2-1-2020

Optimal uniform continuity bound for conditional entropy of classical–quantum states

Mark M. Wilde
Louisiana State University

Optimal uniform continuity bound for conditional entropy of classical–quantum states

Mark M. Wilde*

January 23, 2020

Abstract

In this short note, I show how a recent result of Alhejji and Smith [arXiv:1909.00787] regarding an optimal uniform continuity bound for classical conditional entropy leads to an optimal uniform continuity bound for quantum conditional entropy of classical–quantum states. The bound is optimal in the sense that there always exists a pair of classical–quantum states saturating the bound, and so no further improvements are possible. An immediate application is a uniform continuity bound for entanglement of formation that improves upon the one previously given by Winter in [arXiv:1507.07775]. Two intriguing open questions are raised regarding other possible uniform continuity bounds for conditional entropy, one about quantum–classical states and another about fully quantum bipartite states.

Recently, the following bound was established by Alhejji and Smith in [1] for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1 - 1/|\mathcal{Y}|]$:

$$|H(Y|X)_p - H(Y|X)_q| \leq \varepsilon \log_2(|\mathcal{Y}| - 1) + h_2(\varepsilon), \tag{1}$$

where $h_2(\varepsilon) := -\varepsilon \log_2 \varepsilon - (1-\varepsilon)\log_2(1-\varepsilon)$ is the binary entropy, p_{XY} and q_{XY} are joint probability distributions over the finite-cardinality alphabets $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$,

$$H(Y|X)_p := -\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} p_X(x) \sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} p_{Y|X}(x) \log_2 p_{Y|X}(y|x) \tag{2}$$

*Hearne Institute for Theoretical Physics, Department of Physics and Astronomy, Center for Computation and Technology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803, USA. Email: mwilde@lsu.edu

and $H(Y|X)_q$ (defined in a similar way but with q_{XY}) are conditional Shannon entropies, and

$$\varepsilon \geq \frac{1}{2}\|p_{XY} - q_{XY}\|_1 := \frac{1}{2}\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X},y\in\mathcal{Y}} |p_{XY}(x,y) - q_{XY}(x,y)|\,. \tag{3}$$

The quantity on the right-hand side is known as the total variational distance of the probability distributions p_{XY} and q_{XY}, and it is a measure of their statistical distinguishability. The bound in (1) is called a uniform continuity bound because the right-hand side depends only on ε and the cardinality $|\mathcal{Y}|$. It is optimal in the sense that for every ε and $|\mathcal{Y}|$, there exists a pair of distributions p_{XY} and q_{XY} saturating the upper bound (see Eqs. (27)–(28) of [1]). It generalizes the optimal uniform continuity bound for unconditional Shannon entropy established independently by [2, Eq. (4)] and [3].

Uniform continuity bounds of the form in (1) for both the classical and quantum cases find application in providing estimates for various communication capacities of classical and quantum channels [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11]. Motivated by this application (as well as fundamental concerns), there has been a large amount of work on this topic over the years [12, 13, 3, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18].

In this brief note, I show how to employ the bound in (1) to establish the following optimal uniform continuity bound for conditional entropy of finite-dimensional classical–quantum states, improving (optimally) upon one of the cases given in Lemma 2 of [14]:

Proposition 1 *The following inequality holds for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1 - 1/d_B]$:*

$$|H(B|X)_\rho - H(B|X)_\sigma| \leq \varepsilon \log_2(d_B - 1) + h_2(\varepsilon), \tag{4}$$

where d_B is the dimension of system B, the states ρ_{XB} and σ_{XB} are the following finite-dimensional classical–quantum states:

$$\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} r(x)|x\rangle\langle x|_X \otimes \rho_B^x, \qquad \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} s(x)|x\rangle\langle x|_X \otimes \sigma_B^x, \tag{5}$$

$r(x)$ and $s(x)$ are probability distributions, $\{\rho_B^x\}_x$ and $\{\sigma_B^x\}_x$ are sets of states, the conditional entropy is defined in terms of the von Neumann entropy as $H(B|X)_\rho := \sum_x r(x)H(\rho_B^x)$, and

$$\varepsilon \geq \frac{1}{2}\,\|\rho_{XB} - \sigma_{XB}\|_1\,. \tag{6}$$

Also, there exists a pair of classical–quantum states saturating the bound for every value of d_B and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1 - 1/d_B]$.

