

How dynamics constrains probabilities in general probabilistic theories

Thomas D. Galley^{1,*} and Lluís Masanes²

¹*Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, Waterloo, ON N2L 2Y5, Canada*

²*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University College London,
Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom*

We introduce a general framework for analysing general probabilistic theories, which emphasises the distinction between the dynamical and probabilistic structures of a system. The dynamical structure is the set of pure states together with the action of the reversible dynamics, whilst the probabilistic structure determines the measurements and the outcome probabilities. For transitive dynamical structures whose dynamical group and stabiliser subgroup form a Gelfand pair we show that all probabilistic structures are rigid (cannot be infinitesimally deformed) and are in one-to-one correspondence with the spherical representations of the dynamical group. We apply our methods to classify all probabilistic structures when the dynamical structure is that of complex Grassmann manifolds acted on by the unitary group. This is a generalisation of quantum theory where the pure states, instead of being represented by one-dimensional subspaces of a complex vector space, are represented by subspaces of a fixed dimension larger than one. We also show that systems with compact two-point homogeneous dynamical structures (i.e. every pair of pure states with a given distance can be reversibly transformed to any other pair of pure states with the same distance), which include systems corresponding to Euclidean Jordan Algebras, all have rigid probabilistic structures.

I. INTRODUCTION

General probabilistic theories (GPTs) provide a framework for the study of operational theories beyond quantum theory. Within this framework quantum theory appears as one non-classical theory amongst many. This field has its origin in the work of Segal [1], Mackey [2] and Ludwig [3–5] with other notable contributions at the time including [6–13] amongst others. Contemporary interest in GPTs was kickstarted by Hardy’s seminal work [14] followed by a detailed exposition of the framework by Barrett [15]. Important applications of the framework include the operational derivations of quantum theory of [16–18]. Current treatments have tended to emphasise finite dimensional systems and system composition. Using this framework (or related frameworks such as convex operational theories [19, 20] and operational probabilistic theories [21]) many physical and informational features of general probabilistic theories have been studied, such as interference phenomena [22–25], computation [26, 27], thermodynamics [28–30] and others [31–37].

Examples of GPTs (excepting classical and quantum theory) include Boxworld [15, 38–41], quantum theory over the field of real numbers [42–44] or quaternions [45], theories based on Euclidean Jordan algebras [35], quartic quantum theory [46], d -balls [16, 47, 48], density cubes [49] and quantum systems with modified measurements [50]. Amongst these, only Boxworld, quantum theory over real or quaternionic fields and theories based on Euclidean Jordan algebras are full theories, in that they have non-trivial composites.

The aim of this paper is to provide tools to systematically explore the space of non-classical systems. Rather than generating examples of non-classical systems we can give full classifications

* tgalley1@perimeterinstitute.ca

of families of non-classical systems which share a common dynamical structure (pure states and reversible dynamics) but different probabilistic structures (measurements and measurement outcome probabilities); as done in [50] for systems which share the dynamical structure of quantum systems. We can thus obtain a richer picture of the space of non-classical systems, of which quantum systems are just one example.

We provide a general framework for convex systems and use it to study *transitive* systems, that is to say systems for which any two pure states are related by a reversible transformation. This is a generalisation of the OPF (outcome probability function) framework of [50–52], where the pure states and dynamical group no longer have to be those of quantum theory. We restrict ourselves to systems with reversible dynamics given by finite and compact groups, noting that all the examples of GPT systems mentioned previously are transitive systems with finite or compact dynamical groups. It is worth mentioning that all derivations of the second law of thermodynamics from more fundamental principles invoke the reversibility of the underlying dynamics (both in the classical and quantum frameworks). Also, when all the transformations that can be implemented on a system are generated by reversible dynamics, all the achievable states of the system form a transitive space. Hence, there is a connection between transitivity and the second law of thermodynamics.

We show that for a given dynamical structure (pure states and dynamical group) every possible probabilistic structure (measurements and outcome probabilities) is in correspondence with a representation of the dynamical group. Moreover we find necessary and sufficient conditions on the dynamical structure (the dynamical group and subgroup form a Gelfand pair) which make this correspondence one to one. We find that certain probabilistic structures cannot be infinitesimally deformed and call these rigid. We show that all dynamical structures which are Gelfand pairs do not have any probabilistic structures which can be infinitesimally deformed. We apply the methods developed to classify generalisations of quantum systems, with pure states given by Grassmann manifolds and unitary dynamics. We introduce the family of systems with compact two point homogeneous dynamical structures and show that they all have rigid probabilistic structures.

A. Structure of the paper

In Section II we introduce the OPF framework used for studying transitive systems and present relevant known results (or slight generalisations thereof). In Section III we give the main theorem of this work (the classification theorem), establishing a correspondence between probabilistic structures of transitive systems and group representations, as well as the conditions under which this correspondence is one-to-one. In Section IV we introduce the notion of deformation of probabilistic structures, and show that the only dynamical structures which admit probabilistic structures which can be infinitesimally deformed are those corresponding to non-Gelfand pairs. We also give an explicit example of deformations of a non-rigid probabilistic structure. In Section V we introduce the family of compact dynamical structures which are two point homogeneous and show that they are all rigid. In Section VI we apply the classification theorem to systems with dynamical structures given by complex Grassmann manifolds (a generalisation of complex projective space). In Section VII we discuss the results of this paper in light of existing work as well as comment on the implications of new concepts and results of the present work. Lastly we close with some concluding remarks in Section VIII.

II. SINGLE SYSTEM STATE SPACES

We provide a characterisation of single systems within the GPT framework which emphasises the pure states and reversible dynamics. This will allow us to consider families of systems with the same pure states and reversible dynamics, but different measurements. This is a generalisation of [50] where all systems with the same pure states and reversible dynamics as quantum theory were classified and their informational properties studied. We first describe quantum systems in this framework.

A. A characterisation of finite dimensional quantum systems

Quantum systems are often characterised directly in terms of mixed states, that is to say their convex representation. States are positive semi-definite operators on a complex Euclidean space \mathbb{C}^d , transformations are CPTP maps and measurements are associated to POVMs, with the probability of an outcome occurring being given by the usual trace rule. Here we provide a characterisation of quantum systems which separates their dynamical structure from the probabilistic structure. In this characterisation the mixed state representation described above is derived, rather than postulated. Moreover this distinction between dynamical and probabilistic structures will provide us with a way of classifying families of more general systems which share a common dynamical structure. A quantum system $\mathcal{S}_d^{\text{Quant}}$ associated to a Euclidean space \mathbb{C}^d is given by the following:

- I. Pure states: $\psi \in \text{PC}^d$.
- II. Reversible dynamics: $\psi \mapsto U\psi, U \in \text{SU}(d)$.
- III. Outcome probabilities: $\mathcal{F}_{\text{PC}^d}^{\text{Quant}} = \{Q : \text{PC}^d \rightarrow [0, 1] \mid Q(\psi) = \langle \psi | \hat{Q} | \psi \rangle, \forall \hat{Q} : 0 \leq \hat{Q} \leq \mathbb{I}\}$.

We assume that any subset $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^n$ such that $\sum_i Q_i(\psi) = 1$ for all $\psi \in \text{PC}^d$ forms a valid measurement. This implies that a measurement consists of positive semi-definite operators \hat{Q}_i such that $\sum_i \hat{Q}_i = 1$. Here I. and II. are the dynamical structure, whilst III. is the probabilistic structure. The mixed state representation (density operators) is derived from the dynamical and probabilistic structures. We observe that the probability assignment (Born rule) is not given in terms of the trace, since this already presumes the structure of mixed states. We now define general non-classical systems in terms of dynamical and probabilistic structures and show how to derive the convex representation.

B. Dynamical structure

The pure states of a system \mathcal{S} form a set X , and the reversible dynamics a group G . The action of G on X is given by a group action $\varphi : G \times X \rightarrow X$. This gives X the structure of a G -space.

Definition 1 (Dynamical structure). A dynamical structure \mathcal{D} is a triplet

$$\mathcal{D} = (X, G, \varphi), \tag{1}$$

where X is a set, G is a group and φ a group action.

In the following we leave φ implicit and write gx for $\varphi(g, x)$.

An important family of dynamical structures are transitive. A dynamical structure is *transitive* when for any two pure states $x, x' \in X$ there exists a transformation $g \in G$ such that $x' = gx$. In other words X is the orbit of G acting on an arbitrary $x \in X$.

A central notion to the approach used in this work is that of a *stabilizer subgroup* (also known as isotropy group) of an element $x \in X$, which is just the subgroup of all transformations in G which leave a point x invariant. We write $H_x := \{g \in G : gx = x\}$ for the stabilizer subgroup of a point $x \in X$. For a transitive group action, the stabilizer groups for different points are isomorphic, hence we write H as the stabilizer group.

Given a group G and a subgroup $H \subseteq G$, we denote by $\phi_{G,H}$ the action of G on the set of left cosets G/H . Given a transitive dynamical structure $\mathcal{D} = (X, G, \varphi)$ with stabilizer subgroup H we have the following isomorphism of dynamical structures $(X, G, \varphi) \cong (G/H, G, \phi_{G,H})$. This isomorphism also involves the topological and differentiable structure of each component of the triplet. In particular, when G and H are compact, G/H is compact Hausdorff [53, Proposition 3.1]. For this reason we use the abbreviation

$$\mathcal{D} = (X, G, \varphi) = (G, H) . \quad (2)$$

C. Probabilistic structure

A system is determined by its pure states, dynamics and measurements. Given the dynamical structure we need to specify its probabilistic structure, which characterises the measurements which can be performed on the system.

Definition 2 (Outcome probability function). An outcome of a measurement on a system with pure states X is given by a function $\mathbf{f} : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$, where the probability of the associated outcome \mathbf{f} occurring is $P(\mathbf{f}|x) = \mathbf{f}(x)$.

Definition 3 (Measurement). A measurement \mathcal{M}_j with countable outcomes $i = 1, \dots, n, \dots$ is specified by the list $\{\mathbf{f}_1^j, \dots, \mathbf{f}_n^j, \dots\}$. The elements of this list obey the condition:

$$\sum_i \mathbf{f}_i^j(x) = 1, \quad \forall x \in X . \quad (3)$$

Definition 4 (Unit OPF). The unit OPF \mathbf{u} is $\mathbf{u}(x) = 1, \forall x \in X$.

Definition 5 (Probabilistic structure). The probabilistic structure of a system is the set \mathcal{F}_X of all outcome probability functions \mathbf{f} .

Typically we assume that any set $\{\mathbf{f}_1, \dots, \mathbf{f}_n, \dots\}$ such that $\sum_i \mathbf{f}_i = \mathbf{u}$ forms a valid measurement, however this assumption is not necessary. When this assumption does not hold, one needs to supplement the set \mathcal{F}_X with a specification of which OPFs form a valid measurement. One example of such a specification is the ‘finite measurement outcomes’ assumption:

Definition 6 (Finite measurement outcome assumption). Only finite sets of OPFs $\{\mathbf{f}_1, \dots, \mathbf{f}_n\}$ such that $\sum_i \mathbf{f}_i = \mathbf{u}$ form valid measurements.

The above assumption is sometimes viewed as part of the definition of measurements in an operational framework, since we can never carry out measurements with infinitely many outcomes. We will be making this assumption in the present work.

Operational considerations impose the following constraints on \mathcal{F}_X :

- i . \mathcal{F}_X is closed under taking mixtures: for all $\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2 \in \mathcal{F}_X$ and all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ we have that $\lambda \mathbf{f}_1 + (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{f}_2 \in \mathcal{F}_X$.
- ii . \mathcal{F}_X is closed under composition with group transformations: for all $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}_X$ and $g \in G$ we have that $\mathbf{f} \circ g \in \mathcal{F}_X$, where $(\mathbf{f} \circ g)(x) = \mathbf{f}(gx)$.
- iii . \mathcal{F}_X is closed under coarse graining of measurement outcomes: for any pair of outcomes $\mathbf{f}_i^k, \mathbf{f}_j^k \in \mathcal{M}_k$ of a given measurement \mathcal{M}_k we have that $\mathbf{f}_i^k + \mathbf{f}_j^k \in \mathcal{F}_X$.
- iv . For every $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}_X$, the complement OPF $\mathbf{f}_c = \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{f}$ is also in \mathcal{F}_X

The first constraint implies that \mathcal{F}_X is a convex set, hence it can be extended to a vector space $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_X]$ with addition $(\mathbf{f}_1 + \mathbf{f}_2)(x) = \mathbf{f}_1(x) + \mathbf{f}_2(x)$ and scalar multiplication $(\alpha \mathbf{f})(x) = \alpha \mathbf{f}(x)$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Closedness under composition with group transformations implies that \mathcal{F}_X is a G -space. This and the fact that the group action commutes with taking mixtures implies that $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_X]$ is a linear representation of G . Closedness under coarse graining of measurement outcomes implies that every \mathcal{F}_X contains the unit OPF and the existence of the complement guarantees the existence of the $\mathbf{0}$ OPF. We introduce the following property, though we will not require it in the present treatment.

Definition 7 (Separability of pure states). A probabilistic structure \mathcal{F}_X separates pure states when for any two pure states $x_1, x_2 \in X$ there exists an OPF $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}_X$ such that $\mathbf{f}(x_1) \neq \mathbf{f}(x_2)$.

If one does not have this requirement, the probabilistic structure $\mathcal{F}_X = \{\mathbf{u}\}$ leading to a trivial system for all dynamical structures is valid for example.

D. Systems, state spaces and associated group representations

The above definitions allow us to formally define a system \mathcal{S}_X .

Definition 8 (System). A system \mathcal{S}_X is a triple $\mathcal{S}_X = (X, G, \mathcal{F}_X)$, where (X, G) is a dynamical structure and \mathcal{F}_X is a probabilistic structure.

In the following we briefly outline how the general state space (including mixed states) of a system is derived, both from an operational starting point and directly from the mathematical starting point $\mathcal{S}_X = \{X, G, \mathcal{F}_X\}$.

1. Operational derivation of the state space

Operationally for a single system one has access to a preparation device which is wired up sequentially with a transformation and measurement devices. These devices have classical settings (for instance which transformation to apply) and classical readouts (for instance which measurement outcome occurred). In an experiment one collects the statistics for different outcomes given choices of settings. Typically one assumes that statistics are gathered for all possible setting choices, and that the relative frequencies obtained become probabilities as the number of runs tends to infinity. Using these probabilities (which are directly given by the set \mathcal{F} in the OPF framework) one derives the convex state space (and effect space) of the system. We refer the reader to [54] about how one can in practice derive a state and effect space from experimental data.

2. Mathematical derivation of the state space

In this work we will make the assumption of the possibility of state estimation [52].

Definition 9 (Possibility of state estimation). The system $\mathcal{S} = \{X, G, \mathcal{F}_X\}$ is such that the value of a finite number of outcomes $\mathbf{f}_1, \dots, \mathbf{f}_n \in \mathcal{F}_X$ on any ensemble $\{(p_i, x_i)\}_i$ determines the value of any OPF $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}_X$ on the ensemble $\{(p_i, x_i)\}_i$.

