

On the capacities of bipartite Hamiltonians and unitary gates

C. H. Bennett,² A. Harrow,¹³ D. W. Leung,¹² J. A. Smolin²

²*IBM TJ Watson Research Center, P.O. Box 218, Yorktown Heights, NY 10598, USA*

³*MIT Physics Dept., 77 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA*

October 30, 2018

Abstract

We consider interactions as bidirectional channels, and investigate the capacities for interaction Hamiltonians and nonlocal unitary gates to generate entanglement and transmit classical information. We give analytic expressions for the entanglement generating capacity and entanglement-assisted 1-way classical communication capacity of interactions, and show that these quantities are additive, so that the asymptotic capacities equal the corresponding 1-shot capacities. We give bounds on other capacities and discuss their additivity, along with other open questions.

1 Introduction

1.1 General

The fundamental resource to perform various quantum information processing tasks is the interaction between various quantum systems. These quantum systems can be, for example, individual registers in a quantum computer, or the Hilbert spaces in the possession of several isolated parties. Physically, these interactions are nonlocal (with respect to an individual system) Hamiltonians or their discrete time incarnation as nonlocal unitary gates. Examples of such distributed tasks include converting a given interaction into a different one such as a universal quantum gate, generating entanglement between remote parties, and communicating classical or quantum information. Each of these tasks is an information processing primitive, and the ability to perform it is a resource. The study of the conversions among these various resources and the efficiencies thereof has proved to be a fruitful field.

While our knowledge about the optimal use of a given nonlocal Hamiltonian to provide the derived resources is far from complete, important progress has been made. References [1, 2, 3, 4] provide motivating examples on the interconversion of these resources. These examples apply to many closely related specific tasks:

- (1) Simulation of one nonlocal Hamiltonian or gate with another: Refs. in [5] present methods for doing so, some of which are optimal under certain circumstances.
- (2) Generation of entanglement using nonlocal Hamiltonians and gates: Partial results are obtained in Refs. [7, 8, 9].
- (3) Classical (or quantum) communications using nonlocal Hamiltonians and gates.
- (4) Performing a nonlocal unitary gate or quantum operation using entanglement and classical communication: This is the converse of the last two tasks. General formalisms for the 1-shot bipartite case are given by [6] and methods for more specific gates are given.

¹Correspondence: aram@mit.edu, wcleung@watson.ibm.com

As an example of the relations between these tasks, note that entanglement, forward classical communication and backward classical communications are strictly incomparable resources: no amount of one can be generated even from an infinite supply of the other two. Thus the capacity of a given interaction to create each of the three resources in tasks (2,3) cannot exceed the amount used to implement the interaction in task (4). Similarly, the efficiency for one interaction to simulate another in task (1) provides bounds on the relative efficiency of task (4) for the simulating interaction and tasks (2) and (3) for the simulated interaction.

In this paper we study the capacities of bipartite interactions to generate entanglement and perform classical communication in systems of unlimited Hilbert space dimension, supplemented by arbitrary ancillas. We define communication capacities of an interaction, and give expressions for the entanglement generating capacity and the entanglement-assisted forward classical capacity of an interaction. These quantities are additive in the sense that the amount of entanglement (respectively forward classical communication capacity) generated by n uses of a gate is n times the amount generated by one use.

Besides the expressions for the capacities of resources derived from interactions, there are intriguing questions concerning their relations with each other. For instance, while any 2-qubit interaction has a symmetric normal form [8, 9] and has to be equally good in forward and backward communications, this may not be true in higher dimensions, since interactions are generally asymmetric [24]. As another example, it is unclear if an interaction that generates more entanglement than another also communicates better. Simple interactions such as CNOT and SWAP suggest the validity of these relations, but we will propose examples which suggest otherwise.

In the next two subsections, we elaborate on our motivation to these problems and our discussion of related works.

1.2 Entanglement generating capacity of interactions

Entanglement is recognized as an important resource for quantum information processing and how to establish entanglement given other resources is much studied. Ref. [11] shows how to convert many copies of some pure entangled states to the standard maximally entangled state $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$ (also called an EPR state) which is defined to have 1 “ebit” of entanglement. In [12], the asymptotic rates to create ebits is equated to the quantum channel capacity assisted by 1- or 2-way classical communication. An important primitive involved is called “distillation” which converts many copies of a certain (possibly mixed) bipartite state ρ to EPR pairs, where ρ results from sending one part of an optimal bipartite state through the noisy channel. These asymptotic operations give rise to asymptotic measures for quantifying entanglement [11, 12, 13]. Subsequent studies of 1-shot (nonasymptotic) manipulation of entanglement [14] give rise to other nonasymptotic measures [15].

Likewise, an interaction or bipartite quantum operation, is a bidirectional channel (see next section) and can similarly be used to create entanglement. Simple examples were considered in Refs. [1, 2, 3, 4]. Reference [7] considers the average amount of entanglement created by one use of a nonlocal operation on a distribution of product states. Reference [6] classifies the type of entanglement (bound or free) that can be created from product states. In Refs. [8] and [9], the entanglement created on pure input states without local ancillas are considered, using an arbitrary 2-qubit Hamiltonian and a single use of a gate respectively. Optimal solutions are obtained with initial entanglement [8] or without [9]. In both papers, examples with ancillas show that they increase the created entanglement. Nonasymptotic measures of pure state entanglement are also considered in [9].

In this paper, we consider unitary interactions which can be the time evolution due to a nonlocal Hamil-

tonian or a unitary gate. In the spirit of [12], we investigate the entanglement generating capacity of nonlocal bipartite gates or Hamiltonians, in the limit when an asymptotically large number of the gates (or time use of the Hamiltonian) is given. For generality, we allow arbitrary input states which can be pure or mixed, ancillas of arbitrary dimensions, and arbitrary amount of initial entanglement. These conditions are very different from [8, 9] which are precedents to the current work.

The generality and asymptotic nature of our set up surprisingly simplifies rather than complicates our analysis. We will show that, first, the problem becomes independent of the existence of initial entanglement or catalyst [16]. Second, when the same measure of entanglement are used for the input and output states, the asymptotic rate can be achieved by a noncollective method: repeated use of the optimal 1-shot strategy on the corresponding optimal input. However, preprocessing and postprocessing of the input and output states are generally collective. Furthermore, when entanglement of formation or the entanglement cost are used to quantify entanglement, the asymptotic rate can be achieved on pure input states, and free classical communication is unnecessary. Finally, we consider input and output entanglement measures with proper asymptotic operational meaning. The input and output measures are taken to be the entanglement cost and the distillable entanglement respectively, and we recover the same additivity result.

Leifer, Henderson, and Linden [10] have independently shown, by similar arguments, that the asymptotic entanglement generating capacity on pure input states is an optimization over a 1-shot expression. They also investigate the capacities for many 2-qubit gates with low dimension ancillas both analytically and numerically.

1.3 Bipartite quantum operations as bidirectional channels

Communication capacity is usually discussed in the context of a *noiseless or noisy* channel connecting a sender (Alice) to a receiver (Bob). Classical channels are very simple, having only a single capacity for classical messages, which completely characterizes the channel due to Shannon’s theorem [17] and the (classical) reverse Shannon theorem [18]. It is also known that auxiliary resources such as back communication and shared randomness do not increase the forward channel capacity. In contrast, a quantum channel has different capacities for quantum and classical messages, and each capacity depends on the existence of a variety of auxiliary resources. These auxiliary resources include unlimited one-way or two-way classical communication when transmitting quantum messages [12], and unlimited supply of pure or noisy entanglement when transmitting classical messages [19, 20, 21, 22, 23].

