

# Infinite-fold Quantum Advantage in Classical Correlation Sensing

Janis Nötzel, *Member, IEEE*, Pere Munar-Vallespir  
*Emmy-Noether Group Theoretical Quantum Systems Design,*  
*Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany,*  
 {janis.noetzel,pere.munar}@tum.de

**Abstract**—We study the hypothesis testing problem of detecting the presence of a thermal source emitting coherent quantum states towards an arbitrary but fixed number  $K$  of detectors versus the situation where the detectors are presented uncorrelated thermal noise of the same average energy in the setting of asymmetric hypothesis testing. We compare two variations of this theme: In the first one the detectors perform heterodyne or homodyne detection and then transmit their measured results to a central processing unit with unlimited computational resources. In the second one the detectors are able to teleport the quantum states to the central unit, which acts on the received quantum states with unlimited quantum computational resources. We find that when the average received energy per detector goes to zero, the ratio of the error exponents goes to infinity, indicating an infinite-fold quantum advantage.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Given  $K$  received signals, the ability to quantify their correlations is of importance in a variety of domains, ranging from signal detection and processing in communications [6] over medical signal analysis in important techniques such as electroencephalography, magnetoencephalography or prediction of post-operative complications [13], [15], [17] over to financial data analysis [23]. For a more general overview, we refer the reader to [14].

Mathematically, the topic is related to tensor decompositions - in fact all above references utilize a tensor structure which is at the heart of the so-called CANDECOMP/PARAFAC decomposition. This decomposition can be used as a tool for fitting the received signals to a known structure. In the case at hand, this particular structure is given by a Kruskal tensor, which takes for  $K = 3$  forms such as

$$\sum_r \lambda_r W_r^{(1)} \otimes W_r^{(2)} \otimes W_r^{(3)} \quad (\text{I.1})$$

in signal processing [6] and

$$\sum_x p(x) w_1(x_1|x) w_2(x_2|x) w_3(x_3|x) \quad (\text{I.2})$$

This work was financed by the DFG via grant NO 1129/2-1 and by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research of Germany via grants 16KISQ093, 16KISQ039 and 16KISQ077. The generous support of the state of Bavaria via Munich Quantum Valley, the NeQuS- and the 6GQT project is greatly appreciated. Finally, the authors acknowledge the financial support by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research of Germany in the programme of “Souverän. Digital. Vernetzt.”. Joint project 6G-life, project identification number: 16KISK002.

in information theory [18], where  $w_i(x_i|x)$  are conditional probabilities. Interestingly, such systems have not been studied from the perspective of quantum theory so far. It may only be speculated why, but certainly the hidden assumption that a joint piece “ $i$ ” of information is transmitted into various modes  $W^{(1)}, W^{(2)}, W^{(3)}$  or  $w_1, w_2, w_3$  is suspicious from the perspective of quantum theory where the no-cloning theorem [27] makes it difficult to argue for exactly such processes.

The emission of a qubit or light field from a source towards a number  $K$  of detectors is however a possibility in quantum theory as well. Such emission may take place in several ways, out of which we focus on the particular one where the received state  $\rho_E^{(K)}$  ( $K \cdot E$  denoting the total received energy) equals

$$\rho_E^{(K)} = \frac{1}{\pi \cdot E} \int e^{-|\alpha|^2/E} |\alpha\rangle \langle \alpha|^{\otimes K} d\alpha \quad (\text{I.3})$$

and describes the emission of *classical coherent light* towards the  $K$  detectors (the states  $|\alpha\rangle \langle \alpha|$  are called *coherent* states [22]). Our model thus describes the application of quantum methods to the sensing of specific properties of classical fields, and provides an alternative perspective to the known sensing mechanisms based on Greenberger–Horne–Zeilinger states or squeezed light [22], [24]. From the application perspective, our work may be of relevance to the detection of hidden emitters pointing to the presence of adversarial parties in the context of physical layer security [5] where empirical validation of assumptions on channel models is critical.

Leaving aside the motivating potential applications, we formalize the task to be carried out as one of asymmetric hypothesis testing. In particular, we ask what is the error exponent in asymmetric hypothesis testing when we desire to correctly detect correlation of the signals with a fixed probability  $1 - \epsilon$ , while minimizing the probability of falsely claiming the signals are not correlated (this probability is usually called the type two error). This problem is loosely related to the study of data transmission over quantum systems in the sense that for  $K = 2$  the error exponent of the type two error equals the quantum mutual information of  $\rho_E^{(2)}$ .

For the particular type of scenario studied by us, we prove the asymptotic superiority of the quantum detection method over its classical counterpart, which can be quantified by observing that the ratio of the respective error exponents scales as  $1/E$  for  $E \rightarrow 0$ .

We now describe the problem statement and our results.

