

# A general theory of comparison of quantum channels (and beyond)

Anna Jenčová\*

*Mathematical Institute, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Štefánikova 49, 814 73 Bratislava, Slovakia*

February 12, 2020

## Abstract

We present a general theory of comparison of quantum channels, concerning with the question of simulability or approximate simulability of a given quantum channel by allowed transformations of another given channel. These questions are studied in an extension of the framework of general probabilistic theories (GPT), suitable for dealing with channels. This extension carries a natural norm, which is an extension of the base norm and for quantum channels is the diamond norm. Using this norm, we introduce the notion of deficiency of one channel with respect to the other, defined as the accuracy of simulation by a given set of transformations. We prove a general randomization theorem in the GPT setting, giving an operational interpretation of the deficiency. This theorem is applied to some specific cases of simulability of quantum channels and measurements, obtaining a characterization of deficiency in terms of conditional min-entropies as well as success probabilities in guessing games.

## 1 Introduction

For a pair of quantum channels  $\Phi_1$  and  $\Phi_2$ , we consider the following problem: is it possible to simulate one channel by transforming the other channel by a quantum network of a specified type? Since quantum channels are the fundamental objects in quantum information theory, this question subsumes a variety of special cases already studied extensively in the literature: comparison of statistical experiments [1, 2], simulability of measurements [3, 4] or more general comparison of channels [5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12]. In fact, this kind of questions goes back to the classical theory of comparison of classical statistical experiments [13, 14] (see also [15]). This problem can be also put into the setting of resource theories for channels [16, 17] by choosing the allowed maps to be the free operations in the theory, whence it becomes the important question of simulability of one device by another using free operations.

Two types of characterizations of simulability are mostly discussed: either by inequalities in (some modification of) conditional min-entropy (e.g. [8, 9]), or in terms of success probabilities in some discrimination tasks [5, 12]. These two characterizations are closely related, in fact, the latter can be seen as an operational interpretation of the former. These conditions provide a complete set of monotones in the given resource theory.

In the more general situation where the target channel is simulated only approximately, there are different possible approaches as to e.g. the distance measures used to assess the accuracy of the approximation. A common choice is the diamond norm, which is natural since it is well known as the distinguishability norm for channels [18]. With this choice the problem becomes a direct extension of the problem of the classical theory of comparison of statistical experiments. This framework also includes some more specific cases such as quantum dichotomies [19] (pairs of states), where we can restrict to channels that simulate one of the states exactly, but the other may differ from the target.

The aim of the paper is to study these problems in a convenient framework that in a sense is an extension of the general probabilistic theories (GPTs), suitable for discussion of various types of quantum channels and networks. Our framework includes the operational theories of [20] and higher-order theories [21], where 'non-causality' may appear, in the sense that the theories admit more than one unit effect. Following the classical notions of Le Cam theory of comparison of experiments, we introduce the deficiency as the minimal simulation distance that can be obtained in the given situation. Using certain norms and their duality, appearing naturally in our setting, we prove a general randomization theorem that gives an operational characterization of deficiency. These norms generalize the order unit and base norms from the GPT framework. In particular, the diamond

---

\*jenca@mat.savba.sk

norm and its duality to the conditional min-entropy [11, 22] is obtained as a special case. The general result is then applied to quantum channels with several types of allowed transformations (postprocessings, preprocessings and partial superchannels), the corresponding deficiency is characterized by comparing either some quantities related to (a modification of) the conditional min-entropy of some states, or the success probabilities in certain discrimination tasks (or guessing games). For preprocessings, we also characterize the related pseudodistance as a distance of the ranges of the two channels tensored with identity. As another example, we treat classical simulability for sets of quantum measurements.

## 2 The GPT formulation

General probabilistic theories (GPT) form a framework for description of a large class of physical theories involving probabilistic processes, see [23] for an introduction and background. This framework is built upon basic notions of states and effects and under some general assumptions on the theories, it can be put into the setting of the theory of (finite dimensional) ordered vector spaces.

The basic object in GPT is the set of states of a physical system in the theory, represented as a compact convex subset of an Euclidean space. Such a set can be always seen as a base of a closed convex cone in a finite dimensional real vector space. It is clear that the set of *channels*, or physical transformations of the systems in the theory, has a convex structure as well and can be, at least formally, treated as a "state space" in the convenient framework of GPT. For example, the set of quantum channels was considered in this way in [24]. However, observe that the set of quantum channels is, by definition, a special subset of the cone of completely positive maps, but it no longer forms a base of this cone. We will therefore need a somewhat more general representation of compact convex sets, described in the next paragraph.

### 2.1 Base sections and corresponding norms

Let  $\mathcal{V}$  be a finite dimensional real vector space and let  $\mathcal{V}^+ \subset \mathcal{V}$  be a closed convex cone which is pointed ( $\mathcal{V}^+ \cap (-\mathcal{V}^+) = \{0\}$ ) and generating ( $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}^+ - \mathcal{V}^+$ ). Below, we will say that  $\mathcal{V}^+$  is a proper cone. The cone  $\mathcal{V}^+$  defines a partial order in  $\mathcal{V}$ , defined by  $x \leq y$  if  $y - x \in \mathcal{V}^+$ . Thus the pair  $(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}^+)$  is an ordered vector space.

A convex subset  $B \subset \mathcal{V}^+$  is called a *base section* in  $(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}^+)$  if

- (i)  $B$  is the base of the cone  $\mathcal{V}^+ \cap \text{span}(B)$ ;
- (ii)  $B \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{V}^+) \neq \emptyset$ .

Base sections were studied in [11, Appendix] and in [25] in the special case of the space of hermitian linear operators with the cone of positive operators. In this paragraph, we summarize some of the results.

For the ease of the presentation, it will be convenient to introduce the category  $\mathbf{BS}$  whose objects are finite dimensional real vector spaces  $\mathcal{V}$  endowed with a fixed proper cone  $\mathcal{V}^+ \subset \mathcal{V}$  and a base section  $B(\mathcal{V})$  in  $(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}^+)$ . The morphisms  $\Lambda : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$  in  $\mathbf{BS}$  are linear maps such that  $\Lambda(\mathcal{V}^+) \subseteq \mathcal{W}^+$  and  $\Lambda(B(\mathcal{V})) \subseteq B(\mathcal{W})$ , [26].

For  $\mathcal{V} \in \mathbf{BS}$ , we define the dual object  $\mathcal{V}^* \in \mathbf{BS}$  as the dual vector space with the dual cone

$$\mathcal{V}^{*+} := \{\varphi \in \mathcal{V}^*, \langle \varphi, c \rangle \geq 0, \forall c \in \mathcal{V}^+\}$$

and the dual base section

$$B(\mathcal{V}^*) = \tilde{B}(\mathcal{V}) := \{\varphi \in \mathcal{V}^{*+}, \langle \varphi, b \rangle = 1, \forall b \in B(\mathcal{V})\}.$$

Note that indeed,  $\mathcal{V}^{*+}$  is a proper cone in  $\mathcal{V}^*$  and  $B(\mathcal{V}^*)$  is a base section in  $(\mathcal{V}^*, \mathcal{V}^{*+})$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{V}^{**} \simeq \mathcal{V}$  in  $\mathbf{BS}$ , where the isomorphism is given by the natural vector space isomorphism  $\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^{**}$ .

Let us denote

$$\begin{aligned} [-B(\mathcal{V}), B(\mathcal{V})] &:= \{x \in \mathcal{V}, \exists b \in B(\mathcal{V}), -b \leq x \leq b\} \\ &= \{c_1 - c_2, c_1, c_2 \in \mathcal{V}^+, c_1 + c_2 \in B(\mathcal{V})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\mathcal{V}^+ \cap [-B(\mathcal{V}), B(\mathcal{V})] = [0, B(\mathcal{V})] := \{x \in \mathcal{V}^+, \exists b \in B(\mathcal{V}), x \leq b\}. \quad (1)$$

We now define a norm in  $\mathcal{V}$  as

$$\|x\|_{\mathcal{V}} := \max_{\psi \in [-B(\mathcal{V}^*), B(\mathcal{V}^*)]} \langle \psi, x \rangle.$$

The following proposition summarizes some properties of these norms.

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $\mathcal{V} \in \text{BS}$ . Then*

(i) *The unit ball of  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{V}}$  is  $[-B(\mathcal{V}), B(\mathcal{V})]$ , so that*

$$\|x\|_{\mathcal{V}} = \min_{b \in B(\mathcal{V})} \min\{\lambda > 0, -\lambda b \leq x \leq \lambda b\};$$

(ii) *the norms  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{V}}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{V}^*}$  are mutually dual;*

(iii) *if  $c \in \mathcal{V}^+$ , then*

$$\|c\|_{\mathcal{V}} = \max_{\varphi \in B(\mathcal{V}^*)} \langle \varphi, c \rangle = \min_{b \in B(\mathcal{V})} \min\{\lambda > 0, x \leq \lambda b\};$$

(iv) *if  $b_1, b_2 \in B(\mathcal{V})$ , then*

$$\frac{1}{2}\|b_1 - b_2\|_{\mathcal{V}} = \max_{\varphi \in [0, B(\mathcal{V})]} \langle \varphi, b_1 - b_2 \rangle.$$

(v) *Let  $\Lambda : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$  be a morphism in BS. Then  $\Lambda$  is a contraction with respect to the corresponding norms:*

$$\|\Lambda(x)\|_{\mathcal{W}} \leq \|x\|_{\mathcal{V}}, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{V}.$$

The state spaces of GPT can be also seen as objects in BS. Indeed, let  $K$  be any compact convex subset in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , then there is a finite dimensional real vector space  $\mathcal{V}$  with a proper cone  $\mathcal{V}^+$ , such that  $K$  is a base of  $\mathcal{V}^+$ . This means that there is some functional  $u \in \text{int}((\mathcal{V}^+)^*)$  such that

$$K = \{c \in \mathcal{V}^+, \langle u, c \rangle = 1\}.$$

The space  $\mathcal{V}$  with  $\mathcal{V}^+$  and  $B(\mathcal{V}) = K$  is clearly an object in BS. For the dual object, we have  $B(\mathcal{V}^*) = \{u\}$ . The norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{V}}$  is the base norm with respect to  $K$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{V}^*}$  is the order unit norm with respect to  $u$ . In this way, the category BS is a common generalization of order unit and base normed spaces.

The prototypical examples in GPT are the classical state space of probability distributions over a finite set, and the quantum state space of all density operators on a finite dimensional vector space. In the classical GPT, we have  $\mathcal{V} = \mathbb{R}^n$ , with the simplicial cone  $\mathcal{V}^+ = (\mathbb{R}^+)^n$  and  $K = \{(p_1, \dots, p_n) \in \mathcal{V}^+, \sum_i p_i = 1\}$  is the probability simplex. The morphisms in BS between such spaces are precisely the stochastic maps, given by stochastic matrices. The norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{V}} = \|\cdot\|_1$  is the  $L_1$ -norm. In the quantum case,  $(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}^+)$  is the space of hermitian operators on a finite dimensional Hilbert space with the cone of positive operators and the morphisms are positive trace preserving maps. The two dual norms are the trace norm and the operator norm, respectively.

The prototypical example of an object in BS is the set of quantum channels which is a base section in the vector space of hermitian maps with the cone of completely positive maps, more details will be given in Section 3.1.6.

It is not difficult to see that the restriction of  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{V}}$  to  $\text{span}(B(\mathcal{V}))$  coincides with the base norm with respect to the base  $B(\mathcal{V})$  of the cone  $\mathcal{V}^+ \cap \text{span}(B(\mathcal{V}))$ . The advantage of our extended definition is that the dual space is now an object of the same category. As the base norm,  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{V}}$  has an operational interpretation as a distinguishability norm for elements in  $B(\mathcal{V})$ . Given two elements  $b, b' \in B(\mathcal{V})$ , assume that one of them is chosen, each with probability  $1/2$ . The task is to test the hypothesis that the chosen element is  $b$ , against the alternative  $b'$ . The tests are defined as affine maps  $B(\mathcal{V}) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , assigning to each element the probability of the "yes" outcome. Any test is given by some  $\varphi \in [0, B(\mathcal{V}^*)]$ , these elements are called effects. The maximal probability of a correct guess is  $\frac{1}{2}(1 + \frac{1}{2}\|b - b'\|_{\mathcal{V}})$ .

More generally, an ensemble on  $\mathcal{V}$  is a finite sequence  $\mathcal{E} = \{\lambda_i, x_i\}_{i=1}^k$  of elements  $x_i \in B(\mathcal{V})$  and prior probabilities  $\lambda_i$ . The interpretation is that  $x_i$  is prepared with probability  $\lambda_i$  and the task is to guess which element was prepared. Any guessing procedure is described by a collection of  $k$  effects  $(\psi_i)$ , such that  $\sum \psi_i \in B(\mathcal{V}^*)$ , the value  $\langle \psi_i, x_j \rangle$  is interpreted as the probability of guessing  $i$  if the true state was  $x_j$ . The average success probability using  $\psi = (\psi_i)$  is

$$P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}, \psi) := \sum_i \lambda_i \langle \psi_i, x_i \rangle$$

and the optimal success probability for  $\mathcal{E}$  is

$$P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}) := \max_{\psi} P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}, \psi).$$

## 2.2 Comparison in GPT

We now formulate the comparison problem in the above setting and prove a general randomization theorem, which in later sections will be applied to quantum channels. Assume that a subcategory  $\mathbf{F}$  in  $\mathbf{BS}$  is given, such that for any  $\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W} \in \mathbf{F}$ , the set  $\mathbf{F}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W})$  of all morphisms  $\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$  in  $\mathbf{F}$  is convex (we will say in this case that  $\mathbf{F}$  is a convex subcategory). For two objects  $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2 \in \mathbf{F}$ , let  $b_1 \in B(\mathcal{V}_1)$ ,  $b_2 \in B(\mathcal{V}_2)$ . The  $\mathbf{F}$ -deficiency of  $b_1$  with respect to  $b_2$  is defined as the minimum distance we can get to  $b_2$  by images of  $b_1$  under all morphisms  $\mathcal{V}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_2$  in  $\mathbf{F}$ :

$$\delta_{\mathbf{F}}(b_1 \| b_2) := \inf_{\Lambda \in \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2)} \|\Lambda(b_1) - b_2\|_{\mathcal{V}_2}.$$

We also define the  $\mathbf{F}$ -distance of  $b_1$  and  $b_2$  as

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{F}}(b_1, b_2) := \max\{\delta_{\mathbf{F}}(b_1 \| b_2), \delta_{\mathbf{F}}(b_2 \| b_1)\}.$$

**Proposition 2.**  $\Delta_{\mathbf{F}}$  is a pseudometric on the set  $\{b \in B(\mathcal{V}), \mathcal{V} \in \mathbf{F}\}$ .

