

Exponents of quantum fixed-length pure state source coding

Masahito Hayashi¹*

¹Laboratory for Mathematical Neuroscience, Brain Science Institute,
RIKEN, 2-1 Hirosawa, Wako, Saitama, 351-0198, Japan
(dated: 12 May 2002)

We derive the optimal exponent of the error probability of the quantum fixed-length pure state source coding in both cases of blind coding and visible coding. The optimal exponent is universally attained by Jozsa et al. (PRL, 81, 1714 (1998))'s universal code. In the direct part, a group representation theoretical type method is essential. In the converse part, Nielsen and Kempe (PRL, 86, 5184 (2001))'s lemma is essential.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 02.20.Qs

I. INTRODUCTION

As was proven by Schumacher [1], and Jozsa and Schumacher [2], we can compress the unknown source state into the coding length $nH(\rho_p)$ with a sufficiently small error when the source state on n quantum systems obeys the n -i.i.d. distribution of the known probability p , where $\rho_p := \sum_i p(i) |i\rangle\langle i|$ and $H(\rho)$ is the von Neumann entropy $-\text{Tr} \log \rho$. Jozsa and Schumacher's protocol depends on the mixture state ρ_p , and in this protocol, the coding length is independent for the input. Therefore, this type code is called a quantum fixed length source code.

Concerning the quantum source coding, there are two criteria: One is the blind coding, in which the input is an unknown quantum state. The other is the visible coding, in which the input is classical information that determines the quantum state, i.e., the encoder knows the input quantum state. When a source consists of pure states and depends on an i.i.d. distribution of the probability p , the bound of the compression rate (i.e. the minimum admissible rate) equals the entropy rate $H(\rho_p)$. The proof of this statement is divided into two parts: One is the possibility to compress the quantum source into a larger rate than the entropy rate, which is called the direct part. The other is the impossibility to compress the quantum source into a smaller rate than the entropy rate, which is called the converse part. The former is given by Schumacher's result. The latter was proven by Barnum et al. [3] only in the blind case, however Horodecki [4] proved it in both cases by a simpler method. Winter [5] proved that the both settings have the strong converse property, i.e. if we compress into a smaller rate than the entropy rate, the error goes to 1. Moreover, depending only on the coding length nR , Jozsa et al. [6] constructed a code which is independent of the distribution which the input obeys. In their protocol, the average error tends to 0 when $H(\rho) < R$. Such a code is called a quantum universal fixed-length source code. Of course, we can consider a quantum variable-length source code, but discuss it in

another paper [7].

However, only with the knowledge of the minimum admissible rate we cannot estimate what a compression rate is available for a given error $\epsilon > 0$ and a given integer n . For such an estimate, we need to discuss the decreasing speed of the error for a fixed rate R . In the classical information theory, in order to treat this speed, we focus the exponential rate (exponent) of the error probability, and the optimal exponent is greater than zero when the coding rate R is greater than the entropy rate. Conversely, when the rate R is smaller than the entropy rate, the correct probability exponentially goes to zero. These optimal exponents have been already calculated by using type method. (see Csiszar and Komer [8]).

In this paper, we treat only a quantum fixed-length code at both criteria in the case where any source consists of pure states. We optimize the exponents of the error and the correct in sec. III. Using a group representation theoretical type method introduced in Appendix B, we derive an upper bound of the error of the quantum universal fixed-length source code constructed by Jozsa et al. for any n and any R as (20), (21) and (22) in sec. IV. This upper bound yields its attainability of the optimal exponents. In sec. VI, non-existence of a code exceeding the exponents is proven, which is called the converse part. In the converse part, an inequality is essential and is proven from Nielsen and Kempe's lemma [9] in sec. V.

II. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS RESULTS

Blind and visible codes are mathematically formulated as follows. Assume that a quantum pure state $|i\rangle$ on H corresponding to label $i \in \mathcal{I}$ is generated with probability p_i . We denote the set of quantum states on H by $S(H)$. Therefore, the source is described by $\{ |i\rangle, p_i \}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$. In the blind setting, the encoder is described by a CP map E from $S(H)$ to $S(K)$, and the decoder is described by a CP map D from $S(K)$ to $S(H)$. The average error is given by $\langle E; D \rangle := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} p_i (1 - \text{Tr} D E(|i\rangle\langle i|))$. We call a triple $(K; E; D)$ a blind code.

In the visible setting, the encoder is described by a map

*Electronic address: masahito@brain.riken.go.jp

F from $\text{tp } S(K)$. Then, the average error is given by $(F;D) = \sum_{i_2} p_{i_1} (1 - \text{Tr} D(F(i)_i))$. In this setting, we treat the trade-off between decreasing $\dim K$ and $(F;D)$. We call a triple $(K;E;D)$ a blind code. Similarly, we call a triple $(K;F;D)$ a visible code. In the both settings, we treat the trade-off between decreasing $\dim K$ and $(E;D)$ ($(F;D)$).

A blind code $(K;E;D)$ can be regarded as a visible code in the case where $F(i) = E(i)$. We have more choices in the visible setting than in the blind setting. A blind code is used for saving memories in quantum computing. A visible code is used for efficient use of quantum channel in quantum cryptography, for example, the B92 protocol [10], [11].

In the n -i.i.d. setting, the quantum state $\rho_{n,i_1 i_2} = \rho_{i_1} \otimes \rho_{i_2}$ on the tensored Hilbert space $H^{\otimes n}$ generates with the probability $p_{n,i_1 i_2} = p_{i_1} p_{i_2}$ where $i_n = (i_1; i_2; \dots; i_n)$. This setting is written by the source $f_{n,i_1 i_2}; p_{n,i_1 i_2} g_{i_n, 2^n}$, which is called a n -discrete memoryless source (DMS) generated by the source $f_i; p_i g_{i2}$. Now, we define the minimum admissible rate $R_B(f_i; p_i g_{i2})$ ($R_V(f_i; p_i g_{i2})$) and the converse minimum admissible rate $R_B(f_i; p_i g_{i2})$ ($R_V(f_i; p_i g_{i2})$) of the DMS generated by $f_i; p_i g_{i2}$ in the blind setting (in the visible setting) as follows, respectively.

$$\begin{aligned} R_B(f_i; p_i g_{i2}) &= \inf \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \dim K_n \quad \frac{9f(K_n; E_n; D_n)g;}{(E_n; D_n)! \cdot 0} \\ R_V(f_i; p_i g_{i2}) &= \inf \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \dim K_n \quad \frac{9f(K_n; F_n; D_n)g;}{(F_n; D_n)! \cdot 0} \\ R_B(f_i; p_i g_{i2}) &= \inf \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \dim K_n \quad \frac{9f(K_n; E_n; D_n)g;}{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (E_n; D_n) < 1} \\ R_V(f_i; p_i g_{i2}) &= \inf \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \dim K_n \quad \frac{9f(K_n; F_n; D_n)g;}{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (F_n; D_n) < 1} : \end{aligned}$$

The following theorem is a known result.

Theorem 1 The equations

$$\begin{aligned} R_B(f_i; p_i g_{i2}) &= R_V(f_i; p_i g_{i2}) = R_B(f_i; p_i g_{i2}) \\ &= R_V(f_i; p_i g_{i2}) = H(\bar{p}) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

hold, where $\bar{p} = \sum_{i_2} p_{i_1 i_2}$ and $H(\cdot)$ denotes von Neumann entropy $-\text{Tr} \log \cdot$.

