Quantum subdivision capacities and continuous quantum coding

Alexander Müller-Hermes

joint work with David Reeb and Michael M. Wolf

arXiv:1310.2856

06.02.2014



< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

T_t

Noise channel $\mathcal{T}_t : \mathfrak{M}_d \to \mathfrak{M}_d$ is Markovian, i.e. $\mathcal{T}_t = e^{t\mathcal{L}}$.

Noise channel $\mathcal{T}_t : \mathfrak{M}_d \to \mathfrak{M}_d$ is Markovian, i.e. $\mathcal{T}_t = e^{t\mathcal{L}}$.



Noise channel $\mathcal{T}_t: \mathfrak{M}_d \to \mathfrak{M}_d$ is Markovian, i.e. $\mathcal{T}_t = e^{t\mathcal{L}}$.



▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

Noise channel $\mathcal{T}_t: \mathfrak{M}_d \to \mathfrak{M}_d$ is Markovian, i.e. $\mathcal{T}_t = e^{t\mathcal{L}}$.



▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

Noise channel $\mathcal{T}_t: \mathfrak{M}_d \to \mathfrak{M}_d$ is Markovian, i.e. $\mathcal{T}_t = e^{t\mathcal{L}}$.



▲ロト ▲帰ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト 三日 - の々ぐ

Noise channel $\mathcal{T}_t: \mathfrak{M}_d \to \mathfrak{M}_d$ is Markovian, i.e. $\mathcal{T}_t = e^{t\mathcal{L}}$.



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ □臣 = のへで

Noise channel $\mathcal{T}_t: \mathfrak{M}_d \to \mathfrak{M}_d$ is Markovian, i.e. $\mathcal{T}_t = e^{t\mathcal{L}}$.



Quantum subdivision capacity: $Q_{\mathfrak{C}}(t\mathcal{L})$

Different choices of $\mathfrak C$ lead to different capacities!

Definition (MH, Reeb, Wolf 2013)

The \mathfrak{C} -quantum subdivision capacity of $t\mathcal{L}$ is then defined as the supremum of asymptotical achievable rates

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\mathfrak{C}}\left(t\mathcal{L}
ight):=\sup\{R\in\mathbb{R}^{+}: \ \mathsf{R}=\limsup_{
u
ightarrow\infty}rac{n_{
u}}{m_{
u}}\}.$$

such that the asymptotic communication error vanishes

$$\inf_{k,\mathcal{E},\mathcal{D},\mathcal{C}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{C}_k} \left\| \mathsf{id}_2^{\otimes n_\nu} - \mathcal{D} \circ \prod_{l=1}^k \left(\mathcal{C}_l \circ \left(e^{\frac{t}{k}\mathcal{L}} \right)^{\otimes m_\nu} \right) \circ \mathcal{E} \right\|_\diamond \to 0 \quad \text{as } \nu \to \infty.$$

Infimum goes over:

- $k \in \mathbb{N}$ number of subdivisions
- $\mathcal{E}: \mathfrak{M}_2^{\otimes n_{\nu}} \to \mathfrak{M}_d^{\otimes m_{\nu}}$ and $\mathcal{D}: \mathfrak{M}_d^{\otimes m_{\nu}} \to \mathfrak{M}_2^{\otimes n_{\nu}}$ quantum channels
- $C_I \in \mathfrak{C}$ channels from the subset \mathfrak{C}

Outline

1 Infinitesimal divisible coding maps

2 Unitary coding maps

③ Continuous quantum capacity

Infinitesimal divisible coding maps

1. Example: Let \mathfrak{C} be the set of infinitesimal divisible quantum channels

•
$$C_l = \prod_{i=1}^{N} e^{\mathcal{L}'_i}$$
 for some coding Liouvillians \mathcal{L}'_i

• \rightsquigarrow Denote this set by ID.



