

Semantic Security with Infinite Dimensional Quantum Eavesdropping Channel

Matthias Frey*, Igor Bjelaković†, Janis Nötzel‡, and Sławomir Stańczak*†

*Technische Universität Berlin, Germany

†Fraunhofer Heinrich Hertz Institute, Berlin, Germany

‡Technical University of Munich, Germany

Abstract

We propose a new proof method for direct coding theorems for wiretap channels where the eavesdropper has access to a quantum version of the transmitted signal on an infinite dimensional Hilbert space. This method yields errors that decay exponentially with increasing block lengths. Moreover, it provides a guarantee of a quantum version of semantic security, which is an established concept in classical cryptography and physical layer security. Semantic security has strong operational implications meaning essentially that the eavesdropper cannot use its quantum observation to gather any meaningful information about the transmitted signal. Therefore, it complements existing works which either do not prove the exponential error decay or use weaker notions of security. The main part of this proof method is a direct coding result on channel resolvability which states that there is only a doubly exponentially small probability that a standard random codebook does not solve the channel resolvability problem for the classical-quantum channel.

I. INTRODUCTION

With the emergence of new networking architectures and applications, there has been an increased interest in information theoretic approaches to provide security, called physical layer security (PLS), by exploiting the physical properties of channels. For example, an important trend in these applications is that many low-cost, resource limited, and computationally constrained devices are being deployed, making state-of-the-art cryptography techniques difficult to use. Classical PLS provides resilience against attacks with classical and quantum computers, since it makes no assumptions regarding the computational capability of attackers, and is therefore post-quantum secure. However, security of a system that is argued based on classical analysis is no longer obvious at all if the attack is carried out with quantum hardware such as quantum optical detectors and related quantum measurement devices (cf. [1], [2] for an example).

An important branch of research with long history in PLS addresses fundamental bounds to confidentiality of communication, which is traditionally based on the communication model of the wiretap channel [3]–[7].

It is important to emphasize that the measure of confidentiality itself has undergone a tremendous evolution. While the results of [3], [4] use equivocation as the underlying measure, [5]–[7] rely on strong secrecy or closely related measures as the security metric. The disadvantage of these security metrics is that they allow no or very limited operational interpretation, i.e., they do not provide a way to quantify leakage of information for specific types of eavesdropping attacks. A confidentiality measure that has been known in the cryptography community for a long time and allows a clear operational interpretation is semantic security [8]. It has been adopted in the PLS community as a suitable measure of secrecy and used for wiretap channel coding problems in [9]–[12]. A semantic security based capacity result for quantum wiretap channels over finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces has been established implicitly in a proof contained in [13], although the formulation of the final result itself is based on strong secrecy as a security measure. For related channels and problems on state spaces over infinite dimensional Hilbert spaces, most research has focused on practically relevant bosonic systems [14]–[18]. The direct coding results obtained there are of asymptotic nature. Bounds in the finite block length regime are not only desirable from a mathematical point of view; they can also serve as enablers for the practical integration of PLS into communication networks, as shown by the construction of secrecy maps for indoor and outdoor wireless networks in [19]–[21].

The contribution of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- We establish a semantic security based direct coding theorem for wiretap channels consisting of a continuous alphabet classical channel for the legitimate communication parties and a channel with infinite dimensional quantum output observed by the eavesdropper (cf. Fig. 1) in finite block length regime. The results are stated in qualitative formulation (exponential and doubly exponential decay for a suitable choice of parameters). The explicit form of the exponents can be found in the proofs in Section V.

MF, IB, and SS acknowledge the financial support by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research of Germany in the program of "Souverän. Digital. Vernetzt." Joint project 6G-RIC, project identification numbers: 16KISK020K and 16KISK030. This work was also supported by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research of Germany (BMBF) under grant 01DR21009, as well as by the German Research Foundation (DFG) under grant STA 864/15-1. JN acknowledges the financial support by the DFG Emmy-Noether program under grant number NO 1129/2-1 and by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research of Germany in the programme of "Souverän. Digital. Vernetzt.". Joint project 6G-life, project identification number: 16KISK002.




Fig. 1. Wiretap channel model with classical, continuous alphabet legitimate channel branch W and eavesdropper's channel branch with infinite dimensional quantum output D .

- We develop a new proof method for wiretap channels with the eavesdropper having access to a quantum version of the input signal. Our method is based on symmetrization arguments used to prove non-asymptotic versions of uniform laws of large numbers based on Rademacher complexity.

We should emphasize that we have intentionally omitted some important aspects to keep the focus of the paper on the confidentiality part of the problem. First, we did not consider the energy or power constraints, because we think that they can be incorporated using the same method as in [22]. Furthermore, we have deferred the treatment of quantum channels between the sender and the legitimate receiver, derivation of converse results, and treatment of specific bosonic channels to future work.

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT AND MAIN RESULT

Before we can make the formal problem statement, it is necessary to introduce some preliminaries.

Let \mathcal{H} be a separable Hilbert space over \mathbb{C} and $(\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}), \|\cdot\|_{\text{tr}})$ be the Banach space of trace-class operators (cf. [23]). The trace class $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ is the set of linear operators $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\text{tr}(A^*A)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty$. Endowed with the trace norm $\|A\|_{\text{tr}} := \text{tr}(A^*A)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, the trace class is a Banach space. The set of states or density operators $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ is given by

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) := \{A \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}) : A \geq 0, \text{tr}A = 1\}.$$

We will also occasionally use the operator norm $\|\cdot\|_{\text{op}}$, and for the reader's convenience we summarize the specific properties of both norms in Lemma 5 of the Appendix.

Throughout this work, expectations and integrals of operator-valued random variables and functions will play an important role. Since we do not assume that the input alphabet \mathcal{X} is necessarily finite, this means in particular that the probability space underlying these expectations is possibly infinite as well. The expectations are therefore formally defined as Bochner integrals on the Banach space $(\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}), \|\cdot\|_{\text{tr}})$. The exact definitions and many important facts about Bochner integration can, e.g., be found in [24, Section V.5]. This means in particular that many technical questions of measurability and integrability arise in our proofs. We summarize the preliminaries on measurability that we use in this paper in Lemma 8 and the necessary preliminaries on Bochner integration in Lemma 9 of the Appendix. When talking about the notions of continuity (measurability) of functions, it is important with respect to which topology (σ -algebra) the function in question is continuous (measurable). We therefore adopt the following conventions: When the domain or range of a function is given as \mathcal{X} , measurability is with respect to Σ . When the domain or range is given as $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, the continuity (measurability) of the function is with respect to the topology (Borel σ -algebra) induced by the operator norm. When the domain or range is given as $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ or $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, the continuity (measurability) of the function is with respect to the topology (Borel σ -algebra) induced by the trace norm. When the domain or range is a subset of \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C} , we consider the topology (Borel σ -algebra) induced by the Euclidean norm.

In this work, we study a classical/classical-quantum (c/cq) wiretap channel. Formally, this is a pair (W, D) , where W is a stochastic kernel (i.e., a classical channel), D is a classical-quantum (cq) channel, and W and D share the same input alphabet. The idea behind this definition is that the eavesdropper observes a quantum system instead of a classical output while the legitimate receiver observes a classical output.

In the following, we describe the system model (which is also depicted in Fig. 1) in more detail. The transmitter A transmits a channel input X which is a random variable ranging over a measurable space (\mathcal{X}, Σ) , the input alphabet. The legitimate receiver B observes the output \hat{X} which is a random variable ranging over another measurable space $(\hat{\mathcal{X}}, \hat{\Sigma})$ and its relationship with X is described by a stochastic kernel $W : \hat{\Sigma} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, the legitimate receiver's channel. The eavesdropper E , on the other hand, observes the output of a cq channel which is described by a measurable map $D : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$. The measurability of D is with respect to Σ and the Borel σ -algebra induced by the trace norm.

For $x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$ and $B_1, \dots, B_n \in \hat{\Sigma}$, we set

$$W^n(B_1 \times \dots \times B_n, x^n) := \prod_{i=1}^n W(B_i, x_i), \quad (1)$$

and

$$D^n(x^n) := \bigotimes_{i=1}^n D(x_i). \quad (2)$$

In the following, we use the nomenclature that the stochastic kernel W maps (stochastically) the set \mathcal{X} into the set $\hat{\mathcal{X}}$ and write simply $W : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{X}}$.

A *wiretap code for the c/cq channel* (W, D) with size M and block length n is a pair (Enc, Dec) such that

- The encoder is a stochastic kernel mapping $\text{Enc} : \{1, \dots, M\} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^n$, where \mathcal{X} is the common input alphabet of W and D .
- The decoder is a deterministic mapping $\text{Dec} : \hat{\mathcal{X}}^n \rightarrow \{1, \dots, M\}$, where $\hat{\mathcal{X}}$ is the output alphabet of W .

The *rate* of a wiretap code is defined as $\log(M)/n$. In this paper, we always use the logarithm (as well as the exponential function denoted \exp) with Euler's number as a base and consequently, the rate is given in nats per channel use. We say that the code has *average error* ε if

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{M}} \mathbb{P}(\text{Dec}(\hat{X}^n) \neq \mathfrak{M}) \leq \varepsilon \quad (3)$$

where \hat{X}^n is the random variable observed by the legitimate receiver, resulting from encoding and transmission through channel W^n .

We say that the code has *distinguishing security level* δ if

$$\forall m_1, m_2 \in \{1, \dots, M\} \quad \|D^n \circ \text{Enc}(m_1) - D^n \circ \text{Enc}(m_2)\|_{\text{tr}} \leq \delta. \quad (4)$$

The composition of the stochastic kernel mapping $\text{Enc} : M \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^n$ and the cq channel $D^n : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ is given by

$$D^n \circ \text{Enc}(m) := \int D^n(x^n) \text{Enc}(dx^n, m),$$

for $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$.

