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One of the basic distinctions between classical and quantum mechanics is the existence of fundamentally incompatible quantities. Such quantities are present on all levels of quantum objects: states, measurements, quantum channels, and even higher order dynamics. In this manuscript we show that two seemingly different aspects of quantum incompatibility: the quantum marginal problem of states and the incompatibility on the level of quantum channels are in one-to-one correspondence with each other. Importantly, as incompatibility of measurements is a special case of channel incompatibility, it also forms an instance of the quantum marginal problem. The connection enables the translation of various results between the fields. As examples we solve the marginal problem for pairs of two-qubit Bell diagonal states, derive entropic criteria for channel incompatibility and give a task-oriented characterisation for a well-known semi-definite programming hierarchy of symmetric extendability of quantum states.

Introduction.—Quantum incompatibility is one of the cornerstones of quantum theory [1]. Although being an abstract quantity, incompatibility is closely related to the non-classical behaviour in various practical quantum protocols such as quantum steering [2–5], contextuality [6, 7], tests of macrorealism [8, 9], quantum communication advantage [10–18], and non-locality [19, 20]. In such scenarios any set of incompatible measurements results in genuinely quantum behaviour given that one possesses a properly chosen catalyst state. Conversely, if compatibility is present, the systems are classical for any input state.

Similar arguments can be made for relevant classes of shared quantum states such as entanglement [21–23] and steering [24], and for various single system properties such as coherence [25] and asymmetry [26]. In this case the measurements work as a catalyst and, as optimising over measurements is more demanding than optimising over states, it is typically more challenging to give the quantum properties of states a complete characterisation in terms of tasks. Recently, a framework generating characterisations for subsets of states (as well as for subsets of measurements) has been introduced based on discrimination tasks [12, 27, 28]. However, such characterisation is not directly applicable to shared states without introducing global measurements.

In this paper we consider a specific property of a collection of quantum states not being the reductions of any global quantum state, or in other words belonging to the complement of the set of state tuples for which the quantum marginal problem has a solution. In the case of entangled states the latter property also goes by the name of monogamy of entanglement. We then show that this property is in one-to-one correspondence with the incompatibility property of quantum channels by considering a generalised form of the Choi isomorphism. This result provides a task-oriented characterisation to the quantum marginal problem. As a special case, we develop a task-oriented characterisation for the well-known semidefinite-programming-hierarchy of symmetric extendability [29, 30].

On top of translating the operational characterisation from the field of quantum dynamics to the realm of quantum states, we exemplify the use of our technique by applying known results on the quantum marginal problem to develop criteria on channel broadcastability. Conversely, based on [31] we derive necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of a solution to the quantum marginal problem for a family of symmetric quantum states. As a special case we solve the quantum marginal problem for pairs of two-qubit Bell diagonal states [32].

Quantum marginal problem.—Quantum marginal problem is the problem of deciding whether for a set of quantum states there exists a global state that has every state of the given set as a reduced state, or sometimes called marginal. More precisely, given a collection of states \( \{ \rho_i \} \) for all \( k \) \( \{ g_{J_k} \} \), where \( J_k \subset I \) and \( I = \{ 1, \ldots, n \} \), the question is whether there exists a global state \( \gamma_I \) on \( \mathcal{H}_I \), such that \( g_{J_k} = \text{tr}_{I \setminus J_k} [\gamma_I] \) for all \( k \). It is worth noting that the quantum marginal problem is known as the \( N \)-representability problem [33] in Quantum Chemistry and is considered to be one of the most fundamental unsolved problems in this field [34]. Some partial results on the quantum marginal problem are known [35–38], however, most of them concern non-overlapping marginals, i.e. the case of disjoint sets \( J_k \) and concern only pure global states.

In this work we concentrate on a particular instance of the quantum marginal problem, where all given marginals...
are bipartite and overlap on a single party, namely where \( I := \{ A, B_1, \ldots , B_k \} \) and \( J_k := \{ A, B_k \} \). One immediate necessary condition for the existence of a global state that we will always assume to be true, is that there exists a common marginal on \( A \), i.e. \( \varrho_A = \text{tr}_{B} [\varrho_{A B}] \) is the same for all \( k \).

It is worth noting that a bipartite state is said to be \textit{symmetrically extendible} if a particular quantum marginal problem involving that state has a solution: A bipartite state \( \varrho_{A B} \) is said to have \( n \) symmetric extensions if there exists a state \( \varrho_{A B_1 \ldots B_n} \) such that \( \varrho_B = \text{tr}_{A \setminus B} [\varrho_{A B_1 \ldots B_n}] \) for all \( k \). The states which possess \( n \) symmetric extensions for all \( n = 2, 3, \ldots \) have been characterized (in finite dimensions) as exactly the separable states [39, 40]. See also [41, 42] for the infinite-dimensional case.

Our main result requires a quantifier for incompatibility of states. For this purpose we define a consistent robustness measure for the marginal problem. In the simplest case we have a pair of bipartite states sharing a common first marginal \( \varrho_A \), labeled by \( \varrho_{A(B_1, B_2)} := (\varrho_{A B_1}, \varrho_{A B_2}) \). For this scenario the consistent robustness is defined as

\[
R^c_F[\varrho_{A(B_1, B_2)}] = \min \left\{ t \geq 0 : \frac{\varrho + t \tau}{1 + t} \in F \right\},
\]

where the optimization is performed over all pairs of states \( \tau_{(A B_1, A B_2)} \) with the common marginals \( \text{tr}_{B_1} [\tau_{A B_1}] = \varrho_B \) and \( F \) denotes those pairs of states for which a joint state exists. The term consistent refers to the fact that we don’t consider mixing with all pairs of states, but only the ones with a consistent first marginal with respect to the original pair. The consistent robustness measure can be defined analogously for the problem of symmetric extendibility and for sets of three and more states.

\textit{Quantum channels and compatibility.} — Quantum channels describe changes of quantum systems induced by, e.g., measurements or time evolution. We work exclusively in the Schrödinger picture whereupon channels are linear maps on operators that take states of an input system described by Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H}_A \) into states of the output system described by \( \mathcal{H}_B \); we denote such channels as \( \Phi_{A \rightarrow B} \). Mathematically, channels are completely positive trace-preserving (cptp) maps.

