

# Error bounds for composite quantum hypothesis testing and a new characterization of the weighted Kubo-Ando geometric means

Péter E. Frenkel,<sup>1,2,\*</sup> Milán Mosonyi,<sup>3,4,†</sup> Péter Vrana,<sup>5,‡</sup> and Mihály Weiner<sup>2,4,§</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Algebra and Number Theory,  
Institute of Mathematics, Eötvös Loránd University,  
Pázmány Péter sétány 1/C, Budapest, 1117 Hungary*

<sup>2</sup>*HUN-REN Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics, Reáltanoda street 13-15, H-1053, Budapest*

<sup>3</sup>*Center for Quantum Technologies, National University of  
Singapore Block S15, 3 Science Drive 2, Singapore 117543*

<sup>4</sup>*Department of Analysis and Operations Research, Institute of Mathematics,  
Budapest University of Technology and Economics,  
Műegyetem rkp. 3., H-1111 Budapest, Hungary*

<sup>5</sup>*Department of Algebra and Geometry, Institute of Mathematics,  
Budapest University of Technology and Economics,  
Műegyetem rkp. 3., H-1111 Budapest, Hungary*

## Abstract

The optimal error exponents of binary composite i.i.d. state discrimination are trivially bounded by the worst-case pairwise exponents of discriminating individual elements of the sets representing the two hypotheses, and in the finite-dimensional classical case, these bounds in fact give exact single-copy expressions for the error exponents. In contrast, in the non-commutative case, the optimal exponents are only known to be expressible in terms of regularized divergences, resulting in formulas that, while conceptually relevant, practically not very useful. In this paper, we develop further an approach initiated in [Mosonyi, Szilágyi, Weiner, IEEE Trans. Inf. Th. 68(2):1032–1067, 2022] to give improved single-copy bounds on the error exponents by comparing not only individual states from the two hypotheses, but also various unnormalized positive semi-definite operators associated to them. Here, we show a number of equivalent characterizations of such operators giving valid bounds, and show that in the commutative case, considering weighted geometric means of the states, and in the case of two states per hypothesis, considering weighted Kubo-Ando geometric means, are optimal for this approach. As a result, we give a new characterization of the weighted Kubo-Ando geometric means as the only 2-variable operator geometric means that are block additive, tensor multiplicative, and satisfy the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality. We also extend our results to composite quantum channel discrimination, and show an analogous optimality property of the weighted Kubo-Ando geometric means of two quantum channels, a notion that seems to be new. We extend this concept to defining the notion of superoperator perspective function and establish some of its basic properties, which may be of independent interest.

*Keywords:* Operator geometric means, Kubo-Ando means, arithmetic-geometric mean inequality, composite quantum hypothesis testing

*Mathematics subject classification:* primary 15A45, secondary 81P17.

## CONTENTS

I. Motivation and overview	2
A. Quantum state discrimination	2
B. Operator geometric means	4
C. Overview of results	5
II. Preliminaries	6
III. Classical case	8
IV. Equivalence of weak bounds	13

---

\* frenkelp@cs.elte.hu

† milan.mosonyi@gmail.com

‡ vranap@math.bme.hu

§ elektrubadur@gmail.com

V. Maximality of the Kubo-Ando weighted geometric means for two variables	17
VI. Application to quantum channel discrimination	23
VII. Conclusion	25
A. Examples for (non-)improvement via geometric bounds	26
B. More on the operator perspective	29
C. Superoperator perspective and geometric mean for CP maps	31
Acknowledgments	34
References	34

## I. MOTIVATION AND OVERVIEW

### A. Quantum state discrimination

In the problem of composite i.i.d. state discrimination, an experimenter is presented with several identical copies of a quantum system, all prepared in the same state, and they have to decide between two alternatives: that the state of the system is described by a density operator belonging to some subset  $\mathcal{N}$  of all density operators  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  on the system's Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , or by a density operator belonging to another subset  $\mathcal{A}$ . The most general decision scheme is given by a 2-outcome measurement on the available copies of the system, described by a measurement operator  $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})_{[0,1]}$  (i.e.,  $T$  is an operator on  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$  satisfying  $0 \leq T \leq I$ , where  $n$  is the number of copies of the system): if the corresponding outcome occurs, the experimenter decides in favour of  $\mathcal{N}$ , whereas if the outcome corresponding to  $I - T$  occurs, they choose  $\mathcal{A}$ . The worst-case probabilities of the two possible errors that can occur (conventionally called type I and type II errors) are, respectively,

$$\alpha_n(T) := \sup_{\varrho \in \mathcal{N}} \text{Tr } \varrho^{\otimes n} (I - T),$$

$$\beta_n(T) := \sup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{A}} \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n} T.$$

In the asymptotic analysis of the problem, one is interested in the trade-off between these error probabilities in the limit  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ , which turns out to be quantifiable on the exponential scale by the following quantities,

$$d_r(\mathcal{N}||\mathcal{A}) := \sup \left\{ \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \alpha_n(T) : \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \beta_n(T) \geq r \right\}, \quad (\text{I.1})$$

$$sc_r(\mathcal{N}||\mathcal{A}) := \inf \left\{ \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \alpha_n(T)) : \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \beta_n(T) \geq r \right\}. \quad (\text{I.2})$$

Here,  $d_r(\mathcal{N}||\mathcal{A})$  is called the *direct exponent* corresponding to type II error rate  $r$ , and is relevant for  $r$  below a threshold  $r_0$ , while  $sc_r(\mathcal{N}||\mathcal{A})$  is called the *strong converse exponent* corresponding to type II error rate  $r$ , and is relevant for  $r$  above a (possibly different) threshold  $r_1 \geq r_0$ . Clearly,  $d_r(\mathcal{N}||\mathcal{A})$  and  $sc_r(\mathcal{N}||\mathcal{A})$  cannot be both positive for a fixed  $r$ .

In the simple case where  $\mathcal{N} = \{\varrho\}$  and  $\mathcal{A} = \{\sigma\}$  consist of a single density operator each, the above exponents have been found to have single-copy expressions as [3, 25, 41, 44]

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

$$sc_r(\{\varrho\}||\{\sigma\}) = H_r^*(\varrho||\sigma) := \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha^*(\varrho||\sigma)],$$

where, for any two positive semi-definite operators  $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$ ,

$$D_\alpha(A||B) := \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \text{Tr } A^\alpha B^{1-\alpha}$$

is their *Petz-type Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence* for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  [45], and

$$D_\alpha^*(A\|B) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \operatorname{Tr} \left( B^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} A B^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \right)^\alpha, & \operatorname{supp}(A) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(B), \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

is their *sandwiched Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergence* for  $\alpha > 1$  [43, 50]. Moreover,  $r < D(\varrho\|\sigma) \implies d_r(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{A}) > 0$ , while  $r > D(\varrho\|\sigma) \implies \operatorname{sc}_r(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{A}) > 0$ , where

$$D(A\|B) := \begin{cases} \operatorname{Tr} A(\log A - \log B), & \operatorname{supp}(A) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(B), \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

is the *Umegaki relative entropy of  $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$*  [49].

In the known cases in the finite-dimensional classical setting, i.e., when all density operators in  $\mathcal{N} \cup \mathcal{A}$  commute and  $\mathcal{H}$  is finite-dimensional, the composite exponents still admit single-copy expressions as the worst-case pairwise exponents [10, 22, 23, 42]

$$d_r(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{A}) = \inf_{\varrho \in \mathcal{N}, \sigma \in \mathcal{A}} H_r(\varrho\|\sigma), \quad \operatorname{sc}_r(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{A}) = \sup_{\varrho \in \mathcal{N}, \sigma \in \mathcal{A}} H_r^*(\varrho\|\sigma).$$

In the general composite case, however, these only hold as inequalities

$$d_r(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{A}) \leq \inf_{\varrho \in \mathcal{N}, \sigma \in \mathcal{A}} H_r(\varrho\|\sigma), \quad \operatorname{sc}_r(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{A}) \geq \sup_{\varrho \in \mathcal{N}, \sigma \in \mathcal{A}} H_r^*(\varrho\|\sigma), \quad (\text{I.3})$$

which may be strict in general [5, 42], and the only known universally valid expressions for these and related error exponents are in terms of regularized divergences involving arbitrarily many copies of the states from  $\mathcal{N}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  [5], and therefore, while they are conceptually relevant, have limited practical value.

A new approach to obtaining tighter single-copy bounds was put forward in [42] and elaborated further in [12]. Assume that one can find operators  $C, \tilde{C} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$  such that

$$\operatorname{Tr} C^{\otimes n} T \leq \sup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{A}} \operatorname{Tr} \sigma^{\otimes n} T, \quad \operatorname{Tr} \tilde{C}^{\otimes n} T \leq \sup_{\varrho \in \mathcal{N}} \operatorname{Tr} \varrho^{\otimes n} T, \quad T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{[0,1]}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (\text{I.4})$$

Then one can easily see that

$$d_r(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{A}) \leq \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} \left[ r - D_\alpha(\tilde{C}\|C) \right], \quad (\text{I.5})$$

$$\operatorname{sc}_r(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{A}) \geq \sup_{\varrho \in \mathcal{N}} \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} \left[ r - D_\alpha^*(\varrho\|C) \right]. \quad (\text{I.6})$$

Obviously, for every  $\sigma \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\varrho \in \mathcal{N}$ ,  $C_\sigma := \sigma$  and  $\tilde{C}_\varrho := \varrho$  are such operators, using which in (I.5)–(I.6) recovers (I.3). Tighter bounds on the error exponents than in (I.3) may be obtained from (I.5)–(I.6) by choosing  $C, \tilde{C}$  from a larger set of operators, and one natural candidate here is to use operator geometric means that satisfy the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality; in particular, the Kubo-Ando geometric mean [33] was used in [42] to this effect. This motivates a systematic study of such operator geometric means, which seems to be a new direction in matrix analysis, where operator geometric means are conventionally specified by other properties; we will elaborate on this further in the next section. This approach is strongly underpinned by the findings of [13], where it was shown that in the case where  $\mathcal{A}$  is a closed and commutative subset of the positive definite elements in  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  with a finite-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , optimizing over all weighted geometric means of the elements of  $\mathcal{A}$  in (I.6) gives the exact strong converse exponent, i.e.,

$$\operatorname{sc}_r(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{A}) = \sup_{\varrho \in \mathcal{N}} \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})} \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} \left[ r - D_\alpha^* \left( \varrho \left\| \exp \left( \int_{\mathcal{A}} \log \sigma \, d\nu(\sigma) \right) \right) \right) \right], \quad (\text{I.7})$$

where  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$  stands for all probability measures on the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

We note that the above approach does not give an improvement over the trivial bounds (I.3) when  $\mathcal{A}$  is convex (for the strong converse exponents) or when  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  are both convex (for the direct exponents). On the other hand, a strict improvement can be attained already in the simplest possible case where  $\mathcal{N} = \{\varrho\}$  and  $\mathcal{A} = \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}$ ; in the case of the strong converse exponent, a strict improvement is possible even for commuting states. We elaborate on these in Appendix A.

## B. Operator geometric means

For a measurable space  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{F})$ , we call any function  $G$  satisfying the following properties a  $\mathcal{Y}$ -variable operator function:

- (1)  $G$  is defined on some non-empty  $\mathcal{D}(G) \subseteq \cup_{d \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{C}^d)_{\geq 0}$ , where

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{C}^d)_{\geq 0} := \{A : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)_{\geq 0} \text{ } \mathcal{F}\text{-measurable}\},$$

with  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)_{\geq 0}$  denoting the positive semi-definite linear operators on  $\mathbb{C}^d$ , and

$$A \in \mathcal{D}(G) \cap \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{C}^d)_{\geq 0} \implies G(A) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)_{\geq 0}.$$

- (2)  $G$  is covariant under isometries, i.e., for any  $A \in \mathcal{D}(G) \cap \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{C}^{d_1})_{\geq 0}$  and any isometry  $V : \mathbb{C}^{d_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{d_2}$ , we have  $(VA_yV^*)_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \in \mathcal{D}(G)$  and

$$G((VA_yV^*)_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}) = V G((A_y)_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}) V^*.$$

Due to the isometric covariance, any such operator function can be uniquely extended to families of positive semi-definite operators  $(A_y)_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}$  on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  such that there exists a unitary  $V : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^d$  with  $(VA_yV^*)_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \in \mathcal{D}(G)$ , by defining  $G(A) := V^* G((VA_yV^*)_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}) V$ .

We say that a  $\mathcal{Y}$ -variable operator function  $G$  is a  $\nu$ -weighted operator geometric mean for some probability measure  $\nu$  on  $\mathcal{F}$ , if the following holds:

- (3) For any commuting family  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{C}^d)_{\geq 0}$  such that  $A_y$  is positive definite for every  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$  and  $\{A_y : y \in \mathcal{Y}\}$  is bounded, we have  $A \in \mathcal{D}(G_\nu)$  and

$$G(A) = \exp \left( \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \log A_y d\nu(y) \right).$$

For the purposes of quantum state discrimination, the relevant cases are where  $\mathcal{Y}$  is finite, or it is a compact Hausdorff topological space and  $\mathcal{F}$  is its Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra. In the latter case, it may also be natural to restrict the domain of a geometric mean to continuous functions in  $\cup_{d \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{C}^d)_{\geq 0}$ ; indeed, the typical setting for applications would be where  $\mathcal{Y}$  is simply a closed subset of the state space of a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, and the map  $\mathcal{Y} \ni y \mapsto A_y := y$  is the identity. It is also natural to consider this notion more generally for operators on infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces. In this case, one needs to consider a number of technical issues that are not present in the finite-dimensional case. For instance, from the purely mathematical point of view, operator geometric means may be considered for families of bounded positive (semi-)definite operators, while the applications in quantum state discrimination call for their study for families of density operators (positive trace-class operators with unit trace), and the focus on one of these or some other setting determines, e.g., the topology used in various definitions. We will only consider some questions in this level of generality for weak notions of means in Section IV, where we give more precise definitions.

For the applications in composite quantum state discrimination, we will be interested in operator functions satisfying two additional properties:

- (4) *(Tensor) supermultiplicativity*: For any  $A \in \mathcal{D}(G)$  and any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have  $A^{\otimes n} := (A_y^{\otimes n})_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \in \mathcal{D}(G)$  and

$$G(A^{\otimes n}) \geq G(A)^{\otimes n}.$$

- (5) *Arithmetic mean (AM) boundedness*: There exists a probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{F}$  such that

$$G(A) \leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} A_y d\mu(y), \quad A \in \mathcal{D}(G). \quad (\text{I.8})$$

In fact, instead of arithmetic mean boundedness, it will be sufficient to require that  $G$  satisfies the following weaker property:

- (5') *Individual arithmetic mean (AM) boundedness*: For any  $A \in \mathcal{D}(G)$ , there exists a probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{F}$  such that

$$G(A) \leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} A_y d\mu(y).$$

When  $G = G_\nu$  is a  $\nu$ -weighted operator geometric mean, we will say that it satisfies the *arithmetic-geometric mean (AM-GM) inequality*, if (I.8) holds with  $\mu = \nu$ .

Consider now a composite state discrimination problem specified by  $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  as in Section I A. Clearly, if  $G$  is an operator function with  $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{D}(G) \ni \{\mathcal{Y} \ni y \mapsto A_y := y\} \equiv \mathcal{A}$  and  $\tilde{G}$  is an operator function with  $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}} = \mathcal{N}$ ,  $\mathcal{D}(\tilde{G}) \ni \{\tilde{\mathcal{Y}} \ni y \mapsto A_y := y\} \equiv \mathcal{N}$  that are supermultiplicative and individually AM bounded then

$$\mathrm{Tr} G(\mathcal{A})^{\otimes n} T \leq \mathrm{Tr} G(\mathcal{A}^{\otimes n}) T \leq \int_{\mathcal{A}} \mathrm{Tr} \sigma^{\otimes n} T d\mu_n(\sigma) \leq \sup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{A}} \mathrm{Tr} \sigma^{\otimes n} T, \quad T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})_{[0,1]}, n \in \mathbb{N} \quad (\text{I.9})$$

and similarly,

$$\mathrm{Tr} \tilde{G}(\mathcal{N})^{\otimes n} T \leq \mathrm{Tr} \tilde{G}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}) T \leq \int_{\mathcal{N}} \mathrm{Tr} \varrho^{\otimes n} T d\tilde{\mu}_n(\varrho) \leq \sup_{\varrho \in \mathcal{N}} \mathrm{Tr} \varrho^{\otimes n} T, \quad T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})_{[0,1]}, n \in \mathbb{N} \quad (\text{I.10})$$

leading to the bounds (I.5)–(I.6) with  $C := G(\mathcal{A})$  and  $\tilde{C} := \tilde{G}(\mathcal{N})$ .

The notion of operator geometric mean has been extensively studied in matrix analysis in the past few decades; however, the focus in the usual approach is on other types of properties, like monotonicity of the mean in its arguments (in the positive semi-definite order) or joint concavity. It has been shown in the seminal work [33] that, essentially under these two conditions and the normalization  $G_\nu(X, X) = X$ , for every probability distribution  $\nu$  on a 2-point set ( $\mathcal{Y} = \{1, 2\}$  for simplicity), there exists a unique  $\nu$ -weighted operator geometric mean, given for positive definite operators as  $G_\nu^{\mathrm{KA}}(A_1, A_2) = A_2 \#_{\nu(1)} A_1 := A_2^{1/2} \left( A_2^{-1/2} A_1 A_2^{-1/2} \right)^{\nu(1)} A_2^{1/2}$ ; this is called the  $\nu$ -weighted Kubo-Ando geometric mean. It is easy to see that this mean is also tensor multiplicative and satisfies the AM-GM inequality; in particular, it is suitable for the application in composite state discrimination described above. Extensions of this mean to more variables may be obtained by iteration as  $(\dots (A_1 \#_{t_1} A_2) \#_{t_2} \dots) \#_{t_n} A_{n+1}$ , or by various limiting procedures [2, 9, 36, 38], all of which satisfy tensor multiplicativity and the AM-GM mean inequality by construction. (See also [1, 6–8, 27, 31, 34, 35, 39, 46, 47] for further references on multivariate matrix geometric means).

For two variables, it is easy to construct operator geometric means in the sense of the above definition with properties (1)–(3) that are also manifestly tensor multiplicative (and also block additive; see below) and are different from the Kubo-Ando means. For instance, for any  $t \in (0, 1)$  and  $z \in (0, +\infty)$ ,

$$G_{t,z}(A_1 \| A_2) := \left( A_1^{\frac{t}{2z}} A_2^{\frac{1-t}{z}} A_1^{\frac{t}{2z}} \right)^z, \quad (\text{I.11})$$

$$\tilde{G}_{t,z}(A_1 \| A_2) := \left( A_2^{\frac{1-t}{2z}} A_1^{\frac{t}{z}} A_2^{\frac{1-t}{2z}} \right)^z, \quad (\text{I.12})$$

$$\hat{G}_{t,z}(A_1 \| A_2) := \left( A_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \#_t A_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)^z, \quad (\text{I.13})$$

$$\hat{G}_{t,+\infty}(A_1 \| A_2) := \lim_{z \rightarrow +\infty} \hat{G}_{t,z}(A_1, A_2) = e^{\gamma \log A_1 + (1-t) \log A_2} \quad (\text{I.14})$$

define  $\nu = (t, 1-t)$ -weighted tensor multiplicative geometric means on pairs of positive definite operators, that are all different from  $G_\nu^{\mathrm{KA}}$ , with the exception of  $\hat{G}_{t,1}$ . ( $G_{t,z}$  and  $\tilde{G}_{t,z}$  are related to the family of quantum Rényi divergences considered in [4],  $\hat{G}_{t,z}$  was considered in [30] in connection to the Golden-Thompson inequality, and  $\hat{G}_{t,+\infty}$  is called the log-Euclidean geometric mean.) It is natural to ask then if any of these means satisfy the AM-GM inequality, which has been answered in the negative very recently in [26] (with the obvious exception of  $\hat{G}_{t,1}$ ) by constructing explicit counter-examples.

