigma^B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|$ that POVM elements $(\Pi'')_{[X]; x}^B$ give on states σ^B . Let $W_{[X]; x}$ denote the orthogonal complement of the support of $\Pi_{[X]; x}^{\hat{\mathcal{B}}}$ in $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$.

Step 1: Consider a new Hilbert space \mathcal{L} that is used only as a quantum register to store classical values, and define the extended output space

$$\mathcal{B}' \triangleq (\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathbb{C}^2) \oplus \bigoplus_{(p, r, m, k) \in \mathcal{G}^*(G)} (\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{L}^{(p, r, m, k)}).$$

where $\mathcal{L}^{(p, r, m, k)}$ is isomorphic to \mathcal{L} .

Remark 7. Recall $\zeta(G) = \sum_{(p, r, m) \in \mathcal{G}(G)} r$, the sum of prime powers in the prime factorization of $|G|$. Also recall the set $\mathcal{G}^*(G) \triangleq \{(p, r, m, k) : (p, r, m) \in \mathcal{G}(G), 1 \leq k \leq r\}$. We use a vector representation for the elements of G as follows. First we note that every element of a of \mathbb{Z}_{p^r} can be represented uniquely as a r -length vector (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r) such that a_i takes value in the transversal of $p^{r-i}\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}/p^{r-i+1}\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$. A shorter vector (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) can represent any element in the subgroup $p^{r-k}\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$. This is extended to all of G using the direct sum operation. We denote this mapping as $\nu(a)$. Hence every element of G is represented uniquely as a vector of length $\zeta(G)$. This is also extended to all subgroups of G . Furthermore, we use $(p, r, m, k) \in \mathcal{G}^*(G)$ to index the elements of a vector. The set formed by the (p, r, m, k) -th elements of $\nu(G)$ is denoted as $\mathcal{X}_{(p, r, m, k)}$. This also denotes the Hilbert space associated with the quantum register that stores the corresponding classical values, where a direct sum is replaced with a tensor product.

We extend the space corresponding to the alphabet of (p, r, m, k) -th element of $\nu(G)$ as follows. For every $(p, r, m, k) \in \mathcal{G}^*(G)$ define

$$\mathcal{X}'_{(p, r, m, k)} = \mathcal{X}_{(p, r, m, k)} \otimes \mathcal{L}^{(p, r, m, k)}.$$

This leads to the following extensions. For each subgroup $p^{r-s}\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}^{(m)}$, $s = 1, 2, \dots, r$, the extended space is

$$p^{r-s}\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}^{(m)} \otimes \bigotimes_{k=1}^s \mathcal{L}^{(p, r, m, k)},$$

and for the transversal of $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}^{(m)}/p^{r-s}\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}^{(m)}$, the extended input space is given by

$$\left(\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}^{(m)}/p^{r-s}\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}^{(m)}\right) \otimes \bigotimes_{k=s+1}^r \mathcal{L}^{(p, r, m, k)}.$$

Step 2: Let $0 < \delta < 1$. Consider a vector ℓ indexed by (p, r, m, k) for $(p, r, m, k) \in \mathcal{G}^*(G)$, where $\ell_{(p,r,m,k)} \in \mathcal{L}^{(p,r,m,k)}$, and is a basis element of $\mathcal{L}^{(p,r,m,k)}$. Let $\bar{\ell}_{\hat{\theta}}$ denote the sub-vector corresponding to the subgroup $H_{\hat{\theta}}$, and the complementary sub-vector $[\ell]_{\hat{\theta}}$ corresponding to the transversal $T_{\hat{\theta}}$. For the trivial case $H_{\hat{\theta}} = \{0\}$, we have $[\ell] = \ell$. Recall that in this case, $[X] = X$.

For any subgroup $H_{\hat{\theta}}$ of G , define the *tilting* map $\mathcal{T}_{[X];[\ell],\delta} : \widehat{\mathcal{B}} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}'$ defined as

$$\mathcal{T}_{[X];[\ell],\delta} : |h\rangle \mapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \zeta(G)\delta^2}} \left(|h\rangle + \sum_{(p,r,m,k) \in \mathcal{G}^*(G)/\mathcal{G}^*(H)} \delta |h\rangle |l_{(p,r,m,k)}\rangle \right).$$

Note that we are tilting only along the direction of transversal of $H_{\hat{\theta}}$ in G . Define a state

$$(\rho')_{x,\ell,\delta}^{B'} \triangleq \mathcal{T}_{X;\ell,\delta} \left(\rho_x^B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|^{\mathbb{C}^2} \right).$$

Consider the classical–quantum state

$$(\rho')^{A'B'} \triangleq |\mathcal{L}|^{-\zeta(G)} \sum_{x,\ell} P_X(x) |x, \ell\rangle\langle x, \ell|^{A'} \otimes (\rho')_{x,\ell,\delta}^{B'}. \quad (30)$$

This corresponds to the extended channel \mathcal{N}' with inputs x and ℓ , and output state $(\rho')_{x,\ell,\delta}^{B'}$ in \mathcal{B}' . We will work with this channel instead of the given one \mathcal{N} , until the very end. It can be shown that

$$\left\| (\rho')_{x,\ell,\delta}^{B'} - \rho_x^B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|^{\mathbb{C}^2} \right\|_1 \leq 2\zeta(G)\delta^2. \quad (31)$$

Define the tilted space

$$W'_{[X];x,\ell,\delta} \triangleq \mathcal{T}_{[X];[\ell],\delta}(W_{[X];x})$$

residing in \mathcal{B}' . Define the subspace

$$W'_{x,\ell,\delta} \triangleq \bigoplus_{\hat{\theta} \in \Theta} W'_{[X];x,\ell,\delta}, \quad (32)$$

and $(\Pi')_{W'}^{B'} = (\Pi')_{W'_{x,\ell,\delta}}^{B'}$ the orthogonal projection in \mathcal{B}' onto $W'_{x,\ell,\delta}$. Let $\Pi_{\widehat{\mathcal{B}}}^{B'}$ be the orthogonal projection in \mathcal{B}' onto $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$. Define POVM elements

$$(\Pi')_{x,\ell,\delta}^{B'} \triangleq \left(\mathbf{1}^{B'} - (\Pi')_{W'}^{B'} \right) \Pi_{\widehat{\mathcal{B}}}^{B'} \left(\mathbf{1}^{B'} - (\Pi')_{W'}^{B'} \right), \quad (33)$$

$$(\Pi')^{A'B'} \triangleq \sum_{x,\ell} |x, \ell\rangle\langle x, \ell|^{A'} \otimes (\Pi')_{x,\ell,\delta}^{B'}. \quad (34)$$

Define the following states for any subgroup $H_{\hat{\theta}}$:

$$(\rho')_{[x],[\ell]}^{B'} \triangleq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|\zeta(H)} \sum_{\bar{x}, \bar{\ell}} P(\bar{x}) (\rho')_{x,\ell}^{B'},$$

$$(\rho')^{B'} \triangleq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|\zeta(G)} \sum_{x,\ell} P(x) (\rho')_{x,\ell}^{B'}.$$

We make the following observations using the arguments given in [52]:

$$(\rho')_{[x],[\ell]}^{B'} = \frac{1 + (\zeta(G) - \zeta(H))\delta^2}{1 + \zeta(G)\delta^2} \mathcal{T}_{[X];[\ell]}(\rho_{[x]}^B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|) + N_{[X];[x],[\ell]},$$

$$(\rho')^{B'} = \frac{1}{1 + \zeta(G)\delta^2}(\rho^B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|) + N,$$

for some operators satisfying

$$\|N_{[X];[x],[\ell]}\|_\infty \leq \frac{2\zeta(G)\delta}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{L}|}}, \quad \|N\|_\infty \leq \frac{2\zeta(G)\delta}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{L}|}}. \quad (35)$$

Furthermore, using Holder's inequality, we have

$$\|(\Pi')_{x,\ell}^{B'}\|_1 \leq 2|\mathcal{B}|. \quad (36)$$

Step 3: Probability of Error Analysis: We construct a random code as follows. We generate the random homomorphism as stated in the previous section that maps $u \in J$ to $x \in G$ according to $x = \phi(u) + V$. In addition, we generate for every $u \in J$, a random vector ℓ independently and uniformly such that $[\ell]$ depends only on $[u]$ and $\bar{\ell}$ depends on the entire u . These together determine the random encoding function $u \mapsto (x, \ell)(u)$. The decoding POVM is constructed from the POVM elements $(\Pi')_{x,\ell,\delta}^{B'}$. We use the square root measurement [2], [3] from the collection of operators: $\{(\Pi')_{(x,\ell)(u),\delta}^{B'}\}_{u \in J}$.

We start by computing the average probability of error on the extended channel \mathcal{N}' for a fixed u using Hayashi-Nagaoka inequality [4] as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_C(P(\text{Error}|u)) &= \mathbb{E}_C \text{tr} \left[\left(\mathbf{1}^{B'} - \Lambda_u^{B'} \right) (\rho')_{u,\delta}^{B'} \right] \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}_C \text{tr} \left[\left(\mathbf{1}^{B'} - (\Pi')_{(x,\ell)(u)}^{B'} (\rho')_{(x,\ell)(u),\delta}^{B'} \right) \right] + 4 \sum_{\hat{\theta} \in \Theta} \sum_{u' \in T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)} \mathbb{E}_C \text{tr} \left[(\Pi')_{([x],[\ell])([u']),(\bar{x},\bar{\ell})(u')}^{B'} (\rho')_{([x],[\ell])([u]),(\bar{x},\bar{\ell})(u),\delta}^{B'} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

We show in Appendix E that upper bound on the expected probability of error for a given u can be simplified as

$$\mathbb{E}_C(P(\text{Error}|u)) \leq 32\zeta(G)\delta^2 + \frac{8(1 + \zeta(G)\delta^2)|\Theta|\epsilon}{\delta^2} + 8 \sum_{\hat{\theta} \in \Theta} |T_{\hat{\theta}}| 2^{-I_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon,\hat{\theta}}(\bar{X},[X];B)},$$

for large enough $|\mathcal{L}|$. Since the right hand side is independent of u , the same bound applies to expected probability of error for the CQ channel. Using the bound given in (31), it follows that the expected average probability of error for the given channel \mathcal{N} is at most $\zeta(G)\delta^2$ added to the above upper bound. Thus there exists a group coding scheme whose average probability of error satisfies the bound given in the theorem by choosing $\zeta(G)\delta^2 = \sqrt{\epsilon}$. This completes the proof. \blacksquare

