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Abstract

We consider a family of norms (called operator $E$-norms) on the algebra $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$ of all bounded operators on a separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ induced by a positive densely defined operator $G$ on $\mathcal{H}$. Each norm of this family produces the same topology on $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$ depending on $G$. By choosing different generating operator $G$ one can obtain operator $E$-norms producing different topologies, in particular, the strong operator topology on bounded subsets of $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

We obtain a generalised version of the Kretschmann-Schlingemann-Werner theorem, which shows continuity of the Stinespring representation of CP linear maps w.r.t. the energy-constrained $cb$-norm (diamond norm) on the set of CP maps and the operator $E$-norm on the set of Stinespring operators.

We describe two Banach spaces: the completion of $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$ w.r.t. the operator $E$-norm and the maximal extension of $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$ on which the operator $E$-norms are well defined.

Some results concerning extensions of energy-limited quantum channels and operations to unbounded observables are presented in the last part of the paper.
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1 Introduction and preliminaries

The algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ of all bounded linear operators on a separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, some its subalgebras and subspaces are basic objects in different fields of modern mathematics and mathematical physics [4, 9, 11]. In particular, $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ appears as an algebra of observables in the theory of quantum systems while unital completely positive maps between such algebras called quantum channels play the role of dynamical maps in the Heisenberg picture [6, 19, 21].

The variety of different topologies on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, relations between them and their "physical" sense are well known for anybody who is interested in functional analysis, theory of operator algebras, mathematical and theoretical physics.

In this article we describe families of norms on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ producing different topologies on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, in particular, the strong operator topology on bounded subsets of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. These norms depending on a positive densely defined operator $G$ were introduced in [14] for quantitative analysis of continuity of the Stinespring representation of a quantum channel with respect to the strong convergence of quantum channels and the strong operator convergence of Stinespring isometries.

Now we consider these norms (called the operator $E$-norms) in more general context (assuming that $G$ is an arbitrary positive operator). In Section 2 we consider equivalent definitions and basic properties of the operator $E$-norms. Some of these properties look like natural generalisations of the well known results concerning the operator norm.

The operator $E$-norms make it possible to obtain a generalization the Kretschmann-Schlingemann-Werner theorem proved in [7]. The original version of this theorem shows continuity of the Stinespring representation of a completely positive (CP) linear map with respect to the norm of complete boundedness ($cb$-norm in what follows) on the set of CP maps and the operator norm on the set of Stinespring operators. Our aim was to obtain a version of this theorem for other (weaker) topologies on the sets of CP maps and corresponding Stinespring operators, in particular, for the strong convergence topology on the set of CP maps and the strong operator topology on the set of Stinespring operators. By using the operator $E$-norms one can upgrade the proof of the Kretschmann-Schlingemann-Werner theorem without essential changes. The generalised version of this theorem and its corollaries are presented in Section 3.

In Section 4 we describe two Banach spaces of linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$ naturally connected to the operator $E$-norms and completely determined by the generating operator $G$. The first one denoted by $\mathcal{B}_G(\mathcal{H})$ is the maximal extension of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ on which the operator $E$-norms are well defined. The second Banach space $\mathcal{B}_G^0(\mathcal{H})$ is the completion of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ w.r.t. the operator $E$-norm which forms a proper subspace of $\mathcal{B}_G(\mathcal{H})$ if $G$ is an unbounded operator (if $G$ is a bounded operator then $\mathcal{B}_G(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{B}_G^0(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$).

In Section 5 we apply the above results to analysis of extension of quantum channels and operations to unbounded observables. As a basic example we consider the operators associated with the Heisenberg Commutation Relation.

\footnote{It is also called the diamond norm in the quantum information theory [1, 21].}
Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a separable infinite-dimensional Hilbert space, $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$ – the algebra of all bounded operators on $\mathcal{H}$ with the operator norm $\|\cdot\|$ and $\mathfrak{I}(\mathcal{H})$ – the Banach space of all trace-class operators on $\mathcal{H}$ with the trace norm $\|\cdot\|_1$ (the Schatten class of order 1) [4] [11]. Let $\mathfrak{S}_+(\mathcal{H})$ be the cone of positive operators in $\mathfrak{I}(\mathcal{H})$. Trace-class operators will be usually denoted by the Greek letters $\rho$, $\sigma$, $\omega$, ... The closed convex subsets

$$\mathfrak{S}_{+,1}(\mathcal{H}) = \{\rho \in \mathfrak{S}_+(\mathcal{H}) \mid \text{Tr}\rho \leq 1\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}) = \{\rho \in \mathfrak{S}_+(\mathcal{H}) \mid \text{Tr}\rho = 1\}$$

of the cone $\mathfrak{S}_+(\mathcal{H})$ are complete separable metric spaces with the metric defined by the trace norm. Operators in $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$ are called density operators or states, since any $\rho$ in $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$ determines a normal state $A \mapsto \text{Tr}A\rho$ on the algebra $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$ [4] [6]. Extreme points of $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$ are 1-rank projectors called pure states.

Denote by $I_H$ the unit operator on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and by $\text{Id}_H$ the identity transformation of the Banach space $\mathfrak{I}(\mathcal{H})$.

We will use the Dirac notations $|\varphi\rangle$, $|\psi\rangle\langle\varphi|$, ... for vectors and operators of rank 1 on a Hilbert space (in this notations the action of an operator $|\psi\rangle\langle\varphi|$ on a vector $|\chi\rangle$ gives the vector $\langle\varphi|\chi\rangle|\psi\rangle$) [6].

We will pay a special attention to the class of unbounded densely defined positive operators on $\mathcal{H}$ having discrete spectrum of finite multiplicity. In Dirac’s notations any such operator $G$ can be represented as follows

$$G = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} E_k |\tau_k\rangle\langle\tau_k|$$

(1)

on the domain $\mathcal{D}(G) = \{\varphi \in \mathcal{H} \mid \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} E_k^2 |\langle\tau_k|\varphi\rangle|^2 < +\infty\}$, where $\{\tau_k\}_{k=0}^{+\infty}$ is the orthonormal basis of eigenvectors of $G$ corresponding to the nondecreasing sequence $\{E_k\}_{k=0}^{+\infty}$ of eigenvalues tending to $+\infty$. We will use the following (cf. [23])

**Definition 1.** An operator $G$ having representation (1) is called discrete.

The set $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$ is compact if and only if $\dim \mathcal{H} < +\infty$. We will use the following

**Lemma 1.** [3] If $G$ is a discrete unbounded operator on $\mathcal{H}$ then the set of states $\rho$ in $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$ satisfying the inequality $\text{Tr}G\rho \leq E$ is compact for any $E \geq \inf_{\|\varphi\|=1} \langle\varphi|G|\varphi\rangle$.

We will also use the following results from the convex analysis.

**Lemma 2.** [20] Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space and $G$ a positive operator on $\mathcal{H}$. If the convex set $\mathfrak{S}_{G,E} = \{\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}) \mid \text{Tr}G\rho = E\}$ is nonempty then all its extreme points are pure states.

**Proof.** By using the fact that any closed convex set in a finite-dimensional linear space is a union of the relative interior of its faces [12] Theorem 18.2, one can show that any face $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathfrak{S}_{G,E}$ is the intersection of some face $\mathfrak{F}_*$ of $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$ and the hyperplane determined by the equality $\text{Tr}G\rho = E$. Since the faces of $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$ have dimensions 0, 3, 8, etc. [3] Ch.8], it follows that $\dim \mathfrak{F} = 0$ implies $\dim \mathfrak{F}_* = 0$. Hence all extreme points of $\mathfrak{S}_{G,E}$ are extreme points of $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$, i.e. pure states. □

**Lemma 3.** [22] If $f$ is a concave nonnegative function on $[0, +\infty)$ then for any positive $x < y$ and any $z \geq 0$ the inequality $xf(z/x) \leq yf(z/y)$ holds.
2 Operator \( E \)-norms on \( \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}) \).

Let \( G \) be a positive operator on \( \mathcal{H} \) with a dense domain \( \mathcal{D}(G) \) such that
\[
\inf \{ \langle \varphi | G | \varphi \rangle | \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(G), \| \varphi \| = 1 \} = 0.
\] (2)

For given \( E > 0 \) consider the function on \( \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) defined as
\[
\| A \|_G^E = \sup_{\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}) : \text{Tr} G \rho \leq E} \sqrt{\text{Tr} A \rho A^*},
\] (3)

where the supremum is over all states \( \rho \) in \( \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}) \) satisfying the inequality \( \text{Tr} G \rho \leq E \).

The following proposition is proved in \([14]\).

**Proposition 1.** The function \( A \mapsto \| A \|_G^E \) defined in (3) is a norm on \( \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}) \). For any operator \( A \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) the following properties hold:

a) \( \| A \|_G^E \) tends to \( \| A \| \) as \( E \to +\infty \);

b) the function \( E \mapsto [\| A \|_G^E]^p \) is concave and nondecreasing on \( \mathbb{R}_+ \) for \( p \in (0, 2) \);

c) \( \| A \varphi \| \leq K_\varphi \| A \|_G^E \) for any unit vector \( \varphi \) in \( \mathcal{H} \) with finite \( E_\varphi \equiv \langle \varphi | G | \varphi \rangle \), where \( K_\varphi = 1 \) if \( E_\varphi \leq E \) and \( K_\varphi = \sqrt{E_\varphi / E} \) otherwise.

We will call the norms \( \| \cdot \|_G^E \) the **operator \( E \)-norms** on \( \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}) \). Property b) in Proposition \([14]\) shows that
\[
\| A \|_{E_1}^G \leq \| A \|_{E_2}^G \leq \sqrt{E_2 / E_1} \| A \|_{E_1}^G \quad \text{for any } E_2 > E_1 > 0.
\] (4)

Hence for given operator \( G \) all the norms \( \| \cdot \|_G^E, E > 0 \), are equivalent on \( \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}) \).

**Remark 1.** The definition of the operator \( E \)-norm is obviously generalized to operators between different Hilbert spaces \( \mathcal{H} \) and \( \mathcal{K} \). The norm \( \| A \|_G^E \) of any bounded linear operator \( A : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{K} \) can be defined either by formula (3) in which the trace is taken over the space \( \mathcal{K} \) or by the equivalent formula
\[
\| A \|_G^E \equiv \sup_{\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}) : \text{Tr} G \rho \leq E} \sqrt{\text{Tr} A^* A \rho}.
\] (5)

not depending on the space \( \mathcal{K} \) at all (since the operator \( A^* A \) belongs to \( \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}) \)). It is easy to see that all the above and below results concerning properties of the operator \( E \)-norms remain valid (with obvious modifications) for this generalization. \( \square \)

---

\(^2\)The value of \( \text{Tr} G \rho \) (finite or infinite) is defined as \( \sup_n \text{Tr} P_n G \rho \), where \( P_n \) is the spectral projector of \( G \) corresponding to the interval \([0, n]\).

\(^3\)In \([14]\) condition (2) was not assumed. We use this assumption here, since it simplifies analysis of the norms \( \| \cdot \|_G^E \) without reduction of generality (note that \( \| A \|_{G+\lambda I}^E = \| A \|_{G-\lambda I}^E \) for all \( A \) and \( \lambda > 0 \)).

\(^4\)In \([14]\) the norms \( \| \cdot \|_G^E \) are called energy-constrained operator norms, since \( G \) is treated therein as a Hamiltonian of a quantum system described by the Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H} \).

\(^5\)Definition (3) is better than (5), since it can be extended to unbounded operators (see Section 4).
Since the set of vectors \( \varphi \) with finite \( \langle \varphi | G | \varphi \rangle \) is dense in \( \mathcal{H} \), property c) in Proposition 1 shows that the topology generated by any of the norms \( \| \cdot \|_E \) on bounded subsets of \( \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) is not weaker than the strong operator topology. On the other hand, it is not stronger than the norm topology on \( \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}) \). The following proposition characterizes these extreme cases.

**Proposition 2.** A) The norm \( \| \cdot \|_E^G, E > 0 \), is equivalent to the operator norm \( \| \cdot \| \) on \( \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) if and only if the operator \( G \) is bounded.

B) The norm \( \| \cdot \|_E^G, E > 0 \), generates the strong operator topology on bounded subsets of \( \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) if and only if \( G \) is an unbounded discrete operator (Definition 1).

**Proof.** A) If \( G \) is a bounded operator then \( \| \cdot \|_E^G = \| \cdot \| \) for any \( E \geq \| G \| \).

If \( G \) is an unbounded operator and \( P_n \) is the spectral projector of \( G \) corresponding to the interval \([n, +\infty)\) then \( \| P_n \| = 1 \) for all \( n \). By noting that \( \text{Tr} P_n \rho \leq E/n \) for any state \( \rho \) such that \( \text{Tr} G \rho \leq E \), it is easy to see that \( \| P_n \|_E^G \to 0 \) as \( n \to +\infty \).

B) The ”if” part of this assertion is proved in [14].

Assume there is a spectral projector of the operator \( G \) corresponding to a finite interval \([0, E_0]\) with infinite-dimensional range \( \mathcal{H}_0 \). Since \( \text{Tr} G \rho \leq E_0 \) for any \( \rho \) in \( \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_0) \), we have \( \| A \|_E^G = \| A \| \) for any \( A \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_0) \) and \( E > E_0 \). So, any of the norms \( \| \cdot \|_E^G, E > 0 \), generates the norm topology on \( \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_0) \) in this case.

Different types of operator convergence can be obtained by using the norm \( \| \cdot \|_E^G \) induced by different generating operators \( G \).

**Example.** Let \( \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2 \) and \( G = G_1 \oplus G_2 \), where \( G_k \) is a positive densely defined operator on a separable Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H}_k \) satisfying condition (2), \( k = 1, 2 \). By using definition (3) and the triangle inequality it is easy to show that

\[
\sqrt{p[\| AP_1 \|_E^{G_1}]^2 + (1 - p)[\| AP_2 \|_E^{G_2}]^2} \leq \| A \|_E^G \leq \| AP_1 \|_E^{G_1} + \| AP_2 \|_E^{G_2}
\]

(6)

for any \( p \in [0, 1] \), where \( P_k \) is the projector on the subspace \( \mathcal{H}_k \) and \( \| AP_k \|_E^{G_k}, k = 1, 2 \), are defined in accordance with Remark 1.

