Ultimate Limits of Quantum Channel Discrimination

Kun Fang [*1], Gilad Gour [†2], and Xin Wang [‡1]

[1]Institute for Quantum Computing, Baidu Research, Beijing 100193, China
[2]Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Institute for Quantum Science and Technology, University of Calgary, AB, T2N 1N4, Canada

October 29, 2021

Abstract

This paper studies the difficulty of discriminating quantum channels under operational regimes, proves the quantum channel Stein's lemma (strong converse part), and provides a unified framework to show the operational meaning of quantum channel divergences. First, we establish the exponentially strong converse of quantum channel hypothesis testing under coherent strategies, meaning that any strategy to make the Type II error decays with an exponent larger than the regularized channel relative entropy will unavoidably result in the Type I error converging to one exponentially fast in the asymptotic limit. This result notably delivers the desirable quantum channel Stein's Lemma, enclosing a long-term open problem in quantum information theory. As a byproduct, we show the continuity of the regularized (amortized) Sandwiched Rényi channel divergence at $\alpha = 1$, resolving another open problem in the field. Second, we develop a framework to show the interplay between the strategies of channel discrimination, the operational regimes, and variants of channel divergences. This framework systematically underlies the operational meaning of quantum channel divergences in quantum channel discrimination. Our work establishes the ultimate limit of quantum channel discrimination, deepening our understanding of quantum channel discrimination and quantum channel divergences in the asymptotic regime. As quantum channel discrimination is strongly connected to many other fundamental tasks in quantum information theory, we expect plentiful applications on related topics such as quantum metrology and quantum communication.

Contents

[*]fangkun02@baidu.com
[†]gour@ucalgary.ca
[‡]wangxin73@baidu.com

1 Introduction

Distinguishability is central in information technology from both theoretical and practical perspectives. A fundamental setting for distinguishability is asymmetric hypothesis testing. Given a source generates sample x from one of two probability distributions $p \equiv \{p(x)\}_{x\in\mathcal{X}}$ or $q \equiv \{q(x)\}_{x\in\mathcal{X}}$, asymmetric hypothesis testing seeks 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 [Cov99, Che52] states that, for any constant bound on the Type I error, the optimal Type II error decays exponentially fast in the number of copies, and the decay rate is exactly the relative entropy

$$D(p\|q) = \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} p(x)\log_2[p(x)/q(x)]. \tag{1}$$

In particular this lemma also states the "strong converse property": 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. Such strong converse property indicates no trade-off for Type I error and Type II error exponent in the asymptotic limit, which is a fundamental topic in information processing [Wol78]. The Chernoff-Stein's Lemma gives a rigorous operational interpretation for the relative entropy and establishes a vital bridge 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, ON00, Hay02, ANSV08a, Hay07, BP10, CMW16, MO15, WW19a, WW19b]). The basic task is quantum state discrimination, where we have an independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) quantum state which could be either $\rho^{\otimes n}$ or $\sigma^{\otimes n}$. We set that $\rho^{\otimes n}$ is the null hypothesis and $\sigma^{\otimes n}$ is the alternative hypothesis. The task is to apply a binary measurement $\{\Pi_n, I-\Pi_n\}$ on the state to determine which one it is and the corresponding errors are defined similarly to the classical case as follows:

$$\text{(Type I)}\quad \alpha_n(\Pi_n) := \mathrm{Tr}[(I-\Pi_n)\rho^{\otimes n}], \qquad \text{(Type II)}\quad \beta_n(\Pi_n) := \mathrm{Tr}[\Pi_n\sigma^{\otimes n}]. \tag{2}$$

The quantum state version of the Chernoff-Stein's Lemma [HP91, ON00] (aka. quantum Stein's lemma) states that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log D_H^\varepsilon\left(\rho^{\otimes n}\|\sigma^{\otimes n}\right) = D(\rho\|\sigma), \quad \forall\varepsilon\in(0,1), \tag{3}$$

where $D_H^\varepsilon(\rho\|\sigma) := -\log\inf\{\mathrm{Tr}[\Pi\sigma] : 0\leqslant\Pi\leqslant I, \mathrm{Tr}[\Pi\rho]\geqslant 1-\varepsilon\}$ denotes the quantum hypothesis testing relative entropy that characterizes the decay rate of the optimal Type II error and $D(\rho\|\sigma) = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho(\log\rho-\log\sigma)]$ denotes the quantum relative entropy. This quantum Stein's lemma delivers a rigorous operational interpretation for the quantum relative entropy. Extended research on quantum stein's lemma are presented in [Hay02, NH07, ANSV08a, Hay07, BP10, WR12].

Although research in quantum hypothesis testing has largely focused on quantum states, there are various situations in which quantum channels play the role of the main objects of study. The task of channel discrimination is very similar to that of state discrimination. Here, we are given black-box access to n uses of a channel $\mathcal{G}$ with the aim to identify it from candidates $\mathcal{N}$ and $\mathcal{M}$. However, quantum channel discrimination has more diversities in terms of discrimination strategies (e.g., product strategy, coherent strategy, sequential strategy) due to its nature as dynamic resources [CDP08, Hay09, PW09, CMW16, YF17, WBHK20, WW19b, FFRS20, PLLP19], which leads to several variants of the potential quantum channel Stein's lemma. In particular, for the coherent strategies (also known as parallel strategies in some literatures), the black box can be can be used n times in parallel to any state with a reference system before performing a measurement at the final output to identify the channel. Based on the recently developed resource theory of asymmetric distinguishability for quantum channels, the state-of-the-art result [WW19b] arrives at

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}D_H^\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}) = D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}), \tag{4}$$

with $D_H^\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$ denotes the hypothesis testing relative entropy of quantum channels and $D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$ denotes the regularized quantum relative entropy. That is, for Type I error bounded by ε, the asymptotic optimal rate of the Type II error exponent is given by $D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$ when ε goes to 0.

However, the condition of vanishing ε lefts a notable gap to achieve the quantum channel version of Stein's lemma. Unlike state discrimination, the dynamic feature of quantum channels raises challenging difficulties in determining the optimal discrimination scheme as we have to handle the additional optimization of the input states and the non-i.i.d. structure of the testing states. To fill the gap, it requires a deeper understanding and analysis on the error exponent in hypothesis testing of quantum channels. The solution could promptly advance our understanding of quantum channel discrimination, the resource theory of asymmetric distinguishability for quantum channels, and the related field of quantum metrology [PBG+18, BAB+18, DRC17]. Beyond the quantum channel Stein's lemma, there is an emergence of various channel divergences for analyzing different regimes of quantum channel discrimination. How to unify the channel divergences and the discrimination regimes in a consistent framework is desirable for better understanding the manipulation of quantum channels.

Main contributions In this paper, we resolve the above problems affirmatively. First, we establish the exponentially strong converse of quantum channel hypothesis testing under coherent strategies. This result directly implies that the asymptotically vanishing ε in Eq. (4) could be removed and thus delivers the desirable quantum channel Stein's Lemma. As a byproduct, the exponentially strong converse property also implies the continuity of the regularized (amortized) Sandwiched Rényi channel divergence at $\alpha = 1$, resolving an open question in [FF21]. These results extend and deepen our understanding of quantum channel discrimination and quantum channel divergences in the asymptotic regime. Second, we develop a framework to show the operational meaning of quantum channel divergences in quantum channel discrimination. In particular, we systematically show the interplay between the strategies of channel discrimination (e.g., sequential, coherent, product), the operational regimes (e.g., error exponent, Stein exponent, strong converse exponent), and three variants of channel divergences (e.g., Petz, Umegaki, Sandwiched). As quantum channels represent dynamical resources that are more general than quantum states, our result on quantum channel divergences and quantum channel discrimination can be seen as a more natural and fruitful extension of the previous results in state discrimination. Our results do not solve all the cases. But we hope this framework would stimulate further investigations on quantum channel discrimination, as well as other related topics such as quantum metrology [PBG+18, BAB+18, DRC17], quantum resource theories [CG19, GW19, WW19b, FL20, RT21] and quantum communication [WFD19, BHKW18, WFT19, FFRS20, FWTB20].

2 Preliminaries

In this section we set the notations first. Then we review the mathematical tool of quantum divergences and the operational task of quantum channel discrimination.

2.1 Notation

In the table below, we summarize some of the notations used throughout the paper:

Symbol	Definition
$A, B, C, ...$	Quantum systems and their associated Hilbert spaces
$\|A\|, \|B\|, \|C\|, ...$	Dimension of the Hilbert spaces
A^n	Shorthand for $A_1 A_2 \cdots A_n$
I	Identity operator on a suitable space
$\mathcal{I}$	Identity map
$\mathfrak{L}(A)$	Set of linear operators on system A
$\mathfrak{D}(A)$	Set of density matrices on system A
$\mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B)$	Set of completely positive trace-preserving maps from $\mathfrak{L}(A)$ to $\mathfrak{L}(B)$
$\log$	Logarithm in base 2
$[n]$	Shorthand for $\{1, \cdots, n\}$
$\mathrm{supp}(X)$	Support of operator X
X_+	The positive part of operator X
$\{X \leqslant Y\}$	The projector onto the positive part of operator $Y - X$
$\lambda_{\min}(X)$	Minimum eigenvalue of X
$\lambda_{\max}(X)$	Maximum eigenvalue of X
$\mathrm{Sym}^n(A)$	Symmetric subspace of A^n

Table 1: Overview of notational conventions.

Throughout the paper, we restrict ourselves to finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces. Let A and A' be two isomorphic Hilbert spaces with orthonormal bases $\{|i\rangle_A\}$ and $\{|i\rangle_{A'}\}$ and define $|\Phi\rangle = \sum_i |i\rangle_A \otimes |i\rangle_{A'}$ as the unnormalized maximally entangled state. Then the Choi matrix of a linear map $\mathcal{E}$ from $\mathfrak{L}(A)$ to $\mathfrak{L}(B)$ is defined by $J_{\mathcal{E}} = \mathcal{E}_{A\to B}(\Phi_{AA'})$. We say a map $\mathcal{N} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B)$ is positive definite, denoted by $\mathcal{N} > 0$, if its Choi matrix is positive definite. For any two maps $\mathcal{N}$ an $\mathcal{M}$, denote $\mathcal{N} \geqslant \mathcal{M}$ if the Choi matrix of $\mathcal{N} - \mathcal{M}$ is positive semidefinite.

2.2 Quantum divergences

A divergence between two quantum states is a real-valued function $\boldsymbol{D} : \mathfrak{D} \times \mathfrak{D} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ that satisfies the data processing inequality $\boldsymbol{D}(\mathcal{E}(\rho)\|\mathcal{E}(\sigma)) \leqslant \boldsymbol{D}(\rho\|\sigma)$ for all $\mathcal{E} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B), \rho, \sigma \in \mathfrak{D}(A)$. Divergences are widely used to measure the distinguishability of physical objects. Of particular relevance are the following quantum divergences that will be frequently used in our discussion.

Definition 1 *Let $\rho, \sigma \in \mathfrak{D}(A)$. The Umegaki relative entropy (also called quantum relative entropy) is defined by [Ume54]*

$$D(\rho\|\sigma) := \mathrm{Tr}[\rho(\log\rho - \log\sigma)], \tag{5}$$

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

Definition 2 *Let $\rho, \sigma \in \mathfrak{D}(A)$. The Petz Rényi divergence is defined by [Pet86]*

$$\overline{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) := \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \mathrm{Tr}\left[\rho^\alpha \sigma^{1-\alpha}\right], \tag{6}$$

if $\alpha \in (0,1)$ *or* $\alpha \in (1,+\infty)$ *with* $\mathrm{supp}(\rho) \subseteq \mathrm{supp}(\sigma)$*, and* $+\infty$ *otherwise.*

Definition 3 *Let* $\rho, \sigma \in \mathfrak{D}(A)$*. The Sandwiched Rényi divergence is defined by [MLDS+13, WWY14]*

$$\widetilde{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) := \frac{1}{\alpha-1}\log \mathrm{Tr}\left[\sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}}\rho\sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}}\right]^\alpha, \tag{7}$$

if $\alpha \in (0,1)$ *or* $\alpha \in (1,+\infty)$ *with* $\mathrm{supp}(\rho) \subseteq \mathrm{supp}(\sigma)$*, and* $+\infty$ *otherwise.*

Definition 4 *Let* $\rho, \sigma \in \mathfrak{D}(A)$*,* $\varepsilon \in [0,1]$*. The quantum hypothesis testing relative entropy is defined by*

$$D_H^\varepsilon(\rho\|\sigma) := -\log\inf\{\mathrm{Tr}[\Pi\sigma] : 0 \leqslant \Pi \leqslant I, \mathrm{Tr}[\Pi\rho] \geqslant 1-\varepsilon\}. \tag{8}$$

The following result establishes an inequality relating hypothesis testing relative entropy and the Sandwiched Rényi divergence [CMW16, Lemma 5].

Lemma 5 *For any* $\alpha \in (1,+\infty)$ *and* $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$*, it holds [CMW16]*

$$D_H^\varepsilon(\rho\|\sigma) \leqslant \widetilde{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) + \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\log\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}. \tag{9}$$

Definition 6 *Let* $\rho, \sigma \in \mathfrak{D}(A)$*. The max-relative entropy is defined by [Dat09, Ren05]*

$$D_{\max}(\rho\|\sigma) := \log\inf\left\{t \in \mathbb{R} \ : \ \rho \leqslant t\sigma\right\}, \tag{10}$$

if $\mathrm{supp}(\rho) \subseteq \mathrm{supp}(\sigma)$ *and* $+\infty$ *otherwise. Let* $F(\rho,\sigma) := \|\sqrt{\rho}\sqrt{\sigma}\|_1 + \sqrt{(1-\mathrm{Tr}\,\rho)(1-\mathrm{Tr}\,\sigma)}$ *be the generalized fidelity and* $P(\rho,\sigma) := \sqrt{1-F^2(\rho,\sigma)}$ *be the purified distance. Let* $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$*. Then the smooth max-relative entropy is defined by*

$$D_{\max}^\varepsilon(\rho\|\sigma) := \inf_{\rho':P(\rho',\rho)\leqslant\varepsilon} D_{\max}(\rho'\|\sigma), \tag{11}$$

where the infimum is taken over all subnormalized states that are ε *close to the state* ρ*.*

Definition 7 *Let* $\rho, \sigma \in \mathfrak{D}(A)$ *and* $\varepsilon \in [0,1]$*. Three variants of information spectrum relative entropy are respectively defined by [TH13, DL14]*

$$D_s^\varepsilon(\rho\|\sigma) := \sup\{\gamma \in \mathbb{R} : \mathrm{Tr}(\rho\{\rho \leqslant 2^\gamma\sigma\}) \leqslant \varepsilon\} \tag{12}$$

$$\underline{D}_s^\varepsilon(\rho\|\sigma) := \sup\{\gamma \in \mathbb{R} : \mathrm{Tr}(\rho - 2^\gamma\sigma)_+ \geqslant 1-\varepsilon\} \tag{13}$$

$$\overline{D}_s^\varepsilon(\rho\|\sigma) := \inf\{\gamma \in \mathbb{R} : \mathrm{Tr}(\rho - 2^\gamma\sigma)_+ \leqslant \varepsilon\}. \tag{14}$$

The divergence between quantum states can be naturally extended to quantum channels. The main idea is to quantify the maximum divergence between the outputs from the channels.

Definition 8 *Let* $\boldsymbol{D}$ *be a divergence between quantum states. Let* $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B)$*. Then the channel divergence induced by* $\boldsymbol{D}$ *is defined in the worst-case scenario by [LKDW18]*

$$\boldsymbol{D}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) := \sup_{\psi \in \mathfrak{D}(RA)} \boldsymbol{D}\left(\mathcal{N}_{A\to B}(\psi_{RA})\middle\|\mathcal{M}_{A\to B}(\psi_{RA})\right), \tag{15}$$

where the supremum is taken over all quantum states ψ *on systems* $R \otimes A$ *and* R *is of arbitrary dimension.*

Note that as a consequence of purification, data processing, and the Schmidt decomposition, the supremum can be restricted to be with respect to pure states and the reference system R is isomorphic to the channel input system A.