In the usual model of quantum channels, a quantum system is physically transported from Alice to Bob, with possible changes to the state described by a completely-positive trace-preserving (TCP) map (see [35]). This model of a channel is unidirectional – Bob cannot send information to Alice, unless a back classical channel is available. Physically, this is peculiar, since unlike classical systems, a quantum system cannot affect another quantum system without being changed itself. For example, a classical CNOT always leaves the source bit unmodified, but a quantum CNOT (defined in the computational basis) operates in reverse direction in the conjugate basis. Thus, the quantum CNOT, when used in conjunction with other local gates, can transmit an equivalent amount of information in either direction, unlike our usual model of a quantum channel.

In this paper, we generalize the usual model of quantum channels to take into account the intrinsic bidirectional nature of quantum interactions. In this model, we define a “bidirectional channel” as a bipartite quantum operation (i.e. a trace preserving, completely positive, or TCP, linear map). Alice and Bob each inputs a state to the “bidirectional channel” and receives an output. We focus on unitary bidirectional

channels which is “noiseless”, yet they are far more complicated than usual noiseless channels. We use the term *protocol* for a general quantum circuit using the gate or Hamiltonian, and with bipartite quantum inputs and outputs. Each protocol allows various amount of classical or quantum communication in each direction per use of the unitary gate or per unit time of the Hamiltonian. Generally, there is a tradeoff between the forward and backward amount of communication. For example, a CNOT gate enables Alice to communicate a classical bit to Bob, or vice versa, but not both. As back communication is intrinsic in bidirectional channels, the protocols are intrinsically interactive.

Auxiliary resources play even more important roles in protocols using bidirectional channels than the usual channels. Most generally, Alice and Bob are given unlimited local resources, including the freedom to attach and remove local ancillas, and to perform instantaneous local operations. When communicating via a fixed unitary gate, the local operations are allowed between different uses of the gate, and when communicating via a fixed Hamiltonian, local operations may intersperse the Hamiltonian evolution. Once again one can consider entanglement-assisted classical communication, and classical-communication-assisted quantum communication, and in both cases, shared randomness can be given as a resource.

Our long term goal is to obtain expressions for these capacities, understand the tradeoff between forward and backward communication, and relate the quantities to other capacities such as the entanglement generation capacities. In this paper, we make precise the definitions of various asymptotic capacities of bidirectional channels. We also obtain an expression for the one-way (forward or backward) entanglement-assisted classical capacity for any arbitrary nonlocal gate or Hamiltonian. Surprisingly, the general and asymptotic settings again simplify the problem, similar to the entanglement generating capacity. We found that the asymptotic capacity is achieved by a 1-shot expression, as an optimization over input ensembles for 1 use of the gate. Finally, we discuss the relation of the various capacities for communication and entanglement generation.

We remark that other investigations on optimal methods to perform classical communications in low dimensions without entanglement-assistance are underway. [27, 28, 29]

1.4 Structure of the paper

In the next section, we derive the expression for the entanglement generating capacity for a nonlocal gate. In Sec. 3, we give precise definitions of the various classical communication capacities. In Sec. 4, we derive the expression for the entanglement-assisted one-way classical capacity for a nonlocal gate. In Sec. 5, we prove bounds relating the capacities for generating entanglement and classical communication. We conclude with some open questions.

We also state some implicit assumptions for the paper. Unless otherwise noted, U denotes a nonlocal gate acting on two d -dimensional systems (with shorthand $d \times d$) in the possession of Alice and Bob. We focus our discussion on nonlocal gates. We apply the following argument to show that Hamiltonian capacities are simply gate capacities in the limit of infinitesimal gates, so that no separate analysis is needed for Hamiltonian capacities. A protocol for using a Hamiltonian is similar to one for a gate, with additional freedom on how long each free Hamiltonian evolution can last, before being interspersed with local operations. However, different durations of evolution are simply concatenation of infinitesimal ones, interspersed with identity local operations. Thus any Hamiltonian capacity $C(H)$ can then be expressed as gate capacities $C(U)$:

$$C(H) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} s C(U = e^{\frac{-iH}{s}}).$$

2 Asymptotic entanglement generating capacity

Suppose U is a nonlocal bipartite gate which acts on two d -dimensional systems belonging to Alice and Bob. We consider protocols that create entanglement when Alice and Bob are allowed unlimited local resources, including local ancillas of any dimensions and local operations.

We need to specify other auxiliary resources. For example, what type of initial states are available, whether classical communication, initial entanglement, and catalyst are allowed and so on. We first consider the case with the most general situation allowing completely arbitrary initial state (can be pure or mixed) and all the auxiliary resources. Afterwards, we examine when each of these auxiliary resources are unnecessary.

Intuitively, the entanglement generated by t uses of U is the maximum difference between the entanglement of the input and output states of the best protocol with t uses of U . However, how to properly quantify entanglement of an arbitrary state is an important ongoing research topic [30, 15]. In general, any function that satisfies a list of properties desirable for entanglement is an entanglement measure, but these properties depend heavily on the context. For example, some entanglement measures are defined for both pure and mixed states, while others are only for the former. There are two important regimes: finite and asymptotic, and many fewer measures satisfy proper asymptotic properties. Finally, even among asymptotic measures, only some have operationally clear meaning, and others provide mostly mathematical insights.

Our main concern is operational – creation of the maximum number of EPR pairs. However, we first derive in Sec. 2.1 a simple but important intermediate result which holds whenever the same entanglement measure is used for the input and output states. The measure can be completely arbitrary. We will show that the entanglement capacity is additive given sufficiently general auxiliary resources. Then, we turn to the issue of resources in Sec. 2.2, and focus on asymptotic entanglement measures. We show that for some measures, these auxiliary resources are unnecessary in the asymptotic regime. Finally, in Sec. 2.3 we study different input and output entanglement measures with the operational meaning of creating EPR pairs. We apply the intermediate result to show that the capacity remains additive, and that the auxiliary resources are unnecessary.

2.1 Same input and output entanglement measures

Consider the case when the same entanglement measure E is used for the input and output states. Operationally, we simply try to increase this function E using the nonlocal gate. E is arbitrary except being normalized (that $E = 1$ for the EPR state) and nonincreasing under LOCC. Let $E_U^{(t)}$ be the entanglement generated by t uses of U . Let E_U be the entanglement generated per use of U asymptotically, then $E_U = \sup_t \frac{1}{t} E_U^{(t)}$. The following lemma holds independent of the available auxiliary resources.

Lemma 1: $E_U^{(t)} \leq 2t \log_2 d$ and thus $E_U \leq 2 \log d$.

Proof: Alice and Bob can perform U using $2 \log_2 d$ ebits and LOCC, if Alice teleports her state to Bob, who applies U in his own laboratory and teleports her state back (see [3, 4]). Thus they can perform any protocol with t uses of U by $2t \log_2 d$ ebits and LOCC. If the protocol generates more than $2t \log_2 d$ ebits, Alice and Bob can increase their entanglement by LOCC, a contradiction. \square

If Alice and Bob are given all possible auxiliary resources, including any initial state, entanglement, catalyst, then the following is true:

Theorem 1: $E_U^{(t)} = t E_U^{(1)}$ and thus $E_U = E_U^{(1)}$.

Proof: Since LOCC operations cannot increase entanglement, any 1-use (1-shot) protocol cannot be better than the following:



The only degree of freedom to optimize is the initial state, and

$$E_U^{(1)} = \sup_{\rho_{AA'BB'}} E(U_{AB} \rho_{AA'BB'} U_{AB}^\dagger) - E(\rho_{AA'BB'}). \quad (2)$$

Now, consider the most general protocol with LOCC operations and t uses of U . Without loss of generality, we can divide the circuit into time steps such that in each time step has either 1 use of U or only LOCC operations. The entanglement can only increase in the t time steps with U and each is described by Fig. (1), by defining the ancillas A' and B' to include all registers not acted on by U . Thus, the total entanglement generated is no more than $tE_U^{(1)}$, and $E_U^{(t)} \leq tE_U^{(1)}$. On the other hand, by repeating the 1-use protocol in Fig. (1) with the optimal input t times, $E_U^{(t)} \geq tE_U^{(1)}$. Thus, $E_U = E_U^{(1)}$. \square

Note that Theorem 1 provides an explicit expression for the 1-shot and the asymptotic capacity, together with the method to achieve them. We now prove 2 lemmas concerning the 1-shot capacity:

Lemma 2: For any $\epsilon > 0$, an amount of entanglement $E_U^{(1)} - \epsilon$ can be generated in 1 shot with finite dimensional A' , B' and finite initial entanglement.

