

# Quantum universal variable-length source coding

Masahito Hayashi<sup>1,\*</sup> and Keiji Matsumoto<sup>2,y</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Laboratory for Mathematical Neuroscience, Brain Science Institute,  
RIKEN, 2-1 Hirosawa, Wako, Saitama, 351-0198, Japan

<sup>2</sup>Quantum Computation and Information Project, ERATO,  
JST, 5-28-3, Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, 113-0033, Japan  
(Dated: 5 June 2002)

We construct an optimal quantum universal variable-length code that achieves the admissible minimum rate, i.e., our code is used for any probability distribution of quantum states. Its probability of exceeding the admissible minimum rate exponentially goes to 0. Our code is optimal in the sense of its exponent. In addition, its average error asymptotically tends to 0.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 03.67.Hk

## I. INTRODUCTION

As was proven by Schumacher [1], and Jozsa and Schumacher [2], we can compress the unknown source state into the length  $nH(\rho_p)$  with a sufficiently small error when the source state on  $n$  quantum systems obeys the  $n$ -i.i.d. distribution of the known probability  $p$ , where  $\rho_p := \sum p(\lambda) \rho_\lambda$  and  $H(\rho)$  is the von Neumann entropy  $-\text{Tr} \log \rho$ . Jozsa and Schumacher's protocol depends on the mixture state  $\rho_p$ . Concerning the quantum source coding, there are two settings: blind coding, in which the input is the unknown quantum state, and visible coding, in which the input is classical information which determines the quantum state that we want to send, i.e., the encoder knows the input quantum state. In this paper, we treat only blind coding. In our setting, we allow mixed states as input states.

In blind coding, Koashi and Imoto [3] proved that even if we allow mixed states as input states without trivial redundancies, the minimum admissible length is  $nH(\rho_p)$ . Depending only on the coding length  $nR$ , Jozsa et al. [4] constructed a code which is independent of the distribution which the input obeys. In their protocol, if and only if the minimum admissible length of the distribution  $p$  is less than  $nR$ , we can decode with a sufficiently small error. This kind code is called a quantum universal fixed-length source code.

In the classical system, depending on the input state, the encoder can determine the coding length. Such a code is called a variable-length code. Using this type code, we can compress any information without error. When we suitably choose a variable-length code for the probability distribution  $p$  of the input, the coding length is less than  $nH(p)$ , except for a small enough probability. In particular, Lynch [5] and Davison [6] proposed a variable-length code with no error, in which the coding length is less than  $nH(p)$  except for a small enough probability under the distribution  $p$ . Such a code is called a universal variable-length source code. Today, their code can be regarded as the following two-stage code: at the first step, we send the empirical distribution (i.e., the type) which indicates a subset of data, and in the second step, we send information which indicates every sequence belonging to the subset [7].

This paper deals with quantum data compression in which the encoder determines the coding length, according to the input state. In order to make this decision, he must measure the input quantum system. After this measurement, depending on the data, the encoder compresses the final state of this measurement and sends its data and the compressed state. This type code is called a quantum variable-length source code. However, in general, the encoder knows only that the input state is written as a separable state  $\rho_{x_1} \otimes \rho_{x_2} \otimes \dots \otimes \rho_{x_n}$ . Therefore, it is impossible to determine the coding length without destruction of the input state.

In particular, independently of the probability distribution  $p$ , we construct the code satisfying the following conditions: the average error concerning to Bures distance tends to 0. The probability that the coding length is greater than  $nH(\rho_p)$ , tends to 0. Such a code is called a quantum universal variable-length source code. In our construction, similarly to Key and Werner [8], an essential role is played by the representation theory of the special unitary group and the symmetric group on the tensored space.

---

\*Electronic address: masahito@brain.riken.go.jp

<sup>y</sup>Electronic address: keiji@qci.jst.go.jp

In our code, the encoder performs a quantum measurement closely related to irreducible decomposition of the two groups, and its resulting data can be approximately regarded as a quantum analogue of type. Thus, our code can be regarded as a quantum analogue of Lynch-Davisson code [5],[6]. Of course, if we can estimate the entropy  $H(\Gamma_p)$ , we can compress the coding rate to the admissible rate  $H(\Gamma_p)$  with a probability close to 1. However, when we perform a naive measurement for the estimation of  $H(\Gamma_p)$ , the input state is destroyed. Therefore, in our code, it is the main problem to treat the trade-off between the estimation of  $H(\Gamma_p)$  and the non-destruction of the input state.

One might consider that the universal variable code can be easily realized as follows. First, use the  $n$ , where  $n$  is small, states for the estimation of  $H(\Gamma_p)$ . Second, apply Jozsa et. al. protocol [4] by setting  $R = H(\Gamma_p) + \epsilon$ , and apply to  $n(1 - \epsilon)$  states. If we consider individual error (24), this code successfully compresses the source. However, in our paper, like Jozsa et. al. [4], we consider the total Bures distance (1) between the input state and the output state. In this criterion, 'naive estimate and compress' strategy destroys the input state a lot. The detail will be discussed in section 6. (Note also that our criterion (1) is different from Krawtchenko and Slater's criterion [9] and Schumacher and Westmoreland's criterion [10].)

In this paper, we discuss the universality for the probability family  $P$  consisting of predicted probabilities on  $S(H)$ . For any probability family  $P$  on  $S(H)$ , we define universality of a quantum variable-length source code and evaluate the exponent of the probability that the coding length is greater than the minimum admissible length, which is called the overflow probability. However, unfortunately, in our approach, it is difficult to construct a quantum universal variable-length source code whose error exponentially tends to 0 in the blind setting. In the visible coding case, it is possible to construct such a code. This topic will be discussed in another paper.

We summarize quantum fixed-length source coding in section II. After this summary, we state our mathematical setting and the main results in section III. Our proofs and our construction of code are given in sections V and IV. Moreover, as is demonstrated in section VI, in the 2-dimensional case, a naive code destroys the state and is not used as a quantum universal variable-length source code.

