

Entanglement cost in practical scenarios

Francesco Buscemi^{1,*} and Nilanjana Datta^{2,†}

¹*Institute for Advanced Research, Nagoya University, Nagoya 464-8601, Japan*

²*Statistical Laboratory, DPMMS, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB3 0WB, UK*

(Dated: June 10, 2018)

We quantify the one-shot entanglement cost of an arbitrary bipartite state, that is the minimum number of singlets needed by two distant parties to create a single copy of the state up to a finite accuracy, using local operations and classical communication only. This analysis, in contrast to the traditional one, pertains to scenarios of practical relevance, in which resources are finite and transformations can only be achieved approximately. Moreover, it unveils a fundamental relation between two well-known entanglement measures, namely, the Schmidt number and the entanglement of formation. Using this relation, we are able to recover the usual expression of the entanglement cost as a special case.

Among quantum information processing tasks, entanglement manipulation, namely, the interconversion between entangled states using only local transformations and classical communication, represents an important primitive. In this scenario, the abstract notion of entanglement becomes a fungible resource “*as real as energy*” [1]. This is one of the reasons for which intensive research has been devoted to the study of entanglement manipulations since the very early stages of Quantum Information Theory, making such an *operational* theory of entanglement one of its biggest successes.

In this context, however, the word ‘operational’ should not be confused with ‘practical’. Indeed, most results we have at present about entanglement resource theory rely on two unrealistic (and very strong) assumptions:

(i) Many independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) copies of the initial resource (e.g. the initial entangled state) are to be converted into many i.i.d. copies of the target state. This corresponds to assuming the absence of correlations in the noisy (partially entangled) states which are either produced or consumed by the entanglement manipulation procedure;

(ii) The optimal interconversion rate is computed as the asymptotic input/output ratio, in the limit of infinitely many initial and final copies.

These two assumptions constitute what is usually called the asymptotic i.i.d. scenario. In order to establish a *truly general* entanglement resource theory, then, one should drop both assumptions (i) and (ii). The highest possible degree of theoretical generality is described by the so-called *one-shot* scenario, in which a single initial state has to be transformed into a single desired final state, up to a finite accuracy. Incidentally, this is indeed the scenario in which experiments are performed, since resources available in nature are typically finite and correlated, and transformations can only be achieved approximately.

One end of such a generalized entanglement resource theory, namely, one-shot entanglement distillation, was considered by the present authors in [2]: there we described the case of two distant parties trying to con-

vert, up to some fixed error ε , a finite number of initially shared noisy bipartite entangled states into noiseless entanglement, i.e. singlets, using local operations and classical communication (LOCC) only. In this Letter we completely characterize the other end of the theory, namely, *one-shot entanglement dilution*: here the goal is to utilize a finite amount of initial noiseless entanglement to produce (again, by LOCC and up to some fixed error ε) a single bipartite target state ρ_{AB} , which might not be directly available otherwise. In this scenario, entanglement dilution is relevant as the ‘reverse’ of entanglement distillation: it shows that singlets indeed provide a universal resource from which any bipartite state can be obtained by LOCC, quantifying, at the same time, the minimum amount of singlets needed (i.e. the *cost*) to produce a given bipartite state.

Our main result [3] is a formula for the minimum number of singlets necessary for successfully producing a given target state ρ_{AB} up to a finite error ε . We refer to this quantity as the *one-shot entanglement cost* $E_C^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}; \varepsilon)$. The formula we derive involves a generalized quantum relative entropy, namely, the relative Rényi entropy of order zero [4], and makes use of a smoothing procedure similar to that introduced in [5]. When specialized to the asymptotic i.i.d. scenario, our formula yields the entanglement cost given in terms of the regularized entanglement of formation [6, 7]. This is in accordance with the claim that one-shot entanglement resource theory is more general than the asymptotic i.i.d. one. Finally, as a by-product of our findings, we are able to prove that two entanglement monotones, namely the entanglement of formation [6] and the Schmidt number [8], which were previously considered to be unrelated, are in fact directly connected, in the sense that the former is recovered from the latter by suitable smoothing and regularization, as explained below.

Basic concepts.—In order to clearly state our main results, given in Theorems 1 and 2 below, we first have to introduce some notations and definitions. Throughout the paper, the letter \mathcal{H} denotes finite dimensional Hilbert space, whereas $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$ denotes the set of states (or

density operators, i.e. positive operators of unit trace) acting on \mathcal{H} . Further, let $\mathbb{1}$ denote the identity operator acting on \mathcal{H} . Given a positive operator $\omega \geq 0$, we denote by Π_ω the projector onto its support, and, for a pure state $|\varphi\rangle$, we denote the projector $|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|$ simply as φ . Moreover, given two Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H}_A and \mathcal{H}_B , of dimensions d_A and d_B respectively, with two given orthonormal bases $\{|i_A\rangle\}_{i=1}^{d_A}$ and $\{|i_B\rangle\}_{i=1}^{d_B}$, we define the canonical maximally entangled state (MES) in $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ of Schmidt number $M \leq \min\{d_A, d_B\}$ to be $|\Psi_M^+\rangle = M^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^M |i_A\rangle \otimes |i_B\rangle$.

Information-theoretical protocols, since Shannon, are usually characterized in term of suitable entropic quantities. In Quantum Information Theory too, entropic quantities like the von Neumann entropy, the conditional entropy, and the mutual information are often encountered. All these quantities can in fact be derived from the *quantum relative entropy* [4], which is defined, for a state ρ and an operator $\sigma \geq 0$, as

$$S_r(\rho|\sigma) := \begin{cases} \text{Tr}[\rho \log \rho - \rho \log \sigma], & \text{if } \Pi_\rho \leq \Pi_\sigma, \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(The logarithm in the above equation and in what follows is taken to base 2.) For example, the von Neumann entropy of a state ρ , defined as $S(\rho) := -\text{Tr}[\rho \log \rho]$, can be equivalently written as $S(\rho) = -S_r(\rho|\mathbb{1})$. Our main results are however expressed in terms of an alternative relative entropy, namely, the *relative Rényi entropy of order zero*, which, for a state ρ and an operator $\sigma \geq 0$, is defined as

$$S_0(\rho|\sigma) := \begin{cases} -\log \text{Tr}[\Pi_\rho \sigma], & \text{if } \text{Tr}[\Pi_\rho \Pi_\sigma] \neq 0, \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

From these two relative entropies, S_r and S_0 , we define the corresponding conditional entropy of a given bipartite state ρ_{AB} given a state σ_B as

$$H_\star(\rho_{AB}|\sigma_B) := -S_\star(\rho_{AB}|\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B), \quad (1)$$

and the conditional entropy of ρ_{AB} given the subsystem B as

$$H_\star(\rho_{AB}|B) := \max_{\sigma_B \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)} H_\star(\rho_{AB}|\sigma_B), \quad (2)$$

for $\star \in \{r, 0\}$. It turns out (see e.g. Lemma 6 in [14]) that $H_r(\rho_{AB}|B) = H_r(\rho_{AB}|\rho_B) = S(\rho_{AB}) - S(\rho_B)$, where $\rho_B = \text{Tr}_A[\rho_{AB}]$, for any given ρ_{AB} . However, in general, $H_0(\rho_{AB}|B) \neq H_0(\rho_{AB}|\rho_B)$.

