

# Information capacity of quantum communication under natural physical assumptions

Jef Pauwels,<sup>1,2</sup> Stefano Pironio,<sup>3</sup> and Armin Tavakoli<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Applied Physics, University of Geneva, 1211 Geneva, Switzerland

<sup>2</sup>Constructor University, Geneva, Switzerland

<sup>3</sup>Laboratoire d'Information Quantique, Université libre de Bruxelles (ULB), Belgium

<sup>4</sup>Department of Physics and NanoLund, Lund University, Box 118, 22100 Lund, Sweden

(Dated: April 17, 2024)

The quantum prepare-and-measure scenario has been studied under various physical assumptions on the emitted states. Here, we first discuss how different assumptions are conceptually and formally related. We then identify one that can serve as a relaxation of all others, corresponding to a limitation on the one-shot accessible information of the state ensemble. This motivates us to study the optimal state discrimination probability of a source subject to these various physical assumptions. We derive general and tight bounds for states restricted by their quantum dimension, their vacuum component, an arbitrary uniform overlap, the magnitude of higher-dimensional signals and the experimenter's trust in their device. Our results constitute a first step towards a more unified picture of semi-device-independent quantum information processing.

*Introduction.*— The prepare-and-measure (PM) scenario, Fig. 1, formalizes the simplest instance of a quantum communication experiment. A sender, Alice, encodes classical data into quantum systems which are sent to a receiver, Bob, who performs measurements to extract information. Protocols like BB84 and its many descendants [1] are archetypal examples of PM protocols, featuring fully characterized preparation and measurement devices. The advent of quantum technologies, and cryptographic applications in particular, has motivated the study of PM scenarios where devices are left uncharacterized up to some natural physical assumption on the preparation device. This is often referred to as semi-device-independent (SDI) quantum information.

The most common SDI assumption restricts the Hilbert space dimension of the states. Quantum systems can create correlations that cannot be simulated by classical systems of the same dimension [2, 3]. This quantum-classical separation enables SDI quantum information protocols for quantum key distribution [4, 5], quantum random number generation [6, 7], self-testing and certification [8–11] and entanglement detection [12–14]. Dimension-restricted communication has also been studied when the parties can additionally share unbounded entanglement [15–17].

The dimension represents the number of relevant degrees of freedom under the control of the experimenter. However, this is neither observable nor easy to precisely characterize. These shortcomings, which are especially salient for cryptographic applications, have partly motivated alternative communication assumptions. For example, the “almost dimension” approach assumes the states nearly, but not exactly, admit a  $d$ -dimensional representation [18]. Other proposals move away from the dimension entirely. An approach particularly well-suited to optical platforms supposes a limit on the photon excitations of the states, measured through the magnitude of the non-vacuum component [19]. This has e.g. been used for random number generation, in theory [20, 21] and practice [22–25]. Another approach is to bound the pairwise overlap between the states emitted by Alice [26, 27], which also has been used in various protocols [28–32]. Yet another communication assumption is a bound on the fidelity with which Alice prepares the specific states that she ideally in-




FIG. 1. *Prepare-and-measure scenario.* Different SDI assumptions,  $\gamma$ , specify a restriction on the states that Alice can send to Bob. The set of allowed states under a given SDI assumption is denoted  $\mathcal{S}_\gamma$ .

tends to send to Bob [33]. This may be viewed as a relaxation of the perfect preparation assumption used in one-sided device-independent approaches [34]. For brevity, we shall refer to these different assumptions as (i) the dimension restriction, (ii) entanglement-assisted dimension restriction, (iii) the vacuum component restriction, (iv) the overlap restriction, (v) almost dimension restriction, and (vi) the distrust restriction. Approaches (iii)-(vi) are primarily motivated by practical considerations, and (i)-(ii) partly also by the fundamental interest in comparing classical and quantum systems.

In contrast to the above assumptions that relate directly to the physical or quantum aspects of the preparation, a communication framework was introduced in [35, 36], in which the only assumption has an information-theoretic interpretation. Roughly speaking, it quantifies how much knowledge could in principle be gained about Alice's input by measuring her states. This information restriction on Alice's preparations can, in general, neither be directly deduced from the setup nor accurately bounded by measuring a suitable observable. Operationally, it can be interpreted as the best quantum state discrimination possible on Alice's states [37]. In this way, it provides an avenue to quantify the information cost of creating correlations between Alice and Bob.

In this paper, we begin by structuring this landscape of quantum communication assumptions and then identifying connections between the different frameworks, but argue that they admit no generic hierarchy of relations in terms of the supported quantum correlations. However, we observe that all assumptions (i)-(vi) admit a one-way connection to infor-

mation. To make this connection explicit, we address the independently interesting question of determining the information capacity of quantum communication subjected to any of the restrictions (i)-(vi). This amounts to bounding the best success probability in quantum state discrimination compatible with states limited by the various communication assumptions. For all assumptions, this is achieved analytically, in complete generality and, in most cases, provably tightly.