Proof. The desired inequality is reduced to the classical case by means of a conditional dephasing channel and data processing. This generalizes an approach recalled in the introduction of [14], which is attributed therein to [19]. Suppose without loss of generality that $H(B|X)_\rho \leq H(B|X)_\sigma$. Let a spectral decomposition of ρ_B^x be as follows:

$$\rho_B^x = \sum_y r(y|x)|\phi^{y,x}\rangle\langle\phi^{y,x}|_B, \tag{7}$$

where $r(y|x)$ is a conditional probability distribution and $\{|\phi^{y,x}\rangle_B\}_y$ is a set of orthonormal states (for fixed x). Define the conditional dephasing channel as

$$\overline{\Delta}_{XB}^{\text{cd}}(\omega_{XB}) = \sum_{x,y} \left(|x\rangle\langle x|_X \otimes |\phi^{y,x}\rangle\langle\phi^{y,x}|_B\right) \omega_{XB} \left(|x\rangle\langle x|_X \otimes |\phi^{y,x}\rangle\langle\phi^{y,x}|_B\right), \tag{8}$$

which we think of intuitively as dephasing or measuring system X and then based on the outcome, dephasing system B in the eigenbasis of ρ_B^x. This is a unital channel, and so the entropy of any state on systems X and B does not decrease under its action. When this conditional dephasing acts on σ_{XB}, it leads to the following state:

$$\overline{\Delta}_{XB}^{\text{cd}}(\sigma_{XB}) = \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X},y\in\mathcal{Y}} s(x)s(y|x)|x\rangle\langle x|_X \otimes |\phi^{y,x}\rangle\langle\phi^{y,x}|_B, \tag{9}$$

where $s(y|x)$ is a conditional probability distribution and $\mathcal{Y}$ is an alphabet with the same cardinality as the dimension d_B: $|\mathcal{Y}| = d_B$. Observe that

$$\sigma_X = \text{Tr}_B[\sigma_{XB}] = \text{Tr}_B[\overline{\Delta}_{XB}^{\text{cd}}(\sigma_{XB})]. \tag{10}$$

Furthermore, the state ρ_{XB} is invariant under the action of the conditional dephasing channel:

$$\rho_{XB} = \overline{\Delta}_{XB}^{\text{cd}}(\rho_{XB}). \tag{11}$$

Observe that ρ_{XB} and $\overline{\Delta}_{XB}^{\text{cd}}(\sigma_{XB})$ are commuting states, and thus can be considered as classical–classical states (to be more precise, the first is classical and the second is classical conditioned on the classical value in the first system). Define the joint distributions $r_{XY}(x,y) = r(x)r(y|x)$ and $s_{XY}(x,y) = s(x)s(y|x)$. From (10) and the fact that the conditional dephasing channel is unital, it follows that

$$H(B|X)_\sigma = H(BX)_\sigma - H(X)_\sigma \tag{12}$$
$$= H(BX)_\sigma - H(X)_{\overline{\Delta}^{cd}(\sigma)} \tag{13}$$
$$\leq H(BX)_{\overline{\Delta}^{\mathrm{cd}}(\sigma)} - H(X)_{\overline{\Delta}^{\mathrm{cd}}(\sigma)} \tag{14}$$
$$= H(B|X)_{\overline{\Delta}^{\mathrm{cd}}(\sigma)} \tag{15}$$
$$= H(Y|X)_s. \tag{16}$$

So we have that

$$H(Y|X)_r = H(B|X)_\rho \leq H(B|X)_\sigma \leq H(Y|X)_s, \tag{17}$$

which means that

$$H(B|X)_\sigma - H(B|X)_\rho \leq H(Y|X)_s - H(Y|X)_r. \tag{18}$$

Meanwhile, we have from data processing for normalized trace distance that

$$\frac{1}{2}\left\|\rho_{XB} - \sigma_{XB}\right\|_1 \geq \frac{1}{2}\left\|\overline{\Delta}^{\mathrm{cd}}_{XB}(\rho_{XB}) - \overline{\Delta}^{\mathrm{cd}}_{XB}(\sigma_{XB})\right\|_1 \tag{19}$$
$$= \frac{1}{2}\left\|\rho_{XB} - \overline{\Delta}^{\mathrm{cd}}_{XB}(\sigma_{XB})\right\|_1 \tag{20}$$
$$= \frac{1}{2}\left\|r_{XY} - s_{XY}\right\|_1. \tag{21}$$

