

# Maximal $p$ -norms of entanglement breaking channels

Christopher King  
Department of Mathematics  
Northeastern University  
Boston MA 02115  
king@neu.edu

November 15, 2018

## **Abstract**

It is shown that when one of the components of a product channel is entanglement breaking, the output state with maximal  $p$ -norm is always a product state. This result complements Shor's theorem that both minimal entropy and Holevo capacity are additive for entanglement breaking channels. It is also shown how Shor's results can be recovered from the  $p$ -norm results by considering their behavior for  $p$  close to one.

Holevo [1] introduced the following class of channels:

$$\Phi(\rho) = \sum_{k=1}^K R_k \operatorname{Tr}(X_k \rho) \quad (1)$$

where each  $R_k$  is a density matrix and where the  $\{X_k\}$  form a POVM, that is  $X_k \geq 0$  and  $\sum X_k = I$ . As Shor pointed out [2], channels of this form are entanglement breaking, meaning that the state  $(\Phi \otimes I)(\rho_{12})$  is separable for any bipartite state  $\rho_{12}$ . For this reason these channels are now known as entanglement breaking (EB) channels. Shor proved additivity of the minimal entropy and the Holevo capacity for EB channels [2], thereby settling the question of their classical information-carrying capacity.

The purpose of this note is to show that EB channels also satisfy another additivity-type property involving the maximal  $p$ -norm. This notion was introduced by Amosov, Holevo and Werner [3], and involves the following non-commutative version of the usual  $l_p$  norm for  $p \geq 1$ :

$$\|A\|_p = \left( \operatorname{Tr} |A|^p \right)^{1/p} \quad (2)$$

The maximal  $p$ -norm of a channel  $\Omega$  is defined to be

$$\nu_p(\Omega) = \sup_{\rho} \|\Omega(\rho)\|_p \quad (3)$$

where the sup runs over density matrices in the domain of  $\Omega$ .

**Theorem 1** *Let  $\Phi$  be an entanglement breaking channel, and let  $\Omega$  be an arbitrary channel. Then for any  $p \geq 1$ ,*

$$\nu_p(\Phi \otimes \Omega) = \nu_p(\Phi) \nu_p(\Omega) \quad (4)$$

The proof of Theorem 1 relies on an intermediate bound which we state below as Lemma 2. To set up the notation, consider the action of the channel (1) on a bipartite state  $\rho_{12}$ :

$$(\Phi \otimes I)(\rho_{12}) = \sum_{k=1}^K R_k \otimes \operatorname{Tr}_1 [(X_k \otimes I)(\rho_{12})] \quad (5)$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} x_k &= \text{Tr} [(X_k \otimes I)(\rho_{12})] \\ G_k &= x_k^{-1} \text{Tr}_1 [(X_k \otimes I)(\rho_{12})] \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Then (5) reads

$$(\Phi \otimes I)(\rho_{12}) = \sum_{k=1}^K x_k R_k \otimes G_k \quad (7)$$

where now  $\{R_k, G_k\}$  are all density matrices, and  $x_k \geq 0$  with  $\sum x_k = 1$ . Also, writing  $\rho_1 = \text{Tr}_2(\rho_{12})$  for the reduced density matrix it follows from (7) that

$$\Phi(\rho_1) = \sum_{k=1}^K x_k R_k \quad (8)$$

Define the following  $1 \times K$  block row vector:

$$R = \left( (x_1 R_1)^{1/2} \quad \cdots \quad (x_K R_K)^{1/2} \right) \quad (9)$$