It is shown in Lemma 2 of [52] that this implies that $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}]$ is finite dimensional. Equivalently the convex set of mixed states is embedable in a finite dimensional real vector space. We now briefly outline the derivation of the space of mixed state for a system $\mathcal{S}_X = \{X, G, \mathcal{F}_X\}$ under the assumption ‘‘Possibility of state estimation’’. First the probability of an outcome \mathbf{f} (defined on X) occurring for an ensemble $\{(p_i, x_i)\}_i$ is $P(\mathbf{f}|\{(p_i, x_i)\}_i) = \sum_i p_i \mathbf{f}(x_i)$. Two ensembles $\{(p_i, x_i)\}_i$ and $\{(p'_j, x'_j)\}_j$ are *equivalent* if $P(\mathbf{f}|\{(p_i, x_i)\}_i) = P(\mathbf{f}|\{(p'_j, x'_j)\}_j) \forall \mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$, and we write $\{(p_i, x_i)\}_i \sim \{(p'_j, x'_j)\}_j$. The mixed states are defined as equivalence classes of ensembles under this equivalence relation. For each state $x \in X$ we define the linear functional $\Omega_x : \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as $\Omega_x(\mathbf{f}) = \mathbf{f}(x)$. The probability of outcome \mathbf{f} on ensemble $\{(p_i, x_i)\}_i$ can be written as

$$P(\mathbf{f}|\{(p_i, x_i)\}_i) = \sum_i p_i \mathbf{f}(x_i) = \sum_i p_i \Omega_x(\mathbf{f}) = \omega(\mathbf{f}), \quad (4)$$

where we define the functional associated to ensemble $\{(p_i, x_i)\}_i$ as $\omega = \sum_i p_i \Omega_x$. Therefore, two ensembles $\{(p_i, x_i)\}_i$ and $\{(p'_j, x'_j)\}_j$ are equivalent if and only if, their corresponding functionals are identical $\sum_i p_i \Omega_{x_i} = \sum_j p'_j \Omega_{x'_j}$. The outcome probabilities $P(\mathbf{f}|\{(p_i, x_i)\}_i)$ on the space of ensembles uniquely define linear functionals $\Lambda_{\mathbf{f}}$ on the space of mixed states, such that $\Lambda_{\mathbf{f}} \cdot \omega = \omega(\mathbf{f})$ for all mixed states ω .

The group action $\varphi : X \times G \rightarrow X$, naturally extends to the space of mixed states (embedded linearly in $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_X]^*$) as $\Omega_x \xrightarrow{g} \Omega_{gx}$. This is a linear action which is such that $\Omega_x \xrightarrow{g} \Omega_{gx} \xrightarrow{g'} \Omega_{g'gx}$ is the same as $\Omega_x \xrightarrow{g'g} \Omega_{g'gx}$; hence there exists a homomorphism $\Gamma : G \mapsto \text{GL}(\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_X]^*)$. We call this the group representation *associated* to the system \mathcal{S} . This naturally induces a representation $\Gamma^* : G \mapsto \text{GL}(\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}])$, which is isomorphic to Γ since the representations are unitary and real.

We can summarise the above in the following theorem (fully proven in Appendix D), which is a straightforward generalisation of Result 1 [50] to arbitrary dynamical structures:

Theorem 1 (Result 1 of [50]). For every system $\mathcal{S}_X = \{X, G, \mathcal{F}_X\}$ obeying ‘Possibility of state estimation’ there exists a finite dimensional real vector space $V \cong \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_X]^*$ and the following maps:

$$\Omega : X \rightarrow V \quad (5)$$

$$\Gamma : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(V) \quad (6)$$

$$\Lambda : \mathcal{F}_X \rightarrow V^* \quad (7)$$

satisfying the following properties:

1. Preservation of dynamical structure:

$$\Gamma_g \Omega_x = \Omega_{gx} \quad (8)$$

$$\Gamma_{g_1} \Gamma_{g_2} = \Gamma_{g_1 g_2} \quad (9)$$

2. Preservation of probabilistic structure:

$$\Lambda_{\mathbf{f}} \cdot \Omega_x = \mathbf{f}(x) \quad (10)$$

3. Uniqueness: For any other maps $\Omega', \Gamma', \Lambda'$ satisfying all of the above there is an invertible linear map $L : V \rightarrow V$ such that:

$$\Omega'_x = L\Omega_x, \quad \forall x \in X, \quad (11)$$

$$\Gamma'_g = L\Gamma_g L^{-1}, \quad \forall g \in G, \quad (12)$$

$$\Lambda'_{\mathbf{f}} = \Lambda_{\mathbf{f}} L^{-1}, \quad \forall \mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}_X. \quad (13)$$

We call the representation Γ of Equation (6) the representation of G *associated* to the system \mathcal{S}_X . $\text{conv}(\Omega_X)$ is the convex hull of the extremal states, which we call *state space*.

We assume that the action $\Omega_x \rightarrow \Omega_{gx}$ is continuous for continuous groups and Ω_X has the topological structure of X , i.e. the map $\Omega : x \rightarrow \Omega_x$ is continuous. This entails that the homomorphism $\Gamma : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(V)$ is continuous and that the group representation is a Lie group representation. When $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_X]$ finite this entails that the functions \mathbf{f} are continuous on X . This does not necessarily hold for the infinite case since continuous action on Ω_X does not entail that the OPFs are continuous.

Remark 1. The assumption that $\Omega_x \rightarrow \Omega_{gx}$ is continuous and that Ω_X has the topological structure of X is justified by the following. If this were not the case and we were given access only to the state space $\text{conv}(\Omega_X)$ and asked to reconstruct the dynamical structure, we would not assign it a dynamical structure with X a topological space acted on continuously by the group G . Rather we would assign it the set of pure states X without any topological structure.

Definition 10 (Tomographically equivalent probabilistic structures). Two probabilistic structures \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' are tomographically equivalent if they yield the same equivalence classes of ensembles (i.e. mixed states).

For a given system the asymptotic limit consists of the scenario where all preparation procedures are of n -copies of the same state and n is tended to infinity. In this case all states (including mixed) become perfectly distinguishable (though this does not lift the degeneracy of equivalent ensembles). We denote $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_X$ the equivalence class of all tomographically equivalent probabilistic structures, hence $(X, \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X)$ can be identified with the state space (convex set) $\text{conv}(\Omega_X)$ which is the same for all systems (X, \mathcal{F}_X) with $\mathcal{F}_X \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X$. A representative element is the probabilistic structure corresponding to the (effect) unrestricted system.

Remark 2 (On the link between tomographically equivalent probabilistic structures and restriction of effects). The notion of tomographically equivalent probabilistic structures can be cast in terms of *restriction of effects*. A state space is *effect unrestricted* when all linear functionals $\text{GL}(\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_{G/H}]^*) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ correspond to allowed measurement outcomes. A system is restricted when some of the mathematically allowed functionals do not represent any measurement outcomes of the theory. However when a system has restricted effects, it is always the case that the allowed effects span the dual space V^* of the state space embedded in V . In other words both the restricted and unrestricted systems have the same mixed states (the restricted effects are always such that they separate the initial state space). A system with restricted effects has an tomographically equivalent probabilistic structure to the unrestricted system. Two tomographically equivalent probabilistic structures can be obtained by restriction of a common probabilistic structure.

III. CLASSIFICATION THEOREM

Before stating the main theorem of this work we will need the following definition:

Definition 11 (Gelfand pair). A pair (G, H) with G a group and H a subgroup of G form a Gelfand pair when for all irreducible representations (Γ, V, \mathbb{C}) of G , the restriction $\Gamma|_H$ has at most one trivial sub-representation.

This definition applies to complex irreducible representations. For irreducible representations over the field \mathbb{R} the restriction $\Gamma|_H$ may contain two trivial sub-representations, however all invariant H -vectors are related by invertible transformations which commute with the group action (this does not contradict Schur's Lemma, which applies to irreducible representation over the complex field). More details and proofs can be found in Appendix C.

A representation (Γ, V, \mathbb{C}) of a group G which has a non-zero H -invariant vector (i.e. for which $\Gamma|_H$ contains a trivial sub-representation) is called a *spherical representation* of (G, H) .

Theorem 2 (Classification theorem). Let $\mathcal{D} = (G, H)$ be a transitive dynamical structure, and let us consider probabilistic structures $\mathcal{F}_{G/H}$ such that $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_{G/H}]$ is finite-dimensional. By Theorem 1 every system $\mathcal{S}_{G/H} = (G, H, \mathcal{F}_{G/H})$ has an associated representation $\Gamma : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_{G/H}]^*)$.

- i. Every probabilistic structure $\mathcal{F}_{G/H}$ (up to tomographic equivalence) has an associated representation Γ of the form:

$$\Gamma = \bigoplus_j \Gamma_j, \quad (14)$$

where each term $(\Gamma_j, V_j, \mathbb{R})$ is a real-irreducible representation with least one trivial subrepresentation when restricted to H .

- ii. Conversely every representation of the form (14) is associated to at least one probabilistic structure $\mathcal{F}_{G/H}$.
- iii. When (G, H) forms a Gelfand pair the correspondence between representations (Γ, V, \mathbb{R}) of the form (14) and probabilistic structures (up to tomographic equivalence) $\mathcal{F}_{G/H}$ is one-to-one.
- iv. When (G, H) does not form a Gelfand pair then some representations (Γ, V, \mathbb{R}) of the form (14) have infinitely-many tomographically inequivalent probabilistic structures $\mathcal{F}_{G/H}$ associated to them.

This theorem is proven in Appendix D 2.

Parts i. and iii. entail that for a dynamical structure (G, H) which form a Gelfand pair one can classify all possible probabilistic structures \mathcal{F} (up to equivalence) by finding the irreducible representations Γ of G such that $\Gamma|_{G|H}$ has a trivial representation.

Parts iii. and iv. tell us that for Gelfand pairs all inequivalent probabilistic structures are characterised by different representations of G . Therefore for Gelfand pairs probabilistic are in one-to-one correspondence up to restriction of effects. For non-Gelfand pairs there are inequivalent probabilistic structures which are associated to the same representation of G .

The one-to-one correspondence between probabilistic structures and representations for Gelfand pairs is a direct consequence of the existence of an invertible transformation which commutes with group action for all invariant H -vectors (see Corollary 4 in Appendix C). For real irreducible representations which are also complex irreducible this is just the identity (by Schur's lemma),

however for real irreducible of complex type (i.e. which are complex reducible) the linear space of transformations which commutes with all H -invariant vectors is two dimensional. As shown in Lemma 6 there are no real irreducible representations of quaternionic type which have an H -invariant vector when (G, H) Gelfand.

We observe that this theorem does not guarantee that for a given representation Γ of the form (14) the associated OPF set \mathcal{F} separates the pure states. For instance the trivial representation $\Gamma : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(\mathbb{R})$, $\Gamma(g) = \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{R}}$ for all $g \in G$ is such that any vector $v \in \mathbb{R}$ is H -invariant, and the state space obtained for any choice of non-zero reference vector v is trivial: $\Omega_x = v$ for all $x \in X$.

IV. RIGIDITY OF DYNAMICAL STRUCTURES

In this section we analyse which probabilistic structures can be smoothly deformed. Or, in other words, when a dynamical structures (G, H) has two arbitrarily close probabilistic structures. In order to do so, we define an operational distance between probabilistic structures in terms of how difficult is to discriminate them.

Obviously, one can always smoothly deform a probabilistic structure by restricting the set of OPFs; for example, by adding noise to the measurements. However, all these variants have the same set of mixed states, or in other words, the same equivalence classes of ensembles of pure states $\{(p_i, x_i)\}_i$. We call all these probabilistic structures *tomographically equivalent* because, in estimation processes with multiple measurements, they agree on the set of mixed states. In each tomographically-equivalent class of probabilistic structures this there is a privileged element: the unrestricted probabilistic structure. This one \mathcal{F} includes all linear maps $\Lambda : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that map pure states to probabilities $\Lambda : \Omega(X) \rightarrow [0, 1]$. In order to avoid considering trivial deformations, in this section, we only consider unrestricted probabilistic structures.

A probabilistic structure \mathcal{F}_0 for which every other probabilistic structure \mathcal{F}_1 of the same linear dimension is at a finite bounded distance is called *rigid*. In other words, once the dimension of the space of mixed states is fixed, there is a finite bound on the minimal error when discriminating between probabilistic structures compatible with that dimension.

Theorem 2 tells us that if a dynamical structure (G, H) is a Gelfand pair then the set of unrestricted probabilistic structures is countable. We prove that each finite-dimensional probabilistic structure of a Gelfand pair (G, H) is rigid. We show that for non-Gelfand pairs there exists probabilistic structures \mathcal{F}_0 which are not rigid, and which can be continuously deformed to other probabilistic structures of the same linear dimension.

A. Distance between inequivalent probabilistic structures

For a given dynamical structure (G, H) (with $X \cong G/H$) there is a natural notion of distance between probabilistic structures \mathcal{F}_X . The distance between two OPFs $\mathbf{f}^0 \in \mathcal{F}_X^0$ and $\mathbf{f}^1 \in \mathcal{F}_X^1$ is given by:

$$\text{dist}(\mathbf{f}^0, \mathbf{f}^1) = \max_{x \in X} |\mathbf{f}^0(x) - \mathbf{f}^1(x)| . \quad (15)$$

This distance is directly related to the minimal error made when discriminating between \mathbf{f}^0 and \mathbf{f}^1 . We define the distance between two probabilistic structures \mathcal{F}_X^0 and \mathcal{F}_X^1 as:

$$D(\mathcal{F}^0, \mathcal{F}^1) = \max_{\mathbf{f}^0 \in \mathcal{F}_X^0} \min_{\mathbf{f}^1 \in \mathcal{F}_X^1} \text{dist}(\mathbf{f}^0, \mathbf{f}^1) , \quad (16)$$

which informs us about the error that we make when certifying that a system behaves according to \mathcal{F}_X^0 and not \mathcal{F}_X^1 in the optimal experimental setting $\mathbf{f}^0 \in \mathcal{F}_X^0$. Note that D is not symmetric and hence it is not a metric distance. We introduce the symmetrised distance:

$$D_{\text{sym}}(\mathcal{F}^0, \mathcal{F}^1) = \max\{D(\mathcal{F}^0, \mathcal{F}^1), D(\mathcal{F}^1, \mathcal{F}^0)\}, \quad (17)$$

which is a metric distance. The following theorem (proven in Appendix E 1) provides us with a lower bound on the distance between certain pairs of probabilistic structures \mathcal{F}^0 and \mathcal{F}^1 .

Theorem 3. Let \mathcal{F}^0 and \mathcal{F}^1 be two unrestricted probabilistic structure of the dynamical structure (G, H) . If \mathcal{F}^0 has an irreducible representation of dimension d^0 which does not appear in \mathcal{F}^1 then

$$D(\mathcal{F}^0, \mathcal{F}^1) \geq \frac{1}{2d^0}. \quad (18)$$

Now we recall that for Gelfand systems, two unrestricted probabilistic structures are equal if and only if they have the same irreps in their decomposition. Hence, the above theorem implies that, for Gelfand systems, each pair of unrestricted probabilistic structure can be discriminated by finite means.

B. Rigid and non-rigid probabilistic structures

By Theorem 3 all pairs of probabilistic structures for Gelfand pairs are can be discriminated by finite means. We now look at the property of rigidity of probabilistic structures, i.e. which probabilistic structures are such that every other probabilistic structure of the same linear dimension is at a finitely bounded distance.

Theorem 4. Let \mathcal{F}^0 of dimension $\dim\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_0] = d_0$ be an unrestricted probabilistic structure of (G, H) with associated representation Γ_G .

- i. If every H -invariant vector $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}^0]$ is related by an invertible transformation which commutes with Γ_G then \mathcal{F}^0 is rigid and any other inequivalent probabilistic structure \mathcal{F}_1 such that $\dim\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_1] = d_0$ is at distance:

$$D_{\text{sym}}(\mathcal{F}^0, \mathcal{F}^1) \geq \frac{1}{2(d_0 - 1)}, \quad (19)$$

- ii. If there are H -invariant vectors in $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}^0]$ related by an invertible transformation which does not commute with Γ_G then \mathcal{F}^0 is non-rigid and for any $\epsilon > 0$ ($\epsilon \ll 1$) there is an inequivalent probabilistic structures \mathcal{F}^1 with $\dim\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_1] = d_0$ at distance

$$D_{\text{sym}}(\mathcal{F}^0, \mathcal{F}^1) \leq 2\epsilon. \quad (20)$$

For Gelfand pairs all spherical representations Γ_G have H -invariant vectors related by invertible transformations which commute with Γ_G , hence all probabilistic structures for Gelfand pairs are rigid.