B. Generalized Achievability

Our next objective is to derive a stricter and a more compact lower bound on the rate than what is given in Theorem 4. Consider Abelian groups G and J as in Section III-A. Given a classical-quantum channel $\mathcal{N} = \{\rho_x\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ from the classical alphabet \mathcal{X} to the space \mathcal{B} , where $\mathcal{X} = G$ is an Abelian group, let u , x and ρ_x be the message, the channel input and the channel output respectively. Consider the group code $\mathbb{C} = \{\phi(a) + V | a \in J\}$, where the

distributions of ϕ and V are specified in Definition 3. Consider an arbitrary pair (η, b) . Let π^{AB} denote the joint state of the input and output for an input chosen according to the uniform distribution $P_X \equiv \text{Unif}(H_\eta + b)$, i.e.,

$$\pi^{AB} \triangleq \sum_{x \in H_\eta + b} P_X(x) |x\rangle\langle x|^A \otimes \rho_x^B,$$

for any representation of the inputs x in terms of orthonormal vectors $|x\rangle^A$ on a Hilbert space \mathcal{X} , and where π^A and π^B are the corresponding marginals states. Let $\hat{\theta}$ be a vector indexed by $(p, s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)$ with $0 \leq \hat{\theta}_{p,s} \leq s$. Define the joint state $\pi_{\hat{\theta}}^{AB}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{\hat{\theta}}^{AB} &\triangleq \sum_{x \in H_\eta + b} P_X(x) \sum_{\tilde{x} \in x + H_{\eta + \hat{\theta}}} P_{X|[X]}(\tilde{x}|x + H_{\eta + \hat{\theta}}) |\tilde{x}\rangle\langle \tilde{x}|^A \otimes \rho_x^B \\ &= \sum_{[x_r]} P_{[X]}([x_r]) \sum_{x \in [x_r]} \sum_{\tilde{x} \in [x_r]} P_{X|[X]}(x|[x_r]) P_{X|[X]}(\tilde{x}|[x_r]) |\tilde{x}\rangle\langle \tilde{x}|^A \otimes \rho_x^B \\ &= \sum_{[x_r]} P_{[X]}([x_r]) \sum_{\tilde{x} \in [x_r]} P_{X|[X]}(x|[x_r]) |\tilde{x}\rangle\langle \tilde{x}|^A \otimes \rho_{[x_r]}^B, \end{aligned}$$

where $[x_r] = [x_r]_{\hat{\theta}}$ is the coset $x_r + H_{\eta + \hat{\theta}}$. Define a joint state π_J^{AB} by

$$\pi_J^{AB} \triangleq (|J| - 1)^{-1} \sum_{\hat{\theta} \in \Theta} |T_{\hat{\theta}}| \pi_{\hat{\theta}}^{AB} = \sum_{\hat{\theta} \in \Theta} 2^{(1 - \omega_{\hat{\theta}})R} \pi_{\hat{\theta}}^{AB}. \quad (38)$$

The last equality holds by noting that $\log |T_{\hat{\theta}}(a)| = (1 - \omega_{\hat{\theta}})R$ according to (14), and that the rate of the code is $R = \log |J|$. One may also plug in the definition of $\pi_{\hat{\theta}}^{AB}$ and show that

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_J^{AB} &= (|J| - 1)^{-1} \sum_{\hat{\theta} \in \Theta} |T_{\hat{\theta}}| \sum_{x \in H_\eta + b} P_X(x) \sum_{\tilde{x} \in x + H_{\eta + \hat{\theta}}} P_{X|[X_r]}(\tilde{x}|x + H_{\eta + \hat{\theta}}) |\tilde{x}\rangle\langle \tilde{x}|^A \otimes \rho_x^B \\ &= (|J| - 1)^{-1} \sum_{\hat{\theta}} \sum_{\tilde{u} \in T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)} \sum_{x, \tilde{x}} \Pr(\phi(u) + V = x, \phi(\tilde{u}) + V = \tilde{x}) |\tilde{x}\rangle\langle \tilde{x}|^A \otimes \rho_x^B, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where u is an arbitrary element of J .

Let Q^* be a positive operator that achieves³ $D_{\text{H}}^\epsilon(\pi_{\eta,b}^{AB} \|\pi_{\eta,b,J}^{AB})$ for any $1 > \epsilon > 0$. That is, $\text{tr}[Q^* \pi_{\eta,b}^{AB}] \geq 1 - \epsilon$ and

$$D_{\text{H}}^\epsilon(\pi_{\eta,b}^{AB} \|\pi_{\eta,b,J}^{AB}) = -\log_2 \text{tr}[Q^* \pi_{\eta,b,J}^{AB}].$$

We define the decoding POVM by its elements,

$$E_u = \left(\sum_{u' \in J} A_{x(u')} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} A_{x(u)} \left(\sum_{u' \in J} A_{x(u')} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $x(u) \triangleq \phi(u) + V$ and $A_x \triangleq \text{tr}_A [(|x\rangle\langle x|^A \otimes I^B) Q^*]$. For any state ρ^B on the Hilbert space \mathcal{B} , we have

$$\text{tr}\{A_x \rho^B\} = \text{tr}\{(|x\rangle\langle x|^A \otimes \rho^B) Q^*\}. \quad (40)$$

For a specific choice of ϕ and V and a message $u \in J$, the probability of error is given by

$$\Pr(\text{error}|u, \phi, V) = \text{tr}[(I - E_u) \rho_{x(u)}].$$

³Now we are making the dependence of the state on the pair (η, b) explicit.

Applying Hayashi-Nagaoka inequality [4] with $S = A_{x(u)}$ and $T = \sum_{u' \neq u} A_{x(u')}$, we may bound this term by

$$\Pr(\text{error}|u, \phi, V) \leq (1+c) (1 - \text{tr}[A_{x(u)}\rho_{x(u)}]) + (2+c+c^{-1}) \sum_{u' \neq u} \text{tr}[A_{x(u')}\rho_{x(u)}],$$

for all $c > 0$. Taking expectation over all choices of ϕ, V , but keeping the transmitted message u fixed, we find

$$\Pr(\text{error}|u) \leq (1+c) [1 - \mathbb{E}_{\phi, V} \text{tr}[A_{X(u)}\rho_{X(u)}]] + (2+c+c^{-1}) \sum_{u' \neq u} \mathbb{E}_{\phi, V} \text{tr}[A_{X(u')}\rho_{X(u)}]. \quad (41)$$

Rewriting the first expectation via (40) and the linearity of the trace operator,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\phi, V} \text{tr}[A_{X(u)}\rho_{X(u)}] &= \mathbb{E}_{\phi, V} \text{tr} \left[\left(|X(u)\rangle\langle X(u)|^A \otimes \rho_{X(u)}^B \right) Q^* \right] \\ &= \text{tr} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\phi, V} \left(|X(u)\rangle\langle X(u)|^A \otimes \rho_{X(u)}^B \right) Q^* \right] \\ &= \text{tr} [Q^* \pi^{AB}] \geq 1 - \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we may bound the first term by

$$(1+c) [1 - \mathbb{E}_{\phi, V} \text{tr}[A_{X(u)}\rho_{X(u)}]] \leq (1+c)\epsilon.$$

For the sum in the second term of (41), we adopt an approach similar to that in Section IV-A.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{u' \neq u} \mathbb{E}_{\phi, V} \text{tr}[A_{X(u')}\rho_{X(u)}] &= \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} \sum_{\tilde{u} \in T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)} \sum_{x, \tilde{x}} \Pr(\phi(u) + V = x, \phi(\tilde{u}) + V = \tilde{x}) \text{tr}[A_{\tilde{x}}\rho_x] \\ &= \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} \sum_{\tilde{u} \in T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)} \sum_{[x_r]} \sum_{x \in [x_r]} \sum_{\tilde{x} \in [x_r]} \Pr(\phi(u) + V = x, \phi(\tilde{u}) + V = \tilde{x}) \text{tr}[A_{\tilde{x}}\rho_x] \\ &= \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} P_{err}(u, \hat{\theta}), \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

where $P_{err}(u, \hat{\theta}) \triangleq \sum_{\tilde{u} \in T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)} P_{err}(u, \tilde{u})$ and, for $\tilde{u} \in T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)$,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{err}(u, \tilde{u}) &\triangleq \sum_{[x_r]} \sum_{x \in [x_r]} \sum_{\tilde{x} \in [x_r]} \Pr(\phi(u) + V = x, \phi(\tilde{u}) + V = \tilde{x}) \text{tr}[A_{\tilde{x}}\rho_x] \\ &= \sum_{[x_r]} P_{[X]}([x_r]) \sum_{x \in [x_r]} \sum_{\tilde{x} \in [x_r]} P_{X|[X]}(x|[x_r]) P_{X|[X]}(\tilde{x}|[x_r]) \text{tr}[A_{\tilde{x}}\rho_x] \\ &= \sum_{[x_r]} P_{[X]}([x_r]) \sum_{\tilde{x} \in [x_r]} P_{X|[X]}(\tilde{x}|[x_r]) \text{tr}[A_{\tilde{x}}\rho_{[x_r]}]. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Leveraging equation (40), the above equation can be written as

$$P_{err}(u, \tilde{u}) = \sum_{[x_r]} P_{[X]}([x_r]) \sum_{\tilde{x} \in [x_r]} P_{X|[X]}(\tilde{x}|[x_r]) \text{tr} \left[(|\tilde{x}\rangle\langle \tilde{x}|^A \otimes \rho_{[x_r]}) Q^* \right] = \text{tr}[Q^* \pi_{\hat{\theta}}^{AB}].$$

Therefore the sum in (42) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{u' \neq u} \mathbb{E}_{\phi, V} \text{tr}[A_{X(u')}\rho_{X(u)}] &= \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} |T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)| \text{tr}[Q^* \pi_{\hat{\theta}}^{AB}] \\ &= \text{tr} \left[Q^* \left(\sum_{\hat{\theta}} |T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)| \pi_{\hat{\theta}}^{AB} \right) \right] = \text{tr} \left[Q^* \left(\sum_{\hat{\theta}} 2^{(1-\omega_{\hat{\theta}})} 2^R \pi_{\hat{\theta}}^{AB} \right) \right] \\ &= 2^R \text{tr}[Q^* \pi_J^{AB}] = 2^{R-D_{\hat{\mathfrak{H}}}(\pi^{AB} \|\pi_J^{AB})}. \end{aligned}$$

The bound in (41) reduces to

$$\Pr(\text{error}|u) \leq (1+c)\epsilon + (2+c+c^{-1})2^{R-D_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon}(\pi^{AB}||\pi_J^{AB})},$$

which is independent of u . Therefore we have demonstrated the existence of a $(1, 2^R, \epsilon')$ -code with

$$R \geq D_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon}(\pi^{AB}||\pi_J^{AB}) - \log_2 \frac{2+c+c^{-1}}{\epsilon' - (1+c)\epsilon}. \quad (44)$$

Optimized over c , and (η, b) , this bound implies the following theorem which is the second main result of this section, where the optimum $c = \frac{(\epsilon' - \epsilon)}{(\epsilon' + \epsilon)}$.

Theorem 5. *For a given a CQ channel $\mathcal{N} = \{\rho_x\}_{x \in G}$, and any J as given in (8), there exists a $(1, |J|, \epsilon')$ group transmission system such that*

$$R \geq \max_{\eta, b} D_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon}(\pi_{\eta, b}^{AB}||\pi_{\eta, b, J}^{AB}) - \log_2 \frac{4\epsilon'}{(\epsilon' - \epsilon)^2},$$

for any $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon')$, where the rate $R = \log_2 |J|$.