It is also convenient to introduce, for any given decomposition of a bipartite state ρ_{AB} into a pure-state ensemble $\mathfrak{E} = \{p_i, |\phi_{AB}^i\rangle\}$ such that $\sum_i p_i \phi_{AB}^i = \rho_{AB}$, the tripartite classical-quantum (c-q) state

$$\rho_{RAB}^{\mathfrak{E}} := \sum_i p_i |i\rangle\langle i|_R \otimes \phi_{AB}^i, \quad (3)$$

where R denotes an auxiliary classical system represented by the fixed orthonormal basis $\{|i_R\rangle\}$. Given a pure-state ensemble \mathfrak{E} , let $\rho_A^i := \text{Tr}_B[\phi_{AB}^i]$, for all i .

As noted earlier, in the realistic scenario of finite entanglement resources and imperfect transformations, one is compelled to allow for a non-vanishing error, say ε , in achieving the final desired state. This error ε manifests itself as a “smoothing” of the underlying information-theoretical quantity characterizing the task, which in our case turns out to be a conditional Rényi entropy of order zero. This fact leads us to define, in analogy with [5], a smoothing as follows: for any $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and any pure-state ensemble $\mathfrak{E} = \{p_i, |\phi_{AB}^i\rangle\}$ of ρ_{AB} , we define the *c-q-smoothed conditional zero-Rényi entropy* of the c-q state $\rho_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}} := \text{Tr}_B[\rho_{RAB}^{\mathfrak{E}}] = \sum_i p_i |i\rangle\langle i|_R \otimes \rho_A^i$, given R , as

$$H_0^\varepsilon(\rho_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}}|R) := \min_{\omega_{RA} \in B_{\text{cq}}^\varepsilon(\rho_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}})} H_0(\omega_{RA}|R), \quad (4)$$

where the minimum is taken over classical-quantum operators belonging to the set $B_{\text{cq}}^\varepsilon(\rho_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}})$ defined, for any pure-state ensemble $\mathfrak{E} = \{p_i, |\phi_{AB}^i\rangle\}$ of ρ_{AB} , as follows:

$$B_{\text{cq}}^\varepsilon(\rho_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}}) := \left\{ \omega_{RA} \geq 0 \left| \begin{array}{l} \omega_{RA} = \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i|_R \otimes \omega_A^i \\ \& \|\omega_{RA} - \rho_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon \end{array} \right. \right\},$$

with $\|X\|_1 := \text{Tr}|X|$. The basis $\{|i_R\rangle\}$ used in the above definition is the same as that appearing in eq. (3). Note that operators in $B_{\text{cq}}^\varepsilon(\rho_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}})$ are actually very close to being density operators, since $1 - \varepsilon \leq \text{Tr}[\omega_{RA}] \leq 1 + \varepsilon$, for any $\omega_{RA} \in B_{\text{cq}}^\varepsilon(\rho_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}})$.

Main result.—Two parties, Alice and Bob, share a *single copy* of a maximally entangled state $|\Psi_M^+\rangle$ of Schmidt number M , and wish to convert it into a given bipartite target state ρ_{AB} using an LOCC map Λ . We refer to the protocol used for this conversion as *one-shot entanglement dilution*. For sake of generality, we consider the situation where the final state of the protocol is ε -close to the target state with respect to a suitable distance measure, for any given $\varepsilon \geq 0$. As a measure of closeness, we choose here the (squared) fidelity, which is defined, for states ρ and σ , as $F^2(\rho, \sigma) := (\text{Tr}|\sqrt{\rho}\sqrt{\sigma}|)^2$. In this way, defining the fidelity of the protocol to be $F^2(\Lambda(\Psi_M^+), \rho_{AB})$, we require $F^2(\Lambda(\Psi_M^+), \rho_{AB}) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. Further, for any given initial resource $|\Psi_M^+\rangle$ and any given target state ρ_{AB} , we denote the optimal fidelity of one-shot entanglement dilution as

$$F_{\text{dil}}(\rho_{AB}, M) := \max_{\Lambda \in \text{LOCC}} F^2(\Lambda(\Psi_M^+), \rho_{AB}).$$

Definition 1 (One-shot entanglement cost) *For any given ρ_{AB} and $\varepsilon \geq 0$, the one-shot entanglement cost is defined as follows:*

$$E_C^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}; \varepsilon) := \min_{M \in \mathbb{N}} \{\log M : F_{\text{dil}}(\rho_{AB}, M) \geq 1 - \varepsilon\}.$$

Notice that, by its very definition, the one-shot entanglement cost $E_C^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}; \varepsilon)$ constitutes, for any $\varepsilon \geq 0$, an entanglement (weak) monotone, in that it cannot increase under the action of an LOCC map, [10]. As mentioned earlier, the smoothing here emerges naturally from a purely operational consideration, in the sense that it is a natural consequence of the finite accuracy we allow in the protocol. This is in contrast to the approach adopted in Ref. [11], where a smoothing is instead introduced axiomatically.

Our main result is given by the following theorem:

Theorem 1 *For any given target state ρ_{AB} and any given error parameter $\varepsilon \geq 0$, the one-shot entanglement cost under LOCC, corresponding to an error less than or equal to ε , satisfies the following bounds:*

$$\min_{\mathfrak{E}} H_0^{2\sqrt{\varepsilon}}(\rho_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}}|R) \leq E_C^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}; \varepsilon) \leq \min_{\mathfrak{E}} H_0^{\varepsilon/2}(\rho_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}}|R),$$

where the minimum is taken over all pure-state ensemble decompositions $\mathfrak{E} = \{p_i, |\phi_{AB}^i\rangle\}$ of ρ_{AB} , and $\rho_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}} = \text{Tr}_B[\rho_{RAB}^{\mathfrak{E}}]$, with $\rho_{RAB}^{\mathfrak{E}}$ being the tripartite extension of ρ_{AB} defined in (3).

For any given $\varepsilon \geq 0$, Theorem 1 essentially identifies $\min_{\mathfrak{E}} H_0^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}}|R)$ as the quantity representing the one-shot entanglement cost $E_C^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}; \varepsilon)$, [12].