To introduce channel compatibility, we need three systems denoted as \( \mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{H}_{B_1}, \) and \( \mathcal{H}_{B_2} \). We say that channels \( \Phi_{A \rightarrow B_1} \) and \( \Phi_{A \rightarrow B_2} \) are \textit{compatible} if there exists a broadcasting channel from which they can be obtained as marginals [43]. More precisely, compatibility refers to the existence of a channel \( \Phi_{A \rightarrow B_2|B_1} \) such that

\[
\Phi_{A \rightarrow B_1} (\varrho) = \text{tr}_{B_2} [\Phi_{A \rightarrow B_2|B_1} (\varrho)], \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_{A \rightarrow B_2} (\varrho) = \text{tr}_{B_1} [\Phi_{A \rightarrow B_2|B_1} (\varrho)],
\]

for all states \( \varrho \) on \( \mathcal{H}_A \). This formulation can be directly generalized to the multipartite case: Consider the set \( I := \{ A, B_1, \ldots , B_k \} \) and its subsets \( J_k := \{ A, B_k \} \), each associated with a channel \( \Phi_{J_k} := \Phi_{A \rightarrow B_k} \). These channels are compatible if there is a channel \( \Phi_I \) with the input system \( A \) and the multipartite output Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \) such that \( \Phi_{J_k} (\varrho) = \text{tr}_{I \setminus J_k} [\Phi_I (\varrho)] \) for all input states \( \varrho \).

It is worth noting that channel compatibility contains measurement incompatibility as a special case. Namely, a measurement is represented as positive-operator-valued measure (POVM) \( \mathbf{M} \), that is a collection \( \{ M_a \} \) of positive operators such that \( \sum_a M_a = \mathbb{1} \). A set of POVMs \( \{ M_{a_{ij}} \} \) is called compatible if there exists a single POVM \( \{ G_a \} \) and classical post-processings, i.e. probability distributions, \( \{ p(a|x, \lambda) \} \) such that \( A_{a_{ij}} = \sum_a p(a|x, \lambda) G_a \). As POVMs correspond to channels with trivial output, it is straightforward to see that a set of measurements is compatible if and only if the corresponding channels are compatible, see also [43].

We say that a channel \( \Phi_{A \rightarrow B} \) is \textit{n-self-compatible} if it is broadcasted \( n \) times by some channel, i.e., for \( I = \{ A, B_1, \ldots , B_n \} \) with \( B_i = B \) for all \( i \) and \( \{ A, B_k \} = J_k \), there is a channel \( \Phi_I \) with the input system \( A \) and the multipartite output Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \), such that \( \Phi_{A \rightarrow B} (\varrho) = \text{tr}_{I \setminus J_k} [\Phi_I (\varrho)] \) for all \( k \) and all input states \( \varrho \). We call 2-self-compatible channels simply self-compatible. Channels \( \Phi_{A \rightarrow B_1} \) and \( \Phi_{A \rightarrow B_2} \) are compatible if and only if \( \Phi_{A \rightarrow B_1} = \Phi_{B_1 \rightarrow B_2} \circ \Phi_{A \rightarrow B_2} \) for some \( B_1 \rightarrow B_2 \) channel \( \Phi_{B_1 \rightarrow B_2} \) where \( \Phi_{A \rightarrow B_1} \) is (one of) the conjugate channels of \( \Phi_{A \rightarrow B_1} \) [43]. Clearly this means that a channel is self compatible if and only if it is in this channel post-processing sense below its own conjugate channel. Such channels are also called \textit{antidegradable}. Channels which are \textit{n}-self-compatible for any \( n = 2, 3, \ldots \) have been identified as exactly the entanglement-breaking channels (or measure-and-prepare channels) in Ref. [43].

Compatible sets of channels form a convex set and, hence, channel incompatibility has a natural quantifier called the generalised robustness. Formally, for a set of channels \( \Gamma \) one defines the generalised robustness \( R^c_F (\Gamma) \) with respect to the compatible set \( F \) as

\[
R^c_F (\Gamma) = \min \left\{ t \geq 0 : \frac{\Lambda + t \Gamma}{1 + t} \in F \right\},
\]

where the optimisation is over all sets of channels \( \Gamma \) (with as many members as in \( \Lambda \)).

\textit{The channel-state dualism.} — In this paper, we work with finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces, although the methodology presented in this section generalizes to the infinite-dimensional case in a straightforward manner. Using the spectral decomposition \( \varrho = \sum_n t_n |n\rangle \langle n| \) of a full-rank state, with an orthonormal basis \( \{ |1\rangle, |2\rangle, \ldots \} \subseteq \mathcal{H} \) and eigenvalues \( t_n > 0 \), we define \( \Omega := \sum_n \sqrt{t_n} |n\rangle \otimes |n\rangle \) and call such \( \Omega \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H} \) a canonical purification for \( \varrho \). The following results call for canonical purifications of full-rank states, although we may actually often use more general (cyclic) purifying vectors.

Let \( \mathcal{H}_A \) and \( \mathcal{H}_B \) be Hilbert spaces. Whenever \( g_A \) is a full-rank state on \( \mathcal{H}_A \) and \( \Omega_A \) is a canonical purification for \( g_A \), we denote, for all \( A \rightarrow B \)-channels \( \Phi_{A \rightarrow B} \)

\[
S_{\Omega_A} (\Phi_{A \rightarrow B}) := (\text{id} \otimes \Phi_{A \rightarrow B}) (| \Omega_A \rangle \langle \Omega_A |)
\]
and call this as the $[\Omega_A]$-Choi state of $\Phi_{A\to B}$. According to Refs. [5, 44], the map $S_{[\Omega_A]}$ is a well defined bijection between the set of channels $\Phi_{A\to B}$ and the set of bipartite states $\varrho_{AB}$ with the fixed first marginal $\text{tr}_B[\varrho_{AB}] = \varrho_A$. On the other hand, when $\varrho_{AB}$ is a state on $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, by assuming that the reduced state $\varrho_A = \text{tr}_B[\varrho_{AB}]$ is of full rank (which we are free to do possibly by restricting the dimension of the subsystem $A$) and by giving $\varrho_A$ the canonical purification $[\Omega_A]$, we call the unique channel $\Phi_{A\to B}$ such that $S_{[\Omega_A]}(\Phi) = \varrho_{AB}$ as the $[\Omega_A]$-Choi channel of $\varrho_{AB}$.