In Section V, we give a complete characterization of the weighted Kubo-Ando geometric means as the maximal 2-variable operator geometric means satisfying tensor supermultiplicativity and individual AM boundedness together with the following natural property:

(6) *Block superadditivity*: If  $(A_i, B_i) \in \mathcal{D}(G)$ ,  $i \in [r]$ , then  $(\oplus_i A_i, \oplus_i B_i) \in \mathcal{D}(G)$ , and

$$G(\oplus_{i=1}^r A_i, \oplus_{i=1}^r B_i) \geq \oplus_{i=1}^r G(A_i, B_i).$$

### C. Overview of results

Obviously, one can trivially satisfy the inequality  $\mathrm{Tr} C^{\otimes n} T \leq \sup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{A}} \mathrm{Tr} \sigma^{\otimes n} T$  in (I.4) for all  $T$  by choosing  $C = 0$ , which, however, is not very useful for obtaining bounds on the error exponents; rather,

one would hope to find  $C$  operators satisfying this inequality that are “as large as possible” in some sense. The above inequality clearly follows if an arithmetic mean type bound  $\text{Tr } C^{\otimes n} T \leq \int_{\mathcal{A}} \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n} T d\mu_n(\sigma)$  holds for all  $T$  with some probability measure  $\mu_n$  that may depend on  $n$  (see (I.9) with  $\tilde{C} := G(\mathcal{A})$ ). This in turn is further implied by a weak geometric mean type bound  $\text{Tr } C^{\otimes n} T \leq \exp(\int_{\mathcal{A}} \log \text{Tr } \sigma^{\otimes n} T d\nu_n(\sigma))$  for all  $T$ , and the same considerations hold for  $\tilde{C}$ . For a fixed  $n$ , each of the above bounds is strictly stronger than the previous one, as one can easily see already for numbers. Somewhat surprisingly, however, they all become equivalent when required to hold for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , which is the main result of Section IV.

One may then ask if there exists a maximal possible  $C$  satisfying any (and hence all) of these bounds. As it turns out, the answer is yes in the commutative case: as we show in Theorems III.1 and III.6, under some natural technical conditions, for any probability measure  $\nu$  on a collection of commuting positive semi-definite operators, the corresponding  $\nu$ -weighted geometric mean of the operators (which is unique in this case) is maximal among the positive semi-definite operators satisfying these bounds. Note that the latter is a partially ordered set, and maximality means that no other operator in this set can be larger and different from any given weighted geometric mean.

In Section V, we extend the above result to the 2-variable non-commutative setting: we show that if  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2\}$  has two elements, then any operator  $C$  as above is upper bounded by some weighted Kubo-Ando geometric mean of  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ . That is, for the above approach of obtaining single-copy error bounds, it is sufficient to consider  $C = A_2 \#_t A_1$  for all possible  $t \in [0, 1]$ . As a result, we get a new characterization of the weighted Kubo-Ando geometric means as the only 2-variable operator geometric means that are block additive, tensor multiplicative, and satisfy the AM-GM inequality. We show this from another new characterization that we prove, namely, that the weighted Kubo-Ando geometric means are maximal among the operator geometric means that are block superadditive, tensor supermultiplicative, and individually AM bounded. These are conceptually rather different from the usual characterization [33], the main focus of which, apart from tensor multiplicativity, is monotonicity in the arguments (and extra technical conditions like monotone continuity and the transformer inequality). We note that we also use these properties of the Kubo-Ando means in our proof, but do not impose them on the map  $(A_1, A_2) \mapsto C$ .

In Section VI, we extend some of our results to composite channel discrimination. We show an analogous way to give single-copy bounds on the error probabilities in terms of a single completely positive map  $\mathcal{E}$  (taking the role of  $C$  above), both for parallel and for adaptive discrimination strategies. We introduce the notion of the weighted Kubo-Ando geometric means for completely positive maps, and show their maximality for this approach in the 2-variable case, analogously to the case of state discrimination. Related to this, we introduce the more general notion of superoperator perspective in Appendix C and work out some of its fundamental properties, as it may be of independent interest. This is supported by Appendix B, where we collect some relevant facts about the notion of operator perspective function.

General definitions and technical tools are collected in Section II.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

For a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , let  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  denote the set of all bounded linear operators on  $\mathcal{H}$ , and let  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\text{sa}}$ ,  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$ , and  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{> 0}$  denote the set of self-adjoint, positive semi-definite (PSD), and positive definite operators, respectively. For an interval  $J \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , let  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_J := \{A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\text{sa}} : \text{spec}(A) \subseteq J\}$ , i.e., the set of self-adjoint operators on  $\mathcal{H}$  with their spectrum in  $J$ . In particular,

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{[0,1]} := \{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\text{sa}} : 0 \leq T \leq I\}$$

is the set of *tests* on  $\mathcal{H}$  (also called *effects* in quantum physics). For an operator  $X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ ,

$$\|X\|_{\infty} := \sup\{\|X\psi\| : \psi \in \mathcal{H}, \|\psi\| = 1\}$$

denotes the *operator norm* of  $X$ . The trace functional on the set of trace-class operators will be denoted by  $\text{Tr}$ ; the *trace-norm* is then  $\|X\|_1 := \text{Tr } |X|$ , where  $X$  is any trace-class operator. The positive semi-definite trace-class operators with unit trace are called *density operators*, or *states*, and  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  denotes the set of all density operators on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ .

For a positive semi-definite operator  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$ , we will use the notation

$$A^0 := \lim_{t \searrow 0} A^t$$

for the projection onto  $\text{supp } A := (\ker A)^{\perp}$ .

We will denote the inner product on a Hilbert space by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  and follow the convention that it is linear in its second and conjugate linear in its first variable. We will also use the Dirac notation: for any  $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$ ,  $|y\rangle\langle x| \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  is defined by  $|y\rangle\langle x|z := \langle x, z \rangle y$ ,  $z \in \mathcal{H}$ .

For a continuous function  $f : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the corresponding *operator perspective function*  $\mathcal{P}_f$  is defined on pairs of positive definite operators  $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{>0}$  as

$$\mathcal{P}_f(A, B) := B^{1/2} f\left(B^{-1/2} A B^{-1/2}\right) B^{1/2}, \quad (\text{II.15})$$

and extended to  $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$  as

$$\mathcal{P}_f(A, B) := \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \mathcal{P}_f(A + \varepsilon I, B + \varepsilon I), \quad (\text{II.16})$$

whenever the limit exists [18, 19, 28]. The limit in (II.16) always exists if  $f$  is a non-negative operator monotone function. In particular, for any  $t \in [0, 1]$ , the *t-weighted Kubo-Ando geometric mean*

$$B \#_t A := P_{\text{id}_{(0, +\infty)}}(A, B) := \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} (B + \varepsilon I)^{1/2} \left( (B + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} (A + \varepsilon I) (B + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} \right)^t (B + \varepsilon I)^{1/2}$$

is well-defined for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$ . It is easy to see that for the *transpose function*  $\tilde{f}(x) := xf(1/x)$ ,  $x > 0$ , we have

$$\mathcal{P}_f(A, B) = \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{f}}(B, A), \quad (\text{II.17})$$

whenever both sides are well-defined. In particular,

$$B \#_t A = A \#_{1-t} B.$$

The *t-weighted Kubo-Ando geometric mean* satisfies the *transformer identity* [33]:

$$(XBX) \#_t (XAX) = X(B \#_t A)X \quad (\text{II.18})$$

for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$  and positive definite  $X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{>0}$ .

For a Hausdorff topological space  $\mathcal{Y}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  will denote the set of probability measures on the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathcal{Y}$ . We will always consider it equipped with the weak\*-topology induced by the bounded continuous functions on  $\mathcal{Y}$ , i.e., a net  $(\nu_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  in  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  converges to some  $\nu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  if  $\int_{\mathcal{Y}} f(y) d\nu_i(y)$  converges to  $\int_{\mathcal{Y}} f(y) d\nu(y)$  for any bounded continuous function  $f : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . When  $\mathcal{Y}$  is finite, the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra is just the full power set of  $\mathcal{Y}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  is naturally identified with the set of probability density functions on  $\mathcal{Y}$ , or equivalently, with the simplex spanned by the canonical basis vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{Y}}$ , and the weak\*-topology coincides with the topology induced by any norm on  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{Y}}$ . For an arbitrary non-empty set  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_f(\mathcal{X})$  will denote the set of finitely supported probability density functions on  $\mathcal{X}$ .

By  $\log$  we denote the natural logarithm with its natural extension to  $[0, +\infty]$  as

$$\log x := \begin{cases} -\infty, & x = 0, \\ \log x, & x \in (0, +\infty), \\ +\infty, & x = +\infty. \end{cases}$$

Correspondingly, we define  $e^{-\infty} := 0$ ,  $e^{+\infty} := +\infty$ . Throughout the paper we use the convention

$$0 \cdot (\pm\infty) := 0. \quad (\text{II.19})$$

For a natural number  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $[d] := \{1, \dots, d\}$ .

The following statement from [21, Theorem 5.2] is an extension of the minimax theorems due to Kneser [32] and Fan [20] to the case where  $f$  can take the value  $+\infty$ .

**Lemma II.1** *Let  $X$  be a compact convex set in a topological vector space  $V$  and  $Y$  be a convex subset of a vector space  $W$ . Let  $h : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  be such that*

- (i)  $h(x, \cdot)$  is concave on  $Y$  for each  $x \in X$ , and
- (ii)  $h(\cdot, y)$  is convex and lower semi-continuous on  $X$  for each  $y \in Y$ .

Then

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} h(x, y) = \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} h(x, y), \quad (\text{II.20})$$

and the infima in (II.20) can be replaced by minima.

The following simple observation will be useful in some applications of the above minimax theorem.

**Lemma II.2** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a finite set,  $\mathcal{Y}$  be a compact Hausdorff topological space, and  $h : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$  be a function such that for every  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $h(a, \cdot)$  is Borel measurable. Assume that at least one of the following two conditions hold:*

(i) *For every  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $h(a, \cdot)$  is finite-valued and continuous.*

(ii)  *$\mathcal{Y}$  is finite.*

Then

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A}) \times \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y}) \ni (\mu, \nu) \mapsto \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \mu(a) \int_{\mathcal{Y}} h(a, y) d\nu(y) = \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \mu(a) h(a, y) d\nu(y) =: F(\mu, \nu) \quad (\text{II.21})$$

is (jointly) upper semi-continuous in the product of the total variation norm topology on  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$  and the weak\*-topology induced by continuous functions on  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$ .

**Proof** Either of the conditions (i) or (ii) implies that for every  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $h(a, \cdot)$  is bounded from above, and therefore the integrals in (II.21) exist, and under condition (i), they are even finite. The equality in (II.21) is trivial from the finite additivity of the integral.

Assume that condition (i) holds. Then for every  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y}) \ni \nu \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{Y}} h(a, y) d\nu(y)$  is continuous in the weak\*-topology by the very definition of the latter, and a simple triangle inequality argument shows that  $F$  is even jointly continuous.

Assume for the rest that  $\mathcal{Y}$  is finite, and let  $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$  converging to some  $\mu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$ , and  $(\nu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  converging to some  $\nu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$ . Then

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mu_n(a) \nu_n(y) h(a, y) \quad (\text{II.22})$$

$$= \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left\{ \sum_{(a,y): h(a,y) > -\infty} \mu_n(a) \nu_n(y) h(a, y) + \sum_{(a,y): h(a,y) = -\infty} \mu_n(a) \nu_n(y) h(a, y) \right\} \quad (\text{II.23})$$

$$\leq \sum_{(a,y): h(a,y) > -\infty} \mu(a) \nu(y) h(a, y) + \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \sum_{(a,y): h(a,y) = -\infty} \mu_n(a) \nu_n(y) h(a, y). \quad (\text{II.24})$$

Now, if  $(\mu \otimes \nu)(\{(a, y) : h(a, y) = -\infty\}) > 0$  then  $(\mu_n \otimes \nu_n)(\{(a, y) : h(a, y) = -\infty\}) > 0$  for every large enough  $n$ , and therefore the limsup in (II.24) is equal to  $-\infty = \sum_{(a,y): h(a,y) = -\infty} \mu(a) \nu(y) h(a, y)$ . On the other hand, the limsup in (II.24) is trivially upper bounded by 0, and  $0 = \sum_{(a,y): h(a,y) = -\infty} \mu(a) \nu(y) h(a, y)$  if  $(\mu \otimes \nu)(\{(a, y) : h(a, y) = -\infty\}) = 0$ . Thus, we finally obtain

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mu_n(a) \nu_n(y) h(a, y) \leq \sum_{(x,y): h(a,y) > -\infty} \mu(a) \nu(y) h(a, y) + \sum_{(x,y): h(a,y) = -\infty} \mu(a) \nu(y) h(a, y) \quad (\text{II.25})$$

$$= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}, y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mu(a) \nu(y) h(a, y), \quad (\text{II.26})$$

proving the asserted upper semi-continuity.  $\square$

### III. CLASSICAL CASE

In this section we consider the problems outlined in Section I in the setting where all involved operators commute. In this case, the  $C^*$ -algebra they generate in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  is isomorphic to the space of continuous functions on a compact Hausdorff space, and therefore we will formulate our results for functions, replacing the operator  $C$  with a function  $f$ , and the operators  $(A_y)_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}$  with a collection of functions  $(g_y)_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}$ , on some set  $\mathcal{X}$ . In fact, we consider a slightly more general setting, where we do not assume anything about  $\mathcal{X}$ , whence, in particular,  $f$  and  $g_y$  are not assumed to be continuous functions, either, in lack of a topology to make sense of it.

For a function  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ , its  $n$ -th tensor power is defined as

$$f^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) := \prod_{j=1}^n f(x_j), \quad \underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n.$$

For a function  $g : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we will denote  $g_y(x) := g(x, y)$ ,  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ , and by the above,

$$g_y^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) = \prod_{j=1}^n g(x_j, y), \quad \underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n, y \in \mathcal{Y}.$$

**Theorem III.1** *Let  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$  be non-empty sets,  $\mathcal{F}$  be a  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\mathcal{Y}$ , and  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ ,  $g : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  be functions such that for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $g(x, \cdot)$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable. Consider the following statements:*

(i) (Single-copy upper bound by a weighted geometric mean.) *There exists a probability measure  $\nu$  on  $\mathcal{F}$  such that*

$$\forall x \in \mathcal{X} : \exists \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \log g(x, y) d\nu(y) \in [-\infty, +\infty), \quad (\text{III.27})$$

and

$$f(x) \leq \exp \left( \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \log g(x, y) d\nu(y) \right), \quad x \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (\text{III.28})$$

(ii) (Multi-copy upper bounds by a sequence of weighted geometric means.) *There exists a sequence of probability measures  $(\nu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  on  $\mathcal{F}$  such that*

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \forall \underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n : \exists \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \log g_y^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) d\nu_n(y) \in [-\infty, +\infty), \quad (\text{III.29})$$

and

$$f^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) \leq \exp \left( \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \log g_y^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) d\nu_n(y) \right), \quad \underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n, n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (\text{III.30})$$

(iii) (Multi-copy upper bounds by a weighted arithmetic mean.) *There exists a probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{F}$  such that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$f^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) \leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} g_y^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) d\mu(y), \quad \underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n. \quad (\text{III.31})$$

(iv) (Multi-copy upper bounds by a sequence of weighted arithmetic means.) *There exists a sequence of positive measures  $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  on  $\mathcal{F}$  such that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mu_n(\mathcal{Y}) \leq 0, \quad (\text{III.32})$$

and

$$f^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) \leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} g_y^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) d\mu_n(y), \quad \underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n, n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (\text{III.33})$$

We have (i)  $\iff$  (ii)  $\implies$  (iii)  $\implies$  (iv). If, moreover, at least one of the following conditions is satisfied then also (iv)  $\implies$  (i) holds:

a)  $\mathcal{Y}$  is a compact Hausdorff topological space,  $\mathcal{F}$  is its Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra, and for every  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $g(x, \cdot)$  is strictly positive and continuous on  $\mathcal{Y}$ .

b)  $\mathcal{Y}$  is finite.

**Proof** Clearly, (i) implies (ii) with  $\nu_n = \nu$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and the converse implication is trivial. The implication (i)  $\implies$  (iii) follows by the convexity of the exponential function, and the implication (iii)  $\implies$  (iv) is trivial.

Assume now that (iv) holds. Note that (III.28) holds trivially when  $f(x) = 0$ , and hence we only need to prove it for every  $x \in \text{supp } f := \{z \in \mathcal{X} : f(z) > 0\}$ . Note also that (III.33) is equivalent to

$$1 \leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \tilde{g}_y^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) d\mu_n(y), \quad \underline{x} \in (\text{supp } f)^n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (\text{III.34})$$

where  $\tilde{g}(x, y) := g(x, y)/f(x)$ ,  $x \in \text{supp } f$ ,  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ , and we need to prove

$$1 \leq \exp \left( \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \log \tilde{g}(x, y) d\nu(y) \right), \quad x \in \text{supp } f, \quad (\text{III.35})$$

which is equivalent to (III.28).

Let  $x_1, \dots, x_m \in \text{supp } f$ , and  $r_1, \dots, r_m$  be strictly positive rational numbers summing to 1. We can write  $r_i = a_i/a$  with some natural numbers  $a_1, \dots, a_m$  and  $a := \sum_{i=1}^m a_i$ . For any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , (III.34) yields that

$$1 \leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \prod_{j=1}^m \tilde{g}_y(x_j)^{ka_j} d\mu_{ka}(y) \leq \left( \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \prod_{j=1}^m \tilde{g}_y(x_j)^{a_j} \right)^k \mu_{ka}(\mathcal{Y}).$$

Taking the  $k$ -th root and then the limsup in  $k$  yields

$$1 \leq \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \prod_{j=1}^m \tilde{g}_y(x_j)^{a_j},$$

according to (III.32). By taking the log of both sides, we get

$$0 \leq \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{j=1}^m r_j \log \tilde{g}(x_j, y). \quad (\text{III.36})$$

Assume now that a) or b) holds. Then (III.36) can be rewritten as

$$0 \leq \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \sum_{j=1}^m r_j \log \tilde{g}(x_j, y) d\nu(y), \quad (\text{III.37})$$

where the integral exists as a number in  $[-\infty, +\infty)$ . Moreover, condition (i) or condition (ii) in Lemma II.2 is satisfied with  $\mathcal{A} := [m]$  and  $h(i, y) := \log \tilde{g}(x_i, y)$ , and therefore  $\mathcal{S}([m]) \times \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y}) \ni (r, \nu) \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \sum_{j=1}^m r_j \log \tilde{g}(x_j, y) d\nu(y)$  is jointly upper semi-continuous, which in turn implies that  $\mathcal{S}([m]) \ni r \mapsto \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \sum_{j=1}^m r_j \log \tilde{g}(x_j, y) d\nu(y)$  is upper semi-continuous (see, e.g., [39, Lemma 2.3]). Let  $r = (r_1, \dots, r_m)$  be an arbitrary probability distribution on  $[m]$ , and let  $r^{(n)} = (r_1^{(n)}, \dots, r_m^{(n)})$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , be probability distributions with strictly positive rational weights converging to  $r$ . By (III.36) and the just established upper semi-continuity,

$$0 \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \sum_{j=1}^m r_j^{(n)} \log \tilde{g}(x_j, y) d\nu(y) \leq \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \sum_{j=1}^m r_j \log \tilde{g}(x_j, y) d\nu(y). \quad (\text{III.38})$$

Since this is true for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , any choice of  $x_1, \dots, x_m \in \text{supp } f$  and  $(r_1, \dots, r_m) \in \mathcal{S}([m])$ , we get that

$$0 \leq \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{S}_f(\text{supp } f)} \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mu(x) \log \tilde{g}(x, y) d\nu(y) \quad (\text{III.39})$$

$$= \max_{\nu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})} \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{S}_f(\text{supp } f)} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mu(x) \log \tilde{g}(x, y) d\nu(y). \quad (\text{III.40})$$

$$= \max_{\nu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})} \inf_{x \in \text{supp } f} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mu(x) \log \tilde{g}(x, y) d\nu(y). \quad (\text{III.41})$$

Here, the equality in (III.41) is trivial, and the equality in (III.40) follows by the application of Lemma II.1 to  $X = \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$ ,  $Y = \mathcal{S}_f(\text{supp } f)$ , and  $h(\nu, \mu) := -\int_{\mathcal{Y}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mu(x) \log \tilde{g}(x, y) d\nu(y)$ . Indeed, both  $\mathcal{S}_f(\text{supp } f)$  and  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  are convex, and  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  is compact in the weak\*-topology induced by the continuous functions on  $\mathcal{Y}$ , according to the Markov-Riesz-Kakutani representation theorem and the Banach-Alaoglu theorem. Additionally,  $h$  is affine in both of its variables, and by Lemma II.2,  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y}) \ni \nu \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mu(x) \log \tilde{g}(x, y) d\nu(y)$  is upper semi-continuous for every  $\mu \in \mathcal{S}_f(\mathcal{X})$ . Hence, Lemma II.1 applies.