C. Converse

Toward the converse, we have the following theorem whose proof is given in Appendix F. Given a CQ channel $\mathcal{N} = \{\rho_x\}_{x \in G}$, and an input group J as defined in (8), and a $(1, |J|, \epsilon)$ group transmission system, define the input distribution P_X by the uniform distribution on $\{\phi(J) + V\}$, where ϕ is the homomorphism and V is the shift. Define the CQ state as

$$\rho^{AB} \triangleq \sum_x P_X(x) |x\rangle\langle x|^A \otimes \rho_x^B.$$

Define $\rho^{[A]B}$ and $\rho^{\bar{A}}$ similar to those in Definition 6 for every $\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}$ by noting that $[X]$ is a function of X .

Theorem 6. *Given a CQ channel $\mathcal{N} = \{\rho_x\}_{x \in G}$, and J as given in (8), any $(1, |J|, \epsilon)$ group transmission system satisfies*

$$R \leq \min_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} \frac{1}{1 - \omega_{\hat{\theta}}} I_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon}(\bar{X}_{\eta, b}; [X_{\eta, b}], Y),$$

where the rate $R = \log_2 |J|$.

VI. GROUP CODING IN THE ASYMPTOTIC REGIME

The one-shot results can be used to derive a single-letter lower bound on the asymptotic group capacity of discrete memoryless channels using the AEP. This is accomplished in this section. A matching upper bound is also derived in the case of CQ channels. For the classical channels, we use the upper bound available in [16].

A. Classical Case

Consider a channel $(\mathcal{X} = G, \mathcal{Y}, W_{Y|X})$. For every η and b , let $X_{\eta,b}$ be a random variable distributed uniformly over $H_\eta + b$. Let $[X_{\eta,b}]_{\hat{\theta}} = X_{\eta,b} + H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}}$ which takes values from the cosets of $H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}}$ in $H_\eta + b$. We leverage the one-shot results for classical channel group transmission and show the following capacity result. Let α be a probability distribution on the set of all pairs of η and b , where $\alpha_{\eta,b}$ denote the probability assigned to a particular pair (η, b) . Recall from (8) that the input group J can be specified by the vector w , which was fixed in the one-shot approach. In the asymptotic case, we optimize over all J .

Theorem 7. *For a classical channel $(G, \mathcal{Y}, W_{Y|X})$, the group capacity is given by*

$$C = \sup_{\alpha, w} \min_{\hat{\theta} \neq s} \frac{1}{1 - \omega_{\hat{\theta}}} \sum_{\eta, b} \alpha_{\eta, b} I(X_{\eta, b}; Y | [X_{\eta, b}]_{\hat{\theta}}). \quad (45)$$

Proof: The proof is provided in Appendix G. ■

Remark 8. *In the proof, we use the one-shot achievability bound given in Theorem 1 and apply on the n uses of the given channel for asymptotically large n , and use the AEP to obtain a lower bound on the group capacity of the channel. We cannot directly use the one-shot converse here as the characterization given in Theorem 7 is single-letter in nature. This is an important issue that we want to emphasize. One-shot results are useful toward characterization of the asymptotic capacity only in terms of achievability. We appeal to the asymptotic converse coding theorem given in [16]. As stated in the introduction, the asymptotic performance limits of Abelian group codes have been characterized for classical discrete memoryless channels in [12], [16] using variants of mutual information under maximum likelihood or joint typical decoding procedures. Here we are rederiving the asymptotic result from the one-shot result.*

B. Classical Quantum Case

We provide a single-letter characterization of the group capacity for the CQ channel as follows. This is a new result.

Theorem 8. *For a CQ channel $\mathcal{N} = \{\rho_x\}_{x \in G}$, the group capacity is given by*

$$C(\mathcal{N}) = \sup_{\alpha, w} \min_{\hat{\theta} \neq s} \frac{1}{1 - \omega_{\hat{\theta}}} \sum_{\eta, b} \alpha_{\eta, b} I(X_{\eta, b}; Y | [X_{\eta, b}]_{\hat{\theta}}).$$

where

$$I(X; Y | [X]_{\hat{\theta}}) \triangleq D(\rho^{AB} || \rho^{\bar{A}_{\hat{\theta}}} \rho^{[A]_{\hat{\theta}} B}).$$

Proof: The proof is provided in Appendix Section H. The achievability follows by using Theorem 4 and the AEP. A new asymptotic converse is developed to yield the single-letter characterization. ■

VII. EXAMPLES

Example 5. We start with the classical binary symmetric channel with crossover probability p and with input alphabet $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$. $J = \mathbb{Z}_2$. There are no non-trivial subgroups of J , implying that $\hat{\theta} = 0$ and $\eta = 0$. Hence $w_{\hat{\theta}} = 1$. The one-shot information rate is given by $I_{\mathbb{H}}^{\epsilon}(X; Y)$, which can be computed as follows:

$$I_{\mathbb{H}}^{\epsilon}(X; Y) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 0 < \epsilon < p/2 \\ \log_2(4/3) & \text{if } p/2 \leq \epsilon < p \\ \log_2(2) & \text{if } p \leq \epsilon < (1+p)/2 \\ \log_2 4 & \text{if } (1+p)/2 \leq \epsilon < 1 \end{cases}.$$

The asymptotic performance limit is the group capacity and is given by $I(X; Y) = 1 - h_b(p)$, where $h_b(\cdot)$ is the binary entropy function.

Example 6. Consider a CQ channel given by $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}$, and ρ_0 is given by the ensemble $(|0\rangle, |1\rangle)$, $(1/2, 1/2)$, and ρ_1 is given by $(|+\rangle, |-\rangle)$, $(1/4, 3/4)$, where the states are the eigenvectors of Pauli X operator. We have $G = J = \mathbb{Z}_2$. As in the previous example, $\theta = 0$ and $\eta = 0$. The information rate is given by $I_{\mathbb{H}}^{\epsilon}(X; Y)$, which can be computed as follows. The joint quantum state of the input and the output of the CQ channel is given by $\rho^{AB} = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |x\rangle\langle x|^A \otimes \rho_x^B$, and the state $\rho^A = I/2$. The one-shot information rate can be evaluated numerically and is plotted in Figure 1. The group capacity is given by




Figure 1: Numerical evaluation of the one-shot quantum information rate $I_{\mathbb{H}}^{\epsilon}(X; Y)$ for certain range of values of ϵ .

$$I(X; Y) = H(0.5(\rho_0 + \rho_1)) - 0.5H(\rho_0) - 0.5H(\rho_1) = h_b(3/8) - 1/2 - 1/2h_b(1/4).$$

Example 7. Consider a classical octonary channel $Y = X \oplus_8 Z$, where $G = \mathbb{Z}_8$ and $P(Z = 0) = 1/2$ and Z has the distribution: $P_Z(i) = 1/14$, for $i \neq 0$. Let the input group be $J = \mathbb{Z}_4$. We consider the case when $\eta = 0$. There are two cases to consider: $\hat{\theta} = (1, 0, 3)$ and $\hat{\theta} = (1, 1, 3)$.

Case 1: $\hat{\theta}_{2,2} = 0$. $|H_{\hat{\theta}}| = |2\mathbb{Z}_8| = 4$ and $|T_{\hat{\theta}}| = 2$. We note that $P_{XY}(x, y) = \frac{1}{8}P_Z(y - x)$ for all $x, y \in G$. Moreover, we have for $i \in \{0, 1\}$, $j, y \in G$,

$$P_{[X]}(i)P_{X|[X]}(j|i)P_{Y|[X]}(y|i) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{32}P_Z(y - i - 2\mathbb{Z}_8) & \text{if } (j - i) \text{ is even} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Case 2: $\hat{\theta}_{2,2} = 1$. $|H_{\hat{\theta}}| = |4\mathbb{Z}_8| = 2$ and $|T_{\hat{\theta}}| = 1$. We note that for $i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$, $j, y \in G$,

$$P_{[X]}(i)P_{X|[X]}(j|i)P_{Y|[X]}(y|i) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{16}P_Z(y - i - 4\mathbb{Z}_8) & \text{if 4 divides } (j - i) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

For several values of ϵ , we have computed $I_H^\epsilon(\overline{X}; [X]Y)$ in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Numerical evaluation of the one-shot quantum information rate $I_H^\epsilon(\overline{X}; [X]Y)$ for certain range of values of ϵ : $\hat{\theta}_{22} = 0$ and $\hat{\theta}_{22} = 1$.

Example 8. Coding over decimal numbers $\{0, 1, 2, \dots, 9\}$: Consider coding for a classical channel that takes a decimal number as input and produces a decimal number as output. Let us consider a symmetric model where $P_{Y|X}(y|x) = (1 - p)$ if $x = y$ and $P_{Y|X}(y|x) = p/9$ if $x \neq y$. The capacity of the channel is given by $C(p) = \log(10) - h_b(p) - p \log(9)$. The only Abelian group on this alphabet is \mathbb{Z}_{10} , and is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_5$. It has two non-trivial subgroups $\{0, 5\}$ and $\{0, 2, 4, 6, 8\}$ corresponding to $\hat{\theta} = (0, 1)$ and $\hat{\theta} = (1, 0)$. One can evaluate a lower bound on the group capacity by choosing $\eta = 0$ to yield the following function of p :

$$\sup_{0 \leq w \leq 1} \min\{A, B, C\},$$

where

$$A(p, w) = \frac{w + (1 - w) \log(5)}{w} [h_b(8p/9) + 24p/9 + (1 - 8p/9) - h_b(p) - p \log(9)],$$

$$B(p, w) = \frac{w + (1 - w) \log(5)}{(1 - w) \log(5)} [h_b(5p/9) + \log(5) - h_b(p) - p \log(9)].$$

It turns out (which can be checked numerically) that this lower bound is indeed equal to the Shannon capacity. That is, $C = C(p)$ is smaller than both $A(p, w)$ and $B(p, w)$. This implies that the group capacity is equal to the Shannon capacity of the channel. Next we consider the largest rate achievable using linear codes over \mathbb{Z}_7 (the largest scalar finite field inside \mathbb{Z}_{10}) by using only the first 7 symbols. The rate achievable using linear codes can be computed as

$$L(p) \triangleq [h_b(p/3) + (p/3) \log(3) + (1 - p/3) \log(7) - h_b(p) - p \log(9)].$$

The capacity $C(p)$ and the rate $L(p)$ are plotted in Figure 3. For the symmetric channel, linear codes cannot achieve the capacity.




Figure 3: Codes over the decimal numbers for a symmetric channel: Group codes achieve the capacity while linear codes over \mathbb{Z}_7 do not.