## II. PROBLEM STATEMENT AND RESULT

The mathematical problem statement is taken from the theory of (quantum) hypothesis testing. For the two quantum states  $\rho$  and  $\sigma$ , the task is to determine for  $\epsilon > 0$  the quantity

$$D_Q(\rho, \sigma) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \beta_{n, \epsilon}(\rho, \sigma), \quad (\text{II.1})$$

where  $\beta_{n, \epsilon}(\rho, \sigma) := (\min_{0 \leq P \leq \mathbb{1}^{\otimes n}} \{\text{tr } P \sigma^{\otimes n} : \text{tr } P \rho^{\otimes n} \geq 1 - \epsilon\})$  is called the ‘‘type two error’’. For finite dimensional systems, the error exponent  $D(\rho, \sigma)$  has been shown to equal the quantum relative entropy  $D_Q(\rho \parallel \sigma) := \text{tr}(\rho(\log \rho - \log \sigma))$  in the seminal works [10], [19]. If instead the two hypothesis are given by multivariate normal distributions on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , we may formulate the problem statement along the lines of the recent work [16] as the calculation of

$$D_C(\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_{n, \epsilon}(\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2), \quad (\text{II.2})$$

where  $\alpha_{n, \epsilon}(\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2) := \inf_{p_{Z|X}} \{e_1(p_{Z|X}) : e_2(p_{Z|X}) \leq \epsilon\}$ , where  $e_i(p_{Z|X}) = \int p_{Z|X}(i|x) dp_i(x)$  and  $p_i$  are the probability density functions of the multivariate normal distributions  $\mathcal{N}_i$ . For a large class of distributions, [16] proved a formula for  $D_C$ , which we use for  $n$ -variate normal distributions in the form  $D_C(\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2) = D(\mathcal{N}_1 \parallel \mathcal{N}_2)$ , where  $D(\mathcal{N}_1 \parallel \mathcal{N}_2) = \int p_1(x^n) \log(p_1(x^n)/p_2(x^n)) dx^n$  is the usual Kullback-Leibler divergence. Here and in the following the logarithm  $\log$  is taken with base 2

Our method of analysis is to compare the state of the art technology with the hypothetical future quantum systems when the goal is to distinguish between the hypothesis  $\rho = \rho_E^{(K)}$  and  $\sigma = \rho_E^{\otimes K}$ . Since our systems are Gaussian, they are defined on the infinite-dimensional Fock space  $\mathcal{F}^{\otimes K}$ , where  $\mathcal{F} := \text{span}\{|n\rangle\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , where  $|n\rangle$  are the so-called *number states* [22]. For such infinite-dimensional systems, the usual formulations of Stein’s Lemma in the quantum case do not apply. However, to show the desired quantum advantage, it suffices to show that  $D_Q(\rho_E^{(K)}, \rho_E^{\otimes K})$  is lower bounded by a large enough quantity. This lower bound is then to be compared to an approach which qualifies as ‘‘state of the art’’. We choose to let the  $K$  detectors perform either heterodyne or homodyne detection on their received signal prior to sending it forward to the processing center. Both detection methods are well-established parts of today’s communication infrastructure. In both cases, we then obtain multi-variate normal distributed random variables which we write as  $p_E^{(K)}$  in case the correlated state  $\rho_E^{(K)}$  is given and  $p_E^{\otimes K}$  in case the uncorrelated quantum state  $\rho_E^{\otimes K}$  is given. We will later see that the probability density function  $p_E^{(K)}$  is, for heterodyne detection, given by

$$p_E^{(K)}(x^k) = \frac{1}{\pi^{k+1} E} \int e^{-\frac{|\alpha|^2}{E}} e^{-\sum_{i=1}^K |\alpha - x_i|^2} d\alpha \quad (\text{II.3})$$

and for homodyne detection by

$$\tilde{p}_E^{(K)}(x^k) = \frac{1}{\pi^{k+1} E} \int e^{-\frac{|\alpha|^2}{E}} e^{-\sum_i |\sqrt{2}\Re(\alpha) - x_i|^2} d\alpha. \quad (\text{II.4})$$




Fig. 1. Depicted is the (unbounded) quantum advantage in the error exponent for low energy and the saturation for large energy values. As can be seen, access to a large enough number of observations at a high enough energy can allow the classical system to outperform a corresponding quantum system with access to a lesser number of copies.

The corresponding marginal distributions  $p_E, \tilde{p}_E$  and their  $K$ -fold products  $p_E^{\otimes K}, \tilde{p}_E^{\otimes K}$  are then derived in the obvious way, and allow us to state our main results as follows:

*Theorem 1 (Error Exponents):* The error exponents are bounded as per the following three inequalities:

$$D_Q(\rho_E^{(K)}, \rho_E^{\otimes K}) \geq K \cdot g(E) - f(1 + 2 \cdot K \cdot E) \quad (\text{II.5})$$

$$D(p_E^{(K)} \parallel p_E^{\otimes K}) = \log \frac{(1+E)^K}{(1+K \cdot E)} \quad (\text{II.6})$$

$$D(\tilde{p}_E^{(K)} \parallel \tilde{p}_E^{\otimes K}) = \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{(1+2E)^K}{(1+2K \cdot E)} \quad (\text{II.7})$$

where  $g$  is the Gordon function defined via  $g(x) := (x+1) \log(x+1) - x \log x$  for  $x > 0$  and  $g(0) = 0$  and  $f(x) := \frac{x+1}{2} \log \frac{x+1}{2} - \frac{x-1}{2} \log \frac{x-1}{2}$  for  $x > 1$ ,  $f(1) = 0$ .

