Error exponents of quantum state discrimination with composite correlated hypotheses

Kun Fang *[1]

[1]School of Data Science, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, Guangdong, 518172, China

August 19, 2025

Abstract

We study the error exponents in quantum hypothesis testing between two sets of quantum states, extending the analysis beyond the independent and identically distributed case to encompass composite and correlated hypotheses. We introduce and compare two natural extensions of the quantum Hoeffding divergence and anti-divergence to sets of quantum states, establishing their equivalence or quantitative relationships. Our main results generalize the quantum Hoeffding bound to stable sequences of convex, compact sets of quantum states, demonstrating that the optimal type-I error exponent—under an exponential constraint on the type-II error—is precisely characterized by the regularized quantum Hoeffding divergence between the sets. In the strong converse regime, we provide a lower bound on the exponent in terms of the regularized quantum Hoeffding anti-divergence. These findings refine the generalized quantum Stein's lemma and yield a detailed understanding of the trade-off between type-I and type-II errors in discrimination with composite correlated hypotheses.

Contents

*kunfang@cuhk.edu.cn

1 Introduction

1.1 Quantum hypothesis testing between two quantum states

Distinguishability is a central topic in information theory from both theoretical and practical perspectives. A fundamental framework for studying distinguishability is *asymmetric hypothesis testing*. In this setting, a source generates a sample x from one of two probability distributions $p \equiv \{p(x)\}_{x\in\mathcal{X}}$ or $q \equiv \{q(x)\}_{x\in\mathcal{X}}$. The objective of asymmetric hypothesis testing is to minimize the Type-II error (decides p when the fact is q) while keeping the Type-I error (decides q when the fact is p) within a certain threshold. The celebrated Chernoff-Stein's Lemma [Che52] states that, for any constant bound on the Type-I error, the optimal Type-II error decays exponentially fast in the number of samples, and the decay rate is exactly the relative entropy,

$$D(p\|q) = \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} p(x)[\log p(x) - \log q(x)]. \tag{1}$$

In particular, this lemma also states the "strong converse property", a desirable mathematical property in information theory [Wol78] that delineates a sharp boundary for the tradeoff between the Type-I and Type-II errors in the asymptotic regime: any possible scheme with Type-II error decaying to zero with an exponent larger than the relative entropy will result in the Type-I error converging to one in the asymptotic limit. Therefore, the Chernoff-Stein's Lemma provides a rigorous operational interpretation of the relative entropy and establishes a crucial connection between hypothesis testing and information theory [Bla74].

A natural question is whether the above result generalizes to the quantum case. Substantial efforts have been made to answer this fundamental question in quantum information community (see, e.g., [HP91, NO00, Hay02, ANSV08b, Hay07, BP10, CMW16, MO15, WW19a, WW19b, FFF25, FFF24]). Consider the problem of distinguishing between two quantum hypotheses: the system is prepared either in state ρ_n (the null hypothesis) or in state σ_n (the alternative hypothesis). Operationally, the discrimination is carried out using a two-outcome positive operator-valued measure (POVM) $\{M_n, I - M_n\}$, with $0 \le M_n \le I$. The type-I and type-II errors are, respectively, given by

$$\text{(Type-I)} \quad \alpha(\rho_n, M_n) := \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_n(I - M_n)], \qquad \text{(Type-II)} \quad \beta(\sigma_n, M_n) := \mathrm{Tr}[\sigma_n M_n]. \tag{2}$$

It is generally impossible to find a quantum measurement that simultaneously makes both errors vanish; thus, one studies the asymptotic behavior of α and β as $n \to \infty$, expecting a trade-off between minimizing α and minimizing β. The interplay between these errors can be analyzed in various operational regimes (see Figure 1): (I) the Stein's exponent regime, which focuses on the exponential decay rate of the type-II error when the type-I error is constrained below a constant threshold; (II) the error exponent regime, which investigates the exponential rate at which the type-I error vanishes when the type-II error is required to decay exponentially at a prescribed rate; and (III) the strong converse exponent regime, which examines the exponential rate at which the type-I error converges to one when the type-II error decays exponentially at a given rate.



Figure 1: Illustration depicting different regimes of quantum hypothesis testing. Each curve represents the tradeoff between the Type-I and Type-II errors for varying block lengths, with darker lines corresponding to longer block lengths. (I) represents the Stein's exponent regime, (II) represents the error exponent regime, and (III) represents the strong converse exponent regime.

Stein's exponent. In asymmetric hypothesis testing, one aims to minimize the type-II error while keeping the type-I error below a certain threshold $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. The optimal type-II error is given by

$$\beta_\varepsilon(\rho_n\|\sigma_n) := \min_{0\le M_n\le I}\{\beta(\sigma_n,M_n) : \alpha(\rho_n,M_n)\le\varepsilon\}. \tag{3}$$

The quantum version of the Chernoff-Stein's Lemma (also known as quantum Stein's lemma) states that the optimal type-II error decays exponentially with the number of copies n of the states when the type-I error is restricted below a constant threshold and the optimal exponent is given by the quantum relative entropy [HP91, NO00],

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log\beta_\varepsilon(\rho^{\otimes n}\|\sigma^{\otimes n}) = D(\rho\|\sigma), \quad \forall\varepsilon\in(0,1), \tag{4}$$

where $D(\rho\|\sigma) := \mathrm{Tr}[\rho(\log\rho-\log\sigma)]$.

Error expoent. As a refinement of the quantum Stein's lemma, one can study the optimal type-I error given that the type-II error decays with a given exponential speed. One is then interested in the asymptotics of the optimal Type-I error,

$$\alpha_{n,r}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n) := \min_{0\le M_n\le I}\{\alpha(\rho_n,M_n) : \beta(\sigma_n,M_n)\le 2^{-nr}\}, \tag{5}$$

with $r>0$ a constant. When $r<D(\rho\|\sigma)$, the optimal type-I error $\alpha_{n,r}(\rho^{\otimes n}\|\sigma^{\otimes n})$, also decays with an exponential speed, as was shown in [OH04]. The exact decay rate is determined by the quantum Hoeffding bound theorem [Hay07, Nag06, ANSV08a] as

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log\alpha_{n,r}(\rho^{\otimes n},\sigma^{\otimes n}) = H_r(\rho\|\sigma), \tag{6}$$

where the quantum Hoeffding divergence is defined as

$$H_r(\rho\|\sigma) := \sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)}\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(r - D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\rho\|\sigma)\right), \tag{7}$$

and $D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}$ is the Petz Rényi divergence.

Strong converse exponent. On the other hand, when $r > D(\rho\|\sigma)$, the optimal type-I error $\alpha_{n,r}(\rho^{\otimes n}\|\sigma^{\otimes n})$ goes to 1 exponentially fast [NO00]. The rate of this convergence is [MO15]

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log(1-\alpha_{n,r}(\rho^{\otimes n}\|\sigma^{\otimes n})) = H_r^*(\rho\|\sigma), \tag{8}$$

where the Hoeffding anti-divergence is defined as

$$H_r^*(\rho\|\sigma) := \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(r - D_{\mathrm{s},\alpha}(\rho\|\sigma)\right), \tag{9}$$

and $D_{\mathrm{s},\alpha}$ is the sandwiched Rényi divergence.

The results in Eq. (6) and Eq. (8) provide a comprehensive characterization of the asymptotic trade-off between the type-I and type-II error probabilities. In particular, the quantum Stein's lemma emerges as a special case in the limit $r \to D(\rho\|\sigma)$.

1.2 Quantum hypothesis testing between two sets of quantum states

The quantum hypothesis testing problem has recently been extended to encompass composite and correlated settings [FFF24], moving beyond the traditional i.i.d. framework. In this generalized scenario, one considers the task of discriminating between two sets of quantum states. Specifically, a tester receives samples prepared according to either the set $\mathscr{A}_n$ (the null hypothesis) or the set $\mathscr{B}_n$ (the alternative hypothesis), and must determine, via quantum measurement, from which set the samples were drawn.