Proof: Suppose we restrict to n -dimensional A' and B' in the supremum of Eq. (2), and denote the subsequent supremum by e_n . Then, the sequence $\{e_n\}$ is increasing, and bounded above by Lemma 1. Thus, e_n converges, and for all $\epsilon > 0$ there is a finite n_o such that $e_{n_o} \geq E_U - \epsilon$. \square

If E is chosen to be the entanglement of formation E_f [12], we write $E_U^{(t)}$ and E_U as $E_{fU}^{(t)}$ and E_{fU} . Then, the optimal input can be pure.

Lemma 3: $E_{fU}^{(1)}$ can be attained with a pure input state.

Proof: Let $\rho_{AA'BB'}$ attain the supremum in Eq. (2). We omit the system label when it is $AA'BB'$. Let $\rho = \sum_i \lambda_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$ be its optimal decomposition such that $E_f(\rho) = \sum_i \lambda_i E_f(|\psi_i\rangle)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{fU}^{(1)} &= E_f(U_{AB} \rho U_{AB}^\dagger) - E_f(\rho) \\ &\leq \sum_i \lambda_i (E_f(U_{AB} |\psi_i\rangle) - E_f(|\psi_i\rangle)) \leq \max_i (E_f(U_{AB} |\psi_i\rangle) - E_f(|\psi_i\rangle)). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The first inequality is obtained by applying convexity of E_f to the first term, and the definition of the optimal decomposition in the second term. Thus, $E_{fU}^{(1)}$ can be attained at a pure input state. \square

If E is chosen to be the entanglement cost E_c [13], we write $E_U^{(t)}$ and E_U as $E_{cU}^{(t)}$ and E_{cU} . The optimal input can also be pure.

Lemma 4: $E_{cU}^{(1)}$ can be attained with a pure input state.

Proof: Let $\rho_{AA'BB'}$ attain the supremum in Eq. (2). We omit the system label when it is $AA'BB'$. Then,

$$E_{cU}^{(1)} = E_c(U_{AB} \rho U_{AB}^\dagger) - E_c(\rho) \quad (4)$$

For any ϵ , there exists m such that $\frac{1}{m}E_f(\rho^{\otimes m}) - E_c(\rho) \leq \epsilon$ [13]. Substitute this into Eq. (4),

$$E_{cU}^{(1)} \leq E_c(U_{AB} \rho U_{AB}^\dagger) - \frac{1}{m}E_f(\rho^{\otimes m}) + \epsilon \quad (5)$$

We can use the additivity of E_c and the fact $E_f \geq E_c$ to rewrite the first term in the RHS of Eq. (4) to obtain

$$E_{cU}^{(1)} \leq \frac{1}{m} [E_f(U_{AB}^{\otimes m} \rho^{\otimes m} U_{AB}^{\dagger \otimes m}) - E_f(\rho^m)] + \epsilon \quad (6)$$

But the expression in the bracket represents the entanglement of formation generated by a particular protocol with m uses of U , and is no greater than $mE_{fU}^{(1)}$ by Theorem 1. Using Lemma 3,

$$E_{cU}^{(1)} \leq [\max_{|\psi\rangle_{AA'BB'}} E_f(U_{AB}|\psi\rangle_{AA'BB'}) - E_f(|\psi\rangle_{AA'BB'})] + \epsilon \quad (7)$$

Finally, we have replaced E_f by E_c on the RHS since they coincide on pure states,

$$E_{cU}^{(1)} \leq [\max_{|\psi\rangle_{AA'BB'}} E_c(U_{AB}|\psi\rangle_{AA'BB'}) - E_c(|\psi\rangle_{AA'BB'})] + \epsilon \quad (8)$$

but this precisely means that $E_{cU}^{(1)}$ is attained at pure input states. \square

Lemmas 2-4 concerning $E_U^{(1)}$ implies the same for E_U due to Theorem 1.

Corollary 2: For any $\epsilon > 0$, $E_U - \epsilon$ is achievable by the 1-use protocol in Fig. (1) with finite dimensional A' , B' and finite initial entanglement.

Corollary 3: E_{fU} is attained with the 1-shot protocol with a pure input state.

Corollary 4: E_{cU} is attained with the 1-shot protocol with a pure input state.

Theorem 1': Even though Theorem 1 is proved for the case when U is the only nonlocal quantum resource, the case when different gates are available follows trivially. Thus the entanglement generating capacity is strongly additive: for a protocol that uses n_i copies of the gate U_i , the maximum amount of entanglement generated is simply $\sum_i n_i E_{U_i}^{(1)}$.

2.2 Asymptotic protocols and auxiliary resources

Equal entanglement measures for the input and output states are still assumed in this section. In the 1-shot protocol in Fig. 1, the auxiliary resources of a special input state and initial entanglement are generally necessary to attain full capacity. In contrast, classical communication is never used. Asymptotically, some of these resources become unnecessary (some of our arguments are similar to those in [8]):

- Any catalyst can be created at the beginning of a protocol, using entanglement and classical communication obtained from the nonlocal gate. Then, the optimal protocol can be run repeatedly with the catalyst, whose initial cost vanishes asymptotically. Similarly, finite amount of initial entanglement cannot affect the asymptotic capacity.
- Whenever $E = E_f$ or E_c , or when $E = D$ (distillable entanglement) and Eq. (2) is attained with a pure optimal input state, no auxiliary resources (special input states and classical communication) are needed. Since the optimal input $|\psi\rangle_{AA'BB'}$ is pure, we can achieve the asymptotic capacity by first creating $|\psi\rangle_{AA'BB'}^{\otimes m}$ for large m (inefficiently), and then repeating the cycle: (1) apply $U^{\otimes m}$, (2) “concentrate” [11] the outputs to EPR pairs and (3) dilute [31, 32, 34, 33] some of the EPR pairs to

form $|\psi\rangle_{AA'BB'}^{\otimes m}$. These steps require negligible amount of classical communication and waste negligible amount of entanglement.

- LOCC operations are only needed in the pre-processing or post-processing of the input and output states. Nonnegligible amount of classical communication is only needed as an extra resource during distillation (see Appendix A for a discussion on the classical communication cost in distillation). In contrast, creating mixed states requires only shared classical randomness.

The asymptotic entanglement generating capacity is achieved by the 1-shot protocol in Fig. (1) in the sense that the expression for the capacity involves 1 use of U , and that it is additive. Operationally, possible pre-processing and post-processing of multiple copies of the input and output states are used, but no other collective actions are needed.

We have discussed the simple case when the same entanglement measure is used for the input and output states. We now turn to the more subtle (and difficult) problem of possibly different entanglement measures.

2.3 Different input and output entanglement measures

In principle, different entanglement measures can be used for the input and output. We consider the operation creating EPR pairs as “generating entanglement.” Alice and Bob fabricate the optimal input state (which can be mixed), and distill entanglement from the output. Thus, the appropriate choices for the input and output entanglement measure should be the entanglement cost E_c and the distillable entanglement D . We will show that the optimal input is pure, and Theorem 1 still holds in this case. We will also see that the same result holds when entanglement of formation is chosen for the input instead.

