A number of noncontextual models exist which reproduce different subsets of quantum theory and admit a no-cloning theorem. Therefore, if one chooses noncontextuality as one’s notion of classicality, no-cloning cannot be regarded as a nonclassical phenomenon. In this work, however, we show that the phenomenology of quantum state cloning is indeed nonclassical, but not for the reasons usually given. Specifically, we focus on the task of state-dependent cloning and prove that the optimal cloning fidelity predicted by quantum theory cannot be explained by any noncontextual model. We derive a noise-robust noncontextuality inequality whose violation by quantum theory not only implies a quantum advantage for the task of state-dependent cloning, but also provides an experimental witness of noncontextuality.

The no-cloning theorem [1–3] is widely regarded as a central result in quantum theory. Informally, the theorem states the impossibility of copying quantum information, and is contrasted with the fact that classical information, on the other hand, can be perfectly copied. More precisely, there is no machine $\mathcal{M}$ (formally, a quantum channel) that can take two distinct and nonorthogonal states $\{|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle\}$ as inputs and output the corresponding copies $\{|\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle \otimes |\psi_2\rangle\}$ [4].

While no-cloning is often regarded as an intrinsically quantum feature, one would like to back that claim by a precise theorem stating what operational features cannot be explained within classical models. The theorem should hence define a precise notion of ‘classicality’ and show that such a notion leads to operational predictions incompatible with the relevant quantum statistics [5].

Since we are not dealing with experiments featuring space-like separated measurements, we need a different notion of classicality than the ubiquitous Bell’s locality. Hence, in this paper we take classicality to be noncontextuality, in the generalized sense introduced in Ref. [6]. Contextuality is related to a whole range of other notions of nonclassicality (negativity of quasi-probability representations [7], anomalous weak values [8], nonlocality [6]), and has been recently identified as a necessary resource for universal quantum computation [9, 10] and optimal state discrimination [5].

One should note that, from the point of view of contextuality, no-cloning by itself should not be regarded as a nonclassical phenomenon. There are, in fact, several examples of noncontextual models with a no-cloning theorem. For example, Ref. [11] introduced a model based on classical Hamiltonian dynamics with a ‘resolution restriction’ on phase space. Quantum states there are replaced by probability distributions over phase space and the restriction forbids the preparation of distributions that are arbitrarily sharp in both position and momentum. This noncontextual model is operationally equivalent to the Gaussian subset of quantum theory and, as such, admits a no-cloning theorem [11]. The same can be said for other noncontextual models, such as Spekken’s toy theory [12], which is equivalent to stabilizer quantum mechanics in all odd dimensions [13]. The reason why a no-cloning theorem arises in these theories is that pure, nonorthogonal, quantum states $|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle$ correspond to distinct, overlapping, probability distributions $\mu_1(\lambda), \mu_2(\lambda)$ over the posited set of ontological states $\lambda$. Since $\mu_i$ cannot be cloned, i.e. there exists no stochastic process mapping $\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$ to $\{\mu_1 \otimes \mu_1, \mu_2 \otimes \mu_2\}$, these models provide a simple, classical explanation of the no-cloning theorem.

Since the no-cloning theorem admits noncontextual explanations, here we focus on the ultimate limits of imperfect cloning. The question of what is the best fidelity with which a given set of quantum states can be cloned has been widely studied since the pivotal work of Bužek and Hillery in 1996 [14] (for a review on quantum cloning, see, e.g., Ref. [15]). We find that the optimal fidelity predicted by quantum theory cannot be reproduced by noncontextual model. Specifically, contextuality provides an advantage to the maximum copying fidelity. This shows that quantum cloning is indeed nonclassical, but not for the reasons usually adduced. Our result shows that a strong notion of nonclassicality sits at the core of an important quantum information primitive and directly links contextuality to a quantum advantage.

Optimal state-dependent quantum cloning. Before we discuss our no-go theorem for the maximum copying fidelity achievable in noncontextual models, let us recall the correspondent quantum setting. Let us suppose that one of two pure states, $|a\rangle$ and $|b\rangle$, is sent with equal probability into a cloning machine $\mathcal{M}$. We look for a cloning machine whose outputs maximise the global average fidelity

\[ F_g^Q := \frac{1}{2} F(\mathcal{M}(|a\rangle\langle a|), |aa\rangle\langle aa|) + \frac{1}{2} F(\mathcal{M}(|b\rangle\langle b|), |bb\rangle\langle bb|). \]

It has been shown that the optimal machine $\mathcal{M}$ is a unitary $U$ on the input and a register [16]. Define $|\alpha\rangle := U|a\rangle$, $|\beta\rangle := U|b\rangle$, where $|0\rangle$ is the initial state of the register. Optimising over the choice of $U$, the optimal
global average fidelity reads \[ F_g^{\text{opt}} := \frac{1}{4} \left[ \sqrt{(1 + c_{ab})(1 + \sqrt{c_{ab}})} + \sqrt{(1 - c_{ab})(1 - \sqrt{c_{ab}})} \right]^2, \] where \( c_{ab} := |\langle a|b \rangle|^2 \).

**Noncontextual ontological models of operational theories.** Noncontextuality is a restriction on the ontological models that try to explain the statistics of some operational theory. The elements of an operational theory are: preparations \( P \), measurements \( M \), transformations \( T \), and the set of probabilities \( \{p(x|T(P), M)\} \). These are the probabilities of each outcome \( x \) of any measurement \( M \), performed on a system initialized according to the preparation procedure \( P \) and undergoing a transformation \( T \). For all two-outcome measurements we will use the shortcut \( p(x = 1|P, M) \equiv p(M|P) \).

An ontological model for an operational theory is one which: 1) makes every preparation \( P_s \) correspond to sampling from a probability distribution \( \mu_s(\lambda) \) over some set of ontic variables \( \lambda \) (these are referred to as ‘hidden variables’ in the context of Bell nonlocality); 2) represents transformations by matrices \( T(\lambda'|\lambda) \) of transition probabilities \( T(\lambda'|\lambda) \geq 0, \sum_{\lambda'} T(\lambda'|\lambda) = 1 \forall \lambda \) acting on the corresponding probability density; and, finally, 3) defines its predictions as

\[ p(x|P_s, M_{s'}) = \int d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) \xi_{s'}(x|\lambda), \]

where \( \xi_{s'}(x|\lambda) \) is the response function of the measurement \( M_{s'} \), giving the probability of outcome \( x \) given that the hidden variable takes the value \( \lambda \) \( (\xi_{s'}(x|\lambda) \geq 0, \sum_{x} \xi_{s'}(x|\lambda) = 1) \).

Two operational procedures (be them preparations, measurements or transformations) are said to be operationally equivalent if they cannot be distinguished by any experiment. Noncontextuality, in the generalized form introduced in [6], is a restriction to ontological models which mandates that if two procedures are operationally equivalent, they must be represented in the same way within the ontological model. This notion can be seen as an extension of the traditional notion of Kochen-Specker [6, 18].