One easily finds that the Choi-channel $\Phi_{A\to B}$ of a bipartite state $\varrho_{AB}$ with the margin $\varrho_A$ can be expressed through

$$\Phi_{A\to B}(\varrho) = \text{tr}_A[\varrho_{AB}(\varrho_A^{-1/2} \varrho^{T_A} \varrho_A^{-1/2} \otimes 1_{\mathcal{H}_B})]$$ (3)

where $\varrho \mapsto \varrho^{T_A}$ is the transpose defined w.r.t. the eigen-basis of $\varrho_A$. This inversion formula shows that the Choi-channel of a bipartite state is unique (up to choosing the canonical purification of its first marginal) whereas the Choi state of a channel depends on the full-rank state of the input system and its purification chosen to set up the Choi-Jamiołkowski isomorphism.

Main result.— It is clear that having a matching marginal (on Alice’s side) is a necessary condition for the existence of a joint state. As this amounts to fixing the mapping in the Choi-Jamiołkowski isomorphism, we are ready to state our first observation. The proof can be found in the Appendix A.

**Theorem 1.** Fix the Choi-Jamiołkowski isomorphism, i.e., the full-rank state on $\mathcal{H}_A$ and its canonical purification. A set of channels is compatible if and only if the marginal problem involving their Choi states has a solution. Moreover, this connection is quantitative in that the consistent marginal robustness matches with the incompatibility robustness of the channels.

Note that as a special case of our result one gets a connection between symmetric extendibility and self-extendibility of channels.

Operational interpretation.— The generalised robustness does not only quantify the convex distance from a set, but it also quantifies the possible outperformance of a given set by some point outside of the set in a tailored task [17, 27, 28]. In the case of channel compatibility the task is an input-output game, i.e. a game where one party inputs states from an assemblage to the channels and another party tries to guess the input state by making measurements on the output. In the case of shared states the task is a minimum-error discrimination task that per se does not require the task to be performed using local measurements. Motivated by our result, we present a slight modification of the game formalism that is tailored for shared states and uses only local measurements.

To introduce the idea, it is sufficient to consider the problem of symmetric extendibility of bipartite states. For this purpose, we define a correlation game $G$ as a tuple consisting of a POVM $\{M_a\}$ on Alice, a POVM $\{N_b\}$ on Bob, and a real-valued reward function $\omega_{ab}$ assigning a score to each pair of outcomes $(a,b)$. The task of the players is to prepare a shared state $\varrho_{AB}$ that maximises the following payoff

$$P(\varrho_{AB}, G) := \sum_{a,b} \omega_{ab} \text{tr}[(M_a \otimes N_b)\varrho_{AB}].$$ (4)

The payoff is covariant under scaling and shifting of the reward function. This motivates one to define a canonical form of the game as one that has the minimum payoff equal to zero and the maximal payoff equal to one when optimised over shared states.

As symmetric extendibility can be seen as a property of a single state instead of a set of states, we note that Eq. (1) can be as well written for single shared states. To simplify the discussion further, we take a slightly relaxed version of the consistent robustness, i.e. the generalised robustness $R^F_G$ defined as in Eq. (2). In case of states this is exactly Eq. (1) with the modification that the states $\tau$ do not have to share a common marginal with $\varrho_{AB}$. Noting, furthermore, that the payoff is linear in the reward function. This motivates one to define a canonical form of the game as one that has the minimum payoff equal to zero and the maximal payoff equal to one when optimised over shared states.

As symmetric extendibility can be seen as a property of a single state instead of a set of states, we note that Eq. (1) can be as well written for single shared states. To simplify the discussion further, we take a slightly relaxed version of the consistent robustness, i.e. the generalised robustness $R^F_G$ defined as in Eq. (2). In case of states this is exactly Eq. (1) with the modification that the states $\tau$ do not have to share a common marginal with $\varrho_{AB}$. Noting, furthermore, that the payoff is linear in the reward function.

As symmetric extendibility can be seen as a property of a single state instead of a set of states, we note that Eq. (1) can be as well written for single shared states. To simplify the discussion further, we take a slightly relaxed version of the consistent robustness, i.e. the generalised robustness $R^F_G$ defined as in Eq. (2). In case of states this is exactly Eq. (1) with the modification that the states $\tau$ do not have to share a common marginal with $\varrho_{AB}$. Noting, furthermore, that the payoff is linear in the reward function. This motivates one to define a canonical form of the game as one that has the minimum payoff equal to zero and the maximal payoff equal to one when optimised over shared states.

As symmetric extendibility can be seen as a property of a single state instead of a set of states, we note that Eq. (1) can be as well written for single shared states. To simplify the discussion further, we take a slightly relaxed version of the consistent robustness, i.e. the generalised robustness $R^F_G$ defined as in Eq. (2). In case of states this is exactly Eq. (1) with the modification that the states $\tau$ do not have to share a common marginal with $\varrho_{AB}$. Noting, furthermore, that the payoff is linear in the reward function. This motivates one to define a canonical form of the game as one that has the minimum payoff equal to zero and the maximal payoff equal to one when optimised over shared states.

As symmetric extendibility can be seen as a property of a single state instead of a set of states, we note that Eq. (1) can be as well written for single shared states. To simplify the discussion further, we take a slightly relaxed version of the consistent robustness, i.e. the generalised robustness $R^F_G$ defined as in Eq. (2). In case of states this is exactly Eq. (1) with the modification that the states $\tau$ do not have to share a common marginal with $\varrho_{AB}$. Noting, furthermore, that the payoff is linear in the reward function. This motivates one to define a canonical form of the game as one that has the minimum payoff equal to zero and the maximal payoff equal to one when optimised over shared states.

As symmetric extendibility can be seen as a property of a single state instead of a set of states, we note that Eq. (1) can be as well written for single shared states. To simplify the discussion further, we take a slightly relaxed version of the consistent robustness, i.e. the generalised robustness $R^F_G$ defined as in Eq. (2). In case of states this is exactly Eq. (1) with the modification that the states $\tau$ do not have to share a common marginal with $\varrho_{AB}$. Noting, furthermore, that the payoff is linear in the reward function. This motivates one to define a canonical form of the game as one that has the minimum payoff equal to zero and the maximal payoff equal to one when optimised over shared states.
The validity of the Slater condition corresponds to finding a $\sigma_{AB} \in C_F$ such that $\sigma_{AB} > g_{AB}$. This is clearly true whenever there is a full-rank point in the cone $C_F$. As the completely mixed state is in all the cones we consider, we conclude that the optimal value of the primal and the dual problem coincide in our scenarios.

