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Abstract
In this paper we prove two results related to the Gaussian optimizers conjecture for multimode bosonic system with gauge symmetry. First, we argue that the classical capacity of an arbitrary Gaussian observable is attained on a Gaussian ensemble of coherent states. This generalizes results previously known for heterodyne measurement in one mode. By using this fact and continuous variable version of ensemble-observable duality, we prove an old conjecture that accessible information of arbitrary Gaussian ensemble is attained on the multimode generalization of the heterodyne measurement.

1 Introduction
In this paper we prove two results related to the Gaussian optimizers conjecture for multimode bosonic system with gauge symmetry. In theorem 1 of sec. 3 we argue that the classical capacity of an arbitrary Gaussian observable is attained on a Gaussian ensemble of coherent states. This generalizes result previously known for the heterodyne measurement [1]. In the difficult part of the argument – the minimization of the output differential entropy – we rely upon our previous result [2] obtained as a limiting case of the general solution of the Gaussian optimizers conjecture for quantum Gaussian channels [3].

By using theorem 1 and infinite-dimensional version of ensemble-observable duality developed in sec. 4 we prove the main result of this work – theorem 2 concerning accessible information of arbitrary Gaussian ensemble. In particular, it answers an old conjecture [4], [5], [6] that the accessible information of a Gaussian ensemble is attained by the multimode generalization of the heterodyne measurement. As in the other Gaussian optimizer problems, the difficulty here lies in finding the global maximum of a convex functional, when the optimal solution turns out to be highly non-unique and the standard tools of convex analysis become inefficient.
2 Preliminaries

Let \( \mathcal{M} = \{M(dx)\} \) be an observable (POVM) in a separable Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H} \) with the outcome space \( \mathcal{X} \) which is a complete separable metric space. A corresponding measurement channel is defined as transformation \( \mathcal{M} : \rho \rightarrow \text{Tr} \rho M(dx) \) of density operators (d.o.) \( \rho \) to probability distributions on \( \mathcal{X} \). In [7] the existence of a \( \sigma \)-finite measure \( \mu(dx) \) was shown such that for any d.o. \( \rho \) the probability measure \( \text{Tr} \rho M(dx) \) is absolutely continuous w.r.t. \( \mu(dx) \), thus having the probability density (p.d.) \( p_\rho(x) \). Therefore the measurement channel can be defined as the transformation

\[ \mathcal{M} : \rho \rightarrow p_\rho \]

mapping affinely d.o. on \( \mathcal{H} \) into p.d. on \((\mathcal{X}, \mu)\). Notice that \( \mu(dx) \) is defined uniquely only up to the class of mutually absolutely continuous measures.

A (generalized) ensemble \( \mathcal{E} = \{\pi(dx), \rho_x\} \) consists of probability measure \( \pi(dx) \) on the input space \( \mathcal{X} \) and a measurable family of d.o. \( \rho_x \) on \( \mathcal{H} \). The average state of the ensemble is the barycenter of this measure

\[ \bar{\rho}_\mathcal{E} = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \rho_x \pi(dx), \]

the integral existing in the strong sense in the Banach space of trace class operators. Let \( \mathcal{M} = \{M(dy)\} \) be an observable with the outcome space \( \mathcal{Y} \) and \( \rho \rightarrow p_\rho \) the corresponding measurement channel. The joint probability distribution of \( x, y \) on \( \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \) is uniquely defined by the relation

\[ P(A \times B) = \int_A \pi(dx) \text{Tr} \rho_x M(B) = \text{Tr} \int_B \int_A p_{\rho_x}(y) \pi(dx) \mu(dy), \]

where \( A \) is an arbitrary Borel subset of \( \mathcal{X} \) and \( B \) is that of \( \mathcal{Y} \).

The classical Shannon information between \( x, y \) on \( \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \) is equal to (cf. [8])

\[ I(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M}) = \int \int \pi(dx) \mu(dy) p_{\rho_x}(y) \log \frac{p_{\rho_x}(y)}{p_{\rho_x}(y)}. \]

We will use the differential entropy

\[ h(p) = - \int p(x) \log p(x) \mu(dx) \]

of a p.d. \( p(x) \). There is a special class \( \mathcal{D} \) of p.d.’s we will be using for which the differential entropy is well-defined. Let \( \mathcal{X} \) be a \( d \)-dimensional vector space and \( p(x) \) a bounded p.d. on \( \mathcal{X} \) such that \( p(x) \leq c^d \) (mod \( \mu \)) for some \( c > 0 \). Then \( h(p) \) is well-defined with values in \([d \log c, +\infty] \) because in this case \( \tilde{p}(x) = p(x) / c e^{-d} \) is a p.d. satisfying \( \tilde{p}(x) \leq 1 \) (mod \( \mu \)), hence \( -\tilde{p}(x) \log \tilde{p}(x) \geq 0 \). Thus \( h(\tilde{p}) \) is well-defined with values in \([0, +\infty] \) and by change of variable \( \tilde{x} = cx \),

\[ h(p) = h(\tilde{p}) + d \log c \]

(1)
is also well-defined with values in $[d \log c, +\infty]$.