**Operational features of quantum cloning.** We now describe the operational features of optimal state-dependent quantum cloning which, as we will show, are impossible to explain with noncontextual models (see also Fig. 1). Let \( P_a \) and \( P_b \) denote the experimental procedures followed to prepare the states \(|a\rangle\) and \(|b\rangle\). These states go through a cloning machine \( T \), which outputs new preparations \( P_a = T(P_a) \), \( P_b = T(P_b) \). These finally undergo a ‘test’ measurement, \( M_{aa} \) or \( M_{bb} \) respectively, with outcomes in \{0, 1\}. These measurements are defined such that the probabilities \( p(M_{aa}|P_{aa}) \) of getting outcome 1 in a measurement of \( M_{aa} \) (i.e., ‘passing the test \( M_{aa} \)'), given the preparation \( P_{aa} \) as input, satisfies \( p(M_{aa}|P_{aa}) = 1 \), and the same for \( M_{bb} \). Finally, denoting by \( c_{a''a} = P(M_{a'}|P_a) \) (called ‘confusability’ in Ref. [5]), the cloning fidelity is operationally defined to be \( F_g := \frac{1}{2} c_{aaa} + \frac{1}{2} c_{bbb}, \) i.e. the average probability that the imperfect clones \( P_a \) and \( P_b \) pass the corresponding test measurements for the ideal clones \( P_{aa} \) and \( P_{bb} \) respectively. In this work, we are interested in finding bounds for \( F_g \) as a function of \( c_{ab} \) within noncontextual ontological models. Recall that, in the optimal quantum protocol, \( F_g \) is related to \( c_{ab} \) by Eq. (1).

There are some final operational constraints that allow us to exclude some trivial scenarios (such as those in which the test measurements let pass any preparation). In particular, for every \((s, s')\) in \{\(a, b\), \(ab, ba\), \(aa, a\), \(bb, b\)\}, we require the existence of preparations procedures \( P_{s''}, P_{s'a} \) such that \( p(M_{s''}|P_{s'}) = p(M_{s''}|P_{s'a}) = 0 \). Furthermore, the preparation procedures \( P_{s''}, P_{s'a} \) are such that the mixture \( P_s/2 + P_{s'a}/2 \) (tossing a fair coin and following either \( P_s \) or \( P_{s'a} \)) cannot be distinguished from the mixture \( P_{s''}/2 + P_{s'a}/2 \) by any measurement apparatus, i.e. \( p(M|P_s/2 + P_{s'a}/2) = p(M|P_{s''}/2 + P_{s'a}/2) \) for all \( M \). We denote this operational equivalence as

\[ P_s/2 + P_{s'a}/2 \simeq P_{s''}/2 + P_{s'a}/2. \]

In the quantum experiment, the above operational features can be seen to hold by identifying: \( P_a \) and \( P_b \) with the preparation of the pure states \(|a\rangle\) and \(|b\rangle\) respectively;
which, once rearranged, gives Eq. (5). Inequality gives
\[ \|a\|^2 + \|b\|^2 \leq 2. \]

Optimal cloning is contextual. The assumption of noncontextuality (more precisely, preparation noncontextuality [6]) requires that any ontological model for the above defined experiment satisfies
\[ \frac{1}{2}\mu_s(\lambda) + \frac{1}{2}\mu_{s'}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2}\mu_s(\lambda) + \frac{1}{2}\mu_{s'}(\lambda), \]
for all \((s, s')\) in \[((a, b), (aa, bb), (\alpha, aa), (\beta, bb))\], due to Eq. (2). Our main result is that this restriction implies a strong bound on \(F_g\).

**Theorem 1** (Optimal cloning is contextual). Let \(P_a\), \(P_b\) be the achieved outputs of a cloning process, and \(P_{aa}\), \(P_{bb}\) the target outputs, when the inputs are, respectively, \(P_a\) and \(P_b\). Suppose that for every \((s, s')\) in \[((a, b), (aa, bb), (\alpha, aa), (\beta, bb))\] there are \(P_{s\perp}\), \(P_{s'\perp}\) and \(M_s\) satisfying
1. \(\frac{1}{2}P_s + \frac{1}{2}P_s' \simeq \frac{1}{2}P_{s\perp} + \frac{1}{2}P_{s'\perp},\)
2. \(p(M_k|P_k) = 1, \quad p(M_k|P_{s\perp}) = 0, \quad k = s, s'\).

Then, for any noncontextual model we have that
\[ F_g \leq F_g^{\text{NC}} := 1 - \frac{c_{aa,bb}}{2} + \frac{c_{aa,bb}}{2}. \]  

**Proof sketch.** Adapting an argument given in Ref. [6] Sec. VIII A, we prove that in noncontextual models the confusability \(c_{ss'}\) and the \(\ell_1\) distance between the correspondent epistemic states \(\mu_s\) and \(\mu_{s'}\) are related as follows:
\[ ||\mu_s - \mu_{s'}|| = 2 - 2 \int d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda)\xi_{s'}(\lambda) = 2(1 - c_{ss'}). \]

To complete the proof we use the triangle inequality,
\[ ||\mu_{aa} - \mu_{bb}|| \leq ||\mu_{aa} - \mu_\alpha|| + ||\mu_\alpha - \mu_\beta|| + ||\mu_\beta - \mu_{bb}||. \]

Combining the ‘data processing inequality’, \[ ||\mu_\alpha - \mu_\beta|| \leq ||\mu_a - \mu_b|| \] and Eq. (6), the previous inequality gives
\[ 2(1 - c_{aa,bb}) \leq 2(1 - c_{aa,bb}) + 2(1 - c_{bb,bb}) + 2(1 - c_{ab,bb}), \]
which, once rearranged, gives Eq. (5).

For the complete proof, see the Appendix. In Fig. 2 we compare the optimal quantum cloning (global) fidelity with the maximum noncontextual cloning fidelity, taking into account that, in quantum experiments, one observes \(c_{aa,bb} = c_{ab}^2\). One can see, for any \(0 < c_{ab} < 1\), that quantum mechanics achieves higher copying fidelities than what is allowed by the principle of noncontextuality. Hence, despite the fact that no-cloning theorems can be reproduced within classical models, the phenomenology of optimal cloning is indeed strongly nonclassical. Contextuality provides an advantage for the maximum copying fidelity.

Interestingly, the above derivation also gives an alternative, simple proof of the main result of Ref. [5], since the maximum probability \(s_{aa}\) of distinguishing two preparations \(P_a\) and \(P_b\) is at most \(1/2 + ||\mu_a - \mu_b||/4\). Since we showed that \(||\mu_a - \mu_b|| = 2(1 - c_{ab}^2), s_{ab} \leq 1 - c_{ab}^2/2\), which is the optimal state discrimination probability in noncontextual models, as given in Ref. [5].

We also note that the noncontextual bound on cloning is tight. Denote by \(S_\lambda\) the support of \(\mu_\lambda\). Consider a model in which \(\mu_{aa} = \mu_{aa}\) and \(\xi_\lambda(\lambda) = 1\) if \(\lambda \in S_\lambda\) and zero otherwise. The strategy that saturates the bound is the following: if the input \(\lambda\) is in \(S_\lambda \setminus S_b\), output \((\lambda, \lambda')\), with \(\lambda'\) sampled according to \(\mu_{\lambda}\); otherwise, output \((\lambda, \lambda')\) with \(\lambda'\) sampled according to \(\mu_{\lambda}\). Then \(\mu_{\lambda} = \mu_{\lambda}\mu_{\lambda'}(\lambda)\mu_{\lambda'}(\lambda')\) perfectly, whereas \(\mu_{\lambda} = \mu_{\lambda}(\lambda)\mu_{\lambda}(\lambda')\) for \(\lambda \in S_\lambda \setminus S_b\). Assuming \(\mu_\lambda(\lambda) = \mu_\lambda(\lambda)\) for all \(\lambda \in S_\lambda \cap S_b\), the model satisfies the conditions of Theorem 1 and \(c_{aa,bb} = c_{ab}^2\). Furthermore, by direct inspection, \(F_g = \frac{1}{2}(1 - c_{ab} + c_{ab}^2) + \frac{1}{2} = F_g^{\text{NC}}\).