*Overview of assumptions the scenario.*— Consider the prepare-and-measure scenario in Fig. 1. Alice privately selects an input  $x$  and encodes it in a quantum message  $\rho_x$ , sent to Bob over a noiseless channel, who performs a decoding measurement  $\{M_{b|y}\}_y$  depending on  $y$ . The resulting correlations are given by Born's rule,  $p(b|x, y) = \text{tr}(\rho_x M_{b|y})$ . Naturally, if no restriction is imposed on the systems  $\rho_x$ , Alice may simply send  $x$  over the channel, and Bob can simulate any  $p(b|x, y)$ . Many assumptions have been studied in the literature, most of which we summarise below.

**(i) Dimension.** The state  $\rho_x$  is assumed to live in a Hilbert of fixed dimension  $d$ , that is,  $\rho_x \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ . W.l.g. one can also limit the measurement to be  $d$ -dimensional, but one can notably not assume them projective [38–40].

**(ii) Entanglement-assisted dimension.** Alice and Bob share an entangled state  $\phi_{AB}$ . Alice encodes  $x$  in her share of the state using a quantum channel  $\Lambda_x$  with fixed output dimension  $d$ . Bob measures the total state  $\rho_x = (\Lambda_x \otimes \mathbb{1})[\phi_{AB}]$ . One can generally not restrict the dimension of  $\phi_{AB}$  to  $d$  [41] and no upper bound on it is known.

**(iii) Vacuum component.** Define the the Hamiltonian  $H = \mathbb{1} - |0\rangle\langle 0|$  and associate the state  $|0\rangle$  to vacuum (no photon). A restriction,  $\omega$ , is assumed on photon excitation of Alice's states as  $\text{tr}(H\rho_x) \leq \omega$ .

**(iv) Overlaps.** The states  $\rho_x$  are assumed to have purifications,  $|\psi_x\rangle$ , whose pairwise overlaps are bounded as  $|\langle\psi_x|\psi_{x'}\rangle| \geq a_{xx'}$  for some  $a_{xx'} \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**(v) Almost-dimension.** Assume that there exists a  $d$ -dimensional space, with projector  $\Pi_d$ , in which nearly all of the support of Alice's states is contained,

$$\text{tr}(\rho_x \Pi_d) \geq 1 - \varepsilon, \quad (1)$$

for some small dimension-deviation parameters  $\varepsilon \geq 0$ . The part of the state that is not supported on  $\Pi_d$  corresponds to a deviation from the ideal  $d$ -dimensional system.

**(vi) Distrust.** Alice aims to prepare a state  $|\psi_x\rangle$  but her preparation device realizes the lab state  $\rho_x$ . Her distrust in the device is limited through the fidelity between the target state and the lab state,  $\langle\psi_x|\rho_x|\psi_x\rangle \geq 1 - \epsilon$ , where  $\epsilon \geq 0$  is the distrust parameter. The lab states need not be of the same dimension as the target states.

**(\*) Information.** Given the classical-quantum state  $\rho_{XB} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{x=1}^n |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes \rho_x$ , the conditional min-entropy is  $H_{\min}(X|B) = -\log_2(P_g)$  with

$$P_g(\{\rho_x\}) \equiv \max_{\{N_x\}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{x=1}^n \text{tr}(\rho_x N_x), \quad (2)$$

where  $n$  is the number of states and  $\{N_x\}$  is a measurement. Thus,  $P_g$  is the optimal probability of correctly guessing the

classical value  $x$  given the quantum state  $\rho_x$  [37]. The accessible information, measuring how much information the states  $\rho_x$  convey about  $x$ , is then defined as the entropy difference  $\mathcal{I} \equiv H_{\min}(X) - H_{\min}(X|B) = \log(n) + \log(P_g)$ , where we assumed that  $X$  is uniform. The information restriction assumption introduced in [35, 36] is then the limit  $\mathcal{I} \leq \alpha$  for some  $\alpha \geq 0$ , or equivalently, a limitation  $P_g \leq \frac{2^\alpha}{n}$ .

*Role of shared randomness.*— In general, a communication assumption can be written as  $\{\rho_x\}_x \in \mathcal{S}_\gamma$ , for some selected set  $\mathcal{S}_\gamma$ , where  $\gamma$  indexes the specific assumption parameters. For instance  $\gamma = d$  for (i),  $\gamma = \omega$  for (iii), or  $\gamma = (d, \epsilon)$  for (v). The corresponding PM scenario can always be extended by allowing for shared randomness (SR) between Alice and Bob, leading to the correlations  $p(b|x, y) = \sum_\lambda q_\lambda \text{tr}(\rho_x^\lambda M_{b|y}^\lambda)$ , where  $\lambda$  denotes the shared randomness and  $q$  is a distribution. Now, the assumption can be formulated in two different ways; either as *peak- $\gamma$*  or *average- $\gamma$* . Average- $\gamma$  means that the parameter assumption,  $\gamma$ , holds when averaging out  $\lambda$ ,

$$\{\rho_x^\lambda\}_x \in \mathcal{S}_{\gamma_\lambda} \quad \text{with} \quad \sum_\lambda q_\lambda \gamma_\lambda = \gamma. \quad (3)$$

For instance, the states can sometimes have larger or smaller vacuum components but on average it respects the limit assumed in (iii). Peak- $\gamma$  means that the assumption holds also when conditioning on  $\lambda$ ,

$$\{\rho_x^\lambda\}_x \in \mathcal{S}_\gamma, \quad \forall \lambda. \quad (4)$$

Continuing the example, the states may be different for each  $\lambda$  but their vacuum component always respects the limit assumed in (iii).