In turn, this means that the following bound holds for total variational distance:

$$\frac{1}{2}\left\|r_{XY} - s_{XY}\right\|_1 \leq \varepsilon. \tag{22}$$

Now we have completed the reduction to the classical case and invoke (1) to conclude that

$$|H(B|X)_\rho - H(B|X)_\sigma| = H(B|X)_\sigma - H(B|X)_\rho \tag{23}$$
$$\leq H(Y|X)_s - H(Y|X)_r \tag{24}$$
$$\leq \varepsilon \log_2(d_B - 1) + h_2(\varepsilon), \tag{25}$$

completing the proof of (4). The inequality in (4) is seen to be tight by using the classical example from Eqs. (27)–(28) of [1]. ■

By employing the same method of proof given for Corollary 4 in [14] (and observing that $\delta = \sqrt{\varepsilon(2-\varepsilon)}$ and $\delta \in (0, 1 - 1/d]$ imply that $\varepsilon \in (0, 1 - \frac{\sqrt{2d-1}}{d}]$), we arrive at the following uniform continuity bound for entanglement of formation:

Corollary 2 *Let ρ_{AB} and σ_{AB} be finite-dimensional quantum states such that*

$$\frac{1}{2}\left\|\rho_{AB}-\sigma_{AB}\right\|_1 \leq \varepsilon, \tag{26}$$

where $\varepsilon \in (0, 1-\frac{\sqrt{2d-1}}{d}]$ and $d = \min\{d_A, d_B\}$. Then

$$|E_F(\rho_{AB}) - E_F(\sigma_{AB})| \leq \delta \log_2(d-1) + h_2(\delta), \tag{27}$$

where E_F is the entanglement of formation and $\delta = \sqrt{\varepsilon(2-\varepsilon)}$. The entanglement of formation of a state ω_{AB} is defined as follows [20]:

$$E_F(\omega_{AB}) := \\ \inf\{H(B|X)_\tau : \tau_{XAB} = \sum_x p(x)|x\rangle\langle x|_X \otimes \phi^x_{AB}, \mathrm{Tr}_X[\tau_{XAB}] = \omega_{AB}\}. \tag{28}$$

where each ϕ^x_{AB} is a pure state and $p(x)$ is a probability distribution.

The statement in Proposition 1 has a straightforward generalization to the case in which the classical conditioning system is countable (thus addressing an open question stated in [1]). To arrive at the corollary, let us define conditional entropy in this case as follows:

$$H(B|X)_\rho := \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} p_X(x) H(\rho^x_B), \tag{29}$$

where ρ_{XB} has the same form as in (5), except that $\mathcal{X}$ is now a countable alphabet (correspondingly, X is now a separable Hilbert space). Then we have the following corollary:

Corollary 3 *The following inequality holds for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1-1/d_B]$:*

$$|H(B|X)_\rho - H(B|X)_\sigma| \leq \varepsilon \log_2(d_B - 1) + h_2(\varepsilon), \tag{30}$$

where d_B is the dimension of system B, the states ρ_{XB} and σ_{XB} are the following classical–quantum states:

$$\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} r(x)|x\rangle\langle x|_X \otimes \rho^x_B, \qquad \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} s(x)|x\rangle\langle x|_X \otimes \sigma^x_B, \tag{31}$$

with system B finite-dimensional and the alphabet $\mathcal{X}$ countable, $r(x)$ and $s(x)$ are probability distributions, $\{\rho^x_B\}_x$ and $\{\sigma^x_B\}_x$ are sets of states, and

$$\varepsilon \geq \frac{1}{2}\left\|\rho_{XB}-\sigma_{XB}\right\|_1. \tag{32}$$

Proof. Recall that the conditional entropy of a bipartite state ρ_{LM} acting on a separable Hilbert space, with $H(L)_\rho < \infty$, is defined as [21]

