

Query Complexity of Classical and Quantum Channel Discrimination

Theshani Nuradha^{1,*} and Mark M. Wilde^{1,†}

¹*School of Electrical and Computer Engineering,
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14850, USA*

Quantum channel discrimination has been studied from an information-theoretic perspective, wherein one is interested in the optimal decay rate of error probabilities as a function of the number of unknown channel accesses. In this paper, we study the query complexity of quantum channel discrimination, wherein the goal is to determine the minimum number of channel uses needed to reach a desired error probability. To this end, we show that the query complexity of binary channel discrimination depends logarithmically on the inverse error probability and inversely on the negative logarithm of the (geometric and Holevo) channel fidelity. As a special case of these findings, we precisely characterize the query complexity of discriminating between two classical channels. We also provide lower and upper bounds on the query complexity of binary asymmetric channel discrimination and multiple quantum channel discrimination. For the former, the query complexity depends on the geometric Rényi and Petz Rényi channel divergences, while for the latter, it depends on the negative logarithm of (geometric and Uhlmann) channel fidelity. For multiple channel discrimination, the upper bound scales as the logarithm of the number of channels.

CONTENTS

I. Introduction	2
II. Preliminaries and Notations	3
A. Quantum Information-Theoretic Quantities	3
B. Setup	6
1. Symmetric Binary Channel Discrimination	7
2. Asymmetric Binary Channel Discrimination	7
3. Multiple Channel Discrimination	7
III. Problem Statement	8
IV. Query Complexity of Channel Discrimination	9
A. Symmetric Binary Channel Discrimination	9
B. Asymmetric Channel Discrimination	11
C. Multiple Channel Discrimination	11
Acknowledgments	11

* pt388@cornell.edu

† wilde@cornell.edu

References	11
A. Proof of Proposition 5	14
B. Proof of Theorem 6	15
C. Proof of Theorem 9	19
D. Proof of Theorem 10	21

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum hypothesis testing has been studied in early works of quantum information theory [1–3]. In quantum state discrimination, the hypotheses are modelled as quantum states, and the task is to devise a measurement strategy that maximizes the probability of correctly identifying the state of a given quantum system. In the basic version of this problem, a quantum system is prepared in one of two possible states, denoted by ρ and σ , and it is the goal of the distinguisher, who does not know *a priori* which state was prepared, to determine the identity of the unknown state. In the case that $n \in \mathbb{N}$ copies (or samples) are provided, the states are then denoted by $\rho^{\otimes n}$ and $\sigma^{\otimes n}$. Having extra samples for the discrimination task decreases the probability of making an error in the process. It is well known that the error probability decreases exponentially fast in the number of samples provided that $\rho \neq \sigma$ [4–9]. Quantum hypothesis testing can be generalized to the setting where there are multiple hypotheses [10], and it is also known in this case that the error probability generally decays exponentially fast with n [11].

A scenario analogous to quantum hypothesis testing with quantum channels is referred to as quantum channel discrimination. Here, the task is to use the unknown quantum channel several times (n times) to determine which channel was applied. Quantum channel discrimination in the asymptotic regime (i.e., $n \rightarrow \infty$) has been studied in [12–20]. Also Ref. [21] studied some settings in which a finite number of channel uses are sufficient to distinguish between two channels. More broadly, there has been significant interest in the topic of quantum channel discrimination [22–27].

Recently, Ref. [28] studied the non-asymptotic regime of this fundamental statistical task by considering the sample complexity of quantum hypothesis testing (discrimination of quantum states). Here, sample complexity refers to the optimal number of samples of the unknown state required to achieve a fixed non-zero error probability. Furthermore, Ref. [28] also explored several applications of the sample complexity of quantum hypothesis testing in quantum algorithms for simulation and unstructured search, and quantum learning and classification. This non-asymptotic study also provided a foundation to study information-constrained settings of quantum hypothesis testing with constraints being ensuring privacy [29, 30], where privacy is quantified by quantum local differential privacy [31, 32], and access to noisy quantum states instead of noiseless states [33].

In this work, we extend the study of quantum hypothesis testing to a more general setting of channel discrimination. Here, we consider how many uses of the unknown channel are required to achieve a fixed non-zero error probability of discriminating between two or multiple channels. We use the term “query complexity” to refer to the optimal number of channel uses in this scenario, as this terminology is common in theoretical computer science,

for similar settings including unitary operator and gate discrimination [34–38]. Similar to the sample complexity of quantum hypothesis testing, we suspect that our findings will be useful in applications related to quantum learning theory, quantum computing, and quantum algorithms, where one has to distinguish between several channels.

Contributions: In this paper, we provide a comprehensive analysis of the query complexity of classical and quantum channel discrimination. First, we define the query complexity of three quantum channel discrimination settings, including symmetric binary (Definition 2), asymmetric binary (Definition 3), and symmetric multiple channel discrimination (Definition 4), while providing equivalent expressions in Remark 2.

Next, we study the query complexity of symmetric binary channel discrimination in Theorem 6. To this end, we show that the query complexity scales logarithmically in the inverse error probability $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and inversely in the negative logarithm of the geometric channel fidelity (lower bound) and Holevo channel fidelity (upper bound). Moreover, in Corollary 8, we obtain a tight characterization of the query complexity of discriminating two classical channels \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} .

Furthermore, we characterize the query complexity of asymmetric binary channel discrimination with the use of the geometric Rényi and Petz Rényi channel divergences in Theorem 9. As the third setting, we establish bounds on the query complexity of symmetric multiple channel discrimination in Theorem 10. Here, we find that the query complexity scales with the negative logarithm of the channel fidelities and the upper bound scales as $O(\ln(M))$, where M is the number of distinct channels to be discriminated.

Note: After the completion of our work, we came across the independent study [39], which also studies the non-asymptotic regime of quantum channel discrimination.

II. PRELIMINARIES AND NOTATIONS

In this section, we establish some notation and recall various quantities of interest and relations used in our paper.

Let $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \dots\}$. Throughout our paper, we let ρ and σ denote quantum states, which are positive semi-definite operators acting on a separable Hilbert space and with trace equal to one. Let $\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{A \rightarrow B}$ be quantum channels, which are completely positive trace-preserving maps. Let I denote the identity operator. For every bounded operator A and $p \geq 1$, we define the Schatten p -norm as

$$\|A\|_p := \left(\text{Tr} \left[(A^\dagger A)^{p/2} \right] \right)^{1/p}. \quad (1)$$

A. Quantum Information-Theoretic Quantities

A divergence $\mathbf{D}(\rho\|\sigma)$ is a function of two quantum states ρ and σ , and we say that it obeys the data-processing inequality if the following holds for all states ρ and σ and every channel \mathcal{N} :

$$\mathbf{D}(\rho\|\sigma) \geq \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{N}(\rho)\|\mathcal{N}(\sigma)). \quad (2)$$

Definition 1 (Generalized Divergences). *Let ρ and σ be quantum states.*

1. The normalized trace distance is defined as

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1. \quad (3)$$

2. The Petz–Rényi divergence of order $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$ is defined as [40]

$$D_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) := \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln Q_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) \quad (4)$$

$$\text{where } Q_\alpha(A\|B) := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \text{Tr} \left[A^\alpha (B + \varepsilon I)^{1-\alpha} \right], \quad \forall A, B \geq 0. \quad (5)$$

It obeys the data-processing inequality for all $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 2]$ [40]. Note also that $D_{1/2}(\rho\|\sigma) = -\ln F_{\text{H}}(\rho, \sigma)$, where the Holevo fidelity is defined as [41]

$$F_{\text{H}}(\rho, \sigma) := \left(\text{Tr} [\sqrt{\rho} \sqrt{\sigma}] \right)^2. \quad (6)$$

3. The sandwiched Rényi divergence of order $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$ is defined as [42, 43]

$$\tilde{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) := \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln Q_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) \quad (7)$$

$$\text{where } \tilde{Q}_\alpha(A\|B) := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \text{Tr} \left[\left(A^{\frac{1}{2}} (B + \varepsilon I)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} A^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)^\alpha \right], \quad \forall A, B \geq 0. \quad (8)$$

It obeys the data-processing inequality for all $\alpha \in [1/2, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$ [44, 45]. Note also that $\tilde{D}_{1/2}(\rho\|\sigma) = -\ln F(\rho, \sigma)$, where the quantum fidelity is defined as [46]

$$F(\rho, \sigma) := \left\| \sqrt{\rho} \sqrt{\sigma} \right\|_1^2. \quad (9)$$

The Bures distance is defined as [47, 48]

$$d_{\text{B}}(\rho, \sigma) := \sqrt{2 \left(1 - \sqrt{F(\rho, \sigma)} \right)}. \quad (10)$$

4. The geometric Rényi divergence of order $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$ is defined as [49]

$$\hat{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) := \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \hat{Q}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) \quad (11)$$

$$\text{where } \hat{Q}_\alpha(A\|B) := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \text{Tr} \left[(B + \varepsilon I) \left((B + \varepsilon I)^{-\frac{1}{2}} A (B + \varepsilon I)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right)^\alpha \right], \quad \forall A, B \geq 0. \quad (12)$$

It obeys the data-processing inequality for all $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 2]$ [50, Theorem 7.45]. For $\alpha = 1/2$, we have

$$\hat{D}_{\frac{1}{2}}(\rho\|\sigma) = -\ln \hat{F}(\rho, \sigma), \quad (13)$$

where the geometric fidelity [51] is defined as

$$\hat{F}(\rho, \sigma) := \inf_{\varepsilon > 0} \text{Tr} [\rho(\varepsilon) \# \sigma(\varepsilon)]. \quad (14)$$

Here $A\#B$ denotes the matrix geometric mean of the positive definite operators A and B :

$$A\#B := A^{1/2} (A^{-1/2} B A^{-1/2})^{1/2} A^{1/2}, \quad (15)$$

$\rho(\varepsilon) := \rho + \varepsilon I$, and $\sigma(\varepsilon) := \sigma + \varepsilon I$. Using the geometric fidelity, we also define

$$\widehat{d}_B(\rho, \sigma) := \sqrt{2 \left(1 - \sqrt{\widehat{F}(\rho, \sigma)}\right)}. \quad (16)$$

5. The quantum relative entropy is defined as [52]

$$D(\rho\|\sigma) := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \text{Tr}[\rho(\ln \rho - \ln(\sigma + \varepsilon I))], \quad (17)$$

and it obeys the data-processing inequality [53].