From [2] we are inclined to believe the interesting system behavior is in the regime  $E \approx 0$ , which turns out to be true:

*Theorem 2 (Quantum Advantage):* It holds

$$D(\rho_E^{(K)}, \rho_E^{\otimes K}) \geq K \cdot \ln(K) \cdot E + \mathcal{O}(E^2) \quad (\text{II.8})$$

$$D(p_E^{(K)} \parallel p_E^{\otimes K}) = \frac{(K-1) \cdot K}{\ln(4)} \cdot E^2 + \mathcal{O}(E^3) \quad (\text{II.9})$$

$$D(\tilde{p}_E^{(K)} \parallel \tilde{p}_E^{\otimes K}) = \frac{2(K-1) \cdot K}{\ln(2)} \cdot E^2 + \mathcal{O}(E^3). \quad (\text{II.10})$$

Thus we have  $\lim_{E \rightarrow 0} D(\rho_E^{(K)}, \rho_E^{\otimes K}) / D(p_E^{(K)} \parallel p_E^{\otimes K}) = \infty$  and  $\lim_{E \rightarrow 0} D(\rho_E^{(K)}, \rho_E^{\otimes K}) / D(\tilde{p}_E^{(K)} \parallel \tilde{p}_E^{\otimes K}) = \infty$ .

Finally we note the optimal scaling for  $E = 0$  can be obtained using passive optics and photon counting:

*Theorem 3:* Employing a Hadamard interferometer [8] followed by photon counting yields error exponent

$$D_{PH} = K \cdot \ln(K) \cdot E + \mathcal{O}(E^2). \quad (\text{II.11})$$

Results are illustrated in Figure 1. Where not indicated otherwise, the notation for quantum systems is borrowed from [22].

### III. PROOFS

*Proof of Theorem 1:* We start out by proving the formula for the relative entropy  $D(p_E^{(K)} \| p_E^{\otimes K})$  in Subsection III-A, from which the one for  $D(\tilde{p}_E^{(K)} \| \tilde{p}_E^{\otimes K})$  follows with minor modifications in Subsection III-B, and finally show the lower bound for  $D(\rho_E^{(K)} \| \rho_E^{\otimes K})$  in Subsection III-C.

#### A. Analysis State of the Art: Heterodyne Detection

For the state-of-the-art version of the hypothesis testing problem, we assume the  $K$  detectors perform either heterodyne or homodyne detection on their received signal prior to sending it forward to the processing center. In both cases, they will obtain multi-variate normal distributed random variables  $p_E^{(K)}$  in case the correlated state  $\rho_E^{(K)}$  is given and  $p_E^{\otimes K}$  in case the uncorrelated quantum state  $\rho_E^{\otimes K}$  is given. In such cases, the relative entropy  $D(p_E^{(K)} \| p_E^{\otimes K})$  can be calculated based on a well-known identity. The probability density of a multi-variate normal distribution  $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$  on  $n$  modes can be written as

$$\mathbb{R}^n \ni t \rightarrow (2\pi)^{-n/2} \det(\Sigma)^{-1/2} e^{-(t-\mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (t-\mu)} \quad (\text{III.1})$$

where  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the mean and the  $n \times n$  matrix  $\Sigma$  the variance of the distribution. For two such distributions  $\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2$  with means  $\mu_1, \mu_2$  and variances  $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2$  we have [20, Chapter 1]

$$D(\mathcal{N}_1 \| \mathcal{N}_2) = \frac{1}{2 \ln(2)} (D + M + T), \quad (\text{III.2})$$

where  $D := \ln \det(\Sigma_2) - \ln \det(\Sigma_1)$ ,  $M := (\mu_2 - \mu_1)^T \Sigma_2^{-1} (\mu_2 - \mu_1)$  and  $T := \text{Tr} \{ \Sigma_2^{-1} \Sigma_1 - \mathbb{1}_n \}$ . Normal distributions enter our analysis via heterodyne detection applied to a coherent state  $|\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|$ , leading [25] to a distribution of measurement results  $x \in \mathbb{C}$  as

$$p(x|\alpha) = H_x(|\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|) = \frac{1}{\pi} e^{-|\alpha-x|^2}. \quad (\text{III.3})$$

If the source is measured using  $K$  heterodyne detectors, the probability density for receiving result  $x^k = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$  is

$$p^{(K)}(x^k) = \frac{1}{\pi^E} \int e^{-\frac{|\alpha|^2}{E}} \prod_{i=1}^K H_{x_i}(|\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|) d\alpha \quad (\text{III.4})$$

$$= \frac{1}{\pi^{k+1} E} \int e^{-\frac{|\alpha|^2}{E}} e^{-\sum_{i=1}^K |\alpha-x_i|^2} d\alpha. \quad (\text{III.5})$$

Writing  $x_i = x_{i1} + ix_{i2}$ , the integration over the complex variable  $\alpha = a + ib$  can be carried out based on the formula

$$\int e^{-\frac{a^2}{E} - \sum_i (a-t_i)^2} da = C_{K,E} e^{-\sum_i t_i^2 + \frac{E(\sum_i t_i)^2}{1+K \cdot E}} \quad (\text{III.6})$$

where summations run from 1 to  $K$  and  $C_{K,E} := \sqrt{\frac{\pi E}{1+K \cdot E}}$ . By using the identity  $|\alpha|^2 = \Re(\alpha)^2 + \Im(\alpha)^2$  we conclude from (III.5) that the distribution of the complex measurement results  $x^k$  is actually independent between their real- and their imaginary parts: Defining

$$q^{(K)}(t^k) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\pi^{k+1} E}} \int e^{-\frac{a^2}{E}} e^{-\sum_{i=1}^K (a-t_i)^2} da \quad (\text{III.7})$$