As in standard hypothesis testing, two types of errors can occur: a type-I error, where a sample from $\mathscr{A}_n$ is incorrectly classified as coming from $\mathscr{B}_n$, and a type-II error, where a sample from $\mathscr{B}_n$ is incorrectly classified as coming from $\mathscr{A}_n$. Consider distinguish the sets by a quantum measurement $\{M_n, I - M_n\}$. Since we aim to control the discrimination errors for any state within the given sets, regardless of which one is drawn, the type-I error is defined by

$$\alpha(\mathscr{A}_n, M_n) := \sup_{\rho_n\in\mathscr{A}_n} \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_n(I-M_n)], \tag{10}$$

and the type-II error is defined by

$$\beta(\mathscr{B}_n, M_n) := \sup_{\sigma_n\in\mathscr{B}_n} \mathrm{Tr}[\sigma_n M_n]. \tag{11}$$

The quantum Stein's lemma has been shown in this worst-case setting under some structural assumptions on the sets $\mathscr{A}_n$ and $\mathscr{B}_n$ [FFF24],

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log\beta_\varepsilon(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) = D^\infty(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}), \quad \forall\varepsilon\in(0,1), \tag{12}$$

where the quantum relative entropy between two sets of states is defined as $D(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) := \inf_{\rho_n\in\mathscr{A}_n,\sigma_n\in\mathscr{B}_n} D(\rho_n\|\sigma_n)$ and $D^\infty(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) := \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}D(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)$.

1.3 Main results

In this work, we refine the analysis of asymmetric hypothesis testing for composite and correlated hypotheses, as developed in [HY24, Lam25, FFF24], by extending it to the error exponent and strong converse exponent regimes. Specifically, we consider the optimal type-I error:

$$\alpha_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) := \min_{0\le M_n\le I}\left\{\alpha(\mathscr{A}_n, M_n) : \beta(\mathscr{B}_n, M_n) \le 2^{-nr}\right\}, \tag{13}$$

and seek to determine the following asymptotic exponents:

$$\text{(Error exponent)} \qquad \liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) \quad = \quad ? \tag{14}$$

$$\text{(Strong converse exponent)} \qquad \liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log(1-\alpha_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)) = \quad ? \tag{15}$$

A central challenge in composite hypothesis testing is to define suitable notions of the quantum Hoeffding divergence and anti-divergence for sets of quantum states.

For the error exponent regime, we explore two natural approaches to this extension (see Figure 2). The first treats the Hoeffding divergence as a quantum divergence and considers the minimal divergence between the sets, denoted $H_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)$. The second approach uses the explicit formula for the Hoeffding divergence in terms of the Petz Rényi divergences: we first extend the Rényi divergences to sets of quantum states, $D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)$, and then define the Hoeffding divergence accordingly, denoted $\mathfrak{H}_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)$. We show that these two approaches are equivalent for finite n in general, and we establish a comparison between their regularizations. Furthermore, we prove that the error exponent is completely characterized by the regularized quantum Hoeffding divergence defined via the first approach.



Figure 2: Summary of results in the error exponent regime. Quantitative relationships between the various quantities are indicated by black arrows: the quantity at the tail of an arrow is always greater than or equal to the one at the head. A double arrow indicates an equality.

In the strong converse regime, we likewise investigate two natural extensions of the quantum Hoeffding anti-divergence to sets of quantum states (see Figure 3). The first approach considers the maximal anti-divergence between the sets, denoted $H^*_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)$. The second approach leverages the explicit formula for the anti-divergence in terms of the sandwiched Rényi divergences: we first extend the sandwiched Rényi divergences to sets, $D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)$, and then define the anti-divergence as $\mathfrak{H}^*_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)$. We establish that these two approaches are equivalent for both finite n and in the asymptotic setting, and we prove that the strong converse exponent is lower bounded by the regularized quantum Hoeffding anti-divergence.



Figure 3: Summary of results in the strong converse exponent regime. Quantitative relationships between the various quantities are indicated by black arrows: the quantity at the tail of an arrow is always greater than or equal to the one at the head. A double arrow indicates an equality.

Finally, we leverage our results on the error and strong converse exponents to recover and strengthen the quantum Stein's lemma for composite and correlated hypotheses from [FFF24]. Our findings show that any type-II error exponent r below $D^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$ is achievable, with the corresponding type-I error decaying exponentially at a rate at least $\mathfrak{H}^{\infty}_r(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$. Conversely, if the type-II error exponent r exceeds $D^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$, the type-I error inevitably converges to one exponentially fast, with a rate at least $\mathfrak{H}^{*,\infty}_r(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$. Thus, the regularized quantum relative entropy between sets, $D^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$, delineates a sharp threshold for the asymptotic trade-off in hypothesis testing between two sets of quantum states. In particular, these results apply to adversarial quantum channel discrimination, which satisfies all the required assumptions [FFF25], providing a more refined understanding of the trade-off between type-I and type-II errors in this setting.

1.4 Organization of the paper

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the notations and review relevant quantum divergences, including their extensions to sets of quantum states. Section 3 develops two natural extensions of the quantum Hoeffding divergence and anti-divergence to sets of quantum states, and establishes their relationships. In Section 4, we analyze the asymptotic error exponents in quantum hypothesis testing between two sets of quantum states, generalizing the quantum Hoeffding and strong converse bounds to this setting. Section 5 refines the generalized quantum Stein's lemma using our results on error exponents. We conclude in Section 6 with a discussion of open problems and potential future directions.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Notations

Throughout this work, we adopt the following notational conventions. Finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces are denoted by $\mathcal{H}$, with $|\mathcal{H}|$ indicating their dimension. The set of all linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$ is denoted by $\mathscr{L}(\mathcal{H})$, while $\mathscr{H}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathscr{H}_+(\mathcal{H})$ denote the sets of Hermitian and positive semidefinite operators on $\mathcal{H}$, respectively. The set of density operators (i.e., positive semidefinite operators with unit trace) on $\mathcal{H}$ is denoted by $\mathscr{D}(\mathcal{H})$. Calligraphic letters such as $\mathscr{A}$, $\mathscr{B}$, and $\mathscr{C}$ are used to represent sets of linear operators. Unless otherwise specified, all logarithms are taken to base two and denoted by $\log(x)$.

2.2 Quantum divergences

A functional $\mathbb{D} : \mathscr{D} \times \mathscr{H}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ is called a *quantum divergence* if it satisfies the data-processing inequality: for any completely positive and trace-preserving (CPTP) map $\mathcal{E}$ and any $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathscr{D} \times \mathscr{H}_+$, it holds that $\mathbb{D}(\mathcal{E}(\rho)\|\mathcal{E}(\sigma)) \leq \mathbb{D}(\rho\|\sigma)$. In the following, we introduce several quantum divergences that will be used throughout this work. We also define quantum divergences between two sets of quantum states.