Generalized divergences can be extended to channels as follows [54, Definition II.2]:

$$\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) := \sup_{\rho_{RA}} \mathbf{D}(\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}(\rho_{RA})\|\mathcal{M}_{A \rightarrow B}(\rho_{RA})) \quad (18)$$

Then, we can also define the channel variants of all the generalized divergences presented in Definition 1 (replacing \mathbf{D} with the following: $D_\alpha, \widetilde{D}_\alpha, \widehat{D}_\alpha, d_B, \widehat{d}_B$). In the same spirit, channel fidelities (denoted as \mathbf{F} to include F_H, F, \widehat{F}) are defined as

$$\mathbf{F}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) := \inf_{\rho_{RA}} \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}(\rho_{RA}), \mathcal{M}_{A \rightarrow B}(\rho_{RA})). \quad (19)$$

As shown in [55, Proposition 55], the channel fidelity based on F can be efficiently computed by means of a semi-definite program (SDP), and a similar statement can be made for \widehat{F} by using the SDP for geometric fidelity (see [56, Section 6] and [57, Eq. (1.11) and Lemma 3.20]) and the reasoning used to establish [55, Proposition 55]. Precisely, the SDP is given by

$$\left[\widehat{F}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M})\right]^{1/2} = \sup_{\lambda \geq 0, W_{RB} \in \text{Herm}} \left\{ \lambda : \lambda I_R \leq \text{Tr}_B[W_{RB}], \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}} & W_{RB} \\ W_{RB} & \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{M}} \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \right\}, \quad (20)$$

where $\Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}}$ and $\Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{M}}$ are the Choi operators of \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} , respectively.

We make use of the following inequalities throughout our work: Let $\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{A \rightarrow B}$ denote quantum channels, and let ρ_{RA} and σ_{RA} denote quantum states.

1. Chain rule for geometric Rényi divergence (for $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ [58, Theorem 3.4] and for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ [55, Proposition 45]):

$$\widehat{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}(\rho_{RA})\|\mathcal{M}_{A \rightarrow B}(\sigma_{RA})) \leq \widehat{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) + \widehat{D}_\alpha(\rho_{RA}\|\sigma_{RA}). \quad (21)$$

2. Since $\widehat{D}_{\frac{1}{2}}(\rho\|\sigma) = -\ln \widehat{F}(\rho, \sigma)$, the following is a rewriting of (21):

$$\widehat{F}(\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}(\rho_{RA}), \mathcal{M}_{A \rightarrow B}(\sigma_{RA})) \geq \widehat{F}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) \widehat{F}(\rho_{RA}, \sigma_{RA}). \quad (22)$$

3. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then,

$$F(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}) \leq (F(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}))^n. \quad (23)$$

This follows because

$$F(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}) = \inf_{\rho_{R_n A_n}} F(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}(\rho_{R_n A_n}), \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}(\rho_{R_n A_n})) \quad (24)$$

$$\leq \inf_{\rho_{RA}^{\otimes n}} F(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}(\rho_{RA}^{\otimes n}), \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}(\rho_{RA}^{\otimes n})) \quad (25)$$

$$= \inf_{\rho_{RA}} (F(\mathcal{N}(\rho_{RA}), \mathcal{M}(\rho_{RA})))^n \quad (26)$$

$$= (F(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}))^n, \quad (27)$$

where the first inequality holds by choosing a smaller set comprised of product states for the optimization and the penultimate equality from the multiplicativity of fidelity.

B. Setup

Given two quantum channels $\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{A \rightarrow B}$ acting on an input system A and an output system B , the most general adaptive strategy for discriminating these two channels is as follows. First we prepare an arbitrary input state $\rho_{R_1 A_1} = \tau_{R_1 A_1}$, where R_1 is a reference system (ancillary register). The i th use of the respective channel takes a register A_i as input and gives a register B_i as output. After each use of the channel \mathcal{N} or \mathcal{M} , we apply an (adaptive) channel $\mathcal{A}_{R_i B_i \rightarrow R_{i+1} A_{i+1}}^{(i)}$ to the registers R_i and B_i such that the following holds (depending on the channel applied): First for $1 \leq i \leq n$

$$\rho_{R_i B_i} := \mathcal{N}_{A_i \rightarrow B_i}(\rho_{R_i A_i}), \quad (28)$$

$$\tau_{R_i B_i} := \mathcal{M}_{A_i \rightarrow B_i}(\tau_{R_i A_i}), \quad (29)$$

and

$$\rho_{R_{i+1} A_{i+1}} := (\mathcal{A}_{R_i B_i \rightarrow R_{i+1} A_{i+1}}^{(i)} \circ \mathcal{N}_{A_i \rightarrow B_i})(\rho_{R_i A_i}), \quad (30)$$

$$\tau_{R_{i+1} A_{i+1}} := (\mathcal{A}_{R_i B_i \rightarrow R_{i+1} A_{i+1}}^{(i)} \circ \mathcal{M}_{A_i \rightarrow B_i})(\tau_{R_i A_i}), \quad (31)$$

for every $1 \leq i < n$ on the left hand side, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Finally, a quantum measurement $(Q_{R_n B_n}, I_{R_n B_n} - Q_{R_n B_n})$ is applied on the systems $R_n B_n$ to determine which channel was queried. The outcome Q corresponds to guessing the channel \mathcal{N} at the end of the protocol, while the outcome $I - Q$ corresponds to guessing the channel \mathcal{M} . The probability of guessing \mathcal{N} when \mathcal{M} is applied is given by $\text{Tr}[Q_{R_n B_n} \tau_{R_n B_n}]$ (type II error probability), while the probability of guessing \mathcal{M} when \mathcal{N} is applied is given by $\text{Tr}[(I_{R_n B_n} - Q_{R_n B_n}) \rho_{R_n B_n}]$ (type I error probability).

In what follows, we use the notation $\{Q, \mathcal{A}\}$ to identify a strategy of using the set of channels, $\{\mathcal{A}_{R_i B_i \rightarrow R_{i+1} A_{i+1}}^{(i)}\}_i$, and a final measurement $(Q_{R_n B_n}, I_{R_n B_n} - Q_{R_n B_n})$ as described above. In this setup, we also consider that we have access to $n \in \mathbb{N}$ uses of the channel \mathcal{N} or \mathcal{M} .

1. Symmetric Binary Channel Discrimination

In the setting of symmetric binary channel discrimination, we suppose that there is a prior probability $p \in (0, 1)$ associated with the use of channel \mathcal{N} , and there is a prior probability $q \equiv 1 - p$ associated with using the channel \mathcal{M} . Indeed, the unknown channel is selected by flipping a coin, with the probability of heads being p and the probability of tails being q . If the outcome of the coin flip is heads, then n channel uses of \mathcal{N} are applied, and if the outcome is tails, then n channel uses of \mathcal{M} are applied, along with the adaptive channels $\{\mathcal{A}_{R_i B_i \rightarrow R_{i+1} A_{i+1}}^{(i)}\}_i$ for $1 \leq i < n$ and the input state $\rho_{R_1 A_1} = \tau_{R_1 A_1}$ in both the cases. Thus, the expected error probability in this experiment is as follows:

$$p_{e, \{Q, \mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}}(p, \mathcal{N}, q, \mathcal{M}, n) := p \operatorname{Tr}[(I_{R_n B_n} - Q_{R_n B_n})\rho_{R_n B_n}] + q \operatorname{Tr}[Q_{R_n B_n} \tau_{R_n B_n}]. \quad (32)$$

Given p , the distinguisher can minimize the error-probability expression in (32) over all adaptive strategies $\{Q, \mathcal{A}\}$ and the initial state $\rho_{R_1 A_1}$. The optimal error probability $p_e(p, \mathcal{N}, q, \mathcal{M}, n)$ of hypothesis testing is as follows:

$$p_e(p, \mathcal{N}, q, \mathcal{M}, n) := \inf_{\{Q, \mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} p_{e, \{Q, \mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}}(p, \mathcal{N}, q, \mathcal{M}, n) \quad (33)$$

$$= \inf_{\{Q, \mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} \{p \operatorname{Tr}[(I_{R_n B_n} - Q_{R_n B_n})\rho_{R_n B_n}] + q \operatorname{Tr}[Q_{R_n B_n} \tau_{R_n B_n}]\} \quad (34)$$

$$= \inf_{\mathcal{A}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} \frac{1}{2} (1 - \|p\rho_{R_n B_n} - q\tau_{R_n B_n}\|_1), \quad (35)$$

where the last equality follows by applying the Helstrom–Holevo theorem [2, 3] for states and recalling that the optimization over all final measurements is abbreviated by Q .