and using our convention  $x_i = x_{i1} + ix_{i2}$  again we get

$$q^{(K)}(x^k) = q^{(K)}(\Re x^k) \cdot q^{(K)}(\Im x^k) \quad (\text{III.8})$$

where real- and imaginary parts of a vector are taken per component. Since  $D(r \otimes s \| u \otimes v) = D(r \| u) + D(s \| v)$  we know that we can proceed to evaluate only the real part without loss of generality. We thus set  $t^k := \Re x^k$  and proceed by calculating the matrix  $\Sigma_{q^{(K)}}^{-1}$  corresponding to  $q$ , whose entries we can based on (III.6) identify as:

$$(\Sigma_{q^{(K)}}^{-1})_{ij} := \frac{(1+E(K-1))\delta_{i,j} - (1-\delta_{i,j})E}{1+K \cdot E}. \quad (\text{III.9})$$

where and correspondingly according to Lemma 4 the inverse  $\Sigma_{q^{(K)}}$  can be calculated to have a similar structure:

$$(\Sigma_{q^{(K)}})_{i,j} = (1+E)\delta_{i,j} + E(1-\delta_{i,j}). \quad (\text{III.10})$$

The marginals of  $q^{(K)}$  all have identical distributions, and each of them is calculated to equal

$$q(t) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\pi(1+E)}} e^{-t^2/(1+E)}. \quad (\text{III.11})$$

Since all correlations vanish, we have

$$\Sigma_{q^{\otimes K}}^{-1} = \frac{1}{1+E} \mathbb{1}. \quad (\text{III.12})$$

It then holds

$$\det(\Sigma_{q^{\otimes K}}) = (1+E)^K, \quad (\text{III.13})$$

$$\det(\Sigma_{q^{(K)}}) = 1+K \cdot E \quad (\text{III.14})$$

$$\text{tr}(\Sigma_{q^{\otimes K}}^{-1} \Sigma_{q^{(K)}}) = (1+E)^{-1} \text{tr}(\Sigma_{q^{(K)}}) = K. \quad (\text{III.15})$$

Using (III.2) and noting  $M = 0$  in our case, we get the result

$$D(q_E^{(K)} \| q_E^{\otimes K}) = 2 \cdot D(q^{(K)} \| q^{\otimes K}) \quad (\text{III.16})$$

$$= \log \det(\Sigma_{q^{\otimes K}}) - \log \det(\Sigma_{q^{(K)}}) \quad (\text{III.17})$$

$$= \log \left( \frac{(1+E)^K}{1+K \cdot E} \right). \quad (\text{III.18})$$

#### B. Analysis State of the Art: Homodyne Detection

When homodyne detection is used, the conditional probability of getting the *real-valued* measurement outcome  $x$  given the state was  $|\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|$  is given by  $p(x|\alpha) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-(x-\sqrt{2}\Re(\alpha))^2/2}$  [12, Eq. (11)]. This equivalent to studying the previous problem of heterodyne detection, but with only one quadrature and instead an energy which is increased by a factor of 2. The relative entropy therefore changes to

$$D(\tilde{p}_E^{(K)} \| \tilde{p}_E^{\otimes K}) = \frac{1}{2} \log \left( \frac{(1+2E)^K}{1+2KE} \right). \quad (\text{III.19})$$

#### C. Quantum Approach

In order to prove the desired lower bound, we first have to deal with the problem that the system of interest is infinite-dimensional, and show that for the specific case treated here, we have  $D_Q(\rho_E^{(K)}, \rho_E^{\otimes K}) \geq D(\rho_E^{(K)} \| \rho_E^{\otimes K})$  (hypothesis testing bound). Afterwards, we proceed by noting that  $D(\rho_E^{(K)} \| \rho_E^{\otimes K}) = K \cdot S(\rho_E) - S(\rho_E^{(K)})$  and then calculating the two respective entropies.

a) *Hypothesis Testing Bound*: For convenience, we base our work on [4] which provides near-optimal tests even when the Hilbert space size grows logarithmically with the block-length. We benefit from the fact that all involved systems have bounded energy, which allows us to proceed as follows: We truncate each involved system at finite energy, and use the optimal projection for the resulting finite-dimensional systems. By controlling the approximation error, we are then able to utilize the continuity of entropy and the specific structure of our hypothesis testing problem to arrive at the desired result. Using Lemma 5, we have with  $T_N := \sum_{n=0}^N |n\rangle\langle n|$

$$\text{tr}(T_N \rho_E) \geq 1 - 2^{-N} \quad (\text{III.20})$$

for large enough  $N$ . We conclude that for a suitable  $\kappa_1 > 0$ :

$$\min\{\text{tr}(T_N^{\otimes K} \rho_E^{\otimes K}), \text{tr}(T_N^{\otimes K} \rho_E^{(K)})\} \geq 1 - 2^{-\kappa_1 N}. \quad (\text{III.21})$$

Define  $\mathcal{N}(\rho) := T_N \rho T_N + \text{tr}((\mathbb{1} - T_N)\rho)|0\rangle\langle 0|$  and

$$\tilde{\rho}_E^{(K)} := \mathcal{N}^{\otimes K}(\rho_E^{(K)}), \quad \tilde{\rho}_E^{\otimes K} := \mathcal{N}(\rho_E)^{\otimes K}. \quad (\text{III.22})$$