Since the following relations

$$\begin{aligned} R_B(f_i; p_i g_{i2}) &\leq R_V(f_i; p_i g_{i2}); \\ R_B(f_i; p_i g_{i2}) &\leq R_V(f_i; p_i g_{i2}); \\ R_B(f_i; p_i g_{i2}) &\leq R_B(f_i; p_i g_{i2}); \\ R_V(f_i; p_i g_{i2}) &\leq R_V(f_i; p_i g_{i2}) \end{aligned}$$

are trivial, it is sufficient for (1) to prove

$$R_B(f_i; p_i g_{i2}) \leq H(\bar{p}); \quad R_V(f_i; p_i g_{i2}) \leq H(\bar{p});$$

Schumacher [1] proved the direct part: $R_B(f_i; p_i g_{i2}) \leq H(\bar{p})$, and Jozsa-Schumacher [2] simplified it. Barnum et al. [3] proved the weak converse part: $R_B(f_i; p_i g_{i2}) \leq H(\bar{p})$ of the blind case, and Horodecki [4] proved the weak converse part: $R_V(f_i; p_i g_{i2}) \leq H(\bar{p})$ of the visible case, which is a stronger argument than the one of the blind case. Winter [5] obtained the strong converse part: $R_V(f_i; p_i g_{i2}) \leq H(\bar{p})$. Moreover, Petz and Mosonyi [12] treated the general stationary case, in which there are memory effects.

III. MAIN RESULTS

Next, we define the reliable functions $r_{e;B}(R; f_i; p_i g_{i2})$ and $r_{e;V}(R; f_i; p_i g_{i2})$, and the converse reliable functions $r_{e;B}(R; f_i; p_i g_{i2})$ and $r_{e;V}(R; f_i; p_i g_{i2})$ by

$$\begin{aligned} r_{e;B}(R; f_i; p_i g_{i2}) &= \sup \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log (E_n; D_n) \quad \frac{9f(K_n; E_n; D_n)g;}{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \dim K_n} R \\ r_{e;V}(R; f_i; p_i g_{i2}) &= \sup \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log (F_n; D_n) \quad \frac{9f(K_n; F_n; D_n)g;}{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \dim K_n} R \\ r_{e;B}(R; f_i; p_i g_{i2}) &= \inf \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log (1 - (E_n; D_n)) \quad \frac{9f(K_n; E_n; D_n)g;}{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \dim K_n} R \\ r_{e;V}(R; f_i; p_i g_{i2}) &= \inf \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log (1 - (F_n; D_n)) \quad \frac{9f(K_n; F_n; D_n)g;}{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \dim K_n} R : \end{aligned}$$

The following is the main theorem.

Theorem 2 Assume that $0 < P < \log d$ and $d = \dim H$. We diagonalize $\bar{p}$ as $\bar{p} = \sum_i a_i p_{i1} i_{e1j}$ such that a_i is a probability distribution on a_{i+1} . Then, a $f = f a_i g$ is a probability distribution on

$f_1; \dots; d_g$. The relations

$$r_{e;B}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) = r_{e;V}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) \\ = \max_{0 < s \leq 1} \frac{(1-s)R}{s} (s) \quad (2)$$

$$= \min_{H(\cdot) \in \mathcal{R}} D(k_p^-) \quad (3)$$

$$= \min_{H(\cdot) \in \mathcal{R}} D(bka) \quad (4)$$

$$r_{e;B}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) = r_{e;V}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) \\ = \sup_{s \leq 1} \frac{(1-s)R}{s} (s) \quad (5)$$

$$= \min_{H(\cdot) \in \mathcal{R}} D(k_p^-) \quad (6)$$

$$= \min_{H(\cdot) \in \mathcal{R}} D(bka) \quad (7)$$

hold, where (s) denotes the Reny entropy $\log \text{Tr} \rho_p^{-s}$, $D(k_p^-)$ denotes the quantum relative entropy $\text{Tr}(\rho \log \rho - \rho \log \rho_p^-)$, and b denotes a probability on $f_1; \dots; d_g$.

Our proof of Theorem 2 is outlined as follows. Since any blind code can be demonstrated as a visible code, the relations

$$r_{e;B}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) = r_{e;V}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) \quad (8)$$

$$r_{e;B}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) = r_{e;V}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) \quad (9)$$

are trivial. In sec. IV, we universally construct the optimal quantum fixed-length code with the rate R . This construction is independent of ρ_p^- , and depends only on the rate R . From this construction, we obtain

$$r_{e;B}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) = \min_{H(\cdot) \in \mathcal{R}} D(bka) \quad (10)$$

$$r_{e;V}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) = \min_{H(\cdot) \in \mathcal{R}} D(bka); \quad (11)$$

which is called the direct part. In sec. VI, we prove

$$r_{e;V}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) = \max_{0 < s \leq 1} \frac{(1-s)R}{s} (s) \quad (12)$$

$$r_{e;V}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) = \sup_{s \leq 1} \frac{(1-s)R}{s} (s); \quad (13)$$

which is called the converse part. The equivalence between RHSs of (10), (12) and (3) ((11), (13) and (6)) is proven in Appendix A, respectively.

Remark 1 The inequality $r_{e;V}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) = \min_{H(\cdot) \in \mathcal{R}} D(k_p^-)$ was proven by Winter [5].

Remark 2 We can adopt another criteria for error as:

$$b(E; D) := \sum_{i=1}^X p_i \left(\frac{1}{\text{Tr} D} \text{Tr} (F(i)_i) \right) \\ b(F; D) := \sum_{i=1}^{j_2} p_i \left(\frac{1}{\text{Tr} D} \text{Tr} (F(i)_i) \right); \quad (12)$$

Note that $(\frac{1}{\text{Tr} D} \text{Tr} (F(i)_i)) = (\frac{1}{\text{Tr} D} \text{Tr} (F(i)_i))$ equals Bures distance. In this case, we can define other reliable functions $r_{e;B, b}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2})$ and $r_{e;V, b}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2})$, and other converse reliable functions $r_{e;B, b}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2})$ and $r_{e;V, b}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2})$ by

$$r_{e;B, b}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) \\ = \sup \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log_b (E_n; D_n) \frac{9f(K_n; E_n; D_n)g;}{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \dim K_n} R \\ r_{e;V, b}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) \\ = \sup \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log_b (F_n; D_n) \frac{9f(K_n; F_n; D_n)g;}{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \dim K_n} R \\ r_{e;B, b}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) \\ = \inf \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log (1 - b(E_n; D_n)) \frac{9f(K_n; E_n; D_n)g;}{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \dim K_n} R \\ r_{e;V, b}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) \\ = \inf \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log (1 - b(F_n; D_n)) \frac{9f(K_n; F_n; D_n)g;}{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \dim K_n} R :$$

As proven in Appendix C, the following relations between two criteria

$$r_{e;B, b}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) = r_{e;B}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) \quad (14)$$

$$r_{e;V, b}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) = r_{e;V}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) \quad (15)$$

$$r_{e;B}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) = r_{e;B, b}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) \quad (16)$$

$$r_{e;V}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) = r_{e;V, b}(\mathcal{R} \text{ f } i; p_i g_{i2}) \quad (17)$$

hold.

IV. CONSTRUCTION OF A UNIVERSAL FIXED-LENGTH SOURCE CODE TO ACHIEVE THE OPTIMAL RATE

We construct a universal quantum fixed-length source code to achieve the optimal rate in Theorem 2. For any $r > 0$ and $R > 0$, the set $f \in \mathcal{S}(H)^{\otimes n} \cap \mathcal{H}_H(\cdot) \in \mathcal{R} D(k_p^-) = rg$ is covariant for the actions of the d -dimensional special unitary group $SU(d)$, and any n -i.i.d. distribution p^n is invariant for the action of the n -th symmetric group S_n on the tensored space $H^{\otimes n}$. Thus, our code should satisfy the invariance for these actions on $H^{\otimes n}$.