Then  $R^*$  is a  $K \times 1$  block column vector, and (8) can be rewritten as

$$\Phi(\rho_1) = R R^* \quad (10)$$

**Lemma 2** For all  $p \geq 1$ ,

$$\text{Tr} \left( (\Phi \otimes I)(\rho_{12}) \right)^p \leq \sum_{k=1}^K \text{Tr} [(R^* R)^p]_{kk} \text{Tr} [(G_k)^p] \quad (11)$$

where  $[(R^* R)^p]_{kk}$  is the  $k^{\text{th}}$  diagonal block of the  $K \times K$  block matrix  $(R^* R)^p$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1:* let  $\rho_{12} = (I \otimes \Omega)(\tau_{12})$  so that

$$(\Phi \otimes I)(\rho_{12}) = (\Phi \otimes \Omega)(\tau_{12}) \quad (12)$$

Then from (6) it follows that

$$G_k = \Omega \left( x_k^{-1} \text{Tr}_1 [(X_k \otimes I)(\tau_{12})] \right) = \Omega \left( G'_k \right) \quad (13)$$

where  $G'_k = \text{Tr}_1[(X_k \otimes I)(\tau_{12})]$  is a density matrix. Therefore (3) implies that

$$\text{Tr}[(G_k)^p] \leq \nu_p(\Omega)^p \quad (14)$$

Together with (11) and (12) this implies

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} \left( (\Phi \otimes \Omega)(\tau_{12}) \right)^p &\leq \nu_p(\Omega)^p \sum_{k=1}^K \text{Tr} [(R^* R)^p]_{kk} \\ &= \nu_p(\Omega)^p \text{Tr} [(R^* R)^p] \\ &= \nu_p(\Omega)^p \text{Tr} [(R R^*)^p] \\ &= \nu_p(\Omega)^p \text{Tr} [\Phi(\rho_1)^p] \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where we used the fact that the matrices  $R^* R$  and  $R R^*$  share the same nonzero spectrum (and where  $\text{Tr}$  changes its meaning several times). Using again the definition of maximal  $p$ -norm (3) we deduce

$$\text{Tr} \left( (\Phi \otimes \Omega)(\tau_{12}) \right)^p \leq \nu_p(\Omega)^p \nu_p(\Phi)^p \quad (16)$$

Since this bound holds for all  $\tau_{12}$  it follows that

$$\nu_p(\Phi \otimes \Omega) \leq \nu_p(\Phi) \nu_p(\Omega) \quad (17)$$

and this implies the Theorem since the right side of (4) can be achieved with a product state. **QED**

*Proof of Lemma 2:* this is an application of the Lieb-Thirring inequality [4], which states that for positive matrices  $A$  and  $B$ , and any  $p \geq 1$ ,

$$\text{Tr} \left( A^{1/2} B A^{1/2} \right)^p \leq \text{Tr} \left( A^{p/2} B^p A^{p/2} \right) = \text{Tr} \left( A^p B^p \right) \quad (18)$$

If  $B \geq 0$  and  $C$  is a general (non-positive) matrix, then  $CBC^*$  has the same nonzero spectrum as the matrix  $(C^*C)^{1/2} B (C^*C)^{1/2}$ , so the Lieb-Thirring inequality also implies that in this case

$$\text{Tr} \left( CBC^* \right)^p \leq \text{Tr} \left( (C^*C)^p B^p \right) \quad (19)$$

Recall (7), and define

$$F_k = (x_k R_k)^{1/2} \otimes I \quad (20)$$

$$H_k = I \otimes G_k \quad (21)$$

Then (7) can be rewritten as

$$(\Phi \otimes I)(\rho_{12}) = (F_1 \ \cdots \ F_K) \begin{pmatrix} H_1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & H_K \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} F_1 \\ \vdots \\ F_K \end{pmatrix} = F H F^* \quad (22)$$

where  $F$  is the  $1 \times K$  block row vector indicated, and  $H$  is the  $K \times K$  diagonal block matrix. Applying (19) gives

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left((\Phi \otimes I)(\rho_{12})\right)^p \leq \mathrm{Tr}\left((F^*F)^p H^p\right) \quad (23)$$

Comparing with (9) shows that

$$(F^*F)^p = (R^*R)^p \otimes I, \quad H_k^p = I \otimes G_k^p \quad (24)$$

and hence the result follows. **QED**

As a further comment we note that Shor's results about additivity of minimal entropy and Holevo capacity [2] for EB channels can also be derived easily from Lemma 2. Taking the derivative of (11) at  $p = 1$  gives

$$S\left((\Phi \otimes I)(\rho_{12})\right) \geq S\left(\Phi(\rho_1)\right) + \sum_{k=1}^K x_k S(G_k) \quad (25)$$

