arXiv:1602.08177v2 [quant-ph] 11 Oct 2016

The Fidelity of Density Operators in an Operator-Algebraic Framework

Douglas Farenick, Samuel Jaques, and Mizanur Rahaman
Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Regina, Regina, Saskatchewan S4S 0A2, Canada
(Dated: January 23, 2022)

Josza's definition of fidelity [14] for a pair of (mixed) quantum states is studied in the context of two types of operator algebras. The first setting is mainly algebraic in that it involves unital C*-algebras A that possess a faithful trace functional τ. In this context, the role of quantum states (that is, density operators) in the classical quantum-mechanical framework is assumed by positive elements $\rho \in \mathsf{A}$ for which $\tau(\rho) = 1$. The second of our two settings is more operator theoretic: by fixing a faithful normal semifinite trace τ on a semifinite von Neumann algebra M, we define and consider the fidelity of pairs of positive operators in M of unit trace. The main results of this paper address monotonicity and preservation of fidelity under the action of certain trace-preserving positive linear maps of A or of the predual M_*. Our results in the von Neumann algebra setting are novel in that we focus on the Schrödinger picture rather than the Heisenberg picture, and they also yield a new proof of a theorem of Molnár [20] on the structure of fidelity-preserving quantum channels on the trace-class operators.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 03.67.Hk, 03.65.Db

Introduction

In communication and information theory, the notion of fidelity provides a quantitative measure for the qualitative assessment of how well data or information has been preserved through some type of transmission procedure or information processing task. Not surprisingly, this concept appears in quantum information theory [4, 14, 30] as well, with the aim of providing a similar quantitative measure. In a rather different form (namely, in the guise of the Bures metric [2, 5, 17]), the notion of fidelity also occurs in operator algebra theory.

In one of the most important settings, fidelity is a numerical measure of how close one state σ of a quantum system is to another state ρ. For pure states—that is, for unit vectors ξ and η in a separable Hilbert space H—the fidelity is measured by $|\langle \xi, \eta \rangle|$, the modulus of the inner product of ξ and η. Therefore, high fidelity occurs when the numerical measure is close to 1, and at exactly 1 the vectors ξ and η are identical up to a phase factor. For mixed states—that is, for density operators σ and ρ acting on H—there is a very satisfactory and useful notion of fidelity suggested by Josza [14]: namely, the quantity $F(\sigma, \rho)$ defined by $\mathrm{Tr}(|\sigma^{1/2}\rho^{1/2}|)$, where Tr denotes the canonical trace (or tracial weight) on the algebra $\mathsf{B}(\mathsf{H})$ of a bounded linear operators acting on H. In the case where σ and ρ are rank-1 density operators, then the fidelity measure $\mathrm{Tr}(|\sigma^{1/2}\rho^{1/2}|)$ coincides with $|\langle \xi, \eta \rangle|$, where $\xi, \eta \in \mathsf{H}$ are unit vectors that span the ranges of σ and ρ respectively.

Recall that a *channel*, or *quantum channel*, is a bounded linear map $\mathcal{E} : \mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H}) \to \mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H})$, where $\mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H})$ is the Banach space of trace-class operators on H, such that the dual map $\mathcal{E}^* : \mathsf{B}(\mathsf{H}) \to \mathsf{B}(\mathsf{H})$ is normal, unital, and completely positive. Here, the duality satisfies

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathcal{E}(s)x\right) = \mathrm{Tr}\left(s\mathcal{E}^*(x)\right), \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H}),\ x \in \mathsf{B}(\mathsf{H}).$$

By applying the Stinespring Theorem to $\mathcal{E}^*$ and by making use of the fact that $\mathcal{E}^*$ is unital and normal, Kraus [18, 19] showed that every channel $\mathcal{E}$ of $\mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H})$ has the form

$$\mathcal{E}(s) = \sum_n v_n s v_n^*,\ s \in \mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H}),$$

for some countable set $\{v_n\}_n \subset \mathsf{B}(\mathsf{H})$ such that $\sum_n v_n^* v_n = 1$.

There is a well-known monotonicity property of channels: if $\mathcal{E} : \mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H}) \to \mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H})$ is a channel, then

$$F(\sigma, \rho) \leq F\left(\mathcal{E}(\sigma), \mathcal{E}(\rho)\right)$$

for all states σ and ρ. Now if $\mathcal{E}$ is a unitary channel, which is to say that there exists a unitary operator u on H such that $\mathcal{E}(s) = usu^*$ for every $s \in \mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H})$, then in fact the channel $\mathcal{E}$ preserves fidelity in the sense that $F(\sigma, \rho) = F\left(\mathcal{E}(\sigma), \mathcal{E}(\rho)\right)$ for all density operators σ and ρ. It is therefore quite important and natural to determine whether unitary channels exhaust all cases of channels in which fidelity is preserved. This issue was resolved by Molnár [20]: if $\mathcal{E} : \mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H}) \to \mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H})$ is a surjective channel that preserves fidelity, then $\mathcal{E}$ is a unitary channel.

Our aim in this paper is to study channels and fidelity in the context of (i) unital C*-algebras A that possess a faithful positive linear tracial functional $\tau : \mathsf{A} \to \mathbb{C}$ and (ii) semifinite von Neumann algebras M. In the first of

these two settings, the role of quantum states in the classical quantum-mechanical framework is assumed by positive elements $\rho \in \mathsf{A}$ for which $\tau(\rho) = 1$. We shall also observe that in some situations it is possible to relax the (normally assumed) requirement for completely positivity of a channel to the much weaker condition that the map satisfy the Schwarz inequality. A related study was undertaken by Timoney [29], where he uses the term "tracial geometric mean" for what we are calling fidelity; however, Timoney's work and the results of this paper are quite different.

In the second scenario, when considering quantum operations defined on von Neumann algebras, the first challenge is to define rigorously what is meant by a quantum channel. The recent works of Crann and Neufang [9], and of Crann, Kribs, and Todorov [8], are examples of how to approach the issue via the Heisenberg picture. Herein, we shall adopt an approach using the Schrödinger picture, making use of the identification of the fact that the predual M_* of an arbitrary von Neumann algebra M is a matrix-ordered space, in the sense of Choi and Effros [7]. A notion of fidelity for normal states of any von Neumann algebra M was put forward by Uhlmann [30] based on earlier ideas of Bures [5]. However, in this paper we are concerned with a different notion of fidelity in the von Neumann algebra framework: namely, the one put forward by Jozsa [14], which is defined through the use of a tracial weight. Therefore, our concern in this paper will be with semifinite von Neumann algebras. For von Neumann algebras acting on finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces, Uhlmann fidelity and Josza fidelity are the same quantities. An analysis of various notions of fidelity in the general von Neumann algebra setting was undertaken by Alberti [1].

This first part of this paper is devoted to the study of fidelity in unital C*-algebras that possess a faithful trace functional. The second half of the paper deals with the von Neumann algebra case. In the Schrödinger picture, it is necessary to consider duality: specifically, for any von Neumann algebra M, the dual of the matrix-ordered space M_* is the operator system M [7]. In many applications, such as those where $\mathsf{M} = \mathsf{B}(\mathsf{H})$, all normal completely positive linear maps of M are inner, which is to say that each normal completely positive map admits a Kraus decomposition. In such cases, especially when H has finite dimension, it is common in the literature to blur the distinction between the Heisenberg and Schrödinger pictures when working with quantum operations and channels; however, strictly speaking, the matrix ordered spaces $\mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H})$ and $\mathsf{B}(\mathsf{H})$ are not the same, even though in finite dimensions they result in the same sets of operators. This distinction has consequences for the analysis of fidelity, and is discussed in greater detail in the second part of this paper.

I. FIDELITY IN A C*-ALGEBRA FRAMEWORK

In this section it is assumed that A is a unital C*-algebra. The cone of positive elements of A is denoted by A_+, while the real vector space of selfadjoint (or hermitian) elements of A is given by A_{sa}. The notation $h \leq k$, for $h, k \in \mathsf{A}_{\mathrm{sa}}$, indicates that $k - h \in \mathsf{A}_+$. Two elements $x, y \in \mathsf{A}$ are said to be *orthogonal* if $xy = yx = x^*y = xy^* = 0$. The notation $x \perp y$ is to signify that x and y are orthogonal. The group of invertible elements of A is denoted by $\mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})$ and the set $\mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+$ of positive invertible elements of A is defined by $\mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+ = \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A}) \cap \mathsf{A}_+$.

We shall also assume that A admits at least one faithful trace; that is, there exists a continuous linear map $\tau : \mathsf{A} \to \mathbb{C}$ such that, for all $x, y \in \mathsf{A}$, (i) $\tau(xy) = \tau(yx)$, (ii) $\tau(x^*x) \geq 0$, and (iii) $\tau(x^*x) = 0$ only if $x = 0$.

There are a variety of multiplicative and order-preserving linear maps on A that shall be considered here.

