

# Optimal universal quantum circuits for unitary complex conjugation

Daniel Ebler, Michał Horodecki, Marcin Marciniak, Tomasz Młynik, Marco Túlio Quintino, Michał Studziński

**Abstract**—Let  $U_d$  be a unitary operator representing an arbitrary  $d$ -dimensional unitary quantum operation. This work presents optimal quantum circuits for transforming a number  $k$  of calls of  $U_d$  into its complex conjugate  $\bar{U}_d$ . Our circuits admit a parallel implementation and are proven to be optimal for any  $k$  and  $d$  with an average fidelity of  $\langle F \rangle = \frac{k+1}{d(d-k)}$ . Optimality is shown for average fidelity, robustness to noise, and other standard figures of merit. This extends previous works which considered the scenario of a single call ( $k = 1$ ) of the operation  $U_d$ , and the special case of  $k = d - 1$  calls. We then show that our results encompass optimal transformations from  $k$  calls of  $U_d$  to  $f(U_d)$  for any arbitrary homomorphism  $f$  from the group of  $d$ -dimensional unitary operators to itself, since complex conjugation is the only non-trivial automorphism on the group of unitary operators. Finally, we apply our optimal complex conjugation implementation to design a probabilistic circuit for reversing arbitrary quantum evolutions.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The field of quantum information and computation typically describes how physical devices process information encoded into quantum systems. Said devices are often referred to as quantum gates in mathematical frameworks, and can be combined to quantum circuits by defining processing orders among the gates [1]. Conventionally, quantum gates were thought of as operations which take quantum states and inputs, and output again valid quantum states after processing. Recent studies showed that gates are potential subjects of transformation themselves, in a paradigm sometimes referred to as “higher-order quantum transformations” [2, 3]. Such “circuit-board” approach of viewing quantum operations as modular inputs of more general processes was found to have versatile applications encompassing quantum circuit design [4–6], control of quantum system dynamics [7–9], learning/storing unitary operations [10–12], identifying cause-effect relations [13], and estimating and discriminating quantum channels [14–16], among others.

When considering transformations between unitary operations, previous works have considered tasks such as unitary cloning [17], unitary inversion [18, 19] (see also [20]), unitary transposition [19], unitary conjugation [21], unitary iteration [22], unitary controlisation [23–26], and general

Daniel Ebler is at Huawei Hong Kong Research Center, Hong Kong SAR, P. R. China. Marcin Marciniak, Tomasz Młynik and Michał Studziński are at Institute of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics and National Quantum Information Centre in Gdańsk, and at Faculty of Mathematics, Physics and Informatics, University of Gdańsk. Michał Horodecki is at International Centre for Theory of Quantum Technologies, University of Gdańsk. Marco Túlio Quintino is at Institute for Quantum Optics and Quantum Information (IQOQI), Austrian Academy of Sciences, and at Faculty of Physics, University of Vienna.

homomorphisms and anti-homomorphisms between unitary operators [27, 28]. Unitary complex conjugation was first considered in Ref. [18], which obtained non-exact optimal transformations between a single call of an arbitrary  $d$ -dimensional unitary operation into its complex conjugation. Later, Ref. [21] presented a parallel quantum circuit which attains exact unitary conjugation by making  $k = d - 1$  calls of a  $d$ -dimensional unitary. Also, Ref. [29] considered the problem of exact unitary conjugation with an allowed rate of failure and showed that the probability of success is exactly zero when  $k < d - 1$ . Hence, the probability of transforming  $U_d$  into its complex conjugation cannot be enhanced by multi-call protocols such as the success-or-draw method [30].

In this work, we present deterministic and universal quantum circuits that transform  $k$  calls of an arbitrary  $d$ -dimensional unitary operator  $U_d$  into its complex conjugate  $\bar{U}_d$ . We present an explicit parallel circuit which makes no use of extra auxiliary space or memory for this task. We then prove that our construction attains the maximal performance allowed by quantum theory for any number of calls  $k$  and any dimension  $d$ .




Figure 1. Parallel superchannel transforming  $k$  calls of a unitary operation  $U_d$  into its complex conjugation  $\bar{U}_d$ . Here  $\tilde{E}$  stands for an “encoder” quantum channel which is performed before the input operations  $U_d^{\otimes k}$  and  $\tilde{D}$  stands for a “decoder” quantum channel acting after the input operations. When  $k < d - 1$ , unitary complex conjugation can only be obtained approximately with an average fidelity of  $\langle F \rangle = \frac{k+1}{d(d-k)}$ . Here we present optimal quantum circuits for this task. The optimal circuit can operate in parallel on the input transformations and does not require additional auxiliary spaces (depicted as the extra line above the gates  $U_d$ ).

## II. TRANSFORMING UNITARY OPERATIONS WITH QUANTUM CIRCUITS

In the following, we formally introduce the problem considered in this manuscript.

We start by pointing out that, with no loss in performance, we can restrict circuits designed for unitary complex conjugation to admit a parallel implementation as depicted in Fig. 1. Indeed, it was shown in Ref. [27] that transformations  $f$  acting on unitary operators  $U$  as  $f(U)$  can be implemented optimally by parallel circuits when  $f$  is a homomorphism on operator composition, *i.e.*, for  $f$  satisfying  $f(UV) = f(U)f(V)$  for every unitary  $U$  and  $V$ . The case of unitary complex conjugation is naturally included, since  $\overline{UV} = \overline{U}\overline{V}$ .

In quantum theory, states are described by unit-trace, positive semidefinite linear operators<sup>2</sup> – *i.e.*,  $\rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ ,  $\rho \geq 0$ , and  $\text{tr}(\rho) = 1$ . Deterministic transformations between input-states and output-states are implemented by quantum channels, which are completely positive<sup>3</sup> (CP) and trace-preserving<sup>4</sup> (TP) linear maps<sup>5</sup>  $\tilde{C} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_I) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_O)$ , where  $\mathcal{H}_I$  and  $\mathcal{H}_O$  are the linear spaces relative to input and output, respectively. A quantum channel  $\tilde{U} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_I) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_O)$  is said to be unitary if it can be written as  $\tilde{U}(\rho) = U_d \rho U_d^\dagger$  for some  $d$ -dimensional unitary operator  $U_d$ . Note that unitary operators which only differ by a global phase represent the same unitary channel. Hence, with no loss of generality, we may assume that the unitary operator  $U_d$  belongs to the group of special unitary operators  $SU(d)$ , that is, unitary operators with determinant one.

Let  $\tilde{C}_{\text{in}} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_I) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_O)$  be an arbitrary input channel which may be inserted into a quantum circuit and be transformed into an output channel  $\tilde{C}_{\text{out}} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_P) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_F)$ , where the labels  $P$  and  $F$  stands for past and future, respectively. Quantum circuits designed to obtain the transformation  $\tilde{C}_{\text{in}} \mapsto \tilde{C}_{\text{out}}$  may be analysed by means of encoder and decoder channels [4, 5], a method which we now describe.

- 1) Before performing the input operation  $\tilde{C}_{\text{in}}$ , we apply a quantum channel (encoder)  $\tilde{E} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_P) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_I) \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{aux}}$ , where  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{aux}}$  is an arbitrary auxiliary (memory) space which may be used to improve performance.
- 2) Then, the operation  $\tilde{C}_{\text{in}} \otimes \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_{\text{aux}}$  is applied, where  $\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_{\text{aux}}$  is the identity map, which acts trivially on the auxiliary system, *i.e.*,  $\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_{\text{aux}}(\rho) = \rho$ , for every operator  $\rho$ .
- 3) Finally, we perform a quantum channel (decoder)  $\tilde{D} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_O \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{aux}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_F)$  to obtain the output

$$\tilde{C}_{\text{out}} = \tilde{D} \circ \left( \tilde{C}_{\text{in}} \otimes \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_{\text{aux}} \right) \circ \tilde{E}. \quad (1)$$

<sup>1</sup>Interestingly, parallel circuits are optimal even when considering transformations which do not respect a definite causal order, such as the quantum switch [31] or general process matrices [32].

<sup>2</sup>The symbol  $\mathcal{H}$  denotes a finite Hilbert space which is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}_d$  for some dimension  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ . The symbol  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$  denotes the set of linear operators acting on  $\mathcal{H}$  (endomorphisms).

<sup>3</sup>A linear map  $\tilde{C} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_I) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_O)$  is positive when  $\tilde{C}(\rho) \geq 0$  for every positive semidefinite linear operator  $\rho \geq 0$ ,  $\rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_I)$ . A map is CP if it is positive for all its trivial extensions, that is,  $\tilde{C} \otimes \tilde{\mathbb{1}}(\sigma)$  for every  $\sigma \geq 0$ ,  $\sigma \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{aux}})$  where  $\tilde{\mathbb{1}} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{aux}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{aux}})$  is the identity map on an arbitrary finite space  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{aux}}$ , *i.e.*,  $\tilde{\mathbb{1}}(\rho) = \rho$ ,  $\forall \rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{aux}})$ .

<sup>4</sup>A linear map  $\tilde{C} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_I) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_O)$  is TP when  $\text{tr}(\tilde{C}(\rho)) = \text{tr}(\rho)$  for every linear operator  $\rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_I)$ .

<sup>5</sup>In this paper, we reserve the word map for linear transformations between linear operators. Also, adopt the convention of writing a tilde on the top of maps to make an easy distinction between operators, *e.g.*,  $C \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_I \otimes \mathcal{H}_O)$  and maps  $\tilde{C} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_I) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_O)$ . This convention is particularly useful when dealing with Choi representations of linear maps.

