

# Test-measured Rényi divergences

Milán Mosonyi<sup>1,2,\*</sup> and Fumio Hiai<sup>3,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup> MTA-BME Lendület Quantum Information Theory Research Group

<sup>2</sup> Department of Analysis, Institute of Mathematics,  
Budapest University of Technology and Economics,

Műgyetem rkp. 3., H-1111 Budapest, Hungary

<sup>3</sup> Graduate School of Information Sciences, Tohoku University,  
Aoba-ku, Sendai 980-8579, Japan

## Abstract

One possibility of defining a quantum Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence of two quantum states is to optimize the classical Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence of their post-measurement probability distributions over all possible measurements (measured Rényi divergence), and maybe regularize these quantities over multiple copies of the two states (regularized measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence). A key observation behind the theorem for the strong converse exponent of asymptotic binary quantum state discrimination is that the regularized measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence coincides with the sandwiched Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence when  $\alpha > 1$ . Moreover, it also follows from the same theorem that to achieve this, it is sufficient to consider 2-outcome measurements (tests) for any number of copies (this is somewhat surprising, as achieving the measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence for  $n$  copies might require a number of measurement outcomes that diverges in  $n$ , in general). In view of this, it seems natural to expect the same when  $\alpha < 1$ ; however, we show that this is not the case. In fact, we show that even for commuting states (classical case) the regularized quantity attainable using 2-outcome measurements is in general strictly smaller than the Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence (which is unique in the classical case). In the general quantum case this shows that the above “regularized test-measured” Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence is not even a quantum extension of the classical Rényi divergence when  $\alpha < 1$ , in sharp contrast to the  $\alpha > 1$  case.

## I. INTRODUCTION

It has been known for a long time in classical information theory that Rényi divergences and derived information quantities play a central role in quantifying the trade-off between the relevant operational quantities in many information theoretic problems, like source coding, channel coding, or state discrimination (see, e.g., [6]). Due to the non-commutativity of general quantum states, Rényi divergences can be extended to pairs of quantum states in infinitely many different ways; see, e.g., [3, 5, 8, 16, 23–25, 31, 36, 37, 40, 47] for various different extensions. Some of these extensions have similar operational roles as their classical counterpart [1, 2, 9, 11, 17, 18, 22, 26, 28–30, 33], while others are interesting for their mathematical properties or as useful approximations to the operationally relevant quantities.

One natural way of defining a quantum Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence of two quantum states  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$  is to optimize the classical Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergences of their post-measurement probability distributions over all possible measurements. This leads to the notion of the *measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence*  $D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ , which has nice mathematical properties, but no known direct operational interpretation or closed-form expression. A variant of it with better properties is obtained by regularizing it over many copies of the states as  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) := \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho^{\otimes n} \|\sigma^{\otimes n})$ ; this is called the *regularized measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence*. Quite surprisingly, this admits a closed-form expression, as it turns out to be equal to the *sandwiched Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence* [31, 47] for  $\alpha \in [1/2, +\infty)$ , and a closed-form expression is also available for  $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$ . This was proved in the finite-dimensional case by asymptotic pinching [11, 19, 28], and extended very recently to the infinite-dimensional case [26], and more generally, to states of nuclear  $C^*$ -algebras [17]. Moreover, this is one of the key observations behind the proof for the expression of the strong converse exponent of asymptotic binary quantum state discrimination in terms of the sandwiched Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergences with  $\alpha > 1$ , given in [17, 26, 28]. It also follows from the strong converse theorem that for  $\alpha > 1$ , the regularized measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence can be attained by considering only 2-outcome measurements (tests) for each number of copies of the states. This is rather surprising when one takes into account

---

\*Electronic address: milan.mosonyi@gmail.com

†Electronic address: hiai.fumio@gmail.com

that attaining  $D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho^{\otimes n} \parallel \sigma^{\otimes n})$  for  $n$  copies of the states requires in general a number of measurement outcomes that diverges in  $n$  (this is true even for classical states, as can be seen easily by considering type decompositions).

This motivates the introduction of the (*regularized*) *test-measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergences* as the variants of the usual (regularized) measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergences with only 2-outcome measurements in their definitions. According to the above, the regularized measured and the regularized test-measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergences coincide for  $\alpha > 1$ , and hence it might seem reasonable to expect the same for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Our main result in this paper is that this is not the case. In fact, we show that even for commuting states (classical case) the regularized test-measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence is in general strictly smaller than the Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence (which is unique in the classical case) for every  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . In the general quantum case this shows that the regularized test-measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence is not even a quantum extension of the classical Rényi divergence when  $\alpha < 1$ , in contrast to the  $\alpha > 1$  case.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section II we summarize the necessary preliminaries on Rényi divergences and the Hoeffding bound theorem of quantum state discrimination [9, 33]. In Section III A we introduce the test-measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergences, and two variants of their regularizations, and discuss some basic relations between these quantities and some previously studied Rényi divergences. In Section III B we give an expression for one of the versions of the regularized test-measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  in terms of the Hoeffding divergences, and use this to show that this version is strictly smaller than the standard (or Petz-type) Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence under very mild conditions on the states. We use this result in Section III C to show that the other version of the regularized test-measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence is strictly smaller than the (unique) Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence for unequal commuting states with equal supports. In particular, the results of Sections III B and III C together yield that in the classical case (more precisely, for pairs of probability distributions on at least three points) both versions of the regularized test-measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence are strictly smaller than the classical Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence for generic pairs of states and any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Moreover, we show that, somewhat surprisingly, the two different regularizations may give different values in the classical case.

In Appendix A we explain a connection of our results in Section III B with a very recent result by Salzmann and Datta on a variant of the quantum Hoeffding bound theorem [42]. Finally, in Appendix B we extend the main results in Section III B to the von Neumann algebra setting.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

In the main body of the paper,  $\mathcal{H}$  will always denote a finite-dimensional Hilbert space. We will use the notations  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  for the set of linear operators on  $\mathcal{H}$ , and  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$  for the set of positive semi-definite (PSD) operators. Furthermore,  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) := \{\varrho \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0} : \text{Tr } \varrho = 1\}$  will denote the set of density operators, or states,  $\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{H}) := \{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : 0 \leq T \leq I\}$  the set of *tests* on  $\mathcal{H}$ , and  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H})$  the set of projections on  $\mathcal{H}$ .

In our study of functions of pairs of density operators we will often use that two commuting density operators can be diagonalized in the same orthonormal basis, and hence can be written as

$$\varrho = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \varrho(\omega) |\omega\rangle\langle\omega|, \quad \sigma = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \sigma(\omega) |\omega\rangle\langle\omega|, \quad (\text{II.1})$$

with some orthonormal basis  $(|\omega\rangle)_{\omega \in \Omega}$ , and probability density functions  $\varrho, \sigma$  on  $\Omega$ . We will refer to this setting as the classical case.

For a finite-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  and a finite set  $\mathcal{X}$ , let

$$\text{POVM}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{X}) := \left\{ (M_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}} : M_x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}, x \in \mathcal{X}, \sum_x M_x = I \right\}$$

denote the set of positive operator-valued measures (POVMs) on  $\mathcal{H}$  with outcome set  $\mathcal{X}$ , and let

$$\text{PVM}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{X}) := \{(M_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \in \text{POVM}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{X}) : M_x \in \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}), x \in \mathcal{X}\}$$

denote the subset of projection-valued measures (PVMs). Let

$$\text{PVM}_1(\mathcal{H}) := \{M \in \text{PVM}(\mathcal{H}, [\dim \mathcal{H}]) : \text{Tr } M_k = 1, k = 1, \dots, \dim \mathcal{H}\}$$

be the set of rank 1 PVMs on  $\mathcal{H}$ , i.e, the set of measurements in an orthonormal basis of  $\mathcal{H}$ . For any  $M \in \text{POVM}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{X})$ , let

$$\mathcal{M}(A) := \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (\text{Tr } M_x A) \mathbf{1}_{\{x\}} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{X}}, \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}),$$

where  $\mathbf{1}_{\{x\}}$  is the indicator function of the singleton  $\{x\}$ . If  $\varrho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  is a state then  $\mathcal{M}(\varrho)$  is the post-measurement probability distribution.

For two probability density functions  $\varrho, \sigma$  on some finite set  $\Omega$ , and  $\alpha \in (0, +\infty) \setminus \{1\}$ , let

$$D_\alpha(\varrho \parallel \sigma) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \varrho(\omega)^\alpha \sigma(\omega)^{1-\alpha}, & \alpha \in (0, 1) \text{ or } \text{supp } \varrho \subseteq \text{supp } \sigma, \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

denote the (classical) Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence of  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$ . For  $\alpha = 1$  we have

$$D_1(\varrho \parallel \sigma) := \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} D_\alpha(\varrho \parallel \sigma) = D(\varrho \parallel \sigma) := \begin{cases} \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \varrho(\omega) (\log \varrho(\omega) - \log \sigma(\omega)), & \text{supp } \varrho \subseteq \text{supp } \sigma, \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where  $D(\varrho \parallel \sigma)$  is the *Kullback-Leibler divergence*, or *relative entropy* of  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$ .

There are various extensions of the Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergences to pairs of quantum states. Motivated e.g., by the notion of a quantum  $f$ -divergence introduced in [25], we consider the following:

**Definition II.1.** For  $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, +\infty)$ , a function

$$D_\alpha^q : \cup_{d \in \mathbb{N}} (\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^d) \times \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^d)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is a *quantum Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence* if it is invariant under isometries, i.e., for any  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^d)$  and any isometry  $V : \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{d'}$ ,

$$D_\alpha^q(V \varrho V^* \parallel V \sigma V^*) = D_\alpha^q(\varrho \parallel \sigma),$$

and it reduces to the classical Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence on commuting states, i.e., if  $\varrho = \sum_{i=1}^d p_i |i\rangle\langle i|$  and  $\sigma = \sum_{i=1}^d q_i |i\rangle\langle i|$  are diagonal in the same orthonormal basis then

$$D_\alpha^q(\varrho \parallel \sigma) = D_\alpha((p_i)_{i=1}^d \parallel (q_i)_{i=1}^d).$$

It is clear that any quantum Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence can be uniquely extended to pairs of density operators  $\varrho, \sigma$  on an arbitrary finite-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  by mapping  $\mathcal{H}$  into some  $\mathbb{C}^d$  with an isometry  $V$ , and defining  $D_\alpha^q(\varrho \parallel \sigma) := D_\alpha^q(V \varrho V^* \parallel V \sigma V^*)$ .

Two particularly important families of quantum Rényi divergences are the *standard (or Petz-type) Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergences* [37], given for  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ , and  $\alpha \in (0, +\infty) \setminus \{1\}$ , as

$$D_\alpha(\varrho \parallel \sigma) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \text{Tr } \varrho^\alpha \sigma^{1-\alpha}, & \alpha \in (0, 1) \text{ or } \text{supp } \varrho \subseteq \text{supp } \sigma, \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (\text{II.2})$$

and the *sandwiched Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergences* [31, 47]

$$D_\alpha^*(\varrho \parallel \sigma) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \text{Tr} \left( \varrho^{1/2} \sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \varrho^{1/2} \right)^\alpha, & \alpha \in (0, 1) \text{ or } \text{supp } \varrho \subseteq \text{supp } \sigma, \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Here and henceforth we follow the convention that for a PSD operator  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$  with spectral decomposition  $A = \sum_a a P_a$ , where  $P_a$  is the projection onto  $\{\psi \in \mathcal{H} : A\psi = a\psi\}$ ,  $a \in [0, +\infty)$ , real powers of  $A$  are defined as  $A^x := \sum_{a>0} a^x P_a$ . In particular,  $A^0$  is the projection onto the support of  $A$ . With this convention,

$$D_0(\varrho \parallel \sigma) := \lim_{\alpha \searrow 0} D_\alpha(\varrho \parallel \sigma) = -\log \text{Tr } \varrho^0 \sigma.$$

In what follows, we consider further functions of pairs of density operators  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$ . To avoid trivial pathological cases, we will always implicitly assume that

$$\varrho \not\leq \sigma, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad \text{Tr } \varrho \sigma > 0.$$

For  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ , let us introduce

$$\psi(\alpha) := \psi(\varrho \| \sigma | \alpha) := \log \text{Tr } \varrho^\alpha \sigma^{1-\alpha}, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R},$$

so that  $D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma) = \frac{\psi(\alpha)}{\alpha-1}$  if  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  or  $\varrho^0 \leq \sigma^0$  (otherwise  $D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma) = +\infty$ ).

We will need the following:

**Lemma II.2.** Let  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ . The function  $\psi(\varrho \| \sigma | \cdot)$  is convex and real analytic on  $\mathbb{R}$ , and it is non-positive on  $[0, 1]$ . The functions  $\alpha \mapsto D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma)$  and  $\alpha \mapsto D_\alpha^*(\varrho \| \sigma)$  are non-negative and increasing on  $(0, 1) \cup (1, +\infty)$  with

$$\begin{aligned} D_1(\varrho \| \sigma) &:= D_1^*(\varrho \| \sigma) := \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} D_\alpha^*(\varrho \| \sigma) \\ &= D(\varrho \| \sigma) := \begin{cases} \text{Tr } \varrho(\log \varrho - \log \sigma), & \varrho^0 \leq \sigma^0, \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

being the *relative entropy* of  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$  [46]. Moreover,  $\alpha \mapsto D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma)$  is strictly increasing on  $(0, 1)$  unless

$$\varrho = \sum_{i=1}^m \kappa s_i P_i, \quad (\text{II.3})$$

for some  $\kappa > 0$  and projections  $P_i \leq Q_i$ ,  $i \in [m]$ , where  $\sigma = \sum_{i=1}^m s_i Q_i$  is the spectral decomposition of  $\sigma$ . In this latter case  $D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma) = \log \kappa$ ,  $\alpha \in (0, +\infty)$ .

*Proof.* Real analyticity of  $\psi$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  is easy to see, and its convexity can be easily verified by simply computing its second derivative; see, e.g., [18, Lemma 3.2]. Non-positivity of  $\psi$  on  $[0, 1]$  follows from the above and that  $\psi(0) \leq 0$ ,  $\psi(1) \leq 0$ . Convexity of  $\psi$  implies that

$$D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma) = \frac{\psi(\alpha) - \psi(1)}{\alpha - 1} + \frac{\psi(1)}{\alpha - 1}$$

is strictly increasing on  $(0, 1)$ , unless  $\psi(1) = 0$ , i.e.,  $\varrho^0 \leq \sigma^0$ , and  $\psi$  is affine. The characterization of  $\alpha \mapsto D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma)$  not being strictly increasing then follows from the characterization of  $\psi$  being affine given in [18, Lemma 3.2]. For the assertions about the sandwiched Rényi divergence, see [31].  $\square$

**Remark II.3.** The above proof also yields that  $\alpha \mapsto \frac{\psi(\alpha)}{\alpha-1}$  ( $= D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma)$  for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ) is strictly increasing on  $(0, +\infty)$  unless (II.3) holds.

We will also need the Legendre transforms

$$\varphi(c) := \max_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} \{c(\alpha - 1) - \psi(\alpha)\}, \quad c \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (\text{II.4})$$

$$\varphi_+(c) := \max_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} \{c\alpha - \psi(\alpha)\} = \varphi(c) + c, \quad c \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (\text{II.5})$$

$$\begin{aligned} H_r(\varrho \| \sigma) &:= \sup_{\alpha \in (0, 1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma)] \\ &= \sup_{\alpha \in (0, 1)} \frac{(\alpha - 1)r - \psi(\alpha)}{\alpha} \\ &= \sup_{u \in (-\infty, 0)} \{ur - \tilde{\psi}(u)\}, \quad r \in \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{II.6})$$

where  $\tilde{\psi}(u) := (1 - u)\psi((1 - u)^{-1})$ , and  $H_r(\varrho \| \sigma)$  is the *Hoeffding divergence* of  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$  with parameter  $r$ . In the problem of asymptotic binary state discrimination with null hypothesis  $\varrho$  and alternative hypothesis  $\sigma$ ,  $H_r(\varrho \| \sigma)$  gives the optimal type I error exponent when the type II exponent is at least  $r$  [9, 33]. The functions  $\varphi$  and  $\varphi_+$  give a different description of the trade-off curve of the two exponents; see, e.g., [33].