Definition I.1. *A linear map $\mathcal{E} : \mathsf{A} \to \mathsf{A}$ is:*

1. *a* Jordan homomorphism*, if $\mathcal{E}(x^*) = \mathcal{E}(x)^*$ for all $x \in \mathsf{A}$ and $\mathcal{E}(h^2) = \mathcal{E}(h)^2$ for every $h \in \mathsf{A}_{\mathrm{sa}}$;*
2. *a* homomorphism*, if $\mathcal{E}(x^*) = \mathcal{E}(x)^*$ and $\mathcal{E}(xy) = \mathcal{E}(x)\mathcal{E}(y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathsf{A}$;*
3. *an* automorphism*, if $\mathcal{E}$ is a bijective homomorphism such that $\mathcal{E}(1) = 1$;*
4. positive*, if $\mathcal{E}(\mathsf{A}_+) \subseteq \mathsf{A}_+$;*
5. *n*-positive*, if $\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathsf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})} : \mathsf{A} \otimes \mathsf{M}_n(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathsf{A} \otimes \mathsf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is positive;*
6. completely positive*, if $\mathcal{E}$ is n-positive for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$;*
7. *a* Schwarz map *if $\mathcal{E}(x^*)\mathcal{E}(x) \leq \mathcal{E}(x^*x)$ for every $x \in \mathsf{A}$;*
8. *an* order isomorphism*, if $\mathcal{E}$ is a bijection and if both $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{E}^{-1}$ are positive.*

A Schwarz map is necessarily positive, and so $\mathcal{E}(x^*) = \mathcal{E}(x)^*$ for every $x \in \mathsf{A}$ [26, p. 2]. Furthermore, for each $x \in \mathsf{A}$ the inequality $\mathcal{E}(x^*)\mathcal{E}(x) \leq \mathcal{E}(x^*x)$ implies that $\|\mathcal{E}(x)\|^2 \leq \|\mathcal{E}(x^*x)\| \leq \|\mathcal{E}\| \, \|x^*x\| = \|\mathcal{E}\| \, \|x\|^2$, and so $\|\mathcal{E}\|^2 \leq \|\mathcal{E}\|$; that is, every Schwarz map $\mathcal{E}$ satisfies $\|\mathcal{E}\| \leq 1$. Conversely, every contractive 2-positive linear map $\mathcal{E} : \mathsf{A} \to \mathsf{A}$ is a Schwarz map [26, Corollary 1.3.2]. There are, however, Schwarz maps that are not 2-positive, such as the map $\mathcal{E}$ on $\mathsf{M}_2(\mathbb{C})$ obtained by averaging the transpose and the normalised trace [6, Appendix A].

Our first result provides alternative ways of computing the tracial geometric mean, $\tau(|\sigma^{1/2}\rho^{1/2}|)$, as defined in [29], of positive elements $\sigma, \rho \in \mathsf{A}$. The characterisation (2) below is inspired by an approach of Watrous [31].

Proposition I.2. *If $a, \sigma, \rho \in \mathsf{A}_+$, then*

$$\tau(a) = \frac{1}{2} \inf_{y \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+} \left(\tau(ay) + \tau(ay^{-1})\right), \tag{1}$$

$$\tau(|\sigma^{1/2}\rho^{1/2}|) = \frac{1}{2} \inf_{y \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+} \left(\tau(\rho y) + \tau(\sigma y^{-1})\right) = \tau(|\rho^{1/2}\sigma^{1/2}|), \tag{2}$$

and

$$\tau(|\sigma^{1/2}\rho^{1/2}|) = \frac{1}{4} \inf_{y \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+} \left[\tau(\sigma y) + \tau(\sigma y^{-1}) + \tau(\rho y) + \tau(\rho y^{-1})\right]. \tag{3}$$

Proof. If $a \in \mathsf{A}_+$ and $y \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+$, then both $\tau(ay) = \tau(a^{1/2}ya^{1/2})$ and $\tau(ay^{-1}) = \tau(a^{1/2}y^{-1}a^{1/2})$ are nonnegative real numbers. Because

$$y + y^{-1} - 2 = (y^{\frac{1}{2}} - y^{\frac{-1}{2}})^2 \in \mathsf{A}_+,$$

we have that

$$a^{1/2}ya^{1/2} + a^{1/2}y^{-1}a^{1/2} \geq 2a.$$

Thus,

$$\tau(a) \leq \frac{1}{2} \inf_{y \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+} \left(\tau(ay) + \tau(ay^{-1})\right).$$

In taking $y = 1$, the infimum above is attained and yields

$$\tau(a) = \frac{1}{2} \inf_{y \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+} \left(\tau(ay) + \tau(ay^{-1})\right),$$

which proves equation (1).

Suppose now that each of the τ-states σ and ρ is invertible. Thus, $b = |\rho^{1/2}\sigma^{1/2}| \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+$ and the (completely) positive linear map Ψ on A defined by $\Psi(x) = b^{-1/2}\rho^{1/2}x\rho^{1/2}b^{-1/2}$, for $x \in \mathsf{A}$, is a bijection of $\mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+$ with itself. Furthermore, if $y \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+$, then

$$\tau\left(\Psi(y)b\right) = \tau(\rho y) \text{ and } \tau\left(\Psi(y)^{-1}b\right) = \tau(\sigma y^{-1}).$$

Hence, by equation (1),

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau(b) &= \frac{1}{2} \inf_{y \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+} \left(\tau(by) + \tau(by^{-1})\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \inf_{y \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+} \left(\tau\left(\Psi(y)b\right) + \tau\left(\Psi(y)^{-1}b\right)\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \inf_{y \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+} \left(\tau(\rho y) + \tau(\sigma y^{-1})\right).
\end{aligned}$$

If it so happens that one of σ or ρ is not invertible, then they may be replaced by the positive invertible elements $\sigma_\varepsilon = \sigma + \varepsilon 1$ and $\rho_\varepsilon = \rho + \varepsilon 1$ to obtain for $b_\varepsilon = |\rho_\varepsilon^{1/2}\sigma_\varepsilon^{1/2}| \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+$ that

$$\tau(b_\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{2} \inf_{y \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+} \left(\tau(\rho_\varepsilon y) + \tau(\sigma_\varepsilon y^{-1})\right).$$

Because $\tau(b) < \tau(b_\varepsilon)$ and because $\tau(\rho_\varepsilon y) + \tau(\sigma_\varepsilon y^{-1})$ decreases to $(\tau(\rho y) + \tau(\sigma y^{-1})$ as ε decreases to 0, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau(b) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \inf_{\varepsilon > 0} \left[\inf_{y \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+} \left(\tau(b_\varepsilon y) + \tau(b_\varepsilon y^{-1})\right)\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \inf_{\varepsilon > 0} \left[\inf_{y \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+} \left(\tau(\rho_\varepsilon y) + \tau(\sigma_\varepsilon y^{-1})\right)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Again, using $y = 1$, we obtain

$$F_\tau(\sigma,\rho) = \tau(b) = \frac{1}{2}\inf_{y\in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+}\left(\tau(\rho y) + \tau(\sigma y^{-1})\right),$$

which establishes the first part of equation (2). The second part of equation (2) follows from the first by using the fact that the map $y \mapsto y^{-1}$ is a bijection $\mathrm{G}(\mathsf{A})_+ \to \mathrm{G}(\mathsf{A})_+$.

To prove that $\tau(|\sigma^{1/2}\rho^{1/2}|) = \frac{1}{4}\inf_{y\in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+}\left[\tau(\sigma y) + \tau(\sigma y^{-1}) + \tau(\rho y) + \tau(\rho y^{-1})\right]$, suppose once again that σ and ρ are invertible. With $b = |\sigma^{1/2}\rho^{1/2}|$ and $c = |\rho^{1/2}\sigma^{1/2}|$, the positive linear maps $\Psi, \Phi : \mathsf{A} \to \mathsf{A}$ defined by

$$\Psi(x) = b^{-1/2}\rho^{1/2}x\rho^{1/2}b^{-1/2} \;\text{ and }\; \Phi(x) = c^{-1/2}\sigma^{1/2}x\sigma^{1/2}c^{-1/2},$$

for $x \in \mathsf{A}$, are bijections. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau\left(\Psi(y)b\right) &= \tau\left(\rho y\right), \qquad & \tau\left(\Psi(y)^{-1}b\right) &= \tau\left(\sigma y^{-1}\right),\\
\tau\left(\Phi(y)c\right) &= \tau\left(\sigma y\right), \qquad & \tau\left(\Phi(y)^{-1}c\right) &= \tau\left(\rho y^{-1}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the relations above and the fact that Ψ is a positive linear bijection together imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
2\tau(b) &= \inf_{y\in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+}\left(\tau(by) + \tau(by^{-1})\right)\\
&= \inf_{y\in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+}\left(\tau(b\Psi(y)) + \tau(b\Psi(y)^{-1})\right)\\
&= \inf_{y\in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+}\left(\tau\left(\rho y\right) + \tau\left(\sigma y^{-1}\right)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$2\tau(c) = \inf_{y\in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+}\left(\tau\left(\sigma y\right) + \tau\left(\rho y^{-1}\right)\right).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
2\tau(b) + 2\tau(c) &= \inf_{y\in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+}\left[\tau\left(\rho y\right) + \tau\left(\sigma y^{-1}\right)\right] + \inf_{y\in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+}\left[\tau\left(\sigma y\right) + \tau\left(\rho y^{-1}\right)\right]\\
&\le \inf_{y\in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+}\left[\tau\left(\rho y\right) + \tau\left(\sigma y^{-1}\right)\right) + \left(\tau\left(\sigma y\right) + \tau\left(\rho y^{-1}\right)\right]\\
&= \inf_{y\in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+}\left(\tau\left((b+c)y\right) + \tau\left((b+c)y^{-1}\right)\right)\\
&= 2\tau(b+c).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the intermediate inequality above is an equality. Hence,

$$\inf_{y\in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+}\left[\tau\left(\rho y\right) + \tau\left(\sigma y^{-1}\right)\right) + \left(\tau\left(\sigma y\right) + \tau\left(\rho y^{-1}\right)\right] = 2\left(\tau(|\sigma^{1/2}\rho^{1/2}|) + \tau(|\rho^{1/2}\sigma^{1/2}|)\right) = 4\tau(|\sigma^{1/2}\rho^{1/2}|),$$

which proves equation (3) in the case where σ and ρ are invertible.