Thus, by (III.41), there exists a  $\nu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  such that

$$0 \leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mu(x) \log \tilde{g}(x, y) d\nu(y), \quad x \in \text{supp } f, \quad (\text{III.42})$$

and exponentiating both sides gives (III.35).  $\square$

**Remark III.2** When  $\mathcal{Y}$  is finite, (III.28) can be written in the simpler form

$$f(x) \leq \prod_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} g_y(x)^{\nu(y)}, \quad x \in \mathcal{X}, \quad (\text{III.43})$$

where  $0^t := 0$  for any  $t \in [0, +\infty)$ .

**Remark III.3** A few further remarks are in order related to Theorem III.1. First, it is clear that if a measure  $\nu$  satisfies (III.28) then  $\mu = \nu$  satisfies (III.31). One may wonder whether the opposite implication is true as well; however, it is easily seen to fail even in the simplest setting with  $|\mathcal{X}| = 1$ ,  $|\mathcal{Y}| = 2$ . Indeed, choosing

$$\mathcal{X} = \{0\}, \quad \mathcal{Y} = \{1, 2\}, \quad a := g_1(0) := 1/100, \quad b := g_2(0) := 10, \quad f(0) := 1,$$

with  $t = 1/2$  we have  $1 \leq 10^n/2 \leq (1-t)a^n + tb^n$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , while  $a^{1/2}b^{1/2} = 1/\sqrt{10} < 1$ .

Second, still in this simple setting, it is clear that if (III.31) holds for  $n = 1$  then (III.28) holds, and one may choose  $\nu$  to be one of the two Dirac measures  $\nu = \delta_1$  or  $\nu = \delta_2$ ; indeed, assuming without loss of generality that  $g_1(0) \geq g_2(0)$ ,  $g_1(0)^1 g_2(0)^0 = g_1(0) = \max\{g_1(0), g_2(0)\} \geq \mu(1)g_1(0) + \mu(2)g_2(0) \geq f(0)$ , where the last inequality is by assumption and the rest are trivial. Both of these implications fail in general when  $|\mathcal{X}| \geq 2$ .

Indeed, choosing  $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}$ ,  $g_1(0) = g_2(1) = 1/100$ ,  $g_1(1) = g_2(0) = 10$ , and  $f(0) = f(1) = 1$ , we get that  $f(x) \leq g_1(x)/2 + g_2(x)/2$ ,  $x = 0, 1$ , i.e., (III.31) holds for  $n = 1$  with  $\mu(1) = \mu(2) = 1/2$ , but  $f(0) \leq g_1(0)^{\nu(1)} g_2(0)^{\nu(2)}$  yields  $\nu(1) \leq 1/3$ , while  $f(1) \leq g_1(1)^{\nu(1)} g_2(1)^{\nu(2)}$  yields  $\nu(1) \geq 2/3$ , showing that (III.28) does not hold with any  $\nu$ .

Regarding the other implication, with  $g_1(0) = g_2(1) = 1/10$ ,  $g_1(1) = g_2(0) = 10$ , and  $f(0) = f(1) = 1$ , we get that (III.28) holds with the unique measure  $\nu(1) = \nu(2) = 1/2$  (and obviously (III.31) holds also for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $\mu = \nu$ ), i.e., even if (III.28) holds, it may not hold with  $\nu$  being a Dirac measure.

**Remark III.4** It would be desirable to remove the strict positivity of  $g(x, \cdot)$  in Theorem III.1 when  $\mathcal{Y}$  is not finite. Note that in (iv), we may assume without loss of generality that the sequence of measures  $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is monotone increasing. Assume then that (iv) in Theorem III.1 holds. Then for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (f + \varepsilon)^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) &= f^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) + \sum_{H \subsetneq [m]} f^{\otimes |H|}((x_i)_{i \in H}) \varepsilon^{n-|H|} \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} g_y^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) d\mu_n(y) + \sum_{H \subsetneq [m]} \varepsilon^{n-|H|} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} g_y^{\otimes |H|}((x_i)_{i \in H}) d\mu_{|H|}(y) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} g_y^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) d\mu_n(y) + \sum_{H \subsetneq [m]} \varepsilon^{n-|H|} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} g_y^{\otimes |H|}((x_i)_{i \in H}) d\mu_n(y) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \left( g_y^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) + \sum_{H \subsetneq [m]} \varepsilon^{n-|H|} g_y^{\otimes |H|}((x_i)_{i \in H}) \right) d\mu_n(y) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Y}} (g_y + \varepsilon)^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) d\mu_n(y). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Theorem III.1, there exists a  $\nu_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  such that

$$f(x) + \varepsilon \leq \exp \left( \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \log(g(x, y) + \varepsilon) d\nu_\varepsilon(y) \right), \quad x \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (\text{III.44})$$

To simplify the situation, we may assume that  $\mathcal{Y}$  is a complete separable metric space, whence  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  with the weak\* topology is compact and metrizable. Applying the above to  $\varepsilon_n = 1/n$ , we get that there exists sequence  $n_1 < n_2 < \dots$  such that  $\nu_{1/n_k}$  converges to some  $\nu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$ . It is not clear, however, that this would imply

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \exp \left( \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \log(g(x, y) + 1/n_k) d\nu_{1/n_k}(y) \right) = \exp \left( \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \log g(x, y) d\nu(y) \right).$$

Let us now consider the type of bounds sought for in (I.4) in the context of hypothesis testing. For simplicity, we work in the finite-dimensional setting for the rest of the section. In this case,  $g_y$  would be probability density functions on some finite set  $\mathcal{X}$ , and  $n$ -copy tests represented by functions  $\tau : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow [0, 1]$ . The type of bound we are looking for in this setting is

$$\sum_{\underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n} f^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) \tau(\underline{x}) \leq \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{\underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n} g_y^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) \tau(\underline{x}), \quad \tau \in [0, 1]^{\mathcal{X}^n}. \quad (\text{III.45})$$

We have the following:

**Proposition III.5** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a finite set and  $\mathcal{Y}$  be a compact Hausdorff topological space. Let  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ ,  $g : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  be functions such that for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $g(x, \cdot)$  is continuous. Then (III.45) holds for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  if and only if there exists a probability measure  $\mu_n \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  such that*

$$f^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) \leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} g_y^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) d\mu_n(y), \quad \underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n. \quad (\text{III.46})$$

**Proof** If (III.46) holds then for any  $\tau \in [0, 1]^{\mathcal{X}^n}$ ,

$$\sum_{\underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n} f^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) \tau(\underline{x}) \leq \sum_{\underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n} \tau(\underline{x}) \int_{\mathcal{Y}} g_y^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) d\mu_n(y) = \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \sum_{\underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n} \tau(\underline{x}) g_y^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) d\mu_n(y) \leq \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{\underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n} \tau(\underline{x}) g_y^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}),$$

proving (III.45).

Assume now (III.45). Note that this trivially implies that the inequality in (III.45) holds for any non-negative function  $\tau$  on  $\mathcal{X}^n$ . In particular, for any probability density function  $r$  on  $(\text{supp } f)^n$ , the choice  $\tau(\underline{x}) := r(\underline{x})/f^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) \mathbf{1}_{(\text{supp } f)^n}(\underline{x})$  yields

$$1 = \sum_{\underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n} f^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) \tau(\underline{x}) \leq \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{\underline{x} \in (\text{supp } f)^n} \frac{g_y^{\otimes n}(\underline{x})}{f^{\otimes n}(\underline{x})} r(\underline{x}) = \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \sum_{\underline{x} \in (\text{supp } f)^n} \frac{g_y^{\otimes n}(\underline{x})}{f^{\otimes n}(\underline{x})} r(\underline{x}) d\nu(y).$$

Since this holds for every such  $r$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\leq \inf_{r \in \mathcal{S}((\text{supp } f)^n)} \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \sum_{\underline{x} \in (\text{supp } f)^n} \frac{g_y^{\otimes n}(\underline{x})}{f^{\otimes n}(\underline{x})} r(\underline{x}) d\nu(y) \\ &= \max_{\nu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})} \inf_{r \in \mathcal{S}((\text{supp } f)^n)} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \sum_{\underline{x} \in (\text{supp } f)^n} \frac{g_y^{\otimes n}(\underline{x})}{f^{\otimes n}(\underline{x})} r(\underline{x}) d\nu(y) \\ &= \max_{\nu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})} \inf_{r \in \mathcal{S}((\text{supp } f)^n)} \sum_{\underline{x} \in (\text{supp } f)^n} r(\underline{x}) \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \frac{g_y^{\otimes n}(\underline{x})}{f^{\otimes n}(\underline{x})} d\nu(y), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from Lemma II.1 due to the fact that  $\mathcal{S}((\text{supp } f)^n) \times \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y}) \ni (r, \nu) \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \sum_{\underline{x} \in (\text{supp } f)^n} \frac{g_y^{\otimes n}(\underline{x})}{f^{\otimes n}(\underline{x})} r(\underline{x}) d\nu(y)$  is affine in both variables and continuous in  $\nu$  on the compact convex set  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  (using, as always, the weak\*-topology on  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$ ). Thus, there exists a probability measure  $\nu_n \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  such that

$$1 \leq \inf_{r \in \mathcal{S}((\text{supp } f)^n)} \sum_{\underline{x} \in (\text{supp } f)^n} r(\underline{x}) \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \frac{g_y^{\otimes n}(\underline{x})}{f^{\otimes n}(\underline{x})} d\nu_n(y) = \min_{\underline{x} \in (\text{supp } f)^n} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \frac{g_y^{\otimes n}(\underline{x})}{f^{\otimes n}(\underline{x})} d\nu_n(y),$$

from which (III.46) follows for  $\underline{x} \in (\text{supp } f)^n$  by multiplying both sides by  $f^{\otimes n}(\underline{x})$ , while for  $\underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n \setminus (\text{supp } f)^n$ , (III.46) holds trivially.  $\square$

Theorem III.1 and Proposition III.5 yield immediately the following:

**Theorem III.6** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a finite set and  $\mathcal{Y}$  be a compact Hausdorff topological space, and let  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ ,  $g : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  be functions. Assume that  $\mathcal{Y}$  is finite or that for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $g(x, \cdot)$  is strictly positive and continuous. Then (III.45) holds for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  if and only if any of the statements (i)–(iv) in Theorem III.1 hold. In particular,*

$$\sum_{\underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n} f^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) \tau(\underline{x}) \leq \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{\underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n} g_y^{\otimes n}(\underline{x}) \tau(\underline{x}), \quad \tau \in [0, 1]^{\mathcal{X}^n}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

if and only if there exists a probability measure  $\nu$  on  $\mathcal{F}$  such that

$$f(x) \leq \exp \left( \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \log g(x, y) d\nu(y) \right), \quad x \in \mathcal{X}.$$

**Remark III.7** *Recall the method outlined in Section IA to obtain single-copy bounds on the error exponents of composite state discrimination. Theorem III.6 tells that if the Hilbert space is finite-dimensional,  $\mathcal{N}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{A}$ ) is commutative, and either it is a finite set, or all of its elements are positive definite, then for the purposes of this approach, it is sufficient to consider operators  $\tilde{C}$  (resp.  $C$ ) that are weighted geometric means of the density operators in  $\mathcal{N}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{A}$ ). As it was shown in [13], this is in fact sufficient even to get the exact strong converse exponent; see (I.7).*

#### IV. EQUIVALENCE OF WEAK BOUNDS

In this section, we discuss the relation between various weak bounds of the types considered, e.g., in (I.4) and (I.9).

For the rest of this section, let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be a compact Hausdorff topological space,  $A : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$  be a function, and  $C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$ . For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we fix a subset  $\mathcal{X}_n \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})_{\geq 0}$  such that for every  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$  and  $X \in \mathcal{X}_n$ ,  $A_y^{\otimes n} X$  is trace-class, and so is  $C^{\otimes n} X$  as well (this is always true when  $\mathcal{H}$  is finite-dimensional). Moreover, we will assume that  $\mathcal{X}_n \otimes \mathcal{X}_m := \{X_1 \otimes X_2 : X_1 \in \mathcal{X}_n, X_2 \in \mathcal{X}_m\} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{n+m}$  for any  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ . We will also assume that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and every  $X \in \mathcal{X}_n$ ,  $y \mapsto \text{Tr} A_y^{\otimes n} X$  is continuous and hence, in particular, it is bounded. Note that this boundedness implies that for any  $\nu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$ ,

$$\exists \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \log \text{Tr} A_y^{\otimes n} X d\nu(y) \in [-\infty, +\infty), \quad X \in \mathcal{X}_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (\text{IV.47})$$

Some examples of natural choices of the sets  $\mathcal{X}_n$  are as follows, using the same choice for all  $n$ :

- The set of all rank 1 projections on  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ .
- The set of all rank 1 PSD operators on  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ .
- The set of all non-zero finite rank PSD operators on  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ , optionally with the additional constraint that their operator norm is at most 1.
- The set of all non-zero compact PSD operators on  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ , optionally with the additional constraint that their operator norm is at most 1.
- The set of all density operators on  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ .
- The set of all density operators  $\rho$  on  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$  such that  $\ker(\rho) = \{0\}$ .
- The set of all non-zero tests, i.e.,  $\mathcal{X}_n = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})_{[0,1]} \setminus \{0\}$ ; this can be a valid choice if  $A_y$  is trace-class for all  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ .
- The set of all strictly positive tests, i.e.,  $\mathcal{X}_n = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})_{(0,1]}$ ; this can be a valid choice if  $A_y$  is trace-class for all  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ .

The main application that we have in mind is where  $\mathcal{Y}$  is a subset of  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$ , and  $\mathcal{Y} \ni y \mapsto A_y := y$  is just the identity. This map is obviously continuous in the operator norm, and  $\mathcal{Y} \ni y \mapsto \text{Tr} A_y^{\otimes n} X$  is continuous for every  $X \in \mathcal{X}_n$ , provided that  $\mathcal{X}_n$  is a subset of the set of PSD trace-class operators and  $\mathcal{Y}$  is equipped with the operator norm topology. Alternatively, for state discrimination,  $\mathcal{Y}$  would be a subset

of  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  equipped with the trace-norm topology, and  $\mathcal{Y} \ni y \mapsto \text{Tr} A_y^{\otimes n} X$  is continuous for every  $X \in \mathcal{X}_n$  in this topology for any of the above listed choices of  $\mathcal{X}_n$ .

Note that any of the above choices for  $(\mathcal{X}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  characterizes the PSD order in the sense that for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})_{\geq 0}$ ,

$$A \leq B \iff \text{Tr} AX \leq \text{Tr} BX, \quad X \in \mathcal{X}_n, \quad (\text{IV.48})$$

assuming that  $A, B$  are such that  $AX$  and  $BX$  are trace-class for all  $X \in \mathcal{X}_n$ .

**Proposition IV.1** *In the above setting, consider the following statements:*

(i) (Multi-copy upper bounds by a weighted geometric mean.) *There exists a probability measure  $\nu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  such that*

$$\text{Tr} C^{\otimes n} X \leq \exp \left( \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \log \text{Tr} A_y^{\otimes n} X \, d\nu(y) \right), \quad X \in \mathcal{X}_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (\text{IV.49})$$

(ii) (Multi-copy upper bounds by a sequence of weighted geometric means.) *For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists a probability measure  $\nu_n \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  such that*

$$\text{Tr} C^{\otimes n} X \leq \exp \left( \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \log \text{Tr} A_y^{\otimes n} X \, d\nu_n(y) \right), \quad X \in \mathcal{X}_n. \quad (\text{IV.50})$$

(iii) (Multi-copy upper bounds by a weighted arithmetic mean.) *There exists a probability measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  such that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$\text{Tr} C^{\otimes n} X \leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \text{Tr} A_y^{\otimes n} X \, d\mu(y), \quad X \in \mathcal{X}_n. \quad (\text{IV.51})$$

(iv) (Multi-copy upper bounds by a sequence of weighted arithmetic means.) *There exists a sequence of positive measures  $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  on the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $\mathcal{Y}$  such that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mu_n(\mathcal{Y}) \leq 0, \quad (\text{IV.52})$$

and

$$\text{Tr} C^{\otimes n} X \leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \text{Tr} A_y^{\otimes n} X \, d\mu_n(y), \quad X \in \mathcal{X}_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (\text{IV.53})$$

(v) (Upper bound by the supremum.) *For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$\text{Tr} C^{\otimes n} X \leq \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \text{Tr} A_y^{\otimes n} X, \quad X \in \mathcal{X}_n.$$

*Then we have (i)  $\implies$  (iii)  $\implies$  (iv)  $\implies$  (v) and (i)  $\implies$  (ii)  $\implies$  (iv), and if  $\mathcal{Y}$  is finite or  $\text{Tr} A_y^{\otimes n} X > 0$  for every  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $X \in \mathcal{X}_n$ , then also (iv)  $\implies$  (ii)  $\implies$  (i) hold.*

**Proof** The implications (i)  $\implies$  (iii)  $\implies$  (iv) and (i)  $\implies$  (ii)  $\implies$  (iv) are obvious. To see (iv)  $\implies$  (v), note that (iv) implies that for all  $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $X \in \mathcal{X}_n$ ,

$$\text{Tr} C^{\otimes nk} X^{\otimes k} \leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \text{Tr} A_y^{\otimes nk} X^{\otimes k} \, d\mu_{nk}(y) \leq \left( \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \text{Tr} A_y^{\otimes nk} X^{\otimes k} \right) \mu_{nk}(\mathcal{Y}).$$

Taking then the  $k$ -th root and then the limit  $k \rightarrow +\infty$  yields

$$\text{Tr} C^{\otimes n} X \leq \left( \limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \mu_{nk}(\mathcal{Y})^{1/nk} \right)^n \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \text{Tr} A_y^{\otimes n} X \leq \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \text{Tr} A_y^{\otimes n} X, \quad X \in \mathcal{X}_n,$$

proving (v).

For the rest, we assume that  $\mathcal{Y}$  is finite or  $\text{Tr} A_y^{\otimes n} X > 0$  for every  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $X \in \mathcal{X}_n$ , and prove (iv)  $\implies$  (ii)  $\implies$  (i) under this assumption.

Assume first that (ii) holds, and let  $\mathcal{S}_n$  be the set of probability measures  $\nu$  for which  $\text{Tr } C^{\otimes n} X \leq \exp\left(\int_{\mathcal{Y}} \log \text{Tr } A_y^{\otimes n} X d\nu(y)\right)$  for every  $X \in \mathcal{X}_n$ . Let  $(\nu_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  be a net in  $\mathcal{S}_n$  converging to some  $\nu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  in the weak\*-topology on  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$ . By Lemma II.2, for every  $X \in \mathcal{X}_n$ ,  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y}) \ni \nu \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \log \text{Tr } A_y^{\otimes n} X d\nu(y)$  is upper semi-continuous, and therefore,

$$\text{Tr } C^{\otimes n} X \leq \limsup_i \exp\left(\int_{\mathcal{Y}} \log \text{Tr } A_y^{\otimes n} X d\nu_i(y)\right) \leq \exp\left(\int_{\mathcal{Y}} \log \text{Tr } A_y^{\otimes n} X d\nu(y)\right),$$

i.e.,  $\nu \in \mathcal{S}_n$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{S}_n$  is closed. Now observe that if  $\nu \in \mathcal{S}_{nm}$  then for any  $X \in \mathcal{X}_n$ ,

$$(\text{Tr } C^{\otimes n} X)^m = \text{Tr } C^{\otimes nm} X^{\otimes m} \leq \exp\left(\int_{\mathcal{Y}} \log \text{Tr } A_y^{\otimes nm} X^{\otimes m} d\nu(y)\right) = \left(\exp\left(\int_{\mathcal{Y}} \log \text{Tr } A_y^{\otimes n} X d\nu(y)\right)\right)^m,$$

whence  $\nu \in \mathcal{S}_n$ . Thus, for any  $n_1, \dots, n_k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_{n_1} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{S}_{n_k} \supseteq \mathcal{S}_{n_1 \dots n_k} \neq \emptyset$ . Hence, by the compactness of  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$ ,  $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{S}_n \neq \emptyset$ , and (IV.49) holds with any  $\nu \in \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{S}_n$ , proving (i).