## II. SUMMARY OF QUANTUM FIXED-LENGTH SOURCE CODING

Let  $H$  be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space that represents the physical system of interest and let  $S(H)$  be the set of density operators on  $H$ . Consider a source of quantum state which produces the state  $\tilde{\rho}_n = \rho_1 \otimes \rho_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \rho_n$  with probability the i.i.d. distribution  $p^n$  of the probability  $p$  on  $S(H)$ . In fixed-length source coding, a sequence of states  $\tilde{\rho}_n$  is compressed to the state in a smaller Hilbert space  $H_n \subset H^n$ , whose dimension is  $e^{nR}$ . Here, the encoder and the decoder is a trace-preserving completely positive (TP-CP) map  $E^n$  and  $D^n$ , respectively. The average of the total error is given by

$$n_{\mathcal{P}}(E^n; D^n) = \sum_{\tilde{\rho}_n \in S(H^n)} p^n(\tilde{\rho}_n) b^2(\tilde{\rho}_n; D^n, E^n(\tilde{\rho}_n)); \quad (1)$$

where Bures distance is defined as

$$b(\rho; \sigma) = \sqrt{1 - \text{Tr} \sqrt{p - p}};$$

Note that the support of  $p$  does not necessarily consist of pure states. In this setting, we focus the infimum of the rate with which the average error goes to zero. The infimum is called the minimum admissible rate  $R_p$  of  $p$ , and is defined by

$$R_p = \inf \limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \log \dim H_n - 9f(H_n; E^n; D^n)g; \quad n_{\mathcal{P}}(E^n; D^n) \neq 0;$$

The number  $nR_p$  is called minimum admissible length. When the source has no trivial redundancy in the sense following, it is calculated as

$$R_p = H(\Gamma_p) = -\text{Tr} \rho_p \log \rho_p;$$

where  $\rho_p = \sum_{\rho \in S(H)} p(\rho) \rho$ . The direct part was proven by Schumacher [1], and Jozsa and Schumacher [2], and the converse part was proven by Barnum et al. [14] in the pure state case. In the mixed case, Koashi and Imoto [3] discussed this problem as follows. Indeed, if the source has trivial redundancies, we can compress up to more than the rate  $H(\Gamma_p)$ . We consider the source to have trivial redundancy if

the support  $S(p)$  of  $p$  satisfies the following. The Hilbert space  $H$  is decomposed as (2) satisfying the conditions (i) and (ii):

$$H = \bigoplus_{j=1}^M H_{j,1} \oplus H_{K,1} \quad (2)$$

(i) Any element  $\rho \in S(p)$  is commutative with  $P_1$ , where  $P_1$  denotes the projection to the subspace  $H_{j,1} \oplus H_{K,1}$ .

(ii) The state  $\frac{\text{Tr}_{H_{j,1}} \rho_{P_1}}{\text{Tr} \rho_{P_1}}$  is independent of  $\rho \in S(p)$ .

Precisely, we should state that the conditions (i) and (ii) hold almost everywhere for  $p$ . In this case, without loss of information, we can transform  $\rho$  to  $\rho_{P_1}$ . When the encoder sends the state  $\rho_{P_1}$  instead of  $\rho$ , the decoder can recover the state  $\rho$  from the state  $\rho_{P_1}$ . This fact implies that we can compress up to the rate  $H(p) - \log \dim H_{K,1}$ , i.e.  $R_p$ . Koashi and Imoto also proved the opposite inequality, i.e. proved the equation

$$R_p = H(p) - \log \dim H_{K,1} \quad (3)$$

where the RHS of (3) is given by the nest decomposition satisfying (i) and (ii). Following their proof, we can understand that if  $\limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \log \dim H_n < R_p$ ,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (E^n; D^n) > 0; \quad (4)$$

which is called the weak converse. When the support of  $p$  consists of pure states, if  $\limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \log \dim H_n < R_p = H(p)$ , we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (E^n; D^n) = 1; \quad (5)$$

which is called the strong converse, and was proven by Winter [15] in the first time. A more simple proof was given by Hayashi [16]. However, the strong converse in the mixed states case is an open problem. Moreover, in the pure states case, the optimal exponent of average error was treated by Hayashi [16].

### III. QUANTUM UNIVERSAL VARIABLE-LENGTH SOURCE CODING

In the variable-length case, we need describe a quantum measurement with state evolution, by using an instrument consisting of a decomposition  $E^0 = \{E_i^0\}_{i=1}^2$ , by CPMs from  $S(H)$  to  $S(H_i)$  under the condition  $\sum_{i=1}^2 \text{Tr} E_i^0(\rho) = 1; \forall \rho \in S(H)$ . When we perform the instrument  $E^0 = \{E_i^0\}_{i=1}^2$  for an initial state  $\rho$ , we get the data  $i$  and the final state  $\frac{E_i^0(\rho)}{\text{Tr} E_i^0(\rho)}$  with the probability  $\text{Tr} E_i^0(\rho)$ . A quantum variable-length encoder  $E$  is given by a measurement process  $E^0$  and encoding process  $E_i^0$  depending the data  $i$ , which is a TP-CP map from  $S(H)$  to  $S(H_i)$ , where the Hilbert space  $H_i$  depends on the data  $i$ , as

$$E_i = E_i^0 \circ E_i^0:$$

Therefore, any quantum variable-length encoder  $E$  consists of a decomposition  $E = \{E_i\}_{i=1}^2$ , by CPMs from  $S(H)$  to  $S(H_i)$  under the condition  $\sum_{i=1}^2 \text{Tr} E_i(\rho) = 1; \forall \rho \in S(H)$ . For a detail about instruments, see Ozawa [11, 12, 13].

The decoder is given by a set of TP-CP maps  $D = \{D_i\}_{i=1}^2$ , which presents the decoding process depending the data  $i$ . A pair of an encoder  $E = \{E_i\}_{i=1}^2$  and a decoder  $D = \{D_i\}_{i=1}^2$  is called a quantum variable-length source code on  $H$ . The coding length is described by  $\log j + \log \dim H_j$ , which is a random variable obeying the probability  $P^E(i) = \text{Tr} E_i(\rho)$  when the input state is  $\rho$ . Of course, any quantum variable-length source code can be regarded as a quantum fixed-length source code whose length is the maximum of  $\log j + \log \dim H_j$ .

When the state  $\sim_n$  on  $H^n$  obeys the iid. distribution  $p^n$  of the probability  $p$  on  $S(H)$ , the error of decoding for a variable-length code  $(E^n; D^n)$  on  $H^n$  is evaluated by Bures distance as

$$\sum_{\sim_n \in S(H^n)} \text{Tr} E_{\sim_n}^n (\sim_n) b^2 \sim_n; D_{\sim_n} = \frac{E_{\sim_n}^n (\sim_n)}{\text{Tr} E_{\sim_n}^n (\sim_n)} ;$$

and the average error is given by

$$\sum_{\sim_n \in S(H^n)} p^n(\sim_n) \sum_{\sim_n \in S(H^n)} \text{Tr} E_{\sim_n}^n (\sim_n) b^2 \sim_n; D_{\sim_n} = \frac{E_{\sim_n}^n (\sim_n)}{\text{Tr} E_{\sim_n}^n (\sim_n)} : \quad (6)$$

In this case, the data  $\sim_n$  obeys the probability:

$$P_{p^n}^{E^n}(\sim_n) = \sum_{\sim_n \in S(H^n)} p^n(\sim_n) \text{Tr} E_{\sim_n}^n (\sim_n) = \text{Tr} E_{\sim_n}^n (\Gamma_p^n) : \quad (7)$$

A sequence  $f(E^n; D^n)$  of quantum variable-length source code is called universal for a probability family  $P$  on  $S(H)$  if

$$\sum_{\sim_n \in S(H^n)} (E^n; D^n) \rightarrow 0$$

for any probability  $p \in P$ .