Crucially, any positive operator $W$ on the shared system can be written as $W = \sum_{a,b} \omega_{ab} M_a \otimes N_b$ with $\omega_{ab}$ being real numbers and the sets $\{M_a\}$ and $\{N_b\}$ forming PovM. As from Eq. (1) it is clear that for an optimal witness $W$ one has $\text{tr}[W \tau_{AB}] = 0$, the optimal solution forms an instance of a canonical correlation game up to scaling. We arrive at the following formula noting that the left-hand-side is independent of scaling

$$\sup_G \frac{P(\rho_{AB}, G)}{\max_{\sigma_{AB} \in F} P(\sigma_{AB}, G)} = 1 + R_F^g[\rho_{AB}] \quad (7)$$

Symmetric extendibility can be characterised through hierarchy of semi-definite programs in which the level $n$ of the hierarchy checks for the existence of $n$ symmetric extensions [29, 30]. Choosing the set $F$ to be those shared states that have $n$ or less symmetric extensions gives a task-oriented characterisation for the level $n$ of the hierarchy. The statement holds true also for the limit of infinite extensions, i.e. for separability. Hence, we have derived a task-oriented characterisation for all levels of the hierarchy in terms of correlation games.

It is worth noting that having $n$ symmetric extensions implies that in a correlation experiment any set of $n$ measurements (on Bob’s side) becomes effectively commutative as one can measure each observable on a different subsystem. As such, states with $n$ symmetric extensions behave classically in steering and non-locality tests with $n$ measurements on the extended side. Our result shows that whereas it is not clear whether a given state with exactly $n$ extensions is useful in such correlation experiments with $n+1$ measurements, there is a correlation game in which an advantage quantified by the robustness can be witnessed.

To see that the correlation game characterisation can be given for the marginal problem, we note that all the above calculations can be performed in the marginal scenario by treating pairs (or sets) of shared states as direct sums. One first notes that the free set consists of sums of states and as such the object function of the primal problem will be normalised accordingly, i.e. divided by the number of states. Second, each block of the witness $W$ is given individually a decomposition of the aforementioned type. Finally, the payoff becomes the sum of the payoffs of the individual blocks.

From states to channels. — As mentioned in the introduction, there is no general solution to the quantum marginal problem for the case of overlapping marginals. For the low-dimensional case the existence of a global quantum state $\rho_{AB_1 B_2}$ given $\rho_{AB_1}$ and $\rho_{AB_2}$ can be determined via semidefinite programming (SDP) [45, 46]. In principle, such techniques can be translated to compatibility questions of channels using Theorem 1. However, for higher-dimensional cases, the size of the SDP becomes unmanageable. One can give some approximate solutions by means of entropic constraints, see, e.g., Ref. [47]. Here we choose to demonstrate the use of Theorem 1 by translating the basic entropic results into witnesses of channel incompatibility.

Let us define the $\Omega_A$-entropy of a channel $\Phi_{A \rightarrow B}$ as the von Neumann entropy of its $\Omega_A$-Choi state

$$H_{\Omega_A}(\Phi_{A \rightarrow B}) = - \text{tr}[S_{\Omega_A}(\Phi_{A \rightarrow B}) \log S_{\Omega_A}(\Phi_{A \rightarrow B})].$$

Entropy of the reduced states of $\Omega_A$-Choi state of $\Phi_{A \rightarrow B}$ are simply von Neumann entropy of state $\rho_A$, $H(\rho_A)$ for which $\Omega_A$ is a canonical purifying vector, and von Neumann entropy of $\rho_B = \Phi_{A \rightarrow B}(\rho_A^T)$, where transpose is taken with respect to the basis in which $\Omega_A$-Choi state of $\Phi_{A \rightarrow B}$ is defined.

Von Neumann entropy is known to satisfy certain linear inequalities, sometimes called axioms of entropy [48, 49]. Most notable ones are strong subadditivity (SSA) [49] and weak monotonicity (WM) (Eq. (3.2) of Ref. [48]). The latter can be directly applied to our problem. It takes the following form for two channels $\Phi_{A \rightarrow B_1}$ and $\Phi_{A \rightarrow B_2}$

$$H_{\Omega_A}(\Phi_{A \rightarrow B_1}) + H_{\Omega_A}(\Phi_{A \rightarrow B_2}) - H(\rho_{B_1}) - H(\rho_{B_2}) \geq 0. \quad (8)$$

Although, the above entropic constraints provide only necessary conditions for compatibility, they are applicable to channels of arbitrary dimension. In Fig. 2 we show the boundaries of the areas of compatibility of two depolarizing channels $\Phi_{A \rightarrow B_1}$ and $\Phi_{A \rightarrow B_2}$ defined below.

$$\Phi_{A \rightarrow B_1}(g) = (1 - \mu)W(q, p)gW(q, p)^\dagger + \frac{1}{d}1_d \quad \text{and}$$

$$\Phi_{A \rightarrow B_2}(g) = (1 - \nu)W(r, s)gW(r, s)^\dagger + \frac{1}{d}1_d, \quad (9)$$

with $W(q, p)|j\rangle = e^{i\frac{q}{2}(q+2)p}|j + q\rangle$, for $q, p, r, s \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. For dimensions $d = 2$ and $d = 16$ we compare the constraints from the entropic inequality (8) with analytical
The entropic constraint in Eq. 8 is not the only one that can be translated. For more constraints and their derivation please see Appendix B.

As already stated, the case of symmetric extendibility is a noteworthy example of the marginal problem. The symmetric extension problem involving a bipartite qubit state has been fully resolved in Ref. [51] and this result readily characterizes self-compatibility and, hence, the antidegradability of any qubit-to-qubit channel. See the straight-forward translation in the Appendix C. A very similar analysis to characterize the antidegradable qubit-to-qubit channels has been carried out in Ref. [52]. It is clear that the aforementioned entropic constraints can also be applied to the problem of symmetric extendibility. More details are given in the Appendix B.