For non-Gelfand pairs there exist probabilistic structures \mathcal{F}^0 which have associated representations with H -invariant vectors which are not related by a transformation which commutes with Γ_G . These probabilistic structures can be *continuously deformed* to other probabilistic structures of the same linear dimension. An explicit example of such a deformation map given in Appendix E 3. Hence we have the following corollary:

Corollary 1. Let $\mathcal{D} = (G, H)$ be a dynamical structure.

1. If (G, H) is a Gelfand pair, then every unrestricted probabilistic structure $\mathcal{F}_{G/H}$ is rigid.
2. If (G, H) is not a Gelfand pair, then there exist probabilistic structures $\mathcal{F}_{G/H}$ which are not rigid, which are those with associated representations Γ_G which admit H -invariant vectors related by invertible transformations which do not commute with Γ_G .

The possibility of continuously deforming a probabilistic structure without altering its dynamical structure (and without restricting effects) is a very peculiar feature that is not found in any of the known GPTs (such as boxworld and quantum theory over the field of reals, complex or quaternions) to the best of our knowledge. Moreover we posit that this is a typical feature of GPT systems, in that, most dynamical structures (G, H) are not Gelfand pairs.

If a probabilistic structure can be smoothly deformed then the probabilities can be fine-tuned to suitably describe the observed statistics, and hence, make the theory more difficult to falsify. Hence, the fact that the probabilistic structure of a theory cannot be smoothly deformed makes the falsifiability of the theory more straightforward. We believe that this is a desirable property of a theory. If we consider a dynamical structure (G, H) being a Gelfand pair then we can be sure that any of its probabilistic structures will be straightforwardly falsifiable. Finally, it is important to mention that, a dynamical structure (G, H) cannot be smoothly deformed due to the group and sub-group structures of G and H . That is, adding a single element to G or H will generate lots of new elements via products and inverses. And hence, the probabilistic structure is the only part of a theory that, a priori, could be smoothly deformed.

C. Continuous deformation of probabilistic structures: an example

In this section we analyse a dynamical system (G, H) that is not a Gelfand pair. Hence, some of its probabilistic structures can be continuously deformed, giving rise to different statistical properties. This is an interesting feature of GPTs that has not been explored in the literature.

Let us consider the adjoint action of $G = \text{SU}(3)$ on the space of unit-trace Hermitian 3×3 matrices V , so that the action of $U \in \text{SU}(3)$ on $x \in V$ is $x \mapsto UxU^\dagger$. Without loss of generality we take the reference state to be

$$x_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (21)$$

with $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\sum_i \alpha_i = 1$. Then, the set of pure states is $X = \{Ux_0U^\dagger : \forall U \in \text{SU}(3)\}$. This becomes a three-level quantum system when $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) = (1, 0, 0)$, which has stabiliser group $H \cong \text{U}(2)$. The three-level quantum system is equivalent to all cases with two equal α -coefficients ($\alpha_{i_1} \neq \alpha_{i_2} = \alpha_{i_3}$ with different i_1, i_2, i_3). In this section we analyse the other cases ($\alpha_{i_1} \neq \alpha_{i_2}$ for all i_1, i_2) whose stabiliser group is

$$H = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\phi_1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\phi_2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{-i(\phi_1+\phi_2)} \end{pmatrix} : \forall \phi_1, \phi_2 \in \mathbb{R} \right\}. \quad (22)$$

That is, the diagonal matrices in $\text{SU}(3)$.

We know that the three-level quantum system has three perfectly distinguishable states. Let us show that the other systems ($\alpha_{i_1} \neq \alpha_{i_2}$) have only two. Let us start by assuming the existence of three perfectly distinguishable states $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in V$. This implies the existence of a three-outcome measurement $A_1, A_2, A_3 \in V$ such that $\text{tr}(A_i x_j) = \delta_{ij}$. Without loss of generality we can take the three states to be pure $x_i \in X \subseteq V$. In the following analysis we use a V -basis where A_1 is diagonal

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \gamma_3 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (23)$$

The probability of A_1 with any state x only depends on the diagonal of the state (in this basis). Therefore, in what follows, we characterise the projection of $\text{conv}X \subseteq V$ into the diagonal. A general state Ux_0U^\dagger has diagonal projection

$$[Ux_0U^\dagger]_{ii} = \sum_j U_{ij}\alpha_j[U^\dagger]_{ji} = \sum_j |U_{ij}|^2\alpha_j. \quad (24)$$

The unitarity of U implies that $|U_{ij}|^2$ is a doubly stochastic matrix, and Birkhoff's theorem tells us that $|U_{ij}|^2$ is a mixture of the six permutation-matrices of three elements. Conversely, the six permutation matrices can be written as $|U_{ij}|^2$. This, together with the convexity of the state space, implies that the projection of $\text{conv}X$ into the diagonal is the convex set generated by the six extreme points

$$y_\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{\sigma(1)} \\ \alpha_{\sigma(2)} \\ \alpha_{\sigma(3)} \end{pmatrix}, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}_3, \quad (25)$$

where \mathcal{S}_3 is the group of permutations of 3 elements. These six points are depicted in Figure. 1.

Condition $\text{tr}(A_1 x_j) = \delta_{1j}$ implies that the scalar product $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3) \cdot y_\sigma$ takes the value zero for two permutations σ 's and the value 1 on at least one permutation. However, as shown in Figure. 1, the above is only possible if the scalar product takes the value 0 and 1 for exactly two permutations each. This allows to perfectly encode one bit of information (y_1, y_2 versus y_4, y_5) and simultaneously imperfectly encode another bit (y_1, y_5 versus y_2, y_4). Although only one of the two bits can be retrieved, there is a sense in which this system encodes more than one bit of information despite having only two perfectly-distinguishable states. This fact is a non-quantum feature which sometimes is called: violation of no-simultaneous encoding [55]. Different choices of $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$ will give different success probability when optimally guessing the second bit. This is a statistical feature that distinguishes inequivalent values of $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$.

The vectors y_1, y_2, y_4, y_5 correspond to four pure states with zero off-diagonal components. Hence, the two pairs of states x discriminated by A_1 are completely characterised by their corresponding vectors y_i . This allows to calculate any outcome probability A_2 by only looking at the diagonal. In Figure 1 it can be seen that, no matter how we choose the direction A_2 , the states y_4, y_5 (or y_1, y_2) cannot be told apart. This shows the non-existence of three perfectly distinguishable states in this state space.

V. GELFAND PAIRS AND TWO POINT HOMOGENEITY

In Theorem 2 we have singled out dynamical structures corresponding to Gelfand pairs as being of interest, namely for the convenient property that their probabilistic structures can be classified via




FIG. 1. The six-side figure represents the projection onto the diagonal of the state space generated by $\text{diag}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$ with $\alpha_{i_1} \neq \alpha_{i_2}$. The extreme points y_1, \dots, y_6 are the six permutations of the vector $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$, which can be represented in a two-dimensional plane because of the normalisation condition $\sum_i \alpha_i = 1$. The six points y_i are the projection of pure states $x_i \in X$ with zero off-diagonal components. In the generic case $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$ the figure has two types of sides with alternating length, and for certain values of $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$ the six sides have equal length. In the quantum case the short sides have length zero and the figure looks like a triangle. The only outcome that tells apart states y_1 from y_4, y_5 is A_1 , which gives probability one for states y_1, y_2 and zero for y_4, y_5 . In the figure it can be seen that, no matter how we choose the direction A_2 , the states y_4, y_5 (or y_1, y_2) cannot be told apart. This shows the non-existence of three perfectly distinguishable states in this state space.

the associated group representations. This implies that there are countably-many of them, and that they cannot be continuously deformed. This rigidity is a highly desirable property for a fundamental theory of physics, because it does not allow for ad hoc parameter adjustment, and is thereby easier to falsify. Apart from this, one may also ask whether there are other informational/physical motivations for considering Gelfand pairs. One such reason may be the following.

Definition 12 (Two-point homogeneous action [56]). A group G acts two-point homogeneously on a metric space (X, dist) if for every pair of points (x_1, x_2) and (x'_1, x'_2) in X with $\text{dist}(x_1, x_2) = \text{dist}(x'_1, x'_2)$ there is an element $g \in G$ such that $gx_1 = x'_1$ and $gx_2 = x'_2$.

Two-point homogeneity implies transitivity, since for any points x_1 and x_2 we have $\text{dist}(x_1, x_1) = \text{dist}(x_2, x_2)$ and hence there exists an element such that $gx_1 = x_2$. The following is a very remarkable result.

X	G/H
S^d	$SO(d)/SO(d-1)$
$\mathbb{P}\mathbb{R}^d = S^d/\{\pm I\}$	$O(d)/(O(d-1) \times O(1)) \cong SO(d)/S(O(d-1) \times O(1))$
$\mathbb{P}\mathbb{C}^d$	$SU(d)/S(U(d-1) \times U(1)) \cong U(d)/(U(d-1) \times U(1))$
$\mathbb{P}\mathbb{H}^d$	$Sp(d)/(Sp(d-1) \times Sp(1))$
$\mathbb{P}\mathbb{O}^3$	$F(4)/Sp(9)$

TABLE I. List of all two-point homogeneous spaces which are connected and compact. Here $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{O}^3$ is the projective space of octonionic planes known as the Cayley plane.

Lemma 1 (Prop 2.2 [57]). If G acts two-point homogeneously on a metric space X and H is the stabilizer of a point, then (G, H) is a Gelfand pair.

The requirement of two-point homogeneity restrict us to dynamical structures corresponding to Gelfand pairs. We observe that this requirement requires an additional metric structure to be imposed on the dynamical structure. A natural metric on GPT state spaces is the following.

Lemma 2. (Pure-state metric distance.) The distance between any pair of pure states $x, x' \in X$ defined by

$$\text{dist}(x, x') = \sup_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}_x} [\mathbf{f}(x) - \mathbf{f}(x')] \quad (26)$$

is bounded $\text{dist}(x, x') \leq 1$, it satisfies the metric axioms:

1. $\text{dist}(x, x') = 0$ if and only if $x = x'$,
2. $\text{dist}(x, x') = \text{dist}(x', x)$,
3. $\text{dist}(x, x'') \leq \text{dist}(x, x') + \text{dist}(x', x'')$,

and it is G -invariant

4. $\text{dist}(gx, gx') = \text{dist}(x, x')$ for all $g \in G$.

Therefore we conclude that two-point homogeneous state spaces are Gelfand pairs. It is remarkable that the purely dynamical property of two-point homogeneity implies that all probabilistic structures are rigid.

However we note that not all Gelfand pairs (G, H) give rise to a homogeneous space $X \cong G/H$ which is two-point homogeneous. Indeed the classification of all the compact and connected two point homogeneous symmetric spaces was given in [56]. These are listed in Table I.

The full classification of all finite dimensional probabilistic structures for the compact connected two point homogeneous spaces G/H (where all pairs (G, H) corresponding to such spaces are given in Table I) directly follows from the classification of all irreducible spherical representations. Equivalently these are the irreducible subspaces of the function space $C(G/H, \mathbb{C})$ (continuous functions from G/H to \mathbb{C}) under the action of G , where a specific basis for an irreducible subspace is given by *spherical harmonics*. This is a generalisation of the well known spherical harmonics for $L^2(S^2)$, where the irreducible representation labelled by l has a basis $Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi)$ spanning a $2l+1$ dimensional subspace.

The (G, H) spherical irreducible representations for these pairs are characterised by a condition on the highest weights given by the *Cartan-Hegelson Theorem* [58, 59](see [60, Theorem 11.4.10.]. Explicit characterisations of these the (G, H) spherical irreducible representations (either in terms of the highest weights or other methods) for the pairs in Table I can be found in the literature.

VI. GRASSMANNIAN SYSTEMS

In this section we introduce a family of non-classical systems which generalise the dynamical structure of quantum systems, and make use of Theorem 2 to provide a full classification of these systems.

The pure states of finite dimensional quantum systems are given by $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{C}^d$. This is the set of all one dimensional subspaces of \mathbb{C}^d . We now consider systems with pure states given by the set of all k -dimensional subspaces $W \subseteq \mathbb{C}^d$. This set is known as a Grassmann manifold $\text{Gr}(k, \mathbb{C}^d)$:

$$\text{Gr}(k, \mathbb{C}^d) = \{W \subseteq \mathbb{C}^d, \dim(W) = k\} . \quad (27)$$

Hence $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{C}^d \cong \text{Gr}(1, \mathbb{C}^d)$. Since $\text{SU}(d)$ acts transitively on $\text{Gr}(k, \mathbb{C}^d)$ it can also be expressed as follows (re-parametrising $k = m$ and $d = m + n$):

$$\text{Gr}(m, \mathbb{C}^{m+n}) \cong \text{SU}(m+n)/\text{S}(\text{U}(m) \times \text{U}(n)) \quad (28)$$

Here the embedding of $\text{S}(\text{U}(m) \times \text{U}(n))$ into $\text{SU}(m+n)$ is the direct sum embedding:

$$\text{S}(\text{U}(m) \times \text{U}(n)) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\theta} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix} : A \in \text{U}(m), B \in \text{U}(n), e^{i\theta m} \det A \det B = 1 \right\} . \quad (29)$$

Similarly one can define Grassmann manifolds over \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{H} , generalising the dynamical structures of quantum theory over \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{H} . These are:

$$\text{Gr}(m, \mathbb{R}^{m+n}) \cong \text{SO}(m+n)/\text{S}(\text{O}(m) \times \text{O}(n)) , \quad (30)$$

$$\text{Gr}(m, \mathbb{H}^{m+n}) \cong \text{Sp}(m+n)/(\text{Sp}(m) \times \text{Sp}(n)) . \quad (31)$$

In the next section we will make use of Theorem 2 to classify all possible probabilistic structures for each dynamical structure which is a complex Grassmann manifold.

A. Full classification of all probabilistic structures for complex Grassmann manifolds

Theorem 2 states that for a dynamical structure (G, H) corresponding to a Gelfand pair, every probabilistic structure is in one-to-one correspondence with a spherical representation of (G, H) . Hence the first step in classifying probabilistic structures for the Grassmann dynamical structure $\text{Gr}(m, \mathbb{C}^{m+n}) \cong \text{SU}(m+n)/\text{S}(\text{U}(m) \times \text{U}(n))$ is to determine whether $(\text{SU}(m+n), \text{S}(\text{U}(m) \times \text{U}(n)))$ form a Gelfand pair.

Lemma 3.

1. $(\text{SU}(m+n), \text{S}(\text{U}(m) \times \text{U}(n)))$ form a Gelfand pair.
2. The spherical representations $(\text{SU}(m+n), \text{S}(\text{U}(m) \times \text{U}(n)))$ have a real structure.

The first part of the lemma is found in [61, Corollary 3] and the second part is proven in Appendix F. This lemma entails (using Theorem 2) that all probabilistic structures \mathcal{F}_X where $X \cong \text{SU}(m+n)/\text{S}(\text{U}(m) \times \text{U}(n))$ are in one-to-one correspondence with the spherical representations $(\text{SU}(m+n), \text{S}(\text{U}(m) \times \text{U}(n)))$. Irreducible spherical representations are typically defined over \mathbb{C} , and in general the irreducible representations of a group G over \mathbb{C} are not in one-to-one correspondence with those over \mathbb{R} . Part 2. of the lemma allows us to classify the real irreducible

spherical representations of $(\mathrm{SU}(m+n), \mathrm{S}(\mathrm{U}(m) \times \mathrm{U}(n)))$ by studying the irreducible spherical representations over \mathbb{C} .