**Beyond idealizations.** Theorem 1 is a no-go result for noncontextual ontological models aimed at explaining the phenomenology of state-dependent quantum cloning. However, the inequality derived therein, Eq. (5), is not a proper noncontextuality inequality because the operational features considered refer to an idealized experiment. In any real experiment, on the other hand, one will need to confront noise and imperfections. Theorem 2 below extends Theorem 1 beyond the ideal limit, allowing for the observation of nonperfect correlations in Eq. (4):

**Theorem 2** (Optimal cloning is contextual – noise-ro-
bust version). With the notation of Thm. 1, suppose that for every \((s, s')\) in \(\{(a, b), (aa, bb), (\alpha, aa), (\beta, bb)\}\) there are \(P_{s^\perp}, P_{s'^\perp}\) and \(M_s\) satisfying

1. \(\frac{1}{2} P_s + \frac{1}{2} P_{s^\perp} \simeq \frac{1}{2} P_{s'} + \frac{1}{2} P_{s'^\perp},\)
2. \(p(M_s | P_s) \geq 1 - \epsilon, \quad p(M_s | P_{s^\perp}) \leq \epsilon.\)

Then, for any noncontextual model we have that

\[
F_g^\text{NC} \leq 1 - \frac{c_{ab}}{2} + \frac{c_{aa,bb}}{2} + 8\epsilon. \tag{7}
\]

Moreover, if \(c_{ss'} = c_{s's'}\) for every \((s, s')\) in \(\{(a, b), (aa, bb), (\alpha, aa), (\beta, bb)\}\), then

\[
F_g^\text{NC} \leq 1 - \frac{c_{ab}}{2} + \frac{c_{aa,bb}}{2} + 2\epsilon. \tag{8}
\]

The proof of Theorem 2, given in the Appendix, follows the same lines as that of Theorem 1, with the key addition of the following lemma, which extends Eq. (6) to the noisy setting.

**Lemma 1.** Let \(P_s, P_{s'}\) be preparations. Suppose there exists preparations \(P_{s^\perp}, P_{s'^\perp}\) and a two outcome measurement \(M_s\) such that

1. \(\frac{1}{2} P_s + \frac{1}{2} P_{s^\perp} \simeq \frac{1}{2} P_{s'} + \frac{1}{2} P_{s'^\perp},\)
2. \(p(M_k | P_k) \geq 1 - \epsilon, \quad p(M_k | P_{k^\perp}) \leq \epsilon, \quad k = s, s'.\)

Then, in a noncontextual ontological model,

\[
2(1 - c_{ss'}) - 8\epsilon \leq \|\mu_s - \mu_{s'}\| \leq 2(1 - c_{ss'}) + 8\epsilon. \tag{9}
\]

Moreover, if \(c_{ss'} = c_{s's'}\), then

\[
2(1 - c_{ss'}) - 2\epsilon \leq \|\mu_s - \mu_{s'}\| \leq 2(1 - c_{ss'}) + 2\epsilon. \tag{10}
\]

This is a general result relating the \(\ell_1\) distance between two epistemic states and their confusability in noncontextual models beyond the ideal scenario. Hence, we anticipate that Lemma 1 will be of broader use to identify quantum advantages beyond state-dependent cloning. For instance, following the same reasoning given after Theorem 1, Lemma 1 provides an alternative derivation of the tight noise-robust noncontextual bound on state discrimination of Ref. [5], \(s_{ab} \leq 1 - \frac{c_{ab} - \epsilon}{2}\).

An explicit noise model. Having derived a noise-robust version of our noncontextual bound, the next step is to investigate whether quantum mechanics violates it. We consider a standard noise model in which the ideal quantum preparations, measurements and unitary transformation are all thwarted by a depolarizing channel \(N_v\) with noise level \(v \in [0, 1]\

\[N_v(\rho) = (1 - v) \rho + vI/4.\]

In the Appendix, we show that if one uses the unitary transformation that is optimal for state-dependent cloning in the noiseless setting, one gets a quantum strategy whose global average fidelity reads

\[
F_g^{\text{Q, noisy}}(v) := (1 - v)^3 F_g^{\text{Q, opt}} + \frac{1}{4} v(3 - 3v + v^2) \tag{11}
\]

which coincides with the optimal for \(v = 0\). For every \(v \geq 0\), however, and unlike in the ideal case, the tradeoff between \(c_{ab}\) and \(F_g\) is not always above the noncontextual bound. Nevertheless, a preliminary comparison with the experimental results of [20] suggests that the required low level of noise is not beyond current experiments. In fact, in terms of the parameter \(C_s = 1/2 p(M_s | P_s) + 1/2 p(M_s | P_{s^\perp})\) defined in Ref. [20], \(v = 0.015\) (for which a violation can be observed for all \(c_{ab} \in [0.318, 0.718]\) if \(c_{ss'} = c_{s's'}\), see Fig. 3) corresponds to \(C_s \approx 0.9851\) for \(s = a, b\) and \(C_s \approx 0.9667\) for \(s = aa, bb\). Ref. [20] experimentally realized \(C_s = 0.9969\).

**Remaining assumptions.** There are two remaining idealizations to be considered in an experimental implementation. First, the experimental preparations will respect the required operational equivalences only approximately. To tackle this, one can note that the measurement statistics of any preparation within the convex hull \(C\) of the experimental preparations is known, due to linearity. Hence, one only needs to find ‘secondary’ preparations in \(C\) that satisfy the operational equivalences exactly, as discussed in Sec. IV of Ref. [20]. The price to be paid is the introduction of effective noise, which however can be dealt with through Theorem 2. Second, the notion of operational equivalence relies on the knowledge of a tomographically complete set of measurements. However, if quantum theory is not correct, the tomographically complete set of a post-quantum theory may contain extra unknown measurements. Recent work has shown that...
the problem can be mitigated by the addition of extra (known) measurements and preparations, see Ref. [21], but this goes beyond the scope of the present work. Finally, note that we gave contextuality proofs with and without the operational assumption \( \rho_{ss'} = \rho_{s's} \); if the assumption is used, it must be enforced through a careful choice of the secondary preparations, since it will never hold perfectly in practice (see Sec. VI of Ref. [5]).

Conclusions and open questions. We have shown that the optimal fidelity of a state-dependent cloner predicted by quantum theory fails to admit a noncontextual explanation, in the presence of the relevant operational equivalences. Furthermore, we have derived from this fact a noise-resistant noncontextuality inequality whose experimental violation is a witness of contextuality.

From a foundational point of view, it would be relevant to explore whether the relation between contextuality and cloning fidelity, that we proved for optimal state-dependent cloning, extends to the other types of imperfect cloning studied in the literature, chiefly phase-covariant and/or universal cloning, as well as to probabilistic cloning [15]. From an applications’ point of view, one important open question is if our noncontextual bound can be used to prove a contextual advantage for quantum information processing tasks which rely on optimal quantum state-dependent cloning (e.g., [22, 23]).

Finally, it may be possible to use the connection between \( \ell_1 \) norm and confusability developed here to understand what aspects of other quantum information primitives, such as quantum teleportation, are truly nonclassical.
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[19] See Supplemental Material at [URL will be inserted by publisher] for proofs of the Theorems and Lemmas and for the derivation of Eq. (11).
PROOF OF THEOREM 1

To prove Theorem 1, we first prove a lemma connecting the confusability \( c_{s,s'} = p(M_{s'}|P_s) \) of two preparations \( P_s, P_{s'} \) to the difference, in \( \ell_1 \) norm, between the corresponding distributions \( \mu_s, \mu_{s'} \) over the ontological state space.