From channels to states.— Here we illustrate another direction of Theorem 1 by translating known results for channel compatibility to marginal problem. Let us again consider two depolarizing channels \( \Phi_{A \rightarrow B_1} \) and \( \Phi_{A \rightarrow B_2} \) defined in Eq. 9. The compatibility of these channels was completely characterised in Ref. [31]: for \( \mu, \nu \in [0, 1] \), the channels \( \Phi_{A \rightarrow B_1} \) and \( \Phi_{A \rightarrow B_2} \) are compatible if and only if

\[
\mu + \frac{2}{d} \sqrt{\mu \nu} + \nu \geq 1. \tag{10}
\]

Using Theorem 1 we get the following result.

**Proposition 1.** Suppose that \( |\varphi_{AB_1} \rangle \in H_A \otimes H_{B_1} \) and \( |\varphi_{AB_2} \rangle \in H_A \otimes H_{B_2} \) are unit vectors such that \( \text{tr}_{B_1} |\varphi_{AB_1} \rangle \langle \varphi_{AB_1}| = \text{tr}_{B_2} |\varphi_{AB_2} \rangle \langle \varphi_{AB_2}| =: \varrho_A \) is of full rank. For \( \mu, \nu \in [0, 1] \), there is a tripartite state \( \varrho_{AB_1B_2} \) such that \( \varrho_{AB_1} = (1 - \mu) |\varphi_{AB_1} \rangle \langle \varphi_{AB_1}| + \mu \frac{1}{d} \varrho_A \otimes I_d \) and \( \varrho_{AB_2} = (1 - \nu) |\varphi_{AB_2} \rangle \langle \varphi_{AB_2}| + \nu \frac{1}{d} \varrho_A \otimes I_d \) if and only if inequality (10) holds.

**Proof.** Suppose that \( |\Omega_A \rangle \) is a standard purifying vector for \( \varrho_A \). It easily follows that there are unitaries \( U_{B_1} \) and \( U_{B_2} \) such that \( |\varphi_{AB_1} \rangle = |\Omega_A \rangle \otimes |\psi_{B_1}\rangle \) and \( |\varphi_{AB_2} \rangle = |\Omega_A \rangle \otimes |\psi_{B_2}\rangle \). Clearly the original states are margins of a tripartite state if and only if there is a tripartite state \( \varrho_{AB_1B_2} \) such that \( \varrho_{AB_1} = \varrho_{B_1} \) and \( \varrho_{AB_2} = \varrho_{B_2} \), where \( \varrho_A := (1 - \lambda) |\Omega_A \rangle \langle \Omega_A| + \lambda \frac{1}{d} \varrho_A \otimes I_d \) for all \( \lambda \in [0, 1] \). Using the channel state dualism \( S_{\Omega_A} \), this problem is equivalent with finding those \( \mu, \nu \in [0, 1] \) such that the channels \( g \mapsto (1 - \mu) g + \mu \frac{1}{d} I_d \) and \( g \mapsto (1 - \nu) g + \nu \frac{1}{d} I_d \) are compatible. This happens, according to the above, if and only if the inequality (10) holds. \( \square \)

As a special case of Proposition 1, we have the following: for the maximally entangled state \( |\Omega \rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_d} |j, j\rangle \otimes |j, j\rangle \) and \( \mu, \nu \in [0, 1] \), there is a tripartite state \( \varrho_{AB_1B_2} \) such that \( \varrho_{AB_1} = (1 - \mu) |\Omega_A \rangle \langle \Omega_A| + \mu \frac{1}{d} I_d \otimes I_d \) and \( \varrho_{AB_2} = (1 - \nu) |\Omega_A \rangle \langle \Omega_A| + \nu \frac{1}{d} I_d \otimes I_d \) if and only if inequality (10) holds. In the simplest case where \( d = 2 \), we can say a little bit more. In this situation, the relevant channels are Pauli channels, i.e., convex mixtures of the unitary channels associated with the Pauli matrices (in a fixed basis). In order to state our result in this case we need to introduce the following Notations. For all probability vectors \( p = (p_0, p_2, p_y, p_z) \) and \( q = (q_0, q_2, q_y, q_z) \) and real numbers \( \lambda, \mu, \nu \in [-1, 1] \) we define a \( 4 \times 4 \)-matrix

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
 p_0 & \lambda & \mu & (q_1) - \nu \\
 \lambda & p_2 & \nu & (q_2) - \mu \\
 \mu & \nu & p_y & (q_3) - \lambda \\
 (q_1) - \nu & (q_2) - \mu & (q_3) - \lambda & p_z
\end{pmatrix},
\tag{11}
\]

where \( (q_1) = \frac{1}{2}(q_0 - q_x - q_y + q_z) \), \( (q_2) = \frac{1}{2}(q_0 + q_x - q_y - q_z) \), and \( (q_3) = \frac{1}{2}(q_0 + q_x + q_y - q_z) \). The above matrix is denoted by \( M_{p,q}(\lambda, \mu, \nu) \). Furthermore, for any probability vector \( p = (p_0, p_2, p_y, p_z) \) we denote by \( \Phi_p \) the channel \( g \mapsto p_0 g + p_2 \sigma_x \sigma_1^1 + p_y \sigma_y \sigma_1^1 + p_z \sigma_z \sigma_1^1 \). According to Ref. [31], channels \( \Phi_p \) and \( \Phi_q \) are compatible if and only if there are \( \lambda, \mu, \nu \in [-1, 1] \) such that \( M_{p,q}(\lambda, \mu, \nu) \geq 0 \).

Define the two-qubit vectors \( |\Omega_0 \rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0, 0 \rangle + |1, 1 \rangle) \), where \( \{|0, 1\} \) is the eigenvector of \( \sigma_z \), and \( |\Omega_r \rangle := (|1 \otimes \sigma_x| \Omega_0 \rangle \) for \( r = x, y, z \). A two-qubit state \( \varrho \) is called Bell diagonal if there is a probability vector \( p = (p_0, p_2, p_y, p_z) \) such that \( \varrho = g_p := p_0 |\Omega_r \rangle \langle \Omega_r| + p_z |\Omega_0 \rangle \langle \Omega_0| + p_2 |\Omega_y \rangle \langle \Omega_y| + p_1 |\Omega_x \rangle \langle \Omega_x| \). The following result follows from Theorem 1 and the above result on compatibility of Pauli channels. We are ready to state the solution to the marginal problem of two Bell-diagonal two-qubit states.