The restriction of representations of $\mathrm{SU}(m+n)$ to $\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{U}(m) \times \mathrm{U}(n))$ has been studied in [61]. We summarise the result below. Representations of $\mathrm{SU}(m+n)$ are labelled by a partition λ of an integer k in $m+n-1$ parts (often represented as a *Young diagram*). One can construct the associated irreducible representation by applying the *Schur functor* \mathcal{S}_λ to (\mathbb{C}^{m+n}) [62, Proposition 15.15]

Lemma 4. The representations of $\mathrm{SU}(n+m)$ which have a trivial representation when restricted to $\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{U}(n) \times \mathrm{U}(m))$ are of the following form: When $m = n$:

$$\lambda = (2b_1, b_1 + b_2, \dots, b_1 + b_m, b_1 - b_m, \dots, b_1 - b_2, 0) . \quad (32)$$

When $n \geq m + 1$:

$$\lambda = (2b_1, b_1 + b_2, \dots, b_1 + b_m, \underbrace{b_1, \dots, b_1}_{\text{times } n-m}, b_1 - b_m, \dots, b_1 - b_2, 0) . \quad (33)$$

Where we have $b_1 \geq b_2 \geq \dots \geq b_m \geq 0$. We have added the redundant 0 entry, and these have length $m+n$.

B. Quartic quantum theory over \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C} and \mathbb{H}

Quartic quantum theory over \mathbb{C} , introduced in [46], is a theory which contains some of the systems classified above. In this theory systems $\mathcal{S}_{k,\mathbb{C}}^{\mathrm{Quart}}$ ($k \in \mathbb{Z}, k > 2$) have pure states given by the Grassman manifold $\mathrm{Gr}(k, \mathbb{C}^{k^2})$ and a probabilistic structure $\mathcal{F}_{k,\mathbb{C}}^{\mathrm{Quart}}$ given by the adjoint representation. For example the state space for the system $k = 2$ can be generated by taking reference state:

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} , \quad (34)$$

applying the $\mathrm{SU}(4)$ dynamical group in the adjoint representation:

$$U\rho U^\dagger , \quad (35)$$

and taking the convex hull of the $\mathrm{Gr}(2, \mathbb{C}^4)$ manifold embedded in $V = \mathrm{Herm}(\mathbb{C}^4)$ (the real linear space of Hermitian matrices on \mathbb{C}^4).

One problematic feature of quartic quantum theory is that it does not have well defined composition [25, 46], and as such is just a collection of systems rather than a full theory.

We can similarly introduce two theories (without composition): *real quartic quantum theory* and *quaternionic quartic quantum theory* where systems are given by $\mathcal{S}_{k,\mathbb{R}}^{\mathrm{Quart}} := \left(\mathrm{Gr}(k, \mathbb{R}^{k^2}), \mathcal{F}_{k,\mathbb{R}}^{\mathrm{Quart}} \right)$ and $\mathcal{S}_{k,\mathbb{H}}^{\mathrm{Quart}} = \left(\mathrm{Gr}(k, \mathbb{H}^{k^2}), \mathcal{F}_{k,\mathbb{H}}^{\mathrm{Quart}} \right)$, where $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_{k,\mathbb{R}}^{\mathrm{Quart}}]$ and $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_{k,\mathbb{H}}^{\mathrm{Quart}}]$ are acted on by the adjoint representation of $\mathrm{SO}(k^2)$ and $\mathrm{Sp}(k^2)$ respectively. In both cases the states space for the system associated to $k = 2$ can be generated by taking the reference state ρ above acting with the adjoint representation of the dynamical group and taking the convex hull.

VII. DISCUSSION

A. Comparison to previous work

1. *The generalised quantum mechanics of Mielnik*

The OPF framework presented in this work is similar to the ‘Group theoretical model’ of [10]. The novel aspects of this work include Theorem 2 which, building on the framework, establishes a correspondence between probabilistic structures and group representations. We find specific conditions on transitive dynamical structures which make this correspondence one to one (namely that the dynamical group and stabilizer subgroup form a Gelfand pair). Moreover Mielnik studies examples with the same pure states as quantum theory, but different dynamical groups. We study (and classify) systems which have different pure states and dynamics.

2. *Classification of all alternatives to the measurement postulates of quantum system*

Theorem 2 is a generalisation of the classification theorem of [50], where the dynamical structure is no longer constrained to be that of quantum systems. We also find the necessary and sufficient conditions for which dynamical structures have probabilistic structures which are in one to one correspondence with group representations.

B. Mapping the space of GPT systems

In the GPT formalism a *theory* is considered to be a set of systems together with some composition rules. Quantum theory for example is the set of systems $\text{QT}_{\mathbb{C}} := \{S_d^{\text{quant}}\}_{d=2}^{\text{inf}}$ together with the standard tensor product composition rule and partial trace. We note that $\text{QT}_{\mathbb{C}}$ alone is not a theory, just a set of systems.

In this work we also consider sets of systems which are not expected to form theories, these are sets of systems which share a common dynamical structure. For example the set of systems with shared dynamical structure $(\text{PC}^2, \text{SU}(2))$ form a *sub-family* of systems, and the set of systems which contain all systems with dynamical structure $(\text{PC}^d, \text{SU}(d))$ ($d > 2$) form a *family* of systems.

In this work we have introduced new families of systems (see Sections V and VI) which generalise previously known systems. In Figure 2 we map out the space of transitive systems with compact pure states including the new families of systems introduced in this work.

The advantage of the methods introduced in this work are two-fold: firstly we can generate examples of non-classical systems and secondly we can systematically classify non-classical systems, thus providing us with a fuller picture of non-classical systems lying beyond quantum theory.

Transitive systems with compact pure states




FIG. 2. Map of the space of transitive non-classical systems with compact pure states $X = G/H$. ‘Rigid’ and ‘Non rigid’ are notions defined in this paper. ‘2 point hom.’ stands for two point homogeneous. For a field \mathbb{F} , $\text{Gr}_{\mathbb{F}}$ is the family of systems with pure states given by the Grassmann manifold $\text{Gr}(\mathbb{F}^d, \mathbb{F}^k)$ for all $2 < d < \infty$, $k < d$. $\text{P}\mathbb{F}^d$ is the family of systems with pure states given by projective space over \mathbb{F}^d for all $1 < d < \infty$, hence $\text{P}\mathbb{F}^d := \text{Gr}(\mathbb{F}^d, \mathbb{F}^1)$. $\text{QT}_{\mathbb{F}}$ is quantum theory over \mathbb{F} whilst $\text{Qu}_{\mathbb{F}}$ is quartic quantum theory over \mathbb{F} . ‘EJA_s’ labels special Euclidean Jordan Algebras (EJA) and ‘EJA_e’ the exceptional EJA. V_d is the d -sphere in the standard embedding in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} whilst S^d is the family of systems with pure states given by S^d (hence embeddings of S^d in \mathbb{R}^k where k not necessarily equal to $d + 1$). This map does not capture all the relations, namely there are ‘coincidences’ like the qubit being both in $\text{QT}_{\mathbb{C}}$ and V_d .

C. The search for alternative theories and the issue of composition

The tools presented in this work allow us to systematically search for non-classical systems. However it is not certain that these systems compose in a non-trivial manner (existence of entangled states and measurements). For example it is shown in [52] that the only full theory with systems having the same dynamical structure as quantum theory is quantum theory itself. In [47] it is shown (under certain additional assumptions) that the only systems corresponding to d -balls which compose non-trivially are for $d = 3$. Out of the family of systems classified in section VI it is known that one of them (quartic quantum theory) does not compose [25, 46]. The question remains open as to whether any of the systems with pure states given by Grassmann manifolds compose non-trivially (outside of quantum theory).

VIII. CONCLUSION

In this work we have introduced the *OPF framework* which is used to characterise systems in GPTs. By separating the dynamical and probabilistic components of systems this framework provides new insight into non-classical systems. It allows us to consider *families* of systems which share a common dynamical structure. We introduce the notion of a *rigid* dynamical structure and show that for such structures one can classify all probabilistic structures using representations of the dynamical group. A key feature of rigid dynamical structures is that they do not admit continuous

deformation of probabilistic structure.

Moreover we introduced multiple new families of non-classical systems, such as the *complex Grassmann* systems. Many of these families contain known non-classical systems, as well as providing infinitely many examples of non-classical systems which were not known. As well as exploring the space of non-classical systems by finding new examples, we mapped out this space in a more systematic manner by introducing families of systems which share a dynamical structure.

The present work has limited itself to single systems. In general it is not a given that these systems can be made to compose in a non-trivial way (i.e. with entangled states) and given the existence of results such as [47, 52] showing that most systems in the family of systems S^d and PC^d do not compose, one may conjecture that the majority, if not all, the systems classified in the present work will not compose in a non-trivial manner.

IX. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TG acknowledges helpful discussion with Jon Yard. LM acknowledges financial support by the UK's Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council [grant number EP/R012393/1]. This research was supported in part by Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics. Research at Perimeter Institute is supported by the Government of Canada through the Department of Innovation, Science and Economic Development and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Research, Innovation and Science.

-
- [1] I. E. Segal, "Postulates for general quantum mechanics," *Annals of Mathematics*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 930–948, 1947.
 - [2] G. W. Mackey, *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York, 1963.
 - [3] G. Ludwig, "Versuch einer axiomatischen grundlegung der quantenmechanik und allgemeinerer physikalischer theorien," *Zeitschrift für Physik*, vol. 181, pp. 233–260, Jun 1964.
 - [4] G. Ludwig, "Attempt of an axiomatic foundation of quantum mechanics and more general theories. ii," *Comm. Math. Phys.*, vol. 4, no. 5, pp. 331–348, 1967.
 - [5] G. Ludwig, "Attempt of an axiomatic foundation of quantum mechanics and more general theories. III," *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, vol. 9, pp. 1–12, Mar. 1968.
 - [6] G. Dähn, "Attempt of an axiomatic foundation of quantum mechanics and more general theories. iv," *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, vol. 9, pp. 192–211, Sep 1968.
 - [7] P. Stolz, "Attempt of an axiomatic foundation of quantum mechanics and more general theories v," *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, vol. 11, pp. 303–313, Dec 1969.
 - [8] P. Stolz, "Attempt of an axiomatic foundation of quantum mechanics and more general theories vi," *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, vol. 23, pp. 117–126, Jun 1971.
 - [9] B. Mielnik, "Theory of filters," *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–46, 1969.
 - [10] B. Mielnik, "Generalized quantum mechanics," *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 221–256, 1974.
 - [11] R. Giles, "Foundations for Quantum Mechanics," *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, vol. 11, no. 7, p. 2139, 1970.
 - [12] S. Gudder, "Convex structures and operational quantum mechanics," *Communications in mathematical Physics*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 249–264, 1973.
 - [13] E. B. Davies and J. T. Lewis, "An operational approach to quantum probability," *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 239–260, 1970.

- [14] L. Hardy, “Quantum theory from five reasonable axioms,” *eprint arXiv:quant-ph/0101012*, Jan. 2001.
- [15] J. Barrett, “Information processing in generalized probabilistic theories,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 75, p. 032304, Mar. 2007.
- [16] B. Dakic and C. Brukner, “Quantum Theory and Beyond: Is Entanglement Special?,” in *Deep Beauty - Understanding the Quantum World through Mathematical Innovation* (H. Halvorson, ed.), pp. 365–392, Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [17] L. Masanes and M. P. Muller, “A derivation of quantum theory from physical requirements,” *New Journal of Physics*, vol. 13, no. 6, p. 063001, 2011.
- [18] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, “Informational derivation of quantum theory,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 84, p. 012311, July 2011.
- [19] H. Barnum and A. Wilce, “Information processing in convex operational theories,” *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 270, no. 1, pp. 3 – 15, 2011.
- [20] H. Barnum, R. Duncan, and A. Wilce, “Symmetry, Compact Closure and Dagger Compactness for Categories of Convex Operational Models,” *arXiv e-prints*, p. arXiv:1004.2920, Apr 2010.
- [21] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, “Probabilistic theories with purification,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 81, p. 062348, jun 2010.
- [22] A. J. P. Garner, O. C. O. Dahlsten, Y. Nakata, M. Murao, and V. Vedral, “A framework for phase and interference in generalized probabilistic theories,” *New Journal of Physics*, vol. 15, no. 9, p. 093044, 2013.
- [23] H. Barnum, M. P. Muller, and C. Ududec, “Higher-order interference and single-system postulates characterizing quantum theory,” *New Journal of Physics*, vol. 16, no. 12, p. 123029, 2014.
- [24] H. Barnum, C. Lee, C. Scandolo, and J. Selby, “Ruling out Higher-Order Interference from Purity Principles,” *Entropy*, vol. 19, p. 253, Jun 2017.
- [25] C. M. Lee and J. H. Selby, “Higher-order interference in extensions of quantum theory,” *Foundations of Physics*, vol. 47, pp. 89–112, Jan 2017.
- [26] M. P. Muller and C. Ududec, “Structure of reversible computation determines the self-duality of quantum theory,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 108, p. 130401, Mar 2012.
- [27] C. M. Lee and J. Barrett, “Computation in generalised probabilistic theories,” *New Journal of Physics*, vol. 17, p. 083001, Aug 2015.
- [28] N. Brunner, M. Kaplan, A. Leverrier, and P. Skrzypczyk, “Dimension of physical systems, information processing, and thermodynamics,” *New Journal of Physics*, vol. 16, no. 12, p. 123050, 2014.
- [29] G. Chiribella and C. M. Scandolo, “Operational axioms for diagonalizing states,” *EPTCS*, vol. 2, pp. 96–115, 2015.
- [30] G. Chiribella and C. M. Scandolo, “Entanglement and thermodynamics in general probabilistic theories,” *New Journal of Physics*, vol. 17, p. 103027, oct 2015.
- [31] H. Barnum, J. Barrett, L. Orloff Clark, M. Leifer, R. Spekkens, N. Stepanik, A. Wilce, and R. Wilke, “Entropy and information causality in general probabilistic theories,” *New Journal of Physics*, vol. 12, p. 033024, mar 2010.
- [32] G. Kimura, K. Nuida, and H. Imai, “Distinguishability measures and entropies for general probabilistic theories,” *Reports on Mathematical Physics*, vol. 66, no. 2, pp. 175 – 206, 2010.
- [33] P. Janotta, C. Gogolin, J. Barrett, and N. Brunner, “Limits on nonlocal correlations from the structure of the local state space,” *New Journal of Physics*, vol. 13, no. 6, p. 063024, 2011.
- [34] P. Janotta and R. Lal, “Generalized probabilistic theories without the no-restriction hypothesis,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 87, no. 5, p. 052131, 2013.
- [35] H. Barnum, M. Graydon, and A. Wilce, “Composites and Categories of Euclidean Jordan Algebras,” *eprint ArXiv:1606.09331 quant-ph*, June 2016.
- [36] J. H. Selby and J. Sikora, “How to make unforgeable money in generalised probabilistic theories,” *Quantum*, vol. 2, p. 103, Nov. 2018.
- [37] T. Heinosaari, L. Leppäjärvi, and M. Plávala, “No-free-information principle in general probabilistic theories,” *Quantum*, vol. 3, p. 157, July 2019.
- [38] E. Davies, “Example Related to the Foundations of Quantum Theory,” *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, vol. 13, pp. 39–41, Jan. 1972.