Some properties for state divergence can be naturally extended to the channel divergences, for example, the following continuity holds.

Lemma 9 *For any $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B)$, it holds [CMW16]*

$$\lim_{\alpha \to 1} \overline{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N} \| \mathcal{M}) = \lim_{\alpha \to 1} \widetilde{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N} \| \mathcal{M}) = D(\mathcal{N} \| \mathcal{M}) \,. \tag{16}$$

Moreover, if the state divergence $\boldsymbol{D}$ is superadditive under tensor product of states, then the channel divergences $\boldsymbol{D}$ defined above is also superadditive under tensor product of channels. That is, $\boldsymbol{D}(\mathcal{N}_1 \otimes \mathcal{N}_2 \| \mathcal{M}_1 \otimes \mathcal{M}_2) \geqslant \boldsymbol{D}(\mathcal{N}_1 \| \mathcal{M}_1) + \boldsymbol{D}(\mathcal{N}_2 \| \mathcal{M}_2)$ for any $\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{M}_1 \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A_1 \to B_1)$ and $\mathcal{N}_2, \mathcal{M}_2 \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A_2 \to B_2)$. However, different than state divergences, channel divergences are not additive in general [FFRS20], motivating the definition of their regularization.

Definition 10 *Let $\boldsymbol{D}$ be a divergence between quantum states. Let $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B)$. Then the regularized channel divergence induced by $\boldsymbol{D}$ is defined by*

$$\boldsymbol{D}^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N} \| \mathcal{M}) := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{n} \boldsymbol{D}\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n} \middle\| \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right). \tag{17}$$

If $\boldsymbol{D}$ is superadditive for states, then it is superadditive for channels and we have

$$\boldsymbol{D}^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N} \| \mathcal{M}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \boldsymbol{D}\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n} \middle\| \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right). \tag{18}$$

Another way to induce a channel divergence is to use the idea of amortization.

Definition 11 *Let $\boldsymbol{D}$ be a divergence between quantum states. Let $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B)$. The amortized channel divergence induced by $\boldsymbol{D}$ is defined by [BHKW18]*

$$\boldsymbol{D}^{A}(\mathcal{N} \| \mathcal{M}) := \sup_{\psi, \varphi \in \mathfrak{D}(RA)} \left[\boldsymbol{D}\left(\mathcal{N}_{A \to B}(\psi_{RA}) \| \mathcal{M}_{A \to B}(\varphi_{RA})\right) - \boldsymbol{D}\left(\psi_{RA} \| \varphi_{RA}\right)\right], \tag{19}$$

where the supremum is taken over all quantum states ψ, φ on $R \otimes A$ and R is of arbitrary dimension.

It is worth noting that channel divergences have been used as vital tools to many fundamental areas including the resource theory of quantum channels [CG19, GW19, WW19b, FL20, RT21], quantum communication [WFD19, BHKW18, WFT19, FFRS20, FWTB20], quantum coherence [DFW+18, SCG20], fault-tolerant quantum computing [WWS19] and quantum thermodynamics [FBB19].

2.3 Quantum channel discrimination

The task of channel discrimination is very similar to that of state discrimination. For a given unknown quantum channel $\mathcal{G}$, one aims to identify it from the possible candidates $\mathcal{N}$ or $\mathcal{M}$. The standard approach of discrimination is to perform hypothesis testing that distinguishes between the null hypothesis and the alternative hypothesis. What makes the channel discrimination different is the diverse choice of discrimination strategies.

There are at least three different classes of available strategies illustrated in Figure 1.



(a) Product strategy (b) Coherent strategy (c) Sequential strategy

Figure 1: Three different classes of strategies for quantum channel discrimination.

Each class of strategies is composed with two parts (S_n, Π_n), where S_n is a method to generate a testing state and Π_n ($0 \leqslant \Pi_n \leqslant I$) defines is a quantum test (a binary quantum measurement) $\{\Pi_n, I - \Pi_n\}$ performed on this state.

Product strategy In a product strategy (Figure 1(a)) the testing state is created by choosing a sequence of input states $\varphi_i \in \mathfrak{D}(R_i A_i)$ and sending them to the unknown channel $\mathcal{G}$ individually. The generated testing state is given by $\mathcal{G}^{\otimes n}(\otimes_{i=1}^n \varphi_i)$. The class of all product strategies is denoted as PRO. Note that the input states considered here are not restricted to have the i.i.d. structure (e.g. $\varphi^{\otimes n}$) but general tensor product states. That is, we allow choosing different input states for different instances of $\mathcal{G}$, which makes a difference with the product strategy discussed in [CMW16].

Coherent strategy In a coherent strategy (Figure 1(b)) the testing state is created by choosing an input state $\psi_n \in \mathfrak{D}(RA^n)$ on the joint quantum systems and sending the corresponding register to each copy of the channel. The generated testing state is given by $\mathcal{G}^{\otimes n}(\psi_n)$. The class of all product strategies is denoted as COH. It is clear that if our choice of ψ_n is of a tensor product structure $\otimes_{i=1}^n \varphi_i$ with $\varphi_i \in \mathfrak{D}(R_i A_i)$ we get effectively a product strategy. Thus we have the set inclusion PRO $\subseteq$ COH.

Sequential strategy In a sequential strategy (Figure 1(c)) the testing state is created in an adaptive way. That is, we first choose an initial state $\psi_n \in \mathfrak{D}(R_1 A_1)$ and send it to one copy of the channel $\mathcal{G}$ followed by applying an update channel $\mathcal{P}_1$. After this, apply another copy of the channel $\mathcal{G}$ and then an update channel $\mathcal{P}_2$. Repeat his process n times. We get the final testing state $\mathcal{G} \circ \mathcal{P}_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{P}_2 \circ \mathcal{G} \circ \mathcal{P}_1 \circ \mathcal{G}(\psi_n)$ with $\mathcal{P}_i \in \text{CPTP}(R_i B_i \to R_{i+1} A_{i+1})$. The class of all sequential strategies is denoted as SEQ. It is clear that if all update channels $\mathcal{P}_i$ are chosen as identity maps the sequential strategy reduces to a coherent strategy. Thus we have COH $\subseteq$ SEQ.

For a given strategy (S_n, Π_n), let $\rho_n(S_n)$ and $\sigma_n(S_n)$ be the testing state generated by n uses of the channel depending on whether it is $\mathcal{N}$ or $\mathcal{M}$. One can define the Type I and Type II errors as

$$\text{(Type I)} \quad \alpha_n(S_n, \Pi_n) := \text{Tr}[(I - \Pi_n)\rho_n(S_n)], \qquad \text{(Type II)} \quad \beta_n(S_n, \Pi_n) := \text{Tr}[\Pi_n \sigma_n(S_n)]. \tag{20}$$

Since it is not always possible to perform perfect discrimination (i.e. both errors are equal to zero simultaneously), one instead is interested in the asymptotic behavior of α_n and β_n as $n \to \infty$, expecting there to be a tradeoff between minimizing α_n and minimizing β_n.

3 Exponentially Strong Converse of Channel Hypothesis Testing

In this section we show the strong converse property of hypothesis testing of quantum channels under coherent strategies. That is, any strategy to make the Type II error decays with an exponent larger than $D^{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$ will unavoidably result in the Type I error converging to one in the asymptotic limit.

Theorem 12 *Let $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \text{CPTP}(A \to B)$ and $\mathcal{N} > 0$. Consider any sequence of coherent channel discrimination strategies with Type I error $\{\alpha_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and Type II error $\{\beta_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. If the Type II error has*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log \beta_n =: r > D^{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}), \tag{21}$$

then there exists $c > 0$ such that the Type I error $1 - \alpha_n \leqslant 2^{-cn}$ for sufficiently large n.

Note that the presented result is stronger than a standard strong converse statement, as we have shown not only the convergence but also the behavior of *exponential* convergence. Since the convergence happens exponentially fast, we call this an *exponentially strong converse property*.

The exponentially strong converse property for channel discrimination under sequential strategies also holds and will be discussed in Corollary 21. For now we will focus on coherent strategies.

The proof of Theorem 12 requires the following lemmas.

3.1 Lemmas needed for the proof of Theorem 12

The first lemma is an analog of a result of Ogawa and Nagaoka [ON00] that was originally used to establish the strong converse of quantum Stein's lemma. A similar result was proved by Brandão and Plenio for tensor product states [BP10]. Here we extend it further to permutation-symmetric states.

Lemma 13 *Let $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\rho_n, \sigma_n \in \mathfrak{D}(A^n)$ be symmetric under permutations of the n subsystems such that $\operatorname{supp}(\rho_n) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(\sigma_n)$. Then, for any $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $s \in [0,1]$ the following relation holds*

$$\operatorname{Tr}\left(\rho_n - 2^{\mu n}\sigma_n\right)_+ \leqslant 2^{-nrs+\log \operatorname{Tr}[\rho_n^{1+s}]} + 2^{-ns(\mu-r)+s|A|\log(1+n)+\log \operatorname{Tr}[\rho_n \sigma_n^{-s}]} . \tag{22}$$

Proof Let Π be the projection to the positive part of $\rho_n - 2^{\mu n}\sigma_n$ and $\Pi = \sum_{x=1}^{|A|^n} a_x \Pi_x$ be a decomposition of Π into orthogonal rank-one projectors, where $a_x \in \{0,1\}$ and $\sum_x \Pi_x = I_{A^n}$ (i.e. the set $\{\Pi_x\}$ forms a von-Neumann rank-one projective measurement). In general, this decomposition of Π is not unique, and the precise choice of $\{\Pi_x\}$ will be determined later on in the proof. Finally, denote by $p_x \coloneqq \operatorname{Tr}\left[\rho_n \Pi_x\right]$, $q_x \coloneqq \operatorname{Tr}\left[\sigma_n \Pi_x\right]$ (note that p_x and q_x depends on n), and let $\mathfrak{I}$ be the set of all x for which $p_x > 2^{\mu n} q_x$. Since $\left(\rho_n - 2^{n\mu}\sigma_n\right)_+ = \Pi\left(\rho_n - 2^{n\mu}\sigma_n\right)\Pi$, we have

$$\operatorname{Tr}\left(\rho_n - 2^{n\mu}\sigma_n\right)_+ = \sum_x a_x \left(p_x - 2^{\mu n} q_x\right) \leqslant \sum_{x\in\mathfrak{I}} \left(p_x - 2^{\mu n} q_x\right) \leqslant \sum_{x\in\mathfrak{I}} p_x = \Pr(\mathfrak{I}) , \tag{23}$$

where $\Pr(\mathfrak{I})$ is the probability of the set $\mathfrak{I}$ with respect to the probability distribution $\{p_x\}$. Note that the set $\mathfrak{I}$ can be written as

$$\mathfrak{I} = \left\{ x \ : \ \frac{1}{n}\log p_x > \mu + \frac{1}{n}\log q_x \right\} . \tag{24}$$

We would like to replace the set $\mathfrak{I}$ with two sets: one depends solely on p_x, and the other only on q_x. This can be done in the following way. For any $r \in \mathbb{R}$ define the two sets

$$\mathfrak{I}^{(1)} \coloneqq \left\{ x \ : \ \frac{1}{n}\log p_x \geqslant r \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{I}^{(2)} \coloneqq \left\{ x \ : \ \frac{1}{n}\log q_x \leqslant r - \mu \right\} . \tag{25}$$

Note that if $x \in \mathfrak{I}$ then either $x \in \mathfrak{I}^{(1)}$ or $x \in \mathfrak{I}^{(2)}$. We therefore conclude that

$$\operatorname{Tr}\left(\rho_n - 2^{n\mu}\sigma_n\right)_+ \leqslant \Pr\left(\mathfrak{I}^{(1)}\right) + \Pr\left(\mathfrak{I}^{(2)}\right) . \tag{26}$$

From Cramér's theorem [DZ98] it follows that

$$-\log \Pr\left(\mathfrak{I}^{(1)}\right) \geqslant \sup_{s\in[0,1]} \left\{ nsr - \log \sum_x p_x^{1+s} \right\} \tag{27}$$

$$-\log \Pr\left(\mathfrak{I}^{(2)}\right) \geqslant \sup_{s\in[0,1]} \left\{ ns(\mu - r) - \log \sum_x p_x q_x^{-s} \right\} . \tag{28}$$

We first bound (27) in terms of ρ_n. For this purpose, let $\Delta \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A^n \to A^n)$ be the completely dephasing map (also a pinching map) $\Delta(\omega) \coloneqq \sum_x \Pi_x \omega \Pi_x$ defined on all $\omega \in \mathfrak{D}(A^n)$. Then, the density matrix $\Delta\left(\rho_n\right)$ is diagonal (in the basis that the operators $\{\Pi_x\}$ project to) with components $\{p_x\}$ on its diagonal. Hence, denoting by $\pi_{A^n} \coloneqq I_{A^n}/|A|^n$ the completely mixed state in $\mathfrak{D}(A^n)$, and by $\alpha \coloneqq 1 + s$, we get by direct calculation that

$$-\log \sum_x p_x^{1+s} = n(\alpha - 1)\log|A| - (\alpha - 1)\overline{D}_\alpha\left(\Delta(\rho_n)\middle\|\pi_{A^n}\right) . \tag{29}$$

Since $\overline{D}_\alpha\left(\Delta(\rho_n)\middle\|\pi_{A^n}\right) = \overline{D}_\alpha\left(\Delta(\rho_n)\middle\|\Delta(\pi_{A^n})\right) \leqslant \overline{D}_\alpha\left(\rho_n\middle\|\pi_{A^n}\right)$, we get

$$-\log \sum_x p_x^{1+s} \geqslant n(\alpha - 1)\log|A| - (\alpha - 1)\overline{D}_\alpha\left(\rho_n\middle\|\pi_{A^n}\right) = -\log \operatorname{Tr}\left[\rho_n^\alpha\right] = -\log \operatorname{Tr}\left[\rho_n^{1+s}\right] . \tag{30}$$

Together with (27), this gives the first term on the r.h.s. of (22).