As guaranteed by Theorem 1, we can reduce the coding rate to the admissible rate  $H(\Gamma_p)$  with a sufficiently small error and a probability infinitely close to 1, asymptotically, i.e. there exists a quantum universal variable-length source code  $f(E^n; D^n)$  satisfying that

$$\lim_{p^n} P_{p^n}^{E^n} \frac{1}{n} (\log j_n + \log \dim H_{\sim_n}) - H(\Gamma_p) + \epsilon = 0; \quad \epsilon > 0; \forall p \in P : \quad (8)$$

Conversely, if a quantum variable-length source code  $f(E^n; D^n)$  is universal for a family  $P$  and

$$\lim_{p^n} P_{p^n}^{E^n} \frac{1}{n} (\log j_n + \log \dim H_{\sim_n}) - R = 0; \quad (9)$$

then  $R = R_p$  because the inequality (9) implies the existence of a fixed-length code with the rate  $R$  and an asymptotically small error. When two probabilities  $p, q \in P$  satisfy that  $\Gamma_p = \Gamma_q$ , equation (7) guarantees that  $P_{p^n}^{E^n} = P_{q^n}^{E^n}$ . Thus, any quantum universal variable-length source code  $f(E^n; D^n)$  satisfies the inequality

$$\inf R \lim_{p^n} P_{p^n}^{E^n} \frac{1}{n} (\log j_n + \log \dim H_{\sim_n}) - R = 0 \quad \sup_{q \in P : \Gamma_p = \Gamma_q} R_q :$$

Therefore, the inequalities

$$H(\Gamma_p) \leq \sup_{f(E^n; D^n) \text{ univ. for } P} \inf R \lim_{p^n} P_{p^n}^{E^n} \frac{1}{n} (\log j_n + \log \dim H_{\sim_n}) - R = 0 \quad \sup_{q \in P : \Gamma_p = \Gamma_q} R_q \quad (10)$$

hold. When the support of  $p$  consists of pure states, since the admissible rate  $R_p$  equals  $H(\Gamma_p)$ , the RHS of (10) equals  $H(\Gamma_p)$  i.e. our code is optimal. However, in the mixed states case, the admissible rate  $R_p$  of a probability  $p$  is rarely less than  $H(\Gamma_p)$ . (See equation (3).) In this rare case, our code cannot up to the admissible rate  $R_p$ . When for any  $\sim \in S(H)$  there exists a probability  $q \in P$  such that  $\Gamma_q = \sim$  and  $R_q = H(\Gamma_q)$ , the RHS of (10) equals  $H(\Gamma_p)$ , although the admissible rate  $R_p$  is less than  $H(\Gamma_p)$ . In this case, our code is optimal for any probability  $p \in P$ .

Next, we discuss the exponent of the over flow probability:  $P_{p^n}^{E^n} \frac{1}{n} (\log j_n + \log \dim H_{\sim_n}) - R$ .

**Theorem 1** For any family  $P$ , there exists a quantum variable-length source code  $f(E^n; D^n)$  on  $H^n$  which satisfies the condition that  $\sum_{\sim_n \in S(H^n)} (E^n; D^n)$  tends to 0 uniformly for  $p \in P$  and that

$$\lim_{p^n} \frac{1}{n} \log P_{p^n}^{E^n} \frac{1}{n} (\log j_n + \log \dim H_{\sim_n}) - R = \inf_{q \in P : \Gamma_q = \sim} \min_{V \text{ unitary}} D(\Gamma_q \| \Gamma_p^k V \Gamma_p^V); \quad (11)$$

where  $D(k)$  is quantum relative entropy  $\text{Tr}(\log k - \log \sim)$ .

Of course, when the set  $S = \{ \rho_p \}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$  is unitary invariant, the RHS equals  $\inf_{q \in \mathcal{P}} D(\rho_q \| \rho_p)$ . We construct a quantum variable-length source code satisfying (11) in section IV. Indeed, as is guaranteed by the following theorem, our code is optimal in the sense of the exponent of the decreasing rate of the overflow probability when  $\inf_{q \in \mathcal{P}} D(\rho_q \| \rho_p) = \inf_{q \in \mathcal{P}} \min_{\rho \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{unitary}}} D(\rho \| \rho_q) = \inf_{q \in \mathcal{P}} D(\rho_q \| \rho_p)$ .

**Theorem 2** If a sequence  $\{(\mathbb{E}^n; D^n)\}$  of quantum variable-length source codes on  $H^n$  is universal for a family  $\mathcal{P}$ , then

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \log P_{\mathcal{P}^n}^{\mathbb{E}^n} \leq \frac{1}{n} (\log j_n + \log \dim H^n) \leq \inf_{q \in \mathcal{P}} D(\rho_q \| \rho_p). \quad (12)$$

Of course, when the family consists of all probabilities on  $S(H)$ , the RHS of (11) and the RHS of (12) coincide, i.e. our code is optimal in the sense of the exponent of the overflow probability.

#### IV. CONSTRUCTION OF A QUANTUM VARIABLE-LENGTH SOURCE CODE

First, we construct a universal quantum variable-length source code that achieves the optimal rate (11) for the family of all probabilities on  $S(H)$ . This family is covariant for the actions of the  $d$ -dimensional special unitary group  $SU(d)$ , and any  $n$ -i.i.d. distribution  $p^n$  is invariant for the action of the  $n$ -th symmetric group  $S_n$  on the tensored space  $H^n$ . Thus, our code should satisfy the invariance for these actions on  $H^n$ .

