Universal control of quantum processes using sector-preserving channels
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No universal circuit architecture can implement the coherently controlled version of a completely unknown unitary gate. Yet, universal coherent control of unknown gates has been realised in experiments, making use of a different type of initial resources. Here, we formalise the task achieved by these experiments, extending it to the control of arbitrary noisy channels, and to more general types of control involving higher dimensional control systems. For the standard notion of coherent control, we identify the information-theoretic resource for controlling an arbitrary quantum channel on a $d$-dimensional system: specifically, the resource is an extended quantum channel acting as the original channel on a $d$-dimensional sector of a $(d+1)$-dimensional system. Using this resource, arbitrary controlled channels can be built with a universal circuit architecture. We then extend the standard notion of control to more general notions, including control of multiple channels with possibly different input and output systems. Finally, we develop a theoretical framework, called supermaps on routed channels, which provides a compact representation of coherent control as an operation performed on the extended channels, and highlights the way the operation acts on different sectors.

I. INTRODUCTION

A number of quantum algorithms, such as Kitaev’s phase estimation algorithm \cite{Kitaev:1995} and the DQC1 trace estimation algorithm \cite{Knill:2001}, are based on the use of controlled unitary gates. Controlled gates represent a quantum version of the if-then clause, in which a subroutine is executed depending on the value of a control variable. In the controlled gate $ctrl – U$, the quantum state of a control system determines whether or not a target system is subject to a given unitary gate $U$. When the control system is in a superposition state, the target system experiences a coherent superposition of quantum evolutions \cite{Wallman:2013}. Quantum programming languages that exploit coherent control of quantum gates have been proposed in Refs. \cite{Reck:2013, Cai:2015, Datta:2018}.

The standard way to construct quantum controlled gates is via universal gate sets. To build the controlled gate $ctrl – U$, one first decomposes the gate $U$ into elementary gates, and then adds control to each of these gates \cite{Preskill:2017}. This construction, however, requires a decomposition of the gate $U$ into elementary gates. In many applications, such as quantum factoring \cite{Shor:1997}, the decomposition is known, because the gate $U$ is the quantum realisation of a classical function, for which a classical program is given. In other applications, however, the gate $U$ may be completely unknown: in a cloud computing scenario, for example, the gate $U$ may be implemented remotely by a server, and the program that generated $U$ may be unknown to the other parties involved in the computation. In these situations, it would be convenient to have a way to generate the controlled gate $ctrl – U$ from the access to an unknown, uncontrolled gate $U$. The ability to generate controlled gates would also benefit the implementation of standard quantum algorithms, providing them with an appealing modularity feature \cite{Preskill:2017}. Besides quantum computation, the ability to control an unknown quantum process would be beneficial to other information-processing tasks, such as quantum communication \cite{Bennett:1992, Ekert:1991, Fortney:2017}, quantum metrology \cite{Ma:2019, Cirac:2011}, and quantum machine learning \cite{Wecker:2015, Cerezo:2020}.

The problem of the coherent control of an unknown channel can be phrased in the following way: ‘Is there a universal protocol which, from the use of a black-box channel $C$, implements its coherently controlled version?’ \cite{Cai:2015}. Unfortunately, it has been proven several times, in ever stronger ways \cite{Lidar:2000, Maccone:2008, Havel:2013, Chiribella:2013}, that the answer to this question is ‘No’: no quantum circuit can ‘controllable’ arbitrary operations. For general channels, such a controllisation is not even unambiguously defined in the first place \cite{Chiribella:2013}.

Yet, as has been noted at the same time, coherent control is actually easily implementable in various contexts, such as optical systems \cite{Braunstein:1997, Huelga:1997, Livshits:2010}, trapped ions \cite{Jochym:2021, Lidar:2010}, and superconducting qubits \cite{Clarke:2018}. These realisations are not in contradiction with the no-go theorems because the resources they use are not black boxes: in the computer science terminology, they are grey boxes, whose action is partially known \cite{Shor:1997, Chiribella:2013} (see also Section II.B of this paper for a further elaboration on this point).

This mismatch between the theory and the experiments suggests that it may be necessary to revisit the terms of the problem. A suitable formulation of the problem may help building a theoretical comprehension of the
tasks that can be accomplished in the lab. The main upshot of such a comprehension is that it would allow us to understand exactly in which situations, from which resources, and with which protocols, one can implement a coherently controlled quantum channel. This would in turn allow to study protocols that go beyond the existing examples of implementations of coherent control – for example, to the coherent control of $N > 1$ channels –, and to compare their respective advantages. Another upshot of a theoretical understanding of coherent control is that it would allow to neatly distinguish the informational, implementation-independent aspect of this task from the particular physical features of given experimental protocols; in particular, it would help shift the focus away from optical implementations and towards a more implementation-neutral perspective. Finally, this could retrospectively elucidate some aspects of the existing no-go theorems on coherent control – as studying the protocols that can perform a task usually helps understanding why other protocols could not.

In this work, we start from the experimental implementations, extract their key features, and put forward a new formulation of the problem of coherent control based on these features. We note that the crucial feature of the existing implementations of coherent control is that the channels they use as resources are sector-preserving; i.e., the input systems on which they act can be partitioned into sectors (i.e. orthogonal subspaces), with the property that a state in a given sector always remains in this sector under the channels’ action. In this work, we choose to focus on the case where some sectors are one-dimensional and others are $d$-dimensional, and we investigate the relations between sector-preserving channels on them (hereafter called sector-preserving channels of type $(1,\ldots,1,d,\ldots,d)$) and coherent control of general quantum channels in dimension $d$. Building on these ideas, we further generalise the notion of coherent control to the case of higher-dimensional control systems, especially those where some of the options ‘do nothing’ and ‘apply channel $C$’ are applied to more than one branch.

The perspective that puts emphasis on sector-preserving channels as resources originates from Ref. [10], and was further explored in Refs. [11][12][13]. In these references, the focus was put on the use of several such resources for communication[14]. In contrast, the relevance of the ‘sector-preserving perspective’ to the task of coherent control, and in particular to the problem of universal control of a single channel, has not been explored yet.

The goal of the present paper is to analyse the role of sector-preserving channels as a resource for coherent control. For the usual notion of coherent control, our main findings can be summed up as follows. First, there is a perfect, one-to-one correspondence between sector-preserving channels of type $(1,d)$ and coherently controlled channels on target systems of dimension $d$. Second, this one-to-one correspondence can be implemented physically, by inserting sector-preserving channels into a fixed, universal quantum circuit that simulates the corresponding controlled channels. This universal circuit realises on sector-preserving channels the task one had proved impossible to realise on general channels. We formalise this protocol via a supermap, which we call the CONTROL supermap. We find that there is also a universal circuit (formalised as the CONTROL$^{-1}$ supermap) inverting this implementation, thus proving that sector-preserving channels of type $(1,d)$ and coherently controlled channels on $d$-dimensional systems are fully equivalent resources.

These findings can be summarised in the slogan ‘sector-preserving channels of type $(1,d)$ are the exact resource needed to implement coherent control on $d$-dimensional systems, and the CONTROL supermap realises this implementation’.

We extend these findings to more general versions of coherent control. For instance, there is also a one-to-one correspondence between sector-preserving channels of type $(d,1,1)$ and compositely-controlled channels with two branches applying the identity, and there exist universal circuit architectures implementing this correspondence in both ways.

We also extend these results to the coherent control of $N$ isometric channels (whose input and output spaces can be of different dimensions): given $N$ sector-preserving isometric channels of type $(1 \rightarrow 1, d_{in} \rightarrow d_{out})$, the problem is to generate a single isometric channel that acts as a controlled isometry from a $d_{in}$-dimensional system to a $d_{out}$-dimensional one. We study explicitly the $N = 2$ case, which readily generalises to arbitrary $N$. We find that sector-preserving channels of type $(1 \rightarrow 1, d_{in} \rightarrow d_{out})$ are indeed a sufficient resource: there exists a supermap $2 \rightarrow$ CONTROL through which two such channels can be turned into a channel with coherent control between corresponding isometries.

We show that the coherent control of $N$ non-isometric channels, however, cannot be achieved in this way: its implementation generally requires the use of sector-preserving channels of type $(1 \rightarrow 1, d_{in} \rightarrow d_{out}^\prime)$ which reduce, on their multi-dimensional sector, to purifications of the channels to be controlled. We formalise the universal protocol for the implementation of coherent control from sector-preserving channels in this case.

To derive and express our results, we combine the ideas and methods of two recent frameworks. One, that of routed quantum circuits [35], allows one to faithfully describe protocols in which some channels verify so-called sectorial constraints, i.e., constraints on their ability to relate given sectors of their input and output Hilbert spaces, with these constraints being encoded in a supple-

---

1 In the past, a similar approach had independently been explored in Ref. [28]. A different approach, based on the unitary extension of quantum channels, was developed in Refs. [29][31].

2 This was part of a wider discussion about the communicational advantages yielded by the coherent control of causal order [12][25][26][27].
mentary object called the route. The other framework we will adopt is that of supermaps \(36,38\), which provide the natural setting in which to express and study the manipulation of quantum operations. In particular, we will define ‘supermaps on routed channels’ as a new kind of supermaps, which only admit channels following certain routes in their input slots. The CONTROL and 2 − CONTROL supermaps are prime examples of supermaps on routed channels.

