

# Coherent information of a quantum channel or its complement is generically positive

Satvik Singh<sup>1,2,\*</sup> and Nilanjana Datta<sup>2,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physical Sciences,  
Indian Institute of Science Education and Research (IISER) Mohali, Punjab, India.*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics,  
University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom*

(Dated: July 2, 2021)

The task of determining whether a given quantum channel has positive capacity to transmit quantum information is a fundamental open problem in quantum information theory. In general, the coherent information needs to be computed for an unbounded number of copies of a channel in order to detect a positive value of its quantum capacity. However, in this Letter, we show that the coherent information of a *single copy* of a *randomly selected channel* is positive almost surely if the channel's output space is larger than its environment. Hence, in this case, a single copy of the channel typically suffices to determine positivity of its quantum capacity. Put differently, channels with zero coherent information have measure zero in the subset of channels for which the output space is larger than the environment. On the other hand, if the environment is larger than the channel's output space, identical results hold for the channel's complement.

## I. INTRODUCTION

According to quantum mechanics, the most general physical transformation that a quantum system can undergo is described by a quantum channel. Consequently, quantum channels serve as quantum analogues of classical communication channels and are hence ubiquitous in quantum information-processing protocols. Prime examples of noisy communication channels acting on finite-dimensional (or *discrete*) quantum systems (e.g. spin-1/2 electronic qubits) include depolarizing- [1], amplitude damping- [2], dephasing-[3] and erasure channels [4]; see also [5, 6]. In contrast, quantum communication using *continuous variable* quantum systems (e.g. quantized radiation modes of the electromagnetic field) is modelled via channels acting on infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces [7–9]. Depending on the type of physical medium (e.g. atomic, optical, etc.) used for encoding quantum information, numerous impressive schemes for controlled experimental implementations of important quantum channels (both in finite and infinite dimensions) have been reported [10–19]; see the reviews in [20, 21] as well.

Mathematically, a quantum channel is a completely positive and trace-preserving linear map defined between spaces of operators describing states of quantum systems. Stinespring's dilation theorem asserts that the action of a channel can be represented as a unitary evolution on an enlarged system consisting of the quantum system on which the channel acts and its environment; without loss of generality, the latter can initially be assumed to be in a fixed pure state. Discarding the environment (by tracing over its associated Hilbert space) from the resulting uni-

tarily evolved composite system then yields the output of the channel, whereas discarding the quantum system yields the output of a *complementary* channel. Hence, the leakage of information by the channel to the environment is modelled by its complement. Unsurprisingly, this leakage crucially affects the channel's capacity to transmit quantum information.

Computing the transmission capacities of a channel – which quantify the fundamental limits on reliable communication through it – constitute a central problem in quantum information theory. Unlike a classical channel, a quantum channel can be used to transmit either classical [22, 23] or quantum information [24, 25]. The rate of this communication might be enhanced by the use of auxiliary resources (e.g. shared entanglement between the sender and the receiver [26, 27]) and might also depend on the nature of the states being used as inputs over multiple uses of the channel (i.e. product states or entangled states [25]). Moreover, the information to be transmitted might be private [28]. These considerations lead to different notions of capacities of a quantum channel, in contrast to the classical setting where the capacity of a classical channel is uniquely defined. In this paper, we focus on the *quantum capacity* of a quantum channel, which quantifies the maximum rate at which quantum information can be transmitted coherently and reliably through it, in the absence of any auxiliary resource. By the seminal works of Lloyd [24], Shor [29], and Devetak [28], we know that the quantum capacity  $\mathcal{Q}(\Phi)$  of a quantum channel  $\Phi$  admits a *regularized* formula involving an optimization of an entropic quantity over infinitely many successive and independent uses of the channel:

$$\mathcal{Q}(\Phi) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi^{\otimes n})}{n}, \quad (1)$$

\* satviksingh2@gmail.com

† n.datta@damtp.cam.ac.uk

where

$$\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi) := \max_{\rho} I_c(\rho; \Phi) \quad \text{and} \quad (2)$$

$$I_c(\rho; \Phi) := S[\Phi(\rho)] - S[\Phi_c(\rho)]. \quad (3)$$

In the above definition,  $\Phi_c$  denotes a channel which is *complementary* to  $\Phi$ , and  $S(\rho) := -\text{Tr}(\rho \log_2 \rho)$  is the *von Neumann entropy* of the quantum state  $\rho$ . The quantity  $\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi)$  is called the *coherent information* of  $\Phi$ , which trivially bounds the quantum capacity from below:  $\mathcal{Q}(\Phi) \geq \mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi)$ . However, explicit computation of the quantum capacity is usually intractable because of two reasons. Firstly, Eq. (2) is an instance of a non-concave optimization problem which allows for the existence of local maxima that are not global. Secondly, the coherent information is often strictly *superadditive* [25, 30] (i.e.  $\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi^{\otimes n}) > n\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi)$ ), which implies that the  $n \rightarrow \infty$  regularization in Eq. (1) is necessary.

An important class of channels for which the coherent information is *additive* (i.e.  $\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi^{\otimes n}) = n\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi)$ ) and hence equal to the quantum capacity ( $\mathcal{Q}(\Phi) = \mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi)$ ) is that of *degradable* channels [31]. These channels strictly lie within the set of the so-called *more capable* channels [32], whose defining property is that their complementary channels have zero quantum capacity. Furthermore, there exist pairs of quantum channels (say  $\Phi_1$  and  $\Phi_2$ ), each of which have zero quantum capacity, but which can be used together to transmit quantum information, i.e.  $\mathcal{Q}(\Phi_1 \otimes \Phi_2) > 0$ . This startling effect (known as *superactivation* [33]) is a purely quantum phenomenon because classically, if two channels have zero capacity, the joint channel has zero capacity as well.

The above discussion sheds light on the significance of the set of zero capacity quantum channels. However, even after years of stringent efforts, this set is very poorly understood. At the heart of it, the problem lies in determining if a given quantum channel can be used to reliably transmit quantum information in the absence of any other resource. Until recently, there was no known systematic procedure to solve this problem, except for two special classes of channels, namely, *PPT* and *anti-degradable* channels [34]. Significant progress, however, has recently been made on this issue [35, 36]. In [36], we employed some basic techniques from analytic perturbation theory of Hermitian matrices to develop a sufficient condition for a quantum channel to have positive quantum capacity. By exploiting this result, a plethora of important examples of quantum channels were shown to have positive capacities.

In this Letter, we apply perturbative techniques to *random quantum channels* to obtain an astonishing result: *typically* (or *almost surely*), the coherent information of a randomly selected channel (or that of its complement) is guaranteed to be positive, depending on whether the channel's output space is larger than its environment (Theorem III.3). Random quantum channels have proved to be very useful in establishing generic properties of quantum channels. For instance, they were used by Hay-

den and Winter [37, 38] to disprove the multiplicativity of the maximal  $p$ -norm of a channel for all  $p > 1$ . Hastings also employed random channels to disprove that the minimum output entropy of a channel is additive [39], hence disproving the famous set of globally equivalent additivity conjectures [40] that had been the focus of much research for over a decade. Random channels have also found applications in various other fields which include, for example, the study of information scrambling and chaos in open quantum systems [41, 42], and exploring holographic dualities in theories of quantum gravity [43]. See also [44] and references therein.

Our result amounts to saying that typically, whenever the dimension of the output space of a channel  $\Phi$  is larger than that of its environment, only a single copy of the channel suffices to detect its ability to transmit quantum information, in the sense that the regularized formula for the quantum capacity (Eq. (1)) attains a positive value at just the  $n = 1$  level:  $\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi) > 0$ . This is in stark contrast to the general picture, where it is known that an unbounded number of uses of a channel may be required to detect its quantum capacity [45], i.e., for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exist examples of channels  $\Phi$  for which  $\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi^{\otimes n}) = 0$  yet  $\mathcal{Q}(\Phi) > 0$ . In light of this result, it is surprising how a simple dimensional inequality between the output and environment spaces of a channel drastically simplifies the problem of quantum capacity detection in almost all the cases: both the hurdles of performing regularization in Eq. (1) and solving a non-concave optimization problem in Eq. (2) are eliminated in one stroke!