Next, assume (iv). For a fixed  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let

$$f(X) := \text{Tr } C^{\otimes n} X, \quad g(X, y) := \text{Tr } A_y^{\otimes n} X, \quad X \in \mathcal{X}_n.$$

Then  $g$  satisfies condition a) or b) in Theorem III.1, and for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $X_1, \dots, X_k \in \mathcal{X}_n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f^{\otimes k}(\underline{X}) &= \prod_{i=1}^k \text{Tr } C^{\otimes n} X_i = \text{Tr } C^{\otimes nk} (X_1 \otimes \dots \otimes X_k) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \text{Tr } A_y^{\otimes nk} (X_1 \otimes \dots \otimes X_k) d\mu_{nk} = \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \text{Tr } g_y^{\otimes nk}(\underline{X}) d\mu_{nk}, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality is due to (iv), which also implies that

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{k} \log \mu_{nk}(\mathcal{Y}) \leq 0.$$

Thus, by Theorem III.1, there exists a  $\nu_n \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  such that

$$\text{Tr } C^{\otimes n} X = f(X) \leq \exp\left(\int_{\mathcal{Y}} \log g_y(X) d\nu_n(y)\right) = \exp\left(\int_{\mathcal{Y}} \log \text{Tr } A_y^{\otimes n} X d\nu_n(y)\right), \quad X \in \mathcal{X}_n,$$

proving (ii).  $\square$

Note that if  $\mathcal{Y} \ni y \mapsto \|A_y\|$  is continuous, where the norm may stand for the operator norm or the trace norm, depending on the setting, then for any finite measure  $\mu$  on the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathcal{Y}$ ,  $\int_{\mathcal{Y}} A_y^{\otimes n} d\mu(y)$  is a well-defined operator in the respective space, and for any of the above listed choices of  $\mathcal{X}_n$ , (IV.48) implies that the weak inequality (IV.51) can be equivalently written in the strong form

$$C^{\otimes n} \leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} A_y^{\otimes n} d\mu(y). \quad (\text{IV.54})$$

The inequalities in (IV.49) and (IV.50) do not have obvious strong versions (see, however, Section V), and neither do the type of bounds in (I.4), since a set of PSD operators does not have a supremum in the PSD order except for very special cases. On the other hand, a weak inequality as in (I.4) turns out to be equivalent to the strong inequality in (IV.54) when the integral in (IV.54) exists.

**Proposition IV.2** *Assume that  $\mathcal{Y} \ni y \mapsto A_y$  is continuous in the operator norm and let  $C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$ . Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}} \subseteq \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  be a convex set such that for any  $Z \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$ ,  $\inf_{\varrho \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}} \text{Tr } \varrho Z = \inf \text{spec}(Z)$ , and assume that for some  $\delta > 0$ ,*

$$\{(C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} \varrho (C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} : \varrho \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}, \varepsilon \in (0, \delta)\} \subseteq \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}).$$

Then

$$\text{Tr } CX \leq \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \text{Tr } A_y X, \quad X \in \mathcal{X}, \quad (\text{IV.55})$$

if and only if there exists a probability measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  such that

$$C \leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} A_y d\mu(y). \quad (\text{IV.56})$$

**Proof** The “if” part is obvious, and therefore we prove the “only if” part. Note that (IV.55) implies that

$$\mathrm{Tr}(C + \varepsilon I)X \leq \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathrm{Tr}(A_y + \varepsilon I)X, \quad X \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (\text{IV.57})$$

For an arbitrary  $\varrho \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$  and  $\varepsilon \in (0, \delta)$ , let  $X := (C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} \varrho (C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} \in \mathcal{X}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \mathrm{Tr} \varrho = \mathrm{Tr}(C + \varepsilon I)(C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} \varrho (C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} \\ &\leq \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathrm{Tr}(A_y + \varepsilon I)(C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} \varrho (C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} \\ &= \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \mathrm{Tr}(A_y + \varepsilon I)(C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} \varrho (C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} d\mu(y), \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from (IV.57). Since this holds for every  $\varrho \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\leq \inf_{\varrho \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}} \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \mathrm{Tr}(A_y + \varepsilon I)(C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} \varrho (C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} d\mu(y) \\ &= \max_{\mu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})} \inf_{\varrho \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \mathrm{Tr}(A_y + \varepsilon I)(C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} \varrho (C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} d\mu(y), \end{aligned}$$

where the equality follows from Lemma II.1 due to the facts that  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$  and  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  are convex,  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}} \times \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y}) \ni (\varrho, \mu) \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \mathrm{Tr}(A_y + \varepsilon I)(C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} \varrho (C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} d\mu(y)$  is affine in both variables and continuous in  $\mu$  with respect to the weak\*-topology in  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$ , with respect to which  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  is compact. Thus, there exists a  $\mu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  such that for every  $\varrho \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ ,

$$1 \leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \mathrm{Tr}(A_y + \varepsilon I)(C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} \varrho (C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} d\mu(y) \quad (\text{IV.58})$$

$$= \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \mathrm{Tr} \varrho (C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} (A_y + \varepsilon I)(C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} d\mu(y) \quad (\text{IV.59})$$

$$= \mathrm{Tr} \varrho \int_{\mathcal{Y}} (C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} (A_y + \varepsilon I)(C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} d\mu(y), \quad \varrho \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}, \quad (\text{IV.60})$$

where the second equality follows from the fact that  $\mathcal{Y} \ni y \mapsto (C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} (A_y + \varepsilon I)(C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2}$  is continuous in the operator norm. Thus, by the assumption on  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ ,

$$1 \leq \inf \mathrm{spec} \left( \int_{\mathcal{Y}} (C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} (A_y + \varepsilon I)(C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} d\mu(y) \right),$$

or equivalently,

$$I \leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} (C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} (A_y + \varepsilon I)(C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} d\mu(y) = (C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} \left( \int_{\mathcal{Y}} (A_y + \varepsilon I) d\mu(y) \right) (C + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2},$$

which in turn yields

$$(C + \varepsilon I) \leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} (A_y + \varepsilon I) d\mu(y) = \int_{\mathcal{Y}} A_y d\mu(y) + \varepsilon I.$$

Since this holds for every  $\varepsilon \in (0, \delta)$ , we finally get

$$C \leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} A_y d\mu(y).$$

□

Proposition IV.2 allows to complete Proposition IV.1 by proving (v)  $\implies$  (i) in the latter under some additional technical conditions.

**Theorem IV.3** *Assume that  $\mathcal{Y} \ni y \mapsto A_y$  is continuous in operator norm and let  $C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$ . For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_n \subseteq \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$  be a convex set such that for any  $Z \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})_{\geq 0}$ ,  $\inf_{\varrho \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_n} \mathrm{Tr} \varrho Z = \inf \mathrm{spec}(Z)$ , and let  $(\mathcal{X}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be any sequence of sets as specified in the beginning of this section, with the additional requirement that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , (IV.48) holds. Assume that  $\mathcal{Y}$  is finite, or that  $\mathrm{Tr} A_y^{\otimes n} X > 0$  for every  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $X \in \mathcal{X}_n$ . Then, the following are equivalent:*

(i) For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\mathrm{Tr} X^{1/2} C^{\otimes n} X^{1/2} \leq \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathrm{Tr} X^{1/2} A_y^{\otimes n} X^{1/2}, \quad X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})_{\geq 0}. \quad (\text{IV.61})$$

(ii) There exist  $\delta_n \in (0, +\infty)$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that

$$\mathrm{Tr} C^{\otimes n} X \leq \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathrm{Tr} A_y^{\otimes n} X \quad (\text{IV.62})$$

for every  $X \in \{(C^{\otimes n} + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} \varrho (C^{\otimes n} + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} : \varrho \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_n, \varepsilon \in (0, \delta_n)\}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

(iii) For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists a probability measure  $\mu_n \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  such that

$$C^{\otimes n} \leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} A_y^{\otimes n} d\mu_n(y).$$

(iv) There exists a probability measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  such that

$$C^{\otimes n} \leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} A_y^{\otimes n} d\mu(y), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

(v) There exists a probability measure  $\nu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  such that

$$\mathrm{Tr} C^{\otimes n} X \leq \exp \left( \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \log \mathrm{Tr} A_y^{\otimes n} X d\nu(y) \right), \quad X \in \mathcal{X}_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (\text{IV.63})$$

**Proof** The implication (i)  $\implies$  (ii) is trivial from the fact that if  $X$  is trace-class then  $\mathrm{Tr} X^{1/2} C^{\otimes n} X^{1/2} = \mathrm{Tr} C^{\otimes n} X$  and  $\mathrm{Tr} X^{1/2} A_y^{\otimes n} X^{1/2} = \mathrm{Tr} A_y^{\otimes n} X$ . The implication (ii)  $\implies$  (iii) follows from Proposition IV.2, and the implication (iii)  $\implies$  (i) is trivial. The equivalences (iii)  $\iff$  (iv)  $\iff$  (v) follow from Proposition IV.1 due to the assumption that  $\mathcal{X}_n$  characterizes the PSD order on  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$  as in (IV.48).  $\square$

**Remark IV.4** In the intended application for state discrimination,  $\mathcal{Y}$  is a subset of  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  that is closed in trace norm,  $\mathcal{Y} \ni y \mapsto A_y := y$  is just the identity, which is trivially continuous in operator norm (even in trace norm), and the assumption is that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\mathrm{Tr} C^{\otimes n} T \leq \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathrm{Tr} A_y^{\otimes n} T, \quad T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{[0,1]}.$$

This obviously implies the same inequality for every  $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0} \supseteq (C^{\otimes n} + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}) (C^{\otimes n} + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2}$ ,  $\varepsilon \in (0, +\infty)$ . Thus, by Theorem IV.3, there exists a probability measure  $\nu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  such that

$$\mathrm{Tr} C^{\otimes n} X \leq \exp \left( \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \log \mathrm{Tr} A_y^{\otimes n} X d\nu(y) \right), \quad X \in \mathcal{X}_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (\text{IV.64})$$

where  $\mathcal{X}_n := \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})_{\geq 0}$  when  $\mathcal{Y}$  is finite, and otherwise  $\mathcal{X}_n := \{X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})_{\geq 0} : \mathrm{Tr} A_y^{\otimes n} X > 0, y \in \mathcal{Y}\}$ . Note that with this latter definition, if all  $A_y$  are positive definite then  $\mathcal{X}_n = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})_{\geq 0}$ , and in general,  $\mathcal{X}_n \supseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})_{>0}$ , i.e., it contains all positive definite operators on  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ .

## V. MAXIMALITY OF THE KUBO-ANDO WEIGHTED GEOMETRIC MEANS FOR TWO VARIABLES

In this section, we give a complete characterization of all the operators  $C$  satisfying any (and hence all) of the inequalities given in Proposition IV.1 when  $\mathcal{Y}$  is a 2-point set and the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  is finite-dimensional.

For this, we will need some additional preparation regarding permutation-invariant operators on tensor product Hilbert spaces. Recall that by the Schur-Weyl duality (see, e.g., [24, Chapter 9]), for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$  decomposes as

$$\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in Y_{n,d}} \mathcal{H}_{n,\lambda} \otimes \mathcal{K}_{n,\lambda},$$

where  $Y_{n,d}$  is the set of the Young diagrams up to depth  $d := \dim \mathcal{H}$ , defined as

$$Y_{n,d} := \left\{ \lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_d) : \lambda_i \in \mathbb{N}, i \in [d], \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_d \geq 0, \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i = n \right\},$$

the dimensions of all  $\mathcal{H}_{n,\lambda}$  are polynomially bounded in  $n$  as

$$\max_{\lambda} \{\dim \mathcal{H}_{n,\lambda}\} \leq (n+1)^{\frac{d(d-1)}{2}}, \quad (\text{V.65})$$

and every permutation-invariant operator  $X$  on  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$  is of the form

$$X = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in Y_{n,d}} X_{n,\lambda} \otimes I_{\mathcal{K}_{n,\lambda}}.$$

Here, permutation-invariant means that  $X$  can be written as  $X = \sum_{k=1}^r X_{1,k} \otimes \dots \otimes X_{n,k}$  with  $X_{i,k} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ ,  $i \in [k]$ , such that for any permutation  $\sigma$  of  $[n]$ ,  $X = \sum_{k=1}^r X_{\sigma^{-1}(1),k} \otimes \dots \otimes X_{\sigma^{-1}(n),k}$ . We will denote the projection from  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$  onto  $\mathcal{H}_{n,\lambda} \otimes \mathcal{K}_{n,\lambda}$  by  $P_{\lambda}$ .

For a fixed  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathcal{T}_n([d])$  denote all the probability density functions on  $[d]$  that have rational weights with denominator  $n$  (so-called  $n$ -types). For a given orthonormal basis  $(e_i)_{i=1}^d$  and a  $Q \in \mathcal{T}_n([d])$ , let  $\Pi_Q^n$  be the projection onto

$$\mathcal{H}_Q^n := \text{span} \left\{ e_{\underline{i}} := \otimes_{k=1}^n e_{i_k} : \frac{1}{n} |\{k : i_k = j\}| = Q(j), j \in [d] \right\}.$$

It is clear that  $\Pi_Q^n$  is permutation-invariant, and therefore

$$\Pi_Q^n P_{\lambda} = P_{\lambda} \Pi_Q^n, \quad \lambda \in Y_{n,d}.$$

Moreover, if  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{>0}$  is a positive definite operator that is diagonal in the given basis and therefore can be written as  $A = \sum_{i=1}^d a(i) |e_i\rangle\langle e_i|$ , we have

$$\Pi_Q^n A^{\otimes n} = A^{\otimes n} \Pi_Q^n = \sum_{e_{\underline{i}} \in \mathcal{H}_Q^n} |A^{\otimes n} e_{\underline{i}}\rangle\langle e_{\underline{i}}| = e^{n \sum_{i=1}^d Q(i) \log a(i)} \Pi_Q^n. \quad (\text{V.66})$$

**Theorem V.1** *Let  $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$  be positive semi-definite operators on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , and let  $C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$ . For a  $t \in [0, 1]$ , the following holds:*

$$\text{Tr } C^{\otimes n} X \leq (\text{Tr } A_1^{\otimes n} X)^t (\text{Tr } A_2^{\otimes n} X)^{1-t}, \quad X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})_{\geq 0}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (\text{V.67})$$

if and only if

$$C \leq A_2 \#_t A_1. \quad (\text{V.68})$$

**Proof** The implication (V.68)  $\implies$  (V.67) follows easily, as (V.68) implies  $C^{\otimes n} \leq (A_2 \#_t A_1)^{\otimes n} = A_2^{\otimes n} \#_t A_1^{\otimes n}$ , whence

$$\text{Tr } C^{\otimes n} X \leq \text{Tr}(A_2^{\otimes n} \#_t A_1^{\otimes n}) X \leq (\text{Tr } A_2^{\otimes n} X) \#_t (\text{Tr } A_1^{\otimes n} X) = (\text{Tr } A_1^{\otimes n} X)^t (\text{Tr } A_2^{\otimes n} X)^{1-t},$$

where the second inequality follows from (B.7) due to the fact that the map  $\mathcal{E}(\cdot) := \text{Tr}(\cdot)X$  is positive.

To see the converse direction (V.67)  $\implies$  (V.68), assume first that  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  are invertible. Let  $G_t := A_2 \#_t A_1$ , and for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and any  $X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})_{\geq 0}$ , let

$$\tilde{X} := (G_t^{-1/2})^{\otimes n} X (G_t^{-1/2})^{\otimes n}.$$

By definition,

$$I = G_t^{-1/2} (A_2 \#_t A_1) G_t^{-1/2} = \left( G_t^{-1/2} A_2 G_t^{-1/2} \right) \#_t \left( G_t^{-1/2} A_1 G_t^{-1/2} \right) = \tilde{A}_2 \#_t \tilde{A}_1,$$

where the second equality is due to the transformer identity (II.18). Comparing the leftmost and the rightmost terms above shows by a straightforward computation that  $\tilde{A}_2 = \tilde{A}_1^{-\frac{t}{1-t}}$ ; in particular,  $\tilde{A}_1$  and  $\tilde{A}_2$  commute, and therefore they can be jointly diagonalized in some orthonormal basis  $(e_i)_{i=1}^d$  as

$$\tilde{A}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^d a_1(i) |e_i\rangle\langle e_i|, \quad \tilde{A}_2 = \sum_{i=1}^d a_2(i) |e_i\rangle\langle e_i|.$$

Moreover,

$$I = \tilde{A}_2 \#_t \tilde{A}_1 = \tilde{A}_1^t \tilde{A}_2^{1-t} = \sum_{i=1}^d a_1(i)^t a_2(i)^{1-t} |e_i\rangle\langle e_i| \implies a_1(i)^t a_2(i)^{1-t} = 1, \quad i \in [d]. \quad (\text{V.69})$$

Note that (V.67) implies that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\text{Tr } \tilde{C}^{\otimes n} X = \text{Tr } C^{\otimes n} \tilde{X} \leq (\text{Tr } A_1^{\otimes n} \tilde{X})^t (\text{Tr } A_2^{\otimes n} \tilde{X})^{1-t} = (\text{Tr } \tilde{A}_1^{\otimes n} X)^t (\text{Tr } \tilde{A}_2^{\otimes n} X)^{1-t}, \quad X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})_{\geq 0}. \quad (\text{V.70})$$

Let  $P_\lambda$  and  $\Pi_Q^n$  be defined as above, with  $\Pi_Q^n$  corresponding to an orthonormal basis  $(e_i)_{i=1}^d$  that jointly diagonalizes  $\tilde{A}_1$  and  $\tilde{A}_2$ . Then, we have

$$\|\tilde{C}\|_\infty^n = \|\tilde{C}^{\otimes n}\|_\infty = \max_{\lambda \in Y_{n,d}} \|\tilde{C}^{\otimes n} P_\lambda\|_\infty \leq \max_{\lambda \in Y_{n,d}} \frac{1}{\dim \mathcal{K}_{n,\lambda}} \text{Tr } \tilde{C}^{\otimes n} P_\lambda \quad (\text{V.71})$$

$$= \max_{\lambda \in Y_{n,d}} \frac{1}{\dim \mathcal{K}_{n,\lambda}} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}_n([d])} \text{Tr } \tilde{C}^{\otimes n} \Pi_Q^n P_\lambda \quad (\text{V.72})$$

$$\leq \max_{\lambda \in Y_{n,d}} \frac{1}{\dim \mathcal{K}_{n,\lambda}} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}_n([d])} \left( \text{Tr } \tilde{A}_1^{\otimes n} \Pi_Q^n P_\lambda \right)^t \left( \text{Tr } \tilde{A}_2^{\otimes n} \Pi_Q^n P_\lambda \right)^{1-t} \quad (\text{V.73})$$

$$= \max_{\lambda \in Y_{n,d}} \frac{1}{\dim \mathcal{K}_{n,\lambda}} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}_n([d])} \left( e^{n \sum_i Q(i) \log a_1(i)} \text{Tr } \Pi_Q^n P_\lambda \right)^t \left( e^{n \sum_i Q(i) \log a_2(i)} \text{Tr } \Pi_Q^n P_\lambda \right)^{1-t} \quad (\text{V.74})$$

$$= \max_{\lambda \in Y_{n,d}} \frac{1}{\dim \mathcal{K}_{n,\lambda}} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}_n([d])} e^{n \sum_i Q(i) \log(a_1(i)^t a_2(i)^{1-t})} \text{Tr } \Pi_Q^n P_\lambda \quad (\text{V.75})$$

$$= \max_{\lambda \in Y_{n,d}} \frac{1}{\dim \mathcal{K}_{n,\lambda}} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}_n([d])} \text{Tr } \Pi_Q^n P_\lambda \quad (\text{V.76})$$

$$= \max_{\lambda \in Y_{n,d}} \frac{1}{\dim \mathcal{K}_{n,\lambda}} \text{Tr } P_\lambda = \max_{\lambda \in Y_{n,d}} \dim \mathcal{H}_{n,\lambda} \leq (n+1)^{d(d-1)/2}, \quad (\text{V.77})$$

where the first line is obvious, (V.72) follows from the fact that  $\Pi_Q^n$  commutes with  $P_\lambda$  and  $\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}_n([d])} \Pi_Q^n = I$ , (V.73) follows from (V.70), (V.74) is due to (V.66), (V.75) is obvious, (V.76) is due to (V.69), the equalities in (V.77) are again obvious, and the inequality follows from (V.65).

Thus,  $\|\tilde{C}\|_\infty \leq \sqrt[n]{(n+1)^{d(d-1)/2}}$ , and letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  gives  $\|\tilde{C}\|_\infty \leq 1$ . This shows that  $\tilde{C} \leq I$ , which is equivalent to (V.68).