Example 9. Consider a CQ channel $\mathcal{N} = \{\rho_x\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ with quaternary input $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ with $G = \mathbb{Z}_4$. We compute the group capacity of this channel in the asymptotic regime. $G^n = \mathbb{Z}_4^n$ and $J = \mathbb{Z}_2^{k_1} \oplus \mathbb{Z}_4^{k_2}$. We have $w_1 + 2w_2 = 1$, $w_1 = \frac{k_1}{k_1 + k_2}$, and $w_2 = \frac{k_2}{k_1 + k_2}$. There are 5 non-trivial vectors η : $(0, 0)$, $(0, 1)$, $(1, 0)$, $(1, 1)$, and $(0, 2)$. which yield H_η as follows: \mathbb{Z}_4 in the first 3 cases and $2\mathbb{Z}_4$ in the next 2 cases. There are two non-trivial cases of vector b (which is a scalar for the present example): $b = 0$ and $b = 1$. Recall that $I(X; Y|[X]_{\hat{\theta}}) = D(\rho^{AB} || \rho^{\bar{A}_{\hat{\theta}} \rho^{[A]_{\hat{\theta}} B}})$. Define $I_4 := I(X; Y)$, $I_2 = I(X; Y|[X] = 0)$ and $I'_2 = I(X; Y|[X] = 1)$. The capacity from Theorem 8 can be expressed as

$$C(\mathcal{N}) = \sup_{\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, w_2} \min\{A_1, A_2, A_3\},$$

where $0 \leq \alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, w_2 \leq 1$ and $\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 1$, and

$$A_1 = \alpha_0 I_4 + \alpha_1 I_2 + \alpha_2 I'_2, \quad A_2 = (1 + w_2) \left[\frac{\alpha_0}{2} (I_2 + I'_2) + \alpha_1 I_2 + \alpha_2 I'_2 \right], \quad A_3 = \frac{(1 + w_2) \alpha_0}{w_2} \frac{1}{2} (I_2 + I'_2).$$

Since the expression is symmetric in I_2 and I'_2 , without loss of generality, let us assume that $I'_2 \leq I_2$. There are three cases to consider. Case (a) $I_4 \leq I_2$: Then $\min\{A_1, A_2, A_3\} \leq A_1 \leq I_2$. The upper bound can be reached by

$\alpha_1 = 1$ and any w_2 . Case (b): $I_2 \leq I_4 \leq (I_2 + I'_2)$: Then $\min\{A_1, A_2, A_3\} \leq A_1 \leq I_4$. The upper bound can be reached by $\alpha_0 = 1$ and $w_2 = 1$. Case (c): $I_2 + I'_2 \leq I_4$: Then $\min\{A_1, A_2, A_3\} \leq A_2 \leq I_2 + I'_2$. The upper bound can be reached by $\alpha_0 = 1$ and $w_2 = 1$. Hence the expression for the group capacity can be simplified as

$$C(\mathcal{N}) = \max\{\min\{I_4, I_2 + I'_2\}, I_2, I'_2\}.$$

This corresponds to three possibilities: (a) use the entire channel input alphabet \mathbb{Z}_4 to get the first expression inside the maximization or (b) use only a subset $2\mathbb{Z}_4$, or $2\mathbb{Z}_4 + 1$ to get the other two expressions, respectively. Let us take a particular example of CQ channel. Let ρ_0 be given by the ensemble $(|0\rangle, |1\rangle)$, $(1/2, 1/2)$, ρ_1 be given by $(|+\rangle, |-\rangle)$, $(1/4, 3/4)$, ρ_2 by $(|+\rangle, |-\rangle)$, $(3/4, 1/4)$, and ρ_3 by $(|i\rangle, |-i\rangle)$, $(1/4, 3/4)$, where the last set of states are the eigenvectors of Pauli-Y operator. The quantum mutual information quantities can be computed as $I_4 = 0.1302$, $I_2 = 0.0488$ and $I'_2 = 0.0966$. The capacity is $C(\mathcal{N}) = 0.1302$.

Example 10. Prime-based linear codes: Let us consider a channel (either classical or classical-quantum) with a prime input alphabet $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$ for a prime p . Consider n uses of the channel for some finite n . For this case, we let $G = \mathbb{Z}_p^n$ and $J = \mathbb{Z}_p^k$ for some k . $\mathcal{P}(G) = \{p\}$, $\mathcal{R}_2(G) = \{1\}$, and $S(G) = \{(p, 1)\}$. There is only one choice: $\hat{\theta}_{p,1} = 0$, and $w_{\hat{\theta}} = 0$. Moreover, we have $\eta = 0$. This corresponds to the standard binary (n, k) linear code. The one-shot information rate is given by $I_{\text{H}}^e(X^n; Y^n)$. One can check that this is also the one-shot information rate for random unstructured codes with uniform distribution on the input alphabet \mathcal{X}^n . This demonstrates that random linear code ensemble achieves the same performance as the random unstructured code ensemble with uniform distribution for both classical and classical-quantum channels for any n .

REFERENCES

- [1] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, *Information theory: coding theorems for discrete memoryless systems*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [2] A. S. Holevo, "The capacity of the quantum channel with general signal states," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 269–273, 1998.
- [3] B. Schumacher and M. D. Westmoreland, "Sending classical information via noisy quantum channels," *Physical Review A*, vol. 56, no. 1, p. 131, 1997.
- [4] M. Hayashi and H. Nagaoka, "General formulas for capacity of classical-quantum channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 49, no. 7, pp. 1753–1768, 2003.
- [5] D. Kretschmann and R. F. Werner, "Quantum channels with memory," *Physical Review A*, vol. 72, no. 6, p. 062323, 2005.
- [6] R. Ahlswede and J. Gemma, "Bounds on algebraic code capacities for noisy channels. i," *Information and Control*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 124–145, 1971.
- [7] ———, "Bounds on algebraic code capacities for noisy channels. ii," *Information and Control*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 146–158, 1971.
- [8] T. J. Goblick, "Coding for a discrete information source with a distortion measure," Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1963.
- [9] R. Dobrusin, "Asymptotic bounds of the probability of error for the transmission of messages over a discrete memoryless channel with a symmetric transition probability matrix," *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen*, vol. 7, pp. 283–311, 1962.
- [10] R. Dobrushin, "Asymptotic optimality of group and systematic codes for some channels," *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 47–60, 1963.

- [11] G. D. Forney and M. D. Trott, "The dynamics of group codes: state spaces, trellis diagrams, and canonical encoders," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 1491–1513, 1993.
- [12] G. Como and F. Fagnani, "The capacity of finite abelian group codes over symmetric memoryless channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 55, no. 5, pp. 2037–2054, 2009.
- [13] H.-A. Loeliger, "Signal sets matched to groups," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 1675–1682, 1991.
- [14] H.-A. Loeliger and T. Mittelholzer, "Convolutional codes over groups," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 42, no. 6, pp. 1660–1686, 1996.
- [15] R. Garello and S. Benedetto, "Multilevel construction of block and trellis group codes," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 41, no. 5, pp. 1257–1264, 1995.
- [16] A. G. Sahebi and S. S. Pradhan, "Abelian group codes for channel coding and source coding," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 61, no. 5, pp. 2399–2414, 2015.
- [17] D. Slepian, "Group codes for the gaussian channel," *Bell System Technical Journal*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 575–602, 1968.
- [18] A. G. Sahebi and S. S. Pradhan, "Multilevel polarization of polar codes over arbitrary discrete memoryless channels," in *2011 49th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 1718–1725.
- [19] E. Şaşoğlu, E. Telatar, and E. Arıkan, "Polarization for arbitrary discrete memoryless channels," in *2009 IEEE Information Theory Workshop*. IEEE, 2009, pp. 144–148.
- [20] W. Park and A. Barg, "Polar codes for q -ary channels, $q = 2^r$," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 955–969, 2012.
- [21] R. Ahlswede, "Group codes do not achieve shannon's channel capacity for general discrete channels," *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pp. 224–240, 1971.
- [22] A. Barg and G. D. Forney, "Random codes: Minimum distances and error exponents," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 48, no. 9, pp. 2568–2573, 2002.
- [23] G. Como and F. Fagnani, "Average spectra and minimum distances of low-density parity-check codes over abelian groups," *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 19–53, 2009.
- [24] T. Philosof and R. Zamir, "On the loss of single-letter characterization: The dirty multiple access channel," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 55, no. 6, pp. 2442–2454, 2009.
- [25] J. Körner and K. Marton, "How to encode the modulo-two sum of binary sources (corresp.)," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 219–221, 1979.
- [26] B. Nazer and M. Gastpar, "Computation over multiple-access channels," *IEEE Transactions on information theory*, vol. 53, no. 10, pp. 3498–3516, 2007.
- [27] V. R. Cadambe and S. A. Jafar, "Interference alignment and degrees of freedom of the k -user interference channel," *IEEE transactions on information theory*, vol. 54, no. 8, pp. 3425–3441, 2008.
- [28] T. Han and K. Kobayashi, "A new achievable rate region for the interference channel," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 49 – 60, jan 1981.
- [29] S.-N. Hong and G. Caire, "On interference networks over finite fields," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 60, no. 8, pp. 4902–4921, Aug 2014.
- [30] S. Krishnamurthy and S. Jafar, "On the capacity of the finite field counterparts of wireless interference networks," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 60, no. 7, pp. 4101–4124, July 2014.
- [31] S. Sridharan, A. Jafarian, S. Vishwanath, S. Jafar, and S. Shamai, "A layered lattice coding scheme for a class of three user Gaussian interference channels," in *2008 46th Annual Allerton Conference Proceedings on*, sept. 2008, pp. 531 –538.
- [32] D. Krithivasan and S. S. Pradhan, "Distributed source coding using abelian group codes: A new achievable rate-distortion region," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 57, no. 3, pp. 1495–1519, 2011.
- [33] A. Padakandla, A. G. Sahebi, and S. S. Pradhan, "An achievable rate region for the three-user interference channel based on coset codes," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 62, no. 3, pp. 1250–1279, 2016.