The peak- $\gamma$  assumption is natural for all cases considered above. At the level of the correlations, it corresponds simply to taking the convex-hull of the set of correlations without SR. The average- $\gamma$  restriction has been studied explicitly for the assumptions (iii) [19], (v) [18] and (vi) [33]. It has also been studied for Bell scenarios with dimension assumptions [42]; see also Appendix C in Ref. [18].

It is also relevant to distinguish between whether the states  $\rho_x^\lambda$  are assumed pure or mixed. Depending on the assumption, this can change the set of correlations [36, 43]. While purity can be assumed w.l.g for (i) and (ii), there is neither a proof nor a counterexample of the same holding for (iii)-(vi).

For all assumptions (i)-(vi), the set of correlations without SR under assumption  $\gamma$  is strictly contained in the set with peak- $\gamma$  SR, which itself is strictly contained in the set for average- $\gamma$  SR. In contrast, for the information assumption, the correlations without SR, with peak- $\gamma$  SR, and with average- $\gamma$  SR are all equivalent. Following eqs. (2), (3) and (4), these three sets are defined as those corresponding to a source sending, respectively, states  $\rho_x$  satisfying  $P_g(\{\rho_x\}) \leq \gamma$ , states  $\rho_x^\lambda$  satisfying  $P_g(\{\rho_x^\lambda\}) \leq \gamma$  for all  $\lambda$ , and states  $\rho_x^\lambda$  satisfying  $\sum_\lambda q(\lambda) P_g(\{\rho_x^\lambda\}) \leq \gamma$ . But the SR can always be incorporated in the emitted states themselves without increasing their information content [36]. Indeed, simply define as emitted states the cq-states  $\tilde{\rho}_x = \sum_\lambda q(\lambda) |\lambda\rangle\langle\lambda| \otimes \rho_x^\lambda$ , whose guessing probability is  $P_g(\{\tilde{\rho}_x\}) = \sum_\lambda q(\lambda) P_g(\{\rho_x^\lambda\}) \leq \gamma$ . Any peak- $\gamma$  or average- $\gamma$  strategy can thus be recast as an

equivalent strategy that does not feature SR and which satisfies the information restriction  $P_g \leq \gamma$ .

Note that starting from the information restriction  $\mathcal{I} = \log(n) + \log(P_g(\{\rho_x\})) \leq \alpha \equiv \gamma$ , rather than directly from the guessing probability, there are two ways to extend it from the no SR case to the average- $\gamma$  SR. One possibility is to assume for each  $\lambda$  that  $\mathcal{I}_\lambda \leq \alpha_\lambda$  with  $\sum_\lambda q(\lambda)\alpha_\lambda = \alpha$ , i.e., the average is taken at the level of the information quantity itself. The other possibility is to take the average at the level of the guessing probability and define the information bound as a bound  $\log(n) + \log(\sum_\lambda q(\lambda)P_g(\{\rho_x^\lambda\})) \leq \alpha$ , which is equivalent to the average guessing probability bound  $\sum_\lambda q(\lambda)P_g(\{\rho_x^\lambda\}) \leq 2^\alpha/n$ . This corresponds to the situation described above and to the choice made in [35, 36].

*Connecting the assumptions.*— In Fig. 2, we summarize the relations between the various assumptions (i)-(vi). The dimension is a special case of both the entanglement-assisted dimension and the almost dimension. In the former, we need only to restrict to sharing separable states, while in the latter we just set the dimensional deviation in Eq. (1) to  $\varepsilon = 0$ . However, these two are independent, and therefore incompatible, generalizations of the dimension restriction.

The vacuum component restriction can be seen as a limiting case of an almost dimension restriction. The latter is motivated as a correction to exact dimension restrictions, which are meaningful only when  $d \geq 2$ . However, an almost dimension restriction can in principle also be defined for  $d = 1$ . The projector  $\Pi_d$  is then a pure state, which we call the vacuum  $|0\rangle$ . This reduces Eq. (1) to the vacuum component assumption. Consequently, the methodology developed in Ref. [18] for bounding correlations under almost  $d$ -dimensional systems can also be applied to analyze correlations under a vacuum component restriction. This also a useful observation because, in the absence of such methods, the SDI protocols based on vacuum component restrictions have so far been limited to using just two states (analytically solvable) [19, 20]. Interestingly, the vacuum component restriction can equally be viewed as a limiting case of the distrust restriction. Indeed, the experimenter selects all target states to be vacuum, independently of  $x$ , i.e.  $|\psi_x\rangle = |0\rangle$ . This means that the numerical methods for distrust restricted correlations, developed in [33], also can be used to analyze the case of restricted vacuum components.