Then from (III.20) we know that for some  $\kappa_2 > 0$

$$\max\{\|\tilde{\rho}_E^{(K)} - \rho_E^{(K)}\|_1, \|\tilde{\rho}_E^{\otimes K} - \rho_E^{\otimes K}\|_1\} \leq 2^{-\kappa_2 \cdot N}. \quad (\text{III.23})$$

According to [4, Eqn. (17)] there is for every  $\delta > 0$  a sequence  $(P_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of non-negative operators so that for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists an  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $n \geq N_0$

$$\text{tr}(P_n \tilde{\rho}_E^{(K)}) \geq 1 - \epsilon \quad (\text{III.24})$$

$$\text{tr}(P_n \tilde{\rho}_E^{\otimes K}) \leq 2^{-n \cdot (D(\tilde{\rho}_E^{(K)} \|\tilde{\rho}_E^{\otimes K}) - \delta)}. \quad (\text{III.25})$$

Let  $\{K_i\}_i$  be the Kraus representation of  $\mathcal{N}$ . Then we have, for every quantum state  $\sigma$  and non-negative matrix  $X$ ,

$$\text{tr}(X \mathcal{N}(\sigma)) = \sum_i \text{tr}(X K_i \sigma K_i^\dagger) = \text{tr}\left(\sum_i K_i^\dagger X K_i \sigma\right).$$

In our particular situation,  $P'_n := \sum_i K_i^\dagger P_n K_i$  thus satisfies

$$\text{tr}(P'_n \rho_E^{(K)}) \geq 1 - \epsilon \quad (\text{III.26})$$

$$\text{tr}(P'_n \rho_E^{\otimes K}) \leq 2^{-n \cdot (D(\tilde{\rho}_E^{(K)} \|\tilde{\rho}_E^{\otimes K}) - \delta)}. \quad (\text{III.27})$$

Since  $D(\tilde{\rho}_E^{(K)} \|\tilde{\rho}_E^{\otimes K}) = K \cdot S(\tilde{\rho}_E) - S(\tilde{\rho}_E^{(K)})$  and since  $\text{tr}(\hat{n} \tilde{\rho}_E) \leq \text{tr}(\hat{n} \rho_E)$  and  $\text{tr}(\hat{n}_K \tilde{\rho}_E^{(K)}) \leq \text{tr}(\hat{n}_K \rho_E^{(K)})$  where  $\hat{n}$  and  $\hat{n}_K$  are the photon number operators for 1 and  $K$  modes, respectively, and the original ensembles have finite energy, we may utilize the fact that for such states the entropy is continuous in  $\|\cdot\|_1$  (see [26] and [3]), so that (III.23) and the choice  $N = \log(n)/\kappa_3$  for a suitably chosen  $\kappa_3 > 0$  implies

$$D(\tilde{\rho}_E^{(K)} \|\tilde{\rho}_E^{\otimes K}) \rightarrow D(\rho_E^{(K)} \|\rho_E^{\otimes K}), \quad (\text{III.28})$$

and at the same time  $\text{tr}(P_n \tilde{\rho}_E^{(K)}) \geq 1 - \epsilon - \frac{1}{n}$ . Note that the speed of convergence in [4] is tied to the variance  $V_N$  of the function  $-\log \mu_K$  defined via  $\mu_K(n^k) := \langle n^k, \tilde{\rho}_E^{\otimes K} n^k \rangle$  with respect to the discrete random variable  $N^K$  defined via  $\tilde{s}_N(n^K) := \mathbb{P}(N^K = n^k) = \langle n^k, \tilde{\rho}_E^{(K)} n^k \rangle$ . For  $N = \infty$  it holds  $V_\infty = E(1+E) \log^2(1+E)/E$ . Due to the structure of

$s_N$  one can show that  $V_N \leq V(1 + 2^{-\kappa_4 \cdot N})$ . Thus the central limit theorem for discrete random variables guarantees (III.26), as in [4]. By construction of  $\tilde{\rho}_E^{(K)}$  and  $\tilde{\rho}_E^{\otimes K}$ , this implies the inequality

$$D_Q(\rho_E^{(K)}, \rho_E^{\otimes K}) \geq D(\rho_E^{(K)} \|\rho_E^{\otimes K}). \quad (\text{III.29})$$

b) *Computation of Entropy*: To perform calculations, we use the conventions as described in [25] with the small add-on that we use subscripts like  $\langle \hat{A} \rangle_\rho$  to indicate that the expectation of operator  $\hat{A}$  is meant to be taken with respect to the state  $\rho$ . Using the convention of physical constants as in [22], [25], we have canonical position- and momentum operators equal to  $\hat{q}_k = \hat{a}_k + \hat{a}_k^\dagger$  and  $\hat{p}_k = i(\hat{a}_k^\dagger - \hat{a}_k)$ . The following expectation values are needed for the computation:

$$\langle \hat{p} \rangle_\alpha = \text{tr}(\hat{p}|\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|) = 2\Im(\alpha) \quad (\text{III.30})$$

$$\langle \hat{q} \rangle_\alpha = \text{tr}(\hat{q}|\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|) = 2\Re(\alpha) \quad (\text{III.31})$$

$$\langle \hat{p}^2 \rangle_\alpha = \text{tr}(\hat{p}^2|\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|) = 1 + 4\Re(\alpha)^2 \quad (\text{III.32})$$

$$\langle \hat{q}^2 \rangle_\alpha = \text{tr}(\hat{q}^2|\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|) = 1 + 4\Im(\alpha)^2 \quad (\text{III.33})$$