If observable $\mathcal{M}$ is such that $p_\rho \in \mathcal{D}$ for any d.o. $\rho$, then the Shannon information between $x, y$ is equal to

$$I(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M}) = h(p_{\rho_E}) - \int h(p_{\rho_x}) \pi(dx) \equiv \chi_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{E}).$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

This quantity is well-defined with values in $[0, +\infty]$ due to Jensen’s inequality.

In what follows $\mathcal{H}$ will be the space of a strongly continuous irreducible projective unitary representation $z \rightarrow D(z)$ of the canonical commutation relations (CCR) (see e.g. [9], [10] for a detailed account) describing quantization of a linear classical system with $s$ degrees of freedom such as finite number of physically relevant electromagnetic modes in a receiver’s cavity.

The classical linear system with the preferred complex structure (gauge) is described by the phase space $\mathbb{C}^s$ equipped with the symplectic form $2\text{Im} z^* w$, where

$$z = \begin{bmatrix} z_1 \\ \vdots \\ z_s \end{bmatrix}, \quad z^* = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{z}_1 & \cdots & \bar{z}_s \end{bmatrix}.$$  

We will use the symplectic Fourier transform

$$\tilde{f}(w) = \int \exp (z^* w - w^* z) f(z) \frac{d^{2s} z}{\pi^s} = \int \exp (2i\text{Im} z^* w) f(z) \frac{d^{2s} z}{\pi^s}.$$  

Notice that $\tilde{\tilde{f}} = f$ i.e. inverse transform has the same form.

The quantization gives a bosonic system described by the collection of annihilation-creation operators, in the vector form

$$a = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 \\ \vdots \\ a_s \end{bmatrix}, \quad a^\dagger = \begin{bmatrix} a_1^\dagger & \cdots & a_s^\dagger \end{bmatrix},$$  

where the lower index of a component refers to the number of the mode. The CCR including the nonvanishing commutator

$$a_j a_k^\dagger - a_k^\dagger a_j = \delta_{jk} I,$$

are conveniently written in terms of displacement operators $D(z) = \exp \left( a^\dagger z - z^* a \right)$, namely

$$D(z)D(w) = \exp (-i \text{Im} z^* w) D(z + w), \quad z, w \in \mathbb{C}^s.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

The quantum Fourier transform of a trace class operator $\rho$ is defined as

$$\text{Tr} \rho D(w)$$

The quantum Parceval formula holds:

$$\text{Tr} \rho \sigma^* = \int \text{Tr} \rho D(w) \text{Tr} \sigma D(w) \frac{d^{2s} w}{\pi^s}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)
A gauge invariant Gaussian d.o. is defined by the quantum characteristic function
\[ \text{Tr} \rho \Lambda D(w) = \exp \left[ -w^* \left( \Lambda + \frac{I}{2} \right) w \right], \quad (5) \]
where \( \Lambda = \text{Tr} a \rho a^\dagger \) is the complex covariance matrix. Notice that \( \rho_\Lambda^\dagger = \rho_\Lambda \), where \( ^\dagger \) denotes the transposition operation defined in (42) (see Appendix).

In the Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H} \) of an irreducible representation of CCR there is a unique unit vacuum vector \( |0\rangle \) such that \( a^\dagger |0\rangle = 0 \). The case \( \Lambda = 0 \) in (5) corresponds to the vacuum d.o. \( \rho_0 = |0\rangle \langle 0| \). The coherent state vectors are \( |z\rangle = D(z) |0\rangle \).

We will use the P-representation in the case of nondegenerate \( \Lambda \):
\[ \rho_\Lambda = \int |z\rangle \langle z| \exp \left( -z^* \Lambda^{-1} z \right) \frac{d^2 z}{\pi^s \det \Lambda}, \quad (6) \]
Another important Gaussian d.o. is obtained by action of the displacement operators
\[ \rho_{\Lambda,z} = D(z) \rho_\Lambda D(z)^* = \int |w\rangle \langle w| \exp \left( -(w-z)^* \Lambda^{-1} (w-z) \right) \frac{d^2 w}{\pi^s \det \Lambda}, \quad (7) \]
it has the quantum characteristic function
\[ \text{Tr} \rho_{\Lambda,z} D(w) = \exp \left[ 2i \text{Im} z^* w - w^* \left( \Lambda + \frac{I}{2} \right) w \right]. \]

3 Gaussian observables and ensembles

In this Section we will consider Gaussian observables with the outcome space \( \mathbb{C}^s \),
\[ \tilde{M}(d^2 z) = D(Kz) \rho_N D(Kz)^* \frac{|\det K|^2 d^2 z}{\pi^s} ; \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^s, \quad (8) \]
where \( K \) a nondegenerate complex \( s \times s \)-matrix, and d.o. \( \rho_N \) is defined by \( [5] \) with \( \Lambda = N \). This is a special (gauge covariant) case of general Gaussian observables considered in \([10]\). Particularly important is the case \( K = I \), where
\[ M(d^2 z) = D(z) \rho_N D(z)^* \frac{d^2 z}{\pi^s} ; \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^s. \quad (9) \]
In the Appendix we recall alternative description of such observables via extension to a spectral measure in a composite system including ancillary system (going back to \([4]\)). By taking \( N = 0 \) so that \( \rho_0 = |0\rangle \langle 0| \) is the vacuum state, we obtain the multimode version of the “heterodyne measurement”
\[ M_\ast(d^2 z) = D(z) \rho_0 D(z)^* \frac{d^2 z}{\pi^s} = |z\rangle \langle z| \frac{d^2 z}{\pi^s}, \quad (10) \]
see \([11]\).
Let $\rho$ be an input d.o. then by using (39), (5) and real-valuedness of the quadratic form under the exponent (see Appendix), the output p.d. of the observable (9) is