The main result of this work states that wiretap codes for certain c/cq channels exist which simultaneously have both of these properties. The rates are characterized by two information quantities. The information density and mutual information of the classical channel W associated with an input distribution P on \mathcal{X} are defined in the usual way as

$$i_P(x^n; \hat{x}^n) := \log \frac{dW^n(\cdot, x^n)}{d\hat{P}}(\hat{x}^n), \quad I(P, W) := \mathbb{E} i_P(X; \hat{X}) \quad (5)$$

where \hat{P} is the distribution of the output of W under the input distribution P . Furthermore, we define a quantum analog of the mutual information for D as

$$I(P, D) := \mathbb{E} \text{tr}(D(X) \log D(X)) - \text{tr}(D_P \log D_P), \quad (6)$$

where we define $D_P := \mathbb{E} D(X)$, i.e., the density operator of the output of the channel.

We adopt the convention that whenever $D(X) \log D(X) \notin \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ on a non-null set or $D_P \log D_P \notin \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$, we set $I(P, D) := \infty$.

The proof of the following theorem is relegated to the end of Section V.

Theorem 1. *Let (W, D) be a c/cq wiretap channel, and let P be a probability distribution on the input alphabet \mathcal{X} such that:*

- *There is $\alpha_{\min} < 1$ with $D(x)^{\alpha_{\min}} \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ for almost all x and $D_P^{\alpha_{\min}} \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$;*
- *There is $t > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E} \exp(t i_P(X; \hat{X})) < \infty$.*

Let $R < I(P, W) - I(P, D)$. Then there are $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for sufficiently large n , there exists a wiretap code for (W, D) with the following properties:

- 1) *The code has a rate of at least R .*
- 2) *The code has an average error of $\varepsilon = \exp(-\gamma_1 n)$ as defined in (3).*
- 3) *The code has distinguishing security level $\delta = \exp(-\gamma_2 n)$ as defined in (4).*

III. SECURITY IMPLICATIONS OF THEOREM 1

The distinguishing security criterion provided by Theorem 1 implies security guarantees against eavesdropping attacks that extend beyond an attacker's ability to reconstruct the entire transmitted message. Formally, this means that a large class of possible objectives (which includes the objective of reconstructing the entire transmitted message, but also many others) cannot be reached by the eavesdropper.

Problem 1. (Eavesdropper's objective.) *Each possible eavesdropper's objective that we consider in this paper is defined by a partition Π of the message space $\{1, \dots, M\}$. The eavesdropper's objective is then to output some $\pi \in \Pi$ such that the originally transmitted message is contained in π .*

The partition of $\{1, \dots, M\}$ that corresponds to the reconstruction of the entire message consists of all singleton sets, i.e.,

$$\Pi = \{\{1\}, \dots, \{M\}\}.$$

But also other possible objectives can be defined by a message space partition. For instance, the task of reconstructing the first bit of the transmitted message would be represented by

$$\Pi = \{m : \text{The binary representation of } m \text{ starts with } 0\}, \{m : \text{The binary representation of } m \text{ starts with } 1\}.$$

In this section, we assume that the eavesdropper has prior knowledge of the probability distribution $P_{\mathfrak{M}}$ from which the transmitted message \mathfrak{M} is drawn. While this may not be realistic in some practical scenarios, it is certainly possible, for example when the eavesdropper knows that a protocol is executed in which only certain messages can possibly be transmitted at certain time instances. In any case, this represents an additional advantage that the eavesdropper has compared to a case where no such prior knowledge is available.

We assume in this work that the eavesdropper can perform any Π -valued positive operator-valued measure (POVM) on its quantum state. A Π -valued POVM is a sequence $(F_\pi)_{\pi \in \Pi}$ of operators on \mathcal{H} , such that for all π , $F_\pi \geq 0$, and

$$\sum_{\pi \in \Pi} F_\pi = \mathbf{1}.$$

We allow the eavesdropper to perform post processing, represented by a completely positive trace-preserving map, and obtain the processed version $A(\mathfrak{M})$ of $D^n \circ \text{Enc}(\mathfrak{M})$. Via the Born rule, a Π -valued POVM and $A(\mathfrak{M})$ induce a probability distribution on Π , described by the probability mass function (p.m.f.)

$$p(\pi) := \text{tr}(F_\pi A(\mathfrak{M})). \quad (7)$$

We define the eavesdropper's maximum success probability when a quantum measurement is performed on a quantum state $A(\mathfrak{M})$ as

$$\text{Succ}(\Pi, P_{\mathfrak{M}}, A(\mathfrak{M})) := \sup \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{M}} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi: \mathfrak{M} \in \pi} \text{tr}(F_\pi A(\mathfrak{M})) : (F_\pi)_{\pi \in \Pi} \text{ is a POVM} \right\}.$$

Note that since Π is a partition, the sum consists of only one summand for each fixed realization of \mathfrak{M} .

An important thing to note is that it is not in general possible to guarantee a low eavesdropper's success probability. For instance, \mathfrak{M} could be drawn from a distribution where the binary representation of \mathfrak{M} almost surely starts with 0. What we can control, however, is the advantage that the eavesdropper gains by observing $A(\mathfrak{M})$ compared to the situation where it does not. We denote the maximum achievable success probability in solving Problem 1 for partition Π and message distribution $P_{\mathfrak{M}}$ without observing any quantum state (i.e., by pure guessing) by

$$\text{Guess}(\Pi, P_{\mathfrak{M}}) := \sup \{ \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{M} \in \pi) : \pi \text{ is a random variable ranging over } \Pi \}.$$

Now, we can define the *eavesdropper's advantage* associated with the observation $A(\mathfrak{M})$ as

$$\text{Adv}(A) := \sup \left\{ \text{Succ}(\Pi, P_{\mathfrak{M}}, A(\mathfrak{M})) - \text{Guess}(\Pi, P_{\mathfrak{M}}) : \right.$$

$$\left. \Pi \text{ is a partition of } \{1, \dots, M\}, P_{\mathfrak{M}} \text{ is a probability distribution on } \{1, \dots, M\} \right\}$$

We note that this is a straightforward quantum analog of the term *semantic security* which is already an established performance metric both in classical cryptography and information-theoretic secrecy [25].

Lemma 1. *Suppose that for all $m_1, m_2 \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, A satisfies*

$$\|A(m_1) - A(m_2)\|_{\text{tr}} \leq \delta. \quad (8)$$

Then

$$\text{Adv}(A) \leq \delta. \quad (9)$$

Remark 1. *Theorem 1 states that the eavesdropper's channel output $D^n \circ \text{Enc}(\mathfrak{M})$ satisfies (8). Due to the contractiveness property of quantum channels (see, e.g., [26, Prop. 4.37]), this property automatically extends to any state $A(\mathfrak{M})$ obtained by applying arbitrary quantum processing steps to $D^n \circ \text{Enc}(\mathfrak{M})$. Therefore, there are no quantum processing steps that allow the eavesdropper to increase its advantage beyond δ .*

Proof. Suppose the eavesdropper observes $A(\mathfrak{M})$ and let $(F_\pi)_{\pi \in \Pi}$ be a POVM.

We define a p.m.f.

$$q : \Pi \rightarrow [0, 1], \pi \mapsto \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{M}} p(\pi), \quad (10)$$




Fig. 2. Cq channel model for channel resolvability.

where p is as defined in (7). Clearly, q does not depend on an observed channel output, so we have

$$\text{Guess}(\Pi, P_{\mathfrak{M}}) \geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{M}} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi: \mathfrak{M} \in \pi} q(\pi). \quad (11)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{M}} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi: \mathfrak{M} \in \pi} \text{tr}(F_{\pi} A(\mathfrak{M})) - \text{Guess}(\Pi, P_{\mathfrak{M}}) &\stackrel{(11)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{M}} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi: \mathfrak{M} \in \pi} (\text{tr}(F_{\pi} A(\mathfrak{M})) - q(\pi)) \\ &\stackrel{(7),(10)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{M}} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi: \mathfrak{M} \in \pi} (\text{tr}(F_{\pi} A(\mathfrak{M})) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{M}} \text{tr}(F_{\pi} A(\mathfrak{M}))) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{M}} \text{tr} \left(\sum_{\pi \in \Pi: \mathfrak{M} \in \pi} (F_{\pi} A(\mathfrak{M}) - F_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{M}} A(\mathfrak{M})) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{M}} \left\| \sum_{\pi \in \Pi: \mathfrak{M} \in \pi} (F_{\pi} A(\mathfrak{M}) - F_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{M}} A(\mathfrak{M})) \right\|_{\text{tr}} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{M}} \left\| \sum_{\pi \in \Pi: \mathfrak{M} \in \pi} F_{\pi} \right\|_{\text{op}} \|A(\mathfrak{M}) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{M}} A(\mathfrak{M})\|_{\text{tr}} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{M}} \|A(\mathfrak{M}) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{M}} A(\mathfrak{M})\|_{\text{tr}} \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{M}, \mathfrak{M}'} \|A(\mathfrak{M}') - A(\mathfrak{M})\|_{\text{tr}} \\ &\stackrel{(8)}{\leq} \delta. \end{aligned}$$

(a) is an elementary fact about the trace norm that can, e.g., be found in [27, Lemma III.8(vi)], (b) is by Lemma 5-2), (c) is because F is a POVM, and (d) is by replacing \mathfrak{M} with an independent copy \mathfrak{M}' and then applying Lemma 9-2). Since this derivation holds for every choice of F , $P_{\mathfrak{M}}$ and Π , (9) immediately follows. \square

IV. CQ CHANNEL RESOLVABILITY

An important prerequisite in proving achievability of rates for the wiretap channel will be results of achievability for the channel resolvability problem, depicted in Fig. 2. Here, we do not consider the classical channel output \hat{X} but instead only the quantum state that D outputs. The question will then be which transmit strategies (i.e., rules for generating X^n) the transmitter can employ to approximate the output state $D_P^{\otimes n}$ by $D^n(X^n)$ at the receiver.

Before we can formally introduce our resolvability results, we have to introduce some technical preliminaries, notations and definitions.