An equivalent formulation of Theorem III.3 provides a useful structural insight into the set of quantum channels with zero coherent information, which strictly contains the set of channels with zero quantum capacity. We show that within the subset of those channels for which the dimension of the output space is larger than that of the environment, channels  $\Phi$  with  $\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi) = 0$  contribute no volume (in a well-defined measure-theoretic sense). Similarly, channels  $\Phi$  with  $\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi_c) = 0$  contribute no volume to the subset of those channels for which the environment dimension is larger than that of the output space. In particular, if we consider the set of all channels defined between a pair of fixed input and output spaces as a subset of some Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , channels  $\Phi$  with  $\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi_c) = 0$  reside on the boundary, thus having zero (Lebesgue) volume (Theorems III.4 and III.5). Since all channels  $\Phi$  that are currently known to have additive coherent information (e.g. degradable channels) have  $\mathcal{Q}(\Phi_c) = 0$  (i.e. they are more capable), the above result indicates that the occurrence of channels with additive coherent information is very rare.

## II. PREREQUISITES

We denote the algebra of all  $d \times d$  complex matrices by  $\mathcal{M}_d$  and the identity matrix in  $\mathcal{M}_d$  by  $\mathbb{1}_d$ . The convex compact set of all *quantum states* in  $\mathcal{M}_d$  is denoted by

$\mathcal{S}_d := \{\rho \in \mathcal{M}_d : \rho \geq 0 \text{ and } \text{Tr} \rho = 1\}$ .

A linear map  $\Phi : \mathcal{M}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{out}}}$  is called a *quantum channel* if it is completely positive and trace preserving (CPTP). We collect all quantum channels  $\Phi : \mathcal{M}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{out}}}$  in the convex compact set  $\mathcal{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}$ . All quantum channels in this paper are assumed to be defined on a non-trivial input space ( $d > 1$ ). The *Choi matrix* of a given channel  $\Phi : \mathcal{M}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{out}}}$  is defined as:

$$J(\Phi) := (\Phi \otimes \text{id}) |\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega|, \quad \text{where} \quad (4)$$

$|\Omega\rangle := \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} |i\rangle \otimes |i\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$  is a maximally entangled unnormalized state, and  $\text{id} : \mathcal{M}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_d$  is the identity map [46, 47].

We say that two quantum channels  $\Phi : \mathcal{M}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{out}}}$  and  $\Phi_c : \mathcal{M}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{env}}}$  are *complementary* to each other if there exists an isometry  $V : \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{d_{\text{out}}} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_{\text{env}}}$  such that for all  $X \in \mathcal{M}_d$ ,

$$\Phi(X) = \text{Tr}_{\text{env}}(VXV^\dagger), \quad \Phi_c(X) = \text{Tr}_{\text{out}}(VXV^\dagger). \quad (5)$$

If  $\mathcal{C}_\Phi$  denotes the set of all quantum channels that are complementary to  $\Phi$ , then the *minimal environment* and *output* dimensions of  $\Phi$  are defined, respectively, as:

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{env}}^*(\Phi) &:= \min\{d_{\text{env}} : \exists \Phi_c \in \mathcal{C}_\Phi, \Phi_c : \mathcal{M}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{env}}}\}, \\ d_{\text{out}}^*(\Phi) &:= d_{\text{env}}^*(\Phi_c), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where  $\Phi_c \in \mathcal{C}_\Phi$  is complementary to  $\Phi$ . It is easy to see that the definition of  $d_{\text{out}}^*(\Phi)$  does not depend on the choice of  $\Phi_c \in \mathcal{C}_\Phi$  (see [36, Remark 2.1] or Lemma II.1 below). The following Lemma provides a simple way to compute the minimal output and environment dimensions of any given channel.

**Lemma II.1.** [36, Lemma 2.2] *For a channel  $\Phi : \mathcal{M}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{out}}}$  and some complementary channel  $\Phi_c \in \mathcal{C}_\Phi$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{env}}^*(\Phi) &= \text{rank } J(\Phi) = \text{rank } \Phi_c(\mathbb{1}_d) \\ d_{\text{out}}^*(\Phi) &= \text{rank } J(\Phi_c) = \text{rank } \Phi(\mathbb{1}_d). \end{aligned}$$

Given a quantum channel  $\Phi : \mathcal{M}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{out}}}$ , we have already seen that its *quantum capacity*  $\mathcal{Q}(\Phi)$  admits the regularized expression given in Eq. (1). We define the *complementary coherent information* and the *complementary quantum capacity* of  $\Phi$ , respectively, as

$$\mathcal{Q}_c^{(1)}(\Phi) := \mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi_c) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Q}_c(\Phi) := \mathcal{Q}(\Phi_c), \quad (7)$$

where  $\Phi_c \in \mathcal{C}_\Phi$  is complementary to  $\Phi$ . It can be easily shown that the above mentioned capacity expressions do not depend on the choice of  $\Phi_c \in \mathcal{C}_\Phi$ . Moreover, in all quantum capacity computations, it can be assumed without loss of generality that the channel  $\Phi : \mathcal{M}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{out}}}$  and its complement  $\Phi_c : \mathcal{M}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{env}}}$  are minimally defined, i.e.  $d_{\text{out}} = d_{\text{out}}^*(\Phi)$  and  $d_{\text{env}} = d_{\text{env}}^*(\Phi)$ , see [36, Remark 2.4]. In the above terminology, a channel  $\Phi : \mathcal{M}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{out}}}$  is called *more capable* if  $\mathcal{Q}_c(\Phi) = 0$ .

### III. MAIN RESULTS

Let us begin by recalling the main ideas that were employed in [36] to obtain a simple sufficient condition to detect positive quantum capacities of quantum channels. Since  $\mathcal{Q}(\Phi) \geq \mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi)$  for any channel  $\Phi$ , the natural first step in showing that  $\mathcal{Q}(\Phi) > 0$  would be to show that  $\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi) > 0$ . To do so, we begin with an arbitrary pure state  $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ , for which it is evident that  $I_c(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|; \Phi) = 0 \implies \mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi) \geq 0$ , since both  $\Phi(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$  and  $\Phi_c(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$  have identical non-zero eigenvalues (for any  $\Phi_c \in \mathcal{C}_\Phi$ ), see [3, Theorem 3]. Now, the idea is to slightly perturb the pure input state with a mixed state  $\sigma$  and check if the coherent information becomes positive. To this end, let  $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$  and define

$$\rho(\epsilon) = (1 - \epsilon) |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + \epsilon\sigma,$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi[\rho(\epsilon)] &= (1 - \epsilon)\Phi(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) + \epsilon\Phi(\sigma), \\ \Phi_c[\rho(\epsilon)] &= (1 - \epsilon)\Phi_c(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) + \epsilon\Phi_c(\sigma). \end{aligned}$$

At  $\epsilon = 0$ , let us focus on the  $\lambda = 0$  eigenvalue of the unperturbed outputs  $\Phi(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$  and  $\Phi_c(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$  with multiplicities  $\kappa = \dim \ker \Phi(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$  and  $\kappa_c = \dim \ker \Phi_c(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$ , respectively. When  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\Phi[\rho(\epsilon)]$  and  $\Phi_c[\rho(\epsilon)]$  have exactly  $\kappa$  and  $\kappa_c$  eigenvalues  $\{\lambda_j(\epsilon)\}_{j=1}^\kappa$  and  $\{\lambda_k^c(\epsilon)\}_{k=1}^{\kappa_c}$ , respectively, which converge to zero as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  and admit convergent power series expansions in a neighborhood of  $\epsilon = 0$  [48, Chapter 1]:

$$\lambda_j(\epsilon) = 0 + \lambda_{j1}\epsilon + \lambda_{j2}\epsilon^2 \dots \quad \lambda_k^c(\epsilon) = 0 + \lambda_{k1}^c\epsilon + \lambda_{k2}^c\epsilon^2 \dots$$

