

Application of quantum Pinsker inequality to
quantum communications

Osamu Hirota

Research Center for Quantum Communication,
Quantum ICT Research Institute, Tamagawa University
6-1-1 Tamagawa-gakuen, Machida, Tokyo 194-8610, Japan

Tamagawa University Quantum ICT Research Institute Bulletin, Vol.9, No.1, 1-7, 2019

©Tamagawa University Quantum ICT Research Institute 2019

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form or by any means electrically, mechanically, by photocopying or otherwise, without prior permission of the copy right owner.

Application of quantum Pinsker inequality to quantum communications

Osamu Hirota

Research Center for Quantum Communication,
Quantum ICT Research Institute, Tamagawa University
6-1-1 Tamagawa-gakuen, Machida, Tokyo 194-8610, Japan

E-mail: hirota@lab.tamagawa.ac.jp

Abstract—Back in the 1960s, based on Wiener’s thought, Shikao Ikehara (first student of N.Wiener) encouraged the progress of Hisaharu Umegaki’s research from a pure mathematical aspect in order to further develop the research on mathematical methods of quantum information at Tokyo Institute of Technology. Then, in the 1970s, based on the results accomplished by Umegaki Group, Ikehara instructed the author to develop and spread quantum information science as technology. While Umegaki Group’s results have been evaluated as major achievements in pure mathematics, their contributions to current quantum information science have not been fully discussed. This paper will clarify Umegaki Group’s contributions to design theory of quantum communication with specific examples.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the real world, we have no performance evaluation measures for communication system with operational meanings of information transmission and processing other than various signal detection criteria established by Wiener, and Shannon entropy by Shannon. The same is true even where the physical system for implementation is generalized into quantum system or relativistic system, which means that modern communication theory is the most successful field among other scientific theories in human history.

Quantum information science originates from quantum communication theory, based on which, quantum communication such as quantum key distribution and quantum symmetric key cipher has been developed. These are formulated based on and as quantum versions of statistical signal detection theory and Shannon’s information transmission theory. The former has a beautiful form as a design theory for detection and estimation techniques of signals transmitted in a quantum state established by Helstrom [1], Holevo [2] and Yuen [3]. The theory of Shannon information transmitted in a quantum state was started by Stratonovich, Holevo, et al and studied by Yuen [4] and Hirota [5] from the viewpoint of quantum state control as well as by Jozsa Group [6] and Masashi Ban of Tamagawa University Group [7] in the context of accessible information.

On the other hand, in mathematics, theories may be developed without regard for the operability of information handled by humans or with a focus on physical phenomena of a specific device. Shannon’s entropy

clearly defines very common signals processed in human social activities and it is applied to the communication system with the operational meanings for the relevant information processing. Quantum information theory as mathematics can be modeled on it. However, unlike Shannon information, quantum entropy lacks versatility regard for operational meaning on information transmission. It is defined in consideration of mathematical form or application to physics. Therefore, no new information scientific technology is expected from simple generalization of the concepts of Wiener and Shannon. Only when its contribution to Wiener-Shannon system is proved, the mathematics is deemed to have contributed to information science.

It was Holevo who discovered a liaison between quantum entropy and Shannon information. In the study of accessible information (an application of Shannon’s mutual information) to quantum system, its upper bound is now called Holevo bound, which is given in the form of quantum entropy, and its formula is called Holevo information. Holevo derived the upper bound in flow of the result of Stratonovich on N th extended system in relation to Shannon mutual information in quantum system (see Reference 8). Prior to that, Tamagawa University Group had published a paper providing specific examples of maximization of accessible information and super-additivity in N th extended systems. Jozsa Group proved that the maximum amount of accessible information reaches Holevo information in the limit of pure quantum state system without external noise. Jozsa presented the results at the 3rd International Conference on Quantum Communication, Measurement (QCM 1996). While Holevo had shifted to research on quantum stochastic process, I recommended him that he should generalize Jozsa’s works. In a very short while, Holevo and Tamagawa University Group discussed the proof method in the general model of external noise system with Kitaev, and only after a week later, Holevo showed us the proposed proof on a white board at Tamagawa University. We conveyed the results to Jozsa and Holevo published his proof in IEEE’s Transaction on Information Theory. Jozsa Group also started their consideration and the proof was completed by Shumacher-Westmoreland and published in the Physical Review. Although published at

different times, these are now called Holevo-Shumacher-Westmoreland theorem as the formula of discrete channel capacity of classical-quantum composite system [9, 10].