For every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we fix a spectral decomposition

$$D(x) = \sum_{y \in \mathbb{N}} P(y|x) |e_{y|x}\rangle \langle e_{y|x}|,$$

where $\{e_{y|x}\}_{y \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H} for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$. By Lemma 8-1), for every $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ the map $x \mapsto \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} P(y|x)$ is a pointwise limit of measurable maps and therefore measurable. Moreover, for all x we have $\sum_{y \in \mathbb{N}} P(y|x) = \text{tr} D(x) = 1$. Therefore, the eigenvalues $P(y|x)$ induce a stochastic kernel from \mathcal{X} to \mathbb{N} and together with a probability distribution P on \mathcal{X} , we obtain a joint probability distribution on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{N}$. In a slight abuse of notation, we will use the symbol P to denote this joint probability distribution as well as the marginal on \mathbb{N} and all corresponding p.m.f.s. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ be a probability space and $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be a random variable distributed according to P . We write the density operator of the channel output in terms of its spectral decomposition

$$D_P = \sum_{y \in \mathbb{N}} U(y) |e_y\rangle \langle e_y|.$$

Clearly, U is a p.m.f. on \mathbb{N} which we identify with the probability measure it induces. We define the classical entropies

$$H_P := - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{N}} P(x, y) \log P(y|x) = -\mathbb{E}_X \sum_{y \in \mathbb{N}} P(y|X) \log P(y|X),$$

$$H_U := - \sum_{y \in \mathbb{N}} U(y) \log U(y).$$

If $I(P, D) < \infty$, then H_P and H_U are both finite, and we have

$$I(P, D) = \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \left(\sum_{y \in \mathbb{N}} P(y|X) \log P(y|X) |e_{y|X}\rangle \langle e_{y|X}| \right) - \text{tr} (D_P \log D_P)$$

$$= -H_P + H_U. \quad (12)$$

For n -fold uses of the channel D , we note that via the definitions

$$e_{y^n|x^n} := \bigotimes_{i=1}^n e_{y_i|x_i}$$

$$e_{y^n} := \bigotimes_{i=1}^n e_{y_i}$$

$$P(x^n) := \prod_{i=1}^n P(x_i)$$

$$P(y^n|x^n) := \prod_{i=1}^n P(y_i|x_i)$$

$$U(y^n) := \prod_{i=1}^n U(y_i),$$

we identify P and U with corresponding distributions on $\mathcal{X}^n \times \mathbb{N}^n$ (and the resulting marginals) and \mathbb{N}^n , and we have

$$D^n(x^n) := \bigotimes_{i=1}^n D(x_i) = \sum_{y^n \in \mathbb{N}^n} P(y^n|x^n) |e_{y^n|x^n}\rangle \langle e_{y^n|x^n}|, \quad (13)$$

$$D_P^{\otimes n} = \sum_{y^n \in \mathbb{N}^n} U(y^n) |e_{y^n}\rangle \langle e_{y^n}|. \quad (14)$$

We define a standard random codebook \mathcal{C} of block length n and size M ; i.e., $\mathcal{C} := (\mathcal{C}(m))_{m=1}^M$ where the $\mathcal{C}(m)$ are i.i.d. with distribution P . Each fixed realization of \mathcal{C} defines an induced channel output density

$$D_{\mathcal{C}} := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)). \quad (15)$$

With these definitions, we now have the necessary terminology to state our resolvability results.

Theorem 2. *Let $R > I(P, D)$ and suppose $M \geq \exp(nR)$. Moreover, assume that there is some $\alpha_{\min} \in (0, 1)$ such that $D_P^{\alpha_{\min}} \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ and for P -almost all x , we have $D(x)^{\alpha_{\min}} \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$, and the Bochner integral $\mathbb{E}(D(X)^{\alpha_{\min}}) \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ exists.*

Then, there is $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$ such that for sufficiently large n ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \|D_{\mathcal{C}} - D_P^{\otimes n}\|_{\text{tr}} \leq \exp(-n\gamma).$$

Remark 2. *With methods very similar to those employed in the proof of Lemma 10 of the Appendix, it is possible to show that the existence of α_{\min} with the properties assumed in Theorem 2 implies $I(P, D) < \infty$. However, this is not necessary to prove Theorem 2, since if $I(P, D) = \infty$, then there is no $R > I(P, D)$, hence the theorem holds trivially in this case. Therefore, in the sequel, we are always going to implicitly assume $I(P, D) < \infty$.*

Corollary 1. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2, there are $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for sufficiently large n ,*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}} (\|D_{\mathcal{C}} - D_P^{\otimes n}\|_{\text{tr}} \geq \exp(-\gamma_1 n)) \leq \exp(-\exp(\gamma_2 n)).$$

V. PROOFS

We begin with the proofs of the resolvability results, starting with some preliminary lemmas. The first one encapsulates a symmetrization argument similar to the one used in [28, Theorem 4.10].

Lemma 2. *Let (\mathcal{X}, Σ) be a measurable space and $T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ a measurable map. Let P be a probability measure on \mathcal{X} , and $X := (X_1, \dots, X_\ell)$ be a tuple of \mathcal{X} -valued random variables i.i.d. according to P . Let*

$$T_X := \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} T(X_i).$$

Then, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \|T_X - \mathbb{E}T_X\|_{\text{tr}} \leq 2\text{tr} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\ell} \mathbb{E}(T(X_1)^* T(X_1))}, \quad (16)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \|T_X - \mathbb{E}T_X\|_{\text{tr}} \leq 2\text{tr} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\ell} \mathbb{E}(T(X_1) T(X_1)^*)}. \quad (17)$$

Proof. Let $\hat{X}_1, \dots, \hat{X}_\ell$ be i.i.d. independent copies of X_1, \dots, X_ℓ , and let $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_\ell$ be i.i.d. uniformly on $\{-1, 1\}$. The following derivation are adapted from the proof of [28, Theorem 4.10].

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|T_X - \mathbb{E}T_X\|_{\text{tr}} &= \mathbb{E}_X \left\| \mathbb{E}_{\hat{X}} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{1}{\ell} (T(X_i) - T(\hat{X}_i)) \right\|_{\text{tr}} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_{X, \hat{X}} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{1}{\ell} (T(X_i) - T(\hat{X}_i)) \right\|_{\text{tr}} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{X, \hat{X}, \mathcal{E}} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{1}{\ell} \mathcal{E}_i (T(X_i) - T(\hat{X}_i)) \right\|_{\text{tr}} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{X, \mathcal{E}} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{1}{\ell} \mathcal{E}_i T(X_i) \right\|_{\text{tr}} + \mathbb{E}_{\hat{X}, \mathcal{E}} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{1}{\ell} \mathcal{E}_i T(\hat{X}_i) \right\|_{\text{tr}} \\ &= 2\mathbb{E}_{X, \mathcal{E}} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{1}{\ell} \mathcal{E}_i T(X_i) \right\|_{\text{tr}} \\ &= 2\mathbb{E}_{X, \mathcal{E}} \text{tr} \sqrt{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{1}{\ell} \mathcal{E}_i T(X_i) \right)^* \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{1}{\ell} \mathcal{E}_i T(X_i) \right)} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} 2\text{tr} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{X, \mathcal{E}} \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{1}{\ell} \mathcal{E}_i T(X_i) \right)^* \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{1}{\ell} \mathcal{E}_i T(X_i) \right) \right)} \\ &= 2\text{tr} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\ell^2} \mathbb{E}_X \sum_{i_1, i_2=1}^{\ell} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{E}_{i_1} \mathcal{E}_{i_2}) T(X_{i_1})^* T(X_{i_2})} \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{=} 2\text{tr} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\ell^2} \mathbb{E}_X \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} T(X_i)^* T(X_i)} \\ &= 2\text{tr} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\ell} \mathbb{E}_{X_1} T(X_1)^* T(X_1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Step (a) follows by Lemma 9-2). For step (b), we observe that the equality holds conditioned on any realization of $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_\ell$ since X_i and \hat{X}_i are identically distributed and therefore can be swapped if $\mathcal{E}_i = -1$. Inequality (c) is by Lemma 9-4). Finally, equality (d) holds because $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{E}_{i_1} \mathcal{E}_{i_2})$ equals 1 if $i_1 = i_2$ and 0 otherwise. This concludes the proof of (16). (17) follows in a similar way using $\|A\|_{\text{tr}} = \|A^*\|_{\text{tr}}$ before expanding the trace norm. \square

Remark 3. [28, Theorem 4.10] (from the proof of which the first part of the calculation above is adapted) bounds the absolute deviation of an empirical average from its expectation in terms of the Rademacher complexity of a suitably defined class of functions. Indeed, via the trace norm duality stated in Lemma 5-4), the term

$$\mathbb{E}_{X, \mathcal{E}} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{1}{\ell} \mathcal{E}_i T(X_i) \right\|_{\text{tr}}$$

which appears in the calculation can be argued to be equal to the Rademacher complexity of the function class

$$\{\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, x \mapsto \mathbf{tr}(AT(x)) : A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}), \|A\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1\}.$$

In preparation for the proof of Theorem 2, we introduce some notions of typicality. We fix $\varepsilon \in (0, (R - I(P, D))/4)$ and define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{\varepsilon, n} &:= \{(x^n, y^n) \in \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathbb{N}^n : n(H_P - \varepsilon) < -\log P(y^n | x^n) < n(H_P + \varepsilon)\} \\ \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon, n} &:= \{y^n \in \mathbb{N}^n : n(H_U - \varepsilon) < -\log U(y^n) < n(H_U + \varepsilon)\} \end{aligned}$$

and, based on these definitions,

$$\Psi_{\varepsilon, n}(x^n) := \sum_{y^n \in \mathbb{N}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{P}_{\varepsilon, n}}(x^n, y^n) |e_{y^n | x^n}\rangle \langle e_{y^n | x^n}| \quad (18)$$

$$\Theta_{\varepsilon, n} := \sum_{y^n \in \mathbb{N}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon, n}}(y^n) |e_{y^n}\rangle \langle e_{y^n}|. \quad (19)$$

While $\Theta_{\varepsilon, n}$ is a fixed operator, $\Psi_{\varepsilon, n}$ is an operator-valued function and its measurability is not immediately clear from the definition. Therefore, we note that it can also be written as

$$\Psi_{\varepsilon, n}(x^n) = \mathbb{1}_{(\exp(-n(H_P + \varepsilon)), \exp(-n(H_P - \varepsilon)))}(D^n(x^n))$$

and is therefore a measurable map $\mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ by Lemma 8-2). We also note the following basic properties of these projections which are straightforward to verify from their definitions:

$$\Theta_{\varepsilon, n}^2 = \Theta_{\varepsilon, n}, \quad \Psi_{\varepsilon, n}(x^n)^2 = \Psi_{\varepsilon, n}(x^n), \quad D^n(x^n)\Psi_{\varepsilon, n}(x^n) = \Psi_{\varepsilon, n}(x^n)D^n(x^n). \quad (20)$$

Finally, define

$$\Gamma_{\varepsilon, n} : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}), \quad x^n \mapsto \Theta_{\varepsilon, n}\Psi_{\varepsilon, n}(x^n), \quad (21)$$

which clearly is also measurable.