If one of σ or ρ is not invertible, then let $\sigma_\varepsilon = \sigma + \varepsilon 1$ and $\rho_\varepsilon = \rho + \varepsilon 1$, for $\varepsilon > 0$, so that

$$4\tau(|\sigma_\varepsilon^{1/2}\rho_\varepsilon^{1/2}|) = \inf_{y\in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+}\left[\tau\left(\rho_\varepsilon y\right) + \tau\left(\sigma_\varepsilon y^{-1}\right)\right) + \left(\tau\left(\sigma_\varepsilon y\right) + \tau\left(\rho_\varepsilon y^{-1}\right)\right]$$

Since the traces of the "ε-elements" decrease as $\varepsilon \to 0^+$, the equation above also holds for σ and ρ, which completes the proof of equation (3). □

Motivated by the use of the term "state" for density operators, we shall call the elements of the set S_τ, defined by

$$\mathsf{S}_\tau = \{\rho \in \mathsf{A}_+ \,|\, \tau(\rho) = 1\},$$

τ-states of A. Thus, in this terminology, a τ-state is a positive element of A with trace 1, and is not to be confused with the traditional meaning of the word "state" in C*-algebra theory, which refers to a positive linear functional of norm 1.

Definition I.3. *The* τ-fidelity *of a pair of* τ*-states* $\sigma, \rho \in \mathsf{A}_+$ *is the quantity denoted by* $F_\tau(\sigma, \rho)$ *and defined by*

$$F_\tau(\sigma, \rho) = \tau(|\sigma^{1/2}\rho^{1/2}|).$$

The essential properties of τ-fidelity are described below.

Theorem I.4. *If* $\sigma, \rho \in \mathsf{A}$ *are a pair of* τ*-states, then*

1. $F_\tau(\sigma, \rho) = F_\tau(\rho, \sigma)$,
2. $0 \leq F_\tau(\sigma, \rho) \leq 1$,
3. $F_\tau(\sigma, \rho) = 0$ *if and only if* $\sigma \perp \rho$, *and*
4. $F_\tau(\sigma, \rho) = 1$ *if and only if* $\sigma = \rho$.

Furthermore, if $\mathcal{E} : \mathsf{A} \to \mathsf{A}$ *is a positive linear map such that* $\tau \circ \mathcal{E} = \tau$, *then*

$$F_\tau(\sigma, \rho) \leq F_\tau\left(\mathcal{E}(\sigma), \mathcal{E}(\rho)\right). \tag{4}$$

Proof. Assertion (1) is an immediate consequence of equation (2) of Proposition I.2.

To prove (2), note that $0 \leq F_\tau(\sigma, \rho)$ is obvious. On the other hand, the tracial arithmetic-geometric mean inequality [12, Theorem 2.4] yields

$$F_\tau(\sigma, \rho) = \tau\left(|\sigma^{1/2}\rho^{1/2}|\right) \leq \frac{\tau(\sigma) + \tau(\rho)}{2} = 1.$$

Thus, $0 \leq F_\tau(\sigma, \rho) \leq 1$.

Statement (3) and the sufficiency of statement (4) are straightforward, and so we prove only the necessity of statement (4). If $F_\tau(\sigma, \rho) = 1$, then $\tau\left(|\sigma^{1/2}\rho^{1/2}|\right) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\tau(\sigma) + \tau(\rho)\right)$ is a case of equality in the tracial arithmetic-geometric mean inequality in unital C*-algebras. By [12, Theorem 3.6], equality is achieved only if $\sigma = \rho$.

To prove inequality (4), suppose that $\mathcal{E} : \mathsf{A} \to \mathsf{A}$ is a positive linear map such that $\tau \circ \mathcal{E} = \tau$. With $y = 1$, equation (2) yields

$$F_\tau(\sigma, \rho) \leq \frac{1}{2}\left(\tau(\rho) + \tau(\sigma)\right) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\tau(\mathcal{E}(\rho)) + \tau(\mathcal{E}(\sigma))\right).$$

Equation (2) yields

$$\begin{aligned} 2F_\tau(\sigma, \rho) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \inf_{y \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathsf{A})_+} \left[\tau(\mathcal{E}(\rho)y) + \tau(\mathcal{E}(\rho)y^{-1}) + \tau(\mathcal{E}(\sigma)y) + \tau(\mathcal{E}(\sigma)y^{-1})\right] \\ &= F_\tau(\mathcal{E}(\rho), \mathcal{E}(\sigma)) + F_\tau(\mathcal{E}(\sigma), \mathcal{E}(\rho)) \\ &= 2F_\tau(\mathcal{E}(\sigma), \mathcal{E}(\rho)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $F_\tau(\sigma, \rho) \leq F_\tau\left(\mathcal{E}(\rho), \mathcal{E}(\sigma)\right)$, which establishes inequality (4). □

Corollary I.5. *The function* $d_{B,\tau}$ *on* S_τ *defined by*

$$d_{B,\tau}(\sigma, \rho) = \sqrt{1 - F_\tau(\sigma, \rho)}$$

is a metric.

The metric $d_{B,\tau}$ above is another instance of the *Bures metric*, which has been studied in a number of operator algebraic settings.

The proof of Theorem I.4 above is inspired by the approach taken by Watrous [31] in the case of matrix algebras.

Definition I.6. *A positive linear map* $\mathcal{E} : \mathsf{A} \to \mathsf{A}$ preserves τ-fidelity *if*

1. $\tau \circ \mathcal{E} = \tau$, *and*
2. $F_\tau\left(\mathcal{E}(\sigma), \mathcal{E}(\rho)\right) = F_\tau(\sigma, \rho)$ *for all* τ*-states* $\sigma, \rho \in \mathsf{A}$.

Lemma I.7. *If a positive linear map $\mathcal{E} : \mathsf{A} \to \mathsf{A}$ preserves τ-fidelity, then $\mathcal{E}$ is an injection. Moreover, if $\mathcal{E}$ is also surjective, then $\mathcal{E}$ is an order isomorphism.*

Proof. We first prove that $\mathcal{E}$ is a linear injection. To this end, if $a, b \in \mathsf{A}_+$ satisfy $\mathcal{E}(a) = \mathcal{E}(b)$, then setting $\sigma = \tau(a)^{-1}a$ and $\rho = \tau(b)^{-1}b$ yields elements $\sigma, \rho \in \mathsf{S}_\tau$ for which $\tau(a)\sigma = a$ and $\tau(b)\rho = b$. Thus, $\mathcal{E}(a) = \mathcal{E}(b)$ yields $\tau(a)\mathcal{E}(\sigma) = \tau(b)\mathcal{E}(\rho)$ and, by applying the trace to this last equation, $\tau(a) = \tau(b)$. Hence, $\mathcal{E}(\sigma) = \mathcal{E}(\rho)$ and, therefore,

$$1 = F_\tau\left(\mathcal{E}(\sigma), \mathcal{E}(\rho)\right) = \tau(\sigma, \rho).$$

Theorem I.4 implies that $\sigma = \rho$ and, consequently, that $a = b$. Therefore, $\mathcal{E}_{|\mathsf{A}_+}$ is an injective function.

Assume that $h \in \mathsf{A}$ is selfadjoint and that $\mathcal{E}(h) = 0$. There exist $h_+, h_- \in \mathsf{A}_+$ such that $h = h_+ - h_-$ and so $0 = \mathcal{E}(h_+) - \mathcal{E}(h_-)$. In other words, $\mathcal{E}(h_+) = \mathcal{E}(h_-)$ and so $h_+ = h_-$ because $\mathcal{E}_{|\mathsf{A}_+}$ is an injective function. Thus, $h = 0$. Because $\mathcal{E}$ is real linear, this implies that $\mathcal{E}_{|\mathsf{A}_{\mathrm{sa}}}$ is an injective function. Lastly, suppose that $x \in \mathsf{A}$ satisfies $\mathcal{E}(x) = 0$. Thus, $\mathcal{E}(x^*) = 0$ and, writing $x = a + ib$ for some $a, b \in \mathsf{A}_{\mathrm{sa}}$, $\mathcal{E}(a) + i\mathcal{E}(b) = \mathcal{E}(a) - i\mathcal{E}(b) = 0$. Thus, $\mathcal{E}(a) = \mathcal{E}(b) = 0$, which implies that $a = b = 0$ and $x = 0$. Hence $\mathcal{E}$ is a linear injection.

Because $\mathcal{E}$ is a linear injection and assumed to be surjective, $\mathcal{E}$ admits a linear inverse $\mathcal{E}^{-1}$. We aim to show that $\mathcal{E}^{-1}$ is a positive map. To this end, select $h \in \mathsf{A}_+$ and let $a = \mathcal{E}^{-1}(h)$. Therefore, because $\mathcal{E}$ is an injection,

$$\mathcal{E}(a) = h = h^* = \mathcal{E}(a)^* = \mathcal{E}(a^*)$$

implies that $a = a^*$. Thus, there are $a_+, a_- \in \mathsf{A}_+$ such that $a = a_+ - a_-$ and $a_+ \perp a_-$. Let $b = \mathcal{E}(a_+)$ and $c = \mathcal{E}(a_-)$ to obtain $b, c \in \mathsf{A}_+$. If one of a_+ or a_- is zero, then $bc = cb = 0$. If neither a_+ nor a_- is zero, then scale them by their traces so that $\sigma = \tau(a_+)^{-1}a_+$ and $\rho = \tau(a_-)^{-1}a_-$ are τ-states. Because $\sigma \perp \rho$ and $0 = F_\tau(\sigma, \rho) = F_\tau\left(\mathcal{E}(\sigma), \mathcal{E}(\rho)\right)$, Theorem I.4 yields $\mathcal{E}(\sigma) \perp \mathcal{E}(\rho)$. Therefore, by linearity, $\mathcal{E}(a_+) \perp \mathcal{E}(a_-)$, which shows that $bc = cb = 0$.

