Quantum and private capacities of low-noise channels

arXiv:1705.04335

Felix Leditzky

(JILA & CTQM, University of Colorado Boulder)

Joint work with Debbie Leung and Graeme Smith

ITW Kaohsiung, 10 November 2017







1 Quantum channels and their capacities

- 2 Main result: capacities of low-noise channels
- 3 (Approximate) degradability



1 Quantum channels and their capacities

- 2 Main result: capacities of low-noise channels
- 3 (Approximate) degradability



Quantum channels and their capacities

- Communication (physical evolution) between quantum parties (systems) is modeled with quantum channels.
- A quantum channel N : A → B is a linear, completely positive, trace-preserving map acting on a quantum system A.
- **Many different capacities** depending on the context.
- Quantum capacity Q(N): maximal rate at which entanglement can be generated between A and B through N.
- Private capacity P(N): maximal rate at which secure key can be established between A and B through N.

Coding theorem for ${\mathcal Q}$

Hashing bound:

Coherent information $\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N})$ is achievable,

$$\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{N}) \geq \mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}) \coloneqq \max_{\rho} [S(\mathcal{N}(\rho)) - S((\operatorname{id} \otimes \mathcal{N})(\psi^{\rho}))],$$

where $S(\sigma) = -\operatorname{Tr} \sigma \log \sigma$ is the von Neumann entropy, and $|\psi^{\rho}\rangle$ is a purification of ρ . [Lloyd 1997; Shor 2002; Devetak 2005]

Quantum capacity theorem:

$$\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{N}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n})$$

▶ In general, $Q^{(1)}(N^{\otimes n}) > nQ^{(1)}(N)$, and the regularization over *n* is necessary \implies renders Q(N) intractable to compute!

Complementary channels

▶ For any quantum channel \mathcal{N} : $A \rightarrow B$, there is an isometry

 $V: A \to B \otimes E$ such that $\mathcal{N} = \text{Tr}_E(V \cdot V^{\dagger})$. [Stinespring 1955]

Any isometry V: A → B ⊗ E gives rise to a complementary channel N^c: A → E to the environment,

$$\mathcal{N}^{c}(\rho) \coloneqq \operatorname{Tr}_{B}(V \rho V^{\dagger}).$$

N^c models the loss or *leakage* of information to the environment.

This leakage is "responsible" for super-additivity of Q⁽¹⁾, and makes regularization of Q necessary.

Coding theorems for ${\cal P}$

Let V: A → B ⊗ E be an isometry for N : A → B, and for an ensemble of states {p_x, p_x} define the classical-quantum state

$$ho_{XBE} = \sum_{x}
ho_{x} |x\rangle \langle x|_{X} \otimes V
ho_{x} V^{\dagger}.$$

Define the private information

$$\mathcal{P}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}) := \max_{\{p_x, \rho_x\}} [I(X; B) - I(X; E)],$$

where I(X; B) = S(X) + S(B) - S(XB) is the mutual information.

Private capacity theorem:

[Cai et al. 2004; Devetak 2005]

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{N}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{P}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n})$$

▶ In general, $\mathcal{P}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}) > n\mathcal{P}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}).$

Coding theorems for ${\mathcal Q}$ and ${\mathcal P}$

All inequalities are strict in general:

$$\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}) \leq \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{N}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n})$$

 $|\wedge |\wedge$
 $\mathcal{P}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}) \leq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{N}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{P}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n})$

▶ Trivial situation: identity channel $id: A \rightarrow A$.

$$\mathcal{Q}(\mathsf{id}) = \mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\mathsf{id}) = \mathcal{P}^{(1)}(\mathsf{id}) = \mathcal{P}(\mathsf{id}) \quad (= \log |\mathsf{A}|) \qquad (*)$$

• We call a channel \mathcal{N} low-noise, if $\|\mathcal{N} - \operatorname{id}\|_{\diamond} \leq \varepsilon$.

 $\|\cdot\|_{\diamond}$... diamond norm distance on set of quantum channels.

▶ Is (*) approximately true for low-noise channels? Yes!