These notions of typicality will allow us to split the error term that appears in the proof of Theorem 2 into a typical and an atypical part. These terms can be bounded separately with the help of the next two lemmas.

Lemma 3. (Bound for typical terms). *We have*

- 1) $\forall x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n \quad \Psi_{\varepsilon, n}(x^n)D^n(x^n)\Psi_{\varepsilon, n}(x^n) \leq \exp(-n(H_P - \varepsilon))\Psi_{\varepsilon, n}(x^n)$
- 2) $\Theta_{\varepsilon, n}D_P^{\otimes n}\Theta_{\varepsilon, n} \leq \exp(-n(H_U - \varepsilon))\Theta_{\varepsilon, n}$
- 3) $\mathbf{tr}\Theta_{\varepsilon, n} < \exp(n(H_U + \varepsilon))$.

Proof. For 1), we use the presence of the indicator in the definition of $\Psi_{\varepsilon, n}(x^n)$ to bound

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\varepsilon, n}(x^n)D^n(x^n)\Psi_{\varepsilon, n}(x^n) &= \sum_{y^n \in \mathbb{N}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{P}_{\varepsilon, n}}(x^n, y^n) P(y^n | x^n) |e_{y^n | x^n}\rangle \langle e_{y^n | x^n}| \\ &\leq \sum_{y^n \in \mathbb{N}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{P}_{\varepsilon, n}}(x^n, y^n) \exp(-n(H_P - \varepsilon)) |e_{y^n | x^n}\rangle \langle e_{y^n | x^n}| \\ &= \exp(-n(H_P - \varepsilon))\Psi_{\varepsilon, n}(x^n). \end{aligned}$$

For 2), we have the very similar calculation

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{\varepsilon, n}D_P^{\otimes n}\Theta_{\varepsilon, n} &= \sum_{y^n \in \mathbb{N}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon, n}}(y^n) U(y^n) |e_{y^n}\rangle \langle e_{y^n}| \\ &\leq \sum_{y^n \in \mathbb{N}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon, n}}(y^n) \exp(-n(H_U - \varepsilon)) |e_{y^n}\rangle \langle e_{y^n}| \\ &= \exp(-n(H_U - \varepsilon))\Theta_{\varepsilon, n}. \end{aligned}$$

For 3), we note

$$\mathbf{tr}\Theta_{\varepsilon, n} = \mathbf{tr} \sum_{y^n \in \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon, n}} |e_{y^n}\rangle \langle e_{y^n}| = |\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon, n}|. \quad (22)$$

For every $y^n \in \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon, n}$, we have

$$U(y^n) > \exp(-n(H_U + \varepsilon)).$$

This allows us to argue

$$1 \geq U(y^n \in \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon, n}) = \sum_{y^n \in \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon, n}} U(y^n) > \sum_{y^n \in \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon, n}} \exp(-n(H_U + \varepsilon)) = |\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon, n}| \exp(-n(H_U + \varepsilon)),$$

from which item 3) follows by (22). \square

The next lemma requires some preliminaries on Rényi entropy. To this end, we define for $\alpha \in [\alpha_{\min}, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$

$$H_{P,\alpha} := \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \mathbb{E}_P (P(Y|X)^{\alpha-1}) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \mathbb{E} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{N}} P(y|X)^\alpha = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \mathbb{E} \mathbf{tr} (D(X)^\alpha) \quad (23)$$

$$H_{U,\alpha} := \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \mathbb{E}_U (P(Y)^{\alpha-1}) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \sum_{y \in \mathbb{N}} U(y)^\alpha = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \mathbf{tr} (D_P^\alpha). \quad (24)$$

We will use properties of $H_{P,\alpha}$ and $H_{U,\alpha}$ which are stated and proven in Lemmas 10 and 11 of the Appendix. Lemma 11 allows us to expand the definitions of $H_{U,\alpha}$ and $H_{P,\alpha}$ to the domain $[\alpha_{\min}, \infty)$ and obtain continuous functions in α with $H_{U,1} = H_U$ and $H_{P,1} = H_P$.

Lemma 4. (Bound for atypical terms). *There is $\gamma_1 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for sufficiently large n ,*

$$\mathbb{E} \mathbf{tr} (D^n(X^n) \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n)^*) \geq 1 - \exp(-n\gamma_1),$$

where $\Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}$ is defined in (21).

Proof. We bound the trace as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{tr} (D^n(X^n) \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n)^*) &= \mathbf{tr} (D^n(X^n) \Psi_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n) \Theta_{\varepsilon,n}) \\ &= \mathbf{tr} (D^n(X^n) \Psi_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n)) - \mathbf{tr} (D^n(X^n) \Psi_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n) (1 - \Theta_{\varepsilon,n})) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbf{tr} (D^n(X^n) \Psi_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n)) - \mathbf{tr} \left((1 - \Theta_{\varepsilon,n}) \sqrt{D^n(X^n)} \Psi_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n) \sqrt{D^n(X^n)} (1 - \Theta_{\varepsilon,n}) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \mathbf{tr} (D^n(X^n) \Psi_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n)) - \mathbf{tr} (D^n(X^n) (1 - \Theta_{\varepsilon,n})) \\ &= 1 - \mathbf{tr} (D^n(X^n) (1 - \Psi_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n))) - \mathbf{tr} (D^n(X^n) (1 - \Theta_{\varepsilon,n})) \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where (a) and (b) use (20) along with the cyclic property of the trace and (b) additionally uses $\Psi_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n) \leq \mathbf{1}$, which can be verified with the spectral representation (18).

We bound the expectations of the terms appearing in (25) separately. For the first term, we recall the definition (23) and observe that if $\forall x \in \mathcal{X} : D(X)^\alpha \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$, then $H_{P,\alpha} < \infty$. With that, we have for every $\alpha_1 \in (1, \infty)$ and $\alpha_2 \in [\alpha_{\min}, 1)$

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \mathbf{tr} (D^n(X^n) (1 - \Psi_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n))) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{X^n} \mathbf{tr} \left(\sum_{y^n \in \mathbb{N}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{X}^n \times \mathbb{N}^n \setminus \mathcal{P}_{\varepsilon,n}}(x^n, y^n) P(y^n|x^n) |e_{y^n|x^n}\rangle \langle e_{y^n|x^n}| \right) \\ &= P(\mathcal{X}^n \times \mathbb{N}^n \setminus \mathcal{P}_{\varepsilon,n}) \\ &= P(-\log(P(Y^n|X^n)) \leq n(H_P - \varepsilon)) + P(-\log(P(Y^n|X^n)) \geq n(H_P + \varepsilon)) \\ &= P(P(Y^n|X^n)^{\alpha_1-1} \geq \exp(-n(\alpha_1 - 1)(H_P - \varepsilon))) + P(P(Y^n|X^n)^{\alpha_2-1} \geq \exp(-n(\alpha_2 - 1)(H_P + \varepsilon))) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_P (P(Y^n|X^n)^{\alpha_1-1}) \exp(n(\alpha_1 - 1)(H_P - \varepsilon)) + \mathbb{E}_P (P(Y^n|X^n)^{\alpha_2-1}) \exp(n(\alpha_2 - 1)(H_P + \varepsilon)) \\ &= \exp(-n(\alpha_1 - 1)(H_{P,\alpha_1} + \varepsilon - H_P)) + \exp(-n(1 - \alpha_2)(H_P + \varepsilon - H_{P,\alpha_2})), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where the inequality step (a) is due to Markov's inequality. Lemma 11 allows us to select $\alpha_1 \in (1, \infty)$ with $H_{P,\alpha_1} > H_P - \varepsilon$ and $\alpha_2 \in [\alpha_{\min}, 1)$ with $H_{P,\alpha_2} < H_P + \varepsilon$, resulting in an exponential decay in (26).

Similarly, we recall the definition (24) and note that if $D_P^\alpha \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$, then $H_{U,\alpha} < \infty$. For $\alpha_3 \in (1, \infty)$ and $\alpha_4 \in [\alpha_{\min}, 1)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \mathbf{tr} (D^n(X^n) (1 - \Theta_{\varepsilon,n})) \\ &= \mathbf{tr} (D_P^{\otimes n} (1 - \Theta_{\varepsilon,n})) \\ &= \mathbf{tr} \left(\sum_{y^n \in \mathbb{N}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{X}^n \times \mathbb{N}^n \setminus \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon,n}} U(y^n) |e_{y^n}\rangle \langle e_{y^n}| \right) \\ &= U(\mathcal{X}^n \times \mathbb{N}^n \setminus \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon,n}) \\ &= U(-\log U(y^n) \leq n(H_U - \varepsilon)) + U(-\log U(y^n) \geq n(H_U + \varepsilon)) \\ &= U(U(y^n)^{\alpha_3-1} \geq \exp(-n(\alpha_3 - 1)(H_U - \varepsilon))) + U(U(y^n)^{\alpha_4-1} \geq \exp(-n(\alpha_4 - 1)(H_U + \varepsilon))) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \mathbb{E}_U \left(U(y^n)^{\alpha_3-1} \right) \exp(n(\alpha_3-1)(H_U - \varepsilon)) + \mathbb{E}_U \left(U(y^n)^{\alpha_4-1} \right) \exp(n(\alpha_4-1)(H_U + \varepsilon)) \\
&= \exp(-n(\alpha_3-1)(H_{U,\alpha_3} + \varepsilon - H_U)) + \exp(-n(1-\alpha_4)(H_U + \varepsilon - H_{U,\alpha_4})).
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Lemma 11 allows us to select $\alpha_3 \in (1, \infty)$ with $H_{U,\alpha_3} > H_U - \varepsilon$ and $\alpha_4 \in [\alpha_{\min}, 1)$ with $H_{U,\alpha_4} < H_U + \varepsilon$, resulting in an exponential decay in (27).