From $b = h + c$ we obtain

$$0 = bc = hc + c^2 \text{ and } 0 = cb = ch + c^2.$$

Hence, $hc - ch = 0$. Because h and c commute, so do h and $c^{1/2}$. Thus,

$$0 = bc = hc + c^2 = c^{1/2}hc^{1/2} + c^2$$

expresses 0 as a sum of positive elements $c^{1/2}hc^{1/2}$ and c^2. Therefore $c^2 = hc = 0$, and so $c = 0$ also. Hence, $0 = \mathcal{E}^{-1}(c) = a_- = 0$, which yields $a = a_+ \in \mathsf{A}_+$. Hence, $\mathcal{E}^{-1}$ is a positive map, which implies that $\mathcal{E}$ is an order isomorphism. □

Corollary I.8. *Every surjective positive linear map that preserves τ-fidelity is a Jordan isomorphism.*

Proof. By Kadison's Theorem [26, Theorem 2.1.3], every order isomorphism of a unital C*-algebra is a Jordan isomorphism. □

Jordan isomorphisms are quite general, and somewhat more information can be elicited in cases where the C*-algebra A resembles a matrix algebra in terms of certain algebraic properties.

Definition I.9. *A unital C*-algebra A is:*

1. finite*, if $xy = 1$ implies $yx = 1$, and*
2. quasi-transitive*, if $x\mathsf{A}y = \{0\}$, for some $x, y \in \mathsf{A}$, holds only if $x = 0$ or $y = 0$.*

Theorem I.10 is the first main result of the present paper.

Theorem I.10. *Assume that A is a finite quasi-transitive C*-algebra. If a surjective Schwarz map $\mathcal{E} : \mathsf{A} \to \mathsf{A}$ preserves τ-fidelity, then $\mathcal{E}$ is an automorphism of A.*

Proof. Because $\|\mathcal{E}\| \leq 1$, the element $\mathcal{E}(1) \in \mathsf{A}$ satisfies $\|\mathcal{E}(1)\| \leq 1$. Thus, $\mathcal{E}(1)$ is a positive contraction and, therefore, $1 - \mathcal{E}(1)$ is positive. Apply τ to obtain $0 \leq \tau(1 - \mathcal{E}(1)) = \tau(1) - \tau \circ \mathcal{E}(1) = \tau(1) - \tau(1) = 0$. Because τ is faithful and $1 - \mathcal{E}(1) \in \mathsf{A}_+$, we have $\tau(1 - \mathcal{E}(1)) = 0$ only if $1 - \mathcal{E}(1) = 0$. That is, $\mathcal{E}$ is unital.

Since, by Lemma I.7, $\mathcal{E}^{-1}$ and $\mathcal{E}$ are positive linear maps, their norms are achieved at $1 \in \mathsf{A}$ [24], [26, Theorem 1.3.3]. Hence, $\mathcal{E}^{-1}(1) = 1$ implies that $\|\mathcal{E}^{-1}\| = 1$. Thus, for every $x \in \mathsf{A}$,

$$\|x\| = \|\mathcal{E}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{E}(x)\| \leq \|\mathcal{E}^{-1}\| \, \|\mathcal{E}(x)\| = \|\mathcal{E}(x)\| \leq \|x\|.$$

In other words, $\mathcal{E}$ is an isometry.

Select a unitary $u \in \mathsf{A}$. Because $\mathcal{E}$ is an isometry, we have that $\mathcal{E}(u)$ is in the closed unit ball of A. Suppose that $\mathcal{E}(u) = \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}y$ for some $x, y \in \mathsf{A}$ with $\|x\| \leq 1$ and $\|y\| \leq 1$. Then $u = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{E}^{-1}(x) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{E}^{-1}(y)$. Because $\mathcal{E}^{-1}$ is an isometry and every unitary in A is an extreme point of the closed unit ball of A, $u = \mathcal{E}^{-1}(x) = \mathcal{E}^{-1}(y)$, which implies that $x = y = \mathcal{E}(u)$. Hence, $\mathcal{E}(u)$ is an extreme point of the closed unit ball of A. By [15, Theorem 1], the extreme point $\mathcal{E}(u)$ is necessarily a partial isometry such that, if $e = \mathcal{E}(u)^*\mathcal{E}(u)$ and $f = \mathcal{E}(u)\mathcal{E}(u^*)$, then $(1-e)\mathsf{A}(1-f) = \{0\}$. By the hypothesis that A is quasi-transitive, we obtain $e = 1$ or $f = 1$. Thus, either $\mathcal{E}(u)^*\mathcal{E}(u) = 1$ or $\mathcal{E}(u^*)\mathcal{E}(u) = 1$. Because A is finite, either of these conditions imply that $\mathcal{E}(u)$ is unitary. Hence, $\mathcal{E}(u)$ is unitary for each unitary $u \in \mathsf{A}$. Now for every unitary $u \in \mathsf{A}$, we see that

$$1 = \mathcal{E}(u^*u) = \mathcal{E}(u^*)\mathcal{E}(u) = \mathcal{E}(u)\mathcal{E}(u^*) = \mathcal{E}(uu^*).$$

Hence, every unitary in A is in the multiplicative domain $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{E}}$ of $\mathcal{E}$. Because $\mathcal{E}$ is a Schwarz map, its multiplicative domain is a C*-subalgebra of A [26, Corollary 2.1.6]. Thus, $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{E}}$ contains the norm-closed span of the unitary group of A, which by the Russo–Dye Theorem [24, Theorem 1] implies that $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{E}} = \mathsf{A}$. Hence, the bijective unital map $\mathcal{E}$ is a homomorphism. □

To address the cases in which A may not be finite or quasi-transitive, we shall need to require more positivity of $\mathcal{E}$ than simply the Schwarz map feature.

Definition I.11. *A linear map $\mathcal{E} : \mathsf{A} \to \mathsf{A}$ is said to be a transformation of* order zero *if $\mathcal{E}(x) \perp \mathcal{E}(y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathsf{A}$ for which $x \perp y$.*

Although Gardner [13] has studied order zero maps in a fairly general context, the following results draw upon the structure theory for completely positive order zero maps developed by Winter and Zacharias [32].

Theorem I.12. *If $\mathcal{E} : \mathsf{A} \to \mathsf{A}$ that preserves τ-fidelity, then there is a homomorphism $\pi : \mathsf{A} \to \mathsf{A}$ and a positive element h in the centre of A such that $\mathcal{E}(x) = \pi(x)h$, for every $x \in \mathsf{A}$. In particular, if A has trivial centre, then $\mathcal{E}$ is an injective unital homomorphism.*

Proof. Select any nonzero $a, b \in \mathsf{A}_+$ and scale them by their traces so that $\sigma = \tau(a)^{-1}a$ and $\rho = \tau(b)^{-1}b$ are τ-states. Further, assume that $a \perp b$; thus, $\sigma \perp \rho$. Hence, by Theorem I.4, $0 = F_\tau(\sigma, \rho) = F_\tau\left(\mathcal{E}(\sigma), \mathcal{E}(\rho)\right)$ yields $\mathcal{E}(\sigma) \perp \mathcal{E}(\rho)$ and, by linearity, $\mathcal{E}(a) \perp \mathcal{E}(b)$. By Stinespring's Theorem, $\mathcal{E}(x^*)\mathcal{E}(x) \leq \|\mathcal{E}(1)\|^2\mathcal{E}(x^*x)$ for every $x \in \mathsf{A}$. Therefore, using the proof of Remark 2.4 in [32], we see that the property "$\mathcal{E}(a) \perp \mathcal{E}(b)$ for all positive a and b with $a \perp b$" implies the property "$\mathcal{E}(x) \perp \mathcal{E}(y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathsf{A}$ for which $x \perp y$." That is, $\mathcal{E}$ is a completely positive linear map of order zero.

Because $\mathcal{E}$ is a completely positive linear map of order zero, $h = \mathcal{E}(1)$ is the centre of A and there is a homomorphism $\pi : \mathsf{A} \to \mathsf{A}$ such that $\mathcal{E}(x) = \pi(x)h$, for all $x \in \mathsf{A}$ [32, Theorem 3.3]. If the centre of A is trivial, then $h = \lambda 1$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Further, $\tau(1) = \tau \circ \mathcal{E}(1) = \tau\left(\pi(1)h\right) = \lambda\tau(1)$ implies that $\lambda = 1$, and so $\mathcal{E} = \pi$. The fact that π is an injection follows from the fact that $\mathcal{E}$ is an injection (Lemma I.7). □

The results of this section apply to finite von Neumann algebras N, since such algebras are unital C*-algebras that possess a faithful trace functional. Indeed, if N is a factor, then N has a unique (normal) faithful trace functional τ satisfying $\tau(1) = 1$, and all other tracial functionals on N are positive scalar multiples of τ. Therefore, if a positive linear map on N preserves fidelity with respect to one trace, then it does so with respect to every trace.

Proposition I.13. *Assume that N is a finite factor. If $\mathcal{E} : \mathsf{N} \to \mathsf{N}$ is a surjective Schwarz map that preserves fidelity, then $\mathcal{E}$ is an automorphism of N. If, moreover, N is a finite-dimensional factor, then $\mathcal{E}$ is a unitary channel.*

Proof. Because N is both finite and quasi-transitive as a C*-algebra, Theorem I.10 implies that $\mathcal{E}$ is a necessarily an automorphism of N (and, moreover, automatically normal). If $N \cong \mathsf{M}_d(\mathbb{C})$ for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$, then every automorphism of N is inner; hence, $\mathcal{E}$ is a unitary channel. □

II. FIDELITY IN A VON NEUMANN ALGEBRA FRAMEWORK

Even though Proposition I.13 applies to a finite von Neumann algebra N, the result makes no reference to the predual N_*, and therefore Proposition I.13 should be viewed as a result in the Heisenberg picture. The goal of the present section is to develop a framework for the Schrödinger picture, and to then specialise to the setting of semifinite von Neumann algebras for the purpose of analysing fidelity.

A useful fact about 2×2 matrices over von Neumann algebras is recorded below for later reference.