*Proof.* The only thing to prove is the triangle inequality. So let  $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2, \mathcal{V}_3 \in \mathbf{F}$  and let  $b_i \in \mathcal{V}_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Let  $\Theta \in \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{V}_2, \mathcal{V}_3)$  and let for  $\mu > 0$ ,  $\Lambda_{\mu} \in \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2)$  be such that  $\delta_{\mathbf{F}}(b_1 \| b_2) + \mu \geq \|\Lambda_{\mu}(b_1) - b_2\|_{\mathcal{V}_2}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\mathbf{F}}(b_1 \| b_3) &\leq \|\Theta \circ \Lambda_{\mu}(b_1) - b_3\|_{\mathcal{V}_3} \leq \|\Theta(\Lambda_{\mu}(b_1) - b_2)\|_{\mathcal{V}_3} + \|\Theta(b_2) - b_3\|_{\mathcal{V}_3} \\ &\leq \mu + \delta_{\mathbf{F}}(b_1 \| b_2) + \|\Theta(b_2) - b_3\|_{\mathcal{V}_3}. \end{aligned}$$

since this holds for all  $\Theta \in \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{V}_2, \mathcal{V}_3)$  and all  $\mu > 0$ , we get the result.  $\square$

The following data processing inequalities for  $\delta_{\mathbf{F}}$  follow easily from Prop. 1 (v) (cf. [10, Prop. 3]).

**Proposition 3.** Let  $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2, \mathcal{V}_3 \in \mathbf{F}$ ,  $b_i \in B(\mathcal{V}_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Then

- (i) For any  $\Lambda \in \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2)$ ,  $\delta_{\mathbf{F}}(\Lambda(b_1) \| b_3) \geq \delta_{\mathbf{F}}(b_1 \| b_3)$ ;
- (ii) For any  $\Theta \in \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{V}_2, \mathcal{V}_3)$ ,  $\delta_{\mathbf{F}}(b_1 \| \Theta(b_2)) \leq \delta_{\mathbf{F}}(b_1 \| b_2)$ ;

We next turn to the main result of this paragraph, which is the randomization theorem in GPT. For the proof, we will need the following minimax theorem (cf. [15, Th. 48.5]).

**Theorem 1** (Minimax theorem). Let  $T$  be a convex and compact subset of a locally convex space and let  $Y$  be a convex subset of a vector space. Let  $f : T \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be convex in  $y$  and continuous and concave in  $t$ . Then

$$\inf_{y \in Y} \sup_{t \in T} f(t, y) = \sup_{t \in T} \inf_{y \in Y} f(t, y).$$

**Theorem 2** (Randomization theorem in GPT). Let  $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2 \in \mathbf{F}$  and let  $b_1 \in B(\mathcal{V}_1)$ ,  $b_2 \in B(\mathcal{V}_2)$ . Let  $\epsilon \geq 0$ . Then the following are equivalent.

- (i)  $\delta_{\mathbf{F}}(b_1 \| b_2) \leq \epsilon$ ;
- (ii) for all  $\varphi \in \mathcal{V}_2^{*+}$ , there is some  $\Theta \in \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2)$  such that

$$\langle \varphi, b_2 \rangle \leq \langle \varphi, \Theta(b_1) \rangle + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{V}_2^*};$$

- (iii) for all  $\mathcal{W} \in \mathbf{F}$  and all  $\psi \in \mathcal{W}^{*+}$ , we have

$$\sup_{\Theta \in \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{V}_2, \mathcal{W})} \langle \psi, \Theta(b_2) \rangle \leq \sup_{\Theta' \in \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{W})} \langle \psi, \Theta'(b_1) \rangle + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{W}^*}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\epsilon' > \epsilon$  and let  $\Lambda_0 \in \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2)$  be such that  $\|\Lambda_0(b_1) - b_2\|_{\mathcal{V}_2} \leq \epsilon'$ . Let  $\mathcal{W} \in \mathbf{F}$  and let  $\psi \in \mathcal{W}^{*+}$ . For any  $\Theta \in \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{V}_2, \mathcal{W})$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi, \Theta(b_2) \rangle &= \langle \psi, \Theta \circ \Lambda_0(b_1) \rangle + \langle \psi, \Theta(b_2 - \Lambda_0(b_1)) \rangle \\ &\leq \sup_{\Theta' \in \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{W})} \langle \psi, \Theta'(b_1) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|\Theta(b_2 - \Lambda_0(b_1))\|_{\mathcal{W}} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{W}^*} \\ &\leq \sup_{\Theta' \in \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{W})} \langle \psi, \Theta'(b_1) \rangle + \frac{\epsilon'}{2} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{W}^*}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Prop. 1 (iv) and (v). Since this holds for all  $\Theta \in \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{V}_2, \mathcal{W})$  and  $\epsilon' > 0$ , this proves that (i) implies (iii). Since (iii) obviously implies (ii), it is enough to prove (ii)  $\implies$  (i).

By Prop. 1 (iv), we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\delta_{\mathbf{F}}(b_1\|b_2) = \inf_{\Lambda \in \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2)} \sup_{\varphi \in [0, B(\mathcal{V}_2^*)]} \langle \varphi, b_2 - \Lambda(b_1) \rangle.$$

Note that by Prop. 1 (i), the set  $[0, B(\mathcal{V}_2^*)] = \mathcal{V}_2^{*+} \cap [-B(\mathcal{V}_2^*), B(\mathcal{V}_2^*)]$  is convex and compact and the map  $(\varphi, \Lambda) \mapsto \langle \varphi, b_2 - \Lambda(b_1) \rangle$  is linear in both components, so that we may apply the minimax theorem (Thm. 1). Assume that (ii) holds, then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\delta_{\mathbf{F}}(b_1\|b_2) &= \sup_{\varphi \in [0, B(\mathcal{V}_2^*)]} \inf_{\Lambda \in \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2)} \langle \varphi, b_2 - \Lambda(b_1) \rangle \\ &= \sup_{\varphi \in [0, B(\mathcal{V}_2^*)]} \left( \langle \varphi, b_2 \rangle - \sup_{\Lambda \in \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2)} \langle \varphi, \Lambda(b_1) \rangle \right) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Let us discuss an operational interpretation of the above results. The set  $B(\mathcal{V})$  represents some interesting set of devices in some GPT and the elements  $\varphi \in [0, B(\mathcal{V}^*)]$  are interpreted as tests on this set. Theorem 2 (ii) says that  $\delta_{\mathbf{F}}(b_1\|b_2) \leq \epsilon$  if and only if for any test  $\varphi \in [0, B(\mathcal{V}_2^*)]$  there is some  $\Theta \in \mathbf{F}$  such that  $\Theta(b_1)$  has up to  $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$  a higher probability of the 'yes' outcome than  $b_2$ . Part (iii) says that the same will happen for any image of  $b_2$  under a morphism in  $\mathbf{F}$ .

We next give two easy examples of an application the randomization theorem. In both examples,  $\mathcal{V} \in \mathbf{BS}$  is such that  $K = B(\mathcal{V})$  is a base of  $\mathcal{V}^+$ . The dual object  $\mathcal{V}^*$  is the order unit space  $(\mathcal{V}^*, \mathcal{V}^{*+}, u)$ , where  $u \in \mathcal{V}^{*+}$  is the functional determined by  $\langle u, x \rangle = 1$  for all  $x \in K$ .

*Example 1* (Experiments). A (finite) experiment in  $\mathcal{V}$  is a finite set  $x_1, \dots, x_k \in K$ . The set of all experiments with fixed  $k$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  is an object in  $\mathbf{BS}$ . Indeed, let  $\mathcal{V}^k = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathcal{V}^{k+} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathcal{V}^+$ , then  $K^k = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k K$  is a base section in the ordered vector space  $(\mathcal{V}^k, \mathcal{V}^{k+})$ . As for the dual object,  $\mathcal{V}^{k*} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathcal{V}^*$  and  $\mathcal{V}^{k*+} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathcal{V}^{*+}$ . Moreover, it is easily checked that the dual section is

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{V}^{k*}) = \tilde{K}^k = \{(p_1 u, \dots, p_k u), p_i \in [0, 1], \sum_i p_i = 1\}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{\mathcal{V}^k} &= \max_i \|v_i\|_{\mathcal{V}}, & v = (v_i) \in \mathcal{V}^k \\ \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{V}^{k*}} &= \sum_i \|\psi_i\|_{\mathcal{V}^*}, & \psi = (\psi_i) \in \mathcal{V}^{k*}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\mathbf{F}$  be the subcategory whose objects are experiments with fixed  $k$  and morphisms in  $\mathbf{F}(\mathcal{V}^k, \mathcal{W}^k)$  are given by  $\Phi^k$  with  $\Phi \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}) \subseteq \mathbf{BS}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W})$  for some convex subset  $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W})$ . Let  $x = (x_i) \in B(\mathcal{V}^k)$ ,  $y = (y_i) \in B(\mathcal{W}^k)$ , then the deficiency is

$$\delta_{\mathbf{F}}(x\|y) = \inf_{\Phi \in \mathcal{F}} \max_i \|\Phi(x_i) - y_i\|_{\mathcal{V}}.$$

Theorem 2 (iii) says that  $\delta_{\mathbf{F}}(x\|y) \leq \epsilon$  if and only if for any  $(\psi_i) \in \mathcal{V}^{k*+}$  with  $\sum_i \|\psi_i\|_{\mathcal{V}^*} \leq 1$ , we have

$$\sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_i \langle \psi_i, \Phi(y_i) \rangle \leq \sup_{\Phi' \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_i \langle \psi_i, \Phi'(y_i) \rangle + \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Since the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{V}^*}$  is the order unit norm with respect to  $u$ , any  $(\psi_i)$  of the above form satisfies  $0 \leq \psi_i \leq \|\psi_i\|_{\mathcal{V}^*} u$  and  $\sum_i \psi_i \leq \sum_i \|\psi_i\|_{\mathcal{V}^*} u = u$ . Adding a positive element  $\psi_{k+1} = u - \sum_i \psi_i$ , the collection  $(\psi_i)_{i=1}^{k+1}$  becomes a measurement with  $k+1$  outcomes and the value  $\frac{1}{k} \sum_i \langle \psi_i, \Phi(y_i) \rangle =: \tilde{P}_{succ}(\mathcal{E}, (\psi_i))$  becomes the success probability for the ensemble  $\mathcal{E} = \{\frac{1}{k}, \Phi(y_i)\}$  in the *inconclusive* discrimination with the measurement  $(\psi_i)$ , here  $\psi_{k+1}$  represents the inconclusive outcome. Now we see that  $\delta_{\mathbf{F}}(x\|y) \leq \epsilon$  if and only if for any measurement  $(\psi_i)_{i=1}^{k+1}$ ,

$$\sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{F}} \tilde{P}_{succ}(\{\frac{1}{k}, \Phi(y_i)\}, (\psi_i)) \leq \sup_{\Phi' \in \mathcal{F}} \tilde{P}_{succ}(\{\frac{1}{k}, \Phi'(x_i)\}, (\psi_i)) + \frac{\epsilon}{2k},$$

extending the result [12, Cor. 15].

If we restrict  $\mathbf{F}$  to classical state spaces and let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the set of all stochastic maps,  $\delta_{\mathbf{F}}((x_i)||y_i)$  becomes the Le Cam deficiency of the classical experiments  $(x_i) \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^k$  and  $(y_i) \in (\mathbb{R}^m)^k$ . In this case, Theorem 2 is precisely the Le Cam randomization theorem [14]. Similarly, restricting the objects to quantum state spaces and letting  $\mathcal{F}$  be the set of all quantum channels, we obtain the quantum version of the randomization theorem, cf. [1, 10].

*Example 2 (Measurements).* A measurement (with  $k$  outcomes) is a collection  $M = (M_i) \in \mathcal{V}^{k*+}$ ,  $\sum_i M_i = u$ . It is easy to see that the set  $\mathcal{M}_k(\mathcal{V})$  of all such measurements is a base section in  $(\mathcal{V}^{k*}, \mathcal{V}^{k*+})$  we will denote this object of BS by  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{M}}^k$ . The dual object is  $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}^k, \mathcal{V}^{k+}$  with the base section

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_k(\mathcal{V}) = \{(x, \dots, x), x \in K\}$$

Note that for  $v \in \mathcal{V}^{k+}$ , the dual norm is

$$\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{M}}^{k*}} = \max_{M \in \mathcal{M}_k(\mathcal{V})} \sum_i \langle M_i, v_i \rangle.$$

Dividing  $v$  by  $c := \sum_i \langle u, v_i \rangle$  we obtain an ensemble:  $\mathcal{E} := (c^{-1}v_i = \lambda_i x_i)$ , with  $x_i \in K$  and prior probabilities  $\lambda_i$ , and we have

$$\|v\|_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{M}}^{k*}} = c P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}).$$

Again, let  $\mathbf{F}$  be the subcategory with objects  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{M}}^k$  (with  $k$  fixed) and morphisms  $\Phi^{*k} : \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{M}}^k \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{M}}^k$  for  $\Phi \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{V}) \subseteq \mathbf{BS}(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{V})$ . The randomization theorem tells us that  $\delta_{\mathbf{F}}(M||N)$  if and only if, for any ensemble  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $\mathcal{V}$ ,

$$P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}, N) \leq \sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{F}} P_{succ}(\Phi(\mathcal{E}), N) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}),$$

extending the result of [12, Thm. 14].

More examples will be treated in the next section.