Observations (III.30) and (III.31) imply

$$\langle \hat{p}_k \rangle_{\rho_E^{(K)}} = \langle \hat{q}_k \rangle_{\rho_E^{(K)}} = 0 \quad \forall k \in \{1, \dots, K\}. \quad (\text{III.34})$$

To compute the covariance matrix of  $\rho_E^{(K)}$  we use the integrals

$$\frac{1}{\pi E} \int e^{-|\alpha|^2/E} \langle \hat{p} \rangle_\alpha \langle \hat{p} \rangle_\alpha d\alpha = 2E \quad (\text{III.35})$$

$$\frac{1}{\pi E} \int e^{-|\alpha|^2/E} \langle \hat{q} \rangle_\alpha \langle \hat{q} \rangle_\alpha d\alpha = 2E \quad (\text{III.36})$$

$$\frac{1}{\pi E} \int e^{-|\alpha|^2/E} \langle \hat{p} \rangle_\alpha \langle \hat{q} \rangle_\alpha d\alpha = 0. \quad (\text{III.37})$$

Based on (III.34) we can draw first conclusions on the structure of the covariance matrix  $V^{(K)}$  of the state  $\rho_E^{(K)}$ :

$$(V^{(K)})_{ij} := \frac{1}{2} \langle \hat{x}_i \hat{x}_j + \hat{x}_j \hat{x}_i \rangle_{\rho_E^{(K)}}. \quad (\text{III.38})$$

If  $i = j$  this implies  $(V^{(K)})_{ii} = \langle \hat{x}_i \hat{x}_i \rangle_{\rho_E^{(K)}}$ , and equations (III.32) and (III.33) tell us that  $(V^{(K)})_{ii} = 1 + 2E$  holds.

If  $i \neq j$  but both  $i$  and  $j$  and either  $i$  is even and  $j$  is odd or the other way around, we are looking at correlations between momentum and position of different subsystems, and equation (III.37) implies that  $(V^{(K)})_{ij} = 0$  must hold. If instead  $i$  and  $j$  are both even or both odd, then equations (III.35) and (III.36) imply that  $(V^{(K)})_{ij} = E$ . Thus  $V^{(K)}$  is a Toeplitz matrix defined by the vector  $v^{2K}$  with entries  $v_1 = 2E + 1$  and  $v_{2i} = 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, K$  and  $v_{2i+1} = 2E$  for  $i = 1, \dots, K - 1$ . The entropy of  $\rho^{(K)}$  is calculated based on its symplectic eigenvalues  $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_K$ , which equal the non-negative eigenvalues of the matrix  $i\Omega V^{(K)}$  where

$$\Omega = \bigoplus_{k=1}^K \omega, \quad \omega = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{III.39})$$

Using the structure of our states and the fact that the thermal state  $\rho_E$  has entropy  $g(E)$  [11], we see that

$$D(\rho_E^{(K)} \parallel \rho_E^{\otimes K}) = S(\rho_E^{\otimes K}) - S(\rho_E^{(K)}) \quad (\text{III.40})$$

$$= K \cdot S(\rho_E) - S(\rho_E^{(K)}) \quad (\text{III.41})$$

$$= K \cdot g(E) - \sum_{i=1}^K f(\nu_i). \quad (\text{III.42})$$

It remains to calculate the symplectic eigenvalues  $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_K$  to arrive at the desired result. For  $K = 2$ ,  $V^{(2)}$  is given by

$$V^{(2)} = 2 \begin{pmatrix} E + \frac{1}{2} & 0 & E & 0 \\ 0 & E + \frac{1}{2} & 0 & E \\ E & 0 & E + \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & E & 0 & E + \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{III.43})$$

The symplectic eigenvalues of  $V^{(2)}$  are equal to 1 and  $1 + 4E$ . The relative entropy for  $K = 2$  therefore evaluates to

$$D(\rho_E^{(2)} \parallel \rho_E^{\otimes 2}) = 2 \cdot S(\rho_A) - S(\rho_{AB}) \quad (\text{III.44})$$

$$= 2 \cdot g(E) - f(1 + 4 \cdot E). \quad (\text{III.45})$$

For  $K > 2$ , the vectors  $w_i := -ie_1 - e_2 - ie_i + e_{i+1}$  for  $i = 3, 5, \dots, K - 1$  are all eigenvectors to eigenvalue 1 for  $i\Omega V^{(K)}$ , while  $(i, 1, i, 1, \dots, i, 1)$  is the vector to eigenvalue  $(1 + KE)$ , as can be proven by induction. ■

*Proof of Theorem 2:* The series expansions follow from elementary calculations which we omit for brevity. ■

*Proof of Theorem 3:* Given an incident field  $|\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|^{\otimes K}$  an optical Hadamard transformation [8] will transform it to  $|\sqrt{K}\alpha\rangle\langle\sqrt{K}\alpha| \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|^{\otimes (K-1)}$ . Applying the POVM  $\{\Pi_{b^k}\}_{b^k \in \{0,1\}^K}$  where  $\Pi_{b^k} := \otimes_{i=1}^K \Pi_{b_i}$  with  $\Pi_0 := |0\rangle\langle 0|$  and  $\Pi_1 := \mathbb{1} - \Pi_0$  yields distribution  $p_{(1+KE)^{-1}} \otimes p_1^{\otimes (K-1)}$  when the correlated source is present and  $p_{(1+E)^{-1}}^{\otimes K}$  when the uncorrelated source is present, where  $p_x(0) := x$ . Calculation of the relative entropy  $D(p_{(1+KE)^{-1}} \otimes p_1^{\otimes (K-1)} \parallel p_{(1+E)^{-1}}^{\otimes K})$  and Taylor expansion then yield the result. ■