Suppose E_c and D are the input and output measures respectively. Let \mathcal{P} be the optimal protocol with t uses of U and ρ be the optimal input for \mathcal{P} . We use $E_U'^{(t)}$ in place of $E_U^{(t)}$ when different input and output entanglement measures are used. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
E_U'^{(t)} &\equiv D(\mathcal{P}(\rho)) - E_c(\rho) \leq E_c(\mathcal{P}(\rho)) - E_c(\rho) \\
&\leq t \left[\max_{|\psi\rangle_{AA'BB'}} E_c(U_{AB}|\psi\rangle_{AA'BB'}) - E_c(|\psi\rangle_{AA'BB'}) \right] \\
&= t \left[\max_{|\psi\rangle_{AA'BB'}} D(U_{AB}|\psi\rangle_{AA'BB'}) - E_c(|\psi\rangle_{AA'BB'}) \right] \\
&\leq tE_U'^{(1)} \leq E_U'^{(t)}
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where we have used Corollary 4 in Sec. 2.1 to obtain Eq. (9). Thus all properties for E_U in Sec. 2.1 and all the resources issues in Sec. 2.2 apply in this case. Thus, with E_c as the input measure, it makes no difference whether D or E_c is used for the output.


The above holds when the measure E_c is replaced by another one, E_f , and Corollary 4 replaced by Corollary 3.

3 Capacities of bidirectional channels

We first define the classical communication capacities of bidirectional channels. If Alice and Bob have access to a nonlocal gate U to couple their systems, then the capacity of U is the maximum asymptotic number of classical bits that can be reliably transmitted per use of U . If they have access to a Hamiltonian H , the capacity of H is the maximum asymptotic rate at which classical bits can be reliably transmitted.

Communication can be achieved simultaneously in both directions, with possible tradeoffs. We allow any auxiliary local resources including local ancillas and shared classical randomness. Local operations are assumed instantaneous for the Hamiltonian case.

The most general protocol (bipartite quantum circuit) with t uses of U can be represented as:



In Fig. (10), A and B label the systems of Alice and Bob that are of primary interest, and A' and B' label the rest of their systems. The dimensions of A and B are converted to d by the initial operation $A_0 \otimes B_0$ and are further converted by the final operation $A_t \otimes B_t$. The freedom to apply the gate to any register is included as swap operations in A_i and B_i . Without loss of generality, the local operations A_j, B_j can be assumed unitary, since measurements can be deferred to the end of protocol. In fact, measurements are not needed, except for the final read out of the transmitted messages.

We need to distinguish the cases in which entanglement is available as an extra free resource or not. We first consider the unassisted case. Then, the ancillas A' and B' can be taken to be $|0\rangle_{A'}|0\rangle_{B'}$, since the most general initial state is a fixed separable state and can be created with shared randomness.

Each protocol allows a certain amount of forward and backward classical communication, giving a pair of rates $(R_{\rightarrow}, R_{\leftarrow})$ for the gate.

Definition 1 A pair of rates $(R_{\rightarrow}, R_{\leftarrow})$ is said to be achievable by a gate U if it is possible to intersperse t uses of U with local unitaries $A_j \otimes B_j$, such that an n_1 -bit message M_1 from Alice to Bob and an n_2 -bit message M_2 from Bob to Alice are communicated with high fidelity, and $R_{\rightarrow} \approx n_1/t$, $R_{\leftarrow} \approx n_2/t$. Mathematically $(R_{\rightarrow}, R_{\leftarrow})$ is achievable if:

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall \epsilon, \exists t, \exists n_1 \geq tR_{\rightarrow}, \exists n_2 \geq tR_{\leftarrow}, \exists \{A_j \otimes B_j\}_{j=0}^t, \\ \text{s.t. } & \forall M_1 \in \{0, 1\}^{n_1}, \forall M_2 \in \{0, 1\}^{n_2}, \\ & |\psi_{\text{out}}\rangle = (A_t \otimes B_t) U \cdots U (A_1 \otimes B_1) U (A_0 \otimes B_0) (|M_1\rangle_A |M_2\rangle_B |0\rangle_{A'} |0\rangle_{B'}) \\ \text{and } & F(|M_2\rangle_A \otimes |M_1\rangle_B, \text{tr}_{A'B'} |\psi_{\text{out}}\rangle \langle \psi_{\text{out}}|) > 1 - \epsilon \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Using mixed strategies, the achievable rate pairs $(R_{\rightarrow}, R_{\leftarrow})$ form a convex region. An obvious consequence of Eq. (11) is that, if $(R_{\rightarrow}, R_{\leftarrow})$ is achievable, so is any $(R'_{\rightarrow}, R'_{\leftarrow})$ where $R'_{\rightarrow} \leq R_{\rightarrow}$ and $R'_{\leftarrow} \leq R_{\leftarrow}$. Thus, the boundary of the achievable region never has positive slope.


Using Eq. (11) we can define different communication capacities for a gate. Note that the forward and backward capacities can always be achieved at the boundary point, and can be defined respectively as

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\rightarrow}(U) &= \sup\{R : (R, 0) \text{ is achievable by } U\} \\ C_{\leftarrow}(U) &= \sup\{R : (0, R) \text{ is achievable by } U\} \end{aligned}$$

We can also define various bidirectional capacities, for example, the duplex and the total capacities:

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\leftrightarrow}(U) &= \sup\{R : (R, R) \text{ is achievable by } U\} \\ C_+(U) &= \sup\{R_{\leftarrow} + R_{\rightarrow} : (R_{\leftarrow}, R_{\rightarrow}) \text{ is achievable by } U\} \end{aligned}$$

The achievable region, together with the various capacities, are illustrated in the following:



Protocols and rate pairs for Hamiltonians are similar to Fig. (10) and Eq. (11) for gates. As discussed in Sec. 1.4, we only need to focus on gates.

In general, little is known about the achievable region of $(R_{\rightarrow}, R_{\leftarrow})$ besides the convexity and the monotonicity of its boundary. The most perplexing question is perhaps whether the region has reflective symmetry about $R_{\rightarrow} = R_{\leftarrow}$. For two-qubit gates in the one-shot scenario, it was conjectured [3] that the amount of forward and backward communication should be equal. However, [8, 9] show that any two-qubit gate or Hamiltonian is locally equivalent to one symmetric to Alice and Bob. In this case the achievable region $(R_{\rightarrow}, R_{\leftarrow})$ is symmetric and $C_+ = 2C_{\leftrightarrow}$ and $C_{\rightarrow} = C_{\leftarrow}$.

In higher dimensions, it has been shown (Sec. VII [24]) that there are Hamiltonians (and therefore unitary gates) that are intrinsically asymmetric. However, it remains open whether communication capacities remain symmetric. Another important question is whether $C_{\rightarrow} = C_{\leftarrow}$ or $C_+ = 2C_{\leftrightarrow}$. It is also interesting to compare these capacities with the asymptotic entanglement-generating capacity, and this will be done in Sec. 5.

In the study of classical capacities of the *usual* quantum channels, it simplifies analysis if entanglement is given as a free resource to Alice and Bob [25, 18, 26]. The corresponding classical capacity is called “entanglement-assisted”, and is denoted by C_E . Recently, an expression for C_E (assuming access to only one type of channel) is found and proved to be additive [18]. The study of C_E also provides useful upper bounds for the unassisted capacities and insights to the classification of channels [37]. Likewise, we can define entanglement-assisted capacities for bidirectional channels, in which the most general ancillas A' and B' in Definition 1 also contain maximally entangled states. We denote the corresponding capacities by C_{\rightarrow}^E , C_{\leftarrow}^E , C_{\leftrightarrow}^E , C_+^E .

In the next section, we study the 1-way (forward or backward only) *entanglement-assisted* capacities of bidirectional channels, C_{\rightarrow}^E and C_{\leftarrow}^E , and obtained a simple expression for it. Surprising, this capacity is “additive”, just like C_E for the usual quantum channel [18]!