The structure of this work is as follows. In Section \(\text{II}\) we start by reviewing the existing definitions of controlled unitaries and channel and their extension to the case of several channels, and we define a new notion of compositely-controlled channels. In Section \(\text{III}\) we discuss the existing experimental implementations of coherent control, and use them to motivate a study of sector-preserving channels of type \((1,d)\); we show that these latter channels are in one-to one correspondence with controlled unitaries and channel and their extension to the manipulated quantum operations. In particular, we will define ‘supermaps on routed channels’ as a new kind of supermaps, which only admit channels following certain routes in their input slots. The CONTROL supermap, and that sector-preserving controlled channels are equivalent resources. In Section \(\text{IV}\) we extend the previous study to a more involved case of control, that of \(N\) control, and use them to motivate a study of sector-preserving channels of type \((1,d)\); we show that these latter channels are in one-to one correspondence with controlled channels on their \(d\)-dimensional sector. In Section \(\text{V}\) we show that this correspondence can be physically implemented via a universal protocol, formalised by the CONTROL supermap, and that sector-preserving and controlled channels are equivalent resources. In Section \(\text{VI}\) we generalise this correspondence to the coherent control between \(N\) isometries, showing that it can also be realised via a universal protocol, and we discuss the case of the coherent control between \(N\) general channels, showing that it requires more involved resources. In Section \(\text{VII}\) we extend the previous study to a more involved case of control, that of compositely-controlled channels. Finally, in Section \(\text{VIII}\) we formally define supermaps on routed channels, in order to properly characterise the CONTROL and 2 − CONTROL supermaps.

II. COHERENTLY CONTROLLED QUANTUM CHANNELS

In this section, we review the existing definitions of coherently controlled unitaries and channels. Then, we provide a one-to-one parametrisation of the possible controlled versions of a channel in terms of a ‘pinned Kraus operator’. Finally, we discuss more general types of controlled quantum channels, and we provide one-to-one parametrisations for these in terms of pinned Kraus operators.

A. Controlled channels and pinned Kraus operators

Let us start with the most basic definition of controlled operation: controlled unitary gates. Given a unitary operator \(U\) acting on a \(d\)-dimensional Hilbert space \(\mathcal{H}_S^d\), there is a standard notion of a ‘controlled-\(U\)’ channel: it is the channel corresponding to the unitary operator

\[
\text{ctrl} - U = |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes I + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes U,
\]

acting on a composite system, made of a \(d\)-dimensional target system \(S^1\), and of a two-dimensional control system \(C\).

More generally, one may want to control the evolution of an open system. The general evolution of an open system \(S^1\) is described by a quantum channel \(\mathcal{C}\), that is, a completely positive, trace-preserving map mapping density matrices on \(\mathcal{H}_S^d\) into density matrices on \(\mathcal{H}_S^{d'}\). The action of the channel \(\mathcal{C}\) on a generic density matrix \(\rho\) can be conveniently described in the Kraus representation, as \(\mathcal{C}(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^n C_i \rho C_i^\dagger\), where the operators \((C_i)_{i=1}^n\), called Kraus operators, satisfy the normalisation condition

\[
\sum_{i=1}^n C_i^\dagger C_i = I,
\]

\(I\) being the identity operator on \(\mathcal{H}_S^{d'}\).

Crucially, the Kraus representation of a channel is not unique: if \(V\) is a \(l \times n\) isometry with matrix elements \(V_{jl}\), the operators \((C_j')_{j=1}^n\) defined by \(C_j' := \sum_i V_{ji} C_i^\prime\) also form a Kraus representation of channel \(\mathcal{C}\). The non-uniqueness of the Kraus representation will play an important role in this paper.

For a general quantum channel \(\mathcal{C}\), the definition of coherent control is not straightforward. The naive generalisation of Eq. \((1)\) would be to pick a Kraus representation \((C_i)\) and define the controlled operators \(\text{ctrl} \mathcal{C} - C_i = |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes C_i + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes I\). This definition, however, would fail to give a quantum channel, because the above operators fail to satisfy the normalisation condition \(2\). A suitable generalisation of Eq. \((1)\) was put forward in Ref. \(22\): a controlled version of channel \(\mathcal{C}\) is the channel with Kraus operators

\[
\text{ctrl}_{\alpha_i} - C_i = \alpha_i |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes I + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes C_i,
\]

where \((\alpha_i)_{i=1}^n\) are complex amplitudes satisfying the normalisation condition \(\sum_{i=1}^n |\alpha_i|^2 = 1\). This definition is a special case of the definition of coherent control of two general channels considered in Refs. \(10, 25, 29, 39\), in the special case where one of the two channels is the identity channel, which we will come back to in Section \(\text{IIIB}\).

\(\text{3}\) The ‘1’ superscript is there to ensure compatibility with subsequent notations, in which \(\mathcal{H}_S^d\) will be taken to be a sector (i.e. an orthogonal subspace) of a larger Hilbert space \(\mathcal{H}_S\). Note that in this paper, superscripts on Hilbert spaces serve to label them as sectors of a larger Hilbert space, in line with the conventions of routed quantum circuits \(35\), and do not correspond to tensor powers.

\(\text{4}\) It may be helpful to note that different authors have used different names for what is essentially the same notion: Ref. \(39, 25, 29\) use the expressions ‘interference of CP maps’, ‘gluing of CP maps’, ‘coherent control of quantum channels’, and ‘superposition of quantum channels’, respectively.
It is important to observe that the definition of the controlled channel does not depend only on the channel \( \mathcal{C} \). In general, it can depend both on the choice of Kraus operators \((C_i)_{i=1}^{n}\) and on the choice of amplitudes \((\alpha_i)_{i=1}^{n}\) used in Eq. (3). To emphasise the dependence on the Kraus operators \((C_i)_{i=1}^{n}\) and on the amplitudes \((\alpha_i)_{i=1}^{n}\), we will denote the controlled channel by \(\text{ctrl}_{(\alpha_i),(C_i)} - \mathcal{C}\).

Different choices of Kraus operators and amplitudes generally give rise to different versions of controlled channels, with none of these versions being straightforwardly more natural than the other (although some may be more or less coherent [22]). Given that the definition of controlled channels is non-unique, an important question is how to parametrise the possible controlled channels in a compact way. As it turns out, the parametrisation \(\text{ctrl}_{(\alpha_i),(C_i)} - \mathcal{C}\) is quite redundant: in fact, many choices of \((C_i)_{i=1}^{n}\) and of \((\alpha_i)_{i=1}^{n}\) give rise to the same controlled channel \(\text{ctrl}_{(\alpha_i),(C_i)} - \mathcal{C}\).

In the following, we provide a simple one-to-one parametrisation of the possible controlled channels corresponding to a given uncontrolled channel \(\mathcal{C}\): the controlled channels are in one-to-one correspondence with pairs of the form \((\mathcal{C}, C_1)\), where \(C_1\) is a fixed Kraus operator of \(\mathcal{C}\). We call the pair \((\mathcal{C}, C_1)\) a channel with a pinned Kraus operator.

First, we prove that any controlled version of \(\mathcal{C}\) has a Kraus representation in which only the first Kraus operator is coherent with the identity:

**Lemma 1.** For every controlled channel \(\text{ctrl}_{(\alpha_i),(C_i)} - \mathcal{C}\), one can find a Kraus representation in which one Kraus operator is of the form \([0\rangle\langle 0]\otimes I + [1\rangle\langle 1]\otimes C_1\) and all the others are of the form \([1\rangle\langle 1]\otimes C'_j\), where \((C'_j)_{j'=1}^{n'}\) is a suitable Kraus representation of channel \(\mathcal{C}\). In other words, one has

\[
\text{ctrl}_{(\alpha_i),(C_i)} - \mathcal{C} = \text{ctrl}_{(1,0,\ldots,0),(C'_j)} - \mathcal{C} \quad (4)
\]

**Proof.** As \((\alpha_i)_{i=1}^{n}\) is a normalised vector in \(\mathbb{C}^n\), one can find a unitary matrix \((V_{ji})_{i,j=1}^{n}\) sending it to \((1,0,\ldots,0)\), i.e. such that \(\sum_j V_{ji} \alpha_i = \delta_{j1}\). The \((C'_j)_{j=1}^{n'}\) defined by \(C'_j := \sum_j V_{ji} C_i\) then form an alternative Kraus representation of \(\mathcal{C}\), and the \((K_{j'})_{j'=1}^{n'}\) defined by \(K_{j'} := \sum_j V_{ji} \text{ctrl}_{(\alpha_i),(C_i)} - \mathcal{C}\) form an alternative Kraus representation of \(\text{ctrl}_{(\alpha_i),(C_i)} - \mathcal{C}\). It is straightforward to see that \(V_{ji} K_{j'} = \text{ctrl}_{(\alpha_i),(C_i)} - C'_j\), meaning that \(\text{ctrl}_{(\alpha_i),(C_i)} - \mathcal{C}\) can be characterised as in [4].

This result removes the freedom in the choice of the amplitudes \((\alpha_i)_{i=1}^{n}\): one can simply set the first amplitude to 1, and all the other amplitudes to zero. All the variability of the controlled channels is then included in the choice of Kraus representation for channel \(\mathcal{C}\).

We now show a further simplification: the definition of the controlled channel depends only on the choice of the first Kraus operator in a Kraus representation of \(\mathcal{C}\). In other words, the choice of the other Kraus operators does not affect the type of control one obtains.

**Lemma 2.** Let \((C_i)_{i=1}^{n}\) and \((C'_j)_{j=1}^{n'}\) be two Kraus representations for channel \(\mathcal{C}\). Then, the controlled channels \(\text{ctrl}_{(1,0,\ldots,0),(C_i)} - \mathcal{C}\) and \(\text{ctrl}_{(1,0,\ldots,0),(C'_j)} - \mathcal{C}\) coincide if and only if the operators \(C_1\) and \(C'_1\) coincide. In formula,

\[
\text{ctrl}_{(1,0,\ldots,0),(C_i)} - \mathcal{C} = \text{ctrl}_{(1,0,\ldots,0),(C'_j)} - \mathcal{C} \quad \iff \quad C_1 = C'_1 \quad (5)
\]

**Proof.** We start with the direct implication. Supposing that the left-hand side of (4) holds and writing as \((W_{ji})_{j=1}^{n'}\) the unitary matrix elements relating the Kraus representations \((\text{ctrl}_{(\delta_{j1} - C_1)})_i\) and \((\text{ctrl}_{(\delta_{j1} - C'_1)})_j\), one has \(\sum_j W_{ji} \delta_{j1} = \delta_{j1}\) and \(\sum_j W_{ji} C_i = C'_j\). The first equation and the unitarity of \(W\) imply \(W_{1i} = \delta_{11}\), which, applied to the second equation, gives \(C_1 = C'_1\).