Lemma II.1. ([27, p. 166]) *If M is a von Neumann algebra acting on H and if $a, b \in \mathsf{M}_+$, then the following statements are equivalent for $x \in \mathsf{M}$:*

1. $\begin{bmatrix} a & x \\ x^* & b \end{bmatrix}$ *is a positive operator on* $\mathsf{H} \oplus \mathsf{H}$*;*

2. $x = a^{1/2} y b^{1/2}$ *for some* $y \in \mathsf{M}$ *with* $\|y\| \leq 1$.

A. Duality and Channels

We begin by making sense of the commonly used phrase "ϕ is a trace-preserving completely positive linear map on $\mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H})$." On the one hand, the phrase suggests that $\mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H})$ is a treated as a matrix-order space; on the other hand, much of the literature interprets the phrase to mean that ϕ is a normal completely positive linear map on $\mathsf{B}(\mathsf{H})$ that preserves the trace of operators in $\mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H})$. These two interpretations are not entirely compatible.

We begin by reviewing the matrix order on the predual M_* of an arbitrary von Neumann algebra M. Recall from [7] that if S is a matrix order space, and if the positive cone of $\mathsf{M}_n(\mathsf{S})$ is denoted by $\mathsf{M}_n(\mathsf{S})_+$, then a linear map $\phi : \mathsf{S} \to \mathsf{T}$ of matrix ordered spaces is k-positive if $\phi(\mathsf{M}_n(\mathsf{S})_+) \subseteq \mathsf{M}_n(\mathsf{T})_+$ for every $n = 1, \ldots, k$, and ϕ is completely positive if ϕ is k-positive for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

The matrix order on M is inherited from $\mathsf{B}(\mathsf{H})$: a matrix $X = [x_{ij}]_{i,j} \in \mathsf{M}_n(\mathsf{M})$ is positive if X is a positive operator on the n-fold direct sum $\bigoplus_1^n \mathsf{H}$. A matrix $\Omega = [\omega_{ij}]_{i,j} \in \mathsf{M}_n(\mathsf{M}_*)$ is positive if

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \omega_{ij}(x_{ij}) \geq 0, \tag{5}$$

for every $X = [x_{ij}]_{i,j} \in \mathsf{M}_n(\mathsf{M})$. Let $\mathsf{M}_n(\mathsf{M}_*)_+$ denote the positive matrices over M_*. (Recall that M_* consists of normal linear functionals on M.) A useful criterion for membership in $\mathsf{M}_n(\mathsf{M}_*)_+$ is as follows: $\Omega = [\omega_{ij}]_{i,j} \in \mathsf{M}_n(\mathsf{M}_*)_+$ if and only if the linear map $\mathfrak{L}_\Omega : \mathsf{M} \to \mathsf{M}_n$, defined by

$$\mathfrak{L}_\Omega(x) = [\omega_{ij}(x)]_{i,j}\,, \tag{6}$$

for $x \in \mathsf{M}$, is a completely positive map [7, Lemma 4.7].

In the case where $\mathsf{M} = \mathsf{M}_d(\mathbb{C})$, then every $\omega \in \mathsf{M}_*$ is determined uniquely by some matrix $y_\omega \in \mathsf{M}$ via the formula $\omega(x) = \mathrm{Tr}(x y_\omega)$, for $x \in \mathsf{M}$. It can happen that a matrix $\Omega = [\omega_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^n$ of normal linear functionals is positive, yet the corresponding matrix of operators $Y_\Omega = [y_{\omega_{ij}}]_{i,j=1}^n$ fails to be positive as an operator on $\bigoplus_1^n \mathbb{C}^d$. For example, let $d = 2$ and $\mathsf{M} = \mathsf{M}_2(\mathbb{C})$, and consider the matrix $\Omega = \begin{bmatrix} \omega_{11} & \omega_{12} \\ \omega_{21} & \omega_{22} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathsf{M}_2(\mathsf{M}_*)$, where the corresponding operators $y_{\omega_{ij}} \in \mathsf{M}$ inducing each $\omega_{ij} \in \mathsf{M}_*$ are

$$y_{\omega_{11}} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},\ y_{\omega_{12}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix},\ y_{\omega_{21}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},\ y_{\omega_{22}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The matrix $Y_\Omega \in \mathsf{M}_2(\mathsf{M})$ is not positive, as $Y_\Omega = [1] \oplus \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \oplus [1]$ has one negative eigenvalue. However, the linear map $\mathfrak{L}_\Omega : \mathsf{M} \to \mathsf{M}_2(\mathbb{C})$ satisfies $\mathfrak{L}_\Omega(x) = x$, for every $x \in \mathsf{M}$, and so $\mathfrak{L}_\Omega$ is a completely positive map; by criterion (6), we deduce that $\Omega \in \mathsf{M}_2(\mathsf{M}_*)_+$. Thus, in identifying matrices $[\omega_{ij}]_{i,j}$ over M_* with the matrices $[y_{\omega_{ij}}]_{i,j}$ over M, we deduce from this example that $\mathsf{M}_2(\mathsf{M}_*)_+ \cap \mathsf{M}_2(\mathsf{M}) \not\subseteq \mathsf{M}_2(\mathsf{M})_+$. By similar reasoning, the matrix $\Delta = \begin{bmatrix} \omega_{11} & \omega_{21} \\ \omega_{12} & \omega_{22} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathsf{M}_2(\mathsf{M}_*)$ is induced by the positive operator matrix $Y_\Delta \in \mathsf{M}_2(\mathsf{M})_+$, defined by

$$Y_\Delta = \begin{bmatrix} y_{\omega_{11}} & y_{\omega_{21}} \\ y_{\omega_{12}} & y_{\omega_{22}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

but Δ is not positive in $\mathsf{M}_2(\mathsf{M}_*)$ because $\mathfrak{L}_\Delta : \mathsf{M} \to \mathsf{M}_2(\mathbb{C})$ satisfies $\mathfrak{L}_\Delta(x) = x^t$, for every $x \in \mathsf{M}$, and it is well known that the transpose map fails to be completely positive.

Notwithstanding the discussion of the previous paragraph, it is nevertheless true that a complete positivity linear map $\mathcal{E}$ on the matrix-ordered space $\mathsf{M}_d(\mathbb{C})_* = \mathsf{T}_d(\mathbb{C})$ (the $d \times d$ complex matrices in the trace norm) is also completely positive on the C*-algebra $\mathsf{M}_d(\mathbb{C})$. This is a remarkably fortunate circumstance, as the matrix orders on $\mathsf{T}_d(\mathbb{C})$ and $\mathsf{M}_d(\mathbb{C})$ are distinct (as indicated in the example of the previous paragraph), and the literature (including the literature on fidelity) makes extensive use of this fortunate fact by frequently make little or no reference to the matrix order on $\mathsf{T}_d(\mathbb{C})$ and, instead, drawing entirely upon the matrix order on $\mathsf{M}_d(\mathbb{C})$. Although this fortunate circumstance may be relevant for matrix algebras, one does not expect the same situation to persist with arbitrary von Neumann algebras. Therefore, in what follows, it will be important for us to distinguish between the matricial order on the predual M_* and the matricial order on M in discussing completely positive linear maps on M_*.

With this preface, the following definition is natural.

Definition II.2. *If M is a von Neumann algebra, then a* channel*, or* quantum channel*, is a continuous linear operator $\mathcal{E} : \mathsf{M}_* \to \mathsf{M}_*$ such that the dual map $\mathcal{E}^* : \mathsf{M} \to \mathsf{M}$ is unital, normal, and completely positive.*

Not every completely positive linear map on a von Neumann algebra admits a Kraus decompostion, but those that do are called inner maps [3].

Definition II.3. *Let M be a von Neumann algebra with predual M_*.*

1. *A completely positive linear map $\phi : \mathsf{M} \to \mathsf{M}$ is* inner *if there exists a sequence $\{a_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ in M such that $\phi(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k^* x a_k$, for every $x \in \mathsf{M}$, where the convergence of the sum is with respect to the ultraweak topology of M; that is, for each $x \in \mathsf{M}$,*

$$\omega\left(\phi(x)\right) = \lim_{m\to\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{m} \omega(a_k^* x a_k),$$

   for every $\omega \in \mathsf{M}_*$.

2. *A channel $\mathcal{E} : \mathsf{M}_* \to \mathsf{M}_*$ is* inner *if the unital completely positive linear map $\mathcal{E}^*$ is inner.*

B. Fidelity

Semifinite von Neumann algebras (see [27, 28]) admit a very natural analogue of the classical notion of density operator. Therefore, assume for the remainder of this paper that M is a semifinite von Neumann algebra, and that τ is a fixed faithful normal semifinite tracial weight on M. Because we have already encountered finite von Neumann algebras in the previous section, we shall also assume that M is not finite. Thus, the trace of the identity $1 \in \mathsf{M}$ is infinite.

By definition, τ is a function $\mathsf{M}_+ \to [0, +\infty]$ such that, for all $a, b \in \mathsf{M}_+$, $x \in \mathsf{M}$, and $\lambda \geq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}$, we have $\tau(x^*x) = \tau(xx^*)$, $\tau(a+b) = \tau(a) + \tau(b)$, $\tau(\lambda a) = \lambda\tau(a)$, $\tau(a) > 0$ if $a \neq 0$, $\tau\left(\sup_\alpha a_\alpha\right) = \sup \tau(a_\alpha)$ for every bounded increasing net $\{a_\alpha\}_\alpha$ in M_+, and for each nonzero $h \in \mathsf{M}_+$ there exists nonzero $h_0 \in \mathsf{M}_+$ with $h_0 \leq h$ and $\tau(h_0) < \infty$. As shown in [10], if $z \in \mathsf{M}$, then

$$\mathrm{Tr}(|z|) = \int_0^\infty \mu_z(t)\, dt, \tag{7}$$

where for, each $t \in [0, \infty)$,

$$\mu_z(t) = \inf\left\{\|ze\| \,|\, e \in \mathcal{P}(\mathsf{M}),\, \mathrm{Tr}(1-e) \leq t\right\},$$

and where $\mathcal{P}(\mathsf{M})$ is the projection lattice for M. Moreover, $\mu_z = \mu_{z^*} = \mu_{|z|}$ and, consequently, for any $w, z \in \mathsf{M}$,

$$\mu_{|wz^*|} = \mu_{|zw^*|}. \tag{8}$$

Furthermore, if $h \in \mathsf{M}_+$ and if $\psi : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ is an increasing continuous function such that $\psi(0) = 0$, then

$$\mu_{\psi(h)}(t) = \psi\left(\mu_h(t)\right), \text{ for all } t \in [0, \infty). \tag{9}$$

Using $\psi(t) = \sqrt{t}$, equations (7), (8), (9) imply that

$$\tau(|h^{1/2}k^{1/2}|) = \tau(|k^{1/2}h^{1/2}|) \tag{10}$$

for all $h, k \in \mathsf{M}_+$.