**Lemma II.4.** Let  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ , and  $\varphi, \varphi_+$  be as above.

- (i)  $\varphi_+$  is constant  $-\psi(0)$  on  $(-\infty, \psi'(0)]$ , and it is strictly increasing on  $[\psi'(0), +\infty)$ .
- (ii)  $\varphi$  is strictly decreasing on  $(-\infty, \psi'(1)]$ , and it is constant  $-\psi(1)$  on  $[\psi'(1), +\infty)$ .
- (iii) For every  $r \geq -\psi(0)$  there exists a unique  $c_r \geq \psi'(0)$  such that

$$\varphi_+(c_r) = r, \quad \varphi(c_r) = H_r(\varrho\|\sigma). \quad (\text{II.7})$$

- (iv)  $r \mapsto H_r(\varrho\|\sigma)$  is convex, lower semi-continuous, and monotone decreasing on  $\mathbb{R}$ , and

$$r < -\psi(0) = D_0(\varrho\|\sigma) \iff H_r(\varrho\|\sigma) = +\infty, \quad (\text{II.8})$$

$$r < D(\varrho\|\sigma) \iff H_r(\varrho\|\sigma) > 0. \quad (\text{II.9})$$

*Proof.* The first two points are straightforward to verify (see also [18, Lemma 4.1]). For the third, see [33, Section 2] (or the proof of [18, Theorem 4.8], with the role of  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$  interchanged). The properties of  $r \mapsto H_r(\varrho\|\sigma)$  listed in the fourth point are straightforward to verify; the equivalences in (II.8)–(II.9) follow immediately from the monotonicity of  $D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)$  in  $\alpha$  (see Lemma II.2), with the only exception of the case  $r = -\psi(0)$ , for which a direct calculation yields

$$H_{-\psi(0)}(\varrho\|\sigma) = -\psi'(0) - \psi(0) < +\infty. \quad (\text{II.10})$$

□

**Lemma II.5.** Let  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ . For any  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$-\varphi(b) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \min_{T_n \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})} (\text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n} (I - T_n) + e^{nb} \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n} T_n). \quad (\text{II.11})$$

*Proof.* See [18, Corollary 3.3].

□

The following is a slight variation of the well-known *quantum Hoeffding bound theorem* [1, 9, 10, 33]:

**Lemma II.6.** Let  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ . For any  $r \in (0, +\infty)$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n} T_{n,r,\alpha} \leq e^{-nr}, \quad \text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n} (I - T_{n,r,\alpha}) \leq e^{-n \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)]}, \quad (\text{II.12})$$

where  $T_{n,r,\alpha}$  is the spectral projection of  $\varrho^{\otimes n} - e^{n(r+\psi(\alpha))/\alpha} \sigma^{\otimes n}$  corresponding to its positive eigenvalues.

Conversely, for any  $r > D_0(\varrho\|\sigma)$ , any test sequence  $T_n \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and any strictly increasing sequence  $(n_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\text{if } \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{n_k} \log \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n_k} T_{n_k} \geq r \quad \text{then} \quad \limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{n_k} \log \text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n_k} (I - T_{n_k}) \leq H_r(\varrho\|\sigma). \quad (\text{II.13})$$

*Proof.* The inequalities in (II.12) follow immediately by the application of the trace inequality  $\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(A+B) - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}|A-B| \leq \text{Tr } A^\alpha B^{1-\alpha}$  in [2] to  $A := \varrho^{\otimes n}$  and  $B := e^{n(r+\psi(\alpha))/\alpha} \sigma^{\otimes n}$ ; see [10, Sec. 3.7] for details.

For the proof of (II.13), let  $c_r$  be as in (II.7), and let  $b \in (\psi'(0), c_r)$ . By (II.11) we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\varphi(b) &\leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n_k} \log (\text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n_k} (I - T_{n_k}) + e^{n_k b} \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n_k} T_{n_k}) \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n_k} \log \text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n_k} (I - T_{n_k}), \underbrace{b + \limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n_k} \log \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n_k} T_{n_k}}_{\leq -r} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows since, by their very definitions,  $\liminf_k \frac{1}{c_k} \log(x_k + y_k) \leq \max\{\liminf_k \frac{1}{c_k} \log x_k, \limsup_k \frac{1}{c_k} \log y_k\}$  for non-negative real sequences  $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ ,  $(y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ , and  $0 < c_k \rightarrow +\infty$ . Since  $b - r - (-\varphi(b)) = \varphi_+(b) - \varphi_+(c_r) < 0$ , according to Lemma II.4, we get  $-\varphi(b) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n_k} \log \text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n_k} (I - T_{n_k})$ . Taking  $b \nearrow c_r$ , we get

$$-H_r(\varrho\|\sigma) = -\varphi(c_r) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n_k} \log \text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n_k} (I - T_{n_k}),$$

as required. □

**Remark II.7.** (II.13) is essentially the same as the converse part of the Hoeffding bound theorem given in [33], the only difference being the restriction to a subsequence, which is the form we will need it in the proof of Theorem III.18. The proof above is exactly the same as the one in [33]; we give it in detail since the subsequence version does not follow formally from the corresponding statement in [33].

### III. TEST-MEASURED RÉNYI DIVERGENCES IN FINITE DIMENSION

#### A. Definitions

For  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  and  $\alpha \in (0, +\infty)$ , their *measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence* is defined as

$$D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) := \sup \{D_\alpha(\mathcal{M}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{M}(\sigma)) : M \in \text{POVM}(\mathcal{H}, [d]), d \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

It is known [4, 12] that

$$D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = \max \{D_\alpha(\mathcal{M}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{M}(\sigma)) : M \in \text{PVM}_1(\mathcal{H})\}. \quad (\text{III.14})$$

By restricting to 2-outcome POVMs, we get the notion of the *test-measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence* of  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) &:= \sup \{D_\alpha(\mathcal{M}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{M}(\sigma)) : M \in \text{POVM}(\mathcal{H}, [2])\} \\ &= \max_{T \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{H})} D_\alpha(\mathcal{T}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{T}(\sigma)), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{III.15})$$

where for  $T \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{H})$  we use the notation

$$\mathcal{T}(X) := (\text{Tr } XT, \text{Tr } X(I - T)) \in [0, +\infty)^2, \quad X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}). \quad (\text{III.16})$$

It is obvious from the definitions that

$$D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) \leq D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma). \quad (\text{III.17})$$

It is easy to see that the maximum in (III.15) exists. Indeed, when  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , it follows from the (joint) continuity of the classical Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence in its arguments. When  $\alpha > 1$  and  $\varrho^0 \not\leq \sigma^0$  then  $T := \sigma^0$  yields  $D_\alpha(\mathcal{T}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{T}(\sigma)) = +\infty = D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ . Finally, when  $\alpha > 1$  and  $\varrho^0 \leq \sigma^0$  then  $\varrho \leq \lambda\sigma$  for some  $\lambda > 0$ , and in this case  $D_\alpha(\mathcal{T}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{T}(\sigma))$  is continuous in  $T$ ; see, e.g., [12, Remark 4.16] for details.

Note that every 2-outcome POVM can be decomposed into a convex combination of projective 2-outcome measurements; this follows from the Krein-Milman theorem and the fact that the extreme points of the set of tests are exactly the projections (see, e.g., [44, Chap. I, Lemma 10.1], or [20, Page 23] for an alternative argument.) Since  $D_\alpha$  is jointly quasi-convex in its arguments, we get that

$$D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = \max \{D_\alpha(\mathcal{M}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{M}(\sigma)) : \mathcal{M} \in \text{PVM}(\mathcal{H}, [2])\} \quad (\text{III.18})$$

$$= \max_{T \in \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H})} D_\alpha(\mathcal{T}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{T}(\sigma)). \quad (\text{III.19})$$

**Remark III.1.** For  $\alpha = 1$ ,  $D_\alpha^{\text{meas}} := D_1^{\text{meas}}$  and  $D_\alpha^{\text{test}} := D_1^{\text{test}}$  are also called the *measured relative entropy* and the *test-measured relative entropy*, respectively.

**Remark III.2.** If  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$  are in a unital  $*$ -subalgebra  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  with unit  $I_{\mathcal{H}}$ , and  $\mathcal{E}$  is the trace-preserving conditional expectation (equivalently, the orthogonal projection with respect to the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product) onto  $\mathcal{A}$ , then the simple identity  $\text{Tr } XT = \text{Tr } \mathcal{E}(X)T = \text{Tr } X\mathcal{E}(T)$ ,  $X \in \mathcal{A}$ , implies that an optimal  $T$  attaining the maximum in (III.15) exists with  $T \in \mathcal{A}$ . Moreover, by the same argument leading to (III.18)–(III.19), there exists a projection  $T \in \mathcal{A}$  attaining the maximum in (III.19). In particular, if  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$  commute, and hence they are diagonal in a common orthonormal basis, then there exists an optimal  $T$  in the sense of (III.19) that is also diagonal in the same basis.

**Remark III.3.** It is clear from (III.14) and Remark III.2 that if the subalgebra generated by  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$  is isomorphic to a  $*$ -subalgebra of  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^2)$  then  $D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$  for every  $\alpha \in (0, +\infty)$ .

**Lemma III.4.** For any  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ ,  $\alpha \mapsto D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$  is monotone increasing on  $(0, +\infty)$ .

*Proof.* Obvious from the monotonicity of the classical Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergences in  $\alpha$ ; see, e.g., Lemma II.2.  $\square$

**Lemma III.5.**  $D_\alpha^{\text{test}}$  is strictly positive in the sense that for any  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ ,

$$D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) \geq 0, \quad (\text{III.20})$$

with equality if and only if  $\varrho = \sigma$ .

*Proof.* By the monotonicity stated in Lemma III.4, it is sufficient to prove strict positivity of  $D_\alpha^{\text{test}}$  for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Non-negativity in (III.20) is obvious, since  $D_\alpha(\mathcal{T}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{T}(\sigma)) = 0$  for  $T = I$ . The implication  $\varrho = \sigma \implies D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = 0$  is again obvious. Conversely, assume that  $D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = 0$ . Then  $D_\alpha(\mathcal{T}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{T}(\sigma)) = 0$  for  $T = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ , where  $\psi$  can be any unit vector. Using the strict positivity of the classical Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence, (which is a simple consequence of Hölder's inequality), we get that  $\text{Tr } \varrho |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| = \text{Tr } \sigma |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ ,  $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$ , whence  $\varrho = \sigma$ .  $\square$

**Remark III.6.** It is obvious from the definitions that for any  $\alpha \in (0, +\infty)$ , both  $D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}$  and  $D_\alpha^{\text{test}}$  are monotone non-increasing under the application of the same positive trace-preserving map on both of their arguments.

The *regularized measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence* of  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$  is defined as

$$\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{n} D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho^{\otimes n} \|\sigma^{\otimes n}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho^{\otimes n} \|\sigma^{\otimes n}),$$

where the equality follows from the easily verifiable super-additivity of  $n \mapsto D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho^{\otimes n} \|\sigma^{\otimes n})$  due to Fekete's lemma.

For the *test-measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence*, we consider two potentially different regularizations:

$$\hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{n} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n} \|\sigma^{\otimes n}),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) &:= \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n} \|\sigma^{\otimes n}) \\ &= \sup_{(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}} \left\{ \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} D_\alpha(\mathcal{T}_n(\varrho^{\otimes n}) \|\mathcal{T}_n(\sigma^{\otimes n})) \right\} \\ &= \max_{(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}} \left\{ \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} D_\alpha(\mathcal{T}_n(\varrho^{\otimes n}) \|\mathcal{T}_n(\sigma^{\otimes n})) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{III.21})$$

where the optimizations are taken over all sequences of tests  $T_n \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Note that, unlike for the measured Rényi divergence, it is not obvious from the definition whether  $n \mapsto D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n} \|\sigma^{\otimes n})$  is super-additive, and neither is it obvious whether the above two notions of regularized test-measured Rényi divergence coincide. It is a non-trivial fact that they do for  $\alpha \geq 1$ , and in fact, more is true:

$$\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}} = \hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}} = \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}} = D_\alpha^*, \quad \alpha \geq 1, \quad (\text{III.22})$$

as was shown in [19] for  $\alpha = 1$ , and in [28] for  $\alpha > 1$ . It might be natural to conjecture that the equalities

$$\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}} = \hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}} = \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}$$

hold also for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . (For the relation of  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}$  and  $D_\alpha^*$  for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , see Lemma III.10 below.) However, we show that this is not the case, as for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  we have

$$\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) < D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)$$

in general, according to Theorem III.22 below, and similarly, we have

$$\hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) < D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)$$

for any two unequal commuting states with equal supports, as we show in Theorem III.43. Since for commuting states  $D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) = \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ , this yields that neither  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}$  nor  $\hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}$  is equal to  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}$  for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . In particular, we obtain the following:

**Corollary III.7.** For  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}$  and  $\hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}$  are not quantum Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergences in the sense of Definition II.1.

Moreover, we show in Theorem III.39 that for certain commuting states

$$\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) < \hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$$

holds. Clearly, for these states

$$n \mapsto D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n}\|\sigma^{\otimes n}) \quad \text{is not superadditive.}$$

**Remark III.8.** One may argue that for the study of the strong converse exponent of asymptotic binary state discrimination, the conceptually most natural quantum Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence is  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}$ . To see this, note that for any sequence of tests  $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , and any  $\alpha > 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n}\|\sigma^{\otimes n}) &\geq \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \left( (\text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n} T_n)^\alpha (\text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n} T_n)^{1-\alpha} + (1 - \text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n} T_n)^\alpha (1 - \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n} T_n)^{1-\alpha} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log \text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n} T_n - \log \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n} T_n, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is by definition, and the second one is trivial. This yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\text{sc}}_r(\varrho\|\sigma) &:= \inf \left\{ \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n} T_n : T_n \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}), n \in \mathbb{N}, \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n} T_n \geq r \right\} \\ &\geq \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} \left[ r - \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{III.23})$$

which is the optimality part of the theorem for the strong converse exponent. The above argument is essentially the by now standard argument given in [32], except that instead of using the monotonicity of some family of quantum Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergences as in [32] and [28], the inequalities follow immediately by definition. The attainability part of the strong converse theorem given in [28] tells that equality holds in (III.23); moreover, we have  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_\alpha^*(\varrho\|\sigma)$ ,  $\alpha > 1$ .

In the rest of this section we discuss known relations between the different quantum Rényi divergences introduced above, and also some new inequalities.

We will often benefit from the following simple observation:

**Lemma III.9.** For any  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ ,

$$(1-\alpha)D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) = \alpha D_{1-\alpha}(\sigma\|\varrho), \quad \alpha \in (0, 1). \quad (\text{III.24})$$

If  $\Delta_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)$  denotes any of  $D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ ,  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ ,  $D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ ,  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ ,  $\hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ , then

$$(1-\alpha)\Delta_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) = \alpha\Delta_{1-\alpha}(\sigma\|\varrho), \quad \alpha \in (0, 1). \quad (\text{III.25})$$

*Proof.* The identity in (III.24) is well-known, and follows immediately from the definition in (II.2). In particular, this identity holds for the classical Rényi divergence, which yields (III.25).  $\square$

**Lemma III.10.** For any  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  and  $\alpha \in (0, +\infty)$ ,

$$D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) \leq D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) \quad (\text{III.26})$$

$$\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) \leq \hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) \leq \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) \quad (\text{III.27})$$

$$= \begin{cases} D_\alpha^*(\varrho\|\sigma), & \alpha \in [1/2, +\infty), \\ \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} D_{1-\alpha}^*(\sigma\|\varrho), & \alpha \in (0, 1/2] \end{cases} \quad (\text{III.28})$$

$$\leq D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma). \quad (\text{III.29})$$



*Proof.* The inequalities in (III.26) and (III.27) are obvious by definition. The equality in (III.28) was given in [19] for  $\alpha = 1$ , in [28] for  $\alpha > 1$ , in [11] for  $\alpha \in [1/2, 1)$ , and the case  $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$  follows from the latter due to (III.24) and (III.25). The inequality in (III.29) follows from the Araki-Lieb-Thirring inequality, as observed in [31, 47] (where the case  $\alpha \in [1/2, +\infty)$  was treated; the case  $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$  follows again from this due to (III.24) and (III.25)).  $\square$

**Remark III.11.** Lemmas III.10 and III.5 imply that all the quantities dominating  $D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$  in (III.26)–(III.29) are non-negative, and they are strictly positive when  $\varrho \neq \sigma$ . This does not imply the strict positivity of  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}$ ; we will prove that in Corollary III.28.

**Remark III.12.** In the chain of inequalities

$$D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) \leq \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) \leq D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) \quad (\text{III.30})$$

above, both inequalities are equalities when  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$  commute, i.e.,

$$\varrho\sigma = \sigma\varrho \implies D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma), \quad \alpha \in (0, +\infty),$$

as one can easily verify. Hence, in this case we will only use the notation  $D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)$  to denote the unique quantum Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence of  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$ . Note that it also coincides with  $D_\alpha^*(\varrho\|\sigma)$ .

On the other hand, the second inequality in (III.30) is strict whenever  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$  are non-commuting states and  $D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) < +\infty$ ; this follows from [13, Proposition 2.1], taking also into account (III.24) and (III.25) when  $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$ .

Strict inequality in the first inequality in (III.30) was proved in [4, Theorem 6] for  $\alpha \in (1/2, +\infty)$  and non-commuting invertible states. In the next proposition we give a slightly stronger statement, with a proof that is different from the one in [4].