For the reverse implication, supposing \(C_1 = C'_1\), we write as \((V_{ji})_{1\leq i,j\leq n}\) the unitary matrix elements relating the Kraus representations \((C_i)_{i=1}^{n}\) and \((C'_j)_{j=1}^{n'}\), and extend them to unitary matrix elements \((V_{ji})_{1\leq i,j\leq n}\) by defining \(V_{j1} := \delta_{j1}\) and \(V_{1i} := \delta_{1i}\). The \(V_{ji}\)'s then satisfy \(\sum_j V_{ji}(\text{ctrl}_{(\delta_{j1} - C'_1)}) = \text{ctrl}_{(\delta_{j1} - C_1)}\), proving that \(\text{ctrl}_{(1,0,\ldots,0),(C_i)} - \mathcal{C} = \text{ctrl}_{(1,0,\ldots,0),(C'_j)} - \mathcal{C}\).

Combining Lemmas 1 and 2 we obtain a non-redundant parametrisation of the possible controlled versions of a given channel:

**Theorem 1.** The controlled versions of channel \(\mathcal{C}\), as defined by Eq. (3), are in one-to-one correspondence with the possible choices of a single Kraus operator for channel \(\mathcal{C}\), hereafter called a pinned Kraus operator.

By ‘a Kraus operator for channel \(\mathcal{C}\)’, we mean a Kraus operator appearing in at least one Kraus representation for \(\mathcal{C}\). Equivalently, the possible Kraus operators for a given channel can be characterised as follows:

**Lemma 3.** An operator \(C_1\) is a Kraus operator for channel \(\mathcal{C}\) if and only if the map \(\mathcal{C}_- : \rho \mapsto \mathcal{C}(\rho) - C_1 \rho C_1^\dagger\) is completely positive.

**Proof.** The ‘only if’ part is immediate. For the ‘if’ part, a Kraus representation for \(\mathcal{C}\) containing the operator \(C_1\) can be built by picking an arbitrary Kraus representation for the map \(\mathcal{C}_-\), say \((C_i)_{i=1}^{n}\). For any such choice, the operators \((C_i)_{i=1}^{n}\) form a Kraus representation for channel \(\mathcal{C}\).

Given a Kraus operator \(C_1\), and an arbitrary completion of it into a Kraus representation \((C_i)_{i=1}^{n}\), the corresponding controlled version of \(\mathcal{C}\) is given by the Kraus operators

\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{C}_1 &= [0\rangle\langle 0]\otimes I + [1\rangle\langle 1]\otimes C_1 \\
C_i &= [1\rangle\langle 1]\otimes C_i \quad \forall i \geq 2.
\end{align*}
\]

(6)
From now on, we will use the notation $\text{ctrl}_{\mathcal{C}_1} - \mathcal{C}$ to denote the controlled channel with the above Kraus operators. The action of the controlled channel $\text{ctrl}_{\mathcal{C}_1} - \mathcal{C}$ on a generic product state of the target system and of the control is

$$\text{ctrl}_{\mathcal{C}_1} - \mathcal{C}(\rho \otimes \rho_A) = \sum_i \tilde{C}_i (\rho \otimes \rho_A) \tilde{C}_i^\dagger$$

where h.c. denotes the Hermitian conjugate. In the above formula, the first two terms in the sum represent the classical control on the channel, while the second two terms represent the ‘coherent part’ of the controlled operation.

This pinned Kraus operator $C_1$ coincides with the ‘transformation matrix’ of Ref. [20], the ‘vacuum interference operator’ of Ref. [10], and the ‘$K$ operator’ of Ref. [22]. Ref. [29] derived the ‘transformation matrix’ from a Stinespring dilation of the channel $\mathcal{C}$, and interpreted it as the additional information that has to be provided about the physical implementation of channel $\mathcal{C}$ in order to build a controlled channel. In contrast, Ref. [10] derived the ‘vacuum interference operator’ from an extension of channel $\mathcal{C}$ to a larger channel that can act also on the vacuum. In this paper, we will make connection with the latter approach, showing that the controlled channel $\text{ctrl}_{\mathcal{C}_1} - \mathcal{C}$ is in one-to-one correspondence, both mathematically and physically, with a particular extension of the original channel $\mathcal{C}$, corresponding to the vacuum extension of Ref. [10].

Compared to Refs. [10] [22] [29], our presentation makes it evident that the operator characterising a controlled version of channel $\mathcal{C}$ can be simply understood as a Kraus operator of this channel, a fact that has not been pointed out before\textsuperscript{5}. In addition, the explicit relation between control and pinned Kraus operators suggests further extensions of the notion of quantum control, as discussed in the next subsection.

B. Control between multiple noisy channels

We now consider a generalisation of the notion of coherent control: the case in which each of the two values of the control is associated to the execution of a different channel on the target system. In other words, we now consider the coherent control between the execution of two channels $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, rather than between one channel and the identity channel. We will now take the input and output target systems, $S^1_{\text{in}}$ and $S^1_{\text{out}}$, to be of possibly different dimensions.

If we start with the basic case of two isometric gates, represented by two isometries $U, V : \mathcal{H}^1_{S_{\text{in}}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^1_{S_{\text{out}}}$, the standard notion of a ‘controlled-$(U, V)$’ channel is given by the isometry

$$\text{ctrl} - (U, V) = |0\rangle \langle 0| \otimes U + |1\rangle \langle 1| \otimes V. \quad (8)$$

Extending this definition to the case of the control between two noisy evolutions, represented by CPTP maps $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^1_{S_{\text{in}}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^1_{S_{\text{out}}})$, requires more work. Once again, there are a variety of ways of defining the controlled version of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$. These different versions can be obtained by picking Kraus representations of same length\textsuperscript{6} $(A_i)_{i=1}^n$ and $(B_i)_{i=1}^n$ for $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ and defining the Kraus operators:

$$\text{ctrl} - (A_i, B_i) = |0\rangle \langle 0| \otimes A_i + |1\rangle \langle 1| \otimes B_i. \quad (9)$$

A one-to-one parametrisation of the possible choices is the following, proven in Appendix A.

**Theorem 2.** Given a Kraus representation $(A_i)_{i=1}^n$ of minimal length of $\mathcal{A}$, the choice of a control between $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ is in one-to-one correspondence with the choice of $n$ Kraus operators of $\mathcal{B}$.

By ‘$n$ Kraus operators of $\mathcal{B}$’, we mean $n$ operators that appear together in at least one Kraus representation of $\mathcal{B}$. Calling these operators $B_i$’s, and arbitrarily completing them into a Kraus representation $(B_i)_{i=1}^n$ of $\mathcal{B}$, Kraus operators for the corresponding controlled channel are given by the concatenation of the $(\text{ctrl} - (A_i, B_i))_{i=1}^n$, and the $(\text{ctrl} - (0, B_i))_{n \leq i \leq n'}$. Note that in this parametrisation, only the Kraus operators of $\mathcal{B}$ vary; those of $\mathcal{A}$ are fixed from the start.

The previous considerations can be extended to the case of a control system of dimension $N$, controlling between the execution of $N$ channels $\mathcal{C}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{C}_N$. A strategy would be to proceed via recursion, first picking a control between $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$, then picking a control between this controlled channel and $\mathcal{C}_3$, etc.

III. A NEW RESOURCE FOR COHERENT CONTROL: SECTOR-PRESERVING CHANNELS

Here we discuss the physical resources needed to implement coherent control of general quantum channels.

---

\textsuperscript{5} A proof in Ref. [22] mentioned that any possible ‘$K$ operator’ is a Kraus operator of $\mathcal{C}$, without however discussing the reverse implication.

\textsuperscript{6} Note that any two Kraus representations can be taken to be of the same length by adjoining $0$’s to the shortest one.
A. A no-go theorem for coherent control of unitary gates, and a way to evade it

It has been proven in various ways that it is impossible to construct a controlled unitary gate starting from a black box that implements the corresponding uncontrolled unitary gate [9, 17, 21]. Mathematically, the no-go theorem is that it is impossible to find a quantum supermap that transforms a generic unitary channel \( \mathcal{U} : \rho \mapsto U \rho U^\dagger \) into the controlled unitary channel \( \text{ctrl} – \mathcal{U} : \rho \mapsto \text{ctrl} – U \rho \text{ctrl} – U^\dagger \) with the operator \( \text{ctrl} – U \) defined in Eq. (1).

The origin of the impossibility is that the uncontrolled unitary channel \( \mathcal{U} \) is provided as a black box, without any further information on its action except for the fact that \( \mathcal{U} \) is known to be unitary. One way to evade the no-go theorem is to start from a device that is not a complete black box, but rather a grey box, whose action is partially known. For example, one could be given a device that implements a unitary gate \( \tilde{U} = |\phi_0\rangle\langle\phi_0| \oplus U \), where \( \tilde{U} \) acts on \( \mathcal{H} \) and \( U \) is an unknown unitary gate acting on a \( d \)-dimensional sector (i.e. orthogonal subspace) \( \mathcal{H}^1 \subseteq \mathcal{H} \), and \(|\phi_0\rangle \) is another state, orthogonal to all the states in \( \mathcal{H}^1 \). In this case, the action of the device in the sector \( \mathcal{H}^1 \) is unknown, while the action of the device on the vector \(|\phi_0\rangle \) is known. In this setting, the controlled gate \( \text{ctrl} – U \) can be built from the gate \( \tilde{U} \) using a simple quantum circuit [9, 13, 23].

The use of grey boxes that act in a known way on some input states is central to all existing proposals for experimental implementations of coherent controls of unitary gates. For example, photonic implementations [23, 24] achieve coherent control of certain optical devices, such as polarisation rotators, by exploiting the fact that such devices are passive, and therefore transform the vacuum state into itself. In these examples, the sector \( \mathcal{H}^1 \) is spanned by single-photon polarisation states, and the state \(|\phi_0\rangle \) is the zero-photon Fock state.