Additionally, Holevo and Tamagawa University Group derived continuous channel capacity and formula for reliability function in Gaussian System [11, 12]. As a result, Holevo information, which is expressed in the form of quantum entropy and serves as a parameter of the extreme point of Shannon system, has greatly contributed to the real world.

On the other hand, a formal formulation of Shannon theory was developed as mathematics in a quantum entropy form without considering the operational meaning like Shannon information. The question in this paper is whether it has operational meaning in the actual communication system.

II. PROGRESS IN QUANTUM ENTROPY

A. Approach of Holevo and Umegaki

Let us here denote the most fundamental formula in Shannon's communication theory in the following.

$$H(X) = - \sum_x P(x) \log P(x) \quad (1)$$

$$H(X|Y) = - \sum_y \sum_x P(y)P(x|y) \log P(x|y) \quad (2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} I(X, Y) &= H(X) - H(X|Y) = H(Y) - H(Y|X) \\ &= H(X) + H(Y) - H(X, Y) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Shannon's information $H(X)$ and mutual information $I(X, Y)$ have a clear operational meaning according to the coding theorem. In physics, mutual information is sometimes regarded as a measure of classical correlation between two statistical systems. Meanwhile, entropy was introduced in 1951 by Kullback in statistics [13]. In that case, there is a strong intention to express the distance between probability distributions representing the characteristics of two statistical systems. Therefore, they start based on the following relative entropy:

$$D_c(P(x)||Q(x)) = \sum_x P(x) \log \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} \quad (4)$$

One can generalize the above into the composite system. If we denote the joint probability on the composite system as follows: $P(x, y), Q(x, y) = P(x)P(y)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_c(P(x, y)||Q(x, y)) &= \sum_x \sum_y P(x, y) \log \frac{P(x, y)}{P(x)P(y)} \\ &= I(X, Y) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Thus, from a mathematical definition point of view, the relative entropy looks like "General".

On the other hand, von Neumann defined entropy for quantum systems in response to the development of quantum statistical mechanics. The entropy of a quantum

system with the quantum density operator:

$\rho_{X_q} \in \mathcal{D}(H_S)$ is

$$S(X_q) \equiv S(\rho_{X_q}) = -Tr\{\rho_{X_q} \log \rho_{X_q}\} \quad (6)$$

This is called von Neumann entropy. Research on a quantum version of relative entropy, which is regarded as a mathematical generalization of Shannon's entropy theory, was begun for the first time in the world by Hisaharu Umegaki at Tokyo Institute of Technology. This was driven by the motivation of Shikao Ikehara to recommend the succession of Wiener thought [14,15]. Umegaki, for the first time in the world, defined the following quantum relative entropy on the von Neumann algebra in 1962 and formulated its various features [16-18].

Definition – 1(Umegaki)

$$D_q(\rho||\sigma) = Tr\{\rho[\log \rho - \log \sigma]\} \quad (7)$$

$$supp(\rho) \subseteq supp(\sigma) \quad (8)$$

On the other hand, Helstrom and Holevo inherited the idea of Wiener- Shannon, and they defined that, in a communication system using quantum phenomena, the sender prepares a set of quantum density operators:

$\epsilon = \{p(x), \rho_{Y_q}^x\}$. That is, a message x is mapped to a quantum density operator which corresponds to a concrete signal. The quantum density operator of the set is described as follows:

$$\rho_{Y_q} = \sum_x p(x) \rho_{Y_q}^x \quad (9)$$

The receiving system performs a quantum measurement on the quantum system, and becomes a model for determining the classical parameter $\{x\}$ as a message. This is a problem of Accessible information (Shannon mutual information of classical-quantum composite systems).

$$I_{acc} = \max_{\Pi} I(X_c, Y_q) \quad (10)$$

where Π is detection operator or positive operator valued measure (POVM). That is, to preserve Shannon's view of the world, Holevo considers the set whose signal element is the classical parameter of the quantum density operator, $\epsilon = \{p(x), \rho_{Y_q}^x\}$. And the quantum entropy of the classical-quantum composite system was defined in 1973 as follows.