Assume that \( G_1 \) is a discrete unbounded operator (Def 1) and \( G_2 \) is a bounded operator. Then it follows from (6) and Proposition 2 that

\[
\left\{ \| \cdot \|_E^G - \lim_{n \to \infty} A_n = A_0 \right\} \Leftrightarrow \left\{ s.o.- \lim_{n \to \infty} A_n P_1 = A_0 P_1 \right\} \land \left\{ \| \cdot \| - \lim_{n \to \infty} A_n P_2 = A_0 P_2 \right\}
\]

for a bounded sequence \( \{ A_n \} \subset \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}) \), where s.o.-lim denotes the limit w.r.t the strong operator topology. So, in this case the norm \( \| \cdot \|_E^G \) generates a ”hybrid” topology on bounded subsets of \( \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) – some kind of the Cartesian product of the strong operator and the norm topologies.

### 2.1 Equivalent definitions of the operator \( E \)-norms.

Recall that \( \mathfrak{T}_{+,1}(\mathcal{H}) \) denotes the positive part of the unit ball in \( \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}) \).
Proposition 3. A) For any $E > 0$ the supremum in definition (3) can be taken over all operators in $\Sigma_{+,1}(H)$ satisfying the condition $\text{Tr}G\rho \leq E$, i.e.

$$\|A\|_E^G = \sup_{\rho \in \Sigma_{+,1}(H): \text{Tr}G\rho \leq E} \sqrt{\text{Tr}A\rho A^*}, \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{B}(H). \quad (7)$$

B) If $G$ is a discrete operator (Def. 7) then for any $A \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ and $E > 0$ the supremum in (3) is attained at a pure state $\rho_A$ in $\mathcal{G}(H)$ such that $\text{Tr}G\rho_A \leq E$. This means that

$$\|A\|_E^G = \sup_{\rho \in \Sigma_{+,1}(H): \text{Tr}G\rho \leq E} \|A\rho\| = \|A\varphi_A\|, \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{B}(H), \quad (8)$$

for some unit vector $\varphi_A$ such that $\langle \varphi_A | G | \varphi_A \rangle \leq E$, where $H_1$ is the unit sphere in $H$. The unit sphere $H_1$ in (3) can be replaced by the unit ball $H_{\leq 1}$ of $H$.

Remark 2. Proposition 3A does not hold if the operator $G$ doesn’t satisfy condition (2). It implies the following equivalent definitions of the operator $E$-norms

$$\|A\|_E^G = \sup \left\{ \sqrt{\sum_i \|A\varphi_i\|^2} \mid \{\varphi_i\} \subset H : \sum_i \|\varphi_i\|^2 \leq 1, \sum_i \|G\varphi_i\|^2 \leq E \right\} \quad (9)$$

and

$$\|A\|_E^G = \sup \left\{ \|A \otimes I_K\varphi\| \mid \varphi \in H \otimes K : \|\varphi\| \leq 1, \langle \varphi | G \otimes I_K | \varphi \rangle \leq E \right\}, \quad (10)$$

where $K$ is a separable Hilbert space.

Proposition 3B shows that in the case of discrete operator $G$ the supremum in (9) can be taken over singleton collections $\{\varphi_i\}$ and that the Hilbert space $K$ in (10) can be taken trivial (one-dimensional).

Remark 3. Definition (3) looks more natural than (3), it also produces a norm on $\mathcal{B}(H)$. We use definition (3), since it implies concavity of the function $E \mapsto \|A\|_E^G$ (which is a very desirable property). We don’t know examples of $G$ for which (3) and (8) are different. But if we assume that they are different for some $A$ and $E$ then one can show that definition (8) produces a family of norms not possessing the aforementioned concavity property.

Proof of Proposition 3. A) Since $\mathcal{G}(H) \subset \Sigma_{+,1}(H)$, it suffices to show that ”$\geq$” holds in (7). Let $\rho$ be an operator in $\Sigma_{+,1}(H)$ such that $\text{Tr}G\rho \leq E$ and $r = \text{Tr}\rho$. Then $\hat{\rho} := r^{-1}\rho$ is a state such that $\text{Tr}G\hat{\rho} \leq E/r$. So, by using concavity of the function $E \mapsto \|A\|_E^G$ and Lemma 3 in Section 1 we obtain

$$\text{Tr}A\rho A^* = r \text{Tr}\hat{\rho}A^* \leq r \left[\|A\|_E^G\right]^2 \leq \left[\|A\|_E^G\right]^2.$$  

B) Assume that the operator $G$ has form (1). For given $n$ denote by $H_n$ the linear span of the vectors $\tau_0, ..., \tau_{n-1}$, i.e. $H_n$ is the subspace corresponding to the minimal $n$ eigenvalues of $G$ (taking the multiplicity into account). Denote by $P_n$ the projector onto $H_n$. Let $A$ be any operator in $\mathcal{B}(H)$. By using Lemma 2 in Section 1 it is easy to show that all extreme points of the convex subset of $\mathcal{G}(H_n)$ determined by the
inequality $\text{Tr}G_n\rho \leq E$, where $G_n = GP_n$, are pure states. It follows that the supremum in definition (3) with $A = AP_n$ is attained at a pure state for all $n$.

Thus, to prove that the supremum in definition (3) can be taken only over pure states it suffices to show that

$$\|A\|^G_E = \lim_{n \to +\infty} \|AP_n\|^G_E.$$ 

By the triangle inequality, this relation follows from the vanishing of the sequence $\|AP_n\|^G_E$, where $P_n = I_H - P_n$, which can be shown by using the inequality

$$\text{Tr}A\bar{P}_n\rho\bar{P}_nA^* \leq \|A\|^2\text{Tr}\bar{P}_n\rho \leq \|A\|^2E/E_n$$

valid for any state $\rho$ satisfying the condition $\text{Tr}G\rho \leq E$.

By Lemma 1 in Section 1 the set of pure states $\rho$ satisfying the condition $\text{Tr}G\rho \leq E$ is compact. Hence the supremum in (3) is attained at a pure state. □

### 2.2 Basic properties of the operator $E$-norms

In the following proposition we collect properties of the $E$-norms used below.

**Proposition 4.** Let $G$ be a positive densely defined operator on a Hilbert space $H$ satisfying condition (2) and $\|\cdot\|^G_E$ the corresponding operator $E$-norm defined in (3).

A) $\|A\|^G_E = \|A\|^G_E \leq \sqrt{\|A^*A\|^G_E}$ for all $A \in \mathfrak{B}(H)$ but $\|A^*\|^G_E \neq \|A\|^G_E$ in general;

B) For arbitrary operators $A$ and $B$ in $\mathfrak{B}(H)$ the following inequalities hold

$$m(A)\|B\|^G_E \leq \|AB\|^G_E \leq \|A\|\|B\|^G_E,$$

where $m(A)$ is the infimum of the spectrum of the operator $|A| = \sqrt{A^*A}$.

C) For arbitrary operators $A$ and $B$ in $\mathfrak{B}(H)$ such that $\langle A\varphi | B\varphi \rangle = 0$ for any $\varphi \in H$ the following inequalities hold

$$\max \{\|A\|^G_E, \|B\|^G_E\} \leq \|A + B\|^G_E \leq \sqrt{\|A\|^2_E} + \|B\|^2_E.$$

D) For an operator $\rho$ in $\mathfrak{S}_{+,1}(H)$ with finite $E_\rho = \text{Tr}G\rho$ and any operators $A$ and $B$ in $\mathfrak{B}(H)$ the following inequalities hold

$$|\text{Tr}A\rho B^*| \leq \|A\|\|B\|^* \leq \|A\|^G_E\|B\|^G_{E^*}.$$

E) For any 2-positive map $\Phi : \mathfrak{B}(H) \to \mathfrak{B}(H)$ such that $\Phi(I_H) \leq I_H$ having the predual map\footnote{The map $\Phi_*$ is defined by the relation $\text{Tr}\Phi(A)\rho = \text{Tr}A\Phi_*(\rho)$ for all $A \in \mathfrak{B}(H)$ and $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(H)$. Existence of $\Phi_*$ is equivalent to normality of the map $\Phi$, which means that $\Phi(\sup \lambda A_\lambda) = \sup \lambda \Phi(A_\lambda)$ for any increasing net $A_\lambda$.}$\Phi_* : \mathfrak{S}(H) \to \mathfrak{S}(H)$ with finite $Y_\Phi(E) = \sup \{\text{Tr}\Phi(\rho) | \rho \in \mathfrak{S}(H), \text{Tr}G\rho \leq E\}$ and arbitrary operator $A$ in $\mathfrak{B}(H)$ the following inequalities hold\footnote{If $G$ is a Hamiltonian of a quantum system described by the space $H$ and $\Phi$ is a quantum channel (in the Heisenberg picture) then $Y_\Phi(E)/E$ is the energy amplification factor of $\Phi$ (see Section 5 for details).}$

$$\|\Phi(A)\|^G_E \leq \sqrt{\|\Phi(I_H)\|} \|A\|^G_{Y_\Phi(E)} \leq \sqrt{\|\Phi(I_H)\|K_\Phi} \|A\|^G_E, \quad K_\Phi = \max \{1, Y_\Phi(E)/E\}.$$
Proposition 3 shows that the linear transformations $A \mapsto BA$ and $A \mapsto \Phi(A)$ of $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$, where $B \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\Phi$ is a map with the properties pointed in part E, are bounded operators w.r.t. the norm $\|\cdot\|_E$ (in contrast to the transformation $A \mapsto AB$).

Proof. Assertions B follows directly from the definition of the operator $E$-norms.

A) The equality $\|A\|_E^2 = \|\Phi(A)\|_E^2$ is obvious. The inequality $\|A\|_E^2 \leq \|A^*A\|_E^2$ follows from the operator Cauchy-Schwarz inequality $[\text{Tr}A^*A]\|\Phi(A)\|_E^2 \leq \|A^*A\|_E^2 \|\Phi(A)\|_E^2$.

To show that $\|A\|_E^2$ may not coincide with $\|A\|_E^2$ take any operator $G$ having form (4). It is easy to see that $\|\tau_0\|_E^2 = \sqrt{E/E_n}$ while $\|\tau_0\|_E^2 = 1$ for all $E > 0$.

C) It suffices to note that in this case $\text{Tr}(A+\rho)(A+\rho)^* = \text{Tr}A^2 + \text{Tr}B\rho B^*$ for any state $\rho$ in $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$.

D) The first inequality is obvious. Let $U$ be the partial isometry from the polar decomposition of $A\rho B^*$, i.e. $A\rho B^* = U|A\rho B^*|$. By using the operator Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we obtain

$$\|\text{Tr}A\rho B^*\|_E^2 = \|\text{Tr}U^*A\rho B^*\|_E^2 \leq \|\text{Tr}U^*A\rho B^*\|_E^2 \|\text{Tr}B\rho B^*\|_E^2 \leq \|\text{Tr}A^2 + \text{Tr}B\rho B^*\|_E^2,$$

where that last inequality is due to the fact that $UU^* \leq I_H$. By Proposition 3, the right side of this inequality does not exceed $\|A\|_E^2 \|B\|_E^2$.

E) By Kadison’s inequality and Proposition 3, we have

$$\text{Tr}[\Phi(A)]^*\Phi(A) \leq \|\Phi(I_H)\|\text{Tr}[\Phi(A^*A)] \leq \|\Phi(I_H)\|\|A\|_Y(E),$$

for any $A \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and any $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\text{Tr}G\rho \leq E$ (since the condition $\Phi(I_H) \leq I_H$ guarantees that $\Phi(\rho) \in \mathfrak{S}_{1,1}(\mathcal{H})$). This implies the first inequality. The second inequality follows from (4). □

2.3 Properties of the $E$-norms related to tensor products

If $G_1$ and $G_2$ are positive densely defined operators on Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ satisfying condition (2) then $G_{12} = G_1 \otimes I_2 + I_1 \otimes G_2$ is an operator on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{12} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ with the same properties. The following proposition contains several estimates for the operator $E$-norms of product operators used in Section 3.

Proposition 5. Let $G_1$, $G_2$ and $G_{12}$ be the operators described above.

A) For arbitrary operator $A$ in $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ the following equalities hold

$$\|A \otimes I_2\|_{E_{12}}^2 = \|A \otimes I_2\|_{E_{12}}^2 = \|A\|_{E_{12}}^2$$

B) For arbitrary operators $A \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ and $B \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_2)$ the following inequalities hold

$$\max_{x \in (0,E)} \|A\|_{x}^2 \|B\|_{E-x}^2 \leq \|A \otimes B\|_{E_{12}}^2 \leq \max_{x \in (0,E)} \sqrt{\|A^*A\|_{x}^2 \|B^*B\|_{E-x}^2},$$

If $G_1$ and $G_2$ are Hamiltonians of quantum systems 1 and 2 described by the spaces $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ then $G_{12}$ is the Hamiltonian of the composite quantum system $12$.

Here and in what follows we write $I_X$ instead of $I_{\mathcal{H}_X}$ (where $X = 1, 2, A, B, \ldots$) to simplify notations.
and
\[ \|A \otimes B\|_{E}^{G_{12}} \leq \min \left\{ \|A\|_{E}^{G_{1}}, \|A\|_{E} \right\}. \] (12)

Proof. A) It suffices to note that \( \text{Tr}[|A|^{2} \otimes |I_{2}|] \rho_{12} = \text{Tr}|A|^{2} \rho_{1} \) and that \( \text{Tr}G_{12} \rho_{12} = \text{Tr}G_{1} \rho_{1} + \text{Tr}G_{2} \rho_{2} \) for any state \( \rho_{12} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{12}) \), where \( \rho_{1} = \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{2}} \rho_{12} \) and \( \rho_{2} = \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{1}} \rho_{12} \) are the partial states of \( \rho_{12} \).