In trapped-ions implementations [25, 26], the input device uses a laser pulse to implement a unitary gate by stimulating the transition between the two electronic levels. The pulse is far off resonance with the transition between the other electronic levels of the ion, and therefore the device acts trivially on such levels. In this case, the state \(|\phi_0\rangle \) can be any of the levels that are unaffected by the pulse. A similar situation arises in superconducting-qubits implementations [24].

In summary, all the existing proposals of experimental implementations use grey box unitary gates \( \tilde{U} \) that act

1. as unknown gates \( U \) on a sector \( \mathcal{H}^1 \), and
2. as the identity gate \( I \) on another sector \( \mathcal{H}^0 \), orthogonal to \( \mathcal{H}^1 \).

In the following we will extend this scheme from unitary gates to arbitrary noisy channels, and to the case of gates implementing acting as the identity on several sectors, showing that access to a suitable grey box channel allows one to build a controlled channel that is in one-to-one correspondence with it.

We will restrict ourselves to the case in which the sectors on which the identity is applied are one-dimensional; however, all our arguments could be extended to the case in which they are multi-dimensional and the grey boxes act as the identity on each of them. Note that when the supplementary sectors have the same dimension as \( \mathcal{H}^0 \), the above requirements lead to the usual definition of controlled channels.

B. Modelling noisy grey boxes: sector-preserving channels

We now consider how the grey box approach of the previous section can be extended from unitary gates to arbitrary noisy channels.

To this purpose, we consider a noisy quantum channel \( \mathcal{C} \) that acts on a system \( \mathcal{S} \) with a Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H}_S \) partitioned into two sectors, \( \mathcal{H}_S = \mathcal{H}^0_S \oplus \mathcal{H}^1_S \), with \( \mathcal{H}^0_S \) one-dimensional. The channel \( \mathcal{C} \) will act

1. as an unknown channel \( \mathcal{C} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^1_S) \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^1_S) \) on the input states in \( \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^1_S) \), and

2. as the identity channel \( I \) on the unique input state in \( \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^0_S) \).

Such grey boxes have a simple characterisation: they are the channels that preserve the sectors \( \mathcal{H}^k_S \).

**Definition 1.** Let \( \mathcal{H}_S = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m} \mathcal{H}^k_S \) be a Hilbert space with a preferred partition into sectors. A channel \( \mathcal{C} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_S) \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_S) \) is sector-preserving if it preserves the set of states with support in the subspace \( \mathcal{H}^k_S \), for every \( k \in \{0,\ldots,m\} \). In formula,

\[
\forall k, \forall \rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^k_S), \quad \mathcal{C}(\rho) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^k_S),
\]

Note that \( \rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^k_S) \) equivalently means that \( \text{Supp}(\rho) \subseteq \mathcal{H}^k_S \), where \( \text{Supp}(\rho) \) denotes the support of \( \rho \).

Sector-preserving channels can be seen as special case of the notion of channels ‘following a route’ (i.e., satisfying given sectorial constraints), introduced in Ref. [35]; namely, they are the channels that follow the identity route \( \delta \times \delta \). The condition (10) was called the ‘no-leakage condition’ in Ref. [10] in the case of a partition into two sectors.

When some of the sectors \( \mathcal{H}^k_S \) are one-dimensional, the condition of sector preservation (10) implies that the channel \( \mathcal{C} \) acts as the identity channel on each of them. In the following, we will denote the sector preserving channels with \( \text{dim}(\mathcal{H}^k_S) = 1 \forall k < m \) and \( \text{dim}(\mathcal{H}^m_S) = d \) as sector-preserving channels of type \((1,d)\). In particular, the channels we asked for in this Section are the sector-preserving channels of type \((1,d)\).
The approach of considering an extended channel that acts as $\mathcal{C}$ on a given sector was introduced in Ref. [10]. There, there was only one one-dimensional sector, which was called the ‘vacuum sector’, and the channel $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ was called a ‘vacuum extension’, with this terminology motivated by the photonic implementations. Here, however, we prefer to use the expressions ‘supplementary sectors’ and ‘extended channel’, which are neutral with respect to the choice of experimental implementations.

The key point of our paper is that the grey box channel $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, and not the black box channel $\mathcal{C}$, should be regarded as the initial resource for the implementation of coherent control. In other words, we argue that one should shift the terms of the problem away from the question ‘what can one do with an unknown channel $\mathcal{C}$?’? Instead, one should ask the question ‘what can one do with a channel $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ that acts as an unknown channel on a given sector?’?

A similar shift of perspective was proposed in Refs. [10–12] for the purpose of defining quantum communication protocols where messages can travel in a coherent superposition of multiple trajectories. In this context, extended channels were used to describe communication devices that can take as input either one particle (corresponding, in our notations, to the sector $\mathcal{H}^{1}_S$) or the vacuum (corresponding to the sector $\mathcal{H}^{0}_S$). This modelling was essential to define resource theories of quantum communication [12], where the initial resources are communication devices that can be connected in a coherent superposition of multiple configurations. Our paper can be viewed as an application of the same approach to the task of the coherent control of quantum channels: the extended channel represents the initial resource, and the question is which types of controlled channel can be constructed from such resource.

C. The case of one supplementary sector

The case where there is only one supplementary sector $\mathcal{H}^{1}_S$ (i.e., of sector-preserving channels of type $(1,d)$) is particularly relevant in this paper, because, as we will show later, it provides the fundamental resource for the realisation of the controlled channels defined in Eq. (3).

In terms of Kraus representation, the sector-preserving channels of type $(1,d)$ can be characterised as the channels with Kraus operators of the form

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_i = \alpha_i \otimes C_i,$$

where $(C_i)_i$ is a Kraus representation of some channel acting on sector $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^{1}_S)$, and the $\alpha_i$’s are amplitudes satisfying the normalisation condition $\sum_i |\alpha_i|^2 = 1$. For a proof of the above equation, see Lemma 1 in Ref. [10] (this can also be seen as a consequence of the more general Theorem 6 in Ref. [13]).

A one-to-one parametrisation of the sector-preserving channels of type $(1,d)$ can be obtained with the same approach as in Section II.

**Lemma 4.** Every sector-preserving channel of type $(1,d)$ has a Kraus representation of the form

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{C}_1 = 1 \otimes C_1 \\ \tilde{C}_i = 0 \otimes C_i & \forall i \geq 2, \end{cases}$$

where $(C_i)_i$ is a Kraus representation of some channel on the $d$-dimensional sector.

**Proof.** As in the proof of Lemma 1 this alternative Kraus representation can be found by using a unitary matrix $(V_i)_i$ that sends the normalised vector $(\alpha_i)_i$ to $(1,0,\ldots,0)$.

Using the same arguments as in Section II it is easy to see that the sector-preserving channels $\mathcal{C}$ are in one-to-one correspondence with pairs $(\mathcal{C}, C_1)$, consisting of a channel acting on sector $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^{1}_S)$, and of a Kraus operator for $\mathcal{C}$. In short, we have the following.

**Theorem 3.** The sector-preserving channels of type $(1,d)$ are in one-to-one correspondence with channels with a pinned Kraus operator on their $d$-dimensional sector.

The sector-preserving channel of type $(1,d)$ that corresponds to the channel $\mathcal{C}$ with the pinned Kraus operator $C_1$ on its $d$-dimensional sector shall be called $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}[C_1]$. In the case of unitary channels, the characterisation is particularly simple.

**Corollary 1.** Sector-preserving unitary channels of type $(1,d)$ are in one-to-one correspondence with unitary operators in dimension $d$. Explicitly, the correspondence between sector-preserving unitary channels $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ and unitary operators $U$ is given by the relation

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\rho) = (1 \otimes U) \rho (1 \otimes U)^\dagger \quad \forall \rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_S).$$

This is in contrast with the general situation for unitary channels, which correspond to unitary operators only up to an arbitrary global phase. The crucial fact here is that the one-dimensional supplementary sector can be used to fix this phase gauge in the $d$-dimensional sector.

Going back to the case of general channels, Theorem 3 establishes a one-to-one correspondence between sector-preserving channels of type $(1,d)$ and controlled channels:

**Corollary 2.** For any $d$, the following sets are in one-to-one correspondence:

1. controlled channels as defined in [3], with a $d$-dimensional target system;
2. channels with a pinned Kraus operator in dimension $d$;
3. sector-preserving channels of type $(1,d)$.
In fact, a more careful inspection also reveals that the one-to-one correspondence between the above sets can be implemented by linear maps. For the sets of controlled channels and sector-preserving channels, the correspondence can be implemented physically by quantum circuits that convert sector-preserving channels into controlled channels, and vice-versa. This physical correspondence is the object of the next section.

IV. THE CONTROL SUPERMAP AND THE EQUIVALENCE BETWEEN SECTOR-PRESERVING AND CONTROLLED CHANNELS

A. The control supermap

In the previous section, we showed that the controlled channels on target systems of dimension $d$ (the $\text{ctrl}_{C_1} - C$) are in one-to-one correspondence with sector-preserving channels of type $(1, d)$ (the $\tilde{C}[C_1]$).

Our point is now to show that for any given $d$, there is a universal circuit architecture in which an agent who possesses the sector-preserving channel $\tilde{C}[C_1]$ can insert this channel in order to implement the controlled channel $\text{ctrl}_{C_1} - C$.

We thus introduce the control supermap, a supermap which takes as input any sector-preserving channel $\tilde{C}[C_1]$ of type $(1, d)$, and yields the controlled channel $\text{ctrl}_{C_1} - C$ acting on a target system of dimension $d$.

**Theorem 4.** Let $H_S = H_S^0 \oplus H_S^1$ be a Hilbert space, with $\dim(H_S^0) = 1$ and $\dim(H_S^1) = d$, and let $H_C$ be a control space of dimension 2.