$$H(L|M)_\rho := H(L)_\rho - I(L;M)_\rho, \tag{33}$$

where the mutual information is given in terms of the relative entropy $D(\omega\|\tau)$ [22, 23] of states ω and τ as

$$I(L;M)_\rho := D(\rho_{LM}\|\rho_L \otimes \rho_M), \tag{34}$$

$$D(\omega\|\tau) := \frac{1}{\ln 2}\sum_{x,y} |\langle\phi_x|\psi_y\rangle|^2 \left[\lambda_x \ln(\lambda_x/\mu_y) + \mu_y - \lambda_x\right], \tag{35}$$

and spectral decompositions of states ω and τ are given by

$$\omega = \sum_x \lambda_x |\phi_x\rangle\langle\phi_x|, \qquad \tau = \sum_y \mu_y |\psi_y\rangle\langle\psi_y|. \tag{36}$$

Let us first verify that the formula in (33) reduces to that in (29). Evaluating the formulas in (34) and (35) for the case of interest (the state ρ_{XB} in (31)), while taking spectral decompositions of ρ_{XB} and $\rho_X \otimes \rho_B$ as

$$\rho_{XB} = \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} r(x)|x\rangle\langle x|_X \otimes \sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} r(y|x)|\phi^{y,x}\rangle\langle\phi^{y,x}|_B, \tag{37}$$

$$\rho_X \otimes \rho_B = \sum_{x'\in\mathcal{X}} r(x')|x'\rangle\langle x'|_X \otimes \sum_{z\in\mathcal{Z}} q(z)|\psi_z\rangle\langle\psi_z|_B, \tag{38}$$

with $\mathcal{X}$ countable, $\mathcal{Y}$ and $\mathcal{Z}$ finite, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} I(X;B)_\rho = \frac{1}{\ln 2} \sum_{x,y,z,x'} &\left|\left(\langle x'|_X \otimes \langle\psi_z|_B\right)\left(|x\rangle_X \otimes |\phi^{y,x}\rangle_B\right)\right|^2 \\ &\times \left[r(x)r(y|x)\ln\left(\frac{r(x)r(y|x)}{[r(x')q(z)]}\right) + r(x')q(z) - r(x)r(y|x)\right] \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

$$\begin{aligned} = \frac{1}{\ln 2}\sum_{x,y,z} &|\langle\psi_z|\phi^{y,x}\rangle_B|^2 \\ &\times \left[r(x)r(y|x)\ln\left(\frac{r(x)r(y|x)}{[r(x)q(z)]}\right) + r(x)q(z) - r(x)r(y|x)\right] \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\ln 2}\sum_x r(x)\sum_{y,z} |\langle\psi_z|\phi^{y,x}\rangle_B|^2 \left[r(y|x)\ln\left(\frac{r(y|x)}{q(z)}\right) + q(z) - r(y|x)\right] \tag{41}$$

For every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we find that

$$\sum_{y,z} |\langle \psi_z | \phi^{y,x} \rangle_B|^2 \left[r(y|x) \ln \left(\frac{r(y|x)}{q(z)} \right) + q(z) - r(y|x) \right] \tag{42}$$

$$= \sum_{y,z} |\langle \psi_z | \phi^{y,x} \rangle_B|^2 \left[r(y|x) \ln \left(\frac{r(y|x)}{q(z)} \right) \right] \tag{43}$$

$$= \sum_{y,z} |\langle \psi_z | \phi^{y,x} \rangle_B|^2 \left[r(y|x) \ln \left(r(y|x) \right) \right] + \sum_{y,z} |\langle \psi_z | \phi^{y,x} \rangle_B|^2 \left[r(y|x) \ln \left(\frac{1}{q(z)} \right) \right] \tag{44}$$

$$= \sum_{y} \left[r(y|x) \ln \left(r(y|x) \right) \right] + \sum_{z} \langle \psi_z | \rho_B^x | \psi_z \rangle \ln \left(\frac{1}{q(z)} \right) \tag{45}$$

$$= - (\ln 2)\, H(\rho_B^x) + \sum_{z} \langle \psi_z | \rho_B^x | \psi_z \rangle \ln \left(\frac{1}{q(z)} \right). \tag{46}$$