For the second term, observe that

$$\sum_x p_x q_x^{-s} = \operatorname{Tr}\left[\Delta\left(\rho_n\right)\left(\Delta\left(\sigma_n\right)\right)^{-s}\right] = \operatorname{Tr}\left[\rho_n\left(\Delta\left(\sigma_n\right)\right)^{-s}\right] \ . \tag{31}$$

We now estimate this term by utilizing the symmetry of ρ_n and σ_n. Since ρ_n and σ_n are symmetric under permutations of the n subsystems they can be expressed as

$$\rho_n = \bigoplus_{\lambda\in\operatorname{Irr}(\mathcal{S}_n)} I^{B_\lambda}\otimes\rho_\lambda^{C_\lambda} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_n = \bigoplus_{\lambda\in\operatorname{Irr}(\mathcal{S}_n)} I^{B_\lambda}\otimes\sigma_\lambda^{C_\lambda} \tag{32}$$

where λ represents an irrep of the natural representation of the permutation group $\mathcal{S}_n$ on A^n, and $\rho_\lambda, \sigma_\lambda \geqslant 0$. We therefore have

$$\rho_n - 2^{\mu n}\sigma_n = \bigoplus_{\lambda\in\operatorname{Irr}(\mathcal{S}_n)} I^{B_\lambda}\otimes\left(\rho_\lambda^{C_\lambda} - 2^{\mu n}\sigma_\lambda^{C_\lambda}\right) \tag{33}$$

The condition $\operatorname{supp}(\rho_n)\subseteq\operatorname{supp}(\sigma_n)$ implies that without loss of generality we can assume that $\sigma_n > 0$ (otherwise we can restrict our consideration to the subspace of $\operatorname{supp}(\sigma_n)$ and embed ρ_n in this space). Therefore, under this assumption we have that each $\sigma_\lambda > 0$. Let P_λ be the projector to the support of $(\rho_\lambda - 2^{\mu n}\sigma_\lambda)_+$, and let $P_\lambda \coloneqq \sum_{j=1}^{|C_\lambda|^n} a_{\lambda,j}P_{\lambda,j}$ be a decomposition of P_λ into orthogonal rank-one projectors, where $a_{\lambda,j}\in\{0,1\}$ and $\sum_j P_{\lambda,j} = I^{C_\lambda}$. Moreover, for each $\lambda\in\operatorname{Irr}(\mathcal{S}_n)$ decompose $I^{B_\lambda} \coloneqq \sum_{k=1}^{|B_\lambda|}|\psi_{\lambda,k}\rangle\langle\psi_{\lambda,k}|^{B_\lambda}$, where $\{|\psi_{\lambda,k}\rangle\}_k$ forms an orthonormal basis of B_λ. Finally, we denote by $x\coloneqq\{\lambda,j,k\}$ and take $\Pi_x \coloneqq |\psi_{\lambda,k}\rangle\langle\psi_{\lambda,k}|^{B_\lambda}\otimes P_{\lambda,j}^{C_\lambda}$. With this choice of Π_x we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta(\sigma_n) &= \bigoplus_{\lambda\in\operatorname{Irr}(\mathcal{S}_n)}\sum_{j,k}|\psi_{\lambda,k}\rangle\langle\psi_{\lambda,k}|^{B_\lambda}\otimes P_{\lambda,j}^{C_\lambda}\sigma_\lambda^{C_\lambda}P_{\lambda,j}^{C_\lambda} \\
&= \bigoplus_{\lambda\in\operatorname{Irr}(\mathcal{S}_n)} I^{B_\lambda}\otimes\sum_j P_{\lambda,j}^{C_\lambda}\sigma_\lambda^{C_\lambda}P_{\lambda,j}^{C_\lambda} \\
&= \bigoplus_{\lambda\in\operatorname{Irr}(\mathcal{S}_n)} I^{B_\lambda}\otimes\Delta_\lambda^{C_\lambda\to C_\lambda}\left(\sigma_\lambda^{C_\lambda}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

where each $\Delta_\lambda(\cdot)\coloneqq\sum_j P_{\lambda,j}(\cdot)P_{\lambda,j}$ is a completely dephasing map in $\operatorname{CPTP}(C_\lambda\to C_\lambda)$. Therefore,

$$\sum_x p_x q_x^{-s} = \operatorname{Tr}\left[\rho_n\left(\Delta\left(\sigma_n\right)\right)^{-s}\right] = \sum_{\lambda\in\operatorname{Irr}(\mathcal{S}_n)}|B_\lambda|\operatorname{Tr}\left[\rho_\lambda\big(\Delta_\lambda(\sigma_\lambda)\big)^{-s}\right] \ . \tag{35}$$

From the pinching inequality, for each $\lambda\in\operatorname{Irr}(\mathcal{S}_n)$ we have $\Delta_\lambda(\sigma_\lambda)\geqslant\frac{1}{|C_\lambda|}\sigma_\lambda$. Moreover, since the function $r\mapsto r^\alpha$ is operator anti-monotone for $\alpha\in[-1,0]$ we get that

$$\big(\Delta_\lambda(\sigma_\lambda)\big)^{-s} \leqslant \left(\frac{1}{|C_\lambda|}\sigma_\lambda\right)^{-s} \ . \tag{36}$$

Substituting this into (35) gives

$$\sum_x p_x q_x^{-s} \leqslant \sum_{\lambda\in\operatorname{Irr}(\mathcal{S}_n)}|C_\lambda|^s|B_\lambda|\operatorname{Tr}\left[\rho_\lambda\sigma_\lambda^{-s}\right] \ . \tag{37}$$

Now, since C_λ can be viewed as a subspace of $\operatorname{Sym}^n(A)$, its dimension cannot exceed that of $\operatorname{Sym}^n(A)$ which itself is bounded by $(n+1)^{|A|}$. We therefore conclude that

$$\sum_x p_x q_x^{-s} \leqslant (n+1)^{s|A|}\sum_{\lambda\in\operatorname{Irr}(\mathcal{S}_n)}|B_\lambda|\operatorname{Tr}\left[\rho_\lambda\sigma_\lambda^{-s}\right] = (n+1)^{s|A|}\operatorname{Tr}\left[\rho_n\sigma_n^{-s}\right] \ . \tag{38}$$

Together with (28), this gives the second term on the r.h.s. of (22). ■

The next lemma shows that the eigenvalues of the output from n use of a positive definite channel are uniformly bounded by an exponential factor.

Lemma 14 *Let $\mathcal{N} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B)$ and $\mathcal{N} > 0$. Then, there exists $b \in (0,1)$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\max_{\rho \in \mathfrak{D}(R^n A^n)} \left\| \mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\left(\rho_{R^n A^n}\right) \right\|_\infty \leqslant b^n \,. \tag{39}$$

Proof Since $\mathcal{N} > 0$ we have its Choi matrix $J_{\mathcal{N}} > 0$. Then there exists $\tau \in \mathfrak{D}(B)$ with $\|\tau\|_\infty < 1$ (e.g. the maximally mixed state) and its associated replacer channel $\mathcal{R}_\tau$ such that $tJ_{\mathcal{N}} > J_{\mathcal{R}_\tau}$ for some $t \in (0,\infty)$. Equivalently, we have $t\mathcal{N} > \mathcal{R}_\tau$. Set $\varepsilon := 1/t$ and then $\mathcal{M} := (\mathcal{N} - \varepsilon\mathcal{R}_\tau)/(1-\varepsilon) > 0$; in particular, $\mathcal{M} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B)$ and $\mathcal{N} = (1-\varepsilon)\mathcal{M} + \varepsilon\mathcal{R}_\tau$. Observe that

$$\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n} = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} (1-\varepsilon)^k \varepsilon^{n-k} \mathcal{F}_{n,k} \tag{40}$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{n,k} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A^n \to B^n)$ is a uniform convex combination of $\binom{n}{k}$ channels all having the form $\mathcal{M}^{\otimes k} \otimes \mathcal{R}_\tau^{\otimes n-k}$ up to permutations of the n channels. Now, observe that

$$\left\| \mathcal{M}^{\otimes k} \otimes \mathcal{R}_\tau^{\otimes n-k}\left(\rho_{R^n A^n}\right) \right\|_\infty = \left\| \mathcal{M}^{\otimes k}\left(\rho_{R^n A^k}\right) \otimes \tau^{\otimes n-k} \right\|_\infty \leqslant \left\| \tau^{\otimes n-k} \right\|_\infty = \|\tau\|_\infty^{n-k} \,. \tag{41}$$

Note that the order that $\mathcal{N}$ and $\mathcal{R}_\tau$ appear in the equation above does not effect this upper bound. Therefore, since $\mathcal{F}_{n,k}$ is a convex combination of such channels we conclude that also

$$\left\| \mathcal{F}_{n,k}\left(\rho_{R^n A^n}\right) \right\|_\infty \leqslant \|\tau\|_\infty^{n-k} \,. \tag{42}$$

Hence, for any $\rho \in \mathfrak{D}(R^n A^n)$

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\left(\rho_{R^n A^n}\right) \right\|_\infty &\leqslant \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} (1-\varepsilon)^k \varepsilon^{n-k} \left\| \mathcal{F}_{n,k}\left(\rho^{R^n A^n}\right) \right\|_\infty \\ &\leqslant \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} (1-\varepsilon)^k \varepsilon^{n-k} \|\tau\|_\infty^{n-k} \\ &= \left(1 - \varepsilon + \|\tau\|_\infty \varepsilon\right)^n \,. \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

The proof is completed by taking $b := 1 - \varepsilon + \|\tau\|_\infty \varepsilon$ which is clearly in $(0,1)$. ■

The next lemma shows that by utilizing the permutation symmetry of tensor product channels we can restrict the optimal input states in the discrimination strategies to be symmetric states. This reduces the problem from the most general form to a particular one that can be tackled more easily.

Lemma 15 *Let $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B)$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a pure state $|\varphi\rangle \in \mathrm{Sym}^n(\tilde{R}A)$ such that*

$$\max_{\psi \in \mathfrak{D}(R^n A^n)} D_H^\varepsilon\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}(\psi_{R^n A^n}) \middle\| \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}(\psi_{R^n A^n})\right) = D_H^\varepsilon\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}(\varphi_{\tilde{R}^n A^n}) \middle\| \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}(\varphi_{\tilde{R}^n A^n})\right). \tag{44}$$

Proof First recall a variational expression of the hypothesis testing relative entropy [BG17, Eq.(2)]

$$D_H^\varepsilon(\rho\|\sigma) = -\log \max_{t \geqslant 0} \left\{ (1-\varepsilon)t - \mathrm{Tr}(t\rho - \sigma)_+ \right\}. \tag{45}$$

Therefore, we have

$$D_H^\varepsilon\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n} \middle\| \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right) = -\log \max_{t \geqslant 0} \left\{ (1-\varepsilon)t - \mathrm{Tr}\left(t\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}(\psi_{R^n A^n}) - \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}(\psi_{R^n A^n})\right)_+ \right\}, \tag{46}$$

for some state $\psi_{R^n A^n} \in \mathfrak{D}(R^n A^n)$. Let

$$\omega_{X R^n A^n} = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_n} |\pi\rangle\langle\pi|_X \otimes P_\pi \psi_{R^n A^n} P_\pi^* \tag{47}$$

where X is a 'flag' system of dimension $|X| = n!$. By construction, the marginal state $\omega_{R^nA^n}$ is symmetric under permutations (i.e. has support on $\mathrm{Sym}^n(RA)$), so there exists a symmetric purification of $\omega_{R^nA^n}$ which we denote by $\varphi_{C^nR^nA^n}$, where $C \cong RA$ [Ren05, Lemma 4.2.2]. Let $\omega_{DXR^nA^n}$ be a purification of $\omega_{XR^nA^n}$ and thus also a purification of $\omega_{R^nA^n}$. Since all purifications of a density matrix are related via isometries, there exists an isometry $V_{C^n\to DX}$ such that

$$\omega_{DXR^nA^n} = (V_{C^n\to DX})\varphi_{C^nR^nA^n}(V_{C^n\to DX})^\dagger. \tag{48}$$

Taking a partial trace of the system D on both sides gives

$$\omega_{XR^nA^n} = \mathcal{E}_{C^n\to X}\left(\varphi_{C^nR^nA^n}\right) , \tag{49}$$

where $\mathcal{E}(\cdot) = \mathrm{Tr}_D\, V(\cdot)V^\dagger \in \mathrm{CPTP}(C^n \to X)$. Let $\tilde{R} \coloneqq CR$, then $|\varphi_{\tilde{R}^nA^n}\rangle \in \mathrm{Sym}^n(\tilde{R}A)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Tr}\left(t\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\left(\varphi_{\tilde{R}^nA^n}\right) - \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\left(\varphi_{\tilde{R}^nA^n}\right)\right)_+ \\
&\geqslant \mathrm{Tr}\left(t\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\left(\omega_{XR^nA^n}\right) - \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\left(\omega_{XR^nA^n}\right)\right)_+ &(50)\\
&= \frac{1}{n!}\sum_{\pi\in\mathcal{S}_n} \mathrm{Tr}\left(t\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\left(P_\pi\psi_{R^nA^n}P_\pi^*\right) - \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}(P_\pi\psi_{R^nA^n}P_\pi^*)\right)_+ &(51)\\
&= \mathrm{Tr}\left(t\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}(\psi_{R^nA^n}) - \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}(\psi_{R^nA^n})\right)_+ &(52)
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the data processing inequality of $\mathrm{Tr}(\cdot)_+$ [1], the first equality follows from the block diagonal structure of $\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\left(\omega_{XR^nA^n}\right) - t\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\left(\omega_{XR^nA^n}\right)$, the second equality follows because $\mathrm{Tr}(\cdot)_+$ is unitary invariant and $\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}$ commute with permutations. Together with (46), we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
D_H^\varepsilon\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right) &\leqslant -\log\max_{t\in\mathbb{R}}\left\{(1-\varepsilon)t - \mathrm{Tr}\left(t\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}(\varphi_{\tilde{R}^nA^n}) - \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}(\varphi_{\tilde{R}^nA^n})\right)_+\right\}\\
&= D_H^\varepsilon\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\left(\varphi_{\tilde{R}^nA^n}\right)\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\left(\varphi_{\tilde{R}^nA^n}\right)\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

This completes the proof. ■

Remark 1 We say that a quantum divergence, $\boldsymbol{D}$, satisfies *the direct sum property* if there exists a one-to-one function $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that for any pair of cq-states $\rho, \sigma \in \mathfrak{D}(XA)$ of the form $\rho_{XA} \coloneqq \sum_x p_x|x\rangle\langle x|^X \otimes \rho_x^A$ and $\sigma^{XA} \coloneqq \sum_x p_x|x\rangle\langle x|^X \otimes \sigma_x^A$ where $\{p_x\}$ is a probability distribution and $\rho_x, \sigma_x \in \mathfrak{D}(A)$, we have $f^{-1}\left(\boldsymbol{D}\left(\rho_{XA}\middle\|\sigma_{XA}\right)\right) = \sum_x p_x f^{-1}\left(\boldsymbol{D}\left(\rho_x^A\middle\|\sigma_x^A\right)\right)$. The direct sum property is essentially equivalent to the *general mean property* used by Rényi and Müller-Lennert et al. for its generalization to the quantum case and holds for almost all the quantum divergences studied in the literature. Following a similar proof, we can show that Lemma 15 holds for any quantum divergence with the direct sum property.

Lemma 16 *Let $\sigma \in \mathfrak{D}(A)$ and $t \in (0, 1/|A|]$. For each $\tau \in \mathfrak{D}(A)$ such that $\tau_A \geqslant tI_A$ define*

$$f_\sigma(\tau) \coloneqq \mathrm{Tr}\left[\sigma(\log\tau)^2\right] - \left(\mathrm{Tr}\left[\sigma\log\tau\right]\right)^2 . \tag{54}$$

Then,

$$\max_{\substack{\tau\in\mathfrak{D}(A)\\ \tau\geqslant tI}} f_\sigma(\tau) \leqslant \|\sigma\|_\infty \log^2\left(1 + t^{-1} - |A|\right) . \tag{55}$$

Proof Set $d \coloneqq |A|$ and let $\tau = \sum_{x=1}^d p_x|x\rangle\langle x|$ be the spectral decomposition of τ. Denote by $q_x \coloneqq \langle x|\sigma|x\rangle$. With these notations

$$f_\sigma(\tau) = g_{\vec{q}}(\vec{p}) \coloneqq \sum_{x=1}^d q_x(\log p_x)^2 - \left(\sum_{x=1}^d q_x\log p_x\right)^2 \tag{56}$$

[1] This can be easily seen from the equation $\mathrm{Tr}(X)_+ = (\|X\|_1 + \mathrm{Tr}\, X)/2$ and the data processing inequality of trace norm.