There exists a supermap $\text{CONTROL}$ of type $(S \rightarrow S) \rightarrow (C \otimes S^1 \rightarrow C \otimes S^1)$ such that for any sector-preserving channel $\tilde{C}[C_1]$,

$$\text{CONTROL}[\tilde{C}[C_1]] = \text{ctrl}_{C_1} - C.$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

Furthermore, this supermap is unitary-preserving on the sector-preserving channels on $S$.

One can give a semi-explicit formulation of the $\text{CONTROL}$ supermap, depicted in Figure 1. Theorem 4 can be proven in a straightforward way by using this expression.

The control supermap constitutes the correct theoretical formalisation of the existing experimental schemes for the implementation of coherent control. It is the universal protocol through which sector-preserving channels of type $(1, d)$ can be turned into their corresponding controlled channel.

We note that even though we defined this supermap as accepting as input any possible channel $S \rightarrow S$, the only thing we are interested in is in fact its action on sector-preserving channels. An alternative way of defining it would be to formally restrict its inputs to be only sector-preserving channels (or extensions of those); this would make clearer the fact that this protocol is only useful when sector-preserving channels are used, and would also allow to get rid of superfluous information in the specification of the supermap – namely, information that only modifies the action of the supermap on non-sector-preserving channels. We will do this in Section VII coinig the notion of supermaps on routed channels.

Let us also comment on the specific case of unitary channels. Per Corollary 3 we know that unitary sector-preserving channels of type $(1, d)$ are in one-to-one correspondence with unitary operators on their $d$-dimensional sector. Noting as $U_\tilde{C}$ the unitary operator corresponding to the unitary sector-preserving channel $\tilde{C}$, the control supermap will then precisely map any unitary sector-preserving channel $\tilde{C}$ to the gate applying the controlled-unitary $\text{ctrl} - U_\tilde{C}$ defined in equation (15):

$$\forall \tilde{C} \text{unitary}, \text{CONTROL}[\tilde{C}] = \text{ctrl} - U_\tilde{C}. \hspace{1cm} (15)$$

The control supermap thus also realises, in particular, the coherent control of unitary gates.

B. Sector-preserving and controlled channels are equivalent as resources

The previous section showed that there is a universal circuit structure which turns sector-preserving channels of type $(1, d)$ into their corresponding controlled channel. As resources, sector-preserving channels of type $(1, d)$ thus allow one to obtain controlled channels. We now show the opposite: from a controlled channel, one can obtain its corresponding sector-preserving channel of type $(1, d)$, once again using a universal circuit structure.

**Theorem 5.** Let $H_S^0$ be a Hilbert space, and $H_C$ be a control space of dimension 2.

Taking $H_S^0 \cong C$ and $H_S := H_S^0 \oplus H_S^1$, there exists a supermap $\text{CONTROL}^{-1}$ of type $(C \otimes S^1 \rightarrow C \otimes S^1) \rightarrow (S \rightarrow S)$ such that for any controlled channel $\text{ctrl}_{C_1} - C$,

$$\text{CONTROL}^{-1}[\text{ctrl}_{C_1} - C] = \tilde{C}[C_1]. \hspace{1cm} (16)$$

Furthermore, this supermap is unitary-preserving on the controlled channels on $C \otimes S^1$.

**Proof.** One can define $\text{CONTROL}^{-1}$'s action on a given channel $K : C \otimes S^0 \rightarrow C \otimes S^0$ as $\text{CONTROL}^{-1}[K] = W \circ K \circ V$. $V$ arises from the isometry $V : H_S \rightarrow H_C \otimes H_S^0$ that acts as $V|\psi\rangle = |0\rangle \otimes |\psi\rangle$ for $|\psi\rangle \in H_S^0$ and $V|s\rangle = |1\rangle \otimes |\phi^0\rangle$ for $|s\rangle \in H_S^1$, where $|\phi^0\rangle$ is a fixed arbitrary state in $H_S^0$. $W$ acts as $V^\dagger$ on $V$'s range and in an arbitrary way elsewhere.

From this definition, a simple computation shows that (16) holds.
The existence of this inverse control supermap shows that sector-preserving channels of type \((1, d)\) and controlled channels are fully equivalent resources: one can go from a sector-preserving channel to its corresponding controlled channel and back again, using a universal circuit architecture in both cases. This concludes our demonstration of the main claim of this paper.

Note that \(\text{CONTROL}^{-1} \circ \text{CONTROL}\) acts as the identity supermap only on input channels that are sector-preserving. A way of formally restricting the CONTROL supermap to only act on sector-preserving channels will be described in Section \[\text{VII}\]. Once viewed in this way, the CONTROL supermap can be said to be unitary-preserving and invertible.

V. IMPLEMENTING COHERENT CONTROL OF MULTIPLE CHANNELS

A. The case of isometric channels

We now show how the previous methods apply to the coherent control of \(N \geq 2\) channels, as defined in Section \[\text{II}\]. For simplicity, we restrict ourselves to the case of isometric channels, and to \(N = 2\). The methods we present are readily extendable to the \(N > 2\). Note that the coherent control of isometric gates includes that of unitary gates and of pure states, as both are specific examples of isometric gates.

If we define the task of coherent control between two isometric gates as that of implementing controlled-\((U, V)\) (as defined in equation \[\text{III}\]) from uses of the isometric gates \(U\) and \(V\), then it is a direct consequence of the aforementioned no-go theorems that such a task cannot be achieved via a universal circuit architecture.

To circumvent this, we will instead keep our perspective of considering coherent control as a task performed on sector-preserving channels. Here, as in Section \[\text{II}\], we take the input and output target systems to be of possibly different dimensions. Accordingly, we will slightly extend the relevant definitions. For instance, Definition \[\text{III}\] can be extended in a straightforward way to encompass sector-preserving channels from \(\mathcal{H}_{\text{in}} := \bigoplus_k \mathcal{H}_{\text{in}}^k\) to \(\mathcal{H}_{\text{out}} := \bigoplus_k \mathcal{H}_{\text{out}}^k\). In the case in which the Hilbert spaces are both partitioned between a multi-dimensional sector and several one-dimensional ones, we will refer to these channels as being sector-preserving of type \((1 \to 1, \ldots, 1 \to 1, d \to d')\). Structural theorems about these channels can be seen to extend from those of Section \[\text{III}\] (Lemma \[\text{I}\], Theorem \[\text{III}\] and Corollaries \[\text{I}\] and \[\text{II}\]) in a natural way.

In particular, Corollary \[\text{I}\] can be extended to a statement about isometric sector-preserving channels \(\mathcal{C}\) of type \((1 \to 1, d \to d')\): they are in one-to-one correspondence with isometric operators \(U\) in dimension \(d \to d'\). Our point is to implement this correspondence physically in order to create a control between two isometric gates. We single out a version of the control supermap that allows one to build the coherent control between two isometric gates from the two sector-preserving isometric channels of type \((1 \to 1, d \to d')\) corresponding to these isometries. This supermap was originally introduced in Ref. \[\text{III}\] (in the case \(d = d'\)), in a slightly different framework.

**Theorem 6.** Let \(\mathcal{H}_{\text{in}} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{in}}^0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_{\text{in}}^1\) and \(\mathcal{H}_{\text{out}} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{out}}^0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_{\text{out}}^1\) be partitioned spaces, with \(\mathcal{H}_{\text{in}}^0\) and \(\mathcal{H}_{\text{in}}^1\) one-dimensional, and let \(\mathcal{C}\) be a control space of dimension 2.

There exists a supermap \(2 - \text{CONTROL}\) of type \((\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}} \to \mathcal{S}_{\text{out}}^0) \otimes (\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}} \to \mathcal{S}_{\text{out}}^1) \to (\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}^0 \to \mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{S}_{\text{out}}^1)\) such that for any pair of isometric sector-preserving channels \(\mathcal{C}\) and \(\mathcal{D}\).
2 – CONTROL[C ⊗ D] = ctrl – (U_C, U_D). \hspace{1cm} (17)

Proof. This can be easily computed from the semi-explicit formulation of the 2–CONTROL supermap shown in Figure 2.

Theorem 6 is the proper formalisation of the existing experimental schemes for coherently controlling two unitaries, such as the superposition of paths [10]. It is easy to see that it could be readily generalised to the coherent control between \( N \) isometries by a control system of dimension \( N \).

In particular, one can see in this formulation that the coherent control of two isometries can be implemented with a simple parallel combination of the two resource sector-preserving channels.

B. What about general channels?

A natural question to ask would be whether the previous result can be extended to the case of controls between two general noisy channels, as defined in equation [9] and classified in Theorem 2, i.e., whether a given version of a control between two channels \( A \) and \( B \) can be obtained from the application of the 2–CONTROL supermap on suitably chosen sector-preserving channels of type \( (1 \rightarrow 1, d \rightarrow d') \). The answer to this question, however, is negative.

To see this, take \( A = B = D \), where \( D \) is the depolarising channel on a qubit, i.e. \( D : \rho \mapsto \frac{1}{2}(\rho + Z \rho Z) \). One natural version of a control between \( A \) and \( B \) is then given by the channel \( \mathcal{I}_C \otimes \mathcal{D}_{S1} \) : i.e., \( D \) is always applied to \( S1 \) and the control doesn’t play any part. However, no use of the 2–CONTROL supermap on \( A \) and \( B \) can yield this channel. This is essentially because, in channels obtained from the use of the 2–CONTROL supermap, there can only be full coherence between one Kraus operator of \( A \) and one Kraus operator of \( B \).

Implementing the control between two noisy channels in general will therefore require the use of a more elaborate scheme, using more involved resources. In Appendix B, we propose such a scheme. Rather than sector-preserving channels of the form \( \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathcal{H}_{B_{in}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathcal{H}_{B_{out}} \), this scheme will require the use of sector-preserving channels of the form \( \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathcal{H}_{B_{in}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathcal{H}_{B_{in}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{E} \), where \( \mathcal{H}_{E} \) is an auxiliary Hilbert space. In such a scheme, the number of Kraus operators of \( A \) and \( B \) that can be coherent with each other in the produced controlled channel is capped by the dimension of \( \mathcal{H}_{E} \).