$$p_{\rho}(z) = \text{Tr} \rho \mathcal{D}(z) \rho \mathcal{D}(z)^*$$

and that of observable (8) is $\tilde{p}_{\rho}(z) = p_{\rho}(Kz) |\det K|^2$. Notice that all these p.d.’s belong to the class $\mathcal{D}$ because $0 \leq \text{Tr} \rho \sigma \leq 1$ for any two d.o. $\rho, \sigma$. Thus the differential entropy of the output p.d. is well-defined and

$$h(\tilde{p}_\rho) = h(p_\rho) - 2 \log |\det K|.$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

Let $\Sigma$ be a nonnegative definite complex Hermitian $s \times s$–matrix. By $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$ we denote the set of all d.o. which have zero first moments, finite second moments with the complex covariance matrix

$$\text{Tr} \ a \rho a^\dagger = \Sigma,$$

and other second moments such as $\text{Tr} \ a_j \rho a_k$, $\text{Tr} \ a_j^\dagger \rho a_k^\dagger$ vanishing. There is a unique Gaussian state in $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$ with the characteristic function (5) where $\Lambda = \Sigma$. Its output p.d. is given by the formula (44) in Appendix.

We will be interested in the following constrained $\chi$–capacity of the channel $\mathcal{M}$

$$C_\chi(\mathcal{M}; \Sigma) = \sup_{E \in \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)} \chi_{\mathcal{M}}(E),$$

where $\chi_{\mathcal{M}}(E)$ is the classical information quantity defined in (2).

**Theorem 1** Let $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ be the measurement channel corresponding to the Gaussian observable (8), then the supremum in (13) is equal to

$$C_\chi(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}; \Sigma) = \log \det \left( I + (N + I)^{-1} \Sigma \right)$$

and is attained on the Gaussian ensemble of coherent states

$$\left\{ \exp \left( -z^* \Sigma^{-1} z \right) \frac{d^2z}{\pi^s |\det \Sigma|}, |z\rangle \langle z| \right\}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)

The relation (14) can be considered as a multimode version of a formula obtained in [1] by “information exclusion” argument.

**Proof.** The channel $\mathcal{M}$ defined by (9) is covariant with respect to the irreducible action of the displacement operators $\mathcal{D}(z)$ which means

$$D(w)^* M(B) D(w) = M(B - w)$$

for any Borel subset $B \subseteq \mathbb{C}^s$ or, equivalently,

$$p_{D(w)\rho D(w)^*}(z) = p_\rho(z - w).$$
By adapting the argument from [12] for irreducibly covariant quantum channel to our case of quantum-classical channel, we can obtain

$$C_{\chi}(\mathcal{M}; \Sigma) = \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)} h(p_\rho) - \hat{h}(\mathcal{M}),$$

(16)

where

$$\hat{h}(\mathcal{M}) = \min_{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|} h(p_{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|})$$

is the minimal output differential entropy. By a proof of generalization of the Wehrl conjecture to the measurements of the form (9) obtained in [2], the minimum is attained on the vacuum state $\rho_0 = |0\rangle\langle0|$ to which corresponds the output p.d.

$$p_{\rho_0}(z) = \det(N + I)^{-1} \exp(-z^*(N + I)^{-1}z).$$

so that

$$\hat{h}(\mathcal{M}) = h(p_{\rho_0}) = \log e^s \det(N + I),$$

Take an ensemble $\mathcal{E}$ such that $\bar{\rho}_\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$. Then $p_{\bar{\rho}_\mathcal{E}}$ has the covariance matrix $\Sigma + N + I$ (see n.1 of the Appendix). By the classical maximum entropy principle, the maximum of $h(p_{\bar{\rho}_\mathcal{E}})$ is attained on the Gaussian state $\bar{\rho}_\mathcal{E} = \rho_\Sigma$ when $p_{\bar{\rho}_\mathcal{E}}(z)$ is the Gaussian p.d. (44) and is equal to

$$\max_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)} h(p_\rho) = h(p_{\rho_{\Sigma}}) = \log e^s \det(\Sigma + N + I).$$

Thus we obtain the value

$$C_{\chi}(\mathcal{M}; \Sigma) = \log \det(\Sigma + N + I) - \log \det(N + I) = \log \det\left(I + (N + I)^{-1}\Sigma\right).$$

(17)

By taking into account (12) we also obtain that

$$C_{\chi}(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}; \Sigma) = C_{\chi}(\mathcal{M}; \Sigma),$$

i.e. rescaling the observable by nondegenerate $K$ has no effect on the $\chi$—capacity of the measurement [9] and the optimal ensemble. □