Definition – 2(Holevo)

$$\chi(\epsilon) = S(\rho_{Y_q}) - \sum_x p(x) S(\rho_{Y_q}^x) \quad (11)$$

This is called the Holevo information. As stated in the introduction, the Holevo -Shumacher-Westmoreland theorem guarantees that the limit of Shannon information transmitted in a quantum system is the maximum value

of Holevo information. This fact shows that quantum entropy theory contributes to the Shannon theory.

As mentioned above, Umegaki developed with a foundation of mathematical statistics, and Holevo developed quantum communication theory while faithfully inheriting Shannon's world.

B. More progress

Although quantum entropy can be developed by mathematical formalism, there is no guarantee that it will have the operational meaning applicable in the real world like Shannon theory. Wiener criticized simple mathematical generalization, claiming that unless a research directly transforms the technical system in the real world through mathematical generalization, it is not an authentic mathematical study. This is called Wiener's criteria for mathematical generalization research. This paper discusses whether quantum entropy theory satisfies Wiener's criteria.

Based on Umegaki's quantum relative entropy, we can formally replace Shannon's formula with its quantum version. Masanori Ohya carried it out faithfully and contributed to the development of quantum entropy theory as mathematics by collaborating with both Japanese and foreign researchers such as Accardi, Belavkin and Petz [19].

Let us construct the Shannon's mutual information by quantum entropy form. When the quantum density operator is $\rho_{X_q Y_q} \in \mathcal{D}(H_X \otimes H_Y)$, we have

$$S(X_q, Y_q) = -Tr\{\rho_{X_q Y_q} \log \rho_{X_q Y_q}\} \quad (12)$$

Therefore, the quantum mutual information can be defined as follows.

$$I_q(X_q, Y_q) = S(X_q) + S(Y_q) - S(X_q, Y_q) \quad (13)$$

However, since the quantum entropy is not information in the meaning of a message, the above expression does not have an operational meaning of a general communication system. On the other hand, mathematically, the Holevo information can be expressed in this context. Let us assume that the quantum density operator as a set of classical-quantum composite systems is given by

$$\rho_{X_q Y_q} = \sum_x p(x) |x\rangle\langle x|_{X_q} \otimes \rho_{Y_q}^x \quad (14)$$

So we have

$$S(X_c, Y_q) = H(X_c) + \sum_x p(x) S(Y_q | x) \quad (15)$$

From the above, also we have

$$\chi(\epsilon) = I_{cq}(X_c, Y_q) \quad (16)$$

In this way, the quantum mutual information contains formally the Holevo information, but the operational meaning is completely different, and only the Holevo information has significance for the Shannon system that

has a great impact on the real world. On the other hand, from a mathematical point of view, the quantum mutual information can be expressed in terms of quantum relative entropy. That is,

$$I_q(X_q, Y_q) = D_q(\rho_{X_q Y_q} || \rho_{X_q} \otimes \rho_{Y_q}) \quad (17)$$

Furthermore, the Holevo information is also described by quantum relative entropy as follows:

$$\chi(\epsilon) = \sum_x p(x) D_q(\rho_{Y_q}^x || \rho_{Y_q}) \quad (18)$$

Thus, from the mathematical point of view, quantum relative entropy is the most fundamental notion. Based on this, quantum entropy theory has advanced rapidly in the 21st century as a mathematical study applying quantum statistical physics [20]. In the next section, we focus on Pinsker inequalities that give linkages to statistics and signal detection theory in the classical theory.