VI. COMPOSITELY-CONTROLLED CHANNELS

In this section, we consider another generalisation of the notion of controlled quantum channels, corresponding to higher-dimensional control systems, and we show how to implement it, via a universal architecture, using as resources sector-preserving channels of type \( (d, 1, \ldots, 1) \).

A. Compositely-controlled channels and multiple pinned operators

We introduce a generalisation that can be useful in the description of quantum programs, which may contain instructions of the form "if \( f(x) = 1 \), then execute channel \( C \), otherwise do nothing", where \( f \) is a Boolean function taking as input a parameter \( x \) labelling the different branches of the computational process.

To get started, consider a three-dimensional control system \( C \), with basis states \( \{|0\}, |1\}, \{|2\} \). We associate state \( |0\rangle \) to the execution of the given channel \( C \), and states \( |1\rangle \) and \( |2\rangle \) to the ‘do nothing’ option. This corresponds to choosing the Boolean function \( f \) to be \( f(0) = 1 \) and \( f(1) = f(2) = 0 \). A controlled channel can then be defined in terms of the Kraus operators

\[
\text{ctrl}_{\alpha_i, \beta_i} - C_i = |0\rangle \langle 0| \otimes C_i + \alpha_i |1\rangle \langle I + \beta_i |2\rangle \otimes I ,
\]

where \( (C_i)_{i=1}^N \) is a Kraus representation of channel \( C \), and \( (\alpha_i)_{i=1}^N \) and \( (\beta_i)_{i=1}^N \) are complex amplitudes satisfying the normalisation conditions \( \sum_{i=1}^N |\alpha_i|^2 = 1 \) and \( \sum_{i=1}^N |\beta_i|^2 = 1 \), respectively. We shall call a controlled channel as defined in (18) a 2-compositely-controlled channel. In the following, this controlled channel will be denoted by \( \text{ctrl}_{(C_i), (\alpha_i), (\beta_i)} - C \).

As with standard controlled channels, different choices of Kraus representations and of amplitudes generally lead to different kinds of controlled channels, and again, one may ask for a one-to-one parametrisation. The generalisation of Theorem 1 is the following.

Theorem 7. The 2-compositely-controlled versions of channel \( C \), as defined by Eq. (18) are in one-to-one correspondence with triples of the form \( (C'_1, C'_2, \gamma_{12}) \), where \( C'_1 \) and \( C'_2 \) are two Kraus operators for channel \( C \), and of a complex amplitude \( \gamma_{12} \in \mathbb{C} \) satisfying \( |\gamma_{12}| \leq 1 \). Explicitly, the Kraus operators for the controlled channel can be written as

\[
\begin{align*}
C'_1 &= |0\rangle \langle 0| \otimes C'_1 + |1\rangle \langle I + \gamma_{12} |2\rangle \otimes I , \\
C'_2 &= |0\rangle \langle 0| \otimes C'_2 + \sqrt{1 - |\gamma_{12}|^2} |2\rangle \otimes I , \\
C'_i &= |0\rangle \langle 0| \otimes C'_i \quad \forall i \geq 3 ,
\end{align*}
\]

for some suitable Kraus representation \( (C'_i) \) of channel \( C \).

---

7 Except in the case where \( |\gamma_{12}| = 1 \); the choice of \( C'_2 \) is then irrelevant. Given that this is a set of measure 0, we will neglect the existence of this case in the rest of this paper.
Proof. The proof is a generalisation of the proof of Theorem 1. Starting from the Kraus operators in Eq. (18), one can generate a new Kraus representation of the controlled channel using a unitary matrix. To choose the appropriate unitary matrix, we apply the Gram-Schmidt construction to the column vectors $|\alpha\rangle = (\alpha_i)_{i=1}^n$ and $|\beta\rangle = (\beta_i)_{i=1}^n$. In other words, we construct an orthonormal basis $\{|v_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^n$ where the first vector is $|v_1\rangle = |\alpha\rangle$ and the second vector is $|v_2\rangle = |\beta\rangle - \langle\beta|\alpha\rangle |\alpha\rangle / \|\beta\rangle - \langle\alpha|\beta\rangle |\alpha\rangle \|$. One can then define the unitary operator $U = \sum_{j=1}^n |j\rangle \langle v_j|$, and use its matrix elements to define a new Kraus representation $C_j = \sum_i U_{ji} \text{ctrl} \alpha_i, \beta_i - C_i$. Explicit calculation of the Kraus operators yields Eq. (19), with $\gamma_{12} = \langle\alpha|\beta\rangle$, $C'_1 = \sum_i \alpha_i C_i$ and $C'_2 = \sum_i (\beta_i - \langle\beta|\alpha\rangle \alpha_i) / \sqrt{1 - |\gamma_{12}|^2} C_i$.

For every given controlled channel $\text{ctrl}_{C_i, \alpha_i, \beta_i} - C$, the pinned Kraus operators $C_1$ and $C_2$, and the amplitude $\gamma_{12}$ can be uniquely determined from the action of the channel on a generic product state of the target and the control. Explicitly, one has

$$\text{ctrl}_{C_i, \alpha_i, \beta_i} - C = (\rho\otimes \rho_C)$$

$$= (0|0\rangle \langle 0| \otimes C(\rho_A) + \langle 0|0\rangle (|1\rangle \langle 1| \otimes \rho_A) + \langle 2|2\rangle (|2\rangle \langle 2| \otimes \rho_A) + (0|0\rangle C_1|0\rangle |1\rangle C \otimes \rho_A + \text{h.c.}) + (0|0\rangle 2\rangle \sqrt{1 - |\gamma_{12}|^2} |0\rangle 2\rangle \otimes C_2 \rho_A + \text{h.c.}) + (1|1\rangle \gamma_{12} |1\rangle 2\rangle \otimes \rho_A + \text{h.c.}),$$

(20)

from which the operators $C_1$ and $C_2$, and the amplitude $\gamma_{12}$ can be extracted by taking the appropriate matrix elements of the output state.

In summary, every 2-compositely-controlled channel as defined by Eq. (18) can be parameterised by two pinned Kraus operators ($C'_1$, $C'_2$) and one amplitude $\gamma_{12}$, and the triple $(C'_1, C'_2, \gamma_{12})$ is uniquely determined by the channel.

The above notion of controlled channel can be easily extended to higher dimensional systems, introducing controlled Kraus operators of the form

$$\text{ctrl}_{C_i} - C = |0\rangle \langle 0| \otimes C + \sum_{k=1}^m \alpha^k |k\rangle \langle k| \otimes I,$$

(21)

where, for each $k \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, the amplitudes $(\alpha^k)^i$ satisfy the normalisation condition $\sum_i |\alpha^k_i|^2 = 1$. Controlled channels of the form (21) will be called $m$-compositely controlled channels. In this case, the controlled channel is in one-to-one correspondence with $m$ pinned Kraus operators, and $m-1$ complex amplitudes: using the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 1 one can show that the controlled channel has a Kraus representation of the form.

![FIG. 2. The 2-CONTROL supermap. All the notations are the same as in Figure 1. This supermap was first defined implicitly in Ref. [10] for the case $S^1 = S^1_{out}$.](image)
where \((C'_i)^k\) is a Kraus representation of channel \(\mathcal{C}\), and \((\gamma_{ij})_{i<k}\leq m\) are suitable amplitudes.

In summary, controlled channels can represent if-then clauses in the execution of a quantum program, and every branch of the program corresponding to the ‘do nothing’ instruction corresponds to a pinned Kraus operator.

**B. A resource: sector-preserving channels of type \((d, 1, \ldots, 1)\)**

We now consider the types of channels that can be used as resources for the implementation of \(m\)-composite control. To do this, we extend the approach of Section IV to consider sector-preserving channels with one \(d\)-dimensional sector and \(m\) 1-dimensional sectors, i.e. those of type \((d, 1, \ldots, 1)\).

The Kraus operators of such channels have the form

\[
\hat{C}_i = C_i \oplus \alpha_i^2 \oplus \alpha_i^3 \oplus \cdots \oplus \alpha_i^m,
\]

(23)

where \((C_i)^{\oplus}\) is a Kraus representation of a channel \(\mathcal{C}\) in dimension \(d\), and, for every \(k \in \{1, \ldots, m\}\), \((\alpha_i^k, \gamma_{ij})_{i<k}\leq m\) are amplitudes satisfying the condition \(\sum_i |\alpha_i^k|^2 = 1\). The existence of this form is a consequence of Theorem 6 in Ref. [35].

A one-to-one parametrisation can be obtained using the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 7 which allows us to show that every sector-preserving channel of this type is in one-to-one correspondence with \(m\) pinned Kraus operators of a channel \(\mathcal{C}\) in dimension \(d\), and with a set of complex amplitudes \((\gamma_{ij})_{i<k}\leq j\leq m\). To illustrate the situation, we consider the \(m = 2\) case. In this case, it is possible to show that every sector-preserving channel \(\mathcal{C}\) admits a Kraus representation of the form

\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{C}_1 &= C_1 \oplus 1 \oplus \gamma_{12} \\
\hat{C}_2 &= C_2 \oplus 0 \oplus \sqrt{1 - |\gamma_{12}|^2} \\
\hat{C}_i &= C_i \oplus 0 \oplus 0 \quad \forall i \geq 3,
\end{align*}
\]

(24)

where \((C_i)^{\oplus}\) are Kraus operators of a suitable quantum channel \(\mathcal{C}\) in dimension \(d\). Note that this expression is completely analogous to Eq. (19). In this case, it is possible to show that the quadruple \((\mathcal{C}, C_1, C_2, \gamma_{12})\) provides a one-to-one parametrisation.