Then we find that

$$I(X;B)_\rho = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} r(x) \left[-H(\rho_B^x) + \sum_{z} \langle \psi_z | \rho_B^x | \psi_z \rangle \log_2 \left(\frac{1}{q(z)} \right) \right] \tag{47}$$

$$= - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} r(x) H(\rho_B^x) + \sum_{z} \langle \psi_z | \left[\sum_{x} r(x) \rho_B^x \right] | \psi_z \rangle \log_2 \left(\frac{1}{q(z)} \right) \tag{48}$$

$$= - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} r(x) H(\rho_B^x) + \sum_{z} \langle \psi_z | \rho_B | \psi_z \rangle \log_2 \left(\frac{1}{q(z)} \right) \tag{49}$$

$$= - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} r(x) H(\rho_B^x) + \sum_{z} q(z) \log_2 \left(\frac{1}{q(z)} \right) \tag{50}$$

$$= - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} r(x) H(\rho_B^x) + H(\rho_B). \tag{51}$$

So finally

$$H(B)_\rho - I(X;B)_\rho = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} r(x) H(\rho_B^x), \tag{52}$$

as expected.

Now, it is known from [21] that the following limit holds

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} H(B|X)_{\rho^k} = H(B|X)_\rho, \tag{53}$$

where

$$\rho_{XB}^{k} := \mathcal{P}_{X}^{k}(\rho_{XB}) := \Pi_{X}^{k}\rho_{XB}\Pi_{X}^{k} + \frac{\Pi_{X}^{k}}{\mathrm{Tr}[\Pi_{X}^{k}]} \otimes \mathrm{Tr}_{X}[(I_{X} - \Pi_{X}^{k})\rho_{XB}], \quad (54)$$

and $\left\{\Pi_{X}^{k}\right\}_{k}$ is a sequence of finite-dimensional projections strongly converging to the identity. Then by taking the projection $\Pi_{X}^{k} := \sum_{x=1}^{k} |x\rangle\langle x|_{X}$, we find from (32) and data processing for normalized trace distance with respect to the channel defined in (54) that

$$\varepsilon \geq \frac{1}{2}\left\|\rho_{XB}^{k} - \sigma_{XB}^{k}\right\|_{1}, \quad (55)$$

where $\sigma_{XB}^{k} := \mathcal{P}_{X}^{k}(\sigma_{XB})$. Now applying the uniform continuity bound from Proposition 1 to the finite-dimensional states ρ_{XB}^{k} and σ_{XB}^{k}, we arrive at the following inequality holding for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\left|H(B|X)_{\rho^{k}} - H(B|X)_{\sigma^{k}}\right| \leq \varepsilon \log_{2}(d_{B} - 1) + h_{2}(\varepsilon) \quad (56)$$

Finally applying the limit in (53), we arrive at the statement of the corollary. ■

Two intriguing questions remain about continuity of conditional entropy. The first is whether the following inequality could hold

$$|H(X|B)_{\rho} - H(X|B)_{\sigma}| \overset{?}{\leq} \varepsilon \log_{2}(d_{X} - 1) + h_{2}(\varepsilon), \quad (57)$$

where ρ_{XB} and σ_{XB} are the same classical–quantum states from (5) (with the systems in the conditional entropy flipped, we could call these states "quantum–classical" now). The other question is whether the following inequality could hold for fully quantum states ρ_{AB} and σ_{AB} that satisfy $\frac{1}{2}\left\|\rho_{AB} - \sigma_{AB}\right\|_{1} \leq \varepsilon$ where $\varepsilon \in (0, 1 - 1/d_{A}^{2}]$:

$$|H(A|B)_{\rho} - H(A|B)_{\sigma}| \overset{?}{\leq} \varepsilon \log_{2}(d_{A}^{2} - 1) + h_{2}(\varepsilon). \quad (58)$$

This inequality is saturated by an example given in Remark 3 of [14]. These questions were raised during the open problems session at the workshop "Algebraic and Statistical ways into Quantum Resource Theories," held in Banff, Canada during July 2019. It seems that solving them requires techniques beyond what is currently known.