4 A general expression for entanglement-assisted capacity

4.1 Preliminaries

In this section we derive expressions for C_{\rightarrow}^E and C_{\leftarrow}^E , and without loss of generality, we focus on C_{\rightarrow}^E . C_{\rightarrow}^E is given by Definition 1 but with entangled ancillas. The capacity can still be determined using the general framework of transmitting classical information using quantum resources [38, 39, 40]. Again, a protocol refers to a quantum circuit describing how the given resources (usual or bidirectional channels, with or without entanglement assistance) are used.

We first review the capacity for a usual channel without entanglement assistance. Classical messages i , occurring with probability p_i , are encoded as input states η_i for the protocol \mathcal{P} , which outputs to Bob corresponding states $\rho_i = \mathcal{P}(\eta_i)$. We denote the *output ensemble* $\{p_i, \rho_i\}$ by \mathcal{E} . The mutual information between Bob's measurement outcome and the message i is bounded by the *Holevo information* χ of the output ensemble \mathcal{E} , defined as

$$\chi(\mathcal{E} = \{p_i, \rho_i\}) \equiv S\left(\sum_i p_i \rho_i\right) - \sum_i p_i S(\rho_i) \quad (12)$$

This amount of mutual information is achievable with multiple uses of the protocol. The classical capacity is $C = \sup_{\mathcal{E}} \chi(\mathcal{E})$, optimized over ensembles of valid output states. This is called the Holevo-Schumacher-Westmoreland Theorem (HSW Thm) (see [39, 40] and Ch. 12.3.2 of [35]). Since any input η_i is valid in this case, valid output states are of the form $\mathcal{P}(\eta_i)$. Given a protocol, a valid output ensemble is induced by some valid input ensemble, the convenient object to be optimized in the evaluation of capacities.

For an entanglement-assisted channel or a bidirectional channel with/without entanglement-assistance, both input and output of the protocol can be bipartite. Causality puts extra constraints in the valid bipartite input states η_i – Bob's half should be independent of i . Bob's final output ensemble consists of state $\rho_i = \text{tr}_{AA'} \mathcal{P}(\eta_i)$ given by reduced density matrices of the i -th bipartite output.

Generation of entanglement and entanglement-assisted classical communication are surprisingly similar. Their respective goals are to maximize the entanglement and Holevo information, and their respective optimizations are over the input state and the ensemble of input states (besides the protocol). We will see that even the optimal strategies for the two tasks are very similar. We take $E = E_f$ for simplicity. To achieve E_U , Alice and Bob prepare a large number n copies of the optimal input, and repeatedly apply $U^{\otimes n}$, concentrate and re-create the optimal input by diluting part of the entanglement yield. The basic element is repetition of the optimal 1-shot protocol in Fig. 1 with optimal input states more general than necessary in the asymptotic protocol. In fact, it is this generality in the 1-shot protocol that makes its capacity equal to the asymptotic capacity. We will show that the basic element in the optimal strategy for entanglement-assisted one-way classical communication is to repeat an optimal 1-shot protocol that maximizes the increase in the Holevo information, again with such general input ensembles that are not allowed in usual communication problems. Again, the mathematically convenient (and not necessarily realistic) 1-shot capacity captures is indeed the realistic asymptotic capacity. The resulting C_{\rightarrow}^E is again a “1-shot” expression, maximized over ensembles of bipartite states over 1 copy of the Hilbert space acted on by U together with arbitrary ancillas. We will first prove that the 1-shot increase in mutual information is an upper bound on the asymptotic capacity. Then, we provide a method to achieve the upper bound, thereby proving additivity and providing a realistic asymptotic strategy.

4.2 An additive upper bound

Our analysis is similar to that in Sec. 2.1. First, the proof for Lemma 1 implies the analogue:

Lemma 5: $C_{\rightarrow}^E \leq 2 \log_2 d$ and $C_{\leftarrow}^E \leq 2 \log_2 d$.

Proof: As $2t \log_2 d$ bits of forward classical communication, together with entanglement and back classical communication are sufficient to simulate t uses of U , $C_{\rightarrow}^E \leq 2 \log_2 d$ by causality. Similarly $C_{\leftarrow}^E \leq 2 \log_2 d$. \square

Let $\mathcal{E} = \{p_i, |\psi_i\rangle_{AA'BB'}\}$ be an ensemble of bipartite states. An operation acts on \mathcal{E} by acting on each component state (without changing the probability). For example, we will write $U\mathcal{E} = \{p_i, U_{AB}|\psi_i\rangle_{AA'BB'}\}$, $\text{tr}_{AA'}\mathcal{E} = \{p_i, \text{tr}_{AA'}|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|_{AA'BB'}\}$, $\text{tr}_{AA'}U\mathcal{E} = \{p_i, \text{tr}_{AA'}U_{AB}|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|_{AA'BB'}U_{AB}^\dagger\}$.

Suppose our goal is to maximize the increase of Holevo information χ with 1 use of the gate. The optimal protocol is like in Fig. (1) – just apply U since local operations do not increase mutual information. In other words, the maximum 1-shot increase in χ is given by

$$\Delta\chi_U^{(1)} = \sup_{\mathcal{E}} [\chi(\text{tr}_{AA'}U\mathcal{E}) - \chi(\text{tr}_{AA'}\mathcal{E})] \quad (13)$$

where the supremum is over the most general bipartite pure state ensemble $\mathcal{E} = \{p_i, |\psi_i\rangle_{AA'BB'}\}$. Without loss of generality, we can restrict the optimization to pure state ensembles because mixed states can be created using the free resources of entanglement and shared randomness starting from pure states. However, unlike the usual communication problem, we allow mutual information in the initial state. This generality does not affect our result as an upper bound.

After defining these 1-shot notations, we now return to the asymptotic problem. We obtain the analogue of half of Theorem 1, with similar reasoning.

Theorem 2 (1st half): $C_{\rightarrow}^E \leq \Delta\chi_U^{(1)}$.

Proof: Consider the most general protocol \mathcal{P}_t with t uses of U (such as depicted in Fig. (10)). Let \mathcal{E} be an arbitrary bipartite input ensemble, with $\chi(\text{tr}_{AA'}\mathcal{E}) = 0$. Then, the final mutual information is the sum of the increase in χ in each step, and is upper bounded by

$$\chi(\text{tr}_{AA'}\mathcal{P}_t\mathcal{E}) \leq t\Delta\chi_U^{(1)} \quad (14)$$

The inequality is obtained by noting that local operations cannot increase χ , and since each use of U can be described by the 1-shot protocol above, the increase in χ by each use is bounded by Eq. (13). The information transmitted per use of the gate, with supremum over all protocols of any number of uses with any initial ensemble with $\chi = 0$, i.e. the capacity, is also bounded:

$$C_{\rightarrow}^E = \sup_t \left[\frac{1}{t} \sup_{\mathcal{P}_t} \sup_{\mathcal{E}} \chi(\text{tr}_{AA'}\mathcal{P}_t\mathcal{E}) \right] \leq \Delta\chi_U^{(1)} \quad (15)$$

4.3 Protocol to achieve the upper bound

Theorem 2 (2nd half): $C_{\rightarrow}^E \geq \Delta\chi_U^{(1)}$.

Proof: This is due to the following protocol with asymptotic capacity C_{\rightarrow}^E .

In entanglement generation, the following basic cycle is repeated:

- (1) convert EPR pairs into n copies of the optimal input states,
- (2) apply the gate to each,
- (3) convert the optimal output states into EPR pairs.

More EPR pairs are obtained in (3) than required in (1) – as excess entanglement “generated.”

In entanglement-assisted classical communication, we want a similar basic cycle:

- (1) convert classical communication to create n states drawn from the optimal *input* ensemble,
- (2) apply the gate to each,
- (3) convert the states from the optimal *output* ensemble into classical communication.

