

## Recap

→ Relative entropy:  $\rho$  quantum state,  $\sigma \geq 0$

$$D(\rho \parallel \sigma) = \begin{cases} \operatorname{tr} \rho (\log \rho - \log \sigma) & \text{if } \operatorname{supp} \rho \subseteq \operatorname{supp} \sigma \\ \infty & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

→ Data-processing inequality:  $D(\rho \parallel \sigma) \geq D(N(\rho) \parallel N(\sigma))$

for any quantum channel  $N$

→ Functions on operators: A Hermitian with spectral decomp.  $A = \sum_i \lambda_i |i\rangle\langle i|$

$$f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ with } I \supseteq \operatorname{spec} A: \quad f(A) = \sum_i f(\lambda_i) |i\rangle\langle i|$$

→ Examples: matrix logarithm  $\log \rho = \sum_{i: \lambda_i > 0} (\log \lambda_i) |i\rangle\langle i|$

$$\text{entropy function } \eta(t) = -t \log t: \quad \eta(\rho) = \sum_i \eta(\lambda_i) |i\rangle\langle i|$$

defined for all  $\rho \geq 0$ .

→  $f$  is operator-convex if  $f(\lambda A + (1-\lambda)B) \leq \lambda f(A) + (1-\lambda)f(B)$

$\lambda \in [0, 1]$

→ Not every convex function is operator-convex (e.g.,  $t \mapsto t^3$ )

→  $- \log t$  and  $\eta(t) = -t \log t$  are operator-convex.

→ Operator Jensen inequality:  $f$  operator-convex,  $V$  isometry:

$$f(V^\dagger A V) \leq V^\dagger f(A) V$$

.) Multiplication maps:  $L_A(X) = AX$ ,  $R_B(X) = XB$

.)  $[L_A, R_B] = 0$

.) A Hermitian,  $f: \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $\text{spec } A \subseteq \mathbb{I}$ :

$$f(L_A) = L_{f(A)}, \quad f(R_A) = R_{f(A)}$$

**Def 8** Let  $X, Y \in \mathcal{B}(V)$  be Hermitian,  $Y$  invertible.

The relative modular operator  $\Delta \equiv \Delta^{X, Y}$  is defined as

$$\Delta^{X, Y} = L_X R_{Y^{-1}} : z \mapsto XzY^{-1}$$

**Lemma 9** Let  $X, Y \geq 0$ ,  $Y$  invertible, and  $\eta(t) = t \log t$ .

$$\text{Then } \eta(\Delta^{X, Y}) = \Delta^{X, Y} (L_{\log X} - R_{\log Y}).$$

Proof:  $X = \sum_i x_i |e_i X f_i\rangle$ ,  $Y = \sum_i y_i |f_i X f_i\rangle$  ( $Y$  invertible  $\Rightarrow \underline{y_i > 0}$ )  
spectral decompositions.

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^{X, Y}(|e_i X f_j\rangle) &= L_X R_{Y^{-1}}(|e_i X f_j\rangle) = X|e_i X f_j\rangle Y^{-1} \\ &= x_i |e_i X f_j\rangle y_j^{-1} = x_i y_j^{-1} |e_i X f_j\rangle \end{aligned}$$

$\Rightarrow d^2$  eigenmatrices:  $|e_i X f_j\rangle$  is an eigenmat. of  $\Delta^{X, Y}$  with  
eigenvalue  $x_i y_j^{-1}$ .

$$\eta(\Delta)(|e_i\rangle\langle f_j|) = \eta(x_i y_j^{-1}) |e_i\rangle\langle f_j|$$

$$\downarrow \eta(t) = t \log t \quad = x_i y_j^{-1} (\log x_i - \log y_j) |e_i\rangle\langle f_j|$$

$$\eta(\Delta) \stackrel{!}{=} \underline{\Delta^{x,y} (L_{\log x} - R_{\log y})}$$

$$\Delta^{x,y} (L_{\log x} - R_{\log y})(|e_i\rangle\langle f_j|) = x_i y_j^{-1} (\log x_i - \log y_j) |e_i\rangle\langle f_j|$$

Since  $\{|e_i\rangle\langle f_j|\}_{i,j=1}^d$  forms a basis for  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ ,

$$\eta(\Delta^{x,y}) = \Delta^{x,y} (L_{\log x} - R_{\log y}) \quad \square$$

Now we're ready to prove data-processing for  $D(\cdot||\cdot)$  (Thm 5)

Proof of Thm 5:

$$\text{supp } \rho \not\subseteq \text{supp } \sigma \Rightarrow D(\rho||\sigma) = \infty$$

1) w.l.o.g. we assume  $\text{supp } \rho \subseteq \text{supp } \sigma \Rightarrow \sigma$  can be taken to be invertible.