The theory developed here not only provides a complete characterization of the one-shot entanglement cost, it also yields a simple proof of a fundamental asymptotic result. It is known [7] that the asymptotic entanglement cost $E_C(\rho_{AB})$ of preparing a bipartite state ρ_{AB} is equal to the *regularized entanglement of formation*, defined as,

$$E_F^{\infty}(\rho_{AB}) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} E_F(\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}), \quad (5)$$

where $E_F(\rho_{AB}) := \min_{\mathfrak{E}} \sum_i p_i S(\rho_A^i)$ denotes the entanglement of formation of the state ρ_{AB} [6]. Applying our main result, Theorem 1, to the case of multiple (n) copies of the bipartite state ρ_{AB} , and taking the asymptotic limit ($n \rightarrow \infty$) yields a new proof of the identity $E_C(\rho_{AB}) = E_F^{\infty}(\rho_{AB})$:

Theorem 2 *For any given target state ρ_{AB} , the following identity holds:*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} E_C^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}; \varepsilon) = E_F^{\infty}(\rho_{AB}). \quad (6)$$

Theorem 2, together with the results in Ref. [7], establishes that the asymptotic entanglement cost is alternatively expressible as the regularized one-shot entanglement cost, in the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$.

The theorems stated above emphasize the generality and two-fold relevance of the one-shot analysis: on one hand, it gives a complete description of realistic scenarios of entanglement dilution, on the other hand, it provides a

unified theoretical framework from which previous results can be derived as special cases.

Discussion.—In the case of perfect (zero-error) entanglement dilution, corresponding to the case $\varepsilon = 0$, Theorem 1 says that the corresponding one-shot entanglement cost is given by

$$E_C^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}; 0) = \min_{\mathfrak{E}} H_0(\rho_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}}|R). \quad (7)$$

The above equation can be made more explicit as follows:

$$E_C^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}; 0) = \min_{\mathfrak{E}} \max_i \log \text{Tr} \left[\Pi_{\rho_A^i} \right],$$

where, for any given pure-state ensemble decomposition $\mathfrak{E} = \{p_i, |\phi_{AB}^i\rangle\}$ of ρ_{AB} , $\rho_A^i := \text{Tr}_B[|\phi_{AB}^i\rangle\langle\phi_{AB}^i|]$. The quantity on the right-hand side of the equation above coincides with the logarithm of the Schmidt number (log-Schmidt number, for short) of the mixed state ρ_{AB} , introduced and studied in [8]. In [9], the same quantity, was denoted as $E_{sr}(\rho_{AB})$, and was shown to characterize the zero-error entanglement cost $E_C^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}; 0)$. However, until now, there was a gap in the theory of entanglement dilution, in the sense that it was unclear how these zero-error results could be related to the usual notion of entanglement cost, for which the error vanishes only in the asymptotic limit.

The results we presented above show that it is indeed possible to fill such a gap by suitably smoothing the zero-error quantities. In fact, let us introduce a smoothed log-Schmidt number as follows:

$$E_{sr}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{AB}) := \min_{\omega_{AB} \in C_{\varepsilon}(\rho_{AB})} E_{sr}(\omega_{AB}), \quad (8)$$

where now the smoothing is performed with respect to the compact set of normalized states $C_{\varepsilon}(\rho_{AB})$ centered at ρ_{AB} defined as:

$$C_{\varepsilon}(\rho_{AB}) := \{ \omega_{AB} \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B) \mid F^2(\omega_{AB}, \rho_{AB}) \geq 1 - \varepsilon \}.$$

Then, using the arguments given below, one can prove that, for any $\varepsilon \geq 0$, the identity $E_C^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}; \varepsilon) = E_{sr}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{AB})$ holds. First, for any $\omega_{AB} \in C_{\varepsilon}(\rho_{AB})$, $E_{sr}(\omega_{AB})$ singlets can be used to create, with zero-error, the state ω_{AB} , which is, by construction, ε -close to ρ_{AB} . This proves that $E_C^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}; \varepsilon) \leq E_{sr}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{AB})$. For the other direction, let us assume that $E_C^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}; \varepsilon) < E_{sr}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{AB})$. Definition 1 then implies that, with $E_C^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}; \varepsilon)$ singlets, it is possible to create a state, say $\tilde{\omega}_{AB}$, which is ε -close to ρ_{AB} . This in turn implies that $\tilde{\omega}_{AB} \in C_{\varepsilon}(\rho_{AB})$, with $E_{sr}(\tilde{\omega}_{AB}) = E_C^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}; \varepsilon) < E_{sr}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{AB})$, which contradicts the fact that $E_{sr}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{AB})$ is defined as a minimum in (8).

We hence obtain the following corollary of Theorem 2:

Corollary 1 *For any given state ρ_{AB} , the entanglement of formation $E_F(\rho_{AB})$ and the log-Schmidt number*

$E_{sr}(\rho_{AB})$ are related as follows:

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} E_{sr}^\varepsilon(\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}) = E_F^\infty(\rho_{AB}). \quad (9)$$

Essence of proofs.—We present here only the main steps of the proofs of the results stated above. The interested reader is referred to [3] for detailed derivations. The proof of Theorem 1 relies on the following lemma:

Lemma 1 ([9, 13]) *For any given bipartite state ρ_{AB} , the optimal dilution fidelity is given by*

$$F_{\text{dil}}(\rho_{AB}, M) = \max_{\mathfrak{E}} \sum_i p_i \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j^{(i)}, \quad (10)$$

where the maximum is over all pure-state decomposition $\mathfrak{E} = \{p_i, |\phi_{AB}^i\rangle\}$ of ρ_{AB} , and $\{\lambda_j^{(i)}\}_j$ are the eigenvalues of $\rho_A^i = \text{Tr}_B[\phi_{AB}^i]$, arranged in non-increasing order.

Using this lemma and Definition 1, we can prove that $E_C^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}; \varepsilon) = \min_{\mathfrak{E}} E^\varepsilon(\mathfrak{E})$, where

$$E^\varepsilon(\mathfrak{E}) := \min_{\{\Pi_A^i\}} \left\{ \max_i \log \text{Tr} [\Pi_A^i] \left| \sum_i p_i \text{Tr} [\Pi_A^i \rho_A^i] \geq 1 - \varepsilon \right. \right\},$$

where $\{\Pi_A^i\}$ is an unconstrained set of projectors, that is, not necessarily orthogonal nor complete. The proof of Theorem 1 then reduces to proving that $H_0^{2\sqrt{\varepsilon}}(\rho_{RA}^\mathfrak{E}|R) \leq E^\varepsilon(\mathfrak{E}) \leq H_0^{\varepsilon/2}(\rho_{RA}^\mathfrak{E}|R)$, for any ensemble \mathfrak{E} and any $\varepsilon \geq 0$. This is done by standard tools like convexity arguments and the ‘‘gentle measurement’’ lemma [15].