where $\vec{q} \coloneqq (q_1, ..., q_d)^T$ and $\vec{p} = (p_1, ..., p_d)^T$. We first fix the basis $\{|x\rangle\}$ (so that $\vec{q}$ is a fixed vector) and maximize over $\{p_x\}$. Note that the condition $\tau \geqslant tI$ implies $p_x \geqslant t$ for all $x \in [d]$. First, note that if $\vec{p}$ is a critical point of the function $g_{\vec{q}}$ then for all $x \in [d]$

$$0 = \frac{\partial g_{\vec{q}}(\vec{p})}{\partial p_x} = \frac{2q_x}{p_x}\Big(\log p_x - \sum_{x'=1}^{d} q_{x'} \log p_{x'} \Big) \tag{57}$$

which is only possible if $\log p_x = \sum_{x'=1}^{d} q_{x'} \log p_{x'}$ for all $x \in [d]$. This implies that $p_1 = p_2 = \cdots = p_d$ so we must have $\vec{p} = \vec{u}$, where $\vec{u}$ is the uniform probability vector in $\mathfrak{D}(d)$. However, since $g_{\vec{q}}(\vec{u}) = 0$ we conclude that the maximum of the function $f_{\vec{q}}(\vec{p})$ does not occur at the critical point of $f_{\vec{q}}$. This mean that the maximum occur at the boundary of the set $\mathfrak{S} \coloneqq \{\vec{p} \in \mathfrak{D}(d) \ : \ p_x \geqslant t \ \forall \ x \in [d]\}$. A vector $\vec{p} \in \mathfrak{D}(A)$ is in the boundary of $\mathfrak{S}$ if and only if one of its component equals to t. For simplicity suppose $p_1 = t$. Then, we can define the function $\tilde{g}_{\vec{q}}(p_2, ..., p_d) \coloneqq g_{\vec{q}}(t, p_2, ..., p_d)$ and continue with the maximization of $\tilde{g}_{\vec{q}}(p_2, ..., p_d)$ over all $\{p_2, ..., p_d\}$. Similar arguments as above would implies that the maximum of $\tilde{g}_{\vec{q}}(p_2, ..., p_d)$ is obtained at the boundary, and therefore one of the components $\{p_2, ..., p_d\}$ must be equal to t. Continuing in this way we conclude that the maximum of $g_{\vec{q}}(\vec{p})$ is obtained if $(d-1)$ of the components of $\vec{p}$ are equal to t, and therefore the remaining component is equal to $1-(d-1)t$. Let $y \in [d]$ be the index for which $p_y = s \coloneqq 1-(d-1)t$ and $p_x = t$ for all $x \neq y$. Then, for such a $\vec{p}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\vec{q}}(\vec{p}) &= q_y\big(\log s\big)^2 + \sum_{x\neq y} q_x (\log t)^2 - \Big(q_y \log s + \sum_{x\neq y} q_x \log t\Big)^2 \\ &= q_y\big(\log s\big)^2 + (1-q_y)(\log t)^2 - \Big(q_y \log s + (1-q_y) \log t\Big)^2 \\ &= q_y(1-q_y)\left(\log \frac{s}{t}\right)^2 \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

We therefore conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\substack{\tau\in\mathfrak{D}(A)\\ \tau\geqslant tI}} f_\sigma(\tau) &= \log^2\left(1 + t^{-1} - d\right) \max\left\{q_x(1-q_x)\right\} \\ &\leqslant \max\{q_x\} \log^2\left(1 + t^{-1} - d\right) = \|\sigma\|_\infty \log^2\left(1 + t^{-1} - d\right) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

where the maximum in all the lines above is over $x \in [d]$ *and* over all orthonormal bases $\{|x\rangle\}$ of A. This completes the proof. ■

The last lemma we need is the following.

Lemma 17 *Let $\{\rho_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\sigma_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be two sequences of states with the following properties:*

1. *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the states $\rho_n, \sigma_n \in \mathfrak{D}(A^n)$ are symmetric under permutations of the n subsystems.*
2. *There exists two numbers $a, b \in (0,1)$ such that $\sigma_n \geqslant a^n I_{A^n}$ and $a^n I_{A_n} \leqslant \rho_n \leqslant b^n I_{A^n}$.*
3. *The supremum $\nu \coloneqq \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \left\{\frac{1}{n} D(\rho_n \| \sigma_n)\right\} < \infty$.*

Then, for every $\mu > \nu$ there exists $c > 0$ such that $\operatorname{Tr}\left(\rho_n - 2^{n\mu}\sigma_n\right)_+ \leqslant 2^{-cn}$ for sufficiently large n.

Proof From Lemma 13 we have that for any $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $s \in [0,1]$

$$\operatorname{Tr}\left(\rho_n - 2^{n\mu}\sigma_n\right)_+ \leqslant 2^{-np_n(s)} + 2^{-nq_n(s)} \tag{60}$$

where

$$p_n(s) \coloneqq rs - \frac{1}{n} \log \operatorname{Tr}[\rho_n^{1+s}] \tag{61}$$

$$q_n(s) \coloneqq s(\mu - r) - s|A| \frac{\log(1+n)}{n} - \frac{1}{n} \log \operatorname{Tr}[\rho_n \sigma_n^{-s}] \ . \tag{62}$$

The assertion can be proved by finding suitable choices of r and s.

We set $r = -\frac{1}{n}H(\rho_n) + \frac{1}{2}\delta$ with $\delta > 0$ and denote $f(s) \coloneqq \log \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_n^{1+s}]$. Since $f(0) = 0$ and $f'(0) = -H(\rho_n)$ from Taylor's theorem, there exists $t \in [0, s]$ such that

$$f(s) = -H(\rho_n)s + \frac{1}{2}f''(t)s^2 \,. \tag{63}$$

Substituting this into the expression of $p_n(s)$ gives

$$p_n(s) = \left(-\frac{1}{n}H(\rho_n) + \frac{1}{2}\delta\right)s + \frac{1}{n}H(\rho_n)s - \frac{1}{2n}f''(t)s^2 = \frac{1}{2}s\delta - \frac{1}{2n}f''(t)s^2 \,. \tag{64}$$

Now, a direct calculation gives

$$f''(t) = \mathrm{Tr}\left[\omega_t(\log \rho_n)^2\right] - \left(\mathrm{Tr}\left[\omega_t \log \rho_n\right]\right)^2 \quad \text{where} \quad \omega_t \coloneqq \frac{\rho_n^{1+t}}{\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_n^{1+t}]} \,. \tag{65}$$

Since $\rho_n \geqslant a^n I_{A^n}$ we get from Lemma 16 that

$$f''(t) \leqslant \|\omega_t\|_\infty \log^2(1 - |A| + a^{-n}) \leqslant \|\omega_t\|_\infty n^2 \log^2(a) \,. \tag{66}$$

We also have

$$\|\omega_t\|_\infty \leqslant \frac{b^{(1+t)n}}{\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_n^{1+t}]} \,. \tag{67}$$

Since the function $r \mapsto r^t$ with $t \in [0, 1]$ is operator monotone, and since $\rho_n \geqslant a^n I_{A_n}$ we get that $\rho_n^t \geqslant a^{nt} I_{A^n}$. Therefore,

$$\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_n^{1+t}] = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_n \rho_n^t] \geqslant a^{nt} \,. \tag{68}$$

Substituting this into the previous equation gives

$$\|\omega_t\|_\infty \leqslant \left(\frac{b^{1+t}}{a^t}\right)^n \,. \tag{69}$$

Therefore, by taking $0 < s < \frac{-\log(b)}{\log(b/a)}$ we get $t \leqslant s < \frac{-\log(b)}{\log(b/a)}$ which implies $\frac{b^{1+t}}{a^t} < 1$ so that $\|\omega_t\|_\infty$ goes to zero exponentially fast with n. We therefore conclude that for any $0 < s < \frac{-\log(b)}{\log(b/a)}$ and sufficiently large n

$$p_n(s) = \frac{1}{2}s\delta - \frac{s^2}{2n}f''(t) \geqslant \frac{1}{4}s\delta > 0. \tag{70}$$

We next bound $q_n(s)$. For any $\mu > \nu$, it also holds $\mu - 2\delta > \nu$ for small enough δ. Then

$$q_n(s) = s\left(\mu + \frac{1}{n}H(\rho_n) - \frac{1}{2}\delta\right) - s|A|\frac{\log(1+n)}{n} - \frac{1}{n}\log \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_n \sigma_n^{-s}] \,. \tag{71}$$

Observe also that $\mu > \nu + 2\delta \geqslant \frac{1}{n}D(\rho_n\|\sigma_n) + 2\delta$, and for sufficiently large n the quantity $|A|\frac{\log(n+1)}{n} \leqslant \frac{1}{2}\delta$. Hence, for sufficiently large n

$$q_n(s) \geqslant s\left(\delta - \frac{1}{n}\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_n \log \sigma_n]\right) - \frac{1}{n}\log \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_n \sigma_n^{-s}] \tag{72}$$

Let $g(s) \coloneqq \log \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_n \sigma_n^{-s}]$ and observe that $g(0) = 0$ and $g'(0) = -\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_n \log \sigma_n]$. From Taylor's theorem there exists $t \in [0, s]$ such that $g(s) = g(0) + g'(0)s + \frac{1}{2}g''(t)s^2$. Substituting this into the inequality above we get

$$q_n(s) \geqslant s\left(\delta - \frac{1}{n}\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_n \log \sigma_n]\right) + \frac{1}{n}s\log \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_n \log \sigma_n] - \frac{1}{2n}g''(t)s^2 = s\delta - \frac{1}{2n}g''(t)s^2 \,. \tag{73}$$

Now, a straightforward calculation gives

$$g''(t) = \mathrm{Tr}\left[\eta_t(\log \sigma_n)^2\right] - \left(\mathrm{Tr}\left[\eta_t \log \sigma_n\right]\right)^2 \quad \text{where} \quad \eta_t \coloneqq \frac{\sigma_n^{-t/2}\rho_n\sigma_n^{-t/2}}{\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_n \sigma_n^{-t}]} \,. \tag{74}$$

Since $\sigma_n \geqslant a^n I_{A^n}$ we get from Lemma 16 that

$$g''(t) \leqslant \|\eta_t\|_\infty \log^2(1 - |A| + a^{-n}) \leqslant \|\eta_t\|_\infty n^2 \log^2(a) \tag{75}$$

Now,

$$\|\eta_t\|_\infty = \frac{\left\|\sigma_n^{-t/2}\rho_n\sigma_n^{-t/2}\right\|_\infty}{\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_n\sigma_n^{-t}]} \leqslant \frac{b^n\left\|\sigma_n^{-t}\right\|_\infty}{\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_n\sigma_n^{-t}]} \leqslant \frac{1}{\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_n\sigma_n^{-t}]}\left(\frac{b}{a^t}\right)^n \leqslant \left(\frac{b}{a^t}\right)^n , \tag{76}$$

where the first inequality follows because $\rho_n \leqslant b^n I_{A^n}$, the second inequality follows because $\sigma_n \geqslant a^n I_{A^n}$, in the last inequality we used the fact that $\sigma_n \leqslant I_{A^n}$ so that $\sigma_n^{-t} \geqslant I_{A^n}$ and therefore $\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_n\sigma_n^{-t}] \geqslant 1$. Therefore, for $t < \frac{\log b}{\log a}$ we have $\frac{b}{a^t} < 1$ in which case $\|\eta_t\|_\infty$ goes to zero exponentially fast with n. Hence, for $0 < s < \frac{\log b}{\log a}$ and sufficiently large n we have

$$q_n(s) \geqslant s\delta - \frac{1}{2n}g''(t)s^2 \geqslant \frac{1}{2}s\delta > 0 . \tag{77}$$

Combining (60), (70), (77) and letting $c := \frac{1}{8}s\delta$, we have

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left(\rho_n - 2^{n\mu}\sigma_n\right)_+ \leqslant 2^{-\frac{1}{2}s\delta n} + 2^{-\frac{1}{4}s\delta n} \leqslant 2^{-cn} \tag{78}$$

for sufficiently large n. This completes the proof. ■

We are now in the position to prove Theorem 12.

3.2 Proof of Theorem 12

Consider a sequence of strategies with Type I error $\{\alpha_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and Type II error $\{\beta_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. By the assumption of (21), for sufficiently large n and sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ we have

$$-\frac{1}{n}\log\beta_n > D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) + 2\delta. \tag{79}$$

Let $\psi \in \mathfrak{D}(R^nA^n)$ be such that

$$D_H^\varepsilon\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right) = D_H^\varepsilon\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}(\psi_{R^nA^n})\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}(\psi_{R^nA^n})\right) , \tag{80}$$

and for simplicity, denote by $\rho_n := \mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}(\psi_{R^nA^n})$ and by $\sigma_n := \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}(\psi_{R^nA^n})$. From Lemma 15 we can assume without loss of generality that ρ_n and σ_n are symmetric under permutations. With these notations and the variational expression of D_H^ε (45) we have

$$D_H^\varepsilon\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right) = -\log\max_{t\geqslant 0}\left\{(1-\varepsilon)t - \mathrm{Tr}(t\rho_n - \sigma_n)_+\right\} . \tag{81}$$

Set $\mu := D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) + \delta$. Taking $t = 2^{-n\mu}$ in the equation above gives

$$D_H^\varepsilon\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right) \leqslant n\mu - \log\left(1 - \varepsilon - \mathrm{Tr}\left(\rho_n - 2^{n\mu}\sigma_n\right)_+\right) . \tag{82}$$

Since the strategy considered is clearly a feasible solution for $D_H^{\alpha_n}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n})$, we have

$$-\log\beta_n \leqslant D_H^{\alpha_n}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}) \leqslant n\mu - \log\left(1 - \alpha_n - \mathrm{Tr}\left(\rho_n - 2^{n\mu}\sigma_n\right)_+\right), \tag{83}$$

which is equivalent to

$$1 - \alpha_n \leqslant 2^{-n(-\frac{1}{n}\log\beta_n - \mu)} + \mathrm{Tr}\left(\rho_n - 2^{n\mu}\sigma_n\right)_+ . \tag{84}$$

From (79) we have $-\frac{1}{n}\log\beta_n - \mu > \delta$, which implies

$$2^{-n(-\frac{1}{n}\log\beta_n - \mu)} \leqslant 2^{-n\delta}. \tag{85}$$

We next bound the second term $\operatorname{Tr}\left(\rho_n - 2^{n\mu}\sigma_n\right)_+$ by using Lemma 17. Let $\varphi \in \mathfrak{D}(RA)$ be the maximally entangled state and define

$$\omega_n := \frac{1}{1+\delta_n}\psi_{R^nA^n} + \frac{\delta_n}{1+\delta_n}\varphi^{\otimes n} \in \mathfrak{D}(R^nA^n)\ , \tag{86}$$

where $\delta_n := 2^{-n(\mu+\delta)}$. Denote also by $\tilde{\rho}_n := \mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}(\omega_n)$, $\tilde{\sigma}_n := \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}(\omega_n)$, $\rho := \mathcal{N}(\varphi)$ and $\sigma := \mathcal{M}(\varphi)$. Observe that

$$\rho_n = (1+\delta_n)\tilde{\rho}_n - \delta_n\rho^{\otimes n} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_n = (1+\delta_n)\tilde{\sigma}_n - \delta_n\sigma^{\otimes n}\ . \tag{87}$$

We therefore have

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\rho_n - 2^{n\mu}\sigma_n\right)_+ &= \operatorname{Tr}\Big((1+\delta_n)\big(\tilde{\rho}_n - 2^{n\mu}\tilde{\sigma}_n\big) - \delta_n\big(\rho^{\otimes n} - 2^{n\mu}\sigma^{\otimes n}\big)\Big)_+ \\ &\leqslant (1+\delta_n)\operatorname{Tr}\left(\tilde{\rho}_n - 2^{n\mu}\tilde{\sigma}_n\right)_+ + \delta_n\operatorname{Tr}\left(\rho^{\otimes n} - 2^{n\mu}\sigma^{\otimes n}\right)_+ - (1-2^{n\mu})\delta_n \\ &\leqslant (1+\delta_n)\operatorname{Tr}\left(\tilde{\rho}_n - 2^{n\mu}\tilde{\sigma}_n\right)_+ + 2^{n\mu}\delta_n\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

where the first inequality follows from Lemma 31 in the Appendix and the second inequality follows because $\operatorname{Tr}\left(\rho^{\otimes n} - 2^{n\mu}\sigma^{\otimes n}\right)_+ \leqslant 1$ (also from Lemma 31). By definition, $\tilde{\rho}_n$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_n$ are symmetric under permutations, and

$$\frac{1}{n}D\left(\tilde{\rho}_n\middle\|\tilde{\sigma}_n\right) = \frac{1}{n}D\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}(\omega_n)\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}(\omega_n)\right) \leqslant \frac{1}{n}D\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right) \leqslant D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) < \mu\ . \tag{89}$$

Moreover, observe that the minimum eigenvalue of $\tilde{\rho}_n$ (also of $\tilde{\sigma}_n$) satisfies [2]

$$\lambda_{\min}(\tilde{\rho}_n) \geqslant \frac{\delta_n}{1+\delta_n}\lambda_{\min}\big(\mathcal{N}(\varphi)\big)^n \geqslant \frac{1}{2}\Big(2^{-\mu-\delta}\lambda_{\min}\big(\mathcal{N}(\varphi)\big)\Big)^n \geqslant a^n \tag{90}$$

for some $a \in (0,1)$. Finally, from Lemma 14 it follows that $\lambda_{\max}(\rho_n) \leqslant b^n$ for some $b \in (0,1)$ so that

$$\lambda_{\max}(\tilde{\rho}_n) \leqslant \frac{1}{1+\delta_n}b^n + \frac{\delta_n}{1+\delta_n}\lambda_{\max}(\rho)^n \leqslant \tilde{b}^n \tag{91}$$

where $\tilde{b} := \max\{b, \lambda_{\max}(\rho)\} < 1$. That is, $\tilde{\rho}_n$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_n$ satisfies all the conditions of Lemma 17. So there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that $\operatorname{Tr}\left(\tilde{\rho}_n - 2^{n\mu}\tilde{\sigma}_n\right)_+ \leqslant 2^{-c_1 n}$. Together with (88) we have

$$\operatorname{Tr}\left(\rho_n - 2^{n\mu}\sigma_n\right)_+ \leqslant 2\cdot 2^{-c_1 n} + 2^{-\delta n} \leqslant 2^{-c_2 n} \tag{92}$$

for sufficiently large n, where the second inequality holds by taking $c_2 := \frac{1}{2}\min\{\frac{1}{2}c_1, \delta\}$. Finally, combining (84), (85) and (92) we have

$$1 - \alpha_n \leqslant 2^{-\delta n} + 2^{-c_2 n} \leqslant 2^{-cn} \tag{93}$$

for sufficiently large n and $c := \frac{1}{2}\min\{\delta, c_2\}$. This completes the proof.