#### D. Appendix

*Lemma 4:* Let the  $n \times n$  matrix  $A$  have entries  $(A)_{i,j} = (a - b)\delta_{i,j} + b$  where  $a \neq b$ . Then  $A^{-1}$  exists and has entries

$$(A^{-1})_{i,j} = C^{-1} \cdot [(a + (n - 2)b)\delta_{i,j} - b(1 - \delta_{i,j})] \quad (\text{III.46})$$

where  $C = a^2 + (n - 2)ab - (n - 1)b^2$ . Further, the determinant of  $A$  is given by  $\det(A) = (a - b)^{n-1}(a + (n - 1)b)$ .

*Proof of Lemma 4:* The matrix  $A$  has  $n$  eigenvectors where the first is given by  $\sum_{i=1}^n e_i$  with eigenvalue  $a + (n - 1)b$ , and the next  $n - 1$  vectors are given by  $-e_1 + e_i$  (with eigenvalue  $a - b$ ). As a result, the determinant is given by  $(a - b)^{n-1}(a + (n - 1)b)$ . ■

*Lemma 5:* Let  $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $T_N := \sum_{n=0}^N |n\rangle\langle n|$ . Then

$$\text{tr } T_N(|\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{N!} \cdot \max\{2, |\alpha|^2\}^N \quad (\text{III.47})$$

Let  $E > 0$ . If  $N \geq 2 \cdot 50^2 \cdot E \cdot \log(e^{-1})$ , then

$$\text{tr } T_N \frac{1}{\pi E} \int e^{-|\alpha|^2/E} |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha| d\alpha \geq 1 - 2^{-N}. \quad (\text{III.48})$$

*Proof of Lemma 5:* We first prove (III.47), from which (III.48) follows. To show this preliminary result, we first introduce the Gamma- and the incomplete Gamma functions:

$$\Gamma(a) := \int_0^\infty t^{a-1} e^{-t} dt \quad (\text{III.49})$$

$$\gamma(a, z) := \int_0^z t^{a-1} e^{-t} dt \quad (\text{III.50})$$

$$\Gamma(a, z) := \int_z^\infty t^{a-1} e^{-t} dt. \quad (\text{III.51})$$

The incomplete gamma functions can be used to define a probability distribution [1, 6.5.1]

$$P(a, z) := \Gamma(a)^{-1} \gamma(a, z). \quad (\text{III.52})$$

which [1, 6.5.13] obeys the relation

$$P(a, z) = 1 - e^{-z} \sum_{n=0}^a \frac{z^n}{n!} \quad (\text{III.53})$$

for  $a \in \mathbb{N}$ . Upon setting  $z = |\alpha|^2$  and  $a = N$  we obtain

$$\text{tr } T_N |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha| = e^{-|\alpha|^2} \sum_{n=0}^N \frac{|\alpha|^{2n}}{n!} = 1 - \gamma(N, |\alpha|^2)/N!$$

To obtain a lower bound on  $\text{tr } T_N |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|$  we derive an upper bound on  $\gamma(a, z)$  which is tight for  $a \gg z > 0$ :

$$\gamma(a, z) = \int_0^1 t^{a-1} e^{-t} dt + \int_1^z t^{a-1} e^{-t} dt \quad (\text{III.54})$$

$$\leq \int_0^1 t^{a-1} dt + \int_1^z t^{a-1} e^{-1} dt \quad (\text{III.55})$$

$$= \frac{1}{a} + \frac{e^{-1}}{a} (z^a - 1) \quad (\text{III.56})$$

$$\leq \max\{2, z^a\}. \quad (\text{III.57})$$

This shows the first part of Lemma 5. We then utilize Stirling's approximation in the weak version  $N! \geq N^N e^{-N}$  and our assumption  $N \geq 8 \cdot e \cdot \max\{2, |\alpha|^2\}$  to arrive at

$$\text{tr } T_N |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha| \geq 1 - 4^{-N}. \quad (\text{III.58})$$

Let us define  $B(r) := \{\alpha : |\alpha|^2 \leq r\}$ . As a result of the formula  $\frac{2}{E} \int_0^R r e^{-r^2/E} r dr = 1 - e^{-R^2/E}$  we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \int \frac{e^{-|\alpha|^2/E}}{\pi E} \text{tr } T_N |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha| d\alpha &\geq \int_{B(N/50)} \frac{e^{-|\alpha|^2/E}}{\pi E} d\alpha (1 - 4^{-N}) \\ &\geq (1 - e^{-(N/50)^2/E}) (1 - 4^{-N}) \geq 1 - 2^{-N}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{III.59})$$