Finally, the Lemma follows from (25), (26) and (27) for any choice of

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_1 \in \left(0, \max \left((\alpha_1 - 1)(H_{P,\alpha_1} + \varepsilon - H_P), \right. \right. \\
(1 - \alpha_2)(H_P + \varepsilon - H_{P,\alpha_2}), \\
(\alpha_3 - 1)(H_{U,\alpha_3} + \varepsilon - H_U), \\
\left. \left. (1 - \alpha_4)(H_U + \varepsilon - H_{U,\alpha_4}) \right) \right).
\end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Proof of Theorem 2. We multiply identities and use the triangle inequality to bound

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left\| D_{\mathcal{C}} - D_P^{\otimes n} \right\|_{\text{tr}} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left(D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) \right) \right\|_{\text{tr}} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left((\Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)) + \mathbf{1} - \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m))) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left((\Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)) + \mathbf{1} - \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m))) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) \right) \right) \right\|_{\text{tr}} \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left(\Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) \right) \right) \right\|_{\text{tr}} \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left((\mathbf{1} - \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m))) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left((\mathbf{1} - \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m))) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) \right) \right) \right\|_{\text{tr}} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left(\Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) \right) \right) \right\|_{\text{tr}} \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left((\mathbf{1} - \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m))) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) (\Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)) + \mathbf{1} - \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)))^* \right. \right. \\
&\quad \quad \left. \left. - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left((\mathbf{1} - \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m))) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) (\Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)) + \mathbf{1} - \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)))^* \right) \right) \right\|_{\text{tr}} \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left(\Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) \right) \right) \right\|_{\text{tr}} \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left(D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m))^* - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left(D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m))^* \right) \right) \right\|_{\text{tr}} \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left(\Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m))^* - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m))^* \right) \right) \right\|_{\text{tr}} \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left((\mathbf{1} - \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m))) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) (\mathbf{1} - \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)))^* - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left((\mathbf{1} - \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m))) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) (\mathbf{1} - \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)))^* \right) \right) \right\|_{\text{tr}}
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

We next bound the summands in (28) separately. For the last summand, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left((\mathbf{1} - \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m))) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) (\mathbf{1} - \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)))^* - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left((\mathbf{1} - \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m))) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) (\mathbf{1} - \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)))^* \right) \right) \right\|_{\text{tr}} \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left((\mathbf{1} - \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m))) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) (\mathbf{1} - \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)))^* \right) \right\|_{\text{tr}} \\
& \quad + \left\| \frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \sum_{m=1}^M \left((\mathbf{1} - \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m))) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) (\mathbf{1} - \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)))^* \right) \right\|_{\text{tr}} \\
& \stackrel{(b)}{=} 2 \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \text{tr} \left((\mathbf{1} - \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m))) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) (\mathbf{1} - \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)))^* \right) \\
& = 2 \mathbb{E}_{X^n} \text{tr} \left((\mathbf{1} - \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n)) D^n(X^n) (\mathbf{1} - \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n))^* \right) \\
& = 2 \mathbb{E}_{X^n} \left(1 - \text{tr} \left(\Theta_{\varepsilon,n} \Psi_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n) D^n(X^n) \right) - \text{tr} \left(D^n(X^n) \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n)^* \right) + \text{tr} \left(\Theta_{\varepsilon,n} \Psi_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n) D^n(X^n) \Psi_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n) \Theta_{\varepsilon,n} \right) \right) \\
& \stackrel{(c)}{\leq} 2 \left(1 - \mathbb{E}_{X^n} \left(\text{tr} \left(D^n(X^n) \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n)^* \right) \right) \right) \\
& \stackrel{(d)}{\leq} 2 \exp(-n\gamma_1).
\end{aligned}$$

(a) is due to the triangle inequality, (b) is because trace and trace norm are equal for positive semidefinite operators, (c) is by cyclic permutations inside the trace and using (20). Finally, (d) is due to Lemma 4.

For the first summand in (28), we apply (17) of Lemma 2 with $T : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$, $x^n \mapsto \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(x^n) D^n(x^n)$, $\ell = M$ and $X_m = \mathcal{C}(m)$. This yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left(\Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) \right) \right) \right\|_{\text{tr}} \\
& \leq 2 \text{tr} \sqrt{\frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E}_{X^n} \left(\Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n) D^n(X^n) \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n)^* \right)} \\
& \stackrel{(20)}{=} 2 \text{tr} \sqrt{\frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E}_{X^n} \left(\Theta_{\varepsilon,n} D^n(X^n)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Psi_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n) D^n(X^n) \Psi_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n) D^n(X^n)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta_{\varepsilon,n} \right)}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the second summand in (28), we use (16) of Lemma 2 with $T : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$, $x^n \mapsto D^n(x^n) \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(x^n)^*$ and obtain the exact same upper bound.

For the third summand in (28), we use Lemma 2 one more time with $T : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$, $x^n \mapsto \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(x^n) D^n(x^n) \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(x^n)^*$ (this time it does not matter which alternative we use because T has self-adjoint values) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left(\Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m))^* - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m)) D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(\mathcal{C}(m))^* \right) \right) \right\|_{\text{tr}} \\
& \leq 2 \text{tr} \left(\frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E}_{X^n} \left(\Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n) D^n(X^n) \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n)^* \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n) D^n(X^n) \Gamma_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n)^* \right) \right) \\
& \stackrel{(20)}{=} 2 \text{tr} \sqrt{\frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E}_{X^n} \left(\Theta_{\varepsilon,n} D^n(X^n)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Psi_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n) D^n(X^n)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Psi_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n) \Theta_{\varepsilon,n} \Psi_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n) D^n(X^n)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Psi_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n) D^n(X^n)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta_{\varepsilon,n} \right)} \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 2 \text{tr} \sqrt{\frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E}_{X^n} \left(\Theta_{\varepsilon,n} D^n(X^n)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Psi_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n) D^n(X^n) \Psi_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n) D^n(X^n)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta_{\varepsilon,n} \right)}.
\end{aligned}$$

(a) is by $\Theta_{\varepsilon,n} \leq \mathbf{1}$ and once more applying (20). We have obtained matching upper bounds in all three cases and can conclude our calculation with a successive application of the sub-items of Lemma 3 in conjunction with the operator monotonicity of the square root [29, Theorem]. The number of the subitem of Lemma 3 is indicated above the inequality sign where it is applied.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{tr} \sqrt{\frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E}_{X^n} \left(\Theta_{\varepsilon,n} D^n(X^n)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Psi_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n) D^n(X^n) \Psi_{\varepsilon,n}(X^n) D^n(X^n)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta_{\varepsilon,n} \right)} \\
& \stackrel{1)}{\leq} \text{tr} \sqrt{\frac{1}{M} \exp(-n(H_P - \varepsilon)) \mathbb{E}_{X^n} \left(\Theta_{\varepsilon,n} D^n(X^n) \Theta_{\varepsilon,n} \right)} \\
& = \text{tr} \sqrt{\frac{1}{M} \exp(-n(H_P - \varepsilon)) \Theta_{\varepsilon,n} D_P^{\otimes n} \Theta_{\varepsilon,n}}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\stackrel{2)}{\leq} \mathbf{tr} \sqrt{\frac{1}{M} \exp(-n(H_P + H_U - 2\varepsilon))} \Theta_{\varepsilon, n} \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}n(H_P + H_U + R - 2\varepsilon)\right) \mathbf{tr} \Theta_{\varepsilon, n} \\
&\stackrel{3)}{\leq} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}n(H_P - H_U + R - 4\varepsilon)\right) \\
&\stackrel{\text{eq. (12)}}{=} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}n(R - I(P, D) - 4\varepsilon)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Step (a) is due to the assumption $M \geq \exp(nR)$ and (20). The assumptions of the theorem and choice of ε ensure $R - I(P, D) - 4\varepsilon > 0$. Therefore, the theorem follows with any choice

$$\gamma \in \left(0, \min\left(\gamma_1, \frac{1}{2}(R - I(P, D) - 4\varepsilon)\right)\right). \quad \square$$

The proof of Corollary 1 is essentially an application of the bounded differences inequality [30]. For the reader's convenience, we reproduce the result here in the form that we will be using.

Theorem 3. (Bounded differences inequality as stated in [31, Th. 6.2].) *Let \mathcal{X} be a measurable space, and let $f : \mathcal{X}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Assume that there are nonnegative constants c_1, \dots, c_ℓ with the property*

$$\forall i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\} \sup \left\{ |f(x_1, \dots, x_\ell) - f(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x'_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_\ell)| : x_1, \dots, x_\ell, x'_i \in \mathcal{X} \right\} \leq c_i, \quad (29)$$

and denote

$$v := \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} c_i^2.$$

Let X_1, \dots, X_ℓ be independent random variables such that $\mathbb{E}f(X_1, \dots, X_\ell)$ exists. Then for any $t \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(f(X_1, \dots, X_\ell) - \mathbb{E}f(X_1, \dots, X_\ell) > t) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2v}\right).$$

The condition (29) is called the *bounded differences property* which gives Theorem 3 its name.

Proof of Corollary 1. We apply Theorem 3 to the function

$$f : (\mathcal{C}(1), \dots, \mathcal{C}(M)) \mapsto \|D_{\mathcal{C}} - D_{\hat{P}}^{\otimes n}\|_{\text{tr}},$$

so we first need to compute c_m with

$$\sup \left\{ \left| \|D_{\mathcal{C}} - D_{\hat{P}}^{\otimes n}\|_{\text{tr}} - \|D_{\mathcal{C}'} - D_{\hat{P}}^{\otimes n}\|_{\text{tr}} \right| : \forall m \in \{1, \dots, \hat{m} - 1, \hat{m} + 1, \dots, M\} : \mathcal{C}(m) = \mathcal{C}'(m) \right\} \leq c_m.$$

To this end, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \|D_{\mathcal{C}} - D_{\hat{P}}^{\otimes n}\|_{\text{tr}} - \|D_{\mathcal{C}'} - D_{\hat{P}}^{\otimes n}\|_{\text{tr}} \right| \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \|D_{\mathcal{C}} - D_{\hat{P}}^{\otimes n} - D_{\mathcal{C}'} + D_{\hat{P}}^{\otimes n}\|_{\text{tr}} \\
&\stackrel{(15)}{=} \left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M (D^n(\mathcal{C}(m)) - D^n(\mathcal{C}'(m))) \right\|_{\text{tr}} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} \frac{1}{M} \|D^n(\mathcal{C}(\hat{m})) - D^n(\mathcal{C}'(\hat{m}))\|_{\text{tr}} \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \frac{2}{M},
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) is due to the triangle inequality, (b) is because $\mathcal{C}(m) = \mathcal{C}'(m)$ whenever $m \neq \hat{m}$, and (c) is an application of the triangle inequality and the fact that the range of D is $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$.