**Proposition III.13.** For any  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ ,

$$D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) \leq \begin{cases} \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma), & \alpha \in (0, 1/2) \cup (1/2, 1), \\ D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma), & \alpha = 1/2. \end{cases} \quad (\text{III.31})$$

Moreover, if one of the following holds, then  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$  commute:

- (i)  $\varrho^0 \leq \sigma^0$  and  $D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$  for some  $\alpha \in (1/2, 1)$ ;
- (ii)  $\varrho^0 \geq \sigma^0$  and  $D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$ ;
- (iii)  $\varrho^0 \leq \sigma^0$  or  $\varrho^0 \geq \sigma^0$ , and  $D_{1/2}^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_{1/2}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ .

*Proof.* The inequality in (III.31) is a special case of the inequalities given in Lemma III.10.

Assume that  $\varrho^0 \leq \sigma^0$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha = 1/2 \quad & \text{and} \quad D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma), \quad \text{or} \\ \alpha \in (1/2, 1) \quad & \text{and} \quad D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_\alpha^*(\varrho\|\sigma), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is due to [11]. According to (III.14), in each case above there exists a measurement  $M_\alpha \in \text{PVM}_1(\mathcal{H})$  such that with the CPTP map

$$\mathcal{M}_\alpha(X) := \sum_{i=1}^{\dim \mathcal{H}} (\text{Tr } M_\alpha X) |i\rangle\langle i|, \quad X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}),$$

where  $(|i\rangle)_{i=1}^{\dim \mathcal{H}}$  is an orthonormal basis in  $\mathbb{C}^{\dim \mathcal{H}}$ , we have

$$D_\alpha(\mathcal{M}_\alpha(\varrho)\|\mathcal{M}_\alpha(\sigma)) = \begin{cases} D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma), & \alpha = 1/2, \\ D_\alpha^*(\varrho\|\sigma), & \alpha \in (1/2, 1). \end{cases}$$

In the case  $\alpha \in (1/2, 1)$ , the results of [24] combined with the above imply that

$$(\mathcal{M}_\alpha)_\sigma^*(\mathcal{M}_\alpha(\varrho)) = \varrho, \quad (\mathcal{M}_\alpha)_\sigma^*(\mathcal{M}_\alpha(\sigma)) = \sigma,$$

where

$$(\mathcal{M}_\alpha)_\sigma^*(Y) := \sigma^{1/2} \mathcal{M}_\alpha^* \left( (\mathcal{M}_\alpha(\sigma))^{-1/2} Y (\mathcal{M}_\alpha(\sigma))^{-1/2} \right) \sigma^{1/2}, \quad Y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^{\dim \mathcal{H}}),$$

is a CPTP map, called the *Petz map* [38]. A double application of the monotonicity of  $D_{1/2}$  under CPTP maps [37] then yields

$$D_{1/2}(\mathcal{M}_\alpha(\varrho) \| \mathcal{M}_\alpha(\sigma)) = D_{1/2}(\varrho \| \sigma).$$

Using a suitable modification of the proof of [39, Lemma 4.1], where the invertibility of the states is replaced with the condition  $D_1^0 \leq D_2^0$  (equivalent to our assumption that  $\varrho^0 \leq \sigma^0$ ), one then obtains that  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$  commute. (See also [16, Sec. 7.2] in a more general setting.)

This completes the proof of the assertion about the equality in (III.31) in the case  $\alpha \in [1/2, 1)$ . The case  $\alpha \in (0, 1/2]$  follows from this immediately due to (III.24) and the identities in Lemma III.9.  $\square$

**Remark III.14.** For  $\alpha = 1/2$  we have  $D_{1/2}^{\text{meas}}(\varrho \| \sigma) = -2 \log F(\varrho, \sigma) = D_{1/2}^*(\varrho \| \sigma) = \overline{D}_{1/2}^{\text{meas}}(\varrho \| \sigma)$ , where  $F(\varrho, \sigma) := \text{Tr}(\varrho^{1/2} \sigma \varrho^{1/2})^{1/2}$  is the *fidelity* of  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$ , the first equality is explained, e.g., in [34, Sec. 9], the second equality is by definition, and the last equality (which is a special case of the equality in (III.28)) follows from the above and the monotonicity of the fidelity under CPTP maps and its multiplicativity under tensor products. In particular,  $D_{1/2}^{\text{meas}}(\varrho \| \sigma) = \overline{D}_{1/2}^{\text{meas}}(\varrho \| \sigma)$  always holds, and does not imply the commutativity of  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$ , which is why the  $\alpha = 1/2$  case is treated separately in Proposition III.13.

**Example III.15.** Let  $\psi, \phi \in \mathcal{H}$  be unit vectors that are neither parallel nor perpendicular. For any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$D_\alpha(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \| |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|) = \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log |\langle\psi, \phi\rangle|^2, \quad (\text{III.32})$$

$$D_\alpha^*(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \| |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|) = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log |\langle\psi, \phi\rangle|^2, \quad (\text{III.33})$$

$$\begin{aligned} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \| |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|) &= D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \| |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|) \\ &= \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \| |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|) = \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \| |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|) = \hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \| |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|) \\ &= \begin{cases} -\log |\langle\psi, \phi\rangle|^2, & \alpha \in (0, 1/2], \\ \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log |\langle\psi, \phi\rangle|^2, & \alpha \in [1/2, 1). \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{III.34})$$

In particular, with  $\Delta_\alpha$  as in Lemma III.9,

$$\begin{aligned} D_\alpha^*(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \| |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|) &= \alpha D_\alpha(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \| |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|) \\ &< (1-\alpha) D_\alpha(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \| |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|) \\ &= \Delta_\alpha(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \| |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|) \\ &< D_\alpha(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \| |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{III.35})$$

for every  $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$ , and

$$\Delta_\alpha(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \| |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|) = D_\alpha^*(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \| |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|) = \alpha D_\alpha(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \| |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|) < D_\alpha(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \| |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|) \quad (\text{III.36})$$

for every  $\alpha \in (1/2, 1)$ .

Indeed, the above are easy to see as follows. First, it follows by a straightforward computation that for any  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ ,

$$D_\alpha^*(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \| \sigma) = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log \langle\psi, \sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \psi\rangle, \quad D_\alpha(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \| \sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \langle\psi, \sigma^{1-\alpha} \psi\rangle,$$

from which the equalities in (III.32) and (III.33) follow immediately.

We have

$$-\log |\langle\psi, \phi\rangle|^2 \leq D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \| |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|), \quad -\log |\langle\psi, \phi\rangle|^2 \leq \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \| |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|), \quad (\text{III.37})$$

where the first inequality follows by choosing the test  $T = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ , and the second inequality by choosing the test sequence  $T_n = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|^{\otimes n}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . For  $\alpha \in (0, 1/2]$  we have

$$\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} D_{1-\alpha}^*(|\phi\rangle\langle\phi| \parallel |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \frac{1-\alpha}{-\alpha} \log |\langle\psi, \phi\rangle|^2 = -\log |\langle\psi, \phi\rangle|^2, \quad (\text{III.38})$$

where the first equality is by (III.28), and the second equality is due to (III.33). Combining (III.37) and (III.38) with the inequalities in Lemma III.10 yields the equalities in (III.34) for  $\alpha \in (0, 1/2]$ , and the equalities for  $\alpha \in [1/2, 1)$  follow from this due to (III.25). The statements in (III.35)–(III.36) are obvious from (III.32)–(III.34).

**Remark III.16.** As it was shown in [4, Theorem 7], for any  $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$  and any non-commuting invertible states  $\varrho, \sigma$ , the strict inequality  $D_\alpha^*(\varrho\|\sigma) < D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$  holds. In view of Example III.15, it is natural to ask whether in this setting we also have  $D_\alpha^*(\varrho\|\sigma) < D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ ,  $D_\alpha^*(\varrho\|\sigma) < \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ , or  $D_\alpha^*(\varrho\|\sigma) < \hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ . It is also a question whether such strict inequalities may be obtained without any conditions on the supports. Note, for instance, that the strict inequalities in Example III.15 are not covered by the results of [4], since the states are not invertible.

**Remark III.17.** It is obvious from the definitions that for any  $\alpha \in (0, +\infty)$ ,  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}$ ,  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}$ , and  $\hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}$  are all monotone non-increasing under the application of the same completely positive trace-preserving (CPTP) map on both of their arguments.

### B. Analysis of $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$

According to (III.22), both versions of the regularized test-measured Rényi divergence are the same and coincide with the sandwiched Rényi divergence for  $\alpha > 1$ , and hence for the rest we focus on the case  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Our key technical result regarding  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$  is the following:

**Theorem III.18.** For any  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  and any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n} \parallel \sigma^{\otimes n}) \quad (\text{III.39})$$

$$= \sup_{r > 0} \min \left\{ r, \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} H_r(\varrho\|\sigma) \right\} \quad (\text{III.40})$$

$$= \sup \left\{ r \geq 0 : H_r(\varrho\|\sigma) \geq \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} r \right\}. \quad (\text{III.41})$$

*Proof.* If  $\varrho \perp \sigma$  then all the terms in (III.39)–(III.41) are equal to  $+\infty$  and the assertion holds trivially. Hence, for the rest we assume that  $\varrho \not\perp \sigma$ . On the other hand, if  $\varrho = \sigma$  then all the terms in (III.39)–(III.41) are equal to 0 and again the assertion holds trivially. Hence, for the rest we also assume that  $\varrho \neq \sigma$ .

Let  $r > 0$  and  $H_r := H_r(\varrho\|\sigma)$ . If  $r < D(\varrho\|\sigma)$  (so that  $H_r > 0$ ), let  $H \in (0, H_r)$ , otherwise let  $H := 0$ . By Lemma II.6, there exists a sequence of tests  $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that

$$\text{Tr} \sigma^{\otimes n} T_n \leq e^{-nr}, \quad \text{Tr} \varrho^{\otimes n} (I - T_n) \leq e^{-nH}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Along any such sequence, and for any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} D_\alpha(\mathcal{T}_n(\varrho^{\otimes n}) \parallel \mathcal{T}_n(\sigma^{\otimes n})) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \left( \underbrace{(\text{Tr} \varrho^{\otimes n} T_n)^\alpha}_{\leq 1} \underbrace{(\text{Tr} \sigma^{\otimes n} T_n)^{1-\alpha}}_{\leq e^{-nr(1-\alpha)}} + \underbrace{(\text{Tr} \varrho^{\otimes n} (I - T_n))^\alpha}_{\leq e^{-nH\alpha}} \underbrace{(\text{Tr} \sigma^{\otimes n} (I - T_n))^{1-\alpha}}_{\leq 1} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \frac{1}{n} \log \left( e^{-nr(1-\alpha)} + e^{-nH\alpha} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \max\{-(1-\alpha)r, -\alpha H\} - \frac{1}{n} \frac{\log 2}{1-\alpha} \\ &= \min \left\{ r, \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} H \right\} - \frac{1}{n} \frac{\log 2}{1-\alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{III.42})$$

In particular,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} D_\alpha (\mathcal{T}_n(\varrho^{\otimes n}) \| \mathcal{T}_n(\sigma^{\otimes n})) \geq \min \left\{ r, \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} H \right\}. \quad (\text{III.43})$$

Thus, for any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \| \sigma) &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n} \| \sigma^{\otimes n}) \\ &\geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n} \| \sigma^{\otimes n}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{III.44})$$

$$\geq \max \left\{ 0, \sup_{0 < r < D_0(\varrho \| \sigma)} \sup_{0 \leq H < H_r} \min \left\{ r, \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} H \right\} \right\} \quad (\text{III.45})$$

$$= \sup_{r > 0} \min \left\{ r, \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} H_r \right\} = \sup \left\{ r \geq 0 : H_r \geq \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} r \right\}, \quad (\text{III.46})$$

where the first equality is by definition, the first inequality is obvious, the second inequality follows by optimizing (III.43) over the choices made at the beginning of the proof, and the rest are obvious due to (II.9). Our aim is to show that the inequalities in (III.44)–(III.46) are in fact equalities.

First, note that by (II.8) we can rewrite (III.46) as

$$\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \| \sigma) \geq \sup_{r > 0} \min \left\{ r, \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} H_r \right\} = \max \left\{ D_0(\varrho \| \sigma), \sup_{r > D_0(\varrho \| \sigma)} \min \left\{ r, \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} H_r \right\} \right\}. \quad (\text{III.47})$$

(Note that the lower bound  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \| \sigma) \geq D_0(\varrho \| \sigma)$  can also be obtained from the definition of  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \| \sigma)$  by choosing the test sequence  $T_n = (\varrho^0)^{\otimes n}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .)

For the rest we fix an  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a test sequence attaining the maximum in (III.21), and let  $(n_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a strictly increasing sequence in  $\mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \| \sigma) = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n_k} D_\alpha (\mathcal{T}_{n_k}(\varrho^{\otimes n_k}) \| \mathcal{T}_{n_k}(\sigma^{\otimes n_k})).$$

For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &(\text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n} T_n)^\alpha (\text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n} T_n)^{1-\alpha} + (\text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n} (I - T_n))^\alpha (\text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n} (I - T_n))^{1-\alpha} \\ &\geq \min \left\{ \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n} T_n, \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n} (I - T_n) \right\}^{1-\alpha} \underbrace{\left( (\text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n} T_n)^\alpha + (\text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n} (I - T_n))^\alpha \right)}_{\geq 1}, \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \| \sigma) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{n_k} \log \min \left\{ \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n_k} T_{n_k}, \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n_k} (I - T_{n_k}) \right\}.$$

Let us define a new test sequence  $\tilde{T}_n := T_n$  if  $\text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n} T_n \leq 1/2$ , and  $\tilde{T}_n := I - T_n$  otherwise. Then

$$\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \| \sigma) = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n_k} D_\alpha \left( \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{n_k}(\varrho^{\otimes n_k}) \| \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{n_k}(\sigma^{\otimes n_k}) \right) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{n_k} \log \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n_k} \tilde{T}_{n_k} =: r. \quad (\text{III.48})$$

Note that  $r < D_0(\varrho \| \sigma)$  is impossible due the lower bound in (III.47). If  $r = D_0(\varrho \| \sigma)$  then (III.47) and (III.48) yield that the inequality in (III.47) is an equality, and hence the inequalities in (III.44)–(III.45) are also equalities, proving the theorem. Hence, for the rest we assume that  $r > D_0(\varrho \| \sigma)$ . By Lemma II.6,

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{n_k} \log \text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n_k} (I - \tilde{T}_{n_k}) \leq H_r. \quad (\text{III.49})$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} D_\alpha \left( \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{n_k}(\varrho^{\otimes n_k}) \| \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{n_k}(\sigma^{\otimes n_k}) \right) &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \left( \left( \text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n_k} (I - \tilde{T}_{n_k}) \right)^\alpha \left( \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n_k} (I - \tilde{T}_{n_k}) \right)^{1-\alpha} \right) \\ &= \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log \text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n_k} (I - \tilde{T}_{n_k}) - \log \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n_k} (I - \tilde{T}_{n_k}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{III.50})$$

By assumption,  $r > 0$ , and hence  $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n_k} (I - \tilde{T}_{n_k}) = 1$ , according to (III.48). Using also (III.49) and (III.50), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \parallel \sigma) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n_k} D_\alpha \left( \tilde{T}_{n_k}(\varrho^{\otimes n_k}) \parallel \tilde{T}_{n_k}(\sigma^{\otimes n_k}) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{n_k} \log \text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n_k} (I - \tilde{T}_{n_k}) \leq \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} H_r. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{III.51})$$

By (III.48) and (III.51),  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \parallel \sigma) \leq \min\{r, \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} H_r\}$ , and thus (III.47) holds as an equality, whence the inequalities in (III.44)–(III.46) hold as equalities.  $\square$

**Remark III.19.** From (III.41) and (III.42) we get immediately that for any  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ , any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , and any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\frac{1}{n} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n} \parallel \sigma^{\otimes n}) + \frac{1}{n} \frac{\log 2}{1-\alpha} \geq \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \parallel \sigma);$$

in particular,

$$D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \parallel \sigma) + \frac{\log 2}{1-\alpha} \geq \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \parallel \sigma).$$

**Remark III.20.** Assume that  $\varrho \neq \sigma$ , so that  $D(\varrho \parallel \sigma) > 0$ , and let  $H_r := H_r(\varrho \parallel \sigma)$ . It is clear from the properties listed in Lemma II.4 that  $H_r/r = +\infty$  for all  $r < D_0(\varrho \parallel \sigma)$ , and  $r \mapsto H_r/r$  is a strictly decreasing continuous function on  $(D_0(\varrho \parallel \sigma), D(\varrho \parallel \sigma))$ , with

$$\lim_{r \nearrow D(\varrho \parallel \sigma)} \frac{H_r}{r} = 0, \quad \lim_{r \searrow D_0(\varrho \parallel \sigma)} \frac{H_r}{r} = \begin{cases} \frac{\psi'(0)}{\psi(0)} + 1, & D_0(\varrho \parallel \sigma) > 0, \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

From this it follows that for any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} < \lim_{r \searrow D_0(\varrho \parallel \sigma)} \frac{H_r}{r}$  there exists a unique  $r_\alpha \in (D_0(\varrho \parallel \sigma), D(\varrho \parallel \sigma))$  such that  $\frac{H_{r_\alpha}}{r_\alpha} = \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}$ , and for this  $r_\alpha$ ,

$$\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \parallel \sigma) = r_\alpha. \quad (\text{III.52})$$

Although (III.52) still involves in fact continuum many optimizations (one for each  $H_r$ ), and the solution of the non-trivial equation  $H_r = \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} r$ , it is still remarkable in the sense that it is single-letter, i.e., does not involve a limit. In particular, numerical computations for small dimensions are feasible.