By feeding the above analytic expressions for the eigenvalues into the formula for coherent information  $I(\epsilon) := I_c(\rho(\epsilon); \Phi)$  (Eq. (3)), it can be shown that

$$I'(\epsilon) = \left[ \sum_{j:\lambda_{j1} \neq 0} \lambda_{j1} - \sum_{k:\lambda_{k1}^c \neq 0} \lambda_{k1}^c \right] \log_2 \frac{1}{\epsilon} + K(\epsilon),$$

where  $K(\epsilon)$  is bounded in  $\epsilon$ . Notice that the only unbounded contribution to the derivative comes from the non-zero first order correction terms  $\lambda_{j1}$  and  $\lambda_{j1}^c$ , which are known to be equal to the non-zero eigenvalues of  $K_\psi \Phi(\sigma) K_\psi$  and  $K_\psi^c \Phi(\sigma) K_\psi^c$ , where  $K_\psi$  and  $K_\psi^c$  are the orthogonal projections onto the unperturbed eigenspaces  $\ker \Phi(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$  and  $\ker \Phi_c(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$ , respectively; see [49, Section 3.7]. Hence, the expression in the parenthesis above is  $\text{Tr}(K_\psi \Phi(\sigma)) - \text{Tr}(K_\psi^c \Phi(\sigma))$ . If this is positive, it is easy to find a small enough interval  $(0, \delta)$  in which  $I'(\epsilon) > 0$ , implying that  $I(\epsilon)$  is also positive in the same interval (recall that  $I(0) = 0$ ). We summarize this result succinctly in the following theorem.

**Theorem III.1.** [36, Theorem 3.1] *Let  $\Phi$  and  $\Phi_c$  be complementary channels. Then,*

- $\mathcal{Q}(\Phi) \geq \mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi) > 0$  if  $\exists |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|, \sigma$  such that

$$\text{Tr}(K_\psi \Phi(\sigma)) > \text{Tr}(K_\psi^c \Phi(\sigma)).$$

- $\mathcal{Q}_c(\Phi) \geq \mathcal{Q}_c^{(1)}(\Phi) > 0$  if  $\exists |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|, \sigma$  such that  $\text{Tr}(K_\psi\Phi(\sigma)) < \text{Tr}(K_\psi^c\Phi_c(\sigma))$ .

Now, for any channel  $\Phi$  and an arbitrary pure state  $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ , it can be shown that

$$\text{rank } \Phi(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \leq \min\{d_{\text{out}}^*(\Phi), d_{\text{env}}^*(\Phi)\},$$

see [3, Theorem 3] and Lemma II.1. Hence, if we consider a pair of minimally defined complementary channels  $\Phi : \mathcal{M}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{out}}}$  and  $\Phi_c : \mathcal{M}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{env}}}$  (with  $d_{\text{out}} < d_{\text{env}}$ , say) and assume that there exists a state  $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$  with  $\text{rank } \Phi(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = \min\{d_{\text{out}}, d_{\text{env}}\} = d_{\text{out}}$ , then it is clear that  $K_\psi = 0$  but  $K_\psi^c \neq 0$ , so that

$$0 = \text{Tr}(K_\psi\Phi(\mathbb{1}_d)) < \text{Tr}(K_\psi^c\Phi_c(\mathbb{1}_d)) \implies \mathcal{Q}_c(\Phi) > 0.$$

A similar argument can be applied when  $d_{\text{env}} < d_{\text{out}}$ . We thus arrive at the following crucial corollary.

**Corollary III.2.** [35, Section IV] [36, Corollary 3.2] *Let  $\Phi$  and  $\Phi_c$  be complementary channels such that there exists a pure state  $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$  with  $\text{rank } \Phi(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = \min\{d_{\text{out}}^*(\Phi), d_{\text{env}}^*(\Phi)\}$ . Then,*

- $d_{\text{out}}^*(\Phi) > d_{\text{env}}^*(\Phi) \implies \mathcal{Q}(\Phi) \geq \mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi) > 0$ .
- $d_{\text{out}}^*(\Phi) < d_{\text{env}}^*(\Phi) \implies \mathcal{Q}_c(\Phi) \geq \mathcal{Q}_c^{(1)}(\Phi) > 0$ .

Once the minimal output and environment dimensions of a given channel are computed with the help of Lemma II.1, the difficult step in applying the above corollary is to ascertain the existence of a pure state that gets mapped to a maximal rank output state [50]. This problem can be linked to the problem of determining whether a given matrix subspace contains a full rank matrix, which is known to be hard [51, 52]. It is easy to find examples of channels that map every pure state to a rank deficient output state (e.g. the Werner-Holevo channel [53]). However, it turns out that the desired pure state exists for *almost all channels*, in the sense that a channel which is selected *randomly* (according to the distribution defined below) maps at least one pure state to a maximal rank output state almost surely (i.e. with probability one; see [54, Remark S6]).

There are different ways of sampling random channels from the set of all channels with given input and output dimensions (see e.g. [55] for a detailed review). A natural way to obtain a random channel stems from the consideration of the Stinespring isometry of a channel. First, we fix the input and output dimensions to be  $d > 1$  and  $d_{\text{out}}$ , respectively, and hence focus on channels in the set  $\mathcal{C}_{d, d_{\text{out}}}$ . Then, for every environment dimension  $d_{\text{env}}$  satisfying  $d \leq d_{\text{out}}d_{\text{env}}$ , we select a random isometry  $V : \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{d_{\text{out}}} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_{\text{env}}}$  according to the Haar measure on the set of all such isometries [54, Eq. (S4)]. This is equivalent to a uniformly random selection of a  $d$ -dimensional subspace from the collection of all  $d$ -dimensional subspaces (also called the *Grassmannian space*) of the composite output-environment space  $\mathbb{C}^{d_{\text{out}}} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_{\text{env}}}$ . The random channel  $\Phi : \mathcal{M}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{out}}}$  is then defined as

$$\Phi(X) = \text{Tr}_{\text{env}}(VXV^\dagger),$$

and we say that  $\Phi$  is distributed according to the *Stinespring probability measure*  $\mu_{d, d_{\text{out}}}^{\text{denv}}$  (denoted  $\Phi \sim \mu_{d, d_{\text{out}}}^{\text{denv}}$ ). Now, it can be shown that a  $d_{\text{out}}d_{\text{env}} \times d$  random Haar isometry  $V$  contains at least one column vector  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^{d_{\text{out}}} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_{\text{env}}}$  with full Schmidt rank =  $\min\{d_{\text{out}}, d_{\text{env}}\}$  almost surely [54, Theorem S3], so that  $\Phi \sim \mu_{d, d_{\text{out}}}^{\text{denv}}$  sends at least one pure state to a maximal rank output state almost surely. Moreover, it is known that the measures  $\mu_{d, d_{\text{out}}}^{\text{denv}}$  are supported within the subset of channels with  $d_{\text{out}}^*(\Phi) = \min\{d_{\text{out}}, dd_{\text{env}}\}$  and  $d_{\text{env}}^*(\Phi) = \min\{d_{\text{env}}, dd_{\text{out}}\}$ , i.e.  $\Phi \sim \mu_{d, d_{\text{out}}}^{\text{denv}}$  has the stated minimal output/environment dimensions almost surely, see [55, Section 3]. Therefore, if  $d_{\text{env}} \neq d_{\text{out}}$  and  $\Phi \sim \mu_{d, d_{\text{out}}}^{\text{denv}}$ , Corollary III.2 can be readily applied to infer that  $\Phi$  or its complement has positive coherent information almost surely. The necessary measure-theoretic background needed to rigorously formulate the above discussion and the full proof of the main result stated below is included in the Supplemental Material [54].