Now, we focus on the irreducible decomposition of the tensored space $H^{\otimes n}$ concerning the representations of S_n and $SU(d)$, and define the Young index n as,

$$X^d \\ n = (n_1; \dots; n_d); \quad n_i = n; n_i = n_{i+1}; \\ i=1$$

and denote the set of Young indices n by Y_n . Young index n uniquely corresponds to the irreducible unitary representation of S_n and the one of $SU(d)$. Now, we denote the representation space of the irreducible unitary representation of S_n ($SU(d)$) corresponding to n by

$V_n(U_n)$, respectively. In particular, regarding a unitary representation of $SU(d)$, Young index n gives the highest weight of the corresponding representation. Then, the tensor space H^n is decomposed as follows; i.e. H^n is equivalent with the following direct sum space under the representation of S_n and $SU(d)$.

$$H^n = \bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash n} W_{\lambda}; \quad W_{\lambda} \cong U_{\lambda} \otimes V_{\lambda}$$

For details, see Weyl [13], Goodman and Wallach [14], and Iwahori [15]. The efficiency of this representation method was discussed from several viewpoints. Regarding fixed-length source coding, it was discussed by Jozsa et. al. [6]. Regarding quantum relative entropy, it was by Hayashi [16]. Regarding quantum hypothesis testing, it was by Hayashi [17]. Regarding estimation of spectrum, it was by Keyl and Werner [18].

Next, we construct a blind code with rate R . We define the Hilbert space $K_{R,n}$, the blind encoder $E_{R,n}$, the visible encoder $F_{R,n}$ and the decoder $D_{R,n}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} K_{R,n} &= \bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash n} W_{\lambda} \\ E_{R,n}(\cdot) &= P_{R,n} P_{R,n} + \text{Tr}(\cdot P_{R,n}) \frac{I_{K_{R,n}}}{\text{Tr} I_{K_{R,n}}} \\ F_{R,n}(\cdot) &= \frac{P_{R,n} \otimes I_{H^n}}{\text{Tr} P_{R,n} \otimes I_{H^n}} P_{R,n} \\ D_{R,n}(\cdot) &= \cdot; \end{aligned}$$

where we denote the projection to $K_{R,n}$ by $P_{R,n}$.

Lemma 3 We define R_n by

$$R_n = R - \frac{4d}{n} \log(n+d); \quad (18)$$

The rates of the blind code $f(K_{R,n}; E_{R,n}; D_{R,n})g$ and the visible code $f(K_{R,n}; F_{R,n}; D_{R,n})g$ satisfies

$$\dim K_{R,n} = e^{nR_n}; \quad (19)$$

When the mixture $\bar{\rho}_p$ of the source is diagonalized as $\bar{\rho}_p = \sum_{j=1}^d a_j |e_j\rangle\langle e_j|$, we can evaluate the average errors as

$$\begin{aligned} & (F_{R,n}; D_{R,n}) \\ & (n+d)^{4d} \exp \left(-n \min_{\lambda \vdash n} D(\rho_{\lambda}) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & (E_{R,n}; D_{R,n}) \\ & 2(n+d)^{4d} \exp \left(-n \min_{\lambda \vdash n} D(\rho_{\lambda}) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & 1 - (F_{R,n}; D_{R,n}) \\ & (n+d)^{\frac{d(d+1)}{2}} \exp \left(-n \min_{\lambda \vdash n} D(\rho_{\lambda}) \right) \frac{n}{n+d} a; \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where a is defined as $a = f(a;g)$ and $b = f(b;g)$ denotes a probability on $\{1, \dots, d\}$. Taking the limit, we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log (E_{R,n}; D_{R,n}) = \min_{\lambda \vdash n} D(\rho_{\lambda}); \quad (23)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log (1 - (F_{R,n}; D_{R,n})) = \min_{\lambda \vdash n} D(\rho_{\lambda}); \quad (24)$$

Inequalities (23) and (24) imply (10) and (11), respectively. Conversely, the opposite inequalities of (23) and (24) are guaranteed by inequalities (12) and (13).

Remark 3 The subspace $K_{R,n}$ is equal to the subspace introduced by Jozsa et al. [6] because both are invariant for the action of the symmetric group. Therefore, our code $E_{R,n}$ coincides with their protocol.

Remark 4 Even if the source states ρ_i are not pure, we can prove inequalities similar to (20), (21) and (22) by using some calculations similar to Appendix C in Hayashi and Matsumoto [7]. However, in this case, this exponent does not seem to be optimal.

Proof of Lemma 3: Using Lemma 10, we can evaluate as

$$\begin{aligned} \dim K_{R,n} &= (n+1)^d \max_{\lambda \vdash n} \dim W_{\lambda} \\ &= (n+1)^{2d} \max_{\lambda \vdash n} \dim V_{\lambda} \\ &= (n+1)^{2d} (n+d)^{2d} e^{nR_n}; \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain (19). The average error of the visible code can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} & (F_{R,n}; D_{R,n}) \\ &= \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} P_{\lambda} \frac{1}{\dim W_{\lambda}} \text{Tr} \left(\frac{P_{R,n} \otimes I_{H^n}}{\text{Tr} P_{R,n} \otimes I_{H^n}} P_{R,n} \right) \\ &= \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} P_{\lambda} \frac{1}{\dim W_{\lambda}} \text{Tr} P_{R,n} \otimes I_{H^n} \\ &= \frac{1}{\dim W_{R,n}} \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} P_{\lambda} \otimes I_{H^n} A \\ &= \frac{1}{\dim W_{R,n}} \text{Tr} P_{R,n} \otimes I_{H^n} \bar{\rho}_p; \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Lemma 11 guarantees (20) and (22). Con-

versely,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (E_{R_n, m}; D_{R_n, m}) \\
 & = \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_n} p_{n, j_n} \frac{1}{2^n} \text{Tr}_{n, j_n} \left(\frac{I_{K_{R_n, m}}}{\text{Tr} I_{K_{R_n, m}}} \right. \\
 & \quad \left. P_{R_n, m} \otimes P_{R_n, m} + \text{Tr}_{n, j_n} (I \otimes P_{R_n, m}) \right) \\
 & = \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_n} p_{n, j_n} \frac{1}{2^n} \text{Tr}_{n, j_n} P_{R_n, m} \otimes P_{R_n, m} \\
 & = \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_n} p_{n, j_n} \frac{1}{2^n} (\text{Tr}_{n, j_n} P_{R_n, m})^2 \\
 & = \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_n} p_{n, j_n} \frac{1}{2^n} \text{Tr}_{n, j_n} P_{R_n, m} \otimes P_{R_n, m} \\
 & = \text{Tr}_p^{-n} P_{R_n, m}^2 = \text{Tr}_p^{-n} P_{R_n, m} \\
 & \text{which implies (21).}
 \end{aligned}$$

V. NECESSARY INEQUALITY FOR THE CONVERSE PART

For an Hermitian matrix X , we define the projections $f_X \geq 0$; $f_X < 0$ by

$$f_X \geq 0 = \sum_{s_j \geq 0} E_j; \quad f_X < 0 = \sum_{s_j < 0} E_j;$$

where the spectral decomposition of X is given by $X = \sum_j s_j E_j$ (s_j is an eigenvalue corresponding to projection E_j). Under a source $f_i; p_i g_{i2}$, the following lemma holds.

Lemma 4 Any visible code $(K; F; D)$ satisfies the following inequalities

$$(F; D) + e \dim K - \text{Tr}_p^{-n} f_p^{-n} e < 0 \quad (25)$$

$$1 - (F; D) - e \dim K + \text{Tr}_p^{-n} f_p^{-n} e \geq 0 \quad (26)$$

for $8 \leq R$.

Moreover, the inequality

$$1 - (F; D) - e \dim K + e^{(1-s)} + (s) \quad (27)$$

holds for $8 \leq R; s \leq 1$.

For our proof of the above lemma, we require the following two lemmas.