Define:

$$\mathfrak{n}_\tau = \{x \in \mathsf{M} \,|\, \tau(x^*x) < \infty\} \text{ and } \mathfrak{m}_\tau = (\mathfrak{n}_\tau)^2 = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{k} x_j y_j \,|\, k \in \mathbb{N},\, x_j, y_j \in \mathfrak{n}_\tau \right\}.$$

The sets $\mathfrak{m}_\tau$ and $\mathfrak{m}_\tau$ are (algebraic) ideals of M. If $\mathfrak{p}_\tau \subseteq \mathsf{M}_+$ is the set of all $a \in \mathsf{M}_+$ such that $\tau(a) < \infty$, then $\mathfrak{p}_\tau = \mathfrak{m}_\tau \cap \mathsf{M}_+$ and the function $\tau_{|\mathfrak{p}_\tau}$ extends to a linear map, which we denote again by τ, on $\mathfrak{m}_\tau$ such that $\tau(x^*) = \overline{\tau(x)}$, $\tau(xy) = \tau(yx)$ for all $x \in \mathsf{M}$ and $y \in \mathfrak{m}_\tau$, and $\tau(xy) = \tau(yx)$ for all $x, y \in \mathfrak{n}_\tau$. The ideal $\mathfrak{m}_\tau$ is called the *trace ideal* of τ. If $\mathsf{M} = \mathsf{B}(\mathsf{H})$ and if τ is the canonical trace on $\mathsf{B}(\mathsf{H})$, then $\mathfrak{m}_\tau = \mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H})$. Hence, the elements of the ideal $\mathfrak{m}_\tau$ are analogues of trace-class operators.

Recall from [22] and [28, Chapter IX] that H and M determine a topological vector space $\mathfrak{M}(\mathsf{H})$ and a topological involutive algebra $\mathfrak{M}(\mathsf{M})$ such that H and M are dense (in appropriate topologies) in $\mathfrak{M}(\mathsf{H})$ and $\mathfrak{M}(\mathsf{M})$ respectively, and that $\mathfrak{M}(\mathsf{M})$ acts on $\mathfrak{M}(\mathsf{H})$ in a natural fashion. In this context, for each $z \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathsf{M})$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a projection $p \in \mathsf{M}$ such that $zp \in \mathsf{M}$ and $\tau(1-p) < \varepsilon$. The set $\mathfrak{M}(\mathsf{M})_+$ of all z^*z, for $z \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathsf{M})$, is a pointed convex cone and for each $a \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathsf{M})_+$ there is a unique $b \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathsf{M})_+$ (denoted by $a^{1/2}$) for which $b^2 = a$. Thus, the element $|z|$ given by $(z^*z)^{1/2}$ lies in $\mathfrak{M}(\mathsf{M})$ for each $z \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathsf{M})$. Furthermore, the function τ extends to $\mathfrak{M}(\mathsf{M})_+$ via $\tau(a) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0^+} \tau\left(a(1+\varepsilon a)^{-1}\right)$, for $a \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathsf{M})_+$, and satisfies the usual trace properties: $\tau(z^*z) = \tau(zz^*)$, $\tau(a+b) = \tau(a) + \tau(b)$, and $\tau(\lambda a) = \lambda\tau(a)$ for all $z \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathsf{M})$, $a, b \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathsf{M})_+$, and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\lambda \geq 0$.

The predual M_* is linearly order isomorphic to set $\{z \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathsf{M}) \,|\, \tau(|z|) < \infty\}$, and so we identify these two sets. The map $z \mapsto \tau(|z|)$ defines a norm $\|\cdot\|_1$ on M_* and with respect to this norm M_* is a Banach space containing $\mathfrak{m}_\tau$ as a norm-dense linear submanifold. In the case of a type I von Neumann algebra M, nothing new is obtained, since $\mathfrak{M}(\mathsf{M}) = \mathsf{M}$ in this case. In particular, if $\mathsf{M} = \mathsf{B}(\mathsf{H})$, then $\mathfrak{M}(\mathsf{M}) = \mathsf{M}$ and $\mathsf{M}_* = \mathfrak{m}_\tau = \mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H})$.

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\tau^{(n)} : \mathsf{M}_n(\mathfrak{m}_\tau) \to \mathsf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ denote the linear map

$$\tau^{(n)}(Y) = \left[\tau(y_{ij})\right]_{i,j},$$

for $Y = [y_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^n \in \mathsf{M}_n(\mathfrak{m}_\tau)$.

Lemma II.4. *If $Y \in \mathsf{M}_n(\mathfrak{m}_\tau)$ is a positive operator on $\bigoplus_1^n \mathsf{H}$, then $\tau^{(n)}(Y)$ is a positive operator on $\mathbb{C}^n$.*

Proof. Recall that $\mathfrak{p}_\tau = \mathfrak{m}_\tau \cap \mathsf{M}_+$ [27, Lemma V.2.16] and that if ω is a normal state on M, then ω is a completely positive linear map of M. Because the trace $\tau : \mathsf{M}_+ \to [0, \infty]$ is normal, it is a sum of a family of normal states [27, p. 332]; hence, $\tau^{(n)}(X)$ is a (possibly nonconvergent) sum of positive elements of $\mathsf{M}_n(\mathbb{C})_+$. Therefore, because $Y \in \mathsf{M}_n(\mathfrak{m}_\tau) \cap \mathsf{M}_n(\mathsf{M})_+$, the complex matrix $\tau^{(n)}(Y)$ is a (convergent) sum of positive elements and is, hence, positive. □

Lemma II.5. *If $a, b \in \mathfrak{m}_\tau \cap \mathsf{M}_+$, then $|a^{1/2}b^{1/2}| \in \mathfrak{m}_\tau$.*

Proof. Recall from equation (7) that $\tau(|z|) = \int_0^\infty \mu_z(t)\, dt$, for every $z \in M$.Since a and b are positive, we have, for every $s > 0$ in $\mathbb{R}$, that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^s \mu_{a^{1/2}b^{1/2}}(t)\, dt &\leq \int_0^s \mu_{a^{1/2}}(t)\mu_{b^{1/2}}(t)\, dt \\
&= \int_0^s \mu_a(t)^{1/2}\mu_b(t)^{1/2}\, dt \\
&\leq \left(\int_0^s \mu_a(t)\, dt\right)^{1/2} \left(\int_0^s \mu_b(t)\, dt\right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\tau(a)\tau(b)},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first of the inequalities above is a consequence of [10, Corollaire 4.4]. Thus, $\tau(|a^{1/2}b^{1/2}|) \leq \sqrt{\tau(a)\tau(b)}$, which implies that $|a^{1/2}b^{1/2}| \in \mathfrak{m}_\tau$. □

Definition II.6. *A* density operator in M *is a positive operator* $\rho \in \mathsf{M}$ *such that* $\tau(\rho) = 1$.

Let $\mathfrak{s}_\tau$ denote the set of all density operators in M. If $\mathcal{E} : \mathsf{M}_* \to \mathsf{M}_*$ is a channel, then $\mathcal{E}$ is trace preserving and so $\mathcal{E}$ maps $\mathfrak{s}_\tau$ back into itself. Because $\mathfrak{s}_\tau$ spans $\mathfrak{m}_\tau$, we deduce that

$$\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{m}_\tau) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}_\tau,$$

for every channel $\mathcal{E} : \mathsf{M}_* \to \mathsf{M}_*$.

Lemma II.7. *If a channel* $\mathcal{E} : \mathsf{M}_* \to \mathsf{M}_*$ *is inner, then*

1. *there exists a sequence* $\{a_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ *in* M *such that* $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k^* a_k = 1$, *and* $\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k \rho a_k^*$, *for every density operator* $\rho \in \mathsf{M}$,
2. $\mathcal{E}^{(2)}\left(\mathsf{M}_2(\mathfrak{m}_\tau) \cap \mathsf{M}_2(\mathsf{M})_+\right) \subseteq \mathsf{M}_2(\mathsf{M})_+$, *and*
3. $\mathcal{E}(y)^*\mathcal{E}(y) \leq \mathcal{E}(y^* y)$, *for every* $y \in \mathfrak{m}_\tau$.

Proof. By definition of inner, there exists a sequence $\{a_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ in M such that $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k^* a_k = 1$, and $\mathcal{E}^*(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k^* x a_k$, for every $x \in \mathsf{M}$, where the convergence of the sum is with respect to the ultraweak topology of M. Therefore, if $\rho \in \mathfrak{s}_\tau$ and $x \in \mathsf{M}$, then

$$\tau\left(\mathcal{E}(\rho)x\right) = \tau\left(\rho\mathcal{E}^*(x)\right) = \lim_{m\to\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{m} \tau(\rho a_k^* x a_k) = \lim_{m\to\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{m} \tau(x a_k \rho a_k^*) = \lim_{m\to\infty} \tau\left(x \sum_{k=1}^{m} a_k \rho a_k^*\right),$$

and so $\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k \rho a_k^*$, which proves the first statement. The second and third statements follow immediately from the inner structure of $\mathcal{E}$. □

By Lemma II.5, if $\sigma, \rho \in \mathfrak{s}_\tau$, then $|\sigma^{1/2}\rho^{1/2}|$ has finite trace; thus, we may define fidelity for pairs of density operators in M.