This means that we can choose $c_m := 2/M$ for all m . Consequently, we obtain

$$v = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\hat{m}=1}^M \frac{2^2}{M^2} = M^{-1}.$$

We fix real numbers $\beta, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$ with the properties

$$0 < \beta < \gamma < \gamma_1, \quad \beta < \frac{R}{2}, \quad 0 < \gamma_2 < R - 2\beta \quad (30)$$

where γ is from the statement of Theorem 2. With this, we have, for sufficiently large n ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\|D_{\mathcal{C}} - D_P^{\otimes n}\|_{\text{tr}} \geq \exp(-\gamma_1 n) \right) &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\|D_{\mathcal{C}} - D_P^{\otimes n}\|_{\text{tr}} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \|D_{\mathcal{C}} - D_P^{\otimes n}\|_{\text{tr}} \geq \exp(-\gamma_1 n) - \exp(-\gamma n) \right) \\
&\stackrel{(30)}{\leq} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\|D_{\mathcal{C}} - D_P^{\otimes n}\|_{\text{tr}} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \|D_{\mathcal{C}} - D_P^{\otimes n}\|_{\text{tr}} \geq \exp(-\beta n) \right) \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \exp \left(-\frac{\exp(-2\beta n)}{2M^{-1}} \right) \\
&\leq \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \exp((R - 2\beta)n) \right) \\
&\stackrel{(30)}{\leq} \exp(-\exp(\gamma_2 n)).
\end{aligned}$$

(a) is the application of Theorem 2 and (b) the application of Theorem 3. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. We begin with the choice of a few parameters that will be necessary for our construction later on. The assumption $R < I(P, W) - I(P, D)$ allows us to choose a $\tilde{R} \in (I(P, D), I(P, W) - R)$. For sufficiently large n , this then allows us to fix $M, L \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying

$$M \geq \exp(n\tilde{R}) \quad (31)$$

$$ML \leq \exp(n(R + \tilde{R})) \quad (32)$$

$$L \geq \exp(nR). \quad (33)$$

a) *Codebook generation:* We generate a wiretap codebook $\mathcal{C} := (\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_L)$ which is an L -tuple of i.i.d. standard random codebooks drawn according to P .

b) *Encoding procedure:* Let $\mathfrak{M} \in \{1, \dots, L\}$. In order to generate the corresponding output of Enc, we draw a random number $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ and output $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{M}}(m)$. Note that (33) ensures that our code has a rate of at least R .

c) *Decoding procedure:* We use a joint typicality decoder; i.e., Dec outputs $\hat{\mathfrak{M}}$ if there is $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ such that $\mathcal{C}_{\hat{\mathfrak{M}}}(m)$ is jointly typical with \hat{X}^n and $\hat{\mathfrak{M}}, m$ are unique with this property. If no such $\hat{\mathfrak{M}}, m$ exist, the decoder outputs 1. The definition of typicality we use is in terms of information density (cf. [32, Def. 4.34]). The average error property of our wiretap code is proven in [32, Lemma 4.37] which states that there are $\gamma_1, \beta_1 \in (0, \infty)$ with the property

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{M}} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathfrak{M}} \neq \mathfrak{M}) \geq \exp(-n\gamma_1) \right) \leq \exp(-n\beta_2). \quad (34)$$

d) *Distinguishing security level:* We first note that by passing \mathfrak{M} through Enc and D^n , we obtain the density operator $D_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{M}}}$. Let us assume that we have for every $\ell \in \{1, \dots, L\}$

$$\|D_{\mathcal{C}_{\ell}} - D_P^{\otimes n}\|_{\text{tr}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \exp(-\gamma_2 n). \quad (35)$$

The triangle inequality then yields, for all ℓ_1, ℓ_2 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|D_{\mathcal{C}_{\ell_1}} - D_{\mathcal{C}_{\ell_2}}\|_{\text{tr}} &\leq \|D_{\mathcal{C}_{\ell_1}} - D_P^{\otimes n}\|_{\text{tr}} + \|D_{\mathcal{C}_{\ell_2}} - D_P^{\otimes n}\|_{\text{tr}} \\
&\stackrel{(35)}{\leq} \exp(-\gamma_2 n),
\end{aligned}$$

which means that our wiretap code has distinguishing security level $\exp(-n\gamma_2)$.

So it remains to calculate the probability that (35) is not true for all ℓ . By Corollary 1, we can find $\gamma_2, \beta_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for sufficiently large n , we have for every $\ell \in \{1, \dots, L\}$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\|D_{\mathcal{C}_{\ell}} - D_P^{\otimes n}\|_{\text{tr}} \geq \frac{1}{2} \exp(-\gamma_2 n) \right) \leq \exp(-\exp(\beta_2 n)). \quad (36)$$

With this, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\exists \ell \in \{1, \dots, L\} \ \|D_{\mathcal{C}_{\ell}} - D_P^{\otimes n}\|_{\text{tr}} \geq \frac{1}{2} \exp(-\gamma_2 n) \right) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\|D_{\mathcal{C}_{\ell}} - D_P^{\otimes n}\|_{\text{tr}} \geq \frac{1}{2} \exp(-\gamma_2 n) \right) \\
&\stackrel{(36)}{\leq} L \exp(-\exp(n\beta_2)) \\
&\stackrel{(31), (32)}{\leq} \exp(n\tilde{R} - \exp(n\beta_2)), \quad (37)
\end{aligned}$$

where step (a) is by the union bound.

In conclusion, if n is sufficiently large so that (34) and (37) hold and also large enough so that the right hand sides in these inequalities sum to less than 1, we have found a wiretap code with rate R , average error $\exp(-n\gamma_1)$ and distinguishing security level $\exp(-n\gamma_2)$, concluding the proof of the theorem. \square

APPENDIX

Lemma 5. *The norms $\|\cdot\|_{\text{op}}$ on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\text{tr}}$ on $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$, we have the following properties:*

- 1) $\forall A \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}) : \|A\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|A\|_{\text{tr}}$
- 2) $\forall A_1 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}), A_2 \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}), A_3 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : A_1 A_2 A_3 \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}) \wedge \|A_1 A_2 A_3\|_{\text{tr}} \leq \|A_1\|_{\text{op}} \|A_2\|_{\text{tr}} \|A_3\|_{\text{op}}$
- 3) $\forall A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}) : \|A_1 A_2\|_{\text{tr}} \leq \|A_1\|_{\text{tr}} \|A_2\|_{\text{tr}}$
- 4) *The maps $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})'$, $A \mapsto \text{tr}(A \cdot)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})'$, $A \mapsto \text{tr}(A \cdot)$ are isometric isomorphisms. In particular,*

$$\forall A \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}) : \|A\|_{\text{tr}} = \sup \left\{ |\text{tr}(AB)| : B \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}) \wedge \|B\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Since these are well-known facts, we provide references to textbooks in lieu of a proof: 1) follows from [27, Theorem III.4], 2) follows from [27, Lemma III.8(v)], 3) is immediate from 1), 2), and 4) is [23, Th. VI.26].

Lemma 6. *Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the map $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})^\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$, $(A_1, \dots, A_\ell) \mapsto A_1 \circ \dots \circ A_\ell$ is continuous.*

Proof. The proof is by induction on ℓ . The case $\ell = 1$ is clear, and the case $\ell > 2$ follows by induction hypothesis and the case $\ell = 2$.

Hence, the only case left to prove is $\ell = 2$. Let $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$, and for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $(A_i^{(j)})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence with

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|A_i - A_i^{(j)}\|_{\text{tr}} = 0.$$

Then we use the triangle inequality and sub-multiplicativity of the trace norm in Lemma 5-3) to argue

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_1 A_2 - A_1^{(j)} A_2^{(j)}\|_{\text{tr}} &= \|A_1 A_2 - A_1^{(j)} A_2 + A_1^{(j)} A_2 - A_1^{(j)} A_2^{(j)}\|_{\text{tr}} \\ &\leq \|A_1 - A_1^{(j)}\|_{\text{tr}} \|A_2\|_{\text{tr}} + \|A_1^{(j)}\|_{\text{tr}} \|A_2 - A_2^{(j)}\|_{\text{tr}} \end{aligned}$$

Since the norm of a convergent sequence is upper bounded, we can apply the limit on both sides and obtain

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|A_1 A_2 - A_1^{(j)} A_2^{(j)}\|_{\text{tr}} = 0. \quad \square$$

Lemma 7. *Let $D : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ be measurable. Let $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous and assume that there is $c \in (0, 1]$ with $f(t) = 0$ for all $t < c$. Then $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$, $x \mapsto f(D(x))$ is measurable.*

Proof. We begin with a brief outline of the proof. We will first prove that if $p : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a polynomial function with $p(0) = 0$,

$$\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}), x \mapsto p(D(x)) \text{ is measurable.} \quad (38)$$

Next, we will infer that $f(D(x)) \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and

$$\forall h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, x \mapsto \langle h_1, f(D(x)) h_2 \rangle \text{ is measurable.} \quad (39)$$

Finally, we will use (39) to verify the criterion [33, Th. E.9] for measurability of operator valued functions.

For (38), we note that since $p(0) = 0$, we can write

$$p(D(x)) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} a_i D(x)^i.$$

Each summand is the composition of the measurable map $D^i : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})^i$, $x \mapsto (D(x), \dots, D(x))$ and the product of operators which is continuous by Lemma 6. Both the trace class and the set of measurable functions are closed under finite summations, hence we obtain (38).