**Remark III.21.** A different expression for  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \parallel \sigma)$  can be obtained by exploiting a connection with a recently studied hypothesis testing problem in [42]; this yields

$$\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \parallel \sigma) = \alpha \sup_{0 < t < 1} \frac{(t-1)D_t(\varrho \parallel \sigma)}{t(2\alpha-1)-\alpha}, \quad \alpha \in (0, 1). \quad (\text{III.53})$$

We give the details in Appendix A.

The main result of this section is the following:

**Theorem III.22.** Let  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ . For every  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\frac{1}{2} D_\alpha(\varrho \parallel \sigma) \leq \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \parallel \sigma) \leq D_\alpha(\varrho \parallel \sigma). \quad (\text{III.54})$$

Moreover, the following are equivalent:

- (i) The second inequality in (III.54) is strict for every  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .
- (ii) The second inequality in (III.54) is strict for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .
- (iii)  $\frac{1}{n} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n} \parallel \sigma^{\otimes n}) < D_\alpha(\varrho \parallel \sigma)$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- (iv)  $\beta \mapsto D_\beta(\varrho \parallel \sigma)$  and  $\beta \mapsto D_\beta(\sigma \parallel \varrho)$  are strictly increasing on  $(0, 1)$ .

*Proof.* The second inequality in (III.54) was already stated in Lemma III.10. Note that by definition,

$$\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} H_r(\varrho\|\sigma) \geq -r + D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma),$$

for every  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and every  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ . Choosing  $r = D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)/2$  yields, by (III.41), the first inequality in (III.54).

The implications (i) $\implies$ (ii) $\implies$ (iii) are trivial. We prove the implication (iii) $\implies$ (iv) by contraposition. Note that by Lemma III.9,  $\frac{1}{n} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n}\|\sigma^{\otimes n}) < D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  if and only if  $\frac{1}{n} D_{1-\alpha}^{\text{test}}(\sigma^{\otimes n}\|\varrho^{\otimes n}) < D_{1-\alpha}(\sigma\|\varrho)$  for the same  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Hence, the roles of  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$  are symmetric, and therefore we may assume without loss of generality that it is  $\beta \mapsto D_\beta(\varrho\|\sigma)$  that is not strictly increasing on  $(0, 1)$ . Then we can write  $\varrho = \sum_{i=1}^m \kappa s_i P_i$  as in Lemma II.2. It follows immediately that

$$0 = \log \text{Tr } \varrho = \log \kappa + \log \sum_{i=1}^m s_i \text{Tr } P_i = \log \kappa + \log \text{Tr } \varrho^0 \sigma,$$

and for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , the test  $T_n := (\varrho^0)^{\otimes n}$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} D_\alpha(\mathcal{T}_n(\varrho^{\otimes n})\|\mathcal{T}_n(\sigma^{\otimes n})) &= \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \left( (\text{Tr}(\varrho^0)^{\otimes n} \varrho^{\otimes n})^\alpha (\text{Tr}(\varrho^0)^{\otimes n} \sigma^{\otimes n})^{1-\alpha} \right) \\ &= -n \log \text{Tr } \varrho^0 \sigma = n \log \kappa = n D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\frac{1}{n} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n}\|\sigma^{\otimes n}) = D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)$  for every  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , as required.

Finally, we assume (iv) and prove (i). Note that the assumption that  $\beta \mapsto D_\beta(\varrho\|\sigma)$  is strictly increasing on  $(0, 1)$  is in fact equivalent to the strict inequality  $D_0(\varrho\|\sigma) < D_\beta(\varrho\|\sigma)$  for all (equivalently, some)  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ ; see Lemma II.2. Note that it also implies that  $\varrho \neq \sigma$ , whence

$$D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) > 0, \quad \alpha \in (0, 1);$$

see Remark III.11. Let us fix an  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . By Lemma II.4,  $r \mapsto H_r(\varrho\|\sigma) - \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} r$  is a finite-valued convex, and hence continuous, function on the non-trivial interval  $[D_0(\varrho\|\sigma), D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)]$ . Hence, by (III.41) in Theorem III.18, to prove the strict inequality  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) < D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)$ , we only need to show that

$$H_r(\varrho\|\sigma) - \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} r < 0 \tag{III.55}$$

for  $r = D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)$ . By (II.6), this is equivalent to

$$\sup_{\beta \in (0, 1)} \frac{\beta-1}{\beta} [D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) - D_\beta(\varrho\|\sigma)] < \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma).$$

Since  $\beta \mapsto D_\beta(\varrho\|\sigma)$  is monotone increasing, it is sufficient to prove that

$$\sup_{\beta \in [\alpha, 1)} \frac{\beta-1}{\beta} [D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) - D_\beta(\varrho\|\sigma)] < \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma),$$

or equivalently, that

$$\inf_{\beta \in [\alpha, 1)} \left\{ \underbrace{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) - \frac{\beta-1}{\beta} [D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) - D_\beta(\varrho\|\sigma)]}_{=: g(\beta)} \right\} > 0. \tag{III.56}$$

For any  $\beta \in [\alpha, 1)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(\beta) &= \underbrace{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)}_{=D_{1-\alpha}(\sigma\|\varrho)} + \frac{1-\beta}{\beta} D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) - \underbrace{\frac{1-\beta}{\beta} D_\beta(\varrho\|\sigma)}_{=D_{1-\beta}(\sigma\|\varrho)} \\ &= \underbrace{\frac{1-\beta}{\beta} D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)}_{>0} + \underbrace{D_{1-\alpha}(\sigma\|\varrho) - D_{1-\beta}(\sigma\|\varrho)}_{\geq 0} \\ &> 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the equality in the second line is by (III.24). Moreover,

$$g(1) := \lim_{\beta \nearrow 1} g(\beta) = D_{1-\alpha}(\sigma \| \varrho) - D_0(\sigma \| \varrho) > 0,$$

where the strict inequality follows by the assumption on  $\beta \mapsto D_\beta(\sigma \| \varrho)$ . Hence,  $g$  is a strictly positive continuous function on the compact interval  $[\alpha, 1]$ , and therefore (III.56) holds.  $\square$

A trivial reformulation of the above gives the following:

**Corollary III.23.** Let  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  with spectral decompositions  $\varrho = \sum_{i=1}^r r_i P_i$ ,  $\sigma = \sum_{i=1}^m s_i Q_i$ . The following are equivalent:

- (i)  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \| \sigma) = D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma)$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .
- (ii)  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \| \sigma) = D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma)$  for every  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .
- (iii)  $\frac{1}{n} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n} \| \sigma^{\otimes n}) = D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma)$  for every  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- (iv) One of the following two conditions is satisfied: a) there exist a number  $\kappa > 0$  and projections  $P'_i \leq Q_i$ ,  $i \in [m]$ , such that  $\varrho = \sum_{i=1}^m \kappa s_i P'_i$ , or b) there exist a number  $\eta > 0$  and projections  $Q'_i \leq P_i$ ,  $i \in [r]$ , such that  $\sigma = \sum_{i=1}^r \eta r_i Q'_i$ .

Moreover, if any (and hence all) of the above holds then

$$\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \| \sigma) = \hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \| \sigma) = D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma), \quad \alpha \in (0, 1). \quad (\text{III.57})$$

*Proof.* Since the above points are just the negations of the corresponding points in Theorem III.22, their equivalence is immediate from Theorem III.22 (in the last point we also use Lemma II.2). The equalities in (III.57) are immediate from the above and the inequalities in Lemma III.10.  $\square$

**Remark III.24.** Note that the first inequality in (III.54) can also be obtained from (III.53) by putting  $t = \alpha$  instead of the optimization over  $t$ .

**Remark III.25.** Combining the first inequality in (III.54) with the inequalities in Lemma III.10 yields

$$\frac{1}{2} D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma) \leq \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho \| \sigma), \quad \alpha \in (0, 1).$$

Taking into account (III.28) and (III.24), the above is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{2} D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma) \leq D_\alpha^*(\varrho \| \sigma), \quad \alpha \in [1/2, 1). \quad (\text{III.58})$$

This is a non-trivial inequality between the standard and the sandwiched Rényi divergences. However, it was shown in [21, Corollary 2.3] that  $\alpha D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma) \leq D_\alpha^*(\varrho \| \sigma)$  for  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ , which gives a stronger inequality than (III.58) when  $\alpha \in (1/2, 1)$ .

**Remark III.26.** Assume that  $D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma) = D_0(\varrho \| \sigma) > 0$ ,  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ; in particular,  $\beta \mapsto D_\beta(\varrho \| \sigma)$  is constant, while  $\beta \mapsto D_\beta(\sigma \| \varrho) = \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} D_0(\varrho \| \sigma)$  is strictly increasing on  $(0, 1)$  (see (III.24) for the equality). Then

$$H_r(\varrho \| \sigma) = \begin{cases} +\infty, & r < D_0(\varrho \| \sigma), \\ 0, & r \geq D_0(\varrho \| \sigma), \end{cases}$$

and thus, by Theorem III.18,  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \| \sigma) = D_0(\varrho \| \sigma) = D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma)$ ,  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . On the other hand,  $H_{D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma)}(\varrho \| \sigma) = H_{D_0(\varrho \| \sigma)}(\varrho \| \sigma) = 0 < \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma)$  for all  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Hence, (III.55) and the strict increasing of  $\beta \mapsto D_\beta(\sigma \| \varrho)$  are not sufficient to conclude  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\sigma \| \varrho) < D_\alpha(\sigma \| \varrho)$ ,  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , in the proof of (iv)  $\implies$  (i) in Theorem III.22.

**Remark III.27.** Related to the above remark, assume that  $0 < D_0(\varrho\|\sigma)$ . Then, by (II.10) and Theorem III.18, we get that for a given  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_0(\varrho\|\sigma) &\iff \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} D_0(\varrho\|\sigma) \geq H_{D_0(\varrho\|\sigma)}(\varrho\|\sigma) = -\psi(0) - \psi'(0) \\ &\iff \alpha \leq \frac{\psi(0)}{\psi'(0) + 2\psi(0)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{III.59})$$

In particular, if  $\beta \mapsto D_\beta(\varrho\|\sigma)$  is strictly increasing, then  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_0(\varrho\|\sigma) < D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)$  for every  $\alpha$  as in (III.59).

We close this section with a few further corollaries of Theorems III.18 and III.22.

**Corollary III.28.**  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}$  is strictly positive for all  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  in the sense that  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) \geq 0$  for all  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ , with equality if and only if  $\varrho = \sigma$ .

*Proof.* Immediate from Theorem III.22 and the strict positivity of  $D_\alpha$  (see Remark III.11).  $\square$

**Corollary III.29.**  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}$  is *weakly additive* in the sense that

$$\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes k}\|\sigma^{\otimes k}) = k\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

*Proof.* Immediate from (III.39).  $\square$

**Corollary III.30.** For any states  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  and any  $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) \geq \frac{\alpha(1-\beta)}{\alpha - 2\alpha\beta + \beta} D_\beta(\varrho\|\sigma). \quad (\text{III.60})$$

*Proof.* Since  $D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) \geq \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ , Theorem III.18 gives

$$\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) \geq H_{D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)}(\varrho\|\sigma) \geq \frac{\beta-1}{\beta} [D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) - D_\beta(\varrho\|\sigma)], \quad (\text{III.61})$$

where the second inequality is obvious by definition. Multiplying by  $\alpha\beta$ , and noting that  $(\alpha + \beta)/2 \geq \sqrt{\alpha\beta} > \alpha\beta$ , so that division by  $\alpha - 2\alpha\beta + \beta$  does not change the direction of the inequality, we get (III.60) from (III.61) by a simple rearrangement.  $\square$

The *Chernoff divergence* of  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$  is defined as

$$C(\varrho\|\sigma) := - \min_{0 \leq \alpha \leq 1} \log \text{Tr } \varrho^\alpha \sigma^{1-\alpha} = - \min_{0 \leq \alpha \leq 1} \psi(\alpha).$$

It is not too difficult to see from its operational interpretation in hypothesis testing [2, 35] that

$$H_r(\varrho\|\sigma) = r \iff r = C(\varrho\|\sigma). \quad (\text{III.62})$$

**Corollary III.31.** For any  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ ,

$$\overline{D}_{1/2}^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = C(\varrho\|\sigma).$$

*Proof.* Immediate from Theorem III.18 and (III.62). Alternatively, it follows from the operational interpretation of the Chernoff divergence [2, 35] and Proposition A.1, or directly from (III.53).  $\square$

Recall from (III.22) that the regularized measured and the regularized test-measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergences all coincide for  $\alpha \geq 1$  and, moreover, for  $\alpha = 1$  they all yield the Umegaki relative entropy. In the following proposition we will use the *max-relative entropy* [7, 41] of two states  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$ , defined as

$$D_{\max}(\varrho\|\sigma) := \begin{cases} \log \min\{\lambda \geq 0 : \varrho \leq \lambda\sigma\}, & \varrho^0 \leq \sigma^0, \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$



**Proposition III.32.** For  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ , let  $\Delta_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)$  denote any of the (regularized) measured or test-measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergences, as in Lemma III.9. Then  $\Delta_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)$  is increasing in  $\alpha \in (0, +\infty)$ , and

- (i)  $\lim_{\alpha \searrow 0} \Delta_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_0(\varrho\|\sigma)$ ;
- (ii)  $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ ;
- (iii)  $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ ;
- (iv)  $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} \hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D(\varrho\|\sigma)$ ;
- (v)  $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow +\infty} \Delta_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_{\max}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ .

*Proof.* Monotonicity in  $\alpha$  is obvious from the monotonicity of the classical Rényi divergences in  $\alpha$ ; see, e.g., Lemma II.2.

(i): With the test  $T := \varrho^0$  we have

$$D_0(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_0(\mathcal{T}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{T}(\sigma)) = \lim_{\alpha \searrow 0} D_\alpha(\mathcal{T}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{T}(\sigma)) \leq \lim_{\alpha \searrow 0} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma),$$

where the first equality is straightforward to verify, and the second equality and the inequality are by definition. The assertion then follows from this and the inequalities in Lemma III.10, except when  $\Delta_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) = \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ , in which case it follows immediately from (III.54).

(ii) and (iii): We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) &= \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \sup_{T \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{H})} D_\alpha(\mathcal{T}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{T}(\sigma)) \\ &= \sup_{T \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{H})} \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} D_\alpha(\mathcal{T}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{T}(\sigma)) \\ &= \sup_{T \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{H})} D(\mathcal{T}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{T}(\sigma)) \\ &= D^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma), \end{aligned}$$

which gives  $\lim_{\alpha \nearrow 1} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ . An analogous argument gives  $\lim_{\alpha \nearrow 1} D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ .

If  $\varrho^0 \not\leq \sigma^0$  then  $\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = +\infty = D^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$  and  $\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = +\infty = D^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$  hold trivially, and hence for the rest we assume  $\varrho^0 \leq \sigma^0$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) &= \inf_{\alpha > 1} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) \\ &= \inf_{\alpha > 1} \sup_{T \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{H})} D_\alpha(\mathcal{T}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{T}(\sigma)) \\ &= \sup_{T \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{H})} \inf_{\alpha > 1} D_\alpha(\mathcal{T}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{T}(\sigma)) \\ &= \sup_{T \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{H})} D(\mathcal{T}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{T}(\sigma)) \\ &= D^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma), \end{aligned}$$

where the third equality can be seen from the minimax theorem in [27, Corollary A.2], since  $T \mapsto D_\alpha(\mathcal{T}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{T}(\sigma))$  is continuous on the compact space  $\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{H})$ . An analogous argument gives that  $\lim_{\alpha \searrow 1} D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ , using (III.14) and the continuity of  $M \mapsto D_\alpha(\mathcal{M}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{M}(\sigma))$  on the compact space  $\text{PVM}_1(\mathcal{H})$ .