Definition II.8. *The* fidelity *of a pair of density operators* $\sigma, \rho \in \mathsf{M}$ *is the nonnegative real number* $F_\tau(\sigma, \rho)$ *defined by*

$$F_\tau(\sigma, \rho) = \tau\left(|\sigma^{1/2}\rho^{1/2}|\right).$$

The following is the main result on the fidelity of density operators.

Theorem II.9 (Fidelity in Semifinite von Neumann Algebras)**.**

1. *(Basic Properties of Fidelity) If* $\sigma, \rho \in \mathfrak{s}_\tau$, *then*
   (a) $F_\tau(\sigma, \rho) = F_\tau(\rho, \sigma)$,
   (b) $0 \leq F_\tau(\sigma, \rho) \leq 1$,
   (c) $F_\tau(\sigma, \rho) = 0$ *if and only if* $\sigma \perp \rho$, *and*
   (d) $F_\tau(\sigma, \rho) = 1$ *if and only if* $\sigma = \rho$.
2. *(Monotonicity of Fidelity) If* $\mathcal{E} : \mathsf{M}_* \to \mathsf{M}_*$ *is a linear map such that* $\mathcal{E}^{(2)}\left(\mathsf{M}_2(\mathfrak{m}_\tau) \cap \mathsf{M}_2(\mathsf{M})_+\right) \subseteq \mathsf{M}_2(\mathsf{M})_+$, *then* $\mathcal{E}$ *is a positive and*

$$F_\tau(\sigma, \rho) \leq F_\tau\left(\mathcal{E}(\sigma), \mathcal{E}(\rho)\right), \tag{11}$$

   for all $\sigma, \rho \in \mathfrak{s}_\tau$.
3. *(Preservation of Fidelity) If* M *is a factor and if* $\mathcal{E} : \mathsf{M}_* \to \mathsf{M}_*$ *is a bijective positive linear map such that*

$$F_\tau(\sigma, \rho) = F_\tau\left(\mathcal{E}(\sigma), \mathcal{E}(\rho)\right), \tag{12}$$

   for all $\sigma, \rho \in \mathfrak{s}_\tau$, *then* $\mathcal{E}^*$ *is an automorphism of* M.

Proof. Equation (10) shows that $F_\tau(\sigma,\rho) = F_\tau(\rho,\sigma)$, whereas [12, Corollary 3.2] yields $0 \leq F_\tau(\sigma,\rho) \leq 1$. It is clear that $F_\tau(\sigma,\rho) = 0$ if and only if $\sigma \perp \rho$, while [12, Theorem 3.4] shows that $F_\tau(\sigma,\rho) = 1$ if and only if $\sigma = \rho$.

To establish monotonicity of fidelity, we again draw upon a method of proof given in Watrous's monograph [31]. First, however, note that the hypothesis $\mathcal{E}^{(2)}\left(\mathsf{M}_2(\mathfrak{m}_\tau) \cap \mathsf{M}_2(\mathsf{M})_+\right) \subseteq \mathsf{M}_2(\mathsf{M})_+$ immediately yields the positivity of $\mathcal{E}$ by considering positive 2×2 matrices of the form $\begin{bmatrix} y & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, for $y \in \mathfrak{m}_\tau \cap \mathsf{M}_+$.

Suppose that $\sigma, \rho \in \mathfrak{s}_\tau$ and $x \in \mathsf{M}$, and consider the matrix $X = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma & x \\ x^* & \rho \end{bmatrix}$ in $\mathsf{M}_2(\mathsf{M})$. By Lemma II.1, the matrix $X \in \mathsf{M}_2(\mathsf{M})_+$ if and only if $x = \sigma^{1/2} y \rho^{1/2}$ for some $y \in \mathsf{M}$ with $\|y\| \leq 1$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup\left\{ |\tau(x)| \,\middle|\, \begin{bmatrix} \sigma & x \\ x^* & \rho \end{bmatrix} \in M_2(\mathfrak{m}_\tau)_+ \right\} &= \sup\left\{ |\tau(\rho^{1/2}\sigma^{1/2} y)| \, y \in \mathsf{M},\ \|y\| \leq 1 \right\} \\
&= \|\rho^{1/2}\sigma^{1/2}\|_1 \\
&= \tau\left(|\rho^{1/2}\sigma^{1/2}|\right) \\
&= F_\tau(\sigma,\rho).
\end{aligned}$$

We shall show that a similar formula applies to the fidelity of the density operator $\mathcal{E}(\sigma)$ and $\mathcal{E}(\rho)$. To this end, fix $y \in \mathsf{M}$ with $\|y\| \leq 1$ and let $x = \sigma^{1/2} y \rho^{1/2}$. Thus, the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \sigma & x \\ x^* & \rho \end{bmatrix}$ in $\mathsf{M}_2(\mathfrak{m}_\tau)$ belongs to the cone $\mathsf{M}_2(\mathsf{M})_+$. Therefore, by the hypothesis on $\mathcal{E}$, we deduce that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{E}(\sigma) & \mathcal{E}(x) \\ \mathcal{E}(x^*) & \mathcal{E}(\rho) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathsf{M}_2(\mathsf{M})_+.$$

Hence, Lemma II.4 yields

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tau\left(\mathcal{E}(\sigma)\right) & \tau\left(\mathcal{E}(x)\right) \\ \tau\left(\mathcal{E}(x^*)\right) & \tau\left(\mathcal{E}(\rho)\right) \end{bmatrix} = \tau^{(2)}\left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{E}(\sigma) & \mathcal{E}(x) \\ \mathcal{E}(x^*) & \mathcal{E}(\rho) \end{bmatrix} \right) \in \mathsf{M}_2(\mathbb{C})_+,$$

and so $|\tau(x)| = |\tau(\mathcal{E}(x))| \leq F_\tau\left(\mathcal{E}(\sigma), \mathcal{E}(\rho)\right)$. Therefore, the supremum of the real numbers $|\tau(x)|$ over all $x \in \mathfrak{m}_\tau$ for which $\begin{bmatrix} \sigma & x \\ x^* & \rho \end{bmatrix} \in \mathsf{M}_2(\mathsf{M})_+$ is also bounded above by $F_\tau\left(\mathcal{E}(\sigma), \mathcal{E}(\rho)\right)$, which implies that $F_\tau(\sigma,\rho) \leq F_\tau\left(\mathcal{E}(\sigma), \mathcal{E}(\rho)\right)$.

Lastly, assume that $\mathcal{E}$ is a positive linear bijection that preserves fidelity. Thus, $\mathcal{E}^*$ is an invertible operator on M. If $x \in \mathsf{M}_+$ and $y = (\mathcal{E}^*)^{-1}(x)$, then for every $\rho \in \mathfrak{s}_\tau$,

$$\tau\left(y\rho\right) = \tau\left((\mathcal{E}^*)^{-1}(x)\rho\right) = \tau\left(x\mathcal{E}^{-1}(\rho)\right) \geq 0.$$

That is, $\omega(y) \geq 0$ for every normal state ω on M; hence, $y \in \mathsf{M}_+$, which proves that $(\mathcal{E}^*)^{-1}$ is positive linear map. Thus, $\mathcal{E}^*$ is a linear order isomorphism. By [15, Theorem 5], $\mathcal{E}^*$ is a Jordan isomorphism. Because $\mathcal{E}^*$ satisfies the Schwarz inequality $\mathcal{E}^*(x^*x) \geq \mathcal{E}^*(x^*)\mathcal{E}^*(x)$ for all $x \in \mathsf{M}$, the Jordan isomorphism $\mathcal{E}^*$ is in fact an automorphism [25, Corollary 3.6]. □

Corollary II.10. *If $\mathcal{E}$ is an inner channel, then $F_\tau(\sigma,\rho) \leq F_\tau\left(\mathcal{E}(\sigma), \mathcal{E}(\rho)\right)$, for all $\sigma, \rho \in \mathfrak{s}_\tau$.*

Proof. By Lemma II.7, $\mathcal{E}$ satisfies $\mathcal{E}^{(2)}\left(\mathsf{M}_2(\mathfrak{m}_\tau) \cap \mathsf{M}_2(\mathsf{M})_+\right) \subseteq \mathsf{M}_2(\mathsf{M})_+$. Therefore, by Theorem II.9, $\mathcal{E}$ has the monotonicity property for fidelity. □

In the classical setting of type I factors, the following known result [20] is recovered.

Corollary II.11 (Molnár)**.** *If $\mathcal{E} : \mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H}) \to \mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H})$ is a channel, then $F_\tau(\sigma,\rho) \leq F_\tau\left(\mathcal{E}(\sigma), \mathcal{E}(\rho)\right)$, for all density operators $\sigma, \rho \in \mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H})$. Furthermore, if $\mathcal{E} : \mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H}) \to \mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H})$ is surjective channel and preserves fidelity, then $\mathcal{E}$ is a unitary channel.*

Proof. In this case, $\mathsf{M} = \mathsf{B}(\mathsf{H})$ and $\mathsf{M}_* = \mathfrak{m}_\tau = \mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H})$. By Kraus's theorem [18], every channel on $\mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H})$ is inner. Hence, $\mathcal{E}$ has the monotonicity property for fidelity. Moreover, the proof of Lemma I.7 is valid in $\mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H})$, and so $\mathcal{E}$ is injective. Therefore, coupled with the hypothesis that $\mathcal{E}$ is surjective, Theorem II.9 indicates that $\mathcal{E}^*$ is an automorphism of $\mathsf{B}(\mathsf{H})$. Hence, there is a unitary $u \in \mathsf{B}(\mathsf{H})$ such that $\mathcal{E}^*(x) = u^* x u$ for all $x \in \mathsf{B}(\mathsf{H})$. That is, $\mathcal{E}(s) = usu^*$ for every $s \in \mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H})$. □

III. DISCUSSION

The principal achievements of this paper broaden the context in which the classical notion of density operator has meaning. In the first of these extensions the ambient operator algebra is a unital C*-algebra equipped with a faithful tracial functional, whereas in the second type of extension the ambient operator algebra is a semifinite von Neumann algebra. Examples of such operator algebras are described below.