B) For each \( x \in (0, E) \) and any \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there exist states \( \rho_{1} \) in \( \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{1}) \) and \( \rho_{2} \) in \( \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{2}) \) such that \( \sqrt{\text{Tr}|A|^{2}} \rho_{1} > \|A\|^{G_{1}}_{x} - \varepsilon \), \( \text{Tr}G_{1} \rho_{1} \leq x \), \( \sqrt{\text{Tr}|B|^{2}} \rho_{2} > \|B\|^{G_{2}}_{E-x} - \varepsilon \) and \( \text{Tr}G_{2} \rho_{2} \leq E-x \). Then \( \text{Tr}G_{12} \rho_{1} \rho_{2} \leq x+E-x = E \) and \( \sqrt{\text{Tr}[|A|^{2} \otimes |B|^{2}] \rho_{1} \rho_{2}} \geq \|A\|^{G_{2}}_{x} - \varepsilon \)\( \|B\|^{G_{2}}_{E-x} - \varepsilon \). Since \( \varepsilon \) is arbitrary, this implies the left inequality in (11).

By the operator Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for any state \( \rho_{12} \) in \( \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{12}) \) we have
\[ \text{Tr}[|A|^{2} \otimes |B|^{2}] \rho_{12} \leq \sqrt{\text{Tr}[|A|^{4} \otimes I_{2}] \rho_{12}} \sqrt{\text{Tr}[I_{1} \otimes |B|^{4}] \rho_{12}} \]
\[ = \sqrt{\text{Tr}[|A|^{4}]} \rho_{1} \sqrt{\text{Tr}[|B|^{4}] \rho_{2}} \leq \|A\|^{G_{1}}_{\text{Tr}G_{1} \rho_{1}} \|B\|^{G_{2}}_{\text{Tr}G_{2} \rho_{2}} \]
Since \( \text{Tr}G_{12} \rho_{12} = \text{Tr}G_{1} \rho_{1} + \text{Tr}G_{2} \rho_{2} \), this implies the right inequality in (11).

To prove inequality (12) it suffices to note that \( A \otimes B = [A \otimes I_{2}] [I_{1} \otimes B] = [I_{1} \otimes B] [A \otimes I_{2}] \) and to apply Proposition 4B and part A of this proposition. \( \square \)

3 The \( E \)-version of the Kretschmann-Schlingemann-Werner theorem

In this section we consider application of the operator \( E \)-norms to the theory of completely positive (CP) linear maps between Banach spaces of trace class operators on separable Hilbert spaces (the Schatten classes of order 1). Since \( \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H})^{*} = \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}) \), the below results can be reformulated in terms of CP linear maps between algebras of bounded operators on separable Hilbert spaces. Nevertheless, the use of the "predual picture" is more natural for representation of our results. The theory of CP linear maps between Banach spaces of trace class operators has important applications in mathematical physics, in particular, in the theory of open quantum systems, where CP trace-preserving linear maps called quantum channels play the role of dynamical maps (in the Schrodinger picture), while CP trace-non-increasing linear maps called quantum operations are essentially used in the theory of quantum measurements [6, 19, 21].

For a CP linear map \( \Phi : \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_{A}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_{B}) \) the Stinespring theorem (cf. [17]) implies existence of a Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H}_{E} \) and an operator \( V_{\Phi} : \mathcal{H}_{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{B} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{E} \) such that
\[ \Phi(\rho) = \text{Tr}_{E} V_{\Phi} \rho V_{\Phi}^{*}, \quad \rho \in \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_{A}), \] (13)
where \( \text{Tr}_{E} \) denotes the partial trace over \( \mathcal{H}_{E} \). If \( \Phi \) is trace-preserving (correspondingly, trace-non-increasing) then \( V_{\Phi} \) is an isometry (correspondingly, contraction) [6 Ch.6].
The dual CP linear map $\Phi^* : \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_B) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ has the corresponding representation
\[
\Phi^*(B) = V_B^*[B \otimes I_E]V_\Phi, \quad B \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_B).
\] (14)

The norm of complete boundedness ($cb$-norm in what follows) of a linear map between the algebras $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ and $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ (cf. [9]) induces (by duality) the norm
\[
\|\Phi\|_{cb} = \sup_{\rho \in \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_AR), \|\rho\|_1 \leq 1} \|\Phi \otimes Id_R(\rho)\|_1
\] on the set of all linear maps between Banach spaces $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ and $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_B)$, where $\mathcal{H}_R$ is a separable Hilbert space and $\mathcal{H}_AR = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_R$. If $\Phi$ is a Hermitian preserving map then the supremum in (15) can be taken over the set $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_AR)$ [19, Ch.3].

The Kretschmann-Schlingemann-Werner theorem (the KSW-theorem in what follows) obtained in [7] states that
\[
\frac{\|\Phi - \Psi\|_{cb}}{\sqrt{\|\Phi\|_{cb} + \|\Psi\|_{cb}}} \leq \inf_{V_\Phi, V_\Psi} \|V_\Phi - V_\Psi\| \leq \sqrt{\|\Phi - \Psi\|_{cb}},
\]
where the infimum is over all common Stinespring representations
\[
\Phi(\rho) = \text{Tr}_E V_\Phi \rho V_\Phi^* \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi(\rho) = \text{Tr}_E V_\Psi \rho V_\Psi^*.
\] (16)

In the proof of the KSW theorem it is shown that the quantity $\inf_{V_\Phi, V_\Psi} \|V_\Phi - V_\Psi\|$ coincides with the Bures distance between the maps $\Phi$ and $\Psi$ defined by the expression
\[
\beta(\Phi, \Psi) = \sup_{\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_AR)} \beta(\Phi \otimes Id_R(\rho), \Psi \otimes Id_R(\rho)),
\] (17)
in which $\mathcal{H}_R$ is a separable Hilbert space and $\beta(\cdot, \cdot)$ in the r.h.s. is the Bures distance between operators in $\mathfrak{T}_+(\mathcal{H}_BR)$ defined as
\[
\beta(\rho, \sigma) = \sqrt{\|\rho\|_1 + \|\sigma\|_1 - 2\sqrt{F(\rho, \sigma)}},
\] (18)
where
\[
F(\rho, \sigma) = \|\sqrt{\rho} \sqrt{\sigma}\|_1^2
\] (19)
is the fidelity of the operators $\rho$ and $\sigma$ [6, 19, 21]. The Bures distance between CP linear maps $\Phi$ and $\Psi$ is connected to the operational fidelity of these maps introduced in [2] by the relation similar to (18).

The KSW theorem shows continuity of the map $V_\Phi \mapsto \Phi$ and selective continuity of the multi-valued map $\Phi \mapsto V_\Phi$ with respect to the $cb$-norm topology on the set $\mathfrak{S}(A, B)$ of all CP linear maps $\Phi$ from $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ to $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ and the operator norm topology on the set of Stinespring operators $V_\Phi$.

The $cb$-norm topology is widely used in the quantum theory, by it is too strong for description of physical perturbations of infinite-dimensional quantum channels [15, 23]. Our aim is to obtain a version of the KSW theorem which would show continuity of the
map $V_\Phi \mapsto \Phi$ and selective continuity of the multi-valued map $\Phi \mapsto V_\Phi$ with respect to \textit{weaker topologies} on the sets of CP linear maps $\Phi$ and Stinespring operators $V_\Phi$. A natural way to do this is to use the operator $E$-norms induced by some positive operator $G$ on $\mathcal{H}_A$ (naturally generalized to operators between different separable Hilbert spaces, see Remark [1] and the energy-constrained $cb$-norms

$$\|\Phi\|_{cb}^E \doteq \sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A): \text{Tr}G\rho \leq E} \|\Phi \otimes \text{Id}_R(\rho)\|_1, \quad E > 0,$$

where $\text{Tr}_R(\rho)$

on the set of Hermitian-preserving linear maps from $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ to $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ introduced independently in [15] and [23] (the positive operator $G$ is treated therein as a Hamiltonian of a quantum system $A$).\footnote{Slightly different energy-constrained $cb$-norm is used in [10].} If $G$ is a discrete unbounded operator (see Def [11]) then the topology generated by any of the norms \footnote{This topology is a restriction to the set $\mathcal{F}(A,B)$ of the strong operator topology on the set of all linear maps from $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ to $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}_B)$. The strong convergence of a sequence $\{\Phi_n\} \subset \mathcal{F}(A,B)$ to a map $\Phi_0$ means that $\lim_{n \to \infty} \Phi_n(\rho) = \Phi_0(\rho)$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}_A)$.} on bounded subsets of $\mathcal{F}(A,B)$ coincides with the strong convergence topology generated by the family of seminorms $\Phi \mapsto \|\Phi(\rho)\|_1$, $\rho \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ [15, Proposition 3].\footnote{Throughout this section we use a fixed generating operator $G$, so we will denote the operator $E$-norm by $\|\cdot\|_E$ (instead of $\|\cdot\|_E^G$) to simplify notations.}

Following [13] introduce the \textit{energy-constrained Bures distance}

$$\beta_E(\Phi, \Psi) = \sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)} \beta(\Phi \otimes \text{Id}_R(\rho), \Psi \otimes \text{Id}_R(\rho)), \quad E > 0,$$

between CP liner maps $\Phi$ and $\Psi$ from $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ to $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}_B)$, where $\beta(\cdot, \cdot)$ in the r.h.s. is the Bures distance between operators in $\mathcal{K}^+(\mathcal{H}_{BR})$ defined in [18] and $\mathcal{H}_R$ is a separable Hilbert space. The distance $\beta_E(\Phi, \Psi)$ turns out to be extremely useful in quantitative continuity analysis of capacities of energy-constrained infinite-dimensional quantum channels [13, Theorem 2]. By using the well known relations between the trace norm and the Bures distance in [18] one can show that for any $E > 0$ the distance $\beta_E(\Phi, \Psi)$ generates the same topology on bounded subsets of $\mathcal{F}(A,B)$ as any of the energy-constrained $cb$-norms \footnote{The results of calculation of $\beta_E(\Phi, \Psi)$ for real quantum channels can be found in [8].}

Theorem 1. Let $G$ be a positive densely defined operator on $\mathcal{H}_A$. Let $\|\cdot\|_{cb}^E$ and $\|\cdot\|_E$ be, respectively, the energy-constrained $cb$-norm and the operator $E$-norm induced by $G$.\footnote{Throughout this section we use a fixed generating operator $G$, so we will denote the operator $E$-norm by $\|\cdot\|_E$ (instead of $\|\cdot\|_E^G$) to simplify notations.} For any CP linear maps $\Phi$ and $\Psi$ from $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ to $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ the following inequalities hold

$$\frac{\|\Phi - \Psi\|_{cb}^E}{\sqrt{\|\Phi\|_{cb}^E} + \sqrt{\|\Psi\|_{cb}^E}} \leq \inf_{V_\Phi, V_\Psi} \|V_\Phi - V_\Psi\|_E \leq \sqrt{\|\Phi - \Psi\|_{cb}^E},$$

where the infimum is over all common Stinespring representation \footnote{Throughout this section we use a fixed generating operator $G$, so we will denote the operator $E$-norm by $\|\cdot\|_E$ (instead of $\|\cdot\|_E^G$) to simplify notations.}. The quantity $\inf_{V_\Phi, V_\Psi} \|V_\Phi - V_\Psi\|_E$ coincides with the energy-constrained Bures distance $\beta_E(\Phi, \Psi)$ defined in \footnote{Throughout this section we use a fixed generating operator $G$, so we will denote the operator $E$-norm by $\|\cdot\|_E$ (instead of $\|\cdot\|_E^G$) to simplify notations.}. The infimum in \footnote{Throughout this section we use a fixed generating operator $G$, so we will denote the operator $E$-norm by $\|\cdot\|_E$ (instead of $\|\cdot\|_E^G$) to simplify notations.} is attainable.
Proof. We will follow the proof of the KSW theorem (given in [7]) with necessary modifications concerning the use of the energy-constrained cb-norms and the operator $E$-norms (instead of the ordinary cb-norm and the operator norm).

To prove the first inequality in (22) assume that $\rho$ is a state in $\mathcal{G}(H_A)$ such that $\text{Tr}G\rho_A \leq E$. For a given common Stinespring representation (16) we have

$$\| (\Phi - \Psi) \otimes \text{Id}_R(\rho) \|_1 \leq \| V_\Phi \otimes I_R \cdot \rho \cdot V_\Psi \otimes I_R - V_\Psi \otimes I_R \cdot \rho \cdot V_\Phi \otimes I_R \|_1$$

$$\leq \| (V_\Phi - V_\Psi) \otimes I_R \cdot \rho \cdot V_\Phi^* \otimes I_R \|_1 + \| V_\Psi \otimes I_R \cdot \rho \cdot (V_\Phi^* - V_\Psi^*) \otimes I_R \|_1$$

$$\leq \| (V_\Phi - V_\Psi) \otimes I_R \|_E \| V_\Phi \otimes I_R \|_E + \| (V_\Phi - V_\Psi) \otimes I_R \|_E \| V_\Psi \otimes I_R \|_E$$

$$\leq \| V_\Phi - V_\Psi \|_E \| V_\Phi \|_E + \| V_\Phi - V_\Psi \|_E \| V_\Psi \|_E.$$  

The first and the second inequalities follow from the properties of the trace norm (the non-increasing under partial trace and the triangle inequality), the third inequality follows from Proposition 4D, the last one – from Proposition 5A. By noting that $\|V_\Phi\|_E^2 = \|\Phi\|_c^2$ and $\|V_\Psi\|_E^2 = \|\Psi\|_c^2$ we obtain the first inequality in (22).