Lemma 5 The set of visible encoders from $\mathcal{S}(K)$ coincides with the convex hull of the set of extremal points, which equals

$$f \in \mathcal{F}(i) \text{ is a pure state } 8i \geq 2 \quad (28)$$

Proof: If a visible encoder F satisfies that $f(i)$ is a pure state for any $i \geq 2$, then F is an extremal point. It is sufficient to show that for any visible encoder $F(i) = \sum_{j_1} s_{j_1} j_{j_1} i_{j_1} j$ is written by a convex hull of (28). A visible encoder $F(j_1; j_2; \dots; j_n)$ defined by

$$F(j_1; j_2; \dots; j_n) = j_{j_1} i_{j_1} j$$

belongs to (28). Since the relation $F = \sum_{j_1; j_2; \dots; j_n} s_{j_1} s_{j_2} \dots j_n \mathcal{B}(j_1; j_2; \dots; j_n) j$ holds, we obtain the lemma. ■

Lemma 6 The set of decoders from $\mathcal{S}(K)$ to $\mathcal{S}(H)$ coincides with the convex hull of the subset

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \{ D \mid \text{There exists a Hilbert space } H^0 \text{ and} \\
 & \text{an isometry } T \text{ from } \mathcal{S}(K) \text{ to } \mathcal{S}(H \oplus H^0) \text{ such that } D(\cdot) = T_{H^0} \circ T(\cdot) \} \quad (29)
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof: From the Steinspring representation theorem, there exist a Hilbert space K^0 and a unitary U on $K \oplus K^0 \oplus H$ and an element $0 \in \mathcal{S}(K^0 \oplus H)$ such that

$$D(\cdot) = T_{K \oplus K^0 \oplus H} U \quad 0 U; \quad 8 \in \mathcal{S}(K):$$

Assume that $0 = \sum_j s_j j_{j_1} i_{j_1} j$. Then, the decoder $D_j:$

$$D_j(\cdot) = T_{K \oplus K^0 \oplus H} U \quad j_{j_1} i_{j_1} j \quad ; \quad 8 \in \mathcal{S}(K)$$

belongs to (29). Since $D = \sum_j s_j D_j$, the proof is complete. ■

For a proof of Lemma 4, an entanglement viewpoint plays an essential role. A state $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H_A \oplus H_B)$ is called separable if there exist states $\rho_A \in \mathcal{S}(H_A); \rho_B \in \mathcal{S}(H_B)$ and a probability p_i such that

$$\rho = \sum_i p_i \rho_A \otimes \rho_B;$$

The following lemma was proven from the viewpoint of entanglement by Nielsen and Kempe [9].

Lemma 7 When the state $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H_A \oplus H_B)$ is separable, the inequality

$$\max \{ \text{Tr}_P \rho_A : \text{projection on } H_A; \text{rank } P = k \}$$

$$\max \{ \text{Tr}_P \rho_B : \text{projection on } H_A \oplus H_B; \text{rank } P = k \}$$

holds for any integer k , where $\rho_A = \text{Tr}_{H_B} \rho$.

Proof of Lemma 4: From Lemma 5 and Lemma 6, it is sufficient to show the inequalities (25), (26) and (27) for the pair an encoder F belonging to (28) and a decoder D belonging to (29). Assume that the Hilbert space H^0 satisfies that $D(\cdot) = T_{H^0} \circ T(\cdot)$. The state $\rho_i = \frac{i \cdot \text{Tr}(F(i)) \cdot i}{\text{Tr} T(F(i)) \cdot i} \in \mathcal{S}(H \oplus H^0)$ is pure and satisfies that $\text{Tr} D(F(i))_i = \text{Tr} T(F(i))_i \cdot I = \text{Tr} T(F(i))_i^0$. Since $\text{Tr}_{H^0} \rho_i = i$, there exists a pure state $\rho_i \in \mathcal{S}(H^0)$ such that $\rho_i = i \otimes \rho_i$. Since the state $\rho_p = \sum_{i \geq 2} p_i \rho_i =$

$P_{i2} P_{i1} P_{i1} P_{i2}$ is separable and $\bar{P} = \text{Tr}_H P_{i1}^{-0}$, Lemma 7 guarantees that

$$\begin{aligned} \max \text{Tr} P_{i1}^{-0} P_{i2} & : \text{projection on } H \otimes H^0; \text{rank } P = \dim K \\ \max \text{Tr} P_{i2}^{-0} P_{i1} & : \text{projection on } H; \text{rank } P = \dim K \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Since $I = F(i)$, we have $T(I) = T(F(i))$. The relations

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i2} P_{i1} \text{Tr} D(F(i))_{i1} &= \sum_{i2} P_{i1} \text{Tr} T(F(i))_{i1}^{-0} \\ \sum_{i2} P_{i1} \text{Tr} T(I)_{i1}^{-0} &= \text{Tr} T(I)_{i1}^{-0} \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

hold. The relations $I = T(I) = 0$ and $\text{Tr} T(I) = \text{Tr} I_K = \dim K$ imply that

$$\text{Tr} T(I)_{i1}^{-0} = \max \text{Tr} P_{i1}^{-0} P_{i2} : \text{projection on } H \otimes H^0; \text{rank } P = \dim K \quad (32)$$

Assume that P_{i1} is a projection on H whose rank is $\dim K$, then

$$\text{Tr}(P_{i1}^{-0} P_{i2}) = \text{Tr}(P_{i1}^{-0} P_{i2}^{-0} P_{i1}) = 0;$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\text{Tr} P_{i1}^{-0} P_{i2} = \dim K + \text{Tr} P_{i1}^{-0} P_{i2}^{-0} P_{i1} = 0; \quad (33)$$

From (30), (31), (32) and (33),

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - (F; D) &= \sum_{i2} P_{i1} \text{Tr} D(F(i))_{i1} \\ \max \text{Tr} P_{i1}^{-0} P_{i2} & : \text{projection on } H \otimes H^0; \text{rank } P = \dim K \\ \max \text{Tr} P_{i2}^{-0} P_{i1} & : \text{projection on } H; \text{rank } P = \dim K \\ &= \dim K + \text{Tr} P_{i1}^{-0} P_{i2}^{-0} P_{i1} = 0; \end{aligned}$$

We obtain (26). Since $\text{Tr} P_{i1}^{-0} P_{i2}^{-0} P_{i1} = 0$, $\text{Tr} P_{i1}^{-0} P_{i2}^{-0} P_{i1} = 0$, the inequalities (25) and (26) hold. Applying Markov inequality (E1) given in Appendix E to the probability $a = f_{a1}$ and the random variable a_{i1}^t , we obtain the inequality

$$\text{Tr} P_{i1}^{-0} P_{i2}^{-0} P_{i1} = 0 \leq e^{-t} \text{Tr} P_{i1}^{-0} P_{i2}^{-0} P_{i1}^{1+t} \leq 8t = 0;$$

where $a_1, \dots, a_d$ are eigenvalues of $\bar{P}$. Substituting $1+t$ for s , we obtain (27). ■

Remark 5 Assume that D is not a CP map but a positive map. In this case, the inequality

$$1 - (F; D) \leq 2e \dim K + 2 \text{Tr} P_{i1}^{-0} P_{i2}^{-0} P_{i1} = 0 \quad (34)$$

holds for $8 \leq R$ instead of (26). This inequality is proven in Appendix D.