While the full matrix algebra $\mathsf{M}_d(\mathbb{C})$ of $d \times d$ complex matrices is one such example, there are many other examples that are infinite-dimensional. One of the most important of such examples is the Fermion algebra $\mathsf{A} = \bigotimes_1^\infty \mathsf{M}_2(\mathbb{C})$, which is the C*-algebra representing the infinite canonical anticommutation relations arising from the quantum mechanical study of fermions and which has a (unique) faithful trace functional τ that arises from the normalised canonical trace on $\mathsf{M}_{2k}(\mathbb{C}) \cong \bigotimes_1^k \mathsf{M}_2(\mathbb{C})$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ [11, §11.9]. Thus, every positive τ-preserving linear map $\mathcal{E} : \mathsf{A} \to \mathsf{A}$ satisfies the monotonicity property of fidelity, by Theorem I.4. Furthermore, because the Fermion C*-algebra A is also finite and quasi-transitive [23, Theorem 5.10], a surjective fidelity-preserving Schwarz map $\mathcal{E} : \mathsf{A} \to \mathsf{A}$ is necessarily an automorphism of A, by Theorem I.10.

In considering the setting of von Neumann algebras, one of course has the classical case of $\mathsf{B}(\mathsf{H})$ and its predual $\mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H})$. In this setting, a (classical) density operator is a positive (compact) operator ρ on H for which the sequence of eigenvalues of ρ (repeated according to geometric multiplicity) is summable. These type I factors are precisely the von Neumann algebras that arise in ordinary quantum mechanics.

Quantum statistical mechanics involving (infinitely) many particles is modelled mathematically on von Neumann algebras of type II and III. That is, when the number of particles is very large, then a mathematical model that treats large as infinite is adopted, leading to so-called infinite systems. A nice explanation of this approach is provided by Kadison in [16, p. 13394]. Of particular interest are those von Neumann algebras that arise through a limiting process involving finite quantum systems. A specific example is afforded by the hyperfinite II_1-factor R, which is constructed from the Fermion algebra as follows. Consider the trace τ on the Fermion algebra $\mathsf{A} = \bigotimes_1^\infty \mathsf{M}_2(\mathbb{C})$, normalised so that $\tau(1) = 1$. By the Gelfand-Naimark-Segal theorem, there exist a unital homomorphism $\pi : \mathsf{A} \to \mathsf{B}(\mathsf{H})$ and a unit vector $\xi \in \mathsf{H}$ such that $\{\pi(a)\xi \,:\, a \in \mathsf{A}\}$ is dense in H and $\tau(a) = \langle \pi(a)\xi, \xi\rangle$, for every $a \in \mathsf{A}$. If R denotes the closure of $\pi(\mathsf{A})$ in $\mathsf{B}(\mathsf{H})$ with respect to the strong operator topology, then the trace τ extends to a faithful trace on R (denoted by τ again) such that $\tau(x) = \langle x\xi, \xi\rangle$, for every $x \in \mathsf{R}$ [11, Corollary 11.105]. The von Neumann algebra R is a finite factor (and, hence, quasi-transitive), which means that the C*-algebra results obtained herein apply to R. In particular, every surjective channel on R that preserves fidelity is necessarily an automorphism of R.

With the semifinite but non-finite setting, continue with the notation of the previous paragraph and let M denote the closure, with respect to the strong operator topology, of the linear span M_0 all operators acting on the Hilbert space $\mathsf{H} \otimes \mathsf{H}$ of the form $\rho \otimes y$, where $\rho \in \mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H})$ and $y \in \mathsf{R}$ are arbitrary. The linear map $\mathsf{M}_0 \to \mathbb{C}$ that sends each $\rho \otimes y$ to $\mathrm{Tr}(\rho)\tau(y)$ extends to a tracial weight Tr_{M} on M. In particular, linear combinations of finitely many elements of the form $\rho \otimes y$, where $\rho \in \mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H})$ and $y \in \mathsf{R}$, lie in the trace ideal $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathsf{M}}}$.

Finally, in a different direction, the effort undertaken herein to establish the monotonicity of fidelity is substantially greater than the effort required to prove some of the other basic properties of fidelity. This fact of effort is very reminiscent of recent work of Müller-Hermes and Reeb [21] in proving the monotonicity of quantum relative entropy for trace-preserving positive linear maps on $\mathsf{T}(\mathsf{H})$. Although Schwarz maps are positive but not nessecarily 2-positive, it would be of interest to know whether our main results on fidelity preservation, which rely upon sufficient level of positivity as embodied by the Schwarz inequality, hold for arbitrary trace-preserving positive linear maps.

Acknowledgements

This work of the first author is supported in part by the Discovery Grant program of the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada. We thank Sarah Plosker for introducing us to the use of fidelity in quantum information theory and for bringing Molnár's work [20] to our attention.

[1] P. M. Alberti. Playing with fidelities. *Rep. Math. Phys.*, 51(1):87–125, 2003.

[2] P. M. Alberti and A. Uhlmann. Stochastic linear maps and transition probability. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 7(2):107–112, 1983.

[3] C. Anantharaman-Delaroche and J.-F. Havet. On approximate factorizations of completely positive maps. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 90(2):411–428, 1990.

[4] M. Berta, F. Furrer, and V. B. Scholz. The smooth entropy formalism for von Neumann algebras. *J. Math. Phys.*, 57:015213, 2016.

[5] D. Bures. An extension of Kakutani's theorem on infinite product measures to the tensor product of semifinite w^*-algebras. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 135:199–212, 1969.

[6] M. D. Choi. Some assorted inequalities for positive linear maps on C^*-algebras. *J. Operator Theory*, 4(2):271–285, 1980.

[7] M. D. Choi and E. G. Effros. Injectivity and operator spaces. *J. Functional Analysis*, 24(2):156–209, 1977.

[8] J. Crann, D. W. Kribs, R. H. Levene, and I. G. Todorov. Private algebras in quantum information and infinite-dimensional complementarity. *J. Math. Phys.*, 57(1):015208, 14, 2016.

[9] J. Crann and M. Neufang. Quantum channels arising from abstract harmonic analysis. *J. Phys. A*, 46(4):045308, 22, 2013.

[10] T. Fack. Sur la notion de valeur caractéristique. *J. Operator Theory*, 7(2):307–333, 1982.

[11] D. Farenick. *Fundamentals of functional analysis*. Universitext. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2016.

[12] D. R. Farenick and S. M. Manjegani. Young's inequality in operator algebras. *J. Ramanujan Math. Soc.*, 20(2):107–124, 2005.

[13] L. T. Gardner. Linear maps of C^*-algebras preserving the absolute value. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 76(2):271–278, 1979.

[14] R. Jozsa. Fidelity for mixed quantum states. *J. Modern Opt.*, 41(12):2315–2323, 1994.

[15] R. V. Kadison. Isometries of operator algebras. *Ann. Of Math. (2)*, 54:325–338, 1951.

[16] R. V. Kadison. On representations of finite type. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 95(23):13392–13396 (electronic), 1998.

[17] H. Kosaki. On the Bures distance and the Uhlmann transition probability of states on a von Neumann algebra. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 89(2):285–288, 1983.

[18] K. Kraus. General state changes in quantum theory. *Ann. Physics*, 64:311–335, 1971.

[19] K. Kraus. *States, effects, and operations*, volume 190 of *Lecture Notes in Physics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983. Fundamental notions of quantum theory, Lecture notes edited by A. Böhm, J. D. Dollard and W. H. Wootters.

[20] L. Molnár. Fidelity preserving maps on density operators. *Rep. Math. Phys.*, 48(3):299–303, 2001.

[21] A. Müller-Hermes and D. Reeb. Monotonicity of the quantum relative entropy under positive maps. *arXiv:1512.06117v2*, 2016.

[22] E. Nelson. Notes on non-commutative integration. *J. Functional Analysis*, 15:103–116, 1974.

[23] C. E. Rickart. Banach algebras with an adjoint operation. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 47:528–550, 1946.

[24] B. Russo and H. A. Dye. A note on unitary operators in C^*-algebras. *Duke Math. J.*, 33:413–416, 1966.

[25] E. Størmer. On the Jordan structure of C^*-algebras. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 120:438–447, 1965.

[26] E. Størmer. *Positive linear maps of operator algebras*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, Heidelberg, 2013.

[27] M. Takesaki. *Theory of operator algebras. I*, volume 124 of *Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2002. Reprint of the first (1979) edition, Operator Algebras and Non-commutative Geometry, 5.

[28] M. Takesaki. *Theory of operator algebras. II*, volume 125 of *Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. , Operator Algebras and Non-commutative Geometry, 6.

[29] R. M. Timoney. Some formulae for norms of elementary operators. *J. Operator Theory*, 57(1):121–145, 2007.

[30] A. Uhlmann. The "transition probability" in the state space of a *-algebra. *Rep. Mathematical Phys.*, 9(2):273–279, 1976.

[31] J. Watrous. *Theory of quantum information*. draft manuscript, 2015.

[32] W. Winter and J. Zacharias. Completely positive maps of order zero. *Münster J. Math.*, 2:311–324, 2009.