2. Asymmetric Binary Channel Discrimination

In the setting of asymmetric channel discrimination, there are no prior probabilities associated with the selection of the channel \mathcal{N} or \mathcal{M} —we simply assume that one of them is chosen deterministically, but the chosen channel is unknown to the distinguisher. The goal of the distinguisher is to minimize the probability of the second kind of error subject to a constraint on the probability of the first kind of error in guessing which channel is selected. Given a fixed $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$, the scenario reduces to the following optimization problem:

$$\beta_\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}^{(n)} \parallel \mathcal{M}^{(n)}) := \inf_{\{Q, \mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} \{ \operatorname{Tr}[Q_{R_n B_n} \tau_{R_n B_n}] : \operatorname{Tr}[(I_{R_n B_n} - Q_{R_n B_n})\rho_{R_n B_n}] \leq \varepsilon \}. \quad (36)$$

3. Multiple Channel Discrimination

Here the goal is to select one among M possible channels as the guess for the selected channel. Let $\mathcal{S} := \{(p_m, \mathcal{N}^m)\}_{m=1}^M$ be an ensemble of M channels with prior probabilities taking values in the set $\{p_m\}_{m=1}^M$. Without loss of generality, let us assume that $p_m > 0$ for all $m \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$. Fix the adaptive channels applied after each channel use as $\{\mathcal{A}_{R_i B_i \rightarrow R_{i+1} A_{i+1}}^{(i)}\}_i$ and the input to the protocol as $\rho_{R_1 A_1}$. Denote for all $1 \leq m \leq M$, $\rho_{R_1 A_1}^m := \rho_{R_1 A_1}$ and

$$\rho_{R_{i+1} A_{i+1}}^m := (\mathcal{A}_{R_i B_i \rightarrow R_{i+1} A_{i+1}}^{(i)} \circ \mathcal{N}_{A_i \rightarrow B_i}^m)(\rho_{R_i A_i}^m), \quad (37)$$

for all $1 \leq i < n$.

The minimum error probability of M -channel discrimination, given n channel uses of the unknown channel, is as follows:

$$p_e(\mathcal{S}, n) := \inf_{\{Q, \mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} \sum_{m=1}^M p_m \operatorname{Tr}[(I_{R_n B_n} - Q_{R_n B_n}^m) \rho_{R_n B_n}^m], \quad (38)$$

where the minimization is over all adaptive strategies denoted by \mathcal{A} , every initial state $\rho_{R_1 A_1}$, and every positive operator-valued measure (POVM) denoted as Q applied at the final stage (i.e., a tuple $(Q_{R_n B_n}^1, \dots, Q_{R_n B_n}^M)$ satisfying $Q_{R_n B_n}^m \geq 0$ for all $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ and $\sum_{m=1}^M Q_{R_n B_n}^m = I_{R_n B_n}$).

III. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Formally, we state the definitions of the query complexity of symmetric binary, asymmetric binary, and multiple channel discrimination in the following Definitions 2, 3, and 4, respectively. In each case, we define them by employing the error-probability metrics in (34), (36), and (38) and in such a way that the query complexity is the minimum value of $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (number of channel uses) needed to get the error probability below a threshold $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$.

Definition 2 (Query Complexity of Symmetric Binary Channel Discrimination). *Let $p \in (0, 1)$, $q = 1 - p$, and $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$, and let \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} be quantum channels. The query complexity $n^*(p, \mathcal{N}, q, \mathcal{M}, \varepsilon)$ of symmetric binary channel discrimination is defined as follows:*

$$n^*(p, \mathcal{N}, q, \mathcal{M}, \varepsilon) := \inf \{n \in \mathbb{N} : p_e(p, \mathcal{N}, q, \mathcal{M}, n) \leq \varepsilon\}. \quad (39)$$

Definition 3 (Query Complexity of Asymmetric Binary Channel Discrimination). *Let $\varepsilon, \delta \in [0, 1]$, and let \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} be quantum channels. The query complexity $n^*(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}, \varepsilon, \delta)$ of asymmetric binary channel discrimination is defined as follows:*

$$n^*(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}, \varepsilon, \delta) := \inf \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \beta_\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}^{(n)} \| \mathcal{M}^{(n)}) \leq \delta\}. \quad (40)$$

Definition 4 (Query Complexity of M -ary Channel Discrimination). *Let $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$, and let $\mathcal{S} := \{(p_m, \mathcal{N}^m)\}_{m=1}^M$ be an ensemble of M channels. The query complexity $n^*(\mathcal{S}, \varepsilon)$ of M -ary channel discrimination is defined as follows:*

$$n^*(\mathcal{S}, \varepsilon) := \inf \{n \in \mathbb{N} : p_e(\mathcal{S}, n) \leq \varepsilon\}. \quad (41)$$

Remark 1 (Equivalent Expression). *Note that we can rewrite the query complexity of asymmetric binary channel discrimination as follows:*

$$n^*(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}, \varepsilon, \delta) = \inf \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \beta_\delta(\mathcal{N}^{(n)} \| \mathcal{M}^{(n)}) \leq \varepsilon\}. \quad (42)$$

Remark 2 (Equivalent Expressions for Query Complexities). *The query complexity $n^*(p, \mathcal{N}, q, \mathcal{M}, \varepsilon)$ of symmetric binary quantum channel discrimination has the following equivalent expressions:*

$$n^*(p, \mathcal{N}, q, \mathcal{M}, \varepsilon) = \inf_{\{Q, \mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} \{n \in \mathbb{N} : p \operatorname{Tr}[(I_{R_n B_n} - Q_{R_n B_n}) \rho_{R_n B_n}] + q \operatorname{Tr}[Q_{R_n B_n} \tau_{R_n B_n}] \leq \varepsilon\} \quad (43)$$

$$= \inf_{\mathcal{A}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \frac{1}{2} (1 - \|p\rho_{R_n B_n} - q\tau_{R_n B_n}\|_1) \leq \varepsilon \right\} \quad (44)$$

By recalling the quantity $\beta_\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}^{(n)} \|\mathcal{M}^{(n)})$ defined in (36), we can rewrite the sample complexity $n^*(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}, \varepsilon, \delta)$ of asymmetric binary quantum hypothesis testing in the following two ways:

$$n^*(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}, \varepsilon, \delta) = \inf_{\{Q, \mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \begin{array}{l} \text{Tr}[(I_{R_n B_n} - Q_{R_n B_n})\rho_{R_n B_n}] \leq \varepsilon, \\ \text{Tr}[Q_{R_n B_n}\tau_{R_n B_n}] \leq \delta \end{array} \right\} \quad (45)$$

$$= \inf \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \beta_\delta(\mathcal{M}^{(n)} \|\mathcal{N}^{(n)}) \leq \varepsilon \right\}. \quad (46)$$

This follows from reasoning similar to that presented in [28, Appendix C] because the expression in (45) indicates that the query complexity for asymmetric binary quantum channel discrimination can be thought of as the minimum number of queries to the unknown channels needed for the type I error probability to be below ε and the type II error probability to be below δ .

Finally, the query complexity $n^*(\mathcal{S}, \varepsilon)$ of M -ary quantum channel discrimination can be rewritten as follows:

$$n^*(\mathcal{S}, \varepsilon) = \inf_{\{Q, \mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \sum_{m=1}^M p_m \text{Tr}[(I_{R_n B_n} - Q_{R_n B_n}^m)\rho_{R_n B_n}^m] \leq \varepsilon \right\}. \quad (47)$$

IV. QUERY COMPLEXITY OF CHANNEL DISCRIMINATION

In this section, we provide lower and upper bounds on the query complexity of quantum channel discrimination, applicable to the three main settings discussed in Section II B (namely, symmetric binary channel discrimination, asymmetric binary channel discrimination, and symmetric multiple channel discrimination).

A. Symmetric Binary Channel Discrimination

Proposition 5 (Trivial Cases). *Let $p, q, \varepsilon, \mathcal{N}$, and \mathcal{M} be as stated in Definition 2. If one of the following conditions hold:*

1. $\varepsilon \in [1/2, 1]$,
2. $\exists s \in [0, 1]$ such that $\varepsilon \geq p^s q^{1-s}$,
3. $\exists \psi_{RA}$ with the dimensions of the systems R and A being equal such that $\text{supp}(\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}(\psi_{RA})) \cap \text{supp}(\mathcal{M}_{A \rightarrow B}(\psi_{RA})) = \emptyset$,

then

$$n^*(p, \mathcal{N}, q, \mathcal{M}, \varepsilon) = 1. \quad (48)$$

If $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{M}$ and $\min\{p, q\} > \varepsilon \in [0, 1/2)$, then

$$n^*(p, \mathcal{N}, q, \mathcal{M}, \varepsilon) = +\infty. \quad (49)$$

Proof. See Appendix A. □

Define for $s \in [0, 1]$

$$C_s(\mathcal{N}||\mathcal{M}) := - \inf_{\rho_{RA}} \ln \text{Tr} [\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}(\rho_{RA})^s \mathcal{M}_{A \rightarrow B}(\rho_{RA})^{1-s}]. \quad (50)$$

Theorem 6 (Query Complexity: Symmetric Binary Channel Discrimination). *Let $p, q, \varepsilon, \mathcal{N}$, and \mathcal{M} be as stated in Definition 2 such that the conditions in Proposition 5 do not hold. Then the following bounds hold*

$$\max \left\{ \frac{\ln(pq/\varepsilon)}{-\ln \widehat{F}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M})}, \frac{1 - \frac{\varepsilon(1-\varepsilon)}{pq}}{[\widehat{d}_B(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M})]^2} \right\} \leq n^*(p, \mathcal{N}, q, \mathcal{M}, \varepsilon) \leq \left\lceil \inf_{s \in [0, 1]} \frac{\ln\left(\frac{p^s q^{1-s}}{\varepsilon}\right)}{C_s(\mathcal{N}||\mathcal{M})} \right\rceil, \quad (51)$$

where $C_s(\mathcal{N}||\mathcal{M})$ is defined in (50).