The use of  $k$  independent calls of a unitary channel  $\tilde{U}_d$  may be mathematically represented by a single channel  $\tilde{U}_d^{\otimes k}$ . Then, a parallel quantum circuit that transforms  $k$  calls of a unitary operation  $\tilde{U}_d$  may be done by following the single input operation case described above and identifying  $\tilde{U}_d^{\otimes k}$  as  $\tilde{C}_{\text{in}}$ , to obtain the transformation

$$\tilde{U}_d^{\otimes k} \mapsto \tilde{D} \circ \left( \tilde{U}_d^{\otimes k} \otimes \tilde{\mathbb{1}} \right) \circ \tilde{E}, \quad (2)$$

as illustrated in Fig. 1. When the input channel is composed of  $k$  operations, it is convenient to write the input space  $\mathcal{H}_I$  as  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{I}} := \mathcal{H}_{I_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{H}_{I_k}$ , where the bold letter  $\mathbf{I}$  emphasises that the linear space  $\mathcal{H}_I$  has an internal tensor product structure. Similarly, we also write  $\mathcal{H}_O := \mathcal{H}_{O_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{H}_{O_k}$ . And, since we aim to transform  $k$  calls of  $d$ -dimensional unitary operations into a unitary operation, we have that  $\mathcal{H}_P \cong \mathcal{H}_F \cong \mathcal{H}_{I_i} \cong \mathcal{H}_{O_i} \cong \mathbb{C}_d$  for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{I}} \cong \mathcal{H}_O \cong \mathbb{C}_d^{\otimes k}$ .

The performance of transformations between quantum operations can be quantified by means of channel fidelity, which is known to respect several relevant properties for information processing [33]. The fidelity between quantum channels is normally defined through their Choi operators. The Choi isomorphism, which maps a quantum channel to its Choi operator, is defined as follows. Let  $T : \mathcal{H}_I \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_O$  be a linear operator. Its Choi vector  $|T\rangle\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_I \otimes \mathcal{H}_O$  is,

$$|T\rangle\rangle := \sum_i |i\rangle \otimes (T|i\rangle), \quad (3)$$

where  $\{|i\rangle\}_{i=1}^d$  is a canonical orthonormal basis for  $\mathbb{C}_d$ , often referred to as computational basis. Similarly, let  $\tilde{C} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_I) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_O)$  be a linear map between linear operators. Its Choi operator  $C \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_I \otimes \mathcal{H}_O)$  is

$$C := \sum_{ij} |i\rangle\langle j| \otimes \tilde{C}(|i\rangle\langle j|). \quad (4)$$

Direct calculation shows that the Choi operator of a unitary channel  $\tilde{U}(\rho) = U\rho U^\dagger$  may be conveniently expressed as  $|U\rangle\rangle\langle\langle U|$ .

The fidelity between an arbitrary quantum channel  $\tilde{C}$  and a unitary channel  $\tilde{U}_d(\rho) = U\rho U^\dagger$  is then given by,

$$F(\tilde{C}, \tilde{U}) := \frac{1}{d^2} \langle\langle U|C|U\rangle\rangle, \quad (5)$$

where  $C$  is the Choi operator of  $\tilde{C}$  and  $|U\rangle\rangle$  the Choi vector of  $U$ .

We now turn to the task of transforming  $k$  copies of a unitary operator  $U_d$  into its complex conjugate  $\overline{U}_d$  in the canonical computational basis  $\{|i\rangle\}_{i=1}^d$ . That is, if  $U_d = \sum_{ij} \alpha_{ij} |i\rangle\langle j|$ , for some complex coefficients  $\alpha_{ij} \in \mathbb{C}$ , then  $\overline{U}_d = \sum_{ij} \overline{\alpha_{ij}} |i\rangle\langle j|$ . Since we can restrict the analysis to parallel quantum circuits, the target transformation can be written as,

$$\tilde{U}_d^{\otimes k} \mapsto \tilde{D} \circ \left( \tilde{U}_d^{\otimes k} \otimes \tilde{\mathbb{1}} \right) \circ \tilde{E} \approx \overline{U}_d, \quad (6)$$

which is completely described by the encoding and decoding channels as in Eq. (2). Requiring the circuit to achieve said transformation uniformly well for each possible input  $U_d$ , we

relate the performance of the circuit to the average channel fidelity. For unitary complex conjugation, we have

$$\langle F \rangle := \int_{U_d \in \mathcal{SU}(d)} F\left(\tilde{D} \circ (\tilde{U}_d^{\otimes k} \otimes \tilde{\mathbb{1}}) \circ \tilde{E}, \tilde{U}_d\right) dU, \quad (7)$$

where the integral is taken in accordance to the Haar measure. Also, as proven in Ref. [28], for the case of homomorphic transformations (including the complex conjugation), the optimal average fidelity coincides with the optimal worst-case fidelity and there is a one-to-one correspondence between average fidelity and the robustness of the transformation to noise, ensuring that the average fidelity is indeed a relevant figure of merit.

### III. OPTIMAL QUANTUM CIRCUIT FOR UNITARY COMPLEX CONJUGATION

In this section, we state our main result and provide an explicit construction for the optimal quantum circuit for complex conjugation of an arbitrary unitary operation. The proof of optimality and performance evaluation of the circuit presented here are given in Sec. IV.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $U_d$  be a unitary operator representing an arbitrary  $d$ -dimensional unitary operation  $\tilde{U}_d(\rho) = U\rho U^\dagger$ . When  $k \leq d-1$  uses are available, the optimal quantum circuit which transforms  $k$  uses of  $U_d$  into its complex conjugation  $\overline{U}_d$  attains average fidelity  $\langle F \rangle = \frac{k+1}{d(d-k)}$ . Additionally, the optimal circuit admits a parallel implementation which makes no use of additional auxiliary spaces.*

Note that when  $k = d-1$ , we obtain  $\langle F \rangle = 1$ , hence unitary complex conjugation may be done exactly when the number of calls respects  $k \geq d-1$ . This optimal and exact transformation for the  $k = d-1$  case was first presented at Ref. [21] and will be reviewed in this section for convenience.

It is useful to state some facts regarding the antisymmetric subspace, which will play a major role in constructing optimal quantum circuits for unitary complex conjugation. Let  $S_N$  be the group of permutations of  $N$  elements, and  $V(\pi) \in \mathbb{C}_d^{\otimes N}$  be a representation for the permutation  $\pi \in S_N$  in  $\mathbb{C}_d^{\otimes N}$ , explicitly is defined via

$$V(\pi)|\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\psi_2\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\psi_N\rangle = |\psi_{\pi^{-1}(1)}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\pi^{-1}(2)}\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\psi_{\pi^{-1}(N)}\rangle. \quad (8)$$

The antisymmetric subspace of  $N$   $d$ -dimensional parties is a subspace of  $\mathbb{C}_d^{\otimes N}$  formed by vectors  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}_d^{\otimes N}$  respecting

$$V(\pi)|\psi\rangle = \text{sgn}(\pi)|\psi\rangle, \quad \forall \pi \in S_N \quad (9)$$

where  $\text{sgn}(\pi)$  is the sign<sup>6</sup> of the permutation  $\pi$ . When  $d = N$ , the antisymmetric subspace of  $\mathbb{C}_d^{\otimes N}$  is one-dimensional, and it is spanned by a single vector, known as the totally antisymmetric state,

$$|\psi_{A_d}\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N!}} \sum_{\pi \in S_N} \text{sgn}(\pi) |\pi(1)\rangle \otimes |\pi(2)\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\pi(d)\rangle, \quad (10)$$

<sup>6</sup>That is,  $\text{sgn}(\pi) = +1$  when  $\pi$  can be written as a composition of even pairwise transpositions and  $\text{sgn}(\pi) = -1$  when  $\pi$  can be written as a composition of odd pairwise transpositions.

where we use  $\{|1\rangle, |2\rangle, \dots, |d\rangle\}$  as a basis for  $\mathbb{C}_d$ . The totally antisymmetric state is known to respect

$$U_d^{\otimes d} |\psi_{A_d}\rangle = |\psi_{A_d}\rangle, \quad \forall U_d \in \mathcal{SU}(d), \quad (11)$$

which is equivalent to

$$\left(\mathbb{1}_d \otimes U_d^{\otimes(d-1)}\right) |\psi_{A_d}\rangle = \left(U^\dagger \otimes \mathbb{1}_d^{\otimes(d-1)}\right) |\psi_{A_d}\rangle. \quad (12)$$

By doing the partial transposition on the first linear space of Eq. (12), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\left(\mathbb{1}_d \otimes U_d^{\otimes(d-1)}\right) |\psi_{A_d}\rangle\right)^{T_1} &= \left(U^\dagger \otimes \mathbb{1}_d^{\otimes(d-1)} |\psi_{A_d}\rangle\right)^{T_1} \\ &= |\psi_{A_d}\rangle^{T_1} \left(\overline{U}_d \otimes \mathbb{1}_d^{\otimes(d-1)}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

With Eq. (13), we can now recover the result of Ref. [21] stating that when  $k = d-1$ , it is possible to transform  $U_d^{\otimes(d-1)}$  into  $U_d$  exactly. We set  $N = k+1$  and define the transformation  $V : \mathbb{C}_d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_d^{\otimes(d-1)}$  as,

$$V := \frac{\sqrt{d!}}{\sqrt{(d-1)!}} |\psi_{A_d}\rangle^{T_1} \quad (15)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{(d-1)!}} \sum_{\pi \in S_N} \text{sgn}(\pi) |\pi(1)\rangle \otimes |\pi(2)\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\pi(d)\rangle. \quad (16)$$

Note that  $V$  is an isometry since  $V^\dagger V = \mathbb{1}_d$ . Now, in order to transform  $k = d-1$  uses of  $U_d$  into  $\overline{U}_d$ , we simply perform  $V$  before  $U_d^{\otimes(d-1)}$ , and the operator  $V^\dagger$  after to obtain

$$V^\dagger U_d^{\otimes(d-1)} V = \overline{U}_d. \quad (17)$$

In the following, we move to the case  $k < d-1$ . The identification of the optimal circuit for this scenario is the main finding of this work.