1 Quantum channels and their capacities

2 Main result: capacities of low-noise channels

3 (Approximate) degradability



Main result

Quantum and private capacities of low-noise channels

For low-noise channels \mathcal{N} with $\|\operatorname{id} - \mathcal{N}\|_{\diamond} \leq \varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{N}) &= \mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{3/2}\log\varepsilon) \\ \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{N}) &= \mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{3/2}\log\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

For **Pauli channels**, the error term can be improved to $O(\varepsilon^2 \log \varepsilon)$.

▶ Main proof tool: (Approximate) degradability.

1 Quantum channels and their capacities

2 Main result: capacities of low-noise channels

3 (Approximate) degradability



Degradable channels

A channel is called **degradable**, if there is another channel

 $\mathcal{D}: B \to E$ such that $\mathcal{N}^c = \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{N}$. [Devetak and Shor 2005]

- For a degradable channel, the receiver B can locally simulate N^c, i.e., the loss to the environment.
- Degradable channels: [Devetak and Shor 2005; Smith 2008]

$$\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{N}) = \mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}) = \mathcal{P}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}) = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{N}).$$



degradable: $\exists \mathcal{D} \colon B \to E \text{ s.t.}$ $\mathcal{N}^c = \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{N}$

Approximate degradability

- ► Idea: What if degradability is only approximately satisfied? Do we have Q(N) ≈ Q⁽¹⁾(N)?
- **Goal:** Find map \mathcal{D} that brings \mathcal{N} as close as possible to \mathcal{N}^c .
- Measured by degradability parameter [Sutter et al. 2015]

$$\mathsf{dg}(\mathcal{N}) \coloneqq \min_{\mathcal{D}: B \to E} \| \mathcal{N}^{\mathsf{c}} - \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{N} \|_{\diamond}.$$

▶ For
$$\mathcal{N}$$
 with dg $(\mathcal{N}) = \varepsilon$,

$$egin{aligned} &|\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{N})-\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N})|\leq f_1(arepsilon)\ &|\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{N})-\mathcal{P}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N})|\leq f_2(arepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where $f_i(\varepsilon) \in O(\varepsilon \log \varepsilon)$ and $f_i(\varepsilon) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \to 0} 0.$ [Sut

[Sutter et al. 2015]

• $dg(\mathcal{N})$ can be computed using **semidefinite programming**.

Approximately degrading a low-noise channel

Complementary channel id^c of identity channel: completely depolarizing map id^c = Tr(·)|0⟩⟨0|, and

$$\mathsf{id}^c = \mathsf{id}^c \circ \mathsf{id} \ .$$

▶ We prove: For a low-noise channel \mathcal{N} with $\|\mathcal{N} - \operatorname{id}\|_{\diamond} \leq \varepsilon$, $\|\mathcal{N}^{c} - \mathcal{N}^{c} \circ \mathcal{N}\|_{\diamond} \leq 2\varepsilon^{3/2}$. (*)

Intuition: N^c is very noisy and almost useless, so you might as well use it as the degrading map!

• (*) implies dg
$$(\mathcal{N}) \leq 2\varepsilon^{3/2}$$
 and our main result.

1 Quantum channels and their capacities

- 2 Main result: capacities of low-noise channels
- 3 (Approximate) degradability



Pauli channels

Consider a Pauli channel

$$\mathcal{N}_{ec{q}}(
ho) = q_0\,
ho + q_1\,X\,
ho\,X + q_2\,Y\,
ho\,Y + q_3\,Z\,
ho\,Z,$$

where *X*, *Y*, *Z* are the usual Pauli matrices and \vec{q} is a probability distribution.

▶ $\mathcal{N}_{\vec{q}}$ is a low-noise channel, since $\|\mathcal{N}_{\vec{q}} - \operatorname{id}\|_{\diamond} = 2(q_1 + q_2 + q_3)$.

Hence, with our results from before,

$$\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{N}_{\vec{q}}) = \mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\mathcal{N}_{\vec{q}}) + O(\varepsilon^{3/2}\log\varepsilon)$$

for $\varepsilon = 2(q_1 + q_2 + q_3)$, and same for $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{N}_{\vec{q}})$.