### 3 Comparison of quantum channels

In this section we will present the sets of quantum channels and superchannels as objects in BS and show how Theorem 2 applies for some choices of the subcategory  $\mathbf{F}$ , obtaining several types of randomization theorems for quantum channels. These results will be applied to characterizations of simulability of quantum measurements. We need some preparation first.

#### 3.1 Basic ingredients

In what follows,  $\mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{H}_B, \dots$  will always denote a finite dimensional Hilbert space, labelled by the system it represents. The Hilbert space will often be referred to by its label, so we denote by  $\mathcal{B}(A)$  the set of bounded operators on  $\mathcal{H}_A$ , similarly,  $\mathcal{B}_h(A)$  denotes the set of self-adjoint operators,  $\mathcal{B}_+(A)$  the set of positive operators and  $\mathfrak{S}(A)$  the set of states on  $\mathcal{H}_A$ . We will also put  $d_A := \dim(\mathcal{H}_A)$  and  $I_A$  denotes the identity operator on  $\mathcal{H}_A$ . The trivial Hilbert space  $\mathbb{C}$  will be labeled by 1.

For  $W \in \mathcal{B}(A_0)$ , we will use the notation (cf. [27])

$$|W\rangle\rangle := \sum_i W|i\rangle_{A_0} \otimes |i\rangle_{A_0} = \sum_i |i\rangle_{A_0} \otimes W^T|i\rangle_{A_0}, \quad (2)$$

here  $W^T$  denotes the transpose of  $W$  in the standard basis  $\{|i\rangle\}$ .

##### 3.1.1 Linear maps and Choi representation

Let  $\mathcal{L}(A_0, A_1)$  denote the set of hermitian linear maps  $\mathcal{B}(A_0) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(A_1)$ , that is, linear maps satisfying

$$\Phi(X^*) = \Phi(X)^*, \quad X \in \mathcal{B}(A_0).$$

Let  $\mathcal{L}_+(A_0, A_1)$  denote the subset of completely positive maps in  $\mathcal{L}(A_0, A_1)$  and  $\mathcal{C}(A_0, A_1)$  the set of quantum channels, that is, trace preserving maps in  $\mathcal{L}_+(A_0, A_1)$ .

The Choi matrix of  $\Phi \in \mathcal{L}(A_0, A_1)$  is defined as  $C_{\Phi} := (\Phi \otimes id_{A_0})(|I_{A_0}\rangle\rangle\langle\langle I_{A_0}|)$ . This establishes a linear isomorphism between  $\mathcal{L}(A_0, A_1)$  and  $\mathcal{B}_h(A_1 A_0)$  that maps  $\mathcal{L}_+(A_0, A_1)$  onto  $\mathcal{B}_+(A_1 A_0)$  and  $\mathcal{C}(A_0, A_1)$  onto the set

$$\{X \in \mathcal{B}_+(A_1 A_0), \text{Tr}_{A_1}[X] = I_{A_0}\}.$$

### 3.1.2 Diagrams

We will make use of the common diagrammatic representation of maps in  $\mathcal{L}(A_0, A_1)$  as

$$\begin{array}{c} \overline{A_0} \quad \boxed{\phi} \quad A_1 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

If some of the systems is trivial, the corresponding wire will be omitted. The special symbols

$$\begin{array}{c} \overline{A_0} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \overline{A_0} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \overline{A_0} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \overline{A_0} \end{array}$$

will represent  $|I_{A_0}\rangle\rangle\langle\langle I_{A_0}|$  as a preparation (a channel  $1 \rightarrow A_0A_0$ ) and as an effect (a channel  $A_0A_0 \rightarrow 1$ ) respectively. In this way, we may write the Choi isomorphism and its inverse as

$$\begin{array}{c} \overline{A_0} \quad \boxed{\phi} \quad A_1 \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \overline{A_0} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{C_\phi} \\ \overline{A_1} \\ \text{---} \\ \overline{A_0} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{T} \\ \overline{A_1} \\ \text{---} \\ \overline{A_0} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \overline{A_0} \quad \boxed{\phi_T} \quad A_1 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

### 3.1.3 The link product

The Choi matrix of a composition of maps is given by the link product of the respective Choi matrices, [27]. For general multipartite matrices  $X \in \mathcal{B}(AB)$  and  $Y \in \mathcal{B}(BC)$ , the link product is defined as

$$X * Y = \text{Tr}_B[(X \otimes I_C)(I_A \otimes Y^{T_B})]$$

here  $(\cdot)^{T_B}$  denotes the partial transpose on the system  $B$ . Diagrammatically:

$$\begin{array}{c} \boxed{X * Y} \\ \overline{A} \\ \text{---} \\ \overline{C} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{X} \\ \overline{A} \\ \text{---} \\ \overline{B} \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{Y} \\ \overline{B} \\ \text{---} \\ \overline{C} \end{array}$$


The link product is commutative (up to the order of the spaces) and associative provided that the three matrices have no labels in common. The order of the spaces is not taken into account, applying an appropriate unitary conjugation swapping the spaces in the tensor products if necessary, so, for example, if  $X \in \mathcal{B}(AB_1B_2)$  and  $Y \in \mathcal{B}(B_2B_1C)$ , then

$$X * Y \equiv X * \mathcal{U}_{B_1, B_2}(Y), \quad (3)$$


where  $\mathcal{U}_{B_1, B_2}$  is the conjugation by the unitary swap  $U_{B_1, B_2} : \mathcal{H}_{B_1B_2} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{B_2B_1}$ .

### 3.1.4 Superchannels and 2-combs

A quantum superchannel is a special type of causal quantum network that transforms channels into channels, with possibly different input and output systems. Any superchannel  $\Lambda$  that maps  $\mathcal{C}(A_0, A_1)$  into  $\mathcal{C}(B_0, B_1)$  is a channel in  $\mathcal{C}(B_0A_1, B_1A_0)$ , consisting of a pre-processing channel  $\Lambda_{pre} \in \mathcal{C}(B_0, RA_0)$  and a post-processing channel  $\Lambda_{post} \in \mathcal{C}(RA_1, B_1)$ , where  $R$  is some ancilla [27]. We will write  $\Lambda = \Lambda_{pre} * \Lambda_{post}$  for this concatenation of channels. The set of all such superchannels will be denoted by  $\mathcal{C}_2(A, B)$ , where we used the abbreviation  $A = A_0A_1$ ,  $B = B_0B_1$ . Diagrammatically,  $\Lambda$  can be represented as



and acts on a map  $\phi$  as



The Choi matrices of superchannels are called 2-combs in [27]. Using the link product and its properties, we have  $C_\Lambda = C_{\Lambda_1} * C_{\Lambda_2}$  and  $C_{\Lambda(\Phi)} = C_\Lambda * C_\Phi = C_{\Lambda_{pre}} * C_\Phi * C_{\Lambda_{post}}$ . An element  $C \in \mathcal{B}_+(B_1 A_0 B_0 A_1)$  is a 2-comb if and only if

$$\text{Tr}_{B_1}[C] = I_{A_1} \otimes C_2, \quad \text{Tr}_{A_0}[C_2] = I_{B_0}, \quad (4)$$

which means that  $C_2$  is the Choi matrix of some channel in  $\mathcal{C}(B_0, A_0)$ .

### 3.1.5 c-c channels and superchannels

Let  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_{A_0} \in \mathcal{C}(A_0, A_0)$  denote the channel with the Choi matrix

$$C_{\mathcal{P}} = C_\delta := \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i| \otimes |i\rangle\langle i|.$$

We will use the symbol

$$\underline{\text{cl}} \quad \text{or} \quad \underline{\text{cl}_{A_0}}$$

as the diagrammatic representation of  $\mathcal{P}$ .

Clearly,  $\mathcal{P}^2 = \mathcal{P}$ . A channel  $\Phi$  is classical-to-quantum (or c-q) if  $\Phi = \Phi \circ \mathcal{P}$  and quantum-to-classical (q-c) if  $\Phi = \mathcal{P} \circ \Phi$ . Note that the c-q channels can be interpreted as quantum experiments (Example 1) and the q-c channels as measurements (Example 2). The classical-to-classical (c-c) channels are characterized by  $\Phi = \mathcal{P} \circ \Phi \circ \mathcal{P}$ . The Choi matrix of a c-c channel  $A_0 \rightarrow A_1$  has the form

$$C_p := \sum_{i=1}^{d_{A_1}} \sum_{j=1}^{d_{A_0}} p(i|j) |i\rangle\langle i| \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|$$

for a set of conditional probabilities  $p = \{p(i|j)\}$  and any matrix of this form is the Choi matrix of a c-c channel. The c-c channel determined by  $p$  will be denoted by  $\alpha_p$ .

We will also encounter c-c superchannels, that is, c-c channels in  $\mathcal{C}_2(A, B)$ . In such a case, there are conditional probabilities  $\{p(x, i|y, j)\}$  such that the Choi matrix has the form

$$C_p = \sum_{x=1}^{d_{B_1}} \sum_{i=1}^{d_{A_0}} \sum_{y=1}^{d_{B_0}} \sum_{j=1}^{d_{A_1}} p(x, i|y, j) |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes |i\rangle\langle i| \otimes |y\rangle\langle y| \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|.$$

Using (4), this is a 2-comb if and only if there are conditional probabilities  $\{q(i|y)\}$  such that

$$\sum_x p(x, i|y, j) = q(i|y), \quad \forall i, y, \forall j.$$

By putting  $p_{i,y}(x|j) := q(i|y)^{-1} p(x, i|y, j)$  if  $q(i|y) > 0$  and choosing any conditional probabilities for  $p_{i,y}$  otherwise, we obtain the following result.

**Lemma 1.** *A channel  $\Theta \in \mathcal{C}(B_0 A_1, A_0 B_1)$  is a c-c superchannel if and only if there are conditional probabilities  $\{p_{i,y}(x|j)\}$  and  $\{q(i|y)\}$ , with  $i = 1, \dots, d_{A_0}$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, d_{A_1}$ ,  $x = 1, \dots, d_{B_1}$ ,  $y = 1, \dots, d_{B_0}$  such that  $C_\Theta = C_p$  for*

$$p(x, i|y, j) = q(i|y) p_{i,y}(x|j).$$

A c-c superchannel corresponding to conditional probabilities of the above form will be denoted by  $\Theta_p$ .



### 3.1.6 Diamond norm and the conditional min-entropy

It is not difficult to see that  $\mathcal{L}(A_0, A_1)$  with the cone  $\mathcal{L}_+(A_0, A_1)$  and  $B(\mathcal{L}(A_0, A_1)) = \mathcal{C}(A_0, A_1)$  is an object in BS, similarly for the set of superchannels. It was observed in [25] that in these cases the structures described in Section 2.1 yield some well known quantities. This will be discussed in the present and the next section.

We will use the identification of the dual space  $\mathcal{L}^*(A_0, A_1)$  with  $\mathcal{B}_h(A_0 A_1)$ , with duality for  $X \in \mathcal{B}_h(A_0 A_1)$  and  $\phi \in \mathcal{L}(A_0, A_1)$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle X, \phi \rangle &:= \langle\langle I_{A_1} | (\phi \otimes id)(X) | I_{A_1} \rangle\rangle = \text{Tr}[XC_{\phi^*}] = \text{Tr}[XC_{\phi^T}^T] \\ &= X * C_{\phi^T} = X * C_{\phi}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Diagrammatically, this can be expressed as

$$\langle X, \phi \rangle = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{X} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{A_0} \boxed{\phi} \xrightarrow{A_1} \\ \xrightarrow{A_1} \end{array} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{X} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{A_0} \\ \xrightarrow{A_1} \boxed{\phi^T} \xrightarrow{A_0} \end{array} \end{array}$$

Here  $\phi^*, \phi^T \in \mathcal{L}(A_1, A_0)$  are maps determined by

$$\text{Tr}[X\phi^*(Y)] = \text{Tr}[\phi(X)Y], \quad \phi^T(Y) = (\phi^*(Y^T))^T$$

for  $X \in \mathcal{B}_h(A_0)$  and  $Y \in \mathcal{B}_h(A_1)$ . The last equality in (5) follows from (3) and  $C_{\phi^T} = \mathcal{U}_{A_1, A_0}(C_{\phi})$ . Note that by (5) we also have

$$\langle X, \phi \rangle = \text{Tr}[X\mathcal{U}_{A_1, A_0}(C_{\phi})^T] = \text{Tr}[\mathcal{U}_{A_1, A_0}^*(X^T)C_{\phi}]. \quad (6)$$

With these identifications, the dual cone is  $\mathcal{L}_+^*(A_0, A_1) \simeq \mathcal{B}_+(A_0 A_1)$  and the dual section

$$B(\mathcal{L}^*(A_0, A_1)) = \tilde{\mathcal{C}}(A_0, A_1) = \{\sigma_{A_0} \otimes I_{A_1}, \sigma_{A_0} \in \mathfrak{S}(A_0)\}.$$

The corresponding base section norm is the diamond norm

$$\|\Phi\|_{\mathcal{L}(A_0, A_1)} = \|\Phi\|_{\diamond} := \max_{\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(A_0 A_0)} \|(\Phi \otimes id)(\rho)\|_1, \quad \Phi \in \mathcal{L}(A_0, A_1),$$

well known as the distinguishability norm for quantum channels, [18, 28].

*Remark 1.* Using the Choi representation, we may also identify  $\mathcal{L}^*(A_0, A_1) \simeq \mathcal{L}(A_1, A_0)$ , with duality  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_*$  given as

$$\langle \psi, \phi \rangle_* := \langle C_{\psi}, \phi \rangle = \tau(\phi \circ \psi),$$

where the functional  $\tau : \mathcal{L}(A_0, A_0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is given by

$$\tau(\xi) = \sum_{i,j} \text{Tr} [|i\rangle\langle j| \xi (|i\rangle\langle j|)] = \langle\langle I_{A_0} | C_{\xi} | I_{A_0} \rangle\rangle,$$

in diagram

$$\tau(\xi) = \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{A_0} \boxed{\xi} \xrightarrow{A_0} \\ \xrightarrow{A_0} \end{array} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{C_{\xi}} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{A_0} \\ \xrightarrow{A_0} \end{array} \end{array}$$

Choosing the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product and the basis  $\{|i\rangle\langle j|\}$  in  $\mathcal{B}(A_0)$ , we see that  $\tau$  is the usual trace of elements in  $\mathcal{L}(A_0, A_0)$  as linear maps. In this identification, the dual section becomes the set of replacement channels in  $\mathcal{C}(A_1, A_0)$ , mapping all states in  $\mathfrak{S}(A_1)$  to a fixed state  $\sigma_{A_0} \in \mathfrak{S}(A_0)$ .