Does an almost dimension restriction admit any meaningful connection to a distrust restriction? The almost dimension too can be reformulated as a fidelity condition. The definition of fidelity for mixed states is  $F(\sigma, \tau) = (\text{tr} \sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma}\tau\sqrt{\sigma}})^2$ . For arbitrary positive operators  $A$  and  $B$ , it follows that  $F(A, BAB) = \text{tr}(AB)^2$ . The almost dimension assumption can then be interpreted as the fidelity between  $\rho_x$  and its normalized projection onto the  $d$ -dimensional subspace  $\Pi_d$ . That is,  $F(\rho_x, \frac{\Pi_d \rho_x \Pi_d}{\text{tr}(\rho_x \Pi_d)}) = \text{tr}(\rho_x \Pi_d) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$  via Eq. (1). What decisively distinguishes it from the distrust assumption is that  $\Pi_d$  cannot depend on  $x$ , as this would defeat the notion of the ensemble  $\{\rho_x\}$  approximating a  $d$ -dimensional system.

Finally, the overlap restriction can be viewed as a relaxation of a vacuum restriction in the special case where all




FIG. 2. Relation between various SDI assumptions. Blue (grey) arrows indicate that one assumption is a special case (relaxation) of the other. The overlap relaxation of the vacuum only holds for pure states.

states  $|\psi_x\rangle$  are pure. The vacuum component restriction  $\text{tr}(|\psi_x\rangle\langle\psi_x|(\mathbb{I} - |0\rangle\langle 0|)) \leq \omega$  imposes a constraint on minimal overlap of the lab states,  $|\langle\psi_x|0\rangle| \geq \sqrt{1 - \omega}$ . This restriction, on the minimal overlap between the lab states and the fixed reference state  $|0\rangle$ , in turn, implies a restriction on the minimal pairwise overlaps between the lab states. We will soon return to quantifying this.

While the assumptions (i)-(vi) in general are not comparable, they can all be linked to the notion of restricted accessible information (see Fig. 2). This is possible because the information restriction has no privileged state spaces but only concerns how operationally useful the states are for carrying the information. Specifically, there exist fundamental limits on the amount of information an  $n$ -state quantum ensemble can carry when restricted by any one of the assumptions (i)-(vi) under pure states. This leads directly to a bound under average- $\gamma$  SR in all cases except (ii), for which the bound necessarily diverges unless one restricts to peak- $\gamma$  SR.

*Information cost.*— Determining the largest accessible information that can be carried by an ensemble of  $n$  pure states limited by any one of the assumptions (i)-(vi) amounts to evaluating an upper limitation on the ability to use these states for state discrimination, see Eq. (2). We express this as

$$P_g^* \equiv \max_{\{\psi_x\} \in \mathcal{S}_\gamma} P_g(\{\psi_x\}), \quad (5)$$

where  $\psi_x = |\psi_x\rangle\langle\psi_x|$  is pure. We now address this problem for all settings (i)-(vi). Then, we show how the results are valid also under SR.

(i). For completeness, we first rederive the known fact that any dimension-restricted ensemble, i.e.  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ , carries at most  $\log d$  bits [44]. Taking  $n \geq d$  and using the fact that for any measurement  $N_x$  the corresponding optimal states  $\psi_x$  are projectors on the eigenvector of  $N_x$  with the largest eigenvalue, we obtain  $P_g^* = \max_{\{N_x\}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_x \lambda_{\max}(N_x) \leq \max_{\{N_x\}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_x \text{tr}(N_x) = \frac{d}{n}$ , where we have used that  $\sum_x N_x = \mathbb{I}_d$ . The information cost becomes  $\mathcal{I} \leq \log(d)$ , independently of  $n$ . This bound can be saturated trivially by  $d$  states forming a basis of  $\mathbb{C}^d$ .

(ii). The set of states  $\psi_x$  generated via entanglement-assisted quantum communication obeys no-signaling, mean-

ing that Bob's local state is independent of Alice's operation, i.e.  $\psi_x^B \equiv \text{tr}_A(\psi_x) = \phi_B$ . We can thus restrict to bipartite states with a constant marginal on Bob. Then, for  $n \geq d^2$  [15],  $P_g^* \leq \max \frac{d}{n} \sum_x \text{tr}(\psi_x^B N_x^B) = \max \frac{d}{n} \sum_x \text{tr}(\psi_B N_x^B) = \frac{d^2}{n}$ . Here, we used that the Schmidt number of  $\psi_x$  is at most  $d$  which implies  $\text{tr}(\psi_x N_x) \leq d \text{tr}(\psi_x^B N_x^B)$ , where  $N_x^B = \text{tr}_A(N_x)$ . In the last step, we used that  $\sum_x N_x^B = \text{tr}_A \sum_x N_x = \text{tr}_A(\mathbb{1}_d \otimes \mathbb{1}) = d\mathbb{1}$ . The associated information cost is  $\mathcal{I} \leq 2 \log(d)$ . This can be saturated using a  $d$ -dimensional dense coding protocol [45].