( $\mathcal{X} = \ker \sigma \oplus \text{supp } \sigma$ ; restrict  $\mathcal{X}$  to  $\text{supp } \sigma$  by proj.)

2) remember: for any quantum channel  $\mathcal{N}: A \rightarrow B$ ,

$\exists$  isometry  $V: \mathcal{X}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_B \oplus \mathcal{X}_C$  s.t.

$$\mathcal{N}(X_A) = \text{tr}_C V X_A V^\dagger$$

Recall:  $f(VAV^t) = V R(A) V^t$  by definition

applying to matrix logarithm  $\Rightarrow D(V \rho V^t \| V \sigma V^t) = D(\rho \| \sigma)$

$N = \text{tr}_B V \cdot V^t \Rightarrow$  claim follows from proving DPI

for  $N = \text{tr}_B : AB \rightarrow A$

3) to show:  $D(\rho_{AB} \| \sigma_{AB}) \geq D(\rho_A \| \sigma_A)$  ( $\rho_{AB}$  state,  $\sigma_{AB} \geq 0$ )

since  $\text{supp } \sigma_{AB} \subseteq \text{supp } \sigma_A \otimes \text{supp } \sigma_B$  (\*)

w.l.o.g. assume both  $\sigma_{AB}$  and  $\sigma_A$  to be invertible.

(\*) proved in arXiv: quant-ph/0512258, Lem. B.4.1)

Define  $\Delta_{AB} = L_{\rho_{AB}} R_{\sigma_{AB}^{-1}}$ ,  $\Delta_A = L_{\rho_A} R_{\sigma_A^{-1}}$

$$D(\rho_{AB} \| \sigma_{AB}) = \text{tr}_{\rho_{AB}} (\log \rho_{AB} - \log \sigma_{AB})$$

$$\langle X, \eta \rangle = \text{tr} X^t \eta$$

on  $\mathcal{B}(X)$

$\eta(t) = t \log t$

$$= \langle \sigma_{AB}^{1/2}, \eta(\Delta_{AB}) (\sigma_{AB}^{1/2}) \rangle$$

$$\stackrel{\text{Lemma 9}}{=} \langle \sigma_{AB}^{1/2}, \Delta_{AB} (L \log \rho_{AB} - R \log \sigma_{AB}) (\sigma_{AB}^{1/2}) \rangle$$

$$= \langle \sigma_{AB}^{1/2}, \rho_{AB} \log \rho_{AB} \sigma_{AB}^{1/2} \sigma_{AB}^{-1} - \rho_{AB} \sigma_{AB}^{1/2} \log \sigma_{AB} \sigma_{AB}^{-1} \rangle$$

$\Leftrightarrow$

$$= \text{tr}_{\rho_{AB}} \log \rho_{AB} - \text{tr}_{\rho_{AB}} \log \sigma_{AB}$$

$$D(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) = \langle \sigma_A^{1/2}, \eta(\Delta_A) (\sigma_A^{1/2}) \rangle$$

$$D(\rho_{AB} \| \sigma_{AB}) = \langle \sigma_{AB}^{\eta/2}, \eta(\Delta_{AB}) (\sigma_{AB}^{\eta/2}) \rangle$$

( $\geq$ )

$$D(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) = \langle \sigma_A^{\eta/2}, \eta(\Delta_A) (\sigma_A^{\eta/2}) \rangle$$

operator Jensen's inequality:  $V$  isometry:  $f(V^\dagger X V) \leq V^\dagger f(X) V$

Goal: find  $V: \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$  s.t.