Let us introduce the notation

$$\|\cdot\|_{A_1|A_0}^{\diamond} := \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}^*(A_0, A_1)}$$

for the dual norm. By Prop. 1 (iii), we have for  $\rho \in \mathcal{B}_+(A_0 A_1)$ :

$$\|\rho\|_{A_1|A_0}^{\diamond} = \min_{\sigma_{A_0} \in \mathfrak{S}(A_0)} \min\{\lambda > 0, \rho \leq \lambda \sigma_{A_0} \otimes I_{A_1}\} = 2^{-H_{\min}(A_1|A_0)_{\rho}} \quad (7)$$

where  $H_{min}$  denotes the conditional min-entropy [29, 30]. We also have

$$\|\rho\|_{A_1|A_0}^\diamond = \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{C}(A_0, A_1)} \langle \rho, \alpha \rangle = \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{C}(A_0, A_1)} \langle \langle I_{A_1} | (\alpha \otimes id)(\rho) | I_{A_1} \rangle \rangle. \quad (8)$$

Note that the last equality corresponds to the operational interpretation of the conditional min-entropy as (up to multiplication by  $d_A$ ) the maximum fidelity with the maximally entangled state that can be obtained by applying a quantum channel to part  $A_0$  of the state  $\rho_{A_0 A_1}$  [30].

The following result follows easily from the first equality in (7).

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $\rho \in \mathcal{B}_+(A_0 A_1)$ . Then there is some  $V \in \mathcal{B}(A_0)$ ,  $\text{Tr}[VV^*] = 1$ , and  $G \in \mathcal{B}_+(A_0 A_1)$  such that*

$$\rho = (\chi_V \otimes id)(G), \quad \|G\| = \|\rho\|_{A_1|A_0}^\diamond.$$


Here  $\chi_V := V \cdot V^* \in \mathcal{L}_+(A_0, A_0)$  and  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the operator norm.

### 3.1.7 Diamond 2-norm and conditional 2-min entropy

As we have seen, the set of superchannels  $\mathcal{C}_2(A, B)$  is a subset of  $\mathcal{C}(B_0 A_1, B_1 A_0)$ . In fact, it is itself a base section. More precisely, put  $\mathcal{L}_2(A, B) := \mathcal{L}(B_0 A_1, B_1 A_0)$  with  $\mathcal{L}_2^+(A, B) := \mathcal{L}_+(B_0 A_1, B_1 A_0)$  and  $B(\mathcal{L}_2(A, B)) = \mathcal{C}_2(A, B)$ , then  $\mathcal{L}_2(A, B) \in \text{BS}$ . Using the same identification of the dual space as before, we have  $\mathcal{L}^*(A, B) = B_h(B_1 A_0 B_0 A_1)$  and the dual section is

$$B(\mathcal{L}_2(A, B)) = \{\sigma * C_\gamma \otimes I_{B_1}, \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}(B_0 R), \gamma \in \mathcal{C}(A_0 R, A_1), R \text{ an ancilla}\}$$

Using the identification of the dual space as in Remark 1, this corresponds to a set of superchannels where the preprocessing is a replacement channel, of the form




The norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(A, B)}$  is the distinguishability norm  $\|\cdot\|_{2\circ}$  for quantum networks, see [31, 32] for the definition. Let us denote

$$\|\cdot\|_{B|A}^{2\circ} := \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2^*(A, B)},$$

then for  $\rho \in \mathcal{B}_+(B_0 A_1 B_1 A_0)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho\|_{B|A}^{2\circ} &= \min_{\sigma, \gamma} \min\{\lambda > 0, \rho \leq \lambda(\sigma * C_\gamma)_{B_0 A_1 A_0} \otimes I_{B_1}\} =: 2^{-H_{min}^{(2)}(B|A)_\rho} \\ &= \max_{\Theta \in \mathcal{C}_2(A, B)} \langle \rho, \Theta \rangle = \max_{\Theta \in \mathcal{C}_2(A, B)} \langle \langle I_{A_0 B_1} | (\Theta \otimes id)(\rho) | I_{A_0 B_1} \rangle \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $H_{min}^{(2)}$  will be called the conditional 2-min entropy. Note that this quantity coincides with the extended conditional min-entropy of [9] but we prefer the present notation since it can be extended to any  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  in an obvious way using the set of  $N$ -combs, see also [22]. The last equality shows an operational interpretation as the maximum fidelity (again up to multiplication by the dimension) with the maximally entangled state that can be obtained by applying a structured quantum channel to part  $B_0 A_1$  of  $\rho_{B_0 A_1 B_1 A_0}$  as depicted in the diagram



### 3.1.8 Guessing games

Let  $\mathcal{E} = \{\lambda_i, \rho_i\}_{i=1}^k$  be an ensemble of states  $\rho_i \in \mathfrak{S}(A)$  and prior probabilities  $\lambda_i$ . Quantum measurements with  $k$  outcomes are given by operators  $M = \{M_1, \dots, M_k\}$ , where  $M_j \in \mathcal{B}_+(A)$ ,  $\sum_j M_j = I_A$ , the set of all such measurements for the system  $A$  will be denoted by  $\mathcal{M}_k(A)$ . It is well known that the optimal success probability  $P_{succ}(\mathcal{E})$  is related to the conditional min entropy as follows, [30]. Let us define the quantum-classical state  $\rho_{\mathcal{E}} = \sum_i \lambda_i \rho_i \otimes |i\rangle\langle i| \in \mathfrak{S}(AR)$ , where  $d_R = k$ . Then for any channel  $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}(A, R)$ , we have

$$\langle \rho_{\mathcal{E}}, \alpha \rangle = P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}, M) = \langle \rho_{\mathcal{E}}, \Phi_M \rangle,$$

where  $M \in \mathcal{M}_k(A)$ ,  $M_i = \alpha^*(|i\rangle\langle i|)$  and  $\Phi_M \in \mathcal{C}(A, R)$  is the q-c channel given by  $\Phi_M(\sigma) = \sum_i \text{Tr}[\sigma M_i] |i\rangle\langle i|$ . It follows that

$$\|\rho_{\mathcal{E}}\|_{R|A}^{\diamond} = P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}), \quad (9)$$

see also Example 2. This implies the following result that will be useful later.

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $\mathcal{E} = \{\lambda_i, \rho_i\}_{i=1}^k$  be an ensemble on  $A$  and let  $M \in \mathcal{M}_k(B)$ . Then for any pair of channels  $\Phi_1, \Phi_2 \in \mathcal{C}(A, B)$ , we have*

$$P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}, \Psi_1^*(M)) - P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}, \Psi_2^*(M)) \leq \frac{1}{2} P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}) \|\Psi_1 - \Psi_2\|_{\diamond}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\rho = \rho_{\mathcal{E}} \in \mathfrak{S}(AR)$ . Note that the q-c channel  $\Phi_{\Psi_i^*(M)} = \Phi_M \circ \Phi_i$  and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}, \Phi_1^*(M)) - P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}, \Phi_2^*(M)) &= \langle \rho, \Phi_M \circ \Phi_1 - \Phi_M \circ \Phi_2 \rangle \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\rho\|_{R|A}^{\diamond} \|\Phi_M \circ (\Phi_1 - \Phi_2)\|_{\diamond} \leq \frac{1}{2} P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}) \|\Phi_1 - \Phi_2\|_{\diamond}, \end{aligned}$$

here we used Prop. 1 (iv) and (v) and (9). □

It was proved in [10, Prop. 2] that the dual norm  $\|\cdot\|_{R|A}^{\diamond}$  can be interpreted as a success probability not only for quantum-classical states. Namely, for any state  $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(AR)$  we can find an ensemble  $\mathcal{E}_{\rho}^R$  on  $AR$  such that

$$\|\rho\|_{R|A}^{\diamond} = d_R P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}_{\rho}^R). \quad (10)$$

This is obtained as follows. Let  $\{U_1^R, \dots, U_{d_R}^R\}$  be the group of generalized Pauli unitaries on  $R$  and let  $\mathcal{U}_i^R$  denote the conjugation by  $U_i^R$ , so that we have

$$\sum_i \mathcal{U}_i^R(X) = d_R \text{Tr}[X] I_R.$$

Let

$$\mathbf{B}_i^R := d_R^{-1} (id \otimes \mathcal{U}_i^R)(|I_R\rangle\langle I_R|) = d_R^{-1} |(U_i^R)^T\rangle\langle (U_i^R)^T|$$

then  $\mathbf{B}^R = \{\mathbf{B}_1^R, \dots, \mathbf{B}_{d_R}^R\}$  defines the Bell measurement on  $RR$ . We also put

$$\mathcal{E}_{\rho}^R = \{d_R^{-2}, (id_A \otimes \mathcal{U}_i^R)(\rho)\}_{i=1}^{d_R^2}.$$

For any channel  $\beta \in \mathcal{C}(A, R)$  we have

$$\langle \rho, \beta \rangle = d_R P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}_{\rho}^R, (\beta^* \otimes id)(\mathbf{B}^R)). \quad (11)$$

Also conversely, for any measurement  $M \in \mathcal{M}_{d_R^2}(AR)$  there is  $\beta \in \mathcal{C}(A, R)$  such that

$$d_R P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}_{\rho}, M) = \langle \rho, \beta \rangle, \quad C_{\beta^*} = \sum_i d_R^{-1} (id \otimes (\mathcal{U}_i^R)^*)(M_i), \quad (12)$$

this proves (10).

*Remark 2.* The above construction implies another operational interpretation of  $\|\rho\|_{R|A}^\diamond$ . Namely, observe that  $\{d_R^{-2}, \mathcal{U}_i^R\}$  can be interpreted as an ensemble of quantum channels. Here the measurements can be described by pairs  $(\rho, M)$ , consisting of an input state  $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(AR)$  with some ancilla  $A$  and  $M$  is a measurement on  $AS$ , such triples are also called quantum testers [31]. The average success probability for the tester  $(\rho, M)$  is then

$$P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}, \rho, M) := P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}(\rho), M)$$

where  $\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \{\lambda_i, (\Phi_i \otimes id)(\rho)\}$ .

Any state  $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(AR)$  can be seen as the input state of some tester. We claim that the norm  $\|\rho\|_{R|A}^\diamond$  can be interpreted as  $(d_R)$  times the maximal success probability that can be obtained by all testers with input state  $\rho$  for equiprobable ensembles  $\mathcal{E} = \{d_R^{-2}, \Phi_i\}_{i=1}^{d_R^2}$ , where  $\Phi_i \in \mathcal{C}(R, S)$  are unital channels. Indeed, let  $M \in \mathcal{M}_{d_R^2}(AS)$  be any measurement, we have

$$P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}, \rho, M) = d_R^{-2} \sum_i \text{Tr}[(id \otimes \Phi_i)(\rho)M_i] = d_R^{-1} \text{Tr}[\rho C],$$

where  $C = d_R^{-1} \sum_i (id \otimes \Phi_i^*)(M_i) \in \mathcal{B}_+(AR)$ . Since  $\Phi_i^*$  is trace preserving, we see that  $\text{Tr}_R[C] = d_R^{-1} \text{Tr}_R[\mathbb{I}] = \mathbb{I}_A$ . Hence there is a channel  $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}(R, A)$  such that  $C = C_{\alpha^*}$ . Finishing the above computation, we obtain

$$P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}, \rho, M) = d_R^{-1} \text{Tr}[\rho C_{\alpha^*}] = d_R^{-1} \langle \rho, \alpha \rangle \leq d_R^{-1} \|\rho\|_{R|A}.$$

As we have seen, equality is attained for  $\Phi_i = \mathcal{U}_i^R$ .

Let us now return to the guessing game given an ensemble  $\mathcal{E}$  of states of  $A$ , but assume that only one given measurement  $M \in \mathcal{M}_l(A)$  can be performed and the true state has to be guessed using its outcome. Any guessing procedure is described by conditional probabilities  $\{p(i|j)\}$ , giving the probability of guessing  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  if  $j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$  was measured. The average probability of a correct guess using this procedure is

$$P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}, M, p) := \sum_{i,j} \lambda_i p(i|j) \text{Tr}[\rho_i M_j]$$

and the maximal success probability is denoted by (cf. [3])

$$P_{succ}^Q(\mathcal{E}, M) := \sup_{\{p(i|j)\}} P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}, M, p).$$


Let  $\Phi_M \in \mathcal{C}(A, S)$ ,  $d_S = l$ , be the q-c channel given by  $M$ . Note that for any set of conditional probabilities  $\{p(i|j)\}$  we have

$$P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}, M, p) = \langle \rho_{\mathcal{E}}, \alpha_p \circ \Phi_M \rangle,$$

(see Section 3.1.5 for the definition of  $\alpha_p$ ). Moreover, for any  $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}(S, R)$ , there are conditional probabilities  $\{p(j|i) := \langle j|\alpha(|i\rangle\langle i|)|j\rangle\}$ , such that

$$\langle (\Phi_M \otimes id)(\rho_{\mathcal{E}}), \alpha \rangle = \langle \rho_{\mathcal{E}}, \alpha \circ \Phi_M \rangle = \langle \rho_{\mathcal{E}}, \alpha_p \circ \Phi_M \rangle = P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}, M, p), \quad (13)$$

in diagram



This proves the following result.