Now, we focus on the irreducible decomposition of the tensored space  $H^n$  concerning the representations of  $S_n$  and  $SU(d)$ , and define the Young index  $n$  as,

$$n = (n_1; \dots; n_d); \quad n_i = n; n_{i+1} = 0; \quad i=1$$

and denote the set of Young indices  $n$  by  $Y_n$ . Young index  $n$  uniquely corresponds to the irreducible unitary representation of  $S_n$  and the one of  $SU(d)$ . Now, we denote the representation space of the irreducible unitary representation of  $S_n$  ( $SU(d)$ ) corresponding to  $n$  by  $V_n$  ( $U_n$ ), respectively. In particular, regarding a unitary representation of  $SU(d)$ , Young index  $n$  gives the highest weight of the corresponding representation. Then, the tensored space  $H^n$  is decomposed as follows; i.e.  $H^n$  is equivalent with the following direct sum space under the representation of  $S_n$  and  $SU(d)$ .

$$H^n = \bigoplus_n^M W_n; \quad W_n = U_n \otimes V_n;$$

For details, see Weyl [18], Goodman and Wallach [19], and Iwahori [20]. The efficiency of this representation method was discussed from several viewpoints. Regarding fixed-length source coding, it was discussed by Jozsa et. al. [4]. Regarding quantum relative entropy, it was by Hayashi [21]. Regarding quantum hypothesis testing, it was by Hayashi [22]. Regarding estimation of spectrum, it was by Keyel and Werner [8].

In the following, for an intuitive explanation of our construction, we naively construct a good variable-length code in the case  $H = \mathbb{C}^2$ . For this construction, we need a strictly increasing sequence  $a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  of real numbers such that  $\frac{1}{2} = a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_l < a_{l+1} = 1$ . We define the encoder  $E^{a,m}$  whose data set  $\{f_1; \dots; f_l\}$  by

$$\begin{aligned} H_i^{a,m} &= \frac{n}{n} \cdot \frac{n-1}{n-2} [a_i; a_{i+1}) W_n \quad i=1::l-1 \\ H_l^{a,m} &= \frac{n}{n} \cdot \frac{n-1}{n-2} [a_l; a_{l+1}] W_n \\ E_i^{a,m}(n) &= P_i^{a,m} P_i^{a,m}; \quad n \in S(H): \end{aligned}$$

and define the decoder  $D_i^{a,m}$  as the embedding from  $H_i^{a,m}$  to  $H^n$ , where we denote the projection to  $H_i^{a,m}$  by  $P_i^{a,m}$ . When the larger eigenvalue of the mixture  $\bar{\rho}_p$  belongs to the interval  $[a_i; a_{i+1})$ , as is guaranteed by Lemma 5 in Appendix A, if the larger eigenvalue of the mixture  $\bar{\rho}_p$  does not lie on the boundary on the interval  $[a_i; a_{i+1})$ , the probability  $\text{Tr} \bar{\rho}_p^n P_i^{a,m}$  tends to 1. Thus, we can prove  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (E^{a,m}; D^{a,m}) = 0$ . Its speed depends on the divergence between the probability and the boundary. Of course, if we choose  $a_{i+1} - a_i$  to be sufficiently small, the coding length is close to the entropy  $H(\bar{\rho}_p)$  with almost probability

1. However, when the larger eigenvalue lies on the boundary, the state is demolished, as is caused by the same reason of Lemma 2. In this case, similarly to Lemma 2, we can prove

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (E^{a_n}; D^{a_n}) > 0:$$

Now, we assume that the interval  $a_{i+1} - a_i$  ( $i = 2; \dots; l-1$ ) is  $\frac{1}{2}$  and that  $a_2 - a_1; a_{l+1} - a_l < \frac{1}{2}$ . Then, our code is uniquely defined by the choice of  $a_2 \in (\frac{1}{2}; \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2^n})$ . For the non-demolition of initial states, we construct a variable-length code, by choosing  $a_2 \in (\frac{1}{2}; \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2^n})$ ;  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_g$  at random. In this protocol, we can expect that the average error tends to 0 for any probability  $p$  on  $S(\mathbb{C}^2)$ . Note that the set  $\{f_n^k; k \in \mathbb{Z}_g\}$  corresponds to the data set  $\mathbb{Z}_g$ . In order to achieve the rate  $H(\Gamma_p)$ , we need to choose the set  $\mathbb{Z}_g$  so that  $\frac{1}{n} \log |\mathbb{Z}_g| \rightarrow 0$ . It is essential for our code to restrict  $a_2$  to this lattice  $\{f_n^k; k \in \mathbb{Z}_g\}$ .

Moreover, for a fixed number  $n$ , when  $n$  is large, the demolition of initial state seems small and the coding length seems long. Therefore, roughly speaking, in this code for a finite number  $n$ , by choosing  $\epsilon$ , we can treat the trade-off between the coding length and the non-demolition of the input state.

Next, we generalize the above code to the  $d$ -dimensional case, and evaluate its average error. In order to satisfy the universality and the condition (11), we need choose  $\epsilon$  depending on  $n, m$  more carefully. For  $\epsilon > 0$  we define a subset  $Y_m$  of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  as

$$Y_m := \left\{ k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \mid k_i = n; \forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\} \right\};$$

and define an operator  $M_k^m$  for any element  $k \in Y_m$  as

$$\begin{aligned} M_k^m &:= \frac{1}{C_{1,d}(n)} P_k^m \\ P_k^m &:= \prod_{i=1}^m P_{n_i} \\ U_p &:= \left\{ q \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid q_k = q \right\} \\ C_{1,d}(x) &:= \# \left\{ k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \mid k_k = x; k_i = 0 \right\}; \end{aligned}$$

where  $P_n$  denotes the projection to  $W_n$ .

The number  $\# \{ k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus U_{n,m} \mid k_i = n \}$  is independent for  $n \in Y_m$  and equals  $C_{1,d}(n)$ . Thus, we have the relations

$$\prod_{k \in Y_m} M_k^m P_n = \frac{\# \{ k \in Y_m \mid k_i = n \}}{C_{1,d}(n)} P_n = P_n;$$

which implies the condition

$$\prod_{k \in Y_m} M_k^m = I;$$

The encoder  $E^m$  whose data set is  $Y_m$  is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} H_k^m &:= \prod_{i=1}^m W_{n_i} \\ E_k^m(n) &:= \prod_{i=1}^m M_{k_i}^m; \quad \forall n \in S(H^n); \end{aligned}$$

and the decoder  $D_k^m$  is defined as the embedding from  $H_k^m$  to  $H^n$ .