As regards the asymptotic result of Theorem 2, the starting point is to note that the entanglement of formation itself can be expressed as a conditional entropy $E_F(\rho_{AB}) = \min_{\mathfrak{E}} H_r(\rho_{RA}^\mathfrak{E}|R)$, in close analogy with the expression (7) of the zero-error one-shot entanglement cost. Theorem 2 then reduces to the identity

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \min_{\mathfrak{E}_n} H_0^\varepsilon(\rho_{R_n A_n}^{\mathfrak{E}_n} | R_n) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \min_{\mathfrak{E}_n} H_r(\rho_{R_n A_n}^{\mathfrak{E}_n} | R_n) \equiv E_F^\infty(\rho_{AB}), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where \mathfrak{E}_n denotes a pure-state ensemble decomposition $\{p_i^n, |\phi_{A_n B_n}^i\rangle\}$ of $\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}$, such that $\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n} = \sum_i p_i^n \phi_{A_n B_n}^i$, and $\rho_{R_n A_n}^{\mathfrak{E}_n} = \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B^{\otimes n}}[\rho_{R_n A_n B_n}^{\mathfrak{E}_n}]$, with $\rho_{R_n A_n B_n}^{\mathfrak{E}_n}$ denoting the c-q extension of $\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}$ as in equation (3). The identity (11) is proved by employing the information spectrum method [16], results of [17], and a generalized version of Stein’s lemma established in [18].

Acknowledgments—FB acknowledges support from Japan’s MEXT-SCF Program for Improvement of Research Environment for Young Researchers. ND acknowledges support from the European Community’s Seventh

Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement number 213681. This work was completed when FB was visiting the Statistical Laboratory of the University of Cambridge.

* Electronic address: buscemi@iar.nagoya-u.ac.jp

† Electronic address: n.datta@statslab.cam.ac.uk

- [1] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 865 (2009).
- [2] F. Buscemi and N. Datta, *J. Math. Phys.* **51**, 102201 (2010).
- [3] For the technical details, we refer to the supplementary materials provided together with the submission.
- [4] see e. g. M. Ohya and D. Petz, *Quantum Entropy and Its Use* (Springer, 1993), and references therein.
- [5] R. Renner, *Security of Quantum Key Distribution* (PhD thesis, ETH Zurich, 2005).
- [6] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 3824 (1996).
- [7] P. M. Hayden, M. Horodecki, and B. M. Terhal, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **34**, 6891 (2001).
- [8] B. M. Terhal and P. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 040301 (2000).
- [9] M. Hayashi, *Quantum Information: an Introduction* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006).
- [10] If Λ is an LOCC transformation, $E_C^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}; \varepsilon) \geq E_C^{(1)}(\Lambda(\rho_{AB}); \varepsilon)$. To see this, note that, by Definition 1, there exists an LOCC map T that transforms $E_C^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}; \varepsilon)$ singlets into a state $\tilde{\rho}_{AB}$ which is ε -close to ρ_{AB} . Then, by the monotonicity of the fidelity, $\Lambda(\tilde{\rho}_{AB})$ is also ε -close to $\Lambda(\rho_{AB})$, meaning that the composed LOCC map $\Lambda \circ T$ transforms $E_C^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}; \varepsilon)$ singlets into a state which is ε -close to $\Lambda(\rho_{AB})$. This implies that $E_C^{(1)}(\Lambda(\rho_{AB}); \varepsilon) \leq E_C^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}; \varepsilon)$.
- [11] C.-E. Mora, M. Piani, and H.-J. Briegel, *New J. Phys.* **10**, 083027 (2008).
- [12] The presence of different smoothing parameters in the bounds of Theorem 1 arises from having defined the dilution error in terms of the fidelity and the c-q smoothing in terms of the trace-norm. Such definitions have been adopted anyway, for sake of overall simplicity.
- [13] G. Bowen and N. Datta, arXiv:0704.1957v1 [quant-ph].
- [14] F. Buscemi and N. Datta, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **56**, No.3, 1447 (2010).
- [15] A. Winter, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, **45**, 2481 (1999); T. Ogawa and H. Nagaoka, *Proc. of Int. Symp. Inf. Th., ISIT 2002*, p.73.
- [16] S. Verdú and T. S. Han, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **40**, 1147 (1994); T. Ogawa and H. Nagaoka, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **46**, 2428 (2000); M. Hayashi and H. Nagaoka, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Th.* **49**, No.7, 1753 (2003); G. Bowen and N. Datta, *Proc. of Int. Symp. Inf. Th., ISIT 2006*, p.45; H. Nagaoka and M. Hayashi, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **53**, 534 (2007).
- [17] N. Datta, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Th.* **55**, No.6, 2816 (2009).
- [18] F. G. S. L. Brandao and M. B. Plenio, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **295**, 791 (2010).

DETAILED PROOF OF THEOREM 1

For a given bipartite state ρ_{AB} , let $\mathfrak{E} = \{p_i, |\phi_{AB}^i\rangle\}$ be an ensemble of pure states such that $\sum_i p_i \phi_{AB}^i = \rho_{AB}$. We introduce the following quantity:

$$E^\varepsilon(\mathfrak{E}) := \min_{\{\Pi_A^i\}} \left\{ \max_i \log \text{Tr} [\Pi_A^i] \left| \sum_i p_i \text{Tr} [\Pi_A^i \rho_{RA}^i] \geq 1 - \varepsilon \right. \right\}, \quad (12)$$

where $\rho_{RA}^i := \text{Tr}_B[\phi_{AB}^i]$, and $\{\Pi_A^i\}$ is an unconstrained set of projectors, that is, not necessarily orthogonal nor complete.

We first prove the following lemma relating $E^\varepsilon(\mathfrak{E})$ to the c-q-smoothed conditional zero-Rényi entropy appearing in the statement of Theorem 1:

Lemma 2 *For any $\varepsilon \geq 0$, and any choice of the pure-state ensemble \mathfrak{E} for ρ_{AB} , the following holds:*

$$H_0^{2\sqrt{\varepsilon}}(\rho_{RA}^\mathfrak{E}|R) \leq E^\varepsilon(\mathfrak{E}) \leq H_0^{\varepsilon/2}(\rho_{RA}^\mathfrak{E}|R), \quad (13)$$

where $\rho_{RA}^\mathfrak{E}$ is the reduced state obtained from the tripartite extension $\rho_{RAB}^\mathfrak{E}$ defined in (3). \square

Proof. We first prove the bound

$$H_0^\varepsilon(\rho_{RA}^\mathfrak{E}|R) \geq E^{2\varepsilon}(\mathfrak{E}). \quad (14)$$