In the general case, note that (V.67) implies that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\text{Tr } C^{\otimes n} X \leq (\text{Tr}(A_1 + \varepsilon I)^{\otimes n} X)^t (\text{Tr}(A_2 + \varepsilon I)^{\otimes n} X)^{1-t}, \quad X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})_{\geq 0}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By the above,

$$C \leq (A_2 + \varepsilon I) \#_t (A_1 + \varepsilon I), \quad \varepsilon > 0,$$

and taking  $\varepsilon \searrow 0$  gives (V.68).  $\square$

Theorems V.1 and IV.3 yield immediately the following:

**Theorem V.2** *Let  $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$  be positive semi-definite operators on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , and let  $C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$ . The following are equivalent:*

(i) For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\mathrm{Tr} C^{\otimes n} X \leq \max\{\mathrm{Tr} A_1^{\otimes n} X, \mathrm{Tr} A_2^{\otimes n} X\}, \quad X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})_{\geq 0}. \quad (\text{V.78})$$

(ii) There exists a  $p \in [0, 1]$  such that

$$C^{\otimes n} \leq pA_1^{\otimes n} + (1-p)A_2^{\otimes n}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (\text{V.79})$$

(iii) There exists a  $t \in [0, 1]$  such that

$$\mathrm{Tr} C^{\otimes n} X \leq (\mathrm{Tr} A_1^{\otimes n} X)^t (\mathrm{Tr} A_2^{\otimes n} X)^{1-t}, \quad X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})_{\geq 0}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (\text{V.80})$$

(iv) There exists a  $t \in [0, 1]$  such that

$$C \leq A_2 \#_t A_1. \quad (\text{V.81})$$

**Remark V.3** By Theorem V.1, a  $t \in [0, 1]$  satisfies (V.81) if and only if it satisfies (V.80), and for any such  $t$ , (V.79) holds with  $p = t$ . However, for a  $p \in [0, 1]$  that satisfies (V.79), (V.80) (equivalently, (V.81)) might not hold with  $t = p$ .

Theorem V.2 yields the following characterizations of the weighted Kubo-Ando geometric means announced at the end of Section IB. For simplicity, we will write 2-variable operator function instead of  $\{1, 2\}$ -variable operator function.

**Theorem V.4** Let  $G$  be a 2-variable operator function that is tensor supermultiplicative, block superadditive, and individually AM bounded. Then there exists a  $t \in [0, 1]$  such that  $G \leq G_{(t, 1-t)}^{\mathrm{KA}}$ , i.e.,

$$G(A_1, A_2) \leq G_{(t, 1-t)}^{\mathrm{KA}}(A_1, A_2) \quad (= A_2 \#_t A_1), \quad (A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{D}(G).$$

If, moreover,  $G = G_\nu$  is a  $\nu$ -weighted operator geometric mean, then the above  $t$  is unique as  $t = \nu(1)$ ; in particular,  $G_\nu \leq G_\nu^{\mathrm{KA}}$ .

**Proof** By assumption, for any  $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{D}(G)$  and for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists a probability measure  $\mu_n$  on  $\{1, 2\}$  such that

$$G(A_1, A_2)^{\otimes n} \leq G(A_1^{\otimes n}, A_2^{\otimes n}) \leq \mu_n(1)A_1^{\otimes n} + \mu_n(2)A_2^{\otimes n}.$$

Thus, by Theorems IV.3 and V.2, there exists a  $t \in [0, 1]$  such that  $G(A_1, A_2) \leq A_2 \#_t A_1 = G_{(t, 1-t)}^{\mathrm{KA}}(A_1, A_2)$ . Hence,  $T(A_1, A_2) := \{t \in [0, 1] : G(A_1, A_2) \leq A_2 \#_t A_1\}$  is non-empty, and it is easily seen to be closed. Now, for any  $(A_{i,1}, A_{i,2}) \in \mathcal{D}(G)$ ,  $i \in [r]$ , and any  $t \in T(\oplus_i A_{i,1}, \oplus_i A_{i,2})$ , we have

$$\oplus_{i=1}^r G(A_{i,1}, A_{i,2}) \leq G(\oplus_{i=1}^r A_{i,1}, \oplus_{i=1}^r A_{i,2}) \leq (\oplus_{i=1}^r A_{i,2}) \#_t (\oplus_{i=1}^r A_{i,1}) = \oplus_{i=1}^r (A_{i,2} \#_t A_{i,1}).$$

Thus,  $G(A_{i,1}, A_{i,2}) \leq A_{i,2} \#_t A_{i,1}$  for every  $i \in [r]$ , whence  $t \in \cap_{i=1}^r T(A_{i,1}, A_{i,2})$ . This shows for any finite collection of  $(A_{i,1}, A_{i,2}) \in \mathcal{D}(G)$ ,  $i \in [r]$ ,  $\cap_{i=1}^r T(A_{i,1}, A_{i,2}) \neq \emptyset$ , and thus, by the compactness of  $[0, 1]$ , we get that

$$\bigcap_{(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{D}(G)} T(A_1, A_2) \neq \emptyset,$$

and by definition, for any  $t$  in the above set,

$$G(A_1, A_2) \leq A_2 \#_t A_1, \quad (A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{D}(G).$$

If  $G = G_\nu$  for some probability distribution  $\nu$  on  $\{1, 2\}$  then  $G_\nu(A_1, A_2) = G_\nu^{\mathrm{KA}}(A_1, A_2)$  for any pair of commuting positive definite  $A_1, A_2$ , and the assertion follows from the fact that the classical 2-variable geometric means are incomparable. Indeed, if  $A_1 = (p, 1-p)$  and  $A_2 = (q, 1-q)$  are probability distributions with  $0 < p < q < 1$  then  $[0, 1] \ni t \mapsto p^t q^{1-t}$  is strictly decreasing, while  $[0, 1] \ni t \mapsto (1-p)^t (1-q)^{1-t}$  is strictly increasing, whence for any  $0 \leq s < t \leq 1$ ,  $A_1^s A_2^{1-s} \not\leq A_1^t A_2^{1-t}$  and  $A_1^s A_2^{1-s} \not\geq A_1^t A_2^{1-t}$ .  $\square$

As an application of the above result, we show the following.

**Proposition V.5** *The following operator geometric means, defined in (I.11)–(I.14), do not satisfy the AM-GM inequality; in fact, they are not even individually AM bounded:*

(i)  $G_{t,z}$ ,  $t \in (0, 1)$ ,  $z \in (0, +\infty)$ ;

(ii)  $\tilde{G}_{t,z}$ ,  $t \in (0, 1)$ ,  $z \in (0, +\infty)$ ;

(iii)  $\hat{G}_{t,z}$ ,  $t \in (0, 1)$ ,  $z \in (1, +\infty]$ .

**Proof** It is clear from their definitions that all the above operator geometric means are block additive and tensor multiplicative. Hence, by Theorem V.4, it is sufficient to show that for any fixed  $t \in (0, 1)$ , none of them is upper bounded by  $G_{(t,1-t)}^{\text{KA}}$ , which we show in Lemma V.6 below.  $\square$

**Lemma V.6** *For a fixed  $t \in (0, 1)$ , let  $G'_t$  be any of the operator geometric means in Proposition V.5. Then there exist positive definite operators  $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^2)_{>0}$  such that*

$$G'_t(A_1, A_2) \not\leq A_2 \#_t A_1. \quad (\text{V.82})$$

**Proof** First, note that  $G'_t(A_1, A_2) = \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} G'_t(A_1 + \varepsilon I, A_2 + \varepsilon I)$  and similarly,  $A_2 \#_t A_1 = \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} (A_2 + \varepsilon I) \#_t (A_1 + \varepsilon I)$ , whence it is sufficient to find  $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^2)_{\geq 0}$  PSD (not necessarily invertible) operators such that (V.82) holds.

It is well-known that  $(A_2 \#_t A_1)^0 = A_2^0 \wedge A_1^0$  [33, Proposition 3.7]. Thus, in particular, if  $A_1 = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ ,  $A_2 = |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$  are rank 1 projections, then for any  $t \in (0, 1)$ ,  $A_2 \#_t A_1 = 0$ , while it is easy to see that  $G_{t,z}(A_1, A_2) \neq 0$ ,  $\tilde{G}_{t,z}(A_1, A_2) \neq 0$ ,  $z \in (0, +\infty)$ , proving the assertion for these two families.

Next, let

$$A_1 := |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \quad \text{with} \quad \psi := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad A_2 := \begin{bmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & b \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{with} \quad 0 < a < b,$$

and let  $p := 1/z$ . Then a straightforward computation yields

$$\hat{G}_{t,z}(A_1, A_2) = \left( A_2^{\frac{p}{2}} \left( A_2^{-\frac{p}{2}} |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| A_2^{-\frac{p}{2}} \right)^t A_2^{\frac{p}{2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \left\| A_2^{-\frac{p}{2}} \psi \right\|^{\frac{2(t-1)}{p}} |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| = \left( \frac{a^{-p} + b^{-p}}{2} \right)^{\frac{t-1}{p}} |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|.$$

Thus, by the strict convexity of  $\text{id}_{(0,+\infty)}^{\frac{1}{p}}$ , we have

$$\hat{G}_{t,z}(A_1, A_2) = \left( \frac{a^{-p} + b^{-p}}{2} \right)^{\frac{t-1}{p}} |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \succeq \left( \frac{a^{-1} + b^{-1}}{2} \right)^{t-1} |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| = \hat{G}_{t,1}(A_1, A_2) = A_2 \#_t A_1,$$

proving the assertion for  $z \in (0, +\infty)$ . The case  $z = +\infty$  follows by taking the limit  $p \searrow 0$  in the above, which yields  $\hat{G}_{t,+\infty}(A_1, A_2) = \sqrt{ab}^{1-t} |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \succeq A_2 \#_t A_1$ .  $\square$

We can actually get an even stronger characterization of the Kubo-Ando means, under some mild additional conditions. For the following, we introduce the notation

$$\mathcal{D}(\text{G})_{>0} := \{(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{D}(\text{G}) : A_1 > 0, A_2 > 0\}.$$

We will say that an operator function  $\text{G}$  is *regular*, if for any  $(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{D}(\text{G})$ , there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that for every  $\varepsilon \in (0, \delta)$ ,  $(A_1 + \varepsilon I, A_2 + \varepsilon I) \in \mathcal{D}(\text{G})$ , and

$$\text{G}(A_1, A_2) = \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \text{G}(A_1 + \varepsilon I, A_2 + \varepsilon I).$$

For a positive definite  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)_{>0}$ , let us introduce the shorthand notation

$$A^{-\text{T}} := (A^{-1})^{\text{T}} = (A^{\text{T}})^{-1},$$

where the transposition is taken in the canonical orthonormal basis of  $\mathbb{C}^d$ .

**Lemma V.7** *Let  $\text{G}$  be a 2-variable operator function that is tensor supermultiplicative, block superadditive, and individually AM bounded. Assume, moreover, that for any positive definite  $(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{D}(\text{G})_{>0}$ ,  $\text{G}(A_1, A_2)$  is also positive definite, and one of the following hold:*

(i)  $(A_1^{-1}, A_2^{-1}) \in \mathcal{D}(G)$ , and

$$G(A_1^{-1}, A_2^{-1}) = G(A_1, A_2)^{-1}.$$

(ii)  $(A_1^{-T}, A_2^{-T}) \in \mathcal{D}(G)$ , and

$$G(A_1^{-T}, A_2^{-T}) = G(A_1, A_2)^{-T}.$$

Then there exists a  $t \in [0, 1]$  such that for any two positive definite  $(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{D}(G)_{>0}$ ,

$$G(A_1, A_2) = A_2 \#_t A_1. \quad (\text{V.83})$$

If, moreover,  $G$  is regular, then (V.83) holds for every  $(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{D}(G)$ .

**Proof** By Theorem V.4, there exists a  $t \in [0, 1]$  such that for any  $(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{D}(G)$ ,  $G(A_1, A_2) \leq A_2 \#_t A_1$ . Now, if  $(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{D}(G)_{>0}$  and (ii) holds then we also have

$$G(A_1, A_2) = G(A_1^{-T}, A_2^{-T})^{-T} \geq (A_2^{-T} \#_t A_1^{-T})^{-T} = A_2 \#_t A_1,$$

completing the proof of (V.83). The proof under condition (i) goes the same way. The assertion about a regular  $G$  then follows immediately.  $\square$

Let  $\wedge^k \mathbb{C}^d$  denote the  $k$ -th antisymmetric tensor power of  $\mathbb{C}^d$ , and for any  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ , let  $A^{\wedge k}$  denote the restriction of  $A^{\otimes k}$  onto  $\wedge^k \mathbb{C}^d$ . Recall that  $\dim \wedge^d \mathbb{C}^d = 1$  and there exists a unitary  $V : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \wedge^d \mathbb{C}^d$  such that

$$V^* A^{\wedge d} V = \det(A), \quad (\text{V.84})$$

and  $\dim \wedge^{(d-1)} \mathbb{C}^d = d$ , and there exists a unitary  $U : \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \wedge^{(d-1)} \mathbb{C}^d$  such that for any  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)_{>0}$ ,

$$U^* A^{\wedge (d-1)} U = (\det(A)) A^{-T}. \quad (\text{V.85})$$

(Both (V.84) and (V.85) can be verified in a straightforward way by writing out the matrix elements of  $A^{\wedge d}$  (resp.  $A^{\wedge (d-1)}$ ) in the canonical orthonormal basis of  $\wedge^d \mathbb{C}^d$  (resp.  $\wedge^{(d-1)} \mathbb{C}^d$ .)

We introduce two further technical properties of an operator function  $G$  that will be used in the following.

- *Reduction property:*  $(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{D}(G)$  implies that for any non-zero projection  $P$ ,  $(PA_1P, PA_2P) \in \mathcal{D}(G)$ .
- *Scalar tensor multiplicativity:*  $(0, +\infty) \times (0, +\infty) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(G)$ ,  $G(a_1, a_2) > 0$  for every  $a_1, a_2 \in (0, +\infty)$ , and for any  $a_1, a_2 \in (0, +\infty)$  and  $(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{D}(G)_{>0}$ ,

$$G(a_1 A_1, a_2 A_2) = G(a_1, a_2) G(A_1, A_2).$$

Note that scalar tensor multiplicativity is a simple version of strong tensor multiplicativity, which would mean that  $(A_1, A_2), (B_1, B_2) \in \mathcal{D}(G)$  implies  $(A_1 \otimes B_1, A_2 \otimes B_2) \in \mathcal{D}(G)$ , and  $G(A_1 \otimes B_1, A_2 \otimes B_2) = G(A_1, A_2) \otimes G(B_1, B_2)$ . However, we will not need this stronger property.

**Lemma V.8** *Let  $G$  be a 2-variable operator function that is tensor multiplicative, scalar tensor multiplicative, block additive, and has the reduction property. Then for any  $(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{D}(G)_{>0}$ ,  $(A_1^{-T}, A_2^{-T}) \in \mathcal{D}(G)_{>0}$ ,  $G(A_1, A_2)$  is also positive definite, and*

$$G(A_1^{-T}, A_2^{-T}) = G(A_1, A_2)^{-T}. \quad (\text{V.86})$$

**Proof** Let  $(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{D}(G)_{>0}$ ,  $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ . We may write  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes d} = \wedge^d \mathbb{C}^d \oplus \mathcal{K}$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} V \det G(A_1, A_2) V^* \oplus G(A_1, A_2)^{\otimes d} \Big|_{\mathcal{K}} &= G(A_1, A_2)^{\otimes d} = G(A_1^{\otimes d}, A_2^{\otimes d}) \\ &= G(V \det(A_1) V^* \oplus A_1^{\otimes d} \Big|_{\mathcal{K}}, V \det(A_2) V^* \oplus A_2^{\otimes d} \Big|_{\mathcal{K}}) \\ &= V G(\det(A_1), \det(A_2)) V^* \oplus G(A_1^{\otimes d} \Big|_{\mathcal{K}}, A_2^{\otimes d} \Big|_{\mathcal{K}}), \end{aligned}$$

where the first and the third equalities are due to (V.84), the second equality is due to tensor multiplicativity, and the last equality is due to the reduction property, block additivity, and unitary covariance. Thus,

$$\det(\mathsf{G}(A_1, A_2)) = \mathsf{G}(\det(A_1), \det(A_2)). \quad (\text{V.87})$$

By assumption,  $\det(A_1)\det(A_2) > 0$  and thus  $0 < \mathsf{G}(\det(A_1), \det(A_2)) = \det(\mathsf{G}(A_1, A_2))$ , showing that  $\mathsf{G}(A_1, A_2) > 0$ .

Likewise,  $\mathbb{C}^{\otimes(d-1)} = \wedge^{d-1}\mathbb{C}^d \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{K}}$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} & \det(\mathsf{G}(A_1, A_2)) U \mathsf{G}(A_1, A_2)^{-\text{T}} U^* \oplus \mathsf{G}(A_1, A_2)^{\otimes(d-1)}|_{\tilde{\mathcal{K}}} \\ &= \mathsf{G}(A_1, A_2)^{\otimes(d-1)} = \mathsf{G}(A_1^{\otimes(d-1)}, A_2^{\otimes(d-1)}) \\ &= \mathsf{G}\left(\det(A_1) U A_1^{-\text{T}} U^* \oplus A_1^{\otimes(d-1)}|_{\tilde{\mathcal{K}}}, \det(A_2) U A_2^{-\text{T}} U^* \oplus A_2^{\otimes(d-1)}|_{\tilde{\mathcal{K}}}\right) \\ &= \mathsf{G}\left(\underbrace{\det(A_1) U A_1^{-\text{T}} U^*, \det(A_2) U A_2^{-\text{T}} U^*}_{=\mathsf{G}(\det(A_1), \det(A_2)) U \mathsf{G}(A_1^{-\text{T}}, A_2^{-\text{T}}) U^*}\right) \oplus \mathsf{G}\left(A_1^{\otimes d}|_{\mathcal{K}}, A_2^{\otimes d}|_{\mathcal{K}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the first and the third equalities are due to (V.85), the second equality is due to tensor multiplicativity, and in the last line we used the reduction property, block additivity, and unitary covariance. Combining with (V.87), we get (V.86).  $\square$

Lemmas V.7 and V.8 yield immediately the following:

**Theorem V.9** *Let  $\mathsf{G}$  be a 2-variable operator function that is tensor multiplicative, scalar tensor multiplicative, individually AM bounded, block additive, and has the reduction property. Then there exists a  $t \in [0, 1]$  such that for any two positive definite  $(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{D}(\mathsf{G})_{>0}$ ,*

$$\mathsf{G}(A_1, A_2) = A_2 \#_t A_1. \quad (\text{V.88})$$

*If, moreover,  $\mathsf{G}$  is regular, then (V.83) holds for every  $(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{D}(\mathsf{G})$ .*

**Corollary V.10** *Let  $\mathsf{G}_\nu$  be a 2-variable  $\nu$ -weighted operator geometric mean that is tensor multiplicative, scalar tensor multiplicative, individually AM bounded, block additive, and has the reduction property. Then  $\mathsf{G}_\nu(A_1, A_2) = \mathsf{G}_\nu^{\text{KA}}(A_1, A_2)$  for every  $(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{D}(\mathsf{G}_\nu)_{>0}$ , and also for every  $(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{D}(\mathsf{G}_\nu)$ , if  $\mathsf{G}_\nu$  is regular.*

**Proof** Follows immediately from Theorem V.9 in the same way as the analogous statement in the proof of Theorem V.4.  $\square$

Note that Corollary V.10 gives a slightly different proof of Proposition V.5, as it is very easy to show that for a fixed  $t$ , none of the operator geometric means  $\mathsf{G}_{t,z}$ ,  $\tilde{\mathsf{G}}_{t,z}$ ,  $\hat{\mathsf{G}}_{t,z}$ , are equal to  $\mathsf{G}_{(t,1-t)}^{\text{KA}}$ , with the exception of  $\hat{\mathsf{G}}_{t,1}$ . In particular, we can complete Proposition V.5 as follows:

**Proposition V.11** *For any  $t \in (0, 1)$  and  $z \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\hat{\mathsf{G}}_{t,z}$  does not satisfy the AM-GM inequality.*

**Proof** Using the same construction as in the proof of Lemma V.6, we can now appeal to the strict concavity of  $\text{id}_{(0,+\infty)}^{\frac{1}{p}}$  to obtain that  $\hat{\mathsf{G}}_{t,z}(A_1, A_2) \neq \hat{\mathsf{G}}_{t,1}(A_1, A_2)$ , and the conclusion then follows by Corollary V.10.  $\square$

## VI. APPLICATION TO QUANTUM CHANNEL DISCRIMINATION

In this section, we show how the results of the previous sections can be applied to composite channel discrimination. For terminology and notation regarding completely positive maps, we refer to Appendix C.