As is proven in Appendixes B and C, the quantum variable-length source code  $(E^m; D^m)$  on  $H^n$







where  $\mathbb{E}_{n,q}^n; D^n \frac{1}{n} (\log j_n + \log \dim H_{!_n}) < R$  denotes the conditional average of the total error under the condition  $\frac{1}{n} (\log j_n + \log \dim H_{!_n}) < R$ . Thus, we have the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{n,q}^n(\mathbb{E}^{R,n}; D^{R,n}) - \mathbb{E}_{n,q}^n(\mathbb{E}^n; D^n) \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{q^n}^n \frac{1}{n} (\log j_n + \log \dim H_{!_n}) - R + 1 - \mathbb{E}_{n,q}^n(\mathbb{E}^n; D^n \frac{1}{n} (\log j_n + \log \dim H_{!_n}) - R) \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{q^n}^n \frac{1}{n} (\log j_n + \log \dim H_{!_n}) - R = \mathbb{P}_{q^n}^n \frac{1}{n} (\log j_n + \log \dim H_{!_n}) - R : \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Since the support of  $q$  consists of pure states and  $H(\bar{q}) = R_q > R$ , we obtain the relation:

$$\mathbb{E}_{n,q}^n(\mathbb{E}^{R,n}; D^{R,n}) \rightarrow 1$$

which is called the strong converse part of the quantum fixed-length pure state source coding [15]. Since the universality guarantees the relation

$$\mathbb{E}_{n,q}^n(\mathbb{E}^n; D^n) \rightarrow 0; \quad (21)$$

we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{n,q} = \mathbb{P}_{q^n}^n \frac{1}{n} (\log j_n + \log \dim H_{!_n}) - R \rightarrow 1; \quad (22)$$

Using the monotonicity of quantum relative entropy, we have

$$nD(\bar{q}_q k_p^-) = D(\bar{q}_q^n k_p^{-n}) - \mathbb{P}_{n,q} \log \frac{\mathbb{P}_{n,q}}{\mathbb{P}_{n,p}} + (1 - \mathbb{P}_{n,q}) \log \frac{1 - \mathbb{P}_{n,q}}{1 - \mathbb{P}_{n,p}};$$

where we define  $\mathbb{P}_{n,p}$  similarly to (22). Since  $(1 - \mathbb{P}_{n,q}) \log(1 - \mathbb{P}_{n,p}) \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$\frac{\log \mathbb{P}_{n,p}}{n} = \frac{nD(\bar{q}_q k_p^-) + h(\mathbb{P}_{n,q})}{n\mathbb{P}_{n,q}} \rightarrow D(\bar{q}_q k_p^-);$$

where  $h(x)$  is the binary entropy  $-x \log x - (1-x) \log(1-x)$ . Now, we obtain inequality (12) in the pure states case.

Next, we proceed the general case. It follows from (4) and the inequality  $R < R_q$  that we have

$$\liminf_{n,q} \mathbb{E}_{n,q}^n(\mathbb{E}^{R,n}; D^{R,n}) > 0; \quad (23)$$

From (20) and (21), the relation  $\liminf_{n,q} \mathbb{P}_{n,q} > 0$  holds. There exists a POVM  $M^n = \{M_{!_n}^n\}$  such that

$$\text{Tr}_{!_n} M_{!_n}^n = \text{Tr}_{!_n} \mathbb{E}_{!_n}^n(\bar{q}_q); \quad \forall n \geq 2, S(H^n):$$

Letting

$$T_n = \sum_{!_n: \frac{1}{n} (\log j_n + \log \dim H_{!_n}) < R} M_{!_n}^n;$$

we have  $\mathbb{P}_{n,q} = \text{Tr}_{q^n} T_n$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{n,p} = \text{Tr}_{p^n} T_n$ . Thus, Lemma 1 guarantees that

$$\limsup \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}_{n,p} = D(\bar{q}_q k_p^-):$$

Now, the proof is completed.

## V I. D I S C U S S I O N

In our code, the nonzero number is essential. One may expect that the quantum variable-length source code  $\{ \mathbb{E}^{0,n}; D^{0,n} \} g$  is universal. However, this code destroys the input state by a quantum measurement as follows.

Lemma 2 Assume that  $d = 2$  and  $f_{j_1 i_1}; j_2 i_2$  is a CONS of  $C^2$ . If the support of  $p$  is pure states  $f_{j_1 i_1}; j_2 i_2$ , the average error  $\sum_{n,p} (E^{0,n}; D^{0,n})$  does not tends to 0.

As is understood from our proof of Theorem 1, bound (11) cannot be achieved unless  $\epsilon_n$  tends to 0. It seems essential to approximate the nonzero number  $\epsilon_n > 0$  to 0.

If we discuss quantum universal coding under another error  $\sum_{n,p} (E^n; D^n)$  instead of  $\sum_{n,p} (E^{0,n}; D^{0,n})$  (c.f. (6)):

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n,p} (E^n; D^n) &= \sum_{\substack{X \\ \sim_n 2 S(H)}} p^n(\sim_n) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^X \text{Tr} E_{i,n}^n(\sim_n) b_{i,n}^2(\sim_n) \\ \sim_n &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr} E_{i,n}^n(\sim_n) = \text{Tr} E_{i,n}^n(\sim_n); \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

we can use several strategies for quantum universal coding. For example, if we use  $n$  states only for the estimation of  $H(\Gamma_p)$ , we can reduce the error  $\sum_{n,p} (E^{0,n}; D^{0,n})$  to zero, asymptotically, by use of Jozsa et. al. protocol [4]. However, in this strategy, we cannot reduce the error  $\sum_{n,p}$  because the demolition of the first  $n$  states is crucial for this criterion.

Next, we discuss how rapidly the average error  $\sum_{n,p}$  tends to 0 in our code. Assume that  $d = 2$  and  $f_{j_1 i_1}; j_2 i_2$  is a CONS of  $C^2$ . Unless  $j_n > 0$  satisfies  $j_n < 1$ , the coding length always equals  $2n$ . Then, we can assume that  $j_n < 1$ .

Lemma 3 If the support of  $p$  is pure states  $f_{j_1 i_1}; j_2 i_2$ , the relation

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_{n,p} (E^{n,n}; D^{n,n}) = 0; \quad (25)$$

holds for any sequence  $f_{j_n}$  satisfying  $j_n < 1$ .

Therefore, it seems impossible to construct a universal code whose average error  $\sum_{n,p}$  exponentially tends to 0.