Proof. See Appendix B. □

Corollary 7. *Let $p, q, \varepsilon, \mathcal{N}$, and \mathcal{M} be as stated in Definition 2 such that the conditions in Proposition 5 do not hold. Then the following bounds hold*

$$\frac{\ln(pq/\varepsilon)}{-\ln \widehat{F}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M})} \leq n^*(p, \mathcal{N}, q, \mathcal{M}, \varepsilon) \leq \left\lceil \frac{2 \ln\left(\frac{\sqrt{pq}}{\varepsilon}\right)}{-\ln F_H(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M})} \right\rceil. \quad (52)$$

Proof. Proof follows directly from Theorem 6 together with the substitution $s = 1/2$ in the upper bound therein. □

For classical channels, where the input and output systems of a channel are classical, the query complexity is tight, and it is a function of channel fidelities.

Corollary 8 (Query Complexity: Classical Channels). *Let \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} be classical channels, then we have that*

$$n^*(p, \mathcal{N}, q, \mathcal{M}, \varepsilon) = \Theta\left(\frac{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)}{-\ln F(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M})}\right). \quad (53)$$

Proof. Proof follows by adapting Corollary 7 and identifying that, for classical channels with classical inputs, the following equality holds: $F(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) = \widehat{F}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) = F_H(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M})$. □

Remark 3 (Special Classes of Channels). *For some special classes of channels, including environmental seizable channels [14, Definition 36], the query complexity bounds boil down to quantum hypothesis testing of states with the environment states as the states. In that case, the results derived in [28] can be directly used to derive bounds on the query complexity. Furthermore, for the task of discriminating bosonic dephasing channels, it will be possible to provide analytical expressions for the query complexity by utilizing the findings in [59].*

B. Asymmetric Channel Discrimination

Theorem 9 (Query Complexity: Asymmetric Channel Discrimination). *Fix $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$, and let \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} be quantum channels. Then the following bounds hold for the query complexity $n^*(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}, \varepsilon, \delta)$ of asymmetric binary channel discrimination defined in Definition 3:*

$$\begin{aligned} \max \left\{ \sup_{\alpha \in (1, 2]} \left(\frac{\ln \left(\frac{(1-\varepsilon)^{\alpha'}}{\delta} \right)}{\widehat{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N} \parallel \mathcal{M})} \right), \sup_{\alpha \in (1, 2]} \left(\frac{\ln \left(\frac{(1-\delta)^{\alpha'}}{\varepsilon} \right)}{\widehat{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{M} \parallel \mathcal{N})} \right) \right\} &\leq n^*(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}, \varepsilon, \delta) \\ &\leq \min \left\{ \left[\inf_{\alpha \in (0, 1)} \left(\frac{\ln \left(\frac{\varepsilon^{\alpha'}}{\delta} \right)}{D_\alpha(\mathcal{N} \parallel \mathcal{M})} \right) \right], \left[\inf_{\alpha \in (0, 1)} \left(\frac{\ln \left(\frac{\delta^{\alpha'}}{\varepsilon} \right)}{D_\alpha(\mathcal{M} \parallel \mathcal{N})} \right) \right] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

where $\alpha' := \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}$.

Proof. See Appendix C. □

C. Multiple Channel Discrimination

Theorem 10 (Query Complexity: M -ary Channel Discrimination). *Let $n^*(\mathcal{S}, \varepsilon)$ be as stated in Definition 4. Then,*

$$\max_{m \neq \bar{m}} \frac{\ln \left(\frac{p_m p_{\bar{m}}}{(p_m + p_{\bar{m}})\varepsilon} \right)}{-\ln \widehat{F}(\mathcal{N}^m, \mathcal{N}^{\bar{m}})} \leq n^*(\mathcal{S}, \varepsilon) \leq \left[\max_{m \neq \bar{m}} \frac{2 \ln \left(\frac{M(M-1)\sqrt{p_m}\sqrt{p_{\bar{m}}}}{2\varepsilon} \right)}{-\ln F(\mathcal{N}^m, \mathcal{N}^{\bar{m}})} \right]. \quad (55)$$

Proof. See Appendix D. □

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Amira Abbas, Marco Cerezo, and Ludovico Lami for helpful discussions. TN and MMW acknowledge support from NSF Grant No. 2329662.

-
- [1] C. W. Helstrom, Detection theory and quantum mechanics, [Information and Control](#) **10**, 254 (1967).
 - [2] C. W. Helstrom, Quantum detection and estimation theory, [Journal of Statistical Physics](#) **1**, 231 (1969).
 - [3] A. S. Holevo, Statistical decision theory for quantum systems, [Journal of Multivariate Analysis](#) **3**, 337 (1973).
 - [4] F. Hiai and D. Petz, The proper formula for relative entropy and its asymptotics in quantum probability, [Communications in Mathematical Physics](#) **143**, 99 (1991).
 - [5] T. Ogawa and H. Nagaoka, Strong converse and Stein's lemma in quantum hypothesis testing, [IEEE Transaction on Information Theory](#) **46**, 2428 (2000).

- [6] K. M. R. Audenaert, J. Calsamiglia, R. Muñoz-Tapia, E. Bagan, L. Masanes, A. Acin, and F. Verstraete, Discriminating states: The quantum Chernoff bound, [Physical Review Letters](#) **98**, 160501 (2007).
- [7] M. Nussbaum and A. Szkoła, The Chernoff lower bound for symmetric quantum hypothesis testing, [Annals of Statistics](#) **37**, 1040 (2009).
- [8] H. Nagaoka, The converse part of the theorem for quantum Hoeffding bound (2006), [arXiv:quant-ph/0611289](#).
- [9] M. Hayashi, Error exponent in asymmetric quantum hypothesis testing and its application to classical-quantum channel coding, [Physical Review A](#) **76**, 062301 (2007).
- [10] H. P. Yuen, R. S. Kennedy, and M. Lax, Optimum testing of multiple hypotheses in quantum detection theory, [IEEE Transactions on Information Theory](#) **21**, 125 (1975).
- [11] K. Li, Discriminating quantum states: The multiple Chernoff distance, [The Annals of Statistics](#) **44**, 1661 (2016).
- [12] M. Hayashi, Discrimination of two channels by adaptive methods and its application to quantum system, [IEEE Transactions on Information Theory](#) **55**, 3807 (2009).
- [13] T. Cooney, M. Mosonyi, and M. M. Wilde, Strong converse exponents for a quantum channel discrimination problem and quantum-feedback-assisted communication, [Communications in Mathematical Physics](#) **344**, 797 (2016), [arXiv:1408.3373](#).
- [14] M. M. Wilde, M. Berta, C. Hirche, and E. Kaur, Amortized channel divergence for asymptotic quantum channel discrimination, [Letters in Mathematical Physics](#) **110**, 2277 (2020).
- [15] X. Wang and M. M. Wilde, Resource theory of asymmetric distinguishability for quantum channels, [Physical Review Research](#) **1**, 033169 (2019).
- [16] K. Fang, O. Fawzi, R. Renner, and D. Sutter, Chain rule for the quantum relative entropy, [Physical Review Letters](#) **124**, 100501 (2020).
- [17] B. Bergh, N. Datta, R. Salzmänn, and M. M. Wilde, Parallelization of adaptive quantum channel discrimination in the non-asymptotic regime, [IEEE Transactions on Information Theory](#) **70**, 2617 (2024).
- [18] F. Salek, M. Hayashi, and A. Winter, Usefulness of adaptive strategies in asymptotic quantum channel discrimination, [Physical Review A](#) **105**, 022419 (2022).
- [19] B. Bergh, J. Kochanowski, R. Salzmänn, and N. Datta, Infinite dimensional asymmetric quantum channel discrimination (2023), [arXiv:2308.12959 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [20] Z. Huang, L. Lami, and M. M. Wilde, Exact quantum sensing limits for bosonic dephasing channels, [PRX Quantum](#) **5**, 020354 (2024).
- [21] A. W. Harrow, A. Hassidim, D. W. Leung, and J. Watrous, Adaptive versus nonadaptive strategies for quantum channel discrimination, [Physical Review A](#) **81**, 032339 (2010).
- [22] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Memory effects in quantum channel discrimination, [Physical Review Letters](#) **101**, 180501 (2008), [arXiv:0803.3237](#).
- [23] R. Duan, Y. Feng, and M. Ying, Perfect distinguishability of quantum operations, [Physical Review Letters](#) **103**, 210501 (2009), [arXiv:0908.0119](#).
- [24] M. Piani and J. Watrous, All entangled states are useful for channel discrimination, [Physical Review Letters](#) **102**, 250501 (2009).
- [25] W. Matthews, M. Piani, and J. Watrous, Entanglement in channel discrimination with restricted measurements, [Physical Review A](#) **82**, 032302 (2010).
- [26] D. Puzzioli and J. Watrous, Ancilla dimension in quantum channel discrimination, [Annales Henri Poincaré](#) **18**, 1153 (2017), [arXiv:1604.08197](#).
- [27] V. Katariya and M. M. Wilde, Evaluating the advantage of adaptive strategies for quantum