- [39] A. J. Short and J. Barrett, “Strong nonlocality: a trade-off between states and measurements,” *New Journal of Physics*, vol. 12, no. 3, p. 033034, 2010.
- [40] D. Gross, M. Müller, R. Colbeck, and O. C. O. Dahlsten, “All reversible dynamics in maximally nonlocal theories are trivial,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 104, p. 080402, Feb 2010.
- [41] S. W. Al-Safi and A. J. Short, “Reversible dynamics in strongly non-local boxworld systems,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, vol. 47, no. 32, p. 325303, 2014.
- [42] L. Hardy and W. K. Wootters, “Limited Holism and Real-Vector-Space Quantum Theory,” *Foundations of Physics*, vol. 42, pp. 454–473, Mar. 2012.
- [43] A. Aleksandrova, V. Borish, and W. K. Wootters, “Real-vector-space quantum theory with a universal quantum bit,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 87, p. 052106, May 2013.
- [44] W. K. Wootters, “Optimal Information Transfer and Real-Vector-Space Quantum Theory,” *arXiv eprints:quant-ph/1301.2018*, Jan. 2013.
- [45] D. N. Finkelstein, *Notes on Quaternion Quantum Mechanics*. CERN publications: European Organization for Nuclear Research, CERN, 1959.
- [46] K. Życzkowski, “Quartic quantum theory: an extension of the standard quantum mechanics,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, vol. 41, no. 35, p. 355302, 2008.
- [47] L. Masanes, M. P. Müller, D. Perez-Garcia, and R. Augusiak, “Entanglement and the three-dimensionality of the Bloch ball,” *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, vol. 55, no. 12, p. 122203, 2014.
- [48] M. Krumm and M. P. Müller, “Quantum computation is the unique reversible circuit model for which bits are balls,” *npj Quantum Information*, vol. 5, p. 7, Dec 2019.
- [49] B. Dakić, T. Paterek, and C. Brukner, “Density cubes and higher-order interference theories,” *New Journal of Physics*, vol. 16, no. 2, p. 023028, 2014.
- [50] T. D. Galley and L. Masanes, “Classification of all alternatives to the born rule in terms of informational properties,” *Quantum*, vol. 1, p. 15, jul 2017.
- [51] T. D. Galley and L. Masanes, “Any modification of the Born rule leads to a violation of the purification and local tomography principles,” *Quantum*, vol. 2, p. 104, Nov. 2018.
- [52] L. Masanes, T. Galley, and M. P. Müller, “The measurement postulates of quantum mechanics are operationally redundant,” *Nature Communications*, vol. 10, no. 1361, 2019.
- [53] R. Vinroot, “Topological groups.” <http://www.math.wm.edu/~vinroot/PadicGroups/topgroups.pdf>, 2018.
- [54] M. D. Mazurek, M. F. Pusey, K. J. Resch, and R. W. Spekkens, “Experimentally bounding deviations from quantum theory in the landscape of generalized probabilistic theories,” *arXiv e-prints*, p. arXiv:1710.05948, Oct 2017.
- [55] L. Masanes, M. P. Müller, R. Augusiak, and D. Perez-Garcia, “Existence of an information unit as a postulate of quantum theory,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 110, no. 41, pp. 16373–16377, 2013.
- [56] H.-C. Wang, “Two-point homogeneous spaces,” *Annals of Mathematics*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 177–191, 1952.
- [57] B. H. Gross, “Some applications of gelfand pairs to number theory,” *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, vol. 24, pp. 277–301, 04 1991.
- [58] E. Cartan, “Sur la détermination d’un système orthogonal complet dans un espace de riemann symétrique clos,” *Rendiconti del Circolo Matematico di Palermo (1884-1940)*, vol. 53, pp. 217–252, Dec 1929.
- [59] S. Helgason, *Groups and geometric analysis: integral geometry, invariant differential operators, and spherical functions*. No. 113 in Pure and applied mathematics, Orlando: Academic Press, 1984.
- [60] J. Wolf, *Harmonic Analysis on Commutative Spaces*, vol. 142 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. Providence, Rhode Island: American Mathematical Society, July 2007.
- [61] M. B. Halima, “Branching rules for unitary groups and spectra of invariant differential operators on complex Grassmannians,” *Journal of Algebra*, vol. 318, pp. 520–552, Dec. 2007.
- [62] W. Fulton and J. Harris, *Representation theory : a first course*. Graduate texts in mathematics, New York, Berlin, Paris: Springer-Verlag, 1991.
- [63] M. R. Sepanski, *Compact Lie Groups*. Springer-Verlag New York, 1 ed., 2007.

[64] A. S. Holevo, *Probabilistic and statistical aspects of quantum theory*. No. 1 in Quaderni Monographs, Pisa: Edizioni della normale, 2., english ed ed., 2011.

Appendix A: Notation

(Γ, V, \mathbb{F})	Representation $\Gamma : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(V)$ of a group G on linear space V over the field \mathbb{F}
\mathcal{S}_X	System with pure states X
\mathcal{F}_X	OPF set for system with pure states X
$\text{Sym}(X)$	Symmetric group on set X
$\text{Diff}(X)$	Group of diffeomorphisms on manifold X
$\{(p_i, x_i)\}_i$	Ensemble of pure states
$\{(p_i, x_i)\}_i \mapsto \sum_i p_i \Omega_{x_i}$	Mixed state representation of an ensemble
$\mathbf{f} \mapsto \Lambda_{\mathbf{f}}$	Extension of an OPF to ensembles/mixed states
Ω_x	Image of Ω map for en element x
Ω_X	The set $\Omega_x, \forall x \in X$
$\text{conv}(\Omega_X)$	Convex hull of Ω_X
$m(V, V_i)$	Multiplicity of the sub-representation V_i in the representation V
$\text{Hom}_G(V, W)$	Linear space of G -equivariant maps from V to W
$W_{\mathbb{C}}$	Complexification of a real representation W
$V_{\mathbb{R}}$	Restriction to reals of a complex representation V
$C(X, \mathbb{F})$	Continuous functions $X \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ for a topological space X and a field \mathbb{F}
V_G	G -module (carrier space of a representation of G)
\mathbb{I}_V	Identity operator on V

Appendix B: Background group theory and group representation theory

We briefly outline a few concepts from group representation theory which will be needed for the proofs.

1. Representation theory basics

Definition 13 (Group representation). A representation of a group G is a homomorphism $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(V)$, where V is a finite dimensional vector space. When G is a Lie group this is a continuous map. V is called the carrier space of the representation, or a G -module.

Let us denote by $\text{Hom}(V, W)$ the space of linear maps $V \rightarrow W$.

Definition 14 (Intertwining operators). Let (ρ, V) and (σ, W) be representations of G . An element $T \in \text{Hom}(V, W)$ is called an intertwining operator if $T \circ \rho = \sigma \circ T$. We denote the linear space of all such maps $\text{Hom}_G(V, W)$.

$\text{Hom}_G(V, W)$ is a subspace of $\text{Hom}(V, W)$.

Theorem 5 (Schur's Lemma). Let (ρ, V) and (σ, W) be irreducible representations of G over \mathbb{C} . Then we have $\dim \text{Hom}_G(V, W) = 1$ when $V \cong W$ and $\dim \text{Hom}_G(V, W) = 0$ otherwise.

This implies that $\text{Hom}_G(V, V) = \mathbb{C}\mathbb{I}_V$ for irreducible V . Schur's Lemma also has important consequences for reducible representations. For instance consider the case where $\dim(\text{Hom}_G(V, W)) = 1$ where V irreducible and W reducible. Then Schur's Lemma entails that W must contain the irreducible representation exactly once, and that $\text{Hom}_G(V, W) = \mathbb{C}\mathbb{I}_V$.

2. Left regular and $C(G)$ representations

Definition 15 (Left regular representation (finite group)). The left regular representation of a finite group G is given by:

$$\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(\mathbb{C}[G]) , \quad (\text{B1})$$

$$\rho_g |g'\rangle = |gg'\rangle , \quad (\text{B2})$$

where $\mathbb{C}[G]$ is a complex linear space spanned with orthonormal basis $\{|g\rangle\}_{g \in G}$.

Here the action of G on $\mathbb{C}[G]$ is just permutation of the basis vectors.

Definition 16 (Left regular representation (compact group)). The left regular representation of a compact topological group G is given by:

$$\rho_g f(g') = f(g^{-1}g') , \quad (\text{B3})$$

where $f \in C(G, \mathbb{C})$.

ρ is continuous a homomorphism: $\rho_g \rho_h f(g') = \rho_h f(g^{-1}g') = f(h^{-1}g^{-1}g') = f((gh)^{-1}g') = \rho_{gh} f(g')$.

3. Restricted and induced representations

a. Restricted representation

Definition 17 (Restricted representation). The restriction of a representation (ρ, V) of a group G to a subgroup H is a representation of H on V with operators $\rho(h) : V \rightarrow V$ for all $h \in H$. It is denoted $\rho|_H$.

In general the restriction of an irreducible representation G will give a reducible representation H .

Example 1. Consider the fundamental representation of $\text{SO}(3)$ on \mathbb{R}^3 and restrict to the subgroup $\text{SO}(2)$ with matrices:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos(\theta) & -\sin(\theta) \\ 0 & \sin(\theta) & \cos(\theta) \end{pmatrix} . \quad (\text{B4})$$

This is a reducible representation of $\text{SO}(2)$ containing the trivial and fundamental representation.

b. *Induced representation*

Definition 18 (Induced representation: G and H finite). A representation $\rho : H \rightarrow \text{GL}(V)$ of a subgroup H of G induces a representation of G given by the right regular representation of G on:

$$\text{Ind}_H^G(V) = \{\phi : G \rightarrow V \mid \phi(hg) = \rho(h)\phi(g), \forall h \in H, g \in G\} . \quad (\text{B5})$$

The carrier space $\text{Ind}_H^G(V)$ is the space of functions $G \rightarrow V$ which are H -equivariant. We can write it as $\text{Ind}_H^G(V) \cong \text{Hom}_H(G, V)$

Definition 19 (Induced representation: G locally compact and H closed). A representation $\rho : H \rightarrow \text{GL}(V)$ of a subgroup H of G induces a representation $(\sigma, \text{Ind}_H^G(V))$ of G :

$$\text{Ind}_H^G(V) = \{\phi : G \rightarrow V \mid \phi(gh^{-1}) = \sigma(h)\phi(g), \forall h \in H, g \in G, \phi \text{ continuous}\} . \quad (\text{B6})$$

The action of G on $\text{Ind}_H^G(V)$ is given by $\sigma(g)\phi(g') = \phi(g^{-1}g')$ where $\sigma : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(\text{Ind}_H^G(V))$.

4. Frobenius reciprocity

Theorem 6 (Frobenius reciprocity). [63, Theorem 7.47] Take G a finite group and H a subgroup or G a Lie group and H a closed subgroup of G . Given V a representation of H and W a representation of G , then as vector spaces

$$\text{Hom}_G(W, \text{Ind}_H^G(V)) \cong \text{Hom}_H(W|_H, V) . \quad (\text{B7})$$

Corollary 2. For (G, H) finite the irreducible representation W occurs in $\mathbb{C}[G/H]$ with multiplicity equal to the multiplicity of the trivial representation in $W|_H$. For (G, H) compact the irreducible representation W occurs in $C(G/H, \mathbb{C})$ with multiplicity equal to the multiplicity of the trivial representation in $W|_H$.

Proof. First observe for (G, H) finite $\text{Ind}_H^G(\mathbb{C}) = \mathbb{C}[G/H]$ and for (G, H) compact $\text{Ind}_H^G(\mathbb{C}) = C(G/H, \mathbb{C})$.

Let us consider the case where V is the trivial representation: $V \cong \mathbb{C}$. Then $W|_H$ contains a trivial representation with multiplicity $m(W|_H, 1_H)$. Using Schur's lemma the only H -equivariant map from $W|_H$ to V are identities on the trivial representations. In other words $\text{Hom}_H(W|_H, \mathbb{C}) = \mathbb{C}^{m(W|_H, 1_H)}$.

Similarly we have that $\text{Hom}_G(W, \text{Ind}_H^G(\mathbb{C})) = \mathbb{C}^{m(\text{Ind}_H^G(\mathbb{C}), W)}$ where $m(\text{Ind}_H^G(\mathbb{C}), W)$ is the multiplicity of W in $\text{Ind}_H^G(\mathbb{C})$. By Theorem 6 we obtain:

$$m(\text{Ind}_H^G(\mathbb{C}), W) = m(W|_H, 1) . \quad (\text{B8})$$

□

Appendix C: Representations over \mathbb{R}

A representation Γ is a homomorphism $G \rightarrow \text{GL}(V)$ for some vector space V . Typically V is assumed to be a vector space over \mathbb{C} , and many tools in representation theory apply to this case.

Schur's lemma for instance holds for representations over the complex field, but not always for those over \mathbb{R} . For a Gelfand pair (G, H) the property of having a trivial irreducible representation when restricted to H which is of multiplicity 0 or 1 holds for representations over \mathbb{C} , and not necessarily \mathbb{R} .

In this section we explore some of the subtleties involved in dealing with representations over \mathbb{R} and prove some lemmas which will be needed for Theorem 2. First we present an example to introduce some of the relevant concepts.

Example 2 (Fundamental representation of $\text{SO}(2)$). Consider the representation of $\text{SO}(2)$ over \mathbb{R}^2 :

$$\Gamma(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\theta) & -\sin(\theta) \\ \sin(\theta) & \cos(\theta) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{C1})$$

This representation is irreducible over \mathbb{R}^2 . However consider this representation acting on \mathbb{C}^2 (obtained from \mathbb{R}^2 by allowing complex linear combinations of the basis elements). Then there exist the following matrices S and S^{-1} :

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} -i & i \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad S^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{i}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \\ -\frac{i}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C2})$$

such that $\Gamma'(\theta) = S^{-1}\Gamma(\theta)S$, with

$$\Gamma'(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\theta} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\theta} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{C3})$$

So the irreducible representation over \mathbb{R}^2 is reducible over \mathbb{C}^2 . Consider once again the irreducible representation Γ over \mathbb{R} . Then this commutes with all matrices proportional to the identity, but also matrices proportional to J , where J is:

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{C4})$$

Moreover one can show that only matrices which are linear combinations of J and \mathbb{I} commute with the whole group.

1. Definitions

Definition 20 (Real, complex and quaternionic structure). Consider an irreducible representation ρ, V with V a complex vector space. Then V has a real structure if there exists an equivariant anti-linear map $j : V \rightarrow V$ such that $j^2 = 1$, V has a quaternionic structure if there exists an equivariant anti-linear map $j : V \rightarrow V$ such that $j^2 = -1$. Otherwise V has a complex structure.

Lemma 5. For an arbitrary representation (V, \mathbb{C}) , $W = V \oplus \bar{V}$ has a real structure.

Proof. We now argue that for an arbitrary complex representation V , $W = V \oplus \bar{V}$ has a real structure. A vector space W has a real structure if there exists an equivariant anti-linear map $j : W \rightarrow W$ such that $j^2 = 1$. A map j is anti-linear when $j(\lambda w) = \bar{\lambda}j(w)$.

Consider the matrix:

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbb{I}_{\bar{V}} \\ \mathbb{I}_V & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C5})$$

which is such that $J^2 = \mathbb{I}_W$. Now consider J applied to a vector $w = v_1 \oplus \bar{v}_2$, where scalar multiplication acts on the vector as $\lambda \cdot (v_1 \oplus \bar{v}_2) = \lambda v_1 \oplus \bar{\lambda} \bar{v}_2$. $J(\lambda v_1 \oplus \bar{\lambda} \bar{v}_2) = \lambda \bar{v}_2 \oplus \lambda v_1 = \bar{\lambda} \cdot (J(w))$ as required.

An element of G acts as $v_1 \rightarrow v'_1$ and $\bar{v}_2 \rightarrow \bar{v}'_2$ on $w = v_1 \oplus \bar{v}_2$. J is equivariant: $J(gw) = J(w') = J(v'_1 \oplus \bar{v}'_2) = \bar{v}'_2 \oplus v'_1 = g\bar{v}_2 \oplus gv_1 = gJ(w)$.

Consider $W^J : \{w \in W : J(w) = w\}$. Observe that this set is closed under real linear combinations, and not complex linear combinations. As such it has the structure of a real vector space. Moreover $W^J \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C} \cong W$.

W^J is closed under the action of G . An element of G acts as $v_1 \rightarrow v'_1$ and $\bar{v}_2 \rightarrow \bar{v}'_2$. Let us assume $w = v_1 \oplus \bar{v}_2$ in W^J , i.e. $v_1 \oplus \bar{v}_2 = \bar{v}_2 \oplus v_1$. Then $w \rightarrow w' = v'_1 \oplus \bar{v}'_2$ under G . $J(w') = \bar{v}'_2 \oplus v'_1$. We see that $J(gw) = gw$.