(iv): By (III.22) and Lemmas II.2 and III.10, it suffices to prove that  $\lim_{\alpha \nearrow 1} \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) \geq D(\varrho\|\sigma)$ . Since this holds trivially when  $\varrho = \sigma$ , for the rest we assume that  $\varrho \neq \sigma$ , or equivalently, that  $D(\varrho\|\sigma) > 0$ . Note that  $H_r(\varrho\|\sigma)/r > 0 \iff r \in (0, D(\varrho\|\sigma))$ , according to (II.9), and hence for a given  $r \in (0, +\infty)$ , there exists an  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  such that  $H_r(\varrho\|\sigma)/r \geq (1 - \alpha)/\alpha$  if and only if  $r \in (0, D(\varrho\|\sigma))$ . Using then Theorem III.18 we get

$$\lim_{\alpha \nearrow 1} \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \sup \left\{ r : \frac{H_r(\varrho\|\sigma)}{r} \geq \frac{1 - \alpha}{\alpha} \right\} = D(\varrho\|\sigma),$$

where the first equality is trivial from the previously stated monotonicity in  $\alpha$ .

(v): The assertion is trivial when  $\varrho^0 \not\leq \sigma^0$ , so for the rest we assume that  $\varrho^0 \leq \sigma^0$ . If  $\lambda > 0$  is such that  $\varrho \leq \lambda\sigma$  then  $\Delta_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) \leq \lambda$  is easy to see for every  $\alpha > 1$ , which implies

$$\Delta_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) \leq D_{\max}(\varrho\|\sigma), \quad \alpha > 1. \quad (\text{III.63})$$

It is easy to verify that

$$D_{\max}(\varrho\|\sigma) = \log \max \left\{ \frac{\text{Tr } \varrho T}{\text{Tr } \sigma T} : T \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{H}), \text{Tr } \sigma T > 0 \right\}; \quad (\text{III.64})$$

see, e.g., [26, Corollary III.45]. Choosing a  $T$  that attains the maximum in (III.64) gives that

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow +\infty} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) \geq \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow +\infty} D_\alpha(\mathcal{T}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{T}(\sigma)) = \log \frac{\text{Tr } \varrho T}{\text{Tr } \sigma T} = D_{\max}(\varrho\|\sigma). \quad (\text{III.65})$$

Choosing for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  the test  $T_n := T^{\otimes n}$  with the above  $T$  yields for every  $\alpha > 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n}\|\sigma^{\otimes n}) &\geq \frac{1}{n} \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \left( (\text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n} T_n)^\alpha (\text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n} T_n)^{1-\alpha} \right) \\ &= \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log \frac{\text{Tr } \varrho T}{\text{Tr } \sigma T} + \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \text{Tr } \sigma T \\ &= \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} D_{\max}(\varrho\|\sigma) + \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \text{Tr } \sigma T. \end{aligned}$$

Taking first the limit  $n \rightarrow +\infty$  and then the limit  $\alpha \rightarrow +\infty$ , we get

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow +\infty} \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) \geq D_{\max}(\varrho\|\sigma). \quad (\text{III.66})$$

Combining the lower and the upper bounds in (III.63)–(III.66) with the inequalities in Lemma III.10 gives the desired statement.  $\square$

**Remark III.33.** An alternative proof for  $\lim_{\alpha \nearrow 1} \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D(\varrho\|\sigma)$ , given in (iv) of Proposition III.32, can be obtained from (III.53), or more precisely, from [42, Lemma 2]; our case corresponds to  $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0}$  in the latter. In detail,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\alpha \nearrow 1} \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) &= \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) \\ &= \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \sup_{t \in (0,1)} \frac{(t-1)D_t(\varrho\|\sigma)}{t(2-1/\alpha)-1} \\ &= \sup_{t \in (0,1)} \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{(t-1)D_t(\varrho\|\sigma)}{t(2-1/\alpha)-1} \\ &= \sup_{t \in (0,1)} D_t(\varrho\|\sigma) = D(\varrho\|\sigma), \end{aligned}$$

which from the second equality is the same proof as in [42, Lemma 2].

**Remark III.34.** It is known that

$$D_\infty^*(\varrho\|\sigma) := \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow +\infty} D_\alpha^*(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_{\max}(\varrho\|\sigma) \quad (\text{III.67})$$

for any pair of states  $\varrho, \sigma$ ; see [31, Theorem 5] or [45, Sec. 4.2.4]. This of course also implies that  $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow +\infty} \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow +\infty} \hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow +\infty} \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_{\max}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ , if we use the identities in (III.22); however, in the proof of Proposition III.32 (v) above, we did not rely on these.

Vice versa, we can get a new proof of (III.67) from Proposition III.32 (v) by only using the monotonicity of  $D_\alpha^*$  under CPTP maps for  $\alpha > 1$  as follows. First, it is straightforward to verify that  $D_\alpha^*(\varrho\|\sigma) \leq D_{\max}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ . Second, using monotonicity gives  $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow +\infty} D_\alpha^*(\varrho\|\sigma) \geq \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow +\infty} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_{\max}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ , where the equality is due to Proposition III.32 (v).

### C. Analysis of $\hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}$

Our goal in this section is to show that the strict inequality  $\hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) < \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$  can hold for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ; in fact, we show that this is the case for any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  whenever  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$  are commuting states (and hence  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)$ ), that are not equal and have the same supports. Interestingly, we will derive this from the strict inequality  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) < D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)$ , (established in Theorem III.22) which might seem a bit counter-intuitive at first sight, since  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) \leq \hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ ; moreover, this last inequality might be strict, as we show below. The key to go from the strict upper bound on  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}$  to the strict upper bound on  $\hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}$  is a simple observation, given in the following two lemmas:

**Lemma III.35.** If  $\frac{1}{n}D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n}\|\sigma^{\otimes n}) < \hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$  for all  $n$ , then  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = \hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ ; or equivalently, if  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) < \hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$  then there exists an  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\frac{1}{n}D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n}\|\sigma^{\otimes n}) = \hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ .

*Proof.* If  $\frac{1}{n}D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n}\|\sigma^{\otimes n}) < \hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$  for all  $n$ , then there exists a strictly increasing function  $k : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{k(n)} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes k(n)}\|\sigma^{\otimes k(n)}) \leq \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma),$$

where the inequality is by definition. Since  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) \leq \hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$  is obvious, the statement follows.  $\square$

**Lemma III.36.** If  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  are such that

- (i)  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) < \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ ;
- (ii)  $\frac{1}{n}D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n}\|\sigma^{\otimes n}) < \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

then  $\hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) < \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ .

*Proof.* Assume that  $\hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ . Then, by (ii) above,  $\frac{1}{n}D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n}\|\sigma^{\otimes n}) < \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = \hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$  for all  $n$ , i.e., the assumption in Lemma III.35 holds, and therefore  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = \hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ , contradicting (i).  $\square$

We have seen in Theorem III.22 that (i) in Lemma III.36 holds for generic commuting pairs, and hence for the rest we focus on finite-copy bounds as in (ii) of Lemma III.36. First, we consider the case where equality holds in (III.17).

**Lemma III.37.** Let  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . If  $D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$  holds, then for any projection  $P = T$  attaining the maximum in (III.19), we have

$$(\text{Tr } \sigma P) P \varrho P = (\text{Tr } \varrho P) P \sigma P, \quad (\text{Tr } \sigma P^\perp) P^\perp \varrho P^\perp = (\text{Tr } \varrho P^\perp) P^\perp \sigma P^\perp. \quad (\text{III.68})$$

If, moreover,  $\varrho \neq \sigma$  then  $\varrho^0 \leq \sigma^0$  implies  $P \sigma P \neq 0$ ,  $P^\perp \sigma P^\perp \neq 0$ , and  $\varrho^0 \geq \sigma^0$  implies  $P \varrho P \neq 0$ ,  $P^\perp \varrho P^\perp \neq 0$ .

*Proof.* Assume that  $D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$  holds, and let  $P = T$  be a projection attaining the maximum in (III.19). Let  $(e_i)_{i=1}^r$  be an orthonormal basis in  $\text{ran } P$ , and  $(e_i)_{i=r+1}^d$  be an orthonormal basis in  $\text{ran } P^\perp$ . By Hölder's inequality,

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \langle e_i, \varrho e_i \rangle^\alpha \langle e_i, \sigma e_i \rangle^{1-\alpha} \leq \left( \sum_{i=1}^r \langle e_i, \varrho e_i \rangle \right)^\alpha \left( \sum_{i=1}^r \langle e_i, \sigma e_i \rangle \right)^{1-\alpha} = (\text{Tr } \varrho P)^\alpha (\text{Tr } \sigma P)^{1-\alpha}, \quad (\text{III.69})$$

$$\sum_{i=r+1}^d \langle e_i, \varrho e_i \rangle^\alpha \langle e_i, \sigma e_i \rangle^{1-\alpha} \leq \left( \sum_{i=r+1}^d \langle e_i, \varrho e_i \rangle \right)^\alpha \left( \sum_{i=r+1}^d \langle e_i, \sigma e_i \rangle \right)^{1-\alpha} = (\text{Tr } \varrho P^\perp)^\alpha (\text{Tr } \sigma P^\perp)^{1-\alpha}. \quad (\text{III.70})$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{\alpha}^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma) &\geq \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \sum_{i=1}^d \langle e_i, \varrho e_i \rangle^{\alpha} \langle e_i, \sigma e_i \rangle^{1-\alpha} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log ((\text{Tr } \varrho P)^{\alpha} (\text{Tr } \sigma P)^{1-\alpha} + (\text{Tr } \varrho P^{\perp})^{\alpha} (\text{Tr } \sigma P^{\perp})^{1-\alpha}) \\
&= D_{\alpha}^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is by definition, and the second one follows from (III.69)–(III.70). Therefore, the assumed equality implies that the inequalities in (III.69)–(III.70) hold as equalities. Using the characterization of equality in Hölder's inequality, we get

$$(\text{Tr } \sigma P) \langle e_i, \varrho e_i \rangle = (\text{Tr } \varrho P) \langle e_i, \sigma e_i \rangle, \quad i \in [r], \quad (\text{III.71})$$

and similarly for  $P^{\perp}$  in place of  $P$  and  $i = r+1, \dots, d$ . Since (III.71) holds for every orthonormal basis in  $\text{ran } P$ , and any unit vector  $\psi \in \text{ran } P$  can be extended to such an orthonormal basis, we get that

$$(\text{Tr } \sigma P) \langle \psi, \varrho \psi \rangle = (\text{Tr } \varrho P) \langle \psi, \sigma \psi \rangle, \quad \psi \in \text{ran } P,$$

or equivalently,

$$\langle \psi, [(\text{Tr } \sigma P) P \varrho P - (\text{Tr } \varrho P) P \sigma P] \psi \rangle = 0, \quad \psi \in \mathcal{H},$$

and similarly with  $P^{\perp}$  in place of  $P$ , which is exactly (III.68).

Consider now the case  $\varrho \neq \sigma$  and  $\varrho^0 \leq \sigma^0$ . Assume that  $P \sigma P = 0$ , or equivalently,  $\sigma^0 \leq P^{\perp}$ . Then we also have  $\varrho^0 \leq P^{\perp}$ , and

$$D_{\alpha}^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_{\alpha}(\mathcal{P}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{P}(\sigma)) = \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \underbrace{(\text{Tr } \varrho P^{\perp})^{\alpha}}_{=1} \underbrace{(\text{Tr } \sigma P^{\perp})^{1-\alpha}}_{=1} = 0 < D_{\alpha}^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma),$$

where  $\mathcal{P}$  is defined analogously to  $\mathcal{T}$  in (III.16), and the last inequality is due to the strict positivity of  $D_{\alpha}^{\text{test}}$  given in Lemma III.5. This is a contradiction, and hence  $P \sigma P = 0$  cannot hold. Replacing  $P$  with  $P^{\perp}$  in the same argument gives that  $P^{\perp} \sigma P^{\perp} = 0$  cannot hold, either. The assertion about the case  $\varrho^0 \geq \sigma^0$  follows in the same way.  $\square$

**Corollary III.38.** Assume that  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  commute, and hence can be written as in (II.1). Then the following are equivalent:

- (i)  $D_{\alpha}^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_{\alpha}(\varrho\|\sigma)$  for all  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ;
- (ii)  $D_{\alpha}^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_{\alpha}(\varrho\|\sigma)$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ;
- (iii) there exists a subset  $\Omega_0 \subseteq \Omega$  such that

$$\sigma(\Omega_0) \varrho(\omega) = \varrho(\Omega_0) \sigma(\omega), \quad \omega \in \Omega_0, \quad \sigma(\Omega_1) \varrho(\omega) = \varrho(\Omega_1) \sigma(\omega), \quad \omega \in \Omega_1, \quad (\text{III.72})$$

where  $\Omega_1 := \Omega \setminus \Omega_0$ , and  $\sigma(\Omega_0) := \sum_{\omega \in \Omega_0} \sigma(\omega)$ , etc.

Moreover, if any (and hence all) of the above holds then

$$D_{\alpha}^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = \hat{D}_{\alpha}^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_{\alpha}(\varrho\|\sigma), \quad \alpha \in (0, 1).$$

*Proof.* The implication (i)  $\implies$  (ii) is obvious. By Remark III.2, an optimal projective test  $P$  as in Lemma III.37 can be written as  $P = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega_0} |\omega\rangle\langle\omega|$  for some  $\Omega_0 \subseteq \Omega$ , and (ii)  $\implies$  (iii) follows from Lemma III.37.

Assume now that (iii) holds, and let  $P := \sum_{\omega \in \Omega_0} |\omega\rangle\langle\omega|$ . A straightforward computation yields that for any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$D_{\alpha}(\mathcal{P}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{P}(\sigma)) = \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log (\varrho(\Omega_0)^{\alpha} \sigma(\Omega_0)^{1-\alpha} + \varrho(\Omega_1)^{\alpha} \sigma(\Omega_1)^{1-\alpha}) = D_{\alpha}(\varrho\|\sigma),$$

whence  $D_{\alpha}^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_{\alpha}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ . Thus, (i) holds.

The last assertion is immediate from the above and the inequalities  $D_{\alpha}^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) \leq \hat{D}_{\alpha}^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) \leq D_{\alpha}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ ,  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .  $\square$

Corollaries III.38 and III.23 yield immediately that  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$  and  $\hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$  need not be equal in general:

**Theorem III.39.** Let  $\varrho = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \varrho(\omega) |\omega\rangle\langle\omega|$  and  $\sigma = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \sigma(\omega) |\omega\rangle\langle\omega|$  be unequal commuting states, and assume that (III.72) holds with  $\varrho(\Omega_k) \neq 0$ ,  $\sigma(\Omega_k) \neq 0$ ,  $k = 0, 1$ . Then

$$\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) < \hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma), \quad \alpha \in (0, 1). \quad (\text{III.73})$$

In particular, this is the case for unequal commuting qubit states with full support.

*Proof.* The equality in (III.73) is immediate from Corollary III.38. Note that  $\frac{\varrho(\Omega_0)}{\sigma(\Omega_0)} \neq \frac{\varrho(\Omega_1)}{\sigma(\Omega_1)}$ , since otherwise (III.72) would imply  $\varrho = \sigma$ , contrary to the assumption. Thus, by (III.72), neither a) nor b) in (iv) of Corollary III.23 hold, whence  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) < D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)$ ,  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . The last assertion about qubit states is obvious.  $\square$

Finally, we show (in Theorem III.43 below) that (III.72) is not only sufficient but also necessary for the equality  $\hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)$  in the case of generic commuting states, thereby giving a complete and practically verifiable condition for this equality for such pairs of states. To this end, we first prove the following two lemmas:

**Lemma III.40.** For any  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ ,

$$D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) \leq \begin{cases} \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma), & \alpha \in (0, 1/2) \cup (1/2, 1), \\ D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma), & \alpha = 1/2. \end{cases} \quad (\text{III.74})$$

Moreover, if  $\varrho^0 \leq \sigma^0$  and equality holds above for some  $\alpha \in [1/2, 1)$ , or  $\varrho^0 \geq \sigma^0$  and equality holds above for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1/2]$ , then  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$  commute (whence they can be written as in (II.1)), and (iii) of Corollary III.38 holds.