The case  $k < d-1$  turns out to be more involved, as we need to consider scenarios where the antisymmetric subspace is not one-dimensional. When  $N < d$ , the antisymmetric subspace of  $\mathbb{C}_d^{\otimes N}$  is spanned by a set of  $\binom{d}{N} := \frac{d!}{N!(d-N)!}$  orthogonal vectors given by  $|\psi_{A_{d,N}}^{(i)}\rangle$ . These vectors may be explicitly constructed by a simple method. First, let us set the vector with index  $i = 1$  as

$$|\psi_{A_{d,N}}^{(1)}\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N!}} \sum_{\pi \in S_N} \text{sgn}(\pi) |\pi(1)\rangle \otimes |\pi(2)\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\pi(N)\rangle. \quad (18)$$

Note that, since  $N < d$ , other orthogonal antisymmetric vectors can be constructed – for instance

$$|\psi_{A_{d,N}}^{(2)}\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N!}} \sum_{\pi \in S_N} \text{sgn}(\pi) |\pi(1)+1\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\pi(N)+1\rangle \quad (19)$$

also respects  $V(\pi)|\psi_{A_{d,N}}^{(2)}\rangle = \text{sgn}(\pi)|\psi_{A_{d,N}}^{(2)}\rangle$  for every permutation  $\pi \in S_N$ . Here, we defined the permutation index to be cyclic, i.e.  $\pi(j)+1 := 1$  if  $\pi(j) = N$ . The set of  $\binom{d}{N}$  vectors of this form then span the whole antisymmetric

space of  $\mathbb{C}_d^{\otimes N}$ . We can now write the projector onto the antisymmetric space as

$$A(d, N) = \sum_{i=1}^{\binom{d}{N}} |\psi_{A_d, N}^{(i)}\rangle\langle\psi_{A_d, N}^{(i)}|, \quad (20)$$

which may also be equivalently written as [34]

$$A(d, N) = \sum_{\pi \in S_N} \text{sgn}(\pi) V(\pi). \quad (21)$$

We are now in position to present the optimal circuit for unitary complex conjugation. Our circuit does not make use of any auxiliary space. The action of the encoder channel  $\tilde{E} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_P) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_I)$ , with  $\mathcal{H}_P \cong \mathbb{C}_d$ , and  $\mathcal{H}_I \cong \mathbb{C}_d^{\otimes k}$  may be equivalently expressed in the Choi or operator-sum representation, which are respectively given by

$$\tilde{E}(\rho) := \text{tr}_P \left( \rho_P^T \otimes \mathbb{1}_I E_{PI} \right) \quad (22)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{\binom{d}{k+1}} K_i \rho K_i^\dagger, \quad (23)$$

where  $\text{tr}_P$  denotes the trace over the past space  $\mathcal{H}_P$ , and  $E \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_P \otimes \mathcal{H}_I)$ ,  $E := \frac{d}{\binom{d}{k+1}} A(d, k+1)$  is the Choi operator of the map  $\tilde{E}$  and  $K_i := \frac{d}{\binom{d}{k+1}} |\psi_{A_d, N}^{(i)}\rangle^{T_1}$  are the Kraus operators of  $\tilde{E}$ . The decoder channel  $\tilde{D} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_O) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_F)$ , where  $\mathcal{H}_O \cong \mathbb{C}_d^{\otimes k}$ , and  $\mathcal{H}_F \cong \mathbb{C}_d$  may be equivalently expressed in the Choi or operator-sum representation, given by

$$\tilde{D}(\rho) := \text{tr}_O \left( \rho_O^T \otimes \mathbb{1}_F D_{OF} \right) \quad (24)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{\binom{d}{k+1}} K_i^\dagger \rho K_i + \text{tr} \left( (\mathbb{1}_d^{\otimes k} - A(d, k)) \rho \right) \sigma_F \quad (25)$$

where  $D \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_O \otimes \mathcal{H}_F)$ ,

$$D := \frac{\binom{d}{k}}{\binom{d}{k+1}} A(d, k+1)_{OF} + \left( \mathbb{1}_d^{\otimes k} - A(d, k) \right)_O \otimes \sigma_F, \quad (26)$$

is the Choi operator of the map  $\tilde{D}$  and  $\sigma \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_F) \cong \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}_d)$  is an arbitrary quantum state, *i.e.*,  $\sigma \geq 0$  and  $\text{tr}(\sigma) = 1$ .

By adding everything together, optimal complex conjugation attains the transformation

$$\tilde{D} \circ \tilde{U}_d^{\otimes k} \circ \tilde{E} \approx \tilde{U}_d, \quad (27)$$

with fidelity

$$F \left( \tilde{D} \circ \tilde{U}_d^{\otimes k} \circ \tilde{E}, \tilde{U}_d \right) = \frac{k+1}{d(d-k)} \quad (28)$$

for any unitary operation  $\tilde{U}_d$ .

#### IV. PROOF OF OPTIMALITY

##### A. Quantum superchannels

A useful mathematical framework for analysing transformations between quantum operations is given by the formalism of quantum superchannels, also referred to as 1-slot quantum combs or quantum supermaps [4–6].

**Definition 1.** A linear operator  $S \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_P \otimes \mathcal{H}_I \otimes \mathcal{H}_O \otimes \mathcal{H}_F)$  is a parallel superchannel if it can be written as

$$S = \text{tr}_{\text{aux}} \left( E_{PI_{\text{aux}}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{OF} \right) \left( \mathbb{1}_{PI} \otimes D_{\text{aux}OF} \right), \quad (29)$$

where  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{aux}}$  is an arbitrary finite linear space and  $E \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_P \otimes \mathcal{H}_I \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{aux}})$  and  $D \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{aux}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_O \otimes \mathcal{H}_F)$  are operators such that,

$$E \geq 0, \quad \text{tr}_{I_{\text{aux}}}(E) = \mathbb{1}_P \quad (30)$$

$$D \geq 0, \quad \text{tr}_F(D) = \mathbb{1}_{\text{aux}O}. \quad (31)$$

That is,  $E$  is the Choi operator of a quantum channel from  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_P)$  to  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_I \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{aux}})$  and  $D$  is the Choi operator of a quantum channel from  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{aux}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_O)$  to  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_F)$ .

The concept of superchannel presented in Def. 1 is useful because it incorporates every possible quantum circuit based in encoder-decoder schemes [5, 6]: a positive semidefinite operator  $S \geq 0$ ,  $S \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_P \otimes \mathcal{H}_I \otimes \mathcal{H}_O \otimes \mathcal{H}_F)$  is a parallel superchannel if and only if there exists a positive semidefinite operator  $C \geq 0$ ,  $C \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_P \otimes \mathcal{H}_I)$  such that,

$$\text{tr}_F(S) = C_{PI} \otimes \mathbb{1}_O, \quad (32)$$

$$\text{tr}_I(C) = \mathbb{1}_P \quad (33)$$

that is,  $C$  is the Choi operator of a quantum channel from  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_P)$  to  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_I)$ . And from the decomposition of Eq. (32) to explicitly construct an encoder and decoder channel [5, 6]. For that, we set the auxiliary space as  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{aux}} := \mathcal{H}_{P'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{I'}$  where  $\mathcal{H}_{P'}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{I'}$  are isomorphic  $\mathcal{H}_P$  and  $\mathcal{H}_I$  and define

$$E := \left( \sqrt{C_{PI}}^T \otimes \mathbb{1}_{P'I'} \right) |\mathbb{1}\rangle\langle\mathbb{1}|_{PP'} \otimes |\mathbb{1}\rangle\langle\mathbb{1}|_{II'} \left( \sqrt{C_{PI}}^T \otimes \mathbb{1}_{P'I'} \right)^\dagger \quad (34)$$

$$D := \left( \sqrt{C_{P'I'}}^{-1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{OF} \right) S_{P'I'OF} \left( \sqrt{C_{P'I'}}^{-1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{OF} \right)^\dagger, \quad (35)$$

where  $\sqrt{C}$  is the unique positive semidefinite square root of  $C$  and  $\sqrt{C_{P'I'}}^{-1}$  is the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse defined on the support of  $\sqrt{C_{P'I'}}$ . By using the relation  $C \otimes |\mathbb{1}\rangle\langle\mathbb{1}| = \mathbb{1} \otimes C^T |\mathbb{1}\rangle\langle\mathbb{1}|$  and the cyclic property of the trace, we verify that  $S = \left( \text{tr}_{\text{aux}} \left( (E_{PI_{\text{aux}}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{OF}) (\mathbb{1}_{PI} \otimes D_{\text{aux}OF}) \right) \right)$ .