To prove the second inequality in (22) note that $\beta_E(\Phi, \Psi) \leq \sqrt{\|\Phi - \Psi\|_c^2}$. This follows from the inequality $\beta(\rho, \sigma) \leq \sqrt{\|\rho - \sigma\|_1}$ valid for any $\rho$ and $\sigma$ in $\mathcal{F}_+(\mathcal{H})$, which is easily proved by using the inequality $\text{Tr}(\sqrt{\rho} - \sqrt{\sigma})^2 \leq \|\rho - \sigma\|_1$ (see the proof of Lemma 9.2.3 in [6]). So, it suffices to show that

$$\inf_{V_\Phi, V_\Psi} \| V_\Phi - V_\Psi \|_E = \beta_E(\Phi, \Psi).$$  

(23)

Denote by $\beta'_E(\Phi, \Psi)$ the l.h.s. of (23). Let $\mathcal{C}^\delta_{G,E}$ be the subset of $\mathcal{G}(H_A)$ determined by the inequality $\text{Tr}G\rho \leq E$ and $\mathcal{N}(\Phi, \Psi) = \bigcup V_\Phi^*V_\Psi$, where the union is over all common Stinespring representations (16). Then it is easy to see that

$$\beta'_E(\Phi, \Psi) = \inf_{N \in \mathcal{N}(\Phi, \Psi)} \sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{C}^\delta_{G,E}} \sqrt{\text{Tr}\Phi(\rho) + \text{Tr}\Psi(\rho) - 2\text{Re}\text{Tr}\rho}.$$  

(24)

Following the proof of Theorem 1 in [7] show that $\mathcal{N}(\Phi, \Psi)$ coincides with the set

$$\mathcal{M}(\Phi, \Psi) = \{ V_\Phi^*(I_B \otimes C)V_\Psi | C \in \mathcal{B}(H_E), \|C\| \leq 1 \},$$

defined via some fixed common Stinespring representation (16). It will imply, in particular, that $\mathcal{M}(\Phi, \Psi)$ does not depend on this representation.

To show that $\mathcal{M}(\Phi, \Psi) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(\Phi, \Psi)$ it suffices to find for any contraction $C \in \mathcal{B}(H_E)$ a common Stinespring representation for $\Phi$ and $\Psi$ with the operators $V_\Phi$ and $V_\Psi$ from $\mathcal{H}_A$ to $\mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$ such that $V_\Phi^*V_\Psi = V_\Phi^*(I_B \otimes C)V_\Psi$.

Let $\mathcal{H}_E = \mathcal{H}^{1}_{E_1} \oplus \mathcal{H}^{2}_{E_2}$, where $\mathcal{H}^{1}_{E_1}$ and $\mathcal{H}^{2}_{E_2}$ are copies of $\mathcal{H}_E$. For given $C$ define the operators $\tilde{V}_\Phi$ and $\tilde{V}_\Psi^C$ from $\mathcal{H}_A$ into $\mathcal{H}_B \otimes (\mathcal{H}_{E_1} \oplus \mathcal{H}_{E_2}) = \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_{E_1} \oplus \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_{E_2}$ by setting

$$\tilde{V}_\Phi|\phi\rangle = V_\Phi|\phi\rangle \oplus |0\rangle, \quad \tilde{V}_\Psi^C|\phi\rangle = (I_B \otimes C)V_\Psi|\phi\rangle \oplus \left( I_R \otimes \sqrt{I_E - C^*C} \right) V_\Psi|\phi\rangle.$$  

(25)
for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_A$, where we assume that the operators $V_\Phi$ and $V_\Psi$ act from $\mathcal{H}_A$ to $\mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_E^1$ and $\mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_E^2$ correspondingly, while the contraction $C$ acts from $\mathcal{H}_E^2$ to $\mathcal{H}_E^1$. It is easy to see that the operators $\tilde{V}_\Phi$ and $\tilde{V}_\Psi$ form a common Stinespring representation for the maps $\Phi$ and $\Psi$ with the required property.

To prove that $\mathcal{N}(\Phi, \Psi) \subseteq \mathcal{M}(\Phi, \Psi)$ take any common Stinespring representation for the maps $\Phi$ and $\Psi$ with the operators $\tilde{V}_\Phi$ and $\tilde{V}_\Psi$ from $\mathcal{H}_A$ to $\mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$. By Theorem 6.2.2 in [6] there exist partial isometries $W_\Phi$ and $W_\Psi$ from $\mathcal{H}_E$ to $\mathcal{H}_E$ such that $\tilde{V}_\Phi = (I_B \otimes W_\Phi)V_\Phi$ and $\tilde{V}_\Psi = (I_B \otimes W_\Psi)V_\Psi$. So, $\tilde{V}_\Phi^*V_\Psi = V_\Phi^*(I_B \otimes W_\Phi^*W_\Psi)V_\Psi \in \mathcal{M}(\Phi, \Psi)$, since $\|W_\Phi^*W_\Psi\| \leq 1$.

Since $\mathcal{N}(\Phi, \Psi) = \mathcal{M}(\Phi, \Psi)$, the infimum in (24) can be taken over the set $\mathcal{M}(\Phi, \Psi)$. This implies

$$
\beta_E(\Phi, \Psi) = \inf_{C \in \mathfrak{B}_1(\mathcal{H}_E)} \sup_{\rho \in \mathfrak{C}_{G,E}} \sqrt{\text{Tr}(\Phi) + \text{Tr}(\Psi) - 2\text{Re}(\text{Tr}V_\Phi^*(I_B \otimes C)V_\Psi \rho)}
$$

$$
= \sup_{\rho \in \mathfrak{C}_{G,E}} \inf_{C \in \mathfrak{B}_1(\mathcal{H}_E)} \sqrt{\text{Tr}(\Phi) + \text{Tr}(\Psi) - 2\text{Re}(\text{Tr}V_\Phi^*(I_B \otimes C)V_\Psi \rho)}
$$

$$
= \sup_{\rho \in \mathfrak{C}_{G,E}} \sqrt{\text{Tr}(\Phi) + \text{Tr}(\Psi) - 2\sup_{C \in \mathfrak{B}_1(\mathcal{H}_E)} |\text{Tr}V_\Phi^*(I_B \otimes C)V_\Psi \rho|},
$$

where the possibility to change the order of the optimization follows from Ky Fan’s minimax theorem [16] and the $\sigma$-weak compactness of the unit ball $\mathfrak{B}_1(\mathcal{H}_E)$ of $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_E)$ [4]. It is easy to see that

$$
\sup_{C \in \mathfrak{B}_1(\mathcal{H}_E)} |\text{Tr}V_\Phi^*(I_B \otimes C)V_\Psi \rho| = \sup_{C \in \mathfrak{B}_1(\mathcal{H}_E)} |\langle V_\Phi \otimes I_R \varphi | I_{BR} \otimes C | V_\Psi \otimes I_R \varphi \rangle|,
$$

where $\varphi$ is a purification of $\rho$, i.e. a vector in $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_R$ such that $\text{Tr}_R|\varphi\rangle \langle \varphi | = \rho$.

Since for any common Stinespring representation (16) and any purification $\varphi$ of a state $\rho$ the vectors $V_\Phi \otimes I_R |\varphi \rangle$ and $V_\Psi \otimes I_R |\varphi \rangle$ in $\mathcal{H}_{BER}$ are purifications of the operators $\Phi \otimes \text{Id}_R(\rho)$ and $\Psi \otimes \text{Id}_R(\rho)$ in $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_{BR})$, by using the relation $\mathcal{N}(\Phi, \Psi) = \mathcal{M}(\Phi, \Psi)$ proved before and Uhlmann’s theorem [18, 21] it is easy to show that the square of the r.h.s. of (27) coincides with the fidelity of these operators defined in (19). Note also that $\text{Tr}\Phi \otimes \text{Id}_R(\sigma) = \text{Tr}(\Phi(\sigma_A))$ and $\text{Tr}\Psi \otimes \text{Id}_R(\sigma) = \text{Tr}(\Psi(\sigma_A))$ for any state $\sigma$ in $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AR})$. These observations and (26) imply that $\beta_E^*(\Phi, \Psi) = \beta_E(\Phi, \Psi)$, i.e. that (23) holds.

The last assertion can be derived from the attainability of the infimum in the first line in (26) which follows from the $\sigma$-weak compactness of the unit ball $\mathfrak{B}_1(\mathcal{H}_E)$. □

Theorem 1 shows continuity of the map $V_\Phi \mapsto \Phi$ and selective continuity of the multi-valued map $\Phi \mapsto V_\Phi$ with respect to the energy-constrained $cb$-norm on the set of CP linear maps $\Phi$ and the operator $E$-norm on the set of Stinespring operators $V_\Phi$. Its basic assertion is the equality

$$
\beta_E(\Phi, \Psi) = \inf_{V_\Phi, V_\Psi} \|V_\Phi - V_\Psi\|_E.
$$

Some difficulty of applying Theorem 1 is related to the fact that the infimum in (28) is over all common Stinespring representation (16). But by using the constructions from
the proof of this theorem one can obtain its versions which are more convenient for applications, in particular, for analysis of converging sequences of CP linear maps.

**Theorem 2.** Let $G$ be a positive densely defined operator on $\mathcal{H}_A$, $\beta_E$ and $\|\cdot\|_E$ be, respectively, the energy-constrained Bures distance and the operator $E$-norm induced by $G$. Let $\Phi$ be a CP linear map from $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ to $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H}_B)$.

A) There is a Stinespring representation of $\Phi$ with the operator $V_\Phi' : \mathcal{H}_A \to \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$, such that

$$\beta_{E}(\Phi, \Psi) = \inf_{V_{\Psi}} \|V_{\Phi}' - V_{\Psi}\|_E,$$

for any CP linear map $\Psi : \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H}_B)$, where the infimum is over all Stinespring representations of $\Psi$ with the same environment space $\mathcal{H}_E$. The infimum in (29) is attainable.

B) If $V_{\Phi} : \mathcal{H}_A \to \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$ is the operator from a given Stinespring representation of $\Phi$ such that $\dim \mathcal{H}_E = +\infty$ then

$$\beta_{E}(\Phi, \Psi) \leq \inf_{V_{\Psi}} \|V_{\Phi} - V_{\Psi}\|_E \leq 2\beta_{E}(\Phi, \Psi),$$

for any CP linear map $\Psi : \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H}_B)$, where the infimum is over all Stinespring representations of $\Psi$ with the same environment space $\mathcal{H}_E$.

**Proof.** If $V_{\Phi} : \mathcal{H}_A \to \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$ is the operator from a Stinespring representation of $\Phi$ such that $\dim \mathcal{H}_E = +\infty$ then, since any separable Hilbert space can be isometrically embedded into $\mathcal{H}_E$, we may assume that any CP linear map $\Psi : \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ has a Stinespring representation with the same environment space $\mathcal{H}_E$. Denote by $V_{\Psi}$ the Stinespring operator of $\Psi$ in this representation. Let $\tilde{V}_{\Phi}$ and $\tilde{V}_{\Psi}^C$ be the operators from $\mathcal{H}_A$ into $\mathcal{H}_B \otimes (\mathcal{H}_E^1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_E^2) = (\mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_E^1) \oplus (\mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_E^2)$ defined by formulae (25), where $\mathcal{H}_E^1$ and $\mathcal{H}_E^2$ are copies of $\mathcal{H}_E$ and $C$ is a contraction in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_E)$. The arguments from the proof of Theorem 1 show that $\beta_{E}(\Psi, \Phi) = \|\tilde{V}_{\Psi}^C - \tilde{V}_{\Phi}\|_E$ for some $C_{0} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_E)$ depending on $\Phi$ and $\Psi$. So, to obtain assertion A it suffices to take $\tilde{V}_{\Phi}$ in the role of $V_{\Phi}$.

To prove assertion B we will use the above operators $\tilde{V}_{\Phi}$ and $\tilde{V}_{\Psi}^C$ as follows. Assume first that the operator $C_0$ is nondegenerate, i.e. $\ker C_0 = \{0\}$. Let $U$ be the isometry from the polar decomposition of $C_0$, i.e. $C_0 = U|C_0|$. Since $\|\tilde{V}_{\Psi}^C - \tilde{V}_{\Phi}\|_E = \beta_{E}(\Psi, \Phi)$, it follows from Proposition 4B that

$$\|(I_B \otimes C_0)\tilde{V}_{\Phi} - \tilde{V}_{\Phi}\|_E \leq \beta_{E}(\Psi, \Phi) \quad \text{and} \quad \left\|\left(I_B \otimes \sqrt{I_E - |C_0|^2}\right)\tilde{V}_{\Phi}\right\|_E \leq \beta_{E}(\Psi, \Phi)$$

(30)

Hence the triangle inequality and Proposition 4B imply that

$$\|(I_B \otimes U)\tilde{V}_{\Phi} - \tilde{V}_{\Phi}\|_E \leq \|(I_B \otimes C_0)\tilde{V}_{\Phi} - \tilde{V}_{\Phi}\|_E$$

$$+ \|(I_B \otimes C_0)\tilde{V}_{\Phi} - (I_B \otimes U)\tilde{V}_{\Phi}\|_E \leq \beta_{E}(\Psi, \Phi) + \|I_B \otimes (I_E - |C_0|)\tilde{V}_{\Phi}\|_E.$$

(31)

Since $C_0$ is a contraction, by using Proposition 4B and the second inequality in (30) we obtain

$$\|I_B \otimes (I_E - |C_0|)\tilde{V}_{\Phi}\|_E \leq \|I_B \otimes (I_E - |C_0|^2)\tilde{V}_{\Phi}\|_E \leq \|I_B \otimes \sqrt{I_E - |C_0|^2}\tilde{V}_{\Phi}\|_E \leq \beta_{E}(\Psi, \Phi)$$

and hence

$$\|I_B \otimes (I_E - |C_0|)\tilde{V}_{\Phi}\|_E \leq \beta_{E}(\Psi, \Phi)$$

(32)

Since $C_0$ is a contraction, by using Proposition 4B and the second inequality in (30) we obtain

$$\|I_B \otimes (I_E - |C_0|^2)\tilde{V}_{\Phi}\|_E \leq \|I_B \otimes \sqrt{I_E - |C_0|^2}\tilde{V}_{\Phi}\|_E \leq \beta_{E}(\Psi, \Phi)$$

(33)
Thus, it follows from \((31)\) that \(\|(I_B \otimes U)V_\psi - V_\phi\|_E \leq 2\beta_E(\Psi, \Phi)\). Since \(U\) is an isometry, \((I_B \otimes U)V_\psi\) is a Stinespring operator for \(\Psi\).