VI. PROOF OF THE CONVERSE PART OF THEOREM 2

First, using Lemma 4, we prove inequality (12).

$$r_{e,v}(R, f_{i1}; P_{i1} G_{i2}) = \max_{0 \leq s \leq 1} \frac{(1-s)R - (s)}{s} : \quad (35)$$

Assume that a sequence of visible codes $f(K_n; F_n; D_n)$ satisfies that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \dim K_n = R : \quad (36)$$

It follows from (25) in Lemma 4 that

$$(F_n; D_n) = \text{Tr} P_{i1}^{-n} P_{i2}^{-n} = e^{-ns} = 0 \text{ if } e^{-ns} \dim K_n > 0;$$

When $S = R$, $(S) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \text{Tr} P_{i1}^{-n} P_{i2}^{-n} = e^{-ns}$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log (F_n; D_n) = (S) :$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log (F_n; D_n) &= \inf (S) \leq R = (S) \\ &= \inf (S) \leq (S) = R; \end{aligned}$$

Now, applying (E4) to the random variable $\log a_{i1}$ under the probability distribution a , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (S) &= (1 - s(S)) - (s(S)) \text{ if } H(\cdot) = S^{-0}(0) \\ (S) &= (-0(0)) \text{ if } S > 0(0) \\ (S) &= 0 \text{ if } S < H(\cdot); \end{aligned}$$

where the definition of $s(S)$ is given in Lemma 8 in Appendix A. When $H(\cdot) < S < 0(0)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d(S)}{dS} &= 1 - s(S) = 0 \\ \frac{d(S - R - (S))}{dS} &= s(S) = 0; \end{aligned}$$

When $H(\cdot) < R < \log d = 0(0) = 0(0) - (-0(0))$, we obtain

$$\inf (S) \leq (S) = R = (S) = S_R = R :$$

When $0 \leq R = H(\cdot)$, we obtain

$$\inf (S) \leq (S) = R = \inf (S) \leq H(\cdot) = 0 :$$

Using Lemma 9, we obtain (12).

Next, we prove (13). Assume that a sequence of visible codes $f(K_n; F_n; D_n)$ satisfies that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \dim K_n = R : \quad (37)$$

When $H(\cdot) = R$, it is trivial that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log(1 - (F_n; D_n)) - S_H(\cdot) = 0;$$

Lemma 9 implies (13).

Assume that $a_1 = a_k > a_{k+1}$ and $\log k < R < H(\cdot)$. Since $\log \text{Tr}(\Gamma_p^n)^s = n(s)$, substituting $s = nS_R$ and $s = s(S_R) - 1$ into (27), we have

$$1 - (F_n; D_n) \leq e^{-n(S_R - R)} + e^{-n(S_R(1 - s(S_R)) - (s(S_R)))}; \quad (38)$$

Note that the definitions of $S_R; s(S)$ are given in Lemma 8. Since $S_R - R = S_R(1 - s(S_R)) - (s(S_R))$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log(1 - (F_n; D_n)) - S_R - R \\ = \frac{(1 - s(S_R))R + (s(S_R))}{s(S_R)}; \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where the last inequality follows from $S_R = \frac{R + (s(S_R))}{s(S_R)}$ obtained from (A2). From Lemma 9, we obtain (13).

Assume that $0 < R < \log k$. Substituting $s = n(\log a_1 - \epsilon)$ into (27), we have

$$1 - (F_n; D_n) \leq e^{-n(\log a_1 - R)} + e^{-n((\log a_1 - \epsilon)(1 - s) - (s))} \quad (40)$$

for $\epsilon > 0$ and $\delta s \geq 1$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{s \rightarrow 1} (\log a_1 - \epsilon)(1 - s) - (s) \\ = \lim_{s \rightarrow 1} (s - 1) - \log \frac{ka_1^s}{d \prod_{i=1}^s a_i^s} - \log a_1 + \log k = 1; \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log(1 - (F_n; D_n)) - \log a_1 - R = 0;$$

Arbitrariness of $\epsilon > 0$ implies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log(1 - (F_n; D_n)) - \log a_1 - R = 0;$$

Lemma 9 implies (13).

VII. DISCUSSION

When the source $\mathbf{x}_i$ is mixed and has no trivial redundancies, Koashi and Imoto [19] proved that the bound R_B equals $H(\cdot)$ in the blind case. Lemma 3 holds for the mixed case. However, its optimality is not proven in the sense of exponents in the mixed case. In this case it may not be optimal.

It is interesting that our exponent corresponds to the exponents of the variable-length universal entanglement concentration given by Hayashi and Matsumoto [20] and

the fixed-length entanglement concentration given by Hayashi et al. [21]. However, our error exponent corresponds to the success exponent of [20], and our correct exponent corresponds to the failure exponents of [20] and [21]. Note that in [21] the optimal exponent r is given as the function of the rate R while in this paper and [20], the rate R is given as a function of the optimal exponent r . In addition, in quantum hypothesis testing, an error exponent similar to (2) is given in Ogawa and Hayashi [22].

Acknowledgment

The author is grateful to Dr. A. Winter for advice on Nielsen and Kempe's paper [9]. He acknowledges stimulating discussions with Professor H. Nagaoka, Professor K. Matsumoto and Dr. T. Ogawa. He, also, thanks an anonymous referee for useful comments.

APPENDIX A: EQUIVALENCE BETWEEN DIFFERENT CHARACTERIZATIONS

In the classical case, the exponent has two forms [8][23][24]. Following Ogawa and Nagaoka [25], we prove this equivalence in the quantum source coding case. In this section we treat a state $\rho = \sum_i a_i \rho_i$ and the function $s(\rho) = \log \text{Tr} \rho^s$, where $a_i = a_{i+1}$. We assume that $a_1 = a_k > a_{k+1}$ and $d = \dim H$.

Lemma 8 If $\log a_1 < S$ and $\log k < R < \log d$, we can uniquely define $s(S) > 0$ and S_R such that

$$S = s(S); \quad (A1)$$

$$R = s(S_R)S_R + (s(S_R)); \quad (A2)$$

Conversely, when $R < \log k$,

$$R < s^{-1}(s) + (s); \quad (A3)$$

Proof: Since

$$s(s) = \frac{\text{Tr}(\log \rho)^2 \text{Tr} \rho^s - (\text{Tr}(\log \rho^s))^2}{(\text{Tr} \rho^s)^2} > 0 \quad (A4)$$

for $s > 0$, the function $s(s)$ is monotone decreasing. Because $\lim_{s \rightarrow 1} s(s) = \log a_1$, $s(S)$ is uniquely defined in $(\log a_1; s(0)]$.

When $S \geq (\log a_1; s(0)]$, we can calculate

$$\frac{d}{ds} s(S)S + (s(S)) = s(S) > 0;$$

As shown latter, the equation

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 1} s(s)S + (s) = \log k; \quad (A5)$$

holds. Since

$$s(0)0 + (0) = (0) = d;$$

S_R also is uniquely defined. The inequality $\frac{d}{ds} (s^0(s) + (s)) = s^0(s) - 0$ yields (A3).

Finally, we show (A5). We calculate as

$$\begin{aligned}
 s^0(s) + (s) &= \sum_{i=1}^{X^d} s \log a_i - \frac{a_i^s}{\prod_{j=1}^d a_j^s} + \log a_1^s \\
 &= \sum_{i=k+1}^{X^d} s \frac{a_i^s}{\prod_{j=1}^d a_j^s} \log a_i + \log a_j^s \log ka_1^s \\
 &\quad + k s \frac{a_1^s}{\prod_{j=1}^d a_j^s} \log a_1 + s \log a_1 + \log k \\
 &= \sum_{i=k+1}^{X^d} s \frac{a_i^s}{\prod_{j=1}^d a_j^s} \log a_i + \log \frac{\prod_{j=1}^d a_j^s}{ka_1^s} \\
 &\quad + s \frac{\prod_{i=k+1}^d a_i^s}{\prod_{j=1}^d a_j^s} \log a_1 + \log k:
 \end{aligned}$$

The terms $\frac{a_i^s}{\prod_{j=1}^d a_j^s}$ and $\frac{\prod_{i=k+1}^d a_i^s}{\prod_{j=1}^d a_j^s}$ exponentially go to 0 as $s \rightarrow 1$. The term $\frac{\prod_{j=1}^d a_j^s}{ka_1^s}$ goes to 1. Thus, we obtain (A5). ■