- [34] S.-N. Hong and G. Caire, “On interference networks over finite fields,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 60, no. 8, pp. 4902–4921, 2014.
- [35] M. Hayashi and Á. Vázquez-Castro, “Computation-aided classical-quantum multiple access to boost network communication speeds,” *Physical Review Applied*, vol. 16, no. 5, p. 054021, 2021.
- [36] M. A. Sohail, T. A. Atif, A. Padakandla, and S. S. Pradhan, “Computing sum of sources over a classical-quantum mac,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 68, no. 12, pp. 7913–7934, 2022.
- [37] A. Padakandla, “Communicating over a classical-quantum mac with state information distributed at senders,” in *2022 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 2445–2450.
- [38] Y. Yao and S. A. Jafar, “The capacity of classical summation over a quantum mac with arbitrarily distributed inputs and entanglements,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03122*, 2023.
- [39] T. S. Han and S. Verdú, “Approximation theory of output statistics,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 752–772, 1993.
- [40] N. Datta and T. C. Dorlas, “The coding theorem for a class of quantum channels with long-term memory,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, vol. 40, no. 28, p. 8147, 2007.
- [41] T. Dorlas and C. Morgan, “Invalidity of a strong capacity for a quantum channel with memory,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 84, no. 4, p. 042318, 2011.
- [42] R. Renner, S. Wolf, and J. Wullschleger, “The single-serving channel capacity,” in *2006 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*. IEEE, 2006, pp. 1424–1427.
- [43] M. Mosonyi and N. Datta, “Generalized relative entropies and the capacity of classical-quantum channels,” *Journal of Mathematical physics*, vol. 50, no. 7, 2009.
- [44] L. Wang and R. Renner, “One-shot classical-quantum capacity and hypothesis testing,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 108, no. 20, p. 200501, 2012.
- [45] M. Tomamichel, *Quantum information processing with finite resources: mathematical foundations*. Springer, 2015, vol. 5.
- [46] F. Salek, A. Anshu, M.-H. Hsieh, R. Jain, and J. R. Fongllosa, “One-shot capacity bounds on the simultaneous transmission of classical and quantum information,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 66, no. 4, pp. 2141–2164, 2019.
- [47] M. Berta, M. Christandl, and R. Renner, “The quantum reverse shannon theorem based on one-shot information theory,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, vol. 306, pp. 579–615, 2011.
- [48] C. T. Li and V. Anantharam, “A unified framework for one-shot achievability via the poisson matching lemma,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 2624–2651, 2021.
- [49] N. Elkayam and M. Feder, “One shot approach to lossy source coding under average distortion constraints,” in *2020 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 2389–2393.
- [50] V. Strassen, “Asymptotische abschatzungen in shannon’s informationstheorie,” in *Transactions of the Third Prague Conference on Information Theory etc, 1962. Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, Prague, 1962*, pp. 689–723.
- [51] M. Hayashi, “Information spectrum approach to second-order coding rate in channel coding,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 55, no. 11, pp. 4947–4966, 2009.
- [52] P. Sen, “Unions, intersections and a one-shot quantum joint typicality lemma,” *Sādhanā*, vol. 46, no. 1, p. 57, 2021.
- [53] M. Suzuki, *Structure of a group and the structure of its lattice of subgroups*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012, vol. 10.
- [54] J. H. Conway and N. J. A. Sloane, *Sphere packings, lattices and groups*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013, vol. 290.
- [55] M. Tomamichel and M. Hayashi, “A hierarchy of information quantities for finite block length analysis of quantum tasks,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 59, no. 11, pp. 7693–7710, 2013.
- [56] K. Li, “Second-order asymptotics for quantum hypothesis testing,” *The Annals of Statistics*, vol. 42, no. 1, 2014.
- [57] N. J. Bloch, “Abstract algebra with applications,” (*No Title*), 1987.
- [58] T. Ogawa and H. Nagaoka, “Strong converse and stein’s lemma in quantum hypothesis testing,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 46, no. 7, pp. 2428–2433, 2000.

APPENDIX

A. More on the $H_{\hat{\theta}}$ coset

We show the derivation for (14) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \log |T_{\hat{\theta}}| &= \sum_{(p,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)} (s - \hat{\theta}_{p,s}) k_{p,s} \log p \\
 &= k \cdot \left[\frac{\sum_{(p,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)} (s - \hat{\theta}_{p,s}) \omega_{p,s} \log p}{\sum_{(p,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)} s \omega_{p,s} \log p} \right] \sum_{(p,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)} s \omega_{p,s} \log p \\
 &= (1 - \omega_{\hat{\theta}}) k \sum_{(p,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)} s \omega_{p,s} \log p = (1 - \omega_{\hat{\theta}}) nR. \tag{46}
 \end{aligned}$$

We recall the following result from [16].

Lemma 2. For $a, \tilde{a} \in J$, $x, \tilde{x} \in G^n$ and for $(p, s) \in \mathcal{Q}(J) = \mathcal{S}(G)$, let $\hat{\theta}_{p,s} \in \{0, 1, \dots, s\}$ be such that $\tilde{a}_{p,s} - a_{p,s} \in p^{\hat{\theta}_{p,s}} \mathbb{Z}_{p^s}^{k_{p,s}} \setminus p^{\hat{\theta}_{p,s}+1} \mathbb{Z}_{p^s}^{k_{p,s}}$, i.e., $\tilde{a} \in T_{\hat{\theta}}(a)$. Consider a random homomorphism ϕ and a dither V with distribution specified as in Definition 3. Then,

$$\Pr(\phi(a) + V = x, \phi(\tilde{a}) + V = \tilde{x}) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|G|^n} \frac{1}{|H_{\hat{\theta}}|^n} & \text{if } \tilde{x} - x \in H_{\hat{\theta}}^n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

B. Proof of Achievability for Classical Channel

Denote by $P_{err}(u)$ the probability of the event $E_2(u) \cap (E_1(u))^c$, averaged over the randomness of ϕ, V . We can provide an upper bound on this probability as

$$\begin{aligned}
 P_{err}(u) &\triangleq \mathbb{E} [\Pr(E_2(u) \cap (E_1(u))^c)] \\
 &= \sum_{(x,y) \in A_\epsilon} W(y|x) \Pr \left(\begin{array}{l} \phi(u)+V=x, \exists \tilde{u} \in J: \\ \tilde{u} \neq u, (\phi(\tilde{u})+V,y) \in A_\epsilon \end{array} \right) \\
 &\leq \sum_{(x,y) \in A_\epsilon} \sum_{\substack{\tilde{u} \in J \\ \tilde{u} \neq u}} \sum_{\substack{\tilde{x} \in G \\ (\tilde{x},y) \in A_\epsilon}} W(y|x) \Pr \left(\begin{array}{l} \phi(u)+V=x, \\ \phi(\tilde{u})+V=\tilde{x} \end{array} \right) \\
 &= \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq s} \sum_{(x,y) \in A_\epsilon} \sum_{\tilde{u} \in T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)} \sum_{\substack{\tilde{x} \in G \\ (\tilde{x},y) \in A_\epsilon}} W(y|x) \Pr \left(\begin{array}{l} \phi(u)+V=x, \\ \phi(\tilde{u})+V=\tilde{x} \end{array} \right) \\
 &= \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq s} P_{err}(u, \hat{\theta}), \tag{47}
 \end{aligned}$$

where $P_{err}(u, \hat{\theta}) \triangleq \sum_{\tilde{u} \in T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)} P_{err}(u, \tilde{u})$ and for $\tilde{u} \in T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)$,

$$P_{err}(u, \tilde{u}) \triangleq \sum_{(x,y) \in A_\epsilon} \sum_{\substack{\tilde{x} \in G \\ (\tilde{x},y) \in A_\epsilon}} W(y|x) \Pr \left(\begin{array}{l} \phi(u)+V=x, \\ \phi(\tilde{u})+V=\tilde{x} \end{array} \right), \tag{48}$$

and \mathbf{s} denote the vector whose components satisfy $\mathbf{s}_{(p,s)} = s$ for all $(p, s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)$. The term $\Pr(\phi(u) + V = x, \phi(\tilde{u}) + V = \tilde{x})$ in (48) can be found using Lemma 2. Let $x \in [x_r]$ be a shorthand for $[x] = [x_r]$, or equivalently, $x \in [x_r] + H$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{err}(u, \tilde{u}) &= \sum_{(x,y) \in A_\epsilon} \sum_{\tilde{x} \in x + H_{\hat{\theta}}} W(y|x) \mathbb{I}_{A_\epsilon}(\tilde{x}, y) \frac{1}{|G|} \frac{1}{|H_{\hat{\theta}}|} \\
&= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{\tilde{x} \in x + H_{\hat{\theta}}} \sum_{\substack{(x,y) \in A_\epsilon \\ (\tilde{x}, y) \in A_\epsilon}} W(y|x) \frac{1}{|G|} \frac{1}{|H_{\hat{\theta}}|} \\
&\leq \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{\tilde{x} \in x + H_{\hat{\theta}}} \sum_{y: (\tilde{x}, y) \in A_\epsilon} W(y|x) \frac{1}{|G|} \frac{1}{|H_{\hat{\theta}}|} \\
&= \sum_{[x_r]} \frac{|H_{\hat{\theta}}|}{|G|} \sum_{x \in [x_r]} \sum_{\tilde{x} \in [x_r]} \sum_{y: (\tilde{x}, y) \in A_\epsilon} W(y|x) \frac{1}{|H_{\hat{\theta}}|^2} \\
&= \sum_{[x_r]} P([x_r]) \sum_{\tilde{x} \in [x_r]} \sum_{y: (\tilde{x}, y) \in A_\epsilon} P(\tilde{x} | [x_r]) P(y | [x_r]). \tag{49}
\end{aligned}$$

The probability of the event $E_1(u)$ can be bounded as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(E_1(u)) &= \Pr((\phi(u) + V, Y) \notin A_\epsilon) = \Pr((X, Y) \notin A_\epsilon) \\
&= \Pr\left((X, Y) \in \cup_{\hat{\theta}} (A_{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}^*)^C\right) \leq \sum_{\hat{\theta}} \Pr\left((X, Y) \in (A_{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}^*)^C\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{\hat{\theta}} \epsilon_{\hat{\theta}} = \epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $A_\epsilon \subset A_{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}^*$, we may exploit (49) and show that the term $P_{err}(u, \tilde{u})$ is then bounded from above as follows:

$$P_{err}(u, \tilde{u}) \leq \sum_{[x_r]} P([x_r]) \sum_{\tilde{x} \in [x_r]} \sum_{y: (\tilde{x}, y) \in A_{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}^*} P(\tilde{x} | [x_r]) P(y | [x_r]) = \exp_2\{-I_{\mathbf{H}}^{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}, \hat{\theta}}(\bar{X}; [X]Y)\},$$

which leads to the following bound,

$$P_{err}(u) \leq \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} |T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)| \exp_2\{-I_{\mathbf{H}}^{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}, \hat{\theta}}(\bar{X}; [X]Y)\}. \tag{50}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\Pr(E(u)) \leq \epsilon + \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} |T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)| \exp_2\{-I_{\mathbf{H}}^{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}, \hat{\theta}}(\bar{X}; [X]Y)\}.$$

The average probability of error of the group transmission scheme can be bounded from above by

$$\Pr(\text{error}) = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{J}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{J}|} \Pr(E(u)) \leq \epsilon + \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} |T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)| \exp_2\{-I_{\mathbf{H}}^{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}, \hat{\theta}}(\bar{X}; [X]Y)\}.$$

C. Proof of Proposition 1

Recall that the set $A_{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}^*$ in the proof of Theorem 1 is the minimizer in the definition of the right-hand side of (2) for $I_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}(\bar{X}; [X]Y)$, i.e., $P_{XY}(A_{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}^*) \geq 1 - \epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}$ and

$$I_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}(\bar{X}; [X]Y) = -\log_2 \left[\sum_{[x_r]} P([x_r]) \sum_{x \in [x_r]} P(x | [x_r]) \sum_{y: (x,y) \in A_{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}^*} P(y | [x_r]) \right] = -\log_2 P_{XY|\hat{\theta}}(A_{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}^*).$$

Denote by A_{ϵ}^{T1} the intersection $A_{\epsilon}^{\text{T1}} = \cap_{\hat{\theta} \neq s} A_{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}^*$. The probability of error for message u , denoted by $\Pr^{\text{T1}}(E(u))$, is bounded as $\Pr^{\text{T1}}(E(u)) \leq \epsilon + P_{\text{err}}(u)$, where $P_{\text{err}}(u)$ is bounded in (50) as

$$P_{\text{err}}(u) \leq \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq s} |T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)| P_{XY|\hat{\theta}}(A_{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}^*) = \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq s} |T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)| \exp_2 \{ -I_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}(\bar{X}; [X]Y) \}.$$

In the proof of Theorem 2, the probability of error for message u , denoted here by $\Pr^{\text{T2}}(E(u))$, is bounded as $\Pr^{\text{T2}}(E(u)) \leq \epsilon + P_{\text{err}}^{\text{T2}}(u)$, where we have

$$P_{\text{err}}^{\text{T2}}(u) \leq \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq s} |T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)| P_{XY|\hat{\theta}}(A_{\epsilon}^{\text{T2}}) = (|J| - 1) P_{XY|J}(A_{\epsilon}^{\text{T2}}).$$

Here the set A_{ϵ}^{T2} is a subset of $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ that achieves $D_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon}(P_{XY} \| P_{XY|J})$. That is, $P_{XY|J}(A_{\epsilon}^{\text{T2}}) \leq P_{XY|J}(A)$ for any A such that $P_{XY}(A) \geq 1 - \epsilon$.