We apply the spectral theorem for self-adjoint trace class operators to write

$$f(D(x)) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} f(\lambda_\ell(x)) |e_\ell(x)\rangle \langle e_\ell(x)|,$$

where $(e_\ell(x))_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of corresponding orthonormal eigenvectors and $(\lambda_\ell(x))_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the non-increasing sequence of eigenvalues of $D(x)$ which contains all nonzero eigenvalues counted with multiplicity and converges to 0. For every x , we

have $f(\lambda_\ell(x)) > 0$ for only finitely many ℓ , and thus $f(D(x)) \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$. In order to prove (39), we apply the Weierstraß approximation theorem to obtain a sequence of polynomials $(p_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $p_i(0) = 0$ for every i and

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \|f - p_i\|_\infty = 0,$$

where the difference is pointwise and p_i is implicitly identified with its restriction to $[0, 1]$. By the continuity of the continuous functional calculus, this implies, for every x ,

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \|f(D(x)) - p_i(D(x))\|_{\text{op}} = 0.$$

The map $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, A \mapsto \langle h_1, Ah_2 \rangle$ is continuous, so it follows that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \langle h_1, p_i(D(x))h_2 \rangle = \langle h_1, f(D(x))h_2 \rangle. \quad (40)$$

Clearly, the identity map $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is also continuous and $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}), x \mapsto p_i(D(x))$ is measurable by (38). Therefore, (40) is a representation of the map $x \mapsto \langle h_1, f(D(x))h_2 \rangle$ as a pointwise limit of measurable functions, hence we obtain (39).

The criterion [33, Th. E.9] requires us to verify that for every $\varphi \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})'$, the map $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, x \mapsto \varphi(f(D(x)))$ is measurable. By Lemma 5-4), the map

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})', A \mapsto \mathbf{tr}(A \cdot)$$

is an isometric isomorphism. Therefore, it remains to show that for all $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, the map $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, x \mapsto \mathbf{tr}(Af(D(x)))$ is measurable.

By Lemma 5-2), $Af(D(x)) \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$. Pick an orthonormal basis $(e_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of \mathcal{H} . Then, by [23, Th. VI.24],

$$\mathbf{tr}(Af(D(x))) := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle e_i, Af(D(x))e_i \rangle$$

converges absolutely and regardless of the choice of basis. For every $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \langle e_i, Af(D(x))e_i \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \langle A^*e_i, f(D(x))e_i \rangle,$$

which is a measurable function of x by (39). So we have written the map $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, x \mapsto \mathbf{tr}(Af(D(x)))$ as a pointwise limit of measurable maps. \square

Lemma 8. *Let $D : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ be measurable. For every $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, define a map $\lambda_\ell : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ in such a way that for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $(\lambda_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the non-increasing sequence which contains all nonzero eigenvalues of $D(x)$ counted with multiplicity.*

Then, we have the following:

- 1) *For every $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, the map $\lambda_\ell : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is measurable.*
- 2) *Let $0 < a < b \leq 1$. Then $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}), x \mapsto \mathbb{1}_{(a,b)}(D(x))$ is measurable.*

Proof. For item 1, we let $s_\ell : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be the map that maps each A to its ℓ -th largest eigenvalue (counted with multiplicity). We note that $s_\ell \circ D = \lambda_\ell$. Since by Lemma 5-1 the operator norm is upper bounded by the trace norm, [34, Application (b) following Th. III.9.1] implies that the map s_ℓ is continuous. Therefore λ_ℓ is measurable, since it is the composition of a continuous and a measurable map.

For item 2, we define a sequence $(f_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of functions $[0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$f_i(t) := \begin{cases} 1, & t \in [a + \frac{1}{i}, b - \frac{1}{i}] \\ i(t - a), & t \in (a, a + \frac{1}{i}) \\ i(b - t), & t \in (b - \frac{1}{i}, b) \\ 0, & t \notin (a, b). \end{cases}$$

It is straightforward to verify that $(f_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of continuous functions and that for all i and all $t < a$, we have $f_i(t) = 0$. This allows us to apply Lemma 7 and conclude that the functions $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}), x \mapsto f_i(D(x))$ are measurable.

It remains to show that for every x , $f_i(D(x))$ converges to $\mathbb{1}_{(a,b)}(D(x))$ in trace norm. We are going to prove the stronger statement

$$\forall x \in \mathcal{X} \exists i' \in \mathbb{N} \forall i \geq i' : f_i(D(x)) = \mathbb{1}_{(a,b)}(D(x)).$$

To this end, we observe that we have equality if f_i and $\mathbb{1}_{(a,b)}$ coincide on $\sigma(D(x))$. It can easily be verified that these functions coincide everywhere but on $(a, a + \frac{1}{i})$ and $(b - \frac{1}{i}, b)$. But if $\sigma(D(x))$ has nonempty intersection with one of these intervals for infinitely many i , we have found an accumulation point of $\sigma(D(x))$ either at a or b , contradicting $a, b \neq 0$. \square

Lemma 9. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ be a probability space, \mathcal{H} a separable Hilbert space and let $A : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ be a random variable. Then, we have the following:*

- 1) The Bochner integral $\mathbb{E}A \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ exists iff the Lebesgue integral $\mathbb{E}\|A\|_{\text{tr}}$ exists and is finite.
- 2) $\|\mathbb{E}A\|_{\text{tr}} \leq \mathbb{E}\|A\|_{\text{tr}}$
- 3) If $\mathbb{E}A$ exists, then $\mathbb{E}\text{tr}A$ exists and $\text{tr}\mathbb{E}A = \mathbb{E}\text{tr}A$.
- 4) If for all $\omega \in \Omega$, we have $A(\omega) \geq 0$ and $\sqrt{A(\omega)} \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$, then

$$\mathbb{E}\sqrt{A} \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}A}.$$

Proof. For 1 and 2 we note that the separability of \mathcal{H} implies that $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ is separable, which means that A has separable range. Therefore, the statements are proven in [24, V.5, Th. 1 and Cor. 1]. For 3), we recall that the trace is a bounded linear operator [27, Lemmas III.1.4 and III.1.8(vi)], so we can invoke [24, Cor. V.5.2] to obtain the statement.

We will show 4) as an application of the Theorem in [35] in the form of eq. (K') with the function $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$, $A \mapsto A^*A$ substituted for g . To this end, we first have to note that the function is continuous by Lemma 6 and that it satisfies the convexity condition in [35]. In order to show the latter, we calculate for $t \in [0, 1]$ and $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$:

$$\begin{aligned} & (tA_1 + (1-t)A_2)^*(tA_1 + (1-t)A_2) \\ &= t^2A_1^*A_1 + t(1-t)(A_1^*A_2 + A_2^*A_1) + (1-t)^2A_2^*A_2 \\ &= tA_1^*A_1 + (1-t)A_2^*A_2 + (t^2-t)A_1^*A_1 + ((1-t)^2 - (1-t))A_2^*A_2 + t(1-t)(A_1^*A_2 + A_2^*A_1) \\ &= tA_1^*A_1 + (1-t)A_2^*A_2 - t(1-t)(A_1^*A_1 - A_1^*A_2 - A_2^*A_1 + A_2^*A_2) \\ &= tA_1^*A_1 + (1-t)A_2^*A_2 - t(1-t)(A_1 - A_2)^*(A_1 - A_2) \\ &\leq tA_1^*A_1 + (1-t)A_2^*A_2. \end{aligned}$$

We can now argue

$$\mathbb{E}\sqrt{A} \stackrel{(a)}{=} \sqrt{(\mathbb{E}\sqrt{A})^* \mathbb{E}\sqrt{A}} \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(\sqrt{A^*} \sqrt{A})} \stackrel{(c)}{=} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}A}.$$

(a) is due to $\mathbb{E}\sqrt{A} \geq 0$, (b) is the application of [35, Theorem] combined with the fact that the square root is operator monotone [29, Theorem], and (c) follows directly from $A \geq 0$. \square

Clearly, the assumptions of Theorem 2 assure that both $H_{P,\alpha}$ and $H_{U,\alpha}$ are finite.

Lemma 10. Let $p : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a p.m.f. with

$$\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} p(i)^{\alpha_{\min}} < \infty.$$

Then the function

$$f_p : \alpha \mapsto \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} p(i)^\alpha \tag{41}$$

is continuously differentiable on (α_{\min}, ∞) , and its derivative is

$$f'_p : \alpha \mapsto \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} p(i)^\alpha \log p(i) \in (-\infty, 0]. \tag{42}$$

Moreover, for every $\alpha_0 > \alpha_{\min}$, we have $g_{\max}(\alpha_0) \in [0, \infty)$ such that for all $\alpha \in [\alpha_0, \infty)$

$$|f'_p(\alpha)| \leq g_{\max}(\alpha_0) \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} p(i)^{\alpha_{\min}} < \infty. \tag{43}$$

Proof. Fix an arbitrary $\alpha_0 > \alpha_{\min}$. Because α_0 can be chosen arbitrarily close to α_{\min} , it is sufficient to compute f' on $[\alpha_0, \infty)$. By [36, Theorem 7.17], we only have to show that

$$\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{d}{d\alpha} p(i)^\alpha = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} p(i)^\alpha \log p(i)$$

converges uniformly for $\alpha \in [\alpha_0, \infty)$. To this end, we write

$$-p(i)^\alpha \log p(i) = -p(i)^{\alpha_{\min}} p(i)^{\alpha_0 - \alpha_{\min}} p(i)^{\alpha - \alpha_0} \log p(i) \leq -p(i)^{\alpha_{\min}} p(i)^{\alpha_0 - \alpha_{\min}} \log p(i)$$

By the Weierstraß criterion, we only have to show that

$$\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \left(-p(i)^{\alpha_{\min}} p(i)^{\alpha_0 - \alpha_{\min}} \log p(i) \right)$$

converges. To this end, we first examine the function

$$g : (0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty), t \mapsto -t^{\alpha_0 - \alpha_{\min}} \log t.$$

Clearly, $g(1) = 0$. Moreover, by substituting $\hat{t} := -\log t$, we get

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \left(-t^{\alpha_0 - \alpha_{\min}} \log t \right) = \lim_{\hat{t} \rightarrow \infty} \hat{t} \exp(-\hat{t}(\alpha_0 - \alpha_{\min})) = 0,$$

so g can be extended to a continuous function on the whole interval $[0, 1]$ with $g(0) = g(1) = 0$. This means that g takes a finite maximum value g_{\max} on $[0, 1]$. So we have

$$\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \left(-p(i)^{\alpha_{\min}} p(i)^{\alpha_0 - \alpha_{\min}} \log p(i) \right) \leq g_{\max} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} p(i)^{\alpha_{\min}} < \infty$$

by the assumption of the lemma, concluding the proof. \square

Lemma 11. $\alpha \mapsto H_{U,\alpha}$ and $\alpha \mapsto H_{P,\alpha}$ are continuously differentiable on $(\alpha_{\min}, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$. Moreover, we have

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} H_{U,\alpha} = H_U \quad (44)$$

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} H_{P,\alpha} = H_P. \quad (45)$$

Proof. In order to apply Lemma 10, we define functions f_U and $f_{P(\cdot|X)}$ as in (41), where the p.m.f. U (respectively $P(\cdot|X)$) is substituted for p . Observe that

$$H_{U,\alpha} = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log f_U(\alpha),$$

where f_U is defined by (41) with $p := U$. Therefore, the continuous differentiability follows immediately from Lemma 10.