In the problem of composite i.i.d. channel discrimination, an experimenter has to decide whether a given black box implements a quantum operation (or quantum channel, i.e., a completely positive trace-preserving map) belonging to a given set of quantum operations  $\mathcal{C}_0$ , or one belonging to another set  $\mathcal{C}_1$ .

I.i.d. means that if the quantum operation that the channel implements is  $\mathcal{E}$ , then  $n$  applications of the black box implements  $\mathcal{E}^{\otimes n}$ .

An  $n$ -copy *parallel discrimination strategy* is described by a quantum state  $\varphi_{RA^n}$  on  $\mathcal{H}_{RA^n} := \mathcal{H}_R \otimes \mathcal{H}_A^{\otimes n}$  (where  $R$  labels some reference system, and  $A$  labels the input system of the channel, and  $RA^n$  denotes the joint system of the reference and  $n$  copies of the input system), and a binary measurement with measurement operators  $T_0 = T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{RB^n})_{[0,1]}$  and  $T_1 = I - T$ , where  $B$  labels the output system of the channel. The type I error probability of erroneously deciding that the channel belongs to  $\mathcal{C}_1$  is then given by  $\alpha_n(\varphi, T) = \sup_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{C}_0} \text{Tr}(I - T)(\text{id}_R \otimes \mathcal{N}^{\otimes n})\varphi_{RA^n}$ , and the type II error probability of erroneously deciding that the channel belongs to  $\mathcal{C}_0$  is  $\beta_n(\varphi, T) = \sup_{\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{C}_1} \text{Tr} T(\text{id}_R \otimes \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n})\varphi_{RA^n}$ .

A more general  $n$ -copy *adaptive strategy* is specified by an input state  $\varphi_{R_1 A_1}$ , a sequence of channels  $\vec{\mathcal{A}} = (\mathcal{A}_{B_i R_i \rightarrow A_{i+1} R_{i+1}})_{i=1}^{n-1}$ , and a binary measurement with measurement operators  $T_0 = T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{B_n R_n})$  and  $T_1 = I - T$ , where  $A_i$  denotes the input system of the  $i$ -th application of the channel and  $B_i$  its output system. The error probabilities are then given by

$$\alpha_n(\varphi, \vec{\mathcal{A}}, T) := \sup_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{C}_0} \text{Tr}(I - T) \mathbb{S}_{\vec{\mathcal{A}}}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n})\varphi_{R_1 A_1}, \quad \beta_n(\varphi, \vec{\mathcal{A}}, T) := \sup_{\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{C}_1} \text{Tr} T \mathbb{S}_{\vec{\mathcal{A}}}(\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n})\varphi_{R_1 A_1},$$

where  $\mathbb{S}_{\vec{\mathcal{A}}}$  is a completely positive supermap acting on a tensor power channel  $\mathcal{E}^{\otimes n}$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{S}_{\vec{\mathcal{A}}}(\mathcal{E}^{\otimes n}) &:= (\text{id}_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_n})} \otimes \mathcal{E}_{A_n R_n \rightarrow B_n R_n}) \circ \mathcal{A}_{B_{n-1} R_{n-1} \rightarrow A_n R_n} \circ \left( \text{id}_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_{n-1}})} \otimes \mathcal{E}_{A_{n-1} R_{n-1} \rightarrow B_{n-1} R_{n-1}} \right) \circ \dots \\ &\dots \circ \mathcal{A}_{B_1 R_1 \rightarrow A_2 R_2} \circ \left( \text{id}_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_1})} \otimes \mathcal{E}_{A_1 R_1 \rightarrow B_1 R_1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that any parallel strategy can be written as an adaptive strategy, and therefore adaptive strategies are at least as powerful as parallel ones.

The direct exponent  $d_r^s(\mathcal{C}_0 \| \mathcal{C}_1)$  and the strong converse exponent  $\text{sc}_r^s(\mathcal{C}_0 \| \mathcal{C}_1)$  can be defined analogously to (I.1)–(I.2), where the asymptotics of the error probabilities are optimized over all parallel strategies when  $s = \text{par}$ , and over all adaptive strategies when  $s = \text{ad}$ . Just as in the case of state discrimination, we have the trivial bounds

$$d_r^s(\mathcal{C}_0 \| \mathcal{C}_1) \leq \inf_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{C}_0, \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{C}_1} d_r^s(\{\mathcal{N}\} \| \{\mathcal{M}\}), \quad \text{sc}_r^s(\mathcal{C}_0 \| \mathcal{C}_1) \geq \sup_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{C}_0, \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{C}_1} \text{sc}_r^s(\{\mathcal{N}\} \| \{\mathcal{M}\}).$$

Improved bounds of the form

$$d_r^s(\mathcal{C}_0 \| \mathcal{C}_1) \leq d_r^s(\{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}\} \| \{\mathcal{E}\}), \quad \text{sc}_r^s(\mathcal{C}_0 \| \mathcal{C}_1) \geq \sup_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{C}_0} \text{sc}_r^s(\{\mathcal{N}\} \| \{\mathcal{E}\})$$

can be obtained if one finds CP maps  $\mathcal{E}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{C}_0} \text{Tr}(I - T)(\text{id}_R \otimes \mathcal{N}^{\otimes n})\varphi_{RA^n} &\geq \text{Tr}(I - T)(\text{id}_R \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\otimes n})\varphi_{RA^n}, \\ \sup_{\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{C}_1} \text{Tr} T(\text{id}_R \otimes \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n})\varphi_{RA^n} &\geq \text{Tr} T(\text{id}_R \otimes \mathcal{E}^{\otimes n})\varphi_{RA^n}, \end{aligned}$$

for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and any  $n$ -copy parallel strategy  $(\varphi, T)$  in the case  $s = \text{par}$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{C}_0} \text{Tr}(I - T) \mathbb{S}_{\vec{\mathcal{A}}}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n})\varphi_{R_1 A_1} &\geq \text{Tr}(I - T) \mathbb{S}_{\vec{\mathcal{A}}}(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\otimes n})\varphi_{R_1 A_1}, \\ \sup_{\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{C}_1} \text{Tr} T \mathbb{S}_{\vec{\mathcal{A}}}(\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n})\varphi_{R_1 A_1} &\geq \text{Tr} T \mathbb{S}_{\vec{\mathcal{A}}}(\mathcal{E}^{\otimes n})\varphi_{R_1 A_1} \end{aligned}$$

for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and any  $n$ -copy adaptive strategy  $(\varphi, \vec{\mathcal{A}}, T)$  in the case  $s = \text{ad}$ .

This leads to an analogous mathematical problem as in the case of state discrimination, and the results related to state discrimination can be directly applied here. For simplicity, below we restrict to a setting corresponding to the case where finite sets of channels are to be distinguished.

**Theorem VI.1** *Let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be a finite set and  $\mathcal{N}_y \in \text{CP}(\mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{H}_B)$ ,  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ , and  $\mathcal{E} \in \text{CP}(\mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{H}_B)$  be completely positive maps. Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) *For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and every  $n$ -copy adaptive strategy  $(\varphi, \vec{\mathcal{A}}, T)$ ,*

$$\text{Tr} T \mathbb{S}_{\vec{\mathcal{A}}}(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\otimes n})\varphi_{R_1 A_1} \leq \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \text{Tr} T \mathbb{S}_{\vec{\mathcal{A}}}(\mathcal{N}_y^{\otimes n})\varphi_{R_1 A_1}.$$

(ii) For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and every  $n$ -copy parallel strategy  $(\varphi, T)$ ,

$$\mathrm{Tr} T(\mathrm{id}_R \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\otimes n})\varphi_{RA^n} \leq \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathrm{Tr} T(\mathrm{id}_R \otimes \mathcal{N}_y^{\otimes n})\varphi_{RA^n}.$$

(iii) There exists a probability measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  such that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\mathcal{E}^{\otimes n} \leq_{\mathrm{CP}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mu(y) \mathcal{N}_y^{\otimes n}. \quad (\text{VI.89})$$

If, moreover,  $\mathcal{Y}$  is a 2-element set (w.l.o.g.  $\mathcal{Y} = \{1, 2\}$ ), then the above are further equivalent to the following:

(iv) There exists a  $t \in [0, 1]$  such that

$$\mathcal{E} \leq_{\mathrm{CP}} \mathcal{N}_2 \#_t \mathcal{N}_1. \quad (\text{VI.90})$$

**Proof** The implication (i)  $\implies$  (ii) is trivial, as any parallel strategy is also adaptive, and the implication (iii)  $\implies$  (i) is trivial from the monotonicity of  $\mathbb{S}_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}}$ .

To see (ii)  $\implies$  (iii), let  $\Psi = \sum_{i=1}^{d_A} \tilde{e}_i \otimes e_i \in \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{A}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_A$  be a Choi vector, where  $(e_i)_{i=1}^{d_A}$  is an orthonormal basis in  $\mathcal{H}_A$  and  $(\tilde{e}_i)_{i=1}^{d_A}$  is an orthonormal basis in  $\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{A}}$ , and consider  $n$ -copy parallel strategies of the type  $R = \tilde{A}^n$ ,  $\varphi_{RA^n} = \Psi^{\otimes n}$ , and  $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{A}^n B^n})_{[0,1]}$  arbitrary. Then (ii) implies that

$$\mathrm{Tr} T C_{\Psi}(\mathcal{E})^{\otimes n} \leq \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathrm{Tr} T C_{\Psi}(\mathcal{N}_y)^{\otimes n}, \quad T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{A}^n B^n})_{[0,1]}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By Theorem IV.3, this implies the existence of a probability measure  $\nu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{Y})$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr} T C_{\Psi}(\mathcal{E})^{\otimes n} &\leq \exp \left( \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \nu(y) \log \mathrm{Tr} T C_{\Psi}(\mathcal{N}_y)^{\otimes n} \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \nu(y) \mathrm{Tr} T C_{\Psi}(\mathcal{N}_y)^{\otimes n}, \quad T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{A}^n B^n})_{[0,1]}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{VI.91})$$

Thus,

$$C_{\Psi}(\mathcal{E})^{\otimes n} \leq \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \nu(y) C_{\Psi}(\mathcal{N}_y)^{\otimes n} = C_{\Psi} \left( \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \nu(y) \mathcal{N}_y^{\otimes n} \right), \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

which in turn implies (VI.89).

Finally, assume that  $\mathcal{Y} = \{1, 2\}$ . As we have seen above, (i)–(iii) are equivalent to (VI.91), which in turn is equivalent to  $C_{\Psi}(\mathcal{E}) \leq C_{\Psi}(\mathcal{N}_2) \#_{\nu(1)} C_{\Psi}(\mathcal{N}_1)$ , according to Theorem V.1, and this latter inequality is equivalent to (VI.90) with  $t = \nu(1)$  by definition.  $\square$

## VII. CONCLUSION

We have developed further an approach first put forward in [42] to obtaining tighter than previously known single-copy bounds on the error exponents of binary composite i.i.d. state discrimination by comparing not only individual states from the two sets representing the two hypotheses, but also various subnormalized PSD operators associated to each set. We have shown a number of equivalent characterizations of such operators to be useful for this approach; in particular, we have shown that weak sup-type, arithmetic mean-type, and weak geometric mean-type inequalities all become equivalent when required to hold for arbitrary number of copies. Most importantly, we have obtained a full characterization of the maximal such operators in two important special cases: when the set representing a hypothesis contains only commuting density operators, and when it contains two density operators on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space. In the first case, the maximal operators are exactly the weighted geometric means of the states, which are uniquely defined for any probability measure on the (Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra of the) set of states.

In the second case, the maximal operators are exactly the  $t$ -weighted Kubo-Ando geometric means for every  $t \in [0, 1]$ . The resulting error bounds in the second case are

$$d_r(\{\varrho_1, \varrho_2\} \parallel \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}) \leq \inf_{s, t \in [0, 1]} \sup_{\alpha \in (0, 1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha(\varrho_2 \#_s \varrho_1 \parallel \sigma_2 \#_t \sigma_1)], \quad (\text{VII.92})$$

$$\text{sc}_r(\{\varrho_1, \varrho_2\} \parallel \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}) \geq \max_{i=1, 2} \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha^*(\varrho_i \parallel \sigma_2 \#_t \sigma_1)]. \quad (\text{VII.93})$$

It was shown in [13] that (VII.93) holds as an equality when the  $\sigma$  operators commute, and probably the most important open question related to our results is whether equality holds in (VII.93) or (VII.92) also in the general non-commutative case.

For more than two operators, there are many different notions of weighted geometric mean for any given non-degenerate probability measure on the set of density operators (more generally, PSD operators), that all satisfy the desirable properties of tensor multiplicativity and the AM-GM inequality, and therefore provide valid error bounds in the above approach. This also means that any possible characterization extending the 2-variable case above would need to take this ambiguity into account. Here we make the (admittedly bold) proposal to define multi-variate matrix geometric means as the maximal operators satisfying the equivalent conditions e.g., in Theorem IV.3. Whether a complete description of these maximal elements is possible in a more or less explicit form is an open question already for three operators. The natural question to ask then from the point of view of state discrimination, is whether these maximal elements give an exact single-copy expression for the error exponents, as was shown to be the case for the strong converse exponent for a commutative alternative hypothesis in [13].

### Appendix A: Examples for (non-)improvement via geometric bounds

For the rest of this section, let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, and  $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$  be the null- and the alternative hypothesis, respectively, of a composite i.i.d. state discrimination problem.

For any  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ , let

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{R}) := \left\{ C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0} : \text{Tr } C^{\otimes n} T \leq \sup_{\omega \in \mathcal{R}} \text{Tr } \omega^{\otimes n} T, \quad T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})_{[0, 1]} \right\}.$$

Obviously,

$$\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{R}), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

and by Proposition IV.2, for any  $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{R})$ , there exists a probability measure  $\mu_C \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R})$  such that

$$C \leq \int_{\mathcal{R}} \omega d\mu_C(\omega) =: \mathbb{A}_{\mu_C}(\mathcal{R}). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

It is easy to see that the Petz-type Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergences are anti-monotone in both of their arguments for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , and the sandwiched Rényi  $\alpha$ -divergences are anti-monotone in their second argument for  $\alpha > 1$ , i.e., for any  $\varrho_1 \leq \varrho_2$  and  $\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2$ ,

$$D_\alpha(\varrho_1 \parallel \sigma_1) \geq D_\alpha(\varrho_2 \parallel \sigma_2), \quad \alpha \in (0, 1), \quad D_\alpha^*(\varrho_1 \parallel \sigma_1) \geq D_\alpha^*(\varrho_1 \parallel \sigma_2), \quad \alpha > 1. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

(See, e.g., [40, 43] for details.) For a set  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ , let  $\text{co}(\mathcal{R})$  denote its convex hull. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\varrho \in \mathcal{N}} \inf_{\sigma \in \mathcal{A}} \sup_{\alpha \in (0, 1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha(\varrho \parallel \sigma)] &\geq \inf_{\tilde{C} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{N})} \inf_{C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A})} \sup_{\alpha \in (0, 1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha(\tilde{C} \parallel C)] \\ &\geq \inf_{\tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{N})} \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})} \sup_{\alpha \in (0, 1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha(\mathbb{A}_{\tilde{\mu}}(\mathcal{N}) \parallel \mathbb{A}_\mu(\mathcal{A}))] \\ &= \inf_{\varrho \in \text{co}(\mathcal{N})} \inf_{\sigma \in \text{co}(\mathcal{A})} \sup_{\alpha \in (0, 1)} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha(\varrho \parallel \sigma)], \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from (A.1), the second inequality from (A.2) and (A.3), and the equality is trivial. In particular, if  $\mathcal{N}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  are both convex, then all the inequalities above are equalities, and

therefore the bound in (I.5) does not give an improvement over the trivial bound in (I.3). Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\varrho \in \mathcal{N}} \sup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{A}} \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha^*(\varrho \parallel \sigma)] &\leq \sup_{\varrho \in \mathcal{N}} \sup_{C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A})} \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha^*(\varrho \parallel C)] \\ &\leq \sup_{\varrho \in \mathcal{N}} \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})} \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha^*(\varrho \parallel \mathbb{A}_\mu(\mathcal{A}))] \\ &\leq \sup_{\varrho \in \mathcal{N}} \sup_{\sigma \in \text{co}(\mathcal{A})} \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha^*(\varrho \parallel \sigma)]. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if  $\mathcal{A}$  is convex, all the above expressions are equal, and the bound in (I.6) does not give an improvement over the trivial bound in (I.3).

Examples with a simple null hypothesis  $\mathcal{N} = \{\varrho\}$  and a composite alternative hypothesis  $\mathcal{A} = \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}$  where the geometric bound (I.5) gives a strict improvement over the trivial bound in (I.3) were given in [42] (for this, the states  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  necessarily have to be non-commuting; see [42, Section III.A].) Below we show an example with  $\mathcal{N} = \{\varrho\}$  and  $\mathcal{A} = \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}$  such that  $\varrho, \sigma_1, \sigma_2$  are commuting, and

$$\sup_{\varrho \in \mathcal{N}} \sup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{A}} \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha^*(\varrho \parallel \sigma)] < \sup_{\varrho \in \mathcal{N}} \sup_{C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A})} \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha^*(\varrho \parallel C)] \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$= \sup_{\varrho \in \mathcal{N}} \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})} \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha^*(\varrho \parallel \mathbb{G}_\nu(\mathcal{A}))] \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$= \text{sc}_r(\mathcal{N} \parallel \mathcal{A}) \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$< \sup_{\varrho \in \mathcal{N}} \sup_{\sigma \in \text{co}(\mathcal{A})} \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha^*(\varrho \parallel \sigma)]. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

(The first equality follows from Theorem V.2 and (A.3), and the second one from [11, 13].) That is, the geometric bound (I.6) gives a strict improvement over the trivial bound (I.3), while extending the optimization to the convex hull of  $\mathcal{A}$  overshoots the strong converse exponent.

To demonstrate such an example, we will need some simple facts about Rényi divergences and the Hoeffding anti-divergences for commuting operators, which we will always naturally identify with functions on a finite set. For such operators, the Petz-type and the sandwiched Rényi divergences coincide, and we will denote both by  $D_\alpha$ . For a finite set  $\mathcal{X}$  and for non-zero non-negative functions  $\varrho, \sigma \in [0, +\infty)^{\mathcal{X}}$  such that  $\text{supp } \varrho \subseteq \text{supp } \sigma$ , let

$$D_\infty(\varrho \parallel \sigma) := \log \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{\varrho(x)}{\sigma(x)} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

be their *max-relative entropy* [16, 48], and

$$\mathcal{X}_\infty := \left\{ x \in \mathcal{X} : \log \frac{\varrho(x)}{\sigma(x)} = D_\infty(\varrho \parallel \sigma) \right\}, \quad r_\infty := -\log \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}_\infty} \sigma(x). \quad (\text{A.9})$$

**Lemma A.1** *In the above setting, assume that there exists no  $\kappa \in (0, +\infty)$  such that  $\varrho(x) = \kappa \sigma(x)$ ,  $x \in \text{supp } \sigma$ . Then the following hold:*

(i)  $(0, +\infty) \ni \alpha \mapsto \psi(\alpha) := \log \text{Tr } \varrho^\alpha \sigma^{1-\alpha}$  is strictly convex, and  $(0, +\infty) \ni \alpha \mapsto D_\alpha(\varrho \parallel \sigma)$  is strictly increasing, with

$$D(\varrho \parallel \sigma) = D_1(\varrho \parallel \sigma) := \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} D_\alpha(\varrho \parallel \sigma) < D_\alpha(\varrho \parallel \sigma) < D_\infty(\varrho \parallel \sigma) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow +\infty} D_\alpha(\varrho \parallel \sigma), \quad \alpha \in (0, +\infty).$$

(ii) For any  $r \in (D(\varrho \parallel \sigma), +\infty)$ ,

$$r - D_\infty(\varrho \parallel \sigma) \leq H_r^*(\varrho \parallel \sigma) := \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha(\varrho \parallel \sigma)] < r - D(\varrho \parallel \sigma), \quad (\text{A.10})$$

and the first inequality is also strict whenever  $r < r_\infty$ .