**Theorem III.3.** *Let  $\Phi : \mathcal{M}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{out}}}$  be a random quantum channel distributed according to the Stinespring probability measure  $\mu_{d, d_{\text{out}}}^{\text{denv}}$ . Then,*

- $\mathcal{Q}(\Phi) \geq \mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi) > 0$  almost surely if  $d_{\text{out}} > d_{\text{env}}$ .
- $\mathcal{Q}_c(\Phi) \geq \mathcal{Q}_c^{(1)}(\Phi) > 0$  almost surely if  $d_{\text{out}} < d_{\text{env}}$ .

Let us now discuss an important special case of the above theorem in some detail. For simplicity, let us consider the set  $\mathcal{C}_d := \mathcal{C}_{d, d}$  consisting of quantum channels with input and output dimensions both equal to  $d$ . Then, for every  $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}_d$ , its Choi matrix  $J(\Phi)$  is a  $d^2 \times d^2$  Hermitian matrix defined by  $d^4$  real parameters. Complete positivity of  $\Phi$  forces  $J(\Phi)$  to be positive semi-definite and the trace-preserving property  $\text{Tr}_1[J(\Phi)] = \mathbb{1}_d$  enforces  $d^2$  additional constraints on  $J(\Phi)$ . Hence, the Choi isomorphism  $J$  identifies  $\mathcal{C}_d$  with a convex compact set  $J(\mathcal{C}_d) \subset \mathbb{R}^D$  with  $D = d^4 - d^2$ , thus allowing us to define the uniform *Lebesgue measure* (denoted  $\mu_{\text{Leb}}$ ) on  $\mathcal{C}_d$  by normalizing the standard Lebesgue measure on the ambient Euclidean space. It turns out that the earlier defined Stinespring probability measure on  $\mathcal{C}_d$  for  $d_{\text{env}} = d^2$  is equal to the Lebesgue measure, i.e.  $\mu_{d, d}^{\text{denv}} = \mu_{\text{Leb}}$  [55, Proposition 3]. Thus, one special case of Theorem III.3 can be restated as follows.

**Theorem III.4.** *Let  $\Phi : \mathcal{M}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_d$  be a random quantum channel distributed uniformly according to the Lebesgue measure  $\mu_{\text{Leb}}$ . Then,*

$$\mathcal{Q}_c(\Phi) \geq \mathcal{Q}_c^{(1)}(\Phi) > 0 \text{ almost surely.}$$

Notice that the above result amounts to saying that quantum channels with zero complementary coherent information contribute no Lebesgue volume to the set of all channels. Perhaps a geometric interpretation would provide a more insightful description of this result. Since  $J_d := J(\mathcal{C}_d)$  is a compact convex subset of  $\mathbb{R}^D$  (with

the standard Euclidean metric), it makes sense to talk about the usual topological interior  $\text{int}(J_d)$  and boundary  $\partial J_d$  of  $J_d$ , so that the following disjoint splitting occurs:  $J_d = \text{int}(J_d) \cup \partial J_d$ . Now, it is easy to show that  $J(\Phi) \in \text{int} J_d \iff \text{rank} J(\Phi) = d^2$  [56, Proposition 15]. Interestingly, for channels  $\Phi \in \mathfrak{C}_d$  with  $d_{\text{env}}^*(\Phi) = \text{rank} J(\Phi) > d(d-1)$ , a pure state which gets mapped to a maximal rank output state always exists [50], so that Corollary III.2 can be readily applied to deduce that  $\mathcal{Q}_c^{(1)}(\Phi) > 0$ . Hence, it is clear that every channel  $\Phi \in \mathfrak{C}_d$  with  $J(\Phi) \in \text{int} J_d$  is such that  $\mathcal{Q}_c^{(1)}(\Phi) > 0$ . In other words, all channels  $\Phi \in \mathfrak{C}_d$  with zero complementary coherent information must lie within the boundary  $\partial J_d$ , which clearly has no Lebesgue volume. We state the above conclusion in the form of a theorem below.

**Theorem III.5.** *Quantum channels  $\Phi : \mathcal{M}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_d$  with zero complementary coherent information – including all more capable channels and hence all degradable channels as well – lie within the topological boundary of the ambient convex compact set  $\mathfrak{C}_d \subset \mathbb{R}^D$  with  $D = d^4 - d^2$ .*

#### IV. CONCLUSION

The task of detecting whether a given quantum channel  $\Phi$  has positive quantum capacity generally requires computation of the coherent information  $\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi^{\otimes n})$  of an arbitrarily large number  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  of copies of the channel

[45]. However, whenever the output space of  $\Phi$  is larger than its environment, we have shown that only a single copy of  $\Phi$  typically suffices to detect its ability to reliably transmit quantum information, i.e.,  $\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi) > 0$  almost surely. In other words, the set of all quantum channels with zero coherent information  $\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi) = 0$  contribute no volume to the subset of channels for which the output space is larger than the environment. On the other hand, if the channel's output space is smaller than its environment, we have shown that identical results hold for the channel's complement. Our work opens up several new avenues of research, some of which we list below:

- Can the above stated results be strengthened if a finite number  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  (with  $n > 1$ ) of copies of a given channel are allowed to be used in Eq. (1) for detection of its quantum capacity?
- What can be said about the coherent information and the quantum capacity of a randomly selected channel when its output space is equal in size or smaller than the environment?
- It would be interesting to see if the results of this Letter can be extended to randomly selected quantum channels in infinite dimensions.

**Acknowledgements.** The authors would like to thank Ludovico Lami for his helpful feedback on a first draft of this paper.

- 
- [1] C. King, The capacity of the quantum depolarizing channel, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **49**, 221 (2003).
- [2] V. Giovannetti and R. Fazio, Information-capacity description of spin-chain correlations, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 032314 (2005).
- [3] C. King, K. Matsumoto, M. Nathanson, and M. Ruskai, Properties of conjugate channels with applications to additivity and multiplicativity, *Markov Processes And Related Fields* **13**, 391 (2007).
- [4] M. Grassl, T. Beth, and T. Pellizzari, Codes for the quantum erasure channel, *Phys. Rev. A* **56**, 33 (1997).
- [5] M. M. Wilde, *Quantum Information Theory* (Cambridge University Press, 2009).
- [6] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information: 10th Anniversary Edition*, 10th ed. (Cambridge University Press, USA, 2011).
- [7] A. S. Holevo, *Quantum Systems, Channels, Information* (De Gruyter, 2012).
- [8] S. L. Braunstein and P. van Loock, Quantum information with continuous variables, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **77**, 513 (2005).
- [9] C. Weedbrook, S. Pirandola, R. García-Patrón, N. J. Cerf, T. C. Ralph, J. H. Shapiro, and S. Lloyd, Gaussian quantum information, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **84**, 621 (2012).
- [10] B. Marques, A. A. Matoso, W. M. Pimenta, A. J. Gutiérrez-Esparza, M. F. Santos, and S. Pádua, Experimental simulation of decoherence in photonics qudits, *Scientific Reports* **5**, 10.1038/srep16049 (2015).
- [11] M. Ricci, F. D. Martini, N. J. Cerf, R. Filip, J. Fiurášek, and C. Macchiavello, Experimental purification of single qubits, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 170501 (2004).
- [12] A. Shaham and H. S. Eisenberg, Realizing controllable depolarization in photonic quantum-information channels, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 022303 (2011).
- [13] Y.-C. Jeong, J.-C. Lee, and Y.-H. Kim, Experimental implementation of a fully controllable depolarizing quantum operation, *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 014301 (2013).
- [14] I. Marcikic, H. de Riedmatten, W. Tittel, H. Zbinden, and N. Gisin, Long-distance teleportation of qubits at telecommunication wavelengths, *Nature* **421**, 509 (2003).
- [15] R. Ursin, T. Jennewein, M. Aspelmeyer, R. Kaltenbaek, M. Lindenthal, P. Walther, and A. Zeilinger, Quantum teleportation across the Danube, *Nature* **430**, 849 (2004).
- [16] H. Takesue, S. W. Nam, Q. Zhang, R. H. Hadfield, T. Honjo, K. Tamaki, and Y. Yamamoto, Quantum key distribution over a 40-dB channel loss using superconducting single-photon detectors, *Nature Photonics* **1**, 343 (2007).
- [17] C.-Z. Peng, T. Yang, X.-H. Bao, J. Zhang, X.-M. Jin, F.-Y. Feng, B. Yang, J. Yang, J. Yin, Q. Zhang, N. Li, B.-L. Tian, and J.-W. Pan, Experimental free-space distribution of entangled photon pairs over 13 km: Towards satellite-based global quantum communication, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 150501 (2005).
- [18] T. Schmitt-Manderbach, H. Weier, M. Fürst, R. Ursin, F. Tiefenbacher, T. Scheidl, J. Perdigues, Z. Sodnik, C. Kurt-