**Lemma 4.** For any ensemble  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $A$  and  $M \in \mathcal{M}_{d_S}(A)$ ,

$$P_{succ}^Q(\mathcal{E}, M) = \|(\Phi_M \otimes id)(\rho_{\mathcal{E}})\|_{S|A}^\diamond = P_{succ}(\Phi_M(\mathcal{E})).$$

### 3.2 Randomization theorems for quantum channels

We now prove several versions of the randomization theorem for a pair of quantum channels  $\Phi_1$  and  $\Phi_2$ . We will use the setting of Section 2.2, where the objects in  $\mathbf{F}$  are some spaces of channels (as in Sec. 3.1.6) and morphisms between them are given by some convex subsets of superchannels, (so  $\mathbf{F}$  is in fact a convex subcategory of the category of quantum channels with superchannels). We will use the notation

$$\mathbf{F}(A, B) := \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{L}(A_0, A_1), \mathcal{L}(B_0, B_1)) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_2(A, B).$$

Let  $\mathcal{L}(A_0, A_1)$  and  $\mathcal{L}(B_0, B_1)$  be objects in  $\mathbf{F}$  and let  $\Phi_1 \in \mathcal{C}(A_0, A_1)$ ,  $\Phi_2 \in \mathcal{C}(B_0, B_1)$ . The  $\mathbf{F}$ -deficiency of  $\Phi_1$  with respect to  $\Phi_2$  becomes

$$\delta_{\mathbf{F}}(\Phi_1 \parallel \Phi_2) = \inf_{\Lambda \in \mathbf{F}(A, B)} \|\Lambda(\Phi_1) - \Phi_2\|_{\diamond}.$$

The following general randomization theorem for quantum channels is a straightforward reformulation of Thm. 2 from the GPT setting.

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $\epsilon \geq 0$ . The following are equivalent.*

(i)  $\delta_{\mathbf{F}}(\Phi_1 \parallel \Phi_2) \leq \epsilon;$

(ii) *for any  $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(B_0 B_1)$ , there is some  $\Theta \in \mathbf{F}(A, B)$  such that*

$$\langle \rho, \Phi_2 \rangle \leq \langle \rho, \Theta(\Phi_1) \rangle + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|\rho\|_{B_1|B_0}^{\diamond};$$

(iii) *for any  $\mathcal{L}(R_0, R_1) \in \mathbf{F}$  and any  $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(R_0 R_1)$ ,*

$$\sup_{\Theta \in \mathbf{F}(B, R)} \langle \rho, \Theta(\Phi_2) \rangle \leq \sup_{\Theta' \in \mathbf{F}(A, R)} \langle \rho, \Theta'(\Phi_1) \rangle + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|\rho\|_{R_1|R_0}^{\diamond}.$$

In the paragraphs below, we will consider several choices of  $\mathbf{F}$ : quantum channels with postprocessings and preprocessings, bipartite channels with superchannels applied to one of the parts. We will show that in these cases, the quantities in the part (iii) of the above theorem can be expressed as conditional min-entropies or conditional 2-min-entropies. Furthermore, we will show an operational interpretation in terms of success probabilities in some modified guessing games that involve the use the channel  $\Phi_1$  or  $\Phi_2$ . Such games can be described as follows.

Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be an ensemble on  $A$  and let a channel  $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}(B, C)$  be fixed. Let  $\mathcal{C}_{pre} \subseteq \mathcal{C}(A, B)$  be a set of channels and  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_k(C)$  a set of measurements. We consider guessing games where the allowed procedures consist of preprocessing the unknown state by some  $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}_{pre}$ , sending it through the channel  $\Phi$  and measuring some  $M \in \mathcal{M}$ . The optimal success probability using this scheme is then

$$P_{succ}^{\mathcal{C}_{pre}, \Phi, \mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{E}) := \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{C}_{pre}, M \in \mathcal{M}} P_{succ}(\alpha(\mathcal{E}), \Phi^*(M)).$$

### 3.3 Comparison by postprocessings

We begin with the description of the postprocessing deficiency. This case was already considered in [10], where the results below were obtained. We will state these results without proof for completeness, just noting that they fit into the present setting.

Assume that the channels  $\Phi_1 \in \mathcal{C}(A_0, A_1)$  and  $\Phi_2 \in \mathcal{C}(A_0, B_1)$  have the same input spaces. The postprocessing deficiency of  $\Phi_1$  with respect to  $\Phi_2$  is defined as

$$\delta_{post}(\Phi_1 \parallel \Phi_2) := \min_{\Lambda \in \mathcal{C}(A_1, B_1)} \|\Lambda \circ \Phi_1 - \Phi_2\|_{\diamond}.$$

Let the objects of  $\mathbf{F}$  be the spaces of channels  $\mathcal{L}(A_0, R_1)$  with a fixed input system  $A_0$  and morphisms  $\mathcal{L}(A_0, R_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(A_0, S_1)$  given by postprocessings:  $\Phi \mapsto \Lambda \circ \Phi$  for some  $\Lambda \in \mathcal{C}(R_1, S_1)$ . Then it is clear that  $\delta_{\mathbf{F}} \equiv \delta_{post}$ .

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $\Phi_1 \in \mathcal{C}(A_0, A_1)$ ,  $\Phi_2 \in \mathcal{C}(A_0, B_1)$  and let  $\epsilon \geq 0$ . The following are equivalent.*

(i)  $\delta_{post}(\Phi_1 \parallel \Phi_2) \leq \epsilon;$

(ii) For any  $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(A_0B_1)$ , there is some  $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}(A_1, B_1)$  such that

$$\langle \rho, \Phi_2 \rangle \leq \langle \rho, \alpha \circ \Phi_1 \rangle + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|\rho\|_{B_1|A_0}^\diamond;$$

(iii) For any ancilla  $R_1$  and  $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(A_0R_1)$ , we have

$$\|(\Phi_2 \otimes id_{R_1})(\rho)\|_{R_1|B_1}^\diamond \leq \|(\Phi_1 \otimes id_{R_1})(\rho)\|_{R_1|A_1}^\diamond + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|\rho\|_{R_1|A_0}^\diamond;$$

(iv) For any ancilla  $R_1$  and any ensemble  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $A_0R_1$ , we have

$$P_{succ}((\Phi_2 \otimes id_{R_1})(\mathcal{E})) \leq P_{succ}((\Phi_1 \otimes id_{R_1})(\mathcal{E})) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}).$$

Moreover, in (iii) and (iv), it is enough to use  $R_1 \simeq B_1$  and equiprobable ensembles.

Note that for  $\epsilon = 0$ , we obtain an ordering on the set of channels that was treated also in [6, 7, 5, 8]. For the infinite dimensional case, see [33].

### 3.4 Comparison by preprocessings

This time, the objects of  $\mathbb{F}$  are  $\mathcal{L}(R_0, A_1)$ , with fixed output system  $A_1$ , and the morphisms  $\mathcal{L}(R_0, A_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(S_0, A_1)$  in  $\mathbb{F}$  are restricted to preprocessings  $\Phi \mapsto \Phi \circ \Lambda$ ,  $\Lambda \in \mathcal{C}(S_0, R_0)$ . The  $\mathbb{F}$ -deficiency becomes the preprocessing deficiency of  $\Phi_1$  with respect to  $\Phi_2$ :

$$\delta_{pre}(\Phi_1 \|\Phi_2) = \min_{\Lambda \in \mathcal{C}(B_0, A_0)} \|\Phi_1 \circ \Lambda - \Phi_2\|_\diamond.$$

We will also consider the corresponding  $\mathbb{F}$ -distance, which will be denoted by  $\Delta_{pre}$ .

A part of the following theorem was proved in [11].

**Theorem 5.** *Let  $\Phi_1 \in \mathcal{C}(A_0, A_1)$ ,  $\Phi_2 \in \mathcal{C}(B_0, A_1)$  and let  $\epsilon \geq 0$ . The following are equivalent.*

(i)  $\delta_{pre}(\Phi_1 \|\Phi_2) \leq \epsilon;$

(ii) For any  $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(B_0A_1)$ , there is some  $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}(B_0, A_0)$  such that

$$\langle \rho, \Phi_2 \rangle \leq \langle \rho, \Phi_1 \circ \alpha \rangle + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|\rho\|_{A_1|B_0}^\diamond;$$

(iii) For any ancilla  $R_0$  and  $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(R_0A_1)$ , we have


$$\|(id_{R_0} \otimes \Phi_2^T)(\rho)\|_{B_0|R_0}^\diamond \leq \|(id_{R_0} \otimes \Phi_1^T)(\rho)\|_{A_0|R_0}^\diamond + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|\rho\|_{A_1|R_0}^\diamond,$$

(iv) For any ancilla  $R_0$ , any ensemble  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $R_0A_1$  and any fixed measurement  $M$  on  $A_1A_1$ , we have

$$P_{succ}^{C(R_0, B_0), \Phi_2, \{M\}}(\mathcal{E}) \leq P_{succ}^{C(R_0, A_0), \Phi_1, \{M\}}(\mathcal{E}) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}).$$

Moreover, in (iii) and (iv), it is enough to use  $R_0 \simeq B_0$  and equiprobable ensembles.

Note that in (iv) we skipped some tensoring with identity channels, so the preprocessing channels and  $\Phi_1$  or  $\Phi_2$  are applied to appropriate systems, as in the diagram




Here the measurement  $M$  is fixed,  $\Phi$  is either  $\Phi_1$  or  $\Phi_2$  and  $\alpha$  is any preprocessing chosen from  $\mathcal{C}(R_0, A_0)$  or  $\mathcal{C}(R_0, B_0)$ .

*Proof.* The equivalences (i)  $\iff$  (ii)  $\iff$  (iii) follow from Thm. 2 and

$$\langle \rho, \Phi \circ \alpha \rangle = (\rho * C_\Phi) * C_\alpha = \langle (id_{R_0} \otimes \Phi^T)(\rho), \alpha \rangle$$

In diagram:



We next prove (i)  $\implies$  (iv). Assume that there is some  $\Lambda \in \mathcal{C}(B_0, A_0)$  such that  $\|\Phi_1 \circ \Lambda - \Phi_2\|_\diamond \leq \epsilon$ . Let  $\mathcal{E} = \{\lambda_i, \rho_i\}_{i=1}^k$  be an ensemble on  $R_0 A_1$  and let  $M \in \mathcal{M}_k(A_1 A_1)$ . For any  $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}(R_0, B_0)$ , we have by Lemma 3

$$\begin{aligned} P_{succ}((\alpha \otimes id)(\mathcal{E}), (\Phi_2^* \otimes id)(M)) &\leq P_{succ}((\alpha \otimes id)(\mathcal{E}), ((\Lambda \circ \Phi_1)^* \otimes id)(M)) \\ &\quad + \frac{\epsilon}{2} P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} P_{succ}((\alpha \otimes id)(\mathcal{E}), ((\Lambda \circ \Phi_1)^* \otimes id)(M)) &= P_{succ}((\Lambda \circ \alpha \otimes id)(\mathcal{E}), (\Phi_1^* \otimes id)(M)) \\ &\leq P_{succ}^{\mathcal{C}(R_0, A_0), \Phi_1, \{M\}}(\mathcal{E}). \end{aligned}$$

Conversely, assume (iv) holds with  $R_0 = B_0$  and let  $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(B_0 A_1)$  and  $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}(B_0, A_0)$ . Recall the notation of Sec. 3.1.8 and put  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_\rho^{A_1}$ . Since  $(\alpha \otimes id)(\mathcal{E}) = \mathcal{E}_{(\alpha \otimes id)(\rho)}^{A_1}$ , we obtain by (11)

$$d_{A_1} P_{succ}((\alpha \otimes id)(\mathcal{E}), (\Phi_1^* \otimes id)(B^{A_1})) = \langle (\alpha \otimes id)(\rho), \Phi_1 \rangle = \langle \rho, \Phi_1 \circ \alpha \rangle$$

so that

$$d_{A_1} P_{succ}^{\mathcal{C}(R_0, A_0), \Phi_1, \{B^{A_1}\}}(\mathcal{E}) = \|(id_{R_0} \otimes \Phi_1^T)(\rho)\|_{A_0 | R_0}^\diamond$$

and similarly for  $\Phi_2$ . This yields (iii) with  $R_0 = B_0$ , which clearly implies (ii).  $\square$

Let us consider the more general situation when the morphisms of  $\mathbf{F}$  are preprocessings by channels in some convex subset  $\mathcal{F}(S_0, R_0) \subseteq \mathcal{C}(S_0, R_0)$  such that  $\mathbf{F}$  is a subcategory. Then

$$\delta_{\mathbf{F}}(\Phi_1 \| \Phi_2) = \inf_{\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}(B_0, A_0)} \|\Phi_1 \circ \Lambda - \Phi_2\|_\diamond.$$

It can be seen as in the above proof that we have  $\delta_{\mathbf{F}}(\Phi_1 \| \Phi_2) \leq \epsilon$  if and only if for any ensemble  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $B_0 A_1$  and any fixed measurement  $M$  on  $A_1 A_1$  there is some  $\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}(B_0, A_0)$  such that

$$P_{succ}((\Phi_2 \otimes id)(\mathcal{E}), M) \leq P_{succ}((\Phi_1 \circ \Lambda \otimes id)(\mathcal{E}), M) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}).$$

Let now  $\Phi_1 = id_{A_1}$ ,  $\Phi_2 = \Phi \in \mathcal{C}(A_0, A_1)$ , then the  $\mathbf{F}$ -deficiency becomes

$$\delta_{\mathbf{F}}(id \| \Phi) = \inf_{\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}(A_0, A_1)} \|\Lambda - \Phi\|_\diamond,$$

that is, the distance of  $\Phi$  to the set  $\mathcal{F}$ . If  $\mathcal{F}$  is the set of free channels in a resource theory for quantum channels, then  $\mathbf{F}$  is a subcategory and this distance is a resource measure, [16]. The above considerations now give the following operational characterization of this distance.

**Corollary 1.**  $\inf_{\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}(A_0, A_1)} \|\Lambda - \Phi\|_\diamond \leq \epsilon$  if and only if for any ensemble  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $A_0 A_1$  and any measurement  $M$  on  $A_1 A_1$  we have

$$P_{succ}((\Phi \otimes id)(\mathcal{E}), M) \leq \sup_{\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}} P_{succ}((\Lambda \otimes id)(\mathcal{E}), M) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}).$$

### 3.4.1 $\Delta_{pre}$ as the distance of ranges

In this paragraph, we obtain a characterization of the deficiency  $\delta_{pre}$  and the pseudo-distance  $\Delta_{pre}$  in terms of the ranges of channels. Recall that the range of a channel  $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}(A_0, A_1)$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{R}(\Phi) = \Phi(\mathfrak{S}(A_0)).$$

Our first result in this direction is based on the following simple lemma. The proof is rather standard and is included for the convenience of the reader.