Note that $P_{XY}(A_{\epsilon}^{\text{T1}}) \geq 1 - \epsilon$. We thus have $P_{XY|J}(A_{\epsilon}^{\text{T2}}) \leq P_{XY|J}(A_{\epsilon}^{\text{T1}})$ and

$$\sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq s} |T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)| P_{XY|\hat{\theta}}(A_{\epsilon}^{\text{T2}}) \leq \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq s} |T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)| P_{XY|\hat{\theta}}(A_{\epsilon}^{\text{T1}}) \leq \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq s} |T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)| P_{XY|\hat{\theta}}(A_{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}^*).$$

Therefore the upper bound on $\Pr^{\text{T2}}(E(u))$ is smaller or equal to that on $\Pr^{\text{T1}}(E(u))$. This completes the proof.

D. Proof of Converse for Classical Channel

Based on Lemma 1, for each group code $\mathbb{C} \leq G$, there exists a group J and a homomorphism such that \mathbb{C} is the image of the homomorphism. Assume now that a group transmission system with parameters $(1, |J|, \epsilon)$ exists over a channel $(\mathcal{X} = G, \mathcal{Y}, W_{Y|X})$, and that the group J takes the form in equation (8). Assume that the homomorphism ϕ for the group code \mathbb{C} is a one-to-one mapping. We have:

$$\mathbb{C} = \left\{ \bigoplus_{(p,r,m) \in \mathcal{G}(G)} \sum_{s=1}^{r_p} u_{p,s} g_{(p,s) \rightarrow (r,m)} + V : u \in J \right\}.$$

Let $\hat{\theta}$ be a vector indexed by $(p, s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)$ with $0 \leq \hat{\theta}_{p,s} \leq s$. For a message $u \in J$, construct a one-to-one correspondence between $u_{p,s} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^s}^{k_{p,s}}$ and the tuple $(\tilde{u}_{p,s}, \hat{u}_{p,s})$ where $\tilde{u}_{p,s} \in p^{\hat{\theta}_{p,s}} \mathbb{Z}_{p^s}^{k_{p,s}}$ and $\hat{u}_{p,s} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^{\hat{\theta}_{p,s}}}^{k_{p,s}}$. Let U denote the random message of the group transmission system of the code. Let \hat{U} denote the part of the random message such that $\hat{U}_{p,s} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^{\hat{\theta}_{p,s}}}^{k_{p,s}}$, for all $(p, s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)$. Consider the subcode of \mathbb{C} :

$$\mathbb{C}_1(\hat{\theta}, \hat{u}) = \left\{ \bigoplus_{(p,r,m) \in \mathcal{G}(G)} \sum_{s=1}^{r_p} (\tilde{u}_{p,s} + \hat{u}_{p,s}) g_{(p,s) \rightarrow (r,m)} + V : \tilde{u}_{p,s} \in p^{\hat{\theta}_{p,s}} \mathbb{Z}_{p^s}^{k_{p,s}}, \forall (p, s) \in \mathcal{S}(G) \right\}.$$

Let $x = \phi(u) + V$ be the channel input and $H_{\hat{\theta}}$ be given as in (15). Then $\mathbb{C}_1(\hat{\theta}, \hat{u}) = x + H_{\hat{\theta}}$. That is, there is a one-to-one correspondence between \hat{U} and $[X]_{\hat{\theta}}$. Also, $|T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)| = |\mathbb{C}_1(\hat{\theta}, \hat{u})| = |H_{\hat{\theta}}|$ for all $u \in J$. Let $x \in [x_r]$ be a shorthand for $[x] = [x_r]$, or equivalently, $x \in [x_r] + H$, where we omit the $\hat{\theta}$ subscript when it is clear from the context.

Define a one-to-one correspondence between x and the tuple $(\tilde{x}_{\hat{\theta}}, [x]_{\hat{\theta}})$ where $\tilde{x}_{\hat{\theta}} = \phi(\tilde{u})$. Consider a genie-aided receiver which gets access to \hat{U} and performs maximum likelihood decoding. Equivalently, this receiver has access to the coset information $[X]_{\hat{\theta}}$ of X and can be written as $\mathcal{D}^{ga} : ([x]_{\hat{\theta}}, y) \mapsto x' \in \mathcal{X}$. Clearly the average probability of error for this decoder must be not greater than ϵ . Let $X' \in \mathcal{X}$ be the output of \mathcal{D}^{ga} . For every $\hat{\theta}$ with $0 \leq \hat{\theta}_{p,s} \leq s$, $\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}$, the average probability of error for this decoder is

$$\sum_{\hat{u}} \sum_{x, x'} \Pr(\hat{u}) P_{X X' | \hat{U}}(x, x' | \hat{u}) \mathbf{1}_{\{x' \neq x\}} = \sum_{x, x'} P_{X X'}(x, x') \mathbf{1}_{\{x' \neq x\}} \leq \epsilon,$$

where

$$P_{X X' | \hat{U}}(x, x' | \hat{u}) \triangleq P(x | [x]) \sum_{y: \mathcal{D}^{ga}([x], y) = x'} W(y | x).$$

Consider a strategy to distinguish between $P_{X X'}$ and $P_{\hat{U}}(P_{X | \hat{U}} \otimes P_{X' | \hat{U}})$ as follows. The strategy guesses $P_{X X'}$ if it sees $X = X'$, and guesses $P_{\hat{U}}(P_{X | \hat{U}} \otimes P_{X' | \hat{U}})$ otherwise. When $P_{X X'}$ is the true underlying distribution, the type-I error probability is exactly the probability that $X \neq X'$ computed from $P_{X X'}$, namely, the average probability of a decoding error, and is thus not larger than ϵ . When $P_{\hat{U}}(P_{X | \hat{U}} \otimes P_{X' | \hat{U}})$ is the true underlying distribution, the probability of type-II error (misdetection) is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\hat{u}} P_{\hat{U}}(\hat{u}) \sum_{x, x'} P_{X | \hat{U}}(x | \hat{u}) P_{X' | \hat{U}}(x' | \hat{u}) \mathbf{1}_{\{x' = x\}} &= \sum_{[x_r]} P([x_r]) \sum_{x, x'} P(x | [x_r]) P(x' | [x_r]) \mathbf{1}_{\{x' = x\}} \quad (51) \\ &= \sum_{[x_r]} \frac{|H|}{|G|} \sum_x P(x | [x_r]) P(x | [x_r]) \\ &= \sum_{[x_r]} \frac{|H|}{|G|} \sum_{x \in [x_r]} \frac{1}{|H|} P(x | [x_r]) = \frac{1}{|H|}, \end{aligned}$$

where (51) follows from the one-to-one mapping between \hat{U} and $[X]_{\hat{\theta}}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\mathbb{H}}^{\epsilon, \hat{\theta}}(P_{X Y} \| P_{[X]} P_{X | [X]} P_{Y | [X]}) &\geq D_{\mathbb{H}}^{\epsilon, \hat{\theta}}(P_{X X'} \| P_{[X]} P_{X | [X]} P_{X' | [X]}) \\ &= D_{\mathbb{H}}^{\epsilon}(P_{X X'} \| P_{\hat{U}}(P_{X | \hat{U}} \otimes P_{X' | \hat{U}})) \\ &\geq -\log_2 \frac{1}{|H|} = \log_2 |H| = \log_2 |T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)| \\ &= (1 - \omega_{\hat{\theta}}) k \sum_{(p,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)} s \omega_{p,s} \log p, \quad (52) \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the data processing inequality [44]. Equivalently,

$$I_{\mathbb{H}}^{\epsilon}(\bar{X}; [X] Y) \geq (1 - \omega_{\hat{\theta}}) R, \quad (53)$$

which yields Theorem 3.

E. Proof of Achievability for CQ Channel

We work on the two terms in the right hand side of (37). The first term can be simplified as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_C \text{tr} \left[\left(\mathbf{1}^{B'} - (\Pi')_{([x],[\ell])([u]),(\bar{x},\bar{\ell})(u)}^{B'} \right) (\rho')_{([x],[\ell])([u]),(\bar{x},\bar{\ell})(u),\delta}^{B'} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|^{\zeta(G)}} \sum_{x,\ell} P(x) \text{tr} [(\rho')_{x,\ell}^{B'} - (\Pi')_{x,\ell}^{B'} (\rho')_{x,\ell}^{B'}] \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{4}{|\mathcal{L}|^{\zeta(G)}} \sum_{x,\ell} P(x) \text{tr} [(I - (\Pi)_{\hat{B}}^{B'}) (\rho')_{x,\ell}^{B'} + (\Pi')_{W_{x,\ell}}^{B'} (\rho')_{x,\ell}^{B'}] \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 16\zeta(G)\delta^2 + \frac{4}{|\mathcal{L}|^{\zeta(G)}} \sum_{x,\ell} P(x) \text{tr} [(\Pi')_{W_{x,\ell}}^{B'} (\rho_x^B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|)] \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} 16\zeta(G)\delta^2 + \frac{4(1 + \zeta(G)\delta^2)}{|\mathcal{L}|^{\zeta(G)}\delta^2} \sum_{x,\ell} P(x) \sum_{\hat{\theta} \in \Theta} \left[1 - \text{tr} [(\Pi)_{[X];x}^{\hat{B}} (\rho_x^B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|)] \right] \\
&= 16\zeta(G)\delta^2 + \frac{4(1 + \zeta(G)\delta^2)}{|\mathcal{L}|^{\zeta(G)}\delta^2} \sum_{x,\ell} P(x) \sum_{\hat{\theta} \in \Theta} [1 - \text{tr} [(\Pi'')_{[X];x}^B \rho_x^B]] \\
&\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} 16\zeta(G)\delta^2 + \frac{4(1 + \zeta(G)\delta^2)|\Theta|\epsilon}{\delta^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where we provide the following arguments. (a) follows from Fact 3 of [52] and (b) from (31). (c) follows from Proposition 2 [52] by using $l = |\Theta|$, and $\alpha = \frac{\delta^2}{1 + \zeta(G)\delta^2}$, and (d) follows from (29).