Theorem (MH, Reeb, Wolf 2013)

For any noise Liouvillian $\mathcal{L}:\mathfrak{M}_d\to\mathfrak{M}_d$ and any $t\in\mathbb{R}^+$ we have

 $\mathcal{Q}_{ID}(t\mathcal{L}) = \log(d)$

Proof of $Q_{ID}(t\mathcal{L}) = \log(d)$

Continuity of quantum capacity:

$$\mathcal{Q}\left(e^{\frac{t}{k}\mathcal{L}}\right)
ightarrow \log(d), \quad k
ightarrow \infty$$

Coding scheme achieving maximal subdivision capacity log(d):



But the channel $\mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{E}$ is not necessarily infinitesimal divisible!

Proof of $Q_{ID}(t\mathcal{L}) = \log(d)$

Implement intermediate coding via unitaries and pure ancillas Almost pure ancillas from the infinitely divisible channel:

$$ho\mapsto (1-e^{-rt}){
m tr}\left(
ho
ight)\left|0
ight
angle\left\langle 0
ight|+e^{-rt}
ho$$
 , for large rate r



How many pure ancillas are sufficient?

Proof of
$$Q_{ID}(t\mathcal{L}) = \log(d)$$

$$\frac{1}{4} \inf_{\mathcal{D}} \left\| \mathsf{id} - \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{T}^{\otimes m} \circ \mathcal{E} \right\|_{\diamond}^{2} \leq \left\| \left(\mathcal{T}^{\otimes m} \circ \mathcal{E} \right)^{c} - \mathsf{tr}\left(\bullet \right) \sigma^{\mathcal{E}} \right\|_{\diamond}$$

- Random isometry \mathcal{E} leads to asymptotically vanishing r.h.s.
- Then $\mathcal D$ has the form

$$\mathcal{D}\left(
ho
ight)=\mathsf{tr}_{E}\left(V
ho V^{\dagger}
ight)$$

for isometry V, where $|E| = \operatorname{rank} (\sigma^{E})$.



Schumacher Compression:

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\sigma^{E}\right)\simeq2^{mS\left(\sigma^{E}
ight)}$$

→ number of qubit ancillas sublinear in m

・ロト・日本・日本・日本・日本・日本

Proof of
$$Q_{ID}(t\mathcal{L}) = \log(d)$$

$$\frac{1}{4} \inf_{\mathcal{D}} \left\| \mathsf{id} - \mathcal{D} \circ \left[e^{\frac{t}{k}\mathcal{L}} \right]^{\otimes m} \circ \mathcal{E} \right\|_{\diamond}^{2} \leq \left\| \left(\left[e^{\frac{t}{k}\mathcal{L}} \right]^{\otimes m} \circ \mathcal{E} \right)^{c} - \mathsf{tr}\left(\bullet \right) \sigma^{\mathcal{E}} \right\|_{\diamond}$$

- Random isometry \mathcal{E} leads to asymptotically vanishing r.h.s.
- Then $\mathcal D$ has the form

$$\mathcal{D}\left(
ho
ight) = \mathsf{tr}_{E}\left(oldsymbol{V}
hooldsymbol{V}^{\dagger}
ight)$$

for isometry V, where $|E| = \operatorname{rank} (\sigma^{E})$.



Schumacher Compression:

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\sigma^{E}\right)\simeq2^{mS\left(\sigma^{E}
ight)}$$

→ number of qubit ancillas sublinear in m

・ロト・日本・日本・日本・日本・日本

Proof of
$$Q_{ID}(t\mathcal{L}) = \log(d)$$

$$\frac{1}{4}\inf_{\mathcal{D}}\left\|\mathsf{id}-\mathcal{D}\circ\left[e^{\frac{t}{k}\mathcal{L}}\right]^{\otimes m}\circ\mathcal{E}\right\|_{\diamond}^{2}\leq\left\|\left(\left[e^{\frac{t}{k}\mathcal{L}}\right]^{\otimes m}\circ\mathcal{E}\right)^{c}-\mathsf{tr}\left(\bullet\right)\sigma^{\mathcal{E}}\right\|_{\diamond}$$

- Random isometry \mathcal{E} leads to asymptotically vanishing r.h.s.
- Then $\mathcal D$ has the form

$$\mathcal{D}\left(
ho
ight) = \mathsf{tr}_{E}\left(oldsymbol{V}
hooldsymbol{V}^{\dagger}
ight)$$

for isometry V, where $|E| = \operatorname{rank}(\sigma^{E})$.