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}(AR)$  and let  $Z \in \mathcal{B}(R)$  be such that  $\sigma_R = \text{Tr}_A[\sigma] = ZZ^*$ . Then there is some channel  $\beta \in \mathcal{C}(R, A)$  such that  $\sigma = (\beta \otimes id)(|Z^T\rangle\rangle\langle\langle Z^T|)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $p = \text{supp}(\sigma)$  and let  $p_R = \text{supp}(\sigma_R)$ , then  $p \leq I \otimes p_R$  and we may put

$$C := (I \otimes U^* \sigma_R^{-1/2}) \sigma (I \otimes \sigma_R^{-1/2} U) + d_A^{-1} I_A \otimes (I - U^* p_R U),$$

where  $U \in \mathcal{B}(R)$  is a unitary such that  $Z = \sigma_R^{1/2} U$  and the inverse is restricted to  $p_R$ . Since  $C \geq 0$  and  $\text{Tr}_A[C] = I_R$ , there is some  $\beta \in \mathcal{C}(R, A)$  such that  $C = C_\beta$ . We have

$$\sigma = (I \otimes Z) C_\beta (I \otimes Z^*) = (\beta \otimes id)(|Z^T\rangle\rangle\langle\langle Z^T|).$$

□

**Corollary 2.** *Let  $\Phi_1 \in \mathcal{C}(A_0, A_1)$ ,  $\Phi_2 \in \mathcal{C}(B_0, A_1)$  and let  $\epsilon \geq 0$ . Then*

$$\delta_{pre}(\Phi_1 \| \Phi_2) = \sup_{\xi \in \mathfrak{S}(B_0 R)} \inf_{\substack{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}(A_0 R) \\ \sigma_R = \xi_R}} \|(\Phi_1 \otimes id)(\sigma) - (\Phi_2 \otimes id)(\xi)\|_1$$

where  $R \simeq B_0$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\Lambda \in \mathcal{C}(B_0, A_0)$  be such that  $\|\Phi_1 \circ \Lambda - \Phi_2\|_\diamond \leq \epsilon$ . Then for any  $\xi \in \mathfrak{S}(B_0 R)$ , we have

$$\|(\Phi_1 \circ \Lambda \otimes id)(\xi) - (\Phi_2 \otimes id)(\xi)\|_1 \leq \|\Phi_1 \circ \Lambda - \Phi_2\|_\diamond \leq \epsilon.$$

Put  $\sigma = (\Lambda \otimes id)(\xi)$ , then we also have  $\sigma_R = \xi_R$ , so that the supremum on the right hand side is upper bounded by  $\delta_{pre}$ . For the converse, let  $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(B_0 A_1)$ . By Lemma 2, there is some  $V \in \mathcal{B}(B_0)$ ,  $\text{Tr}[VV^*] = 1$  and an element  $G \in \mathcal{B}_+(B_0 A_1)$  such that

$$\rho = (\chi_V \otimes id)(G), \quad \|\rho\|_{A_1|B_0}^\diamond = \|G\|.$$

Using (5) and (6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \rho, \Phi_2 \rangle &= \langle (\chi_V \otimes id)(G), \Phi_2 \rangle = \langle G, \Phi_2 \circ \chi_V \rangle = \text{Tr}[C_{\Phi_2 \circ \chi_V} \tilde{G}] \\ &= \text{Tr}[(\Phi_2 \otimes id)(|V\rangle\rangle\langle\langle V|) \tilde{G}], \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{G} = \mathcal{U}_{A_1, B_0}^*(G^T)$ . Note that  $\xi := |V\rangle\rangle\langle\langle V| \in \mathfrak{S}(B_0 B_0)$ , with  $\text{Tr}_1[\xi] = V^T (V^T)^*$ . Assume that there is some  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}(A_0 B_0)$  with  $\sigma_{B_0} = \text{Tr}_1[\xi]$  and

$$\|(\Phi_2 \otimes id)(\xi) - (\Phi_1 \otimes id)(\sigma)\|_1 \leq \epsilon.$$

By Lemma 5, there is some channel  $\beta \in \mathcal{C}(B_0, A_0)$  such that  $\sigma = (\beta \otimes id)(|V\rangle\rangle\langle\langle V|)$ . We now have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \rho, \Phi_2 - \Phi_1 \circ \beta \rangle &= \langle G, (\Phi_2 - \Phi_1 \circ \beta) \circ \chi_V \rangle \\ &= \text{Tr}[(\Phi_2 \otimes id)(\xi) - (\Phi_1 \otimes id)(\sigma)] \tilde{G} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|(\Phi_2 \otimes id)(\xi) - (\Phi_1 \otimes id)(\sigma)\|_1 \|G\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|\rho\|_{A_1|B_0}^\diamond, \end{aligned}$$

here the inequalities follow from the fact that  $\tilde{G} \in \mathcal{B}_+(A_1 B_0)$ , properties of the trace norm  $\|\cdot\|_1$  and  $\|\tilde{G}\| = \|G\| = \|\rho\|_{A_1|B_0}^\diamond$ . From Thm. 5 (ii), we obtain that  $\delta_{pre}(\Phi_1 \| \Phi_2) \leq \epsilon$ .

□



Using the above corollary, we immediately obtain that for any  $R$  with  $d_R \geq d_{B_0}$ ,  $\delta_{pre}(\Phi_1 \|\Phi_2) = 0$  is equivalent to the inclusion

$$\mathcal{R}(\Phi_2 \otimes id_R) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\Phi_1 \otimes id_R).$$

In the case of q-c channels, that is for measurements (POVMs), this result was proved in [34], where also a counterexample was given, showing that inclusion of the ranges of the channels is not enough for existence of even a positive preprocessing, so that tensoring with  $id_R$  is necessary in general.

We next show that the pseudo-distance  $\Delta_{pre}$  can be expressed as the distance of ranges. Recall that for two subsets  $S, T$  of a metric space with metric  $m$ , the Hausdorff distance is defined by

$$m_H(S, T) = \max\{\sup_{s \in S} \inf_{t \in T} m(s, t), \sup_{t \in T} \inf_{s \in S} m(s, t)\}.$$

A natural choice for a metric on the set of states would be the trace distance

$$\|\sigma - \rho\|_1 = \text{Tr} |\sigma - \rho|, \quad \sigma, \rho \in \mathfrak{S}(A_1 R).$$

As it turns out, we will have to add a term for the distance of the restrictions to  $R$ . For  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathfrak{S}(R)$ , let  $p(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$  denote the purified distance

$$p(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = \sqrt{1 - F(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)^2} = \inf_{V_1 V_1^* = \sigma_1, V_2 V_2^* = \sigma_2} \frac{1}{2} \| |V_1^T\rangle\langle V_1^T| - |V_2^T\rangle\langle V_2^T| \|_1,$$

where  $F$  denotes the fidelity  $F(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = \|\sigma_1^{1/2} \sigma_2^{1/2}\|_1$ .

**Corollary 3.** *For  $\Phi_1 \in \mathcal{C}(A_0, A_1)$  and  $\Phi_2 \in \mathcal{C}(B_0, A_1)$ , we have*

$$\Delta_{pre}(\Phi_1, \Phi_2) = m_H(\mathcal{R}(\Phi_1 \otimes id_R), \mathcal{R}(\Phi_2 \otimes id_R)),$$

where  $d_R = \max\{d_{A_0}, d_{B_0}\}$  and  $m_H$  is the Hausdorff distance with respect to the metric  $m$  in  $\mathfrak{S}(A_1 R)$ , given as

$$m(\xi, \sigma) = \|\xi - \sigma\|_1 + 2p(\xi_R, \sigma_R)$$

*Proof.* From Corollary 2, we easily obtain that  $m_H(\mathcal{R}(\Phi_1 \otimes id_R), \mathcal{R}(\Phi_2 \otimes id_R)) \leq \Delta_{pre}(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$ . For the converse, put

$$\epsilon := m_H(\mathcal{R}(\Phi_1 \otimes id_R), \mathcal{R}(\Phi_2 \otimes id_R)).$$

The idea of the proof is similar to the previous proof. Let  $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(RA_1)$ ,  $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}(R, B_0)$  and let  $V$  and  $G$  be connected to  $\rho$  as in the proof of Corollary 2. Let also  $\xi := (\alpha \otimes id)(|V\rangle\langle V|) \in \mathfrak{S}(B_0 R)$ . Then there is some  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}(A_0 R)$  such that

$$m((\Phi_2 \otimes id)(\xi), (\Phi_1 \otimes id)(\sigma)) \leq \epsilon.$$

Note that unlike the previous proof, we may now have  $\xi_R \neq \sigma_R$ . Let  $W \in \mathcal{B}(R)$  be such that  $W^T(W^T)^* = \sigma_R$  and

$$2p(\xi_R, \sigma_R) = \| |V\rangle\langle V| - |W\rangle\langle W| \|_1$$

(such  $W$  always exists since  $\|\cdot\|_1$  is unitarily invariant). By Lemma 5, there is a channel  $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(R, A_0)$  such that

$$\sigma = (\gamma \otimes id)(|W\rangle\langle W|) = C_{\gamma \circ \chi_W}.$$


We now have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \rho, \Phi_2 \circ \alpha - \Phi_1 \circ \gamma \rangle &= \langle G, (\Phi_2 \circ \alpha - \Phi_1 \circ \gamma) \circ \chi_V \rangle \\ &= \langle G, \Phi_2 \circ \alpha \circ \chi_V - \Phi_1 \circ \gamma \circ \chi_W \rangle + \langle G, \Phi_1 \circ \gamma \circ (\chi_W - \chi_V) \rangle \\ &= \text{Tr} [((\Phi_2 \otimes id)(\xi) - (\Phi_1 \otimes id)(\sigma)) \tilde{G}] \\ &\quad + \text{Tr} [(\Phi_1 \circ \gamma \otimes id)(|W\rangle\langle W| - |V\rangle\langle V|) \tilde{G}] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\rho\|_{A_1 R}^\diamond (\|(\Phi_2 \otimes id)(\xi) - (\Phi_1 \otimes id)(\sigma)\|_1 + \tilde{m}_B(\xi_R, \sigma_R)) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|\rho\|_{A_1 R}^\diamond. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality implies that  $\delta_{pre}(\Phi_1 \|\Phi_2) \leq \epsilon$  and we similarly obtain that also  $\delta_{pre}(\Phi_2 \|\Phi_1) \leq \epsilon$ .  $\square$

### 3.5 Comparison of bipartite channels

Assume that we have a pair of bipartite channels,  $\Phi_1 \in \mathcal{C}(A_0C_0, A_1C_1)$ ,  $\Phi_2 \in \mathcal{C}(B_0C_0, B_1C_1)$  and the task is to approximate  $\Phi_2$  by applying a superchannel  $\Lambda = \Lambda_1 * \Lambda_2 \in \mathcal{C}_2(A, B)$  to the first part of  $\Phi_1$ , in diagram



In the setting of Sec. 2.2, the objects of  $\mathbf{F}$  are spaces of channels  $\mathcal{L}(R_0C_0, R_1C_1)$  with  $C_0, C_1$  fixed. The morphisms  $\mathcal{L}(R_0C_0, R_1C_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(S_0C_0, S_1C_1)$  in  $\mathbf{F}$  are given by elements of  $\mathcal{C}_2(R, S)$ . The corresponding  $\mathbf{F}$ -deficiency will be called the  $A|B$  deficiency of  $\Phi_1$  with respect to  $\Phi_2$ :

$$\delta_{A|B}(\Phi_1 \| \Phi_2) := \min_{\Theta \in \mathcal{C}_2(A, B)} \|(\Theta \otimes id_C)(\Phi_1) - \Phi_2\|_{\diamond}.$$

**Theorem 6.** *Let  $\Phi_1 \in \mathcal{C}(A_0C_0, A_1C_1)$ ,  $\Phi_2 \in \mathcal{C}(B_0C_0, B_1C_1)$  and let  $\epsilon \geq 0$ . The following are equivalent.*

(i)  $\delta_{A|B}(\Phi_1 \| \Phi_2) \leq \epsilon$ ;

(ii) for any  $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(B_0C_0B_1C_1)$ , there is some  $\Theta \in \mathcal{C}_2(A, B)$  such that

$$\langle \rho, \Phi_2 \rangle \leq \langle \rho, (\Theta \otimes id)(\Phi_1) \rangle + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|\rho\|_{B_1C_1|B_0C_0}^{\diamond};$$

(iii) For any spaces  $R_0, R_1$  and  $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(R_0C_0R_1C_1)$ , we have

$$\|\rho * C_{\Phi_2}\|_{R|B}^{2\circ} \leq \|\rho * C_{\Phi_1}\|_{R|A}^{2\circ} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|\rho\|_{R_1C_1|R_0C_0}^{\diamond};$$


(iv) For any spaces  $R_0, R_1$ , any ensemble  $\mathcal{E}$  of  $k$  states on  $R_0C_0R_1C_1$ , any fixed measurement  $M \in \mathcal{M}_k(C_1C_1)$  and any ancilla  $S$  with  $d_S \geq d_{A_0R_0}$ , we have

$$P_{succ}^{\mathcal{C}(R_0, SB_0), \Phi_2, \mathcal{M}_2}(\mathcal{E}) \leq P_{succ}^{\mathcal{C}(R_0, SA_0), \Phi_1, \mathcal{M}_1}(\mathcal{E}) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}),$$

where  $\mathcal{M}_1 = \mathcal{M}_k(SR_1A_1) \otimes M$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2 = \mathcal{M}_k(SR_1B_1) \otimes M$ .

Moreover, in (iii) and (iv) it is enough to put  $R_0 \simeq B_0$ ,  $R_1 \simeq B_1$  and  $S \simeq A_0B_0$ .