##### B. The performance operator

A useful tool to evaluate the performance of superchannels for transforming unitary  $k$  uses of a unitary operation  $U_d$  into  $f(U_d)$  is given by the performance operator [18]. The performance operator is defined by

$$\Omega := \frac{1}{d^2} \int_{U_d \in \text{SU}(d)} \overline{|f(U_d)\rangle}\langle\langle f(U_d) |_{PF} \otimes |U_d^{\otimes k}\rangle\rangle\langle\langle U_d^{\otimes k} |_{IO} dU. \quad (36)$$

Direct calculation shows that when using a superchannel  $S$  with encoder channel  $\tilde{E}$  and decoder channel  $\tilde{D}$ , the average fidelity may be written as

$$\int_{U_d \in \text{SU}(d)} F \left( \tilde{D} \circ \tilde{U}_d^{\otimes k} \circ \tilde{E}, \widehat{f(U_d)} \right) dU = \text{tr}(S\Omega). \quad (37)$$

Hence, when the performance operator  $\Omega$  is given, by combining Eq. (37) with the superchannel characterisation given by

Eq. (32), the problem of finding the optimal average fidelity with a parallel superchannel reads

$$\max \text{tr}(S\Omega) \quad (38)$$

$$\text{s.t. : } S \geq 0 \quad (39)$$

$$\text{tr}_F(S) = C_{PI} \otimes \mathbb{1}_O \quad (40)$$

$$\text{tr}_I(C) = \mathbb{1}_P. \quad (41)$$

Reference [18, 28] shows that the dual optimisation problem is given by

$$\min c \quad (42)$$

$$\text{s.t. : } \Omega \leq c\hat{S} \quad (43)$$

$$\hat{S} = W_{PIO} \otimes \mathbb{1}_F \quad (44)$$

$$\text{tr}_O(W) = \rho_P \otimes \mathbb{1}_I \quad (45)$$

$$\text{tr}(\rho) = 1. \quad (46)$$

As the notation suggests,  $\rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_P)$  represents a quantum state,  $W \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_P \otimes \mathcal{H}_I \otimes \mathcal{H}_O)$  is a causally ordered process [6, 32], and  $\hat{S}$  lies in the dual affine set of (parallel) superchannels [15, 18]. By definition of the dual problem, any feasible point for the dual problem constitutes as an upper bound for the primal. Additionally, for this particular problem we have strong duality, which means that the optimal value for the dual problem coincides with the optimal value for the primal problem.

The performance operator for transforming  $k$  calls of a unitary  $U_d$  into its complex conjugate  $U_d$  reads as

$$\Omega = \int_{U_d \in SU(d)} |U_d\rangle\rangle\langle\langle U_d|_{PF} \otimes |U_d^{\otimes k}\rangle\rangle\langle\langle U_d^{\otimes k}|_{IO} dU, \quad (47)$$

and Ref. [28] shows that this performance operator takes the form of

$$\Omega = \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_i \frac{B_{PI}^i \otimes \overline{B_{OF}^i}}{d_i} \quad (48)$$

where  $\{B^i\}_i$  is an orthonormal basis, *i.e.*,  $\text{tr}(B^i B^{j\dagger}) = \delta_{ij} d_i$ , for the subspace spanned by operators commuting with  $U^{\otimes(k+1)}$ . In Sec. IV-D1 we are going to employ methods from group representation theory to present an explicit basis for this subspace.

### C. Evaluating the performance of the superchannel presented in Sec. III

In this section, we show that the superchannel presented in Sec. III attains optimal performance. The proof of its optimality is presented in subsection IV-D.

The superchannel  $S \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_P \otimes \mathcal{H}_I \otimes \mathcal{H}_O \otimes \mathcal{H}_F)$  described in Eq. (22) and Eq. (24) reads as

$$S := E_{PI} \otimes D_{OF} \quad (49)$$

$$E := \frac{d}{\binom{d}{k+1}} A(d, k+1) \quad (50)$$

$$D := \frac{\binom{d}{k}}{\binom{d}{k+1}} A(d, k+1) + \left( \mathbb{1}_d^{\otimes k} - A(d, k) \right) \otimes \sigma, \quad (51)$$

where  $A(d, k)$  is the projector onto the antisymmetric space of  $\mathbb{C}_d^{\otimes k}$  and  $\sigma$  is an arbitrary quantum state.

**Lemma 1.** *The quantum circuit described in Sec. III transforms  $k$  uses of a  $d$ -dimensional unitary operation  $U_d$  into its complex conjugation  $\overline{U_d}$  with an average fidelity respecting  $\langle F \rangle \geq \frac{k+1}{d(d-k)}$ .*

*Proof.* We prove the theorem by showing that

$$\text{tr}(\Omega S) = \frac{k+1}{d(d-k)} \quad (52)$$

with  $\Omega$  being the performance operator for the unitary complex conjugation transformation

$$\Omega = \int_{U_d \in SU(d)} |U_d\rangle\rangle\langle\langle U_d|_{PF} \otimes |U_d^{\otimes k}\rangle\rangle\langle\langle U_d^{\otimes k}|_{IO} dU, \quad (53)$$

and  $S$  the superchannel described in Eq. (49).

As previously stated, Ref. [28] shows that the performance operator for unitary complex conjugation may be written as

$$\Omega = \sum_i \frac{1}{d^2} \frac{B_{PI}^i \otimes \overline{B_{OF}^i}}{d_i} \quad (54)$$

where  $\{B^i\}_i$  is an orthonormal basis, *i.e.*,  $\text{tr}(B^i B^{j\dagger}) = \delta_{ij} d_i$ , for the subspace spanned by operators commuting with all unitary operators  $U^{\otimes(k+1)}$ . Since the projector onto the antisymmetric space  $A(d, k+1)$  respects  $A(d, k+1)U^{\otimes(k+1)} = U^{\otimes(k+1)}A(d, k+1)$ , we can set  $A(d, k+1)$  as  $B_1$ , one of the operators of the orthonormal basis  $\{B^i\}_i$ . We can then write

$$\Omega = \frac{1}{d^2} \frac{A(d, k+1)_{PI} \otimes A(d, k+1)_{OF}}{\text{tr}(A(d, k+1))} + \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{i>1} \frac{B_{PI}^i \otimes \overline{B_{OF}^i}}{d_i}. \quad (55)$$

Now, since  $E_{PI} = \frac{d}{\binom{d}{k+1}} A(d, k+1)$  and  $\text{tr}(A(d, k+1) B^i) = 0$  for  $i > 1$ , it holds that

$$\text{tr}(\Omega S) = \frac{1}{d^2} \frac{\text{tr}(E A(d, k+1)) \text{tr}(D A(d, k+1))}{\text{tr}(A(d, k+1))}. \quad (56)$$

We now recall from Sec. III that  $\text{tr}(A(d, k)) = \binom{d}{k}$ , and since  $A(d, k)^2 = A(d, k)$ , we have that

$$\text{tr}(\Omega S) = \frac{1}{d^2} \frac{d \binom{d}{k} \binom{d}{k+1} \binom{d}{k+1}}{\binom{d}{k+1} \binom{d}{k+1} \binom{d}{k+1}} \quad (57)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{d^2} \frac{d \binom{d}{k+1}}{\binom{d}{k+1}} \text{tr}(A(d, k+1) (\mathbb{1}_d^{\otimes k} - A(d, k)) \otimes \sigma). \quad (58)$$

Since  $\mathbb{1}_d^{\otimes k} - A(d, k)$  is positive semidefinite, we have that

$$\text{tr}(\Omega S) \geq \frac{1}{d^2} \frac{d \binom{d}{k} \binom{d}{k+1} \binom{d}{k+1}}{\binom{d}{k+1} \binom{d}{k+1} \binom{d}{k+1}} \quad (59)$$

$$= \frac{\binom{d}{k}}{d \binom{d}{k+1}} \quad (60)$$

$$= \frac{d!}{k!(d-k)(d-k-1)!} \frac{(k+1)k!(d-k-1)!}{d!} \quad (61)$$

$$= \frac{k+1}{d(d-k)}. \quad (62)$$

This finishes the proof.  $\square$

As we are going to show next, this protocol cannot be improved. Its average fidelity is exactly  $\langle F \rangle = \frac{k+1}{d(d-k)}$  and we have that  $\text{tr} \left( A(d, k+1) (\mathbb{1}_d^{\otimes k} - A(d, k)) \otimes \sigma \right) = 0$  for any quantum state  $\sigma$ .

#### D. A tight upper bound for the unitary conjugation problem

To prove that the superchannel  $S$  presented in section III is indeed optimal, we provide here a feasible solution for the dual problem defined by equations (42)-(45), and show that its solution matches with the solution of the respective primal problem from (38)-(41) solved in section IV-C. In particular, we show that for our proposed ansatz, the value of the constant  $c$  from (42) matches with the value from (38) – reproducing the value of optimal fidelity from Theorem 1. In order to proceed, we need to introduce basic knowledge from representation theory, including the famous Schur-Weyl duality [34, 35], Young diagrams and their relation to irreducible representation (irrep) of the symmetric group [34, 35]. We give a brief introduction in the following subsection, while the solution of the dual problem for the unitary conjugation problem is derived later.

1) *Young diagrams, Schur-Weyl duality and irreducible representations of the symmetric group:* A partition  $\lambda$  of a natural number  $n$ , which we denote as  $\lambda \vdash n$ , is a sequence of positive numbers  $\lambda = [\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_m]$ , such that

$$\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_m, \geq 0 \quad \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i = n. \quad (63)$$

This can be represented graphically. Namely, every partition can be visualised as a *Young diagram* - a collection of boxes arranged in left-justified rows.

Now we introduce the notion of a step representation for a given Young tableau [36]. Let  $k_1, k_2, \dots, k_s$  be multiplicities of numbers  $\lambda_i$  in the non-increasing sequence (63). Let us also define  $p_i = \lambda_{k_i} - \lambda_{k_i+1}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ , where we assume  $\lambda_{k_s+1} = 0$ . Observe that

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq s} k_i p_j = n, \quad (64)$$

and a Young diagram is uniquely determined by the sequence,

$$(k_1, p_1, k_2, p_2, \dots, k_s, p_s). \quad (65)$$

Let us name the sequence a *step representation* of a diagram  $\lambda$ .

For every two boxes  $b_1 = (i_1, j_1), b_2 = (i_2, j_2)$  let us define their *axial distance*

$$d(b_1, b_2) := |i_1 - i_2| + |j_1 - j_2|. \quad (66)$$

Let  $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_s$  be corner boxes

$$c_j = (k_1 + k_2 + \dots + k_j, p_j + p_{j+1} + \dots + p_s), \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, s. \quad (67)$$

For further applications let us observe that for  $i < j$ ,

$$d(c_i, c_j) = p_i + \dots + k_j, \quad (68)$$

where the above notation means the sum of all numbers occurring in the sequence (65) between  $k_i$  and  $p_j$  including them.