Let $\bar{\omega}_{RA} = \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i|_R \otimes \bar{\omega}_A^i$ in $B_{\text{cq}}^\varepsilon(\rho_{RA}^\mathfrak{E})$ be the operator achieving the minimum in (4). The projection onto its support is given by $\Pi_{\bar{\omega}_{RA}} = \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i|_R \otimes \Pi_{\bar{\omega}_A^i}$. Hence, $\bar{\omega}_{RA} \in B_{\text{cq}}^\varepsilon(\rho_{RA}^\mathfrak{E})$ yields a set of projectors $\{\Pi_{\bar{\omega}_A^i}\}$ for which

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_i p_i \text{Tr}[\Pi_{\bar{\omega}_A^i} \rho_{RA}^i] = \text{Tr}[\Pi_{\bar{\omega}_{RA}} \rho_{RA}^\mathfrak{E}] \\ &= \text{Tr}[\Pi_{\bar{\omega}_{RA}} \bar{\omega}_{RA}] + \text{Tr}[\Pi_{\bar{\omega}_{RA}} (\rho_{RA}^\mathfrak{E} - \bar{\omega}_{RA})] \\ &\geq 1 - \varepsilon - \varepsilon = 1 - 2\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

In the last line we have made use of the fact that $\bar{\omega}_{RA} \in B_{\text{cq}}^\varepsilon(\rho_{RA}^\mathfrak{E})$, due to which $\text{Tr}[\bar{\omega}_{RA}] \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. This implies that the set of projectors $\{\Pi_{\bar{\omega}_A^i}\}$ satisfies the condition required in definition (12) of $E^{2\varepsilon}(\mathfrak{E})$, hence proving (14).

We now prove the lower bound

$$E^\varepsilon(\mathfrak{E}) \geq H_0^{2\sqrt{\varepsilon}}(\rho_{RA}^\mathfrak{E}|R). \quad (15)$$

Let $\{\bar{\Pi}_A^i\}$ be the set of projectors achieving the minimum in eq. (12). Therefore, $\sum_i p_i \text{Tr}[\bar{\Pi}_A^i \rho_{RA}^i] \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. For later convenience, let us set $\varepsilon_i := 1 - \text{Tr}[\bar{\Pi}_A^i \rho_{RA}^i]$, so that $\sum_i p_i \varepsilon_i \leq \varepsilon$. Let us define $\bar{\omega}_A^i := \bar{\Pi}_A^i \rho_{RA}^i \bar{\Pi}_A^i$ and $\bar{\omega}_{RA} := \sum_i p_i |i\rangle\langle i|_R \otimes \bar{\omega}_A^i$. The so-called Gentle Measurement

Lemma [15] guarantees that $\|\bar{\omega}_A^i - \rho_{RA}^i\| \leq 2\sqrt{\varepsilon_i}$, for all i . Also, by the concavity of $x \mapsto \sqrt{x}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{\omega}_{RA} - \rho_{RA}^\mathfrak{E}\|_1 &= \sum_i p_i \|\bar{\omega}_A^i - \rho_{RA}^i\|_1 \\ &\leq \sum_i p_i 2\sqrt{\varepsilon_i} \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{\sum_i p_i \varepsilon_i} \leq 2\sqrt{\varepsilon}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

The above inequalities prove that $\bar{\omega}_{RA} \in B_{\text{cq}}^{2\sqrt{\varepsilon}}(\rho_{RA}^\mathfrak{E})$. Moreover, since, by construction, $\Pi_{\bar{\omega}_A^i} \leq \bar{\Pi}_A^i$ for all i , we obtain eq. (15). \blacksquare

With Lemma 2 in hand, the proof of Theorem 1 reduces to proving the following identity:

$$E_C^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}; \varepsilon) = \min_{\mathfrak{E}} E^\varepsilon(\mathfrak{E}). \quad (17)$$

We split the proof of this identity into Lemma 3 and Lemma 4 below.

Lemma 3 (Direct part) *For any $\varepsilon \geq 0$,*

$$E_C^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}; \varepsilon) \leq \min_{\mathfrak{E}} E^\varepsilon(\mathfrak{E}).$$

Proof. From Lemma 1,

$$F_{\text{dil}}(\rho_{AB}, M) = \max_{\mathfrak{E}} \sum_i p_i \text{Tr}[Q_M^i \rho_{RA}^i], \quad (18)$$

where, for each i , Q_M^i is the projector onto the eigenvectors associated with the M largest eigenvalues of ρ_{RA}^i . Let us now fix an ensemble decomposition $\bar{\mathfrak{E}} := \{\bar{p}_i, |\bar{\phi}_{AB}^i\rangle\}$ for ρ_{AB} , and choose the integer \bar{M} such that $\log \bar{M} = E^\varepsilon(\bar{\mathfrak{E}})$. Then, from definition (12), we know that there exists a set of projectors $\{\bar{\Pi}_A^i\}$, with $\text{rank} \bar{\Pi}_A^i \leq \bar{M}$ for all i , such that $\sum_i \bar{p}_i \text{Tr}[\bar{\Pi}_A^i \bar{\rho}_{RA}^i] \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. This implies that $\log \bar{M}$ is an ε -achievable rate, since

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\text{dil}}(\rho_{AB}, \bar{M}) &\geq \sum_i \bar{p}_i \text{Tr}[\bar{Q}_{\bar{M}}^i \bar{\rho}_{RA}^i] \\ &\geq \sum_i \bar{p}_i \text{Tr}[\bar{\Pi}_A^i \bar{\rho}_{RA}^i] \geq 1 - \varepsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where $\bar{Q}_{\bar{M}}^i$ is, for each i , the projector onto the \bar{M} largest eigenvalues of $\bar{\rho}_{RA}^i$. The second inequality in (19) is due to the fact that, for any projector $\bar{\Pi}_A^i$ with $\text{rank} \bar{\Pi}_A^i \leq \bar{M}$, $\text{Tr}[\bar{\Pi}_A^i \bar{\rho}_{RA}^i] \leq \text{Tr}[\bar{Q}_{\bar{M}}^i \bar{\rho}_{RA}^i]$. Hence $E^\varepsilon(\bar{\mathfrak{E}})$ is itself an ε -achievable rate for any choice of $\bar{\mathfrak{E}}$, and the statement of the lemma follows. \blacksquare

Lemma 4 (Weak converse) *For any $\varepsilon \geq 0$,*

$$E_C^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}; \varepsilon) \geq \min_{\mathfrak{E}} E^\varepsilon(\mathfrak{E}). \quad (20)$$