III. QUANTUM PINSKER INEQUALITY

Relative entropy is essentially the distance between two probability distributions in statistics. Thus, it is natural to consider the relationship with various mathematical distances. In general, the distance between two probability distributions is called a statistical distance or Kolmogorov distance, and is defined as follows.

$$\|P(x) - Q(x)\|_c = \sum_x |P(x) - Q(x)| \quad (19)$$

Such a concept of distance is often discussed in the language of distinguishability, and it is a source of great misunderstanding when one applies such mathematics to another problem. Here, it is discussed as a distance. The most important inequality in distance relations in statistics is the following Pinsker inequality shown by Pinsker in 1964.

Theorem – 1 (Pinsker)

$$D_c(P(x) || Q(x)) \geq \frac{1}{2 \ln 2} \|P(x) - Q(x)\|_c^2 \quad (20)$$

By utilizing this, generalization to the mutual information for the composite system becomes possible as follows:

Theorem – 2

$$I(X, Y) \geq \frac{2}{\ln 2} \Delta_c^2 \quad (21)$$

$$\Delta_c = \frac{1}{2} \|P(x, y) - P(x)P(y)\|_c \quad (22)$$

In quantum systems, the quantum density operator corresponds to the probability distribution in classical statistics. So the basic distance is "trace distance" defined as follows:

$$\Delta_q = Tr\{\Pi^{opt}(\rho - \sigma)\} = \frac{1}{2} \|\rho - \sigma\|_q \quad (23)$$

where Π^{opt} is detection operator or a positive operator valued measure (POVM). The relationship between relative entropy and statistical distance shifts to the relationship between quantum relative entropy and trace distance. It was expressed by the cooperation among Hiai, Ohya, and Tsukada as follows [21].

Theorem – 3(Quantum Pinsker Inequality)

$$D_q(\rho||\sigma) \geq \frac{1}{2 \ln 2} \|\rho - \sigma\|_q^2 \quad (24)$$

This can be further generalized to a quantum composite system. Let us assume quantum density operators in composite system as follows: $\rho_{X_q Y_q} \in \mathcal{D}(H_X \otimes H_Y)$, $\Delta_q = 1/2 \|\rho_{X_q Y_q} - \rho_{X_q} \otimes \rho_{Y_q}\|_q$ then we have the relation between quantum mutual information $I_q(X_q, Y_q)$ and trace distance.

Theorem – 4

$$I_q(X_q, Y_q) \geq \frac{1}{\ln 2} \|\rho_{X_q Y_q} - \rho_{X_q} \otimes \rho_{Y_q}\|_q^2 = \frac{2}{\ln 2} \Delta_q^2 \quad (25)$$

At this stage, quantum entropy theory does not play an important role in the Wiener-Shannon systems, and does not contribute as a design theory for real communication technologies.

IV. UPPER BOUND THEORY OF GUESSING PROBABILITY IN QKD

In the quantum entropy theory, only the Holevo information contributes to the Wiener and Shannon systems related to information communication systems, and it opened up the real world of optical quantum communication systems. On the other hand, in the context of Umegaki and Ohya's research, the Holevo information can be formally expressed as a special example of quantum mutual information from Eq(16). Here let us denote the trace distance as follows:

$$\Delta_q = \frac{1}{2} \left\| \sum_x p(x) |x\rangle\langle x|_{X_q} \otimes \rho_{Y_q}^x - \sum_x p(x) |x\rangle\langle x|_{X_q} \otimes \rho_{Y_q} \right\|_q \quad (26)$$

then it is easy to show the following theorem [22] based on Eqs(17, 18, 25, 26):

Theorem – 5

$$\chi(\epsilon) \geq \frac{2}{\ln 2} \Delta_q^2 \quad (27)$$

Even at this stage, the trace distance of the two quantum density operators in the above show only the characteristics of the quantum system, and the relationship with the evaluation of the technical operation in the Wiener-Shannon system is not clear. That is, the contribution to the real system is not visible. In order to show that the theory of quantum entropy contributes to the Wiener-Shannon's communication theory, it is necessary

to show that the trace distance defined before observation contributes directly to traditional performance evaluation measures in Wiener-Shannon system.