i)  $V$  is an isometry:  $V^\dagger V = \text{id}_A$

ii)  $V^\dagger \Delta_{AB} V = \Delta_A$

iii)  $V(\sigma_A^{\eta/2}) = \sigma_{AB}^{\eta/2}$

assume we have found such a  $V$ :

$$D(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) \stackrel{\text{Lemma 9}}{=} \langle \sigma_A^{\eta/2}, \eta(\Delta_A) (\sigma_A^{\eta/2}) \rangle$$

$$\stackrel{(ii)}{=} \langle \sigma_A^{\eta/2}, \eta(V^\dagger \Delta_{AB} V) (\sigma_A^{\eta/2}) \rangle$$

$$\stackrel{\text{op. Jensen}}{\leq} \langle \sigma_A^{\eta/2}, \underbrace{V^\dagger \eta(\Delta_{AB}) V}_{V(\sigma_A^{\eta/2})^\dagger} (\sigma_A^{\eta/2}) \rangle$$

(i)

$$\stackrel{(iii)}{=} \langle \sigma_{AB}^{\eta/2}, \eta(\Delta_{AB}) (\sigma_{AB}^{\eta/2}) \rangle \stackrel{\text{Lemma 9}}{=} D(\rho_{AB} \| \sigma_{AB})$$

Choice for isometry:  $V(X_A) = (X_A \sigma_A^{-1/2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_B) \sigma_{AB}^{1/2}$

$$V: \mathcal{B}(X_A) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(Y_{AB})$$

i) easy to check:  $V^\dagger(Y_{AB}) = \text{tr}_B(Y_{AB} \sigma_{AB}^{1/2} (\sigma_A^{-1/2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_B))$

$$V^\dagger V(X_A) = V^\dagger(X_A \sigma_A^{-1/2} \sigma_{AB}^{1/2}) \quad (\text{omit identity operators})$$

$$= \text{tr}_B(X_A \sigma_A^{-1/2} \underbrace{\sigma_{AB}^{1/2} \sigma_{AB}^{1/2}}_{\sigma_{AB}} \sigma_A^{-1/2})$$

$$= X_A \sigma_A^{-1/2} \sigma_A \sigma_A^{-1/2} = X_A \quad \forall X_A \Rightarrow V^\dagger V = \text{id}_A$$

$$\text{ii) } V^\dagger \Delta_{AB} V = \Delta_A$$

$$\underline{V^\dagger \Delta_{AB} V}(X_A) = V^\dagger \Delta_{AB}(X_A \sigma_A^{-1/2} \sigma_{AB}^{1/2})$$

$$= V^\dagger(\rho_{AB} X_A \sigma_A^{-1/2} \underbrace{\sigma_{AB}^{1/2} \sigma_{AB}^{-1}}_{\sigma_{AB}^{-1/2}})$$

$$= \text{tr}_B(\rho_{AB} X_A \sigma_A^{-1/2} \cancel{\sigma_{AB}^{-1/2}} \cancel{\sigma_{AB}^{1/2}} \sigma_A^{-1/2})$$

$$= \text{tr}_B(\rho_{AB} X_A \sigma_A^{-1}) = \rho_A X_A \sigma_A^{-1} = \Delta_A(X_A)$$

$\forall X_A$

$$\text{iii) } V(\sigma_A^{1/2}) = \sigma_{AB}^{1/2} \quad \checkmark$$

□

Remarks: We proved DPI for quantum channels  $\rightarrow$  generalize?

$\rightarrow$  Dines Potz: Proofs of DPI based on relative modulus operators work for trace-preserving,  $\tau$ -positive maps:

$\Phi$  is  $\tau$ -positive if  $\Phi \otimes \text{id}_2$  is positive ( $X_{AB} \geq 0 \Rightarrow (\Phi \otimes \text{id}_2)(X_{AB}) \geq 0$ )

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \geq 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \begin{pmatrix} \Phi(A) & \Phi(B) \\ \Phi(C) & \Phi(D) \end{pmatrix} \geq 0$$

block matrix

$$A, B, C, D \in B(\mathcal{X})$$

Needed for these proofs: Schwarz inequality  $\Phi^\dagger(X^\dagger X) \geq \Phi^\dagger(X^\dagger) \Phi^\dagger(X)$   
(holds for  $\Phi$   $\tau$ -positive and TP)

$\rightarrow$  Very recent result (Müller-Herms, Reeb arXiv: 1512.06117):

DPI holds for all trace-preserving, positive maps

(different proof based on complex interpolation)