Definition 1. *(Umegaki relative entropy [Ume54].) For any $\rho \in \mathscr{D}$ and $\sigma \in \mathscr{H}_+$, the Umegaki relative entropy is defined by*

$$D(\rho\|\sigma) := \mathrm{Tr}[\rho(\log\rho - \log\sigma)], \tag{16}$$

if $\mathrm{supp}(\rho) \subseteq \mathrm{supp}(\sigma)$ *and* $+\infty$ *otherwise.*

Definition 2. *(Petz Rényi divergence [Pet86].) Let $\alpha \in (0,1) \cup (1,+\infty)$. For any $\rho \in \mathscr{D}$ and $\sigma \in \mathscr{H}_+$, the Petz Rényi divergence is defined by*

$$D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\rho\|\sigma) := \frac{1}{\alpha - 1}\log Q_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) \quad \textit{with} \quad Q_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) := \mathrm{Tr}\left[\rho^\alpha\sigma^{1-\alpha}\right], \tag{17}$$

if $\mathrm{supp}(\rho) \subseteq \mathrm{supp}(\sigma)$*, and* $+\infty$ *otherwise.*

Definition 3. *(Sandwiched Rényi divergence [MLDS+13, WWY14].) Let $\alpha \in (0,1) \cup (1,+\infty)$. For any $\rho \in \mathscr{D}$ and $\sigma \in \mathscr{H}_+$, the sandwiched Rényi divergence is defined by*

$$D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\rho\|\sigma) := \frac{1}{\alpha - 1}\log \mathrm{Tr}\left[\sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}}\rho\sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}}\right]^\alpha, \tag{18}$$

if $\mathrm{supp}(\rho) \subseteq \mathrm{supp}(\sigma)$*, and* $+\infty$ *otherwise.*

Definition 4. *(Quantum divergence between two sets of states.) Let $\mathbb{D}$ be a quantum divergence between two quantum states. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space. Then for any sets $\mathscr{A}, \mathscr{B} \subseteq \mathscr{D}(\mathcal{H})$, the quantum divergence between these two sets is defined by*

$$\mathbb{D}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) := \inf_{\substack{\rho\in\mathscr{A}\\ \sigma\in\mathscr{B}}} \mathbb{D}(\rho\|\sigma). \tag{19}$$

Let $\mathscr{A} = \{\mathscr{A}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathscr{B} = \{\mathscr{B}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be two sequences of sets of quantum states[1]*, where each $\mathscr{A}_n, \mathscr{B}_n \subseteq \mathscr{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$. the regularized divergence between these sequences is defined by*

$$\underline{\mathbb{D}}^\infty(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) := \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{D}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n), \tag{20}$$

$$\overline{\mathbb{D}}^\infty(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) := \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{D}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n). \tag{21}$$

If the following limit exists, we define the regularized divergence as

$$\mathbb{D}^\infty(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{D}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n). \tag{22}$$

Remark 5. *Note that if $\mathbb{D}$ is lower semicontinuous (which is true for most quantum divergences of interest), and $\mathscr{A}$ and $\mathscr{B}$ are compact sets, the infimum in the above expression is always attained and can thus be replaced by a minimization [KZ05, Theorem 7.3.1].*

In many practical scenarios, the sequences of sets under consideration are not arbitrary but possess a structure that is compatible with tensor products. This property, known as *stability* (or closeness) under tensor product, is formalized as follows.

[1] We abuse the notation $\mathscr{A}, \mathscr{B}$ to refer both to sets of states and to sequences of such sets, depending on the context.

Definition 6 (Stable sequence)**.** *Let $\mathscr{A} \subseteq \mathscr{H}_+(\mathcal{H}_1)$, $\mathscr{B} \subseteq \mathscr{H}_+(\mathcal{H}_2)$, and $\mathscr{C} \subseteq \mathscr{H}_+(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2)$. We say that $(\mathscr{A}, \mathscr{B}, \mathscr{C})$ is stable under tensor product if, for any $X_1 \in \mathscr{A}$ and $X_2 \in \mathscr{B}$, it holds that $X_1 \otimes X_2 \in \mathscr{C}$. In short, we write $\mathscr{A} \otimes \mathscr{B} \subseteq \mathscr{C}$. A sequence of sets $\{\mathscr{C}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $\mathscr{C}_n \subseteq \mathscr{H}_+(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ is called stable under tensor product if $\mathscr{C}_n \otimes \mathscr{C}_m \subseteq \mathscr{C}_{n+m}$ for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Remark 7. *If the divergence $\mathbb{D}$ is subadditive under tensor product states, then its extension to sets of states is also subadditive for stable sequences of sets [FFF24, Lemma 26]. This implies the existence of the regularized divergence and the following equalities,*

$$\mathbb{D}^\infty(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) = \underline{\mathbb{D}}^\infty(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) = \overline{\mathbb{D}}^\infty(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) = \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{D}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n). \tag{23}$$

3 Hoeffding divergence and anti-divergence for sets of states

In this section, we develop extensions of the quantum Hoeffding divergence and anti-divergence to sets of quantum states. Two natural approaches arise for this purpose. The first approach treats the Hoeffding divergence as a quantum divergence and extends it to sets via Definition 4. The second approach leverages the explicit formula for the Hoeffding divergence in terms of the Petz Rényi divergences. Analogous constructions apply to the anti-divergence. We demonstrate that, for arbitrary sets of quantum states, these two approaches yield equivalent definitions. Furthermore, for stable sequences of sets, we establish the equivalence for the Hoeffding anti-divergence and provide a quantitative comparison for the Hoeffding divergence.

3.1 Quantum Hoeffding divergence

Definition 8. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, $r > 0$ a real number, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\rho_n, \sigma_n \in \mathscr{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ be two quantum states. The quantum Hoeffding divergence is defined as*

$$H_{n,r}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n) := \sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(nr - D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n)\right). \tag{24}$$

Lemma 9 (Subadditivity)**.** *For any $\rho_m, \sigma_m \in \mathscr{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes m})$ and $\rho_n, \sigma_n \in \mathscr{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$, it holds that*

$$H_{(m+n),r}(\rho_m \otimes \rho_n\|\sigma_m \otimes \sigma_n) \leq H_{m,r}(\rho_m\|\sigma_m) + H_{n,r}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n). \tag{25}$$

Proof. This can be seen as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&H_{(m+n),r}(\rho_m \otimes \rho_n\|\sigma_m \otimes \sigma_n) \\
&\quad= \sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left((m+n)r - D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\rho_m \otimes \rho_n\|\sigma_m \otimes \sigma_n)\right) &(26)\\
&\quad= \sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left((m+n)r - D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\rho_m\|\sigma_m) - D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n)\right) &(27)\\
&\quad\leq \sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(mr - D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\rho_m\|\sigma_m)\right) + \sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(nr - D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n)\right) &(28)\\
&\quad= H_{m,r}(\rho_m\|\sigma_m) + H_{n,r}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n), &(29)
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality uses the additivity of $D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}$ under tensor product states, and the inequality follows from splitting the supremum over α for each term. □

Definition 10 (Quantum Hoeffding divergence between sets of states)**.** *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, and $r > 0$ be a real number, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathscr{A}_n, \mathscr{B}_n \subseteq \mathscr{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ be two sets of quantum states. Two variants of the quantum Hoeffding divergence between these sets are defined as*

$$H_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) := \inf_{\substack{\rho_n\in\mathscr{A}_n\\ \sigma_n\in\mathscr{B}_n}} H_{n,r}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n), \tag{30}$$

$$\mathfrak{H}_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) := \sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(nr - D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)\right), \tag{31}$$

where $D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)$ is defined as in Definition 4. Moreover, let $\mathscr{A} = \{\mathscr{A}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathscr{B} = \{\mathscr{B}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be two sequences of sets of quantum states, where each $\mathscr{A}_n, \mathscr{B}_n \subseteq \mathscr{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$. The regularized quantum Hoeffding divergences between these sequences are defined as

$$\underline{H}_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) := \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n), \tag{32}$$

$$\overline{H}_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) := \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n), \tag{33}$$

$$\underline{\mathfrak{H}}_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) := \sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(r - \underline{D}_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})\right), \tag{34}$$

$$\overline{\mathfrak{H}}_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) := \sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(r - \overline{D}_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})\right), \tag{35}$$

where $\underline{D}_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$ and $\overline{D}_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$ are defined as in Definition 4. If the following limits exist, we define the regularized quantum Hoeffding divergence as

$$H_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n), \tag{36}$$

$$\mathfrak{H}_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) := \sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(r - D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})\right), \tag{37}$$

where $D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$ is defined as in Definition 4.