**Proof** The claims in (i) follow by straightforward computations; see, e.g., [42, Section II.B]. The first inequality in (A.10) is obvious from  $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha(\varrho \parallel \sigma)] = r - D_\infty(\varrho \parallel \sigma)$ , and the second inequality in (A.10) follows as

$$\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha(\varrho \parallel \sigma)] < \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(r - D(\varrho \parallel \sigma)), & \alpha \in (1, 2], \\ \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} [r - D_2(\varrho \parallel \sigma)] < r - D(\varrho \parallel \sigma), & \alpha > 2. \end{cases}$$

Note that

$$H_r^*(\varrho \parallel \sigma) = \sup_{u \in (0,1)} [ur - \tilde{\psi}(u)], \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{\psi}(u) := (1-u)\psi(1/(1-u)). \quad (\text{A.11})$$

It is easy to see that  $\tilde{\psi}$  is also strictly convex,  $\tilde{\psi}'(0) = D(\varrho \parallel \sigma)$ ,  $\lim_{u \nearrow 1} \tilde{\psi}'(u) = r_\infty$ , whence for any  $r \in (D(\varrho \parallel \sigma), r_\infty)$ , the supremum in (A.11) is uniquely attained at some  $u_r \in (0, 1)$ , whereby  $H_r^*(\varrho \parallel \sigma) > \lim_{u \rightarrow 1} [ur - \tilde{\psi}(u)] = r - D_\infty(\varrho \parallel \sigma)$ , showing the strictness of the first inequality in (A.10).  $\square$

**Proposition A.2** *Let  $\varrho = (1/2, 1/2)$ ,  $\sigma_1 = (1/4, 3/4)$ ,  $\sigma_2 = (3/4, 1/4)$  be probability density functions on  $\{0, 1\}$  (identified with commuting states on a 2-dimensional Hilbert space). Then for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , and any  $r > D(\varrho^{\otimes k} \parallel \sigma_j^{\otimes k}) = k \log(2/\sqrt{3})$ ,*

$$\max_{j=1,2} \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha(\varrho^{\otimes k} \parallel \sigma_j^{\otimes k})] \quad (\text{A.12})$$

$$< r - D(\varrho^{\otimes k} \parallel \sigma_j^{\otimes k}) = r - k \log(2/\sqrt{3}) \quad (\text{A.13})$$

$$= \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha(\varrho^{\otimes k} \parallel (\sigma_1^{\otimes k})^t (\sigma_2^{\otimes k})^{1-t})] = \text{sc}_r(\{\varrho^{\otimes k}\} \parallel \{\sigma_1^{\otimes k}, \sigma_2^{\otimes k}\}) \quad (\text{A.14})$$

$$\leq \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sup_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} [r - D_\alpha(\varrho^{\otimes k} \parallel t\sigma_1^{\otimes k} + (1-t)\sigma_2^{\otimes k})], \quad (\text{A.15})$$

and the last inequality is strict whenever  $k$  is odd, or  $k$  is even and  $r < k \log \frac{4}{\sqrt{3}} - \log \binom{k}{k/2}$ .

**Proof** Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  be fixed. The equality  $D(\varrho^{\otimes k} \parallel \sigma_j^{\otimes k}) = k \log(2/\sqrt{3})$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , follows by a straightforward computation. Assume for the rest that  $r > k \log(2/\sqrt{3})$ . Then, the inequality in (A.13) follows immediately from Lemma A.1.

The second equality in (A.14) is due to [11, 13], and the first equality can be seen as follows. The function  $[0, 1] \ni t \mapsto D_\alpha(\varrho^{\otimes k} \parallel (\sigma_1^{\otimes k})^t (\sigma_2^{\otimes k})^{1-t})$  is symmetric under  $t \leftrightarrow 1-t$ , and a simple Hölder inequality shows that it is convex in  $t$ , whence its minimum is attained at  $t = 1/2$ . A straightforward computation shows that

$$D_\alpha(\varrho^{\otimes k} \parallel (\sigma_1^{\otimes k})^{1/2} (\sigma_2^{\otimes k})^{1/2}) = \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \sum_{\underline{x} \in \{0,1\}^k} \left(\frac{1}{2^k}\right)^\alpha \left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}\right)^{k(1-\alpha)} = k \log \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}.$$

Since this is independent of  $\alpha$ , the supremum over  $\alpha$  in (A.14) is attained at  $\alpha = +\infty$ , proving the first equality in (A.14).

Finally, consider the expression in (A.15), and let

$$\begin{aligned} Q_\alpha(t) &:= \exp((\alpha-1)D_\alpha(\varrho^{\otimes k} \parallel t\sigma_1^{\otimes k} + (1-t)\sigma_2^{\otimes k})) \\ &= \sum_{\underline{x} \in \{0,1\}^k} \left(\frac{1}{2^k}\right)^\alpha \left[ (1-t) \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{m(\underline{x})} \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{k-m(\underline{x})} + t \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{m(\underline{x})} \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{k-m(\underline{x})} \right]^{1-\alpha} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2^k}\right)^\alpha \left(\frac{1}{4^k}\right)^{1-\alpha} \sum_{m=0}^k \binom{k}{m} [(1-t)3^{k-m} + t3^m]^{1-\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $m(\underline{x})$  is the number of 0s in the sequence  $\underline{x}$ . This is again a convex function of  $t$  that is symmetric under  $t \leftrightarrow 1-t$ , whence the supremum over  $t$  in (A.15) is attained at  $t = 1/2$ . Replace  $\varrho$  with  $\hat{\varrho}^{(k)} := \varrho^{\otimes k}$

and  $\sigma$  with  $\hat{\sigma}^{(k)} := (\sigma_1^{\otimes k} + \sigma_2^{\otimes k})/2$  in (A.8)–(A.9); then

$$D_\infty(\hat{\rho}^{(k)} \parallel \hat{\sigma}^{(k)}) = \log \max_{\underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}^k} \frac{\frac{1}{2^k}}{\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{m(\underline{x})} \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{k-m(\underline{x})} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{m(\underline{x})} \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{k-m(\underline{x})}} = \begin{cases} k \log \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}, & k \text{ even,} \\ (k-1) \log \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}, & k \text{ odd,} \end{cases}$$

$$r_\infty = -\log \sum_{\underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}^k: \frac{k-1}{2} \leq m(\underline{x}) \leq \frac{k+1}{2}} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{m(\underline{x})} \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{k-m(\underline{x})} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{m(\underline{x})} \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{k-m(\underline{x})} \right]$$

$$= \begin{cases} k \log \frac{4}{\sqrt{3}} - \log \binom{k}{k/2}, & k \text{ even,} \\ (k-1) \log \frac{4}{\sqrt{3}} - \log \binom{k}{(k-1)/2}, & k \text{ odd.} \end{cases}$$

By Lemma A.1,  $H_r^*(\hat{\rho}^{(k)} \parallel \hat{\sigma}^{(k)}) \geq r - D_\infty(\hat{\rho}^{(k)} \parallel \hat{\sigma}^{(k)})$ . When  $k$  is odd,  $r - D_\infty(\hat{\rho}^{(k)} \parallel \hat{\sigma}^{(k)}) = r - (k-1) \log \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} > r - k \log \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}$ , proving the strict inequality in (A.15). When  $k$  is even,  $r - D_\infty(\hat{\rho}^{(k)} \parallel \hat{\sigma}^{(k)}) = r - k \log \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}$ , proving the inequality in (A.15). If, moreover,  $r < r_\infty$ , Lemma A.1 gives the strict inequality  $H_r^*(\hat{\rho}^{(k)} \parallel \hat{\sigma}^{(k)}) > r - k \log \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}$ , showing that also the inequality in (A.15) is strict.  $\square$

**Remark A.3** The  $k = 1$  case in the above proposition is special in the sense that  $\varrho \in \text{co}(\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\})$ , while for every  $k > 1$ ,  $\varrho^{\otimes k} \notin \text{co}(\{\sigma_1^{\otimes k}, \sigma_2^{\otimes k}\})$ .

**Remark A.4** A typical scenario for composite state discrimination with a finite null- or alternative hypothesis is when instead of exactly identifying one out of  $r > 2$  possible messages encoded into multiple copies of some quantum states  $\varrho_1, \dots, \varrho_r$ , the receiver only wants to know whether a specific message  $k$  was sent or not, resulting in  $\mathcal{N} = \{\varrho_k\}$ ,  $\mathcal{A} = \{\varrho_i : i \in [r] \setminus \{k\}\}$ . In a more realistic model, a small neighbourhood  $B_i$  of states centered around  $\varrho_i$  may be assigned to each message, accounting for preparation errors on the side of the sender, yielding  $\mathcal{N} = B_k$ ,  $\mathcal{A} = \cup_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k\}} B_i$ . Note that even in this case, the alternative hypothesis will typically not be a convex set, and therefore the geometric bounds (I.5)–(I.6) might provide an improvement over the trivial bounds (I.3).

## Appendix B: More on the operator perspective

For the rest of this section,  $f : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  will denote an operator convex function,  $\tilde{f}(x) := xf(1/x)$ ,  $x \in (0, +\infty)$ , denotes its transpose function, and we will use the notations

$$f(0^+) := \lim_{x \searrow 0} f(x), \quad \tilde{f}(0^+) := \lim_{x \searrow 0} \tilde{f}(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{f(x)}{x}.$$

Recall the definition of the operator perspective function  $\mathcal{P}_f$  corresponding to  $f$  given in (II.15)–(II.16): for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$ , where  $\mathcal{H}$  is a finite-dimensional Hilbert space,

$$\mathcal{P}_f(A, B) := \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} (B + \varepsilon I)^{1/2} f \left( (B + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} (A + \varepsilon I) (B + \varepsilon I)^{-1/2} \right) (B + \varepsilon I)^{1/2},$$

whenever the limit exists.

The following properties are straightforward to verify from the definition:

- *Positive scalar homogeneity:* If  $\mathcal{P}_f(A, B)$  is defined then so is  $\mathcal{P}_f(\lambda A, \lambda B)$  for any  $\lambda \in (0, +\infty)$ , and

$$\mathcal{P}_f(\lambda A, \lambda B) = \lambda \mathcal{P}_f(A, B). \quad (\text{B.1})$$

- *Direct sum property:* If for every  $i \in [r]$ ,  $A_i, B_i \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_i)_{\geq 0}$  are such that  $\mathcal{P}_f(A_i, B_i)$  is defined then also  $\mathcal{P}_f(\oplus_i A_i, \oplus_i B_i)$  is defined, and

$$\mathcal{P}_f(\oplus_{i=1}^r A_i, \oplus_{i=1}^r B_i) = \oplus_{i=1}^r \mathcal{P}_f(A_i, B_i). \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Equivalently, if for every  $i \in [r]$ ,  $A_i, B_i \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$  are such that  $\mathcal{P}_f(A_i, B_i)$  is defined, and  $A_i^0 \vee B_i^0 \perp_{i \neq j} A_j^0 \vee B_j^0$  then  $\mathcal{P}_f(\sum_i A_i, \sum_i B_i)$  is defined, and

$$\mathcal{P}_f \left( \sum_{i=1}^r A_i, \sum_{i=1}^r B_i \right) = \sum_{i=1}^r \mathcal{P}_f(A_i, B_i). \quad (\text{B.3})$$

- *Tensor homogeneity with a projection:* If  $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$  is such that  $\mathcal{P}_f(A, B)$  is defined then for any projection  $P$  on some other finite-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{K}$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_f(A \otimes P, B \otimes P)$  is defined, and

$$\mathcal{P}_f(A \otimes P, B \otimes P) = \mathcal{P}_f(A, B) \otimes P. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

- *Tensor homogeneity:* If  $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$  is such that  $\mathcal{P}_f(A, B)$  is defined then for any PSD operator  $C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})_{\geq 0}$  on some other finite-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{K}$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_f(A \otimes C, B \otimes C)$  is defined, and

$$\mathcal{P}_f(A \otimes C, B \otimes C) = \mathcal{P}_f(A, B) \otimes C. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

This follows immediately using any eigen-decomposition  $C = \sum_{i=1} c_i |e_i\rangle\langle e_i|$ , the direct sum property (B.3), positive scalar homogeneity (B.1), and tensor homogeneity with a projection (B.4).

The following was given in [28, Proposition 3.30] (see also [29, Proposition 2.5] and [37, Lemma 3]). We include the short proof for completeness.

**Lemma B.1** *Let  $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{>0}$  be positive definite, and  $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$  be positive. Then*

$$\mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{E}(A), \mathcal{E}(B)) \leq \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{P}_f(A, B)). \quad (\text{B.6})$$

**Proof** The map  $\mathcal{E}_B(\cdot) := \mathcal{E}(B)^{-1/2} \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{E}(B)^{1/2}(\cdot)\mathcal{E}(B)^{-1/2}) \mathcal{E}(B)^{-1/2}$  is positive, whence, by [17] and [15, Theorem 2.1],  $f(\mathcal{E}_B(B^{-1/2}AB^{-1/2})) \leq \mathcal{E}_B(f(B^{-1/2}AB^{-1/2}))$ , from which (B.6) follows by a trivial rearrangement.  $\square$

The above can be extended to more general pairs of PSD operators as follows. For a proof, see Propositions 3.25, 3.26, 3.30 in [28].

**Lemma B.2** *Let  $f : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be operator convex and  $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$  be such that at least one of the following conditions hold:*

$$(S1) \ A^0 = B^0.$$

$$(S2) \ f(0^+) < +\infty \text{ and } \tilde{f}(0^+) < +\infty.$$

$$(S3) \ f(0^+) < +\infty \text{ and } A^0 \leq B^0.$$

$$(S4) \ \tilde{f}(0^+) < +\infty \text{ and } A^0 \geq B^0.$$

*Then for any sequence  $C_n \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$  such that  $A + C_n, B + C_n \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{>0}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} C_n = 0$ , we have*

$$\mathcal{P}_f(A, B) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{P}_f(A + C_n, B + C_n).$$

*Moreover, for any positive linear map  $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ , the monotonicity inequality (B.6) holds.*

**Remark B.3** *Note that if  $f : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a non-negative operator monotone function (e.g.,  $f = \text{id}_{(0, +\infty)}^t$  with some  $t \in [0, 1]$ ) then  $-f$  satisfies (S2) above. In particular, the conclusions of Lemma B.2 hold for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$  and  $-f$  in place of  $f$ . For the Kubo-Ando weighted geometric means this gives the well-known fact that for any  $t \in [0, 1]$ , any  $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$ , and any positive map  $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ ,*

$$\mathcal{E}(B) \#_t \mathcal{E}(A) \geq \mathcal{E}(B \#_t A). \quad (\text{B.7})$$

**Corollary B.4** (Generalized convexity with positive superoperators) *Let  $f$  and  $A_i, B_i \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_i)$ ,  $i \in [r]$ , be such that for some  $k \in [4]$ , (Sk) in Lemma B.2 is satisfied for all  $i \in [r]$ . For all  $i \in [r]$ , let  $\mathcal{E}_i : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$  be positive and  $\lambda_i \in (0, +\infty)$ . Then  $\mathcal{P}_f(\sum_i \lambda_i \mathcal{E}_i(A_i), \sum_i \lambda_i \mathcal{E}_i(B_i))$  is defined, and*

$$\mathcal{P}_f\left(\sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i \mathcal{E}_i(A_i), \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i \mathcal{E}_i(B_i)\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i \mathcal{E}_i(\mathcal{P}_f(A_i, B_i)). \quad (\text{B.8})$$

**Proof** Let  $\hat{\mathcal{K}} := \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathbb{C}^r$ ,  $\hat{A} := \sum_i \lambda_i \mathcal{E}_i(A_i) \otimes |e_i\rangle\langle e_i|$ ,  $\hat{B} := \sum_i \lambda_i \mathcal{E}_i(B_i) \otimes |e_i\rangle\langle e_i|$ , where  $(e_i)_{i=1}^d$  is an orthonormal basis in  $\mathbb{C}^d$ , and let  $\text{Tr}_2 : \mathcal{B}(\hat{\mathcal{K}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ ,  $\text{Tr}_2 : X \otimes Y \mapsto X \text{Tr} Y$  be the partial trace. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_f \left( \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i \mathcal{E}_i(A_i), \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i \mathcal{E}_i(B_i) \right) &= \mathcal{P}_f \left( \text{Tr}_2 \hat{A}, \text{Tr}_2 \hat{B} \right) \leq \text{Tr}_2 \mathcal{P}_f \left( \hat{A}, \hat{B} \right) \\ &= \text{Tr}_2 \sum_{i=1}^r \mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{E}_i(A_i), \mathcal{E}_i(B_i)) \otimes \lambda_i |e_i\rangle\langle e_i| = \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i \mathcal{E}_i(\mathcal{P}_f(A_i, B_i)), \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality is due to Lemma B.2, and the second equality follows from the tensor homogeneity (B.4).  $\square$

Corollary B.4 has a number of special cases that are worth spelling out in detail.

**Corollary B.5** (Generalized convexity with operator weights) *Let  $f$  and  $A_i, B_i \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_i)$ ,  $i \in [r]$ , be such that for some  $k \in [4]$ , (Sk) in Lemma B.2 is satisfied for all  $i \in [r]$ , and let  $K_i \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_i, \mathcal{K})$ ,  $i \in [r]$ , for some finite-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{K}$ . Then  $\mathcal{P}_f \left( \sum_i K_i A_i K_i^*, \sum_i K_i B_i K_i^* \right)$  is defined, and*

$$\mathcal{P}_f \left( \sum_{i=1}^r K_i A_i K_i^*, \sum_{i=1}^r K_i B_i K_i^* \right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^r K_i \mathcal{P}_f(A_i, B_i) K_i^*. \quad (\text{B.9})$$

**Proof** Follows from Lemma B.4 by taking  $\lambda_i = 1$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_i(\cdot) := K_i(\cdot)K_i^*$ ,  $i \in [r]$ .  $\square$

**Corollary B.6** (Transformer inequality for the operator perspective) *Assume that  $f$  and  $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\geq 0}$  are related such that (Sk) holds for some  $k \in [4]$  in Lemma B.2. Then for any  $X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ ,  $f$  and  $XAX^*, XBX^*$  satisfy the same (Sk), and*

$$\mathcal{P}_f(XAX^*, XBX^*) \leq X \mathcal{P}_f(A, B) X^*. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

In particular, if  $X$  is invertible then we have the following operator homogeneity relation:

$$\mathcal{P}_f(XAX^*, XBX^*) = X \mathcal{P}_f(A, B) X^*.$$

**Proof** Follows from Corollary B.5 by taking  $r = 1$ .  $\square$

**Corollary B.7** (Generalized convexity of the operator perspective) *If  $A_i, B_i \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ ,  $i \in [r]$ , are such that  $\mathcal{P}_f(A_i, B_i)$  is defined for every  $i \in [r]$ , then for any  $\lambda_i \in (0, +\infty)$ ,  $i \in [r]$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_f \left( \sum_i \lambda_i A_i, \sum_i \lambda_i B_i \right)$  is defined, and*

$$\mathcal{P}_f \left( \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i A_i, \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i B_i \right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i \mathcal{P}_f(A_i, B_i). \quad (\text{B.11})$$

**Proof** For positive definite  $A_i, B_i$ , the assertion follows from Lemma B.1 using the proof of Corollary B.4, and the extension to general PSD arguments is trivial.  $\square$

**Remark B.8** *The generalized joint convexity (B.11) of the operator perspective function was first shown for positive definite arguments in [18, 19] by a different method.*

### Appendix C: Superoperator perspective and geometric mean for CP maps

For two finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces  $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}$ , let  $\text{CP}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$  denote the set of all completely positive linear maps from  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  to  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ , and  $\text{CPTP}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$  the set of completely positive trace-preserving linear maps from  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  to  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ . We will often use the terminology in which elements of  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}), \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}))$  are called *superoperators*.