Before entering the main topic, we discuss with regard to the trace distance in the theory of quantum key distribution (QKD), because there is a theory that is misunderstood. It is supposed in QKD theory that there are quantum density operators formed by real protocols and quantum density operator formed by ideal protocols. They introduced Helstrom's quantum signal detection theory as a model to discriminate between these two quantum density operators and show the following average error probability or detection probability from the Helstrom formula.

$$P_e = \frac{1}{2} [1 - \Delta_q(\rho_{AE}^R, \rho_{AE}^I)] \quad (28)$$

$$P_d = \frac{1}{2} [1 + \Delta_q(\rho_{AE}^R, \rho_{AE}^I)] \quad (29)$$

where $\Delta_q = \frac{1}{2} \|\rho_{AE}^R - \rho_{AE}^I\|_q$ is the trace distance. At present, the reason for the security of QKD is to interpret this trace distance as "Failure probability" that the real protocol does not realize as an ideal protocol, and its value is about 10^{-12} . In the first place, there is no communication system that transmits and receives real and ideal quantum density operators, so this model cannot be a tool for discussing the security of QKD. Δ_q is a parameter and cannot have a probability meaning by itself. So such operational meaning of the trace distance that contributes to traditional information science, as described in many papers and books, is completely wrong.

On the other hand, in 2009, Yuen provided a significant inequality. That is, when the attacker accesses the number of signals $M = 2^{|K|}$ with key sequence length $|K|$ for real protocols in the context of the security of QKD, for the statistical distance Δ_c of the probability distributions after quantum measurement, the upper bound of the guessing probability is given as follows [23,24,25].

Theorem – 6(Yuen)

$$P_{guess} \leq \frac{1}{M} + \Delta_c \quad (30)$$

$$\Delta_c = \frac{1}{2} \|P(x, y) - P(x)P(y)\|_c$$

The author's group were able to conclude from the discussion with Yuen that the above relationship could be applied to the level of trace distance before making specific observations. The final expression is as follows [22,26].

Theorem – 7

Let the trace distance of the quantum density operators between an actual protocol and the ideal one be:

$$\Delta_q = \max_{\Lambda} \text{Tr} \Lambda \left(\sum_k p(k) \rho_{KE}^k - \rho_K \otimes \rho_E \right) \quad (31)$$

$k \in \mathcal{M}, \quad \Lambda : \text{POVM}$

Then the average guessing probability for real QKD signals is

$$\frac{1}{M} \leq P_{guess} \leq \frac{1}{M} + \Delta_q \quad (32)$$

The above equation can be obtained from the relationship between the statistical distance and the trace distance, but another direct proof is shown in the appendix for the convenience of the readers.

From the results of Theorem 5 and Theorem 7, Umegaki's quantum relative entropy contributes to the design theory of actual communication technologies in a sense different from the Holevo-Shumacher-Westmoreland theorems via the Holevo information. Furthermore, theorem 6 leads to electronics applications in quantum communications.

V. CONTRIBUTION TO ASYMPTOTIC THEORY IN STATISTICS

In the real world, asymptotic theory does not work, but is an important for the development of conceptual and mathematical frameworks, and many research groups are active on this issue. Since entropy theory has a high affinity with asymptotic theory, quantum relative entropy into the relationship with asymptotic theory like Stein's lemma is natural. So in this field, Umegaki's thought has been inherited to Fumio Hiai, and Umegaki's achievements are clear. For details, please refer to the many explanations by Hiai that convey the heart to his thesis professor.

VI. CONCLUSION

Quantum communication theory based on the basic concept of Wiener and Shannon has already contributed to the real optical communication system in a concrete manner [27, 28, 29]. I believe that this success originates from Ikehara's human resource development activities for mathematical basic research of quantum information, which were passed down to the later generations as part of Umegaki's extensive mathematical research. I also believe that philosophies of Ikehara and Umegaki greatly influenced researchers of the world who contributed to the development of today's quantum information science via the researchers trained at the international conference [30-39] that I established under the direction of Ikehara. I hope that this paper gives an opportunity to reaffirm that. As Wiener pointed out, in order to create new concepts in the future, the researchers of information science must lead quantum information science. In other words, a mathematical research is expected to be carried out in consideration of real communication system from the perspective of information science, not quantum statistical physics.