• We can improve this to $O(\varepsilon^2 \log \varepsilon)!$

Pauli channels

- ► Assume for simplicity that q_i = q_i(p) for some underlying single noise parameter p ∈ [0, 1].
- ► Example: **Depolarizing channel** D_p

$$\mathcal{D}_{\rho} \colon \rho \longmapsto (1-\rho)\rho + rac{\rho}{3}(X\rho X + Y\rho Y + Z\rho Z)$$

Example: XZ-channel C_p (a.k.a. BB84-channel)

$$\mathcal{C}_{p}\colon
ho\longmapsto(1-p)^{2}
ho+(p-p^{2})\,X
ho X+p^{2}\,Y
ho Y+(p-p^{2})\,Z
ho Z$$

▶ In both cases, numerics suggest that $dg(D_p) = O(p^2)$ and $dg(C_p) = O(p^2)$.

Strategy: Prove this by guessing good degrading map!

Pauli channels

▶ Ansatz: Again the complementary channel, but make it slightly noisier, D_s^c with $s = p + ap^2$.

► We prove: For
$$a = \frac{8}{3}$$
,

$$dg(\mathcal{D}_p) \le \|\mathcal{D}_p^c - \mathcal{D}_{p+ap^2}^c \circ \mathcal{D}_p\|_{\diamond} \le \frac{8}{9}(6 + \sqrt{2})p^2 + O(p^3)$$

Similarly, for a = 4,

 $\mathsf{dg}(\mathcal{C}_p) \leq \|\mathcal{C}_p^c - \mathcal{C}_{p+ap^2}^c \circ \mathcal{C}_p\|_\diamond \leq 16p^2 + 32p^{5/2} + \mathcal{O}(p^3)$

These are remarkably accurate approximations to the true degradability parameters dg(D_p) and dg(C_p)!

$$\mathcal{D}_{\rho}(\rho) = (1-\rho)\rho + rac{
ho}{3}(X
ho X + Y
ho Y + Z
ho Z)$$





1 Quantum channels and their capacities

- 2 Main result: capacities of low-noise channels
- 3 (Approximate) degradability



Summary of results

- Quantum and private capacity: regularization of the coherent and private information, notoriously hard to compute, except for (approximately) degradable channels.
- Low-noise channels are approximately degraded by their complementary channel.
- Consequence: both capacities of low-noise channels are essentially equal to the single-letter coherent information.
- Approximation is even better for the class of Pauli channels (includes depolarizing channel and BB84 channel).

Discussion and open problems

- ► The regularization for Q(N) is necessary because we know of instances where Q⁽¹⁾(N^{⊗n}) > nQ⁽¹⁾(N).
- This is called superadditivity of the coherent information, and is achieved by degenerate quantum codes.

[DiVincenzo et al. 1998; Smith and Smolin 2007]

For the private information P⁽¹⁾(N), super-additivity is achieved by **shielding** private data from corruption.

[Horodecki et al. 2005; Leung et al. 2014]

- Our results show that for low-noise channels degeneracy and shielding have no considerable effect.
- Capacities are still poorly understood in the high-noise regime!

References

Cai, N. et al. (2004). Problems of Information Transmission 40.4, pp. 318–336.

Devetak, I. (2005). IEEE Transactions on Information Theory 51.1, pp. 44-55. arXiv: quant-ph/0304127.

Devetak, I. and P. W. Shor (2005). Communications in Mathematical Physics 256.2, pp. 287–303. arXiv: quant-ph/0311131

[quant-ph].

DiVincenzo, D. et al. (1998). Physical Review A 57.2, pp. 830-839. arXiv: quant-ph/9706061.

Horodecki, K. et al. (2005). Physical Review Letters 94.16, p. 160502. arXiv: quant-ph/0309110.

Leditzky, F. et al. (2017). arXiv preprint. arXiv: 1705.04335 [quant-ph].

Leung, D. et al. (2014). Physical Review Letters 113.3, p. 030502. arXiv: 1312.4989 [quant-ph].

Lloyd, S. (1997). Physical Review A 55, pp. 1613-1622. arXiv: quant-ph/9604015.

Shor, P. (2002). Lecture notes, MSRI Workshop on Quantum Computation.

Smith, G. (2008). Physical Review A 78.2, p. 022306. arXiv: 0705.3838 [quant-ph].

Smith, G. and J. A. Smolin (2007). Physical Review Letters 98.3, p. 030501. arXiv: quant-ph/0604107.

Stinespring, W. F. (1955). Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society 6.2, pp. 211–216.

Sutter, D. et al. (2015). arXiv preprint. arXiv: 1412.0980 [quant-ph].

Thank you very much for your attention!