Lemma 9 When $\log k < R < \log d$, the equations

$$S_R - R = S_R (1 - s(S_R)) - (s(S_R)) \quad (A6)$$

$$= \frac{(1 - s(S_R))R - (s(S_R))}{s(S_R)} \quad (A7)$$

$$= \min_{H(b)=R} D(bka) = \min_{H(\cdot)=R} D(k) \quad (A8)$$

hold, where $\cdot$ is a state on H and b is a probability on $f_1, \dots, d$. When $0 < R < \log k$, the equations

$$\min_{H(b)=R} D(bka) = \min_{H(\cdot)=R} D(k) = \log a_1 - R: \quad (A9)$$

hold. When $H(\cdot) < R < \log d$,

$$S_R - R = \min_{H(b)=R} D(bka) = \min_{H(\cdot)=R} D(k) \quad (A10)$$

$$= \max_{0 < s < 1} \frac{(1-s)R - (s)}{s} \quad (A11)$$

$$0 = \min_{H(b)=R} D(bka) = \min_{H(\cdot)=R} D(k) \quad (A12)$$

$$= \max_{s < 1} \frac{(1-s)R - (s)}{s}: \quad (A13)$$

When $\log k < R < H(\cdot)$,

$$0 = \min_{H(b)=R} D(bka) = \min_{H(\cdot)=R} D(k) \quad (A14)$$

$$= \max_{0 < s < 1} \frac{(1-s)R - (s)}{s} \quad (A15)$$

$$S_R - R = \min_{H(b)=R} D(bka) = \min_{H(\cdot)=R} D(k) \quad (A16)$$

$$= \max_{s < 1} \frac{(1-s)R - (s)}{s}: \quad (A17)$$

When $0 < R < \log k$,

$$0 = \min_{H(b)=R} D(bka) = \min_{H(\cdot)=R} D(k) \quad (A18)$$

$$= \max_{0 < s < 1} \frac{(1-s)R - (s)}{s} \quad (A19)$$

$$\log a_1 - R = \min_{H(b)=R} D(bka) = \min_{H(\cdot)=R} D(k) \quad (A20)$$

$$= \sup_{s < 1} \frac{(1-s)R - (s)}{s}: \quad (A21)$$

Proof: Equation (A6) follows from (A2). Equation (A2) yields

$$S_R = \frac{R - (s(S_R))}{s(S_R)}:$$

Substituting the above equation into $S_R - R$, we obtain (A7). We prove (A8). Assume that $\log k < R < \log d$. Letting $s = \frac{s}{Tr s}$, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
 D(k) - D(s k) &= Tr(\log \log) - Tr \frac{s}{Tr s} \log \frac{s}{Tr s} \log \\
 &= Tr \log \log \frac{s}{Tr s} \\
 &\quad + Tr \frac{s}{Tr s} \log \frac{s}{Tr s} \log \\
 &= D(k_s) - (1-s) Tr \frac{s}{Tr s} \log \\
 &\quad H(\cdot) + H(s) \\
 &= Tr \log \log \frac{s}{Tr s} \\
 &\quad + Tr \frac{s}{Tr s} \log \frac{s}{Tr s} \\
 &= D(k_s) + s Tr \frac{s}{Tr s} \log:
 \end{aligned}$$

Equation (A2) guarantees that $H(s(S_R)) = R$. Assuming that $H(\cdot) = R$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{D(k_{s(S_R)})}{s(S_R)} &= Tr_{s(S_R)} \log \\
 &= \frac{1}{1 - s(S_R)} D(k) - D(s(S_R)k) - D(k_{s(S_R)})
 \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$D(k) - D(s(S_R)k) = \frac{1}{s(S_R)} D(k_{s(S_R)}) - 0:$$

It implies that

$$D(s(S_R)k) = \min_{H(\cdot)=R} D(k) = \min_{H(b)=R} D(bka):$$

Note that s is commutative with $\cdot$. Equation (A2) yields

$$D(s(S_R), k) = \frac{1}{s(S_R)} (1 - s(S_R)) (s(S_R)) \\ = s_R (1 - s(S_R)) (s(S_R)):$$

Then, we obtain (A8).

Next, we proceed (A9) and assume that $0 < R < \log k$. When $H(\cdot) = R$,

$$D(k) = \text{Tr} \log + \text{Tr} (\log) \\ H(\cdot) + \text{Tr} (\log a_1) = \log a_1 - R:$$

Let $c = \{c_i\}_{i=1}^k$ be a probability whose entropy is R . Then we have

$$D\left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k c_i \log c_i\right) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k c_i (\log c_i - \log a_1) \\ = \log a_1 - R:$$

Thus, we obtain (A9), which implies (A20).

Taking the derivative with respect to R in (A2), we have

$$\frac{d}{dR} s(S_R) = \frac{1}{s(S_R) - \log(s(S_R))} < 0: \quad (\text{A22})$$

From (A1), we have

$$\frac{d}{dR} (S_R - R) = \frac{1}{s(S_R)} \frac{d}{dR} s(S_R) - 1 = \frac{1 - s(S_R)}{s(S_R)}: \\ \frac{d}{dR} (S_R - R) = \frac{1}{s^3(S_R)} \log(s(S_R)) > 0:$$

Thus, the function $R \mapsto S_R - R$ is convex, and $\frac{d}{dR} (S_R - R) = 0$ if and only if $s(S_R) = 1$, i.e. $R = H(\cdot)$. The function takes minimum value 0 at $R = H(\cdot)$ because $S_H(\cdot) - H(\cdot) = 0$. Therefore, we obtain (A10), (A12), (A14), (A16), and (A18).

Next, we discuss the other forms described by $\cdot$. We can calculate the derivatives as

$$\frac{d}{ds} \frac{(1-s)R - (s)}{s} = \frac{R - s \log(s) + (s)}{s^2} \quad (\text{A23})$$

$$\frac{d}{ds} (R - s \log(s) + (s)) = \frac{1}{s} \log(s) < 0; \quad (\text{A24})$$

where the last inequality follows from (A4). In (A24) and (A4), the equalities hold if and only if $s = 0$.

Assume $\log k < R < \log d$. Since it follows from (A1) and (A2) that

$$R - s(S_R) \log(s(S_R)) + (s(S_R)) = 0; \quad (\text{A25})$$

the equation

$$\max_{s>0} \frac{(1-s)R - (s)}{s} = \frac{(1-s(S_R))R + (s(S_R))}{s(S_R)}$$

holds. Relation (A22) implies that the function $R \mapsto s(S_R)$ strictly monotonically decreases, and $s(S_R) = 1$ if and only if $R = H(\cdot)$. Therefore,

$$\max_{0 < s < 1} \frac{(1-s)R - (s)}{s} \\ = \begin{cases} \frac{(1-s(S_R))R + (s(S_R))}{s(S_R)} & \text{if } H(\cdot) < R < \log d \\ 0 & \text{if } \log k < R = H(\cdot) \end{cases} \\ \max_{s=1} \frac{(1-s)R - (s)}{s} \\ = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } H(\cdot) < R < \log d \\ \frac{(1-s(S_R))R + (s(S_R))}{s(S_R)} & \text{if } \log k < R = H(\cdot) \end{cases}$$

Note that $\frac{(1-s)R - (s)}{s} = 0$. We obtain (A11), (A13), (A15) and (A17).

When $0 < R < \log k$, Lemma 8 guarantees that the RHS of (A23) is positive for any $s > 0$. Thus,

$$\sup_{s>0} \frac{(1-s)R - (s)}{s} = \lim_{s \rightarrow 1} \frac{(1-s)R - (s)}{s} \\ = \log a_1 - R;$$

which implies

$$\max_{0 < s < 1} \frac{(1-s)R - (s)}{s} = 0 \\ \sup_{s=1} \frac{(1-s)R - (s)}{s} = \log a_1 - R:$$

We obtain (A15) and (A21). ■

APPENDIX B: REPRESENTATION THEORETICAL TYPE METHODS

In this section, we prove the following two lemmas used in our proof of Lemma 3. We assume that $\mathbf{c} = \{c_i\}_{i=1}^d$ and d is the dimension of H .