Examples of entropy theoretical approaches include Masaki Sohma [40], Masahito Hayashi [41], Keiji Matsumoto [42, 43] and Tomohiro Ogawa [44], and examples of approaches from signal detection theory include the

researches by Masashi Ban [45], Kenji Nakahira [46], and Kentaro Kato [47]. They are appreciated as significant contributors in the world. In Part 2, I will report how the results produced by the above-mentioned researchers contributed to electronics applications in the real world.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. W. Helstrom, *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory* (Academic Press, 1976).
- [2] A. S. Holevo, "Statistical decision theory for quantum systems," *J. Multivar. Anal.*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 337-394, Dec. 1973.
- [3] H. P. Yuen, R. S. Kennedy, and M. Lax, "Optimum testing of multiple hypotheses in quantum detection theory," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 125-134, Mar. 1975.
- [4] H. P. Yuen and J. H. Shapiro, "Quantum statistics of homodyne and heterodyne detection," In: L. Mandel and E. Wolf E. (eds), *Coherence and Quantum Optics IV* (Plenum Press/Springer, Boston), pp. 719-727, 1978.
- [5] O. Hirota, "Generalized quantum measurement theory and its application for quantum communication theory — optical communications by two-photon laser —," *Trans. IECE of Japan*, vol. 60-A, no. 8, pp. 701-708, Aug. 1977; in Japanese.
- [6] R. Jozsa, D. Robb, and W. K. Wootters, "Lower bound for accessible information in quantum mechanics," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 668-677, Feb. 1994.
- [7] M. Ban, M. Osaki, and O. Hirota, "Upper bound of accessible information and lower bound of Bayes cost in quantum signal detection process," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 54, no. 4, pp. 2718-2727, Oct. 1996; and also M. Ban, K. Yamazaki, and O. Hirota, "Accessible information in combined and sequential quantum measurement on binary state signal," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 22-26, Jan. 1997.
- [8] O. Hirota, *Optical Communication Theory — Basis of Quantum Theory —* (Morikita Publishing, Tokyo, 1985); in Japanese.
- [9] A. S. Holevo, "The capacity of the quantum channel with general signal states," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 269-273, Jan. 1998.
- [10] B. Schumacher and M. D. Westmoreland, "Sending classical information via noisy quantum channel," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 131-138, July 1997.
- [11] A. S. Holevo, M. Sohma, and O. Hirota, "Capacity of quantum Gaussian channels," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 1820-1828, Mar. 1999.
- [12] A. S. Holevo, M. Sohma, and O. Hirota, "Error exponents for quantum channels with constrained inputs," *Rep. Math. Phys.*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 343-358, Dec. 2000.
- [13] S. Kullback, *Information Theory and Statistics* (Dover, 1959).
- [14] H. Love, "The Ikehara collection: Norbert Wiener's Japan connections," *IEEE Technol. Soc. Mag.*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 44-49, June 2017.
- [15] O. Hirota, "What I learned from Prof. Shikao Ikehara," IEICE General Conference 2019, AK-2-9, Mar. 2019; in Japanese.
- [16] H. Umegaki, "Conditional expectation in operator algebra, IV (Entropy and information)," *Kōdai Math. Sem. Rep.*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 59-85, 1962.
- [17] H. Umegaki's selected papers: *Operator Algebra and Mathematical Information Theory* (Kaigai Publications, Tokyo, 1985).
- [18] H. Umegaki and M. Ohya, *Theory of quantum entropy* (Kyoritsu Shuppan, Tokyo, 1984); in Japanese.
- [19] M. Ohya and D. Petz, *Quantum Entropy and Its Use* (Springer, 1993).
- [20] M. M. Wilde, *Quantum Information Theory* (Cambridge University Press, 2016); and J. Watrous, *The Theory of Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2018).
- [21] F. Hiai, M. Ohya, and M. Tsukada, "Sufficiency, KMS condition and relative entropy in von Neumann algebras," *Pac. J. Math.*, vol. 96, no.1, pp. 99-109, Sep. 1981.
- [22] O. Hirota, "Incompleteness and limit of quantum key distribution," *Tamagawa University Quantum ICT Research Institute Bulletin* (open access), vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 25-34, 2012; also arXiv:1208.2106v2 [quant-ph], 2012.