The importance of the quantity (13) is apparent: it is a key for computing the energy-constrained classical capacity of the channel $\mathcal{M}$ (see e.g. [11]). Indeed, let

$$H = a^\dagger \epsilon a = \sum_{j,k=1}^s \epsilon_{jk} a^\dagger_j a_k$$

be a quadratic gauge invariant Hamiltonian, where $\epsilon = [\epsilon_{jk}]$ is positive definite Hermitian matrix, so that the mean energy of the input d.o. $\rho$ is equal to

$$\text{Tr} \rho H = \sum_{j,k=1}^s \epsilon_{jk}\Sigma_{kj} = \text{Sp} \epsilon \Sigma,$$
where $\text{Sp}$ denotes trace of $s \times s$-matrices as distinct from the trace of operators. Then the energy constraint has the form $\text{Sp} \epsilon \Sigma \leq E$, where $E$ is a positive number, and the energy-constrained classical capacity of the channel $\mathcal{M}$ is equal to

$$C(\mathcal{M}; H, E) = \sup_{\Sigma: \text{Sp} \epsilon \Sigma \leq E} C_\chi(\mathcal{M}; \Sigma).$$

Notice that the additivity issue does not arise here because measurement channels are entanglement breaking [7], [10].

Given an explicit expression for $C_\chi(\mathcal{M}; \Sigma)$ such as (14), computation of the last supremum is a separate optimization problem which can be solved analytically in some special cases. For example, if $H = \sum_j \hbar \omega_j a_j^\dagger a_j$, so that $\epsilon$ is diagonal, and $N = \text{diag} [n_j]$, then the optimal $\Sigma$ is also diagonal and its entries $s_j^*$ can be found with a simple generalization of the “water-filling solution”, cf. [13], namely

$$s_j^* = \left(\nu/\hbar \omega_j - n_j - 1\right)_+, \tag{19}$$

where $\nu$ is found from the equation $\sum_j s_j^* \hbar \omega_j s_j^* = E$, and

$$C(\mathcal{M}; H, E) = \sum_{j=1}^s \log \left(1 + \frac{s_j^*}{n_j + 1}\right). \tag{15}$$

The following result (for observable (10)) was conjectured in the early seventies. In [4] it was observed that the measurement (10) for the Gaussian ensemble (18) gives the information amount (17) which is thus the lower bound for the accessible information of the ensemble defined as

$$A(\mathcal{E}) = \sup_{\mathcal{M}} I(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M}),$$

where the supremum is over all observables $\mathcal{M}$. The conjecture was that the observable (10) gives the global maximum. In [5] the authors verified the necessary local extremality condition for information based on the first variation derived in [14], and in [6] the second variation was shown nonpositive[4]. However to our knowledge the question of the global maximum was open until now.

**Theorem 2** Let $\mathcal{E}$ be the Gaussian ensemble $\{\pi(d^{2s}z), \rho_{N,z}\}$, where

$$\pi(d^{2s}z) = \exp \left(-z^* \Sigma^{-1} z\right) \frac{d^{2s}z}{\pi^s \det \Sigma}, \tag{18}$$

$$\rho_{N,z} = D(z) \rho_N D(z)^\dagger \tag{19}$$

is d.o. [7] with $\Lambda = N$. \footnote{The English versions of [5], [6] were also posted as arXiv:quant-ph/0511042, arXiv:quant-ph/0511043.} \footnote{For the clarity of proofs we assume that the covariance matrices $\Sigma, N$ are nondegenerate, although this restriction can be relaxed by using more abstract computations with the quantum characteristic functions.}
Then the accessible information $A(\mathcal{E})$ of this ensemble is equal to (17) and is attained on any Gaussian observable of the form

$$\tilde{M}_*(d^2s_z) = D(Kz)\rho_0D(Kz)^* \frac{|\det K|^2}{\pi^s} d^2s_z,$$

(20)

where $\det K \neq 0$, in particular, on the observable (16).

**Proof.** By using convolution of Gaussian densities, we obtain the average state of the ensemble (18)

$$\tilde{\rho}_E = \int |w\rangle \langle w| \exp \left( -w^* (\Sigma + N)^{-1} w \right) \frac{d^2s_w}{\pi^s \det (\Sigma + N)} = \rho_{\Sigma + N}. 

(21)

Direct computation gives

$$\chi_{\mathcal{M}_*}(\mathcal{E}) = h(p_{\rho_{\Sigma + N}}) - h(p_{\rho_N}) = \log \det (\Sigma + N + I) - \log \det (N + I)$$

$$= \log \det \left( I + (N + I)^{-1} \Sigma \right)$$

for the ensemble $\mathcal{E}$ and observable $\mathcal{M}_*$ defined by (10), thus giving the lower bound for the accessible information $A(\mathcal{E})$. Any observable (20) gives the same value by (12).