**Lemma 2.** Let \( P_s, P_{s'} \) preparations. Suppose there exists preparations \( P_{s_⊥}, P_{s_⊥} \) and a two outcome measurement \( M_s \) such that

1. \( \frac{1}{2}P_s + \frac{1}{2}P_{s_⊥} = \frac{1}{2}P_{s'} + \frac{1}{2}P_{s_⊥}, \)
2. \( p(M_k|P_k) = 1, \ p(M_k|P_{k_⊥}) = 0, \ k = s, s'. \)

Then, in a non-contextual ontological model,

\[
\|\mu_s - \mu_{s'}\| = 2(1 - c_{s,s'}).
\]

**Proof.** The first part of the proof essentially follows the argument given in Ref. [6] Sec. VIIIA and reproduced in Ref. [5] Sec. IIA, but it is slightly adapted to use the fewer assumptions of the statement. We have that

\[
1 = p(M_k|P_k) = \int_{S_k} d\lambda \mu_k(\lambda) \xi_k(\lambda), \quad k = s, s',
\]

where \( S_k \) denotes the support of \( \mu_k \). From this equation, it follows that \( \xi_k(\lambda) = 1 \) almost everywhere on \( S_k \). Furthermore,

\[
0 = p(M_k|P_{k_⊥}) = \int_{S_{k_⊥}} \mu_{k_⊥}(\lambda) \xi_k(\lambda), \quad k = s, s',
\]

from which it follows that \( \xi_k(\lambda) = 0 \) almost everywhere on \( S_{k_⊥} \). Hence, \( S_k \cap S_{k_⊥} = \emptyset \) modulo sets of zero measure.

The operational equivalence of assumption 1 implies that in a noncontextual model

\[
\mu_s(\lambda) + \mu_s(\lambda) = \mu_{s'}(\lambda) + \mu_{s'}(\lambda), \quad \forall \lambda \in \Lambda,
\]

(15)

Since \( S_s \cap S_{s_⊥} = S_{s'} \cap S_{s_⊥} = \emptyset \) modulo a set of zero measure, this implies \( \mu_s(\lambda) = \mu_{s'}(\lambda) \) for almost all \( \lambda \in S_s \cap S_{s_⊥} \). Hence, using the facts above, if \( \Lambda \) is the ontic state space,

\[
\|\mu_s - \mu_{s'}\| = \int_{\Lambda \setminus S_s} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda) + \int_{\Lambda \setminus S_{s'}} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) = 2 - 2 \int_{S_s \cap S_{s'}} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) = 2 - 2 \int_{S_s \cap S_{s'}} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) \xi_{s'}(\lambda).
\]

Note that the last integral can be extended to \( \Lambda \). In fact, by contradiction suppose that \( \xi_{s'}(\lambda) \neq 0 \) for some nonzero measure set \( X \subseteq S_s \setminus S_{s'} \). Then, from Eq. (15), it follows that, for almost all \( \lambda \in X, \ 0 < \mu_s(\lambda) = \mu_{s'}(\lambda) \). However, as we discussed \( \xi_{s'}(\lambda) = 0 \) almost everywhere on \( S_{s_⊥} \), which gives the desired contradiction. Hence the integral can be extended to \( S_s \) and, trivially, to all \( \Lambda \). In conclusion,

\[
\|\mu_s - \mu_{s'}\| = 2 - 2 \int_{\Lambda} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) \xi_{s'}(\lambda) = 2(1 - c_{s,s'}).
\]

\[\square\]

We are now ready to derive a bound on the maximum average state-dependent cloning fidelity achievable in noncontextual ontological models, under the assumption that a set of operational equivalences is observed:

**Theorem 3** (Optimal cloning is contextual). Let \( P_\alpha, P_\beta \) be the achieved outputs of a cloning process, and \( P_a, P_b, P_{a, b} \) the target outputs, when the inputs are, respectively, \( P_a \) and \( P_b \). Suppose that for every \( (s, s') \) in \( \{(a, b), (aa, bb), (a, aa), (\beta, bb)\} \) there are \( P_{s_⊥}, P_{s_⊥} \) and \( M_s \) satisfying

1. \( \frac{1}{2}P_s + \frac{1}{2}P_{s_⊥} \simeq \frac{1}{2}P_{s'} + \frac{1}{2}P_{s_⊥}, \)
2. \( p(M_k|P_k) = 1, \ p(M_k|P_{k_⊥}) = 0, \ k = s, s'. \)

Then, for any noncontextual model we have that

\[
F_{\text{NC}} \leq 1 - \frac{c_{ab}}{2} + \frac{c_{aa, bb}}{2}.
\]

(17)
Proof. Using the triangle inequality,
\[
\|\mu_a - \mu_{bb}\| \leq \|\mu_a - \mu_{\alpha}\| + \|\mu_{\alpha} - \mu_{bb}\| + \|\mu_{bb} - \mu_{bb}\|.
\]
By definition, \(\mu_{\alpha}(\lambda) = \int d\lambda T(\lambda|\lambda')\mu_a(\lambda')\), for a stochastic matrix \(T(\lambda|\lambda')\). Similarly, \(\mu_{bb}(\lambda) = \int d\lambda T(\lambda|\lambda')\mu_b(\lambda')\), with the same stochastic matrix. Since \(\int d\lambda T(\lambda|\lambda') = 1\) and \(T(\lambda|\lambda') \geq 0\), one can readily verify from the convexity of the absolute value that \(\|\mu_{\alpha} - \mu_{bb}\| \leq \|\mu_{\alpha} - \mu_{bb}\|\), which implies
\[
\|\mu_{aa} - \mu_{bb}\| \leq \|\mu_{aa} - \mu_{\alpha}\| + \|\mu_{\alpha} - \mu_{bb}\| + \|\mu_{bb} - \mu_{bb}\|.
\]
We can apply Lemma 2 to each of the couples \((s, s')\), obtaining from the previous inequality
\[
2(1 - c_{aa,bb}) \leq 2(1 - c_{aa}) + 2(1 - c_{ab}) + 2(1 - c_{bb}),
\]
which, once rearranged, provides the final result. \(\square\)

**Proof of Lemma 3**

For ease of reading, we will split Lemma 3 from the main text into two smaller lemmas, Lemma 3 and Lemma 4 below, for the cases of symmetric and nonsymmetric confusabilities. Note that for the sake of generality we will not assume all error terms to be equal, as we did for simplicity in the main text.

**Lemma 3.** Let \(P_s, P_{s'}\) be preparations. Suppose there exists preparations \(P_{s^+}, P_{s'^+}\) and a two outcome measurement \(M_s\) such that
1. \(\frac{1}{2}P_s + \frac{1}{2}P_{s^+} \simeq \frac{1}{2}P_{s'} + \frac{1}{2}P_{s'^+}\),
2. \(p(M_k|P_k) \geq 1 - \epsilon_k, \quad p(M_k|P_{k^+}) \leq \epsilon_k, \quad k = s, s'\).
3. \(c_{ss'} = c_{s's}\)

Then, in a noncontextual ontological model,
\[
2(1 - c_{ss'}) - 2c_{ss'} \leq \|\mu_s - \mu_{s'}\| \leq 2(1 - c_{ss'}) + 2c_{ss'},
\]
where \(c_{ss'} = \min\{\epsilon_s, \epsilon_{s'}\}\).