Schumacher Compression:

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\sigma^{E}\right)\simeq2^{mS\left(\sigma^{E}
ight)}$$

~ number of qubit ancillas sublinear in m

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

Proof of
$$Q_{ID}(t\mathcal{L}) = \log(d)$$

$$\frac{1}{4}\inf_{\mathcal{D}}\left\|\mathsf{id}-\mathcal{D}\circ\left[e^{\frac{t}{k}\mathcal{L}}\right]^{\otimes m}\circ\mathcal{E}\right\|_{\diamond}^{2}\leq\left\|\left(\left[e^{\frac{t}{k}\mathcal{L}}\right]^{\otimes m}\circ\mathcal{E}\right)^{c}-\mathsf{tr}\left(\bullet\right)\sigma^{\mathcal{E}}\right\|_{\diamond}$$

- Random isometry \mathcal{E} leads to asymptotically vanishing r.h.s.
- Then $\mathcal D$ has the form

$$\mathcal{D}\left(
ho
ight) = \mathsf{tr}_{E}\left(oldsymbol{V}
hooldsymbol{V}^{\dagger}
ight)$$

for isometry V, where $|E| = \operatorname{rank}(\sigma^{E})$.



Schumacher Compression:

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\sigma^{E}\right)\simeq2^{mS\left(\sigma^{E}
ight)}$$

~ number of qubit ancillas sublinear in m

◆□ > ◆□ > ◆豆 > ◆豆 > ̄豆 = のへで

Proof of
$$Q_{ID}(t\mathcal{L}) = \log(d)$$

$$\frac{1}{4}\inf_{\mathcal{D}}\left\|\mathsf{id}-\mathcal{D}\circ\left[e^{\frac{t}{k}\mathcal{L}}\right]^{\otimes m}\circ\mathcal{E}\right\|_{\diamond}^{2}\leq\left\|\left(\left[e^{\frac{t}{k}\mathcal{L}}\right]^{\otimes m}\circ\mathcal{E}\right)^{c}-\mathsf{tr}\left(\bullet\right)\sigma^{\mathcal{E}}\right\|_{\diamond}$$

- Random isometry \mathcal{E} leads to asymptotically vanishing r.h.s.
- Then $\mathcal D$ has the form

$$\mathcal{D}\left(
ho
ight) = \mathsf{tr}_{E}\left(V
ho V^{\dagger}
ight)$$

for isometry V, where $|E| = \operatorname{rank}(\sigma^{E})$.



Schumacher Compression:

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\sigma^{E}\right)\simeq2^{mS\left(\sigma^{E}
ight)}$$

~ number of qubit ancillas sublinear in m

◆□ > ◆□ > ◆豆 > ◆豆 > ̄豆 = のへで

Proof of
$$Q_{ID}(t\mathcal{L}) = \log(d)$$

$$\frac{1}{4} \inf_{\mathcal{D}} \left\| \mathsf{id} - \mathcal{D} \circ \left[e^{\frac{t}{k}\mathcal{L}} \right]^{\otimes m} \circ \mathcal{E} \right\|_{\diamond}^{2} \leq \left\| \left(\left[e^{\frac{t}{k}\mathcal{L}} \right]^{\otimes m} \circ \mathcal{E} \right)^{c} - \mathsf{tr}\left(\bullet \right) \sigma^{\mathcal{E}} \right\|_{\diamond}$$

- Random isometry \mathcal{E} leads to asymptotically vanishing r.h.s.
- Then $\mathcal D$ has the form

$$\mathcal{D}\left(
ho
ight) = \mathsf{tr}_{E}\left(V
ho V^{\dagger}
ight)$$

for isometry V, where $|E| = \operatorname{rank}(\sigma^{E})$.