#### IV. CONCLUSION

We motivated a novel quantum hypothesis testing problem, and provided proof of an unbounded quantum advantage in the low energy regime. Our analysis shows that joint detection methods may not only improve communication systems [2], [7], but also sensing abilities related to a variety of applications. Given that our problem statement describes the analysis of (weak) classical electromagnetic radiation, our findings shine some light on potential fields of application for quantum computing. We leave the analysis of concrete detection schemes [8], [21] as well as possible connections to recent work on learning classical structures from quantum data [9] to future work.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun. *Handbook of Mathematical Functions with Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables*. UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, 1972.
- [2] Konrad Banaszek, Ludwig Kunz, Michal Jachura, and Marcin Jarzyna. Quantum limits in optical communications. *Journal of Lightwave Technology*, 38(10):2741–2754, May 2020.
- [3] Simon Becker, Nilanjana Datta, and Michael G. Jabbour. From classical to quantum: Uniform continuity bounds on entropies in infinite dimensions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 69:4128–4144, 2021.
- [4] Igor Bjelakovic and Rainer Siegmund-Schultze. Quantum stein’s lemma revisited, inequalities for quantum entropies, and a concavity theorem of lieb, 2012.
- [5] N. Cai, A. Winter, and R.W. Yeung. Quantum privacy and quantum wiretap channels. *Probl Inf Transm*, 40:318–336, 2004.
- [6] Andrzej Cichocki, Danilo Mandic, Lieven De Lathauwer, Guoxu Zhou, Qibin Zhao, Cesar Caiafa, and HUY ANH PHAN. Tensor decompositions for signal processing applications: From two-way to multiway component analysis. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 32(2):145–163, March 2015.
- [7] V. Giovannetti, R. García-Patrón, N. J. Cerf, and A. S. Holevo. Ultimate classical communication rates of quantum optical channels. *Nature Photonics*, 8(10):796–800, September 2014.
- [8] Saikat Guha. Structured optical receivers to attain superadditive capacity and the holevo limit. *Physical Review Letters*, 106(24), jun 2011.
- [9] Mohsen Heidari, Arun Padakandla, and Wojciech Szpankowski. A theoretical framework for learning from quantum data. In *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 1469–1474, 2021.
- [10] F. Hiai and D. Petz. The proper formula for relative entropy and its asymptotics in quantum probability. *Commun.Math. Phys.*, 143:99–114, 1991.
- [11] Alexander S. Holevo. *Quantum Systems, Channels, Information*. DE GRUYTER, Berlin, Boston, jan 2012.
- [12] Toru Kawakubo and Katsuji Yaamamoto. Optical homodyne detection in view of the joint probability distribution. *Physical Review A*, 82(3), September 2010.
- [13] Renaud B. Kim, Olivia P. Alge, Gang Liu, Ben E. Biesterveld, Glenn Wakam, Aaron M. Williams, Michael R. Mathis, Kayvan Najarian, and Jonathan Gryak. Prediction of postoperative cardiac events in multiple surgical cohorts using a multimodal and integrative decision support system. *Sci Rep*, 12:11347, 2022.
- [14] Tamara G. Kolda and Brett W. Bader. Tensor decompositions and applications. *SIAM Review*, 51(3):455–500, September 2009.
- [15] Carolina Bergeling Linda Karlsson, Emma Fallenius and Bo Bernhardsson. Tensor decomposition of EEG signals for transfer learning applications. *Brain-Computer Interfaces*, 11(4):178–192, 2024.
- [16] Valentinian Lungu and Ioannis Kontoyiannis. Finite-sample expansions for the optimal error probability in asymmetric binary hypothesis testing, 2024.
- [17] Kristina Naskovska, Stephan Lau, Amr Aboughazala, Martin Haardt, and Jens Haueisen. Joint meg-eeeg signal decomposition using the coupled secsi framework: Validation on a controlled experiment. In *2017 IEEE 7th International Workshop on Computational Advances in Multi-Sensor Adaptive Processing (CAMSAP)*, pages 1–5, 2017.
- [18] Janis Nötzel and Walter Swetly. Deducing Truth From Correlation. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(12):7505–7517, 2016.
- [19] Tomohiro Ogawa and Hiroshi Nagaoka. *Strong Converse and Stein’s Lemma in Quantum Hypothesis Testing*, page 28–42. WORLD SCIENTIFIC, February 2005.
- [20] L. Pardo. *Statistical Inference Based on Divergence Measures*. Statistics: A Series of Textbooks and Monographs. CRC Press, New York, 2018.
- [21] Matteo Rosati. Decoding protocols for classical communication on quantum channels, 2017.
- [22] A. Serafini. *Quantum Continuous Variables: A Primer of Theoretical Methods*. CRC Press, 2023.
- [23] A Spelta. Financial market predictability with tensor decomposition and links forecast. *Appl Netw Sci*, 2(7), 2017.
- [24] Géza Tóth and Iagoba Apellaniz. Quantum metrology from a quantum information science perspective. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 47(42):424006, October 2014.
- [25] Christian Weedbrook, Stefano Pirandola, Raúl García-Patrón, Nicolas J. Cerf, Timothy C. Ralph, Jeffrey H. Shapiro, and Seth Lloyd. Gaussian quantum information. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 84(2):621–669, May 2012.
- [26] Andreas J. Winter. Tight uniform continuity bounds for quantum entropies: Conditional entropy, relative entropy distance and energy constraints. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 347:291–313, 2015.
- [27] W. Wootters and W.A. Zurek. A single quantum cannot be cloned. *Nature*, 299:802–803, 1982.