- [23] H. P. Yuen, "Key generation: Foundations and a new quantum approach," *IEEE J. Sel. Top. Quantum Electron.*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 1630-1645, Nov./Dec. 2009.
- [24] H. P. Yuen, "Fundamental quantitative security in quantum key generation," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 82, no. 6, 062304, Dec. 2010.
- [25] H. P. Yuen, "Security of quantum key distribution," *IEEE Access*, vol. 4, pp. 724-749, Feb. 2016.
- [26] O. Hirota, "A correct security evaluation of quantum key distribution," *Tamagawa University Quantum ICT Research Institute Bulletin* (open access), vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1-9, 2014.
- [27] G. Cariolaro, *Quantum Communications* (Springer, 2015).
- [28] G. C. Papan and R. E. Blahut, *Lightwave Communications* (Cambridge University Press, 2019).
- [29] P. Verma, M. El Rifai, and K. W. C. Chan, *Multi-photon Quantum Secure Communication* (Springer, 2019).
-
- The Proceedings of Conference on Quantum Communication, Measurement, and Computing*
- [30] C. Bendjaballa, O. Hirota, and S. Reynoud (Eds.), *Quantum Aspects of Optical Communications*, (Lecture Note in Physics, 378), (Springer Verlag, 1991).
- [31] V. P. Belavkin, O. Hirota, and R. L. Hudson (Eds.), *Quantum Communications and Measurement*, (Prenum Press; Springer, 1995).
- [32] O. Hirota, A. S. Holevo, and C. M. Caves (Eds.), *Quantum Communication, Computing, and Measurement* (Prenum Press; Springer, 1997).
- [33] P. Kumar, G. M. D'Ariano, and O. Hirota (Eds.) *Quantum Communication, Computing, and Measurement 2* (Kluwer Academic/Prenum Press; Springer, 1999).
- [34] P. Tombesi and O. Hirota (Eds.) *Quantum Communication, Computing, and Measurement 3* (Kluwer Academic/Plenum Press; Springer, 2001).
- [35] J. H. Shapiro and O. Hirota (Eds.) *Quantum Communication, Measurement and Computing* (Rinton Press, 2003).
- [36] S. M. Barnett, E. Anderson, J. Jeffers, P. Öhberg, and O. Hirota (Eds.), *Quantum Communication, Measurement and Computing*, (AIP conference proceedings, 734), (American Institute of Physics Press, 2005).
- [37] O. Hirota, J. H. Shapiro, and M. Sasaki (Eds.), *Quantum Communication, Measurement and Computing* (NICT Press, 2007).
- [38] A. Lvovsky (Ed.), *Quantum Communication, Measurement and Computing*, (AIP conference proceedings, 1110), (American Institute of Physics Press, 2009).
- [39] T. Ralph and P. K. Lam (Eds.), *Quantum Communication, Measurement and Computing*, (AIP conference proceedings, 1363), (American Institute of Physics Press, 2011).
-
- [40] M. Sohma, "Capacity of quantum Gaussian channels," *Trans. IEICE of Japan*, vol. J88-A, no. 8, pp. 895-902, Aug. 2005; in Japanese.
- [41] M. Hayashi, *Quantum Information: An Introduction* (Springer, 2006).
- [42] K. Matsumoto, "Reverse test and characterization of quantum relative entropy," arXiv:1010.1030 [quant-ph], 2010.
- [43] K. Matsumoto, "On single-copy maximization of measured f -divergence between a given pair of quantum states," arXiv:1412.3676v5 [quant-ph], 2016.
- [44] T. Ogawa and H. Nagaoka, "A new proof of the channel coding theorem via hypothesis testing in quantum information theory," arXiv:0208139 [quant-ph], 2002.
- [45] M. Ban, K. Kurokawa, R. Momose, and O. Hirota, "Optimum measurements for discrimination among symmetric quantum states and parameter estimation," *Int. J. Theor. Phys.*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 1269-1288, June 1997.
- [46] K. Nakahira, K. Kato, and T. S. Usuda, "Generalized quantum state discrimination problems," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 91, no. 5, 059901, May 2015.
- [47] K. Kato, M. Osaki, M. Sasaki, and O. Hirota, "Quantum detection and mutual information for QAM and PSK signals," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 248-254, Feb. 1999.
- [48] C. Portmann and R. Renner, "Cryptographic security of quantum key distribution," arXiv:1409.3525 [quant-ph], 2014.