Remark 11. *Since $D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n)$ is lower semicontinuous in (ρ_n, σ_n) for any fixed α [MH23, Proposition III.11], it follows from Lemma 30 that $H_{n,r}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n)$ is also lower semicontinuous in (ρ_n, σ_n). Consequently, if $\mathscr{A}_n$ and $\mathscr{B}_n$ are compact sets, we know from Lemma 29 that the infimum in the definition of $H_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)$ is achieved.*

Remark 12. *The quantum Hoeffding divergence is subadditive under tensor product states by Lemma 9. So this property extends to stable sequences of sets by Remark 7,*

$$H_{(m+n),r}(\mathscr{A}_{m+n}\|\mathscr{B}_{m+n}) \leq H_{m,r}(\mathscr{A}_m\|\mathscr{B}_m) + H_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n). \tag{38}$$

As a consequence, the regularized quantum Hoeffding divergence exists and satisfies

$$H_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) = \overline{H}_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) = \underline{H}_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) = \inf_{n\geq 1} \frac{1}{n} H_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n). \tag{39}$$

Simlarly, due to the additivity of $D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}$ under tensor product states, the regularized quantum Hoeffding divergence $\mathfrak{H}_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$ also exists for stable sequences and satisfies

$$\mathfrak{H}_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) = \overline{\mathfrak{H}}_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) = \underline{\mathfrak{H}}_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}). \tag{40}$$

The following results establish the relationship between the two variants of the quantum Hoeffding divergence for sets and sequences of sets.

Lemma 13. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, and $r > 0$ be a real number, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathscr{A}_n, \mathscr{B}_n \subseteq \mathscr{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ be two convex compact sets of quantum states. Then it holds that*

$$H_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n \| \mathscr{B}_n) = \mathfrak{H}_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n \| \mathscr{B}_n). \tag{41}$$

Proof. This result was previously established in [MSW22, Lemma II.8]. □

Remark 14 (Computability)**.** *For any fixed $\alpha \in (0,1)$, the function $Q_\alpha(\rho_n \| \sigma_n)$ is jointly concave in (ρ_n, σ_n). Consequently, the quasi-divergence $Q_\alpha(\mathscr{A}_n \| \mathscr{B}_n)$ can be efficiently computed using the QICS package [HSF24], provided that $\mathscr{A}_n$ and $\mathscr{B}_n$ admit semidefinite representations. If the sets $\mathscr{A}_n$ and $\mathscr{B}_n$ exhibit additional symmetries, the computational complexity can be further reduced. With this, $\mathfrak{H}_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n \| \mathscr{B}_n)$ can be efficiently evaluated by scanning over $\alpha \in (0,1)$.*

Lemma 15. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, and $r > 0$ be a real number. Let $\mathscr{A} = \{\mathscr{A}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathscr{B} = \{\mathscr{B}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be two stable sequences of convex compact sets of quantum states, where each $\mathscr{A}_n, \mathscr{B}_n \subseteq \mathscr{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$. Then it holds that*

$$H_r^\infty(\mathscr{A} \| \mathscr{B}) \geq \mathfrak{H}_r^\infty(\mathscr{A} \| \mathscr{B}). \tag{42}$$

Proof. The existence of the regularizations on both sides is ensured by Remark 12. Then we have the following chain of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
H_r^\infty(\mathscr{A} \| \mathscr{B}) &= \inf_{n\geq 1} \frac{1}{n} H_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n \| \mathscr{B}_n) && (43)\\
&= \inf_{n\geq 1} \sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} \left(r - \frac{1}{n} D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n \| \mathscr{B}_n) \right) && (44)\\
&\geq \sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)} \inf_{n\geq 1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} \left(r - \frac{1}{n} D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n \| \mathscr{B}_n) \right) && (45)\\
&= \sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} \left(r - \inf_{n\geq 1} \frac{1}{n} D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n \| \mathscr{B}_n) \right) && (46)\\
&= \sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} \left(r - D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}^\infty(\mathscr{A} \| \mathscr{B}) \right) && (47)\\
&= \mathfrak{H}_r^\infty(\mathscr{A} \| \mathscr{B}), && (48)
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from Remark 12, the second equality follows from Lemma 13, the inequality follows by minimax inequality, the fourth equality follows from Remark 12, and the last equality follows by definition. □

If the minimax equality in the above proof can be established, then equality would hold in Lemma 15. However, this appears to be challenging, as existing minimax theorems typically require at least one of the spaces to be compact—a condition that is not directly satisfied here.

3.2 Quantum Hoeffding anti-divergence

Analogous to the quantum Hoeffding divergence, we can also define the quantum Hoeffding anti-divergence for sets of quantum states.

Definition 16. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, and $r > 0$ a real number, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\rho_n, \sigma_n \in \mathscr{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ be two quantum states. The quantum Hoeffding anti-divergence is defined as*

$$H^*_{n,r}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n) := \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(nr - D_{\mathrm{s},\alpha}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n)\right). \tag{49}$$

Lemma 17 (Subadditivity)**.** *For any $\rho_m, \sigma_m \in \mathscr{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes m})$ and $\rho_n, \sigma_n \in \mathscr{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$, it holds that*

$$H^*_{(m+n),r}(\rho_m \otimes \rho_n\|\sigma_m \otimes \sigma_n) \leq H^*_{m,r}(\rho_m\|\sigma_m) + H^*_{n,r}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n). \tag{50}$$

Proof. This can be seen as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&H^*_{(m+n),r}(\rho_m \otimes \rho_n\|\sigma_m \otimes \sigma_n) \\
&\quad= \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left((m+n)r - D_{\mathrm{s},\alpha}(\rho_m \otimes \rho_n\|\sigma_m \otimes \sigma_n)\right) &(51)\\
&\quad= \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left((m+n)r - D_{\mathrm{s},\alpha}(\rho_m\|\sigma_m) - D_{\mathrm{s},\alpha}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n)\right) &(52)\\
&\quad\leq \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(mr - D_{\mathrm{s},\alpha}(\rho_m\|\sigma_m)\right) + \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(nr - D_{\mathrm{s},\alpha}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n)\right) &(53)\\
&\quad= H^*_{m,r}(\rho_m\|\sigma_m) + H^*_{n,r}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n), &(54)
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality uses the additivity of $D_{\mathrm{s},\alpha}$ under tensor product states, and the inequality follows from splitting the supremum over α for each term. □

Definition 18 (Quantum Hoeffding anti-divergence between sets of states)**.** *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, and $r > 0$ be a real number, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathscr{A}_n, \mathscr{B}_n \subseteq \mathscr{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ be two sets of quantum states. Two variants of the quantum Hoeffding anti-divergence between these sets are defined as* [2]

$$H^*_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) := \sup_{\substack{\rho_n\in\mathscr{A}_n\\ \sigma_n\in\mathscr{B}_n}} H^*_{n,r}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n), \tag{55}$$

$$\mathfrak{H}^*_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) := \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(nr - D_{\mathrm{s},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)\right), \tag{56}$$

where $D_{\mathrm{s},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)$ is defined as in Definition 4. Moreover, let $\mathscr{A} = \{\mathscr{A}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathscr{B} = \{\mathscr{B}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be two sequences of sets of quantum states, where each $\mathscr{A}_n, \mathscr{B}_n \subseteq \mathscr{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$. The regularized quantum Hoeffding anti-divergences between these sequences are defined as

$$\underline{H}^{*,\infty}_r(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) := \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H^*_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n), \tag{57}$$

$$\overline{H}^{*,\infty}_r(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) := \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H^*_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n), \tag{58}$$

$$\underline{\mathfrak{H}}^{*,\infty}_r(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) := \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(r - \underline{D}^{\infty}_{\mathrm{s},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})\right), \tag{59}$$

$$\overline{\mathfrak{H}}^{*,\infty}_r(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) := \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(r - \overline{D}^{\infty}_{\mathrm{s},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})\right). \tag{60}$$

[2] The anti-divergence is monotone non-decreasing under CPTP maps, so the extension to sets is based on the supremum rather than the infimum.

where $\underline{D}^{\infty}_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$ *and* $\overline{D}^{\infty}_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$ *are defined as in Definition 4. If the following limits exist, we define the regularized Hoeffding divergence as*

$$H_r^{*,\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H^*_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n), \tag{61}$$

$$\mathfrak{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) := \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(r - D^{\infty}_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})\right), \tag{62}$$

where $D^{\infty}_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$ *is defined as in Definition 4.*

Remark 19. *It is known that* $H^*_{n,r}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n)$ *is upper semicontinuous in* (ρ_n,σ_n) *[MSW22, Corollary V.16]. So the supremum in the definition of* $H^*_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)$ *is achieved for any compact sets.*

The following results aim to establish the relationship between the two variants of the quantum Hoeffding anti-divergence for sets and sequences of sets.