We now derive the upper bound. Let us compute observable $\mathcal{M}'$ from the ensemble dual to (18) (see Eq. (30) in the next section). It will turn out Gaussian so we can later apply to it theorem 1 to obtain the right-hand side of the inequality (35). We have

$$M'(d^2s_z) = \tilde{\rho}_E^{-1/2} \rho_{N,z} \tilde{\rho}_E^{-1/2} \pi(d^2s_z)$$

$$= \int \tilde{\rho}_E^{-1/2} |w\rangle \langle w| \tilde{\rho}_E^{-1/2} \exp \left( -(w - z)^* N^{-1} (w - z) \right)$$

$$\times \frac{d^2s_w}{\pi^s \det N} \pi(d^2s_z).$$

(23)

By using the decomposition in the normal modes associated with the orthonormal basis of eigenvectors of the matrix $\Sigma + N$, we obtain (see Appendix for detail)

$$\tilde{\rho}_E^{-1/2} |w\rangle = \sqrt{\det (\Sigma + N + I)} \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} w^* (\Sigma + N)^{-1} w \right\} \delta \left( \frac{(\Sigma + N + I)}{(\Sigma + N)} w \right).$$

(24)

Substituting this into (23), we get

$$\int \left\{ \delta \left( \frac{(\Sigma + N + I)}{(\Sigma + N)} w \right) \langle \ldots | \exp \left( -w^* \left[ N^{-1} - (\Sigma + N)^{-1} \right] w + 2\Re w^* N^{-1} z \right)$$

$$\times \frac{d^2s_w \det (\Sigma + N + I)}{\pi^s \det N} \exp \left( -z^* N^{-1} z \right) \pi(d^2s_z).$$
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By making change of variables
\[ w = \sqrt{(\Sigma + N)(\Sigma + N + I)} u, \quad \tilde{z} \equiv \sqrt{(\Sigma + N)(\Sigma + N + I)\Sigma^{-1}z} = Kz, \]
and denoting
\[ \tilde{N}^{-1} = \sqrt{\frac{(\Sigma + N)}{(\Sigma + N + I)}} \left[ N^{-1} - (\Sigma + N)^{-1} \right] \sqrt{\frac{(\Sigma + N)}{(\Sigma + N + I)}} \]
we obtain
\[ M'(d^{2s}z) = \int |u\rangle\langle u| \exp \left( -\tilde{z}^*\tilde{N}^{-1}(u - \tilde{z}) \right) \frac{d^{2s}u}{\pi^s} \frac{d^{2s}\tilde{z}}{\pi^s}, \]
which has the same Gaussian form as \( \tilde{M} \) in theorem 1.

We now use the general upper bound (35) from the next section. We compute the supremum in the right hand side of (35) by using theorem 1 with \( N \) replaced by \( \tilde{N} \) and \( \Sigma \) replaced by \( \tilde{\Sigma} = \Sigma + N \) from the average state (21). Theorem 1 then implies
\[ \sup_{E': \rho_{E'} = \bar{\rho}_E} \chi_{M'}(E') \leq C(\chi(\mathcal{M'}; \tilde{\Sigma})) = \log \det \left( I + \left( \tilde{N} + I \right)^{-1} \tilde{\Sigma} \right). \] (26)
A computation (see Appendix, n. 3) shows that
\[ \det \left( I + \left( \tilde{N} + I \right)^{-1} \tilde{\Sigma} \right) = \det \left( I + T^{-1} \Sigma (N + I)^{-1} T \right) = \det \left( I + (N + I)^{-1} \Sigma \right), \] (27)
where \( T = \sqrt{(\Sigma + N)(\Sigma + N + I)} \). This gives the upper estimate for \( A(E) \) which coincides with the lower estimate (22), thus proving the theorem. □

4 Ensemble-observable duality

The proof of theorem 2 uses the duality between ensembles and observables in the case of infinite dimensions and continuous variables (for the finite-dimensional case see [1], [15] or [16]).

Proposition 3 Let \( E = \{ \pi(dx), \rho_x \} \) be an ensemble and \( \mathcal{M} = \{ M(dy) \} \) an observable such that
\[ M(B) = \int_B m(y)\mu(dy), \] (28)
where $m(y)$ is weakly measurable function with values in the cone of bounded positive operators in $H$ and the integral weakly converges ($B$ is an arbitrary Borel subset of $H$).

Define the dual pair ensemble-observable $(E', M')$ by the relations

$$\pi'(B) = \text{Tr} \bar{\rho}_E M(B), \quad \rho'_y = \frac{\bar{\rho}_E^{1/2} m(y) \bar{\rho}_E^{1/2}}{\text{Tr} \bar{\rho}_E m(y)}; $$

(29)

$$\langle \psi | M'(A) | \psi \rangle = \int_A \langle \bar{\rho}_E^{-1/2} \psi | \rho_x | \bar{\rho}_E^{-1/2} \psi \rangle \pi(dx),$$

(30)

for $\psi \in \text{ran} \bar{\rho}_E^{1/2} \oplus H_0$, where $H_0 = \ker \bar{\rho}_E^{1/2}$.

Then the average states of both ensembles coincide

$$\bar{\rho}_E = \bar{\rho}_{E'}.$$ (31)

Moreover, the joint distribution of $x, y$ is the same for both pairs $(E, M)$ and $(E', M')$ and

$$I(E, M) = I(E', M').$$ (32)

Proof. From (29) it follows

$$\bar{\rho}_E = \int \rho_y' \pi'(dy) = \int \bar{\rho}_E^{1/2} m(y) \bar{\rho}_E^{1/2} \mu(dy) = \bar{\rho}_E^{1/2} \int m(y) \mu(dy) \bar{\rho}_E^{1/2} = \bar{\rho}_E.$$

The definition (30) implies

$$0 \leq \langle \psi | M'(A) | \psi \rangle \leq \int_X \langle \bar{\rho}_E^{-1/2} \psi | \rho_x | \bar{\rho}_E^{-1/2} \psi \rangle \pi(dx) = \langle \psi | \psi \rangle,$$

for dense domain of $\psi$ implying that $M'(A)$ are bounded positive operators with $M'(A) = I$. The definition via integral also implies $\sigma$-additivity, hence $M'$ is an observable.