Step (1) is called remote state preparation [32, 41, 42] (RSP), a procedure whereby Alice constructs quantum states in Bob’s laboratory using entanglement and classical communication. In RSP, Alice performs a measurement on her half of the share entangled state, sends the outcome to Bob, who conditioned on the outcome operates on his half of the shared entangled state to complete the RSP. It is known [43] how to approximately prepare n pure bipartite states from an ensemble \mathcal{E} with free entanglement and $n\chi(\text{tr}_{AA'}\mathcal{E}) + o(n)$ bits of classical communication.² Step (3) follows from the HSW theorem: Alice can communicate $\approx n\chi(\text{tr}_{AA'}U\mathcal{E})$ bits to Bob reliably if she can choose n states in the output ensemble $\text{tr}_{AA'}U\mathcal{E}$. Just like generating entanglement, n is chosen large enough to ensure the efficiency of steps (1) and (3).

When describing and analyzing the protocol, we loosely call \mathcal{E} the optimal ensemble achieving the supremum in Eq. (13). For arbitrarily small ϵ , \mathcal{E} is chosen so that $\chi(\text{tr}_{AA'}U\mathcal{E}) - \chi(\text{tr}_{AA'}\mathcal{E}) \geq \Delta\chi_U^{(1)} - \epsilon$. Since how ϵ enters the following analysis is obvious, and the analysis is independent of the choice of ϵ and \mathcal{E} , ϵ is omitted for simplicity.


Protocol that achieves $\Delta\chi_U^{(1)}$:

Let \mathcal{E} be the optimal ensemble. If Alice is given $n\chi(\text{tr}_{AA'}\mathcal{E})$ bits of classical communication as an initial resource, she can transmit k messages $M_{i=1,\dots,k}$ each of length $n\Delta\chi_U^{(1)}$ (a total of $nk\Delta\chi_U^{(1)}$ bits) with nk uses of U as follows:

- *Alice’s preprocessing:* Alice determines k messages N_i each of $n\chi(\text{tr}_{AA'}U\mathcal{E})$ bits. For each N_i she also computes a corresponding $|\psi_i\rangle \in \mathcal{E}^{\otimes n}$ such that $U^{\otimes n}|\psi_i\rangle \in (U\mathcal{E})^{\otimes n}$ encodes N_i (by the HSW Thm). Each N_i has 2 parts: the message M_i to be sent, and an RSP instruction R_i of length $n\chi(\text{tr}_{AA'}\mathcal{E})$ for Bob to create the state $|\psi_{i+1}\rangle \in \mathcal{E}_j^{\otimes n}$ ($U^{\otimes n}|\psi_{i+1}\rangle$ in turns encodes N_{i+1}). By construction, the lengths of M_i and R_i indeed sum to that of N_i . In order to generate M_i , Alice needs to perform her measurement for the RSP of $|\psi_{i+1}\rangle$. So Alice will begin by computing M_k and work backwards to M_1 .
- *Quantum protocol:* Alice uses the given initial classical communication to create the state $|\psi_1\rangle$ shared with Bob. Then $U^{\otimes n}$ is applied to convert it to $U^{\otimes n}|\psi_1\rangle$, Bob reads off the message N_1 , which instructs him to do RSP for $|\psi_2\rangle$ and so on.

² $\mathcal{O}(n)$ and $o(n)$ respectively denote a function linear and sublinear in n .

The protocol is summarized in Fig. (16).



In the above diagram, RSP_{iA} denotes Alice's RSP measurement to obtain the instruction for Bob to prepare $|\psi_i\rangle$. RSP_{iB} denotes Bob's conditional operation to complete the preparation of $|\psi_i\rangle$.

The initial amount of classical communication can be created by Alice and Bob using cn uses of U inefficiently, for some constant c .³ The initial classical communication assumed in the above, which is an extra resource, is unnecessary asymptotically. The rate is

$$\frac{kn\Delta\chi}{cn + nk} \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} \Delta\chi_U^{(1)} \quad (17)$$

We have not discussed small inaccuracies and inefficiencies in the protocol. The asymptotic correctness of this protocol taking these into account follows from the asymptotic reliability of its component pieces: RSP and encoding at the Holevo bound. However, since errors and inefficiencies accumulate over many rounds, we need to choose the rate of increase of n and k slightly more carefully.

Suppose that preparing a member of $\mathcal{E}^{\otimes n}$ with RSP requires $n(\chi_0 + \delta_n^{\text{RSP}})$ bits of communication and has error ϵ_n^{RSP} , where $\delta_n^{\text{RSP}}, \epsilon_n^{\text{RSP}} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Similarly, a state in $(U\mathcal{E})^{\otimes n}$ provides $n(\chi(\text{tr}_{AA'} U\mathcal{E}) - \delta_n^{\text{HSW}})$

³In Sec. 5 we prove rigorously that any nonlocal gate U has some method for sending n bits with $\mathcal{O}(n)$ uses.

bits of information with error ϵ_n^{HSW} , where again $\delta_n^{\text{HSW}}, \epsilon_n^{\text{HSW}} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Combining these into $\delta_n = \delta_n^{\text{RSP}} + \delta_n^{\text{HSW}}$ and $\epsilon_n = \epsilon_n^{\text{RSP}} + \epsilon_n^{\text{HSW}}$, we find that the rate is

$$\frac{kn(\Delta\chi_U^{(1)} - \delta_n)}{cn + nk} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{kn\Delta\chi_U^{(1)}}{cn + nk} \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} \Delta\chi_U^{(1)} \quad (18)$$

and the total error is $k\epsilon_n$. This can be made to vanish by choosing n as a function of k , such that for each k , $\epsilon_n k$ is small.

Thus, we show that the entanglement-assisted one-way capacity C_{\rightarrow}^E is indeed

$$C_{\rightarrow}^E = \Delta\chi_U^{(1)} = \sup_{\mathcal{E}} \chi(\text{tr}_{AA'} U\mathcal{E}) - \chi(\text{tr}_{AA'} \mathcal{E}) \quad (19)$$

and is achievable using the above protocol, proving the second half of Theorem 2.

4.4 Discussions

On entanglement assisted classical capacity

- The entanglement-assisted one-way capacity is additive. The n copies of U are applied to n states chosen from the optimal input ensemble. In the other words, inputs to different uses of U are not entangled. On the other hand, the inputs can be classically correlated.
- Our expression for C_{\rightarrow}^E remains additive even if classical capacities for quantum channels are not additive. If the usual classical capacity is not additive, it can affect the upper bound of C_{\rightarrow}^E . But the usual channel capacity can still be obtained by the HSW Thm by if entangled inputs are allowed. Our analysis can be modified by initially considering entangled inputs to many copies of the protocol in our derivation for the upper bound. The rest of the derivation still holds.
- We have bipartite inputs and outputs, so that the output from one use of the gate is the input to another use of the gate. In contrast, in the usual channel, the state disappear from Alice's laboratory, and the output to Bob is never an input to further uses of the channel. This is one reason why additivity holds on C_{\rightarrow}^E but not on C the usual capacity.

Comparing entanglement and entanglement assisted classical capacity

- Classical communication is different from entanglement in that it cannot be stored, and be used later. In particular, a striking difference to the entanglement generating protocol is that, Alice has to work her protocol backwards, and all the classical messages have to be pre-determined, or else a large portion of the output classical communication is "wasted."
- The generality in the 1-shot protocols is what makes it as high as the asymptotic capacity. The general structure of the problem is that, given a function of bipartite states, it has an optimization vcas a 1-shot protocol if the function is only increased by the given resource (gate), and if arbitrary ancillas and states are allowed, the asymptotic maximum increase of the function should be given by a 1-shot protocol.

5 Other general bounds

We have proved the general bounds $E_U \leq 2\log_2 d$, $C_{\rightarrow}^E \leq 2\log_2 d$. We now derive two other general bounds that are valid for all U .