We give a diagrammatic description of the guessing games of (iv): For an ensemble  $\mathcal{E} = \{\lambda_i, \rho_i\}$  and a fixed measurement  $M$ , we pick a preprocessing  $\alpha$  and a measurement  $N$ , applied as




here  $\Phi$  is either  $\Phi_1$  or  $\Phi_2$ .

*Proof.* As before, the equivalences (i)  $\iff$  (ii)  $\iff$  (iii) follow from Thm. 2 and the definition of the norm  $\|\cdot\|^{2\circ}$ . To prove that (i)  $\implies$  (iv), let  $\Lambda \in \mathcal{C}_2(A, B)$  be such that  $\|(\Lambda \otimes id)(\Phi_1) - \Phi_2\|_\circ \leq \epsilon$  and let  $\Lambda_1$  and  $\Lambda_2$  be channels such that  $\Lambda = \Lambda_1 * \Lambda_2$ . Let  $\mathcal{E} = \{\lambda_i, \rho_i\}$ ,  $M$  and  $S$  be as in (iv). Then for any  $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}(R_0, SB_0)$  and  $N \in \mathcal{M}_k(SR_1B_1)$ , we have by Lemma 3

$$P_{succ}(\alpha(\mathcal{E}), \Phi_2^*(N \otimes M)) \leq P_{succ}(\alpha(\mathcal{E}), (\Lambda \otimes id)(\Phi_1)^*(N \otimes M)) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}).$$

Note that  $\Theta := \alpha * \Phi_N$  is a superchannel mapping every channel  $B_0 \rightarrow B_1$  to a q-c channel on  $R_1R_0$ :



By the properties of the link product

$$\begin{aligned} P_{succ}(\alpha(\mathcal{E}), (\Lambda \otimes id)(\Phi_1)^*(N \otimes M)) &= \langle (\alpha \otimes id)(\rho_{\mathcal{E}}), (\Phi_N \otimes \Phi_M) \circ (\Lambda \otimes id)(\Phi_1) \rangle \\ &= (C_\alpha * \rho_{\mathcal{E}}) * (C_{\Lambda(\Phi_1)} * C_{\Phi_N} * C_{\Phi_M}) \\ &= \rho_{\mathcal{E}} * (C_\alpha * C_{\Phi_N} * (C_\Lambda * C_{\Phi_1}) * C_{\Phi_M}) \\ &= \rho_{\mathcal{E}} * (C_\Theta * C_\Lambda * C_{\Phi_1}) * C_{\Phi_M} \\ &= \rho_{\mathcal{E}} * C_{\Theta'(\Phi_1)} * C_{\Phi_M}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Theta' := \Theta \circ \Lambda$  is a superchannel on  $\mathcal{C}(A_0, A_1)$  with range in the set of q-c channels. By [27], there is a realization of  $\Theta'$  as  $\Theta' = \Theta_1 * \Theta_2$  such that the ancilla dimension is equal to  $d_{A_0R_0}$ . It follows that we may assume that  $\Theta_1 \in \mathcal{C}(R_0, SA_0)$  and that  $\Theta_2$  is a q-c channel on  $SR_1A_1$  with  $k$  outcomes. Let  $N' \in \mathcal{M}_k(SR_1A_1)$  be such that  $\Theta_2 = \Phi_{N'}$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\mathcal{E}} * C_{\Theta'(\Phi_1)} * C_{\Phi_M} &= \rho_{\mathcal{E}} * C_{\Theta_1} * C_{\Phi_1} * C_{\Phi_{N'}} * C_{\Phi_M} \\ &= \langle (\Theta_1 \otimes id)(\rho_{\mathcal{E}}), (\Phi_{N'} \otimes \Phi_M) \circ \Phi_1 \rangle \\ &= P_{succ}(\Theta_1(\mathcal{E}), \Phi_1^*(N' \otimes M)) \\ &\leq P_{succ}^{\mathcal{C}(R_0, SA_0), \Phi_1, \mathcal{M}_1}(\mathcal{E}), \end{aligned}$$

this proves (iv).

To finish the proof, we will show that (iv) with  $R_0 \simeq B_0$ ,  $R_1 \simeq B_1$ ,  $S \simeq A_0B_0$  and an equiprobable ensemble implies (ii). As before, we will use the results of Sec. 3.1.8 to relate the values of  $\langle \rho, \Theta(\Phi_i) \rangle$  in (ii) to success probabilities in the guessing games of (iv).


So let  $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(B_0C_0B_1C_1)$  and consider the ensemble  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_\rho^{B_1C_1}$ . Note that the group of generalized Pauli unitaries on  $B_1C_1$  has the form

$$\{U_{xy}^{B_1C_1} = U_x^{B_1} \otimes U_y^{C_1}, x = 1, \dots, d_{B_1}^2, y = 1, \dots, d_{C_1}^2\}$$

and we have  $\mathfrak{B}^{B_1C_1} = \mathfrak{B}^{B_1} \otimes \mathfrak{B}^{C_1}$ . By (10), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \rho, \Phi_2 \rangle &= d_{B_1} d_{C_1} P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}_\rho^{B_1C_1}, (\Phi_2 \otimes id)^*(\mathfrak{B}^{B_1} \otimes \mathfrak{B}^{C_1})) \\ &\leq d_{B_1} d_{C_1} P_{succ}^{\mathcal{C}(B_0, SB_0), \Phi_2, \mathcal{M}_2}(\mathcal{E}_\rho^{B_1C_1}), \end{aligned}$$

where we put the fixed measurement to  $M_{x,y} = \mathfrak{B}_y^{C_1}$ ,  $x = 1, \dots, d_{B_1}^2$ ,  $y = 1, \dots, d_{C_1}^2$ . The inequality is seen by the choice  $\alpha = id_{B_0} \otimes \sigma_S \in \mathcal{C}(B_0, SB_0)$  for arbitrary  $\sigma_S \in \mathfrak{S}(S)$  and  $N \in \mathcal{M}_{d_{B_1}^2 d_{C_1}^2}(SB_1B_1)$ ,  $N_{x,y} = I_S \otimes \mathfrak{B}_x^{B_1}$ ,  $x = 1, \dots, d_{B_1}^2$ ,  $y = 1, \dots, d_{C_1}^2$ . In diagram:



here the diagram on the left gives the value  $\langle \rho, \Phi_2 \rangle$ , while summing over all  $x, y$  of the right hand side and dividing by  $d_{B_1 C_1}^2$  gives  $d_{B_1 C_1} P_{succ}((\alpha \otimes id)(\mathcal{E}), \Phi_2^*(N \otimes M))$ .

From this inequality and (iv), we obtain that there is some channel  $\beta \in \mathcal{C}(B_0, SA_0)$  and a measurement  $N' \in \mathcal{M}_{d_{B_1 C_1}^2}(SB_1 A_1)$  such that

$$\langle \rho, \Phi_2 \rangle \leq d_{B_1} d_{C_1} P_{succ}((\beta \otimes id)(\mathcal{E}), (\Phi_1 \otimes id)^*(N' \otimes M)).$$

Since the channel  $\Phi_1 \circ \beta$  acts only on  $B_0 C_0$ , we see that with  $\tilde{\rho} = \Phi_1 \circ \beta(\rho)$ , the last expression is equal to  $d_{B_1} d_{C_1} P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\rho}}, N' \otimes M)$ . We now use (12) to show that there is a channel  $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(SA_1 C_1, B_1 C_1)$  such that

$$d_{B_1} d_{C_1} P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\rho}}, N' \otimes M) = \langle \tilde{\rho}, \gamma \rangle = \text{Tr}[\tilde{\rho} C_{\gamma^*}].$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\gamma^*} &= \sum_{x,y} d_{B_1 C_1}^{-1} (id \otimes \mathcal{U}_{x,y}^{B_1 C_1})^*(N'_{x,y} \otimes M_{x,y}) \\ &= \sum_{x,y} d_{B_1 C_1}^{-1} (id \otimes \mathcal{U}_x^{B_1})^*(N'_{x,y}) \otimes (id \otimes \mathcal{U}_y^{C_1})^*(M_{x,y}) \\ &= \sum_x d_{B_1}^{-1} d_{C_1}^{-1} (id \otimes \mathcal{U}_x^{B_1})^* \left( \sum_y N'_{x,y} \otimes |I_{C_1}\rangle\langle I_{C_1}| \right) = C_{\gamma_1^*} \otimes |I_{C_1}\rangle\langle I_{C_1}| \\ &= C_{\gamma_1^*} \otimes id \end{aligned}$$

for some channel  $\gamma_1 \in \mathcal{C}(SA_1, B_1)$ . Putting all together, we obtain using the link product and its properties

$$\langle \rho, \Phi_2 \rangle \leq \langle \tilde{\rho}, \gamma \rangle = \rho * C_{\beta} * C_{\Phi_1} * C_{\gamma_1} = \langle \rho, \Theta(\Phi_1) \rangle,$$

where  $\Theta = \beta \circ \gamma_1 \in \mathcal{C}_2(A, B)$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$

### 3.6 Classical simulability of measurements

As an application, we investigate the problem of classical simulability of measurements, [4]. In this problem, two sets of measurements  $\mathbb{M} = \{M^1, \dots, M^k\}$ ,  $M^i \in \mathcal{M}_l(C)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, k$  and  $\mathbb{N} = \{N^1, \dots, N^m\}$ ,  $N^y \in \mathcal{M}_n(C)$ ,  $y = 1, \dots, m$  are given. We will say that  $\mathbb{M}$  can simulate  $\mathbb{N}$  if all elements in  $\mathbb{N}$  can be obtained as convex combinations of postprocessings of elements in  $\mathbb{M}$ . It can be seen that we may exchange the order of convex combinations and postprocessings, and always obtain the same notion of simulability.

Our aim is to study an approximate version with respect to some suitable norm. In particular, we will show that this problem can be put into the setting of comparison of bipartite channels: we represent  $\mathbb{M}$  and  $\mathbb{N}$  by bipartite channels and express the simulations as applications of superchannels to one of the parts.

Let  $\Phi_{\mathbb{M}}$  be a channel in  $\mathcal{C}(A_0 C, A_1)$ ,  $d_{A_0} = k$ ,  $d_{A_1} = l$  with the Choi matrix

$$C_{\mathbb{M}} := \sum_{i,j} |j\rangle\langle j| \otimes |i\rangle\langle i| \otimes (M_j^i)^T.$$

Note that  $\Phi_{\mathbb{M}}$  is a bipartite channel as in the setting of Thm. 6, with  $C_0 = C$  and  $C_1 = 1$ , moreover, the first input and the output of  $\Phi_{\mathbb{M}}$  is classical. Similarly,  $\mathbb{N}$  is represented by a similar channel  $\Phi_{\mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{C}(B_0 C, B_1)$ , with  $d_{B_0} = m$ ,  $d_{B_1} = n$ .

We now introduce the following notion of approximate simulability: for  $\epsilon \geq 0$ , we say that  $\mathbb{N}$  is  $\epsilon$ -simulable by  $\mathbb{M}$  if  $\mathbb{M}$  can simulate some set of measurements  $\mathbb{N}' = \{(M')^1, \dots, (M')^m\} \subset \mathcal{M}_n(C)$  such that

$$\|\Phi_{\mathbb{N}} - \Phi_{\mathbb{N}'}\|_{\diamond} \leq \epsilon.$$

Assume that  $\mathbb{M}$  can simulate  $\mathbb{N}'$ . Then there are conditional probabilities

$$p_{i,y}(x|j), \quad x = 1, \dots, n, \quad j = 1, \dots, l, \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \quad y = 1, \dots, m$$

and

$$q(i|y), \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \quad y = 1, \dots, m$$

such that

$$\Phi_{\mathbb{N}'} = \sum_i q(i|y) \alpha_{p_{i,y}} \circ \Phi_{M^i}, \quad y = 1, \dots, m,$$


so that

$$(N')^y_x = \sum_i q(i|y) \sum_j p_{i,y}(x|j) N_j^i, \quad x = 1, \dots, n, \quad y = 1, \dots, m.$$

By Lemma 1, the set of conditional probabilities  $p(i, x|j, y) := q(i|y)p_{i,y}(x|j)$  defines a c-c superchannel  $\Theta_p \in \mathcal{C}_2(A, B)$ . It is easily checked that

$$C_p * C_{\mathbb{M}} = C_{\mathbb{N}'},$$

and hence we obtain that  $\Phi_{\mathbb{N}'} = \Theta_p(\Phi_{\mathbb{M}})$ , in diagram



The next result shows that the deficiency  $\delta_{A|B}(\Phi_{\mathbb{M}}\|\Phi_{\mathbb{N}})$  is related to approximate simulability.

**Proposition 4.** *Let  $\mathbb{M} = \{M^1, \dots, M^k\} \subset \mathcal{M}_l(C)$ ,  $\mathbb{N} = \{N^1, \dots, N^m\} \subset \mathcal{M}_n(C)$ ,  $\epsilon \geq 0$ . Let  $A_0, A_1, B_0, B_1$  be systems such that  $d_{A_0} = k$ ,  $d_{A_1} = l$ ,  $d_{B_0} = m$ ,  $d_{B_1} = n$ . Then  $\mathbb{N}$  is  $\epsilon$ -simulable by  $\mathbb{M}$  if and only if*

$$\delta_{A|B}(\Phi_{\mathbb{M}}\|\Phi_{\mathbb{N}}) \leq \epsilon.$$

*Proof.* Assume that  $\mathbb{N}$  is  $\epsilon$ -simulable by  $\mathbb{M}$ . As shown above, there is some superchannel  $\Theta_p$  such that  $\|\Theta_p(\Phi_{\mathbb{M}}) - \Phi_{\mathbb{N}}\|_{\diamond} \leq \epsilon$  and hence  $\delta_{A|B}(\Phi_{\mathbb{M}}\|\Phi_{\mathbb{N}}) \leq \epsilon$ . For the converse, let  $\Theta \in \mathcal{C}_2(A, B)$ , then

$$\|\Theta(\Phi_{\mathbb{M}}) - \Phi_{\mathbb{N}}\|_{\diamond} \geq \|\mathcal{P}_{B_1} \circ (\Theta(\Phi_{\mathbb{M}}) - \Phi_{\mathbb{N}}) \circ \mathcal{P}_{B_0}\|_{\diamond} = \|\mathcal{P}_{B_1} \circ \Theta(\Phi_{\mathbb{M}}) \circ \mathcal{P}_{B_0} - \Phi_{\mathbb{N}}\|_{\diamond},$$


so that the minimum in  $\delta_{A|B}(\Phi_{\mathbb{M}}\|\Phi_{\mathbb{N}})$  is attained at a c-c superchannel  $\Theta_p$  and using Lemma 1, we see that  $\Theta_p(\Phi_{\mathbb{M}}) = \Phi_{\mathbb{N}'}$  for some set  $\mathbb{N}'$  of measurements that are simulated by  $\mathbb{M}$ . It follows that  $\mathbb{N}$  is  $\epsilon$ -simulable by  $\mathbb{M}$ .  $\square$

We now show that  $\epsilon$ -simulability can be characterized by guessing games and that in this case, it is enough to use ensembles on the system  $C$  (so  $R_0 = R_1 = 1$  in Thm. 6 (iv)). For  $\mathbb{M}$  consisting of a single element and  $\epsilon = 0$ , this result was proved in [3].