Lemma 20. *Let* $\mathcal{H}$ *be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, and* $r>0$ *be a real number,* $n\in\mathbb{N}$*. Let* $\mathscr{A}_n,\mathscr{B}_n\subseteq\mathscr{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ *be two convex compact sets of quantum states. Then it holds that*

$$H^*_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) = \mathfrak{H}^*_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n). \tag{63}$$

Proof. By definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
H^*_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) &= \sup_{\substack{\rho_n\in\mathscr{A}_n\\ \sigma_n\in\mathscr{B}_n}} \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(nr - D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n)\right) && (64)\\
&= \sup_{\alpha>1} \sup_{\substack{\rho_n\in\mathscr{A}_n\\ \sigma_n\in\mathscr{B}_n}} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(nr - D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n)\right) && (65)\\
&= \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(nr - \inf_{\substack{\rho_n\in\mathscr{A}_n\\ \sigma_n\in\mathscr{B}_n}} D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n)\right) && (66)\\
&= \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(nr - D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)\right) && (67)\\
&= \mathfrak{H}^*_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n), && (68)
\end{aligned}$$

where in the third line we exchange the two suprema. □

It is important to note that $H^*_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)$ is defined as a supremum over the feasible states, which makes its additivity property for stable sequences unclear—even though we know the Hoeffding anti-divergence for states is subadditive. As a result, we cannot directly apply Remark 7 as in previous discussions of Remark 12. Nevertheless, the following result shows that the regularization $H_r^{*,\infty}$ does indeed exist for stable sequences and coincides with $\mathfrak{H}_r^{*,\infty}$ in general.

Lemma 21. *Let* $\mathcal{H}$ *be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, and* $r>0$ *be a real number. Let* $\mathscr{A}=\{\mathscr{A}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *and* $\mathscr{B}=\{\mathscr{B}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *be two stable sequences of convex compact sets of quantum states, where each* $\mathscr{A}_n,\mathscr{B}_n\subseteq\mathscr{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$*. Then it holds that*

$$H_r^{*,\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) = \mathfrak{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}). \tag{69}$$

Proof. We have the following chain of inequalities:

$$\underline{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) = \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{n,r}^*(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) \tag{70}$$

$$= \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathfrak{H}_{n,r}^*(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) \tag{71}$$

$$= \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\big(nr - D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)\big) \tag{72}$$

$$\geq \sup_{\alpha>1} \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\big(nr - D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)\big) \tag{73}$$

$$= \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\big(r - \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)\big) \tag{74}$$

$$= \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\big(r - D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)\big) \tag{75}$$

$$= \mathfrak{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}), \tag{76}$$

where the second line follows from Lemma 20, the inequality follows by the fact that for any sequence of numbers $x_{\alpha,n}$, $\liminf_{n\to\infty}\sup_{\alpha>1} x_{\alpha,n} \geq \sup_{\alpha>1}\liminf_{n\to\infty} x_{\alpha,n}$, the second last line follows from Remark 7 and the stability of the sequences.

On the other direction, we have

$$\overline{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{n,r}^*(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) \tag{77}$$

$$= \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathfrak{H}_{n,r}^*(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) \tag{78}$$

$$= \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\big(nr - D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)\big), \tag{79}$$

where the second line follows from Lemma 20. Note that $D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)$ is subadditive for stable sequences, so we have $\frac{1}{n} D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) \geq D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This gives

$$\frac{1}{n} \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\big(nr - D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)\big) \leq \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\big(r - D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})\big). \tag{80}$$

Then taking the limit of n, we have

$$\overline{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) \leq \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\big(r - D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})\big) = \mathfrak{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}). \tag{81}$$

Combining Eq. (76) and Eq. (81), we have the asserted result. □

4 Hypothesis testing between two sets of quantum states

In this section, we derive the asymptotic error exponents for quantum hypothesis testing between two sets of quantum states. Specifically, we generalize the quantum Hoeffding bound and the strong converse exponent to the setting where both the null and alternative hypotheses are given by stable sequences of convex, compact sets of quantum states. We show that the optimal type-I error exponent, under an exponential constraint on the type-II error, is precisely characterized by a regularized quantum Hoeffding divergence between the sets. Similarly, we establish a lower bound on the strong converse exponent, describing the exponential rate at which the optimal type-I error approaches one. These results extend the classical and quantum i.i.d. cases to a broad class of composite and correlated hypothesis testing scenarios.

4.1 Optimal type-I error probability

Recall that the optimal type-I error probability for hypothesis testing between two sets of quantum states, $\mathscr{A}_n$ and $\mathscr{B}_n$, is defined as

$$\alpha_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) := \min_{0\leq M_n\leq I}\left\{\alpha(\mathscr{A}_n, M_n) : \beta(\mathscr{B}_n, M_n) \leq 2^{-nr}\right\}, \tag{82}$$

where the measurement M_n is chosen to minimize the worst-case type-I error $\alpha(\mathscr{A}_n, M_n)$, subject to the constraint that the type-II error $\beta(\mathscr{B}_n, M_n)$ does not exceed the threshold 2^{-nr}. In other words, the measurement must perform universally well for all states in $\mathscr{A}_n$ and $\mathscr{B}_n$. The following result shows that the optimal type-I error for hypothesis testing between two sets of quantum states is precisely determined by the most challenging pair of states from these sets. This implies that there exists a universal measurement for $\mathscr{A}_n$ and $\mathscr{B}_n$ whose performance matches that of the optimal measurement for the worst-case pair of states.

Lemma 22. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, and $r > 0$ be a real number, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathscr{A}_n, \mathscr{B}_n \subseteq \mathscr{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ be two convex sets of quantum states. Then it holds that*

$$\alpha_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) = \sup_{\substack{\rho_n\in\mathscr{A}_n\\ \sigma_n\in\mathscr{B}_n}} \alpha_{n,r}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n). \tag{83}$$

Proof. We begin by noting the following symmetry role between type-I and type-II errors:

$$\alpha(\mathscr{A}_n, M_n) = \beta(\mathscr{A}_n, I - M_n) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta(\mathscr{B}_n, M_n) = \alpha(\mathscr{B}_n, I - M_n). \tag{84}$$

This allows us to rewrite the optimization in Eq. (82) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) &= \min_{0\leq M_n\leq I}\left\{\beta(\mathscr{A}_n, I - M_n) : \alpha(\mathscr{B}_n, I - M_n) \leq 2^{-nr}\right\} && (85)\\
&= \min_{0\leq M_n\leq I}\left\{\beta(\mathscr{A}_n, M_n) : \alpha(\mathscr{B}_n, M_n) \leq 2^{-nr}\right\} && (86)\\
&= \sup_{\substack{\rho_n\in\mathscr{A}_n\\ \sigma_n\in\mathscr{B}_n}} \min_{0\leq M_n\leq I}\left\{\beta(\rho_n, M_n) : \alpha(\sigma_n, M_n) \leq 2^{-nr}\right\} && (87)\\
&= \sup_{\substack{\rho_n\in\mathscr{A}_n\\ \sigma_n\in\mathscr{B}_n}} \min_{0\leq M_n\leq I}\left\{\beta(\rho_n, I - M_n) : \alpha(\sigma_n, I - M_n) \leq 2^{-nr}\right\} && (88)\\
&= \sup_{\substack{\rho_n\in\mathscr{A}_n\\ \sigma_n\in\mathscr{B}_n}} \min_{0\leq M_n\leq I}\left\{\alpha(\rho_n, M_n) : \beta(\sigma_n, M_n) \leq 2^{-nr}\right\} && (89)\\
&= \sup_{\substack{\rho_n\in\mathscr{A}_n\\ \sigma_n\in\mathscr{B}_n}} \alpha_{n,r}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n), && (90)
\end{aligned}$$

where the first and fourth equalities use Eq. (84), the second and fifth equalities follow by substituting M_n to $I - M_n$ in the optimization, the third equality uses [FFF24, Lemma 31] which allows us to pull out the optimization over $\mathscr{A}_n, \mathscr{B}_n$ for the optimal type-II error probability when type-I error is restricted to a constant threshold, and the last equality is by definition. □

4.2 Quantum Hoeffding bound for sets of quantum states

We now present the main result of this section, which establishes the asymptotic behavior of the optimal type-I error in the error exponent regime for hypothesis testing between two sets of quantum states. This theorem generalizes the quantum Hoeffding bound from the i.i.d. case

to the more general setting of composite and correlated hypotheses. Notably, the result holds under minimal and standard assumptions, which are satisfied by the frameworks considered in the generalized quantum Stein's lemmas [HY24, Lam25, FFF24].