**Proposition 2.** For probability vectors \( p \) and \( q \), there is a three-qubit state \( \varrho_{AB_1B_2} \) such that \( \varrho_{AB_1} = \varrho_p \) and \( \varrho_{AB_2} = \varrho_q \) if and only if there are \( \lambda, \mu, \nu \in [-1, 1] \) such that \( M_{p,q}(\lambda, \mu, \nu) \geq 0 \).

Together with the symmetric extendibility result of Ref. [51], Proposition 2 can be taken as a first step towards characterizing all those pairs of two-qubit states which are margins of a three-qubit state.

**Conclusions.**— In this work we have built a connection between channel compatibility and marginal problems. Importantly, this brings together seemingly different modes of incompatibility, i.e., incompatibility of states, measurements and channels. Moreover, as a special case, our work proves a connection between symmetric extendibility on the level of states and self-compatibility on the level of channels.

To demonstrate the usefulness of the connection, we have translated results from one field to the other. First, as channel compatibility has a task-oriented characterisation, we have provided a corresponding interpretation for compatibility of states and especially semi-definite programming hierarchies for symmetric extendibility. Second, we have characterised the compatibility of Bell diagonal two-qubit states, hence, extending former results on symmetric extendibility of this class. Third, we have provided analytical and easy to evaluate criteria for channel and, hence, measurement incompatibility. Finally, we have discussed the self-compatibility or antidegradability of channels, the qubit case being completely characterised.

The connection between compatibility and marginal problems as presented in Theorem 1 is also valid when the
input system of the channels, i.e., the shared subsystem of the marginal states, is a separable Hilbert space but not necessarily finite dimensional. The other Hilbert spaces may even be non-separable. Marginal problems are mainly studied in the finite-dimensional settings but this connection allows us to approach infinite-dimensional marginal problems using the well-established methods of incompatibility developed for the study of compatibility of channels between infinite-dimensional systems. One promising future direction is Gaussian states and channels. Furthermore, it will be of interest to search for task-oriented characterisations of quantum properties in this setting.
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Appendix A: Formal statement and proof of Theorem 1

In this appendix we give a more formal statement of our central result, Theorem 1, with a proof. We also give some small additional results alluded to in this paper this far.

Let us first derive Equation (3). Let us assume that $\Phi_{A\rightarrow B}$ is a channel and $\varrho_{AB}$ is a state on $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$ such that this state and channel are connected with the Choi-Jamiolkowski isomorphism associated with a canonical purification $|\Omega_A\rangle$ of the first margin $\varrho_A$ of $\varrho_{AB}$. We may assume that there are $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that $\sum_n |\langle n| \varrho_A| n\rangle| \leq \epsilon_0$. Denote the transpose defined w.r.t. the basis $\{|n\rangle\}_n$ by $D \mapsto D^T$. Recall that we may define the Heisenberg dual $\Phi_{AB}$ (a completely positive (normal) linear map taking bounded operators of the output $\mathcal{H}_B$ to those of the input $\mathcal{H}_A$) of $\Phi_{A\rightarrow B}$ through $\text{tr}[\Phi_{A\rightarrow B}(D)] = \text{tr}[\Phi_{A\rightarrow B}(\varrho)D]$. We have, for any bounded operator $D$ on $\mathcal{H}_B$ and $\mathcal{H}_E$ on $\mathcal{H}_E$,

$$\text{tr}[\varrho_{AB}(D \otimes E)] = \text{tr}[(\text{id} \otimes \Phi_{A\rightarrow B})(|\Omega_A\rangle \langle \Omega_A|)D \otimes E] = \langle \Omega_A| D \otimes \Phi_{A\rightarrow B}(E)|\Omega_A\rangle = \sum_{m,n} \sqrt{t_m t_n} |m\rangle \langle n| \Phi_{A\rightarrow B}(E) |n\rangle = \sum_{m,n} \sqrt{t_m t_n} |n\rangle \langle m| \Phi_{A\rightarrow B}^\dagger(A) |m\rangle \langle n| \Phi_{A\rightarrow B}^\dagger(E) |n\rangle = \text{tr}\left[\varrho_A^{1/2} D \varrho_A^{1/2} \Phi_{A\rightarrow B}(E)\right] = \text{tr}\left[\Phi_{A\rightarrow B}(\varrho_A^{1/2} D \varrho_A^{1/2}) \Phi_{A\rightarrow B}(E)\right].$$

Note that this calculation holds even in the case where $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$ is infinite dimensional and separable. If dim $\mathcal{H}_A < \infty$, we may substitute $D = \varrho_A^{-1/2} D \varrho_A^{-1/2}$, and we obtain Equation (3). Note also that, even when $\mathcal{H}_A$ is separable but not finite dimensional, $\Phi_{A\rightarrow B}$ is fully determined by evaluating it on inputs $\varrho_A^{1/2} D \varrho_A^{1/2}$ with bounded operators $D$ on $\mathcal{H}_A$ whenever $\varrho_A$ is faithful (which is the proper counterpart of being of full rank in infinite dimensions) since this set is dense in the trace class of $\mathcal{H}_A$ w.r.t. the trace norm.

We may now formalize Theorem 1:

Theorem 2. Denote $I := \{A, B_1, \ldots, B_n\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $J_j := \{A, B_j\}$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, where $A$ is associated with the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $B_j$ with $\mathcal{H}_{B_j}$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Moreover, we define $H_j := \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_j}$ and $H := \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_n}$.

(i) Let $\varrho_A$ be a full-rank (or, in the infinite-dimensional case, faithful) state on $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $|\Omega_A\rangle$ be a canonical purification for $\varrho_A$. Channels $\Phi_{A\rightarrow B_j}$ from $\mathcal{H}_A$ to $\mathcal{H}_{B_j}$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, are compatible if and only if there is a state $\varrho$ on $H$ such that $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_A} [\varrho_B] = S_{|\Omega_A\rangle\langle \Omega_A|}(\Phi_{A\rightarrow B_j})$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$.