Proof. Let $\log M$ be an ε -achievable rate. This is equivalent to saying that $F_{\text{dil}}(\rho_{AB}, M) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. In the following, we prove that this implies that

$$\log M \geq \min_{\mathfrak{E}} E^\varepsilon(\mathfrak{E}). \quad (21)$$

Let $\bar{\mathfrak{E}} := \{p_i, |\phi_{AB}^i\rangle\}$ be the ensemble decomposition of ρ_{AB} achieving $F_{\text{dil}}(\rho_{AB}, M)$ in (10), and consider the Schmidt decomposition of its elements $|\phi_{AB}^i\rangle = \sum_j \sqrt{\lambda_j^{(i)}} |j_A^{(i)}\rangle |j_B^{(i)}\rangle$, where the Schmidt coefficients $\{\lambda_j^{(i)}\}_j$ are arranged in non-increasing order for all i . The optimal dilution fidelity given by eq. (10) can then be expressed as

$$F_{\text{dil}}(\rho_{AB}, M) = \sum_i p_i \text{Tr}[\bar{\omega}_A^i] \geq 1 - \varepsilon, \quad (22)$$

where

$$\bar{\omega}_A^i := \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j^{(i)} |j^{(i)}\rangle \langle j^{(i)}|_A. \quad (23)$$

We now proceed by observing that

$$E^\varepsilon(\bar{\mathfrak{E}}) \leq \min_{\{\omega_A^i\}} \left\{ \max_i \log \text{Tr} \left[\Pi_{\omega_A^i} \right] \left| \begin{array}{l} \sum_i p_i \text{Tr}[\omega_A^i] \geq 1 - \varepsilon \\ \& \omega_A^i \leq \rho_A^i, \forall i \end{array} \right. \right\}. \quad (24)$$

This is due to the fact that, for any set of operators $\{\omega_A^i\}$ satisfying both conditions at the right hand side, the corresponding set of projectors $\{\Pi_{\omega_A^i}\}$ satisfies the conditions required in the definition (12) of $E^\varepsilon(\bar{\mathfrak{E}})$. This is because $1 - \varepsilon \leq \sum_i p_i \text{Tr}[\omega_A^i] \leq \sum_i p_i \text{Tr}[\Pi_{\omega_A^i} \rho_A^i]$. In particular, also the set of subnormalized density operators $\{\bar{\omega}_A^i\}$ defined by (23) satisfies both conditions required at the right hand side of eq. (24), since $\bar{\omega}_A^i \leq \rho_A^i$ for all i (by definition), and $\sum_i p_i \text{Tr}[\bar{\omega}_A^i] \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ (by eq. (22)). We then have:

$$\min_{\mathfrak{E}} E^\varepsilon(\mathfrak{E}) \leq E^\varepsilon(\bar{\mathfrak{E}}) \leq \max_i \log \text{Tr} \left[\Pi_{\bar{\omega}_A^i} \right] \leq \log M, \quad (25)$$

for any ε -achievable rate $\log M$. ■

DETAILED PROOF OF THEOREM 2

By defining the asymptotic entanglement cost as

$$E_C(\rho_{AB}) := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} E_C^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}; \varepsilon), \quad (26)$$

we prove that

$$E_C(\rho_{AB}) = E_F^\infty(\rho_{AB}). \quad (27)$$

Hence, we also prove indirectly that definition (26) is equivalent to the alternative definitions of asymptotic entanglement cost proposed in Ref. [7]. We split the proof of Theorem 2 into Lemma 5 and Lemma 6 below. In the following, \mathfrak{E}_n denotes a pure-state ensemble decomposition $\{p_i^n, |\phi_{A_n B_n}^i\rangle\}$ of $\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}$, such that $\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n} = \sum_i p_i^n \phi_{A_n B_n}^i$. Notice that, even though the state $\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}$ is in product form, the pure states $\{|\phi_{A_n B_n}^i\rangle\}$ in some of its decompositions may well be entangled. For the reader's convenience, we recall that the entanglement of formation $E_F(\rho_{AB}) := \min_{\mathfrak{E}} \sum_i S(\rho_A^i)$ can itself be written as a conditional entropy: $E_F(\rho_{AB}) = \min_{\mathfrak{E}} H_r(\rho_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}} | R) = \min_{\mathfrak{E}} H_r(\rho_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}} | \rho_R^{\mathfrak{E}})$, where $\rho_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}} = \text{Tr}_B \rho_{RAB}^{\mathfrak{E}}$, with $\rho_{RAB}^{\mathfrak{E}}$ being the tripartite extension of the state ρ_{AB} , defined by (3). Hence, $E_F^\infty(\rho_{AB}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \min_{\mathfrak{E}_n} H_r(\rho_{R_n A_n}^{\mathfrak{E}_n} | \rho_{R_n}^{\mathfrak{E}_n})$, where $\rho_{R_n A_n}^{\mathfrak{E}_n}$ is as in (11).

Lemma 5 *The following holds:*

$$E_C(\rho_{AB}) \geq E_F^\infty(\rho_{AB}). \quad \square \quad (28)$$

Proof. We start with the lower bound in Theorem 1. For any $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, this gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} E_C^{(1)} \left(\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}; \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4} \right) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{n} \min_{\mathfrak{E}_n} H_0^\varepsilon \left(\rho_{R_n A_n}^{\mathfrak{E}_n} | R_n \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{n} \min_{\mathfrak{E}_n} \min_{\omega_{R_n A_n}^n \in B_{\varepsilon_{\text{cq}}}(\rho_{R_n A_n}^{\mathfrak{E}_n})} H_0(\omega_{R_n A_n}^n | R_n) \\ & = \frac{1}{n} H_0(\bar{\omega}_{R_n A_n}^n | R_n) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{n} H_r(\bar{\omega}_{R_n A_n}^n | R_n) \\ & = \frac{1}{n} H_r(\bar{\omega}_{R_n A_n}^n | \bar{\omega}_{R_n}^n) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{n} \min_{\mathfrak{E}_n} H_r \left(\rho_{R_n A_n}^{\mathfrak{E}_n} \left| \rho_{R_n}^{\mathfrak{E}_n} \right. \right) - O(\varepsilon) - O(1/n), \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where: in the fourth line, $\bar{\omega}_{R_n A_n}^n$ is the minimizing operator for the minimizing pure-state ensemble $\bar{\mathfrak{E}}_n$ of $\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}$; in the fifth line we use the fact that $H_0(\bar{\omega}_{R_n A_n}^n | R_n) \geq H_r(\bar{\omega}_{R_n A_n}^n | R_n)$ which follows from the well-known fact that $S_0(\rho \| \sigma) \leq S_r(\rho \| \sigma)$ [4]; the sixth line follows from Lemma 6 in [14]. The last approximation comes by applying Fannes' inequality to $H_r(\bar{\omega}_{R_n A_n}^n | \bar{\omega}_{R_n}^n) = S(\bar{\omega}_{R_n A_n}^n) - S(\bar{\omega}_{R_n}^n)$. Then, by considering the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ followed by $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$, we arrive at eq. (28). ■