In general, even if  $R_p = H(\Gamma_p)$  for  $p \in P$ , the RHS of (11) does not necessarily coincide with the RHS of (12). For example, when

$$\begin{aligned} P &= \{p_t; t \in (0; 1=2)\}; \quad H(\Gamma_{p_t}) = R_{p_t}; \\ \frac{1}{p_t} &= \frac{t \cos^2(t) + (1-t) \sin^2(t)}{(1-2t) \cos(t) \sin(t)} = \frac{(1-2t) \cos(t) \sin(t)}{(1-t) \cos^2(t) + t \sin^2(t)} \end{aligned}$$

and  $\frac{1}{p_t}$  is continuous and one-to-one, the both sides of (10) coincide with  $H(\Gamma_{p_t})$  while the RHS of (11) is strictly smaller than the RHS of (12) as follows. For  $t_1, t_0 \in (0; 1=2)$ , we can calculate as:

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{t \in (0; 1=2)} \sup_{h(t_1) \leq V \text{ unitary}} D(\Gamma_{p_t} | K_{p_{t_0}}^{-1} V) &= d(t_1; t_0) \\ \inf_{t \in (0; 1=2)} \sup_{R_{p_t} > h(t_1)} D(\Gamma_{p_t} | K_{p_{t_0}}^{-1}) &= \cos^2(t) \frac{d(t; t_0)}{d(t; 1-t_0)} \\ &\quad + \sin^2(t) \frac{d(t; 1-t_0)}{d(t; t_0)}; \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} h(t) &= t \log t + (1-t) \log(1-t) \\ d(t; t_0) &= t \log \frac{t}{t_0} + (1-t) \log \frac{1-t}{1-t_0}; \end{aligned}$$

Thus, its difference equals  $\sin^2(t) \frac{d(t; 1-t_0)}{d(t; t_0)} - \cos^2(t) \frac{d(t; t_0)}{d(t; 1-t_0)} > 0$ . This gap is closely related to the ambiguity of the large deviation-type bounds in quantum estimation [17]. It seems very hard to match the upper bound and the lower bound concerning the exponent of the overflow probability in the general case.

## VII. CONCLUSION

We construct a quantum variable-length code satisfying equation (11). This is optimal in the sense of Theorem 2 when the family  $P$  consists of probabilities on  $S(H)$  with no trivial redundancies. However, in our code the average error does not exponentially vanish. The construction of such a code seems to be difficult.

The authors wish to thank Professor H. Nagaoka and Dr. A. Winter for useful comments. They also thank an anonymous referee for useful comments.

## Appendix

### A. REPRESENTATION THEORETICAL TYPE METHOD

For our proof, we need the following two lemmas.

Lemma 4 The relation

$$\dim V_n \leq C(n) (n+d)^{2d} (n+d)^{2d} \exp -nH \frac{n}{n} \quad (26)$$

$$\# \{f_n\} \leq (n+1)^d \quad (27)$$

$$\dim U_n = (n+1)^d \quad (28)$$

holds, where  $C(n)$  is defined as

$$C(n) := \frac{n!}{n_1! n_2! \dots n_d!} :$$

Proof: Inequality (27) is trivial. Using Young index  $n$ , the basis of  $U_n$  is described by  $f_{e_n} g_{n^0} Y^n$ , where  $Y^n$  is defined as

$$Y^n = \sum_{i=1}^d n_i^0 f_{e_i} g_{n^0} Z^d = \sum_{i=1}^d n_i^0 f_{e_i} g_{n^0} Z^d = \sum_{i=1}^d n_i^0 f_{e_i} g_{n^0} Z^d : \\ s \text{ is any permutation}$$

Thus, we obtain (28). Note that the correspondence  $n^0$  and  $e_n$  depends on the choice of Cartan subalgebra, i.e. the choice of basis of  $\mathfrak{h}$ .

According to Weyl [18], Iwahori [20], the following equation holds, and it is evaluated as

$$\dim V_n = \frac{n!}{(n_1+d-1)!(n_2+d-2)!\dots n_d!} \sum_{j>i} (n_i - n_j - i + j) \\ \frac{n!}{n_1! n_2! \dots n_d!} \sum_{j>i} (n_i - n_j - i + j) = C(n) (n+d)^{2d} \\ (n+d)^{2d} \exp -nH \frac{n}{n} :$$

■

The following is essentially equivalent to Keyl and Werner's result [8]. For the reader's convenience, we give a simpler proof.

Lemma 5 Assume that  $p$  is the spectrum of  $\rho$  such that  $p_1 = p_2 = \dots = p_d$ . The following relations

$$\text{Tr} P_n = (n+d)^{3d} \exp -nD \frac{n}{n} p \quad (29)$$

$$\sum_{\frac{n}{n} \in R} \text{Tr} P_n = (n+d)^{4d} \exp -nm \ln D(qkp) \quad (30)$$

hold for a subset  $R$  of  $R_+^{d+1}$ .

Proof: Let  $U_n^0$  be an irreducible representation of  $SU(d)$  in  $H^n$ , which is equivalent to  $U_n$ . We denote its projection by  $P_n^0$ . Now, we choose the basis  $f_{e_n} g_{n^0} Y^n$  of  $U_n^0$  depending the basis  $f_{e_i}$  of  $\mathfrak{h}$ .

The base  $e_{n^0}$  is the eigenvector of  $P_n$  with the eigenvalue  $\prod_{i=1}^d a_i^{n_i^0}$ . Since  $n^0$  is majorized by  $n$ , we can calculate the operator norm by

$$\|P_n^0\| = \prod_{i=1}^d a_i^{n_i^0}; \quad (31)$$

where  $\|X\| = \sup_{\|x\|_2=1} \|Xx\|_2$ . from (26), (28) and (31), the relations

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} P_n^0 &= \dim V_n \cdot \text{Tr} P_n^0 = (n+d)^{3d} C(n) \prod_{i=1}^d a_i^{n_i^0} \\ &= (n+d)^{3d} \text{Mul}(a; n) \end{aligned}$$

hold, where we denote the multinomial distribution of  $a$  by  $\text{Mul}(a; \cdot)$ . Thus, we obtain (29). Inequality (27) guarantees

$$\sum_{\frac{n}{n^0} \geq R} \text{Tr} P_n^0 = (n+d)^{4d} \exp(-n \inf_{q \geq R} D(q \| p)) : \quad \blacksquare$$

## B. PROOF OF (14) AND (18)

First, we prove inequality (14). For a sufficiently large integer  $n$ , the relations

$$|Y_{j,n}| \leq \sum_{k=1}^d |Y_{k,n}| \leq (n+1)^d$$

hold. Since  $\dim U_n = (n+d)^d$ , for any  $k \in Y_{j,n}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log |Y_{j,n}| + \log \dim H_k^{j,n} &\leq d \log(n+1) + \max_{n^0 \in Y_{j,n} \setminus U_{k,n}} \log \dim U_n + \log \dim V_n \\ &\leq 4d \log(n+d) + \max_{n^0 \in Y_{j,n} \setminus U_{k,n}} n H\left(\frac{n}{n^0}\right) : \end{aligned}$$