- siefer, J. G. Rarity, A. Zeilinger, and H. Weinfurter, Experimental demonstration of free-space decoy-state quantum key distribution over 144 km, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 010504 (2007).
- [19] S.-K. Liao, H.-L. Yong, C. Liu, G.-L. Shentu, D.-D. Li, J. Lin, H. Dai, S.-Q. Zhao, B. Li, J.-Y. Guan, W. Chen, Y.-H. Gong, Y. Li, Z.-H. Lin, G.-S. Pan, J. S. Pelc, M. M. Fejer, W.-Z. Zhang, W.-Y. Liu, J. Yin, J.-G. Ren, X.-B. Wang, Q. Zhang, C.-Z. Peng, and J.-W. Pan, Long-distance free-space quantum key distribution in daylight towards inter-satellite communication, *Nature Photonics* **11**, 509 (2017).
- [20] K. Hammerer, A. S. Sørensen, and E. S. Polzik, Quantum interface between light and atomic ensembles, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82**, 1041 (2010).
- [21] S. Slussarenko and G. J. Pryde, Photonic quantum information processing: A concise review, *Applied Physics Reviews* **6**, 041303 (2019).
- [22] B. Schumacher and M. D. Westmoreland, Sending classical information via noisy quantum channels, *Phys. Rev. A* **56**, 131 (1997).
- [23] A. Holevo, The capacity of the quantum channel with general signal states, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **44**, 269 (1998).
- [24] S. Lloyd, Capacity of the noisy quantum channel, *Phys. Rev. A* **55**, 1613 (1997).
- [25] D. P. DiVincenzo, P. W. Shor, and J. A. Smolin, Quantum-channel capacity of very noisy channels, *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, 830 (1998).
- [26] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Mixed-state entanglement and quantum error correction, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 3824 (1996).
- [27] C. H. Bennett, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and A. V. Thapliyal, Entanglement-assisted classical capacity of noisy quantum channels, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 3081 (1999).
- [28] I. Devetak, The private classical capacity and quantum capacity of a quantum channel, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **51**, 44 (2005).
- [29] P. Shor, The quantum channel capacity and coherent information, MSRI Workshop on Quantum Computation (2002).
- [30] F. Leditzky, D. Leung, and G. Smith, Dephasing channel and superadditivity of coherent information, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 160501 (2018).
- [31] I. Devetak and P. W. Shor, The capacity of a quantum channel for simultaneous transmission of classical and quantum information, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **256**, 287 (2005).
- [32] S. Watanabe, Private and quantum capacities of more capable and less noisy quantum channels, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 012326 (2012).
- [33] G. Smith and J. Yard, Quantum communication with zero-capacity channels, *Science* **321**, 1812 (2008).
- [34] G. Smith and J. A. Smolin, Detecting incapacity of a quantum channel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 230507 (2012).
- [35] V. Siddhu, Log-singularities for studying capacities of quantum channels (2020), [arXiv:2003.10367](https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.10367) [quant-ph].
- [36] S. Singh and N. Datta, Detecting positive quantum capacities of quantum channels (2021), [arXiv:2105.06327](https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.06327) [quant-ph].
- [37] P. Hayden and A. Winter, Counterexamples to the maximal p-norm multiplicativity conjecture for all  $p > 1$ , *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **284**, 263 (2008).
- [38] A. Montanaro, Weak multiplicativity for random quantum channels, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **319**, 535 (2013).
- [39] M. B. Hastings, Superadditivity of communication capacity using entangled inputs, *Nature Physics* **5**, 255 (2009).
- [40] P. W. Shor, Equivalence of additivity questions in quantum information theory, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **246**, 453 (2004).
- [41] P. Hosur, X.-L. Qi, D. A. Roberts, and B. Yoshida, Chaos in quantum channels, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2016**, 10.1007/jhep02(2016)004 (2016).
- [42] P. Zanardi and N. Anand, Information scrambling and chaos in open quantum systems (2021), [arXiv:2012.13172](https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.13172) [quant-ph].
- [43] P. Hayden, S. Nezami, X.-L. Qi, N. Thomas, M. Walter, and Z. Yang, Holographic duality from random tensor networks, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2016**, 10.1007/jhep11(2016)009 (2016).
- [44] R. Movassagh and J. Schenker, Theory of ergodic quantum processes (2020), [arXiv:2004.14397](https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.14397) [quant-ph].
- [45] T. Cubitt, D. Elkouss, W. Matthews, M. Ozols, D. Pérez-García, and S. Strelchuk, Unbounded number of channel uses may be required to detect quantum capacity, *Nature Communications* **6**, 10.1038/ncomms7739 (2015).
- [46] M.-D. Choi, Completely positive linear maps on complex matrices, *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **10**, 285 (1975).
- [47] A. Jamiołkowski, Linear transformations which preserve trace and positive semidefiniteness of operators, *Reports on Mathematical Physics* **3**, 275 (1972).
- [48] F. Rellich and J. Berkowitz, *Perturbation Theory of Eigenvalue Problems*, New York University. Institute of Mathematical Sciences (Gordon and Breach, 1969).
- [49] H. Baumgärtel, *Analytic perturbation theory for matrices and operators* (Birkhäuser Verlag, 1985).
- [50] Interestingly, the existence of a pure input state that gets mapped to a maximal rank output state is guaranteed if certain dimensional inequalities between the channel's input, output, and environment spaces hold, see ([35, Corollary I], [36, Corollaries 3.4 and 3.6]).
- [51] L. Lovász, Singular spaces of matrices and their application in combinatorics, *Boletim da Sociedade Brasileira de Matemática* **20**, 87 (1989).
- [52] L. Gurvits, Classical deterministic complexity of Edmonds' problem and quantum entanglement, in *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '03 (Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2003) p. 10–19.
- [53] R. F. Werner and A. S. Holevo, Counterexample to an additivity conjecture for output purity of quantum channels, *Journal*

of *Mathematical Physics* **43**, 4353 (2002).

- [54] See the Supplemental Material for the relevant measure-theoretic background and the complete proof of Theorem III.3 discussed in the main text, which contains the references [55, 57–62].
- [55] R. Kukulski, I. Nechita, L. Pawela, Z. Puchała, and K. Życzkowski, Generating random quantum channels (2021), [arXiv:2011.02994 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.02994).
- [56] E. Haapasalo, M. Sedlák, and M. Ziman, Distance to boundary and minimum-error discrimination, *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 062303 (2014).
- [57] P. Halmos, *Measure Theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics (Springer New York, 1976).
- [58] G. Edgar, *Measure, Topology, and Fractal Geometry*, Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics (Springer New York, 2008).
- [59] J. Ginibre, Statistical ensembles of complex, quaternion, and real matrices, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **6**, 440 (1965).
- [60] F. Mezzadri, How to generate random matrices from the classical compact groups, *Notices of the American Mathematical Society* **54**, 592 (2007).
- [61] D. Leung and G. Smith, Continuity of quantum channel capacities, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **292**, 201 (2009).
- [62] D. Kretschmann, D. Schlingemann, and R. F. Werner, The information-disturbance tradeoff and the continuity of Stinespring’s representation, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **54**, 1708 (2008).