**Proof.** Recall that we denote by \(S_s\) the support of \(\mu_s\). Define a partition \(S_s \cup S_{s'} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{4} R_i\), as summarized in Figure 4:
1. \(R_1 = S_s \setminus (S_s \cap S_{s'})\), \(R_4 = S_{s'} \setminus (S_s \cap S_{s'})\).
2. \(R_2 = \{\lambda \in S_s \cap S_{s'}|\mu_s(\lambda) \geq \mu_{s'}(\lambda)\}\), \(R_3 = \{\lambda \in S_s \cap S_{s'}|\mu_s(\lambda) < \mu_{s'}(\lambda)\}\).

Then,
\[
\|\mu_s - \mu_{s'}\| = \int d\lambda[\mu_s(\lambda) - \mu_{s'}(\lambda)] = \int_{R_1} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) + \int_{R_4} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda) + \int_{R_2} d\lambda [\mu_s(\lambda) - \mu_{s'}(\lambda)] + \int_{R_3} d\lambda [\mu_{s'}(\lambda) - \mu_s(\lambda)]
\]
\[
= 2 - \int_{R_2 \cup R_3} d\lambda [\mu_s(\lambda) + \mu_{s'}(\lambda)] + \int_{R_2} d\lambda [\mu_s(\lambda) - \mu_{s'}(\lambda)] + \int_{R_3} d\lambda [\mu_{s'}(\lambda) - \mu_s(\lambda)] = 2 - 2\int_{R_3} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) - 2\int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda).
\]
Consider,
\[ c_{ss'} - \int_{R_3} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) - \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda) = c_{s's} - \int_{R_3} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) - \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda) \]
\[ = \int_{R_2 \cup R_3 \cup R_4} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda) \xi_s(\lambda) - \int_{R_3} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) - \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda) \]
\[ \leq \int_{R_3 \cup R_4} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) \xi_s(\lambda) - \int_{R_3} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) \]
\[ = \int_{R_3 \cup R_4} d\lambda \xi_s(\lambda) \mu_s(\lambda) - \mu_{s'}(\lambda) - \mu_{s'}(\lambda) \xi_s(\lambda) \]
\[ = - \int_{R_3} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) \xi_s(\lambda) + \int_{R_3 \cup R_4} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda) - \mu_{s'}(\lambda) \xi_s(\lambda) \]
\[ \leq \int_{R_3 \cup R_4} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda) \xi_s(\lambda) \leq \int_{R_3 \cup R_4} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) = p(M_s | P_s) \leq \epsilon_s, \]
where we used assumption 3 in the first line, \( \xi_s \leq 1 \) in the third, assumption 1 and non-contextuality in the fourth.

Then, using Eq. (21),
\[ \| \mu_s - \mu_{s'} \| \leq 2(1 + \epsilon_s - c_{ss'}) = 2(1 - c_{ss'}) + 2\epsilon_s. \]

Furthermore, recalling that \( \xi_{s'} = 1 - \xi_s \),
\[ \int_{R_3} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) + \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda) - c_{ss'} = \int_{R_3} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) + \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda) - c_{s's} \]
\[ = \int_{R_3} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) + \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda) - \int_{R_2 \cup R_3} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda) \xi_s(\lambda) \]
\[ = \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) \xi_{s'}(\lambda) + \int_{R_3} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda) - \mu_{s'}(\lambda) \xi_s(\lambda) \]
\[ \leq \int_{R_3} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) \xi_{s'}(\lambda) \leq \int_{R_3} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) \xi_{s'}(\lambda) = p(M_{s'} | P_s) \leq \epsilon_s. \]

where we used assumption 3 in the first line and in the fourth line we used that \( \mu_{s'}(\lambda) \leq \mu_s(\lambda) \) in \( R_2 \) and \( \mu_s(\lambda) \leq \mu_{s'}(\lambda) \) in \( R_3 \). Hence, we have that
\[ c_{ss'} - \int_{R_3} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) - \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda) \geq -\epsilon_s \]
and, using Eq. (21), that
\[ \| \mu_s - \mu_{s'} \| \leq 2(1 + \epsilon_s - c_{ss'}) = 2(1 - c_{ss'}) + 2\epsilon_s. \]

Finally, noting that the above derivation is symmetric under the exchange of \( s \) with \( s' \) we arrive to the desired result
\[ 2(1 - c_{ss'}) - 2 \min \{ \epsilon_s, \epsilon_s' \} \leq \| \mu_s - \mu_{s'} \| \leq 2(1 - c_{ss'}) + 2 \min \{ \epsilon_s, \epsilon_s' \}. \]

Now we prove the remaining part of Lemma 3 from the main text, reproduced in Lemma 4 below, in which we drop the assumption of perfectly symmetric confusabilities.

**Lemma 4.** Let \( P_s, P_{s'} \) be preparations. Suppose there exists preparations \( P_{s',s} \), \( P_{s,s'} \) and a two outcome measurement \( M_s \) such that

1. \( \frac{1}{2} P_s + \frac{1}{2} P_{s'} \approx \frac{1}{2} P_{s'} + \frac{1}{2} P_{s'} \),
2. \( p(M_k | P_k) \geq 1 - \epsilon_k, \quad p(M_k | P_{k'}) \leq \epsilon_k, \quad k = s, s' \).

Then, in a noncontextual ontological model,
\[ 2(1 - c_{ss'}) - 4(\epsilon_s + \epsilon_{s'}) \leq \| \mu_s - \mu_{s'} \| \leq 2(1 - c_{ss'}) + 4(\epsilon_s + \epsilon_{s'}). \] (22)
For the proof of Lemma 4 we rely on the following additional lemma, which shows that a form of imperfect symmetry of confusabilities holds for noncontextual models in the presence of noise.

**Lemma 5 (Symmetrization).** Let \( P_s, P_{s'} \) preparations. Suppose there exists preparations \( P_{s'\perp}, P_{s'\perp} \) and a two outcome measurement \( M_s \) such that

1. \( \frac{1}{2} P_s + \frac{1}{2} P_{s'\perp} = \frac{1}{2} P_{s'} + \frac{1}{2} P_{s'\perp} \),
2. \( p(M_k|P_k) \geq 1 - \epsilon_k \) for \( k = s, s' \).

Then, in a non-contextual ontological model with a set of states \( \Lambda \) and any \( S \subseteq \Lambda \),

\[
c_{s,s'} - c_{s',s} = \int_S [\mu_s(\lambda)\xi_{s'}(\lambda) - \mu_{s'}(\lambda)\xi_s(\lambda)]d\lambda \leq \epsilon_s + \epsilon_{s'}
\]  

(23)

**Proof.** Let us write the core integral as the sum of two integrals, which we will then analyze separately:

\[
\int_S [\mu_s(\lambda)\xi_{s'}(\lambda) - \mu_{s'}(\lambda)\xi_s(\lambda)]d\lambda = \int_S [\mu_s(\lambda) - \mu_{s'}(\lambda)]\xi_s(\lambda)d\lambda + \int_S \mu_{s'}(\lambda)[\xi_{s'}(\lambda) - \xi_s(\lambda)]d\lambda.
\]  

(24)