Lemma 6 *The following holds:*

$$E_C(\rho_{AB}) \leq E_F^\infty(\rho_{AB}). \quad \square \quad (30)$$

Proof. From the upper bound in Theorem 1 we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n} E_C^{(1)}(\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}; 2\varepsilon) \leq \frac{1}{n} \min_{\mathfrak{E}_n} H_0^\varepsilon(\rho_{R_n A_n}^{\mathfrak{E}_n} | R_n), \quad (31)$$

where $\rho_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}_n} = \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B^{\otimes n}}[\rho_{R_n A_n B_n}^{\mathfrak{E}_n}]$, with $\rho_{R_n A_n B_n}^{\mathfrak{E}_n} \in \mathfrak{S}((\mathcal{H}_R \otimes \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)^{\otimes n})$ denoting the c-q extension of the state $\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}$ corresponding to its pure-state ensemble decomposition \mathfrak{E}_n . By taking the appropriate limits ($n \rightarrow \infty$ followed by $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$) on either side of (31) and employing Lemma 7 and Lemma 8 below, one arrives at:

$$\begin{aligned} E_C(\rho_{AB}) &\leq \min_{\mathfrak{E}} \{-S_r(\rho_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}} \|\rho_R^{\mathfrak{E}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_A)\} \\ &\equiv \min_{\mathfrak{E}} H_r(\rho_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}} | \rho_R^{\mathfrak{E}}) = E_F(\rho_{AB}). \end{aligned}$$

Inequality (30) is finally obtained by employing standard blocking arguments, see for example Ref. [7]. ■

Before stating and proving Lemma 7 and Lemma 8, we need to recall some definitions and notations extensively used in the Quantum Information Spectrum Method [16]. A fundamental quantity used in this approach is the *quantum spectral inf-divergence rate*, defined as follows:

Definition 2 (Spectral inf-divergence rate) *Given a sequence of states $\hat{\rho} = \{\rho_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$, $\rho_n \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$, and a sequence of positive operators $\hat{\sigma} = \{\sigma_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$, where σ_n acts on $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$, the quantum spectral inf-divergence rate is defined in terms of the difference operators $\Delta_n(\gamma) = \rho_n - 2^{n\gamma} \sigma_n$ as*

$$\underline{D}(\hat{\rho} \|\hat{\sigma}) := \sup \left\{ \gamma : \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} [\{\Delta_n(\gamma) \geq 0\} \Delta_n(\gamma)] = 1 \right\}, \quad (32)$$

where the notation $\{X \geq 0\}$, for a self-adjoint operator X , is used to indicate the projector onto the subspace where $X \geq 0$.

We first note that, by definitions (1) and (2), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &\min_{\mathfrak{E}_n} H_0^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{R_n A_n}^{\mathfrak{E}_n} | R_n) \\ &= - \max_{\mathfrak{E}_n} \max_{\omega_{R_n A_n}^n \in B_{\text{cq}}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{R_n A_n}^{\mathfrak{E}_n})} \min_{\sigma_{R_n}^n} S_0(\omega_{R_n A_n}^n \|\sigma_{R_n}^n \otimes \mathbb{1}_A^{\otimes n}). \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

We then prove the following lemma:

Lemma 7 *For any bipartite state ρ_{AB} , with a pure-state ensemble decomposition \mathfrak{E} , let $\rho_{RAB}^{\mathfrak{E}}$ denote its c-q extension. Then using the notation of (11), we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ - \min_{\mathfrak{E}_n} H_0^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{R_n A_n}^{\mathfrak{E}_n} | R_n) \right\} \\ &\geq \max_{\hat{\sigma}_R} \min_{\hat{\mathfrak{E}}} \underline{D}(\hat{\rho}_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}} \|\hat{\sigma}_R \otimes \hat{\mathbb{1}}_A), \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where $\hat{\rho}_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}} := \{(\rho_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}})^{\otimes n}\}_{n \geq 1}$, $\hat{\mathbb{1}}_A := \{\mathbb{1}_A^{\otimes n}\}_{n \geq 1}$, and $\hat{\sigma}_R := \{\sigma_R^n \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_R^{\otimes n})\}_{n \geq 1}$.

Proof. Let $\bar{\mathfrak{E}}$ be the pure state ensemble decomposition of ρ_{AB} for which the maximum on the r.h.s. of eq. (34) is achieved, and let $\rho_{RA}^{\bar{\mathfrak{E}}}$ be its reduced state. Since $\bar{\mathfrak{E}}$ is

fixed, in the following, we drop the superscript whenever no confusion arises, denoting $\rho_{RA}^{\bar{\mathfrak{E}}}$ simply as ρ_{RA} .

Note that, for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &- \min_{\mathfrak{E}_n} H_0^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{R_n A_n}^{\mathfrak{E}_n} | R_n) \\ &= \max_{\mathfrak{E}_n} \max_{\omega_{R_n A_n}^n \in B_{\text{cq}}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{R_n A_n}^{\mathfrak{E}_n})} \min_{\sigma_{R_n}^n} S_0(\omega_{R_n A_n}^n \|\sigma_{R_n}^n \otimes \mathbb{1}_A^{\otimes n}) \\ &\geq \max_{\mathfrak{E}} \max_{\omega_{R_n A_n}^n \in B_{\text{cq}}^{\varepsilon}((\rho_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}})^{\otimes n})} \min_{\sigma_{R_n}^n} S_0(\omega_{R_n A_n}^n \|\sigma_{R_n}^n \otimes \mathbb{1}_A^{\otimes n}) \\ &\geq \max_{\omega_{R_n A_n}^n \in B_{\text{cq}}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{RA}^{\otimes n})} \min_{\sigma_{R_n}^n} S_0(\omega_{R_n A_n}^n \|\sigma_{R_n}^n \otimes \mathbb{1}_A^{\otimes n}). \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

For each $\sigma_{R_n}^n$ and any $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, define the projector

$$P_n^{\gamma} \equiv P_n^{\gamma}(\sigma_{R_n}^n) := \{\rho_{RA}^{\otimes n} - 2^{n\gamma}(\sigma_{R_n}^n \otimes \mathbb{1}_A^{\otimes n}) \geq 0\}. \quad (36)$$

Since the operator $\omega_{R_n A_n}^n$ in (35) is a c-q operator, it is clear that the minimization over $\sigma_{R_n}^n$ in (35) can be restricted to states diagonal in the basis chosen in representing c-q operators. Consequently, also P_n^{γ} has the same c-q structure.