To omit the assumption \(\ker C_0 = \{0\}\) it suffices to note that nondegenerate operators form a dense subset of \(\mathfrak{B}_1(\mathcal{H}_E)\) in the weak operator topology and that the expression under the square root in the first line of \((26)\) is a continuous function of \(C\) in this topology. \(\Box\)

If \(\{V_n\}\) is a sequence of operators from \(\mathcal{H}_A\) to \(\mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_E\) converging to an operator \(V_0 : \mathcal{H}_A \to \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_E\) w.r.t. the norm \(\|\cdot\|_E\) then the first inequality in \((22)\) implies that the sequence of CP maps \(\Phi_n(\rho) = \text{Tr}_E V_n \rho V_n^*\) converges to the map \(\Phi_0(\rho) = \text{Tr}_E V_0 \rho V_0^*\) w.r.t. the norm \(\|\cdot\|_{cb}^E\) and

\[
\frac{1}{2}\|\Phi_n - \Phi_0\|_{cb}^E \leq \beta_E(\Phi_n, \Phi_0) \left[\sqrt{\|\Phi_n\|_{cb}^E} + \sqrt{\|\Phi_0\|_{cb}^E}\right] \leq \|V_n - V_0\|_E \|\|\|V_n\|_E + \|V_0\|_E\| \quad \forall n.
\]

Theorem \((2)\) allows to describe all sequences of CP linear maps converging w.r.t. the energy-constrained \(cb\)-norm.

**Corollary 1.** Let \(\{\Phi_n\}\) be a sequence of CP linear maps from \(\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)\) to \(\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)\) converging to a CP linear map \(\Phi_0\) with respect to the norm \(\|\cdot\|_{E}\).

A) There exist a separable Hilbert space \(\mathcal{H}_E\) and a sequence \(\{V_n\}\) of operators from \(\mathcal{H}_A\) into \(\mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_E\) converging to an operator \(V_0\) with respect to the norm \(\|\cdot\|_E\) such that \(\Phi_n(\rho) = \text{Tr}_E V_n \rho V_n^*\) for all \(n \geq 0\) and

\[
\|V_n - V_0\|_E = \beta_E(\Phi_n, \Phi_0) \leq \sqrt{\|\Phi_n - \Phi_0\|_{cb}^E}.
\]

B) If \(V_0 : \mathcal{H}_A \to \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_E\) is the operator from a given Stinespring representation of the map \(\Phi_0\) such that \(\dim \mathcal{H}_E = +\infty\), then there exists a sequence \(\{V_n\}\) of operators from \(\mathcal{H}_A\) into \(\mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_E\) converging to the operator \(V_0\) with respect to the norm \(\|\cdot\|_E\) such that \(\Phi_n(\rho) = \text{Tr}_E V_n \rho V_n^*\) for all \(n\) and

\[
\|V_n - V_0\|_E \leq 2\beta_E(\Phi_n, \Phi_0) \leq 2\sqrt{\|\Phi_n - \Phi_0\|_{cb}^E}. \tag{32}
\]

Factor ”2” in \((32)\) is a cost of the possibility to take the sequence \(\{V_n\}\) of Stinespring operators representing the sequence \(\{\Phi_n\}\) for given \(\mathcal{H}_E\) and \(V_0 : \mathcal{H}_A \to \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_E\).

If the generating operator \(G\) is discrete and unbounded (Def.\((1)\)) then the norm \(\|\cdot\|_{cb}^E\) generates the strong convergence topology on bounded subsets of the set \(\mathfrak{S}(A, B)\) of all CP linear maps from \(\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)\) to \(\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)\) (by Proposition 3 in \((13)\)), while the norm \(\|\cdot\|_E\) generates the strong operator topology on subsets of linear maps from \(\mathcal{H}_A\) to \(\mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_E\) bounded by the operator norm (by Proposition \((23)\)). Thus, in this case Corollary \((1)\) gives representation of bounded strongly converging sequences of CP linear maps via strongly converging sequence of Stinespring operators. For sequences of quantum channels such representation is obtained in \((14)\) (in the form of part A of Corollary \((1)\).
4 Two Banach spaces related to the norm $\| \cdot \|_E^G$

In this section we describe two Banach spaces related to the norm $\| \cdot \|_E^G$: the maximal extension of $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$ on which the norm $\| \cdot \|_E^G$ is well defined and the completion of $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$ w.r.t. this norm. We will assume that $G$ is a positive unbounded operator on $\mathcal{H}$ with dense domain satisfying condition (2). The case of discrete type operator $G$ will be considered separately after formulations of general results.

Let $\mathcal{L}_G(\mathcal{H})$ be the set of all linear (bounded or unbounded) operators $A$ on $\mathcal{H}$ whose domain $\mathcal{D}(A)$ contains the set $\mathcal{V}_G = \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{G}) = \{ \varphi \in \mathcal{H} | \langle \varphi | G | \varphi \rangle < +\infty \}$.

We will say that operators $A$ and $B$ in $\mathcal{L}_G(\mathcal{H})$ are $G$-equivalent if they coincide on the set $\mathcal{V}_G$. In what follows we will identify $G$-equivalent operators.

An operator $\rho$ belongs to the set $\mathcal{C}_G^0 = \{ \rho \in \mathcal{T}_+^1(\mathcal{H}) | \text{Tr} G \rho < +\infty, \text{rank} \rho < +\infty \}$ if and only if it has a finite decomposition

$$\rho = \sum_i |\alpha_i \rangle \langle \varphi_i|,$$

where $\{\varphi_i\}$ is a set of vectors in $\mathcal{V}_G$. Moreover, any such decomposition of $\rho$ consists of vectors in $\mathcal{V}_G$.

To avoid the notion of adjoint operator we will define the operator $A \rho B^*$ for any $A,B \in \mathcal{L}_G(\mathcal{H})$ and an operator $\rho \in \mathcal{C}_G^0$ with finite representation (33) as follows

$$A \rho B^* = \sum_i |\alpha_i \rangle \langle \beta_i|,$$

where $|\alpha_i \rangle = A |\varphi_i\rangle$, $|\beta_i \rangle = B |\varphi_i\rangle$. (34)

By using Schrodinger’s mixture theorem (see [3, Ch.8]) it is easy to show that the r.h.s. of (34) does not depend on representation (33) and that $\rho \mapsto A \rho B^*$ is an affine function on $\mathcal{C}_G^0$. Definition (34) implies, in particular, that

$$\text{Tr} A \rho A^* = \sum_i \| A |\varphi_i\|_E^G,$$

for any operator $\rho \in \mathcal{C}_G^0$ with representation (33).

By using this definition of $\text{Tr} A \rho A^*$ we may define the quantity $\| A \|_E^G$ for any operator $A$ in $\mathcal{L}_G(\mathcal{H})$ (as a number in $[0, +\infty]$) as follows

$$\| A \|_E^G = \sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{C}_G^0, \text{Tr} \rho = 1} \sqrt{\text{Tr} A \rho A^*},$$

(35)

---

13If $G$ is a bounded operator then the norm $\| \cdot \|_E^G$ is equivalent to the operator norm by Proposition 2A.

14It means that we will consider classes of $G$-equivalent operators as vectors of all the Banach spaces under consideration (similar to the case of the Banach space $L_2(\mathbb{R})$).

15We make no assumptions about closability of unbounded operators, so the adjoint operators may not exist as densely defined operators [11].
where $\mathcal{C}_{G,E}^0 = \{ \rho \in \mathcal{F}_{+,1}(\mathcal{H}) \mid \text{Tr} G \rho \leq E, \text{rank} \rho < +\infty \}$. It is clear that (35) coincides with (3) for any bounded operator $A$.

By repeating the arguments from the proof of Proposition 3A one can show that the function $E \mapsto [\|A\|_E^G]^2$ is nondecreasing and concave on $\mathbb{R}_+$ for any $A \in L_G(\mathcal{H})$ and that $\|\cdot\|_E^G$ is a norm on the linear subspace

$$\mathcal{B}_G(\mathcal{H}) = \{ A \in L_G(\mathcal{H}) \mid \|A\|_E^G < +\infty \}$$

of $L_G(\mathcal{H})$. By the concavity of the function $E \mapsto [\|A\|_E^G]^2$ inequalities (4) holds. They show that the r.h.s. of (36) does not depend on $E$: the finiteness of $\|A\|_E^G$ for some $E > 0$ implies finiteness of $\|A\|_E^G$ for all $E > 0$.

**Remark 4.** By the proof of Proposition 3A (based on Lemma 3) the concavity of the function $E \mapsto [\|A\|_E^G]^2$ implies that the supremum in definition (35) can be taken over all operators in $\mathcal{C}_{G,E}^0$ (not only states). It follows that

$$\|A\|_E^G = \sup \left\{ \sqrt{\sum_i \|A \varphi_i\|^2} \mid \{\varphi_i\} \subset \mathcal{V}_G : \sum_i \|\varphi_i\|^2 \leq 1, \sum_i \sqrt{\|\varphi_i\|^2} \leq E \right\},$$

where $\{\varphi_i\}$ is a finite or countable collection of vectors in $\mathcal{V}_G$.

Thus, for any vector $\varphi$ in $\mathcal{H}$ such that $\|\varphi\| \leq 1$ and $E_\varphi = \langle \varphi | G | \varphi \rangle < +\infty$ we have

$$\|A \varphi\| \leq \|A\|_E^G \leq K_\varphi \|A\|_E^G,$$

where $K_\varphi = 1$ if $E_\varphi \leq E$ and $K_\varphi = \sqrt{E_\varphi / E}$ otherwise. This implies the following

**Lemma 4.** Let $P_E$ be the spectral projector of $G$ corresponding to the interval $[0, E]$. Then for any $A \in \mathcal{B}_G(\mathcal{H})$ the operator $AP_E$ lies in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\|AP_E\| \leq \|A\|_E^G$.

**Proof.** It follows from (35) that $\|AP_E \varphi\| \leq \|A\|_E^G$ for any unit vector $\varphi$ in $\mathcal{H}$, since $\langle \varphi | P_E G P_E | \varphi \rangle \leq E$ and $\|P_E \varphi\| \leq 1$. \square

In what follows we assume that the set $\mathcal{B}_G(\mathcal{H})$ is equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_E^G$. So, $\mathcal{B}_G(\mathcal{H})$ is a normed linear space containing $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ as a proper subspace. The non-coincidence of $\mathcal{B}_G(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is confirmed by the following lemma used below.

**Lemma 5.** If $G$ is an unbounded positive operator then $\|\sqrt{G}\|_E^G = \sqrt{E}$ for any $E$.

**Proof.** It suffices to note that for any $E > 0$ there is a 2-rank state $\rho$ such that $\text{Tr} G \rho = E$. \square

In the following theorem we will assume that $G$ is a positive unbounded densely defined operator on $\mathcal{H}$ satisfying condition (2) and

$$\mathcal{C}_{G,E} = \{ \rho \in \mathcal{F}_{+,1}(\mathcal{H}) \mid \text{Tr} G \rho \leq E \}, \quad E > 0.$$  

For a separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$ we introduce the sets:

$$\mathcal{V}_G \otimes \mathcal{K} = \text{lin} \{ \varphi \otimes \psi \}_{\varphi \in \mathcal{V}_G, \psi \in \mathcal{K}},$$

i.e. $\mathcal{V}_G \otimes \mathcal{K}$ is the linear span of all vectors $\varphi \otimes \psi$, where $\varphi \in \mathcal{V}_G$, $\psi \in \mathcal{K}$, and

$$\mathcal{V}_{G \otimes I_{\mathcal{K}},E} = \{ \eta \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K} \mid \langle \eta | G \otimes I_{\mathcal{K}} | \eta \rangle \leq E \}, \quad E > 0.$$
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Theorem 3. A) $\mathfrak{B}_G(\mathcal{H})$ is a nonseparable Banach space. The completion of $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$ w.r.t. any of the operator $E$-norms defined by formula (3) coincides with the proper subspace $\mathfrak{B}_G^0(\mathcal{H})$ of $\mathfrak{B}_G(\mathcal{H})$ determined by the condition

$$\|A\|_E^G = o(\sqrt{E}) \quad \text{as} \quad E \to +\infty. \quad (42)$$

B) An operator $A$ in $\mathfrak{B}_G(\mathcal{H})$ belongs to $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$ if and only if the function $E \mapsto \|A\|_E^G$ is bounded. In this case $\|A\| = \sup_{E>0} \|A\|_E^G$.