*Proof.* The inequality and the statement about the case of equality follows immediately from Proposition III.13 and the obvious inequality  $D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) \leq D_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ . In particular, equality in (III.74) under the stated assumptions yields that  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$  commute, and (ii) of Corollary III.38 holds, whence (iii) of the same corollary holds as well.  $\square$

**Lemma III.41.** Let  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  be unequal states with  $\varrho^0 = \sigma^0$ . For every  $n \geq 2$ ,

$$\frac{1}{n} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n} \|\sigma^{\otimes n}) < \begin{cases} \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma), & \alpha \in (0, 1/2) \cup (1/2, 1), \\ D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma), & \alpha = 1/2. \end{cases} \quad (\text{III.75})$$

*Proof.* Assume that equality holds in (III.75) for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Then, by Lemma III.40,  $\varrho^{\otimes n}$  and  $\sigma^{\otimes n}$  commute. This of course implies that  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$  commute, and hence they can be written as in (II.1). Moreover, still by Lemma III.40, there exists a subset  $\Omega_{n,0} \subseteq \Omega^n$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho^{\otimes n}(\underline{\omega}) &= c_{n,0} \sigma^{\otimes n}(\underline{\omega}), & \underline{\omega} \in \Omega_{n,0}, \\ \varrho^{\otimes n}(\underline{\omega}) &= c_{n,1} \sigma^{\otimes n}(\underline{\omega}), & \underline{\omega} \in \Omega_{n,1}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Omega_{n,1} := \Omega^n \setminus \Omega_{n,0}$ , and  $c_{n,0} := \varrho^{\otimes n}(\Omega_{n,0}) / \sigma^{\otimes n}(\Omega_{n,0})$ ,  $c_{n,1} := \varrho^{\otimes n}(\Omega_{n,1}) / \sigma^{\otimes n}(\Omega_{n,1})$  are strictly positive constants. This is equivalent to

$$\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \tau_{n,\underline{\omega}}(\omega) \log \frac{\varrho(\omega)}{\sigma(\omega)} = \frac{1}{n} \log c_{n,0} =: \tilde{c}_{n,0}, \quad \underline{\omega} \in \Omega_{n,0}, \quad (\text{III.76})$$

$$\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \tau_{n,\underline{\omega}}(\omega) \log \frac{\varrho(\omega)}{\sigma(\omega)} = \frac{1}{n} \log c_{n,1} =: \tilde{c}_{n,1}, \quad \underline{\omega} \in \Omega_{n,1}, \quad (\text{III.77})$$

where  $\tau_{n,\underline{\omega}}$  is the type of  $\underline{\omega}$ , i.e.,  $\tau_{n,\underline{\omega}}(\gamma) := \frac{1}{n} \#\{k \in [n] : \omega_k = \gamma\}$ ,  $\gamma \in \Omega$ . In particular,  $\{\tau_{n,\underline{\omega}} : \underline{\omega} \in \Omega_{n,0}\}$  is in the intersection of the probability simplex with a hyperplane with normal vector  $\left(\log \frac{\varrho(\omega)}{\sigma(\omega)}\right)_{\omega \in \Omega}$ , and  $\{\tau_{n,\underline{\omega}} : \underline{\omega} \in \Omega_{n,1}\}$  is in the intersection of the probability simplex with a translate of that hyperplane. Obviously, the two hyperplanes are different, i.e.,  $c_{n,0} \neq c_{n,1}$ , since the opposite would yield that  $\varrho = \sigma$ .

Since  $\tau_{n,\underline{\omega}}$  is the Dirac probability density function  $\mathbf{1}_{\{\omega\}}$  when  $\underline{\omega} = (\omega, \dots, \omega)$  for some  $\omega \in \Omega$ , we get

$$\log \frac{\varrho(\omega)}{\sigma(\omega)} = \tilde{c}_{n,0}, \quad (\omega, \dots, \omega) \in \Omega_{n,0}, \quad \log \frac{\varrho(\omega)}{\sigma(\omega)} = \tilde{c}_{n,1}, \quad (\omega, \dots, \omega) \in \Omega_{n,1}.$$

Combining this with (III.76)–(III.77), we get that for any sequence  $\underline{\omega} \in \Omega^n$ ,

$$\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \tau_{n,\underline{\omega}}(\omega) \log \frac{\varrho(\omega)}{\sigma(\omega)} = \frac{k}{n} \tilde{c}_{n,0} + \frac{n-k}{n} \tilde{c}_{n,1}, \quad (\text{III.78})$$

where  $k := \#\{j \in [n] : (\omega_j, \dots, \omega_j) \in \Omega_{n,0}\}$ . If  $n > 1$  then there exist sequences  $\underline{\omega}$  containing elements from both  $\Omega_{n,0}$  and  $\Omega_{n,1}$ , whence the RHS of (III.78) is strictly between  $\tilde{c}_{n,0}$  and  $\tilde{c}_{n,1}$ . By (III.76)–(III.77), this means that  $\underline{\omega}$  is neither in  $\Omega_{n,0}$  nor in  $\Omega_{n,1} = \Omega^n \setminus \Omega_{n,0}$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Remark III.42.** Note that the support condition in Lemma III.41 cannot be weakened to  $\varrho^0 \leq \sigma^0$  in general. Indeed, if  $\sigma = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \sigma(\omega) |\omega\rangle\langle\omega|$  and  $\varrho = \kappa \sum_{\omega \in \Omega_0} \sigma(\omega) |\omega\rangle\langle\omega|$  are commuting states, where  $\Omega_0 \subseteq \Omega$  and  $\kappa \in (0, +\infty)$ , then it is easy to see that  $\frac{1}{n} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n} \| \sigma^{\otimes n}) = D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma)$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\alpha \in (0, +\infty)$ .

**Theorem III.43.** Let  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$  be unequal states with  $\varrho^0 = \sigma^0$ , such that they are commuting, and hence can be jointly diagonalized as  $\varrho = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \varrho(\omega) |\omega\rangle\langle\omega|$  and  $\sigma = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \sigma(\omega) |\omega\rangle\langle\omega|$  as in (II.1). Then the following are equivalent:

- (i)  $\hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \| \sigma) = D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma)$  for every/some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ;
- (ii)  $D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \| \sigma) = D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma)$  for every/some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ;
- (iii) there exist some  $\Omega_0 \subseteq \Omega$  and strictly positive constants  $c_0, c_1$  such that

$$\varrho(\omega) = c_0 \sigma(\omega), \quad \omega \in \Omega_0, \quad \varrho(\omega) = c_1 \sigma(\omega), \quad \omega \in \Omega \setminus \Omega_0.$$

In particular, if (iii) is not satisfied then  $\hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \| \sigma) < D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma)$  for every  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .

*Proof.* The equivalence (ii)  $\iff$  (iii) follows from Corollary III.38, and the implication (ii)  $\implies$  (i) is obvious from the inequalities in Lemma III.10.

We prove (i)  $\implies$  (iii) by contraposition. Assume that (iii) does not hold. Then, by Corollary III.38, we have  $\frac{1}{n} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n} \| \sigma^{\otimes n}) < \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho \| \sigma) = D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma)$  for every  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and  $n = 1$ , and the same holds for every  $n \geq 2$  by Lemma III.41. Hence, (ii) in Lemma III.36 holds for every  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . According to Lemma II.2, the assumptions that  $\varrho^0 = \sigma^0$  and  $\varrho \neq \sigma$  guarantee that  $\beta \mapsto D_\beta(\varrho \| \sigma)$  is strictly increasing on  $(0, 1)$ , whence, by Theorem III.22,  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \| \sigma) < D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma)$ , i.e., (i) in Lemma III.36 holds for every  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Thus, by Lemma III.36,  $\hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \| \sigma) < D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma)$  for every  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .  $\square$

**Remark III.44.** Note that (iii) in Theorem III.43 is a single-copy condition, as are  $\varrho^0 = \sigma^0$  and  $\varrho \neq \sigma$ . Hence, these can be easily verified.

Moreover, if  $\varrho$  and  $\sigma$  are probability density functions on a finite set  $\Omega$  with  $|\Omega| \geq 3$  that are selected randomly according to the uniform distribution on the probability simplex, then with probability 1 the conditions  $\varrho^0 = \sigma^0$  and  $\varrho \neq \sigma$  are satisfied, while (iii) in Theorem III.43 fails, and hence  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \| \sigma) < D_\alpha(\varrho \| \sigma)$  with probability 1.

## IV. CONCLUSION

We have introduced two different definitions of the regularized test-measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergences, which coincide with each other and also with the regularized measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergences, for  $\alpha > 1$ . Our main result is that for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , both versions are strictly smaller than the unique classical Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence for generic pairs of classical probability distributions (on at least three points), and hence neither definitions give a quantum extension of the classical Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence.

In Theorem III.39 we showed that strict inequality between the two different regularized test-measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergences may hold as  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \| \sigma) < \hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho \| \sigma) = \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho \| \sigma)$  for commuting pairs of states. It would be interesting to find explicit examples with non-commuting states where this holds. It is also an

open question whether examples exist where the above can be strengthened to  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) < \hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) < \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{meas}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$ ; this would be interesting both in the commuting and in the non-commuting cases.

It is also an interesting question whether closed-form expressions can be found for the regularized test-measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergences for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , similarly to the  $\alpha > 1$  case. In this respect probably the best one can hope for is the representation in (III.53) based on the results of [42].

### Acknowledgments

The work of M.M. was partially funded by the National Research, Development and Innovation Office of Hungary via the research grants K124152 and KH129601, and by the Ministry of Innovation and Technology and the National Research, Development and Innovation Office within the Quantum Information National Laboratory of Hungary. The authors are indebted to an anonymous reviewer for pointing out the example demonstrating that  $\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) < \hat{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma)$  can happen.

### Appendix A: Relation to the hypothesis testing problem of Salzmann and Datta

It is easy to see that Theorem III.18 is closely related to a problem recently studied in [42]. We have the following:

**Proposition A.1.** For any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n} \|\sigma^{\otimes n}) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \min_{T \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})} \left\{ (\text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n} (I - T))^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} + \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n} T \right\}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n} \|\sigma^{\otimes n}) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \min_{T \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})} \left\{ (\text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n} (I - T))^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} + \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n} T \right\}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

In particular,

$$\exists \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n} \|\sigma^{\otimes n}) \iff \exists \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \min_{T \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})} \left\{ (\text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n} (I - T))^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} + \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n} T \right\}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

and if the limits exist then they are equal.

*Proof.* We prove the equality in (A.1), as the equality in (A.2) follows in a similar way.

For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $T_n$  be the minimizer of  $(\text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n} (I - T))^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} + \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n} T$  over all tests, and let  $c < \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \left( (\text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n} (I - T_n))^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} + \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n} T_n \right)$ . Then there exists a strictly increasing sequence  $(n_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\mathbb{N}$  such that  $(\text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n_k} (I - T_{n_k}))^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} < e^{-n_k c}$ ,  $\text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n_k} T_{n_k} < e^{-n_k c}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , whence

$$\underbrace{(\text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n_k} T_{n_k})^\alpha}_{\leq 1} \underbrace{(\text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n_k} T_{n_k})^{1-\alpha}}_{< e^{-n_k c(1-\alpha)}} + \underbrace{(\text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n_k} (I - T_{n_k}))^\alpha}_{< e^{-n_k c(1-\alpha)}} \underbrace{(\text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n_k} (I - T_{n_k}))^{1-\alpha}}_{\leq 1} < 2e^{-n_k c(1-\alpha)}.$$

Thus,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n} \|\sigma^{\otimes n}) \geq \limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n_k} D_\alpha(\mathcal{T}_{n_k}(\varrho^{\otimes n_k}) \|\mathcal{T}_{n_k}(\sigma^{\otimes n_k})) \geq c.$$

Since this holds for all  $c$  as above, we get LHS  $\geq$  RHS in (A.1).

If the LHS in (A.1) is 0 then, by the above, both expressions in (A.1) are 0, and the proof is complete. Hence, for the rest we assume that the LHS in (A.1) is strictly positive.

For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $T_n$  be a test achieving  $D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n} \|\sigma^{\otimes n})$ , and let  $0 < c < \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} D_\alpha(\mathcal{T}_n(\varrho^{\otimes n}) \|\mathcal{T}_n(\sigma^{\otimes n}))$ . Then there exists a strictly increasing sequence  $(n_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\mathbb{N}$  such that for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-n_k(1-\alpha)c} &> (\text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n_k} T_{n_k})^\alpha (\text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n_k} T_{n_k})^{1-\alpha} + (\text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n_k} (I - T_{n_k}))^\alpha (\text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n_k} (I - T_{n_k}))^{1-\alpha} \\ &\geq \left[ (\text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n_k} T_{n_k})^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n_k} T_{n_k} + (\text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n_k} (I - T_{n_k}))^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n_k} (I - T_{n_k}) \right]^{1-\alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Since  $D_\alpha(\mathcal{T}_{n_k}(\varrho^{\otimes n})\|\mathcal{T}_{n_k}(\sigma^{\otimes n}))$ , as well as the expression in (A.4), are symmetric under exchanging  $T_{n_k}$  with  $I - T_{n_k}$ , we may assume that  $\text{Tr} \sigma^{\otimes n_k} T_{n_k} \leq 1/2$ , and thus  $\text{Tr} \sigma^{\otimes n_k} (I - T_{n_k}) \geq 1/2$  for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . This, together with (A.4), implies that

$$(\text{Tr} \varrho^{\otimes n_k} (I - T_{n_k}))^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} < 2e^{-n_k c}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In particular,  $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \text{Tr} \varrho^{\otimes n_k} T_{n_k} = 1$ , so that  $\text{Tr} \varrho^{\otimes n_k} T_{n_k} > (1/2)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}$  for every  $k \geq k_0$  with some  $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ , which, when combined with (A.4), yields

$$\text{Tr} \sigma^{\otimes n_k} T_{n_k} < 2e^{-n_k c}, \quad k \geq k_0.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \min_{0 \leq T \leq I} \left\{ (\text{Tr} \varrho^{\otimes n} (I - T))^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} + \text{Tr} \sigma^{\otimes n} T \right\} \\ & \geq \limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{n_k} \log \left( (\text{Tr} \varrho^{\otimes n_k} (I - T_{n_k}))^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} + \text{Tr} \sigma^{\otimes n_k} T_{n_k} \right) \geq c. \end{aligned}$$

Since this holds for every  $c$  as above, we get that LHS  $\leq$  RHS in (A.1).  $\square$

Theorem III.18 shows that the limit on the LHS in (A.3) exists, and is equal to the expressions in (III.41), while [42, Theorem 7] shows that the limit on the RHS in (A.3) exists, and gives a different expression for it. Combining the two results yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n}\|\sigma^{\otimes n}) = \sup \left\{ r : \frac{H_r}{r} \geq \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} \right\} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \min_{0 \leq T \leq I} \left\{ (\text{Tr} \varrho^{\otimes n} (I - T))^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} + \text{Tr} \sigma^{\otimes n} T \right\} \\ &= \alpha \sup_{0 < t < 1} \frac{(t-1)D_t(\varrho\|\sigma)}{t(2\alpha-1)-\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality was proved in [42].

## Appendix B: The von Neumann algebra case

In this appendix we extend the main results in Section III B to the general von Neumann algebra case. For that, it is sufficient to extend Theorem III.18; once that is done, the extensions of Theorem III.22 and Corollaries III.28–III.31 follow the same way as in Section III B. Moreover, the essential thing for the proof of Theorem III.18 is the version of the Hoeffding bound theorem given in Lemma II.6, so it is crucial for our purpose to extend Lemma II.6 to the von Neumann algebra setting, which was mainly done in [22], under some technical assumptions. Our main contribution below is removing those assumptions, and showing that Lemma II.6 can be extended to the von Neumann algebra setting for arbitrary pairs of normal states  $\varrho, \sigma$ .

We assume that the reader is familiar with the standard form of von Neumann algebras and the notions of the relative modular operator and Connes' cocycle derivative. We refer to [15] for the details.

Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a von Neumann algebra represented in the *standard form*  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{H}, J, \mathcal{P})$ . Let  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{M}_*^+$  (normal positive linear functionals on  $\mathcal{M}$ ) and  $\Delta_{\varrho, \sigma}$  be the *relative modular operator*  $\Delta_{\varrho, \sigma}$  with the spectral decomposition  $\Delta_{\varrho, \sigma} = \int_0^{+\infty} t dE_{\varrho, \sigma}(t)$ . We define

$$Q_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) := \|\Delta_{\varrho, \sigma}^{\alpha/2} \xi_\sigma\|^2 = \int_{(0, +\infty)} t^\alpha d\|E_{\varrho, \sigma}(t) \xi_\sigma\|^2, \quad \alpha \in [0, 1],$$

where  $\xi_\sigma \in \mathcal{P}$  is the vector representative of  $\sigma$  so that  $\sigma(x) = \langle \xi_\sigma, x \xi_\sigma \rangle$  ( $x \in \mathcal{M}$ ). We define

$$\psi(\alpha) = \psi(\alpha|\varrho\|\sigma) := \log Q_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma), \quad \alpha \in [0, 1],$$

and further define  $\varphi(c)$  and  $\varphi_+(c)$  for  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  as in (II.4)–(II.5), where the existence of the maxima in the definitions of  $\varphi(c)$ ,  $\varphi_+(c)$  is clear from the continuity of  $\psi$  (see (i) in Lemma B.1). In our discussions below



it is convenient to consider the measure  $d\nu_{\varrho,\sigma}(t) := d\|E_{\varrho,\sigma}(t)\xi_\sigma\|^2$  for  $t \in (0, +\infty)$ , i.e.,  $\nu_{\varrho,\sigma}$  is the spectral measure of  $\Delta_{\varrho,\sigma}$  on  $s(\Delta_{\varrho,\sigma})\mathcal{H}$  with respect to  $\xi_\sigma$ , where  $s(\Delta_{\varrho,\sigma})$  is the support projection of  $\Delta_{\varrho,\sigma}$ . Note that  $s(\Delta_{\varrho,\sigma}) = s(\varrho)Js(\sigma)J$ ; see [15, Proposition 10.3]. We then have  $Q_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) = \int_{(0,+\infty)} t^\alpha d\nu_{\varrho,\sigma}(t)$  for all  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ .

Let  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{M}_*^+$  be normal states. The *standard  $\alpha$ -Rényi divergence*  $D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)$  with parameter  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$  is

$$D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) := \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log Q_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma).$$

Properties of  $D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)$  as well as  $Q_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)$  in the present setting can be found in [14]. The *Hoeffding divergence*  $H_r(\varrho\|\sigma)$  of  $\varrho, \sigma$  for  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  is defined by

$$H_r(\varrho\|\sigma) := \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{(\alpha - 1)r - \psi(\alpha)}{\alpha} = \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)]. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Just like in Section III A, the *test-measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence* of  $\varrho, \sigma$  is defined as

$$D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) := \sup_{T \in \mathcal{M}, 0 \leq T \leq 1} D_\alpha(\mathcal{T}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{T}(\sigma)) = \max_{T \in \mathcal{M}, 0 \leq T \leq 1} D_\alpha(\mathcal{T}(\varrho)\|\mathcal{T}(\sigma)),$$

where  $\mathcal{T}(\varrho) := (\varrho(T), \varrho(1 - T))$  and similarly for  $\mathcal{T}(\sigma)$ . The *regularized test-measured Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence* is defined as

$$\overline{D}_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho\|\sigma) := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} D_\alpha^{\text{test}}(\varrho^{\otimes n}\|\sigma^{\otimes n}),$$

where the  $n$ -fold tensor products  $\varrho^{\otimes n}, \sigma^{\otimes n}$  are normal states on the  $n$ -fold von Neumann algebra tensor product  $\mathcal{M}^{\overline{\otimes} n}$ .

If  $s(\varrho) \perp s(\sigma)$  for the support projections of  $\varrho, \sigma$ , then it is immediate to see that  $D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) = D_\alpha(\varrho^{\otimes n}\|\sigma^{\otimes n}) = +\infty$  for all  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $H_r(\varrho\|\sigma) = +\infty$  for all  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ ; thus Theorem III.18 holds trivially. So in the rest we always assume that  $s(\varrho) \not\perp s(\sigma)$ .

**Lemma B.1.** Let  $\varrho, \sigma$  be normal states on  $\mathcal{M}$ .

- (i)  $\psi$  is a  $(-\infty, 0]$ -valued continuous and convex function on  $[0, 1]$ , and real analytic in  $(0, 1)$ .
- (ii)  $\varphi_+$  is a strictly increasing function on  $(\psi'(0^+), +\infty)$  mapping onto  $(-\psi(0), +\infty)$ .
- (iii) For every  $r > -\psi(0)$  there exists a unique  $c_r \in (\psi'(0^+), +\infty)$  such that  $\varphi_+(c_r) = r$  and  $H_r(\varrho\|\sigma) = r - c_r = \varphi(c_r)$ .
- (iv)  $r \mapsto H_r(\varrho\|\sigma)$  is convex, lower semi-continuous, and monotone decreasing on  $\mathbb{R}$ , and for every  $r < -\psi(0)$ ,  $H_r(\varrho\|\sigma) = +\infty$ .

*Proof.* (i): That  $Q_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) > 0$  for all  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  follows from the assumption  $s(\varrho) \not\perp s(\sigma)$ . As in the proof of [14, Proposition 5.3], convexity of  $\psi$  is a consequence of the Hölder inequality

$$\int_{(0,+\infty)} t^{\lambda\alpha_1 + (1-\lambda)\alpha_2} d\nu_{\varrho,\sigma}(t) \leq \left[ \int_{(0,+\infty)} t^{\alpha_1} d\nu_{\varrho,\sigma}(t) \right]^\lambda \left[ \int_{(0,+\infty)} t^{\alpha_2} d\nu_{\varrho,\sigma}(t) \right]^{1-\lambda}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} Q_0(\varrho\|\sigma) &= \|s(\Delta_{\varrho,\sigma})\xi_\sigma\|^2 = \|s(\varrho)\xi_\sigma\|^2 = \sigma(s(\varrho)) \leq 1, \\ Q_1(\varrho\|\sigma) &= \|\Delta_{\varrho,\sigma}^{1/2}\xi_\sigma\|^2 = \|s(\sigma)\xi_\sigma\|^2 = \varrho(s(\sigma)) \leq 1, \end{aligned}$$

convexity of  $\psi$  implies that  $\psi(\alpha) \leq 0$  for all  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ . Note (see, e.g., [15, Theorem A.7]) that  $\Delta_{\varrho,\sigma}^{z/2}\xi_\sigma$  is continuous on  $0 \leq \text{Re } z \leq 1$  and analytic in  $0 < \text{Re } z < 1$  in the strong operator topology, so that  $\langle \Delta_{\varrho,\sigma}^{\overline{z}/2}\xi_\sigma, \Delta_{\varrho,\sigma}^{z/2}\xi_\sigma \rangle$  is analytic in  $0 < \text{Re } z < 1$ . Hence  $Q_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)$  is real analytic in  $0 < \alpha < 1$  and so is  $\psi(\alpha)$ .

The proofs of the remaining (ii)–(iv) are similar to those in [18, Sec. IV] in the finite-dimensional case, while we give them for readers' convenience.

(ii): It is obvious that  $\varphi_+$  is strictly increasing on  $[\psi'(1^-), +\infty)$  (whenever  $\psi'(1^-) < +\infty$ ). Let us show that  $\varphi_+$  is strictly increasing on  $(\psi'(0^+), \psi'(1^-))$  (whenever  $\psi'(0^+) < \psi'(1^-)$ ). By (i) note that  $\psi'(\alpha)$  is strictly increasing in  $(0, 1)$ . For every  $a \in (\psi'(0^+), \psi'(1^-))$  there exists a unique  $\alpha_a \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\psi'(\alpha_a) = a$  and hence  $\varphi_+(a) = a\alpha_a - \psi(\alpha_a)$ . Let  $\psi'(0^+) < a < b < \psi'(1^-)$ . Then, since

$$a\alpha_a - \varphi_+(a) = \psi(\alpha_a) > b(\alpha_a - \alpha_b) + \psi(\alpha_b) = b\alpha_a - \varphi_+(b),$$

one has  $\varphi_+(b) - \varphi_+(a) > (b-a)\alpha_a > 0$ , so  $\varphi_+(a) < \varphi_+(b)$ . Hence  $\varphi_+$  is strictly increasing on  $(\psi'(0^+), +\infty)$ . Furthermore, it is immediate to see that  $\varphi_+(a) \rightarrow +\infty$  as  $a \rightarrow +\infty$  and  $\varphi_+(a) \rightarrow -\psi(0)$  as  $a \rightarrow \psi'(0^+)$ .

(iii): Let  $r > -\psi(0)$ . By (ii) there exists a unique  $c_r \in (\psi'(0^+), +\infty)$  such that  $\varphi_+(c_r) = r$ . Then, in view of (II.5),  $\psi(\alpha) \geq c_r\alpha - r$  for all  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  and  $\psi(\alpha_r) = c_r\alpha_r - r$  for some  $\alpha_r \in [0, 1]$ . Since  $r > -\psi(0)$  and hence  $c_r > \psi'(0^+)$ , one has  $\alpha_r \in (0, 1]$  and  $(r + \psi(\alpha_r))/\alpha_r = c_r$ . Therefore,

$$H_r(\varrho\|\sigma) = \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1]} \frac{(\alpha-1)r - \psi(\alpha)}{\alpha} = r - c_r = \varphi_+(c_r) - c_r = \varphi(c_r).$$

(iv): Since  $\alpha \mapsto D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)$  is continuous on  $(0, 1)$  (see the proof of (i)), the assertion on  $r \mapsto H_r(\varrho\|\sigma)$  is obvious by (B.1). If  $r < -\psi(0)$ , then  $-r - \psi(\alpha) \rightarrow -r - \psi(0) > 0$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow 0^+$ , so it is immediate that  $H_r(\varrho\|\sigma) = +\infty$ .  $\square$

**Lemma B.2.** For every normal states  $\varrho, \sigma$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  and any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\psi(\alpha|\varrho^{\otimes n}\|\sigma^{\otimes n}) = n\psi(\alpha|\varrho\|\sigma), \quad \alpha \in [0, 1]; \quad D_\alpha(\varrho^{\otimes n}\|\sigma^{\otimes n}) = nD_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma), \quad \alpha \in [0, 1].$$

*Proof.* It suffices to show that when  $\mathcal{M}_k$  ( $k = 1, 2$ ) are von Neumann algebras and  $\varrho_k, \sigma_k \in (\mathcal{M}_k)_*^+$ , we have

$$Q_\alpha(\varrho_1 \otimes \varrho_2\|\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2) = Q_\alpha(\varrho_1\|\sigma_1)Q_\alpha(\varrho_2\|\sigma_2), \quad \alpha \in [0, 1]. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

To prove this let  $M_k$  be represented in the standard form  $(\mathcal{M}_k, \mathcal{H}_k, J_k, \mathcal{P}_k)$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ . Then the standard form of  $\mathcal{M}_{12} := \mathcal{M}_1 \overline{\otimes} \mathcal{M}_2$  is given as  $(\mathcal{M}_{12}, \mathcal{H}_{12}, J_{12}, \mathcal{P}_{12})$  with  $\mathcal{H}_{12} := \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ ,  $J_{12} := J_1 \otimes J_2$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{12} \supseteq \{\xi_1 \otimes \xi_2 : \xi_k \in \mathcal{P}_k, k = 1, 2\}$ . Let  $\xi_{\varrho_k}, \xi_{\sigma_k} \in \mathcal{P}_k$  be the vector representatives of  $\varrho_k, \sigma_k$ , so that  $\xi_{\varrho_1} \otimes \xi_{\varrho_2}, \xi_{\sigma_1} \otimes \xi_{\sigma_2} \in \mathcal{P}_{12}$  are those of  $\varrho_1 \otimes \varrho_2, \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2$  respectively. With use of Connes' cocycle derivative  $(D\varrho : D\sigma)_t$  for  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{M}_*^+$  (see [15, 43]) note by [15, Proposition 10.11] that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\varrho_1 \otimes \varrho_2, \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2}^{it}(\xi_{\sigma_1} \otimes \xi_{\sigma_2}) &= (D(\varrho_1 \otimes \varrho_2) : D(\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2))_t(\xi_{\sigma_1} \otimes \xi_{\sigma_2}) \\ &= ((D\varrho_1 : D\sigma_1)_t \otimes (D\varrho_2 : D\sigma_2)_t)(\xi_{\sigma_1} \otimes \xi_{\sigma_2}) \\ &= (D\varrho_1 : D\sigma_1)_t \xi_{\sigma_1} \otimes (D\varrho_2 : D\sigma_2)_t \xi_{\sigma_2} \\ &= \Delta_{\varrho_1, \sigma_1}^{it} \xi_{\sigma_1} \otimes \Delta_{\varrho_2, \sigma_2}^{it} \xi_{\sigma_2}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned}$$

where the equality above is due to [43, Sec. 3.9], which is given under the assumption  $s(\varrho_1) \leq s(\sigma_1)$  and  $s(\varrho_2) \leq s(\sigma_2)$  but it can be removed. By analytic continuation and continuity we have

$$\Delta_{\varrho_1 \otimes \varrho_2, \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2}^{\alpha/2}(\xi_{\sigma_1} \otimes \xi_{\sigma_2}) = \Delta_{\varrho_1, \sigma_1}^{\alpha/2} \xi_{\sigma_1} \otimes \Delta_{\varrho_2, \sigma_2}^{\alpha/2} \xi_{\sigma_2}, \quad \alpha \in (0, 1),$$

which gives (B.3).  $\square$

We write for every  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{M}_*^+$ ,

$$\chi(\varrho\|\sigma) := \min_{T \in \mathcal{M}, 0 \leq T \leq 1} \{\varrho(1-T) + \sigma(T)\} = \frac{1}{2} \{\varrho(1) + \sigma(1) - \|\varrho - \sigma\|\},$$

where the minimum is attained by  $T = s((\varrho - \sigma)_+)$ , the support projection of the positive part of  $\varrho - \sigma$ . The Chernoff bound theorem in [2, 35] (see also [18]) was extended in [22, Theorem 6.5] to the non-i.i.d. von Neumann algebra setting. In our i.i.d. setting [22, Theorem 6.5] says the following:

**Lemma B.3.** For any pair of normal states  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{M}_*^+$  such that  $\psi'(0^+) < \psi'(1^-)$ , (i.e.,  $\psi$  is not affine on  $[0, 1]$ ), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \chi(\varrho^{\otimes n}\|\sigma^{\otimes n}) = -\varphi(0). \quad (\text{B.4})$$

**Remark B.4.** The equality in (B.4) was proved in [22, Theorem 6.5] under the assumption that  $\varrho, \sigma$  are faithful; however, it is easy to see that this assumption is not needed in the proof.

Keys to prove (B.4) are the following inequalities for  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{M}_*^+$  [22, Theorem 6.1]:

$$\chi(\varrho\|\sigma) \leq Q_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) = \int_{(0,+\infty)} t^\alpha d\nu_{\varrho,\sigma}(t), \quad \alpha \in [0, 1], \quad (\text{B.5})$$

$$\chi(\varrho\|\sigma) \geq \langle \xi_\sigma, \Delta_{\varrho,\sigma}(1 + \Delta_{\varrho,\sigma})^{-1} \xi_\sigma \rangle = \int_{(0,+\infty)} \frac{t}{1+t} d\nu_{\varrho,\sigma}(t). \quad (\text{B.6})$$

In Lemma B.6 below we extend (B.4) to the form (II.11) with removing the assumption  $\psi'(0^+) < \psi'(1^-)$ . To do so, we give two more lemmas.

**Lemma B.5.** For every  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{M}_*^+$  the following conditions are equivalent:

- (i)  $\psi$  is affine on  $[0, 1]$ , i.e.,  $\psi'(0^+) = \psi'(1^-)$ ;
- (ii)  $\nu_{\varrho,\sigma}$  is supported at a single point  $\kappa \in (0, +\infty)$ .

In this case,  $\psi(\alpha) = \alpha \log \kappa + \log \sigma(s(\varrho))$  for  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ , and  $\nu_{\varrho,\sigma} = \sigma(s(\varrho))\delta_\kappa$ .

*Proof.* Assume (i); then inequality (B.2) must always be an equality. From the equality case of the Hölder inequality one can easily see that  $\nu_{\varrho,\sigma}$  is supported at a single point. Conversely, assume (ii) so that  $\nu_{\varrho,\sigma} = \sigma(s(\varrho))\delta_\kappa$  with some  $\kappa \in (0, +\infty)$ , since  $\nu_{\varrho,\sigma}((0, +\infty)) = \sigma(s(\varrho))$ . Then

$$\psi(\alpha) = \log[\kappa^\alpha \sigma(s(\varrho))] = \alpha \log \kappa + \log \sigma(s(\varrho)), \quad \alpha \in [0, 1],$$

and hence (i) follows.  $\square$

We give some further characterizations of  $\psi$  being affine in Remark B.10 below.

The equality in (B.7) below is an extension of (B.4), and it has been shown in the proof of [22, Theorem 6.6] for faithful normal states and  $b \in (\psi'(0^+), \psi'(1^-))$ . We show that it holds for arbitrary pairs of normal states and  $b$  values.

**Lemma B.6.** For every normal states  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{M}_*^+$  and any  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \chi(\varrho^{\otimes n} \| e^{nb} \sigma^{\otimes n}) = -\varphi(b). \quad (\text{B.7})$$

*Proof.* First, we show that (B.4) holds also when  $\psi$  is affine on  $[0, 1]$ . Since the inequality

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \chi(\varrho^{\otimes n} \| \sigma^{\otimes n}) \leq -\varphi(0)$$

was shown in [22] from (B.5) for general  $\varrho, \sigma$ , we need only to show that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \chi(\varrho^{\otimes n} \| \sigma^{\otimes n}) \geq -\varphi(0). \quad (\text{B.8})$$

When  $\psi$  is affine, by Lemma B.5 one has  $\nu_{\varrho,\sigma} = \sigma(s(\varrho))\delta_\kappa$  and  $\psi(\alpha) = \alpha \log \kappa + \log \sigma(s(\varrho))$  for  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ . Therefore,

$$-\varphi(0) = \begin{cases} \log[\kappa \sigma(s(\varrho))] & \text{if } 0 < \kappa \leq 1, \\ \log \sigma(s(\varrho)) & \text{if } \kappa > 1. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , since  $\psi(\alpha|\varrho^{\otimes n} \| \sigma^{\otimes n}) = \alpha \log \kappa^n + \log \sigma(s(\varrho))^n$  by Lemma B.2, it follows from Lemma B.5 again that  $\nu_{\varrho^{\otimes n}, \sigma^{\otimes n}} = \sigma(s(\varrho))^n \delta_{\kappa^n}$ . Moreover, since  $t/(1+t) \geq \frac{1}{2} \min\{t, 1\}$  for  $t \in (0, +\infty)$ , by (B.6) for  $\varrho^{\otimes n}, \sigma^{\otimes n}$  one has

$$\chi(\varrho^{\otimes n} \| \sigma^{\otimes n}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{(0,+\infty)} \min\{t, 1\} d\mu_{\varrho^{\otimes n}, \sigma^{\otimes n}}(t) = \frac{1}{2} \min\{\kappa^n, 1\} \sigma(s(\varrho))^n.$$

Therefore,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \chi(\varrho^{\otimes n} \|\sigma^{\otimes n}) \geq \begin{cases} \log[\kappa \sigma(s(\varrho))] & \text{if } 0 < \kappa \leq 1, \\ \log \sigma(s(\varrho)) & \text{if } \kappa > 1. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.10})$$

Combining (B.9) and (B.10) yields (B.8). Thus, by the above and Lemma B.3, we obtain (B.7) with  $b = 0$  without any assumption on the states  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{M}_*^+$ .