Next we look at the second term as follows. Note that

$$T_{\hat{\theta}}(u) = \{u' : [u'] = [u], \bar{u}' \neq \bar{u}\}.$$

For any $u' \in T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_C \text{tr} \left[\left((\Pi')_{([x],[\ell])([u]),(\bar{x},\bar{\ell})(u')}^{B'} \right) (\rho')_{([x],[\ell])([u]),(\bar{x},\bar{\ell})(u),\delta}^{B'} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|^{\zeta(G)+\zeta(H)}} \sum_{[x],[\ell],\bar{x},\bar{\ell}} \sum_{\bar{x}',\bar{\ell}'} P([x])P(\bar{x})P(\bar{x}') \text{tr} [(\Pi')_{[x],[\ell],\bar{x}',\bar{\ell}'}^{B'} (\rho')_{[x],[\ell],\bar{x},\bar{\ell},\delta}^{B'}] \\
&= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|^{\zeta(G)}} \sum_{[x],[\ell],\bar{x},\bar{\ell}} P([x])P(\bar{x}') \text{tr} [(\Pi')_{[x],[\ell],\bar{x},\bar{\ell}}^{B'} (\rho')_{[x],[\ell]}^{B'}] \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{[x],[\ell],\bar{x},\bar{\ell}} \frac{P([x])P(\bar{x}')}{|\mathcal{L}|^{\zeta(G)}} \text{tr} [(\Pi')_{[x],[\ell],\bar{x},\bar{\ell}}^{B'} \mathcal{T}_{[X];[\ell]} (\rho_{[x]}^B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|)] + \frac{4\zeta(G)\delta|B|}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{L}|}} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{[x],[\ell],\bar{x},\bar{\ell}} \frac{P([x])P(\bar{x}')}{|\mathcal{L}|^{\zeta(G)}} \text{tr} [(I - (\Pi')_{W_{[x],[\ell],\bar{x},\bar{\ell}}}^{B'}) \mathcal{T}_{[X];[\ell]} (\rho_{[x]}^B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|)] + \frac{4\zeta(G)\delta|B|}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{L}|}} \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \sum_{[x],[\ell],\bar{x},\bar{\ell}} \frac{P([x])P(\bar{x}')}{|\mathcal{L}|^{\zeta(G)}} \text{tr} [(I - (\Pi')_{W_{[x],[\ell],\bar{x},\bar{\ell}}}^{B'}) \mathcal{T}_{[X];[\ell]} (\rho_{[x]}^B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|)] + \frac{4\zeta(G)\delta|B|}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{L}|}}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{(d)}{=} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|^{\zeta(G)}} \sum_{[x],[\ell],\bar{x}',\bar{\ell}'} P([x])P(\bar{x}') \text{tr}[(I - (\Pi)_{\hat{W}_{[X];[x],\bar{x}'}}^{\hat{B}})(\rho_{[x]}^B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|)] + \frac{4\zeta(G)\delta|B|}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{L}|}} \\
& = \sum_{[x],[\ell],\bar{x}',\bar{\ell}'} \frac{P([x])P(\bar{x}')}{|\mathcal{L}|^{\zeta(G)}} \text{tr}[(\Pi'')_{[X];[x],\bar{x}'}^B(\rho_{[x]}^B)] + \frac{4\zeta(G)\delta|B|}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{L}|}} \\
& \stackrel{(e)}{\leq} 2 \left(2^{-I_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}(\bar{X};[X],B)} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

for large enough \mathcal{L} , where (a) follows from (35) and (36), (b) from using (33), (c) from using (32), (d) from the fact that $\mathcal{T}_{[X];[\ell]}$ is an isometry, and hence

$$\text{tr}[(\Pi')_{[X];[x],[\ell],\bar{x}',\bar{\ell}'}^{B'} \mathcal{T}_{[X];[\ell]}(\rho_{[x]}^B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|)] = \text{tr}[(\Pi)_{\hat{W}_{[X];[x],\bar{x}'}}^{\hat{B}}(\rho_{[x]}^B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|)],$$

and (e) from (29). Combining the three terms we obtain the average probability of error for a fixed u as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}}(P(\text{Error}|u)) \leq 32\zeta(G)\delta^2 + \frac{8(1 + \zeta(G)\delta^2)|\Theta|\epsilon}{\delta^2} + 8 \sum_{\hat{\theta} \in \Theta} |T_{\hat{\theta}}| 2^{-I_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}(\bar{X};[X],B)},$$

for large enough $|\mathcal{L}|$.

F. Proof of Converse for CQ Channel

We do the preparation for the converse as done in the classical case. Based on Lemma 1, for each group code $\mathbb{C} \leq G$, there exists a group J and a homomorphism such that \mathbb{C} is the image of the homomorphism. Assume now that a group transmission system with parameters $(1, |J|, \epsilon)$ exists over a classical-quantum channel $\mathcal{N} = \{\rho_x^B\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$, where $\mathcal{X} = G$ is an Abelian group, and $J = \bigoplus_{p \in \mathcal{P}(G)} \bigoplus_{s=1}^{r_p} \mathbb{Z}_{p^s}^{k_{p,s}}$. Assume that the homomorphism ϕ for the group code \mathbb{C} is a one-to-one mapping.

Let $\hat{\theta}$ be a vector indexed by $(p, s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)$ with $0 \leq \hat{\theta}_{p,s} \leq s$. For a message $u \in J$, construct a one-to-one correspondence between $u_{p,s} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^s}^{k_{p,s}}$ and the tuple $(\tilde{u}_{p,s}, \hat{u}_{p,s})$ where $\tilde{u}_{p,s} \in p^{\hat{\theta}_{p,s}} \mathbb{Z}_{p^s}^{k_{p,s}}$ and $\hat{u}_{p,s} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^{\hat{\theta}_{p,s}}}^{k_{p,s}}$. Consider the subcode $\mathbb{C}_1(\hat{\theta}, \hat{u})$ of \mathbb{C} as defined in the classical channel case. Let $x = \phi(u) + V$ be the channel input and $H_{\hat{\theta}}$ be given as in (15). Then $\mathbb{C}_1(\hat{\theta}, \hat{u}) = [x]_{\hat{\theta}} = x + H_{\hat{\theta}}$. That is, there is an one-to-one correspondence between \hat{U} and $[X]_{\hat{\theta}}$. Also, $|T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)| = |\mathbb{C}_1(\hat{\theta}, \hat{u})| = |H_{\hat{\theta}}|$ for all $u \in J$.

Define a one-to-one correspondence between x and the tuple $(\tilde{x}_{\hat{\theta}}, [x]_{\hat{\theta}})$ where $\tilde{x}_{\hat{\theta}} = \phi(\tilde{u})$. Consider a genie-aided receiver which gets access to \hat{U} and denote it by \mathcal{D}^{ga} . Equivalently, this receiver has access to the coset information $[X]_{\hat{\theta}}$ of X and can be realized by a family of POVMs $\{E_x^{[x]}\}$. Clearly, the average probability of error for this decoder must be not greater than ϵ . Let $X' \in \mathcal{X}$ be the output of \mathcal{D}^{ga} . For every $\hat{\theta} \neq s$, the average probability of error for this decoder is

$$\sum_{\hat{u}} \sum_{x, x'} \Pr(\hat{u}) P_{X X' | \hat{U}}(x, x' | \hat{u}) \mathbf{1}_{\{x' \neq x\}} \leq \epsilon,$$

where $P_{X X' | \hat{U}}(x, x' | \hat{u}) \triangleq P_{X|[X_r]}(x|[x]) \text{tr} \left[E_{x'}^{[x]} \rho_x \right]$.

Note that the decoding POVM can be viewed as a CPTP map. This CPTP maps ρ^{AB} to the (classical) state $P_{XX'}$, denoting the joint distribution of the transmitted codeword X and the decoder's guess X' . Similarly, it maps $\rho^{\bar{A}}\rho^{[A]B}$ to $P_{\hat{U}}(P_{X|\hat{U}} \otimes P_{X'|\hat{U}})$. Hence, it follows from the data processing inequality for $D_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon}(\rho\|\sigma)$ that

$$D_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon}(P_{XX'}\|P_{\hat{U}}(P_{X|\hat{U}} \otimes P_{X'|\hat{U}})) \leq D_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon}(\rho^{AB}\|\rho^{\bar{A}}\rho^{[A]B}) .$$

Consider the strategy to distinguish $P_{XX'}$ and $P_{\hat{U}}(P_{X|\hat{U}} \otimes P_{X'|\hat{U}})$ as given in the classical channel case, under which the type-I error probability is not larger than ϵ , and the probability of type-II error (misdetection) is $\frac{1}{|H|}$. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon}(\rho^{AB}\|\rho^{\bar{A}}\rho^{[A]B}) &\geq D_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon}(P_{XX'}\|P_{\hat{U}}(P_{X|\hat{U}} \otimes P_{X'|\hat{U}})) \\ &= \log_2 |H| = \log_2 |T_{\hat{\theta}}(u)| . \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

Using (14), we may rewrite (54) compactly as $I_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon}(\bar{X}; [X]Y) \geq (1 - \omega_{\hat{\theta}})R$. This completes the proof.

G. Proof of Theorem 7

Achievability– We use n independent copies of the channel, and make the observation that $\mathcal{S}(G) = \mathcal{S}(G^n)$ for all $n \geq 1$. Fix an input group J characterized by the corresponding vector $w_{q,s}$, $(q, s) \in \mathcal{S}(J)$. First we consider the special case where α is the distribution such that $\eta = \eta^*$ and $b = b^*$ with probability one, where η^* and b^* are all-zero vectors in their respective spaces (see the definitions that precede the theorem).

Using this and Theorem 1, we see that there exists a $(n, |J|, \epsilon')$ -code such that

$$\epsilon' \leq \epsilon + \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq s} \exp_2 \left\{ (1 - \omega_{\hat{\theta}})nR - I_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}(\bar{X}_{\hat{\theta}}^n; [X]_{\hat{\theta}}^n Y^n) \right\},$$

where the rate R is given in Equation (12), and the joint distribution of the input and the output of the channel is given by

$$P(X^n = x^n, Y^n = y^n) = \prod_{i=1}^n P_X(x_i) W_{Y|X}(y_i|x_i),$$

where $P_X(x) = \frac{1}{|G|}$. Then the random vectors will have the following distributions. For $x_r^n = (x_{r,1}, x_{r,2}, \dots, x_{r,n}) \in G^n$, $[x_r^n]$ denotes the coset representative of $x_r^n + H^n$ in G^n , and the product conditional distribution $P_{Y|[X]}^n$ is defined as

$$P_{Y|[X]}^n(y^n | [x_r^n]) \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^n P_{Y|[X]}(y_i | [x_{r,i}]) = \sum_{x^n \in [x_r^n] + H^n} P_{X|[X]}^n(x^n | [x_r^n]) W_{Y|X}^n(y^n | x^n),$$

where $P_{[X]}$ and $P_{X|[X]}$ are given in Definition 4 and used in the one-shot case.

$$P_{[X]}^n = \frac{|H|^n}{|G|^n}, \quad P_{X|[X]}^n(x^n | [x_r^n]) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|H|^n} & \text{if } x^n \in [x_r^n]^n, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Now since all distributions are in a product form, we can use AEP [44] for hypothesis testing relative entropy as: for all $\epsilon > 0$, and all $\hat{\theta}$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} I_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon, \hat{\theta}}(\bar{X}_{\hat{\theta}}^n; [X]_{\hat{\theta}}^n Y^n) = I(\bar{X}_{\hat{\theta}}; [X]_{\hat{\theta}}, Y) = I(X; Y | [X]_{\hat{\theta}}).$$

This gives the desired achievability result in the special case of η^* and b^* .