Theorem 23 (Quantum Hoeffding bound for sets of quantum states)**.** *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, and $r > 0$ be a real number. Let $\mathscr{A} = \{\mathscr{A}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathscr{B} = \{\mathscr{B}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be two stable sequences of convex compact sets of quantum states, where each $\mathscr{A}_n, \mathscr{B}_n \subseteq \mathscr{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$. Then it holds that*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) = H_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}). \tag{91}$$

Proof. 1) *proof of the lower bound*: Recall that for any $V, W \in \mathscr{H}_+$ and $\alpha \in (0,1)$, it holds that [ACMT+07],

$$\mathrm{Tr}[V^{\alpha}W^{1-\alpha}] \geq \mathrm{Tr}\, W\{W \leq V\} + \mathrm{Tr}\, V\{W > V\}. \tag{92}$$

Let $\rho_n \in \mathscr{A}_n$ and $\sigma_n \in \mathscr{B}_n$. Applying the inequality with the choice $V = \rho_n$ and $W = 2^{nR}\sigma_n$ with an arbitrary real number R. Then we have

$$\mathrm{Tr}\, 2^{nR}\sigma_n\{2^{nR}\sigma_n \leq \rho_n\} + \mathrm{Tr}\, \rho_n\{2^{nR}\sigma_n > \rho_n\} \leq 2^{n(1-\alpha)R}Q_{\alpha}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n). \tag{93}$$

This implies that

$$\mathrm{Tr}\, \rho_n\{2^{nR}\sigma_n > \rho_n\} \leq 2^{n(1-\alpha)R}Q_{\alpha}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n), \tag{94}$$
$$\mathrm{Tr}\, \sigma_n\{2^{nR}\sigma_n \leq \rho_n\} \leq 2^{-n\alpha R}Q_{\alpha}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n). \tag{95}$$

Now, letting the constant

$$R = \frac{nr + \log Q_{\alpha}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n)}{n\alpha}. \tag{96}$$

we get

$$\mathrm{Tr}\, \rho_n\{2^{nR}\sigma_n > \rho_n\} \leq 2^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}n\left(r - \frac{1}{n}D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n)\right)}, \tag{97}$$
$$\mathrm{Tr}\, \sigma_n\{2^{nR}\sigma_n \leq \rho_n\} \leq 2^{-nr}. \tag{98}$$

Let $M_n = \{2^{nR}\sigma_n \leq \rho_n\}$, which is a valid quantum measurement operator. Then Eq. (98) implies that it is a feasible solution to the optimization problem in Eq. (5). Therefore, we have

$$\alpha_{n,r}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n) \leq 2^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}n\left(r - \frac{1}{n}D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n)\right)}. \tag{99}$$

This gives

$$-\frac{1}{n}\log \alpha_{n,r}(\rho_n,\sigma_n) \geq \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(r - \frac{1}{n}D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n)\right). \tag{100}$$

Taking infimum over $\rho_n \in \mathscr{A}_n$ and $\sigma_n \in \mathscr{B}_n$ on both sides, we have

$$-\frac{1}{n}\log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n,\mathscr{B}_n) \geq \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(r - \frac{1}{n}D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)\right), \tag{101}$$

where we use Lemma 22. Taking supremum over $\alpha \in (0,1)$, we have

$$-\frac{1}{n}\log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n, \mathscr{B}_n) \geq \sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(r - \frac{1}{n}D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)\right) = \frac{1}{n}H_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n), \tag{102}$$

where the equality follows from Lemma 13. Taking limit of n, we have

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n, \mathscr{B}_n) \geq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}H_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) = H_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}), \tag{103}$$

where the equality follows from the stability assumption of the sequences and Eq. (39).

2) *proof of the upper bound*: For any fixed $m \in \mathbb{N}$ any $\rho_m \in \mathscr{A}_m, \sigma_m \in \mathscr{B}_m$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) &\leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{mn}\log \alpha_{mn,r}(\mathscr{A}_{mn}, \mathscr{B}_{mn}) && (104)\\
&= \liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{mn}\log \sup_{\substack{\rho_{mn}\in\mathscr{A}_{mn}\\ \sigma_{mn}\in\mathscr{B}_{mn}}} \alpha_{mn,r}(\rho_{mn}, \sigma_{mn}) && (105)\\
&\leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{mn}\log \alpha_{mn,r}(\rho_m^{\otimes n}, \sigma_m^{\otimes n}) && (106)\\
&= \frac{1}{m}H_{m,r}(\rho_m\|\sigma_m). && (107)
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows as the lower limit of a subsequence is no smaller than the lower limit of the sequence, the first equality follows from Lemma 22, the second inequality follows by taking a particular feasible solution and the stability of the sequences, the second equality follows from the quantum Hoeffding bound between two quantum states (see Eq. (6)). As this holds for any $\rho_m \in \mathscr{A}_m, \sigma_m \in \mathscr{B}_m$, we have

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) \leq \frac{1}{m}H_{m,r}(\mathscr{A}_m\|\mathscr{B}_m). \tag{108}$$

Taking limit of m, we get

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) \leq \liminf_{m\to\infty} \frac{1}{m}H_{m,r}(\mathscr{A}_m\|\mathscr{B}_m) = H_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}), \tag{109}$$

where the equality follows from the stability assumption of the sequences and Eq. (39). □

4.3 Strong converse exponent for sets of quantum states

The following result extends the strong converse exponent from the i.i.d. setting to the broader context of composite and correlated hypotheses and shows that the strong converse exponent is lower bounded by a regularized quantum Hoeffding anti-divergence between the sets.

Theorem 24 (Strong converse exponent for sets of quantum states)**.** *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, and $r > 0$ be a real number. Let $\mathscr{A} = \{\mathscr{A}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathscr{B} = \{\mathscr{B}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be two stable sequences of convex compact sets of quantum states, where each $\mathscr{A}_n, \mathscr{B}_n \subseteq \mathscr{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$. Then*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log(1-\alpha_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)) \geq H_r^{*,\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}). \tag{110}$$

Proof. Let ρ_n, σ_n be optimizers for $D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)$, i.e., $D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n) = D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)$. By standard arguments, e.g. [CMW16, Lemma 5], we have for any $0 \leq M_n \leq I$, that

$$\frac{1}{n}\log\left(1 - \mathrm{Tr}[(I-M_n)\rho_n]\right) \leq \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(\frac{1}{n}D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n) + \frac{1}{n}\log \mathrm{Tr}[M_n\sigma_n]\right). \tag{111}$$

Since $\mathrm{Tr}[(I-M_n)\rho_n] \leq \alpha(\mathscr{A}_n, M_n)$ and $\mathrm{Tr}[M_n\sigma_n] \leq \beta(\mathscr{B}_n, M_n)$, it follows that

$$\frac{1}{n}\log\left(1-\alpha(\mathscr{A}_n, M_n)\right) \leq \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(\frac{1}{n}D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) + \frac{1}{n}\log\beta(\mathscr{B}_n, M_n)\right). \tag{112}$$