Thus G acts on W^J as a real representation. \square

Definition 21 (Descent map). Given a representation over a complex space W equipped with a real structure j the map $V \rightarrow V^j$ is a descent map. V^j carries a real representation.

Definition 22 (Complexification). A real vector space V has complexification $V_{\mathbb{C}} := V \otimes \mathbb{C}$ is a complex vector space. A basis for this complex vector space is $v \otimes 1$. $\dim_{\mathbb{R}}(V) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(V_{\mathbb{C}})$.

We sometimes write $V_{\mathbb{C}} \cong V \oplus iV$.

Definition 23 (Restriction to scalars). A complex vector space is isomorphic (as a real vector space) to the real vector space $V_{\mathbb{R}}$. $\dim_{\mathbb{R}}(V_{\mathbb{R}}) = 2 \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(V)$.

Consider V a complex vector space and W a real vector space.

$$(V_{\mathbb{R}})_{\mathbb{C}} \cong_{\mathbb{C}} V \oplus \bar{V}, \quad (\text{C6})$$

$$(W_{\mathbb{C}})_{\mathbb{R}} = W \oplus W, \quad (\text{C7})$$

where scalar multiplication acts on \bar{V} as $\lambda \cdot v = \bar{\lambda}v$.

Theorem 7. [62, Theorem 3.37, p.41] For an irreducible representation (ρ, W, \mathbb{R}) the action of G extends naturally to $W_{\mathbb{C}}$. It has one of the following decompositions:

1. $W_{\mathbb{C}} \cong V$ for a complex irreducible representation V if and only if V has a real structure.
2. $W_{\mathbb{C}} \cong V \oplus \bar{V}$ for a complex irreducible representation V if and only if V has a complex structure.
3. $W_{\mathbb{C}} \cong V \oplus V$ for a complex irreducible representation V if and only if V has a quaternionic structure.

Every real irreducible representation (ρ, W, \mathbb{R}) can be obtained from irreducible complex representations of the above form, by taking the descent map $W_{\mathbb{C}}^j$.

Corollary 3. Consider the set of all irreducible complex representations of a group G , these are the representations $\{V_i^r\}$ of real type, the representation $\{V_j^c\}$ complex type and the representations $\{V_j^q\}$ of quaternionic type. The set of all real irreducible representative has a representative element in $\{V_i^r\} \cup \{V_i^c/*\} \cup \{V_j^q\}$, where $\{V_i^c/*\}$ is the set of complex representations where conjugate representations are equivalent.

2. Lemmas

Lemma 6. For a Gelfand pair (G, H) all irreducible representations (Γ, V, \mathbb{C}) with an H -invariant subspace have either a real or complex structure.

Proof. For (G, H) finite every representation (Γ, V, \mathbb{C}) with an H -invariant subspace occurs exactly once in the decomposition of $\mathbb{C}[G/H]$ by Corollary 2. $\mathbb{C}[G/H]$ has a real structure (compatible with the group action) and decomposes as $\mathbb{R}[G/H] \oplus i\mathbb{R}[G/H] \cong \mathbb{R}[G/H]_{\mathbb{C}}$.

By Theorem 7 $\mathbb{R}[G/H]_{\mathbb{C}}$ sends every real irreducible representation W in $\mathbb{R}[G/H]$ to either:

1. An irreducible representation $W_{\mathbb{C}} \cong V$ in $\mathbb{C}[G/H]$ if W is real.
2. A reducible representation $W_{\mathbb{C}} \cong V \oplus \bar{V}$ in $\mathbb{C}[G/H]$ if W is complex.
3. A reducible representation $W_{\mathbb{C}} \cong V \oplus V$ in $\mathbb{C}[G/H]$ if W is quaternionic.

However since $\mathbb{C}[G/H]$ only contains single copies of irreps it cannot contain $V \oplus V$ and hence no irrep W can be of quaternionic form.

For (G, H) compact every representation (Γ, V, \mathbb{C}) with an H -invariant subspace occurs exactly once in the decomposition of $C(G/H, \mathbb{C})$ by Corollary 2. $C(G/H, \mathbb{C})$ is the complexification of $C(G/H, \mathbb{R})$ and the same proof as for the finite case follows through. \square

Lemma 7. For (G, H) a Gelfand pair and (Γ, V, \mathbb{R}) an irreducible representation over \mathbb{R} , then the following holds:

1. If Γ is irreducible over $V_{\mathbb{C}}$ then the (real) dimension of the H -invariant subspace in V is the same as the (complex) dimension of the H -invariant subspace in $V_{\mathbb{C}}$: $\dim_{\mathbb{R}}(\text{Hom}_H(\Gamma, 1_H)) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\text{Hom}_H(\Gamma, 1_H))$. It is either 0 or 1.
2. If Γ is reducible over $V_{\mathbb{C}}$ then the (real) dimension of the H -invariant subspace in V is twice that of the (complex) dimension of the H -invariant subspace in $V_{\mathbb{C}}$: $\dim_{\mathbb{R}}(\text{Hom}_H(\Gamma, 1_H)) = 2 \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\text{Hom}_H(\Gamma, 1_H))$. It is either 0 or 2.

Proof. 1. Take Γ' the irreducible representation over \mathbb{C}^n . There is a one dimensional complex subspace invariant under H , with an invariant vector v'_H where we choose the representation to be such that it is the first basis vector v'_1 . We can take $\Gamma = L\Gamma'L^{-1}$ to be such that it just has real entries. It acts on basis vectors $v_j = Lv'_j$ and $v_H = Lv'_H = \sum_i \alpha_i v_i$. Using this basis for the map $\mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ we have that the group action is well defined on \mathbb{R}^n and that v_1 spans the unique H invariant real subspace of \mathbb{R}^n .

2. By Lemma 6 if Γ is irreducible over \mathbb{R} but reducible over \mathbb{C} then it has a complex structure and is of the form $\rho \oplus \rho^*$ where ρ and ρ^* are irreducible. Since (G, H) a Gelfand pair and Γ contains an H -invariant vector then both contain a unique H -invariant vector.

$$\Gamma' = \begin{pmatrix} \rho & 0 \\ 0 & \rho^* \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{C8})$$

By Schur's lemma all matrices which commute with the whole group are of the form:

$$M'(\alpha, \beta) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \mathbb{I} & 0 \\ 0 & \beta \mathbb{I} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{C9})$$

All H -invariant vectors are of the form:

$$v'_H = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha v' \\ \beta v' \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C10})$$

where v' is some H -invariant vector in each subspace (since the representations can be chosen in a basis such that this holds). Let us call the basis $\{v'_1, \dots, v'_n\}$. Now we consider the change of basis given by matrices S and S^{-1} :

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} -i\mathbb{I} & i\mathbb{I} \\ \mathbb{I} & \mathbb{I} \end{pmatrix}, \quad S^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{i\mathbb{I}}{2} & \frac{\mathbb{I}}{2} \\ -\frac{i\mathbb{I}}{2} & \frac{\mathbb{I}}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C11})$$

and apply $S\Gamma'S^{-1}$ to obtain

$$\Gamma = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\rho+\rho^*}{2} & \frac{i(\rho^*-\rho)}{2} \\ \frac{i(\rho-\rho^*)}{2} & \frac{\rho+\rho^*}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C12})$$

which is real has real valued entries and is irreducible. The action of S on the basis vectors v'_j is:

$$v_j = Sv'_j = i(v'_{\frac{n}{2}+j} - v'_j), \quad j \in \{1, \dots, \frac{n}{2}\}, \quad (\text{C13})$$

$$v_j = Sv'_j = (v'_{j-\frac{n}{2}} + v'_j), \quad j \in \{\frac{n}{2} + 1, \dots, n\}. \quad (\text{C14})$$

A real basis for the space is $\{\{v_j\}, \{iv_j\}\}$, where Γ acts irreducibly on each real subspace.

The image of the H -invariant vectors under S is:

$$Sv'_H = \begin{pmatrix} i(\beta - \alpha)v \\ (\alpha + \beta)v \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{C15})$$

We take the descent map from $\mathbb{R}^n \oplus i\mathbb{R}^n$ to \mathbb{R}^n and consider the real subspace spanned by $\{v_j\}$.

The matrices $M'(\alpha, \beta)$ transform to

$$M(\alpha, \beta) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\alpha+\beta}{2}\mathbb{I} & \frac{i(\beta-\alpha)}{2}\mathbb{I} \\ \frac{i(\alpha-\beta)}{2}\mathbb{I} & \frac{\alpha+\beta}{2}\mathbb{I} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C16})$$

which all commute with Γ . This is real valued for $\alpha = \beta = 1$, $\alpha = -\beta = i$ and all real linear combinations of these matrices.

The vectors v_H^1 and v_H^2 form a basis for the two dimensional H invariant subspace in \mathbb{R}^n , where:

$$v_H^1 = \begin{pmatrix} v \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C17})$$

$$v_H^2 = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ v \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{C18})$$

These are related by the real valued transformation $M(i, -i)$ which commute with the whole group action. Two arbitrary H -invariant vectors will be related by a linear combination of $M(1, 1)$ and $M(i, -i)$, which commutes with Γ .

□

Corollary 4. For (G, H) a Gelfand pair and Γ an irreducible representation over \mathbb{R}^n , then all H -invariant vectors are related by an invertible transformation which commutes with Γ .

Corollary 5. For Γ, W an irreducible representation over \mathbb{R}^n , then the following holds:

1. If $W_{\mathbb{C}}$ is irreducible then $\text{Hom}_G(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n) = \mathbb{R}$. The only equivariant homomorphisms are scalar multiples of the identity.
2. If $W_{\mathbb{C}}$ is reducible into irreducible representations with complex structure then the real dimension $\text{Hom}_G(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n) = \mathbb{R}^2$.

Lemma 8. For a Gelfand pair of finite groups (G, H) , the representation of G acting on $\mathbb{R}[G/H]$ contains exactly once every irreducible representation of G which has a trivial sub-representation when restricted to H and does not contain any other representations.

Proof. By Corollary 2 $\mathbb{C}[G/H]$ contains every irreducible representation W with an H invariant subspace with multiplicity 1, if an irreducible is of complex type then its complex conjugate is necessarily also in $\mathbb{C}[G/H]$, since if W has a H -invariant vector so does W^* .

We have $\mathbb{C}[G/H] = \mathbb{R}[G/H]_{\mathbb{C}}$ which contains only irreducible representations with complex or real structures by Lemma 6. Therefore we have:

$$\mathbb{C}[G/H] = \bigoplus V_i \oplus \bigoplus (U_j \oplus \bar{U}_j), \quad (\text{C19})$$

where V_j are the irreducible representations of real type, and U_j are irreducible representations of complex type. There are no degeneracies.

$\mathbb{R}[G/H]$ decomposes into real irreducible representations W_i .

$$\mathbb{R}[G/H] = \bigoplus_i W_i, \quad (\text{C20})$$

$$\mathbb{C}[G/H] = \mathbb{R}[G/H]_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{R}[G/H] \otimes \mathbb{C} = \bigoplus_i (W_i \otimes \mathbb{C}). \quad (\text{C21})$$

Hence every irreducible representation W_i is sent to $(W_i)_{\mathbb{C}}$ in $\mathbb{C}[G/H]$. By Theorem 7 these are of the form V for V irreducible of real type, $V \oplus \bar{V}$ for V of complex type and $V \oplus V$ for V of quaternionic type, where we know by Lemma 6 that this latter case does not occur.

Combining the above:

$$\bigoplus_i (W_i \otimes \mathbb{C}) \cong \bigoplus V_j \oplus \bigoplus (U_k \oplus \bar{U}_k), \quad (\text{C22})$$

where every real irreducible subspace $(W_i \otimes \mathbb{C})$ corresponds to either a subspace V_j or $(U_k \oplus \bar{U}_k)$. Since these occur with multiplicity 1, every $(W_i \otimes \mathbb{C})$ occurs with multiplicity one in $\mathbb{R}[G/H]_{\mathbb{C}}$. This implies that every W_i occurs with multiplicity 1 in $\mathbb{R}[G/H]$. \square

Lemma 9. For a Gelfand pair (G, H) , where G compact and H a closed subgroup, the representation of G acting on $C(G/H, \mathbb{R})$ contains exactly once every irreducible representation of G which has a trivial sub-representation when restricted to H and does not contain any other representations.

Proof. By Corollary 2 $C(G/H, \mathbb{C})$ contains W with multiplicity equal to $m(W, 1_H)$. Since (G, H) a Gelfand pair this either 0 or 1. Hence $C(G/H, \mathbb{C})$ contains exactly once every irreducible representation W with a trivial H -invariant subspace, and no other representations. Since (G, H) a Frobenius pair:

$$C(G/H, \mathbb{C}) = \bigoplus_i W_i, \quad (\text{C23})$$

does not contain any repetitions. By Lemma 6 all of these have real or complex structures. In the case of representations with complex structure if W_i occurs then so does W_i^* .

$$C(G/H, \mathbb{R}) = \bigoplus_i \mathbb{R}^{m(V_i, C(G/H, \mathbb{R}))} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} V_i, \quad (\text{C24})$$

where there may be repeated representations. We consider the complexification:

$$C(G/H, \mathbb{R})_{\mathbb{C}} = \bigoplus_i \mathbb{R}^{m(V_i, C(G/H, \mathbb{R}))} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} V_i \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C} = \bigoplus_i \mathbb{C}^{m(V_i, C(G/H, \mathbb{R}))} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} V_i, \quad (\text{C25})$$

$$C(G/H, \mathbb{R})_{\mathbb{C}} = \bigoplus_i \mathbb{C}^{m(V_i, C(G/H, \mathbb{R}))} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} (W_i \oplus \bar{W}_i) \oplus \bigoplus_j \mathbb{C}^{m(V_j, C(G/H, \mathbb{R}))} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} W_j, \quad (\text{C26})$$

where the first sum contains complex irreducible representations of complex type and the second of real type both obtained by complexification. Since $C(G/H, \mathbb{C}) = C(G/H, \mathbb{R})_{\mathbb{C}}$ the complex irreducible representations all occur with multiplicity 1. Hence $m(V_i, C(G/H, \mathbb{R})) = 1$ for all i . \square

Appendix D: Convex linear state space

In this appendix we derive the convex linear state space associated to a system $\mathcal{S}_X = \{X, G, \mathcal{F}_X\}$.

Definition 24 (Preparation space). The preparation space of $\mathcal{S}_X = \{X, G, \mathcal{F}_X\}$ consists of the space of all ensembles $\{(p_i, x_i)\}_i$ for X finite, which is affinely equivalent to the simplex $\text{conv}(\Omega_X^{\mathbb{C}})$. When X is a topological space, the preparation space consists of all positive normalised measures on X , $M_1^+(X)$ which is the simplex $\text{conv}(\Omega_X^{\mathbb{C}})$.

In some treatments [64] a mixture space is considered, where the mixing operation applies also to ensembles. For example one can take j ensembles $\{(p_i^j, x_i^j)\}_i$ to prepare an ensembles $\{(p_j, \{(p_i^j, x_i^j)\}_i)\}_j$. In our case we can consider ensembles of ensembles by setting $\{(p_j, \{(p_i^j, x_i^j)\}_i)\}_j = \{(p_j p_i^j, x_i^j)\}_{ij}$ which is an ensemble of pure states and hence in the preparation space. We note that in a mixture space $\{(p_j, \{(p_i^j, x_i^j)\}_i)\}_j = \{(p_j p_i^j, x_i^j)\}_{ij}$ are two distinct elements, even if there can be no affine functional which separates them, by definition. In the ‘‘maximally separated’’ classical state space, these two ensembles are always equivalent. As such there is no loss of generality when considering a preparation space, as opposed to a mixture space.