For a fixed number  $n$ , the number of Young diagrams determines the number of nonequivalent irreps of  $S_n$  in an abstract decomposition. However, working in the representation space  $\mathcal{H} \equiv (\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$ , for every decomposition of  $S_n$  into irreps we take Young diagrams  $\lambda$  with height  $h(\lambda)$  of at most  $d$ . For example, in the case of qubits ( $d = 2$ ), we allow only for diagrams up to two rows.

The celebrated Schur-Weyl duality relates irreps of the general linear group  $GL_d(\mathbb{C})$  and symmetric group  $S_n$ . Namely, it is known that the diagonal action of the general linear group  $GL_d(\mathbb{C})$  of invertible complex matrices and of the symmetric group on  $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$  commute:

$$V(\pi)(X \otimes \dots \otimes X) = (X \otimes \dots \otimes X)V(\pi), \quad (69)$$

where  $\pi \in S_n$  and  $X \in GL_d(\mathbb{C})$ . Due to the above relation, there exists a basis called the Schur basis, producing a decomposition into irreps of  $GL_d(\mathbb{C})$  and  $S_n$  simultaneously. Hence, for the whole space  $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$  we have the following

**Theorem 2.** *The tensor product space  $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$  can be decomposed as*

$$(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n} = \bigoplus_{\substack{\lambda \vdash n \\ h(\lambda) \leq d}} \mathcal{U}_\lambda \otimes \mathcal{S}_\lambda, \quad (70)$$

where the symmetric group  $S_n$  acts on the space  $\mathcal{S}_\lambda$  and the general linear group  $GL_d(\mathbb{C})$  acts on the space  $\mathcal{U}_\lambda$ , labelled by the same partitions.

From the decomposition given in Theorem 2 we deduce that for a given irrep  $\lambda$  of  $S_n$ , the space  $\mathcal{U}_\lambda$  is the multiplicity space of dimension  $m_\lambda$  (multiplicity of irrep  $\lambda$ ), while the space  $\mathcal{S}_\lambda$  is the representation space of dimension  $d_\lambda$  (dimension of irrep  $\lambda$ ).

With every irrep  $\lambda$  we can associate irreducible basis operators  $E_{ij}^\lambda$ , for  $i, j = 1, \dots, d_\lambda$ , spanning the representation space  $\mathcal{S}_\lambda$ . These operators admit the following appealing form in the Schur basis

$$E_{ij}^\lambda = \mathbb{1}_\lambda^\mathcal{U} \otimes |\lambda, i\rangle \langle \lambda, j|_{\mathcal{S}}. \quad (71)$$

The above operators fulfill the following properties, which are

$$E_{ij}^\lambda E_{kl}^{\lambda'} = \delta^{\lambda\lambda'} \delta_{jk} E_{il}^\lambda, \quad \text{tr} E_{ij}^\lambda = \delta_{ij} m_\lambda. \quad (72)$$

From the operators  $E_{ij}^\lambda$  we can construct so-called Young projectors  $P^\lambda$  on the irreducible components  $\lambda$ :

$$P^\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{d_\lambda} E_{ii}^\lambda = \mathbb{1}_\lambda^\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathbb{1}_\lambda^\mathcal{S}. \quad (73)$$

Now, suppose we have  $\alpha \vdash n-1$  and  $\lambda \vdash n$ . Writing  $\lambda \in \alpha$  we consider such Young diagrams  $\mu$  which can be obtained from  $\alpha$  by adding a single box. Similarly, writing  $\alpha \in \lambda$  we consider such Young diagrams  $\alpha$ , which can be obtained from  $\mu$  by removing a single box.

Let us take  $\mu \vdash n$  and  $\alpha, \beta \vdash n-1$ , such that  $\alpha, \beta \in \mu$ . Consider an arbitrary unitary irrep  $\phi^\mu(\pi)$  for some  $\pi \in S_n$ . Then it can be always unitarily transformed to block form as

$$\phi^\mu(\pi) = \left( \phi_{k_\mu, l_\mu}^\mu(\pi) \right) = \left( \phi_{i_\alpha, j_\alpha}^{\alpha\beta}(\pi) \right), \quad (74)$$

where the indices  $k_\mu, l_\mu$  are the standard matrix indices running from 1 to  $d_\mu$ . The matrices on the diagonal, *i.e.*, for  $\alpha = \beta$  are of dimension of the corresponding irrep  $\varphi^\alpha$  of  $S_{n-1}$ . It means that the indices  $i_\alpha, j_\alpha$  run from 1 to  $d_\alpha$ . In particular, when one considers an irrep  $\phi^\mu(\pi')$  for  $\pi' \in S_{n-1}$ , we have

$$\phi^\mu(\pi') = (\delta^{\alpha\beta} \varphi_{i_\alpha, j_\alpha}^\alpha(\pi')) = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \mu} \varphi^\alpha(\pi'). \quad (75)$$

A similar procedure can be also done in the reverse order, *i.e.* starting from an irrep  $\varphi^\alpha$  of  $S_{n-1}$  we can induce irreps  $\phi^\mu$  of a larger group  $S_n$ . Informally, this means that to a given  $\alpha$  by adding one box in different ways allows for different induced representations  $\mu$ . For more details, we refer the reader to [37, 38]. The above considerations give us a way how to represent elements of the algebra  $\mathbb{C}[S_n]$  in terms of elements from the algebra  $\mathbb{C}[S_{n-1}]$  and vice versa. This allows us to introduce the following:

**Corollary 1.** *Operator  $E_{ij}^\alpha \otimes \mathbb{1}$ , where  $E_{ij}^\alpha$  are basis operators of the algebra  $\mathbb{C}[S_{n-1}]$ , can be written in terms of basis elements of the algebra  $\mathbb{C}[S_n]$  as*

$$E_{i_\alpha, j_\alpha}^\alpha \otimes \mathbb{1} = \sum_{\lambda \in \alpha} E_{i_\alpha, j_\alpha}^{\alpha\alpha}(\lambda). \quad (76)$$

2) *Direct derivations of the upper bound for the unitary conjugation problem:* Due to the presentation of the performance operator  $\Omega$  in (47), we see that it commutes with the diagonal action of the unitary group. This means that its nontrivial part, due to the Schur-Weyl duality in Theorem 2, is supported on the representation space  $\mathcal{S}_\lambda$  connected to the symmetric group. Therefore, the operators from (48) can be chosen to be operators  $E_{ij}^\lambda$  defined in (71). Then the operator  $\Omega$  from (48) has the following presentation:

$$\Omega = \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{\substack{\lambda \vdash (k+1) \\ h(\lambda) \leq d}} \sum_{p, q=1}^{d_\lambda} \frac{(E_{pq}^\lambda)_{IP} \otimes (E_{pq}^\lambda)_{OF}}{m_\lambda}. \quad (77)$$

Since the operator  $\Omega$  is non-trivial only on the space  $\mathcal{S}_\lambda$ , we assume the same property for the operator  $\hat{S}$  from (43) given in formulation of the dual problem described in section IV-B. For the time being, except additional symmetries imposed on the operator  $\hat{S}$  we see that it can have an arbitrary form. However, the considered operator  $\hat{S}$  must also satisfy constraints from (43)-(46), which obviously limits the compatible choices for  $\hat{S}$ . Since our goal is to find a tight upper bound which matches with the solution of the primal problem from section IV-C, it is sufficient to present a feasible solution satisfying aforementioned conditions. To this purpose, we choose the operator  $\hat{S}$  to be of the following form:

$$\hat{S} = \sum_{\substack{\alpha \vdash k \\ h(\alpha) \leq d}} \sum_{k, l=1}^{d_\alpha} \frac{d}{m_\alpha} (E_{kl}^\alpha)_I \otimes \tau_P \otimes (E_{kl}^\alpha)_O \otimes \tau_F. \quad (78)$$

In the above, the operators  $\tau_P = \tau_F = \frac{\mathbb{1}}{d}$  are maximally mixed states on the respective systems. It is easy to see that the operator  $\hat{S}$  satisfies the constraints (44)-(46) by construction. Indeed, we have the following:

$$W_{PIO} = \sum_{\substack{\alpha \vdash k \\ h(\alpha) \leq d}} \sum_{k, l=1}^{d_\alpha} \frac{1}{m_\alpha} (E_{kl}^\alpha)_I \otimes \tau_P \otimes (E_{kl}^\alpha)_O. \quad (79)$$

Now, exploiting properties of irreducible operator basis  $\{E_{ij}^\alpha\}$  from expression (72), we write:

$$\text{tr}_O(W_{PIO}) = \sum_{\substack{\alpha \vdash k \\ h(\alpha) \leq d}} \sum_{k, l=1}^{d_\alpha} \frac{\text{tr}[(E_{kl}^\alpha)_O]}{m_\alpha} (E_{kl}^\alpha)_I \otimes \tau_P \quad (80)$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{\alpha \vdash k \\ h(\alpha) \leq d}} \sum_{k=1}^{d_\alpha} (E_{kk}^\alpha)_I \otimes \tau_P \quad (81)$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{\alpha \vdash k \\ h(\alpha) \leq d}} (P^\alpha)_I \otimes \tau_P \quad (82)$$

$$= \mathbb{1}_I \otimes \tau_P, \quad (83)$$

and finally  $\text{tr}(\tau_P) = 1$ . Having the above, we are in position to evaluate the minimal value of the constant  $c$  satisfying constraint (43).

**Lemma 2.** *The minimal value of the constant  $c$  satisfying constraint (43) for the operator  $\hat{S}$  from (78) is given by,*

$$c = \frac{1}{d} \max_{\lambda \vdash (k+1)} \frac{\sum_{\beta \in \lambda} m_\beta}{m_\lambda}, \quad (84)$$

where  $m_\lambda, m_\beta$  are multiplicities of irreps  $\lambda \vdash k+1, \beta \vdash k$  in the Schur-Weyl duality. The symbol  $\beta \in \lambda$  denotes all Young diagrams obtained from a Young diagram  $\lambda$  by removing a single box.