(iii). W.l.g we can select the amplitude associated with the vacuum  $|0\rangle$  to be real and then use the simulation technique of [46] to embed the non-vacuum components in a sufficiently high-dimensional real-valued Hilbert space. The reachable state space therefore forms a cone around the vacuum state with radius  $\sqrt{1-\omega}$ . We optimally choose all states on the boundary of this cone, i.e.  $\sqrt{1-\omega} = \langle 0|\psi_x\rangle$ . The value of  $P_g$  is invariant under permutations of the label  $x$ . From any optimal solution, we can then always form a solution where all the states have identical overlaps  $\langle \psi_x|\psi_{x'}\rangle = a$  for all  $x \neq x'$ . Indeed, consider the direct sum states  $|\Psi_x\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \oplus_k \sigma_k |\psi_x\rangle$  where the sum  $k$  runs over the  $N$  permutations  $\sigma_k$  of the input labels  $x$ . Then the states  $|\Psi_x\rangle$  have now equal overlaps, guessing probability  $P_g$  at least equal to the original one, and all have an overlap  $\sqrt{1-\omega}$  with the vacuum state  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \oplus_k |0\rangle$  (which can be unitarily mapped to the original vacuum state  $|0\rangle \oplus 0 \dots \oplus 0$  if desired).

It is known that for ensembles that are equiprobable and equiangular [47] the optimal measurement for state discrimination is the so-called pretty good measurement [48], defined as  $N_x = S^{-1/2} \psi_x S^{-1/2}$  where  $S = \sum_x \psi_x$ . Thus, to evaluate  $P_g$ , we only need to minimize the overlap  $a$ . The Gram matrix associated with the states  $\{|\psi_1\rangle, \dots, |\psi_n\rangle, |0\rangle\}$  is  $G = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ B^T & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ , where  $A$  is  $n \times n$  with 1 on the diagonals and  $a$  on the off-diagonals, and  $B$  is  $n \times 1$  with all entries  $\sqrt{1-\omega}$ .

It is positive semidefinite by construction. We therefore compute  $a^* = \min_{G \succeq 0} a$ . Using Schur complements, the eigenvalues of  $G$  can be evaluated analytically. From the smallest one, we obtain the result  $a^* = 1 - \frac{n}{n-1}\omega$ . Combining this with the pretty good measurement leads to the bound

$$P_g \leq \frac{1}{n} \left( \sqrt{\omega(n-1)} + \sqrt{1-\omega} \right)^2, \quad (6)$$

valid when  $0 \leq \omega \leq \frac{n-1}{n}$ , while  $P_g = 1$  otherwise. It can be saturated by construction. The corresponding accessible information increases monotonically in  $n$ . The reason is that even if  $\omega$  is very small, since there is no dimension restriction, we can always choose the small non-vacuum component of each state orthogonal to that of all the other states, thus increasing the information.

(iv). When  $n = 2$ , the overlap of two pure states is one-to-one with their accessible information. This follows from the derivation of the Helstrom bound for two-state discrimination [49]. In this sense, the overlap is a special case of the information restriction (thus the connection in Fig. 2). For  $n > 2$

and a uniform overlap constraint  $\langle \psi_x|\psi_{x'}\rangle \geq a$ , the information capacity can be evaluated in analogy with the above case of (iii), leading to  $P_g \leq \frac{1}{n} \left( (n-1)\sqrt{T} + \sqrt{a+T} \right)^2$  where  $T = \frac{1-a}{n}$ .

(v)-(vi). For bounding the information capacity associated with almost dimension-restricted or distrust-restricted states, we rely on a useful operator inequality. Specifically, we observe that the method in Ref. [50] for proving Lemma 1 can be recycled to prove the following more general statement. Let  $|\phi\rangle$  be any state such that  $\langle \phi|\Pi_d|\phi\rangle \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ . Then,  $|\phi\rangle\langle\phi| \preceq (1 + \mu)\tilde{\sigma} + h(\varepsilon, \mu)\mathbb{1}_D$  for every  $\mu \geq -1$ , where  $\tilde{\sigma} = \frac{\Pi_d|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|\Pi_d}{\langle \phi|\Pi_d|\phi\rangle}$  and  $h(\varepsilon, \mu) = (\sqrt{\mu^2 + 4\varepsilon(1+\mu)} - \mu)/2$ . We apply this independently to each pure  $\psi_x$  in Eq. (2) and optimally choose each associated  $\mu$  to be identical. Using that  $n$  states span an  $n$ -dimensional subspace, we can restrict to  $n$ -dimensional POVMs and obtain  $P_g^* \leq (1 + \mu) \left[ \max\{N_x\} \frac{1}{n} \sum_x \text{tr}(\tilde{\psi}_x N_x) \right] + h(\mu, \varepsilon)$ . In the case of the almost dimension assumption,  $\tilde{\psi}_x$  are  $d$ -dimensional and hence the maximization is bounded by  $d/n$ . In the case of distrust assumption,  $\Pi_d$  is simply replaced by  $|\psi_x\rangle\langle\psi_x|$  and we have  $\tilde{\psi}_x = |\psi_x\rangle\langle\psi_x|$ . Therefore, the maximisation becomes just  $P_g(\{\psi_x\})$  for the target ensemble. Let  $P_g^0$  denote the value of the maximization for either the almost dimension case or the distrust case. Minimising the RHS over  $\mu$ , we find

$$P_g^\varepsilon \leq P_g^0 + (1 - 2P_g^0)\varepsilon + 2\sqrt{P_g^0(1 - P_g^0)}\sqrt{\varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon)}. \quad (7)$$