4 Limits of Channel Divergence

In this section we show that the exponentially strong converse of channel hypothesis testing in Theorem 12 directly implies some foundational results on the limits of channel divergences. In particular, the first implication of Theorem 12 is a complete analog of Stein's lemma for quantum channels.

Theorem 18 (Channel Stein's Lemma) *Let $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B)$ and $\mathcal{N} > 0$. Then, for any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ it holds*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}D_H^\varepsilon\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right) = D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})\ . \tag{94}$$

[2] Note that for two Hermitian operators X, Y it holds $\lambda_{\min}(X) \geqslant \lambda_{\min}(Y)$ if $X \geqslant Y$.

Proof We prove the achievable direction first. The proof of this direction relies on the relation of the hypothesis testing relative entropy and the Petz Rényi divergence (see Lemma 32 in the Appendix). Applying Lemma 32 to channel divergence gives

$$D_H^\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) \geqslant \overline{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) + \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}\left(\frac{h(\alpha)}{\alpha} - \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\right), \tag{95}$$

for any $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. Therefore,

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} D_H^\varepsilon\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right) \geqslant \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\overline{D}_\alpha\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right) = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{n}\overline{D}_\alpha\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right). \tag{96}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} D_H^\varepsilon\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right) &\geqslant \sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{n}\overline{D}_\alpha\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right) \\
&= \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)} \frac{1}{n}\overline{D}_\alpha\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right) \\
&= \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{n} D\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right) \\
&= D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}),
\end{aligned} \tag{97}$$

where the first equality follows by swapping the two suprema, the second equality follows by the fact that $\sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)} \overline{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) = \lim_{\alpha\to 1^-} \overline{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) = D(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$ (see Lemma 9), the last equality follows by definition.

As for the converse direction, suppose $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} D_H^\varepsilon\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right) > D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$, then there exists a subsequence n_k such that $\lim_{n_k\to\infty} \frac{1}{n_k} D_H^\varepsilon\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n_k}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n_k}\right) > D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$. This implies a sequence of strategies such that the Type I error $\alpha_{n_k} \leqslant \varepsilon$ and the Type II error $\lim_{n_k\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n_k}\log\beta_{n_k} > D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$. By Theorem 12, we know that the second condition implies $1-\alpha_{n_k} \leqslant 2^{-cn_k}$ for some $c > 0$, which contradicts to the first condition $\alpha_{n_k} \leqslant \varepsilon$. This completes the proof. ■

Besides the hypothesis testing relative entropy, quantum divergences such as the max-relative entropy and information spectrum relative entropies also play a crucial role in information processing such as data compression, randomness extraction and source coding [TH13, DL14]. Of particular importance are their asymptotic equipartition properties (AEP). Here we establish the AEP of their channel divergences.

Theorem 19 *Let $\boldsymbol{D}^\varepsilon \in \{D_{\max}^\varepsilon, \underline{D}_s^\varepsilon, \overline{D}_s^\varepsilon, D_s^\varepsilon\}$ be one of the quantum divergences. Let $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A\to B)$ with $\mathcal{N} > 0$. Then it holds*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \boldsymbol{D}^\varepsilon\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right) = D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}). \tag{98}$$

Proof This result can be seen as a direct consequence of the channel Stein's lemma in Theorem 18. As the proof works similarly for all $\boldsymbol{D}^\varepsilon \in \{D_{\max}^\varepsilon, \underline{D}_s^\varepsilon, \overline{D}_s^\varepsilon, D_s^\varepsilon\}$, we only showcase the proof for $D_{\max}^\varepsilon$ without loss of generality.

For any two quantum states $\rho, \sigma \in \mathfrak{D}(A)$, any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, and any $\varepsilon' \in (0, 1-\varepsilon)$ it is known that [DKF+14, Proposition 4.1] [DMHB13, Theorem 11],

$$D_H^{\varepsilon'}(\rho\|\sigma) + \log\left(1-\varepsilon-\varepsilon'\right) \leqslant D_{\max}^\varepsilon(\rho\|\sigma) \leqslant D_H^{1-\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2}(\rho\|\sigma) + \log\left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon^2}\right). \tag{99}$$

Applying this to channel divergence gives

$$D_H^{\varepsilon'}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) + \log\left(1-\varepsilon-\varepsilon'\right) \leqslant D_{\max}^\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) \leqslant D_H^{1-\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) + \log\left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon^2}\right) \tag{100}$$

Taking n copies of $\mathcal{N}$ and $\mathcal{M}$ we get

$$\frac{1}{n}D_H^{\varepsilon'}\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right)+\frac{1}{n}\log\left(1-\varepsilon-\varepsilon'\right)$$
$$\leqslant\frac{1}{n}D_{\max}^{\varepsilon}\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right)\leqslant\frac{1}{n}D_H^{1-\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2}\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right)+\frac{1}{n}\log\left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon^2}\right). \quad (101)$$

From the channel Stein's Lemma in Theorem 18 we get that for $\mathcal{N}>0$ we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}D_H^{\varepsilon'}\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right)=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}D_H^{1-\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2}\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right)=D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}). \quad (102)$$

Therefore, taking the limit $n\to\infty$ in (101) we get that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}D_{\max}^{\varepsilon}\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right)=D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}). \quad (103)$$

Finally, the proofs for $\underline{D}_s^{\varepsilon}, \overline{D}_s^{\varepsilon}$ and D_s^{ε} work similarly by using their one-shot equivalent relations with D_H in [TH13, Lemma 12] and [DL14, Proposition 2]. ■

Note that our results are stronger than the usual AEPs as they hold for any fixed $\varepsilon\in(0,1)$ instead of vanishing ε. In this sense, we will call such a result by the *strong asymptotic equipartition property*.

As D_H and $D_{\max}$ are the two extreme cases of one-shot quantum divergences, Theorems 18 and 19 implies that the strong asymptotic equipartition property holds for any divergence between D_H and $D_{\max}$ after appropriate smoothing.

Besides the above strong asymptotic equipartition properties, the exponentially strong converse in Theorem 12 also implies the continuity of the regularized (amortized) Sandwiched Rényi channel divergence at $\alpha=1$, addressing the open question left in [FF21, Remark 5.6] and leading to a deeper understanding of channel discrimination in the strong converse regime. Moreover, this continuity implies that the exponentially strong converse also holds for channel discrimination under sequential strategies.

Theorem 20 *Let $\mathcal{N},\mathcal{M}\in\mathrm{CPTP}(A\to B)$ and $\mathcal{N}>0$.*

$$\lim_{\alpha\to1^+}\widetilde{D}_\alpha^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})=\inf_{\alpha>1}\widetilde{D}_\alpha^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})=D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}). \quad (104)$$

As a consequence,

$$\lim_{\alpha\to1^+}\widetilde{D}_\alpha^{A}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})=\inf_{\alpha>1}\widetilde{D}_\alpha^{A}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})=D^{A}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}). \quad (105)$$

Proof Note that the Sandwiched Rényi divergence between states is monotone-increasing in α. So this directly implies the monotonicity of $\widetilde{D}_\alpha^{\mathrm{reg}}$ and thus the first equality in (104). It remains to show the second equality. For any $\alpha>1$, we have $\widetilde{D}_\alpha^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})\geqslant D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$. Thus it is clear that $\inf_{\alpha>1}\widetilde{D}_\alpha^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})\geqslant D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$. We now prove the other direction. If $\inf_{\alpha>1}\widetilde{D}_\alpha^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})>D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$, we can find a real number r such that $\inf_{\alpha>1}\widetilde{D}_\alpha^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})>r>D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$. Consider a sequence of coherent channel discrimination strategies such that the Type II error converges at an exponential rate r. By the result [FF21, Theorem 5.5 and Remark 5.6], we know that the strong converse exponent is zero since $r<\inf_{\alpha>1}\widetilde{D}_\alpha^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$, which means the Type I error does not exponentially converge to one. However, by Theorem 12, the condition $r>D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$ implies that the Type I error has to converge exponentially to one, which forms a contradiction and concludes that $\inf_{\alpha>1}\widetilde{D}_\alpha^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})\leqslant D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$. Finally, the assertion for the amortized channel divergence directly follows from $\widetilde{D}_\alpha^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})=\widetilde{D}_\alpha^{A}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$ [FF21, Theorem 5.4] and $D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})=D^{A}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$ [FFRS20, Corollary 3]. ■

Corollary 21 *Let $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B)$ and $\mathcal{N} > 0$. Consider any sequence of sequential channel discrimination strategies with Type I error $\{\alpha_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and Type II error $\{\beta_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. If the Type II error has*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} -\frac{1}{n}\log\beta_n =: r > D^A(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}), \tag{106}$$

then there exists $c > 0$ such that the Type I error $1-\alpha_n \leqslant 2^{-cn}$ for sufficiently large n.

Proof By the result in [WBHK20, Proposition 20], for any sequential strategies and $\alpha > 1$ it holds

$$-\frac{1}{n}\log(1-\alpha_n) \geqslant \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left(-\frac{1}{n}\log\beta_n - \widetilde{D}^A_\alpha(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})\right). \tag{107}$$

By the assumption (106), there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $-\frac{1}{n}\log\beta_n \geqslant r-\delta > D^A(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$ for sufficiently large n. Since $r > D^A(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$ and $\lim_{\alpha\to 1^+}\widetilde{D}^A_\alpha(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) = D^A(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$, then there exists $\alpha_0 > 1$ such that $r-\delta > \widetilde{D}^A_{\alpha_0}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$. Then we have

$$-\frac{1}{n}\log\beta_n - \widetilde{D}^A_{\alpha_0}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) \geqslant r-\delta-\widetilde{D}^A_{\alpha_0}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) =: b > 0, \tag{108}$$

and

$$-\frac{1}{n}\log(1-\alpha_n) \geqslant \frac{\alpha_0-1}{\alpha_0}b =: c > 0, \tag{109}$$

which is equivalent to $1-\alpha_n \leqslant 2^{-cn}$. This completes the proof. ■

5 Channel Discrimination and Channel Divergence

The task of channel discrimination aims to distinguish a quantum channel from the other under a given type of strategy. A standard approach for discrimination is to perform hypothesis testing and make a decision based on the testing result. However, two types of error (Type I error and Type II error) arise. In the same spirit of state discrimination, one can study the asymptotic behavior of these errors in different operational regimes, particularly,

- Stein exponent regime that studies the exponent of the exponential decay of the Type II error given that the Type I error is within a constant threshold;
- strong converse exponent regime that studies the exponent of the exponential convergence of the Type I error given that the Type II error exponentially decays;
- error exponent regime that studies the exponent of the exponential convergence of the Type I error given that the Type II error exponentially decays.

The discrimination between quantum states in different operational regimes has been well-studied. In particular, there is a nice correspondence between the regime studied and the divergence of quantum states. More precisely, the Stein exponent is given by the Umegaki relative entropy [HP91, ON00], the strong converse exponent is determined by the Sandwiched Rényi divergence [MO15], and the error exponent is determined by the Petz Rényi divergence [Hay07, Nag06, ANSV08b]. However, when it comes to channel discrimination, the situation becomes much involved due to the diverse range of discrimination strategies and different extensions of channel divergence.

In this section we give a systematic study of the interplay between the strategies of channel discrimination (e.g., sequential, coherent, product), the operational regimes (e.g., error exponent, Stein exponent, strong converse exponent), and three variants of channel divergences (e.g., Petz, Umegaki, Sandwiched). We find a nice correspondence summarized in Table 2, which shows that the proper divergences to use (Petz, Umegaki, Sandwiched) are determined by the operational regime of interest, while the types of channel extension (one-shot, regularized, amortized) are determined by the discrimination strategies. The solution of each particular case includes both direct and converse parts. Existing results are either for specific channels (e.g replacer channels [CMW16], cq channels [BHKW18]) or providing partial solutions (e.g. weak converse [WW19b], strong converse bounds [BHKW18]). Our main contributions (highlighted in yellow) are mostly on the strong converse parts, contributing to a complete picture of channel discrimination in this unified framework.



Figure 2: A table of relations between the operational regimes, channel discrimination strategies and channel divergences. The symbol [*] represents contributions in this paper. "✔","✔" and "?" represent that the case is solved, partially solved and not solved, respectively. Some key references are also included.

5.1 Stein exponent

In this subsection we consider minimizing the Type II error probability, under the constraint that the Type I error probability does not exceed a constant threshold $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. We characterize the exact exponent, named *Stein exponent*, with which the Type II error exponentially decays.

Definition 22 (Stein exponent) *Let $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. The Stein exponents of quantum channel discrimination by the strategy class $\Omega \in \{\mathrm{PRO}, \mathrm{COH}, \mathrm{SEQ}\}$ are defined by*

$$\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{st}}_{\Omega,\sup}(\varepsilon|\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) := \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} D^{\varepsilon}_{H,\Omega}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}), \tag{110}$$

$$\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{st}}_{\Omega,\inf}(\varepsilon|\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) := \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} D^{\varepsilon}_{H,\Omega}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}), \tag{111}$$

where

$$D^{\varepsilon}_{H,\Omega}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}) := \sup_{(S_n,\Pi_n)\in\Omega} \left\{ -\frac{1}{n}\log \beta_n(S_n,\Pi_n) : \alpha_n(S_n,\Pi_n) \leqslant \varepsilon \right\} \tag{112}$$

the supremum is taken over all possible stategies $(S_n,\Pi_n) \in \Omega$ satisfying the condition.