Consider the first integral. Using that \( \xi_s(\lambda) + \xi_{s'}(\lambda) = 1 \) for all \( \lambda \in \Lambda \),

\[
\int_S [\mu_s(\lambda) - \mu_{s'}(\lambda)]\xi_s(\lambda)d\lambda = \int_S [\mu_s(\lambda) - \mu_{s'}(\lambda)]\xi_s(\lambda)d\lambda - \int_S \mu_{s'}(\lambda)[\xi_{s'}(\lambda) - \xi_s(\lambda)]d\lambda.
\]  

(25)

Noncontextuality and the operational equivalence (assumption 1 of the lemma) imply that \( \mu_{s'} = \mu_s + \mu_{s'} - \mu_{s'\perp} \). Hence,

\[
\int_S [\mu_s(\lambda) - \mu_{s'}(\lambda)]\xi_s(\lambda)d\lambda = \int_S [\mu_s(\lambda) - \mu_s(\lambda)]\xi_s(\lambda) + \mu_{s'}(\lambda)\xi_s(\lambda)]\xi_{s'}(\lambda)d\lambda
\]

\[
\leq \int_S [\mu_s(\lambda)]\xi_{s'}(\lambda) + \mu_{s'}(\lambda)\xi_s(\lambda)]\xi_{s'}(\lambda)d\lambda \leq \int_S [\mu_s(\lambda)]\xi_{s'}(\lambda) + \mu_{s'}(\lambda)\xi_{s'}(\lambda)]d\lambda
\]

\[
\leq 1 - P(M_s|P_s) + P(M_{s'}|P_{s'}) \leq \epsilon_s + \epsilon_{s'},
\]

where in the first inequality we removed a negative term; in the second inequality we used \( \xi_{s'}(\lambda) \leq 1 \) in the first term and \( \xi_s(\lambda) \leq 1 \) in the second term; in the third inequality we extended the integrals from \( S \) to \( \Lambda \); and in the last inequality we used assumption 2 of the lemma.

Substituting this inequality back into Eq. (24) we obtain:

\[
\int_S [\mu_s(\lambda) - \mu_{s'}(\lambda)]\xi_s(\lambda)d\lambda \leq \epsilon_s + \epsilon_{s'} - \int_S \mu_{s'}(\lambda)\xi_{s'}(\lambda)d\lambda.
\]  

(26)

Consider now the second integral on the right hand side of Eq. (24). Since \( \xi_s(\lambda) + \xi_{s'}(\lambda) = 1 \) for all \( \lambda \in \Lambda \),

\[
\int_S \mu_{s'}(\lambda)[\xi_{s'}(\lambda) - \xi_s(\lambda)]d\lambda = \int_S [\mu_{s'}(\lambda)]\xi_{s'}(\lambda)\xi_s(\lambda) + \mu_{s'}(\lambda)\xi_s(\lambda)]\xi_{s'}(\lambda)d\lambda \leq \int_S d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda)\xi_{s'}(\lambda)\xi_{s'}(\lambda),
\]  

(27)

where in the inequality we used that \( \xi_{s'}(\lambda) \leq 1 \). Substituting Eq. (26) and Eq. (27) into Eq. (24), one obtains the claimed bound. \qed

Now we continue with the proof of Lemma 4.

**Proof of Lemma 4.** Let \( R_1, R_2, R_3 \) and \( R_4 \) be as in the proof of Lemma 3. Then,

\[
\|\mu_s - \mu_{s'}\| = \int d\lambda |\mu_s(\lambda) - \mu_{s'}(\lambda)| = \int_{R_1} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) + \int_{R_1} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda) + \int_{R_2} d\lambda [\mu_s(\lambda) - \mu_{s'}(\lambda)] + \int_{R_3} d\lambda [\mu_{s'}(\lambda) - \mu_s(\lambda)]
\]

\[
= 2 - \int_{R_2\cup R_3} d\lambda [\mu_s(\lambda) + \mu_{s'}(\lambda)] + \int_{R_2} d\lambda [\mu_s(\lambda) - \mu_{s'}(\lambda)] + \int_{R_3} d\lambda [\mu_{s'}(\lambda) - \mu_s(\lambda)] = 2 - 2 \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) - 2 \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda).
\]  

(28)
Furthermore,
\[
\int_{R_3} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) + \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda) - c_{ss'} = \int_{R_3} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) + \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda) - \int_{R_1 \cup R_2 \cup R_3} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) \xi_{s'}(\lambda)
\leq \int_{R_3} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) \xi_{s'}(\lambda) + \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda) - \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) \xi_{s'}(\lambda),
\]
where we dropped the integral over \(R_1\) and used \(\xi_{s'\perp} = 1 - \xi_{s'}\). Then,
\[
\int_{R_3} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) + \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda) - c_{ss'} \leq \int_{R_3} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) \xi_{s'}(\lambda) + \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda) - \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) \xi_{s'}(\lambda) + \epsilon_s + \epsilon_{s'}
\]
\[
= \int_{R_3} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) \xi_{s'}(\lambda) + \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda) \xi_{s'}(\lambda) + \epsilon_s + \epsilon_{s'} \leq \int_{R_3} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) \xi_{s'}(\lambda) + \epsilon_s + \epsilon_{s'}
\]
\[
\leq 1 - P(M_s|P_{s'}) + 1 - P(M_s|P_{s'}) + \epsilon_s + \epsilon_{s'} \leq 2(\epsilon_s + \epsilon_{s'}),
\]
which is the first of the two claimed bounds. To obtain the second bound we apply the symmetrization lemma (Lemma 5) to both \(\int_{R_1} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) \xi_{s'}(\lambda)\) and \(\int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) \xi_{s'}(\lambda)\):
\[
c_{ss'} = \int_{R_3} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) - \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda) = \int_{R_1} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) \xi_{s'}(\lambda) + \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) \xi_{s'}(\lambda) - \int_{R_3} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) \xi_{s'}(\lambda) - \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda)
\leq \int_{R_1} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) \xi_{s'}(\lambda) + \epsilon_s + \epsilon_{s'} + \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) \xi_{s'}(\lambda) + \epsilon_s + \epsilon_{s'} - \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) - 2(\epsilon_s + \epsilon_{s'}) - \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda) \xi_{s'}(\lambda),
\]
where we used that \(\mu_{s'}\) is zero in \(R_1\). It follows that \(c_{ss'} - \int_{R_3} d\lambda \mu_s(\lambda) - \int_{R_2} d\lambda \mu_{s'}(\lambda) \leq 2(\epsilon_s + \epsilon_{s'})\), which can be substituted into Eq. (28) to obtain
\[
\|\mu_s - \mu_{s'}\| \leq 2 + 2[-c_{ss'} + 2(\epsilon_s + \epsilon_{s'})] = 2(1 - c_{ss'}) + 2(\epsilon_s + \epsilon_{s'}).
\]

\[
\text{PROOF OF THEOREM 2}
\]

From the noisy version of Lemma 2, we derive the noisy version of Theorem 3:

**Theorem 4** (Optimal cloning is contextual - nonideal scenario). *With the notation of Thm. 3, suppose that for every \((s, s')\) in \(\{(a, b), (aa, bb), (a, aa), (b, bb)\}\) there are \(P_{s\perp}, P_{s\perp'}\) and \(M_s\) satisfying*

1. \(\frac{1}{2}P_s + \frac{1}{2}P_{s\perp} \preceq \frac{1}{2}P_{s'} + \frac{1}{2}P_{s'\perp},\)
2. \(p(M_s|P_s) \geq 1 - \epsilon_s,\quad p(M_s|P_{s\perp}) \leq \epsilon_s.\)