Bound 1: $E_U \geq C_+$

Proof: Suppose there exists a (not necessarily unitary) protocol to transmit n_a bits from Alice to Bob, and n_b bits from Bob to Alice with t uses of U and fidelity $1 - \epsilon$. To prove $E_U \geq C_+$ we modify the protocol to create $n_a + n_b$ EPR pairs with high fidelity. We first present the main idea by assuming $\epsilon = 0$, and then present a rigorous proof for $\epsilon > 0$.

Without entanglement assistance, the ancillas can at best be separable, but they can be assumed to be product states by giving Alice and Bob shared randomness. Thus the initial state is given by $|x\rangle_A |y\rangle_B |0\rangle_{A'} |0\rangle_{B'}$ where x is an n_a -bit string, and y is an n_b -bit string. If $\epsilon = 0$, the protocol is exact and deterministic, thus can be made unitary (the Church of larger Hilbert space). The final state is then given by $|y\rangle_A |x\rangle_B |\psi_{xy}\rangle_{A'B'}$ for some pure normalized $|\psi_{xy}\rangle_{A'B'}$. To create entanglement, we modify the protocol in two ways. First, Alice's input system A is now half of a maximally entangled state over A and A'' , each with 2^{n_a} dimensions. Likewise, Bob inputs half of a maximally entangled state over B and B'' each with 2^{n_b} -dimensions. Second, A' and B' are not discarded. The final state is given by

$$|\eta\rangle = 2^{-(n_a+n_b)/2} \sum_{xy} |y\rangle_A |x\rangle_{A''} |x\rangle_B |y\rangle_{B''} |\psi_{xy}\rangle_{A'B'} \quad (20)$$

where x and y are summed over their possible values. The entanglement generated is simply the entropy of Alice's reduced density matrix, which can be found by the "Joint Entropy Theorem" (Eq. (1.58) in [35]).

$$\begin{aligned} S(\text{tr}_{B'B''} |\eta\rangle\langle\eta|) &= S\left(2^{-(n_a+n_b)} \sum_{xy} |y\rangle\langle y|_A |x\rangle\langle x|_{A''} \otimes \text{tr}_{B'} |\psi_{xy}\rangle\langle\psi_{xy}|\right) \\ &= (n_a + n_b) + 2^{-(n_a+n_b)} \sum_{xy} S(\text{tr}_{B'} |\psi_{xy}\rangle\langle\psi_{xy}|) \geq n_a + n_b \end{aligned}$$

Since t copies of U are used in the modified protocol to create $n_a + n_b$ of entanglement, $E_U \geq C_+$.

Bound 2:

If $E_U > 0$ then C_{\leftarrow} and C_{\rightarrow} are also positive. (The converse follows trivially from the previous bound.)

Proof:

Let $U = \sum_i A_i \otimes B_i$ be the Schmidt decomposition of U with trace orthonormal A_i , and similarly for B_i . The Schmidt number of U is the minimal number of terms in the Schmidt decomposition ([35] and Ch. 6.4.2 of [36]). If $E_U > 0$, U is not a product operator, and its Schmidt number is at least 2. Suppose Alice and Bob both input half of a maximally entangled state. The output state is given by

$$|\eta\rangle = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{ijk} (A_i |j\rangle_A) \otimes (B_i |k\rangle_B) \otimes |k\rangle_{B'} \quad (21)$$

Tracing A and A' , the reduced density matrix of Bob is given by

$$\frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{ijj'} \text{tr}(A_i A_i^\dagger) B_i |j\rangle\langle j'|_B B_i^\dagger \otimes |j\rangle\langle j'|_{B'} \quad (22)$$

which is not pure. Thus, Alice and Bob can create finite amount of entanglement E_0 per use of the gate.

Alice can send 1 bit to Bob using t uses of U as follows. Bob inputs one half of his (local) maximally entangled state for each use of U . To send "0", Alice inputs one half of her (local) maximally entangled state for each use of U , so that their final entanglement is tE_0 . To send "1", Alice inputs the same d -dimensional system (say, in a state $|0\rangle$) to all t uses of the gate. (In other words, she takes the output from the first use of U and input it to the second use, and so on.) Their final entanglement is no more

than $\log_2 d$ in this case. The difference in entanglement is $tE_0 - \log 2$, which provides a lower bound of the distance between Bob's reduced matrices in the two cases, so that Bob can well distinguish the two messages for large t .

6 Open Questions

We conclude with a list of open questions.

- How large an ancilla do we need to generate the optimal amount of entanglement?
- How many states are needed in the optimal ensemble for communication?
- What sorts of tradeoff curves are possible for forward and backward communication?
- Are forward and backward capacities always equal?
- Is there a gate U with $C_+ \leq E_U$ a strict inequality?
- When can gates be simulated, asymptotically or otherwise, by an amount of some resource equal to their capacity?
- Two usual channels with the same C_E can simulate each another with unit asymptotic efficiency [18, 37]. If two bidirectional channels has equal C_{\rightarrow}^E and C_{\leftarrow}^E , can they simulate each another with unit asymptotic efficiency?

7 Acknowledgements

We thank M. Leifer, L. Henderson, and N. Linden for discussions and for kindly sharing their results on entanglement capacity prior to publication. We also thank the above, as well as L. Spector and H. Bernstein, and K. Hammerer, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac for communications about their results on classical communications using gates and Hamiltonians. We thank P. Shor for his discussion on RSP of entangled states, which is crucial to one of our main results. We thank D. DiVincenzo, A. Kitaev, B. Terhal, and G. Vidal for discussions that contribute significantly to our development of the results.

A Linear bound in communication cost for distillation

In this appendix, we obtain a bound on the communication cost in distillation using [44] which derives the enhancement factor of the capacity of a noiseless quantum channel assisted by noisy entanglement, i.e. unlimited supply of the mixed state ρ .

Suppose given $\rho^{\otimes qn}$, cn forward classical bits (in either direction) is sufficient to distill n ebits ($q \leq 1/D(\rho)$). Here, the yield of entanglement needs not be maximum, but the communication cost is a lower bound of distillation, which requires maximum yield of entanglement.

Then, the following is a noisy superdense coding strategy for Alice and Bob – first distill and than perform noiseless super-dense coding:

$$\begin{aligned} cn \text{ cbits} + \rho^{\otimes qn} &\rightarrow n \text{ ebits} \\ n \text{ ebits} + n \text{ qubits} &\rightarrow 2n \text{ cbits} \end{aligned}$$

Together, the “capacity” or enhancement factor is equal to $\frac{2n-cn}{n} = 2 - c$, which cannot exceed the optimal value [44].

$$C_{sd} = 1 + \sup_n \sum_{\Lambda_A} \frac{nS(\text{tr}_A(\rho)) - S(\Lambda_A(\rho^{\otimes n}))}{S(\Lambda_A(\text{tr}_B(\rho^{\otimes n}))}$$

where the supremum is taken over all trace-preserving completely positive maps Λ_A on Alice’s half of $\rho^{\otimes n}$. Hence $c \geq 2 - C_{sd} \equiv \Delta$. This deficit Δ from full capability to do superdense coding, is intrinsic to the state ρ . Even though Δ cannot be calculated an arbitrary ρ (and therefore it is unclear if it is vanishingly small as a function of n), it is unlikely to be so for all ρ .