Notice the identity

$$\bar{\rho}_E^{1/2} M'(A) \bar{\rho}_E^{1/2} = \int A \rho_x \pi(dx).$$ (33)

Then the joint distribution of $x, y$

$$P(A \times B) = \int_A \pi(dx) \text{Tr} \rho_x M(B) = \text{Tr} \int_A \rho_x \pi(dx) M(B),$$

via (33) is equal to

$$\text{Tr} \bar{\rho}_E^{1/2} M'(A) \bar{\rho}_E^{1/2} M(B) = \text{Tr} \int_B \bar{\rho}_E^{1/2} m(y) \bar{\rho}_E^{1/2} \mu(dy) = \int_B \pi'(dy) \text{Tr} \rho'_y M'(A) = P'(A \times B),$$

3We use the generalized inverse for $\bar{\rho}_E^{-1/2}$. 
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hence (32) holds. □

The equality (32) implies an estimate for the accessible information of the ensemble

\[ A(\mathcal{E}) = \sup_{\mathcal{M}} I(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M}), \]

where the supremum is over all observables \( \mathcal{M} \).

**Proposition 4** Let \( \mathcal{E} \) be a fixed ensemble and \( \mathcal{M}' \) is the dual observable, then

\[ \sup_{\mathcal{M}} I(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M}) = \sup_{\mathcal{E}', \tilde{\rho}_E = \tilde{\rho}_E} I(\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{M}'). \tag{34} \]

**Proof.** We first prove the inequality

\[ A(\mathcal{E}) \leq \sup_{\mathcal{E}', \tilde{\rho}_E = \tilde{\rho}_E} \chi_{\mathcal{M}'}(\mathcal{E}'). \tag{35} \]

which we need in the proof of theorem \( \ref{thm:ensemble} \). It is sufficient to show that

\[ \sup_{\mathcal{M}} I(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M}) = \sup_{\mathcal{M}, \ref{eq:ensemble}} \chi_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{E}), \tag{36} \]

where on the right the supremum is taken over observables \( \mathcal{M} \) which satisfy \( \ref{eq:ensemble} \) with respect to some measure \( \mu \). Then by using the proposition \( \ref{prop:ensemble} \) we obtain

\[ \sup_{\mathcal{M}, \ref{eq:ensemble}} \chi_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{E}) = \sup_{\mathcal{E}', \ref{eq:ensemble}} \chi_{\mathcal{M}'}(\mathcal{E}'), \tag{37} \]

whence (35) follows.

Proof of the equality (36) is based on two facts. First, we show that any observable \( \mathcal{M} \) can be approximated by a sequence of observables \( \{M_n(dy)\} \) satisfying \( \ref{eq:ensemble} \) for some measures \( \mu_n \). Second, we observe that the information quantity \( \chi_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{E}) \) is lower semicontinuous in this approximation.

Let \( \mathcal{M} = \{M(dy)\} \) be an observable, and let \( \{P_n\} \) be a nondecreasing sequence of projections in \( \mathcal{H} \) such that \( P_n \uparrow I \) as \( n \to \infty \). Define the measure \( \mu_n(B) = \text{Tr} P_n M(B) \) and the sequence of observables

\[ M_n(B) = P_n M(B) P_n \oplus (I - P_n) \mu_n(B)/\text{Tr} P_n. \]

Then \( \mathcal{M}_n = \{M_n(dy)\} \) satisfies \( \ref{eq:ensemble} \) with the measure \( \mu_n(B) \). Indeed, \( 0 \leq P_n M(B) P_n \leq P_n \mu_n(B) \) and \( M_n(B) = \int_B m_n(y) \mu_n(dy) \), with \( \|m_n(y)\| \leq 1 \) (mod \( \mu_n \)).

For arbitrary d.o. \( \rho \) and arbitrary Borel \( B \subseteq \mathcal{Y} \)

\[ |\text{Tr} \rho M(B) - \text{Tr} \rho M_n(B)| \leq |\text{Tr} \rho (M(B) - P_n M(B) P_n)| + \|\mu_n(B)/\text{Tr} P_n \| \text{Tr} (I - P_n) \rho \]

\[ \leq |\text{Tr} \rho (I - P_n) M(B)| + |\text{Tr} \rho P_n M(B) (I - P_n)| + \text{Tr} (I - P_n) \rho \]

\[ \leq 3 \| (I - P_n) \rho \|_1 \to 0 \]

as \( n \to \infty \).
Now let $\mathcal{V} = \{B_k\}$ be a finite decomposition of the space $\mathcal{Y}$ into Borel subsets $B_k$. Define the finitely valued “coarse-grained” observable $\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{V} = \{M(B_k)\}$. A general result of classical information theory (cf. [8]) implies

$$I(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M}) = \sup_{\mathcal{V}} I(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M}_\mathcal{V}),$$

where the supremum is taken over all the decompositions $\mathcal{V}$. We will prove that for a fixed $\mathcal{V}$ the functional $I(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M}_\mathcal{V})$ is continuous with respect to the approximation (37), then it will follow that $I(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M})$ is lower semicontinuous. Denoting $P_\rho(B) = \text{Tr} \rho M(B)$, we have

$$I(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M}_\mathcal{V}) = - \sum_k P_{\rho_\mathcal{E}}(B_k) \log P_{\rho_\mathcal{E}}(B_k) + \int \pi(dx) \sum_k P_{\rho_x}(B_k) \log P_{\rho_x}(B_k).$$