This can be easily extended to the case when η^* and b^* are arbitrary vectors. Now the channel input is just restricted to $H_{\eta} + b$ instead of the entirety of G . We can apply the above result to this case by defining a new channel that takes inputs in H_{η} and then adds b to the input and feeds it to the given channel. Using the invariance of mutual information under one-to-one mapping of the random variables involved, and the above result, we see that the following rate is achievable

$$R = \min_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} \frac{1}{1 - \omega_{\hat{\theta}}} I(X_{\eta^*, b^*}; Y | [X_{\eta^*, b^*}]_{\hat{\theta}}),$$

where $[X_{\eta^*, b^*}]_{\hat{\theta}} = X_{\eta^*, b^*} + H_{\eta^* + \hat{\theta}}$.

Toward extending these arguments to the general α , we note that the random homomorphism used by the encoder has the structure that for a given message, the outputs corresponding to different \mathbb{Z}_{p^r} components of G are mutually independent. Consider a set of positive integers $n_{\eta, b}$ indexed by η, b , such that $\alpha_{\eta, b} = n_{\eta, b}/n$, for large n , where $n = \sum_{\eta, b} n_{\eta, b}$. We construct random encoder such that its output takes values in $H_{\eta} + b$ for $n_{\eta, b}$ samples for all η, b .

Next we note the following superadditivity of smoothed Hypothesis testing relative entropy:

$$D_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon}(P_1 \times P_2 \| Q_1 \times Q_2) \stackrel{(a)}{\geq} -\log_2[Q_1(A_1) \times Q_2(A_2)] \quad (55)$$

$$= D_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon/2}(P_1 \| Q_1) + D_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon/2}(P_2 \| Q_2), \quad (56)$$

where (a) follows by defining A_i to be the decision region that achieves the optimality in $D_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon/2}(P_i \| Q_i)$, and noting that $P_1(A_1)P_2(A_2) = 1 - \epsilon + \epsilon^2/4 \geq 1 - \epsilon$. Using such a suboptimal decision region that has a product structure across different values of η and b , we see that there exists a $(n, |J|, \epsilon')$ -code such that

$$\epsilon' \leq \epsilon + \sum_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} \exp_2 \left\{ (1 - \omega_{\hat{\theta}})nR - \sum_{\eta, b} \alpha_{\eta, b} I_{\text{H}}^{\epsilon_{\hat{\theta}}}(\bar{X}_{\hat{\theta}}^{n_{\eta, b}}; [X]_{\hat{\theta}}^{n_{\eta, b}} Y^{n_{\eta, b}}) \right\}.$$

Using the AEP, we see that the following rate is achievable:

$$\min_{\hat{\theta} \neq \mathbf{s}} \frac{1}{1 - \omega_{\hat{\theta}}} \sum_{\eta, b} \alpha_{\eta, b} I(X_{\eta, b}; Y | [X_{\eta, b}]_{\hat{\theta}}),$$

for rational $\alpha_{\eta, b}$. By approximating and optimizing over α and the input group, we get the desired result.

Converse– The converse follows from [16].

$$\mathbb{C}_2(\hat{\theta}) = \left\{ \bigoplus_{\eta,b} \bigoplus_{i \in \Gamma(\eta,b)} \left[\bigoplus_{(p,r,m) \in \mathcal{G}(G)} \sum_{s=1}^{r_p} a_{p,s} g_{(p,s) \rightarrow (r,m)}^{(i)} + b + H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}} \right] : a_{p,s} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^s}^{kw_{p,s}}, \forall (p,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G) \right\}$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{=} \left\{ \bigoplus_{\eta,b} \bigoplus_{i \in \Gamma(\eta,b)} \left[\bigoplus_{(p,r,m) \in \mathcal{G}(G)} \sum_{s=1}^{r_p} \hat{a}_{p,s} g_{(p,s) \rightarrow (r,m)}^{(i)} + b + H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}} \right] : \hat{a}_{p,s} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^{\hat{\theta}_{p,s}}}^{kw_{p,s}}, \forall (p,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G) \right\}$$

H. Proof of Theorem 8

Achievability– The achievability follows by exploiting the product nature of the input distribution, the quantum Stein’s lemma [58, Theorem 2], the superadditivity of smoothed hypothesis testing quantum relative entropy, and Theorem 4 as in the classical case, We skip the details for conciseness.

Converse– Toward a converse, consider the following arguments. Consider an arbitrary shifted group code \mathbb{C} with parameters n, k and w . We assume that the associated homomorphism is a one-to-one mapping. Recall that we can express the code compactly as follows:

$$\mathbb{C} = \left\{ \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \left[\bigoplus_{(p,r,m) \in \mathcal{G}(G)} \sum_{s=1}^{r_p} a_{p,s} g_{(p,s) \rightarrow (r,m)}^{(i)} + B^{(i)} \right] : a_{p,s} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^s}^{kw_{p,s}}, \forall (p,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G) \right\}.$$

For every pair of vectors (η, b) as defined earlier, define

$$\Gamma_{\eta,b} = \left\{ i \in [1, n] : g_{(p,s) \rightarrow (r,m)}^{(i)} \in p^{\eta_{p,r,m,s} + |r-s|^+} \mathbb{Z}_{p^r}^{kw_{p,s}}, g_{(p,s) \rightarrow (r,m)}^{(i)} \notin p^{\eta_{p,r,m,s} + 1 + |r-s|^+} \mathbb{Z}_{p^r}^{kw_{p,s}}, \right. \\ \left. B^{(i)} = b, \forall (p, r, m, s) \right\}$$

Let $\hat{\theta}$ be an arbitrary vector whose components $\hat{\theta}_{p,s}$ are indexed by $(p, s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)$ and satisfy $0 \leq \hat{\theta}_{p,s} \leq s$. Construct a one-to-one correspondence $a_{p,s} \leftrightarrow (\tilde{a}_{p,s}, \hat{a}_{p,s})$ where $\tilde{a}_{p,s} \in p^{\hat{\theta}_{p,s}} \mathbb{Z}_{p^s}^{kw_{p,s}}$ and $\hat{a}_{p,s} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^{\hat{\theta}_{p,s}}}^{kw_{p,s}}$. For an arbitrary $\hat{a}_{p,s} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^{\hat{\theta}_{p,s}}}^{kw_{p,s}}$, consider the following subcode of \mathbb{C} :

$$\mathbb{C}_1(\hat{\theta}, \hat{a}) = \left\{ \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \bigoplus_{(p,r,m) \in \mathcal{G}(G)} \sum_{s=1}^{r_p} (\hat{a}_{p,s} + \tilde{a}_{p,s}) g_{(p,s) \rightarrow (r,m)}^{(i)} + B : \tilde{a}_{p,s} \in p^{\hat{\theta}_{p,s}} \mathbb{Z}_{p^s}^{kw_{p,s}}, \forall (p, s) \in \mathcal{S}(G) \right\}.$$

The rate of the code $\mathbb{C}_1(\hat{\theta}, \hat{a})$ is given by $(1 - \omega_{\hat{\theta}}) \frac{k}{n} \sum_{(p,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)} s w_{p,s} \log p$.

For a given CQ channel \mathcal{N} , suppose that rate R is achievable using group codes. Consider an arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$. This implies that there exists a shifted group code \mathbb{C} with parameters n, k and w that yields an average error probability τ such that $\tau \leq \epsilon$ and $\frac{k}{n} \sum_{(p,s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)} s w_{p,s} \log p \geq R - \epsilon$. Using a uniform distribution on a , we let X_i denote the random channel input at the i th channel use induced by this code.

Using the fact that \tilde{a} is uniformly distributed over its range, for $i \in \Gamma_{\eta,b}$, in the code $\mathbb{C}_1(\hat{\theta}, \hat{a})$, the channel input $X_i(\hat{\theta}, \hat{a})$ at the i th channel use has the following distribution

$$P(X_i(\hat{\theta}, \hat{a}) = \beta) = \prod_{(p,r,m) \in \mathcal{G}(G)} p^{-|r - \theta(\eta+\hat{\theta})_{(p,r,m)}|^+} = \frac{1}{|H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}}|},$$

if

$$\beta_{(p,r,m)} \in \sum_{s=1}^{r_p} \hat{a}_{p,s} g_{(p,s) \rightarrow (r,m)}^{(i)} + b_{p,r,m} + p^{\theta(\eta+\hat{\theta})_{(p,r,m)}} \mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$$

for all $(p, r, m) \in \mathcal{G}(G)$, and $P(X_i(\hat{\theta}, \hat{a}) = \beta) = 0$ otherwise.

Let A denote the random message of the group transmission system of the code \mathbb{C} . Let \hat{A} denote the part of the random message such that $\hat{A}_{p,s} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^{\hat{\theta}_{p,s}}}^{kw_{p,s}}$, for all $(p, s) \in \mathcal{S}(G)$. Now consider a genie-aided receiver which gets access to \hat{A} . This receiver implements the POVM as in the original case, but substitutes its estimate of \hat{A} with the actual realization given by the genie. The probability of error of this receiver is clearly no greater than τ . Using the definition of quantum mutual information $I(X; Y | [X]_{\hat{\theta}}) = D(\rho^{AB} || \rho^{\hat{A}_{\hat{\theta}}} \rho^{[A]_{\hat{\theta}} B})$, classical Fano's inequality on the outcome of the POVM (measurement) [59, Chapter 5], quantum data processing inequality by viewing POVM as a CPTP map, we have for every $\hat{\theta}$ with $0 \leq \hat{\theta}_{p,s} \leq s$, we have the following argument with regard to quantum mutual information:

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \omega_{\hat{\theta}})(R - \epsilon)(1 - \tau) - \frac{1}{n} &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\hat{a}} P(\hat{a}) I(X^n(\hat{\theta}, \hat{a}); Y^n | \hat{A} = \hat{a}) \\ &\leq \sum_{\hat{a}} P(\hat{a}) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(X_i(\hat{\theta}, \hat{a}); Y_i) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{\eta, b} \sum_{i \in \Gamma(\eta, b)} \sum_{\hat{a}} \frac{P(\hat{a}) I(X_i; Y_i | X_i \in \hat{a} \mathbf{g}^{(i)} + b + H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}})}{n} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{\eta, b} \sum_{i \in \Gamma(\eta, b)} \frac{1}{n} I(X_i; Y_i | X_i \in \hat{A} \mathbf{g}^{(i)} + b + H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}}) \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{=} \sum_{\eta, b} \frac{|\Gamma(\eta, b)|}{n} I(X_{\eta, b}; Y | [X_{\eta, b}]_{\hat{\theta}}), \quad (58)$$

where in (a) we have expressed $\bigoplus_{(p,r,m) \in \mathcal{G}(G)} \sum_{s=1}^{r_p} \hat{a}_{p,s} g_{(p,s) \rightarrow (r,m)}^{(i)} + b_{p,r,m}$ as $\hat{a} \mathbf{g}^{(i)} + b$, in (b) \hat{A} denotes the random variable corresponding to \hat{a} , in (c) we have used the fact that $\hat{A} \mathbf{g}^{(i)} + b + H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}}$ is uniform over the set of cosets of $H_{\eta+\hat{\theta}} + b$ in $H_{\eta} + b$. Hence the converse follows. ■