References

- [1] C. H. Bennett, S. Braunstein, I. L. Chuang, D. P. DiVincenzo, D. Gottesman, J. A. Smolin, B. M. Terhal, W. K. Wootters, unpublished discussion during the sixth quantum computation workshop, ISI, Torino, Italy (1998).
- [2] C. H. Bennett and D. Gottesman, personal communications (1998).
- [3] J. Eisert, K. Jacobs, P. Papadopoulos, and M.B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. A **62** (2000) 052317, arXiv e-print quant-ph/0005101v1.
- [4] D. Collins, N. Linden, and S. Popescu, arXiv e-print quant-ph/0005102v1
- [5] The following is a partial list on results that aim at achieving a certain unitary evolution using the resource of some given Hamiltonian or gate. N. Linden, H. Barjat, R. Carbajo, and R. Freeman. *Chemical Physics Letters*, 305:28–34, 1999. arXiv e-print quant-ph/9811043. D. W. Leung, I. L. Chuang, F. Yamaguchi, and Y. Yamamoto. *Phys. Rev. A*, 61:042310, 2000. arXiv e-print quant-ph/9904100. J. Jones and E. Knill. *J. of Mag. Res.*, 141:322–5, 1999. arXiv e-print quant-ph/9905008. J. L. Dodd, M. A. Nielsen, M. J. Bremner, R. T. Thew, arXiv e-print quant-ph/0106064. P. Wocjan, D. Janzing, Th. Beth, arXiv e-print quant-ph/0106077. D. Leung, arXiv e-print quant-ph/0107041v2, to appear in J. Mod. Opt.. M. Stollsteimer and G. Mahler, arXiv e-print quant-ph/0107059v1, to appear in Phys. Rev. A. N. Khaneja, R. Brockett, and S. J. Glaser, Phys. Rev. A., **63**, 032308 (2001). C.H. Bennett, J.I. Cirac, M.S. Leifer, D. W. Leung, N. Linden, S. Popescu, G. Vidal, to appear in Phys. Rev. A, arXiv e-print quant-ph/0107035. G. Vidal and J. Cirac, arXiv e-print quant-ph/0108076,0108077. P. Wocjan, M. Roetteler, D. Janzing, and Th. Beth, arXiv e-print quant-ph/0109063,0109088. M. A. Nielsen, M. J. Bremner, J. L. Dodd, A. M. Childs, C. M. Dawson, arXiv e-print quant-ph/0109064. H. Chen, arXiv e-print quant-ph/0109115. G. Vidal, K. Hammerer, and J. I. Cirac, arXiv e-print quant-ph/0112168. Ll. Masanes, G. Vidal, and J. I. Latorre, arXiv e-print quant-ph/0202042. W. Dur, G. Vidal, J. I. Cirac, arXiv e-print quant-ph/0112124.
- [6] J. I. Cirac, W. Dur, B. Kraus, M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86** 544 (2001). arXiv e-print quant-ph/0007057.
- [7] P. Zanardi, C. Zalka, and L. Faoro, arXiv e-print quant-ph/0005031.
- [8] W. Dur, G. Vidal, J. I. Cirac, N. Linden, and S. Popescu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87** 137901 (2001). arXiv e-print quant-ph/0006034.
- [9] B. Kraus and J.I. Cirac, arXiv e-print quant-ph/0011050.
- [10] M. Leifer, L. Henderson, and N. Linden, arXiv e-print quant-ph/02050XX.

- [11] C. H. Bennett, H. J. Bernstein, S. Popescu, and B. Schumacher *Phys. Rev. A*, **53** (1996) 2046-52. arXiv e-print quant-ph/9511030.
- [12] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters. *Phys. Rev. A*, 54:3824, 1996. arXiv e-print quant-ph/9604024.
- [13] P. M. Hayden, M. Horodecki, and B. M. Terhal *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* 34(35):6891-6898, 2001. arXiv e-print quant-ph/0008134.
- [14] There are many papers in the subject, and a partial is given by the following, together with [15, 16]. H.-K. Lo and S. Popescu, *Phys. Rev. A*, **63** (2001) 022301. arXiv e-print quant-ph/9707038. M. A. Nielsen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **83** (1999) 436-39. arXiv e-print quant-ph/9811053. G. Vidal, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83** (1999) 1046-49. arXiv e-print quant-ph/9902033. D. Jonathan and M. B. Plenio, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83** (1999) 3566. arXiv e-print quant-ph/9905071. G. Vidal, D. Jonathan, and M. A. Nielsen *Phys. Rev. A* **62** (2000) 012304. arXiv e-print quant-ph/9910099. L. Hardy, arXiv e-print quant-ph/9903001.
- [15] G. Vidal, *J. Mod. Opt.* **47** (2000) 355. arXiv e-print quant-ph/9807077.
- [16] D. Jonathan and M. B. Plenio, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83** (1999) 1455. arXiv e-print quant-ph/9903054.
- [17] C. E. Shannon, *Bell Systems Technical Journal*, **28** (1949) p. 656-715.
- [18] C. H. Bennett, P. W. Shor, and J. A. Smolin, and A. V. Thapliyal, arXiv e-print quant-ph/0106052.
- [19] C. H. Bennett and S. J. Wiesner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **69** (1992) p. 2881-2884.
- [20] S. Bose, M. B. Plenio, and B. Vedral. Mixed state dense coding and its relation to entanglement measures. *Jour. of Modern Optics*, 47:291, 2000, quant-ph/9810025.
- [21] T. Hiroshima. Optimal dense coding with mixed state entanglement. quant-ph/0009048.
- [22] G. Bowen. Classical information capacity of superdense coding. *Phys. Rev. A*, 63:022302, 2001, quant-ph/0101117.
- [23] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, D. Leung and B. Terhal, *Quantum Information and Computation*, **1** (2001) p. 78.
- [24] C.H. Bennett, J.I. Cirac, M.S. Leifer, D. W. Leung, N. Linden, S. Popescu, G. Vidal, to appear in *Phys. Rev. A*, arXiv e-print quant-ph/0107035.
- [25] C. H. Bennett, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and A. V. Thapliyal, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, pp. 3081–3084 (1999). arXiv e-print quant-ph/9904023.
- [26] A. S. Holevo, arXiv e-print quant-ph/0106075.
- [27] K. Hammerer, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac, in preparation.
- [28] M. Leifer, L. Henderson, and N. Linden, in preparation ?? .
- [29] H. Bernstein and L. Spector, in preparation.
- [30] A partial list includes: Sandu Popescu and Daniel Rohrlich, *Phys. Rev. A*. **56** (1997) R3319. arXiv e-print quant-ph/9610044. V. Vedral and M. B. Plenio, *Phys. Rev. A*. **57** (1998) 1619-1633. arXiv e-print quant-ph/9707035. A. Uhlmann, *Open Sys. Inf. Dyn.* **5** (1998) 209. arXiv e-print quant-ph/9701014. Michal Horodecki, Pawel Horodecki, Ryszard Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 84 (2000) 2014. arXiv e-print quant-ph/9908065. Matthew J. Donald, Michal Horodecki, Oliver Rudolph, arXiv e-print quant-ph/0105017.
- [31] H.-K. Lo and S. Popescu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **83** (1999) 1459-62. arXiv e-print quant-ph/9902045.
- [32] H.-K. Lo, *Phys. Rev. A*, **62** (2000) 012313. arXiv e-print quant-ph/9912009.

- [33] P. Hayden and A. Winter, arXiv e-print quant-ph/0204092.
- [34] A. Harrow and H.-K. Lo arXiv e-print quant-ph/0204096.
- [35] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum computation and quantum information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 2000).
- [36] M. Nielsen. PhD thesis, The University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, 1998.
- [37] C. H. Bennett and P. W. Shor, in preparation.
- [38] P. Hausladen, R. Jozsa, B. Schumacher, M. Westmoreland, and W. Wootters. *Phys. Rev. A*, 54:1869, 1996.
- [39] A. S. Holevo, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, **44** (1998) 269-73.
- [40] B. Schumacher and M. D. Westmoreland, Phys. Rev. A, **56** (1997) 131-38.
- [41] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, B. M. Terhal, and W. K. Wootters. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 87:077902, 2000. arXiv e-print quant-ph/0006044.
- [42] I. Devetak and T. Berger. Low-entanglement remote state preparation, 2001. arXiv e-print quant-ph/0102123.
- [43] P. W. Shor, personal communications.
- [44] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, D. W. Leung, and B. M. Terhal, Quantum Information and Computation, **1** (2001) p. 78. arXiv e-print quant-ph/0106080.