(ii) Let $\varrho_B$ be a state over $\mathcal{H}_B$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$. There is a state $\varrho$ on $H$ such that $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_A} [\varrho_B] = \varrho_B$ if and only if $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_A} [\varrho_B] = \varrho_B$ is fixed for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$ and, upon assuming that $\varrho_A$ is of full rank (or faithful) and picking a canonical purification $|\Omega_A\rangle$ for $\varrho_A$, the $|\Omega_A\rangle$-Choi channels of $\varrho_B$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, are compatible.

(iii) Let $\Phi_{A\rightarrow B_j}$ be channels from $\mathcal{H}_A$ to $\mathcal{H}_{B_j}$ and $\varrho_B$ be states over $\mathcal{H}_j$ sharing the common (full-rank or faithful) $A$-margin $\varrho_A$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$, and pick a canonical purification $|\Omega_A\rangle$ for $\varrho_A$. Whatever $\rho_j = S_{|\Omega_A\rangle\langle \Omega_A|}(\Phi_{A\rightarrow B_j})$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$, the incompatibility robustness of $(\Phi_{A\rightarrow B_1}, \ldots, \Phi_{A\rightarrow B_n})$ coincides with the consistent marginal robustness of $(\varrho_1, \ldots, \varrho_n)$.

Proof. Let us prove item (i): Let us first assume that $\Phi_{A\rightarrow B_j}$ are compatible and fix a joint channel $\Phi$ for them; recall that the input space of $\Phi$ is $\mathcal{H}_A$ and the output space is $\mathcal{H}_{B_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_n}$. Denote $\varrho_j := S_{|\Omega_A\rangle\langle \Omega_A|}(\Phi_{A\rightarrow B_j})$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, and $\varrho := S_{|\Omega_A\rangle\langle \Omega_A|}(\Phi)$. Denote the identity operator on $\mathcal{H}_{B_j}$ by $\mathbb{I}_j$. Using the above derivation of Equation (3), we have, for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$,

$$\text{tr}[\varrho_j(D \otimes E)] = \text{tr}\left[\Phi_{A\rightarrow B_j}(\varrho_A^{1/2} D \varrho_A^{1/2}) \mathbb{I}_j(\mathbb{I}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{I}_{j-1} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{j+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{I}_n)\right] = \text{tr}[\varrho(D \otimes \mathbb{I}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{I}_{j-1} \otimes E \otimes \mathbb{I}_{j+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{I}_n)]= \text{tr}[\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_A\mathcal{H}_{B_j\backslash j}}(\varrho(D \otimes E))].$$
for all bounded operators $D$ on $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $E$ on $\mathcal{H}_B$. Thus, $\varrho_j = \text{tr}_{\Gamma[J_j]}[\varrho]$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$. The proof of the converse statement is contained in the proof of item (ii).

Let us go on to proving item (ii): Note that, for the existence of a joint state $\varrho$ of the claim, it is necessary that the $A$-margins of the states $\varrho_j$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, coincide. According to our earlier observation, we may freely assume that this shared margin $\varrho_A$ is of full rank (or faithful) and we may fix a canonical purification $\{\Omega_A\}$ for it. Assume first that there is $\varrho$ such that $\text{tr}_{\Gamma[J_j]}[\varrho] = \varrho_j$. Denote, for each $j = 1, \ldots, n$, by $\Phi_{A\rightarrow B_j}$ the channel such that $S_{[\Omega_A]}(\Phi_{A\rightarrow B_j}) = \varrho_j$ and by $\Phi$ the channel (with the input $\mathcal{H}_A$ and output $\mathcal{H}_{B_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_n}$) such that $S_{\{\Omega_A\}}(\Phi) = \varrho$. Denote, again, the identity operator on $\mathcal{H}_B$ by $I_1$ and pick $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. For any bounded $D$ on $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $E$ on $\mathcal{H}_{B_j}$,

$$
\text{tr}[\text{tr}_{\Gamma[J_j]}(\varrho^{1/2} D^{1/2})E] = \text{tr}[\varrho^{1/2} D^{1/2}] (1_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes 1_{j-1} \otimes E \otimes 1_{j+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes 1_n)
$$

$$=
\text{tr}[\varrho (D^{TA} \otimes 1_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes 1_{j-1} \otimes E \otimes 1_{j+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes 1_n)] = \text{tr}[\varrho_j (D^{TA} \otimes E)] = \text{tr}[\Phi_{A\rightarrow B_j} (\varrho_A^{1/2} D^{1/2})E].
$$

According to our discussion after the proof of Equation (3), this implies $\Phi_{A\rightarrow B_j} (\varrho) = \text{tr}_{\Gamma[J_j]}(\Phi(\varrho))$ for all states $\varrho$ on $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $j = 1, \ldots, n$. The proof of the converse statement follows from the proof of item (i).

The item (iii) follows from the observation that the Choi-Jamiolkowski isomorphism $S_{[\Omega_A]}$ is an affine bijection between the set of channels $\Phi_{A\rightarrow B}$ and the set of states $\varrho_{AB}$ such that $\text{tr}_{B}[\varrho_{AB}] = \varrho_A$ is fixed (and of full rank or faithful). Thus, all the convex structures of these sets are mapped in a one-to-one fashion and, particularly, the two robustness measures coincide.

\section*{Appendix B: More entropic constraints}

Further constraints can be derived by combining SSA and WM constraints in a way that the resulting inequalities do not contain the unknown parameters like $\langle \Omega_A \rangle$-entropy of global channels. This can be done with the techniques of linear programming (see e.g. Ref. [53]). Here we introduce a new constraint for compatibility of three channels $\Phi_{A\rightarrow B_1}$, $\Phi_{A\rightarrow B_2}$, and $\Phi_{A\rightarrow B_3}$:

$$
H_{[\Omega_A]}(\Phi_{A\rightarrow B_1}) + H_{[\Omega_A]}(\Phi_{A\rightarrow B_2}) + 2H_{[\Omega_A]}(\Phi_{A\rightarrow B_3}) - H(\varrho_{B_1}) - H(\varrho_{B_2}) - 2H(\varrho_A) \geq 0. \quad (B1)
$$

Naturally, the entropic constraints can be applied to the problem of self-compatibility of quantum channels (as a translation of the results on symmetric extendibility of states). Taking both marginal entropies and $\langle \Omega_A \rangle$-entropies of channels equal, we obtain conditions for self-compatibility of channel $\Phi_{A\rightarrow B}$: $H_{[\Omega_A]}(\Phi_{A\rightarrow B}) - H(\varrho_B) \geq 0$ and $2H_{[\Omega_A]}(\Phi_{A\rightarrow B}) - H(\varrho_B) - H(\varrho_A) \geq 0$ from Eq. (8) and Eq. (B1) respectively. Whenever $H(\varrho_A) \geq H(\varrho_B)$, the second constraint is tighter.