*Proof.* Writing the constraint from (43) explicitly by using expressions (77) and (78) we get the following inequality

$$\frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{\substack{\lambda \vdash (k+1) \\ h(\lambda) \leq d}} \sum_{p, q=1}^{d_\lambda} \frac{(E_{pq}^\lambda)_{IP} \otimes (E_{pq}^\lambda)_{OF}}{m_\lambda} \quad (85)$$

$$\leq c \cdot \sum_{\substack{\alpha \vdash k \\ h(\alpha) \leq d}} \sum_{k, l=1}^{d_\alpha} \frac{d}{m_\alpha} (E_{kl}^\alpha)_I \otimes \tau_P \otimes (E_{kl}^\alpha)_O \otimes \tau_F. \quad (86)$$

To keep the notation simple, we drop indices the  $I, O, P, F$ , since it will be clear from the context which systems are referred to. Now, by applying Corollary 1, every irreducible basis operator labelled by  $\alpha \vdash k$  extended by identity are block-diagonal with respect to irreps  $\lambda \vdash k+1$ , so that by (76) they have the following specific form

$$E_{ij}^\alpha \otimes \mathbb{1} = \sum_{\lambda \in \alpha} E_{i_\alpha, j_\alpha}^{\alpha\alpha}(\lambda). \quad (87)$$

Additionally, the irreducible operator basis labelled by  $\lambda \vdash k+1$  can be written in terms of the irreducible basis of  $\beta \vdash k$  such that  $\beta \in \lambda$ , giving us the following expression:

$$E_{pq}^\lambda = \sum_{\beta, \beta' \in \lambda} E_{p_\beta q_{\beta'}}^{\beta\beta'}(\lambda). \quad (88)$$

Combining (87), (88) with (85), we get for every  $\lambda \vdash k+1$ :

$$\frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{\beta, \beta' \in \lambda} \sum_{p_\beta, q_{\beta'}} \frac{E_{p_\beta q_{\beta'}}^{\beta\beta'}(\lambda) \otimes E_{p_\beta q_{\beta'}}^{\beta\beta'}(\mu)}{m_\mu} \quad (89)$$

$$\leq c \cdot \sum_{\alpha \in \lambda} \sum_{i_\alpha, j_\alpha} \frac{1}{dm_\alpha} E_{i_\alpha j_\alpha}^{\alpha\alpha}(\lambda) \otimes E_{i_\alpha j_\alpha}^{\alpha\alpha}(\lambda). \quad (90)$$

All the operators in the above expression are the irreducible basis operators for the symmetric groups  $S_{k+1}$  and  $S_k$ . Hence, by Schur-Weyl duality, they act non-trivially only on the symmetric component of the Schur-Weyl decomposition (70). Now, using the explicit forms of the irreducible basis operators in the Schur basis from (71) we rewrite (89) in the following way (ignoring the multiplicity space):

$$\frac{1}{d^2 m_\lambda} \sum_{\beta, \beta' \in \lambda} \sum_{p_\beta, q_{\beta'}} |\beta, p_\beta\rangle \langle \beta', q_{\beta'}| \otimes |\beta, p_\beta\rangle \langle \beta', q_{\beta'}| \quad (91)$$

$$\leq \sum_{\alpha \in \lambda} \sum_{i_\alpha, j_\alpha} \frac{c}{dm_\alpha} |\alpha, i_\alpha\rangle \langle \alpha, j_\alpha| \otimes |\alpha, i_\alpha\rangle \langle \alpha, j_\alpha|. \quad (92)$$

Using the definition  $|\Phi_\alpha^+\rangle = \sum_{i_\alpha=1}^{d_\alpha} |i_\alpha\rangle |i_\alpha\rangle$  for an unnormalised maximally entangled state on irrep  $\alpha$ , we get

$$\frac{1}{d^2 m_\lambda} \sum_{\beta, \beta' \in \lambda} |\beta\beta\rangle \langle \beta'\beta'| \otimes |\Phi_\beta^+\rangle \langle \Phi_{\beta'}^+| \quad (93)$$

$$\leq \sum_{\alpha \in \lambda} \frac{c}{dm_\alpha} |\alpha\alpha\rangle \langle \alpha\alpha| \otimes |\Phi_\alpha^+\rangle \langle \Phi_\alpha^+|. \quad (94)$$

Rearranging irreps on the right-hand side leads to

$$\frac{1}{d^2 m_\lambda} \sum_{\beta, \beta' \in \lambda} |\beta\beta\rangle \langle \beta'\beta'| \otimes |\Phi_\beta^+\rangle \langle \Phi_{\beta'}^+| \quad (95)$$

$$\leq \sum_{\beta \in \lambda} \frac{c}{dm_\beta} |\beta\beta\rangle \langle \beta\beta| \otimes |\Phi_\beta^+\rangle \langle \Phi_\beta^+|. \quad (96)$$

Now, we notice that by applying an isometry  $|\beta\beta\rangle \mapsto |\beta\rangle$  we can rewrite the above inequality as:

$$\frac{1}{d^2 m_\lambda} \sum_{\beta, \beta' \in \lambda} |\beta\rangle \langle \beta'| \otimes |\Phi_\beta^+\rangle \langle \Phi_{\beta'}^+| \quad (97)$$

$$\leq \sum_{\beta \in \lambda} \frac{c}{dm_\beta} |\beta\rangle \langle \beta| \otimes |\Phi_\beta^+\rangle \langle \Phi_\beta^+|. \quad (98)$$

Defining a new set of normalised vectors  $|\psi_\beta\rangle := \frac{|\tilde{\psi}_\beta\rangle}{\|\tilde{\psi}_\beta\|} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_\beta}} |\tilde{\psi}_\beta\rangle$ , where  $|\tilde{\psi}_\beta\rangle := |\beta\rangle \otimes |\Phi_\beta^+\rangle$ , we rewrite the above equation as

$$\frac{1}{d^2 m_\lambda} \sum_{\beta, \beta'} \sqrt{d_\beta d_{\beta'}} |\psi_\beta\rangle \langle \psi_{\beta'}| \leq \frac{c}{d} \sum_{\beta \in \lambda} \frac{d_\beta}{m_\beta} |\psi_\beta\rangle \langle \psi_\beta|. \quad (99)$$

Notice that the matrix  $A := \sum_{\beta \in \lambda} \frac{d_\beta}{m_\beta} |\psi_\beta\rangle \langle \psi_\beta|$  is diagonal and of the full rank. These properties allow us to compute

easily  $A^{-1/2}$ , which is  $A^{-1/2} = \sum_{\beta \in \lambda} \sqrt{\frac{m_\beta}{d_\beta}} |\psi_\beta\rangle \langle \psi_\beta|$ , since blocks labelled by different  $\beta$  are orthogonal. Sandwiching inequality (99) by  $A^{-1/2}$  and using fact that  $\langle \psi_\beta | \psi_{\beta'} \rangle = \delta_{\beta\beta'}$ , gives the following after a few simple steps

$$\frac{1}{dm_\lambda} \sum_{\beta, \beta' \in \lambda} \sqrt{m_\beta m_{\beta'}} |\psi_\beta\rangle \langle \psi_{\beta'}| \leq c \cdot \mathbb{1}, \quad (100)$$

$$\frac{1}{dm_\lambda} |\psi\rangle \langle \psi| \leq c \cdot \mathbb{1}, \quad (101)$$

where we defined  $|\psi\rangle := \sum_{\beta \in \lambda} \sqrt{m_\beta} |\psi_\beta\rangle$ , with  $\|\psi\|^2 = \sum_{\beta \in \lambda} m_\beta$ . Expression (101) implies that

$$\forall \mu \vdash k+1 \quad \frac{1}{d} \frac{\sum_{\beta \in \lambda} m_\beta}{m_\lambda} \leq c. \quad (102)$$

To satisfy the above inequality, one has to choose the constant  $c$  at least equal to the maximal possible value of the ratio  $\sum_{\beta \in \lambda} m_\beta / m_\lambda$  calculated for all possible  $\lambda$ 's. This finally leads to

$$c = \frac{1}{d} \max_{\lambda \vdash (k+1)} \frac{\sum_{\beta \in \lambda} m_\beta}{m_\lambda}. \quad (103)$$

□

Lemma 2 connects the minimal value of the constant  $c$  from (43) with the specific choice of the operator  $\hat{S}$  in (78) and group theoretical parameters describing irreps of the symmetric groups  $S_k$  and  $S_{k+1}$ . However, the final expression (84) still involves a maximisation problem. To solve this maximisation explicitly, let us define an auxiliary function of Young diagrams of  $n$  boxes:

$$c(\lambda) := \frac{\sum_{\beta \in \lambda} m_\beta}{m_\lambda}. \quad (104)$$

For the above defined function we can formulate the following:

**Proposition 1.** *For a Young diagram  $\lambda \vdash n$  with its step representation  $(k_1, p_1, k_2, p_2, \dots, k_s, p_s)$ , the function from (104) is given by*

$$c(\lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^s \frac{k_j p_j}{d - \sum_{i=1}^j k_i + \sum_{i=j}^s p_i} \times \quad (105)$$

$$\times \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \left(1 + \frac{k_i}{d(c_i, c_j)}\right) \prod_{i=j+1}^s \left(1 + \frac{p_i}{d(c_j, c_i)}\right), \quad (106)$$

where we assume that the product is equal to 1 when the lower range of the products is larger than the upper one.