## Supplemental Material: Coherent information of a quantum channel or its complement is generically positive

### I. MATHEMATICAL FOUNDATIONS OF RANDOMNESS

For the sake of completeness, we include some basics of measure theory in this appendix. Measure theory deals with the problem of sensibly defining a notion of volume for subsets of a given set  $\Omega$ . For example, if  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}$ , one defines a function (called the *Lebesgue measure*) which is a generalization of the usual notion of length for intervals. It is reasonable to demand that shifting a subset by a real number does not change its length and that the length of a countable disjoint union of subsets is just the sum of the individual lengths of the subsets. However, the *axiom of choice* forbids such a length function to be defined for all subsets of the real line  $\mathbb{R}$  [57, Section 16], and hence we must restrict the domain of definition of the length function to only a special kind of collection of subsets, called a  $\sigma$ -algebra. We will denote the empty subset of a set  $\Omega$  by  $\emptyset$ . For subsets  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subseteq \Omega$ ,  $\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{B} := \{x \in \mathcal{A} : x \notin \mathcal{B}\}$  is the set of all elements that are in  $\mathcal{A}$  but not in  $\mathcal{B}$ .

**Definition S1.** A collection  $\mathfrak{F}$  of subsets of a set  $\Omega$  is called a  $\sigma$ -algebra if:

- $\emptyset, \Omega \in \mathfrak{F}$ .
- $\mathcal{A} \in \mathfrak{F} \implies \Omega \setminus \mathcal{A} \in \mathfrak{F}$ .
- $\{\mathcal{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathfrak{F} \implies \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{A}_n \in \mathfrak{F}$ .

A pair  $(\Omega, \mathfrak{F})$  consisting of a set  $\Omega$  and a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{F}$  is called a *measurable space*, and the subsets in  $\mathfrak{F}$  are called *measurable*. The analogue of the notion of *continuous* functions between topological spaces is the notion of *measurable* functions between measurable spaces.

**Definition S2.** Let  $(\Omega_1, \mathfrak{F}_1)$  and  $(\Omega_2, \mathfrak{F}_2)$  be measurable spaces. A function  $f : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$  is said to be measurable (with respect to  $\mathfrak{F}_1$  and  $\mathfrak{F}_2$ ) if  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathfrak{F}_2 \implies \text{preim}_f(\mathcal{A}) := \{x \in \Omega_1 : f(x) \in \mathcal{A}\} \in \mathfrak{F}_1$ .

For a finite-dimensional complex vector space  $W$ , there is a unique way to turn  $W$  into a measurable space. We proceed by equipping  $W$  with the *standard topology*  $\tau_W$  induced by some norm on  $W$  (note that since  $W$  is a finite-dimensional complex vector space, it can be equipped with a norm and moreover, all norms on  $W$  are equivalent, so that the induced topology is uniquely defined). Now, let

$$\sigma(\tau_W) := \bigcap \{ \mathfrak{F} : \mathfrak{F} \text{ is a } \sigma\text{-algebra which contains } \tau_W \}. \quad (\text{S1})$$

It is easy to see that  $\sigma(\tau_W)$  is uniquely defined as the *minimal*  $\sigma$ -algebra which contains  $\tau_W$ , i.e. if  $\mathcal{G}$  is another  $\sigma$ -algebra which contains  $\tau_W$ , then  $\sigma(\tau_W) \subseteq \mathcal{G}$  [58, Theorem 5.2.1]. We say that  $\sigma(\tau_W)$  is the standard *Borel* sigma algebra on  $W$  (generated by the standard topology  $\tau_W$ ).

**Remark S3.** More generally, any topological space  $(\Omega, \tau)$  can be converted into a measurable space by defining  $\mathfrak{F} = \sigma(\tau)$  to be the *Borel sigma-algebra* generated by  $\tau$  in the sense of Eq. (S1).

**Remark S4.** It is easy to show that if  $(\Omega_1, \tau_1)$  and  $(\Omega_2, \tau_2)$  are two topological spaces and  $f : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$  is a continuous map (with respect to the standard topologies  $\tau_1$  and  $\tau_2$ ), then  $f$  is also measurable (with respect to the Borel sigma algebras  $\sigma(\tau_1)$  and  $\sigma(\tau_2)$ ).

We now introduce the central definition of a measure.

**Definition S5.** Let  $(\Omega, \mathfrak{F})$  be a measurable space. A set function  $\mu : \mathfrak{F} \mapsto [0, \infty]$  is said to be a measure on  $\Omega$  if  $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$  and if  $\mu$  is countably additive, i.e. for all countable pairwise disjoint collections of measurable subsets  $\{\mathcal{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathfrak{F}$ ,  $\mu(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{A}_n) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(\mathcal{A}_n)$ .

A triple  $(\Omega, \mathfrak{F}, \mu)$  consisting of a set  $\Omega$ , a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{F}$ , and a measure  $\mu : \mathfrak{F} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ , is called a *measure space*. Given a measure space  $(\Omega_1, \mathfrak{F}_1, \mu)$ , a measurable space  $(\Omega_2, \mathfrak{F}_2)$ , and a measurable function  $f : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$ , we can push the measure  $\mu$  from  $(\Omega_1, \mathfrak{F}_1)$  forward to  $(\Omega_2, \mathfrak{F}_2)$  via  $f$  to define the *push-forward* measure  $f_*(\mu) : \mathfrak{F}_2 \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  as

$$\forall \mathcal{A} \in \mathfrak{F}_2 : f_*(\mu)(\mathcal{A}) := \mu(\text{preim}_f(\mathcal{A})). \quad (\text{S2})$$

**Remark S6.** If  $(\Omega, \mathfrak{F}, \mu)$  is a measure space such that  $\mu(\Omega) = 1$ , then it is called a *probability space*. The measurable subsets  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathfrak{F}$  are then interpreted as events occurring with probability  $\mu(\mathcal{A})$  under the given probability rule defined by the set function  $\mu : \mathfrak{F} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ . An event  $\mathcal{A}$  is said to occur almost surely if  $\mu(\mathcal{A}) = 1 \iff \mu(\Omega \setminus \mathcal{A}) = 0$ .

**Remark S7.** In this paper, every finite dimensional complex vector space  $W$  comes equipped with the standard topology  $\tau_W$  and the associated Borel sigma algebra  $\sigma(\tau_W)$ . Similarly, any subset  $K \subseteq W$  comes equipped with the standard subset topology  $\tau_K$  (inherited from the standard topology on  $W$ ) and the associated Borel sigma algebra  $\sigma(\tau_K)$ . Hence, any measure on  $W$  (or  $K$ ) will always be assumed to be defined on the standard Borel sigma algebra  $\sigma(\tau_W)$  (or  $\sigma(\tau_K)$ ).

**Complex Ginibre distribution.** The set  $\mathcal{M}_{d_1 \times d_2} \simeq \mathbb{C}^{d_1 d_2}$  of complex  $d_1 \times d_2$  matrices comes equipped with the standard Lebesgue measure, which we denote by  $\mu_{\text{Leb}}$ . The complex Ginibre distribution,  $\mu_G$ , on  $\mathcal{M}_{d_1 \times d_2}$  is a probability measure defined as a product of the *standard complex Gaussian distributions* (one for each matrix entry):

$$d\mu_G(Z) = P(Z) d\mu_{\text{Leb}}(Z), \quad \text{where } \forall Z \in \mathcal{M}_{d_1 \times d_2} : P(Z) = \prod_{i=1}^{d_1} \prod_{j=1}^{d_2} \frac{e^{-|z_{ij}|^2}}{\pi} \quad (\text{S3})$$

and  $z_{ij}$  denotes the  $ij^{\text{th}}$  entry of  $Z$  [59].