**Corollary 4.**  *$\mathbb{N}$  is  $\epsilon$ -simulable by  $\mathbb{M}$  if and only if for any ensemble  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $C$ ,*

$$\max_{1 \leq y \leq m} P_{succ}^Q(\mathcal{E}, N^y) \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} P_{succ}^Q(\mathcal{E}, M^i) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}).$$

*Proof.* We proceed by expressing the success probabilities of part (iv) of Thm. 6 for  $R_0 = R_1 = 1$ . Since  $C_0 = C$  and  $C_1 = 1$ , the guessing games with  $\Phi_{\mathbb{M}}$  can be represented as in the diagram



Here, as a preprocessing, we pick a quantum-classical state  $\sigma \in \mathcal{B}_+(SB_0)$ , and we also pick a measurement  $F$  on  $SB_1$ . The success probability is then

$$P_{succ}((\sigma \otimes id)(\mathcal{E}), \Phi_{\mathbb{M}}^*(F)) = \langle \rho_{\mathcal{E}}, \Theta(\Phi_{\mathbb{M}}) \rangle,$$

with  $\Theta := \sigma * \Phi_F \in \mathcal{C}_2(A, Q)$ , where as before  $A = A_0A_1$  and  $Q = Q_0Q_1$ ,  $Q_0 = 1$ ,  $Q_1$  is the output system of  $\Phi_F$ . Since  $\Theta$  is obviously a c-c superchannel, by Lemma 1 there are conditional probabilities  $p_i(a|j)$  and probabilities  $q(i)$  such that  $\Theta = \Theta_p$  with  $p(ai|j) = q(i)p_i(a|j)$ . We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \rho_{\mathcal{E}}, \Theta(\Phi_{\mathbb{M}}) \rangle &= \rho_{\mathcal{E}} * C_p * C_{\mathbb{M}} = \sum_i q(i) \sum_{j,a} \lambda_a p_i(a|j) \text{Tr}[\rho_a M_j^i] \\ &= \sum_i q(i) P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}, M^i, p_i). \end{aligned}$$

Since any c-c superchannel in  $\mathcal{C}_2(A, Q)$  consists of a preprocessing and postprocessing of the above form, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{succ}^{\mathcal{C}(1, SA_0), \Phi_{\mathbb{M}}, \mathcal{M}_1}(\mathcal{E}) &= \sup_{\sigma, F} P_{succ}((\sigma \otimes id)(\mathcal{E}), \Phi_{\mathbb{M}}^*(F)) = \sup_{\Theta_p \in \mathcal{C}_2(A, Q)} \langle \rho_{\mathcal{E}}, \Theta(\Phi_{\mathbb{M}}) \rangle \\ &= \sup_{q, \{p_i\}} \sum_i q(i) P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}, M^i, p_i) = \\ &= \sup_q \sum_i q(i) P_{succ}^Q(\mathcal{E}, M^i) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} P_{succ}^Q(\mathcal{E}, M^i). \end{aligned}$$

Since we have a similar equality for  $\Phi_{\mathbb{N}}$ , we obtain the 'if' part.

For the converse, let  $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(B_0CB_1)$ . It is easy to see from the shape of the Choi matrix  $C_{\mathbb{N}}$  that there are probabilities  $\lambda(y)$ , conditional probabilities  $\mu(x|y)$  and states  $\rho_x^y \in \mathfrak{S}(C)$  such that

$$\langle \rho, \Phi_{\mathbb{N}} \rangle = \rho * C_{\mathbb{N}} = \sum_y \lambda(y) \sum_x \mu(x|y) \text{Tr}[\rho_x^y N_x^y] = \sum_y \lambda(y) P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}_y, N^y),$$

here  $\mathcal{E}_y = \{\mu(x|y), \rho_x^y\}_{x=1}^n$ . For each  $y$ ,  $P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}_y, N^y) \leq P_{succ}^Q(\mathcal{E}_y, N^y)$ , so that by the assumption, there is some  $1 \leq i_y \leq k$  and conditional probabilities  $p_y(x|j)$  such that

$$P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}_y, N^y) \leq P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}_y, M^{i_y}, p_y) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}_y).$$

Put  $q(i|y) = \delta_{i, i_y}$ , then  $q(i|y)$  are conditional probabilities. Put  $p(i, x|y, j) = q(i|y)p_y(x|j)$ , then  $\Theta_p$  is a c-c superchannel in  $\mathcal{C}_2(A, B)$ . It can be easily computed that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \rho, \Theta_p(\Phi_{\mathbb{M}}) \rangle &= \rho * C_p * C_{\mathbb{M}} = \sum_{i,j,x,y} \lambda(y) \mu(x|y) \text{Tr}[\rho_x^y M_j^i] p(i, x|y, j) \\ &= \sum_{y,x,j} \lambda(y) \mu(x|y) \text{Tr}[\rho_x^y M_j^{i_y}] p_y(x|j) = \sum_y \lambda(y) P_{succ}^Q(\mathcal{E}_y, M^{i_y}, p_y) \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\langle \rho, \Phi_{\mathbb{N}} \rangle \leq \langle \rho, \Theta_p(\Phi_{\mathbb{M}}) \rangle + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \sum_y \lambda(y) P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}_y).$$

Let now  $F^y \in \mathcal{M}_n(C)$  be such that  $P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}_y) = P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}_y, F^y)$  and let  $\mathbb{F} = \{F^1, \dots, F^m\}$ . As we have seen before,

$$\sum_y \lambda(y) P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}_y) = \sum_y \lambda(y) P_{succ}(\mathcal{E}_y, F^y) = \langle \rho, \Phi_{\mathbb{F}} \rangle \leq \|\rho\|_{B_1|B_0C}^{\diamond}.$$

By Thm. 3 (ii), this finishes the proof.  $\square$

## 4 Conclusions

We have introduced a general framework for comparison of channels, in quantum information theory as well as in the broader setting of GPT. The framework is based on the category BS, which is a special category of ordered (finite dimensional) vector spaces, modelled on the set of channels. In this setting, we defined a notion of deficiency and pseudo-distance with respect to a convex subcategory F and proved a general randomization theorem giving an operational characterization of these notions. In the case of classical state spaces, our randomization theorem corresponds to the classical randomization criterion for statistical experiments due to Le Cam [14].

This result was then applied to several problems of comparison (or simulability) of quantum channels, where we obtained a characterization of the deficiency by (an extension of) the conditional min-entropy and by success probabilities in some guessing games. Note that Thm. 3 is broad enough to include a variety of problems of simulability of special types of channels by specified types of networks e.g. LOCC or PPT. By the properties of the link product, we have in the setting of this theorem that

$$\langle \rho, \Theta(\Phi_i) \rangle = \rho * (C_{\Theta} * C_{\Phi_i}) = (\rho \otimes C_{\Phi_i}) * C_{\Theta} = \langle \rho \otimes C_{\Phi_i}, \Theta \rangle.$$

It follows that the suprema in Thm. 3 (iii) can be, similarly as the conditional 2-min entropy, interpreted as a modification of the conditional min-entropy of the element  $\rho \otimes C_{\Phi_i}$ . Moreover, as can be seen from the structure of the proofs, the characterization by success probabilities in modified guessing games can be extended to any F such that the corresponding superchannels can be characterized as concatenations  $\Theta_{pre} * \Theta_{post}$  with  $\Theta_{pre} \in F_{pre}$  and  $\Theta_{post} \in F_{post}$  for some suitable sets of channels  $F_{pre}$  and  $F_{post}$ .

This work concerns only the one shot situation, when the channels in question are used only once. To go beyond the one shot setting in the general framework, we have to discuss possible monoidal structures (tensor products) in BS, their properties and the corresponding behaviour of the related norms. Another important direction is an extension to infinite dimensions. The present framework strongly depends on the finite dimensional setting, but some corresponding results for post- and preprocessings for quantum channels on semifinite von Neumann algebras were proved in [33].

## Acknowledgements

I am indebted to Martin Plávala for the idea of introducing the category that is here called BS and sharing his notes, as well as, together with Gejza Jenča, for discussions on its definition and properties. Part of the results (Section 3.5) were presented at the Algebraic and Statistical ways into Quantum Resource Theories workshop at BIRS in July 2019. The research was supported by grants VEGA 2/0142/20 and APVV-16-0073.

## References

- [1] K. Matsumoto, “A quantum version of randomization criterion.” arXiv:1012.2650, 2010.
- [2] F. Buscemi, “Comparison of quantum statistical models: Equivalent conditions for sufficiency,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, vol. 310, p. 625647, Jan 2012.
- [3] P. Skrzypczyk and N. Linden, “Robustness of measurement, discrimination games, and accessible information,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 122, p. 140403, Apr 2019.
- [4] L. Guerini, J. Bavaresco, M. Terra Cunha, and A. A. Acn, “Operational framework for quantum measurement simulability,” *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, vol. 58, p. 092102, Sep 2017.
- [5] A. Chefles, “The quantum blackwell theorem and minimum error state discrimination.” arXiv:0907.0866, 2009.

- [6] F. Buscemi, “Degradable channels, less noisy channels, and quantum statistical morphisms: An equivalence relation,” *Problems of Information Transmission*, vol. 52, p. 201213, Jul 2016.
- [7] F. Buscemi, “Comparison of noisy channels and reverse data-processing theorems,” in *IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*, pp. 489–493, 2017.
- [8] G. Gour, D. Jennings, F. Buscemi, R. Duan, and I. Marvian, “Quantum majorization and a complete set of entropic conditions for quantum thermodynamics,” *Nature Communications*, vol. 9, 2018.
- [9] G. Gour, “Comparison of quantum channels by superchannels,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 65, no. 9, pp. 5880–5904, 2019.
- [10] A. Jenčová, “Comparison of quantum channels and quantum statistical experiments,” in *2016 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, IEEE Conference Publications, pp. 2249 – 2253, 2016.
- [11] A. Jenčová, “Randomization theorems for quantum channels.” arXiv:1404.3900, 2014.
- [12] R. Takagi and B. Regula, “General resource theories in quantum mechanics and beyond: operational characterization via discrimination tasks,” *Phys. Rev. X*, vol. 9, 2019.
- [13] D. Blackwell, “Comparison of experiments,” in *Proceedings of the Second Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability*, (Berkeley, Calif.), pp. 93–102, University of California Press, 1951.
- [14] L. Le Cam, “Sufficiency and approximate sufficiency,” *Ann. Math. Statist.*, vol. 35, pp. 1419–1455, 12 1964.
- [15] H. Strasser, *Mathematical Theory of Statistics*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 1985.
- [16] Z.-W. Liu and A. Winter, “Resource theories of quantum channels and the universal role of resource erasure.” arXiv:1904.04201, 2019.
- [17] Y. Liu and X. Yuan, “Operational resource theory of quantum channels,” 2019, arXiv:1904.02680.
- [18] A. Kitaev, “Quantum computations: Algorithms and error correction,” *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, vol. 52, pp. 1191–1249, 1997.
- [19] F. Buscemi, D. Sutter, and M. Tomamichel, “An information-theoretic treatment of quantum dichotomies,” *Quantum*, vol. 3, p. 209, Dec 2019.
- [20] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, “Informational derivation of Quantum Theory,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 84, p. 012311, 2011.
- [21] A. Bisio and P. Perinotti, “Theoretical framework for higher-order quantum theory,” *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, vol. 475, p. 20180706, May 2019.
- [22] G. Chiribella and D. Ebler, “Optimal quantum networks and one-shot entropies,” *New Journal of Physics*, vol. 18, no. 9, p. 093053, 2016.
- [23] L. Lami, *Non-classical correlations in quantum mechanics and beyond*. PhD thesis, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 2018, arXiv:1803.02902.
- [24] A. Jenčová and M. Plávala, “Conditions on the existence of maximally incompatible two-outcome measurements in general probabilistic theory,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 96, Aug 2017.
- [25] A. Jenčová, “Base norms and discrimination of generalized quantum channels,” *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, vol. 55, no. 2, p. 022201, 2014.
- [26] M. Plávala, “Private communication.” 2019.
- [27] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, “Theoretical framework for quantum networks,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 80, Aug 2009.
- [28] J. Watrous, *The Theory of Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press, 2018.



- [29] R. Renner, “Security of quantum key distribution,” *International Journal of Quantum Information*, vol. 6, no. 01, pp. 1–127, 2008.
- [30] R. Konig, R. Renner, and C. Schaffner, “The operational meaning of min- and max-entropy,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 55, p. 43374347, Sep 2009.
- [31] G. Chiribella, G. M. DAriano, and P. Perinotti, “Memory effects in quantum channel discrimination,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 101, Oct 2008.
- [32] G. Gutoski, “On a measure of distance for quantum strategies,” *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, vol. 53, p. 032202, Mar 2012.
- [33] P. Ganesan, L. Gao, S. K. Pandey, and S. Plosker, “Quantum majorization on semifinite von neumann algebras.” arXiv:1909.10038, 2019.
- [34] F. Buscemi, M. Keyl, G. M. DAriano, P. Perinotti, and R. F. Werner, “Clean positive operator valued measures,” *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, vol. 46, p. 082109, Aug 2005.