The non-asymptotic quantity in (112) can also be written as a notion of hypothesis testing relative entropy between the testing states,

$$D^{\varepsilon}_{H,\Omega}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}) = \sup_{S_n\in\Omega} D^{\varepsilon}_{H}(\rho_n(S_n)\|\sigma_n(S_n)), \tag{113}$$

where the hypothesis testing relative entropy on the r.h.s. is between two quantum states which is defined in (8) and the supremum is taken over all strategies $S_n \in \Omega$ that generate the testing states $\rho_n(S_n)$ and $\sigma_n(S_n)$. More explicitly, when $\Omega = \mathrm{PRO}$, we have $\rho_n(S_n) = \mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}(\otimes_{i=1}^n \varphi_i)$, $\sigma_n(S_n) = \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}(\otimes_{i=1}^n \varphi_i)$ and the supremum is taken over all $\varphi_i \in \mathfrak{D}(R_iA_i)$. When $\Omega = \mathrm{COH}$, we have $\rho_n(S_n) = \mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}(\psi_n)$, $\sigma_n(S_n) = \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}(\psi_n)$ and the supremum is taken over all $\psi_n \in \mathfrak{D}(RA^n)$. When $\Omega = \mathrm{SEQ}$, we have

$\rho_n(S_n) = \mathcal{N} \circ \mathcal{P}_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{P}_2 \circ \mathcal{N} \circ \mathcal{P}_1 \circ \mathcal{N}(\psi_n)$, $\sigma_n(S_n) = \mathcal{M} \circ \mathcal{P}_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{P}_2 \circ \mathcal{M} \circ \mathcal{P}_1 \circ \mathcal{M}(\psi_n)$ and the supremum is taken over all $\psi_n \in \mathfrak{D}(R_1 A_1)$ and $\mathcal{P}_i \in \mathrm{CPTP}(R_i B_i \to R_{i+1} A_{i+1})$.

Theorem 23 *Let $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. It holds*

$$\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{st}}_{\mathrm{PRO,sup}}(\varepsilon|\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) = \mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{st}}_{\mathrm{PRO,inf}}(\varepsilon|\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) = D(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}). \tag{114}$$

Proof It suffices to show that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} D^{\varepsilon}_{H,\mathrm{PRO}}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}) = D(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}). \tag{115}$$

For the achievable part, let $\varphi \in \mathfrak{D}(RA)$ be an optimal input state for $D(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$, i.e., $D(\mathcal{N}(\varphi)\|\mathcal{M}(\varphi)) = D(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$. Using $\varphi^{\otimes n}$ as the input state in the product strategy, we have

$$\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{st}}_{\mathrm{PRO,inf}}(\varepsilon|\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) \geqslant \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} D^{\varepsilon}_{H}([\mathcal{N}(\varphi)]^{\otimes n}\|[\mathcal{M}(\varphi)]^{\otimes n}) = D(\mathcal{N}(\varphi)\|\mathcal{M}(\varphi)) = D(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}), \tag{116}$$

where the first equality follows from the quantum Stein's lemma [HP91, ON00] and the second equality follows from the optimality assumption of φ. For the converse part, consider any input states $\otimes_{i=1}^n \varphi_i$ with $\varphi_i \in \mathfrak{D}(R_i A_i)$ and $\alpha > 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n} D^{\varepsilon}_{H}\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{N}(\varphi_i)\middle\|\bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}(\varphi_i)\right) &\leqslant \frac{1}{n}\widetilde{D}_{\alpha}\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{N}(\varphi_i)\middle\|\bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}(\varphi_i)\right) + \frac{1}{n}\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\log\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} && (117)\\
&= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \widetilde{D}_{\alpha}\left(\mathcal{N}(\varphi_i)\middle\|\mathcal{M}(\varphi_i)\right) + \frac{1}{n}\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\log\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} && (118)\\
&\leqslant \widetilde{D}_{\alpha}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) + \frac{1}{n}\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\log\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}, && (119)
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from Lemma 5, the first equality follows from the additivity of Sandwiched Rényi divergence under tensor product states, the second inequality follows from the definition of channel divergence. Taking the supremum of all input states $\otimes_{i=1}^n \varphi_i$ and taking the limit of $n \to \infty$, we have

$$\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{st}}_{\mathrm{PRO,sup}}(\varepsilon|\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} D^{\varepsilon}_{H,\mathrm{PRO}}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}) \leqslant \widetilde{D}_{\alpha}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}). \tag{120}$$

Finally, taking $\alpha \to 1$ and applying Lemma 9 we have the converse part. ■

Note that we can actually extend the input choices of product strategy to convex combination of tensor product states $\sum_{j=1}^m p_j(\otimes_{i=1}^n \varphi_{i,j})$. In this case Theorem 23 still holds by adding an extra step in the proof of the converse part and using the joint quasi-convexity of the Sandwiched Rényi divergence (e.g. [MO15, Corollary 3.16]). This indicates that shared randomness between the input states for each uses of the channel will not help to get a faster convergence rate of the type II error for channel discrimination.

Theorem 24 *Let $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B)$ with $\mathcal{N} > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. Then, it holds*

$$\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{st}}_{\mathrm{COH,sup}}(\varepsilon|\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) = \mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{st}}_{\mathrm{COH,inf}}(\varepsilon|\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) = D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}). \tag{121}$$

Proof The assertion is basically a restatement of Theorem 18 by noting that $D^{\varepsilon}_{H,\mathrm{COH}}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\big\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}) = D^{\varepsilon}_{H}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\big\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n})$. ■

Theorem 25 *Let $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B)$ with $\mathcal{N} > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. Then, it holds*

$$\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{st}}_{\mathrm{SEQ,sup}}(\varepsilon|\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) = \mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{st}}_{\mathrm{SEQ,inf}}(\varepsilon|\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) = D^A(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}). \tag{122}$$

Proof By definition it is clear that $\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{st}}_{\mathrm{SEQ,inf}}(\varepsilon|\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$ is monotone increasing in ε. Thus for any fixed $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ we have

$$\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{st}}_{\mathrm{SEQ,inf}}(\varepsilon|\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) \geqslant \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{st}}_{\mathrm{SEQ,inf}}(\varepsilon|\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) = D^A(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}), \tag{123}$$

where the equality follows from [WW19b, Theorem 6].

Next we prove the converse part. For any $\psi_n \in \mathfrak{D}(RA^n)$, $\mathcal{P}_i \in \mathrm{CPTP}(R_iB_i \to R_{i+1}A_{i+1})$, denote

$$\rho_n = \mathcal{N} \circ \mathcal{P}_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{P}_2 \circ \mathcal{N} \circ \mathcal{P}_1 \circ \mathcal{N}(\psi_n) \tag{124}$$

$$\sigma_n = \mathcal{M} \circ \mathcal{P}_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{P}_2 \circ \mathcal{M} \circ \mathcal{P}_1 \circ \mathcal{M}(\psi_n). \tag{125}$$

Due to Lemma 5, it holds for any $\alpha > 1$ that

$$\frac{1}{n} D^{\varepsilon}_H(\rho_n\|\sigma_n) \leqslant \frac{1}{n} \widetilde{D}_\alpha(\rho_n\|\sigma_n) + \frac{1}{n}\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\log\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}. \tag{126}$$

Note that for any quantum state ρ, σ and quantum channels $\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}$, we have by definition

$$\widetilde{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{E}(\rho)\|\mathcal{F}(\sigma)) \leqslant \widetilde{D}^A_\alpha(\mathcal{E}\|\mathcal{F}) + \widetilde{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma). \tag{127}$$

By using this relation and the data-processing inequality of $\widetilde{D}_\alpha$ iteratively, we have $\widetilde{D}_\alpha(\rho_n\|\sigma_n) \leqslant n\widetilde{D}^A_\alpha(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$. This gives

$$\frac{1}{n} D^{\varepsilon}_H(\rho_n\|\sigma_n) \leqslant \widetilde{D}^A_\alpha(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) + \frac{1}{n}\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\log\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}. \tag{128}$$

Taking on both sides the supremum over all sequential strategies following by the limit $n \to \infty$ gives

$$\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{st}}_{\mathrm{SEQ,sup}}(\varepsilon|\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} D^{\varepsilon}_{H,\mathrm{SEQ}}\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right) \leqslant \widetilde{D}^A_\alpha(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}). \tag{129}$$

Since the above inequality holds for all $\alpha > 1$, by taking $\alpha \to 1^+$ and using Theorem 20 we have

$$\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{st}}_{\mathrm{SEQ,sup}}(\varepsilon|\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) \leqslant D^A(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}). \tag{130}$$

This completes the proof. ■

Note that Theorem 24 and 25 have been proved in [WW19b, Theorem 3 and Theorem 6] for vanishing ε. But our results here are stronger as it holds for any fixed $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ without the need to take $\varepsilon \to 0$. This corresponds to the strong converse property of channel discrimination under coherent or sequential strategies.

5.2 Strong converse exponent

In the task of state discrimination, the strong converse exponent is defined by

$$\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{sc}}(r|\rho\|\sigma) := \inf_{\{\Pi_n\}} \left\{ -\liminf_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho^{\otimes n}\Pi_n : \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log \mathrm{Tr}\,\sigma^{\otimes n}\Pi_n \leqslant -r \right\}, \tag{131}$$

where the infimum is taken over all possible sequences of quantum tests $\{\Pi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying the condition. It has been shown in [MO15, Theorem 4.10] that this exponent is precisely characterized by:

$$\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{sc}}(r|\rho\|\sigma) = \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[r - \widetilde{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma)\right]. \tag{132}$$

We aim to extend this result to the channel case.

Let us start by defining the strong converse exponent of channel discrimination.

Definition 26 (Strong converse exponent) *Let $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B)$ and $r > 0$. The strong converse exponent of channel discrimination by the strategy class $\Omega \in \{\mathrm{PRO}, \mathrm{COH}, \mathrm{SEQ}\}$ is defined by*

$$\mathrm{E}_{\Omega}^{\mathrm{sc}}(r|\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) := \inf_{(S_n,\Pi_n)\in\Omega} \left\{ -\liminf_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log(1-\alpha_n(S_n,\Pi_n)) : \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \beta_n(S_n,\Pi_n) \leqslant -r \right\}, \tag{133}$$

where the infimum is taken over all possible strategies $(S_n, \Pi_n) \in \Omega$ satisfying the condition.

Theorem 27 *Let $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B)$ and $r > 0$. Then it holds*

$$\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{PRO}}^{\mathrm{sc}}(r|\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) = \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} \left[r - \widetilde{D}_{\alpha}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) \right]. \tag{134}$$

Proof We first prove the converse part which closely follows the proof of its state analog in [MO15, Lemma 4.7]. For any product strategy $(\{\varphi_i\}_{i=1}^n, \Pi_n)$ with input states $\varphi_i \in \mathfrak{D}(R_i A_i)$ and measurement opeartor $0 \leqslant \Pi_n \leqslant I$. Let $\rho_n := \mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}(\otimes_{i=1}^n \varphi_i)$, $\sigma_n := \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}(\otimes_{i=1}^n \varphi_i)$ be the output states and $p_n := (\operatorname{Tr} \rho_n \Pi_n, \operatorname{Tr} \rho_n (I - \Pi_n))$ and $q_n := (\operatorname{Tr} \sigma_n \Pi_n, \operatorname{Tr} \sigma_n (I - \Pi_n))$ be the post-measurement states. Then the Type I error is $\alpha_n = \operatorname{Tr}[(I - \Pi_n)\rho_n]$ and the Type II error is $\beta_n = \operatorname{Tr}[\Pi_n \sigma_n]$. By definition it suffices to consider sequences $(\{\varphi_i\}_{i=1}^n, \Pi_n)$ such that $\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \beta_n \leqslant -r$. From the data-processing of the Sandwiched Rényi divergence, we have for any $\alpha > 1$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{D}_{\alpha}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n) &\geqslant \widetilde{D}_{\alpha}(p_n\|q_n) \\ &\geqslant \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \left[(\operatorname{Tr} \rho_n \Pi_n)^{\alpha} (\operatorname{Tr} \sigma_n \Pi_n)^{1-\alpha} \right] = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log(1-\alpha_n) - \log \beta_n. \end{aligned} \tag{135}$$

This can be equivalently written as

$$-\frac{1}{n} \log(1-\alpha_n) \geqslant \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} \left[-\frac{1}{n} \log \beta_n - \frac{1}{n} \widetilde{D}_{\alpha}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n) \right]. \tag{136}$$

By the assumption of $(\{\varphi_i\}_{i=1}^n, \Pi_n)$ and taking $\limsup_{n\to\infty}$ on both sides, we have

$$-\liminf_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log(1-\alpha_n) \geqslant \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} \left[r - \liminf_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \widetilde{D}_{\alpha}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n) \right]. \tag{137}$$

By the additivity of Sandwiched Rényi divergence under tensor product states and the definition of channel divergence, we have $\widetilde{D}_{\alpha}(\rho_n\|\sigma_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n \widetilde{D}_{\alpha}(\mathcal{N}(\varphi_i)\|\mathcal{M}(\varphi_i)) \leqslant n \widetilde{D}_{\alpha}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$. Thus

$$-\liminf_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log(1-\alpha_n) \geqslant \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} \left[r - \widetilde{D}_{\alpha}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) \right]. \tag{138}$$

Finally taking the infimum over all product strategies and the supremum over all $\alpha > 1$ on both sides, we can conclude the converse part.

We then proceed to show the achievable part. Let $\varphi \in \mathfrak{D}(RA)$ be an optimal quantum state such that $\widetilde{D}_{\alpha}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) = \widetilde{D}_{\alpha}(\mathcal{N}(\varphi)\|\mathcal{M}(\varphi))$. Consider the task of distinguishing quantum states $\mathcal{N}(\varphi)$ and $\mathcal{M}(\varphi)$. Suppose the optimal test in $\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{sc}}(r|\mathcal{N}(\varphi)\|\mathcal{M}(\varphi))$ is given by the sequence $\{\Pi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Then by the quantum converse Hoeffiding theorem (see (132)) we have

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \operatorname{Tr}[\mathcal{M}(\varphi)]^{\otimes n} \Pi_n \leqslant -r \qquad \text{and} \tag{139}$$

$$-\liminf_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \operatorname{Tr}[\mathcal{N}(\varphi)]^{\otimes n} \Pi_n = \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} \left[r - \widetilde{D}_{\alpha}(\mathcal{N}(\varphi)\|\mathcal{M}(\varphi)) \right]. \tag{140}$$

Note that $(\{\varphi\}_{i=1}^n, \Pi_n)$ is a product stategy for the task of channel discrimination between $\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{PRO}}^{\mathrm{sc}}(r|\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) &\leqslant -\liminf_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log \mathrm{Tr}\,\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}(\varphi^{\otimes n})\Pi_n && (141)\\ &= \sup_{\alpha>1}\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[r-\widetilde{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}(\varphi)\|\mathcal{M}(\varphi))\right] && (142)\\ &= \sup_{\alpha>1}\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[r-\widetilde{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})\right] && (143)\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from (140), the second equality follows from the optimality assumption of φ. This completes the proof. ■

Note here that one can extend the input choices of product strategy to convex combination of tensor product states $\sum_{j=1}^m p_j(\otimes_{i=1}^n \varphi_{i,j})$. In this case Theorem 27 still holds by adding an additional step in the proof of the converse part and using the joint quasi-convexity of the Sandwiched Rényi divergence (e.g. [MO15, Corollary 3.16]). This indicates that shared randomness between the input states for each use of the channel will provide no advantage in reducing the convergence rate of the Type I error.

Also note that the strong converse exponents under coherent and sequential strategies have been settled in [FF21, Theorem 5.5]. However, in terms of the exact threshold for the exponential convergence, their result only implies the threshold to be $\inf_{\alpha>1}\widetilde{D}^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$. Our continuity result in Theorem 20 helps to completely determine this threshold to be $D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$, contributing to a better understanding of the strong converse regime of channel discrimination.

5.3 Error exponent

In the task of state discrimination, the error exponent is defined by

$$\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{er}}(r|\rho\|\sigma) := \sup_{\{\Pi_n\}}\left\{-\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log \mathrm{Tr}[(I-\Pi_n)\rho^{\otimes n}] : \limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log \mathrm{Tr}[\Pi_n\sigma^{\otimes n}] \leqslant -r\right\}, \quad (144)$$

where the supremum is taken over all possible sequences of quantum tests $\{\Pi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying the condition. It has been shown in [Hay07, Nag06, ANSV08b] that the error exponent is precisely given by:

$$\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{er}}(r|\rho\|\sigma) = \sup_{0<\alpha<1}\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[r-\overline{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma)\right]. \quad (145)$$

We aim to extend this result to the channel case.