**Theorem 8.** The sector-preserving channels of type \((d, 1, 1)\) are in one-to-one correspondence with quadruples of the form \((\mathcal{C}, C_1, C_2, \gamma_{12})\), where \(\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_S^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_S^d)\) is a channel in dimension \(d\), \(C_1\) and \(C_2\) are two Kraus operators for \(\mathcal{C}\), and \(\gamma\) is a complex amplitude satisfying \(|\gamma_{12}| \leq 1\).

Combining Theorem 8 with Theorem 7, we obtain the following.

**Corollary 3.** The following sets are in one-to-one correspondence:

1. 2-compositely-controlled channels, as defined in [78], with a \(d\)-dimensional target system;
2. quadruples of the form \((\mathcal{C}, C_1, C_2, \gamma_{12})\), where \((\mathcal{C}, C_1, C_2)\) is a channel with two pinned Kraus operators in dimension \(d\), and \(\gamma_{12}\) is a complex amplitude satisfying \(|\gamma_{12}| \leq 1\);
3. sector-preserving channels of type \((d, 1, 1)\).

The case of arbitrary \(m \geq 2\) can be treated similarly, and also in this case, one can show that there exists a one-to-one correspondence between the set of \(m\)-compositely-controlled quantum channels of type \((d, 1, 1, \ldots, 1)\) and the set of sector-preserving channels of type \((d, 1, 1, \ldots, 1)\).

**C. Implementing compositely-controlled channels via a universal circuit architecture**

We now turn to the generalisation of the result of Section IV to the implementation of \(m\)-compositely-controlled channels. For illustration, we once again focus on the case \(m = 2\).

As stated in Corollary 3, for any given \(d\), there is indeed a one-to-one correspondence between the 2-compositely-controlled channels on target systems of dimension \(d\) (which can be written as the \(\text{ctrl}_{C_1, C_2, \gamma_{12}} \mathcal{C}\)), and the sector-preserving channels of type \((d, 1, 1)\) (which can be written as the \(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{C}_{1, C_2, \gamma_{12}})\)). This correspondence can also be implemented via a universal circuit architecture.

**Theorem 9.** Let \(\mathcal{H}_S = \mathcal{H}_S^0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_S^1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_S^2\) be a Hilbert space, with \(\dim(\mathcal{H}_S^0) = d\) and \(\dim(\mathcal{H}_S^1) = \dim(\mathcal{H}_S^2) = 1\), and let \(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{C}}\) be a control space of dimension 3.
There exists a supermap $\text{CONTROL}_{(2)}$ of type $(S \to S) \to (C \otimes S^0 \to C \otimes S^0)$ such that for any sector-preserving channel $\overline{c}[C_1, C_2; \gamma_{12}]$,

$$\text{CONTROL}_{(2)}[\overline{c}[C_1, C_2; \gamma_{12}]] = \text{ctrl}_{C_1, C_2; \gamma_{12}} - C.$$  \hspace{1cm} (25)

Furthermore, this supermap is unitary-preserving on the sector-preserving channels on $\mathcal{H}_S$.

This Theorem can be proven in a straightforward way using the formulation of the $\text{CONTROL}_{(2)}$ supermap presented in Figure 3.

Similarly, an inverse $\text{CONTROL}^{-1}_{(2)}$ of this control map can easily be defined, showing that sector-preserving channels of type $(d, 1, 1)$ and 2-compositely-controlled channels are fully equivalent resources.

These results can be generalised in a straightforward way to the case of general $m$: for any given $m, d$, there exists a universal circuit architecture (represented by a supermap $\text{CONTROL}_{(m)}$) turning a sector-preserving channel of type $(d, 1, \ldots, 1)$ into its corresponding $m$-compositely-controlled channel, and a universal circuit architecture realising the converse task.

**VII. SUPERMAPS ON ROUTED CHANNELS**

We now turn to a formal construction allowing to describe the $\text{CONTROL}$ and $2 - \text{CONTROL}$ supermaps as acting solely on sector-preserving channels. We achieve this through the introduction of the notion of supermaps on routed channels.

Supermaps, first introduced in [36], can be conceptually defined as ‘operations on operations’: they are linear transformations taking quantum channels as input and mapping them to output quantum channels. Their main use is to model the different ways of using and connecting together ‘black-box’ operations [38], for example in a quantum comb [37] or in more exotic setups, such as the quantum switch [38]; they provide a well-defined and unambiguous framework to study the features and relative advantages of these manipulations of the black boxes.

Here, we define (deterministic) ‘supermaps on routed channels’ as supermaps which only accept a subset of all channels as input; namely, in the language of Ref. [35], those that follow a certain route – i.e. satisfy a given set of sectorial constraints. These restrictions will make the possible supermaps more diverse, as they are no longer required to be well-defined on all possible input channels. Fortunately, a good deal of the formal work necessary in order to define such supermaps on routed channels has been undertaken already: in [38], deterministic supermaps on a restricted set of quantum channels were defined in general. We will recall the main parts of this definition, then apply it to the definition of supermaps on routed channels.

We denote a system $X$ as corresponding to a finite-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_X$. For two systems $A_{\text{in}}$ and $A_{\text{out}}$, we denote $\text{Herm}(A_{\text{in}} \to A_{\text{out}})$ to be the real vector space of Hermitian-preserving linear maps from $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{A_{\text{in}}})$ to $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{A_{\text{out}}})$, and $\text{QChan}(A_{\text{in}} \to A_{\text{out}})$ to be its subset containing quantum channels of type $A_{\text{in}} \to A_{\text{out}}$. We also note $\text{St}(X) \subseteq \text{Herm}(\mathcal{H}_X)$ to be the set of states for system $X$. The first notion we need is that of an extension of a set of channels, which allows us to take into consideration channels which also
act on an ancillary system. Given a subset of channels \( S \subseteq \text{QChan}(A_{in} \rightarrow A_{out}) \) and two systems \( X_{in}, X_{out} \), the extension of \( S \) in \( \text{QChan}(A_{in} X_{in} \rightarrow A_{out} X_{out}) \) is the set \( \text{Ext}_{X_{in} \rightarrow X_{out}}(S) := \{ C \in \text{QChan}(A_{in} X_{in} \rightarrow A_{out} X_{out}) \mid \forall \sigma \in \text{St}(X_{in}), \text{Tr}_{X_{out}}(C \circ (I_{A_{in}} \otimes \sigma_{X_{in}})) \in S \} \). With this notion, one can define deterministic supermaps on a restricted set of channels \[^{[35]}\].

**Definition 2** (Deterministic supermaps on a restricted set of quantum channels). Let \( S \subseteq \text{QChan}(A_{in} \rightarrow A_{out}) \) and \( T \subseteq \text{QChan}(P \rightarrow F) \) be subsets of channels. A deterministic supermap of type \( S \rightarrow T \) is a linear map \( S \) from \( \text{Herm}(A_{in} \rightarrow A_{out}) \) to \( \text{Herm}(P \rightarrow F) \) such that, for any auxiliary systems \( X_{in}, X_{out} \) and for any channel \( C \in \text{Ext}_{X_{in} \rightarrow X_{out}}(S) \), one has

\[
(S \otimes I)[C] \in \text{Ext}_{X_{in} \rightarrow X_{out}}(T),
\]

where \( I \) is the identity on \( \text{Herm}(X_{in} \rightarrow X_{out}) \).

We can first apply this notion to the definition of supermaps acting on a single routed channel. First, we briefly recall the basic notions introduced in Ref. \[^{[35]}\]. Here, we will restrict ourselves to routes with full coherence, i.e., only encoding sectorial constraints and not coherence constraints.\[^{[4]}\] A partitioned Hilbert space \( X_{k} \) is a Hilbert space with a preferred orthogonal partition, labelled by a finite set \( Z_{X} \); i.e., \( H_{X} := \bigoplus_{k \in Z_{X}} H_{X_{k}} \). Given two such partitioned spaces \( A_{in}^{k} \) and \( A_{out}^{l} \), and a relation \( \lambda : Z_{A_{in}} \rightarrow Z_{A_{out}} \) (or, in other terms, a Boolean matrix \( (\lambda_{l}^{k})_{(k, l) \in Z_{A_{out}} \times Z_{A_{out}}} \), we say that a channel \( A \in \text{QChan}(A_{in} \rightarrow A_{out}) \) follows the route \( \lambda \) if

\[
\forall k, \forall \rho \in \mathcal{L}(H_{A_{in}}^{k}), \ A(\rho) \in \mathcal{L}\left( \bigoplus_{\lambda_{l}^{k} = 1} H_{A_{out}}^{l} \right). \tag{27}
\]

Equivalently (see Theorem 6 in Ref. \[^{[35]}\]), given any Kraus representation \( (K_{i}) \), of \( A \), \( A \) follows \( \lambda \) if and only if

\[
\forall i, \forall k, \forall \psi \in H_{A_{in}}^{k}, K_{i} \psi \in \bigoplus_{\lambda_{l}^{k} = 1} H_{A_{out}}^{l}. \tag{28}
\]

We note the set of channels of type \( A_{in} \rightarrow A_{out} \) that follow the route \( \lambda \) as \( \text{QChan}^{\lambda}(A_{in}^{k} \rightarrow A_{out}^{l}) \subseteq \text{QChan}(A_{in} \rightarrow A_{out}) \). We will also say that these channels have type \( A_{in}^{k} \xrightarrow{\lambda} A_{out}^{l} \); it is this type of channels on which we want to define supermaps. It is easy to prove that the condition defining the extension of \( A_{in}^{k} \xrightarrow{\lambda} A_{out}^{l} \) to ancillary systems can be simplified.