The argument for the continuous differentiability of

$$H_{P,\alpha} = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \mathbb{E} f_{P(\cdot|X)}(\alpha)$$

is similar, but we need an additional argument that

$$\frac{d}{d\alpha} \mathbb{E} f_{P(\cdot|X)}(\alpha) = \mathbb{E} f'_{P(\cdot|X)}(\alpha), \quad (46)$$

(and, implicitly, that the derivative on the left hand side exists) where $f'_{P(\cdot|X)}$ is given in (42). It is sufficient to show that this is the case for all $\alpha > \alpha_0 > \alpha_{\min}$. We argue this with the criterion [37, Th. 16.8] for interchangeability of differentiation and expectation, which requires us to show that $f'_{P(\cdot|x)}$ is a continuous function of α for fixed x and that $|f'_{P(\cdot|x)}(\alpha)|$ has an upper bound that is uniform in α and integrable over X . The former clearly follows from Lemma 10, and for the latter, we note the bound (43) in Lemma 10 and observe that

$$\sum_{y \in \mathbb{N}} P(y|x)^{\alpha_{\min}} = \mathbf{tr}(D(x)^{\alpha_{\min}}),$$

so by the interchangeability of expectation and trace, the integrability follows from the assumption in Theorem 2 that $\mathbb{E} D(X)^{\alpha_{\min}} \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ exists.

In order to show (44), we note that

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} H_{U,\alpha} = - \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} \frac{\log f_U(\alpha) - \log f_U(1)}{\alpha - 1} = (\log \circ f_U)'(1).$$

Lemma 10 and the chain rule yield

$$(\log \circ f_U)'(1) = \frac{f'_U(1)}{f_U(1)} = H_U.$$

For (45), we have

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} H_{P,\alpha} = - \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} \frac{\log \mathbb{E} f_{P(\cdot|X)}(\alpha) - \log \mathbb{E} f_{P(\cdot|X)}(1)}{\alpha - 1} = g'(1),$$

where g' is the derivative of

$$g : \alpha \mapsto \log \mathbb{E} f_{P(\cdot|X)}(\alpha).$$

We use (46) and the chain rule for differentiation to obtain

$$g'(\alpha) = \frac{\mathbb{E} f'_{P(\cdot|X)}(\alpha)}{\mathbb{E} f_{P(\cdot|X)}(\alpha)} = \frac{\mathbb{E} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{N}} P(y|X)^\alpha \log P(y|X)}{\mathbb{E} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{N}} P(y|X)^\alpha},$$

so clearly, $g'(1) = H_P$, concluding the proof of the lemma. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Ferrigno and M. Hlaváč, “When aes blinks: introducing optical side channel,” *IET Information Security*, vol. 2, pp. 94–98(4), September 2008. [Online]. Available: https://digital-library.theiet.org/content/journals/10.1049/iet-ifs_20080038
- [2] J. Krämer, M. Kasper, and J.-P. Seifert, “The role of photons in cryptanalysis,” in *2014 19th Asia and South Pacific Design Automation Conference (ASP-DAC)*, 2014, pp. 780–787.
- [3] A. D. Wyner, “The wire-tap channel,” *Bell Labs Technical Journal*, vol. 54, no. 8, pp. 1355–1387, 1975.
- [4] I. Csiszar and J. Korner, “Broadcast channels with confidential messages,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 339–348, 1978.
- [5] I. Csiszár, “Almost independence and secrecy capacity,” *Problems Inform. Transmission*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 40–47, 1996.
- [6] M. Hayashi, “General nonasymptotic and asymptotic formulas in channel resolvability and identification capacity and their application to the wiretap channel,” *Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 1562–1575, 2006.
- [7] M. R. Bloch and J. N. Laneman, “Strong secrecy from channel resolvability,” *Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 12, pp. 8077–8098, 2013.
- [8] S. Goldwasser and S. Micali, “Probabilistic encryption,” *Journal of computer and system sciences*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 270–299, 1984.
- [9] M. Bellare, S. Tessaro, and A. Vardy, “Semantic security for the wiretap channel,” in *Advances in Cryptology—CRYPTO 2012*. Springer, 2012, pp. 294–311.
- [10] P. Cuff, “Soft covering with high probability,” in *ISIT*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 2963–2967.
- [11] Z. Goldfeld, P. Cuff, and H. H. Permuter, “Semantic-security capacity for wiretap channels of type ii,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 62, no. 7, pp. 3863–3879, July 2016.
- [12] —, “Semantic-security capacity for the physical layer via information theory,” in *2016 IEEE International Conference on Software Science, Technology and Engineering (SWSTE)*, June 2016, pp. 17–27.
- [13] I. Devetak, “The private classical capacity and quantum capacity of a quantum channel,” *Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 44–55, 2005.
- [14] S. Guha, J. H. Shapiro, and B. I. Erkmen, “Capacity of the bosonic wiretap channel and the entropy photon-number inequality,” in *2008 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, 2008, pp. 91–95.
- [15] M. M. Wilde, P. Hayden, and S. Guha, “Quantum trade-off coding for bosonic communication,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 86, p. 062306, Dec 2012. [Online]. Available: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.86.062306>
- [16] H. Qi and M. M. Wilde, “Capacities of quantum amplifier channels,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 95, p. 012339, Jan 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.95.012339>
- [17] D. Ding and S. Guha, “Noisy feedback and loss unlimited private communication,” in *2018 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2018, pp. 586–590.
- [18] M. M. Wilde and H. Qi, “Energy-constrained private and quantum capacities of quantum channels,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 64, no. 12, pp. 7802–7827, 2018.
- [19] Z. Utkovski, P. Agostini, M. Frey, I. Bjelakovic, and S. Stanczak, “Learning radio maps for physical-layer security in the radio access,” in *2019 IEEE 20th International Workshop on Signal Processing Advances in Wireless Communications (SPAWC)*, 2019, pp. 1–5.
- [20] Z. Utkovski, M. Frey, P. Agostini, I. Bjelakovic, and S. Stanczak, “Semantic security based secrecy maps for vehicular communications,” in *WSA 2021; 25th International ITG Workshop on Smart Antennas*, 2021, pp. 1–5.
- [21] R. Schulz, O. Günlü, R. Elschner, R. F. Schaefer, C. Schmidt-Langhorst, C. Schubert, and R. F. Fischer, “Semantic security for indoor thz-wireless communication,” in *2021 17th International Symposium on Wireless Communication Systems (ISWCS)*, 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [22] M. Frey, I. Bjelaković, and S. Stańczak, “Towards secure over-the-air computation,” in *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2021, pp. 700–705.
- [23] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Functional Analysis, revised and enlarged edition*, ser. Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics. San Diego: Academic Press, 1980, vol. 1.
- [24] K. Yosida, *Functional Analysis*, 6th ed., ser. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften. Berlin Heidelberg New York: Springer-Verlag, 1980, vol. 123.
- [25] M. Bellare, S. Tessaro, and A. Vardy, “Semantic security for the wiretap channel,” in *Annual Cryptology Conference*. Springer, 2012, pp. 294–311.
- [26] T. Heinosaari and M. Ziman, *The Mathematical Language of Quantum Theory. From Uncertainty to Entanglement*. Cambridge New York Melbourne Madrid Cape Town Singapore São Paulo Delhi Tokyo Mexico City: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [27] R. Schatten, *Norm Ideals of Completely Continuous Operators*, 2nd ed., ser. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer, 1970, vol. 27.
- [28] M. J. Wainwright, *High-Dimensional Statistics. A Non-Asymptotic Viewpoint*, 1st ed., ser. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019, vol. 48.
- [29] G. K. Pedersen, “Some operator monotone functions,” *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 309–310, November 1972.
- [30] C. McDiarmid *et al.*, “On the method of bounded differences,” *Surveys in combinatorics*, vol. 141, no. 1, pp. 148–188, 1989.
- [31] S. Boucheron, G. Lugosi, and P. Massart, *Concentration Inequalities. A Nonasymptotic Theory of Independence*, 1st ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- [32] F. Bender, “Non-asymptotic channel estimation for secrecy maps,” Master’s thesis, Technische Universität Berlin, 2021, available: <https://www.netit.tu-berlin.de/menue/theses/>.
- [33] D. L. Cohn, *Measure theory*, 2nd ed., ser. Birkhäuser Advanced Texts Basler Lehrbücher. New York Heidelberg Dordrecht London: Birkhäuser, 2013.
- [34] I. Gohberg and S. Goldberg, *Basic Operator Theory*. Boston Basel Stuttgart: Birkhäuser, 1980.
- [35] T. O. To and Y. K. Wing, “A generalized Jensen’s inequality,” *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 255–259, 1975.
- [36] W. Rudin, *Principles of Mathematical Analysis*, 3rd ed., ser. International Series in Pure and Applied Mathematics. New York St. Louis San Francisco Auckland Bogotá Caracas Lisbon London Madrid Mexico City Milan Montreal New Delhi San Juan Singapore Sydney Tokyo Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1976.
- [37] P. Billingsley, *Probability and Measure*, 2nd ed., ser. Wiley series in probability and mathematical statistics. New York Chichester Brisbane Toronto Singapore: Wiley, 1986.