Next, let us denote by $\hat{\rho}_{RA}$ the i.i.d. sequence of states $\{\rho_{RA}^{\otimes n}\}_{n \geq 1}$. For any sequence $\hat{\sigma}_R := \{\sigma_{R_n}^n\}_{n \geq 1}$, fix $\delta > 0$ and choose $\gamma \equiv \gamma(\hat{\sigma}_R) := \underline{D}(\hat{\rho}_{RA} \|\hat{\sigma}_R \otimes \hat{\mathbb{1}}_A) - \delta$. Then it follows from the definition (32) that, for n large enough,

$$\text{Tr} [P_n^{\gamma} \rho_{RA}^{\otimes n}] \geq 1 - \varepsilon^2/4, \quad (37)$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Further, define $\omega_{R_n A_n}^{n,\gamma} \equiv \omega_{R_n A_n}^n(\sigma_{R_n}^n) := P_n^{\gamma} \rho_{RA}^{\otimes n} P_n^{\gamma}$, which is clearly in $B_{\text{cq}}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{RA}^{\otimes n})$, due to the Gentle Measurement Lemma [15].

Then, using the fact that $\Pi_{\omega_{R_n A_n}^{n,\gamma}} \leq P_n^{\gamma}$, and Lemma 2 of [17], we have, for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \{\text{r.h.s. of (35)}\} \\ &\geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \min_{\sigma_{R_n}^n} S_0(\omega_{R_n A_n}^{n,\gamma} \|\sigma_{R_n}^n \otimes \mathbb{1}_A^{\otimes n}) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \min_{\sigma_{R_n}^n} \left\{ - \log \text{Tr} \left[\Pi_{\omega_{R_n A_n}^{n,\gamma}} (\sigma_{R_n}^n \otimes \mathbb{1}_A^{\otimes n}) \right] \right\} \\ &\geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \min_{\sigma_{R_n}^n} \left\{ - \log \text{Tr} [P_n^{\gamma} (\sigma_{R_n}^n \otimes \mathbb{1}_A^{\otimes n})] \right\} \\ &\geq \min_{\hat{\sigma}_R} \gamma(\hat{\sigma}_R) \\ &= \min_{\hat{\sigma}_R} \underline{D}(\hat{\rho}_{RA} \|\hat{\sigma}_R \otimes \hat{\mathbb{1}}_A) - \delta \\ &= \max_{\hat{\mathfrak{E}}} \min_{\hat{\sigma}_R} \underline{D}(\hat{\rho}_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}} \|\hat{\sigma}_R \otimes \hat{\mathbb{1}}_A) - \delta \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Since this holds for any arbitrary $\delta > 0$, it yields the required inequality (34) in the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. ■

From (31), (33) and Lemma 7 it follows that

$$E_C(\rho_{AB}) \leq - \max_{\mathfrak{E}} \min_{\hat{\sigma}_R} \underline{D}(\hat{\rho}_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}} \|\hat{\sigma}_R \otimes \hat{\mathbb{1}}_A), \quad (39)$$

with $\hat{\rho}_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}} = \{(\rho_{RA}^{\mathfrak{E}})^{\otimes n}\}_{n \geq 1}$. Further, from the Generalized Stein's Lemma [18] and Lemma 4 in [14], the lemma below follows:

Lemma 8 For any given bipartite state ρ_{RA} ,

$$\min_{\hat{\sigma}_R} \underline{D}(\hat{\rho}_{RA} \|\hat{\sigma}_R \otimes \hat{\mathbb{1}}_A) = S_r(\rho_{RA} \|\rho_R \otimes \mathbb{1}_A), \quad (40)$$

where $\hat{\rho}_{RA} = \{\rho_{RA}^{\otimes n}\}_{n \geq 1}$, $\hat{\sigma}_R := \{\sigma_{R_n}^n \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_R^{\otimes n})\}_{n \geq 1}$, and $\hat{\mathbb{1}}_A := \{\mathbb{1}_A^{\otimes n}\}_{n \geq 1}$.

Proof. Consider the family of sets $\mathcal{M} := \{\mathcal{M}_n\}_{n \geq 1}$

$$\mathcal{M}_n := \{\sigma_{R_n}^n \otimes \tau_{A_n}^n \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_R^{\otimes n} \otimes \mathcal{H}_A^{\otimes n})\}, \quad (41)$$

such that $\tau_{A_n}^n := (\mathbb{1}_A/d_A)^{\otimes n}$. For this family, the Generalized Stein's Lemma (Proposition III.1 of [18]) holds.

More precisely, for a given bipartite state ρ_{RA} , let us define

$$S_{\mathcal{M}}^\infty(\rho_{RA}) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} S_{\mathcal{M}_n}(\rho_{RA}^{\otimes n}), \quad (42)$$

with $S_{\mathcal{M}_n}(\rho_{RA}^{\otimes n}) := \min_{\omega_{R_n A_n}^n \in \mathcal{M}_n} S_r(\rho_{RA}^{\otimes n} \|\omega_{R_n A_n}^n)$, and $\Delta_n(\gamma) = \rho_{RA}^{\otimes n} - 2^{n\gamma} \omega_{R_n A_n}^n$. From the Generalized Stein's Lemma [18] it follows that, for $\gamma > S_{\mathcal{M}}^\infty(\rho_{RA})$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min_{\omega_{R_n A_n}^n \in \mathcal{M}_n} \text{Tr} [\{\Delta_n(\gamma) \geq 0\} \Delta_n(\gamma)] = 0, \quad (43)$$

implying that $\min_{\hat{\omega}_{RA} \in \mathcal{M}} \underline{D}(\hat{\rho}_{RA} \|\hat{\omega}_{RA}) \leq S_{\mathcal{M}}^\infty(\rho_{RA})$. On the other hand, for $\gamma < S_{\mathcal{M}}^\infty(\rho_{RA})$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min_{\omega_{R_n A_n}^n \in \mathcal{M}_n} \text{Tr} [\{\Delta_n(\gamma) \geq 0\} \Delta_n(\gamma)] = 1, \quad (44)$$

implying that $\min_{\hat{\omega}_{RA} \in \mathcal{M}} \underline{D}(\hat{\rho}_{RA} \|\hat{\omega}_{RA}) \geq S_{\mathcal{M}}^\infty(\rho_{RA})$. Hence

$$\min_{\hat{\omega}_{RA} \in \mathcal{M}} \underline{D}(\hat{\rho}_{RA} \|\hat{\omega}_{RA}) = S_{\mathcal{M}}^\infty(\rho_{RA}).$$

Finally, by noticing that, due to the definition (41) of \mathcal{M} ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\hat{\omega}_{RA} \in \mathcal{M}} \underline{D}(\hat{\rho}_{RA} \|\hat{\omega}_{RA}) \\ &= \min_{\hat{\sigma}_R} \underline{D}(\hat{\rho}_{RA} \|\hat{\sigma}_R \otimes \hat{\mathbb{1}}_A) + \log d_A, \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

and that, due to Lemma 4 in [14],

$$S_{\mathcal{M}}^\infty(\rho_{RA}) = S_r(\rho_{RA} \|\rho_R \otimes \mathbb{1}_A) + \log d_A, \quad (46)$$

we obtain the statement of the lemma. ■