C) If $A$ is either a closable operator in $\mathfrak{B}_G(\mathcal{H})$ or an operator in $\mathfrak{B}_G^0(\mathcal{H})$ then

(i) For any Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$ the operator $A \otimes I_{\mathcal{K}}$ naturally defined on the set $\mathcal{V}_G \otimes \mathcal{K}$ has a unique linear extension to the set $\mathcal{V}_{G \otimes I_{\mathcal{K}}} \equiv \bigcup_{E>0} \mathcal{V}_{G \otimes I_{\mathcal{K}},E}$ with the property:

$$A \otimes I_{\mathcal{K}} \left( \sum_i |\varphi_i \rangle \otimes |\psi_i \rangle \right) = \sum_i A |\varphi_i \rangle \otimes |\psi_i \rangle \quad (43)$$

for any countable sets $\{\varphi_i\} \subset \mathcal{V}_G$ and $\{\psi_i\} \subset \mathcal{K}$ such that $\sum_i \|\sqrt{G} \varphi_i \|^2 < +\infty$ and $\langle \psi_i | \psi_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$, which implies that $\|A \otimes I_{\mathcal{K}}\|_{E}^{G \otimes I_{\mathcal{K}}} = \|A\|_E^G$ for any $E > 0$. If $A \in \mathfrak{B}_G^0(\mathcal{H})$ then this extension is uniformly continuous on $\mathcal{V}_{G \otimes I_{\mathcal{K}},E}$ for any $E > 0$. Quantitatively,

$$\|A \otimes I_{\mathcal{K}}|\eta\rangle - A \otimes I_{\mathcal{K}}|\theta\rangle\| \leq f_A(E,\varepsilon)$$

for any $\eta$ and $\theta$ in $\mathcal{V}_{G \otimes I_{\mathcal{K}},E}$ such that $\|\eta - \theta\| \leq \varepsilon$, where $f_A(E,\varepsilon) = \varepsilon \|A\|_{4E/\varepsilon^2}^G$ is a function vanishing as $\varepsilon \to 0^+$ by condition (42).

(ii) The function $\rho \mapsto A\rho A^*$ is well defined by formula (34) on the set $\mathcal{C}_G = \bigcup_{E>0} \mathcal{C}_{G,E}$. If $A \in \mathfrak{B}_G^0(\mathcal{H})$ then this function is uniformly continuous on $\mathcal{C}_{G,E}$ for any $E > 0$. Quantitatively,

$$\|A\rho A* - A\sigma A*\| \leq 2 \|A\|_{E}^G f_A(E,\sqrt{\varepsilon})$$

for any $\rho$ and $\sigma$ in $\mathcal{C}_{G,E}$ such that $\|\rho - \sigma\| \leq \varepsilon$, where $f_A(E,\varepsilon)$ is the function defined in part (i).

If $A \in \mathfrak{B}_G(\mathcal{H}) \setminus \mathfrak{B}_G^0(\mathcal{H})$ then the operator $A \otimes I_{\mathcal{K}}$ and the function $\rho \mapsto A\rho A^*$ have no continuous extensions to the sets $\mathcal{V}_{G \otimes I_{\mathcal{K}},E}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{G,E}$ correspondingly for any $E > 0$.

E) Any ball in $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is complete with respect to any of the operator $E$-norms.

F) If $G$ is a discrete operator (Def.11) then the Banach space $\mathfrak{B}_G^0(\mathcal{H})$ is separable and

$$\|A\|_E^G = \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_1: \|\varphi\| \leq E} \|A\varphi\|, \quad \forall A \in \mathfrak{B}_G^0(\mathcal{H}), \quad (44)$$

where $\mathcal{H}_1$ is the unit sphere in $\mathcal{H}$. The supremum in (44) is attainable. The unit sphere $\mathcal{H}_1$ in (44) can be replaced by the unit ball $\mathcal{H}_{\leq 1}$ of $\mathcal{H}$.

\[^{16}\text{The sets } \mathcal{C}_{G,E}, \mathcal{V}_G \otimes \mathcal{K} \text{ and } \mathcal{V}_{G \otimes I_{\mathcal{K}},E} \text{ are defined in (38)-(41).}\]
Remark 5. The below proof of Theorem 3A shows that condition (12) is equivalent to the following one
\[
\lim_{n \to +\infty} \| A \tilde{P}_n \|_E^G = 0,
\]
where \( \tilde{P}_n \) is the spectral projector of \( G \) corresponding to the interval \( (n, +\infty) \).

Remark 6. Theorem 3C shows, in particular, that operators \( A \) in \( \mathfrak{B}_G^0(\mathfrak{H}) \) are characterized by continuity of the operator \( A \otimes I_K \) on the set \( \mathcal{V}_{G \otimes I_K} \) and by continuity of \( \mathfrak{H} \) on \( \mathfrak{H} \). It follows from \( (38) \) that for any vector \( \varphi \in \mathcal{V}_G \), the sequence \( \{ A_n \varphi \} \) is a Cauchy sequence in \( \mathfrak{H} \). So, it has a limit which will be denoted by \( A \varphi \). It is clear that \( \varphi \mapsto A \varphi \) is a linear operator on \( \mathcal{V}_G \). So, \( A \) belongs to the set \( \mathcal{L}_G \). We will show that \( \| A_n - A \|_E^G \) tends to zero as \( n \to +\infty \). Assume, there is \( \varepsilon > 0 \) such that \( \| A_n - A \|_E^G > \varepsilon \) for all \( n \). Then for each \( n \) there is a state \( \rho_n = \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} | \varphi_n^i \rangle \langle \varphi_n^i | \) in \( \mathcal{E}_{G,E} \) of finite rank \( r_n \) such that
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \| (A_n - A) \varphi_n^i \|_E^2 \geq \varepsilon^2.
\]
Choose \( n \) such that \( \| A_m - A_n \|_E^G \leq \varepsilon / 3 \) for all \( m > n \). Then \( ^{17} \)
\[
\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \| (A_n - A) \varphi_n^i \|_E^2} \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \| (A_n - A_m) \varphi_n^i \|_E^2} + \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \| (A_m - A) \varphi_n^i \|_E^2}.
\]
The first term in the r.h.s. of this inequality does not exceed
\[
\sqrt{\text{Tr}((A_n - A_m) \rho_n (A_n - A_m)^*)} \leq \| A_n - A_m \|_E^G \leq \varepsilon / 3.
\]
The second term can be made less than \( \varepsilon / 3 \) by choosing sufficiently large \( m \). So, we obtain a contradiction to the above assumption.

Thus, \( \mathfrak{B}_G(\mathfrak{H}) \) is a Banach space. To show the nonseparability of \( \mathfrak{B}_G(\mathfrak{H}) \) take any increasing sequence \( \{ E_n \}_{n=0}^{+\infty} \subset \mathbb{R}_+ \) such that \( P_G((E_{n-1}, E_n]) \neq 0 \) for all \( n \), where \( P_G \) is the spectral measure of \( G \), \( E_1 > E > 0 \) and \( E_n/E_{n-1} \to 1 \) as \( n \to +\infty \). Consider the operators
\[
A_{\tilde{x}} = \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} x_n \sqrt{E_n} P_G((E_{n-1}, E_n]),
\]
where \( \tilde{x} = \{ x_n \} \) is a binary sequence. It is easy to see that \( A_{\tilde{x}} \in \mathfrak{B}_G(\mathfrak{H}) \) for any \( \tilde{x} \).
If \( \tilde{x} \neq \tilde{y} \) then there is \( n \) such that \( x_n \neq y_n \). Let \( \varphi \) be a unit vector in the range of \( P_G((E_{n-1}, E_n]) \). Since \( \langle \varphi | G | \varphi \rangle \leq E_n \) and \( \| (A_{\tilde{x}} - A_{\tilde{y}}) \varphi \| \geq E_n \), we have
\[
\| A_{\tilde{x}} - A_{\tilde{y}} \|_E^G \geq (E/E_n) \| A_{\tilde{x}} - A_{\tilde{y}} \|_E^G \geq (E/E_n) \| (A_{\tilde{x}} - A_{\tilde{y}}) \varphi \| \geq (E/E_n) E_n = E,
\]
\(^{17}\) We use the inequality \( \sqrt{\sum_i \| \alpha_i - \beta_i \|^2} \leq \sqrt{\sum_i \| \alpha_i - \gamma_i \|^2} + \sqrt{\sum_i \| \beta_i - \gamma_i \|^2} \) valid for any sets \( \{ \alpha_i \}, \{ \beta_i \} \) and \( \{ \gamma_i \} \) of vectors in a Hilbert space.
where the first inequality follows from (1). So, \( \mathfrak{B}_G(\mathcal{H}) \) contains the uncountable family \( \{A_x\} \) of operators with the \( E \)-norm distance between each other \( \geq \sqrt{E} \).

To show that \( \mathfrak{B}_0^0(\mathcal{H}) \) is a subspace of \( \mathfrak{B}_G(\mathcal{H}) \) note first that condition (42) is preserved under linear operations. Assume that \( \{A_n\} \) is a sequence in \( \mathfrak{B}_0^0(\mathcal{H}) \) converging to \( A_* \in \mathfrak{B}_G(\mathcal{H}) \) w.r.t. the norm \( \|\cdot\|_E^G \). By using the triangle inequality and (1) we obtain

\[
\left| \frac{\|A_n\|_E^G}{\sqrt{E}} - \frac{\|A_\ast\|_E^G}{\sqrt{E}} \right| \leq \frac{\|A_n - A_*\|_E^G}{\sqrt{E}} \leq \frac{\|A_n - A_*\|_{E_0}}{\sqrt{E}}
\]

for any given \( E_0 > 0 \) and arbitrary \( E > E_0 \). Since condition (42) holds with \( A = A_n \) for all \( n \) and \( \|A_n - A_*\|_{E_0} \) tends to zero as \( n \to +\infty \), condition (42) holds with \( A = A_* \), i.e. \( A_* \) belongs to the set \( \mathfrak{B}_0^0(\mathcal{H}) \).

To prove density of \( \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) in \( \mathfrak{B}_G^0(\mathcal{H}) \) it suffices, by Lemma 1, to show that for any \( A \in \mathfrak{B}_G^0(\mathcal{H}) \) the sequence \( \{A\_Pn\} \), where \( P_n = P_G([0, n]) \), converges to \( A \) with respect to the norm \( \|\cdot\|_E^G \). For given \( P_n \) let \( \rho \) be any finite rank state such that \( TrG\rho \leq E \) and \( x_n = 1 - TrP_n\rho > 0 \). Let \( \bar{P}_n = I_G - P_n \) and \( \rho_n = x_n^{-1}\bar{P}_n\rho\bar{P}_n \). We have

\[
TrAP_n\rho\bar{P}_nA^* = x_nTrA\rho_nA^* \leq x_n \left[ \|A\|_{E/x_n}^G \right]^2 \leq (E/n) \left[ \|A\|_G^2 \right].
\]

The first inequality follows from the definition of the \( E \)-norm and the inequality \( TrG\rho \leq E/x_n \), the second one follows from concavity of the function \( E \mapsto \left[ \|A\|_E^G \right]^2 \), Lemma 3 and the inequality \( x_n \leq E/n \) (which holds, since \( TrG\rho \leq E \)). The above estimate implies that

\[
\|A - AP_n\|_E^G \leq \sup_{\rho \in \mathfrak{e}_G^0, E} \sqrt{TrAP_n\rho\bar{P}_nA^*} \leq \sqrt{E/n}\|A\|_n^G.
\]

So, condition (42) guarantees that \( \|A - AP_n\|_E^G \) tends to zero as \( n \to +\infty \).

The above arguments and Lemma 1 imply that (42) is equivalent to (45). Lemma 5 shows that \( \mathfrak{B}_G^0(\mathcal{H}) \neq \mathfrak{B}_G(\mathcal{H}) \).

B) The "only if" part and the expression \( \|A\| = \sup_{E > 0} \|A\|_E^G \) follow from Proposition 1. If \( \|A\|_E^G \leq M < +\infty \) for all \( E > 0 \) then it follows from (38) that \( \|A\_E\| \leq M \) for any unit vector \( \varphi \) in \( \mathcal{V}_G = \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{G}) \). Since \( \mathcal{V}_G \) is dense in \( \mathcal{H} \), this implies that \( A \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}) \).

C) To prove (i) assume first that \( A \) is a closable operator. Any vector \( \eta \) in the unit ball of \( \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K} \) can be represented as

\[
|\eta\rangle = \sum_i |\varphi_i\rangle \otimes |\psi_i\rangle,
\]

where \( \{\varphi_i\} \) and \( \{\psi_i\} \) are collections of orthogonal vectors in \( \mathcal{H} \) and \( \mathcal{K} \) correspondingly. We may assume that \( \{\psi_i\} \) consists of unit vectors. If \( \eta \) lies in \( \mathcal{V}_{G \otimes I\_K, E} \) then

\[
\sum_i \langle \varphi_i|G|\varphi_i\rangle = \langle \eta|G \otimes I\_K|\eta\rangle \leq E.
\]
Since $A$ is closable, $A \otimes I_K$ is closable as well \[(11)\]. To prove that $\eta$ belongs to the domain of the closure of $A \otimes I_K$ if suffices to show that the series $\sum_i A|\varphi_i\rangle \otimes |\psi_i\rangle$ converges in $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K}$. Since $\sum_i \|\varphi_i\|^2 = \|\eta\|^2 \leq 1$, expression \[(37)\] and \[(47)\] imply that $\sum_i \|A\varphi_i\|^2 \leq \left[\|A\|_E^2\right]^2 < +\infty$. This guarantees the convergence of the above series. The same arguments also show that the closure of $A \otimes I_K$ satisfies \[(13)\].

Assume now that $A \in \mathfrak{B}_G^0(\mathcal{H})$. Note first that for any unit vector $\eta$ in $\mathcal{V}_G \otimes \mathcal{K}$ we have

$$\|A \otimes I_K \eta\| = \sqrt{\text{Tr}[\text{Tr}_K|\eta\rangle \langle \eta|]A^*} \leq \|A\|_{E,\eta}, \quad \text{where} \quad E_\eta = \langle \eta|G \otimes I_K|\eta\rangle. \quad (48)$$

Let $E > 0$ be arbitrary and $A$ the intersection of $\mathcal{V}_G \otimes \mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{V}_G \otimes I_K, E$. Show that $A$ is dense in $\mathcal{V}_G \otimes I_K, E$. Any vector $\eta$ in $\mathcal{V}_G \otimes I_K, E \subset \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K}$ has representation \[(46)\] with some are collections $\{\varphi_i\} \subset \mathcal{H}$ and $\{\psi_i\} \subset \mathcal{K}$ of orthogonal and orthogonal unit vectors correspondingly. It follows from \[(47)\] that the vectors $|\eta_n\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n |\varphi_i\rangle \otimes |\psi_i\rangle$ belong to the set $A$ for all $n$.

For arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ let $\eta$ and $\theta$ be any vectors in $A$ such that $\|\eta - \theta\| \leq \varepsilon$. By using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality it is easy to show that $\langle \eta - \theta|G \otimes I_K|\eta - \theta\rangle \leq 4E$. So, by using \[(48)\], the concavity of the function $E \mapsto \left[\|A\|_E^2\right]^2$ and Lemma \[3\] we obtain

$$\|A \otimes I_K (\eta - \theta)\| = \|\eta - \theta\| \left\|A \otimes I_K \frac{\eta - \theta}{\|\eta - \theta\|}\right\| \leq \|\eta - \theta\| \|A\|_{4E,\|\eta - \theta\|} \leq \varepsilon \|A\|_{4E/\varepsilon^2}. \quad (49)$$

By condition \[(42)\] the r.h.s. of this inequality tends to zero as $\varepsilon \to 0^+$. Thus, the function $\eta \mapsto A \otimes I_K |\eta\rangle$ is uniformly continuous on $A$. By the density of $A$ in $\mathcal{V}_G \otimes I_K, E$, it has a unique uniformly continuous extension to the set $\mathcal{V}_G \otimes I_K, E$ satisfying \[(49)\].

So, in this case the operator $A \otimes I_K$ has a linear extension to the set $\mathcal{V}_G \otimes I_K$ which is uniformly continuous on the set $\mathcal{V}_G \otimes I_K, E$ for any $E > 0$. Hence it is a unique linear extension of $A \otimes I_K$ to the set $\mathcal{V}_G \otimes I_K$ satisfying \[(43)\].

In both cases the equality $\|A \otimes I_K\|_{E,\mathcal{K}}^G = \|A\|_E^G$ follows from Lemma \[6\] below.

(i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii). If $\rho = \sum_i |\varphi_i\rangle \langle \varphi_i|$ is an infinite rank operator in $\mathcal{C}_G$ and $\{\psi_i\}$ is a set of orthogonal unit vectors in a separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$ then $|\eta\rangle = \sum_i |\varphi_i\rangle \otimes |\psi_i\rangle$ is a vector in $\mathcal{V}_G \otimes I_K$ such that $\rho = \text{Tr}_K|\eta\rangle \langle \eta|$. So, by using (i) and the well known relation between different purifications of a given state \[6, 21\], it is easy to show that the r.h.s. of formula \[(31)\] with $B = A$ does not depend on countable representation \[(33)\] of $\rho$. It follows that this formula correctly defines an affine function $\rho \mapsto A\rho A^*$ on the set $\mathcal{C}_G$.

Let $\rho$ and $\sigma$ be operators in $\mathcal{C}_G, E$ such that $\|\rho - \sigma\| \leq \varepsilon$. If $\mathcal{K} \cong \mathcal{H}$ then one can find vectors $\eta$ and $\theta$ in $\mathcal{V}_G \otimes I_K, E$ such that $\rho = \text{Tr}_K|\eta\rangle \langle \eta|$, $\sigma = \text{Tr}_K|\theta\rangle \langle \theta|$ and $\|\eta - \theta\| \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}$. Thus, since the trace norm does not increase under partial trace, the continuity of the function $\eta \mapsto A \otimes I_K |\eta\rangle$ on the set $\mathcal{V}_G \otimes I_K, E$ (which follows from (i)) implies continuity of the function $\rho \mapsto A\rho A^*$ on the set $\mathcal{C}_G, E$. If the continuity bound \[(49)\] holds then by using the inequality $\|\alpha\rangle \langle \alpha| - \beta\rangle \langle \beta\| \leq \|\alpha - \beta\| (\|\alpha\| + \|\beta\|)$ we obtain

$$\|A\rho A^* - A\sigma A^*\| \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon} \|A\|_{4E/\varepsilon} \left(\sqrt{\|A\rho A^*\|_E} + \sqrt{\|A\sigma A^*\|_E}\right) \leq 2\sqrt{\varepsilon} \|A\|_E \|A\|_{4E/\varepsilon}.$$
where the last inequality follows from Remark 4.

If \( A \in \mathcal{B}_G(\mathcal{H}) \setminus \mathcal{B}_G^0(\mathcal{H}) \) then, by the above part of the proof, the sequence \( \| A \hat{P}_n \|_E^G \), where \( \hat{P}_n \) is the spectral projector of \( G \) corresponding to the interval \((n, +\infty)\), does not tend to zero. Hence there is a sequence \( \{\rho_n\} \) of states in \( \mathcal{E}_{G,E} \) such that the sequence \( \{\text{Tr}A\hat{P}_n\rho_n\hat{P}_nA^*\} \) does not tend to zero. Since the condition \( \text{Tr}G\rho \leq E \) implies \( \text{Tr}\hat{P}_n\rho_n \leq E/n \), this shows discontinuity of the function \( \rho \mapsto A\rho A^* \) on the set \( \mathcal{E}_{G,E} \).

The above proof of the implication (i) \( \Rightarrow \) (ii) implies that the operator \( A \otimes I_K \) has no continuous extension to the set \( \mathcal{V}_{G \otimes I_K,E} \) in this case.

D) To prove this assertion assume that \( \{A_n\} \) is a sequence in \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) converging to an operator \( A_0 \in \mathcal{B}_G^0(\mathcal{H}) \) such that \( \|A_n\| \leq M < +\infty \) for all \( n \). Since \( \|A_n\|_E^G \leq \|A_n\| \leq M \) for all \( n \) and \( E > 0 \) and the right hand side of the inequality

\[
\left| \|A_n\|_E^G - \|A_0\|_E^G \right| \leq \|A_n - A_0\|_E^G
\]

tends to zero as \( n \to +\infty \) for any \( E > 0 \), it is easy to see that \( \|A_0\|_E^G \leq M \) for all \( E \).

Thus, this assertion follows from part B of the theorem.

E) If \( G \) is a discrete operator then any spectral projector of \( G \) corresponding to a finite interval has finite rank. So, to prove that the supremum in definition (35) for any \( A \in \mathcal{B}_G^0(\mathcal{H}) \) can be taken only over pure states it suffices to use Proposition 4 and the equivalence of (42) and (45). The possibility to replace unit sphere \( \mathcal{H} \) in (44) by the unit ball \( \mathcal{H}_{\leq 1} \) follows from Remark 4.

By Lemma 4 in Section 1 the set of pure states satisfying the condition \( \text{Tr}G\rho \leq E \) is compact. So, by the continuity of the function \( \rho \mapsto \text{Tr}A\rho A^* \) on this set (which follows from assertion C) the supremum in (35) is attained at some pure state.

Separability of \( \mathcal{B}_G^0(\mathcal{H}) \) follows from separability of \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) w.r.t. any of the \( E \)-norms, which can be easily shown by using Proposition 2B and separability of \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) w.r.t. the strong operator topology. □

**Lemma 6.** Let \( A \) be an operator in \( \mathcal{B}_G(\mathcal{H}) \) and \( K \) a separable Hilbert space. If the operator \( A \otimes I_K \) naturally defined on the set \( \mathcal{V}_G \otimes K \) has a linear extension to the set \( \mathcal{V}_{G \otimes I_K} \) with the property (42) then \( \|A \otimes I_K\|_{E \otimes I_K}^G = \|A\|_E^G \) for any \( E > 0 \).

Proof. By expression (37) the square of \( \|A \otimes I_K\|_{E \otimes I_K}^G \) coincides with

\[
\sup \left\{ \sum_k \|A \otimes I_K \eta_k\|^2 \Bigg| \{\eta_k\} \subset \mathcal{V}_{G \otimes I_K} : \sum_k \|\eta_k\|^2 \leq 1, \sum_k \|\sqrt{G} \otimes I_K \eta_k\|^2 \leq E \right\},
\]

where \( \{\eta_k\} \) is a finite or countable collection of vectors in \( \mathcal{V}_{G \otimes I_K} \). So, by taking collections \( \{\eta_k = \phi_k \otimes \psi\} \), where \( \{\phi_k\} \subset \mathcal{V}_G \) and \( \psi \) is a unit vector in \( K \), and by using expression (37) for \( \|A\|_E^G \) it is easy to show that \( \|A \otimes I_K\|_{E \otimes I_K}^G \geq \|A\|_E^G \).

To prove the converse inequality take any acceptable collection \( \{\eta_k\} \) and note that any vector \( \eta_k \) can be represented as \( \sum_i \phi_i^k \otimes \psi_i^k \), where \( \{\phi_i^k\} \) and \( \{\psi_i^k\} \) are collections of vectors in \( \mathcal{V}_G \) and \( K \) correspondingly such that \( \langle \psi_i^k | \psi_j^k \rangle = \delta_{ij} \). The conditions \( \sum_k \|\eta_k\|^2 \leq 1 \) and \( \sum_k \|\sqrt{G} \otimes I_K \eta_k\|^2 \leq E \) imply, respectively, that \( \sum_k \|\phi_i^k\|^2 \leq 1 \) and
\[ \sum_{k,i} \| \sqrt{G} \varphi_k^i \|^2 \leq E. \] So, it follows from the assumption of the lemma and expression (37) that
\[ \sum_k \| A \otimes I \eta_k \|^2 = \sum_i \| \sum_k A \varphi_k^i \otimes \psi_k^i \|^2 \leq \sum_{k,i} \| A \varphi_k^i \|^2 \leq [\| A \|^G_E]^2. \]

Many properties of the norm \( \| \cdot \|^G_E \) on \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) described in Section 2 remain valid for its extension to the set \( \mathcal{B}_G(\mathcal{H}) \). In particular, by using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and definition (34) it is easy to show that
\[ | \text{Tr} A \rho B^* | \leq \| A \rho B^* \|_1 \leq \| A \|_{E\rho} \| B \|_{E\rho}, \quad \text{where } E\rho = \text{Tr} G \rho, \tag{50} \]
for any operator \( \rho \in C_G^0 \) and arbitrary operators \( A \) and \( B \) in \( \mathcal{B}_G(\mathcal{H}) \).\(^{18}\)

Since \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) is dense in \( \mathcal{B}_G^0(\mathcal{H}) \), Property E in Proposition 4 implies the following

**Proposition 6.** Let \( G \) be a positive densely defined operator on \( \mathcal{H} \) and \( E > 0 \). Any 2-positive linear map \( \Phi : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) such that \( \Phi(I) \leq I \) having the predual map \( \Phi^* : \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}) \) with finite

\[ Y_\Phi(E) = \sup \{ \text{Tr} G \Phi^*(\rho) | \rho \in C(\mathcal{H}), \text{Tr} G \rho \leq E \} \tag{51} \]
is uniquely extended to the bounded linear operator \( \Phi_G : \mathcal{B}_G(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_G(\mathcal{H}) \) such that
\[ \| \Phi_G(A) \|_G^E \leq \sqrt{\| \Phi(I) \|_G} \| A \|_G^E \leq \sqrt{\| \Phi(I) \|} K_\Phi \| A \|_E^G, \tag{52} \]
where \( K_\Phi = \max \{1, Y_\Phi(E)/E\} \).

In the following section we will show that by assuming complete positivity of \( \Phi \) the assertion of Proposition 6 can be made more strong and explicit.

### 5 On extension of quantum channels and operations to unbounded observables

Unital and subunital CP linear maps between algebras of all bounded operators play important role in the quantum theory. Unital CP linear maps called quantum channels describe evolution of open quantum systems in the Heisenberg picture, subunital CP linear maps called quantum operations are also used essentially, in particular, in the theory of quantum measurements \[6, 19, 21\].

Since many important quantum observables are unbounded operators \[6\ Ch.12\], it is natural to explore possibility to extend quantum channels and operation to unbounded operators and to study analytical properties of such extensions. In this section we describe an approach to this problem based on the results of Section 4.

The first result in this direction is given by Proposition 6 in Section 4 (since complete positivity implies 2-positivity). If \( G \) is a Hamiltonian of a quantum system described by the space \( \mathcal{H} \) then \( \text{Tr} G \rho \) is the mean energy of a state \( \rho \) \[6, 21\]. So, if \( \Phi \) is a quantum channel then the finiteness of the quantity \( Y_\Phi(E) \) defined in (51) means that

\(^{18}\)Inequalities (50) hold for any operator \( \rho \) in \( \mathcal{T}_{+,1}(\mathcal{H}) \) with finite \( E\rho \) provided that \( A \) and \( B \) are either closable operators in \( \mathcal{B}_G(\mathcal{H}) \) or operators from the subspace \( \mathcal{B}_G^0(\mathcal{H}) \).
energy-bounded states are mapped by the predual channel \( \Phi \) to energy-bounded states. Quantum channels possessing this property are called \textit{energy-limited channels} in [23]. We will extend this definition to quantum operations. The quantity \( Y_\Phi(E)/E \) can be called the energy amplification factor of a quantum channel (operation) \( \Phi \). It is easy to show that finiteness of \( Y_\Phi(E) \) for some \( E \) implies finiteness of \( Y_\Phi(E) \) for all \( E \) (by proving concavity of the function \( E \mapsto Y_\Phi(E) \)) and that

\[
\{ Y_\Phi(E) < +\infty \} \iff \{ \text{Tr} G \Phi_*(\rho) < +\infty \text{ for any } \rho \text{ such that } \text{Tr} G \rho < +\infty \}
\]

(by noting that a finite concave function on a closed convex set is bounded on this set). Thus, the finiteness of \( Y_\Phi(E) \) is a physically motivated condition: it holds for any quantum channel (operation) \( \Phi \) produced in a physical experiment.

If \( \Phi : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) is a completely positive map such that \( \Phi(I_\mathcal{H}) \leq I_\mathcal{H} \) then it has the Stinespring representation

\[
\Phi(A) = V_\Phi^*[A \otimes I_E]V_\Phi,
\]

(53)

where \( \mathcal{H}_E \) is a separable Hilbert space and \( V_\Phi \) is a contraction from \( \mathcal{H} \) into \( \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}_E \).