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a finite-dimensional vector space. Any vector of the form  $\Psi \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ ,  $\Psi = \sum_{i=1}^d \tilde{e}_i \otimes e_i$ , where  $\dim \tilde{\mathcal{H}} = \dim \mathcal{H}$ ,  $(e_i)_{i=1}^d$  is an ONB in  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $(\tilde{e}_i)_{i=1}^d$  is an ONB in  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ , is called a *Choi vector* on  $\mathcal{H}$ . For any finite-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{K}$ ,  $\Psi$  defines an isomorphism

$$\text{C}_\Psi : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}), \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}),$$

called the *Choi-Jamiołkowski isomorphism*, as

$$C_\Psi : \mathcal{N} \mapsto (\text{id}_{\mathcal{B}(\tilde{\mathcal{H}})} \otimes \mathcal{N}) |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| = \sum_{i,j=1}^d |\tilde{e}_i\rangle\langle\tilde{e}_j| \otimes \mathcal{N}(|\tilde{e}_i\rangle\langle\tilde{e}_j|), \quad \mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}), \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})).$$

Note that if  $\Phi = \sum_{i=1}^d \hat{f}_i \otimes f_i \in \hat{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \mathcal{H}$  is another Choi vector then there exists a unitary  $U : \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{H}}$  such that  $\Phi = (U \otimes I)\Psi$ , whence

$$C_\Phi = \text{Ad}_{U \otimes I} \circ C_\Psi, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad C_\Phi(\mathcal{N}) = (U \otimes I) C_\Psi(\mathcal{N})(U^* \otimes I), \quad \mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}), \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})). \quad (\text{C.1})$$

For the completely depolarizing channel  $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}}(\cdot) := \frac{1}{\dim \mathcal{K}} I_{\mathcal{K}} \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}(\cdot)$ , we have

$$C_\Psi(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}}) = \frac{1}{\dim \mathcal{K}} I_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} \otimes I_{\mathcal{K}}.$$

For  $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \text{CP}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ , we will write

$$\mathcal{N} \leq_{\text{CP}} \mathcal{M}, \quad \text{if} \quad \mathcal{M} - \mathcal{N} \in \text{CP}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}) \quad \text{iff} \quad C_\Psi(\mathcal{N}) \leq C_\Psi(\mathcal{M}),$$

where the last inequality is for any (equivalently, all) Choi vector, and the inequality is in the PSD order.

The notion of the operator perspective can be extended to define the *superoperator perspective* function of a continuous function  $f : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  on a pair of completely positive maps  $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \text{CP}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$  as

$$\mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) := C_\Psi^{-1}(\mathcal{P}_f(C_\Psi(\mathcal{N}), C_\Psi(\mathcal{M}))), \quad (\text{C.2})$$

whenever  $\mathcal{P}_f(C_\Psi(\mathcal{N}), C_\Psi(\mathcal{M}))$  is well-defined. According to (II.16), we have

$$\mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) = \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{N} + \varepsilon \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M} + \varepsilon \mathcal{I}), \quad (\text{C.3})$$

whenever this limit exists; in particular, this is the case when  $f$  is a non-negative operator monotone function and  $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \text{CP}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$  are arbitrary, and hence the  $t$ -weighted Kubo-Ando geometric mean  $\mathcal{M} \#_t \mathcal{N}$  is well-defined for any pair of  $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \text{CP}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ .

According to the following lemma,  $\mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M})$  is independent of the Choi vector  $\Psi$  in the definitions (C.2)–(C.3), and only depends on the pair of CPTP maps  $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M})$ .

**Lemma C.1** *For any Choi vectors  $\Psi \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \mathcal{H}$  and  $\Phi \in \hat{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ , and any  $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \text{CP}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ ,*

$$C_\Psi^{-1}(\mathcal{P}_f(C_\Psi(\mathcal{N}), C_\Psi(\mathcal{M}))) = C_\Phi^{-1}(\mathcal{P}_f(C_\Phi(\mathcal{N}), C_\Phi(\mathcal{M}))).$$

**Proof** Immediate from (C.1). □

It is easy to see that the notion of the superoperator perspective is a natural extension of the corresponding notion of the operator perspective, in the following sense:

**Lemma C.2** *Let  $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})_{\geq 0}$  be such that  $\mathcal{P}_f(A, B)$  is defined, and let  $\mathcal{A}(\cdot) := A \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}(\cdot)$ ,  $\mathcal{B}(\cdot) := B \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}(\cdot)$ . Then  $\mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is defined, and*

$$\mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \mathcal{P}_f(A, B) \text{Tr}(\cdot).$$

**Proof** Easy to verify from the fact that  $C_\Psi(\mathcal{A}) = I_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} \otimes A$  and  $C_\Psi(\mathcal{B}) = I_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} \otimes B$  using (B.4). □

The following properties of the superoperator perspective follow immediately from the corresponding properties of the operator perspective (see Appendix B).

- *Generalized convexity:* If  $f$  and  $\mathcal{N}_i, \mathcal{M}_i \in \text{CP}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ ,  $i \in [r]$  are such that  $\mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{N}_i, \mathcal{M}_i)$  are defined for every  $i \in [r]$ , then  $\mathcal{P}_f(\sum_i \lambda_i \mathcal{N}_i, \sum_i \lambda_i \mathcal{M}_i)$  is defined for any  $\lambda_i \in (0, +\infty)$ ,  $i \in [r]$ , and

$$\mathcal{P}_f\left(\sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i \mathcal{N}_i, \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i \mathcal{M}_i\right) \leq_{\text{CP}} \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i \mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{N}_i, \mathcal{M}_i). \quad (\text{C.4})$$

- *Tensor homogeneity/stability:* If  $f$  and  $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \text{CP}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{K}_1)$  are such that  $\mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M})$  is defined, then for any  $\mathcal{E} \in \text{CP}(\mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{K}_2)$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{N} \otimes \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{E})$  is defined, and

$$\mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{N} \otimes \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{E}) = \mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) \otimes \mathcal{E}. \quad (\text{C.5})$$

This follows from the tensor homogeneity (B.5) of the operator perspective by taking into account that if  $\Psi_1 \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_1$  and  $\Psi_2 \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$  are Choi vectors then  $\Psi_1 \otimes \Psi_2$  is a Choi vector, and  $\text{C}_{\Psi_1 \otimes \Psi_2}(\mathcal{F}_1 \otimes \mathcal{F}_2) = \text{C}_{\Psi_1}(\mathcal{F}_1) \otimes \text{C}_{\Psi_2}(\mathcal{F}_2)$  for any  $\mathcal{F}_i \in \text{CP}(\mathcal{H}_i, \mathcal{K}_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ .

**Proposition C.3** (Monotonicity under post-processing) *Assume that  $f$  is operator convex, and  $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \text{CP}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$  are such that at least one of (S1)–(S4) in Lemma B.2 holds with  $A := \text{C}_\Psi(\mathcal{N})$  and  $B := \text{C}_\Psi(\mathcal{M})$  for some (equivalently, any) Choi vector  $\Psi$ . Then*

$$\mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{M}) \leq_{\text{CP}} \mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) \quad (\text{C.6})$$

for any  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{CP}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{L})$ . If, moreover,  $\mathcal{F}$  has a completely positive inverse (in particular, if  $\mathcal{F}$  is a unitary channel) then equality holds in (C.6).

**Proof** Note that  $\text{C}_\Psi(\mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{N}) = (\text{id} \otimes \mathcal{F}) \text{C}_\Psi(\mathcal{N})$ , and similarly for  $\mathcal{M}$ . In particular, one of (S1)–(S4) holds also with  $A := \text{C}_\Psi(\mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{N})$  and  $B := \text{C}_\Psi(\mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{M})$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{C}_\Psi(\mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{M})) &= \mathcal{P}_f((\text{id} \otimes \mathcal{F}) \text{C}_\Psi(\mathcal{N}), (\text{id} \otimes \mathcal{F}) \text{C}_\Psi(\mathcal{M})) \\ &\leq (\text{id} \otimes \mathcal{F}) \mathcal{P}_f(\text{C}_\Psi(\mathcal{N}), \text{C}_\Psi(\mathcal{M})) \\ &= (\text{id} \otimes \mathcal{F}) \text{C}_\Psi(\mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M})) \\ &= \text{C}_\Psi(\mathcal{F} \circ (\mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}))), \end{aligned}$$

where the equalities follow from the respective definitions, and the inequality is due to the monotonicity of the operator perspective function stated in Lemma B.2.  $\square$

**Proposition C.4** (Monotonicity under pre-processing) *Assume that  $f$  is operator convex, and  $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \text{CP}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$  are such that at least one of (S1)–(S4) in Lemma B.2 holds with  $A := \text{C}_\Psi(\mathcal{N})$  and  $B := \text{C}_\Psi(\mathcal{M})$  for some (equivalently, any) Choi vector  $\Psi$ . Then*

$$\mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{N} \circ \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M} \circ \mathcal{E}) \leq_{\text{CP}} \mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) \circ \mathcal{E}. \quad (\text{C.7})$$

**Proof** Note that, according to the standard transpose trick, if  $\mathcal{E}(\cdot) = \sum_{i=1}^r K_i(\cdot) K_i^*$  is a Kraus decomposition of  $\mathcal{E}$  then

$$\text{C}_\Psi(\mathcal{E}) = \sum_{i=1}^r (I \otimes K_i) |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| (I \otimes K_i^*) = \sum_{i=1}^r (K_i^{\text{T}} \otimes I) |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| ((K_i^{\text{T}})^* \otimes I),$$

where  $K_i^{\text{T}} := \sum_{k,l=1}^{\dim} \langle e_k, K_i e_l \rangle |\tilde{e}_l\rangle\langle\tilde{e}_k|$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{C}_\Psi(\mathcal{N} \circ \mathcal{E}) &= (\text{id} \otimes \mathcal{N})(\text{id} \otimes \mathcal{E}) |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^r (\text{id} \otimes \mathcal{N})(K_i^{\text{T}} \otimes I) |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| ((K_i^{\text{T}})^* \otimes I) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^r (K_i^{\text{T}} \otimes I) \underbrace{(\text{id} \otimes \mathcal{N}) |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|}_{=\text{C}_\Psi(\mathcal{N})} ((K_i^{\text{T}})^* \otimes I), \end{aligned}$$

and similarly for  $C_\Psi(\mathcal{M} \circ \mathcal{E})$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
C_\Psi(\mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{N} \circ \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M} \circ \mathcal{E})) &= \mathcal{P}_f(C_\Psi(\mathcal{N} \circ \mathcal{E}), C_\Psi(\mathcal{M} \circ \mathcal{E})) \\
&= \mathcal{P}_f\left(\sum_{i=1}^r (K_i^T \otimes I) C_\Psi(\mathcal{N}) ((K_i^T)^* \otimes I), \sum_{i=1}^r (K_i^T \otimes I) C_\Psi(\mathcal{M}) ((K_i^T)^* \otimes I)\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^r (K_i^T \otimes I) \mathcal{P}_f(C_\Psi(\mathcal{N}), C_\Psi(\mathcal{M})) ((K_i^T)^* \otimes I) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^r (K_i^T \otimes I) C_\Psi(\mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M})) ((K_i^T)^* \otimes I) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^r (K_i^T \otimes I) (\text{id} \otimes \mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M})) |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| ((K_i^T)^* \otimes I) \\
&= (\text{id} \otimes \mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M})) (\text{id} \otimes \mathcal{E}) |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| \\
&= C_\Psi(\mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) \circ \mathcal{E}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality is due to Corollary B.5, and the rest of the steps are straightforward.  $\square$

Quantum supermaps are linear transformations mapping superoperators to superoperators; they are called completely positive (CP) if whenever they are acting on half of a bipartite completely positive superoperator, the resulting superoperator is again completely positive. This implies as a special case that CP supermaps map CP superoperators to CP superoperators. According to [14], any supermap  $\mathbb{S} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1), \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}_1)) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2), \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}_2))$  can be written as a composition of three supermaps: first tensoring the input with a fixed CP map, and then applying pre- and postprocessing. Thus, (C.5) and Propositions C.3 and C.4 yield immediately the following:

**Proposition C.5** (Monotonicity under supermaps) *Assume that  $f$  is operator convex, and  $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \text{CP}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{K}_1)$  are such that at least one of (S1)–(S4) in Lemma B.2 holds with  $A := C_\Psi(\mathcal{N})$  and  $B := C_\Psi(\mathcal{M})$  for some (equivalently, any) Choi vector  $\Psi$ . Then, for any supermap  $\mathbb{S} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1), \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}_1)) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2), \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}_2))$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_f(\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{N}), \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{M}))$  is defined, and*

$$\mathcal{P}_f(\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{N}), \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{M})) \leq \mathcal{P}_f(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}).$$

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was partially funded by the National Research, Development and Innovation Office of Hungary (NKFIH) via the research grants K 124152 and EXCELLENCE 151342, and by the Ministry of Culture and Innovation and the National Research, Development and Innovation Office within the Quantum Information National Laboratory of Hungary (Grant No. 2022-2.1.1-NL-2022-00004). The work of Péter Vrana was further supported by a Bolyai fellowship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, and by the NKFIH FK 146643 grant. The work of PEF was partially supported by the NKFIH KKP 139502 grant. MM was supported by the Ministry of Education, Singapore, through grant T2EP20124-0005. MM is grateful to Fumio Hiai for discussions on matrix geometric means.

- 
- [1] Martial Agueh and Guillaume Carlier. Barycenters in the Wasserstein space. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 43(2):904–924, 2011.
  - [2] T. Ando, Chi-Kwong Li, and Roy Mathias. Geometric means. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 385:305–334, 2004.
  - [3] K. M. R. Audenaert, M. Nussbaum, A. Szkola, and F. Verstraete. Asymptotic error rates in quantum hypothesis testing. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 279:251–283, 2008.
  - [4] Koenraad M. R. Audenaert and Nilanjana Datta.  $\alpha$ -z-relative Rényi entropies. *J. Math. Phys.*, 56:022202, 2015.
  - [5] Mario Berta, Fernando G.S.L. Brandao, and Christoph Hirche. On composite quantum hypothesis testing. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 385:55–77, 2021. arXiv:1709.07268.
  - [6] Rajendra Bhatia, Stéphane Gaubert, and Tanvi Jain. Matrix versions of the Hellinger distance. *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 2019.

- [7] Rajendra Bhatia and John Holbrook. Riemannian geometry and matrix geometric means. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 413(2):594–618, 2006. Special Issue on the 11th Conference of the International Linear Algebra Society, Coimbra, 2004.
- [8] Rajendra Bhatia, Tanvi Jain, and Yongdo Lim. On the Bures-Wasserstein distance between positive definite matrices. *Expositiones Mathematicae*, 2018.
- [9] Dario A. Bini, Beatrice Meini, and Federico Poloni. An effective matrix geometric mean satisfying the Ando-Li-Mathias properties. *Math. Comp.*, 79:437–452, 2010.
- [10] Fernando G.S.L. Brandao, Aram W. Harrow, James R. Lee, and Yuval Peres. Adversarial hypothesis testing and a quantum Stein’s lemma for restricted measurements. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 66(8), 2020.
- [11] Gergely Bunth. *On quantum Rényi divergences*. PhD thesis, Budapest University of Technology and Economics, 2024.
- [12] Gergely Bunth, Milán Mosonyi, and Péter Vrana. Single-copy bounds on error exponents in composite state discrimination. In preparation.
- [13] Gergely Bunth and Péter Vrana. Equivariant relative submajorization. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2022. arXiv:2108.13217.
- [14] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti. Transforming quantum operations: Quantum supermaps. *Europhysics Letters*, 83(3):30004, jul 2008.
- [15] M.-D. Choi. A Schwarz inequality for positive linear maps on  $C^*$ -algebras. *Illinois J. Math.*, 18:565–574, 1974.
- [16] Nilanjana Datta. Min- and max-relative entropies and a new entanglement monotone. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 55(6):2816–2826, 2009.
- [17] Chandler Davis. A Schwarz inequality for convex operator functions. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 8(1):42–44, 1957.
- [18] A. Ebadian, I. Nikoufar, and M. Eshaghi Gordji. Perspectives of matrix convex functions. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 108(18):7313–7314, 2011.
- [19] E. Effros. A matrix convexity approach to some celebrated quantum inequalities. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 106(4):1006–1008, 2009.
- [20] Ky Fan. Minimax theorems. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.*, 39(1):42–47, 1953.
- [21] Bálint Farkas and Szilárd Révész. Potential theoretic approach to rendezvous numbers. *Monatshefte für Mathematik*, 148(4):309–331, 2006.
- [22] Fang-Wei Fu and Shi-Yi Shen. Hypothesis testing for arbitrarily varying source. *Acta Mathematica Sinica*, 12(1):33–39, 1996.
- [23] Fang-Wei Fu and Shi-Yi Shen. Hypothesis testing for arbitrarily varying source with exponential-type constraint. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 44(2):892–895, 1998.
- [24] Roe Goodman and Nolan R. Wallach. *Representations and Invariants of the Classical Groups*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [25] Masahito Hayashi. Error exponent in asymmetric quantum hypothesis testing and its application to classical-quantum channel coding. *Physical Review A*, 76(6):062301, December 2007.
- [26] Fumio Hiai. Unpublished, presented at the “Focused Workshop on Quantum Rényi Divergences”, Erdős Center, Budapest, 22–26 July 2024.
- [27] Fumio Hiai and Yongdo Lim. Operator means of probability measures. *Advances in Mathematics*, 365:107038, 2020.
- [28] Fumio Hiai and Milán Mosonyi. Different quantum  $f$ -divergences and the reversibility of quantum operations. *Reviews in Mathematical Physics*, 29(7):1750023, 2017.
- [29] Fumio Hiai and Dénes Petz. The proper formula for relative entropy and its asymptotics in quantum probability. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 143(1):99–114, December 1991.
- [30] Fumio Hiai and Dénes Petz. The Golden-Thompson trace inequality is complemented. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 181:153–185, 1993.
- [31] Sejong Kim and Hosoo Lee. The power mean and the least squares mean of probability measures on the space of positive definite matrices. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 465:325–346, 2015.
- [32] Hellmuth Kneser. Sur un théorème fondamental de la théorie des jeux. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 234:2418–2420, 1952.
- [33] F. Kubo and T. Ando. Means of positive linear operators. *Math. Ann.*, 246:205–224, 1980.
- [34] J. Lawson and Y. Lim. Monotonic properties of the least squares mean. *Math. Ann.*, 351:267–279, 2011.
- [35] J. Lawson and Y. Lim. Karcher means and Karcher equations of positive definite operators. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. Series B*, 1:1–22, 2014.
- [36] Yongdo Lim and Miklós Pálfi. Matrix power means and the Karcher mean. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 262(4):1498–1514, 2012.
- [37] K. Matsumoto. A new quantum version of  $f$ -divergence. In *Nagoya Winter Workshop 2015: Reality and Measurement in Algebraic Quantum Theory*, pages 229–273, 2018.
- [38] Maher Moakher. A differential geometric approach to the geometric mean of symmetric positive-definite matrices. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 26(3):735–747, 2005.
- [39] Milán Mosonyi, Gergely Bunth, and Péter Vrana. Geometric relative entropies and barycentric Rényi divergences. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 699:159–276, 2024. arXiv:2207.14282.

- [40] Milán Mosonyi and Fumio Hiai. On the quantum Rényi relative entropies and related capacity formulas. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57(4):2474–2487, April 2011.
- [41] Milán Mosonyi and Tomohiro Ogawa. Quantum hypothesis testing and the operational interpretation of the quantum Rényi relative entropies. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 334(3):1617–1648, 2015.
- [42] Milán Mosonyi, Zsombor Szilágyi, and Mihály Weiner. On the error exponents of binary quantum state discrimination with composite hypotheses. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 68(2):1032–1067, 2022. arXiv:2011.04645.
- [43] Martin Müller-Lennert, Frédéric Dupuis, Oleg Szehr, Serge Fehr, and Marco Tomamichel. On quantum Rényi entropies: A new generalization and some properties. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 54(12):122203, December 2013.
- [44] Hiroshi Nagaoka. The converse part of the theorem for quantum Hoeffding bound. quant-ph/0611289, 2006.
- [45] D. Petz. Quasi-entropies for states of a von Neumann algebra. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.*, 21:781–800, 1985.
- [46] Dénes Petz and Róbert Temesi. Means of positive numbers and matrices. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 27(3):712–720, 2005.
- [47] J. Pitrik and D. Virosztek. Quantum Hellinger distances revisited. *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 110:2039–2052, 2020.
- [48] Renato Renner. *Security of Quantum Key Distribution*. PhD thesis, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich, 2005. Diss. ETH No. 16242.
- [49] H. Umegaki. Conditional expectation in an operator algebra, IV: Entropy and information. *Kodai Math. Sem. Rep.*, 14:59–85, 1962.
- [50] Mark M. Wilde, Andreas Winter, and Dong Yang. Strong converse for the classical capacity of entanglement-breaking and Hadamard channels via a sandwiched Rényi relative entropy. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 331(2):593–622, October 2014.