When we approximate $\mathcal{M}$ by $\mathcal{M}_n$, the first term converges by (37) and by continuity of the Shannon entropy. In the second term the integrand converges pointwise by (37) and it is uniformly bounded because $-e^{-1} \log e \leq P \log P \leq 0$ for $0 \leq P \leq 1$. This finishes the proof of (35).

Let us now prove the stronger result: the equality (34) by showing that any ensemble $\mathcal{E} = \{\pi(dy), \rho_y\}$ with fixed average state $\bar{\rho}_\mathcal{E}$ can be approximated by ensembles of the form (29). First, if $\bar{\rho}_\mathcal{E}$ has finite rank, the problem reduces to finite dimensional one which is easily solved. Therefore assume that the rank of $\bar{\rho}_\mathcal{E}$ is infinite (for simplicity we can assume that $\bar{\rho}_\mathcal{E}$ is nondegenerated). Let $P_n$ be the projection onto the eigenspace of $\bar{\rho}_\mathcal{E}$ corresponding to $n$ largest eigenvalues. Let

$$m_n(y) = P_n \bar{\rho}_\mathcal{E}^{-1/2} \rho_y \bar{\rho}_\mathcal{E}^{-1/2} P_n \otimes (I - P_n) \frac{1}{1 - \text{Tr} \rho_y P_n},$$

then

$$0 \leq m_n(y) \leq \lambda_n^{-1} P_n \otimes (I - P_n) / \text{Tr} \bar{\rho}_\mathcal{E} (I - P_n),$$

where $\lambda_n$ is the smallest eigenvalue for eigenvectors in the range of $P_n$. Then

$$\int m_n(y) \pi(dy) = P_n \otimes (I - P_n) = I,$$

hence $M(B) = \int_B m_n(y) \pi(dy)$ is an observable. Moreover, $\text{Tr} \bar{\rho}_\mathcal{E} m_n(y) = 1$ (mod $\pi$). Define ensemble $\mathcal{E}'_n = \{\pi_n(dy), \rho_y^n\}$ by taking $\pi_n(dy) = \pi(dy)$ and

$$\rho_y^n = \bar{\rho}_\mathcal{E}^{-1/2} m_n(y) \bar{\rho}_\mathcal{E}^{-1/2},$$

then by (38) the average state of $\mathcal{E}'_n$ is $\bar{\rho}_\mathcal{E}$. Ensemble $\mathcal{E}'_n$ has the required form (29). Moreover, for any observable $\mathcal{M}' = \{M(dx)\}$ the joint probability

$$P_n'(A \times B) = \int_B \pi(dy) \text{Tr} \rho_y^n M(A) \to \int_B \pi(dy) \text{Tr} \rho_y M(A) = P(A \times B).$$
Indeed,

\[ \text{Tr} \rho_y^n M(A) = \text{Tr} P_n \rho_y P_n M(A) + \text{Tr} \bar{\rho} \bar{P}_n \left( I - P_n \right) M(A) \frac{1 - \text{Tr} \rho_y P_n}{1 - \text{Tr} \bar{\rho} \bar{P}_n} \to \text{Tr} \rho_y M(A) \]

pointwise, remaining uniformly bounded by 1. For any finite decomposition \( \mathcal{V} = \{ A_k \} \) of the space \( \mathcal{X} \) and \( \mathcal{V}' = \{ B_k \} \) of the space \( \mathcal{Y} \), the “coarse-grained” mutual information is continuous and the mutual information is lower semicontinuous by the argument in the proof above, hence

\[ \lim \inf_{n \to \infty} I(\mathcal{E}'_n, \mathcal{M}') \geq I(\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{M}'). \]

It implies finally the equality \( \square \).

5 Appendix

1. Let \( \rho, \sigma \) be two d.o., then, generalizing (11), the relation

\[ \text{Tr} \rho D(z) \sigma D(z)^* \]

defines a p.d. on \( \mathbb{C}^\times \). Its classical characteristic function expressed via the symplectic Fourier transform is

\[
\begin{align*}
\int \exp [i \text{Im} z^* w] \text{Tr} \rho D(z) \sigma D(z)^* \frac{d^2 z}{\pi^2} &= \int \exp [i \text{Im} z^* u] \int \text{Tr} \rho D(u) \exp [i \text{Im} z^* u] \text{Tr} \sigma D(u) \frac{d^2 u}{\pi^2} \quad (39) \\
&= \int \int \exp [i \text{Im} z^* (w - u)] \frac{d^2 z}{\pi^2} \text{Tr} \rho D(u) \text{Tr} \sigma^\top D(\bar{w}) d^2 u \quad (40) \\
&= \text{Tr} \rho D(w) \text{Tr} \sigma^\top D(\bar{w}), \quad (41)
\end{align*}
\]

where in (39) we used (3) and the Parceval identity (4), and in (40) the transposition \( \sigma \to \sigma^\top \) is defined by the relation

\[ \text{Tr} \sigma^\top D(\bar{w}) = \overline{\text{Tr} \sigma D(w)}, \quad w \in \mathbb{C}^\times. \quad (42) \]