Lemma 10 The relations

$$\exp -nH \frac{n}{n} (n+d) \frac{d(d+1)}{2} \\ \dim V_n \quad (\text{B1})$$

$$(n+d)^{2d} \exp -nH \frac{n}{n} \quad (\text{B2})$$

$$\# \{f_n\}_{n=1}^2 Y_n g (n+1)^d \quad (\text{B3})$$

$$\dim U_n (n+1)^d \quad (\text{B4})$$

hold, where $C(n)$ is defined as

$$C(n) = \frac{n!}{n_1! n_2! \dots n_d!}:$$

Proof: Inequality (B3) is trivial. Using Young index n , the basis of U_n is described by $\{e_{n_1} e_{n_2} \dots e_{n_d}\}$, where the

set Y^n is defined as

$$Y^n = \sum_{i=1}^n n^0 = \sum_{i=1}^n f_{n_i}^0 g_{2Z^d} \quad \begin{matrix} P \\ P_{i=1}^n n_i^0 = P_{i=1}^n n_i^0; \\ 1 \quad 8m \quad d \quad 1; \\ s \text{ is any permutation} \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} 9 \\ \sum \\ \sum \end{matrix} :$$

Thus, we obtain (B4). Note that the correspondence n^0 and e_{n^0} depends on the choice of Cartan subalgebra, i.e. the choice of basis of H .

According to Weyl [13], and Iwahori [15], the following equation holds and is evaluated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \dim V_n &= \frac{n!}{(n_1 + d - 1)!(n_2 + d - 2)! \cdots n_d!} \sum_{j > i}^Y (n_i - n_j - i + j) \\ &= \frac{n!}{n_1! n_2! \cdots n_d!} \sum_{j > i}^Y (n_i - n_j - i + j) \\ &= C(n) (n + d)^{2d} \\ &= (n + d)^{2d} \exp -nH \frac{n}{n} : \end{aligned} \quad (B5)$$

Thus, we obtain (B2). As an opposite inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dim V_n &= \frac{n!}{(n_1 + d - 1)!(n_2 + d - 2)! \cdots n_d!} \\ &= \frac{n!}{n_1! n_2! \cdots n_d!} \frac{1}{n + d} \frac{1}{n + d} \cdots \frac{1}{n + d} \\ &= C(n) \frac{1}{n + d} \frac{d(d+1)}{2} \exp -nH \frac{n}{n} (n + d) \frac{d(d+1)}{2}; \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from

$$C(n) \frac{1}{(n+1)^d} \exp -nH \frac{n}{n} ;$$

which is easily proven by the type method [8]. We obtain (B1). ■

The following is essentially equivalent to Keyl and Werner's result [18]. For the reader's convenience, we give a simpler proof.

Lemma 11 The following relations

$$\begin{aligned} (n + d) \frac{d(d+1)}{2} \exp -nD \frac{n}{n} a \\ \text{Tr} P_n^n \end{aligned} \quad (B6)$$

$$(n + d)^{3d} \exp -nD \frac{n}{n} a \quad (B7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (n + d) \frac{d(d+1)}{2} \exp -n \min_{n \in 2nR \setminus Y_n} D \frac{n}{n} a \\ \sum_{n \in 2nR} \text{Tr} P_n^n \end{aligned} \quad (B8)$$

$$(n + d)^{4d} \exp -n \inf_{b \in 2R} D(bka) ; \quad (B9)$$

hold, where R is a subset consisting of probabilities on $\{1, \dots, d\}$ and we denote the projection to W_n by P_n .

Proof: Let U_n^0 be an irreducible representation of $SU(d)$ in H^n , which is equivalent to U_n . We denote its projection by P_n^0 . Now, we choose the basis $f_{n^0} g_{n^0} Y^n$ of U_n^0 depending the basis f_{n^0} of H . The base e_{n^0} is the eigenvector of n with the eigenvalue $\sum_{i=1}^d a_i^{n_i}$. Since n^0 is a $\mathbb{Z}$ -lattice, we can calculate the operator norm by

$$P_n^0 P_n^0 = \sum_{i=1}^d a_i^{n_i}; \quad (B10)$$

where $\|X\| = \sup_{\|x\|=1} \|Xx\|$. from (B4), (B5) and (B10), the relations

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} P_n^n &= \dim V_n \text{Tr} P_n^0^n = (n + d)^{3d} C(n) \sum_{i=1}^d a_i^{n_i} \\ &= (n + d)^{3d} \text{Mul}(a; n) \end{aligned}$$

hold, where we denote the multinomial distribution of a by $\text{Mul}(a; \cdot)$. Inequality (B3) guarantees

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{(n+1)^d} \exp -nD \frac{n}{n} a &= \text{Mul}(a; n) \\ \exp -nD \frac{n}{n} a & : \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain inequality (B7). Inequality (B3) guarantees that

$$\sum_{n \in 2nR \setminus Y_n} \text{Tr} P_n^n = (n + d)^{4d} \exp -n \inf_{b \in 2R} D(bka) ;$$

which implies inequality (B9). From (B10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} P_n^n &= \dim V_n \text{Tr} P_n^0^n \\ \exp -nH \frac{n}{n} (n + d) \frac{d(d+1)}{2} \sum_{i=1}^d a_i^{n_i} \\ &= (n + d) \frac{d(d+1)}{2} \exp -nD \frac{n}{n} a : \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain inequalities (B6) and (B8). ■

APPENDIX C: PROOF OF (14), (15), (16) AND (17)

Since

$$\begin{aligned} (F; D) &= \sum_{i=1}^X p_i (1 - \text{Tr} D F(i)_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^X p_i (1 - \frac{1}{\text{Tr} D F(i)_i}) = \sum_{i=1}^X (F; D) ; \end{aligned}$$

the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} r_{e;V,B}(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{i; p_i g_{i2}\}) &= r_{e;V}(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{i; p_i g_{i2}\}) \\ r_{e;V}(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{i; p_i g_{i2}\}) &= r_{e;V,B}(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{i; p_i g_{i2}\}) \end{aligned} \quad (C1)$$

hold. Similarly, we can prove that

$$\begin{aligned} r_{e;B,B}(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{i; p_i g_{i2}\}) &= r_{e;B}(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{i; p_i g_{i2}\}) \\ r_{e;B}(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{i; p_i g_{i2}\}) &= r_{e;B,B}(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{i; p_i g_{i2}\}): \end{aligned}$$

Using Jensen's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (F_n; D_n) &= \sum_{i2} p_i (1 - \text{Tr} D_n - F_n(i)) \\ &= 1 - \sum_{i2} p_i \frac{1}{\text{Tr} D_n - F_n(i)} \\ &= 1 - (1 - b(F_n; D_n))^2 = 2b(F_n; D_n) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain the opposite inequality from (C1) and then obtain (15). Similarly, we can prove (14).

APPENDIX D: PROOF OF (34)

For any visible code $(K; F; D)$, we define an operator T by $T = FD(I) - 1 - 0gD(I)FD(I) - 1 - 0g + FD(I) - 1 > 0g$. The operator inequality

$$P \leq P + (I - P)(I - P) \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad (D1)$$

holds for any projection P . It is sufficient for (D1) to show the pure state case. The pure state case of (D1) is directly proven using the inequality $2(\|x\|^2 + \|y\|^2) \geq \|x + y\|^2$ for any two complex numbers x, y . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} FD(I) - 1 - 0gD(F(i))FD(I) - 1 - 0g \\ + FD(I) - 1 > 0gD(F(i))FD(I) - 1 > 0g \\ \frac{1}{2}D(F(i)): \end{aligned} \quad (D2)$$

The inequality $D(I) - D(F(i))$ follows from the inequality $I \geq F(i)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} FD(I) - 1 - 0gD(I)FD(I) - 1 - 0g \\ FD(I) - 1 - 0gD(F(i))FD(I) - 1 - 0g: \end{aligned} \quad (D3)$$

From the relations $\text{Tr} D(F(i)) = 1$ and $D(F(i)) \geq 0$, we can prove

$$\begin{aligned} FD(I) - 1 > 0g \\ FD(I) - 1 > 0gD(F(i))FD(I) - 1 > 0g: \end{aligned} \quad (D4)$$

It follows from (D3) and (D4) that

$$\begin{aligned} FD(I) - 1 - 0gD(I)FD(I) - 1 - 0g + FD(I) - 1 > 0g \\ FD(I) - 1 - 0gD(F(i))FD(I) - 1 - 0g \\ + FD(I) - 1 > 0gD(F(i))FD(I) - 1 > 0g: \end{aligned} \quad (D5)$$

From (D5) and (D2), we have

$$T \geq \frac{1}{2}D(F(i)): \quad (D6)$$

Note that

$$\text{Tr} T = \text{Tr} D(I) = \dim K: \quad (D7)$$

Since $I \geq T \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(e^{-tT}) &= \text{Tr}(e^{-tF(i)}) \\ \text{Tr}(e^{-tF(i)}) &= 0g: \end{aligned} \quad (D8)$$

From (D6), (D7) and (D8), we obtain (26).