Note that in the special case of  $d = 1$ , for the almost dimension, for which  $P_g^0 = \frac{1}{n}$ , this bound reduces to that obtained for vacuum component restrictions in Eq. (6). We have not been able to prove that the bound is tight in general, but for every numerical case study conducted, we find that the bound is indeed tight for the almost dimension assumption. For the distrust assumption, the bound is generally not tight unless the target states are optimal for state discrimination<sup>1</sup>.

It can be straightforwardly shown that the above information capacity bounds hold also when SR is included. First, from the linearity of  $P_g$ , our results also hold for the peak- $\gamma$  SR assumption. Second, we note that the bound on  $P_g$  for every assumption except (ii) is concave in each of the respective assumption parameters (the dimension  $d$ , the energy  $\omega$ , the overlap  $a$ , distrust parameter  $\varepsilon$ , almost qudits  $(\varepsilon, d)$ <sup>2</sup>). This implies that our results also hold for the average- $\gamma$  assumption, for all but assumption (ii)<sup>3</sup>.

An independently interesting consequence of this result is to bound the information capacity of  $n$  optical coherent states

<sup>1</sup> The MATLAB script that was used to verify this can be found on <https://github.com/jefpauwels/SDISeesaw>.

<sup>2</sup> It is straightforward to verify the concavity of the bivariate function (7) from the negativity of the Hessian.

<sup>3</sup> For example, setting  $N = 30$ , with an entanglement-assisted qutrit, a dense coding strategy achieves  $P_g = 9/30$ . However, one can send an average qutrit by mixing a qubit with probability  $2/3$  and a 5-dimensional system with probability  $1/3$ . Using dense coding strategies, one can achieve a guessing probability of  $P_g = 11/30$ .

with a limited average photon number but arbitrary phase. Recall the coherent state  $|\alpha\rangle = e^{-\frac{|\alpha|^2}{2}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{|\alpha|^k e^{i\theta k}}{\sqrt{k!}} |k\rangle$ . For small average photon numbers,  $N = |\alpha|^2$ , this can be seen as an almost qubit with  $\varepsilon = 1 - e^{-|\alpha|}(1 + |\alpha|) \approx \sqrt{N}$ . Inserting this in (7) and then computing  $\mathcal{I}$  yields the desired bound.

*Final remarks.*— Quantum communication assumptions in the prepare-and-measure scenario can be divided into two classes. The first class limits the weight of the state on various subspaces. These can correspond to the available degrees of freedom (i, ii, v), the vacuum subspace (iii), the subspace spanned by each of the other states of Alice (iv), the subspace corresponding to her target states (vi) etc. The second class does not favor any particular subspaces but is instead concerned with limiting the capacity of the states w.r.t. a specific operational task. This task can for instance be state discrimination, as in the considered information restriction setting, but can in principle be arbitrary. Developing a formalism and methodology for correlations obtained under assumptions on bounded subspace weights and capacity restrictions are natural next steps towards a unified picture of SDI. This is important because although we have established several tight information capacity relations, this does not imply that the set of correlations under a given communication assumption can w.l.g. be substituted with that obtained from the associated informationally restricted communication. In this context, we also note that while the set of correlations without SR, with average- $\gamma$  SR, and with peak- $\gamma$  SR can be distinct depending on the assumption, they all relax to the same set of information-constrained correlations if in the latter the SR

is taken at the level of  $P_g$ . This would not be the case for an alternative definition, where the information itself is averaged over the SR.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A.T. is supported by the Wenner-Gren Foundation, by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation through the Wallenberg Center for Quantum Technology (WACQT) and the Swedish Research Council under Contract No. 2023-03498. J.P. acknowledges support from the Swiss National Science Foundation via the NCCR-SwissMap. S.P. acknowledges funding from the VERIQ-TAS project within the QuantERA II Programme that has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under Grant Agreement No 101017733 and the F.R.S-FNRS Pint-Multi program under Grant Agreement R.8014.21, from the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation program under the project "Quantum Security Networks Partnership" (QSNP, grant agreement No 101114043), from the F.R.S-FNRS through the PDR T.0171.22, from the FWO and F.R.S.-FNRS under the Excellence of Science (EOS) program project 40007526, from the FWO through the BeQuNet SBO project S008323N, from the Belgian Federal Science Policy through the contract RT/22/BE-QCI and the EU "BE-QCI" program. S.P. is a Research Director of the Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique – FNRS.