\section*{Appendix C: Self-compatibility of channels}

We now go on to study self-compatibility of channels. In the discussion earlier on the entropic bounds for the compatibility of channels, we have defined the $\langle \Omega_A \rangle$-entropy of a channel as von Neumann entropy of its $\langle \Omega_A \rangle$-Choi state. However, one can equivalently define it as the Shannon entropy of the $\langle \Omega_A \rangle$-Choi state spectrum. In that sense, the results on the entropic bounds provide nonlinear inequalities for spectra of self-compatible channels. One would expect, however, that the explicit forms of these spectra can be very cumbersome to write. On the other hand, some spectral constrains for symmetric extendibility of two-qubit states are known [51], which we translate below to the problem of self-compatibility of channels.

In order to identify the spectrum of the Choi-state of a channel, recall that operators $K_i : \mathcal{H}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_B$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots$, contribute a Kraus decomposition for an $A \rightarrow B$-channel $\Phi$ if $\Phi(\varrho) = \sum_i K_i \varrho K_i^\dagger$ (where the series converges w.r.t. the trace norm). For any state $\varrho_A$ on $\mathcal{H}_A$, $\Phi$ has a Kraus operators $K_i$ such that $\text{tr}[K_i \varrho_A K_i^\dagger] = 0$ whenever $i \neq j$; see Section 3.1 of [44]. In this case, we say that $K_i$ are $\varrho_A$-orthogonal. Whenever $\varrho_A$ is of full rank and $\langle \Omega_A \rangle$ is a canonical purification for $\varrho_A$, we have the spectral decomposition $S_{[\Omega_A]}(\Phi) = \sum_i |w_i \rangle \langle w_i |$ where $|w_i \rangle = (I_{\mathcal{H}_B} \otimes K_i) |\Omega_A\rangle$ for any $\varrho_A$-orthogonal set $\{K_i\}$ of Kraus operators for $\Phi$ [44, Proposition 1]. Thus, the spectrum of $S_{[\Omega_A]}(\Phi)$ consists of the numbers

$$
\lambda_{\varrho_A}^\Phi(i) := \text{tr}[K_i \varrho_A K_i^\dagger]
$$

and the vector $\lambda_{\varrho_A}^\Phi := (\lambda_{\varrho_A}^\Phi(i))_i$ is essentially independent of the particular $\varrho_A$-orthogonal set of Kraus operators for $\Phi$. 

Let $A$, $B$, and $C$ be now qubit systems. According to Ref. [51], a state $\varrho$ on $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ is symmetrically extendable, i.e., there is a three-qubit state $\mathcal{H}_{ABC}$ such that $\varrho_{AB} = \varrho = \varrho_{AC}$ if and only if $\text{tr}[\varrho_A |\varrho|^2] \geq \text{tr}[\varrho^2] - 4 \sqrt{\det(\varrho)}$. Let $\Phi_{A \rightarrow B}$ be the Choi channel of $\varrho$, i.e., $\varrho = S_{\Omega_A}(\Phi_{A \rightarrow B})$ for a standard purification $[\Omega_A]$ of $\text{tr}_B[\varrho]$. The right-hand side of the above inequality can be written entirely in terms of the spectrum of $\varrho$ and, thus, in terms of the probability vector $\lambda_{\Phi_{A \rightarrow B}}$. Moreover, $\text{tr}_A[\varrho] = \Phi_{A \rightarrow B}(\varrho_A)$. Thus, we have the following:

**Proposition 3.** A qubit-to-qubit channel $\Phi$ is self-compatible if, for some (and, hence, for any) full-rank qubit state $\varrho_A$.

$$\text{tr}[\Phi(\varrho_A)]^2 \geq \sum_i \lambda_{\Phi}(i)^2 - 4 \prod_i \sqrt{\lambda_{\Phi}(i)}.$$ 

In particular, choosing $\varrho_A = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{1}$ and a Hilbert-Schmidt-orthogonal set $\{K_i\}_R$ of Kraus operators for $\Phi$, $R \leq 4$ being the Kraus rank of $\Phi$, the channel $\Phi$ is self-compatible if and only if

$$\text{tr}[\Phi(\mathbb{1})]^2 \geq \sum_i \|K_i\|_{HS}^4 - \frac{16}{2^R} \prod_i \|K_i\|_{HS}$$

where, for any qubit operator $K$, the Hilbert-Schmidt norm is defined as $\|K\|_{HS} := \sqrt{\text{tr}[K^\dagger K]}$.

---

When one tries to resolve the compatibility of channels via explicit methods of marginal problem, e.g. SDP, the choice of $|Ω_A⟩$ in Choi isomorphism does not play any role. This is, however, not the case when one applies the entropic constraints. In the example above, of two depolarizing channels, the optimal Choi isomorphism corresponds to the maximally entangled state. For channels with other types of noise the optimal choice of $|Ω_A⟩$ can be different. For example, for the noise $\frac{1}{d-1} \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} |i⟩⟨i|$ the optimal $|Ω_A⟩ = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \sqrt{\pi_i} |i⟩ ⊗ |i⟩$ is the one with $\pi_i$ epsilon-small and the rest of $\pi_i$ close to $\frac{1}{d-1}$.

When one tries to resolve the compatibility of channels via explicit methods of marginal problem, e.g. SDP, the choice of $|Ω_A⟩$ in Choi isomorphism does not play any role. This is, however, not the case when one applies the entropic constraints. In the example above, of two depolarizing channels, the optimal Choi isomorphism corresponds to the maximally entangled state. For channels with other types of noise the optimal choice of $|Ω_A⟩$ can be different. For example, for the noise $\frac{1}{d-1} \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} |i⟩⟨i|$ the optimal $|Ω_A⟩ = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \sqrt{\pi_i} |i⟩ ⊗ |i⟩$ is the one with $\pi_i$ epsilon-small and the rest of $\pi_i$ close to $\frac{1}{d-1}$.