- channel distinguishability, *Physical Review A* **104**, 052406 (2021).
- [28] H.-C. Cheng, N. Datta, N. Liu, T. Nuradha, R. Salzmann, and M. M. Wilde, An invitation to the sample complexity of quantum hypothesis testing (2024), [arXiv:2403.17868v3](#).
- [29] T. Nuradha and M. M. Wilde, Contraction of private quantum channels and private quantum hypothesis testing, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **71**, 1851 (2025), [arXiv:2406.18651](#).
- [30] H. Cheng, C. Hirche, and C. Rouzé, Sample complexity of locally differentially private quantum hypothesis testing, in *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)* (2024) pp. 2921–2926, [arXiv:2406.18658](#).
- [31] C. Hirche, C. Rouzé, and D. S. França, Quantum differential privacy: An information theory perspective, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **69**, 5771 (2023).
- [32] T. Nuradha, Z. Goldfeld, and M. M. Wilde, Quantum pufferfish privacy: A flexible privacy framework for quantum systems, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **70**, 5731 (2024), [arXiv:2306.13054](#).
- [33] I. George, C. Hirche, T. Nuradha, and M. M. Wilde, Quantum doebelin coefficients: Interpretations and applications (2025), [arXiv:2503.22823](#).
- [34] X. Huang and L. Li, Query complexity of unitary operation discrimination, *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **604**, 127863 (2022).
- [35] A. Kawachi, K. Kawano, F. Le Gall, and S. Tamaki, Quantum query complexity of unitary operator discrimination, *IEICE TRANSACTIONS on Information and Systems* **102**, 483 (2019).
- [36] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and M. Roetteler, On the query complexity of perfect gate discrimination, in *8th Conference on the Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication and Cryptography (TQC 2013)* (Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2013) pp. 178–191.
- [37] Z. M. Rossi, J. Yu, I. L. Chuang, and S. Sugiura, Quantum advantage for noisy channel discrimination, *Physical Review A* **105**, 032401 (2022).
- [38] R. Ito and R. Mori, Lower bounds on the error probability of multiple quantum channel discrimination by the bures angle and the trace distance (2021), [arXiv:2107.03948](#).
- [39] L. Li, Sampling complexity of quantum channel discrimination, *Communications in Theoretical Physics* (2025).
- [40] D. Petz, Quasi-entropies for finite quantum systems, *Reports on Mathematical Physics* **23**, 57 (1986).
- [41] A. S. Holevo, On quasiequivalence of locally normal states, *Theoretical and Mathematical Physics* **13**, 1071 (1972).
- [42] M. Müller-Lennert, F. Dupuis, O. Szehr, S. Fehr, and M. Tomamichel, On quantum Rényi entropies: A new generalization and some properties, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **54**, 122203 (2013).
- [43] M. M. Wilde, A. Winter, and D. Yang, Strong converse for the classical capacity of entanglement-breaking and Hadamard channels via a sandwiched Rényi relative entropy, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **331**, 593 (2014).
- [44] R. L. Frank and E. H. Lieb, Monotonicity of a relative Rényi entropy, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **54**, 122201 (2013).
- [45] M. M. Wilde, Optimized quantum f -divergences and data processing, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **51**, 374002 (2018).
- [46] A. Uhlmann, The “transition probability” in the state space of a $*$ -algebra, *Reports on Math-*

- ematical Physics **9**, 273 (1976).
- [47] C. W. Helstrom, Minimum mean-squared error of estimates in quantum statistics, *Physics Letters A* **25**, 101 (1967).
 - [48] D. Bures, An extension of Kakutani's theorem on infinite product measures to the tensor product of semifinite ω^* -algebras, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **135**, 199 (1969).
 - [49] K. Matsumoto, A new quantum version of f-divergence, in *Nagoya Winter Workshop: Reality and Measurement in Algebraic Quantum Theory* (Springer, 2015) pp. 229–273.
 - [50] S. Khatri and M. M. Wilde, Principles of quantum communication theory: A modern approach (2024), [arXiv:2011.04672v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.04672v2).
 - [51] K. Matsumoto, Reverse test and quantum analogue of classical fidelity and generalized fidelity (2010), [arXiv:1006.0302](https://arxiv.org/abs/1006.0302).
 - [52] H. Umegaki, Conditional expectation in an operator algebra. IV. Entropy and information, *Kodai Mathematical Seminar Reports* **14**, 59 (1962).
 - [53] G. Lindblad, Completely positive maps and entropy inequalities, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **40**, 147 (1975).
 - [54] F. Leditzky, E. Kaur, N. Datta, and M. M. Wilde, Approaches for approximate additivity of the Holevo information of quantum channels, *Physical Review A* **97**, 012332 (2018), [1709.01111](https://arxiv.org/abs/1709.01111).
 - [55] V. Katariya and M. M. Wilde, Geometric distinguishability measures limit quantum channel estimation and discrimination, *Quantum Information Processing* **20**, 78 (2021).
 - [56] K. Matsumoto, Quantum fidelities, their duals, and convex analysis (2014), [arXiv:1408.3462](https://arxiv.org/abs/1408.3462) [quant-ph].
 - [57] S. Cree and J. Sikora, A fidelity measure for quantum states based on the matrix geometric mean (2020), [arXiv:2006.06918](https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.06918).
 - [58] K. Fang and H. Fawzi, Geometric Rényi divergence and its applications in quantum channel capacities, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **384**, 1615 (2021).
 - [59] Z. Huang, L. Lami, and M. M. Wilde, Exact quantum sensing limits for bosonic dephasing channels, *PRX Quantum* **5**, 020354 (2024).

Appendix A: Proof of Proposition 5

We first prove (48).

First condition: Assume that $\varepsilon \in [1/2, 1]$. The trivial strategy of guessing the channel uniformly at random achieves an error probability of $1/2$ (i.e., with $n = 1$, $Q = I/2$ in (34)). Thus, if $\varepsilon \in [1/2, 1]$, then the trivial strategy accomplishes the task with just a single access to the channel.

Second condition: Now assume that there exists $s \in [0, 1]$ such that $\varepsilon \geq p^s q^{1-s}$. With a single use of the channel, we can achieve the error probability $\frac{1}{2} (1 - \|p\rho_{R_1 B_1} - q\tau_{R_1 B_1}\|_1)$ for the initial state $\rho_{R_1 A_1}$, and by invoking [6, Theorem 1] with $A = p\rho_{R_1 B_1}$ and $B = q\tau_{R_1 B_1}$, we conclude that

$$\frac{1}{2} (1 - \|p\rho_{R_1 B_1} - q\tau_{R_1 B_1}\|_1) \leq p^s q^{1-s} \text{Tr}[\rho_{R_1 B_1}^s \tau_{R_1 B_1}^{1-s}] \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$\leq p^s q^{1-s} \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$\leq \varepsilon. \quad (\text{A3})$$

In the above, we used the Hölder inequality $|\text{Tr}[AB]| \leq \|A\|_r \|B\|_t$, which holds for $r, t \geq 1$, such that $r^{-1} + t^{-1} = 1$, to conclude that $\text{Tr}[\rho_{R_1 B_1}^s \tau_{R_1 B_1}^{1-s}] \leq 1$. That is, set $r = s^{-1}, t = (1-s)^{-1}$, $A = \rho_{R_1 B_1}$, and $B = \tau_{R_1 B_1}$. The last inequality follows by the assumption. So we conclude that only a single access to the channel is needed in this case also.

Third condition: Assume that $\exists \psi_{RA}$ such that $\text{supp}(\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}(\psi_{RA})) \cap \text{supp}(\mathcal{M}_{A \rightarrow B}(\psi_{RA})) = \emptyset$. In this case, choose the initial state to be $\rho_{R_1 A_1} = \psi_{RA}$. Then the minimum error evaluates to be $\frac{1}{2}(1 - \|p\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}(\psi_{RA}) - q\mathcal{M}_{A \rightarrow B}(\psi_{RA})\|_1)$. Since the supports of the two output states are disjoint, we get $\|p\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}(\psi_{RA}) - q\mathcal{M}_{A \rightarrow B}(\psi_{RA})\|_1 = p + q = 1$. Then, we achieve zero-error by following this procedure and the choice of the initial state with just one access of the channel, concluding the proof.

We finally prove (49). This follows because it is impossible to distinguish the states and the desired inequality $\frac{1}{2}(1 - \|p\rho_{R_n B_n} - q\tau_{R_n B_n}\|_1) \leq \varepsilon$ cannot be satisfied for any possible value of n . Indeed, in this case, since $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{M}$ we have $\rho_{R_n B_n} = \tau_{R_n B_n}$ and

$$\frac{1}{2}(1 - \|p\rho_{R_n B_n} - q\tau_{R_n B_n}\|_1) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - |p - q| \|\rho_{R_n B_n}\|_1) \quad (\text{A4})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}(1 - |p - (1-p)|) \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}(1 - |1 - 2p|) \quad (\text{A6})$$

$$= \min\{p, q\}. \quad (\text{A7})$$

Then, with the assumption $\min\{p, q\} \geq \varepsilon$, for all $n \in \mathcal{N}$, error probability is always greater than ε . Thus, (49) follows.