Schumacher Compression:

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\sigma^{E}\right)\simeq2^{mS\left(\sigma^{E}
ight)}$$

~ number of qubit ancillas sublinear in m

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 三臣 - のへで

2. Example: $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{U}$, i.e. unitary coding maps.

Theorem (MH, Reeb, Wolf 2013)

For any noise Liouvillian $\mathcal{L}: \mathfrak{M}_d \to \mathfrak{M}_d$ and any $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ we have

 $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathfrak{U}}\left(t\mathcal{L}
ight)>0$

2. Example: $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{U}$, i.e. unitary coding maps.



Theorem (MH, Reeb, Wolf 2013)

For any noise Liouvillian $\mathcal{L}:\mathfrak{M}_d\to\mathfrak{M}_d$ and any $t\in\mathbb{R}^+$ we have

 $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathfrak{U}}\left(t\mathcal{L}
ight)>0$

2. Example: $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{U}$, i.e. unitary coding maps.



Theorem (MH, Reeb, Wolf 2013)

For any noise Liouvillian $\mathcal{L}:\mathfrak{M}_d\to\mathfrak{M}_d$ and any $t\in\mathbb{R}^+$ we have

 $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathfrak{U}}(t\mathcal{L}) > 0$

2. Example: $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{U}$, i.e. unitary coding maps.



Maximal entropy of ancilla states never reached in finite time!

Theorem (MH, Reeb, Wolf 2013)

For any noise Liouvillian $\mathcal{L}: \mathfrak{M}_d \to \mathfrak{M}_d$ and any $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ we have

 $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathfrak{U}}(t\mathcal{L}) > 0$

Is $Q_{\mathfrak{U}}(t\mathcal{L})$ also $\log(d)$?

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Answer: No!

Liouvillian depolarizing onto state $\rho_0 \in \mathfrak{M}_d$:

$$\mathcal{L}^{\mathsf{dep}}\left(\rho\right) := \mathsf{tr}\left(\rho\right)\rho_{0} - \rho$$

 \rightsquigarrow Generates depolarizing channel: $e^{t\mathcal{L}^{dep}}\left(\rho\right) = \left(1 - e^{-t}\right) \operatorname{tr}\left(\rho\right) \rho_{0} + e^{-t}\rho$

Theorem (MH, Reeb, Wolf 2013)

For the noise Liouvillian $\mathcal{L}^{dep}:\mathfrak{M}_d\to\mathfrak{M}_d$ and $t\in\mathbb{R}^+$ we have

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\mathfrak{U}}\left(t\mathcal{L}^{dep}
ight) \leq \log(d) - \left(1-e^{-t}
ight) \mathcal{S}\left(
ho_{0}
ight)$$

Proof of $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathfrak{U}}\left(t\mathcal{L}^{\mathsf{dep}}\right) \leq \log(d) - (1 - e^{-t}) S\left(\rho_{0}\right)$

Consider subdivision coding scheme achieving rate R:

$$\inf_{k,\mathcal{E},\mathcal{D},\mathcal{C}_{1},\ldots,\mathcal{C}_{k}} \left\| \mathsf{id}_{2}^{\otimes Rm} - \mathcal{D} \circ \prod_{l=1}^{k} \left(\mathcal{U}_{l} \circ \left(e^{\frac{t}{k}\mathcal{L}} \right)^{\otimes m} \right) \circ \mathcal{E} \right\|_{\diamond} \to 0$$

Entropy growth for depolarizing channels [Aharonov, et al.]:

$$S\left(\left(e^{t\mathcal{L}^{\mathsf{dep}}}
ight)^{\otimes m}\left(
ho
ight)
ight)\geq\left(1-e^{-t}
ight)mS\left(
ho_{0}
ight)\;\;orall
ho$$

$$egin{aligned} m\log(d) &\geq S\left(rac{1}{2^{Rm}}\sum_{i=1}^{2^{Rm}} ilde{\mathcal{T}}_m\left(\ket{i}ig\langle iert
ight)
ight) \ &\simeq H\left(\{rac{1}{2^{Rm}}\}
ight) + \sum_{i=1}^{2^{Rm}}rac{1}{2^{Rm}}S\left(ilde{\mathcal{T}}_m\left(\ket{i}ig\langle iert
ight)
ight) \ &\geq Rm + \left(1-e^{-t}
ight)mS\left(
ho_0
ight) \end{aligned}$$