For any $0 \leq M_n \leq I$ such that $\beta(\mathscr{B}_n, M_n) \leq 2^{-nr}$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n}\log\left(1-\alpha(\mathscr{A}_n, M_n)\right) \leq \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(\frac{1}{n}D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) - r\right). \tag{113}$$

Taking the supremum over all such M_n, we find

$$-\frac{1}{n}\log\left(1-\alpha_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)\right) \geq \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(r - \frac{1}{n}D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)\right). \tag{114}$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log\left(1-\alpha_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)\right) &\geq \liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(r - \frac{1}{n}D_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)\right) &(115)\\ &= \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(r - D^{\infty}_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})\right), &(116)\end{aligned}$$

where the equality follows from Remark 7 and the stability of the sequences. Since this holds for any $\alpha > 1$, we conclude that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log\left(1-\alpha_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)\right) \geq \sup_{\alpha>1}\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(r - D^{\infty}_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})\right) = \mathfrak{H}^{*,\infty}_r(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}). \tag{117}$$

Finally, by Lemma 21, we have the asserted result. □

5 Refining the Stein's lemma between two sets of quantum states

As discussed in the introduction, the error exponent and strong converse exponent regimes offer a more refined characterization of the trade-off between type-I and type-II errors than the Stein's exponent regime. In this section, we utilize the results developed in this work to refine and extend the generalized quantum Stein's lemma established in [FFF24, Theorem 32] for quantum hypothesis testing between two sets of quantum states.

Assumption 25. *Consider a family of sets $\{\mathscr{A}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying the following properties,*

- *(A.1) Each $\mathscr{A}_n$ is convex and compact;*
- *(A.2) Each $\mathscr{A}_n$ is permutation-invariant;*
- *(A.3) $\mathscr{A}_m \otimes \mathscr{A}_k \subseteq \mathscr{A}_{m+k}$, for all $m, k \in \mathbb{N}$;*
- *(A.4) $(\mathscr{A}_m)^{\circ}_{+} \otimes (\mathscr{A}_k)^{\circ}_{+} \subseteq (\mathscr{A}_{m+k})^{\circ}_{+}$, for all $m, k \in \mathbb{N}$,*

where the polar set is defined as $(\mathscr{C})^{\circ}_{+} := \{X \in \mathscr{H}_{+} : \mathrm{Tr}[XY] \leq 1, \forall\, Y \in \mathscr{C}\}$.

The following generalized quantum Stein's lemma for hypothesis testing between two sets of quantum states was established in [FFF24, Theorem 32].

Theorem 26 (Generalized quantum Stein's lemma)**.** *Let $\mathscr{A} = \{\mathscr{A}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathscr{B} = \{\mathscr{B}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be two sequences of sets satisfying Assumption 25 and $\mathscr{A}_n \subseteq \mathscr{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$, $\mathscr{B}_n \subseteq \mathscr{H}_{+}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ and $D_{\max}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) \leq cn$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}_{+}$. Then for any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log\beta_{\varepsilon}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) = D^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}). \tag{118}$$

The above result can be both recovered and strengthened as follows.

Theorem 27. *Let $\mathscr{A} = \{\mathscr{A}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathscr{B} = \{\mathscr{B}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be two sequences of sets satisfying the same assumptions in Theorem 26. For any $0 < r < D^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$, then*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) \geq \mathfrak{H}_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) > 0. \tag{119}$$

For any $r > D^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$, then

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log(1-\alpha_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)) \geq \mathfrak{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) > 0. \tag{120}$$

This result shows that any type-II error exponent below $D^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$ is achievable, with the corresponding type-I error decaying exponentially at a rate at least $\mathfrak{H}_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$. Conversely, if the type-II error exponent exceeds $D^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$, the type-I error inevitably converges to one exponentially, with a rate at least $\mathfrak{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$. Thus, the regularized quantum relative entropy between sets, $D^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$, delineates a sharp threshold for the asymptotic trade-off in hypothesis testing between two sets of quantum states. In particular, these results apply to adversarial quantum channel discrimination, which satisfies all the required assumptions [FFF25], thereby providing a more refined understanding of the trade-off between type-I and type-II errors in this setting.

Proof. By the assumptions on the sequences, we have

$$D^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) = \sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)} D^{\infty}_{\mathrm{M},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) \leq \sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)} D^{\infty}_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) \leq D^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}), \tag{121}$$

where the first equality follows from [FFF24, Lemmas 27, 28], and the inequalities use that $D_{\mathrm{M},\alpha}(\rho\|\sigma) \leq D_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\rho\|\sigma) \leq D(\rho\|\sigma)$ for any $\alpha \in (0,1)$. This implies

$$\sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)} D^{\infty}_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) = D^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}). \tag{122}$$

Note that $D^{\infty}_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$ is monotone increasing in α. Therefore, for any $0 < r < D^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$, there exists $\alpha \in (0,1)$ such that $r < D^{\infty}_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$. Then

$$\mathfrak{H}_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) = \sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(r - D^{\infty}_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})\right) > 0, \tag{123}$$

By Theorem 23 and Lemma 15, we have

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log \alpha_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n) = H_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) \geq \mathfrak{H}_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) > 0 \tag{124}$$

which shows that the type-I error decays exponentially, and thus r is an achievable rate. This recovers the direct part of the generalized quantum Stein's lemma in Theorem 26.

Since $\inf_{\alpha>1} D^{\infty}_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) = D^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$ [FFF24, Lemma 27] and $D^{\infty}_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$ is monotone increasing in α, for any $r > D^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$, there exists $\alpha > 1$ such that $r > D^{\infty}_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$. This implies that

$$\mathfrak{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) = \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(r - D^{\infty}_{\mathrm{S},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})\right) > 0. \tag{125}$$

Applying Theorem 24 and Lemma 21, we obtain

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log(1-\alpha_{n,r}(\mathscr{A}_n\|\mathscr{B}_n)) \geq H_r^{*,\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) = \mathfrak{H}_r^{*,\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) > 0. \tag{126}$$

This shows that the type-I error converges to one exponentially, and thus r is not an achievable rate, recovering the converse part of the generalized quantum Stein's lemma in Theorem 26. □

It is worth emphasizing that the quantum Hoeffding bound in Theorem 23 and the strong converse exponent in Theorem 24 hold in great generality and do not require the polar assumption. However, to recover the Stein's setting from the error exponent regime, one needs the continuity of the regularized Petz Rényi divergences, i.e., $\sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)} D^{\infty}_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) = D^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$. For this, we adopt the polar assumption in Eq. (121). Therefore, to recover the generalized quantum Stein's lemma as in [HY24, Lam25], it suffices to establish the continuity $\sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)} D^{\infty}_{\mathrm{P},\alpha}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) = D^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$ under their respective assumptions. Achieving this would provide an alternative proof of the generalized quantum Stein's lemma proposed by Brandão and Plenio [BP10], in addition to those in [HY24, Lam25], although this approach remains technically challenging. Interestingly, a similar situation also arises in the context of best-case channel discrimination, where the continuity of the regularized sandwiched Rényi divergence between channels is sufficient to establish the quantum Stein's lemma for two quantum channels (particularly the strong converse part); see [FGW25, Theorem 21] for further details.

6 Discussion

We have established a framework for analyzing the error exponents in quantum hypothesis testing between two sets of quantum states, extending the classical and quantum i.i.d.settings to composite and correlated hypotheses. Our main results include a generalization of the quantum Hoeffding bound and the strong converse exponent to stable sequences of convex, compact sets of quantum states. We have shown that the optimal type-I error exponent, under an exponential constraint on the type-II error, is precisely characterized by the regularized quantum Hoeffding divergence between the sets. Similarly, we derived a lower bound on the strong converse exponent in terms of the regularized quantum Hoeffding anti-divergence. These results refine the generalized quantum Stein's lemma and provide a more detailed understanding of the trade-off between type-I and type-II errors in discrimination with composite and correlated hypotheses.