Again letting  $\rho_{12} = (I \otimes \Omega)(\tau_{12})$  and using (13) it follows that

$$S(G_k) = S\left(\Omega(G'_k)\right) \quad (26)$$

where  $G'_k$  is a density matrix. Using the definition of minimal entropy

$$S_{\min}(\Omega) = \inf_{\rho} S\left(\Omega(\rho)\right) \quad (27)$$

it follows from (25) that

$$S_{\min}(\Phi \otimes \Omega) \geq S\left(\Phi(\rho_1)\right) + \sum_{k=1}^K x_k S_{\min}(\Omega) \geq S_{\min}(\Phi) + S_{\min}(\Omega), \quad (28)$$

which immediately implies the additivity of  $S_{\min}$ .

The additivity of Holevo capacity also follows easily from (25). It is convenient to first introduce a new quantity, the minimal average entropy of an output ensemble from the channel, for a fixed average input state  $\rho$ :

$$S_{\text{av}}(\Omega; \rho) = \inf_{\{p_k, \rho_k\}} \left[ \sum_k p_k S(\Omega(\rho_k)) : \sum_k p_k \rho_k = \rho \right] \quad (29)$$

As Matsumoto et al point out [5], the Holevo capacity of a channel  $\Omega$  can be expressed in terms of this average output entropy:

$$\chi^*(\Omega) = \sup_{\rho} \left[ S(\Omega(\rho)) - S_{\text{av}}(\Omega; \rho) \right] \quad (30)$$

**Lemma 3** *Let  $\Phi$  be an entanglement breaking channel, and let  $\Omega$  be an arbitrary channel. Then for any bipartite state  $\tau_{12}$ ,*

$$S_{\text{av}}(\Phi \otimes \Omega; \tau_{12}) \geq S_{\text{av}}(\Phi; \tau_1) + S_{\text{av}}(\Omega; \tau_2) \quad (31)$$

Lemma 3 follows easily from (25), by taking the average input state to be  $\tau_{12} = \sum p_k \tau_{12}^{(k)}$  and applying the bound to each term in the sum

$$\sum_k p_k S(\Phi \otimes \Omega(\tau_{12}^{(k)})) \quad (32)$$

Then combining (31) and (30) with the subadditivity bound

$$S(\Phi \otimes \Omega(\tau_{12})) \leq S(\Phi(\tau_1)) + S(\Omega(\tau_2)) \quad (33)$$

immediately implies that

$$\chi^*(\Phi \otimes \Omega) \leq \chi^*(\Phi) + \chi^*(\Omega), \quad (34)$$

which establishes the additivity result for  $\chi^*$ .

**Acknowledgements** This work was partially supported by National Science Foundation Grant DMS-0101205. Part of this work was completed at a workshop hosted by the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute, and the author is grateful to the workshop organisers and the Institute for the invitation to participate.

## References

- [1] A. S. Holevo, “Quantum coding theorems”, *Russian Math. Surveys*, **53**, 1295–1331 (1999).
- [2] P. Shor, “Additivity of the classical capacity of entanglement-breaking channels”, *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, **43**, no. 9, 4334 – 4340 (2002).
- [3] G. G. Amosov, A. S. Holevo, and R. F. Werner, “On Some Additivity Problems in Quantum Information Theory”, *Problems in Information Transmission*, **36**, 305 – 313 (2000).
- [4] E. Lieb and W. Thirring, “Inequalities for the Moments of the Eigenvalues of the Schrödinger Hamiltonian and Their Relation to Sobolev Inequalities”, in *Studies in Mathematical Physics*, E. Lieb, B. Simon, A. Wightman eds., pp. 269–303 (Princeton University Press, 1976).
- [5] K. Matsumoto, T. Shimono and A. Winter, “Remarks on additivity of the Holevo channel capacity and of the entanglement of formation”, preprint lanl:quant-ph/0206148.