1. Proof of Theorem 1

We consider a system $\mathcal{S}_X = \{X, G, \mathcal{F}_X\}$ where $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_X]$ is finite as a linear space. We consider only a preparation space of finite ensembles for this proof (one can extend to continuous ensembles, but

for finite dimensional systems this is not necessary). One can extend the OPFs to the preparation space:

$$P(\mathbf{f}|\{(p_i, x_i)\}_i) = \sum_i p_i \mathbf{f}(x_i) . \quad (\text{D1})$$

Two ensembles $\{(p_i, x_i)\}_i$ and $\{(p'_j, x'_j)\}_j$ where $P(\mathbf{f}|\{(p_i, x_i)\}_i) = P(\mathbf{f}|\{(p'_j, x'_j)\}_j)$ for all $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$ are equivalent ensembles. We can define the linear form $\Omega_x \in \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_X]^*$: $\Omega_x(\mathbf{f}) = \mathbf{f}(x) \forall \mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}_X$.

$$P(\mathbf{f}|\{(p_i, x_i)\}_i) = \sum_i p_i \mathbf{f}(x_i) = \left(\sum_i p_i \Omega_{x_i} \right) (\mathbf{f}) . \quad (\text{D2})$$

Hence to the ensemble $\{(p_i, x_i)\}_i$ we associate the mixed state $\omega = \sum_i p_i \Omega_{x_i}$, which is naturally an element of $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_X]^*$. Any two indistinguishable ensembles are mapped to the same mixed state. Now we can map the OPFs to linear functionals $\Lambda_{\mathbf{f}}$ in $(\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_X]^*)^*$:

$$\Lambda_{\mathbf{f}}(\omega) = P(\mathbf{f}|\omega), \quad \forall \omega \in \text{conv}(\Omega_X) . \quad (\text{D3})$$

By assumption $\Omega_x \rightarrow \Omega_{gx}$ is a continuous group action when G is a continuous group. Moreover it extends to $\text{conv}(\Omega_X)$ as follows

$$\sum_i p_i \Omega_{x_i} \xrightarrow{g} \sum_i p_i \Omega_{gx_i} . \quad (\text{D4})$$

This uniquely extends to $\text{span}(\Omega_X) \cong \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_X]^*$ and hence $\Gamma : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_X]^*)$ is a group representation.

2. Proof of Theorem 2

1. Take $\mathcal{S} = \{X \cong G/H, \mathcal{F}\}$ with (G, H) a Gelfand pair and $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}]$ finite. To every $x \in X$ we associated a linear functional $\Omega_x \in \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}]^*$. Let us call Γ the representation of G acting on $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}]^*$. In general Γ may be reducible:

$$\Gamma = \bigoplus_i \Gamma^i . \quad (\text{D5})$$

We can also decompose states:

$$\Omega_x = \bigoplus_i \Omega_x^i . \quad (\text{D6})$$

We have the following equality:

$$\Gamma_g \Omega_x = \Omega_{gx} . \quad (\text{D7})$$

Since x is stabilized by H we have

$$\Gamma_h \Omega_x = \Omega_x, \quad \forall h \in H . \quad (\text{D8})$$

This implies

$$\Gamma_h^i \Omega_x^i = \Omega_x^i, \quad \forall h \in H . \quad (\text{D9})$$

This implies that each $\Gamma_{|H}^i$ has at least one trivial sub-representation.

2. Let us consider a representation of G :

$$\Gamma = \bigoplus_i \Gamma_i \quad (\text{D10})$$

such that each Γ_i has at least one H -invariant subspace. Take a reference vector $v \in V$ which has support only in the invariant H -invariant subspaces, and has support in each subspace V_i . By applying Γ_G to v we obtain $\Omega_{G/H} \in V$, where we observe that $\text{conv}(\Omega_{G/H})$ has $\Omega_{G/H}$ as extremal points, since Γ_G can be expressed in orthogonal matrices and hence $\Omega_{G/H} \subset S^n$ (a hyper-sphere in the affine span of the normalised states, centred on the maximally mixed state). By taking the convex set of all linear functionals which give values in $[0, 1]$ we obtain $\Lambda_{\mathcal{F}}$ a probabilistic structure.

3. Since (G, H) a Gelfand pair, all real irreducible representations V_i are such that any pair of H -invariant vectors are related by an invertible linear transformation L_i . For a representation:

$$\Gamma = \bigoplus_i \Gamma^i, \quad (\text{D11})$$

take two H -invariant vectors v and v' which have support in every irreducible subspace. These are related by a transformation $L: Lv = v'$ which commutes with the group action. Their orbits under Γ_G generate Ω_X and Ω'_X . Since L commutes with the group action $L\Omega_X = \Omega'_X$. Let us consider the unrestricted effect spaces for both: $\Lambda_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\Lambda'_{\mathcal{F}'}$. $\Lambda'_{\mathcal{F}'}(\Omega'_X) = \Lambda'_{\mathcal{F}'}(L\Omega_X)$. The set of all effects on $L\Omega_X$ is just $\Lambda_{\mathcal{F}}L^{-1}$, hence $\Lambda'_{\mathcal{F}'} = \Lambda_{\mathcal{F}}L^{-1}$.

4. Let us take the case where (G, H) is not a Gelfand pair. There exist (complex) irreducible representations W such that $W|_H$ contains more than one trivial sub-representation.

One can obtain a real irreducible representation from W by one of the three following methods:

- (a) Restriction to \mathbb{R} of W if W is of real type.
- (b) Restriction to \mathbb{R} of $W \oplus \bar{W}$ if W is of complex type.
- (c) Restriction to \mathbb{R} of $W \oplus W$ if W if of quaternionic type

In each case the real irreducible representation V obtained is such that it has invariant H -vectors which are not related by a transformation which commutes with the group representation. Let us fix a basis and consider the matrices Γ_g acting on V . Let us pick two H -invariant vectors v_1 and v_2 such that there is no transformation which commutes with the group action such that $Lv_1 = v_2$.

Let us call $\text{conv}(\Omega_X)$ the convex hull of the orbit $\Gamma_g v$ and $\text{conv}(\Omega'_X)$ the convex hull of the orbit $\Gamma_g v'$. We call $\Lambda_{\mathcal{F}} \in V^*$ the set of all linear functionals giving values in $[0, 1]$ on \mathcal{S} and $\Lambda'_{\mathcal{F}'} \in V^*$ the set of all linear functionals giving values in $[0, 1]$ on \mathcal{S}' . Necessarily $\text{span}(\Lambda_{\mathcal{F}'}) = \text{span}(\Lambda'_{\mathcal{F}'}) = V^*$.

Consider an invertible linear transformation such that $L\Omega_X = \Omega'_X$. This implies that $L\omega_x = \omega'_x$ for all pure states $x \in X$. Since the state spaces are transitive we have $\omega_x = \Gamma_g \omega_{x_0}$ for some reference state x_0 , and $\omega'_x = \Gamma_g \omega'_{x_0}$. Using $L\omega_x = \omega'_x \forall x \in X$ we obtain:

$$L\Gamma_g \omega_{x_0} = \Gamma_g \omega'_{x_0}, \forall g \in G. \quad (\text{D12})$$

Moreover $L\omega_{x_0} = \omega'_{x_0}$ we obtain

$$L\Gamma_g \omega_{x_0} = \Gamma_g L\omega_{x_0}, \forall g \in G. \quad (\text{D13})$$

Hence there is a transformation L which commutes with the group action such that $L\omega_{x_0} = \omega'_{x_0}$. This is in contradiction with the assumption that the two reference states were not related by such a transformation.

Appendix E: Deformation of probabilistic structure

1. Proof of Theorem 3

Proof. Let $\Gamma^i : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(V^i)$ be the representation of G associated to \mathcal{F}^i , let $\Omega^i : X \rightarrow V^i$ be the representation of pure states, and let $\Lambda^i : \mathcal{F}^i \rightarrow (V^i)^*$ be the representation of OPFS, for $i = 0, 1$. We can decompose the group action into irreducible representations as $\Gamma^i = \bigoplus_j \Gamma_j^i$, $V^i = \bigoplus_j V_j^i$, $\Gamma_j^i : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(V_j^i)$, where $j = 0, 1, \dots$. Recall that there must be one (and only one) trivial irrep, which we label by $j = 0$. Also, we can decompose the representation of pure states $\Omega^i = \bigoplus_j \Omega_j^i$ and $\Omega_j^i : X \rightarrow V_j^i$, and the representation of OPFs $\Lambda^i = \bigoplus_j \Lambda_j^i$ and $\Lambda_j^i : \mathcal{F}^i \rightarrow (V_j^i)^*$. Within this proof we follow the convention that

$$\langle \Omega_j^i(x), \Omega_j^i(x) \rangle_j = 1, \quad (\text{E1})$$

for all i, j, x , where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_j$ is a group-invariant scalar product. This scalar product provides an isomorphism $(V_j^i)^* \cong V_j^i$. Using this decomposition we can write any $\mathbf{f}^i \in \mathcal{F}^i$ as

$$\mathbf{f}^i(x) = c_0^i(\mathbf{f}^i) + \sum_{j \geq 1} \langle \Lambda_j^i(\mathbf{f}^i), \Omega_j^i(x) \rangle_j, \quad (\text{E2})$$

where we define $c_j^i(\mathbf{f}^i) = \langle \Lambda_j^i(\mathbf{f}^i), \Omega_j^i(\mathbf{f}^i) \rangle_j^{1/2}$. Using Shur's Lemma we obtain

$$\int_G dg \mathbf{f}^i(gx) = \int_G dg \left[c_0^i(\mathbf{f}^i) + \sum_{j \geq 1} \langle \Lambda_j^i(\mathbf{f}^i), \Gamma_j^i(g) \Omega_j^i(x) \rangle_j \right] = c_0^i(\mathbf{f}^i), \quad (\text{E3})$$

and

$$\int_G dg [\mathbf{f}^i(gx)]^2 = \sum_j \frac{c_j^i(\mathbf{f}^i)^2}{d_j^i}, \quad (\text{E4})$$

where $d_j^i = \dim V_j^i$.

Now, suppose that \mathcal{F}^0 and \mathcal{F}^1 are unrestricted and tomographically-inequivalent probabilistic structures of (G, X) . Then, without loss of generality, we assume that irrep Γ_1^0 is inequivalent to irrep Γ_j^1 for all j . Also, let us choose $\mathbf{f}^0 \in \mathcal{F}^0$ so that its corresponding vector $\Lambda^0(\mathbf{f}^0)$ only has support on the subspaces $j = 0, 1$. This is possible because the probabilistic structure \mathcal{F}^0 is unrestricted.

Next, let us lower-bound the distance between the chosen OPFs $\mathbf{f}^0 \in \mathcal{F}^0$ and $\mathbf{f}^1 \in \mathcal{F}^1$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(\mathbf{f}^0, \mathbf{f}^1) &= \max_{x \in X} |\mathbf{f}^0(x) - \mathbf{f}^1(x)| \geq \int_G dg |\mathbf{f}^0(gx_0) - \mathbf{f}^1(gx_0)| \\ &\geq \int_G dg [\mathbf{f}^0(gx_0) - \mathbf{f}^1(gx_0)]^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E5})$$

for any $x_0 \in X$. This bound is independent of whether the probabilistic structures \mathcal{F}^0 and \mathcal{F}^1 are

equivalent or not. Now, using Shur's lemma as in (E3) and (E4) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{dist}(\mathbf{f}^0, \mathbf{f}^1) &\geq \sum_{j=0}^1 \frac{c_j^0(\mathbf{f}^0)^2}{d_j^0} + \sum_j \frac{c_j^1(\mathbf{f}^1)^2}{d_j^1} - 2c_0^0(\mathbf{f}^0)c_0^1(\mathbf{f}^1) \\
&= \frac{c_1^0(\mathbf{f}^0)^2}{d_1^0} + \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{c_j^1(\mathbf{f}^1)^2}{d_j^1} + [c_0^0(\mathbf{f}^0) - c_0^1(\mathbf{f}^1)]^2 \\
&\geq \frac{c_1^0(\mathbf{f}^0)^2}{d_1^0} + \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{c_j^1(\mathbf{f}^1)^2}{d_j^1}, \tag{E6}
\end{aligned}$$

for any $\mathbf{f}^1 \in \mathcal{F}^1$, therefore

$$\min_{\mathbf{f}^1 \in \mathcal{F}^1} \text{dist}(\mathbf{f}^0, \mathbf{f}^1) \geq \frac{c_1^0(\mathbf{f}^0)^2}{d_1^0}. \tag{E7}$$

Using expression (E2) with our chosen \mathbf{f}^0 we obtain

$$\mathbf{f}^0(x) = c_0^0(\mathbf{f}^i) + \langle \Lambda_1^0(\mathbf{f}^0), \Omega_1^0(x) \rangle_1 \in [0, 1]. \tag{E8}$$

The normalisation (E1) implies that

$$c_0^0(\mathbf{f}^0) - c_1^0(\mathbf{f}^0) \geq 0, \tag{E9}$$

$$c_0^0(\mathbf{f}^0) + c_1^0(\mathbf{f}^0) \leq 1. \tag{E10}$$

Apart from these two constraints, we can choose $\mathbf{f}^0 \in \mathcal{F}^0$ (and hence $c_0^0(\mathbf{f}^0), c_1^0(\mathbf{f}^i)$) as we please. One such choice is $c_0^0(\mathbf{f}^0) = c_1^0(\mathbf{f}^i) = 1/2$. Which, when substituted in (E7) gives the statement of the lemma. \square

2. Proof of Theorem 4

a. Proof of Theorem 4 i.

Proof. Let \mathcal{F}^0 of dimension $\dim_{\mathbb{R}}[\mathcal{F}_0] = d_0$ be an unrestricted probabilistic structure of (G, H) with associated representation Γ_G^0 such that all H -invariant vectors are related by invertible transformations which commute with Γ_G^0 .

Consider two such vectors v_H and v'_H where $v'_H = Lv_H$, with $L \in \text{GL}(\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_0])$. We can generate a state space with extremal points G/H by applying Γ_G to the reference states:

$$\Omega_{G/H} = \Gamma_G v_H, \tag{E11}$$

$$\Omega'_{G/H} = \Gamma_G v'_H = \Gamma_G Lv_H = L\Omega_{G/H}. \tag{E12}$$

Both the state spaces $\text{conv}(\Omega_{G/H})$ and $\text{conv}(\Omega'_{G/H})$ are related by an invertible transformation and hence are equivalent as convex sets. In other words they correspond to tomographically equivalent probabilistic structures. Since we are only considering unrestricted probabilistic structures they both generate the same state space corresponding to \mathcal{F}_0 (the linear transformation L is just

a change of co-ordinates, including rescalings). Probabilistic structures H -invariant vectors related by invertible transformations which commute with Γ_G there is a unique unrestricted probabilistic structure associated to Γ_G .

Therefore the only other probabilistic structures \mathcal{F}_1 such that $\dim\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_1] = d_0$ (if they exists) are associated to different representations Γ_G^1 . The largest dimensional irreducible representation they can differ by is of dimension $d_0 - 1$ (corresponding to the case where either Γ^0 or Γ^1 consists of a $d_0 - 1$ dimensional irreducible representation and the trivial and the other representation consists of the trivial representation and some reducible representation). Therefore by Theorem 3 the distance between the two probabilistic structures is lower bounded by $\frac{1}{2(d_0-1)}$. Any other possibility (i.e. both consist of a trivial representation and different reducible one would give a lower bound which is higher). \square

b. *Proof of Theorem 4 ii.*

Let \mathcal{F}^0 of dimension $\dim\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_0] = d_0$ be an unrestricted probabilistic structure of (G, H) with associated representation Γ_G^0 such that there are H -invariant vectors related by invertible transformations which does not commute with Γ_G^0 . These H -invariant vectors belong to an H -invariant subspace V_H .