*Then, for any noncontextual model we have that*
\[
F_{NC}^g \leq 1 - \frac{c_{ab}}{2} + \frac{c_{aa,bb}}{2} + \text{Err},
\]
where \(\text{Err} = \epsilon_a + \epsilon_b + \epsilon_\alpha + \epsilon_\beta + 2(\epsilon_{aa} + \epsilon_{bb}).\) *Moreover, if \(c_{ss'} = c_{s's'}\) and \(\epsilon_{ss'} = \min\{\epsilon_s, \epsilon_{s'}\}\) for every \((s, s')\) in \(\{(a, b), (aa, bb), (a, aa), (b, bb)\}\), then*
\[
F_{NC}^g \leq 1 - \frac{c_{ab}}{2} + \frac{c_{aa,bb}}{2} + \text{Err}',
\]
where \(\text{Err}' = \frac{1}{2}(\epsilon_{ab} + \epsilon_{aa,bb} + \epsilon_{a,aa} + \epsilon_{b,bb}).\)
Proof. Following the same reasoning as in Theorem 3, based on the triangle inequality and the contractivity of the \(\ell_1\) norm under stochastic processes, one can show that the following equation holds (see Eq. (18)):

\[
\|\mu_a - \mu_b\| \leq \|\mu_a - \mu_{aa}\| + \|\mu_{a} - \mu_{b}\| + \|\mu_{b} - \mu_{bb}\|.
\] (33)

Using both upper and lower bounds for the \(\ell_1\) distance derived in Lemma 4, this implies

\[
2(1 - c_{aa,bb}) - 4(\epsilon_a + \epsilon_b) \leq 2(1 - c_{\alpha,aa}) + 4(\epsilon_a + \epsilon_{aa}) + 2(1 - c_{ab}) + 4(\epsilon_a + \epsilon_b) + 2(1 - c_{\beta,bb}) + 4(\epsilon_{\beta} + \epsilon_{bb}),
\] (34)

and, using the ones derived in Lemma 3, for the case of symmetric confusabilities it implies,

\[
2(1 - c_{aa,bb}) - 2\epsilon_{aa,bb} \leq 2(1 - c_{\alpha,aa}) + 2\epsilon_{\alpha,aa} + 2(1 - c_{ab}) + 2\epsilon_{ab} + 2(1 - c_{\beta,bb}) + 2\epsilon_{\beta,bb},
\] (35)

which can be rearranged to give the claimed bounds.

Note that, while we gave an independent and simpler proof of Theorem 3, we can now see it as a corollary of Eq. (31) and Eq. (32), respectively.

QUANTUM VIOLATION OF NOISE-CONTEXTUAL BOUND UNDER DEPOLARIZING NOISE

Introducing noise

We will assume that all experimental procedures in the ideal quantum cloning experiment (that is, preparations, measurements and transformations) are affected by a depolarizing channel \(\mathcal{N}_v\) with noise level \(v \in [0, 1]\):

\[
\mathcal{N}_v(\rho) = (1 - v) \rho + v \mathbb{I}_4.
\]

Therefore, for \(x \in \{a, b\}\), the ideal input preparations transform as

\[
|x0\rangle \mapsto \mathcal{N}_v(|x0\rangle \langle x0|) = (1 - v) |x0\rangle \langle x0| + v \mathbb{I}_4,
\]

so that the actual input preparations become

\[
\rho_x := \text{Tr}_2[\mathcal{N}_v(|x0\rangle \langle x0|)] = (1 - v) |x\rangle \langle x| + v \mathbb{I}_{ab} / 2,
\]

with \(\mathbb{I}_{ab}\) the projector over the span\(\{|a\rangle, |b\rangle\}\). The ideal cloning transformation \(\mathcal{U}\) becomes \(\mathcal{N}_v \circ \mathcal{U} = (1 - v) \mathcal{U} + v \mathcal{D}\), where \(\mathcal{D}(\rho) = \mathbb{I} / 4\) for all \(\rho\). Hence, the actual outcomes \(\chi \in \{\alpha, \beta\}\) correspondent to input \(x \in \{a, b\}\) become

\[
\rho_{x} := \mathcal{N}_v \circ \mathcal{U}(\rho_x) = [(1 - v) \mathcal{U} + v \mathcal{D}] \left( (1 - v) |x0\rangle \langle x0| + v \mathbb{I}_4 / 4 \right) = (1 - v)^2 |\chi\rangle \langle \chi| + (1 - (1 - v)^2) \mathbb{I}_4 / 4.
\]

The actual target copies would become \(\mathcal{N}_v(|xx\rangle \langle xx|)\). While this is the minimal amount of noise in this preparation required by our model, not all operational equivalences are satisfied under it. A simple (albeit likely not optimal) way to fix this issue is to let the noise act for a second step; hence, define

\[
\rho_{xx} := \mathcal{N}_v \circ \mathcal{N}_v(|xx\rangle \langle xx|) = (1 - v)^2 |xx\rangle \langle xx| + (1 - (1 - v)^2) \mathbb{I}_4 / 4.
\]

Finally, for the ideal measurements, they transform as (for \(x \in \{a, b\}, \chi \in \{\alpha, \beta\}\),

\[
\{ |x\rangle \langle x|, \mathbb{I}_{ab} - |x\rangle \langle x| \} \mapsto M_x := \left\{ (1 - v) |x\rangle \langle x| + v \mathbb{I}_{ab} / 2, (1 - v)(\mathbb{I}_{ab} - |x\rangle \langle x|) + v \mathbb{I}_{ab} / 2 \right\},
\]

\[
\{ |xx\rangle \langle xx|, \mathbb{I} - |xx\rangle \langle xx| \} \mapsto M_{xx} := \left\{ (1 - v) |xx\rangle \langle xx| + v \mathbb{I}_{4} / 4, (1 - v)(\mathbb{I} - |xx\rangle \langle xx|) + v \mathbb{I}_{4} / 4 \right\},
\]

\[
\{ |\chi\rangle \langle \chi|, \mathbb{I} - |\chi\rangle \langle \chi| \} \mapsto M_\chi := \left\{ (1 - v) |\chi\rangle \langle \chi| + v \mathbb{I}_{4} / 4, (1 - v)(\mathbb{I} - |\chi\rangle \langle \chi|) + v \mathbb{I}_{4} / 4 \right\}.
\]
Orthogonal preparations and operational equivalences

We now introduce the orthogonal preparations, necessary for the satisfaction of the operational equivalences. We start with the ones pertaining to the pair of input preparations \((a, b)\). For, \(x \in \{a, b\}\), let

\[
\rho_{x^\perp} := (1 - v) |x^\perp\rangle \langle x^\perp| + v \frac{I_{ab}}{2},
\]

with \(|x^\perp\rangle \in \text{span}(\{|a\rangle, |b\rangle\})\) and \(|x\rangle \langle x^\perp| = 0\). Note that these are naturally thought as the noisy version of the perfect orthogonal preparations, \(\rho_{x^\perp} = \mathcal{N}_v(|x^\perp0\rangle \langle x^\perp0|)\). Now, let us check that the operational equivalence is satisfied,

\[
\frac{1}{2} \rho_a + \frac{1}{2} \rho_{a^\perp} = (1 - v) \frac{|a\rangle \langle a| + |a^\perp\rangle \langle a^\perp|}{2} + v \frac{I_{ab}}{2} = (1 - v) \frac{|b\rangle \langle b| + |b^\perp\rangle \langle b^\perp|}{2} + v \frac{I_{ab}}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \rho_b + \frac{1}{2} \rho_{b^\perp}.
\]

Next, we consider the pair of preparations \(s \in \{a, aa\}\). Let

\[
\rho_{s^\perp} := (1 - v)^2 |s\rangle \langle s| + (1 - (1 - v)^2) \frac{I}{4},
\]

with \(|s^\perp\rangle \in \text{span}(\{|a\rangle, |aa\rangle\})\) and \(|s\rangle \langle s^\perp| = 0\). \(\rho_{s^\perp}\) can be seen as the state resulting from preparing \(|s^\perp\rangle\) and letting the noise channel act for two steps, i.e. \(\rho_{s^\perp} = \mathcal{N}_v \circ \mathcal{N}_v(|s^\perp\rangle \langle s^\perp|)\).