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Theorem 7

Let us consider a guessing probability of real system and that of the ideal case. Now we can apply the theory of multi-hypothesis quantum detection by Holevo [2]-Yuen [3]. A set of quantum states in the signal space H_S is given as $\rho_i \in H_S$, $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, M$. The criterion of quantum detection strategy is as follows:

$$P_e = \min_{\Pi} \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^M p(i) \text{Tr} \Pi_i \rho_i \right) \quad (33)$$

$$P_d = 1 - P_e \quad (34)$$

where P_e and P_d are average error probability and detection probability. Here, I employ Portman's method [48] as a basis. First, we apply the above to find the detection probability in QKD system with quantum composite system. Let us consider two different cases such as detection probability of real one, and that of the ideal case, and compare both detection probabilities. A set of density operators for the real one is given by $\{\rho_{KE}^k\}$ and a set of the ideal one is given by $\rho_K \otimes \rho_E$, where $\{k \in \mathcal{M}\}$. Each detection probability in two cases is deduced by using the formula of Eq(33) or Eq(34). But, here let us assume that $\Lambda^+ = (\sum_k |k\rangle\langle k| \otimes \Pi_k^{opt})$ as sub-optimum POVM in composite system, and the density operator for the ideal one is $\rho_K \otimes \rho_E = \sum_k (1/M) |k\rangle\langle k| \otimes \rho_E$. Then the detection probability of real case P_d^R and that of the ideal P_d^I are

$$P_d^R = \text{Tr} \Lambda^+ p(k) \rho_{KE}^k \quad (35)$$

$$P_d^I = \text{Tr} \Lambda^+ \rho_K \otimes \rho_E = \frac{1}{M} \quad (36)$$

Since the trace distance Δ_q is defined by Eq(31) as the maximum with respect to any POVM, the trace distance between Eq(35) and Eq(36) satisfies

$$\text{Tr} \Lambda^+ \left(\sum_k p(k) \rho_{KE}^k - \rho_K \otimes \rho_E \right) \leq \Delta_q \quad (37)$$

Hence we have the following one from Eqs(33-36) as the upper bound of detection probability for the real system:

$$P_d^R = \text{Tr} \Lambda^+ p(k) \rho_{KE}^k \leq \frac{1}{M} + \Delta_q \quad (38)$$

Then, the average guessing probability is given by

$$\begin{aligned} P_{guess} &= \max \sum_{i=1}^M p(y_i) p(x_i | y_i) \\ &= \max \sum_{i=1}^M p(i) p(y_i | x_i) \\ &= P_d \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

The lower bound of the detection probability is simply $1/M$ as the pure guessing in the signal detection theory. It can be given by $\Delta_q = 0$ which means that the real case is equal to the ideal case [22,26]. That is, there is no

correlation between key sequence K and observation data E of Eve. So one can denote associated with Shannon theory in the perfect case as follows:

$$P(K|E) = P(K), \quad \text{or} \quad H(K|E) = H(K) \quad (40)$$