- 
- [1] N. Gisin, G. Ribordy, W. Tittel, and H. Zbinden, Quantum cryptography, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**, 145 (2002).
  - [2] N. Brunner, M. Navascués, and T. Vértesi, Dimension witnesses and quantum state discrimination, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 150501 (2013).
  - [3] A. Tavakoli, A. Hameedi, B. Marques, and M. Bourennane, Quantum random access codes using single  $d$ -level systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 170502 (2015).
  - [4] M. Pawłowski and N. Brunner, Semi-device-independent security of one-way quantum key distribution, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 010302 (2011).
  - [5] E. Woodhead and S. Pironio, Secrecy in prepare-and-measure Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt tests with a qubit bound, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 150501 (2015).
  - [6] H.-W. Li, M. Pawłowski, Z.-Q. Yin, G.-C. Guo, and Z.-F. Han, Semi-device-independent randomness certification using  $n \rightarrow 1$  quantum random access codes, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 052308 (2012).
  - [7] T. Lunghi, J. B. Brask, C. C. W. Lim, Q. Lavigne, J. Bowles, A. Martin, H. Zbinden, and N. Brunner, Self-testing quantum random number generator, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 150501 (2015).
  - [8] A. Tavakoli, J. m. k. Kaniewski, T. Vértesi, D. Rosset, and N. Brunner, Self-testing quantum states and measurements in the prepare-and-measure scenario, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 062307 (2018).
  - [9] M. Farkas and J. m. k. Kaniewski, Self-testing mutually unbiased bases in the prepare-and-measure scenario, *Phys. Rev. A* **99**, 032316 (2019).
  - [10] A. Tavakoli, Semi-device-independent certification of independent quantum state and measurement devices, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 150503 (2020).
  - [11] M. Navascués, K. F. Pál, T. Vértesi, and M. Araújo, Self-testing in prepare-and-measure scenarios and a robust version of Wigner's theorem, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 250802 (2023).
  - [12] A. Tavakoli, A. A. Abbott, M.-O. Renou, N. Gisin, and N. Brunner, Semi-device-independent characterization of multipartite entanglement of states and measurements, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 052333 (2018).
  - [13] G. Moreno, R. Nery, C. de Gois, R. Rabelo, and R. Chaves, Semi-device-independent certification of entanglement in superdense coding, *Phys. Rev. A* **103**, 022426 (2021).
  - [14] P. Bakhshinezhad, M. Mehboudi, C. R. i Carceller, and A. Tavakoli, Scalable entanglement certification via quantum communication (2024), [arXiv:2401.00796 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.00796).
  - [15] A. Tavakoli, J. Pauwels, E. Woodhead, and S. Pironio, Correlations in entanglement-assisted prepare-and-measure scenarios, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 040357 (2021).
  - [16] J. Pauwels, A. Tavakoli, E. Woodhead, and S. Pironio, Entanglement in prepare-and-measure scenarios: many questions, a few answers, *NJP* **24**, 063015 (2022).
  - [17] C. Vieira, C. de Gois, L. Polliceno, and R. Rabelo, Interplays between classical and quantum entanglement-assisted communication scenarios, *NJP* **25**, 113004 (2023).
  - [18] J. Pauwels, S. Pironio, E. Woodhead, and A. Tavakoli, Almost