Appendix B: Proof of Theorem 6

Upper bound: We first set

$$n := \left\lceil \inf_{s \in [0,1]} \frac{\ln\left(\frac{p^s q^{1-s}}{\varepsilon}\right)}{C_s(\mathcal{N} \parallel \mathcal{M})} \right\rceil, \quad (\text{B1})$$

and let $s^* \in [0, 1]$ be the optimal value of s above.

With $C_s(\mathcal{N} \parallel \mathcal{M}) \geq 0$ due to $-\ln \text{Tr}[\rho^s \sigma^{1-s}] \geq 0$ for all states ρ and σ and $s \in [0, 1]$, then

$$n \geq \frac{\ln\left(\frac{p^{s^*} q^{1-s^*}}{\varepsilon}\right)}{C_{s^*}(\mathcal{N} \parallel \mathcal{M})} \quad (\text{B2})$$

$$\Leftrightarrow n C_{s^*}(\mathcal{N} \parallel \mathcal{M}) \geq \ln(p^{s^*} q^{1-s^*}) - \ln \varepsilon \quad (\text{B3})$$

$$\Leftrightarrow -\inf_{\rho_{RA}} \ln \text{Tr} \left[((\mathcal{N}(\rho_{RA}))^{\otimes n})^{s^*} ((\mathcal{M}(\rho_{RA}))^{\otimes n})^{1-s^*} \right] - \ln(p^{s^*} q^{1-s^*}) \geq -\ln \varepsilon \quad (\text{B4})$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \inf_{\rho_{RA}} \text{Tr} \left[(p(\mathcal{N}(\rho_{RA}))^{\otimes n})^{s^*} (q(\mathcal{M}(\rho_{RA}))^{\otimes n})^{1-s^*} \right] \leq \varepsilon. \quad (\text{B5})$$

Now applying quantum Chernoff bound in [6, Theorem 1] with $A = p\rho^{\otimes n}$ and $B = q\sigma^{\otimes n}$, we conclude that

$$\varepsilon \geq \inf_{\rho_{RA}} \text{Tr} \left[(p\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}(\rho_{RA}^{\otimes n})^{\otimes n})^{s^*} (q\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}(\rho_{RA}^{\otimes n})^{\otimes n})^{1-s^*} \right] \quad (\text{B6})$$

$$\geq \inf_{\rho_{RA}} \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \|p\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}(\rho_{RA}^{\otimes n}) - q\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}(\rho_{RA}^{\otimes n})\|_1 \right). \quad (\text{B7})$$

Consider that

$$p_e(p, \mathcal{N}, q, \mathcal{M}, n) = \inf_{\{Q, \mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \|p\rho_{R_n B_n} - q\tau_{R_n B_n}\|_1 \right). \quad (\text{B8})$$

Choosing n copies of the input state and passing it through channel \mathcal{N} or \mathcal{M} in its n uses, the final state before the measurement is applied evaluates to be either of these states ($\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}(\rho_{RA}^{\otimes n})$ or $\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}(\rho_{RA}^{\otimes n})$). This is one strategy that is included in the set of all adaptive strategies. This leads to the following upper bound:

$$p_e(p, \mathcal{N}, q, \mathcal{M}, n) \leq \inf_{\rho_{RA}} \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \|p\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}(\rho_{RA}^{\otimes n}) - q\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}(\rho_{RA}^{\otimes n})\|_1 \right). \quad (\text{B9})$$

The choice of n in (B1) thus satisfies the constraint (44) in Definition 2, and since the optimal query complexity cannot exceed this choice, this concludes our proof of the upper bound in (51).

Lower Bound 1: Let us consider the case where

$$\varepsilon \geq p_e(p, \mathcal{N}, q, \mathcal{M}, n) = \inf_{\{\mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \|p\rho_{R_n B_n} - q\tau_{R_n B_n}\|_1 \right). \quad (\text{B10})$$

Applying the fact that

$$\|p\rho - q\sigma\|_1^2 \leq 1 - 4pqF(\rho, \sigma), \quad (\text{B11})$$

we arrive at

$$\inf_{\{\mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \|p\rho_{R_n B_n} - q\tau_{R_n B_n}\|_1 \right) \geq \inf_{\{\mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} \frac{2pqF(\rho_{R_n B_n}, \tau_{R_n B_n})}{1 + \|p\rho_{R_n B_n} - q\tau_{R_n B_n}\|_1} \quad (\text{B12})$$

$$\geq \inf_{\{\mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} pqF(\rho_{R_n B_n}, \tau_{R_n B_n}) \quad (\text{B13})$$

$$\geq \inf_{\{\mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} pq\widehat{F}(\rho_{R_n B_n}, \tau_{R_n B_n}), \quad (\text{B14})$$

where the last inequality follows because $\widehat{F} \leq F$.

Recall that, for $1 \leq i \leq n$,

$$\rho_{R_i B_i} := \mathcal{N}_{A_i \rightarrow B_i}(\rho_{R_i A_i}), \quad (\text{B15})$$

$$\tau_{R_i B_i} := \mathcal{M}_{A_i \rightarrow B_i}(\tau_{R_i A_i}), \quad (\text{B16})$$

and

$$\rho_{R_{i+1} A_{i+1}} := (\mathcal{A}_{R_i B_i \rightarrow R_{i+1} A_{i+1}}^{(i)} \circ \mathcal{N}_{A_i \rightarrow B_i})(\rho_{R_i A_i}), \quad (\text{B17})$$

$$\tau_{R_{i+1} A_{i+1}} := (\mathcal{A}_{R_i B_i \rightarrow R_{i+1} A_{i+1}}^{(i)} \circ \mathcal{M}_{A_i \rightarrow B_i})(\tau_{R_i A_i}), \quad (\text{B18})$$

for every $1 \leq i < n$. With the above notation, and by using the chain rule for geometric fidelity in (22), we have that

$$\widehat{F}(\rho_{R_n B_n}, \tau_{R_n B_n}) = \widehat{F}(\mathcal{N}_{A_n \rightarrow B_n}(\rho_{R_n A_n}), \mathcal{M}_{A_n \rightarrow B_n}(\rho_{R_n A_n})) \quad (\text{B19})$$

$$\geq \widehat{F}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) \widehat{F}(\rho_{R_n A_n}, \tau_{R_n A_n}). \quad (\text{B20})$$

Then using the data processing of geometric fidelity under the channel $\mathcal{A}_{R_{n-1}B_{n-1} \rightarrow R_n A_n}^{(n-1)}$, we have that

$$\widehat{F}(\rho_{R_n A_n}, \tau_{R_n A_n}) \geq \widehat{F}(\mathcal{N}_{A_{n-1} \rightarrow B_{n-1}}(\rho_{R_{n-1} A_{n-1}}), \mathcal{M}_{A_{n-1} \rightarrow B_{n-1}}(\tau_{R_{n-1} A_{n-1}})). \quad (\text{B21})$$

Proceeding with the application of the chain rule and the data processing under the adaptive channels for $n - 1$ times, we obtain

$$\widehat{F}(\rho_{R_n B_n}, \tau_{R_n B_n}) \geq \left(\widehat{F}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) \right)^{n-1} \widehat{F}(\rho_{R_1 B_1}, \tau_{R_1 B_1}) \quad (\text{B22})$$

$$= \left(\widehat{F}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) \right)^{n-1} \widehat{F}(\mathcal{N}_{A_1 \rightarrow B_1}(\rho_{R_1 A_1}), \mathcal{M}_{A_1 \rightarrow B_1}(\tau_{R_1 A_1})). \quad (\text{B23})$$

Combining the above inequality with (B14), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\{\mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} \frac{1}{2} (1 - \|p\rho_{R_n B_n} - q\tau_{R_n B_n}\|_1) \\ & \geq pq \left(\widehat{F}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) \right)^{n-1} \inf_{\{\mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} \widehat{F}(\mathcal{N}_{A_1 \rightarrow B_1}(\rho_{R_1 A_1}), \mathcal{M}_{A_1 \rightarrow B_1}(\tau_{R_1 A_1})) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B24})$$

$$= pq \left(\widehat{F}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) \right)^n, \quad (\text{B25})$$

where the last equality follows by the definition of channel fidelity with the choice \widehat{F} in (19).

With the above together with the error constraint in (B10), we conclude the proof of the first lower bound.

Lower bound 2: Using [28, Eq. (F13)], we have that

$$\|p\rho - q\sigma\|_1^2 \leq 1 - 4pqF(\rho, \sigma) \quad (\text{B26})$$

$$\leq 1 - 4pq + 4pq [d_B(\rho, \sigma)]^2 \quad (\text{B27})$$

$$\leq 1 - 4pq + 4pq \left[\widehat{d}_B(\rho, \sigma) \right]^2 \quad (\text{B28})$$

$$= 1 - 4pq + 8pq \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{\left[\widehat{d}_B(\rho, \sigma) \right]^2}{2} \right) \right), \quad (\text{B29})$$

where the third inequality follows by $\widehat{F} \leq F$.