Definition 28 (Error exponent) *Let $\mathcal{N},\mathcal{M}\in\mathrm{CPTP}(A\to B)$ and $r>0$. The error exponent of quantum channel discrimination by the strategy class $\Omega\in\{\mathrm{PRO},\mathrm{COH},\mathrm{SEQ}\}$ is defined by*

$$\mathrm{E}_{\Omega}^{\mathrm{er}}(r|\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) := \sup_{(S_n,\Pi_n)\in\Omega}\left\{-\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\alpha_n(S_n,\Pi_n) : \limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\beta_n(S_n,\Pi_n)\leqslant -r\right\}, \quad (146)$$

where the supremum is taken over all possible strategies $(S_n,\Pi_n)\in\Omega$ satisfying the condition.

Theorem 29 *Let $\mathcal{N},\mathcal{M}\in\mathrm{CPTP}(A\to B)$ and $r>0$. Then it holds*

$$\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{PRO}}^{\mathrm{er}}(r|\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) \geqslant \sup_{0<\alpha<1}\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[r-\overline{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})\right]. \quad (147)$$

Proof Let $\varphi \in \mathfrak{D}(RA)$ an optimal input state such that $\overline{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) = \overline{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}(\varphi)\|\mathcal{M}(\varphi))$. Consider the task of distinguishing quantum states $\mathcal{N}(\varphi)$ and $\mathcal{M}(\varphi)$. Suppose the optimal test in $\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{er}}(r|\mathcal{N}(\varphi)\|\mathcal{M}(\varphi))$ is given by the sequence $\{\Pi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Then by the quantum Hoeffding theorem (145) we have

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathrm{Tr}[\mathcal{M}(\varphi)]^{\otimes n}\Pi_n \leqslant -r \qquad \text{and} \tag{148}$$

$$-\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log(1-\mathrm{Tr}[\mathcal{N}(\varphi)]^{\otimes n}\Pi_n) = \sup_{0<\alpha<1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[r - \overline{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}(\varphi)\|\mathcal{M}(\varphi))\right]. \tag{149}$$

Note that $(\{\varphi\}_{i=1}^n, \Pi_n)$ is a product strategy for the task of channel discrimination between $\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{er}}_{\mathrm{PRO}}(r|\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) &\geqslant -\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log(1-\mathrm{Tr}\,\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}(\varphi^{\otimes n})\Pi_n) && (150)\\
&= -\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log(1-\mathrm{Tr}[\mathcal{N}(\varphi)]^{\otimes n}\Pi_n) && (151)\\
&= \sup_{0<\alpha<1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[r - \overline{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}(\varphi)\|\mathcal{M}(\varphi))\right] && (152)\\
&= \sup_{0<\alpha<1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[r - \overline{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})\right] && (153)
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from (149), the third equality follows from the optimality assumption of φ. This completes the proof. ■

Theorem 30 *Let $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B)$ and $r > 0$. Then it holds*

$$\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{er}}_{\mathrm{COH}}(r|\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) \geqslant \sup_{0<\alpha<1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[r - \overline{D}^{\mathrm{reg}}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})\right]. \tag{154}$$

Proof For any given $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\psi_m \in \mathfrak{D}(RA^m)$ an optimal input state such that $\overline{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes m}\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes m}) = \overline{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes m}(\psi_m)\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes m}(\psi_m))$. Denote $\rho_m := \mathcal{N}^{\otimes m}(\psi_m)$ and $\sigma_m := \mathcal{M}^{\otimes m}(\psi_m)$. Consider the task of distinguishing quantum states ρ_m and σ_m. Suppose the optimal test in $\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{er}}(r|\rho_m\|\sigma_m)$ is given by the sequence $\{\Pi_{m,n}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Then by the quantum Hoeffding theorem (see (145)) we have

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathrm{Tr}[\sigma_m]^{\otimes n}\Pi_{m,n} \leqslant -r \qquad \text{and} \tag{155}$$

$$-\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log(1-\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_m]^{\otimes n}\Pi_{m,n}) = \sup_{0<\alpha<1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[r - \overline{D}_\alpha(\rho_m\|\sigma_m)\right]. \tag{156}$$

Note that $(\psi_m^{\otimes n}, \Pi_{m,n})$ is a coherent strategy for the task of channel discrimination between $\mathcal{N}^{\otimes mn}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{\otimes mn}$, satisfying

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{mn} \log \mathrm{Tr}\,\mathcal{M}^{\otimes mn}(\psi_m^{\otimes n})\Pi_{m,n} \leqslant -\frac{r}{m}. \tag{157}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{er}}_{\mathrm{COH}}\left(\frac{r}{m}\middle|\middle|\mathcal{N}\middle\|\mathcal{M}\right) &\geqslant -\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{mn} \log(1-\mathrm{Tr}\,\mathcal{N}^{\otimes mn}(\psi_m^{\otimes n})\Pi_{m,n}) && (158)\\
&= -\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{mn} \log(1-\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_m]^{\otimes n}\Pi_{m,n}) && (159)\\
&= \frac{1}{m}\sup_{0<\alpha<1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[r - \overline{D}_\alpha(\rho_m\|\sigma_m)\right] && (160)\\
&= \frac{1}{m}\sup_{0<\alpha<1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[r - \overline{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes m}\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes m})\right] && (161)\\
&= \sup_{0<\alpha<1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[\frac{r}{m} - \frac{1}{m}\overline{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes m}\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes m})\right], && (162)
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from (156), the third equality follows from the optimality assumption of ψ_m. Replacing r/m as r, we have

$$\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{COH}}^{\mathrm{er}}(r|\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) \geqslant \sup_{0<\alpha<1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[r - \frac{1}{m}\overline{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes m}\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes m})\right]. \tag{163}$$

Since (163) holds for any integer $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{COH}}^{\mathrm{er}}(r|\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) &\geqslant \sup_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\sup_{0<\alpha<1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[r - \frac{1}{m}\overline{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes m}\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes m})\right] && (164)\\
&= \sup_{0<\alpha<1}\sup_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[r - \frac{1}{m}\overline{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes m}\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes m})\right] && (165)\\
&= \sup_{0<\alpha<1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[r - \sup_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\frac{1}{m}\overline{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes m}\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes m})\right] && (166)\\
&= \sup_{0<\alpha<1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[r - \overline{D}_\alpha^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})\right]. && (167)
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. ■

6 Discussions

We prove a complete analog of Stein's lemma for quantum channels, particularly, the strong converse direction of channel hypothesis testing under coherent strategies. This directly leads to the establishment of strong asymptotic equipartition property for equivalent channel divergences such as the max-relative entropy and variants of information spectrum relative entropies. Together with the known results on the strong converse exponent of channel discrimination, we prove the continuity of the regularized (amortized) Sandwiched Rényi channel divergence, completing our understanding on the threshold of strong converse in channel discrimination. We also give a systematic study on the interplay between the strategies of channel discrimination, the operational regimes, and variants of channel divergences, contributing to a better understanding of the task of channel discrimination as well as the operational meaning of different channel divergences. As quantum channel discrimination is strongly connected to many other fundamental tasks in quantum information theory, we expect plentiful applications of our framework to be found.

Some results in this paper rely on the technical assumption that the channel is positive definite. Despite that this condition is generically satisfied, we expect to remove this assumption, hopefully by a continuity argument, in a future study. Actually, we can replace the assumption of $\mathcal{N} > 0$ to a weaker one that $t\mathcal{N} \geqslant \mathcal{R}_\tau$ for some $t > 0$ and non-pure state τ. Then all the results still hold without further modification. Note that the approach to defining a channel divergence is not unique. In Appendix B we provide another definition of the channel max-relative entropy, which would be useful in the task of channel simulation. However, its asymptotic equipartition property is still open and Appendix B provides partial progress on this. Other interesting directions include exploring the second-order expansions of the channel divergences and also completing the remaining part of Table 2 by solving the error exponents of channel discrimination.

Acknowledgements. The authors thank the organization of the 23rd Annual Conference on Quantum Information Processing (QIP 2020), held in Shenzhen, China during January 2020, at which this work was initiated. GG would like to acknowledge support from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC).

References

[ANSV08a] Koenraad M R Audenaert, Michael Nussbaum, Arleta Szkoła, and Frank Verstraete. Asymptotic error rates in quantum hypothesis testing. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 279(1):251–283, 2008.

[ANSV08b] Koenraad MR Audenaert, Michael Nussbaum, Arleta Szkoła, and Frank Verstraete. Asymptotic error rates in quantum hypothesis testing. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 279(1):251–283, 2008.

[BAB+18] Daniel Braun, Gerardo Adesso, Fabio Benatti, Roberto Floreanini, Ugo Marzolino, Morgan W Mitchell, and Stefano Pirandola. Quantum-enhanced measurements without entanglement. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 90(3):35006, 2018.

[BG17] Francesco Buscemi and Gilad Gour. Quantum relative lorenz curves. *Physical Review A*, 95(1):012110, 2017.

[BHKW18] Mario Berta, Christoph Hirche, Eneet Kaur, and Mark M Wilde. Amortized channel divergence for asymptotic quantum channel discrimination. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.01498*, 2018.

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

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

[CDP08] Giulio Chiribella, Giacomo M. D'Ariano, and Paolo Perinotti. Memory Effects in Quantum Channel Discrimination. *Physical Review Letters*, 101(18):180501, oct 2008.

[CG19] Eric Chitambar and Gilad Gour. Quantum resource theories. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 91(2):025001, apr 2019.

[Che52] Herman 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] Tom Cooney, Milán Mosonyi, and Mark 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.

[Cov99] Thomas M Cover. *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 1999.

[Dat09] Nilanjana Datta. Min-and max-relative entropies and a new entanglement monotone. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 55(6):2816–2826, 2009.

[DFW+18] María García Díaz, Kun Fang, Xin Wang, Matteo Rosati, Michalis Skotiniotis, John Calsamiglia, and Andreas Winter. Using and reusing coherence to realize quantum processes. *Quantum*, 2:100, oct 2018.

[DKF+14] Frederic Dupuis, Lea Kraemer, Philippe Faist, Joseph M Renes, and Renato Renner. Generalized entropies. In *XVIIth International Congress on Mathematical Physics*, pages 134–153. World Scientific, 2014.

[DL14] Nilanjana Datta and Felix Leditzky. Second-order asymptotics for source coding, dense coding, and pure-state entanglement conversions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 61(1):582–608, 2014.

[DMHB13] Nilanjana Datta, Milan Mosonyi, Min-Hsiu Hsieh, and Fernando GSL Brandao. A smooth entropy approach to quantum hypothesis testing and the classical capacity of quantum channels. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 59(12):8014–8026, 2013.

[DRC17] Christian L Degen, F Reinhard, and Paola Cappellaro. Quantum sensing. *Reviews of modern physics*, 89(3):35002, 2017.

[DZ98] A. Dembo and O. Zeitouni. Large deviations techniques and applications. *Springer-Verlag*, 1998.

[FBB19] Philippe Faist, Mario Berta, and Fernando Brandão. Thermodynamic Capacity of Quantum Processes. *Physical Review Letters*, 122(20):200601, may 2019.

[FF21] Hamza Fawzi and Omar Fawzi. Defining quantum divergences via convex optimization. *Quantum*, 5:387, 2021.

[FFRS20] Kun Fang, Omar Fawzi, Renato Renner, and David Sutter. Chain rule for the quantum relative entropy. *Physical review letters*, 124(10):100501, 2020.

[FL20] Kun Fang and Zi-Wen Liu. No-go theorems for quantum resource purification: new approach and channel theory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11822*, 2020.

[FWTB20] Kun Fang, Xin Wang, Marco Tomamichel, and Mario Berta. Quantum Channel Simulation and the Channel's Smooth Max-Information. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 66(4):2129–2140, apr 2020.

[GW19] Gilad Gour and Andreas Winter. How to quantify a dynamical quantum resource. *Physical review letters*, 123(15):150401, 2019.

[Hay02] Masahito 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] Masahito Hayashi. Error exponent in asymmetric quantum hypothesis testing and its application to classical-quantum channel coding. *Physical Review A*, 76(6):062301, 2007.

[Hay09] Masahito Hayashi. Discrimination of Two Channels by Adaptive Methods and Its Application to Quantum System. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 55(8):3807–3820, aug 2009.

[HP91] Fumio Hiai and Dénes Petz. The proper formula for relative entropy and its asymptotics in quantum probability. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 143(1):99–114, 1991.

[LKDW18] Felix Leditzky, Eneet Kaur, Nilanjana Datta, and Mark M Wilde. Approaches for approximate additivity of the holevo information of quantum channels. *Physical Review A*, 97(1):012332, 2018.

[MLDS+13] Martin Müller-Lennert, Frédéric Dupuis, Oleg Szehr, Serge Fehr, and Marco Tomamichel. On quantum rényi entropies: A new generalization and some properties. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 54(12):122203, 2013.

[MO15] Milán Mosonyi and Tomohiro Ogawa. Quantum hypothesis testing and the operational interpretation of the quantum rényi relative entropies. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 334(3):1617–1648, 2015.

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

[NH07] H Nagaoka and M Hayashi. An Information-Spectrum Approach to Classical and Quantum Hypothesis Testing for Simple Hypotheses. 53(2):534–549, 2007.

[ON00] T Ogawa and H Nagaoka. Strong converse and Stein's lemma in quantum hypothesis testing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 46(7):2428–2433, 2000.

[PBG+18] Stefano Pirandola, B Roy Bardhan, Tobias Gehring, Christian Weedbrook, and Seth Lloyd. Advances in photonic quantum sensing. *Nature Photonics*, 12(12):724–733, 2018.

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

[PLLP19] Stefano Pirandola, Riccardo Laurenza, Cosmo Lupo, and Jason L Pereira. Fundamental limits to quantum channel discrimination. *npj Quantum Information*, 5(1):1–8, 2019.

[PW09] Marco Piani and John Watrous. All Entangled States are Useful for Channel Discrimination. *Physical Review Letters*, 102(25):250501, jun 2009.

[QWW18] Haoyu Qi, Qingle Wang, and Mark M Wilde. Applications of position-based coding to classical communication over quantum channels. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 51(44):444002, 2018.

[Ren05] Renato Renner. *Security of QKD*. PhD thesis, PhD thesis, ETH, 2005, quant-ph/0512258, 2005.

[RT21] Bartosz Regula and Ryuji Takagi. Fundamental limitations on distillation of quantum channel resources. *Nature Communications*, 12(1):1–12, 2021.

[SCG20] Gaurav Saxena, Eric Chitambar, and Gilad Gour. Dynamical resource theory of quantum coherence. *Physical Review Research*, 2(2):23298, 2020.

[TH13] Marco Tomamichel and Masahito Hayashi. A hierarchy of information quantities for finite block length analysis of quantum tasks. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 59(11):7693–7710, 2013.

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

[WBHK20] Mark M. Wilde, Mario Berta, Christoph Hirche, and Eneet Kaur. Amortized channel divergence for asymptotic quantum channel discrimination. *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 110(8):2277–2336, aug 2020.

[WFD19] Xin Wang, Kun Fang, and Runyao Duan. Semidefinite Programming Converse Bounds for Quantum Communication. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 65(4):2583–2592, apr 2019.

[WFT19] Xin Wang, Kun Fang, and Marco Tomamichel. On Converse Bounds for Classical Communication Over Quantum Channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 65(7):4609–4619, jul 2019.

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

[WR12] Ligong Wang and Renato Renner. One-Shot Classical-Quantum Capacity and Hypothesis Testing. *Physical Review Letters*, 108(20):200501, may 2012.

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

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

[WWS19] Xin Wang, Mark M Wilde, and Yuan Su. Quantifying the magic of quantum channels. *New Journal of Physics*, 21(10):103002, oct 2019.

[WWY14] Mark M Wilde, Andreas Winter, and Dong Yang. Strong converse for the classical capacity of entanglement-breaking and hadamard channels via a sandwiched rényi relative entropy. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 331(2):593–622, 2014.