The expression (41) can be rewritten as

\[ \text{Tr} \left( \rho \otimes \sigma^\top \right) (D(w) \otimes D(\bar{w})) \]

\[ = \text{Tr} \left( \rho \otimes \sigma^\top \right) \exp \left( \alpha^\dagger w - w^* \alpha \right), \quad (43) \]

where \( \alpha, \alpha^\dagger \) act in \( \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}_0 \), \( \mathcal{H}_0 \simeq \mathcal{H} \) is the Hilbert space of the ancillary system. The vectors \( \alpha, \alpha^\dagger \) have the components

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha_j &= a_j \otimes I_0 + I \otimes a_j^\dagger, \\
\alpha_k^\dagger &= a_k^\dagger \otimes I_0 + I \otimes a_k,
\end{align*}
\]

13
where $a^\dagger_{0j}$, $a^\dagger_{ij}$ are annihilation-creation operators in $\mathcal{H}_0$. These components are commuting normal operators, so that they have joint probability distribution with the classical characteristic function \((13)\). Assuming that $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(\Sigma)$, $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}(N)$, let us find the complex covariance matrix of this distribution. It has the components

$$
M_{\alpha_j \alpha_k^\dagger} = \text{Tr} \alpha_j (\rho \otimes \sigma^\dagger) a_{k}^\dagger
$$

Thus the complex covariance matrix

$$
M_{\alpha \alpha^\dagger} = \Sigma + N + I.
$$

2. By using \((40)\) and real-valuedness of the quadratic form under the second exponent, one obtains

$$
\text{Tr} \rho_0 D(z) \rho_N D(z)^* = \int \exp \left[ -w^* \left( \Sigma + \frac{I}{2} \right) w \right] \times \exp \left[ 2\text{Im} z^* w - w^* \left( N + \frac{I}{2} \right) w \right] \frac{d^{2s}w}{\pi^s} = \frac{1}{\pi^s \det (\Sigma + N + I)} \exp \left[ -z^* (\Sigma + N + I)^{-1} z \right],
$$

which is complex Gaussian p.d. with the covariance matrix $\Sigma + N + I$. In particular,

$$
\text{Tr} \rho_0 D(z) \rho_\Lambda D(z)^* = \frac{1}{\pi^s \det (\Lambda + I)} \exp \left[ -z^* (\Lambda + I)^{-1} z \right].
$$

Let $\{e_k\}$ be an orthonormal basis in $\mathbb{C}^s$, and let $z = \sum_{k=1}^s \zeta_k e_k$ be a decomposition of the vector $z$ in this basis. Then $a^\dagger = \sum_{k=1}^s \zeta_k b_k^\dagger$, where $a^\dagger e_k = b_k^\dagger$ are the new creation operators, corresponding to the modes associated with the basis $\{e_k\}$. Let $|n_k\rangle$ be the eigenvector of the $k$–th mode number operator $b_k^\dagger b_k$, corresponding to the eigenvalue $n_k (= 0, 1, \ldots)$. Then one has tensor product decomposition of a coherent state vector

$$
|z\rangle = \bigotimes_{k=1}^s \sum_{n_k=0}^\infty \frac{\zeta_k^n}{\sqrt{n_k!}} |n_k\rangle \exp \left( -\frac{||\zeta_k||^2}{2} \right).
$$

If $\{e_k\}$ is the basis of eigenvectors of the covariance matrix $\Lambda$ of the Gaussian d.o. $\rho_\Lambda$, with the corresponding eigenvalues $\lambda_k$, then

$$
\rho_\Lambda = \bigotimes_{k=1}^s \frac{1}{\lambda_k + 1} \sum_{n_k=0}^\infty \left( \frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda_k + 1} \right)^{n_k} |n_k\rangle\langle n_k|.
$$
The formula (24) is obtained by choosing the basis of eigenvectors of the covariance matrix $\Sigma + N$ and then using the decompositions (46), (45).

3. From (25) we obtain

$$\tilde{N} + I = \sqrt{\frac{(\Sigma + N + I)}{(\Sigma + N)}} (\Sigma + N) \sqrt{\frac{(\Sigma + N + I)}{(\Sigma + N)}} ,$$

then

$$\left( \tilde{N} + I \right)^{-1} \Sigma = \sqrt{\frac{(\Sigma + N)}{(\Sigma + N + I)}} \left[ \Sigma^{-1} N + (\Sigma + N + I)^{-1} \right]^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{(\Sigma + N)}{(\Sigma + N + I)}} .$$

(47)

Substituting

$$\Sigma^{-1} N + (\Sigma + N + I)^{-1} = (\Sigma + N + I)^{-1} (N + I) \Sigma^{-1} (\Sigma + N)$$

into (47), we obtain

$$\left( \tilde{N} + I \right)^{-1} \hat{\Sigma} = T^{-1} \Sigma (N + I)^{-1} T,$$

hence (27) follows.
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