< ロ > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

Proof of $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathfrak{U}}\left(t\mathcal{L}^{\mathsf{dep}}\right) \leq \log(d) - (1 - e^{-t}) S\left(\rho_{0}\right)$

Consider subdivision coding scheme achieving rate R:



Entropy growth for depolarizing channels [Aharonov, et al.]:

$$S\left(\left(e^{t\mathcal{L}^{\mathsf{dep}}}
ight)^{\otimes m}(
ho)
ight) \geq \left(1-e^{-t}
ight)mS\left(
ho_{0}
ight) \;\;orall
ho$$

$$egin{aligned} m\log(d) &\geq S\left(rac{1}{2^{Rm}}\sum_{i=1}^{2^{Rm}} ilde{\mathcal{T}}_m\left(\ket{i}ig\langle iert
ight)
ight)\ &\simeq H\left(\{rac{1}{2^{Rm}}\}
ight)+\sum_{i=1}^{2^{Rm}}rac{1}{2^{Rm}}S\left(ilde{\mathcal{T}}_m\left(\ket{i}ig\langle iert
ight)
ight)\ &\geq Rm+\left(1-e^{-t}
ight)mS\left(
ho_0
ight) \end{aligned}$$

Continuous quantum capacity

Definition (MH, Reeb, Wolf 2013)

The \mathfrak{C} -continuous quantum capacity of noise Liouvillian $t\mathcal{L}$ is then defined as the supremum of asymptotical achievable rates

$$\mathcal{Q}^{ ext{cont}}_{\mathfrak{C}}\left(t\mathcal{L}
ight):=\sup\{R\in\mathbb{R}^{+}: \ \mathsf{R}=\limsup_{
u
ightarrow\infty}rac{n_{
u}}{m_{
u}}\}.$$

such that the asymptotic communication error vanishes

$$\inf_{\mathcal{E},\mathcal{D},\mathcal{L}_{c}}\left\|\mathrm{id}_{2}^{\otimes n_{\nu}}-\mathcal{D}\circ T\exp\left(\int_{0}^{t}\mathcal{L}^{\oplus m_{\nu}}+\mathcal{L}_{c}\left(t'\right)dt'\right)\circ\mathcal{E}\right\|_{\diamond}\rightarrow0$$

as $\nu \to \infty$. Infimum goes over:

- $\mathcal{E}: \mathfrak{M}_2^{\otimes n_\nu} \to \mathfrak{M}_d^{\otimes m_\nu}$ and $\mathcal{D}: \mathfrak{M}_d^{\otimes m_\nu} \to \mathfrak{M}_2^{\otimes n_\nu}$ quantum channels
- $\mathcal{L}_c \in \mathfrak{C}$ time-dependent coding Liouvillians from the subset \mathfrak{C}

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Can dissipation improve quantum capacity?

Answer: Yes

Even for usual quantum capacity we have:

Theorem (MH, Reeb, Wolf 2013)

There exist time-independent Liouvillians $\mathcal{L}: \mathfrak{M}_d \to \mathfrak{M}_d$ and $\mathcal{L}': \mathfrak{M}_d \to \mathfrak{M}_d$ where \mathcal{L}' is purely dissipative such that

$$\mathcal{Q}\left(e^{\mathcal{L}}\right) < \mathcal{Q}\left(e^{\mathcal{L}+\mathcal{L}'}\right)$$

▲ロト ▲帰ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト 三日 - の々ぐ

Some riddles...

To what extend can
$$\mathcal{Q}\left(e^{\mathcal{L}+\mathcal{L}'}\right)$$
 differ from $\mathcal{Q}\left(e^{\mathcal{L}}\right)$?

What are good choices for \mathfrak{C} in the various capacities?

Is there a closed formula for $Q_{\mathfrak{U}}(t\mathcal{L})$?

Thank you for your attention.

For more information see: arXiv:1310.2856

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ □臣 = のへで