Take $\Omega_H \in V_H$ and $\Omega_H^\epsilon = L^t \Omega_H$ where $L = e^{iRt}$ with $R \in \mathfrak{gl}(V_H)$. Take Ω_H^ϵ for ϵ an infinitesimal element. We can expand as:

$$\Omega_H^\epsilon = (\mathbb{I} + \epsilon R + \dots)\Omega_H \approx \Omega_H + \epsilon R \Omega_H . \quad (\text{E13})$$

The image of a point $x = gH$ is $\Omega_{gH} = \Gamma_g \Omega_H$ and $\Omega_{gH}^\epsilon = \Gamma_g \Omega_H^\epsilon$:

$$\Omega_{gH}^\epsilon = \Omega_{gH} + \epsilon \Gamma_g R \Omega_H . \quad (\text{E14})$$

Let us take an OPF $\mathbf{f}_0 \in \mathcal{F}_0$ with associated effect $\Lambda_{\mathbf{f}_0}$ and an OPF $\mathbf{f}_1 \in \mathcal{F}_\epsilon$ with associated effect $\Lambda_{\mathbf{f}_1}^\epsilon$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f}^0(gH) &= \Lambda_{\mathbf{f}_1} \cdot \Omega_{gH} , \\ \mathbf{f}^1(gH) &= \Lambda_{\mathbf{f}_1}^\epsilon \cdot \Omega_{gH}^\epsilon . \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{dist}(\mathbf{f}^0, \mathbf{f}^1) = \max_{x \in X} |\mathbf{f}^0(x) - \mathbf{f}^1(x)| = \max_{x \in X} |\Lambda_{\mathbf{f}_0} \cdot \Omega_x - \Lambda_{\mathbf{f}_1}^\epsilon \cdot \Omega_x| \quad (\text{E15})$$

$$= \max_{g \in G} |(\Lambda_{\mathbf{f}_0} - \Lambda_{\mathbf{f}_1}^\epsilon) \cdot \Omega_{gH} - \epsilon \Lambda_{\mathbf{f}_1}^\epsilon \Gamma_g R \Omega_H| . \quad (\text{E16})$$

For a fixed \mathbf{f}_0 we want to find an \mathbf{f}^1 which minimizes the distance.

$$\min_{\mathbf{f}^1 \in \mathcal{F}^\epsilon} \text{dist}(\mathbf{f}^0, \mathbf{f}^1) = \min_{\mathbf{f}^1 \in \mathcal{F}^\epsilon} \max_{g \in G} |(\Lambda_{\mathbf{f}_0} - \Lambda_{\mathbf{f}_1}^\epsilon) \cdot \Omega_{gH} - \epsilon \Lambda_{\mathbf{f}_1}^\epsilon \Gamma_g R \Omega_H| . \quad (\text{E17})$$

We observe that that the transformations Γ_g and R leave the normalisation degree of freedom unchanged, therefore if we take $\mathbf{f}^0 = \mathbf{u}^0$ then we can choose $\mathbf{f}^1 = \mathbf{u}^1$ to obtain $\text{dist}(\mathbf{u}^0, \mathbf{u}^1) = 0$.

For any effect with support outside the normalisation subspace this expression is not linear in Ω_{gH} (due to the last term) and as such there is no choice of $\Lambda_{\mathbf{f}_1}$ which will make $(\Lambda_{\mathbf{f}_0} - \Lambda_{\mathbf{f}_1}^\epsilon)$ cancel

out with $\epsilon \Lambda_{\mathbf{f}^1}^\epsilon \Gamma_g R \Omega_H$ for all $g \in G$, which is needed to make the distance go to 0. Hence for \mathbf{f}^0 not proportional to \mathbf{u}^0 we have the bound:

$$\min_{\mathbf{f}^1 \in \mathcal{F}^\epsilon} \text{dist}(\mathbf{f}^0, \mathbf{f}^1) > 0 .$$

We observe that every Ω_x^ϵ is ϵ close to Ω_x , therefore any $\Lambda_{\mathbf{f}^0}$ which is not ϵ tight on Ω_X (i.e. which gives values in $[0 + \epsilon, 1 - \epsilon]$) will be valid on Ω_X^ϵ . Let us minimize the distance $\min_{\mathbf{f}^1 \in \mathcal{F}^\epsilon} \text{dist}(\mathbf{f}^0, \mathbf{f}^1)$ for the choice of \mathbf{f}^0 not tight. We observe that by choosing $\Lambda_{\mathbf{f}^1}^\epsilon = \Lambda_{\mathbf{f}^0}$ we obtain:

$$\max_{g \in G} |(\Lambda_{\mathbf{f}^0} - \Lambda_{\mathbf{f}^1}^\epsilon) \cdot \Omega_{gH} - \epsilon \Lambda_{\mathbf{f}^1}^\epsilon \Gamma_g R v_H| = |\epsilon \Lambda_{\mathbf{f}^1}^\epsilon \Gamma_g R \Omega_H| \leq \epsilon , \quad (\text{E18})$$

which implies that

$$\min_{\mathbf{f}^1 \in \mathcal{F}^\epsilon} \text{dist}(\mathbf{f}^0, \mathbf{f}^1) \leq \epsilon . \quad (\text{E19})$$

Finally if \mathbf{f}^0 is ϵ -tight (i.e. has some values in $[0, \epsilon]$ or $[1 - \epsilon, 1]$), one can take $\Lambda_{\mathbf{f}^0}$ and add ϵ noise in order to obtain an effect $\Lambda'_{\mathbf{f}^0}$ which is valid on Ω_X^ϵ :

$$\max_{g \in G} |(\Lambda_{\mathbf{f}^0} - \Lambda'_{\mathbf{f}^0}) \cdot \Omega_{gH} - \epsilon \Lambda'_{\mathbf{f}^0} \Gamma_g R \Omega_H| \quad (\text{E20})$$

$$= \min_{\mathbf{f}^1 \in \mathcal{F}^\epsilon} \max_{g \in G} |\epsilon - \epsilon \Lambda_{\mathbf{f}^1}^\epsilon \Gamma_g R \Omega_H| \leq 2\epsilon . \quad (\text{E21})$$

Therefore

$$\min_{\mathbf{f}^1 \in \mathcal{F}^\epsilon} \text{dist}(\mathbf{f}^0, \mathbf{f}^1) \leq 2\epsilon . \quad (\text{E22})$$

This implies that

$$\max_{\mathbf{f}^0 \in \mathcal{F}^0} \min_{\mathbf{f}^1 \in \mathcal{F}^\epsilon} \text{dist}(\mathbf{f}^0, \mathbf{f}^1) \leq 2\epsilon . \quad (\text{E23})$$

3. Deformation map

In the following we only consider systems up to tomographic equivalence, where two systems are tomographically equivalent if and only if they have the same equivalence classes of ensembles (i.e. the same mixed states). For a given set of pure states X each probabilistic structure $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_X$ induces a map $\Omega : X \rightarrow V$ (where $V \cong \mathbb{R}^n$) by Theorem 1. Two tomographically equivalent probabilistic structures induce the same maps Ω , and we define a deformation of probabilistic structure as a map between different Ω maps (since there is a one to one correspondence between equivalence classes of probabilistic structures $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_X$ and Ω maps). Deformation maps are maps between Ω maps which we now formally define.

For two systems $S_X^0 = (X, \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X^0)$ and $S_X^1 = (X, \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X^1)$ with associated maps $\Omega^0 : X \rightarrow V^0$ and $\Omega^1 : X \rightarrow V^1$. A generic map $\Omega_X^0 \rightarrow \Omega_X^1$, where Ω_X is the image of $\Omega : X \rightarrow V$ is a Ω -transformation map.

Definition 25 (Trivial Ω -transformation map). For two systems $S_X^0 = (X, \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X^0)$ and $S_X^1 = (X, \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X^1)$ with associated maps $\Omega^0 : X \rightarrow V^0$ and $\Omega^1 : X \rightarrow V^1$ we define the trivial Ω -transformation map $M_{0 \rightarrow 1} : \Omega_X^0 \rightarrow \Omega_X^1$ as $M_{0 \rightarrow 1} : \Omega_x^0 \mapsto \Omega_x^1, \forall x \in X$.

If $M_{0 \rightarrow 1}$ is convex-linear, i.e. $M_{0 \rightarrow 1}(\lambda \Omega_{x_a}^0 + (1 - \lambda) \Omega_{x_b}^0) = \lambda M_{0 \rightarrow 1}(\Omega_{x_a}^0) + (1 - \lambda) M_{0 \rightarrow 1}(\Omega_{x_b}^0)$ then it extends to the mixed states as $M_{0 \rightarrow 1}^{\text{ext}}$. In this case $M_{0 \rightarrow 1}$ is not a deformation map. If $M_{0 \rightarrow 1}^{\text{ext}}$ is invertible, S_0 and S_1 are tomographically equivalent (same as convex sets). If such a map is not invertible then S_0 and S_1 are not equivalent. An example of such a map is the projection from a system $S_{G/H}^0$ with an associated representation Γ^1 which is reducible to a system $S_{G/H}^1$ with an associated representation Γ^2 which is a sub-representation of Γ^1 , i.e. $\Gamma^2 \cong \Gamma^1 \oplus \Gamma^3$ for some representation Γ^3 of G .

If $M_{0 \rightarrow 1}$ is not convex linear then it will not extend to a well defined map $M_{0 \rightarrow 1}^{\text{ext}}$ on S^0 and S^1 and M is called a *deformation map*. An example of such a map is one between two convex sets $S_{G/H}^0$ and $S_{G/H}^1$ associated to two inequivalent irreducible representations Γ^1 and Γ^2 . We observe that if the map $M_{0 \rightarrow 1}$ is convex-linear and not invertible then the map $M^{1 \rightarrow 0}$ will not be convex linear (it would need to be one-to-many to be defined on the mixed states).

Definition 26 (Deformation map). A deformation map is a trivial Ω -transformation map which is not convex linear.

Definition 27 (Deformation of probabilistic structures). Two probabilistic structures \mathcal{F}_X^1 and \mathcal{F}_X^2 (with associated Ω maps Ω^1 and Ω^2) can be deformed into one another if the trivial Ω -transformation maps $M_{0 \rightarrow 1}$ and $M_{1 \rightarrow 0}$ are both deformation maps.

Every Ω map is in one to one correspondence with an equivalence class of tomographically equivalent probabilistic structures. We can take the unrestricted probabilistic structure as a representative member of an equivalence class. We can define the distance between Ω maps as the distance between the associated unrestricted probabilistic structures given by Equation 17. Thus for a given dynamical structure X every Ω -map has a distance relative to every other Ω -map which lies in the interval $[0, 1]$.

A deformation map $M_{0 \rightarrow 1}$ can be continuous or discontinuous. A deformation of probabilistic structure is continuous/discontinuous if the associated maps $M_{0 \rightarrow 1}$ and $M_{1 \rightarrow 0}$ are continuous/discontinuous. Here by continuity we mean with respect to the topology of the reals, and consider $M_{0 \rightarrow 1}$ to be continuous if it is of the form $M_{0 \rightarrow t}$, where $t \in [0, 1]$ and the set $M_{0 \rightarrow t}$, $t \in [0, 1]$ is in bijection with $[0, 1]$. In other words there is a connected path in the space of deformation maps M between $M_{0 \rightarrow 0}$ and $M_{0 \rightarrow 1}$, where this connected path has the topology of $[0, 1]$.

Definition 28 (Rigid dynamical structure). A dynamical structure (G, H) is rigid if all deformation maps are discontinuous.

If a dynamical structure admits of a continuous deformation map then it is *non-rigid*.

In the following theorem we show that for dynamical structures which are Gelfand pairs such maps are always discontinuous, however there always exists a continuous one for a given dynamical structure which is not a Gelfand pair.

Theorem 8. For dynamical structures (G/H) where (G, H) is not a Gelfand pair there are inequivalent state spaces $(G/H, \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{G/H}^0)$ and $(G/H, \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{G/H}^1)$ which can be continuously deformed into one another. For dynamical structure which are Gelfand pairs, any inequivalent finite dimensional state spaces $(G/H, \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{G/H}^0)$ and $(G/H, \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{G/H}^1)$ cannot be continuously deformed into one another.

Two convex sets S_0 and S_1 with pure states X linearly embedded in isomorphic spaces $V_0 \cong V_1 \cong \mathbb{R}^n$ (i.e. for which there exist injective maps $\Omega^0 : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\Omega^1 : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $S_i = \text{conv}(\Omega^i(X))$) can be continuously deformed one into the other if there exists a *continuous non-linear map* $L :$

$\Omega_X^1 \rightarrow \Omega_X^2$ parameterised by $t \in [0, 1]$ where $L_t(\Omega_X^1) = \Omega_X^t$ is a convex set embedded in \mathbb{R}^n with pure states X . We observe that L is defined just on the extremal points (and is invertible), but is not defined on the interior of convex hull of the extremal points.

Now consider a non-Gelfand pair (G, H) , and an irreducible spherical representation Γ with inequivalent H -invariant vectors v_H and v'_H (which always exists for a given non-Gelfand pair). Any vector in $\text{span}(v_H, v'_H)$ is H -invariant, moreover any two vectors in $\text{span}(v_H, v'_H)$ which are not proportional will generate inequivalent state spaces under Γ_G . Consider a rotation $R \in \text{GL}(\text{span}(v_H, v'_H))$ such that $Rv_H = v'_H$, which is linear and continuous.

We now show the existence of an invertible, continuous non-linear map between two state spaces S and S' generated by two non-equivalent H -invariant vectors v_H and v'_H . For a given state $v_{gH} = \Gamma_g v_H$ and $v'_{gH} = \Gamma_g v'_H$ we have the relation:

$$v'_{gH} = \Gamma_g R v_H = \Gamma_g R \Gamma_{g^{-1}} v_{gH} . \quad (\text{E24})$$

Hence there is a continuous linear map $\Gamma_g R \Gamma_{g^{-1}}$ between the two points v'_{gH} and v_{gH} for all points v'_{gH} and v_{gH} . Hence there is a one-to-one (i.e. invertible) map $S \rightarrow S'$, however since this map is g -dependent (i.e. its action depends on each extremal point v_{gH}) it is not linear however remains continuous (since every extremal point v_{gH} is continuously mapped to a point an extremal point of S'). Hence the map $S \rightarrow S'$ is an invertible continuous non-linear pure state preserving map. It is not necessarily well defined on the mixed states of S and S' , but just on the extremal points.

Appendix F: Proof of Lemma 3 part 2

We make use of Proposition 26.24 of [62] which we translate slightly:

Lemma 10. Any irreducible representation of $\text{SU}(d)$ with Dynkin indices $j = (j_1, \dots, j_{d-1})$ is complex if $j_i \neq j_{d-i}$ for any i , real if $j_i = j_{d-i}$ for all i and n is odd, or $n = 4k$, or $n = 4k + 2$ and j_{2k+1} is even, and quaternionic if $j_i = j_{d-i}$ for all i and j_{2k+1} is odd.

We translate the partitions (32) and (33) into Dynkin indices:

When $m = n$:

$$j = (b_1 - b_2, b_2 - b_3, \dots, 2b_m, b_{m-1} - b_m, \dots, b_1 - b_2) \quad (\text{F1})$$

where this has $m + n - 1$ entries.

For all i $j_i = j_{m+n-i}$, hence for $m + n$ odd and $m + n = 4k$ these are all real. For $m + n = 4k + 2$ we observe that j_{2k+1} (the central entry) is $2b_m$ and hence even. This implies the representation is real.

When $n \geq m + 1$:

$$\lambda = (b_1 - b_2, b_2 - b_3, \dots, b_m, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{\text{times } n-m-1}, b_m, \dots, b_2 - b_3, b_1 - b_2) \quad (\text{F2})$$

where this has $m + n - 1$ entries.

For all i $j_i = j_{m+n-i}$, hence for $m + n$ odd and $m + n = 4k$ these are all real. For $m + n = 4k + 2$ we observe that j_{2k+1} (the central entry) is 0 and hence even. This implies the representation is real.