I acknowledge support from the National Science Foundation under Grant no. 1714215. I am grateful to an anonymous referee for correcting an error and a typo in a previous version of the manuscript.

References

[1] Mohammad A. Alhejji and Graeme Smith. A tight uniform continuity bound for equivocation. September 2019. arXiv:1909.00787v1.

[2] Zhengmin Zhang. Estimating mutual information via Kolmogorov distance. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 53(9):3280–3282, September 2007.

[3] Koenraad M. R. Audenaert. A sharp continuity estimate for the von Neumann entropy. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 40(28):8127, July 2007. arXiv:quant-ph/0610146.

[4] Debbie Leung and Graeme Smith. Continuity of quantum channel capacities. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 292(1):201–215, 2009.

[5] David Sutter, Volkher B. Scholz, Andreas Winter, and Renato Renner. Approximate degradable quantum channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 63(12):7832–7844, December 2017. arXiv:1412.0980.

[6] Felix Leditzky, Debbie Leung, and Graeme Smith. Quantum and private capacities of low-noise channels. *Physical Review Letters*, 120(16):160503, April 2018. arXiv:1705.04335.

[7] Felix Leditzky, Eneet Kaur, Nilanjana Datta, and Mark M. Wilde. Approaches for approximate additivity of the Holevo information of quantum channels. *Physical Review A*, 97(1):012332, January 2018. arXiv:1709.01111.

[8] Eneet Kaur and Mark M. Wilde. Amortized entanglement of a quantum channel and approximately teleportation-simulable channels. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, July 2017. arXiv:1707.07721.

[9] Kunal Sharma, Mark M. Wilde, Sushovit Adhikari, and Masahiro Takeoka. Bounding the energy-constrained quantum and private capacities of bosonic thermal channels. *New Journal of Physics*, 20:063025, June 2018. arXiv:1708.07257.

[10] Sumeet Khatri, Kunal Sharma, and Mark M. Wilde. Information-theoretic aspects of the generalized amplitude damping channel. March 2019. arXiv:1903.07747.

[11] Eneet Kaur, Saikat Guha, and Mark M. Wilde. Asymptotic security of discrete-modulation protocols for continuous-variable quantum key distribution. January 2019. arXiv:1901.10099.

[12] Mark Fannes. A continuity property of the entropy density for spin lattices. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 31:291, 1973.

[13] Robert Alicki and Mark Fannes. Continuity of quantum conditional information. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 37(5):L55–L57, February 2004. arXiv:quant-ph/0312081.

[14] Andreas Winter. Tight uniform continuity bounds for quantum entropies: conditional entropy, relative entropy distance and energy constraints. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 347(1):291–313, October 2016. arXiv:1507.07775.

[15] Maksim E. Shirokov. Tight uniform continuity bounds for the quantum conditional mutual information, for the holevo quantity, and for capacities of quantum channels. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 58(10):102202, 2017.

[16] Maksim E. Shirokov. Adaptation of the Alicki-Fannes-Winter method for the set of states with bounded energy and its use. *Reports on Mathematical Physics*, 81(1):81–104, February 2018. arXiv:1609.07044.

[17] Maksim E. Shirokov. Uniform continuity bounds for information characteristics of quantum channels depending on input dimension and on input energy. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 52(1):014001, December 2018. arXiv:1610.08870.

[18] Maksim E. Shirokov. Advanced Alicki-Fannes-Winter method for energy-constrained quantum systems and its use. July 2019. arXiv:1907.02458.

[19] Denes Petz. *Quantum Information Theory and Quantum Statistics*. Springer Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2008.

[20] Charles H. Bennett, David P. DiVincenzo, John A. Smolin, and William K. Wootters. Mixed-state entanglement and quantum error correction. *Physical Review A*, 54(5):3824–3851, November 1996. arXiv:quant-ph/9604024.

[21] Anna A. Kuznetsova. Quantum conditional entropy for infinite-dimensional systems. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 55(4):709–717, November 2011. arXiv:1004.4519.

[22] Harold Falk. Inequalities of J. W. Gibbs. *American Journal of Physics*, 38(7):858–869, July 1970.

[23] Göran Lindblad. Entropy, information and quantum measurements. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 33(4):305–322, December 1973.