Rewriting (B10) by algebraic manipulations, we get

$$(1 - 2\varepsilon)^2 \leq \sup_{\{\mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} \|p\rho_{R_n B_n} - q\tau_{R_n B_n}\|_1^2 \quad (\text{B30})$$

$$\leq 1 - 4pq + 8pq \left(1 - \inf_{\{\mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} \left(1 - \frac{\left[\widehat{d}_B(\rho_{R_n B_n}, \tau_{R_n B_n}) \right]^2}{2} \right) \right) \quad (\text{B31})$$

$$\leq 1 - 4pq + 8pq \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{[\widehat{d}_B(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M})]^2}{2} \right)^n \right) \quad (\text{B32})$$

$$\leq 1 - 4pq + 4pqn [\widehat{d}_B(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M})]^2, \quad (\text{B33})$$

where the last inequality follows from $1 - (1 - x)^n \leq nx$ for $0 \leq x \leq 1$. Now, we prove the penultimate inequality: first observe that

$$1 - \frac{[\widehat{d}_B(\rho, \sigma)]^2}{2} = \widehat{F}(\rho, \sigma). \quad (\text{B34})$$

This relation is also true for the channel variants

$$1 - \frac{[\widehat{d}_B(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M})]^2}{2} = \widehat{F}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}). \quad (\text{B35})$$

Using (B23), we have that

$$\widehat{F}(\rho_{R_n B_n}, \tau_{R_n B_n}) \geq \left(\widehat{F}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) \right)^{n-1} \widehat{F}(\mathcal{N}_{A_1 \rightarrow B_1}(\rho_{R_1 A_1}), \mathcal{M}_{A_1 \rightarrow B_1}(\tau_{R_1 A_1})) \quad (\text{B36})$$

$$\geq \left(\widehat{F}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}) \right)^n \quad (\text{B37})$$

$$= \left(1 - \frac{[\widehat{d}_B(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M})]^2}{2} \right)^n, \quad (\text{B38})$$

where the last inequality follows by the definition of channel fidelities in (19), and the last equality by (B35). With that, we prove that

$$\inf_{\{\mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} \left(1 - \frac{[\widehat{d}_B(\rho_{R_n B_n}, \tau_{R_n B_n})]^2}{2} \right) \geq \left(1 - \frac{[\widehat{d}_B(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M})]^2}{2} \right)^n. \quad (\text{B39})$$

This completes the proof of (B33).

By rearranging terms in (B33), we obtain that

$$n \geq \frac{(1 - 2\varepsilon)^2 - (1 - 4pq)}{4pq [\widehat{d}_B(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M})]^2} \quad (\text{B40})$$

$$\geq \frac{pq - \varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon)}{pq [\widehat{d}_B(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M})]^2}, \quad (\text{B41})$$

which concludes the proof of the lower bound.

Appendix C: Proof of Theorem 9

Lower bound:

Let $\alpha \in (1, 2]$. Then, by the data-processing inequality for the geometric Rényi divergence under the measurement channel (comprised of the POVM elements $Q, I - Q$)

$$\widehat{D}_\alpha(\rho \| \tau) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln(\text{Tr}[Q\rho]^\alpha \text{Tr}[Q\tau]^{1-\alpha} + \text{Tr}[(I - Q)\rho]^\alpha + \text{Tr}[(I - Q)\tau]^{1-\alpha}) \quad (\text{C1})$$

$$\geq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \ln \text{Tr}[Q\rho] - \ln \text{Tr}[Q\tau]. \quad (\text{C2})$$

Let $\rho = \rho_{R_n B_n}$, $\tau = \tau_{R_n B_n}$ with the constraint that $\text{Tr}[Q_{R_n B_n} \rho_{R_n B_n}] \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. Then, the above inequality can be rewritten as

$$\widehat{D}_\alpha(\rho_{R_n B_n} \| \tau_{R_n B_n}) \geq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \ln(1 - \varepsilon) - \ln \text{Tr}[Q_{R_n B_n} \tau_{R_n B_n}] \quad (\text{C3})$$

From here, let us optimize over all $\{Q, \mathcal{A}\}$ and $\rho_{R_1 A_1}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\{Q, \mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} \widehat{D}_\alpha(\rho_{R_n B_n} \| \tau_{R_n B_n}) \\ & \geq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \ln(1 - \varepsilon) - \ln \inf_{\{Q, \mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} \{\text{Tr}[Q_{R_n B_n} \tau_{R_n B_n}] : \text{Tr}[Q_{R_n B_n} \rho_{R_n B_n}] \geq 1 - \varepsilon\} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C4})$$

$$= \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \ln(1 - \varepsilon) - \ln \beta_\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}^{(n)} \| \mathcal{M}^{(n)}). \quad (\text{C5})$$

By assuming $\beta_\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}^{(n)} \| \mathcal{M}^{(n)}) \leq \delta$, we also have that

$$\sup_{\{Q, \mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} \widehat{D}_\alpha(\rho_{R_n B_n} \| \tau_{R_n B_n}) \geq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \ln(1 - \varepsilon) - \ln \delta \quad (\text{C6})$$

$$= \ln \left(\frac{(1 - \varepsilon)^\alpha}{\delta} \right), \quad (\text{C7})$$

where α' is defined in the statement of Theorem 9.

By using the chain rule for the geometric Rényi divergence in (21), we have that

$$\widehat{D}_\alpha(\rho_{R_n B_n} \| \tau_{R_n B_n}) = \widehat{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}_{A_n \rightarrow B_n}(\rho_{R_n A_n}) \| \mathcal{M}_{A_n \rightarrow B_n}(\rho_{R_n A_n})) \quad (\text{C8})$$

$$\leq \widehat{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N} \| \mathcal{M}) + \widehat{D}_\alpha(\rho_{R_n A_n} \| \tau_{R_n A_n}). \quad (\text{C9})$$

Then using the data-processing inequality for the geometric Rényi divergence under the channel $\mathcal{A}_{R_{n-1} B_{n-1} \rightarrow R_n A_n}^{(n-1)}$, we have that

$$\widehat{D}_\alpha(\rho_{R_n A_n} \| \tau_{R_n A_n}) \leq \widehat{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}_{A_{n-1} \rightarrow B_{n-1}}(\rho_{R_{n-1} A_{n-1}}) \| \mathcal{M}_{A_{n-1} \rightarrow B_{n-1}}(\tau_{R_{n-1} A_{n-1}})). \quad (\text{C10})$$

Proceeding with the application of the chain rule and the data-processing inequality under the adaptive channels for $n - 1$ times, we obtain

$$\widehat{D}_\alpha(\rho_{R_n B_n} \| \tau_{R_n B_n}) \leq (n - 1) \widehat{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N} \| \mathcal{M}) + \widehat{D}_\alpha(\rho_{R_1 B_1} \| \tau_{R_1 B_1}) \quad (\text{C11})$$

$$= (n - 1) \widehat{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N} \| \mathcal{M}) + \widehat{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}_{A_1 \rightarrow B_1}(\rho_{R_1 A_1}) \| \mathcal{M}_{A_1 \rightarrow B_1}(\tau_{R_1 A_1})) \quad (\text{C12})$$

$$\leq n\widehat{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}), \quad (\text{C13})$$

where the last inequality follows by the definition of the channel variant of the geometric Rényi divergence obtained by replacing \mathbf{D} in (18) with \widehat{D}_α .

Combining (C7) and (C13), we arrive at the following for all $\alpha \in (1, 2)$:

$$n\widehat{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) \geq \ln\left(\frac{(1-\varepsilon)^{\alpha'}}{\delta}\right), \quad (\text{C14})$$

which leads to

$$n \geq \sup_{\alpha \in (1, 2)} \frac{\ln\left(\frac{(1-\varepsilon)^{\alpha'}}{\delta}\right)}{\widehat{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})}. \quad (\text{C15})$$

The other lower bound is obtained by switching the roles of \mathcal{N} with \mathcal{M} , and ε with δ with the use of the fact

$$n^*(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}, \varepsilon, \delta) := \inf \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \beta_\delta(\mathcal{M}^{(n)}\|\mathcal{N}^{(n)}) \leq \varepsilon\} \quad (\text{C16})$$

as given in (46).

Upper bound: By [28, Lemma 20], for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, we have that

$$-\ln \inf_Q \{\text{Tr}[Q\sigma] : \text{Tr}[Q\rho] \geq 1 - \varepsilon\} \geq D_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) + \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \ln\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right). \quad (\text{C17})$$

With that for our setup, let us consider $\rho = \rho_{R_n B_n}$ and $\sigma = \tau_{R_n B_n}$ and $Q = Q_{R_n B_n}$ and supremize over all adaptive strategies $\{Q, \mathcal{A}\}$ and input states $\rho_{R_1 A_1}$ to obtain

$$-\ln \beta_\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}^{(n)}\|\mathcal{M}^{(n)}) = -\ln \inf_{\{Q, \mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} \{\text{Tr}[Q_{R_n B_n} \tau_{R_n B_n}] : \text{Tr}[Q_{R_n B_n} \rho_{R_n B_n}] \geq 1 - \varepsilon\} \quad (\text{C18})$$

$$\geq \sup_{\{Q, \mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} D_\alpha(\rho_{R_n B_n}\|\tau_{R_n B_n}) + \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \ln\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right). \quad (\text{C19})$$

Consider a product strategy, where we discriminate between the states $[\mathcal{N}(\rho_{RA})]^{\otimes n}$ and $[\mathcal{M}(\rho_{RA})]^{\otimes n}$ with the input state being ρ_{RA} and optimizing over such strategies with different input states is included in the set of all possible strategies. This provides the following lower bound:

$$\sup_{\{Q, \mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} D_\alpha(\rho_{R_n B_n}\|\tau_{R_n B_n}) \geq \sup_{\{Q, \mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{RA}} D_\alpha([\mathcal{N}(\rho_{RA})]^{\otimes n}\|[\mathcal{M}(\rho_{RA})]^{\otimes n}) \quad (\text{C20})$$

$$= n \cdot \sup_{\{Q, \mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{RA}} D_\alpha(\mathcal{N}(\rho_{RA})\|\mathcal{M}(\rho_{RA})), \quad (\text{C21})$$

where the last equality follows by the additivity of the Petz-Rényi relative entropy.