[YF17] Haidong Yuan and Chi-Hang Fred Fung. Fidelity and Fisher information on quantum channels. *New Journal of Physics*, 19(11):113039, 2017.

A Technical Lemmas

Lemma 31 *For any two matrices $M, N \in \mathrm{Herm}(A)$ we have*

$$\mathrm{Tr}(M-N)_+ \leqslant \mathrm{Tr}\, M_+ + \mathrm{Tr}\, N_+ - \mathrm{Tr}\, N\ . \tag{168}$$

Proof Observe that $\mathrm{Tr}(X)_+ = (\|X\|_1 + \mathrm{Tr}\, X)/2$. Then it holds

$$\mathrm{Tr}(M-N)_+ = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}(M-N) + \frac{1}{2}\|M-N\|_1 \leqslant \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}(M-N) + \frac{1}{2}\|M\|_1 + \frac{1}{2}\|N\|_1\ . \tag{169}$$

By using the observation again to the r.h.s., we have the asserted result. ■

Recall that the hypothesis testing relative entropy can be lower bounded by the Petz Rényi divergence [QWW18, Proposition 3],

$$D_H^\varepsilon(\rho\|\sigma) \geqslant \overline{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) - \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}\log\frac{1}{\varepsilon}. \tag{170}$$

Here we provide a tighter lower bound with a simple proof. This result can be of independent interest.

Lemma 32 *Let $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and $\rho, \sigma \in \mathfrak{D}(A)$. For all $\alpha \in (0,1)$,*

$$D_H^\varepsilon(\rho\|\sigma) \geqslant \overline{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) + \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}\left(\frac{h(\alpha)}{\alpha} - \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\right)\ , \tag{171}$$

where $h(\alpha) = -\alpha\log\alpha - (1-\alpha)\log(1-\alpha)$ is the binary entropy.

Proof Let $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and recall that

$$2^{-D_H^\varepsilon(\rho\|\sigma)} = \max_{t\geqslant 0}\left\{t(1-\varepsilon) - \mathrm{Tr}(t\rho-\sigma)_+\right\}\ . \tag{172}$$

To bound the term $\mathrm{Tr}(t\rho-\sigma)_+$ we use the quantum weighted geometric-mean inequality; i.e. for any two positive semidefinite matrices M, N and any $\alpha \in [0,1]$

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\left[M+N-\left|M-N\right|\right] \leqslant \mathrm{Tr}\left[M^\alpha N^{1-\alpha}\right]\ . \tag{173}$$

Since the term $|M-N|$ can be expressed as $|M-N| = 2(M-N)_+ - (M-N)$, the above inequality is equivalent to

$$\mathrm{Tr}(M-N)_+ \geqslant \mathrm{Tr}[M] - \mathrm{Tr}\left[M^\alpha N^{1-\alpha}\right] \tag{174}$$

Taking $M = t\rho$ and $N = \sigma$ we have

$$\mathrm{Tr}(t\rho-\sigma)_+ \geqslant t - t^\alpha\,\mathrm{Tr}\left[\rho^\alpha\sigma^{1-\alpha}\right] = t - t^\alpha 2^{(\alpha-1)\overline{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma)}\ . \tag{175}$$

Substituting this into (172) gives

$$2^{-D_H^\varepsilon(\rho\|\sigma)} = \max_{t\geqslant 0}\left\{t(1-\varepsilon) - \mathrm{Tr}(t\rho-\sigma)_+\right\} \leqslant \max_{t\geqslant 0}\left\{-t\varepsilon + t^\alpha 2^{(\alpha-1)D_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma)}\right\}\ . \tag{176}$$

It is straightforward to check that for fixed $\alpha, \rho, \sigma, \varepsilon$, the function $t \mapsto -t\varepsilon + t^\alpha 2^{(\alpha-1)\overline{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma)}$ obtains its maximal value at

$$t = \left(\frac{\alpha}{\varepsilon}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} 2^{-\overline{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma)}\ . \tag{177}$$

Substituting this value into the optimization in (176) gives

$$2^{-D_H^\varepsilon(\rho\|\sigma)} \leqslant (1-\alpha)\left(\frac{\alpha}{\varepsilon}\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} 2^{-D_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma)}\ . \tag{178}$$

By taking $-\log$ on both sides we get (171). This concludes the proof. ■

In the following we prove several properties of channel divergences that will be frequently used.

Lemma 33 *Let $\boldsymbol{D}$ be a quantum divergence for states. Let $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B)$. If $\boldsymbol{D}$ is superadditive under tensor product of states, then*

$$\boldsymbol{D}^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) \geqslant \frac{1}{n}\boldsymbol{D}\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right), \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{179}$$

Proof Denote $a_n \coloneqq \frac{1}{n}\boldsymbol{D}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n})$ and observe that

$$a_{2n} = \frac{1}{2n}\boldsymbol{D}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes 2n}\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes 2n}) \geqslant \frac{1}{2n}(\boldsymbol{D}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}) + \boldsymbol{D}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n})) = a_n\ , \tag{180}$$

where the inequality follows by the superadditivity of the channel divergence $\boldsymbol{D}$ (directly follows from the superadditivity for states). Hence, since $a_{2n} \geqslant a_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we also have $a_{4n} \geqslant a_{2n} \geqslant a_n$, and more generally, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $a_{n2^k} \geqslant a_n$. By taking $k \to \infty$ and using the fact that the limit of $\{a_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ exists, the assertion follows. ∎

A desirable property of quantum divergence is the additivity, which holds for most of the divergences between states (e.g. Umegaki, Petz, Sandwiched). However, such a property does not trivially extend to the channel divergences (see e.g [FFRS20]). Nevertheless, the next lemma shows that the additivity of amortized channel divergence follows from the additivity of the associated state divergence.

Lemma 34 *Let $\boldsymbol{D}$ be a quantum divergence for states. Let $\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{M}_1 \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A_1 \to B_1)$ and $\mathcal{N}_2, \mathcal{M}_2 \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A_2 \to B_2)$. If $\boldsymbol{D}$ is additive under tensor product of states, then*

$$\boldsymbol{D}^A(\mathcal{N}_1 \otimes \mathcal{N}_2\|\mathcal{M}_1 \otimes \mathcal{M}_2) = \boldsymbol{D}^A(\mathcal{N}_1\|\mathcal{M}_1) + \boldsymbol{D}^A(\mathcal{M}_1\|\mathcal{M}_2). \tag{181}$$

Proof For any quantum state $\psi, \varphi \in \mathfrak{D}(RA_1A_2)$, it holds

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{D}(\mathcal{N}_1 \otimes \mathcal{N}_2(\psi)\|\mathcal{M}_1 \otimes \mathcal{M}_2(\varphi)) &\leqslant \boldsymbol{D}^A(\mathcal{N}_1\|\mathcal{M}_1) + \boldsymbol{D}(\mathcal{N}_2(\psi)\|\mathcal{M}_2(\varphi)) &(182)\\ &\leqslant \boldsymbol{D}^A(\mathcal{N}_1\|\mathcal{M}_1) + \boldsymbol{D}^A(\mathcal{N}_2\|\mathcal{M}_2) + \boldsymbol{D}(\psi\|\varphi), &(183)\end{aligned}$$

where the two inequalities follow by using the definition of the amortized channel divergence twice. Then move $\boldsymbol{D}(\psi\|\varphi)$ to the l.h.s. and supremum over all input states ψ, φ, we have one direction of the stated result. On the other hand, for any input states $\rho_1, \sigma_1 \in \mathfrak{D}(R_1A_1)$ and $\rho_2, \sigma_2 \in \mathfrak{D}(R_2A_2)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\boldsymbol{D}^A(\mathcal{N}_1 \otimes \mathcal{N}_2\|\mathcal{M}_1 \otimes \mathcal{M}_2) &(184)\\ &\geqslant \sup_{\rho_1,\rho_2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}\left[\boldsymbol{D}(\mathcal{N}_1 \otimes \mathcal{N}_2(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2)\|\mathcal{M}_1 \otimes \mathcal{M}_2(\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2)) - \boldsymbol{D}(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2\|\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2)\right] &(185)\\ &= \sup_{\rho_1,\rho_2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}\left[\boldsymbol{D}(\mathcal{N}_1(\rho_1)\|\mathcal{M}_1(\sigma_1) - \boldsymbol{D}(\rho_1\|\sigma_1)\right] + \left[\boldsymbol{D}(\mathcal{N}_2(\rho_2)\|\mathcal{M}_2(\sigma_2) - \boldsymbol{D}(\rho_2\|\sigma_2)\right] &(186)\\ &= \sup_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}\left[\boldsymbol{D}(\mathcal{N}_1(\rho_1)\|\mathcal{M}_1(\sigma_1) - \boldsymbol{D}(\rho_1\|\sigma_1)\right] + \sup_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}\left[\boldsymbol{D}(\mathcal{N}_2(\rho_2)\|\mathcal{M}_2(\sigma_2) - \boldsymbol{D}(\rho_2\|\sigma_2)\right] &(187)\\ &= \boldsymbol{D}^A(\mathcal{N}_1\|\mathcal{M}_1) + \boldsymbol{D}^A(\mathcal{N}_2\|\mathcal{M}_2), &(188)\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows as tensor product states are particular choices of input states for $\boldsymbol{D}^A(\mathcal{N}_1 \otimes \mathcal{N}_2\|\mathcal{M}_1 \otimes \mathcal{M}_2)$, the first equality follows by the additivity assumption of $\boldsymbol{D}$. ∎

By the chain rules of Umegaki relative entropy [FFRS20] and Sandwiched Rényi divergence [FF21], we know from Lemma 34 that D^{reg} and $\widetilde{D}_\alpha^{\mathrm{reg}}$ ($\alpha > 1$) are also additive under tensor product of channels. The additivity of these divergences can be hard to prove solely from their definitions.

The above result directly leads to the following order of relation:

Lemma 35 *Let $\boldsymbol{D}$ be a quantum divergence for states. Let $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B)$. If $\boldsymbol{D}$ is superadditive under tensor product of states, then*

$$\boldsymbol{D}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) \leqslant \boldsymbol{D}^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) \leqslant \boldsymbol{D}^A(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}). \tag{189}$$

Proof The first inequality follows from Lemma 33 by choosing $n = 1$. We also have that

$$\frac{1}{n}\boldsymbol{D}(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}) \leqslant \frac{1}{n}\boldsymbol{D}^A(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}) \leqslant \boldsymbol{D}^A(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) \tag{190}$$

where the first inequality follows by definition and the second inequality follows from (183). Taking $n \to \infty$, we have $\boldsymbol{D}^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) \leqslant \boldsymbol{D}^A(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M})$. ∎

B Towards the AEP of Max-relative Entropy under Channel Smoothing

For any $\mathcal{N} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B)$, let

$$\mathfrak{B}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{cptp}}(\mathcal{N}) := \left\{ \mathcal{N}' \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B) \ : \ \frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathcal{N}' - \mathcal{N} \right\|_{\diamond} \leqslant \varepsilon \right\} \tag{191}$$

$$\mathfrak{B}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{cp}}(\mathcal{N}) := \left\{ \mathcal{N}' \in \mathrm{CP}(A \to B) \ : \ \frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathcal{N}' - \mathcal{N} \right\|_{\diamond} \leqslant \varepsilon \right\} . \tag{192}$$

Note that the second "Ball" of channels contains trace increasing channels. We define

$$\begin{aligned} D^{\varepsilon,\diamond,\mathrm{cptp}}_{\max}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) &:= \inf_{\mathcal{N}' \in \mathfrak{B}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{cptp}}(\mathcal{N})} D_{\max}\left(\mathcal{N}'\middle\|\mathcal{M}\right), \\ D^{\varepsilon,\diamond,\mathrm{cp}}_{\max}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) &:= \inf_{\mathcal{N}' \in \mathfrak{B}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{cp}}(\mathcal{N})} D_{\max}\left(\mathcal{N}'\middle\|\mathcal{M}\right) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{193}$$

where $D_{\max}\left(\mathcal{N}\middle\|\mathcal{M}\right) := D_{\max}(J_{\mathcal{N}}\|J_{\mathcal{M}})$. Recall also the definitions

$$D^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) := \sup_{\psi \in \mathfrak{D}(RA)} D^{\varepsilon}_{\max}\left(\mathcal{N}^{A\to B}(\psi^{RA})\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{A\to B}(\psi^{RA})\right). \tag{194}$$

It is easy to see from the definitions that

$$D^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) \leqslant D^{\varepsilon,\diamond,\mathrm{cptp}}_{\max}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) \quad \text{and} \quad D^{\varepsilon,\diamond,\mathrm{cp}}_{\max}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) \leqslant D^{\varepsilon,\diamond,\mathrm{cptp}}_{\max}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) \ . \tag{195}$$

Lemma 36 *Let $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. Then,*

$$D^{\varepsilon,\diamond,cp}_{\max}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) \geqslant D^{2\varepsilon}_{\max}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) + \log(1-2\varepsilon). \tag{196}$$

Proof Let $\psi \in \mathfrak{D}(RA)$ be such that $D^{2\varepsilon}_{\max}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) = D^{2\varepsilon}_{\max}\left(\mathcal{N}(\psi)\|\mathcal{M}(\psi)\right)$. Set $\rho := \mathcal{N}(\psi)$, $\sigma := \mathcal{M}(\psi)$. Let $\mathcal{N}' \in \mathrm{CP}(A \to B)$ be such that $D^{\varepsilon,\diamond,\mathrm{cp}}_{\max}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) = D_{\max}\left(\mathcal{N}'\|\mathcal{M}\right)$. Denote $\omega := \mathcal{N}'(\psi)$, $\tilde{\omega} := \omega / \operatorname{Tr}[\omega]$ and $s := \operatorname{Tr}[\omega]$. Then,

$$D^{\varepsilon,\diamond,\mathrm{cp}}_{\max}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) = D_{\max}\left(\mathcal{N}'\|\mathcal{M}\right) = D_{\max}\left(\omega\|\sigma\right) = D_{\max}\left(\tilde{\omega}\|\sigma\right) + \log s. \tag{197}$$

Observe that since $\frac{1}{2}\left\|\mathcal{N}' - \mathcal{N}\right\|_{\diamond} \leqslant \varepsilon$ we have in particular

$$\frac{1}{2}\left\|s\tilde{\omega} - \rho\right\|_1 \leqslant \varepsilon \ . \tag{198}$$

By the data processing of trace norm, the above inequality also implies that $\frac{1}{2}|s-1| \leqslant \varepsilon$. Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{2}\left\|\tilde{\omega} - \rho\right\|_1 \leqslant \frac{1}{2}\left\|\tilde{\omega} - s\tilde{\omega}\right\|_1 + \frac{1}{2}\left\|s\tilde{\omega} - \rho\right\|_1 \leqslant 2\varepsilon \ . \tag{199}$$

This implies

$$D_{\max}\left(\tilde{\omega}\middle\|\sigma\right) \geqslant D^{2\varepsilon}_{\max}\left(\rho\|\sigma\right) = D^{2\varepsilon}_{\max}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}). \tag{200}$$

Continuing with (197), we get that

$$D^{\varepsilon,\diamond,\mathrm{cp}}_{\max}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) \geqslant D_{\max}\left(\tilde{\omega}\middle\|\sigma\right) + \log\left(1-2\varepsilon\right) \geqslant D^{2\varepsilon}_{\max}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) + \log\left(1-2\varepsilon\right) \ . \tag{201}$$

This completes the proof. ■

Combining Lemma 36 and Theorem 18, we get

Lemma 37 *Let $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} \in \mathrm{CPTP}(A \to B)$ with $\mathcal{N} > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. Then,*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} D^{\varepsilon,\diamond,cp}_{\max}\left(\mathcal{N}^{\otimes n}\middle\|\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}\right) \geqslant D^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathcal{N}\|\mathcal{M}) \ . \tag{202}$$

The other direction of this result remains an open question.