Several open questions remain. While we have established that $H_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) \geq \mathfrak{H}_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$, proving the equality $H_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B}) = \mathfrak{H}_r^{\infty}(\mathscr{A}\|\mathscr{B})$ in full generality remains open; this would require a minimax theorem applicable in the regularized setting. Moreover, for the strong converse exponent, our results provide a lower bound, but establishing a matching upper bound is an important challenge for future work. Resolving these questions would yield a complete characterization of the error exponents for composite and correlated quantum hypothesis testing. Finally, since the generalized quantum Stein's lemma implies asymptotic reversibility in the associated resource theory [FFF24, Section 6], our refined analysis of error exponents may offer new insights into the rates and convergence properties of resource interconversion. This could potentially enable finer control over the reversibility and efficiency of resource transformations in the asymptotic regime. Exploring these connections represents an interesting direction for future research.

Acknowledgements. We thank Masahito Hayashi for suggesting the study of the quantum Hoeffding setting. K.F. is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant No. 92470113 and 12404569), the Shenzhen Science and Technology Program (grant No. JCYJ20240811311351 9025), the Shenzhen Fundamental Research Program (grant No. JCYJ20241202124023031), the 1+1+1 CUHK-CUHK(SZ)-GDST Joint Collaboration Fund (grant No. GRD P2025-022), and the University Development Fund (grant No. UDF01003565).

References

[ACMT+07] K. M. Audenaert, J. Calsamiglia, R. Munoz-Tapia, E. Bagan, L. Masanes, A. Acin, and F. Verstraete. Discriminating states: The quantum Chernoff bound. *Physical Review Letters*, 98(16):160501, 2007.

[ANSV08a] K. M. Audenaert, M. Nussbaum, A. Szkoła, and F. Verstraete. Asymptotic error rates in quantum hypothesis testing. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 279(1):251–283, 2008.

[ANSV08b] K. M. R. Audenaert, M. Nussbaum, A. Szkoła, and F. Verstraete. Asymptotic error rates in quantum hypothesis testing. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 279(1):251–283, 2008.

[BDB23] S. Ben-David and E. Blais. A new minimax theorem for randomized algorithms. *Journal of the ACM*, 70(6):1–58, 2023.

[Bla74] R. Blahut. Hypothesis testing and information theory. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 20(4):405–417, 1974.

[BP10] F. G. Brandao and M. B. Plenio. A generalization of quantum stein's lemma. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 295(3):791–828, 2010.

[Che52] H. Chernoff. A measure of asymptotic efficiency for tests of a hypothesis based on the sum of observations. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pages 493–507, 1952.

[CMW16] 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(3):797–829, 2016.

[FFF24] K. Fang, H. Fawzi, and O. Fawzi. Generalized quantum asymptotic equipartition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.04035*, 2024.

[FFF25] K. Fang, H. Fawzi, and O. Fawzi. Adversarial quantum channel discrimination. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.03060*, 2025.

[FGW25] K. Fang, G. Gour, and X. Wang. Towards the ultimate limits of quantum channel discrimination and quantum communication. *Science China Information Sciences*, 68(8):180509, 2025.

[FR06] B. Farkas and S. G. Révész. Potential theoretic approach to rendezvous numbers. *Monatshefte für mathematik*, 148(4):309–331, 2006.

[Hay02] M. Hayashi. Optimal sequence of quantum measurements in the sense of Stein's lemma in quantum hypothesis testing. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 35(50):10759, 2002.

[Hay07] M. Hayashi. Error exponent in asymmetric quantum hypothesis testing and its application to classical-quantum channel coding. *Physical Review A—Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics*, 76(6):062301, 2007.

[HP91] F. Hiai and D. Petz. The proper formula for relative entropy and its asymptotics in quantum probability. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 143:99–114, 1991.

[HSF24] K. He, J. Saunderson, and H. Fawzi. QICS: Quantum information conic solver. *arXiv: 2410.17803*, 2024.

[HY24] M. Hayashi and H. Yamasaki. Generalized quantum Stein's lemma and second law of quantum resource theories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.02722*, 2024.

[KZ05] A. Kurdila and M. Zabarankin. *Convex Functional Analysis*. Systems & Control: Foundations & Applications. Birkhäuser Basel, 2005.

[Lam25] L. Lami. A solution of the generalized quantum Stein's lemma. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 71(6):4454–4484, June 2025.

[MH23] M. Mosonyi and F. Hiai. Some continuity properties of quantum Rényi divergences. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 70(4):2674–2700, 2023.

[MLDS+13] 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(12), 2013.

[MO15] M. Mosonyi and T. Ogawa. Quantum hypothesis testing and the operational interpretation of the quantum Rényi relative entropies. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 334:1617–1648, 2015.

[MSW22] M. Mosonyi, Z. Szilagyi, and M. Weiner. On the error exponents of binary state discrimination with composite hypotheses. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 68(2):1032–1067, February 2022.

[Nag06] H. Nagaoka. The converse part of the theorem for quantum hoeffding bound. *arXiv preprint quant-ph/0611289*, 2006.

[NO00] H. Nagaoka and T. Ogawa. Strong converse and Stein's lemma in quantum hypothesis testing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 46(7):2428–2433, feb 2000.

[OH04] T. Ogawa and M. Hayashi. On error exponents in quantum hypothesis testing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 50(6):1368–1372, 2004.

[Pet86] D. Petz. Quasi-entropies for finite quantum systems. *Reports on Mathematical Physics*, 23(1):57–65, 1986.

[Ume54] H. Umegaki. Conditional expectation in an operator algebra. *Tohoku Mathematical Journal, Second Series*, 6(2-3):177–181, 1954.

[Wol78] J. Wolfowitz. Coding theorems of information theory. *Mathematics of Computation*, 1978.

[WW19a] X. Wang and M. M. Wilde. Resource theory of asymmetric distinguishability. *Physical Review Research*, 1(3):033170, 2019.

[WW19b] X. Wang and M. M. Wilde. Resource theory of asymmetric distinguishability for quantum channels. *Physical Review Research*, 1(3):033169, dec 2019.

[WWY14] 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*, 331:593–622, 2014.

A Useful lemmas

The following lemma is a minimax theorem that account for the infinity values of the function. Let X be a convex set in a linear space. function $f : X \to (-\infty, -\infty]$ said to be convex, if $f(px + (1-p)y) \leq pf(x) + (1-p)f(y)$, the multiplication $0 \cdot f(x)$ is interpreted as 0 and $p \cdot +\infty = +\infty$ for $p \neq 0$. Similar definiton holds for concave functions.

Lemma 28. *[FR06, Theorem 5.2] Let X be a compact, convex subset of a Hausdorff topological vector space and Y be a convex subset of the linear space. Let $f : X \times Y \to (-\infty, +\infty]$ be lower semicontinuous on X for fixed $y \in Y$, and assume that f is convex in the first and concave in the second variable. Then*

$$\sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} f(x, y) = \inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y). \tag{127}$$

The following lemmas are standard results in mathematical analysis and will be used frequently in our proofs. For detailed proofs, see, e.g., [BDB23, Lemma 2.8, 2.9].

Lemma 29. *Let X be a nonempty compact topological space, and let $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be a function. Then if f is upper semicontinuous, it attains its maximum, meaning there is some $x \in X$ such that for all $x' \in X$, $f(x') \leq f(x)$. Similarly, if f is lower semicontinuous, it attains its minimum.*

Lemma 30. *Let X be a topological space, let I be a set, and let $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a collection of functions $f_i : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$. Then if each f_i is upper semicontinuous, the function $f(x) = \inf_{i \in I} f_i(x)$ is also upper semicontinuous. Similarly, if each f_i is lower semicontinuous, the pointwise supremum is lower semicontinuous.*