**Lemma S8.** The set  $\mathcal{M}_{d_1 \times d_2}^*$  of all full rank matrices in  $\mathcal{M}_{d_1 \times d_2}$  is Borel measurable. Further,

$$\mu_G(\mathcal{M}_{d_1 \times d_2}^*) = 1.$$

*Proof.* Assume  $d_1 \leq d_2$ . Let  $f : \mathcal{M}_{d_1 \times d_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be defined as  $f(X) = \sum_I |\det X[I]|$ , where the sum runs over all index sets  $I \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, d_2\}$  of size  $|I| = d_1$  and  $X[I]$  is a matrix consisting of columns of  $X$  that are labelled by  $I$ . Clearly,  $f$  is continuous, so that  $\mathcal{M}_{d_1 \times d_2}^* = \mathcal{M}_{d_1 \times d_2} \setminus \text{preim}_f(\{0\})$  is Borel measurable.

The second claim amounts to saying that the set  $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{d_1}\}$  of vectors chosen independently and identically from  $\mathbb{C}^{d_2}$  according to the complex Ginibre distribution is linearly independent with probability one, which is a well-known fact.  $\square$

**Haar measures.** Let  $\mathcal{U}(d)$  denote the set of unitary matrices in  $\mathcal{M}_d$ . Being a compact topological group with respect to the standard subset topology and matrix multiplication as the group operation,  $\mathcal{U}(d)$  can be equipped with a unique left (or right) invariant *Haar* probability measure,  $\mu_{\text{Haar}}$ . For any  $d' \leq d$ , we denote the set of isometries  $V : \mathbb{C}^{d'} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^d$  by  $\mathcal{V}(d', d) := \{V \in \mathcal{M}_{d \times d'} : V^\dagger V = \mathbb{1}_{d'}\}$ . Then, the continuous map  $f : \mathcal{U}(d) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}(d', d)$  whose action is to remove the rightmost  $d - d'$  columns from the input unitary matrix, can be used to obtain the push-forward probability measure

$$\mu_{\text{Haar}}^\mathcal{V} := f_*(\mu_{\text{Haar}}), \quad (\text{S4})$$

which is called the *Haar* measure on  $\mathcal{V}(d', d)$ . There is an equivalent way to define  $\mu_{\text{Haar}}^\mathcal{V}$ , which we will employ in the proof of Theorem S3 below. We start with the complex Ginibre distribution  $\mu_G$  on the matrix space  $\mathcal{M}_{d \times d'}$ . Recall that according to Lemma S8,  $\mu_G(\mathcal{M}_{d \times d'}^*) = 1$ , where  $\mathcal{M}_{d \times d'}^*$  is the set of all full rank matrices in  $\mathcal{M}_{d \times d'}$ .

Now, if  $GS : \mathcal{M}_{d \times d'}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{V}(d', d)$  denotes the (continuous) *Gram Schmidt orthonormalization* map (performed on the linearly independent columns of the full rank input matrix), then the push-forward measure  $GS_*(\mu_G)$  turns out to be the Haar measure  $\mu_{\text{Haar}}^\mathcal{V}$  on  $\mathcal{V}(d', d)$ , see [60, Sections 4 and 5], i.e.,

$$\mu_{\text{Haar}}^\mathcal{V} = GS_*(\mu_G). \quad (\text{S5})$$

## II. RANDOM CHANNELS

Consider the set  $\mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}$  of all quantum channels  $\Phi : \mathcal{M}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{out}}}$  and for each  $d_{\text{env}} \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $d \leq d_{\text{out}}d_{\text{env}}$ , let  $\mathcal{V}(d, d_{\text{out}}d_{\text{env}})$  be the set consisting of all isometries  $V : \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{d_{\text{out}}} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_{\text{env}}}$ . Let us define a continuous map  $\Phi : \mathcal{V}(d, d_{\text{out}}d_{\text{env}}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}$  in the following fashion:

$$\forall V \in \mathcal{V}(d, d_{\text{out}}d_{\text{env}}), \forall X \in \mathcal{M}_d : \quad \Phi_V(X) = \text{Tr}_{\text{env}}(VXV^\dagger). \quad (\text{S6})$$

Now, by implementing a two step push-forward process via the mappings

$$\mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{out}}d_{\text{env}} \times d} \xrightarrow{GS} \mathcal{V}(d, d_{\text{out}}d_{\text{env}}) \xrightarrow{\Phi} \mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}, \quad (\text{S7})$$

we can construct the following probability measure on  $\mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}$

$$\mu_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}} := \Phi_*(\mu_{\text{Haar}}^{\mathcal{V}}) = \Phi_*(GS_*(\mu_G)). \quad (\text{S8})$$

Hence, for every input dimension  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  and output dimension  $d_{\text{out}} \in \mathbb{N}$ , the set  $\mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}$  of quantum channels can be endowed with a sequence of probability measures defined as in Eq. (S8), one for each positive integer  $d_{\text{env}} \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfying  $d \leq d_{\text{out}}d_{\text{env}}$ . For other probability measures that can be defined on  $\mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}$ , see e.g. [55].

## III. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULT

The following lemma establishes the continuity of the quantum capacity and coherent information functions.

**Lemma S1.** *The quantum capacity functions  $\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{Q}_c : \mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and the coherent information functions  $\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}, \mathcal{Q}_c^{(1)} : \mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are continuous.*

*Proof.* The diamond norm  $\|\cdot\|_\diamond$  on the set  $\mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}$  is defined as (see e.g. [5, Chapter 9]):

$$\|\Phi\|_\diamond := \sup\{\|(\text{id}_d \otimes \Phi)(X)\|_1 : X \in \mathcal{M}_d \otimes \mathcal{M}_d, \|X\|_1 \leq 1\},$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_1$  is the usual trace norm on the relevant matrix algebras. In [61], the authors proved the continuity of  $\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{Q}^{(1)} : \mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by showing that for all  $\Phi, \Psi \in \mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}$  and  $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ :

$$\|\Phi - \Psi\|_\diamond \leq \epsilon \implies |\mathcal{Q}(\Phi) - \mathcal{Q}(\Psi)|, |\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi) - \mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Psi)| \leq 8\epsilon \log d_{\text{out}} - 4[\epsilon \log \epsilon + (1 - \epsilon) \log(1 - \epsilon)].$$

Now, by employing [62, Theorem 1], it is clear that if  $\|\Phi - \Psi\|_\diamond \leq \epsilon$ , then there exist  $\Phi_c \in \mathfrak{C}_\Phi$  and  $\Psi_c \in \mathfrak{C}_\Psi$  with  $\Phi_c, \Psi_c : \mathcal{M}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{env}}}$  and  $\|\Phi_c - \Psi_c\|_\diamond \leq \epsilon_c = 2\sqrt{\epsilon}$ , implying that

$$|\mathcal{Q}_c(\Phi) - \mathcal{Q}_c(\Psi)|, |\mathcal{Q}_c^{(1)}(\Phi) - \mathcal{Q}_c^{(1)}(\Psi)| \leq 8\epsilon_c \log d_{\text{env}} - 4[\epsilon_c \log \epsilon_c + (1 - \epsilon_c) \log(1 - \epsilon_c)],$$

thus completing the proof.  $\square$

For fixed input and output dimensions  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  (with  $d > 1$ ) and  $d_{\text{out}} \in \mathbb{N}$ , respectively, we consider the set  $\mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}$  consisting of all quantum channels  $\Phi : \mathcal{M}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{out}}}$ . Let us collect all channels  $\Phi \in \mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}$  with zero quantum capacity and zero complementary quantum capacity, respectively, in the sets

$$\mathcal{Z}_{d,d_{\text{out}}} := \{\Phi \in \mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}} : \mathcal{Q}(\Phi) = 0\} \subset \{\Phi \in \mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}} : \mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi) = 0\} := \mathcal{Z}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{(1)} \quad (\text{S9})$$

$$\mathcal{Z}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^c := \{\Phi \in \mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}} : \mathcal{Q}_c(\Phi) = 0\} \subset \{\Phi \in \mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}} : \mathcal{Q}_c^{(1)}(\Phi) = 0\} := \mathcal{Z}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{(1c)} \quad (\text{S10})$$

Before proving the main result, let us recall Corollary III.2 from the main text.