Formally, we may define the action of \( \Phi \) on any unbounded operator \( A \) by substituting it in the r.h.s. of (53). But, in general, the result of such substitution may be nonadequate, in particular, the operator \( \Phi(A) \) may not be densely defined on \( \mathcal{H} \).

By using Theorem 3 one can obtain the following.

\textbf{Proposition 7.} Let \( \mathcal{D}_G(\mathcal{H}) \) be the linear span of \( \mathcal{B}_G^0(\mathcal{H}) \) and all closable operators in \( \mathcal{B}_G(\mathcal{H}) \) and \( \mathcal{D}_G^1(\mathcal{H}) \) the \( \|\cdot\|_G^1 \)-norm closure of \( \mathcal{D}_G(\mathcal{H}) \).

If \( \Phi : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) is a completely positive linear map such that \( \Phi(I_\mathcal{H}) \leq I_\mathcal{H} \) with finite \( Y_\Phi(E) \) (defined in (21)) then any Stinespring representation (53) of \( \Phi \) defines a unique map from \( \mathcal{D}_G(\mathcal{H}) \) into \( \mathcal{B}_G(\mathcal{H}) \) which can be extended to the bounded linear operator \( \Phi_G \) from \( \mathcal{D}_G^1(\mathcal{H}) \) into \( \mathcal{B}_G(\mathcal{H}) \) satisfying (22).

The subspace \( \mathcal{B}_G^0(\mathcal{H}) \) is invariant under \( \Phi_G \). If \( Y_\Phi(E) = o(E) \) as \( E \to +\infty \) then the operator \( \Phi_G \) maps \( \mathcal{D}_G(\mathcal{H}) \) into \( \mathcal{B}_G^0(\mathcal{H}) \).

\textbf{Note:} The set \( \mathcal{D}_G(\mathcal{H}) \) contains all symmetric operators in \( \mathcal{B}_G(\mathcal{H}) \) (in particular, all essentially self-adjoint operators in \( \mathcal{B}_G(\mathcal{H}) \)), since they are closable [11].

\textit{Proof.} Let \( A \) belongs to the set \( \mathcal{D}_G(\mathcal{H}) \). By Theorem 3C the operator \( A \otimes I_E \) has a unique extension to the set \( \mathcal{V}_{G \otimes I_E} \) satisfying (13).

The predual map to \( \Phi \) has the form \( \Phi_*(\rho) = \text{Tr} E V_\Phi \rho V_\Phi^* \). So, the finiteness of \( Y_\Phi(E) \) shows that \( V_\Phi(\varphi) \in \mathcal{V}_{G \otimes I_E} \) for any \( \varphi \in \mathcal{V}_G \). So, the above remark implies that the operator \( V_\Phi^*[A \otimes I_E]V_\Phi \) is well defined on \( \mathcal{V}_G \), i.e. it belongs to the set \( \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) \).

Let \( \{ \varphi_k \} \) be a set of vectors in \( \mathcal{H} \) such that \( \sum_k \| \varphi_k \|^2 \leq 1 \) and \( \sum_k \| \sqrt{G} \varphi_k \|^2 \leq E \). Since \( V_\Phi(\varphi) = \Phi(I_\mathcal{H}) \), we have \( \| V_\Phi \|^2 = \| \Phi(I_\mathcal{H}) \| \leq 1 \) and hence \( \sum_k \| V_\Phi \varphi_k \|^2 \leq E \).

\footnote{It is easy to construct an example of \( \Phi \) such that \( \mathcal{D}(\Phi(A)) = \{ 0 \} \) for a positive densely defined operator \( A \).}

\footnote{For simplicity we consider only quantum channels and operations with the same input and output systems. All the results are obviously generalized to the case of different input and output systems.}
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1. Let \( \rho = \sum_k |\varphi_k\rangle \langle \varphi_k| \) be an operator in the unit ball of \( \mathcal{T}_+^k(\mathcal{H}) \). Then \( \text{Tr} G \rho = \sum_k \| \sqrt{G} \varphi_k \|^2 \leq E \) and hence \( \sum_k \| \sqrt{G} V \varphi_k \|^2 = \text{Tr} \Phi^* (\rho) \leq Y_\Phi (E) \). So, expression (37) implies that

\[
\sum_k \| V^* \Phi [A \otimes I_E] V \varphi_k \|^2 \leq \| \Phi (I_\mathcal{H}) \| \sum_k \| [A \otimes I_E] V \varphi_k \|^2 \leq \| \Phi (I_\mathcal{H}) \| \left[ \| A \otimes I_E \| G \right]^2.
\]

By Lemma 6 in Section 4 the r.h.s. of this inequality coincides with \( \| \Phi (I_\mathcal{H}) \| \left[ \| A \| G \right]^2 \).

Thus, inequality (52) follows from expression (37) for \( \| V^* \Phi [A \otimes I_E] V \varphi_k \|^2 \leq \| \Phi (I_\mathcal{H}) \| \left[ \| A \otimes I_E \| G \right]^2 \).

Example: the operators associated with the Heisenberg Commutation Relation

Let \( H = L^2 (\mathbb{R}) \) and \( S(\mathbb{R}) \) be the set of infinitely differentiable rapidly decreasing functions with all the derivatives tending to zero quicker than any degree of \(|x|\) when \(|x| \to +\infty\). Consider the operators \( q \) and \( p \) defined on the set \( S(\mathbb{R}) \) by setting \( (q\varphi)(x) = x\varphi(x) \) and \( (p\varphi)(x) = \frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}\varphi(x) \).

These operators are essentially self-adjoint. They represent (sharp) real observables of position and momentum of a quantum particle in the system of units where Planck’s constant \( \hbar \) equals to 1 [6, Ch.12]. On the domain \( S(\mathbb{R}) \) these operators satisfy the Heisenberg commutation relation

\[
[q, p] = i I_\mathcal{H}.
\]

For given \( \omega > 0 \) consider the operators

\[
a = (\omega q + ip)/\sqrt{2\omega} \quad \text{and} \quad a^\dagger = (\omega q - ip)/\sqrt{2\omega}
\]

defined on \( S(\mathbb{R}) \). Via these operators the commutation relation (54) can be rewritten as \([a, a^\dagger] = I_\mathcal{H}\). The operator

\[
N = a^\dagger a = aa^\dagger - I_\mathcal{H}
\]

is positive and essentially self-adjoint. It represents (sharp) real observable of the number of quanta of the harmonic oscillator with frequency \( \omega \). The selfadjoint extension of \( N \) has the form (1) with \( E_n = n \) and the basic \( \{ \tau_n \} \) of eigenvectors of \( N \) which can be described as follows

\[
\tau_0 (x) = \sqrt{\frac{\omega}{\pi}} \exp \left[ -\frac{\omega x^2}{2} \right], \quad \tau_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n!}} [a^\dagger]^n |\tau_0\rangle, \quad n \geq 1.
\]

So, \( N \) is a discrete positive unbounded operator in terms of Definition 1.
The operators \( a \) and \( a^† = a^* \) are called *annihilation* and *creation* operators correspondingly, since

\[
|τ_0⟩ = 0, \quad a|τ_n⟩ = √n|τ_{n-1}⟩ \quad \text{and} \quad a^†|τ_n⟩ = √n+1|τ_{n+1}⟩.
\]

(57)

So, the operators \( a \) and \( a^† \) are correctly extended to the set

\[
\mathcal{V}_N = D(\sqrt{N}) = \left\{ ϕ ∈ \mathcal{H} \mid \sum_{n=0}^{∞} n|⟨ϕ|τ_n⟩|^2 < +∞ \right\}
\]

By using relations (53) the operators \( p \) and \( q \) are also extended to the set \( \mathcal{V}_N \).

Thus, the operators \( q, p, a \) and \( a^† \) belong to the set \( L_N(\mathcal{H}) \). We will estimate the \( E \)-norm of these operators induced by the operator \( N \) (which up to the constant coincides with the Hamiltonian of a quantum oscillator). By using (53) it is easy to show that \( ||a||^N_E = ||\sqrt{N}||^N_E = \sqrt{E} \) and \( ||a^†||^N_E = \sqrt{E} + 1 \) for any \( E > 0 \). For the operators \( q = (a^† + a)/\sqrt{2ω} \) and \( p = i\sqrt{ω}/2(a^† - a) \) one can obtain the following estimates

\[
\sqrt{\frac{2E + 1/2}{ω}} < ||q||^N_E \leq \sqrt{\frac{2E + 1}{ω}}, \quad \sqrt{(2E + 1/2)ω} < ||p||^N_E \leq \sqrt{(2E + 1)ω}
\]

(58)

(the \( E \)-norms of \( q \) and \( p \) depend on \( ω \), since the operator \( N \) depends on \( ω \)). The right inequalities in (58) directly follow from the triangle inequality and the above expressions for \( ||a||^N_E \) and \( ||a^†||^N_E \). To prove the left inequalities in (58) it suffices to show that

\[
\sup_{ϕ ∈ \mathcal{H}_1 : ||ϕ||^N_E ≤ E} ||(a^† ± a)ϕ|| > \sqrt{4E + 1}.
\]

This can be easily done by using the unit vectors \( |ϕ±⟩ = \sqrt{1 - r} \sum_{n=0}^{+∞} c_n^± r^{n/2} |τ_n⟩ \), where \( r = E/(E + 1) \), \( c_n^+ = e^{iπn/2} \) and \( c_n^- = 1 \) for all \( n \).

So, the operators \( q, p, a \) and \( a^† \) belong to the Banach space \( \mathfrak{B}_N(\mathcal{H}) \) but not lie in the completion \( \mathfrak{B}_N^0(\mathcal{H}) \) of \( \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) w.r.t. the norm \( ||·||^N_E \).

Since \( q \) and \( p \) are essentially self adjoint operators, all the operator \( q, p, a \) and \( a^† \) belong to the subspace \( \mathcal{D}_N(\mathcal{H}) \) of \( \mathfrak{B}_N(\mathcal{H}) \) defined in Proposition 7. So, this proposition and estimates (58) imply the following

**Corollary 2.** Let \( Φ : \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}) → \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) be an energy-limited (w.r.t. \( G = N \)) quantum channel or operation with representation (53) and \( E > 0 \). Formula (53) defines a unique bounded linear operator \( Φ_N \) from the linear subspace

\[
\{ αq + βp + A \mid A ∈ \mathfrak{B}_N^0(\mathcal{H}), \ α, β ∈ \mathbb{C} \} \subset \mathfrak{B}_N(\mathcal{H})
\]

into \( \mathfrak{B}_N(\mathcal{H}) \) with the norm not exceeding \( B_Φ = \sqrt{||Φ(I_\mathcal{H})||} \max\{1, Y_Φ(E)/E\} \). In particular,

\[
||Φ_N(q)||^N_E ≤ B_Φ \sqrt{\frac{2E + 1}{ω}}, \quad ||Φ_N(p)||^N_E ≤ B_Φ \sqrt{(2E + 1)ω},
\]
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\[ \|\Phi_N(a)\|_E^N \leq B_\varphi \sqrt{E}, \quad \|\Phi_N(a^\dagger)\|_E^N \leq B_\varphi \sqrt{E + 1}. \]

The subspace \( \mathfrak{B}_N^0(\mathcal{H}) \) is invariant under \( \Phi_N \). If \( Y_\varphi(E) = o(E) \) as \( E \to +\infty \) then the operator \( \Phi_N \) maps \( \mathfrak{D}_N(\mathcal{H}) \) into \( \mathfrak{B}_N^0(\mathcal{H}) \).

For any \( t < 1 \) consider the operators \( a_t \) and \( a_t^\dagger \) well-defined on the set \( \mathcal{V}_N \) by settings
\[ a_t|\tau_0\rangle = 0, \quad a_t|\tau_n\rangle = n^{t/2}|\tau_{n-1}\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad a_t^\dagger|\tau_n\rangle = (n + 1)^{t/2}|\tau_{n+1}\rangle. \quad (59) \]

It is easy to show that
\[ \lim_{t \to 1} a_t|\varphi\rangle = a|\varphi\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{t \to 1} a_t^\dagger|\varphi\rangle = a^\dagger|\varphi\rangle \quad \text{for any} \quad \varphi \in \mathcal{V}_N. \quad (60) \]

Since \( a_t^\dagger a_t = N_t \) and \( a_t a_t^\dagger = (N + I_\mathcal{H})t \), by using concavity of the function \( x \mapsto x^t \), we obtain
\[ \|a_t\|_E^N \leq \sqrt{\sup_{\Tr N \rho \leq E} \left[ \Tr N \rho \right]^t} = E^{t/2}, \quad \|a_t^\dagger\|_E^N \leq \sqrt{\sup_{\Tr N \rho \leq E} \left[ \Tr (N + I_\mathcal{H}) \rho \right]^t} = (E + 1)^{t/2}. \]

So, the operators \( a_t \) and \( a_t^\dagger \) belong to the set \( \mathfrak{B}_N^0(\mathcal{H}) \) for all \( t < 1 \), while the "limit" operators \( a_1 = a \) and \( a_1^\dagger = a^\dagger \) lie in \( \mathfrak{B}_N(\mathcal{H}) \setminus \mathfrak{B}_N^0(\mathcal{H}) \). So, \( a_t \) and \( a_t^\dagger \) do not tend to \( a \) and \( a^\dagger \) as \( t \to 1 \) w.r.t. the norm \( \|\cdot\|_E^N \) in spite of the strong operator convergence \( (60) \).

Remark 7. It follows from \( (38) \) that
\[ \|\cdot\|_E^G \lim_{n \to \infty} A_n = A_0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \lim_{n \to \infty} A_n|\varphi\rangle = A_0|\varphi\rangle \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{V}_G \]
for a sequence \( \{A_n\} \subset \mathfrak{B}_G(\mathcal{H}) \). The above example shows that the converse implication is not valid.
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