- qudits in the prepare-and-measure scenario, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 250504 (2022).
- [19] T. Van Himbeek, E. Woodhead, N. J. Cerf, R. García-Patrón, and S. Pironio, Semi-device-independent framework based on natural physical assumptions, *Quantum* **1**, 33 (2017).
- [20] T. V. Himbeek and S. Pironio, Correlations and randomness generation based on energy constraints (2019), [arXiv:1905.09117 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.09117).
- [21] G. Senno and A. Acín, Semi-device-independent full randomness amplification based on energy bounds (2021), [arXiv:2108.09100 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.09100).
- [22] D. Rusca, T. van Himbeek, A. Martin, J. B. Brask, W. Shi, S. Pironio, N. Brunner, and H. Zbinden, Self-testing quantum random-number generator based on an energy bound, *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 062338 (2019).
- [23] D. Rusca, H. Tebyanian, A. Martin, and H. Zbinden, Fast self-testing quantum random number generator based on homodyne detection, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **116**, 264004 (2020).
- [24] H. Tebyanian, M. Zahidy, M. Avesani, A. Stanco, P. Villoresi, and G. Vallone, Semi-device independent randomness generation based on quantum state's indistinguishability, *QST* **6**, 045026 (2021).
- [25] M. Avesani, H. Tebyanian, P. Villoresi, and G. Vallone, Semi-device-independent heterodyne-based quantum random-number generator, *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **15**, 034034 (2021).
- [26] J. B. Brask, A. Martin, W. Esposito, R. Houlmann, J. Bowles, H. Zbinden, and N. Brunner, Megahertz-rate semi-device-independent quantum random number generators based on unambiguous state discrimination, *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **7**, 054018 (2017).
- [27] Y. Wang, I. W. Primaatmaja, E. Lavie, A. Varvitsiotis, and C. C. W. Lim, Characterising the correlations of prepare-and-measure quantum networks, *npj Quantum Inf.* **5**, 17 (2019).
- [28] M. Ioannou, M. A. Pereira, D. Rusca, F. Grünenfelder, A. Boaron, M. Perrenoud, A. A. Abbott, P. Sekatski, J.-D. Bancal, N. Maring, H. Zbinden, and N. Brunner, Receiver-Device-Independent Quantum Key Distribution, *Quantum* **6**, 718 (2022).
- [29] M. Ioannou, P. Sekatski, A. A. Abbott, D. Rosset, J.-D. Bancal, and N. Brunner, Receiver-device-independent quantum key distribution protocols, *NJP* **24**, 063006 (2022).
- [30] C. Roch i Carceller, K. Flatt, H. Lee, J. Bae, and J. B. Brask, Quantum vs noncontextual semi-device-independent randomness certification, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 050501 (2022).
- [31] W. Shi, Y. Cai, J. B. Brask, H. Zbinden, and N. Brunner, Semi-device-independent characterization of quantum measurements under a minimum overlap assumption, *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 042108 (2019).
- [32] Q. Fan, M.-Y. Ma, Y.-N. Sun, Q.-P. Su, and C.-P. Yang, Experimental certification of nonprojective quantum measurements under a minimum overlap assumption, *Opt. Express* **30**, 34441 (2022).
- [33] A. Tavakoli, Semi-device-independent framework based on restricted distrust in prepare-and-measure experiments, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 210503 (2021).
- [34] I. Šupić, P. Skrzypczyk, and D. Cavalcanti, Measurement-device-independent entanglement and randomness estimation in quantum networks, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 042340 (2017).
- [35] A. Tavakoli, E. Zambrini Cruzeiro, J. Bohr Brask, N. Gisin, and N. Brunner, Informationally restricted quantum correlations, *Quantum* **4**, 332 (2020).
- [36] A. Tavakoli, E. Zambrini Cruzeiro, E. Woodhead, and S. Pironio, Informationally restricted correlations: a general framework for classical and quantum systems, *Quantum* **6**, 620 (2022).
- [37] R. König, R. Renner, and C. Schaffner, The operational meaning of min- and max-entropy, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **55**, 4337 (2009).
- [38] A. Tavakoli, M. Smania, T. Vértesi, N. Brunner, and M. Bourennane, Self-testing nonprojective quantum measurements in prepare-and-measure experiments, *Sci. Adv.* **6**, eaaw6664 (2020), <https://www.science.org/doi/pdf/10.1126/sciadv.aaw6664>.
- [39] D. Martínez, E. S. Gómez, J. Carriñe, L. Pereira, A. Delgado, S. P. Walborn, A. Tavakoli, and G. Lima, Certification of a non-projective qudit measurement using multipoint beam splitters, *Nat. Phys.* **19**, 190 (2023).
- [40] L.-T. Feng, X.-M. Hu, M. Zhang, Y.-J. Cheng, C. Zhang, Y. Guo, Y.-Y. Ding, Z. Hou, F.-W. Sun, G.-C. Guo, D.-X. Dai, A. Tavakoli, X.-F. Ren, and B.-H. Liu, Higher-dimensional symmetric informationally complete measurement via programmable photonic integrated optics (2023), [arXiv:2310.08838 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.08838).
- [41] Y. Guo, H. Tang, J. Pauwels, E. Z. Cruzeiro, X.-M. Hu, B.-H. Liu, Y.-F. Huang, C.-F. Li, G.-C. Guo, and A. Tavakoli, Experimental higher-dimensional entanglement advantage over qubit channel (2023), [arXiv:2306.13495 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.13495).
- [42] S. Gribbling, D. de Laat, and M. Laurent, Bounds on entanglement dimensions and quantum graph parameters via non-commutative polynomial optimization, *Math. Program.* **170**, 5 (2018).
- [43] A. Tavakoli, E. Z. Cruzeiro, R. Uola, and A. A. Abbott, Bounding and simulating contextual correlations in quantum theory, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 020334 (2021).
- [44] A. Nayak, Optimal lower bounds for quantum automata and random access codes, in *40th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (Cat. No.99CB37039)* (1999) pp. 369–376.
- [45] C. H. Bennett and S. J. Wiesner, Communication via one- and two-particle operators on einstein-podolsky-rosen states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 2881 (1992).
- [46] M. McKague, M. Mosca, and N. Gisin, Simulating quantum systems using real hilbert spaces, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 020505 (2009).
- [47] H. Krovi, S. Guha, Z. Dutton, and M. P. da Silva, Optimal measurements for symmetric quantum states with applications to optical communication, *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 062333 (2015).
- [48] A. Montanaro, On the distinguishability of random quantum states, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **273**, 619 (2007).
- [49] C. W. Helstrom, Quantum detection and estimation theory, *J. Stat. Phys.* **1**, 231 (1969).
- [50] A. Tavakoli, Quantum steering with imprecise measurements (2023), [arXiv:2308.15356 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.15356).