**Corollary S2.** *Let  $\Phi$  and  $\Phi_c$  be complementary channels such that there exists a pure state  $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$  with  $\text{rank } \Phi(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = \min\{d_{\text{out}}^*(\Phi), d_{\text{env}}^*(\Phi)\}$ . Then,*

- $d_{\text{out}}^*(\Phi) > d_{\text{env}}^*(\Phi) \implies \mathcal{Q}(\Phi) \geq \mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\Phi) > 0.$
- $d_{\text{out}}^*(\Phi) < d_{\text{env}}^*(\Phi) \implies \mathcal{Q}_c(\Phi) \geq \mathcal{Q}_c^{(1)}(\Phi) > 0.$

We are now ready to prove our main result, which was stated as Theorem III.3 in the main text.

**Theorem S3.** *The sets  $\mathcal{Z}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{(1)}, \mathcal{Z}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{(1c)} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}$  as defined above are Borel measurable. Moreover,*

- for all  $d_{\text{env}} < d_{\text{out}}$  :  $\mu_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}}(\mathcal{Z}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{(1)}) = 0 \iff \mu_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}}(\mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}} \setminus \mathcal{Z}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{(1)}) = 1.$
- for all  $d_{\text{env}} > d_{\text{out}}$  :  $\mu_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}}(\mathcal{Z}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{(1c)}) = 0 \iff \mu_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}}(\mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}} \setminus \mathcal{Z}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{(1c)}) = 1.$

*Proof.* Clearly, since both the coherent information functions  $\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}, \mathcal{Q}_C^{(1)} : \mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are continuous, the sets  $\mathcal{Z}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{(1)} = \text{preim}_{\mathcal{Q}^{(1)}}(\{0\})$  and  $\mathcal{Z}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{(1c)} = \text{preim}_{\mathcal{Q}_C^{(1)}}(\{0\})$  are Borel measurable. Now, in order to prove the remaining assertions, let us define the following subsets of quantum channels (for  $d_{\text{env}} \in \mathbb{N}$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}} &:= \left\{ \Phi \in \mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}} : \max_{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{S}_d} \text{rank } \Phi(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = \min\{d_{\text{out}}, d_{\text{env}}\} \right\} \\ \mathcal{B}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}} &:= \left\{ \Phi \in \mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}} : d_{\text{out}}^*(\Phi) = \min\{d_{\text{out}}, dd_{\text{env}}\} \text{ and } d_{\text{env}}^*(\Phi) = \min\{d_{\text{env}}, dd_{\text{out}}\} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

From Corollary S2, we can immediately deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{env}} < d_{\text{out}} &\implies \mathcal{A}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}} \cap \mathcal{B}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}} \setminus \mathcal{Z}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{(1)} \\ d_{\text{env}} > d_{\text{out}} &\implies \mathcal{A}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}} \cap \mathcal{B}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}} \setminus \mathcal{Z}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{(1c)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, in order to prove the required claims, it suffices to show that  $\mu_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}}(\mathcal{A}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}} \cap \mathcal{B}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}}) = 1$  for all  $d_{\text{env}}$  such that  $d \leq d_{\text{out}}d_{\text{env}}$ . Now, it has been shown in [55, Section III] that  $\mu_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}}$  is supported on  $\mathcal{B}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}}$ , i.e.  $\mu_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}}(\mathcal{B}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}}) = 1$ . So we only need to worry about the set  $\mathcal{A}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}}$ . Let us define a continuous map for  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} f_r &: \mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ \Phi &\mapsto \max_{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{S}_d} \det_r \Phi(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|). \end{aligned}$$

Here, for  $X \in \mathcal{M}_d$ , we define  $\det_r X = \sum_I |\det X[I]|$ , where the sum runs over all index sets  $I \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$  of size  $|I| = r$  and  $X[I]$  is the  $|I| \times |I|$  principle submatrix consisting of entries  $X_{ij}$  with  $i, j \in I$ . It is easy to see that  $\text{rank } X < r \iff \det_r X = 0$ . Hence, we can choose  $r = \min\{d_{\text{out}}, d_{\text{env}}\}$ , so that

$$\mathcal{A}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}} = \text{preim}_{f_{r+1}}(\{0\}) \setminus \text{preim}_f(\{0\})$$

is Borel measurable.

Now, from the definition of  $\mu_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}}$  (Eq. (S8)), we have

$$\mu_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}}(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}}) = \mu_{\text{Haar}}^{\mathcal{V}}(\text{preim}_{\Phi}(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}})) = \mu_G \left( \text{preim}_{GS}(\text{preim}_{\Phi}(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}})) \right),$$

where  $\Phi : \mathcal{V}(d, d_{\text{out}}d_{\text{env}}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}$  is defined as in Eq. (S6),  $GS : \mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{out}}d_{\text{env}} \times d}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{V}(d, d_{\text{out}}d_{\text{env}})$  is the Gram Schmidt orthonormalization map, and  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}} = \mathfrak{C}_{d,d_{\text{out}}} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}}$ . Clearly,

$$\text{preim}_{\Phi}(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}}) \subseteq \underbrace{(\mathcal{S} \times \dots \times \mathcal{S})}_{d \text{ times}} \cap \mathcal{V}(d, d_{\text{out}}d_{\text{env}}),$$

where  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{d_{\text{out}}} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_{\text{env}}}$  is the set of all unit vectors with Schmidt rank  $< \min\{d_{\text{out}}, d_{\text{env}}\}$ . Further,

$$\text{preim}_{GS}((\mathcal{S} \times \dots \times \mathcal{S}) \cap \mathcal{V}(d, d_{\text{out}}d_{\text{env}})) \subseteq (\tilde{\mathcal{S}} \times \underbrace{\mathbb{C}^{d_{\text{out}}d_{\text{env}}} \times \dots \times \mathbb{C}^{d_{\text{out}}d_{\text{env}}}}_{d-1 \text{ times}}) \cap \mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{out}}d_{\text{env}} \times d}^*,$$

where  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{d_{\text{out}}} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_{\text{env}}}$  is the set of all vectors with Schmidt rank  $< \min\{d_{\text{out}}, d_{\text{env}}\}$ , so that  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$  can be easily identified with the set  $\mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{out}} \times d_{\text{env}}} \setminus \mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{out}} \times d_{\text{env}}}^*$  of rank deficient matrices in  $\mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{out}} \times d_{\text{env}}}$ . From Lemma S8, we can infer that

$$\mu_G \left( (\tilde{\mathcal{S}} \times \mathbb{C}^{d_{\text{out}}d_{\text{env}}} \times \dots \times \mathbb{C}^{d_{\text{out}}d_{\text{env}}}) \cap \mathcal{M}_{d_{\text{out}}d_{\text{env}} \times d}^* \right) = 0 \implies \mu_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}}(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}}) = 0,$$

so that  $\mu_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}}(\mathcal{A}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}}) = 1$ , and we obtain the desired conclusion:

$$\mu_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}}(\mathcal{A}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}} \cap \mathcal{B}_{d,d_{\text{out}}}^{d_{\text{env}}}) = 1.$$

□