We can now see that with this choice of states the operational equivalences are satisfied:

\[
\frac{1}{2} \rho_a + \frac{1}{2} \rho_{a^\perp} = (1 - v)^2 \frac{|a\rangle \langle a| + |a^\perp\rangle \langle a^\perp|}{2} + (1 - (1 - v)^2) \frac{I_{aa}}{4} = (1 - v)^2 \frac{|b\rangle \langle b| + |b^\perp\rangle \langle b^\perp|}{2} + (1 - (1 - v)^2) \frac{I_{aa}}{4} = \frac{1}{2} \rho_a + \frac{1}{2} \rho_{a^\perp},
\]

with \(I_{aa}\) the projector over the \(\text{span}(\{|a\rangle, |aa\rangle\})\). Following the same argumentation, one can see that for the remaining pairs of preparations \((\beta, bb)\) and \((aa, bb)\), if we let

\[
\rho_{\beta^\perp} := (1 - v)^2 |\beta^\perp\rangle \langle \beta^\perp| + (1 - (1 - v)^2) \frac{I}{4},
\]

\[
\rho_{bb^\perp} := (1 - v)^2 |bb^\perp\rangle \langle bb^\perp| + (1 - (1 - v)^2) \frac{I}{4},
\]

with \(|bb^\perp\rangle, |\beta^\perp\rangle \in \text{span}(\{|\beta\rangle, |bb\rangle\})\) and \(|bb\rangle \langle bb^\perp| = |\beta\rangle \langle \beta^\perp| = 0\), the operational equivalence for \((\beta, bb)\) is satisfied:

\[
\frac{1}{2} \rho_{\beta} + \frac{1}{2} \rho_{\beta^\perp} = \frac{1}{2} \rho_{bb} + \frac{1}{2} \rho_{bb^\perp}.
\]

And letting

\[
\rho'_{aa^\perp} := (1 - v)^2 |aa^\perp\rangle \langle aa^\perp| + (1 - (1 - v)^2) \frac{I}{4},
\]

\[
\rho'_{bb^\perp} := (1 - v)^2 |bb^\perp\rangle \langle bb^\perp| + (1 - (1 - v)^2) \frac{I}{4},
\]

with \(|aa^\perp\rangle, |bb^\perp\rangle \in \text{span}(\{|aa\rangle, |bb\rangle\})\), and \(|aa\rangle \langle aa^\perp| = |bb\rangle \langle bb^\perp| = 0\), the operational equivalence for \((aa, bb)\) is satisfied:

\[
\frac{1}{2} \rho_{aa} + \frac{1}{2} \rho'_{aa^\perp} = \frac{1}{2} \rho_{bb} + \frac{1}{2} \rho'_{bb^\perp}.
\]

Notice that \(\rho_{aa^\perp}, \rho'_{aa^\perp}\) and \(\rho_{bb^\perp}, \rho'_{bb^\perp}\) are alternative choices of orthogonal preparations, tailored to each pair of preparations appearing in the operational equivalences.
Noise parameter and Error term in the NC bound

In this subsection, we find the expression for each of the measurement error probabilities appearing in the error term in Eq. (31) as a function of the noise parameter $v$ of the depolarizing channel.

For $x \in \{a, b\}$,

$$1 - \epsilon_x = p(M_x|P_x) = \text{Tr} \left[ \left( (1 - v) |x\rangle \langle x| + v \frac{I_{ab}}{2} \right) \left( (1 - v) |x\rangle \langle x| + v \frac{I_{ab}}{2} \right) \right]$$

$$= (1 - v)^2 + 2v(1 - v) \text{Tr} \left[ \frac{|x\rangle \langle x|}{2} \right] + v^2 \text{Tr} \left[ \frac{I_{ab}}{4} \right] = (1 - v)^2 + v(1 - v) + \frac{v^2}{2}$$

$$\Rightarrow \epsilon_x = v - \frac{v^2}{2}.$$

For $\chi \in \{\alpha, aa\}$,

$$1 - \epsilon_{\alpha} = p(M_{\alpha}|P_{\alpha}) = \text{Tr}[\rho_{\alpha}M_{\alpha}] = 1 - \epsilon_{aa} = p(M_{aa}|P_{aa}) = \text{Tr}[\rho_{aa}M_{aa}]$$

$$= \text{Tr} \left[ \left( (1 - v)^2 |\chi\rangle \langle \chi| + (1 - (1 - v)^2) \frac{I}{4} \right) \left( (1 - v) |\chi\rangle \langle \chi| + v \frac{I}{4} \right) \right]$$

$$= (1 - v)^3 + \frac{(1 - v)^2 v}{4} + \frac{(1 - (1 - v)^2)(1 - v)}{4} + \frac{(1 - (1 - v)^2)v}{4}$$

$$= \frac{1}{4}(4 - 9v + 9v^2 - 3v^3)$$

$$\Rightarrow \epsilon_{aa} = \epsilon_{\alpha} = \frac{3}{4}v(3 - 3v + v^2),$$

and analogously for $\chi$ in $\{\beta, bb\}$ and $\{aa, bb\}$. Hence,

$$\text{Err} = \epsilon_{\alpha} + \epsilon_{\beta} + \epsilon_{a} + \epsilon_{b} + 2(\epsilon_{aa} + \epsilon_{bb}) = 2(1 - \frac{v^2}{2}) + 6 \frac{3}{4}v(3 - 3v + v^2) = \frac{1}{2}v(31 - 29v + 9v^2).$$

Following the same arguments, it is easy to see that, for the case of symmetric confusabilities, the error term in Eq. (32) becomes, as a function of $v$,

$$\text{Err}' = \frac{1}{8}v(31 - 21v + 9v^2)$$

Quantum performance

In this last subsection, we compute the global average fidelity $F_g^Q$ in the noisy setting of the optimal quantum cloner for the ideal setting as a function of the noise channel’s parameter $v$.

$$F_g^Q = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[M_{aa}\rho_{\alpha}] + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[M_{bb}\rho_{\beta}]$$

$$= \text{Tr} \left[ \left( (1 - v)^2 |xx\rangle \langle xx| + (1 - (1 - v)^2) \frac{I}{4} \right) \left( (1 - v) |\chi\rangle \langle \chi| + v \frac{I}{4} \right) \right]$$

$$= (1 - v)^3 |xx\rangle \langle xx| + \frac{(1 - (1 - v)^2)(1 - v)}{4} + \frac{(1 - (1 - v)^2)v}{4} + \frac{(1 - (1 - v)^2)v}{4}$$

$$= (1 - v)^3 |xx\rangle \langle xx| + \frac{v}{4}(3 - 3v + v^2).$$

Hence,

$$F_g^{Q, \text{noisy}}(v) := (1 - v)^3 F_g^{Q, \text{opt}} + \frac{1}{4}v(3 - 3v + v^2).$$