From (30), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} M_k^{j,n} &\leq \frac{|Y_{j,n}|}{C_{1,d}(n)} (n+d)^{3d} \max_{n^0 \in Y_{j,n} \setminus U_{k,n}} \exp(-n D(\frac{n}{n^0} \| p)) \\ &\leq (n+d)^{4d} \max_{n^0 \in Y_{j,n} \setminus U_{k,n}} \exp(-n D(\frac{n}{n^0} \| p)) \\ &\leq (n+d)^{4d} \max_{q \in U_{k,n}^{d+1} \setminus R_+^{d+1}} \exp(-n D(q \| p)) : \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\frac{n}{n^0}}^{E,n} &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_X \log |Y_{j,n}| + \log \dim H_k^{j,n} \leq R \\ &\quad + \text{Tr} M_k^{j,n} \\ &\leq \max_{k \in Y_{j,n}} \max_{n^0 \in Y_{j,n} \setminus U_{k,n}} H\left(\frac{n}{n^0}\right) + R + \frac{4d}{n} \log(n+d) \\ &\leq |Y_{j,n}| (n+d)^{4d} \max_{n^0 \in Y_{j,n} \setminus U_{k,n}} \max_{q \in U_{k,n}^{d+1} \setminus R_+^{d+1}} \exp(-n D(q \| p)) \\ &\quad + (n+d)^{5d} \max_{q \in R_+^{d+1} \setminus (q) \in R} \max_{q^0 \in R_+^{d+1} \setminus q} \exp(-n D(q^0 \| p)) : \end{aligned}$$

Then, we obtain (14).



Inequality (13) follows from (33) and (37).

Similarly to (33), we can prove

$$\mathbb{E}_{n,p}(\mathbb{E}^m; D^m) \leq 1 + \sum_{k \geq 2Y_n} \frac{1}{C_{1,d}(n)} \text{Tr}_{p^n P_k}^{-n} m^{\frac{3}{2}};$$

which implies (16).

In the general case, similarly to (33), we can prove that

$$\mathbb{E}_{n,p}(\mathbb{E}^m; D^m) \leq 1 + \sum_{k \geq 2Y_{i_1, n}(S)} \frac{1}{C_{1,d}(n)} \text{Tr}_{p^n P_k}^{-n} m^{\frac{3}{2}}; \quad (38)$$

Since  $Y_{i_1, n}(S) \setminus U_{n,p,m-1} = Y_n \setminus U_{n,p,m-1}$ , we can prove that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \geq 2Y_{i_1, n}(S)} \frac{1}{C_{1,d}(n)} \text{Tr}_{p^n P_k}^{-n} m^{\frac{3}{2}} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{C_{1,d}(n)} \sum_{k \geq 2Y_n \setminus U_{n,p,m-1}} \text{Tr}_{p^n P_k}^{-n} m^{\frac{3}{2}} \\ & \leq \frac{C_{2,d}(n)}{C_{1,d}(n)} \leq 1 + (n+d)^{4d} \exp(-nC_{3,d}(1)^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}; \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Inequality (17) follows from (38) and (39).

#### D. PROOF OF LEMMA 2

In this case, the average error is calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{n,p}(\mathbb{E}^{0,m}; D^{0,m}) &= 1 + \sum_{e_n} \sum_{n_2 \in Y_n} p(e_n) (\mathbb{E}_{n,p} \mathbb{E}_{n_2} i)^{\frac{3}{2}} \\ &= 1 + \sum_{e_n} p(e_n) \sum_{n_2 \in Y_n} (\mathbb{E}_{n,p} \mathbb{E}_{n_2} i)^{\frac{3}{2}}; \end{aligned}$$

where  $e_n = e_{i_1} e_{i_2}$ ,  $i_n \in H^n$ . We define  $n(e_n) = (n_1(e_n); n_2(e_n))$  by

$$n_i(e_n) = \# \{j \in [1;n] : e_{i_j} = e_i\}; \quad (40)$$

Now, we focus a typical element  $e_n$ , i.e.  $\frac{n_i(e_n)}{n} = p_i$ . The number satisfying (40) is  $\frac{n(e_n)}{n_2(e_n)}$ , and

$\dim V_n^0 = \frac{n}{n_2(e_n)} - \frac{n}{n_2(e_n) - 1}$ , where  $n(e_n) = (n_1(e_n); n_2(e_n)) \in Y_n$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{n,p} \mathbb{E}_{n(e_n)} i &= \frac{n-1}{n_2(e_n)} + \frac{n}{n_2(e_n)} \frac{n}{n_2(e_n)-1} \\ &= 1 + \frac{n_2(e_n)}{n_1(e_n) + 1} = \frac{\frac{n_1(e_n)}{n} + \frac{1}{n}}{\frac{n_1(e_n)}{n} + \frac{1}{n}} = \frac{p_1 + p_2}{p_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $x^{\frac{3}{2}} + y^{\frac{3}{2}} \leq (x+y)^{\frac{3}{2}}$  for  $0 < x, y < 1$ , we can evaluate

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n \geq 2Y_n} (\mathbb{E}_{n,p} \mathbb{E}_{n(e_n)} i)^{\frac{3}{2}} \leq \sum_{n \geq 2Y_n} (\mathbb{E}_{n,p} \mathbb{E}_{n(e_n)} i)^{\frac{3}{2}} + (\mathbb{E}_{n,p} \mathbb{E}_{n(e_n)}^0 i)^{\frac{3}{2}} \\ &= 1 + \frac{p_1 + p_2}{p_1}^{\frac{3}{2}} + \frac{p_1 + p_2}{p_1}^{\frac{3}{2}} \\ &= \frac{p_2}{p_1}^{\frac{3}{2}} + \frac{p_1 + p_2}{p_1}^{\frac{3}{2}} < 1; \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (E^{0^n}; D^{0^n}) = 1 - \frac{p_2}{p_1}^{\frac{3}{2}} + \frac{p_1 - p_2}{p_1}^{\frac{3}{2}} > 0:$$

### E. PROOF OF LEMMA 3

For any  $n \geq Y_n; \epsilon_n > 0$ , we denote  $(\lfloor n_1 - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_n \rfloor; \lfloor n_2 - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_n \rfloor) \in Y_n$  by  $k(n; \epsilon_n)$ , where  $\lfloor x \rfloor$  is defined as the maximum integer  $n$  satisfying  $n \leq x$ . The element  $k(n; \epsilon_n)$  satisfies

$$n = (n_1; n_2) \in U_{k(n; \epsilon_n); \epsilon_n} \\ (n_1 + 1; n_2 - 1) \notin U_{k(n; \epsilon_n); \epsilon_n}:$$