---

\[^{[4]}\] This leads us to adopting notations that are somewhat different from those of Ref. \[^{[35]}\]. There, for general channels were taken to be completely positive relations \( \Lambda_{k,l}^{n} \). As fully coherent routes are those \( \Lambda \)'s which can be written as \( \Lambda_{k,l}^{n} = \Lambda_{k}^{n} \Lambda_{l}^{n} \), we simplify our notations in the present article by just referring to them as \( \Lambda_{k}^{n} \).

\[^{[9]}\] It is straightforward to see that such supermaps could also be defined as acting on any probabilistic mixture of such product routed channels, or, more generally, to any linear combination thereof. In Ref. \[^{[35]}\] the set of input channels considered was that of non-signalling channels, which was proven to be equal to the set of channels that are linear combinations of product channels.
A \mapsto \rightarrow A := S \quad A \mapsto \rightarrow A := \sigma

correspondence: for any given
dence, we showed the existence of a physical one-to-one
In addition to this mathematical one-to-one correspon-
d system. We did so by demonstrating that both share
the implementation of controlled channels on a
-dimensiona
ls, such as a channel on
system. We also generalised these results to the im-
plemetation of such schemes to more complex architectures.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In this work, we showed that sector-preserving chan-
nels of type (1, d) are the necessary resource for the im-
plementation of controlled channels on a d-dimensional
system. We did so by demonstrating that both share
the same non-redundant characterisation, as a channel on
the d-dimensional system with a pinned Kraus operator.
In addition to this mathematical one-to-one corre-
dence, we showed the existence of a physical one-to-one correspondence: for any given d, there exist two universal
circuit architectures that convert sector-preserving chan-
nels into controlled channels in either direction.

We generalised these results, by defining compositely-
controlled channels, in which several states of the control
are associated with the ‘do-nothing’ option, and show-
that they are in (both mathematical and physical)
correspondence with sector-preserving channels of type
(d, 1, \ldots, 1). We also generalised these results to the im-
plementation of coherent control between N channels,
and showed that, when these channels are not isome-
tries, such an implementation requires the use of sector-
preserving channels of type (1, d) which reduce, on their
-dimensiona
rs, to purifications of the channels to
be controlled.

Overall, the framework of sector-preserving provides
an information-theoretic underpinning to the existing
experimental schemes for the universal implementation of
coherent control \[ \text{\cite{23, 27} } \], and a pathway to the general-
isation of such schemes to more complex architectures.
As byproduct, it also motivates new experiments on the
realisation of composite control.

Finally, in order to properly characterise the super-
maps we defined, we introduced the notion of super-
maps on routed channels, and gave them a rigor-
ous mathematical definition, building on the framework
of Ref. \[ \text{\cite{35} } \]. However, the supermaps presented in the
present work can always be extended to act on general
channels (even though this will make them lose their
unitary-preserving property). An interesting open ques-
tion is whether there exist supermaps on routed channels
which cannot be extended to act on general channels.
FIG. 6. Fully explicit formulation of the $2 - \text{CONTROL}$ supermap as a supermap on sector-preserving channels, in the framework of routed quantum circuits [35]. $a^1$ is the only state on the one-dimensional sector $L(H_1)$. The Boolean vector $(\lambda^{p,k,m})_{p,k,m \in \{0,1\}}$ has coefficients 1 for indices 001 and 110, and 0 elsewhere. $(\lambda^{p,l,n})_{p,l,n \in \{0,1\}}$ is its transpose. An advantage of the routed formulation is to allow to get rid of this superfluous information that was present in the standard formulation (Figure 2).
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Appendix A: Parametrisation of the coherent control between two channels

In this Appendix, we prove Theorem 2. We fix a Kraus representation \((A_j)_{j=1}^m\) of minimal length of \(A\). We first prove that any version of a controlled channel between \(A\) and \(B\) admits a Kraus decomposition \((K_j)_{j=1}^m\), where \(m \geq n\), \(K_j = \text{ctrl} - (A_j, B_j)\) for \(j \leq n\) and \(K_j = \text{ctrl} - (0, B_j)\) for \(j > n\). Let us take such a channel, given by Kraus operators \((\text{ctrl} - (A'_j, B'_j))_{j=1}^m\). The \(A'_j\) form a Kraus representation of \(A\); therefore, \(m \geq n\) and there exists an unitary matrix \((V_j)_{j=1}^m\) such that \(\sum_j V_j A'_j = A_j\) for \(j \leq n\) and \(0\) for \(j > n\). Then, \((\sum_j V_j K_j)_{j=1}^m\) is a Kraus representation of the right form for the controlled channel.

We now prove that, given two choices \((B_i)_{i=1}^m\) and
Here, we defined this supermap as a routed one (also using the convention of contracting Kronecker deltas) for clarity, but this could also be arbitrarily expanded into a supermap acting on all channels from $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{S_{\text{out}}})$ to $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{S_{\text{out}}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{E}^1)$. Note that when writing such a non-routed supermap, one would have to write the combination of $S_{\text{out}}$ and $E^1$ as a single wire, as the way in which they combine to form $S_{\text{out}} E^1$ is not a tensor product and cannot be expressed using standard quantum circuits.

Appendix B: Control of two noisy channels

In this Appendix, we propose a universal circuit implementation for all possible versions of the control between two noisy channels $A$ and $B$ from $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{S_{\text{out}}})$ to $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{S_{\text{out}}})$.

Recall that, as proven in Section V in the case where $A$ and $B$ are isometric channels these versions could be implemented using as resources sector-preserving channels from $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{S_{\text{out}}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{S_{\text{out}}})$ to $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{S_{\text{out}}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{S_{\text{out}}})$, where $\mathcal{H}_{S_{\text{out}}} := \mathcal{H}_{S_{\text{out}}}$, $\mathcal{H}_{S_{\text{out}}} := \mathcal{H}_{S_{\text{out}}}$, and $\mathcal{H}_{S_{\text{out}}} \cong \mathcal{H}_{S_{\text{out}}} \cong \mathcal{H}_{S_{\text{out}}} \cong \mathcal{H}_{S_{\text{out}}}$, with these channels restricting respectively to $A$ and $B$ on $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{S_{\text{out}}})$. However, the controlled channels yielded by this method can feature full coherence only between at most one Kraus operator of $A$ and one operator of $B$.

Here, we shall therefore make use of more complex resources. These resources will be sector-preserving channels whose multi-dimensional output sector will not be $\mathcal{H}_{S_{\text{out}}}$, but $\mathcal{H}_{S_{\text{out}}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{E}^1$, where $\mathcal{H}_{E}^1$ is an ancillary Hilbert space. The restrictions of these channels to this sector will have to yield $A$ and $B$ when $E^1$ is traced out. In other words, to get the full scope of controls between $A$ and $B$ we need to use sector-preserving channels that restrict to (possibly partial) purifications of $A$ and $B$ on their multi-dimensional sectors. Using such resources, the number of Kraus operators of $A$ and $B$ between which there can be full coherence in the controlled channel is capped by the dimension of $\mathcal{H}_{E}^1$. In particular a sufficiently large $\mathcal{H}_{E}^1$ will ensure that all possible controlled channels can be generated.

More formally, we define the supermap $2 - \text{CONTROL}(E)$ from the supermap $2 - \text{CONTROL}$ in the following way.

\begin{equation}
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
2 - \text{CONTROL}(E) & \text{CONTROL} \text{(B1)}
\end{array}
\end{equation}

Let us now prove that, for a given choice of $E$, $2 - \text{CONTROL}(E)$ can produce all controlled channels in which the number of coherent pairs of Kraus operators is less than the dimension of $E$.

Theorem 10. We fix an environment $E$ with dimension $D$, and use the one-to-one parametrisation of the control between two channels provided by Theorem 3, i.e., given a Kraus representation $(A_i)_{i=1}^n$ of $A$ of minimal length, the parametrisation is given by the choice of $n$ Kraus operators $B_i$ of $B$.

Then any choice of a control in which only the $D$ first operators $B_i$ are non-zero can be obtained from the use of the $2 - \text{CONTROL}(E)$ supermap.

Proof. In the case $D = 1$ (i.e. that of the $2 - \text{CONTROL}$ supermap), it can easily be computed, from the formula of Fig. 2, that any controlled version in which there is coherence between $A_1$ and $B_1$ can be obtained by plugging the channels $\tilde{A}^{A_1}$ and $\tilde{B}^{B_1}$ in $2 - \text{CONTROL}$.

Considering now the case $D > 1$, let us take a version $C$
of a control between $A$ and $B$ for which a Kraus representation is \( (|0\rangle_C \otimes A_1 + |1\rangle_C \otimes B_1, \ldots, |0\rangle_C \otimes A_D + |1\rangle_C \otimes B_D, |0\rangle_C \otimes A_{D+1}, \ldots, |0\rangle_C \otimes A_n, |1\rangle_C \otimes B_{D+1}, \ldots, |1\rangle_C \otimes B_m) \). Then a (possibly partial) purification of $C$ is given by the channel of type $CS_1^1 \rightarrow CS_1^1 E$ for which a Kraus representation is \( \left( \sum_{i=1}^D (|0\rangle_C \otimes A_i + |1\rangle_C \otimes B_i) \otimes |i\rangle_E, |0\rangle_C \otimes A_{D+1} \otimes |1\rangle_E, \ldots, |0\rangle_C \otimes A_n \otimes |1\rangle_E, |1\rangle_C \otimes B_{D+1} \otimes |1\rangle_E, \ldots, |1\rangle_C \otimes B_m \otimes |1\rangle_E \right) \). This latter channel can be seen as being a version of a control between two channels $S_1^1 \rightarrow S_1^1 E^1$ with coherence between one pair of Kraus operators. By the first part of the proof, it can thus be obtained by applying the $2 - \text{CONTROL}$ supermap to suitable sector-preserving channels of type $S_{\text{in}}^k \rightarrow S_{\text{out}}^k$. Discarding $E^1$ then yields $C$. The $2 - \text{CONTROL}(E)$ as defined in (B1) thus yields $C$ when applied to the same sector-preserving channels.

In particular, as any channel $S_{\text{in}}^1 \rightarrow S_{\text{out}}^1$ admits a Kraus representation of length less than the product of the dimensions of $S_{\text{in}}^1$ and $S_{\text{out}}^1$, all versions of controlled channels can be obtained from the use of the supermap $2 - \text{CONTROL}(E)$ when $E$ is of that dimension.