APPENDIX E: MARKOV INEQUALITY AND CRAMER'S THEOREM

In this section, we summarize Markov inequality and Cramer's Theorem which are applied in this paper. Let p be a probability distribution and X be a positive real valued random variable. For any real number $c > 0$, we can easily prove the inequality

$$\frac{E_p(X)}{c} \leq p\{X \geq c\}; \quad (E1)$$

where E_p presents the expectation under the distribution p . This inequality is called Markov inequality.

This inequality can be used for large deviation evaluation as follows. Let Y be a real valued random variable. In the n -i.i.d. setting, we focus on the random variable.

$$Y^n = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{Y_i}{n};$$

where Y_i is the i -th random variable identical to Y . Applying Markov inequality for the random variable e^{tY^n} , we have

$$p^n\{Y^n \geq x\} = p^n\{e^{n t Y^n} \geq e^{n t x}\} \leq \frac{e^{n(t)x}}{e^{n t x}}$$

for $t \geq 0$, which is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{n} \log p^n\{Y^n \geq x\} \leq t(x);$$

where $t(x) = \log E_p(\exp(tY))$. Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{n} \log p^n\{Y^n \geq x\} \leq \sup_{t \geq 0} (t(x) - t): \quad (E2)$$

Conversely, the inequality

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p^n\{Y^n \geq x\} \geq \inf_{x' > x} I(x') \quad (E3)$$

holds, where $I(x) = \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} (t(x) - t)$. For a proof of (E3), see Chapter II of Bucklew [26]. The pair of (E2) and (E3) is called Cramer's Theorem.

In the following, we discuss the case $t(\cdot)$ is convex and differentiable. We define three real numbers x_1, x_2 and x_3 as

$$x_1 := \lim_{t \downarrow 1} t^0(t); \quad x_2 := \lim_{t \downarrow 1} t^0(t); \quad x_3 := t^0(0):$$

For any $x \in (x_2, x_1)$, we can uniquely define $t(x)$ as

$$x = t^0(t(x)):$$

Then,

$$I(x) = xt(x) - t(x); \quad I^0(x) = t(x);$$

$$I^{\infty}(x) = t^0(x) = \frac{1}{t^0(t(x))};$$

where the last equation follows from

$$1 = \frac{dx}{dt} = t^0(x) - t^0(t(x)):$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p^n f_{Y_n}(x) = \begin{cases} xt(x) - t(x) & \text{if } x_3 < x < x_1 \\ +1 & \text{if } x > x_1 \\ 0 & \text{if } x < x_3 \end{cases} \quad (\text{E } 4)$$

except for $x = x_1$.

-
- [1] B. Schumacher, "Quantum coding," *Phys. Rev. A*, 51 (4), 2738-2747, (1995).
- [2] R. Jozsa and B. Schumacher, "A new proof of the quantum noiseless coding theorem," *J. Mod. Optics*, 41 (12), 2343-2349, (1994).
- [3] H. Barnum, C. A. Fuchs, R. Jozsa and B. Schumacher, "General Fidelity Limit for Quantum Channels," *Phys. Rev. A*, 54, 4707-4711 (1996).
- [4] M. Horodecki, "Limits of compression of quantum information carried by ensembles of mixed state," *Phys. Rev. A*, 57, 3364-3369 (1998).
- [5] A. Winter, "Coding Theorems of Quantum Information Theory," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, (2000). LANL eprint quant-ph/9907077, (1999).
- [6] R. Jozsa, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki and R. Horodecki, "Universal Quantum Information Compression," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 81, 1714 (1998). LANL eprint quant-ph/9805017 (1998).
- [7] M. Hayashi and K. Matsuoto, "Quantum universal variable-length source coding," LANL eprint quant-ph/0202001, (2002).
- [8] I. Csiszar and J. Komer, *Information Theory: Coding Theorems for Discrete Memoryless Systems*, (Academic Press, New York, 1981).
- [9] M. A. Nielsen and J. Kempe, "Separable States are More Disordered Globally than Locally," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 86, 5184-5187 (2001). LANL eprint quant-ph/0011117, (2000).
- [10] C. H. Bennett, "Quantum cryptography using any two nonorthogonal states," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 68, pp. 3121-3124, 1992.
- [11] H. Barnum, C. M. Caves, C. A. Fuchs, R. Jozsa, and B. W. Schumacher "On quantum coding for ensembles of mixed states," LANL eprint quant-ph/0008024, (2000).
- [12] D. Petz and M. Mosonyi, "Stationary quantum source coding," *J. Math. Phys.*, 42, 4857, (2001).
- [13] H. Weyl, *The classical groups, their invariants and representations*, (Princeton, 1939).
- [14] R. Goodman and N. Wallach, *Representations and Invariants of the Classical Groups*, (Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- [15] N. Iwahori, *Taishougun to Ippansenkeigun no Hyogenron*, (Iwanami, Tokyo, 1978). (In Japanese)
- [16] M. Hayashi, "Asymptotics of quantum relative entropy from a representation theoretical viewpoint," *J. Phys. A: Math. and Gen.* 34, 3413-3419 (2001). LANL eprint quant-ph/9704040, (1997).
- [17] M. Hayashi, "Optimal sequence of POVMs in the sense of Stein's lemma in quantum hypothesis testing,"
- [18] M. Keyl and R. F. Werner, "Estimating the spectrum of a density operator," *Phys. Rev. A* 64, 052311 (2001). LANL eprint quant-ph/0102027, (2001).
- [19] M. Koashi and N. Imoto "Compressibility of Mixed-State Signals," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 87, 017902 (2001). LANL eprint quant-ph/0103128, (2001).
- [20] M. Hayashi and K. Matsuoto, "Variable length universal entanglement concentration by local operations and its application to teleportation and dense coding," LANL eprint quant-ph/0109028 (2001). appear in *Phys. Rev. A*.
- [21] M. Hayashi, M. Koashi, K. Matsuoto, F. Morikoshi and A. Winter, "Error exponents for entanglement concentration," LANL eprint quant-ph/0206097 (2002).
- [22] T. Ogawa and M. Hayashi, "On Error Exponents in Quantum Hypothesis Testing," LANL eprint quant-ph/0206151 (2002)
- [23] R. E. Blahut, *Principles and Practice of Information Theory*, (Addison-Wesley, 1987).
- [24] I. Csiszar and G. Longo, "On the error exponent for the noiseless encoding for testing simple statistical hypothesis," *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar.*, vol 6, 181-191, (1971).
- [25] T. Ogawa and H. Nagaoka, "Strong converse and Stein's lemma in quantum hypothesis testing," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol 46, 2428-2433, (2000). LANL eprint quant-ph/9906090, (1999).
- [26] J. A. Bucklew, *Large Deviation Techniques in Decision, Simulation and Estimation*, (John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1990).