*Proof.* Let  $(k_1, p_1, \dots, k_s, p_s)$  be a step representation of  $\lambda \vdash n$ . Note that removing a one box from the Young diagram  $\lambda$  produces a new Young diagram if and only if the box removed is a corner box. Diagrams  $\beta \in \lambda$  can therefore be labelled by  $\mu = 1, 2, \dots, s$ . We use the convention that  $\beta_\mu$  denotes the diagram obtained by removing the box  $c_\mu$ . According to formula (104)

$$c(\lambda) = \sum_{\mu=1}^s \frac{m_{\beta_\mu}}{m_\lambda} = \sum_{\mu=1}^s \frac{\prod_{b \in \beta_\mu} \frac{d - i_b + j_b}{h_\mu(b)}}{\prod_{b \in \lambda} \frac{d - i_b + j_b}{h(b)}}, \quad (107)$$



where  $i_b, j_b$  denote the coordinates of a box  $b$ ,  $h_\mu(b)$  and  $h(b)$  is the length of the hook of  $b$  in  $\beta_j$  and  $\lambda$  respectively. Here we used a relation between multiplicity of a given irrep with the number of semisimple Young diagrams [35].

For  $\mu = 1, 2, \dots, s$  we define the following subsets  $R_\mu, C_\mu$  of  $\lambda$

$$R_\mu := \{b \in \lambda : i_b = i_{c_\mu}, j_b < j_{c_\mu}\}, \quad (108)$$

$$C_\mu := \{b \in \lambda : i_b < i_{c_\mu}, j_b = j_{c_\mu}\}. \quad (109)$$

These subsets contain respectively boxes which are in the same row/column as the corner box  $c_\mu$  not taking into account  $c_\mu$  itself. Let  $G_\mu := R_\mu \cup C_\mu \cup \{c_\mu\}$ . Observe that  $h_\mu(b) = h(b)$  if  $b \notin G_\mu$ . Thus, (107) simplifies to

$$c(\lambda) = \sum_{\mu=1}^s \frac{\prod_{b \in G_\mu \setminus \{c_\mu\}} \frac{d - i_b + j_b}{h_\mu(b)}}{\prod_{b \in G_\mu} \frac{d - i_b + j_b}{h(b)}} \quad (110)$$

$$= \sum_{\mu=1}^s \frac{1}{d - i_{c_\mu} + j_{c_\mu}} \prod_{b \in C_\mu} \frac{h(b)}{h(b) - 1} \prod_{b \in R_\mu} \frac{h(b)}{h(b) - 1}, \quad (111)$$

where we used the fact that  $h(c_\mu) = 1$ , and  $h_\mu(b) = h(b) - 1$  for  $b \in G_\mu \setminus \{c_\mu\}$ . We define

$$C_{\mu,\nu} := \{b \in C_\mu : i_{c_{\nu-1}} < i_b \leq i_{c_\nu}\} \quad (112)$$

for  $\nu = 1, \dots, \mu$ , and

$$R_{\mu,\nu} := \{b \in C_\mu : j_{c_{\nu+1}} < j_b \leq j_{c_\nu}\} \quad (113)$$

for  $\nu = \mu, \dots, s$ , with the convention that  $i_{c_0} = 0 = j_{c_{s+1}}$ . Observe that  $C_\mu = \bigcup_{\nu=1}^\mu C_{\mu,\nu}$  and  $R_\mu = \bigcup_{\nu=\mu}^s R_{\mu,\nu}$ , and for  $b \in C_\mu \cup R_\mu$ ,

$$h(b) = \begin{cases} i_{c_\mu} - i_b + j_{c_\nu} - j_{c_\mu} + 1, & \text{if } b \in C_{\mu,\nu}, \\ i_{c_\nu} - i_{c_\mu} + j_{c_\mu} - j_b + 1, & \text{if } b \in R_{\mu,\nu}. \end{cases} \quad (114)$$

Hence, exploiting (67), we have

$$\prod_{b \in C_\mu} \frac{h(b)}{h(b) - 1} = \prod_{\nu=1}^\mu \prod_{b \in C_{\mu,\nu}} \frac{h(b)}{h(b) - 1} \quad (115)$$

$$= \prod_{\nu=1}^\mu \prod_{b \in C_{\mu,\nu}} \frac{i_{c_\mu} - i_b + j_{c_\nu} - j_{c_\mu} + 1}{i_{c_\mu} - i_b + j_{c_\nu} - j_{c_\mu}} \quad (116)$$

$$= \prod_{i=i_{c_{\mu-1}}+1}^{i_{c_\mu}-1} \frac{i_{c_\mu} - i + 1}{i_{c_\mu} - i} \times \quad (117)$$

$$\times \prod_{\nu=1}^{\mu-1} \prod_{i=i_{c_{\nu-1}}+1}^{i_{c_\nu}} \frac{i_{c_\mu} - i + j_{c_\nu} - j_{c_\mu} + 1}{i_{c_\mu} - i + j_{c_\nu} - j_{c_\mu}} \quad (118)$$

$$= (i_{c_\mu} - i_{c_{\mu-1}}) \prod_{\nu=1}^{\mu-1} \frac{i_{c_\mu} - i_{c_{\nu-1}} + j_{c_\nu} - j_{c_\mu}}{i_{c_\mu} - i_{c_\nu} + j_{c_\nu} - j_{c_\mu}} \quad (119)$$

$$= k_\mu \prod_{\nu=1}^{\mu-1} \frac{k_\nu + p_\nu + \dots + k_\mu}{p_\nu + \dots + k_\mu} \quad (120)$$

$$= k_\mu \prod_{\nu=1}^{\mu-1} \left(1 + \frac{k_\nu}{d(c_\nu, c_\mu)}\right). \quad (121)$$

Analogously, we have

$$\prod_{b \in R_\mu} \frac{h(b)}{h(b) - 1} = \prod_{\nu=\mu}^s \prod_{b \in R_{\mu,\nu}} \frac{h(b)}{h(b) - 1} \quad (122)$$

$$= \prod_{\nu=\mu}^s \prod_{b \in R_{\mu,\nu}} \frac{i_{c_\nu} - i_{c_\mu} + j_{c_\mu} - j_b + 1}{i_{c_\nu} - i_{c_\mu} + j_{c_\mu} - j_b} \quad (123)$$

$$= \prod_{j=j_{c_{\mu+1}}+1}^{j_{c_\mu}-1} \frac{j_{c_\mu} - j + 1}{j_{c_\mu} - j} \times \quad (124)$$

$$\times \prod_{\nu=\mu+1}^s \prod_{j=j_{c_{\nu+1}}+1}^{j_{c_\nu}} \frac{i_{c_\nu} - i_{c_\mu} + j_{c_\mu} - j + 1}{i_{c_\nu} - i_{c_\mu} + j_{c_\mu} - j} \quad (125)$$

$$= (j_{c_\mu} - j_{c_{\mu+1}}) \prod_{\nu=\mu+1}^s \frac{i_{c_\nu} - i_{c_\mu} + j_{c_\nu} - j_{c_{\nu+1}}}{i_{c_\nu} - i_{c_\mu} + j_{c_\mu} - j_{c_\nu}} \quad (126)$$

$$= p_\mu \prod_{\nu=\mu+1}^s \frac{p_\mu + \dots + k_\nu + p_\nu}{p_\mu + \dots + k_\nu} \quad (127)$$

$$= p_\mu \prod_{\nu=\mu+1}^s \left(1 + \frac{p_\nu}{d(c_\mu, c_\nu)}\right). \quad (128)$$

Coming back to (111), we get

$$c(\lambda) = \sum_{\mu=1}^s \frac{k_\mu p_\mu}{d - i_{c_\mu} + j_{c_\mu}} \times \quad (129)$$

$$\times \prod_{\nu=1}^{\mu-1} \left(1 + \frac{k_\nu}{d(c_\nu, c_\mu)}\right) \prod_{\nu=\mu+1}^s \left(1 + \frac{p_\nu}{d(c_\mu, c_\nu)}\right) \quad (130)$$

what, after taking (67) into account, ends the proof.  $\square$

As an example, let us consider the diagram  $\lambda = [1, 1, \dots, 1] = [1^{\times n}]$ . Its step representation is  $s = 1$ ,  $(k_1, p_1) = (n, 1)$ . Direct application of the formula (104) shows that

$$c([1^{\times n}]) = \frac{n}{d - n + 1}. \quad (131)$$

Now, we are ready to prove the main theorem of this subsection

**Theorem 3.** For every diagram  $\lambda$  with  $n$  boxes,

$$c(\lambda) \leq c([1^{\times n}]). \quad (132)$$

*Proof.* It was shown in [36] that

$$\sum_{j=1}^s k_j p_j \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \left(1 + \frac{k_i}{d(c_i, c_j)}\right) \prod_{i=j+1}^s \left(1 + \frac{p_i}{d(c_j, c_i)}\right) = n. \quad (133)$$

Observe that  $\sum_{i=1}^j k_i \leq n$  and  $\sum_{i=j}^s p_i \geq 1$  for every  $j = 1, 2, \dots, s$ . Hence,  $d - \sum_{i=1}^j k_i + \sum_{i=1}^j p_i \geq d - n + 1$ . From (104) and (133) we get

$$c(\lambda) \leq \frac{1}{d - n + 1} \sum_{j=1}^s k_j p_j \times \quad (134)$$

$$\times \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \left(1 + \frac{k_i}{d(c_i, c_j)}\right) \prod_{i=j+1}^s \left(1 + \frac{p_i}{d(c_j, c_i)}\right) \quad (135)$$

$$= \frac{n}{d - n + 1}. \quad (136)$$

According to (131) the latter number is equal to  $c([1^{\times n}])$ .  $\square$

The above theorem clearly shows that the maximum possible value of the constant from (103) is attained for antisymmetric partitions with  $n = k + 1$  boxes:

$$c = \frac{1}{d} \max_{\lambda \vdash (k+1)} c(\lambda) = \frac{k+1}{d(d-k)}. \quad (137)$$

This exactly reproduces the lower bound obtained from the primal problem and proves optimality of chosen ansatz.