To prove (B.7), we observe that the proof of (B.4) in [22], as well as the discussions in this section so far, works even for general  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{M}_*^+$  (without being states). Therefore,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \kappa_n(\varrho^{\otimes n} \| e^{nb} \sigma^{\otimes n}) = -\varphi(0|\varrho\|e^b\sigma),$$

where we write  $\varphi(c|\varrho\|\sigma)$  for  $\varphi(c)$  given  $\varrho, \sigma$ . It is easy to confirm that  $\varphi(0|\varrho\|e^b\sigma) = \varphi(b)$ .  $\square$

Next we extend Lemma II.6 to the von Neumann algebra setting.

**Lemma B.7.** Let  $\varrho, \sigma$  be normal states on  $\mathcal{M}$ . For any  $r \in (0, +\infty)$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\sigma^{\otimes n}(T_{n,r,\alpha}) \leq e^{-nr}, \quad \varrho^{\otimes n}(1 - T_{n,r,\alpha}) \leq e^{-n \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)]},$$

where  $T_{n,r,\alpha}$  is the support projection of  $(\varrho^{\otimes n} - e^{n(r+\psi(\alpha))/\alpha} \sigma^{\otimes n})_+$ .

Furthermore, for any  $r > D_0(\varrho\|\sigma)$ , any test sequence  $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  (i.e.,  $T_n \in \mathcal{M}^{\overline{\otimes n}}$ ,  $0 \leq T_n \leq 1$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ) and any strictly increasing sequence  $(n_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ ,

$$\text{if } \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{n_k} \log \sigma^{\otimes n_k}(T_{n_k}) \geq r \quad \text{then} \quad \limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{n_k} \log \varrho^{\otimes n_k}(1 - T_{n_k}) \leq H_r(\varrho\|\sigma).$$

*Proof.* For every  $r \in (0, +\infty)$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  let  $b := (r + \psi(\alpha))/\alpha$ . Using (B.5) for  $\varrho^{\otimes n}$  and  $e^{nb} \sigma^{\otimes n}$  implies that

$$Q_\alpha(\varrho^{\otimes n} \| e^{nb} \sigma^{\otimes n}) \geq \chi(\varrho^{\otimes n} \| e^{nb} \sigma^{\otimes n}) = \varrho^{\otimes n}(1 - T_{n,r,\alpha}) + e^{nb} \sigma^{\otimes n}(T_{n,r,\alpha}).$$

Since

$$Q_\alpha(\varrho^{\otimes n} \| e^{nb} \sigma^{\otimes n}) = e^{nb(1-\alpha)} Q_\alpha(\varrho^{\otimes n} \| \sigma^{\otimes n}) = e^{n(b(1-\alpha) + \psi(\alpha))},$$

one has

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^{\otimes n}(T_{n,r,\alpha}) &\leq e^{n(-b\alpha + \psi(\alpha))} = e^{-nr}, \\ \varrho^{\otimes n}(1 - T_{n,r,\alpha}) &\leq e^{n(b(1-\alpha) + \psi(\alpha))} = e^{n[r(1-\alpha) + \psi(\alpha)]/\alpha} = e^{-n \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma)]}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of the latter assertion is the same as that of Lemma II.6, by using Lemmas B.6 and B.1.  $\square$

We are now in a position to present the main result in this appendix.

**Theorem B.8.** For any normal states  $\varrho, \sigma$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  and any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , the expressions in Theorem III.18 hold.

*Proof.* Once Lemmas B.1 and B.7 have been shown, the proof of Theorem III.18 remains valid as it is, even in the more general von Neumann algebra setting. Indeed, we may just replace  $\text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n} T_n$ ,  $\text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n} T_n$  with  $\varrho^{\otimes n}(T_n)$ ,  $\sigma^{\otimes n}(T_n)$  respectively.  $\square$

**Remark B.9.** It is quite easy to verify that the proof of [42, Lemma 4] works without alteration in the above general von Neumann algebra setting, and so does the proof of Proposition A.1 as well, whence we also have (III.53).

We close this appendix with the following supplement to Lemma B.5, which might be of independent interest.

**Remark B.10.** In the finite-dimensional case, the condition of  $\psi$  being affine was explicitly characterized in [18, Lemma 3.2] in terms of the density operators  $\varrho, \sigma$ . We can prove that if  $\varrho, \sigma \in \mathcal{M}_*^+$  are such that  $s(\varrho) \leq s(\sigma)$ , then the following conditions are equivalent:

- (i)  $\psi(\alpha\|\varrho\|\sigma)$  is affine on  $[0, 1]$ ;
- (ii)  $D_0(\varrho(1)^{-1}\varrho\|\sigma) = D(\varrho(1)^{-1}\varrho\|\sigma)$ ;
- (iii)  $s(\varrho)$  is in the centralizer of  $\sigma|_{s(\sigma)\mathcal{M}s(\sigma)}$  (see [15] for the definition) and  $\varrho = \kappa\sigma(s(\varrho)\cdot)$  for some constant  $\kappa > 0$ .

Note that in the finite-dimensional case, the above conditions are equivalent to that (II.3) holds as stated in Lemma II.2, i.e., the characterization in [18, Lemma 3.2]. A similar condition to the latter is unknown in the von Neumann algebra case.

Here, for readers' convenience we give a sketchy proof of the above equivalence. To see that (i)  $\iff$  (ii), it suffices to assume that  $\varrho(1) = 1$ . Since  $s(\varrho) \leq s(\sigma)$  means  $\psi(1) = 0$  in this case, the equivalence of (i) and (ii) is immediate. To see that (i)  $\iff$  (iii), we use Haagerup's  $L^p$ -spaces  $L^p(\mathcal{M})$  and Connes' cocycle derivative  $(D\varrho : D\sigma)_t$ . Note that the standard form of  $\mathcal{M}$  is given as  $(\mathcal{M}, L^2(\mathcal{M}), J = *, L^2(\mathcal{M})_+)$  and  $\mathcal{M}_*$  is order-isomorphic to  $L^1(\mathcal{M})$  by a linear bijection  $\omega \in \mathcal{M} \mapsto h_\omega \in L^1(\mathcal{M})$ , so the vector representative of  $\sigma$  is  $h_\sigma^{1/2} \in L^2(\mathcal{M})_+$ . Assume (iii); then  $h_\varrho = \kappa s(\varrho)h_\sigma$  and hence by [15, (10.9)],

$$\Delta_{\varrho,\sigma}^{\alpha/2} h_\sigma^{1/2} = h_\varrho^{\alpha/2} h_\sigma^{(1-\alpha)/2} = \kappa^{\alpha/2} s(\varrho) h_\sigma^{1/2}, \quad \alpha \in [0, 1].$$

Therefore,  $Q_\alpha(\varrho\|\sigma) = \kappa^\alpha \sigma(s(\varrho))$  for all  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  so that (i) follows. Conversely assume (i). By (ii) of Lemma B.5 one has  $E_{\varrho,\sigma}((0, +\infty) \setminus \{\kappa\}) h_\sigma^{1/2} = 0$  so that by [15, (10.19)],

$$(D\varrho : D\sigma)_t h_\sigma^{1/2} = \Delta_{\varrho,\sigma}^{it} h_\sigma^{1/2} = \kappa^{it} s(\varrho) h_\sigma^{1/2}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Since  $h_\sigma^{1/2}$  is separating for  $s(\sigma)\mathcal{M}s(\sigma)$ , this means that  $(D\varrho : D\sigma)_t = \kappa^{it} s(\varrho)$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , from which (iii) can be verified.

- 
- [1] K. M. R. Audenaert, M. Nussbaum, A. Szkola, and F. Verstraete, "Asymptotic error rates in quantum hypothesis testing," *Comm. Math. Phys.*, vol. 279, pp. 251–283, 2008. arXiv:0708.4282.
  - [2] K. M. R. Audenaert, J. Calsamiglia, R. Muñoz-Tapia, E. Bagan, Ll. Masanes, A. Acín, and F. Verstraete, "Discriminating states: the quantum Chernoff bound," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 98, p. 160501, 2007. arXiv:quant-ph/0610027.
  - [3] K. M. R. Audenaert and N. Datta,  $\alpha$ -z-relative Rényi entropies, *J. Math. Phys.*, vol. 56, p. 022202, 2015. arXiv:1310.7178.
  - [4] M. Berta, O. Fawzi, and M. Tomamichel, "On variational expressions for quantum relative entropies," *Lett. Math. Phys.*, vol. 107(12), pp. 2239–2265, 2017. arXiv:1512.02615.
  - [5] M. Berta, V. B. Scholz, and M. Tomamichel, "Rényi divergences as weighted non-commutative vector-valued  $L_p$ -spaces," *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, vol. 19, pp. 1843–1867, 2018. arXiv:1608.05317.
  - [6] I. Csiszár, "Generalized cutoff rates and Rényi's information measures," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 41(1), pp. 26–34, January 1995.
  - [7] N. Datta, "Min- and max-relative entropies and a new entanglement monotone," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 55(6), pp. 2816–2826, 2009.
  - [8] H. Fawzi and O. Fawzi, "Defining quantum divergences via convex optimization," *Quantum*, vol. 15, p. 387, 2021.
  - [9] M. Hayashi, "Error exponent in asymmetric quantum hypothesis testing and its application to classical-quantum channel coding," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 76(6), p. 062301, December 2007. arXiv:quant-ph/0611013.
  - [10] M. Hayashi, "Quantum Information Theory: Mathematical Foundation," 2nd ed. Graduate Texts in Physics, Springer, 2017.
  - [11] M. Hayashi and M. Tomamichel, "Correlation detection and an operational interpretation of the Rényi mutual information," *J. Math. Phys.*, vol. 57, p. 102201, 2016.
  - [12] F. Hiai and M. Mosonyi, "Different quantum  $f$ -divergences and the reversibility of quantum operations," *Rev. Math. Phys.*, vol. 29, p. 1750023, 2017.
  - [13] F. Hiai, "Equality cases in matrix norm inequalities of Golden–Thompson type," *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, vol. 36, pp. 239–249, 1994.
  - [14] F. Hiai, "Quantum  $f$ -divergences in von Neumann algebras. I. standard  $f$ -divergences," *J. Math. Phys.*, vol. 59, p. 102202, 2018.
  - [15] F. Hiai, "Lectures on Selected Topics in von Neumann Algebras," EMS Press, Berlin, 2021.
  - [16] F. Hiai, "Quantum  $f$ -Divergences in von Neumann Algebras: Reversibility of Quantum Operations," Mathematical Physics Studies. Springer, Singapore, 2021.

- [17] F. Hiai and M. Mosonyi, “Quantum Rényi divergences and the strong converse exponent of state discrimination in operator algebras,” arXiv:2110.07320, 2021.
- [18] F. Hiai, M. Mosonyi, and T. Ogawa, “Error exponents in hypothesis testing for correlated states on a spin chain,” *J. Math. Phys.*, vol. 49, p. 032112, 2008.
- [19] F. Hiai and D. Petz, “The proper formula for relative entropy and its asymptotics in quantum probability,” *Commun. Math. Phys.*, vol. 143(1), pp. 99–114, December 1991.
- [20] A. S. Holevo, “Quantum Systems, Channels, Information,” Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston, 2012.
- [21] R. Iten, J. M. Renes, and D. Sutter, “Pretty good measures in quantum information theory,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 63(2), pp. 1270–1279, 2017. arXiv:1608.08229.
- [22] V. Jakšić, Y. Ogata, C.-A. Pillet, and R. Seiringer, “Quantum hypothesis testing and non-equilibrium statistical mechanics,” *Rev. Math. Phys.*, vol. 24(6), p. 1230002, 2012. arXiv:1109.3804.
- [23] A. Jenčová, “Rényi relative entropies and noncommutative  $L_p$ -spaces,” *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, vol. 19, pp. 2513–2542, 2018. arXiv:1609.08462.
- [24] A. Jenčová, “Rényi relative entropies and noncommutative  $L_p$ -spaces II,” *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, vol. 22, pp. 3235–3254, 2021. arXiv:1707.00047, 2017.
- [25] K. Matsumoto, “A new quantum version of  $f$ -divergence,” In: Nagoya Winter Workshop 2015: Reality and Measurement in Algebraic Quantum Theory, pp. 229–273, 2018.
- [26] M. Mosonyi, “The strong converse exponent of discriminating infinite-dimensional quantum states,” arXiv:2107.08036, 2021.
- [27] M. Mosonyi and F. Hiai, “On the quantum Rényi relative entropies and related capacity formulas,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 57(4), pp. 2474–2487, April 2011.
- [28] M. Mosonyi and T. Ogawa, “Quantum hypothesis testing and the operational interpretation of the quantum Rényi relative entropies,” *Commun. Math. Phys.*, vol. 334(3), pp. 1617–1648, 2015. arXiv:1309.3228.
- [29] M. Mosonyi and T. Ogawa, “Strong converse exponent for classical-quantum channel coding,” *Commun. Math. Phys.*, vol. 355(1), pp. 373–426, June 2017. arXiv:1409.3562.
- [30] M. Mosonyi and T. Ogawa, “Divergence radii and the strong converse exponent of classical-quantum channel coding with constant compositions,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 67(3), pp. 1668–1698, 2021. arXiv:1811.10599.
- [31] M. Müller-Lennert, F. Dupuis, O. Szehr, S. Fehr, and M. Tomamichel, “On quantum Rényi entropies: A new generalization and some properties,” *J. Math. Phys.*, vol. 54(12), p. 122203, December 2013. arXiv:1306.3142.
- [32] H. Nagaoka, “Strong converse theorems in quantum information theory,” In: Proceedings of ERATO Workshop on Quantum Information Science, p. 33, 2001. Also appeared in “Asymptotic Theory of Quantum Statistical Inference,” ed. M. Hayashi, World Scientific, 2005.
- [33] H. Nagaoka, “The converse part of the theorem for quantum Hoeffding bound,” arXiv:quant-ph/0611289, November 2006.
- [34] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, “Quantum Computation and Quantum Information,” Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [35] M. Nussbaum and A. Szkoła, “The Chernoff lower bound for symmetric quantum hypothesis testing,” *Ann. Statist.*, vol. 37(2), pp. 1040–1057, 2009.
- [36] D. Petz, “Quasi-entropies for states of a von Neumann algebra,” *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.*, vol. 21, pp. 787–800, 1985.
- [37] D. Petz, “Quasi-entropies for finite quantum systems,” *Rep. Math. Phys.*, vol. 23, pp. 57–65, 1986.
- [38] D. Petz, “Sufficiency of channels over von Neumann algebras,” *Quart. J. Math.*, vol. 39(1), pp. 97–108, March 1988.
- [39] D. Petz, “Monotonicity of quantum relative entropy revisited,” *Rev. Math. Phys.*, vol. 15(1), pp. 79–91, 2003.
- [40] D. Petz and M. B. Ruskai, “Contraction of generalized relative entropy under stochastic mappings on matrices,” *Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top.*, vol. 1, pp. 83–89, 1998.
- [41] R. Renner, “Security of Quantum Key Distribution,” PhD thesis, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich, 2005. Diss. ETH No. 16242.
- [42] R. Salzmann and N. Datta, “Interpolating between symmetric and asymmetric hypothesis testing,” arXiv:2104.09553, 2021.
- [43] S. Strătilă, “Modular Theory in Operator Algebras,” Editura Academiei and Abacus Press, Tunbridge Wells, 1981.
- [44] M. Takesaki, “Theory of Operator Algebras I,” Springer, New York, 1979.
- [45] M. Tomamichel, “Quantum Information Processing with Finite Resources,” vol. 5 of Mathematical Foundations, SpringerBriefs in Math. Phys. Springer, 2016.
- [46] H. Umegaki, “Conditional expectation in an operator algebra, IV (Entropy and information),” *Kodai Math. Sem. Rep.*, vol. 14, pp. 59–85, 1962.
- [47] M. M. Wilde, A. Winter, and D. Yang, “Strong converse for the classical capacity of entanglement-breaking and Hadamard channels via a sandwiched Rényi relative entropy,” *Commun. Math. Phys.*, vol. 331(2), pp. 593–622, October 2014. arXiv:1306.1586.