Combining (C19) and (C21), we have that

$$-\ln \beta_\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}^{(n)}\|\mathcal{M}^{(n)}) \geq n \cdot \sup_{\{Q, \mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{RA}} D_\alpha(\mathcal{N}(\rho_{RA})\|\mathcal{M}(\rho_{RA})) + \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \ln\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right), \quad (\text{C22})$$

for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

Using that, with the choice

$$n \geq \inf_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \left(\frac{\ln\left(\frac{\varepsilon^{\alpha'}}{\delta}\right)}{D_\alpha(\mathcal{N} \parallel \mathcal{M})} \right), \quad (\text{C23})$$

we have that $\beta_\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}^{(n)} \parallel \mathcal{M}^{(n)}) \leq \delta$. Then, the optimum number of channel uses with this strategy is

$$n = \left\lceil \inf_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \left(\frac{\ln\left(\frac{\varepsilon^{\alpha'}}{\delta}\right)}{D_\alpha(\mathcal{N} \parallel \mathcal{M})} \right) \right\rceil, \quad (\text{C24})$$

which leads to

$$n^*(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}, \varepsilon, \delta) \leq \left\lceil \inf_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \left(\frac{\ln\left(\frac{\varepsilon^{\alpha'}}{\delta}\right)}{D_\alpha(\mathcal{N} \parallel \mathcal{M})} \right) \right\rceil. \quad (\text{C25})$$

Appendix D: Proof of Theorem 10

Lower bound: Recall (38), so that

$$p_e(\mathcal{S}, n) := \inf_{\{Q, \mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} \sum_{m=1}^M p_m \text{Tr}[(I_{R_n B_n} - Q_{R_n B_n}^m) \rho_{R_n B_n}^m], \quad (\text{D1})$$

where Q denotes a POVM $(Q_{R_n B_n}^1, \dots, Q_{R_n B_n}^M)$ satisfying $Q_{R_n B_n}^m \geq 0$ for all $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ and $\sum_{m=1}^M Q_{R_n B_n}^m = I_{R_n B_n}$.

For $1 \leq m \neq \tilde{m} \leq M$, choose $L_{R_n B_n}$ and $T_{R_n B_n}$ to be positive semi-definite operators satisfying $L_{R_n B_n} + T_{R_n B_n} = I_{R_n B_n} - Q_{R_n B_n}^m - Q_{R_n B_n}^{\tilde{m}}$. With that, define $\tilde{Q}_{R_n B_n}^m := Q_{R_n B_n}^m + L_{R_n B_n}$ and $\tilde{Q}_{R_n B_n}^{\tilde{m}} := Q_{R_n B_n}^{\tilde{m}} + T_{R_n B_n}$, so that we have $\tilde{Q}_{R_n B_n}^m + \tilde{Q}_{R_n B_n}^{\tilde{m}} = I$.

Consider

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m=1}^M p_m \text{Tr}[(I_{R_n B_n} - Q_{R_n B_n}^m) \rho_{R_n B_n}^m] \\ & \geq p_m \text{Tr}[(I_{R_n B_n} - Q_{R_n B_n}^m) \rho_{R_n B_n}^m] + p_{\tilde{m}} \text{Tr}[(I_{R_n B_n} - Q_{R_n B_n}^{\tilde{m}}) \rho_{R_n B_n}^{\tilde{m}}] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D2})$$

$$\geq p_m \text{Tr}[(I_{R_n B_n} - \tilde{Q}_{R_n B_n}^m) \rho_{R_n B_n}^m] + p_{\tilde{m}} \text{Tr}[(I_{R_n B_n} - \tilde{Q}_{R_n B_n}^{\tilde{m}}) \rho_{R_n B_n}^{\tilde{m}}] \quad (\text{D3})$$

$$= (p_m + p_{\tilde{m}}) \left(\frac{p_m}{p_m + p_{\tilde{m}}} \text{Tr}[(I_{R_n B_n} - \tilde{Q}_{R_n B_n}^m) \rho_{R_n B_n}^m] + \frac{p_{\tilde{m}}}{p_m + p_{\tilde{m}}} \text{Tr}[(I_{R_n B_n} - \tilde{Q}_{R_n B_n}^{\tilde{m}}) \rho_{R_n B_n}^{\tilde{m}}] \right) \quad (\text{D4})$$

$$\geq (p_m + p_{\tilde{m}}) \inf_{\{\tilde{Q}, \mathcal{A}\}, \rho_{R_1 A_1}} \left(\frac{p_m}{p_m + p_{\tilde{m}}} \text{Tr}[\tilde{Q}_{R_n B_n} \rho_{R_n B_n}^m] + \frac{p_{\tilde{m}}}{p_m + p_{\tilde{m}}} \text{Tr}[(I_{R_n B_n} - \tilde{Q}_{R_n B_n}) \rho_{R_n B_n}^{\tilde{m}}] \right) \quad (\text{D5})$$

$$\geq \frac{p_m p_{\tilde{m}}}{p_m + p_{\tilde{m}}} \left(\hat{F}(\mathcal{N}^m, \mathcal{N}^{\tilde{m}}) \right)^n, \quad (\text{D6})$$

where the second inequality follows by the explicit construction of \tilde{Q} so that $Q_{R_n B_n}^i \leq \tilde{Q}_{R_n B_n}^i$ for $i \in \{m, \tilde{m}\}$ and the last inequality by applying (B25).

By optimizing the left-hand side over all $\{Q, \mathcal{A}\}$ and $\rho_{R_1 A_1}$ and imposing the constraint on the error, we have that

$$\varepsilon \geq p_e(\mathcal{S}, n) \quad (\text{D7})$$

$$\geq \frac{p_m p_{\tilde{m}}}{p_m + p_{\tilde{m}}} \left(\widehat{F}(\mathcal{N}^m, \mathcal{N}^{\tilde{m}}) \right)^n. \quad (\text{D8})$$

Rearranging the terms in the above inequality and maximizing over all arbitrary pairs m, \tilde{m} such that $1 \leq m \neq \tilde{m} \leq M$ concludes the proof of the desired lower bound.

Upper bound: By employing the product strategy of discriminating the following states $\{(\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^m(\rho_{RA}))^{\otimes n}\}_m$ with the initial state ρ_{RA} , we have that

$$p_e(\mathcal{S}, n) \leq \inf_{Q, \rho_{RA}} \sum_{m=1}^M p_m \text{Tr}[(I_{R_n B_n} - Q_{R_n B_n}^m) (\mathcal{N}^m(\rho_{RA}))^{\otimes n}] \quad (\text{D9})$$

$$\leq \inf_{Q, \rho_{RA}} \frac{1}{2} M(M-1) \max_{\tilde{m} \neq m} \sqrt{p_m} \sqrt{p_{\tilde{m}}} \sqrt{F}(\mathcal{N}^m(\rho_{RA}), \mathcal{N}^{\tilde{m}}(\rho_{RA})) \quad (\text{D10})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} M(M-1) \max_{\tilde{m} \neq m} \sqrt{p_m} \sqrt{p_{\tilde{m}}} \sqrt{F}(\mathcal{N}^m, \mathcal{N}^{\tilde{m}}), \quad (\text{D11})$$

where the second inequality follows by applying [28, Eq.(J8)] to this setting and the last equality by the definition of channel fidelities in (19) with the choice F .

Then, by choosing

$$n \geq \max_{m \neq \tilde{m}} \frac{2 \ln \left(\frac{M(M-1) \sqrt{p_m} \sqrt{p_{\tilde{m}}}}{2\varepsilon} \right)}{-\ln F(\mathcal{N}^m, \mathcal{N}^{\tilde{m}})}, \quad (\text{D12})$$

we obtain that $p_e(\mathcal{S}, n) \leq \varepsilon$ using (D11). The optimum n to choose with this strategy would be

$$n = \left\lceil \max_{m \neq \tilde{m}} \frac{2 \ln \left(\frac{M(M-1) \sqrt{p_m} \sqrt{p_{\tilde{m}}}}{2\varepsilon} \right)}{-\ln F(\mathcal{N}^m, \mathcal{N}^{\tilde{m}})} \right\rceil. \quad (\text{D13})$$

With this, we conclude that

$$n^*(\mathcal{S}, \varepsilon) \leq \left\lceil \max_{m \neq \tilde{m}} \frac{2 \ln \left(\frac{M(M-1) \sqrt{p_m} \sqrt{p_{\tilde{m}}}}{2\varepsilon} \right)}{-\ln F(\mathcal{N}^m, \mathcal{N}^{\tilde{m}})} \right\rceil. \quad (\text{D14})$$