For any  $\epsilon_n > 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (E^{0^n}; D^{0^n}) \\ &= \sum_{\epsilon_n=0}^{\infty} p^n(\epsilon_n) \sum_{k \in Y_n} \frac{1}{C_{1;d}(n)} (\text{Tr} P_{k(n; \epsilon_n)}^m)^{\frac{3}{2}} A \\ &= \sum_{\epsilon_n=0}^{\infty} p^n(\epsilon_n) \sum_{k \in k(n; \epsilon_n) \in Y_n} \frac{1}{C_{1;d}(n)} (\text{Tr} P_{k(n; \epsilon_n)}^m)^{\frac{3}{2}} + \sum_{k \in Y_n \setminus k(n; \epsilon_n)} \frac{1}{C_{1;d}(n)} (\text{Tr} P_{k(n; \epsilon_n)}^m)^{\frac{3}{2}} A \\ &= \sum_{\epsilon_n=0}^{\infty} p^n(\epsilon_n) \frac{1}{C_{1;d}(n)} (\text{Tr} P_{k(n; \epsilon_n)}^m)^{\frac{3}{2}} + \frac{1}{C_{1;d}(n)} (\text{Tr} P_{k(n; \epsilon_n)}^m)^{\frac{3}{2}} \\ &= \sum_{\epsilon_n=0}^{\infty} p^n(\epsilon_n) \frac{1}{C_{1;d}(n)} \text{Tr} P_{k(n; \epsilon_n)}^m (\text{Tr} P_{k(n; \epsilon_n)}^m)^{\frac{3}{2}} \\ &= \sum_{\epsilon_n=0}^{\infty} p^n(\epsilon_n) \frac{1}{C_{1;d}(n)} \text{Tr} P_{k(n; \epsilon_n)}^m (\text{Tr} P_{k(n; \epsilon_n)}^m)^{\frac{3}{2}} \\ &= \sum_{\epsilon_n=0}^{\infty} p^n(\epsilon_n) \frac{1}{C_{1;d}(n)} \frac{p_1 - p_2}{p_1} \frac{p_1 - p_2}{p_1}^{\frac{3}{2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{C_{1;d}(n)} \frac{p_1 - p_2}{p_1} \frac{p_1 - p_2}{p_1}^{\frac{3}{2}} \frac{1}{2^{Y_n}} \frac{p_1 - p_2}{p_1} \frac{p_1 - p_2}{p_1}^{\frac{3}{2}}: \end{aligned}$$

Note that the RHS is independent of  $\epsilon_n > 0$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \log \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (E^{0^n}; D^{0^n}) &= \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{1}{2^{Y_n}} + \log \frac{p_1 - p_2}{p_1} \frac{p_1 - p_2}{p_1}^{\frac{3}{2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \log 2(n+1)^2 - \log \frac{p_1 - p_2}{p_1} \frac{p_1 - p_2}{p_1}^{\frac{3}{2}} > 0: \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain (25).

- 
- [1] B. Schumacher, "Quantum coding," Phys. Rev. A, 51, 2738-2747, (1995).  
 [2] R. Jozsa and B. Schumacher, "A new proof of the quantum noiseless coding theorem," J. Mod. Optics, 41 (12), 2343-2349, (1994).  
 [3] M. Koashi and N. Imoto "Compressibility of Mixed-State Signals," Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 017902 (2001). LANL eprint quant-ph/0103128, (2001).  
 [4] R. Jozsa, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki and R. Horodecki, "Universal Quantum Information Compression," Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 1714 (1998). LANL eprint quant-ph/9805017.

- [5] T. J. Lynch, \Sequence time coding for data compression," *Proc. IEEE*, 54, 1490-1491, (1966).
- [6] L. D. D avisson, \Comments on 'Sequence time coding for data compression'," *Proc. IEEE*, 54, 2010, (1966).
- [7] I. C siszar and J. K omer, *Information Theory: Coding Theorem s for D iscrete M em oryless System s*, (Academ ic Press, New York, 1981).
- [8] M . K eyland R . F . W eimer, \Estim ating the spectrum of a density operator," *Phys.Rev.A* 64, 052311 (2001). LANL eprint quant-ph/0102027, (2001).
- [9] C . K rattenthanler and P . B . Slater \A sym ptotic Redundancies for U niversal Q uantum Coding," *IEEE Trans. IT* -46, 801-819 (2000).
- [10] B . Schum acher and M . D . W estmoreland \Indeterm inate-length quantum coding," *Phys.Rev.A* 64, 042304 (2001). LANL eprint quant-ph/0011014 (2000).
- [11] M . O zawa, *J. M ath. Phys.* 25, 79 (1984).
- [12] M . O zawa, *M athem atical characterizations of m easurement statistics*, in *Q uantum Communication and M easurement*, edited by V . P . Belavkin et al., Plenum Press, New York, 1995.
- [13] M . O zawa, *Phys.Rev.A* 62, 062101 (2000).
- [14] H . B amum , C . A . Fuchs, R . Jozsa and B . Schum acher, \G eneral Fidelity L im it for Q uantum Channels," *Phys.Rev.A* , 54, 4707-4711 (1996).
- [15] A . W inter, \Coding Theorem s of Q uantum Information Theory," Ph.D .dissertation, UniB ielefeld, (2000). LANL eprint quant-ph/9907077, (1999).
- [16] M . H ayashi, \Exponents of quantum xed-length pure state source coding," LANL eprint quant-ph/0202002 (2002).
- [17] M . H ayashi, \Two quantum analogues of Fisher information from a large deviation viewpoint of quantum estimation," LANL eprint quant-ph/0202003 (2002).
- [18] H . W eyl, *The classical groups, their invariants and representations*, (P rinceton, 1939).
- [19] R . G oodm an and N . W allach, *Representations and Invariants of the C lassical G roups*, (C am bridge U niversity Press, 1998).
- [20] N . Iwahori, *Taishougun to Ippansenkeigun no Hyougenron*, (Iwanam i, Tokyo, 1978). (In Japanese)
- [21] M . H ayashi, \A sym ptotics of quantum relative entropy from a representation theoretical viewpoint," *J. Phys. A : M ath. and Gen.* 34, 3413-3419 (2001). LANL eprint e-print quant-ph/9704040, (1997).
- [22] M . H ayashi, \O ptim al sequence of POVM s in the sense of Stein's lem m a in quantum hypothesis," LANL eprint quant-ph/0107004, (2001).
- [23] T . O gawa and H . N agaoka, \Strong C onverse and Stein's Lem m a in the Q uantum Hypothesis Testing," *IEEE Trans. IT* -46, 2428-2433 (2000). LANL eprint quant-ph/9906090, (1999).