## V. DISCUSSIONS

We have presented the optimal quantum circuits for transforming  $k$  calls of a  $d$ -dimensional unitary operation  $U_d$  into its complex conjugate  $\overline{U_d}$  in a deterministic non-exact manner. When considering probabilistic exact transformations, Ref. [29] shows that transforming  $k$  uses of  $U_d$  into its complex conjugation  $\overline{U_d}$  necessarily has probability one or probability zero, and shows that probability one can only be attained when  $k \geq d-1$  – completely solving the probabilistic exact complex conjugation. Hence, the problem of designing circuits for unitary complex conjugation is solved on the probabilistic exact paradigm and following our work now also on the deterministic non-exact one.

A direct application of our circuit for unitary complex conjugation is to design a quantum circuit for reversing quantum operations. In Ref. [29], the authors present a simple probabilistic circuit which performs exact unitary transposition  $U_d \mapsto U_d^T$  with probability  $1/d^2$ . Since  $U_d^{-1} = \overline{U_d^T}$ , if we perform a unitary transposition protocol after the complex conjugation circuit presented here, we can transform  $k$  uses of  $U_d$  into its inverse  $U_d^{-1}$  with probability  $1/d^2$  and an average fidelity of  $\langle F \rangle = \frac{k-1}{d(d-k)}$ .

As stated earlier, since  $(\overline{U_d V_d}) = (\overline{U_d})(\overline{V_d})$ , the complex conjugation function  $f(U_d) = \overline{U_d}$  is a homomorphism. Also, complex conjugation is the only non-trivial homomorphism  $f$  between  $d$ -dimensional special unitary operators  $f : SU(d) \rightarrow SU(d)$ . This follows from the fact that there exist only three  $d$ -dimensional representations for the group  $SU(d)$  [34]: the trivial representation  $f_{\text{trivial}}(U) = 1$ , the defining representation,  $f_{\text{def}}(U) = U$ , and the conjugate representation  $f_{\text{conj}}(U) = \overline{U}$ . Hence, we have obtained optimal circuits for transforming  $k$  uses of  $U_d$  into  $f(U_d)$  for all homomorphic functions  $f : SU(d) \rightarrow SU(d)$ .

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

MS, TM are supported through grant Sonata 16, UMO-2020/39/D/ST2/01234 from the Polish National Science Centre. M.T.Q. acknowledges the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) through the SFB project BeyondC (sub-project F7103), a grant from the Foundational Questions Institute (FQXi) as part of the Quantum Information Structure of Spacetime (QISS) Project (qiss.fr). The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the John Templeton Foundation. This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie

Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 801110. It reflects only the authors’ view, the EU Agency is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains. ESQ has received funding from the Austrian Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Research (BMBWF). MH acknowledges support from the Foundation for Polish Science through IRAP project co-financed by the EU within the Smart Growth Operational Programme (contract no. 2018/MAB/5).

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge Series on Information and the Natural Sciences (Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- [2] A. Bisio and P. Perinotti, Theoretical framework for higher-order quantum theory, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series A* **475**, 20180706 (2019), arXiv:1806.09554.
- [3] P. Perinotti, Causal structures and the classification of higher order quantum computations, *Tutorials, Schools, and Workshops in the Mathematical Sciences*, 103–127 (2017), arXiv:1612.05099 [quant-ph].
- [4] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Quantum circuit architecture, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 060401 (2008), arXiv:0712.1325 [quant-ph].
- [5] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Transforming quantum operations: Quantum supermaps, *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **83**, 30004 (2008), arXiv:0804.0180 [quant-ph].
- [6] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Theoretical framework for quantum networks, *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 022339 (2009), arXiv:0904.4483 [quant-ph].
- [7] M. Navascués, Resetting Uncontrolled Quantum Systems, *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 031008 (2018), arXiv:1710.02470 [quant-ph].
- [8] D. Trillo, B. Dive, and M. Navascués, Translating Uncontrolled Systems in Time, *Quantum* **4**, 374 (2020), arXiv:1903.10568 [quant-ph].
- [9] D. Trillo, B. Dive, and M. Navascués, A universal quantum rewinding protocol with an arbitrarily high probability of success, arXiv e-prints (2022), arXiv:2205.01131 [quant-ph].
- [10] A. Bisio, G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, S. Facchini, and P. Perinotti, Optimal quantum learning of a unitary transformation, *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 032324 (2010), arXiv:0903.0543 [quant-ph].
- [11] M. Sedláč, A. Bisio, and M. Ziman, Optimal Probabilistic Storage and Retrieval of Unitary Channels, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 170502 (2019), arXiv:1809.04552 [quant-ph].
- [12] Y. Mo and G. Chiribella, Quantum-enhanced learning of rotations about an unknown direction, *New Journal of Physics* **21**, 113003 (2019), arXiv:1906.01300 [quant-ph].
- [13] G. Chiribella and D. Ebler, Quantum speedup in the identification of cause-effect relations, *Nature Communications* **10**, 1472 (2019), arXiv:1806.06459 [quant-ph].

- [14] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Memory Effects in Quantum Channel Discrimination, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 180501 (2008), [arXiv:0803.3237 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [15] J. Bavaresco, M. Murao, and M. T. Quintino, Strict hierarchy between parallel, sequential, and indefinite-causal-order strategies for channel discrimination, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 200504 (2021), [2011.08300 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [16] J. Bavaresco, M. Murao, and M. T. Quintino, Unitary channel discrimination beyond group structures: Advantages of sequential and indefinite-causal-order strategies, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **63**, 042203 (2022), [2105.13369 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [17] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Optimal Cloning of Unitary Transformation, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **101**, 180504 (2008), [arXiv:0804.0129 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [18] G. Chiribella and D. Ebler, Optimal quantum networks and one-shot entropies, *New Journal of Physics* **18**, 093053 (2016), [arXiv:1606.02394 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [19] M. T. Quintino, Q. Dong, A. Shimbo, A. Soeda, and M. Murao, Reversing Unknown Quantum Transformations: Universal Quantum Circuit for Inverting General Unitary Operations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **123**, 210502 (2019), [arXiv:1810.06944 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [20] S. Yoshida, A. Soeda, and M. Murao, Universal construction of decoders from encoding black boxes, *arXiv e-prints* (2021), [arXiv:2110.00258 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [21] J. Miyazaki, A. Soeda, and M. Murao, Complex conjugation supermap of unitary quantum maps and its universal implementation protocol, *Phys. Rev. Research* **1**, 013007 (2019), [arXiv:1706.03481 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [22] M. Soleimanifar and V. Karimipour, No-go theorem for iterations of unknown quantum gates, *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 012344 (2016), [arXiv:1510.06888 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [23] M. Araújo, A. Feix, F. Costa, and Č. Brukner, Quantum circuits cannot control unknown operations, *New Journal of Physics* **16**, 093026 (2014), [arXiv:1309.7976 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [24] A. Bisio, M. Dall’Arno, and P. Perinotti, Quantum conditional operations, *Phys. Rev. A* **94**, 022340 (2016), [arXiv:1509.01062 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [25] Z. Gavorová, M. Seidel, and Y. Touati, Topological obstructions to implementing controlled unknown unitaries, *arXiv e-prints* (2020), [arXiv:2011.10031 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [26] Q. Dong, S. Nakayama, A. Soeda, and M. Murao, Controlled quantum operations and combs, and their applications to universal controllization of divisible unitary operations, *arXiv e-prints* (2019), [arXiv:1911.01645 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [27] A. Bisio, G. D’Ariano, P. Perinotti, and M. Sedlák, Optimal processing of reversible quantum channels, *Physics Letters A* **378**, 1797–1808 (2014), [arXiv:1308.3254 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [28] M. T. Quintino and D. Ebler, Deterministic transformations between unitary operations: Exponential advantage with adaptive quantum circuits and the power of indefinite causality, *Quantum* **6**, 679 (2022), [arXiv:2109.08202 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [29] M. T. Quintino, Q. Dong, A. Shimbo, A. Soeda, and M. Murao, Probabilistic exact universal quantum circuits for transforming unitary operations, *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 062339 (2019), [arXiv:1909.01366 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [30] Q. Dong, M. T. Quintino, A. Soeda, and M. Murao, Success-or-Draw: A Strategy Allowing Repeat-Until-Success in Quantum Computation, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 150504 (2021), [arXiv:2011.01055 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [31] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, P. Perinotti, and B. Valiron, Quantum computations without definite causal structure, *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 022318 (2013), [arXiv:0912.0195 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [32] O. Oreshkov, F. Costa, and Č. Brukner, Quantum correlations with no causal order, *Nature Communications* **3**, 1092 (2012), [arXiv:1105.4464 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [33] M. Ragsky, A fidelity measure for quantum channels, *Physics Letters A* **290**, 11–18 (2001), [arXiv:quant-ph/0107108 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [34] W. Fulton and J. Harris, *Representation Theory: A First Course*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics (Springer New York, 1991).
- [35] W. Fulton, *Young tableaux: with applications to representation theory and geometry* (Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- [36] A. M. Vershik, Hooks formula and related identities, *J. Soviet Math.*, **59** (1992), 1029–1040 **59:5**, 1029–1040 (1992).
- [37] M. Mozrzykas, M. Studziński, and M. Horodecki, A simplified formalism of the algebra of partially transposed permutation operators with applications, *Journal of Physics A Mathematical General* **51**, 125202 (2018), [arXiv:1708.02434 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [38] M. Studziński, M. Mozrzykas, P. Kopszak, and M. Horodecki, Efficient multi port-based teleportation schemes, *arXiv e-prints* (2020), [arXiv:2008.00984 \[quant-ph\]](#).